BAYLE's

DICTIONARY.

Volume the Fourth.

P—Z

BRIT [illegible]

AN

Hiſtorical *and* Critical DICTIONARY.

BY

MONSIEUR *BAYLE*.

Tranſlated into Engliſh, *with many* ADDITIONS *and* CORRECTIONS, *made by the Author himſelf, that are not in the* French *Editions.*

VOLUME *the* FOURTH.

P—Z.

M. Vr Gucht Sculp.

LONDON:

Printed for *C. Harper*, *D. Brown*, *J. Tonſon*, *A.* and *J. Churchill*,
T. Horne, *T. Goodwin*, *R. Knaplock*, *J. Taylor*, *A. Bell*, *B. Tooke*,
D. Midwinter, *B. Lintott* and *W. Lewis*. MDCCX.

BRITISH MUSEUM

P.

PACHECO (*Alvarez*) a *Spaniſh* Colonel and Kinſman[*] of the Duke of *Alba*, ſerv'd under him in the *Low-Countries*, and was ſent to *Fluſhing*, to be Commander of the Place, and alſo to haſten the building of a Citadel there in 1572: But before he Landed there had been an Inſurrection in the City, and the *Spaniſh* Garriſon was driven from thence. He was then in a maze, and found himſelf in the Power of the Enemies, who cauſed him to be Hang'd, without any regard to his Petition, that he ſhou'd be Beheaded upon the account of his Nobility, ſince they were not willing to ſave his Life for the Price he offer'd for it. *Treſlon* being angry [†] with the Duke of *Alba*, wou'd abate nothing of the Sentence, but *Pacheco* muſt take his turn at the Gallows with two other *Spaniards*. *Meurſius* relates this Matter at large; but he has confounded this *Pacheco* with a famous [β] Ingineer whom the Duke of *Alba* had brought from *Italy*, who was call'd *Paciotti*; he ſuppoſes that he who was Hang'd was call'd *Paciottus*. Mr. *du Maurier* obſerves ſome other (*A*) Miſtakes concerning our *Spaniard*, who probably was of the Family of the Cardinals *Pacheco*, mention'd by *Moreri*.

PADILLA (*Mary de*) Miſtreſs to *Peter* the cruel King of *Caſtile*, was educated at the Houſe of *Alfonſus d' Albuquerque*, when that Monarch fell in Love with her, during the Expedition of *Aſturia*. One of the King's Brothers took up Arms in that Country; and this Rebellion being ſupported by another Brother in *Arragon*, might have been of a miſchievous Conſequence; wherefore the Court thought it neceſſary to put a ſtop to it very quickly, and the King march'd in Perſon with an Army towards *Aſturia* [γ]. The Wife of *Dom Alfonſus d' Albuquerque* was in this Journey; and *Mary de Padilla*, one of the Maids ſhe had in her Service, was there alſo, who, by her Beauty, ſmote the cruel Heart of the Monarch. She did not make him Sigh long for her, for they lay together [δ] during that Journey. *John de Hiniſtroſa* Uncle, by the Mother's ſide, to the Maid, ſerv'd them [ζ] as a Procurer and Confident: This was done in the Year 1352. The Prince was already Contracted to *Blanche* of *Bourbon* [η] the Daughter of *Peter* the Firſt of that Name, Duke of *Bourbon*, and Siſter to the [θ] Daughter-in-Law of the King of *France*; but altho' (*A*) the Perſon, to whom he was Contracted, was as Beautiful as his Miſtreſs, and of a Houſe infinitely more Illuſtrious, yet he made no great haſte to conſummate the Marriage; neither did he take it well of *Albuquerque* [ι] that he ſhould preſs hard upon this Point: *Albuquerque*, I ſay, who was afraid leſt the Kindred of *Padilla* ſhould be promoted to the higheſt degrees of Favour. At laſt, the Marriage was celebrated

[*] *Strada Dec.*1. *l.*7. *ad ann.* 1572.

[†] *Becauſe the Duke had put this* Treſlon's *Brother to Death in* 1568.

[β] Se maxime Albanum lædere exiſtimabat, ſi munitionum artificem tam inſignem, belli egregium miniſtrum & propinquo ſanguinis nexu, tempore tam alieno eriperet. *Meurſ. Guill. Auriac. l.*5.

[γ] Mariana *ubi infra.*

[δ] Eo in itinere Regis animus Mariæ Padillæ quæ in Albuquerquii familia educabatur, eximia pulchritudine captus, cum ea ad S. Facundi oppidum ſtupri conſuetudinem habere cœpit, ſponſæ immemor, noviſque amoribus amens. *Mariana, de rebus Hiſpaniæ l.*16. *c.*17. *p.m.* 80. *ad ann.* 1352.

[ζ] Internuncius, pravæque conſuetudinis conciliator. *Id. ibid.*

[η] *Father* Anſelm, *Hiſt. Geneal. p.* 260.

[θ] *She had married the Son of* K. John, *who was* Charles V.

[ι] *Id. ib. c.*17. *p.*81.

(*A*) *Some other Miſtakes.*] Thus he expreſſes himſelf: (*a*) "As to this *Pacheco*, I cannot ſufficiently "admire the diverſity of Opinions which I have "obſerv'd among the moſt famous Hiſtorians, who "have written of the Affairs of the *Low-Countries*; "for *Grotius* ſays, that he was a *Savoyard*, altho' "*Bentivoglio*, *Strada*, *Meurſius*, and *Emanuel de Meteren* agree, that he was a *Spaniard*. Cardinal "*Bentivoglio* ſays, That he was Beheaded; and others write, That he was Hang'd. Again, *Meurſius* calls this executed Kinſman of the Duke of "*Alba*, *Paciotti*, altho' all the others call him *Pacheco*, confounding this *Pacheco* and *Francis* "*Paciotti* of *Urbino*, Count of *Montefabro*, who was "ſo skilful in Fortifications and warlike Engines, "(*b*) that having built the Citadel of *Antwerp*, his "Name was given to one of the five Baſtions of the "Fortreſs, by order of the Duke of *Alba*, that the "Name of ſo great a Man might be perpetuated "to Poſterity. The four other Baſtions were call'd "the *Duke*, *Ferdinand*, *Toledo*, and *Alba*, being the "ſeveral Names of this Duke, without calling any "of them by the Name of King *Philip* his Maſter. "In fine, To return to this *Pacheco*, *Emanuel de* "*Meteren*, altho' he be a very exact Hiſtorian, calls "him *Peter Pacheco*, whom *Famianus Strada*, being "better inform'd, calls *Alvarez*. Properly ſpeaking, *Grotius* cannot be rank'd among the Hiſtorians who ſay that *Pacheco* was Hang'd. *Secuti Hollandiæ oppidum*, ſays he, (*c*) *Fliſſingani quos ſurgentis arcis aſpectus & præſidium adventans commoverat*; *Pacieco Allobroge, operum Albanicorum peritiſſimo curatore ad ſupplicium rapto, in cauſam deſcendunt.* Perhaps he call'd him *Savoyard*, becauſe he had read, that the Duke of *Alba* had obtain'd him of the Duke of *Savoy*. (*d*) *Impetraverat à Duce Sabaudiæ Franciſcum Paciottum Urbinatem, Montiſfabri Comitem, arcium bellicarumque machinarum peritiſſimum.* *Thuanus* furniſhes us with a new Variation, for he ſays, (*e*) that *Peter Paciottus* was kill'd in a popular Commotion, and that his Head was firſt fix'd on the top of a Spear, and afterwards upon the Walls of the City. Who knows but he thought that it was the ſame Ingineer, whom he had nam'd (*f*) *Paciottus Allobrox*, ſpeaking of the Citadel of *Antwerp*? He informs us, That this *Paciottus* had built, a little before, the Citadel of *Turin*, by the Order of Duke *Emanuel Philibert*. From hence, perhaps, *Grotius* took the word *Allobrox*, which no ways agrees with this famous Ingineer, for he was of *Urbino*. Another Hiſtorian (*g*) gives the Name of *Iſidorus Paciottus* to him who built the Citadel of *Antwerp*; and remarks, that he left two Sons behind him, who were excellent Ingineers; one, nam'd *Vido Ubaldus*, was kill'd at the taking of *Calais* in 1556. the other nam'd *Frederick* (*h*) was in *Amiens* the next Year, when the *French* retook that Town.

(*A*) *Altho' the Perſon, to whom he was contracted, was as beautiful and of a birth.*] The words of *Mariana* are theſe: (*i*) *Vix Caſtellæ Rex nuptiarum celebritate peracta, novam nuptam faſtidivit, in Padillæ amorem effuſus, ſi regiæ ſtirpi compararetur, ignobilis, neque majori formæ pulchritudine. Tanti plerumque eſt præpoſtera animum libidini mancipari.* He ſays elſewhere, (*k*) that ſhe was very Beautiful, very Honeſt, and that the Ambaſſadors of the King made choice of her among the ſix Daughters of the Duke of *Bourbon*, as moſt worthy to be his Spouſe: (*l*) *E ſex quas habebat, eam expetituri quam regio toro idoneam fore maximè judicarent. Blanca concedente patre delecta.* Note, That this Duke of *Bourbon* had ſeven Daughters, but ſince the eldeſt (*m*) was already married, we muſt not blame *Mariana* for mentioning only ſix: Neither muſt we cavil, becauſe the other Siſters of *Blanche* were not all old enough to be

(*a*) Du Maurier's *Memoirs*, *pag.* 48.

(*b*) Du Maurier *took this from* Strada, *Decad.* 1. *l.* 7.

(*c*) *Annal. lib.*2. *p.*50. *edit. in* 12. *Ann.*1658.

(*d*) Strada *dec.*1. *l.*6.

(*e*) Petro Pacioto quem Albanus arci exſtruendæ præfecerat, in tumultu occiſo, cujus caput conto præfixum & pro mœnibus ſtatutum eſt. *Thua. l.*54.

(*f*) *Thuan. l.*41.

(*g*) Angelus Galuccius de bello Belg. *part* 1. *l.* 8. Thuan *l.*116. *p.*747. *calls him alſo* Iſidorus.

(*h*) Galluc. *ib. l.* 9.

(*i*) Mariana de rebus Hiſpaniæ, *l.* 16. *c.*18. *init. p.m.* 81.

(*k*) Lectiſſima forma, ſanctiſſimis moribus, prudentiaque. *Id. ibid. l.*17. *c.* 4. *p.*100.

(*l*) *Id. ib. l.*16. *c.* 17. *p.*79.

(*m*) *She was married in* 1337, *to* Charles *of* France, *who was King* Charles *the Fifth.* *See* F. Anſelm's *Hiſt. Genealog. p.* 260.

brated in the beginning of *June* 1353, without any Pomp ‖: Some time before the Miſtreſs was brought to Bed of a Daughter ‡. The King quickly conceiv'd a very great diſtaſte of his Spouſe, for the very third Day after his Marriage, he made himſelf ready to run to his Miſtreſs, whom he had left in a Fortreſs on the Banks of the *Tagus*. The Queen his Mother, and the Princeſs *Eleonor* his Aunt being advertis'd of his Deſign, conjur'd him not to do ſo, and repreſented to him (*B*) the conſequences of this Conduct. He was no ways mov'd with their Prayers or their Reaſons; but only deny'd that he had form'd any ſuch Deſign, and then immediately went away with great Secrecy. Many Courtiers follow'd him, reſolving rather to humour his Paſſion, than to remonſtrate to him what he ought to do: Yet there were ſome who earneſtly perſuaded him to return to his Wife, and at laſt prevail'd with him to do it: But after he had ſpent two Days with her, he was carried back again to his Concubine, by the Power of his Paſſion *. Some thought that there was (*C*) Witchcraft in the caſe, others believ'd that he was jealous of his Spouſe, and that for this reaſon he could not endure her. Every Day he added new degrees to his unworthy Treatment of her, and at laſt † caus'd her to be Poyſon'd in 1361. All the World deplor'd the Fate of this Princeſs, thus taken out of the World at the Age of 25 Years γ. The Miſtreſs died a little after at *Sevil* π, and was Interr'd in a Monaſtery ‡ which ſhe had built: Her Funeral was ſolemniz'd thro' all the Kingdom, as if ſhe had been a lawful Queen, and her Children were educated (*D*) as preſumptive Heirs to the Crown ‡. She was ſo much in (*E*) favour that ſhe could do what ſhe pleas'd with the King. *Diego de Padilla* her Brother was

‖ *Id. ib.*
‡ *Id. ib. p.* 80.
* *Id. ib. cap.* 18.
† *Id. ib. l.* 17. *c.* 4.
γ *Id. ib.*
π *Id. ib. c.* 5.
‡ In Stadilli Monaſterio. *Id. ib.*
‡ *Id. ib.*

Marriageable (*n*), for this could never hinder the Ambaſſadors from preferring one of the youngeſt before all the reſt, if ſhe had appear'd to them better made and more beautiful.

(*B*) *And repreſented to him the conſequences of this Conduct.*] They told him, that he run the hazard of loſing not only his Reputation, but alſo all his Dominions; That the *French* would make War againſt him to revenge the Injury his Spouſe had receiv'd; That this would give occaſion to the *Caſtilians* to riſe up in Arms; and, That Men never fear to attack ſuch People whom they fancy to be abandon'd by Heaven upon account of the Crimes they have committed. This is only a rough Draught of the Thoughts of *Mariana*, and therefore I will now ſet them down in his own words: (*a*) *Regina mater, Eleonora amita regis conſilio indicato, cum remotis arbitris per omnia numina & quicquid in terris ſanctum eſt, ne ſe, regnum, fortunas, nominis exiſtimationem præcipiti temeritate perditum eat, profuſis lacrymis obteſtantur. Quid orbi ſermonem, Gallis arma injuriam non laturis, civibus diſſidiorum materiam daret! Ignorare videlicet integra probitatis fama humana imperia conſtare, quos deſtitui à numine, quibus infenſum cœlum eſſe, ſemel fuerit perſuaſum, in eos homines mala omnia quaſi facto agmine impetum dare.*

(*C*) *Some thought that there was Witchcraft in the caſe, others believed that he was Jealous.*] A Report was ſpread abroad, that *Don Pedro* was Bewitch'd, and that a Girdle poyſon'd by the Inchantment of a Jew, diſcover'd to this Monarch the Figure of a Dragon, (*b*) *Non amplius biduo apud eam* (Blancam) *ſubſtitit, tanto impudici amoris impatientia veſaniaque ut injectam carminibus amentiam fama vulgaverit: zona Judæi cujuſdam arte medicata draconis ſpecie regiis oculis objecta.* Some ſuſpected that the King had not entertain'd an Averſion for the Queen without a juſt Cauſe, ſince ſhe had been debauch'd by *Frederic*, *Dom Pedro*'s Brother, and had by him a Son, the Head of the Houſe of the *Henriques*. *Mariana* rejects theſe two Opinions, and looks upon (*c*) the ſecond as impudent and raſh (*d*): *Neutrum nobis veriſimile viſum eſt: ac credam potius ubi tetri amoris flamma pectori inſederit, non alia philtra amatoria quærenda neque alias offenſionis cauſas præpoſtere excogitandas, ut juvenis animus in furorem agi & de poteſtate mentis exiiſſe videretur.* He's in the right to ſay, That the Love this Monarch had conceiv'd for *Padilla*, was ſufficient to diſturb his Mind, and poſſeſs him with a hatred for his Spouſe. Such an Immorality as this is a fruitful Source from whence an hundred other diſorders may ariſe. I wonder that *Mariana* forgot what is ſaid of this Girdle. The King (*e*) *offer'd a thouſand Indignities to* Blanche, *by the Perſuaſion of a Lady whom he kept, call'd* Padilla, *who gave him to underſtand, That the Queen, out of ſpite to her, had caus'd a Jewiſh Inchanter to make a Girdle, adorn'd with Buttons of Gold to be given to him, which was ſo Inchanted, that as ſoon as he ſhould tie it about him, on a ſudden he ſhould loſe all his Strength and Underſtanding; and by this means ſhould fall under the Power of his Wife, who, for the future, ſhould govern him and all the Kingdom entirely according to her own fancy.* The Author of the Hiſtory of Favourites has (*f*) Paraphras'd this fine Tale wholly to his own Mind: He ſays, That the next Day after the Marriage the Queen gave the King (*g*) *a Girdle of precious Stones of great value, and of an ingenious Workmanſhip*; that (*h*) Mary Padilla *having learn'd of whom* Dom Pedro *had it, deſir'd it of him, that ſhe might imitate the Workmanſhip of it; that for raiſing Ramparts againſt the* Inconſtancy of the Hearts of Kings, *ſhe made uſe of a Jew, a profeſs'd Magician, who by his black and abominable Art, committed Crimes as horrid as his Soul. It was with this Diſciple of the Devil,* continues he, *that ſhe entruſted the Girdle of* Dom Pedro; *and the Charm put upon it was ſuch, that when he wore it, he fanſied himſelf to be encompaſſed and hurt by a Serpent, whereupon he made terrible outcries. There was no need of ſuch wicked Arts to deſtroy a Queen already ſo unhappy;* Mary Padilla *and all her Creatures told the King, that this Preſent of his Spouſe was a deadly favour, which ſhe had not poyſon'd in a Day. This Diſcourſe and the terrible effect of the Girdle, redoubled his Averſion to the Queen, ſo that he reſolved to ſhun her eternally.* I ſhould not have alledg'd ſo long a Paſſage out of the Hiſtory of *Favourites*, if I had not known, that the ſame thing is related in a meer Hiſtory, I mean in ſuch a Work as does only tranſcribe Hiſtorians, without taking the liberty of mixing with Matters of Fact the Fictions of the Author's Brain. Read this following Paſſage, (*i*) "*Diego de* "*Valera* writes, That among the many Ornaments "which Queen *Blanche* brought from *France*, there "was a rich Girdle, which ſhe preſented to her "Spouſe, and that *Mary Padilla* getting it into "her hands, found a *Jewiſh* Magician, who put "ſuch a Charm upon it, that when the King wore "it, he thought himſelf encompaſſed with a Ser"pent; and having complain'd of it to his Favou"rites, moſt of 'em Related to *Mary Padilla*, "they perſwaded him, that it was a pernicious "Preſent of the Young Queen; which encreas'd his "Averſion to her, and carried his Contempt of her "to the laſt Extremity.

(*D*) *And her Children were educated as Heirs preſumptive to the Crown.*] This is what *Mariana* ſays, (*k*) *Filii regio cultu, & in ſpem paterni regni educati.* I think ſhe had but one Son and three Daughters. The Son was call'd *Alphonſus*, and was born at *Tordeſilla* in 1359: his Birth occaſion'd an extraordinary Joy to the King, which was quickly chang'd into great Sorrow; for he liv'd not very long. *Garſias de Toledo*, Great Maſter of the Order of St. *James*, was deſign'd to bring him up. (*l*) *Beatrice*, the eldeſt of all the Children, was born at *Corduba*, in 1353. (*m*) *Conſtantia* the ſecond Daughter was born the next Year: She was married to the Duke of *Lancaſter*, Son to the King of *England* (*n*). The third Daughter was nam'd *Iſabel*, and was born at *Tordeſilla* in 1555 (*o*).

(*E*) *She was ſo much in favour with the King, that ſhe could do what ſhe pleas'd with him.*] Her Brothers and Kinſmen were preferr'd to Dignities, and had the

(*n*) Mariana *l.* 17. *c.* 4. *ſays, That* Blanche *was poyſon'd in* 1361, *at the Age of* 25 *Years. She was therefore but* 10 *years old when the Ambaſſadors of* Dom Pedro, *King of* Caſtile, *made choice of her, in* 1352. *and therefore ſome of her younger Siſters were not marriageable.*

(*a*) Mariana, *l.* 16. *c.* 18. *p.* 81.

(*b*) *Id. ib. p.* 82.

(*c*) Quibuſdam ſuſpicio fuit temeraria ſane & impudens regem non ſine cauſa à Blanca uxore repente alienatum: vitiumque illi à Friderico fratre illatum. *Id. ib.*

(*d*) *Id. ib.*

(*e*) Paulus Æmilius *B.* 9. *in the Life of* Charles V. *p. m.* 548. *I make uſe of the tranſlation of* John Regnart.

(*f*) *Printed at Amſterdam* 1697.

(*g*) *The Hiſtory of Favourites p.* 8.

(*h*) *Ib. p.* 9.

(*i*) *A Chronological Hiſtory of* Spain *by* Madam... *To.* 2. *pag.* 272, 273. *of the Edit. at* Roterdam, 1694

(*k*) Mariana *l.* 17. *c.* 5

(*l*) *Id. ib. c.* 5.

(*m*) *Id. ib. l.* 16. *c.* 17.

(*n*) *Id. ib. c.* 18. *p.* 84.

(*o*) *Id. ib. c.* 21. *p.* 90.

γ was prefer'd to the Office of Great Chamberlain in 1353; and to the Dignity of Great Maſter of the Order of *Calatrava* the next Year. *John Padilla*, his other Brother, ‡ was made Great Maſter of St. *James*, in the room of *Dom Frederick*, the King's Brother, in 1354. His Marriage was no obſtacle to his Promotion to this Maſterſhip, altho' there was no Precedent, that it had been poſſeſs'd by Married Men. Nevertheleſs, we muſt not think that *Mary de Padilla* enjoy'd his Favour without any mixture of Trouble; for in 1357, another Miſtreſs appear'd more amiable than ſhe in the Eyes of *Dom Pedro the Cruel*. This Prince † abandon'd himſelf ſo much to the Paſſion he entertain'd for *Alfonſa Coronella* that he thought no more of our *Mary* γ, which we may eaſily conceive was very grievous to the firſt Miſtreſs. What ſhall we ſay then of the Anxieties which ſhe muſt have endured, whilſt *Dom Pedro* was ſo enamour'd (*F*) of a lovely Widow, that to enjoy her he made her believe, that he was not married, and that he could eſpouſe her: In effect, he did eſpouſe her; and tho' he quickly forſook her, yet he muſt have given rude Shocks to the Heart of his Concubine. I ſhall not refer my Reader to the Hiſtory of *Favourites*, printed * in 1697, for what is there ſaid of our *Padilla* is a Legend made up of a thouſand Romantick Tales: We muſt not therefore ſearch for the Truth in ſuch Works, but in ſuch Authors as *Mariana*. He confeſſes, That this Woman wanted nothing but Chaſtity to merit the Crown: *Fæminæ*, ſays he, ‡ *præter injuriam pellicatûs, magnis animi & corporis dotibus, dignæque imperio.*

γ Id. ib. l.16. c.18.

‡ Id. ib. c.21. p.86.

† Id. ib. l.17. c.11 p.94.

γ In ea Urbe (*Hiſpali*) Alfonſæ Coronellæ amoribus ita indulſit ut præ illa Padilla contemptui eſſet. *Id. ib.*

* At Amſterdam, by Paul Marret.

‡ *Id. ib. l.17. c.5. p.101.*

PADILLA (*John de*) one of the Ring-leaders of the Sedition which was rais'd in *Caſtile* in 1520. 'Tis ſaid, that his Wife perſwaded him to this Revolt, and that ſhe engag'd in it, becauſe ſhe had (*A*) ſeen him in a Dream Great Maſter of St. *James*. Some add, That ſhe had a Maid-ſervant who (*B*) practiſ'd Witchcraft, and foretold to her ſome great Advancement. However that be, this is certain, that there was not in that Confederacy any Lord who teſtified more Zeal (C) than this Lady, to deprive *Charles* V. of the Crown. She robb'd the Churches to get Money for maintaining

the greateſt Intereſt at Court (*p*). Nothing was done in the Kingdom but according to their Proſpects: The Grandees and even the King's Brothers endeavour'd to inſinuate themſelves into the Good-liking of this Favourite, and ſpar'd neither for Preſents nor Submiſſions to obtain it. (*q*) *Omnino ſe Rex & rempublicam Mariæ propinquis gubernandum tradiderat: eorum arbitratu belli & pacis conſilia gerebantur: proceres ipſique Regis fratres tempori ſervire, atque ad fortunæ motum ſe movere: ad Mariæ gratiam donis, officiis, aſſentatione aditum certatim captare.* In favour of this Woman the moſt ancient Cuſtoms were trodden under Feet, even when they had great affinity with the Principles of Religion. Was it not for her ſake, that the Great Maſterſhip of the Order of St. *James* was made conſiſtent with Marriage (*r*)? It muſt be confeſs'd, this was a great Irregularity, and a great occaſion of Scandal and Diſcontent to the People. Thoſe who read ſuch kind of things are much leſs offended than moſt of thoſe who ſee them. But you muſt take notice, that I place this oppoſition between thoſe who read much, and thoſe who ſcarce read any thing at all. The latter fancy to themſelves that the Corruption of their Time is ſomething extraordinary; they imagine that other Countries are not ſubject to the like, and that other Ages have been preſerv'd from it. This is that which makes them Murmur the more; but thoſe who know by the reading of Hiſtory, that the Diſorders of their Times are common to all Ages, and to all Nations, more or leſs; thoſe, I ſay, lay hold of Patience, they are uſed to Toils, and harden themſelves againſt Matters of Scandal. To ſuch the domineering of the Concubines of Princes is no cauſe of Indignation, they know too many Examples of it: But thoſe who read nothing are furiouſly offended to ſee, that an unchaſte Favourite ſhould be Idoliz'd by Courtiers, becauſe ſhe beſtows all Offices. See (*a*) the Article of *Diana* of *Poitiers*.

(*F*) *Don Pedro was ſo enamour'd of a lovely Widow.*] (*b*) She was call'd *Joan de Caſtro*, and had been married to *Don Diego de Haro*. (*c*) Her Beauty and her Chaſtity were extraordinary: The King fell in Love with her, and having no hopes of ſatisfying his Paſſion but in the quality of a Husband, he feign'd that he was not married, and produc'd Proofs of the Averſion wherewith he had married *Blanche* of *Bourbon*. Two Biſhops were conſulted, who declar'd, That this Marriage was null. In purſuance of this Sentence he made haſte to eſpouſe the Widow; but he was quickly diſguſted at her, and did not continue with her but a few Days. Some ſay, that he forſook her the next Day after the Marriage (*d*). Nevertheleſs ſhe was with Child, and had a Son, who was a Comfort to her, tho' he proved the Sport of Fortune. (*e*) *Copia faſtidium ut antea faciente, paucis apud novam nuptam diebus moratur, ſunt qui una tantum noſſe dicant. . . . Joannes filius ex iis nuptiis procreatus eſt, matri ſolamen, fortunæ ludibrium futurus.*

(*A*) *Becauſe ſhe had ſeen him in a Dream.*] Let us ſee what *Antony de Guevara* wrote to her. (*f*) *I know very well, that the firſt Aſſembly was held in your Houſe, in which place the Fire was kindled, which you did always blow up: Which made me many times enquire, what occaſion you had thus to diſturb the Kingdom; and I was anſwer'd by ſome of your Relations and Friends, that it was becauſe you dream'd or fancy'd you ſaw your Husband Great Maſter of the Order of St.* James: *And if this be true, it was in you great folly and madneſs; for 'tis poſſible, that inſtead of giving him this Commandery, or the Order, which is a Croſs, we ſhall give him another Croſs.* Is it not a deplorable thing, that the Dream of a Woman ſhould be able to produce ſo great Tumults and Outrages through a whole Kingdom? The firſt that gave the riſe to this great Revolt was *Dom Ferdinand d' Avalos*; and he gain'd the Lady we have mention'd. The Lady ſeduc'd her Husband, who having brought over *Don Pedro Giron*, put all things in ſuch a Commotion, that they (*g*) talk'd of nothing leſs than erecting every great City of *Caſtile* into a Commonwealth. (*h*) Ferdinand d' Avalos *was the firſt Inventor of the Rebellion, and I am well inform'd that it began in your Houſe; ſo that he furniſh'd the Wood, but you put the Fire under it.* This Civil War, therefore, is one of thoſe which proceeded from frivolous Cauſes.

(*B*) *A Maid-ſervant who practiſ'd Witchcraft.*] This is what *Guevara* objects to her. (*i*) By ſome on this ſide *I have been told, That you have a Woman-Slave, a great Witch, who ſaid, and aſſur'd you, that you ſhall ſhortly be Queen, and your Husband King, and ſo you ſhall ſucceed to the Kings of* Spain, Dom Carlos *and Lady* Iſabel: *And if it be ſo, that you give heed to ſuch Follies, which I cannot believe, have a care of the Devil, and his Deceits and Frauds.* In another Letter he ſpeaks to her after this manner: (*k*) *'Tis ſaid, moreover, that you have a white Woman-Slave, or rather a fooliſh Slave, who is a great Witch: And 'tis ſaid, that ſhe told and aſſur'd you, That in a little time the Title of Excellency ſhould be given to you as to a Princeſs; and the Title of Highneſs to your Husband: So that you pretend to ſucceed to the Queen our Sovereign Lady, and your Husband promiſes himſelf, that he ſhall take the Place of* Charles the Fifth.

(*C*) *More Zeal than this Lady to deprive.*] 'Tis very much to ſay ſo; for *Dom Antonio d' Acugna*, Biſhop of *Zamora*, was as violent in this Revolt, at Seventy Years of Age, as the youngeſt and moſt reſolute Brigadeer of the Army could be. *Dom Guevara* wrote him a Letter, of which it may not be

(*p*) See Mariana c.18. B.15.

(*q*) *Id. ib. p.* 82, 84.

(*r*) Joannem Padilliam Villageræ regulum in Friderici fratris locum D. Jacobi Magiſtrum ſubſtituendum curavit, & quidem conjugem contra ſuperioris temporis exempla. Novum exemplum legibus, moribuſq; validius fuit. ab eoque initium ſuſceptum ut conjuges iidem & Magiſtri eſſent. Mariæ in gratiam quæ novi Magiſtri ſoror erat majorum inſtituta violata. *Mariana l.16. c.20. pag. 86.*

(*a*) *At the Remark N.*

(*b*) *Marian. ubi ſupra l.16. c.18.*

(*c*) Vidua, cui forma comparari nulla poterat, inſigni pudicitiæ laude viduitatis incommoda ſuſtentabat. *Id. ib*

(*d*) *Id. ib.*

(*e*) *Id. ib.*

(*f*) *Golden Epiſtles, B.1. p. m. 135. This Letter is dated March 10. 1522. The ſame thing is found in a Letter of the 3d Book p. m. 21. dated* Jan. 15. 1522.

(*g*) *Brant. foreign Captains T.1. p.173 He took this from the Letter of* Guevara *p. m.171. B.1.*

(*h*) Guev. *B.3. p.71.*

(*i*) *Ibid. B.1. p.187.*

(*k*) Guev. *B.3. p.21.*

taining the Sedition; but ſhe committed this Sacrilege (D) devoutly. The behaviour of a Prieſt towards (E) *Padilla* was ſuch, that it deſerves to be related. The Rebellion of this Man and his Spouſe, who were both of a very illuſtrious Family, prevail'd moſt at *Toledo* *. The Husband had ſcarce any Merit, and the Wife was little worth, tho' ſhe highly valued herſelf; for ſhe was extreamly proud †. He was defeated near *Villalar*, and fell into the hands of the Conqueror; and two Days after he was Beheaded ‖; but his Wife eſcap'd into *Portugal* ‡. She was call'd *Mary Pacheco*, and was the Daughter of *Tendillos de Mendoza*, if we may believe *Paulus Jovius*, § who ſays alſo, that ſhe was Learned.

* *The Count de la Roca, Hiſt. of* Charles V. *p. m.* 45.
† *Id. ib.*
‖ *Id. ib. p.* 54.
‡ *Id. ib. p.* 56.
§ Quum Maria Paceca Tendilli Mendocii filia erudita ingenii & virilis animi mulier, Padillæ conjugis vexillum ne concitatæ multitudini deeſſet dux gerendo bello ſuſtuliſſet. *Paul. Jovius Hiſt. lib.* 19. *fol. m.* 7. *verſo.*

PADILLA

unpleaſant to ſee ſome Paſſages. *To make Soldiers Prieſts, as he writes to him,* (l) *is a thing that is tolerable; but to make Prieſts Soldiers is a ſcandalous Action, which we ſhall not ſay, your Lordſhip hath permitted, but rather, you yourſelf have done it: Since you have brought more than Three Hundred Prieſts of Zamora to fight* Tordeſilla: *And when a good Prelate ſhould have employ'd them in the beginning of Lent to take Confeſſions, you have carried them away to begin the War. In the Aſſault made by the Knights and Governours of the Kingdom againſt your Party, I ſaw, with my own Eyes, a Prieſt, who being behind a Battlement, ſtruck to the Ground eleven of our Men with a Harquebuſs; and it was pleaſant to ſee, that at the ſame time he aim'd to hit them, he bleſs'd them, with a Harquebuſs, and after that he diſpatch'd them with a Bullet. I ſaw likewiſe, that before the Battle was ended this Jolly Prieſt receiv'd a Blow with an Arrow in his Forehead, which kill'd him ſo ſuddenly, that he had no time to confeſs, nor ſo much as to Croſs himſelf. . . . . .* (m) *I often ſaw you having a Spear upon your Shoulders, and never ſaw you with a Book in your hand, nor a Stole about your Neck; and what I ſhould not omit to tell, to the Soldiers that batter'd the Fortreſs of* Ampudia, *and fell down from a high place, you ſaid thus: Courage, my Boys, Courage, get up, get up, mount, mount, and fight valiantly as brave Champions, and if you die, let my Soul be with yours, ſince you have ſo juſt a Cauſe and ſo holy a Pretenſion. Now you know very well, my Lord Biſhop, that the Soldiers who died in that place were excommunicated by the Pope, as Traytors to the King, diſturbers of the Kingdom, ſacrilegious Perſons, Robbers, Enemies to the Commonwealth, and the ſource of all the Seditions in it. Wherefore 'tis plain enough, that a Biſhop who purſues ſuch Deſigns, was not very fearful or ſcrupulous of loſing his Soul, ſince he lov'd to die like a Soldier; and I do not wonder, that a Man choſe to die like a deſperate Soldier, who never valued his State.* The Lady *Mary Padilla* (n) therefore muſt have been very furious, if ſhe equall'd the Rage of this Prelate. There were ſome other Women engag'd in this Faction, *and who were moſt violent, as we have ſeen,* ſays *Brantome,* (o) *in our Civil Wars of the League, for what reaſon I cannot tell, but that they were wheedled and drawn in by the Sermons and Perſwaſives of ſome Preachers.* Give heed to theſe laſt words, and note, that the Biſhop of *Zamora* was at laſt taken and Strangled (a).

(l) *Id. ib.* B. 1. *p.* 170.
(m) *Ibid. p.* 171.
(n) *Thus* Guevara *calls her: Others call her* Donna Maria Padrecco, *as* Brantome *informs us,* ubi ſupra, *p.* 174. *Probably* Guevara *gave her the Name of her Husband. The Count de la Roca, Hiſt. of* Charles V. *calls her* Mary Pacheco, *and to this we muſt hold.*
(o) Brant. *Ib. p.* 174.
(a) *The Count de la Roca, Ib. p.* 56.

(D) *She committed this Sacrilege devoutly.*] It is better to hear *Brantome* himſelf relating this, than to tranſlate his Style. (b) "Another "ſuch like and more comical Exploit is related of "*Donna Maria Padilla*, one of the honourable La"dies of *Spain*, and who was well-affected to the "Rebellion rais'd in *Spain*, at the beginning of the "Reign of the Emperor *Charles*, as *Dom Antony* "*Guevara* relates, who wanting Money to pay her "Soldiers, took all the Gold and Silver from the "Reliques of *Toledo*. But this was done with a "ſanctimonious and pleaſant Ceremony; for when "ſhe enter'd the Church ſhe claſp'd her Hands, co"ver'd her Face with a black Veil, or, to ſpeak "more properly, with a wet Sack, according to "*Rabelais*, with a ſad and mournful Countenance, "beating her Breaſt, weeping and ſighing, having "two great Torches lighted carried before her; "and then having genteely committed the Robbery, "ſhe retir'd no leſs genteely with the ſame Cere"mony, believing moſt firmly, that upon the ac"count of this doleful Ceremony, God was nowiſe "diſpleaſed with her. They might very well laugh "who could ſee her Act this ſame Myſtery: But "the beſt of it was, ſays the Story, that Thieves, "when they rob any thing do it with great Joy and "Chearfulneſs, and when they are puniſh'd they "Mourn; but this Lady, on the contrary, when ſhe "was Robbing, ſhe wept, and conſequently, if ſhe "had been puniſh'd ſhe muſt have laugh'd, contrary "the cuſtom of other Robbers, as appears. The firſt words of this Paſſage diſcover, that the Author had been ſpeaking of ſuch another Exploit; and every curious Reader would be glad to know what it is; wherefore for their ſakes who cannot preſently conſult *Brantome*, I will here ſet down what he had related. *Antony de Leve* being at the Siege *of Pavia,* (c) *and wanting Money to ſatisfy and pay his Soldiers, inſomuch that even the* German *Foot mutinied, he invented a Trick which is mention'd in Hiſtories, tho' I ſhould ſay nothing of it; but the moſt pleaſant, as the* Spaniards *relate, was thus:* que tomò toda la plata conſagrada de los Templos, prometiendo todas vezes con voto ſolemne à los ſantos, que ſi quedava vencedor, coſas harto majores que las que tomava, de que hizo batir dinero groſamente. *That is to ſay, he took the conſecrated Silver of the Temples, promiſing, nevertheleſs, to the Saints, with a ſolemn Vow, to give greater things than he took, if he ſhould be Conqueror; and then of this Silver he coin'd Money, after a courſe manner. But he acted according to the Proverb,* Paſſato il pericolo, gabbato il ſanto, *and never paid any thing of it. What a payer of Debts was he! And in my younger Days it was ſtill ſaid in* Pavia, *that he left the Debt to be paid, and the Vow to be perform'd by the Emperor, becauſe it was for his Intereſt that he borrow'd and ſpent it.*

(b) Brant. *Foreign Captains,* To. 1. *pag.* 127, 128. *He took this from a Letter which* Don Antonio Guevara *wrote to this Lady. It is in the* 1ſt *Book of his Golden Epiſtles, p.* 184 *of the* French *Tranſlation Printed at* Ant. 1591.
(c) Brant. *ib. p.* 126, 127.

(E) *The behaviour of a Prieſt towards* Padilla.] We will continue to make uſe of the words of *Brantome*, (d) "A Prieſt of the Village of *Mediana* . . . . was "ſo well affected to *Don Juan de Padilla*, one of the "principal Seditious Captains, that every *Sunday*, "at his Exhortation to the People, he did not fail "to recommend him, and the Holy Sedition of "which he was the great Favourer, with a *Pater-"noſter* and an *Ave-maria*, and continu'd theſe Pray"ers for the ſpace of a Month; at the end of "which it happen'd by chance, that the Troops of "the ſaid *Padilla* paſs'd thro' the Village of the "Prieſt, who eat up all his Fowls and Bacon, and "drank up all his Wine, and which is more than all "that, they carried away his Maid. The *Sunday* "after he made his Complaint at his Exhortation, "and related to the People all the damage theſe "Troops had done him; above all, the taking a"way of his Maid *Catherine*, naming her openly, "and admoniſhing the People, not to follow any "more the Party of *Padilla*, but the King's: After "this he gave all his Seditious Partiſans to the De"vil, and conjur'd all his People to cry, *Long live "the King, and let* Padilla *periſh*; which was done, "and all the reſt were ſent to the Devil. Such "like Actions have we ſeen done alſo in our Civil "Wars of the League, according to the Malice and "Diſcontent of ſome Perſons who had been robb'd, "for they renounc'd this Holy League and goodly "Confederacy like a Devil. That it may appear whether *Brantome* took too much liberty either in abridging or amplifying the Authors he tranſcrib'd from, I ſhall relate, word for word, the Narrative of *Guevara*, tranſlated by the Phyſician *Guterry*. (e) "A *Biſcain* Prieſt, being a half-witted Fellow, "had ſo great an Affection for *John de Padilla*, that "every *Sunday*, in his Diſcourſe to the People, he was "wont to ſay thus: My Brethren, I recommend to "you one *Pater* and one *Ave-maria*, for the Holy "Sedition and popular Commotion, that it may "never ceaſe; and I recommend to you another "*Pater* for the Majeſty of King *John de Padilla*, that "God would proſper him, and as much for the "Queen his Wife; for to tell you the truth, theſe "are our true and natural Kings, and all others, to "this Day, have been Tyrants. When theſe pray"ers had laſted near three Weeks, at the expira"tion of them *John de Padilla* happen'd to paſs thro' "the Village with his Horſe-Guards, and becauſe "the Soldiers, who lodg'd in his Houſe, carried a"way his Maid, drunk up his Wine, and forgot

"not

(d) Brant. *ubi ſupra p.* 175. *He borrow'd this from the Golden Epiſtles of* Guevara, *B.* 1. *p. m.* 173.
(e) Guevara. *B.* 1. *p.* 173.

PADILLA (*Louiſe de*) Counteſs *d' Aranda*, in the Seventeenth Century, was extreamly commended by the *Spaniards*, as may be ſeen in a (*F*) Paſſage of *Dom John Laſtanoſa*, which I ſhall tranſcribe.

PAGEAU (N.) one of the moſt Illuſtrious Advocates of the Parliament of *Paris*, died in the Month of *July*, 1683, μ *when he was not very ancient*. His *Elogium* taken from a Manuſcript, Inticuled, *Portraits des Avocats*, is to be found ε in the *Mercure Gallant*, and in a Piece ‡ of Father *Bouhours*.

μ *Mercure Gallant, Month of* July, 1683, *pag.* 128.
ε *Ibid. pag.* 129, *&c.*
‡ *Intitled*, The Art of Thinking well, in the compoſing of Ingenious Works. *p.* 395, *&c. of the Holland Edit.*

PAYS (*René le*) paſs'd for a Wit: He was of *Bretagne*, but ſcarce ever appear'd except in the (*A*) Province of *Dauphine*. He was employ'd there in the Treaſury. His *Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes*, Printed in 1664, were the admiration of the Provinces, and deſerv'd the (*B*) Applauſe even of the chief City. There were ſome Ladies of the firſt Quality who read them with much pleaſure, and enquir'd of the Bookſeller what kind of Perſon the Author was: After he knew that the Dutcheſs of *Nemours* had this obliging Curioſity he ſent her a deſcription of his Perſon. The Piece is Intitled, *Portrait de l' Auteur des Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes.* It is a Miſcellany of Verſe and Proſe; the Style is merry, like that of the Piece which had pleas'd that Princeſs. The ſucceſs of this firſt Book encourag'd *Mr. le Pays* to employ the Printers; but his *Zelotide* having not been reliſh'd, he abated of his ardour, and appear'd in Print but ſeldom. The Letter which he wrote to *Mr. du Gue*, Intendant of *Dauphine*, when an enquiry was made after the falſe Noblemen, was well enough eſteem'd: In it he proves the (*C*) nobility of his Muſe to deſcend from that of *Voiture*, and he collects together divers curious Facts con-

" not to eat up his Bacon and Pullets, and all that " he had, he told them the next *Sunday*, at his Exhortation, You know, my Brethren, how *John* " *Padilla* paſs'd thro' here this Week, and I believe " you are not ignorant that the Soldiers who lodg'd " in my Houſe, have not left me ſo much as one " Pullet, that they have alſo eaten up my Bacon, " and drunk up my four Barrels of Wine; and, " above all, the Wretches have carried away, as " you know, my poor *Catherine*. I tell you this, " my Friends, to the end, that for the future you " may not pray for him, but for the King *Dom* " *Charles*, and the Queen, Madam *Joan* his Mother, " who are our natural Kings.

(*F*) *In a Paſſage . . . which I ſhall tranſcribe.*] (*f*) " I have heard two ſorts of Readers complain of " the Works of *Balthaſar Gracian*: Some complain " of the Matter, others of the Style; thoſe becauſe " they infinitely eſteem his Books, and theſe becauſe they wiſh they had been a little more to " their purpoſe. The former, and among them the " Phenix of our Age, the Learned Counteſs *de* " *Aranda*, (1) whoſe Name is written with ſix immortal Pens, are offended becauſe Matters ſo " high, and which are proper only for Hero's, " become common by Printing of them; ſo " that the meaneſt Citizen can have, for a Crown, " thoſe things, which, becauſe of their excellency, " cannot well be in ſuch hands. This Complaint puts me in mind of thoſe who were offended with Mr. *du Pin* for publiſhing in *French* a new *Bibliotheque* of Eccleſiaſtical Writers. See the laſt Page of his Preface, and the *News from* (*g*) *the Republick of Learning*.

(*f*) John Laſtanoſa *Preface to the Treatiſe of* Gracian. *Intitled*, The Diſcreet. *See the Preface of Mr.* Amelot de la Houſſaie, *upon* the Courtier.
(1) Donna Luiſa de Padilla.

(*g*) *The Month of* June 1686 *Art.* 4. *p.* 658.

(*A*) *Except in the Province of* Dauphine.] For this reaſon Mr. *Allard* has put him in the Catalogue of the Writers of that Province: *The greateſt part of his Works*, ſays he, *were written in* (*b*) Dauphine, *either in* Grenoble *or* Valence. This he might do according to Cuſtom; for thoſe who write a *Bibliotheque* of a certain Country, do commonly place in it the Strangers who ſojourned in that Country, when they compoſed or publiſhed Books. The following Paſſage of the Author of *Friendſhip and Amours* will not be impertinent: † *What probability is there that a Wit ſo ſublime as that of* Your Highneſs, *a Genius to whom all the fineſt Wits of our Age do daily pay their Homage, and who is accounted at Court a Fountain of Learning, could find any thing agreeable in the Collection of my Trifles, and in the Works of a Man brought up in an obſcure Province: That a Wit originally of* Bretagne *tranſplanted into* Gaſcogne, *and afterwards into the Mountains of* Dauphiné, *could produce ſuch Fruits as ſhould ſatisfy ſo fine and nice a Palate? No, Madam, I ought not to believe it, my Preſumption would be too great, and I ſhould be afraid of being rude to you.*

(*b*) Allard *Bibliotheq. of* Dauph. *p.* 169.

† Pays *in his Letter to the Dutcheſs of* Nemours, *wherein he deſcribes himſelf.*

(*B*) *Deſerv'd the Approbation even of the chief City.*] The *Pariſians* eaſily pardon the publiſhing of a good Book in a Provincial who has made a long ſtay in *Paris*, but they take it very heinouſly, that any Perſon, who never went out of his Province, ſhould be a good Author. They look upon it as an Attempt of dangerous Conſequence; one wou'd think that they imagine it to be a breaking looſe from Order, and withdrawing oneſelf from the lawful Authority of one's Superiors, and erecting in the Republick of Learning a Sect of Independants, which is ſo odious in the Church: They were therefore little inclin'd to judge favourably of the *Friendſhips and Amours* of our Author; for it was a Book that came to them from the Country of the *Allobroges*, it was the Work of an Author born in *Bretagne*, and from thence tranſplanted firſt into *Guienne*, and after that into the Mountains of *Dauphine*. Theſe are the Schools in which he became the Diſciple of *Voiture*, and wherein he form'd the Deſign of ſetting up for his Succeſſor. Thus theſe Prejudices were no ways favourable to him, and yet his Book ſold mightily in *Paris*, and he found many that approv'd it, both at Court and in the City: But I do not pretend to affirm, that he was neither Cenſur'd nor Deſpis'd there by many Perſons. Read theſe words of Mr. *Gueret*, (*a*) *Whilſt one ſhall make ſilly Love-Letters for his Miſtreſs, and another ſhall write wretched Raillery to his Butcher, they ſhall no wiſe be guilty of any Conſpiracy againſt the State.* He points to the Letters of Mr. *Pays*, and thoſe of Mr. *Montreuil.* In the next Page he is not ſo diſobliging, but his Praiſes are very aukward: *Becauſe*, ſays he, Amours, Amitiez, & Amourettes, *paſs'd for an agreeable Title, does it thence follow, that* Fleurs, Fleurettes, & Paſſetemps, *ſhould be receiv'd after the ſame manner?* Mr. *Deſpreaux* ſaid ſomething againſt Mr. *Pays*. He receiv'd the Rebuke with a good Grace; and he was never obſerv'd to be tranſported, nor to fly out into Reproaches, as the greateſt part of his Companions in Diſgrace did; but he anſwer'd (*b*) Civilly and Modeſtly. What I have ſaid of *Paris*, I think to be true of ancient *Rome*: I do not believe that in the Age of *Cicero* or *Pliny* the younger, the *Romans* would have taken it well, that the Poets and Orators, who liv'd beyond the *Alps* and the *Pyrenees*, ſhould have written fine Pieces before they had quitted their Native Soil.

(*a*) Parnaſſus Reform'd, *p. m.* 113.

(*b*) *See his Letter to Mr.* Tiger. *It is the firſt of the 2d Book of the 2d Part of his new Pieces.*

To confirm, by an authentick Proof, what I have ſaid of the great Succeſs of the firſt Piece of our Author, I need only cite a Journaliſt, who does not flatter at all. Let us ſee the beginning of an Extract which he made of another Piece of the ſame (*c*) Writer: (*d*) *The* Amours, Friendſhips, and Love-Frolicks *of Mr.* Pays, *were ſo well receiv'd by all polite Perſons, that the Publick will entertain an agreeable Idea of this Conteſt between* Wit *and* Judgment, *as ſoon as it is known that he is the Author of it. It was ſaid, That Love had given him a Feather of his Wing to write his* Amours; *and therefore he makes* Love *and* Reaſon *quarrel ſo ingeniouſly, that none of the Reaſons of* Wit *are forgotten in this Work.*

(*c*) *Intitl'd* A Conteſt between Wit and Judgment, *Printed at* Paris 1688

(*d*) Baſnage de Beauval, *Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, Sept.* 1688. *Art.* 15. *p.* 129.

(*C*) *The nobility of his Muſe.*] The Letter which he publiſh'd upon this Subject was inſerted afterwards in the Edition (*e*) of his new Works, it is Intitled, *The Titles of the Nobility of the Amorous Muſe, to my Lord* Gue, *Counſellor in ordinary to the King*, &c. One who had read it when it was newly come

(*e*) *It is the 25th of the 2d Book of the 2d Part.*

concerning the Genealogy of the Poets, conſider'd as Poets. He did but imitate one of the fineſt Epiſodes of the *Clelia* of *Mademoiſelle de Scuderi*. Some time after he publiſh'd a new Collection of Pieces. It appears by ſome of his Letters, that he had been in *Holland* and *England*. The Accounts he gives of theſe Countries are too waggiſh and very unjuſt; and there is a mixture of Reflections in them which are ſomewhat ſerious, (D) but very falſe. This does a prejudice to the whole *French* Nation. He was of the Academy (E) of *Arles*. He was honour'd with the eſteem (F) of the Duke of *Savoy*, who made him a Knight of St. *Maurice*. He wrote a very pretty (G) Letter upon

come out, aſſur'd me, that the Intention of the Author was to prove, that he was Noble upon the Account of his Muſe, and that therefore none ought to demand of him other Titles of Nobility, nor pretend to tax him if he did not produce any other Title. But having read this Work, I found nothing in it which ſignified this Intention. I cannot ſay whether this Author was Noble or no, for it is ſo long ſince I read his Works, that I cannot remember the places where he might ſay either in expreſs words, or equivalent Terms, *I am a Gentleman*. I remember a place where he mentions a Quarrel of his Brother, whom he ſpeaks of as a Gentleman; but there are an infinite number of ignoble Men that live nobly, who would ſpeak upon ſuch an occaſion with no leſs aſſurance. Here is what he writes in Anſwer to a (f) Letter of Conſolation: (g) *The Care you have taken of my Brother's Quarrel and your goodneſs in endeavouring to compoſe it, are ſo great Obligations, that I can never acknowledge them enough. I am very ſorry that this little diſaſter ſhould have happen'd to him: But ſince he ought to be ſo prudent as not to involve himſelf in ſuch troubleſome Affairs, he ought alſo to have the Courage to vindicate himſelf when any Injury is done him; and I will never pardon him, if he ſuffers any diſgrace to remain upon this Account.*

(D) *Reflections . . . . very falſe.*] (h) “It is a thing at which I am exceedingly troubl'd, that the *Jews* are tolerated at *Amſterdam* and not the *Catholicks*: At *Paris* the Bawdy-Houſes do not ſo much fear the Conſtables, as thoſe Houſes at *Amſterdam* do wherein the Holy Maſs is celebrated. Yet I have obſerv'd, that Policy here is the greateſt Enemy of our Religion. The *Hollanders* do not ſo much hate *Rome* as *Madrid*; and I believe they would ſooner obey *Alexander* the Seventh, than *Philip* the Fourth: This is ſo true, that in a certain Company where I was lately, one having ſaid in Jeſt, that a Miniſter had obtain'd leave, a little while ago, to preach at *Madrid*, that the Inquiſition was going to be ſuppreſs'd, and that the *Catholick* King was ready to declare himſelf a *Huguenot*; an ancient *Hollander* anſwer'd him briskly, and from the abundance of his Heart, That if *Spain* turn'd *Huguenot*, *Holland* muſt be forc'd to turn *Catholick*. After this, you may judge, Sir, whether they be very firmly fix'd in their Religion, or very averſe to ours. It may be affirm'd, that they hate nothing ſo much as the *Spaniſh* Tyranny.” The Letter from which I take theſe words is not dated, and this is a common defect (1) in this kind of Works; but by the Circumſtances it may be known, that it was written in 1652; and hence you may judge whether our Author underſtood well what he ſaid. Would not any one think, that he took this Relation from ſome Book, compos'd in the time of the Duke of *Alba*, or before the end of the Truce which *Henry* the Fourth concluded between *Philip* the Third and the United Provinces? For at that time the ſcurrilous Writers might pretend, that the *Hollanders* hated the Tyranny more than the Religion of the *Spaniards*; and I do not doubt but they ſaid ſo in many Books: But 'tis certain, that when Mr. *Pays* was in *Holland*, the hatred to the *Spaniſh* Nation was quite worn out; for the hatred laſted no longer than the fear, which is long ſince diſſipated. After the taking of *Boiſleduc*, *Maeſtricht*, and *Breda*, and after the War which was declar'd againſt *Spain* by *Lewis* the Thirteenth, the United Provinces were ſure, that they ſhould never fall again under the Yoke of the *Spaniards*; they were more troubled with the fear that they ſhould be too much humbled, and that *France* ſhould make an advantage of their too low Eſtate, than with the fear that they ſhould recover what they had loſt. This uneaſineſs contributed as much as any other thing to the Treaty which they concluded at *Munſter* with *Philip* the Fourth, and ſince that time they have had more true and cordial Affection for the *Spaniards*, than for the *French*: which was moſt natural, and moſt agreeable to true Policy. 'Tis needleſs to refute this Author, as to the Complaints he makes of the force us'd againſt the *Catholicks* at *Amſterdam*, and as to his ſatyrical Reflections againſt the (a) *Engliſh* and (b) *Dutch* Women.

(E) *He was of the Academy of Arles.*] This is an Academy of fine Wits, ſettled according to the Model of the *French* Academy. None is admitted into it, no more than into that of *Paris*, but upon requeſting it. Mr. *Pays* knowing that his Admiſſion was wiſh'd for, and that his Demand, which he muſt make to that end, according to the Statutes, would be favourably heard, wrote to thoſe Gentlemen, and was immediately receiv'd into their Society. His Letter is dated from *Grenoble* the 12th of *May* 1668. It is (c) in the ſecond Part of his new Works, with the (d) Thanks which he wrote to the Academy.

(F) *The eſteem of the Duke of Savoy.*] If I do rightly remember it, he dedicated his *Zelotide* to that Duke, who wrote him a very obliging Letter. The Anſwer he made to this Prince, *March* 9. 1666, is the 19th Letter of the Second Part of his New Works. He made a Journey to *Turin*, in 1670. and thus he relates the Honours he receiv'd. (e) “Without Vanity, or with Vanity, if you pleaſe, I can aſſure you, I was receiv'd very obligingly by their Royal Highneſſes; and in their Names I have been invited to ſee the Feaſt of S. *Hubert* at the *Venerie*. It will be a moſt magnificent Feaſt: The Ladies there hunt the Stag with Equipages all Embroider'd with Gold and precious Stones. After the taking of the Stag, there will be for the ſpace of two days Feaſting, Balls, Dancing, Muſick, and Plays; which things are prepar'd a long while before: But after all this, will you believe me when I ſhall tell you, that His Royal Highneſs caus'd a Chamber to be appointed for me in the Palace, and order'd that Horſes ſhould be given me out of his own Stables for Hunting.”

(G) *A very pretty Letter upon this Subject.*] He was made (f) *a Knight by the hand of the Marquiſs of St.* Damien: He had *for Godfather*, one of that Lord's Sons, and another of his Sons *honour'd and regal'd him with a Feaſt*. 'Tis of him that he merrily demanded the Revenue of a Commandery, becauſe otherwiſe he would be uncapable of accompliſhing the Vow of Hoſpitality. Here follow ſome Paſſages of his Letter, but we muſt remember that he writes to the Grand Prior of the Order of St. *Maurice*. *Since you are my Superior*, ſays he to him, (g) *and that I have the Honour to be one of your Brethren, I ought from time to time to give your Excellency an exact Account of my Conduct. I ſhould be very unhappy if the* Alps, *which part us, ſhould deprive me of the light of your Guidance, when at this great diſtance I have more need of it than others; and therefore I pray you, Sir, for the quiet of my Conſcience, to aſſiſt me with your wholſome Counſel, and to remove ſome Scruples I have concerning the obſervation of my Vows: As to Chaſtity, thanks to the rigidneſs of the Fair Sex, I obſerve it religiouſly: As to Obedience, I have hitherto obſerv'd it very well, and my Superiors, who have Cammanded me nothing, have no reaſon to complain: As to Hoſpitality, this is the Point which occaſions my Scruples, and about which I am troubled with cruel remorſe; for, in ſhort, Sir, I do not obſerve it at all: Not but I have a great Inclination to be hoſpitable; but how can it be when I have neither Houſe-room to lodge my Gueſts, nor a Fund of Money to entertain them? I think, Sir, that in making this laſt Vow I did implicitly make a Vow to be a Commander, ſince I cannot obſerve it without a Commandery. This ſhould make you think of procuring me one, and even one of the beſt, that my Vow may be the better perform'd. . . . (h) Beſides, by making me a Commander, you will ſtop the Mouths of a thouſand ridiculous People who come to ask me impertinent Queſtions about the Croſs which I carry: Some are ſuch Fools as to come to me, and ask me,* How much, dear Sir, do you get every Year for carrying this Croſs? *I muſt confeſs to you, that then*

I

(f) *It was written to him while he was afflicted for the loſs of a Siſter. The manner of expreſſing his Grief and tenderneſs for the Deceas'd becomes a Perſon of Piety and Honour. See Letter 42 and 43 of the 2d Book*

(g) Pays's Friendſhips Amours, and Frolicks, B. 2. *Letter* 42. *p.* 154. *of the* Holland *Edit.* 1665

(h) Pays *Ibid. Lett.* 38. *of the* 2d *Book*, *p.* 153, 154.

(1.) *This Word muſt not be taken ſtrictly, for the date is ſometimes found in that ſort of Writings*

(a) *In Letter* 35 *of the* 2d *Book*.

(b) *In Lett.* 38 *of the ſame Book*.

(c) *It is Letter* 28 *of the* 1ſt *Book*.

(d) *Dated at* Grenoble, June 12. 1668. *It is Letter* 29 *of the ſame Book*.

(e) Pays's *New Works Part* 2. *B.* 1. *Letter* 41. *p.* 105. *of the* Holland *Edit.*

(f) *Idem Letter* 43 *of the ſame Book, p.* 112 *dated at* Grenoble, May 20. 1671.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 110.

(h) *Ibid.* p. 112.

upon this occaſion. (H) He complains often of Fortune, and does no leſs reproach her than the *Pagan* Poets. Theſe are common places in which Vanity has commonly too great a ſhare. He was very willing that it ſhould be known

I don't know what to anſwer them; . . . . But when I ſhall have a Commandery, I ſhall have wherewith to ſatisfy all the World, I ſhall be able to perform my Vow of Hoſpitality, and I ſhall be no more troubled with impertinent Queſtions about the Revenue of my Croſs. Be ſo kind, Sir, as to anſwer my Reaſons, and Cure my Scruples, and you will give eaſe to the Soul of him who of all your Brethren is, with the greateſt reſpect.

(H) *He complains often of Fortune.*] This Fault is almoſt the epidemical Diſeaſe of the Republick of Learning: There are ſcarce any Authors who do not complain of the Ingratitude of their Age. Thoſe who are call'd fine Wits, do ſignalize themſelves above others by this kind of Complaint. They think that they ſhould not be in faſhion, if they ſhould agree that Fortune look'd upon them with a good Eye. One would think, that they are afraid, leſt if they ſhould appear contented with her Favours, the Publick would take it for a Confeſſion, that they have no Merit; for there is a Common-place, very ancient, which informs us that ſhe is blind, and that ſhe makes a bad choice of the Objects of her Love. Read all the Letters of *Balzac*, and you may learn from them two things, one is, that he had a pretty good Revenue, which allow'd him to treat his Friends, to give them excellent Soops, &c. and to have for himſelf all the Conveniencies of Life, in one of the pleaſanteſt places of the Kingdom; the other is, That he look'd upon himſelf as confin'd to a Deſert, and ſo perſecuted by ill Fortune, that one wou'd think her ſharpeſt and moſt poyſon'd Darts had been directed againſt him. What can be concluded from theſe two things, but that he had too good an Opinion of himſelf? for one that is truly modeſt, how great ſoever his Merit be, thinks himſelf very well rewarded, if he hath wherewithal to ſupply his Neceſſities. Thus all thoſe Common-places, which our fine Wits, and ſo many other Writers urge againſt Fortune, are, in troth, a pompous Commendation of the great and good Qualities they fancy themſelves poſſeſs'd of: there is therefore a little too much Vanity in them. I will add, That oftentimes theſe kind of Complaints are much more a ſign of the Ingratitude of the Authors towards their Age, than a teſtimony of the Ingratitude of the Age towards Authors; for commonly thoſe who are moſt at eaſe, are they who murmur moſt at the capriciouſneſs of Fortune, and the injuſtice of the Times.

I ſay this only in general; I ſhall make no Application to our Mr. *Pays*; for I am not ſo well acquainted with his Hiſtory as to be able to ſay, whether he had a Fortune wherewith he ought to have been contented. But I think he ſhould not have found it ſtrange, that other Men of buſineſs ſhou'd raiſe themſelves more than he did; for a *Financier* with Love-Letters, Songs, and Madrigals, ought not to pretend to merit the Favour of his Superiors, and their recommendation to be advanc'd to great Employments, as he might deſerve, if he would punctually follow, as others do, this Precept of Mr. *Deſpreaux*:

Chooſe (i) *you the beſt part: leave all your Books.*
A hundred Livres au denier cinq, *how much make*
they? twenty Livres.
That's well ſaid. Get you gone, you know as much
as needs to be known.
What Riches, what Honours are ready to befal you!
Exerciſe yourſelf, my Son, in this high Science.
Take, inſtead of Plato, *the Book of Rates.*
Enquire what Province enriches moſt the Farmers?
How much the Salt may bring to the King every Year.
Harden your Heart, be a Robber, a Plunderer,
Unjuſt, Violent, Unfaithful, Double, Falſe.

To ſtudy polite Language, to employ whole Days in a Letter of Gallantry, to correct a Sonnet, or a Song a hundred times, till it have a happy Cadence, be well turn'd, very tender, and very paſſionate: This is not the way to ſupplant a Rival, or to hinder him from ſupplanting you; I mean, a Rival as to Employments, which depend upon the Directors of the Finances, or upon the General Farmers. If it were a Love-Rival, it wou'd be another thing: You will learn much better to ſupplant him, by ſpending your time in a Letter of Gallantry, than by ſpending it in a Rule of Arithmetick. But ſtill, in this Parallel, we muſt ſtop at the immediate effects; for if any one ſhould alledge to me, that by applying oneſelf to Caſting up of Accounts, one would be better qualify'd to grow Rich, than by applying oneſelf to a piece of Gallantry; and that a Rival who is richer, will be preferr'd to a fine Wit, I will not diſpute any more. I have read ſomewhere, That (k) *Ludovicus Sforza* ſaid, *A good Wit was a bad Qualification for a Soldier, and that he would not eaſily receive ſuch into his Service as valued themſelves upon it.* The Marſhal *de Gaſſion* was alſo of this Opinion, who was one Day ſo offended with the Reflections of the Abbot *de la Riviere*, who would have his Royal Highneſs the Duke of *Orleans* to raiſe the Siege of *Courtray* (l) "That being chaf'd into a ſudden Fit "of Anger, he told him theſe words: *Mr. Abbot,* "*fine Wits are but mean Tools for War.* Neither are they much fitter for the Finances, generally ſpeaking.

But at laſt, let us come to the Subject in hand, and ſay ſomething of the Complaints of our Author againſt his hard Fate: His chagrin Letter againſt (a) Fortune is well turn'd, and well furniſh'd with Thoughts; out of which I ſhall ſet down the following Paſſages: "I was born under a certain Star, "whoſe malignity cannot be overcome; and I am "ſo perſwaded of the Power of this malevolent Star, "that I accuſe it of all my Miſfortunes, and I never "lay the fault upon any body. And therefore, "Madam, tho' you ſhould not obtain for me what "you ſollicit with ſo much ardour and addreſs, I "ſhould nevertheleſs reckon myſelf oblig'd all my "Lifetime to your generous and active Friendſhip. "'Tis not only at this time that endeavours to ad-"vance me have prov'd unſucceſsful, you may re-"member, &c. In my younger Days I did like "others, and ſought after Fortune with a reſtleſs "Mind; I enquir'd for the places which ſhe haunts "for the moſt part, and endeavour'd to place my-"ſelf in her Paſſage. Going to meet her, I thought "that ſhe being blind would puſh me forward, even "without taking notice of me; but I fancy ſhe had "Eyes to ſee me, ſince ſhe knew ſo well how to ſhun "all my Approaches to her. I have done what I could "to make my Court to her: Obſerving in the World "that ſhe treated ill the Men of Learning, and ca-"reſs'd the Men of Buſineſs, to pleaſe her I offer'd "violence to my own Inclination; I addicted "myſelf wholly to the Finances, and made the Muſes "only my Recreation: Yet ſtill all my Cares and "Endeavours were fruſtrated, for unto this Day I "could never find her favourable. Since then For-"tune is made a blind Goddeſs, but yet ſuch a God-"deſs to whom all Men pay an Homage, which looks "ſomewhat like an Act of Religion, I fancy we "may believe, without Hereſy, that this Goddeſs "has, among her Creatures, ſome that are Elect, "and ſome that are Reprobate, who are happy or "unhappy by her choice, and without owing any "thing to their own Conduct. After I underſtood "that ſhe had plac'd me in the number of the "latter, I endeavour'd by all means to comfort my-"ſelf. . . . . If my Reflections were not tedious to "you, I would make many more before I concluded "this Letter; I would yet inveigh with greater "warmth againſt the Caprices of Fortune: But "withal you muſt know, that I do not hate her ſo "much becauſe ſhe has not preferr'd me, as becauſe "ſhe has degraded our incomparable Friend, whom "I find to be much more unhappy than myſelf; for "a Man cannot fall from ſo high a place without "feeling the bruiſe of ſuch a cruel Fall all his Life-"time. But as to me, who have always crept upon "the Ground, I never could fall; all the Miſchief "which happen'd to me, is ſome weakneſs that re-"mains ſtill, becauſe I have made ſome attempts to "advance myſelf. Our dear Friend has much more "cauſe to complain, and I am ſo much the more "ſorry for him, becauſe he leſs deſerv'd his Diſ-"grace. When I ſee a Fool abandon'd by For-"tune, I am no more ſurpris'd at it, than when I "ſee a Blind-Man fall into a Precipice, becauſe he "walks without a Guide. But when I ſee Fortune "overturn a Man that has a ſolid Foundation of Pru-"dence, I cannot ſufficiently exclaim againſt her "unjuſt Cruelty. The Miſchief is, that one can

"hard-

(i) Deſpreaux, Sat. 8.

(k) Silhon's *Miniſter of State. B.1. ch.15.*

(l) *The Abbot de Pure, his Life of Marſhal de Gaſſion, To.4. c.4. p.35. ad an. 1645.*

(a) *'Tis the firſt of the 1ſt Book of the 2d Part of his new Works. It is written to the Counteſs de . . . and is without Date.*

known that he was a great (I) Fumbler. The Letter he wrote to a Lady, who boaſted of the Box on the Ear ſhe gave him, is ſpiteful enough *. It may very well be that it was an Epiſtle, which he compos'd for his pleaſure, and wrote to no body; and this is not the only Adventure which appears to be imaginary among the things which

“ hardly put himſelf into ſuch a condition as to avoid her Injuſtice. She is a Goddeſs that makes ſport with her Adorers, as well as with her Enemies; ſhe often does Evil to thoſe who ſhun her: At Court ſhe ſtirs up an envious Perſon againſt you, who blackens your *Actions*; a Rival who does you ill Offices with the Prince: In the Country ſhe will ſtrike off a Stone from a Rock, or cauſe an Eagle to lift up a Tortoiſe into the Air, which ſhall cruſh you. She does almoſt equally ſlight the Altars which are built for her by the Courtiers, and the Contempt ſhe receives from the Philoſophers. Alas! if Wiſdom and Virtue could ſecure us from her Blows, good Men needed not fear her, and none but ſuch as are ſtupid or wicked would be found among the Unfortunate; but virtuous and witty Men ſeem to be moſt expos'd to her Power. All the Eyes of Prudence are not ſharp enough to penetrate into the ſecret Springs which ſet her Wheels in motion. Her Motions are conceal'd from us, and ſince we cannot know the cauſes of them, we cannot avoid their effects. This being ſo, it were folly to be griev'd for it; but we ought to endure her Motions, and look upon them as upon thoſe of the Stars. If any one ſhould torment himſelf becauſe of an Eclipſe of the Sun or Moon, he wou'd be look'd upon as a Madman; and he that is griev'd for a change of Fortune is little leſs unreaſonable. He wrote in another (b) Letter the Grief he endur'd at *Fontainebleau* in ſolliciting an Affair wherein he did not ſucceed: A thouſand Crowns were cut off from his Salary, and he could not revoke this Retrenchment. “Since I came to *Fontainebleau*, ſays he, “I have loſt every Day nine or ten Hours exactly in a very melancholy Hall, where indeed I have, for Companions, many Perſons more conſiderable than myſelf, who are receiv'd there with no more Ceremony, nor diſpatch'd with greater diligence. . . . . When I endeavour to allay my Grief, ſometimes I fancy, that if one who is altogether indifferent, and unconcern'd about any buſineſs, ſhould come into the Hall where all the People wait ſo impatiently, he would take a great deal of pleaſure in ſeeing our different Poſtures; ſome are Muſing, others Raging; ſome are Walking, others Leaning againſt the Wall; and when the Patron's Door makes the leaſt noiſe, preſently all caſt their Eyes that way; and tho' none comes out but a Lacquey, they all make a profound Reverence. If this Lacquey ſays the Patron is Indiſpos'd, all our Affairs fall ſick; and the miſchief on't is, that when he is well, mine are ſcarce ever the better. Sometimes, at length, he appears like Lightning, then all the People follow him, crowd about him, and deſire to be heard. I endeavour to be heard, among the reſt; but my weak Voice is loſt in the Crowd, and is not heard. Sometimes, to eaſe my Grief, I go to feed my Eyes with the Charms of *Fontainebleau*, and the Beauties of the Court: Sometimes I go to ſee the Queen's Maids of Honour, and ſometimes the Chambers and Galleries of the Caſtle: After this I walk along the Canals, and there I go a great way in the darkneſs of the Woods. But the retrenching of my thouſand Crowns embitters all the Pleaſure I would take, it tarniſhes the Eyes and Complexions of the Ladies *Soubize*, *Briſſac*, St. *Geran*, *Lanois*, *la Mark*, and *Rouvroy*: It defaces the Beauty of the Tapiſtry, the Painting, and Gilding of the richeſt Apartments; it troubles the Waters of the Canals, Fountains, and Caſcades; it dries up the Leaves and Bloſſoms of the Elm-Trees, the Linden and Orange-Trees.

I have not ſeen the Verſes which he made (c) upon a Decree, which cruſh'd him, by condemning him to be accountable for a Man who had ſpent His Majeſty's Money; but I have a good Opinion of them, when I conſider that they are a part of a Collection of Poems, in which there was a Piece which was highly eſteem'd by a good Judge, who is no ways prodigal of his Praiſes: *To this we may add a third*, ſays he, (d) *which Mr.* Pays *wrote in Praiſe of* Tobacco, *which doubtleſs will contribute very much to augment the Sale of it, and the letting it out to Farm. He wrote two Poems upon this barren Subject, and he took the pains to mingle in them ſo many pleaſant things, and to extol its Virtues ſo much, that for the future this Plant will be ſeen among the Flowers of Parnaſſus.* To underſtand all this Paſſage, we muſt know, that the Author had alledg'd two other Reaſons, which I ſhall relate, becauſe they are ſubſervient to the Hiſtory of him, who is the Subject of this Article: “Beſides the Reaſons taken from the Proceſs itſelf, there are two others, which ſeem'd to ſecure Mr. *Pays* from ſo terrible a Condemnation; one is, that he was never enrich'd in the ſpace of thirty Years, that he was concern'd in the King's Farms: the other is, That he was too great a Wit to engage in the Accompts and Calculations of the Treaſury. I am ſure, I may be allow'd to conjecture, that a Poet who had ſucceeded ſo well in writing the Praiſes of Tobacco, did expreſs very well in the ſame Tome, his Indignation againſt the Injuſtice of a cruel Decree. The Muſes are never more eloquent, more lively, nor more fruitful in Thoughts than upon ſuch like occaſions. Theſe are not ſuch Circumſtances to which we may apply that Phraſe, *Curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes ſtupent.* Nevertheleſs, I leave it to thoſe who have read thoſe Pieces to determine, whether we ſhould ſay of Mr. *Pays*, what he wrote to a Count: (e) “It were pity, Sir, that you ſhould not have met with ſome Trouble, for you make ſo agreeable an uſe of it, and your Letter has given me ſo good a Picture of it, that I ſhould now be very ſorry, if you had gain'd the Suit which gives you diſturbance. *Neque dii, neque deæ faciant ut te fortuna in deliciis habeat.* If I were *Seneca*, you ſhould be my *Lucilius*, and I would make you the like Compliment as he did. In effect, Sir, would I not have reaſon to ſpeak after this manner, after I have read the chagrin and pleaſant things which your pretended Misfortune has cauſ'd you to write. . . . Yes, Sir, your Troubles have given me a great Diverſion, becauſe you treat of them ſo well, that ſurely they have ſcarce done you any hurt. If you were overwhelm'd with them, as you ſay, you would not ſpeak of them with ſo much eaſe as you do. *Coſtar* (f) was very near of the ſame Humour. *There is but one thing*, ſays he, *which the moſt ſevere* could blame, *in the Complaint that Mr.* Balzac made of his Diſeaſes and Diſgraces; *and that is, That they are too eloquent, and too curiouſly ſought after. And truly, he has employ'd in them ſo great a number of merry Thoughts, that he brings to my Mind the Comedian* Apelles, *who, during the time that* Caligula *cauſ'd him to be whipt, cried with ſo harmonious a Voice, that this wicked Prince,* (a) *to prolong the Pleaſure he receiv'd by it, made the Puniſhment of this unhappy Man to continue the longer. None but* Caligula *was capable of ſuch a Barbarity. But, I think, there are ſome People to be met with, who, without being barbarous, are ſo addicted to their Pleaſure, that they would almoſt rejoice at the* Sciatica *and* Stone *of our Orator, when they read in ſome of his Letters*, &c. Here he gives many Extracts of 'em, after which he ſays, (b) *The greateſt part of all theſe things are ſo pleaſantly contriv'd, that I ſhould be a declar'd Enemy to the publick Joy, if it were true that I was offended with them, as my Adverſary affirms.*

(I) *That it ſhould be known that he was a great Fumbler.*] He ought to have conceal'd this Fault, for it is ſomewhat contrary to Politeneſs. Conſult the Dictionary of *Furetiere*, and there you will find not only the Definition, but alſo the condemnation of this way of acting. The Definition contains theſe words: (c) *'Tis ſaid alſo, that a Woman is* Fumbled, *when her Arms, Boſom, &c. are handled.* The Condemnation contains theſe: *There are none but Country-Women and Servant-Maids that ſuffer themſelves to be* Fumbled. Fumbling *is not uſ'd by the finer ſort of People. . . . The Provincials are great* Fumblers. *Furetiere* had reaſon to ſay this of the Provincials; he might have added, That this Fault reigns more or leſs in the Provinces of *France*; according as they are more or leſs diſtant from *Paris*; and that it is much more common in the Cities than in the Country, and yet more in the little Towns than in the great ones: Which proves, that this is not which he relates. 'Tis very probable, that he never ſaw his Miſtreſs as naked (K) as his Hand, and that he only forg'd it, that he might have occaſion to publiſh many Conceits. He was Caſt in a troubleſome † Suit a little before his Death, and died at *Paris*, *April* 30. 1690. There was a Satyr || publiſh'd againſt him in 1670.

---

* *See the Remark I.*

(b) *The 30th of the 2d Book of the 1ſt part of his new Works. It is written from* Fontainebleau Aug. 13. *to the Count* de Lionne, *the Year is not ſet down.* A DESCRIPTION of the ſollicitation of Affairs at Court.

(c) *See the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, for the Month of* Sept. 1688. p. 132.

(d) Baſnage de Beauval *Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned* Ib. p. 132.

(e) Pays *in his New Works, P. 2 B. 1. Let. 9. It is written to the Count du* Bouchage, *and dated* June 12. 1668.

(f) Coſtar *Apolog. p.* 111.

(a) Suetonius *does not ſay ſo, he ſays, only,* Cum aſſiſtens ſimulacro Jovis Apellem tragœdum conſuluiſſet, uter illi major videretur, cunctantem flagellis diſcidit: collaudans ſubinde vocem deprecantis, quaſi etiam in gemitu prædulcem. *Sueton. in Calig. c.* 33.

(b) Coſtar *ib. p.* 113.

(c) Furet. *Dictionary, at the word* Patiner.

PALEARIUS (*Aonius*) one of the moſt virtuous Men in the World, and one of the good Writers in the ſixteenth Century, was born at *Veroli*, * an Epiſcopal City (A Δ) in the *Campania di Roma*. He was well ſkill'd both in the *Latin* and *Greek*; and to this knowledge of polite Learning he join'd the knowledge of Philoſophy and Divinity; and to improve himſelf the more in this Learning, he travel'd over the greateſt part of *Italy*, and ſtudied as a Scholar under the moſt excellent Philoſophers he could find there. He ſpent ſix whole Years at *Rome*, before † that City was taken by the Army of *Charles* the Fifth, and return'd thither ſeveral times after that Deſolation. He gave a publick Teſtimony of his Improvement, in a fine Poem which he wrote about the β Immortality of the Soul, for which he was highly eſteem'd by the Learned (A) and great Wits of that time. Having retir'd into *Tuſcany*, he choſe

† *See the Remark H.*

|| *Printed, if I miſtake not, either at* Grenoble *or* Lyons. *He was very ill treated in this little Piece.*

* *From hence comes his ſurname* Verulanus.

† Palearius *Epiſt. 4. l. 1. p. 406.*

β *See the Remark E.*

not regulated according to the Ideas of Morality, but according to thoſe of Politeneſs and of a genteel Carriage. There is another notable Proof of it, which is this, That Luſt is more commonly carried on to the finiſhing Act in Cities, than in Villages; and in great Cities than in little ones. We will add, *en paſſant*, that notwithſtanding the politeneſs of the Age of *Auguſtus*, the young Maids of *Rome* were obliged to beware of the Hands of Fumblers; they made uſe of their Nails, but they were well pared (d). I have (e) elſewhere quoted a Paſſage, which probably concerns a Provincial, who had ſtayed a long time at *Paris*, and who nevertheleſs was of Opinion, that to procure to himſelf the eſteem of the Marchioneſſes he muſt Fumble them. We will relate this again, and add to it what follows. (f) “M. M. was going into *Bretagne* with the Marchioneſs of *Lavardin*, to ſee Madam *de Sevigny*; he was in the Coach of the Marchioneſs, and by the way, *per non parer troppo coglione*, he cajol'd her, and took her by the Hand to kiſs it. Madam *de Lavardin* told him Smiling, *Sir, You take me then for Madam de S. . . .* The ſame Man being in Company with the Counteſs *de la Suze*, handled her Hands, and ſhe told him this Verſe of *Scarron*; *Fumblers are an intolerable People.* To which he anſwered immediately in the Verſe which follows; *Even to thoſe Beauties which deſerve moſt to be Fumbled.*

You do not prove, will ſome ſay, what muſt be prov'd. A little patience, ſay I, and it ſhall quickly be prov'd. The Proof appears in many Letters of Mr. *Pays*, and particularly in the firſt Book of his *Amitiez*, in the 24th Letter, where he ſays to his *Caliſle*; *I was afraid of you, tho' you was (g) Naked and Diſarm'd, and tho' probably you had not that curſed Bodkin, wherewith you puniſh'd* ſo often *my little tranſports.* What I am now to add, furniſhes a Proof yet more evident, which I ſhall take from a Letter which he wrote to a Lady, who boaſted of having given him a Box on the Ear. “I muſt diſabuſe you, dear Madam. The Glory of treating me ill is not ſo great as you think: I have had twenty Miſtreſſes, who were more fierce than you, who knew better how to repulſe my Attacks, and yet never boaſted of it. You are but a Novice in the point of Cruelty; and your very Maid could teach you a Leſſon about it. For leſſer Freedoms *Catin* hath treated me more cruelly; you gave me but a Box on the Ear, but ſhe gave me more than twelve; you tore only a Ribbon, but ſhe tore out half my Hair, and yet ſhe never told any thing to any body of it. You reſemble your Great Couſin for Vanity; he never ſaw any thing of War but one wretched Skirmiſh, and he makes a Relation of it to all the World: You, perhaps, have never treated any body ill but me, and you make a Story of it to all the City; but if you would tell how all things paſs'd, I could endure your Vanity, and not complain of your Indiſcretion. Why all this buſtle, and ſo much fierceneſs? Why do you diminiſh in your Diſcourſe the exceſs of the boldneſs that I us'd? Why do you encreaſe the ſharpneſs of your Reproaches, and the weight of the Blow you gave me? Ah! Madam, if you remember, the Reproaches were not very ſharp, and the Blow was ſcarce of any weight. In Juſtice I deſerv'd more; and if you had done all that you have ſaid, you would have done but half your Duty. Nevertheleſs, you know very well, that in your Heart you were afraid of having been in too great a Paſſion; you were afraid leſt I ſhould be more provok'd than you, and at laſt you aſſum'd ſuch an Air as might perſwade me, that you would be no more offended with my boldneſs: But your Gentleneſs did not pacify me; and when I ſaw your Reſiſtance grow ſo quickly faint, I deſpis'd a Victory ſo eaſy. Confeſs the truth, Madam, this was the Cauſe of your Rage, my Contempt offended you, and you thought it neceſſary to cloak it with the appearance of yours (h). The Letter which precedes this is no leſs ſpiteful; it was written to a Lady who found Mr. *Pays* too familiar; and it deſerves to be read, for it may ſerve for a Leſſon to many Perſons who ſtand in need of it.

(K) *That he never ſaw his Miſtreſs as naked as his hand.*] He affirms it without flinching. (i) “Laſtly, *Caliſle*, all your Wiles were in vain. I found out the place, yeſternight, where you bathed. . . . For God's ſake, why do you take ſo much care to hide yourſelf? In truth, you did not ſhow any parts that are ſhameful; and if there were any ſuch, they were the Knees and other Members of your Siſter and Couſin, which ſhould have been aſham'd to appear in the preſence of yours. But as to you, tho' you ſhowed all that you have, you ſhow'd nothing but what is very beautiful, nothing but what is glorious to you. I perceiv'd then that the Parts which you kept conceal'd, were not inferior to thoſe you ſuffer'd to be ſeen; and I thought with myſelf, that there are ſome of the Fair Sex, who had more reaſon to hide their Noſes, than you have to hide your Buttocks. The reſt of that Letter is a medley of pretty Thoughts; which makes me believe that he feign'd this Adventure, that he might have an opportunity to publiſh them. Whatever Privilege the Fair Sex may have in many Provinces of *France*, to allow themſelves with decency many Freedoms which would diſgrace them in *Italy*, I am certain that the Miſtreſs of Mr. *Pays*, nor the Siſter and Couſin of that *Caliſle*, did not bathe in a River without a Shift, or Linen Cover, in view of one another, and that with ſo little Precaution that a Man might ſurpriſe them in this Condition, and compare at his leiſure the moſt ſecret Parts of one with the moſt ſecret Parts of the others. I doubt whether even the Country Women allow themſelves ſo much liberty: Much more may we think, that thoſe Maids, who, without any great abuſe, had the Title of *Demoiſelles*, would never ſo far violate the Laws of Chaſtity and Decency. If they intended to ſtrip themſelves wholly of their Cloaths, that they might the better enjoy the cool Air, doubtleſs they waited for the darkneſs of the Night to do it in. There is no ſuch Cuſtom in our Days, as there was in the Days (k) of *Diana*. I may ſay therefore of this Letter, and of many other Pieces of the ſame Nature, that ſome things are publiſh'd in them as if they had really happen'd, which are only the Invention of the Author.

(A Δ) *An Epiſcopal City in the* Campania di Roma.] I do not at all underſtand theſe words of the Preface, which I ſhall quote here under: *Natus eſt Aonius Verulis (oppidum id eſt Latii Epiſcopalis)* and I conjecture, that he who ſpoke this had before his Eyes a Book, wherein there was, *Urbs Latii Epiſcopalis*, and that having put *oppidum* inſtead of *Urbs*, he forgot to put *Epiſcopale* inſtead of *Epiſcopalis*.

(A) *He was highly eſteem'd by the Learned and great Wits.*] The Preface prefix'd before the New Edition of the Works of *Aonius Palearius*, acquaints us with the Names of ſome Perſons by whom he was lov'd and

(d) Nos convivia, nos prælia virginum Sectis in juvenes unguibus acrium, Cantamus vacui. *Hor. Ode 6. lib. 1. Elſewhere he ſays, that they would defend themſelves ill againſt thoſe that endeavour'd to kiſs them.* Dum flagrantia detorquet ad oſcula Cervicem, aut facili ſævitiâ negat, Quæ poſcente magis gaudeat eripi, Interdum rapere occupet? *Id. Od. 12. l. 2. See alſo Ode 9. l. 1.*

(e) *In the Article* Lycurgus.

(f) *A continuation of* Menagiana, *p.* 378, 379. *This is ſaid of M.* Menage *himſelf.*

(g) *He ſuppoſes that he ſurpris'd her at the Bath.*

(h) Pays *in his new Works, Par. 1. B. 2. Lett. 3. p. m. 107, 108.*

(i) Pays's Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes, *B. 1. Letter 24. p. m. 22.*

(k) *See* Ovid's *Metamorph. l. 2. v. 461. & lib. 3. v. 173.*

choſe the City of *Siena* for his fix'd Habitation; where he was made Profeſſor of Humane Learning, and had a great number of Scholars: And there he married at the Age of 34 Years, to a young Maid, whom he lov'd paſſionately all his Life, who brought him ɣ four Children. His Repoſe was a little diſturbed by a Quarrel he had with one of his Collegues, who was troubled to ſee his own Reputation obſcur'd by the luſtre of that of *Palearius*. But *Peter Aretin* quickly quell'd (B) this envious Man. After this there aroſe another Storm, which was much more terrible, *Antony Bellantes*, a Nobleman of *Siena*, being accus'd of many Miſdemeanors, deliver'd himſelf from this troubleſome Affair by means of *Palearius*'s Pleading for him. Some time after he accus'd ſome Monks of having robb'd his Grandmother, and employ'd again the Eloquence of *Palearius* to maintain his Right. The Defendants having ſworn that they took nothing from the good Woman, were Acquitted by the Judgment of the Court; but they kept in their Minds a lively Reſentment againſt the Advocate of the other Party, and had recourſe to their common Artifices to deſtroy him: To which purpoſe they defam'd him as an impious Wretch, and preach'd againſt him on this Head: But he made an Apology for himſelf with ſo much Vigour and Eloquence, that the Accuſation vaniſh'd. Nevertheleſs, being wearied with the Perſecutions to which he ſaw himſelf expos'd, he left *Siena*, and went to ſettle at (C) *Lucca*; from whence, after a few Years, he remov'd to *Milan*. The Magiſtrates call'd him thither, and gave him Marks of their eſteem, by granting him * ſeveral Immunities, beſides a good Penſion. It happen'd unfortunately for him, that a Cardinal who had been a *Dominican*, and a ſevere Inquiſitor, became Pope † after the Death of *Pius* the Fourth. He had a mind to ſignalize himſelf by the Puniſhment of ſome famous Hereticks at the beginning of his Reign, and for that end he ordain'd that the Cauſe of *Palearius* ſhould be review'd. This Learned Man was ſeiz'd at *Milan*, and carried to *Rome*, where he was eaſily convicted of having ſpoken in (D) favour of the *Lutherans*, and againſt the Inqui-

ɣ *Two Sons and two Daughters.*

* *In the Year* 1559.

† *Under the Name of* Pius V.

and eſteem'd. *Summo in honore fuit Palearius apud viros ætatis iſtius principes: Petrum Bembum, Jacobum Sadoletum, Franciſcum Sfondratum, Ennium Philonardum, Eccleſiæ Romanæ Cardinales; Janum Benedictum Lampridium, Marcum Antonium Flaminium, Andream Alciatum.* To know the Names of many others of his Friends, you need do no more but caſt your Eyes upon a Liſt which was Printed of them, at the end of his Letters in the laſt Edition: There we find the Names of thoſe who wrote to him, and of thoſe to whom he wrote. In the ſame Edition we find after the Preface, the good Teſtimony which many Learned Men gave him; but becauſe the following Verſes of *Baptiſta Pigna*, are not to be met with there, I think fit to ſet them down here.

Aoni (a) *decus Aonum ſororum,*
Quos mihi dedit aureos libellos
Riccius tuus, aureos libellos
Qui deſiderium omnibus relinquunt,
Quo magis relegunt magis legendi,
Intentis oculis libenter hauſi.
Immortalem animam probas in ipſis.
Ipſi ſecula ſempiterna, & eſſe
Immortalem operam tuam probabunt.

(a) Jo. Baptiſta Pigna, Carmin. *l.* 3. *p. m.* 81.

(B) Peter Aretin *quickly quell'd this envious Man.*] If I be not miſtaken, his deſign was not to revenge *Palearius*'s Quarrel, but to revenge himſelf, or to ſatisfy his ſlandering Humour. (b) Senis *primum exagitari cœpit inſanis contentionibus neſcio cujus profeſſoris, (ipſe* Machum Blateronem *vocat) qui putabat tantum decedere de ſuo honore, quantum Aonii virtutibus & meritis dabatur. Quamquam hunc morionem ignobilem brevi compeſcuit mordax ingenium Petri Aretini, qui ſtolidum pecus omnium ludibriis ſanniſque expoſuit in fabula quadam vulgari idiomate conſcripta, & Venetiis publico ſpectaculo exhibita. Palearius* complains very much of this Enemy, of whom he ſpeaks as of a meer *Ignoramus*, who had taught the *Latin* Tongue at *Siena*, with ſo little Judgment that his own Scholars did very much deſpiſe him. When *Palearius* wrote this, that Man taught at *Lucca*, and endeavour'd, by his (c) Calumnies, to hinder his Adverſary from being call'd thither. We ſhall ſee in the following Remarks that his Efforts were fruitleſs. (d) *Machus Blatero, is de quo hominibus noſtris fabula data eſt ab Aretino, lepidè & feſtivè ſcripta, homo impudentiſſimus, & puræ veræque Latinitatis tàm ignarus, quàm ii qui trans Taurum incolunt: Senis quam diu fuit, magnas mihi turbas fecit, veritus ne munus interpretationis ſcriptionum Latinarum mihi demandaretur: in qua cum ille infeliciter multos annos laboraſſet, apud eruditiores juvenes nihil aliud fuerat aſſequutus, quàm turpiſſimum infantiæ nomen: Is nunc Lucæ eſt, utinam tàm cognitus, quàm Venetiis, ubi & fabula acta eſt, & Machus ludibrio habitus.*

(b) *Præfat. operum Aonii Palearii Edit.* 1696.

(c) *Palearius Epiſt.* 17. *l.* 3. *p.* 500.

(d) *Ibid. p.* 499.

(C) *And went to ſettle at* Lucca.] He was called thither by the Magiſtrates, to teach humane Learning; and if he accepted this Office (e) it was not upon the account of any pleaſure he took in teaching, but becauſe he had not a Revenue ſufficient to maintain the expences of his Family. His Wife lov'd to make a ſhew, his Children were not free from Vain-glory, and therefore, contrary to his own Inclination, he muſt turn a Teacher, tho' he was afraid leſt that exerciſe ſhould leſſen his Wit, and blunt the vigour he felt for more ſublime Studies. He is not the only Perſon who has been reduc'd to this Pinch, and whom domeſtick Expences forc'd to groan under the burden of Repetitions and Leſſons. Read the words of this Author, who expreſſes himſelf well: *(f) Moriar ſi non me angunt putidiſſimæ interpretationes meæ, ſive Græcæ, ſive Latinæ, in quas veluti in piſtrinum detruſi me, non tàm imprudentiâ, quam neceſſitate. Ego enim, ut ex meis ſtudiis noſſe potuiſti, ſemper judicavi obſcurum & ſordidum iis, quorum ingenio aliquid fieri poteſt illuſtrius, ſi interpretandis ſcriptis aliorum humiles ac demiſſi, quaſi ſervitia ancillentur. Sed cùm mihi res domi eſſet anguſta, uxor lauta, liberi ſplendidi, & propterea magnos ſumptus facerem, mancipavi propè me iis ſtudiis, à quibus ſemper abhorrui.*

(e) Cum Lucenſes homines honeſtiſſimi propoſitis præmiis invitarent me ſingulorum dierum unius horæ uſurâ ad interpretandum, accepi conditionem duram mihi & aſperam, & vero etiam odioſam. *Palearius epiſt.* 4. *lib.* 4. *p.* 509.

(f) Ibid.

(D) *Of having ſpoken in favour of the* Lutherans, *and againſt the Inquiſition.*] The Monks that endeavour'd to deſtroy him at *Siena*, decry'd him as an Heretick, becauſe he declar'd plainly enough, that he diſapprov'd certain Superſtitions. Beſides, they did not approve the Book he wrote about the Merits (g) of Jeſus Chriſt. In the Apology he was oblig'd to make he was not afraid to ſay, That the *German* Doctors who follow'd *Luther* were commendable in ſome things, and that the Inquiſition was deſign'd for putting Learned Men to Death. His Affair was (h) amicably concluded, and it was ſaid, that all the Copies of his Apology ſhou'd be thrown into the Fire. Nevertheleſs three of them were preſerv'd, whereof he kept one, his Adverſary had another, and the third was that which *Peter Victorius* had (a). The Copy which remain'd in the hands of his Accuſer, ſerv'd for the Conviction of *Aonius*; for the following words, in favour of the Proteſtants, are to be found in it. (b) *Germanos vocas Oecolampadium, Rotherodamum, Melancthonem, Lutherum, Pomeranum, Bucerum, & cæteros qui in ſuſpicionem vocati ſunt? Ego verò ex Theologis noſtris tam ſtupidum arbitror eſſe neminem, qui non intelligat & fateatur, permulta eſſe in his quæ ab illis ſcripta ſunt, digna prorſus omni laude: ſunt enim graviter, accuratè & ſyncerè ſcripta, repetita vel ex patribus illis primis, qui præcepta nobis ſalutaria reliquerunt: vel ex commentationibus Græcorum, & noſtrorum hominum.* Let us relate alſo what he ſays of

(g) *This Work is loſt. It was in* Italian. *See the Plan of it in the Harangue of* Palearius, *pag.* 90, 91.

(h) *Preface to the Works of* Palearius.

(a) *Ibid.*

(b) *Palearius Orat.* 3. *p.* 83.

Inquiſition. He was (E) condemn'd to the Fire, and the Sentence was executed without any Mercy in 1566.* There are many Pieces written by him both in Verſe and in Proſe; the beſt Edition of them is that of Mr. *Wetſtein* at *Amſterdam* 1696.

PALINGENIUS (*Marcellus*) is famous for a Poem divided into twelve Books, and entitled, (A) *Zodiacus Vitæ.* He ſpent † many Years in Compoſing it, and dedicated it to *Hercules d'Eſt*, the ſecond of the Name, Duke of *Ferrara.* Some ſay that he was (B) Phyſician to that Prince: Others place him ‡ in the number of thoſe Learned *Lutherans*, whom the Dutcheſs of *Ferrara*, *Renata* of *France*, receiv'd into her Court, and honour'd with her protection. 'Tis certain that he ſpoke againſt the Monks and the abuſes of the Church with extream freedom; and hence it comes to paſs that he is found in ‡ the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, among the Hereticks of the firſt Rank, as being a *Lutheran.* 'Tis ſaid alſo that his dead Body (C) was dug up and burnt under pretence of Hereſy. Nevertheleſs he declares himſelf a good Catholick at the end of his Epiſtle Dedicatory; for he ſubmits (D) his whole Doctrine

of the Inquiſition. (c) *Quid niſi indicti concilii ſpes bonis injecta eſſet, negotium felix & ſalutare à Pontificibus, à Cæſare, à Regibus unà ſuſceptum iri, ut magnis concurſibus omnium gentium, omnium nationum celeberrimi conventus peragantur, deſperaremus omnino tantarum perturbationum finem ullum unquam futurum: deſperaremus poſſe fieri, ut ſica iſta diſtricta in omnes ſcriptores, de manibus eorum extorqueatur, qui vel leviſſimis de cauſis crudeliſſimè ferire didicerunt: à quibus appetitus fuit aliquando vir omnium ſanctiſſimus & integerrimus, Sadoletus meus.* When he made this Apology it was but (d) a little time after *Ochinus* had made his eſcape, and therefore we ought to believe that it was made in 1542. or 1543. *Palearius* was then a good Proteſtant, but he did not ſay all that he thought. A Book written with his Hand was found in 1596. entitled, *Teſtimonium ad gentes & nationes quæ invocant nomen Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti*, to which is added a much longer Treatiſe, entitled, *Actio ex Declaratione teſtimonii in Pontifices Romanos & eorum Aſſeclas. Ad Principes Chriſtianos, & Præfectos Concilii, in quibus habitat Spiritus Dei.* He wrote this piece a little before the opening of the Council of *Trent*; his deſign was to have it preſented to that Aſſembly by the Ambaſſadors of the Emperor. It is a Plea in good form for the Cauſe of the Proteſtants, which was never publiſh'd till the Year (e) 1606. There are two Opinions in it which they do not approve of; one is, that Marriage is a Sacrament; the other is, that a Chriſtian ought not to ſwear at all, no, not before the Judges. (f)

(E) *Condemn'd to the Fire . . . . in 1566.*] He that publiſh'd the *Actio in Pontifices* in 1606. informs us, that *Palearius* was burnt at *Rome* about the Year 1558. (g) and that he declar'd publickly what was his Faith; but he is miſtaken as to the time. He that wrote the Preface to the new Edition ſhows plainly that we muſt hold with *Thuanus* (h), who ſays, that this Learned Man was burnt in 1566. This may ſerve to refute *Simler*, who ſays, (i) that this Martyr was beheaded in 1570. which is both an Error in Chronology and as to the kind of Death. I have heard ſome ſay, that he was burnt for his Book of the Immortality of the Soul, but this is falſe; for there is nothing in that fine Poem which the Roman Catholicks could condemn. A certain Perſon wrote from *Italy* to *Marcus Velſerus*, that this Piece was not *Aonius Palearius*'s; but I know not what Anſwer he made to *Velſerus*, who demanded immediately to what Author it muſt be attributed (k). We have ſhewn above that *Pigna* praiſes *Palearius* for writing this Poem; and all the Catalogue Writers aſcribe it to him. I find in the *Epitome* of *Geſner* that it was Printed at *Lyons* in 1536. *James Sadoletus*, Biſhop of *Carpentras*, wrote to (l) *Gryphius*, to exhort him to print it. He wrote alſo a Letter to the Author (m) wherein he mightily commends this Piece. *Palearius* had ſent him a Copy of an Edition (n) that was uncorrect, and pray'd him to get *Gryphius* to reprint it. A Book cannot be more advantageouſly recommended to a Printer than *Sadoletus* recommends this to *Sebaſtian Gryphius.* I ſhall only relate part of his *Elogium.* (o) *Numerus porro carminis is eſt, ut videatur Lucretium velle imitari, redolet enim antiquum illud; ſed ita ſapore humanitatis conditum eſt, ut aſperitate demiſſa, vetuſtatis tamen autoritas ſalva remaneat. Atque hæc in univerſum. Illa jam partium ſingularum propria, nihil non accuratè, quove judicium & diligentiam adhibitam eſſe non pateat: multaque præterea ubique nitentia ingenii & venuſtatis luminibus, &, quod ego pluris quam reliqua omnia facio, Chriſtiana mens, integra, caſtaque religio, erga Deum ipſum honos, pietas, ſtudium; in eo libro vel maximè, non ſolum docere mentes errantium, ſed etiam animos incendere ad amorem puræ religionis poſſint.*

(A) *Divided into twelve Books, and intitled, Zodiacus vitæ.*] *Hoc eſt de hominis vita, ſtudio, ac moribus optime inſtituendis libri* 12. Each of theſe twelve Books has the name of one of the twelve Signs of the Zodiack, and I make no doubt but this is the reaſon why this Author calls himſelf *poeta ſtellatus.* *Scaliger* the Father (p) has cenſur'd it ſharply, and I think with very good reaſon, for the little reſemblance there is between the Matters of each Book, and the qualities of the Sign of the Zodiack, which is the Title of it. I obſerve, by the by, that *Barthius* has written a Poem (q) in imitation of this; the Title of it is, *Zodiacus vitæ Chriſtianæ, Satyricon pleraque omnia veræ ſapientiæ myſteria ſingulari ſuavitate enarrans.* He divided it into twelve Books, whereof each bears the name of a Sign of the Zodiack. He does not trouble himſelf to obſerve ſome reſemblance between the Matters of each Book, and the Virtue which is attributed to each of thoſe twelve Conſtellations.

(B) *That he was Phyſician to that Prince.*] *Scævola de Sainte Marthe* affirms it (r); I dare not deny it: I ſhall only ſay, that this Poet was not known to the Duke of *Ferrara* when he dedicated his Book to him; for he declares in his Epiſtle Dedicatory, that underſtanding by report the Learning of the Duke, he had taken the boldneſs to addreſs to him, after the hopes of a good reception which *Braſavolus* had given him. (ſ) *Quid mihi cum principe qui alienis oculis videt? ore loquitur alieno? illum volo qui per ſe poſſit curvum diſcernere recto: cui non auſint maligni homines dicere candida de nigris, & de candentibus atra. Talem igitur cùm te eſſe omnes prædicent, Dux illuſtriſſ. audacter ad te profectus ſum: eo maximè quòd Antonius Muſa Braſavolus, vir ſingulari doctrina integritateque conſpicuus, qui excellentiam tuam fideliſſimè colit, mihi de te ſpem optimam attulit: quippe qui doctrinam, humanitatem, liberalitatemque tuam mirificè apud me commendavit. Cujus verbis tantum habeo fidei, quantum dici poſſit. Ego igitur ſuadente, &c.* Note, that he is not in the Catalogue of Poetical Phyſicians compil'd by *Bartholinus.*

(C) *That his dead Body was dug up and burnt.*] I read this in Melchior Adam: *Edidit præterea*, ſays he (t) ſpeaking of *Chriſtopher Wirſungus*, *Marcelli Palingenii ſtellatenſis (cujus cadaver, propter pietatis doctrinam in Italia exhumatum concrematumque fuit) poëmata doctiſſimis adjectis commentariis.*

But I have a teſtimony more authentical; for *Gyraldus*, who liv'd in that time, and in the Country where the thing happen'd, affirms, That they dealt cruelly by the Aſhes of this Poet, (v) *poſt ejus mortem in ejus cineres ſævitum eſt, ob impietatis crimen.*

(D) *He ſubmits all his Opinions to the cenſure of the Church.*] He confeſſes that having related the Opinions of Philoſophers, he had perhaps ſaid ſome things that were falſe, but that he was not anſwerable for them. It will be better to hear him himſelf. (w) *Si tamen in tanto opere aliquid fortè reperitur quod à noſtra religione aliquantum diſſentire videatur, mihi minimè imputandum cenſeo. Nam dum aliquando de rebus philoſophicis loquor, diverſorum philoſophorum opiniones refero, præſertim Platonicorum. Quæ ſi falſa ſunt, non ego, ſed ipſi reprehendi debent: cùm mea ſit intentio, à catholica fide nunquam declinare. Quocirca in omnibus quæ ſcripſi, orthodoxæ Eccleſiæ me humiliter ſubjicio: ejuſque cenſuram, ut virum Chriſtianum decet, libenter accipio.* After this the Inquiſition could not in juſtice proceed againſt his Perſon, nor declare him an Heretick, which Cenſure could at moſt belong only to his Doctrine; for it is Dogmaticalneſs and not Error which is condemn'd in a Man.

(c) *Ibid. p.* 91.

(d) *Ibid.*

(e) *Neither the Year nor Place of the Edition appear in the Title, but we learn from the Journal of Leipſick for the Month of* January, 1696. *p.* 44. *that it was printed at* Leipſick *in* 1606.

(f) *See the Advertiſement to the Reader.*

(g) Circiter annum Domini 1558. (ut ejus amicus quidam mihi narravit) Mediolani captus, vinctus, & Romam miſſus eſt, ubi fidei ſuæ confeſſione fortiter edita, flammis adjudicatus eſt.

(h) Thuan Hiſtor. lib. 39. pag. *m.* 779.

(i) In Epitome Biblioth. Geſner.

(k) *See the Letters of* Velſerus, *p.* 878.

(l) *His Letter is found in the Editi- of* Aonius Palearius, 1696. *p.* 564.

(m) *It is found ib. p.* 562.

(n) *See Letter* 2. *of B.* 3. *of Palearius, page* 434.

(o) *Sadolet. Epiſt. ad Gryph. p.* 565. *Operum Palearii edit.* 1696. *It is alſo among the Letters of Sadolet, p.* 184. *edit. Lugd.* 1554.

* *Taken from the Preface which is before the Works of Palearius, of the Amſterdam Edi.* 1696.

† Opus noſtrum . . . . in duodecim libros digeſtum, multoſque per annos elaboratum, Celſitudini tuæ donamus. *Epiſt. dedicat.*

‡ *See Seckendorf, Hiſt.* Lutheran. *l.* 2. *p.* 122. *n.* 5. *ad ann.* 1528. *He cites the Annals of* Scultetus, *p.* 148.

† *Pag.* 765. *edit.* 1667. *in Fol.*

(p) Julius Cæſar Scaliger, *Poet. l.* 6. *p. m.* 731, 732.

(q) *Printed at* Francfort *in* 1623. *in* 8vo.

(r) *In the Title of his French Tranſlation of ſome Paſſages of* Palingenius, apud du Verdier Vau-Privas his French Bibliotheque. *p.* 842.

(ſ) *Palingenius Epiſt. Dedicat.*

(t) *Melch. Adam in vitis Philoſophorum. p.* 253.

(v) Gyrald. de Poet. ſuorum temporum dial. 2. *p. m.* 569.

(w) Palingen. *Epiſt. dedicat.*

Doctrine to the Cenſure of the Church. All his Opinions cannot be approved by the Proteſtants. He urg'd ſome Objections of the Libertines too far, and explain'd them after ſuch a manner as ſhow'd he did not condemn them. Excepting this, his Zodiack is fill'd with good Things, and contains a handſome Philoſophical Satyr * againſt Immoralities and falſe Prejudices. There is an infinite number of Editions (*E*) of this Poem; but I find no Body who knows that which *Chriſtopher Wirſungus* illuſtrated with a † Commentary. 'Tis ſomewhat ſtrange that a Poet of his Merit ſhould appear ſo little among the great number of *Elogiums* which the *Italians* have publiſh'd on the Writers of their own Nation; probably his Title of Heretick was the cauſe of it. However, the Life of this Perſon is ſcarce at all known. He was the favourite Author of *Naudæus*.

A Man of Letters thinks that *Marcellus Palingenius* is a falſe Name under which *Marſilius Ficinus* is diſguis'd; which conjecture he confirms by a paſſage wherein *Ficinus* ‖ aſſigns himſelf two Fathers, *ſe duos habuiſſe patres, Ficinum Medicum, & Coſmum Medicen; ex illo natum, ex iſto renatum.* He might eaſily perſwade me that the Name *Palingenius* was not the Name of the Family of the Author of *Zodiacus vitæ*, but a Name turn'd into *Greek* according to the mode of that time. Nevertheleſs, I cannot think that this Piece was compos'd by *Ficinus*, ſince we are inform'd by *Giraldus* § of the proceſs made againſt the Aſhes of the Author of this Poem.

PALLAVICINO (*Ferrante*) the Author of ſome Satyrical Pieces, which made him loſe his Head upon a Scaffold. I have nothing to add to what *Moreri* has ſaid of him, but that there is an Abridgment of his Life prefix'd to the new Verſion ¶ of his Celeſtial Divorce.

PANORMITA (*Antony*) a native of * *Palermo* in *Sicily*, and deſcended from the Illuſtrious Family ɔ of the *Beccatelli*, which had been illuſtrious a long time at * *Bologna*, was one of the ableſt Men of the XVth Century. He being a Perſon of great worth for his Virtue and Learning, offer'd his Service to *Philip* Duke of *Milan*, and was receiv'd by him with great teſtimonies of his Goodneſs and Liberality. He taught him Hiſtory, and made publick Lectures, for which he had a Salary of 800 Crowns a Year. He was afterwards Secretary to *Alphonſus* King of *Naples*, and the chief director (*A*) of his Studies. The Learned Diſputes he had with *Laurentius Valla*, occaſion'd a torrent of Reproaches on both ſides, wherewith their Common Enemies very much diverted themſelves. He waited till he was old before he Married (*B*), and then he eſpous'd a beautiful Maid, for whom he had a particular Tenderneſs; and by whom he had Children who left Poſterity ‡. He was a Man

(*E*) *An infinite number of Editions of this Poem.*] The Authors of the *Index librorum prohibitorum* quote that of *Baſil* 1537, and obſerve that it followed that of *Italy*; but they neither ſet down the Year nor the Place of the latter Edition (*a*). I make uſe of that of 1569. in *Octavo*, where there is neither the Name of the Printer, nor the Place of the Impreſſion. The Alphabetical Table of Matters in it is very large, which was in the former Edition of 1537. as *Geſner* (*b*) obſerves. His Abridger ſays nothing of the Commentary of *Wirſungus*, neither under the word *Palingenius*, nor under that of *Wirſungus*. Mr. *Moreri* affirms that this Book was tranſlated into *French* and other Languages. *La Croix du Maine* ſays only, that *Scævola de Sainte Marthe* promis'd an entire Verſion of this Author, having publiſh'd one part of it. His Words are theſe, (*c*) "As he hath ſhewn "by his fine and well-poliſh'd imitations of the "Learned *Italian* Poet *Marcellus Palingenius*, whom "he tranſlated with ſo much grace that this diverted many from ſetting about it, who before had "reſolved to tranſlate it into our Language. He promis'd to continue till he had made an intire Verſion of the Zodiack of the ſaid *Palingenius*; but "hitherto he has Printed but one part of it, with "his other *French* Poems, which he entitled, *His firſt Works*, containing four Books of Imitations "and Tranſlations of ſeveral *Greek* and *Latin* Poets "printed at *Paris* by *Frederic Morel*, in the Year "1569. *Du Verdier* agrees with this Account, "who ſays (*d*) "That *Scævola de Sainte Marthe*, publiſh'd a Collection of many Diſcourſes taken from "the Zodiack of Life, written by *Marcellus Palingenius*, Phyſician to the Duke of *Ferrara*, and "tranſlated *by him* into *French* Verſe. If any one ſhould have ask'd of Mr. *Moreri*, what are the other (*e*) Poems of this *Italian*, he would have been a little puzzled to give an Account of them.

(*A*) *Secretary to Alphonſus* . . . *and chief Director of his Studies.*] This is what may be gather'd from theſe Phraſes of *Paulus Jovius*, [(*f*) *Panormita Alphonſo adhæſit, ſecretioris ſcrinii magiſter, & ſtudiorum, expeditionumque omnium terra marique perpetuus comes.* See the Remark *C* of the Article of this Prince, and add to it if you pleaſe, this Paſſage of *Jovianus Pontanus*: (*h*)] *Rex Alphonſus ſtatim poſt prandium, vel Antonium Panormitam, vel è doctis aliquem audiebat, ut qui dignum judicaret animum quoque cibo ſuo poſt paſtum corporis reficiendum eſſe. Note*, That this Prince caus'd Letters of Naturalization to be drawn up for *Panormita*, and made him a Free-man of *Naples*; he made him alſo his Counſellor, and Preſident of the Royal Chamber (*i*).

(*B*) *He waited till he was old before he married.*] This is what *Paulus Jovius* remarks, *Senex*, ſays he, (*k*) *uxorem duxit Arcellam ſibi magnopere dilectam, liberoſque ſuſcepit quorum honeſta ſoboles Neapoli viſitur.* The King underſtanding that *Panormita* was about to marry, at firſt blam'd the Deſign; for he thought that his Secretary not being able for the future to mind both his Spouſe and his Books, he ſhould loſe the Pleaſure of Studying; but when he knew that his Spouſe was both Beautiful and Virtuous, he changed his Opinion, believing that the Pleaſures of this Marriage would compenſate thoſe of Studying. *Panormita* himſelf gives an Account of this particular: (*l*) *Cum audiſſet Rex me uxorem eſſe ducturum, primo improbavit, arbitratus de cætero literis ſimul & uxori me operam dare non poſſe, ac proinde vera ſolidaque literarum voluptate cariturum. Sed cum mox audiſſet, me Leonoram Aureliam virginem probam, nobilem ac formoſam duxiſſe, approbavit, literarum commoda, & honeſti conjugii ſuavitatem in æquo ponens.* I believe that *Aureliam* is a Fault either of the Tranſcriber or the Printer, for *Arceliam*; for the Epitaph of this Woman in the Poems of *Jovius Pontanus*, has this prefix'd to it, (*m*) *Lauræ Arceliæ uxoris Antonii Panormitæ* (tumulus). I know not whence *Varillas* took the particulars I ſhall here ſubjoyn. "*Antony* of *Palermo* . . . had been "very moderate the firſt 70 Years of his Life, but "at 71, he fell in love with a beautiful Maid of *Naples*, call'd *Marcilla*, and began to think of Marriage. He had many Children by her, and dyed "10 Years after, with ſo little Pain and Diſtraction, "that a Moment before he expir'd, he wrote his "own Epitaph (*n*). Mr. *Varillas* names not right the Miſtreſs of *Panormita*, and he ſpoils, by too bold an Hyperbole, what *Paulus Jovius* ſays concerning the time when *Panormita* wrote his own Epitaph: (*o*) *Æger vitaque diffidens in ſupremo morbo hoc carmen compoſuit.* Which ſignifies only, that the Author

* See Baillet's *Judgment of Poets, tom.* 4. *p.* 149.

† See the *Remark C.*

‖ *Ficinus Epiſt. dedicat. ad Laurent. Medicen in lib. de vita, tom.* 1. *p. m.* 482.

§ See the *Remark C.*

¶ *Printed at* Amſterdam 1696. *and written by a Man of much Wit and Merit.*

* *Hieron. Raguſa, elog. Siculorum. p.* 33.

ɔ *Jovius elog. c.* 12. *pag.* 33.

* *For this he is call'd by ſome Authors* Antonius Bononia.

‡ *Jovius ibid.*

(*a*) *The ſame thing is to be ſaid of* Geſner & *his Abridgers.*

(*b*) In Biblioth. *fol.* 492.

(*c*) *La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Françoiſe, pag.* 452.

(*d*) *Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag.* 842.

(*e*) *He compos'd ſome Poems, and among the reſt, that which is intitled* Zodiacus vitæ.

Moreri at the word Palingenius.

(*f*) *Paulus Jovius Elog. c.*12. *p.* 33.

(*h*) *Jov. Pontanus de conviv. pag.* 143. *apud Leonard. Nicodemum Addiz. alla bibl. Napolet. pag.* 21, 22.

(*i*) *Nicolo Toppi, bibl. Napoletan. p.* 24.

(*k*) *Jovius ubi ſupra p.* 34.

(*l*) *Panormita de dictis & factis Alfonſi lib.* 3. *n.* 27. *p.* 63. *edit. Hanov.* 1611.

(*m*) *Jovian Pontan. tumulorum lib.* 2. *fol. m.* 83. *verſo.*

(*n*) *Varillas Anecdotes de Flor. pag.* 165.

(*o*) *Jovius ubi ſupra.*

Man of a very good † humour, and one who made the *Porticus of Naples* (C) famous, wherein many Perſons of Wit aſſembled to diſcourſe with him about a hundred Things. He was the beſt Poet of his time, and (D) he receiv'd from the Emperor *Sigiſmund* a Poetical Crown, according to the ancient Ceremonies. Beſides, he underſtood the Civil Law; he wrote well in proſe, and was alſo a good Orator *. He was employ'd in Affairs (E) of State, as well upon account of his great Capacity as of his Reputation for Wiſdom. He was deputed to the *Venetians* in 1451. by King *Alphonſus* to demand of them the Bone of the Arm of *Livy*, ‡ which was granted him. He ſold a Farm (F) to purchaſe this Hiſtorian. He wrote an Epitaph for

† *Imprimis facet. Facius de rebus geſtis Alfonſi lib. 3. pag. 103.*

* *Id. ib.*

‡ *See the Article* Titus Livius.

thor compos'd it during that Sickneſs of which he never hoped to be cured, and of which he really dyed. If it be true, as *Jovianus Pontanus* ſeems to ſay, (p) That *Panormita* and *Theodorus Gaza* dyed much about the ſame time, it may be thought that *Varillas* was not miſtaken as to the Age of *Panormita*, but he muſt be miſtaken as to the Continuance of the Marriage, ſince 'tis certain that *Panormita* married while *Alphonſus* was alive, and that this Prince dyed in the Year 1458, and *Theodorus Gaza* twenty Years after.

(C) *Who made the* Porticus *of Naples famous*] *Jovianus Pontanus* his Diſciple, in one of his Dialogues, introduces a *Sicilian*, who asks of an Inhabitant of *Naples* where this *Porticus* is, (a) *Quænam quæſo, bone civis, Antoniana eſt Porticus?* To whom Anſwer was made *Antonium ne hoſpes requiris, an eam quæ ab illo Porticus Antoniana dicitur?* We will ſet down the Reply of the *Sicilian*, wherein you will find the Character of the Converſations of *Panormita*, which reſembled thoſe of *Socrates*. (b) *Et porticum ipſam noſſe, & Antonium videre cupio, audio enim pomeridianis horis illic conventum haberi literatorum hominum. Ipſum autem Antonium quanquam multa dicit, plura tamen ſciſcitari quàm docere ſolitum; nec tam probare quæ dicantur, quàm Socratico quodam more irridere diſſerentes. Auditores verò ipſos magis voluptatis cujuſdam eorum quæ à ſe dicuntur plenos domum dimittere, quàm certos rerum earum quæ in quæſtione verſentur.* I add to this a Fragment of the Reply of the *Neapolitan* (c). *Hæc illa eſt Porticus in qua ſedere ſolebat ille ſenum omnium feſtiviſſimus. Conveniebant autem docti viri, nobileſque item homines ſanè multi. Ipſe quòd in proximo habitaret, primus hic conſpici, interim dum Senatus, ut ipſe uſurpabat, cogeretur, aut jocans cum prætereuntibus, aut ſecum aliquid ſuccinens, quo animum oblectaret.*] Since *Panormita* was a Man of witty Sayings, I believe it may be ſaid, that if the Mode of making Collections which end in *Ana*, had prevail'd in that time, as it prevails ſome time ſince (d), we ſhould have had a Book intituled *Panormitaniana*, which wou'd have taught us many things. The Aſſemblies of this *Porticus* may doubtleſs be compar'd to the *Mercuriales* of Mr. *Menage*. If you deſire a Proof that *Panormita* ſaid witty Things, read the Book of *Pontanus de Sermone*, and there you will ſee ſome of them, and among others, you will find there a Thought which is become very common, and it is this, That to make a good Agreement in a Family, you ſhould joyn together a blind Woman and a deaf Husband. (e) *Antonius Panormita ſuavis admodum vir interrogatus ad rem uxoriam jucunde concorditerque agendam, quibusnam maximè opus eſſe duceret? ſumpto argumento à frequentia moleſtiarum ac magnitudine, quæ in vita contingerent conjugali: duobus tantum opus eſſe reſpondit, vir ut aurium ſurditate teneretur, uxor verò ut oculis eſſet capta: ne altera videlicet inſpiceret quæ à marito intemperanter fierent plurima, alter ne audiret obgannientem aſſiduo domi uxorem.*

(D) *The beſt Poet of his time . . . and he receiv'd a Poetical Crown.*] He is eſteem'd the firſt (f) Reſtorer of Latin Poetry, and here follows the Compliment which *Faccius* made to him under the Perſon of *Guarinus*: (g) *Quod in cæteris partibus te antecedam, in eo tibi planè non aſſentior, præſertim cum tu Juris conſultus & Eques ſis: cumque plures Rhetores his temporibus inveniuntur ſatis clari, poëta autem illuſtris præter te nullus, qui quidem Sigiſmundo Imperatore propter optimum de te judicium, conſenſu omnium excitatum, laurea corona more majorum donatus ſis, quæ res uſque adhuc noſtrum contigit nemini.* *Voſſius* did not rightly underſtand theſe Words, for he thought that they ſignified that no Man before *Panormita* had receiv'd the Poetick Crown. This is a Miſtake; if *Faccius* had meant this, he would have publiſh'd a groſs Lye; for who is ignorant of the Solemnity of the Poetick Coronation of *Petrarch*? But the Compliment of *Guarinus* was this, *The Emperor has crown'd you after the manner of our Anceſtors, and ſince that time none of us learned Men hath obtained that Honour.* This Senſe is very different from that of *Voſſius*, which he thus expreſſes: (h) *Panormita hic à Bartholomæo Facio initio lib. de humanæ vitæ felicitate* poëta, atque eques præclarus *nominatur: & mox*, clarus & ſingularis poëta, & juriſconſultus. *Ac paulo poſt ait Sigiſmundo Imp. laurea donatum corona, more majorum, quæ res uſque ad id tempus contigiſſet nemini.*

(E) *Employ'd in Affairs of State, as well upon the Account.*] Read theſe Words of *Faccius*, (i) *Miſit igitur Otolinus ad Alphonſum qui peteret ad ſe mitti quempiam ex iis quibus fidelioribus uteretur qui cum de deditione ageret, & nominatim Antonium Panormitam, quem poëtam non inſuetum Mediolani apud Philippum in magna gratia & dignitate cognoverat: cumque non tantum propter prudentiam, ſed multo etiam magis propter æquitatis opinionem, & quod illum ab Alphonſo apprime diligi acceperat.* You will find in the Hiſtorian whom I cite, the Harangue which *Panormita* made to the Inhabitants of *Gaeta*, in the Name of *Alphonſus*, and that which he made to the *Venetians*, to congratulate them about the Peace.

(F) *He ſold a Farm to purchaſe* Livy.] (k) "It is "very well known, that *Beccatelli*, otherwiſe call'd "*Bologna*, of *Palermo*, was obliged to ſell a "Farm that he might purchaſe a *Livy*, written with "the Hand of *Poggius Florentinus*, who employ'd "this Price of his Book to purchaſe a Farm near "*Florence*, about the Year 1455. Theſe are the Words of Mr. *Baillet*, who quotes for it the 154 page of the Treatiſe of Libraries, compos'd by Mr. *le Gallois*. I have conſulted this Treatiſe, and found in it a French Tranſlation of the Letter which was written on this Subject to King *Alphonſus*, which follows: "(l) Sir, You have "acquainted me from *Florence*, that the Books of "*Livy*, written in a fair Hand, are to be ſold, "and that they asks for them 120 Crowns. I pray "your Majeſty to cauſe this Author to be brought "to me, which we are wont to call the King of "Books. And I intreat your Prudence to let me "know, whether *Poggius* or I does better, he who "to purchaſe a Farm near *Florence*, ſells *Livy*; or I "who to purchaſe the Book written with his own "Hand, ſell my Land. Your Goodneſs and Mo"deſty induce me to put this familiar Queſtion to "you. Farewel and triumph. If you would ſee the Reflections of Mr. *Gallois*, you need only read what follows: "(m) I think ſo great a King ſhould "not have ſuffered ſo honeſt a Man to ſell his Land "to purchaſe *Livy*. He ought, like a Prince, to have "generouſly given it to him. Neither do I ſee any "Cauſe why *Pecatel* (n) ſhould blame *Poggius* for "ſelling *Livy*, ſince he might have two Copies of "him, or at leaſt he might have read him ſo many "times over, that he had no further need of him.

I have three little Notes to make. *Firſt*, It is not true that *Panormita* declar'd, he purchas'd this Manuſcript from *Poggius*; on the contrary he intimates very plainly, that the *M. S.* of *Poggius* was already ſold, and that the Price of it was employ'd in purchaſing a Farm; let us here ſet down his Latine Letter, that the unfaithfulneſs of him who tranſlated it into French may appear. (o) *Significaſti mihi nuper ex Florentia extare Titi Livii opera venalia, literis pulcherrimis, libro pretium eſſe cxx. aureos. Quare Majeſtatem tuam oro, ut Livium quem Regem librorum appellare conſuevimus, emi meo nomine, ac deferri, ad nos facias. Interim ego pecuniam procurabo quam pro libri pretio tradam. Sed illud à prudentia tua ſcire deſidero, uter ego an Poggius melius fecerit; is ut villam Florentiæ emeret, Livium vendidit quem ſua manu pulcherrimè ſcripſerat: ego ut Livium emam fundum proſcripſi. Hæc ut familiariter à te peterem ſuaſit humanitas & modeſtia tua. Vale & triumpha.*

In

(p) *See the laſt Remark. n. 7.*

(a) *Id.* in dialogo Antonius init.

(b) *Id. ib. p.* 1196.

(c) *Id. ib. p.* 1198. *See alſo* de Sermone. *l.* 6. *c.* 4. *pag.* 1741.

(d) *This I writ in the Year* 1697.

(e) Jovian Pontanus de Sermone. *lib.* 3. *c.* 17. *pag.* 1645, 1646.

(f) Obliteratam nedum langueſcentem in Italia poëticam reſtituit in antiquam pene formam. *Id.* de Sermone. *lib.* 6. *c.* 4. *p. m.* 1738.

(g) Barthol. Faccius de hum. vitæ felicitate circa init. *p. m.* 108.

(h) Voſſius de hiſtor. Latin. *lib.* 3. *p.* 593.

(i) Faccius ubi ſupra *pag.* 102, 103. apud Leon. Nicodemum addit. alla bibliot. Napolet. *p.* 22, 23.

(k) Baillet, Jugem. des Sav. *tom.* 1. *pag.* 545.

(l) Gallois traité des Biblioth. *pag.* 154, 155.

(m) *Id. ib. p.* 155.

(n) *It ſhould be* Beccatel.

(o) Anton. *Panormita* epiſtol. lib. 5. apud Naudé addit. à l'hiſt. de *Louis* XI. *pag.* 23.

for himſelf (G) which is a proof of his Preſumption, and of his Orthodoxy at the ſame time. He ſuffer'd with much conſtancy long (H) pains by reaſon of a difficulty in making Urine, and diſcourſ'd admirably about Adverſity and Proſperity. The publick hath ſeen ſome of his † Writings, but his *Latin* Poem entitled *Hermaphroditus*, was never publiſh'd. It is a piece (I) ſo full of Obſcenity that even *Poggius* diſlik'd it. Mr. *Moreri* has not committed many (K) conſiderable Faults: Thoſe of *Varillas* are not very numerous; ſee them in the Remark B.

† There were printed at Venice 1553. five Books of his Letters, 2 Harangues, & ſome Verſes. See the laſt Remark.

PARA-

In the *ſecond Place*, 'tis not true that *Panormita* blames *Poggius*, he leaves it to King *Alphonſus* to judge, whether it be more Prudent to ſell a Book to purchaſe ſome Land, or to ſell Land to purchaſe a Book, and as to himſelf he determines nothing about the Matter. *Thirdly*, The Excuſe that *Poggius* might have read *Livy ſo often, that he ſhould have no further need of him*, is chimerical; for a Book of this Nature is not got by Heart, although it be read ſeveral times over, and it cannot be ſuperfluous, unleſs one had it almoſt by Heart.

(G) *An Epitaph, which is a Proof of his Preſumption and of his Orthodoxy*] It contain'd theſe four Verſes.

Quærite Pierides alium qui ploret amores,
Quærite qui Regum fortia facta canat.
Me Pater ille ingens hominum ſator atque redemptor,
Evocat & ſedes donat adire pias.

That's to ſay, Muſes, ſeek out another Poet who ſhould make Verſes of Love, and ſing the brave Actions of Kings, for as to me I am a going to Paradiſe; the great God, Creator and Redeemer of Mankind, calls me thither. *Gyraldus* conſider'd this Epitaph only on the wrong ſide, (p) he perceiv'd in it the Arrogance, but not the Faith of the Author. I do not think that he found any heterodox Principle in it, upon Pretence that Purgatory is excluded out of it.

(H) *He ſuffer'd with much Conſtancy, long Pains, and he diſcours'd admirably about Adverſity.*] *Jovian Pontanus* his Diſciple ſhall here be my Warrant, who ſpeaks as an Eye-witneſs. (a) *Vidimus Antonium Panhormitam multos annos tormina & urinæ difficultatem tam ſedate ferre, ut etiam diſſimulare videri poſſet ægritudinem.* He ſays in another Book, that *Panormita* was always cheerful, whether his Affairs went well or ill: His Principle was to refer all to God, and to ſuppoſe that the Cauſes of Good or Ill Fortune were hid from us; and that there are many Accidents which are thought unhappy, which are not, ſince they are only Occaſions which Providence offers us to ſhow our Conſtancy. (b) *Quid erat lætiꝰ in rebus Antonio jucundius? quid rurſus in turbatis atque aſperis gratius? Incredibilis quædam in ejus oratione vis inerat res humanas contemnendi, ferendique fortuitos caſus æquo animo, quippe cum omnia referret ad Deum, diceretque latêre nos & bonorum, & malorum cauſas. Pleraque autem videri quæ non eſſent mala, ut quæ objecta nobis eſſent à Deo, quo humana in iis conſtantia fortitudoque eniteſceret. Quotum enim fortem inveniri, ſi quieta & ſecura omnia nobis forent? natos eſſe homines ad comparandam virtutem, ad excolendos animos, neminem autem ſine laboribus plurimis poſſe hoc aſſequi, ſed decipi opinione, nimiſque demiſſè, ac molliter nobiſcum nos ipſos agere: quæ fluant aquas ſalubriores eſſe, magiſque probari: quæ vero reſtagnent, noxias ac peſtilentes eſſe..... Optimo itaque & fortiſſimo cuique labores ac moleſtias offerri à Deo, eamque veluti materiam præberi in qua ſeſe exerceat, cum excellentia hominum cæterorum. Tum Imperatores ipſi quos præcipuè ament, & quorum virtus eſt proſpectior, iis graviſſima & periculoſiſſima quæque demandent. Atque hanc quidem ipſam, non quæ prædam quæritaret, maximè illuſtrem militiam eſſe. Et verò ignavi eſſe, imbecillis, deſidis, odiſſe labores, fugitare moleſtias, velleque in otio, ac ſub umbra marceſcere.* There is nothing finer than theſe common Places; and they are very true according to the preſent Condition of humane Nature: But at the ſame time it muſt be acknowledg'd, that they ſuppoſe that it is a very odd Condition; for what can be more aſtoniſhing and incomprehenſible, than to ſee a Man reduc'd to ſuch a State, that he muſt be unhappy to avoid greater Evils? Why is he not conducted from one Good to another, until he arrive at Perfection? Why ſhould Vexation, Grief and Miſery, be the leaſt inconvenient Way that he can take? The Pagans could ſay nothing that was Good to this Difficulty, and they were ſtupid enough hardly to think of it: Revelation only can ſolve it.

(p) Senex diem obiit hocque ſibi moriens epitaphium arrogantiæ plenum condidiſſe legi. *Gyraldus de poët. ſui tempor. dial.* 1.

(a) Jovian. Pontanus de fortitudine *lib.* 2. *fol. m.* 51.

(b) *Id.* in Dialogo *Antonius* init. *pag. m.* 1197.

(I) *His Hermaphroditus is a Piece ſo full of Obſcenity that even Poggius diſlik'd it.*] It was dedicated to *Coſmus de Medicis*, who made many Copies of it (c) whereof ſome ſtill remain in the Library of St. *Laurence*. The Reaſon why it was dedicated to that great Man, was becauſe he regarded not the Opinion of the Vulgar, but pleas'd himſelf with reading this laſcivious Piece. The Author himſelf makes this Remark, for thus he begins, (d) *Hermaphroditi libellus incipit ad Coſmum Florentinum ex illuſtri progenie Mediceorum virum clariſſimum. Quod ſpreto vulgo libellum æquo animo legat, quamvis laſcivum & ſecum una priſcos viros imitetur.* Mr. *Magliabecchi* (e) has a manuſcript Copy of this Poem. At that time many Letters were written about that Poetry. (f) *Guarin of Verona* wrote one to *John Lamola*, wherein he gives great Praiſe to the *Hermaphroditus* and its Author; of which Letter Mr. *Magliabecchi* has a Copy. *Gyraldus* thought it very ſtrange, that this Poem ſhould be commended. *Legi*, ſays he, (g) *ejus ætatis quorundam epiſtolas quibus Hermaphroditus illius multis laudibus commendatur, ſed quare neſcio. Dicam ego vobis ſanè quid ſentio, nec is mihi poëta bonus, nec bonus Orator, quæ enim ſoluto & pedeſtri ſermone ejus ſcripta legi, luxuriantis magis quam bonæ frugis referta videntur, ut impudicas & proſtitutas ejus Muſas mittam.* You ſee that he does not only deteſt the Obſcenity of this Piece, but he deſpiſes alſo the Verſes themſelves. But the Cenſure of *Poggius* was not ſo, for he commended the Invention, the Wit, and the Ornaments of the Work; but he condemn'd the Obſcenity, and counſell'd the Author, for the future, to beſtow his Pains upon Subjects more becoming a Chriſtian. (h) *Delectatus ſum, meherclè, varietate rerum & elegantia verſuum: ſimulque admiratus ſum res adeo impudicas, adeo ineptas tam venuſtè tam compoſitè à te dici, atque ita multa exprimi turpiuſcula, ut non enarrari ſed agi videantur: nec ficta à te jocandi cauſa, ut exiſtimo, ſed acta exiſtimari poſſint. Laudo ego doctrinam tuam, jucunditatem carminis, jocos ac ſales..... pro charitate tamen qua omnibus debitores ſumus, unum eſt quod te monere & debeo & volo, ut ſcilicet deinceps graviora quidem mediteris, hæc enim quæ adhuc edidiſti, vel ætati concedi poſſunt, vel licentiæ jocandi..... ſcis enim non licere idem nobis qui Chriſtiani ſumus, quod olim poëtis qui Deum ignorabant.* *Panormita* anſwer'd *Poggius*, and alledged to him ſome Reaſons to juſtify or excuſe himſelf. (i) *Poggius* reply'd, and maintain'd, that a Man ought to be Virtuous, not only in his Actions, but in his Writings (k). From whence we may conclude, that he repented of having employ'd his Pen in laſcivious Writings during his youth (l). We will conclude with the Words of a Dutch Writer, who had read this obſcene Poem of *Panormita*: (m) *de Hermaphrodito quod dicit* (Gyraldus) *non eſt de nihilo: ego enim legi manu deſcriptum, (neque enim unquam eſt typis excuſus) adeo ſpurcum, adeo abominabilem, ut nihil ſupra. Verſus deinde ipſi vix ſunt tolerabiles, tantum abeſt ut laudem aliquam mereantur. Inſcribitur autem Hermaphroditus, eo quod utriuſque ſexus membra genitalia utriuſque libelli omnem materiam faciunt. Hæc qui patienter legit, ne illum oportet eſſe hominem frugi.*

(K) *Mr.* Moreri *has not committed many Faults that are conſiderable.*] 1. Inſtead of ſaying as he does, that *Panormita* was *a Native of Bologna*, and originally from *Sicily*, he ſhould have ſaid the quite contrary. Mr. *Varillas* (n) alſo makes him a Native of *Bologna*. 2. He ſhould not have affirm'd, that Philip, *Lord of* Milan *invited him to his Houſe*, but he ſhould rather have ſaid, that *Panormita* made an offer of his Wit to *Philip* Duke of *Milan*: (o) *Quum Philippo Mediolanenſium principi fertilis ingenii induſtriam obtuliſſet, tanta liberalitate ſuſceptus eſt ut, &c.* Theſe are the Words of *Paulus Jovius*, cited by Mr. *Moreri*. 3. Why does he ſay, that *Panormita* did not ſerve the King of *Naples* until after the Death of the Duke of *Milan*? Does not *Paulus Jovius* (p) intimate the contrary? 4. I have ſhown elſewhere the Falſhood of theſe Words of *Moreri*: *He wrote with Care*

the

(c) Leonardo Nicodemo ubi ſupra *pag.* 21.

(d) *See* Nicodemo *ibid. p.* 20.

(e) *Id. ib.*

(f) *So I correct* Gravino Veroneſe, *which I find in* Nicodemo. *ibid.*

(g) Lil. Gregor. Gyraldus de poëtis ſui tempor. dial. 1 *pag.* 385. apud Nicodemum *ibid.*

(h) Poggius epiſt. *pag.* 131. 132. apud Nicodemum *ib. p.* 21.

(i) Nicodem. *ib.*

(k) *Id. ib.*

(l) Dal che ſi comprende ch'eſſo ſi pentiſſe delle facezie, e dell' altre coſe meno oneſte che in gioventu ſcritte avea. *Nicodemo ib.*

(m) Author Anonymus notarum ad poëmata Sannazarii *pag.* 202, 203. edit. Amſtel. 1689.

(n) Varillas, Anecdot. de Florence *pag.* 169.

(o) Jovius ubi ſupra.

(p) Verum eo (*Philippo*) graviſſimis bellis occupato *Panhormita Alphonſo adhæſit. Id. ibid.*

PARACLET, An Abbey of Nuns of the Foundation of *Peter Abelard*. This Learned Man being a Monk in the Abbey of St. *Denys*, after the Relations of *Heloiſa* had villainouſly caſtrated him, quarrell'd more than once with his Brethren; and at laſt it was to be fear'd that he ſhould be deliver'd over to the Secular Power, becauſe he had ſaid, that St. *Denys* the *Areopagite* had not converted *France*. He made his eſcape into the Territories of *Thibaud*, Earl of *Champagne*, and kept next to *Provins* in a Cell which did belong to the Monks of *Troies*. Some time after, having obtain'd leave from the Abbot of St. *Denys* to retire to any Hermitage he pleas'd, provided he ſhould not depend upon any Community; he made choice of a very ſolitary Retirement in the Dioceſs (*A*) of *Troies*. There he built β a Cottage on a piece of Ground that was given him, and, with the leave of the Biſhop, he made of that Cottage an Oratory, which he conſecrated to the Trinity. His Scholars knowing this, ran from all parts to this Deſart, and there built themſelves Huts, being well ſatisfy'd to live upon Herbs and Roots, and to ſubſiſt, as I may ſay, upon Bread and Water, provided they might enjoy the benefit of the Lectures of this famous Profeſſor. He could not dig the Ground, and he was aſham'd to beg, and therefore he thought it convenient to get a Subſiſtence by his Tongue, and by reaſſuming his ancient profeſſion, knowing that his Scholars would furniſh him with what was neceſſary for his Subſiſtence. And they did more than this, for they inlarg'd the Oratory, and built it of Wood and Stone: Then *Abelard* gave it the Name of *Paraclet*, to preſerve the memory of the Conſolations he had receiv'd in this Deſart. The jealouſie of Profeſſion,' which a long time before had ſtir'd up againſt him *Alberic* of *Rheims*, and *Ludolfus* of *Lombardy*, was furiouſly reviv'd, when they ſaw ſo many Scholars flock about him, notwithſtanding the Inconveniencies of the Place, and in contempt of the Maſters they could ſo conveniently find in the Cities. They ſought therefore for all Occaſions to vex him, and did not forget that which the Title of *Paraclet* did afford them. They ſaid, that it was an Innovation, and that it was not more lawful to conſecrate Churches to the Holy Spirit than to God the Father. The rumour of this was ſpread among a great number of People: But the Perſecution was infinitely more terrible, when the two Perſons above nam'd had prevail'd with St. *Bernard* and St *Norbert* to eſpouſe their Intereſt, who valued themſelves upon the Account of their great Zeal, and their Humour of Reformation. He could by no means ſtand againſt ſuch Adverſaries; *Abelard* therefore quitted that Place, and went into the lower *Britain*, where the Monks of the Abbey of St. *Gildas* of *Ruys* had choſen him for their Head. The *Paraclet* remain'd empty, until ſuch time as the Abbot of St. *Denys* drove away the Nuns of *Argenteuil* from their Convent. *Heloiſa* their Prioreſs, not knowing where to go, was overjoyed that her ancient Husband ſhould yield her the *Paraclet*. Pope *Innocent* II. confirmed this Donation † in the Year, 1131; and this was the Original of the Abbey of the *Paraclet*, whereof *Heloiſa* was the firſt Abbeſs. Great Riches γ were given to it in a little time. The Abbeſſes who ſucceeded her, were very often of the moſt ancient Houſes of the Kingdom; you may ſee a Catalogue of them in the Works * of *Abelard*, from

the Hiſtory of this King. This pretended Hiſtory is nothing but a Collection of the *Apophthegmes*, and memorable Actions of *Alphonſus*, *de dictis & factis Alfonſi Regis Aragonum libri quatuor*. That Prince (*r*) rewarded the Author for it with 1000 Crowns. 5. He impoſes upon us when he ſays, *That we have divers Editions of that Hiſtory, with the Remarks, and Commentaries of* Æneas Sylvius; for theſe pretended Comentaries, are nothing but a Collection of the Actions and Sentences of other Princes like thoſe of *Alphonſus*. By the by obſerve a Fault of *Voſſius*, who thought that the Piece of *Panormita*, and that of *Sylvius*, had always been printed (*ſ*) apart, until *Marquardus Freherus* publiſh'd them as Parallels. This Miſtake he might have avoided, by conſulting the *Bibliotheca* of *Geſner*, where he might have ſeen, that in the *Baſil* Edition, 1538. what *Panormita* had done was interwoven Chapter by Chapter (*t*) with what *Æneas Sylvius* had collected. *Paulus Jovius* was not ignorant of this, for ſpeaking of *Panormita*'s Book, he ſays, (*v*) *Quem pius pontifex exemplis paribus* INTERTEXTIS *nobiliorem reddidiſſe videtur*. I do not blame in *Voſſius* the Word *Commentariis*, which he makes uſe of, ſpeaking of the Book of *Æneas Sylvius*, for this Word in Latin is of a larger Extent than our Word Commentary. 6. Since none of the three Authors whom *Moreri* cites, ſays any ſuch thing, he had no Reaſon to ſay, *That it is certain that* Panormita *ſurviv'd King* Alphonſus, *who dyed in* 1458. and that *'tis probable* he did not die till after 1460. 7. This Probability is not well prov'd by alledging a Letter written to *Panormita* by *Philelphus* in 1458, for without doubt he receiv'd many Letters the ſame Year that he died. *Note*, That I do not mean to deny that he liv'd till after the Year 1460; I only condemn the Raſhneſs of an Author, who affirms that which his Witneſſes do not affirm. I believe that *Panormita* died after 145[illegible], becauſe I find in the ſame Dialogue, where it is ſaid that he was lately (*a*) dead, that *Theodorus* the *Grecian* had departed this Life not long before: Now I fanſie that this *Theodorus*, (*b*) is not different from *Theodorus Gaza*, who died (*c*) in the Year 1478. therefore I do not alledge what we read in the ſame Dialogue, that it was a little more than an Age (*d*) ſince there had happen'd a Conflagration in the Iſle *Ænaria*, for the Calculation of *Pontanus* is not exact, ſince this Eruption of Fire happen'd (*e*) in the Year 1301. 8. He ſhould have cited *Miraus in Auctario*, and not *in Aug.* but this Fault I place to the Account of the Correctors of the Printing-Houſe; but that of having cited *Miraus* is to be reckon'd the Author's. It was very needleſs to cite him, ſince that little which he ſays of *Panormita* is to be found in *Paulus Jovius*. I could criticize upon the Place he has aſſign'd to our *Panormita*, for he ſpeaks of him under the Word *Antony*, which is not his proper Place.

(*A*) *In the Dioceſs of* Troies.] In favour of thoſe who would know the Particulars, I add, that the Paraclet was built in the Pariſh of *Quincey*, upon the little River of *Arduzon*, near to *Nogent* upon the *Seine*. The Letter of Pope *Innocent* II. to *Heloiſa*, touches on the greateſt part of theſe Particulars. (*f*) *Heloiſa Abbatiſſæ cæteriſque ſororibus in Oratorio, quod in pago Trecenſi, in Parrochia Quinceii, ſupra fluvium Arduconem ſitum eſt.* The Chronicle of *William de Nangis* ſays this of It, (*g*) *Conſtruxerat Monaſterium in Epiſcopatu Trecenſi juxta Nogentum ſuper Sequanam, in quodam prato ubi legere ſolitus fuerat.* This laſt Circumſtance is contrary to the (*h*) Narrative of *Abelard*, according to which 'tis certain, that he taught not in the Place where he built the Oratory, until after he had built It. I think three Stations of *Abelard* may be reckon'd in the Territories of the Earl of *Champagne*; for firſt, he retir'd to it with

β *Ibi a quibuſdam terra mihi donata, aſſenſu Epiſcopi terræ Oratorium quoddam in nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis ex calamis & culmo primum conſtruxi. Abelard. Oper. pag. 28.*

† *Taken from the Letter of* Abelard, *which contains the Hiſtory of his Misfortunes.*

γ Plus ut arbitror uno anno in terrenis commodis ſunt multiplicatæ, quam ego per centum ſi ibi permanſiſſem. *Ib. pag.* 34.

* Not. Andr. du Cheſne in hiſtor. Calamit. *Abælardi.*

(*r*) Jovian. Pontanus de liberalitate, *fol. m.* 97.

(*ſ*) Utrumque opus SEORSIM antea excuſum παραλλήλως atque emendatius in Germania prodiit (*Hanoviæ an.* 1611.) cura Marquardi Freheri. *Voſſius* de Hiſtor. Latinis *pag.* 593.

(*t*) Cum Æneæ Sylvii commentariis quæ capitatim cum Alphonſinis contendunt. *Geſn. bibl. fol.* 62. *verſo.*

(*v*) Jovius ubi ſupra *p.* 34.

(*a*) Nuper paucos antequam morbo aggravaretur dies. Pontanus in dialago *Antonius pag.* 1198.

(*b*) Et Theodorus Græcus qui diem nuper obiit. *Id. ib. pag.* 1237.

(*c*) Geſner in Biblioth. *fol.* 611. *verſo.*

(*d*) Centum ante annis aut paulo amplius. *Id. ibid. pag.* 1231.

(*e*) Scipio Mazzella, de balneis Puteolanis *p. m.* 255.

(*f*) Du Cheſne, not. in hiſt. calamitat. *p.* 1177.

(*g*) Apud eumd. *ib.*

(*h*) *See the Letter intitled* Hiſtoria calamitatum from the firſt Foundation, which happen'd in the Year 1130, to the Year 1615. But it was not judg'd convenient to obſerve in it, that *Jane Chabot*, who died the 25th of *June* 1593, publickly profeſs'd the Proteſtant Religion, *yet without marrying or quitting the Habit* ‡ *of a Nun, which ſhe always retain'd, tho' ſhe was driven from her Nunnery.* To conclude, It is a difficulty which is look'd upon as a matter of conſequence, to know whether it muſt be call'd (*B*) *Paraclet* or *Paraclit*. Not to forget that *Heloiſa* underſtood much *Greek*, the Nuns are wont to have the Office read in that Language on *Whitſunday* †.

PARE (*Ambroſe*) in *Latin*, *Paræus*, a Native of *Laval* in the Country of *Maine*. I ſhall only add three things to the Article that *Moreri* has given of him, *viz.* That he was a Proteſtant, and that he was ſav'd from (*T*) the Maſſacre on St. *Bartholomew's*-Day, by the ſpecial Favour of *Charles* the Ninth; and that he had many obſtacles (*Z*) to remove, when he publiſh'd his Book about Phyſick. He had expreſs'd himſelf ſmuttily.

A modern Writer relates two things; one is, || That *Ambroſe Pare* being Surgeon to *Francis* the Second, putting a Confidence in Admiral *Coligni*, declar'd to him, that the Diſtemper in the Ear of that Monarch was extreamly dangerous. The other, That it was ſuſpected he had * put Poyſon in the Ear of this Prince *when he dreſs'd it.* The Author abovemention'd adds to each of theſe two things many Particulars; believe them who will, I find nothing of them in good Hiſtorians, only I know that *Beaucaire* has related the ſuſpicion concerning the Poyſon. *Spondanus* x relates it after him, and does not ſeem to believe it.

PAREUS (*David*) a famous Reform'd Divine, was born at *Francoſtein* in *Sileſia*, *December* 30. 1548. *John Wængler*, his Father, Son of a rich Countryman, z made him Study at *Francoſtein*, and then he put him out to an Apprenticeſhip in *Breſlaw*, with an Apothecary, and after that with a Shooemaker. But this Child

‡ *Maimb. Hiſt. of Calvin. p.* 454.

† *Aub. Miræus in Schol. ad Henr. Gand. Lovenſ. de ſcript. Eccleſ. p.* 155.

|| *The Life of Gaſpar* Coligni *p.* 220. *Edit.* 1686

* *Ib. p.* 221.

x *Spondan. ad Ann.* 1560. *n.* 10.

z *Who liv'd more than* 100 *Years, and ſaw more than* 20 *Children alive.* Philip. Pareus in vita Davidis Parei.

---

with the leave of the Monks of *St. Denys*, and there read Lectures to a great Number of Scholars. This was interrupted by the Thunder-clap which the Council of *Soiſſons* ſtruck him with in 1121. Being ſent back to his Cloyſter, and having there brought himſelf into Trouble about *Denys* the *Areopagite*, he eſcap'd by Night to *Provins*, and remain'd in a little Cell until ſuch time as his Difference with the Monks of St. *Denys* was ended; after which, having leave to live in any Solitude he pleas'd, he tranſported himſelf to the Place where he built the Oratory. It was known that he liv'd there very retiredly (*i*); the Scholars flock'd to him, and he begun again his Lectures. It does in no wiſe appear, that he retir'd to the ſame Place the firſt and the third time, and it may rather be inferr'd from his Narrative, that theſe two Places of Retreat, were remote from one another: Thus *William de Nangis* may very well be miſtaken.

(*B*) *Whether it muſt be call'd* Paraclet, *or* Paraclit.] This Queſtion had never been much diſcuſs'd, if this Word had not been found in the Divine Service. This was the ground of the Diſpute, ſome maintaining that it ſhould be pronounc'd *Paracletus*, while others thought it better to call it *Paraclitus*; the latter have publickly obtain'd a compleat Victory. *Paſquier* relates a curious thing, "The Ignorance of "the common People call'd (*k*) it *Paraclit.* So have I "ſeen in my younger Days, that in the Churches, "the Holy Spirit was call'd, *Spiritum Paraclytum*, "not *Paracletum*, two Words of quite contrary Sig"nifications, for the one ſignifies a Flatterer, and "the other a Comforter. Nay, a little after I came "to the Palace, one Maſter *John Sabelat*, a Canon "of *Chartres*, a Man brought up to Learning, hav"ing pronounc'd at the Celebration of his Maſs, "*Paracletus*, and not *Paraclitus*, was for that ſuſ"pended, *à divinis*, by the Biſhop, from which "Sentence he appeal'd as a Grievance, and in main"tainance of his Cauſe, he publiſh'd a very learned "Manifeſto, which I had in my Poſſeſſion ſome "time; and afterwards the Cauſe was compromis'd "between them by ſome Friends of the Biſhop, "that he might not be laugh'd at by the (*a*)People. There are two things to be reprehended in this Diſcourſe of *Paſquier*; 1. 'Tis falſe that thoſe who do not pronounce *Paracletus*, pretend to pronounce *Paraclytus*; for they pretend to pronounce *Paraclitus*, and to ſay the very ſame thing with thoſe who pronounce *Paracletus*. The Queſtion turns only upon this Grammatical Nicety, *viz.* Whether the η of the Greeks does anſwer to the *e* or *i* of the Latins. 2. παράκλυτος does not ſignify a Flaterer, but in general, a Man of a bad Name. *Garaſſe* (*b*) here does not ſpare *Stephen Paſquier*, but inſults him with his uſual Pride, and maintains againſt him, that the Greek Tongue has no ſuch Word as *Paraclytus*, and that if this Word might be made by Analogy, it would not ſignify a *Flatterer*, but it would ſignify either an Infamous Man, or one that is honour'd above his Merits. The Apologiſt of *Paſquier* did act a very ſilly Part, when he writ againſt this; for inſtead of confeſſing that his Client was miſtaken, he took upon him to defend him, and he did not ſo much as know how to invent many falſe Reaſonings; what he replied was equally ſhort and bad. He ſays, (*c*) that we find in the great *Etymologicon*, and in *Scapula*, that *Paraclytus* with an υ ſignifies a Flatterer. I have a *Scapula* in folio, Printed at *Baſil* in 1605, and there I find παράκλυτος at p. 810, and this refutes Father *Garaſſe*; but there I find that this Word ſignifies *infamis*, *famoſus*, which refutes the Defender of *Stephen Paſquier*. But to return to the general Diſpute, I ſay that Mr. *Thiers* has wrote a Treatiſe *de retinenda in Eccleſiaſticis libris voce* Paraclitus, wherein he teaches us many curious things, as that, (*d*) "In the Ninth Century, that Diſpute "was warmly debated by the Biſhops of *France* and "*Germany*, upon occaſion of a Greek who came "to Court, and who hearing in the King's Chappel "*Paraclitus Spiritus Sanctus*, remonſtrated, that "they ſhould ſay *Paracletus*. His Remonſtrances were to no Purpoſe; none durſt (*e*) change the pronounciation of this Word, becauſe it was the Cuſtom to read ſo, and there muſt be no Innovation. Mr. *Thiers* adds, that in 1526, the Faculty of *Theology* in *Paris*, having paſt a Cenſure upon *Eraſmus*'s Works, condemned him among other things for this, that he maintain'd that we ought to write *Paracletus*.

(*T*) *He was ſav'd from the Maſſacre.*] What *Brantome* ſays upon this Subject is too remarkable to be here omitted (*f*) "The King, aſſoon as it was "Day, having put his Head out of his Chamber-"Window, whenever he ſaw any in the Suburbs of "St. *Germains* removing and making their eſcape, "took a great hunting Harquebuſs which he had, "and ſhot with full force at them, but in vain, for "the Harquebuſs would not carry ſo far, and cry'd "out continually, *Kill*, *kill*; and would have none "of them to eſcape but Mr. *Ambroſe Pare*, his firſt Sur"geon, and the beſt in Chriſtendom, and ſent to "ſeek for him, and bring him that Night to his own "Chamber and Wardrobe, commanding him not to "ſtir from thence; for he ſaid, that it was not rea"ſonable that he who could do great ſervice to a "great many People ſhould be thus maſſacred.

(*Z*) *Many obſtacles to remove.*] I change nothing in the Expreſſions of the Author, who informs me of this: "*Ambroſe Pare*, ſays he, (*g*) a Surgeon to three "Kings ſucceſſively, Learn'd and Experienc'd, who "hath publiſh'd many good and curious Books, "which were for ſome time ſtop'd from being prin"ted and publiſh'd by the College of Learned Phy"ſicians

(*i*) Oratorium quoddam in nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis ex calamis & culmo primum conſtruxi. Ubi cum quodam Clerico noſtro latitans, illud vere Domino poteram decantare, ecce elongavi fugiens & manſi in ſolitudine. Quod cum cognoviſſent ſcholares, cœperunt undique concurrere. *Abal. p.* 28.

(*k*) *He ſpeaks of the Oratory of* Abelard.

(*a*) Paſquier's *Enquiries of* France, *l.* 6. *c.* 17. *p. m.* 511.

(*b*) *Enquiry of Enquiries*, *B.* 3. *ſect.* 12.

(*c*) *Defence for* Steph. Paſquier, *p.* 795.

(*d*) *See the Journal of the Learned, of the* 16*th of* Decem. 1669.

(*e*) *Ibid. ex Haimone Epiſcopo Alberſtad.*

(*f*) Brantome's *Memoirs*, *Tom.* 4. *Diſcourſe of* Charles IX

(*g*) Louis Guyon *divers Lectures*, *to.* 2. *b.* 2. *ch.* 8. *p.* 298.

Child was not born for such little things; and as the Author of his Life says, the God who presides over the Muses did not abandon him to the Caprices of a Step-mother, who was the Cause of this unworthy Treatment. The good Man, *John Wangler*, order'd him to return to his Studies in 1564, and sent him to *Hirschberg* in the Neighbourhood, where there was a College, of which a Learned Man call'd *Christopher Schilling* † was Rector. There our young Scholar acquir'd the Name of *Pareus* (A) taken from the Greek by Allusion to that of his Family. This was the common Custom of that time, and particularly of *Schilling*. The bad Humour of the Step-mother, was a little pacified no doubt, because the Pension for *David* was not to be paid; for he maintain'd himself by means of (B) a Preceptorship, and by the Money he receiv'd from one of the principal Men ‡ of the Place, every time that he presented him with Verses. His Regent did not only take from him his Paternal Name, but also turn'd him from Lutheranism, by explaining to him the Nature of the Lord's Supper, as well as to the rest of his Scholars. This was of mischievous Consequence both to the Master and the Scholar; the former was turned out of his School, at the Importunity of the Minister of the Place; the latter was like to be disinherited by his Father, from whom he could very hardly extort leave to go to the *Palatinate*, altho he made use of a Reason, which is commonly most prevailing, to wit, that by this means he would make an end of his Studies without any expence to the Family. Having obtain'd this Leave at last, he follow'd his Master, who was invited by the Elector Palatine *Frederick* the III, to be Principal of the School of *Amberg*. The Allowance which his Father gave him for his Journey was so small, that he was forc'd sometimes to beg by the Way. A little after his Arrival at *Amberg*, in 1566, he was sent with Ten of his Comrades to *Heidelberg*, by their common Master, who gave them so good Recommendations, that they were all admitted into the College of the *Sapience*, whereof *Zachary Ursinus*, Professor of Divinity, was Director. The University of *Heidelberg* was then most flourishing in all the Faculties, and so *Pareus* wanted nothing to improve himself considerably in the Languages, in Philosophy and Divinity. He was admitted Minister in 1571, and sent in the Month of *May* into a Village call'd *Schlettenbach*, where he was much entangled, because the Protestants and Roman Catholicks (C) were there at Difference with one another. Nevertheless he was ready to marry there, before the Winter came on, when he was call'd back to *Heidelberg*, to be Regent of the third Class. This Call made his Project of Marriage vanish away, and he so well acquitted himself in his Employment, that at the end of two Years, he was promoted

† We shall speak of him in its proper Place.

‡ Albert Kindler Lord of Zackenstein, who was since Governour of Lusatia.

" ficians in *Paris*, not upon the account of any Er-" ror that was discover'd in them relating to the Art " of which he treated; but because in his Book of " Generation, thro' inadvertence, he had inserted " some Passages about it which were a little immo-" dest; and after he had corrected them he met " with no more opposition.

(A) ***The name of* Pareus *taken from the* Greek.**] His Father was call'd *Wangler*. Now *Wange* in the *German* Tongue signifies the same thing with παρειὰ in *Greek*, *i. e.* the Cheek. Παρεὺς therefore was form'd ἀπὸ τῆς παρειᾶς, *quasi dicas*, GENIUS *Wangler*. The Son of *Pareus*, from whom I take this Remark, says, (*b*) That his Father opposed as much as he could this change of Name, but that he was forc'd at last to submit to it when *Zachary Ursinus* had approv'd it. He adds, That the greatest part of the People wrote *Paræus*, and that they did ill in it, *Because*, says he, *τὸ ει Græcorum transit, in ē longum, apud Latinos, ut* ἠλεῖοι *Elēi*, *αἰνείας Ænēas*, *ἀλφειὸς Alphēus*, *λύκειον Lycēum*, *μουσεῖον Musēum*, *πρυτανεῖον Prytanēum & id genus alia non pauca.* As to the Christian Name *David*, it was given to his Father, says he, because he was born on the 30th of *December*, which is a Day consecrated to *David*; *Penultima Decembris die quæ* DAVIDI *est sacra . . . . & parentibus sic placuisset liberis suis, quotquot illis nascerentur, ea imponere nomina quæ præ se ferrent solemnes fasti ad ipsum nativitatis diem.* Every body does not know that St. *David*'s Day is in the Calendar.

(B) *By means of a Preceptorship.*] Here the Historian is not very exact: He says, That (*i*) *David Pareus* spent two Years at *Hirschberg*, two Months at the expence of his Father, and the rest of the time by being Preceptor in the House of an Honourable Citizen, whom he names. A little while after 'tis said, That the Lord of *Zackenstein* was very liberal to him, that he maintain'd him (*k*) *gratis*, upon the account of the Verses wherewith the Death of his eldest Son was honour'd by this Young-man; and that afterwards he gave him some Money for every Poem he order'd him to make. The same Historian mentions a Letter of that Lord, wherein he desired to know, whether that *Pareus* who had lodg'd in his House 25 Years ago, (*l*) *Quem ante annos XXV. hospitem domesticum habuisset*, was the same Person by whose care the *German* Bible had been Printed? Is not this to put a Body in two places at the same time? *David Pareus* was sent to *Hirschberg* in 1564, he receiv'd the Letter from this Lord in 1589, he lodg'd therefore with him in the Year 1564. He was not therefore Preceptor 21 Months in the House of *James Schilder*. There are every where such like Faults to be met with.

(C) ***The Protestants and Roman Catholicks were there at difference.***] It became necessary to use force for maintaining the Pretensions of the Elector *Palatine* against those of the Bishop of *Spire*; the latter maintain'd, that the Collation of Benefices in the Community of *Alsestad* belong'd to his Chapter: The Elector granted this, but he maintain'd, that since the Patronage was his, the Collators were oblig'd, according to the Peace of *Passaw*, to present such Pastors whose Religion was agreeable to him. By virtue of this Right he settled the Reform'd Religion in that Community, and sent *Pareus* to *Schlettenbach*. The Catholicks shut up the Gates of the Church against him; but they were broke open, and then the Statues and Altars were overthrown; after which, the great Trouble of *Pareus* was to get the Church clean'd, for (*a*) every one turn'd over to another the Trouble of removing the Rubbish. The Rector of the University of *Heidelberg*, alludes to all this in his Program for the Obsequies of *Pareus*. *Ad pastoratum*, says he, (*b*) *Schlettenbacensem . . . . . missus, ibidem cum statuis & altaribus acri duello primus conflictatus.* *Pareus* was also the first Pastor of *Hemsbach*, and found there the People more teachable (*c*): for after the Elector *Palatine*, who as the Patron of this Parish, resolv'd to reform it, had broke open the Gates of the Church, *Pareus* remov'd all the Images, and burnt them with the Consent of the People. To this the Program of the Rector had Reference in these Words: (*d*) *Hinc anno 73. Ecclesiæ Hemsbacensi (& hic iconomachus futurus* LEO *non imperator sed Pastor) Minister præfectus.* The Occasion which induc'd the Prince to settle the Reformation in this Place is very singular. The Priest having drunk all the Night before Easter, slept upon his Wine, the next Morning, at the time of the Office; at last being awak'd by the Sexton, he went to Church, and after singing,

(*b*) Philip. Pareus in vita David Parei *pag. m.* 5.

(*i*) In ea Schola vixit biennium trimestri spatio sumptibus parentis, reliquo tempore pædagogi officio functus apud civem honestum Jacobum Schilderum. *Id. ib. pag.* 8. *ad ann.* 1564.

(*k*) Convictum, quod filio defuncto epicedio carmine parentasset, gratuitum facile dedit. *Ibid.*

(*l*) *Ibid. pag.* 45.

(*a*) Expurgationem ruderum ab his & ab illis frustra quærebat novus Pastor. *Ib. pag.* 24.

(*b*) *Ibid. pag.* 96.

(*c*) Nemine refragante è plebe quæ sese omnimodis docilem præbuit, idola templi consentienti populo removit & Vulcano obtulit. *Ib. pag.* 27.

(*d*) *Ibid. pag.* 96.

moted to the ſecond Claſs, but he abandon'd it at the end of ſix Months, that he might re-aſſume the Function of the Miniſtery, which he went to diſcharge at *Hemsbach* in the Dioceſs of *Worms*. Growing weary of lodging in a publick Houſe, he married four Months after his Arrival, with the Siſter of *John Stibelius* ‖ Miniſter of *Heppenheim*. The Marriage was celebrated on the 5th of *January*, 1574. He loſt that Church in 1577, becauſe after the Death of the Elector *Frederick* III. *Louis* his Son, being a great Zealot for Lutheraniſm, ſettled Lutheran Miniſters in his Dominions in the Room of the Reformed. *Pareus* retired into the Territories of Prince *John Caſimir*, Brother to that Elector, and was Miniſter at *Ogerſheim* near *Franckental*, for the Space of three Years, and then at *Winzingen* (*D*) near *Neuſtad*. This Neighbourhood was ſo much the more uſeful and agreeable to him, becauſe Prince *Caſimir* had founded a *Schola illuſtris* at *Neuſtad* in 1578. where he plac'd all the Profeſſors that were driven away from *Heidelberg*. The Elector *Louis* dying in 1583, Prince *Caſimir* had the ſole Guardianſhip of *Frederick* IV, his Nephew, and the Adminiſtration of the *Palatinate*. Then the Reform'd Miniſters were reſtor'd, and a ſecond Profeſſor's Place in the College of the *Sapience*, at *Heidelberg*, was given to *Pareus*; this was done in the Month of *September*, 1584. He began two Years after to ſet up for an Author, by Printing the Method *Ubiquitariæ Controverſiæ*. He Printed the *German* Bible at *Neuſtad* with Notes, in 1589, which occaſion'd a fierce Diſpute between him and a Lutheran of *Tubingen* nam'd *James Andrew*. He became the firſt Profeſſor of the College of the *Sapience*, in the Month of *January*, 1591, and Counſellor of the Eccleſiaſtical Senate in the Month of *November* 1592. The next Year he was ſolemnly admitted Doctor in Divinity. He had already had ſeveral Quarrels with the Writers of the *Augsburg* Confeſſion; but that of the Year 1596 was one of the moſt conſiderable. It produc'd an Apology for *Calvin*, who was accus'd of favouring Judaiſm, in the Interpretation of many Paſſages of Scripture. Two Years after he was honour'd with the Place of Divinity Profeſſor of the Old Teſtament in the Univerſity; whereby he was deliver'd from * the dreadful Fatigues, he had endur'd for the Space of fourteen Years, in governing the Youth which was entertain'd in the College of the *Sapience*; Fatigues ſo terrible, that the good *Zachary Urſinus* thought himſelf happy for being baniſh'd by the *Lutherans*, ſince that Baniſhment delivered him (*D*Δ) from that miſerable Place of Exerciſe. *Pareus* was advanc'd in 1602, to be Theological Profeſſor of the New Teſtament, after the Death of *Daniel Toſſanus*. His Reputation encreas'd daily, after ſuch a Manner, that many Students came from *Hungary* and *Poland* upon his account. He publiſh'd divers Commentaries on the Scripture, and particularly (*E*) one on the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, which was extreamly diſlik'd in *England*, becauſe it contain'd ſuch Maxims as were a little Antimonarchical. The Evangelical Jubile, was celebrated at *Heidelberg* in 1617, with great Pomp. There was nothing to be heard but Harangues, Diſputes, Poems and Diſcourſes, about the great Mercy of God ſhown to the Church 100 Years before, in delivering it from the Yoke of Popery. *Pareus* for his Part, wrote ſome Pieces upon this Subject, which expos'd him to the Attacks of the Jeſuits of *Mentz*, to whom he was oblig'd to reply; but this was not the moſt ‡ troubleſome Controverſy that he had. He was deſign'd to be ſent the next Year to the Synod of *Dort*, according to the Deſire of the States General; but he excus'd † himſelf from going upon the Account of the Infirmities of his old Age, which did not permit him to undertake a long Journey, nor to uſe a new Diet. He had otherwiſe

‖ See in the Remark C of the Article Urſinus (Zachary) a Miſtake of Time which concerns this Subject.

* Huic omnino invitus eam in ſe ſuſcepit, pertæſus ſcilicet Siſyphiarum moleſtiarum quas in annum decimum quartum ærumnabili prorſus cura in collegio volviſſet effrenem juventutem gubernando. Philip. *Pareus in vita Dav. Parei pag.* 53. *edit. in* 8. *Gen.* 1641. *cum Comm. in Matthæum.*

‡ *See the Remark G.*

† Idem ἐμπόδισμα ſenem emaciatum longinquioris itineris exoticæque diætæ impatientem D. Pareum in Academia domi ſervavit. *Ib. pag.* 65.

ſinging, he went up into the Pulpit, begun his Sermon, fell down upon his Knees according to Cuſtom to ſay (*e*) the Lord's Prayer, and then fell aſleep. The People thought that this long Kneeling proceeded from a very conſiderate Zeal, but the too long Continuance of it oblig'd the Sexton to pull the Prieſt by the Sleeve. He roſe being half aſleep, and cry'd out with an Oath, that he could not Preach, (*f*) *ich kan beym Sacrament nicht predigen.* The Biſhop of *Worms* being inform'd of this Scandal, caus'd the Prieſt to be impriſon'd, and in his Room ſubſtituted another who had ſeven Baſtards. The Marriage of *Pareus* being celebrated in the Face of the Church, was ſuch a ſhow as had never been ſeen in the Pariſh of *Hemsbach*: As for Concubines and Baſtards of Prieſts, none of theſe was a Show that was look'd upon as ſo Prodigious as the other. But the People were eaſily reconcil'd to the Novelty, when they underſtood what St. *Paul* orders concerning the Marriage of a Biſhop. (*g*) *Celebratæ ſunt nuptiæ d.* 5. *Januarii Hemsbaci: ubi antehac nullus Eccleſiæ Miniſter ſponſus vel maritus fuit. Portenti igitur ſimile habebatur matrimonium Paſtoris Eccleſiæ ejus loci, ubi nunquam niſi ſacrificulorum concubinas, coquillas, & ſcortilla viderant. Verum percepta in Concionibus doctrina Apoſtoli:* (1) Oportet Epiſcopum eſſe unius uxoris Virum: *Et* (2) Epiſcopus ſit unius uxoris Vir: liberos habens fideles: *& vernaculis Sacramentorum liturgiis auditis, matrimonium & miniſterium novi Paſtoris cuncti approbaverunt.*

(*D*) Winzingen *near* Neuſtad] *Paul Freherus* affirms, (*h*) that *David Pareus* was Miniſter of *Neuſtad*; but *Philip Pareus*, who aſſigns him only a Church in the Neghbourhood of *Neuſtad*, is more to be credited than the Continuator of *Boiſſard* cited by *Freherus*; I ſay he is more to be credited both as to this Matter, and as to the Honours of *John Wangler*, the Father of *David Pareus*. According to *Freherus*, *John Wangler* was Preſident of the *Echevins* in his Country, but he was only *Echevin*, *aſſeſſor Scabinatus*, according to *Philip Pareus*.

(*D* Δ) *Delivered him from that miſerable Place of Exerciſe.*] The Words which *Philip Pareus* uſes, are very emphatical. (*a*) *Quantumvis pauper & debilis ſim & non proſpiciens ullum peregrinationis aut exilii portum, tamen gaudebo me dimitti ex meo ergaſtulo. Non poſſum amplius* δυσμεταχείριστον & ἀχάλινον *illam juventutem regere. Defeſſus enim ſum & infirmus factus.*

(*E*) *On the Epiſtle to the Romans which was extreamly diſlik'd in* England.] King *James* caus'd it to be burnt by the Hands of the Hangman; the Univerſity of *Oxford* condemn'd it in the moſt diſgraceful manner. See their Proceedings in a Book of *Grotius*, intitled *Votum pro pace Eccleſiaſtica.* The Sieur *Konig* refers us to *p.* 754, of an (*b*) Abridgment of Univerſal Hiſtory, wherein I find only 544 Pages, altho' my Edition be the third, which is that of the Year 1661. Here I find a Fault in the Index, for under the Word *David Pareus*, we are referr'd

(*e*) *It ſhould be the* Ave Maria. Pareus *the Son might well be Miſtaken in ſome other little Circumſtances, becauſe he knew not the Romiſh Ceremonies*

(*f*) Per Sacramentum (*that is the great Oath of the Germans*) non poſſum concionari. *Ib. p.* 26.

(*g*) *Ibid. pag.* 32.

(1) 1 *Tim.* 3. 2.

(2) *Tit.* 1. 17.

(*h*) *Paul. Freher. in Theatro. pag.* 413.

(*a*) Phil. Pareus in vita Davidis Parei.

(*b*) *'Tis that of* John Lætus. *He publiſh'd it the firſt time in* 1642. *I am ſure the firſt Edition contains more Pages than the third.*

wiſe been a very fit Man for that Aſſembly; for he was a great Enemy to all (F) Innovations in Point of Doctrine. After that time this venerable old Man had ſcarce ever any reſt. He was afraid of what might happen to the Elector his Maſter for having accepted the Crown of *Bohemia*. He fancied, I know not how many troubleſome Preſages, founded upon ſeveral Things he ſaw, either when Awake or in his Sleep; for he (G) gave Credit to Dreams; and while he ſaw People working at the Fortifications of *Heidelberg*, he ſaid that it was loſt Labour. Calling to mind the Books he had publiſh'd againſt the Pope, he look'd upon it as a dreadful Miſfortune to fall into the Hands of the Monks, and therefore he hearkned to thoſe who adviſ'd him to retire to a Place of Safety: And for his Retirement he made Choice of *Anweil* in the Dutchy of *Deux-Ponts*, near *Landau*, and arriv'd there in the Month of *October*, 1621. After ſome Months he went from thence to *Neuſtad* and reſolved to return from thence to *Heidelberg*, chooſing rather to die in his own (H) *Pareanum*, and to be buried near the Profeſſors of the Univerſity, than in any

referr'd to *pag.* 715, 745, and 755. I know not whether the Sieur *Konig* was not deceived by this means; however the Places where I found *David Pareus*, which are at *pag.* 509, 535, and 536, ſay nothing of the Diſgracing of his Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*. There was an *Engliſh* Divine call'd *David Owen*, who refuted him. *Philip Pareus* anſwer'd him, and endeavour'd to juſtify his Father. See (c) the *Anti* of Mr. *Baillet*, and the Apology of (d) Mr. *Arnauld* for the Catholicks, where we find that *David Pareus* was juſtifyed among other means by that which the Jeſuits make uſe of, when they are accus'd of corrupting the Chriſtian Morality. They ſhow that they are neither the Firſt, nor the only Perſons, who have taught this or that.

(F) *A great Enemy to all Innovations in Point of Doctrine.*] See what will be ſaid in the next Remark concerning his Antipathy to the *Ramiſts*. That Temper of Mind link'd him in a moſt intimate Friendſhip to a certain Divine of *Franeker*, call'd *Sibrandus Lubbertus*, who vigorouſly oppoſed the Promoters of new Ways of Speaking and Teaching. *Pareus* call'd him (e) his Soul, and would not ſet him any bad Examples, for he would by no means permit that any ſhould depart from the Catechiſm of his Profeſſor *Urſinus*, as ſome Divines, I know not who, departed from it, who (f) added no fewer than three Kinds of Imputations, to that which was laid down by *Urſinus*, as the Matter of our Juſtification before God, *viz.* The Imputation of the Death of Jeſus Chriſt, the Imputation of his Actual Righteouſneſs, and Habitual Holineſs. There were alſo Diſſenſions in the Year 1604, about a Queſtion of the ſame *Palatine* Catechiſm, *viz.* the 76, which treats of the Efficacy of the Holy Supper. *Pareus*, like a brave Champion of the receiv'd Doctrine, would not ſuffer it to be chang'd. Theſe Innovations (g) according to him, were a removing of the Boundaries of Truth, which ought to be ſacred and immutable, like thoſe which part Lands of Inheritance; and he thought that theſe Attacks, which were made upon the Catechiſm, were the Preſage of an approaching Deſolation, which he (h) expreſs'd in theſe two Verſes.

Aula ruit: Politia ruit: ruet & Catecheſis;
Ante fores noſtram quis jam neget eſſe ruinam.

'Tis in vain to ſay, that *Pareus* by this means introduc'd the Principle of Authority in lieu of that of Enquiry, and that this was to employ the Engines of Popery againſt his Brethren, after he had inveigh'd againſt them as abominable. It is in vain to complain that this Conduct reſembles the Stratagem of the *Trojans*:

Mutemus (i) clipeos, Danaumque inſignia nobis
Aptemus. Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirat?

It is in vain, I ſay, to declaim thus, and to reproach others with a thouſand Contradictions; thoſe who know the powerful Virtue of *diſtinguo*, thoſe who remember, *diſtingue tempora & conciliabis ſcripturas*, thoſe who conſider, that there are certain Maxims which may be laid aſide at a certain time, and which muſt be taken up again at laſt, and that the Abuſe does not take away the Uſe, will ſuffer theſe Declaimers to cry out and ſtorm againſt them. Fancy to your ſelves a Circle hanging at the Entry of a Houſe, whereof one half is without, and the other half within; make it turn about upon its Centre, and you will ſee that exactly, as one half goes out of the Houſe, another will enter in; juſt ſo it is with certain Principles of Humane Society; it is a thing that muſt be done: And after all, the moſt intolerable Perſecution is not that of the ſecular Arm, but that of ſome reſtleſs Men, who very unſeaſonably ſet up for Reformers. Our *Pareus* (k) ſaid of ſuch People with *Luther*, *A Doctore glorioſo, & Paſtore contentioſo, & inutilibus quæſtionibus liberet Eccleſiam ſuam Dominus.*

(G) *He gave credit to Dreams.*] His Son informs us, that he found in the Journal of his Father, divers Dreams and other augural Obſervations. Take one Inſtance: *Pareus* (l) wrote in his Journal at the 25th of *December*, 1617. that he dream'd that a Cat ſcratch'd his Face, and that certainly this was an augural Dream, *ſine dubio ominoſum*. Two Days after having receiv'd the firſt Leaf of a Book that was Printing at *Mentz*, he ſaid this was the Cat that was to ſcratch him, and ſet down this Expoſition in his Journal. This is certain, that the Jeſuits of *Mentz* wrote bitterly againſt him; but what he ſuffer'd from *Scaliger*'s Hand, was a much (m) heavier Blow. It had been better for him, that he had never engag'd his Pen againſt ſuch a Chronologer, *impar congreſſus Achilli*: but he was troubled a little with the Itch of medling with too many Affairs. His Comfort was to ſee his Adverſary ſuffer the *Lex talionis*; and then his Muſe awoke, and was deliver'd of this Epigram:

Nobiliore (n) canum jactans ſe ſtirpe Moloſſus
Forte viatorem dum petit ore minax,
A cane degenere incautus miſer ipſe necatur:
Hanc Nemeſin juſtam quis neget eſſe ſuam?

He means the Inſults of the Wicked *Scioppius*; about which let us hear alſo *Philip Pareus*. *Nullus præterea fuit*, ſays he (o), *nobilem adverſarium in ſtudiis Chronologicis, ſuperciliſiſſimum Criticum* JOSEPHUM SCALIGERUM *Julii Cæſaris à Burden filium, qui ſatyrica protervia erga* PAREUM *uſus jure* ἀντιπεπονθότος *eo ipſo tempore infamia notam penè indelebilem ab Apoſtatico quodam Alaſtore coactus fuit ſubire* (p). I muſt not paſs over in Silence, that *Pareus* attributes to his Father a great Meekneſs, and a notable Gentleneſs. We muſt confeſs indeed that he was not one of thoſe moroſe Divines, who would ſacrifice nothing for Peace ſake: The *Irenicon* which he wrote, ſhows the contrary. But to pretend that he did not write in a Style full of Reproaches, and violent Expreſſions upon many Occaſions, is certainly to be guilty of ſuch an Illuſion as is very common. Every one fancies, that there are no piquant Reproaches, but ſuch as are ſaid to him, and thoſe of his Party. *Pareus* was otherwiſe an Enemy to the ſmalleſt Innovations, as I have ſhown in the preceding Remark. Now although it be often the Cauſe of very great Miſchief in Matters of Religion, to depart in the leaſt from the common Opinions, yet it can never be ſaid, that thoſe who are ſo brisk againſt the leaſt Alterations, are endow'd with much Moderation, what ever other Commendations may be given to their Important Services. *Ramus* (a) was inſupportable to *Pareus*, for daring to remove the Boundaries of our Anceſtors, and therefore he regal'd him with this Epigram:

Quæ (b) mutas perdis, dixit Democritus, & quæ
Servas in phyſicis ſunt, Epicure, mea.
Nonne idem Ariſtoteles in Ramum maſtiga dicat
Quæ mutas, perdis: quæ retines mea ſunt!

In fine, *Pareus* had ſo many People to write againſt, that it was ſcarce poſſible but he muſt contract a Habit of reproachful Language. Thoſe who know what it is to whet the Pen in the Republick of Learning, will underſtand what I mean.

(H) *In his* Pareanum.] Having bought a Houſe in the Suburbs of *Heidelberg*, in the Year [illegible], he

cauſ'd

(c) *In Vol.* 3. *n.* 138.

(d) *In Ch.* 4. *of the* III *part.*

(e) Animam ſuam appellavit. Amavit autem eum præcipuè ob rotundum ingenium in tuenda ὀρθοδοξίᾳ: quippe qui non paſſus fuerit à ſciolis mutari terminos doctrinæ receptos, intrepidoque animo iis ſeſe oppoſuerit, qui inconſueta forma loquendi ac docendi quicquam mutare præſumerent. *Philip Pareus. pag.* 106.

(f) *Ibid. p.* 102.

(g) Theologos illos qui καινοδοξίαν aut καινοτομίαν in dogmatibus vel phraſibus affectarent, nec ſervarent ex præcepto Apoſtoli ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαινόντων λόγων, dicere ſolebat movere veritatis terminos qui debeant eſſe immobiles atque ſacroſancti. *Ib. pag.* 101.

(h) *Ibid. pag.* 103.

(i) *Virg. Æn. l.* 2. *v.* 389.

(k) *Ibid. pag.* 103.

(l) Philippus Pareus *ib. pag.* 65.

(m) Eo conflictu non ſolum optimo patri ſed omnibus paſſim viris doctis, ſi palpones & canes venaticos alios excipias, nihil unquam ægrius indignuſve accidiſſe probe recordor. *Ibid. pag.* 107.

(n) *Ibid. pag.* 108.

(o) *Ibid. pag.* 107.

(p) *See the new Letters againſt the Calviniſm of* Maimbourg, *tom.* 1. *pag.* 182, 183.

(a) Novellam artem quæ a Ramo ſectario nomen jactat perpetuo rejecit. Huic nimium quantum ſuccenſuit ideò quod per eam diceret antiquos artis terminos moveri, nihil ſuo loco relinqui, ingenium juventutis ad αὐθάδειαν & θρασύτητα traduci. *Philip. Pareus ubi ſupra pag.* 21.

(b) *Ibid. pag.* 22.

any other Place. He had this Confolation, for, having yielded up the Ghoſt in his own Houſe, on the 15th of *June* 1622, at the Age of near 74 Years, he receiv'd ſuch an honourable Burial as the Univerſities of *Germany* beſtow upon their Profeſſors. His *Exegetical* Works were collected in three Volumes in Folio. He publiſh'd many Treatiſes againſt Cardinal *Bellarmine*, and left a Son call'd *Philip*, of whom we ſhall ſpeak afterwards, and who wrote his Father's Life, from which I have taken what has been ſaid. I find nothing in it concerning his Diſpute (*H*∆) with the Jeſuit, *John Magirus*.

PAREUS (*Philip*) † Son of the Preceding *Pareus*, was born at *Hembach* in the Dioceſs of *Worms*, *May* the 24th, 1576. He was one of the moſt laborious Grammarians that *Germany* ever produc'd. He begun his Studies at *Neuſtad*, and continued them at *Heidelberg*, and after that, * at the Expence of the Elector *Palatine*, in foreign Univerſities. He went to ſee that at *Baſil*, in 1599, and afterwards he went to *Geneva*, where he continued more than a Year. In his Paſſage he ſaw ſome others, and was much eſteem'd every where, as well upon the Account of his own Learning, as for the great Veneration they had for his Father. He convers'd very much at *Paris* with the Famous *Caſaubon*. ‡ He was made Rector of the College of *Neuſtad* in 1610, and poſſeſs'd that ‡ Office till the *Spaniards*, becoming Maſters of the City in 1622, ordain'd him to depart the Country immediately. His Library was robb'd. He had already publiſh'd many (*A*) Books, which ſhow his prodigious Application, and his peculiar Affection for the (*B*) Comedies of *Plautus*. It was a thing of bad Example, that there aroſe between him and *John Gruterus* (*C*), Profeſſor at *Heidelberg*, a fierce Diſpute occaſion'd by *Plautus*. I have already ſaid, * that our *Pareus* took in hand the Cauſe of his deceaſed Father againſt *David Owen*, who had printed at *Cambridge* in 1622, an *Anti-Paræus*. He anſwer'd him a little while after with an *Anti-Owenus* †. He was Rector of divers Colleges, and

† *In his 1st Book he takes the Name of* John Philip.

* *Theatr. Freheri* p. 501.

‡ *Daniel Pareus, not. in Muſæum verſ. 1.*

‡ *Ipſe in Vita Davidis Parei.*

* *In the Remark E of the preceding Article.*

† *It is wanting in the curious Collection of Mr. Baillet.*

caus'd an Apartment to be built in his Garden, wherein to place his Library and his Study; and this is what he call'd *Pareanum*. This was afterwards the Name of the whole Houſe, and all the City call'd it ſo. The Elector granted to this Houſe certain Privileges and Immunities. *Pareus* plac'd upon the Frontiſpiece of it two Inſcriptions, one Latin, the other German (*c*). Now ſince his Son hop'd, after the Ravage that was made by the Troops of the Catholick League in the *Palatinate*, that this Houſe ſhould (*d*) preſerve ſtill the Title of *Pareanum*, it muſt have continued ſound and entire. I know not what became of it ſince, but I believe that it is ruin'd at this time. The poor City of *Heidelberg* was made ſo deſolate by the Troops of *France*, in the Years 1689, and 1693, that there is no probability that the Houſe of *Pareus* ſhould ſtill continue. We may Remark, *en paſſant*, that Certain Cities ſeem to be built under a malignant Conſtellation, for they are equally unhappy, whatever Side gains the Day. *Heidelberg* ruin'd for being contrary to the Emperor, and for being faithful to him, is an Inſtance of it.

(*H*∆) *Concerning his Diſpute with the Jeſuit* Magirus.] *Pareus* ſpoke an Harangue at *Heidelberg*, the 23d of *March* 1602. *de Jeſuitarum ſtrophis circa Canonem Sacræ ſcripturæ.* He maintain'd alſo a *Theſis*, in 1603, about the Cononical Authority of the Scripture, and the Infallibility of the Church, and deſired the Jeſuits of *Spire* to be preſent at this Diſpute. Not one of them appear'd, but *Magirus* having written to *Pareus September* the 7th, 1603, this occaſion'd a Diſpute which was publiſh'd. The Superſcription and exordium of *Magirus*'s Letter was thus: *Doctiſſimo viro Domino D. Pareo Doctori & Profeſſori Facultatis pro tempore Decano in Academia Heydelbergenſi. Nudius tertius venit ad Collegium noſtrum adoleſcens, ingenio præfervido, moribus linguaque protervus: is ita narrabat à te miſſum ſe eſſe, ut & diſputationem primam de S. S. authoritate adverſus Jeſuitarum impoſturas quam examinandam propoſueras ad diem 26 Auguſti nobis redderet, ſimulque ad eam diſputationem nos humaniter invitaret.* It is ſign'd, *ſalutis tuæ cupidus Joannes Magirus. Pareus* anſwer'd and us'd this Superſcription, *Clariſſimo viro Domino Joanni Magiro Societatis Jeſu dictæ Concionatori apud Spirenſes, amico ſuo in Chriſto.* He complains that *Magirus* had abus'd him in his Sermons by Invectives, and he obſerves that the Jeſuite had call'd him *Pereus* inſtead of *Pareus. Si amanuenſis ſphalma eſt, tranſeat: ſi ſtudium tuum ut pereundi verbo me pungeres, illiberale eſt, ac ſi quis pro Magiro Megærum diceret.* This Piece of *Pareus* was printed in 1604. *typis Voegelianis*, and contains *diſceptatio epiſtolaris Joannis Magiri Jeſuitæ Concionatoris, & Davidis Parei Chriſtiani Theologi de authoritate Divina & Canonica S. S. deque abſoluta Eccleſiæ infallibilitate. De S. S. authoritate adverſus Jeſuitarum impoſturas. Exegeſis diſputationis de authoritate Divina & Canonica, adverſus Jeſuitarum ſtrophas & impoſturas.* Mr. *Bachelier des Marets* furniſhed me with all that I have ſaid.

(*A*) *Already publiſhed many Books.*] Beſides thoſe whoſe Titles I mention in the next Remark, he had in 1616, publiſh'd *Calligraphia Romana, ſeu Theſaurus phraſium linguæ Latinæ*; and in 1615. *Electa Symmachiana, Lexicon Symmachianum, Calligraphia Symmachiana*, and ſome other Pieces at ſeveral times.

(*B*) *A peculiar Affection for the Comedies of* Plautus.] He did not only publiſh them with Notes in 1609, but he alſo publiſh'd a *Lexicon Plautinum* in 1614. *Analecta Plautina* in 1617, a Treatiſe *de imitatione Terentiana, ubi Plautum imitatus eſt*, in 1617. a 2d Edition of *Plautus* in 1619, and his *Electa Plautina* in 1620. I muſt explain what I have ſaid, of the firſt Edition of *Plautus*. I am not ignorant that it has in the Title the Year 1610. But ſince among the Thanks and Elogiums that were written to the Author, there are ſome which are dated in the Year 1609, there's no doubt but the Year 1610 was one of thoſe anticipations which the Bookſellers commonly make uſe of. If they did only this, they would not cauſe ſo much Confuſion to thoſe who collect ſeveral Editions: But how often do they Re-print the firſt Page of their Books, to make them paſs for new ones? Sometimes alſo they are ſo bold as to call this a new Edition, and this ſtrangely multiplies in our Opinion, and even in the Catalogue of Libraries, the Editions of a Book. He publiſh'd at *Franckfort*, in 1641, the third Edition of his *Plautus*. The *Prolegomena* which are in it, about the Life of that Poet, about the Character of his Verſifying, and the Quality of his Railleries, were all put together, before the Edition of *Plautus in uſum Delphini*.

THE CONFUSION caus'd by the Printers, who reprint the firſt Page of Books.

(*C*) *Between him and* John Gruterus.] *Gruterus* having attack'd *Pareus*, the latter quickly publiſh'd his Anſwer in 1620, under the Title of *Provocatio ad Senatum Criticum pro Plauto & Electis Plautinis.* They grew hotter and hotter, neither was the Conſideration of the Miſeries which hang'd over their Heads, by the Ruin wherewith the *Palatinate* was threatned, ſufficient to inſpire them with ſome kind of Moderation: ſo eaſily are theſe Philologers and Grammarians provok'd, and ſo difficultly appeas'd. The long Preface which our *Pareus* prefix'd to his *Analecta Plautina*, printed at *Franckfort* in 1623, is dated in the Month of *October* 1621, and conſequently he fill'd it with Gall and Animoſity, being upon the Brink of the Deſolations, which ruin'd both their Univerſities and their Libraries, and reduc'd their Perſons to the greateſt Extremities. Their Baniſhment did not abate this violent Humour, for thoſe *Analecta*, being printed ſince

(*c*) *Ibid. pag.* 55.

(*d*) Quo nomine incolis civitatis ſtatim innotuit, & à poſteris, ſi bene ominor, eam gratiam retinebit. *Ib. He wrote the Life of his Father in* 1628.

and particularly of that of *Hanaw* (*D*) in the Year 1645, as appears by the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his *Lexicon Criticum*, printed that Year at *Noremberg*. It is but one thick Octavo, but it coſt much Pains, *ærumnabili labore congeſtus*, as the Author ſays. He wrote alſo ſome Commentaries upon the Scripture, and ſome Pieces of Theology. We will now ſay ſomething of his Son *Daniel*.

PAREUS (*Daniel*) Son of the foregoing, walk'd in the ſteps of his Father, and applied himſelf, as he had done, with all his Heart to the Study of Humane Learning. He was a pretty good Grecian, and publiſh'd ſome (*A*) Books. He was (*A*Δ) unhappily kill'd by Robbers on the High-way, during the Life of his Father. *Voſſius* eſteem'd him (*B*) very much, and made it his Buſineſs to find out Bookſellers, who would print his Works.

PARRHASIUS (*Janus*) Born at *Coſenza* in the Kingdom of *Naples* * in the Year 1470. follow'd the Cuſtom of the *Humaniſts* at that time, who chang'd their Names into others much more agreeable to Paganiſm than to Chriſtianity. He caus'd himſelf to be nam'd † *Aulus Janus Parrhaſius*, in lieu of *Johannes Paulus Pariſius*. He underſtood very well polite Learning, and ‡ was Profeſſor in the City of *Milan*, with great Reputation. He had the Satisfaction to ſee in his Auditory General *Trivulce*, who was 60 Years of Age. His Pronunciation (*A*) was exceeding pleaſant. The Liberty he allow'd himſelf to cenſure thoſe who were Regents of the Claſſes in the *Milaneze*, provok'd them to ſuch a Degree, that they entered into a horrible Conſpiracy againſt his Reputation: They defam'd him as a Man that lov'd his Scholars unchaſtly. This bad Report which diſpleas'd the *Milaneſe* extreamly, forc'd him to quit his (*B*) Poſt. He was invited to *Rome* by *Leo* X. to

* Nicolo Toppi, Biblioteca Napoletana p. 112.

† Sertorio Quattromani, dell' origine e principii della Città di Coſenza apud Nicodemum, addizioni alla Biblioteca Napoletana pag. 80.

‡ Paulus Jovius, in elog. c. 127. pag. 270.

ſince their Diſperſion, are every where ſtuff'd with groſs Reproaches againſt *Gruterus*. This was nothing but Repriſals, for *Gruterus* had us'd him after ſo violent a Manner, that there were reckon'd no fewer than 136 cruel Reproaches in one of his Books againſt *Philip Pareus*. The (*a*) Jeſuit *James Gretſerus*, pleas'd himſelf in writing this Liſt. There you will find *Pareus* call'd an Aſs, a Mule, a Boar, a Ram, a Goat, a Hog, *ſtercoreus Grammaticalis cellæ inquilinus*, &c. *Gruterus* had been a long time before diſpos'd to ſquabble with the other, for thus he writes to (*b*) *Goldaſtus*, *June* 19. 1601. *Mirabeiis carmen tui Parei, qui me nondum inviſit ex quo à vobis abiit, nuper autem factus eſt Rector ſcholæ civitatis ſic ſatis magnæ, ut alios regat ſcilicet qui ſe regere non poteſt.*

(*D*) *Of* Hanaw *in* 1645.] This ſhows that *Paul Freherus* is miſtaken, when he ſays (*c*) that *Pareus* died about the Year 1643. Probably the Sieur *Witte*, in the ſecond Part of his *Diarium Biographicum*, did only abrigde *Freherus*, as to what concerns our *Philip*; at leaſt he agrees with him, as to the time of his Death in 1643. If they had but caſt their Eyes upon the *Lexicon Criticum*, they had ſeen in the Frontiſpiece the Face of the Author when he was ſeventy Years old, from whence they might have concluded, that he did not die at the Age of ſixty ſeven Years, as they both ſay; and if they had conſulted the End of the Epiſtle Dedicatory, they had ſeen that he was ſtill alive, *Auguſt* 24. 1645. 'Tis a ſtrange thing that he appears leſs deform'd in the Figure of 1645, than in that of 1641, which is prefix'd to the third Edition of *Plautus*. *Rivetus* in a Book (*d*) which he wrote in 1646, ſpeaks of him as of a Man then alive. He was ſtill alive in 1647, as appears by the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Exegetical Works of his Father, which he caus'd to be printed that Year at *Francfort*, in three Volumes in *Folio*.

(*A*) *He publiſh'd ſome Books*] In the Year 1627, he printed the Poem of *Muſæus* about *Hero* and *Leander* with Notes, which are either ſtuff'd with Greek Citations and Phraſes, or taken from the old Latin. He publiſh'd alſo in the ſame Year, a thick Volume in Quarto, which he dedicated to the Univerſity of *Oxford*, and is intitled *Mellificium Atticum*: which is a Collection of Sentences reduc'd into common Places, and taken from Greek Authors. He publiſh'd in 1631 another Book (*e*) entitled *Medulla Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ*, and Notes with a Lexicon upon *Lucretius*; but the Life of *Lucretius* which he added, is not of his compoſing, for he did only take away ſomething from that which *Giſanius* wrote. If the Dauphin's Scholiaſt had minded this, he would not have ſtopt at *Daniel Pareus* as the Source, with reſpect to the Life of *Lucretius*, which he prefix'd to his Commentary upon this Poet, but would have mounted higher up to *Giſanius*. There is a *Spicilegium ſubciſivum* of Notes, by *Daniel Pareus*, upon *Quintilian*, in the Edition of *Quintilian* at *London*, 1641. in Octavo.

(*A*Δ) *He was unhappily kill'd by Robbers on the Highway.*] This I learn from *William Frey*, in the Verſes he made upon the *Lexicon Criticum* of *Philip Pareus*. *Ceſſit avus fatis; ſurum ſcelerata nepotem*, ſays he, *trajecit mediis cuſpide turma viis.* But others ſay, that he was kill'd at the taking of *Keiſerſlauteren* in the *Palatinate*. See *Gisbert Voetius* in Tome 3. of *Politica Eccleſiaſtica. p.* 164, 165.

(*B*) Voſſius *eſteem'd him very much, and made it his Buſineſs.*] This appears by a Letter (*f*) which he wrote, when it was ſaid, that in *Holland* many Cities would erect (*g*) Academies after the Example of *Amſterdam*. He gives him to underſtand, that in that Caſe he could procure him a Profeſſor's Place. He renew'd (*h*) the ſame offers of Service ſome time after; and gave him an Account of the Care he had already taken, and would ſtill take to find out a Printer for the Hiſtory of the Church; which was a Piece of *Daniel Pareus*. He confeſſes to him that *le Maire* had refuſed to take this Work upon him, upon Pretence that he did not know the Bigneſs of it, and that his Preſſes were already very full. (*i*) *La-Merium conveni ipſe, ac poſtea idem filius fecit. Sed nihil promittere voluit, qui neſciret de magnitudine libri. Solet ille magis capi iis, quæ minoris ſunt molis: Addebat jam prælum ſudare multis & variis.* He makes him hope that if this Printer ſhould perſiſt in his Refuſal, after the Declaration that was made to him, that he ſhould not be required to make haſte, others would be glad to ptint the Book. Nevertheleſs he lets him know, that there is no Country in the World where it is more difficult to find Printers than in *Holland*, except in theſe two Caſes: One is, if the Author pay the whole Expences of the Impreſſion; the other is, if the Copy be a Book of Controverſy, or a frivolous Pamphlet, for nothing ſells better than Books of that Nature. (*k*) *Quod ſi is difficilem ſe præbeat, non deerunt, ut ſpero, alii, qui lubenter id facient. Diſſimulare tamen non poſſum, nuſquam difficilius eſſe typographum reperire quam apud nos, niſi quis ſuis ſumptibus librum edat. Fit hoc ob rerum omnium ſummam caritatem, quam cauſat grave & diuturnum bellum, quod nobis eſt cum hoſte potentiſſimo. Sola excipio* ἐριστικὰ, *& nugalia quibus nihil vendibilius, ut ipſi non diſſimulant typographi* (*l*). This Letter of *Voſſius* informs us, that *Daniel Pareus* would quickly be Preceptor in the Houſe of the Count of *Iſenburg*. See the Letter 31, which ſhows that our *Pareus* dedicated a (*m*) Book to *Voſſius*.

(*A*) *His Pronounciation was exceeding pleaſant*]. 'Twas in this chiefly that he excell'd all the other Profeſſors. (*a*) *Cunctos noſtri ſeculi doctores erudito rerum omnium* (*b*) *quæ explicaret apparatu, ac una præſertim rotundæ pronunciationis gloria ſuperavit.* *Pierius Valerianus* obſerves, that (*c*) the fine Voice of *Parrhaſius*, enticed a great Concourſe of Auditors to come after him.

(*B*) *Forc'd him to quit his Poſt. He was invited to* Rome.] *Paulus Jovius*, whom I have follow'd in this Narrative, has left here a Gap which may be

fill'd

(*a*) *See* Theoph. Raynaud *Erotemat. pag.* 115.

(*b*) *See the Collection of Letters written to* Goldaſtus, *printed at* Francfort, *in the year* 1688. *pag.* 73.

(*c*) *Theat. pag.* 501.

(*d*) *Rivetus*, *Grot. Diſcuſſ. Oper. to* 3. *pag.* 1163.

(*e*) *See the Article* (Henry) Alting, *in the Remark F.*

(*f*) *It is the* 100. *p.* 135. London *Edit.* 1693.

(*g*) *In tranſlating word for word, the Terms us'd in* Holland, *you muſt ſay* illuſtrious Schools.

(*h*) *See his Letter* 317, *pag.* 307.

(*i*) *Voſſius*, *epiſt.* 317. *pag.* 307.

(*k*) *Id. ib.*

(*l*) *If* Voſſius *had written when I write this in* 1696. *he would have had yet more reaſon to ſay this. The Bookſellers may be excuſed as above in the Article* Craterus.

(*m*) *He dedicated to him his* Lucretius.

(*a*) *Paulus Jovius*, *elog. c.* 127. *pag.* 270.

(*b*) *It is a Soleciſm, I know not whether it eſcap'd Paulus Jovius or the Printers.*

(*c*) Ad cujus jucundam vocem undique concurrebatur. *Pier. Valerianus de infel. literat. pag.* 25.

to be publick Profeſſor of Humane Learning. He carryed with him thither *Baſil Chalcondylas* his Wife's Brother, and Son of *Demetrius Chalcondylas*, Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue at *Milan*. He did not long enjoy the Office which the Pope gave him; but being grievouſly tormented with the Gout, he was forced to retire into his own Country, where he dyed a little after †. He left his Books to *Antony* * *Seripande*, his good Friend, who built a Tomb for him in the Convent of the *Auguſtines* of *Naples* ȝ. Poverty was one Cauſe which oblig'd him to depart out of *Rome* ♯. He was amply commended by *Henry Stephens* in an ɣ Epiſtle Dedicatory. He was accus'd of citing Authors whom he had never ſeen. You will find this Accuſation in a ‡ Letter of *Andrew Alciatus*, which was printed at *Utrecht* in 1697, with many others taken out of the Library of Mr. *Gudius*. The ſame *Alciatus* complained that he never ‖ received again a Manuſcript of *Juvenal* which he lent him. We have an Harangue (*C*), wherein he complains very much againſt Fortune. I ſhall relate (*D*) ſome other Matters of Fact in criticizing upon *Moreri*.

fill'd up by conſulting a Harangue of *Parrhaſius*. It informs us, that this Profeſſor went out of *Milan*, to go to *Vicenza*, where a better Sallary was offer'd him, and that when the Territoires of *Venice* were ravag'd by the Troops of the *League*, he retir'd into his own Country, from whence (*d*) *Thomas Phedrus* would have fetch'd him to *Rome*, if Pope *Julius* the 2d had not died. That which was but a Project under *Julius* II. became an effectual Call under *Leo* X. (*e*) *Ut ex animo gaviſus eſt* (Phaedrus) *ubi certior à me factus audivit, in Gallia citeriore portum jam me tenere, Mediolanique publicè conductum profiteri. Quid? quum ſequutus uberiora ſtipendia, Vicetiam commigraſſem: Germanis, Gallis, Hiſpanis, cæteriſque barbaris nationibus, infeſtis ſignis irrumpentibus in Venetiam, dii boni, quàm de nobis erat anxius! quàm non aliter ſaluti noſtræ timebat quàm ſi ipſe vocaretur in partem diſcriminis! Extant ab eo ad me tum datæ epiſtolæ, teſtes inquietis animi, quouſque reſcivit elapſum me per medios hoſtes in patriam ſeceſſiſſe. Nec ita quidem de nobis cogitandi finem fecit, auctorque Julio ſecundo fuit ut nos huc evocaret. Sed eo maturè defuncto, Leoni decimo per Janum Laſcarim, virum ad promerendum homines natum, mihi jam conciliato, calcaria ſponte currenti (quod aiunt) admovit. In urbem reverſo quàm præſto mihi fuit! &c.* He had ſaid, that being at *Rome* under the Pontificate of *Alexander* VI. he was like to be involved in the Misfortunes of *Bernardin Cajetan*, and *Silius Sabellus*, with whom he had held Correſpondence, and that *Thomas Phedrus* adviſ'd him to deliver himſelf from the Danger, by retiring to ſome other Place.

(*C*) *An Harangue wherein he complains much againſt Fortune.*] 'Tis that which has furniſh'd me the Matters of Fact in the preceding Remark. He ſays, That Fortune fought inceſſantly againſt him, to force him to confeſs that he was overcome; but that the Miſeries which oppreſs'd him, did not at all oblige him to make this Confeſſion. (*f*) *Continenter enim (ſi neſcitis) aſſiduumque mecum Fortuna bellum gerit, obnixéque contendit oppreſſo mihi victoriæ confeſſionem extorquere. Rurſus ego, tametſi cumulatis ſtragibus obrutus, extrema tamen experiri malle quàm tantulum de jure meo remittere, nedum manus dare.* He declares, that being unwilling to ſtudy the Civil Law, as his Anceſtors had done, he (*g*) had incurr'd the Indignation of his Father, who would no more furniſh Expences for his Studies. He affirms that he loſt five times his Library, that he was forced to abandon his Country, when the French invaded the Kingdom of *Naples*, that he loſt in a little time his Father, his Mother, his two Brothers, and all his Children. He regrets very much the Loſs of *Theophilus*, and *Baſil Chalcondylas*, his two Brothers-in-law, who died very young and promiſed great things (†).

There is a Letter publiſh'd, which he wrote to *Baſil Chalcondylas*, a little before the Affair of his Calling to *Rome* was concluded. In that Letter he declares two domeſtick Afflictions which had faln upon him; one was, that his Brother's Widow, after ſhe had refus'd all that courted her for the Space of three Years, like another *Penelope*, had at laſt married clandeſtinely one *Caputus*, and had robb'd her Children of all their Patrimony: (*h*) *Expilata penitus hæreditate parvorum liberûm.* The other was, that his Brother's Daughter had been got with Child by an Advocate, who was the Widower of her Siſter. To ſhun the Penalty of Death, which both of them had reaſon to fear in this Caſe of Inceſt, they were clandeſtinely married, no Body being admitted into the Secret of the Marriage, but the Mother of the Maid that was got with Child. This being inſufficient to ſecure them from Danger, unleſs the Pope would grant them a Diſpenſation, *Parrhaſius* employ'd all his Friends to obtain this Favour from *Leo* X. and to get the Expences moderated. (*i*) *Itaque cum eo deducta res eſſet, ut utrique moriendum foret, conſcia tantum* [illegible] *matre concubitum confarreant, atque ſic honeſto nomine nefandum crimen velant. Verum ne ſic quidem, quin ferro cadant, effugient; niſi Deus aliquis eos aſpexerit, id eſt, à ſummo Pontifice veniam inceſtus inſcriptis impetraverint; ut furtivum dedecus profeſſo matrimonio diluatur. Ad hanc rem velim omnes ingenii tui nervos intendas, utariſque gratia ac authoritate Laſcaris, Phædri, Citrariique, & omnium denique amicorum, ut ex leges has nuptias, ad evitandum paratæ cædis periculum, Pontifex privilegio juſtas rataſque faciat, indicta pro copiarum facultate mulcta. Acceſſit hoc enim meis ærumnis, ut opes ne tantæ ſaltem ſint, quæ poſſint impendia ſuſtinere. Quas ob res abs te primum peto, ſuppliciterque (ſi poteris) oro, omni ſtudio ut cures impetrandam (quam dixi) veniam. Deinde ut quam minimum poteris impendas.* He complains that his other Miſfortunes are accompanied with this, that he is too poor to bear the Expence of this Affair. He therefore does moſt earneſtly entreat his Brother-in-law *Chalcondylas*, to omit no Means neceſſary for obtaining a Diſpenſation at the moſt reaſonable Rate that is poſſible. He was anſwer'd, that the Diſpenſation was granted, and that he muſt haſten to *Rome* for the Profeſſorſhip, which the Pope had given him that was worth 200 Ducats a Year; that he muſt not forget to bring the Money at which the Diſpenſation was rated, and that perhaps when he comes, his Friends would take care to exempt him from ſo great an Expence (*k*).

Perhaps it may be demanded, how *Parrhaſius* came to inquire how much the Diſpenſation would coſt; for he might have known it by the Book of Rates of the Apoſtolick Chancery. But you muſt obſerve that beſides what is ſet down in that Book, there (*l*) muſt always be an Agreement with the Datary.

(D) *Some other Matters of Fact in criticizing upon* Moreri.] I. It muſt not be ſaid, that *Parrhaſius* being driven out of *Milan*, and troubled *with the Gout, retired to* Coſenza; for upon his going out of *Milan*, he went to *Vicenza* to teach there. The War made him go from thence, and then he retir'd to his own Country, and afterwards was Profeſſor at *Rome*. And there it was that he was ſo afflicted with the Gout, that it forc'd him to go from thence to *Coſenza*, if we believe *Paulus Jovius*. (*m*) *In Urbem venit; ſed tanti ſuggeſtus honore diu perfrui non potuit, articulari morbo membra omnia ſæviſſimè deformante, unde ei maturatus in patriam reditus cum vita exitu contigit.* *Parrhaſius* in the Harangue which I have cited, and which he ſpoke at *Rome*, informs us, that in the preceding Year, he was more tormented with the Gout than ever; he does not ſay, that this inſpir'd him with the thought of returning to his own Country. (*n*) *Quum ſolito gravius articulari morbo torquerer anno ſuperiori, tuo hortatu T. Phedre, incredibiles omnium Membrorum cruciatus animi vigore ſuperavi: quumque mea magis intereſſet ex hoc ergaſtulo tetroque carcere primo quoque tempore emitti, in tuam gratiam pene revixi.* I do not mention this to call in queſtion what *Paulus Jovius* ſays, for I know very well that the Pains of the Gout and Poverty conſtrained *Parrhaſius* to retire from *Rome*. The miſerable Condition to which he was reduc'd is contain'd in theſe Words of *Valerianus*. (*o*) *Is dum aſſiduis vigiliis, & longe lectionis laboribus maceratur, in eam incidit articularis morbi truculentiam, ut per annos aliquot nil præter linguam in univerſo corpore haberet incolumem,*

---

† Taken from Paulus Jovius.

* Brother of Cardinal Jerom Seripande.

ȝ See the Muſeum Italicum of Peter Mabillon tom. 1. pag. 115.

♯ See in the Remark D the Words of Pierius Valerianus.

ɣ In Lewis Caſtelvetro before the Book of Parrhaſius de quæſitis per epiſtolam, which Henry Stephens publiſh'd in 1567.

‡ Gudii epiſt. pag. 61.

‖ Ib. p. 85.

(*d*) Profeſſor of Rhetorick and Canon of Lateran.

(*e*) *Janus Parrhaſius, in orat. ante prælectionem epiſtol. Ciceronis ad Atticum*: It is in p. 142. of the Book de quæſitis per epiſtolam *edit.* 1567. *See there pag.* 145.

(*f*) *Id. ib. pag.* 142.

(*g*) Indulgentis alioqui in me patris animum depravarit (*fortuna*) ne ſumptus ad otia Muſarum ſuppeditaret tanquam relicta à majoribus trita ſemita degeneri quod, ut illi, leges ediſcere neglexiſſem. *Id. ibid. pag.* 143.

(†) *See* Barthius *in Theb. Statii lib.* 4. *p.* 1008.

(*h*) *Epiſt. ad Gudium pag.* 137. *edit. Ultraj.* 1697.

(*i*) *Ibid. p.* 137, 138.

(*k*) *Ex epiſtola Baſilii Chalcondyla ad Parrhaſium ibid. pag.* 139.

(*l*) Et præterea componendum ſemper eſt cum Datario. *Taxa Cancel. p.* 4. *edit.* 1701.

(*m*) *Paul. Jovius in elog. p.* 127. *p. m.* 271.

(*n*) *Parrhaſius ubi ſupra pag.* 145.

(*o*) *Pierius Valerianus de litteratorum infelicitate lib.* 1. *pag. m.* 25.

PARTHENAI, a City of *Poitou* under the Jurisdiction of the *Presidial* of *Poitiers*. It was often taken and retaken during the Wars about Religion in the XVI. Century. The Protestants retir'd thither on the Day of the Battel of † *Moncontour*; but because they thought they could not maintain it, they abandon'd it at the approach of the Troops of the Duke of *Anjou*. They had taken it in the preceding Year, and also caus'd *Malo* to be hang'd who commanded in the Castle ‡. The Reason of this Rigour was, because he had the Boldness to defend himself against an Army. The History of the Sieur *d'Aubigné* informs us, that they miscarried more than once in the Design of Surprizing that Place in the Year 1588. They have been there in great Numbers since the Edict of *Nantes*, as we may judge from the (A) Ill-grounded Complaint of the Clergy of *France*, and the Answer which Mr. *Drelincourt* made to this Complaint in 1656. The Lords of *Parthenai* are ‖ Honorary Secular Canons of St. *Martin* of *Tours*. We must not forget, that *Parthenai* * is the Capital City of the little Country of *Gastine*, and of the Duchy of *Meilleraye*.

The Lordship of *Parthenai* was reunited to the Crown in 1422, by the Death (B) of *John l'Archeveque*.

PARTHENAI, a Family. It continued a long time in Splendor. The last Male of that illustrious House, was *John de Parthenai l'Archeveque*, Lord of § *Soubise*,

† *October 3d. 1569.*
‡ *The true and compleat History of the Troubles l. 4. p. 151.*
‖ *Mercure Galant of February, 1684. p. 31.*
* *Du Val's Treatise of France, p. 155.*
§ *See his Article under the Word Soubise.*

---

lumem, siderato propemodum utroque crure, ut nullo pedum officio uti posset, lacertisque præ dolore, & contractione redditis inutilibus, magna insuper inopia, & egestate oppressus, rerum demum omnium desperatione ductus, relicta Roma in Calabriam cum secessisset, in febrim subito incidit, qua diu vexatus, miserabilique ex cruciatu superatus expiravit. Note, That Mr. *Moreri* was so far from filling up the Gap which *Paulus Jovius* had made, that he made it greater. II. 'Tis false that *Parrhasius* publish'd only two Books, if we suppose, as Mr. *Moreri* does, that he publish'd *some Commentaries upon* Claudian, *and upon* Ovid's *Poem in Ibin*, for he publish'd some Fragments of Antiquity, when he was Professor at *Milan*. This *Aldus Minutius* (a) relates in the fourth Book of his Grammar. 'Tis a little strange that we can in no wise know by the large Additions of *Nicodemo* to the *Bibliotheque* of *Naples* of *Nicolo Toppi*, what are the Works which *Parrhasius* publish'd. Nay, we do not find very plainly there, that he publish'd a (†) Commentary upon *Claudian*. All the Editions which *Nicodemo* mentions of the Works of this Critick, are posthumous. That which we find sometimes clearly mention'd is, That one Part of *Parrhasius*'s Works, was publish'd by the Care of others. *Bernardin Martiranus* publish'd the Commentary on the Poetical Art of *Horace*: The Title of the Book related by (b) *Nicolo Toppi*, informs us of this in express terms, and yet this Author affirms, that *Parrhasius* publish'd it. (c) *Nicodemo* takes Notice of that Fault. 'Tis not at all probable, that *Parrhasius* should have published a Commentary upon the *Ibis* of *Ovid*; there is none that ever boasted that he had seen this Commentary, and therefore (d) *Nicodemo* looks upon it as false what *Paulus Jovius* relates, (e) *Edidit Commentarios in . . . . Nasonis Ibin.* (f) *John Matthew Toscanus*, (g) *Gaddi*, (h) *Barri*. Mr. *Moreri*, and many others, follow *Paulus Jovius* in this. Another Reason which perswades me that they are mistaken is this, that Mr. *Boissieu* (i) having search'd carefully for all the Authors that wrote upon this Poem of *Ovid*, makes no mention of this Commentary of *Parrhasius*, although he gives a long List of other Commentators: So far is he from that, that he reckons *Parrhasius* to be only one of those Criticks, who corrected upon occasion some Passages of *Ovid*. *Note*, That *Parrhasius* wrote a great Number of Books, and that the greatest part of them were never printed. Consult the Additions of *Nicodemo*.

(A) *The ill-grounded Complaint.*] Lest you should believe that I make use of this Epithet out of a Prejudice for a Party, I shall here give you a Parallel of this Complaint, and of the Answer to it. The Archbishop of *Sens*, who spoke in the Name of the whole Clergy, expressed himself after this Manner. (k) "In the City of *Partenai*, Sir, the Piety of the Catholicks was forc'd the last Summer, to yield to the Violence of the Enemies of this holy Mystery; who by an Affectation altogether irreligious, undertook to make a Funeral pass by at the same Instant with the Procession, which is made to honour, according to the Laws of the Church, a Sacrament, which is the Centre of our Religion. They disturbed the whole Course of this holy Ceremony, by a Rencounter maliciously concerted; and the Catholicks who have a mind to signalize themselves by their Modesty, at the same time that their wicked Brethren endeavour to make themselves considerable for their Insolence, were forc'd to give Place to the Multitude of these profane and Impious Men, and to return into the Church with Sorrow and Sadness in their Countenance. . . . . Was there ever, Sir, such a Boldness, and can your Majesty suffer in your Kingdom, so outrageous an Injury to the Honour of the Son of God? No, Sir, we cannot believe it, and we ought to be perswaded that you will revenge, as we pray you to do, the Quarrel of the Living God. It will be sufficient to relate the Substance of the Answer: (l) On the 2d Sunday of *April* there was brought to *Partenai* from a Place two Leagues off the Body of a Gentleman, to be buried after the 2d Sermon. When the whole Company was going to the Interment, they perceiv'd by some Tapestry near the Citadel, that a Procession was to pass that way; they stopt short, but having no other Passage to go to the Burying-Place which is near the Castle, it was thought convenient to send with all possible Respect to the Parish of *holy Cross*, from whence the Procession was to come, to know of the Canons, whether they would have the People that attended the Funeral to stop, until the Procession was gone by; or whether their Procession not being yet ready to depart, they should think fit that the Company should go on: To which they answer'd, that they might finish the Interment, and that the Procession would not depart so soon: And in effect it did not set out from the Place, till half an hour after the whole Funeral was over; and to show an entire Deference, the Reform'd remain'd in the Burying-Place till the whole Procession was finish'd, and all the Hangings were taken down; and therefore it could not be truly said, that it return'd with great Trouble and Sorrow, for having met with the Funeral, since it was not come forth, and did not come forth till a long time after the Funeral was past. For many Days after there was not a Word heard of this Affair, but at last the Baylif of *Partenai*, being a violent Man, and heated by some Boutefeus, addressed himself to Mr. *Filleau* the King's Advocate at *Poitiers*, who gloried in persecuting the Protestants upon all Occasions; and then many of the Consistory of *Partenai*, were summoned to the Presidial at *Poitiers*, to be there fin'd for having disturb'd the Procession; but Mr. *de la Meilleray* stopt the Course of this unjust Prosecution, and even those who had commenc'd it were asham'd of it, insomuch that the thing ended there. I have retain'd the Expressions of the Author.

Would they have answer'd with such Confidence, if the thing had not been certain? Here is then an Error in Matter of Fact, which falls under our Cognizance. We leave to the Reader, the Trouble of Reflecting upon the horrible Storms which a vehement Orator is capable of exciting for nothing (m).

(B) *By the Death of* John l'Archeveque.] He (n) had sold this Lordship to the Duke of *Berry*, reserving the Profits of it while he liv'd. . . . He had no Children, and for this Reason in the Year of his above mention'd Decease, Messire *James Harcourt*, who had married his Niece, had a Mind to turn him out of the said Lordship and Castle of *Partenai*, but he was hindred by the Inhabitants, who defended themselves and kill'd the said *Harcourt*.

(a) *Apud Barrium lib. 2. de antiquitate & situ Calabriæ pag. 1050. citante Nicodemo ubi supra pag. 88.*

(†) *Consult Barthius ubi supra pag. 1007.*

(b) *Nicolo Toppi, bibliot. Napolet. pag. 112.*

(c) *Nicodemo ubi supra pag. 87.*

(d) *Ibid.*

(e) *Jovius ubi supra pag. 271.*

(f) *In Peplo Italiæ l. 3. pag. 63, 64. apud Nicodemum ubi supra pag. 88.*

(g) *De scriptoribus non Ecclesiasticis tom. 2. p. 182. apud eund. ib. pag. 87.*

(h) *De antiquitate & situ Calabriæ apud eund. ib. pag. 88.*

(i) *Dionysius Salvagnius Boessius comment. in Ibin p. 2, & 3.*

(k) *Remonstrance of the Clergy of* France *in 1656. p. m. 20.*

(l) *See the Letter of an Inhabitant of Paris to one of his Friends in the Country, upon the Remonstrance of the Clergy. p. 133. &c. edit. in 8.* Mr. Drelincourt, *Minister of* Paris *is the Author of that Letter.*

(m) *See the Critical Answer to* Maimburg*'s History of Calvinism. Letter 24. p. 93. &c. of the 3d. Edition.*

(n) John Bouchet *Annals of* Aquitain, *part. 4. ch. 7. fol. m. 137.*

Soubise, who left only one Daughter, *viz. Catherine de Parthenai*, Mother of the Duke of *Rohan*, General of the *Huguenot* Armies in *France*, under the Reign of *Lewis* the XIIIth. Hereafter I shall give an Article for this Lady. Some think that the Lords of *Parthenai* took the Surname of *l'Archeveque*, because they were descended from an Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*. Some think that this Archbishop of *Bourdeaux* was *Josselin de Parthenai*, who died in 1086, and that *William de Parthenai*, who took the Surname of *l'Archeveque*, was his Son. Others † refer this Original to one *Archimbald* Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*, Predecessor to *Josselin*; but seeing this *Archimbald* having been depos'd, became Lord of *St. Maixent*, and there is not found any Person of that Name, nor any Lord of *St. Maixent* in the Family of *Parthenai*, this Opinion is not very probable *. " The eldest Branch of *Parthenai*, " with all its Estate, fell into the House of *Melun Tancarville*, from whence is de" scended by Alliance that of *Longueville*; and the Lords of *Soubise* were parted from the " Stock about the Year 1330, when *Guy l'Archeveque*, youngest Brother of *John Sire de* " *Parthenai* was Lord of *Soubise*. It was always thought very probable that those of " *Parthenai* were of *Lezignem*, whose Arms they bore, rebated, upon the Account of " their being the younger Branch, with a Band of *Gules*; but they must be descended " thence before the Year 1000, for since that time we have the Succession of them, " until *John l'Archeveque* Lord of *Soubise*, Grand-father by the Mother's Side to the Duke of *Rohan*. It is observ'd in the Life of this Duke, printed in 1667, that his Mother was the principal Heiress of the House of *Lusignan*.

PARTHENAI (*Anne de*) The Wife of *Antony de Pons*, Count *de Marennes*, and Daughter of *John de Parthenai-l'Archeveque*, and of (*A*) *Michelle de Saubonne*, was a Lady of great Wit and Learning. She was one of the principal Ornaments of the Court of *Renée* of *France*, the Daughter of *Lewis* the XII. and Dutchess of *Ferrara*; and 'tis very well known, that there were few Courts in the World so polite as that was. *Anne de Parthenai* γ did not only study the Latin, but with great Application undertook the Study of the Greek Tongue; so that she might easily make use of Greek Books. Nay, her Curiosity prompted her to read even Books of Theology: And she was a great Proficient in Holy Writ, and took a great Delight in reasoning almost every Day about these Matters with Divines. The Authors of that time, did not spare their Elogies; they bestowed a thousand Praises upon her, and did not forget to ζ say that she sung divinely, and that she understood all sorts of Musick in perfection. See the Epistle Dedicatory which I have cited ✠. The Interest she had in the Dutchess of *Ferrara*, and the Knowledge of Theology wherewith she was furnished, will doubtless render her suspected of Calvinism to the Catholicks who shall read this. But because I would not have them to remain in bare Suspicions, I will cite to them an Author (*B*) who will convince them, that she was a good *Huguenot*, and a worthy Sister of *Soubise*, who was one of the Pillars of the Party. Her Spouse was oblig'd (*C*) to leave the Court of *Ferrara*.

PARTHENAI (*Catharine de*) the Daughter and Heiress of *John de Parthenai l'Archeveque*, Lord of *Soubise*, Niece of the above mentioned *Anne*, was married

* Duchesne Annot. upon the Works of Alain Chartier.

† Laboureur Addit. to the Memoirs of Castlenau. tom. 1. pag. 904.

γ Non modo in Latinis literis quibus ab ipsis incunabilis gnaviter operam dedisti, sed in Græcis quoque ita profecisti ut Græcos autores intrepide evolvas. *Gyraldus epist. dedicat. Dialogi 2. Histor. Poet.*

ζ Quid nunc memorem qualis sis in dignoscendis & modulandis carminibus, quasi venustate canas & gratia? Quantum denique in omni Musica profeceris id eius disciplinæ periti prædicant. *Id. ibid.*

✠ *See also* Clement Marrot *in his* Epistle lost at play *against Madam* de Pons. *pag.* 206, &c. *of the* Hague *Edition.* 1700.

(*A*) *Of* Michelle de Saubonne.] She was a Lady of *Bretagne*, who had been one of the Ladies of Honour to Queen *Anne* of *Bretagne*. She married by the Favour of that Queen in the Year 1507, *John l'Archeveque*, the 5th of the Name, Lord of *Soubise*, Head of the House of *Parthenai*. The same Queen chose her for the Governess of *Renée* of *France* her Daughter, Dutchess of *Ferrara* (*a*). There is in the third Letter of *Rabelais* something that concerns that Governess. " Monsieur *de Limoges*, who was " at *Ferrara* Ambassador for the King, seeing that " the said (*b*) Duke, without giving him Notice of " his Enterprize, was retired to the Emperor, is " return'd into *France*. There is Danger lest Madam " *Renée* should be troubled for it. The said Duke " has taken from her Madam *de Soubise*, her Go" verness, and will have her to be serv'd by *Italian* " Women, *which is no good Sign*. This Letter was written in the Year 1536.

(*B*) *An Author who will convince them.*] " As to " the City of *Pons*, the Lord of the Place, while " the Lady *Anne de Parthenai* his first Wife, and " Sister to the Lord of *Soubise*, liv'd, was a Lover " of Virtue and Truth, and improv'd so much in " the Knowledge of Holy Scripture, that there was " hardly a Man of the Robe who seconded him with " so much Zeal; for he himself took much Pains " to teach his poor Subjects, of whom he edified " many, as well Officers as others in his City of *Pons*. " But immediately after the Decease of that good " and virtuous Lady, God so took away his under" standing, that at his second Marriage, he espoused " one of the most infamous Ladies of *France*, viz. " *Mary de Monchenu*, call'd the Lady *de Massy*; and " then God depriv'd him of the remainder of his " Sense and Judgment, insomuch that without any " Occasion whatsoever, he became from that time, " in an instant an Enemy and Persecutor of the " Truth, which he had so well known and so much " advanc'd (*c*). To confirm what *Theodorus Beza* has said, concerning the Ascendant of the Virtuous *Anne de Parthenai* over her Husband, I will now relate a Passage of *Gregory* (*d*) *Gyraldus*, wherein he testifies that that Lady and the Count *de Marennes*, her Spouse, follow'd the same Studies with the same Success. *Quid porro dicam qua charitate & amore, ac potius pietate prosequaris illustrem virum tuum, jure tuum, ut qui eisdem quibus tu studiis & virtutibus post militares artes sit ornatissimus?* This Count was first Gentleman of the Chamber to the Duke of *Ferrara*; and *Gyraldus* dedicated to him the fourth Dialogue of his History of Poets.

(*C*) *Was oblig'd to leave the Court of* Ferrara.] It is of him doubtless, that these words of one of our Historians are to be understood (*e*). " If the King of " *France* thought, that there was just Cause for Ex" pelling Monsieur *de Pons* from *Ferrara*, because he " said he was of as good a House as those of (*f*) " *Aest*, it being unreasonable that he who liv'd by " the Bread of the Dutchess of *Ferrara*, and by her " Wages, should make such a Comparison, although " the aforesaid deceased King held the House of " *Pons*, as ancient as that of *Aest*; is it not as in" supportable that those of the House of *Guise*, who " are grown great and fat only with the Substance " and Fatness of the House of *France*, should offer " to compare themselves with the Princes of the " said House? 'Tis great imprudence in those who serve others to compare themselves to them. If they excel them in Nobleness of Blood, they should seem to know nothing of the Matter. And this is more especially necessary as to Soveraigns; their Relations ought to forget that they are their Relations.

(*A*) Aged

(*a*) *See the Notes upon the Letters of* Rabelais. *pag.* 85.

(*b*) *That's to say the Duke of* Ferrara.

(*c*) Theodorus Beza. *hist. Ecclesiast. tom.* 1. *l.* 2. *pag.* 201. (*& not* 199, *as it is set down in the Book*) *at the year* 1559.

(*d*) *Gyrald. epist. dedicator. Dialogi* 2. *Histor. Poëtarum.*

(*e*) *The President* de la Place, *of the State of Religion* l. 2. *fol.* 63.

(*f*) *It should be* Est.

married in the Year 1568 § to the Baron *du Pont*, and then in 1575 to *René de Rohan*, the second of the Name, whose Widow she remain'd µ in the Year 1585; and then she thought of nothing but of giving a good Education to her Family; and her Pains had all the Success she could promise her self; for the Eldest of her Sons was the famous Duke of *Rohan*, who maintain'd the Reformed Party in *France* with so much Vigour during the Civil Wars, under the Reign of *Lewis* XIII. Her second Son was the Duke of *Soubise*. She had three Daughters: *Henrietta*, who died in 1624, and was never married. *Catharine*, who married ‡ a Duke of *Deux-ponts*, and who made this fine Answer to *Henry* the IVth, upon his sighing for her, † *I am too poor to be your Wife, and of too good a House to be your Mistress*; and *Anne*, who was never married, and surviv'd all her Brothers and Sisters, and render'd her self very Famous for her Piety and Learning. It will be sufficiently understood that I mean the Famous *Anne de Rohan* †, who endur'd with so much Constancy all the Inconveniencies of the Siege of *Rochelle*. The Courage of her Mother was yet more wonderful, who notwithstanding her old Age, endur'd with a prodigious Constancy the Necessity to which she was reduc'd, of living for the Space of three Months upon Horse-flesh, and four Ounces of Bread a Day. And notwithstanding this miserable Condition, she wrote to her Son, that he should continue as he had begun; and that the consideration of the Extremities to which she was reduc'd, *should not make him abate any thing to the Prejudice of his Party, whatever she should suffer by so doing* *. She and her Daughter refused to be comprehended in the Capitulation, and were made Prisoners of War. They were ‡ carried to the Castle of *Niort*, *November* 2d 1628. There are some who say that *Catharine de Parthenai* was then Aged (A) 91 Years, but others assign her only 70. *la Croix du Maine* informs me, that she understood (B) Poetry very well. I must not forget the troublesome Suit (C) about Impotency, which her first Husband had upon his Hands. If what a learned ‡ Man has said be certain, that *Mademoiselle de Parthenai Lady of Soubise was spoken of* as being an Author,

§ *Thuan. lib.* 51.

µ *Father Anselme and Moreri.* [illegible] *1555.* *I have follow'd the Author of the Life of the Duke of Rohan.*

‡ *In the year* 1[illegible] *She died in the year* 1[illegible]

† *See the Observ. upon the Amours of* Alcander *and the Key.*

‡ *See the Article of him.*

* *Hist. of the Duke* of Rohan, *pag.* 99. *of the* Holland *Edit.* 1667.

‡ *Merc. Franc. tom.* 14. *p.* 716.

‡ Baillet *Authors disguis'd pag.* 255.

(A) *Aged 91 Years.*] Father *Anselme* was of that Opinion, for in giving us (a) the Posterity of *Peter de Rohan*, call'd the Marshal *de Gié*, he sets in the Margin over against our *René de Rohan* II of that Name, that *Catharine de Parthenai* his Wife *died at Paré in* Poitou, October 26, 1631. *Aged 94 Years. Moreri* says the same thing, except that instead of *Paré* he has put *Parc*. But (b) the Author of the History of the Duke of *Rohan*, observes, speaking of the Siege of *Rochel*, and of the Famine she indured there, that she was Aged 70 Years. This was not a Place to take away Years from her, and he that would have flatter'd her, should rather have added to them, than taken from them. Neverthelefs 'tis very probable, that this Author made her younger than she was, for in the Year 1574, a Tragedy was acted of her composing. 'Tis rare to see Women of 16 Years write Tragedies; and when this happens *la Croix du Maine* would not be ignorant of it, nor conceal it. I insist less upon the Impotency whether true or false of the *Baron du Pont*, which was the Subject of a Suit in 1572. A Maid is more capable of bearing Children at 14 Years, than of writing Tragedies at 16. But what *Varillas* observes would not be a Proof to be rejected. He says, that in 1562, "(c) The Viscount *de Rohan* led the Troops of *Languedoc* and *Dauphine*, "which he had rais'd at the Sollicitation of *Soubise*, "who had promised him in Marriage his only "Daughter. Can a Man that is of Age to raise and command Troops, rely upon the Marriage of a Maid of four Years of Age. But that which follows would make the Argument much stronger. In the Year 1567, this only Daughter was married to the Baron *du Pont*, for we find among the Lords, who went to joyn the Admiral after the Battle of St. *Denys*, (d) one *Soubise*, who was no other than this Baron; I have said, that it *wou'd make* the Argument stronger, and not *that it does* make it so; for I trust more to a Letter I have receiv'd, which says, That the Heiress of *Soubise* was married to the Baron *du Pont* in 1568, than to the Exactness of Historians about such Niceties. This is certain, that good Father *Anselme* was mistaken; for the Marriage of *John de Parthenai* with *Antoinette Bouchard* of *d'Aubeterre*, Father and Mother to the Lady of whom we now speak, was celebrated *May* the 3d, 1553. She was born therefore at the soonest in 1554, and could not be above 77 Years of Age, when she died in 1631. On the other Side, since she was married in 1568, she must have been more than 70 Years old at the Siege of *Rochel*.

(B) *She understood Poetry very well.*] "This Lady, "*says he*, (e) is much to be esteem'd for the Ex-"cellency and Greatness of her Wit, of which "her Writings are a sufficient Proof, without any "other Testimony; for she hath compos'd many "Tragedies and Comedies in French, and among "the rest, the Tragedy of *Holofernes*, which "was publickly acted at *Rochel* in the Year 1574, "or thereabouts; it is not yet printed. She has "writ many Elegies or Complaints upon the "Death of the Baron *du Pont*, her first Husband, "and also upon the Admiral, and other great "Lords and illustrious Persons. She has transla-"ted the Precepts of *Isocrates* to *Demonicus*, not "yet printed. She flourishes, *continues he*, this "Year 1584. I have not her other Writings, be-"cause I have not had the Happiness to know "her.

(C) *The troublesome Suit about Impotency.*] This ought not to be plac'd to the Account of our *Catharine de Parthenai*, but to that of her Mother. It was not the Wife that sued her Husband, it was the Mother-in-law, who declar'd against her Son-in-law; and therefore, though none can reasonably doubt of the secret Confidence between the Daughter and the Mother, yet it must be granted, that the Reflection of Mr. *Des Preaux* (f), does in no wise concern the Heiress of *Soubise*.

Jamais la Biche en rut n'a pour fait d'impuissance
Trainé du fond des bois un Cerf à l'audience;
Et jamais Juge entr'eux ordonnant le congrés,
De ce burlesque mot n'a sali ses arrêts.

If on the one Side it is astonishing, that when the Protestant Ladies distinguish'd themselves by the Reformation of Manners, as well as of Doctrines, one of the Chief (g) of the Party should think fit to commence a Suit, which tended so little to Edification; on the other Side it ought to be consider'd, that the continual reading of the Bible was then more capable of communicating certain Inclinations; because then they studied with more Zeal to imitate the Temper of the Holy Patriarchs, and of their Spouses, among whom reign'd an earnest but very chast Desire of leaving Posterity behind them. The Lady of *Soubise*, besides this, might have a Motive of Zeal upon another Account. The Protestant Religion was not yet well settled, great Violence was us'd to destroy it; and therefore it was necessary to perpetuate Families by all due and reasonable Ways, which like her's were the Pillars of it. But what shall we say of the Curiosity of the Ladies of the Court of *France*, upon occasion of this Affair? Before I relate what the Historians have said of it, I ought to advertise you, that the Suit was ended by the Massacre on St. *Bartholomew's* Day, wherein the Son-in-law of *Soubise* lost his Life. Let us hear now what Mr. *Varillas* says; "(h) The Resistance of the "Baron *du Pont-Kuellevé* (i) was so long, that those "who saw he did not yield till after he was pierc'd "through like a Sieve, gave him this Testimony, that

he

(a) *Histoire des grands Offic. pag.* 153.

(b) *It is thought to be Mr.* Fauvelet du Toc.

(c) *Hist. of* Charles IX. *l.* 3. *init.*

(d) D'Aubigne. *tom.* 1. *p.* 372. *Thuanus l.* 42. *p.* 854. *Varillas Hist. of* Charles *the 9th. l.* 7.

(e) *La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franc. pag.* 478.

(f) *Satyr* 8.

(g) *See in the Remarks of the Article* Soubise, *the great Zeal of that Lady.*

(h) *Hist. of* Charles *the IX. tom.* 2. *pag.* 276. *of the* Holland *Edit.*

(i) *It should be* Quellenec. *See the Article of this Name.*

thor, *before Madam* de Rohan *had been known in the World*, ſhe (*D*) muſt have written ſomething when ſhe was very young. Some have thought, that ſhe wrote an Apology (*E*) for *Henry* the IVth, which at the Bottom was nothing but a ſharp Satyr.

PASCAL (*Blaiſe*) was one of the ſublimeſt Wits in the World, born at *Clermont* in *Auvergne* the 19th of *June*, 1623. He never had any Maſter but his Father, who was a very (*A*) learned Man, an able Mathematician, and Preſident of the Court of *Aids* in his Province, and one who had an extraordinary Tenderneſs for this Child, his * only Son. This Tenderneſs mov'd him to quit his Office, and ſettle at *Paris* in 1631, that he might the more uſefully ſpend his time in the Inſtruction of his Son, who from his Infancy gave Proofs of a Wit far above what is common; for "† he deſired to know the Reaſon of every thing ··· and he could not yield to any thing but "what appear'd to him evidently true; ſo that when good Reaſons for any thing were "not given him, he himſelf would ſearch about for better; and when he ſtudied to "know any thing, he would never leave it till he had found out ſomething that could "give him Satiſfaction. It was to be fear'd leſt having ſuch a Turn of Wit, he ſhould throw himſelf headlong into Libertiniſm, and yet he was always very far from that Fault. He diſtinguiſh'd exactly all his Life-time (*B*) the Laws of Faith from thoſe of

* *He had 2 Daughters, whereof one was a Nun at Port-Royal, the other was married to Mr. Perier.*

† *The Life of Mr. Paſchal by Madam Perier*, p. 5.

"he was more than a Man in a Fight, if he was "not Man enough in the Nuptial Bed. He had "married the Heireſs of *Soubiſe*, and his Wife's Mother had commenc'd a Suit againſt him for Impotency, which was not yet determin'd. His Body "was dragg'd as far as the Gate of the *Louvre*, "where the Pity which he ſhould have inſpir'd "did not hinder many of the Court-Ladies "from viewing him narrowly, to ſee if there appear'd any Mark of that Defect whereof he was "accus'd. Thoſe who underſtand Latin, may ſee in the Margin, with what noble Expreſſions (*k*) *Thuanus* relates this Fact. It ſeems at firſt, that *d'Aubigne* was guilty of a Miſtake, as if he had ſaid of *Soubiſe* what he ſhould have ſaid only of his Son-in-law. "*Berni* and *Soubiſe* were dragg'd dead, and plac'd "in Order before the *Louvre*, and expos'd to the "View of the Ladies, who lookt upon the latter to "know whether he was incapable of Marriage, be"cauſe he was at Law about it. But when we come to know that the Son-in-law had the ſame Name with the Father-in-law, this Hiſtorian can only be blam'd for not inſerting ſome Words of Diſtinction, as others have done. *Mezerai* would be altogether inexcuſable, *Who can believe it*, ſays he, at *p.* 156, of the 5 tome of his Chronological Abridgement, *of ſo many valiant Men* (he had nam'd the great Lords maſſacred on St *Bartholomew*'s Day, and had not paſſed over in Silence *Francis de Quellevé*, Husband to the Heireſs of *Soubiſe*,) *not one of them died with Sword in Hand but* Guerchi. He is much more in Fault in his great Hiſtory, for he does not only call this Husband *Charles de Quellevé-Pontivy*, which is to confound two Perſons in one, but he attributes to the Wife the Proceſs for Impotency, which was commenc'd againſt the Baron *du Pont*. This is in ſome meaſure to affront her, which *Thuanus* was not guilty of; for he attributes this Accuſation and Proſecution only to the Mother-in-law. See the Article *Quellenec*.

(*D*) *She muſt have written ſomething when ſhe was very young.*] For ſhe loſt the Name of *Mademoiſelle de Parthenai* in 1568, by her Marriage with the Baron *du Pont*, and could be then but 14 years old, ſince the Marriage of her Father and Mother was ſolemnized in *May* 1553. See the Remark *A* towards the End.

(*E*) *An Apology for* Henry *the IVth.*] It was printed as a Work of the Dutcheſs of *Rohan*, in the new Editions of the Journal of *Henry* the III. See how *d'Aubigné* ſpeaks of this Piece. "(*a*) He that "would ſee this Matter more learnedly debated, let "him read the Apology for the King, written by Mr. "*Cahier* then Miniſter to *Madam*. The King ſhow'd "it to me as being the Style of Madam *de Rohan*. "It is a prevaricating Apology, which *Roquelaure* "hearing read cry'd out, Oh! how well the Authors "of that Piece are inform'd of what we do! Some "accuſe *la Ruſſie* of it, becauſe after he had diſcours'd "of the King's Humour, which is to puniſh Services, "and reward Offences, he ſays to thoſe who complain of his Majeſty, you ought to complain of "your ſelves and not of him, for knowing his "Temper, if you wou'd have Rewards, you ſhould "merit them by worthy Actions. Whoſoever compos'd this Apology, was a Perſon of Wit, and I doubt very much whether *Peter Victor Cayet* was capable of giving ſuch a Turn to his Railing. Mr. *Varillas* did not know who was pointed at in this Satyr, for ſpeaking of *Antony King* of *Navarre*, he ſays, "(*b*) that *Catharine de Parthenai*, Mother of the "famous Duke of *Rohan*, reproach'd him that "he never did good but to thoſe whom he fear'd. It was not to this Prince, but to *Henry* the IVth his Son, that this Reproach was made in the Satyr attributed to that Lady.

(*k*) Eadem calamitas Baudinetum Acierii fratrem, Pluviaſium & Bernium involvit, crudeliter à militibus ſegus occiſos, nec non Carolum Quellevetum Pontium Armoricæ Regulum qui Catharinam Parthenæam Joannis Subiſii filiam & hæredem in uxorem duxerat, ſed à Parthenæa matre frigiditatem generi cauſſata de diſſolvendo matrimonio lite aliquanto ante tempore intentata neque dum finita. Itaque cum corpora eorum ſicuti à percuſſoribus ſinguli occidebantur ante arcem Regiique Reginæ ac totius aulici comitatus conſpectum abjicerentur, frequentes è gynæceo Fœminæ, nequaquam crudeli ſpectaculo eas abſterrente, curioſis oculis nudorum corpora inverecunde intuebantur, & Pontio præcipue aciem defigebant, ſi qua ratione frigiditatis illius cauſſam aut notas perrimari poſſent. *Thuan.* 52. *pag. m.* 1076. (*a*) *Confeſſ. Cathol. de Sancy B.* 1 *chap.* 5.

(*b*) *In the Advertiſement of Tom.* 5. *of the Hiſt. of Hereſy.*

(*A*) *His Father who was a very learned Man.*] He was call'd *Stephen Paſcal*, and was born in the Year 1588, "(*c*) at *Clermont* in *Auvergne*, of one of "the good Families of the Province. His Father "was Treaſurer of *France* at *Riom*, and his Mother, "who bore likewiſe the Surname of *Paſcal*, was "the Daughter of the *Seneſchal* of *Auvergne* at *Clermont*. *Stephen Paſcal* (*d*) quitted the Province, "after he had delivered up his Office of Preſident "to one of his Brethren, and retir'd to *Paris*, as to "a Place favourable to his Deſign of giving a good Education to his Son. He joyn'd (*e*) with Mr. *de Roberval*, to anſwer the Objections of *Deſcartes*, againſt a Piece of Mr. *Fermat*, *de maximis & minimis*; but he had ſcarce any ſhare in the Conſequences of this Diſpute, for he removed from *Paris*, "(*f*) and retir'd far from publick Converſe, leſt "his Preſence ſhould provoke ſome offended "Powers, and move them to do ſomething to the "Prejudice of his Liberty. The Diſgrace into "which he thought he was faln, was nothing elſe "but the Conſequence of the Diſgrace of one of "his intimate Friends, who had been arreſted "and carried to the *Baſtile*, for making a Diſturbance in the Town-Houſe. Mr. *Paſcal* being "perſwaded of the Integrity of his Friend, had obſerv'd, that there was more Misfortune than "Crime in his Manner of occaſioning that Trouble. "He did not only ſpeak in favour of his Friend, "but he was alſo ſo bold as to take upon him the "Defence of ſeveral Perſons unjuſtly treated by "the Vexation of ſome intereſted Officers. Beſides "he had learn'd, that this Affair had been related "with very odious Circumſtances to the Chancellor "*Seguier*; wherefore the fear of having diſpleas'd "this prime Magiſtrate of the Kingdom, made him "depart to prevent the Effects of his Reſentment. "He continued about a Year in this Retirement, "untill Cardinal *de Richelieu* being inform'd of his "great Merit, and of the Occaſion of his Retiring by "the Dutcheſs of *Aiguillon*, and by the Chancellor himſelf, cauſed him to return in 1639, and "made him in a little time after Intendant of *Normandy* at *Roan*. He died (*g*) in 1651. He was become a Friend to *Deſcartes*.

(*B*) *The Laws of Faith from thoſe of Reaſon.*] This we are told, in his Life written by Madam *Perier*, his Siſter. "(*h*) He was hitherto (*i*) by a peculiar divine Protection, preſerv'd from all the "Vices of Youth, and which is yet more ſtrange to "a Wit of that Character, he was never enclin'd "to Libertiniſm, as to what concerns Religion, but "always confined his Curioſity within things natural. "He told me many times, that he added that Obligation to all the reſt he had to my Father; who "having

(*c*) Baillet. *Life of* Deſcartes, *tom.* 1. *p.* 331.

(*d*) *Id. ib.*

(*e*) *Id. ib. p.* 331. *ad ann.* 1638.

(*f*) *Id. ib.* 339, 340.

(*g*) *Id. ib. p.* 331.

(*h*) *Life of Paſcal. p.* 12, 13.

(*i*) *i. e. untill the Age of* 24 *Years.*

of Reaſon. What is told of the Manner how he learn'd (C) the Mathematicks, ſeems to be miraculous, as well as the Progreſs which he made (D) in that Science in a

very

having himſelf a very great Reverence for Religion inſpir'd it into him in his Infancy, giving him this for a Maxim, that every thing which is the Object of Faith cannot be the Object of Reaſon, and much leſs can be ſubject to it. This Maxim which was often repeated to him by a Father for whom he had a great Eſteem, and in whom he ſaw great Learning, with clear and ſtrong Reaſon, made ſo great an Impreſſion upon his Mind, that whatſoever Diſcourſes he heard from the Libertines, he was not at all moved by them; and although he was very young, he look'd upon them as a ſort of People who had a falſe Principle, and who thought that human Reaſon was above all things, and knew not the Nature of Faith. And thus that great Soul, ſo vaſt and ſo full of curious Learning, which enquir'd with ſo much Care into the Cauſes and Reaſons of all Things, was at the ſame time as ſubmiſſive in Matters of Religion, as a Child, which Simplicity prevail'd in him all his Life-time; inſomuch that even after he reſolv'd to ſtudy nothing but Religion, he never applied himſelf to any curious Queſtions of Theology; and us'd his moſt vigorous endeavours to know and practiſe the Perfection of Chriſtian Morality, to which he conſecrated all the Talents which God had given him.

(C) *The Manner how he learn'd the Mathematicks ſeems to be miraculous.*] His Father perceiving in him an extraordinary Inclination (k) to *Matters of Reaſon*, was afraid that the Knowledge of the Mathematicks *would hinder his learning of the Tongues. He reſolv'd therefore to take from him, as much as he could*, all Notions of Geometry; *he lock'd up all the Books that treated of it, and refrain'd even to ſpeak of it in his Preſence, with his Friends.* Yet he could not refuſe this general Anſwer to the importunate Curioſity of his Son: *Geometry is a Science which Teaches the Way of making exact Figures, and of finding out the Proportions there are between them; but at the ſame time he forbad him to ſpeak or think of it any more.* Upon this bare opening of the Matter, the Child (l) ſet himſelf *to muſe at his hours of Recreation*, and to make Figures upon the Chamber-floor with Charcoal. He ſought out the Proportions of Figures, he himſelf made Definitions and Axioms, and Demonſtrations, *and he carried his Enquiries ſo far, that he came to the 32d Propoſition of the firſt Book of* Euclid. For his Father having ſurpriz'd him one Day in the midſt of his Figures, *and having ask'd him what he was doing, he told him he was ſearching for ſuch a thing, which was juſt* that Propoſition of *Euclid. He ask'd him afterwards, what made him think of this, and he anſwer'd, that it was becauſe he had found out ſuch another thing; and ſo going backward and uſing the Names of* Bar *and* Round, *he came at length to the Definitions and Axioms he had ſcan'd to himſelf.* You will find all this more at large with the Conſequences of it in the Authors I quote in the Margin (m). I have elſewhere related a Matter of Fact which comes ſomething near to this, concerning Father *Maignan*. See the Remark D of his Article.

(D) *The Progreſs which he made in a very little time.*] Mr. *le Pailleur* knowing what is abovesaid, adviſ'd Mr. *Paſcal*, the Father, who told him of it, no longer to vex his Son. Mr. *Paſcal* follow'd this Advice, and gave *Euclid*'s Elements to the Child, who " (a) underſtood it all by himſelf alone, without ever needing any Explication, and he improv'd in it at firſt ſo far, that afterwards he was conſtantly preſent at the Conferences which were held every Week, where all the moſt ingenious Men of *Paris* were aſſembled, either to bring there their own Works, or to examine thoſe of others. Young Mr. *Paſcal*, kept his Place there, as well as any other, either for examining or writing Books. He carried thither as often as any Man new Things, and ſometimes it happen'd, that he diſcover'd Faults in the Propoſitions that were examin'd, which the reſt did not perceive. Yet he employ'd only his time of Recreation in the Study of Geometry, becauſe he was learning the Languages which his Father taught him. But finding in thoſe Sciences the Truth, which he lov'd in all things with an extream Paſſion, he made ſuch Progreſs in the little time he ſpent upon them, that at the Age of 16 Years he wrote a Treatiſe of Conicks, which in the Judgment of the moſt learned was accounted one of the greateſt Efforts of Wit that can be imagin'd. And therefore Mr. *Deſcartes*, who had been in *Holland* for a long time, having read it, and having heard ſome ſay, that it was written by a Child of 16 Years of Age, choſe rather to believe, that Mr. *Paſcal* the Father, was the true Author of it, who willingly robb'd himſelf of that Glory which juſtly belong'd to him, to transfer it to his Son, than to be perſwaded, that a Child of that Age, was capable of writing a Book with ſuch ſtrength of Reaſon; and by this backwardneſs to believe a thing which was very true, he ſhewed that it was in effect a thing incredible and prodigious. At the Age of 19 Years he invented that (b) admirable Machine of Arithmetick, which was eſteemed one of the moſt extraordinary things that was ever ſeen: And afterwards at the Age of 23 Years, having ſeen the *Torricellian* Experiment, he invented and tried a very great number of other new Experiments. We muſt not forget an early Proof he gave of his great Wit. " (c) When he was yet but 11 Years old, one at Table, without thinking of it, having ſtruck a fine earthen Diſh with a Knife, he took Notice, that it made a great Sound, but as ſoon as the Hand was laid upon it, the Sound ceas'd. He had a mind at the ſame time to know the Cauſe of it; and this Experiment having led him to make many others about Sounds, he obſerv'd ſo many things about them, that he wrote a Tract upon that Subject, which was judg'd very ingenious and ſolid.

What follows is a thing that deſerves to be related. An ingenious Man, who rally'd finely (d) thoſe that made the Preface (e) which I have quoted, introduces *Deſcartes* making uſe of theſe Words: " (f) This Man is happy in point of Reputation; for formerly he made many People believe, that he wrote from his own Fund of Ingenuity a Book of Conicks at the Age of 16; which Book was ſent to me, and before I had read one half of it, I thought (1) he had learn'd very much from Mr. *des Argues*, in which Opinion I was preſently after confirm'd by the Confeſſion he made of it to me himſelf (g). The Author who brings in *Deſcartes* talking after this Manner, preſently makes this Anſwer to him. " (h) What you ſay ſurprizes me a little, for in the Preface to a Treatiſe of the *Æquilibrium* of Liquors, printed after the Death of Mr. *P*... your Teſtimony is alledged in this point, which is not altogether agreeable to that which you now give me; for there is no mention there of the Aſſiſtance he had from Mr. *des Argues*; but it is only ſaid, that the thing appear'd to you ſo incredible and prodigious, that you had no mind to believe it; that you perſwaded your ſelf, that Mr. *P*... the Father was in effect the Author of the Book, and that he had a mind to give the Honour of it to his Son. Mr. *Deſcartes* replies, " I know not what they make me ſay or think in that Preface; but I know very well that I ſay nothing now, but what I writ in expreſs terms to (2) F. *Merſenne*, as ſoon as I ſaw the Book. I may be without doubt allow'd to ſay, that the Author of this Dialogue does not relate exactly what was written by Mr. *Deſcartes* to Father *Merſenne*. The Words of the letter are theſe, " (i) I have receiv'd alſo the Eſſay concerning Conicks from Mr. *Paſcal*'s Son, and before I had read over one half of it, I thought that he had learn'd of Mr. *des Argues*, in which Opinion I have been confirm'd preſently after, by the Confeſſion which he himſelf makes about it. This plainly ſignifies, that Mr. *Paſcal* a little after the half of his Book, confeſſes that he has receiv'd great Light from Mr. *des Argues*: But the Words of the Dialogue do plainly imply that Mr. *Paſcal* writing to Mr. *Deſcartes*, made him this Confeſſion, which makes one be apt to believe, that this young Man having heard that this Philoſopher ſuſpected him of having improved by the Inſtructions of Mr. *des Argues*, wrote to him a Letter, wherein he owned the Juſtice of this Suſpicion. Such are the natural Conſequences of the Relation made by this Dialogiſt; and therefore we muſt conclude, that

(k) *Preface to the Æquilibrium of Liquors. See alſo Madam* Perier*'s Life of Mr.* Paſcal. *p. 6.*

(l) *He was then but 12 years old. Madam* Perier *Ib. and the Preface to the Æquilibrium of Liquors.*

(m) *Preface to the Æquilibrium of Liquors. Madam* Perier *in the Life of* Paſcal. *Mr.* Baillet, *famous Children. p.* 305. *&c.*

(a) *Preface to the Æquilibrium of Liquors. See alſo Mad.* Perier. *p.* 8. *&c.*

(b) *He preſented one of them to the King, and one to the Chancellor, and then he gave one to Mr.* Carcavi. *See* Baillets *Life of* Deſcartes. *tom.* 2. *p.* 378.

(c) *Preface to the* Æquilibrium *of Liquors.*

(d) *See the Book intitled* a Voyage to the World of Deſcartes. *p.*191,192. *of the* Holland *Edit.*

(e) *That of the* Æquilibrium *of Liquors.*

(f) *i. e. Mr.* Paſcal.

(1) *Tom.* 2. *Let.* 38.

(g) *Voyage to the World of* Deſcartes. *pag.* 188.

(h) *Ibid. pag.* 189.

(2) *Tom.* 2. *Let.* 38.

(i) Deſcartes. *Tom.* 2. *Let.* 38. *p. m.* 217.

very little time. But that which we are told of (E) his Piety and Humility, is little leſs wonderful. After he had taken a great deal of Pains in (F) Experiments of the new Philoſophy, he forſook that Study, *and all* † *his other Enquiries, to apply himſelf only to that one thing which* JESUS CHRIST *calls neceſſary.* He was not yet 24 Years old, when the Reading of ſome pious Books, put him upon making this holy Reſolution. The Patience which he diſcover'd in his Diſeaſes, that were long and frequent

† Ibid. p. 11.

he ſets the Reader out of the right Way, and prompts him to form a falſe Idea of the Fact. The Objection is nevertheleſs very ſtrong againſt the Preface to the *Æquilibrium*; For Mr. *Deſcartes* did not write any thing to Father *Merſenne*, whereby it may appear that he admir'd young *Paſcal*, he gave him no *Elogium*, he does not ſay that the Book of Conicks appear'd to him to be well done, he ſays nothing of it neither good nor ill. Where then is this Teſtimony that he is pretended to have given, (k) *that the thing in effect was incredible and prodigious!* It is, will ſome ſay, in another Letter that was never printed; it muſt be added, and which was never written to Father *Merſenne*; for if it had been written to him, Mr. *Baillet* would have cited it, and not have been contented to refer us to the Preface of the *Æquilibrium* of Liquors. Mr. *Baillet* informs us of 3 things. 1. That Mr. *Roberval* and Mr. *le Pailleur*, and other Friends of Mr. *Paſcal*, were ſorry for what Mr. *Deſcartes* had written to Father *Merſenne*, (l) *And that they complain'd of his Opinion, which did not appear obliging enough for a Child of ſuch an extraordinary Merit; wherein they were follow'd by the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, who upon this Point gave their Opinion to Mr.* Clerſelier, *after he had publiſh'd this Teſtimony of* Deſcartes *in the firſt Edition of his Letters.* 2. That this great Philoſopher, going upon Probability, could not be perſwaded that a young Child was the Author of ſo good a Book. He therefore acquainted his Friend *with the thing, without any Artifice, as he believ'd it.* He choſe rather to ſeek for that *Book, an Author among the moſt accompliſh'd Mathematicians, than to venture to loſe in other Occaſions, the Credit he had obtain'd with thoſe who knew him to be ſincere, by his eaſineſs to believe a thing, which he could not make others believe upon his bare Word. And therefore when he ſaw upon the Account of ſome Circumſtances that clear'd up the Matter, that this Book could not with any probability be attributed to his Friend Mr.* des Argues, " *He* (3) *choſe rather to believe that* Paſcal *the Father, was the true Author of it, than to be perſwaded that a Child of that Age was capable of writing a Book with ſuch ſtrength of Reaſon.* 3. (m) *That Mr.* Deſcartes *might probably fall the more eaſily into an Error about this Fact, when he remembred the Correſpondence between Mr.* des Argues *and Mr.* Paſcal, *and when he ſaw in the Treatiſe of the young Author, ſuch things as he believ'd he had ſeen a little while before in a Piece of Mr.* des Argues; *for this might induce him to think that Mr.* des Argues *might have a Hand in that Treatiſe, and ſo much the rather, becauſe young Mr.* Paſcal *cited Mr.* des Argues *in it.*

(k) *Preface to the* Æquilibrium *of Liquors.*

(l) Baillet *Life of* Deſcartes. *tom. 2. p. 92. ad an. 1639, 1640.*

(3) *Preface to the* Æquilibrium *of Liquors.*

(m) *Id.* Baillet. *ib. pag. 41.*

One cannot well judge of this Diſpute until two Things be explain'd; one is, Whether it be true, that Mr. *Deſcartes* renouncing his firſt Opinion, wrote that Mr. *Paſcal* the Father had transferr'd to his Son the Glory of his Conicks. This does not appear by his printed Letters, nor by his Manuſcript Letters which Mr. *Baillet* conſulted, nor by any other circumſtantial Proof. There is nothing about this Matter, but an uncertain Teſtimony of thoſe who publiſh'd the *Æquilibrium* of Liquors. The other thing which is to be cleared up, is the knowing of the Terms, in which Mr. *des Argues* is mention'd in the Treatiſe of Mr. *Paſcal*. If he be ſimply nam'd in it, Mr. *Deſcartes* is much to blame, to maintain that Mr. *Paſcal* confeſſes he had learn'd from Mr. *des Argues*. But if Mr. *Paſcal* does make this Confeſſion in it, his and his Father's Friends are much to blame to complain of Mr. *Deſcartes*.

(E) *That which we are told of his Piety.*] I ſhall ſpeak hereafter (n) more largely of this: Here I ſhall only mention one Proof of it, (o) *In the 4 laſt Years of his Life; becauſe he was not able to take Pains, his chief Diverſion was to go and viſit the Churches, where there were ſome Reliques expos'd, or ſome Solemnity obſerv'd, and for that end, he had a ſpiritual Almanack, which inform'd him of the Places where there were particular Devotions. And this he did with ſo much Devotion and Simplicity, that thoſe who ſaw him were ſurpriz'd at it, which gave Occaſion to that fine Saying of a very virtuous and knowing Perſon, That the Grace of God diſcovers it ſelf in great Wits by little Things, and in common Wits by great Things.*

(n) *In the Remark G.*

(o) *Mad.* Perier *ubi ſupra p. 40.*

(F) *In Experiments of the new Philoſophy, he forſook that Study.*] The firſt Experiment he made was that of *Torricellius*, which he repeated many times, " (a) and from it drew many Conſequences, for the Proof of which, he made many new Experiments, in the Preſence of the moſt conſiderable Perſons of the City of *Roan*, (b) where he then (c) was . . . He caus'd them to be printed in the Year 1647, and made a little Book of them, which he diſpers'd through all *France*, and afterwards he ſent it into foreign Countries. . . . . In the ſame Year he was inform'd of a Thought that *Torricellius* had, that the Air was heavy, and that its Weight might be the Cauſe of all the Effects which had been hitherto attributed to the Horror of a *Vacuum*. He look'd upon this as a very fine Thought; but ſince it was a meer Conjecture of which there was not any Proof, he made many Experiments to diſcover whether it were true or falſe, . . . which not being ſatisfactory, at the end of the ſame Year 1647, he meditated upon the famous Experiment which was tried in 1648. . . . . The Succeſs of that Experiment, which he repeated many times, confirm'd him altogether in the Thought of *Torricellius* about the Weight of the Air, and gave him Occaſion afterwards to draw from thence many very fine and uſeful Conſequences, and to make alſo many other Experiments, which he put into a large Treatiſe, which he wrote at that time, wherein he fully explain'd all that Matter, and anſwer'd all the Objections that were made againſt him. But this Treatiſe was loſt, or rather, becauſe he lov'd Brevity, he himſelf reduc'd it to a *little Tracts, which appear'd after his Death, whereof one is entitled*, the Æquilibrium of Liquors, *and the other*, the Weight of the Maſs of the Air.

(a) *Preface to the* Æquilibrium *of Liquors.*

(b) *His Father was Intendant there.*

(c) *i.e. in 1646. See Mr.* Baillet's *Life of* Deſcartes, *tom. 2. p. 328.*

(d) *A Voyage to the World of* Deſcartes. *p. 188.*

Here we muſt take Notice of the Objection that was made againſt him, that he had not that Gratitude for *Deſcartes* that was due to him. And in ſpeaking to this, let us keep to the Dialogue of a modern Author. " (d) M. *Deſcartes* interrupted me in this Place, and asked me, what was that Experiment of M. P. . . . I anſwer'd him that it was that which was made in 1648, upon a Mountain call'd *puy de Domme*, with the Tube of *Torricellius*, wherein the Quick-ſilver was found of much leſs height on the Top of the Mountain, than in the middle, or at the Foot of it, from whence he clearly inferr'd the Weight of the Air. This is call'd, *replied Deſcartes*, the Experiment of M. *P*. . . . It is therefore becauſe he perform'd it, or cauſ'd it to be perform'd by Mr. *Perier*; for certainly, it is neither becauſe he invented it, nor becauſe he foreſaw the Succeſs of it. And if that Experiment ought to be call'd by the Name of its Author, it may more juſtly be call'd the (1) Experiment of *Deſcartes*; for it was I who deſired him (e) two Years before to try it, and aſſur'd him of Succeſs, as being altogether agreeable to my Principles, otherwiſe he had never thought of it, being of a contrary Opinion. Mr. *Baillet* has confirm'd this Reproach to be juſt, for thus he informs us under the Year 1647. (f) *M.* Deſcartes *being very well pleaſed with the Diſcourſe of Mr.* Paſcal, *found that all theſe Experiments were very agreeable to the Principles of his Philoſophy, altho Mr.* Paſcal *oppos'd him,* (2) *as being of the ſame Opinion with Mr.* Roberval *and others, who maintain'd a* Vacuum. *But to make him amends for his Converſation, he adviſ'd him* (3) *to make other Experiments about the Maſs of the Air, to the Weight whereof, as we have already remark'd, he attributed all that the Vulgar Philoſophers had in vain attributed to the fear of a* Vacuum, (4). *He aſſured him of the Succeſs of theſe Experiments, altho he had not yet made them, becauſe he ſpoke of them agreeably to his own Principles. Mr.* Paſcal *who was not yet convinc'd of the Solidity of his Principles, and who had promiſ'd*

ſome

(1) *Letter* 77. *of* Deſcartes. *tom. 4.*

(e) *Mr.* Deſcartes *miſtakes one Year, he pray'd Mr.* Paſcal *at* Paris *in* 1647. *and the Experiment was made in* 1648. *See Mr.* Baillet's *Life of* Deſcartes, *tom. 2. pag. 330. I will cite his Words immediately.*

(f) Baillet's *Life of* Deſcartes, *tom. 2. p. 330.*

(2) *Letter M. S. to* Merſenne *of the 4th of* April, 1648.

(3) *Tom. 3. of Letters, pag.* 443, *and* 438.

(4) *Mr.* Auzout *pretends to have given the ſame Advice at the ſame time to M.* Paſcal.

frequent, ought alſo to be matter (G) of aſtoniſhment: Neither ought we leſs to admire his Temper towards thoſe who offended him, and towards thoſe who fail'd in the obedience which was due to the King. He was inſenſible to the Faults of the

ſome time after to make ſome Objections againſt his Materia ſubtilis, would, perhaps, have had no regard to his Advice, if he had not been acquainted, about the ſame time, with a Thought of Torricellius *which was perfectly like this. The Experiments he made about the weight of (5) the Air in 1648, upon theſe Advices, were found very ſucceſsful. But he choſe rather to return Thanks to M.* Torricellius, *than to M.* Deſcartes, *who was depriv'd of his acknowledgment either in (6) his Letter to Mr.* Ribeyre, *firſt Preſident of the Court of Aids in* Clermont-Ferrand, *wherein he gives an Account of his Experiments, or in the Preface which one of his Friends wrote to his Poſthumous Treatiſe of the* Æquilibrium *of Liquors, and of the weight of the Air.* You ſee that he does not juſtify Mr. *Paſcal*, with reſpect to *Deſcartes*, as he does with reſpect to *Torricellius* in theſe words: (g) "The report of his Experiments being ſpread in *Paris*, they were confounded with thoſe of *Italy*; and in this confuſion ſome attributed the whole to Mr. *Paſcal*, others attributed nothing to him. To inform the Publick of this matter, in all its circumſtances, and to do that Juſtice which was due to all thoſe who had any ſhare in that Invention, Mr. *Paſcal* reſolv'd, the next Year, to Print an exact Account of the Experiments he had try'd in *Normandy*; and he prefix'd a Preface, wherein he declar'd thoſe of *Italy* made by an Author unknown to him, whoſe Name he could not tell, and which was not known at *Paris* till ſome time after, that Cavalier *del Pozzo* wrote from *Rome*, that it was the famous *Torricellius*, who died about that time. This ſeeming ſuppreſſion of the Name of a Perſon, whom Mr. *Paſcal* otherwiſe preferr'd to all the Geometricians of Antiquity, gave occaſion to ſome to ſuſpect, that he intended to turn Plagiary of *Torricellius*, and to believe, tho' falſly, that he had ſtole alſo from the famous Capuchin *Valerian Magni*.

Immediately after all theſe Experiments, which confirm'd Mr. *Paſcal* in the Opinion of the weight of the Air, he (i) addicted himſelf to more ſerious Studies, *which ſo diſguſted him with Mathematicks and Phyſicks, that he abſolutely forſook them. For altho' he wrote afterwards a Tract intituled,* de la Roulette, *under the Name of* Ettonville, *this is no wiſe contrary to what I now ſay, becauſe he found all that is contain'd in it by chance, and without any application to Study; and he wrote it to ſerve a Deſign perfectly remote from the Mathematicks, and from all curious Sciences, as will perhaps be prov'd ſometime hereafter (k).*

(G) The Patience he diſcover'd in his Diſeaſes .... is matter of aſtoniſhment.] His Siſter relates many particulars about it, I ſhall tranſcribe but one. (l) "To this ardent Charity he join'd, during his Sickneſs, an admirable Patience, which edified and ſurpriz'd all Perſons that were about him; and he ſaid to thoſe who declar'd they were troubled to ſee him in ſuch a condition, that, for his own part, he was no wiſe troubled, and that he was even afraid of being cur'd; and when he was ask'd the reaſon, he anſwer'd, Becauſe I know the dangers of Health, and the advantages of Sickneſs. He ſaid yet, in the height of his Pain, when ſome were griev'd to ſee him endure it, Be not troubl'd for me, Sickneſs is the natural State of Chriſtians, becauſe they ſhould always be in a Suffering condition, depriv'd of all good things, and of all the Pleaſures of Senſe, free from Paſſions, without Ambition and Avarice, and in a continual expectation of Death. Is it not thus that Chriſtians ought to paſs their Lives? And is it not a happineſs, when they are by neceſſity in ſuch a condition in which they ought to be, and when they have nothing elſe to do but to ſubmit humbly and peaceably? Wherefore I only deſire to pray to God, that he would grant me his Grace. This was the Temper with which he endur'd all his Pains." The Author of the *News from the Republick of Learning*, hath made ſome Reflections upon this, and upon the advantage that may be drawn from the extraordinary Devotion of ſo excellent a Mathematician, and ſo great a Philoſopher. It ſerves, ſays he, to refute the Libertines, (m) *They cannot now tell us, that none but little Wits have any Piety.* It cannot be deny'd, but it is rare to ſee a great Devotion in Perſons who have once taſted of Mathematical Studies, and made an extraordinary progreſs in thoſe Sciences. I do not know but we may ſay, in this caſe, what the Abbot *Furetiere* ſaid of Attorneys: (n) "There are ſome Saints who have been Advocates, Bailiffs, nay, even Comedians (o); in fine, There is no Profeſſion, how mean ſoever it be, but there have been Saints of it; but there never was any Saint that was an Attorney." Some talk of a Prieſt who adopted a Maxim like that of Mr. *Paſcal*, but it was with reference to another, and not to himſelf. I remember this Queſtion is put in the Evening Conferences of Mr. *Bouchet*, (a) *Whether a Prieſt did well in refuſing to pray for the Health of his Pariſhioner, who had ſent for him to come and pray to God that he would reſtore him to Health? For the Prieſt having ask'd him at what time he found himſelf the better Chriſtian, whether in Health or in Sickneſs, the ſick Man anſwer'd him, That he was a better Man when God viſited him. It would be better therefore, reply'd the Prieſt, that you ſhould continue Sick, that you may be the better Man.* This Action of this Prieſt is none of the moſt difficult; but if he had deſir'd, during a great Sickneſs, that others ſhou'd pray to God that it might continue, he had done an extraordinary thing.

There were in the Conduct of Mr. *Paſcal* ſome other things, which are no leſs ſingular than his Maxims about Health. (b) "The Converſations in which he was often engag'd, altho' they were wholly about Charity, yet they ſometimes made him afraid, leſt he ſhould fall into danger by them, but ſince he could not in Conſcience refuſe the Relief which ſome Perſons demanded of him, he found out a Remedy for this. He took, upon occaſion, an Iron Girdle full of Points, and put it round about his naked Fleſh, and when any vain Thought came into his Mind, or he took ſome pleaſure in the place where he was, or any ſuch like thing happen'd, he gave himſelf ſome Blows with his Elbow, to redouble the violence of the prickings; and thus he made himſelf remember his Duty. He had always in his Mind (c) *theſe two great Maxims, of renouncing all Pleaſure and all Superfluity; and he practis'd them in the worſt of his Illneſs, with a continual watchfulneſs over his Senſes, refuſing them abſolutely every thing that was agreeable to them: And when neceſſity conſtrain'd him to do ſomething which might give him ſome ſatisfaction, he had a wonderful Art of diverting his Mind from it, that it might have no ſhare in it. As for inſtance, his continual Sickneſs obliging him to feed delicately, he took great care not to reliſh what he did eat.* He had (d) no violent Affection for thoſe whom he lov'd, and adviſ'd others *not to ſuffer that any Body* (e) *ſhould love them in a very high degree; that this was a Fault which they did not ſufficiently conſider, becauſe the greatneſs of it was not ſufficiently apprehended, ſince by entertaining and cheriſhing ſuch an ardent Affection, a Man poſſeſſes a Heart which belongs only to God; and that this is to rob him of the thing in all the World which is moſt dear to him.* He found fault with *ſome Diſcourſes* of his Siſter, which ſhe thought very innocent. *If I ſaid ſometimes*, ſays ſhe, (f) *upon occaſion, that I had ſeen a beautiful Woman, he was angry, and would tell me, that I muſt not hold theſe Diſcourſes before Lacqueys and young People, becauſe I did not know what Thoughts I might excite in their Minds by them.* He had ſo much Humility, that the Curate of St. *Stephen du Mont*, who ſaw him in all his laſt Sickneſs, ſaid at every turn, (g) *He is a Child, he is humble, he ſubmits like a little Child.* By the ſame Vertue, (h) *he allow'd a perfect freedom of telling him of his Faults, and yielded to the Advices which were given him, without reſiſtance.* Having embrac'd a kind of Life, abſtracted from the World, at the Age of Thirty Years, he govern'd himſelf by this Maxim, (i) *of renouncing all Pleaſures and Superfluities, and this he practis'd during the remainder of his Life. To ſucceed in this Deſign, he begun from that time, as he did ever ſince, to diſuſe the Service of his Domeſticks, as much as he could. He made his Bed himſelf, he went and took his Dinner in the Kitchin, and carried it to his Chamber; and after he had Din'd he carried back the remainder. In fine, he made uſe of no body, but only to Dreſs his Meat, to go into the City, and do ſuch other things as he could by no means do himſelf.* Laſtly, among many other Maxims of Mr. *Paſcal*, which

(5) *See the MS. Letter of* Deſcart. *to* Merſen. *of* Dec. 13. 1647. *of* Febr. 7. 1648. *of* Jan. 31. 1648. *and of* April 4. 1648.

(6) *Of* July 12. 1651.

(g) Baillet *ib. p.* 329.

(i) *Preface to the* Æquilibrium *of Liquors, towards the end. See alſo Madam* Perier, ubi ſupra, *p.* 12.

(k) *See Madam* Perier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 24, 25.

(l) *Madam* Perier, *ib. pag.* 44.

(m) *News from the Republick of Learning* Dec. 1684. *in the Catalogue of new Books, n.* 2.

(n) *Furetieriana, pag.* 44. *of the Holl. Edition.*

(o) *Mr.* Chappuzeau *in his* French *Theatre obſerves, that there is a Martyr who was a Comedian; and that* St. Geneſt, *whoſe Feſtival the Church celebrates,* Auguſt 31. *ended his days by a glorious Tragedy.*

(a) Bouchet, *Serée* 33. *p.* 224. Lions 1618 *in* 8.

(b) *Mad.* Perier, *ib. pag.* 22.

(c) *Ibid. pag.* 25.

(d) *Ibid pag.* 34.

(e) *Ibid. pag.* 35.

(f) *Ibid. pag.* 32.

(g) *Ibid. pag.* 41.

(h) *Ibid.*

(i) *Ibid. pag.* 19.

the former, and irreconcilable (H) to the latter. He died at *Paris, Aug. 19, 1662*, Aged Thirty Nine Years and Two Months *. He had been a long time about a Work againſt the Atheiſts, and againſt all thoſe who do not admit the Truths of the Goſpel. He did not live long enough to put into Form the Materials he had gather'd together. What was found, concerning that Subject, among his Papers, was made publick, and was admir'd. He ſet in a good light a Thought which *Arnobius* (I) made uſe of, which is, That thoſe who believe a God may be eternally happy, if they be in the right, and that they loſe nothing if they are miſtaken: But

which doubtleſs appear very ſtrange to worldly People, I muſt not omit one, which is very ſingular; he did not approve of any Man's uſing theſe Phraſes, *I have ſaid, I have done, &c.* See the laſt Remark.

(H) *Irreconcilable to* Rebels.] (k) "He had "ſo great a Zeal for the Glory of God, that he could "not endure it ſhould be impeach'd in any thing "whatſoever; and this render'd him ſo zealous for "the Service of the King, that he reſiſted every "Body at the time of the Troubles in *Paris*, and "has ever ſince call'd all the Reaſons that were us'd "to excuſe that Rebellion, Bare Pretences: And he "ſaid, That in a State ſettled in the form of a Republick, ſuch as *Venice* was, it was a great Sin to "place a King there, and oppreſs the Liberty of the "People, which God had given them: But that in "a State where the Royal Power is ſettled, the Reverence due to it cannot be violated, without a "kind of Sacrilege; ſince it is not only an Image of "the Power of God, but a participation of that "ſame Power, which could not be oppos'd without "viſibly reſiſting the Ordinance of God; and therefore that he could not ſufficiently heighten the "greatneſs of that Fault; beſides, that it is always "accompanied with a Civil War, which is the "greateſt Sin that can be committed againſt Charity "to our Neighbour. And he obſerv'd this Maxim "ſo ſincerely, that he refus'd at that time very conſiderable Advantages, rather than he would depart from it. He was wont commonly to ſay, "that he abhorr'd this Sin as much as to Aſſaſſinate "Man, or to Rob on the High-way. And laſtly, "That there was nothing more contrary to his Temper, and by which he was leſs tempted. Theſe "were his Sentiments, as to the Service of the King, "and ſo he was irreconcilable to all thoſe who "oppos'd them; and that this ſtiffneſs was not from "his Temper or Inclination, ſufficiently appear'd "from his admirable Mildneſs towards thoſe who "offended him. He forgot ſo perfectly what concern'd only his own Perſon, that it was difficult to "make him remember it, unleſs they mention'd, for "that end, the circumſtances of things. And when "ſometimes he was admir'd for this, he would ſay, "Do not wonder at this, it is not any Vertue in me, "it is really my Forgetfulneſs, I remember nothing "of all this. Nevertheleſs 'tis certain, that hence "it appears, that the Offences which concern'd only his own Perſon, did not make any great Impreſſion upon him, ſince he did ſo eaſily forget "them; for he had ſo excellent a Memory, that he "would often ſay, he never forgot any thing he "had a mind to remember (l). If this and the other things I have related be true, it muſt needs be granted that Mr. *Paſcal* was a Prodigy; and if I might be ſo bold as to make uſe of the Expreſſion, I would call him a Paradoxical Individuum of Human-kind. He deſerv'd that one ſhou'd doubt whether he was born of a Woman, much better than that great Philoſopher of *Sicily*, whom *Lucretius* (m) has regal'd with that Commendation. One thing may leſſen the admiration of the hatred he had for Seditions, which is, That in his Time a War was rais'd in the Kingdom, the moſt unjuſt that ever was ſeen, and moſt prejudicial to the welfare of the Monarchy. Upon the view of the terrible Conſequences which that Sedition had, wherein the *Pariſians* were engag'd, in 1648, to ſet ſome Magiſtrates at liberty, there is no good Man but will conceive an horror againſt Inſurrections, and reaſon almoſt as *Balzac* did, and even with leſs reſpect for the Prince of *Condé*, the fatal Head of the Revolt (n). *Then begin here to take courage again*, ſays he (o), *after the Siege of* Coignac *has been rais'd, and we are not now ſo apprehenſive for our Province. But if the Peace was to be concluded to Morrow, this ſhort War would leave behind it a long remembrance of the Miſchiefs it has done. If States are thus to be reform'd and govern'd, happy are the States which are left in Corruption and Diſorder! The Hero of Monſieur* d'Ablancourt *was alſo mine; but we equally deteſt the Civil Wars, and will not pardon even* Julius Cæſar, *altho' we tranſlate his Commentaries.* To conclude, the Friends of Mr. *Paſcal* glory much, that they are Followers of the Doctrine which condemns Rebellion. See what Mr. *Arnauld* (p) has cited from the Second Tome of the Moral Eſſays.

(I) *A Thought which Arnobius made uſe of.*] That Father confeſſes to the Pagans, that the Promiſes of JESUS CHRIST cannot be prov'd, becauſe they concern a future happineſs; but he adds, that between two uncertain things, 'tis better to chooſe that which gives us hopes, than that which gives us none. The force of this Reaſon will be more clearly perceiv'd in the Original Words. (a) *Sed & ipſe* (Chriſtus) *quæ pollicetur, non probat. Ita eſt. Nulla enim, ut dixi, futurorum poteſt exiſtere comprobatio. Cum ergo hæc ſit conditio futurorum, ut teneri & comprehendi nullius poſſint anticipationis attactu, nonne purior ratio eſt, ex duobus incertis, & in ambigua expectatione pendentibus, id potius credere, quod aliquas ſpes ferat, quam omnino quod nullas? In illo enim periculi nihil eſt, ſi quod dicitur imminere, caſſum fiat & vacuum: in hoc damnum eſt maximum, id eſt, ſalutis amiſſio, ſi cum tempus advenerit, aperiatur non fuiſſe mendacium.* Mr. *Paſcal* unfolds this Thought very well, and does ſucceſsfully make uſe of the Proportions between a Wager, and the hazard of Loſs and Gain, which make the Wager prudent. See (b) *Ch. 6.* of his Thoughts: They were Printed in 1669, confirm'd with many Approbations, which give an *Elogium* of them. (c) Eight Years after there appear'd a Book wherein this Reaſoning of Mr. *Paſcal* was improv'd, with much extent and a great force. The Author had been little moved with the Cenſure of Mr. *Paſcal*'s Deſign, made by the Defender of Father *Bouhours*. That Apologiſt concludes his Cenſure with Criticizing upon this Paſſage. (d) "'Tis certain that God is, or is not, there is no "Medium, and there is an infinite diſtance between "theſe two Extreams. A Man plays a Game at this "infinite diſtance, which ſhall bring Croſs or Pile. "What Wager will you lay? By Reaſon, you cannot "ſay that God is; by Reaſon, you cannot deny it. "Accuſe not therefore of a Falſhood, thoſe who "have made a Choice; for you know not whether "they are in the wrong, or whether they have made "an ill choice. No, will you ſay, but I will blame them "for making, not this Choice, but a Choice; and he "who takes Croſs, and he who takes Pile are both to "blame. Yes, will I reply, but a Wager muſt be laid, "this is not left to your Will; and not to lay that God "is, is to lay that he is not. Which ſide will you take? "Let us weigh the Gain and the Loſs, by chooſing "to believe that God is. If you win, you win all; "if you loſe, you loſe nothing. If you ſay, that "'tis uncertain whether you ſhall win, and that 'tis "certain that you hazard the Pleaſures of this Life, "which you lay in the Wager; and that the infinite "diſtance which is between the Certainty which "you venture, and the uncertainty of what you "might Gain, equals the finite Good, which you certainly venture, to the infinite Good which is uncertain. This is not ſo, for every Player hazards "with Certainty, to gain with uncertainty, without "offending againſt Reaſon. Let us now ſee how he refutes this. (e) *Be ſilent* Paſchaſius, *I loſe all Patience to hear you treat thus of the ſublimeſt of all Subjects, and ground the moſt important Truth in the World, and the Principle of all Truths, upon a Notion ſo mean and childiſh, upon a Compariſon of playing at Croſs and Pile, which is more fit to make a Man laugh than to convince him, and upon an Argument ſo defective, and grounded upon ſuch a Foundation as is uncertain, and perhaps altogether falſe. I will not ſay that at firſt you laid down ſomething which a wiſe Man would not do, neither can I tell with what Conſcience you could ſay to a Libertine, That by Reaſon we cannot be aſſur'd that there is a God. I know many People who would be ſtrangely ſcandaliz'd, to hear you uſe this* horrible

---

* Taken from his Life written by Mad. Perier, his Siſter. That Life is prefix'd to the Thoughts of Mr. Paſcal of the Amſterd. Edit. 1684.

(k) *Ibid. pag.* 38.

(l) *We may therefore apply to him what* Cicero *in his* Orat. pro Ligario ſub fin. *ſays to* Cæſar, qui obliviſci nihil ſoles præter injurias.

(m) Nil tamen hoc habuiſſe viro præclarius in ſe, Nec ſanctum magis, & mirum, charumq; videtur. Carmina quinetiam divini pectoris ejus Vociferantur & exponunt præclara reperta, Ut vix humana videatur ſtirpe creatus. *Lucret. lib.* 1. *v.* 730.

(n) *i. e. Of the War to which the* Barricades in 1648, *gave occaſion by degrees.*

(o) Balzac *Letter* 25. *to* Conrart *B.* 2. *p. m.* 148, 149. *The Letter is dated* Nov. 20. 1651.

(p) *Arnauld Apology for the Catholicks* 1 *Part ch.* 11. *p.* 145.

(a) *Arnobius adverſus gentes lib.* 2. *pag. m.* 44.

(b) *It is Intituled,* That it is more advantageous to believe than not to believe what the Chriſtian Religion teaches.

(c) *Intitl'd* A Treatiſe of Religion againſt Atheiſts, Deiſts, and the new *Pyrrhonians. Printed at Paris by* Lambert Roulland, 1677, *in* 12.

(d) *Abbot of* Villars's *Treatiſe of Delicacy, Dial.* 5. *p.* 115, 116. *of the* Holl. *Edition.*

(e) *Id. ib. pag.* 116.

But an Atheiſt gains nothing if he be in the right, and renders himſelf eternally miſerable if he be miſtaken. The *Provincial Letters* of Mr. *Paſcal* have been, and are ſtill eſteem'd (*K*) a Maſter-piece. Some Authors have very impertinently deny'd

horrible Language, and who would not venture a Wager upon the Theology of the Director who ſuffers you to uſe ſuch ways of ſpeaking. Yet this were ſomething, if your Moral Reaſon were good; but to the ſhame be it ſpoken, both of his Theology and your Morality, it concludes nothing, becauſe all its force depends upon the Truth of this Propoſition, That every Gameſter hazards with Certainty to gain with Uncertainty, and yet does not offend againſt Reaſon. In truth, Paſchaſius, if the exiſtence of a Deity were as Problematical as that Propoſition, we ſhou'd be in a bad condition. All the Fathers and Husbands, who will not have their Children or Wives to Play, would be Atheiſts, and would maintain obſtinately, that 'tis very unreaſonable for a Man to hazard the Money that is in his Pocket, with which he can live free from Miſery, to gain what is uncertain, and venture, as it often happens, to loſe both the one and the other. But I have heard ſome ſay, that you were a great Enemy to looſe Caſuiſts; whence then comes it to paſs, that you do not only allow of Gaming, but that you would make Religion, and the being of a Deity, to depend upon the Game of Croſs and Pile? This Refutation is weak, and deſerves not to be examined: It may ſuffice to refer the Reader to the Chapter of Mr. *Paſcal*, which I have cited, and to the Writer who made a fine Paraphraſe upon it eight Years after. I ſhall only make one obſervation, which will diſcover, that Father *Bouhours* his Friend fail'd either in exactneſs or equity. He looks upon it as a ſcandalous Propoſition, contrary to Wiſdom and Conſcience, and deſerving the thundering Rebuke of a good Director, which is contain'd in theſe words of Mr. *Paſcal*, *By Reaſon you cannot ſay that God exiſts.* He ſuppoſes that this is to own to a Libertine, *That by Reaſon it cannot be affirm'd that there is a God.* This Explication is very falſe; for Mr. *Paſcal* does not acknowledge the truth of the Propoſition, he deſigns only not to oppoſe it, that he may take advantage of it in order to reclaim the Atheiſts. 'Tis as clear as the Day, that the words of Mr. *Paſcal*, addreſs'd to the Libertine, are equivalent to theſe, *You maintain that by Reaſon you cannot ſay that there is a God.*

(*K*) *The* Provincial Letters *are . . . a Maſter-piece.*] See the Praiſes Mr. *Perrault* has given (*f*) this Book: They engag'd the beſt *French* Pens which are among the Jeſuits, to refute theſe Letters, in a Book (*g*) which was ſuppreſs'd in *France*, aſſoon as it appear'd, in 1694, and which the Bookſellers of *Holland* reprinted. Of all the Books which have been publiſh'd againſt the Jeſuits, there is none that has done them more harm, and given them more trouble, than theſe Provincial Letters. They have been tranſlated into many Languages. Mr. *Nicolle* (*h*) under the Name of *William Wendrock*, a Divine of *Saltzburg*, turn'd them into *Latin*, and added to them ſome Notes and Diſſertations. Others have tranſlated them into *Engliſh*, (*i*) *Italian* and (*k*) *Spaniſh*. I have ſeen an Edition in 8o. in four Columns, which contains the *French*, with the *Latin*, *Italian*, and *Spaniſh* Verſions, having two Columns in one Page, and two in another; ſo that by opening the Book, all the four Columns are to be ſeen at one time.

I ſhall here give you ſome Collections, which will diſcover what is ſaid of the new Anſwer of the Jeſuits to the Provincial Letters, the effects which it has produc'd, and divers things which belong to the Hiſtory of theſe two Books. (*l*) "At the end of Forty Years there came out of the Aſhes of ſo many Apologies that had been confuted, a new Apology for the extravagancies of the Caſuiſts; an Apology ſo much the more dangerous, becauſe the Author of it has dexterouſly conceal'd his End and Deſign, and dreſs'd it up with all the Ornaments and Artifices which his Rhetorick could furniſh, on purpoſe to blind and ſeduce the Reader. We are well inform'd that it was Printed contrary to the Advice of the *R. F. de la Chaiſe*, contrary to the expreſs Prohibition of the late Archbiſhop of *Paris*, and againſt all the Laws of Policy. It was diſpers'd with great Profuſeneſs, and an extream Zeal. It was tranſlated into *Latin* by one of the beſt Pens of the Society. It was rendred into *Italian* by another; and by theſe means the Editions of it have been multiplied, ſo that the World is fill'd with them. The Impreſſions which they have cauſed to be made in *France*, *Holland*, *Flanders*, and elſewhere, and the care they took to recommend it to Men and Women devoted to them, give juſt cauſe to apprehend, that this Book has already done much miſchief, at a time when the remiſneſs of the diſcipline is already but too much in vogue, and too much ſupported. It was hop'd that the Holy See would not ſuffer a Work ſo dangerous to be ſpread with Impunity; but the multitude of great Affairs which have for ſome Years ſince been upon the Anvil at *Rome*, muſt have delay'd to another time, the Examination of a Book fill'd with ſo many Facts and Citations, that it would require much leiſure to enquire into the truth of them." Thus ſpeaks the anonymous (*m*) Author, who has refuted *the Anſwer to the Provincial Letters, or the Conferences of* Cleander *and* Eudoxus; thus, I ſay, he ſpeaks in his Epiſtle Dedicatory. Here is a Paſſage out of his Preface: "The *Conferences of* Cleander *and* Eudoxus, whereof common Fame makes *F. Daniel* the Author, are, it ſeems, the firſt reſource of the Society. Almoſt half an Age was requir'd to produce ſuch a Maſter-piece, and to form the Workman: and as ſoon as it has appear'd in the World, their joyful Shouts which have been heard every-where, do plainly diſcover that this was the Prophet whom they expected, and that his Work was the Salvation of the Society. If they flatter'd themſelves with the hopes of enticing the Publick into the ſame Sentiments of eſteem for it, and to force them by the ſparkling Eloquence of this new Defence, to declare againſt Mr. *Paſcal*; it does not belong to me to ſay, whether they have been miſtaken or no: Yet I am much miſtaken myſelf if notwithſtanding this new effort, the Provincial Letters be not ſtill the delight of Men of Wit, and an Original almoſt inimitable. As to *Wendrock*, the illuſtrious Defender of them, his Book will be to all Ages a ſovereign Antidote againſt the Poyſon of a corrupt Morality, a Book wherein the moſt important Principles of all Chriſtian Morality are aſſerted and defended in the moſt ſolid and agreeable manner, and an Apology for the Provincial Letters, which all the efforts of the Society will never be able to weaken."

I think it may be ſaid, That altho' the Work of Father *Daniel* were more Ingenious and more Argumentative than it is, it would not bring off the Admirers of the Provincial Letters from their Opinion. To this purpoſe read the words which a Writer, who was critical enough, and naturally much inclin'd to the moſt biting Cenſure, has inſerted in one of his Collections. *There is lately come out*, ſays he, (*a*) *an Anſwer to the Provincial Letters, which ruins them intirely, and yet will do them no great hurt. But how can this be? The reaſon of it is, becauſe altho' this Anſwer does plainly diſcover, the horrible Injuſtice, the cruel Calumnies, the injurious Falſities which are boldly ſpread in all theſe Letters, againſt one of the moſt famous Societies, that maintain the Intereſts of the Church; yet they have ſo long, by their pleaſant and comical turns of Wit, engag'd all the ſcoffing Party on their ſide, that they are in poſſeſſion of an Authority and Credit that cannot eaſily be taken from them. In vain will the Jeſuits endeavour to do conſiderable Service to the Church and the Publick. . . . Many People will not forbear to read the Provincial Letters with an eaſy credulity, and will not ſee the Anſwer to them, nor ſo much as endure any to ſpeak of it. Indeed the Prejudice upon this occaſion is a very unjuſt Judgment, very cruel and obſtinate, ſince (altho' theſe Letters have been condemn'd by Popes, Biſhops, and Doctors, and burnt by the Hand of the Hangman, according to the Decrees of Parliament and of the Council of State) it has taken ſuch poſſeſſion of Mens Minds, that it reſiſts all theſe Powers.* 'Tis certain that the Zeal of the Anti-Moliniſts is reviv'd, for the Provincial Letters, ſince the Anſwer of Father *Daniel*. They have reprinted them with a new Appendix (*b*), in which they have us'd great application. Read what follows: (*c*) "You know that the late Mr. *Nicole*, under the Name of *Wendrock*,

---

(*f*) *In the ſecond Tome of the Parallel between the Ancients and Moderns.*

(*g*) *Intitled* An Anſwer to the Provincial Letters of *L. de Montalte, or,* The Conferences of *Cleander* and *Eudoxus. See an Abſtract of it in the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, Nov. 1694. p. 113, &c.

(*h*) *See the Article* Nicolle *Remark B.*

(*i*) Coſimo Brunetti, *a Gentleman of* Florence, *is the Author of the* Italian *Verſion.*

(*k*) Gratian Cordero de Burgos *is the Author of the* Spaniſh *Verſion*

(*l*) *Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Apology for the Provincial Letters, of* Lewis de Montalte, *p. 8. of the* Roan *Edition*, 1697.

(*m*) *'Tis believed that it is* Dom Petit Didier *a Benedictin of the Congregation of* S. Vannes.

(*a*) Richelet, *the fineſt French Letters upon all ſorts of Subjects, to. 2. p. 322, 323, of the* Amſterd. *Edit.* 1698 *He advertiſes that he who wrote the Letter from which this Paſſage is taken, is called Mr.* Bordellon.

(*b*) *See the News from the Republick of Learning*, Aug. 1699. p. 202.

(*c*) *News from the Republick of Learning*, Jan. 1700. p. 113.

ny'd that there were any Decrees (K Δ) of Condemnation againſt them. It was given out, that in the laſt Days of his Sickneſs † he deteſted that Book, and that he repented of his having been (L) a *Janſeniſt*; but this was found to be falſe, altho' it
cannot

“ had publiſh'd in Latin the Provincial Letters, with very large Notes of his own. This Book a little while ago was tranſlated into French, and 'tis pretended to be done by a Lady of *Paris*; and it was printed at *Lyons* in 4 Volumes in 12s. The Court being inform'd of it, the King order'd that the Copies ſhould be ſeiz'd; which Order was executed with great Noiſe, but without Succeſs. They went to the Houſes of the Partners of the Sieur *Aniſon*, who were ſuſpected of having printed this Edition, but as is ſaid, they had timely enough Notice of it, to lay out of the way all the Copies, ſo that not one of them was found. There are now ſome here (at *Paris*) that are ſold at nine Livres, which is double of what they were ſold for before. There is an Advertiſement prefix'd to the firſt Volume, wherein the Author ſays, that he made this Tranſlation, becauſe the *Conferences* of F. *Daniel*, which were publiſh'd in 1694, againſt the *Provincial Letters*, attack'd in French an Author who had written in Latin; and becauſe it is fit that every Body ſhould be able to judge of the Difference. There is afterwards an Hiſtory of the *Provincial Letters*, which is ſcarce any thing elſe, but the four Latin Prefaces of *Wendrock*. At the End, we have an Account of the Intrigue, which was carried on at *Bourdeaux*, to procure the Condemnation of the Letters of *Wendrock*, by the Parliament.

(K Δ) *Who very impertinently deny'd, that there were any Decrees of Condemnation againſt* the Provincial Letters.] A Miniſter having ſaid (*d*), *That the Cenſure of the Morality of the Jeſuits, written by the Gentlemen of* Port-Royal, *the Provincial Letters and the other Books which cenſured that deteſtable Morality, had been burnt by the Hand of the Hangman*; here follows the Anſwer to him: “(*e*) But whither do you wander Mr. *Jurieu?* For beſides that it is not known, that any Cenſure of the Morality of the Jeſuits, made by the Writers of *Port-Royal*, was burnt, and that in general 'tis falſe, that the other Books which cenſur'd this Morality, and even the Provincial Letters, were burnt and tore by the Hands of the common Hangman; yet tho' all this were true, it wou'd not have been done by the Authority of the Church, but by an Authority purely ſecular; and conſequently you ought not to reproach the Church with it. The Author who ſpeaks after this Manner, calls himſelf the Abbot *Richard*, and is a very good Friend of the *Janſeniſts*. How then could he be ignorant of the Fate of the Provincial Letters in a Point ſo important? Why did he neglect ſo much the Writings of the Jeſuits againſt that? Does it become him never to have caſt his Eyes upon the Decree of the Parliament of *Aix*, which they printed at the end of their Anſwers to the Provincial Letters? The Tenor of the Decree is as follows: “(*f*) The Court having heard the Report of the Commiſſioners, who have ſeen and examin'd the ſaid Letters, and having peruſed them, declares them to be Defamatory, ſlanderous and pernicious to the Publick; and conſequently ordains, that they ſhall be deliver'd into the Hands of the Executioner, to be by him burnt upon the Pillory in the Place call'd *Preachers Fields* in the City of *Aix*; and Prohibits and forbids all Printers for the future to print this Book, or any other of the like Nature, and all Bookſellers and others of whatſoever Condition or Quality they be, to keep, ſell or publiſh them upon pain of Corporal Puniſhment; and enjoyns them to ſend the Books without delay to the Clerk of the Court that they may be ſuppreſſed, under the ſame Penalty; and ordains that the Tranſgreſſors ſhall be inform'd againſt by the Judge Royal, or Serjeant of the Court, to the end that the Informations being made, they may proceed againſt the Guilty, upon the Declaration of the above mention'd Penalties. And to the End that none may pretend Ignorance, the preſent Decree ſhall be read and publiſh'd with ſound of Trumpet in all the Places and Croſs-Streets of the City of *Aix*. Done at the Parliament of *Provence* ſitting at *Aix*, and publiſh'd at the Bar, *Feb.* 9th, 1657. The Author of the Hiſtory of the 5 Propoſitions of *Janſenius*, informs us, (*g*) *That among the Works of the* Port-Royal, *two of the moſt conſiderable are thoſe which appear'd in Latin, one under the Name of* Paul Irenæus, *to juſtify* Janſenius *in denying the Fact; the other under the Name of* Wendrokius, *which contain'd a Latin Tranſlation of the Provincial Letters, with Notes or Diſſertations of the ſame Author, who is known to be* Mr. Nicole. *Theſe two Books being given by the King's Order, to be examin'd by 13 Doctors of the Faculty of* Paris, *whereof four were Biſhops, and the other for the moſt part Profeſſors of Divinity, were condemn'd to the Fire by a Decree of the Council of State, made upon the Advice of theſe 13 Cenſors; the Words whereof here follow:* “We whoſe Names are under written, being deputed by the King's Order, to give our Judgment of a Book entitled, *The Provincial Letters of* Lewis de Montalte, *&c.* having diligently examin'd the ſame, do certify, that the Hereſies of *Janſenius*, condemn'd by the Church, are therein maintain'd and defended, not only in the Letters but alſo in the *Notes of William Wendrock*, and in the *Diſquiſitions of* Paul Irenæus, which are joined with them. . . . . Moreover we teſtify, that Calumny and Inſolence are ſo natural to theſe three Authors, that . . . . and that this Book therefore deſerves the Penalties which the Laws decree againſt defamatory and heretical Libels. Done at *Paris*, *September* 7th 1660. Now let any one judge whether the Cenſurer of the Miniſter be excuſable, who denied a thing built on ſuch Facts.

(L) *That he repented of his having been a* Janſeniſt, *but this is found to be falſe.*] Here follows a Paſſage taken out of a Letter of Father *Bouhours*, written to a Lord of the Court in 1668. “(*h*) Is there any body that does not know, that Mr. *Paſcal* is the Author of the Provincial Letters, and that he was engag'd in the Party when he wrote them? If any doubt of a Truth ſo manifeſt as this, it will be eaſie to convince him of it by the Teſtimony of Mr. *Paſcal* himſelf, whom we know from good Hands (1) to have abjur'd *Janſeniſm* at his Death. The *Janſeniſts* maintain'd it to be falſe, that Mr. *Paſcal* had made this Abjuration. Read the following Words of the Anſwer which they made to the Apology of the Archbiſhop of *Ambrun*: They refer to a Writing, wherein this Fact was refuted by convincing Proofs. “(*i*) Neither is it neceſſary to deſtroy particularly all that has been refuted elſewhere, by Treatiſes written on purpoſe, as that which he imputes to Mr. *Paſcal* upon a pretended Atteſtation of the Rector of St. *Stephen's* Pariſh, that he had abjur'd *Janſeniſm*, the Falſity whereof appear'd by convincing Proofs, which are the Subject of a Letter printed after the Refutation of the Book of F. *Anat* about the Mandate of the Biſhop of *Alet*. F. *Bonhours* having inſerted his Letter in a Collection of Tracts, which he publiſh'd at *Paris* in 1684, cut out that Part which concerns the Abjuration, which ſhews that he acknowledg'd it was falſe. Neverthеleſs he did aſſert this Fact very poſitively in the firſt Edition, and referred the Reader to an Authentick Proof. Who would not have believed it?

THE JESUITE, *Cornelius Hazart*, in the Anſwer to the *Caſe* of the Relations of *Janſenius*, affirms, (*a*) *That the Provincial Letters were retracted and deteſted by the Author of them, when he was to give an Account to his Saviour.* To whom this Reply was made. “Here is another Falſhood no leſs groſs, *viz.* That Mr. *Paſcal* retracted and deteſted the *Provincial Letters* before he died. It concerns the Jeſuits, who have affirm'd it in their *Theſes*, and ſpread it in the World, to make Proof of it. It is now above 20 Years ſince it was made appear in a printed Piece, which yet remains without an Anſwer, that what Mr. *Paſcal* ſaid to his Confeſſor in his laſt Sickneſs, of a little Difference between him and his Friends, was miſunderſtood by the Confeſſor, as he declar'd afterwards; but it is certain, that this did no ways concern the *Provincial Letters*. Theſe Words are Mr. *Arnauld's*, and there is reaſon to believe that they are very true, ſince a Writer, a Friend of the Jeſuits, has obſerv'd, (*b*) that Mr. *Paſcal*, who had chang'd his Opinion as to the principal Matters in his *Provincial Letters*, and *who could not doubt but he was oblig'd to retract thoſe things publickly*,
might

† See the Remark L towards the End.

(d) *Jurieu, Prejugez*, tom. 1. pag. 387.

(e) *Critique des Prejugez de Mr.* Jurieu, p. 304.

(f) *Anſwer to the Provincial Letters*, p. 517, 518. of the Liege *Edition*, 1658.

(g) *Hiſt. of the 5 Propoſitions.* liv. 3. pag. 175, 176.

(h) *A Letter to a Lord at Court.* pag. 21, 22. Paris *Edit.* 1668. in 4°.

(1) *This is atteſted by a Writing ſigned with the hand of the Rector of St.* Stephen du Mont *who aſſiſted* Mr. Paſcal *at his death. This Writing is in the Hands of the Archbiſhop of* Paris.

(i) *Pieces about the New Teſtament of* Mons. *tom.* 1. p. 498. *of the Cologne Edit.* 1669. in 8vo.

(a) *See the 8th Volume of Practical Morality.* p. 465.

(b) *The Abbot* du Mas, *Hiſt. of the 5 Propoſitions.* p. 202.

cannot be deny'd, that there was ſome (*LΔ*) Miſunderſtanding between him and the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*. I had almoſt forgot to tell you, that it was from him that the *Janſeniſts* (*M*) learn'd to denote themſelves by *on*.

PASOR

to diſabuſe thoſe whom his Letters had engag'd, or might engage for the future in his former Opinion. . . . (c) never thought it his Duty to inform the Publick of it, not even at his Death, though he had full time and opportunity to do it.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 203.

(LΔ) *There was ſome Miſunderſtanding between him and the Gentlemen of* Port-Royal.] It appears by the Hiſtory of the 5 Propoſitions, that this Difference turn'd upon theſe two Points, *viz.* The Signature of the Formulary, and the Variations whereof he accus'd the *Janſeniſts*.

I. He had ſaid in the 17 and 18 of his Letters, that there was (*d*) no *Diſpute about the Doctrine but only about the Fact*; and that he thought himſelf oblig'd to acquieſce in the Deciſion of the Pope, *with reſpect to the Doctrine.* " (*e*) But ſome time after he " went over to the oppoſite Extream, which was to " believe that the Senſe of *Janſenius*, which he did " not diſtinguiſh from the Senſe of Grace efficacious " by it ſelf, had been effectually condemn'd by the " Conſtitutions of the Popes; that it was nevertheleſs " a Matter of Faith, which it was not lawful to aban- " don; and that therefore the Popes in condemning " it were miſtaken, not as to the Fact, but as to the " Doctrine it ſelf. From whence Mr. *Paſcal* conclu- " ded that it was impoſſible on that Occaſion to ſe- " parate the Fact from the Doctrine, that the Sig- " nature of the Patrons of *Janſenius* was deceitful, " unleſs they proteſted expreſly, that they would not " condemn that Senſe; and laſtly, that they could " not in Conſcience do otherwiſe. This is what we " learn partly from a piece of Mr. *Paſcal*, and partly " from the Anſwers which the Divines of *Port-Royal* " wrote againſt it. He wrote that piece upon the " Occaſion of the Signature of the Formulary of the " (†) Aſſembly by the Nuns of *Port-Royal*. In Signing " of it they had ſaid, *We embrace ſincerely, and with* " *all our Heart, all the Deciſions made by his Holineſs* " (Alexander *the* VII.) *and Pope* Innocent *the* X, " *concerning the Faith, and reject all the Errors, which* " *they have adjudged contrary to them:* But they did " not add expreſly, that they excepted the Senſe " of *Janſenius*; they thought they had ſuffici- " ently excepted it, becauſe they excus'd themſelves " in their Signature from teſtifying any thing elſe " but the *Purity of their Faith*; whereby they tacit- " ly intimated, that they would ſay nothing con- " cerning the Fact of *Janſenius*. Nevertheleſs Mr. " *Paſcal* begun *not only to blame that Signature freely,* " *but he alſo wrote a Piece wherein he pretended to* " *prove that it was not ſincere.* Theſe are the Words " of the Divines of *Port-Royal*, in the (1) *Letter of an* " *Eccleſiaſtick to one of his Friends, upon the Subject of* " *the Declaration of the Curate of St.* Stephen, *&c.* " This Letter which is dated *July* 15th 1666, is " at the end of a piece of the *Port-Royal*, entituled, " *A Refutation of the Book of* F. Annat, *containing Re-* " *flections upon the Mandate of the Biſhop of* Alet, *&c.* " And in another Piece written the next Year, inti- " tuled, *A Defence of the Faith of the Nuns of* P. R. " *part* 2*d*, they repeat more diſtinctly what they " had ſaid in the Letter.

(d) Id. ib. pag. 195.

(e) Ibid. pag. 196. See the thing otherwiſe turn'd in the Hiſt. of Janſeniſm tome 2. p. 515. ad ann. 1661.

(†) i. e. of the Aſſembly of the Clergy of France.

(1) p. 80.

II. (*f*) *He had no leſs chang'd his Thoughts concerning the Fact of the* Janſeniſts, *than concerning that of* Janſenius. *For whereas in writing the Provincial Letters, he affirm'd ſpeaking of them, that their Doctrine about Grace was never chang'd, and that they never had any different from that of the School of St.* Thomas; *he afterwards publickly accuſed them of uſing a Language different from what they had us'd before. Thus they themſelves relate the Matter in their* Letter of an Eccleſiaſtick to one of his Friends, *&c.*(2) " Nay, he " believ'd that it was not only upon Occaſion of the " Signature of the Nuns of *Port-Royal*, that they had " appear'd inſincere; but that the ſame Fault might " be found in divers Pieces, which were written after " that Affair which has ſo long troubled the Peace of " the Church; that in their Writings they regarded " only what might ſerve the preſent Intereſt, and that " becauſe it changed at ſeveral times, their Writings " did not appear altogether conſiſtent one with " another; and therefore he thought that it had been " convenient to review them all, and to reduce them " to a perfect Agreement of Expreſſions. To excite " the more powerfully the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* " to do this, he wrote another Piece, wherein he " pretended to ſhow the Advantage they gave their " Enemies by this Diverſity, and that they might " be convinc'd of having ſpoken more warily " ſince the Bulls than before. *The Anſwer of the* Janſeniſts *was, that Mr. Paſcal was miſtaken, when he fancied a Contrariety between their Works before and after the Bulls, becauſe there was not really any. And to point out the cauſe of his Error, they affirm that he* himſelf did not conſult the Proofs of what he aſſerted, but look'd only into the Memoires which ſome of his Friends furniſh'd him with, who did not examin exactly enough the Paſſages (4) of which they compos'd them. *From whence it happen'd, add they,* that he could not avoid falling into a great Number of Miſtakes, and that there are in his Piece ſome Hiſtories altogether fabulous, which ſerve (5) for a Foundation to thoſe pretended Contrarieties he imputed to them, and ſome Dialogues wherein People are made to ſay on both Sides ſuch things as were never ſpoken of. *That is to ſay, according to the Confeſſion of the* Janſeniſts, *Mr.* Paſcal *did then againſt them the ſame thing, which he had done in their Favour in the Provincial Letters, if we may believe their Adverſaries and his.*

(f) Hiſt. of the 5. Propoſitions, pag. 203.

(2) p. 81.

All this in the Hiſtory of the 5 Propoſitions is accompany'd with many Remarks, which perhaps would puzzle an Apologiſt for Mr. *Paſcal*.

(4) p. 81.

(5) p. 82.

(*M*) *The* Janſeniſts *learn'd to denote themſelves by* on.] (*g*) *He pretended, that an honeſt Man ought to ſhun the naming of himſelf, and even to make uſe of the Words* I *and* me, *and he was wont to ſay upon this Occaſion, that Chriſtian Piety annihilates the human* me, *and that human Civility conceals and ſuppreſſes it. 'Tis not*, adds the Author (*h*) of the Art of Thinking, *that this Rule ſhould be improv'd to a Scruple, for there are ſome Occaſions wherein a Man would needleſly torment himſelf, if he would ſhun theſe Words; but 'tis always good to have it in view, to keep ones ſelf from the ill Cuſtom of ſome Perſons, who ſpeak only of themſelves, and are always quoting themſelves, when the Queſtion is not about their Opinion.* From whence probably it came that the *Janſeniſts* of *France* did ſo much affect to make uſe of the Particle *on*. One of their Adverſaries pretended to know by that Mark, that the Book of an Anonymous Writer (*i*) which he refuted, was to be attributed to them. Thus he diſcourſes after he has given a ſtrong Proof of the Affection of that Anonymous Author for the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*. " (*k*) But if this be not ſuffici- " ent, and if one would have a plainer Proof, all " the World knows their *on*; it is the Manner " wherein they cite one another, no Body made " uſe of it before them, and there is ſcarce any " but they who make uſe of it. He does not on- " ly never cite them otherwiſe, *comme on a dit dans* " *la Grammaire* (5) *raiſonnée; comme on l'a remarque* " *dans l'Art de penſer; on a Parlé de cela dans la Gram-* " *maire generale:* but he ſpeaks of himſelf, only under " this Term, in his Preface, *en revoyant cet Ouvrage* " *on s'eſt cru obligé; on a cru qu'il eſtoit plus à propos.* " I have heard an excellent Man ſay, that this " way of ſpeaking of ones ſelf by this Term *on*, (4) was " a kind of plural Equivalent to *nous*, which Kings " and other Potentates make uſe of. Our Critick " does in ſome ſort own it, by ſaying that inſtead " of *on* they formerly wrote *hons* (1), which is as " much as to ſay *Hommes, ſo that*, adds he, *on dit,* " *is the ſame thing with* Hommes *or* les Hommes di- " ſent. Yet this illuſtrious Perſon did not believe, " that theſe Gentlemen, us'd this way of Speaking " out of Vanity, but only out of Sincerity, to de- " note that they did nothing wherein many did not " bear a part, and that therefore they could not put " to their Books one particular Name of an Author, " without acting againſt Truth, ſince there is none " of them that is the Work of one Author only. " And if they ſhould name all thoſe that had a hand " in them, this would be liable to other Inconve- " niencies; both which are equally avoided by this " Myſterious *on*; I ſhould never have believ'd, if " this able Man had not ſaid ſo, that it includes " ſo many Things. See in the Margin (z). Mr. *Paſcal* ſaid of theſe Authors, who ſpeaking of their own Works, ſay, *my Book*, *my Commentary*, *my Hiſtory*, &c. that they are like thoſe Citizens, who having a Houſe of their own, have always in their Mouths *my Houſe*: they had better ſay, added that excellent Gentleman, *our Book*, *our Commentary*, *our Hiſtory*, &c. ſince commonly theſe is more in it that is another's, than is their own.

(g) The Art of Thinking, 1ſt part ch. 10. n. 6. p. m. 450. See alſo the Thoughts of Mr. Paſcal, c. 29. n. 27.

(h) Ibid.

(i) It is intituled, Reflections upon the preſent uſage of the French Tongue, or new and critical Remarks upon the politeneſs of the French Language: At Paris, 1689. in 12.

(k) The Abbot de St. Real's Diſcours de la Critique. c. 10. pag. 223. of the Lyons Edition, 1691.

[5] Pag. 255. 313. 523.

[4] See Mr. St. Evremont's Miſcellanies. tom. 4. p. m. 135. where he ſcoffs at the Abuſe of on.

[1] Pag. 334.

[z] The 2 Tomes of the Miſcellanies of Vigneul Marville, contains this at p. 200, of the Rotterdam Edition. 1701.

PASOR (*Matthias*) Profeſſor of Divinity at *Groningen*, born at *Herborn* in the County of *Naſſaw April* the 12th 1599, was the Son of *George Paſor*, who after he had taught Divinity and the Hebrew Tongue for the Space of Nineteen Years at *Herborn*, was call'd to *Franeker* in 1626, to be there Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue, and died there the 10th of *December*, 1637. Our *Matthias* had already made a good Progreſs at *Herborn*, when the Peſtilence occaſion'd him to be ſent to *Marpurg* in 1614. He ſpent his time there very uneaſily; the Profeſſors ſhunn'd him as a peſtiferous Wretch, and ſome * Scholars inſulted him a hundred times, and beat him, to revenge what his Father, being Rector at *Herborn*, had done in making them pay a Fine, when they committed ſome Diſorders. He was forc'd at laſt to leave the City, and return'd the next Year to *Herborn*, where he applyed himſelf very much to Study. He went to *Heidelberg* in 1616, and meeting there with all ſorts of good Profeſſors, he improv'd himſelf exceedingly by them. He found alſo the Means of leſſening the Expence of his Family, for he taught in a Chamber the Mathematicks and Hebrew, and was receiv'd as Tutor in the Houſe of an honeſt Man of *Heidelberg*. He made himſelf ſo well known by many Academick Acts, that he hop'd to obtain a Profeſſor's Place which happen'd to be vacant; he hop'd ſo, I ſay, altho one of his Antagoniſts had many more Friends than he. By an extraordinary good Fortune, his Hope did not deceive him, and he was declar'd Profeſſor of the Mathematicks, *April* 23. 1620; but he was forc'd a little after to fly becauſe of the Invaſion of the *Palatinate*. The Storm being a little over, he went to continue his Function at *Heidelberg*, and endur'd in that unhappy City, all the Inconveniences and Dangers that could be imagin'd; and did not go out of it, till the Troops of *Tilly* had ſack'd it in the Year 1622. After this he went to *Herborn* through a Thouſand Difficulties, and reſolv'd in the Year 1624 to make a Journey into *England*. He made private Lectures at *Oxford*, as well upon the Hebrew as the Mathematicks, and went into *France* with ſome *Germans*. He paſs'd the Winter in *Paris*, and heard among other Lectures, thoſe of *Gabriel* (*A*) *Sionita*, Profeſſor in *Chaldee* and *Arabick*. Being return'd into *England* in the Summer time of the Year, 1625, he found the Univerſity of *Oxford* ſtrangely diſpers'd, by reaſon of the Peſtilence. After the Plague ceas'd, he found ſome Scholars to be inſtructed either in Divinity or the Oriental Languages; and he choſe rather to ſtay there, than to go into *Ireland* with the learned *Uſher*, who offer'd him his Table and an honourable Penſion. The Requeſt that he preſented to be made Profeſſor of the Oriental Tongues was favourably heard. So that he commenc'd Profeſſor of them, *October* 25. 1626, and diſcharg'd that Office until the Year 1629, when he was call'd to *Groningen* to be Profeſſor of Philoſophy, which Office he enter'd upon *Auguſt* 27 of the ſame Year. Six Years after he was made Profeſſor of the Mathematicks, and in 1645, of Divinity, which was the Cauſe that he did not go to *Harderwick*, where he was offer'd the Place of Profeſſor in ordinary of Divinity and Hebrew. He receiv'd the Degree of Doctor of Divinity at *Groningen*, *October* 21ſt 1645, and abdicated the Profeſſorſhip of the Mathematicks, but kept that of Moral Philoſophy. He made a Journey into his own Country of *Naſſaw* in the Year 1653, and went as far as *Heidelberg*, where he received a thouſand Civilities from the Elector *Palatine* †. He liv'd to the 28th of *January* 1658. He was never (*B*) married, and he lived very honeſtly in his Celibacy ‡. He publiſh'd not (*C*) many Books;

* Studioſi nonnulli memores mulctæ ſibi ob petulantiam Herbornæ à patre Rectore irrogatæ, me innocentem & minime ferocem ſed meticuloſum depoſitionis in Academiis Germanicis receptæ occaſione, verberibus & contumeliis variis affecerunt. *Matthias Paſor in vita ſua p. m.* 22.

† *Taken from the Journal of his Life written by himſelf and Printed at* Groningen *in* 1658. *in* 4.

‡ *Ex orat. funebri.*

(*A*) *Thoſe of* Gabriel Sionita.] This Profeſſor had for ſome Years left off his Lectures, becauſe no Body came to hear them; and he return'd them at the Deſire of our *Paſor*, but he did not read them in the Royal College, but in his own Houſe (*b*). 'Tis a ſtrange thing, that a great Kingdom, and ſuch a City as *Paris*, ſhould not furniſh three Auditors to a Profeſſor ſo famous in foreign Countries, that *Bangius*, (*c*) a learned *Dane* would not accept the Place of Hebrew Profeſſor at *Copenhagen*, unleſs time were granted him to go and perfect himſelf at *Paris* under this Man. And here is a Profeſſor at *Heidelberg*, who deſires to be a Diſciple of the ſame Man, while there were not two Scholars at *Paris* that car'd to hear him. Such is the Temper of Men, that they go a great way off to ſeek after the ſame Things, which they would neglect, if they were at their own Door.

(*B*) *He was never married.*] 'Tis expreſly obſerv'd (*d*) in his funeral Oration, that he liv'd not a Batchelor by reaſon of any particular Vow, or from any Averſion to a well-choſen Marriage; for on the contrary he was an Apologiſt for it, and wou'd praiſe it, although he was very ſorry, that a Condition ſo uſeful and neceſſary, which was inſtituted in the very State of Innocency, ſhould become liable by reaſon of Sin, to ſo many Difficulties. The true Reaſon therefore why he did not marry was this, that in his younger Years he wanted to be free from domeſtick Cares, after which follow'd a State of Perſecution and Baniſhment, and then he found his Health empair'd; beſides that he had conceiv'd great Hopes of *George Paſor* his Brother's Son.

(*C*) *He publiſh'd not many Books.*] He carefully reviſ'd two or three of his Father's Books, which are of wonderful uſe to Scholars and Students in Divinity; I mean *Lexicon novi Teſtamenti*, *Manuale Novi Teſtamenti*, and the Greek Grammar of the New Teſtament. His Father wrote ſome other Books, as the Funeral Oration of *Piſcator*, the Analyſis of the difficult Words in Heſiod, *Collegium Heſiodeum*, &c. As to *Matthias Paſor*, I do not think that any thing of his was publiſh'd but *Theſes*, or general Idea's of ſome Sciences. It was very ill done to publiſh the Journal he had written of his Life, which ſhould have been ſuppreſs'd, or at leaſt many little Trifles ſhould have been ſtruck out; for to inſtance in a few things, what neceſſity was there that the Publick ſhould know, that the Tavern where the Profeſſors of *Heydelberg* in a Body treated *Matthias Paſor*, had (*e*) two Swords for its Sign? What neceſſity was there, to make it publickly known, (*f*) that at *Hanaw*, in the beginning of a great Feaſt, he was forc'd to leave the Table becauſe he found himſelf indiſpos'd, and wanted to throw up a little Bile. But I do not wonder that they publiſh ſuch Journal, when in the Funeral Orations upon Profeſſors, we commonly meet with an exact Deſcription of all the Symptoms of their laſt Sickneſs; that on ſuch a Day they did ſweat, on another they were conſtipate, troubled with a Looſneſs, *&c.*

(*b*) *Ex vita Matthiæ Paſoris. pag.* 41.

(*c*) *See the Article of him.*

(*d*) Abdias Widmarius *Miniſter of the holy Goſpel, and Profeſſor of Divinity at* Groningen, *is the Author of that Funeral Oration.*

[*e*] Partim univerſi in prandio honorario lauto, inſtituto ad ſignum enſium. *pag.* 54.

[*f*] In prandio lauto nihil ventriculo arridebat, imo ſub initium menſæ ſurgere coactus ſum & bilem evomui. *Ib. pag.* 55.

(*D*) *The*

Books; the two Reaſons he gives for it (D) are admirable, and deſerve to ſerve for a Rule to many People, without excepting my ſelf.

PATERCULUS (*Caius Velleius) a Latin Hiſtorian, under the Empire of Tiberius. 'Tis very probable he was born in the † Year of Rome 735. His (A) Anceſtors were Illuſtrious for their Merit and their Offices. He was ‖ a Tribune of the Soldiers when Caius Cæſar, a Grandſon of Auguſtus, had an Interview with the King of the Parthians in an Iſle of Euphrates, in the Year 753. He Commanded the Cavalry in Germany, under Tiberius §, and accompanied that Prince nine Years ſucceſſively, in all his Expeditions. He receiv'd ‡ honourable Rewards from him. He was preferr'd to the (B) Prætorſhip, but not to higher Dignities. The Praiſes he (C) beſtows upon Sejanus give ſome probability to the Conjecture ¶, that he was look'd upon as a Friend of this Favourite, and conſequently that he was involv'd in his

(D) *The two Reaſons he gives for it are admirable.*] The firſt is, That he would not be the cauſe of taking off Youth from reading the good Books we have already. The ſecond is, That he would not expoſe the Bookſellers to the hazard of loſing their Money, who are often at great Expences in Printing Books, which either ſell but ſlowly, or elſe for ever remain at the bottom of their Warehouſes. *Noluit*, ſays he, (a) *nimis multa ſcribere, 1. ne juventutem abſtraherem à lectione graviorum Authorum quos per Dei gratiam habemus. 2. Ne miſeris typographis imponeretur, qui ſæpe magnos ſumptus impendunt libris, nunquam vel tardè admodum diſtrahendis.*

(A) *His Anceſtors were illuſtrious.*] See what he ſays of 'em, ſpeaking of the Confederate War: (b) *Neque ego verecundia domeſtici ſanguinis gloriæ quidquam, dum verum refero, ſubtraham, quippe multum Minatii Magii, atavi mei, Aſculanenſis, tribuendum eſt memoriæ: qui nepos Decii Magii, Campanorum principis, celeberrimi & fideliſſimi viri, tantam hoc bello Romanis fidem præſtitit, ut cum legione, quam ipſe in Hirpinis conſcripſerat, Herculaneum ſimul cum T. Didio caperet, Pompeios cum L. Sulla oppugnaret, Coſamque occuparet, cujus de virtutibus cum alii, tum maxime dilucideque Q. Hortenſius in Annalibus ſuis retulit: cujus pietati plenam populus R. gratiam retulit; ipſum viritim civitate donando, duos filios ejus creando prætores, cum ſeni adhuc crearentur.* Here is ſomething very ſingular concerning the degrees of Generation: *Paterculus*, born in the Year of *Rome* 735, reckons for his Great Grandfather's Grandfather *Minatius Magius*, who, at the Head of a Legion, which he had raiſ'd, beſieg'd and took ſome Cities, about the Year 664, and who was Grandſon to *Decius Magius*, whoſe Fidelity to the *Romans* was ſo famous at *Capua*, in the Year 538. On one ſide here are five Generations in the ſpace of 71 Years, and on the other there are but two in the ſpace of 126 Years. There ſeems to me to be more difficulty in the five Generations than in the two; and perhaps we muſt conjecture, that *atavus* was inſerted by the Tranſcribers inſtead of *avus*; or, that *atavus* was not regularly taken, upon all occaſions, for the Great Grandfather's Grandfather. Mr. *Dodwell* underſtood the Great Grandfather by (c) *atavus*. If the conjecture of which I have ſpoken were true, we muſt ſay, that *Paterculus* was not deſcended from *Decius Magius* but by the Mother's ſide, for there is no doubt but *Caius Valerius* mention'd in *Chap.* 76. of the ſecond Book, was his Grandfather by the Father's ſide, and different from *Minatius Magius*. I ſhall ſet down this Paſſage, that I may ſhew all that is to be known of his Anceſtors. (d) *Quod alieno teſtimonium redderem, in eo non fraudabo avum meum, quippe C. Velleius, honoratiſſimo inter illos 350 Judices loco, a Cn. Pompeio lectus, ejuſdem, Marcique Bruti ac Tironis præfectus fabrûm, vir nulli ſecundus, in Campania, digreſſu Neronis à Neapoli, cujus ob ſingularem cum eo amicitiam partium adjutor fuerat, gravis jam ætate & corpore, cum comes eſſe non poſſet, gladio ſe ipſe transfixit.* Here a ſcruple ariſes. *Paterculus* had a Brother who was call'd *Magius Celer*; 'tis therefore very probable, that by the Father's ſide they deſcended from *Decius Magius*. The Editions give the ſurname of *Velleianus* to this *Magius Celer*; but 'tis pretended, that this Epithet (e) is only the Invention of the Criticks, and that it is not found in the Manuſcript Copy. Mr. *Dodwell* obſerves, (f) that if it were true that *Magius Celer* had the Surname of *Velleianus*, this would be a plain Proof that by Adoption it paſs'd from the Family *Velleia* into that of the *Magius*'s. In this caſe it might be ſaid, that he had been adopted by a Kinſman on the Mother's ſide, deſcended from *Decius Magius*, from Father to Son. The Learned Man, whom I juſt now cited, would not admit this Hypotheſis, for he pretends that our *Paterculus* (g) belong'd, on the Father's ſide, to the Family *Magia*, and that he bore the Name of *Velleius*, only by virtue of ſome Adoption. But note, that his Grandfather was call'd *Velleius*. This Hiſtorian had an Uncle on the Father's ſide (h) who was call'd *Capito*, and was a Senator, and who join'd with *Agrippa* in accuſing *Caſſius*, the Murderer of *Cæſar*. Let us now ſpeak of his Brother, (i) *Cæſar ad alteram Belli Dalmatici molem animum atque arma contulit, in qua regione quali adjutore legatoque fratre meo, Magio Celere Velleiano, uſus ſit, ipſius patriſque ejus prædicatione teſtatum eſt, & ampliſſimorum honorum, quibus triumphans eum Cæſar donavit, ſignat memoria.* He was Prætor, as may be ſeen in the beginning of the next Remark. I ſhall ſay ſomething hereafter (k) of their Father.

(B) *He was preferr'd to the Prætorſhip.*] This was in the Year wherein *Auguſtus* died: He informs us of this himſelf, and with ſuch a turn of Expreſſion as ſhows the ſubtilty of his Wit. (l) *Quo tempore mihi fratrique meo, candidatis Cæſaris, proxime à nobiliſſimis ac ſacerdotibus viris, deſtinari prætoribus contigit: conſecutis, ut neque poſt nos quemquam D. Auguſtus, neque ante nos Cæſar commendaret Tiberius.* We will here ſet down ſome other Paſſages, which declare the progreſs of his Fortune: *Habuit in hoc quoque bello*, ſays he, (m) ſpeaking of the War againſt the *Dalmatians* and *Pannonians* in the Year 759. *mediocritas noſtra ſpecioſi miniſtri locum. Finita equeſtri militia, deſignatus quæſtor, nec dum ſenator æquatus ſenatoribus, etiam deſignatus tribunus plebis partem exercitus ab Urbe, traditi ab Auguſto, perduxi ad filium ejus: in quæſtura deinde, remiſſa ſorte provincia, legatus ejuſdem ad eundem miſſus.* He ſays elſewhere, (n) *Hoc tempus me functum ante tribunatu caſtrorum, Ti. Cæſaris militem fecit: quippe protinus ab adoptione miſſus cum eo præfectus equitum in Germaniam, ſucceſſor officii patris mei, cæleſtiſſimorum ejus operum per annos continuos IX. præfectus aut legatus, ſpectator & pro captu mediocritatis meæ adjutor fui.* I have already ſaid, (o), that he appear'd at the Triumph of *Tiberius* with ſplendid Marks of Honour. *Hankius* (p) places this Triumph in the Year of *Rome* 744, he anticipates it twenty Years or more, and he was ignorant that *Paterculus* made his firſt Campagne in the Year 753. How then could he appear at a Triumph in 744, with Marks of Honour, which he deſerved but by his conſtant Attendance in the Service of *Tiberius*, (q) after his firſt Feats of Arms.

(C) *The Praiſes he beſtows upon* Sejanus.] See *Chap.* 127 and 128 of his ſecond Book: I ſhall extract but one thing out of it: He ſhows, by great Examples, that a Prince may ſhare the Cares of the Goverment with a Miniſter. (r) *Raro eminentes viri non magnis adjutoribus ad gubernandam fortunam ſuam uſi ſunt; ut duo Scipiones duobus Læliis, quos per omnia æquaverunt ſibi; ut D. Auguſtus M. Agrippa, & maxime ab eo, Statilio Tauro: quibus novitas familiæ haud obſtitit, quo minus ad multiplices conſulatus triumphoſque, & complura eniterentur ſacerdotia; etenim magna negotia magnis adjutoribus egent.* This Paſſage, and ſome others ſuch like, afforded a fine pretence to the Panegyriſts of Cardinal *de Richelieu* and Cardinal *Mazarin*. They ſung to another Tune, and had different Maxims after the Death of the latter, as I have elſewhere (ſ) obſerv'd. Here we ſhall ſet down a Thought of *la Mothe le Vayer*. "He is "blam'd, *ſays he* (t), and that with great Reaſon... "for having given ridiculous Elogiums, not only to his Ruine. He wrote an Abridgement of (D) the *Roman* Hiſtory, which is very curious, and he promiſed a * larger Hiſtory. The Elogiums he beſtows upon the Emperor *Tiberius* are exceſſive, and he underſtood ſo well the Art of Flattering this Emperor, that 'tis thought he did not forget to ſpeak evil of (E) *Germanicus*. 'Tis not true, that an Annaliſt of *Rome* was nam'd (F) *Cneius Velleius*, as *Glandorpius* imagines. I ſhall mark ſome Faults (G) of Mr. *Moreri*.

---

* *Others call him* Publius *or* Marcus.

† *See the* Annales Velleiani, *of Mr.* Dodwell, *prefix'd to the* Oxford *Edition of* Paterculus *in* 1693, *in* 8vo.

‖ Velleius Paterculus *l.* 2. *c.* 101.

§ *See the* Remark B.

‡ *See the ſame Rem.*

¶ Dodwell *ubi ſupra n.* 30.

(a) *Ubi ſupra, p.* 58.

(b) *Paterc. l.* 2. *c.* 16.

(c) Avos ſimiliter *Velleii* fuiſſe neceſſe erat *Minatii Magii filios* ſiquidem *atavus* ipſe fuerat Minatius. *Dodwellus ann. Velleian. n.* 7.

(d) *Vell. Paterculus l.* 2. *c.* 76.

(e) *Dodwel ubi ſupra.*

(f) *Id. ib.*

(g) Eoque adeo gentile auctoris noſtri nomen *Magius*, *Velleius adſcititium* ex adoptione in familiam *Velleiam*. *Id. ib.*

(h) Quo tempore Capito patruus meus vir ordinis Senatorii Agrippæ ſubſcripſit in C. Caſſium. *Vell. Patercul. lib.* 2. *c.* 69.

(i) *Id. ib. c.* 115. *Add to this what he ſays c.* 121. quem (*Tiberium in triumpho*) mihi fratrique meo, inter præcipuos præcipuiſque donis adornatos viros, comitari contigit.

(k) *In the laſt Remark. n.* 3.

(l) *Id. ib. c.* 124.

(m) *Id. ib. c.* 111.

(n) *Id. ib. c.* 104. *this relates to the Year* 757 *of* Rome.

(o) *In the Remark A. letter i.*

(p) *Hankius de ſcriptoribus rerum Romanarum, tom.* 1. *p.* 70.

(q) *See Paterculus l.* 2. *c.* 101, 104, 121.

(r) *Id ib.* 127.

(ſ) *See the new Letter of the General Anſwer to* Maimbourg, *pag.* 81, &c

(t) *La Mothe le Vayer ubi infra, pag.* 194.

PATIN

“ *Tiberius*, but alſo to his Favourite *Sejanus*, whoſe Merit he twice declares, as of one of the principal and moſt vertuous Perſons in the *Roman* Republick. What did he do in this, but what commonly happens to all thoſe who will take Pen in Hand to write the Hiſtory of their own Time, and will publiſh it while the Perſons are yet alive? This Reflection is right; for it is ſcarce poſſible to be ſincere, when we ſpeak of Princes that are living, or of thoſe whoſe Sons do ſtill reign.

(D) *He wrote an Abridgment of the* Roman *Hiſtory, which is very curious.*] The beginning of it is loſt, which was a general Idea of Ancient Times. *La Mothe le Vayer* was not miſtaken in what I ſhall now ſubjoin: (a) “The remembrance of the Countries he had ſeen, while he was Military Tribune, and travelling thro' the Provinces of *Thrace, Macedonia, Achaia, Aſia the leſs*, and other more Eaſtern Countries; and eſpecially on both ſides of the *Pontus Euxinus*, furniſh'd him with very agreeable Diverſions. From hence we may judge, that if he had written that entire and large Hiſtory he promis'd ſo often, we ſhould have read an infinite number of very conſiderable things, as related by him who had been an Eye-witneſs of them, and had a hand in performing them. In that little which ſtill remains of this, wherein there is nothing repreſented but by way of Abridgment, there are many particulars obſerv'd, which are ſo much the more valuable, becauſe it is the only place where they are to be learn'd, either thro' the ſilence of other Hiſtorians, or thro' the common misfortune of loſing ſome part of their Works. The Stile of *Velleius Paterculus* is very worthy of the Age he wrote in. He is excellent chiefly when he Blames or Commends thoſe he ſpeaks of, which he does in ſuch fine Terms, and ſuch delicate Expreſſions, as are not to be found in any other Hiiſtorian or Orator. . . . We have nothing more pure in any *Latin* Author, nor more worthy of *Tiberius* or *Auguſtus*'s Times.” (b) Is it not ſtrange, that a Work ſo worthy to be carefully preſerv'd, and of which many Copies might be eaſily made, by reaſon of its brevity, ſhould be like to be loſt? 'Tis pretended that the Manuſcript of *Morbac*, from which *Rhenanus* publiſh'd the firſt Edition (c) of this Author, was the only (d) one that was in the World. Beſides, 'tis obſerv'd (e) that no ancient Author but *Priſcian*, makes mention of *Paterculus*. The Moderns have done him infinitely more juſtice; for they have publiſh'd him with Notes or Commentaries. The *French* have tranſlated him into their Language, which Mr. *Doujat* took the pains to do for the uſe of the *Dauphin* in 1679; and to make his Work a continu'd Hiſtory, he ſupply'd what was wanting in *Paterculus*. I ſay nothing in particular of the Edition of *Lipſius* at *Leyden*, in 1591; nor of that of *Schegkius* at *Franckfort*, 1602, in 12; nor of that of *Gerard Voſſius* at *Leyden*, in 1639, in 12; nor of that of *Boeclerus* at *Strasburg*, 1642, in 8vo; nor of many others. I ſhall only add, that the *Annales Velleiani* of Mr. *Dodwell*, prefix'd to the *Oxford* Edition 1693, are a piece of Learning which diſcovers a very great Skill in Antiquity.

Note, That *Paterculus* wrote this Book in the (f) 782 Year of *Rome*, in the ſixteenth Year of the (g) Empire of *Tiberius*.

(E) *He did not forget to ſpeak evil of* Germanicus.] A Learned Critick does by no means agree to this; for he maintains that this Paſſage, (h) *Quo quidem tempore ut pleraque ignave Germanicus*, is not correct, and that inſtead of *ignave* we ſhould read *gnave*. He founds his Opinion (i) upon ſuch Reaſons as appear to me ſolid; for, in ſhort, 'tis very true, that *Paterculus*, in other places, has prais'd *Germanicus*. However, his unjuſt partiality for the Paſſions of *Tiberius*, do plainly appear, by the care he takes to paſs over ſlightly the illuſtrious Actions of *Germanicus*, and even to ſuppreſs the greateſt part of them, and to impeach the Honour of *Agrippina*, and other Perſons whom the Emperor lov'd not. See how *Juſtus Lipſius* has cenſur'd him. (l) *Ex antiquis bilem etiam mihi movet Velleius Paterculus. Ælium Sejanum omnibus virtutibus accumulat, & quaſi in theatro plena manu dilaudat. O hiſtorici! at nos eum ſcimus natum & extinctum exitio generis humani. Liviam Auguſtam, poſt multas laudes, diis quam hominibus ſimiliorem fœminam concludit. Jam de Tiberio, flagitium ſit ſi uſquam aliter quam ut de Jove immortali loquatur. Hic liber & ingenuus animus qui ferat! Contrà ut Germanici Cæſaris virtutes ubique callidè diſſimulat! Ut Agrippinam, & quibus aliis infenſior Tiberius credebatur, obliquè premit! Quid multa! Non aliquid quam mancipium aulæ agit. Dices, intuta illis temporibus veritas fuit. Fateor. Sed vera ſcribere ſi non licuit, falſa non debuit. Nemo ſilentii cauſam reddit.*

(F) *Was nam'd* Cneius Velleius.] *Glandorpius*'s words are theſe: (m) *Cn. Velleius hiſtoricus, cujus Annales citantur apud Gellium, lib. 18. cap. 12. quo tempore in repub. vixerit, non comperi.* In this place of *Aulus Gellius*, of *Henry Stephens*'s Edition, it is *Cn. Vellius in Annalibus.* Here then is a fault in *Glandorpius*, that he puts *Velleius* inſtead of *Vellius*. And another is this, that he ſhould have read in *Aulus Gellius*, *Gellius* and not *Vellius*; for without doubt he cites the ſame Author here, which he had cited in chap. 12, of the eighth Book; and in chap. 21, of the thirteenth Book, under the Name of *Cn. Gellius*. *Voſſius* (n) pretends that *Glandorpius* conjectur'd, that inſtead of *Cn. Velleius*, we muſt read *Cn. Gellius*, in the twelfth Chapter of the eighteenth Book of *Aulus Gellius*; but the words of *Glandorpius*, which we have juſt now cited, do plainly ſhow, that this is falſe. If *Voſſius* had ſaid, that according to the conjecture of *Glandorpius*, the Annaliſt, *Gellius*, differs not from *Cn. Gellius*, againſt whom (o) *Cato* the Cenſor pleaded, he had been very much in the right; for *Glandorpius* (p) expreſſes himſelf thus: *Fors idem eſt annalium ſcriptor cujus librum 3. citat Gellius 13. capite 21. &* (q) 15. There is nothing there that relates to the Paſſage, where the Edition of *Henry Stephens* places *Cn. Vellius*.

(G) *I ſhall mark ſome Faults of Mr.* Moreri.] I. The Moderns, ſays he, differ whether his firſt Name was *Caius*, *Marcus*, or *Publius*. This Phraſe is not good, and may incline one to believe, that *Paterculus* was firſt known by one of theſe Names, and that afterwards he quitted it to aſſume another. This Cuſtom is very common among the Moderns: One of the *French* Warriors, of the Seventeenth Century, was known by the Name of the Count *de Bouteville*, and after that, by that of the Duke of *Luxemburg*. We ought not to entertain any ſuch thought of our Hiſtorian, either with reſpect to the Name of *Caius* or *Publius*, &c. for this kind of Names was always kept. In a word, Mr. *Moreri* ſhould have ſaid the *Prænomen* or the *Proper-name*, and not the *firſt Name*. II. He ſhould not have affirm'd, that *Paterculus was originally of* Naples; where is this to be found? *Paterculus* ſays, that (r) his *atavus* was of *Aſculum*; and that the Grandfather of this *atavus* was chief among the *Campaneſe*, (ſ) *Campanorum Principis*. Elſewhere (t) he affirms, that his Grandfather ſaw nothing above himſelf in *Campania*. Here is nothing particularly about the City of *Naples*; and I wonder that Mr. *Dodwell* (u) ſhould ſay that this City was the Native Country of the Grandfather of *Paterculus*, for this cannot be concluded from this good Old-Man's killing himſelf, becauſe he was not able to accompany *Tiberius* when he retir'd from *Naples*. Mr. *Doujat* (w) is fall'n into theſe two Faults of Mr. *Moreri*, probably as being his Tranſcriber; from whence we may gather, that the Author of a Dictionary has ſometimes the Honour to be conſulted and tranſcribed by Perſons who know more of the matter than himſelf. So little do Men love to gather together Materials, when they can find heaps of them ready at hand. III. 'Tis very true that *Paterculus* was Succeſſor to his Father (x) in the Command of the Cavalry;

---

* *Paterculus lib.* 2. *c.* 48. 103. *& paſſim alibi.*

(a) La Mothe le Vayer *in the Treatiſe of Hiſtorians, p.* 193, 194. *of the* 3*d Tome of the Edition in* 12. *What he ſays of the Travels of* Paterculus *is in ch.* 101. *of the* 2 *Book.*

(b) *Id. ib. p.* 197.

(c) *At* Baſil *in* 1520.

(d) *See the Preface of* Paterculus *printed at* Oxford *in* 1693.

(e) Dodwell *ubi ſupra n.* 30.

(f) Patercul. *l* 1. *c.* 8.

(g) *Id. l.* 2. *c.* 125.

(h) Paterculus *l.* 2. *c.* 125.

(i) *See the Notes of* Boeclerus *upon this Paſſage of* Paterculus

(k) Paterculus, *l.* 2. *c.* 115, 129.

(l) Juſtus Lipſius *l.* 4. *epiſtol. quæſt. epiſt.* 11. *pag. m.* 529. *tom.* 1.

(m) Gland. Onomaſt. *p.* 847.

(n) Voſſius *de Hiſtor. Lat. l.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 34.

(o) Aulus Gellius *l.* 14. *c.* 2.

(p) Glandorp. *ubi ſupra, pag.* 380.

(q) *'Tis not known what* Glandorpius *meant by this* 15; *but whether he underſtood it of the Book or the Chapter he is miſtaken*

(r) Paterculus *l.* 2. *c.* 16.

(ſ) *Id. ib.*

(t) *Id. ib. c.* 76. *See above, the Remark* A. *Letter* b.

(u) Dodw. *in Synopſi Chronolog. ad calcem Annal. Velleian.*

(w) Doujat *Preface to the Tranſlation of* Paterculus

(x) Miſſus cum eo (*Tiberio*) Præfectus equitum in Germaniam ſucceſſor officii patris mei. *Patercul. l.* 2. *c.* 104.

PATIN (*Guy*) Profeſſor of Phyſick, in the Royal College of *Paris*, was a Man of much Wit and Learning. See his Elogium prefix'd to his Letters, which are ſo well known to all the World, that this will excuſe me from ſpeaking of his Merit. It is enough for me to acquaint you, that you may be inform'd about it in the Preface I have mention'd. It would be too great a nicety, if any one ſhould blame the Author of this Elogium, for not giving us the Hiſtory of *Guy Patin*. This is the common way of the Writers of Elogiums, they ſeldom trouble themſelves to inform us, whence a Man is, nor how he raiſed himſelf; neither do they ſay any thing of his Actions, but when they have a plain relation to the Vertues for which they commend him. 'Tis therefore neceſſary that I ſhould tell you, that our *Patin* was born at * *Houdan* in *Bray*, three Leagues from *Beauvais* †, in 1602. He does not boaſt of his being of a good Family, but ſpeaks of it much after the ſame manner (*A*) as *Horace* does. Doubtleſs he was one that made his own Fortune, and I know, from a good Hand ||, that he was Corrector to a Preſs. 'Tis not eaſy to decide, whether it would not have been better, that his Letters ſhould have been prepar'd for the Publick (*B*) by the Author himſelf, than that they ſhould be written in a careleſs manner, for the particular uſe of thoſe to whom they are directed; but howſoever this be decided, I am ſure it will be agreed, that it was very fit they ſhould be printed: Not but that they do much hurt to the City of *Paris* (*C*), which they repreſent

valry; but this was not before he had been *Military Tribune*: He had already been (*y*) a Tribune of the Camp, which was an Office above that of mere Tribune of Soldiers. IV. He had not his Father for a Collegue in any Office. V. *Magius Celer Velleianus* was his Brother, and not his Father. VI. We find no where that he was *Lieutenant-General to* Tiberius, *in the Armies of* Germany *and* Hungary, but (*z*) in *Dalmatia*. VII. And then his Brother, who was (*aa*) abſent, could not be his Collegue.

(*A*) *He ſpeaks of his Family much after the ſame manner as* Horace.] I was the Son of a good ſort of People, *ſays he* (*a*), "whom I would not have exchang'd for thoſe that are more Rich. I have "here their Pictures before my Eyes, I call to mind "every Day their Vertue, and am very glad that "I ſaw the Innocence of their Lives, which was "admirable. Such a thing as this is not to be ſeen "in the Cities, and particularly in *Paris*. I ſee "nothing there but Vanity, Impoſture, and Cheating. God has reſerv'd us for a wicked and dangerous Age. And now let us ſee what *Horace* ſaid of his Father:

(b) Purus & inſons
(Ut me collaudem) ſi vivo, & charus amicis,
Cauſa fuit pater his, qui macro pauper agello,
Noluit in Flavi ludum me mittere magni,
. . . .
Nec timuit, ſibi ne vitio quis verteret, olim
Si præco parvas, aut (ut fuit ipſe) coactor
Mercedes ſequerer: neque ego eſſem queſtus. Ob hoc nunc
Laus illi debetur, & à me gratia major.
Nil me pœniteat ſanum patris hujus: eoque
Non, ut magna dolo factum negat eſſe ſuo pars,
Quod non ingenuos habeat claroſque parentes,
Sic me defendam: longè mea diſcrepat iſtis
Et vox & ratio. Nam ſi natura juberet
A certis annis ævum remeare peractum,
Atque alios legere ad faſtum, quoſcunque parentes
Optaret ſibi quiſque: meis contentus, honeſtos
Faſcibus & ſellis nolim mihi ſumere: demens
Judicio vulgi.

(*B*) *Whether it would not have been better, that his Letters ſhould have been prepar'd for the Publick.*] If he had written them with a deſign to publiſh them, he would have fill'd them with Learning and exact Obſervations upon the Hiſtory of Learned Men, and their Works; for he had a very good Memory, he had read much, and had an excellent Library. He would not have publiſh'd things which were not well examin'd, and as they offer'd themſelves to his Fancy: In a word, we ſhould find fewer Falſhoods in his Work; but then we ſhould not find there his natural Wit and Genius, we ſhould not meet there with ſo many curious Matters of Fact, ſo many lively and bold Strokes which divert us, and put us upon making ſolid Reflections. Some ſelect Letters were firſt publiſh'd at *Geneva* in 1683, and reprinted quickly after in *Holland*. The Sale encourag'd a Bookſeller of *Geneva* to publiſh thoſe which had been left out in the firſt Impreſſion, which he added to the former, and by that means publiſh'd a Collection in three Volumes, in 1691. It was counterfeited in *Holland* a little while after; but it had been better it had been counterfeited in *Germany*, becauſe the *German* Bookſellers have a laudable Cuſtom of adding good Tables to the Books they reprint; and never a Book had more need of them than this. It was not difficult to perceive, that every thing in them is not true. Here follows the Judgment which the Author of the *News from the Republick of Learning* gave of them: (*c*) "'Tis fit "the Reader ſhould be advertis'd, that all the witty "Sayings, or all the Stories he relates are not true. "There are ſome places wherein he ſhews a terrible "Malice and a prodigious Boldneſs, in giving a "criminal turn to all things. We ſhould be very "much to blame to believe theſe things, becauſe "they are printed. All that can be gather'd from "them is, That Mr. *Patin* wrote them to his Friend, "as a thing he had heard from others, and to continue the Cuſtom he had a long time obſerv'd, of "diverting himſelf with him by Letters as he would "have done, if they had taken a Walk together. "'Tis very well known, Men talk as ſoon of a Report "that is current thro' the City, tho' it be not true, "as of any News that is true. And when one is "of a ſatyrical Humour, as it muſt be granted "Mr. *Patin* was, that which is publiſh'd to the diſadvantage of our Neighbour is much more improv'd, than that which is ſpoken to his Praiſe. Mr. *Menage* has given the ſame Opinion of them. (*d*) *The Letters of* Guy Patin *are full of Falſhoods. Mr.* Bigot *and I have obſerv'd a great number of them. Mr.* Patin *was not very cautious in what he wrote, and prejudice made him believe a thouſand things which were not true.* See the *Journal of Leipſick* at the Month of *May* 1684. (*e*). There are ſome hopes (*f*) that we ſhall have the *Latin* Letters of *Guy Patin*, which will be accompanied with an *eloquent and learned Elogium*, written by *Mr.* Theveneau, *a Phyſician of* Nevers.

(*C*) *The City of* Paris, *which they repreſent as infected with Corruption.*] We ſhould never make an end, if we ſhould collect together all the Complaints he made upon this Subject: Let us therefore confine ourſelves to what he has obſerv'd about the wickedneſs of thoſe unchaſte Women who murder their Infants. (*g*) "a great noiſe is made here about the Death of *Mademoiſelle de Guerche*; the "Midwife had been ſecur'd in the *Châtelet*, and "thence ſhe is remov'd into the publick Jayl by order "of the Court. The Curate of S. *Euſtache* has refus'd "Burial to the Body of this Lady: 'Tis ſaid it was "carried to the Palace of *Condé*, and that it was "there put into Quick-Lime, that it might be conſum'd the ſooner, and that nothing of it may be "known, if any ſhould come to ſearch it. The Midwife did well enough defend herſelf hitherto, "but *aliæ admovebantur machinæ, aliæ artes adhibebantur ad eruendum verum*: I believe ſhe will be "put to the Torture: The Vicars-General and the "Penitentiaries are gone to complain to the firſt "Preſident, that in a Years time ſix hundred Women have confeſs'd, that they had kill'd and "ſtrangl'd their Children, and that they have taken "particular notice of it, upon the Advice that had "been given them. And now I have propos'd this Adventure, I muſt go on to ſhew the Conſequences of it. (*h*) *Here is a Libel ſpread about* (*i*) *of eight Pages in Quarto, wherein 'tis prov'd,* That the

---

* *Patin's Letter* 201 *p.* 551. *of To.* 4. *of the Geneva Edit.* 1691.

† *According to his Elogium he died 70 Years old, in* 1672.

|| *Monſieur* DRELINCOURT, *Profeſſor of Phyſick at* Leyden *inform'd me of it.*

(*y*) Functum ante tribunatu caſtrorum *Id. ib.*

(*z*) *Id. ib. c.* 115.

(*aa*) *If he had been preſent would he have ſaid only, that his Brother had the advantage of being with* Tiberius?

(*a*) Patin's *Letter* 293. *p. m.* 561. *of tom.* 2.

(*b*) *Horat. Sat.* 6. *lib.* 1. *v.* 68.

(*c*) News from the Republick of Learning, April 1684. *Art.* 1. *p. m.* 115, 116.

(*d*) Menag. *p.* 279. *of the firſt* Holl. *Edit.*

(*e*) *Pag.* 248, &c.

(*f*) *See the Preface to the Letters of* Guy Patin, *Edit.* 1691.

(*g*) Patin's *Letter* 184 *dated* June 22. 1660. *See pag.* 113. *of tom.* 2.

(*h*) *Id. Lett.* 185. *p.* 119. *of the ſame Tom.*

(*i*) *It was burnt by the Hand of the common Hangman at* la Croix du Tiroir, *by Order of the Lieutenant Civil*, Id. Lett. 190. *p.* 142, 143.

repreſent as infected with an horrible Corruption, and as fill'd with ſuch Creatures who having done all that was neceſſary to People the Earth, do afterwards all that

is

the Crime whereof Dame *Conſtantin* the Midwife was accus'd a little while ago, is nothing but a conſequence of the Doctrine of the Jeſuits, and alſo to diſabuſe thoſe Ladies, who have been perverted by this Error, under pretence that theſe Fathers teach it in their Books. *'Tis ſaid, that the Midwife defends herſelf very well, ſhe confeſſes that Madam Guerchi died at her Houſe, but that ſhe gave her no Drink, that ſhe came to her very Sick, where ſhe died, making terrible Outcries, that ſhe has heard of a certain Drink that Lady had taken, but that ſhe knew not what it was, nor who gave it her.* (k) *Dame* Conſtantin *the Midwife is ſtill in the* Châtelet, *in Priſon, and to Morrow ſhe is to be Examin'd*, N. *and* le Large *have receiv'd a Summons to come there and Anſwer, as to their Facts, and the Depoſition they have given in*, an ut ibi Paris cedat pudore carceris, & metu lethalis ſupplicii confeſſa! *'Tis ſaid ſhe defends herſelf very well, and that there is not ſufficient Proof againſt her to condemn her to Death, but ſome Monitions are expected, which ſhortly are to be publiſh'd thro' all the Pariſhes of the City and Suburbs of Paris: Others ſay, that ſhe will be ſav'd, and that ſhe is too much recommended by the greateſt Perſons. Nevertheleſs, 'tis thought that ſhe deſerves Death, and more, and that if ſhe were hang'd, ſhe wou'd not die Innocent. 'Tis ſaid, that her Houſe was a Publick Bawdy-Houſe, and that many Whores went thither, either to be brought to Bed*, vel abortum paſſuræ. . . . (l) *On* Wedneſday *the 14th of* July *Dame* Conſtantin, *the Midwife, was condemn'd at the* Châtelet, *to be Hang'd and Strangl'd, after ſhe had been put to the Torture; from whence ſhe has Appeal'd: She has been remov'd to the* Conciergerie. *'Tis thought, that the next Week the Sentence will be confirm'd at the* Tournelle. . . . (m) *The Midwife is ſtill a Priſoner, but 'tis ſaid, that it will be only for the next Week, and that the Attorney-General Appeals againſt her from her Sentence* à minima; *that he will give in hard Concluſions againſt her, that ſhe deſerves to be burnt alive, unleſs ſhe names all her Accomplices.* In fine, He informs his Friend, in a Letter (n) dated Auguſt the 16th, 1660, that the Midwife was hang'd, " *damnata fuit laqueo infelix obſtetrix & ſuffocata*, " in good Company at *la Croix du Tiroir* (o). We have now ſeen the concluſion of the Tragedy, as well with reſpect to her that brought the Lady to Bed, as to her that was brought to Bed. But let us now ſee part of the Preliminaries concerning the latter. I will not warrant all that is ſaid for true, but if any thing be falſe, the Writer, whom I cite, muſt anſwer for it. (a) " The Duke of *Joyeuſe* " courted Mademoiſelle *de Guerchi*, (b) a Companion of Mademoiſelle *de Pons*, who ſacrific'd him " quickly after to the Commander *de Jars*, of the " Houſe of *Rochechouard* . . . (c) She forſook the " Commander *de Jars*, to deliver herſelf up to " *Jeannin de Caſtile*, the King's Treaſurer, and ſhe " behav'd herſelf with ſo little Modeſty, that the " Queen baniſh'd her from the Court. Nevertheleſs, " the Duke of *Vitry* embark'd with her, and treated " her with as much reſpect as if ſhe had always " been very Chaſte, altho' ſhe had had four or five " Children by ſeveral Fathers. She was got with " Child yet once more, and the Duke would have " her brought to Bed, to preſerve her Reputation, " which he thought was not ſo far loſt as it really " was. It was in vain for her to tell him, that ſhe " would be mightily pleas'd to have this pledge of " his Friendſhip; he was fully reſolv'd, that ſhe " ſhould deſtroy this Fruit of their Amours, and " therefore ſent to her a Midwife, call'd *Conſtantin*, " whom he deſir'd to bring her to Bed by force; " but ſhe died in the operation, and the Midwife " was hang'd. The Duke of *Vitry* was inconſolable " for her Death, and had ſo great a reſpect for her " Memory, that he embark'd afterwards with a Proſtitute, becauſe ſhe reſembl'd her. This Woman " being enrich'd with his great Gifts, married afterwards the Marquis *de Goudron*, a younger Brother of the Houſe of *Gainache*. Theſe Citations do not carry me ſo far from my Subject as ſome may imagine; for they contain Proofs of the Text of this Remark, or at leaſt they confirm what *Guy Patin* has publiſh'd. Beſides, I do not trouble myſelf about being cenſur'd for making too long Citations, provided I do not diſpleaſe a good part of my Readers, by inſtructing them by halves, or giving them the trouble to ſeek out the Conſequences of things, by going from Book to Book: But howſoever this be, here follows a Citation which has a nearer relation to the Narrative of Mr. *Patin*.

Thuanus relates, That in 1557, a Law was made which condemn'd to Death, as guilty of Parricide, all thoſe Women that ſhould conceal either their big Bellies, or their Lying-in, and that ſhould not bring in Certificates concerning the ſtate in which their Child was born, if there was any proof, that it was buried without Ceremony, and without having receiv'd Baptiſm. (d) *Ea lege ſancitum, ut quæ graviditatem partumve celaſſet, neque alterutrius teſtationem aut de edito fœtu ſeu vivo ſeu mortuo* [illegible], *ſi eum lavacro juſtiſve exequiarum privatum probationibus conſtaret, de illa tanquam parricidii rea ultimum ſupplicium ſumeretur.* Since that time this Crime was puniſh'd more ſeverely, than any other; and to the end that no Perſon ſhould pretend Ignorance, the Judges cauſed it to be inſerted in the Decree of Condemnation, that the Ordinance ſhould be publiſh'd with the ſound of a Trumpet, in all Cities where there are Tribunals of Juſtice; and that the Curates ſhould publiſh it (e) in their Pulpits, on the Feſtival-Days, in all Burroughs and Villages. But notwithſtanding this Crime continu'd to be more common than all the reſt; for *Thuanus* teſtifies, That there paſt few Weeks wherein the Judges in Criminal Matters, at *Paris*, did not place one or more Women, accus'd of this Parricide, upon the Seat of the Guilty: So great is the force of Shame, that, in a timorous Sex, it prevails over the fear of a Gibbet, and the remorſe of Conſcience. (f) *In nullum crimen ab eo tempore ſeverius vindicatum fuit. At ne qua ignorantiæ excuſatio prætexeretur, ſententiis judicum ſemper additum eſt, ut lex in inferioribus tribunalibus palam & per plateas urbium publica præconis voce promulgaretur, & per oppida ac pagos à curionibus coram populo diebus feſtis recitaretur. Nihilominus nullum frequentius crimen etiam hodie eſt, nec ulla fere ſeptimana abit, quin in claſſe, quæ de judiciis capitalibus cognoſcit, una pluresve tam horrendi flagitii reæ producantur; adeo malus pudor in verecundo & impotenti ſexu ſupplicii terrorem, & quod omni corporis pœna gravius eſt, conſcientiæ morſus vincit.* It will be convenient to relate what gave occaſion to this Law: Notice had been given, that many Women, to ſhun the Infamy, kill'd their Children when they were brought to Bed, and threw them either into a River or a Bog-houſe, or buried them in ſome profane place, without initiating them into the Chriſtian Church by Baptiſm. Thoſe who were proſecuted in a Court of Juſtice for this Crime, told the Judges, that Shame did not permit them to diſcover that they were big with Child, and that, contrary to their deſire, their Children were born dead. By this means they deliver'd themſelves from Trouble, there was no proof of the contrary, and the greater part of the Judges were of Opinion, that they ſhould be put to the Torture: If they endur'd it, without confeſſing they had put a Child to Death, they were diſcharg'd from all further Puniſhment. It was therefore believ'd, that Impunity made the Wickedneſs increaſe; and therefore a moſt rigorous Law was ſollicited, which was obtain'd, and ſeverely put in execution; and yet the Evil was not cur'd. To this purpoſe let us hear *Thuanus*: (g) *Altera lex in ſpeciem ſevera, ſed qua impiis & abominandis parricidiis, quæ antea impunita, nunc etiam poſt legem conditam nimis frequentia ſunt, pœna conſtituta eſt, poſtulante Senatu promulgatur V. Non. Martias. Fœminæ, quæ viros non habebant, ubi ex furtivo complexu conceperant, malo pudore territæ utero celato ad extremum partus fere enecabant, geminato ſcelere famæ conſulere ſe exiſtimantes, & enecatos aut in ſterquilinium, ſeu profluentem abjiciebant, aut loco profano defoſſos perdebant, atque ita neceſſaria ſacri lavacri religione ac ſepulturæ honore privabant. Quod ſi quando res in judicium deduceretur, pudorem, quominus culpam confeſſæ eſſent, cauſſatæ mortuos ſe enixas dicebant, & ita deficientibus aliunde probationibus debitam inhumano ſceleri pœnam effugiebant. Nam judicum in hujuſmodi cauſis, incertæ plerumque erant & vagabantur ſententiæ, cum ad mortem alii tanti criminis reas damnarent; alii, quod ſæpius accidebat, pronioribus ad miſericordiam animis, quæſtionum violentiæ ſubjiciendas cenſerent, ut vivoſne an mortuos fœtus enixæ eſſent ex ipſarum confeſſione conſtaret; quam ſi obſtinato animo ferrent, liberæ dimittebantur* (h).

This

(k) Id. Lett. 187. pag. 131.

(l) Id. Lett. 188. dated July 15. 1660. p. 135.

(m) Id. Lett. 190. p. 144.

(n) The 194. pag. 162, of Tom. 2.

(o) I believe it is ſhe whom the Abbot de Marolles ſpeaks of in the Paſſage which ſhall be cited hereafter. Compare with this the Memoirs of Chavagnac p. m. 210.

(a) The Gallantries of the Kings of France, Tom. 2. p. 138 of the Bruſſels Edit. 1694.

(b) That is to ſay, that ſhe was Maid of Honour to the Queen Mother, Anne of Auſtria.

(c) Id. ib. p. 210.

(d) Thuan. l. 19. p. 435. ad ann. 1557.

(e) See the Remark D D, at the end.

(f) Id. ib.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) We ſhall ſhew hereafter that the uſe of Abortions is very ancient. See the Commentators of Minucius Felix, in editione Ouzeliana upon theſe words: Sunt quæ in ipſis viſceribus medicaminibus epotis, originem futuri hominis extinguant, & parricidium faciant antequam pariant.

is neceſſary to People (*D*) the *Limbus* of little Children. This will give me occaſion to ſpeak † of an Ordinance of *Henry* the Second, which was ſo rigorous, that it might hap-

A COMPARISON of the power of Conſcience with that of the Point of Honour.

This powerfully confirms ſome of the Doctrines of the Author of (*I*) the *Thoughts about Comets*; for who will dare to deny, after he has read this place of *Thuanus*, that the Idea's of the Point of Honour, are the ſtrongeſt Bank which ſtops the Torrent of Incontinence? Who will dare to maintain, generally ſpeaking, that the Laws of Religion are the moſt effectual Remedy, or as effectual as this? If Religion had more Power over Women than the Point of Honour, would there be ſo many found that ſtifle their Children? Is it not a Murder more cruel and more barbarous, than to kill a good Old Man in the corner of a Wood? Is there any Crime more enormous and more contrary to Nature, than that of thoſe wretched Mothers? They are perſwaded, that by deſtroying the Fruit of their Womb, they commit a more deteſtable Murder in the Eyes of God, than thoſe who Rob and Murder on the High-way. Thoſe of whom *Thuanus* and Mr. *Patin* ſpeak are, beſides, for the moſt part perſwaded, that they deprive their Children of Eternal Life, and that they throw them headlong into the *Limbo*, where they ſhall ſuffer for all Eternity. This Perſwaſion advances their Crime to ſuch a degree of Cruelty as is not imaginable: Nevertheleſs they commit it in contempt of God, and in ſpite of their Religion, and all this becauſe they will not loſe their ſhare in Human Honour; and therefore this Honour muſt have more power over them, than the inſtinct of Conſcience and all Human Laws: Nay, it has even greater power than the fear of Death; for after that ſevere Law mention'd by *Thuanus*, they expos'd themſelves to the danger of Death, and it was very probable that they ſhould be puniſh'd with it; and yet this Law, tho' it were often put in execution, ſerv'd for nothing, for theſe Murders were ſtill as frequent as ever. What can be ſaid more convincing to prove the dominion of Honour, and the abſolute Power it has over our Souls? Can it be deny'd, that it wou'd be capable of confining Uncleanneſs within thoſe Bounds which we now ſee it to have? 'Tis none of its buſineſs to hinder ſecret Crimes; this belongs to Conſcience: But when thoſe ſecret Crimes draw after them ſuch Conſequences as can hardly eſcape the Eyes of the Publick, it is of great force to prevent them. Such is the Incontinence of one of the Female Sex, who is unmarried. 'Tis in vain to ſay, that the Art of Abortion is not far from its Perfection; and that if you except the Art of curing Venereal Diſtempers, there is none which an unhappy Induſtry, occaſion'd by the Wants of an infinite number of People, has improv'd more than this; for it cannot be deny'd, but that the Conſequences which I have mention'd, can very hardly be avoided. How many Women are there, who after a thouſand anxious Thoughts, and a thouſand Inconveniencies, and after they have taken many Drugs, yet could not hinder but their Fault ſhould be known? The Murder does not always conceal it; it becomes, ſometimes, more infamous and diſmal by the Death wherewith it is puniſh'd: Upon which account, if a violent Paſſion, and a furious Tranſport of the Temper do not wholly take away the uſe of Reaſon, theſe Women will have a care of expoſing themſelves to ſuch inconvenient and dangerous Conſequences as theſe. From whence we may conclude, That ſince *Thuanus* and Mr. *Patin* declare, that a great number of ſuch Perſons break through this Barrier, they muſt needs (*a*) be violently Tormented. Obſerve, That they ſpeak only of thoſe who kill the Fruit of their Womb. If the Confeſſors would give in a Liſt of thoſe who uſe precaution betimes, and before the Soul be arriv'd, their number would not be confin'd to ſix hundred in a Year, in ſuch a City as *Paris* is, a City, as unprejudic'd Travellers ſay, leſs impure than the greateſt part of the Capital Cities in the Weſt. Beſides, theſe over-haſten'd or preventive Abortions are really Murders, according to the beſt Caſuiſts. Read the Paſſage of *Tertullian*, (*b*) which I have put in the Margin, which *Guy Patin* ſhow'd to the Lieutenant Criminal, when he made the Proceſs againſt the Midwife.

I remember I have ſometimes heard this Queſtion put, Whether or no to ſpare ſo many Crimes to ſuch Women as have not the Gift of Continence, and to ſave ſo many Subjects to the Republick, of which it is otherwiſe depriv'd, it would not be neceſſary to weaken a little the Empire of the Point of Honour, *i. e.* to diminiſh notably the Diſgrace of a Woman unmarried who gets Children; for it is obſerv'd, that in Countries which are leſs nice about this Affair, and where ſuch Perſons do eaſily find the means of Marrying, and appear bare-fac'd in Company, that theſe Abortions are much more rare, and the Judges are leſs employ'd in puniſhing thoſe who murder their Children. A grave Man anſwer'd, and prov'd by very good Reaſons, that the Remedy would be worſe than the Diſeaſe, and that there is nothing which the Republick ought to maintain with greater Care, than this fear of Diſgrace, when it is join'd to Criminal Actions, as in the preſent caſe. For this reaſon, ſaid he, Magiſtrates ought to be extreamly ſparing in inflicting a Note of Infamy, becauſe one that is made Infamous loſes the Rein which reſtrain'd him, and Infamy is leſs fear'd when we ſee it made uſe of every Day. (*c*) *Da principio ſi hanno in grande horrore gli infami, mentre ſi veggono miſti tra gli altri Cittadini: ma con l'aſſuefarſi à tolerarli, pare, che ſi di giorno in giorno ſi alleggeriſca la macchia, che quaſi al fine ſvaniſca in tutto. Così vienſi à poco à poco à porre in uſo nella Città il traſcurare l'infamia, errore d'ogni altro più grave, e più pericoloſo per il viver Civile. Però ſtimo io bene l'andar lento à dichiarar publicamente infami i rei, quando la nota, con cui ſi ſegnano, non ſia perpetua per terrore degli altri. Perche, ſe ben l'infamia naſce propriamente dalla operatione, di chi commette il misfatto; nondimeno non bene manifeſta da tutti ſi diſcerne, finche publica dichiaratione non vi ſi aggiunga.* But ſince I have ſaid ſo much, I beg leave to add a word or two more. Would you plainly ſee, that the force of the Point of Honour is ſuperior to that of Conſcience, conſider one of the ſix hundred Women who had deſtroy'd their Children. Religion diſſwaded them from it by many Motives: It ſhow'd them the Murder, the eternal Damnation of the Infant, the injuſtice of their Intention, and the good uſe they ſhould make of their Sin. They deſir'd to preſerve the Reputation of Women of Honour; this deſign was unjuſt, a robbery, a meer Uſurpation of that which did not belong to them: nay, it was an uſurpation deſign'd for a very bad uſe, for deceiving the Publick in general, and a Husband in particular; for they wiſh'd they were in a condition to beſtow themſelves upon a Man, as a Chaſte and Modeſt Maid, and without any defect. The advantage they might reap from diſcovering their Fault was great, with reſpect to their Salvation; from thence they might draw a thouſand Reaſons of Humility and Contrition. The Point of Honour no ſooner appear'd, but it overturn'd all this great number of Batteries: Muſt it not therefore be acknowledg'd, that it is a thouſand times more powerful than Conſcience. The *Italian* Author is here alſo for me. (*d*) *Però ſi doverà à giudicio mio aſſerire, che aſſolutamente la Religione ſia più atta à render gli huomini giuſti, & innocenti: ma che all' incontro per lo riſpetto degli intereſſi, e per la ripugnanza degli affetti, i quali quaſi venti contrarii, turbano il mare della vita civile, più operi per la felicità Morale il zelo dell' Honore. Perche gli huomini ſono più facili à moverſi à bene operare per lo premio dell' Honore, & à guardarſi dal mal fare per la macchia della infamia, che ſi veggono innanzi à gli occhi, che per le promeſſe di premii, ò pur di caſtighi futuri, e lontani.*

(*D*) *To People the* Limbus Infantium.] There is ſcarce any need of a Commentary, after what we have ſaid; nevertheleſs I will add a Paſſage of Mr. *Drelincourt*. *It ſeems*, ſays he, (*e*) *ſpeaking of the Miſſionaries, that ſame Maſters of your Schools have really deſcended into the Bowels of the Earth, and exactly diſcover'd and viſited all the ſecret places there. Their moſt common Opinion is,* (1) *That there are under the Earth four different places, or one deep place divided into four parts: They ſay that the loweſt place is Hell, where all the Souls of the damn'd, and where their Bodies ſhall alſo be after their Reſurrection, and there alſo the Devils are to be ſhut up. That the place next to Hell is Purgatory, or the place where Souls are purg'd; but rather, where they ſatisfy Divine Juſtice by their Sufferings. They ſay, that in theſe two places there is the ſame Fire, and an equal Heat, and that all the difference is only in reſpect of Duration. They think that adjoining to Purgatory there is the* Limbus

of

---

† *See the Remark C.*

(*I*) *See the Articles 152, 154 of the Thoughts about Comets.*

(*a*) *See the* Thoughts about Comets. *ubi ſupra.*

(*b*) Nobis vero homicidio ſemel interdicto, etiam conceptum utero dum adhuc ſanguis in hominem delibatur, diſſolvere non licet: homicidii feſtinatio eſt prohibere naſci, nec refert natam quis eripiat animam, an naſcentem diſturbet: homo eſt & qui eſt futurus; etiam fructus omnis jam in ſemine eſt. *Tertull. in Apologet.* c. 9. Patin *Letter* 188 p. 137. *cites him. What he cites p.*144 *out of the ſame* Tertullian de anima *cap.* 25. *is not to the purpoſe.*

(*c*) *Lodovico Zuccolo, Academico Filopono di Faenza, diſcorſo dell' honore, capitolo 22. p.112. edit. Venetia 1623.*

(*d*) *Id. ib. Capitolo* 20. *p.* 105.

(*e*) Drelincourt's *Dialogue about the deſcent of Christ into Hell, p.*309 *Edit.* 1664.

(1) *See Cardinal* Bellarmin *in his Treatiſe of* Purgatory.

happen that a Woman shou'd suffer Death by vertue thereof, tho' she was not guilty of murdering her Child. We will produce upon this occasion the Observation of a (DΔ) famous Civilian, and relate a Passage of *Henry Stephens*, which informs us, among (DΔΔ) many other things, that none but Servant-Maids were put to Death

of little Children who die without the Sacrament; and that the fourth place is the Limbus of the Fathers, i.e. the place where the Souls of the Just are gather'd together, who died before the Death of our Lord Jesus Christ. They maintain that this place is empty at present; so that there is one House to Let. According to this Doctrine, the *Limbus* of little Children is become the Porch of Hell since the Ascension of JESUS CHRIST, for the *Limbus* of the Fathers must go for nothing after that time. Here we might put the same Question which formerly the Cynick Philosopher ask'd, when he saw (f) the Entry of a little House, *where's the House of this Gate!* because the Entry of it was so very great. The Frontiers of Hell must needs be of larger extent than all the Kingdom, which is very monstrous. Let us put together all the Infants who lose their Lives without having receiv'd Baptism, either because they died after their Birth, or because they perish'd by a voluntary or involuntary Miscarriage, and doubtless you will have the two thirds of Mankind. The number of Abortions would be astonishing, if they were certainly known, altho' we should only reckon the Victims of the Point of Honour, those of (g) Jealousy, and those of (h) effeminate softness. All Times have concern'd themselves about this Crime, in all parts of the Earth, as might be easily prov'd; but I shall only produce two Testimonies. Consider the words of *Juvenal*, (i) *Cum tot abortivis fœcundam Julia vulvam Solveret.* And elsewhere,

Sunt (k) quæ eunuchi imbelles, ac mollia semper
Oscula delectent, & desperatio barbæ,
Et quod abortivo non est opus.

Ovid exclaim'd against this Crime before *Juvenal*, and he also represented the danger to which they are expos'd who commit it.

Quid (l) juvat immunes belli cessare puellas,
Nec fera peltatas agmina velle sequi,
Si sine Marte suis patiuntur vulnera telis,
Et cæcas armant in sua fata manus?
. . . .
. . . .
Hoc neque in Armeniis tigres fecere latebris:
Perdere nec fœtus ausa leæna suos.
At teneræ faciunt, sed non impune, puellæ.
Sæpe, suos utero quæ necat, ipsa perit.
Ipsa perit, ferturque toro resoluta capillos:
Et clamant, Meritò, *qui modocunque vident.*

You may see some other Passages of this Poet in the Remark DΔΔ. This furnishes me with new Proofs of the Power of the Point of Honour. The means which were us'd at that time to kill the Infant were dangerous to the Mother; they destroy'd many times the Life of both; and nevertheless the Young-Women chose rather to run the hazard of Death than of Defamation: And even to this Day, those who wait too long perish sometimes under the Remedy; witness the Lady *Guerchi*. Note, That those who preserve the Child are deliver'd without any crying, unless it be in such a place where they are in no fear of being defam'd by the discovery of the Mystery: And this is a new proof of the inconceivable Power of the Point of Honour; for it suppresses the effects of the sharpest Pain in a tender Sex, which Sighs, Mourns and Cries for the least thing.

It was said one Day to a Missionary, You cannot say of the *Limbus* what the Poets say of Hell, that it is a little House, (m) *Domus exilis Plutonia.* There needs not much place, answer'd he, for Embryos. But, reply'd the other, how many Children four or five Years old, go to the *Limbus?* and besides, Do you not know, that Embryos and all Children shall rise perfect Men. Well, answer'd he, do not trouble yourself about it, the World is big enough.

There are some People who think that *Virgil*, who own'd a *Limbus*, should have divided it into two Parts; one for the Children that die before they are born, the other for those that die in the Cradle. The great number of the former deserved very well a particular Class, say these People. Whence comes it then, that this great Poet says nothing of those poor Creatures?

Continuo (c) auditæ voces, vagitus & ingens,
Infantumque animæ flentes in limine primo,
Quos dulcis vitæ exortes, & ab ubere raptos
Abstulit atra dies, & funere mersit acerbo.

(DΔ) *The observation of a famous Civilian.*] He says, That the benefit of Laws ought not to be suspended, upon pretence of some Inconveniences that they produce; and upon this occasion he relates what *Cato* said, That there is no Law that is convenient to all private Persons. *Bodin's* words are these: (b) "I confess it would be better to absolve "the Guilty, than to condemn the Innocent, but "then I say, that he who is Convicted by strong "Presumptions, is not Innocent; as he who was "found with a bloody Sword near the murder'd "Person, when there was none other but he, and "the Conjectures we have remark'd. Wherefore "King *Henry* the Second made an Edict in this Kingdom that was very useful, which was publish'd "and register'd the fourth of *March* 1556, (c) "wherein he ordains, That a Woman shall be reputed to have kill'd her Child, and be punish'd "with Death, if she conceal'd her big Belly and "her Delivery, and if her Child died without Baptism, and she could produce no Testimony of the "one or the other; neither shall they be believ'd "who say, that the Child was born Dead: Which "has since been put in practice by several Sentences. ". . . And, nevertheless, 'tis possible, that a Woman, to save her Honour, will conceal her big "Belly and her Delivery, and that the Infant which "she would willingly have maintain'd, may die in "the Delivery: But forasmuch as under pretence, "that the Child was born dead, many Murders were "committed, it was wisely determin'd, that such a "presumption is sufficient to proceed to the Punishment of Death, to revenge the Innocent Blood. "For we must not, for an Inconvenience which does "not often happen, suspend the execution of a "good Law, (1) and for this cause I was of Opinion, that a Woman who lived near *Soissons*, should "be condemn'd to Death, having conceal'd her "big Belly and her Delivery, and buried her Child "in a Garden in the Month of *March* 1578. I know the Author of the *Dutch Gazette* of *Haerlem*, hath publish'd, in the Article from *Paris*, not very (d) long ago, That orders were given, that this Edict of *Henry* the Second, should be restor'd to its former Vigour, and read on the Festival-Days in all the Parish-Churches. I know not whether any other Gazetteers made mention of it; but I do not remember that I found this News either in the *Mercure-Politique*, or in the *Historical Letters*. Nevertheless it might have furnish'd many Reflections.

(DΔΔ) *A Passage of* Henry Stephens, *which informs us, among many other things.*] Because those other things may serve for a Confirmation and Supplement to the preceding Remarks, I shall not only relate what concerns the impunity of Persons of Quality, but shall also join with them many Facts and Notes which this Author sets down, before he tells us, that respect of Persons did take place in the execution of the Ordinance of *Henry* the Second. The Time wherein he wrote shows plainly enough, that he had in his view the Punishments which follow'd after this Ordinance. *As to Women Murderers of their Children,* says he, (e) . . . "the number of 'em is great, as well "those who murder them assoon as they come into "the World, as of those who exercise the same "Cruelty upon them, even before they are born. "And first, As to the latter, 'tis certain, their "Wickedness is very ancient; for we find the *Greek* "Poet *Phocylides* expresly warning the Women to "take heed, that they do not commit such Acts. "And *Ovid*, a Pagan as well as he, upbraids a Woman mightily for it, and adds many fine Remonstrances against her. Likewise we find that *Hippocrates*, among other things he swore to observe, "places this, That he would never present to Women that whereby they might destroy the Fruit of "their Womb. This Wickedness is practis'd for two "Reasons; by some, for fear they should be known "to be Women, instead of Maids, or generally lest "they shou'd be discover'd to have done that which "it

---

(f) Diogenes Laertius *l. 6. n. 57. relates it otherwise.* Myndum profectus (*Diogenes Cynicus*) cum videret magnificas portas & urbem modicam, Viri, inquit, Myndii portas claudite, ne urbs vestra egrediatur.

(g) *In the Countries where Polygamy is allow'd, the Wives of one and the same Husband play a thousand Tricks to hinder the fruitfulness of one another.*

(h) i. e. *There are some married Women who to preserve their good Complexion, or to save expences, destroy their Children. 'Tis pretended that certain Casuists lend them a helping hand.*

(i) *Juven. Sat.* 2. v. 32.

(k) *Id. Sat.* 6. v. 364. *See also* v. 593.

(l) *Ovidius Amorum l.* 2. *Eleg.* 14.

(m) *Horat. od.* 4. *lib.* 1.

(c) Virgil. Æneid. l. 6. v. 4[illegible]

(b) *Demonomanie des Sorciers, l. 4. c. 5. p. m.* 447, 448.

(c) *Beginning the Year after* Easter.

(1) *L.* 2 *&* 4. *de legibus ff.* 9. Sic Cato diebat nullam legem satis commodam omnibus esse.

(d) *I believe it was in the Year* 1698.

(e) Henry Stephens's *Apology of* Herodotus *B.* 1. *c.* 18. *p.* 223, &c. Antwerp *Edition*, 1568. 8vo.

Death upon Account of that rigorous Law. Thoſe two Letters ſhow particularly

“ it was not lawful for them to do, whether they be married Women or Widows; by others, for fear they ſhould ſhorten the time of their Youth (f), and particularly for fear of what *Ovid* ſays,

Scilicet ut careat rugarum crimine venter,
Sternetur pugnæ triſtis arena tuæ?

“ And as to what I have ſaid concerning the ſhortening of the time of Youth, the ſame Poet alſo teſtifies it, ſaying, *Adde quod & partus faciunt breviora Juventæ Tempora.* And without his Teſtimony we ſee the experience of it every Day before our Eyes. I have heard alſo of ſome Ladies, nay, I have known ſome who made no ſcruple to wear Busks, at the expence of the Child that was in their Womb, and that they might not loſe the Honour of having genteel Shapes, they made no Conſcience of deſtroying that which ſhould be as dear to them as their Life. For I ſpeak of thoſe very Perſons who were with Child by thoſe only who ſhould get them with Child. As for thoſe who are murderers of their Children as ſoon as they are born, throwing them, or cauſing them to be thrown away, ſome Years ago, the Monaſteries of Nuns might have furniſh'd us with a great many Examples of them, (as well as of thoſe who murder them in their Womb) even in the time of *Pontanus*, witneſs what he ſays, *Quod quidem execrationis genus maximè ſacerdotes attingit, quæ Deo virginitatem quum voverint, pollutis tamen votis, rituque ſacerdotali perjuranter atque inceſte contaminato, gravidæ factæ, ne ſcelus pateat, execrabiliori conantur ſcelere idipſum prohibere ac corrigere: dum aut medicaminibus adhibitis abortionem procurant, aut partum ſtatim ipſum exanimant, terræque aut cloacæ clàm infodiunt.* When, I ſay, that a great number of 'em might have been found ſome Years ago, I do not mean that it would be difficult to find ſome at this very day, if any one had occaſion for them, but that the number of them was then greater than at preſent; as well becauſe the number of Nuns was then greater, as becauſe they were more afraid of being diſgrac'd, and even of receiving Correction, if they were Convicted of having play'd the Harlot, than they are at preſent, when their Fathers Confeſſors (h) are not ſo very ſevere; but, on the contrary, they themſelves, upon occaſion, would be forward enough to have a touch. Beſides, they ſee many who were Nuns before, as they are now, married (i) publickly, and well eſteem'd of; which makes them look a little better to their Conſciences, than to attempt ſuch Murders. But it muſt be confeſs'd, that this Wickedneſs extends far beyond the Cloyſters, even to thoſe unmarried Maids that live with their Fathers and Mothers, or are under the Inſpection of their Relations, and even to thoſe of a good Family; nay, it extends to many Women that are Widows. This is what the abovesaid *Pontanus* has not conceal'd concerning thoſe of his time; for he adds, to what I have alledg'd already from him, *Nec verò monſtroſa hac feritate ſacerdotes tantùm, verumetiam viduæ ac nubiles puellæ ſplendidiſſimaque etiam fœdantur familiæ.* Servant-Maids have alſo plaid that Trick very often, and 'tis to them commonly, and not to others, that the Judges addreſs themſelves, according to the Proverb above-mention'd out of *Juvenal*, *Dat veniam corvis, vexat cenſura columbas.* For I have very often ſeen Servant-Maids hang'd at *Paris* for this Crime, but no Perſons of Quality; and particularly I remember I ſaw in the Schools of Phyſick, the Anatomy of a Servant-Maid, who had been hang'd for this Fact, *viz.* for throwing her Child into the Houſe of Office. . . . (a) None can be better acquainted with ſuch Secrets than the Midwives; were it not the Cuſtom, at this day, to go and fetch them into their Houſes, and after they have blindfolded them, to carry them to the Houſe where the Woman is that wants their help, who is then Mask'd, or otherwiſe blinded, for fear of being known by them, whoſe Eyes muſt needs be then uncovered. . . . (k) 'Tis true that many Ladies now have no need to proceed ſo far, by reaſon of the Preſervatives they uſe, to keep themſelves from being with Child. There are ſome Faults in this Paſſage of the Apology of *Herodotus*, as will appear, if any one will take the Pains to read my Marginal Obſervations: And this alone may ſerve for an excuſe for my relating it at ſo great length.

The firſt Paſſage of *Ovid*, which *Henry Stephens* has cited, is in the 14th Elegy of the ſecond Book *de Amoribus*, and diſcovers to us, that a thing was commonly known at *Rome* in that Age, which an old Apothecary, who had read many Books of Chirurgery and Phyſick, confeſs'd to me he did not know, before he ſaw a new Book which I lent him. He told me, when he reſtor'd it, that he had, by it, learn'd two Obſervations very curious, which he had never heard of before, and which concern the Signs by which one may know whether a Woman has had any Children. Mr. *Lamy*, a Phyſician of the Faculty of *Paris*, is the Author of the Book abovemention'd; and he gives the following Account: (d) “ This Woman (e) had had Children, and before we open'd her, and without ſuſpecting any thing of what we found, we knew it by certain Signs. Mrs. *la Marche*, chief Midwife of the *Hôtel-Dieu* was there preſent: She had a ſingular Capacity in her Profeſſion, and much Wit and Diſcretion in all things. I ask'd her Opinion about many Queſtions concerning the Signs of Virginity; I deſir'd to know how ſhe knew, at firſt, that this Woman, whom we were now to open, had had Children. She made me obſerve the Folds of the Belly: And when I reply'd to her, that theſe might be occaſion'd, either becauſe ſhe had been Hydropical, or becauſe her Belly might be ſwell'd from other Cauſes than her being big with Child, and that theſe Folds might remain. To convince me, ſhe ſhow'd me, and all the Company, what the Midwives call, among themſelves, the rending of the *Fourchete*, which is the tearing of the Entry of the external Orifice towards the *anus*, which is always made at the Birth of the firſt Child, which conſequently is an undoubted Sign of the Delivery which preceded. Of theſe two Signs of Delivery, the firſt is incomparably more terrible than the ſecond, to one that is betrothed to a Man, and who paſſes for a Maid; for ſhe has good reaſon to hope, that her Spouſe will not know the ſecond, and to fear that he will know the other. And by this we underſtand the Verſe of *Ovid*, much better than by the Commentators; and we plainly know why the *Roman* Maids expos'd themſelves to ſuch a dreadful danger, *viz.* that they might ſhun *rugarum crimen*, that the Wrinkles of the Skin of their Belly might not diſcover their Crime. Theſe Wrinkles therefore were much more to be fear'd, than the Wrinkles of the Face; and there is no doubt but the Conſequences of them are commonly known in our Age, as well as in that of *Auguſtus*; and that this does create great trouble, even to ſuch Perſons as have been reliev'd by (f) *Lucina* with the greateſt Secrecy imaginable. Their Invocations conceiv'd according to the Form of Prayer which was addreſs'd to (g) *Laverna*,

Labra (h) movet, metuens audiri: Pulchra Laverna,
Da mihi fallere, da juſtum ſanctumque videri:
Noctem peccatis & fraudibus objicere nubem.

Their Invocations, I ſay, being fully heard, according to the deſign of that Form, do not free their Minds from fear upon the approach of a new Huſband, who does not expect to find out Wrinkles or Folds, and from thence it comes to paſs, that they have recourſe to Drugs as ſoon as poſſible. *Henry Stephens* did rightly obſerve, that in his time (i) *many Ladies had many Preſervatives to keep themſelves from being with Child.* Ancient *Greece* and ancient *Rome* were but Novices in this wicked Art, in compariſon of the Sixteenth Century; and 'tis pretended that the Seventeenth Century does even exceed the preceding; and yet they have practis'd the groſſeſt and moſt dangerous ways mention'd by *Ovid*. Read the Abbot *de Marolles*, upon this Paſſage of *Ovid* (k): *Veſtra quid effoditis ſubjectis viſcera telis?* Why do you pierce your Entrails with little Darts? “ 'Tis a ſtrange thing, ſays he, (l) that ſo damnable an

---

(f) *Note that here* H. Steph. *commits a groſs fault, for he applies theſe two Verſes of* Ovid *to Mothers who murder their Children for other Reaſons than that of covering the Crime. See in the ſequel of this Remark, that the fear* rugarum ventris *is not the fear of ſpoiling any bodily Beauty, but the fear of having convincing Signs of a preceding big Belly.*

(h) H. Stephens *is miſtaken here, for in his time the corruption of the Monaſteries, and the connivance of the Confeſſors, were leſs than in former times, the Reproaches of the Proteſtants having ſtir'd them up to ſome ſort of ſhame and watchfulneſs.*

(i) *I do not underſtand this place of* H. Stephens, *for either he ſpeaks of the Nuns which became Proteſtants, or of thoſe whom the Pope permitted to marry; and nothing of all this ſeems proper to move a Nun that is big-belly'd to ſave her Child: to declare herſelf big-bellied is not the way to obtain of the Pope a diſpenſation of her Vows.*

(a) *Henry Stephens, ib.* p. 225.

(k) [illegible]

(d) *Lamy's Diſſertation againſt the new Opinion, that all Animals are engender'd of an Egg, pag.* 214, *&c. This Diſſertation was publiſh'd with ſome other Treatiſes of the ſame Authors at* Paris 1678 *in* 12o.

(e) *i. e. A Woman who was Anatomiz'd.*

(f) *The Goddeſs who preſideth over Child-bearing.*

(g) *The Goddeſs who was the Patroneſs of Thefts, and ſuch Enterpriſes as People would have conceal'd.*

(h) *Horat. Epiſt.* 16. *l.* 1. *v.* 60.

(i) H. Stephens *ubi ſupra* p. 225.

(k) *Ovid. Eleg.* 14. *l.* 2. *Amorum*, v. 27.

(l) *Abbot* de Marolles *Remarks upon the* 2d *Book of* Ovid *de Amoribus*, p. 269, 270. *This Book was Printed in* 1661.

fairly, that the Author's Creed was (E) very short, and that he had a great tenderness for his Children. This is sufficient to refute the (F) extravagant Imposture which a *German* Writer has publish'd. 'Tis observ'd, that *Guy Patin* (G) resembl'd *Cicero*. He died in 1672, and left a Son, who became (H) very Famous, and who excell'd in the knowledge of Medals. He had lost his eldest Son, for whom he had obtain'd, in 1667, the Reversion of his Professorship, and who had

" Invention should have been put in practice, so " long ago, and that it shou'd be renew'd in our " time. A wicked Woman being convicted of this " abominable Crime, after she had kill'd the Mo-" ther, thinking only to kill the Child in her " Belly, was punish'd exemplarily at *Paris*, in " the same Year that I wrote this Book. How ingenious soever the Passions be which are kept up by the Point of Honour, the danger is great, even at this day, for a Maid or a Widow, who grants the last favour to a Gallant; for oftentimes the Preservatives fall short of their end, the ninth Month comes upon their backs, and there's the Devil on't, that Scene is more troublesome than all the rest. For a Testimony to this I cite these Verses of Madam *des Houlieres*.

(m) A BALLAD to Mademoiselle D***

Now is the time to give you Advice,
As to the dangers to which Beauty exposes you.
A Maid resembles this pretty Rose-bud,
Which in a few Days becomes full blown.
While it is a Bud People covet to enjoy it,
And every one that sees it desires to snatch it.
But after the Sun has fully spen'd it,
It is no more esteem'd, one Morning ruines it,
Then of the Rose the Thorn alone is thine.
Thus when a Lover (for the Instance is very parallel)
Discovers the desires which Modesty opposes,
Unless they be shun'd, Love is the Sun
By which, no doubt, the Flower is disclos'd.
Then, in a short time, all the Transports and Cares,
For which the simple Maid was proud of her self,
Do vanish away, and no longer dazle the Eyes.
Contempt succeeds to Love, which declines.
Then, of the Rose, the Thorn alone is thine.
Now Sleep is quite taken away;
And if at some time there's a moment's repose,
A terrible Dream makes you wake in a fright:
Then a hundred and a hundred times the Cause is curs'd.
You would gladly hide, in the Bowels of the Earth,
The tender Secret, which you fear some Traytor
Will spread abroad to make the World rejoice:
Tho' you speak low, you think some can Divine.
Then of the Rose the Thorn alone is thine.

The MESSAGE.

Compleat Gallants, Soothers of the Fair Sex,
'Tis in vain for me to preach, that 'tis dangerous to
listen to you,
Every Maid is to Coquetry inclin'd,
I could sooner spin unhatchel'd Hemp,
Than make Women approve my Doctrine.
But when with a low Voice thou must call on Lucina,
Then of the Rose the Thorn alone is thine.

(E) *The Author's Creed was very short.*] Let us set down these words of his *Elogium*: (n) " He deliver'd himself with the indifference of " a Stoick, yet his words were nipping; therein " he out-did *Rabelais*. It was said he wrote Com-" mentaries upon this Author, and that he un-" derstood him perfectly; which was the reason " why he was accus'd of being a little inclin'd to " Libertinism. The truth is, he could not endure " Bigotry, Superstition and Hypocrisy; but he had " an upright Soul, and an Heart well dispos'd: He " was passionately affected for his Friends, affable " and courteous to all the World, and particularly " towards Strangers and Learned Men. Take notice, that in answer to the accusation of Libertinism, the Author of the *Elogium* does not say, that Dr. *Patin* was at the bottom well perswaded of the Christian Orthodoxy; but he only assures us, that he hated Superstition, and that he was an honest Man. See the *News* (o) *from the Republick of Learning*. This is not the Answer that was made in behalf of the Prince of *Condé*; for in opposition to Fame, they publish'd the Declaration he made at his Death, (p) *I never doubted of the Mysteries of Religion, tho' it has been said so; but I doubt less of them now than ever.* It may perhaps be said, that the Booksellers of *Geneva* have inserted into *Patin's* Book all that they thought fit; but this Thought is ridiculous.

(F) *The extravagant Imposture which a German Writer has publish'd.*] His name is *Aetius*: He publish'd, in a *Letter about Antimony, which is join'd to a Treatise de Arboribus coniferis at Jena in 1672*, that Dr. *Patin would have poyson'd his own Son with Antimony, which he believ'd to be a Poyson, but that happily, contrary to his expectation, it cur'd him* (a). *Charles Patin* having complain'd of this Calumny to the Faculty of Physick at *Jena*, obtain'd all the satisfaction he could pretend to; for the Faculty ordain'd *Aetius* the Physician to make a publick Recantation: *Saluberrima Facultas illum* (b) *παλινῳδίαν cantare coegit, quam suppressa calumnia typis mandatam ad me transmisit*, 'tis *Charles Patin* (c) who speaks, *his verbis*: Editioni Tractatus hujus de arboribus, Benevole lector, subjunxeram Epistolam de Antimonio, cui relationem de Illustrissimo Guidone Patino inserueram: Quia autem certo comperi illam falsam, & ab ipsius malevolis sine dubio effictam esse, Epistolam rursus imprimi curavi, fabulam expunxi, & Manibus celeberrimi illius viri injuriam factam esse aperte profiteor.

(G) *That* Guy Patin *resembled* Cicero.] " The late " Mr. *Huguetan*, Advocate of *Lyons*, who knew him " particularly, found that he had the Air of *Cicero*, " whose Statue is to be seen at *Rome*. Which brings to my mind what some say, that the Chancellor *de l' Hospital* resembled *Aristotle*: (e) *Specie fuit augusta, vultu gravi & tranquillo, qui ut ex veteri numismate apparuit Aristotelis faciem plane referret.*

(H) *A Son who became very famous.*] He was call'd *Charles* PATIN, and was born at *Paris*, *Febr.* 23. 1633. He made such wonderful progress, that he maintain'd *Greek* and *Latin Theses* about all parts of Philosophy in 1647. His Professor, (f) who was an *Irish*-Man, and did not understand the *Greek* Tongue, was very angry at these *Theses*, when he was desir'd to examine them; but seeing the Young-Man was ready to defend them without a Moderator, he was forc'd to preside at the Disputation, lest he should prostitute his Reputation. The Pope's Nuncio, thirty four Bishops, and many Persons of Quality, of the Court and City, were present at these *Theses*: The Respondent stood the shock for the space of five Hours, in both Languages, and was with great Glory admitted to his Degree of Master of Arts. He studied the Civil Law in complaisance to his Uncle by the Mother's side, who was an Advocate in the Parliament: He took his License at *Poitiers*, after sixteen Months, and was admitted Advocate in the Parliament of *Paris*. He spent six Years in this Study, but he could not forsake that of Physick, to which his Inclination always led him. It was not therefore difficult for him to suit himself to his Father's Will, which was, that he should give over the Law, and devote himself to the Profession of Physick. He relish'd, without difficulty, the good Reasons that were alledg'd to him, which were confirm'd to him by the Testimony of *Marescot*. That famous Physician confess'd himself indebted to his Profession for three things, which he could never have obtain'd by the Priesthood, for which his Father design'd him: He had enjoy'd a perfect Health until the Age of Eighty Two Years, and he had gain'd a Hundred Thousand Crowns, and the intimate Friendship of many illustrious Persons. (g) *Artem disceres doceresque non Magistratibus tantum sed Regibus ipsis & Imperatoribus leges præscribentem: Sapientissimos tandem quosque ab ore tuo pendentes, tuoque submissos arbitrio cerneres. Recorderis, mi Stoice* (sic quippe ob nescio quam ἀπάθειαν me compellare solebat) *Marescottum nostrum tria se sacræ arti nostræ debere professum, quibus caruisset, si propositum à Parentibus sacerdotium suscepisset, sanitatem athleticam ætatis anno LXXXII. centum aureorum millia, atque intimam innumerorum illustrium amicitiam.* Assoon as *Charles Patin* was admitted Dr. of Physick, he addicted himself to Practice, and had a great one. He read Lectures of Physick, in the room of Professor *Loper*, who went to *Bourdeaux*. Fearing to be Imprison'd if he should continue longer in *France*, he intended to retire into *Holland*: (h) *Excedere Patria consultius fuit, quam libertatis discrimen subire.* But the Privateers of *Ostend*

(m) *Poems of Madam* des Houlieres, *pag.* 144, 145. *Edition of* Amsterd. 1694.

(n) *Advertisement to the Reader before the Letters of* Guy Patin, *fol.* * 6. *verso.*

(o) *The Month of* Apr. 1684. *Art.* 1. *pag.* 116, 117. *See also the Journ. of* Leipsic, 1684, *pag.* 251.

(p) *See his Funeral Oration spoken by the Bishop of* Meaux, March 10. 1687. *pag.* 56, 57. *of the* Holl. *Edition.*

(a) *Taken from the Elogium of* Guy Patin *prefix'd to his Letters.*

(b) *He should have said canere.*

(c) Carolus Patinus in Lyceo Patavino, *p.* 102, 103.

(d) *Taken from the same Elogium.*

(e) *Sammarthanus Elog. l.* 1. *p. m.* 59.

(f) *He was call'd* Rogerius O-moloy.

(g) Carolus Patinus, *ubi supra*, p. 83, 84.

(h) *Id. ib. p.* 91.

had not the *Gratitude that was due to the Affection of ſo good a Father. This was a great addition to his Affliction for the Diſgrace (*I*) of his other Son.

* *See his Letter 555. p. 537 of the 3d Tome.*

PATRICIUS (*Auguſtin*) a Canon of *Siena*, and then Maſter of the Ceremonies of the Pope's Chapel, and at laſt Biſhop of *Pienza* in *Tuſcany*, flouriſh'd towards the end of the Fifteenth Century. Cardinal *Francis Piccolomini*, Archbiſhop of *Siena*, who has been Pope, by the Name of *Pius* the Second, order'd him to write an Abridgment of the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*. We ſhall ſee hereafter what

Oſtend, did ſo diſturb Navigation, that he return'd from *Havre de Grace* to *Paris*, and afterwards took the Road of the *Palatinate*. He ſtop'd ſome time at *Heidelberg*, and then travell'd into *Germany*, *Holland*, *England*, *Switzerland*, and *Italy*. He fix'd at *Baſil*, but the War which was between the *French* and *Germans* upon thoſe Frontiers, made him ſo uneaſy, that he removed with all his Family into *Italy*. He was made Profeſſor of Phyſick at *Padua* in 1676; three Years after he was honour'd with the Dignity of Kt. of St. *Mark*. He underſtood, in 1681 that the King of *France* would receive him into his Favour; and perhaps he would have return'd into *France*, if the chief Profeſſor's Place in Surgery had not been given him, with an augmentation of his Salary. I take this from a Book which he publiſh'd at *Padua* in 1682, Intitled, *Lyceum Patavinum, ſive Icones & vitæ Profeſſorum Patavii* 1682, *publice docentium*. He died (*k*) in that City, in 1693, leaving two Daughters, who became Famous (*l*) for the Works they publiſh'd. His Wife (*m*) was alſo an Author. Here follows a Catalogue of the Books which he publiſh'd, from the Year 1662, to the Year 1682. *Itinerarium Comitis Briennæ, Pariſiis*, 1662, *in 8vo. Familiæ Romanæ ex ant. Numiſmatibus, Pariſ.* 1663. *Fol. A Treatiſe of combuſtible Turf: Paris*, 1663, *in 4to. An Introduction to the Hiſtory of Medals: Paris*, 1665, and *Amſterdam* 1667, *in* 12o. *Imperatorum Romanorum Numiſmata: Argentinæ*, 1671. *Fol. Theſaurus Numiſmatum: Amſtelodami*, 1672. *in 4to. Four Hiſtorical Relations: Baſil* 1673, and *Lyons* 1674. *in* 12o. *Prattica delle Medaglie: Venezia*, 1673. *in* 12o. *Suetonius illuſtratus: Baſileæ*, 1675. *De numiſmate antiquo Auguſti & Platonis: Baſileæ*, 1675. *in 4to. Encomium moriæ Eraſmi, cum fig. Holbenianis: Baſil.* 1676. *in* 12o. *De optima Medicorum ſella: Patavii*, 1676. *in 4to. De Febribus: Patavii*, 1677. *in 4to. De Avicenna: Patavii*, 1678. *in 4to. De Numiſmate ant. Horatii Coclitis:* 1678. *in* 4. *De Scorbuto: Patavii* 1679. *in 4to. Judicium Paridis: Patavii*, 1679. *in 4to. Le pompoſe feſte di Vicenza: Padua*, 1680. *in 4to. Natalitia Jovis: Patavii*, 1681. *in 4to. Quod optimus Medicus debeat eſſe chirurgus: Patavii*, 1681. *in 4to. Lyceum Patavinum, Patavii*, 1682. *in 4to.* He himſelf gave us this Catalogue in his *Lycæum Patavinum*. He forgot his *Epiſtola ad Eggelingium de Numiſmatibus quibuſdam abſtruſis Imperatoris Neronis*, publiſh'd at *Bremen*, in 1681, with the Anſwers (*n*) of *Eggelingius*. He wrote after this a *Latin* (*o*) Tranſlation of the Introduction to the Knowledge of Medals, which was printed (*p*) in 1683. *Diſſertatio Therapeutica de Peſte*, at *Augsburg*, 1683. in *4to*. *Commentarius in tres Inſcriptiones Græcas Smyrnæ nuper allatas*, at *Padua*, 1685, *in 4to. Commentarius in antiquum monumentum Marcellinæ*, at the ſame place, 1688. *in 4to. Commentarius in antiquum Cenotaphium Marci Artorii Medici*, at the ſame place, 1689. in *4to*. He had a hand in the Edition of the *Theſaurus numiſmatum Petri Mauroceni*, done at *Venice*, 1683. and he added ſome Notes to it. Perhaps I have forgot ſome of his Works. I muſt add, That his Hiſtorical Relations were Printed in *Holland*, in 1695. and that his *Introduction to the Knowledge of Medals* was Printed at *Paris* the (*q*) ſame Year. This Book was Cenſured by Mr. *Sallo* the firſt time (*r*) it was Printed. The Author anſwer'd this Cenſure in a Piece Intitled, *A Letter from a Friend of Mr.* Patin, *about the Journal of the Learned, for* Febr. 23. 1665. Mr. *Sallo*, ſpeaking of this Letter, (*ſ*) continued to treat Mr. *Patin* with great Contempt; which very much anger'd *Guy Patin*, as appears by theſe words of his Lett. 351. I ſet 'em down ſomewhat at length, becauſe they inform us, among other things, of the reaſon which hinder'd *Charles Patin* from continuing his Apology. (*f*) "I do not know if you have re"ceiv'd a kind of *Gazette*, which is call'd the "*Journal of the Learned*, the Author whereof ha"ving complain'd of a little Article againſt my Son "*Charles*, concerning a Medal which was made here "the laſt Year for the *Switzers*, he has anſwer'd him. "I have ſent you his Anſwer, which is wiſe and "modeſt. This new Gazetteer has reply'd to him, "and there he ſpeaks as one that is ignorant and "extravagant. To which Reply he ſhould doubtleſs "have had a ſmart and ſtrong Anſwer, if *Charles* "had not been deſir'd to forbear his Reply, and "threaten'd with a Letter under the King's Signet. "The truth is, Mr. *Colbert* takes into his Protection "the Authors of this Journal, which is attributed to "Mr. *Sallo*, a Counſellor in Parliament; to the Ab"bot *de Bourzé*; to Mr. *Gomberville*; to Mr. *Chapelain*, &c. So that *Charles* is adviſ'd to delay his "Anſwer; and this is alſo the Opinion of the firſt "Preſident, who deſir'd it ſhou'd be ſo: The rea"ſon of it is ſaid to be, That he is not in favour "with Mr. *Colbert*, ſince the Suit of Mr. *Fouquet*. "We ſhall ſee hereafter, whether theſe pretended "Cenſurers, *ſine ſuffragio Populi & Quiritum*, have "Power and Authority to criticiſe thus all thoſe "Authors who do not write ſo as to pleaſe their "Palate. Are we in the times of *Juvenal*, who "ſaid boldly, *Dat veniam corvis, vexat cenſura columbas!* Yet there is one thing that comforts us, "and that is, That we are not to blame, and that "the Learned and Judicious are of our Opinion; "but theſe Gentlemen abuſe their Power. The Re"publick of Learning is on our ſide, but Mr. *Colbert* "is againſt us; and if my Son defends himſelf, 'tis "ſaid he will be ſent to the *Baſtille*: 'Tis better "therefore not to write.

(*f*) *Guy* Patin, *Letter* 351. *p.* 34, 35. *of the 3d Tome. See alſo pag.* 44, 54, 52, 63, 74. *of the ſame Vol.*

(*I*) *The diſgrace of his . . . Son.*] *Charles Patin* deplor'd it; he ſays, that Calumny had been the true cauſe of it. *Cùm ecce ἀτυχία*, ſays he, (*a*) *verius διαβολὴν, & calumniam dixero, me præcipitem egit, & κακῶν ἰλιάδα intulit. Timanthum* (*b*) *imitari liceat, benigne lector, qui cùm mæſtos pinxiſſet adſtantes, & triſtitiæ omnem imaginem conſumſiſſet, ob Iphigeniam ſtantem ad aras perituram, patris vultum velavit quem ſatis mæſtum pingere deſperabat. Velum hic protendamus, ſeu dolore commoti ob fortunas perditas, ſeu charitate ob invidorum nequitiam.* His Father was not ſo myſterious; he particularly mentions certain Cauſes, or rather Pretences, I know not what prohibited Books found in the Study of his Son. It will be better to hear him ſpeak: (*c*) "Every body pities "him, no body accuſes him, and he is belov'd by "every body, except ſome knaviſh Bookſellers. And "yet he is abſent, and we have oblig'd him to re"ſolve upon it in ſpite of his Stoical Humour. He "always hop'd that the Juſtice of the King would "extend to him, but our Enemies have too much "Power. Yet to allay the ſmart of our Wound, 'tis "ſaid, 1. That it is for contempt of the Court that "a Proceſs was commenc'd againſt him, as being "one that is abſent, and will not defend himſelf. "2. That it was by a ſovereign and particular Com"miſſion, without right of Appeal, which is extra"ordinary, and denotes ſo much the more the de"ſign there was to deſtroy him. 3. That the great"eſt part of the Judges have receiv'd Letters under "the King's Signet, and of recommendation to make "an Example of him. 4. 'Tis alledg'd, That "a Man of great Power, was our ſecret Enemy, "who promoted and manag'd the thing againſt "us; becauſe they found among thoſe Books ſome "Volumes of Mr. *Fouquet's Caſe*, and of the Hi"ſtory of the Enterprize of *Gigeri*. . . . Three "Books are nam'd, one full of Impiety, which "is an Huguenot Book, Intitled, *The Anatomy of the Maſs*, by *Peter du Moulin*, a Miniſter of "*Charenton*, as if the Inquiſition were in *France*. It "is a Six-peny Book: *Paris* is full of ſuch Books; "and there is ſcarce any Library in *France* where

(*a*) Carolus Patinus in Lyceo Patavino, *pag.* 91.

(*b*) *He ſhould have ſaid* Timanthem.

(*c*) Guy Patin's *Lett.* 458. *p.* 370 *of the 3d Tom.*

(*k*) *There was found a Polypus in his Heart, and in the Aorta, wherewith he was choak'd. I have this from Mr.* Drelincourt, *Profeſſor at* Leyden, *to whom a Profeſſor of* Padua, *who was of the Retinue of the* Venetian *Ambaſſadors, told it. I mean the Ambaſſadors who arrived in* Holland *in* Mar. 1696. *to go and Congratulate* H. B. M. *They went, with all their Retinue, to a Lecture on of Mr.* Drelincourt, Apr. 2. *of the ſame Year, and paid him many Civilities, as he very well deſerv'd.*

(*l*) *See the Journal of* Leipſic, *in the Year* 1684. *pag.* 587. *and in* 1691, *pag.* 337, *and* 547. *News from the Repub. of Learn.* Ap. 1685, *p.* 452. (*m*) *Nouvel. &c. Ib. p.* 453. (*n*) *See the Journal of* Leipſic, 1684. *p.* 35. (*o*) *I uſe the Title which he uſes in his Catalogue, altho' the true Title is*, An Introduction to Hiſtory by the knowledge of Medals. (*p*) *At* Amſterdam *in* 12o. (*q*) *See the Hiſtory of the* Works of the Learned, Dec. 1694. *p.* 174. (*r*) *See the* Journal of the Learned, Feb. 23. 1665. *p. m.* 150. (*ſ*) *In the* Journal of Mar. 9. 1665. *p. m.* 202.

what manner (Z) this was perform'd. This is not the only Work of *Auguſtinus Patricius*; he wrote another concerning the Ceremonies (ZZ) of the Pope's Chapel. He was Secretary to this Cardinal *Francis Piccolomini*, in his Legation of *Germany*, under the Pontificate of *Paul* II. γ. I ſhall examine whether Father *Mabillon* had reaſon to ſay, that there was another *Auguſtinus* (ZZZ) *Patricius* different from this.

PATRICIUS (*Francis*) Biſhop of *Gaieta*, a Native of *Siena*, ſhew'd a great reading, in his Books *De Regno & regis Inſtitutione*, and in thoſe, *De Republicæ Inſtitutione*. He Flouriſh'd in the Fifteenth Century. He is ſometimes δ confounded with another *Francis PATRICIUS*, a great *Antiperipatetic* Philoſopher, who was born ζ in the Territories of the *Venetians*, in the Year 1529, θ or in 1530, and who died at *Rome*, *February* the 6th ‡ 1597. Conſult Mr. *Moreri*, as alſo † Mr. *Teiſſier*. They have prevented me in moſt Things that I was to ſay, and therefore I ſhall only collect (A) ſome Errors, and obſerve ſome Things as to the Editions. I will

“ ſome of them are not to be found; nay, there are “ ſome of them even in the Studies of the Monks. “ The ſecond is a Book, as they ſay, againſt the “ Service of the King, and that is, *The Buckler of State*, which was ſold publickly in the *Palace-Yard*, “ and to which there are two Anſwers in the Preſs “ here. The third is, *The Gallant Hiſtory of the Court*; “ which are little Libels that rather deſerve Contempt than Anger. I think that theſe Three Books “ are only a pretence, and that there is ſome ſecret Enemy that Acts againſt my Son, and is the “ cauſe of our Misfortune. In all this you ſee nothing that comes up to the Fact; I mean the cauſe which was given out in *Paris*, to be the true reaſon of the Diſgrace. It was ſaid, 1. That *Charles Patin* was ſent into *Holland* with an Order to buy up all the Copies of the *Amours of the Royal Palace*; and to burn them upon the place, without ſparing any. 2. That a great Prince gave him this Commiſſion, and promis'd to reward him for his pains. 3. That this Commiſſioner having bought up all the Copies, did not burn them, but ſent a great number of them into the Kingdom. This is the common Report, I know not whether it be well grounded.

(Z) *After what manner this was perform'd.*] *Auguſtinus Patricius*, among other Books, made uſe of two great Volumes, whereof the Cardinal of *St. Mark* lent him a Copy. He affirms, that he ſaw them at *Baſil*, where they are kept with a particular Care, as anciently the Books of the *Sibyls* were kept, and that *John* of *Segovia*, a *Spaniard*, call'd the Cardinal of St. *Calixtus* by the Council of *Baſil*, a Man who continued obſtinately in the Schiſm until Death, is the Author of theſe two Collections. He adds, that he made uſe of an Hiſtory which *Dominick*, Cardinal of *Ferme* had compos'd of the firſt part of this Council: This Cardinal was preſent there 'till the time of the Rupture between *Eugenius* the Fourth and that Aſſembly. *Note*, That the Work of *Auguſtinus Patricius* is not Printed. Mr. *Rigault* lent it in Manuſcript (d) to *Spondanus* (e).

(ZZ) *He compoſed a* Treatiſe *concerning the Ceremonies of the Pope's Chappel.*] The Latin words of *Spondanus*, whom I have followed, are (f) *Librum de* ritibus ſacelli Pontificii *conſcripſit*. 'Tis, without doubt, the ſame with that which I have ſpoken of elſewhere in relating a Paſſage of Mr. *Couſin*, where we ſee by whom, and how the Book of *Auguſtin Patricius*, concerning *the Rites of the Roman Church*, was publiſhed, and what were the Conſequences of that Publication. We ſee there alſo that *Auguſtine Patricius* was Nephew to *Pius* II. *who had given him the Surname of Piccolomini*, and that he began to be Maſter of the Ceremonies under the ſame Pope. 'Tis certain, that in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Book *Sacrarum Ceremoniarum*, inſerted by Father *Mabillon* in (h) the ſecond Tome of his *Muſæum Italicum*, and dated from *Rome* the firſt of *March* 1488, he calls himſelf *Auguſtin Patricius Piccolomineus*; but for all that I dare neither affirm, that Pope *Pius* II. gave him that Surname, or that he was his Uncle: It ſeems to me more probable, that he receiv'd it from his Maſter Cardinal *Francis Piccolomini*; however, I affirm nothing. I know that *Pius* II. confer'd the Name of *Piccolomini* on an Ingenious (i) Man, who was his Secretary, and whom he made Cardinal.

(ZZZ) *Whether Father* Mabillon *had reaſon to ſay, that there was another* Auguſtin Patricius *different from this.*] He has inſerted in the firſt Tome (k) of the *Muſæum Italicum*, the Life of *Fabian Bencius*, written by *Auguſtin Patricius*, Biſhop of *Pienza*, and he ſays (l) that this Biſhop, who was Maſter of the Ceremonies under the Pontificate of *Innocent* VIII. is different from *Auguſtin Patricius*, who was Secretary to Cardinal *Francis Piccolomini*, and who wrote an Account of what paſſed in the Diet of *Ratiſbon*, when that Cardinal was Nuncio there. So that there are, if we believe him, two *Auguſtin Patricius's*, who were Authors; one was Maſter of the Ceremonies, and afterwards Biſhop of *Pienza*, in 1483; the other Secretary to *Francis Piccolomini*. The firſt writ the Life of *Fabian Bencius*, and an Account (m) of the Emperor *Frederick* III's entrance into *Rome*: The ſecond drew up the Acts of a Diet of *Ratiſbon*. 'Tis of the latter, and not of the other, continues Father *Mabillon*, that *Voſſius* ſpeaks, in his Volume of the *Latin* Hiſtorians: You may obſerve, that *Voſſius*, (n) in effect, gives no other Title to his *Auguſtin Patricius*, than that of Secretary to *Francis Picolomini*, Cardinal of *Siena*; and that he attributes to him no other Book than that of the Relation of what was done at the Diet of *Ratiſbon*. He takes notice, that it was Dedicated by the Author in 1471, to *James Piccolomini*, Cardinal of *Pavia*; and he adds, (o) that *Campanus* called this *Patricius*, *Cicero*'s Ape. I dare ſay, that Father *Mabillon* is miſtaken; it does not ſeem neceſſary to me to find here two Authors of the ſame Names, and I adhere to *Spondanus*, who ſays, that the ſame *Auguſtin Patricius*, Secretary to *Francis Piccolomini*, was Maſter of the Ceremonies, and Biſhop of *Pienza*.

(A) *Collect ſome Errors, and obſerve.*] GESNER (p) had no reaſon to believe, that *Francis Patricius*, the *Sieneſe*, did not, perhaps, differ from *Franciſcus Lucius Durantinus*, the Author of a Book *De optima Republica adminiſtratione*, Printed at *Venice* in the Year 1522. He ſhould have ſaid, That theſe are two Writers; for the Work of this *Lucius* is divided only into three Books, whereof the laſt is partly deſign'd to commend the Republick of *Venice*; but the Work of *Patricius* is divided into nine Books, and has nothing particular in behalf of the *Venetians*. In the Epitome of *Geſner* (q) *Francis Patricius* the *Antiperipatetick* is confounded with the Biſhop of *Gaieta*. The ſame Fault is to be found in the *Oxford-Catalogue*, for the *Peripatetick* Diſcuſſions, &c. and the Books *De Regno* and *de Reipublicæ Inſtitutione*, are attributed to one and the ſame Author. In the Epitome of *Geſner* we have two other *Patricius's*, who are meer Chimera's; for the pretended *Fredericus Patricius Venetus*, is no other than the Philoſopher who attack'd *Ariſtotle*. This appears plainly from hence, that the ſame Books (r) are attributed to him, which were before aſcrib'd to *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis*. It can hardly be conceiv'd, that there ſhould be any Compilers ſo heedleſs: they ſay in the ſame Column of a Page, that *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis* wrote the *Peripatetick* Diſcuſſions, and ten Dialogues in *Italian*, *de legendæ ſcribendæque hiſtoriæ ratione*, and that *Fridericus Patricius Venetus*, wrote the ſame Dialogues in *Italian*, and the *Peripatetick* Diſcuſſions. They tell us of one *Franciſcus Patricius*, whoſe Comm. were abridg'd, and Printed at *Paris*. It is the ſame Author of whom they had already given the Article: It is, I ſay, *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis*. The Sieur *KONIG* deſerves ſome Cenſure; he did not know *Patricius* the *Sieneſe*, and applies to the other *Patricius* a Paſſage of *Barthius*, which cannot agree to him. Take notice, that according to him (s) that *Patricius* of whom he ſpeaks died at *Rome* in the Year 1597, and that he Characterizes him after ſuch a manner, that none can take him but for the *Antiperipatetick*. 'Tis therefore an Abſurdity to pretend, that, acording to *Barthius*, he was Beheaded. This will eaſily appear, if any one does but caſt his Eyes upon theſe words of *Barthius*: (t) *Sed quid coacervemus plures? cum hanc rationem* (u) æra pulſandi, *neque aliam potuiſſe inducere videam qui horum* clan-

---

γ *Taken from Spondanus, ad ann.* 1431. *n.* 9. *p. m.* 804.

δ *See the Remark A.*

ζ *At Cliſſa in Iſtria, according to Thuanus l.* 119. *p.* 817.

θ *His Epiſtles before his Peripatetick Diſcuſſions imports, that he was in his* 51 *Year in* 1580: *and he ſays in the beginning of his* Nova Philoſophia de Univerſis, *that in* 1588 *he was writing this in the* 58. *Year of his Age.*

‡ Thuanus *Ibid. pag.* 91.

† *Additions to the Eloges taken from* Thuanus.

(d) *He took it out of the Kings Library.*

(e) *Taken from* Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1431. *n.* 9. *p. m.* 805.

(f) Spond. *as above.*

(h) *Page* 244, *&c.*

(i) James Ammanatus, *commonly known by the Name of Cardinal* of Pavia. *See the* Nomenclator Cardinalium, *p. m.* 96.

(k) *Page* 251, *&c.*

(l) Mabillon Muſæum Italicum *Tom.* 1. *p.* 255.

(m) *'Tis in the* Muſ. Ital. *ib. p.* 256, *&c.*

(n) Voſſius de Hiſtorici Latinus, *pag.* 604.

(o) Auguſtinum hunc ſimiam Ciceronis ob ſtudium ornandæ Dictionis appellat Campanus epiſtola quadam inter eas Piccolominæi quas diximus, *Idib.*

(p) Geſner in Biblioth. *fol.* 250, & 253, *verſo*

(q) *Page* 242.

(r) *In the Epitome of* Geſner.

(s) Konig. Biblioth. *p.* 612.

(t) Barth. *in lib.* 2. (*and not* 1. *as* Konig *ſays*) Thebaidos Statii, *p.* 437.

(u) *He ſpeaks there of the Kettles that rung at the time of the Eclipſes of the Moon.*

I will only add, That *Francis Patricius*, the Philoſopher, complains (*B*) very much of his

clangorum meminerant, è quibus Pindarum & Steſichorum cum aliis jam olim produxit, & inde Juvenalem enarravit Franciſcus Patricius Lib. II. de Regno & Inſt. Regis, vir omnino meliore fato dignus, quam qui in patria ſua ſecuri capite truncatus fuerit, Anno M.CCCC.XLVII. aut paulo ante, ſcribente Raphaele Volaterrano Lib. XXI. Comm. Urbanor. Can a Paſſage that ſpeaks of a Man Beheaded in 1447, or a little before, be applied to a Man that died (*c*) in the Year 1597. I do not think that *Barthius* is guilty of an Error in Chronology, ſince although *Volaterranus* does not ſet down in what Year this *Patricius* was puniſh'd with Death, yet he ſufficiently intimates, that it was about that time. Having mention'd *Gregory* of *Tifernum*, and *Antonius Panormita*, he adds (*d*) *Joannes Aurispa Secretarius Apoſtolicus ſub Eugenio inter eruditos non admodum ignobilis ea tempeſtate. Patricii quoque Senenſis, qui in factione Civitatis ſecuri percuſſus fuit magnopere commendatur oratio ſimul & eruditio. Petrus Candidus Nicolai V. Magiſter brevium fuit.* This ſeems to ſhew that he ſpeaks of one *Patricius* who flouriſh'd under *Eugenius* IV. and who was not alive under *Nicolas* V. I confeſs this is not convincing, but however if *Barthius* has not hit right upon the Year, he is excuſable; and this Fault ought rather to be pardon'd in him, than that which he has committed, in ſuppoſing that an Author who was beheaded in 1447, is the ſame *Francis Patricius* of *Siena*, who wrote the Books *de regno & inſt. regis.* The Latter liv'd under (*e*) *Sixtus* IV, to whom he dedicated his Treatiſe *de Republica, & Reipublicæ inſtitutione.* Note, That *Volaterranus* in the 5th Book (*f*) of his Work, gives us to underſtand that the *Patricius*, whom the *Sieneſe* beheaded, was puniſh'd in that manner during the War they had with *Picinin*, who invaded one of their Cities, from whence they drove him away, being aſſiſted by Pope *Calixtus*. But that Pope was not choſen till the Year 1455. Mr. *MORERI* is to blame for not ſaying, that *Patricius*, the *Sieneſe*, was Biſhop of *Gaieta*. He aſſigns him the Biſhoprick of *Cariati* in *Calabria*; probably a Fault of the Printer, which he did not perceive in the Book of *Aubertus Miræus*, led him into this Miſtake. He had read in that Author (*g*) *Franciſcus Patritius, Senenſis, præſul Caretanus*, and not perceiving that it was to be read *Caietanus*, he made him to be Biſhop of *Cariati* in *Calabria*. 'Tis upon the Authority of the ſame Writer, that he has plac'd this Prelate in the beginning of the XVIth Century; which he had not done, if he had known that *Francis Patricius*, who was promoted to the Biſhoprick of *Gaieta* (*h*) by *Pius* II, died in the Year 1494. If Mr. *Moreri* who refers us to (*i*) *Ughelli*, had conſulted him, he would have ſeen this. What he ſays after *Miræus* concerning the Editions of the Works of his pretended *Biſhop of Cariati*, requires a little Supplement. The Latin Edition of the Nine Books *de Regno*, and of the Nine Books *de Republica*, printed at *Paris* in 1519, is accompanied with the Notes of *John Savigni*, (*k*) *Cum Joannis Savigneii ſcholiis.... cum ejuſdem annotationibus.* The *Scholia* belong to the Books *de Regno*, and the Notes to the Books *de Republica*. One *Nicodon* of *Saimmaixent* (*l*) publiſh'd the Books *de Republica* at *Paris* in 1580 in 16, and added to them the Contents of the Chapters, and the Citations of Authors, *John le Blond* Lord of *Branville* made ſome Extracts out of all theſe Works of *Patricius*, and publiſh'd them in French at *Paris* in 1550, as *du Verdier* informs us (*m*). Mr. *Joly* (*n*) obſerves that this *John le Blond* turn'd into French *an Extract, or a Collection of the fineſt Maxims of* Eraſmus's *Book, de Inſtitutione Principis Chriſtiani*, and that this Extract was printed at *Paris* in 1546, with the Abridgement of the Republick of *Francis Patricius*. He obſerves alſo that this Extract was compos'd by *Giles d' Aurigni, call'd le Pamphile*, an Advocate in the Parliament; and that it was printed at *Paris* in 1543, with an Abridgement of the Republick of *Francis Patricius*. We find in the Bibliotheque of *du Verdier* (*o*) that *John du Ferey a Counſellor of the Kings Privy Council, tranſlated out of Latin the firſt Book of the Writings of Francis Patricius, a Sieneſe, Biſhop of Gaietta, which treat of the Reign or Government of one ſingle Perſon, call'd Monarchy, and of the Inſtitution of a good King, at* Paris, 1577. in 8vo. There is a French Tranſlation of the Nine Books *of the Republick*, printed at *Paris* in 1610. in 8vo. The Author of that Verſion, is call'd the *Sieur de la Monchettiere*. I cannot tell, whether the Notes which are found at the End of each Chapter, are the Work of the Tranſlator, or only a Verſion of the Notes of *John Savigni*. Who would not imagine, after ſo many Additions, that it is an Admirable Work, and yet thoſe that are good Judges deſpiſe it. (*p*) *Eodem fermè* (*q*) *tempore Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis Farraginem quandam exemplorum ſub Reipublicæ titulo, puerorum credo uſui, ac chriarum in Scholis compoſitioni, evulgavit; tantum diſſimilis alteri Franciſco Patricio Romano* (*r*), *qui nonnihil pariter de hac re inter opuſcula juvenilia protulit, quantum nilbus Aquilæ, aut anſer diſpar eſt olori.*

You will find in the Treatiſe of the Origin of Printing at *Paris*, that the Edition which *John Savigni* put forth did not pleaſe him at all, although the Impreſſion was *in a very good Letter*. It was full of Faults, and this (*ſ*) vex'd him him ſo much the more, becauſe he had taken a great deal of Pains *to correct thoſe that were in the MS*; for you muſt know that this Edition was made *from a MS, which* John Prevoſt *a Counſellor of the Parliament had brought from* Italy. From whence one might perhaps conclude, that this Edition of *Paris* is the Firſt.

(*B*) Patricius *the Philoſopher complains much of his Fate.*] He regrets the Seven Years he had ſpent in the Iſle of *Cyprus*, being far diſtant from his Studies, and taken up with ſuch Affairs as were profitable only to others. Growing weary of his Pains, which were ſo little to his own Advantage, he applied himſelf to *Philip Mocenigo* Archbiſhop of that Iſle, and after he had been ſome time in his Houſe, he follow'd him to *Venice*, and then to *Padua* (*t*). Returning with great Satisfaction to his Studies, he wrote the Life of *Ariſtotle*; but his unhappy Fate took him off from this pleaſant Employment, and tranſported him into *Spain*, though from Nine Years of Age he had ſcarce done any thing but run from Place to Place, by Sea and by Land. (*v*) *Ecce me fati quædam vis, quæ me novem annorum puerum, ad hanc uſque ætatem, peregrinationibus continuis terraque marique exercuerat, in Hiſpanias abripuit.* He return'd to *Venice* at the End of Six Months, and finiſh'd the Life of *Ariſtotle*. This Work contain'd alſo a Judgment upon the Writings of this Philoſopher; in a Word it is the firſt (*w*) Volume of his Peripatetick Diſcuſſions. This is what the Epiſtle Dedicatory of this Volume informs us of. The Dedication of the ſecond diſcovers to us that the Author found a Place of Refuge at the Court of the Duke of *Ferrara*, and an Employ to his Mind, ſince he permitted him to teach in the Univerſity of *Ferrara* the Philoſophy of *Plato*. (*x*) *Cui melius labores meos dicarem*, thus he ſpeaks to *Antony Montecatin*, firſt Secretary to *Alphonſus d' Eſt*, the ſecond of that Name. . . . *quam ei viro qui me peſſum Cyprico bello datum, peſſimorumque hominum ingratitudine, fraudibus, inſidiiſque agitatum, perque multos annos fortunæ adverſiſſimæ fluctibus actum, in portum recepit, in Sereniſſi. Principis hujus familiam interpoſuit, Platonicam philoſophiam, in ſingulare hujuſce Academiæ ornamentum publice profiteri dedit?* Theſe are the heavy Complaints he makes in a few Words againſt the Malice of his envious Enemies, and the Hardneſs of his Fate. He repeats the ſame thing in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the 4th Tome; for in his Addreſs to a Biſhop, who had formerly been his Fellow Student at *Padua*, he informs him of the Entertainment he had found after many Misfortunes in the City of *Modena*, and how *Ferrara* ſerv'd him at laſt for a Harbour. (*y*) *Neque enim locorum diſtantia, qua tu quidem per Italiam perque Galliam, ego vero per Dalmatiam, per Græciam, per Aſiam, ac demum per Hiſpaniam atque Galliam disjuncti poſtea ſemper fuimus, potuit eam oblivioni tradere, neque ex animis noſtris eradere fortuna diſpar, quæ te in arduis ſemper negotiis ac magnis magnorum principum habuit, donec ad eam dignitatem, qua nunc frueris, longè merito es evectus. Ego vero pauperie preſſus, dum aliena commoda curo, mea non curo, continuis itineribus terraque marique exercitus, Cyprica clade oppreſſus, atque ingratiſſimorum peſſimorumque hominum fraudibus inſidiiſque circumventus, Mutinæ in patria tua, te abſente, apud veteres amicos, apudque Alexandrum Baranzonum equitem, ac Tarquiniam Molziam ſingularem totius ſeculi fœminam, primum reſedi, poſtea è marinis fortunæque fluctibus in hunc portum ſum devectus.* I do not find that he was Profeſſor at *Padua*, as (*z*) *Lorenzo Craſſo*, and after him Mr. *Moreri* ſay. It had been better to have

follow'd

(*c*) In the Jugemens des Savans ſur les Poetes tom. 3. n. 1032. p. 45. 'Tis ſaid, that Francis Patricius was beheaded at Rome in 1597. viz. the Philoſopher that oppos'd Ariſtotle.

(*d*) *Volaterran. Commentar. Urbanor. lib.* 21. *p. m.* 773.

(*e*) *Who was advanc'd to the Popedom in* 1471.

(*f*) *pag. m.* 158.

(*g*) *Miræus de ſcriptoribus ſæculi XVI. pag.* 22.

(*h*) *The* 23*d of March* 1460. Ughelli ubi infra.

(*i*) *Ughelli, Italia ſacra, tom.* 1. *p.* 588.

(*k*) *Epitome Bibliot. Geneſri.*

(*l*) *Ibid.*

(*m*) *Bibliot. Franc. p.* 406.

(*n*) *Joly*, Conſeille Chretien *the Preface. pag.* 35. *Edit.* 1666.

(*o*) *At p.* 689, 690.

(*p*) *Naudæi Bibliogr. polit. pag. m.* 21.

(*q*) *i. e. at the time when a Book of* Robortel, *and the Treatiſe of* Jerom Vida de Republica, *appear'd.* Naudæus *is miſtaken, for the Book of Patricius was dedicated to Pope* Sixtus IV. Robortel & Vida *were alive ſtill after the middle of the* 16*th Century.*

(*r*) Naudæus *is miſtaken, this* Patricius *was not a Roman, he was born in the Territories of* Venice.

(*ſ*) *At p.* 187.

(*t*) *See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the firſt Tome of the Peripatetick Diſcuſſions.*

[*v*] *Ibid.*

[*w*] *It was printed at* Venice, 1571. *in* 4.

[*x*] *Patricius epiſt. dedicator.* 2 *Tom. diſcuſſ. peripatet. pag.* 177. *edit. Baſil* 1581. *in fol.*

[*y*] *Id. in epiſt. dedicatoria* 4. *tomi diſcuſſ. peripatet. ad Benedictum Manzolium epiſcopum Regienſem pag.* 352.

[*z*] *Lor. Craſſo Elogii d' huom. letter. tom.* 1. *pag.* 22.

his Fate. He diſguiſ'd himſelf under the Name of † *Francis Mutm* in the Title Page of his *Diſceptationes contra Theodori Angelutii calumnias.* This *Angelutius* a famous Phyſician had undertaken againſt him a Defence of *Ariſtotle.* There is in the laſt Edition of *Moreri's* Dictionary, a new Article (C) about which I have a Remark to make.

PATRICIUS (*Andrew*) was one of the learned Men who were born in *Poland* in the XVI. Century. He ſtudied at *Padua*, and acquir'd the eſteem of the moſt famous Profeſſors of that Country, particularly of *Sigonius* and *Paul* * *Manutius.* He publiſh'd ſome Works (D) that made him famous, and got good Benefices in his own Country. He was Provoſt of the Church of *Warſaw*, Archdeacon of *Wilna*, and at laſt Biſhop of *Wenden.* The King of *Poland*, *Stephen Battori*, having recover'd *Livonia*, which the *Muſcovites* had uſurp'd, erected a Biſhoprick in the City of *Wenden*, and gave it to our *Patricius*, who enjoy'd it not very long, for he died quickly after. This was in the Year 1583 ‡.

PAUL (*Father*) a Religious Servite, and Theologer of the Republick of *Venice.* See **SARPI.**

PAULICIANS. Thus were the *Manichees* in *Armenia* call'd, when one *Paul* became their Head in the VII. Century †. " They arriv'd at ſo great a Power " (1) either by the Weakneſs of the Government, or by the Protection of the *Saracens*, or even by the favour of the Emperor *Nicephorus*, who favour'd that Sect " very much, that at laſt, being perſecuted by the Empreſs *Theodora*, the Wife of " *Baſil*,

follow'd *Thuanus* (*aa*), who ſays that *Patricius* having been Profeſſor ſeventeen Years at *Ferrara*, went from thence (*bb*) to *Rome*, being invited by *Clement* VIII.

A certain Perſon told me the other Day, *Patricius* was born at *Cliſſa* in *Iſtria*, as *Thuanus* affirms, and there is a Fortreſs call'd *Cliſſa* in *Dalmatia*; it may be therefore that *Franciſcus Patricius Dalmata*, does not differ from this *Patricius*, altho' Mr. *Teiſſier* (*a*) deſires us " to take heed that we do not confound *Francis Patricius*, of whom we now ſpeak, " with *Francis Patricius* born in *Sclavonia*, who is " the Author of a Book entituled, Eſpoſitione delli oracoli di Leone Imperatore (*b*). I anſwered poſitively, that there is no diſtinction to be made between them. *Thuanus* in the firſt Book *de vita ſua*, gives the Epithet of *Dalmata* to *Franciſcus Patricius*, the Author of the Peripatetick Diſcuſſions. I was not ſo poſitive about theſe Words of the Book of Mr. *Teiſſier*, (*c*) *His new Philoſophy about the Univerſals.* He has ill tranſlated, ſaid that Perſon to me, the *Nova de univerſis Philoſophia* of *Thuanus.* This Tranſlation means that this Philoſopher propos'd new Doctrines about the *Genus*, *Species*, *Differentia*, *Proprium & Accidens*: And 'tis no wiſe probable, that he would take the Pains to refute the Schoolmen about ſuch things, in all that work. I durſt not be poſitive.

NOW I know what is the Book which Mr. *Teiſſier* call'd *New Philoſophy about the Univerſals*: But he ſhould not have thus tranſlated the Latin Title of this Work; for it treats not at all of the Univerſals. It is a Folio, and the Edition of *Venice*, 1593. *apud Robertum Meiettum*, has this Title Page: *Nova de Univerſis Philoſophia libris quinquaginta comprehenſa. In qua Ariſtotelica methodo non per motum, ſed per lucem & lumina ad primam cauſam aſcenditur. Deinde nova quadam ac peculiari methodo tota in contemplationem venit divinitas. Poſtremo methodo Platonica rerum univerſitas à conditore Deo deducitur. Auctore Franciſco Patricio Philoſopho eminentiſſimo, & in celeberrimo Romano Gymnaſio ſumma cum laude eandem Philoſophiam publice interpretante, quibus poſtremo ſunt adjecta Zoroaſtris oracula CCCXX. ex Platonicis collecta. Hermetis Triſmegiſti libelli & fragmenta quotcunque reperiuntur ordine ſcientifico diſpoſita. Aſclepii diſcipuli tres libelli. Myſtica Ægyptiorum à Platone dictata, ab Ariſtotele excepta, & perſcripta Philoſophia. Platonicorum dialogorum novus penitus a Franciſco Patricio inventus ordo ſcientificus. Capita demum multa in quibus Plato concors, Ariſtoteles vero Catholicæ fidei adverſarius oſtenditur.* You have ſeen that the Title promiſes only 50 Books; yet the whole Work is divided into four Parts, whereof the Firſt contains 10 Books, the Second 22, the Third 5, and the Fourth, 32, which makes in all 69 Books. The Author intitles the Firſt, *Panaugia*, the Second, *Panarchia*, the Third, *Pampſychia*, and the Fourth, *Pancoſmia.* He treats of the ſublimeſt Queſtions in Phyſicks and Metaphyſicks, and this he does upon Hypotheſes altogether extraordinary. He vents many Paradoxes, but not without diſcovering an admirable and profound Genius. He dedicated this Work to Pope *Gregory* the XIVth, and the Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated at *Ferrara*, *Auguſt* the 5th, 1591. This Book was cenſur'd (*d*), and the Author was oblig'd to retract, which he did a ittle before his Death (*e*).

(C) *A New Article, upon which I have a Remark to make.*] This New Article is that of *PATRICIUS* (*Francis*), and is to be found at Page 133, of the *Paris* Edition 1699. It contains this; That this *Francis Patricius*, " liv'd in the XVII. Century; *that he* wrote " in Italian a Hiſtory of Poetry, divided into Ten " Books; *that he* does only act the Part of an Hiſtorian in this Work, without enlarging much upon " the Rules of Art; *that* his Head was cut off at *Rome* " in 1597. *Janus Nicius Erythræus* is cited *in Pinacotheca I.* page 204 and 205. My firſt Obſervation will be, That this *Francis Patricius* ought not to be the Subject of a New Article, ſince he does not any wiſe differ from *Francis Patricius* the Philoſopher, who is in page 134. The Proofs of this are demonſtrative; for it is moſt evident, that *Nicius Erythræus* in the Place cited, ſpeaks only of *Francis Patricius*, the Adverſary of *Ariſtotle*, and that he ſays two or three Things of him, which *Moreri* attributes to *Patricius* at page 134. 'Tis certain alſo, that *Erythræus* aſcribes to *Patricius* a Book *de Arte Poetica*, which is the ſame with that wherein, if we may believe Father *Rapin* cited by Mr. *Baillet* (*f*), he contents himſelf with " acting the part of an Hiſtorian, without enlarging much upon the Rules of Art. I ſhall obſerve by the bye, that it is very probable that this Jeſuit did ſcarce know this Piece of *Francis Patricius.* It is a Work divided into two (*g*) Decads, in the firſt of which the Author writes like an Hiſtorian, and in the ſecond, like a Diſputant (*h*) who preſſes *Ariſtotle* very hard. My ſecond Obſervation is, that ſince they intended to ſpeak only to the Diſadvantage of this Work, they ought not to have cited only *Janus Nicius Erythræus*, who ſpeaks very much to its Advantage. (*i*) *Edidit de ſcribenda hiſtoria tres Dialogos, & de Arte Poetica totidem decades, quibus precium ſtatui pro illorum æſtimatione vix poteſt.* Neither ſhould they have obſerved, that this Work is divided into Ten Books; for *Erythræus* ſuppoſes that it contain'd three Decads. I believe he is miſtaken, but 'tis certain that it contains two. Laſtly, They ſhould not have ſaid, that *Patricius* was beheaded; for it is falſe, and it is no where to be found in the Author whom they cite. To place in the XVII. Century a Man who is believ'd to have had his Head cut off in 1597, is a Fault that ought to be aſcribed to the Printers, but not that of ſaying (*k*) that *Gaietta* is in *Calabria.*

(D) *He publiſh'd ſome Works which made him famous.*] He had carefully cultivated the Study of philological Learning, and wrote in Latin with ſome politeneſs. Which appears by his Commentaries on two Orations of *Cicero*, and by the Harangues he made to the King of *Poland*, *Stephen Battori*, to congratulate him in the Name of the Clergy of *Warſaw*, for having beaten

---

† *Random. de fat. & vita termini pag. m. 27.*

* *See the three Letters which* Paul Manutius *wrote to* Andrew Patricius. *They are the 19th and 20th of the 4th Book, and the 6th of the 3d.*

‡ *Taken from* Simon Starovolſcius *in Elogiis centum Polonorum pag. 27. 28.*

† *Biſhop of* Meaux, *in his Hiſt. of Variations l. 11. n. 13. p. m. 128.*

(1) *Cedrenus tom. 2. pag. 480.*

(*aa*) Thuanus *l. 119. pag. 817.*

(*bb*) *Lor. Craſſo ib. and* Moreri, *place his Profeſſorſhip at* Rome, *before that which 'tis pretended he had at* Padua.

(*a*) *Teiſſier Eloges, tom. 2. p. 279. Edit.* 1696.

(*b*) *See* Hankius de ſcriptor. Byzantinis. *part* 1. *p.* 417.

(*c*) *Ubi ſupra. pag.* 277.

(*d*) *Thuan. lib.* 119. *pag.* 817.

(*e*) *Id. ib.*

(*f*) *In the* 1. *Tome of the* Jugement ſur les Poetes *n.* 1062. *p.* 45.

(*g*) Della *Poetica deca iſtoriale.* Della *Poetica deca diſputata. This Work was printed at* Ferrara *in* 1586.

(*h*) *Lorenzo Craſſo, elogii tom.* 1. *pag.* 62.

(*i*) *Nicius Erythræus Pinac.* 1. *pag.* 204, 205.

(*k*) *This is found in* Moreri's *Dictionary of the* Holland *Edition*, 1698. *and in that of* Paris, 1699. *in the Article* Patricius, *the Author of the Book* de regno & regis inſtitutione.

" *Baſil*, (s) they were able to build Towns, and to take up Arms againſt their " Princes. Thoſe Wars were long and bloody under the Empire of *Baſil* the *Ma-* " *cedonian*, *i. e.* at the End of the IXth Century. Nevertheleſs there was ſo great a (*A*) Slaughter of thoſe Hereticks under the Empreſs *Theodora*, that it ſeem'd they would never be able to riſe again. It is thought that the Preachers whom they ſent (*B*) into *Bulgaria*, ſettled there the *Manichean* Hereſy, and that † *from thence it ſpread it ſelf ſoon after into the other Parts of* Europe. They condemn'd the Worſhip of Saints, (*C*) and the Images of the Croſs; but this was not their principal Character. Their fundamental Doctrine, was that of Two Coeternal Principles, and independent one upon another. This Doctrine at firſt hearing creates Horror, and conſequently 'tis ſtrange, that the *Manichean* Sect (*D*) could ſeduce ſo great a Part of the World. But on the other Side, 'tis ſo difficult (*E*) to Anſwer their Objections, about the Origin of Evil, that we muſt not wonder that the Hypotheſis of two Principles, the one Good and the other Bad, ſhould have dazzled the Eyes of

beaten thrice the Army of the *Muſcovites*. The Pains he took, and which doubtleſs were very great, to collect together the Fragments of *Cicero*, diſcovered a great many good things, which a great many learned Men would not have diſcover'd, when they lay ſcatter'd up and down before he had collected them. The Works of *Cicero* which are loſt by the Injury of Time, were ſome of the fineſt that he wrote. Many Paſſages of them which are found in St. *Auguſtin* and elſewhere, are admirable; but how many learned Men are there, who would never have ſought for them in thoſe Places? It is therefore a great Advantage to them that *Andrew Patricius* has collected together theſe Fragments. He wrote alſo ſome Works of Controverſy, *Paralleli Eccleſiæ Orthodoxæ cum Synagoga Hæreticorum. De vera & falſa Eccleſia libri quinque* (*l*).

(*A*) *So great a Slaughter of theſe Hereticks.*] There is mention made of it in the Supplement (*a*) to *Moreri's* Dictionary, Father *Maimbourg* is cited there, whoſe own Words are theſe, (*b*) "*Theodora* . . . reſolv'd effectu- " ally to procure the Converſion of thoſe *Paulici-* " *ans*, or to rid the Empire of them, if they ob- " ſtinately oppos'd their true Happineſs. . . . . 'Tis " true that thoſe to whom ſhe gave a Commiſſion " and Forces to compaſs this Deſign, us'd them with " too much Rigour and Cruelty; for inſtead of en- " deavouring to bring them at firſt by mild and " gentle Ways, and with a charitable Diſpoſition, " to the Knowledge of the Truth, they ſeized " thoſe wretched People, that were ſcatter'd in the " Cities and Burroughs, and, as is ſaid, they kill'd " near a hundred thouſand of them all over *Aſia*, by " all kinds of Deaths, which oblig'd all the reſt to " go and yield themſelves up to the *Saracens*, who " knew very well, how to make uſe of them ſome " time after againſt the Greeks. But the Empreſs " who had no hand in this Inhumanity of her Lieu- " tenants, did nevertheleſs draw this Advantage " from it, that the Empire at leaſt was purg'd from " this Vermine, during her Reign of fourteen Years. Theſe Ways of Converting are altogether Mahometan, and confirm what I have ſaid elſewhere, (*c*) That the Chriſtians have been infinitely more cruel than the Followers of *Mahomet*, againſt thoſe who were not of their Religion.

(*B*) *The Preachers which they ſent into* Bulgaria.] *Petrus* (*d*) *Siculus* who was ſent by the Emperor *Baſil*, the *Macedonian*, " to *Tibrica* in *Armenia*, one " of the Places of theſe Hereticks, to treat with " them about the Exchange of Priſoners . . . (*e*) " diſcover'd during the time of his Embaſſy, that " it had been reſolv'd in the Council of theſe *Pauli-* " *cians*, to ſend ſome Preachers of their Sect into *Bul-* " *garia*, to ſeduce the People that were newly con- " verted. *Thrace* bordering upon this Province, " had been a long time ago infected with this Here- " ſy: and therefore there was but too much reaſon " to fear for the *Bulgarians*, if the *Paulicians*, who " were the moſt cunning of the *Manichees*, ſhould " attempt to ſeduce them; and this oblig'd *Petrus* " *Siculus*, to addreſs to their Archbiſhop the Book " (*f*) we have mention'd, that he might fore-arm " them againſt ſo dangerous Hereticks. But in " ſpite of all his Care 'tis manifeſt, that the *Mani-* " *chean* Hereſy took deep Root in *Bulgaria*.

(*C*) *The Worſhip of Saints, and the Images of the Croſs.*] " (*g*) *Petrus Siculus* relates, that a *Mani-* " *chean* Woman ſeduc'd an Ignorant Layman " call'd *Sergius*, by telling him the Catholicks ho- " nour'd Saints as Deities, and that it was for that " Reaſon, that the Laity were hindred from reading " the Holy Scripture, for fear they ſhould diſco- " ver many ſuch like Errors. See what has been cited from Father *Maimbourg* in the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary.

(*D*) *Could ſeduce ſo great a Part of the World.*] We have ſeen elſewhere (*h*) with what earneſtneſs Pope *Leo* admoniſhes all the Biſhops, that they ſhould not ſuffer thoſe Hereticks condemn'd to Baniſhment by the Imperial Laws, to find any Place of Refuge. Yet this Hereſy ſupported it ſelf, and it became neceſſary to perſecute it with Laws much more ſevere, and to condemn to Death all thoſe who ſhould make Profeſſion of it; nevertheleſs " (*i*) it " continued and ſpread. The Emperor *Anaſtaſi-* " *us*, and *Theodora* the Wife of *Juſtinian* favour'd " it. The Followers of it appear under the Chil- " dren of *Heraclius*, *i. e.* in the ſeventh Century, " in *Armenia*. We have already ſpoken of the great Progreſs it made there. We have already ſeen that the Maſſacre of 100000 *Paulicians* did not hinder the ſpreading of it in *Thrace* and *Bulgaria*. It infected afterwards great Numbers of Perſons in many Provinces of *France*. Conſult the Biſhop of *Meaux* (*k*). *Lambert Danæus* obſerves, that it made a great Devaſtation in *Perſia*, *Syria*, and *Meſopotamia*, under the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*, and in *Sicily* under Pope *Gregory the Great*. (*l*) *Romam ipſam occupavit hæc hæreſis, unde tamen expulſa eſt à Leone Pontifice Romano circa annum à Chriſto paſſo* 414. *In Arabia tamen, Perſide & Ægypto maximè viguit patuitque, unde poſtea Mahumetiſmus tanquam ex ſerpentis vipereque ovo enatus & excluſus. Diutiſſimè etiam ſubſtitit. Nam & Anaſtaſii Imperatoris temporibus adhuc in Perſide, Meſopotamia, & Syria graſſabatur apertè, & Gregorii Magni Pontificatu in Sicilia, id eſt, annos poſt Manetem mortuum plus quam* 340: *ut apparet ex Gregorii epiſt. 6. lib. 4. & P. Diaconi lib. 15. Hiſtoria, ubi Indaganam eorum Epiſcopum commemorat.* I dare not affirm, that it ſpread into the Provinces of the Eaſt, where the Doctrine of two Principles is diſcover'd, among ſome Infidel Nations; for they might have receiv'd it by other Means than by the *Manichees*. I approve the Thought of *Lewis Thomaſſin*. " The " Relations that are often given us of *Aſia*, diſco- " ver that there are ſtill, *ſays he* (*m*), ſome *Mani-* " *chees* at this day, beyond the Bounds of the An- " cient Roman Empire. I cannot very poſitively " affirm, that they are the Remainder, or the Po- " ſterity of thoſe who were ſo often proſcrib'd in " the whole Roman Empire, and who retir'd into " the Neighbouring Provinces. There is in this " ſome probability, but not the ſame certainty, as " when we ſaid the ſame thing of the *Arians*, *Neſto-* " *rians* and *Eutychians*. Theſe are truly Hereticks, " who could not have their Original but from the " Catholick Church in their time, whoſe Bowels " they tore to come forth from it. But the *Mani-* " *chees* originally came from the Eaſt, as deſcen- " ding from the ancient Idolaters, who admitted " alſo two firſt Principles, one of Good, the other " of Evil, as you may read in *Plutarch*, and many " other Profane Hiſtorians.

(*E*) *'Tis ſo difficult to anſwer the Objections of the* Manichees *about the Origine of Evil.*] I have (*n*) prepar'd my Readers to ſee here three Obſervations which I ſhould have plac'd in the Article of the *Manichees*, but that I had a mind to avoid Prolixity in that Place. Let us now perform our Promiſe, and not fruſtrate the Expectation of thoſe who have a mind to attend our Reference. I ſhall hereafter place by themſelves (*o*) the ſecond and third Obſervation: But here follows the firſt.

The

(s) *Ibid. pag.* 141.

† *Hiſt. of the Variat. l.* 16. *n.* 16. *pag.* 141.

(*l*) *See Staroveljeius in elog. centum Polonorum pag.* 26.

(*a*) *Under the word* Paulicians.

(*b*) Maimbourg's *Hiſt. of the* Iconoclaſts *B.* 5. *p.* 253. Holl. *Edit. ad an.* 845.

(*c*) *In the Article* Mahomet *pag.* 1975. 1981.

(*d*) *Bp. of* Meaux *Hiſt. of the Variations l.* 11. *n.* 14.

(*e*) *Ibid. n.* 16.

(*f*) *'Tis a Book whoſe Title is* Hiſtoria de Manichæis. Radreus *tranſlated it out of Greek into Latin, and publiſh'd it at* Ingolſtad *with Notes.* in 1604. in 4to.

(*g*) *Hiſt. of the Variations ib. n.* 15.

(*h*) *In the Article* Manichees *Remark E.*

(*i*) *Hiſt. of the Variations ib. n.* 13.

(*k*) *Hiſt. of the Variat. l.* 11.

(*l*) *Lambert. Danæus in Auguſtin. de hæreſib. c.* 45. *fol. m.* 119. *verſo.*

(*m*) Thomaſſin *of the Unity of the Church, Tom.* 1. *part.* 2. *chap.* 9. *pag.* 373.

(*n*) *In the Article* Manichees.

(*o*) *In the Remarks G and H.*

of many Ancient Philoſophers, and then found ſo many Followers in Chriſtendom, where the Doctrine which teaches the Capital Enmity of the Devils to the true God,

The Fathers of the Church, who have ſo well refuted the *Marcionites*, the *Manichees*, and in general all thoſe who admitted two Principles, have not well anſwer'd the Objections which relate to the Origin of Evil. They ſhould have abandoned all the Reaſons *à priori*, as the Outworks of a Place, which may be inſulted, and cannot be maintain'd; they ſhould have contented themſelves with Reaſons *à poſteriori*, and placed all their Forces behind this Entrenchment. The Old and New Teſtament are two Parts of Revelation, which mutually confirm one another; ſince therefore theſe Hereticks acknowledged the Divine Authority of the New, it was no difficult Matter to prove to them the Divine Authority of the Old, after which it was eaſie to deſtroy their Objections, by ſhewing that they are contrary to Experience. According to Scripture there is but one Good Principle, and yet Moral and Phyſical Evil have been introduc'd among Mankind: It is not therefore contrary to the Nature of a Good Principle, to permit the Introduction of Moral Evil, and to puniſh Crimes; for it is not more evident, that four and four are eight, than that if a thing come to paſs, 'tis poſſible. *Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia*, is one of the cleareſt and moſt unconteſtable Axioms in Metaphyſicks. This is an impregnable Rampart, and this is ſufficient to render the Cauſe of the Orthodox victorious, altho' their Reaſons *à priori* may be refuted. But may they be ſo, will ſome ſay? I will anſwer, yes; the Manner of introducing Evil, under the Empire of a Sovereign Being, infinitely Good, infinitely Holy, and infinitely Powerful, is not only inexplicable but incomprehenſible; and all that is objected againſt the Reaſons why this Being has permitted Evil, is more agreeable to natural Light, and the Idea's we have of Order, than theſe Reaſons are. Let us conſider well this Paſſage of *Lactantius*, which contains an Anſwer to an Objection of *Epicurus*. (*a*) *Deus, inquit* Epicurus, *aut vult tollere mala, & non poteſt; aut poteſt, & non vult; aut neque vult, neque poteſt; aut & vult & poteſt. Si vult, & non poteſt, imbecillis eſt, quod in Deum non cadit. Si poteſt & non vult, invidus, quod æque alienum à Deo. Si neque vult neque poteſt, & invidus & imbecillis eſt; ideoque neque Deus. Si vult & poteſt, quod ſolum Deo convenit, unde ergo ſunt mala? aut cur illa non tollit? Scio pleroſque Philoſophorum, qui Providentiam defendunt, hoc argumento perturbari ſolere, & invitos pene adigi, ut Deum nihil curare fateantur, quod maxime quærit Epicurus. Sed nos ratione perſpecta, formidoloſum hoc argumentum facile diſſolvimus. Deus enim poteſt, quicquid velit; & imbecillitas, vel invidia in Deo nulla eſt: poteſt igitur mala tollere, ſed non vult; nec ideo tamen invidus eſt. Idcirco enim non tollit, quia & ſapientiam (ſicut docui) ſimul tribuit, & plus boni, ac jucunditatis in ſapientia, quam in malis moleſtiæ. Sapientia etiam facit, ut etiam Deum cognoſcamus, & per eam cognitionem immortalitatem aſſequamur, quod eſt ſummum bonum. Itaque niſi prius malum agnoverimus, nec bonum poterimus agnoſcere. Sed hoc non vidit Epicurus, nec alius quiſquam; ſi tollantur mala, tolli pariter ſapientiam; nec ulla in homine virtutis remanere veſtigia; cujus ratio ſuſtinenda & ſuperanda malorum acerbitate conſiſtit. Itaque propter exiguum compendium ſublatorum malorum maximo, & vero, & proprio nobis bono careremus. Conſtat igitur, omnia propter hominem propoſita, tam mala, quam etiam bona.*

The whole Strength of the Objection could not be more ſincerely repreſented; *Epicurus* himſelf could not have propos'd it with greater Clearneſs and Strength. See the Margin (*b*). But the Anſwer of *Lactantius* is pitiful, and 'tis not only weak, but full of Errors, and perhaps of Hereſies. It ſuppoſes that God muſt produce Evil, becauſe otherwiſe he would not be able to communicate either Wiſdom or virtue, or the Knowledge of what is Good. Can any thing be ſhown more monſtrous than this Doctrine? Does it not overthrow all that Divines tell us about the Happineſs of Paradiſe, and the State of Innocence? They tell us that *Adam* and *Eve* in this happy State felt, without any Mixture of Uneaſineſs, all the Pleaſures, which that delicious and charming Place, the Garden of *Eden*, where God placed them, could afford 'em. They add, that if they had not ſinn'd, they and all their Poſterity ſhould have enjoy'd this Happineſs, without being ſubject either to Diſeaſes or Troubles, and that neither the Elements nor Animals, had ever done 'em any harm. It was their Sin that expos'd them to Cold and Heat, to Hunger and Thirſt, to Pain and Sorrow, and to the Miſchiefs which certain Beaſts do us. So far is it from being true, that Virtue and Wiſdom cannot belong to a Man without Phyſical Evil, as *Lactantius* affirms, that on the contrary it muſt be maintain'd, that Man has been ſubject to this Evil, only becauſe he renounc'd Virtue and Wiſdom. If the Doctrine of *Lactantius* were good, we muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe, that the good Angels are Subject to a thouſand Inconveniencies, and that the Souls of the Bleſſed do alternately change from Joy to Sorrow; ſo that in the Manſions of Glory, and in the Boſom of the Beatifick Viſion, none are ſecur'd from Adverſity. Nothing is more contrary to the unanimous Sentiment of Divines, and to right Reaſon, than this Doctrine. It is alſo true in Philoſophy, That 'tis no wiſe neceſſary, that our Soul ſhould feel Evil, to the end it may reliſh what is Good, and that it ſhould paſs ſucceſſively from Pleaſure to Pain, and from Pain to Pleaſure, that it may be able to diſcern that Pain is an evil, and that Pleaſure is a good Thing. And thus *Lactantius* does not leſs thwart the Light of Nature, than the Reaſons of Divines. We know by Experience, that our Soul cannot feel at one and the ſame time both Pleaſure and Pain; it muſt therefore at firſt either have felt Pain before Pleaſure, or Pleaſure before Pain. If its firſt Senſation was that of Pain, it found that State to be uneaſy, although it was ignorant of Pleaſure. Suppoſe then that its firſt Senſation laſted many Years without interruption, you may conceive that it was in an eaſy Condition, or in one that was uneaſy. And do not alledge to me Experience; do not tell me, that a Pleaſure which laſts a long time becomes inſipid, and that a long Pain becomes ſupportable; for I will anſwer you, that this proceeds from a Change in the Organ, which makes that Pain which continues the ſame as to Kind, to be different as to Degrees. If you have had at firſt a Senſation of ſix Degrees, it will not continue of ſix to the end of two Hours, or to the end of a Year, but only either of one Degree, or of one 4th Part of a Degree. Thus Cuſtom blunts the Edge of our Senſations; their Degrees correſpond to the Concuſſions of the parts of the Brain, and this Concuſſion is weakned by frequent Repetitions, from whence it comes to paſs that the Degrees of Senſation are diminiſh'd. But if Pain or Joy were communicated to us in the ſame Degree ſucceſſively for a hundred Years, we ſhould be as unhappy or as happy in the hundredth Year as in the firſt Day; which plainly proves that a Creature may be happy with a continued Good, or unhappy with a continued Evil; and that the Alternative, which *Lactantius* ſpeaks of, is a bad Solution of the Difficulty. It is not founded upon the Nature of Good and Evil, nor upon the Nature of the Subject which receives them, nor upon the Nature of the Cauſe which produces them. Pleaſure and Pain are no leſs proper to be communicated the ſecond Moment than the firſt, and the third moment than the ſecond, and ſo of all the reſt. Our Soul is alſo as ſuſceptible of them after it has felt them one Moment, as it was before it felt them, and God who gave them is no leſs capable of producing them the ſecond Moment than the firſt. This is what we learn from the natural Idea's we have of theſe Objects. Chriſtian Theology confirms this invincibly, ſince it teaches us, that the Torments of the damn'd ſhall be eternal and continued, and as ſharp at the End of a hundred thouſand Years as at the firſt Day; and that on the contrary the Pleaſures of Paradiſe ſhall laſt eternally and continually, without ever abating of their Vigor. I would gladly know, whether ſuppoſing a Thing which is very eaſy, that there were two Suns in the World, whereof one ſhould riſe when the other ſets, we muſt not conclude, that Darkneſs would be unknown to Mankind. According to this fine Philoſophy of *Lactantius*, we muſt alſo conclude, that a Man could not know the Light, he

ONE may feel one of the Contraries without having ever felt the other.

(*a*) *Lactant. de ira Dei cap.* 13. *pag. m.* 548.

(*b*) *Note that this Objection of* Epicurus *does not concern moral Evil, and if it did, it would yet be more difficult to be anſwer'd.*

God, is always accompanied with the Doctrine, which teaches the Rebellion and Fall of one [illegible] of the good Angels. This Hypotheſis of Two Principles would probably

and ſee the Objects before him, &c. See the Margin (e).

(e) I will cite hereafter a Paſſage of Plutarch, which may be applied againſt the Anſwers of Lactantius.

What I have juſt now ſaid, proves invincibly, I think, that there is no Advantage to be gain'd againſt our *Paulicians*, by repreſenting to them, that God has mingled Good and Evil, only becauſe he foreſaw that a pure and unmix'd Good would ſeem to us too inſipid in a little time. They will anſwer that this Property is not contain'd in the Idea we ought to have of a good Thing, and that it is directly contrary to the common Doctrine about the Happineſs of Paradiſe. And as to the Experience which teaches us but too much, 1. That the Joys of this Life are not ſenſible, but proportionably as they deliver us from a troubleſom State: 2. That they draw after them ſome Diſguſt, when they have continued a little while: they will maintain, that this *Phænomenon* is inexplicable, unleſs we have Recourſe to the Hypotheſis of two Principles. For if we depend, will they ſay, only upon one Cauſe Almighty, infinitely Good and infinitely Free, and which diſpoſes univerſally of all Beings, according to the Pleaſure of his own Will, we ought not to feel any Evil, all our Goods ought to be pure, and we ought never to have the leaſt Diſlike. The Author of our Being, if he is infinitely Beneficent, ought to take a continual Pleaſure in making us happy, and preventing every thing that may diſturb or diminiſh our Joy: For it is a Character eſſentially contain'd in the Idea of ſupream Goodneſs. The Fibers of our Brain, cannot be the Cauſe that God weakens our Pleaſures; for according to you, he is the only Author of Matter; he is Almighty, and nothing can hinder him from acting according to the full extent of his infinite Goodneſs; he needs only Will, that our Pleaſures ſhould not depend upon the Fibres of our Brain, and if he wills that they ſhould depend upon them, he can preſerve theſe Fibres eternally in the ſame State; he needs only will that they ſhould not wear out at all, or that the Damage they ſuffer ſhould be quickly repair'd. You cannot therefore explain what we Experience, but by the Hypotheſis of two Principles. If we feel Pleaſure, it is the good Principle that gives it to us; but if we do not feel it perfectly pure, and if we are quickly diſguſted with it, it is becauſe there is an ill Principle that croſſes the Good. The Latter, to be even with him, makes our Pains leſs ſenſible by Cuſtom, and gives us always ſome hopes in the greateſt Evils. This and the good Uſe that is often made of Adverſity, and the bad Uſe that is often made of Proſperity, are *Phænomena*, which are admirably explain'd according to the *Manichean* Hypotheſis. Theſe are things which lead us to ſuppoſe, that the two Principles made an Agreement which reciprocally limits their Operations. The Good Principle cannot do us all the Good he deſires: It was neceſſary that in order to do us a great deal of Good, he ſhould conſent, that his Adverſary ſhould do us as much Evil; for without this Conſent the Chaos would ſtill have remain'd a Chaos, and no Creature would ever have felt what is Good. Thus the Good Principle finding it a better Way for his own Satiſfaction, to ſee the World ſometimes happy and ſometimes miſerable, than never to ſee it happy, made an Agreement which produc'd the Mixture of Good and Evil we now ſee in Mankind. By aſcribing to your Principle an Almighty Power, and the Glory of enjoying Eternity alone, you have depriv'd him of an Attribute which goes before all the reſt; for *optimus* precedes always *maximus* in the Style of the moſt knowing Nations, when they ſpeak of God. You ſuppoſe that having nothing to hinder him from loading his Creatures with good Things, he oppreſſes them with Evils; and if any of them be advanc'd, it (*b*) is that their Fall may be the greater: We clear him from any Guilt in all this Matter, we explain without impeaching his Goodneſs, all that can be ſaid of the Inconſtancy of Fortune, the Jealouſy of *Nemeſis*, and the continual Sport which *Æſop* makes the Employment of God: (*c*) He exalts Things, ſays he, that are low, and abaſes Things that are high. He could obtain no more, ſay we, from his Adverſary: His Goodneſs extended as far as it could; if he does us no more Good, it is becauſe he can not; we have no Reaſon therefore to complain.

(*b*) Tolluntur in altum ut lapſu graviore ruant. *Claudian. in Rufinum lib.* 1. *circa init.*

(*c*) *See the Article* Æſop.

Who will not admire and deplore the Fate of our Reaſon! Behold here the *Manichees*, who with an Hypotheſis altogether abſurd and contradictory, explain what we experience, a hundred times better than the Orthodox do, with a ſuppoſition ſo juſt, ſo neceſſary, and ſo true of one firſt Principle, which is infinitely Good and Almighty.

Let us ſhow, by another Example, the bad ſucceſs of the Fathers in their Diſputes againſt theſe Hereticks, with reſpect to the origine of Evil. Here follows a Paſſage of St. *Baſil*: (*d*) *At neque à Deo ipſum malum profluxiſſe, pium eſt dicere: propterea quod nihil contrariorum à contrario ſuo gignitur --- at ſi nec ingenitum, inquies, ipſum malum nec à Deo profluxit, unde naturam ſortitur? Nam mala eſſe nemo particeps vitæ contradixerit. Quid igitur eſt dicendum: nempe malum non eſſentiam viventem animaque præditam eſſe; ſed affectionem animæ, virtuti contrariam, deſidioſis ac inertibus, propterea quod à bono deciderunt, inditam. Noli itaque malum foriſecus circumſpicere, atque inquirere, neque quandam naturam Principem malignitatis imaginare, ſed malitiæ quiſque ſuæ ſeipſum Autorem agnoſcat. Nam ſemper ea, quæ nobis eveniunt, partim è natura proficiſcuntur, ut ſenectus, ut infirmitas: partim ſuâ ſponte proveniunt, quales ſunt caſus inopini alienis principiis accidentes ---- partim vero in nobis ipſis ſunt collocata, ut cupiditates ſpernere, aut voluptatibus modum non ponere, continere iram, aut manus injicere in eum qui injuriâ laceſſivit, vera dicere aut falſa, manſuetum moribus eſſe ac moderatum, aut faſtu ſuperbum arrogantiaque elatum. Quorum itaque tute Dominus es, horum principia non aliunde quærere velis, ſed quod propriè malum eſt, id ab ultronea & voluntaria electione ſumpſiſſe principium ſcito, &c.* The *German* Divine (*e*) who relates this Paſſage, had reaſon to ſay, that this Father granted to the *Marcionites* more than he ought; for he will not ſo much as acknowledge, that God is the Author of Natural Evil, ſuch as Sickneſs and Old Age, and of a hundred things which proceed from external Cauſes, and happen ſuddenly. Thus to diſintangle himſelf from a difficulty, he adopts Errors, and perhaps even Hereſies. But there is another Fault in this Anſwer; he fanſies he can extricate himſelf from this Difficulty, and clear Providence from any Guilt; provided he affirms, that Vices have their original in the Soul of Man. How came he not to perceive, that he ſhuns the difficulty? or that he gives for a Solution of it the very thing wherein the principal difficulty conſiſts? The pretence of *Zoroaſter*, *Plato*, *Plutarch*, the *Marcionites*, and *Manichees*, and in general of all thoſe who admit one Principle naturally good, and another Principle naturally Evil, both eternal and independant, is, That without this Suppoſition, no account can be given how Evil came into the World. You anſwer, That it came into the World by Man: But how can that be, ſince, according to you, Man is the Workmanſhip of a Being infinitely Holy, and infinitely Powerful? Ought not the Work of ſuch a Cauſe to be good? Can it be any thing elſe but good? Is it not more impoſſible, that Darkneſs ſhould proceed from Light, than that the Product of ſuch a Principle ſhould be bad? There lies the Difficulty. St. *Baſil* could not be ignorant of it. Why then does he ſay ſo coldly, That we muſt not ſearch for Evil but in the Soul of Man? But who put it there? The Man himſelf, by abuſing the Grace of his Creator, who being ſovereign Goodneſs itſelf, produc'd him in a State of Innocence. If you anſwer thus, you fall into a *Petitio Principii*. You diſpute with a *Manichee*, who maintains, That two contrary Creators concurr'd to the Production of Man, and that Man receiv'd from the good Principle, whatever Good he has; and from the bad Principle, whatever he has of Evil; and you anſwer his Objections, by ſuppoſing that the Creator of Man is an only and moſt Good Being. Is not this to give your own Theſis for an Anſwer? 'Tis plain that St. *Baſil* diſputes ill: But ſince 'tis a thing that nonpluſſes all Philoſophy, he ſhould have retir'd into his Strong-hold, *i. e.* he ſhould have prov'd, (*f*) by the Word of God, that the Author of all things is but one, and that he is infinite in Goodneſs and all ſorts of Perfections; and that Man coming out of his Hands innocent and Good, has loſt his Innocence and his Goodneſs by his own Fault: This is the Origine of Moral and Natural Evil. Let *Marcion*, and all the *Manichees* reaſon as much as they

(*d*) *Baſilius Magnus Hexaem. homil.* 2. *apud Tobiam Pfannerum ſyſtem. Theologiæ gentilis cap.* 9. *pag. m.* 253.

(*e*) *Tobias Pfanner. ibid.*

(*f*) *See the Article of the* Manichees.

probably have made a greater Progreſs, if the particulars of it had been given leſs groſly, and if it had not been attended with many odious Practices *, or if there had

* *See the Remark D. of the Article Manichees.*

they pleaſe, to ſhow, that under a Providence infinitely Good and Holy, this Fall of an Innocent Man could not happen, they argue againſt Matter of Fact, and conſequently they make themſelves ridiculous. I ſuppoſe always, that they are ſuch People as may be reduc'd by Arguments *ad hominem*, to acknowledge the Divine Authority of the old Teſtament. For if one had to do with *Zoroaſter* or *Plutarch*, it would be quite another thing.

That you may ſee 'tis not without reaſon I urge, That we muſt only oppoſe theſe Sectaries, with this Maxim, *Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia*, and with this ſhort Enthymem, *This has come to paſs, therefore it is not repugnant to the Holineſs and Goodneſs of God*, I obſerve that we cannot join Iſſue in this diſpute, upon any other foot, without ſome diſadvantage. The reaſons for the permiſſion of Sin, which are not taken from the Myſteries (*g*) reveal'd in Scripture, have this defect, how good ſoever they be, that they may be oppos'd by other Reaſons more ſpecious, and more agreeable to the Ideas we have of Order. For Inſtance, If you ſay that God permitted Sin to manifeſt his Wiſdom, which ſhines the more brightly by the Diſorders which the wickedneſs of Men produces every Day, than it would have done in a ſtate of Innocence; It may be anſwer'd, That this is to compare the Deity to a Father who ſhould ſuffer his Children to break their Legs on purpoſe to ſhow to all the City his great Art in ſetting their Broken Bones; or to a King who ſhould ſuffer Seditions and Factions to encreaſe thro' all his Kingdom, that he might purchaſe the Glory of quelling them. The Conduct of this Father and Monarch is ſo contrary to the clear and diſtinct Ideas, according to which we judge of Goodneſs and Wiſdom, and in general of the whole Duty of a Father and a King, that our Reaſon cannot conceive how God can make uſe of the ſame. But you will ſay, The ways of God are not our ways. Keep to that then, (*h*) this is a Text of Scripture, and do not reaſon any more (*i*). Do not any more tell us, That without the Fall of the Firſt Man, the Juſtice and Mercy of God would have remain'd unknown; for you will be anſwer'd, that there was nothing more eaſy than to make Man know theſe two Attributes: the ſole Idea of a Being infinitely perfect, clearly informs ſinful Man, that God poſſeſſes all the Vertues that are worthy of a Nature infinite in all reſpects: How much more would it have inform'd an innocent Man, that God is infinitely juſt? But he had never puniſh'd any Body: By this very thing his Juſtice would have been known, this had been a continued Act, a perpetual exerciſe of that Vertue. None had deſerv'd to be puniſh'd, and conſequently the forbearing of all Puniſhment had been an exerciſe of Juſtice. I deſire you to anſwer me: There are two Princes, whereof one ſuffers his Subjects to fall into Miſery, that he may deliver them, when they have ſufficiently languiſh'd under it; and the other preſerves them always in a proſperous State. Is not the latter much better, and more merciful than the other? Thoſe who teach the immaculate Conception of the Virgin, prove demonſtratively that God pour'd upon her his Mercy, and the Benefits of Redemption, more than upon other Men. One needs not be a Metaphyſician to know this: a Countryman clearly perceives, that it is a much greater Goodneſs to hinder a Man from falling into a Ditch, than to let him fall in, (*a*) and then take him out an Hour after; and that it is much better to hinder an Aſſaſſin from killing a Man, (*b*) than to break him upon the Wheel after he has been permitted to commit the Murther. All this ſerves to admoniſh us, that we muſt not join Iſſue with the *Manichees*, till we have before all things laid down the Doctrine (*c*) *of the exaltation of Faith, and the abaſement of Reaſon.*

Thoſe who ſay that God permitted Sin, becauſe he could not hinder it without deſtroying Free-will, which he had given to Man, and which was the beſt Preſent he had made him, expoſe themſelves very much. The Reaſon they give is ſpecious, there is in it *I know not what* which dazles the Eyes, ſomething that appears Great: But nevertheleſs it may be oppos'd by ſuch Reaſons as are more ſuited to the Capacity of all Men, and more founded upon good ſenſe, and the Idea's of Order. Without having read the fine Treatiſe of *Seneca* about Benefits, any one knows by the light of Nature, that it is eſſential to a Benefactor not to beſtow ſuch Favours which he knows will be abus'd in ſuch a Manner, that they will ſerve only to the Ruin of him to whom they are given. There is no Enemy ſo inveterate, who would not upon theſe Terms load his Enemy with Favours. It is eſſential to a Benefactor to ſpare nothing to make the Perſon happy with his Benefits, whom he honours with them. If he could confer on him the Knowledge of making good Uſe of them, and ſhould refuſe it him, he would very ill ſuſtain the Character of a Benefactor; neither would he better ſuſtain it, if being able to keep his Client from abuſing the Benefits, he ſhould not hinder him by curing his bad Inclinations (*d*). Theſe are Idea's which are known as well to the common People as to the Philoſophers. I confeſs that if one could not prevent the ill Uſe of a Favour, but by breaking the Arms and Legs of one's Clients, or by ſhackling their Feet with Irons in a Dungeon, one would not be oblig'd to prevent it; it were better to refuſe them the Benefit: But if one can prevent it by changing the Heart, and by giving a Man a reliſh of Good Things, one ought to do it: Now this is what God might have done eaſily, if he would. Obſerve well what *Cicero* ſays, in oppoſition to thoſe, who alledge that it is not the Fault of God, if Men do not uſe aright his Favours. (*e*) *Huic loco ſic ſoletis occurrere, Non idcirco non optimè nobis à diis eſſe proviſum, quod multi eorum beneficio perversè uterentur: etiam patrimoniis multos malè uti: nec ob eam cauſam eos beneficium à patribus nullum habere. Quis iſtuc negat? aut quæ eſt in collatione iſta ſimilitudo? nec enim Herculi nocere Deïanira voluit, cùm ei tunicam, ſanguine Centauri tinctam, dedit: nec prodeſſe Pheræo Jaſoni, is qui gladio vomicam ejus aperuit, quam ſanare medici non potuerant. MULTI ENIM, ETIAM CUM OBESSE VELLENT, PROFUERUNT, ET CUM PRODESSE, OBFUERUNT. Ita non fit ex eo, quod datur, ut voluntas ejus qui dederit, appareat: nec ſi is, qui accepit, bene utitur, idcirco is, qui dedit, amice dedit.* There is no good Mother who having given leave to her Daughters to go to a Ball, but would revoke that leave, if ſhe were ſure that they would yield to Enticement, and leave their Virginity behind them; and every Mother, who knowing that this would certainly come to paſs, ſhould nevertheleſs ſuffer them to go to a Ball, being contented with exhorting them to Vertue, and threatning them with her Diſgrace, if they ſhould not return Maids, would at leaſt juſtly bring upon herſelf the Blame of not loving her Daughters, nor Chaſtity. It would be in vain for her to ſay, in her own Juſtification, that ſhe had no mind to reſtrain the Liberty of her Daughters, nor to ſhow any Diſtruſt of them: She would be anſwer'd, That this Management was very unskilful and ſavour'd more of a provok'd Step-mother, than of a Mother; and that it had been better to keep her Daughters in her Sight than to give them the Privilege of Liberty to ſuch bad Purpoſes, and to grant them ſuch Marks of her Confidence. This diſcovers the Raſhneſs of thoſe who aſſign for a Reaſon the Regard which, they ſay, God ſhow'd to the Free Will of the firſt Man. They had better believe and be ſilent, than alledge ſuch Reaſons as may be refuted by the Examples I have juſt now made uſe of. *Cotta* in *Cicero* brings ſo many Arguments againſt thoſe who ſay, Reaſon is a Gift which the Gods beſtow'd upon Man, that *Cicero* found himſelf unable to anſwer thoſe Difficulties; for if he had been able, he would have refuted them; his Academic Spirit was in its Element, when he could make it appear, that one may Diſpute *pro* and *con in infinitum*. Since therefore he has given no Anſwer to the Reaſons of *Cotta*, we muſt believe that he could not do it. Yet *Cicero* was one of the greateſt Wits that ever was. *Cotta* having ſhown that Reaſon is an Accomplice in all Crimes, and that therefore the Gods ſhould have given it to us, if they intended to do us a Miſchief (*f*), propoſes to himſelf the common Solution, which is, that Men abuſe the Favours of Heaven. *Sed urgetis identidem hominum eſſe iſtam culpam, non Deorum .... in hominum vitiis ais eſſe culpam* (*g*). He replies that the abuſe ſhould have been prevented, and that Men

(*g*) *We will here ſet down what a Father of the Church ſaid*, Felix culpa quæ talem meruit habere redemptorem.

(*h*) *Iſai. c. 55. v. 8.*

(*i*) *See below, the Remark KSS towards the end.*

(*a*) *See* Garaſſe *Somme Theologique, p. 430.*

(*b*) Cur omnium crudeliſſimus tam diu Cinna regnavit? At dedit pœnas. Prohiberi melius fuit, impedirique ne tot ſummos viros interficeret, quàm ipſum aliquando pœnas dare. Summo cruciatu, ſuppliciοque Varius homo importuniſſimus periit: ſed quia Druſum ferro, Metellum veneno ſuſtulerat: illos conſervari melius fuit, quam pœnas ſceleris Varium pendere. *Cicero de nat. Deorum l. 3. p. m. 679.*

(*c*) *Mr.* Amyrald *has wrote a Book that bears that Title.*

(*d*) *See concerning all this the Remark E. of the Article* Origen.

(*e*) Cicero *de nat. Deorum l. 3. p. m. 658. Add to this what has been ſaid of the* Eutrapelus *of* Horace *in the Article of* Origen.

(*f*) *Becauſe it was late he feigns that* Balbus *did not anſwer* Cotta, *and put it off till another day which never came,* Quoniam advesperaſcit dabis diem nobis aliquam ut contra iſta dicamus. Cotta *anſwers that he wiſhes he were refuted, and hopes it.* Ego vero & opto redargui me, Balbe, & ea quæ diſputavi diſſerere malui quam judicare, & facile me à te vinci poſſe certo ſcio. *Cicero de nat. Deor. l. 3. ſub fin.*

(*g*) Non ut patrimonium relinquitur, ſic ratio homini eſt beneficio deorum data: quid enim potius hominibus dediſſent ſi iis nocere voluiſſent. *Id. ib. p. m. 658.*

had been (F) then as many Diſputes about Predeſtination, as there are at this Day, in which the Chriſtians accuſe one another, either of making God the Author of

Men ſhould have had ſuch a Reaſon, as ſhould have driven away whatever is Evil; and that thoſe cannot be excus'd who give what they know will prove pernicious. He proves this by many Examples. (h) *Eam dediſſes hominibus rationem, quæ vitia, culpamque excluderet. Ubi igitur locus fuit errori Deorum? nam patrimonia ſpe bene tradendi relinquimus, qua poſſumus falli; Deus falli qui potuit? An ut Sol in currum cum Phaethontem filium ſuſtulit? aut Neptunus, cum Theſeus Hippolytum perdidit, cum ter optandi à Neptuno patre habuiſſet poteſtatem? Poëtarum iſta ſunt: nos autem philoſophi eſſe volumus, rerum auctores, non fabularum. Atque ii tamen ipſi Dii poëtici ſi ſciſſent perniciosa fore illa filiis, peccaſſe in beneficio putarentur. Et ſi verum eſt quod Ariſto Chius dicere ſolebat, Nocere audientibus Philoſophos iis qui bene dicta male interpretarentur: poſſe enim aſotos ex Ariſtippi, acerbos è Zenonis ſcholâ exire. Prorſus, ſi qui audierant vitioſi eſſent diſceſſuri, quod perverſè philoſophorum diſputationem interpretarentur, tacere præſtare philoſophis quam iis qui ſe audiſſent, nocere. Sic ſi homines rationem bono conſilio à Diis immortalibus datam, in fraudem, malitiamque convertunt, non dare illam, quam dari humano generi melius fuit, ut ſi medicus ſciat eum ægrotum, qui juſſus ſit vinum ſumere, meracius ſumpturum, ſtatimque periturum, magnâ ſit in culpâ: ſic veſtra iſta Providentia reprehendenda, quæ rationem dederit iis, quos ſcierit eâ perverſè & improbè uſuros. Niſi forte dicitis eam neſciviſſe. Utinam quidem; ſed non audebitis: non enim ignoro quanti ejus nomen putetis?* By theſe Reaſons it were eaſy to ſhow, that the Free Will of the firſt Man, which was preſerved to him ſound and entire, in the Circumſtances wherein he was to make uſe of it to his own Loſs, to the Ruin of Mankind, to the eternal Damnation of the greateſt Part of his Poſterity, and to the Introduction of a terrible Deluge of Evils, was not a good Gift. We ſhall never underſtand, that this Privilege could be preſerv'd to him by an effect of Goodneſs, and out of Love for Holineſs. Thoſe who ſay, that it was neceſſary there ſhould be free Beings, (i) to the end that God might be lov'd with a Love of Choice, are conſcious to themſelves, that this Hypotheſis does not ſatiſfy Reaſon; for when it is foreſeen, that thoſe free Beings will chooſe not the Love of God but of Sin, one may plainly perceive, that the intended End is defeated, and that therefore it is no wiſe neceſſary, that Free Will ſhould be preſerv'd. I ſhall examin this again in the Remark K △ △. See in the Margin (k) our Inſtruction.

(F) *If there had been then as many Diſputes about Predeſtination, as there are at this Day.*] If the *Manichees* ſhould go no further, they would renounce their principal Advantages: For the moſt terrible Objections are theſe following. 1. It cannot be conceiv'd that the firſt Man could receive from a good Principle the Faculty of doing Ill. This Faculty is vicious, and every thing that can produce Evil is bad, ſince Evil cannot proceed but from a bad Cauſe; and therefore the free Will of *Adam* proceeded from two contrary Principles: Inaſmuch as he could take the right Way, he depended upon a good Principle; but inaſmuch as he could embrace Evil, he depended upon an ill Principle. 2. 'Tis impoſſible to comprehend, that God did only permit Sin; for a bare Permiſſion of Sin added nothing to Free-will, and was not a Means to fore-ſee, whether *Adam* would perſevere in his Innocence or fall from it. Beſides according to the Idea we have of a created Being, we cannot comprehend that it can be a Principle of Action, that it can move it ſelf, and that receiving in every Moment of its Duration its Exiſtence and the Exiſtence of its Faculties, wholly from another Cauſe, it ſhould create in it ſelf any Modalities by a Power peculiar to it ſelf. Theſe Modalities muſt be either not diſtinct from the Subſtance of the Soul, as the new Philoſophers will have it, or diſtinct from the Soul, as the Peripateticks affirm. If they be not diſtinct, they cannot be produc'd but by the Cauſe, which can produce the very Subſtance of the Soul; but it is manifeſt that Man himſelf is not this Cauſe, neither can he be. If they are diſtinct, then they are created Beings, produc'd out of nothing, ſince they are not compos'd of the Soul, nor of any other pre-exiſtent Nature; they cannot therefore be produc'd but by a Cauſe that can create. Now all the Sects of Philoſophy agree, that Man is not, nor can be ſuch a Cauſe. Some think (a) that the Motion which excites him proceeds from ſome other Cauſe, and that nevertheleſs he can ſtop it, and fix it upon a certain Object. This is contradictory, ſince there is no leſs Power requir'd to ſtop that which is in Motion, than to move that which is at Reſt. Seeing therefore a Creature cannot be mov'd by a bare permiſſion of Acting, and has not in it ſelf a Principle of Motion, it is abſolutely neceſſary that God ſhould move it; he muſt therefore do ſomething elſe than barely permit Man to Sin. 3. This may be proved by a new Reaſon: It cannot be comprehended, that a bare Permiſſion ſhould put contingent Events out of the Number of Things merely poſſible, nor that it ſhould put the Deity in a Capacity of being certainly ſure that the Creature will ſin. A meer Permiſſion cannot be the Foundation of the Divine Preſcience. This is what Obliges the greateſt Part of Divines to ſuppoſe, that God has made a Decree, which imports that the Creature will ſin, and which according to them is the Foundation of Preſcience. Others think that the Decree imports, that the Creature ſhall be plac'd in ſuch Circumſtances, wherein God has foreſeen that it will ſin. Thus ſome think that God foreſaw the Sin by reaſon of the Decree; others, that he made the Decree, becauſe he foreſaw the Sin. Howſoever this be explain'd, it follows plainly, that God was willing that Man ſhould ſin, and that he preferr'd this to the perpetual Duration of Innocence, which it was ſo eaſy for him to procure and ordain. Reconcile this if you can with the Goodneſs he ought to have for his Creatures, and the infinite Love he ought to have for Holineſs. 4. But if you ſay with thoſe that come nearer to juſtifying Providence, that God did not fore-ſee the Fall of *Adam*, you will gain but little by it; for at leaſt he knew very certainly, that the firſt Man run the hazard of loſing his Innocence, and introducing into the World all the Evils of Puniſhment and Guilt, which follow'd his Apoſtacy. Neither his Goodneſs, nor his Holineſs, nor his Wiſdom can permit, that he ſhould run the hazard of theſe Events; for our Reaſon convinces us very evidently, that a Mother who ſhould ſuffer her Daughters to go to a Ball, when ſhe knew moſt certainly that they would run a great hazard with reſpect to their Honour, would ſhew thereby, that ſhe neither loved her Daughters, nor Chaſtity: and if it be ſuppos'd, that ſhe has an infallible Preſervative againſt all Temptations, and that ſhe gives it not to her Daughters when ſhe ſends them to a Ball, it is moſt evident that ſhe is guilty, and that ſhe takes but little care that her Daughters ſhould preſerve their Virginity. Let us carry on the Compariſon a little further; If that Mother ſhould go to this Ball, and through a Window ſhould ſee and underſtand, that one of her Daughters defends her ſelf but weakly in the Corner of a Chamber againſt the Sollicitations of a young Gallant; if even when ſhe ſees, that her Daughter is but one Step from yielding to the deſires of the Tempter, ſhe ſhould not go then to aſſiſt her and deliver her from the Snare, would not every one have reaſon to ſay, that ſhe acts like a cruel Step-mother, and that ſhe would not ſcruple to ſell the Honour of her own Daughter? This is a Repreſentation of the Conduct which the Socinians attribute to God. They cannot ſay, that he knew the Sin of the firſt Man, but as a poſſible Event; he knew all the particulars of the Temptation, and he muſt needs have known a Moment before *Eve* yielded, that ſhe was going to deſtroy her ſelf; he muſt, I ſay, have known it with ſuch a certainty, as renders one inexcuſable if he does not prevent the Evil, and diſables him from ſaying, *I had reaſon to believe that this would not happen, I had ſtill great hopes.* There are no People of ſo little Experience, but without ſeeing what paſſes in the Heart, and knowing the Matter any otherwiſe than by Signs, may be ſure, that a Woman is ready to yield, if they ſee through a Window how ſhe defends her ſelf when really her Fall is near. Before the Moment of her Conſent, there are certain Indications wherein they are not deceiv'd. How much greater Reaſon have we to think,

(h) *Ibid.*

(i) *See the Treatiſe of Morality of Father* Malebranche.

(k) Sancta illa & profunda fidei myſteria non pari paſſu cum cauſis naturalibus ambulant, eoque rectius illa & creduntur clauſis oculis, & intelliguntur; I ſegreti del ciel ſol colui vede, che ſerra gli occhi, e crede. *Franciſcus Redi de gener. Inſectorum.*

(a) *Father* Malebranche *in the Treatiſe of Nature and Grace.*

of Sin, or of depriving him of the Government of the World. The Pagans could better answer

think, that God who knew all the Thoughts of *Eve*, (this Knowledge the *Socinians* do not deny him) could not doubt but she was just ready to yield. He did therefore suffer her to sin, and this he did at the same time when he foresaw that she would certainly sin. The Sin of *Adam* was yet more certainly foreseen; for the Example of *Eve* gave some light the better to foresee the Fall of her Husband. If God had purpos'd to preserve Man and his Innocence, and to prevent all the Miseries which were to be the Consequence of Sin, would he not at least have fortifyed the Husband after the Wife had fain? Would he not have given him another Wife sound and perfect, instead of that which was seduc'd? We say therefore that the Socinian System, by depriving God of Prescience, reduces him to Slavery, and to a pitiful Form of Government, and does not remove the grand Difficulty which it should remove, and which forces these Hereticks to deny the Foreknowledge of contingent Events (c).

I refer you to a Professor of Divinity (d) yet living (e), who has prov'd as clear as the day, that neither the Method of the *Scotists*, nor that of the *Molinists*, nor that of the *Remonstrants*, nor that of the *Universalists*, nor that of the *Pajonists*, nor that of Father *Malebranche*, nor that of the *Lutherans*, nor that of the *Socinians*, can solve the Objections of those who impute to God the introduction of Sin, or who pretend, that it is not consistent with his Goodness, nor with his Holiness, or Justice; insomuch that this Professor finding nothing better elsewhere, continues in the Hypothesis of St. *Augustin*, which is the same with that of *Luther* and *Calvin*, and of the *Thomists* and *Jansenists*; I say he continues there, (f) *being distress'd with the astonishing Difficulties* he has produc'd (g), *and oppressed with their Weight* (h). Since *Luther* and *Calvin* appear'd, I do not think that a Year has pass'd wherein they have not been accus'd of making God the Author of Sin. The Professor of whom I speak, confesses, That (i) with respect to *Luther*, the Accusation is just; the *Lutherans* at this Day pretend the same thing as to *Calvin*. The Roman Catholicks pretend the same thing as to both. The Jesuits pretend it as to *Jansenius*. Those who are a little equitable and moderate, do not take it to be an Act of Insincerity in their Adversary, when he protests, that he does not at all impute to God the sin of Man, that he does not at all make him the Author of it: they are willing to grant that he does not expresly teach it, and that all the Consequences of his Doctrine are not perceiv'd by him; but they add, that *protestatio facto contraria nihil valet*, and that if he will take the pains to define exactly, what was necessary for God to have done that he might be the Author of the Sin of *Adam*, he will find that according to his Doctrine, God has done all that was necessary in order to that End. You therefore, add they, act quite contrary to *Epicurus*; he deny'd in effect (k) that there were any gods, and yet he said that there were some. You on the contrary deny in your Words that God is the Author of Sin, but in effect you teach it.

Let us come at last to the Text of this Remark. The Disputes which have arisen in the West among Christians since the Reformation, have so clearly shown that a Man does not know which Side to take, when he would solve the Difficulties about the Origine of Evil, that a *Manichee* at this Day would be more terrible than in former times, because he would refute every Party by the others. You have drain'd, would he say, all the Forces of your Wit; you have invented the *Scientia media*, which like a *Deus è Machina* is brought in to clear your Chaos. This Invention is chimerical; it cannot be conceiv'd, that God should foresee things future otherwise than in his Decrees, or in the Necessity of Causes. This is no less inconceivable in Metaphysicks, than it is inconceivable in Morals, that he who is Goodness and Holiness it self should be the Author of Sin. I refer you to the *Jansenists*. See how they run down your *Scientia media*, both by direct Proofs, and by retorting your Arguments. The *Socinians* endeavour to extricate themselves by denying Prescience, but they have the Disgrace to see that their Hypothesis vilifies the Government of God, without clearing him of the Guilt. I refer them to the Protestants, who overthrow and utterly confound them. As to absolute Decrees, the certain Cause of Prescience, see, I pray you, after what Manner the *Molinists* and the *Remonstrants* oppose them, There is a Divine, who confesses almost with Tears in his Eyes, (b) *That there is no Body more troubled than he with the Difficulties of* these Decrees, and that he continues in this Condition, only because when he had a mind to go over to Methods mitigated, *he found himself still oppress'd with the same Weights.* He enlarges (c) with great Strength upon all this in another Work; and you cannot deny but he refutes invincibly all those Methods; and consequently you have no recourse left, unless you will adopt my System of the Two Principles. By this means you'll extricate your self from this Trouble, all the Difficulties will vanish away; you will fully justify the good Principle, and you only pass from one *Manicheism* to another more reasonable: for if you examine your System carefully, you will acknowledge, that you as well as I admit Two Principles, the one of Good, and the other of Evil; but instead of placing them as I do, in two Subjects, you joyn them together in one and the same Substance, which is monstrous and impossible. The only Principle which you admit, will'd from all Eternity, according to you (d), that Man should Sin, and that this Sin should be Infectious, that it should produce without End and without Intermission all imaginable Crimes over the Face of the whole Earth: In Consequence whereof he prepar'd for Mankind in this Life all the Miseries that can be conceiv'd, such as Pestilence, War, Famine, Pain, Vexation, and after this Life an Hell, wherein all Men almost shall be eternally tormented, after such a Manner as makes our Hairs stand on end, when we read the Descriptions of it. If such a Principle is otherwise perfectly Good, and loves Holiness infinitely, must we not acknowledge, that the same God is at one and the same time, perfectly Good and perfectly Bad, and that he loves Vice no less than he does Vertue? Now is it not more reasonable to divide these two opposite Qualities, and to give all that is Good to one Principle, and all that is Bad to another Principle? Humane History will prove nothing to the Disadvantage of the Good Principle. I do not say, as you do, that of his own Will, and only because it was his good Pleasure, he subjected Mankind to Sin and Misery, when nothing hindred him from making them Holy and Happy: I suppose he did not consent to this but to shun a greater Evil, and that he did it as it were against his Will. This clears him of Guilt. He saw that the Evil Principle would destroy all; he oppos'd him as much as he could, and (e) by Agreement he obtain'd the State to which Things are now reduc'd. He acted like a Monarch, who to avoid the Ruin of all his Dominions, is obliged to sacrifice one part of them to the good of the other. This is a grand Inconveniency, and which at first frightens humane Reason, to talk of a first Principle, and a necessary Being, as of a Thing that does not all it has a mind to, and which is forc'd for want of Power to submit to Emergencies; but it is yet a greater Imperfection (f) to resolve to do Evil, when one can do Good. This is what might be said by this Heretick. I shall conclude with the good Use for which I made these Remarks.

WHAT Use is to be made of the Dispute related here above.

'Tis more useful than one would think, to humble the Reason of Men, by showing them with what Force, the most foolish Heresies, such as those of the *Manichees* are, may confound it, and embroil the most fundamental Truths. This should teach the *Socinians*, who make Reason the Rule of Faith, that they throw themselves into the Way of Error, which can only make 'em deny or doubt of all things, and that they lay themselves open to be beaten by the most execrable People. What must be done then? Men must captivate their Understandings to the Obedience of Faith, and never dispute about some Things:

yaranſwer than the Chriſtians to the Objections (G) of the *Manichees*; but ſome of their Philoſophers

---

(c) *See Mr. Arnauld's Reflections upon the System of* F. Malebranche *l. 1. c. 13. pag. 255. where he shews that unless God combines by particular Wills the Wills of Men, and the Motions of Matter, the Events which are call'd contingent, would be such even with respect to God.*

(d) *This I write in the beginning of* April, 1695.

(e) Jurieu's *Judgment concerning the mitigated and rigid Methods of explaining Providence and Grace.*

(f) *Id. ib. pag.* 23.

(g) *Pag.* 19, 20, 21, *and* 22.

(h) *Ibid. page* 23.

(i) *After he has related the Opinion of* Luther, *he says,* Hæc omnia abdicamus & horremus ut religionem omnem pessundantia & Manichæismum spirantia. *Petrus Jurius de pace inter Protestantes ineunda pag.* 214. *See the Bishop of* Meaux *in the Addit. to the Histor. of Variat.* (k) Epicurum verbis reliquisse Deos, re sustulisse. *Cicero de natura Deorum lib.* 1. *pag. m.* 123. *See also* Lactantius *lib. de ira Dei cap.* 4.

(b) *Jurieu's Judgment on the Methods, p.* 23.

(c) *See the Remark I.*

(d) *According to the* Molinists, *he decreed to place Men in such Circumstances wherein he certainly knew they would sin, and he could either have put them in more favourable Circumstances, or not have put them in these.*

(e) *In the Remark I, another way different from this Transaction is propos'd.*

(f) *See what shall be cited out of* Plutarch *and* Cicero *in the following Remark.*

particularly they muſt not oppoſe the *Manichees* but by the Scripture, and by the Principle of Submiſſion, as St. *Auguſtine* does. " (g) Their Doctors who were Philoſophers, or rather Sophiſts, profeſſing to follow nothing but Reaſon, without paying any Deference to Authority, very eaſily entangled by their Reaſonings and the deceitful Subtilties of a Philoſophy meerly humane, thoſe who had not Knowledge enough to anſwer them, and could only oppoſe to them the Scripture, and the Authority of the Church, to which it belongs to interpret Scripture according to its true Senſe. Thus by promiſing to their Diſciples that they would diſcover the Truth to them by the meer natural Light of good Senſe and Reaſon, and making every thing paſs for an Error which is above it, as our Myſteries are, they perverted many. And this is that which made St. *Auguſtin*, (t) who knew both the ſtrong and weak Side of that Sect, write againſt them his Excellent Book of the uſefulneſs of Faith, and the Neceſſity there is of believing, chiefly in Things ſupernatural, and which belong to Religion.

(G) *The Pagans could better Anſwer . . . . to the Manichean Objections.*] I do not ſpeak abſolutely of all the Pagans; for we have ſeen elſewhere (h), that the Philoſopher *Meliſſus*, who acknowledg'd but one Principle of all Things, could not have anſwered the Objections of *Zoroaſter*, who acknowledged two Principles, the one Good and the other Bad. If there be but one Principle, and this Principle is eſſentially Good, how comes it that Men are ſubject to ſo many Miſeries? How comes it that they are ſo wicked? (i) What hath he gain'd, if he made the World out of Love for them? (k) *An hæc, ut fere dicitis, hominum cauſa à Deo conſtituta ſunt; ſapientumne? propter paucos ergo tanta eſt facta rerum molitio: an ſtultorum? at primum cauſa non fuit cur de improbis bene mereretur: deinde quid eſt aſſecutus, cùm omnes ſtulti ſint ſine dubio miſerrimi, maximè quòd ſtulti ſunt? Miſerius enim ſtultitiâ quid poſſumus dicere? Deinde quod ita multa ſunt incommoda in vita, ut ea ſapientes commodorum compenſatione leniant: ſtulti nec vitare venientia poſſint, nec ferre præſentia.* If this only Principle that you admit be wicked by Nature, how comes it that Man enjoys ſo many Pleaſures (l)? And that he can receive them in Crouds, thro' all his Senſes, as through ſo many Doors? Whence comes the Paſſionate Deſire with which he ſeeks after them? Whence comes the indefatigable Induſtry, by which he multiplies them, and invents new ones? Whence comes it that he has not only the Idea of Honeſty, but alſo that many vertuous and charitable Actions are practis'd among Men? It is impoſſible, will the *Manichees* ſay, to give the Reaſon of theſe *Phænomena*, unleſs you ſuppoſe that two Principles, the one Good and the other Bad, have regulated the Conditions of the Union between our Soul and our Body, and in general, every thing which concerns the Government of the Univerſe. *Meliſſus* and *Permenides* were not the only Perſons, who were diſtreſs'd with theſe Difficulties; the *Stoicks* alſo were much imbaraſs'd with them; the *Stoicks*, I ſay, who without denying that there were many Gods, reduc'd them all to *Jupiter* (m) as to the ſoveraign Diſpenſer of all Events. To him they attributed Providence, and they acknowledg'd him as a Being infinitely Good and infinitely Wiſe. Upon this *Plutarch* founded the Objections he made to them taken from the Miſery of Mankind. There is not a wiſe Man, ſays he, (n) " nor ever was upon Earth, and on the contrary, there are innumerable Millions of Men miſerable to the laſt Extremity, under the Rule and Dominion of *Jupiter*, whoſe Government and Adminiſtration is very good. And what could be more contrary to common Senſe than to ſay, that *Jupiter* governing extremely well, we ſhould be extremely unhappy. If therefore, what is not lawful to ſay, he would be no longer a Saviour, nor a Deliverer, nor a Protector, but quite contrary to all theſe fine Names; there can no Goodneſs be added to the Things that are, neither as to their Multitude nor Magnitude, as theſe Men ſay, all Men living to the height miſerably and wickedly, and Vice neither receiving Addition, nor Unhappineſs increaſe. Nor is this the worſt; but they are angry with *Menander* for ſaying upon the Stage,

" *The chief Beginning of Mens Miſeries*
" *Are things exceeding good.*

" ſaying that this is againſt common Senſe. And yet they make God, who is Good, the beginning of Evils. For Matter produc'd not any Evil of it ſelf, becauſe it is without Qualities, and whatever Differences it has, it has received them all from that which moves and forms it, not being made to move and form it ſelf. So that of neceſſity, Evil muſt come either from nothing, and from what has no Being, or if from ſome moving Principle, it muſt be from God. But if they think that *Jupiter* has not the command of his Parts, nor uſes every one of them according to his own Reaſon, they ſpeak againſt common Senſe, and imagin an Animal, many of whoſe Parts are not ſubſervient to his Will, uſing their own Operations and Actions, to which the whole gives no incitation, nor begins their Motion. For there is nothing which has Life, ſo ill compacted, as that againſt its Will, its Feet ſhould go, its Tongue ſpeak, its Horns puſh, or its Teeth bite; the moſt of which things God muſt of neceſſity ſuffer, if the Wicked being Parts of him, do againſt his Will, lye, cheat, rob, and murther one another. But if, as *Chryſippus* ſays, the leſt Part cannot poſſibly behave it ſelf otherwiſe than according to *Jupiter*'s Pleaſure, and if every living Thing is ſo fram'd by Nature, as to reſt and move according as he inclines it, and as he turns, ſtays, and diſpoſes it: This ſaying is more impious than the former. For 'twere more tolerable to ſay, that many Parts of *Jupiter* are through his Weakneſs and want of Power, hurryed on to do many abſurd Things againſt his Nature and Will, than that there is not any Intemperance or Wickedneſs of which *Jupiter* is not the Cauſe. Obſerve this Concluſion: If one of theſe two Evils was to be choſen, either that *Jupiter* ſhould want Power, or that he ſhould want Goodneſs, *Plutarch* is of Opinion that the firſt ſhould be choſen; and that it is better (a) to ſay, that God has not all the Power that is neceſſary to prevent Crimes, than to aſſert that he moves Men to commit them. *Cicero* took Advantage of the ſame Doctrine of the *Stoicks*, concerning God's Almighty Power, to oppoſe his Providence; as if the only Excuſe that could be alledged for the many Diſorders of this World, was to ſay that God cannot think upon every thing. If there was no other Excuſe but this, no Apology could be made for the *Stoicks*; for they pretended that the Power of *Jupiter* was infinite. Here are the Words of *Cicero*: (b) *At ſubvenire certe potuit* (Deus), *& conſervare urbes tantas, atque tales. Vos enim ipſi dicere ſoletis, nihil eſſe quod Deus efficere non poſſit, & quidem ſine labore ullo: ut enim hominum membra nulla contentione, mente ipſa ac voluntate moveantur, ſic numine Deorum omnia fingi, moveri, mutarique poſſe. Neque id dicitis ſuperſtitioſè, atque aniliter, ſed phyſicâ, conſtantique ratione. Materiam enim rerum ex qua, & in qua omnia ſint, totam eſſe flexibilem, & commutabilem, ut nihil ſit, quod non ex ea quamvis ſubito fingi, convertique poſſit: Ejus autem univerſa rectricem, & moderatricem divinam eſſe Providentiam: hanc igitur, quocunque ſe moveat, efficere poſſe quicquid velit. Itaque aut neſcit quid poſſit, aut negligit res humanas, aut quid ſit optimum, non poteſt judicare.* He had ſaid before, that (c) the Ruin of *Corinth* was to be aſcribed to *Critolaus*, and that of *Carthage* to *Aſdrubal*, and not to the Anger of God; ſeelug God, according to the *Stoicks*, is never angry; nevertheleſs he ought to have come to the Aſſiſtance of thoſe two Towns. The *Stoicks* were ſo hard put to it, that they were forced to aſſert that Vice was uſeful; for otherwiſe ſaid they, there had been no Vertue. (d) * * * *Homines feciſſe dicatur: tantam vim eſſe ærumnarum & malorum. Adverſus ea Chryſippus quum in libro* περὶ προνοίας *quarto diſſereret, Nihil eſt prorſus iſtis, inquit, imperitius, nihil inſipidius, qui opinantur bona eſſe potuiſſe, ſi*

non

(g) Maimbourg *Hiſt. of St. Leo, l. 1. pag.* 14, 15. *of the* Holland *Edit.*

(t) *Auguſt. de utilit. cred.*

(h) *In the Article* Manichees.

(i) *See the Article* Manichees.

(k) *Cicero de nat. Deorum, l. 1. p.* 31.

(l) Si quidem Deus eſt, unde mala? bona vero unde, ſi non eſt? *Boet. de conſol. lib.* 1. *proſa* 4. *pag. m.* 11. *See what will be cited from* Cicero *in the Article* Pericles *Remark* I.

(m) *See* Plutarch *adverſus Stoicos. p.* 1075.

(n) *Ibid.*

(a) Μᾶλλον γὰρ ἦν ἀνεκτὸν ἄπειρα μέρη ἀδυναμίᾳ τοῦ Διὸς ἐκβιαζόμενα πολλὰ δρᾶν ἄτοπα παρὰ τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν καὶ βούλησιν, ἢ μήτε ἀκρασίαν εἶναι μήτε κακουργίαν, ἧς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Ζεὺς αἴτιος. Tolerabilius enim erat infinitas partes dicere Jovi ob ejus imbecillitatem vi facta agere multa improbè contra ipſius naturam & voluntatem, quàm nullam eſſe libidinem, nullum ſcelus, quod non Jovi autori imputandum eſſet. *Plut. ibid. pag.* 1076. *E.*

(b) *Cicero de nat Deor. l.* 3. *p. m.* 703.

(c) Critolaus, inquam, evertit Corinthum, Carthaginem Aſdrubal. Hi duos illos oculos oræ maritimæ effoderunt, non iratus alicui, quem omnino iraſci poſſe negatis, Deus &c. *Id. ibid.*

(d) Aul. Gel. *l.* 6. *c.* 1. *The* Aſterisks *ſignify that there is a Gap in this Place of* Aulus Gellius.

loſophers found it a difficult thing. I ſhall obſerve in what Senſe the Orthodox ſeem to

non eſſent ibidem mala. Nam cum bona malis contraria ſint, utraque neceſſarium eſt, oppoſita inter ſe & quaſi mutuo adverſo quæque fulta niſu, conſiſtere. Nullum adeo contrarium ſine contrario altero. Quo enim pacto juſtitiæ ſenſus eſſe poſſet, niſi eſſent injuriæ? aut quid aliud juſtitia eſt, quam injuſtitiæ privatio? quid item fortitudo intelligi poſſet, niſi ex ignaviæ appoſitione? quid continentia niſi ex intemperantia? quo item modo prudentia eſſet, niſi foret contrà imprudentia? proinde, inquit, homines ſtulti cur non hoc etiam deſiderant ut veritas ſit & non ſit mendacium? namque itidem ſunt bona & mala, felicitas & infortunitas, dolor & voluptas. Alterum enim ex altero, ſicuti Plato ait, verticibus inter ſe contrariis deligatum eſt. Suſtuleris unum, abſtuleris utrumque.

Let us ſee how ſtrongly they have been refuted by *Plutarch*. " (e) Is there then no Good among " the Gods, becauſe there is no Evil? And when " *Jupiter* having reſolved all Matter into himſelf, " ſhall be alone, other Differences being taken " away, will there then be no Good, becauſe there " will be no Evil? But is it true that there is Me- " lody in a Quire, though none in it ſings faultily? " And Health in the Body, though no Member is " ſick? And yet cannot Virtue have its exiſtence " without Vice? . . . I wonder they do not ſay, " that the Conſumption was made for the ſound " Conſtitution of Men's Bodies, and the Gout " for the Swiftneſs of their Feet; and that *Achilles* " would not have had a good Head of Hair, if " *Therſites* had not been bald. For what Difference " is there between ſuch Triflers and Ravers, and " thoſe who ſay, that Intemperance was not " brought forth unprofitably for Continence, nor " Injuſtice for Juſtice? That ſo we may pray " to the Gods, there may be always Wicked- " neſs.

" *Lies, fawning Speeches, and deceitful Manners:* " If theſe be taken away, Vertue will alſo vaniſh, " and be loſt. Or do you deſire to underſtand the " greateſt Sweetneſs of his Eloquence and Perſuaſi- " on? For, ſays he, (f) *As Comedies have in them* " *ſometimes ridiculous Epigrams, which though bad in* " *themſelves, give nevertheleſs a certain Grace to the* " *whole Poem: So, tho' you may blame Vice in it* " *ſelf, yet it is not uſeleſs to other things.* Firſt then " to ſay that Vice was made by the Providence of " God, as a wanton Epigram by the Will of the " Poet, tranſcends in abſurdity all Imagination. " For this being granted, how will the Gods be " rather givers of Good than Evil? How will Wick- " edneſs be diſpleaſing to them, and hated by " them? And what ſhall we have to oppoſe againſt " theſe ill ſounding Sentences of the Poets?

" ——— *A Cauſe to Men God ſends,*
" *When to chaſtiſe ſome Houſe his Wrath intends?*

" And again,

" (g) *Which of the Gods theſe Seeds of Strife did ſow?*

" Moreover, a lewd Epigram adorns the Comedy, " and contributes to its End, which is to pleaſe the " Spectators, and make them laugh. But *Jupiter*, " who is ſurnamed *Fatherly*, *Supream*, *Juſt*, and " as *Pindarus* has it, *the moſt perfect Artiſt*, fram- " ing the World, not as a great Interlude, full " of Variety and great Learning, but as a City com- " mon to Gods and Men, living together in Con- " cord and Happineſs, with Juſtice and Virtue: " What need had he, for the attaining to this ex- " cellent End, of Thieves, Murderers, Parricides, " and Tyrants? For Vice entred not as a Morisk " Dance, pleaſing and delightful to God; nor was " brought in amongſt the Affairs of Men, to cauſe " Mirth and Laughter by its Railery and facetiouſ- " neſs, ſince there is not to be ſeen in it ſo much " as a Shadow of that celebrated Agreement with " Nature. Beſides, that fooliſh Epigram is a very " ſmall part of the Poem, and takes up but a very " little Place in the Comedy; neither do ſuch " things abound in it, nor do they corrupt any of " thoſe things, which ſeem to have been well done, " or ſpoil their Grace. But all humane Affairs " are repleat with Vice, and the whole Life, from " the very Prologue and Beginning to the End, be- " ing diſorder'd, deprav'd and diſturb'd, and hav- " ing no part of it pure, or irreprehenſible, as " theſe Men ſay, is the moſt filthy and unpleaſant " of all Farces. (a). . . . You may read in *Plutarch* the remaining Part of this Paſſage, which contains ſome other Reaſons, whereby the Paradox of the *Stoicks* concerning the Uſefulneſs of Vice, is ſtrongly refuted. Nevertheleſs it muſt be acknowledged that they were in the right in ſome reſpects; for to give an inſtance of it, can any thing be more uſeful than Luxury for the maintenance of many Families, that would ſtarve if great Men ſpent but little? Our *Paulicians* might make uſe of this, to prove their two Principles: They might ſay that the ill Principle produced Luxury, and that the good one conſented to it in exchange of ſome good Thing which his Adverſary permitted him to produce, and beſides that he reſerved to himſelf the Right of getting ſome Benefit by the ill Production. But if he had been alone, neither Luxury nor any other Vice had ever been ſeen amongſt Men: Pure Vertue would have made us happy.

(e) *Plut. ubi ſupra pag.* 1065.

(f) *Viz.* Chryſippus *in the 2d Book of Nature.*

(g) *Iliad. lib.* 1.

(a) *See what I have ſaid before againſt* Lactantius: *the Refutation of the Doctrine of that Father is mightily ſtrengthned by this Paſſage out of* Plutarch.

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that no Body ought to wonder that *Cicero* and *Plutarch* ſhould have attack'd the *Stoicks* in that manner, for though that Sect of Philoſophers admitted (b) of two Principles, God and Matter, God as the Agent, and Matter as the Patient, yet they did not believe that Matter was an ill Principle; and herein they were more Orthodox than *Arnobius*. *Quid enim*, ſays he, (c) *ſi prima materies quæ in rerum quatuor elementa digeſta eſt, miſeriarum omnium cauſas ſuis continet in rationibus involutas.*

The generality of the Heathens needed not fear the above mention'd Objections; for their publick Worſhip moved upon theſe two Hinges; that ſome Gods were good and gracious, and others miſchievous, and that in general the Gods had not always the ſame Paſſions; that they grew angry, and were appeas'd; that they changed Parties; that ſome engaged to favour a Nation, and others to perſecute it; in a word, (d) that they oppoſed one another. The Hiſtory of Men might as well be explained by that Suppoſition, as by that of *Zoroaſter*. *Arnobius* has very well refuted thoſe two ſorts of Gods, ſome whereof are good and gracious, and others miſchievous; but he went too far, for he made uſe of a Principle which is very favourable to *Manicheiſm*. He ſays without any Reſtriction, that the Nature of God does not allow him to diſturb any One's Tranquility: But he might have been ask'd, from whence come the Plague and the Famine? Are they not call'd God's Scourges, by Chriſtians? However let us ſet down his Words: (e) *Quod dici à vobis accepimus, eſſe quoſdam ex Diis bonos, alios autem malos, & ad nocendi libidinem promptiores: illiſque ut proſint, his vero ne noceant, ſacrorum ſollemnia miniſtrari: quanam illud ratione dicitur, intelligere confitemur non poſſe. Nam Deos benigniſſimos dicere, leneſque habere naturas, & ſanctum, & religioſum & verum eſt: malos autem, & lævos nequaquam ſumendum eſt auribus; ideo quoniam divina illa vis ab nocendi procul eſt dimota & disjuncta natura. Quidquid autem potis eſt cauſam calamitatis inferre, quid ſit primum videndum eſt, & ab Dei nomine longiſſima debet differitate ſeponi. Itaque ut vobis commodemus aſſenſum, dextrarum, ſiniſtrarumque rerum Deos eſſe fautores, nulla nec ſic ratio eſt, cur alios alliciatis ad proſpera, alios vero, ne noceant, ſacrificiis commulceatis & præmiis. Primum quod Dii boni male non queunt facere, etiam ſi nullo fuerint honore mactati. Quidquid enim mite eſt, placidumque natura, ab nocendi procul eſt uſu, & cogitatione diſcretum: malus vero comprimere ſuam ferociam neſcit, quamvis gregibus mille, & mille alliciatur altaribus. Neque enim in dulcedinem vertere amaritudo ſe poteſt: aut ariditas in humorem, calor ignis in frigora: aut quod rei cuicunque contrarium eſt, id quod ſibi contrarium eſt, ſumere in ſuam atque immutare naturam. Ut ſi manu viperam mulceas, venenato blandiaris aut ſcorpio, petat illa te morſu, hic contractus aculeum figat: nihilque illa proſit alluſio, cum ad nocendum res ambæ non ſtimulis exagitentur irarum, ſed quadam proprietate naturæ. Ita nihil prodeſt promereri velle per hoſtias Deos lævos, cum ſive illud feceris, ſive contrà non feceris, agant ſuam naturam, & ad ea quæ facti ſunt ingenitis legibus, & quadam neceſſitate ducantur. Quid quod iſto modo utrique Dii deſinunt eſſe ſuis in viribus, & ſuis in qualitatibus permanere. Nam ſi bonis ut proſint, res divina conficitur, aliis autem ne noceant, iiſdem rationibus ſupplicatur; ſequitur ut intelligi debeat, nihil dexteros profuturos, nulla ſi acceperint munera, fierique ex hoc malos: malos autem ſi acceperint, nocendi poſituros mentem, fierique ex hoc bonos. Atque ita producitur res eo, ut neque hi dexteri, neque illi ſint lævi: aut, quod fieri non poteſt, utrique*

ipſi

(b) *Diog. Laert. l.* 7. *n.* 134. *See the Commentators on that Place, and* Lipſius, Phyſic. Stoic. *l.* 2. diſſert. 2.

(c) *Arnob. l.* 1. *adv. gent. p.* 5

(d) Sæpe premente Deo, fert Deus alter opem. Mulciber in Trojam, pro Trojâ ſtabat Apollo: Æqua Venus Teucris, Pallas iniqua fuit. Oderat Æneam propior Saturnia Turno: Ille tamen Veneris numine tutus erat. Sæpè ferox cautum petiit Neptunus Ulyſſem: Eripuit patruo ſæpè Minerva ſuo. *Ovidius Triſt. l.* 1. *eleg.* 2.

(e) *Arnob. l.* 7. *pag. m.* 228, 229. *See the Paſſage of* Aulus Gellius *in the Article* Manichees.

to admit of Two Firſt (H) Principles, and in what ſenſe it cannot be ſaid that according to the *Manichees*, God is the Author (I) of Sin. I ſhall alſo criticize a Modern

ipſi ſint dextri, & utrique iterum lævi. Tho' this Paſſage of *Arnobius* favours the *Manichees*, it contains a Remark which puzzles them, and overthrows all their Worſhip; for the Reaſon why they admitted of an Ill Principle, was, that they believ'd the Good Principle could do no Harm: They believ'd therefore that the other Principle could do no Good; and ſo all their divine Worſhip was needleſs, the gracious God had never puniſhed them for their Irreligion, and they could never expect that the miſchievous God ſhould be propitious to them. *Arnobius* carries on that Objection againſt the Heathens with great force; but they might have anſwered him, that the moſt cruel Tyrants make a very great Diſtinction, between thoſe who honour them, and thoſe who deſpiſe them; and that the mildeſt Kings make the ſame Diſtinction between thoſe who reſpect them, and thoſe who offend them; and that proportionably the ſame Judgment ought to be made of good and miſchievous Deities. I think that ſuch a Reply cannot be made uſe of againſt the Syſtem of *Zoroaſter*, or that of the *Manichees* by a Man who reaſons cloſely.

(H) *The Orthodox ſeems to admit of two Firſt Principles.*] It has been a conſtant Opinion amongſt Chriſtians from the Beginning, that the *Devil* is the Author of all falſe Religions; that he moves the Hereticks to dogmatize, and inſpires Men with Errors, Superſtitions, Schiſms, Lewdneſs, Avarice, Intemperance; in a Word, with all the Crimes that are committed amongſt Men: That he deprived *Adam* and *Eve* of their Innocency; from whence it follows that he is the Cauſe of Moral Evil, and of all the Miſeries of Man. He is therefore the firſt Principle of Evil; but becauſe he is not Eternal nor uncreated, he is not the firſt Ill Principle, in the Senſe of the *Manichees*: which afforded thoſe Hereticks I know not what matter of boaſting and Inſulting over the Orthodox. They might have told them, Your Doctrine is much more prejudicial to the Good God than ours; for you make him the Cauſe of the Ill Principle; you aſſert that he produced him, and that tho' he could ſtop him at the firſt Step he made, yet he permitted him to uſurp ſo great a Power in this World, that Mankind having been divided into two Cities, (f) that of God and that of the Devil, the firſt was always very ſmall, and even ſo ſmall for many Ages, that it had not two Inhabitants, when the other had two Millions. We are not obliged to enquire into the Cauſe of the Wickedneſs of our Ill Principle; for when an uncreated Being is ſo or ſo, one cannot ſay why it is ſo; it is its Nature, one muſt neceſſarily ſtop there; but as for the Qualities of a Creature, one ought to inquire into the Reaſon of them, and it cannot be found but in its Cauſe. You muſt therefore ſay that God is the Author of the Devil's Malice, that he himſelf produced it ſuch as it is, or ſowed the Seeds of it in the Soil that he created; which is a thouſand times more diſhonourable to God, than to ſay that he is not the only neceſſary and independent Being. This brings in again the above mention'd Objections concerning the Fall of the firſt Man; it is not therefore neceſſary to inſiſt any longer upon it. We muſt humbly acknowledge that Philoſophy is here at a ſtand, and that its Weakneſs ought to lead us to the Light of Revelation, where we ſhall find a ſure and ſtedfaſt Anchor. Note, That thoſe Hereticks made an ill uſe of ſome Paſſages of the holy Scripture, wherein the Devil is call'd the (g) Prince, and the (h) God of this World.

(I) *That according to the* Manichees, *God is the Author of Sin.*] The Style of the Orthodox does not at all vary in this Point: To be a *Manichee*, and to make God the Author of Sin, are two Expreſſions which always ſignified the ſame thing amongſt Orthodox Chriſtians; and when a Chriſtian Sect accuſes another of making God the Author of Sin, it never fails to impute *Manicheiſm* to it in that reſpect. It is a juſt Accuſation in one Senſe, ſeeing it is true that the Sectators of *Manes* acknowledged that an Eternal Being was the Cauſe of Sin: But if you conſider the Thing another way, you will find another Senſe, according to which they may ſay they don't make God to be the Author of Sin; for they may maintain that none but the Good Principle deſerves the Name of *God*, and that ſo great and ſo glorious a Name, ought never to be beſtowed upon the Ill Principle, and conſequently that their *Hypotheſis* is the moſt favourable to God. All other *Hypotheſes* involve him in Sin, as the above mention'd Miniſter acknowledges it. Provided it be ſuppoſed, *ſays he* (a), “That God drew a Plan of all the Events of Eternity, and was willing that all the Evils, Diſorders and Crimes which prevail in the World, ſhould come into it, this is enough. It will be impoſſible to perſwade any one that ſo many Crimes crept by Chance into the Project of God's Providence. And if they came into it by the Diſpoſition of the moſt profound Wiſdom of God, whether that Diſpoſition be call'd Permiſſion, or Will, the Minds of each Men will never be ſatisfied, and it will never be clearly ſhewn that this agrees with the Hatred God expreſſes otherwiſe for Sin. It will not be in any one's Power to hinder the Libertines from accuſing Chriſtianity of making God the Author of Sin; for the common Senſe of all Men leads them to believe, that he who could prevent the Fall of the firſt Man, as eaſily as he permitted it, and who opened all the Ways wherein Men have wandred, when he might eaſily have ſhut 'em, may be look'd upon as the Author of the Evil which he ſhould have prevented, according to his Principles, and his hatred for Evil. Afterwards he anſwers an Objection grounded upon the *Scientia media.* “This does not at all leſſen the Difficulty, *ſays he*: For I may ſay, that ſince God foreſaw that *Adam* being placed in ſuch Circumſtances, would undo himſelf and an infinity of Millions of Men by his Free Will, and yet he placed him in thoſe ſad Circumſtances, it is plain that he is the firſt Author of all Evils. If a Soveraign knew certainly, that if he ſhould place a Man in a Crowd with a Sword in his Hand, it would raiſe a Sedition, and occaſion a Fight, in which ten thouſand Men ſhould be kill'd, he might very well, according to the rigour of the Law, be look'd upon as the firſt Author of all thoſe Murthers. It would be to no purpoſe for him to ſay, I order'd not that Man to ſtrike any Body with his Sword, nor to raiſe a Sedition; on the contrary, I forbad him to do it. I have not moved his Arm to kill, nor form'd his Voice to excite the People to fight. He would be anſwered, you knew certainly that that Man being placed in ſuch Circumſtances would be the Cauſe of thoſe Miſeries. It was in your Power to place him in more favourable Circumſtances, which might have produced all manner of Happineſs. I am ſure he could reply nothing that could put a ſtop to the murmuring of the People; and if we will ſpeak ſincerely, we muſt confeſs that nothing can be anſwered for God, that can ſilence the Minds of Men. . . . (b) Laſtly the very God of *Socinus* may be accuſed of being the Author of Sin. . . . . (c) To conclude, I maintain, that there is no convenient *Medium* between the God of St. *Auguſtin* and the God of *Epicurus*, who was altogether unconcerned with the Affairs of Mankind, or the God of *Ariſtotle*, whoſe Care extended not lower than the Sphere of the Moon. For as ſoon as you acknowledge a general Providence, which imbraces every Thing, the Difficulty ſprings up again, and when you think you have ſhut a Door, it comes in again thro' another. This Author does not mince the Matter. But if the God of the *Manichees*, I mean the Good Principle whom they call'd God by Excellency, had preſented himſelf to the Mind of that Miniſter, I fancy he would have expreſs'd himſelf ſomewhat differently, and confeſs'd that their *Hypotheſis* clears God; for it aſcribes all Evil to the Ill Principle. It will not be needleſs to know what he anſwers to his Cenſors. “(d) There is alſo in this Traſh, (*ſays Mr.* Jurieu,) an Obſervation upon what I have ſaid ſomewhere, that whatever Method be made uſe of, it will never be poſſible perfectly to reſolve the Scruples, which the Objections of prophane Men raiſe in one's Mind concerning God's Providence about Sin. If thoſe Gentlemen have found out the Way of clearing perfectly thoſe Difficulties, they will oblige us to acquaint us with it.

Perhaps it will be ſaid you are in the Wrong, when dern Author, who ſays that the Doctrine, which makes God the Author of Sin, does not

---

(a) Jurieu, *Judgement about rigid and mitigated Methods.*

(b) Ib. *pag.* 72.

(c) Ib. *pag.* 73.

(d) Jurieu, 2d *Apolog.* p. 30. col. 2. *apud* Saurin's *Examination of Mr.* Jurieu's *Theology. pag.* 340.

(f) *See St.* Auguſtin de Civitate Dei.

(g) *John* XIV. 30.

(h) 2 *Ep. to the* Corinth. *ch.* 4. v. 4.

when you acknowledge that the *Manichean Hypotheſis* clears God; for if they pretend that he made a Tranſaction with the Ill Principle, as you ſaid (*e*) before, he conſented to the Introduction of Evil, he engaged by an Agreement to ſuffer it, and was willing that all the Crimes and Miſeries of Men ſhould be produced: Which is more diſhonourable to him, than if one ſhould ſay, as the *Socinians* do, that he knew not whether a Free Creature ſhould Sin, and that if he was willing to run the Hazard of it, he was in great hopes that the Knowledge wherewith his Creatures were endowed, and his Threatnings would keep them from ſinning. I think a *Manichee* would not find this very difficult: For, 1. He might ſay, that God made that Tranſaction, becauſe he could not otherwiſe have done any Good to his Creatures. There is therefore a great difference between *Manicheiſm* and *Socinianiſm*. The *Socinians* own, that though God might eaſily have hindred Men from being Sinners and unhappy, yet he let them fall into Sin and Miſery; but the *Manichees* ſuppoſe that God conſented to that Fall only out of meer Neceſſity, and to avoid a greater Evil. 2. One might deny that God made any Agreement with the Ill Principle, and maintain that he continually oppoſes Sin, and the Miſery of his Creatures with all his Power, to make them perfectly holy and happy; but that the Ill Principle acting on his Part with all his Power, for a quite contrary Deſign, the Mixture of Good and Evil which is to be ſeen in this World, reſults from that Conflict, as the Action and Re-action of Cold and Heat produce a Quality between both. You may apply to this what the Schoolmen ſay concerning the Nature of mix'd Bodies, which reſults from the ſtruggling of the Elements. I know very well that either of thoſe two Explications lies open to a world of abſurd Difficulties; but the only Queſtion now, is to know whether that *Hypotheſis* acquits God; but thoſe wretched Hereticks pretend, that any Difficulty is inconſiderable in reſpect of that which ariſes from making him the Author of Sin; and it is certain, that all Chriſtians abhor to acknowledge him to be the Cauſe of it.

WHETHER the Doctrine that ſhould make God the Author of Sin, ſhould lead to Atheiſm.

The *Jeſuits* maintain (*f*) *that it were better for a Man to be an Atheiſt, and to acknowledge no Deity, than to pay divine Honours to a Being*, who forbids Man to do Evil, and yet makes him commit it, and then puniſhes him for it. They maintain, *that the God of* Epicurus *is more innocent, and if one may ſay ſo, more a God* than the other; *and when the* Marcionites *and* Manichees *went about to make a ſecond God Author of all Evils, they worſhipp'd another, who was the Giver of all good Things; whereas yours*, ſay the *Jeſuits* to the *Reformed*, *is worſe than Men*. They who are upbraided with this do not reject thoſe Conſequences, they only reject the Principle; they maintain only that it is a ſhameful Calumny to charge them with making God the Author of Sin (*g*). The ſame *Jeſuits* pretend that the Doctrine of *Calvin* concerning Predeſtination, is attended with Conſequences, (*h*) *that deſtroy altogether the Idea we ought to have of God, and leads directly to Atheiſm.* The Miniſter who anſwer'd Mr. *Maimbourg*, convicted him of having unfaithfully reported the Doctrine of *Calvin*. He ſhould have ſtopt there; for when he adds that Mr. *Maimbourg* drew a falſe Conſequence from the Doctrine which he imputes to *Calvin*, he reaſons pitifully: Let the Reader judge of it. (*i*) *Beſides I ſay that his Concluſion is wrong, and that there is nothing more abſurd, and leſs Theological than the Conſequence which Mr.* Maimbourg *draws from the Doctrine of thoſe Divines*; *viz.* That it deſtroys altogether the Idea we ought to have of God, and leads directly to Atheiſm. *There was never any thing ſaid more inconſiderately.* If that Doctrine, (*I ſhall put the worſt Conſtruction upon it*,) deſtroys the Idea we ought to have of God, *'tis becauſe it repreſents God to us as being Cruel, Unjuſt, and puniſhing innocent Creatures with everlaſting Torments; and this is preciſely what Mr.* Maimbourg *means, when he ſays that it deſtroys the Idea of God, becauſe the Idea of God implies the Attributes of Mildneſs, Juſtice, and Equity. But how can a Doctrine, which gives us the Idea of a ſevere and tyrannical God, who uſes his Authority with the utmoſt Rigour, lead Men to Atheiſm? . . . . It is a fooliſh thing to ſay that an* Hypotheſis *leads to Atheiſm, when it brings God into* (*k*) *every thing, makes him the Cauſe of all Things, and the only Aim of all his own Actions, and raiſes him ſo much above his Creatures as to be able to diſpoſe of them in ſuch a Manner as ſeems to be unjuſt to human Reaſon. That Opinion of the Supralapſarians is ſo far from leading to Atheiſm, that on the contrary it places the Deity in the higheſt Degree of Elevation that can be conceived. For it does ſo much debaſe the Creatures before the Creator, that the Creator, according to this Syſtem, is bound by no Laws to his Creatures, but may diſpoſe of them as he thinks fit, and make them ſubſervient to his Glory in ſuch a method as he judges moſt proper, and they have no right to contradict him.*

Here is the moſt monſtrous Doctrine, and the moſt abſurd Paradox in Divinity that was ever heard of, and I am very much miſtaken if any famous Divine did ever ſay any ſuch thing. All imaginable Methods have been us'd to explain the Manner how God influences the Actions of Sinners: The *Hypotheſis* of abſolute Predeſtination was kept on, as long as it was thought to do no wrong to the Holineſs of God; but it has been laid aſide, as ſoon as it was perceived that it ſtruck at that Divine Attribute. They who were not ſenſible that Free Will is inconſiſtent with the phyſical Predetermination, have taught that Predetermination all along; but they who believ'd that it deſtroyed Free Will, have rejected it, and admitted only of a *Simultaneous* and indifferent Concourſe. They who believe that any Concourſe is contrary to Man's Liberty, ſuppoſe that (*a*) he only is the Cauſe of his Actions. The only Reaſon which moves them to make ſuch a Suppoſition, is becauſe they think that all the Decrees whereby God would engage to concur with our Will (*b*), would make all Events neceſſary, whereby our wicked Actions would be no leſs an Effect of God than of his Creatures. They could not reſt ſatisfied with ſaying that Sin is not a Being, that it is only a Privation and a nothingneſs which has no efficient, but a *deficient* Cauſe. Laſtly, Some are gone ſo far as to maintain, that God cannot foreſee the free Actions of his Creatures. Why ſo many Suppoſitions? What was the Reaſon of ſo many Steps? It was the deſire of clearing God; for it was plainly perceived that Religion was at Stake, and that Men would be neceſſarily led to Atheiſm, if God was ſaid to be the Author of Sin. Hence it is that all Chriſtian Sects, that are accuſed by their Adverſaries of holding ſuch a Doctrine, deny it as a horrible Blaſphemy, and a deteſtable Impiety, and complain that they are deviliſhly calumniated. But here is a Miniſter (c) who very gravely tells us, that it is a Doctrine, *which places God in the higheſt Degree of Glory and Elevation that can be conceived.* He does not ſcruple to beſtow ſuch an Encomium upon a Doctrine which *repreſents God to us as being Cruel, Unjuſt, and puniſhing* INNOCENT *Creatures with everlaſting Torments.* He appeals to our Conſciences, to know whether the Idea of a Tyrannical God leads us to Atheiſm, taking *things in the worſt Senſe*, that is ſuppoſing *Maimbourg* was in the right to ſay that (*d*) according to *Calvin*, *God created the greateſt Part of Mankind to damn 'em, not becauſe they deſerved it by reaſon of their Crimes, but becauſe he will have it ſo; and that he foreſaw their Damnation only becauſe he order'd it before he foreſaw their Crimes*; ſuppoſing, I ſay, that *Maimbourg* does juſtly accuſe *Calvin* of ſaying, that they who ſuffer eternal Torments are *innocent* (*e*) *Creatures*, and conſequently that God is the Author of their Sins, Mr. *Jurieu* cannot abide that *Maimbourg* ſhould conclude, *therefore* Calvin's *Doctrine deſtroys the Idea we ought to have of God, and leads directly to Atheiſm.* He is not contented to pretend that (*f*) *there was never any thing ſaid more inconſiderately* than this Concluſion, but he alſo calls it (*g*) *a fooliſh Thought*, and (*h*) *a piece of Ignorance*; and ſays that it ſhews *Maimbourg* to be *a* (*i*) *ſilly Philoſopher, and a pitiful Divine*, and that (*k*) *there is nothing more abſurd and leſs Theological* than ſuch a Conſequence. The Fault wherewith *Ovid* was upbraided is a great one in Matters of Controverſy, (*l*) *Neſcire quod bene ceſſit relinquere: neſcire deſinere.* That Miniſter had very well juſtified the *Supralapſarians*, by (*m*) ſhewing what is wrongfully imputed to them, and by declaring that they diſown the Conſequence wherewith they are charged of making God the Author of Sin. He ſhould have retired from the Field of Battel after ſuch an

Onſet,

(*e*) See the Article of the Manichees.

(*f*) Father Adam *apud* Daillé's *Reply to Adam & Cottibi part 2. ch. 1. pag. 2. and 3.*

(*g*) *See* Daillé *in that whole Chapter.*

(*h*) Maimbourg's *Hiſt. of* Calviniſm *Book 1. p. m. 73. ſee alſo p. 55.*

(*i*) Jurieu's *Apology for the Reformers 1. part chap. 19. p. 245, 246. in 4o.*

(*k*) *Yet* Spinoziſm *which teaches that all Things are God himſelf, is an execrable Atheiſm.*

(*a*) *Durandus de S. Porciano, and many other Divines ſuppoſe it. See an Abridgement of a Treatiſe of Mr.* de Launoi *inſerted in Mr.* Papin's *Eſſay of Theology Printed in the Year* [illegible]

(*b*) *See the Book of* Louis de Dole *a Capucin, intituled*, Diſputatio quadripartita de modo conjunctionis concurſuum Dei & creaturæ ad actus liberos ordinis naturalis, præſertim vero ad pravos, adverſus prædeterminantium & aſſertorum ſcientiæ mediæ modernorum opiniones. *That Book was printed at Lyons in the Year 1634 in 4o.*

(*c*) *See* Papin's *Eſſay of Theology againſt this Doctrine, in the Treatiſe againſt phyſical Predetermination.*

(*d*) *Jurieu ubi ſupra pag. 241.*

(*e*) *Id. ib. pag. 246.*

(*f*) *Ib.*

(*g*) *Ib.*

(*h*) *Ib. p. 247.*

(*i*) *Ib.*

(*k*) *Ib. p. 245.*

(*l*) *Scaurus apud Senecam Controv. 28 pag. m. 272.*

(*m*) *Jurieu Ibid. pag. 244, 245.*

not lead a Man to Irreligion. Nay, he ſays, that Doctrine raiſes God to the higheſt Degree of Glory that can be conceived. The Ancient Fathers were not ignorant that the Queſtion concerning (K) the Origin of Evil, is a moſt perplexing one. They could not reſolve it by *the Platonick* Hypotheſis, (K△) which was at the Bottom

a

Onſet, without being ſo raſh as to aſſert that even if they ſhould *make God a cruel and unjuſt Being, puniſhing innocent Creatures with eternal Torments*; that is to ſay, that tho' they ſhould make God the Cauſe of Sin, and yet a ſevere Judge who puniſhes Men for ever for Sins which they are not guilty of, they ſhould not lead Men to Atheiſm; but on the contrary ſhould raiſe God to the higheſt Degree of Glory that can be conceived. We may therefore aſk him, How comes it that all Chriſtian Sects avoid to ſay that God is the Author of Sin, as being the moſt dangerous thing that can be ſaid in Divinity? How comes it that the meer Idea of ſuch a Doctrine is abhorred by all Men? I muſt needs ſay that ſome Men are very lucky: If another Miniſter had ſaid any ſuch thing, his Readers had been offended at it; he would have been obliged to recant it as being an impious thing, and perhaps I am the only Man who took Notice of ſo ſtrange a Doctrine.

But, ſays he (n), the more you aſſert that God is concerned in every thing, the more you ſuppoſe that he exiſts and is powerful. So that it is a fooliſh thing to argue thus, *God is the Author of Sin, therefore there is no God*: It is therefore falſe that this Doctrine leads to Atheiſm. What a poor Shift is this! At that rate the Ancient Poets who aſcribed (o) all ſorts of Crimes to *Jupiter* and the other Gods, and even (p) that of inducing Men to Evil, yet without ſaying that the ſame God who moved them to it puniſhed them for it, ſaid nothing that will deſtroy the Idea of God, put an end to Religion, and introduce Atheiſm. Note, that there is no Difference between a Man who commits a Crime by himſelf, or by the Inſtrument of another. It is manifeſt to any one who reaſons, that God is a moſt perfect Being, and that of all Perfections, none is more eſſential to him than Goodneſs, Holineſs and Juſtice. If you deprive him of thoſe Perfections, to make him a Law-giver who forbids Men to Sin, and yet induces them to ſin, and then puniſhes them for it, you make him a Being in whom Men cannot put their Truſt, a deceitful, malicious, unjuſt and cruel Being: He can be no longer an Object of Worſhip; to what purpoſe ſhould any one pray to him, and endeavour to live a ſober Life? It is therefore the way to Atheiſm. The Fear which Religion inſpires, ought to be attended with Love, Hope, and a great Veneration. When an Object is dreaded only becauſe it has the Power and Will of doing Harm, and exerciſes that Power cruelly and unmercifully, it muſt needs be hated and deteſted: this can be no religious Worſhip.

To repreſent God as a Being, who makes ſome Laws (q) againſt Sin, which he induces Men to tranſgreſs, that he may have a Pretence to puniſh them, is to expoſe Religion to the Railleries of the Libertines. That Being will not be depriv'd of its Exiſtence, whilſt it is ſuppoſed to be the Author of Sin; which is evident, for a Cauſe muſt needs exiſt when it acts: but it will prove at laſt to be nothing elſe but the World it ſelf, or the God of the *Spinoziſts*, who exiſts and acts neceſſarily, without knowing what he does, and is an underſtanding Being, only becauſe the Thoughts of the Creatures are his Modifications.

There is another thing to be blamed in the Doctrine of that Miniſter. *That Opinion of the* Supralapſarians, ſays he (r), *is ſo far from leading Men to Atheiſm, that on the contrary it places the Deity in the higheſt Degree of Glory and Elevation that can be conceived. For it does ſo much debaſe the Creatures before the Creator, that the Creator, according to this Syſtem, is bound by no Laws to his Creatures, but may diſpoſe of them as he thinks fit, and make them ſubſervient to his Glory in ſuch a Method as he judges moſt proper, and they have no right to contradict him. I confeſs that this Opinion is liable to a great many Inconveniencies, and is ſo harſh that it cannot be eaſily reliſhed. And therefore St.* Auguſtin's *Hypotheſis is without doubt to be preferr'd to it.* What a ſtrange Doctrine is this! How can a Profeſſor of Divinity be ſo bold as to ſay, there are ſome *Hypotheſes* which are undeniably preferable to that which *places the Deity in the higheſt Degree of Glory and Elevation that can be conceived?* It is certain that all our Thoughts and Actions ought to aim not only at the Glory of God, but alſo at his greateſt Glory. Our Actions and Opinions muſt tend *ad majorem Dei gloriam*. It ought to be the *Motto* not only of a particular Society, but alſo of all Communities, and private Men. And therefore a Divine, who owns on the one ſide, that the Syſtem of the *Supralapſarians* tends to the greateſt Glory of God, and attains to it better than any other Suppoſition, and who maintains on the other ſide, that *St. Auguſtin's Hypotheſis is without doubt to be preferr'd*, is guilty of a prophane and blaſphematory Thought. Nor can that prophanation be excuſed by reaſon of the *Harſhneſs* of the Supralapſarian Syſtem, *which cannot eaſily be reliſhed*; for under Pretence of ſome Difficulties more or leſs, none can be allow'd to prefer the leſſer Glory of God to the greateſt, and *to place* the Supreme Being in *an inferiour Degree of Glory and Elevation.* If St. *Auguſtin's* Syſtem was plain and eaſy, I ſhould not ſo much wonder at the ill taſte of the Author; but he himſelf owns that he finds an oppreſſing Weight in it, and that he bears that Burthen only becauſe the mitigated Methods cannot free him from it. For the ſame Reaſon he ſhould be a *Supralapſarian*; for if the Suppoſition of the *Jeſuits* does not remove the Difficulties of St. *Auguſtin's* Hypotheſis, it is plain that St. *Auguſtin's* Hypotheſis does not remove the Harſhneſs of the *Supralapſarian* Syſtem. Every thing being duly conſidered, it appears that the *Supralapſarians*, and they that go by the Name of *Infralapſarians* maintain the ſame thing at the Bottom; they cannot do one another much Harm; they never fail to come off by the help of Arguments *ad hominem*, and Retortions. You have here the Character of this Doctor in little; there is no Juſtneſs in his Cenſures, and no Connexion in his Doctrines; his Writings are full of wrong Conſequences, Contradictions, and Variations. If any one would give himſelf the trouble to examin his Works carefully, every Page would afford him Matter of criticizing him.

Let us conclude that a *Manichee* obſerving how carefully the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtianity invent ſuch *Hypotheſes* as they think will acquit God, without ever owning that they make him the Author of Sin, will always boldly maintain that this is a more dangerous Rock than any other. Conſider well what has been ſaid againſt *Chryſippus*, who maintain'd (b) *That 'tis not unprofitable there ſhould be unprofitable, hurtful, and unhappy Perſons.* To which *Plutarch* replies (c), *What Manner of God then is* Jupiter? *I mean* Chryſippus's *Jupiter, who puniſhes an Act neither done willingly, nor unprofitably; for Vice is indeed, according to* Chryſippus's *Diſcourſe, wholly irreprehenſible: But* Jupiter *is to be blamed, whether he has made Vice, being an unprofitable thing, or having made it not unprofitably, puniſhes it.*

(K) *The . . . Fathers were not ignorant that the Queſtion concerning the Origin of Evil is a moſt perplexing one.*] I ſhall only quote a Paſſage out of *Origen*. (d) Εἴπερ ἄλλος τις τόπ☉ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐξεταζόμεν☉, δυσθεώρητός ἐστι τῇ φύσει ἡμῶν, ἐν τούτοις κ) ἡ τῶν κακῶν ταχ' ἂν γένεσις. *Si quis alius eſt locus in rebus humanis, ſcrutatu difficilis naturæ noſtræ; inter hos merito numerari poteſt malorum origo.*

(K△) *The* Platonick *Hypotheſis, which was at the Bottom a Branch of* Manicheiſm.] I ſhall only conſider that *Hypotheſis* as it was explained by *Maximus Tyrius* in his Treatiſe concerning this Queſtion (e), *From whence comes Evil, ſeeing God is the Author of good Things?* That Author ſuppoſes that in order to know the Cauſe of the good Things that are in the World, 'tis not neceſſary to conſult the Oracle, and that it is plain enough they come from God, (f) and that Evil cannot come from Heaven where there are no envious Beings; but that in order to know from whence comes Evil, one muſt look for Diviners, that is to ſay, conſult *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, or ſome other God who propheſies and takes Care of humane Affairs. Afterwards he makes an Enumeration of the Miſeries our Bodies are ſubject to, and

---

(n) *Vid. ubi ſup. p.* 246, 247.

(o) Nec multo abſurdiora ſunt ea quæ poëtarum vocibus fuſa, ipſâ ſuavitate nocuerunt, qui & irâ inflammatos, & libidine furentes induxerunt Deos, feceruntque ut eorum bella, pugnas, prælia, vulnera videremus: odia præterea, diſſidia, diſcordias, ortus, interitus, querelas, lamentationes, effuſas in omni intemperantia libidines, adulteria, vincula, cum humano genere concubitus, mortaleſque ex immortali procreatos. *Cicero l.* 1. *de nat. Deor. fol.* 281. D.

(p) *See the Rem.* C. *in the Art. of* Egialea. *and the Remark* T *and* T △ *of the Art* Helena.

(q) *Note that if it be ſaid, as the* Reformed *do, that Man is the only Cauſe of his Sins, their Diſtinction between God as a Lawgiver, and as a Diſpenſer of Events, is a good one, notwithſtanding what* Puffendorf *ſays to the contrary p.* 250 *of his* Jus feciale divinum, *&c.*

(r) *Jurieu ubi ſupra* page 246.

(b) *Plut. de Stoicor. repugn. p.* 1051.

(c) Ποῖος οὖν ὁ Ζεὺς, λέγω δὲ τὸν Χρυσίππου, κολάζων πρᾶγμα, μήτ' ἀφ' αὑτοῦ μήτ' ἀχρήστως γενόμενον; ἡ μὲν γὰρ κακία παντάπασιν ἀνέγκλητός ἐστι κατὰ τὸν Χρυσίππου λόγον, ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς ἐγκλητός, εἴτ' ἄχρηστον οὖσαν τὴν κακίαν πεποίηκεν, εἴτε ποιήσας οὐκ ἀχρήστως κολάζει. Qualis eſt Jupiter (de Chryſippo loquor) rem puniens neque ultro neque inutiliter factam? nam Chryſippi ratio efficit vitia omnino culpanda non eſſe, ſed Jovem; ſive is fecit vitia, quæ nihil prodeſſent, ſive puniit cùm feciſſet non inutilia. *Id. ib.*

(d) *Origenes contra Celſum lib.* 4. *p.* 207.

(e) Τῷ θεῷ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιοῦντ☉, πόθεν τὰ κακά. Cum Deus bona faciat, unde ſint mala. *This is the Subject of the* 25th *Diſſertation of* Maximus Tyrius.

(f) Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μὰ Δία, οὐκ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ· ἐξόριστος γὰρ φθόνος τοῦ (*vid. infra lit. o*) χορῦ ἵσταται. Non enim è cœlo me hercules, non è cœlo. Exulat enim illic invidia. *Maxim. Tyrius diſſert.* 25. *pag. m.* 253.

Z

concludes

a Branch of *Manicheiſm*, ſeeing it admitted of two Principles; they found themſelves obliged to have recourſe to the Privilege of the Free-Will of Man; but the more we reflect on that manner of reſolving the Difficulty, the more we find that the natural (KΔΔ) light of Philoſophy ties and intangles that Gordian Knot. A Learned Man pretends, that the *Pythagoreans* gave occaſion for that difficult Queſtion. They

concludes from thence (g) that Man is the moſt unhappy of all Creatures.

Οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο.
Nil nutrit tellus homine infelicius uno.

And then he conſiders the innumerable Evils which torment our Souls, and pretends, that the Gods being conſulted about it, anſwer'd, That Men have no reaſon to aſcribe the Cauſe of their Miſeries to God, ſeeing they themſelves are the Authors of their unhappineſs by their own Fault. He makes uſe of two Verſes of *Homer* to expreſs this. (h) Τί ἂν οὖν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποκρίναιτο ὁ Ζεύς, ἢ ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ἢ τις ἄλλος μαντικὸς θεός; ἀκούσωμεν τοῦ ὑποφήτου λέγοντος.

Ἐξ ἡμέων γάρ φασι κάκ' ἔμμεναι· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
Σφῇσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουσι.

Quid queſo ad iſta aut Jupiter, aut Apollo reſpondebit, aut alius fatidicus Deus? Audiamus quid eorum interpres dicat:

Aſcribunt ſuperis homines mala, cum tamen ipſi
Criminibus propriis ſibi talia damna crearint.

He goes on and ſays, That Heaven and Earth are two very different places. There are no Evils in Heaven; and there is a mixture of Good and Evil upon Earth; but good things come down from Heaven, and Evils ſpring from a Depravation which is natural to the Earth, and contains two kinds, one whereof conſiſts in the qualities of Matter, and the other in the liberty of the Soul. (i) ὥστε τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ ἐπιῤῥεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὰ δὲ κακὰ ἐξ αὐτοφυοῦς μοχθηρίας ἀνίσχειν. διττὴ δὲ αὕτη, ἡ μὲν ὕλης πάθος, ἡ δὲ ψυχῆς ἐξουσία. *Ita ut bona quidem, è cœlo veniant: mala vero ex innata illi (terræ) improbitate oriantur. Improbitas vero ea duplex eſt: aut enim corrupta materia affectio eſt, aut animæ licentia.*

As to the firſt of thoſe two ſorts of Depravation, he ſays, That Matter ought to be conſider'd as the Subject upon which a good Workman works. All the Beauties it acquires ought to be aſcribed to Art; but if there be any Works upon Earth that are not as they ſhould be, thoſe Irregularities ought not to be imputed to Art; for the Intention of the Workman does not ſwerve from Art, no more than that of a Lawgiver from Juſtice; and we muſt remember that the Divine Underſtanding will hit the Mark much better than the Art of Man can do. Afterwards he uſes a Compariſon, *viz.* That there are ſome things in Mechanicks which are the principal Object of Art, and ſome things which reſult from the Work, and are not the effect of Art, but depend upon the Modification of Matter: Such are the Sparkles which fly up when a Smith ſtrikes a red-hot Iron upon an Anvil. They make no part of the deſign which the Smith propoſes to himſelf, they are only an accidental effect, which reſults from his Action, without his aiming at it, and it is only annex'd to the quality of the Iron. We muſt ſay likewiſe, that the Evils which are to be ſeen upon Earth, are not the Work of the Divine Art; God aims in the firſt place, and directly to the conſtruction of the World, but it happens that thoſe Evils do neceſſarily flow from his Work. The Author adds a Remark which has no great coherence with the firſt: He ſays, That the Artificer calls the Evils which we complain of, the Preſervation of the World; tho' we look upon them as its ruin and deſtruction. He pretends, that the Architect of the World propoſes to himſelf, the preſervation of the Whole, and that the Parts muſt ſuffer for the ſake of the Whole. (k) Ταῦτα ὁ τεχνίτης καλεῖ σωτηρίαν τοῦ ὅλου· μέλει γὰρ αὐτῷ τοῦ ὅλου· τὸ δὲ μέρος ἀνάγκη κακοῦσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ὅλου. *Ea conſummationem totius vocat opifex. Quia totum reſpicit, cujus cauſa neceſſe eſt corrumpi partes.* Peſtilential Diſeaſes, Earthquakes, Inundations, and the burnings of Mount *Ætna* do no harm but to ſome parts of the whole, and ſerve for the production of ſome others; for, as *Heraclitus* ſays, the latter live by the Death of the former, and the former die by the life of the latter. The death of the Earth gives life to Fire; the death of Fire gives life to the Air; the death of the Air gives life to Water; and the Death of Water gives life to the Earth (l). *Maximus Tyrius* might have been told, Why did you maintain then that the Phyſical Evils of Mankind are neither intended nor produced by God? If they are ſo neceſſary for the preſervation of the whole, and if the Divine Artificer aims at the preſervation of the whole, he muſt needs have them in view. Notwithſtanding this Objection, we may very well ſay, that according to the *Hypotheſis* of that Philoſopher, the Plague, Famine, and other Miſeries of Mankind are involuntary with reſpect to God, and come only into the World as an unavoidable effect of the diſpoſition of Matter (m). Let us now ſee what he ſays about the other ſort of Depravation, *viz.* Moral Evil: He ſays, (n) That the Power of the Soul is the Mother and Nurſe of it, and that the Earth being to be formed, which was to produce Plants and living Creatures, and to contain Evils in its Boſom, Evils being baniſhed from Heaven were lodged in it; that the living Creatures were divided into two Kinds, *viz.* Beaſts and Men; that Men were to ſurpaſs all other Animals, and be inferior to God; that this Inferiority does not conſiſt in their dying, for their Death is only the beginning of another Immortal Life; that God, in order to make them inferior (o) to the Divine Nature, placed the Soul in a mortal Body, as a Charioteer upon a Chariot, put the Reins in its hands, and gave it leave to run any where: He gave it the Power to drive that Chariot according to the Rules, or againſt the Rules of Art. It directs the Chariot, and reſtrains the impetuoſity of the Horſes, but they are ignorant of all the Rules, and go ſome one way, ſome another way; ſome towards Intemperance, others towards Raſhneſs and Fury; others are Sluggiſh and Lazy, ſo that the Chariot being driven up and down confounds the Charioteer, who yields and runs towards the place whither the moſt unruly Horſe draws him: He runs into Gluttony and Lewdneſs, if the ſtrongeſt Horſe turns that way, and ſo on. Such is the Solution of that Platonick Philoſopher.

It is defective in two reſpects. For 1. he acknowledges two Principles, God and Matter, the one very good indeed, but who cannot mend all the depravation of the other. That natural and abſolutely incorrigible Depravation is the Cauſe of Phyſical Evils, and the occaſion of Moral Evil; it does ſo violently incline a Humane Body to Vices and Crimes, that the Soul is carried away, as it were, by unruly Horſes. 2. *Maximus Tyrius* does not acquit the ſupream Goodneſs and Holineſs of God. A good and virtuous Father would never cauſe his Children to ride unruly Horſes, and ſend them into the Army, if he did certainly foreſee, or think, with great probability, that notwithſtanding their Skill in Riding, they ſhould fall and kill themſelves; and that notwithſtanding their Education, the War would make them the moſt infamous of all Men. In a word, that *Hypotheſis* ſets ſome Bounds to the Divine Power, and leaves the other Attributes of God expoſed to the Objections of the *Manichees*; ſo that having the conveniencies of the Chriſtian *Hypotheſis* concerning Free-Will, it has the inconveniencies of it.

(KΔΔ) *The more we reflect ..... the more we find that the natural Light ..... ties and intangles,* &c.] I found it ſo by Experience, as I was reading this Article again to make it ready for a Second Edition. Some new Thoughts came into my Mind, (q) which convince me anew, and more ſtrongly than ever, that the beſt Anſwer that can be (r) naturally returned to the Queſtion, *Why did God permit that Man ſhould ſin?* is this, *I don't know, I only believe that he had ſome reaſons for it very worthy of his infinite Wiſdom, but they are incomprehenſible to me.* You will ſtop with ſuch an Anſwer the moſt obſtinate Diſputers; for if they will go on they muſt ſpeak alone, and ſo they will ſoon hold their Tongues. If you ſhould enter the Liſts with them, and undertake to maintain, that the inviolable privileges of Free-Will have been the true reaſon which moved God to permit that Men ſhould ſin, you would be forced to anſwer their Objections to their ſatisfaction; and I do not know how you could well do it, for they might object two things which ſeem moſt evident to Reaſon:

I. The firſt is, That God having cauſed his Creatures

(g) *Id. ib. p.* 255.

(h) *Id. ib.*

(i) *Id. ib. pag.* 256.

(k) *Id. ib. p.* 257.

(l) *See about this Doctrine of* Heraclitus, *the Notes of* Daniel Heinſius *in* Maximum Tyrium, *pag.* 110.

(m) *See a like thought in the Rem.* T. *of the Art.* Chryſippus.

(n) *Max. Tyrius ubi ſupra, pag.* 257.

(o) *This is an abſurd and impious thing, and it does not agree with what was ſaid by the Author (Lett. ſ.) that there are no envious Beings in Heaven. Note, That according to the conjecture of* Heinſius, θεῶ, ought *to be join'd with* γῆ *in that Paſſage.*

(q) *See alſo the new Remarks of the Art. of* Origen.

(r) *That is, without conſulting the Revelation, but only Philoſophical Ideas.*

They look'd for ſuperlatives in every Thing; that is to ſay, they aimed by their Interrogations, at the Knowledge of Things that are in the higheſt Degree every one in its kind. They ask'd, for inſtance, What is the ſtrongeſt, the moſt Ancient, the moſt Common, the Trueſt Thing? It was anſwer'd, as to the laſt Point, that

tures to exiſt by an Effect of his Goodneſs, he gave them alſo, under the Character of a bountiful Cauſe, all the Perfections which are proper for every Kind. We muſt therefore ſay, that he expreſt a greater Love for thoſe which receiv'd very excellent Qualities from him, than for thoſe who receiv'd leſs excellent Qualities. He has therefore out of a particular Goodneſs beſtowed Free Will upon Men, ſince that Quality raiſes them above all the Beings that are upon Earth. But we cannot conceive, how a gracious and bountiful Nature can make a conſiderable Preſent, without deſigning to increaſe thereby the Happineſs of thoſe who receive it, and conſequently that bountiful Being ought to put them in a Condition of getting ſuch an Advantage by it, and keep them, if it be poſſible, from being utterly ruined and deſtroyed by it. But if there is no other way of preventing that than by revoking one's Gift, one ought to do it; whereby much better than by any other Means one may keep the Quality of Patron and Benefactor. Whoever does ſo does not change his Mind with reſpect to the *Donee*, but preſerves without any Shadow of Variation, the good Will wherewith he made him that Preſent. The ſame Goodneſs which moves one to give a Thing which he thinks will make happy thoſe that ſhall enjoy it, moves him likewiſe to take it away as ſoon as he obſerves that it makes them unhappy; and if he has Time enough, and a ſufficient Power, he will not put off the withdrawing of his Gift till it proves the Cauſe of that Miſery, but he will take it away before it has done any Harm. What has been ſaid follows from the Ideas of Order, and the Notions whereby we may judge of the Eſſence and Characters of Goodneſs, in whatever Subject it is to be found, whether in the Creator or in a Creature, a Father, Miniſter, or King, &c. From thence comes the Matter of this *Dilemma*; either God has given a Free Will to Men by an Effect of his Goodneſs, or without any Goodneſs: You ſay that he has done it with great Goodneſs; but it does neceſſarily reſult from thence that he ſhould have depriv'd them of it at any rate, rather than ſtay till it ſhould prove their Eternal Damnation by the Production of Sin, which is a Monſter he does eſſentially abhor: and if he has been ſo patient as to leave ſo diſmal a Preſent in their Hands, till the Evil happened, it is a ſign either that his Goodneſs was altered, even before they left the right Way, which you dare not ſay; or that Free Will was not given them out of Goodneſs, which is againſt the Suppoſition granted in the above mention'd *Dilemma*.

There is a reſpectful Caution, which ought never to be diſpenſed with but in Caſes of Neceſſity; Men in ſuch Caſes ought to uſe no ſuch Caution. If a Son ſhould ſee his Father ready to throw himſelf out of the Window, either in a Fit of Frenſie, or becauſe he is troubled in his Mind, he would do well to chain him, if he could not reſtrain him otherways. If a Queen ſhould fall into the Water, any Footman that ſhould get her out of it, either by embracing her, or taking her by the Hair (*d*), tho' he ſhould pluck off above one half of it, would do a very good Action; ſhe would not certainly complain of his want of Reſpect to her. If any one ſhould ſuffer a Lady finely dreſt to fall into a Precipice, would it not be a very fooliſh Excuſe to ſay, that it had not been poſſible to ſtop her without ſpoyling her Ribbons and Head-dreſs? Upon ſuch an Occaſion as that, Reſtraint and Violence are an Effect of Goodneſs, and if a Man was to be ſnatch'd even againſt his will out of the Jaws of Death, it would be a piece of Charity to ſnatch him out, tho' you ſhould run the hazard of putting one of his Members out of Joint, if he could not be ſaved any other way; that Man, when his Paſſion is allay'd, will not fail to thank you for it. This Maxim, *viz.* That (*e*) to ſave a Man againſt his Will, is the ſame thing as if one ſhould kill him, is of no uſe in this Caſe; and the greateſt Favourers of Toleration, will tell you that the pretended Command, *Compel them to come in*, ſhould be executed in a literal Senſe, if the only ſafe and infallible Way of ſaving Hereticks, was to make them go to the Proteſtant Church, or to Maſs, with a Cudgel in one's Hand. I take the Philoſophical Commentator to witneſs. *If I ſhould ſee*, ſays he, (*f*) *before the Door of a Houſe a Man very wet whilſt it rains very hard, and if out of pity I would deliver him from that Inconveniency, I might uſe theſe two Means, either to deſire him to come into the Houſe, or to take him by the Arm, if I was ſtronger than he, and puſh him in. Theſe two Means are equally good in order to obtain the Thing I ſhould aim at, viz. To keep that Man from the Rain; 'tis no great matter whether he comes into the Houſe willingly, or againſt his Will, and by Force, for he is equally under a Shelter againſt the Rain. If Hell could be avoided the ſame Way, I grant that our Converters would be well grounded; for if it was enough, in order to it, to be under the Vaults of a Church, it would be no great matter whether one came into it willingly, or was dragged into it being bound Hand and Foot, and ſo the ſtrongeſt Labourers and Porters ſhould be hired to take hold of Hereticks as ſoon as they ſhould appear in the Streets, and carry them upon their Shoulders to the neareſt Church; nay, their Doors ſhould be blown up with a Petard, if there was occaſion for it, and they ſhould be carried with all Speed from their Beds to Church.* What I have ſaid concerning the Right which Men have, by Vertue of the Laws of Charity, to moleſt and vex thoſe whom they preſerve from Death by that Means, is truer ſtill with reſpect to Fathers. They ſhould be altogether wanting to their Duty, if they did not take away from a Son, a Knife or a Sword wherewith he is ready to wound himſelf. They ought notwithſtanding his Tears, to ſnatch away thoſe Preſents from him, and if they ſee him ready to ruin himſelf for ever in a certain Courſe of Life, they are obliged to bring him off by Force, and even to implore the Aſſiſtance of the temporal Power. If they neglect the Welfare of their Sons, alledging for their Excuſe, that they will uſe no Violence, as if their Sons were Slaves, they ſhew that they have no Love, or know not how to uſe it right.

It does clearly appear from all theſe things, that they who would ſubmit to the Judgment of Reaſon, the Conduct of the Divine Providence, with reſpect to the Permiſſion of the firſt Sin, would infallibly loſe their Cauſe, if they had nothing to ſay but that the Privileges of Free Will ought not to be violated. They would be anſwered, how can you conceive that God is the Father of Men, and yet ſay that he had rather ſave them the ſhort and inconſiderable trouble of forcing them to renounce an agreeable Converſation, wherein they were ready to make an ill uſe of their Liberty, than prevent their eternal Damnation, which they incur by the ill uſe of their Free Will? Where do you find ſuch Ideas of Paternal Goodneſs? To have a Regard to the Free Will of a Man, and carefully to abſtain from laying any Reſtraint upon his Inclination, when he is going to loſe his Innocence for ever, and to be Eternally damned, can you call that a lawful Obſervation of the Privileges of Liberty? You would be leſs unreaſonable, if you ſhould ſay to a Man who gets a Fall near you, and breaks his Leg, *that which hindred us from preventing your Fall, is that we were afraid to undo ſome Folds of your Gown; we had ſo great a Reſpect for its Symmetry, that we would not undertake to ſpoil it, and we thought it was much better to let you run the hazard of breaking your Bones.*

I will not deny but that the Permiſſion of making uſe of a Thing, and of abuſing it, (*a*) has had ſometimes the Character of a moſt eſpecial Favour; but then that Permiſſion implies the Impunity of the Abuſe. This can be therefore of no uſe in the preſent Caſe. See the Margin (†).

II. But the Second Thing which I am to propoſe will give more trouble to the Defendants than the other. I have argued hitherto upon this Principle; when thoſe whom we love cannot be preſerved from Death, or Infamy, or ſome other great Evil, unleſs we make them feel a leſſer Pain, we are oblig'd to make 'em feel it. To indulge them in their capricious or bad Inclinations, would be rather an act of Cruelty than of Goodneſs; and as they would infallibly be angry, as ſoon as they come to know the Conſequences of it, ſo they would be ready to thank thoſe who did hurt them ſo much for their Good. The Evidence of thoſe Propoſiti-

Z 2 ons

(*d*) *Thus Queen* Chriſtina *was taken out of a Lake whereinto ſhe fell near* Stockholm. *I think St.* Amand *has mention'd that Adventure in his Poem intitled* Moyſe Sauvé.

(*e*) *Invitum qui ſervat, idem facit occidenti.* Horat de Art. Poet. *ſub. fin.*

(*f*) *A Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words* Compel them to come in. *Part* 2. *p.* 57. *&* Sep

(*a*) *The Emperor* Nerva *permitted theſe two things to the Father of* Herodes Atticus *who found a Treaſure in his Houſe. See* Triſtan's *Comment. tom.* 1. *pag.* 357. *and* Spon's *Travels.* 2. *Tom. pag.* 164. *of the* Dutch *Edition.*

(†) *The right way of conferring a Benefit is not to permit the Abuſe of it, but to add to it the Art of making uſe of it. Otherwiſe a Preſent is a Body without a Soul, as* Horace *intimates Epiſt.* 4. *lib.* 1. *ad* Tibullum: non tu corpus eras ſine pectore: Dii tibi formam, Dii tibi divitias dederant, ARTEMQUE FRUENDI.

that (K∆∆∆) Men are wicked, and that God is Good; which gave Occasion to this other Queſtion, How comes it that God being Good, Men are wicked? The Solution of this Difficulty ſeem'd to *Simplicius* to be of very great Importance.

PAULINA

ons is obvious to every Body, and it cannot be doubted that *Adam* and *Eve* would have look'd upon God's Reſtraint to keep them from Falling, as a new Favour as great as the Precedent.

This is what the Principles of my firſt Obſervation run upon; but now I take another Way: I grant to the Adverſaries all their Demands; let them ſay that ſeeing Man had received the Privilege of Liberty, he was to have the intire Poſſeſſion and Uſe of it, and no manner of Reſtraint was to be put upon him. Let them ſay it was not a proper time to ſave a Man by pulling him by the Arm, or by the Hair, by throwing him upon the Ground, and ſaying to him, (b) *It is hard for thee to kick againſt the Pricks.* Let them ſay that the Free Will of Man was a Barrier altogether inviolable, and a Privilege which it was not lawful to ſtrike at. I will grant it. But was there no other Means of preventing the Fall of Man? God was not to oppoſe a corporal Motion; which is a troubleſome Oppoſition: A meer Act of the Will was the Thing in Queſtion. But all the Philoſophers ſay that the Will cannot be forced, *Voluntas non poteſt cogi*, and it is a Contradiction to ſay that a *Volition* is forced, for every Act of the Will is eſſentially voluntary. Now it is infinitely more eaſy for God to imprint in the Souls of Men ſuch an Act of the Will as he thinks fit, than it is for us to fold a Napkin, therefore, *&c.* Here is another Obſervation more convincing ſtill. All Divines own that God can infallibly produce a good Act of the Will in a humane Soul (c) without depriving it of the Uſe of Liberty. A preventing Delectation, the Suggeſtion of an Idea which weakens the Impreſſion of the tempting Object, and a thouſand other preliminary Means of acting upon the Mind and the ſenſitive Soul, move infallibly the rational Soul to make a good Uſe of its Liberty, and to follow the right Way without being invincibly forc'd to it. *Calvin* would not deny it with reſpect to the Soul of *Adam*, during the time of Innocency, and all the Divines of the Church of *Rome*, without excepting the (d) *Janſeniſts*, own it with reſpect to Man conſidered as a Sinner. They acknowledge that his Actions may be meritorious, though he acts only by a Grace that is either efficacious by it ſelf, or ſufficient in ſuch a Degree that it never fails to produce its Effect. They muſt therefore acknowledge a Divine Help ſo ſeaſonably beſtowed upon *Adam*, and ſo tempered that it had infallibly prevented his Fall, would have been very conſiſtent with the uſe of his Liberty, and had been no reſtraint upon him, nor unpleaſant to him, and had left him an Occaſion for doing meritorious Actions.

Thus the Defendants are driven from all their Intrenchments. Perhaps their laſt Anſwer will be, That God owes nothing to his Creatures, and that he was not bound to beſtow a neceſſitating or infallible Grace upon them. But why then did they ſay before, that he was to uſe humane Liberty with Caution? If he was obliged to preſerve that Prerogative of Men, he muſt needs owe ſomething to his own Work. But not to inſiſt upon that Argument *ad hominem*; one may anſwer them, That if he owes nothing to his Creatures, he is altogether bound to himſelf, and can do nothing againſt his Eſſence. But it is (†) eſſential to the Holineſs of God, and to his Infinite and Almighty Goodneſs, not to ſuffer the Introduction of Moral and Phyſical Evil.

Well, will they reply at laſt, but (f) *Shall the thing formed ſay to him that formed it, why haſt thou made me thus?* This is well ſaid: We ſhould have ſtop'd there. We are come again to the beginning of the Liſts; it had been better to ſtay there, for it is needleſs to engage in a Diſpute, if after having run for ſome time, one muſt at laſt ſhut up one's ſelf in one's *Theſis*. The Doctrine which the *Manichees* oppoſe, ought to be look'd upon by the Orthodox, as a Truth clearly reveal'd, and ſince it muſt at laſt be confeſt, that the Cauſes and Reaſons of it cannot be apprehended, it is better to own it from the very beginning, and ſtop there, and look upon the Objections of Philoſophers as a vain wrangling, and oppoſe nothing to them but Silence, together with the Shield of Faith.

(K∆∆∆) *That Men are wicked, and that God is good. Which gave Occaſion to this other Queſtion.*] This is what I find in the Learned *Daniel Heinſius*. (g) *Antiquiſſima Pythagoricorum diſputatio, & ab iis potiſſimum quae ἀκουσματικὰ vocabant Pythagorici, qui tria quaerere ſolebant: Primo, τὸ τί ἐστι, ſecundo, τὸ τί μάλιστα, tertio, τὸ τί δεῖ πράττειν . . . (h) In qua quaeſtione etiam conſtabat ſeptem ſapientum philoſophia, qui nihil aliud quaerebant quam τί μάλιστα. Nec quid bonum ſed quid optimum, nec quid difficile ſed quid difficillimum. Notum eſt illud ex Plutarchi Sympoſio ſeptem ſapientum. . . . Sic cum quaereretur, quid veriſſime diceretur, reſpondebant, ὅτι πονηροὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀγαθὸς ὁ θεός. Unde primo manavit ζήτημα tale, Τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ὄντος πόθεν κακοὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Quod teſtantur verſiculi apud Jamblichum Hippodamantis antiqui poetae, qui in laudem hujus quaeſtionis celebrat:*

Ὦ θεῖοι πόθεν ἐστὲ, πόθεν τοιοὶ δ' ἐγένεσθε;
Ἄνθρωποι πόθεν ἐστὲ, πόθεν κακοὶ ὧδ' ἐγένεσθε;

Unde hoc dimanavit, Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ παρόντος, πόθεν τὸ κακόν. This Paſſage is to be found in the Notes of *Heinſius* upon a Diſſertation (i) above mention'd. He adds, that *Maximus Tyrius* the Author of that Diſſertation examined that Subject by reaſon of *Plato's* Doctrine (a) concerning three Attributes of God: 1. That God is Eſſentially Good, and Goodneſs it ſelf. 2. That he is Immutable. 3. That he is Truth it ſelf. The firſt Attribute ſignifies not only that God is Good, but alſo that he is the Author of Good, ſeeing he is the Idea of Good, and the Idea of Good is the Cauſe which produces Good. Now becauſe the *Platonick* Philoſophers affirm'd, that every Idea is God, they acknowledged no Idea of Evil, and conſequently no Cauſe of Evil; which gave Occaſion to this Queſtion, From whence comes Evil? (b) *Ex primo ſequitur, Deo, ſi talis ſit, convenire non tantum bonum κατὰ δύναμιν, ſed etiam κατ' ἐνέργειαν, nec tantum ut bonus ſit, ſed etiam ut efficiat bonum: quia idea boni eſt. Idea autem boni, boni quoque cauſa eſt & exemplar. Porro cum Ideam mali tollant Platonici, quia ut Parmenides dicebat, πᾶσα ἰδέα θεός ἐστι, ſequitur ut quaeratur, Unde mala proficiſcantur.* Laſtly, *Heinſius* obſerves that this Queſtion was thought to be of great Importance for Piety, and refers us to *Simplicius's* Commentary upon *Epictetus*. The Words of that Commentator ſeem to me to be ſo remarkable, that I think they'll be an Ornament to this Part of my Dictionary. Here they are: (c) Περὶ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τῶν κακῶν ὁ λόγος μὴ καλῶς διορθωθεὶς, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβείας αἴτιος γέγονε, καὶ τὰς τοῦ ἤθους εὐζωΐας τὰς ἀρχὰς διέστρεψε, καὶ πολλαῖς καὶ ἀλύτοις ἀπορίαις ἐνέβαλε τοὺς μὴ καλῶς αἰτιολογήσαντας αὐτήν. Εἴτε γάρ τις λέγοι τὸ κακὸν, ὡς εἶναι δύο τῶν ὄντων ἀρχὰς, τί, τὸ ἀγαθὸν, καὶ τὸ κακὸν, πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄτοπα συμβαίνει. *Diſputatio de natura atque ortu malorum, non bene explicata, tum impietatis erga Deum cauſa extitit, tum morum honeſtaque diſciplinae principia perturbavit: tum multis, iiſque inexplicabilibus dubitationibus involvit eos, qui cauſas illius non veras reddiderunt. nam ſive quis malum à Deo conditum, ſive principium eſſe dicat, ut duo ſint principia rerum bonum & malum: multae magnaeque abſurditates ſequuntur.* He mentions three great Inconveniencies; for he aſſerts that the falſe Explication of the Origine of Evil has been the Cauſe of Impiety, and has confounded the Principles of Morals, and involved into many inſoluble Doubts thoſe who had a wrong Notion of this Subject. He refutes with great Force and Solidity the *Hypotheſis* of the *Manichees* conſidered in general: He refutes it better ſtill when he comes to the particular Explications they made uſe of. But when he undertakes in his turn to clear and prove his own *Hypotheſis*, he does not ſo fully ſatisfy his Reader. He makes uſe of the ſame Method which the ancient Fathers made uſe of, that is he gives no other Cauſe of the Origine of Evil than the Free Will of Man: 'tis the only thing he could do; a Man muſt come to this at laſt, and then he finds himſelf in the middle of a croſs Way. Which gave occaſion to a learned Abbot at *Paris*, to ſay not long ſince, I am in the middle of four Ways, that of the *Calviniſts*, that of the *Janſeniſts*, that of the *Thomiſts*, and that of the *Moliniſts*. I know very well which way I ought not to go, but I don't know which way I ought to go, *Quem fugiam habeo, quem ſequar non habeo.* The firſt Way is contrary to the Council of *Trent*; the ſecond, to the

(b) *Act. IX. 5.*

(c) *See the Rem.* F∆ *of the Art.* marcionites.

(d) *That is to ſay conſidering that they affirm that they condemn the Propoſitions of* Janſenius *in the Senſe that the Pope condemned them.*

(†) *That is, it ſeems ſo to our weak Reaſon.*

(f) *Rom. IX. 20.*

(g) *Dan. Heinſius in Max. Tyr. p.* [illegible]

(h) *There is left out ſomething in the Original, I have* [illegible] *it out of order, and I gueſs that the Printers ſuppreſt ſeveral Lines.*

(i) *In the Rem.* K∆.

(a) *In lib. 2. de Republica.*

(b) *Heinſ. ib. p.* [illegible]

(c) *Simplicius in hac enchiridii Epicteti verba cap.* τὸ Ὥσπερ σκοπὸς οὐ τίθεται πρὸς τὸ ἀποτυχεῖν, οὕτως οὐδὲ κακοῦ φύσις ἐν κόσμῳ γίνεται. Qumadmodum aberrandi cauſa meta non ponitur, ſic nec mali natura in mundo exiſtit.

PAULINA (*Lollia*). See the Remarks of the Article LOLLIUS.

PEYRAREDE (*John de*) a Gentleman † of *Gaſcogne*, and (*A*) a Proteſtant, was a good Latin Poet, and a good Critick. He began to be known at *Paris* towards the beginning of the Reign of *Lewis* XIV. He publiſhed ſome Remarks upon *Terence*, and ſome *Hemiſticks*, which filled up the Imperfect Verſes of the *Æneis*, to which he added ſome Verſes. He dedicated that Work to the Queen of *Sweden*, β. His Corrections and critical Conjectures upon *Florus*, deſerved the Approbation of *la Mothe le Vayer*, who follow'd them often, and (A*) made an honourable mention of him. *Balzac* ſpeaks of him ſometimes in his Letters. I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage out of them which is very (*B*) glorious to him. We find in a Letter γ which he writ from *Paris* the 20th of *April* 1641. to *Iſaac Voſſius*, that he began to feel the Infirmities of old Age, and that for the Space of Thirty Years he had laboured under great Difficulties, or ſpent his Time in improving his Eſtate. It appears from that Letter that he had a Son.

PEYRE (*James D'Auzoles* ζ *la*) a Gentleman ‡ of *Auvergne*, one of the moſt ridiculous Writers of the XVII. Century, tells us in the Preface before his Works, that he was Son of *Peter d'Auzoles*, and of *Mary Fabri* of *Auvergne*. He deſerved not to be refuted by ſome learned (*C*) Men, yet he had that Honour. He was ridiculed to ſome purpoſe in a ‡ Work of Mr. *Baillet*, ſpeaking of a Book which he intitled † *Anti-Baban*. He dyed of an Apoplexy * at *Paris* the 19th of *May*, 1642. I have ſaid ſomething of him in the Article of *Balzac*, and I ſhall give an Inſtance of the Narrowneſs (*D*) of his Genius.

PEYRERE (*Iſaac La*) born at *Bourdeaux*, made himſelf Famous by his Treatiſe

---

the *Popes* Conſtitutions; the third, to Reaſon; and the fourth, to St. *Paul*. The Proteſtants may more eaſily get out of this Perplexity, by preferring St. *Paul's* Authority to that of the Popes and Councils.

(*A*) *And a Proteſtant.*] He was a very zealous Proteſtant, as one may gueſs from a Letter of Mr. *de Balzac* to Mr. *Conrart*. (*d*) *But who told you*, ſays he to him, *that I hate the* Huguenots? *It cannot be Mr.* Conrart, *nor Mr.* de Saumaiſe, *nor Mr.* Daillé, *whom I have ſo much praiſed and celebrated, and whom I profeſs to love, honour and eſteem infinitely. I perceive that* Monſieur Peyrarede *was not pleaſed to make a Difference between Jeſt and Earneſt, and that in the free Converſation we had together, he put an ill Conſtruction upon ſome Words, which I ſpoke without any Deſign. Without inſiſting any longer upon it, I proteſt, dear Sir, that I hate the* Huguenots *no more than you hate the* Catholicks.

(AΔ) *And made an honourable mention of him.*] (*e*) "I follow the Interpretation of the Learned "*Monſieur Peyrarede*, ſays he, in his Notes upon the 19th Chapter of the 2d Book: He uſes a nobler Epithet in another Place. *Thoſe Words*, ſays he (*f*), *are obſcure, I have interpreted them according to the Expoſition of the illuſtrious Monſieur* Peyrarede. The Abbot *de Marolles* quotes him often in his Remarks upon *Statius*.

(*B*) *A Paſſage . . . . which is very glorious to him.*] "The Poſt of *Friday* laſt, brought me ſome "News of Monſieur *de Peyrarede*. Do you know "that his Name makes already a great Noiſe at "*Paris*, and that the *Celtæ* admire the *Aquitani*? "Or, if you had rather I ſhould expreſs my ſelf "another Way, and ſpeak Poetically of a Poet, "the God of the *Seine* is ſurpriſed to hear the Muſes "of the *Dordogne* ſing ſo well. For my Part, I am "charmed with their laſt Compoſition, and if the "Souls of the Bleſſed could be raiſed up by the "Charms of fine Verſes, I don't doubt but that the "Soul of the Duke *de Brezé* would come down from "Heaven, at the very Moment that he ſhould be "told:

" - - - - *Tu nube ſerena*
" *Stellato fulgens apice, & radiante coronâ,*
" *Ad tua Sacra veni, quæ multo Regia luctu*
" *Concelebrat, ſacrique Chori, ſanctuſque Senatus, &c.*
" *Aſpice ut ipſa gemens, ingenti affixa feretro,*
" *Horridaque & laceris luget Victoria pennis,*
" *Quæ quondam tua caſtra, tuas comitata triremes,*
" *Heſperiis toties mutas dum ſanguine Pontum,*
" *Deſeruit tua ſigna ſemel: nunc cadis acerbæ*
" *Invidiam lenire velit, fatiſque malignis*
" *Imputat, infandæque excuſat crimina cladis, &c.*

"Did you ever ſee any thing more noble or more "pathetical than that poor Victory afflicted with "the Death of that brave Duke? What a Spectacle "to ſee her with her torn Clothes, and broken "Wings, make Penance for a Fault which ſhe "thought to be guilty of; to ſee her faſtened and "as it were nailed to that great Coffin, which ſhe "waſhes with her Tears? She cannot eaſe her "Grief for the Misfortune that happen'd at *Orbitello*: She would fain impute it to a bad Deſtiny: "She, *&c.* (*g*). Mr. *de Balzac* writ this the 4th of *December*, 1646.

(*C*) *To be refuted by ſome learned Men.*] His little Book *of the Parmanent Life of Melchiſedech* printed in the Year 1622, was refuted by *Salian* a *Jeſuit*. His *Job* printed the next Year, was refuted by *Bolduc* a *Capuchin*, and by *Petavius* (*b*). He ſhould have thanked that *Jeſuit*, inſtead of being ſo imprudent as to write againſt him a Chronological Book intitled *the Diſciple of Time*. 'Tis he that is mention'd, without being named, in the Preface of the 2d Part of the *Rationarium temporum*, wherein 'tis ſaid that of all Chronological Books that were come out till then, none was more wretched than that which was intitled *Holy Chronology*. *La Peyre* was the Author of it, and of a ſmall *Folio* printed in 1629, and intitled *the Holy Geography, or an exact Deſcription of the Earth, and a true Demonſtration of the Terreſtrial Paradiſe*. I wonder that *Voſſius* placed not that Author in his long Catalogue of Chronologers.

(*D*) *An Inſtance of the Narrowneſs of his Genius.*] I find it in the Abbot *de Marollos*. "Mr. *le Febure* "*Chantereau, ſays he* (*a*), maintains that the com"mon Way of reckoning the Years of our Lord, "is the beſt, and ought to be preferred to all "others, againſt the Opinion of *Scaliger*, Father "*Petau*, and others who reckon ſome few Years "more, or cut off ſome; and when I ſaw that he "praiſed upon that Account, the late Mr. *de la* "*Peyre James d' Auzoles*, whom I knew alſo very "well, I did a little wonder at it, becauſe the good "Man had no great Genius for it, though he ap"plied himſelf very much to it: which I eaſily "perceived, becauſe he was of Opinion that the "Year might be made up of three hundred and "ſixty four Days, inſtead of three hundred and "ſixty five, and ſomewhat more, that it might al"ways begin of a Sunday, and end with a Saturday. "Certainly he underſtood not very well that Sci"ence; for if his Opinion was followed, *January* "would ſoon be found in the Seaſon of *Auguſt*, be"cauſe the Years would always be too ſhort by one "Day and ſome Hours; which being loſt upon the "Months, they muſt neceſſarily go forward. But "he never could underſtand it, and fell into a great "Paſſion about it; from whence I inferred that "Mr. *de la Peyre* was not ſo great a Man as he "thought himſelf to be in the Science which he profeſt. He obſerved ſometimes in his Diſputes what is practiſed by thoſe that are at Law; for he declared where he made his Abode. (*b*) He dated his *Anti-Babau, at* Paris *in the Houſe of Mr.* Couturier *a Man of Probity and Honour, wherein he lived the 5th of* Auguſt, 1631. Is not this a Sign of a weak Man?

(*A*) Con-

---

† *He call'd himſelf* nobilis Aquitanus *in his Works, as the Abbot de Marolles obſerves in the Liſt of the Authors who oblig'd him.*

β *See the Abbot de* Marolles. *ib.*

γ *It is the* 424. *of thoſe that were written to* J. Gerard Voſſius.

ζ *What we read in* Moreri's *Dictionary, that his Name was* d'Auzoles la Reine, *is not true.*

‡ Nobilis Arvernas. *Ludov. Jacob, ubi infra.*

‡ *In the 2d Tome of the* Anti. *pag.* 236.

† *'Tis an Anſwer to a Letter of Father* Bolduc.

* *Ludov. Jacob, Bib. Pontific. pag.* 343. *Peter de St. Romuald, chronol. journ. tom.* 1. *p.* 619. *ſays that he dyed of a malignant Fever the* 30 *of June.*

(*d*) *Balzac's Let. to Conrart. Book* 1. *p. m.* 25, 26.

(*e*) *La Mothe le Vayer, Remarks upon* Florus, *p.* 910. *See alſo p.*842.

(*f*) *Idib. pag.* 933.

(*g*) Balzac, *choice Let.* 2 *Part Book* 3. *Letter* 37. *p. m.* 378.

(*b*) *See Mr.* Baillet's Anti, *tom.* 2. *p.* 240, 241.

(*a*) *Marol. Memoirs. pag.* 271, 272.

(*b*) *Baillet, ubi ſup. pag.* 242.

Treatise concerning the *Pre-Adamites*, (A) which was printed in *Holland* in the Year 1655, and immediately refuted (A△) by a Multitude of Authors. He was then a Protestant, and had a Place in the House of the Prince of *Conde*. Tho' he published his Book without putting his Name to it, he was known to be the Author of it, hence it is that he was Imprisoned in the *Spanish* (B) *Netherlands*. He found no better Way to come off, than to lay his Doctrine upon the Principles of the Protestants, and to promise to go to Mass. He went to *Rome*, where he was † kindly received by *Alexander* VII. He publish'd, as is usual, the Motives which induced him to change his Religion. Some Catholicks (B△) laught at it. He spent the last Years of his Life in a ‡ Retirement. He had been in *Denmark*, wherein he attended Mr. *de la Thuillerie* Ambassador of *France*, and composed there (C) two Relations which have been printed. He is mention'd (D) in the *Menagiana*, as you may see in the Remarks. You will find some (E) very curious Circumstances in the Fragment of a Letter which I shall set down.

PEIRESC.

(A) *Concerning the Pre Adamites, which was printed in* Holland *in the Year* (c) 1655.] Mr. *Heidanus* was accused of having had a hand in the printing of that Book; but he cleared himself of it, and his Accuser never durst reply to it. 'Tis what I find in *Petrus ab Andla.* (d) *Ignorantiam Maresii sequitur ejus effrons & immane mendacium, quovis pæna dignissimum.* Eum *scilicet* qui familiam ducit inter hodiernos Cartesianos, obstetricatum fuisse editioni libri de Præadamitis inscripti. *Sed cum vir ille doctissimus detestandam hanc calumniam publice à se sit amolitus in parte secunda suarum considerationum de Sabbatho & die Dominica pag. 31. Nec ille,* qui ut inquit *Maresius*, olim per indirectum id exprobraverat, *cujus gonorrheam & profluvia hic lambere ac resorbere voluit noster, quicquam respondere potuerit, maledicentissimæ linguæ speculum inter scruta rejiceremus, nisi dudum in authoris caput recidisset cum immortali ejus ignominia.* You'll find in *Moreri*'s Supplement the Plan of the Book concerning the *Pre-Adamites.*

(A△) *And immediately refuted by a Multitude of Authors.*] The Author of *Moreri*'s Supplement names only four (e) Persons who wrote against the System of the *Pre Adamites.* Here is a larger Catalogue. *Joh. Conrad. Dannhawerus*, Professor of Divinity at *Strasburg* published there, *Præadamita utis, sive fabula priorum hominum ante Adamum conditorum explosa.* *John Micralius* Professor of Philosophy, and Rector of a College at *Stetin*, published a Book (f) against *la Peyrere.* *John Henry Ursinus* printed at *Francfort*, *Novus Prometheus Præadamitarum plastes ad caucasum relegatus & religatus.* *Samuel Maresius* Professor of Divinity at *Groningen*, printed there, *Refutatio fabulæ Præadamiticæ absoluta septem primibus quæstionibus cum præfatione Apologetica pro αὐθεντίᾳ sacræ scripturæ.* *John Hilpertus* Professor at *Helmstad*, printed at *Amsterdam*, *Disquisitio de Præadamitis.* The *Non ens Præadamaticum* of *Antony Hulsius* was printed for *John Elzevir* at *Leyden.* *Philip le Prieur* published at *Paris Animadversiones in librum Præadamitarum.* He took the Name of *Eusebius Romanus.* All those Books were printed in the Year 1656, as *Thomas Bangius* (g) observes, who adds, that *La Peyrere* shewed him his Manuscript at *Coppenhagen* in 1645; and then he says, *Neutiquam tamen persuadere nobis unquam potuimus ex temeritatis dilapsurum virum alias humanum & ingeniosum ut hoc commentum publicis typis excudendum daret, nisi res ipsa nostris oculis exposita fuisset.* Mr. *Crenius* (h) observes that *Calovius* and *Schotanus* have warmly disputed against the Pre-Adamitick Hypothesis; the Former in the three Volumes of his common Places, and the Latter in his Bibliotheque of the holy History. He says also, (i) That there are to be found in the Edition of the *Prometheus Præadamitarum* of *John Henry Ursinus*, *doctissimorum quorumdam Gallorum in librum de Præadamitis notæ censoriæ*, and that *Philip le Prieur* (k) put out another Edition of his Work at *Paris*, in the Year 1658, wherein he praises his Antagonist for having embrac'd the Church of *Rome*. *Bangius* says nothing of a Treatise printed at *Leyden* in 1656, with this Title, *Responsio exetastica ad tractatum incerto autore nuper editum, cui titulus* Præadamitæ. *Autore J. Pythio Ministro Jesu Christi in Swartewael.*

(B) *That he was imprisoned in the* Spanish Netherlands.] In the Year (l) 1655. "The Bishop of "*Namur* published a Censure of the Book concerning the Pre-Adamites, written by the Sieur *la* "*Peyrere*, but without naming him, because he "had not said that he was the Author of it, tho' "it was but too well known. But he was used "worse upon the same Account, being at *Brussels* "in *February* (m) 1656. Thirty Armed Men rushe "into his Chamber and apprehended him, and "then having carryed him through several long "Windings of the Streets of *Brussels*, they clapp'd "him up at last in the Tower of *Terremberg*, with "the Consent of the Arch-Duke *Leopold.* He was "told, that it was by the Authority of the great "Vicar of the Archbishop of *Mechlen.* At last after he had been some time in that Tower, he "came out of it by the Credit of the Prince of "*Conde* his Master, and immediately, by his Advice, he went to *Rome*, and threw himself at the "Pope's Feet, and submitted himself and his Book "to his Will: And so he became a Catholick, and "had as good a Success as he could wish. 'Tis "what he himself says in his Petition to the most "Holy Father Pope *Alexander* VII. See the Remark E.

(B△) *Some Catholicks laugh'd at it.*] Read this Passage out of a Letter of *Guy Patin*, written the 9th of *April*, 1658. "The Author of the Book concerning the Pre-Adamites, whose Name is *Isaac* "*de la* (n) *Pereire*, a *Gascon*, is here, being return'd "from *Rome.* He has published a little Book in "Quarto, in which he gives an Account of the "Reasons which moved him to change his Religion, "(which in School Terms is call'd, to abjure one's "Heresy) and he disowns his Book concerning "the Pre-Adamites. I have seen the Book, it does "not sell well. 'Tis said that the Pope has given "him a small Abbey, and that *Mazarin* has promised him some new Favour from Heaven or Purgatory. He is here waiting for that Favour, as greedily as you may fancy of a *Gascon*, who is afraid "of starving, and who hath changed his Religion "only to raise himself and fare better, at any "Body's Cost. He shews himself here as if he was "a great Worker of Miracles, or a Publisher of Pardons. . . . (o) A *Gascon*, who is a learned Man, "a Courtier, and a converted Huguenot lately come "from *Rome*, is very fit to act such a Comedy.

(C) *Two Relations which have been Printed.*] He made 'em for *la Mothe le Vayer*, his Friend; one of them is a Relation of *Greenland*, and the other of *Island*; they are both curious enough: I have quoted something of the Latter in the Article *Jonas* (*Arngrimus*). He dedicated it to the Prince of *Conde*; and he intimates in the Epistle Dedicatory that he designs to write the Life of that Hero. I think he is the Author of the Relation of the Battel of *Lens*.

(D) *He is mention'd in the* Menagiana.] (a) "*Isaac* "*de la Peyrere* of *Bourdeaux*, is the Author of a Book "intitled, *The Pre-Adamites*, wherein he pretends "to shew that *Adam* is not the First Man. The good "Man boarded at *Nostre Dame des Vertus* in the "House of the Fathers of the Oratory. He was still "infatuated with his Pre-Adamites, and 'tis likely "he dyed with that fantastical Notion. He would "have been very well pleased, had he known that "there is a Rabbin who mentions *Adam*'s Tutor. But "that Rabbin was a Rabbin, that is to say, an Author not to be minded. When the Book concerning the Pre-Adamites came out, it was condemned to be burnt by the Hangman. I desired "the Author who was my Friend, to send it me before it came to Light. He understood the Jest, "and sent me a Copy of it with this Verse of *Ovid*, "changing the Word *Urbem* into that of *Ignem*.

"*Parve, nec invideo, sine me liber ibis in ignem* (b).

See the Miscellanies (†) of *Vig. Marville* p. 144. 1. *tom.*

(E) *You will find some . . . . Circumstances in the Fragment of a Letter.*] I don't trust much *Peter de St. Romuald*,

† *See the Remark B.*

‡ *See the Remark D.*

(c) *Note that I have seen in the Catalogue of a Library which was sold at* Leyden *on the first of* October, *1695. that Book concerning the* Pre-Adamites *printed in 8vo. in 1655. and these Words are added,* Editio optima.

(d) *Pet. ab Andla animadv. ad vindicias Dissertationis. pag. 10.*

(e) *Mr.* Morin: (*Morin* the Astrologer) Antony Hulsius *Author of the* Non ens Præadamiticum. *J. Pythius, & J. Hilpertus.*

(f) *It was printed at* Stetin.

(g) *Tho. Bangius in cælo Orientis exercit. II. quæst. 8. pag. 134. apud Thomam Crenium fasc. 2. exercitationum philologico-historicarum pag. 13.*

(h) *Tho. Crenius ib.*

(i) *Id. ib. pag. 8.*

(k) *Id. ib. pag. 10.*

(l) Peter *de St.* Romuald, *a Chronological and Historical Journal.* 25 Decem. *p.m.* 675.

(m) *Moreri is therefore mistaken, when he says that* la Peyrere *retracted his Opinion in a Book printed at* Rome *in the Year 1655. His Printers have put in 1555.*

(n) *He should have said* La Peyrere.

(o) Patin. *Lett.* 117. *pag.* 454, 455. *of the* 1 *Tom.*

(a) *He should have said* Isaac la Peyrere. Moreri *should not have named him* la Perere.

(b) *Continuat. of the* Menagiana. *p.* 38. *of the Dutch Edit.*

(†) *He is named there* de la Pereyre.

PEIRESC (*Nicolas Claude Fabri, Lord of*) Counſellor in the Parliament of *Aix*, was born in *Provence* ‡ the Firſt of *December* 1580. I might add many Things to what has been ſaid by *Moreri*; but having little room with reſpect to the Letters of the Alphabet that are next to *P*, I am forced to ſuppreſs many Articles, and to touch ſlightly upon many others. I ſhall only ſay that no Man was ever more ſerviceable to the Commonwealth of Learning. He was, if I may ſay ſo, its Attorney-General: He encouraged Authors, furniſhed them with Knowledge and Materials, and ſpent his Revenue in buying, or getting Copies of the moſt ſcarce and uſeful Monuments. He kept Correſpondence with Learned Men (*A*) in all the Parts of the World: Philoſophical Experiments, Curioſities of Nature, Productions of Art, Monuments of Antiquity, Hiſtory, and Languages were equally the Object of his Care and Curioſity. You will find an exact Account of all thoſe Things in his Life, which was elegantly and learnedly written (*B*) by *Gaſſendus*. It will not be needleſs to obſerve, that *Peireſc*, who was ſo Famous all over *Europe*, and whoſe Death was lamented by ſo many Poets, and in (*C*) ſo many Languages,

Romuald, and therefore I deſired a Gentleman of great Merit, who lived then in the Houſe of the Prince of *Conde*, to let me know whether that good *Feuillant* has given a true Account of the Matter. Here is the Gentleman's Anſwer to me, " I think I " am able to give you an exact Account of what " you deſire of me, becauſe Mr. *de la Peyrere* was " my very good Friend. He was arreſted at *Bruſſels* " in the time mention'd by your Author. But the " ſecret Hiſtory of it is, that the late Prince con" cerned himſelf in that Buſineſs by the means of " his Confeſſor, who was a Jeſuit, and loved Mr. " *de la Peyrere*, abating his Religion, which he " would have him to change. The *Pre-Adamite* was " therefore arreſted, and was made afraid of the " Conſequences of his Book, unleſs he changed his " Religion. The good Man, who was not obſtinate " about what is call'd Religion, changed it very " ſoon, and his Maſter gave him wherewith to go " and fetch his Abſolution at *Rome*, which he did " not much value. He return'd to his Maſter's, who " loved him to the laſt, and maintained him, ſince " his Return into *France*, in the Houſe of the Fa" thers of the Oratory of *Paris*. I have often ſeen " him there, and found that he was far from being " a true Papiſt; but he was very fond of his No" tion concerning the *Pre-Adamites*, about which " he writ and ſpoke ſecretly to his Friends till he " dyed. The Procurator General of that Order, " who is a Friend of mine, and who loved him, " invited me to dine with him, and made him con" feſs, that he writ Books ſtill, which he told me " ſoftly would be burnt after the Death of the good " Man. *La Peyrere* was an extraordinary good" natur'd Man, who lived a quiet Life, and had but " little Faith.

(*A*) *He kept Correſpondence with Learned Men in all Parts of the World.*] I have been informed by a (*c*) Letter of the Abbot *Nicaiſe*, that Mr. *Thomaſſin Mazaugues* (*) Counſellor in the Parliament of *Aix*, has ten thouſand Letters *in his hands*, which were found amongſt the Papers of Mr. *de Peireſc*, and that he makes Choice of them; that there a great many which that famous Senator had received from *Holſtenius*, Father *Kircher*, Cavalier *del Pozzo*, *Salmaſius*, *Selden*, *Camden*, *Pignorius*, *Gualdo*, the *Puteanus's*, *Rigaltius*, and ſeveral other learned Men, of which he could make one Volume *in 4o.* and intitle it *Epiſtolæ virorum eruditorum quæ extant ad Peireſkium*. You will find ſome curious Things about thoſe Letters in the beginning of the *Menagiana*, 2d Edition. Here is a Paſſage of *Balzac*, which will not be improperly alledged. " (*d*) I " agree with you in all the greateſt and moſt magni" ficent Things you ſay of your Friend; and if you " will allow me to make uſe of a Word borrowed " from *Greece*, I add, that we have loſt in that " great Man, *a Piece of the Shipwrack of Antiquity,* " *and the Relicks of the Golden Age.* All the Virtues " of the Heroical Times had retired into that noble " Soul. The Univerſal Corruption of Mankind " could not work upon his good Conſtitution. His " Generoſity was neither confined by the Sea, nor " ſhut up on this ſide of the *Alps*; it diffuſed its " Favours and Kindneſſes every where, and it re" ceived Thanks from the Extremities of *Syria*, and " from the very Top of Mount *Libanus*. With an " indifferent Eſtate he had the Soul of a Potent " Lord, and without the Friendſhip of *Auguſtus*, he " was a *Mecenas*. Again, (*e*) *The late Mr.* de Malherbe *was one of his particular Friends, and ſometimes ſpoke to me of him, but only as of a Man extreamly Curious, a great lover of Relations and News, a great Searcher of Medals and Manuſcripts, who had abundance of Acquaintance in Foreign Countries, and was a great Admirer of all the Doctors of* Leyden, *&c.*

(*B*) *His Life . . . . . written by* Gaſſendus.] That Work is very much eſteem'd. Yet there is an Author who pretends that many Things have not been well related (*f*) in it. I think he means ſome Paſſages wherein *Salmaſius* is concerned. A Phyſician (*g*) of *Caſtres*, who has collected ſome Facts omitted by *Gaſſendus*, forgot on the other hand ſeveral Encomiums on Mr. *de Peireſc*, which *Colomeſius* has inſerted in his (*h*) *Gallia Orientalis*.

(*C*) *Death was lamented . . . in ſo many Languages.*] *Naudæus* will afford me a whole Commentary on this Text. (*i*) " I would fain . . . hear thee " diſcourſe about that famous Academy of the *Hu*" *mouriſts*, where, as the Baron *de Rians* ſaid one " day, the Obſequies of his Uncle the Abbot and " Counſellor *Peireſc* had been celebrated in more than " Forty ſeveral Languages. . . . (*k*) Thou may'ſt " well judge how much that Academy is eſteemed " at *Rome*, ſince Monſieur *Peireſc*, that Ornament of " *France*, that great Favourer of Learned Men, that " Abyſs of Learning, deſired to be a Member of it; " and ſince as he had honoured that famous Acade" my with his Name, they did alſo in their turn ho" nour his Memory with ſuch Duties as they had ne" ver before paid but to thoſe by whom they had " been governed, eſpecially upon the Account of " their extraordinary Virtue and Learning. *Naudæus* quotes thereupon *Gaſſendus*, who ſays, that beſides the Funeral Oration, pronounced in Latin by Mr. *Bouchard*, ſeveral Elogies of the Deceaſed (*l*) were recited in Italian, Latin, and Greek Verſes; and then *Naudæus* obſerves that the Baron *de Rians*, *who mentions Forty Languages, and* Gaſſendus *who mentions only three, are both in the right: for,* ſays he, (*a*) *the Praiſes of Monſieur* Peireſc *were only celebrated in three Languages in the Academy, and before the Cardinals; but afterwards they added to the Collection of thoſe Elogies printed at* Rome, *this Pangloſſia*, five generis humani Leſſus in funere delicii ſui Nicolai Claudii Fabricii Peireſcii, *which does effectually contain the Elogies of that great Man in Forty Idioms, and I might almoſt ſay, in as many different Characters. From whence* Scipio de Grammond, *who was preſent at that Ceremony, and who dyed ſome time after at* Venice, *took occaſion to compoſe theſe Verſes, to ſhew how Advantageous that Pangloſſia was both to the ſaid Sieur* Peireſc, *and to the City of* Rome.

Indus, Arabs, Medus, Gallus, Germanus, Etruſcus,
  Anglus, Idumæus, Sarmata, Grajus, Iber,
Et quicunque venit gelido de cardine, & uſto,
  Eoiſque plagis, occiduiſque ſonus;
Omnes Fabricio concordi voce parentant,
  Qui norat proprios reddere cuique ſonos.
Pro ſuperi! quanta eſt Romana potentia, quæ nunc
  Tot populis, & tot gentibus ora aperit.
Romana verè nunc clauditur orbis in urbe,
  Cui tam multifido competit ore loqui.

Balzac expreſſes ſome Contempt for the (*b*) *Pangloſſia*. " (*c*) What does Signor *John* (*d*) *James* " think of with his frightful Title of *Pangloſſia*? To " go as far as Forty, there muſt be three and twenty " which were unknown to *Scaliger*, and the Soul of

" *Parnaſſus*;

---

‡ *In the Village of* Beaugencier, *which* Gaſſendus *calls in Latin* Belgencerium.

(*f*) Multa perperam neſcioquo fato, in vita Peireskii a Gaſſendo relata, alias fortaſſe docebimus. *Clementius in vita Salmaſii.*

(*g*) Peter Borel: *his* Auctarium ad vitam Peireskii, *was printed at the Hague in the year* 1654.

(*h*) *Page* 175. *& Seq.*

(*i*) *Naudæus, Dialogue de Maſcurat, pag.* 138.

(*k*) *Id. ib. pag.* 139.

(*l*) Et carmina quidem in defuncti laudem Italicè, Latinè, Græcè recitarunt lectiſſima totius urbis ingenia: funebrem verò orationem copioſam ſanè, & elegantem pronunciavit Joannes Jacobus Buccardus delectus ad id muneris. *Gaſſend. in vita Peireskii lib.* 6. *pag. m.* 349.

(*a*) *Naudæus, ib. pag.* 141.

(*b*) Moreri *is in the wrong to call it* Pandegloſſie. *The Dutch Editions of* Moreri *have* Leſſas *inſtead of* Leſſus.

(*c*) Balzac, *Let.* 26. *to* Chapelain *Book* 4.

(*d*) *That is to ſay,* Bouchard, *who made the Funeral Oration, and call'd himſelf* Joannes Jacobus Buscardus.

(*c*) *Dated at* Dijon *the* 21*th of* Feb. 1696.

(*) *He did me the honour to write to me the* 4*th of* Feb. 1699. *a long account of it, which I had inſerted at the end of this Remark* A, *were it not that I thought the Publick would ſee it in the Preface to thoſe choice Letters before the* 2*d Edition of this Dictionary be ended. Thoſe Letters are printing at* Geneva.

(*d*) Balzac *Let. to Mr.* l'Huillier. *'Tis the* 2*d of the* 2*d Book of the* 1*ſt Part of the choice Letters p.* 48. *of the Dutch Edition.*

(*e*) *Id. Let.* 13. *to* Chapelain *Book* 2. *p. m.* 73.

Treatiſe concerning the *Pre-Adamites*, (*A*) which was printed in *Holland* in the Year 1655, and immediately refuted (*A*Δ) by a Multitude of Authors. He was then a Proteſtant, and had a Place in the Houſe of the Prince of *Conde*. Tho' he publiſhed his Book without putting his Name to it, he was known to be the Author of it, hence it is that he was Impriſoned in the *Spaniſh* (*B*) *Netherlands*. He found no better Way to come off, than to lay his Doctrine upon the Principles of the Proteſtants, and to promiſe to go to Maſs. He went to *Rome*, where he was † kindly received by *Alexander* VII. He publiſh'd, as is uſual, the Motives which induced him to change his Religion. Some Catholicks (*B*Δ) laugh'd at it. He ſpent the laſt Years of his Life in a ‡ Retirement. He had been in *Denmark*, wherein he attended Mr. *de la Thuillerie* Ambaſſador of *France*, and compoſed there (*C*) two Relations which have been printed. He is mention'd (*D*) in the *Menagiana*, as you may ſee in the Remarks. You will find ſome (*E*) very curious Circumſtances in the Fragment of a Letter which I ſhall ſet down.

PEIRESC.

(*A*) *Concerning the Pre Adamites, which was printed in* Holland *in the Year* (*c*) 1555.] Mr. *Heidanus* was accuſed of having had a hand in the printing of that Book; but he cleared himſelf of it, and his Accuſer never durſt reply to it. 'Tis what I find in *Petrus ab Andlo*. (*d*) *Ignorantiam Mareſii ſequitur ejus effrons & immane mendacium, quavis pœna digniſſimum.* Eum *ſcilicet* qui familiam ducit inter hodiernos Carteſianos, obſtetricatum fuiſſe editioni libri de Præadamitis inſcripti. *Sed cum vir ille doctiſſimus deteſtandam hanc calumniam publice à ſe ſit amolitus in parte ſecunda ſuarum conſiderationum de Sabbatho & die Dominica pag.* 31. *Nec ille*, qui *ut inquit Mareſius*, olim per indirectum id exprobraverat, *cujus gonorrhœam & profluvia hic lambere ac reſorbere voluit miſer, quicquam reſpondere potuerit, maledicentiſſimæ linguæ ſpiculum inter ſcruta rejiceremus, niſi dudum in auctoris caput recidiſſet cum immortali ejus ignominia.* You'll find in *Moreri's* Supplement the Plan of the Book concerning the *Pre-Adamites*.

(*A*Δ) *And immediately refuted by a Multitude of Authors.*] The Author of *Moreri's* Supplement names only four (*e*) Perſons who wrote againſt the Syſtem of the *Pre Adamites*. Here is a larger Catalogue. *Joh. Conrad. Dannhawerus*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Straſburg* publiſhed there, *Præadamita utis, ſive fabula priorum hominum ante Adamum conditorum exploſa.* *John Micrælius* Profeſſor of Philoſophy, and Rector of a College at *Stetin*, publiſhed a Book (*f*) againſt *la Peyrere*. *John Henry Urſinus* printed at *Francfort*, *Novus Prometheus Præadamitarum plaſtes ad caucaſum relegatus & religatus.* *Samuel Mareſius* Profeſſor of Divinity at *Groningen*, printed there, *Refutatio fabulæ Præadamiticæ abſoluta ſeptem primibus quæſtionibus cum præfatione Apologetica pro αὐθεντίᾳ ſacræ ſcripturæ.* *John Hilpertus* Profeſſor at *Helmſtad*, printed at *Amſterdam*, *Diſquiſitio de Præadamitis.* The *Non ens Præadamaticum* of *Antony Hulſius* was printed for *John Elzevir* at *Leyden*. *Philip le Prieur* publiſhed at *Paris* *Animadverſiones in librum Præadamitarum.* He took the Name of *Euſebius Romanus*. All thoſe Books were printed in the Year 1656, as *Thomas Bangius* (*g*) obſerves, who adds, that *La Peyrere* ſhewed him his Manuſcript at *Coppenhagen* in 1645; and then he ſays, *Neutiquam tamen perſuadere nobis unquam potuimus eo temeritatis dilapſurum virum alias humanum & ingenioſum ut hoc commentum publicis typis excudendum daret, niſi res ipſa noſtris oculis expoſita fuiſſet.* Mr. *Crenius* (*h*) obſerves that *Calovius* and *Schotanus* have warmly diſputed againſt the Pre-Adamitick Hypotheſis; the Former in the three Volumes of his common Places, and the Latter in his Bibliotheque of the holy Hiſtory. He ſays alſo, (*i*) That there are to be found in the Edition of the *Prometheus Præadamitarum* of *John Henry Urſinus*, *doctiſſimorum quorumdam Gallorum in librum de Præadamitis notæ cenſoriæ*, and that *Philip le Prieur* (*k*) put out another Edition of his Work at *Paris*, in the Year 1658, wherein he praiſes his Antagoniſt for having embrac'd the Church of *Rome*. *Bangius* ſays nothing of a Treatiſe printed at *Leyden* in 1656. with this Title, *Reſponſio exetaſtica ad tractatum incerto autore nuper editum, cui titulus* Præadamitæ. *Autore J. Pythio Miniſtro Jeſu Chriſti in Swartewael.*

(*B*) *That he was impriſoned in the* Spaniſh Netherlands.] In the Year (*l*) 1655. “The Biſhop of *Namur* publiſhed a Cenſure of the Book concerning the Pre-Adamites, written by the Sieur *la Peyrere*, but without naming him, becauſe he had not ſaid that he was the Author of it, tho' it was but too well known. But he was uſed worſe upon the ſame Account, being at *Bruſſels* in *February* (*m*) 1656. Thirty Armed Men ruſhe into his Chamber and apprehended him; and then having carryed him through ſeveral long Windings of the Streets of *Bruſſels*, they clapp'd him up at laſt in the Tower of *Turemberg*, with the Conſent of the Arch-Duke *Leopold*. He was told, that it was by the Authority of the great Vicar of the Archbiſhop of *Mechlen*. At laſt after he had been ſome time in that Tower, he came out of it by the Credit of the Prince of *Conde* his Maſter, and immediately, by his Advice, he went to *Rome*, and threw himſelf at the Pope's Feet, and ſubmitted himſelf and his Book to his Will: And ſo he became a Catholick, and had as good a Succeſs as he could wiſh. 'Tis what he himſelf ſays in his Petition to the moſt Holy Father Pope *Alexander* VII. See the Remark *E*.

(*B*Δ) *Some Catholicks laugh'd at it.*] Read this Paſſage out of a Letter of *Guy Patin*, written the 9th of *April*, 1658. “The Author of the Book concerning the Pre-Adamites, whoſe Name is *Iſaac de la* (*n*) *Pereire*, a *Gaſcon*, is here, being return'd from *Rome*. He has publiſhed a little Book in Quarto, in which he gives an Account of the Reaſons which moved him to change his Religion, (which in School Terms is call'd, to abjure one's Hereſy) and he diſowns his Book concerning the Pre-Adamites. I have ſeen the Book, it does not ſell well. 'Tis ſaid that the Pope has given him a ſmall Abbey, and that *Mazarin* has promiſed him ſome new Favour from Heaven or Purgatory. He is here waiting for that Favour, as greedily as you may fancy of a *Gaſcon*, who is afraid of ſtarving, and who hath changed his Religion only to raiſe himſelf and fare better, at any Body's Coſt. He ſhews himſelf here as if he was a great Worker of Miracles, or a Publiſher of Pardons. . . . (*o*) A *Gaſcon*, who is a learned Man, a Courtier, and a converted Huguenot lately come from *Rome*, is very fit to act ſuch a Comedy.

(*C*) *Two Relations which have been Printed.*] He made 'em for *la Mothe le Vayer*, his Friend; one of them is a Relation of *Greenland*, and the other of *Iſland*; they are both curious enough: I have quoted ſomething of the Latter in the Article *Jonas* (*Arngrimus*). He dedicated it to the Prince of *Conde*; and he intimates in the Epiſtle Dedicatory that he deſigns to write the Life of that Hero. I think he is the Author of the Relation of the Battel of *Lens*.

(*D*) *He is mention'd in the* Menagiana.] (*a*) “*Iſaac de la Peyrere* of *Bourdeaux*, is the Author of a Book intitled, *The Pre-Adamites*, wherein he pretends to ſhew that *Adam* is not the Firſt Man. The good Man boarded at *Noſtre Dame des Vertus* in the Houſe of the Fathers of the Oratory. He was ſtill infatuated with his Pre-Adamites, and 'tis likely he dyed with that fantaſtical Notion. He would have been very well pleaſed, had he known that there is a Rabbin who mentions *Adam*'s Tutor. But that Rabbin was a Rabbin, that is to ſay, an Author not to be minded. When the Book concerning the Pre-Adamites came out, it was condemned to be burnt by the Hangman. I deſired the Author who was my Friend, to ſend it me before it came to Light. He underſtood the Jeſt, and ſent me a Copy of it with this Verſe of *Ovid*, changing the Word *Urbem* into that of *Ignem*.

“*Parve, nec invideo, ſine me liber ibis in ignem* (*b*).

See the Miſcellanies (†) of *Vig. Marville* p. 144. 1. *tom.*

(*E*) *You will find ſome . . . . Circumſtances in the Fragment of a Letter.*] I don't truſt much *Peter de St. Romuald*,

---

† See the Remark B.

‡ See the Remark D.

(*c*) *Note that I have ſeen in the Catalogue of a Library which was ſold at* Leyden *on the firſt of* October, *1695. that Book concerning the* Pre-Adamites *printed in* 8vo. *in* 1654. *and theſe Words are added,* Editio optima.

(*d*) *Pet. ab Andlo animadv. ad vindicias Diſſertationis. pag.* 10.

(*e*) *Mr.* Morin: (*Morin* the Aſtrologer) Antony Hulſius *Author of the* Non ens Præadamiticum. *J. Pythius, & J. Hilpertus.*

(*f*) *It was printed at* Stetin.

(*g*) *Tho. Bangius in cœlo Orientis exercit. II. quæſt.* 8. *pag.* 134. *apud Thomam Crenium faſc* 2. *exercitationum philologico-hiſtoricarum pag.* 13.

(*h*) *Tho. Crenius ib.*

(*i*) *Id. ib. pag.* 8.

(*k*) *Id. ib. pag.* 10.

(*l*) Peter *de St.* Romuald, *a Chronological and Hiſtorical Journal.* 25 Decem. *p.m.* 675.

(*m*) *Moreri is therefore miſtaken, when he ſays that* la Peyrere *retracted his Opinion in a Book printed at* Rome *in the Year* 1655. *His Printers have put in* 1555.

(*n*) *He ſhould have ſaid* La Peyrere.

(*o*) Patin. *Lett.* 117. *pag.* 454, 455. *of the* 1 *Tom.*

(*a*) *He ſhould have ſaid* Iſaac la Peyrere. Moreri *ſhould not have named him* la Perere.

(*b*) *Continuat. of the* Menagiana. *p.* 38. *of the Dutch Edit.*

(†) *He is named there* de la Pereyre.

PEIRESC (*Nicolas Claude Fabri, Lord of*) Counſellor in the Parliament of *Aix*, was born in *Provence* ‡ the Firſt of *December* 1580. I might add many Things to what has been ſaid by *Moreri*; but having little room with reſpect to the Letters of the Alphabet that are next to *P*, I am forced to ſuppreſs many Articles, and to touch ſlightly upon many others. I ſhall only ſay that no Man was ever more ſerviceable to the Commonwealth of Learning. He was, if I may ſay ſo, its Attorney-General: He encouraged Authors, furniſhed them with Knowledge and Materials, and ſpent his Revenue in buying, or getting Copies of the moſt ſcarce and uſeful Monuments. He kept Correſpondence with Learned Men (*A*) in all the Parts of the World: Philoſophical Experiments, Curioſities of Nature, Productions of Art, Monuments of Antiquity, Hiſtory, and Languages were equally the Object of his Care and Curioſity. You will find an exact Account of all thoſe Things in his Life, which was elegantly and learnedly written (*B*) by *Gaſſendus*. It will not be needleſs to obſerve, that *Peireſc*, who was ſo Famous all over *Europe*, and whoſe Death was lamented by ſo many Poets, and in (C) ſo many Languages,

‡ *In the Village of* Beaugencier, *which* Gaſſendus *calls in Latin* Belgenſerium.

Romuald, and therefore I deſired a Gentleman of great Merit, who lived then in the Houſe of the Prince of *Conde*, to let me know whether that good *Feuillant* has given a true Account of the Matter. Here is the Gentleman's Anſwer to me, “I think I “am able to give you an exact Account of what “you deſire of me, becauſe Mr. *de la Peyrere* was “my very good Friend. He was arreſted at *Bruſſels* “in the time mention'd by your Author. But the “ſecret Hiſtory of it is, that the late Prince con“cerned himſelf in that Buſineſs by the means of “his Confeſſor, who was a Jeſuit, and loved Mr. “*de la Peyrere*, abating his Religion, which he “would have him to change. The *Pre-Adamite* was “therefore arreſted, and was made afraid of the “Conſequences of his Book, unleſs he changed his “Religion. The good Man, who was not obſtinate “about what is call'd Religion, changed it very “ſoon, and his Maſter gave him wherewith to go “and fetch his Abſolution at *Rome*, which he did “not much value. He return'd to his Maſter's, who “loved him to the laſt, and maintained him, ſince “his Return into *France*, in the Houſe of the Fa“thers of the Oratory of *Paris*. I have often ſeen “him there, and found that he was far from being “a true Papiſt; but he was very fond of his No“tion concerning the *Pre-Adamites*, about which “he writ and ſpoke ſecretly to his Friends till he “dyed. The Procurator General of that Order, “who is a Friend of mine, and who loved him, “invited me to dine with him, and made him con“feſs, that he writ Books ſtill, which he told me “ſoftly would be burnt after the Death of the good “Man. *La Peyrere* was an extraordinary good“natur'd Man, who lived a quiet Life, and had but “little Faith.

(*A*) *He kept Correſpondence with Learned Men in all Parts of the World.*] I have been informed by a (*c*) Letter of the Abbot *Nicaiſe*, that Mr. *Thomaſſin Mazaugues* (*) Counſellor in the Parliament of *Aix*, has ten thouſand Letters *in his hands*, which were found amongſt the Papers of Mr. *de Peireſc*, and that he makes Choice of them; that there a great many which that famous Senator had received from *Holſtenius*, Father *Kircher*, Cavalier *del Pozzo*, *Salmaſius*, *Selden*, *Camden*, *Pignorius*, *Gualdo*, the *Puteanus's*, *Rigaltius*, and ſeveral other learned Men, of which he could make one Volume *in 4o.* and intitle it *Epiſtolæ virorum eruditorum quæ extant ad Peireſkium*. You will find ſome curious Things about thoſe Letters in the beginning of the *Menagiana*, 2d Edition. Here is a Paſſage of *Balzac*, which will not be improperly alledged. “(*d*) I “agree with you in all the greateſt and moſt magni“ficent Things you ſay of your Friend; and if you “will allow me to make uſe of a Word borrowed “from *Greece*, I add, that we have loſt in that “great Man, *a Piece of the Shipwrack of Antiquity*, “*and the Relicks of the Golden Age*. All the Virtues “of the Heroical Times had retired into that noble “Soul. The Univerſal Corruption of Mankind “could not work upon his good Conſtitution. His “Generoſity was neither confined by the Sea, nor “ſhut up on this ſide of the *Alps*; it diffuſed its “Favours and Kindneſſes every where, and it re“ceived Thanks from the Extremities of *Syria*, and “from the very Top of Mount *Libanus*. With an “indifferent Eſtate he had the Soul of a Potent “Lord, and without the Friendſhip of *Auguſtus*, he “was a *Mæcenas*. Again, (*e*) *The late Mr.* de Malherbe *was one of his particular Friends, and ſometimes ſpoke to me of him; but only as of a Man extreamly Curious, a great lover of Relations and News, a great Searcher of Medals and Manuſcripts, who had abundance of Acquaintance in Foreign Countries, and was a great Admirer of all the Doctors of* Leyden, *&c.*

(*B*) *His Life . . . . . written by* Gaſſendus.] That Work is very much eſteem'd. Yet there is an Author who pretends that many Things have not been well related (*f*) in it. I think he means ſome Paſſages wherein *Salmaſius* is concerned. A phyſician (*g*) of *Caſtres*, who has collected ſome Facts omitted by *Gaſſendus*, forgot on the other hand ſeveral Encomiums on Mr. *de Peireſc*, which *Colomeſius* has inſerted in his (*h*) *Gallia Orientalis*.

(*C*) *Death was lamented . . . in ſo many Languages.*] *Naudæus* will afford me a whole Commentary on this Text. (*i*) “I would fain . . . hear thee “diſcourſe about that famous Academy of the *Humouriſts*, where, as the Baron *de Rians* ſaid one “day, the Obſequies of his Uncle the Abbot and “Counſellor *Peireſc* had been celebrated in more than “Forty ſeveral Languages. . . . (*k*) Thou may'ſt “well judge how much that Academy is eſteemed “at *Rome*, ſince Monſieur *Peireſc*, that Ornament of “*France*, that great Favourer of Learned Men, that “Abyſs of Learning, deſired to be a Member of it; “and ſince as he had honoured that famous Acade“my with his Name, they did alſo in their turn ho“nour his Memory with ſuch Duties as they had ne“ver before paid but to thoſe by whom they had “been governed, eſpecially upon the Account of “their extraordinary Virtue and Learning. *Naudæus* quotes thereupon *Gaſſendus*, who ſays, that beſides the Funeral Oration, pronounced in Latin by Mr. *Bouchard*, ſeveral Elogies of the Deceaſed (*l*) were recited in Italian, Latin, and Greek Verſes; and then *Naudæus* obſerves that the Baron *de Rians*, *who mentions Forty Languages*, *and* Gaſſendus *who mentions only three, are both in the right: for*, ſays he, (*a*) *the Praiſes of Monſieur* Peireſc *were only celebrated in three Languages in the Academy, and before the Cardinals; but afterwards they added to the Collection of thoſe Elogies printed at* Rome, *this Pangloſſia*, five generis humani Leſſus in funere delicii ſui Nicolai Claudii Fabricii Peireſcii, *which does effectually contain the Elogies of that great Man in Forty Idioms, and I might almoſt ſay, in as many different Characters. From whence* Scipio de Grammond, *who was preſent at that Ceremony, and who dyed ſome time after at* Venice, *took occaſion to compoſe theſe Verſes, to ſhew how Advantageous that Pangloſſia was both to the ſaid Sieur* Peireſc, *and to the City of* Rome.

Indus, Arabs, Medus, Gallus, Germanus, Etruſcus,
  Anglus, Idumæus, Sarmata, Grajus, Iber,
Et quicunque venit gelido de cardine, & uſto,
  Eoiſque plagis, occiduiſque ſonus;
Omnes Fabricio concordi voce parentant,
  Qui norat proprios reddere cuique ſonos.
Pro ſuperi! quanta eſt Romana potentia, quæ nunc
  Tot populis, & tot gentibus ora aperit.
Romana verè nunc clauditur orbis in urbe,
  Cui tam multifido competit ore loqui.

Balzac expreſſes ſome Contempt for the (*b*) *Pangloſſia*. “(*c*) What does Signor *John (d) James* “think of with his frightful Title of *Pangloſſia*? To “go as far as Forty, there muſt be three and twenty “which were unknown to *Scaliger*, and the Soul of

(*c*) *Dated at* Dijon *the 21th of* Feb. 1696.

(*) *He did me the honour to write to me the 4th of* Feb. 1699. *a long account of it, which I had inſerted at the end of this Remark A, were it not that I thought the Publick would ſee it in the Preface to thoſe choice Letters before the 2d Edition of this Dictionary be ended. Thoſe Letters are printing at* Geneva.

(*d*) Balzac *Let. to Mr.* l'Huillier. *'Tis the 2d of the 2d Book of the 1ſt Part of the choice Letters p. 48. of the Dutch Edition.*

(*e*) *Id. Let. 13. to* Chapelain *Book 2. p. m. 73.*

(*f*) Multa perperam neſcioque fato, in vita Peireſkii a Gaſſendo relata, alias fortaſſe docebimus. *Clementius in vita Salmaſii.*

(*g*) Peter Borel: *his* Auctarium ad vitam Peireſkii, *was printed at the* Hague *in the year* 1655.

(*h*) *Page* 175. *& Seq.*

(*i*) *Naudæus, Dialogue de Maſcurat. pag.* 138.

(*k*) *Id. ib. pag.* 139.

(*l*) Et carmina quidem in defuncti laudem Italicè, Latinè, Græcè recitârunt lectiſſima totius urbis ingenia: funebrem verò orationem copioſam ſanè, & elegantem pronunciavit Joannes Jacobus Buccardus delectus ad id muneris. *Gaſſend. in vita Peireskii lib. 6. pag. m.* 349.

(*a*) *Naudæus, ib. pag.* 141.

(*b*) Moreri *is in the wrong to call it* Pandegloſſie. *The Dutch Editions of* Moreri *have* Leſſas *instead of* Leſſus.

(*c*) Balzac, *Let. 26. to* Chapelain *Book* 4.

(*d*) *That is to ſay,* Bouchard, *who made the Funeral Oration, and call'd himſelf* Joannes Jacobus Buccardus.

“ *Parnaſſus,*

guages, and caused a pompous Mourning among the *Humourists* * of *Rome*, was unknown (*D*) to several French Men, though Men of Merit and Learning. He died the 24th of *June* 1637. The Astrologers had foretold, that he (*E*) should marry and have Children; yet he never was married.

* See the Remark B.

PELIAS, Son of *Neptune*, and of *Tyro* Daughter of *Salmoneus*, was † nursed by a Mare. He reigned in *Thessaly* with great Injustice; for after he had (*A*) usurp'd the Throne, he maintain'd himself on it by putting to Death, or persecuting those who had a Right to it. He durst not make use of Violence against his Nephew *Jason*, who went to demand of him || the Crown of his Father: He chose rather to elude the Justice of that Demand, by proposing to that young Prince a pious Expedition, and such as would get him a great Reputation. It was the Conquest of the Golden Fleece. *Jason* undertook it. It was reported that that Enterprise had proved

† Ælian. Hist. l. 12. c. 42.

|| Pindar. Od. 4. Pyth.

" *Parnassus* must be praised in *Basque*, and *Low-Breton*: that's enough to make a mad Musick upon " your *Parnassus*. It is to introduce the Barbarians into that sacred Place, and to commit as " great a Crime, as those who opened the Gates of " *Italy* to the Predecessors of the King of *Sweden*. See also what he says in two (*e*) other Letters to the same Mr. *Chapelain*.

(*D*) *Was unknown to several French men, tho' Men of Merit.*] *Balzac* affords me the Proof of it. (*f*) " Can you believe that Monsieur *de la Rochefoucaut*, had never heard of our Mr. *de Peiresc*, " and that a great many other Persons, who are " neither *Barbarians* nor Ignorant, knew him not, " no more than he? You see thereby that his Reputation was good, but that the *Italian* Signor " undertook to make it great, and that his *Panglossia* is rather an effect of his Sollicitations, than a " voluntary Duty which the People thought of. Here is a second Passage: (*g*) *I am fully persuaded of the Merit of Monsieur* de Peiresc; *but I was speaking of his Reputation, and you know that there is a* donum famæ *which all Learned Men have not, and whereby they who are in Possession of it, are not only known to the Senate, and to the Order of Knights, but also to the common People and Tradesmen.*

(*E*) *The Astrologers had foretold.*] *Gassendus*, the dreadful Adversary of that sort of Men, did not fail to make this Observation against them; for having set down the Day and Hour of the Birth of his Hero, he adds, (*h*) *Quod attingo solum, ne videar circa temporis circumstantiam non fuisse satis diligens; non verò ut faciam hariolandi ansam conjectoribus, qui jam post viri obitum, certiùs quàm antè, fata retexant. Etenim mirum dictu est, quàm multa mentiti Astrologi fuerint, seu annos spectes, quibus non vixit; seu uxorem, & liberos, aliaque, quibus caruerit; seu cætera multa, quæ est consequutus.* These words of the *Menagiana* ought therefore to be mended: " (*i*) Mr. *Peiresc* ordered, " by his last Will, that Mr. *Gassendi* might have a " hundred Volumes out of his Library, at his choice; " his Son refusing to execute his Father's Will, was " compell'd to it by the way of Justice.

(*A*) *After he had usurp'd the Throne, he maintain'd himself on it, by putting to death, or persecuting those.*] The Kingdom did belong to *Æson*, and not to *Pelias*, as it appears from their Genealogy. *Æson* was the Son of *Chretheus*, whose Father was *Æolus* (*l*); but *Pelias* was (*m*) Son of *Neptune*, and of a Daughter of *Salmoneus*, Brother (*n*) of *Chretheus*. I add, That the Kingdom had been given to *Æolus* by *Jupiter*, for himself and his Posterity.

(*o*) Τάν ποτε
Ζεὺς ὤπασε λαγέτᾳ
Αἰόλῳ, καὶ παισὶ τιμάν.

Quod (regnum) *olim Jupiter dedit populorum duci Æolo & liberis* ut esset illis *decus*. So that according to the Laws of Succession, it did belong not to *Pelias*, who descended from *Æolus* only by his Mother's side, but to *Æson* who descended from him by the Males. Note that *Æson* and *Pelias* were born of the same Mother; for *Tyro*, Daughter of *Salmoneus*, after she had two Twins (*p*) by *Neptune*, viz. *Pelias* and *Neleus*, married *Chretheus* (*q*) her Uncle, by whom she had three Boys, *Æson*, *Amythaon*, and *Pheres*. It is plain that *Pelias* was an Usurper, having excluded *Æson* from the Throne. *Æson* and his Wife dreaded him so much, that they durst not breed up *Jason* their Son; but assoon as he was born (*r*) they convey'd him into the Den of *Chiron*, and gave out that he was dead; and the better to deceive the Tyrant they performed all the Ceremonies of the Funeral. They saved their Child by that means, but they could not preserve themselves from *Pelias*'s Cruelty; for he forced (*s*) *Æson* to drink of the Blood of a Bull, and order'd that *Amphinome*, *Æson*'s Wife, should be put to Death, and caused *Promachus*, their Son, to be kill'd. This happen'd during the Voyage of the *Argonautæ*, and upon a false report of their Death. Note that *Amphinome* (*t*) having retir'd to the *Penates* of *Pelias*, and having made a thousand Imprecations against him, stabb'd herself. Others (*u*) say that she hang'd herself. I say nothing of *Pelias*'s Violence against (*w*) *Sidero*, *Tyro*'s Mother-in-Law. He kill'd her upon the very Altar of *Juno*, to revenge his Mother *Tyro*, who had been very ill used by that Step-mother. (*x*) Τελειωθέντες δὲ ἀνεγνώρισαν τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τὴν μητρυιὰν ἀπέκτειναν (*y*) σιδήρῳ. Κακουμένην γὰρ γνόντες ὑπ' αὐτῆς τὴν μητέρα, ὥρμησαν ἐπ' αὐτήν. Ἡ δὲ φθάσασα, εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἥρας τέμενος κατέφυγεν. Πελίας δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν βωμῶν αὐτὴν κατέσφαξε. Καὶ καθόλου διετέλει τὴν Ἥραν ἀτιμάζων. *Qui* (Pelias & Neleus) *cum ad justam integramque ætatem pervenissent, agnita matre, novercam, quod ejus opera parentem male affectam percepissent, facto in eam impetu occiderunt: quæ, tametsi intra Junonis templum confugere antevertisset, eam tamen Pelias super aram ipsam jugulavit: & in omnibus rebus Junonem negligebat.* The Author from whom I have this, adds one thing which will not be unseasonable in this place, viz. that *Pelias* and *Neleus*, two Twins, could not agree together; and that *Neleus* was forced to yield, and to look for another Habitation: (*z*) Ἐστασίαζον δὲ ὕστερον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ Νηλεὺς μὲν ἐκπεσὼν, ἧκεν εἰς Μεσσήνην, καὶ Πύλον κτίζει: *Atqui postea inter se discordiam exercere non desierunt. Neleus demum regno pulsus Messenam commigravit, & Pylo urbe condita, &c.* *Diodorus Siculus* (*a*) mentions the Discord of those two Brothers, and observes, that *Pelias* having obtain'd the City of *Jolcos*, and the adjacent Countries, rais'd an Army, and brought it into *Peloponnesus*. *Pausanias* (*b*) says that *Neleus* fled from *Jolcos* because he fear'd *Pelias*.

(*B*) *By proposing to that young Prince a Pious Expedition, and such as, &c.*] A great many Authors agree in this, that he favoured the design of the *Argonautæ*, for no other reason, but because he hoped by that means to get rid of his Nephew *Jason*, whose Merit he fear'd. I shall only quote *Valerius Flaccus*: The Passage is somewhat long, but 'tis no matter, since you shall find another Fact in it, viz. the extent of that Tyrant's States.

Hæmoniam (*c*) *primis Pelias frenabat ab annis:*
Jam gravis, & longus populis metus: illius omnes,
Ionium quicunque petunt: ille Othryn & Hæmum,
Atque imum felix versabat vomere Olympum.
Sed non ulla quies animo, fratrisque paventi
Progeniem, divumque minas: hunc nam fore regi
Exitio vatesque canunt, pecudumque per aras
Terrifici monitus iterant: super ipsius ingens
Instat fama viri, virtusque haud læta tyranno.
Ergo anteire metus, juvenemque exstinguere pergit
Æsonium: letique vias, ac tempora versat.

Pindar, if I am not mistaken, is the only Writer (*d*) who tells us, that *Pelias* incourag'd his Nephew to undertake that Expedition by a motive of Religion. (*e*) Here is the substance of the Discourse of that great Poet, I shall use the words of *Meziriac*. " *Jason* being two and twenty Years of Age, came " out of the Den of *Chiron*, and return'd to the House " of his Father *Æson*, where he was visited by abundance of his Relations, amongst whom were " his Uncles *Pheres* and *Amythaon*, and his first Cousins *Acastus* and *Melampus*. He treated them, and " made merry with them five Days together, and " on the sixth Day he went to *Pelias*, with all that " Company, and summon'd him to restore to him " the

(*e*) The 18th of the 4th Book, and the 1st of the 5th.

(*f*) Lett. 1. of the 4th Book to Chapelain. p. 203, 205.

(*g*) Id. Let. 4. of the same Book. p. 212.

(*h*) Gassend. in Vit. Peiresc. l. 1. circa init.

(*i*) Menag. p. 2. of the 1st Edit. in Holland. That Mistake has been mended in the 2d Edit.

(*k*) Apollod. l. 1. p. m. 45.

(*l*) Id. ib. p. 27.

(*m*) Id. ib. p. 45.

(*n*) Id. ib. p. 27, 43.

(*o*) Pindar. Pyth. Od. 4. p. m. 241.

(*p*) Apollod. ib. p. 43.

(*q*) Id. ib. p. 45.

(*r*) Pindar. ubi supra.

(*s*) Diod. Sicul. l. 4. c. 51. p. m. 251. See also Apoll. ubi supra. p. 59.

(*t*) Id. ib.

(*u*) Apollod. ibid.

(*w*) Diod. Sicul. l. 4. c. 70. p. 257. gives him that Name, whereby Meziriac upon Ovid's Epist. has corrected several Passages, p. 541.

(*x*) Apollod. ib. p. 45.

(*y*) Read Σιδηρώ according to Meziriac's Correction, which has been approv'd by Tanaq. Faber, in his Notes upon Apoll. p. 258.

(*z*) Id. ib.

(*a*) Diod. Sicul. ubi sup. p. 258.

(*b*) Pausan. l. 4. p. 112.

(*c*) Valer. Flac. Argon. l. 1. v. 22.

(*d*) See Benedictus upon Pind. Od. 4. Pyth. p. 355.

(*e*) Mezir. upon Ovid's Ep. p. 542, 543. That Discourse of Pindar is in the 4. Pyth. Od.

proved fatal to him, which made *Pelias* bolder ‡ in his Cruelty. He was puniſh'd for it by the Craft of *Medea*; his own Daughters cut his Throat, * in hopes that they ſhould make him grow young again, as ſhe had promiſed 'em. He was ſo willing ſhe ſhould do him that Service, that he told her, || *I give you leave to flea me alive, provided you reſtore me to the ſtate of a young Boy.* Some ſay, that ſhe did effectually reſtore him to his former Youth. *Cicero* is one of them. I don't believe that he did

" the Kingdom, which did lawfully belong to him. " *Pelias* ſeeing him ſo well attended, was oblig'd to " give him fair words, and anſwer'd him, That he " was ready to yield him his Royalty; but that he " would exhort him firſt to execute a pious and glo- " rious Enterpriſe, which was to go to *Colchis* to " appeaſe the *Manes* of *Phryxus*, and bring back " into *Theſſaly* the Golden Fleece, foraſmuch as the " Shade of *Phryxus* had appear'd to him for a long " time, and warn'd him to ſend ſome body into " *Colchis*, to call his Soul thrice upon his Sepulchre, " and bring back the Golden Fleece from thence; " and that having conſulted the Oracle about it, " *Apollo* had commanded the very ſame thing. He " added, That had it not been for his Old Age, he " himſelf would have undertaken that Voyage; but " that *Jaſon* could alledge no good excuſe againſt " it, becauſe he was in the Flower of his Youth, " and of ſuch an Age wherein the deſire of ac- " quiring Glory ſhould Work more upon him, than " the vain Ambition of Reigning. At laſt, he pro- " miſed and ſwore, in a ſolemn manner, that he " would reſtore the Kingdom to him, at his re- " turn.

(C) Cicero *is one of them: I don't believe that he did deſignedly . . . . . , as* Muret *fanſies.*] Let Mr. *Menage* perform the Office of a Commentator. " (c) That Fable of *Æſon*'s being made young again " by the Enchantment of *Medea*, is to be found at " large in the Seventh Book of *Ovid's Metamorphoſis*. " But what *Ovid* ſays of *Æſon* in that Book, *Plau-* " *tus* in his (d) *Pſeudolus*, or rather a Cook, who is " one of his Actors, ſays it of *Pelias*:

" *Quia ſorbitione faciam ego te hodie meâ,*
" *Item ut Medea Peliam concoxit ſenem;*
" *Quem medicamento & ſuis venenis dicitur*
" *Feciſſe rurſus ex ſene adoleſcentulum;*
" *Item ego te faciam.*

" *Cicero* ſays the ſame thing under the Name of Old " *Cato*, in his Book *de Senectute*: *Quo quidem me* " *proveſcentem haud ſanè quis facile retraxerit; nec ſi* " *tamquam Peliam recoxerit.* But if we believe " *Ovid* and *Apollodorus*, *Pelias* was not made young " again by *Medea*. He was, by the Perſwaſion of " *Medea*, kill'd by his Daughters, who hop'd to " make him young again, in the ſame manner as " *Medea* had made an old Bull young again. *Muret* " in the Tenth Chapter of the ſixth Book of his " *Variæ Lectiones*, thinks, That *Plautus* and *Cicero* " have deſignedly miſtaken thoſe Names; *Plautus* " in the Perſon of a Cook, who never read any *Me-* " *tamorphoſis*; and *Cicero* in that of an Old Man, " whom his Memory fails often; and herein he has " been follow'd by *Camerarius*, *Scioppius*, *Freherus*, " and ſeveral other Criticks. For my part I am " fully perſwaded, that *Plautus* and *Cicero* ſpoke " in earneſt; and that what they ſay of *Pelias* had " been ſaid by ſome ancient Authors, whom they " follow'd, as *Ovid* follow'd ſome others. Mr. *Me-* *nage* adds, that *What* Ovid *ſays of* Æſon, Jaſon's *Father, was ſaid of* Jaſon *himſelf, by* Pherecydes *and* Simonides, *as we may learn from the Argument of* Euripides's Medea: Φερεκύδης δὲ καὶ Σιμωνίδης φασὶν ὡς ἡ Μήδεια ἀνεψήσασα τὸν Ἰάσονα, νέον ποιήσαι . . . . *So that it is likely that ſome ancient Author ſaid, that* Pelias *was made young again by* Medea, *as well as his Brother* Æſon . . . . *and* Plautus *and* Cicero *have follow'd that Author, as* Ovid *follow'd the Author of a Poem Intitled,* Νόστοι, *that is to ſay,* the Returns; *for we learn from the abovemention'd Argument of the* Medea, *that that Author ſaid of* Æſon, *in that Poem, what* Ovid *ſaid of him in his* Metamorphoſis.

I cannot believe that *Plautus* told a Lye to keep a *Decorum*, no not if I was told a hundred times, that it becomes a Cook to falſify Hiſtory upon the Stage. But it would be more difficult ſtill for me to believe what is ſaid of *Cicero*, that he thought that *Decorum* requir'd of him, that the Memory of *Cato*, an old grave Man, ſhould fail him. 'Tis better to aſcribe that Miſtake to *Cicero* himſelf, if it be a Miſtake: which is alſo one of *Muret*'s Shifts. (e) *Tale aliquid hic quoque comminiſcendum eſt: nam aut decorum id* [illegible] *Cato credidit, quod ſe memoria vacillare* [illegible]*, & interdum habet aliquid gravitatis in magnis viris minus accurata fabularum & talium rerum cognitio: aut hic quoque inter prœpoſtera Ciceronis* ἁμαρτήματα *numerandum eſt.* It is no eaſy thing to refute *Menage*, for the Ancients did ſo differently relate Mythological Adventures, that it is not unlikely that ſome ſaid, that *Pelias* was actually made young again. Perhaps it will be ſaid, that if *Medea* had done him that good Office, ſhe would have done it before ſhe and *Jaſon* fell out: But how likely is it that ſhe had been willing before that time, to beſtow ſo great a Favour upon the Murderer of the Father and Mother of her Husband. This is a weak Objection, ſince moſt Authors ſuppoſe, that he did not put to Death the Father of *Jaſon*. The moſt common Tradition ſays, That *Æſon*, *Jaſon*'s Father, was made young again by *Medea*; and ſome (f) Authors ſay, That he died in a quiet Poſſeſſion of his Kingdom, and left the Tuition of his Son to *Pelias*. We have ſeen (g) that the latter ſwore in a ſolemn manner, that he would reſtore the Kingdom to *Jaſon*, at his return. Why ſhould not we believe, that ſome Authors have ſaid that he kept his Word: And then it might be ſaid, without any difficulty, that *Medea* reſtor'd his former Youth to him at *Jaſon*'s deſire. What is very certain is, that there are ſtill extant ſome Teſtimonies of his great deſire that ſhe would do him that Favour. See *Diodorus* (h) *Siculus*, where he relates how *Medea* acting like a Fanatick, and pretending that ſhe came from the *Hyperborean* Country, to make *Pelias* and his Kingdom happy, perſwaded that Prince that ſhe was order'd to reſtore him to the Flower of his Youth. But eſpecially read theſe words of *Varro*: (i) *Peliam Medea permiſiſſe ut ſe vel vivum deglúberet, dummodo redderet puellum.* Let us obſerve that the Funeral of *Pelias* was celebrated with great magnificence, and that *Jaſon* was one of the Heroes who contended for the Prize in the Funeral Games of that Ceremony (k). Is it not a ſign that *Pelias* died, being reconciled with his Nephew? It is ſomewhat ſtrange that Authors ſhould ſay, that ſhe reſtor'd her Husband *Jaſon* to his former Youth, for he was very young when he married her; and if ſome Years after ſhe was uneaſy to ſee him diſpoſed for a ſecond Marriage (l), it was becauſe ſhe begun to grow old. Perhaps a wrong daſh of the Pen, either by an Author or a Copyiſt, produc'd at laſt this Tradition, that *Medea* reſtor'd *Jaſon* to his Youth. If inſtead of writing Αἴσων, ſomebody writ Ἰάσων, it happen'd that the Son and the Husband took the place of the Father, and of the Father-in-Law; I mean, of *Æſon* whom *Medea* made young again. Such a miſtake in writing would be only the tranſpoſition of a Letter; and I grant that ſuch tranſpoſitions are more frequent in Printing than in Writing; yet Authors and Copyiſts are not ſo free from them as it were to be wiſh'd. One may therefore have ſome reaſon to believe, that they who ſaid that *Medea* reſtor'd *Jaſon* to his Youth, grounded their Opinion upon a Book into which the word Ἰάσων had crept, through inadvertency, inſtead of the word Αἴσων. Which cannot be ſaid of the (m) Writer quoted by Mr. *Menage*, for the Sequel of the Diſcourſe ſhews, that he ſpeaks of *Jaſon*'s being reſtor'd to his Youth, I think that Mr. *Menage* would have quoted *Lycophron*, if he had remember'd theſe words: (n) καὶ λέβητι δαιτρευθεὶς δέμας ἐν αἰθύνοις ἥρπαξεν ἐρρὰς σαῦλος: *Et in lebete corpus excoctus non impune cepit arietis vellus.* Upon which *Canterus* made this Note, *Jaſonem à Medea recoctum fuiſſe, notum eſt.*

Note, That if a Woman had the Gift which is aſcrib'd to *Medea*, ſhe would uſe it eſpecially for her Husband. So that all things duly conſider'd, I ſhould not much wonder if ſome Authors had ſaid, that *Medea* reſtor'd to their Youth, not only (o) the Nurſes of *Bacchus*, and their Husbands, and *Æſon* her Father-in-Law, and *Pelias*, *Æſon*'s Brother, but alſo her Husband *Jaſon*. It is a greater wonder that ſhe forgot herſelf: Why did ſhe permit that one might

---

‡ See the Remark E.
* See Diod. Sicul. l. 4. c. 52. ſeq.
|| See the words of Varro in the Remark C.

(c) Menag. Obſervations upon Malherbe, p. 349, 350.

(d) In the 8th verſe of the 2d Scene of the 3d Act, p. m. 541.

(e) Muret. var. Lect. l. 6. c. 10. p. m. 983.

(f) Scholiaſt. Homeri Odyſſ. l. 12. he quotes Pherecydes. See Meziriac, ubi ſup. p. 135.

(g) In the abovemention'd Paſſage of Pindar, Let. b.

(h) Diod. Sicul. l. 4. c. 52, 53. See alſo Hyginus, c. 24.

(i) Varro in Marcipore apud Nonium Marcellum v. puellos p. m. 158.

(k) Pauſ. l. 5. p. 155.

(l) Diod. Sicul. ib. c. 55. p. 244.

(m) The Author of the Argument of Euripides's Medea.

(n) Lycoph. v. 1313.

(o) Æſchyl. in nutricibus Bacchi apud Autorem Argumenti Medeæ Euripidis.

did deſignedly take the one for the other, as *Moret* fancies. *Jaſon* treated (D) *Pelias's* Daughters generouſly, and even left the Kingdom to the Son of that Uſurper.

PELIAS was the (E) name of the † Lance which *Peleus* was * preſented with on his Wedding-Day. He us'd it β in Battles, and gave it to his Son *Achilles*, who made it extraordinarily famous. It was ſo heavy γ that none but he was able to dart it. It was made of an Aſh-Tree, which *Chiron* cut off upon Mount *Pelion* δ. See *Pliny* §.

PELLISSON (*Paul*) was one of the greateſt Wits of the Seventeenth Century. The ſame reaſon which hindred me from giving a long Article of Mr. *Menage*, obliges me ‡ to be very ſhort in this Article. All that I could ſay of the particular Honour (A) which the *French* Academy did to Mr. *Pelliſſon*, and of the Praiſes he deſerv'd during the Perſecutions which he was expoſed to, for having been in Mr. *Fouquet's* ſervice; all thoſe things, I ſay, and ſeveral other parts of his Life, are ſtill freſh in the Memory of all my Readers. It would be as needleſs to mention his Application to the Great Affair, as it was call'd in *France*; for the Complaints and Railleries of the *Proteſtants* about it, are known to every body. But there is a Circumſtance which, perhaps, is not ſo well known: Some Perſons have aſſur'd me, that he wiſhed the Great Affair of Converſions had been always carried on in the ſame method as had been uſed for many Years, without having recourſe to the *Dragonades*, which will be eternally abhorred by honeſt Men, whatever Country or Religion they be of. He had been for a long time about a Book of Controverſy, concerning the Euchariſt, but he had not time enough to finiſh it. Something of it (B) has been publiſh'd ſince his Death. One may perceive in it the ſubtlety of his Wit; which is all that he could put in it. The ſame ſubtlety may be obſerv'd in his (C) Reflections upon Diſputes about Religion, wherein he forgot not what the Church of *Rome* pretends to be the Stumbling-block of the *Proteſtants*;

might ſay to her, *Medice cura teipſum*; Since you make other People young, why don't you part with your Old Age? It would be at leaſt as uſeful to you as the reſtoration of your Huſband's Youth. I ſhall conclude this Remark with obſerving a Miſtake of *Aldus Manutius* the younger. He (a) ſaid that *Pelias* was *Jaſon's* Father.

(D) *Treated* Pelias's *Daughters generouſly, and even left the Kingdom to the Son.*] They were three: *Jaſon* married them very advantageouſly. *Alceſtis*, the eldeſt of them all, was *Admetus's* Wife. The name of the ſecond was *Amphinome*, ſhe married *Andræmon*. The third had for her Huſband, *Canus*, King of the *Phoceans*, and Son of *Cephalus*; her name was *Evadne* (b). I find this in *Diodorus Siculus*. That Hiſtorian (c) obſerves, That *Jaſon* plac'd *Acaſtus*, *Pelias's* Son, on the Throne of his Father; yet he ſays, a little before, that (d) *Pelias* having no Son, was afraid of being dethron'd by his Brother. It cannot be ſaid, in order to excuſe him, that he obſerves, that the fabulous Narrations do very much differ one from another; he makes that obſervation that he may not be condemned, if he does not always agree with other Authors, (e) Καθόλε γὰρ τοῖς παλαιοῖς μύθοις οὐχ ἁπλῆν ἐδὲ συμπεφωνημένην ἱστορίαν ἔχειν συμβέβηκε. Διόπερ ἐ χρὴ θαυμάζειν ἐάν τινα τῶν ἀρχαιολογουμένων μὴ σύμφωνα ἅπασι τοῖς ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν εὑρίσκωμεν. *In priſcis enim fabulis nulla omnino ſimplex & per omnia ſibi conſentiens eſt hiſtoria. Haud ergo mirandum eſt, ſi in antiquitatibus illis recenſendis cum poetis & ſcriptoribus aliis non ubique nobis conveniat.* But I do not believe that he pretended, that ſuch an Obſervation ſhould ſerve for his Juſtification, in caſe he contradicted himſelf: he were to blame if he pretended ſuch a thing. Let us therefore boldly ſay, that he deſerves a little Cenſure upon this occaſion; for he ſhould not have adopted *pag.* 233, the Opinion of thoſe who ſaid, that *Pelias* had no Son, and a quite contrary Opinion *pag.* 243. He ſhould, at leaſt, have told his Reader, that ſome ſaid one thing, and others another. He had reaſon to obſerve, that his Narrations agreed not with thoſe of other Writers. We have an Example of it here; for we read in *Apollodorus*, that *Alceſtis*, (f) during the Life of *Pelias*, was married to *Admetus*, who had performed the hard Conditions (g) which *Pelias* requir'd of thoſe who courted her. *Apollodorus* (h) ſays, that *Pelias* had four Daughters, and names them one after another. *Hyginus* (i) ſays, that he had five, and tells their Names. *Pauſanias* (k) ſays, that the Daughters of that Prince being overwhelm'd with Grief, becauſe they had kill'd their Father, thinking to make him young again, left the Country and retir'd into *Arcadia*, where they died and were buried. That Author mentions their Sepulcher, and adds, That none of the Poets, whom he read, told their Names; but that *Micon*, a Painter, put upon their Pictures the Names *Aſterope* and *Antinoe*. He obſerves, in another place, (l) that one of them was call'd *Alceſtis*, in the Repreſentation of *Pelias's* Funeral. I wonder he had not read the Books from which *Apollodorus* and *Diodorus* had the Names of *Pelias's* Daughters, or that he had not read thoſe two Authors. Let us obſerve, that the Name of *Pelias's* Wife was (m) *Anaxibia*, and that ſhe was *Bias's* Daughter.

(E) *Was the name of the Lance.*] In *Homer* 'tis only an Epithet taken from the place where *Chiron* cut off the Aſh-Tree. (n) Πηλιάδα μελίην: *Peliadem fraxinum*. (o) Πηλιὰς μελίη: *Pelias fraxinus*. The Latines changed that Epithet into a proper Name.

(A) *The particular Honour which the French Academy.*] "The French Academy having deſired to hear "in a full Aſſembly the Reading of that (p) Work, "which was as yet but Manuſcript, ordered ſome "Days after of their own Motion, in favour of the "Author; That the firſt place vacant in that Body "ſhould be deſign'd for him; and that in the mean "time he ſhould have a Right to aſſiſt in thoſe Aſſemblies, and to give his Vote as an Academician: "with this Clauſe, That the ſame Favour ſhould not "be done to any body elſe for the time to come, "upon any account whatſoever. You will find thoſe words (q) in the Hiſtory of the *French* Academy: They are attended with a Diſcourſe which the Author pronounc'd to thank that Aſſembly, the 30th of *December* 1652.

(B) *Something of it has been publiſhed.*] See the Abſtract which Mr. *de Beauval* made of it in his Hiſtory (r) of the Works of the Learned, and that of Mr. *Couſins* (s).

(C) *In his Reflections upon Diſputes about Religion.*] The firſt part of that Work was printed at *Paris* in 2 Vol. in 12°. in the Year 1686. See the Abſtract of it in the News (t) from the Republick of Learning. The next Year the Author reprinted it, and added a new Tome to it, with this Title, *An Anſwer to the Objections from* England *and* Holland, or, *Of the Authority of the greateſt number in the Chriſtian Religion.* See the Journal of the Learned (u). Some time after he added another Tome to it, divided into four parts, and Inticled, *Mr.* Jurieu's *Chimera's*: or, *A general Anſwer to his Paſtoral Letters of the ſecond Year, againſt the Book of Reflections, and a ſhort Examination of his Prophecies.* One may eaſily gueſs, that ſo ſubtle a Man had the advantage of a Chimerical Interpreter of the *Revelations*. All thoſe Works of Mr. *Pelliſſon* have been reprinted in *Holland*. See the *Leipſick Journal* (x). They make up the three firſt Parts of the Reflections upon Diſputes about Religion. The fourth Part was publiſh'd

---

† *Ovid. Metam. l.* 13. *fab.* 3.

* *Schol. Homeri in Iliad. l.* 16. *v.* 143.

β *Id. ib.*

γ *Hom. ib.*

δ *Id. ib.*

§ *Plin. l.* 16. *c.* 13. *p. m.* 298.

‡ *The Eloge and Abridgment of Mr. Pelliſſon's Life, are to be found in ſeveral new Books, which are very common, as the* Mercure Gallant, *the* Journ. of the Learned, *the* Hiſtorical Mercury, *the* Hiſtorical Letters, *&c.*

(a) *Ald. Manut. P. F. in Cicer. de Senect. ſub. fin.*

(b) *Taken from* Diod. Siculus, *ubi ſupra, c.* 54. *p.* 242.

(c) *Id. ib.*

(d) *Id. ib. c.* 41. *p.* 233.

(e) *Diod. Sicul. l.* 4. *p.* 172. *Edit. H. Stephani* 1559.

(f) *Apoll. l.* 1. *p.* 51. *Hygin. c.* 51.

(g) *He required that they ſhould bring a Chariot drawn by a Lion and a Wild Boar. Apollod. ib.*

(h) *Apoll. ib. p.* 45.

(i) *Hygin. c.* 24.

(k) *Pauſa. l.* 8. *p.* 245.

(l) *Id. l.* 3. *p.* 154.

(m) *Apoll. ib. Hygin. c.* 14. *p. m.* 44. *& c.* 51. *p.* 98.

(n) *Hom. Iliad. l.* 16. *v.* 143.

(o) *Id. ib. l.* 21. *v.* 277.

(p) *That is of the Hiſtory of the French Academy. That Work of Mr.* Pelliſſon *has always been look'd upon as a Maſter-piece. See* Mr. Baillet, *Judgments of the Learned, tom.* 2. *p.* 153.

(q) *Pag.* 359. *of the* Paris *Edit.* 1672. *in* 12.

(r) *Aug.* 1694. *p.* 513. *& ſeq.*

(s) *In the* 20 *Journal of the Learned* 1694.

(t) July 1686. *Art.* 1. *See alſo the* Journ. of the Learned *of the* 29. *of* Apr. 1686.

(u) *Of the* 12 *of Apr.* 1688. *p.* 540. *of the Dutch Edit.*

(x) Nov. 1689. *p.* 564. *and in the Supplement, tom.* 1. *p.* 609.

I mean the Difficulties which ariſe from the way of Examination. That Stumbling-block, if it be one, is rather that of (D) *Rome*, than that of *Geneva*, as I have ſaid elſewhere. I ſpeak of it again in the Commentary, and I ſhall ſay occaſionally, that ſome People think it is very likely that no body makes uſe of the way of Examination, properly ſo called, tho' it be very much talk'd of. Beſides, I don't know but it may be ſaid, that the obſtacles to a right Examination do not ſo

liſh'd at *Paris* 1692. and is intitled, *Of the Toleration of Religions. Some Letters of Mr. de* Leibnitz, *and Mr.* Pelliſſon's *Anſwers to them.* Here is the Marginal Note which is to be found in the firſt Page. *Theſe Objections have been made by Mr. de* Leibnitz, *who is well known by his Merit. They were ſent into* France *by the Dutcheſs of* Hanover, *to the Abbeſs of* Maubuiſſon *her Siſter. The Author of them was not known at that time.* They, who have a thouſand Proofs of the Extent of Mr. *Leibnitz's* Genius, cannot too much admire the purity of his French Style, which appears in thoſe Objections. He is one of thoſe rare Men, who can find no bounds in the Sphere of Humane Merit, and who fill it up altogether.

(D) *Rather the Stumbling-block of* Rome, *than that of* Geneva, *as I have ſaid elſewhere.*] See the Article of Mr. *Nicolle* (a), you will find in it, that that Doctor having objected ſeveral great Difficulties, could not anſwer thoſe which were objected againſt him. Order required that he ſhould anſwer the Objections retorted upon him, and clear the Way of Authority. The many Incumbrances of that Way required the ſpeedy Work of his Hands; yet he put it off till another time, and durſt not poſitively engage his Word for it. He expreſs'd himſelf thus (b): "Mr. *Jurieu* treating two principal Queſtions in his Book, one concerning the "Syſtem of the Church, the other concerning the "Analyſis of Faith, I ſhall only apply myſelf to the "firſt in this Treatiſe, adding to it the Conſequences which have ſome relation with it, and "which Mr. *Jurieu* treats in ſeveral places, eſpecially in his third Book. We ſhall ſee afterwards "whether there will be the ſame neceſſity to treat "of the Analyſis of Faith. But the Queſtion concerning the Church is important enough to be examined by itſelf, and in a ſeparate Work. And "this is what I deſign to do. Abundance of People have been of Opinion, that that Partition was made artificially. One of the two Pieces was taken, and the other left out; becauſe the one promiſed, at leaſt, that the Victory would be diſputed, whereas the other threatned with an unavoidable Defeat. Which made ſome People conclude, That Mr. *Nicolle* knew very well that the way of Authority is but a Chimera. Some wiſer People have been contented to believe, That he doubted not but it was the way which God has ſhewn to the Simple, tho' it is not poſſible to anſwer the Objections of the Proteſtants: So that his Silence ought not to be look'd upon as a proof of Hypocriſy; but as an effect of that Prudence which does not permit that Hereticks ſhould be made known, that there are ſome important Truths, which cannot be well defended againſt the Objections of the Adverſaries. I don't take upon myſelf to judge of what paſſes in another Man's Heart; and therefore I will not ſay, that Mr. *Nicolle* was not perſwaded of what he ſaid in one of his Books. (c) "God has not only given up the Material World to the Diſputes of Men, according "to the Scripture; but by a more terrible effect of "his Juſtice, he has, in a manner, given up to them "the Divine Myſteries, and the Holy Truths reveal'd "to them, by permitting that they ſhould be contradicted by them, that they ſhould become the "Subject of their Conteſts, and that ſome raſh "Sophiſts ſhould inſolently rail at 'em in their Diſcourſes and Writings. It is true, that we cannot "ſay altogether of that ſort of Diſputes, what the "Wiſe-man ſays of thoſe which have Natural things "for their Object, that Men can never come to know "the truth of 'em by their Inquiries: *Mundum tradidit diſputationibus eorum, ut nunquam inveniant opus quod operatus eſt.* On the contrary, it is certain, "that it appears, and even ſhines among the Clouds "which Men endeavour to caſt over it; and that "humble, ſincere, and underſtanding Men will "find it out among thoſe intricate Queſtions, and "falſe Subtleties which they endeavour to hide it "with. Which ſignifies, That the Controverſy about the Way of Authority and the Way of Examination, is not one of thoſe things which God has given up to the Diſputes of Men, without permitting them to diſcover at any time what he has done. But ſome fancy, that Mr. *Nicolle* believed the contrary: He had a thouſand ſtrong Objections againſt the Way of Examination: He knew that they are retorted againſt the Way of Authority, and that new ones are added to them, which it was impoſſible for him to reſolve. He believed therefore, that the way whereby revealed Truth ought to be diſcerned, is altogether like the Works of Nature, about which God permits us to diſpute, but does not permit (d) to diſcover the Myſtery thereof. Once more I am not ſo raſh as to judge of another Man's Conſcience.

Mr. *Pelliſſon* has not been more lucky than Mr. *Nicolle* in the Defenſive part. I confeſs, that he has, without much difficulty, deſtroyed the diſtinction between an Examination of Attention, and an Examination of Diſcuſſion, and ſome others; but at laſt he was at a ſtand, as well as his Brethren, when he came to reſolve the Objection, retorted upon him, and remove the Difficulties which ariſe from the Way of Authority. So that we may (e) repeat here, that it had been better for both Churches, never to ſtir that Queſtion. (f) "Nothing can be more pernicious than Mr. *Nicolle*'s "Method: For if he could once perſwade Men, "that it is impoſſible to find out Truth by the way "of Examination, as he does his utmoſt towards it, "he would ſoon perceive that he went about to ſet "up Pyrrhoniſm, and conſequently to ruin Religion. Every one might then argue thus. It is impoſſible to find out Truth by the way of Examination, Mr. *Nicolle* has convinc'd us of it. It is "evident that it cannot be found out by the way of "Authority, and this is much more certain than "the reſt. What can we do better therefore than "to give over, once for all, the hopes of ever "knowing that Truth which ſo many People ſeek, "and which no body can find? This is the natural "effect of Mr. *Nicolle*'s Method, from whence one "may perceive how pernicious it is. For nothing "can be more oppoſite to Religion than Pyrrhoniſm. It is a total extinction not only of Faith, "but alſo of Reaſon; and there is nothing more "impoſſible than to reclaim thoſe who have run "themſelves to ſuch an Exceſs. Theſe are the Words of a Man of Parts, (g) who Thinks very much, who is a perfect Maſter of the Art of Reaſoning, and who has made ſeveral new Objections to Mr. *Nicolle*: For he ſhews not only that, in order to make a right uſe of the way of Authority, we muſt know the Church which is in poſſeſſion of that Authority; but alſo that Mr. *Nicolle*'s Arguments would neceſſarily lead us to the Doctrine of Probability, in its whole extent. This laſt Point would be very contrary to Mr. *Nicolle*, who has ſo well refuted the Doctrine of Probability. The other Point requires a great many Diſcuſſions. We cannot know where the Authority reſides, but by examining what are the Marks of the Church which is in Poſſeſſion of it. (h) *We muſt know the preciſe number of thoſe Marks. We muſt know not only that there are ſo many, but alſo that there are no more.* We muſt know whether they who reckon a Hundred are more reaſonable than thoſe who reckon Fifteen, or Twelve, or Ten, or Six. When we have fixed the number of the Marks, we muſt examine, whether they agree with the Church of *Rome*, rather than with the *Greek* Church. Which requires a great deal of Pains, and a long Series of Diſcuſſions: So that they who will avoid the way of Examination, are neceſſarily brought to it again.

It is to be feared that a third Party will ſtart up and teach that Men are neither led to the True Religion by the Way of Authority, nor by the Way of Examination, but ſome by Education, and others by Grace. Education without Grace and Examination does but perſwade. Grace with Education, and ſometimes without Education and Examination, or

---

(a) Rem. C.

(b) Nicolle of the unity of the Church, at the end of the Preface.

(c) *Well-grounded Prejudices against the Calviniſts, in the Preface.*

(d) Mundum tradidit diſputationibus eorum, ut nunquam inveniant opus quod operatus eſt. *Salomon in Eccleſiaſte c. 3. v. 11.*

(e) *See the Art.* Nicolle *Remark D.*

(f) *La Placette, A Treatiſe of Conſcience. p. 377. He had ſaid p. 372.* That nothing is more falſe and more pernicious than that Objection of *Mr. Nicolle*; that it runs upon Suppoſitions which are moſt certainly contrary to Truth, and that it is only fit to baniſh the certainty of Faith, and Morality, and to ſet up an univerſal Pyrrhoniſm in Religion.

(g) *Heretofore a Miniſter in* Bearn, *and now at* Coppenhagen.

(h) *La Placette, ib. p.* 372.

ſo much proceed from want of Knowledge, as from (E) Prejudices. It would be an unjuſt Thing to impute to the Proteſtants what was reported, That Mr. *Pelliſſon* refuſed

or with a ſuperficial Examination, perſwades to Salvation. Every Orthodox ought to ſay, *Gratiâ Dei ſum quod ſum*: I am what I am by the Grace of God. I am Orthodox *by Grace* (i), *not of my ſelf, 'tis the Gift of God, not by my Works*, by Inquiries, and Intenſions, *that no Man ſhould glory*. Let the Examination be eaſy, or at leaſt poſſible; let it be difficult, or even impoſſible; this is moſt certain, that (k) no Body makes uſe of it. Moſt Men cannot read; moſt of thoſe who can read, do never read the Works of their Adverſaries; they know the Reaſons of the contrary Party only by ſome Fragments which they find in the Writings of their own Authors. The Pretenſions of the contrary Party are but imperfectly and very weakly repreſented in thoſe Fragments. To know the Force of Objections, they ought to be conſidered as they are placed in their Syſtem, and connected with their general Principles, Conſequences and Dependencies. Therefore, to examine the Opinions of an Adverſary, is not meerly to compare the Anſwer of our Authors with the Objections alledged by them; this is to judge of the Force of a Wheel only by the Effects it may produce being ſeparated from its Engine. Such a Thing cannot be call'd an Examination but abuſively. As for the Doctors, who read the Works of their Adverſaries, they uſe all their Wit not to enquire whether they are in the Right, but to find that they are in the Wrong, and to invent ſome Anſwers. All the Anſwers which they invent, ſeem to them to be good, becauſe they are always ſtrongly perſwaded that their Adverſaries are Hereticks. This cannot be called an Examination neither, but abuſively. The firſt Thing that ſhould be done, in order to a right Examination, would be to doubt of one's Religion. But the leaſt doubt about it would be look'd upon as an Offence againſt God, and a Suggeſtion of the Devil; ſo that when Men go about to diſcern Orthodoxy from Heterodoxy, they are not diſpoſed as St. *Auguſtin* ſays they ſhould be. He would have them to lay aſide the Thoughts of being in Poſſeſſion of the Truth. (a) *Ut autem facilius miteſcatis, & non inimico animo vobiſque pernicioſo mihi adverſemini, quovis judice me impetrare à vobis oportet, ut ex utraque parte omnis arrogantia deponatur. Nemo noſtrum dicat jam ſe inveniſſe veritatem: ſic eam quæramus, quaſi ab utriſque neſciatur. Ita enim diligenter & concorditer quæri poterit, ſi nullâ temerariâ præſumptione inventa & cognita eſſe credatur.* They, who ſay that the Corruption of the Heart hinders a Heretick from diſcovering the Truth, are often miſtaken, if they mean (b) that his Inclination to Drunkenneſs, Whoring, and other bodily Pleaſures, or Pride, Avarice, &c. corrupt his Judgment; but they are not miſtaken, if they mean that his Prepoſſeſſion hinders him from diſcovering good Proofs. He examins the Reaſons of the Orthodox, being fully perſwaded that he has the Truth on his Side, and that he ſhould offend God, if he fancied that the Proofs of the contrary Party are ſolid. He thinks he acts like a faithful Servant of God, if he looks upon thoſe Reaſons as meer Sophiſms, and he cannot believe that his Anſwers are not good, ſince they are directed againſt what he believes to be falſe. He is miſtaken, if he fanſies that he has very well examined the Syſtem of the contrary Party. But I beſeech you to tell me, whether the Orthodox have not the like Perſwaſion, when they examine the Cauſe of Hereticks. They are all like People that are at Law, the Reaſons of their Parties never appear ſolid to them; though they read over and over the Papers which they produce, they look upon 'em as meer wrangling; and when they have been condemn'd by inferiour and ſupreme Judges, they believe ſtill that they are in the Right, and would appeal to another Tribunal, if there was any. From whence comes this? Is it not becauſe they examine every Thing with a full perſwaſion that they have a juſt Cauſe? Nothing can better convince us of the Inutility of a partial Examination, than what happens every Day to the Noveliſts. They perſwade themſelves that the Party which they eſpouſe, has a juſt Cauſe, and they paſſionately deſire that it may prevail. They would be extreamly vexed, if a bright Light ſhould ſhine in their Eyes, whereby they ſhould be convinced of the Juſtice and good Fortune of the contrary Party. Here is the Effect of thoſe Paſſions. They read the Manifeſto's and Relations of the Enemies as ſo many Falſhoods; tho' their Reaſons be never ſo probable, they reject them, and mind only what can be anſwered. But whilſt they are attentive to the ſpecious Appearances of the Anſwer, without minding the fair Side of the Objection, they never acquire any Knowledge but what flatters their Prejudices. If there be any ill News, they don't believe them; they invent a thouſand Reaſons to ſhew that they are falſe; they make it their whole Buſineſs. If there be any good News, their Credulity has no Bounds (c); the weakeſt Appearances are as good to them as a ſtrong Proof; they uſe their utmoſt Endeavours to ſhew the Reality of thoſe Appearances, they remove from their Fancy the contrary Appearances, and ſo they ſpend the Year without Trouble and Uneaſineſs, thanks to their Induſtry which removes the unpleaſant Objects, and creates every Day ſome agreeable Phantaſms in their Fancy. Nothing but an undeniable Evidence can undeceive them; and if they will ſeriouſly examine themſelves, they muſt needs confeſs that they reſt ſatisfied with ſuch Reaſons as they would deſpiſe, if they were alledged in favour of their Enemies. It is certain that if the Reaſons *pro* and *con* in Matters of Religion, are not more carefully examined than thoſe which concern publick News, it does not deſerve the Name of Examination. It is true alſo that the ſame Spirit, which commonly prevails in the Noveliſts who are zealous for a Party, prevails alſo in moſt Men zealous for their Religion. The Loſs of a Battel afflicts a Noveliſt, but he is extreamly pleas'd to hear of a Victory; and therefore he exhauſts all the ſtrength of his Mind to convince himſelf that the Battel was won; and if the Proofs of the contrary are not undeniable, if there be three Probabilities for the Victory againſt ten or twelve Probabilities for the Loſs of the Battel, it is enough for him to believe that it is won. Men are not leſs pleas'd in a Diſpute about Religion, when they believe that their Adverſaries are worſted; they would not be leſs afflicted if they ſhou'd ſee their Adverſaries triumph. So that the Trouble which Men endeavour to avoid on both Sides, and the Pleaſure which they endeavour to procure to themſelves, hinder 'em from examining Things impartially, and make 'em uſe a double Weight and a double Meaſure.

This is what a Third Party might advance, affirming the Right, and denying the Fact; affirming that Men ought to follow the Way of Examination, but that no Body follows it. However it be, the Difference proves very great in the Event; for whereas thoſe that err, would perhaps become Orthodox, if they were not perſwaded that they are ſo already; the Orthodox, it may be, preſerve themſelves from Hereſy, becauſe they firmly believe that they are Orthodox.

(E) *As from Prejudices.*] After what has been ſaid, I need not make a long Commentary upon this. The Example of Men that are at Law, and of the Noveliſts which I have made uſe of, is very fit to make us apprehend, that a Man, who is a Judge and a Party, cannot well diſcern Truth from Falſhood. Men are not allowed to be Judges and Parties, for two very good Reaſons: Firſt, Becauſe they would be apt to decide in their behalf, tho' they ſhould be ſenſible of their Injuſtice: Secondly, Becauſe they would be apt to believe that they are in the Right, even when the Juſtice of the Cauſe of the contrary Party might eaſily be known. Every Body is a Judge and a Party in Diſputes about Religion; for Men do not examine the Reaſons of their Adverſaries with a ſceptical and Pyrrhonian Spirit. Such a Diſpoſition would be look'd upon as a Crime: They examine them therefore being fully perſwaded, that the Religion they profeſs is the only true one. Thus they are almoſt prepoſſeſſed with the above mentioned Paſſions of the *Noveliſts*. Three Probabilities on the ſide of our Pre-poſſeſſion prevail upon ten or twelve on the other ſide: the Reaſon of it is, becauſe we are infinitely more attentive to ſuch Probabilities as pleaſe us, than to thoſe which make us uneaſy. Mr. *Nicolle* confirms what I ſay. (d) *Tho' the Diſproportion there is between God and the Creatures, and between Eternal and Temporal* refuſed (F) to confeſs during his laſt Sickneſs. His Eldeſt Brother died young, and was an Author * already. That Family has produced many (G) Illuſtrious Perſons.

(i) *See the Epiſtle to the Epheſ. c. 2. v. 9.*

(k) *Note, That this is not the Opinion of the Author of this Book, but of a third Party, which may be framed. The ſame Thing ought to be noted in many other Places.*

(a) *Auguſt. contra Epiſt. Fundam. c. 3.*

(b) *See the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe Words* Compel them to come in, *Part 2. ch. 10. p. 548. & Seq. & Part 4. p. 217. & Seq.*

REFLECTIONS upon the Prejudices of the *Noveliſts.*

(c) *Note that there is another ſort of Noveliſts: they have the Art of afflicting themſelves. They believe what they fear, and not what they wiſh.*

(d) *Nicolle, Preface to the well-grounded Prejudices, pag. * 4. of the Dutch Edition.*

PENELOPE.

ſual Things be never ſo infinite, yet the leaſt Pleaſures, and the leaſt worldly Advantages are every Day preferred before God and Eternal Goods; becauſe we have a quick Senſe of thoſe Pleaſures and Advantages, whereas God and Eternal Things are but weakly conceived. In the ſame manner our Minds are carried away by the weakeſt Appearances, and the worſt Reaſons. They need but apply themſelves ſtrongly to them; for ſuch an Application hinders 'em from ſeeing any other Reaſons, and they are ſo full of them, that no other Reaſon can enter into them. Moſt Queſtions ought to be decided only by comparing Reaſons one with another; and 'tis moſt times a piece of Raſhneſs to decide a Queſtion by examining only the Reaſons of one Party. But how eaſy is it to wander in that Compariſon, or to proceed in it unfairly? How many Men are there, who cannot comprehend ſo many things at one time? If they betake themſelves to the Conſideration of one Reaſon, they forget the reſt, and ſo do not truly compare them one with another. They are determined by their preſent Application; and conſequently their Inclination and not their Light is the Principle of their Perſwaſion. That which is moſt terrible, is that as it is an eaſie thing for Men to fall into Error and Illuſion, it is very difficult for them to get out of it, becauſe they know not the Defects which engaged them into it, and having no other ſpiritual Eyes to diſcern them, they judge both of themſelves and other things with thoſe very Eyes which are diſtempered. Ita ſit ut animus de ſe ipſo tum judicet, cum id ipſum quo judicat ægrotet. Be ſure to obſerve, 1. That in ſome Caſes the Truth which diſpleaſes us, is ſo manifeſt that it cannot be miſtaken. 2. That there are ſome Suits at Law, and ſome Controverſies, wherein it is ſo difficult to diſcern Truth from Falſhood, that the moſt unintereſted Judges, and even the moſt ſubtil Scepticks would not know which way to turn. It is therefore true that Men are not always blinded by their Prejudices and Paſſions, and that the Difficulties which they meet with in an Examination are ſometimes in the Things themſelves.

(F) *Refuſed to Confeſs.*] Several Perſons, having read the *Rotterdam* Gazette of the 15th of *February*, 1693, believed that the whole Memorial inſerted in it concerning Mr. *Pelliſſon*, had been forged in the ſame City, and that the Author of that Gazette, out of ſome prudential Reaſons, could not diſpenſe himſelf from publiſhing that Memorial. That Opinion was not exactly true; for it is certain that ſeveral Letters came from *France* into *Holland*, which ſaid that every Body in *Paris* was offended at Mr. *Pelliſſon*'s Way of refuſing to Confeſs. So that theſe Words of the Gazette, (a) *Mr.* Pelliſon *departed this Life yeſterday, having refuſed to hear any Body ſpeak to him of Religion, and without Communion and Confeſſion*, were not invented by the great and ſorry Noveliſt who was ſuſpected of it. It was grounded upon ſeveral Letters which came from *France*. But it will be ſaid, That thoſe Letters had been written by ſome Proteſtants of *Paris*. I know nothing of it; I know only that the Catholicks of *Paris* were the firſt who publiſhed that News. Mademoiſelle *de Scuderi*, an intimate Friend of the Deceaſed, was afflicted at that Report, and deſired the Biſhop of *Meaux* to acquaint her with the Truth of the Matter. That Prelate writ a Letter to her, which was printed. Some other printed Pieces came out about it in *France* and in *Holland*, and a little while after there was no further talk of it. What was undeniable, was that Mr. *Pelliſſon* died without Communion and Confeſſion. There were three Sorts of Judgments about it, as it is uſual in ſuch Caſes. Mr. *Pelliſſon*'s Friends maintain'd, agreeably to the Biſhop of *Meaux*'s Account, that he had ſent for a Confeſſor; but that he was ſuffocated by his Defluxion before the time appointed for his Confeſſion. His Enemies gave as ill a turn as ever they could to all the Circumſtances. Some impartial Perſons were contented to ſay that the whole Buſineſs was to be left to the Searcher of Hearts, and affirm'd only the matter of Fact, *viz.* That Mr. *Pelliſſon* did not Confeſs. They condemned thoſe who publiſhed that he died (b) HAVING REFUSED TO HEAR ANY BODY SPEAK TO HIM OF RELIGION; for it ſuppoſes that ſome People came to ſpeak to him of Religion, and that he refuſed to hear them; which, ſay they, is very falſe. They add, That ſeveral (c) pious Perſons have put off their Confeſſion and Communion in their Sickneſs, either becauſe they did not think to be ſo ill as they were, or becauſe the Concerns of their Family required not that they ſhould be thought to be ready to die. Such Delays, wherein the Conſcience is not concerned, may be the Reaſon why a Man dies without Confeſſion. However, a Catholick (d) Hiſtorian will doubtleſs be alledged againſt Mr. *Pelliſſon*: His Hiſtory was printed at *Paris* with the King's Privilege, in the Year 1693. Theſe Words are to be found in it, Pag. 224. of the 2d Tome. (e) “*Paul Pelliſſon*'s Religion was variouſly ſpoken of; ſome ſaid that he had none; that he was only a Time-ſerver; and that according to him the Religion of the Prince, and that which ſerves his Ambition, was always the beſt: Others believed that he was a Proteſtant in his Heart; and others, that he was a Catholick in earneſt. What is certain is, that he profeſt thoſe two Religions in ſeveral Parts of his Life, and appear'd zealous in both. But at his dying Hour he profeſt none openly; for he would not receive the Sacraments of the Church of *Rome*, nor durſt own himſelf to be a *Huguenot*; but he perſiſted to the laſt in a profound Silence, the Reaſons whereof are only known to God. But they who know that thoſe Words are not to be found in the *Paris* Edition, will not produce that Witneſs. I know that the *Dutch* Edition contains many Things, which Mr. *de Riencourt* never thought of. Note, That the *Dutch* Edition contains in the Title theſe Words, *Paris, for Claude Barbin, in the Palace*, 1694. *with the King's Licence.* Will they who ſhall find it forty Years hence in ſome Library, be able to know that it is a ſuppoſed one? Will they not ſeriouſly believe, that whatever it contains was publiſhed at *Paris* by a Corrector of Accounts? And if any one objects to them, that his Edition does not mention that profound Silence, that (f) Rejection of the Sacraments, *&c.* and that they falſify the publick Hiſtory: Will they not produce a Copy wherein a thouſand Witneſſes may read, PARIS, FOR CLAUDE BARBIN, *&c.*? Will they be at the Trouble of appointing ſome able Perſons for the Verification of thoſe Editions? Not at all: Every one will follow his own Prejudices, and will take for the ſuppoſed Edition that which he does not like. From whence it may be known, how difficult it is for Men to avoid Error, in the midſt of ſo many Clouds which are caſt before hand over the Time to come. Our Predeceſſors took as much Care to deceive us, as we do to deceive our Poſterity. And if Men are ſo bold as to falſify the Works of an Author, whilſt he is alive, who can aſſure us, that the Manuſcripts of the Fathers have been reſpected? Who can aſſure us that no Body ſuffers Perſecution, for defending the Trick of a Falſifyer of Books?

(G) *Many illuſtrious Perſons.*] “(g) From the Family of the *Pelliſſons* came *Raimond Pelliſſon*, firſt Preſident at *Chambery*: *Peter Pelliſſon*, ſecond Preſident in the ſame Place: *Thomas Pelliſſon* Quarter-Maſter of the Troop of *Gend'armes* of *Guy de Maugiron*, Governour of *Chambery*, and high Provoſt of *Dauphine*: *Benedict Pelliſon* the only Recorder Civil and Criminal of the Parliament of *Dauphine*, ſix ſcore Years ago, which was ſo conſiderable a Place, that it is now divided into nine, each whereof is worth eleven Thouſand Crowns: *John Pelliſon de Condrieu*, Principal of the College of *Tournon*, who made an Epitome of the Latin Grammar, which *Deſpautier* (h) inlarged, and who was the firſt that compoſed the Latin

“ Grammar

---

* *He is the Author of an Anonymous Book intituled, Various Problems, printed at* Paris *in the Year* 1647. *in* 12. *See the Antiquities of Caſtres by Peter* Morel.

(a) Rotterdam *Gazette of the* 15th *of Feb.* 1693. *in the* Paris *Article of the* 9th *of* February.

(b) *See above Let.* e.

(c) *M.* Paſcal *having confeſs'd during his laſt Sickneſs, frighted his Friends, and therefore his Phyſicians accuſed him of fear. Whereupon he ſaid,* I would fain communicate, but ſince I perceive that my Friends are ſo ſurpriſed at my Confeſſion, I am afraid they would be more ſtill; wherefore 'tis better to put it off; and the Prieſt having been of the ſame Opinion, he did not communicate. *See his Life pag.* 43. *Whilſt this Sheet is reprinting in* January 1701. *the* Dutch *Gazettes give out that Mr.* Roze, *Secretary of the Cloſet, and Mr.* Stouppe, *Lieutenant General, died at* Paris *without receiving any Sacrament, and no Body infers from thence that they were not good Catholicks.* (d) *Mr.* de Riencourt, *Corrector of Accounts.*] (e) Riencourt's *Hiſtory of* Lewis XIV. *pag.* 223, 224. (f) *For he* WOULD NOT *receive the Sacraments of the Church of* Rome, Riencourt, *ubi ſup.* (g) Peter Borel, *Treaſure of the Gallick and French Antiquities, pag.* 233. (h) *That Author who is ſo well known in the Schools of* France, *is called* Deſpautere, *and not* Deſpautier. *He is ſo far from having inlarged the Work of* John Pelliſſon, *that the latter made an Abridgement of* Deſpautere. *Vid. Epitom. Biblioth. Geſner.*

ſo much proceed from want of Knowledge, as from (E) Prejudices. It would be an unjuſt Thing to impute to the Proteſtants what was reported, That Mr. *Pelliſſon* refuſed

or with a ſuperficial Examination, perſwades to Salvation. Every Orthodox ought to ſay, *Gratiâ Dei ſum quod ſum*: I am what I am by the Grace of God. I am Orthodox by Grace (a), not of my ſelf, *'tis the Gift of God, not by my Works*, by Inquiries, and Intentions, *that no Man ſhould glory*. Let the Examination be eaſy, or at leaſt poſſible; let it be difficult, or even impoſſible; this is moſt certain, that (b) no Body makes uſe of it. Moſt Men cannot read, moſt of thoſe who can read, do never read the Works of their Adverſaries; they know the Reaſons of the contrary Party only by ſome Fragments which they find in the Writings of their own Authors. The Pretentions of the contrary Party are but imperfectly and very weakly repreſented in thoſe Fragments. To know the Force of Objections, they ought to be conſidered as they are placed in their Syſtem, and connected with their general Principles, Conſequences and Dependencies. Therefore, to examine the Opinions of an Adverſary, is not meerly to compare the Anſwer of our Authors with the Objections alledged by them; this is to judge of the Force of a Wheel only by the Effects it may produce being ſeparated from its Engine. Such a Thing cannot be call'd an Examination but abuſively. As for the Doctors, who read the Works of their Adverſaries, they uſe all their Wit not to enquire whether they are in the Right, but to find that they are in the Wrong, and to invent ſome Anſwers. All the Anſwers which they invent, ſeem to them to be good, becauſe they are always ſtrongly perſwaded that their Adverſaries are Hereticks. This cannot be called an Examination neither, but abuſively. The firſt Thing that ſhould be done, in order to a right Examination, would be to doubt of one's Religion. But the leaſt doubt about it would be look'd upon as an Offence againſt God, and a Suggeſtion of the Devil; ſo that when Men go about to diſcern Orthodoxy from Heterodoxy, they are not diſpoſed as St. *Auguſtin* ſays they ſhould be. He would have them to lay aſide the Thoughts of being in Poſſeſſion of the Truth. (a) *Ut autem faciliùs miteſcatis, & non inimico animo vobiſque pernicioſo mihi adverſemini, quovis judice me impetrare à vobis oportet, ut ex utraque parte omnis arrogantia deponatur. Nemo noſtrum dicat jam ſe inveniſſe veritatem: ſic eam quæramus, quaſi ab utriſque neſciatur. Ita enim diligenter & concorditer quæri poterit, ſi nullâ temerariâ præſumptione inventa & cognita eſſe credatur.* They, who ſay that the Corruption of the Heart hinders a Heretick from diſcovering the Truth, are often miſtaken, if they mean (b) that his Inclination to Drunkenneſs, Whoring, and other bodily Pleaſures, or Pride, Avarice, *&c.* corrupt his Judgment; but they are not miſtaken, if they mean that his Prepoſſeſſion hinders him from diſcovering good Proofs. He examins the Reaſons of the Orthodox, being fully perſwaded that he has the Truth on his Side, and that he ſhould offend God, if he fanſied that the Proofs of the contrary Party are ſolid. He thinks he acts like a faithful Servant of God, if he looks upon thoſe Reaſons as meer Sophiſms, and he cannot believe that his Anſwers are not good, ſince they are directed againſt what he believes to be falſe. He is miſtaken, if he fanſies that he has very well examined the Syſtem of the contrary Party. But I beſeech you to tell me, whether the Orthodox have not the like Perſwaſion, when they examine the Cauſe of Hereticks. They are all like People that are at Law, the Reaſons of their Parties never appear ſolid to them; though they read over and over the Papers which they produce, they look upon 'em as meer wrangling; and when they have been condemn'd by inferiour and ſupreme Judges, they believe ſtill that they are in the Right, and would appeal to another Tribunal, if there was any. From whence comes this? Is it not becauſe they examine every Thing with a full perſwaſion that they have a juſt Cauſe? Nothing can better convince us of the Inutility of a partial Examination, than what happens every Day to the Noveliſts. They perſwade themſelves that the Party which they eſpouſe, has a juſt Cauſe, and they paſſionately deſire that it may prevail. They would be extreamly vexed, if a bright Light ſhould ſhine in their Eyes, whereby they ſhould be convinced of the Juſtice and good Fortune of the contrary Party. Here is the Effect of thoſe Paſſions. They read the Manifeſto's and Relations of the Enemies as ſo many Falſhoods; tho' their Reaſons be never ſo probable, they reject them, and mind only what can be anſwered. But whilſt they are attentive to the ſpecious Appearances of the Anſwer, without minding the fair Side of the Objection, they never acquire any Knowledge but what flatters their Prejudices. If there be any ill News, they don't believe them; they invent a thouſand Reaſons to ſhew that they are falſe, they make it their whole Buſineſs. If there be any good News, their Credulity has no Bounds (c); the weakeſt Appearances are as good to them as a ſtrong Proof, they uſe their utmoſt Endeavours to ſhew the Reality of thoſe Appearances, they remove from their Fancy the contrary Appearances, and ſo they ſpend the Year without Trouble and Uneaſineſs, thanks to their Induſtry which removes the unpleaſant Objects, and creates every Day ſome agreeable Phantaſms in their Fancy. Nothing but an undeniable Evidence can undeceive them; and if they will ſeriouſly examine themſelves, they muſt needs confeſs that they reſt ſatisfied with ſuch Reaſons as they wou'd deſpiſe, if they were alledged in favour of their Enemies. It is certain that if the Reaſons *pro* and *con* in Matters of Religion, are not more carefully examined than thoſe which concern publick News, it does not deſerve the Name of Examination. It is true alſo that the ſame Spirit, which commonly prevails in the Noveliſts who are zealous for a Party, prevails alſo in moſt Men zealous for their Religion. The Loſs of a Battel afflicts a Noveliſt, but he is extreamly pleas'd to hear of a Victory, and therefore he exhauſts all the ſtrength of his Mind to convince himſelf that the Battel was won; and if the Proofs of the contrary are not undeniable, if there be three Probabilities for the Victory againſt ten or twelve Probabilities for the Loſs of the Battel, it is enough for him to believe that it is won. Men are not leſs pleas'd in a Diſpute about Religion, when they believe that their Adverſaries are worſted; they would not be leſs afflicted if they ſhou'd ſee their Adverſaries triumph. So that the Trouble which Men endeavour to avoid on both Sides, and the Pleaſure which they endeavour to procure to themſelves, hinder 'em from examining Things impartially, and make 'em uſe a double Weight and a double Meaſure.

This is what a Third Party might advance, affirming the Right, and denying the Fact; affirming that Men ought to follow the Way of Examination, but that no Body follows it. However it be, the Difference proves very great in the Event; for whereas thoſe that err, would perhaps become Orthodox, if they were not perſwaded that they are ſo already; the Orthodox, it may be, preſerve themſelves from Hereſy, becauſe they firmly believe that they are Orthodox.

(E) *As from Prejudices.*] After what has been ſaid, I need not make a long Commentary upon this. The Example of Men that are at Law, and of the Noveliſts which I have made uſe of, is very fit to make us apprehend, that a Man, who is a Judge and a Party, cannot well diſcern Truth from Falſhood. Men are not allowed to be Judges and Parties, for two very good Reaſons: Firſt, Becauſe they would be apt to decide in their behalf, tho' they ſhould be ſenſible of their Injuſtice: Secondly, Becauſe they would be apt to believe that they are in the Right, even when the Juſtice of the Cauſe of the contrary Party might eaſily be known. Every Body is a Judge and a Party in Diſputes about Religion; for Men do not examine the Reaſons of their Adverſaries with a ſceptical and Pyrrhonian Spirit. Such a Diſpoſition would be look'd upon as a Crime: They examine them therefore being fully perſwaded, that the Religion they profeſs is the only true one. Thus they are almoſt prepoſſeſſed with the above mentioned Paſſions of the *Noveliſts*. Three Probabilities on the ſide of our Pre-poſſeſſion prevail upon ten or twelve on the other ſide: the Reaſon of it is, becauſe we are infinitely more attentive to ſuch Probabilities as pleaſe us, than to thoſe which make us uneaſy. Mr. *Nicolle* confirms what I ſay. (d) *Tho' the Diſproportion there is between God and the Creatures, and between Eternal and Temporal* refuſed (F) to confeſs during his laſt Sickneſs. His Eldeſt Brother died young, and was an Author * already. That Family has produced many (G) Illuſtrious Perſons.

(a) *See the Epiſtle to the Epheſ. c. 2. v. 8.*

(b) *Note, That this is not the Diſcourſe of the Author of this Book, but of a third Party, which may be found. The ſame Thing ought to be noted in many other Places.*

(a) *Auguſt. contra Epiſt. Fundam. c. 3.*

(b) *See the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe Words* Compel them to come in, *Part 2. ch. 10. p. 348. & Seq. & Part 4. p. 217. & Seq.*

(c) *Note that there is another ſort of Noveliſts: they have the Art of afflicting themſelves. They believe what they fear, and not what they wiſh.*

REFLECTIONS upon the Prejudices of the *Noveliſts*.

(d) *Nicolle, Preface to the well-grounded Prejudices, pag. * 4. of the Dutch Edition.*

PENELOPE.

poral Things be never ſo infinite, yet the leaſt Pleaſures, and the leaſt worldly Advantages are every Day preferred before God and Eternal Goods; becauſe we have a quick Senſe of thoſe Pleaſures and Advantages, whereas God and Eternal Things are but weakly conceived. In the ſame manner our Minds are carried away by the weakeſt Appearances, and the worſt Reaſons. They need but apply themſelves ſtrongly to them; for ſuch an Application hinders 'em from ſeeing any other Reaſons, and they are ſo full of them, that no other Reaſon can enter into them. Such Queſtions ought to be decided only by comparing Reaſons one with another; and 'tis moſt times a piece of Raſhneſs to decide a Queſtion by examining only the Reaſons of one Party. But how eaſy is it to wander in that Compariſon, or to proceed in it unfairly! How many Men are there, who cannot comprehend ſo many things at one time? If they betake themſelves to the Conſideration of one Reaſon, they forget the reſt, and ſo do not truly compare them one with another. They are determined by their preſent Application; and conſequently their Inclination and not their Light is the Principle of their Perſwaſion. That which is moſt terrible, is that as it is an eaſie thing for Men to fall into Error and Illuſion, it is very difficult for them to get out of it, becauſe they know not the Defects which engaged them into it, and having no other ſpiritual Eyes to diſcern them, they judge both of themſelves and other things with thoſe very Eyes which are diſtempered. Ita fit ut animus de ſe ipſo tum judicet, cum id ipſum quo judicat ægrotet. Be ſure to obſerve, 1. That in ſome Caſes the Truth which diſpleaſes us, is ſo manifeſt that it cannot be miſtaken. 2. That there are ſome Suits at Law, and ſome Controverſies, wherein it is ſo difficult to diſcern Truth from Falſhood, that the moſt unintereſted Judges, and even the moſt ſubtil Scepticks would not know which way to turn. It is therefore true that Men are not always blinded by their Prejudices and Paſſions, and that the Difficulties which they meet with in an Examination are ſometimes in the Things themſelves.

(F) *Refuſed to Confeſs.*] Several Perſons, having read the *Rotterdam* Gazette of the 16th of *February*, 1693. believed that the whole Memorial inſerted in it concerning Mr. *Pelliſſon*, had been forged in the ſame City, and that the Author of that Gazette, out of ſome prudential Reaſons, could not diſpenſe himſelf from publiſhing that Memorial. That Opinion was not exactly true; for it is certain that ſeveral Letters came from *France* into *Holland*, which ſaid that every Body in *Paris* was offended at Mr. *Pelliſſon*'s Way of refuſing to Confeſs. So that theſe Words of the Gazette, (a) *Mr.* Pelliſon *departed this Life yeſterday, having refuſed to hear any Body ſpeak to him of Religion, and without Communion and Confeſſion*, were not invented by the great and ſorry Noveliſt who was ſuſpected of it. It was grounded upon ſeveral Letters which came from *France*. But it will be ſaid, That thoſe Letters had been written by ſome Proteſtants of *Paris*. I know nothing of it; I know only that the Catholicks of *Paris* were the firſt who publiſhed that News. Mademoiſelle *de Scuderi*, an intimate Friend of the Deceaſed, was afflicted at that Report, and deſired the Biſhop of *Meaux* to acquaint her with the Truth of the Matter. That Prelate writ a Letter to her, which was printed. Some other printed Pieces came out about it in *France* and in *Holland*, and a little while after there was no further talk of it. What was undeniable, was that Mr. *Pelliſſon* died without Communion and Confeſſion. There were three Sorts of Judgments about it, as it is uſual in ſuch Caſes. Mr. *Pelliſſon*'s Friends maintain'd, agreeably to the Biſhop of *Meaux*'s Account, that he had ſent for a Confeſſor; but that he was ſuffocated by his Defluxion before the time appointed for his Confeſſion. His Enemies gave as ill a turn as ever they could to all the Circumſtances. Some impartial Perſons were contented to ſay that the whole Buſineſs was to be left to the Searcher of Hearts, and affirm'd only the matter of Fact, *viz.* That Mr. *Pelliſſon* did not Confeſs. They condemned thoſe who publiſhed that he died (b) HAVING REFUSED TO HEAR ANY BODY SPEAK TO HIM OF RELIGION; for it ſuppoſes that ſome People came to ſpeak to him of Religion, and that he refuſed to hear them; which, ſay they, is very falſe. They add, That ſeveral (c) pious Perſons have put off their Confeſſion and Communion in their Sickneſs, either becauſe they did not think to be ſo ill as they were, or becauſe the Concerns of their Family required not that they ſhould be thought to be ready to die. Such Delays, wherein the Conſcience is not concerned, may be the Reaſon why a Man dies without Confeſſion. However, a Catholick (d) Hiſtorian will doubtleſs be alledged againſt Mr. *Pelliſſon*: His Hiſtory was printed at *Paris* with the King's Privilege, in the Year 1694. Theſe Words are to be found in it, Pag. 224. of the 2d Tome. (e) “*Paul Pelliſſon*'s Religion was variouſly ſpoken of; ſome ſaid that he had none; that he was only a Time-ſerver; and that according to him the Religion of the Prince, and that which ſerves his Ambition, was always the beſt: Others believed that he was a Proteſtant in his Heart; and others, that he was a Catholick in earneſt. What is certain is, that he profeſt thoſe two Religions in ſeveral Parts of his Life, and appear'd zealous in both. But at his dying Hour he profeſt none openly; for he would not receive the Sacraments of the Church of *Rome*, nor durſt own himſelf to be a *Huguenot*; but he perſiſted to the laſt in a profound Silence, the Reaſons whereof are only known to God. But they who know that thoſe Words are not to be found in the *Paris* Edition, will not produce that Witneſs. I know that the *Dutch* Edition contains many Things, which Mr. *de Riencourt* never thought of. Note, That the *Dutch* Edition contains in the Title theſe Words, *Paris, for Claude Barbin, in the Palace*, 1694. *with the King's Licence*. Will they who ſhall find it forty Years hence in ſome Library, be able to know that it is a ſuppoſed one? Will they not ſeriouſly believe, that whatever it contains was publiſhed at *Paris* by a Corrector of Accounts? And if any one objects to them, that his Edition does not mention that profound Silence, that (f) Rejection of the Sacraments, *&c.* and that they falſify the publick Hiſtory: Will they not produce a Copy wherein a thouſand Witneſſes may read, PARIS, FOR CLAUDE BARBIN, *&c.*? Will they be at the Trouble of appointing ſome able Perſons for the Verification of thoſe Editions? Not at all: Every one will follow his own Prejudices, and will take for the ſuppoſed Edition that which he does not like. From whence it may be known, how difficult it is for Men to avoid Error, in the midſt of ſo many Clouds which are caſt before hand over the Time to come. Our Predeceſſors took as much Care to deceive us, as we do to deceive our Poſterity. And if Men are ſo bold as to falſify the Works of an Author, whilſt he is alive, who can aſſure us, that the Manuſcripts of the Fathers have been reſpected? Who can aſſure us that no Body ſuffers Perſecution, for defending the Trick of a Falſifyer of Books?

(G) *Many illuſtrious Perſons.*] “(g) From the Family of the *Pelliſſons* came *Raimond Pelliſſon*, firſt Preſident at *Chambery*: *Peter Pelliſſon*, ſecond Preſident in the ſame Place: *Thomas Pelliſſon* Quarter-Maſter of the Troop of *Gend'armes* of *Guy de Maugiron*, Governour of *Chambery*, and high Provoſt of *Dauphine*: *Benedict Pelliſon* the only Recorder Civil and Criminal of the Parliament of *Dauphine*, ſix ſcore Years ago, which was ſo conſiderable a Place, that it is now divided into nine, each whereof is worth eleven Thouſand Crowns: *John Pelliſon de Condrieu*, Principal of the College of *Tournon*, who made an Epitome of the Latin Grammar, which *Deſpautier* (h) inlarged, and who was the firſt that compoſed the Latin

* *He is the Author of an Anonymous Book intituled, Various Problems, printed at Paris in the Year 1647. in 12. See the Antiquities of Caſtres by Peter* Borel.

(a) Rotterdam *Gazette of the 16th of Feb.* 1693. *in the* Paris *Article of the 9th of* February.

(b) *See above Let.* e.

(c) *M. Paſcal having confeſs'd during his laſt Sickneſs, frighted his Friends, and therefore his Phyſicians accuſed him of fear. Whereupon he ſaid*, I would fain communicate, but ſince I perceive that my Friends are ſo ſurpriſed at my Confeſſion, I am afraid they would be more ſtill; wherefore 'tis better to put it off; and the Prieſt having been of the ſame Opinion, he did not communicate. *See his Life pag.* 43. *whilſt this Sheet is reprinting in* January 1701. *the* Dutch *Gazettes give out that Mr.* Roze, *Secretary of the Cloſet, and Mr.* Stouppe, *Lieutenant General, died* at Paris *without receiving any Sacrament, and no Body infers from thence that they were not good Catholicks.*

(d) *Mr.* de Riencourt, *Corrector of Accounts.*

(e) Riencourt's *Hiſtory of* Lewis XIV. *pag.* 222, 224.

(f) *For he* WOULD NOT *receive the Sacraments of the Church of* Rome, Riencourt, *ubi ſup.*

(g) Peter Borel, *Treaſure of the Gallick and French Antiquities, pag.* 233.

(h) *That Author who is ſo well known in the Schools of* France, *is called* Deſpautere, *and not* Deſpautier. *He is ſo far from having inlarged the Work of* John Pelliſſon, *that the latter made an Abridgement of* Deſpautere. *Vid. Epitom. Biblioth. Geſner.*

PENELOPE, Daughter of *Icarius*, Brother of *Tyndarus* King of *Lacedæmon*, was the Wife of *Ulyſſes*, and became ſo Famous by reaſon of her Chaſtity, that ſhe is alledged as an Example to this very Day, and has occaſioned a Proverb. 'Tis ſaid † that *Tyndarus* help'd *Ulyſſes* to obtain her, as a Reward of the ‡ good Advice he had given him. Others § ſay, that he obtain'd her in a Race, *Icarius* having declared to thoſe who ask'd him his Daughter, that the beſt Runner ſhould have her: *Ulyſſes* won the Prize. He might be therefore compared with thoſe who run after a Benefice, and carry it, becauſe they have the beſt Horſes. He could never reſolve to live at *Lacedæmon*, as his Father-in-law deſired: He ſet out for *Ithaca*, and his Wife followed him. What ſhe did when her Father running after them overtook 'em in (*A*) the Way, deſerves to be obſerved. The married Couple loved one another very tenderly, ſo that *Ulyſſes* did what ever he could not to go to the Siege of *Troy* †: But all his Devices proved unſucceſsful, and he was forced to leave his dear Wife by whom he had one Boy. He was twenty Years without ſeeing her. During that long Abſence ſhe was courted by a great many (*B*) Lovers, who urged her to declare

† *Apollodor. Biblioth. lib.* 3. *pag. m.* 217, 218.

‡ *See in the Text of the Article of Helena, what he adviſed* Tyndarus *to do about the Marriage of* Helena.

§ *Pauſan. l.* 3. *p.* 93.

† *See in the Article* Ulyſſes.

“ Grammar and its Rules, with the Inſtitution of Children in a College, printed at *Lyons* 1540. in 16. by *Thibaut Payen*, according to *du Verdier* in his French Bibliotheque. He made alſo the Elogy of Cardinal *de Tournon*, printed at *Lyons* by *Gryphius*, in the Year 1544. in 4to. I could name many other Illuſtrious Men, iſſued from that ancient Family within theſe four hundred Years, who have appear'd both in the Armies and in the Law, with their Illuſtrious Alliances; and I might ſpeak of *Lewis Pelliſſon*, whoſe great Learning has been honourably mention'd by the Preſident *Faber* in the Treatiſe *de Erroribus Pragmat.* and *de Conjecturis*, Chap. 10. As alſo of *Peter* and *John James Pelliſſon*, Counſellors in the Parliament of *Toulouſe*, and in the Chamber of the Edict of *Caſtres*, Men of great Learning; the firſt was ſo great a Gameſter at Cheſs, that an *Italian*, who plaid extraordinary well at it, and was looking for one like himſelf, having play'd with him *incognito*, and having loſt, cryed out; *O è il Diavolo, O il Signor Pelliſſono*. . . . . The Family of the *Pelliſſons* is alſo deſcended (*i*) by the Women, from that of *du Bourg*, which is Famous by Reaſon of the great *Anne du Bourg*, Counſellor in the Parliament of *Paris*, and of *Antony du Bourg*, Chancellor of *France* under *Francis* I. and from the Family of the *Cavaignes* (whoſe Heirs they have been) and of the Preſident *Maſencal*. . . . . I would ſay more of it, if *John Poſſelius* had not written a Book on purpoſe which contains the Praiſes of *Raimond Pelliſſon*, and of the City of *Chambery*, printed at *Lyons* by *Gryphius*. The Author from whom I have this long Paſſage, tells us in another Place (*k*) that *Claude Pelliſſon* was *Knight of the Order of St.* John *of* Jeruſalem, *two* (*l*) *hundred Years ago*, and that the *Pelliſſons* came from an *Engliſh-man*, *Attorney-General to the Prince of* Wales, *when he was in* Guienne.

(*A*) *What ſhe did when her Father running after them overtook 'em in the Way.*] *Icarius* having not been able to perſwade his Son-in-law to ſtay in *Lacedæmon*, endeavoured to prevail upon his Daughter. But his Intreaties could not move her to make ſo great a Sacrifice to him, as to prefer her Father's Houſe to her Husband's. She therefore ſet out with *Ulyſſes*, to go to *Ithaca*. Her Father perceiving that they had made their eſcape, got into his Chariot, ran after them, and overtook 'em, and renewed his Intreaties to his Daughter. *Ulyſſes* being weary of that Perſecution, declared to *Penelope*, that if ſhe would follow him willingly, he ſhould be very glad of it; but that if ſhe had rather return to *Lacedæmon*, he would not oppoſe it. Though *Penelope* return'd no Anſwer, and was contented to let down her Veil, yet *Icarius* diſcovered her Thoughts, and eaſily apprehended that ſhe had a mind to follow her Husband. He conſented to it, and erected in that very Place, a Statue of Modeſty. (*a*) Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ τέως μὲν ἠνείχετο, τέλος δὲ ἐκέλευε συνακολουθεῖν Πηνελόπην ἑκοῦσαν, ἢ τὸν πατέρα ἑλομένην ἀναχωρεῖν ἐς Λακεδαίμονα. καὶ τὴν ἀποκρίνασθαι φασιν οὐδὲν, ἐγκαλυψαμένης δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἐρώτημα, Ἰκάριος τὴν μὲν, ἅτε δὴ συνιεὶς ὡς βούλεται ἀπιέναι μετὰ Ὀδυσσέως, ἀφίησιν· ἄγαλμα δὲ ἀνέθηκεν Αἰδοῦς. ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τῆς ὁδοῦ προήκουσαν ἤδη τὴν Πηνελόπην λέγουσιν ἐγκαλύψασθαι. *Ulyſſes tandem victus hominis importunitate, puellæ optionem dedit, vel ſe ut ſequeretur, ſi id mallet; vel cum patre Lacedæmonem rediret: ibi illam aiunt nihil ſanè reſpondiſſe, ſed faciem tantum velaſſe: Icarium cùm ſibi probe noſſe videtur, quid illa animi haberet, ut cum Ulyſſe abiret, permiſiſſe: ſignum verecundiæ in ea parte dedicaſſe, quo Penelope, cum faciem velavit, pervenerat.* Here are ſome well-mark'd Strokes of the Character of an honeſt Woman. Reaſon will have a Wife to follow her Husband, and Nature requires it. Yet if it be left to her Choice either to go with her Husband, or to ſtay with her Father who does paſſionately deſire it, ſhe ought to be ſilent out of Modeſty, and give to underſtand only by Signs what Party ſhe has a mind to take. The Modeſty and Decency of her Sex don't permit her to tell her Mind boldly and without bluſhing. *Icarius* was ſomewhat unreaſonable; he ask'd a Preference which does neither agree with the Laws of Nature, nor with the Matrimonial Rights. There being nothing in the Word of God but what is inſtructive; it has been obſerved that the Pſalmiſt does not make uſe of many Reaſons to perſwade a Maid, that ſhe ought to prefer her Husband's Houſe to her Father's. It would be needleſs to uſe many Arguments to perſwade ſuch a Thing; and therefore the Holy Ghoſt was contented to promiſe to that Maid, that ſhe ſhould be happy in Children, and that her Husband would love her:

But Thou (*b*) *O Royal Bride give ear,*
And to my Words attend,
Forget thy Native Country now,
And ev'ry former Friend.
So ſhall thy Beauty charm the King,
Nor ſhall his Love decay:
For he is now become thy Lord,
To him due Rev'rence pay.
(*c*) . . . .
Inſtead of Parents left,
(O Queen, the Caſe ſo ſtands,)
Thou ſhalt have Sons, whom thou mayſt ſet
As Princes in all Lands.

This is a very fine *Pſalm*, even when it is conſidered without its Myſtical Senſe, and as a meer Piece of Poetry. But here is a much finer Verſion.

Tuque [*d*] *adeo regina audi, & rem pectore conde:*
Nec mea dicta nega placidas demittere in aures:
Jam nunc & patriam & patrem obliviſcere, jam nunc
Ex animo caros penitus depone propinquos:
Unum oculis ſpecta, unum animo complectere regem,
Regem oculis animoque, tuo qui pendet ab ore,
Unius & pulchris defixus vultibus hæret.
Hunc dominum agnoſce, & ſupplex venerare: nec ille
Officio, ſtudioque tibi concedet.
. . . .
Neu deſiderio nimium tangare tuorum
Virgo, tibi dulcem patriſque & matris amorem
Leniet adnaſcens ſobolis generoſa propago:
Quos regere imperio terras, totumque per orbem
Adſpicies populos ſceptris frænare ſuperbos.

[*B*] *Courted by a great many Lovers.*] Here are the Words of a Learned Commentator. “ [*e*] According to *Homer*, the Number of *Penelope*'s Lovers amounted to 108; for he ſays Odyſs. 16. that there was 52 of the Iſle of *Dulichium*, 24 of the Iſle of *Samos*, 20 of the Iſle of *Zacinthus*, and 12 of *Ithaca*, which ſeveral Numbers make up in all 108. preciſely. *Euſtathius* upon the firſt of the Odyſſes increaſes that Number; for he ſays according to the Opinion of ſome Writers, that they were 300. *Meziriac* makes that Obſervation to juſtify the Verſion of theſe Words of *Ovid*, *quid . . . . alios referam*, which he renders, *I paſs by above a hundred*. Let us ſee the whole Paſſage of *Ovid*; *Dulichii*

(*i*) *See the Hiſtory of the French Academy p. m.* 51.

(*k*) *Ib. p.* 377.

(*l*) *That Book of* Peter Borel *was printed in* 1655.

(*a*) *Pauſan. l.* 3. *p.* 104.

(*b*) *Pſalm* 45.

(*c*) *There is here a Promiſe that ſhe would receive fine Preſents, and would be richly cloathed; but that Promiſe contain'd nothing that was new to a Daughter of a King of* Egypt. *See the whole Paſſage which I omit.*

(*d*) *Pſalm* 45. *According to* Buchanan's *Verſion.*

(*e*) Meziriac *upon* Ovid's *Epiſtles pag.* 101.

declare for them; but she eluded (C) their Amorous Addresses till the Return of her Husband, who destroyed them all. She is justly praised for refusing to trust Ulysses as her Husband, before she was sure (D) that he was Ulysses. Though her Virtue was sung by the greatest of all the Poets, and by abundance of Writers, yet it has been reflected upon. Some have said that if her Lovers were disappointed,

Dulichi (f) Samique, & quos tulit alta Zacynthus,
Turba ruunt in me luxuriosa proci,
Inque tua regnant nullis prohibentibus aula,
Viscera nostra tuae dilacerantur opes.
Quid tibi Pisandrum, Polybumque, Medontaque (g) dirum,
Eurimachique avidas, Antinoique manus,
Atque alios referam? quos omnes turpiter absens
Ipse tuo partis sanguine rebus alis.
Irus egens pecorisque Melanthius actor edendi
Ultimus accedunt in tua damna pudor.

(C) *She eluded their Amorous Addresses.*] "(h) Homer in the 2d and 24th Books of the Odyssee, says, that Penelope, to free her self from the Importunity of her Lovers, declared to them, that she would not marry till she had finish'd a Piece of Cloth which she was about, to wrap up the Body of Laertes, her Father-in-law, when he should die; and so she amused them for the Space of three Years, and her Cloth was never finished, because she undid in the Night what she had done in the Day; from whence comes the Proverb, *the Cloth of* Penelope, speaking of a Work which is never ended. This is *Meziriac's* Commentary upon these Words of *Ovid.*

Nec (i) mihi quaerenti spatiosam fallere noctem,
Lassaret viduas pendula tela manus.

(D) *Before she was sure that he was* Ulysses.] *Meziriac* having alledged a Passage which I have set down in another Place (k), whereby it appears that *Helena* was deceived by the Resemblance she found between *Paris* and her Husband, adds the following Words: *Eustathius (l)* upon the 23d Book of the *Odysses*, "observes that *Penelope* behaved her self much more prudently; for though it seem'd to her that she knew *Ulysses*, yet she would not caress him in the least, and lie with him, till he told her many Particulars, and gave her several Tokens, whereby she was assured that he was truly her Husband, and that she could not be deceived. *Penelope's* Precaution ought to serve for a Rule in all such Occasions; and if a Woman should commit Adultery for want of expecting a full Information of the Truth, she would be justly blamed. 'Tis what has been lately observed by Mr. *Basnage* in a fine Book which he has published. "Let us suppose, *says he*, (m) a Woman, who being transported with Love for her true Husband, runs hastily to one whom she takes for him; that Woman does not design to deceive her self; her Ardour cannot be blamed: it is lawful, if it be expressed to her true Husband: In a Word, her Ignorance is unvoluntary, and only the Effect of a tender and passionate Eagerness. But if an Adulterer has imbraced that Woman, can she be excused? Will she not be somewhat ashamed of her Ardour and Precipitation? Will she not condemn them? The Author who criticized Mr. *Maimbourg*, is very near of the same Opinion. I add that Restriction, because he thinks that if that Woman does not refuse to examin the Matter out of a blameable Motive, she ought to be excused. Here are his Words, "(a) I affirm, That if a Woman being deceived by the Resemblance which may be between her true Husband and another Man, should grant to that other Man all the Privileges of Marriage, her Chastity would not suffer by it. Though this may look like a Paradox, I say, and I repeat it again, that such a Woman would do no real Injury to her Husband, and he would be the most unjust of all Men, if he should accuse her of having violated the Conjugal Faith; supposing that she did not design in the least to deceive her self. For if the Impatience of recovering a Husband, made her overlook the Suspicions she might have, at the Sight of a Man like her Husband, and who takes that Title; if she neglected to examine him well, lest she should not enjoy the Pleasures of Marriage without some Remorses: In a Word, if she should believe that he is her true Husband, because she wishes it may be he, for the Reasons I have intimated, removing from her Mind every thing that might tempt her to doubt of it, I should very much abate of the good Opinion I should have of her Merit, and truly I should not much blame her Husband for doubting of her Chastity, and looking upon her Virtue, as a wavering one. . . . . . (b) The natural Resemblance which is to be found between two Men, is never so perfect, but they differ in something, from whence it may be concluded, that a Woman who is deceived by it, acts unwarily. But in this very thing she wants not an Excuse; for are there any Women that scruple to receive their Husbands after they have been absent for some Months, unless they prove first that they are their Husbands? When they see them come into their Chambers in the dark of the Evening, before the Candles are lighted, don't they go and meet 'em, and are they not ready to shew them all manner of Complaisance; without making any Enquiry? Does any Body blame them for it? If they are not blamed for it, why shou'd we blame an unfortunate Woman who has been deceived by an Impostor, who was in all Respects as like her Husband, as one may appear to be in a dusky Room? It is plain, that if she be blamed, all Women, who behave themselves in that Manner towards their Husbands, are also to blame; for according to right Reason, we ought not to judge of Things by the Event; and before God two Actions which proceed from the same Cause, change not their Species, though the one succeeds accidentally, and the other is attended by accident with unlucky Consequences. To resolve this Difficulty, we must say that any one that behaves himself with Precipitation, is to blame, whether any Evil results from it or not. Whoever will act reasonably, ought to examine whatever he does.

I shall observe by the bye, *Seneca's* Precaution. He affirms that a Man who knows his Wife, being perswaded that she is another Man's Wife, commits Adultery, and that his Wife is innocent. But he does not say, that a Man who should know another Man's Wife, thinking that she is his own Wife, would commit a Sin. See the Words of *Seneca (c)* in the Margin; they prove that *Jacob* did not commit Adultery the first time he knew *Leah*; but that *Leah* committed that Crime; for she knew very well that she was not *Jacob's* Wife.

I return to *Penelope*. They who remember a certain Place of the *Hexameron Rustique*, will perhaps believe that her Pre-caution ought not to be much admired, because *Ulysses* made himself suspicious, by expressing so much eagerness to know her. *(d) What makes me believe that* Homer *designed to make use of that noble Artifice, is the impatience wherewith he represents* Ulysses *in the 23 Book, who was extreamly desirous to lie with his Wife. She had scarce had time enough to know him, and she had scarce spoken three Words to him, but he bluntly commanded his Nurse* Euriclea *to get a Bed ready for them.* 'Tis what Mr. *de la Mothe le Vayer* says in his *Hexameron Rustique.* Whereby he gives us Occasion to believe that *Penelope* mistrusted his Impatience, and fansied that the Reason why he was so hasty, was because he was afraid that the Discovery of his Imposture, would frustrate him of his Desire. Without examining what may be said against that, I shall only make this Observation. *La Mothe le Vayer* deceives us; he doth not understand the Passage of *Homer*; if he had well examined it, he might have known that *Ulysses* did not ask a Bed to lie in it with *Penelope*. He only ask'd a Bed for himself, because his Wife vouchsafed not to come near him, and used him very cruelly. Here are his Words:

Δαιμονίη, (e) περὶ σοί γε γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων
Κῆρ ἀτέραμνον ἔθηκαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχοντες.
Οὐ μὲν κ᾽ ἄλλη ὧδε γυνὴ τετληότι θυμῷ
Ἀνδρὸς ἀφεσταίη, ὅς οἱ κακὰ πολλὰ μογήσας
Ἔλθοι εἰκοστῷ ἔτεϊ ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.
Ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε μοι μαῖα στόρεσον λέχος, ὄφρα καὶ αὐτὸς
Λέξομαι· ἦ γὰρ τῇ γε σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός.

Infelix

(f) Ovid. in Epist. Penelop. ad Ulyssem.

(g) Meziriac pag. [illegible] shews that it ought to be read thus, Quid tibi Pisandrum, Polybumque, Amphimedontaque dirum.

(h) Meziriac ubi sup. p. 4[illegible].

(i) Ovid. in Epist. Penelop. ad Ulyssem.

(k) In the Article of Helena.

(l) Meziriac ubi supra. p. 483.

(m) Basnage, a Treatise of Conscience, Tom. 1. Book 5. p. 85. Amsterdam. 1696.

(a) New Letters of the Author of the Critical Answer to Maimbourg. p. 277, 278.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 285, 286.

(c) Si quis cum uxore sua tanquam cum aliena concumbit, adulter erit, quamvis illa Adultera non sit. Aliquis mihi venenum dedit, sed vim suam remixtum cibo perdidit: venenum illud dando scelere se obligavit, etiam si non nocuit. Non minus latro est cujus telum oppositâ veste elusum est. Omnia scelera etiam ante effectum operis, quantum culpæ satis est, perfecta sunt. *Seneca de constantia Sapientis cap. 7. pag. m. 683.*

(d) Hexameron Rustique pag. m. 104, 105.

(e) Hom. Odyss. l. 23. p. m. 704.

'twas becauſe they (E) had rather fare well at the Coſt of *Ulyſſes*, than lie with his Wife. Others ſay that they (F) lay with her, and that the God *Pan* was the Fruit

Infelix, tibi quidem ſupra fœminas mulierum,
Cor durum poſuerunt [dii] cæleſtes domos habitantes.
Non quidem alia ſic mulier tolerant animo
A viro procul ſtaret, [ac recederet] qui ei mala multa paſſus
Veniſſet vigeſimo anno in patriam terram,
Sed age, mihi nutrix ſterne lectum, ut et ipſe
Dormiam: certè enim huic [eſt] ferreus in pectoribus animus.

Telemachus was offended at *Penelope's* Indifferency; and cenſured his Mother as freely as if ſhe had been his Siſter: *Unhappy Mother*, ſaid he to her, (f) *You are unmerciful, no Wife would behave her ſelf towards her Husband as you do. Your Heart is ſtill harder than a Stone.* *Homer* cannot be accuſed of having committed a Fault againſt Probability; for ſuch Words are common enough in the Mouth of great Boys. But he ſhould not have copied Nature ſo faithfully; he ſhould have made *Telemachus* ſpeak according to the Notions of Reſpect.

[E] *That they had rather fare well.*] *Horace* ſuppoſes that *Tireſias* gave *Ulyſſes* no other Reaſon of *Penelope's* Chaſtity. If (g) your Patron "loves "Women, don't expect that he ſhould intreat you, "prevent him and offer him your *Penelope* with a "chearful Countenance. This is what *Ulyſſes* is adviſed to do: Here's his Anſwer, "What, do you "think that I could perſwade *Penelope* to it? *Penelope*, who has been ſo Chaſt and ſo Virtuous, that "the long Sollicitations of her Lovers could never "work upon her. *Tireſias* replies, "The Reaſon "of it is, that all thoſe young Men who frequented "her Houſe, were not very liberal, and minded eating and drinking more than Love, but if ſhe had "once taſted of a good old Man, and divided the "Profit with you, ſhe would no more leave him "than a hunting Dog leaves a bloody Skin. Mr. *Dacier*, who has tranſlated thus the Verſes of *Horace*, makes this Commentary upon them. "[h] *Tireſias* "gives *Ulyſſes* no other Reaſon of his Wife's Chaſtity, than the Avarice of her Lovers. And that "which makes this very pleaſant, is that it is "grounded upon a Complaint of *Penelope*, as we "find it in the 18. Book of the Odyſſes. She complains to them that *they are very unjuſt*; *and that* "*when many Rivals court a Woman to marry her*, *they* "*make Sacrifices at their own Charges*, *and treat and* "*give Preſents to their Miſtreſs's Friends*, *inſtead of* "*eating what belongs to her*. They were nettled at "that Reproach, one ſent her a Gown, another a "Neck-lace, another ſome Pendants, another a "Bracelet, &c. But hitherto [which was a long time "before the Converſation that *Ulyſſes* had with "*Tireſias*] they had not the leaſt thought of preſenting her with any thing. 'Tis therefore no wonder if they were diſappointed; and I deſire no "other Proof to ſhew the Falſity of what has been "ſaid by ſome Authors, that ſhe favoured them all. I have [i] alledged ſome Verſes of *Ovid*, whereby it appears that the Lovers of *Penelope* made a great waſte in her Houſe.

[F] *That they lay with her, and that the God* Pan.] Some Modern Authors took Delight in collecting ſeveral falſe Evidences about it. *Lucius John Scoppa* [k] cites in the firſt Place this Paſſage of the *Priapeia*:

Ad vetulam tamen [l] ille ſuam properabat: & omnis
Mens erat in cunno Penelopeia tuo.
Quæ ſic caſta manes, ut jam convivia viſas:
Utque fututorum ſit tua Plena domus.
E quibus ut ſcires quicunque valentior eſſet,
Hæc es ad arrectos verba locuta procos:
Nemo meo melius nervum tendebat Ulyſſe:
Sive illi laterum, ſeu fuit artis opus.
Qui quoniam periit, modo vos intendite: qualem
Eſſe virum ſciero, vir ſit ut ille meus.

and then he cites theſe words of *Acron* (m), Penelope *meretrix fuit, quæ amatores ſuos ſua pulchritudine luxurioſos reddebat.* Afterwards he adds that the Poet *Lycophron* (n) ſaid, *Penelopen concubitum omnium procantium paſſam, ex eorum uno genuiſſe filium nomine Pana: quod cum reditu cognoviſſet Ulyſſes ſtatim abiit ad inſulam Cortinam, & ibidem obiit.* He goes on and ſays, that *Duris* of *Samos* publiſhed, *Penelopen proſtituto pudore conſuetudinem cum omnibus procis habuiſſe: unde natus Pan qui caprinis pedibus* Tragoſceles vocabatur. Franciſcus Floridus Sabinus wrote a (e) Chapter about that Subject: he wonders that *Petrarch* (f) ſhould believe *Homer* in favour of *Penelope*, after he had been ſo equitable as to reject the Authority of *Virgil* in favour of *Dido*. He obſerves that thoſe two Poets have been equally ſucceſsful, the one in extolling *Penelope* as an honeſt Woman, tho' ſhe was a lewd Woman, and the other in making People believe that *Dido* was a lewd Woman, tho' ſhe lived very chaſtly. He obſerves that *Penelope* was call'd *βασσάρα κασσωρεύουσα* by *Lycophron*, and he does not approve that *Tzetzes* hath contradicted that Poet. (g) *Duris Samius antiquus ſcriptor, cujus Plutarchus Pliniuſque aliique non pauci egregii ſcriptores mentionem faciunt, idem aſſeruit, ut Joannes Tzetzes Lycophronis interpres ait, quamvis eum communi Græciæ* [illegible] *mentiri dicat. Illam vocem* κασσωρεύουσαν, πορνεύουσαν, *hoc eſt ſcortantem exponens. Inquit autem:* νῦν δὲ βασσάραν λέγει τὴν Πηνελόπην, κασσωρεύουσαν δὲ, ἤγουν πορνεύουσαν. Δοῦρις γὰρ ὁ Σάμιος ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀγαθοκλέους, φησὶ αὐτὴν συγγενέσθαι πᾶσι τοῖς μνηστῆρσι, καὶ γεννῆσαι τὸν τραγοσκελῆ Πᾶνα. ὅπερ οὐκ ἀληθές ἐστι. ὁ γὰρ Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Πηνελόπης Πάν. ἕτερος δὲ Πὰν Διὸς καὶ Ὕβρεως. *Id eſt*, nunc *Baſſaram* dicit Penelopen, κασσωρεύουσαν autem, hoc eſt *ſcortantem*. Duris enim Samius in libro de Agathocle ipſam cum omnibus procis coiiſſe, ac Pana hircina crura habentem genuiſſe inquit. Quod verum non eſt. Hic enim Mercurii & alterius Penelopes filius fuit: alter autem Pan Jovis & Hybreos. He pretends that *Homer*, by the Exerciſe of the Bow, which *Penelope* propos'd to her Lovers, denoted the Amorous Myſtery, and the Tryal which ſhe had a mind to make of their Strength, (h) *Quid verbis opus eſt? cum & ipſe Homerus cujus præconio Penelopes Laus conſtat, ex ſuis operibus id colligi poſſe voluerit? An forte ille propoſitus procis arcus aliud ſignificat quam eam, ut juvenum vires experiretur, id præcipue certamen quo ſe juvenes exercerent delegiſſe? At hoc quidem vel ex eo patet, quod his verbis* νευρὴν ἐντανύσαι, *id eſt* nervum intendere, *ad id quod volebat exprimendum, accommodatis admodum, frequenter utitur.* He pretends that *Ovid* underſtood the true meaning of *Homer*, and that he tells us that *Penelope* put her Gallants to that Tryal: (i) *Nam & Ovidius Homerum idem innuiſſe vult, cum ait libro primo amorum.*

Penelope vires juvenum tentabat in arcu
Qui latus argueret, corneus arcus erat.

He has not forgot the Paſſage of *Horace*, nor that of the *Priapeia*; and he concludes with the Teſtimony of *Herodotus* (k).

Dempſterus quotes a great many Authors, but without any Exactneſs. Being to prove that (l) *Pan* was the Son of *Mercury* and *Penelope*, and that *Mercury* put on the Shape of a Goat when he lay with that Woman, which was the Reaſon why *Pan's* Feet were like thoſe of a Goat; he quotes (m) two Epigrams of the *Anthologia*, and a Paſſage of (n) *Auſonius*, which ſay only that *Pan's* Feet were ſo made, and not that it proceeded from the Figure which his Father put on, when he lay with *Penelope*. Is it not a ridiculous thing to alledge ſuch Authorities? He ſays that an ancient Hiſtorian named *Lyſander* gives the ſame Account of the lewd Life of *Penelope*, which *Duris* has given: and he adds that *Tzetzes* (o) ſays that *Ulyſſes* being not able to bear the Infamy of his Houſe, return'd to *Circe*, and was kill'd by his Son *Telemachus*; and that *Pauſanias* tells us that *Ulyſſes* divorced his VVife becauſe of her Adulteries, and retired to *Sparta*, and a little while after to *Mantinea* where he died. *Dempſterus* aſcribes to the Husband, what *Pauſanias* (p) ſays only of the VVife. Laſtly, He ſays that the lewdneſs of *Penelope* may be known by the Preſents ſhe accepted of, and by the Marriage which ſhe contracted with the Murtherer of her Husband: Beſides, to prevent her being miſtaken in her Choice, ſhe found out by a very good Tryal who was the ſtouteſt of all her Gallants, (q) *Probaturque impudicitia ex eo*, quod à procis munera acceperit, *quod meretricii animi certiſſimum argumentum*, *Homer. lib.* 18. *Odyſs.* & mariti

(f) Ibid. pag. 700.

(g) Sententia erit, cave te roget: ultro Penelopen facilis potiori trade: putaſne, Perduci poterit tam frugi, tamque pudica, Quam nequiere proci recto depellere curſu? Venit enim magnum donandi parca juventus, Nec tantum Veneris, quantum ſtudioſa culinæ. Sic tibi Penelope frugi eſt: quæ ſi ſemel uno De ſene guſtarit, tecum partita lucellum, Ut canis à corio nunquam abſterrebitur uncto. *Horat. Sat.* 5. *l.* 2. *v.* 75. Nos numerus ſumus & fruges conſumere nati Sponſi Penelopes. *Id. epiſt.* 2. *l.* 1.

(h) Dacier upon Horace, *tom.* 7. *p.* 421. *of the Dutch Edit.*

(i) *In the Rem. B.*

(k) *Lucius Joan. Scoppa Parthenopæus Collectaneorum l.* 1. *c.* 32. *That Book was printed in* 1507.

(l) *That is to ſay,* Ulyſſes.

(m) *Acron in* 2 *Epiſt. Hor. lib.* 1.

(n) Lycophron *does not ſay ſo.*

(e) *In the* 2*d of the* 3*d Book of the Lectionum ſubciſivarum of Franciſcus Floridus Sabinus.*

(f) *In an Italian Poem intitled I Triumfi, which he borrowed, as Floridus ſays, of a Greek Poet, who as* Lactantius *has it, lib.* 1. *c.* 11. Divinarum inſtitutionum *had written a Book intitled* Triumphus Cupidinis.

(g) *Florid. Sabin. ib.*

(h) *Id. ib.*

(i) *Id. ib. That Paſſage of* Ovid *is in the* 8 *Elegy of the firſt Book* de Amoribus.

(k) Ἐκ ταύτης γάρ, *inquit de Penelope loquens*, καὶ Ἑρμέω λέγεται γενέσθαι ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων ὁ Πάν, *hoc eſt*, ex hac enim & Mercurio Pan à Græcis genitus dicitur. *The Paſſage of* Herodotus *is in the* 145 *Chapter of the* 2*d Book.*

(l) Ex Adulterio eum ſuſceptum à Mercurio, matre Penelope. *Dempſterus, in Paralipomen. ad antiquitat. Rom. Roſini lib.* 3. *c.* 2. *p. m.* 432.

[m] *The* 84 *and* 85 *of the* 12. *Chap of the* 4*th Book.* [n] *Auſon. Eidyl.* 3. *Moſella v.* 174. *In the* Amſterdam *Edition.* 1671. *'tis Eidyl.* 10. *v.* 172. [o] *In* Lycophron. [p] *See the Remark H.* [q] *Dempſter ib. pag.* 433.

fu

Fruit of their Love: But some Authors say, that she conceived *Pan*, when *Mercury*, having put on the Form of a Goat, took away (*F a*) her Virginity by force. It is a general Opinion, that her Lovers being disappointed in their Hopes of Lying with her, applied (*G*) themselves to her Maids, and debauched them. The Inhabitants of *Mantinea* used to say that she died (*H*) in their City. They who say that

sui Ulysses interfectori nupsit, ex quo connubio natus Italus *Jul. Hygin. fab. capit.* 127. *Et ob id, ipse Ulysses apud Sabinum poetam in responsoriis Epistolis:*

Tot juvenes inter, tot vina liquentia semper,
Hei mihi! quid credam? pignore casta manes?

..... *Et procorum habita delectu, ut fortiori, valentiorique posset concumbere, arcu tentabat singulos. Auctor incertus Priapeiorum carminum.* You may rely better upon *Meziriac*'s Quotations. There are some Authors, says he, (*r*) "who write that *Penelope* "dishonoured her self in the Absence of *Ulysses*, "and that she became the Mother of the God *Pan*: "But those Authors are divided into two Opinions. "Some say that *Pan* was the Son of *Mercury* and "*Penelope*. This is the Opinion of *Herodotus* l. 2. "of *Plutarch* in the Treatise of the Oracles that "ceased; of the Scholiast upon *Pindar* in the Argu"ment of the Pythicks; of *Probus* upon *Virgil*'s "4th Eclogue; of *Lucian* in the Dialogue of *Pan* "and *Mercury*; and of the *Scholiast* upon the 7th "Idyl of *Theocritus*. But the two last add, that "*Pan* (*s*) lay with *Penelope*, having put on the "Form of a Goat, whence it is that *Pan* was born "with Horns, and Goat's Feet: .... Others say "that *Penelope* prostituted her self to all her Gal"lants, and that the God *Pan* was born out of "their mix'd Seed. Thus *Lycophron* calls *Penelope*, "*βασσάραν σεμνῶς κασσωρεύουσαν*, a *Whore whoring* "*honourably*. *Tzetzes* says thereupon, Δῦρις ὁ "Σάμιος (*t*) &c. ..... Some Scholiasts (*v*) "not yet printed, upon the Flute of *Theocritus*, "mention the two Opinions, saying that *Pan*, in "the Opinion of some, was Son of *Mercury* and *Pe*"*nelope*, and in the Opinion of others, of *Penelope* "and all her Suitors. Observe that *Claudius du Verdier* (*w*) is angry with *Lycophron*; he cannot forgive him what he says that *Penelope* prostituted her self; he refutes him by his very Scholiast, and by these Words of *Ovid*, *Penelope mansit, quamvis custode careret, Inter tam multos intemerata procos.*

(*F a*) *When* Mercury *having put on the Form of a Goat, took away her Virginity by Force.*] You'll find that Story in *Lucian* with this notable Circumstance, that *Mercury* had forgot he had plaid that trick to *Penelope*. *Pan* went to make himself known to him, and being received with a scornful Countenance, he produced his Proofs: Don't you remember, said he to him, that formerly you forced a Woman of Quality in *Arcadia*? Why do you bite your Fingers, and hesitate so long? She was *Penelope*, *Icarius*'s Daughter. She told me that my Horns and Goat's Feet proceed from your putting on the Shape of that Beast to lye with her. (x) By *Jupiter*, answer'd *Mercury*, it comes into my Mind that I did a thing of that Nature. There's a very surprizing slip of Memory. The Examples of Divine Forgetfulness, which have been alledged by the Defender of *Voiture*, are not so strange as this is. *Costar* says that *Jupiter*'s Memory failed him sometimes. "I don't "remember, *says he* (*y*), the Name of the God, "who had much ado to make him remember that "wonderful Expedient which he had formerly "found out, to reconcile two Decrees of Fate "which manifestly contradicted one another: and to "say so by the by, it was then that he took so much "Pains, that it made him sweat, and Cabbages "sprung out of his Sweat. I don't know whether any Authors say, that he forgot sometimes his Amorous Exploits. They were so numerous, that his Memory might have failed him; but I don't believe that there are any Examples of his forgetting Things of that Nature. *Mercury* might be alledged for it. Observe by the by, that *Costar* took that Story from *Rabelais*: his Adversary upbraids him with it: "I found that Sweat very cold, *says* "*he to him* (*a*), and *Rabelais* from whom you have "so ingenious a Thought, was perhaps formerly "look'd upon as an excellent Buffoon, but now the "reading of his Works will make very few People "laugh.

(*G*) *They applyed themselves to her Maids.*] 'Tis what we read in the Odyssey, where we find also that *Ulysses* having put to Death his Wife's Lovers, ordered that the Maids who had dishonour'd his Family, should be beaten to Death with Swords; but *Telemachus* being of Opinion that they deserved a more ignominious Death, caused 'em to be hanged.

Θεινέμεναι (*b*) ξίφεσιν τανυήκεσιν, εἰσόκε πασέων
Ψυχὰς ἐξαφέλησθε, καὶ ἐκλελάθωντ' Ἀφροδίτης
Τὴν ἄρ' ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσιν ἔχον, μίσγοντό τε λάθρῃ.
. . . .
Τοῖσι (*c*) δὲ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν·
Μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῷ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἑλοίμην
Τάων, αἳ δὴ ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ κατ' ὀνείδεα χεῦαν,
Μητέρι θ' ἡμετέρῃ, παρά τε μνηστῆρσιν ἴαυον.
Ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ πεῖσμα νεὸς κυανοπρῴροιο, &c.
Diverberate ensibus longe acutis, donec omnium
Animas auferatis, & obliviscantur Veneris,
Quam sub procis habebant, dum clam miscerentur.
. . . .
His vero Telemachus prudens incepit dicere,
Absit vero jam pura morte animam ut auferam
His, quæ jam capiti opprobria effuderunt,
Matrique meæ, apudque procos dormierunt.
Sic dixit: & funem navis nigram proram habentis, &c.

It is observable that of fifty Maids there were but (*d*) twelve who prostituted themselves to their Mistress's Lovers. I must not forget that in the Opinion of *Aristotle*, they who left off Philosophy to apply themselves to other Sciences, resembled *Penelope*'s Lovers. That Thought does not appear natural to some Authors. (*e*) *Cum Aristoteles* NIMIO *Philosophiam studio complectebatur, asserere non dubitabat eos qui reliquas artes consectarentur, hanc vero negligerent, esse Penelopes procis similes, qui ut Homerus, cum domina potiri nequivissent, ad ancillas divertebant.* This is a lame Comparison; for those young Men preferred not the Maids to their Mistress, as they who neglect Philosophy to apply themselves to some other Studies; they courted the Maids only because they could not prevail upon the Mistress. *Plutarch* says, that *Bion* made use of that Comparison. (*f*) Ἀστείως δὴ καὶ Βίων ἔλεγεν ὁ φιλόσοφος, ὅτι ὥσπερ οἱ μνηστῆρες τῇ Πηνελόπῃ πλησιάζειν μὴ δυνάμενοι, ταῖς ταύτης ἐμίγνυντο θεραπαίναις· οὕτω καὶ οἱ φιλοσοφίας μὴ δυνάμενοι κατατυχεῖν, ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις παιδεύμασι τοῖς οὐδενὸς ἀξίοις ἑαυτοὺς κατασκελετεύουσι. *Urbanum est etiam Bionis philosophi dictum, qui aiebat, sicut Penelopes proci quum non possent cum Penelopa concumbere, rem cum ejus ancillis habuissent: ita qui philosophiam nequeunt apprehendere, eos in aliis nullius pretii disciplinis sese conterere.*

(*H*) *That she died at* Mantinea.] *Pausanias* (*g*) affords me the Proof which I want: I shall use the Words of *Meziriac*, they are a faithful Translation of those of *Pausanias*. "[*h*] *Pausanias* describing one "of the Ways that went from the City of *Mantinea* "to that of *Orchomenum*, speaks thus: On the right "hand of the Way there is to be seen a small rising "Ground, which the *Arcadians* will have to be the "Sepulchre of *Penelope*: but what they say, does "not agree with what is written in the Verses "call'd *Thesprotides*; for it is said there, that "after the return of *Ulysses* from *Troy*, *Penelope* "brought a Son to *Ulysses*, who was call'd *Ptolyporthes*; whereas the *Mantenians* affirm, that *Ulysses* "having convinced *Penelope* of having drawn her "Gallants into her House, turn'd her out, and that "she immediately retired to *Sparta*, and a little "while after she went to *Mantinea*, where she ended "the remaining part of her Life.

'Tis affirm'd in the first Tome of the *Chevræana*, that *Pausanias* "says that *Ulysses* being return'd "from *Troy*, *Penelope* who had been extreamly "complaisant to her Lovers, was brought to Bed of "a Son call'd [*k*] *Polyporthes*; that her Husband did "shamefully divorce that lewd Woman, &c. It is plain that *Pausanias* does not say so: of the two Traditions mention'd by him, one whereof was advantageous and the other disadvantageous to the Memory of that Lady; that which was advantageous, said that *Ulysses* had that Son by *Penelope* since his Return from *Troy*. But Mr. *Chevreau* pretends that

(*r*) *Meziriac upon Ovid's Epistles. pag.* 117.

(*s*) *It should be* Mercury.

(*t*) *See the remaining Part of this Passage above Letter g.*

(*v*) *Add to this the Words of* Barthius *in Statium tom.* 1. *p.* 234, 235. Quam (*Penelopen*) cum omnibus procis rem habuisse scripserunt, & inde natum *Panem*, nomine à multis Patribus ducto. Scholiastes Theocriti in Idyllium A. Τὸν Πᾶνα οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν υἱὸν Πηνελόπης καὶ πάντων τῶν μνηστήρων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεσθαι καὶ Πᾶνα.

(*w*) *Claudius Verderius, Censura in auctores pag.* 45.

(*x*) Νὴ Δία μέμνημαι ποιήσας τι τοιοῦτο. Per Jovem memini me tale quiddam facere. *Lucian. in Deor. dialog. tom.* 1. *p.* 176.

(*y*) *Costar, Defence of* Voiture. *p. m.* 115.

(*a*) *Girac, Answer to the Defence of Voiture. pag.* 92.

(*b*) *Hom. Odyss. l.* 22. *p. m.* 688.

(*c*) *Id. ib. p.* 690.

(*d*) Τάων δώδεκα πᾶσαι ἀναιδείης ἐπέβησαν, οὔτ' ἐμὲ τίουσαι οὔτ' αὐτὴν Πηνελόπειαν. Harum duodecim omnes impudentiæ se dediderunt, Neque me honorantes, neque ipsam Penelopen. *Id. ibid. pag.* 688.

(*e*) *Lucius Joannes Scoppa collectaneorum lib.* 1. *c.* 32.

(*f*) *Plut. de liberis educandis. pag.* 7. C.

(*g*) *Lib.* 8. *pag.* 247.

(*h*) *Meziriac ubi sup. pag.* 116, 117.

(*i*) *Pag.* 388. *of the Dutch Edition.*

(*k*) *He should have said* Polyporthes.

that the Reaſon why *Homer* praiſed her ſo much was (*l*) becauſe he deſcended from her, do not reaſon very well. You may ſee in one of the Remarks, that *Penelope* out-lived *Ulyſſes*, and married again. I ſhall ſay ſomething of the Praiſes which (*K*) *Auſonius* beſtowed upon her.

PERAXYLUS. This is the Name which *Arnoldus Arlenius* took, to expreſs his Native Country * in Greek. He was a very ſtudious Man, and a great Grecian, and he took a great deal of Pains to find out old Manuſcripts. *Thuanus* † ſpeaks of him under the Year 1561. and declares, that tho' he has not been able to diſcover the Place and the Day of his Death, he thinks it happen'd at that time. He obſerves that that Learned Man had conſecrated his Labours to the Publick Good, and that Poſterity would be always beholden to him for his Greek Edition of *Joſephus*, which he printed from the Excellent Manuſcript of *Don Diego de Mendoza* Ambaſſador of *Charles* the Vth at *Venice*. He adds that the Books againſt *Appion* were not to be ſeen any where elſe, and that *Arlenius* having left *Don Diego*, when that Lord ſet out from *Venice*, retired to *Baſil*, and exerciſed his Talents there for ſome Years, and made a good uſe of *Henry Stephens*'s Labours. We ſhall ſee what Mr. *Teiſſier* (*A*) ſays of him. *Thuanus*'s Tranſlator has tranſlated this Paſſage (*B*) careleſly.

that *Pauſanias* ſays that ſhe had him by her Lovers, and that ſhe was divorced by reaſon of that Infamy.

(*l*) *The Reaſon why* Homer *praiſed her ſo much was becauſe.*] *Meziriac* having ſet down what has been ſaid by ſome Authors concerning the Lewdneſs of that Lady, raiſes an Objection which he anſwers thus: " (*l*) It might be objected againſt thoſe Authors, " that it is not likely that *Homer* ſhould have propos'd " her to us as an eminent Example of Chaſtity, and " ſhould have beſtowed ſo many Praiſes upon a lewd " Woman, who of all Women in the World de- " ſerved to be blamed: but that Objection may be " very well anſwered two ways. Firſt, it may be " ſaid that *Homer* who, as many believe, lived in the " time of the Trojan War, grew very much in love " with *Penelope*, and lived a long while in *Ithaca* " upon her Account, as 'tis affirmed by *Hermeſianax* " in *Athenæus l.* 13. *c.* 8. and therefore 'tis no won- " der, if he appears ſo fond of ſinging the Praiſes of " *Ulyſſes* and *Penelope*. It may be anſwered in the " ſecond Place, That ſome are of Opinion that " *Homer* was deſcended from *Ulyſſes*, being the Son " of *Telemachus* and *Polycaſte* or *Epicaſte*, *Neſtor*'s " Daughter. Thus we find in a little Greek Book, " intitled the Diſpute of *Homer* and *Heſiod*, that the " Emperor *Adrian* having ask'd the Propheteſs *Pythia* what Country *Homer* was of, and who were " his Parents, he was anſwered:

> Ἀγνωστόν μ' ἔρεαι γενεὴν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν
> Ἀμβροσίου σειρῆνος· ἔθος δ' Ἰθακήσιός ἐστιν.
> Τηλέμαχος δὲ πατὴρ, καὶ Νεστορέη Ἐπικάστη
> Μήτηρ, ἥ μιν ἔτικτε βροτῶν πολὺ πάνσοφον ἄνδρα.

" Thou deſireſt to know of me the unknown Extra- " ction, and Native Country of that Divine Singer: " *Ithaca* is his Country, *Telemachus* is his Fa- " ther; he had for his Mother, the beautiful " *Epicaſte*, *Neſtor*'s Daughter. Thoſe two Anſwers are weak; for if *Homer* had been a long time in *Ithaca* to court *Penelope*, he muſt be reckoned among thoſe Lovers whom he ſpoke ſo ill of; for unleſs he had joyned with them, he muſt have made a very ſad Figure, and even expoſed himſelf to many dangerous Affronts. Thoſe young Men would not have permitted that a private Man ſhould have courted *Penelope* without concerting with them. I add, that they who are in love with a Woman, will very ſeldom make her Husband the Hero of their Poem. Beſides if *Homer* had known that *Penelope* proſtituted her ſelf to her many Lovers, his Love for her would have prompted him to defame her, far from being a Reaſon to move him to beſtow ſo many Praiſes upon her. Jealouſy, Spite, and the Shame of having loved a Woman who diſhonour'd her ſelf, and would not diſtinguiſh him from a Crowd of rude and uncivil Admirers, had violently incenſed him againſt her. Laſtly, I obſerve, That there is no need of having Recourſe to any other Reaſon but this. *Ulyſſes* was the Hero of the Poem; it was therefore neceſſary that his Wife ſhould appear in it as an Heroin, or at leaſt as an honeſt Woman. It would be a Fault againſt the moſt Eſſential Rules not to ſurpreſs all the ſhameful Actions of the Wife of one's Hero. *Meziriac* adds (*m*) that " *Ulyſſes* having been kill'd by *Telegonus*, *Minerva* " adviſed *Telemachus*, *Penelope* and *Telegonus* to " carry his dead Body to *Circe*, in the Iſle of *Ææa*, " and to bury it there, and that with the Advice of " the ſame Goddeſs, *Telegonus* married *Penelope*, " and *Telemachus Circe*: that of *Telemachus* and " *Circe* was born *Latinus*, from whom the Latines " were ſo called: but that *Italus*, who gave his " Name to *Italy*, was born of *Telegonus* and *Penelope*. Theſe are fine Advices indeed, and very worthy of *Minerva*: if *Penelope* had followed them, I ſhould be more inclin'd to believe thoſe who ſay, that ſhe was extremely kind to her Lovers, than thoſe who repreſent her ſo faithful to her Husband. It had been a Fault to marry the unvoluntary Murderer of her Husband; but it had been worſe ſtill, if we believe *Hyginus*, for ſhe muſt have married the Son of *Ulyſſes*.

(*K*) *Of the Praiſes which* Auſonius (*n*) *beſtowed upon her.*] Here's a Piece of *Balzac*'s Converſations. " (*o*) The Kiſſes of *Penelope* were ſcarce known to " her Son *Telemachus*, becauſe her Son was not her " Husband, for whom ſhe reſerved all her Kiſſes. " The Marquis of *Montauzier* has been pleaſed " with thoſe Words: I thought ſo. But you tell " me, that you would know from whom I have " em, and that he is reſolved to know it from me, " without your medling with it. . . . . Thoſe " Words which pleaſe a Man, whoſe Pleaſures are " all honeſt, are the Tranſlation or rather the Pa- " raphraſe of this Verſe, which a Latin Poet (*p*) imi- " tated from a Greek Poet:

> " *Oſcula vix ipſi cognita Telemacho.*

" I might add to the ſhort Paraphraſe I made upon " it, a ſhort Commentary, and I have a mind to do ſo " ſince you invite me to ſpeak. That Commentary contains theſe Words, " *Mary de Medicis* [*a*] whom " we know to have been as chaſt, as the Poets make " *Penelope* to be, was alſo like *Penelope* in this. Could " you believe that during the four Years of her " Regency, ſhe never kiſs'd not ſo much as once the " King her Son? I was told ſo by an old Courtier " of that time, who took the Liberty to tell her, " that thoſe outward Marks of Affection were ne- " ceſſary to get the Love of others, eſpecially of " Children, becauſe they are commonly leſs moved " with Effects than with Appearances.

[*A*] *What Mr.* Teiſſier *ſays of him.*] He obſerves quoting *Gyraldus* [*c*] that Arlenius *compoſed very fine Greek and Latin Epigrams, and that he would have excelled in Poetry, had he not applied himſelf to more ſerious Studies.* He adds, without quoting any Body for it, that the printed Works of *Arlenius* are the following Tranſlations: *Dionis Coccæi Romanæ Hiſtoriæ libri duodecim. Olympiodori Philoſophi Platonici & Peripatetici, Commentarii ad Ariſtotelis Commentaria: Sermones quidam ex Plutarcho de moribus à nemine antehac verſi. Plurimæ Orationes Chryſoſtomi, Theodoreti, & aliorum S. S. Patrum antea non viſæ. Lycophronis Alexandram ſive Caſſandram, & Iſaaci Tzetzis in eam Commentaria edidit & recognovit.*

[*B*] *Has tranſlated this Paſſage careleſly.*] He has rendred *Arnoldus Arlenius* [*d*] by *Arnaud de Lens.* He ſays, that *Arnaud* was call'd *Praxylus*, which was a Name he gave himſelf, and that the Manuſcript he made uſe of for the Edition of *Joſephus*, did belong to *Diego Auſtado Mendoſſe*. I. Why does he pretend that *Arlenius* and *de Lens* are the ſame Name? II. Why does he ſuppreſs the Cauſe of the Name *Peraxylus*, which *Thuanus* alledges? *Trans Dieſam amnem qui Silvam ſeu Boſcum-Ducis alluit vico ignobili natus, indeque nomine ingenioſe ab ipſo effecto Peraxylus nuncupatus.* III. Why does he change *Peraxylus* into feſſy. I have at laſt found out that the Hopes which *Geſnerus* gave of this Author have been taken for printed (C) Books. I wonder that *Swertius* and *Valerius Andreas* knew nothing of *Peraxylus*. He was better known in *Italy* than in the *Low Countries*. See how *Corradus* (D) praiſes him.

---

* A Village of the Campine, ſituated beyond a little River which runs by Boſleduc, and is call'd the Deeſe.

† *Sub fin. l.* 28.

(*l*) *Meziriac ubi ſup. p.* 118.

(*m*) *Ib. p.* 119. *He quotes* Hyginus *c.* 27. *and he had ſaid that as Euſtathius relates it on the 16th Book of the* Odyſſey, the *Colophonian* who wrote the Returns, ſays that *Telemachus* married at laſt *Circe*, and that *Telegonus* married *Penelope*.

(*n*) Intemerata procis, & tot ſervata per annos, Oſcula vix ipſi cognita Telemacho. *Auſonius epigr.* 135. *p. m.* 83.

(*o*) *Balzac entretien* 39. *pag. m.* 372

(*p*) *I obſerve here the ſame Spirit of* Balzac, *which I have ſpoke of in another place. He will not name* Auſonius, *that one may have a greater Idea of his Learning.*

(*a*) Balzac. *ubi ſup. p.* 374.

(*b*) Teiſſier, *Additions to the Elogies taken from* Thuanus *tom.* 1. *p.* 414.

(*c*) De Poet. *ſui temporis. l.* 2.

(*d*) *The Francfort Edition* 1625. *ſays* Artenius.

PEREIRA (*Gomeſius*) a Spaniſh Phyſician who lived in the XVI. Century. He ſet up for a Spirit of Contradiction; for he affected to oppoſe the Doctrines that were beſt eſtabliſhed, and to maintain Paradoxes. The Liberty of Philoſophizing was a great Charm to him; he made uſe of it, even to exceſs. The *Materia prima* (A) which was ſo much talk'd of by the Sectators of *Ariſtotle*, was one of the Monſters he undertook to deſtroy. What he ſubſtituted in the room of that Matter was not * better than what he rejected. He uſed *Galen* very ill becauſe of his Opinion about Agues. But his moſt ſurprizing Paradox was, that Beaſts are meer Machines, and have no Feeling. All thoſe Things may be ſeen in his Book intitled (B) *Antoniana Margarita*. 'Tis pretended by ſome, that *Carteſius* took from him

into *Praxylus*? IV. What does he mean with his *Diego Auſtado*? Why did he not ſay *Hurtado*? I declare that I have nothing to ſay to him as to ſuch things as may depend upon the Careleſneſs of the Correctors of the Preſs, and that I have not ſeen his Verſion any where elſe but in Mr. *Teiſſier*'s Book.

(C) *The Hopes .... have been taken from printed Books.*] I have conſulted Father *Labbe*, Dr. *Cave*, and Mr. *Du Pin* in ſuch Places where they give us a Liſt of the Works of St. *Chryſoſtom*; they mention many Tranſlators, but never *Arnoldus Arlenius*. I have not found him neither in the Authors, who treat of ſeveral Editions and Tranſlations of *Dion*. Whereby I was almoſt convinced that *Arlenius* had never printed the Tranſlations mention'd by Mr. *Teiſſier*. I enquired into the Cauſe of that Miſtake, and found that it ought to be imputed altogether to the Abbreviators of *Geſnerus*. They ſay poſitively that *Arlenius* tranſlated ſome Moral Treatiſes from *Plutarch*'s Greek, which had never been rendred into Latin; that he tranſlated alſo 22 Books of the Roman Hiſtory of *Dion Cocceius*, the Commentaries of *Olympiodorus* (e) upon *Ariſtotle*'s Meteors, and ſome Sermons and Treatiſes of *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, &c. When I go as far as *Geſnerus*, I find that thoſe Tranſlations were only hoped for: *Expectamus*, ſays he, (f) *ab Arlenio noſtro, ſi Deus vitam extenderit, quoſdam ex Plutarcho*, &c. They who abridged *Geſnerus*, ſay that *Arlenius* tranſlated thoſe Books; but they do not ſay that they were publiſhed. They only ſay that he cauſed *Lycophron* with the Commentaries of *Tzetzes* to be printed at *Baſil* in the Year 1545. and (g) then *Joſephus* in the ſame City, with a Preface, but without a Tranſlation.

(D) *See how* Cortadus *praiſes him.*] He ſpeaks of him thus: (h) *Ita quidem* (poſtulabantur interpretationes Epiſtolarum Ciceronis) *ut Arnoldus Arlenius homo eruditiſſimus ex Germania ad me Regium uſque venerit, & me ſuo, Joannis Opporini, Joannis Strathii, Magni Gruberi, aliorumque doctiſſimorum hominum nomine ſit hortatus, eas ut primo quoque tempore foras darem.*

(A) *The* Materia prima ... *was one of the Monſters.*] *Arriaga*, one of the moſt ſubtil School-men of the XVII. Century, acquaints us with what was objected to our *Pereira* about that Subject, and ſhews the Weakneſs of ſome of thoſe Objections. (i) *Recentiores nonnulli referunt quendam Gomeſium Pereiram in ſua Antoniana Margarita, negantem omnino materiam primam: contra quem plura congerunt argumenta, quæ oportet examinare, ne rem certam incertis ſuadeamus rationibus.* ... (k) *Hæc Argumenta non urgent Gomeſium.* They objected to him amongſt other Things, That if his Doctrine was true, it would not be lawful to venerate the Bones or Relicks of Saints; for after their Death, there would remain no Matter that did belong to them. This is one of the five Objections which he might eaſily reſolve, if we believe *Arriaga*, who obſerves (l) that the Opinion of that Philoſopher was not well underſtood. He thinks therefore himſelf obliged to ſet it down faithfully, and then he oppoſes it with ſome other Reaſons. *Pereira*, ſays he, was not ſuch a Madman, as to aſſert that Forms are not received in a Subject, and that Man is only made up of a Soul. He only ſaid, that the Subject to which Souls and other ſubſtantial Forms are united, is a Compound of the four Elements, and not a firſt Matter, and he aſcribed the ſame Simplicity to the Elements, which is aſcribed to the firſt Matter in the Schools of *Ariſtotle*. (m) *Fatetur hic Author libentiſſimè, in homine* (*& idem eſt de aliis mixtis*) *ultra formam ſubſtantialem dari aliquod ſubjectum recipiens illam formam: neque enim tam amens erat hic Author, ut in homine & animantibus nihil aliud præter animam agnoſceret, & poſt mortem illius nihil remanere diceret quod eſſet veneratione dignum in Sanctis, & in quo manerent plura accidentia, quæ prius fuerant in homine vivo, putaretque cadavera nihil eſſe reale ſed apparens & deludens ſenſus noſtros, vel ſaltem nihil illorum antea fuiſſe, quo ſatisfacit ferè omnibus in oppoſitum. Verum in hoc recedit hic Author à vera & recepta ſententia, quod illud commune ſubjectum non dicit eſſe materiam primam ſed ex quatuor elementis unitis, & inter ſe per mixtis putat coaleſcere. Elementa autem ipſa omnino aſſtruit ſimplicia, ſicut nos materiam primam vel formam ſubſtantialem dicimus eſſentialiter ſimplicem.* *Arriaga* was of Opinion that the third Objection againſt *Pereira* was ſomewhat ſtrong, for it proved that one of the Elements produced from another, was a thing naturally made out of nothing. *Pereira* did not much trouble himſelf about it: He (a) maintain'd that ſome Creatures have a Power to create, and *Arriaga* approves his Opinion.

(B) *His Book intitled* Antoniana Margarita.] That Title alludes to his Father's and Mother's Name. *Don Nicolas Antonio* ſpeaks of that Book thus. (b) *Antoniana Margarita, opus Phyſicis, Medicis ac Theologis utile & neceſſarium*, Medinæ Campi 1554. fol. Francofurti deinde 1610. ... Item *nova veteriſque Medicinæ experimentis & evidentibus rationibus comprobata primam partem, ſive Antoniana Margarita ſecundam, quæ quidem Medica eſt poſt priorem illam Philoſophicam.* Hæc ſcilicit pars de *Febribus* tractat, cujus febris eſſentiam, cauſas & ſpecies eſſe uſque in hæc tempora ignota dilucide (uti Author ipſe ait) demonſtrat, *Galenumque non dolo ſed ignorantia excæcatum potiſſimum ſuis de hac re ſcriptis medicis poſteris impoſuiſſe evidenter docet.* An Anonymous Author (c) wrote a Spaniſh Book againſt him in the Year 1556. *Antoniana Margarita* is grown very ſcarce. It was in Mr. *Briot*'s Library, which was ſold at *Paris* in the Year 1679. Mr. *Faure* bought it, he had it for two *Louis d'or*, he ſhewed it me, and told me, that he did not think he ſhould have had it ſo cheap. I think that Book and the whole Library of Mr. *Faure* is now in the Library of the Archbiſhop of *Rheims*.

I find in the Bibliotheque (d) of the Writers that have been Phyſicians, that *Pereira*'s Name was *Georgius Gomez*, and that his *Antoniana Margarita, in qua omnium pene morborum diſcurſus proponuntur*, was printed at (e) *Medina* by *Antony Graſbeet* in the Year 1554. and 1587. and that he publiſhed in the ſame City in 1558. another Book in *fol.* intitled *Nova veraque Medicina Chriſtiana ratione comprobata.* *Konig* has committed ſeveral groſs Miſtakes ſpeaking of that Author. **Bruta**, ſays he [f], *ſenſu prædita eſſe opere operoſo & 30. annis elaborato, cui titulus* Antoniana Margarita, *oſtendere conatus eſt.* Every Body will not perceive that the Particle *non* was omitted after the word *prædita*; and they, who do not perceive it, will think it is a Riddle, or laugh at it. They'll look upon *Pereira* as the greateſt Fool that ever was, for having ſpent 30 Years to prove that Beaſts have a ſenſitive Soul. On the other Side, they who are ſenſible of that Omiſſion, will be apt to believe, that this Spaniſh Phyſician had no other Deſign than to prove that Beaſts have no Feeling; whereas it is but a very ſmall part of his Book. *Konig* goes on, and ſays, *Ex eo omnia* Carteſium *hauſiſſe quæ de brutorum anima commentatus eſt*, Olaus Borrichius *in Epiſtola quadam aff.* This is falſe again. We ſhall ſee by and by that *Carteſius* was of that Opinion, before he heard of *Pereira*. It is certain at leaſt that the Book of that Spaniard could but make him believe

in

---

* See the Rem. A.

(e) *Read* ad Ariſtotelis Meteora, *and not* ad Ariſtotelis Commentaria.

(f) *Biblioth. fol.* 92. *Verſo.*

(g) Geſnerus *ſays that* Joſephus *was printed in* 1544.

(h) *In quæſtura p.* 100. *Lugd. Bat.* 1667.

(i) *Rod. de Arriaga Diſput.* 2. *Phyſica, Sect.* 1. *p. m.* 217.

(k) *Ibid. pag.* 218.

(l) Hæc argumenta non urgent Gomeſium, multo aliter opinantem de entibus naturalibus quam iſti Authores cenſeant. *Ib.*

(m) *Id. ib.*

(a) Reſpondet Gomeſius falſum eſſe nullam creaturam poſſe creare, nec facile hanc ſolutionem redargues ut intra patebit. *Id. ibid.*

[b] *Nicol. Antonius, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpaniæ tom.* 1. *pag.* 414.

[c] Adverſus hanc ſcripſit Anonymus Hiſpanum opuſculum ita nuncupatum, *Endecalogo contra Antonianæ Margarita*, Medinæ Campi 1556. 8. *Id. ibid.*

[d] *Lindenius renovatus pag.* 328.

[e] *Methymnæ Duelli.* Ib.

[f] *Konig. Biblioth. vetus & nova pag.* 619.

him his Paradox concerning the Souls of Beaſts, and that *Pereira* was not the Inventer of it. We ſhall ſee what is to be found (L) about it in the *News from the Republick*

in general that Beaſts have no Feeling. Every thing beſides is particular to the French Philoſopher, and neither ariſes from the Hypotheſis, nor from the Explications of *Pereira*. *Nicolas Antonio* ſays nothing of the Anſwer to the Objections of *Palacios* publiſhed by *Pereira* in the Year 1555.

(L) *What is to be found about it in the* News from the Republick of Learning.] (g) "Any Body would "have ſay'd that no Man would ever be ſo mad as "to maintain the Contrary (h). Yet there "was one in the laſt Century, who ventured that "Paradox in a Country where no Body would have "ſuſpected that ſuch a new Doctrine ſhould take "its Birth. The Reader will know what I mean, "if I add, that a Spaniſh Phyſician publiſhed that "Doctrine at *Medina del Campo* in the Year 1554. "in a Book about which he had been thirty Years, "and which he intitled *Antoniana Margarita*, out of "reſpect to his Father's and Mother's Name. Who "would have thought that *Spain*, where the Freedom "of the Mind is leſs tolerated than that of the Body "in *Turkey*, would produce ſo raſh a Philoſopher, "as to maintain that Beaſts have no Feeling? It is "ſo extraordinary a thing that it does very well "deſerve to be mention'd in this Place; and we "ought not to ſuppreſs the Name of ſo fine a Gentleman, "who is the firſt Author, that we know of, "of that unheard of Paradox. His Name was *Gomeſius Pereira*, "he lived in the XVI. Century, "and not in the XII. as the Abbot *de Gerard*, Doctor "of Divinity, ſays in his Conferences about "the *Philoſophy of Noble Men*. *Gomeſius Pereira* was "vigorouſly aſſaulted by a Divine of *Salamanca*, "whoſe Name was *Michael de Palacios*, and anſwered "him as vigorouſly, ſticking to his Opinion, "(h) *That Beaſts are meer Machines*. But he had "no Sectators, his Doctrine died with him. No "Body did him the honour to dread him, ſo that "he was not better known in our Age than if he "had never lived; and it is very likely that *Carteſius*, "who read not much, had never heard of "him. Yet ſome pretend that he took from that "*Spaniſh* Philoſopher his Opinion concerning "Beaſts; for by ſaying ſo, they think to deprive "him of the Glory of Invention. Some time after the Author of thoſe *News* publiſh'd an Abſtract of a Letter which he had received from *Paris*; it contain'd amongſt other Things, the following words, "(i) What you ſay, pag. 23. is not true, that Mr. "*Deſcartes*'s Opinion about the Souls of Beaſts is "a new one; for there has been formerly ſome "Diſputes about it, as it appears from this Paſſage "of St. *Auguſtin*, de quantitate animæ *chap.* 30. Quod autem tibi viſum eſt non eſſe animam in corpore viventis animantis, quamquam videatur abſurdum, non tamen doctiſſimi homines quibus id placuit DEFUERUNT, neque nunc arbitror DEESSE. The Author received another Letter, wherein he was told that *Carteſius*'s Opinion was much older than St. *Auguſtin*. Mr. *du Rondel* wrote that Letter. An Abſtract of it was inſerted in the *News* of *October* 1684. I am going to tranſcribe it, and ſhall ſet down the Quotations in the Margin, for the Satiſfaction of the Readers. (k) "There has been ſome "Doubts about the Souls of Beaſts, not only in "St. *Auguſtin*'s time, but alſo in the time of the "Cæſars, that is to ſay above three hundred Years "before that Father of the Church. The Stoicks "ſpoke of nothing elſe, and went ſo far as to maintain "in their Schools, that there is but a meer Reſemblance "between our Actions and thoſe of "Beaſts, and that there is a Nature altogether different "in Men and Beaſts. I would not have you "think that they ſaid ſo only of certain Actions of "which we have little or no Perception, ſuch as "Digeſtion, Sanguification, Conception, &c. They "underſtooood it alſo of the moſt lively, violent, "and ſenſible Paſſions. They believed that a Lyon "was not angry, though he tore in Pieces every "Body he met in the Amphitheater. They ſaid "that his Blood boiled within him, being put into "a Heat by ſome Objects diſagreeable to the Nature "of that Animal. (l) *Impetus habent feræ, rabiem, "feritatem, incurſum; iram quidem non magis quàm "luxuriam.* Why ſo? Becauſe, Sir, it happen'd "in *Seneca*'s time that a Lyon ſaved the Life of an "unfortunate Man, without pretending that he "ſhould be obliged to him for it, and without deſigning "to do a good thing, (a) *Qui nec voluit "facere, nec bene faciendi animo facit.* Beſides, if "Beaſts were capable of Anger, they would be alſo "capable of Forgiving. But becauſe Clemency "is an effect of Reaſon, and Beaſts are deprived "of it, thoſe Stoicks concluded that Beaſts are "not ſuſceptible of Anger nor of any other Paſſion. "(b) *Iraſci non magis ſciunt quàm ignoſcere, & quamvis "rationi inimica ſit ira, nuſquam tamen naſcitur, "niſi ubi rationi locus eſt. Iſta ferarum ut extra, "ita intra, forma humanæ diſſimilis eſt.* But, Sir, "a Cynick ſaid all thoſe Things above three hundred "Years before the Stoicks of *Rome*. He believ'd "and taught in expreſs Words, that Beaſts "had neither Feeling nor Knowledge. 'Tis pity "that *Pereira* knew nothing of all this; he would "not have failed to make uſe of it againſt thoſe "who accuſed him of publiſhing a ſtrange Novelty, "and would have laught at the great Learning of "his Adverſaries. Here are the Words of that Cynick. "(c) διὰ δὲ τὸ, he ſpeaks of Beaſts, τὰ μὲν "πυκνότητι, τὰ δὲ πλεονασμῷ τῆς ὑγρασίας μήτε "διανοεῖσθαι, μήτε αἰσθάνεσθαι, that they can have "neither Knowledge nor Feeling becauſe of the "Thickneſs of their Conſtitution, and of their "great Moiſtneſs. I do not ſay that I approve that "Reaſoning of *Diogenes*. The Retractation of the firſt Abſtract is to be found in the *News* of *April*, 1685. Read what follows (d) "He who informed us that "St. *Auguſtin* ſays, that ſome maintain'd in his time "that Beaſts have no Souls, has lately acquainted "us that having conſulted the 30th Chapter of "the Book *de Quantitate Animæ*, where he had "been told that it was contained, he found nothing "in it that has any relation with the Opinion "of *Gomeſius Pereira*. So that my Remark is true "ſtill in that Reſpect, *viz.* That no Body before "*Gomeſius Pereira* taught that Beaſts are meer Machines. "It remains only to enquire, whether the "Paſſages quoted by Mr. *du Rondel* in the *News* of "*October* prove what he ſays. Theſe laſt Words put Mr. *du Rondel* upon collecting ſeveral Proofs. He deſign'd to impart 'em to me, but he loſt 'em, except what follows.

"(e) It is certain that *Diogenes* could not believe "that Beaſts have Souls, by reaſon of his Phyſical "Principles, and the End of his Morals. He "taught that there are ſome Beings and ſome Half-Beings. "The Firſt are what they are by their "own Eſſence, and the Second Exiſt with the Firſt "only by Participation or Imitation, as the Cynicks "ſpeak. The Second are of two Sorts. Some imitate "the Spirit and affect a circular Motion, and "ſome imitate the Soul, and move in a ſtraight Line: "τὰ μὲν Νοῦν μιμεῖται, καὶ κύκλῳ κινεῖται, τὰ δὲ "ψυχὴν ἐπ' εὐθείας. You may eaſily gueſs by that "Circular Motion, that he underſtood the heavenly "Orbs. But he meant eſpecially the Lactean Circle, "to which the Cynicks, as well as ſome other Philoſophers, "aſſign'd the Origin of Paſſions, ἀφ' οὗ "τὸ παθητὸν ἄρχεσθαι σῶμα. But if we conſider "how the Ancients deſcribed the Deſcent of Souls "through thoſe Circles, it is impoſſible that Beaſts "ſhould have any true Paſſions. For a Soul puts on "Ambition in the Sphere of *Jupiter*, Careleſsneſs "in that of *Saturn*, Pride in that of *Mars*, Covetouſneſs "in that of *Mercury*, &c. (f). So that ſeeing "the like Paſſions are not obſerved in Beaſts, at "leaſt in the ſame Manner as they are obſerved in "Man, it follows that they have not Souls, which "are the common Seat of Paſſions, or that "their Paſſions are only counterfeit, or ſomething "like thoſe of Men, by a fortuitous Imitation. And "therefore the Cynicks placed Beaſts amongſt the "Bodies which move in a ſtraight Line, that is to "ſay, amongſt heavy Bodies which have a tendency "towards the Earth. Indeed the Nature of Beaſts "is always the ſame, and keeps always its ordinary "Determination. There is no Difference nor Variety "in their Occupations. They are all condemn'd "to the ſame Rule, and their Capacity does not "reach much farther than to look for Shelter and "Food; and therefore it has been ſaid of 'em that "they have no Inclinations but what are mean, "dull and baſe, and that Nature had made 'em on "purpoſe to ſtoop towards the Earth. *Prona ſunt,*

" &

[g] *News from the Republick of Learning, March* 1684. *Art.* 2. *p.* [illegible] *& Seq.* It is very likely that *Furetiere* took from hence what we read pag. [illegible] of the *Furetieriana printed* at Bruſſels. *Read there* Antoniana *inſtead of* Antomima.

[h] *That is to ſay, that Beaſts have no Feeling.*

[i] *News from the Republick August,* 1684. *Art.* 1. *p.* 555, 556.

[k] *Ibid. October* 1684. *Art.* 11. *pag.* 838. *& Seq.*

[l] Seneca *l.* 1. *de ira c.* 3.

(a) *Id. de Benef. l.* [illegible]

(b) *Id. de Ira. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(c) *Plut. de Placit. Philoſ. l.* 5. *c.* 20. *p. m.* 909.

[d] *News from the Republick of Learning. April,* 1685. *p.* 435.

[e] *Mr.* du Rondel *in a Memorial which he did me the favour to ſend me* in March 1696. *I have added the Citations in the Margin.*

[f] *See Macrobius in ſomnium Scipion. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

Republick of Learning. I shall observe, that the (D) Epoch of that Opinion of *Cartesius* is falsly stated in that Book. If it be a strange Doctrine we ought not to wonder at it; for of all physical Objects, none is more abstruse and perplexing than the Souls of Beasts. The Extream Opinions about that Subject are absurd or very dangerous

"*& ex ipsa quoque suspiciendi difficultate à superis recesserunt, nec ullam divinorum corporum similitudinem aliqua sui parte meruerunt, nihil ex mente sortita sunt, & ideo ratione caruerunt, duo quoque tantum adepta sunt, sentire vel crescere*, says *Macrobius* (g) with this Restriction of *Virgil*, *Quantum non noxia corpora tardant Terrenique hebetant artus*, because, as he goes on, *in animalibus hebescit usus animæ* DENSITATE *corporis*; which seems to be translated from *Diogenes*, who says, that *Beasts can have no Feeling nor Knowledge, by reason of the* THICKNESS *and great quantity of their Moistness*. See *Plutarch Lib. 5. cap. 20.* It seems, I say, that *Macrobius* translated it from *Diogenes*, and it is likely enough since he made use of the same Word; but I don't know very well whether *Virgil*, with his (h) *noxia corpora*, had in view what follows in *Diogenes*, *That Beasts are like Mad-men depriv'd of Reason*, διακεῖσθαι τοῖς μεμηνόσι, [illegible] τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ. For tho' the Word *noxia* implies Damage and Loss, yet μεμηνέναι seems to signify something more: and therefore a Cynick Commentator, to make us apprehend it, explains it, by the Image of Men possess'd with Devils. He says, That when Humane Souls go out of their Bodies, and look for another Habitation, if they meet with no other Subjects but such wherein Reason never dwelt, they follow and harass them, and never inform them as they do Organized Bodies design'd for them, [illegible] Δαίμονες. But you will tell me, that these are Platonick Thoughts, which do not very well agree with the common Notions we have of Cynism. I cannot help it. *Sallust* the Cynick says so: Besides *Diogenes* was not so far from Platonism as 'tis commonly thought. A certain *Tiberianus* tells us in his *Socrates*, that *Diogenes* possessed himself of the whole Philosophical Patrimony of *Plato*: *Memores Platonis sententiæ, cujus hæreditatem Diogenes Cynicus invadens, nihil ibi plus* (1) *aureâ linguâ invenit*.

"But what I say of *Diogenes* will better appear from the End of his Morals. His Opinion was, that if a Man will live as he ought to do, he must be insensible; and tho' this seems a strange and almost impossible thing, yet that Philosopher must needs have attained to that Philosophical State of Life, for the Ancients are too positive about it to be deceived in it. I don't know whether, in order to it, he made use of *Chiron*'s Precepts mention'd by *Maximus Tyrius*. I don't know neither, whether he followed the Rules of *Antisthenes*, who is the Author of the *Apathia*: but *as he was an Angel of* Jupiter, *sent to Men, to teach 'em what is Good and what is Evil*, as *Epictetus* says, I am apt to believe that he was directed by his own Thoughts. As he used to say, that *Reason must be opposed to Passion, Courage to Fortune, and Nature to Custom*, he resolved at last to follow the Design of Nature, and fansied that whoever will be a true Son of that good Mother, ought to be like Beasts, who are a genuine and true Image thereof. *Diogenes* imbraced therefore that Opinion, and put it in practice by Poverty, Fasting, and Asceticks, which he had the Honour to invent. 'Tis said that *Alexander* the Great, being ready to undertake the Conquest of *India*, and being sure of his Destiny, had so much Courage as to wish to be *Diogenes*. He envied the Security of that Philosopher, and a Cynical Life seem'd to him to exceed Nature. (i) *Disputare cum Socrate licet, dubitare cum Carneade, cum Epicuro quiescere, hominis Naturam cum Stoicis vincere, cum* CYNICIS EXCEDERE. Such an Insensibility is a very strange State, and whoever attained to it, paid always very dear for it: *istuc nihil dolere, non sine magnâ mercede contigit, immanitatis in animo, stuporis in corpore*: But it is a very convenient State for the Miseries of this Life. Every Heathen had been glad if what has been said of [k] certain Nations not unknown to you, should have been said of them. *Victui herba, vestitui pelles, cubile humus. Id beatius arbitrantur, quam ingemere agris, illaborare domibus, suas alienasque fortunas spe metuque versare. Securi adversus homines, securi adversus Deos, rem difficillimam assecuti sunt, ut illis ne voto quidem opus sit.*

If I could often present my Readers with a borrowed Erudition as exquisite and profound as this is, how great an Ornament would it be to this Dictionary? I shall quote (l) some Passages of *Aristotle*, which seem to prove that he took Beasts for Machines.

(D) *The Epoch of that Opinion of Cartesius is falsly stated.*] (a) "*Gomesius Pereira* inferred not his Paradox from its true Principles, and did not foresee the Consequences of it, and therefore *Descartes* may be look'd upon as the first who found it out by a philosophical Method. Yet I think it is very probable that he found it, without looking for it: it is likely that he begun and ended his Meditations, without thinking of the Souls of Beasts, and without forsaking the Opinion he had of them from his tender Years: but when he came to consider the Consequences of his Principle concerning the Distinction between Thinking and extended Substances, he perceived that the Knowledge of Beasts destroyed the whole Oeconomy of his System. Nay it may be that this Difficulty did not come into his Mind, before it was objected to him. He was therefore necessitated to assert that Beasts have no Feeling. Had he been able to defend his Principles without it, he had never opposed an Opinion which has not only appear'd undeniable to every Body, but is also attended with an Evidence almost invincible. That we may know whether that Author was mistaken, let us see how he explain'd himself. His Explication is to be found at the End of his Preface, for it was published in the same Book as well as the Passage which wanted to be cleared. (b) *I have said in the second Article of these News*, that it is likely that Mr. *Descartes* begun and ended his Meditations, without thinking of the Souls of Beasts, and without forsaking the Opinion he had of them from his tender Years. "It would be a mistake if I meant his six famous Meditations, which were dedicated to the *Sorbon*, and against which they raised so many Objections; for it does plainly appear from his *Method* printed in the Year 1637. before those six Meditations, that Mr. *Descartes* believed already that Beasts have no Souls. I declare therefore that by Mr. *Descartes*'s Meditations I did not mean those which he dedicated to the *Sorbon*. My meaning is that 'tis likely he built a new System in his Mind, without thinking of the sensitive Souls of Beasts. I don't doubt but he finish'd the Construction of his Work in his Mind, before he published his *Method*. It is certain notwithstanding this Explication, that that Author was mistaken; for the Hypothesis about *Automata* is one of the most Ancient Speculations of *Descartes*, as Mr. *Baillet* has made it out. Here are his Words. [c] "Those who suppose that those Works of Mr. *Descartes* were composed in the Year 1619. make his Opinion about the Souls of Beasts twenty Years older than his Adversaries, and some learned Men besides, did. That Opinion was found in the Works which he writ in his Youth, and therefore it cannot be said, that he begun and ended his *Meditations* without thinking of the Souls of Beasts, and without forsaking the Opinion he had of them from his tender Years. It cannot be said that when he came to consider the Consequences of his Principle, concerning the Distinction between Thinking and Extended Substances, he perceived that the Knowledge of Beasts destroyed the whole Oeconomy of his System. "It cannot be said that the Answers which he was obliged to make to some Objections proposed against him, gave him Occasion to think of a thing for, which he was only beholden to the Freedom of his Thoughts. He was not yet necessitated to assert that Beasts have no Feeling, since he could not foresee what might happen to him twenty Years after. He had then no Principles to defend, for he had laid down none yet for the New Philosophy: at least he had not yet read at that Age, St. *Augustin*, nor *Pereira*, nor any Author from whom he might have had that Opinion concerning the Souls of Beasts. Mr. *Descartes* being returned from his

(g) [illegible] c. 14. p. m. [illegible]

(h) *Virgil. Æn. l. 6. v. 731.*

(1) *'Tis the Art of Living well. That Passage of* Tiberianus *is quoted upon the Account of Virgil's Golden Bough.*

(i) *Senec. de brevit. vitæ. c. 14. p. m. 711.*

(k) *Cicer. Tusc. Quæst. l. 5.*

(l) *In the Rem. H.*

(a) *News from the Republick of Learning, March 1684. p. 22.*

(b) *Ibid. at the End of the Preface.*

(c) *Baillet, Life of* Descartes. *tom. 1. p. 51, 52.*

gerous; and 'tis impoſſible to keep a *Medium*. I hope the Reader will excuſe me for publiſhing, on this occaſion, ſome Collections which I have made concerning the Opinions of the Ancients (*E*) and Moderns about the nature of thoſe Souls. Many

“ his (1) Travels to *Paris* five or ſix Years after, diſcovered that Opinion to ſome of his Friends, and gave to underſtand, that he could not believe that Beaſts are any thing elſe but Machines. So that they who find it difficult to aſcribe that Opinion to him ever ſince the Year 1619, will more eaſily believe that it came into his Mind about the Year 1625 at furtheſt. Perhaps they will not refuſe to believe Mr. *Descartes* himſelf (2), who tells us, that it came into his Mind fifteen or ſixteen Years before he publiſh'd his Metaphyſical Meditations. That Opinion concerning the Souls of Beaſts is what Mr. *Paſcal* eſteem'd moſt in Mr. *Descartes*'s Philoſophy. Mr. *Baillet* was ſo civil to the Author of the *News from the Republick of Learning*, as to refute him without naming him, and on the contrary, he nam'd him when he prais'd a Thought which he approv'd of. It is, in a manner, an exceſs of Ceremony, prejudicial to the liberty which every body ought to enjoy in the Commonwealth of Learning: It is to introduce into it Works of Supererogation; every body muſt be allow'd to name thoſe whom he refutes; and it is enough to forbear ſharp, injurious and uncivil Expreſſions.

Here is another Paſſage of Mr. *Baillet*, which concerns the ſame Subject. (*d*) “ It has been thought by many, that Mr. *Deſcartes* took his famous Opinion about the Souls of Beaſts . . . . out of the Book of *Gomeſius Pereira* . . . . But one may very well doubt, whether Mr. *Deſcartes* ever heard of *Pereira*, and whether his Book, which has been always ſcarce, ever fell into the hands of a Man who cared ſo little for Books and Reading as our Philoſopher did. But we need not doubt of it, ſeeing Mr. *Deſcartes* had not ſeen *Pereira's* Book the Year after the publication of his (3) Metaphyſical Meditations, and had made known his Opinion about Beaſts above fifteen or twenty Years before, as has been ſaid in the Firſt Book of this Hiſtory. Beſides, as Mr. *Bayle* has (4) well obſerved, *Pereira* having not inferred his Paradox from its true Principles, and having not foreſeen the Conſequences of it, *Deſcartes* may be look'd upon as the firſt who found it out by a Philoſophical Method. *Pereira* was not the Inventer of that Doctrine, it was debated by very Learned Men in St. *Auguſtin's* (5) Time, as a thing which might be defended well enough, notwithſtanding the apparent Abſurdity which the Vulgar found in it. That Opinion was older ſtill than St. *Auguſtin*, *Seneca*, and the firſt *Cæſars* (6), according to Mr. *du Rondel's* Obſervation, who carries it as far as the Stoicks and Cynicks.

(*E*) *Concerning the Opinions . . . about the Souls* of Beaſts.] Moſt of the ancient Philoſophers taught, that the Souls of Beaſts were Rational: From whence it follows, that they believed thoſe Souls differed but more or leſs from thoſe of Men. *Anaxagoras* placed that difference in this, *viz.* that Men are able to explain their Reaſonings, whereas Beaſts cannot explain theirs. (*e*) Ἀναξαγόρας πάντα ζῶα λόγον ἔχειν τὸν ἐνεργητικόν, τὸν δ' οἱονεὶ νοῦν μὴ ἔχειν τὸν παθητικόν, τὸν λεγόμενον τοῦ νοῦ ἑρμηνέα. *Anaxagoras omnia animalia habere mentem agentem: non item patientem, qui eſt mentis quaſi interpres.* *Pythagoras* and *Plato* had the ſame thoughts; for they ſaid, that the Souls of Beaſts, tho' truly rational, (*f*) act not according to Reaſon, becauſe they want the uſe of Speech, and their Organs are not well proportion'd. It were to be wiſh'd, that *Plutarch* who knew ſo well how to give a juſt extent to his Subjects, when he had a mind to it, had not been ſo Laconick on this occaſion: but tho' his Language be never ſo conciſe, we can have no doubts about the Doctrine of *Pythagoras*. We ſee clearly enough, that according to that Philoſopher, the Soul of a Beaſt does not ſubſtantially differ from the Soul of a Man; for he taught the Tranſmigration of Souls, that is to ſay, that they paſs indifferently from the Body of a Man into that of a Beaſt: Few Opinions have had ſo many Followers as that. I don't believe that any Philoſopher ſpoke more advantageouſly of the Souls of Beaſts than *Porphyry*; He believ'd not only that they are endow'd with Reaſon, but alſo that they have the Faculty of making their Reaſoning to be underſtood: He believ'd alſo, that their Language had been underſtood by ſome Men, and that Men are above Beaſts, only becauſe their Reaſonings are more refin'd. (*g*) *Porphyrius lib. 3. de Abſtinentia, ſtatuit naturam omnibus animantibus, quibus ſenſum & memoriam dedit, rationem quoque, tum & orationem, tam internam quam externam, tribuiſſe: additque, Apollonium Tyaneum, Melampum, Tireſiam, & Thaletem, brutorum ſermones dijudicaſſe atque intellexiſſe: quos nihil mirum ſi non intelligamus ipſi, qui plurimarum etiam nationum linguam minimè callemus. Aſſerit itaque bruta rationem participare, neque per eam ab illis hominem ſimpliciter diſtingui, ſed quod homini perfectum rationis acumen inſit, illis imperfectum.* He proves it by ſome Reaſons and Authorities: he quotes *Empedocles*, *Plato*, and *Ariſtotle*. (*h*) *Confirmat iſtiuſmodi dogma in primis ex mutua ſignificatione, qua inter ſe bruta utuntur, quod in avibus potiſſimum apparet, quæ ſibi occinunt viciſſimque reſpondent. Deinde, ex admirabili ſolertia, curaque in futurum proſpiciendi, utilia conſectandi, declinandi adverſa. Præterea, teſtimonia Empedoclis & Platonis, atque etiam Ariſtotelis, quæ idem cenſuiſſe, ex eorum dictis ſcriptiſque haberi ait.* Thoſe who alledge theſe words, pretend, that *Ariſtotle* (*i*) is not quoted to the purpoſe; they ſay, that he aſcribes only to Beaſts an Image, or Copy of Reaſon, and they laugh at that pretended Language which was underſtood by *Tireſias*, *Melampus*, &c. whereupon they obſerve, that a Rabbin follow'd the Error of *Porphyry*, and believ'd that *Solomon* underſtood the ſame Language. (*k*) *Quod item addebat Porphyrius, bruta inter ſe colloqui, & à quibuſdam intelligi, non ita eſt, etſi ita eſſe crediderit quidam ex Hebræis doctoribus, teſte Abulenſi ad capit. 3. libr. 3. Regum, quæſt. 11. aſſerens, eorum voces percalluiſſe Salomonem.* Perhaps it would not be an eaſy thing for them to ſhew, that their *Ariſtotle* acknowledg'd a ſubſtantial difference between the Souls of Brutes and thoſe of Men: for if they ſhould ſay, that he believed not that Beaſts act by reaſon, it would not be a good Proof; ſince it is certain that Children and Frenticks have a Soul of the ſame Species with the moſt Rational Men, and that moſt Beaſts ſhew more Reaſon than Children of one Year of Age, and Frenticks. So that one would think that *Ariſtotle* acknowledged only more or leſs difference between the Souls of Beaſts and thoſe of Men, and that he believed the Soul of Man reaſoned ſubtilly and eaſily, and the Soul of a Beaſt but confuſedly, becauſe of the difference of their Organs. Which might be confirmed, if it be true, as ſome pretend (*l*), that he believed not the Immortalility of the Soul.

There is one thing to be obſerved. It does not appear, that the Ancients, when they left the Poetical or Oratorian Style, acknowledged a true difference between a Humane Soul and Matter. I don't mean thick, heavy, and palpable Matter, but that which the Chymiſts call Spirits, which is as eſſentially Body and Matter as Dirt and Fleſh can be. They could not therefore believe, that the Souls of Men and Beaſts ſhould differ otherwiſe than more or leſs, and according to their ſeveral degrees of ſubtilty; and conſequently their Opinion was, that the meer Diſpoſition of the Organs hindred Reaſon from appearing in Beaſts, as it appears in Men. It was, without doubt, the Opinion of *Galen*; for he believed not that our Souls are Incorporal; he did not diſtinguiſh them from Natural Heat, and the Harmony of the Temper (*m*). I know that many Ancients ſaid, that the Souls of Men deſcended from Heaven; but it does not prove, that they believed them to be Immortal. Beſides, the Stoicks taught, that all Souls, without any exception, flowed from the ſame Source. (*n*) *Perſuaſum iis, à Deo, id eſt Mundi animâ, animam hanc eſſe. Laërtius*: (1) Τῆς τῶν ὅλων ψυχῆς μέρη εἶναι τὰς ἐν τοῖς ζώοις: Animæ univerſi, partes eſſe animantium Animas. *Omniumne animantium? omnium: ſed aliæ aliis magis participant, ut ſunt corpora & inſtrumenta. Eſt Socraticum:* (2) Mundi animam, fontem animarum omnium eſſe. *Sed illam, qua ratione uteretur, cognatam & participem, imò jam partem*

(*f*) Οὐ μὴν λογικῶς ἐνεργοῦσι παρὰ τὴν δυσκρασίαν τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τὸ φραστικόν. Non tamen ea agere ſecundum rationem, idque fieri ob incommodum corporum temperamentum & quia loquela deſtituuntur. *Id. ib. p. 909.*

(1) *See the 16. Letter of Iſaac Beeckman to Father Merſenne in 1641. from whence 'tis inferred, that he imparted his Opinion about the Souls of Beaſts to his Friends a long time before.*

(2) *Compare the 16. Treatiſes* Thaumantis Regia *made in his Youth and another which he quotes in his Method, as having been made a great while before, with the Letters of the 2d Tome, p. 24. and of the 3d Tome, p. 9, 47, 230.*

(*d*) *Baillet, ib. Tom. 2. p. 537.*

(3) *He ſent word to Father* Merſenne, *that he had never ſeen that Book, Lett. 30. of the 22d* June 1641.

(4) *News from the Republ. of Learning,* 1684. *Tom.* 1. *p.* 22.

(5) *Tom. 2. p. 12. News from the Republ. of Learning, Auguſtin.* cap. 30. de Quantitate Animæ.

(6) *News from the Repub. ib. p. 291.*

(*e*) *Plut. de Placit. Philoſ. l. 5. c. 20 p. 908*

(*g*) *Conimbricenſes in Phyſ. Ariſt. l. 2. c. 9. quæſt. 2. art. 1. p.m. 225.*

(*h*) *Ibid.*

(*i*) Quod autem aſſerebat Porphyrius, ex Ariſtotelis doctrina colligi, exiſtimaſſe illum bruta ratione pollere; falſum eſt: niſi rationem ſumat pro rationis imitatione quam ſolam brutis quibuſdam Ariſtoteles attribuit, tum loco citato (*that is to ſay*, lib. 4. de hiſtor. animal. c. 9.) tum 1. Metaphyſ. c. 1. *Ibid. art. 3. pag. 227.*

(*k*) *Ibid.*

(*l*) Pomponatius *aſſerted it ſtoutly. See the Diſcourſe of* La Mothe le Vayer *about the Immortality of the Soul, in the 4th Tom. of his Works, Edit. in 12.*

(*m*) *See the Book intitled* Nic. Nancelii Trachyeni Novioduneſis de immortalitate animæ velitatio adverſus Galenum, *Printed at* Paris *in* 1587. *in* 8.

(*n*) *Lipſius Phyſiolog. Stoicor. l. 3. Diſſert. 8. p.m. 984.*

(1) *In Zen.*

(2) *Apul. de Dogm. Plat.*

Many Readers will ſay, that I am too long, but the Learned will think that I do not ſay the fourth part of what they might ſay upon that Subject. They will ſay the ſame thing of ſome other places, wherein I am ſomewhat prolix. Afterwards I ſhall make ſome (*F*) Reflections. I ſhall obſerve that *Voſſius* knew no Author before

partem divinitatis eſſe. *Plutarchus:* (*f*) Ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ μεταχοῦσα καὶ λογισμοῦ, ἐκ ἔργον ἐστὶ τῦ Θεῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέρος, ἐδ' ὑπ' αὐτῦ, ἀλλ' ἀπ' αὐτῦ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῦ γέγονεν: *Anima mentis & ratiocinationis conſors, non opus ſolum Dei, ſed & PARS eſt, neque ab ipſo, ſed ex ipſo eſt facta.* *Animæ etiam aliæ (hac ratione) partes Dei, id eſt mundanæ animæ: ſed illa ſcilicet animæ, & quæ proxime vim naturamque ejus referret.* Therefore how could they believe that the Souls of Beaſts had no Feeling? I don't think they believ'd it; and if *Seneca* ſaid the contrary in the Paſſages mention'd by the Learned Mr. *du Rondel*, 'tis plain he has refuted himſelf in ſome others. Read his laſt Letter, and you will ſee that he deprives Beaſts of Reaſon, Wiſdom, true Goodneſs, and Felicity, and not of Feeling. (*g*) *In quo non poteſt beata vita eſſe, nec id poteſt quo beata vita efficitur: beata autem vita bonis efficitur: in muto animali non eſt quo beata vita efficitur: ergo in muto animali bonum non eſt.* *Mutum animal* SENSU *comprehendit præſentia: præteritorum reminiſcitur, cùm id incidit, quo ſenſus admonetur: tanquam equus reminiſcitur viæ, cùm ad initium ejus admotus eſt. In ſtabulo quidem nulla via, quamvis ſæpè calcata, memoria eſt...... Nec illud nego, ad ea quæ videntur ſecundùm naturam, magnos eſſe mutis animalibus impetus & concitatos, ſed inordinatos ac turbidos. Nunquam autem aut inordinatum eſt bonum, aut turbidum. Quid ergo, inquis, muta animalia perturbatè & indiſpoſitè moventur? Dicerem illa perturbatè & indiſpoſitè moveri, ſi natura illorum ordinem caperet: nunc moventur ſecundùm naturam ſuam. Perturbatum enim id eſt, quod eſſe aliquando & non perturbatum poteſt. Sollicitum eſt, quod poteſt eſſe ſecurum. Nulli vitium eſt, niſi cui virtus poteſt eſſe. Multis animalibus talis ex ſuâ naturâ motus eſt. Sed ne te diu teneam, aliquod erit bonum in muto animali, erit aliqua virtus, erit aliquid perfectum: ſed quale? nec bonum abſolutè, nec virtus, nec perfectum. Hæc enim rationalibus ſolis contingunt, quibus datum eſt ſcire, quare, quatenus, quemadmodum. Ita bonum in nullo eſt, niſi in quo ratio.* *Seneca* lays down a Principle whereby it will appear in what ſenſe he ſays elſewhere, That Beaſts don't grow angry, and are not capable of conferring a Benefit. He ſuppoſes, that a Nature which is not ſuſceptible of the two Contraries, is ſuſceptible of neither of them: From whence he concludes, that Beaſts being not capable of acting according to Order, and the Rules of Reaſon, and being unable to acquire Virtue, do nothing that can be called diſorderly, unreaſonable, and a vicious Action; and therefore he does not call Anger the Violence or Fury of a Lyon: for according to the Stoicks all Paſſions are as many Vices, and conſequently no Being can be liable to them, but ſuch as partake of Virtue and Reaſon, and are able to attain to the Perfection of a Wiſeman. See the Remark *H*Δ. He aſſerts poſitively in another (*h*) Letter, that Beaſts Feel, and he could not have expreſs'd himſelf more clearly, if he had been of our Schoolmens Opinion. (*i*) *Qualis ad nos pervenit animi noſtri ſenſus, quamvis naturam ejus ignoremus, ac ſedem, talis ad omnia animalia conſtitutionis ſuæ* SENSUS. *Neceſſe eſt enim id* SENTIANT, *per quod alia quoque* SENTIUNT: *neceſſe eſt* SENSUM *ejus habeant, cui parent, à quo reguntur. Nemo non ex nobis intelligit eſſe aliquid, quod impetus ſuos moveat: Quid ſit illud, ignorat: & conatum ſibi eſſe ſcit: Quid ſit, aut unde ſit, neſcit. Sicut infantibus, ſic quoque animalibus, principalis partis ſuæ* SENSUS *eſt, non ſatis dilucidus, non expreſſus.* And herein he does but follow the Principles of his Sect. It is the Property of Beaſts, ſaid the Stoicks, to deſire their Preſervation, and to know that Nature recommends them to themſelves. (*k*) Τὴν δὲ πρώτην ὁρμήν φασι τὸ ζῷον ἴσχειν ἐπὶ τὸ τηρεῖν ἑαυτό, οἰκειούσης αὐτῷ τῆς φύσεως ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καθά φησιν ὁ Χρύσιππος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ τελῶν, πρῶτον οἰκεῖον λέγων εἶναι παντὶ ζῴῳ τὴν αὑτῦ σύστασιν, καὶ τὴν ταύτης συνείδησιν. *Primam autem hanc animantis appetitionem fuiſſe dicunt, ſeipſum tuendi atque ſervandi, naturâ ſibi ipſum ab initio conciliante, ut Chryſippus ait in primo De finibus, primum proprium cuique animanti dicens ſui ipſius fuiſſe commendationem, hujuſque conſcientiam.*

As to the Cynicks (*l*), the Paſſage of *Plutarch* mention'd by Mr. *du Rondel*, ſays poſitively, That in the Opinion of *Diogenes* Beaſts had no Feeling. I would ſee the Doctrine of that Philoſopher more at large, for what *Plutarch* ſays of it is very dark, the beginning and the end are very inconſiſtent with the middle part. They partake of Underſtanding; there's the beginning. They are always affected as Madmen are; there's the end. But don't Mad and Furious Men often Feel? If they had been compar'd with Men ſick of a Lethargy, or Apoplexy, there had been ſome connection in his Diſcourſe. However here is the whole Paſſage. (*m*) Διογένης, μετέχειν μὲν αὐτὰ τῦ νοητῦ καὶ ἀέρος, διὰ δὲ τὸ τὰ μὲν πυκνότητι, τὰ δὲ πλεονασμῷ τῆς ὑγρασίας, μήτε διανοεῖσθαι, μήτε αἰσθάνεσθαι, προσφερῶς δὲ αὐτὰ διακεῖσθαι τοῖς μαινομένοις, παρεπταικότος τῦ ἡγεμονικῦ. *Diogenes, rationis & aëris partem ea percipere, ſed vel ob craſſitiem vel ob abundantiam humoris neque intelligere neque ſentire: ac ferè affecta eſſe eo modo quo ſunt inſanientes, qui de mentis exciverunt poteſtate.* Whatever the Doctrine of *Diogenes* was, concerning that Subject, it is certain, that the number of the Ancients who oppos'd it, is much greater than of thoſe who came near it. *Plutarch* made a Treatiſe (*n*) on purpoſe to ſhew that Beaſts do argue. 'Tis alſo the deſign of the Book, wherein he inquires, (*o*) whether Terreſtrial Animals are more induſtrious than thoſe who live in the Water. I ſhall draw an Obſervation from it, which ſeems to be of ſome Importance. The Author deſigning to refute thoſe who ſay, That as there are Rational Animals, there muſt be ſome that are Irrational, maintains that by the ſame Reaſon it might be ſaid, that there are ſome Animals who do not Feel, as there are ſome that Feel. 'Tis to be obſerved, that he ſuppoſes that this laſt Diviſion of Animals had never been made before: He alledges it as an Example of a Doctrine which no body ever would be allowed to advance. His Argument is what we call *reductionem ab abſurdum.* Here are his words: (*p*) Εἰ δέ τις ἀξιοῖ μὴ κολοβὸν εἶναι τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἔμψυχον φύσιν ἔχειν, τὸ μὲν, λογικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἄλογον· ἕτερος ἀξιώσει τὴν ἔμψυχον φύσιν ἔχειν· τὸ μὲν, φανταστικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἀφαντασίαστον. καὶ τὸ μὲν, αἰσθητικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἀναίσθητον· ἵνα δὴ τὰς ἀντιζύγους ταύτας καὶ ἀντιθέτους ἕξεις καὶ στερήσεις περὶ ταυτὸν ἡ φύσις ἔχῃ μέρος οἷον ἰσορροποῦσα. Εἰ δὲ ἄτοπος ὁ ζητῶν τῦ ἐμψύχυ τὸ μὲν, αἰσθητικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἀναίσθητον εἶναι. καὶ τὸ μὲν, φαντασιούμενον, τὸ δὲ, ἀφαντασίαστον. ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἔμψυχον αἰσθητικὸν εὐθὺς εἶναι καὶ φανταστικὸν πέφυκεν. οὐδ' οὕτως ἐπιεικῶς ἀπαιτήσει τὸ μὲν λογικὸν εἶναι τῦ ἐμψύχυ, τὸ δὲ ἄλογον. *Quid ſi quis poſtulet, ne natura ſit manca, debere animatorum alia rationem habere, alia eſſe bruta: invenietur qui eodem jure flagitet, animalium alia debere eſſe vi imaginandi prædita, alia ea carere: alia ſenſum habere, alia non habere: ſcilicet ut oppoſitas habitibus iſtis privationes æqualibus veluti momentis natura habeat. Quid ſi hæc poſtulare abſurdum eſt, cum quodvis animal ſimul & ſentiendi & imaginandi vim nanciſcatur: ne hoc quidem rectè poſtulabitur, eſſe animalium alia ratione prædita, alia bruta.* A little while after he refutes the Stoicks, with a Remark of ſome force. Beaſts, ſay they, have no Paſſions; their Deſires are no Deſires, but almoſt Deſires, &c. What would you anſwer therefore, ſays he to them, if any body ſhould teach that they neither ſee nor hear, but that their Sight is almoſt a Sight. (*q*) Οὐκ οἶδα τί χρήσονται τοῖς λέγουσι μηδὲ βλέπειν, μηδὲ ἀκούειν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ βλέπειν αὐτὰ, καὶ ὡσανεὶ ἀκούειν. μηδὲ φωνεῖν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ φωνεῖν μηδὲ ὅλως ζῆν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ ζῆν. *Neſcio quid reſponſuri ſint iis, qui animalia etiam non videre, non audire, non vocem emittere, ſed quaſi videre, quaſi audire, quaſi vocem edere, denique omnino non vivere, ſed duntaxat quaſi vivere dicerent.* Which ſhews, that *Plutarch* was perſwaded, that no Philoſopher had ever rejected the ſenſitive Souls of Beaſts. From whence it follows, that he underſtood the Opinion of *Diogenes*, otherwiſe than we underſtand the Opinion of *Pereira*.

Leſt I ſhould be too prolix, I refer to another (*r*) place, the remaining part of this Compilation.

(*F*) *Afterwards I ſhall make ſome Reflections.*] I refer them to the Article of *Rorarius*.

(*G*) Voſſius

(*f*) *Quæſt. Platonic.*

(*g*) *Seneca epiſt.* 124. *p.m.* 477.

(*h*) *'Tis the* 121 *Letter, wherein he proves,* omnibus animalibus eſſe conſtitutionis ſuæ ſenſum.

(*i*) *Id. Ep.* 121. *pag.* 457.

(*k*) *Diog. Laert. in Zenone, l.* 7. *n.* 85. *p.m.* 416.

(*l*) *I ſpeak ſo, ſuppoſing this* Diogenes, *whoſe Doctrine is mention'd by* Plutarch *to be the Cynick.*

(*m*) *Plut. de Placit. Philoſ. l.* 5. *c.* 20. *p.* 909. *According to Amyot's Verſion,* Diogenes ſays, that *Beaſts* have ſome UNDERSTANDING, *but* by reaſon of the groſſneſs and thickneſs of their Temper, and becauſe of the great quantity of their Moiſtneſs, they have neither Reaſoning nor Feeling, no more than Madmen, becauſe they are Crack-brain'd, and have not a free uſe of Reaſon.

(*n*) Περὶ τῦ τὰ ἄλογα λόγῳ χρῆσθαι. Bruta animalia ratione uti.

(*o*) Πότερα τῶν ζῴων φρονιμώτερα, τὰ χερσαῖα ἢ τὰ ἔνυδρα. Terreſtriane an aquatilia animalia ſint callidiora?

(*p*) *Plut. de Solert. Animal. circa init. p.m.* 960. *C.*

(*q*) *Id. ib. p* 961. *E.*

(*r*) *In the Art.* Rorarius.

fore *Pereira*, who (*i*) aſſerted, that Beaſts have no Feeling. You may ſee in the ſame Remark, an account of the Opinion of that *Spaniard*. Some endeavour, in vain, to find in *Ariſtotle* the Seeds of Mr. *Deſcartes's* (*H*) Opinion: We are alſo re-

(*G*) *Voſſius knew no Author before* Pereira, *who aſſerted.*] He obſerves that there has been ſome Philoſophers, who made no Diſtinction between Thought and Senſation. From whence they ſhould have concluded, (*f*), either that Beaſts have Reaſon, or that they have no Senſation (*g*). He adds, That the laſt Propoſition pleaſed nobody, that he knew of, among the Ancients: but that it was aſſerted by *Gomeſius Pereira*, in the Sixteenth Century. (*h*) *Hoc conſtituto, conſequitur, vel beſtias non habere ſenſum, cum non habeant rationem, vel ea, cum ſenſu prædita ſint, etiam rationales eſſe. Prior ſententia, quod ſciam, veterum placuit nulli. Sed noſtrorum temporibus amplexus illam fuit Gometius Pereira, Philoſophus ac Medicus Hiſpanus, in opere triginta à ſe annis elaborato, quod, ab Antonii, & Margaritæ, parentum ſuorum, nominibus,* Antonianam Margaritam *inſcripſit. Eandemque opinionem tuetur in Margaritæ hujus apologia, qua objectionibus Michaelis à Palacios, Theologi Salmanticenſis, reſpondet: Utrobique docet, (ut verbis ejus inſiſtam)* illos motus brutales, quicunque in brutis viſuntur, non fieri à brutis videntibus, aut audientibus, aut guſtantibus, ſeu per quemcumque alium ſenſum exteriorem, ſeu interiorem, vitaliter ſenſificè immutatis: ſed vel ab ſpeciebus objectorum inductis in eorum organis, noſtris ſenſitivis ſimilibus, cum præſentia ſunt ſequenda, vel fugienda: vel a phantaſmatis, cum hæc abſunt. *Nimirum cenſet ea, quæ nos facultati ſenſitivæ tribuimus, proficiſci à quadam ſympathia, & antipathia: quemadmodum enim ſuccinum trahit paleas, magnes ferrum; ſic muta animantia trahi à ſpeciebus rerum amicarum: à natura quippe hanc vim eſſe inditam rebus, ut non omnia moveat, ſed res certas: itaque, re amica præſenti, maxillas animantis natura moveri ad illam recipiendam: re præſenti inimica, eaſdem natura refugere cibum, planeque adverſari. Quod ſi natura voluiſſet ſenſum mutis dare animantibus, daturum etiam fuiſſe mentem: at ea ſic habitura fuiſſe animas indiviſibiles, eoque à corpore ſeparabiles.* Conſider theſe two things: *Firſt*, That he explained not the Motions of Beaſts by Mechanical Principles, but by the occult Qualities of Antipathy and Sympathy. *Secondly*, That he rejected the Senſitive Souls, becauſe he believed not that a Material, Diviſible, and Mortal Subſtance was capable of Feeling; from whence he concluded, that if Beaſts had a Senſitive Soul, it was not corporal. When he was put in mind of the Actions of Beaſts, for Example, of a Dog, he anſwered, That it was not neceſſary they ſhould proceed from a Senſitive Faculty; for if it was ſo the Peripateticks would be in the wrong not to aſcribe to a Rational Soul ſo many Actions of a Dog which are like thoſe of a Man. He had Wit enough to take advantage of the weak ſide of the Cauſe of his Adverſaries. It is the common Shift of thoſe who undertake to maintain Abſurdities. (*i*) *Ictus hoſce levi amictu exire ſe poſſe Pereira arbitratur. Putat enim, ut nos non ideo rationem tribuimus beſtiis, quia tam multa actibus faciant ſimillima humanis: ita neque iis adſcribendum eſſe ſenſum, etſi, quæ agant, ſimillima ſint actibus animæ ſenſitivæ. Nec eo movetur, quod tam diſſimiles ſint animarum actus, imò contrarii prorſus: quia, ut ait, natura etiam pro rebus, in quas agit, contraria operetur. Unde Poëta* (*k*):

Limus ut hic dureſcit, & hæc ut cera liqueſcit,
Uno eodemque igni.

Sed longum eſſet omnia ex opere tam operoſo hominis & acuti & docti, adferre pro ridicula ſententia, quam diximus. I thought the Reader would be glad to find here the Doctrine and Genius of that *Spaniard*.

(*H*) *To find in* Ariſtotle *the Seeds of Mr.* Deſcartes's *Opinion.*] Father *Pardies* endeavour'd it. *Perhaps*, ſays he (*l*), *it will not be needleſs to examine ſome Paſſages of* Ariſtotle, *that we may know whether ſo Great a Philoſopher will not afford us ſomething, that may authorize an Opinion which ſeems now to be ſo new and ſo extraordinary.* Afterwards he quotes this Paſſage taken from the 9th Chapter of *Ariſtotle's* Book *de Spiritu*. "One may conceive, without any great difficulty, that Heat is an effect of Nature: but it is difficult to apprehend, how the Nature of Bodies can ſo well manage that Heat, and uſe it as an Inſtrument to give to every thing what it ought naturally to have, and to imprint upon each of them its particular Character with as much Juſtneſs, as if thoſe Bodies were endowed with Knowledge and Reaſon. And certainly (1) all thoſe things cannot be performed without Knowledge and the direction of Reaſon: but, on the other ſide, How can the Faculty of Knowing be aſcrib'd to Material Beings? This Art can, by no means, be aſcrib'd to the Force of Fire and Spirits, or of the moſt ſubtil Bodies: But if we ſhould ſay, that there is within thoſe Bodies ſome Principles that have the Faculty of Knowing; it is a thing which exceeds all Admiration. And we have as much reaſon to wonder, when we conſider the very Souls of Beaſts, ſeeing they are of the ſame Nature with Fire and Spirits." *It appears from that Paſſage*, ſays Father *Pardies* (*m*), *That* Ariſtotle *knew very well how difficult it is to aſcribe Knowledge to Bodies and Beaſts. But he ſeems to have poſitively aſſerted, in another place, what he propoſes here only by way of Admiration; for, ſpeaking of Beaſts, he uſes theſe expreſs words.* (1) Of all Animals Man only has the faculty of Thinking. *Homo unus ex numero animalium omnium vim obtinet cogitandi. . . .* And tho' other Animals be endowed with Memory, and capable of Diſcipline, yet none but Man is capable of Reminiſcence. *It ſeems from theſe words, which* Ariſtotle *has repeated word for word in another* (2) *place, that he granted that Beaſts have Knowledge, ſince he acknowledges they are endowed with Memory; and that if he deprives them of Knowledge, it is only of that ſort of Knowledge, which is attended with a particular Reflection in our Deliberations, and the Inquiries we make to recal things to mind. But it is certain, that* Ariſtotle *has diſtinguiſhed otherwiſe Memory and Reminiſcence; for, in his Opinion, Memory conſiſts only in an* (3) Image and a Repreſentation, imprinted upon the ſubſtance of that part of the Body wherein common Senſe reſides, much in the ſame manner as Figures are repreſented upon Wax by the Impreſſion of Seals: *So that to have the Memory of ſome things*, is to have the Figures of things thus repreſented (4). *Whereas Reminiſcence implies beſides a certain perception of the Mind, whereby when* we recal ſome things to Mind, we know that very thing, *viz.* that we recal ſomething to Mind: *which is common to all ſorts of Thoughts, ſince it is impoſſible to think, without knowing that one thinks. So that* Ariſtotle *ſaying, that Beaſts have no Reminiſcence, and that Man only has that Faculty, 'tis no wonder if he ſaid alſo, that of all Animals none but Man is capable of Thinking. That Philoſopher believed therefore, that Beaſts have no true Thoughts. It remains only, that* Ariſtotle *ſhould acknowledge, that Beaſts are meer* Automata, *and that they move only Machinally, and by the help of ſome Springs. But he has clearly done it; for he ſpeaks thus, explaining how the Motion of Animals is performed.* As thoſe Machines *ſays he*, (5), which are called *Automata*, are no ſooner moved a certain way, but they perform their Motions by the force of the unbent Springs . . . . . ſo Animals move in the ſame manner, having Bones and Nerves, as ſo many Inſtruments fitted for that end by the Induſtry of Nature, which produce the ſame Effect in them which ſeveral Pieces of Wood and Iron, with their Springs, produce in Machines. *He ſays the ſame thing elſewhere.* It may be, *ſays he* (6), that in Animals one thing moves another, and that their Bodies are like thoſe wonderful *Automata*: in effect, they are made up of Members which have the Faculty, even when they are at reſt, *to perform Motions as ſoon as they are determined to them.* And as there is no need at all to touch thoſe Machines, when they are moving, provided they have been touch'd before; *ſo the ſame may be ſaid of Animals.*

Thoſe Paſſages do a great Honour to *Ariſtotle*; they ſhew, 1. That he knew the Mechanical Power which Nature exerciſes in the Bodies of Animals. 2. That he knew how unconceivable it is that Matter ſhould think. But he never advanc'd, either as a certain thing, or as a Suppoſition, that Beaſts have no Feeling: He never depriv'd them of Thought, taking that Word in the ſenſe which the *Carteſians* put upon it, but taking it in a particular Senſe, for what is call'd Meditation, Reflection, Deliberation. It is not at all likely that he defined Memory as Father *Pardies* ſays he did; for by that Definition there will be no difference between Imagination and Memory. Beſides, Beaſts will never be meer Machines,

---

(*f*) *Voſſius de orig. & Progreſ. Idolol. l. 3. c. 41. p. m. 949.*

(*g*) *See* Francis Valeſius de ſacra Philoſophia, c. 55. *p. m.* 274. *where he ſays ſomething by the by, againſt* Pereira, *without naming him.*

(*h*) *Voſſ. ib.*

(*i*) *Id. ib.*

(*k*) *That is to ſay,* Virgil, Eccl. 8. 80.

(*l*) Ignatius Gaſton Pardies *of the Knowledge of Beaſts, n.* 69. *p. m.* 135.

(1) *V. Interpretem Latinum hujus loci.*

(*m*) *Pardies ubi ſup. n. 71. p. 140*

(1) *Hiſt. Animal. c. 1*

(2) *De Mem. & Rem. c. 2.*

(3) *De Mem. & Rem. c. 1.*

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) *De Animal. motione c. 7.*

(6) *2. De gen. anim. c. 1. poſt med.*

referr'd in vain to the fourth Book of *Cicero's Tusculane Questions*, and to the Testimony of *Porphyry*, *Proclus*, &c. There is no (*H*△) resemblance between Mr. *Descartes's* Opinion about Beasts, and what those Ancient Authors say.

PEREZ

Machines, whilst they are able to form the Image of an Object that is absent? This is what Memory implies, according to the very explication of Father *Pardies*. Lastly, That Jesuit had no reason to oppose the Critical Observation made against (*h*) the Translator of *Aristotle*. ἀνάμνησις is a kind of Thought, and not Thought in general; so that tho' Man only were capable of the ἀνάμνησις, as *Aristotle* will have it, yet it would not follow from thence, that there is no other Animal but Man that thinks.

(*H*△) *We are also referr'd in vain to the fourth Book of* Cicero's *Tusculane Questiones . . . . . There is no resemblance.*] A Learned Prelate, who wrote against *Descartes*, accuses him of advancing no Doctrine but what is to be found in the Authors who lived before him. Here are his Proofs, with respect to the Doctrine concerning the Souls of Beasts: (*c*) *Quid hoc est vero, quod* (1) *apud Ciceronem legimus, bestias simile quiddam facere perturbationum animi, in perturbationes non incidere, quod hæ eveniant solum ex aspernatione rationis, qua carent bestiæ? Quid aliud, inquam, suadet hoc nobis, quam bestias mera esse automata? nam si perturbationibus carent, neque herum diligit canis, neque lupum ovis reformidat: imo, nec cibum appetunt, nec dolorem fugiunt, nec mortem timent; sed ex coacta cæca materiæ motu id facere videntur quod non faciunt. Scribit conceptis verbis* (2) *Plutarchus credidisse Diogenem bruta animantes, neque intelligere, neque sentire: Quod & confutavit* (3) *Porphyrius. Sensit* (4) *Proclus animalia tantum rationalia anima esse prædita; additque decretum esse à Platone animam vere esse eam quæ ratione polleat, cæteras simulacra animarum. At nemo doctrinam hanc vel tradidit apertius, vel fusius propugnavit, quam Gometius Pereira.* He alledges four Authorities, *viz.* of *Cicero*, *Plutarch*, *Porphyry*, and *Proclus*. Let us examine them one after another: we need not say any thing more about *Pereira*, whom that Learned Prelate mentions in the last words of that Passage: We have said enough of him in the foregoing Remarks.

I. The Passage of *Cicero* is not a good Proof; it contains nothing else but the Distinction which the Stoicks made use of, and which I have mention'd in another place. They pretended that Passions and Reason were two things contrary one to another, and consequently, that they could have but one and the same Subject; they could not therefore be found in any Animals but such as are rational, and consequently Beasts could not be capable of them. (*d*) *Illud animorum corporumque dissimile est quod animi valentes morbo tentari non possunt, corpora possunt. Sed corporum offensiones sine culpa accidere possunt, animorum non item, quorum omnes morbi & perturbationes ex aspernatione rationis eveniunt. Itaque in hominibus solum existunt. Nam bestiæ simile quiddam faciunt, sed in perturbationes non incidunt.* Thus *Cicero* represents part of the (*e*) Stoical Subtilties about the Doctrine of Passions. What he says does not at all signify, that the Stoicks deprived Beasts of the Sentiments which we call Love, Hatred, Anger, &c. They acknowledged that Beasts do something like what Men do when they grow angry, and give themselves up to Pleasures, Fear, or some other Passion; but they pretended, that such a State was not really Love, or Hatred, or Anger, or, in general, a Passion in Beasts; for to be such, said they, Beasts must fall into it out of Contempt of Reason. But they are irrational, and consequently Reason is not their Rule, they do nothing which tends to swerve from that Rule, or to conform to it: Seeing therefore Passions arise in Men because they swerve from Reason, which is their Rule; and since the nature of Passions consists in being contrary to Reason, which Men ought to follow; it must be concluded, that what passes in Beasts is not a Passion, tho' it seems to be one. This is what the subtilties of the Stoicks came to. It was, properly speaking, a dispute about Words; and it is, at least, very certain, that they did not deny, that what the other Philosophers call'd Anger, or Love, or Fear in Beasts was a true and real Sentiment. They did not deny that a Dog knew his Master, and that a Sheep knew a Wolf, as a thing they ought to avoid. I will not make a Collection of Proofs, whereby the truth of that Fact might appear with the greatest Evidence. It is enough to say, That those who affected most to refute what was Paradoxical in the System of the Stoicks, never objected to them that they made meer Machines of Beasts. Would they have spared them about such a Doctrine?

II. I have already examin'd the Passage of *Plutarch*. We have already seen that it is obscure, and made up of discordant Parts. I add, that one may plainly observe in it an extream opposition between the Doctrine of *Diogenes* and that of Mr. *Descartes*. *Diogenes* said, that Beasts are made up of a Body and a Soul, and that if their Soul does not actually Feel and Reason, 'tis because the thickness of its Organs, and the great quantity of Humours reduce it to the Condition of Mad-men. Whereas *Descartes* acknowledges no sensitive Principle in Beasts; he says, They are only made up of Matter, and have a Body without a Soul. I observe, That if there was any probability in the Doctrine of *Diogenes*, it would be only about Oxen, Hogs, &c. but it appears ridiculous when it is applied to Swallows, Flies, Bees, and Ants, whose Organs are incomparably thinner and less moist than those of Men.

III. I shall insist somewhat longer upon the Passage of *Porphyry*. The Learned Bishop affirms, That that Philosopher refuted what *Diogenes* said of Beasts, That they had neither Understanding nor Feeling; but it is certain, that *Porphyry* refutes no body, who had said that they are Insensible. His Silence is a formal proof, that no body had yet vented such a Paradox; for there being nothing more contrary to the Design of *Porphyry's* Work, he had not failed to refute that Hypothesis. He was about to prove, that Men should not eat the Flesh of Beasts; he found several Inconveniencies in it, and, amongst others, (*f*) that it is an Introduction to Cruelty. He gathered together as many Answers as he could get, to the Objections of his Adversaries: But was there any Objection so strong as this, *viz.* That Beasts have no Feeling? Is it not certain, that this being supposed, there would be no more Cruelty (*g*) in killing an Ox, than in plucking out Turneps? Here is another Observation which perswades me, that *Porphyry* had not heard of that Paradox, which 'tis pretended that he refuted. He lays down, as a Principle generally approved, (*h*) that Beasts feel; from whence he draws this Consequence, (*i*) *They are therefore Rational*; and he finds in that Consequence, the most specious Arguments he can alledge to defend his Opinion. He proposes this Objection to himself, (*k*) *Seeing the Animal Nature includes some Rational Subjects, it must also include some that are Irrational*; and he answers as *Plutarch* does, or rather he transcribes, word for word, three or four Pages of *Plutarch*, without naming him. What he steals from him, contains, amongst other things, what has been seen above in the Remark *E*. They are two Passages which demonstratively prove, That all the Philosophers of that time believed, that there are no Insensible Animals. *Amyot* has so ill translated the first, that it is impossible to understand the meaning of it: he has been more successful in the second. I shall set down his words, and I shall say, by and by, why I do it in this place. " (*l*) As for those who speak so impertinently of " it as to say, that Beasts neither Rejoice nor grow " Angry, nor Fear, that the Swallow makes no Pro- " vision, that the Bee has no Memory, but that it " seems only that the Swallow has some Forecast, " that the Lion seems to be Angry, and the Hind " to quake with Fear: I don't know how they " would answer those who should say, that one " may as well affirm, that they neither See nor " Hear, and have no Voice, but that they seem only " to See and Hear, and have a Voice, and in short, " that they don't Live, but only seem to Live: for " the one is not more against plain Evidence than " the other.„ I have transcrib'd that Passage, to strengthen the Consequence I drew from it, *viz.* That the Doctrine of *Automata* was then look'd upon, not as a Doctrine which had ever been asserted by any Body, but as a Doctrine which the Stoicks would not be able to refute, if any one should undertake to make use of such an Objection, to beat them at their own Weapons. Perhaps it will be said, that *Plutarch* and *Porphyry* use the word λέγων, which is the Participle of the Present Tense: from

---

(*h*) By Scaliger. See Pardies, ib. n.72. p.140.

(*c*) Pet. Daniel Huetius Censura Philos. Cartesianæ c.8. p.208. Pari.1689.

(1) Cicer. Tuscul. l.4.

(2) Plut. de Placit. Philosoph. l. 5. c. 20.

(3) Porphy. de abst. ab anim. l.3.

(4) Proclus in Platon. Philos. l.3. c. 1.

(*d*) Cicer. Tuscul. l.4. fol. m.267. C.

(*e*) Habes ea, quæ de perturbationibus enucleatè disputant Stoici, quæ logica appellant, quia disseruntur subtilius. *Id. ib.*

(*f*) Porphyr. de Abstin. l.3. c.20. p. 125. Cantabr. 1655. See also cap. 19. p. 122.

(*g*) I do not say but Men would thereby use themselves to shed Blood, and grow by degrees less Compassionate, and more cruel to those of their Kind.

(*h*) Id. ib. c. 21.

(*i*) Id. ib. c. 1. p. 101. & c. 21, 22, & alibi.

(*k*) Id. ib. c. 7. p. 109.

(*l*) Plut. What Animals are most wary, p. m. 472. of Amyot's Version. Geneva 1621. in 8.

PEREZ

PEREZ (*Joseph*) in Latin *Peresius*, a Spaniſh Monk, and Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Salamanca*, took a great deal of Pains to illuſtrate the Hiſtory of *Spain*, eſpecially in what concerns the Order of the *Benedictins*. He publiſhed † ſome Eccleſiaſtical Diſſertations in the Year 1688, wherein he refuted ſome Things which Father *Papebroch* had advanced in his *Prolegomena* of *April*; he found him too rigid (Z) as to the Acts of St. *Eleutherus*, but he confeſt that it was well done to lay aſide many Apocryphal Writings which have been publiſhed concerning the Saints. 'Tis not long ‡ ſince he died *.

† *In Latin at Salamanca.*

‡ *I write this in September, 1697.*

* *Taken from Father Papebroch's Anſwer ad exhibitionem errorum art. 11. n. 232, 233.*

PERGAMUS,

whence it will follow that this Objection was actually made againſt the Stoicks. I anſwer that the French Tranſlator of *Plutarch* agrees herein with (h) *Xylander*, approved by the Learned (i) *Holſtenius*, that the Word λέγειν ought to be taken in the future conditional Tenſe. Grammar allows of it, and Hiſtory requires it in this Place; for *Plutarch* and *Porphyry*, thoſe two great Defenders of the Reaſon of Beaſts, had not failed to diſpute againſt the Doctrine of *Automata*, had they known that there was, or that there had been ſuch an Opinion. But they ſay nothing of it.

(h) *The Latin Tranſlator of Plutarch.*

(i) *In his Latin Tranſlation of Porphyry de Abſtinentia.*

IV. As to *Proclus*, it is true that he ſays that according to the Doctrine of *Plato*, the Rational Soul is properly a Soul, and that other Souls are but Images or Simulacres of a Soul; but he ſays at the very ſame time, that they partake of Knowledge and Life, and that Rational Animals are not the only Ones which partake of Underſtanding; that all other Animals which are endowed with Imagination, Memory and Feeling, do alſo partake thereof. Whereby he plainly teaches that Beaſts have a ſenſitive Soul, and ſuch in a Word as the Diſciples of *Ariſtotle* repreſent it to us. Tho' the Paſſage of *Proclus* is ſomewhat long, I ſhall ſet it down here, that the Reader may have no Doubts about the true Senſe of it, and that he may be ſure that it could not ſerve as a Prelude to the *Carteſian* Doctrine concerning Beaſts. (k) Καὶ ὅλως πολλαχοῦ δῆλός ἐστι καὶ ὁ Πλάτων ψυχὴν τὴν λογικὴν εἶναι τιθέμενος, τὰς δὲ ἄλλας, εἴδωλα ψυχῶν· καθ' ὅσον εἰσὶ καὶ αὗται νοεραὶ καὶ ζωτικαὶ, μετὰ τῶν ὅλων παράγουσαι τὰς περὶ τὰ σώματα ζωάς· νοῦ δὲ οὐ μόνον τὰ λογικὰ ζῶα μετέχειν συγχωρήσομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, ὅσα γνωστικὴν ἔχει δύναμιν· φαντασίαν λέγω, καὶ μνήμην, καὶ αἴσθησιν· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ ἐν Φιλήβῳ Σωκράτης, ἐπὶ τὸν νοερὸν ἄγει τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα στοῖχον. *Denique multis in locis conſtat & ipſum Platonem ſtatuere illam ratione præditam animam*, veram eſſe animam, *alias vero*, *animarum* eſſe *ſimulacra*, *quatenus ſunt & illæ intellectuales & vivificæ, cum ipſis univerſis producentes illas vitas, quæ circa ipſa corpora*, & in ipſis corporibus ſunt. *Concedemus autem non ſolum animalia ratione-prædita participare Mentem: ſed etiam alia, quæcumque cognoſcendi facultatem habent. Phantaſiam* autem *dico, & memoriam, & ſenſum. Quoniam & ille Socrates, qui in Philebo* diſputans introducitur, *hujuſmodi omnia ad intellectualem rerum ſeriem reducit.* That this may be the better underſtood, I ſhall obſerve, that according to the Platonick Doctrine, there is a Difference between the Soul and Underſtanding, which is not unlike the Difference which the Peripateticks acknowledge between *Genus* and *Species*. The Platonicks ſaid, that four Things anterior one to another, *viz.* Eſſence, Life, Underſtanding and the Soul, had preceded Bodies; that Life partakes of Eſſence; that the Underſtanding partakes of Life and Eſſence; and that the Soul partakes of Underſtanding, Life and Eſſence, and has Reaſon beſides as its particular Nature. This would be call'd in the Schools the Specifick Difference of the Soul. (l) Τεττάρων τοίνυν τούτων ὄντων πρὸ τῆς σωματικῆς ὑποστάσεως αἰτίων, οὐσίας, ζωῆς, νοῦ, ψυχῆς, ψυχὴ μὲν ἁπάντων μετέχει τῶν πρὸ αὐτῆς, τὸν μὲν λόγον, κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἰδιότητα λαχοῦσα, τὸν δὲ νοῦν, καὶ τὴν ζωὴν, καὶ τὸ ὄν, ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων αἰτίων. *Cum igitur hæ quatuor cauſæ ſint ante corpoream hypoſtaſin, Eſſentia, Vita, Mens, Anima; Anima quidem, particeps eſt omnium eorum, quæ ſunt ante ipſam, ipſam quidem rationem, ſecundum ſuam proprietatem ſortita, Mentem vero, & Vitam, & ipſum Ens ab antiquioribus cauſis* adepta. Thus the Soul may concur four ſeveral Ways in the diſpoſing of all Poſterior Beings. It extends its Influences as far as Bodies, in as much as it exiſts; it extends them as far as Plants, in as much as it lives; and as far as Beaſts, in as much as it partakes of Underſtanding; and as far as the firſt Natures that are ſuſceptible of Reaſon together with the other Attributes, in as much as it is Rational. As for the Underſtanding which precedes the Soul, and is the Fulneſs of Life, and even of Being, it influences three ſeveral Ways the Oeconomy of the Univerſe. It illuminates (m) by its ſpecifick Virtue whatever is endowed with the Faculty of Knowing: and it concurs in communicating Life to a greater Number of Things, and Eſſence to every Thing which Being has form'd. Beaſts are comprehended in the Claſs of Creatures that receive the Irradiation of its Virtue: which is manifeſt from the Words that *Proclus* makes uſe of, ſpeaking of what the Soul does, in as much as it partakes of Underſtanding. (n) Κατὰ μὲν τὸ ὂν τὸ ἑαυτῆς, τὰ πάντα (ὑφίστησι) καὶ μέχρι σωμάτων· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ζωὴν, πάντα τὰ λεγόμενα ζῆν, καὶ μέχρι τῶν φυτῶν· κατὰ δὲ τὸν νοῦν, πάντα τὰ γνωστικὴν ἔχοντα δύναμιν, καὶ μέχρι τῶν ἀλογωτάτων. *Secundum quidem ipſum ipſius Animæ Ens, omnia* (*conſtituit*) *vel uſque ad ipſa corpora. Secundum vero vitam, omnia quæ vivere dicuntur, & uſque ad ipſas plantas. Secundum vero Mentem, omnia quæ cognitione præditam facultatem habent, & uſque ad ipſa maxime bruta.*

(k) *Proclus in Platonis Theologiam lib. 3. c. 1. pag. 128. Hamburg. 1618. in fol. ex verſione Æmilii Porti.*

(l) *Id. ib. pag. 129.*

(m) Νῦ[illegible] *Mens* [illegible] *trifariam omnia* [illegible] *gerit, ip*[illegible]*us quidem intellectualis proprietate facultatem omnibus cognoſcendi vim habentibus per ſuam illuminationem largiens. Id. ibid.*

(n) *Id. ib.*

Nothing would be more eaſy than to heap up a great many Authorities, whereby it would clearly appear, that when *Plato* ſays that the Soul of Beaſts is an Image of a Soul, he pretended not to deprive them of Feeling. See *Plotinus* chap. 11. of the 1ſt Book of his 1ſt Ennead. Conſider alſo theſe Words of a Modern Platonick Philoſopher. (a) *Irrationalem animam Platonici non tam ſubſtantiale aliquid, quam accidentale quiddam eſſe putant, quaſi rationalium* VESTIGIUM *animarum, in quo* SENSUS *quidem ſint, ſed per diverſa corporis inſtrumenta diviſi atque patibiles.* I have given (b) elſewhere an Analyſis of ſome Paſſages of the 25th Diſſertation of a Platonick Philoſopher, who very clearly ſhews what diſtinguiſhes the Soul of a Beaſt from a Humane Soul; but he is contented to deprive Beaſts of Reaſon (c), without depriving them of Feeling.

(a) *Marcil. Ficin. in compendio in Timæum Platon. c. 41. p. m. 1031. operum Platonis.*

(b) *In the Rem. K. of the Article.* Paulicians.

(Z) *Too rigid as to the Acts of St.* Eleutherus.] St. *Eleutherus* Biſhop of *Æcana* (d), and St. *Anthia* his Mother, have been very famous in the Greek Church, ever ſince their Relicks were tranſmitted from *Rome* to *Conſtantinople*, under the Empire of *Arcadius*. Their Acts were compoſed by *Leontius* and *Theodulus*, who are ſaid to have lived at that time. But Father *Papebroch* is not of that Opinion, he thinks they are Suppoſititious, and proves it by many Reaſons. Nevertheleſs he has publiſh'd them under the 18th of *April*. His Cenſure ſeem'd to Father *Perez* to be too ſevere, and therefore he endeavoured to refute him, praiſing at the ſame time the vaſt Labours of the Jeſuites who publiſh the *Acta Sanctorum*, and reject many of them. *Pleraque enim* (*fatendum eſt*) *Sanctorum acta*, ſays he, *circumferebantur, partim apertè falſa, partim tenebris denſiſſimis obſita, quæ ab doctiſſimis patribus admodum falce juxta & face egere videbantur* (e). The Judgement which *Melchior Canus* gave about the Legendary Writers has been approved at laſt: he ſaid that the Lives of the Ancient Philoſophers had been written with more Judgment than thoſe of the Chriſtian Saints. They are now more nicely examin'd: the Acts of the New Saints are not fill'd with ſo many Abſurdities; yet they are not ſo carefully examin'd as they ought to be. Here is the remaining Part of a Paſſage which I have alledged (f) elſewhere: "But what is moſt "diverting of all, dear Goſſip, (ſaid an Attor- "ney's Wife of St. *Germain*'s Pariſh) is that as I was "going to the Church of the bare-footed *Carme-* "*lites*, I heard ſome Body cry the Life and Miracles "of my Lady St. *Thereſa*: I bought one to gain the "Indulgences. But when I came Home, my Hus-

---

(c) Ἄλογον, [illegible] ἀλλὰ [illegible] ἀσύνετον, [illegible] θεοῦ [illegible] ἄμοιρον, [illegible] ἐφημέρου [illegible] καὶ [illegible] ἰσχυρὸν μὲν τῷ σώματι, ἀμήχανον δὲ τῷ λογισμῷ. *Sine ratione aut prudentia, ita ut alterum in perniciem alterius natum, improvidum, divinæ virtutis expers, ſoloque ſenſu in diem gauderet & duceretur: corporis viribus excelleret, intellectu autem nihil poſſet. Maxim. Tyrius pag.* 258.

(d) *It was a City of* Italy.

(e) *Taken from* Daniel Papebroch, *in reſponſ. ad exhibitionem errorum p.* 303, 304.

(f) *In the Rem.* BB. *of the Art.* Hadrian VI.

" band

PERGAMUS, a City of *Aſia* in *Myſia*, became very famous under the Kings who ſucceeded *Philetærus*. Its Situation was very advantageous (*A*). It † was at firſt a Fortreſs built upon a Mountain. *Lyſimachus* one of *Alexander's* Succeſſors, ſhut up his Treaſures in it, and gave the Government of it to a Man, who taking hold of the preſent Junctures made (*B*) himſelf Maſter of it, as we ſhall ſee. (*C*) The ſtately

“ hand fell a reading, and was ſurprized to find “ that St. *Tereſa* had two Fathers, the firſt was King “ *Dom Bermude*, and the ſecond, *Alonſo Sanchez de* “ *Cepede* (*g*). 'Tis ſuppoſed that this Diſcourſe was made upon Occaſion of St. *Tereſa's* Canonization in the Year 1622. The Author of that Book was not of the Proteſtant Religion; he ſpeaks very ill of the Proteſtants.

(*A*) *Its Situation was very Advantageous.*] Eſpecially becauſe of the Conveniency of the Rivers: (*h*) *Longeque Clariſſimum Aſiæ Pergamum quod intermeat Selinus, præfluit Cetius profuſus Pindaſo monte*, ſays *Pliny*. I wonder that he ſaid nothing of the *Caicus*, another River which ran near *Pergamum*, and the only one mention'd by *Strabo* in the Deſcription of that City. (*i*) Παραρρεῖ δ' ὁ Κάϊκος καὶ τὸ Πέργαμον διὰ τοῦ Καΐκου πεδίου προσαγορευομένου, σφόδρα εὐδαίμονα γῆν διεξιών, σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ τὴν ἀρίστην τῆς Μυσίας. *Pergamum præterfluit Caicus per campum valdè opulentum, qui Caicus dicitur, ac ferè optimam partem Myſiæ.*

(*B*) *Made himſelf Maſter of it.*] His Name was *Philetærus*. He had been an Eunuch ever ſince his Infancy, by an Accident. His Nurſe, who carryed him to a Funeral Pomp, was ſo crowded by the Spectators, that the Child's Teſticles were altogether cruſhed. (*k*) Συνέβη γὰρ ἔν τινι ταφῇ θέας οὔσης, καὶ πολλῶν παρόντων, ἀποληφθεῖσαν ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ τὴν κομίζουσαν τροφὸν τὸν Φιλέταιρον ἔτι νήπιον, συνθλιβῆναι μέχρι τοσοῦδε, ὥστε πηρωθῆναι τὸν παῖδα. ἦν μὲν δὴ εὐνοῦχος. *Nam ſpectaculo quodam funebri, in magna hominum frequentia, nutrix cum geſtans etiamnum infantem in turba hominum deprehenſa, adeo fuit oppreſſa, ut pueri etiam colliderentur genitalia. Erat ergo eunuchus.* He was ſo well Educated that he made himſelf capable of Noble Employments; and he had without doubt the Reputation of an honeſt Man, ſince *Lyſimachus* truſted him with the Government of the Fortreſs wherein all his Treaſures were. *Philetærus* was very faithful to his Truſt, till he found himſelf perſecuted by the Calumnies of *Arſinoe*, *Lyſimachus's* Wife. From that time he began to withdraw himſelf from his Allegiance, and to take ſome Meaſures to maintain himſelf in the Independency which he had uſurped. The Junctures proved very favourable to him. *Lyſimachus* being troubled with Domeſtick Diviſions, was forced to put his Son *Agathocles* to Death. Nevertheleſs he was oppreſs'd by *Seleucus Nicator*; and at laſt kill'd by the Treachery of *Ptolemy Ceraunus*. During thoſe Broils *Philetærus* ſecured himſelf in the Poſſeſſion of *Pergamum*; he was ſo cunning as to amuſe with Words and Compliments the Party, which ſeem'd to him to be moſt formidable, ſo that he remain'd Maſter of the Caſtle and Money of *Lyſimachus* for the Space of twenty Years. His (*l*) Nephew *Eumenes* was his Heir, and enlarged his Dominions by invading ſeveral Places about *Pergamum*. He won a Battel near *Sardes* againſt *Antiochus* Son of *Seleucus*, and died having had that Dominion twenty two Years (*m*). *Attalus*, his firſt Couſin, who ſucceeded him, took the Title of King. See the following Article. Chronologers place the Beginning of *Philetærus's* Dominion in the Year of *Rome* 468. He (*n*) lived Eighty Years. Some ſay that his Mother's Name was *Boa* (*o*), and that ſhe was of *Paphlagonia*, a profeſt Curtezan, and a Player upon Inſtruments. He (*p*) was born at *Teium* on the *Euxine Sea*.

(*C*) *The ſtately Library.*] I begin this Remark with *Lomeierus's* Words: (*q*) *Attalus & Eumenes Pergami Reges nobilem bibliothecam conquiſitis undique ſupra ducenta millia exemplaribus, in hædinis pellibus, quæ ab hoc loco pergamena dictæ ſunt, deſcriptis, conſtruxiſſe feruntur.* He quotes *Pliny* in the 2d Chapter of the 35th Book; but we read only theſe Words in that Place, *an priores cœperint Alexandriæ & Pergami Reges, qui bibliothecas magno certamine inſtituere, non facile dixerim.* That Quotation out of *Pliny* is not therefore exact. 'Tis true that *Pliny* tells us in another Place, that the Art of dreſſing Skins to make uſe of them in the room of Paper, was found at *Pergamum*. (*r*) *Mox æmulatione circa bibliothecas regum Ptolemæi & Eumenis, ſupprimente chartas Ptolemæi, idem Varro membranas Pergami tradidit repertas.* We learn from thoſe Words that the King of *Egypt* and the King of *Pergamum* contended who ſhould ſet up the fineſt Library; and that it was the Reaſon why the King of *Egypt* forbad the Exportation of Paper, which occaſion'd the Invention of Parchment. St. *Jerome* ought to be quoted on this Subject: *Chartam*, ſays he (*s*), *defuiſſe non puto, Ægypto miniſtrante commercia, & ſi alicubi Ptolemæus maria clauſiſſet, tamen Rex Attalus membranas à Pergamo miſerat, ut penuria chartæ pellibus penſaretur. Unde & Pergamenarum nomen ad hunc uſque diem, tradente ſibi invicem poſteritate, ſervatum eſt.* As to the Number of Books mention'd by *Lomeierus*, we muſt conſult *Plutarch* (*t*), who ſays that *Mark Antony* preſented *Cleopatra* with the Library of *Pergamum*, which contain'd two hundred thouſand Volumes. Father *Jacob* in his Treatiſe of Libraries Pag. 28. of the firſt Part, ſays falſly that according to *Strabo* that Library contain'd two hundred and eighty thouſand Volumes. Mr. *le Gallois* (*v*) ſays more falſly ſtill, that according to *Pliny* they amounted to a greater Number. *Lipſius* raiſes an Objection, about the Words of *Plutarch*, which is unworthy of him. *Strabo*, ſays he (*w*), who writ under *Tiberius*, aſſures us that the Library of *Pergamum* was ſtill extant, and the ſame as it was when King *Eumenes* ſet it up. It had not been therefore tranſported into *Alexandria* to be given to *Cleopatra*; or it muſt be ſaid that *Auguſtus*, who undid moſt things which *Mark Antony* had done, cauſed it to be carried back to *Pergamum*; or that after it had been loſt under *Mark Antony*, there was another ſet up altogether like the Firſt. This is *nodum in ſcirpo quærere*; for *Strabo* does not mean that *Pergamum* had ſtill the Library and the other Imbelliſhments wherewith *Eumenes* adorned it; he means only that it had not been enlarged ſince *Eumenes*. That Prince, ſays he, made it ſuch as it is now. This is the Senſe of the Greek Words. (*a*) Κατεσκεύασε δ' οὗτος τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τὸ Νικηφόριον ἄλσει κατεφύτευσε, καὶ ἀναθήματα, καὶ βιβλιοθήκας, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τοσόνδε κατοικίαν τοῦ Περγάμου τὴν νῦν οὖσαν ἐκεῖνος προσεφιλοκάλησε. *Hic urbem adornavit, & lucum Nicephorium conſevit, ac donaria & bibliothecas & habitationis locum in Pergamo tantum quantus hodieque eſt conſtituit luculenter* (*b*). *Lipſius's* Objection againſt *Vitruvius* is better grounded. (*c*) *Reges Attalici magnis Philologiæ dulcedinibus inducti cum egregiam bibliothecam Pergami ad communem delectationem inſtituiſſent, tunc item Ptolemæus, infinito zelo cupiditatiſque incitatus ſtudio, non minoribus induſtriis ad eundem modum contenderat Alexandriæ comparare.* Theſe are the Words of *Vitruvius*, which plainly ſignify that *Ptolemy* (*d*) *Philadelphus* adorned the City of *Alexandria* with a fine Library in Emulation of that which the Kings of *Pergamum* had ſet up in the chief Town of their States. *Lipſius* is in the right to ſay that this is falſe: The Library of *Alexandria* was ſet up before the Kings of *Pergamum*, who made a Collection of Books, were born. This is not inconſiſtent with what *Pliny* ſays of the Emulation of *Ptolemy* and *Eumenes*; for without doubt the King of *Egypt*, who lived in the time of *Eumenes*, was ſorry to ſee that the King of *Pergamum* was able to obſcure the Glory of the *Alexandrian* Library. It is to be obſerved that the Emulation of thoſe Princes occaſioned many Impoſtures about Books, as *Galen* obſerves. (*e*) *Scribit Galenus, Comment. 1. in lib. Hippocr. de natura hum. inter Alexandriæ & Pergami reges, contentionem fuiſſe, quis plura veterum volumina compararet. Tum vero multos ab hominibus pecuniæ avidis falſis auctorum nominibus libros inſcriptos eſſe, quo vetuſtatis plurimum iis & auctoritatis accederet.* I have juſt now found in a fine Book, “ (*f*) That it “ is thought the Kings of *Pergamum* began to adorn “ their City with a *Library*, and that *Attalus* made “ his Library twenty two Years before that of *Alex-* “ *andria*. I do not criticize the Author of that Book; for, what he ſays that 'tis thought ſo, is certainly true of ſeveral People: Many Perſons may be of that Perſuaſion. I only ſay that they are miſtaken. The firſt of the Kings of *Pergamum*, who was named

† Strabo, l. 13. pag. 428, 429.

(*g*) *Caquet de l'Accouchée, Seconde journée, pag. 7.*

(*h*) Plin. l. 5. c. 30. p. m. 511.

(*i*) Strabo l. 13. p. 429.

(*k*) *Ib.* p. 428.

(*l*) *Son of* Eumenes, *Brother of* Philetærus.

(*m*) *Taken from* Strabo, *l.* 13. *pag.* 428, 429.

(*n*) *Lucian. in macrobiis.*

(*o*) *Athen. l.* 13. *pag.* 577. *B.*

(*p*) Strabo *l.* 12. *p.* 374.

(*q*) *Lomeier. de Bibliothecis c.* 6. *p.* 96.

(*r*) Plin. *l.* 13. *c.* 11. *p. m.* 78, 79.

(*s*) *Hieron. Ep. ad Chromat. Jovin. & Euſeb.*

(*t*) *Plut. in vit. Marci Antonii.*

(*v*) *Gallois, Treatiſe of Libraries, p.* 27.

(*w*) *Lipſ. Syntagm. de Biblioth. c.* 4.

(*a*) Strabo *l.* 13. *p.* 429.

(*b*) *So thoſe Words ought to be rendred, and not as* Lipſius *has done it, ubi ſupra*, Eumenes urbem inſtruxit, & donariis, ac Bibliothecis, uti nunc eſt, eleganter excoluit. *Mr.* le Gallois, *ubi ſup. adopts all thoſe Thoughts* of *Lipſius*, *without quoting him.*

(*c*) *Vitruv. in Præfat. libri* 7.

(*d*) *The remaining Part of the Words of* Vitruvius *cannot be underſtood of any other but* Ptolomæus Philadelphus.

(*e*) Harduin. *in* Plin. *l.* 35. *c.* 2. *pag.* 175.

(*f*) Jaquelot, *of the Exiſtence of God. p.* 126.

ſtately Library which the Kings of *Pergamum* ſet up, and the Temple of *Æſculapius* (D), were the chief Ornaments of that City. You will find in *Moreri* that the Inhabitants of *Pergamum* built * a Temple to the Emperor *Auguſtus*, and to the City of *Rome*, and that *Galen* was born there. Several other illuſtrious Men were born in that City. *Strabo* will tell ‡ you who they were. Add to them *Oribaſius* † a Phyſician of *Julian* the Apoſtate.

PERGAMUM (*Attalus* King of) ſucceeded in the Year 512. of *Rome Eumenes* his Couſin (A), who had been the Succeſſor of *Philetærus* their Uncle. He took the Title of King, (B) which they had not taken, and he thought he could do it without Arrogance, after the Victory he had obtained ‡ over the *Gauls*. He made

named *Attalus*, was born ſome Years after the Death of *Ptolemy Philadelphus* who began to ſet up the Library of *Alexandria*. The Author adds in the ſame Book, "(g) That the Library of the Kings "of *Pergamum* was tranſported to *Rome*. I wiſh an Author had been quoted for it.

(D) *And the Temple of Æſculapius.*] That God is ſurnamed *Pergamean* by (h) *Martial*, and a Roman Hiſtorian tells us that when an Inquiry was made at *Rome* into falſe *Aſyles*, the Proofs which the *Pergameans* produced for the *Aſyle* of *Æſculapius* were found valid. (i) *Conſules ſuper eas civitates quas memoravi, apud Pergamum Æſculapii compertum aſylum retulerunt: ceteros obſcuris ob vetuſtatem initiis niti.* That Paſſage of *Tacitus* puts one in Mind of the Inquiry into the Titles of thoſe who fally pretend to be Gentlemen, which is from time to time ſo neceſſary in *France*. But the Inquiry made about Places of Refuge was more important. So great an Abuſe had crept into the Græcian Cities, that the Magiſtrates could no longer exerciſe the Rigour of the Laws; all the Criminals and Debtors found Places of Refuge; the Mob protected them, and look'd upon it as a Duty of Religion. (k) *Crebreſcebat enim Græcas per urbes licentia atque impunitas aſyla ſtatuendi: complebantur templa peſſimis ſervitiorum: eodem ſubſidio obærati adverſum creditores, ſuſpectique capitalium criminum receptabantur. Nec ullum ſatis validum imperium erat coercendis ſeditionibus Populi, flagitia hominum ut cærimonias deum protegentis.* To remedy that Diſorder, it (l) was ordered that all the Cities, which had ſome priviledged Temples, ſhould ſend to *Rome* the Proofs of their *Aſyles*. Some of thoſe Cities (m) being ſenſible of the Uſurpation, renounced it. Many others relying upon ſome old Traditions, or ſome Services done to the *Roman* People, ſent their Deputies. The Senate gave 'em Audience; but being weary of the Stories which they told, and of the Factions that grew thereupon, they referred that Inquiry to the Conſuls. (n) *Audita aliarum quoque civitatum legationes. Quorum copia feſſi patres, & quia ſtudiis certabatur, conſulibus permiſere, ut perſpecto jure, & ſi qua iniquitas involveretur, rem integram rurſum ad Senatum referrent.* The Conſuls were not very rigid, they approved of ſeveral Titles of Nobility which were only grounded upon Chimera's; for Example, they admitted as an Authentick Proof what the *Epheſians* told them, that the Olive Tree, upon which *Latona* leaned when ſhe was delivered of *Apollo*, was ſtill extant. (o) *Eſſe apud ſe Cenchriam amnem, lucum Ortygiam, ubi Latonam partu gravidam & oleæ quæ tum etiam maneat adniſam, edidiſſe ea numina, deorumque monitu ſacratum nemus.* Judges would not be leſs indulgent at preſent, if every Pariſh was ſummoned to produce the Proofs of its Devotions and Relicks. Though it is well known how blindly the Heathens maintain'd their Traditions; yet People will not open their Eyes and ſee the Abſurdity of the Stories, which are told in all the Places, that boaſt of a priviledged Devotion.

Polybius will afford us as good a Reflection as that. (p) *Pruſias* having overcome *Attalus*, entred into *Pergamum*, and offered a pompous Sacrifice to *Æſculapius*, and then he return'd to his Camp. The next day he cauſed all the Temples to be plundered, and laid upon his Shoulders the Statue (q) of *Æſculapius* to whom he had offered ſome Sacrifices, and whom he had invoked the Day before. *Polybius* calls it the Action of a Furious and Mad-man. (r) Ἅμα μὲν θύειν ϗ διὰ τούτων ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὸ θεῖον προσκυνοῦντα ϗ λιπαροῦντα τὰς τραπέζας ϗ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἐξ-ὀκλὰξ, ὅπερ ὁ Προυσίας εἰώθει ποιεῖν, [illegible] [illegible] *Etenim ſimul victimas cædere, deoſque propitios orare, omnemque aram ac lapidem exquiſito quodam genere adorare & venerari flexis genibus & muliebri ſuperſtitione, quod Pruſias facere ſolebat, atque interim eadem ſima labefactare, eorumque everſione contumeliam diis facere, quis neget id eſſe rabie perciti hominiſque de ſtatu mentis deturbati?* I am ſure that *Polybius* would not have ſpoken ſo harſhly of thoſe who ſhould have plundered the Temples without having at any time worſhipped the Deities thereof. What he ſays that *Pruſias* entred into *Pergamum*, is conſiſtent with what *Diodorus Siculus* relates, that that Prince having loſt the Hopes of making himſelf Maſter of the Perſon of *Attalus*, fell a plundering the Temple of *Nicephorus*, which was not far from the City (s). But here is a better Argument againſt *Polybius*, will ſome ſay. King *Eumenes* declares expreſly, in the Speech he made to the Senate of *Rome*, that he was beſieged in *Pergamum*, and was ſo happy as to prevent the taking of the City. (t) *Quod miſerrimum eſt in bello, obſidionem paſſus ſum, Pergami incluſus cum diſcrimine ultimo ſimul vitæ regnique, liberatus deinde obſidione, cum alia parte Antiochus, alia Seleucus circa arcem regni mei caſtra haberent, relictis rebus meis tota claſſe ad Helleſpontum L. Scipioni Conſ. veſtro occurri, ut eum in trajiciendo exercitum adjuvarem.* I anſwer that *Polybius* and *Diodorus Siculus* ſay nothing of what happen'd under King *Eumenes*. They mention a Siege of *Pergamum*, which was made afterwards, and ſuſtained by *Attalus Philadelphus* againſt *Pruſias* King of *Bithynia*. See Appian (v).

(A) Eumenes *his Couſin.*] *Philetærus* had two Brothers, the Name of the Elder was *Eumenes*; the other's Name was *Attalus*. The Son of the Former had the ſame Name with his Father, and ſucceeded *Philetærus*. The Son of *Attalus* was call'd *Attalus*, and ſucceeded *Eumenes* (a). If Father *Labbe* (b) had read *Strabo* attentively, he would not have quoted him as having ſaid that *Attalus* was *Brother and Succeſſor* of *Eumenes*. *Moreri* (c) has tranſcribed that Fault. I wonder that Mr. *Menage* did not obſerve a Fault of *Diogenes Laertius* which *Valeſius* (d) had cenſured. That Hiſtorian of the Philoſophers ſays (e) that *Eumenes* was *Philetærus*'s Son. He ſhould have ſaid that he was his *Nephew*; as we find it in *Strabo* and *Athenæus*. I ſhall ſet down the Words of the Latter, becauſe they contain a curious Fact, viz. That *Eumenes* died by too much drinking. (f) ὑπὸ μέθης ἀπέθανεν Εὐμένης ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ὁ Φιλεταίρου τοῦ Περγάμου βασιλεύσαντος ἀδελφιδοῦς, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Κτησικλῆς ἐν τρίτῳ χρόνων. *Eumenes Pergamenus* (g) *Philetæri qui Pergami regnavit ex fratre nepos, ebrietate periit, ut refert Cteſicles libro tertio de temporibus.* Note that *Athenæus* uſes elſewhere (h) the ſame Word βασιλεύσας, ſpeaking of *Philetærus*.

(B) *The Title of King which they had not taken.*] *Strabo* ſays ſo in expreſs Words. (i) Ἀνηγορεύθη βασιλεὺς οὗτος πρῶτος νικήσας Γαλάτας μάχῃ μεγάλῃ. *Hic primus rex ſalutatus eſt cum magna pugna Galatas viciſſet.* *Polybius* ſaid the ſame thing before him: (k) Νικήσας γὰρ μάχῃ Γαλάτας, ὃ βαρύτατον ϗ μαχιμώτατον ἔθνος ἦν τότε κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ταύτην ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο, ϗ τότε πρῶτον αὑτὸν ἔδειξε βασιλέα. *Superatis enim prælio Gallis, quæ gens maxime terribilis ac bellicoſiſſima tum in Aſia erat, tum primum regium nomen palam ſibi adſcivit.* *Livy* is of the ſame Opinion: (l) *Victis deinde prælio uno Gallis quæ tum gens recenti adventu terribilior Aſiæ erat, regium aſcivit nomen cujus magnitudini ſemper animum æquavit.* Thoſe three Teſtimonies are to be preferred to the Authority of *Juſtin* and *Diogenes Laertius*; for 1. *Juſtin* has committed a Miſtake, which ſhews that he did not made an Alliance with the *Romans* * at a time when such a Friend was very necessary to them; for besides that they were to oppose *Annibal* in *Italy*, they were also obliged to make head against *Philip* King of *Macedonia* who had declared himself to be their Enemy. *Attalus* took the Part of the *Romans* with great Zeal, and continued their Friend as long as he lived. He undertook a Journey to *Athens*, to prejudice the King of *Macedonia*. The *Athenians* did him (C) great Honours. He made another Journey into *Greece* β being above Seventy Years of Age, to procure some Allies to the *Romans* against the King of *Macedonia*. He harangued the (D) *Thebans* with so much force to engage them in that League, that his Ardour, somewhat too great for an old Man, was the Cause of a *Vertigo*, or Defluxion, which hindred him from making an End of his Speech. He fell into a Swoon in the middle of his Discourse, and having taken shipping some days after he returned to *Pergamum*, where he dyed in a short time γ, after he had reigned δ 44 Years. He ζ lived Seventy two Years. That Prince loved ‡ Philosophers, and made use of his Riches like a Man of Honour, and a great Soul. He was faithful to his Allies, he lived very well (E) with his Wife, and took Care that his four Sons should have a very good Education ɥ. EUMENES the Eldest of all succeded him. He was a Man of a weak Constitution, but he had a Great Soul which supplied the Weakness of his Body. He loved Glory above all Things, he was Magnificent, and he heaped up Benefits upon many *Græcian* Cities, and private Men. He very much inlarged his Territories, and was only beholden to his Industry and Prudence for it. He knew so well how to keep his Brothers (F) to their Duty, that they concurred

---

* So ſays *Tacitus*, *l. 4. c. 37.* Cum divus Auguſtus ſibi atque urbi Romæ templum apud Pergamum ſiſti non prohibuiſſet.

‡ Strabo *l. 13. pag. 430, 440.*

† *Eunapius in vita Oribaſii.*

‡ *See the Remark B.*

(g) *Id. ib. p. 127.*

(h) *Mart. Epigr. 17. lib. 9.*

(i) *Tacit. Annal. l. 3. c. 63. ad ann. 775.*

(k) *Id. ib. c. 60.*

(l) Igitur placitum ut mitterent civitates jura, atque legatos. *Id. ibid.*

(m) Quædam quod falſo uſurpaverant ſponte omiſere: multæ vetuſtis ſuperſtitionibus, aut meritis in populum Romanum fidebant. *Id. ibid.*

(n) *Id. ib. cap. 63.*

(o) *Id. ib. c. 61.*

(p) Πρεσίας μετὰ τὸ νικῆσαι τὸν Ἄτταλον, μετὰ τὸ παρελθεῖν πρὸς τὸ Πέργαμον. Pruſias victo Attalo, Pergamum ingreſſus. *Polybius in excerptis à Valeſio editis p. 169.*

(q) *An admirable Piece of* Phylomachus, περιβόητος ὑπὸ Φυλομάχου κατεσκευασμένον. *Id. ib.* Diodorus, *ubi infra, calls him* Phyromachus: *'Tis the Name of an excellent Statuary who flouriſhed in the* 120 *Olympiad according to* Pliny *l. 34. c. 8.*

(r) *Polyb. ib.*

(s) *Diodorus Sicul. in Excerpt. à Valeſio publicatis p. 336. He obſerves that Pruſias took away all the Gods, and amongſt others Æſculapius.*

(t) Liv. *l. 37. p. 711.*

(v) *Appian. in Mithridat. circa init.*

(a) Strabo *l. 13. p. 429.*

(b) Labbe *French Chronolog. tom. 2. p. 300. ad an. Rom. 512.*

(c) *In his Article of* Eumenes.

(d) *Hen. Valeſ. not. ad excerpta Polybii. pag. 19.*

(e) Diog. *Laert. l. 4. in Arceſilao n. 48.*

(f) *Athen. l. 10. pag. 445.*

(g) *There is* Attali *in* Dalechampius's *Tranſlation.*

(h) *Athen. l. 13. p. 557.*

(i) Strabo *ubi ſup.*

(k) *Polyb. l. 18. in excerptis Valeſianis pag. 103.*

(l) Liv. *l. 32. pag. 610.*

not carefully inquire into the Truth of the Matter. He says that *Eumenes* was King of *Bithynia*. This might be alledged by those who should deny that our *Attalus* was the First who took the Title of a King. They might say that *Eumenes*, his Predecessor, is stiled a King (m) by *Justin*. But, I shall answer, Did he command in *Bithynia*? Did he not command in *Pergamum*? Can *Justin* be excused, unless he has recourse to some Criticks, who read *Nicomedes* instead of *Eumenes* in that Passage? 2. *Diogenes Laertius* does not treat Historically of *Pergamum*, and mentions *Eumenes* only accidentally, and therefore we have no Reason to believe that he carefully inquired whether that Prince took the Title of a King; it was enough for him to know that *Eumenes* had a Sovereign Authority in *Pergamum*, which made him use an Expression which signifies Royalty. He says (n) that *Eumenes* having heaped up Benefits upon *Arcesilaus*, was the only King to whom that Author dedicated some Books. The Passage of *Athenæus*, which I have quoted, ought not to be objected. We read in it that *Philetærus* reigned in *Pergamum*; but this does not signify that he took effectually the Title of a King. Read the Modern Historians of the Dukes of *Savoy*, the Electors of *Bavaria*, or *Brandenburg*, &c. and you will often find in them the Words *Reign*, and *to Reign*, which denote only an Authority exercised under the Name of a Duke, or an Elector. The Medals which give the Title of a King to *Philetærus*, (o) if we believe *Goltzius*, are a better Proof against *Strabo*, if they are not false. Those which Mr. (p) *Spanheim* has seen, do not give him that Title. To conclude, *Attalus* got a Victory over the *Gauls* (q) the last Year of the 134. Olympiad. It was the 512 Year of *Rome*.

(C) *The* Athenians *did him great Honours.*] The whole Town, Men and Women, and the Priests in their Habits went to meet him. The Gods were like to be forced to do him the same Honour. *Livy* affords me that Thought: (r) *Rex Piræeum, renovandæ firmandæque cum Atheniensibus societatis causa trajecit. Civitas omnis obviam effusa cum conjugibus ac liberis, sacerdotes cum insignibus suis intrantem urbem, ac dii propè ipsi exciti sedibus suis exceperunt.* He observes that *Attalus* thought it became his Dignity to communicate his Proposals in Writing, rather than expose his Modesty to the Necessity of setting forth his Services, and of receiving a vast Number of Praises from a flattering People. The Historian expresses it admirably well: (s) *In concionem extemplo populus vocatus, ut rex quæ vellet, coràm ageret: deinde ex dignitate magis visum, scribere eum, de quibus videretur, quàm præsentem aut referendis suis in civitatem beneficiis erubescere, aut significationibus acclamationibusque multitudinis, assentatione immodica pudorem onerantis.* The War was concluded against *Philip* King of *Macedonia*. It was then proposed to add a New Tribe to the Ten, and to call it *Attalis*, in the Honour of King *Attalus*: (t) *Ingenti consensu bellum adversus Philippum decretum. Honores regi primùm Attalo immodici, deinde & Rhodiis habiti: tum primùm mentio illata de tribu, quam Attalida appellarent, ad decem veteres tribus addenda.*

(D) *He harangued the* Thebans *with so much Force.*] This is so singular, that it deserves to be read in *Plutarch*: Here are his Words: (v) Καὶ μέντοι παρελθὼν ὁ Τίτος, ὡς οὐκ ἔχων τὴν πόλιν, ἐπειδὴν ἐκάλει τὰ Ῥωμαίων Ἀττάλου τοῦ βασιλέως συναγορεύοντος αὐτῷ καὶ συνεξορμῶντος τοὺς Θηβαίους. ἀλλ' Ἄτταλος μὲν (ὡς ἔοικεν) τὸ γῆρας προθυμότερον ἑαυτὸν τῷ Τίτῳ ῥήτορα παρασχεῖν φιλοτιμούμενος, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λέγειν προσπεσόντος ἰλίγγου τινὸς ἢ ῥεύματος, ἄφνω τὴν αἴσθησιν ἐπιληφθεὶς ἔπεσεν, καὶ μετὰ οὐ πολὺ ταῖς ναυσὶν εἰς Ἀσίαν ἀποκομισθεὶς ἐτελεύτησεν. *Titus* (w) *inde, quasi urbe non potiretur, affatus eos est, suadens ut in partes Romanorum discederent adjuvante Attalo & Thebanis incitante. Sed Attalus quidem, quum præter ætatem, (ut mihi quidem videtur) majore contentione oratorem Quintio præstare vellet, & vertigine quadam vel pituita esset in media oratione correptus, collapsus est, nec multis diebus post in Asiam navibus devectus expiravit.* You may see in *Livy* (x) how *Eumenes* the Son of *Attalus*, represented that Accident to the Senate of *Rome*, after he had set forth in a few Words the Services which his Father had done to the Common-wealth.

(E) *Lived very well with his Wife.*] She was of *Cyzicus*, and of a mean Extraction; her Name was *Apollonis*. She had the Title of a Queen, and kept it as long as she lived, not by the (y) Address of a Curtezan, but by her Modesty, Probity, Prudence and Gravity. She loved her four Sons tenderly, and she loved them to the last, tho' she out-lived her Husband several Years. This Clause is not superfluous; for it happens but too often, that Queens Dowagers raise Cabals to the Prejudice of their Children. King *Attalus* her Son had a great Respect for her; it was a Thing very much admired by the Inhabitants of *Cyzicus*, when they saw him and his Brother lead their Mother by the Hand to all the Temples, and other Places of the City. They got a thousand Praises and good Wishes for it (z). No Body would be much surprized now to see such a Thing in the West.

(F) *He knew so well how to keep his Brothers to their Duty.*] *Polybius* giving us the Character of *Eumenes* Marks, as his last distinguishing Stroke, that he behaved himself so wisely towards his Brothers, that they proved the Instruments of the Safety of his Reign. (a) Ἀδελφοὺς ἔχων τρεῖς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ πρᾶξιν πάντας τελείους συνέσχε πειθαρχοῦντας αὐτῷ, καὶ δορυφοροῦντας καὶ σώζοντας τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ἀξίωμα. τοῦτο δὲ σπανίως εὕροι τις ἂν γεγονός. *Fratres cum haberet tres & ætate & industria pollentes, eos in officio omnes continuit & morigeros custodesque regni ac dignitatis suæ habuit satellites. Quod raro admodum contigisse reperias.* He is in the right to say that it is a rare Thing: History is full of cruel Wars, wherein Princes have been engaged against their Brothers or their own Children. So that they, who have carefully read it, may be sensible, "That "it is more difficult for a King, who has Brothers "and Children to govern his Family, than to go-

"vern

---

* In the year 552. See Livy l. 26. p. m. 451.

β Liv. l. 33. p. 610.

γ In the year of Rome 556.

δ Liv. ib. Polyb. in excerptis Valesianis pag. 103.

ζ Polyb. ibid.

‡ See the Article Lacydes.

ɥ Ex eodem Polybio ibid.

(m) Rex Bithyniæ Eumenes. Just. l. 27. c. 3.

(n) Ἐχορήγει αὐτῷ πολλὰ Εὐμένης ὁ τοῦ Φιλεταίρου. διὸ καὶ τούτῳ μόνῳ τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων προσεφώνει. Diogen. Laert. l. 4. n. 38.

(o) Vid. Vales. not. ad excerpta Polyb. p. 19.

(p) Ezech. Spanheim. de præst. & usu Numism. p. 468.

(q) Valesius ub. sup.

(r) Tit. Liv. l. 31. pag. 572.

(s) Id. ib.

(t) Id. ib. pag. 573.

(v) Plut. in vit. Flaminii pag. 372. B.

(w) That is to say, Titus Quinctius Flamininus who was then Consul.

[x] T. Liv. l. 37. pag. 710, 711.

(y) Οὐχ ἑταιρικὴν προσφερομένη πιθανότητα. Non meretriciis illecebris. Polyb. ubi infra.

(z) Polyb. in excerpt. Valesian. p. 113, 114.

(a) Polyb in except. à Valesio editis pag. 159.

curred with him in promoting the publick Good, and never entered upon any factious Deſign †. He kept inviolably his Alliance with the *Romans*, which proved very uſeful to him. He himſelf * brought a great Fleet to the Conſul *Flaminius* during the War againſt *Philip* King of *Macedonia*. He ſtirr'd the *Romans* to make War againſt *Antiochus*, and found by Experience that the ‡ Principles upon which his Advice was grounded were very juſt; for he was gratified with many Provinces (G), which were taken from

“ vern his Kingdom. The preventing of Civil Wars requires troubleſome and continual Precautions, and if a Prince does not prevent 'em, how careful muſt he be to put an end to them! How great are the Troubles and Dangers he is expoſed to? The Politicks of the Turks are horrible, they barbarouſly ſacrifice to the reigning Prince, the Life or the Liberty of all his Brothers; but it is a neceſſary Evil: for otherwiſe that vaſt Empire would be expoſed to the moſt terrible Deſolations. See the Hiſtorical Meditations of *Camerarius*, Chap. 88. of the 1ſt Volume. However let us not look upon the Union, wherein King *Eumenes* kept his Brothers, as a Happineſs, but rather as the Effect of a conſummate Prudence, kept up by a great Merit. It was ſo much the more difficult to keep them to their Duty, becauſe they were ſurrounded with ill Examples. *Syria* and *Egypt* were cruelly torn by Diſputes about the Succeſſion. The Royal Family of *Macedonia* was imbrued with Blood by reaſon of the Jealouſy of Authority. It was an abominable Age. There was nothing to be ſeen but horrible Attempts of Brothers upon Brothers, and of Fathers upon Children, or of Children upon Fathers. This might very well tempt the Brothers of the King of *Pergamus*. Their Mother was very much in the right to think her ſelf happy to ſee them ſo well united. (c) Ἀπολλωνίδα τὴν Κυζικηνὴν, Εὐμένους δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως μητέρα, καὶ τριῶν ἄλλων, Ἀττάλου καὶ Φιλεταίρου καὶ Ἀθηναίου, λέγουσι μακαρίζειν ἑαυτὴν ἀεὶ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς χάριν ἔχειν, οὐ διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον, οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι τοὺς τρεῖς υἱοὺς ἑώρα τὸν πρεσβύτατον δορυφοροῦντας, κἀκεῖνον ἐν μέσοις αὐτοῖς δόρατα καὶ ξίφη φοροῦσιν ἀδεῶς διαιτώμενον. *Apollonidem Cyzicenam, Eumenis regis matrem ac trium præterea filiorum Attali, Philetæri, & Athenæi, prædicaſſe ſubinde ſe beatam, diiſque egiſſe ajunt gratias, non propter divitias vel imperium, ſed quòd tres filios videret natu maximi eſſe ſatellites, eumque in medio ipſorum gladios haſtaſque ferentium abſque metu verſari.* *Attalus*, the eldeſt of the three Brothers, who did not reign, had the greateſt ſhare in the great Affairs. I confeſs that he expreſt a great Love to *Eumenes* on ſeveral Occaſions. Knowing that he was very much afflicted by reaſon of what the Cities (d) of *Peloponneſus* had done, he uſed his utmoſt endeavours to perſwade them to give him Satisfaction for it (e). He call'd a City (f) *Eumenia*, in Honour of his Brother: In a Word, he was ſurnamed *Philadelphus*. Nevertheleſs the King did ſuſpect him, and not without Reaſon, as we find it in *Livy*. That Hiſtorian tells us that after the (g) Conqueſt of *Macedonia*, *Attalus*, who had ſerved the Romans very well in that famous Expedition, came to *Rome* with ſecret Hopes of ſupplanting his Brother, and that he would have manifeſted the whole Intrigue, had not the Phyſician who attended him, diſſwaded him from it. That Phyſician was given him by *Eumenes*, and he was ordered to obſerve him. He was properly the King's Spie; and the King's Suſpicion was well grounded. (h) *Suberat & ſecreta ſpes honorum præmiorumque ab ſenatu, quæ vix ſalva pietate ejus contingere poterant. Erant enim quidam Romanorum quoque non boni authores qui ſpe cupiditatem ejus elicerent: eam opinionem de Attalo & Eumene Romæ eſſe, tanquam de altero Romanis certo amico, altero nec Romanis, nec Perſi fido ſocio. Itaque vix ſtatui poſſe, utrum quæ pro ſe, an quæ contra fratrem petiturus eſſet, ab ſenatu magis impetrabilia forent: adeo univerſos omnia & huic tribuere, & illi vero negare. Eorum hominum (ut res docuit) Attalus erat, qui quantum ſpes ſpopondiſſet cuperent, ni unius amici prudens monitio velut frænos animo ejus geſtienti ſecundis rebus impoſuiſſet. Stratius cum eo fuit medicus, ad idipſum à non ſecuro Eumene Romam miſſus ſpeculator rerum, quæ à fratre agerentur, monitorque fidus ſi decedi fide vidiſſet. Is ad occupatas jam aures ſollicitatumque jam animum cum veniſſet, aggreſſus tempeſtivis temporibus rem prope prolapſam reſtituit.* I don't ſet down the ſolid Reaſons which that Phyſician made uſe of to keep *Attalus* to his Duty. I ſhall only ſay that they deſerve to be read in *Livy*, and that it is likely this was not the leſs moving. He repreſented to *Attalus* (i) that King *Eumenes* was an old Man and had no Children, ſo that he might in a ſhort time lawfully ſucceed him. It is neceſſary to know that the Son of *Eumenes* had not been legitimated. Some things happen'd three or four Years before, which ſhewed that Fraternal Love and Ambition ſtruggled together in the Heart of *Attalus*. King *Eumenes* having been dangerouſly wounded with two Stones thrown at him near *Delphi*, was carried to the Iſle of *Ægina*. His Wounds were dreſs'd ſo ſecretly, that it was ſcarce known by any Body whether he was alive. So that it was reported every where that he was dead. *Attalus* believed it ſooner than a good Brother ought to have done. He ſpoke like a King to his Siſter-in-law, *Eumenes*'s Wife, and to the Governour of the Citadel. In a Word he ſhewed himſelf too haſty to ſucceed. *Eumenes* was not ignorant of it, and tho' he was reſolved to bear it without expreſſing any Reſentment, he could not forbear upbraiding his Brother, at the very firſt Converſation, with his exceſſive Impatience of marrying the Queen. *Livy* ſays no more of it; but the Truth is, if we believe ſome other Authors, that *Attalus* lay effectually with the Queen. (k) *Compoſitum jam ſui regem, amici poſtero die deferunt ad navem: inde Corinthum, à Corintho per iſthmi jugum (l) navibus traductis, Æginam trajiciunt. Ibi adeo ſecreta ejus curatio fuit, admittentibus neminem, ut fama mortuum in Aſiam perferret. Attalus quoque celerius quàm dignum concordia fraterna erat, credidit. Nam & cum uxore fratris, & præfecto arci, tanquam jam haud dubius regni hæres eſt locutus. Quæ poſtea non fefellere Eumenem: & quanquam diſſimulare & tacitè habere id patique ſtatuerat, tamen in primo congreſſu non temperavit, quin uxoris petendæ præmaturam feſtinationem fratri objiceret. Romam quoque fama de morte Eumenis perlata eſt.* *Plutarch* has turned the whole Matter into a Panegyrick both upon *Eumenes* and *Attalus*: he wanted to give it ſuch a Turn, for he was writing a Treatiſe of Brotherly Love, wherein the Royal Family of *Pergamum* ought to give a good Example, after what he had already ſaid (m) of the Mother of the four Brothers. For my part, I find the Account, which *Livy* gives of it, more likely. *Plutarch* relates the Matter thus: (n) “ Having heard that
“ he came from the Sea towards the City to con-
“ ſult the Oracle of *Apollo*, they aſſaulted him be-
“ hind, and threw ſome great Stones at him, which
“ fell upon his Head and Neck, and ſo ſtunn'd him
“ that he ſwoon'd away and fell to the Ground, ſo
“ that 'twas thought he was dead, and the Report
“ of it went every where, and even ſome of his
“ Servants and Friends, made all the haſte they
“ could to bring the News of it to *Pergamum*, as of a
“ thing at which they had been preſent. Where-
“ fore *Attalus*, the eldeſt of his Brothers, who was
“ an honeſt Man, and had always behaved himſelf
“ more faithfully and loyally towards his Brother
“ than any other, was not only proclaimed King,
“ and crowned with the Royal Diadem, but, which
“ is more, he married Queen *Stratonice* his Brother's
“ Wife, and lay with her. But afterwards when
“ the News came that *Eumenes* was alive, and that
“ he was a coming; he laid down his Diadem, re-
“ took his Javelin, which he uſed to carry to guard
“ his Brother, and went to meet him with the other
“ Guards. The King received him kindly, ſaluted
“ and embraced the Queen with great Honour and
“ great Careſſes; and having lived a long time
“ ſince without any complaint or ſuſpicion, he died
“ at laſt, leaving his Kingdom and his Wife to his
“ Brother *Attalus*. But what did *Attalus* do after
“ his Death? He would never put to Death any of
“ his Children which he had by his Wife *Stratonice*,
“ and they were many; but he bred up and educa-
“ ted the Son of his deceaſed Brother, till he came
“ to be a Man, and then he himſelf put the Royal
“ Diadem on his Head, and call'd him King.

(G) *Gratified with many Provinces, which were taken from* Antiochus.] That Prince having been forced from *Antiochus*, after β the Battel of *Magneſia*. He ſtirr'd alſo the *Romans* to make War againſt *Perſeus* King of *Macedonia* γ, and in order to it, he took a Journey to *Rome*. As he was returning to *Pergamum* by the Way of *Delphi*, where he deſign'd to offer a Sacrifice, δ he was dangerouſly wounded by ſome Aſſaſſins whom *Perſeus* had ſuborned: he did not die of it, but the Report of his Death went as far as *Pergamum*. He did ſomewhat conceal his Reſentment againſt his Brother *Attalus*, ε who appeared a little too haſty to ſucceed him. He aſſiſted not at the War againſt *Perſeus* ζ, and ſome ſay that he was ſuſpected by the *Romans*. We muſt not forget that he loſt a Battel at Sea by a Stratagem (H) of *Annibal*, and that he was like to periſh in it. He was then at War with *Pruſias* King of *Bithynia*. He died (I) very old in the Year 596, leaving θ the Tuition of his Son, and the Adminiſtration of the Kingdom to his Brother ATTALUS. The Latter, properly ſpeaking, reigned till he died. He began his Regency with a glorious Action, which was to ‡ re-eſtabliſh *Ariarathes* in the Kingdom of *Cappadocia*. He ſignalized himſelf by ſeveral other Actions, and died in the Year 616. and then ATTALUS his Pupil reigned alone. (K) He was ſurnamed *Philometor*, and was a great Lover (L) of Agriculture, and even writ ſome Books about it. He † was very cruel. He ſent very

---

† Ex ex-cerpt. Polyb. ib. p. 155. & ſeq.

* † Liv. l. 34. pag. 455.

‡ See Liv. l. 35. pag. 551.

(c) Plut. de fraterno amore. p. 480. C.

(d) They pull'd down the Statues of Eumenes by a publick Decree. Polyb. in excerpt. p. 122.

(e) Polyb. ib.

(f) Stephan. voce. Εὐμένεια.

(g) In 585.

(h) T. Liv. l. 45. pag. [illegible]

(i) Haud ambiguum propediem regnaturum eum infirmitate ætateque Eumenis eſſet nullam ſtirpem liberûm habentis. (Nec dum enim agnoverat eum, qui poſtea regnavit.) Quid attineret vim afferre rei ſua ſponte mox ad eum adventuræ! Id. ib.

(k) Id. lib. 42. p. 815.

(l) Here is a remarkable Fact. There was a Ship carried by Land from one of the Gulphs of Peloponneſus to the other. The ſame has been done on ſome other occaſions.

(m) See above let. c.

(n) Plut. of Brotherly Love. p. 489. of the Greek and Latin Edit.

to accept the Peace upon ſuch Terms as the Romans impoſed on him, all the Allies of the Romans endeavoured to have a Share in his Spoils. Their Demands were heard, and they were anſwered: (a) *Decem legatos more majorum ſenatum miſſurum ad res Aſiæ diſceptandas, componendaſque: ſummam tamen hanc fore, ut cis Taurum montem quæ intra regni Antiochi fines fuiſſent, Eumeni attribuerentur, præter Lyciam Cariamque, uſque ad Mæandrum amnem, ea civitatis Rhodiorum eſſent. Cæteræ civitates Aſiæ, quæ Attali ſtipendiariæ fuiſſent, eadem Eumeni vectigal penderent: quæ vectigales Antiochi fuiſſent, ea liberæ atque immunes eſſent.* After ſo formal a Teſtimony it is not neceſſary to hear *Cicero*: Nevertheleſs I ſhall quote him to obſerve a Fault which he has committed: *Antiochum illum magnum*, ſays he (b), *majores noſtri magna belli contentione terra marique ſuperatum intra montem Taurum regnare juſſerunt: Aſiam qua illum multarunt, Attalo ut is regnaret in ea, condonaverunt.* *Cicero* is miſtaken about the Name of the King who obtained ſo noble a Preſent from the Roman People. It was *Eumenes* and not *Attalus*, who received it. I know not whether (c) any Commentator has obſerved that Miſtake; but I have juſt now conſulted two, who inſtead of remarking it, have committed another Fault: ATTALO, ſays *Manutius*, (d) *Eumenis fratri, qui eam poſtea populo Romano moriens teſtamento legavit.* (e) Another ſays, ATTALO *Pergami Regi qui moriens populum Romanum fecit hæredem.* It is not true that *Attalus*, Brother of *Eumenes*, received from the Roman People the Provinces which were taken from *Antiochus*, and it is falſe that he reſtored them to the Roman People by his laſt Will. He, who choſe ſuch an Heir, was *Attalus* Son of *Eumenes*. Father *Abram* has committed another Fault; he thinks that *Cicero* ſpeaks of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and that (f) the ſame *Antiochus* was overcome by *Lucius Scipio*. The Miſtake of *Manutius* is but a Copy of that of *Valerius Maximus*. (g) *Liberalis Populus Romanus magnitudine muneris, quod Attalo regi Aſiam dedit dono. Sed Attalus etiam teſtamenti æquitate gratus, qui eandem Aſiam Populo Romano legavit.*

Note, That when I writ this Article, the Edition of *Cicero*'s Orations, which Mr. *Gravius* has publiſhed, was not yet come out. It came out ſince, (h) I have conſulted it as I was reading this again before I gave it to the Printers, and I have found that the Miſtakes of Father *Abram*, *Manutius*, and *Cicero* have been obſerved by Mr. *Gravius*. See Page 78, and 79 of the 5th Volume.

(H) *He loſt a Battel at Sea by a Stratagem of* Annibal.] *Antiochus* being not able to protect *Annibal* againſt the Romans, who would have him to deliver him up to them, adviſed him to run away. *Annibal* retired into the Iſle of *Crete*, and then to the Court of *Pruſias* King of *Bithynia*, and perſwaded him to break the Peace which the Romans had eſtabliſhed between him and our *Eumenes*. The Conſequences of that Rupture proved at firſt prejudicial to *Pruſias*; he was beaten by Land, and obliged to try whether a Sea-fight would be more favourable to him (i). He won the Battel at Sea by this Means. *Annibal* cauſed all manner of Snakes to be ſhut up in Earthen Pots, and order'd that thoſe Pots ſhould be thrown into the Enemies Ships. That Order was obeyed, and the Victory got by it; for *Eumenes*'s Men were frighted to ſee themſelves ſurrounded with Snakes. (k) *Cum Pruſias terreſtri bello ab Eumene victus eſſet, & prælium in mare tranſtuliſſet, Annibal novo commento auctor victoriæ fuit. Quippe omne ſerpentium genus in fictiles lagenas conjici juſſit, medioque prælio in naves hoſtium mittit. Id primum Ponticis ridiculum viſum, fictilibus dimicare, qui ferro nequeant. Sed ubi ſerpentibus repleri naves cœpere, ancipiti periculo circumventi, hoſti victoriam ceſſere.* *Cornelius Nepos* relates it more at large, and obſerves that (l) the chief Deſign of *Annibal* was to deſtroy *Eumenes*, and therefore it was neceſſary to know what Ship he was in. It was diſcovered by means of a Sloop, which was diſpatched under pretence of carrying a Letter to him; afterwards *Annibal* commanded the Officers of the Ships to apply themſelves chiefly to that of *Eumenes*: they did ſo, and would have taken her, but ſhe ſtood off, making all the Sail ſhe could. The other Ships of *Pergamum* fought ſtoutly, but the Snakes thrown into them forced them to run away. (m) The *Romans* having heard theſe things ſent ſome Ambaſſadors into *Aſia*, to make a Peace between thoſe two Princes, and to demand of *Pruſias* that he ſhould deliver *Annibal* to them; but he prevented it by poiſoning himſelf (n). It was about the 570th Year of *Rome*.

(I) *He died very old.*] He lived Eighty two Years, if we may believe *Lucian*. (o) Ἄτταλος δὲ, ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς φιλάδελφος, τῶν Περγαμηνῶν ϗ οὗτος βασιλέων, πρὸς ὃν ϗ Σκιπίων ὁ τῶν Ῥωμαίων στρατηγὸς ἀφίκετο, δύο ϗ ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν ἐξέλιπε τὸν βίον. *Attalus, cognomento Philadelphus, rex etiam Pergamenorum, ad quem etiam Scipio Romanorum imperator venit, duos & octoginta annos natus è vita migravit.* I don't queſtion but *Lucian* has committed a Fault in this Place. The Roman General he ſpeaks of, is without doubt *Lucius Scipio Aſiaticus*, who defeated *Antiochus*. But *Attalus* reigned not at that time.

(K) *He was ſurnamed* Philometor.] (p) "By "reaſon of his Love for his Mother, which was the "Cauſe of his Death; for as he was digging up a "Sepulchre for her, the heat of the Sun made him "ſick; and he died in ſeven Days. That the Reader may know from whence Mr. *Dacier* had that Circumſtance, I ſhall ſet down theſe Words of *Juſtin*: (q) *Matri deinde ſepulchrum facere inſtituit, cui operi intentus morbum ex ſolis fervore contraxit, & ſeptima die deceſſit.* His Mother's Name was *Stratonice* (r), ſhe was Daughter of *Ariarathes* King of *Cappadocia*: She married *Eumenes* (ſ) a little while after the Victory which the *Romans* got over *Antiochus* at *Magneſia*. Since (t) *Strabo*, (v) *Appianus*, and ſeveral others give him the Surname of *Philometor*; I fancy that *Plutarch* (a) gives him that of *Philopator* thro' a ſlip of Memory. 'Tis in the Life of the *Gracchi*. See the Paſſage quoted by me in the following Remark. *Volaterranus* had related well enough what concerns the Kings of *Pergamum*, but he ſpoils all as to the laſt. He pretends that he was call'd *Philometor* by way of Irony: (b) *Is Philometor ex ſcelere per antiphraſin cognominatus eſt, quod matrem interfecerit.* Nay which is worſe, he quotes *Juſtin* as ſaying that that Prince having ſecretly put his Mother, and his Wife to Death, let his Hair and Beard grow to conceal his Crime. *Juſtin* ſays quite another thing.

(L) *And was a great Lover of Agriculture.*] It was not

β It was fought in the year of Rome 563.

γ *Id. Liv. l. 42. p. 813.*

δ *Id. ib. p. 815.*

ε *See the Rem. F.*

ζ *Liv. l. 44. p. 853.*

θ *Strabo l. 13. p. 429.*

‡ *Polyb. ub. ſup. p. 158.*

† *See the Remark upon the miſtakes of* Moreri.

(a) T. Liv. *l. 37. p. 713. See the Paſſage of* Strabo, *which I ſhall quote in the Remark againſt* Moreri.

(b) *Cic. in* [illegible] *pro Sextio p. m. 92.*

(c) *See the laſt Lines of this Remark.*

(d) *P. Manut. in Orat. Cic. pro Sextio. p. 93.*

(e) *Nic. Abramus in eamd. Orat. p. 100.*

(f) Antiochum Epiphanem ſive illuſtrem de quo auſpiciis Luc. Scipionis Aſiatici ſuperato Appianus in Syriacis, &c. *Id. ib.*

(g) *Val. Max. l. 5. c. 2. n. 3. in extern.*

(h) *That is in the Year* 1699.

(i) *Juſtin l. 32. c. 4.*

(k) *Id. ib.*

(l) Claſſiarios convocat (*Hannibal*) hiſque præcipit, omnes ut in unam Eumenis regis concurrant navem, a ceteris tantum ſatis habeant ſe defendere. Id facilè illos ſerpentium multitudine conſecuturos. Rex autem quâ nave veheretur, ut ſcirent, ſe facturum: quem ſi aut cepiſſent, aut interfeciſſent, magno his pollicetur præmio fore. *Cornel Nepos in vita Hannibalis, p. m.* 359.

(m) *Id. ib.*

(n) *Juſt. & Corn. Nepos ubi ſup.*

(o) *Lucian, in Macrob. p. 637. Tom. 2. Edit. Salmur.*

[p] Dacier *Remarks upon the 1ſt Ode of the 1ſt Book of* Horace. *p. m. 14.*

(q) *Juſt. l. 36. c. 4. p. m. 537.*

[r] Strabo *l. 13. p. 429.*

(ſ) Liv. *l. 38. p. 733.*

[t] Strabo *ib.*

(v) *Appian. in Mithrid.*

(a) *Plut. in vit. Gracchor. p. 830.*

(b) *Volater l. 13. p. m. 497.*

very rich Presents to *Scipio* (*M*) before *Numantia*, and died a little while after about the Year 621. and having no Children, he made * the Roman People his Heir. *Ariſtonicus*, Baſtard † of *Eumenes*, deſpiſed that Will, and declared himſelf to be the lawful Succeſſor; he won ſome Battels, but he was overcome and taken § in the Year of *Rome* 623. Thus ended the Kingdom of *Pergamum* which grew very powerful in a ſhort time, and there was ſo much Magnificence in it, that it became a Proverb (*N*). I ſhall obſerve ſome Faults (*O*) of *Moreri*.

PERGA,

not his firſt Inclination, and it ſeems that it was an effect of his Melancholy. He put to Death ſeveral (*c*) illuſtrious Perſons, and then he grew extreamly Melancholick; he put on, as it were, a Sack-cloth and Aſhes, and minded nothing elſe but the Culture of his Garden. But he did not lay aſide his Cruelty, for his chief Delight was to cultivate the moſt venemous Herbs; he diſtill'd the Juices thereof, which he mixed afterwards with good Remedies, and ſent that ſort of Compoſition as a Preſent to his Friends. Here is my Author: (*d*) *In Aſia Rex Attalus florentiſſimus ab* (*e*) *Eumene patruo acceptum regnum, cædibus amicorum, & cognatorum ſuppliciis, fœdabat, nunc matrem anum, nunc Beronicem ſponſam, maleficiis eorum necatam confingens. Poſt hanc ſceleſtam violentiæ rabiem, ſqualidam veſtem ſumit: barbam capillumque in modum reorum ſummittit: non in publicum prodire, non populo ſe oſtendere, non domi lætiora convivia inire, aut aliquod ſignum ſani hominis habere, prorſus ut pœnas pendere manibus interfectorum videretur. Omiſſâ deinde regni adminiſtratione, hortos fodiebat, gramina ſeminabat, & noxia innoxiis permiſcebat, eaque omnia veneni ſucco infecta, velut peculiare munus, amicis mittebat.* I add theſe Words of *Plutarch*: (*f*) Ἄτταλος ὁ Φιλομήτωρ ἐκήπευε τὰς φαρμακώδεις βοτάνας, οὐ μόνον ὑοσκύαμον καὶ ἐλλέβορον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κώνειον καὶ ἀκόνιτον καὶ δορύκνιον, αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς σπείρων καὶ φυτεύων, ὀπούς τε καὶ καρπὸν αὐτῶν ἔργον πεποιημένος εἰδέναι καὶ κομίζεσθαι καθ' ὥραν. *Attalus Philometor herbas venenoſas colebat, non tantum hyoſcyamum & helleborum, ſed et cicutam, aconitum, dorycnion, ipſe in hortis regiis ſeminans & plantans: liquoreſque & ſemina & fructus horum elaborabat cognoſcere, ac ſuo quæque tempore colligere.* *Attalus* left that Occupation, and (*g*) applied himſelf to the melting of Metals. His Books concerning Husbandry were not unknown to *Varro* (*h*), *Pliny* (*i*), and *Columella* (*k*). Father *Harduin* obſerves that according to the Teſtimony of *Galen*, that Prince underſtood all ſorts of Remedies, and compoſed ſome Books about them. (*l*) *Haud diverſum ab eo puto Attalum eſſe eum, quem Medicum appellat Plinius in indice l. 32. & 33. cum hunc ipſum Pergamenorum regem, omnis generis medicamentorum perquam ſtudioſum fuiſſe Galenus affirmet, l. 1.* κατὰ γένη, *c. 13. p. 657. & l. 1. de antidotis c. 1. p. 865. De medicinis ex animalibus ſcripſiſſe, l. 10. de facult. ſimp. medic. c. 1. p. 275.* Mr. *Menage* (*m*) aſcribes to another what concerns the Gardens of *Attalus*.

(*M*) *Some rich Preſents to* Scipio *before* Numantia.] I have read this no where but in *Tully*. (*n*) *Quo in loco Dejotarum talem erga te cognoviſti, qualis rex Attalus in P. Africanum fuit, cui magnificentiſſima dona, ut ſcriptum legimus, uſque ad Numantiam miſit ex Aſia, quæ Africanus inſpectante exercitu accepit.* What did Father *Abram* think of (*o*), when he ſaid that *Livy* does not agree with *Cicero?* Thereupon he quotes a Paſſage of the (*p*) 58 Book of *Livy*, which ſays that *Scipio* having received great Preſents from *Antiochus* ſhewed them to the whole Army, and ordered the Quæſtor to enter them into his Book of Accounts. *Cicero* meant not that *Scipio*, who overcame *Antiochus*.

(*N*) *The Magnificence of* Pergamus, ... *became a Proverb.*] See the Commentators upon theſe Words of *Horace*: (*q*) *Attalicis conditionibus Nunquam dimoveas ut trabe Cypria Myrtoum pavidus nauta ſecet mare.* Conſider alſo theſe Verſes of *Propertius*.

Nec (*r*) *mihi tunc fulcro ſternatur lectus eburno,*
Nec ſit in Attalico mors mea nixa toro.
Attalicas (*ſ*) *ſupera veſtes, atque omnia magnis,*
Gemmea ſint ludis, ignibus iſta dabis.

'Tis pretended that Hangings were not known at *Rome* before (*t*) thoſe of *Attalus*, which the Roman People inherited, were brought thither. *Servius* (*v*) ſays that they were invented at the Court of the Kings of *Pergamum*, and call'd (*w*) *aulæa, ab aula Attali.* He is miſtaken as to the laſt Point, for the *Romans* call'd 'em ſo, becauſe they were call'd (*x*) αὐλαῖαι in Greek. However the *Attalick* Hangings were very famous. (*y*) *Quid illa attalica, tota Sicilia nominata, ab eodem Heio peripetaſmata emere oblitus es?* King *Attalus* invented the Gold Embroidery: (*z*) *aurum intexere in eadem Aſia invenit Attalus Rex.* Read this Paſſage of *Silius Italicus*:

Quæ (*aa*) *radiis jactat Babylon, vel murice picto*
Læta Tyros, quæque Attalicis variata per artem
Aulæis ſcribuntur acu.

Pliny (*bb*) does often mention the exceſſive Price which King *Attalus* paid for good Pictures.

(*O*) *Some Faults of* Moreri.] What I ſay here concerns the *Dutch* Edition. I. It is not true that *Attalus* the Firſt of that Name *extended his Conqueſts in Aſia, as far as Mount* Taurus; for the Kingdom of *Pergamum* had that Extent under King *Eumenes*; and it was by the Liberality of the *Romans*. Before that time it was but a ſmall State, as I am going to prove it. (*cc*) Συνεπολέμησε δὲ καὶ οὗτος (Εὐμένης) Ῥωμαίοις πρός τε Ἀντίοχον τὸν μέγαν, καὶ πρὸς Περσέα, καὶ ἔλαβεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἅπασαν τὴν ὑπ' Ἀντιόχῳ τὴν ἐντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου. Πρότερον δ' ἦν τὰ περὶ Πέργαμον οὐ πολλὰ χωρία μέχρι τῆς θαλάττης τῆς κατὰ τὸν Ἐλαΐτην κόλπον, καὶ τὸν Ἀδραμυττηνόν. *Hic quoque* (Eumenes) *Romanorum ſocius fuit in bellis adverſus Antiochum Magnum, & Perſeum: accepitque à Romanis quidquid Aſiæ intra Taurum Antiochus poſſederat: cùm antè ſub Pergami ditione fuiſſent pauca quædam loca uſque ad mare, juxta ſinum Elaiticum & Adramyttenum.* Father *Labbe* has been the Occaſion of that Fault of *Moreri*, for here are his Citations about *Attalus*. (*dd*) "*Juſtin* 27. *Livy* 34. *Polybius* 5. where he ſays that he extended his Con"queſts in *Aſia*, as far as Mount *Taurus*. I have not found this in the 5th Book of *Polybius*, but only that *Attalus*, during the War againſt *Achæus*, forced the Inhabitants of many Cities to declare for him. This does not go by the Name of Conqueſt, and it does not appear that after his return to *Pergamum* thoſe Cities were ſubject to him. II. He ſhould not have been contented with Father *Labbe*'s Quotation of thoſe three Authors, ſince they ſay nothing of the Love of the four Brothers which is "commonly propoſed as a Model of the Union "which ought to be between Brothers. He ſhould have quoted *Plutarch* for it, as Father *Labbe* did (*ee*). III. The Wife of *Attalus*, Mother of thoſe four Brothers, was call'd (*ff*) Ἀπολλωνίς. He ſhould not therefore ſay that her Name was *Apollonia*. IV. The Article of *Attalus* the ſecond is a pitiful one. He begins with ſaying that he "was "firſt ſent to *Rome* by his Brother *Eumenes*, in the "Year 596. where he obtained whatever he deſired "of the Senate. This is a meer Tranſcript of (*gg*) Father *Labbe*. *Attalus* was above 60 Years old at that time; his Hiſtory ſhould not therefore begin there, conſidering the memorable Things he had done before. V. I don't think that he was his Brother's Ambaſſador at *Rome* in the Year 596. and I fancy that the times have been confounded: the Journey he made to *Rome* about the Year 584, after the King of *Macedonia* had been taken, has been transferred to the Year 596. VI. It is an abſurd Thing to quote *Polybius l.* 5. and *Juſtin l.* 36. ſeeing they ſay nothing of that *Attalus*. Note that the Hiſtory of *Polybius* did not reach the Year of *Rome* 596. VII. *Attalus* the Third, was ſurnamed *Philometor*, and not *Philopator*. That Fault is alſo to be found in Father *Labbe* (*a*). But *Moreri* is moſt to blame for having inſerted among thoſe three *Attalus*'s an *Attalus Philadelphus*, without ſaying that it is not a New *Attalus*; for the Reader would think that that *Attalus Philadelphus* is different from the other three, and yet he is the ſame with *Attalus* the Second. Let's ſee whether his Article be right. VIII. What he did before he was a King is not diſtinguiſhed

* *Flor. l.* 2. *c.* 20. *& multi alii.*

† *Juſt. l.* 36. *c.* 4.

§ *Id. ib.*

(*c*) *Vid. excerpta Diodor. Siculi à Valeſio collecta p.* 376.

(*d*) *Juſt. ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) *Juſtin is miſtaken he ſhould have ſaid* Attalo.

(*f*) *Plut. in Demetrio, page* 897. *D.*

(*g*) Ab hoc ſtudio ærariæ artis fabricæ ſe tradit cerisque fingendis, & ære fundendo procudendoque oblectabatur. *Juſtin. ubi ſupra.*

(*h*) *He mentions them in the* 1 *Ch. of the* 1 *Book de re Ruſtica.*

(*i*) *Plin. l.* 18. *c.* 3.

(*k*) *Colu. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *but inſtead of* Attalus & Philometor, *read* Attalus Philometor. *See Father* Hardouin *in Indice Pliniano. p.* 100.

(*l*) Harduin *ib.*

(*m*) *See the Rem. B. of the Art.* Lacydes.

(*n*) *Cic. in Orat. pro Rege Dejotaro p. m.* 647.

(*o*) *Abramus com. in Orat. Cic. pro Dejotaro p.* 441.

(*p*) *What remains of* Livy *goes no farther than the* 45 *Book.*

(*q*) *Horat. Ode* 1. *l.* 1.

(*r*) *Propert. Eleg.* 13 *l.* 2. *See alſo Eleg.* 32. *ejuſdem Libri.* (*ſ*) *Id. Eleg.* 17. *l.* 3. *See alſo Eleg.* 5. *l.* 4. (*t*) *See the Notes* Variorum *upon Virgil Georg. l.* 3. *v.* 20. (*v*) Ideo *aulæa* dicta ſunt quod primum in aula Attali, Regis Aſiæ, qui populum Romanum ſcripſit hæredem, inventa ſunt. *Servius in Æn. l.* 1. *v.* 697.

(*w*) *Servius in hæc Verba Georg. l.* 3. *v.* 25. Purpurea intexti tollunt aulæa Britanni.

(*x*) *See Plut. in vit. Themiſtoclis.*

(*y*) *Cicero in Verrem l.* 6. *fol. m.* 7.. 8.

(*z*) *Plin. l.* 8. *c.* 48. *p. m.* 231. *He ſays Chap.* 3. *of the* 33*d Book* Attalicis jampridem aurum intexitur invento regum Aſiæ.

(*aa*) *Sil. Ital. l.* 14. *p. m.* 635.

(*bb*) *Plin. l.* 7. *c.* 38. *and l.* 34, 35.

(*cc*) *Strabo l.* 13. *p.* 429.

(*dd*) Labbe, *Chron. Franc. tom.* 2 *p.* 300. *ad ann. Romæ* 512.

(*ee*) Labbe, *ub. ſup. p.* 335. *ad ann.* 556.

(*ff*) *Strabo l.* 13. *p.* 429.

(*gg*) Labbe *p.* 365. *ad ann.* 596.

(*a*) Labbe *ib. p.* 391. *ad an.* 621.

PERGA, a City of *Pamphylia*. There was a Temple of *Diana* β built near it, upon a very high place. It was very ancient, * and very much respected; and tho' the *Diana* of *Ephesus* was above the *Diana* of *Perga*, yet the latter had a great share in the Devotion of the People. There was an Assembly kept there ε every Year; it was then, without doubt, that they sung the Hymns which *Damophila*, Contemporary of *Sappho*, composed to the Honour of that Goddess, and which were sung still in the time γ of *Apollonius Tyanæus*. The *Diana* of *Perga*, Περγαία Ἄρτεμις, is mention'd δ upon several Medals. It is one of the Cities where St. *Paul* λ preached the Gospel. The famous Geometer *Apollonius* μ *Pergeus*, whose Books of Conick Sections are extant, was born there. It is now in a bad condition; the Archiepiscopal See π was transferr'd from thence to *Attalia*, one of the fourteen Cities which before depended upon it. *Perga* stands eight Miles from the Sea.

PERIANDER, Tyrant of *Corinth*. He was reckon'd one of the seven Wise Men of *Greece*; but it had been better to have plac'd him among the most wicked Men that ever liv'd: for he changed the Government (*A*) of his Country, and oppress'd its Liberty, and establish'd a Monarchical Power for ρ himself; and to maintain himself in his Usurpation χ, he caused the principal Men of the City to be put to Death, thinking they would be able to restore things to their first state. On the day of a solemn Feast he ‡ deprived Women of all their Ornaments, and made of them a Gold Statue which he (*B*) had vowed. He committed Incest with his (*C*) Mother; he kick'd his Wife to death whilst she was big with Child; he caused his Concubines to be burnt, because their Calumnies had exasperated him against his Wife. He was so angry with his second † Son, because he lamented the Death of his Mother, that he turn'd him out, and disinherited him. He formed a villanous Plan of Revenge against the Inhabitants of *Corcyra*: which was to send their young || Boys to King *Alyattes* to be Gelded: and when he heard that the Ship which carried those innocent Victims, had put into *Samos*, and that those Youths had been preserved from the Misery to which they were destinated, he died with Grief

stinguished from what he did under the Reign of his Brother: Every Reader has all the Reason in the World to fancy that whatever is said of this *Attalus*, was done by him, since he was made his Nephew's Tutor *with the Title of a King*. But it is false. IX. 'Twas not he who *sustained the Siege of* Pergamum *against* Antiochus. We have seen (*b*) that King *Eumenes* himself was in *Pergamum* during that Siege. X. He did not make War against *Perseus* King of *Macedonia*: *Moreri* should have said that he was in it as an Ally of the *Romans*. XI. *Strabo* and *Appianus*, quoted by *Moreri*, do not say that *Attalus* made *Prusias* a Prisoner. XII. Nor that he sent some Presents to *Scipio Æmilianus* before *Numantia*. XIII. Nor that he perished by the Ambush of his Nephew *Attalus*. He died before that *Scipio* went to *Numantia*.

(*A*) *He changed the Government of his Country*] *Diogenes Laertius* says so positively. Οὗτος πρῶτος, says he (*c*), δορυφόρους ἔσχε, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς τυραννίδα μετέστησε. *PRIMUS hic armatis circumseptus incessit, magistratumque ad tyrannidem transtulit. Aldobrandinus* observes upon those words, That if we believe *Aristotle*, *Periander* must be look'd upon as the Inventer of most ways whereby Tyranny is establish'd and kept up. (*d*) *Omnium autem earum rerum quæ ad tyrannidem faciunt constituendam & conservandam, auctorem fuisse Periandrum Cypseli filium, tum aliis locis, tum præcipue eodem lib. 5. polit. ait cap. 11.* Τούτων, inquit, τὰ (*e*) πολλά φασι κατασκευάσαι Περίανδρον. Mr. *Menage* upon the same words of *Laertius*, quotes *Suidas*, who says, That *Periander* had 300 Guards, and that he forbad the *Corinthians* to keep any Servants, and to live in Idleness. He invented every Day something to keep them busy, and Fined those whom he found sitting in the Publick Places: He was afraid they should contrive something against him. *Herodotus* does not ascribe to him the first Institution of Tyranny, but to *Cypselus*, who reigned thirty Years in *Corinth* very cruelly, and left all his Authority to his Son *Periander*. Τυραννεύσας δὲ ὁ Κύψελος, τοιοῦτος δή τις ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο· πολλοὺς μὲν Κορινθίων ἐδίωξε, πολλοὺς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε, πολλῷ δ' ἔτι πλείστους τῆς ψυχῆς (*f*). *Cypselus vero tyrannide potitus, talis extitit ut Corinthiorum multos insequutus sit, multos pecunia, longe plurimos anima privaverit. Periander* was not at first so hard a Prince as his Father, but afterwards he became much more cruel than he.

(*B*) *The Gold Statue which he had vowed.*] Observe here a very sensible Proof of the Disorder wherein False Religions leave the Hearts and Minds of Men. They do not correct Mens Inclinations to Sin. We see *Periander* who makes a Vow, and dares not dispense himself with accomplishing it, even when he has no Money (*g*). He therefore believes that there are Gods, he believes a Providence: and yet he pollutes himself with an Incest, he sheds Innocent Blood, he kills his Wife, *&c.* Let us proceed to the Disorders of the Mind. The same Tyrant is not afraid of being punish'd for his Incests and Murders; but he fears, that if he should not offer to the Gods a Lump of Gold, which he promised them, they will oppress him with Miseries, and severely punish him. Nay, he persuades himself, that tho' he fulfils his Vow with a most unjust Robbery, which vexes all the Women of *Corinth*, yet the Golden Statue which he Consecrates will be acceptable to the Gods, and preserve him from the Punishments they would have inflicted upon him, if he had not offered the Statue he promised them. Next to the Violence done to the Honour of honest Women, there is none they are more sensible of, than to see themselves stript of their Ornaments. The desire of being well dress'd, and wearing fine things, has always prevail'd in that Sex. (*h*) *Φιλόκοσμον genus femineum est: multasque etiam insignis pudicitiæ, quamvis nulli virorum, tamen sibi scimus libenter ornari... (i) Ut taceam de inaurium pretiis, candore margaritarum, rubri maris profunda testantium, smaragdorum virore, cerauniorum flammis, hiacynthorum pelago, ad quæ ardent & insaniunt studia matronarum.* I observe this only, to make the Tyrannical Spirit of that pretended Wise-Man more odious. See the Remark *D*.

(*C*) *He committed Incest with his Mother.*] Her Name was (*k*) *Cratea*: Some say, (*l*) that being not able to restrain the Impetuosity of her Passion, she proposed to her Son to lie secretly with a Woman, who was extreamly in love with him, and who would not be known. He consented to it, and so he lay with his Mother without knowing it; for *Cratea* was in the Bed where the pretended Woman, whom she mention'd to her Son, was to lie. This secret Intrigue lasted a long time; but at last *Periander* would know who was the Woman whom he had so often been with: He order'd somebody to hide himself in the Chamber, and as his Mother was going to Bed, he came to her with a Flambeau. He had kill'd her upon the Spot, had not a *Genius*, who appear'd to him, prevented it. Ever since that time he lived as a Furious Man, he was Cruel, and put several Peo-

---

β *Strabo l. 14. p. 460.*

* *Pergæ fanum integerrimum & sanctissimum Dianæ scimus esse, id quoque a te nudatum & spoliatum esse, ex ipsa Diana quod habebat auri detractum atque ablatum esse dicunt. Cicero in Verrem act. 3.*

ε *Strabo ib.*

γ *Vide Philost. in ejus vita l. 1.*

δ *Spanh. de præst. & usu numism. p. 782.*

λ *Act. ch. 13 & 14.*

μ *I have published his Article.*

π *Baudrand. Geog.*

ρ *Diog. Laertius l. 1. n. 98.*

χ *Herodot. l. 5. c. 92. p. m. 324.*

‡ *Diog. Laert. ib. n. 95.*

† *His name was* Lycophron. *See his Article wherein I have set down what* Herodotus *says of him.*

|| Diog. Laert. *does not limit the number of them.* Herodotus *l. 3. c. 48. says, they were three hundred of the best Families of that Island.*

(*b*) *In the last Rem. of the foregoing Art. at the end.*

(*c*) *Diog. Laert. in Periandro n. 98. l. 1.*

(*d*) *Aldobrandin. in Diog. Laert. ib.*

(*e*) Aldobrandinus *should not therefore use the word* Omnium. *What he quotes of* Aristotle *is against him.*

(*f*) *Herod. l. 5. c. 92. p. 324.*

(*g*) Ἔφορος ἱστορεῖ ὡς εὔξαιτο, εἰ νικήσειεν Ὀλύμπια τεθρίππῳ, χρυσοῦν ἀνδριάντα ἀναθεῖναι· νικήσας δὲ καὶ ἀπορῶν χρυσίου, &c. Ephorus in historia, vovisse illum tradit, si Olympia quadriga vicisset, auream statuam deo sacraturum, victoria verò potitum, & auro egentem, &c. *Diog. Laert. ubi supra n. 96. p. 60.*

(*h*) *Hieron. Epist. ad Gaudentium de Pacatulæ institut. p. m. 268.*

(*i*) *Idem Epist. ad Demetriadem de servanda virginitate p. 291.*

(*k*) *Diog. Laert. lib. 1. n. 96.* (*l*) *Parthenius in Eroticis c. 17.*

(*m*) *Aristippus, apud Diogen. Laertium ubi supra.*

Grief for it. He was then about Eighty Years old *. Some say that he lay with his Wife after (D) her Death; a brutality almost as horrible as that of the *Lydian* Monarch who eat (E) his Wife. Some Authors § are so simple as to reckon that Action of *Periander* among the great Examples of Conjugal Love. He reigned 44 Years, according to *Aristotle* ‖, or 40 according to *Diogenes* ¶ *Laertius*. He flourished about the 38th Olympiad †. Mr. *Moreri* has (F) committed some Faults.

There are several things to be found in a Work of *Heraclides*, which are not disadvantageous to *Periander*. If he forbad the Inhabitants of *Corinth* to keep any Servants, he forbad 'em also to live Voluptuously, which is no ill Law. He laid no Taxes upon any body, and was contented with the Custom-Money which accrued to him from the Sale, and Importation, and Exportation of Commodities. He hated wicked Men, and caused all ‡ Pimps and Bawds to be drowned. To conclude, he established a Senate, and regulated the Expence of its Members ‖.

PERIBOEA, Daughter of *Alcathous* King of *Megara*, Wife of *Telamon* King of *Salamis*, and Mother of *Ajax*. See the Remark C of the Article *Telamon*.

PE-

ple to Death. As for *Cratea* she complain'd mightily of her Destiny, and kill'd herself. Others relate this Adventure differently: They say indeed, (m) that the Intrigue of *Periander* and his Mother was cover'd with the Veil of a profound Secret, but that he was not ignorant that he lay with his Mother. They affirm, that he was very well pleased with the Sport, and that he grew Angry only because his Incest was discover'd. He vented his Anger upon his Subjects, and ever since behav'd himself Tyrannically.

After his Mother had kill'd herself he ceased to Honour the Goddess *Venus*, and to offer Sacrifices to her; but he began again to practise that Worship, by reason of some Dreams of his Wife *Melissa*. 'Tis what *Plutarch* observes in the beginning of the Feast of the Seven Wise Men; and he supposes that *Periander* began again to Sacrifice to that Goddess on the very Day of that Feast.

(D) *With his Wife after her Death.*] Here is one of *Herodotus*'s Stories, which he tells upon occasion of the Injustice which the Women of *Corinth* suffered under *Periander*. (a) That Tyrant sent to consult the Oracle of the Dead, desiring to know what was become of a certain *Depositum*. His Wife *Melissa* appear'd, and declar'd, that she would by no means reveal that Secret; for I am very cold, said she, I am stark naked, the Cloaths wherewith I was buried are of no use to me, because they have not been burnt. To prove the truth of what I say, it is enough for me to observe, that *Periander* has put his Bread in a cold Oven. When *Periander* was told of it, that Discourse seem'd to him to be very true, because he remembred that he had lain with *Melissa*, even after she had given up the Ghost. (b) Ταῦτα δὲ ὡς ὀπίσω ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Περιάνδρῳ, πιστὸν γάρ οἱ ἦν τὸ συμβόλαιον, ὃς νεκρῷ ἐούσῃ Μελίσσῃ ἐμίγη. *Hæc Periandro renunciata, ob illud argumentum fidem fecere, quod ipse cum Melissa quamvis defuncta coierat.* He therefore ordered by a Proclamation, that all the Women of *Corinth* should repair to the Temple of *Juno*. They obeyed, and put on the finest things they had, as on a Festival-Day; but the Guards who lay hid in the Temple stript them all, without any exception; the Mistresses and their Maids were treated alike. All their Cloathes were burnt upon the Grave of *Melissa*. She was Daughter of *Procles*, Tyrant of *Epidaurus*; and she was related, by her Mother's side, to some great Lords who reigned almost all over *Arcadia* (c). Another Author in *Athenæus* does not speak so advantageously of *Melissa*'s Quality: he says, (d) That *Periander* grew very much in love with her, having seen her fill some (e) Drink to some Workmen.

(E) *The* Lydian *Monarch who eat his Wife.*] The Sieur *de Rampalle* being about to prove that our Age doth not exceed past Ages in Vices, brings in, amongst other Examples of Intemperance, the Voracity of *Maximinus*, *Albinus*, *Phagon*, and *Astidamas*; and then he says, that (f) *Cambyses King of Lydia supp'd one Night upon his Wife.* He is mistaken as to the Name; I don't think that any King of *Lydia* was called *Cambyses*; however, he who eat up his Wife had not that Name. His Name was *Cambles*. He was a great Eater and a great Drinker. The Historian, who speaks of him, intimates, that he committed that Crime without knowing what he did, and that he knew not his Barbarity; but when he felt his Wife's Hand in his Mouth as he waked.

(g) Ξάνθος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Λυδιακοῖς Καμβλήτην φησὶ τὸν βασιλεύσαντα Λυδῶν πολυφάγον γενέσθαι καὶ πολυπότην, ἔτι δὲ γαστρίμαργον. τοῦτον οὖν ποτε νυκτὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα κατακρεουργήσαντα καταφαγεῖν. ἔπειτα, πρωῒ εὑρόντα τὴν χεῖρα τῆς γυναικὸς ἐνοῦσαν ἐν τῷ στόματι, ἑαυτὸν ἀποσφάξαι περιβοήτου γενομένης. *Xanthus in Lydiacis narrat Cambleta Lydorum olim regem, edacem, bibacem, gulosum fuisse, noctuque uxorem suam in frusta dissectam vorasse: deinde crastino mane, reperta conjugis manu, quæ ad ejus os hæserat, re cognita, & in vulgus sparsa, seipsum jugulasse.* I can scarce believe but this Story is like Old Wives Tales, full of Giants, Man-eaters.

(F) Moreri *has committed some Faults.*] I shall say nothing of his Faults of omission, every body may know them by comparing his *Periander* with mine. 1. He does not reckon well, when he says, that *Periander* began his Reign *in the 38th Olympiad*, and died in the *48th*, after he had reigned 44 Years. He might have said so, if *Periander* having succeeded his Father in the beginning of the 38th Olympiad, had died towards the end of the 48th Olympiad: But then he should have said so precisely. 2. He should not have quoted *Eusebius*; for he does not say, that the Reign of *Periander* lasted 44 Years. He places the beginning of it in the first Year of the 38th Olympiad, and the end (h) in the first Year of the 48th Olympiad. I find a great mistake in these words of *Scaliger*: (i) *Obiit* (Periander) *anno ultimo Olympiadis* XLVIII. *Tyrannidem obtinuit, an.* XL. *auctore Laertio. Ergo ejus initium in primo Olympiadis* XXXVIII. *ut hic recte assignatum.* It is not true, according to *Eusebius*, that *Periander* died the last Year of the 48th Olympiad. But if *Eusebius* had placed the Death of that Prince in that Year, he would not agree with *Diogenes Laertius*, who says, that he reigned only forty Years. *Scaliger* expresses himself better five Pages after (k). 3. Periander *answered not those, who ask'd him why he kept the Domination, that it was as dangerous to quit it as to lose it.* This is an equivocal and perplex'd Answer: it is false whenever a Man loses his Domination together with his Life; for they who lose it in that manner, run no longer any hazard. *Moreri* should have said that he answer'd, It is as dangerous to part willingly with Tyranny, as to be depriv'd of it by one's Enemies. We have not the privilege of speaking obscurely in *French*; we are oblig'd to use more Precautions than the Ancients, to avoid being Criticized. I say so, because I set down in this place the words of the Original. (l) Πότ' ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί τυραννεῖ, ἔφη, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἑκουσίως ἀποστῆναι, καὶ τὸ ἀφαιρεθῆναι κίνδυνον φέρει. *Rogatus aliquando cur in tyrannide persisteret; quia, inquit, & sponte & invitum cedere æque periculosum est.* 4. To what purpose does *Moreri* cite (m) *Sosicrates*, who says nothing of what he says in the Article of *Periander*, and who is of a contrary Opinion to that which he adopts concerning the Age of that Tyrant? He (n) says, that he died 41 Years before the 49th Olympiad. I know that by altering the punctuation (o) his Opinion might come nearer that of *Eusebius*. But did Mr. *Moreri* know of it? And must an Author be quoted upon dubious Readings? This cannot be permitted to any body, but to those who have given notice that they adopt the Correction of such or such a Critick.

Here are some words of *Balzac*, which relate to *Peri-*

---

* *Taken from Diog. Laert. in Vita Periandri l. 1.*

§ *Ravisius Textor, in Officina, l. 5. c. 2. in the Title de amore conjugali p. m. 554. and several others after him.*

‖ *Arist. Polit. l. 5. c. 12.*

¶ *Ubi sup. n. 98.*

† *Ibid.*

‡ *So I render* τὰς μαστροπούς. Cragius *understands by it prostituted Women.*

‖ *Taken from* Heraclides de Politiis *p. 17. Ed. Cragii 1593. in 4.*

(m) *Aristippus, apud Diog. Laertium ubi supra.*

(a) *Herod. l. 5. c. 92.*

(b) *Id. ib.*

(c) *Diog. Laert. l. 1. n. 94.*

(d) *Pythænetus l. 3. de Ægina apud Ath. l. 13 p. 589.*

(e) Ὠνοχοοῦσαν τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις. Operariis vinum ministrantem. *Ibid.*

(f) Rampalle, *that the World does not grow worse and worse, pag.* 94.

(g) *At l. 10. p. 41*

(h) *He mentio the end the Mon chical vernmen of Corint but it i the sam thing w* Periander's *death.*

(i) *Sc Animadv. in Euseb. n. 889. p. m. 84.*

(k) *Ib. n. 929. p.*

(l) *Diog. Laert. ib. n. 97.*

(m) *In the 2d Dutch Edition there is* Socrates.

(n) *Apud Diog. Laert. ib. n. 9*

(o) *Vid. Menag. in Diog. Laert. l. 1. n. p. 55.*

PERICLES.

PERICLES was one of the Greateſt Men that ever lived in Ancient Greece. His Anceſtors by his Father's and Mother's Side, were very Illuſtrious. He was Educated with all imaginable Care; and he had, amongſt other Maſters, Zeno Eleates, and *Anaxagoras*, two of the moſt illuſtrious Philoſophers who taught in *Athens*. He learned of the latter, amongſt other things, to fear the Gods (A) without Superſtition, and to give an Account of Eclipſes, which proved once

OF THE Danger Tyrants expoſe themſelves to, when they Abdicate.

Periander's Anſwer. (p) “It is as dangerous to part with Tyranny, as to ſet it up. *Phalaris* (r) was ready to leave it; but he would have a God to be Security for his Life, if he ſhould deprive himſelf of his Authority; and it has been always a common Opinion, that they who take up Arms againſt their Country or their Prince, are in a manner reduc'd to the neceſſity of doing Miſchief, becauſe 'tis not very ſafe for them to do good. They dare not become Innocent, leſt they ſhould be at the mercy of the Laws, which they have violated, and they go on in their Faults, becauſe they don't believe that People would be ſatisfied with their Repentance.„ This was one of the Maxims which *Mecenas* made uſe of when *Auguſtus* was deliberating with him and *Agrippa*, whether he ſhould reſtore the *Roman* People to their Liberty. *Agrippa* adviſed him to do it, and *Mecenas* diſſuaded him from it. Let us ſet down here what the Learned *Meibomius* has collected about it. *Tangit Xiphilinus*, ſays he (q), *ex parte cauſſam, qua motus Mecenas, Auguſto ſuaſerit, ut imperium retineret.* Regnum nempe juſtum & legitime comparatum imprimis conducere rerum magnitudini *gubernandæ*: nec aliud diſcordantis patriæ remedium eſſe, quam ut ab uno, *ut loquitur Tacitus Ann. Lib.* IV. *Cap.* IX. *unumque Reip. corpus* unius præſidis nutu, quaſi anima & mente regatur, *ut monet Florus Lib.* IV. *Cap.* III. *Potior tamen, & altera cauſſa fuit, quam Suetonius adducit, loco quem* (a) *dixi, quod Auguſtum*, ſi privatus viveret, non ſine periculo fore *cenſeret. Eam etiam inculcat Zonaras; quod qui ſemel imperitarint, tuto privatam vitam agere nullo modo poſſint. Quo ſenſu jam olim Periander interrogatus, cur non deponeret imperium, reſpondit:* Quoniam per vim imperanti, etiam ultro imperio abire periculoſum, *ut ex Xenophontis lib. de Memorabil. Socrat. refert Stobæus Serm.* XLI. *Quin & Mecenas ipſe in Orat. apud Dionem, non alia ratione depoſitionem imperii Auguſto diſſuadet, quam quod oſtendat* neminem Senatui populoque reddita Rep. ipſi parciturum, qui multos offenderit. Hos enim rerum ſummam ad ſe trahendo, id acturos, ut ſe vel ulciſcantur, vel ipſum ſibi adverſantem è medio tollant. *Docet id exemplis Pompeji, Julii Cæſaris, Marii ac Sullæ: Quos abdicata poteſtas vel peſſum dederit, vel peſſum datura fuiſſet, ſi diutius vixiſſent.* To which *Solon's* Anſwer may be added: His Friends wondred that the name of Monarchy ſhould fright him, and that he durſt not take advantage of the preſent Conjunctures to acquire the ſupream Authority. He anſwered them, (b) *Dominion and Tyranny are indeed a fine place, but there is no way to come out of it when one is once got into it.* It ſeems to me that *Xenophon* has illuſtrated that Thought better than any body elſe. He introduces a Tyrant, who makes a lively deſcription of the miſerable Condition he is in: And then *Simonides* asks him, Why do you remain in it? Why don't you leave it? Mind the Anſwer: The greateſt Unhappineſs of Tyranny is, that there is no way to renounce it. How can a Tyrant, who abdicates, repay the great Sums he has extorted; indemniſy thoſe whom he has Impriſoned; reſtore Life to thoſe whom he has put to Death? If ever a Man has a good reaſon to hang himſelf, it is when he exerciſes Tyranny. They who underſtand *Greek* will be charm'd with the *Greek* words: I ſhall therefore ſet them down to pleaſe them. (c) Καὶ πῶς (ἔφη) ὦ Ἱέρων, εἰ οὕτω πονηρόν ἐστι τὸ τυραννεῖν, καὶ τοῦτο σὺ ἔγνωκας, οὐκ ἀπαλλάττῃ οὕτω μεγάλου κακοῦ; οὔτε σὺ οὔτε ἄλλος μὲν δὴ οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἑκὼν εἶναι τυραννίδος ἀφεῖτο, ὅσπερ ἂν ἅπαξ κτήσαιτο; Ὅτι (ἔφη) ὦ Σιμωνίδη, ταύτῃ ἀθλιώτατόν ἐστιν ἡ τυραννίς· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπαλλαγῆναι δυνατὸν αὐτῆς ἐστι. πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις ποτὲ ἐξαρκέσειε τύραννος, ἢ χρήματα ἐκτίνων ὅσους ἀφείλετο, ἢ δεσμοὺς ἀντιπαράσχοι ὅσους δὴ ἐδέσμευσεν, ἢ ὅσους κατέκανε, πῶς ἂν ἱκανὰς ψυχὰς ἀντιπαράσχοιτο ἀποθανουμένας; ἀλλ' εἴπερ τῳ ἄλλῳ, ὦ Σιμωνίδη, λυσιτελεῖ ἀπάγξασθαι, ἴσθι (ἔφη) ὅτι τυράννῳ ἔγωγε εὑρίσκω μάλιστα τοῦτο λυσιτελοῦν ποιῆσαι. μόνῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ οὔτε ἔχειν οὔτε καταθέσθαι τὰ κακὰ λυσιτελεῖ. *Et qui fit, inquit Hieron, ut ſi adeo miſera res eſt tyrannidem gerere, idque te non fugit, non abjiciat tam ingens malum? Neque tu neque alius quiſquam unquam lubens tyrannidem depoſuit, ubi ſemel nactus eſt. Quoniam, inquit, ô Simonide, illo nomine miſerrima eſt tyrannis, quod ab ea non licet diſcedere. Quomodo enim quiſquam tyrannus unquam ſufficerit ad pecuniam rependendam iis quos ſpoliavit? aut quomodo vincula repenſet iis quos detruſit in vincula? aut quomodo reſtituet tot animas extinctas iis quos occidit? Sed ſi cuiquam alteri, ô Simonides, expedit laqueo finire vitam, ſcito, inquit, me compertum habere, ut id faciat nulli magis expedire quàm tyranno, quod ſolum huic uni mala nec retinere nec deponere expedit. Dionyſius* the Tyrant ſaid, that inſtead of returning to a private Man's Condition on Horſeback, one muſt be dragg'd to it by the Feet. *Livy* relates this but he adds another Thought to it which enervates the firſt, *ultima primis obſtant*, and deſtroys the common-place which I am about. The Reader may judge of it, I ſet down the whole Paſſage. (d) *Sed evocatum eum* (e) *ab legatis* Demarata *uxor, filia Hieronis, inflata adhuc regiis animis, ac muliebri ſpiritu, admonet ſæpe uſurpatæ* Dionyſii *tyranni vocis: Qua pedibus tractum, non inſidentem equo relinquere tyrannidem dixerit debere. Facile eſſe momento quo quis velit, cedere poſſeſſione magnæ fortunæ: facere & parare eam, difficile atque arduum eſſe. Paululum ſumeret ſpatii ad conſultandum ab legatis: eo uteretur ad accerſendos ex Leontinis milites, quibus ſi pecuniam regiam pollicitus eſſet, omnia in poteſtate ejus futura. Hæc muliebria conſilia Andronodorus neque tota aſpernatus eſt, neque extemplo accepit.* It is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that the ſecond Maxim is of *Dionyſius*; for in all likelihood it is the Maxim of that Ambitious Woman whom *Livy* introduces ſpeaking. *Cicero* obſerves, (f) that *Dionyſius* could not have renounc'd the Condition he was in, and his wicked Life, without undoing himſelf.

(p) *Balzac ch. 45. of the Prince, p. m. 43, 44.*

(r) *Phalar. in Epiſt.*

(q) *Joan. Henr. Meibom. in vita Mecenatis p. 87, 88.*

(a) *That is* in Octavio *c. 28. Meibomius quotes the 27th Ch.*

(b) Καλὸν μὲν εἶναι τὴν τυραννίδα χωρίον, οὐκ ἔχειν δὲ ἀπόβασιν. Præclarum fundum tyrannidem eſſe, ſed non habere exitum. *Plut. in Solone pag. 85.*

(c) *Xenoph. in Hierone ſive Tyrannico p. 533. Edit. H. Steph. 1581.*

(d) *T. Liv. l. 24. p. m. 493.*

(e) *That is to ſay* Andronodorus, *who was exhorted in* Syracuſa *to give over the too great Power he had uſurped.*

(f) Atque ei ne integrum quidem erat ut ad juſtitiam remigraret civibuſque libertatem & jura redderet. His enim ſe adoleſcens improvida ætate irretierat erratis, eaque commiſerat ut ſalvus eſſe non poſſet ſi ſanus eſſe cœpiſſet. *Cicero Tuſcul. 5. fol. 275. C.*

(A) *To fear the Gods without Superſtition.*] The *Athenians* were alarm'd without any reaſon, aſſoon as any uncommon *Phenomenon* appear'd in the Air; they look'd upon 'em as Signs of the Anger of the Gods. The Philoſopher *Anaxagoras* freed *Pericles* from that fear, explaining to him, by natural Reaſons, the apparition of thoſe Meteors. And ſo he inſpired him with a more rational Religion, and he was not diſturb'd with ſuperſtitious Fears, but he expected Heavenly Favours with a quiet Mind. (g) Οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα τῆς Ἀναξαγόρου συνουσίας ἀπέλαυσε Περικλῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεισιδαιμονίας δοκεῖ γενέσθαι καθυπέρτερος, ὅσην τὸ πρὸς τὰ μετέωρα θάμβος ἐργάζεται τοῖς αὐτῶν τε τούτων τὰς αἰτίας ἀγνοοῦσι, καὶ περὶ τὰ θεῖα δαιμονῶσι καὶ ταραττομένοις δι' ἀπειρίαν αὐτῶν. ἣν ὁ φυσικὸς λόγος ἀπαλλάττων, ἀντὶ τῆς φοβερᾶς καὶ φλεγμαινούσης δεισιδαιμονίας, τὴν ἀσφαλῆ μετ' ἐλπίδων ἀγαθῶν εὐσέβειαν ἐνεργάζεται. *Nec vero hunc ſolum fructum tulit Pericli Anaxagoræ uſus, verum omni etiam liberavit eum ſuperſtitione, quæ terrorem ex rebus æthereis imprimit ignorantibus earum cauſas, & iis qui rerum divinarum metu pavent, percelluntur que rudes earum: quem eximens naturalis ratio, pro terrifica & æſtuante ſuperſtitione, ſecuram inſerit cum bona ſpe religionem.*

What follows in *Plutarch* deſerves to be taken Notice of. It happen'd one day that a Ram's Head, had but one Horn which was brought to *Pericles*. That Ram was born in a Country Houſe of *Pericles*. *Lampon* the Diviner declared that it was a Sign that the Power of the two (h) Factions, which were then in *Athens*, would fall into the Hands of the Perſon in whoſe Houſe that Prodigy happen'd. *Anaxagoras* went another way to work. He diſſected that Monſter, and finding the Scull ſmaller than it ſhould be, and of an Oval Figure, he explained the Reaſon why that Ram had but one Horn, and why it came out in the middle of the Forehead. That Method of giving an Account of Prodigies was admired; but ſome time after *Lampon* was admired, when they ſaw the Faction of *Thucydides* overthrown, and all the Authority in the Hands of *Pericles*. The Hiſtorian ſays thereupon that the Diviner and the Philoſopher might be both in the right, the one for gueſſing at the Effect, and the other for gueſſing at

(g) *Plut. in Pericle p. 154. E.*

A REFLECTION upon the Doctrine of Preſages.

(h) *That of* Pericles, *and that of* Thucydides *Son of* Myleſius.

once very Beneficial (B) to the *Athenians.* They were so unjust as to suspect

at the Cause. It was the Philosopher's Business, says he, to explain from whence and how that only Horn was formed; but it was the Diviner's Duty to declare why it was formed, and what it portended. For they, who say that as soon as a natural Reason is found out, the Prodigy vanishes away, are not aware that they destroy Artificial as well as Celestial Signs. Watch-Lights upon Towers, Sun-Dyals, *&c.* depend upon certain Causes, which act according to certain Rules; yet they are appointed to signify certain Things. This is the most specious and strongest Reason that can be alledged for the Vulgar Opinion which *Anaxagoras* opposed. That a natural *Phenomenon* may be a Prodigy, or a sign of a future Evil, it is not at all necessary that Philosophers should not be able to give any Account of it, for tho' they may explain it by the natural Virtues of Second Causes, yet it may very well be appointed to presage something. Watch Lights are explained by natural Reasons, nevertheless they are a Sign of the Course which Pilots ought to steer. It must be therefore confest that *Plutarch* has defended the common Opinion as learnedly as it can be maintained. The Efficient Cause, when found out, does not exclude the Final Cause, and even necessarily supposes it in every Action directed by an Intelligent Being. What Grounds do therefore Philosophers go upon, when they maintain that Eclipses being a natural Consequence of the Motion of Planets, cannot be a Presage of the Death of a King, and that the overflowing of Rivers being a natural Effect of Rains, or melted Snows, cannot portend a Sedition, the dethroning of a Prince, or such like publick Calamities? I answer that they are of that Opinion because the Effects of Nature cannot be Presages of Future Contingents, unless they be appointed for that End by a particular Intelligent Being. It is evident that the Laws of Nature being left in their general Course, would never raise any Towers, nor set up Watch-Lights upon them for the Use of Pilots. It must be the Work of Men, it is necessary that their particular Wills should apply the Virtue of Bodies in such a Manner as may relate to the End which they propose to themselves. On the other hand, it is manifest that the Laws of Nature being left in their general Course cannot produce any Meteors, or the overflowing of a River, whereby the Inhabitants of a Kingdom may know that there will arise a Sedition in two or three Years time, which will overthrow the Monarchy. It is manifest that a particular Intelligent Being must needs form those Meteors or those great Inundations, that they may be the Signs of a Change of Government. But then it will be impossible to explain them by physical Reasons; for that which depends upon the particular Will of a Man or an Angel, is not the Object of a Science: the Causes thereof cannot be found out by Philosophy. From whence it follows, 1. That an Event which may be explained by physical Reasons, is not a Presage of a Future Contingent, and that such a Presage cannot be explained by the Laws of Nature. So that when *Plutarch* says, that the Diviner found out the Final Cause, and the Philosopher the Efficient Cause, he must suppose that a particular Spirit so disposed the Scull of that Ram, that his Brains being straitned, and ending sharp over against the middle of the Forehead, produced but one Horn which came out in that very Place. He must also suppose that that Spirit modified the Brains of that Ram in such a manner, to the end that the *Athenians* might know that the Faction of *Pericles* would oppress that of *Thucydides*, and have all the Power in its Hands. But that Supposition being contrary to the Notions whereby we know that none but God can foresee Future Contingents, cannot be admitted; and so the Vulgar Opinion about Presages cannot be adopted without acknowledging that God produces miraculously, and by a particular Will all the Natural Effects which are look'd upon as Prognosticks. According to that Supposition, Miracles properly so call'd, would be almost as frequent as Natural Effects; which is a prodigious Absurdity. Observe that if God had been willing to work a Miracle, to inform the *Athenians* that one of their Factions would be destroyed, he needed not straiten the Brains of that Ram. He would have produced a Horn in the middle of the Forehead without making any Alteration in the Brains, which would have set the Prodigy in a greater Light. However, I hope the Reader will not find fault with me, for having made a Reflection upon a Thought of *Plutarch*, which is so specious that it might seem to most Readers to be a solid One.

(B) *An Account of Eclipses, which proved once very Beneficial to the Athenians.*] I shall set down a Passage of *Plutarch*, which concerns a Naval Expedition in the Beginning of the *Peloponnesian War.* (a) "And now the Vessels having their Complement of "Men, and *Pericles* being gone aboard the Admiral's own Galley, it happen'd that the Sun was "in an Eclipse, and it grew dark on a sudden, to "the extream Affrightement of them all, looking "upon it as a dismal Token, and an unlucky ill-boding *Omen.* Wherefore *Pericles* perceiving the "Pilot or Steersman seized with a great Fear, and "at a stand what to do, he took his Cloak and put "it before the Man's Face, and muffling him up in "it that he could not see, he asked him whether he "did imagin there was any dreadful Thing of great "Hurt in this that he had done to him, or whether "he thought it was the Sign of any Hurt: he answering, no; Why, said he, and what does that "there differ from this, only that that which has "caused that Darkness there, is something greater "than a Cloak." *Quintilian* observes that *Pericles* freed the *Athenians* from a great Fear at that time. (b) *An vero cum Pericles Athenienses Solis obscuratione territos, redditis ejus rei causis, metu liberavit: aut cum Sulpitius ille Gallus in exercitu L. Pauli de Lunæ defectione disseruit, ne velut prodigio divinitus facto militum animi terrerentur, non videtur esse usus oratoris officio?* *Valerius Maximus* does not say as *Plutarch* does, that *Pericles* was upon the Fleet; he pretends that this Astronomical Precept was given in the middle of *Athens.* (c) *Cum obscurato repentè sole inusitatis perfusa tenebris Athenæ sollicitudine agerentur, interitum sibi cœlesti denuntiatione portendi credentes, Pericles processit in medium, & quæ à præceptore suo Anaxagora pertinentia ad solis & lunæ cursum acceperat, disseruit: nec ulterius trepidare cives suos vano metu passus est.* *Frontinus* mentions the Explication of the Thunder-bolt, and not of an Eclipse. *Pericles*, says he (d), *cum in castra ejus fulmen decidisset, terruissetque milites, advocata concione, lapidibus in conspectu omnium collisis, ignem excussit, sedavitque turbationem, cùm docuisset similiter nubium attritu excuti fulmen.*

If all the *Athenian* Generals had had the Philosopher *Anaxagoras* for their Master, the Misfortune, which happen'd to the *Athenian* Fleet before *Syracusa*, had not happen'd. It was ready to set Sail in order to return to *Athens*, but the Moon being Eclipsed, the General *Nicias* put off the Departure, which occasion'd the Ruin of the Fleet. Let us hear *Plutarch.* "(e) The Moon fell Eclipsed in the "Night, to the great Fright of *Nicias* and others, "who for want of Experience, or out of Superstition, are fear'd with these Appearances. That "the Sun would be darkened about the thirtieth "day of the Month by the Moon going between, "this even the ordinary People now well enough "understood; but the Moon it self to be dark'ned, "how that could come about, and how on the "sudden a broad full Moon should lose all her "Light, and shew such various Colours, that was "not easy to be comprehended; but they concluded it to be Ominous, and a Sign from God of "heavy Calamities to ensue. For he, who the "first and the most plainly of any, and with the "greatest Assurance, committed to Writing, how "the Moon is enlightned, and over-shadowed, was "*Anaxagoras*; yet neither was he Ancient, nor his "Notion much taken Notice of, but was look'd upon "as Heterodox, and kept secret, passing only "amongst a few, under some kind of Caution and "Confidence, for they would not suffer Naturalists "and μετεωρολέσχας, as they then call'd them, that "is, such who dispute of things above, as lessening "the Divine Power, by deducing Things from natural senseless Causes, and a long Chain of Necessity, without any thing of Providence, or a "Free Agent. Hence it was that *Protagoras* was banished, and *Anaxagoras* cast in Prison, and *Pericles* "had very much a do to procure his Liberty." These Words of *Plutarch* may afford Matter enough for several Reflections.

(B 2) To

(a) Plut. in vit. Pericl.

(b) Quintil. Instit. Orat. l. 1. c. 10. p. m. 55.

(c) Val. Max. l. 8 c. 11. n. 1. ext.

(d) Front. Stratag. l. 1. c. 1

(e) Plut. in Nicia.

ſpect him (Bb) of Atheiſm, becauſe he had thoroughly learn'd the Doctrine of that Philoſopher. He ſignalized himſelf by an undaunted Courage, and an extraordinary force of Eloquence *, which was increaſed and ſtrengthned by the Science of Nature; and he knew ſo well how to accommodate himſelf to the Humour of the People according to the Times, that under a Republican Government, he acquired almoſt as (C) great an Authority as if he had been a Monarch.

I is

* See the Rem. C.

(Bb) *To ſuſpect him of Atheiſm, becauſe.*] I ſhall quote a grave Author for it. (f) ἤκουσε δὲ διδασκάλων, Ἀναξαγόρου μὲν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ, ὅθεν, φησὶν Ἄντυλλος, καὶ ἄθεος ἠρέμα ἐνομίσθη, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν θεωρίας ἐμφορηθείς. *Diſcipulos autem audivit in Philoſophia quidem, Anaxagoram unde etiam, Antyllo teſte, atheus paulatim haberi cœpit, quod illius philoſophiæ diſciplinam avidius hauſiſſet.* See a Paſſage of *Plutarch* at the end of the Remark *M*. Here is another Paſſage out of *Diodorus Siculus*. (g) Διόπερ ἐκκλησίας συναχθείσης περὶ τούτων, οἱ μὲν ἐχθροὶ τοῦ Περικλέους ἔπεισαν τὸν δῆμον συλλαβεῖν τὸν Φειδίαν, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Περικλέους κατηγόρουν ἱεροσυλίαν. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἀναξαγόραν τὸν σοφιστήν, διδάσκαλον ὄντα Περικλέους, ὡς ἀσεβοῦντα εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ἐσυκοφάντουν· συνέπλεκον δ' ἐν ταῖς κατηγορίαις καὶ διαβολαῖς τὸν Περικλέα, διὰ τὸν φθόνον σπεύδοντες διαβαλεῖν τὴν τἀνδρὸς ὑπεροχήν τε καὶ δόξαν. *Advocatâ igitur ob hoc concione, malevoli Periclis ſuaſores populo exiſtunt, ut Phidiam comprehendant, ipſumque Periclem ſacrilegii requirant. Anaxagoram præterea ſophiſtam, qui præceptor Periclis erat, quod impiè de diis ſentiat, criminantur. Eiſdem interim criminibus & calumniis etiam Periclem involvunt, hoc unice agentes, ut excellentem viri authoritatem & gloriam calumniis ſuis convellerent ac labefactarent.* That Author adds, that *Pericles* found no better way to calm that ſtorm, than to engage the Republick in an important War. He knew (h) the *Genius* and Humour of the People. They eſteem a great Man, when they are involved in a great War; but the Sweetneſs of Peace plunging them into Idleneſs, they diſcover their Jealouſies, and indite him as a Criminal.

(C) *Almoſt as great an Authority, as if he had been a Monarch.*] It has been ſaid that he got that Authority by his Eloquence. (a) *Pericles feliciſſimis naturæ incrementis, ſub Anaxagora præceptore ſummo ſtudio perpolitus & inſtructus, liberis Athenarum cervicibus jugum ſervitutis impoſuit: egit enim ille urbem, & verſavit arbitrio ſuo. Cumque adverſus voluntatem populi loqueretur, jucunda nihilominus & popularis ejus vox erat. Itaque veteris comœdiæ maledica lingua, quamvis potentiam viri perſtringere cupiebat, tamen in labris ejus hominis melle dulciorem leporem fatebatur habitare: inque animis eorum, qui illum audierant, quaſi aculeos quoſdam relinqui prædicabat.* *Valerius Maximus* adds, that the only difference between *Piſiſtratus* and *Pericles* was, that the one exercifed Tyranny with Arms, and the other without Arms. *Quid enim inter Piſiſtratum & Periclem interfuit, niſi quod ille armatus, hic ſine armis tyrannidem geſſit?* To give a greater weight to that Teſtimony of *Valerius Maximus*, I ſhall obſerve that he had it from *Cicero*. (b) *Quid Pericles? de cujus dicendi copia ſic accepimus, ut quum contra voluntatem Athenienſium loqueretur pro ſalute patriæ, ſeverius tamen id ipſum, quod ille contra populares homines diceret, populare omnibus, & jucundum videretur, cujus in labris veteres comici etiam quum illi maledicerent, quod tum Athenis fieri licebat, leporem habitaſſe dixerant, tantamque in eo vim fuiſſe, ut in eorum mentibus qui audiſſent, quaſi aculeos quoſdam relinqueret. At hunc non declamator aliquis ad clepſydram latrare docuerat, ſed, ut accepimus, Clazomenius ille Anaxagoras vir ſummus in maximarum rerum ſcientia. Itaque hic doctrina, conſilio, eloquentia excellens, quadraginta annos præfuit Athenis, & urbanis eodem tempore, & bellicis rebus.* We have here a proof of what I ſhall ſay, concerning the Liberty which the Comick Poets took againſt *Pericles*. Their Satyrical Strokes ſet off the Praiſes they could not refuſe him, by reaſon of his Eloquence. If any Body deſires to know the Names of the Poets who praiſed it, he needs only conſult *Cicero*, who tells us that *Eupolis* (c) ſaid that the Goddeſs of Perſuaſion had her Seat upon *Pericles*'s Lips, and that the Eloquence of that Man left a pleaſant Sting in the Hearts of his Hearers. (d) *Non quemadmodum de Pericle ſcripſit Eupolis, cum delectatione aculeos etiam relinqueret in animis eorum à quibus eſſet auditus.* *Diodorus* (e) *Siculus*, and *Pliny* the Younger, have preſerved to us the very Words of that Comick Poet. (f) *Nec me præterit ſummum oratorem Periclem ſic à comico Eupolide laudari,*

Πρὸς δέ γ' αὐτοῦ τῷ τάχει
Πειθώ τις ἐπεκάθιζεν ἐπὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν.
Οὕτως ἐκήλει, καὶ μόνος τῶν ῥητόρων
Τὸ κέντρον ἐγκατέλειπε τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις.

You will find in the Scholiaſt upon *Ariſtophanes* the ſame Verſes of *Eupolis* with ſome others that go before, and contain an *Encomium* upon the Eloquence of *Pericles*, which pleaſed, and was admired and feared: (g) *Hujus ſuavitate maxime hilaratæ ſunt Athenæ, hujus ubertatem & copiam admiratæ, ejuſdem vim dicendi terroremque timuerunt.* It charmed by its Sweetneſs, it was admired by reaſon of its Copiouſneſs, and feared by reaſon of its Force. Don't think it therefore an incredible thing that it made *Pericles* Reign in the middle of a Republick. His Words have been compared with the Thunder. (h) *Qui (Pericles) ſi tenui genere uteretur, nunquam ab Ariſtophane poeta fulgurare, tonare, permiſcere Græciam dictus eſſet.* That Paſſage of *Cicero* was parapheas'd by *Pliny* the Younger. (i) *Adde, quæ de eodem Pericle comicus alter,* ἤστραπτ', ἐβρόντα, ξυνεκύκα τὴν Ἑλλάδα. *Non enim amputata oratio & abſciſſa, ſed lata, & magnifica, & excelſa tonat, fulgurat, omnia denique perturbat ac miſcet.* The firſt time *Cicero* publiſhed his Book, he aſcribed thoſe Words to *Eupolis*; but he acknowledged his miſtake in another Work. (k) *Mihi quidem gratum, & erit gratius ſi non modo in libris tuis, ſed etiam in aliorum per librarios tuos Ariſtophanem repoſueris pro Eupoli.* *Ariſtophanes* mentions only the Lightning and the Thunder; but *Plutarch* mentions the Thunder-Bolt. "The Comedies, *ſays he*, of the then Maſters of "the Stage, who both in good earneſt, and out of "merriment too, let fly many ſhrewd Words at "him, do plainly ſhew that he got that Appellation "(*of Olympian*) eſpecially upon the account of his "being an able Speaker, by ſaying that he Thundered "and Lightned when he Harangued the People, and "that he carried a dreadful Thunder-Bolt in his "Tongue (l). The Author adds an Anſwer of *Thucydides* which confirms this. "When *Archidamus* the King of the *Lacedæmonians* asked him, "whether He or *Pericles* were the better Wreſtler? "he made this Anſwer; When I, ſaid he, have "thrown him and given him a fair Fall, he by "ſtanding out in the denial, ſaying that he had "no Fall, gets the better of me, and perſwades "People into a belief of what he ſays whether "they will or no, though they ſaw the quite contrary."

I have not done yet with the Eloquence of *Pericles*. Some ſay he was the firſt that wrote his Harangues before he recited them. (m) πρῶτος γραπτὸν λόγον ἐν δικαστηρίῳ εἶπε, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ σχεδιαζόντων. *Primus ſcriptam orationem habuit in judicio, cum illi qui ipſum anteceſſerant ex tempore dicerent.* *Corradus* has no reaſon to think (n) that *Pericles* read his Manuſcript; for an Harangue when read, is not very fit to produce the Effects which are aſcribed to the Eloquence of that Orator. Some Harangues of *Pericles* were ſtill extant in *Quintilian*'s time; but that Learned Rhetor finding them diſproportioned to the high Reputation of that great Man, approved (o) the opinion of thoſe who lookt upon 'em as a ſuppoſititious Work. (p) *Cicero in Bruto negat ante Periclem ſcriptum quicquam quod ornatum oratorium habeat: ejus aliqua ferri. Equidem non reperio quicquam tantâ eloquentiæ famâ dignum: ideoque minus miror eſſe qui nihil ab eo ſcriptum putent: hæc autem quæ feruntur, ab aliis eſſe compoſita.* But an indifferent Harangue being recited by an excellent Orator, may charm the Hearers. A good way of Delivery contributes moſt to it. See the Remark *C* of the Article *Narni*. I ſhall conclude with a Paſſage of *Thucydides*, who tells us that *Pericles* having the Gift of reſtraining the *Athenians* when they were too Bold, and of animating them when they wanted Boldneſs, was at the bottom the King of a Titular Republick. (q) Ὁπότε γοῦν αἴσθοιτό αὐτοὺς παρὰ καιρὸν ὕβρει θαρσοῦντας, λέγων κατέ-

πλησσεν

(f) Marcel. in vit. Thucyd.

(g) Diod. Sicul. l. 12. c. 39. p. m. 433.

(h) Id. ib.

(a) Val. Max. l. 8. c. 9. p. m. 699, 700.

(b) Cic. de Oratore l. 3. fol. m. 95. B.

(c) Πειθὼ quam vocant Græci, cujus effector eſt orator, hanc Suadam appellavit Ennius. Ejus autem Cethegum medullam fuiſſe vult, ut quam deam in Periclis labris ſcripſit Eupolis ſeſſitaviſſe, hujus hic medullam noſtrum oratorem fuiſſe dixerit. *Id. in Bruto pag. m.* 104.

(d) Id. ib. p. 62.

(e) Diod. Sicul. l. 12. c. 40. p. m. 434.

(f) Plin. Ep. 20. l. 1. p. m. 60.

(g) Cic. in Bruto p. 61.

(h) Id. in Oratore fol. m. 118 B.

(i) Plin. [illegible]

(k) Cic. ad Attic. Ep. 6. l. 12. p. m. 401, 402.

(l) Αἱ μέντοι κωμῳδίαι τῶν τότε διδασκάλων σπουδῇ τε πολλὰς καὶ μετὰ γέλωτος ἀφεικότων φωνὰς εἰς αὐτόν, ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ μάλιστα τὴν προσωνυμίαν γενέσθαι δηλοῦσι, βροντᾶν μὲν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀστράπτειν ὅτε δημηγοροίη, δεινὸν δὲ κεραυνὸν ἐν γλώττῃ φέρειν λεγόντων. At comœdiæ, quod qui ea tempeſtate docebant eas, & ſerias & ridiculas voces in eum multas ejacularentur, traxiſſe ex vi dicendi eum oſtendunt hoc cognomen: (*Olympii*) Tonare enim & fulminare concionantem, & vehemens eum in lingua fulmen dicebant gerere. *Plut. ib. p.* 156. *B*

(m) *Suidas in* Περικλῆς.

(n) *Corrad. in Brutum Cicer. p.* 77.

(o) Plut. *ibid. ſays that* Pericles *left no other Writings but ſome Decrees.*

(p) *Quint. inſt. Orat. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *p. m.* 115.

(q) *Thucyd. l.* 2. *p.* 141. *Francof.* 1514. *fol.*

'Tis true that he was not free from the Satyrical (D) Railleries of the Comick Poets. He was defamed by them upon ſeveral Accounts, but eſpecially by reaſon of his Love to *Aſpaſia*. His immoderate Love of Women was one of the Vices he was* moſt upbraided with. He bore patiently (E) thoſe Railleries, and he might have

κατέπλησσεν ἐπὶ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι, καὶ δεδιότας αὖ ἀλόγως, ἀντικαθίστη πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ θαρσεῖν. ἐγίγνετό τε λόγῳ μὲν, δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή. *Quoties itaque intelligebat eos* [illegible] *intempeſtive ferociterque* [illegible]*, orationis acrimonia deterrebat: quoties ab re formidantes, rurſus ad fiduciam erigebat. Denique verbo quidem, popularis ſtatus, re autem ipſa, penes primarium virum principatus erat.* *Plutarch* (r) has wonderfully paraphraſed that Paſſage of *Thucydides*; to which he adds very much to the purpoſe what *Plato* ſays concerning the force of Eloquence: he obſerves alſo, that the Poets laught at the Republick for granting ſo much power to one Man, and that they exhorted *Pericles* to promiſe upon his Oath, that he would not be a Tyrant. Αὐτὸν δ᾽ ἀπομόσαι μὴ τυραννήσειν κελεύοντες, ὡς ἀσυμμέτρου πρὸς δημοκρατίαν καὶ βαρυτέρας περὶ αὐτὸν οὔσης ὑπεροχῆς. ὁ δὲ Τηλεκλείδης παραδεδωκέναι φησὶν αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους πόλεών τε φόρους, αὐτάς τε πόλεις, τὰς μὲν δεῖν, τὰς δ᾽ ἀναλύειν· λάϊνα τείχη, τὰ μὲν οἰκοδομεῖν, τὰ δὲ αὖτε πάλιν καταβάλλειν, σπονδὰς, δύναμιν, κράτος, εἰρήνην, πλοῦτόν τ᾽ εὐδαιμονίαν τε. *Ipſumque jubent, ut cujus ſint immodicæ opes & intolerabiles liberæ civitati, tyrannidem ſe uſurpaturum abjurare. Teleclides permiſiſſe ei refert Athenienſes urbium tributa, ipſaſque ædes urbes has ligare, illas ſolvere, muros lapideos nunc extruere, nunc eoſdem demoliri, fœdera, opes, vires, pacem, opulentiam, fortunaſque omnes* (ſ).

I muſt not forget to obſerve that, with the extraordinary force of his Genius, he made a very good uſe of his Philoſophical Knowledge, the better to ſet off his Eloquence. The ſublime Speculations, and the Phyſical and Metaphyſical Depths wherewith *Anaxagoras* had imbibed his Mind, would have proved an obſtacle to ſeveral others, who had been deſirous of acquiring the glory of being Great Orators. But as for him, he found in them wherewith to give a wonderful force to his Harangues. We learn this fine particularity of *Plato*: his Expreſſions are noble, and will charm thoſe who underſtand *Greek*. (t) Πᾶσαι ὅσαι μεγάλαι τῶν τεχνῶν προσδέονται ἀδολεσχίας καὶ μετεωρολογίας φύσεως πέρι· τὸ γὰρ ὑψηλόνουν τοῦτο καὶ πάντῃ τελεσιουργὸν ἔοικεν ἐντεῦθέν ποθεν εἰσιέναι. ὃ καὶ Περικλῆς πρὸς τῷ εὐφυὴς εἶναι ἐκτήσατο. προσπεσὼν γὰρ, οἶμαι, τοιούτῳ ὄντι Ἀναξαγόρᾳ, μετεωρολογίας ἐμπλησθεὶς, καὶ ἐπὶ φύσιν νοῦ τε καὶ ἀνοίας ἀφικόμενος (ὧν δὴ πέρι τὸν πολὺν λόγον ἐποιεῖτο Ἀναξαγόρας) ἐντεῦθεν εἵλκυσεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν λόγων τέχνην τὸ πρόσφορον αὐτῇ. *Magnæ quælibet artes exercitatione dialectica, contemplationeque ſublimium in natura rerum indigent. Ipſa enim mentis ſublimitas, & vis efficax in quavis re perficienda, hinc quodammodo proficiſci videntur: quod Pericles ad ingenii acumen adjunxit. Anaxagoræ namque hujuſmodi rerum indagatoris familiaritate fretus contemplationi ſe tradidit mentiſque & dementiæ naturam illam comprehendit, de qua Anaxagoras diffusè diſſeruit. Unde ad dicendi artem quod ipſi conducere videbatur, traduxit.* *Cicero*, who as I think, had that paſſage of *Plato* in his view, does not expreſs all the ſublimity of it. *Pericles*, ſays he (a), *primus adhibuit doctrinam, quamquam tum nulla erat dicendi, tamen ab Anaxagora phyſico eruditus exercitationem mentis à reconditis abſtruſiſque rebus ad cauſas forenſes popularesque facile traduxerat, hujus ſuavitate*, &c.

(D) *From the Satyrical Railleries of the Comick Poets.*] He was abuſed by *Cratinus*, *Teleclides*, *Eupolis*, *Plato* the Comick Poet, and *Dexippus*. *Plutarch* does not only ſay ſo, but even ſets down (c) their very Words: *Tanaquillus Faber* obſerves (d) that *Cratinus was reſolute and bold in his Compoſitions*, and that *his Pen ſpared not the Principal Officers of the Republick, and the Great and* Olympian *Pericles*. Let us ſee what he ſays in another Place. "(e) *Hermippus* did a thing which St. *Auguſtin* was "doubtleſs ignorant of: for that Great Doctor, who "underſtood not *Greek* ſo well as ſome might think, "and ſtudied more carefully the *Doctrine of Grace*, "than the *Greek* Hiſtory or the Comick Poets, ſays "ſomewhere in his Work *de Civitate Dei*, that the "Licentiouſneſs of the Stage was never ſo impudent "as to offend *Pericles*: whereas *Terence* made no "ſcruple to offend *Jupiter* himſelf. (that Paſſage "is to be found in the *Eunuch*.) He was therefore "miſtaken, for *Hermippus* made ſome Verſes againſt "*Pericles*." There was never a more unjuſt Cenſure than this is; for St. *Auguſtin* does not ſay what the *Salmurian* Critick imputes to him. That Father has quoted a long Paſſage, wherein ſome Body deplores the Caſe of Great *Pericles*, becauſe he was not ſpared by the Stage Poets. (f) *Quid autem hinc ſenſerint Romani veteres, Cicero teſtatur in libris, quos de Republica ſcripſit, ubi Scipio diſputans ait, Nunquam comœdiæ niſi conſuetudo vitæ pateretur, probare ſua theatris flagitia potuiſſent. Et Græci quidem antiquiores vitioſæ ſuæ opinionis quandam convenientiam ſervaverunt, apud quos fuit etiam lege conceſſum, ut quod vellet comœdia nominatim, vel de quo vellet, diceret. Itaque ſicut in eiſdem libris loquitur Africanus, quem illa non attigit, vel potius quem non vexavit, cui pepercit? Eſto: populares homines improbos, in repub. ſeditioſos, Cleonem, Cleophontem, Hyperbolum læſit. Patiamur, inquit, etſi hujuſmodi cives, à cenſore melius eſt quàm à poeta notari: ſed Periclem, cùm jam ſuæ civitati maxima autoritate plurimos annos domi & bello præfuiſſet, violari verſibus, & eos agi in ſcena non plus decuit, quàm ſi Plautus, inquit, noſter voluiſſet, aut Nævius, Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius Marco Catoni maledicere. Deinde paulò poſt noſtræ, inquit, contrà duodecim tabulæ cum perpaucas res capite ſanxiſſent, in his hanc quoque ſanciendam putaverunt, ſi quis occentaviſſet, ſive carmen condidiſſet, quod infamiam faceret, flagitiumve alteri. Præclarè. Judiciis enim ac Magiſtratuum diſceptationibus legitimis propoſitam vitam, non poëtarum ingeniis habere debemus, nec probrum audire, niſi ea lege ut reſpondere liceat, & judicio defendere. Hæc ex Ciceronis quarto de Republica libro ad verbum excerpenda arbitratus ſum, nonnullis propter faciliorem intellectum vel prætermiſſis, vel paululum commutatis.* All Authors ought to learn from this miſtake of *Tanaquillus Faber* to miſtruſt their Memory, and never to alledge any thing, without conſulting over again the Books wherein they remember they have read it. He had read in St. *Auguſtin*, that the *Romans* would not have permitted that their Players ſhould offend *Scipio*, tho' they permitted that *Terence* ſhould offend *Jupiter*: he miſtook *Pericles* for *Scipio*, and then he thought he had a good reaſon to rail at St. *Auguſtin*. Let us ſee the Words of that Father, they are fine and judicious, they upbraid the *Roman* Legiſlators with a very great Fault; they forbad the Poets to abuſe their Magiſtrates, and permitted them to ridicule their Gods. (g) *At Romani, ſicut in illa de Repub. diſputatione gloriatur Scipio, probris & injuriis poëtarum ſubjectam vitam famamque habere noluerunt, capite etiam punire ſancientes tale carmen condere ſi quis auderet. Quod erga ſe quidem ſatis honeſtè conſtituerunt, ſed erga Deos ſuos ſuperbè & irreligioſè. Quos cùm ſcirent non ſolùm patienter, ſed etiam libenter poëtarum probris maledictiſque lacerari, ſe potius hujuſcemodi injuriis indignos eſſe duxerunt, ſeque ab eis etiam lege munierunt, illorum autem iſta etiam ſacris ſolennitatibus miſcuerunt. Itane tandem Scipio laudas, hanc poëtis Romanis negatam eſſe licentiam, ut cuiquam opprobrium infligerent Romanorum, cum videas, eos nulli Deorum pepercisse veſtrorum? Itane pluris tibi habenda eſt exiſtimatio veſtræ curiæ, quàm Capitolii, imò Romæ unius quam cœli totius: ut linguam maledicam in cives tuos exercere poëtæ etiam lege prohiberentur, & in Deos tuos ſecuri, tanta convitia nullo Senatore, nullo Cenſore, nullo Principe, nullo Pontifice prohibente jacularentur? Indignum videlicet fuit, ut Plautus aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius M. Catoni malediceret: & dignum fuit, ut Terentius veſter flagitio Jovis optimi maximi adoleſcentium nequitiam concitaret.* *Arnobius* had already upbraided the Heathens with the ſame thing. See the Margin (b): his Words do very well deſerve to be read.

(E) *He bore patiently thoſe Railleries.*] We don't find that any of the Poets who abuſed him, was puniſhed for it. Yet it is very likely, that a Man of ſo great an Authority, might have eaſily puniſhed

---

* See the Rem. F.

(r) Plut. ub. ſup. p. 151.

(ſ) Id. ib.

(t) Plato in Phædro p. m. 1237. A, B.

(a) Cic. in Bruto p. m. 72, 73.

(c) Plut. in Pericle p. 153, 154, 160, 165, 170.

(d) The Lives of the Greek Poets, p. m. 90.

(e) Ib. p. 81, 82.

(f) Auguſt. de Civ. Dei l. 2. c. 9. p. m. 155.

(g) Aug. ib. c. 12. p. 165, 151.

(b) Nec [illegible] vobis ſaltem iſtum meruerunt honorem, ut quibus expellitis à vobis, eiſdem ab his legibus propulſaretis injurias. Majeſtatis ſunt apud vos rei, qui de veſtris ſequius obmurmuraverint aliquid regibus. Magiſtratum in ordinem redigere, Senatorem aut convitio proſequi, ſuis eſſe decreſtis periculoſiſſimum pœnis. Carmen malum conſcribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur & vita, decemviralibus ſcitis evadere noluiſtis impune: ac ne veſtras aures convitio aliquis petulantiore pulſaret, de atrocibus formulas conſtituiſtis injuriis. Soli Dii ſunt apud vos ſuperi inhonorati, contemptibiles, viles: in quos jus eſt à vobis datum, quæ quiſque voluerit dicere: turpitudinum jacere, quas libido confinxerit atque excogitaverit, formas. *Arnob. l. 4. p. 150, 151.*

ed

have been look'd upon as a happy Man, had he not been expoſed to ſome other Evils; but he felt the malignity of Fortune in ſeveral reſpects, eſpecially in (F) his Family *, for his Wife and Children gave him a great deal of trouble. An

ed the boldneſs of thoſe Men. They touched him in his moſt ſenſible part; for they call'd *Aſpaſia* an Impudent and Lecherous Concubine, they call'd her ſo, I ſay, upon the Stage. (i) *Ἐν δὲ ταῖς κωμῳδίαις Ὀμφάλη τε νέα καὶ Δηϊάνειρα καὶ πάλιν Ἥρα προσαγορεύεται. Κρατῖνος δ' ἄντικρυς παλλακὴν αὐτὴν εἴρηκεν ἐν τούτοις. Ἥραν τέ οἱ Ἀσπασίαν τίκτει καταπυγοσύνη παλλακὴν κυνώπιδα. In comœdiis nova Omphale & Deianira, alias Juno nominatur. Cratinus diſerte pellicem appellavit his verſibus:*

Junonem Aſpaſiam parit,
Et impudicam & pellicem, inverecundamque.

His Indolence proceeded partly from Policy; for if *Pericles* had gone about to ſtop the Mouth of the Poets, he would have made the *Athenians* ſenſible of a thing which it was not his Intereſt they ſhould ſee: they would have perceived that they had only the Titular Government of the Republick, and that all the Power was in effect re-united in one Man. Nothing will more effectually hinder the People from perceiving the Extinction of their Liberty, than to be permitted to abuſe, without being puniſhed for it, thoſe who enjoy the reality of a Monarchical Power, under ſuch Names as have nothing that is odious. It was therefore neceſſary that *Pericles* ſhould deſpiſe the licentiouſneſs of the Stage: but we muſt not aſcribe his Patience to meer Art and Policy: it was alſo an effect of his Great Soul; for a Man ſo courageous and ſo briſk as he was, had never endured ſuch an ill Uſage with ſo much Patience, had he not had an extraordinary great Soul. Read this Paſſage of his Life. (k) “One time being reviled and ill ſpoken of all Day long, in his own Hearing, by a villainous and ill tongued Raſcal, that cared not what he ſaid, he bore it patiently all along without returning him one Word; all this in the open Court or the Aſſembly of the People, where he was at the ſame time engaged in the proſecution and diſpatch of ſome weighty urgent Affair. In the Evening he went Home in very good order, as one unconcerned, this Fellow dogging him at the Heels, and pelting him all the way he went with all the hard Words and foul Language he could take up. As he was ready to go into his Houſe, it being by this time dark, he ordered one of his Servants to take a Light, and to go along with the Man and ſee him ſafe Home.„ He ſhewed the force of his Courage and his great Patience in the beginning of the *Peloponneſian* War. Whilſt the Enemies were Ravaging *Attica*, *Pericles* being not able to repulſe them, was contented to provide for the ſecurity of *Athens*. The *Athenians* murmured at his Conduct, made ſharp Verſes againſt him, and reviled and threatned him. He deſpiſed their Anger, and followed his own Judgment with the greateſt tranquillity. Ἐχρῆτο τοῖς αὐτοῦ λογισμοῖς, *βραχέα φροντίζων τῶν καταβοώντων καὶ δυσχεραινόντων. καίτοι πολλοὶ μὲν αὐτοῦ τῶν φίλων δεόμενοι προσέκειντο, πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀπειλοῦντες καὶ κατηγοροῦντες. πολλοὶ δ' ᾖδον ᾄσματα καὶ σκώμματα πρὸς αἰσχύνην, ἐφυβρίζοντες αὐτοῦ τὴν στρατηγίαν, ὡς ἄνανδρον καὶ προϊεμένην τὰ πράγματα τοῖς πολεμίοις. ἐπεφύετο δὲ καὶ Κλέων ἤδη διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὀργῆς τῶν πολιτῶν πορευόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν δημαγωγίαν... πλὴν ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἐκινήθη τῶν τοιούτων ὁ Περικλῆς, ἀλλὰ πράως καὶ σιωπῇ τὴν ἀδοξίαν καὶ τὴν ἀπέχθειαν ὑφιστάμενος* (a). *Sua ſequens conſilia, contempſit obſtrepentes & ſtomachantes: quamvis multi eum amici obtunderent precibus, multi minitarentur adverſarii inſectarenturque, multi carmina canerent & dicteria probroſa, convitiiſque inceſſerent ejus imperium ut molle & prodens hoſtibus rempubl. Et verò etiam Cleon, incenſam conſpiciens in illum civitatem, mordebat eum, auram popularem captans.———Verum iſtorum movit Periclem nihil: ſed comiter & tacitè tulit ignominiam & invidiam.* What Courage! what Conſtancy! what force of Mind is this!

(F) *He felt the malignity of Fortune .... in his Family.*] The Woman he Married was related to him, and had been already Married to *Hipponicus*, by whom ſhe had a Boy. *Pericles* had two Sons by her, and grew weary of her. She was not pleaſed with him neither, and ſhe conſented without any reluctancy to Marry the Man he propoſed to her (b). I believe ſhe was not altogether in the wrong; for *Pericles* behaved himſelf ſo, as to give his Wife juſt cauſe of being angry with him. He loved ſome other Women; for to ſay nothing (c) of *Chryſilla*, with whom he was perhaps in Love whilſt he was a Husband, it is certain that he kept *Aſpaſia*. He was ſo fond of her that he Married her, tho' ſhe had an ill Reputation. The ill-tongu'd *Athenians* ſpread abroad a thouſand Stories, which could not but exaſperate his Wife againſt him, and perhaps there was ſome truth in the matter. They ſaid that *Phidias* the moſt excellent Sculptor in the World, and Surveyor-General of all the Works which *Pericles* ordered to be made for the Ornament of the City, drew in the Ladies, under pretence of ſhewing them the Works of the greateſt Maſters; but at the bottom to debauch and deliver them to *Pericles*. (d) Πάντα δ' ἦν σχεδὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, *καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπεστάτει τοῖς τεχνίταις διὰ φιλίαν Περικλέους. καὶ τοῦτο τῷ μὲν φθόνον, τῷ δὲ βλασφημίαν ἤνεγκεν, ὡς ἐλευθέρας τῷ Περικλεῖ γυναῖκας εἰς τὰ ἔργα φοιτώσας ὑποδεχομένου τοῦ Φειδίου. δεξάμενοι δὲ τὸν λόγον οἱ κωμικοὶ, πολλὴν ἀσέλγειαν αὐτοῦ κατεσκέδασαν, εἴς τε τὴν Μενίππου γυναῖκα διαβάλλοντες, ἀνδρὸς φίλου καὶ ὑποστρατηγοῦντος, εἴς τε τὰς Πυριλάμπους ὀρνιθοτροφίας, ὃς ἑταῖρος ὢν Περικλέους, αἰτίαν εἶχε ταῶνας ὑφιέναι ταῖς γυναιξὶν αἷς ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπλησίαζε. Omnia fere hic ob Periclis neceſſitudinem curabat, artificibuſque praerat omnibus: id quod huic convitia, illi conflavit invidiam, quaſi ingenuas matronas, ad ſpectanda opera commeantes, in gratiam Phidias Periclis reciperet. Eos rumores excipientes comici, inſolentem laſciviam ei impegere, ac Menippi uxorem amici atque in bello legati improperavere, Pyrilampiſque avium vivaria, cui, quum familiaris Periclis eſſet, inſigebatur, ipſum mulieribus quibus conſueſceret Pericles, ſubjicere pavones.* “(e) The Comick Wits of the Town, when they had got this Story by the end, made much of it, and bedaſhed him with all the Ribaldry they could invent, as if he had been the erranteſt Whoremaſter that ever liv'd; charging him falſly with the Wife of *Menippus*, one who was his Friend, and had been a Lieutenant General under him in the Wars; and with the Votaries or Bird-Cages of *Pyrilampes*, who being an Acquaintance of *Pericles*, they pretended and made as if he were wont to preſent (f) Peacocks and ſuch fine Birds to *Pericles* his Miſtreſs, the Women whom he Gallanted and kept Company with.„ If *Pericles* was not pleaſed with his Wife, he was leſs pleaſed ſtill with his Eldeſt Son. He was a very ill-natur'd and prodigal young Man; he made continual Complaints of his Father's Thriftineſs, eſpecially when he had Married a very coſtly Woman. He borrowed ſome Money in his Father's Name, and when he ſaw that his Father, inſtead of repaying that Sum, entered an Action againſt the Man who had lent it, he did horribly inveigh againſt him. “(g) The young Man *Xanthippus* thought himſelf ſo heinouſly uſed and highly diſobliged, that he openly reviled his Father; and firſt by way of Droll and Raillery, he redicul'd him by telling Stories, what his Carriage and Converſation were at home, and what kind of Diſcourſes he had with the Sophiſters and Scholars that came to his Houſe. As for inſtance, how *Epitimius* the *Pharſalian*, (one who was a Practicer of all the Five Games of Skill) having with a Dart or Javelin unawares againſt his will, ſtruck and killed a Horſe that ſtood in the way, his Father ſpent a whole Day with *Protagoras* in a ſerious and learned Diſpute, whether the Javelin, or the Man that threw it, or the Maſters of the Game, who appointed theſe Sports, were according to the ſtricteſt and beſt reaſon to be accounted the cauſe of this Miſchance or Horſe-Slaughter; whereas, and make the worſt of it, it was but Chance-medley. Further beſides this *Steſimbrotus* tells us, that it was *Xanthippus* himſelf, who ſpread abroad among the People that infamous Story concerning his own Wife, how his Father would make him a Cuckold, and that this untoward grudge of the young Man againſt his Father, and unnatural breach betwixt them, which was never to be healed or made up, continued with him to his very dying Day.„ *Xanthippus* gave out that his Wife had been debauched by *Pericles*. This is *Plutarch's* meaning; but it cannot be known neither by the

---

* *Taken from Plutarch's Life of Pericles.*

(i) *Plut. in Pericle p. 155. D.*

(k) *Id. in Pericle.*

(a) *Plut. in Pericle p. 170. D. & E.*

(b) *Ib. p. 165.*

(c) *Αὐτὸς δὲ (Ἴων) ἐν τοῖς ἐλεγείοις ἐρᾶν μὲν λέγει Χρυσίλλης τῆς Κορινθίας, Τελέω δὲ θυγατρὸς, ἧς καὶ Περικλέα τὸν Ὀλύμπιον ἐρᾶν φησὶ Τηλεκλείδης ἐν Ἡσιόδοις.* Fatetur ille (Jon) ſane in elegiis ſuis dilectam à ſe fuiſſe Chryſillam Corinthiam, Telei filiam, cujus amore captum quoque fuiſſe Periclem Olympium ait Teleclides in Heſiodis. *Athen. lib. 10. p. 436. F.*

(d) *Plut. ib. p. 160. C.*

(e) *Id. in Pericle.*

(f) *Theſe Birds were at that time extreamly dear. See Athen. l. 14. c. 20. p. 654, 655.*

(g) *Plut. in Pericle.*

An Obſervation ought to be made upon the (G) ſcandalous Stories, which were ſpread abroad againſt him. He died in the third Year of the * *Peloponneſian* War, after

* *Thucyd. l. 2. p. m. 118. It was the 3d year of the 87 Olymp.*

the *Greek* Words, not by the *Latin* Tranſlation; it muſt be gueſt at by another Paſſage of the ſame Hiſtorian. He ſays, *pag.* 160. that *Pericles* was accuſed by *Steſimbrotus*, as having lain with his Son's Wife. (*k*) Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος δεινὸν ἀσέβημα καὶ μυθῶδες ἐξενεγκεῖν ἐτόλμησεν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ υἱοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Περικλέους. *Quum Steſimbrotus quoque Thaſius atroci ſcelere & fabuloſo Periclem aſperſerit in filii conjugem admiſſo.* By the help of that Paſſage one may underſtand this, which otherwiſe would be a Riddle. (*l*) Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, καὶ τὴν περὶ τὴν γυναῖκα διαβολὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ξανθίππου φησὶν ὁ Στησίμβροτος εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς διασπαρῆναι. *Infamiam etiam à ſuis ipſius natis Steſimbrotus per Xanthippum memoriæ prodidit vulgatam.* I am going to ſpeak of another Domeſtick Trouble, which is not very great if compared with the former; but it is no ſmall one, if it be conſidered without any compariſon. *Pericles* (*m*) had a Steward, who regulated the Expences of his Houſe with ſo much Thrift, that the meaneſt Citizens could not be more careful to avoid unneceſſary Charges. The Son of *Pericles*, and all the Women in the Houſe grumbled at it. This was ſufficient to check his Joy. One may reaſonably believe that *Pericles* did not think himſelf happy, when he loſt his Eldeſt Son, who gave him ſo much trouble; for we are naturally inclined to wiſh that a Son ſhould live rather than die, tho' he be undutiful. But one may be ſure that that Great Man was not unconcerned, when his ſecond Son, the only lawfully begotten Son he had, died of the Plague. He bore the death of his Eldeſt Son, and of his Siſter, and of moſt of his Friends and Relations with great Conſtancy: but he could not forbear ſhedding Tears when he was ſtruck with this laſt Blow. (*n*) "However he did not ſhrink upon theſe occaſions, nor did "betray or lower his high Spirit, and the greatneſs "of his Mind under all his misfortunes, and "thoſe Calamities which befell him. Nay, ſo un"concerned and ſo great a Maſter of his Paſſions "he was, at leaſt ſeem'd to be, that he was ne"ver known to weep or mourn, at the Funerals "of any of his dead Friends, nor was ſo much as "ſeen at the Burial of any of his Relations, till at "laſt he loſt the only Son which was left of thoſe "who were lawfully begotten, his Son *Paralus*. "This touch'd him home, and made him bow and "relent, and yet he ſtrived what he could to main"tain his principle of Gravity, and to preſerve and "keep up the Greatneſs of his Soul: But all would "not do, for when he came to perform the Cere"mony of putting a Garland of Flowers upon the "Head of the Corps, he was vanquiſhed by his "Paſſion at that ſight, ſo that he burſt out a Cry"ing, and poured forth abundance of Tears, ha"ving never done any ſuch thing (*o*) before." This puts me in mind of a King of *Egypt* mentioned by *Herodotus* (*p*), and of an omiſſion of *Valerius Maximus*. (*q*) *Pericles intra quatriduum duobus mirificis adoleſcentibus filiis ſpoliatus; iis ipſis diebus & vultu priſtinum habitum retinente, & oratione nulla ex parte infractiore concionatus eſt. Ille vero caput quoque ſolito more coronatum gerere ſuſtinuit, ut nihil ex vetere ritu propter domeſticum vulnus detraheret.* I look upon the ſteps which *Pericles* made in favour of his Baſtard, to be very diſadvantageous to him. He cauſed a Law to be Enacted, which proved the ruin of many People; and then he deſired that it ſhould be repealed in favour of his Baſtard; which was granted him meerly out of Compaſſion for his misfortunes. Οἰκτρὸν οὖν ἐδόκει τὸν κατὰ τοσούτων ἰσχύσαντα τὸν νόμον, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν διαλυθῆναι τοῦ γράψαντος, ἡ παροῦσα δυστυχία τῷ Περικλεῖ περὶ τὸν οἶκον, ὡς δίκην τινὰ δεδωκότι τῆς ὑπεροψίας καὶ τῆς μεγαλαυχίας ἐκείνης, ἐπέκλασε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους· καὶ δόξαντες αὐτὸν νεμεσητά τε παθεῖν, ἀνθρωπίνως τε δεῖσθαι, συνεχώρησαν ἀπογράψασθαι τὸν νόθον εἰς τοὺς φράτορας, ὄνομα θέμενον τὸ αὐτοῦ (*r*). *Quum eſſet igitur res indigna, ut quæ contra tam multos vim habuerat, ab eodem lex qui tulerat eam, rurſus abrogaretur: præſens Periclis clades domeſtica (ut qui pœnam luiſſe jam faſtus & arrogantiæ illius ſuæ videretur) infregit populum Athenienſem, putavitque eum, Deorum oppreſſum invidia, eſſe humanitate allevandum, quare indulſit ei ut in curia ſua nothus cenſeretur nomine paterno.* It was without doubt a great trouble to him to think that the whole Town would reflect upon the Conduct of a Man, who having made a Law, whereby part of the Inhabitants were to be Sacrificed, I mean, reduced to Slavery, demands afterwards that it be repealed for his particular Intereſt. It was ordered By the Law I ſpeak of, that all thoſe who were not born of *Athenian* Parents, ſhould be reputed Baſtards, and accordingly near Five Thouſand Citizens were Sold off.

(*k*) *Plut. in Pericle p.* 160. *E.*

(*l*) *Id. ib. p.* 171. *B.*

(*m*) *Id. ib. p.* 162.

(*n*) *Id. ib.*

(*o*) *This does not agree with the Tears he is reported to have ſhed at the Funeral of Aſpaſia. See the Rem. M.*

(*p*) *Lib.* 3. *c.* 14. *He ſays that* Pſammenitus *wept not for the misfortune of his Daughter and Son, and that he wept when he ſaw the misfortune of one of his Friends. See in the ſame place what he anſwered, being ask'd what was the reaſon of ſuch a behaviour. See alſo* Montagne's *Eſſays, c.* 2. *Book* 1.

(*q*) Val. Max. *l.* 5. *c.* 10. *See alſo* Ælian Var. hiſt. l. 9. c. 6. *Note that* Protagoras apud Plutarch. de conſol. ad Apollon. *pag.* 118. *relates the ſame thing as* Valerius Maximus *does, only he reckons* 8 *days between the Death of the two Sons.*

(*r*) *Plut. in Pericle p.* 172. *E.*

(G) *An Obſervation ought to be made upon the ſcandalous Stories, which were ſpread abroad againſt him.*] It is *Plutarch*'s Reflection, and it tends to ſhew the uncertainty of Hiſtory; it is one of the Reaſons of ſuſpenſion in the Syſtem of Hiſtorical *Pyrrhoniſm*. *Plutarch* having related how *Pericles* was abuſed by the Poets, and ſhamefully calumniated by *Steſimbrotus*, cries out, that it is a difficult thing to find out Truth. The Contemporary Authors ſuppreſs or pervert it, ſome out of Hatred and Jealouſie, others out of Love and Flattery. Thoſe that come after them meet with the time paſt, which proves a kind of a Barrier, whereby they are excluded from the true knowledge of things. (*b*) Οὕτως ἔοικε πάντῃ χαλεπὸν εἶναι καὶ δυσθήρατον ἱστορίᾳ τἀληθές, ὅταν οἱ μὲν ὕστερον γεγονότες τὸν χρόνον ἔχωσιν ἐπιπροσθοῦντα τῇ γνώσει τῶν πραγμάτων, ἡ δὲ τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν βίων ἡλικιῶτις ἱστορία, τὰ μὲν φθόνοις καὶ δυσμενείαις, τὰ δὲ χαριζομένη καὶ κολακεύουσα, λυμαίνεται καὶ διαστρέφει τὴν ἀλήθειαν. *Tantæ molis eſt & difficultatis aſſequi ex hiſtoria veritatem, quum poſteriores, antequam cognoſcant res, præveniantur tempore: æqualis rerum geſtarum & hominum hiſtoria partim invidia & odio, partim gratia & adulatione opprimat & pervertat veritatem.* *Plutarch* knew thoſe difficulties by experience. He was obliged to ſay, (*c*) that the cauſe of the *Peloponneſian* War was not well known. What is it then that will be known? The reaſon why the cauſe of that War was obſcure, is the ſame on a thouſand occaſions. The Glory and Power of *Pericles* made him odious; hence it is that his Enemies invented a hundred falſe Stories againſt him. They were reſolved to impute to him the misfortunes of that War: ſome invented one thing, ſome another. Which ſide can a Reader take in the midſt of ſo many malicious Stories? He was no ſooner expoſed to the Hatred of the Multitude, but ſeveral Satyrical Wits ſtarted up, who ſacrificed to that Hatred, as to an ill *Genius*, ſuch Victims as they judged moſt proper for it. (*d*) Καὶ τί ἄν τις ἀνθρώπους σατυρικοὺς τοῖς βίοις καὶ τὰς κατὰ τῶν κρειττόνων βλασφημίας ὥσπερ δαίμονι κακῷ τῷ φθόνῳ τῶν πολλῶν ἀποθύοντας ἑκάστοτε, θαυμάσειεν. *Et quidem quis miretur, petulanti homines lingua, ſi maledicta in principes invidiæ multitudinis, tanquam malo dæmonio, aſſidue conſecraverint.* But they found none more proper than the Injuries whereby he was defamed. *Plutarch* is to be praiſed for having had little regard to the pretenſions of the *Megarians* †, tho' they were grounded upon the teſtimony of *Ariſtophanes*. They were Parties in that Affair againſt *Pericles*, and what has been lately ſaid of a Modern (*e*) Author, may be ſaid of *Ariſtophanes* and all the Comick Poets of that time, *that they are only good to make one doubt of the cleareſt Truths, when they are advanced by them.* If *Plutarch* was now alive, he would ſay that our Poſterity will hardly diſcern the true Hiſtories of our time; for there are ſo many falſities ſpread abroad, and ſo many Victims offered to the ill *Genius* of the Hatred and Envy of the People, that if the *Athenian* Satyriſts ſhould come again into the World, they would think themſelves to be meer Novices. Beſides, there are ſo many Encomiums publiſhed every Day, that if the Flatterers of that Country ſhould riſe again from the Dead, they would be convinced that they were meer School-Boys.

I remember a very fine Paſſage of *Plutarch*, (*f*) wherein *Pericles* is concerned. When a Fact is certain, and the intention of the Author not well known, it is a wicked and malicious thing to aſcribe it to an ill Motive. This was practiſed by the Comick Poets: they ſaid poſitively, that *Pericles* kindled the *Peloponneſian* War for the ſake of his Miſs *Aſpaſia* and *Phidias*, and not at all out of a noble and courageous Ambition of bringing down the Pride of the *Lacedæmonians*. They, who being forced to acknowledge that an Action is worthy of Praiſe, ſearch the intention of the Heart, and ſuppoſe

(*b*) *Id. ib. p.* 159. *F.*

(*c*) *Ib. p.* 159. *A.*

(*d*) *Id. p.* 160. *D.*

(†) *They ſaid that the Rape of two Whores of* Aſpaſia *had ingaged* Pericles *in that War. See the Rem. M.*

(*e*) *The Author of l'Eſprit de* Mr. Arnauld. *See the Art.* Arnauld.

(*f*) *Plut. de Herodoti malignitate p.* 855. *F.*

after a long Sickneſs which (*H*) weaken'd his Judgment. Yet a little before he died, he ſaid a very judicious thing, which gave *Plutarch* occaſion to make a ſolid (*I*) Reflection upon the Nature of God: but that Author went too far;

poſe that it was not good, are come to the higheſt pitch of Envy and Malignity. Ε'ν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς εὐδηλοτάτοις ἔργοις καὶ πεπραγμένοις ἐπιφέρειν αἰτίαν φαύλην ὑποτίθεσθαι, καὶ κατάγειν ταῖς διαβολαῖς εἰς ὑποψίας ἀτόπους περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀφανεῖ προαιρέσεως τοῦ πράξαντος αὐτὸ τὸ πεπραγμένον ἐμφανῶς οὐ δυνάμενον ψέγειν ..... εὔδηλον ὅτι φθόνου καὶ κακοηθείας ὑπερβολὴν οὐ λείπει (h). *Præclaris enim & laudatis factis atque rebus maligni cauſam qui ſubjiciunt vitioſam, calumniandoque in ſiniſtras abducunt ſuſpiciones de latente ejus qui rem geſſit conſilio, quando ipſum factum palam vituperare non poſſunt ..... his liquet ad ſummam invidentiam & nequitiam nihil ſibi feciſſe reliquum.* I would fain know whether *Duris* of *Samos* and *Theophraſtus* aſcribed to *Aſpaſia* the two Wars, which the Poets imputed to her. *Harpocration* quotes them in the ſame manner as he alledges *Ariſtophanes*. (i) Δοκεῖ δὲ δυοῖν πολέμων αἰτία γεγονέναι, τοῦ τε Σαμιακοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ, ὡς ἔστι μαθεῖν ἔκ τε Δούριδος τοῦ Σαμίου, καὶ Θεοφράστου ἐκ τοῦ τετάρτου τῶν πολιτικῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀχαρνέων. *Duorum bellorum, Samiaci & Peloponneſiaci cauſſa cenſetur: ut è Duride Samio, Theophraſti libro quarto Politicorum, & ex Ariſtophanis Acharnenſibus cognoſcere licet.* But who knows whether they ſaid ſo of their own Head, or whether they related it as being the Opinion of *Pericles*'s Enemies, and the Poets.

(*H*) *A long Sickneſs, which weakened his Judgment.*] "(k) The Plague ſeiz'd *Pericles*, not with ſharp "and violent Fits, as it did others that had it; "but a dull and lingring Diſtemper, thro' various "changes and alterations, leiſurely by little and "little waſting the ſtrength of his Body, and un"dermining the noble Faculties of his Soul. So "that *Theophraſtus* in his Morals, having made a "moot-point, Whether Men's Manners do change "with their Fortunes, and their Souls being jogg'd "and diſturb'd by the Ailings of their Bodies, do "ſtart aſide from the Rules of Virtue, hath left it "upon Record, that *Pericles* when he was Sick, "ſhewed one of his Friends that came to viſit him, "an Amulet or Charm, that the Women had hung "about his Neck; as much as to ſay, that he was "very Sick indeed, when he would admit of or "endure ſuch a Foolery as that was." I have ſet down the *Greek* Words of *Plutarch* in the Article *Desbarreaux*. There is without doubt a fault in the Chapter wherein *Ælian* ſays that *Pericles*, *Callias* and *Nicias* having ſpent all that they had, drank off a great Glaſs of Hemlock. It was the laſt (*m*) Health they drank, being reſolved to live no longer, ſince they could no longer make Merry. If *Ælian*'s Memory fail'd him not, we muſt ſay that his Copiſts wrote *Pericles* inſtead of *Epicles*: for we read in (*n*) *Athenæus* that *Antocles* and *Epicles* having reſolved to live together, and to ſacrifice every thing to Voluptuouſneſs, poyſon'd themſelves with a Glaſs of Hemlock, when they ſaw they had ſpent all their Money.

(*I*) *A ſolid Reflection upon the Nature of God.*] What follows is to be found immediately after the Words which I have ſet down in the foregoing Remark. "(*o*) When he was drawing on and near "his time, the beſt of the Citizens, and thoſe of "his Friends who were left alive, ſitting about him, "were diſcourſing of his Virtue and Authority, "how great it was, and were reckoniug up his fa"mous Actions and Atchievements, and the num"ber of his Victories; for there were no leſs than "nine Trophies, which he, as their Chief Com"mander and Conqueror of their Enemies had ſet "up for the Honour of the City and State. Theſe "things they talk'd of together among themſelves: "as though he did not underſtand or mind "what they ſaid, but had been utterly bereft of "his Senſes. But he had liſtned all the while and "given good heed to all the Paſſages of their Diſ"courſes, and ſpeaking out among them ſaid, that "he wondred they ſhould commend and take no"tice of thoſe things in him, which were as much "owing to Fortune as to any thing elſe, and had "happened to many other Captains in former "times, as well as to him, and that at the ſame "time they ſhould not ſpeak or make mention of "that which was the moſt excellent and greateſt "thing of all. For, ſaid he, there was never any "of all my Fellow-Citizens that ever wore Black or "put on Mourning upon my Account." Here is *Plutarch*'s Reflection. "(*a*) And to me it appears "that this one thing of him, did make that other"wiſe Childiſh and Arrogant Title they gave him, "in Nicknaming him *Olympius*, (that is, the Hea"venly or Godlike) to be without Envy, and truly "becoming him: I mean his kind and courteous "Carriage, and a pure and untainted unblemiſh'd "Converſation in the height of Power and Place: "According to thoſe apprehenſion that we have of "the (*b*) Gods themſelves, in their kind; whom, "upon this account that they are naturally the "Authors of all Good things, and are not the Au"thors of any Evil, we do think worthy to Rule "and Govern the World. Not as the Poets rudely "fancy, who confounding us with their fooliſh "unmannerly Conceits and Opinions, are taken "tardy in their own Poems and fictitious Stories, "when they call the Place indeed wherein they "ſay the Gods made their abode, a ſecure and qui"et Seat, free from all Hazards and Commotions, "not troubled with Winds, nor darkned with "Clouds, but at all times alike ſhining round about "with a ſoft ſerenity and a pure Light; in as much "as ſuch a temper'd Station is moſt agreeable and "ſuitable for a bleſſed and immortal Nature to live "in: and yet in the mean while do affirm, that "the Gods themſelves are full of Trouble, and En"mity, and Anger and other Paſſions, which no "way become or belong even to Men that have any "Underſtanding." What *Plutarch* ſays againſt the Poets is very fine and ſolid: the reſt is a deceitful Beauty, and may be compar'd with poiſon'd Flowers, that cover a Serpent, *latet anguis in herba.* Perhaps it will be thought that I mean that there are in thoſe Words ſome Seeds of the falſe Doctrine of *Epicurus*, concerning the Tranquillity of the Gods, free from Hatred and Anger; but 'tis not that: *Plutarch* does not preſent us the Poyſon of *Epicurus*, but that of *Manicheiſm*. We have ſeen elſewhere (*c*) that he poſitively declared for the Doctrine of two Principles. He mentions it again in this Reflection upon *Pericles*'s Anſwer. He does not believe, as *Epicurus* did, that God enjoys an idle Reſt; he aſcribes to him Action and Providence; but it is only a bountiful Providence, which diſtributes Favours and Happineſs. It is not a Providence which grows angry ſometimes, which puniſhes and corrects, and oppreſſes Mankind with Miſeries. He does not approve that *Pericles* ſhould have had the Surname of *Olympian*, that is to ſay, Divine and Heavenly, becauſe his Eloquence Lightned, Thundered and Fulminated, but becauſe he never made uſe of his Authority to revenge himſelf, and not one Family did ever put on Mourning upon his Account. *Plutarch*'s opinion was not the moſt common: moſt People knew better the Divinity of *Jupiter* (*d*) by the Thunder-Bolt, than by the Diſtribution of Benefits: the Religious Ceremonies of the Heathens were rather appointed to avert the Anger of the Gods, than to obtain ſome Favours from them. Yet there was a general Notion which prevailed every where, that nothing is more agreeable to the Divine Nature than to do Good. The Epithet of *Optimus* went before that of *Maximus*, when they praiſed *Jupiter*. (*e*) *Sed ipſe Jupiter, id eſt juvans pater, quem converſis caſibus appellamus a juvando Jovem, à poëtis pater Divumque, hominumque dicitur; à Majoribus autem noſtris Optimus, Maximus, & quidem ante Optimus, id eſt beneficentiſſimus, quàm Maximus: quia majus eſt, certeque gratius prodeſſe omnibus, quàm opes magnas habere.* See the Remark *G* of the Article *Jupiter*. *Plutarch* ſays, that King *Amaſis* havlug ſeveral Queſtions to reſolve, wherein the Superlative was look'd for, I mean the ſupreme Degree of things; for Example, what is moſt ancient, moſt great, moſt wiſe, moſt beautiful, moſt common, moſt beneficial, moſt pernicious? anſwered as to the two laſt Articles, *God and the Dæmon.* (*g*) Τί ὠφελιμώτατον; θεός. Τί βλαβερώτατον; δαίμων. *Quid utiliſſimum? Deus. Quid damnoſiſſimum? Genius.* Here is the Doctrine of the two Principles, and even what the Chriſtians ſay concerning the Devil. I don't know whether theſe words, or this Notion of the δαίμων of

(*h*) *Id. ib. p.* 856. *A.*

(*i*) *Harpocrat. in* Ἀσπασία, *p. m.* 79.

(*k*) *Plut. in Pericle.*

(*m*) Κώνειον τελευταίαν πρόποσιν ἀλλήλοις προπιόντες ὥσπερ ἐκ συμποσίου ἀνέλυσαν. Cicutam invicem propinantes extremam potionem quaſi è convivio ad inferos migrarunt *Ælian. varia hiſt. l.* 4. *c.* 23.

(*n*) *Athen. l.* 12. *p.* 537.

(*o*) *Plut. in Pericle.*

(*a*) *Id. ib.*

(*b*) Καθάπερ τὸ τῶν θεῶν γένος ἀξιοῦμεν, αἴτιον μὲν ἀγαθῶν, ἀναίτιον δὲ κακῶν πεφυκός, ἄρχειν καὶ βασιλεύειν τῶν ὄντων, οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ ποιηταί. Sicut dignam arbitramur deorum gentem, quæ per ſe eſt propitia, & nullius autor mali, ut rebus præſit & moderetur, non ut poetæ. *Plut. ibid. p.* 173. *C.*

(*c*) *In the Art.* Manichees. *See alſo the Rem. G. of the Art.* Paulicians.

(*d*) Cœlo tonantem credidimus Jovem regnare. *Hor. Od.* 5. *l.* 3. Namque Dieſpiter Igni coruſco nubila dividens, &c. *Id. Od.* 34. *l.* 1.

(*e*) *Cic. de nat. Deor. l.* 2. *p. m.* 330.

(*g*) *Plut. in ſeptem ſapientum convivio. p.* 153. *A.*

far; he over-ſtrained the Idea of the Divine Goodneſs, he affirmed that God could

der

the Ancients have been taken notice of. I re-aſſume the Thread of my Diſcourſe. The Philoſopher *Antipater* defined God (*h*) an Animal, happy, immortal, and good to all Men. The Heathens were moſt inclined to Deify thoſe, who had been the Inventers of uſeful things. (*i*) *Perſæus eoſdem Zenonis auditor, eos dicit eſſe habitos Deos, à quibus magna utilitas ad vitæ cultum eſſet inventa, ipſaſque res utiles & ſalutares Deorum eſſe vocabulis nuncupatas: ut ne hoc quidem diceret, illa inventa eſſe Deorum, ſed ipſa divina.* It was the way of obtaining the Apotheoſis, if we believe *Pliny*. (*k*) *Deus eſt mortali juvare mortalem, & hæc ad æternam gloriam via. Hac proceres iere Romani: hac nunc cœleſti paſſu cum liberis ſuis vadit maximus omnis ævi rector Veſpaſianus Auguſtus, feſſis rebus ſubveniens. Hic eſt vetuſtiſſimus referendi bene merentibus gratiam mos, ut tales numinibus adſcribantur. Quippe & omnium aliorum nomina Deorum, & quæ ſupra retuli ſiderum, ex hominum nata ſunt meritis.* Others giving a more reaſonable turn to it, ſaid that the Gods had inſpired Men with the Invention of Arts.

> Κεῖνοι (*l*) γὰρ τέχνας πολυειδέας ἐφράσσαντο
> Δῶκαν ἔχειν, καὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιφροσύνην ἐδίδαξαν.
> *Illi etiam artes multum lucroſas hominibus*
> *Dederunt habere, & omnem ſolertiam docuerunt.*

Laſtly, they ſaid that (*m*) the beſt way of imitating God was to do Good, and that Man never came nearer to the Divine Nature than when he ſaved a Man. *Homines ad Deos nulla re propius accedunt*, ſaid *Cicero* to *Julius Cæſar* towards the End of his Oration for *Ligarius*, *quam ſalutem hominibus dando. Nihil habet nec fortuna tua majus, quàm ut poſſis, nec natura tua melius, quàm ut velis conſervare quamplurimos.* The *Scythians* told *Alexander*: If Thou art a God, thou muſt do Good to Men, and not take from them what is their own; (*n*) *ſi Deus es, tribuere mortalibus beneficia debes, non ſua eripere.* Right Theology agrees with all theſe Notions of the ancient Heathens. There are a hundred Paſſages in the Scripture, whereby it appears, that God is infinitely more inclined to uſe Mercy than Severity. To which may be added theſe fine Words of *Gregory Nazianzen*, who ſays, that Man becomes a God to his miſerable Neighbour, when he helps him. (*o*) Γίνε τῷ ἀτυχοῦντι Θεὸς τὸν ἔλεον Θεοῦ μιμησάμενος. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ὡς τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν, ἄνθρωπος ἔχει Θεῖον. *Eſto miſero Deus Dei miſericordiam imitando. Nihil enim tam ex Deo habet mortalis quàm ut beneficia largiatur.*

Strabo has imitated that thought: he ſays that a happy Life, which is ſpent in Feſtivals, in Mirth, in Philoſophizing and Singing, is a better Imitation of the Divine Nature, than to confer Benefits. His Words deſerve to be ſet down. (*p*) Εὖ μὲν γὰρ εἴρηται καὶ τοῦτο, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τότε μάλιστα μιμεῖσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς, ὅταν εὐεργετῶσιν· ἄμεινον δ' ἂν λέγοι τις, ὅταν εὐδαιμονῶσι· τοιοῦτον δὲ τὸ χαίρειν, καὶ τὸ ἑορτάζειν, καὶ τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν, καὶ μουσικῆς ἅπτεσθαι. *Bene quidem dictum eſt, homines tum maximè Deum imitari, cum beneficia conferunt: rectius autem diceretur, cum fœliciter vivunt: id autem fit gaudendo, dies feſtos agitando, philoſophando, muſicam* TRACTANDO.

I have read in the Voyage of Sir *Francis Drake*, that the Inhabitants of *New-Albion* took the *Engliſh* for Gods, and paid Divine Honours to them, becauſe *when they ſhewed their Wounds to them, they received ſome Plaiſters and Salves which cured them.* On the contrary, the *Spaniards* were look'd upon as Gods in *America*, becauſe they did a great deal of Miſchief with their Cannons. Their Ship was taken for a Bird that brought them down from Heaven (*q*). Which ſhews that two oppoſite things lead Men to the knowledge of God; *viz.* The Power he has to Puniſh Men, which he exerciſes ſo ſeverely, and the Goodneſs wherewith he beſtows a thouſand Benefits upon Mankind. It may be a Queſtion, whether one of thoſe two things is more knowable than the other. *Tacitus* pretends that the Gods have a greater deſire to puniſh Men, than to let 'em be quiet. *Nec enim unquam*, ſays he (*r*), *atrocioribus populi Romani cladibus magiſve juſtis judiciis approbatum eſt, non eſſe curæ deis ſecuritatem noſtram, eſſe ultionem.* A Journaliſt maintains that the effects of Goodneſs are more extended than the effects of Puniſhment. Here are his Words: (*ſ*) "Of all the Virtues of God, *Goodneſs* would be moſt "viſible, if Men would conſider it. What a great "Goodneſs is it to have ſo ordered things, that all "our neceſſary Actions are attended with Pleaſure; "and to have made us ſuſceptible of Pleaſure a "thouſand ways. 'Tis in vain to ſay that we are "more ſuſceptible of Sorrow and Pain; it is not "true, and if it were true, we ſhould not for all "that forget the great Goodneſs of God, ſince we "might eaſily ſee that the Pleaſures we enjoy, "come from the Laws he has eſtabliſhed in Nature, "and that on the contrary moſt of our Sorrows "proceed from the ill uſe we make of our Reaſon. "But it is not true that Men are more unhappy "than happy; our Ungratefulneſs, Pride and Unſatiable Deſires make us ſay ſo. *Falſò queritur de naturâ ſuâ genus humanum*, is a true ſaying of a "famous Hiſtorian in the Preface to the War of "*Jugurtha*. Mankind are more happy than they "deſerve, and it is true in a literal ſenſe, that for "one Pain Men feel a thouſand Pleaſures, except "perhaps a ſmall number of unhappy Souls, which "a Heathen would aſſert to have been produced "by Deſtiny in a ſpiteful moment." Note by the bye, that the Difference he ſpeaks of, and which he grounds upon the conſequences of the ill uſe we make of Liberty, could not ſatisfie a difficult Adverſary, who would ſay that that very thing, *viz.* the ill uſe a Man makes of his Reaſon, to vex himſelf to no purpoſe, is a great unhappineſs, and ought neceſſarily to be placed amongſt Afflictions; ſo that if we make a parallel between the Good and Evil which Providence imparts to Men, we muſt reckon the Evils which proceed from the Weakneſſes of our Reaſon, as well as Sickneſſes, Hunger, Thirſt, *&c.*

Ovid obſerves (*a*) that there are more fine Days than cloudy ones in the Year: it may be ſaid likewiſe, that the Days wherein Men injoy their Health, are in greater number than thoſe wherein they are Sick. But there is perhaps as much Miſery in fifteen Days Sickneſs, as there is Pleaſure in fifteen Months Health: for Pleaſure is ſuch in as much as it is felt; but Men do not much feel their Health when they enjoy it without any Interruption. Obſerve that I conſider Health, as being ſeparated from the other Pleaſures, which may be enjoyed with it. The Journaliſt I have quoted, might have alledged a fine Paſſage of *Cicero*, wherein after an exact enumeration of the advantages which Men receive from Plants and Animals, he ſays, that one would think that Providence went about to procure Pleaſures to Mankind, as if it had been *Epicurean*. *Ex quibus* (*b*) *tanta percipitur voluptas ut interdum Pronæa noſtra Epicurea fuiſſe videatur.* However it be, Men are more apt to perceive the Character of the Divine Nature in the Effects of Goodneſs, than in the Diſtribution of Puniſhments and Miſeries. The Goodneſs of Providence has been perceived in the Service which Great Men have done to their Country. (*c*) *Multos præterea & noſtra civitas & Græcia tulit ſingulares viros, quorum neminem niſi juvante Deo talem fuiſſe credendum eſt ..... nemo igitur vir magnus ſine aliquo afflatu divino unquam fuit.* And *Seneca* ſays in general, that none can be a Good Man, and a Great Man, without the aſſiſtance of God. (*d*) *Bonus vir ſine Deo nemo eſt. An poteſt aliquis ſupra fortunam, niſi ab illo adjutus, exſurgere? ille dat conſilia magnifica, & erecta. In unoquoque virorum bonorum,* (Quis Deus incertum eſt) habitat Deus ..... *Si hominem videris interritum periculis, intactum cupiditatibus, inter adverſa felicem, in mediis tempeſtatibus placidum, ex ſuperiore loco homines videntem, ex æquo deos: non ſubibit te veneratio ejus? non dices, iſta res major eſt altiorque, quàm ut credi ſimilis huic, in quo eſt, corpuſculo poſſit? Vis iſtuc divina deſcendit: animum excellentem, moderatum, omnia tanquam minora tranſeuntem, quidquid timemus optamuſque videntem, cœleſtis potentia agitat. Non poteſt res tanta ſine adminiculo numinis ſtare. Itaque majore ſui parte illic eſt, unde deſcendit.* As to Evils, they made uſe of a thouſand ſhifts not to aſcribe them to God; they formed to themſelves a *Fantaſm*, which they call'd *Fortune*, and to which they imputed their misfortunes: they repreſented to themſelves I know not what Beings miſchievous by their Nature; and *Plutarch* tells us here that the Gods can do no hurt. In another place he laughs at *Chryſippus*, who aſcribed Evils to the Negligence and Malice of the *Genii*, whom *Jupiter* ſet over certain things. (*e*) Τὸ δὲ φαύλους δαίμονας ἐν ἐπιστασίαις ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιαύτας ὀλιγωρίας καθιστάναι πῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἔγκλημα τῷ Θεῷ, καθάπερ βασιλέως

(*h*) Ζῷον μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ εὐποιητικὸν ἀνθρώπων. Plut. de repugn. Stoic. p. 1051.

(*i*) Cic. ib. l. 1. p. 80. Virg. Æn. l. 6. v. 663. was contented to place them in the Elyſian Fields. *Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes, Quique ſui memores alios fecere merendo.*

(*k*) Plin. l. 2. c. 7. p. m. 143, 144.

(*l*) Oppian. l. 2. Ἁλιευτ.

(*m*) Strabo l. 10. p. m. 322. See his Words let. p.

(*n*) Q. Curt. l. 7. c. 8. n. 26. See Freinſhemius ib. who alledges ſeveral ſuch Sentences.

(*o*) Nazianz. Orat. de amore pauperum.

(*p*) Strabo l. 10. p. 322.

(*q*) See la Mothe le Vayer Diſcourſe concerning Hiſtory.

(*r*) Tacit. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 3.

(*ſ*) News from the Repub. of Learning, Aug. 168[illegible], Art. 6. p. m. [illegible]

(*a*) *Si numeres anno ſoles & nubila toto, Invenies nitidum ſæpius iſſe diem.* Ovid Triſt. l. 5. eleg. 8. See the Rem. D. of the Art. Xenophanes.

(*b*) Cic. de nat. Deor. l. 2. p. m. 549. Compare what David, Pſ. 8. obſerves concerning the Goodneſs of God in giving Beaſts for the uſe of Man, and what Seneca ſays de ben. l. 4. c. 5, 6, &c. uſque in delicias amamur. which may be ſeen more at large in the Rem. D. of the Art. Xenophanes.

(*c*) Cic. ib. p. 559.

(*d*) Senec. Ep. 41. p. m. 236. See alſo Ep. 73. p. 305.

(*e*) Plut. de Stoic. repugn. p. 1051. D.

do no harm, and he had rather impute Evil to another Cauſe. We ſhall ſee upon this occaſion, one of his proofs of the Malignity (I∆) of *Herodotus*, and what has been

[illegible] ται. *Malos autem genios à providentia his præfici muneribus, qui non ſit vitio vertendum Deo, qui tanquam rex malis & vecordibus ſatrapis ac præfectis provincias mandaverit, patiaturque ab his deſpici & contumelioſe tractari optimos? Et quidem, ſi multum neceſſitatis admixtum rebus eſt: neque omnia Deus habebit in ſua poteſtate, neque omnia ſecundum ejus rationem gubernabuntur.* Again in another place he accuſes an Hiſtorian (*f*) of a malicious Impiety, for having made *Solon* ſpeak thus: *Why ſhould I be ask'd whether Man is happy, ſeeing I know that all the Gods are envious and turbulent.* (*g*) Τοῖς δὲ θεοῖς λοιδορούμενος ἐν τῷ Σόλωνος προσωπείῳ ταῦτα εἴρηκεν, ὦ Κροῖσε, ἐπιστάμενόν με τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐὸν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες ἐπειρωτᾷς ἀνθρωπηίων πρηγμάτων πέρι· ἃ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐφρόνει περὶ τῶν θεῶν, τῷ Σόλωνι προστριβόμενος, κακοήθειαν τῇ βλασφημίᾳ προστίθησι. *Diis autem maledicens ſub perſona Solonis: Me, inquit, gnarum omne numen invidum eſſe ac tumultuoſum, de rebus humanis interrogas. Suam enim de diis Soloni tribuens ſententiam, malignitatem impio ſermoni adjunxit.* I am ſure he would have laught at the mitigated Gloſs of the ancient Prieſts of *Etruria*. They aſcribed two ſorts of Thunder-Bolts to *Jupiter*, a Favourable one and a Fatal one; and they pretended he never threw the ſecond but with the Advice of the other Gods; whereas he threw the other of his own motion, and without any one's Advice. This would not have ſatisfied *Plutarch*: he believed not that ſuch a Goodneſs as that of mild Princes was ſufficient for God. Good Princes take pleaſure in diſtributing their Favours to Men, and intruſt their Miniſters with the care of Puniſhing them; they are (*h*) ready to Reward, and ſlow to Puniſh. They rejoyce when they do Good, and are ſorry when they inflict any Puniſhment. Herein they reſemble Fathers: but once more *Plutarch* would have been very much diſpleaſed with the Gloſs of the *Etrurians*: he would perhaps have ſaid of their *Jupiter*, what others ſay of an Emperor (*i*) who perſecuted the Chriſtians very much, and would not begin the Perſecution without conſulting his Friends. (*k*) *Placuit ergo amicorum ſententiam experiri. Nam erat hujus malitia. Cùm bonum quid facere decreviſſet, ſine conſilio faciebat, ut ipſe laudaretur. Cum autem malum, quoniam id reprehendendum ſciebat, in conſilium multos advocabat, ut aliorum culpa adſcriberetur quidquid ipſe deliquerat.* It is a cunning Trick of an old Politician, witneſs *Pius* IV. being urged to terminate the Diſputes about Precedency, between the Ambaſſadors of the Moſt Chriſtian King, and thoſe of the Catholick King; he put it off for ſome time, and at laſt he adviſed them to leave the thing to the Deciſion of the Sacred Colledge. He would not be the only Man expoſed to the ill Conſequences of that Judgment; and he ſaid in Jeſt, that he conform'd himſelf to the Conduct of *Jupiter*. (*l*) *Ad extremum utrique occultè ſuadere ut ad ſacrum Cardinalium Collegium cauſam integram remitterent: interea à publicis in Pontificio ſacello cæremoniis abſtinerent. Ratus eâ ratione ob diverſa Cardinalium ſtudia producendum infinitè judicium, ſe certè à ferendæ ſententiæ neceſſitate, atque adèo ab invidiâ ſubtrahendum. Nempe imitandum Principi Jovem facetè dicebat: qui (ut eſt vetus Etruſcarum diſciplinæ commentum) ex duplici fulminum genere, proſperum ipſe per ſe, at infauſtum adhibito Deorum conſilio contorquere ſolitus ſit.*

Thus the Mind of Man, being too narrow to comprehend clearly, how the Miſeries and Crimes which cover the whole Earth, can be conſiſtent with an infinitely Good Being, has run it ſelf into the Hypotheſis of two Principles. This is what I had to ſay concerning *Plutarch*'s Obſervation.

I ſhall only add that the *Greek* Proverb, (*m*) *Every thing that nouriſhes me, is a God to me*, is more deceitful than one can think. See the Anſwer (*n*) which was made to *Philip de Comines*, and that of a Chirurgeon to a Monk of St. *Denis*. " (*o*) It is " certain, that the Pox was unknown in *France* be" fore the Reign of *Charles* VIII. the greateſt part " of that Prince's Army died of it; becauſe that " Diſeaſe being not yet known, they knew no Re" medy for it; which ſhews that it was not the " Leproſy. Neceſſity put Men upon finding ſome " Remedies to cure it, whereby many Chirurgeons " grew very Rich. One of them very thankful for " his happineſs, went one Day to *St. Denis*, and " kneel'd down before the Statue of *Charles* VIII, " to thank him for it: but a Monk having told " him that he was miſtaken, and that it was not " the Image of a Saint: Hold your Tongue, Father, " ſaid he, I know very well what I do, he is a true " Saint to me, ſince I have got by his means Thirty " Thouſand *Livres* a Year, ſo that it is a piece " of Juſtice for me to thank him for it." The Author of *Moyen de parvenir* makes the Sum leſſer, and names the Chirurgeon. Here are his Words. " (*a*) You put me in mind of that Monk " of *St. Denis* in *France*, who was a pretending " Fellow. When he ſaw *Thierre de Hery*, upon " his Knees before the Statue of *Charles* VIII, " he told him, my Friend, you are miſtaken, that " is not the Image of a Saint. I know it very " well, ſaid the Chirurgeon, I am not ſo great a " Fool as you are, I know it is the Statue of King " *Charles* VIII. for whoſe Soul I pray, becauſe he " brought the Pox into *France*, whereby I have got " Six or Seven Thouſand Livres a Year." I will not conclude without quoting *Virgil*. He was very much diſpoſed to Deify his Benefactors: his Lands having been ſpared by a particular favour of *Octavius*, he ſtyl'd him a God.

> O (*b*) *Melibæe*, DEUS nobis hæc otia fecit:
> *Namque erit ille mihi ſemper Deus: illius aram*
> *Sæpè tener noſtris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus.*

Good *Maturinus Corderius* (*c*) out of a pious Fraud, which may be very well excuſed, made his little School-Boys believe that thoſe Words were very pious. He tranſlated them into *French* Verſes, which begins thus, *Melibæus, that Favour comes to us from the only wiſe God.* *Virgil* had no ſuch thought, he only meant (*d*) *Auguſtus*.

(I∆) *One of his Proofs of the Malignity of* Herodotus, *and what has been anſwered to it. That Proof is grounded upon the Jealouſie*, &c.] See the Words of *Plutarch*, which I have ſet down before. I wonder that he confined himſelf to the Anſwer which *Solon* gave to King *Crœſus*, and that he did not at leaſt intimate, that many ſuch Paſſages are found in *Herodotus*. He might thereby have ſtrengthned his Accuſation, and ſhewed that *Herodotus* cannot be juſtified, by ſaying that he let fall that Raillery againſt the Gods out of Inadvertency: he would have obſerved that a Man who makes often the ſame Reflection, is throughly penetrated with the Venom it contains, and with the deſire of infecting his Readers with it. It is certain, that *Herodotus* has often repeated the ſame Maxim which he aſcribed to *Solon*. Here is what he ſuppoſes that a K. of *Egypt* wrote to *Polycrates* Tyrant of *Samos*; " I " am glad to hear that a Man, who is my Friend, " is happy. But your great Proſperity does not " pleaſe me, for I know how envious the Deity is." (*g*) Ἐμοὶ δὲ αἱ σαὶ μεγάλαι εὐτυχίαι οὐκ ἀρέσκουσι, τὸ θεῖον ἐπισταμένῳ ὡς ἔστι φθονερόν. *Tuæ magnæ proſperitates mihi non placent, qui intelligo* QUAM INVIDUM NUMEN SIT. *Henry Stephens*, who juſtifies that Hiſtorian as well as he can in ſeveral other reſpects, takes no notice of this Accuſation of *Plutarch*. I don't find that he intimates any where that he knew it. He has carefully collected many Maxims and Obſervations of *Herodotus*, which may prove his pious Orthodoxy about Providence; nay, he has placed amongſt 'em a Paſſage of the 7th Book, wherein *Artabanus* does very much inſiſt upon the envious Nature of God. (*h*) *Artabanus* ſays, that God throws his Thunder-Bolts only at great Bodies, becauſe he takes delight in oppreſſing whatever is eminent. (*i*) Φιλέει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν. *Gaudet enim Deus eminentiſſima quæque deprimere.* Hence it is that a great Army is beaten by a ſmall one, when God (*k*) out of Envy terrifies them, or throws his Thunder-Bolt. Thus ſome have been precipitated into Miſery otherwiſe than their Dignity required; for God will not by no means endure, that any one beſides him ſhould have a great opinion of himſelf. (*l*) Δι' ὧν ἐφθάρησαν ἀναξίως ἑωυτῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἐᾷ φρονέειν ἄλλον μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἢ ἑωυτόν. *Propterea quidam ſecus ac dignitas ſua poſtulabat*

(*f*) *Herodotus.*

(*g*) *Id. de malignit. Herodoti p.* 857, 858.

(*h*) Sed piger ad pœnas princeps, ad præmia velox, Quique dolet quoties cogitur eſſe ferox. *Ovid. de Ponto l.* 1. *El.* 2.

(*i*) Dioclesian.

(*k*) *Lactant. de mortib. perſecut. c.* 11. *p.* 99, 100. *of the Noble Edition of Mr.* Bauldri. *See his Notes, and thoſe of* Columbus *Part.* 2. *p.* 287.

(*l*) *Famian.* Strada *dec.* 1. *l.* 4. *p. m.* 175. *See* Seneca *nat. quæſt. l.* 2. *c.* 41, *& ſeq.*

(*m*) Τὸ γὰρ τρέφον με τοῦτ' ἐγὼ κρίνω θεόν.

(*n*) *See the Art.* Gregory I.

(*o*) *Furetieriana p.* 113. *of the* Dutch *Edit.*

(*a*) *Moyen de parvenir p. m.* 578, 579.

(*b*) *Virg. Ecl.* 1. *v.* 6.

(*c*) *See his Colloquies.*

(*d*) *Compare the* 15*th Verſe* Sed tamen ille Deus qui ſit, da, Tityre, nobis, *with the* 43*d & ſeq.* Hic illum vidi juvenem, Melibœe, quotannis Bis ſenos cui noſtra dies altaria fumant. Hic mihi reſponſum primus dedit ille petenti: Paſcite, ut ante, boves, pueri, ſubmittite tauros.

(*g*) *Herod. l.* 3. *c.* 40. *p. m.* 178.

(*h*) *Ibid.*

(*i*) *Id. lib.* 7. *c.* 10. *p.* 383. *Valeſius in Amm. Marcel. l.* 14. *c.* 11. *p.* 59. *quotes this as being taken from the ſixth Book of* Herodotus

(*k*) Ἐπεάν σφι ὁ θεὸς φθονήσας. Quoties Deus iis quibus invidet. *Ib.*

(*l*) *Ibid.*

been anſwered to it. That proof is grounded upon the Jealouſie and Envy which
that

that in calamitatem inciderunt, quia Deus neminem alium quam ſeipſum ſinit magnifice de ſe ſentire. This is one of the Examples which *Henry Stephens* gives of the Piety of *Herodotus*, a Piety, ſays he, as great as it could be in a Man deſtitute of the Light of the Goſpel. Nay, he pretends, that this Opinion of *Herodotus* about the Power and Providence of God, is the ſame which Chriſtians ought to have: he pretends that it is impoſſible to ſay any thing more Divine about this Subject than what has been ſaid by that Hiſtorian. (m) *Multæ ſententiæ ſive γνώμας tum quas alio loco adhibuit, tum quas narrationibus vel præfatis, vel tanquam corollaria adjunxit, tanta illum pietate præditum fuiſſe teſtantur, quanta in hominem Chriſtianæ religionis ignarum cadere poteſt: imo vero ea de divina potentia providentiaque ſenſiſſe quæ Chriſtianum ſentire & deceat & oporteat. Hujuſmodi ſunt hæc in Thalia,* SED *profecto...... Conſideremus & hæc ex Polymnia,* VIDEN' *ut Deus (n)...... quid, obſecro, de divina potentia divinius iſtis dici potuit?* Afterwards he alledges four Greek (o) Verſes, much the ſame with ſome Words of *Horace* (p), which he does alſo alledge, and which ſignifie that God is able to turn the World up-ſide down, and that he depreſſes the Great ones, and raiſes the Little ones, and he concludes, that the Praiſes beſtowed upon that Sentence are very well grounded; but that *Herodotus* goes much further, *& merito quidem certè illam veteris poëtæ ſententiam laudibus extollunt: ſed quanto tamen ulterius progreditur hic noſter hiſtoricus!* I cannot apprehend by what miſtake *Henry Stephens* could take this the wrong way. He ſees only the fair ſide of it, and does not at all perceive the moſt viſible Defect. He is charmed with the great Idea which *Herodotus* gives of the Divine Power; but he is not aware that a Power directed by the Jealouſie of the Proſperity of others, is an odious and defective Quality. There lies the ſtreſs of *Plutarch*'s Objection.

Camerarius, who before *Henry Stephens* undertook to juſtifie *Herodotus*, knew very well where the Evil lay; but he found no better Remedy than to change the ſtate of the Queſtion, and to call the main point of the Objection a meer Cavil. Here are his Words, (q) *Nam quod exagitat* (Plutarchus) *præclaram ſententiam de inſtabili & incerta fortuna rerum humanarum, quam Herodotus* (1) *Soloni attribuerit (cui quidem ſimiles & alibi leguntur) nimia ſapientia & pietati hominis concedatur: qui veritus ſit, ne ſi ita de Deo loquamur, ut humanus intellectus quæ dicuntur percipere poſſit, parum pii eſſe videamur. Cur ergo Deo oculos, manus, pedes, aures attribuimus? cur dicimus Deum iraſci? cur ulciſci? etiam vereri profecto, tentare, pœnitere, lætari, dolere.* πόῤῥω γὰρ λύπης καὶ χαρᾶς ἵδρυται τὸ θεῖον. *ſine quibus illa ne intelligi quidem poſſunt. Quid Xenophon? (quo nemo fuit numinis colentior, nemo obſervantior, nemo impietatis erga Deum acrior hoſtis) nonne eandem ſententiam ponere non dubitavit in præclaro illo opere ſuo hiſtoria rerum Græcarum? ſic enim ait* (2), καὶ ὁ θεὸς δὲ, ὡς ἔοικε, πολλάκις χαίρει τοὺς μὲν μικροὺς μεγάλους ποιεῖν, τοὺς δὲ μεγάλους μικρούς. *Hæc igitur ſacrilega eſt in Herodoto ſententia, quia ſecundum hominum intelligentiam* φθονερὸν *dixit eſſe* τὸ θεῖον. *Sed hæc quàm ſint futilia quis non videt?* It is manifeſt that he changes the ſtate of the Queſtion; for *Herodotus* was not blamed for ſaying that the Condition of Humane things is very inconſtant; but he was blamed for ſaying, that the Jealouſie of God is the cauſe of that great Inconſtancy: and it is not at all neceſſary, in order to repreſent to us the Inconſtancy of Fortune, to have recourſe to an Image, whereby we may conceive the Deity as a Being that envies the Happineſs of Men. Beſides, there is a very great difference between the things which ſome other Authors, and even the Holy Scriptures have aſcribed to God, and the Jealouſie which *Herodotus* aſcribes to him. An Eye, Hands, Anger, Repenting, Joy and Fear, may ſerve as Images to repreſent to Men the Conduct of Providence; for thoſe Weakneſſes do not ſeem to us to be inconſiſtent with an Honeſt Man, and an excellent Prince. To be Jealous of one's Glory, and not to ſuffer that it ſhould be uſurped, is not look'd upon as a fault among Men; nay, they believe it is a Quality worthy of Great Kings and Heroes. Wherefore the Scripture does not ſcruple to aſcribe ſuch a Jealouſie to God. But to be Jealous of the Happineſs of other Men, and to ruin them, becauſe their Proſperity makes us feel the Bitings of Envy, is one of the moſt ſhameful Qualities that can be conceived, the baſeſt Tradeſmen could not bear to be accuſed of it. It is a Diſeaſe that few People can avoid, but no Body dares own that he is affected with it. We are ready to own, that a noble Emulation of equalling or ſurpaſſing the Merit and Glory of Great Men, excites us to form glorious Projects; but not that the Envy of the Proſperity of our Neighbours prompts us to ruin them. *Camerarius* can't be therefore well excuſed for having made ſuch Compariſons. The Expreſſions of *Xenophon* cannot very well ſerve to juſtifie *Herodotus*, for if they ſignifie, that God does often delight in overturning the Diſpoſition of things, by reducing the Great ones to the condition of the Little ones, and by raiſing the Little ones to the condition of the Great ones; if they ſignifie that God does ſo at his Play-hours, and that it is his Tennis, as Princes take pleaſure in ſeeing great Beaſts one againſt another at a Bull-Feaſt, whilſt they make much of a little Dog; they are as impious as the Expreſſions of *Herodotus*, and ſo one Impiety would ſerve to juſtifie another Impiety. But nothing requires that ſuch a ſenſe ſhould be put upon the Words of *Xenophon*. They are capable of a reaſonable ſenſe, by ſuppoſing he means that God is pleaſed with that frequent viciſſitude of Conditions, becauſe his Quality of Judge, and common Father of Mankind requires it from him. Great Men abuſe their Power; it is therefore neceſſary that the Fall of ſome ſhould be a Warning to others, and ſhould prevent the Miſchiefs they might have done, and comfort thoſe who were vexed by them. And ſince the condition of Humane Affairs does not permit that all Men ſhould be in great Poſts at the ſame time, every Body muſt be raiſed in his turn, and the common Father of Mankind muſt diſpoſe of them ſometimes in favour of one, ſometimes in favour of another. The Little ones muſt riſe, and the Great ones go down in their turn. It is likely that *Xenophon* underſtood it ſo, and that he inſiſted not upon the meer Idea of the ſupreme Authority which God has over the Goods of Fortune. It would be a thing unworthy of the moſt perfect Being, to overthrow Great Men, and to raiſe Little ones only to ſhew his Power. Any Prince would be juſtly blamed, if out of a meer Oſtentation of his Power, he ſpent his time in levelling Mountains, filling up Valleys, drying up Marſhes, and overflowing Sandy Plains. He muſt propoſe the Publick Good to himſelf, or elſe it is a meer Tyrannical Vain ſhew and Luxury, and a Subject of Scandal or juſt Complaints. Read theſe Words of *Salluſt*. (a) *Nam quid ea memorem, quæ niſi iis, qui videre, nemini credibilia ſunt, à privatis compluribus ſubverſos montes, maria conſtructa eſſe? quibus mihi ludibrio videntur fuiſſe divitiæ. quippe quas honeſte habere licebat, per turpitudinem abuti properabant.* Read alſo theſe Words of *Suetonius* concerning the Emperor *Caligula*: (b) *In extructionibus prætoriorum atque villarum omni ratione poſthabita, nihil tam efficere concupiſcebat quam quod poſſe effici negaretur. Et jacta itaque moles infeſto ac profundo mari, exciſa rupes duriſſimi ſilicis, & campi montibus aggere æquati, & complanata foſſuris montium juga, incredibili quidem celeritate, cum mora culpa capite lueretur.* And to add a Modern Example to the Ancient, read alſo a Paſſage which concerns Mr. *Fouquet*: (c) *Fouquetus...... Lucullianis ſumptibus naturam poſſeſſor domuit, & contumaciam ſitus repugnantem in delicias ſuas manſueſcere coegit nullo læſo, niſi ſe & arca Regia.* I don't doubt but *Xenophon* underſtood the Maxim he advanced in an Orthodox ſenſe. Having ſo much improved under his (d) Profeſſor, he could not ſay that if God is pleaſed to raiſe the Little ones, and to overthrow the Great ones, it is to divert himſelf, or to make a ſhew of his Power. He believed without doubt, that God did ſo only for the Publick Good of Mankind, and conſequently *Camerarius* has alledged him without reaſon in favour of *Herodotus*, who was cenſured for having attributed to God a jealous Humour, which is the cauſe of the Overthrow of Humane Proſperity. Obſerve that it ſignifies nothing to the Earth or Rocks to be in a Valley or in a high place. They are inſenſible Bodies, any Situation is equally good and indifferent to them. Water is neither more nor leſs unhappy, when it runs in the Channel of a River, than when it is forced out of a Pipe into the Clouds; but the Fall of a Monarch, the
Diſgrace

(m) H. Steph. in *Apolog. pro Herodoto, præfixa editioni Latinæ Herodoti Francof.* 1595. *in* 8. *p.* 24, 25.

(n) *He ſets down here the Words which I have quoted out of the 7th B. c.* 10. *of* Herodotus

(o) *Of* Heſiod.

(p) Valet ima ſummis Mutare & inſignem attenuat Deus, Obſcura promens. *Hor. Od.* 34. *l.* 1.

(q) *Joach. Camerarius proœmio in Herodot. p.* 5. *Genev.* 1618. *in fol.*

(1) *Clione c.* 32.

(2) *Hellenicωn l.* 5.

(a) *Salluſt. de bello Catil. pag.* 28. *See alſo p.* 53. *in the Harangue of* Catilina, Quis mortalium, cui virile ingenium eſt, tolerare poteſt illis divitias ſuperare, quas profundant in extruendo mari, & montibus coæquandis, nobis rem familiarem etiam ad neceſſaria deeſſe?

(b) *Suet. in Calig. c.* 37.

(c) *Priolo de rebus Gallicis l.* 9. *c.* 2. *p. m.* 320, 321.

(d) *Socrates.*

that Historian pretends the Divine Nature is subject to. *Valerius Maximus* has committed

Disgrace of a Chief Minister, and other such overthrows of Worldly Prosperities, overwhelm a great many People with sorrow. It would be therefore a less disorder to overturn the situation of some parts of the Earth, meerly to satisfie one's Fancy, and make a shew of one's Riches, than to precipitate the high Fortune of Men, meerly to divert one's self, and make a shew of one's Power. From whence you may conclude, that all those who have had a right notion of Providence, have understood the Maxim of *Xenophon* in the Sense I have mentioned. They believed without doubt, that the ruin of Great Men was an Act of Justice, whereby the Misfortunes of some private Men were compensated by a greater advantage of the Publick.

Valesius's way of justifying *Herodotus* is somewhat more ingenious than that of the other Apologists. See his Commentary upon a Place, wherein *Ammianus Marcellinus* gives us the Description of the Goddess *Nemesis*. That Historian having mentioned the Tragical end of some great Criminals, adds: (e) *Hæc & hujusmodi quædam innumerabilia ultrix facinorum impiorum, bonorumque præmiatrix aliquoties operatur Adrastia, (atque utinam semper) quam vocabulo duplici etiam Nemesim appellamus: . . . . . . Hæc ut regina causarum, & arbitra rerum ac disceptatrix, urnam sortium temperat, accidentium vices alternans: voluntatumque nostrarum exorsa interdum alio, quàm quò contendebant, exitu terminans, multiplices actus permutando convolvit. Eademque necessitatis insolubili retinaculo mortalitatis vinciens fastus tumentes incassum, & incrementorum detrimentorumque momenta versans, ut novit, nunc erectas mentium cervices opprimit & enervat: nunc bonos ab imo suscitans, ad bene vivendum extollit.* You may plainly see, he supposes that the Goddess *Nemesis* presides over the Vicissitudes of Elevation and Overthrow, which are to be seen in the course of Humane things, and that she directs the Play of the Swipe, which I have mention'd in another Place, upon occasion of an Answer of *Æsop*, which is altogether like the Maxim of *Xenophon*; but we must not forget, that he supposes at the same time, that she dispenses the Alternative (g) with a supreme Equity. *Valesius* observes, 1. That she is called *Nemesis*, because she renders to every one his due. 2. That *Plato* in the 4th Book *de Republica*, calls her the Messenger of Justice. 3. That *Dion Chrysostomus* observes in his 64th Oration, that Fortune, as it is Equitable, went by the Name of *Nemesis*, τὸ ἴσον αὐτῆς Νέμεσις. *Æquitas ejus* (Fortunæ) *Nemesis dicta est.* 4. That the Ancients ascribed to God a certain Power which mortified Proud Men, and destroyed all sublime things. 5. That that Power was called either Envy φθόνος, or Indignation νέμεσις. 6. That Indignation or *Nemesis* has a great affinity with Envy, and that in the 2d Book of *Aristotle*'s Morals, it holds the middle place between Envy and the opposite Vice, which makes one rejoyce at other Men's misfortunes (h). 7. That *Herodotus* upon this account makes *Solon* say, that all the Deities are envious, and *Artabanus*, that God was envious. (i) *Artabanus apud eumdem Herodotum in lib.* 7. *iisdem verbis alloquitur Xerxem:* ὁ δὲ θεὸς γλυκὺν γεύσας τὸν αἰῶνα, φθονερὸς ἐν αὐτῷ εὑρίσκεται ἐών. At Deus qui suavi perfruitur ævo, invidus ipse esse deprehenditur. *Quæ quidem Herodoti verba immeritò reprehendit Plutarchus.* 8. That *Plutarch* had no reason to censure (k) those Words of *Herodotus*; for if *Nemesis* is justly attributed to God, why should not Envy φθόνος be ascribed to him? one of those Vices is not lesser than the other among Men: but when such things are spoken of God, they are divested of all Imperfection, and ought to be understood in a favourable sense; or else *Plutarch* himself would be convicted of the same fault, since he said in the Life of *Paulus Æmilius*, (l) Οὐδενὶ γὰρ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνεπίφθονον, πλὴν εἴ τι δαιμόνιον. . . . . . . &c. (m); that is to say, "*Æmilius* was "admired and accounted happy by all Men, and "unenvy'd by every one that was good: Only that "it seems the Province of some God, to lessen the "happiness which is too great and inordinate, and "so to mingle the Affairs of Human Life, that no "one should be intirely free and exempt from Calamities; but, as it is in *Homer*, that those should "think themselves truly blessed, to whom Fortune "has given an equal share of Good and Evil." You will see hereafter what follows in *Plutarch*.

I shall make some short Observations upon this Apology of *Valesius*. I say, 1. That all the Heathen Authors, who ascribe the Functions of *Nemesis* to the Deity, are not to blame; for they who ascribe them to God, according to the above-mentioned Notions of *Ammianus Marcellinus*, or according to that Equality and Equity which *Dion Chrysostomus* speaks of, attribute nothing to him that is unworthy of him, or that includes a Moral Imperfection. But there have been I don't know how many Poets, Orators, and other People, who understood by *Nemesis* a Morose Being, whose greatest delight was to overturn Humane Prosperity, and to poison with some misfortunes such Events as were able to give most Joy to illustrious Men. In that sense it is as impious a thing to use the Word νέμεσις as that of φθόνος, with respect to God; and therefore *Valesius* had no reason to say that the Last could be excused by the First. I say, 2. That the Chapter of *Aristotle*'s Morals, which he refers us to, is not favourable to him. It is true, that we read there, that there are three sorts of Envy, two at the extreams, and one in the Middle. That which is in the Middle, is called νέμεσις, *Nemesis*, and consists in being sorry that a Man, who deserves not to be happy, should be happy notwithstanding. The excessive Extream is called φθόνος, and consists in being sorry that there are any Men happy. The defective Extream is called ἐπιχαιρεκακία, and consists in rejoycing at the misfortune of others (a). This Doctrine is not very exact, and has been very well refuted by the Commentator *Eustratius*. He shews that a Man who rejoyces at the Misery of others, is vexed at the Happiness of others, and consequently that the Passion called φθόνος, and the Passion called ἐπιχαιρεκακία belong to the same Persons. They are not therefore two Extreams, between which the Passion called νέμεσις may be placed. But I leave that Dispute, and I shall only observe, that the popular Style, which Men conformed themselves to in Matters of Religion, admitted not of those scrupulous distinctions, which *Aristotle* made use of in his Morals, and which are most times meer Logical Abstractions. We must not therefore fancy, that they, who feared *Nemesis*, and spoke of her Conduct, had in their Minds, as the Rule of the Nature or Character of that Goddess, the difference which that Philosopher observes between νέμεσις Indignation, and φθόνος Envy. I say 3. That nothing can be more prejudicial to the design of the Apologist, than his having recourse to *Aristotle*'s Morals; for according to that Philosopher the Word φθόνος signifies the trouble and vexation occasioned by the Happiness of others in general, whether the Person that is happy deserves it or not. He that is subject to that Passion is called φθονερὸς (b). He exceeds the Person called νεμεσητικὸς, who feels what goes by the Name of νέμεσις, being sorry for the prosperity of those who are unworthy of it. It is certain that *Herodotus* has given the Epithet of φθονερὸς to God; therefore by *Aristotle*'s Doctrine, he is more to blame than if he had used only the Word *Nemesis* or *Nemesiticus*. Therefore to alledge the 2d Book of *Aristotle*'s Morals, is to furnish the Accusers of *Herodotus* with proofs against him. What did therefore *Valesius* think of? Had he not forgot his usual exactness, when designing to prove that φθόνος and νέμεσις are as vicious the one as the other, he confirmed his opinion by the Doctrine of that Philosopher? I say, 4. That he is in the wrong to assert, that when Envy or such like Imperfections, are ascribed to God, they lose what is Vicious in them, and that they must be favourably understood. This cannot reach so far as Moral Imperfections, or that sort of Faults we think to be inconsistent with an Honest Man. Such are Fraud, Cruelty, Treason, and that sort of base Envy which cannot bear any one's prosperity, and prompts one to persecute all those that excel. All the Blasphemies of the Poets, and all the Impious Doctrines upon which the Religious Worship of the Heathens was grounded, and which have been so solidly refuted by the Fathers of the Church, would be excusable, if the Maxim of *Valesius* was admitted. Let us therefore reject it, and lose no time in putting a Figurative sense upon *Herodotus*'s Words. Let us rather say, that he took the Word *Envy* in an odious sense. We may judge of it as we judge of the Complaints, which the Pagans made of their Gods in their Calamities. Their Reviling of Fortune, and the Cruelty mitted a **Miſtake**, which I ſhall take notice of; it will give me occaſion to mention a (*K*) Political Aphoriſm. *Cimon*'s Siſter undertook one Day to criticize the Conduct of *Pericles*, for which ſhe received a mortifying Anſwer. **That Anſwer ſhews** that *Pericles* had (*L*) a ready Wit. I have promiſed the Hiſtory

---

(e) *Amm. Marcel. l.* 14. *c.* 11. *p. m.* 59, 60.

(g) Jus quoddam sublime numinis efficacis . . . substantialis tutela . . . . quam Theologi veteres fingentes Justitiæ filiam ex abdita quadam æternitate tradunt omnia despectare terrena. *Id. ib. p.* 59.

(h) *Ex Henr. Vales. in Marcel. p.* 59.

(i) *Vales. ib. p.* 60. *you will see at the end of this Rem. why I quote this Passage.*

(k) *Note that* Valesius *has not well ordered this Discourse; for* Plutarch *does not censure the Words of* Artabanus, *but those of* Solon, *which* Valesius *had quoted before he alledged those of* Artabanus.

(l) *Plut. in Paulo Æmilio p.* 273. *F.*

(m) *Ex Valesio ib.*

(a) *See Aristotle's Morals l.* 2. *c.* 7. *p. m.* 19. *and the Paraphrase of* Andronicus *p. m.* 110.

(b) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ νεμεσητικὸς, λυπεῖται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναξίως εὖ πράττουσιν· ὁ δὲ φθονερὸς ὑπερβάλλων τοῦτον ἐπὶ πᾶσι λυπεῖται. Nam qui ad indignandum propensus est is dolet eorum rebus secundis qui eis indigni sunt. Invidus hunc superans, rebus omnibus secundis contabescit. *Arist. ubi supra.*

ety whereof they accuſed the Gods, were underſtood not in an Allegorical ſenſe, but in a Literal one: they deſigned to offend 'em by their Words, as they deſigned to offend them by their Actions, when they threw Stones at their Temples. Did the *Roman* People purifie the Idea of Cruelty, did they diveſt it of ſomething that was vicious, when they murmured at Fortune during the Triumph of *Paulus Æmilius!* Let us make uſe of *Plutarch*'s Words, which follow immediately thoſe which we have ſeen above. They properly concern the Goddeſs *Nemeſis*, or that pretended Divine Virtue which *Herodotus* called Envy. "*Æmilius* had four Sons, " of which *Scipio* and *Fabius* were adopted into " other Families .... the other two which he had " by a ſecond Wife, and were yet but young, he " brought up in his own Houſe. One of theſe died " at 14 years of Age, five days before his Father's " Triumph, the other at 12, three days after. So " that there was no *Roman* without a deep ſenſe " of his ſuffering, and every one dreaded the Cru" elty of Fortune, that did not ſcruple to bring " ſo much ſorrow into a Houſe repleniſhed with " Happineſs, Rejoycing and Sacrifices, and to in" termingle Tears and Complaints with Songs of " Victory and Triumph." It is ſo true that the Word *Envy* was taken in the moſt odious Literal ſenſe, that ſome Wiſe Men oppoſed that Impiety, and ſaid in expreſs Words, that the Gods were not ſubject to that Paſſion. We have ſeen above the Remark of a famous Platoniſt, and we find in *Stobæus* four Greek Verſes of *Phocylides*, which ſay, that there is no Envy among the Gods, ἄφθονοι οὐρανίδαι, *&c.* 5. Laſtly, I ſay that *Plutarch* cannot be guilty of *Herodotus*'s fault, becauſe he ſpeaks only in a doubtful way, he makes uſe of an *If*, he confines himſelf to a certain God, whoſe particular Commiſſion or Lot ſhould be to croſs the happineſs of Men. Whereas *Herodotus* affirms, that all the Gods are Envious and Turbulent. Let us conclude, that *Henricus Valeſius* has not been very happy in undertaking to juſtifie *Herodotus*, and to refute *Plutarch*'s Cenſure.

He has put quite a different ſenſe from mine, upon a Paſſage of *Herodotus*. I give the Reader notice of it, and I confeſs that his Tranſlation is more Literal than that of *Laurentius Valla*, which I have (*f*) followed. I did ſomewhat ſcruple to make uſe of it, but conſidering on the one ſide, that *Henry Stephens* did not criticize it, and on the other ſide, that according to that Tranſlation, *Herodotus* reaſons more nicely and more clearly, I preferred it to that of the Learned *Henricus Valeſius*: perhaps I am in the wrong.

(*K*) *The miſtake of* Valerius Maximus *will give me occaſion to mention an Aphoriſm.*] He ſays that *Ariſtophanes* in one of his Comedies, introduces *Pericles* returning from Hell, and declaring that a Lion ought not to be brought up, and that if he be brought up and ſuffered to grow, he muſt be obey'd. (*g*) *Ariſtophanis quoque altioris eſt prudentiæ præceptum, qui in comœdia introduxit remiſſum ab inferis Athenienſem Periclem, vaticinantem, non oportere in urbe nutriri leonem; ſin autem ſit alitus, obſequi ei convenire. Monet enim, ut præcipuæ nobilitatis & concitati ingenii juvenes refrenentur. Nimio vero favore ac profuſa indulgentia paſti, quo minus potentiam obtineant, ne impediantur: quod ſtultum ſit, & inutile, eas obtrectare vires, quas ipſe foveris.* 'Tis *Æſchylus*, and not *Pericles* that ſays ſo in *Ariſtophanes*. Here are the Words of that Poet:

Οὐ (*h*) χρὴ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν,
Μάλιστα δὲ λέοντα μὴ 'ν πόλει τρέφειν.
Ἢν δ' ἐκτραφῇ τις, τοῖς τρόποις ὑπηρετεῖν.
Catulum ne alas leonis in republica,
Ac maxime ipſum leonem ne alas ibi.
Quod ſi quis alitus; obſequendum moribus.

They were thus Tranſlated by *Eraſmus*, who obſerves (*i*) that *Valerius Maximus* quotes that Paſſage, but he does not cenſure him (*k*) for having taken *Pericles* for *Æſchylus*. He underſtood that Sentence better than *Valerius Maximus*: the latter reaſons thus; Since you have bred up a Man, you ought to conſider his Power as your own Work; it would be therefore a piece of folly to go about to deſtroy it, nay, you would not be able to ſucceed in it. This is a pitiful Reaſoning. The Greek Poet meant no ſuch thing. His meaning was without doubt, that the beſt way to avoid the Miſeries which ariſe from oppoſing a Power, which was ſuffered to grow too great, is to yield to the Stream. *Admonet ænigma,* they are the Words of *Eraſmus* (*l*), *non eſſe fovendam potentiam quæ leges poſſet opprimere: quod ſi forte talis quiſpiam extiterit, non eſſe è rep. decertare cum illo, quem nequeas niſi magno reip. malo devincere. Tyrannus aut ferendus eſt, aut non recipiendus.* It is a great fault in a Republick, when they ſuffer a factious and bold Subject to get too great an Authority. But it is a greater fault ſtill to oppoſe that Man, when they have ſuffered him to become Maſter of a Republick. There are a thouſand Abuſes which ought to be prevented; but when they are grown ſtrong, it is very often a leſſer Evil to tolerate them, than to undertake to reform them. Thoſe who undertake it, do moſt times as *Sylla* did (*m*), they make uſe of a Remedy worſe than the Diſeaſe. An Hiſtorian ſaid very judiciouſly, that it had been better to let the Sick and Wounded Republick lie quiet, than to ſtir it, in order to give it ſome Remedies, and dreſs its Wounds. (*n*) *Expediebat quaſi ægra ſauciaque Reipublicæ requieſcere quomodocunque, ne vulnera curatione ipſa reſcinderentur.* I might alledge a great many things concerning the Inconveniencies of certain Remedies, which are made uſe of to cure Publick Evils; but it would look too much like an Affectation of Common-Places.

(*L*) *The Anſwer of* Pericles *to* Cimon'*s Siſter, ſhews that he had a ready Wit.*] *Cimon* and *Pericles* had very different Intereſts, and were of two contrary Parties. The Latter became ſuperiour to the other, and cauſed him to be Baniſhed (*a*). It was not the only advantage he had over him; for he contributed to his Recalling. That mark of Credit to do and undo things, did but increaſe the Jealouſie of *Cimon*'s Family: The Victories of *Pericles* increaſed alſo that Paſſion. Wherefore *Elpinice*, *Cimon*'s Siſter, being diſpleaſed with the Praiſes beſtowed upon *Pericles*'s Victories, could not forbear reflecting upon them out of ſpite: *Pericles* paid her off with this ſmart Anſwer contained in a Greek Verſe: You ſhould uſe no Paint, you are too Old for that. Let us ſee the Words of *Plutarch*. " (*b*) *Pericles* after " the overthrow of *Samos*, as ſoon as he return'd " back to *Athens*, he took care that thoſe who died " in the War, ſhould be honourably Buried, and made " ſuch a Funeral Harangue, as the Cuſtom is, in " their Commendation at their Graves and Monu" ments, that he was highly admir'd and eſteem'd " for it. As he came down from the Pulpit (or " Place where they delivered their Speeches) the " reſt of the Ladies came and complimented him, " taking him by the Hand, and Crowning him with " Garlands and Ribbons, as they uſed to do with " Gameſters that won the Publick Prizes; only *El*" *pinice* coming near to him, *ſaith ſhe*, Theſe are " brave things, *Pericles*, that you have done, and " ſuch as deſerve our Chaplets, who have loſt us " as many brave worthy Citizens, not in a War " with *Phœnicians* or *Medes*, (Enemies and Foreign" ers) as my Brother *Cimon* was wont to do, but for " the overthrow of a City that was in Alliance, " and of the ſame Country and Kindred with us. " As *Elpinice* ſpoke theſe Words, (*c*) he gently " ſmiling, as 'tis ſaid, returned her this Verſe of " *Archilochus* for Anſwer.

Old Woman as you are,
You ſhould not Powder Hair,
Nor, as you walk, Perfume the Air,
Leave theſe things to the Young and Fair.

Could any thing be ſaid more to the purpoſe to mortifie that Lady? We are told of another Anſwer, which is not ſo glorious to *Pericles*. He was one of *Cimon*'s Accuſers in a Capital Affair. *Elpinice* went and humbly beſought him to be favourable to her Brother: *You are too Old*, ſaid he to her, *to ſucceed in ſuch a Sollicitation.* (*d*) Ἐλθούσης δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τῆς Ἐλπινίκης καὶ δεομένης, μειδιάσας εἶπεν, Ὦ Ἐλπινίκη γραῦς εἶ, ὡς πράγματα τηλικαῦτα πράσσειν. *Quum adiſſet autem eum ſupplex Elpinice, ridens, at enim anus es, inquit, Elpinice: anus es nimium, quàm ut res tantas tranſigas.* The meaning of thoſe Words

(*f*) *In the Art. of* Artabanus.

(*g*) *Val. Max. l.* 7. *c.* 2. *n.* 7. *in Exter.*

(*h*) *Ariſtoph. in Ranis, act.* 5. *ſc.* 4. *p. m.* 264.

(*i*) *Eraſm. adag.* 77. *chil.* 2. *cent.* 3. *p. m.* 451.

(*k*) *Leopardus* Emendat. *l.* 8. *c.* 12. & Pighius, Comment. in hunc loc. Val. Maximi, *cenſure* Valerius Maximus *for it.*

(*l*) *Eraſm. ib.*

(*m*) Ingratus L. Sylla, qui patriam durioribus remediis quam pericula erant, ſanavit. *Seneca de benef. l.* 5. *c.* 16.

(*n*) *Flor. l.* 3. *c.* 23. *See* Balzac'*s Letters to* Chapelain *p.* 107.

(*a*) *Plut. in Pericle p.* 157.

(*b*) *Id. in Pericle.*

(*c*) Ταῦτα τῆς Ἐλπινίκης λεγούσης, Περικλῆς μειδιάσας ἀτρέμα, λέγεται τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου πρὸς αὐτὴν εἰπεῖν, Οὐκ ἂν μύροισι, γραῦς ἐοῦσ', ἠλείφεο. Sic fata Elpinice, ſubriſit Pericles, & ſubmiſſe hoc ei reſpondit Archilochi, *Quando anus es, ungi minus tibi convenit.* Plut. in Pericle, p. 167.

(*d*) *Id. ib. p.* 157. *E.*

Hiſtory of the (M) famous ASPASIA, and I will be as good as my Word.

Words ſeems to be this; If your Youth could perſuade me, that by granting me the poſſeſſion of your Body, you would pay the Service I ſhould do to your Brother, I would ſerve him; but you are too old to make me with ſuch a mark of thankfulneſs, you ſhall therefore obtain nothing from me. Two things might be ſaid for *Pericles*; Firſt, That he ſpoke in jeſt; Secondly, That he meant only, that the other Perſons whom ſhe would endeavour to prevail with, would deſpiſe her Old Age. A Young and Beautiful Sollicitreſs may obtain a thouſand things, which an Old Woman will never obtain. *Plutarch* obſerves, that notwithſtanding that Anſwer, *Pericles* did but weakly purſue his Accuſation. Others ſay, that he liked *Elpinice* very well, and lay with her as a Reward of the good Offices he had done *Cimon*. It was no very difficult thing to gain her, for ſhe lay with her Brother. (e) Καὶ Κίμωνος δ' Ἐλπινίκῃ τῇ ἀδελφῇ παρανόμως συνόντος, ὕστερον ἐκδοθείσῃ Καλλίᾳ, καὶ φυγαδευθέντος, μισθὸν ἔλαβε τῆς καθόδου αὐτοῦ ὁ Περικλῆς τὸ τῇ Ἐλπινίκῃ μιχθῆναι. *Cum Cimon Elpinice ſorore, quam poſt nuptum Calliæ dedit, contra leges abuteretur, exilioque damnatus fuiſſet, ejus reditus mercedem Pericles accepit Elpinices concubitum.* Beſides, ſhe proſtituted her ſelf to a (f) Painter. Obſerve 1. That *Athenæus* (g) from the teſtimony of *Antiſthenes*, ſuppoſes ſhe obtained *Pericles*'s Vote for the Recalling of her Brother, by granting him the Enjoyment of her ſelf. 2. That according to *Plutarch*, ſhe received *Pericles*'s denying Anſwer becauſe of her Old Age, as ſhe was ſolliciting him in a Criminal Proceſs which concerned *Cimon* (h), and which happened before the time mention'd by *Athenæus*. It is neceſſary to obſerve this; for if *Plutarch* had ſpoken of a Sollicitation that was poſterior to the Recalling of *Cimon*, we might believe that the only reaſon why *Pericles* favoured that Exile, was his Engagement to *Elpinice*. The Anſwer mentioned by *Plutarch* would make me believe, that *Elpinice* remembring that the laſt favours ſhe granted to *Pericles*, made him conſent that *Cimon* ſhould be Recalled, applied her ſelf to him again, to deſire him not to be againſt her Brother, who was concerned in a Criminal Proceſs; and that *Pericles* anſwered her in Words to this effect: “Don't expect to obtain any thing from me by your Sollicitations, you are no more what you was, when the amorous Sport you granted me, moved me to do your Brother a good Service; you are now too Old, to deſerve that I ſhould make ſuch an Exchange of Courteſie with you:” But as I have already ſaid, *Plutarch* ſuppoſes that Anſwer was made before *Cimon*'s *Oſtraciſm*. However it be, *Athenæus* tells (i) us that *Pericles* was very much given to Women.

(M) *I have promiſed the Hiſtory of* Aſpaſia.] (k) She was born at *Miletus*: ſhe followed the ſteps of *Thargelia*, who gained the Affection of the Principal *Græcians* of *Ionia* by her Wit and Beauty, and engaged them to favour the King of *Perſia*. *Aſpaſia* was a Woman of ſo great Parts, that *Socrates* went to ſee her, and carried his Friends with him (l); and to ſpeak more clearly, ſhe taught him Rhetorick and Politicks. (m) Ἀσπασία μέντοι ἡ σοφὴ τοῦ Σωκράτους διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν λόγων. *Aſpaſia ſapiens fœmina Socratis in eloquentia ſtudiis magiſtra.* Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Μενεξένῳ τὸν Σωκράτην παρ' αὐτῆς φησι μαθεῖν τὰ πολιτικά. *Plato in Menexeno teſtatur, Socratem ab ea didiciſſe politica* (n). That which is moſt ſtrange, is, that they who frequented her, carried their Wives to her Houſe, that they might hear her Diſcourſes and Lectures, tho' ſhe kept many Whores at home. (o) Τὰς γυναῖκας ἀκροασομένας οἱ συνήθεις ἦγον εἰς αὐτήν, καίπερ οὐ κοσμίου προεστῶσαν ἐργασίας οὐδὲ σεμνῆς, ἀλλὰ παιδίσκας ἑταιρούσας τρέφουσαν. *Fœminaſque ad audiendam eam duxerunt familiares: licet officinam tractaret parum decoram & honeſtam, quæ puellas ad quæſtum corpore faciendum aleret.* She underſtood Politicks very well, and it was ſaid that *Pericles* kept Company with her, becauſe ſhe had a great knowledge of the Maxims of Government; but their great Acquaintance proceeded from ſome other Cauſes. Love had a ſhare in it: *Pericles* loved not his Wife, and parted with her with all his Heart to give her to another, and then he Married *Aſpaſia*, and loved her paſſionately. The Hiſtorian (p) who relates all theſe things, alledges as a very ſingular proof of his Love, a thing which would be looked upon now as a moſt ridiculous proof. *Pericles*, ſays he, never went to, or came from the Senate without kiſſing *Aſpaſia*. (q) Αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν Ἀσπασίαν λαβὼν, ἔστερξε διαφερόντως. καὶ γὰρ ἐξιὼν, ὥς φασι, καὶ εἰσιὼν ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, ἠσπάζετο καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτὴν μετὰ τοῦ καταφιλεῖν. *Aſpaſiam uxorem duxit, quam mire dilexit, nam, ſive exiret, ſive rediret à foro, ſalutabat ſemper eam oſculo.* Perhaps that Author underſtood not well what he read upon that ſubject. I had rather ſay, as (r) an Author intimates in *Athenæus*, that *Pericles* went to ſee *Aſpaſia* twice a Day, and kiſſed her when he came in, and when he went out; which was before he Married her. It has been reported, that he turned out his Wife, and lodged with *Aſpaſia* a *Megarian* Whore, and plunged himſelf into Lewdneſs, and ſpent a great part of his Eſtate upon that Whore. (s) Περικλέα δὲ τὸν Ὀλύμπιόν φησιν Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡδονῆς, ὡς ἀπήλλαξεν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ τὸν μεθ' ἡδονῆς βίον προείλετο, ᾤκει τε μετὰ Ἀσπασίας τῆς ἐκ Μεγάρων ἑταίρας, καὶ τὸ πολὺ μέρος τῆς οὐσίας εἰς ταύτην κατανάλωσε. *Periclem Olympium Heraclides Ponticus ſcribit, libro de voluptate, expulſa domo uxore voluptati ſe tradidiſſe, cum Aſpaſia ſcorto Megarico* (t) *habitaſſe, & magnam rei familiaris partem in eam dilapidaſſe.* *Aſpaſia*, after the Death of *Pericles*, applied her ſelf to a Man of a mean Extraction, whom ſhe raiſed to the principal Dignities of the Republick (v). Which ſhews that nothing was impoſſible to her Wit and Eloquence. She muſt needs have well underſtood the Art of Speaking, ſince many *Athenians* learn'd Rhetorick of her. She acquired ſo great a Reputation, that Young *Cyrus* gave the Name of *Aſpaſia* (w) to a Miſtreſs whom he loved and eſteemed above all things. Our *Aſpaſia* was the cauſe of the War, which the Republick of *Athens* declared againſt the *Samians*. They were at War with the *Mileſians* for the City of *Priene*, which the two Parties laid a claim to. The *Samians* got the Victory. *Aſpaſia* out of Love for her Countrymen, deſired *Pericles* to make the *Athenians* declare War againſt the *Samians* (a). It's ſaid alſo that ſhe was the cauſe of the *Megarian* War, which was the beginning of that of *Peloponneſus*, and that the motive which induced her to it was a very ſhameful one. Some young *Athenians* having drunk too much, went to *Megara*, and carried away a famous Whore. The *Megarians* carried away, by way of Repriſals, two Whores belonging to *Aſpaſia*. This was the ſubject of her Anger, which moved her, as it is ſaid, to make uſe of all her Credit to have the *Megarians* attack'd. (b) Μεγαρεῖς δὲ . . . . . . τὴν αἰτίαν εἰς Ἀσπασίαν καὶ Περικλέα τρέπουσι, χρώμενοι τοῖς περιβοήτοις καὶ δημώδεσι τούτοις ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαρνέων στιχιδίοις, Πόρνην δὲ Σιμαίθαν, ἰόντες Μεγαράδε νεανίαι κλέπτουσι μεθυσοκότταβοι· κᾆθ' οἱ Μεγαρῆς ὀδύναις πεφυσιγγωμένοι, ἀντεξέκλεψαν Ἀσπασίας πόρνα δύο. *Megarenſes vero . . . . . . cauſam omnem in Aſpaſiam detorquent & Periclem, allegantque celebratos & vulgatos hoſce verſus Ariſtophanis ex Acharnibus,*

Juvenes profecti Megaram ebrii auferunt
Simætham ex ſcortatione nobilem:
Megarenſis hinc populus dolore percitus,
Furatur Aſpaſiæ duo ſcorta haud impiger.

Plutarch had done well to ſet down the two following Verſes; for they contain the concluſion which the Poet draws from that Narrative, *viz.* That three Whores were the cauſe (c) of a general War in *Greece*.

Κἀντεῦθεν ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου κατερράγη
Ἕλλησι πᾶσιν, ἐκ τριῶν λαικαστριῶν.
Hinc initium belli prorupit
Univerſis Græcis, ob tres meretriculas.

Athenæus (d), who alledges the ſix Verſes of *Ariſtophanes*, ſays juſt before, that the School of *Aſpaſia* filled the whole Country with Whores. (e) Καὶ Ἀσπασία δὲ ἡ Σωκρατικὴ ἐνεπορεύετο πλήθη καλῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν ἀπὸ τῶν ταύτης ἑταιρίδων ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὡς καὶ ὁ χαρίεις Ἀριστοφάνης παρασημαίνεται λέγων τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον, ὅτι Περικλῆς διὰ τὸν Ἀσπασίας ἔρωτα, καὶ τὰς ἁρπασθείσας ἀπ' αὐτῆς θεραπαίνας ὑπὸ Μεγαρέων, ἀνερρίπισε τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα τὸ δεινόν. *Dalechampius* renders thoſe Greek words thus: *Aſpaſia Socratica formoſas mulieres, & eas quidem multas, Athenis præbuit. Jam*

inde

(e) Athen. l. 13. p. 589. F.

(f) To Polygnotus. See Plut. in Cimone p. 480.

(g) Ubi ſupra.

(h) Plut. in Pericle, p. 157. E. See alſo in vita Cimonis, p. 487, where he quotes Steſimbrotus a contemporary Hiſtorian.

(i) Ἦν δ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ πρὸς ἀφροδίσια πάνυ καταφερής. Fuit quidem ille ad Venerem multum propenſus. Athen. ib.

(k) Plut. in Pericle, p. 165.

(l) Id. ib.

(m) Athen. l. 5. p. 219. See alſo Lucian de Saltatione p. m. 923. tom. 1.

(n) Harpocration voce Ἀσπασία.

(o) Plut. ibid. C.

(p) Id. ib.

(q) Id. ib. D.

(r) Ἀντισθένης δὲ ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἐρασθέντα φησὶν αὐτὸν Ἀσπασίας δὶς τῆς ἡμέρας εἰσιόντα καὶ ἐξιόντα ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀσπάζεσθαι τὴν ἄνθρωπον. Antiſthenes Socraticus narrat amatorem illum Aſpaſiæ, bis quotidie ſalutaturum ad eam introire, exireque inde ſolitum. Athen. l. 13. p. 589. E.

(s) Id. l. 10. p. 533.

(t) She was born at Miletus according to Plutarch. Perhaps Heraclides gives her the Surname of Megarian, becauſe ſhe kept a Bawdy-Houſe at Megara before ſhe came to Athens.

(v) Plut. ib. See alſo Harpocration ub. ſup. and the Notes of Valeſius.

(w) See the Rem. C. of the Art. Cyrus.

(a) Plut. ib. p. 165, 166.

(b) Id. ib. p. 168. E.

(c) Note, that Plutarch does not adopt this Fact. See the Rem. G.

(d) Athen. l. 13. p. 570.

(e) Id. ib. p. 569, 570.

See the Remark *M.* I will make alſo a ſmall Collection of ſome miſtakes, (*N*) which concern

[illegible] abundant Græca, ut indicat facetus Ariſtophanes, Peloponneſiaci belli cauſam explicans, nempe ob amicam Aſpaſiæ, & raptas à Megarenſibus ejus ancillas, Periclem decretum infauſtum illud de bello Megarenſibus inferendo, velut ignem flabello, excitaſſe, & accendiſſe. I muſt not forget that *Aſpaſia* was accuſed of two Crimes by the Comedian *Hermippus*. He (*f*) made himſelf a Party againſt her in due form, and accuſed her before the Judges of Impiety, and of drawing Women into her Houſe to ſatiſfie the Luſt of *Pericles*. I don't know very well whether he pretended that ſhe had been a Bawd to *Pericles* after he had Married her: in ſuch a caſe the ſecond Crime had been as extraordinary as the firſt; for it is ſo rare a thing, that a Woman ſhould be her Huſband's Bawd, as it is a rare thing that ſhe ſhou'd have no Religion. During the Trial of *Aſpaſia*, *Pericles* uſed ſo many Intreaties, and ſhed ſo many Tears that he obtained her Abſolution. He expected not the ſame favour for *Anaxagoras*, who had been accuſed of Irreligion at the ſame time, under pretence that he explained (*g*) Meteors by Philoſophical Reaſons: he ſent him out of *Athens* to ſave him. (*h*) Ἀσπασίαν μὲν οὖν ἐξῃτήσατο πάνυ πολλὰ παρὰ τὴν δίκην, ὥς φησιν Αἰσχίνης, ἀφεὶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς δάκρυα, καὶ δεηθεὶς τῶν δικαστῶν· Ἀναξαγόραν δὲ, φοβηθεὶς, ἐξέπεμψε καὶ προύπεμψεν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως. *Ac Aſpaſiam quidem eripuit Pericles precibus, per qua vim lacrymarum in cauſa dicenda (ut ſcribit Æſchines) profudit, obſecravitque judices: Anaxagoram trepidans ablegavit, atque ex urbe deduxit.* *Athenæus* mentions another Author who relates the ſame Fact, and who obſerves, that when *Pericles* was in danger of loſing his Life, he ſhed not ſo many Tears as he did upon the account of *Aſpaſia*. (*i*) Καὶ φευγούσης ποτὲ αὐτῆς γραφὴν ἀσεβείας, λέγων ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, πλείονα ἐδάκρυσεν, ἢ ὅτε ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἐκινδύνευεν. *Et cùm impietatis accuſata fuiſſet, orationem pro illa habuiſſe, effuſiùs lacrymantem, quàm cùm vitæ ac fortunarum periculum adiiſſet.* *Tanaquillus Faber*, in the Lives of the *Greek* Poets, pag. 81. wraps up this Accuſation of *Aſpaſia* in Words which every one does not underſtand. "*Aſpaſia*, ſays he, deſerves that Honour, "ſince ſhe was the Miſtreſs of a Man who was "Maſter of *Attica*, and of the Iſlands of the "*Ægean* Sea; ſince ſhe was the *Juno* of the *Olympian Pericles*; ſince ſhe made Verſes and Harangues; and laſtly ſince ſhe knew as much "Rhetorick as *Prodicus* and *Gorgias* the great *Cymbaliſt* of *Greece*. But ſhe knew ſomething elſe, "which I would never tell you, were it not that I "am reſolved to ſpeak of *Hermippus* a Comick Poet, "who lived at the ſame time. *Hermippus* .... made "ſome Verſes againſt *Pericles*, and even accuſed "*Aſpaſia* of driving a certain Trade which *Pericles* "hated not. That Trade is the thing which I don't "know how to expreſs. However, let us ſee whether ſo naſty a Subject may not be explained with "honeſt Words. She did, Sir, for *Pericles* what "*Livia* did for *Auguſtus*, when he was diſguſted, "and the Nights ſeemed to him to be too long, *&c.* What *Tanaquillus Faber* ſays of *Livia*, is to be found in *Suetonius* *Chap.* 71. of the Life of *Auguſtus*. *Circa libidines hæſit, poſtea quoque, ut ferunt, ad vitiandas virgines promptior, quæ ſibi undique* ETIAM AB UXORE *conquirerentur.* I ſhall ſet down *Plutarch*'s Words, that one may ſee the whole extent of the Crime which *Aſpaſia* was accuſed of: it will appear that ſhe debauched not Slaves and Outlandiſh Women, but the Noble Ladies of *Athens*. "(*k*) About this time *Aſpaſia* was Indicted of Impiety or Irreligion, upon the complaint of *Hermippus* a Writer of Comedies, who alſo laid further to her Charge, that ſhe was Bawd to *Pericles*, and entertained Citizens Wives and Daughters for his uſe; and *Diopithes* propoſed a Decree, "that Information ſhould be given in againſt ſuch "Perſons as deny a Deity, and thoſe who teach "or make Diſcourſes concerning Meteors and "other Appearances in the Sky; by theſe laſt "words aiming in ſhew at *Anaxagoras*, but really "ſtriking at *Pericles*."

(*N*) *Of ſome miſtakes which concern* Aſpaſia.] *Quintilian* has committed a miſtake in the Account he gives of the Queſtions which were put to *Xenophon*'s Wife. She was aſk'd: *If the Gold of your Neighbour was better than yours, which had you rather have, yours or her's?* Her's, anſwered ſhe. *If her Cloaths and Ornaments were finer than yours, had you rather have her's than yours?* Yes, anſwered ſhe. *But if her Huſband was better than yours, had you rather have him than yours?* She was aſhamed of that Queſtion, and anſwered nothing. *Cicero* (*l*) relates this, and plainly ſays, thoſe Queſtions were put to *Xenophon*'s Wife by *Aſpaſia*. But *Quintilian* ſays that they were put to *Aſpaſia* by *Xenophon*'s Wife: (*m*) *Ut apud Æſchinem Socraticum male reſpondit Aſpaſiæ Xenophontis uxor: quod Cicero his verbis transfert.* *Voſſius* (*n*) cenſured that miſtake, but he was miſtaken in his turn; for he believed that *Quintilian* admitted of (*o*) two *Aſpaſias*. The miſtake does not conſiſt in that; but in believing that *Aſpaſia* mentioned by *Cicero*, was *Xenophon*'s Wife. *Colomeſius* cenſures that fault of *Quintilian* (*p*), and obſerves that (*q*) *Bruſonius* follows it. I believe that overſight comes from the Copiſts, and that *Quintilian* ſaid *apud Æſchinem Socraticum male reſpondit Aſpaſiæ Xenophontis uxor.* A Copiſt not very Learned fancied it ſhould be *Aſpaſia* inſtead of *Aſpaſiæ*, and that it was the Name of *Xenophon*'s Wife. Note, that *Aſpaſia* having by her captious Queſtions reduced the Wife to ſilence, applied her ſelf immediately to the Huſband, ask'd him the ſame Queſtions, and made him bluſh at the third, and reduced him to the ſame ſilence; and then ſhe made a very judicious Diſcourſe to both of 'em (*r*). The Learned *Leopardus* knew not that *Quintilian*, as we have him now, was the cauſe of *Bruſonius*'s miſtake; he was contented to cenſure the modern Author. *Idem Bruſonius*, ſays he (*ſ*), *eodem capite: Aſpaſia, inquit, Xenophontis uxor quum eſſet (ut muliebre ingenium eſt) rerum alienarum appetens atque invida, interrogata, ſi vicina tua, &c.* Here is a fault which *Leopardus* took no notice of. *Bruſonius* ſuppoſes of his own Authority, that *Aſpaſia*, *Xenophon*'s Wife, was a covetous and envious Woman. Where did he find ſuch a thing? Is it lawful to forge things of this nature? To what purpoſe is his Parentheſis? Having ſhew'd my ſmall Correction of *Quintilian* to a learned Humaniſt, he approved of it, and ſome days after, he ſhewed me his Edition of *Quintilian Variorum*, whereby it appears that *Turnebus* had already Corrected that Paſſage.

Suidas ſays falſely, that *Pericles* had two Sons by *Aſpaſia*, viz. *Xanthippus* and *Paralus*, for he had them by his other Wife.

Lloyd takes from our *Aſpaſia* a Paſſage of *Xenophon*, which might have made her very glorious: he underſtands it of another *Aſpaſia*, Wife of *Cleobulus*. But 'tis plain he is miſtaken, for 1. The Name of *Xenophon*'s Interlocutor is not *Cleobulus*, but *Critobulus*. 2. *Socrates*, who is the other Interlocutor, does not ſpeak of *Critobulus*'s Wife; he ſpeaks of the Rhetorician and Learned *Aſpaſia*; he ſays that ſhe will give *Critobulus* better Precepts than he (*Socrates*) can give him. (*a*) Συστήσω δέ σοι ἐγὼ καὶ Ἀσπασίαν, ἣ ἐπιστημονέστερον ἐμοῦ σοὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιδείξει. *Ego tibi exempli cauſa Aſpaſiam conſtituam, quæ doctius hæc omnia quam ego tibi monſtrabit.*

Theſe words of a Commentator upon *Minutius Felix* are not very exact: (*b*) *De Pythagora referunt Diogenes Laërtius lib.* 8. *& Lucianus in Gallo eum dixiſſe ſe primum fuiſſe Æthalidem Mercurii filium, inde Euphorbum Panthi filium, mox Aſpaſiam nobile Periclis ſcortum, deinde Cratem Cynicum.* We have in thoſe Words three Removes of *Pythagoras* one after another: from the Body of *Æthalides* he went into that of *Euphorbus*, and then into that of *Aſpaſia*, and laſtly into that of *Crates*. If the Commentator was exact, that Liſt would be found intire both in *Diogenes Laertius* and *Lucian*; but there is only part of it in the one, and part of it in the other. This is no good way of quoting Authors. This ſhall be the firſt miſtake of that Author. The 2*d* conſiſts in giving a wrong account of the Narrative of *Diogenes Laertius*, who ſays that *Pythagoras* boaſted to have been ſucceſſively *Æthalides*, *Euphorbus*, *Hermotimus*, *Pyrrhus* and *Pythagoras*. 3*dly*, He does not give a better account of *Lucian*'s Narrative; for had he tranſcribed him well, he would have ſaid that the Soul of *Pythagoras* was firſt in the Body of *Euphorbus*; and then in that of *Pythagoras*; and then in that of *Aſpaſia*; and then in that of *Crates*;

(*f*) Καὶ Ἀσπασία δίκην ἔφευγεν ἀσεβείας, Ἑρμίππου τοῦ κωμῳδοποιοῦ διώκοντος, καὶ προσκατηγοροῦντος ὡς Περικλεῖ γυναῖκας ἐλευθέρας εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ φοιτώσας ὑποδέχοιτο. Aſpaſia violatæ religionis eſt rea facta, accuſatore comœdiarum ſcriptore Hermippo: objecit præterea eam liberas fœminas, quibus illudebat Pericles, recipere. *Plutarch. p.* 169. *D.*

(*g*) Ψήφισμα Διοπείθης ἔγραψεν, εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας, ἢ λόγους περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων διδάσκοντας, ἀπερειδόμενος εἰς Περικλέα δι᾽ Ἀναξαγόρου τὴν ὑπόνοιαν. Rogationem tulit Diopithes, nomina ut deferrentur eorum qui eſſe deos negarent, aut qui ſermones de rebus æthereis ſererent, ea ſuſpicione perſtringens Anaxagoræ cauſa Periclem. *Id. ib.* (*h*) *Id. ib. E.* (*i*) *Athenæus l.* 13. *p.* 589. *ex Antiſthene Socratico.* (*k*) *Plut. in Pericle.*

(*l*) *Cic. de Invent. l.* 1. *fol. m.* 92. *A.*

(*m*) *Quintil. l.* 5. *c.* 11. *p. m.* 243.

(*n*) *Voſſ. Inſt. orat. l.* 3. *c.* 5. *p. m.* 405.

(*o*) Quintiliani lapſus in duabus Aſpaſiis. *Id. ib. in Indice rerum & verborum.*

(*p*) Falſus eſt Fabius, quique eum ſecutus eſt Bruſonius in Apophthegm. *Colomeſ. not. ad Quintil. p. m.* 224. *opuſcular.*

(*q*) *Here are all the Titles of that Author:* L. Domitius Bruſonius, Contorſinus, Lucanus. *He made a Collection of Apophthegms, intitled* Septem facetiarum libri.

(*r*) *See Cicero ub. ſup.*

(*ſ*) *Leopard. emendat. l.* 12. *c.* 13.

(*a*) *Xenoph. in Oeconom. p. m.* 482.

(*b*) *Ouzelius in Minut. Felic. p.* 325. *edit.* 1672. *in* 8.

concern that Woman. I shall not forget the faults of Mr. *Moreri* (O), nor those of his

Crates; afterwards in that of a King, &c. and lastly in that of a Cock. 4. He should not have quoted upon this subject, a Man who does nothing but droll, and who takes an Age posteriour to *Pythagoras*. He should have quoted those Authors only, who relate what *Pythagoras* himself said, speaking of the share he had in the Transmigrations of the Soul.

Moreri has not committed many mistakes. I find fault with him only for having said, that *Aspasia was very Learned in Philosophy and Eloquence, but especially in Poetry*. I don't blame *Moreri* for saying that she understood Philosophy and the Art of Speaking. I only say, that he was in the wrong to affirm, that Poetry was the Science that she excelled most in. This is so false, that one may very well doubt, whether she ever made any Verses. I think *Athenæus* is the only Author who might be alledged for it: but his Testimony is very weak; for he only says, that there were some Verses ascribed (c) to *Aspasia*, which had been published by *Herodicus*. To speak exactly of what she excelled in, we must say that it was Rhetorick. *Pericles* was not ashamed to recite (d) the Harangues which she composed. She understood Politicks better than Philosophy, and seeing *Pericles* consulted her about the Art of Reigning, it should not seem strange, that some other great Politicians should very much esteem the Counsels of Women. I said before that the Great *Socrates* learned that Science of her.

(O) *The Faults of Mr.* Moreri.] I. I doubt whether the Masters, who taught *Pericles* Philosophy, were *jealous of the universal knowledge he acquired* of it. The three Authors (e) quoted by *Moreri* say no such thing. I don't find that Circumstance in any ancient Author: yet I dare not say that *Moreri* invented it, or that the Modern Author, from whom he might have it, was the Inventer thereof; I only say, that his general way of quoting Authors, hinders me from denying many Falsities, and makes me speak in a doubtful manner. II. Seeing *Plutarch* says only that *Pericles* got a Victory over the *Sicyonians* (f) at *Nemea*, why does *Moreri* affirm, that this Battel was fought *near the great River Nemea*? III. If it be a River, it is not considerable enough to be called a great River. The following Mistakes are to be found in the Supplement. IV. *Pericles did* not *fortifie the* Isthmus *of* Corinth *with a good Wall*. Two things extreamly different one from another have been confounded together. He caused to be built at *Athens* what went by the Name of *the* (g) *long Wall*. It was rather the business of the *Peloponnesians* to fortifie the *Isthmus* of *Corinth*, than that of the *Athenians*. V. *Plutarch* and *Herodotus* are not well quoted; the latter says nothing of the Apophthegms or Actions of *Pericles*; and the other mentions only part of the things related in the Supplement. The fine Saying *Amicus usque ad aras*, being not in the Life of *Pericles*, the (h) Book of *Plutarch* wherein it is mentioned, should have been quoted. VI. The Article of *Pericles*'s Son is very bad: any Reader would think that he commanded in Chief the *Athenian* Fleet, which defeated that of *Lacedæmon* near the Islands called *Arginusæ*; for we are told, that *he did wonders in that Expedition, and burnt the Fleet of the Enemies*. This Author should have exprest himself so, if he had meant a Man who had the whole Command. He said just before, that *the* Athenians *chose him to succeed* Alcibiades: Which will deceive more and more those who are not ignorant that *Alcibiades* (i) had been Captain-General of the *Athenians*. The truth is, that (k) Ten Generals were chosen in the room of *Alcibiades*, and that *Pericles*'s Son was one of the Ten. *Xenophon* says so positively, and does not say that the *Lacedæmonian* Fleet was burnt; he only says, (l) that it was beaten, and went off, having lost 70 Ships. Note, That the Commander on the Day of the Battle, was not *Pericles*, but (m) *Thrasybulus*. If it be objected that the Collegues of *Pericles* are mentioned in the Supplement, for it says that *he was condemned with the other Seven Captains of the Army, to lose his Head*; I answer that my Censure is well grounded notwithstanding. An Author, who contradicts himself by using some Expressions which destroy one another, gives an ill account of a Fact, and confounds and deceives his Reader. Here is another Deceit; for a Reader being undeceived by this last Phrase, as to *Pericles* his Commanding in Chief, will be apt to believe, that there was but Eight Commanders on Board that Fleet. He will be therefore mistaken, for there were Ten: 'tis true, there was but Eight of them Condemn'd to lose their Lives. The Author of the Supplement ought to have exprest himself thus, *he was condemned with Seven others*. *Xenophon* observes (n) that Six only were put to Death, and that the other two were absent. He or *Diodorus Siculus* should have been quoted in the Supplement, and not *Plutarch*, who mention'd only the Son of *Pericles* (o) by the Bye, and without telling the circumstances of the causes of his Death. They were so unjust, that so enormous a thing was perhaps never seen under the most Despotick Monarchy. The *Athenians* put to Death Six Generals, who had lately obtained the most glorious Victory, that *Grecians* ever obtained over *Grecians*, and who had signalized themselves on many other occasions; they were put to Death, I say, because they had not buried those who died in the Battle. What they alledged in their defence was not at all minded, *viz.* That those whom they had intrusted with that care, met with a Storm, which hindred them from executing (p) that Commission. *Socrates*, one of their Judges, opposed (q) vigorously that Unjustice; but his Reasons were not minded. These brave Men suffered Death after such a manner as rendred that Iniquity most execrable. *Diomedon* spoke for all, and instead of Imprecations and Complaints, instead of setting forth their Services paid with Ungratefulness, he was contented to wish, that their Death might prove happy to their Country, and to desire the Assembly to accomplish the Vows which they had made to obtain the Victory. (r) Τὰ μὲν περὶ ἡμῶν κεκυρωθέντα συνενέγκαι τῇ πόλει· τὰς δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς νίκης εὐχὰς ἐπειδήπερ ἡ τύχη κεκώλυκεν ἡμᾶς ἀποδοῦναι, καλῶς ἔχον ὑμᾶς φροντίσαι, καὶ τῷ Διὶ τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἀποδοῦναι· τούτοις γὰρ εὐξάμενοι, τοὺς πολεμίους κατεναυμαχήσαμεν. *Quod in capita nostra jam decretum est, id faustum ac felix civitati huic eveniat. At vota pro victori. Diis nuncupata, quia fortuna reddere nos prohibuit, vos accurare pium & honestum est. Jovi igitur servatori & Apollini & venerandis Deabus illa persolvitote. Horum enim numine invocato hostes profligavimus.* The Historian who relates this, adds a Reflection upon the Fury which moved the People to such an Unjustice, the People, I say, incensed by their Orators. (s) Οὕτω δὴ ὁ δῆμος τότε παρεξέστη, καὶ παροξυνθεὶς ἀδίκως ὑπὸ τῶν δημαγωγῶν, τὴν ὀργὴν ἀπεσκήψατο εἰς ἄνδρας οὐ τιμωρίας ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ἐπαίνων καὶ στεφάνων ἀξίας. *Tam perditè tunc populus insanivit, ut ab Oratoribus præter jus & fas exacerbatus, iram suam in viros, non modo nulli pœnâ, sed magnis insuper laudibus & coronis dignos, exoneravit.* But why should that sort of Men go by such a Name? An Orator is defined, *an honest Man who understands the Art of Speaking*, (t) *vir bonus dicendi peritus*. The name of Orator or Preacher ought not therefore to be given to a shuffling, factious, and wicked Man, who uses his Eloquence and the Strength of his Lungs, to move the People to some Violence. I have said elsewhere, That *Thomas Hobbes* undertook the Translation of *Thucydides*, to put the *English* out of conceit with the Republican Spirit. It was well enough thought of; but it had been better still, if he had written a Book concerning the Internal State of *Athens*. The History we have of that People is only fit to impose upon us; we are charmed with the fair side of it; we are dazled with the Battles of *Marathon* and *Salamis*; with their Land and Sea-Forces, their Conquests, the Wealth of the Inhabitants, the Pomp of their Publick Shews, and the Magnificence of their Publick Buildings. All those things induce us to think, that to live under another Form of Government, is to be a Slave. But if we had a History which should but touch upon those things, and set forth at large the Tumults of their Assemblies, the Factions which divided that City, the Seditions wherewith it was agitated, the most illustrious Subjects persecuted, (e) banished, punished with Death at the Will of a violent Harangue-maker, we should be convinced, that the *Atheeians* who boasted so much of their Liberty, his Continuator, nor thoſe of another *French* Writer (P) concerning *Pericles*. Which will give me occaſion to obſerve the Unjuſtices and Diſorders which (P△) often prevailed under the Republican State of the *Athenians*.

(c) Ἐν τοῖς [illegible] in carminibus ipsi attributis, & ab Herodico Crateteio publicatis Athen. l. 5. p. 219. Gyraldus *de Poetis Græcis* p. 170. *edit.* 1696. *says that* Athenæus *mentions* Aspasia's *Verses in some other places which he* (Gyraldus) *does not quote. I have not had time enough to verifie it.*

(d) *Plato in Menexeno, p. m.* 517.

(e) *Plut. in his Life: Diod. Sic. l.* 12. *Thucyd. l.* 2, 3, *& seq.*

(f) Ἐν Νεμέᾳ, apud Nemeam. *Plutarch in Pericle p.* 163. *D.*

(g) Μακρὸν τεῖχος, longum murum. *Id. ib. p.* 160. *init.*

(h) '*Tis the Treatise de* vitioso pudore, *p. m.* 531. *See also* Aulus Gellius *l.* 1. *c.* 3.

(i) *See* Plutarch *in the Life of* Alcibiades *p.* 210.

(k) *See Xenophon l.* 1. *de gestis Græcor. p. m.* 259. *See also Diod. Sic. l.* 13. *c.* 100.

(l) *Xenoph. ib. p.* 262.

(m) *Diod. Sicul. l.* 13. *c.* 97.

(n) *Xenoph. ib. pag.* [illegible]

(o) *Plut. in vit. Periclis, sub fin. p.* [illegible]

(p) *See Xenoph. ib. p.* 263.

(q) *See the Life of* Socrates, *written by Mr.* Charpentier, *p. m.* 153. *& seq.*

(r) *Diod. Sic. l.* 13. *c.* 102. *p. m.* 553. *'Tis the* 221 *p. of the Greek and Lat. edit.* 1604. *in fol.*

(s) *Id. ib.*

(t) *See Quintil. l.* 12. *c.* 1. *p. m.* 552.

(e) Hos libros tum scripsisse dicitur (*Thucydides*) quum à Rep. remotus, atque id quod optimo cuique Athenis accidere solitum est, in exilium pulsus esset. *Cicero de Oratore lib.* 2. *fol.* 73. *D.*

Of all the Actions of *Pericles*, his Expedition into *Samos*, of the Motives whereof I have ſaid ſomething in one of my Remarks, was cried down † with the greateſt Malignity. You will find it in *Plutarch*, but he has omitted an odious Circumſtance, which he might have found in *Alexis* the *Samian*, in the Second Book of the Confines of *Samos*. That Author obſerved that the Whores who followed

were at the bottom Slaves to a few Caballiſts, whom they called *Demagogues*, and who made 'em turn ſometimes one way, ſometimes another, according as their Paſſions changed: as the Sea drives the Waves ſometimes one way, ſometimes another, according as it is toſſed with the Winds. If you inquire into the Hiſtory of *Macedonia*, which was a Monarchy, it will not afford you ſo many Examples of Tyranny, as the Hiſtory of the *Athenians* will. But this is too long a Digreſſion. See the Remark P△.

(P) The faults *of another French Writer.*] He did not put his Name to his Book, which was Printed at *Paris* in 2 Vol. in 12. in the Year 1669, and is intitled *A General Hiſtory of Greece*. He ſays (d) That *Phidias was accuſed of having in his Hands a great deal of Sacred Money, which was given him by* Pericles. …… That the *Athenians* (e) *charged* Pericles *with that Sacrilege, and accuſed* Anaxagoras *the Philoſopher his Preceptor of being an Accomplice of it, and of having given him ſuch Inſtructions.* This Author has not well underſtood the Hiſtorian whom he tranſcribes; for we read in *Diodorus Siculus*, that (f) *Phidias* was accuſed of having converted to his own uſe a great Sum of Money, not without the knowledge of *Pericles*, who ordered him to make the Statue of *Minerva*. Whereupon the Enemies of *Pericles* moved the People to impriſon *Phidias*, and to bring an Action of Sacrilege againſt *Pericles*. They accuſed alſo *Anaxagoras* of impious Doctrines, and involved *Pericles* in the ſame Accuſation. It muſt be confeſt that an Hiſtorian, who repreſents that Fact as the Modern Author has repreſented it, does falſify, and conſiderably diſguiſe it. Some Pages after he ſays, (g) That *Pericles* having made the Funeral Oration which is *in the Second Book of* Thucydides ….. *was ſo much careſſed and courted by the* Athenian *Ladies, that as he came down from the Pulpit, they imbraced him, kiſs'd his Hands, and crowned his Head with Flowers, as if he had returned Victorious from the Olympick Games.* This Author confounds the times: the Harangue of *Pericles*, mentioned by *Thucydides*, was pronounced in Commendation of thoſe who had been killed in the Beginning of the *Peloponneſian* War. But the Orator was not careſſed by the Ladies at that time. If our Modern Author had carefully examined *Plutarch* whom he quotes, he might have known that *Pericles* received thoſe Careſſes after the Funeral Harangue he made (h) for thoſe who had loſt their Lives in the *Samian* War. There was a ſpace of 10 (i) Years between thoſe two Harangues. Here is another Miſtake of that Author. Having related what happened in the two firſt Campaigns of the *Peloponneſian* War, he ſays, that *Pericles* being diſpleaſed with the Reproaches of the People (k), harangued the Council of *Athens*, and repreſented many things, which made no great Impreſſion upon them, ſince (l) *that Great Man was Fined. But,* (the Hiſtorian goes on (m),) *he was elected again General of the Athenian Army, an Honour he enjoyed not long, for he died two Years and a half after.* He muſt then have lived till the 5th Year of the *Peloponneſian* War; but *Thucydides* (n) who knew it very well, ſays he died two Years and a half after the Beginning of that War. If that General Hiſtory of *Greece* was thus carefully examined, I think one would find ſuch Miſtakes every where.

(P△) *The Unjuſtices and Diſorders which often prevailed among the* Athenians.] See in the Remark O what I have ſaid upon this Subject by way of Digreſſion. I would add nothing to it, were it not that I know ſome Perſons have been diſpleaſed with that Digreſſion, and even affirmed that I am the only Man who ever made a Remark of that Nature. I will ſhew them that they have not read much, and that the Authorities which might be alledged againſt them, will not be more favourable to them than Reaſon: Reaſon, I ſay; for can any one have a good opinion of a Government, wherein the oppoſite Factions of Declaimers were a neceſſary Evil. (o) Ὁ δ' οὖν Μελάνθιος εἴτε παίζων εἴτε σπουδάζων, ἔλεγε διασώζεσθαι τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν διὰ τὴν τῶν ῥητόρων διχοστασίαν καὶ ταραχήν· οὐ γὰρ ἀποκλίνειν ἅπαντας εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν τοῖχον, ἀλλὰ γίνεσθαί τινα τοῦ βλάπτοντος ἀνθολκὴν ἐν τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν πολιτευομένων. *Sanè Melanthius, ſive ſerio id, ſive joco, Athenienſium civitatem conſervatam fuiſſe dixit oratorum diſſidiis atque turbis. Ita enim non in unum univerſos parietem inclinaſſe, ſed eorum qui rempublicam tractabant in diſſidio quippiam fuiſſe quod repelleret à damnoſa parte urbem.* I deſire you to compare two Paſſages of *Ariſtotle* together, that wherein he deſcribes the Diſorders of *Democracies*, and another wherein he obſerves how the City of *Athens* came to a Democratical Government. You will find by conferring thoſe two Paſſages one with another, that he muſt needs have look'd upon the Government, which was eſtabliſhed at *Athens*, after the Victories obtained over the *Perſians*, as a perfect Tyranny. He ſays (p), that ſince *Solon* intruſted ſome Judges, elected by the People, with the ſupreme Authority, the People were flattered as Tyrants uſe to be; that *Ephialtes* and *Pericles* leſſened the Authority of the *Areopagus*; that *Pericles* rendered Magiſtracy mercenary, and that the other *Demagogues* following thoſe Examples, introduced Democracy at laſt. He pretends that they acted not therein according to *Solon*'s Intentions; and that the Pride of the Inhabitants after the Glory they acquired in the War againſt the *Perſians*, and the ill Qualities of the Demagogues produced that effect. Thus he acknowledges that Democracy reigned in *Athens*, that is, according to the Deſcription he made of that Form of Government in (q) another place of the ſame Book, a State wherein all things, the Laws themſelves, depend upon the Multitude ſet up for a Tyrant, and governed by the Flatteries of ſome Declaimers. *Boetius* brings in Philoſophy ſpeaking theſe Words, which are not advantageous to the *Athenians*: (r) *Si cujus oriundus ſis patria reminiſceris, non uti Athenienſium quondam, multitudinis imperio regitur: ſed* εἷς κοίρανός ἐστιν, εἷς βασιλεύς: *qui frequentia civium non* DEPULSIONE *lætatur.* There is ſcarce any thing more Satyrical againſt the *Athenians*, than the Verſes of *Julius Cæſar Scaliger*, wherewith a Learned Profeſſor of Hiſtory, in the Univerſity of an Imperial City, was extraordinary well pleaſed. I obſerve this, that one may ſee that a Profeſſor who received his Salary from a Republick, did not think himſelf obliged to have any regard for the Government of *Athens*. He is not contented to ſet down the Invective of *Scaliger* the Father, and to praiſe it; but he ſtrengthens it with Examples, and with an Apoſtrophe of *Demoſthenes* to *Minerva*. O Goddeſs, ſaid that Orator, being ready to go into Baniſhment, how come you to be ſo fond of three very troubleſome Beaſts, the Owl, the Dragon, and the People? (ſ) *Cùm nulla cœna tam parca ſit, in qua non hilaritatis poculum circumeat; propinabo ejus loco lepidiſſimos hoſce verſus* Julii Scaligeri *de inſaniente* Athenienſium *vulgo:*

Nulla eſt, puto Reſpublica nationè vera,
Commentitia, fictavè cogitatione,
Aut ſtultitiâ aut nequitiâ Atticâ priores.
Ita conſiliis flagitiiſque Demagogos
Tetris nugivoram excruciaſſe cerno plebem:
Fecem pelagi turbine turbulentiorem.
Juſtos opibus, patria & exuiſſe vita.

Nihil ſolemnius hoc poſtremo; & exemplo eſt Diomedon *apud* Valerium noſtrum, *qui* ad non meritum ſupplicium ductus nihil aliud locutus eſt, quam ut vota pro incolumitate exercitus ab ipſo nuncupata ſolverentur. *Fertur, cum* Demoſthenes *jam exulaturus urbe cederet, extenſis verſus arcem manibus exclamaſſe:* O Domina Polias (*ita Minervam cognominabant*) quid ita gaudes tribus moleſtiſſimis beſtiis, Noctua, Dracone & Populo.

(Q) The

---

† See Plutarch in the Life of Pericles p. 166. & seq.

(d) A General Hiſtory of Greece, tom. 2. p. 390.

(e) Ib. p. 441.

(f) Diod. Sicul. l. 12. c. 39.

(g) Ib. p. 466.

(h) See the Rem. L. let. b.

(i) The War of Samos happened in the 84th Olympiad, and that of Peloponneſus in the 87.

(k) A Gen. Hiſtory of Greece, p. 413.

(l) Ib. p. 415.

(m) Ib. p. 416.

(n) Thucydides l. 2. p. m. 118.

(o) Plut. de audiendis poetis, p. 20 C.

(p) Ariſt. politic. l. 2. c. 12. p. m. 252.

(q) Id. ib. l. 4. c. 4. p. 278.

(r) Boet. de conſol. Philoſ. l. 1. p. m. 15. See the Notes of Renatus Vallinus upon that place of Boetius.

(ſ) Chriſtophorus Adamus Rupertus diſſert. in Val. Max. l. 1. c. 1. p. 33, 34. edit. Noriberg. 1663.

lowed *Pericles* in that Expedition, got so much (Q) Money, that they built the Temple of *Venus*, surnamed of the Reeds, or of the Marshes in *Samos*. Which was a Reflection upon that General, as if he had not well observed Military Discipline.

PERIERS (*Bonaventure des*) born at *Bar* upon the River *Aube* in *Burgundy*, was *Valet de Chambre* to *Margaret de Valois*, Queen of *Navarre*, and Sister of *Francis* I. γ. He Published a Volume of *French* Poetry, which was Printed after his Death ε at *Lyons*, by *John de Tournes*, in the Year 1544, in 8; and the Translation § of *Terence's Andria*, and several other Stories in Prose, (A) intitled *New Recreations* ‡. I never saw his *Cymbalum mundi*: it is (B) said to be a most impious Book. He came to an unhappy End, for ⅓ *he killed himself with a Sword, which he thrust into*

γ *La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franc.* p. 56.

ε *Du Verdier Vau Privas, Biblioth. Franc.* p. 131.

§ *In French Verse.*

‡ *La Croix du Maine ibid.*

⅓ *Id. ib.* p. 57.

(Q) *The Whores ...... got so much Money that they built.*] We find this Particularity in *Athenæus*. (a) 'Ἄλεξις δ' ὁ Σάμιος, says he, ἐν δευτέρῳ Ὥρων Σαμιακῶν τὴν ἐν Σάμῳ Ἀφροδίτην, ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐν Καλάμοις καλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐν Ἕλει, Ἀττικαὶ ἑταῖραι ἱδρύσαντο αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι Περικλεῖ, ὅτε ἐπολιόρκει τὴν Σάμον, ἱκανὰ ἐργασάμεναι ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας. *Alexis Samius libro secundo de Samiorum finibus, scribit, ædem Veneris in Samo, quam in arundinibus quidam vocant, alii in paludibus, meretrices Periclem secutas, cum obsideret Samum, ædificasse, ingenti quæstu prostitutæ formæ ditatas.* Let us wonder at the Blindness of the Minds of Men: here are some Conscientious Whores, who consecrate to Religion a considerable Part of the Money they have got by their infamous Debaucheries. They cannot be better compared than with those *Financiers*, who being grown Rich with the Blood and Sweat of the People, build a magnificent Chappel, and adorn the Great Altar of a Cathedral with their Offerings.

(a) *Athen.* l. 13. c. 4. p. 572.

Si (b) *l'on vient à chercher pour quel secret mystere*
Alidor à ses frais bâtit un monastere.
Alidor, dit un fourbe, il est de mes amis,
Je l'ai connu laquais, avant qu'il fût Commis:
C'est un homme d'honneur, de pieté profonde,
Et qui veut rendre à Dieu ce qu'il a pris au monde.

(b) *Boileau, Sat.* 9.

Some Heathens have been more discerning Men than the *Samians*. Do you think the Emperor *Alexander* would have permitted that the *Curtezans* of *Rome* should spend part of their Gain in the Building of a Temple? He would not so much as permit that the Tribute paid by Publick Whores and Pimps, should be brought into his Treasury; he ordered that it should serve for the repairing of the Amphitheatre, *&c.* (c) *Lenonum vectigal & meretricum, & exoletorum in sacrum ærarium inferri vetuit, sed sumptibus publicis ad instaurationem theatri, circi, amphitheatri & stadii deputavit.*

(c) *Lamprid. in Alexandro Severo* c. 24. p. m. 917, 918. *tom.* 1. *hist. August. scriptor.*

(A) *Several Stories in Prose, intitled* New Recreations.] *La Croix du Maine* (9) says, that *the two first Authors of that Work are* James Peletier *of* Mans, *a Physician and a Philosopher, and* Nicolas Denisot, *surnamed the Count de Alsinois. Stephen Pasquier* speaks otherwise of it in a Letter which he writ to *Tabourot Sieur des Accords*, the Author of a Book intitled *Les Bigarrures*. I find, says he (*d*), “ That “ in this Second Edition, you ascribe the Recrea- “ tions of *Bonavanture du Perier* to *James Pelletier*. “ Give me leave to tell you that I think yon are “ not well informed. I was one of *Pelletier*'s grea- “ test Friends, and he imparted his most secret “ Thoughts to me. I know what Books he told me “ he had made. He never mention'd this to me. “ He was a true Poet, and very Jealous of his “ Name, and I can assure you he would not have “ concealed it from me; the Book being so con- “ siderable by its Subject, that it does not deserve “ to be disowned by its Author, no more than the “ *Facetiæ* of *Poggius Florentinus*. *Du Perier* is the “ Author of them, and of another Book intitled “ *Cymbalum mundi*, which is a *Lucianism*, that “ deserves to be burnt, together with the Author, “ if he was alive. „ What is certain, is, That *Des Periers* is not the Author of all the Stories which are in his *New Recreations*. He cannot be the Author of that which is the first in the Edition mentioned by *Voetius*. 'Tis that of *Rouen* 1606, for *Raphael du Petit-Val*. 'Tis said in the first Story that this Book comes out very seasonably, to afford the Ladies some Diversion during the Civil Wars, which caused so many publick Evils. *Des Periers* could not say that, for he died a great while before the first Civil Wars of *France*. Let us see what that famous Divine thought of that Book. (e) *Eum* (librum) *carptim percurrens, offendi nihil aliud esse quam* colloquia prava; *hoc est, narrationes & dissertationes, meris morologiis, vanitatibus, obscœnitatibus, nominis divini abusibus refertas, quæ quidem nemini nisi Epicureis (quibus voluptas summum bonum) placere potest. Et tamen librum cum auctore in cœlum tollit, qui ipsius præfationem præfixit ...... suffecerit ex prima novella quæ instar præambuli est, annotasse, quod dicat se libellum illum opportunè tunc edere, ut in mediis bellis civilibus & publicis calamitatibus habeant unde se oblectent imprimis matronæ & virgines, quas ad lectionem nominatim scurrilium quæ ibi occurrunt, contentiose invitat. Summam autem & maximè convenientem huic vitæ nostræ doctrinam esse:* Bene vivere & lætari; *quod postea interpretatur:* ridere. *Des Periers* was not the only Author who published such Stories. The nine *Matinees* of the Lord *de Cholieres* are of the same stamp, *Merry and Recreative*, and very full of Obscenities. I think the first Edition is that of the Year 1585, *Paris*, for *John Richer* in 8. with the King's License.

(9) *Bibl. Franc.* p. 36. *See also* p. 193.

(*d*) *Pasquier Letters Book* 8. *tom.* 1. p. 493. *Par.* 1619. *in* 8.

(e) *Gisb. Voet. Disp. Theol. Vol.* 1. p. 200.

(B) *His* Cymbalum mundi: *it is said to be a most impious Book.*] He wrote it *first in Latin*, and then he translated it *into French under the Name of* Thomas du Clevier, *Printed at* Paris *in the Year* 1537. *La Croix du Maine* (*f*) who expresses himself thus, says that it is a *detestable Book, and full of Impieties*. We have already seen that *Stephen Pasquier* had the same Opinion of it. I have found a kind of Analysis of the *Cymbalum mundi* in the *French Bibliotheque* of *du Verdier Vauprivas*, and because most of my Readers cannot conveniently have recourse to that Bibliotheque, I thought they would be glad to find an Abstract of it here. (*g*) “ *Thomas du Clevier* “ translated out of *Latin* into *French*, a Treatise in- “ titled *Cymbalum mundi*, containing four Poetical “ Dialogues, very merry and pleasant, Printed at “ *Lyons* in 16. by *Benoit Bonnyn*, 1538. I have found “ nothing in that Book that deserves a greater “ Censure than *Ovid*'s Metamorphosis, the Dialogues “ of *Lucian*, and the Books of Wanton Subjects “ and Fabulous Fictions. In the first Dialogue the “ Author introduces *Mercury*, *Bryphanes* and *Curtalius*, who being in an Inn at *Athens*, at the Sign “ of the *White Coal*, whether *Mercury* happened to “ come, being descended from Heaven by *Jupiter*'s “ Order, who sent him to get a Book Bound, those “ two Rogues, whilst he went to divert himself, “ take this Book out of a Packet he had left upon “ the Table, steal it, and put another in the room “ of it, containing all the amorous Tricks and “ Follies of *Jupiter*, as when he turned himself “ into a Bull to ravish *Europa*; when he put on “ the Shape of a Swan to go to *Leda*; when he “ took the Form of *Amphytrion*, *&c.* In the Second “ Dialogue he brings in some Philosophers, look- “ ing for some pieces of the Philosophers Stone in “ the Sand of the Theatre; where, as they were “ formerly disputing about it, *Mercury* shewed it to “ them, and those Fools importuned him so much “ with their Intreaties, that knowing not to whom “ he should give it intire, he broke it to pieces, “ and then threw it into the Sand, bidding them “ look well for it, and that if they could find a “ little piece of it, they would do Wonders, trans- “ form Metals, break the Bars of Doors that are “ open, cure People that are not Sick, and obtain “ any thing from the Gods that was Lawful, and “ would necessarily happen, as Rain after fair Wea- “ ther, Flowers in the Spring, Dust and Heat in “ Summer, Cold and Dirt in Winter: whereby the “ Author laughs at the vain Labours of Alchymists. “ ...... (*a*) In the Third Dialogue he resumes “ the Discourse of the First Dialogue, about the “ Book stoln from the Author of all Thefts, inti- “ tled, *Quæ in hoc libro continentur: Chronica rerum* “ *memorabilium quas Jupiter gessit antequam esset ipse.* “ *Fatorum præscriptum: Sive, eorum quæ futura sunt,*

(*f*) *Bibliot. Franc.* p. 55, 57.

(*g*) *Du Verdier Vauprivas Biblioth. Franc.* p. 1177.

(*a*) *Id. ib.* p. 1178.

into his Belly, being grown Mad. Several Authors speak (C) of his Despair. Mr. Allard says, that the Name of our Bonaventure was Perier, and that he was born in the Ambrunois, and that he wrote an Apology in Verse for Marot absent against Sagon, in the Year 1580 †. It is certain that he made that Apology, but not in that Year: for he died before the Year 1544.

PEROT (*Nicolas*) in Latin *Perottus*, born at *Sassoferrato* in *Italy*, was one of the most Learned Men of the XV. Century. He was of a Family which had been (A) formerly Illustrious in his Country, but it fell into an obscure Condition, as it may be gathered from the ‡ small Estate he had, and from his first Profession,

† *Allard. Biblioth. of Dauphiné p. 172.*

‡ Huic quum deessent opes, corporis vires municipali frugalitate, atque duritia constitutæ, perpetuis lucubrationum vigiliis minime deterruerunt. Juvenis in ludo pueros honestos docuit, &c *Jovius elog. c. 18. p. m. 45.*

“ *certa dispositiones. Catalogus Heroum immortalium,* “ *qui cum Jove vitam vivere sunt sempiterni.* “ Wherein the Author ridicules first the Idolatrous “ Heathens, and their false God *Jupiter*, meaning “ that he never existed, or that if he did ever “ exist, he was a Man, and never did any wonder- “ ful Actions, and such as have been fabulously “ written of him. By the second Head of the Ti- “ tle of the Book, he laughs at Destiny, and fatal “ Necessity, and tacitly at Judicial Astrology. And “ by the third, he laughs at those who look upon “ themselves as Gods, by reason of their Grandure. “ Afterwards he brings in *Mercury* discoursing of “ the several Commissions which the Gods and God- “ desses have intrusted him with; and the same “ *Mercury*, by virtue of some Words which he “ mutters, makes a Horse called *Phlegon*, speak and “ reason with his Groom. In the fourth and last “ Dialogue, two Dogs .... discourse together of “ several pleasant things. „ It does not appear that *Du Verdier Vau-Privas* found any thing dangerous in that Book, but only the ridiculousness of the Pagan Religion, *&c.* Most other Readers are of opinion, that *Bonaventure des Periers* wrote against the true Religion, under pretence of ridiculing Paganism. It was the Opinion of Father *Mersenne*. That Man, says he, brings in the Fables of *Jupiter* and *Mercury*, &c. and designs by such means to ridicule the Catholick Faith, and reject the greatest Truths that we teach and believe concerning God. (b) *Per quas* (fabulas) *fidem Catholicam irridere, & ea quæ de Deo verissima esse dicimus & credimus, rejicere velle videtur.* He says that *Bonaventure des Periers* was only the Translator of the *Cymbalum mundi*, and that he was a most impious Knave, *impiissimum nebulonem*, and lookt upon as an Atheist by a great many People. *Voetius*, who had not seen that Book, does not say that the Author was an Atheist, nay he acquits him of Atheism, supposing the *Cymbalum mundi* to be only a Satyr against Purgatory, and many other Inventions of Christians. He adds, that a Man may insinuate Atheism, or Epicureism in a trifling and fabulous Book, and make use of that Artifice to come off, if he is prosecuted for it. He adds also, that in a Stage-Play intitled *Iphigenia*, one may laugh at *Hecate*, who had three several Shapes, and ridicule the Gods who will have Humane Victims, and run down the Priests who advise to offer such Sacrifices. A Man may design to ridicule the Trinity, and the Passion of the Son of God, and to open a Door to Deism and Socinianism; but he may also maintain, if there is any necessity for it, that they who understand it so, are Calumniators, and that he only designed to turn the Fables of Paganism into ridicule. I shall set down the Words of *Voetius*, they intimate that some such thing had happened upon the Stage of a Town in *Holland*. (c) *Quibus reponi potest: nihil vetare, quin Lucianum omnesque prophanos & impios poetas atque antiquos literiones imitando quis subdolè Atheismum, Epicureismum, Gentilismum hominum animis instillet; quamvis stylum ludicris ambiguitatibus, & jocis, item mimesibus, prosopopæis, &c. ita moderetur, ut si quis hæc ad examen revocet, colore aliquo eludere & elabi possit. Quomodo meminimus à Sceptico-Libertinis & Epicureis nebulonibus alicubi in Belgio omnem pietatem & fidem Christianam differiis quibusque apud homines traductam esse: exempli gratia, Tragœdia scribitur, & in theatro exhibetur tit.* Iphigenia: *in quâ Ethnica illa, de Hecate triformi, de diis sanguine humano, idque ex consilio sacerdotum, placandis perstringuntur. Si quis pius metuat* (*ut quidem autores illos novit*) *eos mysterium Trinitatis, & redemptionis nostræ per sanguinem Christi velle deridendum proponere & sic Epicureismo, Deismo, aut Turco-Socinismo viam munire: quomodo hæc evincet; cum promptum semper sit effugium; videri tantum fabulas Gentilium.*

(b) *Mersen. in Genesim p. 669. apud Voet. ub. sup. p. 199.*

(c) *Voet. ub. sup.*

The Reflections of that Professor of Divinity are very reasonable: There are two ways of ridiculing Superstition, the one very good, the other very bad. The Fathers of the Church, who have exposed the Ridiculousness of false Deities, are very much to be praised for it. They knew that by inspiring the Christians with Contempt and Aversion for Paganism, they strengthned their Faith, and gave them some Arms to resist Persecution. But *Lucian*, who did so much ridicule the false Gods of the Heathens, and made a most lively and agreeable Description of the Follies and Impostures of the Religion of the *Grecians*, deserves notwithstanding to be detested, since instead of doing it out of a good motive, he had no other design than to satisfie his Satyrical Humour, and was no less indifferent for Truth than for Lies. Those two Models, that of the Fathers of the Church, and that of *Lucian*, may serve to make one judge of several Satyrs, which have been made in these latter times, against Abuses in matters of Religion. *Rabelais* ought to be looked upon as a Copist of *Lucian*, and I think the same ought to be said of *Bonaventure des Periers*; for I find that the (d) Protestants are not less angry with the *Cymbalum mundi* than the Catholicks. Only we must observe that a great many Abuses have crept into Christianity, which are so like those of the Heathens, that one cannot write against the Pagans, without affording many devout Men a pretence to say, that the Christian Religion is run thro' the sides of the Pagan Religion. 'Tis the duty of those, who give occasion for such Reproaches, to examin seriously what was their Intention, and whether they did actually design, that their Descriptions of the Faults of the Heathens should be look'd upon as a Picture of Modern Abuses. Some Dissenting Protestants in *England*, are accused of having made a lively Description of the Corruption of the Ancient Clergy, only to draw a Picture which might cast an *Odium* upon the present State of the *Episcoparians*. We find in *Milton*'s Life (e), that his History of *England*, as far as *William the Conqueror*, was Printed in the Year 1670, but not such as he writ it; for several Passages were struck out, which contain'd a Description of the Superstition, Luxury and Craft of the Ecclesiasticks, who lived under the *Saxon* Kings. The Revisors of the Manuscript fancied, that it was a Reflection upon the Clergy under the Reign of *Charles* II. The Author of that Life adds (f), that Sir *Robert Howard* having heard, that he was accused of having whipt, in a certain Book, the Clergy of *England*, upon the Back-side of the Pagan and Popish Priests, answered maliciously and subtilly, *what have they to do there* (g)?

(C) *Several Authors speak of his Despair.*] I shall only set down the Words of *Henry Stephens*: (h) “ I will not forget *Bonaventure des Periers*, the “ Author of a detestable Book, intitled *Cymbalum* “ *mundi*, who, notwithstanding the Care that was “ taken to observe him, (because it was known “ that he designed to make away with himself) “ was found run through with his Sword, upon “ which he threw himself, having fastened the “ Pommel against the Ground, so that the Point “ run through his Stomach to his Back. „ See also *John Chassanion*, Chap. 24, (i) of the 1st Book of the Memorable Histories of the great and wonderful Judgments and Punishments of God.

(A) *Of a Family, which had been formerly Illustrious in that Country.*] The Inscription of a Monument set up for him in the Year 1624, says, that the Town of *Sassoferrato* was delivered from Tyranny by his Ancestors, and was beholden to them for its Liberty and Happiness (a). *James Philip Tomasini* explains that Fact. He says (b), that whilst *Innocent* VI. kept his See at *Avignon*, the Towns of *Italy*, which did belong to *St. Peter*'s Patrimony, were exposed to a thousand Miseries. Seditions were frequent there, every place had its Tyrant. *Innocent* VI. to remedy those Disorders, gave the Government of that Province to Cardinal

Giles

(d) La Croix du Maine *whom I have already quoted, and* Henry Stephens. *See his Words in the next Remark.*

(e) *Toland, the Life of* Milton, *p.* 138.

(f) *Id. ib.*

(g) *The Reader will perhaps remember the Comedy intitled,* The Pedant exposed, *where, when he is told of his Son's Ransom, he asks so often,* what the Devil had he to do in that Galley?

(h) *Henry Stephens Apology for Herodotus, c. 18. sub fin. p. m. 231. See also c. 26. p. 309.*

(i) *Page 170. Genev. 1586. in 8.*

(a) *See Ughelli Ital. Sacr. tom. 7. p. 1159.*

(b) *Jac. Phil. Tomasinus in Petrarchâ redivivo p. 111.*

feſſion, which was to teach the Latin Tongue. He acquitted himſelf very well in it, and got abundance of Scholars. He put the Rudiments of the Latin Tongue into a better Order, and a ſhorter Method, and publiſhed them to the great advantage of his Scholars. Afterwards he went to *Rome*, where he ſtudied the *Greek* Tongue with great application. To let the Publick know what Progreſs he had made in it, he undertook to Tranſlate *Polybius* into Latin. That Tranſlation (*B*) was very much eſteemed. He undertook another Work, which contained all the Harveſt of his Reading. It was a Commentary (*C*) upon *Martial*; but finding himſelf inveſted with a noble Employment, and a very eminent Eccleſiaſtical Dignity, he did

Giles Albornati, a Man well skilled in Military Affairs, and very well qualified for ſuch an Employment. He made War againſt all thoſe Petty Tyrants, who oppreſt the Country, and was very well ſerved therein by *Andrew* ***PEROT***, and amongſt other things in the Conſtruction of the Fortreſſes, which are to be ſeen ſtill at *Saſſoferrato*, whereby that Place was ſo well ſecured, that they who had Tyrannized it for a long time, loſt the hopes of getting it again. That *Perot* was the Father of *Juſtina* ***PEROT***, an illuſtrious Maid for her Wit, and application to Learning. *Petrarch* had a great eſteem for her, and anſwered a Sonnet which ſhe addreſt to him: it is to be found in (*c*) the *Petrarcha redivivus* of *Tomaſini*. See alſo the (*d*) *Meſcolanze* of *Menagius*. Note, that *Tomaſini* calls that Lady ***JUSTINA DE LEVIS PEROTTA***, and ſays, (*e*) that *Andrew de Levis Perot* her Father was of the Houſe of *Levis*, one of the moſt noble and illuſtrious Houſes of *France*, and that this Extraction is proved not only by old Deeds, but alſo by ſome Letters, which the Lords of that Houſe wrote from *France* to *Rome*, to *Torquato Perot* Chamberlain to Pope *Urban* VIII. They acknowledged in thoſe Letters, that he was iſſued from the ſame Stock with them: (*f*) *quibus* (literis) *illum unum ſecum ejuſdemque radicis & familiæ ingenuè agnoſcunt.* If this be true, it muſt be confeſt that our Arch-Biſhop of *Siponto* was of a good Extraction, for the Houſe of *Levi* is one of the nobleſt in *France*. I have read in a Book (*g*) Printed at *Paris* in 1557, that it *comes from Levi*, one *of the twelve Tribes of Iſrael, out of which the Virgin* Mary *iſſued, whom Meſſieurs* (*h*) *de Ventadour call their Couſin.*

(c) *Pag.* 111, 112.

(d) *Pag.* 279 *of* *Tom.* *of the Rotterdam Edit.* 1692.

(e) *Tomaſin. ib. p.* 110.

(f) *Id. ib.*

(g) *Intituled* the preſent State of France. *See the p.* 439. *of that Book.*

(h) *'Tis a Branch of the Houſe of* Levi.

(*B*) *That Tranſlation of* Polybius *was very much eſteemed.*] He made it by Order of Pope *Nicolas* V. It was looked upon as a better Tranſlation than thoſe of *Thucydides*, *Diodorus Siculus*, *Plutarch* and *Appian*, and ſome envious People fancied it was the Work of an Ancient Author, and that *Perot* ſtole it. (*i*) *Non defuère tamen ex æmulis, qui ejus auctoris traductionem antiquiſſimam fuiſſe, furtoque ſurreptam exiſtimarint, quod Thucydidem, Diodorum, Plutarchum, & Appianum, clariſſimo ingeniorum certamine converſos unus Polybius egregia fide Latinus, æquabili, & prædulci Romani ſermonis puritate prorſus antecedat.* It may be, that our *Perot* exceeded the Tranſlators who appeared ſome time before, and that he made a Maſter-piece, conſidering that he lived when the Study of Learning was but lately revived; but abſolutely ſpeaking, and even if he be compared with the Tranſlators of the XVI. Century, his Tranſlation cannot be accounted a tollerable one, and conſequently Mr. *Varillas* could not give a better proof of his Ignorance of the *Belles Lettres*, than by Paraphraſing, as he has done, the above-mention'd Words of *Paulus Jovius*. (*k*) "His firſt Eſſay was "the Tranſlation of *Polybius*, wherein he did ſo "admirably ſucceed, that it was queſtioned whe"ther he had made it, and whether he had not "found an ancient Tranſlation of *Polybius*, which "he Printed under his Name..... (*l*) He that "made his Epitaph, was in the right to uſe no o"ther Words but this, *Here lies the Tranſlator of* "*Polybius*; for if *Perot* be the Author of it, "none of thoſe who have Tranſlated *Greek* Writers "into *Latin*, can be compared with, or ſo much "as come near him.„ What a ſhame had it been for *Varillas*, if any Body had ſhewed him what *Caſaubon* ſays of *Perot*'s Tranſlation? He does not deny, but he was learned in *Latin* and *Greek* (*m*) according to the time wherein he lived, and that he may be looked upon as a Man that has but one Eye, in the Kingdom of Blind-Men; but he accuſes him of having very ill performed the Commiſſion of *Nicolas* V. *Jam ille eruditus Italus, quo ipſe* (Nicolaus Quintus) *uſus eſt interprete, partim ſæculi vitio, partim propria culpa, provinciam ſibi demandatam, ita geſſit male; facile ut appareat, non ob ſingularem aliquam eruditionem, in Græcis præſertim literis, Polybium interpretari fuiſſe juſſum; ſed quia nemo erat qui amplius ſciret, velut coelitem inter cæcos captum, qui in vacuam ſtationem pro tempore ſubſtitueretur* (*n*). It would be an abſurd thing to ſuſpect that *Caſaubon* ſaid ſo out of Envy; for what Advantage could it be to him to leſſen the Glory of a Man, who had been dead above a Hundred Years? Beſides, he owns that ſuch Places of *Polybius* as *Perot* had well underſtood, were ſo well Tranſlated, that they looked like an Original. *Nicolaus Perottus*, ſays he (*o*), *Literarum Latinarum, quas perdiu docuit, exquiſitè, ut illa erant tempora, fuit peritus, & cumprimis curioſus. ...... Erat præterea in hoc viro non vulgaris induſtria in Græcis ita vertendis* (*quæ quidem intelligeret*) *ut nullum perſæpè* Græci Idiomatis *in Latinâ ejus Verſione veſtigium appareret: quam interdum eſſe opus nativum quis dicas, non alieni* Interpretationem. *Quod ſi par fides reſponderet, inter excellentiſſimos* Interpretes *poterat ſine dubio* Perottus *recenſeri. Nemo enim illis temporibus* Italorum *erat, qui amplius* Græcè *ſciret, quàm hic* Interpres: *pauci qui tantum, quantum ille.* One may therefore believe him as to what he cenſures in the Work of that Tranſlator. He pretends that it is a Copy ſo unlike the Original, that *Polybius* is altogether diſfigured. (*p*) Nos *vero affirmamus*, Perottum *à fidelis* Interpretis *laude tantum abeſſe, quantum qui longiſſimè. Nullo enim pacto ferendus aut excuſandus eſt hic* Interpres, *homo* Bellicarum rerum *&* totius Tacticæ *adeo rudis & imperitus, ut qui in cæteris partibus* Hiſtoriæ Polybianæ *multa neſciret, in deſcriptionibus* Præliorum *omnia ignoraret, omnia peccaret; atque eâdem operâ tanto* Scriptori, *quod erat ferè præcipuum ejus decus, adimeret. Omnino prælium nullum, facinus militare nullum, à* Polybio *fuerat paulo diligentiùs narratum, in quo graviſſima & momenti maximi peccata ab hoc* Interprete *non ſint admiſſa.* He blames him in another place, for having inſerted in his Tranſlation, many Words of *Livy* in the room of *Polybius*'s Thoughts, and for having ſcarce Tranſlated any one Period (*q*) without committing ſome Faults. (*r*) *Non neſcimus fuiſſe olim, & nunc quoque eſſe quibus Perotti verſio, propter aliquam Latinitatis ſpeciem, mire arrideat. Sed quo iſta Latinitas ſi deeſt fides, abeſt veritas? Nihil dicam de locis infinitis quos propterea aut tranſiit, aut malè interpretatus eſt Perottus, quia vel codices erant corrupti, vel occurrebat dictio aut phraſis aliqua minus vulgaris: cujuſmodi multas ſanè habet Polybius. Verum ubi nihil erat ejuſmodi, quis ferat longè adeo ab auctoris ſui verbis diſcedentem? aut quis neget flagitium eſſe inſigne, tot locis verba, periodos, atque adeo pericopas integras è Livio deſumpſiſſe, & lectoribus Græcæ linguæ imperitis obtruſiſſe pro Polybianis? ubi fides? ubi pudor? in tanta igitur errorum omnis generis copia, ſingula velle perſequi, quod petiverunt à nobis nonnulli, ejus ſit hominis, qui vetus dictum velit tollere in lente unguentum.* What would *Varillas* have ſaid, if his Friends had ſhew'd him how contrary his Opinion was to that of ſo good a Judge, and ſo excellent a Critick? If the very firſt time he made bold to make ſuch raſh Judgments, he had been corrected by ſuch means, it had been a good ſervice done him. Note, That *Perot* did not Tranſlate all that we have of *Polybius*. The firſt Five Books of his Hiſtory were only found out at that Time, which *Perot* Tranſlated. The Abridgment of the Twelve following Books, and the *Excerpta Legationum* were found out ſince. *Perot* has alſo publiſhed a Tranſlation of *Hippocrates*'s Oath.

(*C*) *A Commentary upon* (*s*) *Martial.*] He intitled it *Cornucopia*. I have already ſaid (*t*) why he did not publiſh it. His Nephew *Pyrrhus* ***PEROT*** gave it to the Publick after the Death of the Author. He ſaid in his Preface, that he had added very few things to it, except that he had explained more at large ſome Obſcene Places which his Uncle had but ſlightly touched upon. (*u*) *Nihil fere de meo addidi, præterquam quod loca quædam, quæ ille,*

(i) *Jovius Elog. cap.* 18. *p. m.* 45, 46.

(k) *Varil. the Secret Hiſt. of* Florence, *p.* 170.

(l) *Ibid. p.* 171.

(m) Partem illius (*Polybii*) librorum aliquam nactus (*Nicolaus Quintus*) ejus in Latinum ſermonem transferendæ, viro Græcæ & Romanæ linguæ ut erat captus ejus ætatis non ignaro, munus delegavit. *Caſaub. epiſt. dedicat. Polybii.*

(n) *Caſaub. ib.*

(o) *Id. in præfat. ad lectorem.*

(p) *Id. ib.*

(q) Multa quidem in ſingulis fere periodis Perottus perperam interpretatur. *Id. in comment. ad Polyb. p.* 112.

(r) *Id. ib. p.* 60.

(s) *'Tis only a commentary upon* Martial's *Spectacula and the* 1. *Book of his Epigrams.*

(t) *In the Text.*

(u) *Pyrrhus Perottus in præfat. Cornucop. apud Geſnerum Bibl. fol.* 523.

did not think fit to publiſh that Commentary. He thought it was beneath him and not ſuitable to the Decorum of an Arch-Biſhop's Dignity, by reaſon of the Obſcenities which were in Martial *. That Commentary was Publiſhed after his Death. The Author had a great ſhare in the Benefits and Eſteem of Cardinal *Beſſarion*; but 'tis ſaid, that he hindred (*D*) him from being made a Pope out of a great Imprudence. The Emperor *Frederick* III. gave him the † Poetical Crown in the City of *Bologna*, and honoured him with the Title of his Counſellor. That Dignity was leſs real than the Government of *Perugia* and *Umbria* §, which was given to *Perot*, and the Arch-Biſhoprick of ‡ *Siponto*, to which he was promoted ∥ the 17th of *October* 1458. He built a Houſe of Pleaſure near *Saſſoferrato*, and called it (*E*) *Fugicura*, meaning that it was a Retiring Place, where he Recreated himſelf

* *Taken out of Paulus Jovius.*
† *Ughelli Ital. ſacr. tom. 7. p. 1158.*
§ *Jovius ibid.*
‡ *The modern name of that Arch-Biſhoprick is* Mantredonia, *but they ſay always in Latin* Archiepiſcopus Sipontinus.
∥ *Id. ib.*

ille, quoniam impuritate quadam atque obſcœnitate verborum caſtis ac pudicis auribus execrabilia viderentur, curſim breviterque tetigerit, ipſe latius expoſuit. From whence it appears that Mr. *du Cange* was miſtaken, when he ſaid, (*b*) that *Nicolas Perot*, Biſhop of *Siponto*, publiſhed in the Year 1470, a great Volume of Commentaries upon the Latin Tongue, *cui Cornucopiæ nomen indidit cum duobus ſingularum dictionum indicibus, Græco altero, altero Latino, qui ipſi Dictionarii vicem præſtant.* We muſt remember that our *Perot* lived till the Year 1480. *Geſnerus* obſerves that the *Cornucopiæ* was Printed at *Venice* by *Aldus*, and at *Baſil* by *Curio* and *Valderus* more than once. He forgets the main thing, he does not ſet down the Year of the Firſt Edition. I cannot tell it neither, I can only ſay that the *Strasburg* Edition 1505, was better than the preceding or thoſe that went before; and that of *Venice* 1513, was more exact than that of *Strasburg* (*c*). *Geſnerus* adds, that it is a very Learned Work: (*d*) *Plena Philologiæ & eruditionis variæ, ex optimis quibuſque veterum denſiſſima teſtimonia citans, multiplici cum ad rerum, tum ad vocabulorum cognitionem uſu.* *Perot* is accuſed of having Tranſcribed what others had ſaid, without naming them. *Martinius* (*e*) upbraids him with it, having convicted him of having ſtollen a Paſſage of *Laurentius Valla*, and he makes this Obſervation in his Preface: *Ambroſius Calepinus.... judicio uſus barbara à Latinis ſegregavit, & authoritate veterum verba ſua firmavit: rectius, quàm Perottus qui ſuum copiæ cornu diligenter quidem, at latenter, contexuit, ut eorum nomina à quibus ſua ſumpſerat, ferè ſubticeret.* Several People will wonder to find in this Paſſage the ſincerity of *Calepinus* preferred to that of *Nicolas Perot*; for great Complaints have been made of *Calepinus*, as being an impudent Plagiary of *Nicholas Perot*. (*f*) “To ſay ſomething more particularly about the Conduct of *Calepinus*, I ſhall obſerve, that being not a Literate Man, he had no thoughts of ſetting up for an Author, till he ſaw the *Cornucopia* of *Nicolas Perot*; and having heard that *Perot* ſeem'd to be reſolved to diſown and give over that Fruit of his Secular and Prophane Studies, and to renounce the Quality of Father, as if that of Arch Biſhop would be diſhonoured by it, he thought he could take advantage of his Diſlike, and reſolved to inſert that Work in his Dictionary, as if he had been the Author of it. *Floridus Sabinus* (1) ſays that he did it moſt wretchedly, becauſe he diſſolved the *Cornucopia* with a world of filthy Stuff, which he gathered together out of the worſt Authors of the barbarous and ignorant Ages. He adds, that it contributed on the one ſide to celebrate the Merit of *Perot*, and to make People look for his Original Book, and on the other ſide, to ſhew the Impertinence of *Calepinus*, and the Impurity of his Dictionary. This is the Opinion of the Anonymous Author of the Apology for the Latin Poets (2), of the *German* Author of the *Bibliographia curioſa* (3), and of *Leonardo Nicodemo* in his Additions to *Toppi* (4).„

(*D*) *He hindred* Cardinal Beſſarion *from being made a Pope out of a great Imprudence.*] *Varillas* relates that Adventure thus: “That Cardinal, *ſays he* (*g*), would have been made a Pope, after the Death of *Paul* II. had it not been for the Imprudence of *Nicolas Perrot* ..... who ſerved him as a ConcLaviſt. One Evening, as *Beſſarion* was at his Study according to his Cuſtom, without much caring for the Intrigues of his Collegues; three Cardinals, Heads of ſo many Factions in the Conclave, who agreed at laſt upon his Election, went to his Cell, and aſk'd for him. *Perrot* fancied, that they came only to beg his Patron's Vote, and becauſe he knew him well enough, to be perſuaded that the Sollicitations of thoſe *Cardinals* would be to no purpoſe, he thought there was no need of interrupting *Beſſarion's* Studies. He therefore obſtinately refuſed to introduce them, and to acquaint his Patron that they would ſpeak with him, and what is moſt ſtrange is, that the more he was careſs'd, intreated and threatened, the more he reſolved to keep the Door ſhut, becauſe he confirmed himſelf ſo much the more in his Chimerical Suppoſition, that they were ſo earneſt to come in, only to beg the only Vote they wanted for the Cardinal upon whom they were agreed. The Conteſt laſted ſo long, that the three Cardinals being weary of it, ſaid amongſt themſelves, that it was not proper to raiſe to the Holy See a Man, who not only would not be beholden to them for his Election, but alſo would make 'em depend upon the Caprice of his Domeſticks, whenever they would ſpeak with him. Then they took ſome other Meaſures out of Spite and Indignation: and becauſe Cardinal *Riaire* flattered their Fancy moſt in that inſtant, they made him a Pope, tho' they had agreed before not to give their Votes to any Monk, and tho' *Riaire* had been a *Cordelier*. They thought that the Trouble Cardinal *Beſſarion* would be in, for having loſt the Papacy by the fault of his ConcLaviſt, would afford 'em ſome Pleaſure, and therefore they acquainted him with what had paſt. But *Beſſarion* changed neither his Countenance nor behaviour towards them, and was contented to tell *Perrot*, that he had hindred him from making him a Cardinal.„ There are few Paſſages in *Varillas*, whereby we may better know the liberty he took to joyn his Fancies and Conjectures to the Hiſtories he found in other Authors. All that long Narrative is only a Paraphraſe of theſe Latin Words of **Paulus Jovius**. (*h*) *Paulo morte ſublato, in comitiis fatalis caſus tantæ ſpei Fortunam avertit. Fecerunt enim tres ſummæ authoritatis Cardinales, quum ex decreto, ut Pontificem ſalutarent, abditum in cella conclavis adiiſſent, nec admitterentur à Nicolao Perotto janitore, quod tum vir ineptus lucubranti parcendum diceret, uſque adeò ſtomachatos, ut ſeſe indignanter aversantes reſponderent, Ergo nec prenſanti, nec roganti quidem, ſumma dignitas erit inculcanda: ut quum è cælo ſuffragia expectet, ſuperbis demum ac ſtolidis janitoribus pareamus? ſtatimque ſuffragia Xysto detuliſſe, quo repentè renunciato, adoratoque Beſſarion dixiſſe fertur: Hæc tua, Nicolae, intempeſtiva ſedulitas, & tiaram mihi, & tibi galerum eripuit.* I have ſet down that *Latin* Narration, that by comparing it with that of the *French* Author, one may ſee the Circumſtances he has added to the Text, which was his Original. He has forged them, as he thought fit; which is an intolerable thing. The Latter Hiſtorians ought not to adorn a Fact; they muſt publiſh it ſuch as they find it. Note by the bye, that if that *French* Writer had read all the Manuſcripts he quotes, which is very much doubted of, yet one might very well believe that he ſays a thouſand things of his own Invention; for ſince he was ſo bold as to flouriſh *Paulus Jovius*, who is a Printed Author, much more did he think he might be allowed to alter the Manuſcript Relations which he has only quoted in a very general way. *Gyraldus* (*i*) aſcribes *Beſſarion*'s ill luck to another Cauſe; but he does alſo mention what is ſaid of *Perot* the ConcLaviſt, and he is much ſhorter than *Paulus Jovius* about that Incident. *Menagius* (*k*) ſuppoſes that *Perot* committed that fault in the Conclave wherein *Paul* II. was elected. I think he is leſs to be credited than the (*l*) two *Italian* Authors whom I have alledged.

(*E*) *And called it* Fugicura.] *Moreri* did not at all underſtand this, and has ſo much falſified it, that there

(*b*) *Du Cange, præf. Gloſſarii Latin. p. 41.*

(*c*) *See Borrichius in Analectis ad cogitata de lingua Latina in appendice p. 42.*

(*d*) *Geſner. ub. ſup.*

(*e*) *Matthias Martinius in lexico philolog. voce* ſarcina.

(*f*) *Baillet, the Judgment of learned Men, tom. 4. p. 47, 48. See alſo tom. 3. p. 64. & Borrichius ub ſup.*

(1) *Franc. Florid. Sab. Apolog. l. 1. p. 111.*

(2) *Ap. Obert. Giffan. p. 505 item ap. G. M. Konig. Biblioth. V. & N. p. 153.*

(3) *Bibliogr. cur. Philologic. hiſt. p. 28.*

(4) *In additionib. ad Biblioth. Neapolit. Nic. Topp. p. 184.*

(*g*) *Varill. The Secret Hiſtory of* Florence, *p. 174, 175.*

(*h*) *Jov. in elog. cap. 24. p. 57, 58.*

(*i*) *Gyrald. de Poët. ſuor. tempor. dialog. 1. p. m. 551.*

(*k*) *Menag. Meſcolanze p. 280.*

(*l*) *Paul Jovius, & Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus.*

ſelf after the Fatigue of Affairs, and where he lived without any Cares. He died in that place † in the Year 1480. He fell out with (F) *Domitius Calderinus.* Nature gave him a Quality that goes a great way; for, when he heard of any thing that was unknown to him, * he applied himſelf altogether to it, and laid aſide any other Buſineſs, and left off Sleeping, the better to mind it. *Torquato* PEROT who was of the ſame Family, and Chamberlain to Pope *Urban* VIII, and Biſhop of *Ameria*, cauſed a β Monument to be erected for him in the Great Church of *Saſſoferrato*, in the Year 1624, with a fine Inſcription γ, whereby it appears amongſt other things, that the Popes *Eugenius* IV. *Nicolas* V. *Calixtus* III. and *Pius* II. had a great Kindneſs for him, eſpecially becauſe he applied himſelf very much to reunite the *Greek* Church during the Council of *Ferrara*. The ſame *Torquato* deſign'd δ to put out a New Edition of *Nicolas Perot's* Works, which conſiſts of Tranſlations, Letters, Harangues, Commentaries upon *Statius*, *Martial*, &c. He deſign'd alſo to publiſh the Elogies of the Illuſtrious Men of *Saſſoferrato*, which he had compoſed. He is the Author of ſome *Italian* Works, Printed with thoſe of *Antony Brunus* ζ.

PERROT (*Francis*) Author of an *Italian* Book, which *Bellarmin* refuted. See the Remark *A* of the next Article, towards the End.

PERROT (*Nicolas*) *Sieur d'Ablancourt*, one of the Great Wits of his Age, was born η at *Chalons* upon *Marne*, the 5th of *April*, 1606 θ. He was of a Family very much diſtinguiſhed (*A*) among thoſe of the Long Robe, and he was Educated with a particular Care. ‡ He *was ſent to the College of* Sedan *to ſtudy there*, and he

† *Jovius ub. ſup.*

* *Volaterr. l. 21. p. m. 776.*

β *Jov. ib.*

γ *It is to be found intire in* Ughelli.

δ *Allatius in apibus urbanis.*

ζ *Id. ib.*

η *And not at* Vitry le François, *as 'tis ſaid in the* Menagiana *p. 331. of the firſt Dutch Edit.*

θ *The Life of Mr. d'A*blancourt *in the 2. tom. of Mr.* Patru's *Works, p. 334. of the* Dutch *edit.* 1692.

‡ *Ib. p. 335.*

there is neither Rime nor Reaſon in it. Yet nothing can be clearer than theſe Words of *Paulus Jovius:* (a) *Exceſſit è vita ſenex apud Sentinum in villa viridariis & fontibus peramæna, quam à pingui ocio Fugicuram appellavit.* *Moreri* has *Figurica* inſtead of *Fugicura*, in the very Verſes of *Myrteus*, which he alledges, and which run upon the Alluſion to the avoiding of Cares.

(*F*) *He fell out with* Domitius Calderinus.] I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage of *Alexander ab Alexandro*, which contains a thing which *Paulus Jovius* has not mentioned, and which he ſhould have mentioned, *viz.* that *Nicolas Perrot* read Publick Lectures to the Youth of *Rome*. He and *Calderinus* explained ſome Paſſages of *Martial* at the ſame time; and were more earneſt in contradicting one another, than in explaining that Poet; which occaſioned a world of injurious and empty Words, and after all, the Senſe of *Martial* was leſs underſtood than if they had been ſilent. (*b*) *Nicolaus Perottus Sipontinus præſul, homo fuit accurato ingenio, & lectione multa exercitus: eum Domitius Calderinus, vir, ut in ea tempeſtate, doctus, & æmulatione doctrinæ, & morum diſſimilitudine oſum habebat, jurgiiſque & conviciis apud ſuos ſectatores plerunque inceſſebat, ſæpiuſque apud ſtudioſos in invidiam illum crimenque vocabat: & ut ſunt fere ingenia, in explicandis auctoribus ſi quid in controverſiam veniret, uterque potius, quo pacto diverſus ab altero diſſentiret, quam quid veræ lectionis eſſet, rimabatur. Cum autem in ſcholis Romæ eodem tempore Martialis apophoreta publice lectitarent, cujus hoc diſtichon fuit:*

In precio ſcopas teſtatur palma fuiſſe,
Ocia ſed ſcopis nunc analecta dabunt.

Ita iſtos verſus uterque interpretatus eſt, (†) *ut poſt multa deblatterata verba, vix aliquem ſenſum illorum ex dictis elicere queas, cum modo mendum in verſu poſtremo fuiſſe alter aſſeveret, & pro ocia, precium poni oportere, modo aſarota, non ab à privativa, ſed intenſiva dicta eſſe affirmet: alter ita pleraque nugalia jurgiis & maledictis plena effundat, ut equidem ſingula enarrare & referre pigeat.* Here is another Paſſage whereby it appears, that *Perot* examin'd and criticiz'd in his Letters, the Notes of *Calderinus* upon *Martial*'s Epigrams, and that *Calderinus* was accuſed of being *Perot*'s Plagiary. (*c*) *Domitii Calderini in Martialem commentarios notans, quamvis ſuppreſſo nomine, & furta ex ſcriptis patrui ſui, ſubdit: Recognoſci autem furta facillime poterant ex errorum multitudine, cujus commentarii ejus undique ſcatent, quorum bonam partem patruus meus duob. epiſtolarum, Romanarum ſcilicet ac Peruſinarum, præclaris voluminibus oſtendit.* *Angelus Sabinus* having a Quarrel with *Calderinus* about Learning, was aſſiſted by *Perot*. The latter had the Name of *Fidentinus* given him in the Writings of *Calderinus*, and the other that of *Brotheus*. See *Gyraldus* in the firſt Dialogue (*d*) *de Poetis ſuorum temporum.*

(*A*) *He was of a Family very much diſtinguiſhed amongſt thoſe of the Long Robe.*] *Paul* PERROT *de la Salle* his Father, *famous for his Works* in Verſe and Proſe, and who *had a hand in the Compoſition of the Catholicon*, was Grandſon of *Æmilius* PERROT Councellor in the Parliament, and Son of *Nicolas* PERROT Councellor of the *Grand Chamber. He ſtudied at* Oxford, *where he embraced the Proteſtant Religion, and returning into* France, he retired to *Chaalons*, *where part of the Parliament of* Paris *was then:* Cyprian PERROT *his eldeſt Brother, was a Councellor in that Parliament.* He married at *Chaalons*, *Anne des Forges*, a noble Lady, by whom he had our *Nicolas Perrot Sieur d'Ablancourt*, and two Daughters, one whereof was Mother of Mr. *Fremont d'Ablancourt* (*e*), of whom I ſhall ſpeak (*f*) in this Article. *Cyprian Perrot*, Uncle of him who is the Subject of this Article, was Father of *John Perrot*, Preſident of the *Inqueſts*, who left a Son *Cyprian* PERROT, who was Maſter of the *Requeſts*. The *Perrots* of *Geneva*, the Good *Perrotto* of *Fra Poalo*, my Lord *Perrot*, who was for ſome time in Queen *Elizabeth*'s favour, *the* Perrots *of the* Malmaiſon, *one whereof was Provoſt of the Merchants, and the Beautiful* Perrot *of the Princeſs of* Conti, *are all iſſued from the ſame Stock. Chriſtopher de Thou* firſt Preſident of the Parliament of *Paris* married one *Perrot*. Tne Chancellor *Boucherat* was Grand Son of another *Perrot*, not to mention many other Alliances in the Long Robe (*g*). This is what I have taken out of a Manuſcript Letter. The Life of Mr. *d'Ablancourt*, written by Mr. *Patru*, may ſerve as a Printed Proof. It begins thus: (*h*) “The Family of the *Perrots* is Ancient in the Parliament, and related to the moſt Illuſtrious Perſons of the Long-Robe.”

Thuanus (*i*) reckons amongſt thoſe who were killed in the Maſſacre of *Paris*, *Denys* PERROT, moſt worthy Son of *Æmilius Perrot* Councellor in the Parliament of *Paris*, and as illuſtrious for his Probity as for his Learning. I have ſaid elſewhere, that I don't believe this *Æmilius Perrot* to be a different Perſon from him, who makes a very great figure in *Bunel*'s Letters.

The Good *Perrotto* of *Fra Paolo*, mention'd in the Manuſcript Letter, is without doubt the ſame *Francis* PERROT ſpoken of in the 82 Book (*l*) of *Thuanus*'s Hiſtory, as the Author of a Piece which contained a Refutation of Pope *Sixtus*'s Bull againſt the King of *Navarre*. That Piece was intitled *Aviſo piacevole dato alla bella Italia.* (*m*) “That Book (which was refuted by *Bellarmin*) is a Cenſure of the Court of *Rome*; the Style whereof is ſo fine, that the *Italians* themſelves admired it. The Author is a *French* Man, named *Perrot*, who, as *Thuanus* ſays in his Hiſtory upon the Year 1585, accompanied in his Youth *Gabriel Aramont*, Ambaſſador of his Majeſty to *Solyman*. Afterwards, being come into *Italy*, he got ſome conſiderable Acquaintances there. He knew amongſt other Great Men, Father *Paul*, a Divine of the Republick of *Venice*, to whom he vowed ſo great an Affection, that he continued it to him till he died. The *Italians* on their part had a particular Eſteem for him, ſtyling him commonly a true *Iſraelite*, by reaſon of his Candor and Meekneſs. We have

(*a*) *Jovius elog. cap. 18. p. 46.*

(*b*) *Alexander ab Alexandro genial. dier. l. 4. c. 21. p. 1157. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1673.*

(†) *Tiraquellus makes this Note upon it:* Perottus in Cornucopia ſecus interpretatur, quam hic accuſatur.

(*c*) *Geſner. ub. ſup.*

(*d*) *Pag. 332. oper. Gyraldi. Lugd. Bat. 1695.*

(*e*) *Taken from a Letter which Mr.* Fremont d'Ablancourt *wrote to me the* 14 *of* April 1693.

(*f*) *In the Rem.* D.

(*g*) *Taken from the ſame Letter.*

(*h*) *Patru's Works tom. 2. p. 334. of the Dutch edit.* 1692.

(*i*) *Thuan. l. 52. p. m.* 1077.

(*l*) *Pag. m. 33. ad* 1585.

(*m*) *Colomiès* Bibliotheque choiſie, *p. 20. & 21.*

he made such a progress in his Studies, ι that *being Thirteen Years of Age, he had gone thro' a Course* (B) *of Classick Learning. Then his Father sent for him home, and gave him a Learned Man, not only to run over all his Studies, but also to give him a Tincture of Philosophy. These Exercises lasted about three Years, and then he was carried to* Paris, *where he studied the Civil Law, a matter of five or six Months. Being Eighteen Years of Age, he was made an Advocate in the Parliament, and frequented the Bar.* He soon took a Disgust at it, and plainly shewed his Repugnancy for the Law. His Uncle *Cyprian Perrot,* † *Counsellor of the Great Chamber,* was displeased with it, but he eased his Grief by forsaking the Protestant Religion, in which he was born. He abjured it * being Twenty Years of Age; yet he would not follow the Intentions of his Uncle, who design'd *to make him a Churchman, hoping that he would prove a great Preacher in time. He spent five or six Years in such Diversions as are suitable to those of his Age* β, yet without neglecting *Learning altogether* γ. *It was then that he wrote the Preface to the Book intitled* L'honneste femme, *to please his Friend* Father du Bosc. That Preface, *one of the Master-pieces of our Tongue,* was scarce published, δ *but being about five or six and twenty Years* (C) *of Age, the fancy took him to return to the Religion he had left, the impressions whereof were never quite blotted out of his Mind.* " ζ To do nothing without Knowledge, he betook
" himself first to the Study of Philosophy, and then to the Study of Divinity, and
" took for his Master Mr. *Stuart*, a *Scotch* Man and a *Lutheran*, but a very Learned
" Man. He laboured with so much Eagerness and Ardour, that he spent twelve
" and fifteen Hours every Day in his Studies, without acquainting any Body with
" his Design, and he did so very near three Years...... He set out...... from
" *Paris* to go into *Champagne*, where he made his second Abjuration in the Temple
" of a Village called *Helme* near *Vitry*, and almost at the same time he went into
" *Holland*, to let the Rumour of his new Change drop. He was near a Year at
" *Leyden*, where he learned the *Hebrew* Tongue, and made himself acquainted with
" *Salmasius*. From *Holland* he went over into *England*. „ He returned to *Paris*, and after he had been five or six Weeks in Mr. *Patru*'s House, he *took* η *Lodgings near* Luxembourg, *and sent for* (D) *two of his Nephews to live with him.* " He lived χ a
" very pleasant Life, and though he spent most of his Leisure-Hours in Reading,
" yet he frequented the Ladies, and the most Eminent Men of *Paris* for Learning.
" He went almost every Day to Messieurs *Dupuy*, to that famous Place whither all
" Curious and Learned Men resorted...... In ‡ *September* 1637, he was admitted
" into the *French* Academy with a general Applause. He undertook almost at the
" same time the Translation of *Tacitus*...... But whilst he was about that laborious
" Translation, he was forced to leave *Paris*, and to go into his Province, to
" take care of his Estate, which was not considerable, and which the War lessen'd
" every Day. He therefore left off House-keeping, and retired with his Sister to
" his Country Seat called *Ablancourt*, where he lived till he died. When he first
" retired into the Country, he came pretty often to *Paris*, where he past all the
" Winter..... But at last he left *Paris* altogether, and never went thither but to
" get his Works Printed..... ↓ He had been troubled with the Gravel all his Lifetime
" : Nay, there was a time that he could neither Ride on Horseback, nor in a
" Coach, and wanted a Stick to walk. But he fell a digging his Garden to use
" some Exercise, whereby his pain was much abated, and he recovered his Strength
" in

ι *Ib.*
† *Ib. p.* 336.
* *Ib.*
β *Ib.*
γ *Ib. p.* 337.
δ *Ib.*
ζ *Ib. p.* 338.
η *Ib. p.* 339.
χ *Ib.*
‡ *Ib. p.* 340.
↓ *Ib. p.* 341.

" have also an *Italian* Translation by the same *Perrot*, " of the truth of the *Christian* Religion, written by " Mr. *du Plessis-Mornay*, and printed at *Saumur* in " the Year 1612. Amongst our *French* Authors, " *Lewis de Masures* in his *Latin* Poems, *Hubert* " *Languet* in his Letters to Sir *Philip Sidney*, and " Mr. *de Liques* in the Life of (n) Mr. *du Plessis*, " speak honourably of him.

(B) *Being thirteen Years of Age, he had gone thro' a Course of Classick Learning.*] I would make no Observation upon this, were it not that I must take notice of a fault very common among the makers of *Encomiums*. They love to exceed one another, and by such means they spoil the Truth. *Richelet* (o) not taking it to be so admirable a thing that *d'Ablancourt* should have made an end of his Classick Studies being but thirteen Years of Age, adds Philosophy to the Classick Studies. We may restifie that Mistake, seeing we have the Life of that Illustrious Man written by Mr. *Patru*: but if we had no other Author but *Richelet*, we should believe what he says, and mention it as a kind of Prodigy; for there were six Classes in the College of *Sedan*, the Promotions of the Scholars were made but once a Year, and the Course of Philosophy lasted two Years at least.

(C) *Being about five or six and twenty Years of Age, the fancy took him to return to the Religion he had left.*] The Continuator of *Moreri*, who took the Article of *d'Ablancourt* out of Mr. *Patru* stumbled in this Place. He did not perceive that Mr. *Patru* reckons three Years between the beginning of *d'Ablancourt*'s Design, and the execution thereof: He says that *d'Ablancourt* left the Catholick Church being 25 Years of Age, and went into *Holland*, and was near a Year at *Leyden*, and made himself acquainted with *Salmasius*. His first Mistake was the occasion of another; for he supposes that *d'Ablancourt* left *Leyden* before he was 26 Years old, that is, before the 5th of *April* 1632. But *Salmasius* was not then at *Leyden*, he came thither only (*) towards the end of the same Year. It is almost impossible to misplace a Fact, without committing some other Anachronisms one after another.

(D) *And he sent for two of his Nephews to live with him.*] They were his Eldest Sister's Sons, and their Name was *Fremont*. (a) " Never any Children had a better Education. The second is " dead; but Mr. *Fremont d'Ablancourt*, who was the " Eldest of the two, has shewed that a barren Soil " was not cultivated. He is the Author of the " Dialogue of the Letters of the Alphabet, and of " the Supplement to the true History, which are to " be found at the End of his Uncle's *Lucian*, and " were so well received by the Publick. One of " the Great Princes of *Europe* would have him to be " his Son's Governour; and the important Employments " which he has so well discharged, are sufficient " proofs of his Capacity and Parts. „ Mr. *Patru* might have added to it the Esteem which Mr. *de Turenne* had for Mr. *Fremont d'Ablancourt*. Mr. *de Turenne* procured him the Quality of Envoy of *France* to the Court of *Portugal*, in the (†) Year 1663, and that of Resident of *France* in the City of *Strasburg*, in the Year 1675. That Resident returned

(n) *Page* 13. *where he is qualified* Lord of Mezieres Parisian.

(o) *Richelet, the Lives of the French Authors p.* xxxiv. *of the Dutch edit.* 1699.

(*) *Antn. Clement. in vita Salmas. p.* xlii.

(a) *Patru's Works ub. sup. p.* 339.

(†) *See Mr. d'Ablancourt's Memoirs p.* 127, &c.

" in ſome meaſure. So that he could bear all Sorts of Carriages, and even lay " aſide his Stick, but he retook it ſoon after...... In the Year 1664, in the Be" ginning of *October*, he was ſo violently tormented with the Gravel, that it was " expected every Moment that he ſhould die of it. But at the End of three or " four Days his pain began to abate. „ It returned upon him ſoon after, † *and laſted till he died. He bore ſo* (E) *long and ſo violent a Pain with great Conſtancy. He was attended all the Time of his Sickneſs by the Miniſter of* Vitry, *and by Mr.* du Boſe, *a famous Miniſter of* Caen, *who was then confined at* Chalons. *At laſt he died in the Arms of his Siſter and his Nephew* d'Ablancourt, *the 17th of* November, *being eight and fifty Years,* * *eight Months and twelve Days old.* The Catalogue of his Works, moſt of them Tranſlations, may be ſeen in *Moreri.* The Reaſon, why he choſe rather to be a Tranſlator than an Author, deſerves to be (F) ſet down, as alſo the reaſon why he believed that Princes ſhould underſtand (G) *Latin.* He never was married; § *he was not of a very amorous Complexion, and had a blunt way with him which did not very well ſuit with Love.* " ‡ He uſed to Sleep, to Eat, and to Work indifferently at " any Hour of the Day or of the Night. But after he had been about two Hours " at Work, he refreſhed himſelf either by Walking, or by Reading a pleaſant " Book, and after half an Hour's Relaxation, he returned to his Work. He wrote " a very ill Hand, ſo that being in his declining Age, he could not very often " read it himſelf. He drank but little Wine at his uſual Meals, but he had a ſtrong " Head, and bore it well, ſo that he never drank too much. . . . . ‖ He was the " Son of a Man who made in his Life-time a hundred thouſand Verſes; yet he

" could

returned into *France* after the Death of his Father, and lived a quiet Life in it, reading good Books, and enjoying the Company of Ingenious Men, till the laſt Blow of the Perſecutors obliged him to look for Liberty of Conſcience in foreign Countries. He made ſome ſtay at *Groningen*, and then he came to the *Hague*, where he ſettled himſelf, and was extremely conſidered by the Prince and Princeſs of *Orange.* Beſides, he was gratified with a Penſion, together with the Title of Hiſtoriographer. He died at the *Hague*, about (b) ſix or ſeven Years ago. He was a Man of Merit, very zealous for the Proteſtant Religion, and who did not think it beneath him to write a *French* Catechiſm. He knew a World of thoſe things which are proper to be ſaid in Converſation, and told them with a good Grace. The Sweetneſs which appeared in his Manners, occaſioned the ſurprize of thoſe who read a little Book he publiſhed (c) againſt Mr. *Amelot de la Houſſaie*, in the Year 1686. He expreſt much more Anger and Paſſion than could be expected from a Man of his Gravity and Age, and who had left his Country for his Religion. Several People endeavoured to excuſe him, upon the account of the Tenderneſs he had ſtill for his dear Uncle Mr. *d'Ablancourt*; but becauſe the Queſtion was not whether his Uncle had been an honeſt Man, but only whether his Tranſlation of *Tacitus* deſerved to be blamed, inſtead of enjoying the great Reputation it was in, I think his Apology might have been made with a more ſedate Mind. He publiſhed ſome Dialogues in the Year 1684. They were mention'd in the *Nouvelles* (d) *de la Republique des Lettres.* His Memoirs, containing the Hiſtory of *Portugal* from the *Pyrenean* Treaty in 1659 to 1668. have been publiſhed within theſe few (e) Days. They are worth Reading.

(E) *He bore ſo long . . . . . a Pain with great Conſtancy.*] Mr. *Patru* does not mention what I am going to relate out of the *Menagiana.* (a) " Mr. " *d'Ablancourt* . . . . ſtudied in the Winter above an " Oven (b) at a Paſtry-Cook's. Being about (c) " threeſcore and three Years old, he was tormented with the Stone, and had a mind to go to *Paris* to be cut; but conſidering that being in *November*, he would be obliged to ſtay for the " Spring, and that he would be at great Charges; " he reſolved to abſtain from eating, to ſee an end " of his pain the ſooner, which he did. Notwith" ſtanding, being urged to eat ſomething, he was " perſuaded to it, but it was too late, and he died. „ 'Tis likely that Mr. *Patru* would have ſuppreſt that Circumſtance, even if he had known that it was true. There are ſome things, the Remembrance of which we rather chuſe entirely to ſuppreſs, than to ſhew the Falſity of them. We often believe, that 'tis more advantageous to the Memory of our Friends, that no Body ſhould know that they were Calumniated, than to diſcover the Falſity of thoſe Slanders. But there are ſome Occaſions in which we think ourſelves obliged to let the Publick know how cruelly Innocence has been abuſed. 'Tis what Mr. *le Gendre* did with reſpect to *d'Ablancourt.* " (†) God permitted that Mr. *du Boſe* ſhould attend " him at his Latter-end, to undeceive the World, as " to the falſe Reports that were ſpread abroad, as if " he had died in Deſpair. 'Twas a horrid Calum" ny, as Mr. *du Boſe* made it appear in his Letter to " Mr. *Conrart*, who was ſo much the more afflicted " at the Injury done to his Friend's Memory, be" cauſe it concerned all thoſe of the Reformed Re" ligion; for the King was further told, that it " was the Diſpoſition in which the *Huguenots* gene" rally died. „

(F) *The Reaſon, why he choſe rather to be a Tranſlator than an Author, deſerves to be ſet down.*] (d) " His Genius was much like that of *Montagne*; and " if he had been willing to work of himſelf, he " wanted nothing that was neceſſary for it. He " had a very copious Fancy, and his Mind was full " of good Learning. But when he was told of it, " he ſaid that he was neither a Preacher nor a " Lawyer, to make Pleas or Sermons; that the " World was full of Political Books; that all Mo" ral Diſcourſes were but Repetitions of *Plutarch* " and *Seneca*; and that to ſerve his Country, it " was better to tranſlate good Books, than to make " new ones, which moſt times contain nothing that " is new. „

(G) *Why he believed that Princes ſhould underſtand Latin.*] He ſaid, (e) that it was fit they ſhould learn that Tongue, *becauſe they might learn thereby ſeveral things of the Ancients, which they cannot be told of, and ſee the honeſt Men of Antiquity condemn Princes who are wanting to their Duty.* There is ſome Wit in that Thought, and I know not what that may dazzle and charm thoſe who do not examine things to the bottom. A Stroke of Cenſure that is well drawn, does very much ſet off a Moral Picture, eſpecially when Humane Grandeurs are the Object of that Cenſure. This is our Caſe. Mr. *d'Ablancourt*'s Thought impoſes upon us for that Reaſon, it takes its greateſt Beauty from thence, but it is only an outward Beauty. Examine what he ſays, ſound it well, and you will find it is like Gilt-Wood. 'Tis but an Appearance and a ſuperficial Ornament. All Learned Nations tell Princes of their Faults in their Mother-Tongue, and may inſtruct them in their Duties as well as Latin Books. How can the Books of Ancient *Rome* teach Modern Princes? It is not by telling them *You have committed an Unjuſtice, and a very great Fault in this or in that*: 'tis only by the Cenſure of the Unjuſtices and Faults committed in Ancient Times. But do we want Books written in Vulgar Tongues, that repreſent the Duties of Princes with great force, and defame the Memory of thoſe who have reigned ill, either lately in ſome other Countries, or formerly in the very Country where thoſe Books are written? To ſay nothing of Sermons or Political Writings, let us only inſiſt upon Hiſtorians, *Mezerai*, for inſtance, who lived in the time of *d'Ablancourt.* I confeſs he has not written the Hiſtory of his own Time, but he comes infinitely nearer it than *Livy*, or *Tacitus*, or any of the Ancient *Latin* Authors, and cenſures with great liberty and force, the ill Adminiſtration of the Kings

of

† *Ibid. p.* 343.

* *It ſhould be ſeven.*

§ *Ib. p.* 344.

‡ *Ib. p.* 344.

‖ *Ib.*

(b) *I write this in* January 1701.

(c) *See the News from the Repub. of Learning,* December 1686. *p.* 1460. *& ſeq.*

(d) March, *in the Catalogue of new Books, n.* iv. *p.* 50. *& ſeq.*

(e) *I write this in* January 1701.

(a) *Menagiana p.* 324, 325. *of the 1ſt Dutch edit.*

(b) *See the* Menagiana *p.* 397.

(c) *There is a miſtake here, for* d'Ablancourt *lived not full* 59 *Years.*

(†) *Le Gendre's Life of Mr.* du Boſe. *p.* 37.

(d) *Patru ub. ſup. p.* 345, 346.

(e) *Menagiana p* 389, 390.

" could never make two Verſes together. ,, His Converſation was (H) admirable. He made good uſe of the Advices of his Friends, (I) for the Correction of his Works; but he might have made a better uſe of them, had he not been ſo much in haſte to return into the Country when he was at *Paris* to get his Books printed. † *His Way of Tranſlating was not approv'd by every body, tho' it was admir'd by all the Illuſtrious Men of our Age. 'Tis true, that ſometimes he takes ſome Liberty.* He made an Apology for it in his *Prefaces*, * wherein he ſhewed, *That he propoſed to himſelf the true Notion of a good Tranſlator, who ought to render the Senſe of the Original, without taking any thing from its Force, or Beauty. This is ....* what he has *ſo happily performed; and his lively and bold Expreſſions are ſo far from any Servileneſs, that whoever reads his Tranſlations, would think he reads ſome Originals, and not ſome Tranſlations.* So ſays the Author of his Elogy; but every body does not agree, ‡ that he took no other Liberty but ſuch as he might take. He had a large Extent of Learning, (K) and apply'd himſelf more particularly to the Study of the Bible. We ſhall ſee what he (L) thought concerning the Immortality of the Soul. See his Elogy written by Mr. *Patru*, from which I have taken moſt of what has been ſaid: It contains many other things, which

of *France* that come into his hands. He laſhes them and their Miniſters as meer School-Boys, when Truth requires it. *Varillas* uſes the ſame Freedom, tho' he was ſo great a Flatterer of his Contemporaries; and the greateſt Flatterers of the preſent Times do commonly cenſure the Faults of paſt Times with the greateſt freedom. So that the Reaſon why Mr. *d'Ablancourt* pretends, that Princes ſhould underſtand *Latin*, is falſe. It is ſo much the worſe, becauſe he could not be ignorant that the Writings of ancient *Rome* have been tranſlating for above theſe hundred Years; and if he thought it ſo uſeful a thing for Princes to underſtand that Language, why did he afford them ſo fair a Pretence not to ſtudy it? They needed but ſay, that his Tranſlations diſpenſed them with it. He deſtroyed therefore his own *Theſis*.

(*H*) *His Converſation was admirable.*] " (*g*) He " was, in his Youth, as gay as any one can be; he " was full of Vivacity and Wit, which was attended " with a certain Turn, which none but the genteel " part of the World can give..... His gay Hu- " mour laſted till he died. The Suburbs of *St.* " *Germain* afforded him the Acquaintance of all " thoſe Lords who made up the Court of the " Prince, and went, at that time, by the Name of " (*h*) *Petits Maiſtres*. But Mr. *de Colligny* and Mr. " *de la Moussaye* were extremely fond of him. When " any of them went through *Vitry* or *Chalons*, or " through ſome other Place, not very diſtant from " his Houſe, they would have him; and a Meal had " not been good if Mr. *d'Ablancourt* had not been at " it. He had always ſomething to ſay at Table, and " in Converſation. He ſpoke a great deal, but he " was never tedious; what he ſaid was always new " and agreeable. One would have thought he had " ſtudied every thing he ſaid, ſo proper and perti- " nent were his Ralleries, which he uſed to defend " himſelf, but ſo as never to offend any body. ,, I ſhall confirm this by a Paſſage of the *Menagiana*. (*i*) *Mr. d'Ablancourt uſed to ſay ſo many good and agreeable things in Converſation, that Mr. Peliſſon ſaid, it were to be wiſh'd that he had had always a Regiſter by him, to write down every thing he ſaid.*

(*I*) *He made good uſe of the Advices of his Friends ..... but he might have made a better uſe of them.*] What I am going to ſay, is not only a conſiderable part of the Character and Hiſtory of the Studies of our *Perrot*; but alſo an Inſtruction which may ſerve ſome other Authors, if they avoid what is defective in this Example. (*a*) " At firſt he conſulted no " body but Mr. *Patru*. But ſince he became ac- " quainted with Mr. *Conrart* and Mr. *Chapelain*, he " took alſo their Advice, eſpecially Mr. *Conrart*'s, " with whom he reviſed all his Works, and ſo much " the more willingly, becauſe underſtanding neither " *Greek* nor *Latin* he gave him leſs trouble: For " when he came to *Paris* to Print his Works, he " was always in haſte to return into the Country; " and for that reaſon, when any thing was objected " to him, he anſwer'd it with great Heat, and, as it " were, in Anger; becauſe thoſe Difficulties put " him to Work, and conſequently retarded his Re- " turn. And that Humour did ſo far prevail upon " him, that towards the End of his Life, and in his " laſt Tranſlations, he conſulted, or at leaſt believed " no body: Which was neither out of Preſumption " or Vanity, but only out of Haſtineſs, and a preci- " pitate Deſire of laying down his Burden: For " when his Book was printed, he willingly receiv'd " all the Advices that were given him, and even " was preſſing upon his Friends to adviſe him about " it, that he might make uſe of their Remarks in " a Second Edition; and therefore it will not be im- " proper to mention a notable Particularity. He " had, till then, reviſed all his Works with Mr. *Pa-* " *tru*; but ever ſince his *Arrianus*, which they ex- " amined together, from the beginning to the end, " in eight or ten Afternoons, he printed all his " Books, for the firſt time, without acquainting " him with it in the leaſt, becauſe he vexed him " too much. He did the ſame as to his *Lucian*, but " when it was printed and publiſh'd, he deſir'd that " dear Friend to reviſe it. That dear Friend re- " viſ'd it, and ſent him his Remarks: he approv'd " moſt of 'em; and as for thoſe which he approv'd " not, he referr'd them to Mr. *Conrart* or Mr. *Chape-* " *lain*. Mr. *Patru* join'd with them, and they re- " ſolv'd thoſe Difficulties together: So that the Se- " cond Edition, which was made upon thoſe Obſer- " vations, is much more correct than the firſt. ,,

(*K*) *A large extent of Learning, and he applied himſelf ..... to the ſtudy of the Bible.*] " He had a " quick (*b*) and penetrating Wit: When he under- " took to examine any Difficulty, he preſently ſaw " into the very bottom of it; he underſtood Philo- " ſophy, Theology, Hiſtory, and all the *belles Lettres*. " He underſtood *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Latin*, *Italian*, and " *Spaniſh*; he was very well inſtructed in his Reli- " gion, and more than one would have deſir'd for " his Salvation. But ſo great a Variety of Know- " ledge, ſo deep a Learning, neither dulled his " Wit, nor confounded or impair'd his Judgment; " he clearly underſtood every thing, the ancient " Authors as well as the modern. In his declining " Age he ſcarce read any Books beſides the Holy " Scripture, and the Relations and Hiſtories of the " New World; but eſpecially the Holy Scripture, " which may be ſaid to have been his moſt tender " and laſt Love. He had all the good Commenta- " tors on the Bible, either general or particular " ones. There was not any one Difficulty in the " Bible, but what he was throughly acquainted " with. ,,

(*L*) *What he thought concerning the Immortality of the Soul.*] Having aſſerted in a Converſation, (*c*) *That Religion and not Reaſon teaches us the Immortality of the Soul*, he writ a (*d*) Diſcourſe, which he ſent to Mr. *Patru*, to juſtify his Opinion. He ſays in that Diſcourſe, (*e*) " That the perfect Knowledge " of our Souls is above the ordinary Strength of our " Minds, and that there are no Reaſons that can " prove their Immortality. ,, He alledges the chief of thoſe Reaſons, and adds, *That they are good indeed to confirm in that belief a Soul that is already enlighten'd with Grace, but that they are not ſufficient to ſatisfy a Man who has no other Light than that of Nature.* He ſpeaks (*f*) of the Blindneſs of Philoſophers, and of the Confuſion of *Ariſtotle*'s Doctrine concerning this Subject, and he pretends that we ſhould not wonder at it: (*g*) *The Light of the Goſpel had not yet enlighten'd the World; and that Truth being above Humane Reaſon, ſtood in need of a ſupernatural Help to be known..... You muſt confeſs*, ſays he (*h*) to Mr. *Patru* his Friend, *that we are made Chriſtians by Faith, and not by Natural Reaſon; and that I may be allowed to ſay, ſpeaking as a Philoſopher, that the Reſurrection is impoſſible, provided I believe that God by his infinite Power can do things that are impoſſible to Nature. So that I ſaid nothing but what I might ſay, when I ſaid, that* which will not prove unacceptable to thoſe who are pleaſed with a very particular Account of the Lives of Illuſtrious Men. *Note*, That Mr. *Patru* aſcribes to *Perrot* the moſt excellent Moral Qualities that can be wiſhed for.

---

† Ib. p. 345.

* Ib.

‡ See Baillet's *Jugement des Savans*, *Tom.* 4. *n.* 950. Menage *used to call d'*Ablancourt's *Tranſlation of Tacitus, a fair but an unfaithful one.* Menagiana *p.* 424. *of the 1ſt* Dutch *Edit.*

(*g*) *Patru ubi ſupra*, *p.* 349.

(*h*) Vigneul Marville *is therefore in the right, when he ſays in his Miſcellanies, p.* 284. *of the 1ſt Tome, that* the Prince of *Conde* had ſome of thoſe petits-Maitres. *What he ſays concerning the Origin and Character of thoſe Men is curious. To which you may add what the* Continuator of la Bruyere, *or the modern* Theophraſtus *ſays of 'em, p.* 422. *and ſeq. of his new Characters of Manners of the* Dutch *Edit. See alſo the* Diverſitez curieuſes *of Mr.* Bordellon, 10. *part. p.* 259. *of the* Dutch *Ed.*

(*i*) *Menagiana, pag.* 325. *of the* 1ſt Dutch *Edit.*

(*a*) *Patru*, *ubi ſupra*, *p.* 345, 347.

(*b*) *Id. ib. p.* 348, 349.

(*c*) *Patru ubi ſupra p.* 355.

(*d*) *It is to be found in the 2d Tom. of* Patru's *Works, p.* 354. *& ſeq.*

(*e*) *Ib. p.* 356.

(*f*) *Ibid. p.* 357.

(*g*) *Ibid. p.* 356.

(*h*) *Ibid.*

PER-

that humane Diſcourſes cannot make me comprehend, that our Souls are Immortal, and that the Holy Scripture, and the Revelations of God to his Church have taught me that Truth, which is the foundation of our Religion. Afterwards he maintains, that his Opinion is much better than it would be, if it was grounded upon ſome Philoſophical Proofs. “(i) You believe the Immortality of the Soul, becauſe your Reaſon tells you ſo; as for me, I believe it againſt my Reaſon: I believe that our Souls are Immortal, becauſe our Religion commands me to believe it. Conſider thoſe two Opinions, and you will certainly confeſs, that mine is much better: Yours is not ſo much as Catholick. . . . . (k) As . . . . . it is not ſufficient to do good Works in order to be a Virtuous Man; but, beſides, our Intentions ought to be innocent, and our Actions to proceed from a good Motive: ſo it is not ſufficient, in order to be a Catholick, not to doubt of any thing which the Church will have us to believe, we muſt, beſides, believe like Chriſtians, and Humility, and not Preſumption, ought to be the Cauſe of our Faith. . . . . (l) We have not a perfect Truſt in God, if we rely upon our Reaſon in things which he will have us to believe. If our Reaſon never deceiv'd us, and if we had a perfect Knowledge of ſuch things as fall under our Senſes, perhaps our Raſhneſs would be excuſable; and it would be no wonder, if finding nothing upon Earth that could puzzle us, we inquir'd after ſuch things as are above us. But you know better than I do, what the Knowledge of Man is; and that there are ſtill ſo many things in Nature that are above Philoſophical Enquiries, that we may very well miſtruſt our Strength and our Reaſon. None but a Novice in Philoſophy will think that all manner of Queſtions may be eaſily reſolved. They who go further into the Knowledge of things, meet with greater Difficulties: Two contrary Opinions are often equally probable; and if they embrace one of them, it is rather out of Inclination than out of Reaſon. Man cannot judge certainly of any thing whatſoever; his Reaſon deceives him as well as his Senſes: we live among Errors and Doubts, and we have no certain Truths here below, but thoſe which God has reveal'd to his Church. Take a ſight of all the Schools of Philoſophy, conſider what they do and teach there; you will find Preſumption in ſome, Obſtinacy in others, and Ignorance, Error, and Weakneſs in all of 'em. Certainly we ſtand in need of our Imbecillity to keep to our Duty. . . . (m) ſince our Reaſon is ſo weak that the leaſt Difficulties puzzle it, and that it is deceived and miſtaken at every turn, let us be ſure not to truſt ſuch a blind Guide, and not to ground our Belief upon ſo weak a Foundation. We muſt not rely upon our Arguments, but upon him who made Heaven and Earth. . . . . . (a) Let us always remember that we muſt believe in God, and not in ourſelves, and that if we ſhould uſe our Reaſon in what concerns Divine things, we ſhould imitate the *Cynick*, who not contented with the light of the Sun, look'd for a good Man with a Candle at Noon-day."

Deſcartes and his moſt faithful Followers might find fault with ſome of thoſe Thoughts, but it would be only as meer Philoſophers; for aſſoon as they conſider themſelves as being Chriſtians, they muſt altogether approve *d' Ablancourt*'s Opinion. They are perſuaded, that their Proofs of the Immortality of the Soul are demonſtrative; they would therefore take it ill that he ſhould ſay, that the Light of Reaſon affords no good Proofs of that Immortality: but, after all, he would be only look'd upon as an Hetorodox in Philoſophy; and they would confeſs, that as a Chriſtian he had the fulneſs of Orthodoxy. A Perſuaſion grounded upon the Light of Nature ought to be conſider'd in a Chriſtian as Eloquence in a Philoſopher, or as Agreeableneſs in a Hiſtory, (c) or as Beauty in a Wreſtler: They are things the privation whereof can be no great Prejudice, tho' it be no diſadvantage to enjoy them. (d) *A Philoſopho ſi afferat eloquentiam, non aſperner: Si non habeat, non admodum flagitem.* It is an advantage to be able to reconcile the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion with the Pinciples of Philoſophy; it is a good thing not to be neglected, but rather improv'd as much as it can be; but one muſt be always ready to loſe it without Grief, when it cannot be extended to the Doctrines that are above its reach, and above the Capacity of our Reaſon. One muſt be affected with reſpect to that Advantage, as wiſe Men are affected with reſpect to Fortune: if ſhe is conſtant in her Favours to them, they are glad of it; if ſhe runs away they are not much troubled for it: *I praiſe her*, ſaid *Horace* (e), *when ſhe ſtays with me; but aſſoon as I perceive that ſhe is ready to forſake me, I return her her Gifts, and wrap up myſelf in my Virtue.* True Chriſtians do the ſame, with reſpect to Philoſophical Knowledge: If after they have prov'd ſome Tenets of Religion, it ſeems to be againſt them, and to ſerve the contrary Tenets, we let it go, ſay they, and we wrap up ourſelves in our Faith. It is a thick and impenetrable Vail againſt the Injuries of the Air, that is to ſay, againſt all the Aſſaults of Humane Reaſon. Mr. *d' Ablancourt* did the ſame. There is nothing more judicious and ſolid than his Reflections upon the Nature of Faith, and upon the good uſe which ought to be made of the Uncertainty of Reaſon: the Certainty of Divine Faith is above that of Science. It would be therefore a very unjuſt thing to pretend, that a Faithful wants ſome Philoſophical Proofs to be ſure that his Soul is Immortal. Is it not enough for him to be certain of it by his Submiſſion to the Divine Authority, and by a firm Perſuaſion, that there is no Foundation ſo immutable and unmovable as the Word of God? and muſt not a Chriſtian, if he will act as a Chriſtian, believe the Immortality of the Soul, becauſe God has promis'd us an Eternal Felicity? If he believ'd the Immortality of the Soul for ſome Philoſophical Reaſons, it would be no Act of Faith, which yet he ought to perform, if he deſires to fulfil the Duties of Religion, and to be acceptable to God. Chriſtians have no regard to the Light of Reaſon in an Act of Faith, they lay it aſide, and rely only upon God's Veracity. See what the Schoolmen ſay when they inquire, whether Opinion, Science, and Faith can be in our Minds at the ſame time, with reſpect to the ſame Object.

I have now a very fair Opportunity to ſet down a Paſſage which I have promis'd in another place. Mr. *Lock* found himſelf almoſt in the ſame caſe with Mr. *d' Ablancourt*: he was blamed for having ſaid, that Natural Reaſon does not clearly prove the Immortality of the Soul. Let us ſee his Anſwer. “(g) This your Accuſation of my leſſening the Credibility of theſe Articles of Faith, [the Immortality of the Soul and the Reſurrection of the Body] is founded on this, That the Article of the Immortality of the Soul abates of its Credibility, if it be allowed, That its Immateriality (which is the ſuppoſed Proof from Reaſon and Philoſophy of its Immortality) cannot be demonſtrated from Natural Reaſon: which Argument of your Lordſhip's, bottoms, as I humbly conceive, on this, That Divine Revelation abates of its Credibility in all thoſe Articles it propoſes, proportionably as Humane Reaſon fails to ſupport the Teſtimony of God. And all that your Lordſhip in thoſe Paſſages has ſaid, when examined, will, I ſuppoſe, be found to import thus much, *viz.* Does God promiſe any thing to Mankind to be believed? It is very fit and credible to be believed, if Reaſon can demonſtrate it to be true. But if Humane Reaſon comes ſhort in the caſe, and cannot make it out, its Credibility is thereby leſſen'd; which is, in effect, to ſay, That the Veracity of God is not a firm and ſure Foundation of Faith to rely upon, without the concurrent Teſtimony of Reaſon, *i. e.* with Reverence be it ſpoken, God is not to be believed on his own Word, unleſs what he reveals be in itſelf credible, and might be believed without him. . . . . † Your Lordſhip ſays, *You do not queſtion whether God can give Immortality to a material Subſtance; but you ſay it* takes off very much *from the Evidence of Immortality, if it depends wholly upon God's giving that which, of its own nature, it is not capable of.* To which I reply, Any one's not being able to demonſtrate the Soul to be Immaterial, *takes off* not *very much*, nor at all from the *Evidence of its Immortality*, if God has revealed that it ſhall be Immortal, becauſe the Veracity of

(i) Id. ib. p. 361.

(k) Ibid. p. 362.

(l) Ibid. p. 363.

(m) Ibid. p. 364.

(a) *Patru ubi ſupra* p. 365.

(c) Lucianus in libello de hac re, unum ait eſſe opus Hiſtoriæ, unumque finem, utilitatem: jucundum verò ſi & ipſum ſequatur, melius hoc eſſe: perinde atque in athleta vires requiruntur, forma ac venuſtas laudantur. *Famian. Strada prolus.* 2. *lib.* 2. *pag. m.* 223.

(d) *Cic. de finib. l.* 1. *fol. m.* 215. *A.*

(e) Laudo manentem: ſi celeres quatit Pennas, reſigno quæ dedit, & mea Virtute me involvo. *Horat. od.* 29. *l.* 3.

(g) *Mr. Lock's Reply to the Biſhop of Worceſt. Anſwer to his ſecond Letter. p.* 418. 419. *See alſo the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres Nov. 1699. *p.* 510.

† *Mr.* Lock *ib. p.* 420, 421.

PERSIUS (*Caius* *) was one of the moſt Learned (*A*) Men of his Time. He was *Quæſtor* † in the Year of *Rome* 608, and *Prætor* two Years after. The Poet *Lucilius* fear'd him, and ingenuouſly confeſt that he did not write for ſuch Men, and that he deſired not his Readers ſhould be ſo Learned as he was. It was thought by ſome, that *Perſius* made the ‡ Harangue which was pronounced by the Conſul *Caius Fannius* againſt *Caius Gracchus* in the Year of *Rome* 631. The Reaſon of it was * that *Fannius* was but an indifferent Orator, and that his Harangue was ſo fine that others believed ſeveral Great Men had contributed to it every one according to his Capacity. It was not at that Time a thing without Example, that a Man ſhould make a Diſcourſe, and another recite it. Nevertheleſs *Cicero* refutes thoſe who aſcribed not that Harangue to *Fannius*. Some by a ſtrange Error in Chronology (*B*) have confounded our *Perſius* with the Poet I am going to ſpeak of.

PERSIUS (*Aulus Perſius* (*A*) *Flaccus*) a Satyrical Poet under the Empire of *Nero*,

" God is a Demonſtration of the Truth of what he " has revealed, and the Want of another Demonſtration of a Propoſition, that is demonſtratively " true, takes not off from the Evidence of it. For " where there is a clear Demonſtration, there is " as much Evidence as any Truth can have, that is " not ſelf evident. . . . (*h*) Can any one who admits of Divine Revelation . . . . think this Propoſition leſs credible, The Bodies of Men, after " the Reſurrection, ſhall live for ever; than " this, The Souls of Men ſhall, after the Reſurrection, live for ever? For that he muſt do, if " he thinks either of them is leſs credible than the " other. If this be ſo, Reaſon is to be conſulted, " how far God is to be believed, and the Credit " of Divine Teſtimony muſt receive its Force from " the Evidence of Reaſon, which is evidently to " take away the Credibility of Divine Revelation, " in all ſupernatural Truths, wherein the Evidence " of Reaſon fails. "

The Reader may find ſeveral things in the Article of *Pomponatius*, which concern this matter; but it is to be obſerved here, that many School-Men have aſſerted that the Natural Reaſons of the Immortality of the Soul are not convincing. (*i*) *Naturæ rationes* Henricus *atque* Scotus *probabiliter ſuadere aiunt, non neceſſario demonſtrare. Cajetanus*, who had openly and haughtily rejected that Opinion (*k*), imbraced it at laſt; I believe, ſays he, that our Souls are Immortal, but I don't know it: (*l*) *ſe credere quidem animam rationalem incorruptibilem eſſe, at neſcire tamen.* He and *Scotus*, and *Joannes de Janduno* having examined all the Arguments alledged by *Thomas Aquinas*, declared that they were not demonſtrative, (*m*) *Pronunciarunt tandem rem non eſſe demonſtratam, ſed creditam. Scotus* (*n*) anſwered all the Arguments of *Thomas Aquinas*. The latter propoſed 21 probable Reaſons for the Immortality of the Soul, to which *Joannes de Janduno* added many more.

(*A*) *One of the moſt learned Men.*] *Cicero* mentions him in two or three places. He brings in (*o*) the Orator *Craſſus* who declares, that in imitation of the Poet *Lucilius*, he does not deſire that his Readers ſhould be altogether ignorant, or very learned Men: and upon this occaſion he tells us that *Perſius*, one of thoſe whom that Poet would not have to be his Reader, was in a manner, the moſt Learned Man that was ſeen at *Rome*. *Nam ut Cajus Lucilius homo doctus & perurbanus dicere ſolebat ea quæ ſcriberet neque ab indoctiſſimis neque ab doctiſſimis legi velle, quod alteri nihil intelligerent, alteri plus fortaſſe quàm ipſe de ſe, quo etiam ſcripſit; Perſium non curo legere, hic enim fuit, ut noramus, omnium fere noſtrorum hominum doctiſſimus; Lælium Decimum volo, quem cognovimus virum bonum & non illiteratum, ſed nihil ad Perſium; ſic ego ſi jam mihi diſputandum ſit de his noſtris ſtudiis, nolim equidem apud ruſticos, ſed multo minus apud vos, malo enim non intelligi orationem meam, quàm reprehendi.* *Cicero* declares in another (*p*) Place, that he is not of *Lucilius*'s Mind; he wiſh'd that *Perſius* might have read his Works. *Nec enim ut noſter Lucilius recuſabo quo minus omnes mea legant. Utinam eſſet ille Perſius; Scipio vero & Rutilius multo etiam magis, quorum ille judicium reformidans Tarentinis ait ſe & Conſentinis & Siculis ſcribere.* *Pliny* deſigning to make uſe of *Lucilius*'s Thought, choſe rather to take it from *Cicero* than from its Author; and it appears that he had in view a Paſſage of *Cicero*, wherein the thing was related with ſome different Explications from thoſe we have ſeen. *Præterea*, ſays *Pliny* (*a*), *eſt quædam publica etiam eruditorum rejectio. Utitur illa & M. Tullius extra omnem ingenii aleam poſitus, & (quod miremur) per advocatum defenditur.* (*b*) Nec doctiſſimis: Manium Perſium hæc legere nolo, Junium Congum volo. *Quod ſi hoc Lucilius qui primus condidit ſtyli naſum dicendum ſibi putavit: ſi Cicero mutuandum, præſertim cum de Republica ſcriberet, quanto nos cauſatius ab aliquo judice defendimus.* That Paſſage of *Cicero* was, without doubt, in the Preface to his Books *de Republica*; he had not then the ſame Thought that he had in the 1ſt Book *de Finibus*, but the ſame that he had in the 2d Book *de Oratore*. We ought not to wonder at thoſe Variations, for there are different Subjects. It is a more ſurprizing thing, that every time he mention'd that Thought of *Lucilius*, he brought in ſeveral Perſons oppoſite to *Perſius*, ſometimes *Lælius Decimus*, ſometimes the *Sicilians* and *Tarentines*, ſometimes *Junius Congus*. The Reaſon of it may be, either becauſe *Lucilius* mention'd ſeveral Perſons in the ſame Place, whoſe Penetration he did not much fear, or becauſe he made uſe of the ſame Thought in ſeveral places, ſometimes againſt one, ſometimes againſt another: For when an Author declares that he is afraid of being criticiz'd by a Man by reaſon of his great Learning, it may preſently afford him a Satyrical Stroke againſt thoſe whom he deſigns to expoſe, as Ignorant or Half-Learned Men, by oppoſing them to the Perſon whoſe Judgment he fears. *Lucilius*'s Deſign was not ſo much to praiſe the Learning of *Perſius*, as to exerciſe his Satyrical Wit. He might in both Caſes give occaſion to *Cicero* to diverſifie the Perſons oppoſed to *Perſius*: And therefore Father *Hardouin* did very well to expunge *Lælius Decimus* out of *Pliny*, and in the room of it to aſſert *Junius Congus*, by virtue of the beſt and moſt ancient Manuſcripts.

(*B*) *Some have confounded.*] (*c*) *Fungerus* taking, without any reaſon for it, theſe Words of *Cicero*, *nihil ad Perſium*, for a Proverbial Expreſſion, fancied they were meant of *Perſius*, the Satyrical Poet, born towards the End of the Empire of *Tiberius*. Thoſe two Faults have been obſerved by *Voſſius*. He complains of a great number of ſuch Over-ſights, which he found in Ancient and Modern Authors. *Vellem*, ſays he (*d*), *ut juventus hinc videat quàm neceſſaria ſit doctrina temporum, cujus neglectu ſpiſſe fœdeque peccatur à viris alioqui non ineruditis. Quamquam nec tanti id foret, ſi unus ille (*Fungerus*) ſic exorbitaret. Sexcenta id genus poteram ex aliis adferre, pluſcula etiam ex veteribus ipſis.*

(*A*) *Aulus Perſius Flaccus.*] Thoſe who ſaid that the Surname of *Flaccus* was given him, becauſe he imitated *Horace*, did not obſerve that his (*e*) Father had the ſame Surname, and have not been more lucky in their Gueſs, than when they ſaid that he was called *Severus*, becauſe he profeſt the Stoick Philoſophy. *Caſaubon* affords me (*f*) thoſe two Remarks. He believes as to the ſecond, that an Inſcription found at *Volterra* occaſion'd that Error. Here is the Inſcription: *A. Perſius A. F. Severus* V. *an.* VIII. M. III. D. XIX. Which ſuppoſes that thoſe whom that great Critick cenſures, pretended that the Title of *Severus* was given to *Perſius* as a Surname of a Family, and if it be ſo, they might be cenſured for it; but if they conſidered that Title only as an Epithet, like that of *Ardens*, which *Juvenal* (*g*) beſtowed upon *Lucilius*, they could not be blamed for having taken notice of that Poet's Application to the Stoick Philoſophy, nor could it be pretended that they had any regard to the Inſcription of *Volterra*. No Man was ever more worthy of the Elogy of Severity than that Poet, conſidering the imperious Tone of his Invectives and Cenſures;

---

* *Pliny calls him Manius in Harduin's Edition, See the Rem. A.*

† *According to Voſſius de Poet. Lat. p. 41.*

‡ Alii a C. Perſio literato homine ſcriptam eſſe aiebant, illo quem ſignificat valde doctum eſſe Lucilius; alii multos nobiles quod quiſque potuiſſet in illam orationem contuliſſe. *Cicero in Bruto.*

* Eam ſuſpicionem propter hanc cauſam credo fuiſſe, quod Fannius in mediocribus Oratoribus habitus eſſet, oratio autem vel optima eſſet illo quidem tempore orationum omnium. *Id. ib.*

(*h*) *Id. ib. p.* 422.

(*i*) *Melch. Canus loc. commun. l.* 12. *cap. ult. p. m.* 724.

(*k*) *Id. ib.*

(*l*) *Id. ib.*

(*m*) *Id. ib. p.* 725.

(*n*) *Id. ib. p.* 727.

(*o*) *Cic. de Orat. l.* 2.

(*p*) *De finib. l.* 1. *circa init.*

(*a*) *In præf.*

(*b*) *So Father Harduin reads. In the other Editions 'tis* Nec doctiſſimum Perſium legere nolo, Lælium Decimum volo

(*c*) *In nova proverbior. farragine, apud Voſſium inſt. Orat. l.* 4. *c.* 11. & *de poet. Lat. p.* 41.

(*d*) *De poet. Lat. ib.*

(*e*) *Sueton. in vita Perſii.*

(*f*) *Notis in vitam Perſii.*

(*g*) *Sat.* 1. *So* Perſius *calls* Horace, Vafer, *and* Ovid *gives the Epithet of* Doctus *to* Catullus.

Nero, was born at (B) *Volterra* in *Tuscany*. He was a *Roman* Knight, and related to Persons of the first Rank. He studied at *Volterra* till he was 12 Years of Age, and then he continued his Studies at *Rome*, under the Grammarian *Palæmon*, the Rhetor *Virginius*, and *Cornutus* a Stoick Philosopher, who entertained so great a Love for him, that there was ever since a most intimate Friendship between them. *Persius* has immortalized by * his Works that Friendship, and his Thankfulness for the good Offices of his Friend. Which he exprest more fully by a *Codicil*, for he left him his Library and a great deal of † Money; but *Cornutus* kept only the Books, and left the Money to the Heirs ‖. He advised the Mother of his Friend to suppress some Pieces of Poetry, which her Son made in the beginning of his Youth. He thought, without doubt, they would not answer the great Reputation of those which had been Published, and received by the Publick with so great an Admiration, that all the Copies were presently sold off. This is a Model to be proposed to those who publish so many sorry Posthumous Books, in hopes that the Glory of the Deceased will be a Safeguard to them. They supprest, amongst other Works of *Persius*, some Verses which he had made upon *Arria*, that Illustrious *Roman* Lady, who killed herself to give an Example to her dear Husband. *Moreri* (C) fancied that it was a Satyr against *Arria*, which is false; it was rather an Elogy, and it cannot be reasonably doubted of considering the great Love of the Author for *Thrasea*, Son-in-Law to *Arria* * his Kinswoman. He studied with *Lucan*, under *Cornutus*, and was so much admired by his School-Fellow, that when *Persius* recited

Censures; which is the Reason *Barthius* gives of that Elogy. It was therefore an unreasonable thing to apply to him the severe Reprimand of *Casaubon*. What I say concerns *Magirus* (h); for having set down these Words of *Barthius*, (i) *Severum veteres libri ab auctoritate castigandi & invectione in malos mores nominant*, he adds, *sed videtur huic vanissimo commento occasionem præbuisse inscriptio illa memoria avorum Volaterris inventa, ubi* Aul. PERSII *cujusdam ollennis pueri fit mentio, cui cognomen fuit Severo. Casaub. not. ad Persii vitam.* This Application does not seem to me to be judicious.

(B) *Born at Volterra.*] All Authors don't agree about it; *Etruria* and *Liguria* contend for it. *Persius* might boast of having a good share in *Homer*'s Destiny, two great Provinces strive which shall have him. The *Etrurians* ground their Pretension upon the Testimony of (k) some Ancient Authors, who say that *Persius* was of *Volterra*. The *Ligurians* ground theirs upon these (l) Words;

Mihi nunc Ligus ora
Intepet, hibernatque meum mare, qua latus ingens
Dant Scopuli, & multa littus se valle receptat
Lunai portum est operæ cognoscere cives.

They pretend that the Poet speaks of his Native Country, and consequently that he was born at *Portus Lunæ*, which is called now the Gulph *della Spezzia*. *Don Gasparo Massa* has treated that Matter learnedly, in a Dissertation printed at *Genoa* in 1667, *della vita, Origine è patria di Aulo Persio Flacco.* He believes that the Town (m) call'd formerly *Luna*, was situated in *Tuscany*, and therefore he is far from granting that it was the Native Country of our Poet; for his not being born at *Volterra* would signifie nothing to him, if he could not prove that he was born in the State of *Genoa*. He therefore says, that the Place of his Birth was *Tigulia*, near *Portus Lunæ*, situated in *Liguria*, 80 (n) Stadia distant from *Luna*. You must observe that the Town of *Luna* and the Port of *Luna* are distinguished one from another. *Lewis Aprosio* is of the same Opinion with *Gasparo Massa*, as it appears from his Dissertation *della Patria d'A. Persio*, printed at *Genoa* in the Year 1664. See how little one can rely upon *Moreri*, he pretends that Aprosio *maintains that* Persius *was of* Volterra, *and that* Gaspar Massa *says he was born at* Luna *or* la Spezzia. Which is very false with respect to *Aprosio*, and far from being exact with respect to *Massa*. Tho' the Arguments of those two Gentlemen are none of those which cannot be answered, yet they are probable enough, and if I was to choose, I had rather follow their (o) Opinion than that of *Eusebius*. I shall acquaint my Reader, that *Soprani* being not contented to place *Persius* amongst (p) the Writers of *Liguria*, and to give some Reasons for it, caused those two Discourses to be printed at the end of his Work.

(C) *Moreri fancied ..... which is false.*] I think the true Reason of his Mistake proceeds from these Words: (a) *Scripserat in pueritia Flaccus ...... paucos in sororem Thraseæ & in Arriæ matrem versus quæ se ante virum occiderat.* The Criticks (b) have corrected these Words thus, *in socrum Thraseæ Arriæ matrem*, or *Arriam* (c) *matrem*. The Preposition (d) *In* is Equivocal; it signifies sometimes *against*, and sometimes *upon*. One may easily perceive that it ought to be taken here in the second Sense; for is it likely that *Persius* should have written some Verses against a Lady who was his Kinswoman, and Mother of his best Friend's Wife, and famous for being dead in a most Heroical manner, according to the Notions of the Sect wherein our Poet was bred up? The Friendship of *Persius* and *Thrasea*, Son-in-Law of that Lady, lasted near ten Years, which signifies, as *Casaubon* observes, that *Persius* did not live above ten Years from the Time he contracted an intimate Friendship with *Thrasea*. Now because he lived but 28 Years, any one may see that their Friendship began whilst *Persius* studied Philosophy under *Cornutus* (e): and 'tis likely that he made the Verses in question after he had got such a Friend. The Word *Pueritia* is used by the best Latin Authors for young Men of 18 or 20 Years of Age. I shall place here in order the other Mistakes of *Moreri*. He says *that* Persius *wrote a Book against* Arria, *which his Master* Cornutius *made him burn.* Suppose this to be true, it was not a Book, but some few Verses, *paucos versus*. His Master's Name was not *Cornutius*, but *Cornutus*; and it was only after the Death of the Author, that he advised his Mother to suppress those Verses, and all those he had made in his Youth. (f) *Omnia autem Cornutus auctor fuit* MATRI *ejus ut aboleret.* Whereby the Author of the Epistle, which serves instead of a Preface to the new Translation of *Persius*, may be convinced of a Mistake. His Words run thus: (g) "He composed some Verses upon "(h) that Subject, which were no (i) Commenda-"tion of that generous and faithful Wife: but he "followed the Advice that was given him, he sup-"prest those Verses, and he did well." *Moreri* calls the Rhetorician, under whom *Persius* studied, *Virginius Fulvius*; he shou'd have call'd him *Virginius Flaccus*. He says that this pretended *Virginius Fulvius* and *Rhemnius Palæmon took care of* Lucan's *Education.* To what purpose does he make such a Remark, since he was to say nothing of *Lucan*'s Love for *Persius*? But besides, none of the Authors quoted by him, mention that pretended Education. 'Tis with respect to *Cornutus*, that the Author of the Life of *Persius* observes, that he taught *Lucan* and *Persius* at the same time. We shall see hereafter (k) a Chronological Fault of *Moreri*.

Mr. *Marais* was pleased to acquaint me, that *Moreri* might have taken from Mr. (†) *Geffrier* what he says of *Arria*; for the Reputation of that Lady was so dear to Mr. *Geffrier*, *that to make amends for the wrong* which he pretends *Persius* had done her, he caused a Sonnet to be printed before his Translation, which Father *le Moine* composed to the Praise of *Arria*, and which is to be found in his *Galerie des Femmes fortes*.

---

* *Pers. Sat. 5. passim.*

† *Five and twenty thousand Crowns according to the supputation of some. See the Preface of Persius's Translation by the Jesuit* Tarteron.

‖ *That is,* Persius's *Sisters.*

* Ipse etiam decem fere annis summe dilectus apud Thraseam est, ita ut peregrinaretur quoque cum eo aliquando, cognatam ejus Arriam (*the Daughter of that Arria who killed her self*) uxorem habente. *Suet. in vit. Persii. Instead of* dilectus apud Thraseam, *Lipsius in Ann. Tacit. l. 15. reads* dilectus à Pæto Thrasea.

(h) *Eponymolog. Critic. p.* 648.

(i) VI *Adversar.* 1.

(k) *The Author of* Persius's *Life. Euseb. in Chronic. Cassiodor. in Fastis.*

(l) *Pers. Sat. 6. v. 6.*

(m) *Pag.* 40.

(n) *Aprosio della Patria d'A. Persio, p.* 14.

(o) *'Tis also the Opinion of* Bartholomew Fontius *in his Comment. upon* Persius *printed at* Venice *in* 1491. *and of* Hippolitus Landinelli, Nell'origine di Luni *cap.* 11. *apud Michael. Justiniani, Scritt. Liguri, p.* 108.

(p) *Printed at Genoa in* 4. *in the year* 1667.

(a) *Suet. in vita Persii.*

(b) *Casaub. not. in vit. Persii.*

(c) *Gronovius in eamd. vitam in Edit. Sueton. Graviana.*

(d) *Vid. Casaub. in Pers. Sat.* 1. *p.* 110.

(e) Cum primum pavido custos mihi purpura cessit, Bullaque succinctis laribus donata pependit, Me tibi supposui. *Pers. ad Cornutum Sat.* 5.

(f) *Suet. ub. sup.*

(g) *Epistle before the Translation of* Persius *by Father* Tarteron.

(h) *That is upon the Action of* Arria.

(i) *It is a Mistake, which I refute.*

(k) *In the Rem. E.*

(†) *De quo infra Rem. D. at the end.*

recited his Verſes, *Lucan* could ſcarce forbear breaking out into Acclamations: Which is a rare thing among Poets of the ſame Rank, but ſometimes too common (C∆) out of Cunning and Vanity. *Perſius* became acquainted with *Seneca* very late, and could never like him. He was a good Friend, a (C∆∆) better Son ſtill, a better Brother, and a better Kinſman. He was very Chaſt, tho' a beautiful young Man: He was Sober, as Mild as a Lamb, and as ſuſceptible of Modeſty as a young Maid: So true it is, that we muſt not judge of a Man's Life by his Writings; for the Satyrs of *Perſius* are not very modeſt: beſides, they are ſharp and full of Bitterneſs. Nay, 'tis thought that he ſpared not the Cruel *Nero*, and that he did ſo (D) plainly hint at him, that *Cornutus* thought fit to alter ſome

---

(C∆) *Sometimes too common out of Cunning and Vanity.*] This is finely explained by a Modern Author, who does not pretend that *Lucan* was free from that Fault. “*Perſius*, ſays he (l), was much better pleaſed with *Lucan*, (m) who perhaps inſinuated himſelf into his Favour with much exclaiming at the fineſt Paſſages of his Satyrs, and often repeating theſe Words with great admiration, *These are excellent Pieces indeed!* For tho' an Author be never ſo modeſt, he will be eaſily allured by the Charms of flattering Applauſes, which he receives from a good Judge in a full Aſſembly. But, *Sir*, had not *Lucan* his Aim in it? Didn't he expect the like from *Perſius*? Poets and Authors, you know, do ſeldom give any thing for nothing; and when they come to engage one another with Praiſes and Compliments, they don't ſpare themſelves; they make Paſſes at one another with great force. You know ſome at preſent, as well as I, who are accounted for bravery of Wit, if I may ſay ſo, the *Boutevilles* of this Time: they challenge thoſe that have moſt Skill, and whether it be in a Rencounter, or in formal Duels, which were never prohibited by the King, they ſtrive to conquer one another, and are on both ſides extremely free of the moſt obliging and civil Expreſſions, even in Writing and in Print, that Poſterity may not doubt of it. In that ſort of Duels the weakeſt Man is always the Aggreſſor; 'tis he who ſends or even gives the Challenge. This is, Sir, *Horace*'s Metaphor, and it will appear to you, at leaſt, as pleaſant as it is bold, you may find it in his Epiſtle to *Florus*. As for me, if the Title of Writer made me greedy of Praiſes, I had rather be commended by a good Author, whom I ſhould neither know by his Name, nor by Sight, and who could have no Intereſt in praiſing me; for ſuch Praiſes could not be ſuſpected.”

(C∆∆) *He was a good Friend, a better Son ſtill, a better Brother, and a better Kinſman.*] The Author who affords me theſe Words, will afford me alſo a Commentary upon them. “You wonder at it, *ſays he* (n), and perhaps you have your Reaſons for it. Nevertheleſs, there is nothing truer than this; and they who knew him beſt, ſay, (o) that he might be propoſed as an Example in that reſpect. In effect, he had a ſolid and true Love for his Siſters, and a reſpectful Tenderneſs for his Mother *Fulvia*, tho' ſhe was married again: and if he was but a Child when his Father died, if he was but ſeven or eight Years of Age when ſhe did that . . . . I had almoſt let fall the Word Folly, but we muſt be ſomewhat circumſpect in favour of thoſe Women; he was already clear-ſighted enough to perceive that it was no pleaſant thing, for Reaſon diſplays it ſelf much in ſuch Junctures, it grows ſtrong and lively, and does not always wait for the time appointed to make its Reflections, eſpecially when it happens to be in a Subject that has a diſpoſition to be Satyrical. But, Sir, we muſt ſpeak the whole Truth, the ſecond Husband (p) died in a ſhort time, and left *Perſius* in a condition of reſpecting and loving his Mother, as ſincerely as he did, when he was but a Child. I don't know whether *Fulvia* took great care of her Son's Education, and whether ſhe loved not herſelf too much to mind an Affair of ſo great Importance: This I cannot be ſure of, for a ſecond Wedding, and even the Condition of a young Widow, is a great hindrance to it; but that which I am ſure of, is, that the *Roman* Knight, though never ſo Young, neglected nothing to make himſelf as accompliſhed a Man as I have repreſented him to you.” I ſhall add theſe Words of *Suetonius* to that pretty Commentary; *Reliquit circa H-S XX. matri & ſorori . . . . . Cornutus, ſublatis libris, pecuniam ſororibus, quam frater heredes fecerat, reliquit.* What ſhall we ſay of an Hiſtorian, who in the ſame Page, where he ſays twice, that *Perſius* had but one Siſter, obſerves that *Perſius* left his Eſtate to his Mother and Siſter, and made his Siſters his Heirs?

(l) *Epiſtle prefixed to the Tranſlation of Perſius by the Jeſuit* Tarteron.

(m) Lucanus adeo mirabatur ſcripta Flacci, ut vix retineret ſe illo recitante à clamore quin illa eſſe vera poëmata diceret. *Sueton. in vit. Perſii.*

(n) *Epiſtle prefixed to the New Tranſlation of* Perſius *and* Juvenal *by Father* Tarteron.

(o) Pietatis erga matrem & ſororem & amitam exemplo ſufficientis. *Sueton. in vita Perſii.*

(p) Pater ejus Flaccus pupillum reliquit moriens, annorum fere ſex. Fulvia Siſennia mater nupſit poſtea Fuſio, Equiti Romano: & eum quoque extulit intra paucos annos. *Idem.*

(D) *Did ſo plainly hint at* Nero.] He made uſe of theſe Words in his Firſt Satyr;

Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet.

Cornutus adviſed him to change them into theſe:

Auriculas aſini quis non habet? (a)

If *Cornutus* thought that *Nero* was too plainly hinted at by theſe Words, he did wiſely to uſe that Precaution, tho', perhaps, that Emperor was ſtill in the firſt Years of his Reign, wherein he ſhewed himſelf a good Prince. But how comes it that *Cornutus* made no Alteration in the four Verſes inſerted in the ſame Satyr, and taken from a Tragedy of *Nero*? Was it a dangerous thing to ſay *King Midas has an Aſſe's Ears*, whilſt his Verſes might be propoſed as a Model of ridiculous Poetry without any danger? I find ſome Difficulty in it, and perhaps theſe four Verſes,

Torva (b) Mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis,
Et raptum vitulo caput allatura ſuperbo
Baſſaris, & Lyncem Mænas flexura corymbis
Evion ingeminat: reparabilis adſonat Echo.

were at moſt but an indirect and obſcure Raillery; for if *Nero* had been the Author of thoſe Verſes, how could any Body be ſo bold, as to ſet 'em down Word for Word to laugh at them, ſince it was thought neceſſary to mend thoſe other Words, *Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet?* This is a very ſtrange Diſparity; a great Cowardice on the one hand, and a great Raſhneſs on the other. But I have more Scruples ſtill about it. Methinks *Cornutus* ſpoils the Thought of his Friend without any neceſſity, his Fear ſeems to me to be ill grounded. *Perſius* being told that it was dangerous to cenſure the Faults of other Men, and that he ſhould not ſo much as ſpeak of them to a Pit, anſwers, that he will at leaſt tell his Book buried in the Ground what he has ſeen, *viz.* That King *Midas* had an Aſſe's Ears?

Men' mutire nefas, nec clam nec cum ſcrobe? nuſquam.
Heic tamen infodiam. Vidi, vidi ipſe, libelle,
Auriculas Aſini Mida rex habet.

It is a manifeſt Alluſion to the Hiſtory (c) of *Midas*'s Barber, which was very well known to *Nero*. It was not therefore very likely that he ſhould take it ill, that any one ſhould faithfully relate the beſt Paſſage of that Hiſtory, *Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet.* If you change thoſe Words into theſe, *Auriculas aſini quis non habet*; it is no more the Barber's Text, but a looſe Imitation of it. If I ſhould be told, that it is better to leſſen the Beauty of a Thought, than to exaſperate a Tyrant, I would anſwer as I did before, *Why don't you take off the four Verſes; you ought to force the Author to blot 'em out, not only if they are borrowed from a Poem of* Nero, *but alſo if they only contain ſome of his Phraſes.* In effect, it cannot be doubted but that *Malherbe* would have been offended at theſe Verſes of Mr. *Deſpreaux*, even if he had not been named in them:

Irai-je (d) dans une ode en phraſes de Malherbe,
Troubler dans ſes roſeaux le Danube ſuperbe,
Delivrer de Sion le peuple gemiſſant,
Faire trembler Memphis & palir le Croiſſant,
En paſſant du Jourdain les ondes allarmées
Cueillir *mal à propos* les palmes Idumées?

Mr. *Deſpreaux* names no Body when he ſays:

Tout (e) chantre ne peut pas ſur le ton d'un Orphée,
Entonner en grands vers la diſcorde étouffée:
Peindre Bellone en feu tonnant de toutes parts,
Et le Belge effrayé fuyant ſur ſes remparts.

Yet

(a) *Suet. in vita Perſii.*

(b) *Perſ. ſat. 1. v. 99.*

(c) Secedit humumque Effodit, & domini quales aſpexerit aures Voce refert parvæ terræque immurmurat hauſtæ. *Ovid. Metamorph. l. 11. v. 186.*

(d) *Deſpreaux Sat. 9.*

(e) *Id. ib.*

ſome of his Words *. He died (*E*) being twenty eight Years of Age. His Pater-

Yet can any Body doubt but that it may raiſe the Indignation of the Authors of thoſe Terms? Therefore it ſeems to me that the *Torva Mimalloneis, &c.* can neither be a Fragment of *Nero*'s Poems, nor a Parody or an Imitation of his Verſes: for once more if he would have been diſpleaſed with the *Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet*, which was an old Hiſtory, how could it be expected that he ſhould patiently bear ridiculous Rhapſodies made up of his own Expreſſions? Wherefore, with the old Scholiaſt's Leave, I will not ſubſcribe to theſe Words of Mr. *Deſpreaux* till my Scruples be removed: *Let us examine* Perſius, *ſays he (f), who wrote under* Nero'*s Reign. He does not only rail at the Poets of his time, but alſo ridicules the Verſes of* Nero *himſelf. For every Body knows, and the whole Court of* Nero *knew it, that thoſe four Verſes,* Torva Mimalloneis, *&c. which* Perſius *does ſo ſharply reflect upon, were ſome of* Nero'*s Verſes. Yet we don't find that* Nero, *as Cruel as he was, cauſed* Perſius *to be puniſhed for it; and that Tyrant, though an Enemy to Reaſon, and very fond of his Works, as it is well known, was ſo reaſonable as not to be offended at it, and did not think that upon ſuch an occaſion the Emperor ſhould concern himſelf for the Poet.* I have done with that Scruple. *Caſaubon* pretends, that the four Verſes in Queſtion, were part of a (*g*) Tragedy intitled (*h*) *Bacchæ*, and to prove that *Nero* had compoſed ſuch a Piece, he quotes *Dion Caſſius*, who only ſays, that *Nero* played the Part of a Muſician when that Tragedy was acted. But is this a Proof that he was the Author of it? Beſides, Hexameter Verſes, I think, were not uſed in Tragedies; but the four Verſes in queſtion are Hexameter. If that Learned Commentator had compared his Opinion about *Torva Mimalloneis* with his Preface on the 4th Satyr, I doubt he would not have perſiſted in that Opinion. In effect, he ſays in that Preface, that the chief Deſign of *Perſius* in his 4th Satyr was to cenſure the Conduct of *Nero*; and that to avoid bringing himſelf into Trouble, he ſo diſguiſed his Deſign, that he made uſe of no ſtroke hinting at that Prince, and contrived the Matter ſo as to be able to come off, in caſe he ſhould be accuſed of aiming at the Government. *Caſaubon* obſerves alſo, that this Satyr was compoſed before *Nero* had ſhewn all his ill-nature. *Cujus* (ſatiræ quartæ) *etſi præcipuus erat Scopus in Neronem invehi, atque ipſum ſatirico ſale defricare . . . . ſic tamen poëta in hoc argumento indignationi ſuæ habenas laxavit, ut neque palam neque plenis velis in flagitioſiſſimum principem inveheretur, verum tectè & longè mollius quam vel natura ipſius ferebat, vel Neronis flagitia ac ſcelera merebantur. Nos autem putamus tum ſcriptam eſſe hanc ſatiram cum nondum totus innotuerat Nero, cujus principium laude digna habuit multa. . . . . . Probè vero norat Perſius cum ad hanc ſatiram ſcribendam ſe accingeret, quantam rem & quàm periculoſam moliretur. Quamobrem conſilio prudentiſſimo hoc argumentum Platonis imitatione ſibi tractandum cenſuit, non ſolum nominibus inde petitis, ſed etiam ſententia propemodum univerſa; ut ſi quis forte Corycæus aut Cercops nomen ipſius deferret, probabili excuſatione poſſet factum ſuum defendere quaſi exercendi tantum ſtili cauſa petitum è libris ſummi philoſophi argumentum latinis verſibus tentaſſet complecti. Quare etiam ab omnibus illum videmus abſtinuiſſe, quæ Neronis perſonam propriè erant denotatura.* Is is not a ſtrange thing, that a Man who was of that Opinion, ſhould believe that *Perſius* made bold to ridicule *Nero*'s Verſes, and quoted them Word for Word without any diſguiſe? Perhaps it will be ſaid, that *Nero* was not much concerned for his Quality of Poet: but one muſt give good Proofs of it or not ſay ſo; for every Body (*i*) is commonly fond of his Poetry. The Crown and Scepter cure not a Man of that Fault; and we know that *Nero* was more ſenſibly affected (*k*) with the Cenſure of his Muſick, than with that of his Crimes. Which is a Reaſon to make one believe, that as a Poet he could not bear to be reflected upon. Did he not baniſh *Cornutus*, and (*l*) was he not like to put him to Death, for having had the boldneſs to ſay, that *Nero* ſhould make too many Verſes, if he compoſed four hundred Books of 'em, and that the Example of *Chryſippus* ſhould not be alledged in the caſe, ſeeing the Books of that Philoſopher were uſeful to Humane Life? Didn't he grow Jealous of the Poet *Lucan*, and did not he forbid him (*m*) to make any Verſes? *Lucanum propria cauſſa accendebant, quod famam carminum ejus premebat Nero, prohibueratque oſtentare, vanus adſimulatione* (*n*). *Lucan* was ſo exaſperated at it, that he joyned with the Conſpirators who endeavoured to kill that Prince.

It would be an endleſs thing to quote all the Authors (*o*) who believe that the four Verſes ridiculed by *Perſius*, were *Nero*'s. I ſhall only cite the Notes which have been added to the new Tranſlation of *Petronius*. "(*p*) It has been lawful at all times to criticize ſorry Books, when they are publiſhed. The Defects of the Mind may be cenſured every where, and that Liberty is as ancient as the World. The *Torva*, &c. which we read in *Juvenal* (*q*), ſhews, that *Nero* himſelf, as Cruel as he was, was not offended at it, and never thought of treating as Enemies to the State, thoſe who criticized his Works: he was only out of Humour with thoſe who made Verſes better than he."

Note, That the Life of *Perſius* written (*a*) by *Suetonius*, as 'tis thought, does not tell us that the *Torva Mimalloneis* had any Relation to *Nero*. It alledges no other Example of the Liberty that Poet took to criticize him, than the Verſe wherein *Mida Rex* was to be found, which *Cornutus* adviſed him to alter. We have therefore but one Witneſs for the *Torva Mimalloneis*, viz. The Scholiaſt upon *Perſius*. An *Engliſh* Author, who made good Notes upon the Satyrs of that Poet, does not ſay poſitively, as ſo many others do, that *Nero* was the Author of the four Verſes in queſtion: *Sive a Nerone*, ſays he (*b*), *ſive ab alio quopiam nobili Romano compoſita.* Mr. *Marais* has acquainted me that there is ſuch a Paſſage in the Engliſh Commentator, and that Mr. *Geffrier*, who publiſhed a *French* Tranſlation or a Paraphraſe of *Perſius* at *Paris* in 1658, ſays thoſe four Verſes were *Nero*'s.

(*E*) *Being twenty eight Years of Age.*] Which appears from the Conſulſhips of his Death and Birth. He was born *Fabio Perſico, L. Vitellio Coſſ.* the 4th of *December*, and he died *Rubrio Mario, Aſinio Gallo Coſſ.* the 24th of *November*. There being but 28 Years between theſe two Conſulſhips, it follows that *Perſius* lived 28 Years, within ſome Days. Therefore the Author of his Life made a very wrong reckoning, when after he had fixed the Day and Year of his Death and Birth with ſo much preciſion, he placed his Death in the 30th Year of his Age. St. *Jerome*'s Miſtake is not ſo great, but he has not been exact enough. He ſays that *Perſius* was born in the 2d Year of the 203d Olympiad, and died in the 29th Year of his Life, and the 2d of the 210th Olympiad. Which cannot be true, but by ſaying that he was born in the firſt Months of the Year, and died ſome Months later: but beſides that St. *Jerome* makes no ſuch Diſtinction, we have ſeen that *Perſius* was born in *December*, and died in *November*. I am more ſurprized at *Scaliger*'s approving St. *Jerome*'s Supputation, than at St. *Jerome*'s Miſtake. *Scaliger* ſays, that Father was in the right to reckon 29 Years from the Number 2050 to the Number 2078. He finds alſo 29 Years between the two above mentioned Conſulſhips, but he had done better to find but 28. The firſt of thoſe Conſulſhips falls upon the Year of Chriſt 34, the 20th of *Tiberius*, and the 786th of *Rome*; the other falls upon the Year of Chriſt 62, the 8th of *Nero*, and the 814th of *Rome*, according to *Calviſius*'s Chronology. *Moreri* is not at all exact in this Point. He places the Birth of *Perſius* at the end of the 32 Year of Chriſt, and his Death *when he was 29 Years of Age, in the 9th of* Nero'*s Reign, and the 62d of Chriſt.* To ſay this with any ſhew of Reaſon, he ſhould have added, that he died in the beginning of the 62 Year of the Chriſtian Æra; but then it had been falſe, ſince he died on the 24th of *November*. It is therefore certain, according to *Moreri*'s Supputation, that when *Perſius* died he was near 30 Years old. Beſides, according to *Moreri*, the 32d Year of Chriſt anſwers the 18th of (*c*) *Tiberius*; but it is certain that there are 31 Years from the 18th of *Tiberius* to the 9th of *Nero*: ſo that it would follow that *Perſius* died being 31 Years of Age. The Edition of this Country places his Death in the Year of Chriſt 26. That Miſtake comes from a tranſpoſition of Numbers, which is but too common among Printers. *Auguſtin Oldoini* has committed ſome Childiſh Faults in his Supputation about the Life of *Perſius*.

---

* *Taken from his Life written by Suetonius, as 'tis thought.*

(f) *Id.* Diſcours ſur la Satyre.

(g) Hinc intelligimus Bacchas Neronis ejuſdem argumenti fuiſſe cum Bacchis Euripidis. *Caſaub. in* 1. *Sat. Perſii p.* 142.

(h) Sunt autem Neronis verſus ex ejus Bacchis, cujus carminis etiam Dio nominatim facit mentionem *Id. ib. p.* 140. *Vide etiam p.* 134.

(i) Scripſit ſummo vir ingenio & ſcientia ſingulari Philoſophus artifices omnes opus ſuum adamare, Poetas tamen præcipue. *Menag. Ep. dedic. Carmin.*

(k) Nihil æque doluit, quam ut malum ſe citharœdum increpitum. *Sueton. in Nerone. c.* 41.

(l) *Xiphil. in Nerone.*

(m) *Id. ib. & Tacit. Ann. l.* 15. *c.* 49.

(n) *Tacit. ib.*

(o) *You will find one mentioned in the Rem. (G).*

(p) *Pag.* 23. *tom.* 1. *of the Dutch edit* 1694.

(q) *He ſhould have ſaid* Perſius.

(a) *It is at the end of Suetonius's Treatiſe* de Claris Oratoribus.

(b) *Joan. Bond. in Perſ. Sat.* 1. *p. m.* 24.

(c) *He ſays in the Article of* Tiberius *that that Emperor died in the 23d Year of his Reign, and the 37th of Chriſt.*

Panegyriſts may (F) ſay what they will, it is certain that he wrote harſhly and obſcurely. He might be called (G) the *Lycophron* of the *Latins*. *Scaliger* the Father, and many other excellent Criticks † ſpeak very ill of him. Perhaps they run into an Extreme, which is leſs tolerable than if they had a great Eſteem for that Poet. *Note*, that the Hardneſs of the Time wherein he lived (GΔ) can be no Excuſe for the

fier. He (d) ſays he was born in the *Year* of *Rome* 785, and died being 28 Years of Age, under the 8th Year of *Nero's* Empire. He pretends that the Time of his Birth anſwers the 202d Olympiad, and the 22d Year of *Tiberius's* Reign. Conſult *Calviſius*, and you'll ſee that the 1ſt Year of the 202d Olympiad is the 782th Year of *Rome*, and that the 8th Year of *Nero* is the 815 of *Rome*, and that there are but 28 Years between the 22d of *Tiberius* and the 8th of *Nero*.

Mr. *Marais* has acquainted me in a Letter, that Mr. *Geſner* places the Death of *Perſius* in the 203d Olympiad, in the Year 783 of *Rome*, and in the 22d of *Tiberius's* Empire.

(F) *His Panegyriſts.*] I reckon *Iſaac Caſaubon* (e) amongſt 'em. I grant that the Praiſes he beſtows upon *Perſius*, are not ſo great as thoſe of *Quintilian* and *Martial*, for he intermixes them with ſome Cenſures; but after all he acknowledges that *Perſius* was a Man of great Merit and Parts, and makes himſelf his Champion againſt the Great *Julius Scaliger*, tho' at the ſame time he humbles himſelf with great reſpect at the Feet of that terrible Antagoniſt. I ſhall only mention that part of the Diſpute, which concerns the Obſcurity of our Poet. *Caſaubon* wonders that *Scaliger* ſpoke of it more than once, conſidering that nothing was obſcure to him; but it ſeems to me that he falls into the Sophiſm, which Logicians call *Ignorationem Elenchi*, and which is not leſs common amongſt Criticks than amongſt Philoſophers. *Scaliger* pretended not that *Perſius* was obſcure to him; on the contrary (f) he declares, that he underſtood him from the beginning to the end: he only ſays, that Poet was formerly placed in the number of things that were unknown, and charges him with Impertinency, for having Written to be read, and not to be underſtood. He ſeems to inſult over him, becauſe the Interpreters have fruſtrated his Expectation, by removing the Darkneſs he had deſignedly ſpread over all his Writings, to be eternally buried in it, and eternally admired by Fools.

Omnia (g) enim ſtolidi magis admirantur amantque
Inverſis quæ ſub verbis latitantia cernunt.

The Encomiums which *Quintilian* and *Martial* beſtow upon him, put me in mind of thoſe which are beſtowed upon two of our *French* Poets. (h) "It "is not the Quantity of a Man's Works that makes "him Immortal. Two Sheets of Paper have tranſmitted *Perſius* to us: The Abbot *de Cериſi* will "live longer only by his *Metamorphoſis of* Phillis's "*Eyes into Stars*, than many Authors who take up "a great deal of room in our Libraries, and the "*Temple* (i) *of Death* will more eaſily break thro' "the rigour of Time, than the ſix hundred Volumes of Biſhop *du Bellay*.„ Which does pretty well agree with theſe two Latin Verſes;

Sæpius (k) in libro memoratur Perſius uno,
Quam levis in tota Marſus Amazonide;

and with theſe Words of *Quintilian*, (l) *Multum & veræ gloriæ quamvis uno libro Perſius meruit.*

(G) *The* Lycophron *of the Latins.*] I have read ſomewhere (m), that the Senſe of the troubleſome Volumes of the *Thalmudiſts* "is ſo unknown to us, "out of Envy to their Succeſſors, that their Books "might be cut and tore with better reaſon than "the Satyrs of *Perſius* were by a Father of the "Church, who ſaid, that ſince he would not be "underſtood by the Out-ſide, as other Writers are, "he would ſee whether he was more intelligible in "the In-ſide.„ Here is another Paſſage wherein *Lycophron* and *Perſius* are coupled together. (n) "For my part I think that *Trithemius* his Book "ſhould be Sawn into two, as ſome Body Sawed "formerly *Lycophron's Caſſandra*, to ſee what there "was in the In-ſide, ſince nothing could be known "of it by the Out-ſide. Or, as it is alſo reported "of St. *Jerome*, that he did the like with the Satyrs of *Perſius*, whoſe Enigms and Obſcurities "being not able to underſtand, *intellecturis (o) ignibus ille dedit.*„ I would have this laſt Story and the others alſo, to be well warranted; for I ſee that *Caſaubon* relies upon St. *Jerome's* Teſtimony, to refute thoſe who cenſure *Perſius* (p).

Here is another Obſervation which Mr. *Marais* has imparted to me. The Elogy of *John Bond's* Commentary is to be found in a place where no Body would look for it; *viz.* in the Preface (q) to the *Aloiſiæ Sigeæ Toletanæ Satyra Sotadica*. The Words which contain that Elogy, contain alſo a Deſcription of *Perſius's* Obſcurity; *Gratulerie tibi, Aule Perſi, Obvolviſti te ipſe cæca nocte, videri nolebas, altam verſibus & verſuum ſenſibus profudiſti caliginem. Nolebas intelligi: forte & tu te non intelligebas. Non fecerant ad te nox & caligo ut exturbaret;* Joannes Bond *venit, vidit, diſcuſſit noctem & caliginem. Perſpectum id omne habet, ut tute ſuperis,* quod latet arcanâ non enarrabile fibrâ. *Eripuit tibi te neganti conſpectum. Latebas intra te, ne te curioſa & erudita inveniret ſagacitas. Eras ipſe involucrum tibi. Quis vero fuit furor ille tuus!* That Commentary of *John Bond* upon *Perſius* was printed a Year after the Death of the Author, by the Care of *Roger Prowſe* his Son-in-Law. I have the *London* Edition of 1614. If it be the firſt, as I think it is, we may know that *John Bond* died in the Year 1613. The *Diarium* of Mr. *Witte* ſays nothing of it.

(GΔ) *Can be no excuſe for the obſcurity of his Stile.*] I am ſorry I cannot be of the opinion of the Author, who has afforded me two Paſſages, the reading whereof is ſo agreeable. "I know very "well, *ſays he*, that *Perſius* is not at firſt very intelligible, and that he might have expreſt himſelf more clearly; but how could he do it under "*Nero's* Reign? He was a terrible Man, and could "not bear a Jeſt; and becauſe he had more reaſon "than any Body elſe to think he was concerned "in the ſharpeſt and moſt ingenious part of a Satyr, if there had been the leaſt colour for it, I "am not ſurprized to ſee that *Perſius* affected to be "Enigmatical and Myſterious. Therefore when *Julius Scaliger* called him *Doctus Febricitans*, 'tis likely he did not mind what he ſaid; and I am ſure "this proud and terrible Critick would have been "ſeized with a violent ſhivering, at the meer ſight "of *Nero*. Nay, I admire the Boldneſs of *Perſius* "in venturing once to ridicule that Emperor; for "theſe Words *Auriculas aſini Mida Rex habet*, were "put in on purpoſe for him. *Perſius* had been "undone, if the wiſe and diſcreet *Cornutus* had "not ſuppreſt the proper Name, and ſubſtituted in "the room of it a Word which concerns all Mankind. Nay, I cannot apprehend how that Philoſopher, who was baniſhed ſince by the Tyrant, "becauſe he could not in Conſcience approve the "Deſign of his Poem, ſuffered his Diſciple to expoſe himſelf, by producing with a malicious "deſign, the *Torva Mimalloneis, &c.* as a Model "of moſt excellent Verſes.„ Here are two Obſervations upon that Paſſage.

I. It is evident to any one who reads *Perſius* attentively, that he is Obſcure, not out of Policy, but becauſe he had ſuch a Taſte, and had given ſuch a Turn to his Genius; for if the Fear of bringing himſelf into Trouble had moved him to cover his Conceptions with a thick Cloud, he would have done it only in ſuch Matters as had ſome relation to the Life of the Tyrant. But we ſee that he twiſts his Words, and has recourſe to Alluſions and Enigmatical Figures, even when he is about to inſinuate only a Moral Maxim, the cleareſt Explication whereof could not have afforded *Nero* the leaſt pretence of being Angry with him. I ſhall give no Examples of it, and I refer my Readers to the very Satyrs of that Poet; they make but a little Book; every Body will be able to know in a little time whether I am in the right, or whether I am miſtaken. But if any one had rather not be at that trouble, and refer himſelf to the Judgment of a Learned Critick, he needs go no farther. Here is the Sentence. (b) *Obſcuritatis hujus diverſas afferre cauſſas poſſumus, eaſque certiſſimas: in auctore ſunt aliquæ, aliæ extra illum, quædam in interpretibus. Non negabo perobſcura quædam eſſe in quarta, prima quoque: ſed poëtæ facilè ignoſco, cum cogito crudeliſſimi &* [illegible] *tyranni, in quem illa erant, metu, de induſtria* the Obſcurity of his Stile, as ſome pretend. Some *Italian* (*H*) Genealogiſts will have it that the *Falconcini* of *Volterra* draw their Original from his Father.

---

† See the Preface of Mr. Baillet n. 1168.

(d) Athenæ Ligust. p. 80, 81.

(e) In the Prolegomena of the Commentary he publiſhed upon that Author at Paris in 8. in the year 1605. It was reinſerted in the Edition of Juvenal and Perſius in Holland 1695 in 4.

(f) Perſii ſtilus moroſus, & ille ineptus qui cum legi vellet quæ ſcripſiſſet, intelligi noluit quæ legerentur, quamquam nunc à nobis omnia intelliguntur. At fuit tempus cum inter ignota haberetur. *Jul. Cæſar Scaliger Poetic. l. 6. cap. 6. p. m. 772. See alſo c. 97. of the 3d Book, p. 343.*

(g) *Lucret. l. 1. v. 642.*

(h) Guerre des Auteurs p. 139.

(i) Mr. Habert of the French Academy is the Author of it.

(k) *Mart. Epig. 29. l. 4.*

(l) *Quintil. l. 10. c. 1.*

(m) *In the 1ſt Tome of the* Conferences du Bureau de Adreſſe.

(n) Vigenere, Traité des Chiffres, *p.* 12.

(o) *Ex Ovidio Triſt. l. 4 eleg.* 10.

(p) *Certe aliud Quintilianus judicabat cum vera laude dignum pronunciaret, aliud Hieronymus cum diſertiſſimum fatuicum vocaret. Caſaub. ub. ſup.*

(q) *The Preface of my Edit. of Aloiſiæ, &c. Satyra Sotadica does not contain what Mr. Marais found in his.*

(a) *Epiſtle before the Tranſlation of Father* Tarteron.

(b) *Caſaub. in prolegomenis ad Perſ. fol. m. c. ij.*

PERSONA (*Chriſtopher*) a *Roman* by Birth, and † Prior of the Convent of *Saint ‡ Balbina*, of the Order α of the *Gulielmites*, upon Mount *Aventine*, was a conſiderable Man in the XV. Century, for his Skill in the *Greek* Tongue. 'Tis ſaid that * he went into *Greece* to learn it. He tranſlated *Agathias* and ſome (*A*) other Authors into Latin. We are told ‡ that he died of the Plague in the Year 1486. *Voſſius* ſpeaks of him (*B*) with the greateſt Contempt. Yet ſome ſtrive who ſhall have him; the *Auguſtins* will have him to be one of their Order; but the *Servites* claim him, and place him in the Catalogue of their Authors §.

PETAVIUS (*Dionyſius*), in *French*, *Petau*, born at *Orleans* in the Year 1583, entred into the Society of the Jeſuits in the Year 1605. He taught Rhetorick in their College at *Paris*, and then Divinity ‡ with an extraordinary Capacity. He was one of the moſt Learned Men in *Europe*. I ſhall not give the Character of his vaſt and deep Learning, for it may be found in a new β Book ſold by all the Bookſellers. One may conſult alſo γ the Funeral Oration of that Jeſuit, written in *Latin* by *Henricus Valeſius*, and read in the δ *Gallia Orientalis* a large Collection of ſeveral things which have been ſaid of him, with the Titles of moſt of his Works, and the Time wherein they were Printed. The Titles and Dates of moſt of them are alſo to be found in *Moreri*'s Dictionary. Mr. *Baillet* has collected Abundance of Things

ſtria atramenti ſepiarum aliquid eſſe affuſum : neque dubito ſapientiſſimum præceptorum Cornutum ſcribenti adſuiſſe, qui vetus verbum crebro illi inſuſurraret, Σκότισον . . . . . Cum ſcribit idem [illegible], *verecundiæ virginalis Parthenium noſtrum fuiſſe : aliud agens cauſſam nos docet cur ille locus tenebricoſè fuerit tractatus, cui vix alius toto libro obſcuritate par, obſcœnitate ſimilis nullus.* [illegible] *illum dico è quarta.* At ſi unctus ceſſes. *Etiam illud ultro concedimus, nonnulla Perſii loca tropis parum uſitatis & audacioribus eſſe offuſcata, hujus quoque non culpam, ſed cauſſam, ita enim dicere æquius, ingenio poëtæ aſſignamus : quod cum eſſet magnum, magna ſectabatur. . . . . .* (*c*) *Fuit præterea Flaccus noſter à* [illegible] *non, ſed amans brevitatis : quæ res obſcuritatem eſt ubi illum reddit.* *Caſaubon* aſcribes the Obſcurity of *Perſius* to four Cauſes. 1. He was afraid of *Nero*. 2. He was Modeſt. 3. He had a great Genius. 4. He loved Brevity. Why ſhould theſe four Cauſes be reduced to the firſt, in the Preface of the New Tranſlation?

II. This Author having ſaid, that *Perſius* expreſt himſelf obſcurely, becauſe he was afraid of *Nero*, ſhould not ſuppoſe that the *Torva Mimalloneis*, &c. were ſome Verſes of that Prince. It is not enough to ſay, that one cannot apprehend how *Cornutus* permitted it; we muſt ſay poſitively that he would not have conſented to it, and that *Perſius* wanted no Corrector. Otherwiſe this will be a monſtrous Diſparity, which ſeems to ſurpaſs all the Caprices and Extravagances of the Minds of Men.

(*H*) *Some Italian Genealogiſts.*] *Francis Stelluti* makes uſe of this Reaſon (*d*) to prove that *Perſius* was born at *Volterra*. 'Tis thought, *ſays he*, by virtue of a Tradition, that the *Falconcini* came from *Flaccus*, a *Roman* Knight, who was *Perſius*'s Father; which is ſo much the more likely, becauſe the Name of *Perſius* was preſerved in that Family, and conſtantly appeared in it for above theſe three hundred Years. But it is anſwered that *Perſius* had no Brother, nor Children; that the Surname of *Flaccus* was to be found in many Cities of *Italy*, and that the noble and illuſtrious Family of *Perſius* has been in *Genoa* above four hundred Years. See the above-mention'd Diſſertation of *Gaſparo Maſſa*. *Hippolitus Landinelli* (*e*) ſays, that they ſhew at *Volterra* a Houſe which is ſuppoſed to be that of *Perſius*.

(*A*) *And ſome other Authors.*] He tranſlated into *Latin* the Hiſtory of the *Goths* written by *Procopius*; but thoſe who ſay, as well as *Paulus* (*f*) *Jovius*, that he did alſo tranſlate the Hiſtory which the ſame *Procopius* wrote concerning the War of the *Perſians*, and that of the *Vandals*, are miſtaken. What he publiſhed of *Procopius* ſhewed the Impoſture (*g*) of *Leonardus Aretinus*, which I have mentioned in another place. He made ſeveral other Tranſlations, he tranſlated *Origen*'s Books (*i*) againſt *Celſus*, 25 Homilies of St. *Chryſoſtom*, ſome Treatiſes of *Athanaſius*, and ſome Treatiſes of *Theophylactus*. Thoſe Tranſlations are not very good; but *Paulus Jovius*, and ſo many other Authors, who ſpeak of him, cannot be excuſed for ſaying nothing of them. Mr. *du Pin* is too much a Gentleman to take it ill that I ſhould ſay, there is ſome Obſcurity in theſe Words of his 1ſt Volume. (*k*) *The Treatiſe of* Origen *againſt* Celſus *is divided into 8 Books, which were publiſhed in* Greek *a great while ago, with the Tranſlation of* Gelenius, *and ſome Notes of* Eſchelius, *and of one* Chriſtopher Perſona, *printed at* Rome *in* 1471, *and ſince very correctly in* England *in the Year* 1658. I obſerve 1. that the Change of *Hoeſchelius* into *Eſchelius* may deceive a Reader; he would be apt to believe that there was a Writer named *Eſchelius*, different from the Learned Man of *Ausburg*, to whom the Publick is beholden for many *Greek* Books. 2. Mr. *du Pin* gives us clearly to underſtand that *Perſona* made no Tranſlation of that Book of *Origen*, but only ſome Notes to explain it. But *Geſnerus* (*l*) tells us, that *Perſona* dedicated to *Sixtus* IV. his *Latin* Verſion of the Eight Books of *Origen* againſt *Celſus*. 3. The Meaning of Mr. *du Pin*'s Words is, that thoſe Books were printed at *Rome* in 1471, in *Greek*, with *Gelenius*'s Tranſlation, and ſome Notes of *Eſchelius* and *Perſona*. Which ought not to be ſaid, for *Gelenius* lived in the XVI. Century, and the *Greek* Edition with *Gelenius*'s Tranſlation came out only in 1605. It was a Preſent of *Hoeſchelius*.

I ſhall ſet down here a good Supplement which Mr. *Simon* affords me. The Printers have committed two great Miſtakes in it, by putting the Year 1581 inſtead of the Year 1481 (*m*), and *Suſchelius* inſtead of *Hoeſchelius*. " (*n*) We learn from *Theodorus Gaza*, " (1) that Pope *Nicolas* V. ſent a Man on purpoſe to " *Conſtantinople*, to fetch the Books which he writ " againſt *Celſus*, and that as ſoon as he receiv'd " 'em, he promiſed a good Reward to any one that " would Tranſlate them into *Latin*. But the Pope " being dead, they were not printed at *Rome* in " *Latin* only, but in the Year 1581, under *Sixtus* " IV. *Gaza* who expected not the ſame Reward " from *Sixtus*, as from his Predeceſſor, ingaged " *Chriſtopher Perſona*, Prior of St. *Balbina*, to tran" ſlate 'em into *Latin*, and we have had no other " Tranſlation of 'em till *Suſchelius* publiſhed them " in *Greek* and *Latin* at *Ausburg*, upon ſome other " *Greek* MSS. which he found in ſome Libraries of " *Germany*. Laſtly, *Spencer* an *Engliſh* Proteſtant, " publiſhed a very fine Edition of them at *Cambridge* in 1658, which does not differ from that " of *Ausburg*, becauſe he had no *Greek* MSS. He " was contented to correct the Tranſlation in ſome " places, and to add ſome new Notes to it. "

(*B*) Voſſius *ſpeaks of him with the greateſt contempt.*] The Publication of *Procopius*'s *Greek*, ſays he, was a Preſent ſo much the more conſiderable, becauſe they had at that Time but ſome ſorry Tranſlations of it. He adds, that the moſt impertinent *Chriſtopher Perſona* omitted many things, and publiſhed his Dreams, rather than the Thoughts of that Hiſtorian. (*a*) *Eſtque hoc egregii viri* (Davidis Heſchœlii) *beneficium eo majus, quod Latini interpretes toties abeant à Græcis : imprimis ineptiſſimus ille Chriſtophorus Perſona quatuor rerum Gothicarum libros vertit; ſi vertiſſe, & non pervertiſſe dici is debet, qui multa adeo omittit, & in iis, quæ refert, toties nobis ſua narrat ſomnia.* I have obſerved in another Place a Miſtake of *Voſſius*, which *Sandius* his Critick took no notice of. *Voſſius* ſays (*c*), that *Leonardus Aretinus* having aſcribed to himſelf a Book of *Procopius*,

---

† Jov. Elog. c. 119.

‡ Geſner. in his Bibliotheca ſays St. Albina.

α Id. ib.

* Konig. Biblioth. Vet. & nova.

§ Id. ib.

‡ Baillet Jugemens tom. 3. n. 812.

‡ Proſper. Mandoſius Biblioth. Romana cent. 1. n. [illegible] p. 57.

* Alegambe. Bibl. Scriptor. Societ. p. 95.

β The Elogies of Illuſtrious Men by Perrault, tom. 1. p. 63. & ſeq. of the Dutch edit. 1698.

γ It is in the Lives of Illuſtrious Men collected by William Bats, and printed in London 1681.

δ P. 217. & ſeq.

(c) Id. ib. fol. c. iij.

(d) The Life of Perſius before the Italian Paraphraſe on the ſame Poet.

(e) Nell' Origine di Luni c. 11. ap. Mich. Juſtiniani Scritt. Liguri p. 128.

(f) Jov. Elog. c. 9.

(g) Id. ib. & c. 116.

(i) Geſn. Biblioth.

(k) Du Pin, Bibl. of Eccleſ. Writers tom. 1. p. 133. of the Dutch Edit.

(l) Geſn. Biblioth. fol. 167. verſo.

(m) I ſuppoſe Mr. Simon had written 1481, and not as Mr. du Pin did 1471.

(n) Simon, choice Letters, p. 94. Edit. 1700.

(1) Theod. Gaza Epiſt. ad Chriſtoph. Perſon.

(a) Voſſ. de Hiſt. Gr. p. 259, 270. See alſo de Arte Hiſt. p. 94.

(c) Voſſius de Hiſt. Lat. p. 558.

Things which concern that Great Author. See the 3d Volume of his *Jugemens des Savans*, cap. 513, and the 4th Volume, cap. 951, and the 5th Volume about the Poets, cap. 1474. It is enough for me to have directed the Reader to those Books. I shall only add 1. that *Petavius* died at *Paris* ‡ on the 11th of *December* * 1652, thirteen Weeks after *Salmasius* (*A*) his Antagonist. 2. That without thinking on't, and against his Intention, he did (*B*) a great Service to the *Socinians*. 3. That it

it moved *Persons to translate Agathias*. He should have said, That it moved him to translate that Book of *Procopius* into *Latin*. (*d*) *Procopium Latine loquentem fecit, non dubie in Leonardum Aretinum conflata invidia, qui suppresso Græci authoris nomine Gothicum bellum tanquam è variis scriptoribus decerptum pro suo Juliano Cæsarino Cardinali qui ad Varnam ab Amurathe cæsus periit, nullo pudore nuncuparat.* *Vossius*, who quotes that Passage, has thereby given himself up to his Criticks.

(*A*) *After* Salmasius *his Antagonist.*] They had a very long and very violent Dispute: it had not been possible to couple two better Wrestlers together. 'Tis pity they did not write with more moderation. Their first Quarrel began, if I am not mistaken, a little after *Salmasius* had published his Commentary upon *Tertullian's* Treatise *de Pallio*, in the Year 1622. *Petavius* criticized that Commentary under the false Name of *Antonius Kercoëtius Aremoricus* (*e*). He was answered in a Book printed (*f*) in the Year 1622, and intitled *Confutatio animadversorum Antonii Kercoëtii ad Claudii Salmasii notas in Tertullianum de pallio. Auctore Francisco Franco J. C.* He replied in a Book divided into three Parts, the first whereof was printed at *Paris* in the Year 1622; and the other two one after another the next Year in the same City. The first is intitled *Antonii Kerkoëtii Aremorici Mastigophorus primus, sive elenchus confutationis quam Claudius Salmasius sub ementito nomine animadversis Kerkoëtianis opposuit.* The second, *Antonii Kerkoëtii Aremorici Mastigophorus secundus, sive elenchi confutationis .... pars secunda*; and the Third, *Antonii Kerkoëtii Aremorici Mastigophorus tertius, sive elenchi confutationis ..... pars tertia.* I don't know whether his Reply was refuted, but I know that ever since that first Irruption, he never ceased to look for his Adversary, and to fight him where-ever he found him. Those who know *Salmasius*'s Temper, do easily fancy that he defended himself, and attackt his Adversary in his turn. He made some very fine *Latin* Verses, which *Menagius* inserted in one of his Books, as I have observed in another Place, and which run upon a thing which has been said of Apes. *Scaliger* used the same Comparison, not only against *Lydiat*, but also against *Scioppius*. *Scioppius*, says he (*i*), *scripsit adversus Jesuitas: he goes up too high, and makes himself as ridiculous as an Ape, who the higher he goes, the more he shews his Back-side.* The Author of the Apology for *Stephen Pasquier* against *Garasse*, made use of the *Latin* Verses of *Salmasius* without naming him; he made a kind of a Paraphrase upon them, and alledged some of 'em as they are. Here is the Passage: (*k*) "They tell a pleasant Story "of a Monkey, which I may very well apply to "*Garasse's* Humour and Actions, which are meer "Apish Tricks. One Day an old Monkey without "Hair, but stuffed with Malice in the In-side, posted up Bills in all the Cross-Streets of the Commonwealth of Apes and Baboons, to give notice "that whoever desired to see a fine Show, should "come to a certain Place, at a certain Hour, and "that he would afford them good Sport. The Day "being come, every one makes himself ready, great "and little Monkeys, Apes and Baboons come from "all Parts in Crowds to the appointed Place: Such "a Concourse was never seen before.

" *Conveniunt omnes, Cercopitheci, Simiæ,*
" *Clurinæ pecudes, omne genus Cercopium:*
" *Quæ sunt caudatæ, quæ sine caudis ambulant,*
" *Similes hominibus bestiæ turpissimæ.*
" *Erat inter illos ingens expectatio:*
" *Quidnam editurus, & miri novi foret,*
" *Tam grandium Minator ille* SIMIUS.

"Every one takes his Place, and they staid a great "while for the Farce-Player; at last, after he had "kept 'em at a Bay a matter of four or five Hours, "he comes, and gets up a Tree, which was to "serve him instead of a Stage, he skips from "Bough to Bough, comes down, goes up again, "gets up to the top of the Tree, comes down again; and lastly, after so many turns, he stops "and shews his Back-side to the Assembly, to ridicule, by such an Action, those who trusted the "Promises of a Monkey. *Poggius* says, that a "certain Jack-Pudding plaid the same Trick in "the City of *Bologna*, but *Garasse* affords us a new "Example of it.... The Story mention'd by *Poggius* was applied to *Laurentius Valla*, and perhaps *Menagius* would have alledged it, if he had remembered it. Here is the Story with its Application: (*l*) *Persimilis est* Valla *noster homini ridiculo: qui cum aliquando se ex quadam turri volaturum certo die profiteretur: & populus ad id spectaculum convenisset: homines Suspensos variis alarum ostentationibus ad vesperam usque detinuit. Deinde omnibus volatum cupide expectantibus: populo culum ostendit. Ita Laurentius noster post multas atque ingentes verborum pollicitationes; post tantam expectationem promissorum: tandem non quidem culum, ut ille, sed volantis cerebri insaniam, & pergrandem ignorantiæ supellectilem ostendit.*

It cannot be denied that *Petavius* shewed too much Passion and Haughtiness, not only against *Salmasius*, but also against *Scaliger* and many others. It was well done to insert a Parenthesis upon that Subject, in the Article of that Jesuit, in the *Dutch* Edition of *Moreri*. I wonder Mr. *Perrault* chose rather to Paraphrase a Passage out of *Henr. Valesius's* Harangue, than suppress it. (*m*) *Tanta ejus viri* (Scaligeri) *auctoritas omnium prope præjudicio roborata Petavium nostrum à scribendo minime deterruit. Immo vero ipsum eo magis impulit, ut quæ ab illo emendatore temporum peccata fuerant, ipse in suis de doctrina temporum libris emendaret. Non quod illius viri gloriæ obtrectaret; sed ne plerique forte auctoritate Scaligeri inducti, minime discussa rei veritate, in errorem præcipites laberentur.* 'Tis what *Henricus Valesius* says, and here are Mr. *Perrault's* Words: (*n*) *That Work of* Scaliger *was looked upon as a Rule to which every Body was to conform. Which hindred not* Petavius *from undertaking the same Work, and correcting in his Book* de Doctrina temporum *many Faults which are to be found in* Scaliger's de Emendatione temporum, *which he did, observing all the Rules of Civility which Scholars ought to observe one towards another; so that without obscuring the Glory of his Predecessor, he acquired a very great one in the same Science.* If you read (*o*) a Passage of Mr. *Morus* and another of *Guy Patin*, you will not have so good an opinion of the Civil Behaviour of *Scaliger's* Adversary.

(*B*) *Without thinking on't .... he did a great service to the* Socinians.] I shall transcribe a long Passage of Mr. *Simon*, which concerns that Subject, and contains some other things relating to *Petavius*. (*a*) "Mr. *Hardy* told me that Mr. *de l'Aubespine* had also some difference with *Petavius*, "and threatned him to cause some of his Notes "upon St. *Epiphanius* to be condemned; but I am "perswaded, that that Learned Jesuit would have "made a very good Apology for himself. If there "be any thing to blame in *Petavius's* Works, 'tis "especially in the second Volume of his *Dogmata* "*Theologica*, wherein he seems to favour the *Arians*: "It is true, that he has softened those Passages in "his Preface; but because the Body of the Book remains intire, and the Preface which is an excellent Piece came too late, he has not altogether "remedied the Harm which that Book may do at "this time, wherein the New *Unitarians* boast, "that *Petavius* has given over the Tradition to "them. I have seen some Persons here, who believe that *Grotius*, who kept Correspondence with "*Crellius*, and some other *Socinians*, imposed upon that Learned Jesuit; but it is not at all likely "that so understanding a Man as *Petavius* should "have been deceived by *Grotius* who was his Friend. "It is more likely that he ingenuously wrote his "own Thoughts. It would be for the honour of "the Society to continue the *Dogmata Theologica* of "their Brother, and to follow his Method, which "is an excellent one. It is certain, that he himself had such a Design; for I have seen the Project he made about it, whereby I knew the Course "he it has been ſaid the *Jeſuits* were very much diſpleaſed with his Way of ſpeaking (C) of St. *Auguſtin's* Hypotheſis concerning Grace. 4. That his *Dogmata Theologica*, which were very dear and ſcarce, have been lately reprinted † at *Amſterdam*, with ſeveral Treatiſes added to them.

---

‡ The Parisian Gazett. Decemb. 14. 1652. where it is observed amongst other Elogies that he was demanded by several Princes, especially by Urban VIII but that he refused that honour as much out of modesty as out of obedience to Lewis XIII. who thought it was for the good and glory of his Kingdom to keep so great a Man in it.

* *And not of Novem. as Father* Labbe *says, Chronol. Franc. tom. 5. p.* 894.

(*d*) *Jovius Elog. cap.* 115. *p.* 253

(*e*) *That Critical Answer intitled* Animadversorum Liber *was printed at* Rhenes *in the Year* 1622. *in* 8

(*f*) *At* Paris, *and not at* Middleburg *as the Title says.*

(*i*) *Scaligerana voce* Scioppius *p. m.* 222.

(*k*) *Apology for* Stephen Pasquier *Book* 1. *Sect.* 7. *p.* 93. *& seq.*

(*l*) *Poggius Invect. l.* 1.

(*m*) *Henr. Valef. in orat. funebri Dionys. Petav. p.* 682. *collect. Batesiana.*

(*n*) *Perrault, Illustrious Men, tom.* 1. *p. m.* 65, 66.

(*o*) *See the new Letters against* Maimbourg *p.* 182.

(*a*) *Simon, choice Letters p.* 12, *&* 13.

PETIT

“ he followed in his Studies, wherewith I ſhall perhaps acquaint you in another Letter. A Friend of mine aſſured me, that he was not accounted a great Divine amongſt the Jeſuits, and that he was often obliged to have recourſe to ſome other Fathers of his Society, when the Queſtion was about a Theological Reaſoning. Many of (a) ours ſay the ſame of Father *Morin*, who is really a poor Man for the Reaſoning part. But whatever may be ſaid of *Petavius* in his Society, I admire him in all reſpects. Can any thing be more Charming than his fine *Latin* Stile in ſuch thorny Subjects? I only wiſh he had not been ſo diffuſe in his Expreſſions. An Author can never be too conciſe when he treats of ſome Doctrines; he ought to avoid long Phraſes as much as he can: 'Tis what Father *Sirmond* excelled moſt in, who found out the Secret of explaining himſelf in few Words, and with great clearneſs. Yet he was very much inferiour to *Petavius* as to Learning.„ Mr. *Simon* is in the right to ſay, that the Preface of *Petavius* was not a good Remedy; for the *Socinians* and new *Arians* have, notwithſtanding, taken advantage of the Collections of that Jeſuit, about the Tradition of the three firſt Centuries. Thoſe Collections encouraged *Sandius* to write a Book, which vexed the Orthodox and gave them a great deal of Exerciſe. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (b) in the Abſtract of one of Dr. *Bull's* Books. See alſo Mr. *Jurieu's Tableau du Socinianiſme, pag.* 224, *and* 263. But obſerve that that Miniſter deſigning to take advantage of *Petavius's* Teſtimony, falſified it, and that the Biſhop of *Meaux* took him up for it. This I am going to prove.

(c) *Laſtly the Theology* of the ancient Fathers, ſays Mr. *Jurieu*, *was ſo imperfect* about the Doctrine of the Trinity, *that the Jeſuit* Petavius *was forced to own in expreſs Words, that they gave us* (1) only the firſt Lineaments of it. Here is the Biſhop of *Meaux's* Anſwer. “ (d) Now how can you truſt your Miniſter when he quotes ſome Paſſages? No, my Brethren, he does not read them, or he reads them curſorily; he looks for Difficulties in them, and not for Solutions, that he may thereby perplex your Minds, inſtead of inſtructing you, and he omits nothing to impoſe upon you. As when to make you believe, (2) *that the Theology of the Fathers was imperfect* about the Myſtery of the Trinity, he makes *Petavius* ſay *in expreſs Words, that they gave us only the firſt Lineaments of it.* But that Learned Author ſays the contrary in the Place quoted by the Miniſter, which is the Preface to the 2d Volume of his *Dogmata Theologica.* For he (3) undertakes to prove, that the Catholick Doctrine was always the ſame about that Subject; and in the very firſt Chapter of that Preface he ſhews, that the *main and ſubſtance of that Myſtery* was always very well known by Tradition; that the Fathers of the firſt Centuries *agree with us in the main, in the ſubſtance, and in the thing itſelf, tho' not always in the manner of expreſſing it:* Which he further proves in the ſecond (4) Chapter by the Teſtimony of St. *Ignatius*, St. *Polycarp*, and all the ancient Doctors: Laſtly, in the third (5) Chapter which the Miniſter objects to us ſpeaking of St. *Juſtin*, who of all the Ancients is moſt ſuſpected by Mr. *Jurieu*, that Learned Jeſuit ſays poſitively, that that Holy Martyr *has excellently and clearly propoſed the main and ſubſtance of that Myſtery:* which he proves alſo (6) of *Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus*, and others, *who all believed*, as he ſays, *the main and ſubſtance of that Doctrine without any ſpot*; from whence he concludes, that if there are ſome Paſſages more obſcure in the Writings of thoſe Holy Men, it is becauſe having to do *with Heathens and Philoſophers, they declared not with the greateſt ſubtility and Preciſion the Secret of that Myſtery in the Books which they publiſhed; and in order to gain thoſe Philoſophers, they explained it in a manner more agreeable to* Platoniſm, *which they had learned; as it was likewiſe practiſed for a long time after in the Catechiſms that were made to inſtruct thoſe whom they had a mind to bring over to Chriſtianity, to whom they gave only in the Beginning the firſt Strokes*, or as the Miniſter renders it, *the firſt Lineaments of the Myſteries:* Not but that they were well known, but becauſe it was believed thoſe weak Souls could not bear the whole weight of them; ſo that it was thought fit to introduce them into ſo great a Secret with a caution ſuitable to their Weakneſs: This is what that Father ſays *in expreſs Words.* Your Miniſter makes him ſay the quite contrary *in expreſs Words.* He makes him ſay that *their Theology was imperfect*, becauſe he ſays that it was tempered and accommodated to the Capacity of the Ignorant, and he takes for Ignorance in the Maſters the wiſe Temperament which they made uſe of towards their Diſciples.„ The Biſhop of *Meaux* had ſaid before, (e) that *the learned Preface of* Petavius *is the unravelling of all his Doctrine about that Subject.* I think it is as good an unravelling as a moſt Learned Man could give; but it appears notwithſtanding, that that Learned Jeſuit contradicted himſelf, or fell into thoſe perplexing Variations, which all Writers are ſubject to, when they come to have a different Intereſt and different Motives during the courſe of their Writings. He deſigned at firſt, ingenuouſly to repreſent the Doctrine of the three firſt Centuries. He did not Diſguiſe the Opinion of the Fathers, who had falſe Notions of the Myſtery of the Three Perſons. He was contented to ſet down things as they were, and to add to them the moſt natural Explications which the Words were capable of. Whereby he acquainted the Publick, that many Fathers of the Primitive Church had publiſhed very abſurd Falſities about the Generation of the Word, and the Myſteries that are annexed to it. Which ſtrikes at the Authority of the Canons of the Council of *Nice*; for it might be concluded from thence, that the Article of the Trinity is not a Fundamental Doctrine, ſince thoſe who erred in that Point were ſaved notwithſtanding. The new *Anti-Trinitarians* could draw many Conſequences from it. *Petavius* was told of it, and found himſelf obliged to remedy that Evil as well as he could. He therefore made his Preface with ſuch a Deſign, having now a quite different Aim, and quite different Motives; he made it now his buſineſs to aſſert the Orthodoxy of the Fathers, he was oblig'd to give 'em ſatisfaction, in a Word, he was forced to contradict himſelf. Mr. *Jurieu* has undergone the ſame Trial. He wrote a Paſtoral (f) Letter, wherein he uſed his utmoſt endeavours to ruin the Foundation of the *Hiſtory of the Variations.* It was then neceſſary for him that the Fathers ſhould have erred in the moſt important Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith. He therefore depreſſed them as much as he could, and enlarged upon the abſurd Notions they had of the Trinity. He minded only his preſent Intereſt, and was not able to contain himſelf. But ſome time after he had occaſion (g) to oppoſe thoſe who ſay, That the Doctrine of the Trinity is not neceſſary to Salvation, and conſequently that the *Socinians* ought to be tolerated. It was then neceſſary for him that the Fathers ſhould have been Orthodox; he therefore aſſerted their Orthodoxy, and made them whiter than Snow; he ſet up for their Apologiſt, and Panegyriſt, and laſtly, for the Accuſer (h) of thoſe who deſpiſed 'em, and relied upon his Example. This is to banter the Publick, and to expoſe one's ſelf to ſhame: notwithſtanding his Variations, it has been proved to him (i) that he had ſaved the *Socinians* againſt his Will. Compare with this the Remark C of the Article *Rodon.*

(C) *The Jeſuits were very much diſpleaſed with his way of ſpeaking . . . . . of Grace.*] It has been ſaid, that they vexed him ſo much, that he was like to leave their Houſe: But they maintain that it is a meer Story. Let us quote a printed Book. *Dom Denys de Sainte Marthe*, a *Benedictin*, obſerves (a), that 'tis pretended that *Petavius* retracted in the 10th Book of his 1ſt Volume what he had ſaid in the 9th Book, in favour of St. *Auguſtin's* Doctrine. But it has been anſwered (b) that it is falſe, and that “ The Society never gave any trouble to that Learned Old Man upon that Account, and that had they had any ſuch Deſign, they would

---

† In the year 1700. See what Mr. Bernard ſays of it in his Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Aug. 1700. p. 180. & ſeq.

(a) That is the Fathers of the Oratory, for Mr. Simon was amongſt 'em, when he wrote this.

(b) Sept. 1685. in the Catal. of new Books n. 4. See alſo June 1685 art. 2. p. 611. & June 1684 art. 8. p. 399. of the 2d Edit.

(c) Jurieu's 6th Paſtoral Letter of the 3d year p. 134. in 12.

(1) Theol. Dogm. tom. 2. pref. c. 3.

(d) Boſſuet, firſt Advertiſement to the Proteſtants n. 27. & 28. p. 28. of the Dutch Edit.

(2) Lett. VI. p. 45.

(3) Theol. Dogm. tom. II. Praef. c. 1. n. 10, 12.

(4) Ibid. c. 2.

(5) Ibid. c. 3.

(6) Ibid. n. 3.

(e) Boſſuet, ib. n. 25. p. 25.

(f) The 6th of the 3d year, dated the 15th of Novemb. 1688.

(g) See his 6th & 7th Letters of the Tableau du Socinianiſme printed in the year 1690.

(h) See Mr. Saurin's Examination of Mr. Jurieu's Theology p. 670. & ſeq.

(i) See the Book intitled Janua Cœlorum reſerata p. 126. & ſeq.

(a) See the Book intitled How the Benedictin Fathers behaved themſelves ſince their Edition of St. Auguſtin was cenſured p. 55.

(b) Ib. p. 57. & ſeq.

PETIT (*John*) Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Paris*, in the Beginning of the XV. Century, acquired a great Reputation by his Eloquence and Learning; but he made ſometimes an ill uſe of his Talents, to defend ſome bad Cauſes. He ſpoke * for the Univerſity of *Paris* before the King's Council in the Year 1406, to ſhew that Cardinal *de Chalant*, Pope *Benedict's* Legate, complained without reaſon of thoſe who had forſaken their Obedience to that Pope. *His Concluſion was, that their* Withdrawing *ſhould be obſerved and executed for the time to come . . . . . . and the Church of* France *delivered from the Exactions unjuſtly introduced by the Court of* Rome. The King's Council referred that Cauſe to the Parliament. It was pleaded in the *Great Chamber* β the 7th of *June* in the ſame Year. *John Petit* made a long Diſcourſe, and as ſtrong as could be wiſhed. The Parliament gave no Sentence, but were forced γ ſome time after to give one which favoured the Demands of the Univerſity. *John Petit* was in the famous Embaſſy which *France* ſent into *Italy*, for the Pacification of the Schiſm, and ‡ he made a Harangue in *Rome* the 20th of *July* 1407. Every thing goes well hitherto, he makes uſe of his Eloquence in lawful things; but we ſhall ſee by and by that he made an ill uſe of it. The Duke of *Burgundy* having cauſed the Duke of *Orleans*, the King's only Brother, to be aſſaſſinated, was ſo bold as to own that Action, which was an enormous Crime in all (*A*) its Circumſtances. He ‖ returned to *Paris* as it were in Triumph, and demanded Audience to ſhew that he had good Reaſons to cauſe the Duke

“ have taken another Courſe; for inſtead of obliging him to retract himſelf in the 10th Book, “ they would have made him correct the 9th, ſince “ thoſe Books made part of the ſame Volume.„ From whence 'tis concluded, *That* (c) Petavius *never thought of Removing, and that it is but a poor Story contrived by the* Janſeniſts, *Father* de Sainte Marthe *being only their Echo.* What is certain is, that ſome Paſſages of *Petavius*, which favour the Hypotheſis of the *Auguſtinians*, (d) have been cited in the Writings of the *Janſeniſts*, and it has been ſaid that when he wrote againſt *Janſenius's* Friends, he renounced his firſt Opinion. Read this Paſſage of the Hiſtory of *Janſeniſm*: “ (e) *Petavius* . . . . could not “ refuſe to come to the aſſiſtance of his Brethren, “ to defend the Honour and Doctrine of his Society, againſt his own Opinion, and at the coſt of his “ Reputation. He publiſhed at firſt a Treatiſe *de* “ *Lege & Gratia* againſt *Janſenius*, which came out “ in that Year; and then he endeavoured to refute “ what Mr. *Fromond* had written againſt his Diſſer- “ tation concerning Liberty. And that Book came “ out towards the end of the ſame Year, with this “ Title: *Elenchus Theriacæ Vincentii Lenis, ſive Li-* “ *berti Fromondi, Doctoris Lovanienſis. Pariſiis* 1648.„ This happened in the Year 1648, but the following Paſſage concerns the Year 1651. “ (f) *Petavius* “ a Jeſuit, who, after he had taught in his *Dogmata* “ *Theologica* the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin*, as that of “ the Church, which every Body ought to follow, “ renounced it to defend the Intereſt and Opinions “ of his Society, undertook to explain, according “ to *Molina*, St. *Auguſtin's* Diſtinction between that “ Grace, whereby a Man is enabled to do ſome- “ thing, *auxilium quo*, which is an efficacious Grace; “ and between that Grace, without which a Man “ can do nothing, *auxilium ſine quo non*, which is a “ ſufficient Grace. He intitled that Book, *Diſſer-* “ *tatio brevis de Adjutorio* SINE QUO NON & “ *de Adjutorio* QUO; *ad mentem B. Auguſtini.*„

That my Readers may ſee more amply and clearly what the *Anti-Moliniſts* have publiſhed on this Head, I ſhall copy one Paſſage more. “ (g) *Father Petavius* had almoſt a general Knowledge, “ and his Name is famous among the Learned. If “ his Judgment had been anſwerable to his Read- “ ing, thoſe who ſet a greater value on that Part “ of a Man than upon a vaſt Reading, and believe “ that an excellent Man is ſuch a one who can “ judge well of things with an indifferent Learning, “ would be more ſatisfied with his Works than they “ are. 'Tis ſomewhat ſurprizing and incompre- “ henſible to ſee, how in his *Dogmata Theologica*, “ he has delivered up the Fathers of the three firſt “ Centuries to the *Arians*, and how he makes them “ all Favourers of that Hereſy. I am far from “ thinking that he was not a good Catholick, nor “ will I draw from this all the other extravagant “ Conſequences which the *Calviniſts*, the other “ Proteſtants, and the *Socinians* have drawn. I only “ find fault with his Judgment. 'Tis true, that he “ thought to mend his fault in ſome meaſure, by a “ Preface, which the Doctors of the *Sorbonne* oblig- “ ed him to make; but this was only to adminiſter “ the Remedy after the Diſtemper, and not to heal “ it: he ſhould have burnt that unfortunate Work, “ and by that means he would have avoided a great “ deal of Shame. His Judgment appeared no better “ in what he writ about Grace. For being obliged “ by order of his Superiours to retract the *Auguſti-* “ *nian* Doctrine of Grace and Predeſtination, which “ he had embraced and maintained as the Doctrine “ of the Church in the 9th Book of his 1ſt Tome; “ he declared againſt that Doctrine in the 10th, for “ fear he ſhould be conformable to the Adverſaries “ of his Society: but it was without removing the “ foundation which he had laid in the preceding “ Book . . . . . . I don't ſay this to inſult the Author, “ who was certainly a Man of Merit, nor for the “ pleaſure of ſpeaking ſlightingly of a Jeſuit; but “ to ſhew that it is fit to beware of great Book- “ makers and Collectors of Paſſages, and to take “ good heed of not relying on them, without con- “ ſidering, 1. Whether they write with Judgment, “ and give themſelves time to conſider of what “ they Write. 2. Whether they write freely and “ without Intereſt; that is to ſay, whether they are “ not of a Body which profeſſes not to ſuffer cer- “ tain Opinions, and to imbrace others, and which “ obliges every Member blindly to follow the En- “ gagements of the Society, under the pain of *Re-* “ *moving*, as Father *Petavius* told one of his Friends, “ ſhewing the Reaſon of his Change. *I am too old* “ *to Remove*, ſaid he to Mr. *de Marolles*, Abbot of “ *Villeloin.*„

(*A*) *An Enormous Crime in all its Circumſtances.*] I have ſpoken of it in the Article of that Duke, but without mentioning a Fact which does very much aggravate the Enormity of that Murder. The Monk of *St. Denys*, who wrote the Hiſtory of *Charles* VI. which Mr. *le Laboureur* tranſlated into *French*, ſays, that the Princes of the Royal Family no ſooner heard that the *Burgundian* had cauſed the Duke of *Orleans* to be aſſaſſinated, (h) “ but they de- “ teſted ſo execrable a Treaſon, and wiſhed alrea- “ dy, that the Author of it were in the everlaſting “ Torments which the Enormity of his Crime de- “ ſerved. That which ſhewed them better ſtill the “ Blackneſs of the *Burgundian's* Soul, is, that he “ had very lately, not only reconciled himſelf, but “ alſo made an Alliance of Brotherly Friendſhip “ with the Duke of *Orleans*. Beſides, they had “ newly confirmed it both by Letters and Oaths, “ even ſo as to take God to witneſs, and commu- “ nicate together. They ſeemed to be perfectly “ united in the management of the War, which “ they took upon themſelves; they had defended “ one another's Honour in the ill ſucceſs they had: “ it ſeemed that they had but one and the ſame “ Intereſt, and for a greater ſign of Union and Love “ the Duke of *Burgundy* knowing that the Duke of “ *Orleans* his Couſin was indiſpoſed, viſited him “ with all the Marks, I will not ſay of Civility, but “ of Tenderneſs, and even was perſuaded to come “ and dine with him the next Day, which was a “ *Sunday*. The other Princes of the Blood, who knew “ that, could not but conceive an extreme Indig- “ nation for ſo horrible a Proceeding, and there- “ fore they refuſed to hear his Excuſes, they reti- “ red with Tears in their Eyes from the King's “ Council,

---

* *Hiſt. of* Charles VI. *by a Monk of* St. Denys, *tranſlated into French by Mr.* le Laboureur *Book* 26. *c.* 2. *p.* 544.

β *Id. ib. p.* 544.

γ *Id. ib. cap.* 4. *p.* 547.

‡ *Id. Book* 27. *cap.* 15. *p.* 606.

‖ *Id. ib. Book* 27. *cap.* 27. *p.* 631.

(c) *Ib. p.* 58, 59.

(d) *See the Abridged Hiſtory of the Congregation* de auxiliis *p.* 73. & *ſeq.* 1687.

(e) *Hiſt. of* Janſeniſm *tom.* 1. *p.* 247. *ad an.* 1648. *See alſo p.* 377, 378. *ad. ann.* 1650.

(f) *Ib. p.* 505. *ad an.* 1551.

(g) *Notes on the* 3 *Anſwer of the Prince of* Conti *to Father* d'Champs *p.* 74, &c.

(h) *Hiſt. of* Charles VI. *tranſlated into French by Mr.* le Laboureur, *Book* 27. *cap.* 23. *p.* 627.

Duke of *Orleans* to be killed. He chose *John Petit* to be his Orator, a Mercenary (B) Soul and an Instrument of Iniquity, who maintained in the Great Hall of the Royal *Hotel* of St. *Paul*, on the 8th of *March* 1408, that the Murder of that Duke was lawful †. His Plea * was made Publick: The Honour of the Duke of *Orleans* was torn with greater Rage by it, than his Body had been by the Assassines. The Duke's Widow caused it to be refuted by the Abbot of *St. Denis* ‡ who pleaded for her, and for the Memory of the Deceased before the King's Council, with great Eloquence, on the 11th of *September* 1408. The Doctrine of the Duke of *Burgundy*'s Orator was so (C) enormous, and so proper to introduce all manner of Confusion into the State, that it was condemned by the Bishop of *Paris* as soon as the Duke's Faction proved less powerful. The Proxies of that Prince appealed to the Pope,

† *Id. ib.*

* *You will find the Sum Lines of it in the Monk of* St. Denys, *B.* 27. *c.* 23. *and you may see it intire in* Monstrelet, *B.* 1. *c.* 38, 39.

‡ *Id. ib. B.* 28. *c.* 15. *p.* 660, 661.

‖ *See the Rem. D.*

" Council, and the next Day, as he was coming to " the Parliament, they sent him Word to retire." The Widow's Orator (i) did very much insist upon these Circumstances. Observe here how Humane Nature can joyn in the same Soul the Baseness of Hypocrisy with the most insolent Boldness. There was never a Prince more Haughty nor more Courageous than the Duke *John* of *Burgundy*; he was Surnamed *Without Fear*. Nevertheless, what a shameful Craft and Dissimulation don't we find in his Conduct? Here is an Instance of it. He repaired to the Church whether the Body of the Duke of *Orleans* was brought. (k) *He pretended to be as much afflicted as any Body else, he put on Mourning afterwards, as all the Princes did, and was not ashamed to assist with them at the Funeral Pomp in the Church of the* Celestins, *where that Duke, when alive, desired to be buried.* He pulled off his Mask only when he saw (l) that the King's Council was upon the Point of ordering that *Robert de Canni*, suspected of (m) the Murder, should be Imprisoned.

(B) *A Mercenary Soul and an Instrument of Iniquity.*] The greatest Blot in the Reign of *Charles* VI. is the Triumphant Impunity of the Duke of *Orleans*'s Assassin: but it is not so much a Blot in the King, as in his Kingdom; for most times that unhappy Prince had not the use of his Reason, he was not therefore answerable for the Disorders of the State. The *French* Nation is to blame: The *French* did not support and joyn with the Princes who desired to take Vengeance of that Crime; they were divided, and so made the Party of the Assassin more formidable than the other. The City of *Paris*, where the King's only Brother was massacred, is most of all to blame, for having left that Crime unpunished; the *Burgundian* would have been treated according to the Exigency of the Case, if that City had desired it. It would be a peice of Unjustice to tax the University of *Paris*, because one of their Professors of Divinity was so wicked, as to undertake to make an Apology for that Murder; for they approved not the ill Principles of that furious Declaimer, and seconded the Bishop who condemned them authentically, as soon as he could do it safely. 'Tis what we shall see in the next Remark. Before I make an end of this, I must observe, that *John Petit* was very sure of the Peoples Approbation, when he engaged in the Defence of so detestable a Cause; besides, he knew that he should speak for a Prince whom the King himself dreaded. It is certain that *Charles* VI. (a) sent the Count *de St. Paul* to the *Burgundian*, *to offer him a publick Audience, with Impunity as to himself, and the only thing that was demanded of him, was, that he should deliver up the Assassines, that they might be tried according to Law; but he sent him back very much disappointed, seeing the King was obliged to treat with Honour about the reparation of an Action that was more than wicked, and to send to him the Duke of* Berry, *and the King of* Sicily *at* Amiens. *The noble Duke of* Bourbon *was named to be one of that Embassy, but he generously excused himself, he would not so much as stay at Court, he desired leave to retire into his House, and chose rather to part with the share he had in the Government, than to give his consent to compound with the State, for the Murder of his Nephew; and therefore he said openly, and at several times, as I have been informed, That he would never see with a good Eye the Author of so base and villanous a Treachery.* Those two Considerations, I mean the People's Favour, and the Credit of the Duke of *Burgundy*, cannot excuse the Advocate. The Reason why the People did not much care that the Assassin should be punished, was the Hatred they had conceived against the Duke of *Orleans*, who was the Author of many Taxes. Hence it is, that they rejoyced at his Death, and applauded the Duke of *Burgundy*; so true it is that Men are more tender of their private Interest, than of the Fundamental Laws of the State. (b) *Ita nimirum publica mala sentimus quantum ad privatas res pertinent: nec in eis quicquam acrius quam pecuniae damnum stimulat.* Montagne knew very well this Vanity: *They are not concerned, says he* (c), *for the Confusion, and in as much as it is prejudicial to the Interest of the Publick, and of the State; but they are only concerned, because it touches them Personally. Hence it is that they are so earnest about it, and even beyond Justice and publick Reason.* Non tam omnia universi, quam ea, quae ad quemque pertinent, singuli carpebant. The Impunity of the Duke of *Burgundy* was a mortal Wound given to Justice, and Authority, and to the Majesty of the State. What then? Private Men did not feel it, they saw but afar off the pernicious Consequences of it; and every Body hoped to avoid 'em. But the Taxes of the Duke of *Orleans* fell upon every Citizen. This is the Reason why they did not much care to revenge his Death. We shall see by and by that the Mob of *Paris* changed their Mind, when the Bishop had condemned the Apology for the Duke of *Burgundy*.

(C) *The Doctrine of* John Petit *was so Enormous . . . . . that it was condemned by the Bishop of* Paris.] Before the Condemnation (d) many Learned and Virtuous Men were offended at the Propositions of that Professor of Divinity, and were afraid that they would have *very dangerous Consequences, if they were not censured.* " For my part, *says a Monk of* " St. Denys, I did often very much wonder that the " Bishop of *Paris* and the Inquisitor of the Faith, " neglected a Cause that was so prejudicial to " good Manners, and the Service of God; but I " was always answered, that the formidable Authority of the Duke of *Burgundy* was the Rea- " son of it, and that it was prudently done of " them to let that Plague lie as it were buried in a " deep Silence, rather than venture to see it Au- " thorized by the Credit of that Prince. Which " proved true in its time, for that Safety so much " desired, did no sooner appear, than they ordered " the Members of the Venerable University of *Pa-* " *ris*, to bring whatever they had in their Sheets " and Collections relating to the Proposition of the " said *John Petit*, which served the pretended " Justification of the Duke of *Burgundy*. They cal- " led together in the great Hall of the Bishoprick, " the most famous Doctors and Batchelors of Divi- " nity, and the Doctors of the Canon and Civil " Law, that by their Advice, what was erroneous " in them might be examined; and after they had " applied themselves to it for several Days with all " the diligence which the Interest of Faith re- " quired, on the 16th of *January* they elected out " of that numerous Company sixteen Doctors, cho- " sen in the Colleges of *Paris*, who made an Ab- " stract of the Assertions and Propositions advanced " by that Doctor, which they judged to be condem- " nable as follows." That Historian sets down afterwards 9 Propositions of *John Petit*, with the Censure past upon 'em, and then he adds: " (e) " Such was the Advice of all the Doctors and Re- " gents there met, and that the whole Piece of " *John Petit* was unworthy of a Man of Parts, and " even deserved not to be mention'd: Wherefore " on the 23d of (f) *February*, the said Bishop and " Inquisitor of the Faith, being met in the Hall of " the Bishoprick, in presence of many Prelates and " Eminent Doctors, and a great Croud of People, " thought fit to censure it, as being erroneous as " to Faith and good Manners, and to condemn it, " as being Scandalous in several Respects, to be " burnt in the Porch of *Nostre Dame*. Two Days " after,

(i) *Ib. B.* 28. *c.* 10. *p.* 656.

(k) *Id. ib. B.* 27. *c.* 22. *p.* 625.

(l) *Id. ib. c.* 23. *p.* 625.

(m) *He hated the Duke of* Orleans, *because that Duke loved his Wife for a long time. Id. ib.*

(a) *Id. ib. p.* 627.

(b) *Annibal ad Carthaginienses ap. Livium l.* 30. *sub fin. p. m.* 555.

(c) *Montagne's Essays, B.* 3. *c.* 10. *p. m.* 410, 411.

(d) *Hist. of* Charles VI. *B.* 33. *c.* 28. *p.* 931, 932.

(e) *Id. ib. p.* 933.

(f) *It was in* 1414. *reckoning the beginning of the Year from* January.

Pope, ‡ and he himſelf wrote to the Council of *Conſtance*, to recommend the Cauſe of *John Petit*; his Ambaſſadors and Partizans maintained, that the Propoſitions that were condemned, were not (*D*) to be found in the Book of that Doctor; the Commiſſioners of the Council broke the Sentence of the Biſhop of *Paris*. *Gerſon* appealed from their (*E*) Judgment to the Council, and obtained not all the Satiſfaction he might reaſonably expect. That Aſſembly ſhewed, that a Prince who has an Army is a very good Protector of a Heretick. The Council made only a general

" after, the Execution was made in their Preſence " upon a Scaffold ſet up upon that Account, before " a great Multitude of People, when *Benedict Gencien*, a famous Doctor, had ſhewed the Enormity " of thoſe Opinions. " You ſhall ſee now an Example of the People's Inconſtancy; (*g*) " It was a " ſenſible Affront to the Duke of *Burgundy*, who " learned by an Experience neceſſary to give an " Example, how ſhameful it is for Great Men to " degenerate from the Glory of their Birth; but " his greateſt Spite was to hear, that that fooliſh " Juſtification had made him odious to the wiſeſt " and moderateſt Men, that he was laughed at and " deſpiſed by them, that the Mob derided him, " and that he was the publick Talk, and the Subject of a thouſand Satyrical Songs, wherein he " was publickly called a Traytor and an Aſſaſſin. "

Note, That *Gerſon* (*h*), Chancellor of the Univerſity, did very much contribute to that Cenſure. He preached often againſt the Propoſitions of *John Petit*, and (*i*) refuted *in the Name of the Univerſity before the King all the parts of the Diſcourſe and Book* of that Profeſſor. Note alſo, that the Nine Propoſitions that were cenſured, may be reduced to this: (*k*) *That it is Lawful for any Body, and even a commendable and meritorious thing, to kill a Tyrant of one's private Authority; and that in order to it, all manner of ways may be made uſe of, and even Treaſons and Flatteries, to make him fall into the Snare that is made ready for him, notwithſtanding any Alliances and Oaths whatſoever.*

(*D*) *Maintained that the Propoſitions, that were condemned, were not to be found in the Book of that Doctor; the Commiſſioners of the Council.*] It was the only way they could take, for unleſs they had renounced all Shame, they could not deny that the Cenſure of thoſe Nine Propoſitions was a lawful one. They were therefore obliged to do what the *Janſeniſts* did a long time after, to have recourſe to the Diſtinction *de facto & de jure*, and to maintain that the Nine Propoſitions were not to be found in the Book of *John Petit*. They failed not to do it. Read what follows. I go ſomewhat higher, that my Reader may be more fully informed of that Affair.

(*l*) " That (*m*) Sentence being extremely ſhameful for the Duke of *Burgundy*, whoſe Juſtification " was burnt in that Book, with an eternal Reproach " to his Name; his Proxies appealed to the Holy " See. (1) The Duke undertook to protect the " Pope, to make a Friend of him. . . . . . (2) But " when he heard that he had been arreſted at *Friburg*, before he could get into the County of *Burgundy*, he wrote again to the Council, in anſwer " to the Advice the Council had given him of the " Pope's Flight, that having promiſed to protect " him only upon condition that he would keep " his Word, (3) he was now reſolved to forſake him, ſeeing they approved not of his Conduct, and to adhere intirely to the Council. Having thus induſtriouſly diſpoſed their Minds, he " added, that he was informed his Enemies had " undertaken to defame him, under pretence of " cauſing certain Heretical Propoſitions to be condemned by the Council, which they aſcribed to " the late Dr. *John Petit*, who had defended his " Cauſe like an Honeſt Man; that for as much as " his Honour was concerned in it, he entreated the " Fathers, that before they ſhould decide a Point " of that Importance, and condemn the Book of " that Doctor, they would examine in the preſence " of his Ambaſſadors, whether thoſe Propoſitions " were truly his, or whether they were not maliciouſly contrived by others, who endeavoured to " cauſe them to be condemned under the Name of " that famous Profeſſor, and even under his own " Name. (4) The Council thereupon appointed " ſome Commiſſioners, *viz.* the Cardinals of *Albano*, *Aquileja*, *Florence*, and *d'Ailli*. The Ambaſſadors of the Duke of *Burgundy*, who had made " a powerful Party by their Intrigues, and had at " their Head *Martin Porree*, Biſhop of *Arras*, and " Doctor of Divinity, excepted againſt Cardinal " *Peter d'Ailli*, as having been *John Gerſon's* Maſter, " and maintained boldly, that the Propoſitions " which the Biſhop of *Paris* had condemned, as " being in the Book of Dr. *John Petit*, intitled, *The Juſtification of the Duke of* Burgundy, were not to be " found in it in ſuch terms as they were produced; " that *John Gerſon* being jealous of the Glory Dr. " *Petit* had acquired in the Univerſity, formed " them according to his Fancy, to give 'em an Heretical Senſe, which they themſelves would readily condemn; but that as they were worded in " the Doctor's Book, they were ready to prove that " they were very Orthodox. (5) On the other " Hand, Cardinal *d'Ailli*, who had been excepted " againſt, joyned with *Dr. John Gerſon*, and *Dr. Jourdan Morin*, and theſe three proteſted, That nothing could be more falſe (6) than what the Ambaſſadors of *Burgundy* had advanced; that any one " who has Eyes, and can read, and underſtand " *French*, will plainly ſee that the Propoſitions which " had been condemned, but eſpecially that which " all the reſt had been reduced to, were not only " advanced by *John Petit*, but contained alſo the " Subſtance of his Libel, wherein he makes it his " buſineſs to eſtabliſh them by his pretended Proofs " and falſe Reaſonings. At laſt, after ſome long " Debates about that Point, the Queſtion being only " a plain matter of Fact which the *Burgundians* denied obſtinately, the three Cardinals Commiſſioners, who were for them, made uſe of a very ill " Expedient. For, on the one Hand, approving " not thoſe wicked Propoſitions, and on the other " Hand being not willing to condemn the Advocate " of the Duke of *Burgundy*, (7) they declared that " the Biſhop of *Paris* was an incompetent Judge in " that Cauſe, which did belong to the Holy See; " and thereupon annull'd his Sentence. " Their Judgment was proclaimed by Sound of Trumpet in the Porch of the Cathedral Church of *Paris* (*a*). You may ſee in a Book of *Gerſon* by what Intrigues the Faction of *Burgundy* compaſt the whole Matter. *Inſtituit inter Volucrem & Monimum, id eſt, inter ſe & fratrem ſuum dialogum, ubi* καθ' ἕκαστα *& ſingillatim exponit, quibus molitionibus Burgundiones uſi ſunt ut Pariſienſis cenſura caſſa & irrita declararetur* (*b*).

(*E*) Gerſon *appealed from their Judgment to the Council, and obtained not all the ſatisfaction.*] He deſired, without doubt, that the Council ſhould confirm the Sentence of the Biſhop of *Paris*, by condemning namely the Book which contained the Duke of *Burgundy*'s Apology; but the Council did it not, (*c*) " Whether it be that they had not " the Libel of *John Petit* at *Conſtance*, but only an " Abſtract which contained his Propoſitions; or " whether they would not examine it to diſoblige " no Body, as (8) the Emperor adviſed them; " they were contented according to his Advice, to " apply themſelves to the Doctrine in general, and " to condemn the Fundamental Propoſitions which " contained the Subſtance of all the reſt; which " they did in theſe Words. *It has been remonſtrated to this Holy Council, that ſome Propoſitions have* " *been taught, which are Erroneous and moſt Scandalous, and tending to the Subverſion of the State of* " *the whole Commonwealth, amongſt which this has* " *been preſented to the Council.* (9) *Any Tyrant may* " *and ought lawfully and meritoriouſly to be kill'd by* " *any of his Vaſſals or Subjects, and even they may uſe* " *in order to it Snares, Flatteries and feigned Careſſes,* " *notwithſtanding any Oath or Alliance made with him,* " *without waiting for the Sentence or Command of any* " *Judge whatſoever. The Holy Council, in order to* " *exterminate that Error, declares and defines, upon* " *mature Deliberation, that ſuch a Doctrine is againſt* " *Faith and good Manners, and reproves and condemns* " *it as Heretical and Scandalous, and giving occaſion* " *to Frauds, Cheats, Lies, Treaſons, and Perjuries.* " *Further, it defines and declares, that they who obſtinately maintain that moſt pernicious Doctrine, are* " *Hereticks,* general Decision, which prejudiced neither the Book of *John Petit*, nor the *Burgundian*. The King of *France* on the (F) contrary, caused that Libel to be condemned with the greatest Severity, and expelled many Doctors from *Paris*, who opposed the good Design the others had of ingaging the University in the Cause of the Bishop. But, two Years after, that Prelate was obliged to cause his Sentence (G) to be revoked out of Complaisance to the Duke of *Burgundy*. *John Petit* died † in the Year 1411, at *Hedin*, a Town belonging to that Duke. He fled thither for Refuge, fearing the Sons of the Duke of *Orleans*, who designed to prosecute him as a Heretick. He * was not a Cordelier, as some have said, but a Secular Priest.

---

‡ See the *Rem. D.*

(*g*) *Il. ib.*

(*h*) *Cancellarius contra* Joannis Parvi *aſſertiones concionatur ſæpius, has accurato & diligenti ſtudio expendit, & detectos in iis contra fidem errores configit. Tum curante potiſſimum* Gerſone *errorum cenſura à Theologiæ facultate & Pariſienſi Epiſcopo confecta eſt. Joh. Launoius hiſt. Gymn. Navarr. p.* 482.

(*i*) *Maimbourg, hiſt. of the great Schiſm, l.* 4. *p. m.* 235.

(*k*) *Id. ib.*

(*l*) *Ib. p.* 237.

(*m*) *That is the Sentence of the Biſhop of* Paris.

(1) *J. Juvenal.*

(2) *Cod. Victor. ap. Spond.*

(3) *Act. Victor. ap. Spond.*

(4) *T.* 5. *Hiſt. Un. p.* 299. *ex Monſtrel. J. Juvenal. Cod. Victor.*

(5) *J. Juvenal.*

(6) *Cod. Victor.*

(7) *J. Juvenal.*

(*a*) Dati ſunt à Concilio & ſelecti judices, qui repugnante Gerſone, & aliis qui ab ejus ſtabant partibus, Pariſienſem cenſuram abrogarunt, politicis potius quam Theologicis rationibus ducti. Cenſuræ abrogatio & lecta & publicata eſt buccis concrepantibus in propylæo Ædis beatæ Mariæ Pariſ. Hæc Juvenalis Urſinus ut vidit, ita & retulit in Hiſtoria Caroli VI. *Jo. Launoius ubi ſupra p.* 489.

(*b*) *Id. ib.*

(*c*) *Maimbourg, ub. ſup. p.* 242.

(8) *Cod. Victor.*

(9) *Act. Concil. Conſt. Seſſ.* 15.

PHAON, of *Mitylene* in the Isle of *Lesbos*, was a handsom Man, extraordinarily beloved by the Fair Sex. The poor *Sappho* fell in Love with him, as well as many others; but she found him so unkind that she fell into Despair, as I shall say in her Article. The Poets, who have recourse to Miracles at every turn, say, that his Beauty, so powerful upon the Hearts of the Ladies, was given him by the Goddess *Venus*, as the Reward of the services she had received of him, when he was Master of a Ship. One Day β he took her on Board his Ship, without inquiring who she was, and conveyed her with all speed to the (A) Place she was to go to. He asked nothing γ for his Pains, but he was very well paid notwithstanding. *Venus* presented him with a Vessel of Alabaster full of an Oyntment, wherewith he had no sonner rubbed himself, than he became the Beautifullest of all Men. He inflamed the Women of *Mitylene* with Love. His Youth ζ returned upon him, and what follows. He made an ill use of it, and it cost him his Life; for he was killed

" *Hereticks, and as such, ought to be punished according to the Ordinance of the Holy Canons.* Such was " the Decree of the Council, which for certain " Considerations, and especially for fear of disobliging the Duke of *Burgundy*, would not joyn the " Fact with the Doctrine in this Cause. „

That Conduct did so much the more vex *John Gerson*, (d) because he had been accused of acting not out of love for Truth, but upon the account of some Differences he had had with *John Petit*. They reproached him also, that he had reduced all the Doctrine of that Man to one Proposition, and then that he had made Nine Propositions (e), when he knew that the Examinators were not ignorant that he had mutilated the opinion of his Adversary. He exposed himself so much to the Hatred of the House of *Burgundy*, that he ran a great many Dangers after the sitting of the Council. (f) He had not the liberty to go to *Paris*, to re-assume his Place of Chancellor. He was forced to retire thro' some Byways; he went to hide himself for some time in the Mountains of *Bavaria*, and then he crossed *Swisserland*, and arrived at *Lyons*, where he staid till he died.

(F) *The King of* France ..... *caused that Libel to be condemned with the greatest Severity, and expelled many Doctors from* Paris.] The following Account begins with the last of those two Facts. (g) " Our Doctors who were at *Constance*, (1) fearing " what came to pass, that the Cardinals Commissioners would favour the *Burgundians*, had written " to their Brethren at *Paris*, that they should endeavour to get the University to side with the " Bishop, that his Sentence against the Doctrine of " *John Petit* might be confirmed: But it happened " that many Members of that great Body, having " been gained by the Party of the Doctor, and of the " Duke of *Burgundy*, raised so great a Cabal against " 'em, that they prevented them from obtaining what " they demanded. The honest Doctors, especially " those of the illustrious *Sorbonne* and of *Navarre*, " sticking close to the good Party, which *Gerson* defended with great zeal and force, having made their " Complaints to the King; His Majesty, to clear the " University from those turbulent Fellows, who disturbed the Church and State, ordered above " forty of the most Factious to depart from *Paris* " that very Day upon pain of Death. ..... Afterwards, lest so abominable a Doctrine should be " revived, if the Book which contained it, should " remain; His Majesty sent his Declaration to the " Parliament, against the Errors contained in the " Libel of (2) *John Petit*, intitled, *The Justification of the Duke of* Burgundy, ordering them to tear, in a " full Court, as many Copies of it as could be found, " forbidding every Body to keep any of them upon " pain of forfeiting their Lives and Goods, ordering " further, that this Declaration be registred with " the Sentence of the Bishop of *Paris*, containing " the Doctrine and the Fact joyned together, in the " Condemnation of the most pernicious Errors of the " Libel of Dr. *John Petit*, intitled, *The Duke of Burgundy's Justification*, which begins with these " Words, *Before the most Noble and most High Royal* " *Majesty*, and was publickly (1) Sold in *Paris* and " other Places. The whole was registred in the Parliament on the 4th of *June* 1416; and on the 16th " of *September* in the same Year, the Parliament at " the Request of the University, published a severe " Decree against all those who should be so bold as " to maintain still the Doctrine of that detestable " Libel, declaring them liable to all the Punishments " which, they that are guilty of High Treason, de" serve. „

One may easily perceive that Mr. *Maimbourg* gives a touch to the *Jansenists*.

(G) *That Prelate was obliged to cause his Sentence to be revoked.*] What has been seen at all times was seen in the Cause of *John Petit*: Toleration, Condemnation, Absolution, *&c.* as the Prince his Protector grew stronger or weaker. His Credit was lost at *Paris* in the Year 1414. Then they proceeded rigorously against his Apologist. He could do any thing in that City in the Year 1418, then the Censure was annulled. I shall quote for this an Author of the same Century. *At this time*, says he (a), *a general Procession was made at* Paris, *wherein the University appeared, and especially the Vicars of the Bishop of* Paris, *who was then Sick at* St. Omer. *Which Vicars revoked there, in Sermon time before the whole Assembly, the Condemnation which the said Bishop published heretofore against the Proposition of* Dr. John Petit, *and against the Honour of the Duke of* Burgundy, *repairing, in that respect, his Honour and Fealty, as of a true Champion of the Crown of* France, *and they made appear the Power they had received from the Bishop to that effect, so that the Duke of* Burgundy *was satisfied.*

(A) *To the Place she was to go to.*] There is a Passage of *Lucian* from whence we learn, not whither she was conveyed, but where she took Shipping. (b) Μῶν ϗ σύ τινα ὥσπερ ὁ Φάων τ̃ Ἀφροδίτην ἐκ Χίου διαπορθμεύσας εἶτά σοι εὐξαμένῳ ἔδωκε νέον εἶναι ϗ καλὸν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ϗ ἀξιέραστον. *Num tu quoque*, says *Simylus* to *Polystratus*, *ut & Phaon ille venerem è Chio transvexisti, ut optanti tibi illa dederit juvenescere, ac denuo formosum atque amabilem fieri?* It might be inferred from these Words, that *Phaon* demanded as his Reward, that his Youth and Beauty should be restored to him; but *Palæphatus* says nothing like it: he says that *Phaon* had been a Seaman all his Life time, and never abused any Body, nor made poor People pay for their Passage; that upon this Account he was admired in the Isle of *Lesbos*; that *Venus* having put on the Shape of an old Woman, went on Board his Ship; that he carried her over with all speed, and asked nothing for it; but killed upon the Fact ‡, I mean, being surprized in an Adultery. Some said that the Virtue of a (B) certain Herb was the cause of Sappho's Love for him.

(d) *Spondan. ad ann. 1415. n. 51. p. 751.*

(e) Sentiens nihilominus Gersonius Theologos illos agnovisse fraudem in truncatione propositionum Parvi illas ad novem conclusiones proposuerit. *Id. ib.*

(f) *Launoius ub. sup. p. 490.*

(g) *Maimbourg, ub. sup. p. 242, 243.*

(1) *John Juvenal p. 327. Printed at the* Louvre.

(2) *Hist. Univ. t. 5. p. 400.* Quam M. Joannes Parvi nuncupatus justificationem Ducis Burgundiæ fecit appellari, ejus quaternos & particulas apud quemcumque inveniri poterunt, &c. Prædicta Propositio M. J. Parvi in sese, & in suis assertionibus principaliter intentis & in ea contentis est abolenda atque damnanda tanquam in fide erronea, &c. & eam sic abolemus & damnamus, &c. Quam justificationem D. Ducis Burgundiæ appellavit complures in se errores pestiferos continentem, & quæ in tantum in dictis villa & Diœcesi Parisiensi publicata extitit, quod venditioni publicè exposita & à pluribus empta fuerit. *p.* 301.

† *Monstrelet lib. 1. c. 39. apud Spond. ad ann. 1408. n. 1. p. 704.*

* *Spond. ib. p. 704.*

β *Ælian. Hist. div. l. 12. c. 18.*

γ *Palæph. de fabulis.*

δ *Ælian. ib.*

ζ *Palæph. ib. Lucian. Dial. mort. tom. 1. p. 234.*

(1) Publicæ venditioni exposita, quæ sic incipit. *Before, &c. p.* 302.

(a) John le Fevre *Lord of* St. Remi, *Hist. of* Charles VI. *c.* 88. *p.* 124.

(b) *Lucian. Dial. mort. tom. 1. p. 234.*

PHASELIS, a Sea-Town in *Lycia* * upon the Borders of *Pamphylia*. It was one of the Towns that grew the Richer by the Piracies of the *Cilicians*; which was the reason why † *Publius Servilius* ruined it, after the Victories he obtained over those Pirates. It was in a miserable Condition (C) when *Pompey* landed at it after the Battle of *Pharsalia*. 'Tis said that it was built by *Mopsus* §. That Town has been very much spoken of, upon the account of a Miraculous (D) Favour which

but that of an Old Man, she made him a handsom Young Man. *Servius* (c) touches upon that Story, and adds a Particularity to it which he borrows from two Comick (d) Poets, viz. That *Phaon* built a Temple to *Venus* upon Mount *Leucate*, from whence a Woman, who was very much in Love with him, threw her self into the Sea. *Lucian* thought that *Phaon* (e) was of the Isle of *Chio*, but I think he was mistaken.

(B) *The Virtue of a certain Herb.*] 'Tis a strange thing, that the passionate Love of *Sappho* should not be ascribed meerly to her Temper. *Pliny* ascribes it to a Cause which is as fabulous as the Ointment of *Venus*; he is in the right to say, that the Virtue of that Herb is a monstrous thing. *(f) Portentosum est quod de ea traditur, radicem ejus alterutrius sexus similitudinem referre, raram inventu: sed si viris contigerit mas, amabiles fieri. Ob hoc & Phaonem Lesbium dilectum à Sappho. Multæ (g) circa hoc non Magorum solum vanitates, sed etiam Pythagoricorum.* He speaks of the white *Eryngium*, which the *Latins* call *centum capita*. *Du Pinet* renders it *chardon à cent têtes.*

(C) *In a miserable Condition when* Pompey.] If we believe *Lucan*, there was more People in *Pompey's* Ship than in that Town.

> (h) *Te primum parva Phaseli*
> *Magnus adit. Nam te metui vetat incola rarus,*
> *Exhaustæque domus populis, majorque carinæ*
> *Quam tua turba fuit.*

Yet *Strabo*, who lived after *Pompey*, speaks of *Phaselis* as of a considerable Town, which had three Ports. 'Tis likely he represents it (i) as it was heretofore, but he should not have exprest himself in the Present Tense. (k) Εἶτα Φασηλὶς, τρεῖς ἔχουσα λιμένας, πόλις ἀξιόλογος. *At deinde Phaselis, tres habens portus, urbs memorabilis.*

(D) *A miraculous Favour which* Alexander *was said.*] *Josephus* having described the Passage thro' the Red-Sea, makes this Observation upon it. (l) "No Body ought to look upon it as an impossible "thing, that Men who lived an innocent and simple Life in those first Times, should have found "a Passage through the Sea to make their Escape, "whether it opened of it self, or whether it was by "the Will of God, since the same thing happened "a long time after to the *Macedonians*, when they "went thro' the Sea of *Pamphylia* under the Conduct of *Alexander*, God being willing to make use "of that Nation to destroy the *Persian* Empire, as "it is reported by all the Historians who wrote the "Life of that Prince. However, I leave to every "Body the liberty of judging of it as he thinks "fit." It is not true that all the Historians of *Alexander* represented as a Miracle, his Passage thro' the Streights of *Pamphylia* near *Phaselis*. I shall quote a great Author, who clearly shews that there was nothing miraculous on that Occasion. (m) "*Alexander* passed his Army along the Sea-Coasts of "*Pamphylia* with such Expedition, that many Historians have describ'd and extoll'd it with that "height of Admiration, as if it were no less than "a Miracle, and an extraordinary Effect of Divine "Favour, that the Waves which were wont to come "rowling in from the Main, and hardly ever "leave so much as the Beach under the steep broken Cliffs at any time uncovered, should on a "sudden retire to afford him Passage. *Menander*, "in one of his Comedies, alludes to this wonderful "Event, when he says,

> " *How this resembles* Alexander's *high*
> " *Exploits? This Fellow of his own accord is here.*
> " *Ask him to wade the Sea, and he'll reply,*
> " *Ev'n that to him does passable appear.*

"*Alexander* himself in his Epistles, mentions nothing unusual in this at all, but says, he went "from *Phaselis*, and marched through the Streights "which they call the *Ladders*." We are beholden to *Plutarch* for having mentioned the Letters of that Conqueror; for they resolve the Difficulty, and shew the Imposture of those who described that Passage as being Supernatural and a signal Miracle. If there had been any Prodigy in it, and an extraordinary Favour from Heaven, *Alexander* had certainly mention'd it in the Letters he wrote concerning that March of his Army. He could have no Political Reason to be silent about so wonderful an Event; on the contrary, several important Motives might have induced him to speak of it. It was a thing of the greatest Consequence, to convince all the World, that the Gods had visibly declared for him, that the most untractable Elements were submitted to him, and that Nature left its usual Course to hasten the Ruin of the King of *Persia*. He should have therefore acquainted his Mother, and *Antipater*, and all the Nations of *Greece* with that great Miracle; he should have sent the News of it where ever he desired it should be known. He should have taken care to make his Letters as Authentick as they could be; yet nothing could be plainer than what he wrote upon that occasion. Let no Body say that he would be beholden to his Valour only; it is not true: We have shewed in his (a) Article that the extravagant Ambition he exprest of being accounted a God, was in a great measure the effect of Policy. His whole Conduct shewed, that de desired nothing so eagerly as to see the Nations persuaded of the Ascendant of his Fortune, and of the immutable Happiness of his Destiny. A Man may go a thousand times farther with such a Reputation, than with the Fame of a most Valiant and skilful Captain: for every Body knows that the Valour and Prudence of a General have their Bounds; whereas People are apt to think that nothing can stop a Conqueror for whom Fortune declares, and who has Heaven and Earth, the Sea and the Winds at his disposal, *Cui militat æther, Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti* (b). So that the greatest Interest of Conquerors, is to be look'd upon as Men, whom God has appointed for some great Revolutions, and favours with Miracles. If it abates something of their Glory, with respect to their Courage or Genius, that Loss is plentifully made up in some other respects. The Extent of their Conquests, the Number of their Victories, the Rapidity wherewith great Exploits are performed when Fortune directs them, and when she takes almost all upon herself, without caring for the concourse of Prudence, all those things, I say, are an Object of Admiration, a thousand times more dazzling, than those limited and mean Conquests, which are only owing to the most consummate Prudence and Intrepidity. Are there any Humane Virtues that can inspire us with the same Respect, Veneration and Esteem, which we do naturally conceive for those whom we look upon as chosen Vessels, Men appointed by God for the foundation of Empires, and his Favourites and Darlings? Such Men are much more admired, than if they were only recommendable for their Prudence and Courage. Lastly, we must observe, that there are some things independent upon the Valour and Wisdom of a Conqueror. Those Qualities can never open a way through the Sea and Rivers for the Passage of an Army. When therefore it is said that the Sea and Rivers opened in his behalf, and miraculously gave way to his Troops, he is not deprived of his due Praises, that they may be bestowed upon Fortune; for every Body knows that the Courage and Skill of a great Captain can never produce these Effects: he would be looked upon as a Fool, and laugh'd at, if he should venture to say, that he had found out the Invention of passing a great Army thro' an Arm of the Sea, without Pontons and Ships. No good Reasons can therefore be given, why *Alexander* should have supprest the Miracle in question: We must therefore conclude, that he made no mention of it in the Letters he wrote concerning his March, because there had been nothing extraordinary in it.

WHETHER ALEXANDER could have any Reasons to suppress a Miracle wrought in his behalf.

‡ *Ælian. ubi sup.*

* *Strabo, l. 14. p. 458. See also Liv. l. 37. c. 23.*

† *Nec mari submovisse contentus, validissimas urbes eorum & diutina præda abundantes, Phaselin & Olympon evertit, Isaurumque ipsam arcem Ciliciæ. Flor. l. 3. c. 6.*

§ *Pompon. Mela l. 1. c. 14.*

(c) *Servius in Æn. 3. v. 279. Read in the* Leyden *Edition of* 1680 in anus formam, *instead of* in navis formam.

(d) *Menander & Turpilius.*

(e) *In Navigio tom. 2. p. 656.*

(f) *Plin. l. 22. c. 8.*

(g) *Father* Hardouin *refers us hereupon to a Book falsly intitled* Kiranidum Kirani *p. 37.*

(h) *Lucan. l. 8.*

(i) *Note, that it is not at all likely that Town should have been repaired from the Battle of* Pharsalia *to the time of* Strabo.

(k) *Strab. l. 14. p. 458.*

(l) *Joseph. Ant. Jud. l. 2. sub fin.*

(m) *Plut. in vit. Alexand. p. 673, 674.*

(a) *See the Art.* Macedonia *Rem. G. and that of* Olympias *Rem. F.*

(b) *They are* Claudian's *Words in 3. Consul. Honorii Augusti v. 95. It concerns a Prodigy whereby* Theodosius *obtain'd a Victory over* Eugenius *in the year 394. See* Flechier's *Life of* Theodosius *l. 4. p. 479. Edit. in 12. &* Barth. *in* Claudian. *p. 509. & seq. Here is the whole Passage of* Claudian: O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris Æolus armatas hiemes, cui militat æther, Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti.

which *Alexander* was ſaid to have received from the Gods in that Place. I ſhall make a Remark upon that Subject, as I have promiſed.

P H OC.

I will ſtrengthen this Reaſoning with a very good Obſervation. The moſt ambitious Princes, the Warriors that are moſt greedy of Praiſes, are not ſo inventive (c) as their Flatterers, nor ſo ingenious as a Panegyriſt, in things that may ſet off the Glory of a Conqueror. Since therefore the Flatterers of *Alexander*, the Orators and the Poets, who beſtowed Praiſes upon him, ſaid that the Sea of *Pamphylia* withdrew its Waves, to facilitate the Paſſage of his Army, which happened by a great Miracle, we may very well believe they were perſuaded, that by taking ſuch a Turn, they might more eaſily immortalize his Glory, and make it more admirable. He himſelf did not think of ſuch an Invention; he did not equal in that ſort of Devices the Fecundity of the Wits, of the Flatterers and Rhetoricians, and therefore he plainly and ingenuouſly related how he got over that Place. If there had been any Policy in the Matter, if he had been ſilent about that Prodigy, for fear of leſſening his Glory, by confeſſing that the Gods had ſeconded him; the Flatterers would have known his Judgment about it, they would have accommodated themſelves to it, and had never ſpoken a Word of the Miracle. If we had all the Verſes and looſe Sheets which came out about that Subject, during the Life of that Prince, we ſhould find a great many idle Fancies in them; but becauſe it is the Fate of thoſe little Books to die as ſoon as, or ſooner, than their Authors, Poſterity has not been peſtered with them. We have only the Reduction of them made by ſome more grave Writers; and it is no difficult thing to have a juſt Notion of that Adventure, by conſulting a learned Geographer. *Strabo* tells us, that Mount *Climax* lies ſo near the Sea of *Pamphylia*, that it is only parted from it by a narrow Way, which one may go a Foot when that Sea is calm; but it is covered with Water when that Sea is rough. *Alexander* truſting his good Fortune, ordered his Army to go thro' that Place, without waiting for the Time of the Year when the Waters go off. The Soldiers went over having the Water to their Bellies: this is all the Miracle: (d) Περὶ Φασηλίδα δ' ἐστὶ τὰ κατὰ θάλατταν στενὰ, δι' ὧν Ἀλέξανδρος παρήγαγε τὴν στρατιάν· ἔστι δ' ὄρος Κλῖμαξ καλούμενον· ἐπίκειται δὲ τῷ Παμφυλίῳ πελάγει, στενὴν ἀπολεῖπον πάροδον ἐπὶ τῷ αἰγιαλῷ, ταῖς μὲν νηνεμίαις γυμνουμένην, ὥστε εἶναι βάσιμον τοῖς ὁδεύουσι· πλημμύροντος δὲ τοῦ πελάγους, ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων καλυπτομένην ἐπὶ πολύ. ἡ μὲν οὖν διὰ τοῦ ὄρους ὑπέρβασις, περίοδον ἔχει καὶ προσάντης ἐστὶ, τῷ δ' αἰγιαλῷ χρῶνται κατὰ τὰς εὐδίας. Ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς χειμέριον ἐμπεσὼν καιρὸν, καὶ τὸ πλέον ἐπιτρέπων τῇ τύχῃ, πρὶν ἀνεῖναι τὸ κῦμα ὥρμησε, καὶ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδατι γενέσθαι τὴν πορείαν συνέβη, μέχρι ὀμφαλοῦ βαπτιζομένων. *Apud Phaſelidem ſunt ad mare anguſtiæ, per quas exercitum traduxit Alexander. Eſt enim ibi mons Climax, Pamphylio incumbens mari, & propter litus arctum relinquens tranſitum: qui tranquillo mari nudatur, & à viatoribus perambulari poteſt: mari exundante, fluctibus admodum obtegitur. Alexander autem hybernam incidit in tempeſtatem, cumque fortunæ maximam eventus partem crederet, antequam defluerent undæ profectus eſt: itaque contigit, ut totum diem milites per aquam iter facerent uſque ad umbilicum in eam demerſi.* Others ſay, that the Southerly Winds, which had blown for ſeveral Days, and overflowed all the way to the foot of the Mountain, left off blowing as ſoon as *Alexander* appeared, and that a North Wind aroſe, which drove the Waters toward the Shoar. *Freinſhemius* (e) quotes the Authors who mention this, I ſhall tranſcribe his Words and Quotations. (1) *Parte exercitus ad Pergenſium urbem per montes præmiſſa; cæteros ipſe per litus ducebat, qua Climax mons Pamphylio mari imminens anguſtam euntibus ſemitam relinquit, quoties mare tranquillum eſt; at quum æſtus incubuit, fluctibus operitur. Idque hyeme frequens & prope perpetuum eſt. At Alexander nihil æque ac moram metuens, exercitum per æqua, per iniqua, eodem ardore atque impetu rapiebat. Continui per eos dies Auſtri flaverant, qui mare in litus propellentes, omnia itineris veſtigia altis paludibus opplent: adſidua etiam magnæque pluviæ, ut ventis iſtis ſpirantibus ſolet, ruebant. Sed adventante Alexandro ſubito exortus Aquilo cælum purgavit imbribus, undas rejecit in mare, & Macedonibus tranſitum aperuit. Sic quoque unius* (2) *diei itinere per incerta vada emergendum fuit; aqua ad umbilicum ferme pertingente. Tantum in periculis Alexandri felicitatem, at ab ipſius ingenio profectam non dubito; ita frequentibus prodigiis & ominibus auctam confirmatamque fuiſſe crediderim: poſtquam decreto numinis, clariſſimis maximiſque rebus ſe deſtinari concepit.* *Joſephus* ſhews no great Judgment, when he compares the Paſſage thro' the Red Sea, with the Paſſage thro' the Sea of *Pamphylia*. He hoped that the Miracle of *Alexander* would make the *Greeks* believe that of *Moſes*; but he ſhould have feared that the Paſſage thro' the Red Sea would be aſcribed to ſome Natural Cauſes, as that of the Sea of *Pamphylia* was aſcribed to the North Wind. If *Genebrard* had not made uſe of ſo outragious a Cenſure, one could not blame the Remark he made upon theſe Words of *Joſephus*: (a) *The Egyptians were miſtaken, they knew not that God had opened that way only for his People, and not for their Perſecutors, who followed them only to deſtroy 'em.* Here is his Note. "(b) From hence thou may'ſt know how "execrable is the Impiety of *Joachim Vadianus*, "who was ſo bold as to ſay in his Commentary upon *Pomponius Mela*, that *Moſes* waited for the "time when the Red Sea was to retire into the Ocean, and leave the Bottom dry, as it happens "twice a Day at Mount *St. Michael* in *Normandy*. "For, beſides that God deſigned to ſhew his Power by it, the Red Sea never leaves its Channel by "a Flux and Reflux, being always full, as it is "certain by Geography and Sea-Charts." *Joſephus* ſhould have ſo much the more abſtained from ſuch a Parallel, becauſe there was ſome reaſon to fear, that the *Greek* Philoſophers would take advantage of what is obſerved by the Sacred Hiſtorian, that (c) God *cauſed the Sea to go back by a ſtrong Wind all that Night*. They might have ſaid, that thoſe two Miracles were like one another, and the effect of the Wind. There aroſe a North Wind for *Alexander*, which drove back the Waters of the Sea; another Wind did the ſame for *Moſes*. Several Hiſtorians, to make the Conqueſts of the *Macedonian* Army wonderful, took for a Miracle a North Wind which proved uſeful to him by chance. The Hiſtorian of the *Hebrews* (d) did the like. Therefore to prevent thoſe Objections, *Joſephus* ſhould have avoided the Parallel which he made uſe of very improperly. A Commentator for the uſe of the *Dauphin* Cenſures him ſeverely for it. (e) *Ut imperite, ne dicam impie, feciſſe Joſephus videatur, qui narrato Iſraëlitarum tranſitu per rubrum mare, quo credibile probaret eſſe miraculum, ſimile quiddam Alexandro contigiſſe agnoſcit, & ab omnibus affirmari tradit qui res ejus geſtas literis mandarunt.*

Note, That it is a very eaſie thing to obſerve a capital Difference between what paſſed near *Phaſelis*, and what happened in *Ægypt*. The Wind which drove the Red-Sea back, was preceded by an Humane Action, which ſhews that God interpoſed therein after a ſpecial manner: (f) *Moſes ſtretched out his Hand over the Sea.* Beſides, there happened a thing which cannot be aſcribed to the Wind; the Sea opened, and the *Iſraelites* went upon the dry Ground, *and the waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left.* If it be ſaid that the Wind was the cauſe of that Gap; it muſt be confeſt that it was not Natural, I mean, that it blew only upon a very ſmall part of the Sea, and that leaving the Waters at reſt on the Right and on the Left, it made a way in the Middle; it drove only the Waters that were in that *Intermedium*, and kept up the reſt on each ſide. If any one ſhould aſk me why it was neceſſary that the Wind ſhould blow all Night, ſeeing God does not at all want the help of Second Cauſes to dry up an Arm of the Sea in a Moment: I would anſwer, that Creatures are not to preſcribe to their Creator the manner of his Conduct. Beſides, thoſe who ſay, that the Miracles of the Ancient Law were produced upon occaſion of the Will of a Creature, are not perhaps miſtaken. See what Father *Mallebranche* and Mr. *Arnauld* (g) think of it. If the Angel, who was entruſted with the Conduct of the *Iſraelites*, had been the Occaſional Cauſe of all the Miracles of *Moſes*; it would be no wonder that the Action of Bodies, the Violence of the Winds, &c. ſhould have been made uſe of. Many Difficulties may be accounted for by that means. Perhaps, a Heathen would ſay,

(c) *To this may be applied the Words of Pliny the younger in Paneg. Traj. c. 55. Ingenioſior eſt ad excogitandum ſimulatio veritate, ſervitus libertate, metus amore.*

(d) *Strab. l. 14. p. 458.*

(e) *Supplem. in Q. Curt. l. 2. c. 11. n. 18. See alſo his Index upon Q. Curt. at the Word* Pamphylia.

(1) *Strab. l. 14. Curt. 5. 3. 22. c. 3. 16. Artemon. in Seneca Suaſor. 1. Arrian. 1. 8, 3. Euſtath. in Dionyſ. v. 855, & 855. Appian. l. 2. de Bell. Civ. Joſeph. Ant. l. 2. extrem. Plut. c. 27, & 28.*

(2) *Strab. l. 14.*

(a) *Joſeph. ub. ſup.*

(b) *Genebrard in the Margin of his Tranſlation of Joſephus ſub. fin. l. 2. Ant. Jud. fol. 53. Paris 15[illegible]4. in 8.*

(c) *Exod. XIV. 21.*

(d) *Let all this be aſcribed to thoſe Greek Philoſophers, whom I mention'd before.*

(e) *Michael le Tellier Not. in Q. Curt. l. 5. capite ipſi undecimo p. 193.*

(f) *Exod. ub. ſup. See Mr.* le Clerc's *Diſſertation mention'd in the* Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans, *Octob. 1695. p. 59, 60.*

(g) *Mr.* Arnauld *publiſhed in the year 1685. a Diſſertation concerning the manner how God wrought the Miracles of the Old Law by the Miniſtry of Angels. He refutes Father* Mallebranche.

PHŒBADIUS, Biſhop of *Agen* in the IV. Century, expreſſed a very great Zeal for Orthodoxy, and againſt *Arianiſm*. He writ a Book * againſt the ſecond (*A*) Form of Faith, which *Oſius* and *Potamius* had drawn up at *Sirmium* in the Year 357. He aſſiſted at the Synod of *Ariminum* in the Year 359, and maintained the *Nicene* Form of Faith to the End of that Council, and refuſed to ſubſcribe to that which was propoſed there. " † Neither Fear nor Threatnings could " make him change his Reſolution; but *Taurus* the Governor, perceiving that he " could not overcome his Conſtancy by that means, betook himſelf to Intreaties, " and beſought him with Tears to take the mildeſt Courſe, to deliver a great Number " of Biſhops who had been ſhut up in a Town ſeven Months, and were very " much tired, by reaſon of the Sharpneſs of the Winter, and the Scarcity of all " things .... *Phœbadius* anſwered, That he was ready to go into Baniſhment, " and ſuffer all ſorts of Torments rather than do what was required of him, and " that he would never approve of a Form of Faith made by the *Arians*. Some " Days were ſpent in that Conteſt; but at laſt, ſeeing there was no hopes of a " Peace, he abated of his Conſtancy, when *Urſacius* and *Valens* had declared, That " the Profeſſion of Faith they propoſed was Catholick, and that thoſe to whom it " ſhould not appear to be ſufficient, might add to it what they ſhould think fit. „ Some Orthodox Propoſitions were added to it, namely this, That the Son of God was not a Creature; but *Urſacius* and *Valens* did cunningly inſert in it, That he was not a Creature as others are; and by ſuch a Fraud they obtained the Subſcriptions they would have. ‡ Phœbadius *being returned into his Country, was one of the Biſhops who expreſt the greateſt Sorrow for their Fault, and made amends for it by their Declarations and Proteſtations againſt what they had done by ſurprize. He aſſiſted at the Council of* Valence *in the Year* 374. *We have a Letter of St.* Ambroſe *directed to him and* Delphinius *Biſhop of* Bourdeaux. *St.* Jerome *aſſures us in his Book concerning Illuſtrious Men, that* Phœbadius *was ſtill alive in his time* †, *and that he was very Old. He adds, that he had compoſed many other Works, beſides that which we have mentioned. The Memory of that Saint is particularly honoured at* Agen, *where he is commonly called* (*B*) St. Fiari.

PHÆDRUS, the Author of the Five Books of Fables in Latin Iambick Verſes, was ‡ a *Thracian* by Birth. He was made Free by (*A*) *Auguſtus*, and * lived till

* *Du Pin's Biblioth. tom. 2. p. 147. of the Dutch Edit.*

† *Id. ib.*

‡ *Id. ib.*

† *That is in the year 392. when* St. Jerome *write that Book. See Father* Labbe diſſert. de Scriptor. Eccleſ. tom. 2. p. 221.

‡ *Phædrus in præf. l. 3.*

* *Vid. Scheffer. in vit. Phædr.*

according to the Language of thoſe who ſpoke ſo much of the *Genii* of the Emperors, that the *Genius* of *Alexander* ſtopt the South Wind, and formed a North Wind the very ſame Day that Conqueror deſigned to go along the Shoar of *Phaſelis*. But to perſuade us of it, it were neceſſary to ſhew, that ſuppoſing *Alexander* had been quiet in *Macedonia*, a North Wind had not ſucceeded a South Wind the ſame Day that he marched his Army along that Shoar: which it is a thing that can neither be prov'd nor known. One may apprehend that the *Genii* of the Emperors might, by uſing their Phyſicks, *applicando activa paſſivis*, ſtop a Wind, and raiſe another; but it cannot be known whether they do it in ſuch a place, or at ſuch a time.

(*A*) *He writ a Book againſt the Second Form.*] That Work is extant. You will find the Subſtance of it in (*h*) Mr. *du Pin's Bibliotheque*. Father *Labbe* ſays, that *Petrus Pithœus* was the firſt that publiſhed it. (*i*) *Primum prodiit ſtudio Petri Pithœi cum aliquot aliorum Veterum Galliæ Theologorum ſcriptis, Pariſiis apud Nivellium* 1585. *in* 4. *hoc titulo: liber contra Epiſtolam ſive edictum ſub nomine Conſtantii Imp. emiſſum in Synodo Mediolanenſi.* He adds, that it was inſerted ſince in the Editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and that *Barthius* made ſome Notes upon it. Mr. *du Pin* ſays alſo, that the firſt Edition is that which was publiſhed by *Petrus Pithœus*, but he places it in the Year 1587. *John Darnalt* in his Antiquities of *Agen*, *chap.* 5. mentions a foregoing Edition. *That Epiſtle of* Phœbadius, ſays he (*k*), *was found in our time, and immediately publiſhed by* Robert Stephen, *and ſince by* Nivelle *in* 1586. They that have Libraries may enquire whether it be ſo.

(*B*) *Particularly honoured at* Agen, *where he is commonly called* St. Fiari.] The Name of that Illuſtrious Prelate has undergone ſeveral ſtrange Metamorphoſes. (*a*) *Sulpicius Severus calls him* Fegadius. *He is called* Sœbadius *in* St. Jerome, *and in the Greek Tranſlator of his Book...... We read* Fygadius *in* St. Ambroſe. *Arnalt* bewails thoſe Alterations, and the Deſtruction of the Church conſecrated to that Biſhop. " (*b*) I ſhall ſay by the by, " that the Name of that Holy Biſhop has been ſo " unfortunate, that it is at this Day ſo changed and " altered, not only amongſt the Vulgar, but alſo in " the Books of his own Church, that ſome call him " *Fedarium*, others *Phœbadium* and *Feudarium*, *Ephionius* calls him *Sebaydium*, he is commonly cal" led *St. Fiari*. I ſhall add to the alteration of his " Name, that the Injuries of Time and of the Age " have been ſo great and ſo deplorable, that his " Church was firſt pulled down, and levelled to the " Ground in this City, and the Place where it ſtood " was converted into a prophane uſe. „ *Beza* mentions a thing that is ſomewhat Curious, which belongs to the Year 1561. " (*c*) At that time *John* " *Barrelles*, a Miniſter at *Toulouſe*, being at *Agen* by " reaſon of his Illneſs, where he ſtaid to be cured " of it, preached in the Day time in the Houſe of " *Rouſſanes* a Councellor, and the Aſſembly grew " ſo numerous every Day, that at laſt on the 15th " of *March* he preached in a little Church called " *St. Fiari*, who was formerly Biſhop of *Agen*, and " a very learned Man, having written againſt the " *Arians* in St. *Jerome*'s time, as he himſelf ſays in " his Treatiſe concerning Eccleſiaſtical Writers, " where his Name is falſly written *Sebadius* inſtead " of *Fedarius*. There was in that Church a Marble " Sepulchre, which was ſaid to be that Biſhop's; " the Nurſes were wont to ſcrape it, and to ſwallow the Scrapings with their Porridge, that they " might have abundance of Milk. Yet there is a " little Town near *Toulouſe* called *Benerque*, upon " the River † *Rege*, where, on the 25th of *April*, " which is the Feſtival of the ſaid St. *Fiari*, the " Neighbours uſe to meet in Arms, (which is an " ancient Cuſtom amongſt 'em) for fear, as they " ſay, that the Inhabitants of *Agen* ſhould come and " carry away the Body of that Saint, which they " maintain to have ſtollen from them. Let 'em " debate the Matter amongſt themſelves; but the " Sepulchre having been open'd at laſt at *Agen*, " there was nothing found in it but a Scull with the " Teeth very well preſerved, conſidering the ſaid " Biſhop had been buried there above twelve hundred Years. „

(*A*) *Made Free by* Auguſtus.] He is called *Auguſti Libertus* in the Title of his Fables. *Lipſius*, *Andreas Schottus*, *Dempſterus*, *Borrichius*, and many other Criticks underſtand it of *Tiberius* (*d*). But *Florens Chriſtianus*, *Voſſius*, *Schefferus*, &c. had rather underſtand it of *Auguſtus*. I follow the laſt Opinion, tho' I confeſs that the Proofs that can be given for it, are not demonſtrative. That which is certain, is, that our *Phædrus* relates, as an Ocular Witneſs, ſome things that happened under the Empire of *Auguſtus*. See the 11th Fable of the 3d Book,

(*h*) *Pag.* 107, & 108. *of the* 2d *Tom. of his Biblioth. of Eccleſ. Authors, of the* Dutch *Edit.*

(*i*) *Labbe de Script. Eccleſ. tom.* 2. *p.* 221.

(*k*) Darnalt *the King's Attorney in the Preſidial of* Agen, *Antiquit. of* Agen *fol.* 32. *verſo Paris* 1606. 8vo.

(*a*) *Du Pin ub. ſup. p.* 109.

(*b*) *Arnalt. ub. ſup. fol.* 33.

(*c*) *Beza Hiſt. Eccleſ. l.* 5. *p.* 790, 791.

† *He ſhould have ſaid* Ariege.

(*d*) *See the Notes of* Schefferus *in Phædrum* till after the Death of *Sejanus*. He ‡ was oppreſt by that Favourite of *Tiberius*. He ſpeaks of himſelf as of a Man who did not (B) care to grow Rich. All the Criticks don't agree that he is the ſame *Phædrus* mentioned in one (C) of *Martial*'s Epigrams. It is to be obſerved, that *Caſaubon*, who was ſo Learned a Man, knew not that there was one (D) *Phædrus* amongſt the Ancient Authors, but when *Petrus Pithœus* publiſhed *Phædrus*'s Fables. Since that firſt Edition which came out in 1596, there has been many others with the Notes of the greateſt Criticks. See the Catalogue of them in the Preface of *John Schefferus* upon that Author, to which you may add the Edition † of the Year 1698, publiſhed by Mr. *Burman*, which contains the Notes of *Gudius*, never before publiſhed, the intire Com-

Book, but not the 8th of the 4th Book, wherein *Bathyllus* is mentioned; for *Voſſius* (e) is in the wrong to ſay that *Phædrus* ſpeaks of it as having ſeen it.

(B) *Who did not care to grow Rich.*] See the Preface of his 3d Book: he mentions this amongſt the things which ſhould facilitate his promotion to the Rank of Poets:

Quamvis in ipſa natus ſim pene ſcholâ,
Curamque habendi penitus corde eraſerim,
Et laude invitâ in hanc vitam incubuerim,
Faſtidioſe tamen in cœtum recipior.

See alſo the 5th Fable of the 5th Book (f).

(C) *That is mentioned in one of Martial's Epigrams.*] Here are the Words of that Poet:

Dic (g) Muſa quid agat Canius meus Rufus?
Utrumne chartis tradit ille victuris
Legenda temporum acta Claudianorum?
An quæ Neroni falſus adſtruit ſcriptor?
An æmulatur improbi jocos Phædri?

The Note of *Scriverius* upon the laſt of thoſe five Verſes is extremely injurious to thoſe, who think that *Martial* ſpeaks of our *Phædrus*: (h) *Poſſunt ne magis decipere de judicio, ac magis ludere de otio ſuo viri docti, qui exiſtimant Fabulatorem Phædrum à Clariſſimo Pithœo editum, & cujus Avienus quidam, ſive Avianus, in præfatione Fabularum ſuarum Æſopiarum ad Theodoſium meminit, hunc eundem eſſe, de quo loquitur Martialis? Volunt nos credere ſcilicet, Libertum illum Auguſti Cæſaris fuiſſe, illo atque tempore parem proximumve Laberio vel Publio Mimo, & quidem, quantum conjiciunt, ſub Tiberio vixiſſe, atque adeo poſt Sejanum damnatum: Nugæ. Certè niſi vehementer fallor, avo illo dignus cenſeri minime poteſt ſcriptor ille, cuicui tandem ille alapam & libertatem debeat.* *Scriverius* boaſts that he can prove his Opinion by ſeveral Reaſons, and obſerve, amongſt other things, that *Perot*, Archbiſhop of *Siponto*, is the Author of (i) one of the Fables publiſhed under the Name of *Phædrus*. It is certain, that the Fable which *Perot* ſays he took from *Avienus*, and publiſhed in Iambick Verſes, differs very little from the other. *Alluſit ad fabulam*, ſays he in his Commentary on the 77th Epigram (k) of the 1ſt Book of *Martial*, *quam nos ex Avieno in Fabellas noſtras adoleſcentes Iambico carmine tranſtulimus*:

Olim quas vellent eſſe in tutela ſua
Divi legerunt arbores, &c. (l).

But the Criticks did not fail to ſay, that Prelate aſcribed it unjuſtly to himſelf. However, one may very well wonder, that ſo pleaſant a Book as that of *Phædrus* ſhould have been almoſt unknown for many Ages. Suppoſing that *Martial* ſpeaks of it, we have but two (m) Authors that ſpoke of it. I have ſaid in another Place (n), that *Seneca* knew nothing of it, and I am going to ſay that *Caſaubon* was for a long time in the ſame caſe. Which ought to make us leſs wonder at the Obſcurity wherewith the Name and Glory of *Quintus Curtius* has been covered during ſo many Years. To which I add that *Paterculus* had the ſame Fate.

(D) Caſaubon .... *knew not there was one* Phædrus.] He wrote the following Words to *Petrus Pithœus*: *Ex epiſtola tua primum de Phædro Auguſti liberto cognovi: nam plane mihi ante id nomen incognitum, proinde de eo quæ ſcripſerit quæ ſcripto vel legi nihil, vel ſi eſt aliter non memini.* That Letter of *Caſaubon* was written in the Year 1596, and *Petrus Pithœus* publiſhed *Phædrus*'s Fables in the ſame Year at *Troyes*. He ſent a Copy of it to Father *Sirmond* who was then at *Rome*. That Jeſuit ſhewed it to the Learned Men of *Rome*, who thought at firſt that it was a ſuppoſititious Book; but having more carefully examined it, they changed their Opinion, and found ſome Characters of the Age of *Auguſtus* in it. (o) *Memini equidem Jacobum Sirmundum narrare mihi ſolitum, cum Petrus Pithœus hos Phædri Æſopiarum fabularum quinque libros (p) Lutetiæ edidiſſet primum, & ad ſe Romam pro veteri amicitia muneri miſiſſet; percuſſos illico Romanos novitate voluminis, atque ut gens eſt emunctæ naris, natura nunquam verba cui potuit dare, ſuſpicari cœpiſſe num quidnam partus ille recens ac ſuppoſititius eſſet, qui tanto intervallo appareret, tamque delituiſſet diu: verumtamen libro perlecto toto, neminem dubitaſſe, quin ætatem redoleret Auguſti, ac ſummam illam facilitatem ſtili & ſcripturæ, & beatam copiam repræſentaret; tuncque vixiſſet auctor, cum latè bene loquendi temporum potiùs, quam hominum fuit; ibique etiam apud Cæſarem ſerviſſet, ubi ſolem ac domicilium eruditi colloquii videretur; quo in domo illic & noſter, intimi & familiares, ſervi & liberti literas egregie didiciſſent.* These are the Words of a Jeſuit, who immediately after makes ſome Reflection upon this Paſſage of *Seneca*, *Æſopeos logos intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus*. He pretends, that *Seneca* does not ground what he ſays upon *Phædrus*'s being not a *Roman*, but a *Thracian*; he does ſolidly refute thoſe who have recourſe to ſuch an Explication, and believes either that *Seneca*'s Memory failed him, or that the Succeſſors of *Tiberius* cauſed *Phædrus*'s Book to be immediately ſuppreſt, becauſe their Tyranny was repreſented in it, and ſo *Seneca* knew not that Book. I ſhould not like the laſt Conjecture; for if that Work had been ſuppreſt for that Reaſon, *Seneca* would have more eaſily remembred it. Let's hear the Jeſuit: (a) *Miror vehementer, cur affirmavit Seneca, Æſopios logos eſſe intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus: cum Phædrum hunc haberet, quem opponere poſſet toti Græciæ. Nam quod, clariſſima lumina ſuperioris ſæculi duo, Petrus Pithœus & Juſtus Lipſius prodiderunt, vere id a Seneca dictum; quia Phædrus non genere aut ortu Romanus, ſed Thrax, ſicut ipſe teſtatum reliquit, eſſet: minus ea probabilis videtur expoſitio Senecæ. Quaſi vero Romanis ingeniis opus intentatum, ſit quidquam aliud, quam Latinis literis nondum illuſtratum nec elaboratum opus: aut comœdia fuerit carmen intactum Romanis, quamvis id ſolus natione Afer Terentius tractaſſet: aut ſi percenſeret Seneca, qui philoſophiam ſcriptores Latine explicaſſent; de eo ſe numero eximeret ipſe; propterea quod natione foret Hiſpanus, patria Cordubenſis. At non exemit Quintilianus, qui quo loco de Philoſophis egit Latinis, his illum potiſſimum annumeravit; cum inter oratores, & poëtas, & alios diverſi generis ſcriptores potuiſſet referre. Citius dixerim Senecam vel parum hic attendiſſe, quid ſcriberet: vel iſtud, ut alia, oblitum prorſus, memoriæ vitio peccaſſe.* .... (b) *Illud veriſimilius, iniquiſſimis Tiberii, Caligulæ, Claudii, Neronis temporibus, cum ſcripta edictis abolerentur & ſenatuſconſultis, ſi cui poëtæ aut hiſtorico verbum excidiſſet opportunum delationi & calumniæ; cum ne liberæ quidem relictæ cogitationes; & opinio tacita de principe, ſicunde vel ex vultu argui poſſet, majeſtatis rea fieret: libellum fabularem, cujus in apologis pleriſque mera illius ſæculi tyrannis notaretur, ſuppreſſum fuiſſe continuo, ac evanuiſſe tandem, & ignoratum a Seneca, & reliquæ poſteritatis oculis ſubductum.* We muſt not forget that *Gabriel Faernus* dealt unfairly with the Publick, if we believe *Thuanus* (c). He had a Manuſcript of *Phædrus*, but he took care not to boaſt of it, and not to impart it to the Publick. He was afraid of leſſening the value of the Fables he had made in Latin Verſes, in imitation of *Æſop*, if the World ſhould know that a like Book of *Phædrus*, *Auguſtus*'s Freed-Man, was ſtill extant. We muſt not forget neither Mr. *Perrault*'s Remark upon that Paſſage of *Thuanus*. It is to be found in the Preface of his Tranſlation of *Faernus*'s Fables into *French* Verſes, which was Printed in the Year 1699. “*Faernus* has been called a ſecond *Phædrus*, “by reaſon of the excellent Style of his Fables, “tho' he never ſaw *Phædrus*, who did not come to “our Knowledge, but above thirty Years after his “Death; for *Pithœus* having found that Manuſcript

---

‡ See the ſame Author ib.

† At Amſterdam for Henry Wetſtein.

(e) *Voſſ. de Poet. Lat. p. 38.*

(f) *He ſays it is* [illegible] *fabulis* [illegible] *periculoſum ſemper* [illegible] *Lectum.*

(g) *Mart. Ep. 20. l. 3.*

(h) *Scriverius in Mart. Ep. 20. l. 3. p. m. 88.*

(i) 'Tis the 16th of the 2d Book in the Hamburg Edit. 1673.

(k) And not the 20th of the 3d Book as Menagius ſays in his Meſcolanze, p. 280.

(l) *You may ſee what remains in* Menagius *ib.*

(m) *Avienus mentions it, as* Scriverius *obſerves in the above-cited Words.*

(n) *In the Art. of* Æſop. *See the Words of the Jeſuit* Vavaſſeur *in the next Remark.*

(o) *Franc. Vavaſſor de Ludicra Dictione p. 206, 207.*

(p) *He publiſhed Phædrus at Troyes in Champagne.*

(a) *Id. ib. p. 207.*

(b) *Id. ib. p. 208.*

(c) *Thuan. l. 28. ſub fin. p. m. 578. ad ann. 1561. Du Rier hath not well tranſlated theſe Words of* Thuanus, Si Phædri cujus ſive imitatione ſive æmulatione luſerat, nomen non diſſimulaſſet, *which he renders thus:* s'il n'eût point caché le nom de Phedre ſur lequel il s'étoit joué.

Commentaries of *Conradus Ritterſhuſius*, *Nicolas Rigaltius*, *Nicolas Heinſius*, *John Scheſferus*, and *John Lewis Praſchius*, with an Abſtract of ſome other Commentaries. The Edition † which came out ſince that, by the care and with the Notes of Mr. *Hoogſtraten*, is the fineſt that has been ſeen as yet, both with reſpect to the Character and Figures. 'Tis for the uſe of the young Prince of *Naſſau*, Governor of *Frieſland* and *Groningen*. The *French* Tranſlation, which *Moreri* commends, comes from *Port-Royal*. Tho' it be a good one (*E*) *Tanaquillus Faber* found many faults in it.

PHÆDRUS (*Thomas*) Profeſſor of Eloquence at *Rome*, towards the End of the XV. Century, and in the Beginning of the XVI. was accounted the *Cicero* (*A*) of his Time. He * was Canon of *Lateran*, and Keeper of the *Vatican* Library. He ‡ was beholden for the beginning of his Fortune to the Repreſentation of *Seneca's Hippolytus*, where he acted *Phædra*. Hence it is that he was called *Phædrus*. The cauſe of his (*B*) Death was very ſingular. One Day as he was Riding upon a Mule in the City, he met ſome Wild Oxen which drew a great Cart. His Mule ſtartled and threw him down. He was ſo lucky, that the Cart went over him without hurting him: he found himſelf between the Wheels; but his Fright and his Fall did ſo ſpoil the Maſs of his Blood, that he contracted a Sickneſs, of which he never was cured. Had he lived longer, 'tis likely he would have publiſhed (*C*) ſome Books, which would perhaps confirm what was ſaid of him, that his Tongue ‡ was better than his Pen. *Parrhaſius* his Collegue, who was very much * beholden to him, regretted mightily the loſs of that Friend. I don't know whether *Phædrus* made the Sermon (*D*) which *Eraſmus* criticized with great Reaſon. *Voſſius* thought

† At Amſterdam for Francis Halma 1701. in 4.

* Parrhaſ. de quæſitis per epiſt. p. 34.

‡ See the Rem. A.

‡ See the Rem. A.

* See the Rem. B. of the Art. Parrhaſius

" in the Duſt of an old Library, publiſhed it in the " beginning of this Century. *Thuanus*, who makes " a very honourable mention of our Author in his " Hiſtory, pretends, that *Phædrus* was not unknown " to him, and even blames him for having ſuppreſt " that Author, to conceal what he had ſtoll'n from " him: but there is no ground for what he ſays, " and it is only the effect of the ſtrong Perſuaſion of " all thoſe who are ſo great Admirers of Antiquity, " as to think that a Modern Author can do nothing " that is excellent, unleſs he has an Ancient Author " for his Model. Out of the hundred Fables which " *Faernus* publiſhed in Latin Verſes, there are but " five that have been handled by *Phædrus*, and " out of thoſe five there is but one or two that " have been handled in the ſame manner: which " happened only, becauſe it is impoſſible that two " Men, who treat the ſame Subject, ſhould not jump " ſometimes in the ſame Thoughts, or in the ſame " Expreſſions.„ The latter part of this Paſſage is as full a Vindication of *Faernus* as he could have wiſhed.

(*E*) Tanaquillus Faber *found many faults in it.*] He publiſhed very good Notes upon *Phædrus*, in the Year 1657, and he was already very famous for his Learning; yet the Learned *Scheſferus* had not heard of him in the Year 1660. He knew then the Name of that Author, and the worth of his *Phædrus*, by a Letter (*d*) which he received from *Gronovius*. *Mihi ſane*, ſays he (*e*), *adeo ad Diem illum Faber fuit ignoratus, ut illius nihil ante, ac ne notas quidem in ſcriptorem noſtrum niſi ſero, ut prædixi, viderim vel legerim.* This I obſerve, that one may ſee that the moſt Learned Men are ſometimes unknown to one another, tho' they flouriſh at the ſame time.

(*A*) *Was accounted the* Cicero *of his Time.*] I ſhall quote *Eraſmus*, who tells us ſome curious things about that *Phædrus*. (*f*) *Romæ . . . . . cognovi & amavi* (*g*) Petrum Phædrum, *linguâ veriùs quàm calamo celebrem: mira erat in dicendo tum copia, tum autoritas. Magna felicitatis pars eſt* Romæ *innotuiſſe: ille primùm innotuit ex* Senecæ Tragœdia, *cui titulus* Hippolytus, *in qua repræſentavit perſonam* Phædræ, *in area, quæ eſt ante Palatium Cardinalis* Raphaelis Georgiani. *Sic ex ipſo Cardinale didici, unde &* Phædro *cognomen additum. Is obiit minor annis, ni fallor, quinquaginta, dictus ſui ſeculi* Cicero. *Pierius Valerianus* commends our *Phædrus* for his Eloquence: (*h*) *Neque diu felix fuit Thomas Phædrus affluentiſſimum eloquentiæ flumen, quo non alius eo tempore orando clarior, neque vehementior fuit, Romanæ ipſe quoque cathedræ decus, & ornamentum.* To which you may add what I have quoted out of *Parrhaſius* in the Remark *C*, and the Teſtimony of *Petrus Bembus*: he was a good Judge of Eloquence; he praiſes very much our *Thomas* for it, in the 3d Letter of the 4th Book, dated at *Venice* the 13th of *January* 1505. out of which I ſhall obſerve this Particularity. Some Body writ to him, that *Phædrus* grew big: All the better, ſaid he, for then we may treat him after the manner of the Ancient Hero's, *illum certe poſſumus heroum more ἥρως μέγας* dicere.

(*d*) Scheſfer. præf. in 2. Edit. Phædri.

(*e*) Id. ib.

(*f*) Eraſm. Ep. 5. l. 23. p. 1210.

(*g*) Parrhaſius & Pierius Valerianus call him Thomas.

(*h*) Pierius Valerian. de litter. infelicit. l. 1. p. 25.

(*B*) *The cauſe of his Death was very ſingular.*] This is very well expreſt by *Pierius Valerianus*. (*i*) *Quàm verò miſerabiliter, quàmque inopino mortis genere ſurreptus interiit, dum ſcilicet mula media urbe vehitur junctis factus obviam bubalis, qui viſendæ magnitudinis carrucam trahebant: Conſternata ſiquidem mula, bubaliſque identidem perterrefactis ſimul ab ea calcitroſa excuſſus eſt tam magnæ corporaturæ vir, quantum hominem noſtis, ſimul à plauſtro ſuperatus, quamvis in rotarum medium intervallum incidens eliſionem evitarit, corrupto tamen præ timore, & gravi caſu intra viſcera ſanguine, multa inde longa, & occulta valetudinis incommoda perpeſſus, in ejuſmodi ærumna vita functus eſt.*

(*C*) *'Tis likely he would have publiſhed ſome Books.*] The Reader will be glad to know the Titles of them, which *Parrhaſius* has preſerved, and therefore I ſhall tranſcribe the following Words. It is a great Encomium beſtowed upon *Phædrus*; but we muſt remember, that the Author of it is an Orator, who had received many benefits from him. (*a*) *Quis eſt in hoc orbis terrarum domicilio, (cujus antiquum ſcenæ decus inſtauravit) quis in hac excultiſſima academia, (quæ Phædro rhetore cælum vertice contingebat) quis adeo barbarus à Muſis abeſt & Gratiis, qui ad extincti Phædri nomen ubertim non fleat? O deteſtandam fati importunitatem. Silet, heu, T. Phædre, vox illa tua jucundè ſonora: illa argutæ linguæ ſuadela, quæ mentes hominum in omnes affectus impellebat, quæ Romanam facundiam à Goticis uſque temporibus amiſſam reſtituit. Ubi nunc eſt ille geſtus cum ſententiis congruens? Ubi illa incorrupti Latini ſermonis integritas? Quis ultimam manum tot inchoatis operibus imponet? Quæ (non ſecus ac Apellis illa decantatiſſima Venus) interrupta pendent: luculentiſſima ſcilicet orationes, Apologia Ciceronis in obtrectatores, quam mihi paucis ante diebus quam expiſſet æſtuare, domi ſuæ per ſummam voluptatem legit: Annalium breviarium, quo res omnes à populo Romano geſtas complexus eſt: in Horatii poeticam vigilantiſſima commentaria: in Plauti comœdias ſcrupuloſiſſimæ quæſtiones.* If we knew the Date of that Oration, we might know the Year of *Phædrus*'s Death. Note, That *Volaterranus*, having ſhewed the *Series* of Ancient Wars, expreſſes himſelf thus: (*b*) *Bellorum igitur hujuſmodi excurſum T. Phædri noſtri ex magna parte diligentia collectum, non ab re fuerit ſimul ordine repetiiſſe.*

(*D*) *The Sermon which* Eraſmus (*c*) *criticized with great Reaſon.*] That Sermon was preached before Pope *Julius* II. upon a *Good-Friday*. *Eraſmus* heard it, and was not pleaſed with it; the Preacher made it his only buſineſs to appear *Ciceronian*. *Eraſmus* (*d*) does not Name him, but one may believe that he denotes one of the Profeſſors of Eloquence, of whom he had ſaid: (*e*) *Florebant id temporis Romæ præter cæteros dicendi laude Petrus Phædrus & Camillus hoc ætate minor, ſed eloquendi viribus major, niſi quod ille jam hujus laudis arcem occuparat.*

(*i*) Id. ib.

(*a*) Jani Parrhaſii in orat. ante prælectionem epiſt. Cicer. ad Attic. p. 145, 146.

(*b*) Volaterr. comm. urban. lib. 38. p. m. 1459.

(*c*) See his Ciceronianus p. m. 39. & ſeq.

(*d*) Nomen Oratoris non edam ne cui videar hominis probi & eruditi famam arrodere voluiſſe. *Eraſm. in Ciceroniano p. 39.*

(*e*) Id. ibid. p. 38.

(*E*) Voſſius

thought that our *Roman* Professor was the Author of the Antiquities (*E*) of *Hetruria*, which were published under the Name of *Prosper*.

PHERON, King of *Egypt*, and Successor of *Sesostris*, undertook no War, and became Blind, as a punishment of the Boldness he had to throw a Dart upon the Waters of the *Nile*. They were upwards of 18 Cubits high above the Fields, and very much tossed by the Wind. When the King saw this, he threw a Dart, and lost his Sight immediately. He was ten Years in that condition, and then he was told by an Oracle, that the time of his Misfortune was almost ended, and that he should recover his Sight, if he washed his Eyes with the Urine of a Woman that never lay with any Man but her Husband. He began to make use of his Wife's Urine, but he got no benefit by it. Afterwards he used the Water of other Women, and at last he recovered his Sight. He caused all the Women, whose Water had not been beneficial to him, to be carried into a certain Town, and to be all burnt together with the Town, and then he married the Woman to whom he was beholden for the Recovery of his Sight, and consecrated in the Temples several Monuments of his Thankfulness towards the Gods, namely (*A*) two Obelisks, a hundred Cubits high, and eight Cubits broad, in the Temple of the *Sun*. A Man of *Memphis*, whom the *Greeks* called *Proteus*, reigned after him ‡. This Article being to be found in *Moreri*'s Dictionary, I was resolved to pass it by; but I changed my Mind, having observed that some have taken the liberty to falsifie that Fact. As I designed to censure that Licence, it was requisite that I should set before the Eyes of the Reader, a faithful Exposition of that old Story, that he may compare it (*B*) with the false Copy of some Modern Writers.

‡ *Taken from Herodotus l.* 2. *c.* 111, 112. *p. m.* 129, 130. *See also Diod. Sicul. l.* 1. *c.* 59.

PHILETAS.

(*E*) Vossius *thought that* Phædrus *was the Author of the Antiquities of* Hetruria.] Here are his Words: (*f*) *Fuere qui fatum crederent Guilielmi Postelli. Sed verus auctor est Thomas Phedrus qui vixit anno* CIↃ CCCC XC. A great deal of wrong has been done to *Vossius*, in the Treatise of *Placcius de scriptis anonymis*; for next to the Words, which I have just now set down, and those that go before, we read these following Words. (*g*) *Cujus Thomæ ulteriorem nullam nec apud ipsum, nec apud Gesnerum, aliosve illius generis auctores invenio mentionem. Verum enim vero non opus est ut de eo multum hic solliciti simus, cum non illum, sed ipsum* CURTIUM INGHIRAMIUM, *qui fragmenta illa primus ac si Scornelli prope Vulterram ea sub terra invenisset, Florentiæ publicavit, parentem hujusce supposititii figmenti fuisse prolixè docuerit* Leo Allatius *in suis ad dictas antiquitates annotationibus, Parisiis* 1640. *& biennio post Romæ iterum excusis.* This whole Passage is printed in *Italick* Letters, as well as the Words that are cited out of *Vossius*, and there is nothing whereby one may distinguish the first part of the Passage from the last; so that any Reader may very well fancy that *Vossius* is the Author of all those Words, and consequently that he knew not what *Parrhasius*, *Erasmus* and *Pierius Valerianus* said of him. But the worst of all is, that one may think he did so far blunder as to say in the same Page, that *Thomas Phedrus* is the true Author of a Book which *Curtius Inghiramius* composed. To conclude, the wrong Orthography of *Vossius* has been the occasion of *Konig*'s (*h*) multiplying an Author into two: he gives us *Thomas Fædrus* as a different Author from *Thomas Phædrus*, and refers us to *Hallervord*.

(*f*) *Voss. de Hist. Lat. l.* 1. *c.* 9. *in fine, p.* 41.

(*g*) *Placcius, de scriptis anonymis, in Appendice p.* 30.

(*h*) *See his Biblioth. vetus & nova p.* 310, *&* 628.

(*A*) *Namely, two Obelisks in the Temple of the Sun.*] Sir *John Marsham* (*i*) thinks they are both at *Rome*, and that one of them is that which *Sixtus* V. caused to be set up before St. *Peter*'s Church. He thinks also that *Caligula* caused one of those Obelisks to be carried to *Rome*. He relies upon some Passages of *Pliny*, which do not signifie such a thing. Here are the Words of *Pliny*, according to Father *Hardouin*'s Edition, wherein the wrong Reading, which Sir *John Marsham* followed, has been corrected. (*k*) *Tertius* (obeliscus) *Romæ in Vaticano Caii & Neronis principum Circo, ex omnibus unus omnino fractus est imitatione ejus, quem fecerat Sesostridis filius Nuncoreus. Ejusdem remanet & alius centum cubitorum, quem post cæcitatem visu reddito, ex oraculo Soli sacravit.* See how Sir *John Marsham* quotes that Passage. (*l*) *Plinio appellatur* Nuncoreus Sesostridis filius *ille, qui Obeliscum* centum cubitorum post cæcitatem (visu reddito ex oraculo) Soli sacravit. Ejusdem remanet & alius Romæ (in Vaticano Caii & Neronis principum Circo) ex omnibus unus omnino fractus est in molitione. And observe that *Pliny* (*m*) does not say that the Obelisk which was brought to *Rome* under the Empire of *Caligula*, was one of the two Obelisks of the Son of *Sesostris*.

(*i*) *Marsham. Chron. Can. sectio* 15. *p. m.* 413, 414.

(*k*) *Plin. l.* 36. *c.* 11. *p. m.* 299.

(*l*) *Marsh. ub. sup.*

(*m*) *Plin. l.* 36. *c.* 9. *p.* 296, 297.

(*B*) *That he may compare it with the false Copy of some Modern Writers.*] I have nothing to say against Mr. *Chevreau*, for he has not falsified (*n*) the Narration of *Herodotus*. 'Tis true, that he adds a Circumstance to it, *viz*. That the Woman who restored *Pheron*'s Sight was a Gardener's Wife, but that Addition is of no consequence: besides, an Ancient Historian (*o*) whom he does not quote, says that she was a Gardener's Wife. I don't blame the Reflection which follows that History in the *Chevræana*. Any Author, who relates what he has read, may add some Moral Reflections to it: he must only take care that the Reader be not at a loss to know whether those Reflections are his, or whether they are ascribed to the Author that has been quoted. Mr. *Chevreau* does not keep us in suspence; we easily apprehend that these following Words are his, and not *Herodotus*'s: " (*p*) If there was a *Pheron* at " this Day, if the Remedy which cured him was " in use, and the same Punishment renewed, many " Women would not be afraid of starving with " Cold. „ This is a Gloss which suits the Text; for there is no doubt that this is a meer Story or Satyrical Invention against Women. I need not tell my Readers, 1. That there has been no Oracle that foretold, that a King having been Blind for the space of ten Years, should recover his Sight soon after. 2. That it is not true that the Urine of a Chast Woman did ever restore any one's Sight. Christians are persuaded that this whole Relation of *Herodotus* is a meer Fable, and a Story forged in the times of Ignorance, for the same end as the Apologues, or the Fictions of *Æsop*, I mean, to inspire Men with the fear of the Gods, and to censure Vice. They were sometimes attended with Railleries and sorry Jests against Women. This was not forgotten in the Story of *Pheron*; but some Modern Authors finding it too plain, and too carelessly drest, have been at the Charges of adorning it. It is to be found in the *Saint-Evremoniana* drest in this manner: " (*q*) That a King called *Pheron* having lost " his Sight, and asking the Oracle how he should " recover it, was ordered to use the Urine of a " Woman faithful to her Husband; that his own " Wife, and all the other Wives of his Kingdom " wanting that Virtue, he was obliged to dispatch " some Ambassadors to look for one in the Neighbouring Kingdoms; that after a long Search, " there was one found by chance who cured him; " that he caused his Wife to be burnt first, and " then married the Woman who had restored his " Sight; that she proved not so Chast afterwards, " and the King having ask'd her, why she had been " faithful to her first Husband, she ingenuously answered him, that *she was never asked before*. „ Let *Boccacio* and *Douville* make a Story as pleasant as ever they can, no Body can find fault with them for it. The Ground they work upon is altogether their own, and consequently they may flourish it as they please; but when an Author relates a Story which is to be found in the best ancient Writers that are extant, he is not allowed to adorn it with a new Dress, by adding to it some Circumstances

(*n*) *See the* 2. *part of the* Chevræana *p.* 395. *of the Dutch Edit.*

(*o*) *Diodor. Sicul. l.* 1. *c.* 59.

(*p*) *Chevræana ib. p.* 395.

(*q*) *Saint Evremoniana p.* 132, 133. *of the Dutch Edit.*

PHILETAS, a Grammarian, a Critick and a Poet, was born in the Isle of *Cos*, and lived in the time of *Alexander the Great*, and of *Ptolemy* I. of that Name, King of *Egypt*, who made him Preceptor of his Son *Ptolemy* * *Philadelphus*. He published several pieces of Poetry, whereof we have only some Fragments in *Athenæus*, and in some other (*A*) Ancient Authors who quoted him. He did so well succeed in Elegies, that many Authors gave him the second Rank in that sort of Poetry. It is not certain that *Propertius*, a good Judge of such things, was contented to give (*B*) him the second Rank. If we consider that Elegies were chiefly made use of on sorrowful Occasions, and about the Disgraces of Lovers, it cannot be denied that *Philetas* had a particular Talent to keep up by his Mien, and by his Out-side the Character of the Poems wherein he excell'd, and to prevent the want of Occasions which makes the Muses faint and languid. He was so little and so thin, that he was obliged to put some Lead (*C*) in his Shoes, lest the Wind should carry him away. He was not therefore liable to the Reproaches which Lent-Preachers are so often exposed to, when with a fresh and red Complexion they bewail the Corruption of the World, and the contempt of the Laws of Mortification. It would become them better, if they were as Lean as our *Philetas*. Besides, one may easily apprehend, that he had very often Reason to Sigh for the Cruelty of his ‡ *Battis*; for such an Air as his was, and a Body so wasted and so lean, that the least Wind could throw him down, was no very great Charm in point of Love. Perhaps this was the Reason of his great skill in Elegies. 'Tis very likely that he was seldom fortunate in his Amorous Attempts, and that he suffered continual Repulses. However, the Hectick and wasting Condition he was in, of which he died at last, was not ascribed in his Epitaph (*D*) to his good or ill luck in point of Love, but to his intent Studies: which would be much more advantageous to his Memory than it is, if he had spent his Time in things of great Moment; but the poor Man wore out his Strength and his Health † in running after the captious and intangled Sophisms of the Logicians, particularly after that which was called *Mentiens*, which was a meer (*E*) Childish Subtilty. 'Tis thought that

stances lately invented. Yet this has been done in the *Saint-Evremoniana*. We are told that Mr. *de St. Evremont* (*b*) is not the Author of that Book, and he disowns it from the beginning to the end. Yet there are very good things in that Work, and they seem to have been exprest upon his Model; but whoever is the Author of it, Mr. *de Vigneul Marville* would freely give him this Advice: " (*c*) The " more Particularities, like those that are to be " found in *Brantome*, a Writer publishes, the more " he raises himself above common Writers, and " makes himself useful to the Publick. Those who " publish them, must only take care that they be " true and well grounded: *FOR* a Writer is not " allowed to invent Chimera's to adorn his History. ,,

I shall observe by the by, that this is not the first time that Authors and Booksellers have published some Works under the Name of Mr. *de St. Evremont*. That Trick begins to be worn out, and one cannot think of it without comparing that Illustrious Author with that Man to whom seven Women should say, (*d*) *We will eat our own Bread, and wear out our own Apparel, only let us be called by thy Name to take away our Reproach.*

(*A*) *Ancient Authors who quoted him.*] *Parthenius* (*e*) borrows from him the second of his Amorous Adventures. *Stephanus Byzantinus* quotes him in the Words ἴγναι & χαλιός. He is quoted three or four times in the Great *Etymologicum*. *Stobæus* mentions something of his *Pægnia* in the Discourse, which contains the Subjects of Consolation παραμυθητικά. I suppose that *Philetas* quoted by them is that of *Cos*; for it does not appear that *Philetas* of *Ephesus*, mentioned only by *Suidas*, wrote any Book. I will not say, as many do, that *Claudian* mentions *Philetas* in this Verse, *Fors juvat audentes, Coi sententia vatis*; for it is not (*f*) certain whether we ought to read *Coi* rather than *Cei*, or *Chii*, or *Prisci*.

(*B*) *Gave him the second Rank . . . . . . It is not certain that* Propertius *. . . . . was contented to give him the second Rank.*] I refer it to the Judgment of any one who considers these three Passages of *Propertius*:

Tu (*g*) *satius memorem musis imitere Philetam,*
Et non inflati somnia Callimachi.
Inter (*h*) *Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos,*
Et cecinisse modis Coe poëta tuis.
Callimachi (*i*) *manes & Coi sacra Philetæ*
In vestrum quæso me sinite ire nemus.

I don't desire that these Passages should be understood in the Sense which *Joseph Scaliger* put upon them; for I think he is mistaken when he says that *Propertius* advises not to imitate the swoln *Callimachus*, and when instead of *Coe poëta tuis*, he reads *pure poëta tuis*, to conclude from thence that *Propertius* looks upon *Philetas* as a Poet whose Verses are the sweetest. I desire no such thing; I am sure that without such a help one may perceive that, all things duly considered, *Propertius* does not place *Philetas* beneath *Callimachus*. I don't know why *Ælian* (*k*) reckons *Philetas* amongst the Heroick Poets, nor why *Lorenzo* (*l*) *Crasso* makes *Callimachus* say, that *Philetas* obtains the second Rank in point of Elegy. He should have quoted *Quintilian*; *Elegiæ princeps habetur Callimachus*, says he Chap. 1. of the 10th Book of his Institutions, *secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupavit*. See also *Proclus* in the Abstracts of his *Chrestomathia* to be found in *Photius* (*m*).

(*C*) *Some Lead in his Shoes.*] He tied some Leaden Balls to his Feet, if we believe *Athenæus* (*n*), or soled his Shoes with Lead, if we believe the Authors transcribed by *Ælian*, (*o*) tho' he looks upon it as a meer Story. The Reason of his not believing it, is, that a Man who was not strong enough to resist the Wind, could by no means wear so heavy Shoes.

(*D*) *In his Epitaph.*] *Athenæus* has preserved that particular Fact. *You run the hazard*, says he (*p*), (speaking to a Curious Man, who never touched any Meat, without inquiring how long since it had the Name it went by) *of wearing out your Life by such Inquiries, as* Philetas *wore out his in examining a Sophism; for that Study did so waste his Body, that he died of it. As it appears from this Inscription of his Sepulchre*, &c. *Muretus*, in his Notes upon the first Elegy of the 3d Book of *Propertius*, stretches out the Testimony of *Athenæus* a little more than he should have done; for he makes that Author say, that *Philetas* lost his Sight with much Studying, and because he was vexed that he was not able to find out the Solution of a Sophism. *Athenæus* says nothing of that Vexation. If *Muretus* had said so out of Conjecture, I should not blame him for it; but one must always scruple to impute to any Body what they have not said. The Reader does not desire to confound our Paraphrases, and our Glosses and Conjectures, with the Text of the Ancient Authors quoted by us (*z*).

(*E*) *A meer Childish Subtilty.*] The Sophism which the *Greeks* called ψευδόμενον, is called *Men*-

* Suidas. See also Athen. l. 9. p. 401.

† Nec curtum Coo Callis imitata ... Ovid.

‡ Athen. l. ..., Suidas.

(*b*) See the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres. *Febr.* 1701. *p.* 145.

(*c*) *Vigneul Marville*, Memoires d'Histoire & de litterature, *tom.* 2. *p.* 150. *of the* Dutch *Edit.*

(*d*) *Isaiah cap.* 4. *v.* 1.

(*e*) Parthenius *is quoted wrong in* Moreri's *Dictionary in the Art. of* Philetas. *Instead of* in Erat. *read* in Erot. *that is* in Eroticis.

(*f*) *See Barthius in Claud. Epist. ad Probin. p.* 957.

(*g*) *Propert. l.* 2. *Eleg.* 34.

(*h*) *Id. l.* 3. *El.* 8.

(*i*) *Id. l.* 3. *El.* 1. *There is another passage El.* 6. *l.* 4. *where he hints at these two Poets, and first at* Philetas. Statius Silv. 2. l. 1. *names* Philetas *before* Callimachus.

(*k*) *Ælian. var. hist. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

(*l*) *Istor. de Poet. Græc. p.* 231.

(*m*) *Phot. c.* 239.

(*n*) *Athen. l.* 12. *c.* 12. *p.* 552.

(*o*) *Ælian. var. hist. l.* 9. *c.* 14. *See also l.* 10. *c.* 6.

(*p*) Κινδυνεύεις ἄν ποτε διὰ ταύτας τὰς φροντίδας ὥσπερ ὁ Κῷος Φιλητᾶς ζητῶν τὸν καλούμενον ψευδολόγον τῶν λόγων, ὁμοίως ἐκείνῳ διαλυθῆναι· ἰσχνὸς γὰρ πάνυ τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὰς ζητήσεις γενόμενος ἀπέθανεν, ὡς τὸ πρὸ τοῦ μνημείου αὐτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα δηλοῖ, Ξεῖνε, Φιλητᾶς εἰμί, λόγων ὁ ψευδόμενός με Ὤλεσε, καὶ νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἑσπέριοι. Est itaque periculum ne ob has curas aliquando ut Philetas Cous pervestigans rationem mentientem dictam exolutus pereas: Nam corpore ob id studium valde attenuato is obiit, quod insculptum ejus monumento declarat hoc epigramma, Hospes Philetas sum mendax & captiosa ratio Me perdidit, vespertinæque ac nocturnæ studiorum curæ. *Athen. l.* 9. *p.* 401.

(*z*) *See the Rem. B. of the Article* Pheron.

that he intitled one of his Poems *Telephus*, because it was his Father's Name. The Scholiast α upon *Apollonius* mentions it under that Title; but, according to *Vossius pag.* 401. of his *Greek* Historians, that Scholiast speaks of a Poem intitled *Templum*.

P H I L Y R A, Daughter of *Oceanus*, was so sensible of the Declaration of Love which *Saturn* made her, that she granted him the last Favours. *Rhea*, *Saturn's* Wife, knew nothing of it for some time; but at last suspecting something, she had a watchful Eye over those two Lovers, and surprised them in the Fact. *Saturn* put on (*A*) the Shape of a Horse to disguise himself; but *Philyra* was so confounded that she (*B*) left the Country, and wandred thro' the Mountains of the *Pelasgi*, where she was delivered of the Centaur *Chiron* β. She was so afflicted at the Birth of such a Child, made up of the Nature of a Horse, and of a Man, that she besought the Gods (*C*) to change her into something else. They heard her Prayers, and transformed her into γ a Tree.

P H I L I S T U S, a *Greek* Historian, born at *Syracusa*, had a great share in the Friendship of *Dionysius* the Tyrant, and λ did very much help him to establish his Power. He obtained of him the Government of the Citadel of *Syracusa*. Nay, 'tis thought that he lay with the Mother of that Tyrant, not without her Son's knowledge. He lost his Favour after he had married, without acquainting that Prince with it, the Daughter of *Leptines* μ his Brother, and being Banished, he pitched upon the Town of *Adria* for his Retirement. He was recalled after the Death of that Tyrant: those who persuaded young *Dionysius* to send for him, were contrary to *Dion* *, and feared that *Plato* would change the Mind of the Tyrant, and thought that none could be fitter than *Philistus* to cross that Philosopher. They were not mistaken; for as soon as *Philistus* was restored, he made it his business to oppose *Plato*, and moved the Tyrant to expel *Dion* ⸸. The latter found himself quickly in a capacity of making War against *Dionysius*, and besieged him in the Fortress of *Syracusa*, and beat the Fleet which *Philistus* brought to the assistance of the Besieged, † the first Year of the 107th Olympiad ‡. Some say that *Philistus* having (*A*) lost the Battle, killed himself; others say, that he fell into the Hands of his

α *In Lib.* 4. *ap. Andr. Schottum in Procli Chrestom.*

β *Taken from Apollonius Argon. l.* 2. *v.* 1235. *& seq.*

γ *Viz. A Lime-tree. See the Rem. C.*

λ *Plut. in Dion. p.* 962.

μ *That is to say Brother of* Dionysius.

* *He was Brother of the second Wife of old* Dionysius.

⸸ *Taken from Plut. ub. sup. p.* 962, 963.

† *Id. ib. p.* 970, 973.

‡ *Diod. Sicul. l.* 16. *c.* 16.

---

tiens by *Cicero* in the 2d Book *de Divinatione*. It is one of the most renowned Sophisms that *Eubulides* (*a*), Successor of *Euclid*, produced. It consisted in certain Terms which seem to destroy one another, or as *Africanus* the *Civilian* says (*b*), it is a way of Reasoning *qua quicquid verum esse constitueris, falsum esse reperietur*. Here is an Example of it (*c*): *If you say that you Lye, and if by saying so you speak Truth, you Lye: But you say that you Lye, and herein you speak the Truth; Therefore you Lye when you speak Truth.* It is a Syllogism whereby you prove that a Man does not speak Truth, for that very Reason that he speaks it. One may make the same Sophism by supposing that a Man who Perjures himself, Swears that he Perjures himself; for at one and the same time he Swears Truth, and consequently he does not Perjure himself; and he Swears a Falsity, and consequently he Perjures himself. They drew the same contradictory Consequences from what was said by *Epimenides*, *a Cretian* Poet, that all *Cretians* were Lyars. The Stoicks fell headlong into those false Subtilties of the Sect of *Megara*. Our Modern Logicians use sometimes the Propositions which they call *seipsas falsificantes*; such as this is, *semper mentior*, I Lie always. A little Judgment is sufficient to know the illusion of that sort of Sophisms; yet *Aristotle* (*d*) declares very seriously, that the Sophism called *Mentiens* is a very perplexing one. I am not so well pleased to hear him say so, as to see *Seneca* (*e*) laugh at the great number of Books that were made upon that Sophism. *Quid me detines in eo quem tu ipse pseudomenon appellas, de quo tantum* (*f*) *librorum compositum est? ecce tota mihi vita mentitur, hanc coargue, hanc ad verum, si acutus es, dirige.* See the Rem. *D.* of the Art. *Euclid.*

(*A*) Saturn ...... *put on the Shape of a Horse.*] *Virgil* adds, that he run away as fast as ever he could, and that Mount *Pelion* (*g*) rung all over with his Neighing:

> *Talis* (*h*) *& ipse jubam cervice effundit equina*
> *Conjugis adventu pernix Saturnus, & altum*
> *Peliona hinnitu fugiens implevit acuto.*

This is not unlikely, for a Husband surprised by his Wife in the Fact, is exposed to such a shower of hard Words, and to such Scoldings, that the best thing he can do is to run away. Some say that *Saturn* (*i*) put on the Shape of a Horse to enjoy *Philyra*. The Presence of his Wife was not therefore the Reason of it. Perhaps he used that Trick out of Precaution: he was afraid of the Vigilance of *Rhea*, and so he was resolved before-hand to deceive her.

(*B*) Philyra *was so confounded that she left the Country.*] Authors don't agree about the Scene of this Act. Some place it (*k*) in *Thrace*, others in (*l*) *Thessaly*, others in an Island of the *Euxine Sea*. *Apollonius* (*m*) follows the last Opinion; he says *Philyra* run away as far as *Thessaly*, from whence you may judge how much asham'd she was.

> Ἠ' (*n*) δ' αἰδοῖ χῶρόν τε καὶ ἤθεα κεῖνα λιποῦσα
> Ὠκεανὶς Φιλύρη, εἰς οὔρεα μακρὰ Πελασγῶν
> Ἦλθ'.
> *Sed loco & sedibus illis relictis pudore*
> *Philyra Oceani filia in celsos Pelasgorum montes*
> *Migravit.*

Some pretend that *Saturn* (*o*) changed her into a Mare, to save her the shame of her Fault. Note, that he was then in prosperity: he enjoyed (*p*) his Kingdom, his Son *Jupiter* was still a Nursing; but some will have it that even after he was Dethroned, and after he retired into *Italy*, he plunged himself into the same Debauchery:

> *Advena* (*q*) *quos profugus gignens, & equina libido*
> *Intulit Italiæ: Tuscis namque ille puellis*
> *Primus adhinnivit simulato numine mœchus.*
> *Mox patre deterior silvosi habitator Olympi*
> *Juppiter, incesta spurcavit labe Lacænas.*

Which is likely enough; for as I have observed in another place, the Banishment of Lewd Kings is not a remedy for Love. That Passage of *Prudentius* does not agree with these following Verses:

> *Credo* (*ſ*) *pudicitiam Saturno Rege moratam*
> *In terris visamque diu: cum frigida parvas*
> *Præberet spelunca domos, ignemque laremque*
> *Et pecus & dominos communi clauderet umbra.*

(*C*) *She besought the Gods to change her into something else.*] *Hyginus* pretends that she addrest herself to *Jupiter*: but because *Apollonius* observes that *Chiron* was born during the Infancy of *Jupiter*, 'tis better to say that *Philyra* had not recourse to him; for it is not at all likely that she staid till he became Master of Heaven, after he had expelled *Saturn* from it. (*t*) *Philyra postquam inusitatam speciem se peperisse vidit, petit ab Jove ut se in aliam speciem commutaret, qua in arborem Philyram hoc est tiliam commutata est.*

(*A*) *That* Philistus *killed himself, others say that his Enemies caused him to be cruelly put to Death.*] The best thing I can do is to set down the Account which *Plutarch* gives of it: "(*a*) Those who took "*Philistus* Prisoner, used him in a most barbarous "and cruel manner. *Ephorus* relates, that when he "saw that his Ship was taken, he slew himself. But "*Timonides*, who from the Beginning of the War "was with *Dion* in all the considerable Actions, "writing to *Speusippus* the Philosopher, relates the "Story, That *Philistus's* Galley running a-ground, "he was taken Prisoner alive, and first dis-armed, "then

(*a*) *Diog. Laert. l.* 2.

(*b*) *L. qui quadring.* 88. *ad leg. Falc.*

(*c*) *See Cicero Academ.* 4.

(*d*) *Ethic. Nicom. l.* 7. *c.* 3.

(*e*) *Seneca, Ep.* 45.

(*f*) *Chrysippus wrote* 11. *Books on that Subject.* Diog. Laert. in ejus vita.

(*g*) *A Mountain* in Thessaly.

(*h*) *Virg. Georg. l.* 3. *v.* 92.

(*i*) *Pherecydes ap. Scholiast. Apollonii in l.* 2. *v.* 1237.

(*k*) *Hygin. c.* 138.

(*l*) *Philargyrius in Virgil. Georg. l.* 3. *v.* 93.

(*m*) *Apollon. l.* 2. *v.* 1236.

(*n*) *Id. ib. v.* 1242.

(*o*) Adventante uxore se in equum, illam in equam convertit, atque ita uterque effugerunt. *Philargyr. ub. sup.*

(*p*) *Apollon. ib. v.* 1237.

(*q*) *Prudent. in Symmach. l.* 1. *v.* 56.

(*ſ*) *Juven. Sat.* 6. *init.*

(*t*) *Hygin. c.* 138.

(*a*) *Plut. in Dion. p.* 973.

his Enemies, who caused him to be cruelly put to Death. He was a Man of Merit, if we consider only his Wit, his Learning, and his Writings, and even ‡ his Bravery: but his Moral Qualities are not to be praised, since he made use of his Talents to hide † under some fair pretences the Unjustice of Tyranny. There would be some Generosity in his Conduct, if it (B) had not been mixed with Self-Love. Of all the Books he wrote (C), his History of (D) Sicily was most esteemed. He imitated the

‡ See the Rem. A.

† See the Rem. B.

"then stripped and exposed stark naked, that an "old Man, to all sorts of Scorn and Contumely; "afterwards they cut off his Head, and gave the "Rabble his Body, who dragg'd it along the *Acradina*, and then threw it into a Common-shore. *Timeus* upbraiding him, adds further, that the Boys "tied him by his lame Leg, and so drew him thro' "the Streets of the City, while the *Syracusians* insulted over his Carcass, to see him tied by the "Leg, who said, It would not become *Dionysius* to "be beholden to the swiftness of his Horse to fly "from his Throne, but rather to be dragged from "thence by the Heels; tho' *Philistus* relates, that "this was said to *Dionysius* by another (b), and "not by himself." *Diodorus Siculus* (c) is one of those who relate, that *Philistus* killed himself for fear of falling into the Hands of the Enemies, and to avoid the Torments and the Ignominy they would have exposed him to. *Note*, That the Fight was obstinate, (d) and that *Philistus* had the advantage in the beginning, by reason of his great Bravery: but at last he was surrounded with many Ships of the Enemies, who used their utmost endeavours to take him. The same Historian (e) relates, that his dead Body was most ignominiously used, and left unburied. He observes, 1. That *Philistus* did very great Services to the two *Dionysius*'s, and with a much greater Fidelity than all the rest of their Friends. 2. That the Tyrant finding no Body that was worthy to fill up the Place vacant by the Death of *Philistus*, the most valiant of his Friends, began to despond, and offered one half of his Kingdom, and then his whole Crown to *Dion*. 3. That *Philistus* (f) shewed a great Courage in a Land-Expedition, and that young *Dionysius* gave him the Command of all his Forces, as soon as he heard that the *Syracusians* had promoted *Heraclides*, a great Friend of *Dion*, to the same Employment.

(B) *Some Generosity in his Conduct, if it had not been mixed with Self-Love.*] *Dionysius* the Tyrant loved, and bestowed several Benefits upon him, and afterwards banished him. It is a common thing for an Historian to follow the Resentment of a present Injury, rather than the Remembrance of past Favours; I mean, that if he writes his History during the Banishment which his Patron and Benefactor condemned him to, he blames him more than he praises him. *Philistus* did quite otherwise; he wrote a History during his Disgrace, and said nothing in it whereby it appeared that he hated *Dionysius*; on the contrary, he had a great regard for him, and excused and praised him. One would have thought that he wrote at *Syracusa*, being in that Prince's Favour, and enjoying the noble Employments he had obtained of him. If the good Offices which Princes receive from the Pen of an Historian, to the prejudice of Truth, were sometimes to be commended, none should better deserve it, than those that are done by an Historian to a Prince who has banished him. It is a Sign of a great Soul to preserve more carefully the Remembrance of a Favour, than the Remembrance of an Injury; but because *Philistus* flattered *Dionysius* in hopes of being recalled to *Syracusa*, that personal Interest, that mixture of Self-Love spoils his Action, and we must by no means excuse him, as (g) *Pausanias* did.

(C) *Of all the Books he wrote.*] *Suidas* (h) ascribes to him a Treatise concerning Oratory; *Ægyptiaca* in 12 Books; *Res Siculæ* in 11 Books; some Orations, and one amongst others concerning the City of *Naucratis*; the History of *Dionysius* the Tyrant; three Books about the Theology of the *Egyptians*; a Treatise concerning *Libya* and *Syria*. He observes first of all that *Philistus* was born at *Naucratis*, or at *Syracusa*; which makes me suspect that he makes but one Author of two. There are many Works in his Catalogue, which do not seem to have been written by our *Philistus*, and I should willingly ascribe them to another *Philistus* born at *Naucratis*. The Jesuit *Ragusa* (i) who quotes *Constantin Lascaris*, admits of two *Philistus*'s, the one of *Syracusa* or *Naucratis*, and the other of *Syracusa*. The first, says he, was related to *Dionysius* the Tyrant, and died in a War against the *Carthaginians*: he wrote several things concerning *Sicily*. The second was banished by old *Dionysius*, and composed in his Banishment a good part of his History. *Plura scripsit de rebus Ægyptiacis lib. 12. de Sicanicis lib. 11. item de Bacchis: de Theologia Ægyptiorum lib. 6. de Syria & Libya.* This Author confounds the Matter; for admitting of two *Philistus*'s, he divides what he should have left intire for either of them, he changes the (k) Circumstances, and ascribes to the *Syracusian* what it had been better to ascribe to him, whose Native Country is doubtful.

(D) *His History of* Sicily *was most esteemed.*] It was divided into two parts; the first (l) contained in 7 Books, the History of above 800 Years, and ended with the taking of *Agrigentum*, that is, in the 3d Year of the 93d Olympiad; for that City was then taken by the *Carthaginians*. The second Part which contained 4 Books, began (m) with the Reign of old *Dionysius*, that is, where the first ended; for that *Dionysius* made himself Master of *Syracusa* the Year after the taking of *Agrigentum*. These are the eleven Books *Rerum Sicularum* which *Suidas* ascribes to *Philistus*; but besides, he ascribes to him the particular History of the Tyrant *Dionysius* in 6 Books. *Vossius* pretends that *Cicero* in the Passage which I am going to quote, has only regard to the above-mentioned Division, *viz.* That of the History of *Sicily* into two Parts; one whereof contained 7 Books, and the other 4: (n) *Siculus ille* (Philistus) *capitalis, creber, acutus, brevis, pene pusillus Thucydides: sed utros ejus habueris libros* (*duo enim sunt corpora*) *an utrosque, nescio. Me magis de Dionysio delectat: ipse est enim veterator magnus & perfamiliaris Philisto Dionysius.* The Opinion of *Vossius* is perhaps very reasonable; but it may be also that *Cicero* placed, on the one hand, the general History of *Sicily*, and on the other, the particular History of the Tyrant *Dionysius*, mention'd by *Suidas*. *Dionysius Halicarnasseus* seems to be a little more favourable to those, who should say, that the History of the Tyrant does not differ from the 2d part of the History of *Sicily*, than to those who should say the contrary (o). However, *Cicero* was pleased with our *Philistus* considered as an Historian, and consequently they who despised him may be looked upon as Men who had a depraved Taste, or were too Nice. (p) *Dionysii mater ejus qui Syracusanorum tyrannus fuit ut scriptum apud Philistum est, & doctum hominem & diligentem & æqualem temporum illorum, quum prægnans hunc ipsum Dionysium alvo contineret, somniavit se peperisse Satyriscum.* Those who will weigh the Praises which *Cicero* bestowed upon *Thucydides*, will lay great stress upon his declaring immediately after, that *Philistus* has very well imitated *Thucydides*: (q) *Hunc consecutus est Syracusius Philistus, qui quum Dionysii tyranni familiarissimus esset otium suum consumpsit in historia scribenda,* MAXIMEQUE *Thucididem est, sicut mihi videtur,* IMITATUS. *Quintilian* (r) says that *Philistus* is clearer than *Thucydides*: which is a fine Encomium; for Obscurity is a great Fault, and it may very well balance the advantage which some think *Thucydides* has over *Philistus*. Perhaps, if we could compare their Writings together, we should find that *Dionysius Halicarnasseus* (s) placed *Thucydides* a little too much above *Philistus*. However, this may be said for the Honour of *Philistus*, that he was called *The little Thucydides* by *Cicero*. Those who styled a Comedian of *Paris*, *the little Moliere*, designed to bestow no small Encomium upon him.

I shall observe two Faults, which have been committed upon the *pene pusillus Thucydides*: One of them was criticized by *Vossius*, and the other by a Jesuit. A learned Commentator was of opinion, that *Philistus* was so called by *Cicero*, because he wrote but little in comparison of *Thucydides*. It is a Mistake. (a) *Id referri eo minime debet quod præ Thucydide pauca admodum scripserit, qua* (1) *Pauli Manutii sententia est,* (*nam longe aliud apparet ex iis qua*

(b) *Diod. Sicul. l. 14. c. 8. p. 571. supposes that* Philistus *said so.*

(c) *Diod. Sicul. l. 16. c. 16. p. m. 748.*

(d) *Id. ib.*

(e) *Id. ib.*

(f) *Id. ib. p. 747.*

(g) Εἰ δὲ καὶ Φίλιστος αἰτίαν δικαίαν εἴληφεν, ἐπελπίζων τὴν ἐν Συρακούσαις κάθοδον ἀποκρύψασθαι τῶν Διονυσίου τὰ ἀνοσιώτατα. Nam si Philistus venia dignus habetur, qui cum Syracusas se restitutum iri speraret multa Dionysii flagitia dissimulavit. *Pausanias l. 1. p. 13.*

(h) *Suidas in* Φίλιστος.

(i) *Hieron. Ragusa in Elogiis Siculorum p. 232, 233.*

(k) Philistus *who died in the War, did not fight with the* Carthaginians, *but against the Troops of* Dion *of* Syracusa.

(l) *Diod. Sic. l. 13. c. 103. p. m. 554.*

(m) *Id. ib.*

(n) *Cic. ad Quint. Frat. Ep. 12. l. 2.*

(o) *See Dionys. Halicarn. Ep. ad Pompeium p. m. 261.*

(p) *Cic. l. 1. de Divin. fol. 307. A.*

(q) *Id. l. 2. de Oratore, fol. 73. D.*

(r) Philistus quoque meretur qui turbæ quamvis bonorum post hos authorum eximatur, imitator Thucydidis, & ut multo infirmior ita aliquatenus lucidior. *Quintil. l. 10. c. 1. p. m. 469.*

(s) *Dionys. Halic. Ep. ad Pomp. p. 261, & 262. See also p. 190.*

(a) *Vossius de Hist. Græcis l. 1. c. 6. p. 27.*

(1) *Notis ad eum Ciceronis locum.*

the concise Style of *Thucydides*, and avoided Digressions (F) to an excess. The Historian

[illegible] sed quia non paulo quidem inferior sit Thucydide, ut Fabius (a) quoque censet, attamen imitatur eum non infeliciter. An Author, who made a Collection of the Mistakes of Great Men, fancied that *Cicero* spoke of *Thucydides* with great Contempt, and called him *Little Thucydides*. Here is the Refutation of that Over-sight. (b) *Ille fere palàm hallucinatum fuisse Ciceronem dixit, qui de erroribus magnorum virorum scripsit, illius sententia ut hic illius liber in manus meas incidit. In pagina nonagesima extrema ait, Thucydidem historicum videri ne enarratorem quidem interdum, idemque pene pusillum Ciceroni dictum. Non animadvertit scriptor, tam prorsus aliud agens, neque quemquam ab illis vocari solere pene parvum, aut pene magnum, sed omnino parvum, aut magnum; neque ibi apud Tullium, ubi pene pusillus Thucydides dicitur, usurpari hoc de Thucydide.* Father *Vavasseur* shews afterwards that *Cicero* means our *Philistus*.

I must make another Observation. *Cicero* says that he was better pleased with the History of *Dionysius*, than with the other History, because *Dionysius* was a very Crafty Man, and lived familiarly with that Historian. *Vossius* being afraid that it would give occasion to speak ill of *Cicero*, takes care to clear the Matter. *Cicero*, says he, does not praise the intention of *Philistus*, he only minds in that History the use that can be made of the knowledge of the Craft of that Tyrant. (c) *Non animum Philisti laudavit Tullius, sed utilitatem libri prædicavit: atque id imprimis quidem propter prudentiam quam ex vafri adeo tyranni vita capere esset: sed & propter dictionem quam Thucydidea æmulam fuisse etiam ex secundo de oratore cognoscimus, ac propterea idem in Bruto*, &c. These last Words are altogether needless, not to say worse; for the Question was not to excuse *Cicero*, because he took pleasure in the reading of *Philistus*; but because he was better pleased with the History of the Tyrant *Dionysius*. It is nothing to the purpose to say, that *Philistus* wrote well. We don't know whether that Talent was more conspicuous in his History of *Dionysius*, than in the other. We may therefore say, that *Vossius* had rather make way for a Transition, than argue as he should have done. Those who know how difficult it is to write in a coherent manner, I mean so as to manage Transitions well, and yet to observe very exactly the Precisions of Logick, will less wonder, that Faults of the nature of that of *Vossius*, should be so frequent in Authors.

To conclude, *Vossius*'s Apology for *Cicero* is very solid. Any Curious Man, especially if he meddles with the Affairs of the Common-wealth, will be of that Illustrious *Roman*'s Mind, without acting against Probity. He will rather chuse to read the particular History of a cunning Politician, who is a very wicked Man, and a bold and crafty Usurper, than general Histories, especially when the Writers of it were familiarly acquainted with the Tyrant. If it be said that they will misrepresent things, and give a good turn to the Crimes of their Hero, as *Philistus* practised it: I answer, that an understanding Reader will discover those Artifices, and make a good use of them. I don't question but several Persons would part with four or five ancient Authors that are extant, in order to recover that only Book of *Philistus*. We should find a great many things in it, that are unknown to us. We know very little of *Dionysius* the Tyrant, besides his cruel Actions, and his Diffidence; which is but a very small part of his Picture. A Man who makes himself Master of a potent Republick, and maintains himself many Years in his Usurpation, notwithstanding a thousand Obstacles, is commonly a Man that has many good Physical Qualities. We are ignorant of that mixture with respect to that *Dionysius*, we have no particular Account of his Conduct, and of many Faults of the *Syracusans*. It would be an useful thing to see how *Philistus* described all those things: The Maxim *Interest Reipublicæ cognosci malos*, ought to reach as far as that. Who hears but one Party, knows nothing, or cannot judge right; and if he should judge right, it would be only by chance.

(E) *He avoided Digressions to an Excess.*] It is a Fault to delight in rambling from one's Subject; the Historian *Theopompus* was justly (d) blamed for it: but it does not follow that it is a vertue never to leave the main Subject; on the contrary it is to ever do a good thing (e), and to spoil it. There is a Medium between those two Extremes, as *Theon* judiciously observes. (f) [illegible] *Neque enim oportet simpliciter fugere digressiones, quod Philistus fecit: quia in his animus auditorum acquiescit. Verum illas, quæ adeo sunt prolixæ, ut abducant auditorum animos, ut necesse sit ea, quæ ante dicta sunt, in memoriam revocari: ejusmodi digressionibus utitur Theopompus in Philippicis.* You see that he blames *Philistus* for making no Digressions, and says that they are sometimes necessary, and serve as so many Resting-Places. He is in the right, a little Variety is necessary in all ingenious Works, and it is observed, that the most regular Writers are not read with the greatest pleasure. I could mention some Histories, which make the Reader Gape, and even Sleep, tho' they are written with an exact Observation of all the Rules of Art; tho' their Style be grave, concise, correct and sententious; tho' the Narration be free from Incidents and trifling Niceties; no Particulars, no Excursions; those Authors are always upon the streight Line, because (g) it is the shortest. Some other Writers, who sometimes lay aside their Gravity, either with respect to the Language, or to the Subject, and make no scruple to go out of the way to take in an Episode, write a History that never tires the Reader. He goes thro' it before he is weary of it. I shall not examine whether it be a Proof of one of these two things, rather than of the other, either that the Rules, or the Judgment of the Reader, are false. I insist upon the Fact, and refer myself to the Remark of a Man of a very good Taste. "What a "prodigious distance, *says he* (h), there is between "a fine Work, and a perfect or regular Work! "I don't know whether there has been any yet of "the latter sort. It is, perhaps, less difficult for a "rare Genius to attain to Greatness and Sublimity, "than to avoid all manner of Faults. The *Cid* had "but one Voice at its Birth, *viz.* that of Admiration; it prevailed over Authority and Policy, "which endeavoured in vain to destroy it; it re-"united in its favour those that are always divid-"ed in their Opinions and Sentiments, Great Men "and the common People; they all agree in learn-"ing it by heart, and in preventing the Actors up-"on the Stage when they recite it. To conclude, "the *Cid* is one of the finest Poems that can be "made; and one of the finest Censures that ever "was made of any Subject, is that of the *Cid*.". This is the finest Example that can be alledged of the Insufficiency of the Rules. The Author of the *Cid* observed almost none of them. The *French* Academy declared him an Infringer of them; yet he charmed, and charms still the Publick. He lost his Cause before the Masters, but he carried it every where else: he appeal'd to the People, as that *Horatius* who killed his Sister, and caused the Sentence of the Judges to be revoked by that Tribunal. *Montagne*'s Essays are another Example of a happy Irregularity. Whoever should undertake to make that Book very Methodical, would deprive it of its chief agreeableness.

To conclude, I am not so much concerned in vindicating Digressions, as one might think; for the Historical Part of this Work is a thousand times more agreeable to the manner of *Philistus* than to that of *Theopompus*; and as for my Commentary, I need not make an Apology for the Digressions contained in it. It is a sort of Work which requires or naturally bears them. It is a Compilation, 'tis what we call *Miscellanea*. Variety is essential to that sort of Compositions, and it ought chiefly to be allowed to those who (i) cannot hope to prevent any other way the weariness of the Reader. Note, that a Digression cannot be said to be too long, only because it fills up many Pages, but when every part of it takes up too much room; for though you be never so short upon every one of them, the Conjunction of many will make you prolix. (k) *Solet enim esse quædam partium brevitas quæ longam tamen efficit summam.* I make use of that Thought of *Quintilian* in another Sense than he.

(a) Lib. 10. c. 1.

(b) Franc. Vavassor de Ludicra Dictione p. 156, 157.

(c) Vossius ubi sup. p. 27.

(d) See the Art. of Theopompus in the Remarks.

(e) Insani sapiens nomen ferat, æquus iniqui, Ultra quam satis est virtutem si petat ipsam. Horat. Epist. vi. l. 1.

(f) Theon in Progymnasm. c. 4. p. m. 44.

(g) A puncto ad punctum linea recta est omnium brevissima.

(h) La Bruyere the Characters of this Age, in the Chap. concerning Ingenious Works, p. m. 75, 77.

(i) Liber fuit & opusculis varius & metris: ita solemus qui ingenio parum fidimus satietatis periculum fugere. Plin. Ep. 21. l. 8.

(k) Quint. l. 4. c. 2. p. m. 183.

Historian *Timæus* used him very ill. *Plutarch* cenſures him for it, (*F*) tho' on the other hand he blames *Ephorus* for having beſtowed ſome Praiſes upon *Philiſtus*.

PHILLA, one of the moſt illuſtrious Ladies of Antiquity, was Daughter of *Antipater*, Governor of *Macedonia* during the Abſence of *Alexander*. She was a † very Witty Woman, and very fit to manage great Affairs. She did ſo dexterouſly behave herſelf, according to the ſeveral Humours of thoſe whom ſhe was to bring or keep to their Duty, that ſhe hindred an Army full of factious and turbulent Men from making an Inſurrection: She married poor Maids at her own Charges, and oppoſed the Oppreſſors of Innocency with ſo much vigour, that ſhe ſecured many Perſons who were upon the point of being oppreſt by their Calumniators. Her Capacity was not the Fruit of Experience; for being but a young Maid, ſhe was conſulted about Affairs of the greateſt Moment by her Father *Antipater*, one of the wiſeſt Politicians of that Time ‡. We might know the Particulars of that Princeſs's Capacity §, if we had all the Books of *Diodorus Siculus*; but we have loſt that part of his Hiſtory which contained them. *Philla* married γ firſt *Craterus* δ, who of all the Captains of *Alexander* was moſt beloved by the *Macedonians*. After the Death of *Craterus* ſhe married ζ *Demetrius*, and was the cheif (*A*) of her ſecond Husband's Wives; but ſhe had no great ſhare in his Love: He was a voluptuous Prince η, who kept ſeveral Miſtreſſes at the ſame time, ſome of whom had frequented Bawdy-Houſes. He grew weary θ of *Philla* under pretence that he was younger than ſhe; yet he was extremely fond of the Curtezan κ *Lamia*, tho' ſhe did begin to decline. *Philla* died after a Tragical manner; for when ſhe heard that *Demetrius* had loſt his Dominions, ſhe had not the Courage to ſee him as a miſerable Fugitive, λ but ſhe poiſoned herſelf, curſing the Fortune of her Husband, who had been leſs Conſtant in her Favours to him, than in her ill Uſage *. She had by him τ a Son, and the famous ζ *Stratonice*, who was *Seleucus*'s Wife, and whom *Seleucus* yielded to his Son *Antiochus* ξ. A Niece of the Deceaſed (*B*) did quickly take up her Place.

PHILOMELUS, General of the *Phoceans*, in the beginning of the War that was called *Sacred*, found no better Expedient to reſiſt the Enemies (*A*Δ) of his Country, than to invade the Temple of *Delphos*. He took a Journey to *Lacedæmon* to impart his Deſign to *Archidamus* ‡, who anſwered him, That he could not openly aſſiſt him in his Undertaking, but that he would ſecretly furniſh him

α Diod. Sic. l. 19. c. 6?. p. 1?1?.
† Id. ib. p. ?14.
‡ See Diod. Sic. ib.
γ Id. ib. p. ?1?.
δ Plut. in Demetrio p. ?89. A.
ζ Diod. Sic. ib. Plut. ib.
η Plut. ib.
θ Id. ib. p. 9?2. C.
κ See the Article Lamia, Rem. B.
λ Id. ib. p. 911.
* [illegible] Fortunam eius execrata quæ in adverſitatibus eſſet quam ſecundis rebus ſtabilior, atque hauſto veneno extincta eſt. Id. ib.
τ Id. ib. p. 90?. E. His Name was Antigonus. Id. ib. p. 915.
ζ Id. ib. p. 903. D.
ξ Id. ib. p. 907.
‡ He was King of Lacedæmon.

(*F*) Plutarch *cenſures* Timæus, *tho' on the other hand he blames* Ephorus, &c.] "But *Timæus* takes "this occaſion, and truly a juſt one, of his zealous "and conſtant adherence to the Tyranny, to vent "his own Spleen and Malice againſt him. Thoſe "indeed who were injured by him are the more "excuſable, if they expreſt their Reſentment to his "dead Body; but thoſe who write his Hiſtory after his Death, and were no way wronged by him "in his Life-time, but have had the advantage of "his learned Writings, in Honour ought not with "opprobrious and ſcurrilous Language upbraid him "for thoſe Misfortunes, which many times by unhappy Accidents have befallen even the beſt of "Men. On the other ſide, *Ephorus* is as much out "of the way in the laviſh *Encomiums* he beſtows "on *Philiſtus*; for tho' he is very good at diſguiſing baſe and unworthy Actions, with fair and "colourable Pretences, and in his Expreſſions is "very Florid and Rhetorical, yet when he has "done his beſt, he can never acquit him of the "Imputation he lies under, of being of all Mankind the moſt zealous Aſſertor of Arbitrary Government, and that no Man ever more induſtriouſly promoted, or fondly admired the Luxury, "Power, Riches and Alliances of ſuch as made "themſelves abſolute Princes. But between both "theſe Extreams, he that neither praiſes *Philiſtus* "for his Faults, nor inſults over his Misfortunes, "ſeems to me beſt to conſult his own Credit, and "perform the part of an Hiſtorian (ζ)". What *Plutarch* ſays of thoſe *Alliances* of Tyrants may be confirmed by theſe Words of *Cornelius Nepos*: (*a*) *Philiſtum Hiſtoricum Syracuſas reduxit hominem amicum non magis tyranno quam tyrannidi*: and by theſe Words of *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*: *Philiſtus Thucydidem ſequitur moribus exceptis: hic enim liber eſt & animi magnitudinis ac gravitatis plenus: ille tyrannorum & aliorum cupiditati plus nimio ſubſervit* (*b*).

(*A*) *And was the chief of* Demetrius's *Wives.*] He had many at one and the ſame time: our *Phylla*: *Euridice* (*c*) iſſued from *Miltiades*, and Widow of *Ophelles* King of *Cyrene*: *Deidamia* (*d*) Daughter of *Æacides* King of *Epirus*, and Siſter of *Pyrrhus*. *Phylla* was moſt eſteemed and moſt in Credit. I with the Author who ſays ſo, had imputed that preference to the great Merit of that Lady; but he aſcribes it only to the Glory of *Antipater* and *Craterus*. (*e*) Πολλαῖς ἅμα συνὼν γυναιξὶν ἐν ἀξιώματι μέγιστον εἶχε καὶ τιμὴν Φίλλα, διὰ Ἀντίπατρον τὸν πατέρα, καὶ διὰ τὸ συνῳκηκέναι Κρατερῷ. *Multas uno tempore conjuges habebat* (Demetrius) *quarum erat maxima in dignatione & honore Philla, tum propter patrem Antipatrum, tum quod etiam matrimonio juncta fuiſſet Cratero.* I believe that *Antigonus* pitched upon her to be his Daughter-in-Law, conſidering that ſhe was a good Match for thoſe two Reaſons. *Demetrius* was very much diſpleaſed with it, by reaſon of the diſproportion of their Age; but his Father whiſpered to him in the Ear a Paſſage of *Euripides*, wherein he made ſome alteration. The meaning of it was, that a Man ought to marry a Woman in ſpite of Nature, when ſhe brings a good Portion. (*f*) Ἀπαξιοῦντος δ' ἐκείνου, λέγεται πρὸς τὸ οὖς Εὐριπίδειον εἰπεῖν, Ὅπου τὸ κέρδος, παρὰ φύσιν γαμητέον· ὁμοιόπτωτόν τι τῷ δουλευτέον ἀντιπαρεμβαλόντα. *Abhorrenti vero dicitur in aurem hoc Euripideum inſuſurraſſe.*

Ubi lucrum ſuadet, reluctetur licet
Natura, ducas conjugem.

Ubi Ducas conjugem, pro Servias, ſcitè ſubjecit. It is likely that *Demetrius* eſteemed *Philla*, and took care to give her ſome outward marks of his Eſteem, but that he kept her not for his Pleaſure. Note, that he (*g*) deputed her to *Caſſander* to juſtifie his Conduct towards *Pliſtarchus*, who complained very much of him. 'Tis a ſign that he thought his Wife was fit for a Negociation. Note alſo, that he grew very angry (*h*) becauſe the *Rhodians* gave the King of *Egypt*, a Ship which they had taken, wherein was the Letter which *Philla* writ to him, and the fine Goods ſhe ſent him.

(*B*) *A Niece of the Deceaſed did quickly take up her place.*] She was Daughter of *Ptolemy* and *Euridice*, Siſter of *Philla*, and her Name was *Ptolemais* (*i*). She had been betrothed to *Demetrius* (*k*) during the Life of *Philla*. He had a Son by her called *Demetrius*, who was afterwards King of *Cyrene* (*l*). 'Tis without doubt the ſame whom I have mentioned in the Article of *Arſinoe*.

(*A*Δ) *To reſiſt the Enemies of his Country.*] *Viz.* the *Thebans*: for they cauſed the Senate of the *Amphictyones* to lay an exorbitant Fine upon the *Phoceans*, and they were upon the point of ordering, that if it were not paid, the Lands of the *Phoceans* ſhould be forfeited to the profit of *Apollo* (*m*).

(ζ) Plut. in Dione p. 974.
(*a*) Corn. Nep. in vit. Dionyſ.
(*b*) Dionyſ. Halic. ub. ſup. p. 190.
(*c*) Plut. in Demetrio p. 894. E.
(*d*) Id. ib. p. 900. B.
(*e*) Id. ib. p. 894, 895.
(*f*) Id. ib. p. 895.
(*g*) Id. ib. p. 904. A.
(*h*) Id. ib. p. 898. See alſo Diod. Sic. l. 20. c. 94.
(*i*) Id. ib. p. 911. E.
(*k*) Id. ib. p. 904.
(*l*) Id. ib. p. 915.
(*m*) Diod. Sic. l. 16. c. 23.

him with Men and Money. With ſuch a Succour, *Philomelus* made himſelf Maſter of the Temple, and put to the Sword thoſe who oppoſed him. He was attackt ſoon after by the *Locrians*, and he beat them. He was ſo fluſht with that Victory, that he took the Decrees of the *Amphyctions* out of the Temple of *Delphos*, and forced the Prieſteſs to give him an Oracle. The Anſwer he received could not but be acceptable to him, for the Tenor of it was, That it was lawful for him to do any thing that he had a Mind to. He got an Act of that Revelation, and cauſed it to be read publickly, that every Body might know he ſhould act for the time to come under the Authority, and with the Approbation of God, whatever he ſhould undertake. He ſent ſome Ambaſſadors to all the Nations of *Greece*. The *Athenians* and *Lacedemonians* (*A*) made a Confederacy with him; but the *Thebans* and ſome others joyned in a League againſt him. Which occaſioned the *Sacred* War. *Philomelus* left the Treaſures of the Temple untouched; he was contented to lay great Taxes upon the Inhabitants of *Delphos*, who were grown Rich with the Spoils of the Devotion of other Nations. He took the Field with a great Army, and beat the *Locrians*. That Victory ſwelled his Courage, and abated that of the Vanquiſhed, but it increaſed the number of his Enemies. Therefore finding himſelf obliged to oppoſe greater Forces to them, he laid aſide the Thoughts of (*B*) reſpecting the Temple, and took great Treaſures from it. Having promiſed a great Pay to the Strangers that ſhould liſt themſelves under him, he eaſily raiſed many Troops, tho' * Conſcientious Men refuſed to ſerve under him. He entred into the Country of the Enemies, and had the advantage in the firſt Rencounters: but ſoon after there happened an Occaſion which forced him to maintain a running Fight thro' a very

* *Τῶν δ' ἐπιεικῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐδεὶς ἀπεγράφετο πρὸς τὴν στρατείαν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβειαν· οἱ δὲ πονηρότατοι καὶ διὰ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ὀλιγωροῦντες τῶν θεῶν ἕτοιμοι συνέτρεχον πρὸς τὸν Φιλόμηλον.* Modeſtorum tamen virorum nullus eam in militiam nomen ſuum eſt profeſſus, quòd pietas erga deum aliud ſuadebat. Interim deterrimus quiſque, deoſque lucri ſui gratiâ nauci habens, cupidè Philomelo ſeſe aggregat. *Diod. Sic. l.* 16. *c.* 30. *p.* 759. *edit. Lat. in* 8.

(*A*) *The* Athenians *and* Lacedemonians *made a Confederacy with him.*] We learn from this Hiſtory one of the Political Cuſtoms of States. We have already ſeen that (*a*) the King of *Lacedemon*, inſtead of diſſuading *Philomelus* from invading the Temple of *Delphos*, incouraged him to it, and inabled him to do it. Only he ſo managed the buſineſs, that it could not be proved that he had openly taken the Party of *Philomelus*. He took care that the Publick Authority ſhould not appear in the Succours of Men and Money wherewith he furniſhed the *Phocean* General. The Succeſs of that Enterprize being doubtful, it was without doubt a piece of Prudence not to expoſe the Glory of *Lacedemon* by ſome publick Steps againſt the Intereſt of Religion: but becauſe the Invaſion of that Temple was like to prejudice a Nation (*b*) which was then the moſt dreaded by all its Neighbours, it was a Political thing to favour the impious Deſign of thoſe who had a mind to ſubdue the Oracle of *Delphos*. Such was the cauſe of the Conduct of the King of *Lacedemon*. When that Deſign was executed, he pull'd off the Mask, and joyned openly in a League with *Philomelus*, tho' he was to have for his Enemies, thoſe who declared that they took up Arms to ſet the Oracle of *Delphos* at liberty, and to puniſh the Impiety and Sacrilege of the *Phoceans*. The *Athenians* and *Lacedemonians* ſhewed themſelves the moſt ready and zealous to maintain the Uſurpers of the Temple, either during the Life of *Philomelus*, who began to Plunder it, or during the Adminiſtration of his Succeſſors, who prophaned all its Treaſures, thoſe ancient and rich Monuments of the Piety of ſo many Princes and Nations. Nevertheleſs, the Cities of *Athens* and *Lacedemon* pretended to Religion. Feaſts, Vows and Sacrifices were great things amongſt 'em. Wo to any one that ſhould have had the boldneſs to ſay any thing againſt the Worſhip of the Gods: the greateſt Philoſopher in the World would have run the hazard of his Life, if he had been ſo bold. How comes it therefore to paſs, that thoſe two Cities ſupported and made a League with the *Phoceans*, who were guilty of an impious Action, and had prophaned and deſtroyed the greateſt Object of the Devotion of all *Greece*, and even of the *Barbarians*? The Reaſon of it is this: the *Phoceans* could not have been puniſhed for their Impiety, without letting the Glory and Power of the *Thebans* grow more formidable than before. But the Political Intereſt of the *Athenians* and *Lacedemonians* required that the *Thebans* ſhould be weakened: therefore, tho' the Intereſt of Religion required that the *Phoceans* ſhould be puniſhed, it was thought more expedient to ſupport and make a Confederacy with them againſt the *Thebans*, who were the Heads of a kind of *Cruſade* for the Liberty of *Apollo*. The Temporal Good of the State has been in all times preferred to Religion.

AN EXAMPLE ſhewing that the Temporal Good of the State is preferred to Religion.

Diodorus Siculus (*c*) obſerves, that the *Phoceans* furniſhed the *Athenians* and *Lacedemonians* with more Subſidies than it was neceſſary for the payment of the Troops. It was not therefore a chargeable Alliance, but it was a very odious one; for every Body knew that the *Athenians* and *Lacedemonians* had a ſhare in the profit of the Sacrilege. They furniſhed the *Phoceans* with Troops, and received from them a Subſidy more than ſufficient for the Pay of thoſe Troops. There happened another thing which gave occaſion to talk againſt the *Athenians*. *Dionyſius* Tyrant of *Sicily*, was ſending into *Greece* ſome Gold and Ivory Statues, which he deſigned to conſecrate in the Temples of *Delphos* and *Jupiter Olympian*. *Iphicrates* commanded then an *Athenian* Fleet near *Corcyra*. He took amongſt other Ships thoſe which carried the Statues, and ask'd his Maſters what he ſhould do with them. The People being met about it, made a Decree whereby *Iphicrates* was ordered not to examine ſo narrowly what concerns the Gods, but to take a ſpecial care of the Subſiſtence of the Troops. (*d*) Περιτυχὼν δὲ κομιζούσαις αὐτὰ ναυσὶν ὁ Ἰφικράτης καὶ κρατήσας αὐτῶν, διεπέμψατο πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, ἐπερωτῶν τί χρὴ πράττειν. οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι προσέταξαν αὐτῷ μὴ τὰ περὶ τῶν θεῶν ἐξετάζειν, ἀλλὰ σκοπεῖν ὅπως στρατιῶται διατραφῶσιν. *Iphicrates in naves, quæ dona votiva portabant, fortè fortuna incidens, in poteſtatem redactas Athenas mitteret, cum hac ſciſcitatione, quid facto nunc opus eſſet? populuſque contra, non ſcrupuloſè Deorum res examinare, ſed quomodo militem alat, providere, ipſum juberet.* He underſtood ſo well the meaning of that Decree, that he cauſed all the Statues to be ſold, as well as the other Goods taken by his Capers. The (*e*) *Athenians* were ſeverely upbraided with it, and *Diodorus* obſerves, that they plundered *Apollo* by Sea and Land, tho' they acknowledged him to be their Founder. He obſerves likewiſe the fantaſtical Humour of the *Lacedemonians*, who pretended to be beholden to the Oracles of *Apollo* for their Glory and Proſperity, and yet made a Confederacy with the impious Men who plundered the Temple of *Delphos*. So the World goes, and ſo it will go. (*f*) Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸ θεῖον τοιαῦτα ἔπραξαν, καὶ ταῦτ' εὐχόμενοι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πατρῷον αὐτῶν εἶναι καὶ πρόγονον. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ τῷ περὶ Δελφοὺς μαντείῳ χρησάμενοι, καὶ τὴν θαυμαζομένην παρὰ πᾶσι πολιτείαν διὰ τούτου κτησάμενοι, καὶ περὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἔτι καὶ νῦν τὸν θεὸν ἐπερωτῶντες, ἐτόλμησαν τοῖς τὸ ἱερὸν συλῶσι κοινωνῆσαι τῆς παρανομίας. *Hæc tum Athenienſes in Numen committere non verebantur, qui tamen Apollinem Deum patrium & progenitorem ſuum eſſe gloriari ſolebant. Lacedæmonii etiam, quamvis Rempublicam ſuam cunctis gentibus admirabilem Delphici oraculi conſilio inſtituiſſent, deque rebus maximis (ut ad hanc uſque tempeſtatem factitant) Dei voluntatem exquirerent, cum profligatiſſimis tamen fani expilatoribus ſacrilegæ impietatis ſocietatem inire non dubitant.*

(*B*) *He laid aſide the Thoughts of reſpecting the Temple.*] I ſhall quote *Diodorus Siculus*. (*g*) Ὁ Φιλόμηλος ἔκρινε μισθοφόρων ἀθροίζειν πλῆθος, προσδεόμενος δὲ τοῦ πολέμου χρημάτων πλειόνων, ἠναγκάζετο τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς

(*a*) *In the Text of this Article.*

(*b*) *The* Thebans.

(*c*) *Diod. Sic. l.* 16. *c.* 58.

(*d*) *Id. ib. p.* 453. *The Latin Tranſlation of theſe Words in the Edit. in* 8. *is in the* 781 *page.*

(*e*) *See in* Diod. Sic. ib. *the Letter which* Dionyſius *the Tyrant writ to them.*

(*f*) *Id. ib.*

(*g*) *Diod. Sic. l.* 16. *p.* 430, 431. *edit. Hanov.* 1604.

very bad Way; so that being unwilling to be taken, and being not able to avoid it, but by killing himself, he precipitated himself from a Rock. *Onomarchus*, his Brother, succeeded him. His other Brother, *Phayllus*, succeeded *Onomarchus*. The latter made an end of Plundering the Treasures of the Temple. They used some caution at first; but at last they plunder'd it altogether, and the *Athenians* and *Lacedæmonians* departed not from their Alliance for all that §. These things happen'd in the Time of *Philip* of *Macedonia*, Father of *Alexander* the Great. The Historian who relates them, does not forget the Tragical (C) End of those who committed that Sacrilege.

Nay, He observes that the Divine Justice did severely pursue ß the Women who made bold to adorn themselves with the Ornaments taken by their Husbands from the Temple of *Delphos*; but he does not mention a Woman Dancer, to whom such a (D) Present proved very fatal. *Justin* observes, That tho' the Action of the *Phoceans* was abhorred by every body, yet they were less hated for it, than γ those who reduced them to that necessity δ. The Envy or Hatred of an infamous Action is commonly divided in such a manner, and that Distribution is not altogether unjust; for they who force a Man to do a desperate thing, act more freely than he. *Pausanias* makes an Observation which will not be improperly set down in this place. *Philomelus*, says he, having advised the *Phoceans* to plunder the Temple of *Delphos*, and having made use of several plausible Reasons, persuaded them to do it *, whether God had blinded them, or whether they naturally preferred Gain to Religion. He tells us, that ζ *Philomelus* was a Native of *Ledon*, a Town of *Phocis*, and that the Temple was plunder'd the fourth Year of the 105th Olympiad.

PHLEGON, surnamed η *Trallianus*, composed several Works, of which there is but (A) little extant. He was a Freed-Man of the Emperor *Hadrian*. Those who were of Opinion θ that he was *Augustus*'s Freed-Man, had never read his Books. He lived, at least 'till the 18th Year of the Empire of *Antoninus Pius*, for he mentions

§ Taken from Diodorus Siculus, lib. 16. c. 23. & seq. ad Olympiadem 106.

ß See the Rem. A of the Article Callirhoe, at the end, and the Rem. D of the Art. Helena.

γ Viz. the Thebans.

δ Justin, lib. 8. c. 1.

* Εἴτε ἢ γνώμην σφίσι τῦ θεῦ βλάψαντος, εἴτε ϗ αὐτοῖς πεφυκόσιν ἐπίπροσθεν εὐσεβείας τὰ κέρδη ποιεῖσθαι. Sive quod mentem Deus à rectis consiliis avertisset, seu quod is populus suapte natura religioni solitus esset quæstum anteponere. Pausan. l. 10. p. 318.

ζ Id. ibid. p. 317.

η That is, born at Trallis, (a City of Lydia.)

θ Suidas in Φλέγων mentions that Opinion.

‡ The Year of Christ 156.

[illegible] ϗ συλᾶν τὸ μαντεῖον. (h) *Philomelus majore conductitii militis robore se confirmare statuit. At quia majores bellum sumptus flagitabat, donariis sacris manus injicere coactus, templum deprædatur.* It does plainly appear from these words, that *Philomelus* spared not the Treasures, or the *ex voto* and other Gifts of the Temple of *Delphos*. Nevertheless, *Diodorus Siculus* affirms the contrary in the same Book. I don't know whether that Contradiction was ever taken notice of. (i) Τῶν δὲ προγεγενημένων στρατηγῶν ὁ μὲν πρῶτος ἄρξας Φιλόμηλος ἀπέσχετο τῶν ἀναθημάτων, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος προσαγορευόμενος μὲν Ὀνόμαρχος ἀδελφὸς δ' ὢν Φιλομήλου πλεῖστα τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χρημάτων κατεδαπάνησε, τρίτος δὲ Φάϋλλος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ὀνομάρχου στρατηγήσας οὐκ ὀλίγα τῶν ἀναθημάτων κατέκοψεν εἰς τὰς τῶν ξένων μισθοφορίας. (k) *Priorum sanè ducum, qui primus imperium gesserat, Philomelus à sacris templi donariis se continuerat, successor vero ejus & frater Onomarchus plurimum de consecratis Deo ad belli sumptus convertit. Tertius inde Phayllus Onomarchi frater, dum Prætoris munere fungitur, non pauca de repositis in templo, ad persolvendum conductitiis stipendia, concidit.*

(C) *Does not forget the tragical End of those who committed that Sacrilege.*] This Observation of the Historian (a) ought not to be look'd upon as a superstitious one; for tho' the Temple of *Delphos* was consecrated to a false God, yet it was an impious thing, and a Sacrilege to plunder it, when they believed that *Apollo* was a true God. I own that none but the true God can change the nature of prophane things, they cannot become Sacred but by his Institution. Thus all the Gifts consecrated in the Temple of *Apollo* remain'd in their former state. The golden Tiles which King *Crœsus* (b) consecrated in it were nothing but Gold; it was as lawful to coin it, as it is to coin an Ingot that comes from the Mine; it was, I say, lawful for those who profess'd not the Religion of the Heathens: but they who believed that the Gifts of the Temple of *Delphos* were consecrated to God, could not invade 'em without committing a downright Sacrilege, which the true God, who is the only infallible Judge of the quality of humane Actions, and the only Dispenser of Rewards and Punishments, thought fit to punish; I speak of the Punishments which the *Jews* had deserv'd (c) if they had plunder'd the Temple of *Solomon*.

That the Reader may know how great was the Devotion of the Heathens towards their False Gods, I shall observe by the by, that the Gold and Silver taken out of the Temple of *Delphos* on that occasion, and turn'd into current Money, amounted to Ten (d) Thousand Talents (e). Some say that the Wealth which the *Phoceans* took out of it, equals what *Alexander* found since in the Treasures of King *Darius* (f).

(D) *A Woman Dancer to whom such a Present.*] That is, a Present taken out of the Spoils of the Temple of *Delphos*. Our *Philomelus* gave the Golden Crown of the *Cnidians* to *Pharsalia*, a Woman-Dancer. What a Destination was this, and how little agreeable to the Intention of the *Cnidians*! *Non hos quæsitum munus in usus.* What a Jump from the Vault of a Temple, to the Head of such a Woman! However, she had an ill Bargain on't: She went over from *Greece* into *Italy*, and one Day, as she was Dancing at *Metapontum*, in the Temple of *Apollo*, some young Men rush'd upon her Crown, and striv'd so hard to take away the Booty from one another, that they tore in pieces the Body of *Pharsalia*, as we read in (g) *Plutarch*.

(A) *Composed several Works, of which there is but little extant.*] He writ a History of the *Olympiads*, divided into sixteen Books. (h) It was an universal (i) History, which reached from (k) the first Olympiad, to (l) the 229. It is sometimes quoted under the Name of Olympiads, and sometimes under the Name of Chronicles. *Photius* joins those two Titles together, ἀνεγνώσθη, says he, (m) Φλέγοντος Τραλλιανοῦ . . . ὀλυμπιονικῶν ϗ χρονικῶν συναγωγή. *Lecta mihi Phlegontis Tralliani . . . Olympicorum & Chronicorum collectio.* *Origen* (n) and *Maximus* (o) have quoted it under the Title of Chronicles; *Stephanus Byzantinus* did the same (p), but he quoted it oftner under the Name of Olympiads. *Salmasius* (q) was of Opinion, that *Phlegon*'s Chronicles were, perhaps, a Book by itself, and divided into eight Books. I don't know whether he would have said so, if he had taken notice of the Title mention'd by *Photius*, and of the Citations to be found in *Origen* and *Maximus*. The former quotes the 13th or 14th Book of the Chronicles, and the latter the 14th, to prove, by the Testimony of a Heathen, the same Matters of Fact which *Eusebius* relates (r) as being contain'd in the 13th Book of *Phlegon*'s Olympiads. I don't think that these words of *Suidas*, τὰ πραχθέντα πανταχοῦ, *res ubique gestæ*, ought to be separated from what goes before, and only referr'd to what follows; for they do exactly suit with the History of the Olympiads which he mentions just before. But if I don't follow the Opinion of *Salmasius* (s) herein, I don't reject it as to this, *viz.* that *Suidas* meant that *Phlegon* composed another Work, divided into eight Books, which contain'd also τὰ πραχθέντα πανταχοῦ, *res ubique gestas.* It happens

(h) They who have no other Edition but the Latin one in 8o. 1611. will find this in the 30th Chapter of the 16th Book, p. 759.

(i) Id. Diodor. ib. p. 452.

(k) Pag. 780. of the Edit. in 8o.

(a) *Ubi supra c. 57. p. 779, 780.* (b) *Id. ib. p. 780.* (c) *See the* Pensée sur les Cometes, *n. 118. See also these words of* Seneca, *lib. 7. c. 7. de Benef.* Injuriam sacrilegus Deo quidem non potest facere, quem extra ictum sua divinitas posuit: sed punitur, quia tanquam Deo fecit. Opinio illum nostra, ac sua, obligat pœnæ.

(d) 'Tis about 20 millions of French Livres.

(e) Id. Diod. ib.

(f) Ib.

(g) Plut. de Pythiæ Oracul. p. 397, 398.

(h) Suidas in Φλέγων.

(i) Id. ib.

(k) Phot. Biblioth. n. 97. p. 269.

(l) Suid. ib. Anonymus in descriptione Olymp.

(m) Phot. ib.

(n) Orig. l. 2. cont. Cels.

(o) Maxim. in Schol. ad Dionysii Areopag. Ep. 7. apud Meursium not. ad Phlegontem, p. 170.

(p) Vid. Meurs. ib. p. 169.

(q) Salmas. in Spartian. histor. Adriani c. 16. p. m. 151. tom. 1.

(r) See the Rem. D.

(s) Salmas. ib.

tions]; the Conſuls of that Year, which is the 152 Year after the Death of *Auguſtus*. He had a Freed-Man, who (B) was an Author. 'Twas thought that the Hiſtory of *Hadrian*, which (C) was publiſh'd under the Name of *Phlegon*, was written by *Hadrian* himſelf. *Phlegon** ſpeaks of the Reſurrection of a Maid as an ocular Witneſs. *See Mr. de Tillemont* †. 'Tis pretended that he ſpoke of the (D) Darkneſs which happen'd during our Saviour's

pens often, that a General Hiſtory is compoſed according to different Methods, by the ſame Author. *Photius*, who had read (t) the five firſt Books of *Phlegon*'s Olympiads, ſets down a ſummary of the 177th Olympiad, where they ended. One may judge of the whole Piece by that Pattern, and it muſt be acknowledg'd, as *Voſſius* ſays, that if we had that Chronicle, it would be very uſeful to clear a great many things; but this does not prove, that *Photius* had no reaſon to blame the inſignificant things upon which *Phlegon* inlarged, which (u) tir'd the Readers, and cover'd the moſt memorable Facts with their Shadow. And therefore there is ſomething in the following words of *Voſſius*, which may be diſapprov'd: (w) *Non penitus probare poſſum quod idem* (Photius) *reprehendit anxiam illam curam in Olympiadibus recenſendis, atque iis annotandis quæ ſingularum tempore contigerunt. Imo vero utinam totum Chronicon extaret. Multum enim lucis abſque dubio priſcæ inde Eccleſiæ temporibus accederet.* It will appear from the words of *Photius*, which I ſhall quote in the Remark *E*, that what he cenſures has been miſrepreſented by *Voſſius*. There is nothing extant of that Work of *Phlegon*, beſides a Fragment, which does not take up ſix Pages in the *Leyden* Edition 1622, in 4to. His Treatiſe περὶ μακροβίων, *de longævis*, is ſhort enough, and it is likely we have it not (x) entire; for there is nothing in it concerning ſome illuſtrious Perſons, who lived to a very great Age. As for his Treatiſe περὶ θαυμασίων, *de rebus mirabilibus*, it contains 125 Chapters, moſt of them very ſhort, and there is ſomething wanting in the begining. Theſe are the broken Remnants of *Phlegon*'s Works. *Xylander* rendred them into *Latin*, and publiſh'd them at *Baſil*, together with the *Greek*, and ſome Notes, in the Year 1568. *Meurſius* put out a new Edition of them at *Leyden*, with his own Remarks, in the Year 1622. You will find in *Suidas* the Titles of part of the other Writings of *Phlegon*.

(B) *He had a Freed-Man who was an Author.*] As it appears from theſe words of *Spartianus*: (y) *Legiſſe me apud Ælium Maurum Phlegontis Tralliani libertum memini, Septimium Severum immoderatiſſime cum moreretur lætatum quod duos Antoninos pari imperio reipublicæ relinqueret. Andreas Schottus* (a) pretends, without any good Reaſon for it, that there is a Fault in theſe words, and that they ought to be read thus: *apud Ælii Hadriani libertum Phlegontem Trallianum.* He wonders the Criticks had not yet made that Correction: (b) *quod mendum magnos ævi noſtri Criticos fugiſſe quos nihil pene fugit, equidem miror: ſed & poſteris ſpicas relinquunt non inviti.* He had no reaſon at all to wonder at it, for it is not at all likely that *Spartianus* did quote *Phlegon* in that place. How can any one fancy that *Phlegon* outlived *Severus*, who died 74 Years after *Hadrian*? See (c) *Voſſius*, who made uſe of that Chronological Reaſon againſt *Andreas Schottus*. The Printers have been very (d) faulty in that place.

(C) *The Hiſtory of* Hadrian, *which was publiſhed under the name of* Phlegon, *was written by* Hadrian *himſelf.*] I have already made that Obſervation in another place, but I repeat it here, and I ſhall add to it the very words of *Spartianus*; (f) *Famæ celebris Adrianus tam cupidus fuit, ut libros vitæ ſuæ ſcriptos à ſe libertis ſuis literatis dederit, jubens ut eos ſuis nominibus publicarent: nam Phlegontis libri Adriani eſſe dicuntur.* Thoſe words have been taken in a wrong Senſe by a *German* Author, who ſays, (g) *Eos* (libros de mirabilibus, Olympiadibus & longævis) *tanti æſtimavit Hadrianus, famæ percelebris cupidus, ut pro ſuis venditarit, ut colligere licet ex Ælio Spartiano* in vita Hadriani. How ſtrangely are the words of *Spartianus* perverted! This *German* Author pretends, that *Hadrian* put his Name to *Phlegon*'s Writings, and in order to prove it he quotes an Author who ſays, that *Hadrian* cauſed the Name of *Phlegon* to be put to his own Work. Before I leave off I muſt obſerve a Miſtake of *Moreri*: He has committed few Faults that deſerve more than this to be mended. *Phlegon*, ſays he, *the Emperor* Adrian's *Freed-Man, had a great ſhare in that Prince's Friendſhip, who publiſhed a Hiſtory of his Life under his Name. He relates in his 13th Book, that the 4th Year of the 202 Olympiad, &c.* The conſtruction of theſe words is ſo odd, that 'tis a very hard matter to underſtand them: they ſignify, according to the Laws of our Grammarians, That *Hadrian* ſet his Name to the Hiſtory of his Life which he publiſhed; but this is falſe and againſt *Moreri*'s Intention: Now thoſe words being contrary to the Rules of Grammar, they may be underſtood as if that Emperor had publiſhed *Phlegon*'s Hiſtory under *Phlegon*'s Name; or, as if he had publiſhed it under his own Name. Here is another Fault. The Conſtruction of thoſe words is ſuch, that every Reader will think, the Event of that 4th Year of the 202 Olympiad, is to be found in the 13th Book of the Hiſtory publiſhed by *Hadrian*. The Reader will be therefore deceiv'd, for if he gets out of that Snare, he will fall into another, he'll think that *Phlegon* compos'd but one Work.

(D) *'Tis pretended that he ſpoke of the Darkneſs which happen'd during our Saviour's Paſſion.*] Since the Book, which contain'd the words on which this Pretenſion is grounded, is not extant, the beſt thing I can do is to ſet down the words of *Euſebius*: That Author does not affirm, in a general way, that *Phlegon* ſaid this or that; he quotes his very words, (h) Γράφει δὲ καὶ Φλέγων ὁ τὰς Ὀλυμπιάδας . . . . . περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ιγ. ῥήμασιν αὐταῖς ταῦτα. Τῷ δ' ἔτει τῆς σβ Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐγένετο ἔκλειψις ἡλίου μεγίστη τῶν ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον. καὶ νὺξ ὥρᾳ ς' τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρας ἐν οὐρανῷ φανῆναι. σεισμός τε μέγας κατὰ Βιθυνίαν γενόμενος τὰ πολλὰ Νικαίας κατεστρέψατο, καὶ ταῦτα ὁ δηλωθεὶς ἀνήρ. That is according to St. *Jerom*'s Tranſlation; (i) *Scribit vero ſuper his & Phlego qui Olympiadorum egregius ſupputator eſt, in tertio decimo libro ita dicens:* quarto autem anno CCII. Olympiadis magna & excellens inter omnes quæ ante eam acciderant, defectio ſolis facta: dies hora ſexta in tenebroſam noctem verſus, ut ſtellæ in cœlo viſæ ſint, terraque motus in Bithynia Nicææ urbis multas ædes ſubverterit. *Hæc ſupradictus vir.* You ſee that *Euſebius* pretends, that thoſe words of *Phlegon* relate to the Prodigies which attended the Crucifixion of *Chriſt*. Several other Fathers pretended the ſame thing; but it is a Pretenſion liable to ſome Difficulties, the greateſt whereof, in my Judgment, lies in this. No Man was more deſirous than *Phlegon* (k) to compile wonderful Events, and to obſerve the ſupernatural Circumſtances thereof. How comes it then, that a Man of ſuch a Character did not obſerve what was moſt prodigious in the Eclipſe, which, 'tis ſaid, he ſpeaks of, I mean, that it happen'd when the Moon was full? This Objection was, without doubt, propoſed; and, 'tis likely, that ſome found the beſt way to anſwer it was to aſſert, That *Phlegon* had ſet down that Circumſtance. (l) Φλέγων ἱστορεῖ ἐπὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐν πανσελήνῳ ἔκλειψιν ἡλίου γεγονέναι: *Narrat Phlegon imperante Tiberio Cæſare ſolis eclipſin plenilunio contigiſſe.* Thoſe words of *Africanus* are quoted by *Syncellus*, wherein 'tis poſitively ſaid, that *Phlegon* mentions an Eclipſe of the Sun which happen'd under the Empire of *Tiberius* in a full Moon. But *Phlegon* ſaid no ſuch thing: if he had, *Euſebius* had not fail'd to mention it; and *Origen* would not have ſaid, that *Phlegon* omitted that Circumſtance. (m) *Et Phlegon quidam in Chronicis ſuis ſcripſit in principatu Tiberii Cæſaris factum: ſed non ſignificavit in luna plena factum.* If it be (n) objected, that he does not ſay neither, that the Eclipſe in queſtion happen'd the Moon being new. I anſwer, That there was no need for him to ſay ſo, it being a thing to be ſuppoſed. The Obſervation of *Philoponus* is of no uſe; it is a falſe Gloſs: he pretends that *Phlegon* having mention'd an Eclipſe not like thoſe that were obſerved till then, intimated the Darkneſs which happen'd at the time of our Saviour's Paſſion. (o) Ἐγένετο ἡλίου ἔκλειψις ἐκ ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον . . . . . . μὴ ἐγνῶσθαι τὴν τοιαύτην ἔκλειψιν τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις. *Contigit eclipſis ſolis cujuſmodi nulla ante cognita eſt . . . . ſuperioribus non eſſe cognitam eclipſim hujuſmodi.* That Author ſhews too great an Inclination to make People ſpeak according to the Intereſt of his Party, and at the coſt of Sincerity. *Phlegon* did not ſay our's Passion. *Photius* blames him for inlarging too much upon insignificant things, and for having collected too many Answers of the Oracles. That Censure is (E) so judicious, that it deserves to be set down.

---

* *Phleg. de reb. mirabil. c. 1.*

† *Phleg. ib. c. 1. Tillem. Hiſt. of the Emperors, Tom. 2. p. 457. of the Bruſſels Edit.*

(t) *Phot. ubi ſupra pag. 258.*

(u) *I have ſet down the words of* Photius *in the Remark E.*

(w) *Voſſ. de Hiſt. Gr. l. 2. c. 11. p. m. 219.*

(x) *Voſſ. ubi ſupra.*

(y) *Spartian. in vita Severi c. 20. p. m. 632. tom. 1.*

(a) *And. Schott. Obſervat. humanar. lib. 2. c. 19. p. 57.*

(b) *Id ib.*

(c) *Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. lib. 2. c. 2. p. 176.*

(d) *They have put in* Trullanus *twice, inſtead of* Trallianus, *and* anno *inſtead of* uno. *They have alſo left out ſeveral words.*

(f) *Spartian. in Adriano c. 16. p. m. 150.*

(g) *Tobias Magirus Eponymolog. Critic. p. 659. Edit. 1687.*

(h) *Euſeb. in Chron. ad Olymp. 203. p. 222. Edit. Scal. Amſtel. 1658.*

(i) *See the ſame Edit. of Scalig. pag. 158.*

(k) Ex quo loco apparet qualis fuerit argumentum librorum Olympiadum Phlegontis. Nam ſub quaque Olympiade, quid toto orbe geſtum eſſet recenſebat, prodigia præcipue & monſtra, reſque alias mirabiles memorabileſque, *Salmaſ. in Spart. pag. 152. tom. 1.*

(l) *Africanus apud Georgium Syncellum in Chronographia citante Huetio demonſtr. Evangel. propoſ. 3. p. m. 49.*

(m) *Orig. in Matthæum tract. 35.*

(n) Atque neque interlunio factum id adnotavit. Quare rem in medio reliquit. *Huet. ib.*

(o) *Philoponus de mundi creatione lib. 2. apud Huet. ib.*

PHRÆA † (*John*) a Learned *English-man*, taught polite (*A*) Learning in *Italy* with great Reputation. He ‡ translated out of *Greek* into *Latin* some Trea-

tises

say in general, that the Eclipse we speak of was of another nature than all those that were seen before. Such a general way of speaking wou'd bear several Interpretations, and might favour the Cause of *Philoponus*. But *Phlegon* made use of a limited Expression; he said, that Eclipse was greater than those that were observed before. That Expression may be fully understood, by supposing that he mentions an Eclipse which happen'd during the *Perigæum* of the Moon, and was a central one. Such an Eclipse happens so seldom, that an Historian who relates such things according to the impression they make upon the Minds of Men, and not according to the exact Observations of an Astronomer, who has consulted the *Ephemerides* of all Ages, might have made the Observation which *Phlegon* made. See what the *French* Historians observe about the Eclipse of the second of *October* 1605.

It is not certain that *Phlegon* said, that the Earthquake which overthrew many Houses in the City of *Nicea*, happen'd at the time of the Eclipse. Perhaps he meant only, that those two Events were observed in the same Year. If you will have it by any means that *Phlegon* denoted the same Day, you lie open to another Difficulty; for you must suppose that the light of the Sun disappeared at Noon in *Bithynia*, and consequently that the Darkness at the time of our Saviour's Passion, was general over all the Earth. That Opinion was always refuted (*p*) by some Persons who had no design to prejudice Orthodoxy, and it is liable to a Difficulty, the weight whereof is not easily born; for how can it be apprehended, (*q*) that if that Darkness had happen'd all over the World, *Phlegon* should be the only Man, or (*r*) almost the only one that mention'd it? We must not forget that M. *Huet* (*s*) blames *Kepler* for asserting that *Phlegon*'s Eclipse ought to be placed under the 24th of *November*, of the second Year of the 202 Olympiad.

I come now to a critical Observation of another kind. *Eusebius* pretends, that *Phlegon* writ that in the 13th Book of his History. *Origen* (*t*) says, that it was in the 13th or 14th. *Maximus* (*u*) quotes only the 14th. *Meursius* is of Opinion, that the Quotation of *Maximus* is the right one; for which he gives this Reason: *Phlegon*, says he, (*w*) had a mind that each Book of his History should contain fifteen Olympiads; but having not lived long enough to make an end of the last Book, it contain'd only four Olympiads. It appears, by Supputation, that he was to treat of the 202d Olympiad in the 14th Book, therefore he mention'd the Eclipse in that Book. The Supputation of *Meursius* is right, but his Supposition is false; for that Distribution of fifteen Olympiads for each Book is a meer fancy, since *Photius* (*a*) affirms, that the five first Books of *Phlegon* reached to the 177 Olympiad. It had been as necessary for *Salmasius*, as for *Meursius*, to remember that Passage of *Photius*; he (*b*) fancied, for want of knowing it, that *Phlegon* did so divide his Work, that the eleven first Books contain'd each fourteen Olympiads, and the five last contain'd each fifteen. This is all false; but here is a reasonable Conjecture. *Phlegon* divided that History into sixteen Parts, almost equal: he found Materials for it more and more, as he came nearer his Time; and therefore every one of his last Books contain'd but a small number of Olympiads, whereas the five first contain'd 177. Thus *Mezerai*'s Chronological Abridgment (*c*) contains in the first Volume the Reigns of 31 Kings, and the space of 518 Years, and only the Reign of *Henry* IV. in the last Volume. The like Observation may be made about all the Histories of a Nation (*d*) divided into Books; the first contain more Years than the last. If *Salmasius* had consider'd this, he had not undertaken to correct a Passage of *Stephanus Byzantinus*. *In voce* (*e*) Ὀλύμπιον, says he, (*f*) *citat* (Stephanus) *Phlegontem* ἐν πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ Ὀλυμπιάδων: *in quo nisi fallor mendosæ sunt editiones, legendum enim* ἐν ἕκτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ Ὀλυμπιάδων. *Cujus emendationis hæc ratio est. Meminerat eo libro Phlegon Olympii ab Hadriano vel potius sumptibus Hadriani ab Atheniensibus ædificati. Atqui ejus rei mentionem non nisi ultimo libro, id est decimo sexto facere poterat Phlegon. Nec enim altera tempora Hadriani Olympiadis jam contexuit.* This critical Observation is grounded upon two insignificant Reasons; the first is, that *Phlegon* could not speak of a Building erected at the Charges of the Emperor *Hadrian*, but in the Book which contain'd the Olympiads belonging to the Reign of that Emperor. The second is, that he writ the History of those Olympiads only in his last Book. If you desire to know the falsity of the first Reason, you need only consider, That the best Annalists are apt to make some incident Observations, wherein they relate both what happen'd before, and what came to pass since. If they mention the burning of a Town, they do not scruple to observe, that it was founded by such a one, who flourished at such a time, and to say, by way of anticipation, that it was rebuilt thirty Years after. They are pleased with those Anticipations, especially when they serve to praise the reigning Prince. It may very well be, therefore, that *Phlegon* spoke of an *Olympeium* under an Olympiad anterior to the Empire of *Hadrian* his Master and Benefactor; for treating of a thing which happen'd in the Isle of *Delos*, before the Reign of that Prince, he might say, that the Place where it happen'd, received afterwards a great Honour, seeing the *Athenians* built there an Edifice, which they call'd (*g*) *Hadrian's new Athens*, because that Emperor furnish'd them with the Money they wanted. It is very likely, that he took hold of every occasion that offer'd to Praise that Prince, and spoke of him *in season and out of season*; and therefore the Reason alledged by *Salmasius* is not good. Nevertheless I will not deny that *Phlegon* mention'd the construction of that Building, under the very same Year that it was built; but this does not prove, that he spoke of it in his last Book. In all likelihood he enlarged more upon the Reign of *Hadrian*, than upon the Time that went before. It is the constant Practice of all Historians. It is therefore likely, that his fifteenth and sixteenth Books contain'd only the Olympiads of *Hadrian*'s Reign; and so the second Reason of *Salmasius* is not better than the other. He might be further criticised, because he affirms, that *Phlegon*'s History did not reach farther than the Reign of that Emperor; yet Father *Pagi* (*h*) and some other Learned Men maintain, that the whole 229th Olympiad was in it; from whence it follows, that it contain'd also the four first Years of the Empire of *Antoninus*.

(*E*) *That Censure of* Photius *is so judicious, that it deserves to be set down.*] Here it is, (*i*) Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν οὔτε λίαν χαμαιπετής, οὔτε τὸ ἀττικὸν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς διασώζων χαρακτῆρα. ἄλλως τε δὲ καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς ὀλυμπιάδας, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς τῶν ἀγωνισμάτων ὀνόματα, καὶ τὰς πράξεις, καὶ ἡ περὶ τοὺς χρησμοὺς ἄκαιρος φιλοπονία τε καὶ φιλοτιμία, εἰς κόρον ἀπάγουσα τὸν ἀκροατὴν, καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο πού ἐν τῷ λόγῳ προκύπτειν συγχωροῦσα, ἀηδῆ τε φράσιν τὸν λόγον δεικνύει, καὶ χάριτος οὐδὲν ἔχειν παρατίθησι. χρησμοῖς δὲ παντοίοις ἐς ὑπερβολὴν ἐστι κεχρημένος. *Auctoris stylus neque omnino humi serpit, neque Atticum usquequaque characterem servat. Aliòquin illa nimis putida ipsius accuratio atque diligentia in Olympiadibus percensendis, singulorumque certaminum nominibus, & rebus gestis, atque ipsis etiam oraculis referendis, non tædium modo lectori adfert, dum per eam reliqua omnia in hoc libro obteguntur, neque apparere sinuntur: verumetiam injucundum propemodum reddit sermonem, quique gratia nihil habere judicetur. Et vero omnis generis Deorum responsa sine modo inculcat.*

(*A*) *Taught polite Learning in* Italy.] This I find in a Dedicatory (*k*) Epistle of *Beatus Rhenanus*: *Is Joannes Phraa*, says he, *quod non sine publico Britanniæ, quam nunc Angliam vocant, honore dixerim, utramque linguam egregie percalluit, bonas literas summa cum laude non paucos annos, idque in Italia professus.* Observe that he calls him *Phraa*, and not *Phreas*, or *Phreus*, as *Vossius* (*l*) calls him. Our Author calls himself *Joannes Phraa*, in the Title of a Book which I am going to speak of.

(B) It

---

† See the Rem. A.

‡ Voss. de Hist. Lat. p. 634.

(*p*) Vid. Anton. Bynæum de morte Christi l. 3. p. 30 & seq.

(*q*) Vid. Voss. harm. Evang. l. 2. c. 10. p. 322

(*r*) I use that Restriction because M. Huet ubi supra p. 41. says, that it is mention'd likewise by the Historian Tallus, to which he adds the Testimony of the Chinese as is to be found in the History of China, written by Hadrian Gresson.

(*s*) Huet. ubi supra p. 40.

(*t*) Orig. cont. Cels. lib. 2.

(*u*) Maxi. Schol. ad Epist. 7. Dionys. Areopag.

(*w*) Meurs. not. ad Phlegont. p. 170.

(*a*) Phot. ubi supra.

(*b*) Salmas. ubi supra p. 151.

(*c*) Of the Dutch Edition divided into 6 Vol. in 12

(*d*) See the History of France, written by Gaguinus, Paulus Æmilius, &c.

(*e*) It shou'd be Ὀλυμπιεῖον.

(*f*) Salmas. ib.

(*g*) Steph. Byzant. v. Ὀλυμπιεῖον.

(*h*) Pagi against Baronius, ad ann. 135. n. 4.

(*i*) Phot. Bibl. n. 97. p. 268.

(*k*) Prefixed to the Translation of the Encomium Calvitiei. See the Rem. B.

(*l*) Voss. de Hist. Lat. p. 634.

tiſes of *Xenophon*, and ſome Books of *Diodorus Siculus*. He had tranſlated before that time a † Diſcourſe of *Syneſius*. It was his (B) firſt Eſſay. Pope *Paul* II. was ſo well pleaſed with the Tranſlation which that Learned *Engliſhman* dedicated to him, that he would make him Biſhop of § *Bath*; but Death permitted not *John Phræa* to enjoy that Favour. He * died (C) in the Year 1465, before he was inſtalled. 'Twas thought that he was poiſoned by his Competitor ‡.

Phræa was Fellow of † *Baliol-College* in *Oxford*. 'Tis ſaid that (D) *Poggius* appropriated to himſelf *Phræa's* Tranſlation of *Diodorus Siculus*.

PIASECKI (*Paul*) in *Latin*, *Piaſecius*, Biſhop of *Premiſlia* in *Poland*, lived in the XVII. Century. He † publiſhed in 1646 *a fine Hiſtory of whatever paſſed in the Kingdom of* Poland *from* Stephen Batthory *to that Year. He did accidentally inſert in it the principal Affairs of Chriſtendom.* Mr. *le Laboureur*, of whom I have borrowed thoſe Words, will tell us (Z) what he thought of that Work.

PICARDS. That Name was beſtowed upon the Sectators of a certain Man, who over-ſtretched the Error of the *Adamites*, with reſpect to Nakedneſs. His Name was *Picard*: he went from *Flanders* into *Germany*, and as far as *Bohemia*. It has been ſaid that he deceived the People with Preſtiges. However it be, he had in a little time a great number of Followers, both Men and Women. He commanded them to go always Naked: which was more than was practiſed by the *Adamites* mentioned by St. *Epiphanius*, who were contented to ſtrip themſelves Naked in their Aſſemblies. He ſtyled himſelf * the Son of God, and pretended that he was ſent into the World by his Father, as a new *Adam*, to reſtore the Law of Nature, which he ſaid did chiefly conſiſt in two things, *viz.* the Community of Women, and the Nakedneſs of all the parts of the Body. He retired into an Iſland of the River *Luſmik*, ſeven Leagues from *Thabor*, the Place of Arms of the famous *Ziſca*. It happened unluckily for him, that forty of his Followers having committed great Diſorders, drew the Forces of that famous General upon the whole Crew. Thoſe forty *Adamites* being gone upon a Party, plundered ſome Country-Houſes, and killed above 200 People. Whereupon § *Ziſca* cauſed the Iſland to be attacked, made himſelf Maſter of it, and put all the *Picards* to the Sword, except two (A) whoſe Lives he ſaved, that he might know from them what was their Religion. 'Tis ſaid, that tho' there was no Marriages amongſt them, yet no Man lay with a Woman without the permiſſion of the Head of the Sect. Any one, who had an inclination for a Woman, was obliged to take her by the Hand, and to bring her before *Picard*, to whom he ſaid, *My Spirit is grown hot for this Woman* ‡: *Picard* anſwered him, *Go, encreaſe and multiply.* One of the great Principles of that Sect was, that they were the only free Perſons in the World: all other Men being Slaves, eſpecially when they hid their Privy-Parts. This is what ſome Women of that Sect meant,

(B) *It was his firſt Eſſay.*] He ſays in his Epiſtle Dedicatory, that he would not follow the Method of other Tranſlators. They begin with ſome Authors that are not difficult; and when Time and Labour have increaſed their Strength, they undertake more difficult Tranſlations. He does not blame them for it; but he declares, that he thought he ſhould do well to take quite another way, and to begin with *Syneſius*, one of the moſt obſcure Writers that is. Every Body, ſays he, ought to know what is proper for him: and *Syneſius* muſt needs be a difficult Author, ſince none of the Learned Men, who have tranſlated out of *Greek* into *Latin*, undertook to tranſlate him. Here are his Words. (m) *Nos vero etſi nonnullis perſuaſi rationibus, quas nunc conſulto præterire libet, converſum ordinem magis ad doctrinam conducere arbitramur: ea tamen modeſtia hanc noſtram defenſamus opinionem, ut neque mihi ipſi arrogare, neque quod ſecus alii ſenſerint, id vitio illis dare velim. Suis enim quiſque in rebus, quid magis, quidve minus ſibi conducat, explorator eſt, & judex optimus. Itaque mihi in hoc à reliquis diſſentienti, à Syneſio ſummo Philoſopho, autoreque graviſſimo, interpretationis initium auſpicari placuit. Quos autem hic ſcripſit libros, tot ac tantis obſtructi ſunt difficultatibus, ut haud ſciam ſi qua alia apud Græcos extent volumina, quæ cum his aut ſententiarum perplexitate, aut obſcuritate verborum auſim conferre. Cujus profecto rei argumentum eſt non mediocre, quod in tanto numero interpretum, quos noſtra, quoſve prior ætas vidit, nemo unquam inventus ſit, quod ſciam, qui hujus autoris opus aliquod attigerit.* Amongſt the Writings of *Syneſius*, *Phræa* pitched upon his Encomium of Baldneſs to tranſlate it. *Beatus Rhenanus* publiſhed that Tranſlation at *Baſil* in the Year 1515, to which he added a Commentary. It is not mentioned by Father *Labbe*, nor by Mr. *du Pin*.

(C) *He died in the Year* 1465.] 'Tis a ſtrange thing that *Moreri* having faithfully ſet down that Date (n), ſhould ſay notwithſtanding that *Phræas lived in the* XIV. *Century.*

(D) *That* Poggius *appropriated to himſelf.*] Read theſe Words: (a) Burton hiſt. linguæ Gr. p. 55. *ait Johannem Phræam Anglum Colleg. Baliolenſis Socium Diodori* 6. *libros vertiſſe, illamque verſionem Poggium nactum fuiſſe, & pro ſuo in publicum extruſiſſe, idque teſtari quoque* Brian. Twyn. Antiq. Oxon. l. 3.

(Z) *What he thought of that Work.*] He ſays that Prelate was not well enough informed of ſome Affairs of *France*: "Abating of that, *ſays he* (b), it "is a Piece worthy of the labour of a Man of his "Rank; for he is very impartial, and has ſo generous an abhorrence of Flattery, that he does no "more ſpare the Faults of the late (*) King, than "thoſe of his Son who reigns at preſent, whom "he never Praiſes without having a good Reaſon "for it. He takes notice of the Ambition of the "Houſe of *Auſtria*; he blames the unjuſtice of their "Proceedings, and praiſes with great Ingenuity the "Reaſon of our taking up Arms, and the Alliances "we made, to oppoſe the deſign they had upon "all the States of *Europe*." Here is the Judgment which a *German* Author gives about that Hiſtory: (c) *Quæ noſtram ætatem ſpectant, ea Paulus* Piaſecius *in* Chronicis *geſtorum in* Europa *ſingularium luculentiùs ſubminiſtrat; negant tamen* Piaſecio *in omnibus ſecurè fidem adhiberi aliqui, & certum eſt, non eſſe ipſum ab omni in hiſtoria errore immunem.* Piaſecki's Hiſtory has been reprinted at *Amſterdam* from the *Poliſh* Edition. Mr. *Amelot de la Houſſaie* quotes it, in his Notes upon Cardinal *d'Oſſat's* Letters, in ſuch a manner as ſhews that he eſteems it.

(A) *Except two.*] Mr. *Varillas* (d) pretends, that there was not one Man ſaved; but that the *Women who proved to be big with Child* were ſaved. He adds, "That after they were delivered, they re"fuſed to renounce the Licentiouſneſs of their Sect, "and ſo they were condemned to be burnt, and "threw themſelves into the Fire with a laughing "Countenance." I don't know why he does not keep to the Account which *Æneas Silvius* gives of it, who ſays that *Ziſca* gave Quarter only to two Men, *Adamitas omnes gladio delevit, duobus tantum reſervatis, ex quibus gentis ſuperſtitionem cognoſceret.* Perhaps he had a mind to rectifie that Narrative by another Paſſage of the ſame Hiſtorian, who ſpeaks of ſome Women of that Sect, who Lay-In in a Priſon, and then endured the puniſhment

† *The Encomium of Baldneſs.*

§ *in England.*

* *Idem.*

‡ Veneto ſe competitore extinctum fuiſſe ſuſpicantur. *Idem.*

† *See the Rem.* D.

† *Le Laboureur, a Relation of the Queen of* Poland's *Journey,* 2. *part. p.* 117.

* *Varillas, the Hiſt. of Wiclefaniſm,* 2 *part p.* 43. *& Hiſt. of Hereſie, l.* 2. *ad ann.* 1420.

§ John Slechta *in a Letter to* Eraſmus *in the year* 1519. (*'tis the* 20th *of the* 14th *Book of* Eraſmus's *Letters*) *ſays, that* Picard *communicated his Errors to* Ziſca *and his whole Army.*

‡ In hanc ſpiritus meus concaluit.

(m) *Jo. Phræa in Epiſt. dedicat. Encomii Calvitiei.*

(n) *There is a tranſpoſition of numbers in the Dutch Edition. It ſhould be* 1465. *inſtead of* 1455.

(a) *Henr. a* Sypeſtein *in Epiſtola de Plagiatu p.* 70. *at the end of Almeloveen's* Amænitates Theologico-Philologicæ.

(b) *Le Laboureur, the Journey of the Queen of* Poland, 2 *part p.* 117. *That Relation was written in the year* 1645.

(*) *That is, of the* K. *of* Poland.

(c) *Maurit. de princip. jur. publ. c.* 2. *n.* 25. *ap. Magirum eponymolog. p. m.* 661.

(d) *Varil. Hiſt. of Wiclefian.* 2 *part p.* 43. *and Hiſt. of Hereſie l.* 2. *ad. ann.* 1420.

ments, whom a Bohemian Lord kept Priſoners for ſome time. They ſaid that thoſe who wore Cloaths, eſpecially thoſe who wore Breeches, ought not to be accounted Free. They were brought to Bed in Priſon; and having been condemned to be burnt with their Husbands, they ſuffered that Puniſhment laughing and ſinging ‖. There has been ſome Doting Men among the (B) Anabaptiſts, who had a mind to renew the Extravagancies of the Picards, with reſpect to Nakedneſs. That ſort of Men have been as much abhorred by the Proteſtants, as by the Catholicks, as it is acknowledged by Cardinal † Hoſius. Nevertheleſs, the Brethren of Bohemia (C) were called Picards, tho' they had nothing common with thoſe that were exterminated by Ziſca. Thoſe who * pretend that Tandemus revived the Hereſie of the Adamites in the XII. Century, as Picard revived it in the XV. are not exact; for it is not true that Tandemus ‡ commanded his Followers to wear no Cloaths. We have more reaſon to ſay ſo of the Turlupins, as I ſhall ſhew in its proper place.

PICCOLOMINI (Alexander) Archbiſhop of Patras, and Coadjutor of Sienna, deſerves to be reckoned among the Illuſtrious Men of the XVI. Century. He was born at Sienna, being of the ſame Family γ with Pope Pius II. He had a great extent of Learning, as he ſhewed by the Books (A) he compoſed upon ſeveral ſorts of Subjects. Yet I would not have every Body believe all that is ſaid of (B) him by his Panegyriſts. He wrote ſome Philoſophical Books in his Mother's Tongue,

‖ [illegible]

† Lib. de [illegible] ſpecial. commun. apud [illegible]

* Moreri in the Art. of the Adamites.

‡ See his Article.

γ Thuanus lib. [illegible] p. 233.

ment of Fire with Joy. But that Paſſage cannot ſettle Mr. Varillas, for we ſee that thoſe Women were in a Priſon with their Husbands, and condemned to be burnt with them. To adjuſt all the parts of that Piece, we muſt ſuppoſe either that all the Adamites were not in the Iſland that was forced by Ziſca, or that ſome of them were impriſoned before the Slaughter. If thoſe two Suppoſitions be denied, it is not true that he ſaved only two Adamites. The Proteſtants (e) have praiſed Ziſca very much for that Action.

(B) *Some Doting Men amongſt the Anabaptiſts.*] I have touched upon this in the Article of the Adamites, and quoted *Lindanus*, an Author of no great Authority. But here is a much more credible Author, viz. *Lambertus Hortenſius* (f) in his Relation of the Tumults of the Anabaptiſts, dedicated to the Magiſtrates of *Amſterdam*, whilſt the Memory of thoſe things was ſtill freſh. He ſays, that on the 14th of *February* 1535. ſeven Men and five Women met at *Amſterdam*, in the Houſe of *John Sibert*. One of thoſe Men, whoſe Name was *Theodoret Sartor*, pretended to be a Prophet; he lay upon the Ground to pray to God, and having made an end of his Prayers, he told one of his Brethren, that he had ſeen God in his Majeſty; that he had ſpoken to him; that he was deſcended from Heaven into Hell, and that he knew that the Day of Judgment was near at hand. They met again the ſame Day, and after they had ſpent four Hours in Prayers and Expoſitions, the Prophet all of a ſudden pulls off his Helmet and his Armour, and throws them into the Fire with the reſt of his Arms, and ſhews himſelf Naked to all the Company. He bids them all do the like: every one obeys ſo exactly, that they did not ſo much as leave a Ribbon upon their Heads to keep their Hair tied. They throw every thing into the Fire, as a Burnt-Offering unto the Lord. Then the Prophet bids them follow him, and do as he does. They go out all of them, and run into the Streets with moſt horrid Cries, *Væ, væ, væ, divina vindicta, divina vindicta, divina vindicta!* Wo, wo, wo, Divine Vengeance, Divine Vengeance, Divine Vengeance! The People being frighted with ſuch Howlings, think that the Town is taken, take up their Arms and go out. The naked Crew are apprehended, and brought before the Judges: they ſcorn to put on the Cloaths that are preſented to them. In the mean time the Houſe, from which that infamous Proceſſion ſet out, was a burning, and they had much ado to put out the Fire. On the 25th of *March* the ſeven Men were put to Death; and nine of their Accomplices were puniſhed in the ſame manner ſome few Days after. *Gui de Bres*, a Miniſter, relates that Hiſtory in a (g) Book againſt the *Anabaptiſts* printed in 1565. He did not underſtand well the *Roman* way of Dating, *tertio Id. Februarii, quinto Kal. Mart.* which *Hortenſius* makes uſe of; for he renders it *the 3d of February*, and *the 5th of March*. He gives a faithful Account of the reſt, only he ſays that thoſe Men were put to the Rack and beaten. The *Latin* Original does not mention the Rack, and the Word *percutiuntur* ſignifies a Capital Puniſhment.

(C) *The Brethren of* Bohemia *were called* Picards.] Such they called all thoſe who oppoſed Popery with the greateſt vigour in *Bohemia*: for *Sleidan* divides the *Bohemians* in this manner. (a) *At Bohemis quod attinet, ſic habet. A morte Joannis Huſſi in tres potiſſimum ſectas diviſus eſt populus. Una eſt eorum qui Pontificem Romanum et Eccleſiæ Principem, & Chriſti Vicarium agnoſcunt: altera eorum, qui cœnam Domini percipiunt integram, & in Miſſis non illa recitant lingua populari; cætera autem in rebus à Pontificiis nihil differunt: tertia eſt eorum qui dicuntur Picardi; Pontificem hi Romanum & clientelam ejus omnem appellant Antichriſtum, & meretricem illam in Apocalypſi depictam; præter Biblica ſcripta nihil recipiunt; Sacerdotes & Epiſcopos ſibi deligunt ipſi; matrimonia nemini interdicunt; mortuis nullas faciunt exequias; dies feſtos & ceremonias habent perpaucas.* But *Rudigerus* in his Hiſtory of the Brethren of *Bohemia*, rejects (b) the Name of *Picards* that was impoſed upon them, and thinks that it was given 'em by their Enemies, "To diſhonour them by ſo infamous a Title, as if we had been only, *ſays he*, the wretched Remains of the lewd *Picard*, who renewing the ancient Hereſy of the *Adamites*, introduced Nakedneſs and infamous Actions."

(A) *By the Books he compoſed.*] *Ghilini* mentions theſe that follow: (c) *La Filoſofia morale: la Theorica de' pianetti: l'Inſtituzione dell' huomo: l'Inſtituzione del Principe Chriſtiano: della grandezza dell' acqua e della terra: Parafraſi ſu la Rettorica d'Ariſtotile: Della creanza delle donne: delle ſtelle fiſſe: due Comedie cioè l'Aleſſandra e l'Amor Coſtante: la Sfera: i ſonetti: Tradizione della poetica d'Ariſtotile: annotazione ſopra la medeſima poetica d'Ariſtotile: Teſoro dell' huomo in tre parti diviſo trattà del buon nome, e nella terza fa menzione dell' amor ſopranaturale.* *Voſſius* (d) obſerves that our *Piccolomini* printed at *Venice* in 1565. a *Latin* Commentary upon *Ariſtotle's* Mechanical Queſtions. He praiſes that Author very much: (e) *Philoſophus planè eximius fuit; tum ob ingenium, & induſtriam; tum quia feliciter adeo Matheſin & philoſophiam conjunxit. Utrique ſanè excelluit; ut præclara tot ejus opera oſtendunt.*

(B) *All that is ſaid of him by his Panegyriſts.*] I believe there is an *Hyperbole* in this Paſſage of *Thevet*. "(f) Certainly he was a Man who ſhewed a Divine Eloquence in his Writings, and his way of Speaking was ſo admirable, that he ſeemed rather to charm the Ears of his Hearers, than perſuade them by the Artifice of his Eloquence. He was inferiour to none in his Time as to Languages, either for the Antiquity and Propriety of the *Hebrew* Tongue, or for the Elegancy and Sweetneſs of the *Latin* Style, which he underſtood ſo well, that *Cicero* and the other excellent Orators, could not have expreſt their Thoughts better than our learned *Alexander* did. He made ſuch a progreſs in Divinity, the Civil Law, Phyſick, Mathematicks and Philoſophy, that there is no Secret or Receſs but what he carefully look'd into, as may be atteſted by thoſe who had the happineſs to frequent and converſe with him, and to caſt their Eyes upon his learned and excellent Works. The Facility wherewith he explained and made the moſt difficult Authors intelligible, is particularly praiſed. Let any one take his Commentaries (g) upon *Ariſtotle's* Meteors, and ſome other Books of that Ancient Philoſopher,

(e) See du Pleſſis Mornay, in his Myſtery of Iniquity p. 512. and Rivetus, Remarks in the Anſwer to the Myſtery of Iniquity, 2 part p. 504.

(f) He was Rector of the College of Naerden, his Book was printed at Baſil in 1548.

(g) Intitled, The Root, Spring and Foundation of the Anabaptiſts of our time. See alſo the Hiſt. of the Anabaptiſts printed at Amſterdam in the year 1595. p. 95. & ſeq. There is a tranſpoſition of numbers p. 95. viz. the year 1553. inſtead of 1535.

(a) Sleid. l. 4. See alſo Thuan. l. 6. and the Letter of John Slechta among thoſe of Eraſmus l. 14. p. 675.

(b) P. 1[illegible].

(c) Ghilini Teatro d'huomini letterati, tom. 1. p. 8.

(d) Voſſ. de Scient. Mathem. p. 322.

(e) Id. ib.

(f) Thevet, Elogies of illuſtrious Men tom. 8. c. 3. p. 32, 33. edit. in 12. 1671.

(g) The Abbreviators of Geſner ſay only that he tranſlated the Commentaries of Alexander Aphrodiſienſis upon the 4 Books of Ariſtotle's Meteors.

Tongue, and is accounted the firſt (C) who did ſo. The Treatiſe he publiſhed by order of *Francis de Medicis*, Great Duke of *Tuſcany*, concerning the Reformation of the Calendar, α had the Approbation of the moſt Learned. He is very much to be praiſed for having joyned good Manners and a moſt exemplary Life with the Theory of the Mathematicks and Phyſicks §. He was a ſtrict Follower of ε *Ariſtotle's* Opinions, and a Member of the γ Academy of the *Infiammati* at *Padua*. Notwithſtanding his Gravity, and his great Application to ſome Philoſophical Works, he compoſed (D) ſome Plays, which were very much eſteemed. He died at *Siena* the 12th of *March* † 1578, being threeſcore and ten Years old, and was buried in the Cathedral Church ‡. What *Thuanus* (E) ſays of him is ſomewhat curious, and of a good Example for thoſe who ſtudy: he ſpeaks of it as an Oculer Witneſs. I muſt criticize (F) his Tranſlator.

α *Joh. Imperial. in Muſ. Hiſt. p.* 82, 83.

§ *Id. ib. p.* 83.

ε *Id. ib.*

γ *Ghilini Teatr. part.* 1. *p.* 8.

† *He was not therefore alive in* 1580, *as Moreri affirms it.*

‡ *Imper. ub. ſup.*

PICCOLOMINI (*Francis*) was born at *Siena*, being of the ſame Family with the foregoing. He was a very famous Philoſopher in the XVI. Century. Tho' he was very young when he taught Logick in the Univerſity of *Siena*, yet the whole Town admired him upon the account of his Lectures. Afterwards he taught Philoſophy in the Univerſity of (A) *Macerata*, and then for the Space of ten Years in that of *Perugia*. His Reputation increaſed to ſuch a degree, that the City of *Padua* reſolved to have him for the ſame Employment. He was made extraordinary Profeſſor of Philoſophy there in the Year 1560, and about four Years after Ordinary Profeſſor in the ſame Faculty. He publiſhed ſeveral Commentaries upon *Ariſtotle*, which were very much eſteemed, by reaſon of their Clearneſs

“ loſopher, and it will be found that he has ſo dexterouſly dived into the Senſe of his Author, that *Ariſtotle* himſelf could ſcarce have explained his Opinions better than our *Piccolomini* did. „

(C) *The firſt who did ſo.*] *Imperialis* blames him for it, as being a thing which makes Learning contemptible, and does not agree with the Reſpect due to the Language of Ancient *Rome*. *Efferbuit mire*, ſays he (h), *ingenium Alexandri Piccolominei Senenſis in cogendo ſub Etruſcis vexillis agmine ſcientiarum omnium, quo intentato aliis facinore immortalem ſibi pararet in Italica celebritate triumphum. Memorabilis profecto induſtria niſi trito proteri ſermone rerum apices præclariſſimarum eſſet, contemptum ipſarum quendam apud viliores inducere, & quod magis intereſt, eſſet Latinæ locutionis majeſtatem ac ſtudium abdicare qua ultro utiliſſima quæque comprehenſa & conſignata eſſe palam eſt.* See what *Boccalini* (i) makes our *Alexander* ſay upon *Parnaſſus*. Some Men would be glad that the Key of Learning ſhould not be imparted to the People. They would have all Philoſophical and Learned Books to be publiſhed in *Latin*, and the Commonwealth of Learning to deal with Ancient Books, as the Church of *Rome* deals with the Scripture. She does not allow the Reading of it in a vulgar Tongue, but with a thouſand Precautions. It is a Sanctuary where prophane Men are not permitted to enter. See the Complaint (k) which Mr. *du Pin* has refuted in the Preface of his *New Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Writers.*

(D) *Some Plays, which were very much eſteemed.*] I ſhall quote *John Imperialis* for it: (l) *Neque tamen his dicatus gravioribus muniis abſtinuit interdum à luſibus poetarum comicas concinnando fabulas, quarum inſigniores duæ amoris conſtantis, & Alexandri titulo feruntur impreſſæ, in quibus ſic excelluit, ut ideo comicorum Italicorum princeps Trajani Boccalini judicio cenſeatur.* I think that by vertue of theſe Words *Menagius* might have placed our *Piccolomini* among (m) the *Eccleſiaſticks*, who wrote amorous Verſes.

(E) *What* Thuanus *ſays of him.*] He followed *Paul de Foix*, whom *Charles* IX. ſent Ambaſſador into *Italy* in the Year 1573. That Ambaſſador being come to *Siena*, went to ſee our *Piccolomini*, and found him reviſing his Commentaries upon *Ariſtotle*. All the Servants of the good old Man were gone out, ſo that having had no notice of the Ambaſſador's Viſit, he was ſurprized by him as he lay down. I ſhall ſet down in *Latin* what he told him about the Comfort he found in Reading in the midſt of the Infirmities of old Age. (a) *Dum in urbe eſſet Foxius, Alexandrum Piccolomineum veneranda canicie ſenem in ædibus ſuis inviſit, quem culcitra incumbentem, & Ariſtoteli ſuo, hoc eſt à ſe diverſis explicationibus illuſtrato, recognoſcendo vacantem improviſus invenit. Nam ſolus erat, & famuli huc illuc per feſtum diem diverſi abierant. Quod ille anxietate ſumma excuſavit, & gratias Foxio pro tam honorifica ſalutatione egit, tum ſedere juſſis qui cum Foxio aderant, in iiſque Thuano. Multa de ſtudiis ſuis diſſeruit, eorumque ſe demum in ea ætate dulciſſimum fructum capere dixit, aliis oblectamentis deficientibus quibus aliæ ætates innocenter & citra offenſam gaudere poſſunt. Quod cum dicebat, non tam ſenectuti ſolatium quærere dicebatur, quam adoleſcentes qui aderant, qua humanitate erat, ad deſidiam vitandam & Philoſophiæ ſtudia capeſſenda exemplo ſuo cohortari.*

(F) *I muſt criticize* Thuanus's *Tranſlator.*] Let us compare his Tranſlation with the Latin Words of *Thuanus*. Alexander Piccolomini, *ſays he* (b), *would make People believe that he was of* Æneas Silvius's *Family, who being raiſed to the Papal Dignity, took the Name of* Pius II. Here are *Thuanus's* Words: (c) *Alexand. Piccolomineum Æneæ Silvii, qui Pontifex* Pius II. *dici voluit, Gentilis*, &c. It is evident that *Thuanus* affirms, that our *Alexander* was related to *Pius* II. but the Tranſlator makes him ſay a thing very injurious to the Memory of that Learned Man, as if he had falſly pretended to be related to that Pope. If it be an enormous Over-ſight, becauſe it wrongs an illuſtrious Man, it is no leſs enormous if it be conſidered how eaſy it was to underſtand the Words of the Original. The Tranſlator adds, that *John Baptiſt Sacriſtan, Deiphobus Arch-Prieſt, and his other Brothers beſtowed upon* (d) *him a noble Elogy.* I think theſe Words of *Thuanus* are not well rendred, *in majore patriæ urbis templo ſepultus, & honorifico à Jo. Baptiſta æditus, Deiphobo Archipresbytero aliiſque fratribus elogio ornatus.* I fancy that theſe Words *aliiſque fratribus* ſignifie the other Canons of the Cathedral of *Siena*, and not the Brothers of *Alexander Piccolomini.*

(A) *In the Univerſity of* Macerata, *and then* .... *of* Perugia.] He was 25 Years of Age when he left *Siena* to go to *Macerata*, and his Deſign was rather to ſit down amongſt the Scholars, than to get into the Pulpit as a Profeſſor; but as ſoon as he appear'd at *Macerata* he was made firſt Profeſſor of Philoſophy. So ſays (e) *Imperialis*. He does not intimate in the leaſt what is affirmed by *Tomaſini*, viz. that *Piccolomini* was Profeſſor of Logick at *Siena* before he went to *Macerata*. *Imperialis* adds, that he ſtaid no longer than one Year in this laſt Town, and that being called over to *Perugia*, he took hold of that opportunity of ſhewing his Capacity upon a nobler Stage. He taught Philoſophy there for the ſpace of ten Years, and publiſhed a Volume *de Morali Philoſophia*, which was admir'd: (f) *Tantis omnium cœtuum laudibus exceptum, cum nihil eo, vel ad efformandos mores utilius, vel ad Rempublicam recte gerendam accomodatius, vel ad omnem bonorum malorumque notitiam ſuavius excogitari poſſit.* Father *le Moine* (g) ſpeaks well of that Book, and criticizes ſome Paſſages in it. Take notice of this Title, *Franciſci Piccolominei Senenſis univerſa philoſophia de moribus* nunc primum *in decem gradus redacta & explicata. Venetiis in fol.* 1583. It ſeems to ſignifie that the firſt Edition came out in the Year 1583. If it be ſo, *Imperialis* is miſtaken when he ſays, that *Piccolomini* publiſhed that Book being Profeſſor at *Perugia*, and deſerved by reaſon of ſo fine a Work (h) to be called over to *Padua*; for according to *Imperialis's* reckoning, he began to teach Philoſophy at *Padua* being about 37 Years of Age, that

(h) *Imper. in Muſæo, Hiſt. p.* 82.

(i) *Boccal. Ragguagli di Parnaſo Cent.* 1. *c.* 72. *p. m.* 221, 222.

(k) *It is mentioned in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *June* 1686. *Art.* 4 *p.* 653. *See a Paſſage of* Cicero in orat. pro Muræna *alledged by* Eraſmus *under the Adage* Cornicum oculos configere. *'Tis the* 75th *of the* 3d *Century of the* 1ſt *Chiliad. p. m.* 123.

(l) *Imper. in Muſ. Hiſt. p.* 83.

(m) Menagius *mentions ſome Eccleſiaſticks in the* 145th *Chap. of his Anti-Baillet Tom.* 2.

(a) *Thuan. de vit. ſua l.* 1. *p. m.* 1170. *Col.* 1.

(b) *and* Teiſſier, *Elogies taken from* Thuanus *tom.* 1. *p.* 484, 485.

(c) *Thuan. Hiſt. l.* 65. *p.* 25, *ad ann.* 1578.

(d) *That is, upon* Alexander Piccolomini.

(e) *Jo. Imper. in Muſ. Hiſt. p.* 114.

(f) *Id. ib.*

(g) *In his* peintures morales.

(h) Hoc unum effecit poſtea ut graviſſimo Venetorum judicio ad Patavinum Gymnaſium fuerit convocatus. *Imper. ub. ſup.*

Clearneſs and Subtilty. He endeavoured to revive the *Platonick* (*B*) Philoſophy, and to ſhew that at the bottom it agreed with that of *Ariſtotle* §. The famous *James Zabarella* was his Antagoniſt, againſt whom he publiſhed ſomething. I ſhall ſay in another Place (*C*) wherein he exceeded him. * Having obſerved that the Diſputations which the Profeſſors had appointed in the Afternoon, were the Cauſe of many Diviſions and Quarrels, he wiſely ſuppreſt them; which he was the more willing to do, becauſe † he enjoyed a Penſion of 1400 Florins. He would have been a happy Man, had he been able to put an end to the Quarrels of his Family, as he did to thoſe of his Scholars: but his Sons hated one another ſo violently, and were ſo wicked, that they made him extreamly uneaſie in his old Age. He gave over the Function of a Profeſſor, after he had glorioully exerciſed it (*D*) for the ſpace of 53 Years, and retired to *Siena*, where he died (*E*) very old: he left a great Eſtate to his Heirs ‡. It appeared by his Funeral how much he was eſteemed by the Inhabitants of *Siena*; for every * Body went in Mourning, and all the Courts of Judicature were ſhut up. He had been a Diſciple of the famous *Zimara* β, and Schoolfellow of *Felix Peretti*, who was Pope by the Name of *Sixtus* V. and boaſted as long as he (*F*) lived, that he had been able to anſwer his Objections at a publick Diſputation.

PIENNE (*Jean de Halluin Demoiſelle de*) Maid of Honour to *Catherine de Medicis*, was paſſionately beloved by *Francis* ‡ *de Montmorenci*, Eldeſt Son to the *Conſtable Anne de Montmorenci*. He promiſed her to marry her, without (*A*) acquainting his Father or his Mother with it, ſo much he feared that they ſhould oppoſe his Deſign. 'Tis not likely that they would have conſented to it, tho' that Lady was very Illuſtrious by her Birth, and commendable for her Beauty and Virtue; but there was a particular Reaſon which moved them to oppoſe that Engagement openly, *viz.* becauſe *Henry* II. was deſirous that his Natural Daughter, Widow of the Duke of *Caſtro*, ſhould marry the Lover of the Lady *de Pienne*. The Conſtable's Ambition was too much favoured by ſuch an Alliance, to give him leave to ſuffer that his Son's Engagement ſhould paſs for a good one. Therefore he omitted nothing to get it broke, and being in the greateſt Favour with the King that ever

that is to ſay, in the Year 1557. That Hiſtorian cannot be excuſed, but by ſaying that *Piccolomini* publiſhed his Morals before the Year 1557, and put them afterwards in a new Order, and ſo the abovemention'd Title will denote a ſecond Edition. He inſerted in his Morals printed in the Year 1582, a Treatiſe *de Methodo*, wherein he refuted *Zabarella* his Collegue and Rival: The latter anſwered him, but *Piccolomini* made a Reply intitled *Comes politicus adverſus Jacobum Zabarellam.*

(*B*) *To revive the Platonick Philoſophy.*] *Imperialis* ſays, That he began to apply himſelf to that Study, after he had given over the Functions of a Profeſſor; but *Tomaſini* ſays, that he read Lectures, and wrote ſomething about it even at *Padua*. Here are the Words of *Imperialis*: (*i*) *Hac igitur egregie navata Venetiis opera per annos duos & viginti patriam ſibi tandem vivendam commiſit, in qua extremos etiam ſpiritus hauſit. Ac interim pluribus ad magnum Etruriæ Ducem* (*k*) *legationibus perfunctus plurimiſque honoribus auctus amœniſſime* **Platonis** *philoſophiæ vacare cœpit, quam etiam commentariis exornandam ſuſceperat, ipſum namque dicere ſolitum accepimus, Platonis & Ariſtotelis philoſophiam duos quaſi oculos humani aciem intellectus dirigere, quorum alterutro ſi quis careat Cyclopis inſtar in hac rerum univerſitate labatur neceſſe eſt: ſed communia fata præclaros hoſce illius conatus interciderunt.* See the Words of *Tomaſini* (*l*) in the Margin, and make the neceſſary Compariſons.

(*C*) *I ſhall ſay* (*m*) *in another Place wherein he exceeded* Zabarella.] But I muſt obſerve here that he was inferior to him in ſome reſpects. He did not dive into the bottom of his Subject, as *Zabarella* did, he rambled from one Subject to another, and preſented them rather as a Wine to be taſted, than to be drank off. This ſeems to be the meaning of *Imperialis*. *Piccolomineus*, ſays he (*n*), *oratione quidem utitur expedita, gravi, & illaborata, cæterum ſententiarum nexu frequentior quam forte conveniat, excurrit enimvero, nec in concluſionibus hæret, novis at ſubinde doctrinæ cumulis urget, ut libanda potius quam guſtanda propoſitorum veritas offerri videatur, propterea bene ſentientium calculis ſancitum, hujus ſcripta magis provectiorum auribus inſervire, illius autem juniorum.*

(*D*) *Exerciſed it for the ſpace of 53 Years.*] So ſays *Tomaſini*: but the Account he gives of it cannot be reconciled with the Words of *Imperialis*, who ſays that *Piccolomini* was one Year at *Macerata*, ten Years at *Perugia*, and two and twenty at *Padua*, which makes up but 33 Years. It would be needleſs to ſay that he forgot his profeſſing of Logick at *Siena*; for it could not laſt 20 Years, ſeeing *Piccolomini* was but 25 Years old, when he was made Profeſſor of Philoſophy at *Macerata*. *Ghilini* (*a*) takes in the 53 Years of *Tomaſini*, and he is more excuſable than *Paul Freherus*, (*b*) who admits of them after he had ſaid that *Francis Piccolomini* was made Profeſſor at *Macerata*, being 25 Years of Age, that he kept that Profeſſorſhip but one Year, that he exerciſed that of *Perugia* only ten Years, and that of *Padua* twenty two Years. Such are the Miſtakes, which an Author will be guilty of when he joyns together ſeveral oppoſite Relations.

(*E*) *Where he died very old.*] *Tomaſini* and *Imperialis* agree in making him live 84 Years: they have forgot to ſet down the Year of his Death; but we know from the Date of his Epitaph, as it is in (*c*) *Ghilini*, that it was the Year 1604. *Imperialis* obſerves that that venerable old Man (*d*) was ſo happy as never to want Spectacles.

(*F*) *And boaſted as long as he lived, that he had been able to anſwer.*] I ſhall ſet down the matter of Fact, as it is related by *Imperialis*. (*e*) *Et quidem Fœlix adhuc Minorita quod ſemel propoſitarum in Templo Theſium ex utraque philoſophia publicum impugnatorem ſortitus erat Franciſcum, ſæpius porro pontifex ejus diei memoriam recolebat, ſibi digniſſimum reputans cum acerrimo, ut ipſe ajebat, ingenio in celebri conſeſſu haud ſegniter doctrinæ atque ingenii gloriam ſuſtinuiſſe.*

(*A*) *He promiſed her to marry her, without acquainting his Father or Mother with it.*] Mr. *le Laboureur* who had (*f*) *the Originals of all the Proceedings*, ſays, they *began with the Interrogatory of the two Lovers made in the* Louvre on the 5th of *October* 1556, that *Jane de Halluyn was called firſt, and ſaid ſhe was about* 19 *or* 20 *Years old*, and that 5 or 6 Years before *Meſſire Francis de Montmorenci* "had
"ſpoken to her of Marriage, in the Palace of *Pa-*
"*ris*, or at *St. Germains*, where *he ſaid that he took*
"*her for his Wife, and ſhe anſwered, that ſhe took*
"*him for her Husband: That he had ſpoken to her*
"*about it ſeveral times before, but ſhe would not have*
"*him, becauſe he was too young, and beſides, ſhe was*
"*afraid that the Conſtable would take it ill; to*
"*which he anſwered, that he would ſtay ſo long, and*
"*be ſo obedient to him, that he would make him ap-*
"*prove of it: and ſhe would not have declared it, if*
"*the ſaid* M. de Montmorenci *had not ſpoken of it*,
"*becauſe of the Marriage of the Dutcheſs of* Ca-
"ſtro. She ſaid further, that ſhe had received
"no Gift nor any Preſent, and that every thing
"was done by word of Mouth, without Wit-
"neſſes, and without acquainting any of her Rela-
"tions with it. That he wrote to her about it
"whilſt

§ *Taken from James Philip Tomaſini, Elog. part 1. p. 106. & ſeq.*

* *Id. ib.*

† *This ſhews that the Profeſſors got ſomething by them. Id. p. 107.*

‡ *Freher. ibid.*

* Et ab his etiam quod inſolito civium ſqualore, [illegible], Lacrymis eius in patria funus elatum. *Imper. in Muſeo hiſt. p. 115.*

β *Id. ib. p. 114.*

‡ *Who was made Mareſchal of* France *in the year* 1559.

(*i*) *Id. ib. p. 115.*

(*k*) *He mentions one of theſe Deputations in the Dedicatory Epiſt. of his Book* de rerum definitionibus *dated from* Siena *in* 1600.

(*l*) Platonicam diſciplinam fere collapſam & legendo & ſcribendo in integrum reſtituere conatus eſt, illud in primis enitens ut Platonem cum Ariſtotele in pluribus conciliaret. *Tomaſin. elog. part.* 1. *p.* 209.

(*m*) *In one of the Rem. of the Art.* Zabarella.

(*n*) *Imper. ib. ſup.*

(*a*) *Ghilini, teatro, tom. 1. p. 62. Witten in* Diario Biogr. ad an. 1604. *mentions only 52 years.*

(*b*) *Freher. in Theatro p. 1498.*

(*c*) *Id. ib.*

(*d*) Ex eo fœlix in tanto ſenio quod oculorum vim nullo unquam chryſtalli ſubſidio juvit. *Imper. ib. ſup.*

(*e*) *Imper. ib. p. 114.*

(*f*) *Le Laboureur, addit. to the Memoirs of* Caſtelnau, *tom. 2. p.* 419.

ever a Subject was in, he moved that Prince to uſe all imaginable means to get the Promiſe, which might be alledged by the Lady *de Pienne*, declared null. ǂ *That Affair became the greateſt in Chriſtendom, becauſe of Pope* Paul IV. *who had a mind to marry* that Daughter of *Henry* II. *(who was already Widow of an* Italian, *and a Pope's Grand-Son) to another* Italian *his Nephew. . . . . . The Pope's Intereſt was the only obſtacle to the Diſpenſation which was demanded of him, and which* Francis de Montmorency went to ſollicite in Perſon. The King did not believe that the Pope would deny him any thing, in ſo favourable a Time as that of the League which they were then treating of againſt *Spain*. Nevertheleſs, *Paul* IV. appeared (*B*) ſo averſe to it, that the King was obliged to have recourſe to ſome other Expedients. He

ǂ *Le Laboureur addit. to Caſtelnau tom. 2. p. 419.*

" whilſt he was in Priſon, but that ſhe burnt " his Letters, *that he continued to ſpeak of it ſince " his Return, namely, in the Abbey of* Vauluiſant *where " he was lately, and even Yeſterday in the Evening in " the Conſtable's Houſe, he repeated the ſame things " to her, and deſired her not to be angry. She added that ſhe knew not that the ſaid Marriage was " clandeſtine and prohibited, and that ſhe thought he " might marry of himſelf, tho' he had a Father and a " Mother, becauſe Marriage belongs to God, and Ceremonies to the Church.* For the reſt, ſhe referred it to the *Sieur de Montmorenci*, and ſhe put " her Hand to her Anſwer. That Lord made a like " Anſwer, and after he had ſaid that he was 26 " Years of Age, he confeſt every thing, even that " the Day before in the Evening, he had made a " new Promiſe of Marriage to her, as he was ſpeaking of the Trouble he was in; only being ask'd, " whether having a Father and a Mother, he knew " not that it was not in his power to contract a " Marriage without their Conſent, he ſaid, *that " when he did that Folly, he conſidered not all theſe " things, and that his Age did not bear it, and that if " he was to do the ſame again, he would think more of " it. . . . .* (*g*) Thoſe Depoſitions were ſent to *Rome*, " with abundance of Paſſages collected out of the " Scripture and the Fathers, againſt Marriages contracted without the Conſent of Parents, and the " Pope received the whole graciouſly enough at firſt, " made a great Reception to the *Sieur de Montmorency*, " and promiſed him all manner of Satisfaction: but " either he diſſembled, or had not yet thought of this " occaſion of Allying his Family with the Houſe of " *France*, which made him put off that Buſineſs, " that he might have time to think by what means " he might effect his Deſign. „ In an Act of Proteſtation which Mr. *de Montmorenci* cauſed to be drawn up in the Houſe of Cardinal *du Bellai* at *Rome*, the 23d of *March* 1557, he declared: (*h*) " That five Years ago and above, being in the Heat " of his Youth, he became in Love with the Lady " *Jane de Halluin de Pienne*, and contracted a Marriage with her by word of Mouth, without the " conſent of the King, and of his Father and Mother; that ſince that time the King and his Father being reſolved to marry him to *Diana* of " *France*, he came to *Rome* by their Order to have " the Pope's Abſolution and Diſpenſation; that for " the ſpace of four Months he had not ceaſed to " ſollicite His Holineſs about it, and even juſtified " the Lawfullneſs of his Demand by a Diſpenſation " granted by him in a like Caſe. Whereupon he " had been amuſed with hopes, and referred to a " Congregation of Divines and Canoniſts, ſummoned to meet on the 23d of this Month, with the " Cardinals, Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops, under pretence of making the thing more Juridical; but " in effect, as he had it from very good Hands, to " prejudice his Deſign, notwithſtanding the Promiſes of the Pope, who favoured the Opinions " for his Adverſe Party, and was diſpleaſed with, " and uſed very ill thoſe who were for his Abſolution, and appeared evidently to be contrary to " him. Wherefore having had notice of the Renunciation of the Lady *de Piennes*, he proteſts " againſt whatſoever the Pope may order for the " future, againſt the Liberty which he pretends to " have of Marrying, and demands that the Petitions preſented by him to his Holineſs, and the " Diſpenſation granted by the Pope in a like Caſe, " be entered into a Regiſter. „ We ſhall ſee (*i*) by and by the Reaſons of his Complaints.

(*g*) *Id. ib. p. 420. Obſerve theſe Words of* Brantome *in his Encomium on the Conſtable of* Montmorenci *tom. 2. of his Memoirs p. 137.* As the Conſtable had procured a Match between him and the Natural Daughter of K. *Henry. . . .* when his Father told him of it, and of the Day appointed for the Wedding, *M. de Montmorency* anſwered him that he could not hearken to it, becauſe he was engaged to marry *Mademoiſelle de Pienne.* The old Man was ſtrangely ſurpriſed, and had more recourſe to Tears, &c.

(*h*) *Le Laboureur ib. p. 432.*

(*i*) *See the Rem. B.*

(*B*) Paul IV. *appeared ſo averſe to it that the King was obliged.*] Mr. *le Laboureur* goes on. " The " Pope (*k*) kept a great while *Francis de Montmorenci* in *Rome*, putting him off from Congregation " to Congregation; but at laſt his Game was found " out, and the King and Conſtable being diſappointed in their hopes of the Pope, reſolved to " bring to a concluſion that Buſineſs, which had " made ſo great a Noiſe, and in order to it they " cauſed an Edict to be drawn up, which was made " on purpoſe, publiſhed and verified, whereby " Clandeſtine Marriages were declared to be Null: " Beſides, the poor Lady was forced to deſiſt; for " ſhe was ſhut up in the Convent of the *Filles Dieu* " at *Paris*, where deſpairing to ſucceed in her " Hopes, and fearing of being treated worſe, ſhe " was at laſt perſuaded that the *Sieur de Montmorency* had obtained the Pope's Diſpenſation. „

(*k*) *Id. ib. p. 420.*

That we may well underſtand how much the Intereſt of the Pope's Family did work upon him, we muſt not loſe the ſight of this Capital Point, *viz*, That *Paul* IV. deſired to marry his Nephew with the Natural Daughter of *Henry* II. and that he could not ſucceed in it, if he declared the Promiſe made to the Lady *de Pienne* to be Null. We ſhall ſee that he wiſhed on this occaſion that the Papal Authority were leſſened, and that he was deprived of a Right, of which he would have been very jealous in another Caſe. The particular Advantage of his Family was more dear to him than the Priviledges of Papacy, whether it be that he believed his Succeſſors would eaſily remedy the Prejudice he deſigned to do them, or that he abſolutely preferred perſonal Advantages to thoſe of the Holy See. This Affair was purſued with great heat by the Court of *France*; they omitted nothing to make it ſucceed. They preſented (*a*) the Act whereby the Lady *de Pienne* renounced her Pretenſions, and the Edict againſt Clandeſtine Marriages. They got (*b*) *a Copy of a Diſpenſation* which the Pope *had granted in a like Caſe.* Here is a Paſſage of the Relation which (*c*) Doctor *de la Haye* ſent to the Conſtable: It is a curious thing: " *Paul* IV. (*d*) ſent immediately for the Datary to know how that Diſpenſation had been drawn up; wondring at it, and " much more how it came into our Hands: to " which the Datary anſwered, that it had been " granted in a full Signature, and by His Holineſs; " which he might remember, being deſirous to " know and underſtand, more than any of his Predeceſſors did, what paſſes in his Signature. His " Holineſs was amazed at it, and asked the Datary, " by what means the ſaid Diſpenſation might be " retracted, a thing which the Datary ſaid could " not be done, becauſe it was already in the Hands " of the Parties, and that they were married by " virtue of the ſame. „ I ſhall give alſo ſome Abſtracts of the Reſult of the firſt Congregation held for the Diſpenſation of that Marriage. (*e*) The Pope preſided in it: *many Divines and Canoniſts* were called to it . . . . . *the Pope began*, and having propoſed the Matter of Fact, he ſaid: (*f*) " We " ask whether a Marriage contracted by Word of " Mouth, which is a true Marriage and a true Sacrament, according to the Opinion of the moſt " Holy Divines, may be diſſolved and broke by us, " I mean when a Carnal Copulation has not intervened. And then he added, Do not inſiſt, I deſire you, on the Examples and Facts of our Predeceſſors, which I proteſt I will not follow, but " in as much as the Authority of the Scripture, and " the Reaſons of the Divines will induce you to it. " He went on and ſaid, I do not doubt but that my " Predeceſſors and I may have erred ſometimes, " not only in this Fact, but alſo in many others; " nevertheleſs, we ought not to be condemned " for it; for God does ſo direct his Church as " to conceal many things from Her for a time, " which he reveals afterwards: this Chriſt himſelf has clearly enough intimated to us, as when " he ſaid to St. *Peter*, *What I do now, thou doſt not " underſtand, but thou ſhalt underſtand it hereafter.* " And

(*a*) *Le Laboureur ub. ſup. p. 424.*

(*b*) *Ib. p. 425.*

(*c*) *Ib. p. 424.*

(*d*) *Ib. p. 426. See alſo the Rem. D.*

(*e*) *Ib. p. 427.*

(*f*) *Ib.*

He publiſh'd an Edict, whereby Clandeſtine Marriages were declar'd to be null, and order'd that the Lady *de Pienne* ſhould be ſhut up in a Nunnery, and a Declaration of her deſiſting was extorted from her; and at laſt the Pope was hector'd, (C) for the Marriage of Mr. *de Montmorency* and the Daughter of *Henry* II. was celebrated with Pomp, altho' the Diſpenſation had not been granted. The Pope made an Acknowledgment which deſerves (D) to be here related. There was a great

“ And in another Place he ſaid, *I have many things to ſay, which you cannot comprehend now, but the Spirit, which my Father ſhall ſend in my Name, will teach you all things.* Who knows therefore but that God will now declare by Us what he permitted to be formerly unknown to others, concerning the Indiſſolubility of the Holy Marriage? Therefore, my Brethren and Children, uſe your endeavours to help me in this Affair; and without minding what ſuch and ſuch a one of my Predeceſſors did, as I have already ſaid, ſee whether it be not true, that they have not well underſtood what we are now examining, concerning the Indiſſolubility of Marriage. Having thus ſpoken, he made his Application to Archbiſhop *Conſance*, heretofore the Pope's Nuncio at the Court of the Emperor, and commanded him to give his Opinion. *Conſance* uſed his utmoſt endeavour to ſhew, that ſuch a Marriage could not be diſſolved by any means, and the Pope appear'd to be very well pleaſed with his Opinion; which moved the ſaid Archbiſhop to ſay a great deal more than he deſign'd, as it appears from his Writings and former Conferences about this Matter, from ſo many Smiles, Winkings, Nods, and Clappings of Hands. The Pope ſaid farther, with a loud Voice, That the ſaid Archbiſhop had given the right underſtanding of that Affair. Biſhop *Antoniellus* ſpoke next to him, a very old and venerable Man, who was of a contrary Opinion; and, in a few words gave and made out this Concluſion, That the Pope might do the thing which was in Queſtion. Whom the Pope anſwer'd, That he would not thank him for giving him ſo great a Power on this occaſion. And becauſe the ſaid Biſhop had made uſe of ſome Paſſages out of St. *Thomas*, the Pope added, That St *Thomas* might have ſaid many things being young, which he afterwards retracted, having acquir'd a greater degree of Knowledge; adding theſe Words of St. *Paul*, *When I was a Child I ſpoke like a Child, but when I grew a Man I left childiſh things.* Afterwards he went on and ſaid, 'Tis not without reaſon that I give you this Warning; I do it that none of thoſe who are to deliberate concerning this Matter, may rely upon ſuch Paſſages of St. *Thomas*, which he may have writ in his Youth. The Sacriſt ſpoke next, and was of the ſame Opinion with Biſhop *Antoniellus*, *viz.* That the Pope might and ought to diſſolve ſuch Marriages, when there is a reaſonable Cauſe for it. And becauſe in his Proofs, which were very long and learned, he happen'd to mention a Paſſage of *Durandus*, concerning Marriage, which we do not approve of, and which he did only to alledge that Doctor's Opinion, and not to defend it; the Pope being already offended at his Deliberation, grew very angry with him, as if he had been the Author or Defender of *Durandus*'s Error. And the ſaid Sacriſt excuſing himſelf to His Holineſs, he ſtopt his Mouth with hard Words and great Threatnings, often repeating, that he deſerv'd Correction, and that he would ſpeak to him further about it in private. Which ſo diſcourag'd the reſt, that many of them reſolv'd to alter their Deliberations.,,

There were ſeven Perſons only who gave their Opinions in this Congregation; (g) *the others* were reſerved *to be heard another time.* The Cardinals went out very much diſſatisfied, and one might perceive, (h) *without any further Intelligence of what paſt in it .... that there had been as much confuſion and diſorder in it as there is amongſt Sheep, when their Shepherd is wounded: for every body went home, one one way, another another way, in a great Conſternation, and almoſt with Tears in their Eyes, without being able to tell any Friend or Servant how the thing went, and what Reſolution had been taken.* Cardinal *du Bellay*, and Mr. *de Montmorency* having inform'd the Conſervator of *Naples*, that the King's Edict would eaſily ſupply the Pope's Diſpenſation; and that he ſhould remember, (i) *that a leſſer thing than that occaſion'd the withdrawing of* Germany *and* England *from their Obedience to the Holy See*, the Conſervator ſent the Datary to tell Cardinal *Caraffa*, and Cardinal *de Piſa*, “ (k) That he very much wonder'd at the manner of proceeding of His Holineſs, and that he could never believe he would be a Judge and a Party in this Affair, and think that the Holy Ghoſt was in his Head, and in no body's elſe, deſpiſing every one's Opinion, with little reſpect for himſelf, and for thoſe whom he had appointed and commanded to ſpeak their Thoughts freely and impartially; and that for a leſs thing than this, by reaſon of Cardinal *Cajetan*'s Obſtinacy, *Germany* was in ſuch a Condition as every body knew, without any great hopes of Amendment, except by an extraordinary Grace of God. And that they ſhould well conſider the Tenour of the ſaid Edict; by virtue whereof, together with the Cenſure of the *Sorbonne*, and the Authority of the Ordinary, without any other Diſpenſation of His Holineſs, the ſaid Mr. *de Montmorency* might ſet himſelf at liberty, and take ſuch a Wife as he thinks fit.,, This was repreſented to the Pope, but made him not change his Conduct. From whence it may be concluded, that the Court of *France* look'd upon this Negotiation as a thing of great Moment; but the Pope thought it not leſs important for his Intereſt to come to no Concluſion. If we had two or three Volumes in Folio of ſuch Relations, like that of Dr. *de la Haye*, and that (a) of Cardinal *du Bellay*, it would be one of the moſt curious Works that could be put into a Library.

(C *The Pope was hector'd, for the Marriage .... was celebrated .... altho' the Diſpenſation had not been granted.*] “ (b) The King and the Conſtable thought that they could not better revenge themſelves upon the Pope, for the little regard he had ſhewn to their Recommendation, than by paſſing on to the Marriage, by virtue of the Edict againſt Clandeſtine Marriages; and it was kept with the greater Magnificence at the Arrival of Mr. *de Montmorency* in the Month of *May* 1557, the Court being at *Villiers Cotretz*.,,

(D) *The Pope made an Acknowledgment which deſerves to be related.*] This was done in the Congregation abovemention'd. “ I am not ignorant, ſaid he (c), that the Popes, my Predeceſſors, have granted ſeveral Diſpenſations in this Caſe; they are, in the preſence of God, to give him an account of it. If they have been miſtaken I have no mind to follow them; perhaps they may have done it through Ignorance, and that Age might not then know certainly, what the other Ages clearly perceive, according to the Words of JESUS CHRIST: *Scietis autem poſtea*, &c. *Non poteſtis omnia portare modo*, &c. *Veniet paracletus*, &c. And as to what is ſaid, That I have granted a Diſpenſation in a like Caſe, I would not have this to cauſe any prejudice to this Matter; for God knows that I never underſtood it. In the Signing-Office there is a multitude of People, Prelates, Referendaries, and others, who make a great noiſe; ſo that an old decrepit Pope cannot mind every thing for the Crowd. As to myſelf I proteſt that I never underſtood it: And moreover, that tho' I ſhou'd have err'd in one thing or another, yet I would not continue in my Error.,, This is a Paſſage taken out of a Relation of Cardinal *du Bellay*, which Mr. *le Laboureur* has inſerted in his Additions to *Caſtelnau*'s Memoirs. And here you may ſee a Man who built upon a very weak Diſpenſation; for the Pope himſelf, who granted it, declar'd to the Sacred College, that he never underſtood that Queſtion, and that a Perſon of his great Age could not give ear to all the particular Matters, amidſt the great Noiſe that is rais'd in the Place where the Diſpatches are Sign'd. And yet the Man who had obtain'd this Diſpenſation thought himſelf well married; but if it was null he did commit Adultery great (E) deal of unfair Dealing in those Proceedings, and the Constable's Son

---

(g) *Ibid.* pag. 429.

(h) *Ibid.*

(i) *Ibid.* pag. 430, 431.

(k) I

(a) Mr. le Laboureur *ſets it down at full length ubi ſupra*, p.431, &c.

(b) *Id. i* pag. 43

(c) *Ibid.* pag. 43

dultery every time that he had to do with his Wife. Nothing appear'd shameful to *Paul IV.* provided he might find Pretences not to annul the Marriage of Mr. *de Montmorency*.

(E) *There was a great deal of unfair dealing in those Proceedings.*] Nothing could be more proper for the Pope's Design, than to be able to say, that the Lady *de Pienne* demanded the accomplishment of the Marriage. Therefore to take that Weapon out of his Hands, they provided themselves with an *Act* in due Form, whereby it appear'd, that she had no Pretensions to M. *de Montmorency*. But to obtain such a Declaration from her, they were forced to make her believe, that the Pope had already granted the Dispensation. Wherefore her Lover made no scruple to write such an untruth to her. Here is his Letter, it is as dry as those which he wrote to her before, were sweet and passionate. "(d) *Mademoiselle de Pienne*; Being sensible of the Error into "which I fell unawares, and being sorry that I "have offended God, the King, my Lord and my "Lady Constable, I have acquainted our Holy Fa- "ther the Pope how things past between us, and "begged His Holiness's Pardon, which he, out of "his Bounty and Clemency, has granted me; and, "inasmuch as it was necessary, he has given me a "Dispensation, to be restor'd to my former Liberty, "which I thought fit to give you notice of: and in "order to free ourselves from the Miseries and "Trouble we are in, I desist from all the Words "and Promises of Marriage which past between us, "from which, by virtue of the said Dispensation, "we remain discharged; and I declare you to be "so, beseeching you to do the like towards me, "and to take such a Party as you'll like best; for "I am resolved to keep no longer any Correspon- "dence with you; not but I look upon you to be "a sober and virtuous Lady, but to do my Duty, "and avoid the Mischiefs and Inconveniencies "which might ensue from it; but especially to give "them an occasion to His Majesty, and my said "Lord and Lady to forget the Offence I am guilty "of, that I may be able, not only to make it up, "and endeavour to make myself worthy of their "Favour, but also to perform what I owe them, "according to the Command of God, whom I be- "seech to keep you, *Mademoiselle de Piennes*, under "his Holy Protection. *Rome* the 5th of *February*. "He, whom you will find ready to serve you, "*MONTMORENCY*." *Francis de la Porte*, Gentleman to M. *de Montmorency*, a Master of the Requests, and one of the King's Secretaries, *attended* with two Notaries of the *Chastelet*, went to the Nunnery, where the Lady had been shut up. They had entrance (e) *by virtue of a Letter signed with the King's own hand. They called for the Lady*, and when she had read aloud M. *de Montmorency*'s Letter, the *Sieur de la Porte* told her, "*Mademoiselle*, All that "I have to say comes from M. *de Montmorency*, and "I shall tell it you, if you please, because he has "order'd me so to do. You have seen by his Let- "ter, which you have just now read, how greatly "he thinks he has offended God..... (f) and he "has most humbly Supplicated His Holiness to par- "don him the Offence he had committed, by "promising to marry you, and to dispence both "him and you, that you might marry to ano- "ther whenever you shall think fit. This our "Holy Father has done, and by this means re- "stor'd Mr. *de Montmorency* and you to your "former Liberty, as he has mention'd to you "in his Letter, which was just now given you. "And he being despens'd with, and by that Dis- "pensation made free as he was before, to marry "another whenever he shall think fit; I declare to "you, by his Command, that he acquits you "from all Promises, which may have been in "any manner between you two before this time; "and I pray and require you, in his Name, that "you likewise declare to me, whether you do "not also acquit him from them on your part. To "which the said Lady *de Pienne*, with Tears in her "Eyes, has mournfully answer'd in these words: "M. *de la Porte*, I had rather that the breach of "the Promises of M. *de Montmorency* and of mine, "should come from him than from me. He shows "plainly, by the words you have spoke to me in "his Name, that he has a Heart less than a Wo- "man, and is not such a Man as he pretended to be, "when he told me, That he would lose his Life "rather than change his Resolution. He has very "much abus'd me; and I see plainly, that he had "rather be Rich, than an honest Man." This Answer containing nothing positive, Mr. *de la Porte* return'd to the Charge, and insisted chiefly upon the Papal Dispensation, and desir'd her to declare her Mind plainly: "Whereupon the said Lady, weeping as "before, spoke these words, Alas, Mr. *de la Porte*, "what Answer would you have me to make? Had "Mr. *de Montmorency* the Heart to write me such a "Letter?" This second Answer being as indefinite as the former, a third Question was put so precisely, that the Lady must needs answer to the Matter in hand. "Mr. *de la Porte*, said she (g), since the "Desire of Mr. *de Montmorency* is, that I should ac- "quit him from the Promises of Marriage between "us, and that now he leaves me, I neither will "nor can hinder him from doing what he plea- "ses, and I cannot have a Will contrary to his." Mr. *de la Porte* was not sufficiently satisfy'd with this third Answer, but he urg'd her still, and at last obtain'd that which follows: "(h) Mr. *de la Porte*, "Since Mr. *de Montmorency* does now acquit me "from the Promises of Marriage which were made "betwixt him and me, if he were the Son of a "King, or a Prince, having written to me as he "has done in his Letter which you just now deli- "ver'd, I would not marry him, and so I acquit "him. Nevertheless I wonder at his Way of wri- "ting in that Letter, and I cannot well believe that "he writ it, since he was wont to write to me in "another Way and Style." To this it was re- ply'd, That Mr. *de Montmorency* had been seen to write this whole Letter with his own Hand. As the Lady retir'd she made some efforts of Courage to excuse the Tears she had been seen to shed, but it was impossible for her to appear bold: *every thing she* said favour'd of her Humiliation, Grief, and Trouble, for not marrying this fickle Lover. 'Tis commonly said in Jest, or by way of Gallantry, That a Mistress has much ado to speak the terrible *Yes*, which she is to answer to the Question, *Do you consent to be the Wife of such a Man?* But 'tis very probable, that there never was a *Yes* of that nature more troublesome than that, which the Lady *de Pienne* answer'd to the Question, *Do you consent that Mr.* de Montmorency *should not marry you?*

There happen'd another thing, wherein according to all appearance he was perjur'd; which was this: "Being return'd from *Rome* (a) he gave a Declara- "tion in Writing, before the Chief Persons of the "King's Council, importing, that there had been no "Marriage between him and the Lady *de Pienne*, "really contracted in words; but only an Agree- "ment between them to make it believ'd, that by "this means they might endeavour to make the "Constable, his Father, agree to it." He (b) affirm'd upon Oath, That this Declaration written with his own Hand, *contain'd the truth*; and that if he had desir'd a Dispensation of the Pope by confessing to him more than he should, he did it in hopes to obtain it easily, by means whereof it had not appear'd that he had impos'd a Falsity; but that finding at *Rome* many Difficulties, he, at last, resolv'd to declare to His Majesty and the Constable the truth of the Matter. This is as if he had said, I never promis'd Marriage to the Lady *de Pienne*, but only agreed with her to say, That we had mutually given our Promise to one another; and we had no other design but to Induce, by this Lye, my Father and Mother to consent to this Marriage. Having publish'd many times this Falshood, I was troubled to unsay it again; and that I might not be forc'd to contradict myself, I chose rather to desire of the Pope a Dispensation, and I persisted in my Lye to the Holy Father: but not being able to avoid Contradictions this Way, I acknowledge, at last, that my Discourses were false, and I swear before the principal Members of the King's Council, and attest in Writing, that I have told a Lye for a long time, on purpose to deceive my Father and Mother, the Pope, &c. Must not Ambition have a very tyrannical Power to engage People to make such Confessions? And is there any Probability that this Lover had only so slight an Engagement with so young and so beautiful a Mistress? The Scruples wherewith he was tormented, as I shall now show, justify my Opinion †.

Here

(d) Ibid. pag. 421.

(e) Ibid.

(f) Id. ib. pag. 422.

(g) Ibid.

(h) Ibid. pag. 423.

(a) Ibid. pag. 437.

(b) Ibid. pag. 432.

† *Add to this the Discourses which the Lady* de Pienne *held with the Sieur* de la Porte, *which may be seen above.*

ſon felt ſome Remorſe of Conſcience, which (F) oblig'd him to aſk the Abſolution of Pope *Pius* the Fourth. The Lady married, (G) ſome time after, a Man who was very inferior to the Gallant ſhe had loſt. We have here a very remarkable Inſtance, whereby it appears that the Paſſions of a Prince, which frequently occaſion many Abuſes, prove ſometimes a Remedy for the Diſorders of the State. The

Here I intend to examine an Anſwer which appears to me very Sophiſtical: The Cardinal of Lorrain, after the faſule which I have mention'd in another place, cauſ'd a Letter to be publiſh'd, wherein are found theſe words: (f) " I have heard ſome " others aſcribe the bad diſpoſition of the ſaid " Mr. *de Montmorency* to a more ancient Cauſe, " from the very time when he was perplex'd a" bout his Marriage with the Lady *de Pienne*, which " he confeſs'd and declar'd before the ſaid Lord " Cardinal, and other Lords deputed in this caſe " by the late King *Henry*, and quickly after denied, " and ſwore to the Pope, that he had never made " any Promiſe to the ſaid Lady; inſomuch that the " ſaid Mr. *de Montmorency* was aſham'd to be known " by the ſaid Lord Cardinal to be a perjur'd Man, " and one that might be excepted againſt, and de" graded from all Honour." See here what the Proteſtant anſwer'd who refuted this Letter: " (g) The ſecond Cauſe of the Hatred of Mr. *de* " *Montmorency* proceeds from hence, as you ſay, " becauſe you take him to be a Perjur'd Man, upon " the account of the Marriage of the Lady *de Pienne*. " Before I purge him from this Calumny, by true " Teſtimonies and Authorities, I humbly pray the " King's Majeſty to conſider your Boldneſs, whereby " you have exceeded the bounds of Reaſon, in " daring to publiſh, that the Marriage of his Siſter " is unlawful. Is it poſſible to draw any other " Conſequence from your Diſcourſe? I ſhould wil" lingly pardon your Ignorance, if it were not at" tended with Malice. Can the Promiſe of " Children (although your Accuſation were as " true as it is falſe) be of any Validity to con" clude their Marriage, unleſs it be approv'd by the " Conſent of their Parents, under whoſe Authority " they live? The Examples of *Abraham* and *Iſaac* " ſhow us ſufficiently that it belongs to Fathers to " marry their Children as they pleaſe. And if a " Vow (which is a Promiſe we make to God) made " by a Daughter without the Conſent of her Father is " null by the Law of *Moſes*; much more a Promiſe " of Marriage, made by one Perſon to another, will " be null if the Father conſent not to it. And al" tho' the *Grecians* have been too uncertain in theſe " Marriages, yet they were not ſo far depriv'd of " the Light of Nature, but a Maid made Anſwer, to " one who courted her, in theſe Verſes of *Euripides*,

" *I cannot marry a Man*
" *Without the Will of my Father,*
" *To whom I ſubject am.*

" If any one alledges, that the Authority of Fathers " is not ſo great over their Sons as over their Daugh" ters, all the Laws are againſt him; by which the " Fathers can even ſell them in their Neceſſity." After this the Author alledges the Scripture, the Councils, the Fathers, and the Civilians, to prove, that the Marriage of Children ought to be ſubject to the Will of thoſe from whom they receiv'd Life. But all this long Diſcourſe is nothing but a ſly Evaſion; for this is to ſhift the State of the Queſtion, and to paſs *de Genere in genus*. The Queſtion was not whether the Marriage of Mr. *de Montmorency* with the natural Daughter of *Henry* II. was lawful: The Author of the Letter had not touch'd upon that String; but he had only ſaid, that the Mareſchal was perjur'd for confeſſing and denying ſolemnly, that he had promis'd Marriage to the Lady *de Pienne*. Theſe two Facts are a plain proof of Perjury, whether the Promiſe was obligatory or not: For if a Man ſhou'd promiſe to commit a Crime, he wou'd eaſily obtain before all the Courts of Juſtice a Releaſe from his Promiſe; but if he ſhou'd ſwear before one Court, that he did promiſe it; and before another, that he did never promiſe it, he would be found guilty of Perjury. This was the Caſe of Mr. *de Montmorency*, as was pretended; this was the Subject of the Accuſation. The Enquiry was not whether he ought to keep his Promiſe of Marriage, nor whether it was lawful or unlawful: and yet the Proteſtant who anſwer'd the Letter of the Cardinal of *Lorrain* ſuppoſes, that all the Accuſation was grounded upon this, That that lawful Promiſe had not been kept. Having made this falſe Suppoſition, he rambles about, he alledges the Divine Laws and the Law of Nature, he handles the Common-place of Paternal Right, he ſays a hundred needleſs things, and ſays nothing at all to the purpoſe. This is the common practice of thoſe who cannot make a good Anſwer, and are afraid leſt they ſhould do a Prejudice to their Cauſe by being ſilent. They change the State of the Queſtion, that they may open a way whereby they may ramble from the Subject in hand. I believe many Readers thought, that the Apologiſt for Mr. *de Montmorency* had obtain'd a full Victory, and were very much pleas'd to ſee that he brought *Henry* the Second's Daughter into his Cauſe: a Stratagem too frequent in Polemical Writings, and which, at the bottom, is a meer ſhift.

(F) *Some remorſe of Conſcience, which oblig'd him to aſk the Abſolution.*] " (c) Thus things ſtood while " the Pope and the King liv'd; but either becauſe " Mr. *de Montmorency* had afterwards ſome Scruple " about it, and attributed to it the bad ſucceſs of the " many Big-bellies of his Wife, who had but one " live Child of the many ſhe had conceiv'd, which " died immediately after, or for ſome other Reaſons, " he had recourſe once more to the Holy See, and " ſent a Supplication to Pope *Pius* IV. after the " Death of *Paul*, whereof I have the Original Me" morial; wherein he declares, How by a ſurpriſe " of Love he had formerly made a Promiſe of Mar" riage to the Lady *de Piennes*, on condition, never" theleſs, that he ſhould obtain the Conſent of his " Father, and not otherwiſe; which he being not " able to obtain, the ſaid Lady did freely acquit " him from his Promiſe, as well by Word of " Mouth, as by a Declaration ſign'd by her, in the " preſence of Witneſſes, wherein ſhe perſiſts to " this Day, and he married; and nevertheleſs, " upon account of ſome Aſſertions made by him, " he deſires Abſolution, by way of Caution, and " that the Commiſſion ſhould be addreſs'd to the " Biſhop of *Paris*. Pope *Pius* IV. who had not the " ſame Intereſt with his Predeceſſor, made not ſo " much ado about it, and ſent him a good and ample " Diſpenſation..... (d) This Diſpenſation qui" eted his Conſcience, but did not change the Con" dition of his Marriage, which continued ſtill to " be barren." Mr. *le Laboureur* was very much inclin'd, for ſome domeſtick Reaſons, to juſtify, as much as poſſible, thoſe of the Houſe of Mr. *de Montmorency*; nevertheleſs, he ſeems to believe that it was not true, that the Promiſe I ſpeak of was not made but upon Condition: (e) " If this Marriage " of *Diana* of *France* with Mr. *de Montmorency*, " *ſays he*, was altogether advantageous and glorious " in the Eyes of the World, yet it is juſtly doubted " whether it was pleaſing to God, becauſe it was " contracted with more Violence than Juſtice, to " the prejudice of an Engagement, of Affection and " Promiſe on the part of the Mareſchal with *Jane* " *de Halluin*."

(G) *The Lady married, ſome time after, a Man who was very inferior.*] 'Tis *Brantome* who informs me of this, in a Parentheſis which he has inſerted in the Narrative he has given us of the Reſtitution of the Places of the Duke of *Savoy*. What he ſays is a proof that Love creeps in every where, and ſerves as a Spring to the moſt important Affairs of State. There were ſome wiſe Heads in the King's Council, who were of Opinion, that all the Towns which the Duke of *Savoy* demanded back again ſhould not be reſtor'd to him. The King of *Navarre* (f) argued, " That this Reſtitution ſhould be made abſo" lutely, otherwiſe he ſhould not have the King" dom of *Sardinia*: and that the Duke of *Savoy* had " acquainted and promis'd him, that he would uſe " his Intereſt for him with the King of *Spain*..... " In concluſion, after many Debates, the weaker " Party carried the Cauſe againſt the ſtronger; and " therefore they diſpatch'd into *Piemont*, from " *Bois de Vincennes*, after the taking of *Bourges*, " the Lord *d'Alluye* (*Florimond Robertet*) one of the " Four Secretaries of the Commands, who was very " much

(f) *A Letter of a Lord of the Country of Haynault, ſent to his Neighbour and Friend who followed the Court of* Spain, *pag. m.* 5 & 6.

(g) *An anſwer to the Epiſtle of* Charles de Vaudemont, *Cardinal of* Lorrain, *fol.* E iij *verſo.*

(c) *Id. ib. pag.* 439.

(d) *Ibid. pag.* 440.

(e) *Id. ib. pag.* 419.

(f) *Brantome, Memoir. apud le Laboureur ubi ſupra Tom.* I. *p.* 448.

The Edict whereby all (*H*) clandestine Marriages were declar'd void, occasion'd the enacting of a very good and sound Law; but it was not out of Zeal for the Publick Good that *Henry* II. enacted so good a Law, it was to promote the Intereſt

“much in love with the Lady *de Pienne* . . . .

. . . .

. . . .

. . . .

. . . .

whom he deſired very much to Marry. The King of *Navarre* promiſed him, that if he did manage the Buſineſs to his content, he would make her marry him, of which there was no probability, but by his Favour; foraſmuch as this Lady was of one of the beſt and moſt honourable Houſes of *France*, and one who had refuſed, in her time, ſo high and ſo great Matches, that there was no Reaſon to think that a meer Secretary of the Commands ſhould marry her; who, nevertheleſs, married her afterwards, more out of Humour, and a capricious Fancy in the Maid, than upon any reaſonable Motive. This I have heard many of our Courtiers ſay, and not that the thing had been done by the Favour of the King of *Navarre*, for he had been dead above a Year; nevertheleſs 'twas he who firſt indulg'd him in his Love, and encouraged and aſſiſted him in it as much as he could: Thus, in theſe Matters, the Grandees at Court can do very much, and be very ſerviceable, and even their Companions and particular Friends.,, The King of *Navarre* knew very well how to make choice of his Tools, ſince he made uſe of a Man who was very much in Love, whom he filled with hopes of poſſeſſing the beloved Object.

(*H*) *The Edict whereby Clandeſtine Marriages were declared void, occaſioned the enacting of a very good and ſound Law.*] One of the ableſt Advocates of the Parliament of *Paris* argues very well upon this Subject, in his Letter to *Robert* and *Fournier*, Profeſſors of the Civil Law at *Orleans*, and he is troubled that the Law was not ſevere enough. He would not have had things done by halves, but that abſolutely all Marriages contracted without the Knowledge, or againſt the Will of the Fathers, ſhould have been annull'd. Here follows the beginning of his Letter: “(*b*) The Edict about Marriages has been publiſhed in our Court of Parliament, which is indeed great and magnificent, but greater ſtill, if you underſtood the Motive of it; becauſe ſome of thoſe who hold the chief Places of *France*, were the Cauſe of it. 'Tis ſaid, that the greateſt part of bad Examples, proceed commonly from ſuch things, as were formerly wiſely and holily ordained, but turn into Abuſes in proceſs of Time. On the contrary, never was there a good Law which did not proceed from ſome ſcandalous Practice; the Diſeaſe muſt firſt come, before the Remedy be found out. As to this Edict, every one rejoyces at it, as being brave and worthy of a King: I alone, like another *Timon* or Man-hater, mourn, ſigh and lament, not but that I am glad of the Authority that is given to Fathers over their Children; becauſe that I am ſorry that it is not granted more fully, and that as *Alexander the Great* being arrived in *Aſia*, did not amuſe himſelf with untying the twiſtings of the *Gordian* Knot, like the other Princes who had gone that way before him, but for a greater Diſpatch, cut it quite aſunder; ſo I wiſh this Matter had been fully ſettled, and that by an Ordinance made with the common conſent of the *Gallican* Church, all Marriages of Children had been declared null, for which there are only Promiſes, without the Authority and Conſent of the Fathers and Mothers. Upon this Account I pity *France*, which tho' it was never weary of bringing all Eccleſiaſtical Matters under a good and laudable Diſcipline, dares not put the laſt Hand to this Work.,, What he adds, contains ſeveral judicious Remarks; but his Concluſion is too ſevere, for he would have thoſe who allure any Body with fair Words into the Snare of Marriage, to be puniſhed with Death.,, Our Anceſtors, *ſays he* (*a*), being ſenſible, that it was a thing of a very ill Example, that any one under five and twenty Years of Age, ſhould be thought to be lawfully married by Word of Mouth, to the prejudice of the Paternal Authority, introduced the Action of *Rape*, (which we commonly call *Raptum in parentes*) which is unknown to all other Nations. Whereby Fathers and Mothers, and even Guardians, were permitted to bring an Accuſation before a Royal Judge, againſt a Man or a Woman, who with ſuch fair and affected Words, ſhould entice and draw any of their Children into the Snare of Marriage: and ſuch is the Power and Effect of this Purſuit, that whilſt it laſts, it ſuſpends and ſtops all the Proceedings which might be made before an Official, or an Eccleſiaſtical Judge, for the Validity of the Marriage. But what Advantage did you ever get by ſuch an Accuſation? None at all; only like true *French men*, we are in the Beginning ſtronger than Men, but we prove at laſt weaker than Women. Every Body ſtirs himſelf in the beginning of the Purſuit, the very Judges ſeem mightily to favour the Plaintiffs. But when all is done, you never ſaw an Exemplary Puniſhment made upon ſuch an Account, and at laſt he, who committed the Rape, triumphs over the Law and the afflicted Family, remaining in full poſſeſſion of the Perſon raviſhed. For my part I am of Opinion, either that ſuch an Accuſation ſhould not have been introduced amongſt us, or that it ſhould terminate with the Death of the Guilty; that the Diſſolution of his Life might alſo produce the Diſſolution of his Marriage.,, Perhaps he did not ſpeak his whole Mind, he meant perhaps thoſe, who not contented to ſeduce a young Maid, perſuade her to conſent to her being raviſhed. Suppoſing that out of Inadvertency he omitted this part of the Definition of a Rape, and that he had it in his Mind, his Concluſion cannot be look'd upon as too ſevere in *France*, for the *French* puniſh with Death all thoſe who raviſh a Maid, whether ſhe conſents to it or not. I think that Law was not eſtabliſhed yet, when *Paſquier* wrote his Letter to the two Profeſſors of *Orleans*. I fancy it was eſtabliſhed ſince, becauſe they perceived that the Law which puniſhed only the Raviſhers of a Maid not conſenting, was almoſt of no uſe. It was eaſily eluded, for it was no difficult thing to perſuade a Maid to confeſs that ſhe had conſented to it: ſuch a Confeſſion ſaved a Man's Life, and the Maid was not unwilling to ſave the Life of a Man, who profeſſed that Love had forced him to raviſh her. beſides, ſhe found her ſelf diſhonoured, very much ſuſpected, and in danger of meeting with no good Match, and of being look't upon as the Remains of another, having been for ſome time in the power of a Raviſher; and all thoſe things being duly conſidered by the Daughter and her Parents, they reſolved to ſave the Man, and in order to it, the raviſhed Maid was only to confeſs that ſhe had conſented to it: So that ſuch an Affair ended as thoſe (*c*) mentioned by *Paſquier*, and ſo Rapes became a very common thing; the old Law proved uſeleſs, and it was thought neceſſary to make another more ſevere, that ſhould have no regard to the Declaration which Maids ſhould make of having conſented to their being raviſhed. It was thought fit to puniſh their Conſent; for Impunity tends very much to the multiplying of ſuch ill Examples: thoſe who ſucceed firſt, are an encouragement to others, and then no Body is aſhamed of treading in a way frequented by ſeveral People. See the Remark of the Article *Arioſto*.

Our Lawyer examines the Permiſſion which the Edict gave (*d*) *to Fathers and Mothers to diſinherit their Children, who have been ſo imprudent as to enter into the Bond of Marriage without their Will*. He ſhews that it is neither a Remedy, nor a Conſolation, but a new (*e*) Calamity, and maintains that the only Remedy (*f*) is that *ſuch Marriages ſhould be declared null* by an Ordinance of a Council. He alledges the Scripture, the Fathers, the *Roman* Law, the *French* Law under King *Charles the Bald*, and he ſays that *he does not find that there has been any Council ſince, that took away that noble Juriſdiction from Parents with reſpect to their Children*. He goes on and ſays, “This I know, that ſome hundred Years ſince, ſome Monks, Patchers of old Gloſſes, have inſinuated to us this barbarous and bruitiſh Opinion, that by the Canon Law the Conſent of Fathers and Mothers was requiſite for the Marriage

“of

(*g*) *At this Gap comes in a Parentheſis in the Text of Mr. le Laboureur, which would ſerve to no purpoſe here.*

(*b*) *Paſquier, Letters, Book* 3. *p.* 111. *of tom.* 1.

(*a*) *Id. ib. p.* 112, 113.

(*c*) *When there has been a Rape there is at firſt a great ſtir about it, the Raviſher is firſt threatned with puniſhment; but that eagerneſs cools by degrees, the Raviſher remains Maſter of his Prey, and it is declared to be a good prize. 'Tis fear'd that when he has had ſport enough with his Miſtreſs, he will leave her in the lurch. He muſt be intreated, and ſo he becomes Maſter of the Terms of the Contract.*

(*d*) *Paſquier ib. p.* 113.

(*e*) *Is it not to make my old Age miſerable, that I muſt ſee that Fool unhappy in a great meaſure for having fooliſhly bound himſelf, and that I can have no comfort but by making him altogether miſerable, by diſinheriting him as the Law impowers me to do it? Id. ib. p.* 114.

(*f*) *Id. ib.*

reſt of his Favourite, and to avoid the Shame † of yielding to the artificious Intrigues of the Pope. The Houſe of *Guiſe* did mightily contribute (*I*) to the Oppoſitions which *Francis de Montmorenci* met with at the Court of *Rome*.

† See the Rem. E.

PIGHIUS (*Albertus*) was born at *Campen*, in the Province of *Over-Yſſel*, and is reckoned among the Learned Men of the XVI. Century. *Moreri* ſpeaks of him at large, but he has not obſerved a groſs Miſtake of *Lewis* (*A*) *Guicciardin*, which

“ of their Children, only out of Honour, and not “ out of Neceſſity. Thoſe Monks made a perpetual “ Profeſſion of Celibacy, and would to God, that “ as that wiſe King of *Sparta Ageſilaus*, being ſurpriſed by a Friend, as he was playing with his “ Children, deſired him to ſuſpend his Judgment “ about it till he was a Father; ſo thoſe Monks had “ not been ſo buſie as to interpoſe their Opinion “ concerning Marriage, ſince their Vow and their “ Rule diſpenſed them from being Fathers. Hence “ it is that they meaſure Paternal Affection by their “ own, I mean by a common and trivial Affection. (*g*) „ I wonder how he forgot to ſay, that the Permiſſion of Diſinheriting is not a ſufficient Terror to young Lovers; for there are ſo many Fathers, who have eaſily forgiven the fault of Marrying againſt their Will, and we have ſo few Examples of Fathers who kept their Reſentment as long as they lived, and expreſt it by their laſt Will, that Children flatter themſelves with the hopes of being ſoon reconciled. They relie much upon the natural (*h*) Force of Paternal Love, and they know very well, that a ſhort Mortification will expiate great Faults with a Father, *pro peccato magno paulum ſupplicii ſatis eſt Patri* (*i*).

(*g*) *Id. ib. p.* 117.

(*h*) O nimium potens Quanto parentes ſanguinis vinclo tenes Natura! quàm te colimus inviti quoque! *Seneca in Hippolyto act. 4. v.* 1114.

(*i*) *Terent. in Andria act. 5. ſc. 3. in fine.*

Paſquier's Cenſure is at the bottom a great Encomium upon the Edict of *Henry* II. For ſince that learned Lawyer would have the rebellion of Children under Age, to be more ſeverely puniſhed, he praiſes and approves the new degrees of Puniſhment, which it was made liable to. Beſides, it is to be obſerved, that he declares that what is wanting therein ought to proceed from the Eccleſiaſtical, and not the Royal Authority.

A REFUTATION of thoſe, who endeavour to juſtifie clandeſtine Marriages and Rapes.

Let no Body ſay, that ſuch an Edict is prejudicial to thoſe Perſons, whoſe Fathers are ſo covetous or capricious, that they will never conſent to the Marriage of their Children. This is no reaſonable Objection, there is no Law altogether convenient to every Body, we muſt be therefore contented with ſuch Laws as remedy the greateſt Evils. Now there are infinitely more Children, who in the Heat and Folly of Youth, will marry improperly, than there are Fathers who will oppoſe reaſonable Matches. 'Tis therefore better that the Laws ſhould reſtrain the Liberty of Children, than if they ſhould leſſen the Paternal Authority. Beſides, Children after a certain Age were no longer reſtrained by the Edict of *Henry* II. Let no Body ſay neither that the Liberty of marrying without the conſent of the Fathers, gives honeſt People, who have no Eſtates, an opportunity of making their Fortune. This I have heard ſome *Engliſhmen* ſay, who endeavoured to make an Apology for the Priviledges of ſome Churches in *London*, where a Prieſt may give the Nuptial Benediction without the Obſervation of any preliminary Formalities, and conſequently legitimate the moſt clandeſtine Marriages. It has been ſeen by ſuch means, ſaid they to me, that the Patrimony of a very rich Heireſs dropt into a poor Family, which flouriſhed afterwards, and was the Glory of the Country. The very ſame Argument might ſerve to juſtifie the Impunity of Rapes. But this is a weak Apology; for the greateſt Abuſes will ſometimes prove convenient to ſome private Men: but that is not a Reaſon to keep them up. Can any one be a true honeſt Man, a Man of true Merit, who endeavours to enrich himſelf by depriving a Father of the Power which Divine and Humane Laws give him over his Children? If we reckon right, we ſhall find that for one Man of Merit, who raiſed himſelf that way, there are twenty who have only the Art of Wheedling a young Maid, who is either very ſimple, or diſcontented with the Severity of a Mother, or a Guardian, *&c.* and the falſity of the Apology for the Priviledges of thoſe Churches has been plainly perceived; for we have read not long ſince in the *Gazettes*, that the Parliament of *England* was about to take them away.

(*I*) *The Houſe of* Guiſe *did mightily contribute to the oppoſitions.*] “ (*l*) The Preſence of the Duke of “ *Guiſe* at *Rome*, and the mutual Jealouſie between “ him and the Conſtable, gave ſo much the more “ occaſion to ſuſpect that he croſt that Diſpenſation, becauſe the intended Marriage was very advantageous to the Houſe of *Montmorency*. He and “ the Cardinal his Brother, were nearly allied with “ Pope *Paul* IV. and all the Houſe of the *Caraffa's*, “ they had been the chief Authors of the Rupture of “ the Peace with *Spain* in their behalf, and the Conſtable had oppoſed it; and therefore it was likely “ that they ſet the Pope at Work, and that if they “ did not propoſe to him to ask *Diana* of *France* “ for one of his Nephews, they made him hope “ however, that he might obtain her by ſtarting “ ſome Difficulties againſt the Diſpenſation, and “ made him ſenſible of the Advantages which would “ accrue to his Relations by it. So that they would “ not only have broken a Marriage of great importance to the Houſe of *Montmorency*, but alſo made “ another with a moſt noble Houſe indeed, but unequal in Riches and Grandeur. „ The *Guiſes* found ſo many Advantages in the Marriage of *Francis de Montmorency* with the Lady *de Pienne*, as Mr. *le Laboureur* ſhews, that there can be no doubt but that they played the Game which he ſpeaks of; and if they had not prepoſſeſt the Pope, and helpt him on, 'tis not likely at all that ſo cunning and crafty a Pope ſhould have had ſo little Power over his Paſſions. You have ſeen (*a*) how he expreſt his Partiality by his rough Proceeding, and inveighing againſt thoſe who gave not their Opinion according to his Deſires. Had he left to every one the liberty of giving their Votes, he could not have compaſt his Deſign, that is to ſay, the Execution of the Projects which the *Guiſes* put him upon. Had it not been for that, he had commanded his Paſſions, and covered his Deſign, and perſuaded ſeveral People that his Zeal for the Diſcipline obliged him not to violate the Holy Canons in the leaſt, tho' he might thereby pleaſe the Moſt Chriſtian King, and raiſe the Papal Authority to ſuch a Degree, as his Predeceſſors had raiſed it more than once. Had the Pope's Conduct been ſuch, it might have afforded Mr. *Eſprit* an Example of *the Deceitfulneſs of Humane Virtues*.

(*l*) *Le Laboureur, ub. ſup. tom. 2. p.* 437.

(*a*) *In the Rem. B.*

(*A*) *A groſs Miſtake of* Lewis Guicciardin.] He ſays that *Albertus Pighius*, a great Divine, and a great Mathematician, left *Italy*, where *Hadrian* VI. *Clement* VII. and *Paul* III. had heaped up Honours and Riches on him, and returned into his Country, and died in it glorioſly ſome Years after; and then he adds, that nevertheleſs ſome Authors have ſaid that he died in the Year 1530, at *Bologna* by the Fall of a Bridge. He obſerves, that *Paulus Jovius* is the firſt who told that Story, and that *Surius* and ſome others did blindly tranſcribe him: and from thence he takes occaſion to cenſure the raſhneſs of ſome Copiſts. (*b*) *Paulus tamen Jovius, quem ſecuti ſunt poſtmodùm Frater Laurentius Surius, & alii quidam Scriptores, qui non inſtituta priùs collatione, neque adhibitâ ullâ conſimili diligentiâ, (digni ſanè hoc nomine qui reprehendantur) alienâ fide ſubnixi ad alios ſeſe perpetuò referunt: Paullus (inquam) Jovius, libro hiſtoriarum ſuarum vigeſimo ſexto, Albertum hunc, multò anteà tempore, anno ſcilicit Chriſti 1530, & in ipſa Caroli Quinti Cæſaris inauguratione, fortuita pontis ruinâ Bononiæ mortuum perhibet.* Here's a Cenſure very ill placed! *Guicciardin* does ſharply condemn the Authors, who admit of any Relations, without examining whether they be true or not, he ſpeaks of them with great Contempt, and yet for all that commits the ſame Fault for which he blames them. For if he had been at the pains to conſult *Paulus Jovius*, and Brother *Laurentius Surius*, he might have ſeen that they do not ſay that *Pighius* loſt his Life in the Year 1530. He did therefore blindly tranſcribe ſome Writers, who aſcribed that falſehood to thoſe two Authors. I have conſulted *Paulus Jovius* in the Place quoted by *Guicciardin*, and I found nothing in it relating to the Matter in hand: I look'd for the Place where he deſcribes the Coronation of *Charles* V. and I found only that *Pighius* was one of thoſe who fell, when the Bridge tumbled down. (*c*) *Ibi plerique militibus immixti,*

(*b*) *Ludovicus Guicciardinus, in Deſcriptione Belgii Provinciarum p. m.* 237.

(*c*) *Paul Jovius hiſt. l. 2 fol. m.11 verſ.*

which I ſhall cenſure, not the extream (B) Uglineſs, and the ill Pronunciation of *Albertus Pighius*. (C) *Moreri* has committed ſome conſiderable Faults. *Beza* ſays, that *Pighius* wrote a Book againſt *Calvin*, to (D) be promoted to the Dignity of a Cardinal. Others affirm, that the Reading of *Calvin*'s Works made *Pighius* (E) Heterodox, concerning the Merit of good Works, and the Juſtification of Sinners. 'Tis pretended by others, that *Pighius* examined *Calvin*'s Works with ſo great a deſire of refuting them, that his Averſion for the Opinions of that Adverſary made him run into another Extream. They ſay, that he followed the Steps of the *Pelagians*, and therefore Cardinal *Bona* † adviſes the Reader to read *Pighius*'s Works with caution. His Treatiſes concerning Free Will againſt *Calvin*, and concerning Original Sin, have been placed amongſt the prohibited Books by the *Spaniſh* Inquiſition.

immiſti, fed è caſu procidentes, ſeſe pilis atque ſecuribus induerunt; inter quos fuit Albertus Pighius Belga theologus Lutheromaſtix, minime tamen pro tumultu clades incidit. A Man who ſays that the Fall of the Bridge made more noiſe than hurt, and doth not ſay that *Pighius*, the only Perſon he names amongſt thoſe that fell, was killed by it, intimates plainly enough, that he recovered of it. Note, that he calls him *Lutheromaſtix*, whereby *Guicciardin* may be convicted of a new Over-ſight, for he accuſes (d) *Paulus Jovius* of having charged *Pighius* with *Lutheraniſm*. His Charge againſt *Surius* is very ill grounded, for that *Carthuſian* doth (e) faithfully tranſcribe *Paulus Jovius*, and beſides, he ſays in another place, that *Pighius* died only in the Year (f) 1543. To which I ſhall add, that *Paulus Jovius* obſerves, that the Piety of *Pighius* preſerved him from the diſmal Conſequences of the Fall of the Bridge. (g) *Quum id volumen* (de hierarchia) *commentaretur . . . . . . cum è ſummo vitæ periculo certiſſimum Dei maximi numen eripuit. Bononiæ enim in celeberrima pompa, quum tranſeunte coronato Cæſare Carolo Quinto, pars lignei pontis juxta Cæſarem turbæ pondere corruiſſet, Albertus tignorum, atque hominum ruina ita oppreſſus eſt, ut probitatis, ac inſtituti operis merito ſervaretur. Obiit nondum ſenex in patrio ſolo, ſacerdotiis à Clemente & Paulo liberaliter honeſtatus.* *Hoſpinian* in anſwer to thoſe who alledged, as an Argument againſt the Doctrine of *Zuinglius*, that he died of a violent Death, retorts this Argument upon them amongſt other Reaſons. He names ſome Perſons, zealous for Popery, who ended their Days after a tragical manner, and reckons *Pighius* amongſt them. De Pighio *aliqui ſcribunt*, ſays he (h), *fuiſſe illum in tumultu oppreſſum in magna hominum frequentia una cum pecunia illa quam à Papa & Cardinalibus propter operam ſuam in cauſa pontificia defendenda collocatam, acceperat.* We find in all Chriſtian Societies, ſome Hiſtorians who take advantage of a falſe Report: The Orthodox themſelves are not free from that Fault. See in the Remark *F* a Divine of the Confeſſion of *Augsburg*, who advances the ſame falſity with *Hoſpinian*.

(B) *The extream Uglineſs and the ill Pronunciation.*] *Paulus Jovius* pretends, that Nature abuſed *Pighius* with a kind of Impudence, by covering his great Learning and Chriſtian Eloquence with a hideous Face. (i) *Magna hercle naturæ illudentis inverecundia, excellentem doctrinam cum illuſtri eloquentia conjunctam ſi Chriſtiani ſcriptoris decus ſpectetur, multa infaceti oris truculentia opertam, in Alberto Pighio conſpeximus. . . . . . In diſſerendo vultus Scythico more contuſus & enormis, & aſpero gutture vox educta, & graviter reſonantis naſi tumultus, totam ferè ſapientiæ gloriam deformabant.*

(C) Moreri *has committed ſome conſiderable Faults.*] I. I will not be poſitive about this Queſtion, whether *Pighius*'s Father was a Gentleman; but I dare ſay that *Moreri* aſſures it ſomewhat raſhly. The Word *Patricius*, upon which he relies, is an equivocal Word; it does commonly ſignifie, when 'tis uſed for Modern Families, a Man, whoſe Anceſtors have been Senators, Burgo-Maſters, &c. The Patrician Families in ſome Imperial Towns, and in ſome other Places, are ſometimes Noble; but whether they be ſo or not, they are called Patrician Families, provided they have been for ſome time in poſſeſſion of the Magiſtracy from Father to Son. Perhaps this was all the *Gentility* of *Pighius*'s Father (k). I am not ignorant that *Pighius* had (l) many Lordſhips, and that it is commonly a ſign of a noble Extraction; but becauſe it is not a demonſtrative Proof of it, I will not be poſitive about it. It is enough for me that I have obſerved the ambiguous Senſe of the Word, which gave occaſion to *Moreri*'s Obſervation. II. This Expreſſion is wrong, Mark *of* Benevento *had ſpoiled the Opinion of* Alphonſus, *concerning the ſituation of the Eighth Circle.* There are two Over-ſights in thoſe Words, for *Moreri* ſhould have ſaid, that that Man had ſpoiled (m) the Hypotheſis of *Alphonſus* concerning the Motion of the Eighth Heaven. III. Theſe Words, *he wrote in* 1538 *an Apology for the General Council, which Pope* Paul III. *had publiſhed*, are abſurd; for that Pope did not publiſh an Apology for the Council, but a Bull for the Celebration of a Council. IV. That Apology of *Pighius* was not rewarded with a *Preſent of two thouſand Ducats*, and with the *Provoſtſhip of St.* John *at* Utrecht; for *Pighius* received thoſe two Gratifications in the Year (n) 1535, three Years before the Publication of the Apology. V. When *Moreri* ſays that he died at *Utrecht* the 24th of *Decemb.* 1543, he miſtakes the Senſe of *Valerius Andreas*, who ſaid *obiit*, VII. *Kalend. Januarii, anni ineuntis* CIↃ IↃ XLIII. The meaning of it is, that *Pighius* departed this Life the 25th of *December* 1542. *Valerius Andreas* is not miſtaken, and ſo *Spondanus* committed a Fault when he ſaid that *Pighius* and *Eckius* died in the Year 1543, in a Month's time. He places *Eckius*'s Death on the 10th of *February* (a). *Swertius* (b) places that of *Pighius* on the 29th of *December* 1543, wherein *Bullart* (c) tranſcribes him. They are miſtaken, for Cardinal *Sadoletus* mentions the Death of *Pighius* in a (d) Let- Letter bearing Date *June* 17. 1543. See the Remark *F*.

(D) *To be promoted to the Dignity of a Cardinal.*] That Book of *Pighius*, ſays *Beza*, was deſpiſed by honeſt Men, and the Author was deceived by Satan. Such was his Reward. (e) *Adverſus Albertum Pighium Campenſem, ſophiſtam illius ætatis facile principem, à quo etiam fuerat pro Antagoniſta delectus, ex quo videlicet reportata inſigni victoria, galerum mox, à Pontifice conſequeretur. At ille hoc ſuo labore fruſtratus, id unum aſſequutus eſt quod merentur veritatis hoſtes, nempe ut & doctis ſaniſque hominibus fæteret, & ab ipſo Satana deciperetur.*

(E) *The Reading of* Calvin's *Works made* Pighius *Heterodox.*] *Theophilus Raynaudus* having ſaid that there are ſome Hereticks, who cannot be read without danger by one that has not a deep Learning, but that there are ſome other Hereticks, who vent their Errors in ſo groſs a manner, that a Reader, tho' not very learned, needs not be afraid of reading them; that Author, I ſay, having once laid down that Foundation, brings in *Luther* and *Calvin*. He reckons *Calvin* amongſt the Hereticks of the firſt Claſs, and *Luther* amongſt thoſe of the ſecond, and alledges *Pighius* as a pregnant Example of what he ſays. (f) *Qua ratione Lutherus, qui ubique ſtercora, & cænum crepat, ſuamque animi impotentiam ubique prodit, minorem legentis peritiam expoſcit, quàm Calvinus, cujus in ſcribendo vafrities, etiam mediocriter doctis fraudi eſſe queat, ut in Alberto Pighio eſt deprehenſum, quem conſtat ex lectione librorum Calvini impactum non raro eſſe in ſcopulos: tametſi homo erat non ineruditus, quod edita ab eo volumina teſtatum faciunt.* An *Engliſh* (g) Proteſtant aſſures us that *Pighius* is altogether Orthodox in his Belief concerning Juſtification. Another Proteſtant of the ſame Country ſays, that the Papiſts accuſe *Pighius* of having ſpoiled himſelf by reading *Calvin*, and that *Pighius* maintained that he took his Doctrine only from the Scripture. (h) *Dicunt* Pontificii Pighium, *alioqui* Catholicum Doctorem, *ſeductum ex Lectione librorum* Calvini. *At* Pighius *ipſe teſtatur, ſententiam ſuam ſe è lectione* Scripturarum *hauſiſſe: O* Calvinum

† Albertus Pighius in pr[illegible] Pelagianorum ſectator veſtigia ut opera ejus cum legenda merito cenſuerit Cardinalis Bona. *Narratio Chronol. Cauſæ Michaelis Baji p. 192. tom. 2. oper. Baii edit. 1696. See the Rem. G Letter e and t.*

(d) Lutheraniſmi inſuper, etſi injuſtiſſimè quidem, eum inſimulans: cùm (ut diximus) à doctrinâ Lutheri fuerit alieniſſimus, adeoque ſummus illius hoſtis & antagoniſta. *Ludov. Guicciardin, ub. ſup.*

(e) *Surius commentar. p. m. 239. ad ann.* 1530.

(f) *Id. ib. p.* 491. *ad ann.* 1543.

(g) *Jovius in Elogiis, c.* 105. *p.* 246.

(h) *Hoſpinian. hiſt. ſacrament. tom.* 2. *p.* 210.

(i) *Jov. in elog. p.* 245.

(k) Albertus Pighius [illegible]penſis [illegible]nſiſa[illegible]s patricio ſan[illegible]e na- *Valer.* [illegible]reas [illegible] *Belg.* [illegible]8.

(l) *See the Rem. F.*

(m) *The Words of* Valerius Andreas *ub. ſup. p.* 39. *which* Moreri *has not well tranſlated, are*, poſitionem Alphonſinam de motu octavi orbis depravantem.

(n) *Valer. Andreas ib.*

(a) *Spond. Ann. Eccleſ. ad ann.* 1543. *n.* 12. *p. m.* 479. *He took it from* Surius, *except the Day of* Eckius's *Death not to be found in* Surius.

(b) *Swert. Ath. Belg. p.* 115.

(c) *Bullart, Academ. des Sciences tom.* 2. *p.* 14.

(d) *See p.* 66[illegible]. *of* Sadoletus's *Letters. Lyons* 1554.

(e) *Beza in vita Calvini ad ann.* 1543.

(f) *Theoph. Raynaudus de malis ac bonis libris n.* 453. *p. m.* 263. (g) *Mortonus, Antidot. contra merita cap.* 7. *ſect.* 1. *apud Pope Blount cenſ. author. p.* 423. (h) *Epiſc. Carleton. Conſenſ. Eccleſ. Cathol. contra Tridentin. cap.* 3. *apud Pope Blount ib.*

quiſition. *Poſſevinus* * acquaints his Reader, that *Pighius*'s Doctrine concerning Original Sin, and Grace, are not approved by the Divines, becauſe he ſeems to have departed from the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin*, which the Church approves of. The *Janſeniſt*, who publiſhed ſome Letters of the Prince of *Conti*, has expreſſed himſelf more ſharply. He ſays, that *Pighius* muſt needs be looked upon † *as a wretched Divine*, ſince he is *a Man who ſuſpects the Doctrine of St.* Auguſtin, *a Man who adviſes thoſe who are deſirous to underſtand the true Doctrine of Free Will, rather to read the other Works of St.* Auguſtin, *than thoſe which he writ againſt the Pelagians, &c* *. I ſhall ſet down ſome Remarks that have been made againſt *John Gerhard*, which (F) contain ſome Particulars, not unfit to be inſerted in this Article, and I ſhall not forget that *Pighius* is (G) accuſed of being a Plagiary, and that thoſe ‡ who wrote againſt him, own that he was an Eloquent and Ingenious Man, and that he

vel Adverſariorum teſtimonio beatum, cujus Scripta tantum cum Sacris Scripturis conſenſum retinent, ſi quod Pontificius Doctor *celeberrimus fatetur ſe ex Sacræ Scripturæ lectione habuiſſe, id alii Pontificii lectioni librorum* Calvini *tribuant. Profectò niſi* Scholaſticorum *ſententia cum manifeſtis Scripturis pugnaſſet, nunquam illam deſeruiſſet* Pighius. I ſhall now quote a *French* Miniſter: " (i) Cardinal *Roffenſis* and *Pighius* " who wrote alſo againſt *Luther*, maintained the " Doctrine of Grace; nay, the latter affirmed, that " we are not juſtified *by any inherent Righteouſneſs* " *that is within us*: but he was ſharply cenſured by " the (†) Dean of the Univerſity of *Louvain*, who " upbraided him with having ſhamefully departed " from the Doctrine which they had received toge- " ther in the School of *Adrian* VI. and that he was " ſpoiled by the reading of *Calvin*'s Inſtitution. " I have juſt now peruſed the Treatiſe *de Fide & Juſtificatione*, which is the ſecond of the nine Controverſies which *Pighius* publiſhed at *Cologne* in the Year 1542, with this Title, *Controverſiarum præcipuarum in comitiis Ratiſponenſibus tractatarum, & quibus nunc potiſſimum exagitatur Chriſti fides & religio, diligens & luculenta explicatio*, and I have found ſome things in it which make me wonder, how any Body could ſay with any ſhew of Reaſon, that his Opinion about Juſtification was altogether the ſame with the Opinion of the Proteſtants. He refutes them with all his Might, and ſays in expreſs Words, that when God juſtifies and ſaves a Sinner, he has a ſpecial regard to his good Works. *Ad amorem noſtrum atque opera præcipuum a Deo & majorem quam fidei reſpectum haberi in donando nobis juſtificationis & ſalutis gratiam.* This is the Summary which he put in the Margin, *folio* 63. *verſo*, and in the next *folio*, *opera noſtra coram Deo eſſe meritoria.* I find that the Doctrine of the Text does perfectly agree with the Summary of the Margin. We ſhall ſee (‡) hereafter, that *Calvin* and the *Janſeniſts* accuſe him of being a downright *Pelagian.*

(F) *Some Remarks, have been made againſt* John Gerhard, *which contain ſome Particulars.*] The Author of thoſe Remarks was of *Utrecht*, and a Lawyer by Profeſſion: his Name was *Giſbertus Lappius à Waveren.* He ſent them to *Nihuſius*, who inſerted them in his *Hypodigma*, printed in the Year 1648. They contain a ſharp Cenſure of a Paſſage of *John Gerhard*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Jena.* That Paſſage is to be found in the 5th Tome of the *Loci communes* of that Profeſſor, *Sect.* 14. where he refutes the 14th Mark which *Bellarmin* has given of the true Church, *viz.* that her Oppoſers die of a miſerable Death. *John Gerhard* retorts this Argument againſt *Bellarmin*, and ſpeaks of the unfortunate Death of the Perſecutors of the Proteſtant Religion, and reckons *Pighius* amongſt 'em. *Eodem anno Chriſti* CIↃ IↃ XLIII, ſays he, *mortuus eſt Albertus Pighius, Papatûs defenſor non poſtremus; de quo ſcribunt, fuiſſe illum in tumultu oppreſſum, in magna hominum frequentia, unà cum pecunia, quam à Papa, & Cardinalibus propter operam ſuam, in cauſa Pontificia defendenda collatam, acceperat.* The Critick proves by the Words of *Paulus Jovius* which I have (k) quoted, that the Fall of the Bridge happened in the Year 1530, and that *Albertus Pighius* did not die by it. He adds, that the Pope's Liberality towards him happened after the Year 1530. So that at the worſt, he could not have been cruſhed by the Fall of the Bridge with his Money, as the Profeſſor of *Jena* ſuppoſes. Afterwards he ſhews that *Albertus Pighius* (l) *Præpoſitus & Archidiaconus Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis, liber Dominus in Midrecht, Wilnes, Cudelſteert, Zevenhoven, Tamen; Dominus in Achtienhoven, Blocklant, Nuythoorn*, died having received the Sacraments of the Church, and with a great Preſence of Mind on the 26th of *December* 1542, in a magnificent Houſe which he had at *Utrecht.* (m) *Ultrajecti in ædibus clauſtralibus, quas in immunitate collegiatæ Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis magnificas poſſidebat.* The Date of the Day and Year of his Death is to be found in a Letter which *John Vaſtius de Lombeca*, Dean of the Cathedral Church of *Utrecht*, and one of the Executors of the laſt Will of *Albertus Pighius*, wrote the 29th of *December* 1542, to *Gerard Hamont*, Prior of the Charter-Houſe of *Cologne.* The Critick gives an Abſtract of that Letter: There is a remarkable thing in it. *Pighius* being offended at a Book which *Bucer* wrote againſt him, was ſo moved with it, that notwithſtanding his Illneſs, he was buſie every Day in writing his Apology, and no Body was able to perſuade him to have ſome regard to the ill State of his Health. He would never leave off writing an Anſwer to *Bucer*'s Book, which haſtened his Death. His Anſwer remained imperfect, and was printed (n) notwithſtanding. Here are the very Words of the Dean's Letter: (o) *Hoc adjiciam, præfatum Præpoſitum, D. Pighium, libello quodam, nomine Buceri emiſſo, quo eum acrius punxit, ita, durante ſua ægritudine, fuiſſe commotum, ut nulla perſuaſione induci potuerit, ut aliqua ſuæ valetudinis habita ratione, Apologiam quandam reſponſivam edere, & indies ſcribere, voluerit omittere. Quam quidem, inchoatam tantum, morte præventus reliquit: quæ certe indubitata fuit cauſa celerioris ejus deceſſus. Eandem Apologiam, ſic inchoatam, curabo viſitari, ac deinde typis excudi.* As to what *Gerhard* ſays, that the Cardinals gave a great deal of Money to *Pighius*, the Critick anſwers, that it is very likely they expreſt only in Words the Eſteem and Affection they had for him. He quotes two Letters, one of Cardinal *Sadoletus*, written in the Year 1539, and the other of Cardinal *Marcellus Cervinus* written from *Rome* the 27th of *October* 1542. *Sadoletus* aſſures *Albertus Pighius* that he will recommend him to the Pope and to the Cardinals. *Cervinus* promiſes him to repreſent his Services and his Want to the Pope, and proteſts that if he could afford him wherewith to ſatisfie his Creditors, he would do it with all his Heart: (a) *Quantum verò attinet ad æs alienum tuum, ſi ejus diſſolvendi facultas in mea poteſtate eſſet poſita, non laborares. Et tamen, quamvis S. S. D. N. multis magniſque hoc tempore impenſis ſimul gravetur, non deëro tua merita atque neceſſitates commemorare, & juvare rem tuam familiarem, quantum potero.* Laſtly, he obſerves that *Pighius* grew poor by reaſon of ſeveral Suits at Law, the chief whereof was that which he ſtoutly maintained againſt the Emperor, and againſt the Court of the Province, who called the High Juriſdiction of the Provoſtſhip of St. *John* into queſtion.

It cannot be denied by one who narrowly obſerves all his Steps, that he was an Intriguing Man, and a great *Faciendaire.* I uſe this old *French* Word, which ſeems to me to be very expreſſive, and which I have found in ſome (b) good Authors. I wiſh it had been kept up, and I wonder it is not to be found in *Nicot* nor in *Monet*, nor in *Furetiere.* But there are many other Words as remarkable as that, which they knew nothing of.

(G) Pighius *is accuſed of being a Plagiary.*] *Calvin* accuſes him of it. The Catalogues of Plagiaries, which we have ſeen hitherto, ſay nothing of it. *Pighius* began his Book concerning Free Will, with the Connexion that is between the Knowledge of God and the Knowledge of Man. He found that Method in *Calvin*'s Inſtitution, and made uſe of it, without acknowledging from whence he had it. *Calvin* blames him for it, and cannot apprehend what ground there is for ſo great a Familiarity.

---

* *Poſſevin. in Apparatu.*

† *See at the end of the Prince of Conti's Letters to Father de Champs printed in 1686. the Treatiſe which is intitled* St. Auguſtin juſtifié de Calviniſme *p.* 181, 182.

* *You'll ſee the ſequel of this Paſſage towards the end of the Rem. G.*

‡ Calvin, *Bucer, &c.*

(i) *Baſnage Hiſt. de la Religion des Egliſes Reformées tom.* 2. *p.* 39. *Edit.* 1690 *in* 12.

(†) Tapperus.

(‡) *In the Rem. G. towards the end.*

(k) *See the Rem. A.*

(l) *Giſbertus Lappius à Waveren apud Nihuſium in Hypodigmate p.* 339, 340.

(m) *Id. ib.*

(n) *See Cochlæus in actis Luther ad ann.* 154 *fol. ma*

(o) *Apud Nihuſium ib. p.* 34

(a) *Ib.* 342, 3

(b) *Du Pleſſis Mornai makes of it times.*

he had all the Qualities of a good Sophiſt, and of a good Defender of a bad Cauſe; that he knew how to give an odious Turn to the Doctrines of his Adverſaries, and how to declaim, when he found an Occaſion of ſtirring the Indignation of the Reader againſt 'em, by the help of certain Principles which moſt People will eaſily reliſh; that he knew very well how to hide the weak Side of his Cauſe, grow bold upon it, and ſo to perplex his Matter, as to make one loſe the ſight of the main Difficulty; and that in general he treated his Subject very methodically. He took care to inſert in a * Preface, what his Adverſaries owned concerning his Talents.

P Y L A D E S, born in (*A*) *Cilicia*, was a very famous *Pantomimus* at *Rome*, under the Empire of *Auguſtus*. He perfected, by (*B*) ſome new Inventions, the Art of Dancing a whole Play, as I have already ſaid in the Article of *Bathyllus*. He wrote ‡ a Book concerning that Subject. One may judge of the Skill wherewith he performed his Art, if it be conſidered that *Auguſtus* having recalled him to Rome

miliarity. He can find no other Reaſon for it but the Right of Preſcription, becauſe *Pighius* had been uſed for a long time to this ſort of Plundering. (*c*) *Miror qua fronte auſus fuerit, nulla mei mentione facta, tam familiariter ſumere de meo libro, quod in ſuum tranſcriberet. Neque enim quo jure id faciat, video: niſi fortè præſcriptionem obtendat, quia ſic facere pridem ſolitus ſit. Nam in magno illo libro, quem adverſus noſtram confeſſionem edidit, integras ſæpe ex inſtitutione mea paginas, ubi viſum eſt, inſercit, ac ſuo commodo ſic adaptat, quaſi aliunde non ſumpſiſſet. Velim nunc ſcire quo jure aut titulo mea ſic profuſè uſurpet. Si qua magna eſſet inter nos neceſſitudo, ego hanc confidentiam amicitiæ non difficulter concederem. Sed nunc huic veniæ non eſt locus. An quia hoſtis ſum, ſe jus direptionis in omnia mea habere putat? At hoc prædæ genus nullo, nec jure, nec more, defendi poteſt. Unus ergo prætextus reſtat, homini docto potuiſſe non minus venire in mentem quæ dixeram, quàm mihi prius venerant. Sed lectores obſecro, ſi tantum habeant ocij, ut caput primum libri Pighiani cum primo Inſtitutionis meæ capite conferant. Nihil dico: niſi quod non ſine riſu ac ſtomacho perſpicient nimis perditam hominis impudentiam. Quod ſi ulterius pergere libeat, percurrant quæ de Juſtificatione tractat in altero illo opere, & ad ſextum Inſtitutionis meæ caput exigant: mirum ſi bilem continere queant. Neque enim clanculum furatur aut carptim: neque artificio tegere ita ſtudet ſuas rapinas, ut apud ſe natum videatur, quod apud me legit, ſed ita palam mea ad verbum recitat, ut videatur paginas ipſas totas pigritia aſſuiſſe, quo deſcribendi laborem fugeret. Si fateretur authorem, cum dicerem mutuari: nunc quid cauſari poteſt, quo minus plagiarius palam vocetur?* You ſee that he is accuſed of having ſtolen ſeveral Pages, Word for Word, out of *Calvin's* Inſtitution, to make them his own, without any Alteration. It is a ſurpriſing Security; but *Calvin* adds, to excuſe him, that he was contented to pleaſe thoſe who never conſulted the Writings of his Adverſaries, and approved of every thing that was publiſhed againſt the Proteſtants. (*d*) *Mirabitur quicunque leget, unde tantus homini ſtupor: qui nihil veritus ſit, in ipſo ſtatim veſtigio deprehendi. Ego verò dum omnia bene reputo, habeo quod pro hominis excuſatione dicam: eum ſecuritate magis quàm ſocordia id feciſſe. Satis enim habuit, ſi modò iis placeret, qui non minori religione à noſtris abſtinent, quàm facilitate omnia laudant ac mirantur, quæ nos quovis modo impugnant.* Note, that *Calvin* does not acknowledge that his Works had made *Pighius* Orthodox in the leaſt: on the contrary he calls him a *Pelagian*. (*e*) *Hoc totum non modo Pelagii ſcholam redolet, ſed mera eſt Pelagianæ impietatis magna ex parte profeſſio*..... (*f*) *Quod autem toties cum Pelagianis nihil ſe habere commune jactat, neſcio quos hic Pelagianos comminiſcatur. Neque enim tantùm cum iis, quos deſcribit Auguſtinus, multa habet ſimilia, ſed eorum quibuſdam multò eſt deterior*...... (*g*) *Ergo, ut aliquando claudatur hic liber, fruſtra, aut ſe à Pelagio disjungere conatur Pighius, cujus ſocietate eum teneri implicitum tam apertè demonſtravimus: aut nos Manichæis, aliiſque hæreticis adjungere, à quibus non minus diſſidemus, quàm ipſe ab orthodoxo Eccleſiæ ſenſu.*

The *Janſeniſt*, ſome of whoſe Words I have ſet down in the Text of this Article, calls him alſo a *Pelagian*. "He is a Man, *ſays he* †, who could not "apprehend the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin*, nor that "of the Church, having but an imperfect Knowledge of the Corruption of Nature, and Original "Sin, which is the Key of that Doctrine. He is a "Man full of *Pelagian* Errors about that Matter; "he ſpeaks againſt Predeſtination, and the Doctrine "of efficacious and free Grace, with great Indiſcretion and Ignorance, to ſay no more, tho' he "acknowledges it is the Opinion of St. *Auguſtin*. "He takes the Writings of *Gennadius*, a *Semi-Pelagian*, for a Rule of Faith, and the Confeſſion of "Faith made by *Pelagius* for a Work of St. *Auguſtin*. Laſtly, having thus abuſed his Doctrine, he "does not ſpare him, and repreſents him as a Caviller; *declinat, fugit, diſſimulat, aliud quærit quod cavilletur*. He aſcribes to him as little as he can, "deprives him of all his Strength, and uſes Diſſimulation and Craft to depreſs and weaken him." This *Janſeniſt* concludes, "‡ That 'tis no wonder "if the whole Faculty of *Louvain* in the famous "Cenſure of the Year 1587, calls..... *Pighius* a "Favourer and a Collegue of the *Semi-Pelagians*; "if the Faculty of *Douay* likewiſe in their Cenſure, "reckons him among the Diſciples of *Fauſtus*; if "the Learned *Eſtius*..... ſpoke of him much in "the ſame manner; and if Dr. *John Molanus* ſays, "that *the moſt Learned Divines blame him for having "departed from the Doctrine of* St. Auguſtin, *which "is that of the Church, concerning Original Sin, Predeſtination and Grace*: to which *Aubertus Miræus* "ſubſcribes."

(*A*) *Born in* Cilicia.] This we learn from *Suidas*: what follows, wherein he had perhaps ſet down the Name of his Native Country, is ſo dark, that the Criticks have not been able yet to clear it. *Bulengerus* (*h*) fancied without any Reaſon for it, that there was an oppoſition between thoſe who make *Pylades* a *Cilician*, and the *Anthologia* which ſays, as *Bulengerus* underſtands it, that he came from *Thebes* in *Egypt*; whereupon he quotes theſe Words:

Βάκχας
Ἐκ Θηβῶν ἰταλὴν ἤγαγε πρὸς θυμέλην
Ἀνθρώποις Πυλάδης.

Id eſt quando Bacchas ex Thebis ad pulpitum Italicum hominibus Pylades adduxit. The Meaning of them is only that *Pylades* ſhewed to the *Romans* the Repreſentation of a thing which happened at *Thebes*, and not that he was born at *Thebes*, or had lived there before he came into *Italy*: beſides, 'tis plain that no other Town can be meant here but *Thebes* in *Bœotia*, where *Bacchus* and his Feaſts had their principal Stations. I add that ἰταλὴν πρὸς θυμέλην is very well rendred *ad pulpitum Italicum*, *upon the* Italian *Stage*; but thoſe who have rendred it (*i*) *Italicum ad Sacrificium*, have committed a very groſs Miſtake.

(*B*) *By ſome new Inventions.*] I obſerved in general in the Article of *Bathyllus* what Alterations were made under *Auguſtus* in the Dances of the *Pantomimi*. But to be more particular, I ſhall ſay now that *Pylades*, if we believe St. *Jerome* (*k*), is the firſt who danced at *Rome*, whilſt others played upon Flageolets, and whilſt the *Chorus* ſung, and that before him the *Pantomimi* danced and ſung themſelves at the ſame time. *Salmaſius* (*l*) does not grant all this: He ſhews that from the Time of *Livius*, a Poet and a Comedian, the Dancer was excuſed from the fatigue of Singing, and (*m*) that they gave him a Boy, who ſung, whilſt another was playing on the Flute; but he owns that *Pylades* is the firſt who danced whilſt the *Chorus* ſung, and others played upon Flageolets, *fiſtulas & chorum ſibi ſaltanti ut præcineret curaviſſe*. This agrees with the Anſwer he returned to *Auguſtus*, who asked him what he had joyned to Dancing, (*n*) Αὐλῶν συρίγγων τ' ἐνοπὴν, ὁμαδόν τ' ἀνθρώπων, *the ſound of Flageolets and Flutes, and the ſymphony of Men*; becauſe before him there was but one Flute appoint-

ed

---

* See *Cochlæus in Actis & Scriptis Lutheri ad ann. 1542. pag. in fol. m. 322.*

‡ *Athen. l. 1. c. 17. Suidas in* Πυλάδης.

(*c*) *Calvin. Reſponſ. contra Pighium de libero arbitrio p. 149. Opuſcul. theolog.*

(*d*) *Id. ib.*

(*e*) *Id. ib. p.* 163, 164.

(*f*) *Id. ib. p.* 188. *col.* 1.

(*g*) *Id. ib. p.* 191. *col.* 1.

† *St. Auguſtin juſtifié de Calviniſme p.* 182.

‡ *Ib. p.* 184.

(*h*) *Jul. Cæſ. Bulengerus de Theat. l. 1. c. 48. fol. m. 115. & 117. verſo. You'll ſee in the Rem. E, Letter 1, where theſe* Greek *Verſes are to be found.*

(*i*) **That Fault is in the** Anthologia **of** Lubin's *Edit. in 4. p.* 760.

(*k*) Pylades Cilix Pantomimus, quum veteres ipſi canerent & ſaltarent, primus Romæ chorum ſibi & fiſtulas præcinere fecit. *In Chron. Euſeb. ad ann.* 1995.

(*l*) *Salmaſ. in Vopiſc. p.835. edit. Lugd. Batav. in 8.*

(*m*) *Valer. Maxim. l. 2. c. 4. p. m.* 161. *See alſo Lucian* de Saltatione *p. m.* 925. *tom.* 1.

(*n*) *'Tis the 13th Verſe of the 10th Book of the Iliad.*

quiſition. *Poſſevinus* * acquaints his Reader, that *Pighius's* Doctrine concerning Original Sin, and Grace, are not approved by the Divines, becauſe he ſeems to have departed from the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin*, which the Church approves of. The *Janſeniſt*, who publiſhed ſome Letters of the Prince of *Conti*, has expreſſed himſelf more ſharply. He ſays, that *Pighius* muſt needs be looked upon † *as a wretched Divine*, ſince he is *a Man who ſuſpects the Doctrine of St.* Auguſtin, *a Man who adviſes thoſe who are deſirous to underſtand the true Doctrine of Free Will, rather to read the other Works of St.* Auguſtin, *than thoſe which he writ againſt the Pelagians, &c* *. I ſhall ſet down ſome Remarks that have been made againſt *John Gerhard*, which (*F*) contain ſome Particulars, not unfit to be inſerted in this Article, and I ſhall not forget that *Pighius* is (*G*) accuſed of being a Plagiary, and that thoſe ‡ who wrote againſt him, own that he was an Eloquent and Ingenious Man, and that he

* *Poſſevin. in Apparatu.*

† *See at the end of the Prince of Conti's Letters to Father de Champs printed in 1689, the Treatiſe which is intitled* St. Auguſtin juſtifié de Calviniſme *p.* 181, 182.

* *You'll ſee the ſequel of this Paſſage towards the end of the Rem. G.*

‡ Calvin, Bucer, *&c.*

vel Adverſariorum teſtimonio beatum, cujus Scripta tantum cum Sacris Scripturis conſenſum retinent, ſi quod Pontificius Doctor *celeberrimus fatetur ſe ex Sacræ Scripturæ lectione habuiſſe, id alii Pontificii lectioni librorum* Calvini *tribuant. Profectò niſi* Scholaſticorum *ſententia cum manifeſtis Scripturis pugnaſſet, nunquam illam deſeruiſſet* Pighius. I ſhall now quote a *French* Miniſter: " (*i*) Cardinal *Roffenſis* and *Pighius* " who wrote alſo againſt *Luther*, maintained the " Doctrine of Grace; nay, the latter affirmed, that " we are not juſtified *by any inherent Righteouſneſs* " *that is within us*: but he was ſharply cenſured by " the (1) Dean of the Univerſity of *Louvain*, who " upbraided him with having ſhamefully departed " from the Doctrine which they had received together in the School of *Adrian* VI. and that he was " ſpoiled by the reading of *Calvin's* Inſtitution. „ I have juſt now peruſed the Treatiſe *de Fide & Juſtificatione*, which is the ſecond of the nine Controverſies which *Pighius* publiſhed at *Cologne* in the Year 1542, with this Title, *Controverſiarum præcipuarum in comitiis Ratiſponenſibus tractatarum, & quibus nunc potiſſimum exagitatur Chriſti fides & religio, diligens & luculenta explicatio*, and I have found ſome things in it which make me wonder, how any Body could ſay with any ſhew of Reaſon, that his Opinion about Juſtification was altogether the ſame with the Opinion of the Proteſtants. He refutes them with all his Might, and ſays in expreſs Words, that when God juſtifies and ſaves a Sinner, he has a ſpecial regard to his good Works. *Ad amorem noſtrum atque opera præcipuum a Deo & majorem quam fidei reſpectum haberi in donando nobis juſtificationis & ſalutis gratiam.* This is the Summary which he put in the Margin, *folio* 63. *verſo*, and in the next *folio*, *opera noſtra coram Deo eſſe meritoria.* I find that the Doctrine of the Text does perfectly agree with the Summary of the Margin. We ſhall ſee (‡) hereafter, that *Calvin* and the *Janſeniſts* accuſe him of being a downright *Pelagian*.

(*F*) *Some Remarks, have been made againſt* John Gerhard, *which contain ſome Particulars.*] The Author of thoſe Remarks was of *Utrecht*, and a Lawyer by Profeſſion: his Name was *Giſbertus Lappius à Waveren*. He ſent them to *Nihuſius*, who inſerted them in his *Hypodigma*, printed in the Year 1648. They contain a ſharp Cenſure of a Paſſage of *John Gerhard*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Jena*. That Paſſage is to be found in the 5th Tome of the *Loci communes* of that Profeſſor, *Sect.* 14. where he refutes the 14th Mark which *Bellarmin* has given of the true Church, *viz.* that her Oppoſers die of a miſerable Death. *John Gerhard* retorts this Argument againſt *Bellarmin*, and ſpeaks of the unfortunate Death of the Perſecutors of the Proteſtant Religion, and reckons *Pighius* amongſt 'em. *Eodem anno Chriſti* CIↃ IↃ XLIII, ſays he, *mortuus eſt Albertus Pighius, Papatûs defenſor non poſtremus; de quo ſcribunt, fuiſſe illum in tumultu oppreſſum, in magna hominum frequentia, unà cum pecunia, quam à Papa, & Cardinalibus propter operam ſuam, in cauſa Pontificia defendenda collatam, acceperat.* The Critick proves by the Words of *Paulus Jovius* which I have (*k*) quoted, that the Fall of the Bridge happened in the Year 1530, and that *Albertus Pighius* did not die by it. He adds, that the Pope's Liberality towards him happened after the Year 1530. So that at the worſt, he could not have been cruſhed by the Fall of the Bridge with his Money, as the Profeſſor of *Jena* ſuppoſes. Afterwards he ſhews that *Albertus Pighius* (*l*) *Præpoſitus & Archidiaconus Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis, liber Dominus in Midrecht, Wilnes, Cudelſteert, Zevenhoven, Tamen; Dominus in Achtienhoven, Blocklant, Nuythoorn*, died having received the Sacraments of the Church, and with a great Preſence of Mind on the 26th of *December* 1542, in a magnificent Houſe which he had at *Utrecht*. (*m*) *Ultrajecti in ædibus clauſtralibus, quas in immunitate collegiatæ Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis magnificas poſſidebat.* The Date of the Day and Year of his Death is to be found in a Letter which *John Vorſtius de Lombeca*, Dean of the Cathedral Church of *Utrecht*, and one of the Executors of the laſt Will of *Albertus Pighius*, wrote the 29th of *December* 1542, to *Gerard Hament*, Prior of the Charter-Houſe of *Cologne*. The Critick gives an Abſtract of that Letter: There is a remarkable thing in it. *Pighius* being offended at a Book which *Bucer* wrote againſt him, was ſo moved with it, that notwithſtanding his Illneſs, he was buſie every Day in writing his Apology, and no Body was able to perſuade him to have ſome regard to the ill State of his Health. He would never leave off writing an Anſwer to *Bucer's* Book, which haſtened his Death. His Anſwer remained imperfect, and was printed (*n*) notwithſtanding. Here are the very Words of the Dean's Letter: (*o*) *Hoc adjiciam, præfatum Præpoſitum, D. Pighium, libello quodam, nomine Buceri emiſſo, quo eum acrius punxit, ita, durante ſua ægritudine, fuiſſe commotum, ut nulla perſuaſione induci potuerit, ut aliqua ſuæ valetudinis habita ratione, Apologiam quandam reſponſivam edere, & indies ſcribere, voluerit omittere. Quam quidem, inchoatam tantum, morte præventus reliquit: quæ certe indubitata fuit cauſa celerioris ejus deceſſus. Eandem Apologiam, ſic inchoatam, curabo viſitari, ac deinde typis excudi.* As to what *Gerhard* ſays, that the Cardinals gave a great deal of Money to *Pighius*, the Critick anſwers, that it is very likely they expreſt only in Words the Eſteem and Affection they had for him. He quotes two Letters, one of Cardinal *Sadoletus*, written in the Year 1539, and the other of Cardinal *Marcellus Cervinus* written from *Rome* the 27th of *October* 1542. *Sadoletus* aſſures *Albertus Pighius* that he will recommend him to the Pope and to the Cardinals. *Cervinus* promiſes him to repreſent his Services and his Want to the Pope, and proteſts that if he could afford him wherewith to ſatisfie his Creditors, he would do it with all his Heart: (*a*) *Quantum verò attinet ad æs alienum tuum, ſi ejus diſſolvendi facultas in mea poteſtate eſſet poſita, non laborares. Et tamen, quamvis S. S. D. N. multis magniſque hoc tempore impenſis ſimul gravetur, non deëro tua merita atque neceſſitates commemorare, & juvare rem tuam familiarem, quantum potero.* Laſtly, he obſerves that *Pighius* grew poor by reaſon of ſeveral Suits at Law, the chief whereof was that which he ſtoutly maintained againſt the Emperor, and againſt the Court of the Province, who called the High Juriſdiction of the Provoſtſhip of St. *John* into queſtion.

It cannot be denied by one who narrowly obſerves all his Steps, that he was an Intriguing Man, and a great *Faciendaire*. I uſe this old *French* Word, which ſeems to me to be very expreſſive, and which I have found in ſome (*b*) good Authors. I wiſh it had been kept up, and I wonder it is not to be found in *Nicot* nor in *Monet*, nor in *Furetiere*. But there are many other Words as remarkable as that, which they knew nothing of.

(*G*) Pighius *is accuſed of being a Plagiary.*] *Calvin* accuſes him of it. The Catalogues of Plagiaries, which we have ſeen hitherto, ſay nothing of it. *Pighius* began his Book concerning Free Will, with the Connexion that is between the Knowledge of God and the Knowledge of Man. He found that Method in *Calvin's* Inſtitution, and made uſe of it, without acknowledging from whence he had it. *Calvin* blames him for it, and cannot apprehend what ground there is for ſo great a Familiarity.

(*i*) *Baſnage Hiſt. de la Religion des Egliſes Reformées tom.* 2. *p.* 39. *Edit.* 1690 *in* 12.

(1) Tapperus.

(‡) *In the Rem. G. towards the end.*

(*k*) *See the Rem. A.*

(*l*) *Giſbertus Lappius à Waveren apud Nihuſium in Hypodigmate p.* 339, 340.

(*m*) Id. i

(*n*) *See Cochlæ in actis Luthe ann.* 15 *fol.ma*

(*o*) *And. Nihuſiu ib. p.* 3

(*a*) *I* 342,

(*b*) *De Pleſſi Morna makes of it tiens.*

he had all the Qualities of a good Sophiſt, and of a good Defender of a bad Cauſe; that he knew how to give an odious Turn to the Doctrines of his Adverſaries, and how to declaime, when he found an Occaſion of ſtirring the Indignation of the Reader againſt 'em, by the help of certain Principles which moſt People will eaſily reliſh; that he knew very well how to hide the weak Side of his Cauſe, grow bold upon it, and ſo to perplex his Matter, as to make one loſe the ſight of the main Difficulty; and that in general he treated his Subject very methodically. He took care to inſert in a † Preface, what his Adverſaries owned concerning his Talents.

PYLADES, born in (*A*) *Cilicia*, was a very famous *Pantomimus* at *Rome*, under the Empire of *Auguſtus*. He perfected, by (*B*) ſome new Inventions, the Art of Dancing a whole Play, as I have already ſaid in the Article of *Bathyllus*. He wrote ‡ a Book concerning that Subject. One may judge of the Skill wherewith he performed his Art, if it be conſidered that *Auguſtus* having recalled him to *Rome*

† See [illegible] in [illegible] pro ſcriptis Lutheri ad ann. 1542. ſub fin. fol. m. 422.

‡ Athen. l. 1. c. 17. Suidas in Πυλάδης.

miliarity. He can find no other Reaſon for it but the Right of Preſcription, becauſe *Pighius* had been uſed for a long time to this ſort of Plundering. (*c*) *Miror quâ fronte auſus fuerit, nullâ mei mentione factâ, tam familiariter ſumere de meo libro, quod in ſuum tranſcriberet. Neque enim quo jure id faciat, video: niſi fortè præſcriptionem obtendat, quia ſic facere pridem ſolitus ſit. Nam in magno illo libro, quem adverſus noſtram confeſſionem edidit, integras ſæpe ex inſtitutione meâ paginas, ubi viſum eſt, infercit, ac ſuo commodo ſic adaptat, quaſi aliunde non ſumpſiſſet. Velim nunc ſcire quo jure aut titulo mea ſic profuſe uſurpet. Si qua magna eſſet inter nos neceſſitudo, ego hanc confidentiam amicitiæ non difficulter concederem. Sed nunc huic veniæ non eſt locus. An quia hoſtis ſum, ſe jus direptionis in omnia mea habere putat? At hoc prædæ genus nullo, nec jure, nec more, defendi poteſt. Unus ergo prætextus reſtat, homini docto potuiſſe non minus venire in mentem quæ dixeram, quàm mihi prius venerant. Sed lectores obſecro, ſi tantum habeant ocij, ut caput primum libri Pighiani cum primo Inſtitutionis meæ capite conferant. Nihil dico: niſi quod non ſine riſu ac ſtomacho perſpicient nimis perditam hominis impudentiam. Quod ſi ulterius pergere libeat, percurrant quæ de Juſtificatione tractat in altero illo opere, & ad ſextum Inſtitutionis meæ caput exigant: mirum ſi bilem continere queant. Neque enim clanculum furatur aut carptim: neque artificio tegere ita ſtudet ſuas rapinas, ut apud ſe natum videatur, quod apud me legit, ſed ita palam mea ad verbum recitat, ut videatur paginas ipſas totas pigritia aſſuiſſe, quo deſcribendi laborem fugeret. Si fateretur authorem, cum dicerem mutuari: nunc quid cauſari poteſt, quo minus plagiarius palam vocetur?* You ſee that he is accuſed of having ſtolen ſeveral Pages, Word for Word, out of *Calvin*'s Inſtitution, to make them his own, without any Alteration. It is a ſurpriſing Security; but *Calvin* adds, to excuſe him, that he was contented to pleaſe thoſe who never conſulted the Writings of his Adverſaries, and approved of every thing that was publiſhed againſt the Proteſtants. (*d*) *Mirabitur quicunque leget, unde tantus homini ſtupor: qui nihil veritus ſit, in ipſo ſtatim veſtigio deprehendi. Ego verò dum omnia bene reputo, habeo quod pro hominis excuſatione dicam: eum ſecuritate magis quàm ſocordia id feciſſe. Satis enim habuit, ſi modò iis placeret, qui non minori religione à noſtris abſtinent, quàm facilitate omnia laudant ac mirantur, quæ nos quovis modo impugnant.* Note, that *Calvin* does not acknowledge that his Works had made *Pighius* Orthodox in the leaſt: on the contrary he calls him a *Pelagian*. (*e*) *Hoc totum non modo Pelagii ſcholam redolet, ſed mera eſt Pelagianæ impietatis magna ex parte profeſſio. . . . . (f) Quod autem toties cum Pelagianis nihil ſe habere commune jactat, neſcio quos hic Pelagianos comminiſcatur. Neque enim tantùm cum iis, quos deſcribit Auguſtinus, multa habet ſimilia, ſed eorum quibuſdam multò eſt deterior. . . . . . (g) Ergo, ut aliquando claudatur hic liber, fruſtra, aut ſe à Pelagio disjungere conatur Pighius, cujus ſocietate eum teneri implicitum tam apertè demonſtravimus: aut nos Manichæis, aliiſque hæreticis adjungere, à quibus non minus diſſidemus, quàm ipſe ab orthodoxo Eccleſiæ ſenſu.*

The *Janſeniſt*, ſome of whoſe Words I have ſet down in the Text of this Article, calls him alſo a *Pelagian*. "He is a Man, *ſays he* †, who could not "apprehend the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin*, nor that "of the Church, having but an imperfect Know- "ledge of the Corruption of Nature, and Original "Sin, which is the Key of that Doctrine. He is a "Man full of *Pelagian* Errors about that Matter; "he ſpeaks againſt Predeſtination, and the Doctrine "of efficacious and free Grace, with great Indiſcretion and Ignorance, to ſay no more, tho' he "acknowledges it is the Opinion of St. *Auguſtin*. "He takes the Writings of *Gennadius*, a *Semi-Pelagian*, for a Rule of Faith, and the Confeſſion of "Faith made by *Pelagius* for a Work of St. *Auguſtin*. Laſtly, having thus abuſed his Doctrine, he "does not ſpare him, and repreſents him as a Caviller; *declinat, fugit, diſſimulat, aliud quærit quod cavilletur*. He aſcribes to him as little as he can, "deprives him of all his Strength, and uſes Diſſimulation and Craft to depreſs and weaken him." This *Janſeniſt* concludes, "‡ That 'tis no wonder "if the whole Faculty of *Louvain* in the famous "Cenſure of the Year 1587, calls . . . . . *Pighius* a "Favourer and a Collegue of the *Semi-Pelagians*; "if the Faculty of *Douay* likewiſe in their Cenſure, "reckons him among the Diſciples of *Faultus*; if "the Learned *Eſtius* . . . . . ſpoke of him much in "the ſame manner; and if Dr. *John Molanus* ſays, "that *the moſt Learned Divines blame him for having* "*departed from the Doctrine of* St. Auguſtin, *which* "*is that of the Church, concerning Original Sin, Predeſtination and Grace*: to which *Aubertus Miræus* "ſubſcribes."

(*A*) *Born in* Cilicia.] This we learn from *Suidas*: what follows, wherein he had perhaps ſet down the Name of his Native Country, is ſo dark, that the Criticks have not been able yet to clear it. *Bulengerus* (*h*) fancied without any Reaſon for it, that there was an oppoſition between thoſe who make *Pylades* a *Cilician*, and the *Anthologia* which ſays, as *Bulengerus* underſtands it, that he came from *Thebes* in *Egypt*; whereupon he quotes theſe Words:

Βάκχας
Ἐκ Θηβῶν ἰταλὴν ἤγαγε πρὸς θυμέλην
Ἀνθρώποις Πυλάδης.

Id eſt quando Bacchus ex Thebis ad pulpitum Italicum hominibus Pylades adduxit. The Meaning of them is only that *Pylades* ſhewed to the *Romans* the Repreſentation of a thing which happened at *Thebes*, and not that he was born at *Thebes*, or had lived there before he came into *Italy*: beſides, 'tis plain that no other Town can be meant here but *Thebes* in *Bœotia*, where *Bacchus* and his Feaſts had their principal Stations. I add that ἰταλὴν πρὸς θυμέλην is very well rendred *ad pulpitum Italicum, upon the* Italian *Stage*; but thoſe who have rendred it (*i*) *Italicum ad Sacrificium*, have committed a very groſs Miſtake.

(*B*) *By ſome new Inventions.*] I obſerved in general in the Article of *Bathyllus* what Alterations were made under *Auguſtus* in the Dances of the *Pantomimi*. But to be more particular, I ſhall ſay now that *Pylades*, if we believe St. *Jerome* (*k*), is the firſt who danced at *Rome*, whilſt others played upon Flageolets, and whilſt the *Chorus* ſung, and that before him the *Pantomimi* danced and ſung themſelves at the ſame time. *Salmaſius* (*l*) does not grant all this: He ſhews that from the Time of *Livius*, a Poet and a Comedian, the Dancer was excuſed from the fatigue of Singing, and (*m*) that they gave him a Boy, who ſung, whilſt another was playing on the Flute; but he owns that *Pylades* is the firſt who danced whilſt the *Chorus* ſung, and others played upon Flageolets, *fiſtulas & chorum ſibi ſaltanti ut præcineret curaviſſe*. This agrees with the Anſwer he returned to *Auguſtus*, who asked him what he had joyned to Dancing, (*n*) Αὐλῶν συρίγγων τ' ἐνοπὴν, ὁμαδόν τ' ἀνθρώπων, *the ſound of Flageolets and Flutes, and the ſymphony of Men*; becauſe before him there was but one Flute appointed

(c) Calvin. reſponſ. contra Pighium de libero arbitrio p. 119. Opuſcul. theolog.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Id. ib. p. 163, 164.

(f) Id. ib. p. 128. col. 1.

(g) Id. ib. p. 191. col. 1.

† St. Auguſtin juſtifié de Calviniſme p. 182.

‡ Ib. p. 183.

(h) Jul. Cæſ. Bulengerus de Theat. l. 1. c. 45. fol. m. 115. & 117. verſo. You'll ſee in the Rem. E. Letter 1, where thoſe Greek Verſes are to be found.

(i) That Fault is in the Anthologia of Lubin's Edit. in 4° p. 760.

(k) Pylades Cilix Pantomimus, quum veteres ipſi canerent & ſaltarent, primus Romæ chorum ſibi & fiſtulas præcinere fecit. In Chron. Euſeb. ad ann. 1995.

(l) Salmaſ. in Vopiſc. p. 836. edit. Lugd. Batav. in 8.

(m) Valer. Maxim. l. 2. c. 4. p. m. 161. See alſo Lucian de Saltatione p. m. 925. tom. 1.

(n) 'Tis the 13th Verſe of the 10th Book of the Iliad.

Rome *, from whence he had been expelled by a Faction, did ſo pleaſe the People, that it was one of the Reaſons for which they ceaſed to be angry with ſome inconvenient Laws which that Emperor had made. Others β do not aſcribe the Baniſhment of *Pylades* to the Credit of a contrary Faction, and ſay, that it was a Puniſhment which *Auguſtus* inflicted upon him, becauſe he pointed (*C*) at one of the Spectators. But it may be, that *Mæcenas*, who favoured *Bathyllus* the Rival of *Pylades*, took hold of this Opportunity to remove the latter. *Pylades* had another Competitor, (*D*) whoſe Name was *Hylas*, who had been his Diſciple. We find ſeveral Particulars about it in γ *Macrobius*; that there was a popular Inſurrection δ upon the Account of their Jealouſie, and that *Hylas* dancing one Day a Song, which ended thus, *Great Agamemnon*, expreſt the thing by the poſture of a Man who ſhould meaſure a Perſon of a great Stature. *Pylades*, to find fault with him, cried out, *You make him a Tall Man, and not a Great Man*, and was forced by the Aſſembly to dance the ſame Song. He did it, and when he came to *Great Agamemnon*, he aſſumed the Poſture of a Meditating Man ζ. One Day as he was Dancing the Tragedy of *Hercules Furens*, ſome People found fault with his Steps; he pull'd off his Mask, and told the Laughers, *O ye Fools, don't you ſee that I act a Fool?* That very Day he threw ſome Arrows among the Spectators; he threw ſome alſo, when he acted the ſame Play in the Chamber of *Auguſtus*. That Prince expreſt no Anger for being treated as the *Roman* People were. All theſe things are a great deal more pleaſant in the Original η; the Curious will do very well to have recourſe to it. There are ſome Epigrams (*E*) in the *Anthologia*, to the Honour of our *Pylades*. He left ſome Diſciples, who went ſucceſſively by his Name. We find under the Empire of *Trajan*, a Dancer θ whoſe Name was *Pylades*, particularly beloved by that Prince. We read of another, whom λ *Didius Julianus* cauſed to dance in the Palace where *Pertinax* had been murthered juſt before. *Galen* ſpeaks of a *Pantomimus* named *Pylades* ‡, and found out that a Woman was paſſionately in Love with him: he is without doubt one of them. The Inſcriptions of *Gruterus* ‡ mention ſome *Pantomimi* who had the ſame Name.

P I N (*John Du*) in Latin *Pinus*, Biſhop of *Rieux* in the XVI. Century, was born at *Toulouſe*. He went into *Italy* to cultivate his Mind, he ſtudied Eloquence and the Civil Law at *Bologna*, and publiſhed there ſome Books (*A*), for which he was eſteemed. Thoſe which he publiſhed ſince, confirmed and encreaſed his Reputation. He minded the Politeneſs (*B*) of the Latin Style. He was Counſellor in the Parliament of *Toulouſe*, and Ambaſſador of *France*, I know not where, but I think it was in *Italy*. I would not expreſs myſelf in ſuch general Terms, and I would be

ed for the uſe of the *Pantomimi*, whereas many were appointed for him. We read in *Lucian* that ſeveral other Inſtruments, *cithara, cimbala*, were uſed when the *Pantomimi* danced, as well as certain Stampings of the Feet, which, as *Salmaſius* thinks, were of the ſame uſe as the Motion of the Hands, which we call now *to beat Time*. The ſame Author has (*a*) obſerved, that it was chiefly under *Auguſtus* that Dancing came to its Perfection. *Pylades* is to be praiſed for it, (*b*) *qui ferebatur mutaſſe rudis illius ſaltationis ritum quæ apud majores viguit, & venuſtam induxiſſe novitatem.*

(*C*) *Pointed at one of the Spectators.*] *Auguſtus* muſt needs have been very indulgent to thoſe who hiſſed in a Play, for that Spectator hiſſed at *Pylades*. (*c*) *Pyladem urbe atque Italia ſummoverit quod ſpectatorem à quo exſibilabatur demonſtraſſet digito, conſpicuumque feciſſet.* If an Actor at *Paris* ſhould now (*d*) revenge himſelf in ſuch a manner, he would not be blamed for it. We have ſeen in the Publick News, that a ſevere Regulation has been made in *France* againſt thoſe who hiſs, whoſe Boldneſs was raiſed to the higheſt Degree. The Petition which a Poet preſented to the King, in order to get their Fury reſtrained, is a very pretty Piece of Poetry. It has been printed in the *Mercure Galant*, and again in the Collection which comes out every Month at the *Hague*. An Epigram about the Origin of Hiſſing has been inſerted in the *Fureteriana*. It is aſcribed to an Author very Illuſtrious for his Tragedies; but the Reputation of the Ingenious Man, who is abuſed therein, is ſo well eſtabliſhed, that it can do him no wrong (*e*). There is a fault in the *Dutch* Edition, (*f*) *Hiſtorien* inſtead of *Hiſtrion*.

(*D*) *Another Competitor, whoſe Name was* Hylas.] So ſays *Macrobius*: (*g*) *Hylam diſcipulum uſque ad æqualitatis contentionem eruditione provexit: populus deinde inter utriuſque ſuffragia diviſus eſt.* Several Learned Men (*h*) take *Hylas* and *Bathyllus* to be one and the ſame Perſon: they ſay he had that Name given him, becauſe he had the ſame ſhare in the Love of *Pylades*, which *Hylas* had in the Love of *Hercules*. In a Word, they fancy that there was a Commerce of Pæderaſty between 'em. But this ſeems to me far-fetch'd and ſtrain'd. No Body ſays that *Bathyllus* had been *Pylades*'s Scholar, as *Macrobius* ſays that *Hylas* was. We muſt therefore be contented to ſay, that 'tis likely they have been confounded one with another, as to the Reaſon which moved *Auguſtus* to be angry with *Pylades*; and let us believe that *Hylas* and *Bathyllus* have been two different *Pantomimi*. See the Remark **E** in the Article *Bathyllus*.

(*E*) *Some Epigrams in the* Anthologia.] That (*i*) which *Bulengerus* and *Lubinus* have miſinterpreted, aſcribes to *Pylades* Hands that ſpeak every thing, παμφώνους. If any one undertook to collect the Paſſages, wherein the Ancients have happily repreſented the Manual Language of the *Pantomimi*, it would make a large Volume: I ſhall only ſet down a Paſſage out of *Caſſiodorus* (*k*), *His ſunt additæ Orcheſtarum loquaciſſimæ manus, linguoſi digiti, ſilentium clamoſum, expoſitio tacita*, and another out of *Nonnus*, (*l*) Νεύματα μῦθον ἔχων, παλάμην στόμα, δάκτυλα φωνήν. *Nutus ſermonem habens, manum os, digitos vocem.* Let this ſuffice; I paſs by St. *Cyprian* (*m*), who ſays, *cui ars ſit verba manibus expedire.*

(*A*) *He publiſhed ſome Books, for which he was eſteemed.*] He wrote the Life of *Philippus Beroaldus* (*n*) the Father, and that of *Catherine* of *Siena*: they were printed at *Bologna* in the Year 1505. A Letter and ſome Epigrams to the Praiſe of *Codrus Urceus* were printed with the Works of that Author. He wrote alſo a Treatiſe *de vita aulica*: His Book *de claris fœminis*, of illuſtrious Women, was printed at *Paris* in the Year 1521, in *folio* (*o*). His Life of *St. Roch* was printed at *Paris* in 4o. *apud Joannem Parvum.* He was then *Senator Toloſanus & Orator Regius* (*p*). The *Allobrogicæ narrationis liber* was printed at *Venice* in 4o. in the Year 1516, and ſince at *Paris* by *Badius*, in the ſame Year (*q*).

(*B*) *He minded the Politeneſs of the Latin Style.*] I ſhall prove this by a Paſſage of *Eraſmus*. (*r*) *Poſſet inter hujus laudis* (Tullianæ dictionis) *competitores numerari*, (Joannes Pinus) *niſi & hunc negotiorum tumultus & eccleſiaſtica dignitas à ſtudiis avulſiſſent. Olim certè præclarum ſui ſpecimen dedit, quùm Bononiæ Muſarum ſacra coleret. Nunc epiſcopum audio factum, quid acceſſerit* be more particular, if I had his Books, or if the Authors who ſpeak of him, and whom I have been able to conſult, had ſaid ſomething relating to his Hiſtory; but they know nothing of it. *Catel*, his Country-man, knew him ſo little, that he made a pitiful (C) *Anachroniſm* ſpeaking of him. I cannot tell in what time *Du Pin* was made Biſhop of *Rieux*, nor when he died, I know only that he was in poſſeſſion of that Biſhoprick in 1530, and (D) that he was dead after the Year 1538.

---

* Dio lib. 54.

β Sueton. in Auguſto c. 45.

γ Macrob. Saturnal. l. 2. c. 7.

δ See the Rem. E. in the Art. Bathyllus.

ζ Nihil magis ratus magno duci convenire quam pro omnibus cogitare. Macrob. ib.

η Ap. Macrob. ib.

θ Xiphilin. in Trajan.

λ Id. in Did. Juliano.

‡ See Voſſius inſt. poet. l. 2. p. 184. *He refutes* Brodæus, *who ſays in his Notes upon the* Anthologia, *that there have been only two* Pantomimi *named* Pylades.

‡ *See Scaliger in Euſeb. p. 169. Salmaſ. in Vopiſc. p. 824. edit. in 8o.*

(*a*) Οὐ πάλαι ἀρξαμένη ἐς ποσοῦτον κάλλος ἐπιδέδωκε, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν Σεβαστὸν μάλιστα. *Lucian. ubi ſupra apud Salmaſium ib. p. 836.*

(*b*) *Macrob. Saturn. l. 2. c. 7.*

(*c*) *Sueton. in Aug. c. 45.*

(*d*) *I write this in the year 1696.*

(*e*) *See the Hiſtorical Letters of* March 1696. *p.* 288, 289. (*f*) *Fureteriana p. 72.* (*g*) *Macrob. ub. ſup.* (*h*) *Iſaacus Pontanus in illum locum Macrobii.*

(*i*) *Anthol. l. 4. c. 2, n. 8 p. m. 750.*

(*k*) *Lib. 4. variar.*

(*l*) *Dionyſ. l. 7. v. 13.*

(*m*) *Lib. de ſpectac.*

(*n*) *And not Peter as Moreri has it.*

(*o*) *Ex epitome Bibl. Geſneri p. 485. vel ex Voſſio de hiſt. Lat. p. 662.*

(*p*) *Du Verdier Vau-Privas in ſupplem. Epitomes Bibl. Geſner. p. 53.*

(*q*) *Id. ib.*

(*r*) *Eraſmus in Ciceroniano p. m. 74.*

PINEAU (*Severin*) in Latin *Pineus*, born at † *Chartres*, publiſhed at *Paris*, where he practiced Chirurgery, a Latin Book in 1593, which has been reprinted ſeveral times *. He treats of the Signs of a Maid's Virginity, which in all appearance has been the chief Cauſe of the Sale of that Book. 'Tis affirmed, that (T) the *German* Tranſlation of it, publiſhed at *Francfort* about the Beginning of the XVII. Century, was prohibited by the Magiſtrates: they did not approve that ſuch a Subject ſhould be treated in a Vulgar Language. The Author wrote his Book in *French* at firſt, and deſign'd to publiſh it in that (Z) Language; but when he ſaw that the Specimen, which he ſhewed to ſome Perſons, gave occaſion to ſeveral obſcene Reflections, or ſorry Jeſts, he reſolved to write only for Learned Men; and he put, at the End of his Preface, theſe Verſes of an Ancient ‡: *Odi profanum vulgus, & arceo: Favete linguis: carmina non prius Audita, Muſarum ſacerdos Virginibus pueriſque canto.*

Gabriel du **PINEAU**, in Latin *Pinellus*, Counſellor in the Preſidial of *Angers*, has been a famous Man. He died at *Angers* in the Year 1644, being in his 73 Year §.

PINET (*Antony du*) *Sieur de Norey*, lived in the XVI. Century, and (A) publiſhed many Books. He ‡ was of *Bezançon*, and he ſhewed by ſome of his Works, that he was zealous for the Proteſtant Religion. Which does chiefly appear

acceſſerit eloquentiæ neſcio. Fieri poteſt ut plus acceſſerit eruditionis quàm dignitatis.

(C) Catel . . . . *made a pitiful Anachroniſm.*] See in his Memoirs (a) concerning the Hiſtory of *Languedoc*, the Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Rieux*, and you'll find *John du Pin* two Degrees higher than *Peter Lewis de Valtan Biſhop of* Rieux *in the Year* 1515.

(D) *He was in poſſeſſion of that Biſhoprick in* 1530. . . . . *he was dead after the Year* 1538.] The firſt of theſe two Facts may be proved by a Letter (b) which *Sadoletus* wrote *Pino Rivenſi Epiſcopo* the 1ſt of *March* 1530. It contains ſeveral great Encomiums upon our *du Pin*, to whom the Author ſent a Copy of his firſt Production, which was a Commentary on the 90th Pſalm. I ſhall prove the ſecond Fact by ſome Verſes of *Hubert Suſſanneau in obitum Pini Rivorum Epiſc. cum interfuiſſet ejus funeri.* They are in the 41 *folio verſo* of the four Books *Ludorum* of that Author, of the *Paris* Edition, *apud Simonem Colinæum* 1538. *in* 8o. There we find that that Prelate was buried at *Toulouſe* with great Pomp.

(T) *'Tis affirmed that the* German *Tranſlation.*] I have found this Particularity in a Letter written to *Goldaſtus*, which is the 172d of the Collection printed at *Francfort* in 1688. One of his Friends, whoſe Name was *Segeth*, writing to him from *Hanaw* the 5th of *Auguſt* 1607, deſires him to buy that Tranſlation for him at any Rate, and he is ſo much the more deſirous to have it, becauſe he heard that it was prohibited. *Si in libellum quendam Severini* (c) *Pevini de dignoſcendis virginibus è Gallica in Germanicam linguam verſo incidas, eum mihi quocunque pretio compares, quod cum gratiarum actione reddetur. Audio illbic apud Spieſſium excuſum, & interdictum ejus venditione, quod fateor mihi calcar addidit ad poſcendum.*

(Z) *And deſigned to publiſh it in that Language, but when he ſaw.*] He had a good Intention: He deſign'd to do ſervice to the Judges, who found themſelves very often perplexed in ſome Cauſes, where Women were Plaintiffs, ſometimes becauſe they had their Virginity ſtill, ſometimes becauſe they had loſt it. In the firſt Caſe, a Woman complained of being married to an Impotent Man, and in the ſecond Caſe, of having been violated. Perhaps there was ſome Abuſe in thoſe two ſorts of Complaints, as well as in the Information of the Fact; for either the Judges and other Perſons appointed to ſearch and inſpect their Parts, were ignorant of Nature, or unfair in their Proceedings: and therefore *Pineau* thought himſelf obliged to impart his Diſcoveries to the Publick, and to make them intelligible to thoſe who underſtood not *Latin*; but he changed his Mind for ſome other Reaſons. Here are his Words. (d) *Te autem monitum volumus (amice lector) hoc opuſculum primum nos Gallicum feciſſe, ſicque in publicum proditurum decreviſſe ad eorum ſublevationem, qui judicibus & parentibus referre debent de conformatione naturali, aut vitiata pudendorum virginum nuptarum aut innuptarum, quarum hæ maximam vim à procis integritati ſuæ; ille vero nullam à maritis aut ſaltem ſponſis imbecillioribus & fatuis illatam fuiſſe conqueruntur. Sed cum primas delineationes quibuſdam expoſuiſſemus, cognoviſſemuſque horum alios ad laſciviam, alios ad vaniloquium & procacitatem potius quam ad fructum aliquem ex eo ſibi & reipublicæ utilem colligendum expetere, inſtituti noſtri rationem mutavimus, atque in ſermonem Latinum convertimus, philiatriſque ſolis & literatis hominibus devovimus Horatii exemplo impulſi* (e). Note, that his Book is divided into two Parts. He examines in the firſt Part, the Signs of Virginity, and he maintains in the ſecond, that there are two (f) Bones which part aſunder, when Women bring forth Children. He exhorts the Phyſitians and Surgeons to remember his Hypotheſis; either to facilitate the Disjunction of thoſe two Bones, or to rejoyn them when the Child is born. (g) *Propterea mulieres in utero habentes, & pueros adhuc in eo degentes ac ſtabulantes non ſic negligendos eſſe hortamur, ſed omni auxilio & arte juvandos, ut non minus ſaltem diligentes ſe præbuiſſe videantur Medici & Chirurgi in partibus dilatandis, per quas exit fœtus de utero matris, quam quum editus eſt, in iiſdem conſtringendis ſolliciti ſunt. Quod fit apte & convenienter, ſi medicamenta emollientia quæ voles formâ parata ſymphyſibus prædictorum oſſium pubis & ilium adhibita fuerint, ut natura docet, atque ipſamet quantum poteſt, præſtat. Quæ oſſa his in ſymphyſibus adeo vehementer conſtricta ſunt reliquo vitæ tempore, ut citius alibi, puta, in medio ſui frangerentur, quam à cauſa quadam procatarctica ab invicem diducerentur, quæ tamen tempore partus diſtrahuntur.*

(A) *And publiſhed many Books.*] The moſt conſiderable are only ſome *French* Tranſlations. I ſhall ſpeak of the beſt of 'em all in the laſt Remark of this Article. His other Tranſlations are that of (h) the third Part of the Letters of *Don Antonio de Guevara*, and that of a *Treatiſe* of the ſame *Guevara*, *concerning the Work and Priviledges of Galleys.* That of the (i) *Commentaries of* P. Andreas Matthiolus *upon the Hiſtory of Plants of* Pedacius Dioſcorides Anazarbeus, *Lyons in folio* (k) 1566. That *of the Secret Wonders of Nature, of* Levinus Lemnius, *a Phyſitian of* Zirickzee, *Lyons* (l) 1567. That of the *Common Places of the Holy Scripture, collected by* Wolfangus Muſculus *in* 66 *Titles, at* Geneva, *by* Euſtace Vignon, *in folio* 1577 (m). That of the *Tax of the Caſual Forfeitures*, &c. I ſhall ſpeak of it in the following Remark. Amongſt the Books of his own compoſing, there are ſome which treat of Controverſy, *the Conformity of the Reformed Churches of*

France,

---

† *Cenomanenſis, and not Carnotenſis, as in Draudius, or Carnutenſis, as in Lindenius renovatus.*

* *Lindenius renovatus mentions 8 Editions of it.*

‡ *Horace Od. 1. l. 3.*

§ *See* Menage, *Remarks on the Life of* William Menage *p.* 333. *where he gives a Catalogue of* Pineau's *Books that are publiſh'd or not publiſhed.*

‡ *La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Fran. p.* 19.

(a) *Pag.* 1035.

(b) *In the 4th Book of* Sadoletus's *Letters p.* 150. *Edit. Lugdun.* 1554. *in* 8.

(c) *Read* Pinæi.

(d) *Severin. Pinæus in præfat. ad Lector. p.* 22.

(e) *He places here the Verſes of* Horace, *which I have alledged at the end of the Text of this Article. The application of thoſe Verſes is agreeable to the Title of a Book* de Organis Generationis. *It has been intitled* Sacra Eleuſinia patefacta. *See the* Nouvel. de la Repub. des Lettres. *July* 1684. *p.* 535. *But obſerve that* Reunerus Rolfincius, *the Author of that Book, did not intitle it ſo. It was by a Bookſeller's Trick, that his Book came out as new under that Title, in the Year* 1684, *and without the Name of the Author.*

(f) Os Pubis *and* Os Ilium.

(g) *Id. ib. p.* 21, 22.

(h) *Du Verdier Vau-Privas Bibl. Franc. p.* 76. *who ſays that thoſe two Tranſlations were printed together at* Lyons *in* 4o. *in the Year* 1560.

(i) *Id. ib. p.* 78.

(k) *La Croix du Maine p.* 19.

(l) *Id. ib. p.* 20.

(m) *Du Verdier Vau-Privas ubi ſupra p.* 78.

pear from the Notes (B) which he added to the *French* Tranſlation of the Tax of

France, and of the Primitive Church in Policy and Ceremonies, Lyons 1564 in 8o (n). *Sermons upon the Revelation* (o). Here is a Book of another kind. (p) *Plans, Draughts and Deſcriptions of many Towns and Fortreſſes, as well in* Europe, Aſia *and* Africa, *as in the* Indies *and* America, *their Foundations, Antiquities, and Manner of Living: with many general and particular Maps*, &c. Lyons, *by* John d'Ogerolles *in the Year* 1564, *in folio*. See in the Remark C, a Critical Obſervation againſt that Compilation.

(B) *The Notes which he added to the* French *Tranſlation of the Tax of the Chancery of* Rome.] Here is the Title of the Book. *The Tax of the Caſual Forfeitures of the Pope's Shop*, in Latin *and* French, *with ſome Annotations taken from* Decrees, *Councils and Canons, either Ancient or Modern, for the Verification of the Diſcipline anciently obſerved in the Church, the whole inlarged and reviſed*. By A. D. P. The Epiſtle dedicated *To all faithful Chriſtians*, is dated from *Lyons* the 26th of *March* 1564. I ſhall tranſcribe a Paſſage out of it, that the Reader may judge of this Author's freedom of ſpeaking. " (q) " Which is the Reaſon why I have only ſet before " them the Aſſeſſment of their Souls, according to " the Rates which their Terreſtrial God has ſet upon " them: To the end, that ſeeing the Trade they " make of 'em, and of their Conſciences, and the " Tyranny they are reduced to, and how dangerous " it is, they may lift up their Eyes towards Heaven, and know at laſt how great is the Grace of " God to thoſe whom he delivers from ſuch a Slavery. And leſt any Dataries, Auditors, Bulliſts, " Copiſts, Expeditionary Bankers, and ſuch like, " ſhould fancy that this is a *quid pro quo*, I have truly " ſet down the *Latin* Text of the Tax of the Papal " Chamber, with the *French* Tranſlation, adding " ſome Annotations to it for the good of the Church. " For the Contents of the Text are ſo ſhameful and " deteſtable, that I muſt intreat you, my Brethren, " to forgive me for having dedicated it to ſo Holy " a Company as yours, amongſt whom nothing is to " be heard but Holy Songs, Pſalms and Praiſes to the " Lord our God. But it behoves us to ſhew a Villain " his Villany, and a Fool his Folly, leſt we ſhould be " thought to be like them. „ One may eaſily conjecture, that a Man who ſpeaks ſo in his preliminary Epiſtle, has expreſt himſelf very bluntly in his Gloſs upon a Text ſo liable to Invectives as that of the Tax of the *Roman* Chancery. I wiſh that all the Notes of *du Pinet* did not ſavour of Controverſie, and that he had explained certain ways of Speaking, which come in very often. But I fancy he was not verſed enough in the Canon Law, nor in the Style of the Court of *Rome*, to be able to clear ſuch an Obſcurity. He undertook in the Beginning of his Commentary, to ſhew the Price of every Tax, but he was forced to confeſs, that it was above his Capacity. No Reader can remain ſatisfied with what he ſays on that Subject. I ſhall convince you of it. The three ſorts of Money mentioned in that Apoſtolical Tarif of *Rome*, are *turonenſes*, *ducatus* and *Carlinus*. *Du Pinet* has rendred thoſe Words *Tournois d'Or*, *Ducat de Chambre* and *Carlin*; upon which he makes this Obſervation: (a) " As to the " *Gold Tournois*, ſome take it for a *Livre Pariſis*; " others ſay that it is an old Crown; others are of " Opinion, that it is worth a *Philippus*. In ſhort, I " have not hitherto found out any thing certain con" cerning that Money, tho' the *Tournois de Chambre* is " commonly worth a *Real*: a Ducat is worth a Piſtole and four pence *Tournois*: and a Carlin is " worth four pence. „ Thoſe who love to underſtand every thing they read, want a much better Explication than that; and it is certain that this was one of the Paſſages which the Author of the Notes ſhould have explained with the greateſt Clearneſs, if he could have done it. His Work was reprinted (b) at *Leyden* in the Year 1607. It was reprinted at *Amſterdam*, with a new Preface, in the Year 1700. The Author of that Preface tells us, that all poſſible care has been taken to reduce to our Money the Tournois, Ducats and Carlins, mentioned in the Tax of the Pope's Chancery; but that nothing could be found out to clear that Matter, and that if any Diſcovery be made about it hereafter, it ſhall be inſerted in a new Edition. He alledges what *du Pinet* has obſerved concerning the Value of thoſe three ſorts of Coins, and he adds, that the Author of the Notes upon the *Confeſſion of Sanci* aſſures, that there is at the end of the Book of the Taxes of the *Roman* Chancery, (c) *a Tarif which reduces the Groſs to four pence Tournois, the Ducat to forty pence, and the Carolus to eight Blanks*. The Author of thoſe Notes makes that Obſervation in his Commentary, upon a Part of this Paſſage of *d'Aubigne*. (d) " There is another Book which thoſe whom I mentioned before, " were very deſirous to deſtroy; but the Holy See " will never permit it. . . . . 'Tis the Book of Taxes, " wherein a good Catholick ſees a low Price ſet " upon Sins, and knows in a Moment what he is to " pay for them. He, who has deflowred a Virgin, " ſhall pay ſix Groſſes for it. Whoſoever has had " a Carnal Copulation (but with a mutual Conſent) " with his own Mother, Siſter, Couſin German, &c. let " him pay five Groſſes. But if it be known in the " Church, he ought to pay ſix. For having killed " one's Father or Mother, one Ducat, and five Carlins. „ Upon theſe Words *five Groſſes*, the Commentator ſays, that this is to be found in the 35th *folio verſo*. He means without doubt, the Edition mentioned by *d'Aubigne*, which is that of *Paris* (e) 1570, by *Touſſaint Denis*, in *St. James-Street*, at the *Wooden Croſs*, with this Title, *Cancellaria Apoſtolica*; for here is his Note upon theſe Words, *in the Book of Taxes*. " (f) *Taxa Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, & Taxa Pœnitentiariæ itidem Apoſtolicæ*, print" ed at *Paris* with the King's Licenſe for three " Years in 1520, by *Touſſaint Denis*, in St. *James-Street*, at the *Wooden Croſs*, having in the Frontiſpiece the Arms of the Scutcheon of *France*, " and thoſe of the Houſe of *Medicis*, of which *Leo* " X. was. „ He pretends that " That ſame Book " tranſlated into *French* in the Year 1564, by *Antony du Pinet*, reprinted in the ſame Year in 8o " at *Lyons*, by *John Saugrain*, and reprinted with " the (g) Latin at *Leyden* in 1607, with this Title, " *Taxe de Parties Caſuelles de la Boutique du Pape*, " is to be found among the condemned Anonymous " Authors of the Letter *A*, in the Catalogue of prohibited Books in 1625, by a *Mandamus* of the " Arch-Biſhop of *Paris*: and the Authors of that " Catalogue did not think it neceſſary to mention " the *Latin Gothick* Original; becauſe the Book of " *du Pinet* is written in *French*, and full of Annotations, wherein the Author pretends to ſhew a " great deal of Turpitude in the old Book of Taxes; " whereas, it may be thoſe Gentlemen believed " that the Original was no more to be found; and " beſides, they durſt not, without doubt, ſuppreſs " it, by reaſon of the two great Authorities where" with it is attended. I add, that the *Tax of the* " *Chancery*, &c. was reprinted in 1512. with the " Pragmatick Sanction. „ He will give me leave, I am ſure, to tell him, that the Book which *du Pinet* tranſlated, is not the ſame with the Book quoted by *d'Aubigne*. There is no Money call'd a *Groſs* in the Tax which *du Pinet* tranſlated and explained with Notes. The Chapter of *Perpetual Diſpenſations* mentioned by *d'Aubigne*, is not to be found in it, nor any thing concerning the Tax of thoſe who have committed Inceſt with their Mothers, Siſters, &c. But ſince the Author of the Notes affirms, that thoſe Men are only taxed five Groſſes, *folio* 36. *verſo*, we have reaſon to believe that *d'Aubigne* does not tell a Lye. How comes it therefore to paſs, that neither *du Pinet*, nor thoſe who reprinted his Tranſlation and his Commentary, knew that other Tax which is much more infamous than that which they took care to print? I very much wonder at it, and he is to blame for not ſaying what Edition he made uſe of. The Commentator of *d'Aubigne* gives us for the firſt Edition, that of *Paris* 1520. But I know that in 1664, *Stephen du Mont*, Bookſeller of *Boiſleduc*, put out in *Latin* and *Dutch* from an Edition of *Rome*, a Book intitled, *Taxa Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, & Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apoſtolicæ*, which he had compared Word for Word with his Edition of *Rome*; whereof a Secretary of the Town of *Boiſleduc* gave a Certificate, which is printed *pag.* 131. It is ſaid in the Preface, that this Book was printed at *Cologne* in 1515, *apud Goſuinum Colinium*. I know alſo, that a (h) Profeſſor of the Civil Law in the Univerſity of *Franeker*, publiſhed in 1651, with ſome Notes, *Taxa Cameræ Apoſtolicæ*, which differs from the Book printed at *Boiſleduc*.

If what *d'Aubigne* alledges, is really to be found in the Book of Taxes quoted by him, one may very well wonder how ſuch a Book came out, and how it of the Chancery of *Rome*. **He publiſhed ſome extravagant Notions concerning the Genealogy (C) of ſome Families. Of all his Works, the Tranſlation of *Pliny* (D) was moſt eſteemed.**

(n) Id. ib. p. 79.

(o) Id. ib. p. 75.

(p) Id. ib. p. 79.

(q) *Pinet Epiſt. Dedicat. of the* Taxe des Parties Caſuelles, &c.

(a) *Du Pinet*, Taxe des Parties Caſuelles, &c. p. 7.

(b) *Note, that the* Leyden *Edit. is not the ſame in every thing with the* Lyons *Edit.* 1564.

(c) *Note upon the* Confeſſion of Sanci, p. [illegible] *Edit.* 1693.

(d) *Confeſſion of* Sanci *l.* 2. *c.* 2. *p.* [illegible]

(e) *It ſeems to be a fault of the Print inſtead of* 1520.

(f) *Note upon the* Confeſſion of Sanci p. 100, 101.

(g) *The meaning of it is that the Edit. of* 1564. *did not contain the* Latin, *but it is certain that it did.*

(h) *Laurentius Banckius.*

P I N S-

it came to be authentically reprinted, even after it had afforded the Proteſtants the matter of ſo many Triumphs, I ſhall ſet down the reproachful Words of a Miniſter of *Paris* to the Biſhop of *Belley*. (i) “ I dare not ſay of this Book all that Dr. (1) *Eſpenſe* ſaid of it, even ſo as to apply theſe Words to it ;

“ *Proſtat & in quæſtu pro meretrice ſedet.*

“ Thoſe of your Communion are ſo far from being aſhamed of that Book, which invites Cuſtomers with ſound of Trumpet, that they ceaſe not to publiſh and expoſe it to Sale. I have ſeen three *Paris* Editions of it. The firſt came out in the Year 1520, and it has been often quoted by our Authors. The ſecond in the Year 1545 (2). And the third in the Year 1625, by that very Man who prints your Books (3). I have among my Books the Edition of 1520, and that which was publiſhed in our Time, in the Year 1625. I have compared them, and found 'em the ſame. But eſpecially theſe Words, which cry for Vengeance before God. *Et nota diligenter quod hujuſmodi gratiæ & diſpenſationes non conceduntur pauperibus, quia non ſunt, ideo non poſſunt conſolari.* That is to ſay, *And be ſure to obſerve* (and indeed the thing deſerves it) *that ſuch Graces and Diſpenſations are not granted to the Poor : for, becauſe they have not wherewithall to pay, they cannot be comforted.* Thoſe Words, I ſay, which are in *folio* 23 of the old Edition 1520, are alſo to be found *p.* 208. of the late Edition of 1625, and thoſe who have the Edition of the Year 1545, will find them *folio* 140. „

If any one had ask'd *d'Aubigne* how it came to paſs that the Court of *Rome*, ſo much cried down for her Covetouſneſs, taxed but 20 pence *Tournois* the worſt of Inceſts, he had without doubt anſwered, that a Seller who has ſome Wares which coſt him nothing, gets more by ſelling them at low Rates, becauſe he ſells a greater quantity of 'em upon that Account, and ſo he indemnifies himſelf by reaſon of the great number of Buyers who flock to him, moſt of whom could eaſily be without thoſe Wares, if they were exceſſively dear. But let no Body miſtake the matter : the Tax ſet down in that Book is not all that muſt be paid : One muſt beſides treat with a Datary, and compound with him according to one's Ability (*a*).

(C) *He publiſhed ſome extravagant Notions concerning the Genealogy of ſome Families.*] One of our beſt Hiſtoriographers ſpeaking of *Francis d'Agoult*, Count *de Sault*, (*b*) *the greateſt Lord of* Provence, *and one of the greateſt Captains in his Time*, and very much addicted to the Party of the *Huguenots*, *for which he was killed with* John d'Agoult, *his Brother*, *in the Battle of* St. Denys, in the Year 1567. That Hiſtoriographer, I ſay, making that Lord's Encomium, expreſſes himſelf thus : (*c*) “ He was Brave, Generous and Magnificent, and a Man of great Parts, he loved Learning, and it was out of (†) reſpect to him, that *Antony du Pinet S. de Noroy* collected in his Treatiſe of the Cities and Fortreſſes of the World, ſome trifling Traditions concerning the Origin of the Houſe of *Sault* ; to make a Romance of it leſs credible than the Apologues and the Converſations of Men with Beaſts, and by which the Reputation of that Author had been ruined, had he not maintained it by his Tranſlation of *Pliny*'s Works. I don't believe that Poetry would allow of ſuch Fictions, ſo wonderful and incredible this ſeems to be, as well as the Fable of *Berold* of *Saxony*, the pretended Anceſtor of the Dukes of *Savoy*, and of *Ferry Borſtelſtickel*, whom *Thevet* the Romancer makes the Head of the illuſtrious Houſe of the *Chabots* : and 'tis a ſtrange thing that ſome Daughters of Kings or Emperors, muſt loſe their Honour to lay the Foundation of a falſe Tranſmigration. All that can be ſaid to excuſe *du Pinet*, is, that he wrote in a time when Phantaſms were given for Anceſtors to thoſe, who having loſt the Memory of thoſe from whom they iſſued, afforded, in order to dreſs 'em up, ſome Traditions, and old Wives Tales, whereof Flatterers made ſome Myſteries with the Alluſions they look'd for in the Names and Arms of thoſe Families ; not knowing that Arms and Sirnames have their limited time, and not ſuſpecting that a knowing Age, ſuch as ours is, ſhould ſucceed an ignorant one, ſo as to penetrate into the foreign Countries, whither they went to look for the firſt Heros of every Race. He, whom *du Pinet* choſe for the Houſe of *Agoult*, is one *High* Prince of *Trie*, an imaginary State in *Pomerania*, whom his Bravery and Beauty made worthy of the Love of the Infanta *Valdegue*, Daughter of King *Valdegue* of *Pomerania*. He had a Son by her, whom that Princeſs, who was a Priſoner, letting down from a Window, to deliver him into the Hands of a Country-man, who was to carry him to his Nurſe, a She-Wolf came in of a ſuddain, who ſnatched him out of his Hands, and carried him to her Den with her young ones. She ſuckled him till the next Day, when the King finding her as he was a Hunting, purſued and killed her with her young ones, and found the Child wrapt up in a rich Cloth, whom he cauſed to be baptized, and having heard the Hiſtory of his Birth, he legitimated him by marrying his Daughter to Prince *Hugh*. She died a little while after, and the Prince went to make War againſt the *Grecians*, and married the Daughter of the Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, where he ſettled, and had many Children by her. *Wolf* of *Trie*, his Son by his firſt Marriage, ſo named in Memory of ſo wonderful an Accident, married *Sidrac*, Daughter of the King of *Ruſſia* ; and his eldeſt Son of the ſame Name having married a Princeſs of *Saxony*, came with *Berold* of *Saxony* to the Service of the King of *Arles* (of *Burgundy*) and conquered the Territory and Valley of *Sault* in *Provence*, where he built the Caſtle of *Agoult*, and his Poſterity took their Sirname from it, and left that of *Trie*. He adds, that the Country of *Sault* was infeoffed to him in the Year 1200. Here is a Hotch-potch of Hiſtory, Chronology and Coſmography, and the whole is grounded upon this, that the Arms of *Agoult* are, not a She-Wolf, as they ſhould have been, but a Wolf with the Marks of his *Maſculinity*, and that ſome of that Houſe took in their Latin Titles, the ſeveral Sirnames *de Agoult* and *de Tritis*, becauſe of the Mannor of *Trez*, an ancient Lot of the Viſcounts of *Marſeilles*, which fell unto them by a Marriage. „

This is not the only Place, where *le Laboureur* inveighs with great Reaſon againſt the abſurd Impertinences of the Genealogiſts. See *p.* 801. of the 1. *Tom.* of his Additions to *Caſtelnau*'s Memoirs, and you'll ſee that *du Cheſne* has undeceived the Houſe of *Rochefoucaut*, (*with Honour to that Houſe as well as to himſelf*) *as to the ſilly and fooliſh Impoſtures of Brother* Stephen de Luſignan, *who derives more Tribes from his* (*d*) Melluſine, *than God promiſed* Abraham. See alſo *p.* 559. of the 2d *Tom.* where he ſays, “ That in 1560, *Renatus de Sanzay* compiled with *John le Feron*, King at Arms of *France*, that Genealogy of the Houſe of *Sanzay*, made up of near fifty Degrees of Generation, moſt of them quoted Year by Year, with the Names, Sirnames and Arms of the Women, and all thoſe Names, Families and Arms are true Phantaſms. . . . . Brother *Stephen de Luſignan*, a Friar, having had that fine peice of Work imparted to him, made uſe of it to build his Romance of the 67 Illuſtrious Houſes ſprung from that of *Luſignan*, more incredible ſtill than that of *Melluſine* ; out of whoſe Tub, as out of a publick Fountain, he let out the Nobility and Blood of *Luſignan* to any that was ambitious of it. „ See the Margin (*e*).

(D) *The Tranſlation of* Pliny.] I believe that the firſt Edition of it is of the Year 1562, *Lyons*, in 2 Vol. in Folio. *Du Verdier Vau-Privas* mentions none but that of the Year 1566, *Lyons*, by *Claudius Senneton*. I make uſe of the fourth, printed at *Paris* 1608, by *John Houzé*. It may be ſaid without flattering *du Pinet*, that he deſerved great Praiſes on account of that Tranſlation. He took great pains about it, he conſulted the Ancient MSS. and the old Editions of *Pliny* ; he corrected and compared

with

(i) *Drelincourt*, Reply to the Anſwer of the Bp. of *Belley pag.* 570, 571.

(1) In Epiſt. ad Titum c. 1. Digreſ. 2. *See p.* 479. *of the Paris Edit.* 1619.

(2) *Apud Galeotum a Prato.*

(3) *Apud Gervaſium Alliot.*

(*a*) *See the Rem.* C *in the Art.* Parrhaſius.

(*b*) *Le Laboureur, Addit. to the Memoirs of* Caſtelnau *tom.* 2. *p.* 511.

(*c*) *Id. ib.*

(†) *I fancy that this Count* de Sault *was one of thoſe whom* du Pinet *means in his Preface to* Pliny's *Tranſlation, when he ſays,* for fifteen Months that I have been labouring hard *at this Tranſlation*, I have been often ſick, and charged with ſome Affairs for the Service of ſome great Lords to whom I am devoted.

(*d*) *See what he ſays of* Melluſine *ib. p.* 702, 703.

(*e*) *At that time, ſays* le Laboureur, *p.* 420 *of the* 2 *Tom. they had not the Method of drawing up Genealogies upon Deeds and Records, they were contented with Traditions, and old Womens Stories, to ſupply the Defect of Memory : they ſcarce knew their Grand-Fathers by Rules, and above that they received for true whatever was vented by ſome falſe Antiquarians, and downright Viſionaries, ſuch as* John le Maire de Belges, *Author of the Romance intitled* Le Chevalier du Cygne, *compoſed in the behalf of the Houſe of* Cleves, Forcatel, *a Civilian, Author of the* Montmorency Gaulois, *Brother* Stephen *de* Luſignan, *a great Impoſtor, and* John le Feron, *whom I ſhall only charge with Credulity, who as a King at Arms, ſuffered his Name to be put to many falſe Genealogies, as did in his imitation* Bernard de Girart *Sieur* du Haillan, *a Genealogiſt of the Order of the* Holy Ghoſt.

PINSSON (*Francis*) Professor of Law at *Bourges*, was installed in that Employment on the 8th of *February* 1611. He had already taught for some time the *Institutes* in that City. He was so exact in the Exercise of his Profession, that he never failed to make his Lectures, and rather than miss any of them, he often came from his Country-House, which was five Leagues off, to be in the Auditory at the very same Hour he was expected there. He taught the Canon-Law for a long time, and he had always five or six hundred Scholars. He died at *Bourges* in the Year 1643, being 63 Years of Age. His first Wife was *Mary Bengy*, Daughter (*A*) of *Antony Bengy*, of whom I shall speak in the Remarks, and his second Wife was *N. d'Amours*: He had no Children but by his first Wife. We may expect the * Publication of what he dictated in the Schools of *Bourges* in the Year 1615, *ad Philippi Imperatoris rescripta*, and his Commentary on the Epistles of Pope *Honorius* III. and his Funeral Oration pronounced at the opening of the Schools of *Bourges* in the Year 1643, by Mr. *de Roye*, who was afterwards Professor of Law at *Angers* †.

PINSSON (*Francis*) Son of the foregoing, was born at *Bourges*, the 5th of *April* 1612, and having finished his Studies there, and taken his Degrees, he came to *Paris*, where he was admitted a Lawyer the 5th of *November* 1633. He applied himself to the *Chatelet* at first, and afterwards to the *Palace*, where he had a great deal of Practice, especially in what relates to Beneficial Matters. He published several Books on that Subject. See underneath the Catalogue (*B*) of all the Books he printed, from which you may rightly conclude that he was a Man of great Capacity,

with them, what he wrote; he made a great many Marginal Annotations; he drew up two large Indexes; he composed *a Treatise of ancient Weights and Measures, reduced to the* French, and prefixed it to his Translation: which required abundance of Time. I know he has committed a great many Faults, some whereof are very absurd. "He (*f*) made two *Roman* Gentlemen of two sorts of Marble, the one "called *Lapis Numidicus*, and the other *Sinandicus*: "'tis in the *1st Chap.* of the 45th Book." He who has afforded me that Remark, adds, *that he has observed a great number of other Faults in that Author, whose Work is notwithstanding very useful.* Any one that has never so little Equity, and knows the Difficulty of the Undertaking, will be much more disposed to praise that Author, by reason of so many Passages which he has happily translated, than to despise him by reason of his Over-sights. Read his Preface, and you'll see that he knew very well where the Difficulty lay, and what helps were necessary for such an Undertaking.

(*A*) *Daughter of* Antony Bengy.] *Antony Bengy*, Esq; *Sieur de Puy-Vallée*, was called from the Bar, being 26 Years of Age, to succeed *Cujas* in the Profession of the Law at *Bourges*, in the Year 1595. He exercised it with great diligence till the Year 1616, wherein he died. He had once two thousand Scholars. He dictated, amongst other things, the Treatise concerning Benefices, as far as the 4th Chap. *de oneribus & immunitatibus Ecclesiarum.* I shall speak (*g*) of it. He was made *Echevin* of *Bourges* in the Years 1603 and 1604. The Discourse he made, when he began his Lectures in the Year 1600, was printed in the same Year at *Bourges*, with this Title, *Concio funebris in memoriam defuncti Joannis Mercerii Juris utriusque Doctoris in Schola Biturigum* (*h*). He is the Author of an Epitaph of *Cujas*, which is to be found only in the Collection of the *Priviledges and Antiquities of* Bourges, *by* John Chenu, but not in the last Collection of the Works of *Cujas* in ten Volumes, made by Mr. *Fabrot*. In the Year 1614, he made an Epitaph for the Marshal *de la Châtre*, which was never printed. Note, that he had been a Counsellor in the Provostship of *Bourges*. He left among other Children a Son, who was Counsellor and the King's Advocate in the *Presidial* of *Bourges*, and then the King's Advocate in the Court of the *Finances*, and who married in the Year 1618. *Frances Chenu*, Daughter of *John Chenu*, a famous Lawyer, who has writ many Books (*a*).

(*B*) *The Catalogue of all the Books he printed.*] It appears to me to be so well done, that I shall give it as I have received it. "The first Book which "*Francis Pinsson* published, is his Treatise of Eccle-"siastical Benefices in *Latin*, which he finished af-"ter the Death of Mr. *Bengy* his Grand-Father by "the Mother's side; which is the Reason why the "Title of that Book runs thus: *Antonii Bengii in Alma "Biturigum Academia Antecessoris primicerii, & Fran-"cisci Pinssonii Parisiensis Advocati ejusdem ex filia "Nepotis Tractatus de Beneficiis Ecclesiasticis ex defi-"nitione desumptus ad usum fori Gallici & libertatum "Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ accommodatus, Parisiis sumptibus "Antonii de Sommaville* 1654. *in folio.* dedicated to "the First President *de Bellievre.* He has revi-"sed, corrected, and considerably inlarged that "Work, which is ready to be printed, having ob-"tained a Licence for it from the Chancellor. He "printed in 1663 in 4to *Sancti Ludovici Francorum "Regis Pragmatica Sanctio, & in eam historica præ-"fatio & Commentarius*, dedicated to the King. In "1666, he published that of *Charles* VII. with this "Title: *Caroli Septimi Francorum Regis Pragmatica "Sanctio cum glossis Domini Cosmæ Guymier Parisini su-"premæ Galliarum curiæ Senatoris, & Inquisitionum "præsidis, & additionibus Philippi Probi Biturici ad "Pragmaticæ Sanctionis & Concordatorum dissidia com-"ponenda; accedunt historia Pragmaticæ Sanctionis & "Concordatorum, annotationes marginales, & veterum "instrumentorum supplementa, opera & studio Francisci "Pinssonii Biturici Advocati Parisiensis, Parisiis apud "Franciscum Clouzier* 1666. *in folio*, dedicated to the "King. He answered, in 1674, some Treatises, "which came out at that time under the Title of "*L'Abbé Commendataire*, a Work in 2 little Vo-"lumes, in 12. printed at *Cologne*, by *Nicolas Schou-"ten* in 1673, one under the Name of the *Sieur des "Bois*, Doctor of Law, who is thought to be *Dom "Gabriel Gerberon*, a *Benedictin* Monk, and the se-"cond Part in 1674, under the Name of the *Sieur "Fromont*, done, as it is said, by *Dom .... Delfau*, "another *Benedictin*. That Answer was never prin-"ted: it will be inserted in the new Edition of his "Treatise concerning Beneficial Matters. In 1668, "on the 18th of *December*, he wrote a Consultati-"on, printed since in his second Volume of his "Treatise concerning the *Regalia*, to shew that the "King, by virtue of the Treaty of Peace of *Aix la "Chapelle*, containing the Cession of the City of "*Ath*, has a good Claim to the strong Place of *Conde*, "as being a Dependency of the *Chatelleny* of "*Ath*. He made another since, on the 17th of *June* "1669, printed in the same Place, which is a Con-"tinuation of the foregoing, wherein he shews, "that the Additions made to the Town of *Conde* "ought to belong to the King, as the Body of the "Place. In the Year 1673, he published some Sum-"mary Notes upon the *Indults* granted to the King, "printed in 2 Vol. in 12. by *Charles de Sercy*, and "dedicated to the King. In the Year 1681 he print-"ed his Notes on the Body of the Canon-Law, "which are to be found among the Works of *Charles "du Moulin*, in the 4th Vol. of this last Edition, "with this Title, *Francisci Pinssonii Biturici Parisien-"sis Advocati Manuale juris Pontificii Cæsarei & Gal-"lici, compactum ex annotationibus Caroli Molinæi ad "jus Pontificium sive Canonicum; adversariis Gabrielis "*(*d*) *du Pineau Senatoris Andegavensis ad Molinæa-"nas annotationes, animadversionibusque ejusdem Pins-"sonii ad utrumque; in quibus jus quotidianum & fo-"rense exhibetur ex libertatum Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ the-"siori penu: constitutionum Regiarum tùm antiquiorum, "tùm recentiorum inexhausto fonte, & superiorum Gal-"liæ tribunalium decretorio stylo.* Those Notes are "dedicated to Mr. *Colbert*, *in folio*, *Paris*, for *Gui-"gnard*, &c. Finally, In the Year 1688, his singular "Treatise concerning the *Regalia*, (*e*) or the King's "Rights

---

* *Mr. Pinsson des Riollet, his Grand-Son designs to publish it.*

† *Taken from a MS. Memorial.*

(*f*) *La Mothe le Vayer, hexamer. rustiq. p.m.* 30.

(*g*) *In the Rem. B. of the next Art. in the Title of the first Book published by* Francis Pinsson *the Lawyer.*

(*h*) *That Funeral Oration was printed with* honestorum virorum lamenta Latinis Græcis & Gallicis versibus scripta: *which makes in all 38 pages in 4o.*

(*a*) *Taken from a MS. Memorial.*

(*d*) *'Tis he whom I have mentioned before, p.* 2615.

(*e*) *See an Abstract of it in the Journal of* Leipsick *in the* 1. *tom. of the Supplem. p.* 570. *& seq.*

Capacity and Reputation. He was *Batonnier* (C) of the Society of the Lawyers and Attorneys of the Parliament in 1681, and was made one of the 24 Honorary Doctors of the Faculty of Law at *Paris*, in the room of Mr. *Boſeiger*, the 25th of *February* 1688. He died Sub-Dean of the Society of the Lawyers, the 10th of *October* 1691, being above 79 Years old, and was buried at St. *Stephen du Mont*. He left many Children ‡, and amongſt others, Mr. *Pinſſon des Riolles*, a Lawyer in the Parliament of *Paris*, a Man of Merit, and very well known to the Learned, and one of the moſt officious Friends that can be ſeen. He is writing, amongſt other things, the Lives of the Profeſſors of *Bourges*.

PYRRHO, a *Greek* Philoſopher, born at *Elis* in *Peloponneſus*, was a Diſciple of *Anaxarchus*, and accompanied him as far as *India* β. He followed, without doubt, *Alexander the Great*, from whence one may know in what time he flouriſhed. He had γ been a Painter before he applied himſelf to the Study of Philoſophy. His Opinions did not differ much from (A) thoſe of *Arceſilaus*; for he did almoſt teach, as well as he, the Incomprehenſibility of all Things. He found ſome Reaſons to affirm and deny every thing; and therefore he ſuſpended his Aſſent after he had well examined the Arguments *pro* and *con*, and reduced all his Concluſions to a *non liquet, let the Matter be further enquired into.* Hence it is that he ſought Truth as long as he lived, but he ſo contrived the Matter, as never to grant that he had found it. Tho' he is not the Inventer of that Method of Philoſophizing, yet it goes by his Name: the Art of Diſputing about every thing, without doing any thing elſe but ſuſpending one's Judgment, is called *Pyrrhoniſm*: 'tis its moſt common Name. It is not without Reaſon deteſted (B) in the Schools of Divinity, where

‡ Taken from the ſame Memorial.

β Diog. Laert. in Pyrrhone l. 9. init. n. 61.

γ Id. ib.

(f) The Journaliſts of Leipſick excuſe themſelves for not giving an Abſtract of that part of Work, and give a very good Reaſon for it: quia, ſay they, ib. p. 574. nec res nec verba facile intelligi poſſunt ab iis qui extra Galliam vivunt, & tabem illam fori Eccleſiaſtici, liteſque innumeras, ut & diſſenſiones ignorant quæ non ſolum inter partes fervent, ſed & ſæpe inter Parlamentum & Tribunal regium.

“ Rights over Eccleſiaſtical Benefices, and dedicated to the King, was printed for *John Guignard* and *Antony Dezallier*, in 2 Vol. in 4to. He added to that Work the Conference about the Edict of the *Controll*, and the Declaration of Eccleſiaſtical Inſinuations (f), with many other Inſtructions concerning Beneficial Matters, dedicated to the Advocate-General *de la Moignon*, and to Mr. *de la Moignon de Baſville*, Intendant of *Languedoc*. He has alſo had a Hand in the Edition of the Works of *Antony Mornac*, printed in 4 Vol. in *folio*, for *Antony de Sommaville*, in the Year 1654, and in the two laſt Editions of *Charles du Moulin*'s Works. He made alſo ſome Remarks upon a Book of Mr. *du Bois*, Advocate in Parliament, intitled *Maxims of the Canon-Law*, which have been publiſhed with that Book ſeveral times, for *John Guignard*, in 2 Vol. in 12. in 1678, 1684, &c. by *Denis Simon*, Counſellor in the *Preſidial*, and Aſſeſſor in the *Marſhalſey* of *Beauvais* (g). „

(C) *He was* Batonnier *of the Society of the Lawyers.*] I ſhall ſet down here the Explication of the Word *Batonnier*, for the ſake of thoſe who ſhall read this without having *Furetiere*'s Dictionary. (h) “ *Baſtonnier* is a Law-term, and ſignifies an ancient Lawyer, who is choſen every Year according to Seniority, to be the Head of the Society of Lawyers and Attorneys, to be Maſter of their Chappel and Fraternity, and to preſide when they meet for the maintaining of the Diſcipline of the Palace, and of the Regulations. To him alſo belongs the Commiſſion of the Places of Inferior Judges, when they are interdicted. „

(A) *Did not differ much from the Opinions of* Arceſilaus.] Did I follow punctually *Aſcanius Abderita*, I ſhould ſay that there was no difference between thoſe two Philoſophers. (a) Γενναιότατα δοκεῖ φιλοσοφῆσαι τὸ τῆς ἀκαταληψίας καὶ ἐποχῆς εἶδος εἰσαγαγών, ὡς Ἀσκάνιος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης φησί. *Nobiliſſimè philoſophiam tractaſſe videtur, commentus modum quo de omnibus nihil decerneret, neque quicquam comprehendi poſſe diceret, ut Aſcanius Abderites auctor eſt.* This is poſitively to affirm, that according to *Pyrrho*, the Nature of things is incomprehenſible: now this was the Doctrine of *Arceſilaus*. Nevertheleſs, I had rather acknowledge that there was ſome difference between them, becauſe *Pyrrhoniſm* does not formally ſuppoſe Incomprehenſibility. They were called (b) *Scepticks, Zeteticks, Ephecticks, Aporeticks*, that is to ſay, *Examinators, Inquirers, ſuſpending and doubting Men.* Which ſhews, that they ſuppoſed that it was poſſible to find out Truth, and that they did not poſitively affirm that it was Incomprehenſible. We find in *Aulus Gellius*, that they condemned thoſe who affirm that it is Incomprehenſible; and therein, ſays he, lies the difference between the *Pyrrhoniſts* and (c) *Academicks*: in every thing elſe they were perfectly alike, and they gave one another the above-mentioned (d) Names. (e) *Cum hæc autem conſimiliter tam Pyrrhonii dicant quàm Academici; differre tamen inter ſeſe & propter alia quædam, & vel maximè propterea exiſtimati ſunt, quod Academici quidem ipſum illud nihil poſſe comprehendi, quaſi comprehendunt; & nihil poſſe diſcerni, quaſi diſcernunt: Pyrrhonii ne id quidem ullo pacto videri verum dicunt, quod nihil eſſe verum videtur.* Sextus Empiricus (f) found another difference between 'em; *Arceſilaus* pretended, that the ſuſpenſion of the Mind was naturally Good, and Affirmation naturally Evil; but according to *Pyrrho*, they were only ſo in appearance, οὐ κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον, *non ſecundum naturam, ſed ſecundum id quod apparet.* After all, the one was not more for Doubting than the other, and there was nothing more eaſie than to reconcile them. They ſhould only have been deſired to expreſs themſelves more clearly and ſincerely (g).

(B) *It is not without Reaſon deteſted in the Schools of Divinity, where it endeavours.*] *Pyrrhoniſm* is dangerous with reſpect to that Divine Science; but it is not very dangerous with reſpect to Natural Philoſophy or the State. There is no great harm in ſaying, that the Souls of Men are too narrow to diſcover any thing in Natural Truths, in the Cauſes which produce Heat, Cold, the Flux of the Sea, &c. It is enough for us to endeavour to find out ſome probable Hypotheſes, and to make a Collection of Experiments; and I am ſure that there are very few good Philoſophers in our Age, but are convinced, that Nature is an impenetrable Abyſs, and that its Springs are known to none, but to the Maker and Director of them. So that all thoſe Philoſophers are, in that reſpect, *Academicks* and *Pyrrhoniſts*. The Civil Life needs not be afraid of it; for the *Scepticks* did not deny, (h) but that Men ought to conform to the Cuſtoms of their Country, and practiſe Moral Duties, and reſolve upon thoſe things from a probable Reaſon, without ſtaying for Certainty. They might ſuſpend their Judgment upon this Queſtion, Whether ſuch a Duty was naturally and abſolutely Lawful; but they did not ſuſpend it upon this Queſtion, Whether it was to be practiſed on ſuch and ſuch an Occaſion. From whence it follows, that *Pyrrhoniſm* is only dangerous to Religion; for it ought to be grounded upon Certainty: the Deſign, and the Effects, and Uſe of Religion vaniſh away, as ſoon as the firm Perſuaſion of its Truth is blotted out of the Mind. But on the other ſide, we need not be uneaſie at it; there was never, and there will never be, but a ſmall number of Men capable of being deceived by the Arguments of the *Scepticks*. The Grace which God beſtows upon the Faithful, the force of Education in other Men, and, if you will, (i) Ignorance, and the natural Inclination Men have to be peremptory, are an impenetrable Shield againſt the Darts of the *Pyrrhoniſts*, tho' that Sect fancies it is now more formidable than it was anciently. Let us ſee upon what Grounds they build ſuch a ſtrange Pretenſion.

About two Months ago a Learned Man gave me a full Account of a Conference at which he had been preſent. Two Abbots, one whereof had but common Learning, the other was a good Philoſopher, grew ſo hot by Degrees in their Diſpute, that they

(g) Taken from the ſame MS Memorial.

(h) See the Word Baſtonnier in Furetiere's Dictionary.

(a) Diog. Laert. l. 9. n. 61.

(b) See aſſendus, libro œmiali Philoſo- ia univerſè cap. p.m. 24. e alſo usGel- ub. inf.

Viz. ſe of the Academy nded by ceſilaus

Aulus lius l. c. 5.

Id. ib.

(f) See Voſſius de Philoſophorum ſectis, p. 107.

(g) See the Paſſage of Ariſtocles ap. Euſebium præpar. Evangelic. l. 14. quoted by Voſſius ib. p. 106.

(h) See Diog. Laert. at the end of Pyrrho's Life.

(i) 'Tis a Saying of Simonides thoſe Men are not ſubtle enough to be deceived by ſuch a one as I am. Balzac ſaid the ſame thing of the Maids of his Village. Ageſilaus complained that he had to do with Enemies who underſtood not the War, his Stratagems were uſeleſs, he could not deceive unexperienced Troops. See Plutarch in his Life towards the end.

where it endeavours to get a New, tho' a Chimerical Strength; but it may be of uſe

were like to fall out in earneſt. The firſt had ſaid ſomewhat coldly, that he did forgive the Heathen Philoſophers, their floating in the uncertainty of their Opinions; but that he could not apprehend how there could be any *Pyrrhoniſts* under the Light of the Goſpel. To which the other anſwered, You are in the wrong to reaſon in ſuch a manner. If *Arceſilaus* ſhould return into the World, and was to Diſpute with our Divines, he would be a thouſand times more formidable than he was to the Dogmatiſts of *Old Greece*; the Chriſtian Theology would afford him ſome inſoluble Arguments. All the Aſſiſtants heard this with great ſurprize, and deſired the Abbot to explain himſelf, and doubted not but he had vented a Paradox which would turn to his Confuſion. He anſwered thus, applying himſelf to the firſt Abbot. I will not make uſe of the Advantages which the New Philoſophy gives to the *Pyrrhoniſts*. The Name of *Sextus Empiricus* was ſcarce known in our Schools; what he propoſed with ſo great Subtilty concerning Suſpenſion, was not leſs unknown there, than the *Terra Auſtralis*, when *Gaſſendus* (k) gave an Abridgment of it, which opened our Eyes. *Carteſianiſm* has put the laſt Hand to the Work, and none among good Philoſophers doubts now whether the *Scepticks* were in the right to maintain, that the Qualities of Bodies which ſtrike our Senſes, are only meer Appearances. Every one of us may ſay, *I feel heat by a Fire*, but not *I know that Fire is ſuch in itſelf as it appears to me.* Such was the Style of the ancient *Pyrrhoniſts*. But now the New Philoſophy ſpeaks more poſitively: Heat, Smell, Colours, *&c.* are not in the Objects of our Senſes; they are only ſome Modifications of my Soul; I know that Bodies are not ſuch as they appear to me. They were very willing to except Extenſion and Motion, but they could not do it; for if the Objects of our Senſes appear to us coloured, hot, cold, ſmelling, tho' they are not ſo, why ſhould they not appear extended and figured, at reſt and in motion, tho' they had no ſuch thing (l). Nay, the Objects of my Senſes cannot be the cauſe of my Senſations: I might therefore feel Cold and Heat, ſee Colours, Figures, Extenſion and Motion, tho' there was not one Body in the World. I have not therefore one good (m) Proof of the Exiſtence of Bodies. The only Proof they can give me for it, is, (n) that God ſhould deceive me, if he imprinted in my Soul the Idea's I have of Body, if there were no Bodies; but that Proof is too weak; it proves too much. Ever ſince the beginning of the World all Men, except, perhaps, one in two hundred Millions, do firmly believe that Bodies are coloured, and yet 'tis a Miſtake. I aſk, whether God deceives Men with reſpect to thoſe Colours? If he deceives them in that reſpect, what hinders but he may deceive them with reſpect to Extenſion. This latter Illuſion will not be leſs innocent nor leſs conſiſtent than the former, with the moſt perfect Being. If he does not deceive them with reſpect to Colours, 'tis without doubt becauſe he forces them not to ſay, *thoſe Colours exiſt out of my Soul*, but only, *it appears to me that there are ſome Colours there.* The ſame may be ſaid with reſpect to Extenſion. God does not force you to ſay, that *it does exiſt*, but only to judge that you feel it, and that it appears to you to exiſt. A *Carteſian* can as readily ſuſpend his Judgment about the Exiſtence of Extenſion, as a Peaſant affirm that the Sun ſhines, that the Snow is white, &c. And therefore if we are miſtaken in affirming the exiſtence of Extenſion, God will not be the Cauſe of it, ſince you acknowledge that he is not the Cauſe of that Peaſant's Error. Such are the Advantages which the New Philoſophers would procure to the *Pyrrhoniſts*, but I will not take hold of 'em.

Immediately the ſame Abbot, who was a Philoſopher, declared to the other, that if he would have the better of a *Sceptick*, he muſt before all things, prove, that Truth may certainly be known by ſome Marks. They are commonly called *Criterium veritatis*. You'll have Reaſon to maintain againſt him, That Evidence is a certain Character of Truth, for if Evidence was not that Character, we ſhould have none. Let it be ſo, will he ſay, 'tis what I'd have you be at: I'll ſhew you ſeveral things of the greateſt Evidence, which you reject as falſe. I. It is evident, that (a) things which do not differ from a third, do not differ from each other: 'tis the baſis of all our Reaſonings, all our Syllogiſms are grounded upon it; nevertheleſs we are aſſured by the Revelation of the Myſtery of the Trinity, that it is a falſe Axiom. You may invent as many Diſtinctions as you pleaſe, but you'll never be able to ſhew, that that Maxim is not contradicted by that Great Myſtery. II. It is evident, that there is no difference between *Individuum*, *Nature* and *Perſon*: nevertheleſs, the ſame Myſtery has convinced us, that Perſons may be multiplied, and that *Individuums* and Natures will not ceaſe for all that to be one. III. It is evident, that for a Man to be really and perfectly a Perſon, it is enough to unite together a humane Body and a reaſonable Soul. But the Myſtery of the Incarnation has taught us, that this is not ſufficient. From whence it follows that neither you nor I can be ſure whether we are Perſons; for if it was eſſential to a humane Body and a reaſonable Soul united together to conſtitute a Perſon, God could never do the contrary: We muſt therefore ſay, that Perſonality is merely accidental to them. But every Accident may be ſeparated from its Subject in ſeveral manners; God therefore may hinder us ſeveral ways from being Perſons, tho' we are made up of a Body and a Soul: and can any one aſſure us, that he does not make uſe of ſome ſuch means to ſtrip us of our Perſonality? Is he obliged to reveal to us the ſeveral ways he diſpoſes of us? IV. It is evident, that a humane Body cannot be in ſeveral Places at one time, and that its Head cannot be penetrated, with all its other parts, under an indiviſible Point; nevertheleſs, the Myſtery of the Euchariſt (†) teaches us, that thoſe two things happen every Day: from whence it follows, that neither you nor I can be ſure whether we are diſtinguiſhed from other Men, and whether we are not at this very Moment in the *Seraglio* of *Conſtantinople*, in *Canada*, and in *Japan*, and in every Town of the World, under ſeveral Circumſtances in each Place. Would God, who does nothing in vain, create many Men, when one Man only created in many Places, and cloathed with ſeveral Qualities, may ſuffice? That Doctrine deprives us of the Truth, we find in Numbers; for we know no longer what Two or Three are; we know not what Identity and Diverſity are. If we judge that *John* and *Peter* are two Men, 'tis only becauſe we ſee them in diſtinct Places, and becauſe the one has not the Accidents of the other. But that Ground of Diſtinction becomes null from the Doctrine of the Euchariſt. It may be that there is but one Creature in the World multiplied in ſeveral Places by Production, and by the diverſity of Qualities: we caſt up long Accounts in Arithmetick, as if there were many things diſtinct (b); but this is only a vain Imagination. We are not only ignorant whether there are two Bodies in the World; but we do not ſo much as know whether there is a Body and a Spirit: for if Matter is penetrable, 'tis plain that Extenſion is only an Accident of the Body, and ſo the Body according to its Eſſence, is a Subſtance not extended: it is therefore capable of all the Attributes which we conceive in a Spirit, as the Underſtanding, the Will, the Paſſions, and the Senſations: ſo that we are left without any Rule whereby we may diſcern whether a Subſtance is Spiritual by its Nature, or whether it be Corporeal. V. It is evident, that the Modes of a Subſtance cannot ſubſiſt without the Subſtance, which they modifie; but the Myſtery of (‡) Tranſubſtantiation has taught us that this is falſe. All our Idea's are confounded by it; we can no more define a Subſtance: for if an Accident can ſubſiſt without any Subject, a Subſtance may in its turn ſubſiſt dependently upon another Subſtance, as Accidents do: a Spirit may ſubſiſt after the manner of Bodies, as in the Euchariſt, Matter exiſts after the manner of Spirits: the latter may be impenetrable, as Matter is penetrable in the Euchariſt. Now if by coming from the Darkneſs of Paganiſm to the Light of the Goſpel, we have learned the falſity of ſo many evident Notions, and of ſo many (c) certain Definitions, what will it be when we ſhall come from the Darkneſs of this Life to the Glory of Heaven? Is it not likely that we ſhall then learn the falſity of a thouſand things which appear to us undeniable? Let us make a good uſe of the Raſhneſs of thoſe who lived before the Goſpel, and who affirmed that ſome evident Doctrines were true, the Falſity whereof has been revealed to us by the Myſteries of our Theology.

(k) *In his Book de fine Logicæ, c. 3. p. 72. & ſeq. of the 1. Vol. of his* **Works**, *Lyons 1658.*

(l) *The Abbot Foucher propoſed this Objection in his Refutation of the* Search of Truth. *Father* Mallebranche *made no anſwer to it. He was ſenſible that it is a ſtrong Objection. See the following Citation.*

(m) *F.* Mallebranche *ſhews in one of his Explications of ſome Paſſages of the* Search of Truth, That it is very difficult to prove the Exiſtence of Bodies, and that nothing but Faith can convince us that ſome Bodies do really exiſt.

(n) *See the 28 Chap. of Mr.* Arnaud's *Treatiſe* concerning true and falſe Idea's, *where he refutes the abovementioned Explication of F.* Mallebranche, *by ſome Reaſons taken from this Principle.*

(a) Quæ ſunt idem uni tertio ſunt idem inter ſe.

(†) *Note, that this is the Diſcourſe of an Abbot. I am obliged to give the Reader notice of this in this 2. Edit. becauſe I know that ſeveral Perſons of the Proteſtant Religion have been offended to ſee the Myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation parallell'd with the Doctrines of the Real Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.*

(b) *Note, that if a Body may be produced in ſeveral Places, any other Being, Spirit, Place, Accident, &c. may be multiplied the ſame way, and ſo there will not be a multitude of Beings, but all things will be reduced to one only created Being.*

(‡) *See the preceding Marginal Note.*

(c) *Thoſe who hold Tranſubſtantiation place the Eſſence of Matter in the Faculty of receiving Extenſion, and it with the Eſſence of every thing: nothing is actual, every thing is a paſſive Capacity: but that Capacity may conſiſt with a Spirit, which confounds our Definitions.*

uſe to oblige Man out of a Senſe of his Ignorance, to call for (C) the Help of God, and to ſubmit to the Authority of Faith. Now becauſe what I have related

I come now to Morals. I. It is evident, that Evil ought to be prevented, if it be poſſible, and that 'tis a ſinful thing to permit it when it can be prevented. Nevertheleſs, our Theology ſhews us, that this is falſe: it teaches us that God does nothing but what becomes his Perfections, when he permits all the Diſorders that are in the World, and which he might eaſily have prevented. II. It is evident, that a Creature which does not exiſt, cannot be Accomplice of an ill Action. III. And that it is unjuſt to puniſh that Creature as being guilty of that Action. Nevertheleſs, our Doctrine concerning Original Sin ſhews us the Falſity of thoſe Evidences. IV. It is evident, that what is Honeſt ought to be preferred before what is profitable, and that the more Holy a Being is, the leſs Freedom he has to prefer what is Profitable to what is Honeſt. Nevertheleſs, our Divines tell us, that it being in God's Choice to make a World perfectly regulated, and adorned with all Virtues, and a World like ours, wherein Sin and Diſorder prevail, preferred the latter to the former, as being more conſiſtent with the Intereſt of his Glory. If you ſhould tell me, that the Duties of the Creator ought not to be meaſured by ours, you'll fall into the Net of your Adverſaries. They would have you there; the main thing they aim at (*d*) is, to prove that the abſolute Nature of things is unknown to us, and that we know only ſome Relations they have one to another. We know not, ſay they, whether Sugar be Sweet in itſelf, we only know that it ſeems to us to be Sweet, when we taſte it. We know not whether a certain Action is Honeſt in itſelf and by its Nature, we only believe that with reſpect to ſuch a one, and by Reaſon of certain Circumſtances it has the outſide of Honeſty. But it is another thing in other reſpects, and under ſome other Relations. See therefore how you expoſe yourſelf, by telling them that the Idea's we have of Juſtice and Honeſty are liable to Exception, and are Relative. Beſides, I would have you to obſerve, that the more you raiſe the Rights of God to the Priviledge of acting contrary to our Idea's, the more you deſtroy the only means left you to prove that there are Bodies, *viz.* that God does not deceive us, and that he ſhould do it if the Corporeal World did not exiſt. To ſhew a People a thing which does not exiſt out of their Minds, would be a Deceit: but they will anſwer you, *diſtinguo:* if a Prince did ſo, *concedo:* if God, *nego:* for the Rights of God are quite different from thoſe of Kings. Beſides, if the Exceptions you make to the Principles of Morality are grounded upon the incomprehenſible Infinity of God, I can never be ſure of any thing; for I ſhall never be able to comprehend the whole extent of the Rights of God. I conclude therefore, that if Truth was to be known by any Mark, it would be by Evidence: but Evidence is no ſuch Mark, becauſe it ſuits with Falſities; therefore, *&c.*

The Abbot, to whom this long Diſcourſe was directed, had much ado to forbear interrupting him: he heard him with great uneaſineſs, and when he perceived that every Body was ſilent, he fell into a (*e*) great Paſſion againſt the *Pyrrhoniſts*, and ſpared not the Abbot for having laid open the Objections which they take from the Syſtems of Divinity. This Abbot replied modeſtly, that he knew very well thoſe Objections were very inconſiderable and meer Sophiſms; but that it is reaſonable, that thoſe who ſo much deſpiſe the *Pyrrhoniſts*, ſhould not be ignorant of the State of things. He went on, and ſaid, you did believe hitherto that a *Pyrrhoniſt* could not puzzle you, anſwer me therefore: you are 45 Years of Age, you don't doubt of it, and if there be any thing that you be ſure of, 'tis that you are the ſame Perſon to whom the Abbey of .... was given 2 Years ago. I am going to ſhew you, that you have no good Reaſon to be ſure of it: I argue from the Principles of our Theology. Your Soul has been created; God muſt therefore at every moment renew its Exiſtence; for the Conſervation of Creatures is a continued Creation. How d'ye know but that God permitted this Morning your Soul to relapſe into Nothing, which he had continued to create till then, ever ſince the firſt Moment of your Life? How d'ye know but that he has created another Soul modified (*a*) as yours was? That new Soul is that which you have now. Shew me the contrary; let the Company judge of my Objection. A learned Divine who was there, anſwered, and acknowledged, that the Creation being once ſuppoſed, it was as eaſie for God to create a new Soul at every Moment, as to reproduce the ſame; but that the Idea we have of his Wiſdom, and eſpecially the Light which his Word affords us, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that we have the ſame Numerical Soul to Day, which we had Yeſterday, the Day before, *&c.* and he concluded that it was needleſs to Diſpute with the *Pyrrhoniſts*, and that their Sophiſms could not eaſily be eluded by the meer force of Reaſon; that before all things they ſhould be made ſenſible of the weakneſs of Reaſon, that they may have recourſe to a better Guide, *viz.* Faith. This is the Subject of the following Remark.

(*C*) *Oblige Men ..... to call for the help of God.*] A Modern Author, who made a more particular ſtudy of *Pyrrhoniſm* than of any other Sect, looks (*b*) upon it as a Party the leaſt contrary to Chriſtianity, and that *will receive the Myſteries of our Religion with the greateſt Docility.* He confirms his Opinion by ſome Reaſons, and then he ſpeaks thus: "(*c*) 'Tis "not without Reaſon that we believe the Syſtem "of the *Scepticks*, which is grounded upon an in"genuous Acknowledgment of Humane Ignorance, "to be leſs contrary to our Belief than any o"ther, and the fitteſt to make one receive the ſu"pernatural Light of Faith. We ſay nothing here"in but what is agreeable to the beſt Theology, "ſeeing that (1) of St. *Dionyſius* teaches nothing in "more expreſs Terms, than the Weakneſs of our "Minds, and their Ignorance, eſpecially with re"ſpect to Divine Things. Thus that great Doctor "explains what God himſelf ſaid by the Mouth of "his Prophets, (2) That he made his Retreat in "Darkneſs. For this being ſo, we cannot come "near him, without entring into that myſterious Ob"ſcurity: from whence we draw this important In"ſtruction, that he cannot be known but obſcurely, "covered with Enigms or Clouds, and as the "Schools ſay, by being Ignorant of him. But as "thoſe, who have always profeſt Humility and Ig"norance, will be better pleaſed than others with "that Spiritual Obſcurity; the Dogmatiſts on the "contrary, who never feared any thing ſo much as "to appear Ignorant, are preſently loſt in it: "and being ſo preſumptuous as to believe, that "they are clear-ſighted enough to overcome "all manner of Obſcurity, their Blindneſs increaſes "ſo much the more, becauſe they fancy that they "move forward in a Darkneſs, into which Humane "Nature cannot penetrate. However, I am of Opini"on that *Scepticiſm* is of no little uſe to a Chriſtian "Soul, when it loſes by ſuch means all thoſe Ma"giſterial Opinions which St. *Paul* does ſo much "deteſt." He enlarges more exactly upon that Subject (*d*) in another Book.

When a Man is capable of apprehending all the common Places of Suſpenſion, which have been laid open by *Sextus Empiricus*, he may then perceive that that Logick is the greateſt Effort of Subtilty that the Mind of Man is capable of; but he will ſee at the very ſame time, that ſuch a Subtilty will afford him no Satisfaction: it confounds itſelf; for if it were ſolid, it would prove that it is certain that we muſt doubt. Therefore there would be ſome Certainty, there would be a certain Rule of Truth. That Syſtem would be deſtroyed by it; but you need not fear that things would come to that: the Reaſons for doubting are doubtful themſelves: one muſt therefore doubt whether he ought to doubt. What Chaos! what Torment for the Mind! It ſeems therefore, that this unhappy State is the fitteſt of all to convince us, that our Reaſon is the way to wander, ſince when it diſplays itſelf with the greateſt Subtilty, it throws us into ſuch an Abyſs. What naturally follows from thence, is to renounce that Guide, and beſeech the Cauſe of all Things to give us a better one. It is a great Step towards the Chriſtian Religion, which requires of us, that we ſhould expect from God the Knowledge of what we are to believe, and do, and that we ſhould captivate our Underſtanding to the Obedience of Faith. If a Man is once convinced, that he can expect no Satiſfaction from his Philoſophical Enquiries, he will find himſelf better diſpoſed to pray to God, to ask him the Perſuaſion of the Truths which he ought

(*d*) *The ſtrongeſt part of their Logick or Topicks conſiſted in one common place, viz.* In that of Relation, which was the Eighth out of Ten, whereby thoſe of that Sect ſhew that we judge of things only by compariſon, which they expreſs thus, *πάντα πρός τι, omnia ſunt ad aliquid.* La Mothe le Vayer de la Vertu des Payens, *tom.* 5. *p.* 217.

(*e*) *Compare this with what* la Mothe le Vayer *relates in the* 2. *part of his* Proſe chagrine *in the* 9*th tom. of his Works.*

(*a*) *That is to ſay, with the Reminiſcence which he would have reproduced, if he had continued to create the Soul of the Abbot.*

(*b*) *La Mothe le Vayer*, de la Vertu des Payens, *tom.* 4. *of his Works p.* 229. *See alſo the Diſſertations of the Abbot* Foucher *concerning the Philoſophy of the Academicks.*

(*c*) *La Mothe le Vayer, ib. p.* 231.

(1) *Lib.* 1. *de Myſt. Ph. c.* 1. & 2.

(2) Poſuit tenebras latibulum ſuum.

(*d*) *In the* 2. *part of the* Proſe Chagrine *in the* 9. *tom. of his Works.*

lated * concerning a Conference wherein two Abbots diſputed about *Pyrrhoniſm*, might perplex many Readers, I deſign to clear that Matter at the End of this Work. The Stories of *Antigonus Caryſtius* ‡ concerning *Pyrrho*, ought to be look'd upon as ſorry Jeſts, or rather as Impoſtures, *viz.* that *Pyrrho* did not prefer any Thing to any Thing, and that a Chariot and a Precipice never made him go a Step backwards or aſide, and that his Friends who followed him, ſaved his Life very often. 'Tis not likely at all, that he (D) ſhould have been ſo great a Fool: but there is no doubt that he taught that § the Honour and Infamy of Actions, and their Juſtice and Unjuſtice depended only upon Humane Laws and Cuſtom. That Doctrine, tho' never ſo abominable, does naturally ariſe from that *Pyrrhonian* Principle, that the abſolute and internal Nature of Objects is unknown to us, and that we can be ſure only of what they appear to us in ſome reſpects. The Indifference of (E) *Pyrrho*

* *In the Rem. H.*

‡ *Apud Diog. Laert. ubi ſup. n. 61.*

§ *Diog. Laert. ib. n. 61.*

ought to believe, than if he ſhould flatter himſelf with a good Succeſs in Reaſoning and Diſputing. It is therefore a happy Diſpoſition to Faith, to know the Defects of Reaſon: hence it is that *Paſcal* and ſome others have ſaid, that to convert Libertins, they muſt be made ſenſible of the Weakneſs of Reaſon, and taught to miſtruſt it. *Calvin* is admirable on this Subject, for thus he ſpeaks in the Liturgy (*) for Baptiſm, that is to ſay, thus he begins his Inſtructions for the Candidates of Chriſtianity. "Herein (e) therefore God admoniſhes us to humble and be diſpleaſed with our ſelves; and by "that means he prepares us to deſire and require "his Grace, whereby all the Perverſity and Malediction of our firſt Nature may be removed. For "we are not capable of receiving it, before we are "void of all manner of Confidence in our Virtue, "Wiſdom and Juſtice, even ſo as to condemn every "thing that is in us. But after he has repreſented "to us our Miſery, he does likewiſe comfort us by "his Mercy, promiſing us to regenerate us by his "Holy Spirit into a new Life, which may be to us "as an entrance into his Kingdom. That Regeneration conſiſts of two things, *viz.* That we deny "ourſelves, following not OUR OWN REASON, "our Pleaſure and Will; but that CAPTIVATING "OUR UNDERSTANDINGS, and our Hearts to the "Wiſdom and Juſtice of God, we mortifie whatever belongs to us and to our Fleſh. And then "that we FOLLOW THE LIGHT OF GOD, to "comply with and obey his good Will, as he teaches "us by his Word, and we are directed to it by his "Holy Spirit." However, there are ſome learned Men who maintain, that there can be nothing more oppoſite to Religion than *Pyrrhoniſm*. (f) "It is "the total Extinction not only of Faith, but alſo of "Reaſon, and there is nothing more impoſſible than "to reclaim thoſe who run themſelves into ſuch an "Exceſs. The moſt ignorant Men may be inſtructed, the moſt conceited may be convinced, and "the moſt incredulous may be perſuaded. But it is "impoſſible, I will not ſay to convince a Sceptick, "but to Reaſon cloſe with him; for it is not poſſible to urge him with any Argument, but what is "a Sophiſm, and even the groſſeſt of all Sophiſms, "I mean a Begging the Queſtion. In effect, there "is no Argument that can be concluſive, but by "ſuppoſing, that whatever is evident is true, that "is to ſay, by ſuppoſing what is in queſtion. For "*Pyrrhoniſm*, properly ſpeaking, conſiſts only in not "admitting that (g) Fundamental Maxim of the "Dogmatiſts." See *Voſſius* (h), who having ſaid that *Pyrrhoniſm* and *Epicureiſm* are very contrary to the Chriſtian Religion, confirms his Opinion by a Paſſage out of *Clemens Romanus.* (i) *Hinc Nicetas de ſe, & fratre Aquila in epitome Clementis Romani, de geſtis B. Petri pag. 56. ed. Adr. Turnebi, in Latinâ Perionii tralatione ex Pariſienſi editione Sonnii fol.* 596. Ἠκριβώσαμεν δὲ ϗ τὰ φιλοσόφων, ἐξαιρέτως τὰ ἀθεώτατα. λέγω δὴ τὰ Ἐπικούρου ϗ Πύῤῥωνος, ἵνα ϗ μᾶλλον ἀνασκευάζειν δυνάμεθα. Accuratè etiam ea inquiſivimus, quæ à philoſophis traduntur: præcipuè illa, quæ maximè repugnant pietati erga Deum: Illa, inquam, Epicuri ac Pyrrhonis, quò magis ea refellere poſſemus. *Nempe Nicetas quidem fuerat Epicureus: Aquila vero Pyrrhonios erat ſecutus, ut apud ipſum eſt Clementem in octavo Recognitionum libro* (3), *quod opus Græcè non exſtat, ſed Latinè ex tralatione Rufini Aquilejenſis.*

Obſerve that *la Mothe le Vayer* excludes the *Pyrrhoniſts* from the Grace he beſtowed upon many Ancient Philoſophers: what he ſays thereupon, contains ſome Facts which belong to this Article. (k) "I deſpair of the Salvation of *Pyrrho*, and of "all his Diſciples, who entertained the ſame Opinions concerning the Deity. Not that they profeſt themſelves to be *Atheiſts*, as ſome have believed. One may ſee in (4) *Sextus Empiricus* "that they admitted the Exiſtence of the Gods, as "the other Philoſophers did, that they paid the "common Worſhip to them, and denied not their "Providence. But beſides that they never acknowledged a Firſt Cauſe, whereby they would have "deſpiſed the Idolatry of their Time; it is certain, "that they believed nothing concerning the Divine "Nature, but with a ſuſpention of Mind, and confeſt nothing of what we have ſaid but in a doubting way, and only to accomodate themſelves to "the Laws and Cuſtoms of their Age, and of the "Country where they lived. And conſequently "ſeeing they have not had the leaſt Light of that "implicite Faith, on which we have grounded the "hopes of the Salvation of ſome Heathens, who enjoyed it together with an extraordinary Grace of "God, I cannot ſee how any *Scepticks* or *Pyrrhoniſts* of that kind, could avoid going into Hell."

(D) *That he ſhould have been ſo great a Fool.*] I ſhall ſet down another Paſſage out of *La Mothe le Vayer.* (a) "I know that *Antigonus Caryſtius* ſaid, "that *Pyrrho* would not go out of his way for a "Chariot, nor for a Precipice, or a Mad Dog, and "that his Friends only preſerved him from all "thoſe Inconveniencies. But why ſhould we rather "believe *Antigonus*, than *Æneſidemus*, who wrote "Eight Books concerning the Sect (1) of the *Pyrrhoniſts*, and aſſures, that their Head never committed any ſuch Extravagancies? Indeed they are "ſo unlikely, and it is ſo difficult to imagine how "ſo many Philoſophers ſhould have approved of "'em, that I ſhould ſcruple to believe them, even "tho' they had not been contradicted by any Body, "and tho' the remaining part of *Pyrrho*'s Life did "not ſhew the Falſity thereof. In effect, 'tis agreed "that he lived near fourſcore and ten Years, and "ſpent the greateſt part of that Time in Travelling, for he went to ſee the *Magi* of *Perſia*, and "the *Gymnoſophiſts* of *India.* Is it likely that a Man, "who had expoſed himſelf to all manner of Dangers, ſhould have attained to ſo great an Age? "And how could he have Friends enough every "where to deliver him from ſo many Perils, which "can ſcarce be avoided by thoſe who Travel with "the greateſt care and prudence? However, he is "to be look'd upon as the Founder of a great Sect, "and which conſequently was, without doubt, conſiderable in many reſpects. If we had nothing to "alledge but what we read in his Life, that he "was made High-Prieſt by his Countrymen, it "would be ſufficient to ſhew the Calumny of his "Enemies; for it is not likely at all, that ſo important a Dignity ſhould have been beſtowed upon "a Man ſubject to ſo many Caprices. . . . . (b) "He never wrote any thing; ſo that one cannot "judge of his Capacity by his Works. But beſides "what we may preſume from his great Reputation; "the meer privilege of Immunity which the City "of *Elis*, the Place of his Birth, granted to all Philoſophers upon his Account, and the Honour which "the *Athenians* did him (c) by making him one of "their Citizens, which they granted to few Perſons, "are ſufficient to perſuade us that he was a Man of "great Merit."

(E) *The Indifference of* Pyrrho.] I ſhall alledge but one Example of it. *Anaxarchus* being fallen into a Ditch, was ſeen by *Pyrrho*, but received no help from him. *Pyrrho* went his way, without vouchſafing to reach his Hand to him. He was juſtly blamed for it, for he ſhould have helped in ſuch a Caſe, a Man unknown to him, but much more his Profeſſor. The Maſter knew more than the Diſciple

(*) *Obſerve that that Liturgy is uſed by all the Churches of the Confeſſion of Geneva, and ſo the Maxime contained in it ought to be look'd upon as the general Opinion of thoſe Churches, and not as a particular Opinion of* Calvin.

(e) *That is, by telling us we muſt be born again.*

(f) *La Placette,* Traité de la Conſcience *p.* 377.

(g) *That Maxim was formerly more invincible, for Example, in the Hands of the Stoicks than it is now, that one may maintain to Divines* ad hominem, *that ſome evident Propoſitions are falſe. See above the Diſpute of the two Abbots.*

(h) *Voſſius de Philoſoph. ſectis p.* 107, 108.

(i) *Id. ib. p.* 108.

(3) *Fol.* 81. 6.

(k) De la Vertu des Payens, *p.* 226.

(4) *Lib.* I. *Pyr. Hyp. c.* 1.

(a) *La Mothe le Vayer ibid. p.* 213, 214.

(1) *Diog. Laert. Photius in Bibl.*

(b) *La Mothe le Vayer ibid. p.* 227.

(c) *I'll ſhew in the Rem. H that this is falſe.*

Pyrrho was a wonderful one: he loved nothing, † and was never angry for any thing; and no Man was ever more perſuaded of the (F) Vanity of things. When he ſpoke, he did not care much whether any Body gave ear to what he ſaid or not, and he went on ſtill, tho' his Hearers retired ‡. He kept Houſe with his Siſter, and had an equal ſhare (G) in the ſmalleſt Domeſtick Concerns. Thoſe who

ple about that Point, for *Anaxarchus* did not ſo much as complain of *Pyrrho*, and approved not that he ſhould be cenſured; but beſides, he praiſed him for his Indifferency, and for loving nothing. Could any one do a thing more ſurpriſing under the Diſcipline of *La Trape*? (d) Καὶ ποτε Ἀναξάρχου εἰς τέλμα ἐμπεσόντος, παρελθεῖν μὴ βοηθήσαντα· τινῶν δὲ αἰτιωμένων, αὐτὸν Ἀνάξαρχον ἐπαινεῖν τὸ ἀδιάφορον καὶ ἄστοργον αὐτοῦ. *Et cum aliquando Anaxarchus in ſcrobem incidiſſet, ille pertranſiit nihil ei opem ferens. Idque cùm plerique culparent, Anaxarchus ipſe laudabat, ut indifferenter & ſine affectu ſe habentem.* Which puts me in Mind of a Repartee to be found in a Book of the Abbot *de St. Real*. *I might*, ſays he (e), *anſwer you as an Ancient did, who being told in a reproachful manner, that for a Philoſopher he had no great value for Philoſophy*: 'tis that very thing, *replied he*, which I call to be a Philoſopher. This is worthy of *Pyrrho* and *Anaxarchus*.

I add, that *Pyrrho* maintained, that to die and to live were the ſame thing. Why don't you die then, ſaid one to him; becauſe, anſwered he, there is no difference between Death and Life. *Diogenes Laertius* does not mention this, but *Stobeus* has preſerved it. (f) Πύῤῥων ἔλεγε μηδὲν διαφέρειν ζῆν, ἢ τεθνάναι· καί τις εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν, τί οὖν οὐκ ἀποθνήσκεις; ὁ δὲ, Ὅτι, εἶπεν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει. *Pyrrhon ajebat, nihil intereſſe inter vitam & mortem. Et cùm quidam ad eum diceret, cur igitur ipſe non moreris? Quia nihil intereſt, reſpondit.* Let no Body ſay that he would have forgotten his Maxims, if the Danger of Death had been preſent. Let no Body ſay

Era fuor de perigli un ſacripante,
Ma ne perigli havea cara la vita.

He ſhewed the contrary when he was in great Danger of ſuffering Shipwrack. He was the only one that was not afraid of the Storm; and when he ſaw every Body ſtruck with Fear and Sorrow, he deſired them with a great ſedateneſs of Mind, to look upon a Hog that was there, and eat as he uſed to do: Such ought to be, ſaid he, the Inſenſibility of a Wiſe Man. Τῶν γὰρ ἐμπλεόντων ἐσκυθρωπακότων ὑπὸ χειμῶνος, αὐτὸς γαληνὸς ὢν ἀνέῤῥωσε τὴν ψυχὴν, δείξας ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ χοιρίδιον ἐσθίον, καὶ εἰπὼν, ὡς χρὴ τὸν σοφὸν ἐν τοιαύτῃ καθεστάναι ἀταραξίᾳ (h). *Navi aliquando vehebatur, & cum ſocii tempeſtate acti mæſtiores eſſent, ipſe tranquillo animo porcellum in navi edentem oſtendebat, dicens*, oportere ſapientem tali animi tranquillitate eſſe.

(F) *More perſuaded of the Vanity of things.*] He deſpiſed above all things Humane Nature, and he was never weary to repeat the Words wherein *Homer* compares Men with the Leaves of Trees. (i) Θαυμάζων αὐτὸν καὶ συνεχὲς λέγων,

(k) Οἵηπερ φύλλων γενεὴ, τοιήδε καὶ ἀνδρῶν.

Miratum eum (Homerum) *aſſidueque pronuntiare ſolitum ejus verſiculum*, tale quidem genus eſt hominum quale eſt foliorum. *Gaſſendus* is of Opinion, that he was pleaſed with that Parallel (l), becauſe he found in it the Mortality of Men, and the Inconſtancy of their Opinions, which makes 'em turn like Leaves with the Wind. (m) He uſed to praiſe very much ſome other Paſſages of *Homer*, wherein Men are compared to Birds and Flies, and wherein their Infirmity and Childiſhneſs are deſcribed. (n) Καὶ ὅσα συντείνει εἰς τὸ ἀβέβαιον, καὶ κενόσπουδον ἅμα καὶ παιδαριῶδες τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Sicut & cætera illius, quibus infirmitas & inania ſtudia atque pueriles hominum motus indicantur.* I wonder they don't ſay that he was a great Admirer of this Saying of *Homer*:

Τοῖος (o) γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,
Οἷον ἐπ' ἦμαρ ἄγῃσι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
Talis enim ipſorum eſt hominum mens terricolarum,
Qualem ipſis hominum & divum pater indit in horas.

It ſignifies, that the Mind of Man is uncertain, and that God gives 'em their Proviſion of Reaſon as a kind of Daily Bread, which he renews every Day. Which ſuits admirably well with the *Pyrrhonian* Hypotheſis; they were always ſeeking, and always unſteady, and ready at all Times to reaſon after a new manner, according to the various Occurrences they met with. A certain Doctor of Divinity does the ſame, if we believe his Adverſary: (p) but above all things he does not forgive him his Variations, and perpetual Contradictions. He ſhews him that he lays down ſome Principles, according as he ſtands in need of 'em; and that as ſoon as they begin to incommode him, he ſubſtitutes ſome others in the room of 'em: and if I may tranſcribe his Expreſſions, he upbraids him with *Reaſoning, if one may ſay ſo, from Hand to Mouth*, and according to the Paſſion, *whoſe Turn it is to command* in his Soul: and yet that Doctor is very peremptory; he does magiſterially and readily affirm and deny. He is as bold as the Scepticks were reſerv'd. He ſhould not encroach upon their Rights, but leave them the Priviledge of Reaſoning (a) from Hand to Mouth, which they aſcribe to themſelves in *Tully*. I ſhall conclude with ſaying, that the Inconſtancy of Humane Opinions and Paſſions is ſo great, that one would think Man is a ſmall Republick which often changes its Magiſtrates.

(G) *The ſmalleſt Domeſtick Concerns.*] He (b) carried Chickens, Pigs, &c. to ſell them in the Market, and ſwept the Houſe, and cleaned the Goods, juſt as if he had been the Maid of the Houſe. Every thing was indifferent to him; he believed not that one thing was better than another. Τὰ σκεύη τῆς οἰκίας καθαίρων ἀδιαφόρως, *domique indifferenter munditiem curabat* (c). He was not always the ſame Man, for he happened one Day to be angry with his Siſter; and being told that his Anger was not conſiſtent with the Indolence he profeſt, he anſwered, D'ye think that I will practiſe that Virtue for a Woman? Χολώσας τι περὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς πρὸς τὸν λαβόμενον εἰπεῖν, ὡς οὐκ ἐν γυναίῳ ἡ ἐπίδειξις τῆς ἀδιαφορίας. *Cum ſorori quandoque ſuccenſuiſſet, argueretque illum quiſpiam ut immemorem inſtituti ſui, non, inquit, muliercula documentum erit noſtræ indifferentiæ.* Do not fancy that his Meaning was, that he did not renounce Love, it was none of his Thoughts; he meant, that every Subject does not deſerve that a Man ſhould exerciſe his Doctrine againſt Anger. The Cauſe of his Anger was very unworthy of a Philoſopher, and eſpecially of ſuch a Philoſopher as he was: he grew angry with his Siſter becauſe he had been forced to buy the things which ſhe wanted to offer for a Sacrifice; a Friend who had promiſed to get 'em ready, kept not his Word. This we learn from *Euſebius*. (d) Φιλίστης δὲ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ θυούσης, ἔπειτα τῶν φίλων τινὸς ὑποσχομένου τὰ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν, καὶ μὴ παρασχομένου, τοῦ μέντοι Πύῤῥωνος πριαμένου, καὶ ἀγανακτοῦντος, ἐπειδὴ ὁ φίλος ἔλεγεν, ὡς οὐ ποιήσαιτο σύμφωνα τοῖς λόγοις, οὐδ' ἄξια τῆς ἀπαθείας· εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν, ἐν γοῦν γυναικὶ οὐ δεῖ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν αὐτῆς ποιεῖσθαι. καίτοι δικαίως ἂν εἶπεν ὁ φίλος, ὅτι ματαία καὶ ἐν γυναικὶ, καὶ κυνὶ, καὶ πᾶσιν. *Cum Philiſta ejus ſoror ſacrificium adornaret, quendam ex amicis, qui res ad illud neceſſarias pollicitus fuerat, promiſſis non ſtetiſſe. Pyrrhonem igitur eos ſumptus facere coactum, graviter id acerbeque cum ferret, ex ſuo illo amico audiiſſe, parum ſe omnino ſuorum ex decretorum præſcripto facere, atque ab omni perturbatione vacuum oſtendere. Tum enimvero Pyrrhonem homini repoſuiſſe, hujus rei fidem in muliercula cauſa fieri non debere. Cui ſane amicus ille ſuus merito reſponderet, in muliere, in cane, in reliquis omnibus inane totum hoc diſputandi genus futurum.* In theſe laſt Words the Author made Alluſion to the Anſwer which *Pyrrho* return'd, when he was jeſted upon for having fled from a Dog which purſued him: It is a difficult thing, ſaid he, to put off Man. (e) Ἀντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς γενόμενος χρόνους, καὶ ἀναγεγραφὼς αὐτῶν τὸν βίον, φησὶ τὸν Πύῤῥωνα διωκόμενον ὑπὸ κυνὸς, ἀναφυγεῖν ἐπί τι δένδρον· σκωπτόμενον δ' ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων, εἰπεῖν ὡς χαλεπὸν εἴη τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκδῦναι. *Antigonus Caryſtius, qui ſub eadem vivebat tempora, quique illorum vitam conſcripſit, Pyrrhonem commemorat, ut ſeſe inſequenti cani eriperet, quandam ad arborem confugiſſe: qua de cauſa cum ab iis, qui aderant, rideretur, ægre admodum hominem exui reſpondiſſe.*

(H) A

---

† Don't take this in a ſtrict Senſe; there is no doubt but that he had rather enjoy his Health than be Sick, &c.

‡ Diog. Laert. ub. ſup. n. 63.

(d) Diog. Laert. ub. ſup. n. 63.

(e) Céſarion, ou Entretiens divers p. 21, 22. of the Hague Edition.

(f) Sermone 118.

(h) Diog. Laert. ib. n. 68.

(i) Id. ib.

(k) It is the 146th Verſe of the 6th Book of the Iliads.

(l) Quaſi exinde ſignificetur non hominum modo, perinde ac foliorum naturam caducam, ſed opinionem quoque inconſtans & perinde mutabilis ac minimo vento ſunt arborum folia mobilia. Gaſſend. de Logicæ fine c. 2. p. m. 70.

(m) Diog. Laert. ib. n. 68.

(n) Id. ib.

(o) Homer's Odyſſes l. 18. See St. Auguſtin de Civitate Dei l. 5. c. 8.

(p) Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans, Oct. 1694. p. 72. in the Extract of Mr. Saurin's Book Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu.

(a) Tuſcul. l. 5. fol. 273. D.

(b) Diog. Laert. ib. n. 66.

(c) Id. ib.

(d) Ariſtocles, apud Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 14. c. 18. p. m. 763.

(e) Id. Ariſtocles ib.

who ſay that he was made Citizen of *Athens* for having killed (*H*) a King of *Thrace*, are groſly miſtaken. I cannot upbraid *Moreri* (*I*) with many Faults.

PYRRHUS, Son of *Achilles*, and *Deidamia*, Daughter of *Lycomedes*, King of the Iſle of *Scyrus*, was born in that Iſland a little while before the *Trojan* War. He was educated there till *Ulyſſes* and *Phœnix* α came to fetch him, and to lead him to that famous Siege after his Father's Death. He went to it notwithſtanding the Tears of his (*A*) Grand-Father by his Mother's ſide. The *Græcians* had been told, that they ſhould never take *Troy* without the Son of *Achilles*. He was called β *Neoptolemus*, by reaſon (*B*) of his great Youth, and *Pyrrhus*, by reaſon (*C*) of the Colour of his Hair γ. He ſhewed himſelf worthy of the Blood from which he ſprung; for he was a valiant, brutiſh and fierce Man. His Exploits and good Counſels have been as admirable as *Homer* δ a long while after, and other Poets were pleaſed to make them. One of his nobleſt Combats was againſt ε *Eurypylus*, Son of *Telephus*. He kill'd him, and he was ſo pleaſed with that Victory, that upon that occaſion he inſtituted the ζ Dance which was called *Pyrrhick* from him. The Dancers were to be armed from Top to Toe. He appeared bolder than any of the reſt, when the *Græcians* were to get η into the Wooden Horſe; and his great Intrepidity freed them from the Fear they were ſtruck with. The Night that the Town was taken he made a horrible Slaughter θ, and even barbarouſly murthered (*D*) King *Priamus*, without any regard to his Old Age, or the Holineſs of the Place where he had taken Sanctuary. With the ſame Barbarity he precipitated from the Top ι of a Tower young *Aſtyanax*, *Hector*'s Son; and 'twas he who ſacrificed, with his own Hands, *Polyxena* κ upon the Grave of *Achilles*. He proved not ſo hard-hearted to *Andromache*, Widow of the Valiant *Hector*; he made a ſhift with ſome remains of Beauty he found in her, and made her his Wife μ or Concubine. Authors

(*H*) *A Citizen of* Athens, *for having killed a King of* Thrace.] The Conformity of the Name has occaſioned that Lye. A certain *Pytho* (*f*) Diſciple of *Plato*, was made Citizen of *Athens* for (*g*) having killed *Cotys* King of *Thrace*. From thence comes the Miſtake of thoſe (*h*) who ſay, that our *Pyrrho* committed that Murther, and obtained that Reward for it.

(*I*) *I cannot upbraid* Moreri *with many Faults.*] Five only. I. Theſe Words, Pyrrho *pretended that Men do every thing out of Cuſtom*, are abſurd. He was not ſo great a Fool as to ſay ſo; he knew very well, that ſome Philoſophers maintained, that there is a natural Difference between Virtue and Vice, and that abundance of People do a thouſand things to conform to the Laws. He ſhould have expreſt himſelf thus. *Pyrrho* maintained that there was not really any one thing that was this or that, and that the Nature of Things depended upon Laws and Cuſtoms; that is to ſay, That Men by their Laws and Cuſtoms made ſome things to be good, laudable, ill, blameable, *&c.* Such was his Doctrine. If *Diogenes Laertius* underſtood it otherwiſe, 'tis his Fault. I ſay ſo, becauſe his Words are not clear enough to make one believe that their Meaning is, that *Men by their Laws and Cuſtoms make every thing to be ſo or ſo.* (*i*) Καὶ ὁμοίως ἐπὶ πάντων, μηδὲν εἶναι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. νόμῳ δὲ καὶ ἔθει πάντα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πράττειν· οὐ γὰρ μᾶλλον τόδε ἢ τόδε εἶναι ἕκαστον. *Eadem ratione & de omnibus, nihil verè eſſe: cæterum lege atque conſuetudine cuncta homines facere. Neque enim eſſe quicquam iſtud potius quam illud.* II. I don't know where he found *that* Pyrrho *loved not to be interrupted in his Philoſophical Meditations. Diogenes Laertius* does not ſay ſo, tho' he makes him a Lover of Solitude; nay, (*k*) he ſays, that thoſe who ask'd him Queſtions, were never diſſatisfied with his Anſwers. III. That is but a ſmall Fault if compared with this, *Yet 'tis confeſt that he lived fourſcore and ten Years.* As if a Man, who loves to be alone, and not to be interrupted in his Meditations, could not live long. Moſt Men, who love Meditation, are extreamly deſirous to go on with it; for the leaſt Interruption breaks the ſeries of their Thoughts, and makes 'em loſe Time: and if a Man deſires to be alone, and is weary of Company, the beſt way to prolong his Life, is to permit him to be alone as long as he will. I conclude therefore that *Moreri* made uſe of a *Yet* very ill placed. IV. I don't find that *Pyrrho* was made Citizen of *Athens*. That Fault has been tranſcribed out of *La Mothe le Vayer* (*l*). V. If that Author had been faithfully tranſcribed by *Moreri* in another thing, theſe Remarks would be ended already. *La Mothe le Vayer* ſays (*m*), that by the Eighth Mood of Suſpenſion, which is that of *Relation*, the *Pyrrhoniſts ſhew, that we judge of things only by Compariſon. Moreri* adds to it, the Word *Prejudices*; *The Scepticks*, ſays he, *pretend that we judge only by Prejudices or by Compariſon.* It is no good Disjunction; for the Mood ſpoken of there does not concern Prejudices; but only the Judgments we make of Relative Qualities, ſuch as Heavineſs, Hardneſs, Bigneſs, Smallneſs, *&c.*

(*A*) *Notwithſtanding the Tears of his Grand-Father by his Mother's ſide.*] We find this Particularity in *Tully*, *Chap.* 20. of his Book *de Amicitia*, *p.* 515. of *Grævius*'s Edition. *Rectè etiam*, ſays he, *præcipi poteſt in amicitiis, ne intemperata quædam violentia* (*quod perſæpe fit*) *impediat magnas utilitates amicorum, nec enim* (*ut ad fabulas redeam*) *Trojam Neoptolemus capere potuiſſet, ſi Lycomedem, apud quem erat educatus, multis cum lacrymis iter ſuum impedientem, audire voluiſſet. Langius* pretends that there is a voluntary or unvoluntary Miſtake in thoſe Words; but he is miſtaken. Here are his Words, *p.* 515. of *Grævius*'s Edition. *Quod de* Neoptolemo *Lælius ait, omnes de* Achille *narrant. Itaque vel errat per memoriam Cicero: vel, quod potius credo, de induſtria Lælio, ut illa ætate, Græcanicarum fabularum ignorationem concedit: quod etiam in Catone majore factum videmus; tametſi iſte jam ſenex Græcis litteris ſedulam operam navaverit.*

(*B*) *He was called* Neoptolemus *by reaſon of.*] *Pauſanias* (*n*) gives another Reaſon for it, but it is a pitiful one; *viz.* that *Phœnix* gave him that Name becauſe his Father *Achilles* was very young when he began to bear Arms.

(*C*) *By reaſon of the Colour of his Hair.*] Some Authors ſay (*a*), that he was named *Pyrrhus* for another Reaſon, *viz.* becauſe his Father was called *Pyrrha* (*b*), whilſt he wore a Woman's Cloaths in the Court of *Lycomedes*. That Fact was not very well known to the Grammarians, ſince *Tiberius* having a mind to puzzle them with ſome hard Queſtions, ask'd 'em (*c*) amongſt other things, what Name *Achilles* went by when he was in a Woman's Dreſs.

(*D*) *And even barbarouſly murthered King* Priamus.] This is very nobly deſcribed by *Virgil*:

> (*d*) *Hoc dicens, altaria ad ipſa trementem*
> *Traxit, & in multo lapſantem ſanguine nati*
> *Implicuit comam læva, dextraque coruſcum*
> *Extulit, ac lateri capulo tenus abdidit enſem.*
> *Hæc finis Priami fatorum: hic exitus illum*
> *Sorte tulit.*

The Altar mentioned in this Place, (*e*) is that of *Jupiter Herceus*. 'Tis true, that all Authors did not agree that *Priamus* was killed there: Some ſay (*f*) that he was taken out of his Palace by *Neoptolemus*, and that having been drawn to the Grave of *Achilles*, he was beheaded, and that his Head was carried upon a Pike all over the Town. Others (*g*) affirm, that he was taken by force out of the Temple of *Jupiter*, and that afterwards *Pyrrhus* having met him at the Gate of his Palace, kill'd him. It ſeems

α *Sophocl. in Philoct. See alſo Homer Odyſſ. l.* 11.

β *Euſtath. in Il.* 19.

γ *Servius in Æn.* 2. *v.* 469.

δ *Odyſſ. l.* 11. *Quint. Calab. l.* 7, 8.

ε *Quint. Calab. ib.*

ζ *Heſychius, & Scholiaſtes Pindari in Pyth. Od.* 2.

η *Homer. Odyſſ.* 11.

θ *Virgil. Æn. l.* 2. *v.* 500, 550. *Quint. Calab. l.* 13. *Vid. etiam Pauſan l.* 10. *p.* 343.

ι *Pauſan. l.* 10. *p.* 342.

κ *Euripid. in Hecub. Lycophr. Ovid. Met. l.* 13. *Seneca in Troad. Hygin. c.* 110.

μ *Virgil. Æn. l.* 3. *v.* 325. & *ibi Servius.*

(*f*) *Plut. adverſ. Colotem, circa fin. p.* 1126. *See alſo* de laudando ſeipſo, *p.* 542. & de gerenda republica *p.* 816.

(*g*) *Demoſthenes adverſus Ariſtocratem, p. m.* 445.

(*h*) *Diocles ſays ſo ap. Diog. Laert. ub. ſup. n.* 65.

(*i*) *Diog. Laert. ub. ſup. n.* 61. *p.* 581.

(*k*) *Ibid. n.* 64.

(*n*) *Lib.* 10. *p.* 343.

(*a*) *Hygin. c.* 97.

(*b*) *Hygin. c.* 96. *Sidonius Apollin. Carm.* 9. *v.* 137.

(*c*) *Sueton. in Tiber. c.* 71. *See ſome like Queſtions in* Juvenal *Sat.* 7.

(*d*) *Æn. l.* 2.

(*e*) *Eurip. in Troad. Seneca Agamemn. Pauſan. l.* 4. *p.* 12

(*f*) *Apud Servium in Æn. l.* 2. *v.* 506.

(*g*) *Leſches apud Pauſan. l.* 1

(*l*) *See the Rem. D.* (*m*) *La Mothe le Vayer* de la Vertu des Payens, *tom.* 5. *p.* 217.

Authors do not agree about the Country that he went to after the Sacking of *Troy*; some say that he went to take possession of his Father's Kingdom, which was *Phthia* in ‖ *Thessaly*; others maintain that he went directly into *Epirus* §, and that he settled and founded a State there. 'Tis said that *Helenus*, *Priamus*'s Son, and a good Diviner, one of the Prisoners that fell to him by Lot, advised ✝ him to return into his Country by Land, because of the great Storms which he foresaw the *Grecian* Fleet would meet with. 'Tis likely enough that *Pyrrhus* followed his Advice, for we read, that in his way he made War against *Harpalicus* in *Thrace* ‖. He married the beautiful *Hermione*, ¶ Daughter of *Menelaus* and *Helena*; but it proved not a happy Marriage. *Hermione* had no ‡ Children by him, and grew jealous of *Andromache*, by whom *Pyrrhus* had a Son. Her Jealousie made her resolve * to kill her Rival, together with her Son: but she met with some Obstacles; and her Design being known, she feared her Husband's Resentment, which made her hearken to *Orestes*, who proposed to steal her away, to bring her back to her Father, and to marry her. She had been promised to him (*E*) before she was promised to *Pyrrhus*. Others say, that *Orestes* being resolved to revenge himself upon his Rival, had recourse to a more dismal Expedient, than that of taking away his Wife, with whom he lived not very well †, and that he killed him (*F*) or caused him to be killed in the very Temple of *Delphos*. It is certain enough that *Pyrrhus* was killed in it; but it is not so certain, whether (*G*) he was buried there. He had three Wives, *Hermione*, by whom he had no Children, *Lanassa* and *Andromache*: he had some by the two last. It is not known whether the Kings who have been in possession of *Epirus*, to the time of Him who shall be the Subject of the following Article, descended from (*H*) the Sons of *Lanassa*, or from those of *Andromache*: Authors are divided about it. They agree only in this, that they descended from our *Pyrrhus*.

seems that others (*h*) have said, that *Pyrrhus* killed him near an Altar of *Mercury*: thus the learned (*i*) *Meziriac* understands these Words of *Quintus Calaber*, Ἑρμαίῳ πάρ βωμόν. *Rhodomannus* renders them *ad aram Jovis Hermai*; but it is very likely that we must read Ἑρκείῳ, *Hercai*, instead of Ἑρμαίῳ. See the Notes of *Dausquejus* on that Poet, p. 35.

(*E*) *Had been promised to him before* &c.] *Ovid* says, (*k*) that *Tyndarus*, her Grandfather by the Mother's side, had promis'd her to *Orestes*, during the War of *Troy*, in the absence of *Menelaus*, who, during the same time (*l*) promised her to *Pyrrhus*. *Sophocles*, as he is cited by (*m*) *Eustathius*, said so in a Tragedy which is not now extant. On the contrary, *Euripides* (*n*) says that *Hermione* was promis'd to *Orestes* by *Menelaus*, to prevent her being kill'd by *Orestes*, as he had kill'd *Clytemnestra* his own Mother. Therefore that Promise was made eight Years after the Taking of *Troy*. *Sophocles* relates the thing differently in another (*o*) Tragedy; he says, that *Menelaus* promised *Hermione* to *Orestes*, before the Expedition of *Troy*; and that he promis'd her to *Pyrrhus* during the Siege. (*p*) *Hyginus* follows a particular Opinion, *viz*. That *Menelaus*, notwithstanding the Promise he had made to *Pyrrhus* before *Troy*, gave his Daughter to *Orestes*, and then took her away from him to keep his first Promise, when *Pyrrhus* went to *Lacedæmon* to put him in mind of it. Here are many different Opinions; but it is a common thing, and we ought not to wonder at it. We should rather wonder how Authors came to place among Facts, the Intrigues of a Tragedy, and relate, as the History of *Hermione* and *Orestes*, what a Poet was pleas'd to fancy, in order to fill up his Play with surprising things and Incidents. A Man must have a great deal of Leisure, a Thousand Years hence, if he thought himself obliged not to omit in the History of *Cæsar* and *Pompey*, what we read in *Scuderi*'s and *Corneille*'s Tragedies concerning the Circumstances of the Death of those two Illustrious *Romans*.

(*F*) *And that he kill'd him, or caus'd him to be kill'd.*] Here's a Fact attended with the Fictions of Tragick Poets: For those who relate the various Accounts of Writers concerning the unhappy Death of *Pyrrhus*, do not forget what *Euripides* (*q*) says, *viz*. That *Pyrrhus*, who was gone to *Delphos* to upbraid *Apollo* with the Death of *Achilles*, and to ask him Satisfaction for it, return'd thither to beg his Pardon for that Insult, and to appease his Anger. Authors have given some other Reasons of that Journey: 1. That *Pyrrhus* went to *Delphos* (*r*) to offer up the Spoils of the *Trojans*. 2. That he went (*s*) to know of the Oracle by what means he might get Children by his Wife. 3. That he (*t*) design'd to plunder the Temple. However, he was kill'd in that Temple by the (*u*) Command of *Apollo*, and by a Priest, whose Name was *Machareus*, Μαχαιρεύς. For so we ought to read in the Scholiast upon *Euripides* (*w*), in that Place where the Death of *Pyrrhus* is mention'd: here is the Passage according to the Vulgar Editions: κὴ ὁρῶν κτ' τὸ χρηςήριον κρέα δὲ ἐπιζῶντας τοὺς Δελφοὺς ἀφαιρεῦντας τὰ κρέα αὐτοῦ. ἑαυτὸν δὲ κτείνει μαχαίρᾳ. (*x*) *Meziriac* reads in the beginning ὁρῶν, and at the end, αὐτὸν δὲ κτείνει Μαχαιρεύς: So that instead of saying, that *Pyrrhus* kill'd himself with his own Hand, we must say, *That perceiving that the* Delphians, *near the place of the Oracle, took away the flesh of his Sacrifice, he took it away from them, and was killed by* Machareus. The Scholiast upon *Pindar*, and (*a*) *Pindar* himself mention that Quarrel. But the most common Opinion is, That (*b*) *Orestes* was the chief Author of *Pyrrhus*'s Death; whether he put himself at the Head of the *Delphians*, having made them believe, that they were to prevent the plundering of the Temple; or whether (*c*) he suborned some Assassins, without being present at it. *Virgil* says, that *Pyrrhus* was kill'd by him:

> *Ast* (*d*) *illum ereptæ magno inflammatus amore*
> *Conjugis, & scelerum furiis agitatus Orestes,*
> *Excipit incautum patriasque obtruncat ad aras.*

Velleius (*e*) *Paterculus*, and (*f*) *Hyginus* affirm the same thing.

(*G*) *It is not so certain whether he was buried there.*] For some Authors maintain, that his Bones were scatter'd upon the Frontiers of *Ambracia*. (*g*) *Cujus ossa per fines Ambraciæ sparsa sunt quæ est in Epiri regionibus*. *Ovid* is of the same Opinion:

> *Nec* (*h*) *tua quam Pyrrhi felicius ossa quiescant,*
> *Jacta per Ambracias qua jacuere vias.*

Mr. *de Boissieu* in his Commentary on these two Verses, justly censures *Casaubon* and *Corradus*, for having understood 'em of that *Pyrrhus*, who made War against the *Romans*; for it is certain, from the Testimony of three (*i*) Authors, that that *Pyrrhus* had an honourable Burial. He censures *Reineccius* too for applying the same Words to another *Pyrrhus* than the Son of *Achilles*. Besides, it is most certain, that we find very great Authorities to prove that our *Neoptolemus* was Interr'd at *Delphos*. Some (*k*) say, that his Sepulcher was to be seen in the Grove consecrated to *Apollo*. Others (*l*) observe, that he was buried under the Door of the Temple, and that *Menelaus* caused him to be removed into the Sacred Grove. *Pausanias* (*m*) not contented to say, that his Sepulcher was to be seen on the left hand as one goes out of the Temple, adds, That the *Delphians* made every Day some Funeral Expiation to his Honour. It is true, that they used him for a long time (*n*) as an Enemy, without paying any Honour to his Memory; for they did not honour him before he appear'd in the heat of the Battle, fighting for them against the *Gauls*, who endeavour'd to take the Town, and plunder the Temple.

(*H*) *Descended from the Sons of* Lanassa.] *Justin* (*p*) tells us, that *Lanassa*, Grand-daughter of *Hercules*, was stolen away by *Pyrrhus*, who met her in the Temple of *Jupiter Dodonæus*. He adds, That *Pyrrhus* had eight

---

‖ *Euripid. in Troad. Dictys l. 6. Homer. Odyss. l. 4.*

§ *Pausan. l. 1. p. 10. Pindar. Nem. 7. Justin. l. 17.*

✝ *Servius ub. sup.*

‖ *See the success of that War in the Art. of Harpalicus, & ap. Hygin. c. 193.*

¶ *Hygin. c. 123.*

‡ *Pherecydes apud Schol. Eurip. in Oreste. Pausan. l. 1. p. 10.*

* *Eurip. in Androm.*

† *Ovidius Epist. Herm. ad Orestem.*

(h) *Quint. Calab. l. 13. v. 222.*

(i) *Upon Ovid's Epistles p. 847.*

(k) *Epist. Hermion. ad Orest.*

(l) *Homer. Odyss. 4.*

(m) *In Odyss. l. 4.*

(n) *In Oreste.*

(o) *In Androm.*

(p) *Cap. 123.*

(q) *In Androm. Schol. Pind. in Nem. Od. 7. Strabo l. 9.*

(r) *Pind. Nem. Od. 7.*

(s) *Pherecydes ap. Schol. Euripid. in Oreste.*

(t) *Schol. Pind. & Strabo ub. sup. vid. etiam Pausan. l. 10.*

(u) *Pausan. l. 1. p. 13.*

(w) *In Orest.*

(x) *Upon Ovid's Epistles p. 855.*

(a) *Od. 7. Nem.*

(b) *Eurip. in Andr.*

(c) *Dictys l. 6. Justin l. 17. c. 3. Pausan. l. 2. p. 72.*

(d) *Virg. Æn. l. 3.*

(e) *Patercul. l. 1. c. 1.*

(f) *Hygin. c. 123.*

(g) *Hygin. ib.*

(h) *Ovid. in Ibin v. 305.*

(i) *Valer. Maxim. l. 5. c. 1. Plut. in Pyrrho. Auctor. de viris illustrib.*

(k) *Strabo l. 9.*

(l) *Schol. Pindar. in Od. 7. Nem.*

(m) *Pausan. l. 10. p. 341.*

(n) *Id. l. 1. p. 4.*

(o) *Lib. 6.*

(p) *Justin. l. 17. c. 3.*

PYRRHUS, King of the *Epirotes*, ſprung from the (*A*) preceding, and famous by reaſon of his Wars with the *Romans*, was one of the (*B*) greateſt Captains of all Antiquity. He was Son of *Æacides* and *Phthia*, Daughter of *Menon* the *Theſſalian*. He was expoſed to a violent Perſecution in the Beginning of his Life; for the *Moloſſians* who had dethroned *Æacides*, and killed as many of his Friends as they could apprehend, endeavoured to ſeize on his Son, who was ſtill at Nurſe: but ſo much diligence was uſed to ſave him, that notwithſtanding thoſe Purſuits, he was carried into *Illyricum* to King *Glaucias*, who took great care of his Education, and reſtored him to his Kingdom, being twelve Years of Age. Five Years after there happened a new Inſurrection, whereby *Pyrrhus* loſt his Kingdom. He retired to his Brother-in-Law † *Demetrius*. He was (*C*) with him at the memorable Battle of *Ipſus* ‡, where he gave great proofs of his Courage. The Peace being made between *Demetrius*, and *Ptolemy*, King of *Egypt*, *Pyrrhus* was ſent an Hoſtage to the Court of the latter, where he became ſo conſiderable, that he married *Antigone*, whom *Berenice* had by her firſt Huſband, before ſhe married *Ptolemy*. By the help of that Marriage, he got the Troops and Money he wanted, to recover his Kingdom. He divided it with the Uſurper *; but that Partition did not laſt long. *Pyrrhus* having diſcovered that that Man deſign'd to poyſon him, prevented him; for having invited him to Dinner, he killed him in cold Blood. Not long after he began to think of ſatisfying his Ambition, by the Conqueſt of *Macedonia*. The Miſ-underſtanding of the Sons of *Caſſander* afforded him an Occaſion for it. *Alexander* demanded ſome Succours of him againſt *Antipater* his Eldeſt Brother. He obtained it; but he paid ſeveral Provinces for it. *Demetrius*, of whom *Alexander* had alſo demanded ſome Succours, came to him very late, and yet too ſoon; for he killed *Alexander* to prevent him, and got himſelf proclaimed King of *Macedonia*. This occaſioned a War between him and *Pyrrhus*, in which there was a Battle fought, and *Pyrrhus*, who behaved himſelf with a wonderful Bravery, got the Victory. The Irruption he made afterwards into *Macedonia*, might have been very happy, had he not been obliged to retire with great Precipitation, and the Loſs of part of his Army. Notwithſtanding the Peace which was made ſoon after, he encouraged (*D*) the Succeſſors of *Alexander*, who deſign'd to attack *Demetrius*. The *Macedonians* forſook *Demetrius*, and gave up themſelves to *Pyrrhus*, who finding himſelf

† *He had married* Deidamia, *Pyrrhus's Siſter.*

‡ *In the Year of Rome* 451. *according to* Calviſius.

* *His Name was* Neoptolemus.

---

eight Children by her, and that his Son *Pialis* was his Succeſſor. *Meziriac* (*q*) maintains againſt him, from the Teſtimony of *Plutarch*, that *Lanaſſa* was Grand-daughter of *Hyllus*; but *Hyllus* was the Son of *Hercules*. On the other ſide, he obſerves, that, according to *Pauſanias*, (*r*) he who ſucceeded *Pyrrhus* was called *Pielus*, and was *Andromache's* Son.

(*A*) *Sprung from the preceding.*] See the laſt Remark of the foregoing Article, and the Remark *E* of the Article of *Andromache*. *Lloyd* and *Hofman* have adopted, for want of attention, this Overſight of *Charles Stephen's*, That *Pyrrhus* deſcended from *Achilles*, by his Mother's Side, and from *Hercules*, by his Father's Side: This was ſaid of *Alexander the Great*, not of *Pyrrhus*. They ſhould have ſaid quite the contrary, (*ſ*) as *Aurelius Victor* did.

(*B*) *One of the greateſt Captains of all Antiquity.*] He was ſo valiant a Man, that thoſe who ſaw him fight with ſo much Bravery, ſaid, That *Alexander* was revived in him; and that whereas other Kings were the Picture of that Conqueror, only by their Purple, their Life-Guards, the bending of their Necks, and the loud Tone of their Voice, *Pyrrhus* did repreſent him by his Valour and Noble Exploits. He had compoſed ſome Books (*t*) concerning the Art of War, which were an undeniable Proof of his Ability in Incamping, and Drawing up an Army in order of Battle, *&c.* and (*v*) he invented the Art of teaching that Diſcipline, by a kind of Game at Cheſs. Therefore he was early (*w*) look'd upon as one who would prove the greateſt Captain of his Age, if he lived. *Annibal* gave him the upperhand of all the greateſt Captains, when he told *Scipio*, that *Pyrrhus* was the Firſt of all, he (*Scipio*) the Second, and Himſelf the Third (*x*). But it muſt be confeſs'd, that *Livy* relates the Matter quite otherwiſe: He ſays, That *Annibal* having given the firſt place to *Alexander*, and the ſecond to *Pyrrhus*, aſcribed the third to himſelf. *What would you ſay*, ſaid *Scipio* to him, *if you had overcame me? If I had*, anſwered *Annibal*, *I ſhould think myſelf to be above* Alexander, *above* Pyrrhus, *and above all the Captains of the World.* I ſhall ſet down the Words of *Livy*, that one may know from whence he had this. (*y*) *Claudius ſecutus Græcos Acilianos libros, P. Africanum in ea fuiſſe legatione tradit: eumque Epheſi collocutum cum Annibale. Et ſermonem etiam unum refert, quo quærenti Africano*, quem fuiſſe maximum imperatorem Annibal crederet, *reſpondiſſe*, Alexandrum Macedonum regem; quod parvâ manu innumerabiles exercitus fudiſſet, quodque ultimas oras, quas viſere ſupra ſpem humanam eſſet, peragraſſet. *Quærenti deinde*, quem ſecundum poneret; Pyrrhum *dixiſſe*. . . . . *Exſequenti*, quem tertium duceret; haud dubiè ſemetipſum *dixiſſe*. *Tum riſum obortum Scipioni & ſubjeciſſe.* Quidnam tu diceres, ſi me viciſſes? Tum me verò, *inquit*, & ante Alexandrum, & ante Pyrrhum, & ante omnes alios imperatores eſſe. *Et perplexum Punico aſtu reſponſum, & improviſum aſſentationis genus Scipionem moviſſe: quod è grege ſe imperatorum velut ineſtimabilem ſecreviſſet.* Here follow the Reaſons for which *Annibal* eſteem'd *Pyrrhus*: (*z*) *Caſtra metari primum docuiſſe, ad hoc neminem elegantius loca cepiſſe, præſidia diſpoſuiſſe, artem etiam conciliandi ſibi homines eum habuiſſe, ut Italicæ gentes regis externi, quam populi Romani tamdiu principis in ea terra, imperium eſſe mallent.* Add to this that *Juſtin* ſays, That beſides his Military Virtues he was a Man of great Probity, and lived a very Holy Life. (*aa*) *Satis conſtans inter omnes auctores fama eſt, nullum nec ejus, nec ſuperioris ætatis regem comparandum Pyrrho fuiſſe; raroque non inter reges tantum, verum etiam inter illuſtres viros, aut vitæ ſanctioris, aut juſtitiæ probatioris viſum fuiſſe: ſcientiam certe rei militaris in illo viro tantam fuiſſe, ut cum Lyſimacho, Demetrio, Antigono, tantis regibus, bella gerens, invictus ſemper fuerit Illyriorum quoque, Siculorum, Romanorumque, & Carthaginienſium bellis, nunquam inferior, pleramque etiam victor extiterit, qui patriam certe ſuam anguſtam, ignobilemque, fama rerum geſtarum, & claritate nominis ſui, toto orbe illuſtrem reddiderit.* *Cicero* (*bb*) praiſes him alſo for his great Probity. We ſhall ſee in the Remark *L*, that he knew very well how to make uſe of thoſe Intrigues, the Art whereof is one of the beſt Parts of a Great Captain.

(*C*) *Was with him.*] *Moreri* ſays, That at the Battle of *Ipſus*, *Victory favour'd the Party of* Pyrrhus, *againſt* Antigonus *and* Demetrius. There is nothing of Truth in all this; for the Party of *Pyrrhus* was, at that time, the ſame with that of *Antigonus* and *Demetrius*; or, to ſpeak more exactly, *Pyrrhus* was in that Battle only in the Quality of an Adventurer, or a Volunteer of *Demetrius's* Party. *Hofman* has committed the ſame Fault.

(*D*) *The Succeſſors of* Alexander, *who deſign'd.*] *Pyrrhus* (*a*) did eaſily yield to the Temptation, when

(*q*) *Upon* Ovid's *Epiſtles p.* 851.

(*r*) *Lib.* 1.

(*ſ*) Pyrrhus rex Epeirotarum paterno genere ab Achille, materno ab Hercule oriundus.

(*t*) *See* Tully *Ep. Fam.* 25. *l.* 9.

(*v*) Pyrrhus peritiſſimus ſtrategematon fuit, primuſque quemadmodum ea diſciplina per calculos in tabula traderetur oſtendit. *Donat. in Terent. Eun. act.* 4. *ſc.* 7.

(*w*) *Antigonus ſaid it. Plut. in vit. Pyrrhi p.* 387.

(*x*) *Plut. ib.*

(*y*) *Tit. Liv. l.* 35. *p. m.* 652.

(*z*) *Id. ib. See alſo Ammian. Marcel. l.* 24. *init.*

(*aa*) *Juſtin. l.* 25. *ſub. fin. p. m.* 452, 453.

(*bb*) Cum duobus ducibus de imperio in Italia decertatum, Pyrrho & Annibale. Ab altero, propter probitatem ejus non nimis alienos animos habemus, alterum propter crudelitatem ſemper hæc civitas oderit. *Cicero de amicitia, c.* 8.

(*a*) *See Plutarch ub. infr.*

ſelf by that means Maſter of *Macedonia*, did notwithſtanding divide it with *Lyſimachus*. He loſt his Half in the ſame manner he had got the Whole; for the *Macedonians* forſook him to joyn with *Lyſimachus*, who was their Country-man. Thus *Pyrrhus* was reduced to his Patrimony. He ſtaid not long in it; for he was a reſtleſs Man, who knew not how to ſpend his Time, without *(E)* attacking his Neighbours, or being attacked by them: ſo he willingly hearkened to the Propoſals *(F)* of the *Tarentines*, who deſired him to come over into *Italy*, to be their General againſt the *Romans*. *Cineas* of *Theſſaly*, a Diſciple of *Demoſthenes*, endeavoured to diſſuade *Pyrrhus* from that Expedition; but it was to no purpoſe, *Sic erat in fatis*. That Prince went † over therefore into *Italy*, with very good Troops, and becauſe the *Romans* ſaved him part of the way, he advanced as far as *Heraclea (G)* towards the River *Siris*, without ſtaying for all the Troops of the Allies, and offered his Mediation to the Conſul *Lævinus*, who anſwered him, *that the* Romans *would have none of his Arbitration, and were not afraid of having him for their Enemy.* He went to take a view of the *Roman* Army, and ſaid, that thoſe Barbarians *(H)* had nothing of Barbarity in their manner of Encamping. There was a Battle fought not long after, in which *Pyrrhus* was in great danger of being kill'd, and the Fight proved doubtful for a conſiderable time; for they gave Ground ſeven times on both ſides, but at laſt the *Epirots* got the Victory, becauſe *(I)* of the Elephants, whoſe Smell frighted the *Roman* Horſes. The conſequences of this Victory proved very conſiderable,

† *In the Year of Rome 473, the laſt of the 124th Olympiad.*

when the Heads of the Confederacy repreſented to him, that he took not a prudent Courſe. He had a mind to obſerve the Treaty of Peace whilſt *Demetrius* would be ingaged in a great War: whereby he would have loſt the occaſion of ſucceeding in his Deſign, and his Neighbour might have had time enough to expect a favourable opportunity for himſelf. Why, ſaid they to *Pyrrhus*, had you not rather conquer *Macedonia* upon a Prince who cannot defend it, by reaſon of the great number of Enemies who will attack him, than expoſe your ſelf to the trouble of defending your own Country againſt him, when he has made a Treaty of Peace? They did alſo repreſent to him, how he had been wrong'd by *Demetrius*, who had raviſhed his Wife, and taken the Iſle of *Corcyra* from him. In order to underſtand this, we muſt know that *Lanaſſa*, Daughter of *Agathocles* Tyrant of *Syracuſa*, brought that Iſland to *Pyrrhus* for her Portion; but perceiving that her Husband ſhewed more kindneſs to his other Wives than to herſelf, ſhe looked for another Husband: and becauſe *Demetrius* was accounted a Prince more eaſily to be induced to a new Marriage than any other, ſhe propoſed to him to come and meet her in the Iſle of *Corcyra*, whither ſhe had retired. He did it, and married her, and left a Garriſon in the Iſland *(b)*. Thoſe Reaſons were more than ſufficient to move ſo ambitious a Prince as *Pyrrhus* was, not to obſerve a Treaty of Peace. I ſhall add by the bye, that he had by *Antigone*, a Son called *Ptolemy*, who was killed *(c)* by the *Lacedæmonians*, and by *Lanaſſa* he had *Alexander*, who ſucceeded him, and by *Bircenna*, *Helenus (d)* of whom I ſhall ſpeak in the Remark *P*. I ſhall ſpeak of his Daughters in the next Article.

(b) Taken from Plutarch in vit. Pyrrhi p. 388, 389.

(c) See the Rem. B. in the Art. Cleonymus.

(d) Plut. in vit. Pyrrhi: but Juſtin. l. 23. c. 3. ſays, that Helenus *was Son of the Daughter of* Agathocles.

(E) Without attacking his Neigbours, or being attacked by them.] *Pyrrhus* was a Man of an exorbitant Ambition, and of a ſtirring and reſtleſs Spirit. *Plutarch (e)* compares him with *Achilles*,

——— Who (f) languiſhed there,
When left alone, deſiring Noiſe and War.

He underſtood War *(g)* to admiration; he executed his Deſigns with an incomparable Courage and Reſolution: but he was much fitter to Conquer than to preſerve what he had conquered; becauſe, at the very ſame time that he made new Conqueſts, he fram'd vaſt Deſigns, and fill'd his Mind with new hopes, which kept him from thinking by what means he might preſerve what he had acquired. *Ut (h) ad devincenda regna invictus habebatur, ita devictis acquiſitiſque celeriter carebat. Tanto melius ſtudebat acquirere imperia quam retinere.* *Antigonus* compared him with a Gameſter, who has a fair Game to play, but knows not how to make an advantage of it. The ſame thing was ſaid of *Annibal*; *(i) Non omnia nimirum eidem Dii dederunt; vincere ſcis Annibal, victoria uti neſcis.* It is not an unuſual Fault: Our Age affords us ſeveral Examples of Generals, who knew not how to make an Advantage of their Victories. Things are directed by God in that manner, leſt a Nation be too much oppreſt at one time. One might quote a thouſand Sayings like theſe two. *(k) Non minor eſt virtus quàm quærere parta tueri.* *(l) Parari ſingula acquirendo facilius poſſunt, quàm univerſa teneri.*

(e) Ub. ſup. p. 390.

(f) Hom. Iliad. l. 1. v. 491. Φθινύθεσκε φίλον κῆρ Αὖθι μένων, ποθέεσκε δ' ἀϋτήν τε πτόλεμόν τε.

Mace- bat um cor lic ma- ens, de- derabat tem amo- mque gnam- e.

) Plut. 400.

) Juſt. 25. c. 4.

) Livy l. See alſo rus l. c. 6.

) Ovid. Arte andi l. v. 13.

) Livy 7. See us l. c. 17.

(F) He willingly hearkened to the Propoſals of the Tarentines.] That People fell out with the *Romans* without a Cauſe, and afterwards, tho' *(m)* they were inferiour to them, they could never reſolve to make a Peace with them. A certain ſort of Men called *Demagogues*, put all things in a Combuſtion by their Harangues, and ſtirred up every Body to take up Arms, ſo far as to move the People to call for a Foreign Prince, rather than make a Peace. What was the Conſequence of all this? They were forced to ſubmit to the *Roman* Yoak ſooner than they would have done otherwiſe.

I ſhall obſerve, that the Deputies of the *Tarentines* repreſented to *Pyrrhus* the Service they had done him in the War againſt the *Corcyreans*, and added, that *Italy* was a finer Country than *Greece*. But obſerve eſpecially, that that Prince flattered himſelf with a good Succeſs, conſidering that he was ſprung from *Achilles*, and that the *Romans* were a *Trojan* Colony *(n)*. We can never too much reflect on the Weakneſs and fooliſh Superſtition of Great Men.

(m) Μήτε φέρειν τ̀ πόλεμον δυνάμενοι, μήτε διὰ θρασύτητα ϗ μοχθηρίαν δημαγωγῶν. Pares cùm eis armis non eſſent, neque poſſent ea ob ferociam & pravitatem concionatorum ſuorum deponere. *Plut. in Pyrrho p.* 390.

(n) Pauſan. l. 1. c. 12.

(G) Near Heraclea *towards the River* Siris.] *Florus (o)* committed a Fault in Geography, ſaying: *Apud Heracleam & Campaniæ fluvium Lirim, Lævino Conſule, prima pugna.* *Salmaſius* in his Notes upon that Author, ſhews very well, that *Heraclea* was not in *Campania*, and that *Florus* has confounded the River *Liris* with the River *Siris*. The former is in *Campania*, and not the latter: but becauſe it was certain that the firſt Battle was fought near *Heraclea*, they who confounded thoſe two Rivers, placed *Heraclea* in *Campania*. See *Cluverius*, *Chap.* 14. of the 4th Book of his *Italia antiqua*. He reads in *Florus*, *Apud Heracleam & Lucaniæ fluvium Sirim*, &c.

(o) *Flor. l. 1. c. 18.*

(H) That thoſe Barbarians had nothing of Barbarity.] *Aurelius Victor* makes him ſay a thing on this occaſion, in which there is no Senſe, becauſe it has been removed out of its place. *Viſo*, ſays he, *Lævini exercitu eandem ſibi ait adverſus Romanos, quam Herculi adverſus hydram, fuiſſe fortunam.* According to *Plutarch*, *(a) Cineas* made uſe of that Compariſon, when he ſaw how eaſily the *Romans* had encreaſed their Army after the firſt Battle, and what a Multitude of Inhabitants remained in *Rome*, after all thoſe new Levies. It was then very proper to remember the Heads of the *Hydra*; but it had been an abſurd thing to think of it before the firſt Battle. Now becauſe Authors ſeem to have ſworn never to agree in their Relations, *Florus* aſcribes that very Thought to *Pyrrhus* himſelf. *(b) Video me planè Herculis ſidere procreatum, cui quaſi ab angue Lernæo tot cæſa hoſtium capita de ſanguine ſuo renaſcantur.*

(a) Plut. in Pyrrho p. 395.

(b) Flor. ibid.

(I) Becauſe of the Elephants.] The *Romans* called (c) 'em *Boves Lucas*, becauſe, as 'tis reported, the *Romans* ſaw them for the firſt time in *Lucania*, in the time of *Pyrrhus*'s War. *Pliny* ſays that this happened in the Year 472, and he obſerves that ſome were ſeen at *Rome* ſeven Years after at a Triumph. He ſeems thereby to ſuppoſe, that that War laſted ſeven Years, and according to *Pliny* it ended in the Year 479. *Plutarch* ſays, that *Pyrrhus* returned into his Country ſix Years after his Departure. According to the Supputation of *Calviſius*, as you

(c) *Plin. l. 8. c. 6. Varro de Ling. Lat. l. 6.*

conſiderable, tho' *Pyrrhus* had loſt a great many brave Men, and many good Officers. He remained Maſter of the Field, and advanced within 36 † Miles of *Rome*: Which did not alter in the leaſt the Conſtancy and Reſolution of the *Romans*, nor ſo much as move them to take the Command from *Lævinus*, tho' many People complained (*K*) of his Conduct. *Pyrrhus* being deſirous to make a Peace, ſent (*L*) *Cineas* to * *Rome*. The Eloquence and inſinuating Ways of that Ambaſſador had in ſome meaſure prevailed upon the Senate. But *Appius Claudius*, who, by reaſon of his great Age and want of Sight, had quite laid aſide the Care of Publick Affairs, was carried to the Aſſembly, and made a Speech, which moved the Senate to declare to *Cineas*, that if *Pyrrhus* deſired the Friendſhip of the *Roman* People, he muſt firſt draw his Forces out of *Italy*, and then they would treat with him. The Conſul *Fabricius* was leſs unfortunate than *Lævinus*, and did an Action which was as good as a Victory, with reſpect to the true Glory of a Nation; for he let β *Pyrrhus* know that his Phyſician offered to Poyſon him. The Battle ‡ fought near *Aſculum*, was very Bloody. Some Hiſtorians ſay that the *Epirots* won it; others maintain that it (*M*) was doubtful, and that the Retreat was ſounded on both Sides. *Pyrrhus*'s Army was ſo much leſſened, that he anſwered thoſe who came to Congratulate him, *We are undone, if we get another Victory.* He was therefore very well pleaſed to have a pretence to carry his Arms elſewhere, that is to ſay, to go over ⸸ into *Sicily*, from whence Ambaſſadors had been ſent to him to come to their Aſſiſtance, and to free that Iſland from the Yoke of the *Carthaginians*, and ſeveral other petty Tyrants. That Expedition was attended with a very good Succeſs; but thoſe Iſlanders, whoſe Republican Spirit did not ſuit with *Pyrrhus*'s Humour, could not endure that he ſhould not treat 'em as kindly and civilly as he did in the Beginning: ſo that the ſame Spirit, which moved them to have recourſe to his Protection, made 'em ſoon look for other Maſters. In this difficult Juncture, he received very ſeaſonably ſome Letters from the *Tarentines*, who acquainted him that they ſtood in great need of his Aſſiſtance, ſo that he had a fair Pretence of Boaſting, that he was not forced to leave *Sicily*, but that he went to ſuccour ſome other Allies. He had much ado to get into *Italy*, the *Carthaginians* deſtroyed his Fleet, and the *Mamertines* did very much annoy his Troops after their landing. It was then † that *Pyrrhus*, tho' wounded in the Head, fell with ſuch a Fury upon a Barba-

† *Eutropius reckons but 18 Miles, Florus in.* Victor primo prælio Pyrrhus, *ſays he, l. 1. c. 18.* totam trementem Campaniam, Lirim Fregellaſque populatus, prope captam urbem à Præneſtina arce proſpexit, & viceſimo lapide oculos trepidæ civitatis fumo ac pulvere implevit.

* *In the Year of* Rome 474

β *See the Rem. D in the Art.* Fabricius.

‡ *In the Year of Rome* 475.

⸸ *In the Year of Rome* 475.

† *In the Year of Rome* 478.

may ſee in the Margin, that War began in the Year 473, and ended in the Year 478. But Father *Labbe* places the Beginning of it in the Year 474, and the End in the Year 480. Is it not a ſad thing, that Authors ſhould not agree about Matters of that Importance? To return to the Elephants, they proved both uſeful and miſchievous to *Pyrrhus*, they did him good Service in the firſt Battle: but they were not much feared in the ſecond; one (*d*) of 'em was wounded, whereby it appeared that they were not Immortal: in the third Fight they cauſed a great Diſorder among *Pyrrhus*'s Troops. *Eadem feræ*, ſays *Florus*, *quæ primam victoriam abſtulerant, ſecundam parem fecerant, tertiam ſine controverſia tradidere.* That Hiſtorian knew not that ſome few Lines before he had ſaid, that *Pyrrhus* was quite overcome in the ſecond Battle, which he confirms before he ends his Chapter. He had ſaid juſt before, that the *Romans* did not leave off killing till the Night put a ſtop to it, and that *Pyrrhus* was the laſt of thoſe who fled; and ſince he affirms in the Recapitulation of his Narrative, that the King's Camp was plundered twice, *bis exuto caſtris*, he muſt needs mean that the firſt plundering happened in the ſecond Battle. What was therefore his meaning, when he ſaid *ſecundam parem fecerant?*

(*K*) *Many People complained of the Conduct of* Lævinus.] *Fabricius* ſaid (*e*), that the Loſs was not to be aſcribed to the *Roman* Soldiers, but to their General, and that the *Epirots* had not overcome the *Romans*, but that *Pyrrhus* had overcome the Conſul *Lævinus*. *Pyrrhus* had already beſtowed this Encomium upon himſelf; for he cried out, Oh how eaſie it would be for *Pyrrhus* to conquer the World, if the *Romans* were his Soldiers, or for the *Romans*, if *Pyrrhus* was their King! (*f*) *O quam facile erat orbis imperium occupare aut mihi Romanis militibus, aut me rege Romanis?*

(*L*) *Sent* Cineas *to* Rome.] *Pyrrhus*'s Courage and Bravery were ſo great, that one would think he ſcorned to be beholden to any thing beſides his Sword: but he had too much Experience to have ſuch Thoughts; for the greateſt Warriours have moſt times (*g*) made uſe of Intrigues and Negociations. *Pyrrhus* uſed to ſend *Cineas* before him, that he might prepare his way, and remove difficulties. *Cineas* made out by his Eloquence the Truth of *Euripides*'s Saying (*h*), that any thing that may be done with the Sword, may be done likewiſe with Words. *Pyrrhus* confeſt, that he had got more Towns by the fine Speeches of *Cineas* (*i*), than by his Arms. Methinks *Cicero* is not juſt enough to *Pyrrhus*, becauſe he does not except him from thoſe who were involved (*k*) under this hard Sentence of the Poet *Ennius*, *Semper fuit ſtolidum genus Æacidarum, belli potentes ſunt magis quam ſapientipotentes*: he only believes that that Prince underſtood the Ambiguity of this Oracle, *Aio te Æacida Romanos vincere poſſe.* I ſhall obſerve by the by, that *Cicero* alledges four Reaſons to prove that this Oracle was invented by *Ennius*: 1. The *Grecians* never ſaid any thing of it: 2. *Apollo* never anſwered in *Latin*: 3. He had ceaſed to anſwer in Verſes in the Time of *Pyrrhus*: 4. That Prince was too ſharp-ſighted not to perceive the Illuſion of it. But if he ſhould be anſwered, that *Ennius* rendred in a *Latin* Verſe, an Anſwer which was given in *Greek* Proſe, it would very much weaken his Arguments.

(*M*) *That it was doubtful.*] It is not an Invention of our Age for thoſe that are worſted to have recourſe (*l*) to this ſhift out of Vanity, Shame, or Policy; tho' perhaps that ſort of Unſincerity is now more in vogue than formerly. The *Romans* did not deny that *Pyrrhus* won the firſt Battle, but ſome of their Hiſtorians have ſaid that the Advantage was equal in the ſecond, and others, that (*m*) *Pyrrhus* was defeated. *Plutarch* quotes two Authors, one of whom ſays that the *Romans* loſt about 15000 Men in the firſt Battle, and *Pyrrhus* 13000; the other ſays, that the *Romans* loſt ſeven thouſand Men, and *Pyrrhus* near four thouſand. As to the ſecond Battle, the one ſays that the *Romans* loſt ſix thouſand Men, and *Pyrrhus* 3505, as it appeared from the Records of that Prince; the other ſays in general, that 15 thouſand Men fell on both Sides. From whence it appears that *Moreri* ſhould not have ſaid, that the Loſs of the *Romans* in the two firſt Battles, was leſs than that of the *Epirots*. He is miſtaken alſo as to the Time to which he applies that Reflection of *Pyrrhus*, *We are undone, if we get another Victory*: that Reflection was made after the ſecond Battle. To conclude, the two Authors mention'd by *Plutarch* do very much differ from *Eutropius*, who ſays that the *Romans* had all the Advantage of that Day. *Pyrrhus*, ſays he, *vulneratus eſt, elephanti interfecti, viginti millia cæſa hoſtium, & ex Romanis tantum quinque millia. Pyrrhus Tarentum fugatus.* *Frontinus* (*n*) makes the Loſs amount to the ſame number of Men.

(*N*) He

(*d*) Caius Minucius quartæ legionis haſtatus unius proboſcide abſciſſa, mori poſſe belluas oſtenderat. *Florus l. 1. c. 18.*

(*e*) *Plut. in Pyrrho p.* 394.

(*f*) *Flor. l. 1. c. 18.*

(*g*) *See the Rem. B. in the Art.* Attila.

(*h*) Ὅτι πᾶν ἐξαιρεῖ λόγος ὃ καὶ σίδηρος πολεμίων δράσειεν ἄν. Omne id expugnare verba compta ferrum quod minax poſſit. *Plut. in Pyrrho p. 391. B.*

(*i*) *Plut. ib.*

(*k*) *Cicero de Divinat. l. 2.*

(*l*) *See the Rem. F in the Art.* Fabricius.

(*m*) *See Florus's Contradiction in the Rem. I.*

(*n*) *Stratag. l. 2. c. 3.*

Barbarian, who had challenged him, that he (N) cut his Body aſunder with a Blow he ſtruck on his Head with a Hanger. As ſoon as he came to *Tarentum*, he haſtened his March againſt the *Romans* and loſt a Battle * near *Beneventum*: after which he reſolved to return into his Country, where ſo many Viciſſitudes of Fortune that he went through, could not teach him to be quiet. He engaged in ſeveral new Expeditions. He ſucceeded in that of *Macedonia*; he beat the Army of *Antigonus*, Son of *Demetrius*, and took from him the beſt part of his Kingdom. Afterwards he made a War againſt the *Lacedemonians*, at the Sollicitation of *Cleonymus* γ, who was diſcontented becauſe he reigned not in *Sparta*: but he was ſo vigorouſly repulſed by them, that he was forced to reſt contented with waſting the Country, and taking Winter Quarters in it. In the mean while *Ariſtias* perſuaded him to go to *Argos*, where a Faction had lately broke out between the ſame *Ariſtias* and *Ariſtippus*. *Antigonus* came to the Aſſiſtance of the latter. Tho' *Pyrrhus* was introduced into the City by *Ariſtias*, he could not make himſelf Maſter of it; he was obliged to fight in the Streets with the Inhabitants and the Troops of *Antigonus*, and there he died δ, being wounded in the Head with a (O) Tile. *Antigonus* (P) treated him very generouſly after his Death. Very ſtrange Things (Q) have been reported of *Pyrrhus*; as for Example, that he cured the Spleen with the Touch of his Right Foot, and that his Great Toe had a Divine Virtue ‡.

PYRRHUS, King of *Epirus*, Grand-Son to the former, ſucceeded his Father *Alexander*, and was at firſt under the Tuition of his Mother *Olympias*. During his Minority, the *Ætolians* were ſo unjuſt as to undertake to deprive him of part of *Acarnania*, *viz.* that which fell to the Share of his Father, in the Partition of a Conqueſt which he had made with 'em. *Olympias* had recourſe to *Demetrius* King of *Macedonia*; and the better to ingage him to ſuccour her, ſhe gave him in Marriage her Daughter *Phthia*. The Hiſtorian ǂ ſtops here, without acquainting us with any other Conſequences of the Deſign of the *Ætolians*, except the Irruption which they made into the Frontiers of *Epirus* in the Time of *Ptolemy*, Brother and Succeſſor of our *Pyrrhus*. There muſt be there a Chaſm, for undoubtedly ſome Years paſſed between the Minority and Death of *Pyrrhus*. However, the Princeſs *Olympias* made uſe of too violent a Remedy, to cure her Son of his Love;

(N) *He cut his Body aſunder.*] This is one of the *Feats* of our ancient *Paladins*, who cut aſunder the moſt daring Giants to the very Saddle-bow. It is certain that *Plutarch* has related ſome Actions of *Pyrrhus*, which look rather like the Actions of a Romantick, than of a real Hero: he did well to fortifie himſelf with the Authority of *Homer*, (a) who has obſerved ſomewhere, that of all Virtues, Bravery only is ſubject to Fanatical Tranſports, and Fits of Frenzy. Τῶν ἀρετῶν μόνην τὴν ἀνδρείαν φορὰς πολλάκις ἐνθουσιώδεις καὶ μανικὰς δεχομένην. *Fortitudinem unam identidem lymphatyco & phanatico motu ferri.* The Northern Nations in the time of Paganiſm, believed that the God *Odinus* who preſided over the War, inſpired Men with ſo great a Fury, that one of the weakeſt was able to fight ten Men. *Horum primarius Deus erat Odinus, qui res bellicas dirigere credebatur, furoremque hominibus, quem* Berſerkicum *vocabant, immittere, quo qui correptus erat, vel decem aliis poterat obſiſtere, utut infirmus extra raptum ac debilis* (b).

There is in *Plutarch* another Paſſage, which it will not be improper to ſet down here: (†) "Not "only in Poetry, (as *Plato* very well obſerves) he "that is Inſpired by the Muſes, and as it were poſ"ſeſſed by a Poetical Fury, will make him, who is "otherwiſe a Maſter of his Trade, and an exact "Critick in Poetry, appear Ridiculous: But alſo in "Fighting, thoſe who are Elevated and Inſpired "with a Noble Rage, and a Reſolution (*) and "Courage above the common Pitch, become Invin"cible, and are not to be withſtood. And this is "that Warlike Fury which the Gods, as *Homer* will "have it, infuſe into Men of Honour,

"*He ſpoke——And every Word new Strength Inſpir'd.*
"And again
"*This more than Humane Rage is from the Gods.*

(O) *With a Tile.*] 'Twas a Woman, who from her Windows threw that Tile at the King's Head. The *Argivi*, to make a wonderful thing of that Accident, or to keep up the Credulity of the People, publiſhed that *Ceres* had done it, having put on a Woman's Shape. The Poet *Leuceas* failed not to inſert that Tradition in his Hiſtory of the *Argivi* (c).

(P) Antigonus *treated him generouſly.*] *Pyrrhus*'s Head being cut off, came into the Hands of *Alcyoneus*, who carried it to his Father *Antigonus*. The latter having known it, cudgelled his Son for it, called him a cruel and barbarous Man, cover'd his Face and wept. Afterwards he cauſed the Head and the reſt of *Pyrrhus*'s Body to be honourably Interr'd. *Alcyoneus* learn'd better Manners, for having found *Helenus*, Son of *Pyrrhus*, he made much of him, and carried him to *Antigonus*. That Prince praiſed that Action, and told his Son that it had been more acceptable to him, if he had taken from *Helenus* the ſorry Cloak he had on. Afterwards he ſhewed a great deal of Kindneſs to *Helenus*, and ſent him well equipp'd into *Epirus* (d).

(Q) *Very ſtrange things have been reported of* Pyrrhus.] When he was to cure any Body of the Spleen, he prepared himſelf for it by ſacrificing a white Cock; and then the ſick Perſon lay upon the Ground, and *Pyrrhus* preſt the Spleen gently with his Foot. He was always willing to cure the pooreſt ſort of People. He was preſented with a Cock after he had performed his Sacrifice, and that Preſent was very acceptable to him. His upper Gum was a continued Bone, with ſome Lines in it, which mark'd the number of his Teeth. The Divine Virtue of the Great Toe of his Right Foot appeared when his Corps was burnt, for that Toe was found entire. This is what we find in *Plutarch* (e). We read in *Pliny* (f), that the ſame Toe had the Gift of Healing, and that having not been damaged by the Flames, it was buried by itſelf in a Temple. It was without doubt honoured as a Holy Relick: and can we now object againſt the Heathens, that they had no Kings like our Chriſtian Princes, who cure the Jaundice and the King's Evil? Now becauſe I have promiſed elſewhere, to ſpeak in this Place of a Falſity which concerns *Achilles*, I ſhall ſet it down here. *Camerarius* (h) having ſaid that *Pyrrhus*'s Great Toe had a Divine Virtue, and that it was found intire in the Flames which had conſumed the reſt of the Body, adds immediately after, that *Homer* affirms the ſame thing concerning *Achilles*. *Caſpar à Reies* ſays more than once, but always in general (i), that *Pyrrhus*'s Finger cured thoſe that were ſick of the Spleen; to which he adds in one place, (k) *that* Homer *writes almoſt the ſame thing of* Achilles. He was deceived by *Camerarius*. I would fain know who deceived the latter. *Homer* ſays no ſuch thing, and I can ſcarce believe that any of the Ancients mentioned it. That Toe of *Pyrrhus* puts me in Mind of a Story of the *Rabbins*. It is mention'd by *Agrippa*. They ſay that there is in the Body of Man a little Bone called *Luz*, which cannot be broken nor burnt, out of which our Bodies ſhall grow up again in the Time of the Reſurrection, as a Plant grows up again out of its Seed. (l) *Eſt in hu-*

---

* In 478.

α In 481.

γ See the Article of Cleonymus.

δ In 480 according to Calviſius, or 482 according to F. Labbe.

‡ Taken from Plut. in the Life of Pyrrhus.

ǂ Juſt. l. 28. c. 1. & ſeq.

(a) In vit. Pyrrhi p. 398.

(b) See the Journal of Leipſick 1690. p. 3. in the Abſtract of a Book of Thomas Bartholinus, intitled Antiquitatum Danicarum de cauſis contemtæ à Danis adhuc Gentilibus mortis.

(†) Plut. de Virtute Morali towards the end. p. 452.

(*) Περὶ τὰς μάχας τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐνθουσιῶδες, ἀνυπόστατον δεῖ καὶ ἀήττητον· ὃ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς Ὅμηρος ἐμποιεῖν φησι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (ὡς εἰπὼν ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα ποιμένι λαῶν. καὶ, οὐχ ὅγ' ἄνευθε θεοῦ τάδε μαίνεται.) In præliis etiam animo Concitati ac furore correpti ſubſiſti ſuperarique nequeunt: qualem inſtinctum Homerus ait a diis homini inſeri. *Sic ait atque duci per magna flamina vires inſpirat*: & *furium non abſque inſtinctu furit hic ita inſanus.*

(c) Pauſan. l. 1. p. 12, 13.

(d) Ex Plutarcho ſub fin. vit. Pyrrhi. See alſo Juſtin. l. 25. c. 4. Val. Max l. 5. c. 1.

(e) Pyrrho p. 384.

(f) Lib. 7. c. 2.

(h) Horar. ſucciſ. Cent. 3. c. 42.

(i) He never ſays that it was the Great Toe of the Right Foot. See his E. Elyſius Campus, quæſt. 24. n. 4. & n. 31. & quæſt. 28. n. 24, & 26.

(k) Quæſt. 28. n. 26.

(l) Agrippa de Occulta Philoſophia l. 1. c. 20. p. m. 32.

Love; for ſhe cauſed † his Miſtreſs (Z) to be poyſoned. *Ptolomy*, who ſucceeded his Brother *Pyrrhus*, did not out-live him long. Their Mother follow'd 'em ſoon after, being overwhelm'd with Grief for the loſs of her two Sons. There remained but two Princeſſes of the Royal Family, *Nereis* and *Deidamia*, *Olympias*'s Siſters *, and Daughters of *Pyrrhus*, Grand-father of This. *Nereis* was the Wife of *Gelon*, King of *Sicily*. *Deidamia* was kill'd near the Altar of *Diana* in a Sedition. The Gods, to puniſh that Crime, afflicted the *Epirots* ſeveral ways, and they were almoſt deſtroyed by Famine, and by Civil and Foreign Wars †.

PYTHAGORAS, is the firſt of the Ancient Sages who took the (A) Name of *Philoſopher*. He flouriſhed in the Time of *Tarquin* the laſt King of *Rome*, not in *Numa*'s (B) Time, as many Authors ſay. He made himſelf very Illuſtrious by

---

mano corpore os quoddam minimum, quod Hebræi Luz appellant, magnitudine Ciceris mundati, quod nulli corruptioni obnoxium, nec igne quidem vincitur, ſed ſemper conſervatur illæſum: ex quo (ut dicunt) velut planta ex ſemine, in reſurrectione mortuorum corpus noſtrum animale repullulaſcet. I am beholden for this Paſſage to Mr. *Drelincourt*, Profeſſor of Phyſick; and 'tis a great Satiſfaction to me to make this publick Acknowledgment of it.

(Z) *Cauſed his Miſtreſs to be poyſoned.*] She was of (a) *Leucas*, and her Name was *Tigris*. Mr. *Boiſſieu* (b) rejects all the Explications that have been given of theſe two Verſes of *Ovid*:

Utque nepos dicti, noſtro modo carmine, regis
Cantharidum ſuccos dante parente bibas.

and is of Opinion that they are meant of our *Pyrrhus*, and that his Mother *Olympias* gave him no Quarter no more than to his Concubine *Tigris*. If it be ſo, *Juſtin* ſhould not have aſcribed the Death of that Princeſs to her Grief for the Loſs of her two Sons. An honourable Name ought not to be given to the Deſpair of a Mother tormented with the Remorſes of Conſcience, for having been the Cauſe of her Son's Death.

(A) *The firſt ..... who took the Name of* Philoſopher.] Before him, thoſe who excelled in the Knowledge of Nature, and made themſelves conſpicuous by an Exemplary Life, were called *Sages*, σοφοί. That Title appearing to him too Great, he took another, which ſhewed that he aſcribed not to himſelf the poſſeſſion of Wiſdom, but only the Deſire of poſſeſſing it. He therefore called himſelf *Philoſopher*, that is to ſay, a Lover of Wiſdom. The Profeſſors of the Science of Nature, and of Morals, have retained that Name ever ſince. *Cicero* tells us the Native Country of that new Title, what gave Occaſion to it, and its Signification. (c) *A quibus ducti deinceps omnes, qui in rerum contemplatione ſtudia ponebant, ſapientes & habebantur, & nominabantur: idque eorum nomen uſque ad Pythagoræ manavit ætatem: quem, ut ſcribit auditor Platonis Ponticus Heraclides, vir doctus in primis, Phliuntem ferunt veniſſe, eumque cum Leonte, Principe Phliaſiorum, doctè, & copioſè diſſeruiſſe quædam: cujus ingenium, & eloquentiam cum admiratus eſſet Leon, quæſiviſſe ex eo, qua maximè arte confideret: at illum artem* quidem ſe ſcire nullam, ſed eſſe philoſophum: *admiratum Leontem novitatem nominis, quæſiſſe*, quinam eſſent Philoſophi, & quid inter eos, & reliquos intereſſet, *Pythagoram autem reſpondiſſe, SIMILEM ſibi videri vitam hominum, & mercatum eum, qui haberetur maximo ludorum apparatu totius Græciæ celebritate: nam ut illic alii corporibus exercitatis gloriam, & nobilitatem coronæ peterent: alii emendi, aut vendendi quæſtu, & lucro ducerentur: eſſet autem quoddam genus eorum, idque vel maximè ingenuum, qui nec plauſum, nec lucrum quærerent, ſed viſendi cauſa venirent, ſtudioſeque perſpicerent, quid ageretur, & quo modo: item nos quaſi in mercatus quandam celebritatem ex urbe aliqua, ſic in hanc vitam ex alia vita, & natura profectos; alios gloriæ ſervire, alios pecuniæ: raros eſſe quoſdam, qui, cæteris omnibus pro nihilo habitis, rerum naturam ſtudioſè intuerentur: hos ſe appellare ſapientiæ ſtudioſos, id eſt philoſophos: & ut illic liberaliſſimum eſſet, ſpectare, nihil ſibi acquirentem, ſic in vita longè omnibus ſtudiis contemplationem rerum, cognitionemque præſtare. Nec vero Pythagoras nominis ſolum inventor, ſed rerum etiam ipſarum amplificator fuit.*

(B) *Not in* Numa'*s Time.*] I cannot ſet down the Birth day of the Word *Philoſopher*, the very Year of its Birth is unknown. We only know that *Pythagoras* made that Diſcourſe (d) before he came over into *Italy*, and we are only told in general, that it was under the Reign of *Tarquinius*. (e) *Hanc opinionem* (de immortalitate animæ) *diſcipulus* (f) *ejus Pythagoras maximè confirmavit, qui cum regnante Tarquinio ſuperbo in Italiam veniſſet, tenuit magnam illam Græciam cum honore & diſciplina, tum etiam auctoritate.* (g) *Pythagoras fuit in Italia temporibus iiſdem quibus L. Brutus patriam liberavit.* The Miſtake (h) of thoſe who ſaid that he came over into *Italy* in the Time of *Numa*, is glorious to him; for the only Reaſon which made 'em fancy ſo, is, that they could not believe that *Numa* ſhould have been ſo great a Philoſopher, had he not been a Diſciple of *Pythagoras*. (i) *Quinetiam arbitror*, ſays *Cicero*, *propter Pythagoreorum admirationem, Numam quoque regem, Pythagoreum à poſterioribus exiſtimatum: nam cum Pythagoræ diſciplinam, & inſtituta cognoſcerent, regiſque ejus æquitatem, & ſapientiam à majoribus ſuis accepiſſent, ætates autem & tempora ignorarent, propter vetuſtatem, eum, qui ſapientia excelleret, Pythagoræ auditorem fuiſſe crediderunt.* Note, that *Cicero* alledges only ſome ſlight Conjectures to ſhew that (k) the *Romans* were acquainted with the Doctrine and Reputation of *Pythagoras*. He had not ſaid ſo, if that Philoſopher had been a Citizen of *Rome*, as *Epicharmus* (l) publiſhed it. I ſhall ſay by the by, that an Oracle (m) having ordered that the *Romans* ſhould Erect a Statue to the beſt and wiſeſt of the *Græcians*, they erected one to the Honour of *Alcibiades*, and another to the Honour of *Pythagoras*. *Pliny* tells us in what Time this happened. *Invenio*, ſays he (n), *& Pythagoræ & Alcibiadi, in cornibus Comitii poſitas, cum bello* (o) *Samniti Apollo Pythius fortiſſimo Graiæ gentis juſſiſſet & alteri ſapientiſſimo, ſimulacra celebri loco dicari: eæ ſtetere donec Sylla Dictator ibi Curiam faceret. Mirumque eſt, illos patres Socrati cunctis ab eodem Deo ſapientia prælato Pythagoram prætuliſſe, aut tot aliis virtute Alcibiadem aut quenquam utroque Themiſtocli.* *Pliny* wonders how the *Romans* came to chooſe *Pythagoras* rather than *Socrates*. But how did he know, that they had heard of the Oracle which concerns *Socrates*. Beſides, they may be juſtified by theſe two (p) Reaſons. They knew not *Socrates* ſo well as they knew *Pythagoras*, for the latter had taught for a long time in *Italy* with great Reputation; and their Minds were prepoſſeſt in his behalf, becauſe they fancied that *Numa* had been his Diſciple. It was the common Opinion, and tho' it was never ſo falſe, the Magiſtrates took care to keep it up. Which appeared when it was reported, that *Numa*'s Sepulchre and Books (q) had been found out; for it was publiſhed abroad, that they concerned the *Pythagorean* Philoſophy, and ſome Hiſtorians followed that Opinion. (r) *Adjicit* Valerius Antias *libros Pythagoricos fuiſſe: vulgatæ opinioni qua creditur Pythagoræ auditorem fuiſſe Numam, mendacio probabili accommodata fide.* *Caſſius Hemina* and *Lucius Piſo* followed that popular Opinion in their Writings (s). If I ſhould be ask'd, why the *Romans* had rather believe that *Numa* had been a Diſciple of *Pythagoras*, than aſcribe to *Italy* the Glory of having produced ſo Wiſe a King, who was not beholden for his Philoſophy to the Inſtructions of any Foreigner; I ſhould Anſwer 1. That in all likelihood they did not think of that Intereſt of their Country, when they began to divulge that Opinion. 2. That perhaps they fancied that the Merit of that Prince would be more eaſily believed, by giving him ſo famous a Tutor. Was it an eaſie thing to believe, that a Barbarian ſhould have attained to ſuch a Degree of Capacity without the help of the *Græcians*? St. *Auguſtin* would have eaſily believed that *Numa* was one of *Pythagoras*'s Diſciples, for he ſays that *Thales* (t) lived during the Reign of *Romulus*. But we know that *Thales* and *Pherecydes* were Contemporary; and that *Pythagoras* was Diſciple of *Pherecydes*. Some pretend (v) that *Thales* himſelf was alſo his Diſciple. However, it is certain that *Anaximander*, a Diſciple of *Thales*,

† *Athen. l. 13. p. 589.*

* *She had married her Brother Alexander. Id. lib. 18. cap.*

† *Juſt. 28. cap.*

(a) *Athen. l. 13. p. 58.*

(b) *In Ibin. p. 95.*

(c) *Cicer. Tuſcul. Quæſt. l. 5. circa init.* Diogenes Laertius *relates much the ſame thing. See his* Proem. *n. 12. where he quotes* Heraclides Ponticus ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ἄπνου, in libro de femina ſeptem diebus exanimi. *He ſays that that Diſcourſe was made in* Sicyon. *See alſo what he ſays in the Life of* Pythagoras, *where he quotes* Soſicrates in ſucceſſionibus.

(d) Qui quum poſt hunc Phliaſium ſermonem in Italiam veniſſet, exornavit eam Græciam quæ magna dicta eſt, & privatim & publice, præſtantiſſimis & inſtitutis & artibus. *Cicero ib.*

(e) *Id. Tuſcul. l. 1. fol. 242. A.*

(f) *That is to ſay of Pherecydes.*

(g) *Cicer. Tuſcul. l. 4. init.*

(h) *Ovid follows that falſe Tradition in the 15th Book of his Metam.*

(i) *Cicero ib.*

(k) *Id. ib.*

(l) *Plut. in Numa p. 65.*

(m) *Id. ib.*

(n) *Plin. l. 34. c. 6. p. m. 93.*

(o) *It was a long War: it began in the Year 411. of* Rome.

(p) *Voſſ.* de Philoſoph. ſect. *p. m. 37. alledges them.*

(q) 535 *Years ſince the beginning of his Reign, Plin. l. 13. c. 13. and not about 400 Years after his Death as* Plutarch *ſays in* Numa *p. 74.*

(r) *Liv. l. 40. p. m. 783.*

(s) *Vid. Plin. l. 13. c. 13.*

(t) Eodem Romulo regnante Thales Mileſius fuiſſe perhibetur unus è ſeptem ſapientibus. *Auguſt. de Civit. Dei l. 18. c. 24.*

(v) *Tzetzes affirms it. See his Words ap.* Menag. *in* Laert. *l.* 1. *n.* 11

by his Learning and Virtue, and proved a very useful Man in Reforming and Instructing the World. His Eloquence must needs have been very powerful, seeing his Exhortations moved the Inhabitants of a great City, plunged into Debauchery, to avoid * Luxury and good Cheer, and to live according to the Rules of Virtue. Nay, he prevailed upon the Ladies to part with their fine (C) Cloaths, and all their Ornaments, and to make a Sacrifice of 'em to the Chief Deity of the Place. He prevailed upon his Disciples to practise the most difficult Things: for he made 'em undergo a Noviciate † of (D) Silence, which lasted two Years at least; but he made it last five Years for those whom he knew to be most inclined to Speak. What I have said in another Place, persuades me of the Force of his Censures. He made 'em live ‡ all in common; they left the Property of their Patrimony, and brought all they had to the Feet of their Master. An ill Construction (E) was put upon

Thales and *Pythagoras* lived at the (w) same time. None of the Commentators of *Diogenes Laertius* tell us that these Words are not well rendred, (x) *Φιλοσοφίας δὲ δύο γεγόνασιν ἀρχαί, ἥ τε ἀπὸ Ἀναξιμάνδρου, καὶ ἡ ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου· τοῦ μὲν Θαλοῦ διακηκοότος.* *Ceterum Philosophiæ duæ fuere successiones: quarum altera ab Anaximandro, altera à Pythagora fluxit. Anaximandri Thales auditor fuit.* 'Tis plain they signifie not that *Thales* was Disciple of *Anaximander*; but on the contrary, that *Anaximander* was Disciple of *Thales*.

I shall conclude with a Passage of *Pliny* (y), who says that *Pythagoras* was in *Egypt* in the Reign of *Semneserteus*. Which can scarce be reconciled with what we read in *Laertius* (a), that *Pythagoras* went into *Egypt* with Letters of Recommendation from *Polycrates*, Tyrant of *Samos*, to *Amasis* King of *Egypt*. Father *Hardouin* (b) endeavours to clear the Difficulty, by supposing, that *Pythagoras* went into *Egypt* under the Reign of *Amasis*, and staid there long enough to see the Death of that Prince, and the Reign of *Semneserteus* his Successor. But that Supposition is inconsistent with the Account given us by *Herodotus* (c), who says that *Cambyses* subdued *Egypt* half a Year after the Death of *Amasis*, whom *Psammenitus* his Son did succeed. Perhaps it might be said, that the Name of *Psammenitus*, was by degrees changed into that of *Semneserteus*; and we must not forget, that it seems that *Pythagoras* was in *Egypt* when *Cambyses* took possession of it; for it appears that he was one of the Slaves which that Monarch trasported into *Persia*. This can't be better proved, than by a Passage of *Apuleius*, but it must be corrected by changing *Ægyptum* into *Ægypto*. Which would too much confound the Sense of the Author. 'Tis better to say, that this Passage only proves that *Pythagoras* was in *Egypt* in *Cambyses*'s Time. See the Remark *B* of the Article *Zoroaster* towards the end. These are *Apuleius*'s Words, (d) *Sunt qui Pythagoram aiunt eo temporis inter captivos Cambysæ Regis Ægyptum cum adveheretur, doctores habuisse Persarum Magos, ac præcipue Zoroastrem omnis divini arcani antistitem: post eaque a quodam Gillo crotoniensium Principe recuperatum. Verum enim vero Celebrior fama obtinet sponte eum petisse Ægyptias disciplinas, atque ibi a sacerdotibus Cerimoniarum incredendas potentias, numerorum admirandas vires, Geometriæ solertissimas formulas didicisse.* *John Bernartius* did not succeed in criticizing *Pliny*; for (e) he alledges *Eusebius* against him, as saying, that the Reign of *Semneserteus* began in the 43d Olympiad, and ended in the 45th, that is to say, that King *Amasis* came to the Throne about 30 Years after the Death of *Semneserteus*. If it were so, it would be impossible to justifie *Pliny*, or to reconcile him with *Diogenes Laertius*. But we need not be concerned for him: for *John Bernartius* is mistaken; *Eusebius* does not speak of a King whose Name was *Semneserteus*.

(C) *The Ladies to part with their fine Cloaths.*] All that *Justin* tells us concerning the Reformation introduced by *Pythagoras* into the City of *Crotona*, is so remarkable, that I shall set down the whole Passage. (f) *Crotonam venit, populumque in luxuriam lapsum, auctoritate sua ad usum frugalitatis revocavit. Laudabat quotidie virtutem; & vitia luxuriæ, casusque civitatum ea peste perditarum enumerabat; tantumque studium ad frugalitatem multitudinis provocavit, ut aliquos ex his luxuriatos incredibile videretur. Matronarum quoque separatam à viris doctrinam, & puerorum à parentibus frequenter habuit. Docebat nunc has pudicitiam, & obsequia in viros; nunc illos modestiam, & literarum studium. Inter hæc velut genitricem virtutum frugalitatem omnibus ingerebat, consecutusque disputationum assiduitate erat, ut matronæ auratas vestes, cæteraque dignitatis suæ ornamenta, velut instrumenta luxuriæ deponerent, eaque omnia delata in Junonis ædem ipsi Deæ consecrarent, præ se ferentes, vera ornamenta matronarum pudicitiam, non vestes esse. In juventute quoque quantum profligatum sit, victi feminarum contumaces animi manifestant.* The last Words of that Author are somewhat Satyrical; for he reasons thus: If *Pythagoras* was able to overcome the Obstinacy of Women, you may judge of the progress he made in the Reformation of young Men. It is certain that the (g) Love of fine Cloaths is a piece of so great Resistance, that nothing will so much reflect back the Darts of a Preacher. See the efficacy of *Capistran*'s Sermons against Gamesters. 'Tis not said that he had the same Success against Jewels. *Conette* made more Conquests over Head-dresses with Stones thrown by Children (i), than with Rhetorical Figures. Thus some Christian Preachers could not do what a Heathen Philosopher did with great success. But let us not forget the noble Action of the *Roman* Ladies (k) in the Time of *Camillus*.

A Modern Author has given us in a few Words, the finest Strokes that may serve for the Picture of *Pythagoras*'s Eloquence. " (l) According to the " same *Porphyrius*, when he came into *Italy*, he altered the Policy of a great many Cities, and restored their Liberty: by one Exhortation he " gained and brought over above two thousand " Men to his Philosophy. He taught 'em to overcome their Passions, to suppress all the Motions " of Avarice and Ambition, to have all their Wealth " in common, and to love Silence, Retreat and " Contemplation. „ Let no Body object to me that I represent that Philosopher under the Notion of a Rhetorician; 'tis not my Intention: I am fully persuaded that he assaulted not Vice with Harangues set with Flourishes, and composed according to the Rules, and the shining Subtilties which the Sophists of the following Ages made use of. But notwithstanding, we may very well ascribe a wonderful Eloquence to him, seeing his Discourses were so persuasive. The force of his Eloquence consisted, without doubt, in the grave Exposition of his Reasons, and in the Authority which the Wisdom of his Conduct gave to his Words. He preached by his Life: his very Silence was Eloquent, and contributed as much as his Voice to the Reformation, as an Ancient Poet has very well observed:

Annon (m) Pythagoræ monitus annique silentes
Famosum Oebalii luxum pressere Tarenti?

(D) *A Noviciate of Silence.*] It was a hard Discipline. (n) Ἐστὶ δὲ πάντων χαλεπώτατον ἐγκρατευμάτων τὸ γλώττης κρατεῖν, that is, the most difficult Victory that can be gotten, is to have the mastery of one's Tongue. See among *Cato*'s Distichs, the Encomium that is bestowed on those (o) who know how to be Silent when it is fit they should. *Servius* (p) mentions the Noviciate of five Years, and here is what *Apuleius* observes concerning that which was imposed a matter of five Years on such Disciples as were not so cautious and discreet as others. (q) *Non in totum tamen (*Pythagorici*) vocem desuescebant, nec omnes pari tempore elingues magistrum sectabantur; sed gravioribus viris brevi spatio satis videbatur taciturnitas modificata. Loquaciores enim vero ferme in quinquennium, velut in exilium vocis mittebantur.*

(E) *An ill Construction was put upon that Union.*] That Society of Students was look'd upon as a Faction which conspired against the State; Sixty of 'em were destroyed, the rest ran away. (r) *Sed trecenti ex juvenibus cum sodalitii juris sacramento quodam*

nexi

---

* *Justin. l. 20. c. 4. See the Rem. C.* † *Aulus Gellius l. 1. c. 9.* ‡ *See the Rem. E at the end.*

(w) *Diog. Laert. l. 1. says that Anaximander flourished chiefly in the Time of* Polycrates *Tyrant of* Samos.

(x) *Laert. in Proœm. n. 13.*

(y) In obeliscus quem Divus Augustus in circo magno statuit, excisus est a rege Semneserteo, quo regnante Pythagoras in Ægypto fuit. *Plin. l. 36. c. 9. p. m. 297.*

(a) *Diog. Laert. l. 8. n. 3.*

(b) *In hunc loc. Plinii.*

(c) *Herodot. l. 3. c. 14.*

(d) *Apul. Florid. p. m. 351.*

(e) *Joan. Bernartius in Boetium de consol. Philosoph. l. 1. p. 169.*

(f) *Justin. l. 20. c. 4. p. m. 335.*

(g) *See the Article* [illegible]

(i) *See the Article* Conette.

(k) *See the Article* Camillus, *Rem. C.*

(l) *Thomassin, Methode d'étudier & d'enseigner la Philosophie, l. 1. c. 13. p. 155.*

(m) *Claudian. de Mallii Theodori Consulatu, v. 156. Read* annon, *and not* non *without an Interrogation, as in the Edit. of* Barthius: *and observe that* Barthius, *who is too prolix every where, says almost nothing on this Passage.* Claudian *a little before says,* Quicquid Democritus risit, dixitque tacendo Pythagoras. *Ibid. v. 90.*

(n) *Jamblichus l. 1. c. 31.*

(o) Proximus ille Deo est qui scit ratione tacere.

(p) *Serv. in illud Æn. 10. v. 564.* tacitis regnavit Amyclis.

(q) *Apul. in Florid.* (r) *Just. l. 20. c. 4. See the Rem. O.*

upon their Union, and it proved very fatal to them. One of his greateſt Cares was to correct the Abuſes (F) committed by married Perſons; he did not believe that without this the publick Peace, and Liberty, a good Form of Government, and

nexi ſeparatam à ceteris civibus vitam exercerent, quaſi cœtum clandeſtinæ conjurationis haberent, civitatem in ſe converterunt, quæ eos, cum in unam domum conveniſſent, cremare voluit. In quo tumultu ſexaginta ferme periere, ceteri in exilium profeſſi. We can neither learn from that Paſſage of *Juſtin*, nor from what follows, whether that Storm was excited during the Life of *Pythagoras*. It ſeems more reaſonable to believe, that that Philoſopher was not involved in that Perſecution, than to believe he was. One would think therefore that *Juſtin* relates the ſame Fact which *Polybius* ſpeaks of. Now according to *Polybius* (s), the *Pythagoreans* were burnt in *Great Greece*, ſome time before the War which *Dionyſius*, Tyrant of *Syracuſa*, made againſt the *Crotoniates*: it ſeems therefore that they were not burnt during their Maſter's Life; for there are 120 Years (t) between the Expulſion of *Tarquinius*, and that War of *Dionyſius* againſt *Crotona*. But *Pythagoras* came into *Italy* under the Reign of *Tarquinius*, and died at *Metapontum* (v), after he had been 20 Years in *Crotona*. *Voſſius* obſerves (w), that *Juſtin*, *Polybius*, *Porphyrius*, *Jamblichus* mention the ſame Accident; but the two latter obſerve that none but two Men, *viz.* *Archippus* and *Lyſis*, eſcaped from the Fire: it will be ſaid therefore, that it was not a Cruelty exerciſed on the School of *Pythagoras* during his Life. For *Lyſis* having retired to *Thebes* (x), was there Preceptor to *Epaminondas*; who died 145 Years after the Expulſion of *Tarquinius*. Theſe are Doubts, I grant it, but no ſtrong Proofs againſt thoſe who ſhould maintain, that the Fire out of which *Lyſis* made his Eſcape, happened during the Life of *Pythagoras*. Note, that according to *Plutarch* the two *Pythagoreans* who made their Eſcape, were *Philolaus* and *Lyſis*. He ſays ſo in his Treatiſe concerning (y) the Genius of *Socrates*, and calls *Cyclonians* thoſe who ſet *Pythagoras*'s College on Fire. He calls 'em *Cylonians* in another Place, and obſerves that they burnt *Pythagoras*. (z) Καὶ ὁ Πυθαγόρου ζῶντος ἐμπρησμὸς ὑπὸ τῶν Κυλωνείων. *Quod Pythagoræ vivo à Cyloneis illatum eſt incendium.*

If you deſire to know the Name of the Author, who tells us, that the Diſciples of that Philoſopher deprived themſelves of the Property of their Eſtates, I ſhall refer you to theſe Words of *Aulus Gellius*: (a) *Omnes ſimul qui à Pythagora in cohortem illam diſciplinarum recepti erant, quod quiſque familiæ pecuniæque habebat, in medium dabant, & coibatur ſocietas inſeparabilis, tamquam illud fuerit antiquum conſortium, quod re atque verbo appellabatur* κοινόβιον.

(F) *The Abuſes committed by married Perſons.*] He repreſented to them, that the thing which is to be aimed at in the Copulation of both Sexes, is to produce in a lawful way another Perſon like one's-ſelf; that one muſt endeavour to get well made, ſound and luſty Children; that they muſt be uſed to Labour and Sobriety, and removed from Venereal Pleaſures till they come to be 20 Years of Age, and then they muſt be told not to enjoy them too often. (b) *Neceſſum eſſe ut pueri & virgines in laboribus & exercitationibus omnibuſque tolerantiæ ac temperantiæ generibus congruentibus educentur; ut conveniens victus ipſis adhibeatur, & laborum amans, temperans & continens eorum vita ſit: ut de uſu rei venereæ ſero erudiantur; ac pueros ſic inſtitui & educari oporteat, ut intra viceſimum ætatis annum talem congreſſum nullo modo quærant. Cum autem ad ætatem Veneri maturam pervenerint, hac raro utendum eſſe; incontinentiam enim, bonamque corporis habitudinem, rarius conjunctas eſſe.* He (c) condemned altogether thoſe who perform that Act after they have eaten too much, but much more thoſe who perform it whilſt they are drunk. He would have Husbands not only to leave off Concubinage, but alſo to obſerve the Laws of Chaſtity and Modeſty towards their Wives. They neither did the one nor the other; but 'tis ſaid that they were ſo ſenſibly moved with his Remonſtrances, that they ſhewed a great zeal in reforming themſelves. (d) *Fertur & Pythagoras Crotoniatas à pellicum & illegitimarum feminarum conſuetudine abduxiſſe; maritos etiam monuiſſe, ut erga uxores ſuas caſti & pudici forent: quo factum, ut Crotoniatæ omnem incontinentiam & luxuriam, quæ tum temporis in urbe, ceu peſtis, graſſabantur, e medio tollere laboravint.* The Inhabitants of *Crotona* lived a very looſe and diſſolute Life. They married only *pro forma*, they took a Wife *ad honores*, they neglected and deſpiſed her, and minded only their Concubines. They gave a very ill Example; their Conduct was Contagious; they did not conſider that it was to be feared that they might be imitated, and perhaps they did not much care for it. The Maxim *frangenti fidem frangatur eidem*, is but too common with reſpect to Conjugal Fidelity. *Pythagoras* undertook to correct ſuch a Diſorder. If we may believe *Juſtin*, the Force of his Inſtructions proved ſufficient for it; but ſome Authors intimate, that they proved not effectual enough, and that he was obliged to have recourſe to a more powerful Engine. He pretended therefore that he was juſt come from Hell, and had ſeen in great Torments ſuch Husbands as do not pay the Matrimonial Duty to their Wives. He became very conſiderable upon that Account. (e) Φησὶ δ' Ἱερώνυμος κατελθόντα αὐτὸν εἰς ᾅδου τὴν μὲν Ἡσιόδου ψυχὴν ἰδεῖν πρὸς κίονι χαλκῷ δεδεμένην καὶ τρίζουσαν· τὴν δ' Ὁμήρου κρεμαμένην ἀπὸ δένδρου, καὶ ὄφεις περὶ αὐτήν, ἀνθ' ὧν εἶπε περὶ θεῶν. κολαζομένους δὲ καὶ τοὺς μὴ θέλοντας συνεῖναι ταῖς αὑτῶν γυναιξί. καὶ διὸ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τιμηθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Κρότωνι. *Hieronymus vero ait deſcendiſſe ad inferos atque Heſiodi quidem animam columnæ æreæ vinculis adſtrictam, ſtridentemque vidiſſe; Homeri autem, ex arbore pendentem, ſerpenteſque illam circumdantes, propter ea quæ de diis finxerat. Eos item cruciari qui ſuis uxoribus congredi nollent: ejuſque rei gratia à Crotoniatis honoratum.* That Story is without doubt the ſame which *Hermippus* relates. He ſays (f) that that Philoſopher being arrived into *Italy*, ſhut up himſelf in a Subterranean Place, having deſired his Mother to keep an Account of what ſhould happen. When he had been in that Place as long as he thought fit, his Mother delivered her Table-Book to him, as it had been agreed between 'em. He found in it the Dates and other Circumſtances of what paſt: he came out of that Place with a pale and lean Face; he called the People together, and aſſured them that he came from Hell, and to perſuade 'em of the Truth of it, he told them what had paſt in the City. All his Hearers were ſo moved with what he ſaid, that the whole Aſſembly fell a Groaning and Crying; and they doubted no longer but he was a Divine Man, and they gave him their Wives to inſtruct them. It was without doubt on that occaſion that he frighted ill Husbands, by telling them that thoſe who refuſe to pay the Matrimonial Duties to their Wives, are tormented in Hell with great ſeverity. In all likelihood he ſpoke alſo of the Puniſhments that are inflicted upon wanton Women, and we ought to believe that it was one of the Reaſons which moved the *Crotoniates* to ſend their Wives to his School. Obſerve the Contradiction of that Great Maſter. He taught the *Metempſychoſis* on the one hand, without confining himſelf to the three Removings mentioned (g) by *Pindar*: and on the other hand, he was ſo bold as to ſay, that he had ſeen in Hell the Souls of *Homer*, *Heſiod*, &c. very much tormented. The *Metempſychoſis* deſtroyed Hell, as he declares it in *Ovid*:

> *O genus (h) attonitum gelidæ formidine mortis,*
> *Quid Styga, quid tenebras, & nomina vana timetis,*
> *Materiem vatum, falſique pericula mundi?*
> *Corpora ſive rogus flamma, ſeu tabe vetuſtas*
> *Abſtulerit, mala poſſe pati non ulla putetis.*

But he rather choſe to acquire ſome Authority, and make himſelf fit to extirpate Debauchery by contradicting himſelf, than to follow a coherent Method of Teaching, which would not have proved ſo uſeful.

I ſaid that he confined not himſelf to the three Removings mentioned by *Pindar*, and I ſhall give an evident Proof of it by the Verſes of *Ovid*, which I ſhall quote (i) hereafter. Therefore *Forcatulus* does not ſpeak the Truth when he ſays the contrary. *Conſtat*, ſays he (k), *Druidum imitatorem Pythagoram, deſultoriam animarum migrationem nonniſi tertiam aſſeruiſſe. Nam ſi perenni ſerie animas in alia atque alia corpora tranſcripſiſſet, quis quæſo locus fuiſſet Elyſiis campis, aut cœli ſedibus? quod miror ſatyricis ſcriptoribus ſalſis admodum inſulſè derelictum. Quicunque, inquit Pindarus, ter in utraque vita à vitiis alieni*

(s) *Polyb. l.* 2.

(t) *See* Calviſius *p. m.* 95, 165.

(v) *Juſt. ub. ſup.*

(w) *Voſſius de Philoſoph. ſectis c.* 6. *n.* 26. *p. m.* 38.

(x) *Diog. Laert. ib. n.* 7. *Corn. Nepos in Epaminonda. Ælian. var. hiſt. l.* 3. *c.* 17.

(y) *Plut. in Socrat. Genio. p.* 583.

(z) *Id. de Stoicor. repugn. p.* 1051.

(a) *A. Gell. l.* 1. *c.* 9. *See alſo Laert. l.* 8. *c.* 10.

(b) *Omeiſius in Ethica Pythag. p.* 38. *ex Jamblicho in vita Pythag. l.* 1. *c.* 31.

(c) *Idem p.* 39. *ex eodem ib.*

(d) *Jamblich. ib. c.* 27. *ap. Omeiſium ib. p.* 40.

(e) *Diog. Laert. l.* 8. *n.* 21. *p.* 505.

(f) *Apud Diog. Laert. ib. n.* 41. *p.* 522. *See alſo the Scholiaſt upon* Sophocles. *Menagius* in hunc locum Laertii *p.* 372, 373. *quotes his Words.*

(g) *Olymp. Od.* 2.

(h) *Ovid. Met. l.* 15. *v.* 153.

(i) *In the Rem. M.*

(k) *Forcat. de Gallor. imperio & philoſophia l.* 1. *p. m.* 90.

and other such things, about which (G) he was very zealous, would be able to make private Men happy. I wonder how a Philosopher, so Learned in Astronomy, Geometry, and the other Parts of Mathematicks, took delight in delivering his fine Precepts under the Veil of Enigms. That Veil was so thick that it has afforded the Interpreters (H) a large Field of Conjectures, and as many mystical Senses as came into their Mind. Some take in a Literal Sense the Order he gave to abstain from eating (I) of Beans. Few Men, in those Times, Travelled * in so

alieni fuerunt, viam sibi à Jove destinatam adiere ad Saturni urbem. Ἔνθα μακάρων νᾶσον ὠκεανίδες αὖραι περιπνέουσιν, ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ φλέγει, *id est, Ubi beatorum insulam Oceanides auræ circumflant, & flores aurei fulgent.*

(G) About which he was very zealous.] His Affection for the Publick Good moved him to carry his Instructions to the Palaces of Great Men (l): he easily perceived that if he could work upon the Minds of Princes, and of the chief Magistrates, other Men would plentifully reap the Fruits of his Philosophy. He had the Happiness and the Glory of teaching some Disciples, who proved excellent Law-givers, such as *Zaleucus*, *Charondas*, and some others (m). A Law-maker ought to be looked upon as the best Present that can be given a Society. Those who made Laws are more worthy of Admiration, and of an immortal Glory, than the greatest Conquerors. Yet their Memory is not come to us with the same Noise as that of *Cyrus* and *Alexander*. The Reason of it is, that our Minds being not very capable of knowing true Grandeur, do falsly joyn the Idea of it with such Actions as make a Noise. They cannot discern what is (n) Great from what is Shining; and so the Life of a Man who makes it his Business to cure the internal Distempers of a State with good Laws, is an Object that makes no great Impression, because such a Work goes on slowly. But if a Man subdues Cities and Provinces, and destroys some Millions of Men, and reduces ten times as many to Beggary, he acquires so much Glory, that the remotest Posterity will speak of him with Transports of Admiration. However, it will be an eternal Glory for *Pythagoras*, in the Opinion of those who know how to judge of Things, to have furnished the World with some good Law-givers. It is a Glory which redounds upon the whole Philosophy, as *Seneca* has well observed. (o) *Postquam, surrepentibus vitiis, in tyrannidem regna versa sunt, opus esse cœpit legibus, quas & ipsas inter initia tulere sapientes. Solon, ... Lycurgus . . . . . . Zaleuci leges Charondæque laudantur: hi non in foro, nec in consultorum atrio, sed in Pythagoræ tacito illo sanctoque secessu didicerunt jura, quæ florenti tunc Siciliæ, & per Italiam Græciæ ponerent.* Besides, he took a particular care to pacifie the (p) Wars which arose in *Italy*, and the Intestine Factions of the Cities. He used to say, that War should be made only against these Five Things, the Diseases of the Body, the Ignorance of the Mind, the Passions of the Heart, the Seditions of Cities, and the Discord of Families. They are Five Monsters which ought to be prosecuted with Fire and Sword. (a) *Sustulisse penitus omnes discordias, non à notis solùm & familiaribus, eorumque posteris ad aliquot secula, sed ab omnibus omnino Italiæ atque Siciliæ civitatibus, tam intestinas quam externas, auctor est Porphyrius in ejus Vita: qui addit, hoc apophthegma crebrò ei in ore fuisse, Fugandum omni conatu, & igni atque ferro, & quibuscumque denique machinis præcidendum, à corpore quidem morbum; ab anima, ignorantiam; à ventre, luxuriam; à civitate, seditionem; à familia, discordiam.* 'Tis no wonder if the Inhabitants of *Crotona* desired, that their Senate should be directed by the Counsels of so excellent a Man. *Valerius Maximus* says so, to shew that the Authority of *Pythagoras* was acknowledged out of his College. (b) *Pythagoræ tanta veneratio ab auditoribus tributa est, ut quæ ab eo acceperant, in disputationem deducere nefas existimarent: Quinetiam interpellati ad reddendam caussam, hoc solum respondebant, Ipsum dixisse: Magnus honos, sed schola tenus. Illa urbium suffragiis tributa est. Enixo Crotoniatæ studio ab eo petierunt ut senatum ipsorum, qui mille hominum numero constabat, consiliis suis uti pateretur.* The same Author tells us, that several Cities of *Italy* (c) felt the good Effects of that Philosopher's Studies.

(H) It has afforded Interpreters a large Field of Conjectures.] See, for Example, what they have said upon this Precept of *Pythagoras*, *Don't sit upon a Chœnix, Chœnici ne insideas*, in the Learned Dissertation which I have mention'd in (d) another place. Mr. *du Rondel* is the Author of it. That Symbolical way of Teaching was very much in use in the Eastern Countries and *Egypt*. *Pythagoras* had it, without doubt, from thence. He came from his Travels loaded with the Learning he had got in all the Countries he went through. 'Tis thought that he made a plentiful Harvest among the Jews, and that he learn'd a great many things of *Ezekiel* and *Daniel*. Nay, 'tis pretended that his *Tetractys* is the same thing with the Name *Tetragrammaton*, a Name not to be pronounc'd, and full of Mysteries, as the Rabbins say. See the Learned *Huetius*, *Adde*, says he (e), *& veri persimilem conjecturam Seldeni, & Wendelini, qua mirificam illam Pythagoræ* τετρακτὺν *ipsum esse suspicantur Dei nomen* τετραγράμματον, יהוה, *atque ejus notitiam à Daniele jam sene Pythagoram, cum in Babylonia degeret, accepisse. Danieli adjungi poterat & Ezekiel, ut ostendam infra.* Others say, That the *Tetractys*, that great Object of Veneration, and by which they used to swear, (f) was only a mysterious way of Teaching by Numbers. Consider these Words of the *Leipsick-Journal*, pag. 204, of the Year 1685, in the Abstract of an English Book of *John Turner*. *Ex hac ipsa tamen gentilium notitia inscite à quibusdam colligi ait, Pythagoræorum Tetractyn, quam tam reverenter habuerunt, & per quam jurare etiam soliti leguntur, esse unum idemque cum nomine tetragrammato, quod à Judæis ipsi acceperint . . . . . Aliam proinde viam demonstrat Autor tetractyn istam explicandi, desumptam puta à methodo Pythagoræorum mystica, qua dogmata sua fere per numeros certos indicare & explanare fuerint soliti.* But we must not forget to say, that *Pythagoras* and his Successors had two ways of Teaching, the one for those that were Initiated, and the other for Strangers and Profane Men. The first was Clear and Perspicuous, the second was Symbolical and Enigmatical. See the 13th Chapter of a Book of *John Schefferus*, Professor at *Upsal*, entitled *De natura & constitutione Philosophiæ Italicæ*, Printed at *Upsal* in the Year 1664, in 8o.

(I) To abstain from eating of Beans.] They who explain that Prohibition in a literal Sense, alledge, amongst other Reasons, that *Pythagoras* was taught by the *Egyptians*, and even suffer'd himself to be Circumcised, that he might be admitted to their most secret Mysteries. (g) Δι' οὓς καὶ περιτέμνετο, ἵνα δὴ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄδυτα κατελθὼν, τὴν μυστικὴν παρ' Αἰγυπτίων ἐκμάθοι φιλοσοφίαν. *Propter quos* (Prophetas Ægyptios) *etiam fuit circumcisus, ut adyta ingrediens Ægyptiorum mysticam disceret philosophiam.* But the *Egyptians* abstain'd from Beans: they (h) sowed none, and if they found any that had not been sown, they would not touch 'em. Their Priests carried the Superstition farther, they durst not so much as look upon 'em, they accounted 'em Unclean, and had rather chosen to eat the Flesh of their Fathers. (i) Θᾶττον ἂν τὰς κεφαλὰς φαγεῖν φασι τῶν πατέρων ἢ κυάμους. *Dicunt se parentum capita citius esuros quam Fabas.* From whence they conclude, that *Pythagoras*, who had been their Disciple, forbad the eating of Beans in a literal Sense. Several grave Authors among the Ancients understood it so. Some say he chose rather to be kill'd by those that pursued him, (k) than to make his escape through a Field of Beans, so great was his Respect or Abhorrence for that Plant! I think *Aristoxenus* is the only Author who says, that *Pythagoras* would eat them often. (l) *Aristoxenus musicus vir litterarum veterum diligentissimus, Aristotelis philosophi auditor, in libro, quem de Pythagora reliquit, nullo sæpius legumento Pythagoram dicit usum quàm fabis: quoniam is cibus & subduceret sensim alvum & lævigaret. Verba ista Aristoxeni subscripsi:* Πυθαγόρας δὲ τῶν ὀσπρίων μάλιστα τὸν κύαμον ἐδοκίμασε· λίαν κινητικόν τε γὰρ εἶναι, καὶ διαφορητικόν· διὸ καὶ μάλιστα κέχρηται αὐτῷ. Our Learned Men do not much value the Testimony of *Aristoxenus*; they believe he was mistaken, and look upon that *Pythagorean* Abstinence as a certain Matter of Fact, and enquire into the Reasons of it. *Aristotle*

---

* *See Apul. in Florid.*

(d) *In the Art. Epicurus Remark R.*

(e) *Dem. Evangel. prop. 4. c. 2. n. 8. p. 80. Edit. Lips. 1694. See also Marsham's Chron. Can. Ægyptiac. sec. 11. p. m. 277, 278.*

(l) Πυθαγόρας τοῖς πρωτεύουσιν Ἰταλιωτῶν. *Ac Pythagora principes Italorum. Plutarchus, cum principibus viris philosopho esse disputandum, p. 777. A.*

(m) *Vid. Jambl. in vit. Pythag. l. 1. c. 30.*

(n) *Vid. Plin. Ep. 15. l. 3. where he shews* alia esse clariora, alia majora.

(o) *Senec. Ep. 90. p. m. 369. Vid.* Miscellaneæ observationes *of* Petrus Petitus *p.* 265.

(p) *See the Letter which they say he wrote to* Anaximenes, *ap. Laert. l. 8. n. 49.*

(a) *Menag. in Laert. l. 8. n. 50.*

(b) *Val. Max. l. 8. c. 15. n. 1. in extern.*

(c) Plurimis & opulentissimis urbibus effectus suorum studiorum approbavit. *Id. ib. c. 7. n. 2. extern.*

(f) Διὸ καὶ ἐφθέγγοντο οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι, ὡς μεγίστου ὅρκου ὄντος τῆς τετράδος. Οὐ μὰ τὸν ἀμετέρᾳ ψυχᾷ παραδόντα τετρακτύν. Παγὰν ἀενάου φύσεως ῥιζώματ' ἔχουσαν. Itaque sanctissimum jusjurandum Pythagorei quaternario sunt complexi, quam tetractyn vocant. *Per tibi nostræ animæ præbentem tetrada juro Naturæ fontemque & firmamenta perennis.* Plutarch. de placit. lib. 1. c. 3. p. 877. A.

(g) *Clem. Alexandr. Strom. l. 1. p. 302.*

(h) *Herod. l. 2. c. 37.*

(i) *Sextus Empiricus Pyrrhonic. hypotypos. l. 3. p. 156. See also St.* Chrysostom *Hom. 2. in Joann.*

(k) *See the Rem.* Ò. *Letter* i.

(l) *Aul. Gell. l. 4. c. 11. p. m. 131.*

ſo many Places as he did. He is look'd upon, by ſome, as a great (K) Magician:

Ariſtotle gives four or five Reaſons for it. He pretends (*m*) that *Pythagoras* prohibited the eating of Beans, either becauſe they are like certain Parts, which I will not name, or becauſe they are like the Gates of Hell, or becauſe they provoke Luſt, or becauſe they reſemble the Nature of the Univerſe, or becauſe they were made uſe of in the Election of Magiſtrates. Thoſe who pretend that that Prohibition was a Moral Precept, and that *Pythagoras* underſtood it only in an Allegorical Senſe, fancy that he forbad thereby his Diſciples to meddle with the Government. This is grounded upon the Cuſtom of ſome Cities, wherein every Body gave his Vote with Beans, when they proceeded to the Election of Magiſtrates. Others think that he forbad the Venereal Pleaſure. Here is a Paſſage of *Aulus Gellius*, taken from the Chapter wherein the Author alledges and approves the Teſtimony of *Ariſtoxenus*. (*n*) *Videtur autem de κυάμῳ non eſitato cauſam erroris fuiſſe, quia in Empedocli carmine qui diſciplinas Pythagoræ ſecutus eſt, verſus hic invenitur:*

Δειλοί, πάνδειλοι, κυάμων ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχεσθαι.

opinati enim ſunt plerique κύαμον leguminentum vulgo dici. Sed qui diligentius anquiſitiuſque carmina Empedocli arbitrati ſunt, κυάμους hoc in loco teſticulos ſignificare dicunt; eoſque more Pythagoræ opertè atque ſymbolicè κυάμους appellatos, quia ſint εἰς τὸ κυεῖν δεινοὶ καὶ αἴτιοι τοῦ κυεῖν; & genitura humanæ vim præbeant, idcircoque in Empedocli verſu iſto non à fabulo edendo, ſed à rei venereæ proluvio voluiſſe homines deducere. *Mauro* in a Poem, wherein under the Name *della Fava* (*o*) he denotes ſomething that is Laſcivious, joins together the Opinion of *Ariſtoxenus*, and that which is contrary to it. He pretends that *Pythagoras* prohibited the uſe of Beans, that is to ſay, Venereal Pleaſures; and nevertheleſs that there was no Food which he uſed more frequently than that: He forbad others what he himſelf practiſed; and if we believe *Mauro* ſuch a Conduct is very common.

Non (p) fè Natura mai coſa sì ghiotta,
Che ſenza quaſi romperla co i denti
Pare, ch'ogni perſona ſe la inghiotta.
Furon certi Filoſofi prudenti,
De' quali fù Pitagora il maeſtro,
Che vietava la Fava a quelle genti.
Eran ribaldi, e ladri da capeſtro,
Che ingannavan con arte gli ignoranti,
E poi ſe ne mangiavano un caneſtro.
Così fanno hoggi certi mormoranti,
Che ogni perſona ſepeliſcon viva,
Chiamando Amore, Venere i furfanti.
Riprendono in altrui la vita attiva,
Et eſſi ogn'hor di veſpro, è di mattino
Hanno in uſo l'attiva, e la paſſiva.
Così Maometto gia per torre il vino,
Seppe perſuader provincie, e regni
Co'l ſuo ſottile ingegno, e diavolino.
Gli parue, che i plebei non foſſer degni
Di quel liquore, e così ſempre al mondo
Sovra la forza ſen ſtati gl'ingegni.
Pitagora, c'havea peſcato al fondo,
E de le coſe la ragion ſapea,
Ogni gran ſavio ſea parer ſecondo.
E de le Fave nemico parea,
Ma ſe ne confortava il guſto, e'l tatto,
E d'altra coſa quaſi non vivea.

Cicero intimates, that the Prohibition of Beans was grounded upon their hindring Men from dreaming Divinatory Dreams; for they heat too much, and by that Irritation of the Spirits they ſuffer not the Soul to enjoy that Quietneſs which is neceſſary for the Search of Truth. (*a*) *Ex eadem item opinione M. Cicero in libro de divinatione primo, hæc verba poſuit*; Jubet igitur Plato ſic ad ſomnum proficiſci corporibus affectis, ut nihil ſit quod errorem animis perturbationemque afferat. Ex quo etiam Pythagoreis interdictum putatur, ne faba veſcerentur; quod habet inflationem magnam is cibus tranquillitatem (*b*) mentis quærentibus contrariam. *Hæc quidem M. Cicero.* The Learned *Windet* has inquir'd more Learnedly than any Body elſe into the Reaſons of that Abſtinence: He lays the greateſt ſtreſs upon the Gates of Hell. We have ſeen that one of *Pythagoras*'s Reaſons was taken from the Reſemblance between Beans and thoſe Gates. *Windet* (*c*) does not approve the Opinion of thoſe who ſay, that by κύαμος *Pythagoras* underſtood a Woman's Breaſt, or the Teſticles. He ſticks to the Literal Senſe, but he owns that Beans were forbidden out of a Principle of Chaſtity. What he ſays is full of exquiſite Learning: He ſhews, that in the Opinion of *Pythagoras*, to deſcend into Hell, ſignified to be Begotten, and denoted only the Change which a Soul undergoes when it comes out of the Upper Regions, to be united with an organized Body upon Earth. (*d*) *Cum autem* ἐν ᾅδῃ (localiter) *ſit regio naturæ corruptibilis, hinc* Pythagoricis *animæ cæleſte ſolum vertentes atque* ἰέναι εἰς γένεσιν *dicuntur etiam* κατελθεῖν εἰς ᾅδα. He ſhews, that Beans having no Knots in their Stalks, reſemble the Gates of Hell, thro' which the Souls have always a free Entrance, in order to Generation. He adds, that *Pythagoras* conſidering this Life as a kind of Death or Baniſhment, endeavoured to perſuade Men not to Beget Children, but to return to the Heavenly Places. (*e*) *Atque in eo* Portæ Inferni *ſimilis eſt* Faba, διὰ τὸ ἀγόνατον εἶναι, quod genuum expers ſit, *ut loquitur* (*f*) Ariſtoteles: *vel* διὰ τὸ δι' ὅλου τετρῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τ̃ μεταξὺ τῶν γονάτων ἐμφράξεων, *id eſt*, propterea quod penitus perforetur, nec articulorum obicibus intercipiatur: *perinde ac* porta inferni nunquam oppeſſulata animabus εἰς γένεσιν κατιούσαις in generationem deſcendentibus perpetuo patet. Pythagoras *ergo* Fabas vetando, cavit à generatione continua ac perpetua; *inſinuans ſuis, ſatius fuiſſe pollutum corruptibilis hujuſce regionis hoſpitium nunquam intrâſſe, ſed quando id integrum jam non fuerit, ſaltem ut admiſſi quàm primum* generationem ſiſtant, *atque ad ſuperiora redire nitantur.* He refutes thoſe, who believe (*g*) that the Diſciples of *Pythagoras* were forbidden to eat Beans, becauſe they are unclean Food; and he ſays that it was for ſome Holy and Myſterious Reaſons, which they kept to themſelves. Some of 'em choſe to die rather than to reveal ſo great a Secret. A *Pythagorean* Woman cut off her Tongue (*h*), leſt the ſeverity of the Torments ſhould force her to ſpeak. (*i*) *Ipſum autem* Pythagoram *ferunt ſe vita potiùs ſpoliandum perſequentibus ultro ſtitiſſe, quam per* Fabetum *fuga ſibi conſulere voluiſſe.* Jamblichus *decem*, Suidas *quinquaginta* Pythagoreis *itidem factum memorat.* Millias Crotoniata *mori maluit, quàm* Dionyſio *cauſas exponere propter quas* Pythagorei Fabis *abſtinerent. Perinde etiam eſt quod de ipſo* Pythagora *refert* Suidas. Milliæ *uxor* Timycha, *in ſimilem quæſtionem veniens, ſuam ſibi linguam præmordit, ne, tormentis victa, cogeretur* τῶν ἐχεμυθουμένων τι ἀνακαλύψαι, arcanorum quidpiam detegere, *referente* Jamblicho. *Menagius* quotes a Paſſage taken from the Life of St. *Artemius*, which ſays that (*k*) *Theano*, a Scholar and Wife of *Pythagoras*, refuſing to tell the Reaſon why they abſtained from Beans, was put to Death; but her Tongue was cut off, before ſhe was put to Death.

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the School of *Salerno*, in the Edition of *Renatus Moreau*, forbids to eat Beans; *Manducare fabam caveas, facit illa podagram.* The learned and large Collections which that Phyſician has publiſhed on that Precept, deſerve to be conſulted. They contain a great many Remarks which concern *Pythagoras*.

(*K*) *For a great Magician.*] I ſhall quote a Paſſage out of the Apology for Great Men accuſed of Magick. "He was look'd upon as a Sorcerer and an
" Inchanter, becauſe, firſt, he made a long Stay in
" *Egypt*, and read the Books of *Zoroaſter*, wherein
" he learned, as one may gueſs, the Properties of
" certain Herbs, which he called *Coraceſia*, *Callicia*,
" *Menais*, *Corinthas* and *Aproxis*, the two firſt
" whereof turned Water into Ice, when they were
" put into it, the two next were an excellent Remedy
" againſt the Biting of Serpents, and the
" laſt would be kindled of a ſudden at any diſtance
" from the Fire. Likewiſe in one of his Symbols
" he expreſly forbad the uſe of Beans, which according
" to the ſame Superſtition he boyl'd and
" expoſed to the Moon for ſome Nights, till by a
" great power of Magick they turned into Blood;
" which perhaps ſerved him to make that other
" Preſtige mentioned by *Cælius Rhodiginus* (1) after
" *Suidas* and the Interpreter of *Ariſtophanes* in the
" Comedy of the Clouds, who ſay, that that Philoſopher
" uſed to write with Blood upon a Looking-glaſs,
" any thing that he had a mind to, and
" holding thoſe Letters againſt the Face of the

" Moon

(*m*) Ariſt. in libro de Fabis ap. Diog. Laert. in Pythagora l. 8. n. 34.

(*n*) Aul. Gell. ub. ſup.

(*o*) See the Art. Molza.

(*p*) Mauro, capitolo in lode della fava fol. 78. verſo, in a Collection of Rime Piacevoli, printed at Vicenza 1603.

(*a*) Aul. Gell. ub. ſup.

(*b*) There is in Tully, inflationem magnam is cibus tranquillitati mentis quærenti vera contrariam. Aul. Gell. muſt needs have quoted thoſe Words without Book. See Philip. Caroli animadverſ. in A. Gell. p. m. 266, 267.

(*c*) Eſt qui nixus parum firmo tibicine de papillis muliebribus intellexit; alii teſtes operte ſignificari volunt, alii, alia quæ parumper attinet deſpicere. Ja. Windet de vita functorum ſtatu p. 79. edit. Lond. 1677.

(*d*) Id. ib. p. 108.

(*e*) Id. p. 110, 111.

(*f*) Apud Diog. Laert. l. 8. n. 34. ἢ ὅτι ᾅδου πύλαις ἀγόνατον γὰρ μόνον. Sive quod inferni januis (ſimiles ſunt fabæ) ſolæ enim geniculatæ non ſunt.

(*g*) Nimis autem populariter dictum eſt Ægyptios & Phenetas ipſumque Pythagoram Fabas utpote immundas adſpernatos: cùm revera non ob immunditiem ſed ob ſacras rationes abſtinuerint. Id. ib. p. 81.

(*h*) Compare with this what the Curtezan Leæna did at Athens. Plin. l. 34. c. 8. p. m. 122. Athen. l. 13. p. 596. Pauſ. l. 1. p. 41. and Polyæn. l. 8. ſpeak of it. See Father Bouhours, Entretien du Secret p. m. 197, 198.

(*i*) Id. Windet. ib. p. 84.

(*k*) Θεανὼ δ', ἡ τούτου γαμετὴ καὶ μαθήτρια, μὴ θέλουσα τὴν αἰτίαν ἐξειπεῖν, δι' ἣν τῶν κυάμων οὐκ ἐσθίουσι, τὴν γλῶτταν ἐκτμηθεῖσα, τύραννον καὶ αὐτὴ σφ- ἀπόλλυται, &c. Vita Sancti Artemii in codice MS. Bibliotheca Colbertina numero 82. p. 48. apud Menagium notis in Diogen. Laert. l. 8. n. 50. p. 378.

(1) Lib. 9. c. 23.

tain; we shall see upon what Grounds. I shall observe that *Naudæus* clears (L) him from that Accusation. I might observe a great many other things; but I must be short, and I avoid every thing that may be found in *Moreri*. Nevertheless, the

" Moon when it was at Full, he saw in that Planet " every thing he had written upon his Looking-" glass. To which may be added, that he appear'd " at the Olympick Games with a Golden Thigh, " that he was saluted by the River *Nessus*, that he " stopt an Eagle that was flying, tamed a She-" Bear, killed a Serpent, and drove away an Ox " which spoiled a Field of Beans, only by the Virtue " of some Words. Besides, he was seen the " very same Day, and at the same Hour in the Ci-" ties of *Crotona* and *Metapontum*, and used to fore-" tell Things to come with so great a Confidence, " that many are of Opinion he was named *Py-* " *thagoras*, because the Answers he gave were " not less certain and true than those of *Apollo Py-* " *thius*. " Thus far *Naudæus* in the 15th Chap. pag. 215. of his Apology for Great Men. He tells us, p. 214, that what he has said may be collected out of *Jamblichus*, *Pliny*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *St. Augustin*, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, the Jesuit *Delrio*, and *Boissardus*.

(L) Naudæus *clears him from that Accusation.*] See his Apology for Great Men; I shall only transcribe the following Words. (l) " The Proofs which " are grounded upon that Philosopher's prohibiting " the use of Beans, and his way of turning their " Juice into Blood, may be as easily refuted as the " foregoing, since *Reuchlin* despises with great " Reason all the Fooleries which many crack-brain'd " and Fantastical Men have invented about that " Prohibition, such as that of *Hermippus* in *Dio-* " *genes*, who believed that *Pythagoras* chose to be " kill'd near a Field of Beans, rather than go thro' " it to escape from his Enemies; and if it be true " that he forbad 'em, he did it for no other Reason " than the First out of the Five, which Mr. *Moreau* " gives for it (2) in the above-mention'd Place of " his Commentary on the School of *Salern*...... " (m) In like manner it may be said, that there " was nothing extraordinary in his converting " Beans into Blood; for Mr. *Moreau* very clearly " shews in the said Commentary, that according to " the Principles of Chymists, who reckon Simili-" tude and Resemblance as Causes of Actions, it is " a thing that may be done and explained by " Natural Reasons: but there is no need to believe " that *Pythagoras* made use of that Elixir of Beans, " or Human Blood, to write upon his Looking-" glass: for besides that, he could have no Reason " to use Blood rather than any other Liquor, *Cam-* " *panella* (3) proves with very solid Reasons, that " such an Operation is altogether impossible; and " when *Agrippa* (4) boasted that he had that Se-" cret, and *Natalis Comes* (5) wrote that in the " time of *Francis* I. and *Charles* V. they knew at " *Paris* in the Night, every thing that past in the " Castle of *Milan* in the Day; the former said so " only to commend himself, and to be cried up, " as we shall shew more fully in his Chapter, and " what the latter says, is a meer Fable and Lye, " contrived by those who had a mind to add Ma-" gick to the Arms of those two Great (a) " Princes, as we are told that *Ninus* and *Zoroaster*, " *Pyrrhus* and *Cræsus*, *Nectanebus* and *Philip* of *Ma-* " *cedonia* formerly did. From whence we may " judge, that all that is said of *Pythagoras*'s Look-" ing-glass is as falsely ascribed to him, as the Su-" perstitious Arithmetick, and the Wheel of Ono-" mancy, or that if he practised it at any time, it " was doubtless some Trick, Prestige and Subtilty; " and to conclude with *Suidas*, παίγνιον διὰ κα-" τόπτρου..... (b) It would be needless to insist " any longer upon his killing, with the muttering " of some Words, a Serpent which wasted the Coun-" try of *Italy*, because *Boissardus*, who alledges *A-* " *ristotle* for it, does not quote the Book out of " which he had it, and if any one will more nar-" rowly enquire into the Truth of that Story, it " will be found to be altogether false, being found-" ed only upon the Ignorance of those who change " *Socrates* into *Pythagoras*, and take as a true Histo-" ry the Fable concerning the former, which " may be read in a Book of the Causes and Pro-" perties of the Elements, which (1) *Patricius* " shews to have been falsly ascribed to *Aristotle*. " But that Inadvertency of *Boissardus* might be ea-" sily excused, had he not committed another much " worse, when he quotes *Plutarch* in the Life of " *Numa*, to give Credit to the History of the Ox, " which *Pythagoras* (2) drove out of a Field of " Beans, after he had whispered something in " his Ear. It had been better for him to confess " that he had it from *Cælius Rhodiginus* who does " indeed quote *Plutarch* in the Beginning of " his Chapter, but upon a Subject different from " that Story, of which he never made any men-" tion. "

(l) Nau-
deus, Apo-
logy for
Great Men
accused of
Magick p.
225, 226.

(2) Cap.
19.

(m) Nau-
dæus ib. p.
226, 227.

(3) Lib. 4.
de sensu
c. 15.

(4) Lib. 1.
de occult.
Philosoph.
c. 6.

(5) Lib. 3.
c. 17. My-
thol.

(a) See
the Art.
Francis I.
Rem. H.

(b) Nau-
dæus ib. p.
227.

(1) Discuss.
Peri.
tom.
l. 3.

(2) Lib.
Tertii.

I think the Reader will be glad to find here the *Greek* Words of *Aristophanes*'s Scholiast corrected by the learned *Meziriac*. *I shall conclude this Discourse*, says he (c), *with a pretty Remark, which the Scholiast on* Aristophanes *and* Suidas *make upon these Words*, Θετταλὴ γυνὴ, *which concern a Magical Operation about the Moon.* Ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ Πυθαγόρου παίγνιον διὰ τοῦ κατόπτρου τοιοῦτο· πανσελήνου τῆς σελήνης οὔσης, εἴ τις ἐν κατόπτρῳ ἀπογράψειεν αἵματι ἃ βούλεται, καὶ προειπὼν ἑτέρῳ, σταίη κατόπιν αὐτοῦ, δεικνὺς πρὸς τὴν σελήνην τὰ γράμματα, κἀκεῖνος ἀτενίσαντα ὁ[illegible] εἰς τὸν τῆς σελήνης κύκλον, ἀναγνῶναι πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κατόπτρῳ γεγραμμένα, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς σελήνης γεγραμμένα. There is a Trick of *Pythagoras*'s Invention, which is performed with a Looking-glass in this manner. The Moon being at Full, some Body writes on a Looking-glass any thing that he has a mind to with Blood, and having given notice of it to another, he stands behind him, and turns towards the Moon the Letters written in the Looking-glass, and then the other looking fixedly on the Globe of the Moon, reads in it all that is written on the Looking-glass, as if it were written on the Moon. *I have corrected two Faults in that Passage, reading* πανσελήνου *instead of* πανσελήνης, *according to the Opinion of the learned* Meursius, *in his Book concerning the* Græcian *Games, who had this Correction from* Suidas; *and reading also* ἀτενίσαντα *instead of* ἀτενίσας. *As for* Suidas, *it seems that he only transcribed that Passage Word for Word; but there are many Faults in all the printed Books of that Author.* You will find the Correction of those Faults in *Meziriac*. Consult the Remarks (d) on the *Berger Extravagant*. The impertinent Story of *Natalis Comes* has crept into many Books: so true it is, that any one who prints Hear-says, does the Publick wrong. There are but too many Authors who will adopt it one after another. Because *Saint Romuald* inserted that Story in his Chronological Treasure, Father *l'Enfant* has inserted it in his General History of all the Centuries of the New Law. " The manner, *says he* (e), how to " know what passes abroad, without Magick: write " those things in large Letters upon a Looking-" glass, and hold it against the Moon, and the same " things will be read in another Looking-glass " wherein the Moon is to be seen. Thus *Francis* I. " being at War with *Charles* V. for the Dutchy of " *Milan*, it was known the next Night at *Paris*. " If such things were related to be laugh'd at, one might avoid being censured for it. Thus *John Leo* relates a Fable, which was in vogue in *Egypt*. " Among the *Ptolemies*, *says he* (f), there was one " formerly King of *Alexandria*, who, for the secu-" rity of the City, and to make it impregnable, " and put it in a condition of avoiding, without " any Danger, the Assaults of the Enemy, caused " a Column to be erected, and a Steel-Looking-glass " to be set on the Top of it, which had such a " Virtue, that all the Ships of the Enemies that " sailed by that Column (the Looking-glass being " uncovered) were miraculously set on Fire, which " was the only Reason why he caused it to be e-" rected in that manner, in the Mouth of the Port. " But 'tis said that the *Mahometans* spoiled the " Looking-glass at their Arrival, whereby it lost " that Vertue, no less admirable than unusual, and " then they carried the Column away. But this is a " ridiculous Story, and only fit for Children, and not " for those who have any Judgment. " Add to this what I have said in the Remark *L*, of the Article *Hercules*, and these Words of *William Bouchet*, (g) " That Woman's Looking-glass must needs have " been inchanted and full of Diabolical Magick of " *Toledo*: seeing the Inhabitants of *Rhodes* could

STORIES
about
Looking-
glasses.

(c) Meziri-
ac upon
Ovid's E-
pistles p.
607, 608.

(d) *Upon the 7th Book p. m. 321.*

(e) *David l'Enfant a Dominican*, Hist. Generale de tous les Siecles, *on the 21st of June*, p. 347. *He quotes* Tresor Chronol. *p. 519. tom. 1.*

(f) *Descript. of* Africa, *fol. 358. Antwerp 1556. I make use of the* French *Translation of* John Temporal.

(g) *Will. Bouchet, Serée 19. p. m. 171, 172.*

" see

tho' he ſpeaks of the *Metempſychoſis*, I ſhall ſay (*M*) ſomething of it. I fancy that 'twas by reaſon of this Opinion that he diſapproved the ſacrificing of Beaſts, and 'tis obſerved, that he adored an Altar on which no Sacrifice had ever been offered, as a (*M△*) Place which had never been profaned or polluted. I have not mentioned the Native Country of *Pythagoras*, becauſe there are ſeveral Opinions about it; ſome ſay he was a *Tyrrhenian*, others a *Syrian*, others affirm that he was born in the Iſle of *Samos*, others, in the Iſle * of *Cephalonia* †, &c. The Heathen Philoſophers never ſaid any thing truer, than what he ſaid concerning (*N*) God, and the End of all our Actions; and 'tis likely

" ſee the Ships that ſailed into *Syria* or *Egypt* in a Looking-glaſs, which hung at the Sun's Neck upon their *Coloſſus*."

The Story of *Noſtradamus*'s Looking glaſſes is not better than the foregoing. 'Tis ſaid that he ſaw in ſome Taliſmanick Looking-glaſſes, Things to come, which he happily foretold, as 'tis pretended. (*h*) *Fuit, qui narravit, ſpeculis quibuſdam Aſtrologicis Noſtradamum ad has prædictiones uſum. Nam, qui arcaniora Phyſica & Aſtrologica cognita habent, ajunt è metallis, tanquam Planetis terreſtribus, eâdem configuratione, quâ Planetæ in Thematibus Natalitiis ponuntur, ſub certis conſtellationibus ſpecula fieri poſſe, in quibus futura cernantur. Talia ſpecula non pro hominibus tantum, ſed & nationibus, urbibus, ſeculis, ut illi ajunt, fabricari poſſunt.*

(*M*) *I ſhall ſay ſomething of the* Metempſychoſis.] They ſay that *Pythagoras* bragg'd of a ſpecial Privilege about it; for he boaſted that he could remember in what Body he had been before he was *Pythagoras*. But he went no farther back than the Age of the City of *Troy*. He had been firſt *Æthalides*, who was reputed the Son of *Mercury*, and it being in his Choice to demand of that God whatever he would, he begged of him that he might remember every thing after his Death. Some time after he was *Euphorbus*, and was wounded by *Menelaus* at the Siege of *Troy*. After the Death of *Euphorbus*, he was *Hermotimus*, and then a Fiſher at *Delos* named *Pyrrhus*, and at laſt *Pythagoras*, a Man who remembred all thoſe Tranſmigrations, and what he had ſuffered in Hell, and what other Souls ſuffer there (*i*). Here is a little Contradiction; for if the Souls of Men go from one Body into another, they don't go into Hell. Our Philoſopher goes up no higher than *Euphorbus* in *Ovid*:

Morte (l) carent animæ, ſemperque priore relictâ
Sede, novis domibus vivunt, habitantque receptæ.
Ipſe ego (nam memini) Trojani tempore belli
Panthoides Euphorbus eram: cui pectore quondam
Hæſit in adverſo gravis haſta minoris Atridæ.
Cognovi clypeum lævæ geſtamina noſtræ
Nuper Abanteis, templo Junonis, in Argis.

O happy Memory, ſays *Lactantius*, (*m*) *O miram, & ſingularem Pythagoræ memoriam. O miſeram oblivionem noſtrum omnium, qui neſciamus, qui ante fuerimus; ſed fortaſſe vel errore aliquo, vel gratia ſit effectum, ut ille ſolus lethæum gurgitem non attigerit, nec oblivionis aquam guſtaverit. Videlicet ſenex vanus (ſicut otioſæ aniculæ ſolent) fabulas tanquam infantibus credulis finxit. Quod ſi benè ſenſiſſet de iis, quibus hæc locutus eſt, ſi homines eos exiſtimaſſet, nunquam ſibi tam petulanter mentiendi licentiam vendicaſſet. Sed deridenda hominis leviſſimi vanitas.* *Lactantius* ſhould have known that *Pythagoras* aſcribed his Memory to the favour of the Gods; he might have read it in *Heraclides*; and it will be ſaid, that without this one might eaſily fancy, that *Pythagoras* prevented the Objection which other Men would raiſe againſt him, becauſe they did not remember any Pre-exiſtence. I anſwer to that Objection, that in ſome reſpects it is not likely he would have been ſo bold as to boaſt of ſuch a thing: otherwiſe his Contempt of other Men, as *Lactantius* obſerves, had been very great; but if we conſider the thing another way, we ſhall find nothing in it that is againſt likelihood. He had acquired ſo great a Reputation and made ſo many Experiments of the blind Docility, and great Credulity of his Hearers, that he might eaſily flatter himſelf, that what he ſhould ſay concerning his Memory would not be diſbelieved. If you deſire to know his ſeveral Tranſmigrations ſince the Death of *Pythagoras*, you need but read the following Words, and you'll ſee that he proved a Curtezan at the third Change. (*a*) *Pythagoram verò ipſum ſicuti celebre eſt Euphorbum primo ſe fuiſſe dictitaſſe; ita hæc remotiora ſunt his, quæ Clearchus & Dicæarchus memoriæ tradiderunt, fuiſſe eum poſtea Pyrandrum, deinde Callicleam, deinde feminam pulchra facie meretricem, cui nomen fuerat Alce.* He invented not the *Metempſychoſis*: he learned it of the *Egyptians* (*b*); which made him ſpoil the fine Doctrine he had heard of *Pherecydes*, about the Immortality of the Soul, wherewith he had been ſo moved, that he gave over the Trade of an *Athlete* all of a ſudden, to ſtudy Philoſophy. (*c*) *Quis nunc extremus idiota, vel quæ abjecta muliercula non credit animæ immortalitatem, vitamque poſt mortem futuram? Quod apud Græcos olim primus Pherecydes Aſſyrius cum diſputaſſet, Pythagoram Samium illius diſputationis novitate permotum ex athleta in Philoſophum vertit.*

(*M△*) *That he adored an Altar ..... as a Place which had never been profaned or polluted.*] 'Twas an Altar conſecrated to *Apollo* in the Iſle of *Delos*. Read theſe Words of *Macrobius*: (‡) *Conſtat (ſicut Cloatius Verus ordinatorum libro ſecundo docet) eſſe Deli aram apud quam hoſtia non cæditur, ſed tantum ſolemni deum prece venerantur: verba Cloatii hæc ſunt.* Deli ara eſt Apollinis Γενέτορος in qua nullum animal ſacrificatur, quam Pythagoram quaſi inviolatum adoraviſſe produnt ..... *Meminit hujus aræ & Cato de liberis educandis in hæc verba:* Nutrix hæc omnia faciebat, in verbenis & tubis ſine hoſtia ut Deli ad Apollinis Genitivi Aram.

(*N*) *Than what he ſaid concerning God, and the End of all our Actions.*] He acknowledged the Unity of God; for he ſaid that Unity was the Principle of all things, and that out of it came the Subject it made uſe of as its Matter, and that out of its Action upon that Matter came out Numbers, Figures, Elements, the viſible World, &c. (*d*) Ἀρχὴν μὲν τῶν ἁπάντων, μονάδα· ἐκ δὲ τῆς μονάδος ἀόριστον δυάδα, ὡς ἂν ὕλην τῇ μονάδι αἰτίῳ ὄντι ὑποστῆναι, &c. (*e*) *Omnium rerum id quod unum eſt, eſſe initium; ex eo geminum quod infinitum eſt, profectum tanquam materiem illi ipſi uni, quod cauſa eſt, ſubjectum eſſe, &c.* He ſaid, that that Unity was God, the Good, the Underſtanding, the Mind. (*f*) Τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεόν, καὶ τἀγαθόν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς φύσις, αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς. *Unitatem Deum ac bonum quæ ſit Unius natura, ipſa mens.* *Caſaubon* (*g*) the Son, alledges a Paſſage out of *Stobæus* which ought to be mended. Πυθαγόρας τῶν ἀρχῶν τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεὸν καὶ τ' ἀγαθόν. ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ νοὸς φύσις· ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς. καὶ τὴν ἀόριστον δυάδα, καὶ τὸ κακὸν περὶ ἥν ἐστι τὸ ὑλικὸν πλῆθος. *Stobæus* had it from *Plutarch* (*h*), we muſt therefore read τοῦ ἑνὸς inſtead of τοῦ νοὸς. The Doctrine of *Pythagoras* is not ſo Orthodox in that Paſſage, as in that of *Diogenes Laertius*; for, according to *Plutarch*, he admitted of Two Independent Principles, *Unity* and *Binary*, and aſcribed to the firſt the Divine Eſſence, Goodneſs and Underſtanding, and to the ſecond, the Nature of a *Dæmon*, Evil and Matter. We ſhall judge more advantageouſly of his Doctrine, if we take it out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*. (*i*) Οὐκ ἀποκρυπτέον οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Πυθαγόραν, οἵ φασιν, Ὁ μὲν Θεὸς, εἷς· χ' οὗτος δὲ οὐχ, ὥς τινες ὑπονοοῦσιν, ἐκτὸς τᾶς διακοσμήσιος, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτᾷ ὅλος, ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κύκλῳ, ἐπίσκοπος πάσας γενέσιος, κρᾶσις τῶν ὅλων· ἀεὶ ὤν, καὶ ἐργάτας τῶν αὐτοῦ δυναμίων καὶ ἔργων ἁπάντων, ἐν οὐρανῷ φωστήρ, καὶ πάντων πατήρ, νοῦς καὶ ψύχωσις τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ, πάντων κίνασις. *Nec verò prætermittendi ſunt Pythagoræ ſectatores, quippe qui dicant, Deum quidem unum eſſe, non ita tamen, ut quidam opinantur, quaſi ſit extra mundi adminiſtrationem, ſed eſt totus in ipſa, in toto circulo, ſpeculator totius generationis, univerſorum contemperatio, qui ſemper eſt, & ſuas facultates deducit ad opus, omnium operum in cœlo illuſtrator, pater omnium, mens & animatio totius circuli, omnium motus.* The worſt of it is that *Pythagoras* repreſenting God to himſelf as the Mover of the Univerſe, and the Soul of the

World,

---

* *At Samos a Town of that Iſland.*

† *Vid. Farnab. in Ovid. Met. l. 15. v. 60.*

(*h*) *Morhofius, Polyhiſt. l. 1. c. 10. p. 98.*

(*i*) *Ex Heraclide Pontico ap. Laert. ub. ſup. n. 4. & 5.*

(*l*) *Ovid. Met. l. 15. v. 158.*

(*m*) *Lactant. Div. Inſt. l. 3. c. 18. p. m. 196.*

(*a*) *Aul. Gell. l. 4. c. 11.*

(*b*) *Herodot. l. 2. c. 123. 'Tis true, he did not mention the Name of Pythagoras, but Diodorus Siculus, l. 1. mentions him.*

(*c*) *August. Ep. 3. p. m. 9.*

(‡) *Macrob. Saturn. l. 3. c. 6. p. m. 415.*

(*d*) *Diog. Laert. ub. ſup. n. 25.*

(*e*) *St Aldobrandinus renders it in the beginning of his Note upon these words of Laertius. See alſo Mer. Caſaubon on Laert. ib. n. 25.*

(*f*) *Plut. in plac. philoſoph. l. 1. c. 7. p. 881.*

(*g*) *Not. in Diog. Laert. in Alcmæon. l. 8. n. 83.*

(*h*) *The next Words of Plutarch are* Τὴν δ' ἀόριστον δυάδα δαίμονα καὶ τὸ κακόν, περὶ ἣν ἐστὶ τὸ ὑλικὸν πλῆθος. Infinitam autem binarii naturam, genium & malum unde eſt multitudo materiæ, & viſa

(*i*) *Clem. Alexandr. in admonit. ad Gentes p. 47. C. See alſo Juſt. Mart. Oratione ad Gentes p. 58.*

likely that he had carried his Orthodoxy much farther, had he had Courage enough to expose himself to Martyrdom. The Circumstances (O) of his Death are variously

World, affirmed that our Souls are some Portions of God. There is an Objection against this Doctrine of *Pythagoras* to be found in *Tully*, which cannot be answered. (k) *Nam Pythagoras, qui censuit* (Deum) *animum esse per naturam rerum omnem intentum & commeantem, ex quo nostri animi carperentur, non vidit distractione humanorum animorum discerpi & dilacerari Deum: & cum miseri animi essent, quod plerisque contingeret, tum Dei partem esse miseram: quod fieri non potest. Cur autem quicquam ignoraret animus hominis, si esset Deus? quomodo porro Deus iste, si nihil esset nisi animus, aut infixus, aut infusus esset in mundo.* St. *Epiphanius* ascribes to that Philosopher an ill Opinion, *viz.* that God has a Corporeal and Organized Nature, being nothing else but Heaven, and making use of the Sun and Moon as two Eyes, and so of the other parts of the Firmament (l). But here is a Thought which is absolutely true: *Clemens Alexandrinus* compares it with St. *Paul's* Words. None but God is Wise, said *Pythagoras* (m). The Author of the Jewish Antiquities seems to be very well satisfied with the Doctrines of many Philosophers, especially of *Pythagoras* concerning the Nature of God, and he doubts not but they had spoken more soundly still, had they not been afraid of a Persecution; for as *Plato* says, it is not safe to tell Ignorant Men the Truth concerning the Divine Nature. (n) Καὶ γὰρ Πυθαγόρας καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ Πλάτων, καὶ οἱ μετ' ἐκείνους ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς φιλόσοφοι, καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν ἅπαντες οὕτω φαίνονται περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φύσεως πεφρονηκότες. ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν πρὸς ὀλίγους φιλοσοφοῦντες εἰς πλῆθος δόξαις προκατειλημμένον τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ δόγματος ἐξενεγκεῖν οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν...... (o) Αὐτὸς δὲ Πλάτων ὡμολόγηκεν, ὅτι τὴν ἀληθῆ περὶ θεοῦ δόξαν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὄχλου ἄγνοιαν οὐκ ἦν ἀσφαλὲς ἐξενεγκεῖν. *Pythagoras enim, & Anaxagoras, & Plato, & post illos philosophi Stoici, & pene cuncti, videntur de divina sapuisse natura. Sed hi quidem ad breve philosophantes, populo superstitionum opinionibus jam præoccupato veritatem dogmatis proferre timuêre...... Ipse siquidem Plato confessus est, quia veram de Deo opinionem propter ignorantiam plebis proferre securum non est.* The same *Josephus* affirms, (p) that *Pythagoras* exceeded all the Ancient Philosophers in Piety and Wisdom. We must not forget an Observation of *Plutarch*: when he shews the conformity there was between the Thoughts of *Numa* and those of *Pythagoras*, he says (q), that *Numa* would not have the Deity to be represented by any Images, and that God, according to *Pythagoras*, is an Impassible Nature, which does not fall under our Senses, and can only be the Object of the Understanding. (r) Οὔτε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος αἰσθητὸν ἢ παθητόν, ἀόρατον δὲ καὶ ἀκήρατον καὶ νοητὸν ὑπελάμβανεν εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον. *Neque enim ille sensui aut ulli dolori expositum rerum principium esse, sed invisibile, incorruptum, sola mente existimavit apprehensibile.*

As for the End of our Actions and Studies, nothing can be more admirable, nor more Christian, than what *Pythagoras* said about it; for he taught that the Study of Philosophy should tend to make Men like God. (s) Πρὸς τὴν θείαν ὁμοίωσιν ἀνάγει, καὶ τῆς Πυθαγορικῆς φιλοσοφίας τὸν τελεώτατον σκοπὸν ἐκκαλύπτει: *ad divinam similitudinem ducunt, Pythagoricæque philosophiæ finem perfectissimum ostendunt.* This is an Encomium bestowed on a piece of Poetry, which contains the Doctrines of that Philosopher. They consist of two parts, which may be very well compared to the Purgative and Unitive Ways so much talk'd of by our Mysticks. *Hierocles, qui commentarios eruditissimos in Carmen Aureum Pythagoræ reliquit, statim ab initio de Pythagorica philosophia differens, appellat eam* κάθαρσιν καὶ τελειότητα, purgationem, & perfectionem. *Quæ duo cum subindicent officium ipsius duplex ac propositum, ut loco alio monstravi, duplicem videri possunt Pythagoras & Pythagorici habuisse philosophiam, quarum illa sit* καθαρτικὴ, *hæc vero* τελικὴ, *illa, quæ purgat à malis, separat à materia & corpore, liberat à vinculis & carcere; hæc, quæ perficiat, evehat & reportet sursum,* & εἰς τὸ εἶδος τῆς ἀρχαίας ἕξεως, *ut loquitur Hierocles, id est habitus prioris formam inducat, similesque faciat Deo.... Id quod ipse indicat Hierocles in sequentibus, quando dicit,* αὕτη γὰρ (*carmen aureum*) πάντα περιείληφε πρακτικῆς καὶ θεωρητικῆς τὰ κεφάλαια δόγματα, δι' ὧν ἄν τις ἑαυτὸν καθαίρειν δύναιτο καὶ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ὁμοίωσιν ἐπιτηδεύειν. Continet philosophiæ omnis practicæ ac theoreticæ decreta summa quibus quis & purgare se, & similem Deo facere valeat (t). The Author whom I have quoted, alledges (v) several Passages, whereby it appears, that according to that Philosopher, the Acquisition of Truth was the only way to attain to the Likeness of God; but that Truth cannot be known, unless it be enquired after with a purified Soul, and such as has overcome the Passions of the Body; from whence he concludes thus: (a) *Ex iis, quæ superiori capite attulimus, manifestum est, philosophiam Pythagoricam id habere sibi maxime propositum, ut ad quandam similitudinem cum Deo sectatores suos ducat; id vero fieri aliter non posse, quam si veritati atque sapientiæ pura integraque mente incumbatur.* I add to this the Testimony of the Anonymous Author, who wrote the Life of *Pythagoras*. He says (b), that the Followers of that Philosopher taught, that Men make themselves perfect three ways. 1. By conversing with the Gods; for during that Commerce, they abstain from every evil Action, and become like the Gods, as much as such a thing is possible. 2. By (c) doing good to others; for it is God's Property, it is an Imitation of God. 3. By going out of this Life. The best Presents which Heaven gave to Men, according to *Pythagoras* (d), are to speak Truth, and do good Offices: those two things, said he, resemble the Works of God.

(O) *The Circumstances of his Death are variously reported.*] He lived at *Crotona*, in *Milo's* House with his Disciples, and was burnt in it. A Man whom he refused to admit into his Society, set the House on Fire (e). 'Tis likely that he had not a good Physiognomy; for *Pythagoras* received none for his Disciples, but those whose Look he liked, after he had examined it according to the Rules of Art. It was his first Step. (f) *Jam à principio adolescentes qui sese ad discendum obtulerant,* ἐφυσιογνωμόνει. *Id verbum significat, mores naturasque hominum, conjectatione quadam de oris & vultus ingenio, deque totius corporis filo atque habitu, sciscitari. Eum, qui exploratus ab eo idoneusque fuerat, recipi in disciplinam statim jubebat.* Some say that (g) he was suspected of endeavouring to usurp the Sovereignty; and that to prevent his Design, the *Crotoniates* set his House on Fire. He made his Escape thro' the Flames, and went out of the City; but as he was going into a Field of Beans, he stopt, and chose rather (h) to be kill'd, than to open his Mouth and spoil the Beans. According to *Dicæarchus* (i) he fled to the Temple of the Muses at *Metapontum*, and died there with Hunger, after he had fasted 40 Days. Others say (k), that at his Return from the Isle of *Delos*, whither he went to shut the Eyes of his Master *Pherecydes*, and to Bury him, he himself put a stop to his Life, by abstaining from Food. According to some other Writers (l), he brought all his Disciples to the Assistance of the *Agrigentins* against the *Syracusans*; and having been worsted, he was killed whilst he was running about a Field of Beans. Which does not very well agree neither with the 80 Years which they say (m) he lived, nor with the (n) 90, much less still with the (o) 99, or (p) 104 Years mentioned by others. See upon this the learned Collections of *Menagius* (q). He has not forgot to quote *Arnobius*, who affirms, that *Pythagoras* was burnt alive in a Temple. (r) *Pythagoras Samius suspicione dominationis injusta vivus concrematus in fano est: numquid ea, quæ docuit vim propriam perdiderunt, quia non spiritum sponte, sed crudelitate appetitus effudit?* *Justin* intimates that he died without any violence at *Metapontum*, whither he retired after he had been 20 Years at *Crotona*, and that he died there, being so much admired, that his House was converted into a Temple, and that he was honoured as a God. *Cum annos viginti Crotonæ egisset, Metapontum migravit, ibique decessit, cujus tanta admiratio fuit, ut ex domo ejus tem-*

(k) *Cic. de Nat. Deor. l. 1. p. m. 41.* See *Minutius Felix, who says p. m.* 151. Pythagoræ Deus est animus per universam rerum naturam commeans, & intentus: ex quo etiam animalium omnium vita capiatur. Lactantius *says the same l. 1. c. 5. p. m.* 14.

(l) *Epiph. hær. 13. p.* 14.

(m) *Apud Clement. Alexand. Strom. l. 4. p.* 477.

(n) *Jo*... *pn. cont.* ...*ppi n. l.* ...*p.* 1071.

(o) *Id. ib. p.* 1076.

(p) Σοφίᾳ ... τὰ περὶ ... θεῖον ...εβείᾳ ... Sapientia & divina pietate philosophos omnes excellens. *Id. l. 1. contra Appion. p.* ...45.

(q) *Plut.* ... *Numa* ...65.

(r) *Id.* ... B.

(s) *Hierocles in* ...*gat. ad* ...*mina* ...*ea cir-* ...*fin.* See ...*Stro* ...*s Ec-* ... 11. *c.* ... *where* ... *says* ...*gánt*, Πλάτων ταῦτα τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ, τέλος ὁμοίωσιν ... Socrates & Plato quemadmodum Pythagoras finem dixerunt, dei similitudinem.

(t) *Jean. Scheffer. de Natur. & constitutione philosophiæ Italicæ c. 10. p.* 78.

(v) *Ib. c.* 7.

(a) *Id. ib. c. 8. p.* 56.

(b) *Apud Photium cod. 249. p.* 1313.

(c) Δεύτερον ἐν τῷ εὖ ποιεῖν: θεοῦ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ θεῖον μιμητικόν. Deinde bene de aliis merendo: Dei enim hoc proprium est, in eoque Deum imitatur. *Phot. ib.*

(d) *Ælian. var. hist. l. 12. c.* 59.

(e) *Diog. Laert. ub. sup. n.* 39.

(f) *Aul. Gell. l. 1. c.* 9.

(g) *Laert. ib.*

(h) Ἁλῶναι μᾶλλον ἢ πατῆσαι αἱρετώτερον ἢ χρεῖττον ἢ λαλῆσαι. Capi præstat quam has dare pessum, cadique satius est quam quicquam loqui. *Id. ib.* Meric Casaubon *thinks that 'tis better to read* ἀλῶσαι, vagari, *to wander miserably, instead of* λαλῆσαι.

(i) *Id. ibi n.* 40.

(k) *Id. ib.*

(l) *Id. ib.*

(m) *Id. ib. n.* 44. (n) *Id. ib.* (o) *Tzetzes, Chil.* 11. *v.* 366. (p) *Anonymus ap. Photium p.* 1313. (q) *Menag. in Diog. Laert. p.* 371. *& seq.* (r) *Arnob. l. 1. p.* 23.

ouſly reported. I ſhall name ſome Authors who have treated (P) of his Doctrine. One may ſee in the Hiſtory ‡ of Phyſick, what concerns him as a Phyſician.

PYTHEAS, was born at *Marſeilles*. I think that the moſt certain thing that can be ſaid concerning the Time wherein he lived, is, that he lived (A) in the time

plum facerent, eumque pro Deo colerent (s). *Valerius Maximus* does not ſay ſo much of him; but he is none of thoſe who ſay he was ill uſed. (t) *Cujus ardentem rogum plenis venerationis oculis Metapontus aſpexit: oppidum Pythagoræ quam ſuorum cinerum nobilius clariuſve monumentum.*

St. *Epiphanius* was groſly miſtaken when he ſaid (v) that *Pythagoras* died in the Country of the *Medians*.

(P) *Some Authors who have treated of his Doctrine.*] I ſhall confine my ſelf to Modern Authors. *William Canterus* tranſlated into *Latin* the Fragments of *Pythagoras*, collected by *Stobæus*. *Eraſmus* (w), *Philip Beroaldus, Gyraldus, Claudius Minos, Franceſ Berni, Nicolas Scutelli*, and ſome others, made ſome Notes upon the Symbols of that Philoſopher. See alſo *Lipſius* (x); the Commentaries of *Ritterſhuſius* upon *Malchus*; the Diſſertation of *Holſtenius, De vita & ſcriptis Pythagoræ*; *Rodericus à Caſtro's* Pythagoras; *Paganinus Gaudentius De Pythagorea animarum tranſmigratione*; the Dialogue of *Ambroſius Rhodius de Tranſmigratione*; the Diſſertation of *Claudius Lignier de ſecta Pythagorica*; the Theſis of *Mark Mappus de Ethica Pythagoræ*, maintained at *Straſburg* under the Profeſſor *Schallerus*; *Schilterus's* Diſſertation *de Diſciplina Pythagorica*; the above-mentioned Book of *John Schefferus*; the Book intitled *Ethica Pythagorica* (y) written by *Magnus Daniel Omeis*, Profeſſor at *Altdorf*. See alſo *La Mothe le Vayer* in his Book *de la Vertu des Payens*. 'Tis thought that the *Golden Verſes* of *Pythagoras*, are the Work of his Diſciple *Lyſis*. An Ancient Philoſopher of *Alexandria*, named *Hierocles*, wrote a Commentary on them, and we have that Commentary commented by *Caſaubon*'s Son. We have alſo ſome Commentaries made upon the ſame Verſes by *Vitus Amerbachius, Theodorus Marcilius, Henry Brem, Michael Neander, John Straſelius, William Diezius*, and *Magnus Daniel Omeis*. I had almoſt forgot *Joachim Zehnerus*'s (z) Book.

(A) *That he lived in the time of* Alexander the Great.] *Voſſius* is ſomewhat more (aa) preciſe: he ſays that *Pytheas* lived under *Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Father (bb) *Hardouin* follows him. *Moreri* ſays that it was in the 440th or 445th Year of *Rome*; but he ſhould have known, that the firſt Year of the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus* falls, according to *Calviſius*, on the Year of *Rome* 468. We have ſome Reaſons to believe that *Pytheas* flouriſhed before that time. *Voſſius* ſhews (cc), that *Eratoſthenes* wrote after *Pytheas*; but he did not make uſe of the cleareſt Proof of it: he was contented to alledge this Reaſon, that *Polybius* having pitched amongſt other Geographers upon *Dicæarchus, Eratoſthenes* and *Pytheas*, to cenſure them, ſays (dd) that *Eratoſthenes* wrote the laſt of all. There is a Proof more poſitive than that in the ſame Page, ſeeing *Strabo* ſays in that place, that *Polybius* wondered that *Eratoſthenes* did believe what *Pytheas* had written. *Polybius* wondered ſo much the more at it, becauſe he obſerved that *Eratoſthenes* believed ſeveral things which *Dicæarchus* did not believe. *Pytheas* was therefore (ee) an Author before *Eratoſthenes* and *Dicæarchus* wrote their Geographical Books. We ſhall draw ſome Conſequences from it. But I ſhall firſt give my Opinion concerning the Words wherein *Strabo* thinks that *Polybius*'s way of Reaſoning is ridiculous. Perhaps he underſtood not well what *Polybius* meant. I am apt to think that that Great Man argued thus: *Dicæarchus* is a very credulous Author, and has committed abundance of Miſtakes; yet he would not believe ſeveral things related by *Pytheas*; one may therefore wonder how *Eratoſthenes*, who lived after him, could believe thoſe very things which he knew were rejected by *Dicæarchus*. But *Strabo* pretends that *Polybius* argued thus: *Dicæarchus* is a very judicious Author, and to be look'd upon as a Model; it is therefore very ſtrange that *Eratoſthenes* believed *Pytheas* in ſeveral things, which *Dicæarchus* did not believe. Suppoſing that *Polybius* reaſons after that manner, *Strabo* might very well laugh at him, conſidering the great number of Faults which *Polybius* had criticized in *Dicæarchus*'s Writings. But once more, I would not Swear that he underſtood well *Polybius*'s Meaning. I wiſh we could verifie it; we might then learn many other Facts, which we are ignorant of, by reaſon of the Loſs of ſo many Books of that Author. I ſhall obſerve by the by, a Fault in the Latin Tranſlation of *Strabo*. The whole ſtrength of this Repetition, μὴ τῷ Δικαιάρχῳ πιστεύσαντος, is altogether enervated: to render that Place well, the ſame Repetition which is in the Original, ſhould have been made uſe of. The Reader may judge of it, if he will give himſelf the trouble to examine this Citation. (ff) Ἐρατοσθένη δὲ τὸν μὲν Εὐήμερον Βεργαῖον καλεῖν, Πυθέᾳ δὲ πιστεύειν· καὶ ταῦτα δὲ μὴ τῷ Δικαιάρχῳ πιστεύσαντος. Τὸ μὲν οὖν μὴ τῷ Δικαιάρχῳ πιστεύσαντος, γελοῖον ὥσπερ ἐκείνῳ χρῆσθαι κανόνι προσῆκον, καθ' οὗ τοσούτους ἐλέγχους αὐτὸς προφέρεται. *Interim Eratoſthenem qui Euemerum Bergæum appellet, Pytheæ credere, atque hoc ne Dicæarcho quidem credente. Id quidem ridiculum eſt quod Dicæarchum profert, quaſi vero conveniat eum veluti normam ſequi quem ipſe Polybius tot reprehenſionibus inceſſit.* However we learn from thence that *Pytheas*'s Books were written not only before thoſe of *Eratoſthenes*, but alſo before thoſe of *Dicæarchus*. We know that the latter was Diſciple of *Ariſtotle*, and dedicated a Book to *Theophraſtus*, *Ariſtotle*'s beloved Diſciple. It is therefore very likely that *Pytheas* lived before the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, ſince his Writings came out before thoſe of *Dicæarchus*, who muſt needs have been an old Man under the Reign of that Prince. In effect, the beginning of that Reign falls in the laſt Year of the 123 Olympiad; *Ariſtotle* gave over Teaching (a) before the End of the 114th Olympiad, and his Scholars were moſt of them grown Men. We learn from *Pliny* that (b) *Pytheas* publiſhed his Works before *Timæus* publiſhed his; for the latter affirms upon the other's Word, what I have ſaid concerning Amber, in the Text of this Article. But neither *Timæus* nor *Eratoſthenes*, who wrote after *Pytheas*, can prove any thing againſt *Voſſius*, becauſe they (c) lived ſo long, that they might have ſeen the Relations of *Pytheas*, tho' they had not been publiſhed before the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*; and 'tis well known that an Author who relates what he has read in another, may be older than he, and even Die before him; ſo that tho' *Timæus* and *Eratoſthenes* wrote after *Pytheas*, we can infer from it nothing that is certain concerning the Age of *Pytheas*. The beſt proof we can have to place him before the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, is, becauſe he was cited by *Dicæarchus*. *Voſſius* did not remember it, when he (d) placed *Dicæarchus* before *Pytheas*. If *Sanſon*, one of the beſt Geographers of the XVII. Century, had conſidered this little Point of Chronology, he had not ſaid (e), that *Pytheas* mentioned the Converſations which the Father of *Scipio Africanus* had with the Deputies of *Marſeilles* in the Year of *Rome* 532. One of *Pytheas*'s Lyes in the Opinion of (f) *Polybius*, was, that None of the Inhabitants of *Marſeilles* could tell *Scipio* any remarkable thing concerning *Britain*. I have obſerved in the Article *Abbeville* the other Miſtakes of *Sanſon* about that Matter. It remains to ſay, that he ſhould not have underſtood that *Scipio*, who landed at the Mouth of the *Rhone*, to obſerve the Motions of *Annibal*, ſince it is impoſſible that *Pytheas* ſhould have writ any thing ſince that Voyage of *Scipio*, his Works having been read by *Dicæarchus*, *Ariſtotle*'s Diſciple; for there was a hundred Years at leaſt between the Time when *Ariſtotle* left off teaching School, and the Beginning of the ſecond *Punick* War. It would be a difficult thing to know who was that *Scipio*, who, as *Pytheas* relates it, inquired about *Britain* of the Inhabitants of *Marſeilles*, *Narbonne* and *Corbilon*; but it is certain he was not the Father of that *Scipio* who overcame *Carthage*. I wonder that Father *Labbe* did not obſerve that Miſtake of *Sanſon*, and I don't believe that he was willing to ſpare him. He might alſo have been cenſured for (g) reckoning near a hundred Years between *Pytheas* and *Polybius*. Which does not agree with his *Hypotheſis*, viz. that *Pytheas* wrote his Relations after the Year of *Rome* 532, which was but 16 Years before the Birth of *Polybius* (b). Nay, according to that Suppoſition, *Pytheas* was not returned from his Travels in 532, for if he was returned then, the Deputies of *Marſeilles*

‡ *Printed at Geneva in the year* 1696, *and written by D. L. C. D. M. that is to ſay* David le Clerc Doctor of Phyſick. *He is Brother of Mr.* le Clerc *Profeſſor at* Amſterdam.

(s) *Juſt. l.* 20. *c.* 4. *p. m.* 395.

(t) *Val. Max. l.* 8. *c.* 7. *n.* 2. *in ext.*

(v) *Epiph. hær.* 15. *p.* 14.

(w) *In the Beginning of his Chiliads of Proverbs.*

(x) *Manuduct. ad Philoſoph. Stoic. l.* 1. *diſſert.* 6.

(y) *Printed at* Altdorf 1693.

(z) *Paſtor ac Superintendens Schleugenſis. He publiſhed at* Leipſick *in* 1603. Vitam & fragmenta Pythagoræ.

(aa) *Voſſ. de Philologia p.* 55. *in his Treatiſe* de Hiſt. Græc. *p.* 457. *He adds* vel certè proximus huic tempori fuit.

(bb) *In Indice Plin.*

(cc) *Voſſ. de Hiſt. Græc. p.* 110.

(dd) *Ap. Strab. l.* 1. *p.* 71.

(ee) *See the Rem. F.*

(ff) *Strab. l.* 1. *p.* 71.

(a) *Apol. Ind. apud Diog. Laert. in Ariſt.*

(b) *Plin. l.* 37. *c.* 2.

(c) Eratoſthenes *lived* 80 *Years. He was born in the* 126*th Olympiad, and died in the* 146*th. See Voſſ.* de Hiſt. Græc. *p.* 108. Lucian *ſays he lived* 82 *Years, and that* Timæus *lived* 96 *Years. But* Timæus *wrote the War of* Pyrrhus *againſt the* Romans, *and therefore lived under* Ptolemy Philadelphus.

(d) *De Philolog. c.* 11. *n.* 7. Moreri *hath quoted wrong,* de Philoſ. c. 11. n. 6.

(e) *Nicol.* Sanſon, *An Enquiry into the Antiquities of* Abbeville.

(f) *Ap. Strab. l.* 4. *p.* 131.

(g) *Sanſon ub. ſup. p.* 85.

(b) *He was born in the year of* Rome 548. *See Voſſ. de Hiſt. Græc. p.* 122.

Time of *Alexander the Great*. He wrote ſome Geographical (*B*) Books, which in all likelihood were nothing elſe but a Relation of his Travels. He ſtrangely abuſed this Maxim, *A Traveller may Lie with Authority*; for he fill'd his Books with Fables concerning the Northern Countries, where he pretended to have been. He knew that few Ocular Witneſſes could convict him of his Lies; but Poſterity left not his Boldneſs unpuniſhed. *Polybius* was very hard upon him; *Strabo* falls upon him on ſeveral Occaſions with great * Severity. Thoſe two Authors could not endure that he ſhould ſay with Impunity, that in the Iſle (*C*) of *Thule*, ſix Days Journey from *Great Britain* towards the North, and in all thoſe Parts, there was neither Land, nor Sea, nor Air, but a Compound of thoſe three Things, like the *Pulmo* (*D*) *Marinus*, over which the Sea and Land hung up, and which was a kind of a Tie to all the parts of the World, and that it was impoſſible to go thither on Foot, or in a Ship. He boaſted that he had ſeen that Subſtance which reſembled the *Pulmo Marinus*: as for the reſt, he confeſt that he knew nothing of it but by Hear-ſay. He boaſted alſo, that he had travelled in all the Countries of *Europe* which lie on the Ocean, from *Cadiz* to the River *Tanais*; which *Polybius* could not believe of a meer † Private-Man, and not well provided with Money. However, 'tis confeſt χ, that he underſtood well enough the Properties of the Northern Countries, for what concerns the Aſpects of the Sun; and what he ſaid ‡, that the Barbarians ſhewed him the Place where the Sun went to Sleep, and that in ſome of thoſe Countries the Night laſted not above three Hours, and in others not above two, does not at all look like a Fable, and does him a great deal more Honour than another thing which *Pliny* relates after him, *viz.* that there was an Iſland, a Days Journey from the Country of the *Guttones*, a People of *Germany*, wherein ⸸ they uſed Amber inſtead of Wood for their Fuel. The Reader may conſult the Apology which (*E*) *Peter Gaſſendus* wrote for *Pytheas* at the Deſire of *Peireskius*. Thoſe two illuſtrious Men born in *Provence*, were very willing to raiſe the Glory of their Country, by defending the Reputation of a Writer who was born in *Marſeilles*. *Gaſſendus*, tho' a learned Man, was (*F*) miſtaken in his Conjectures

ſeilles might have anſwered the Queſtions of the *Roman* Conſul.

I ſhall acquaint the Reader that Mr. *Sanſon*, worthy Son of the Great Geographer, who publiſhed the Antiquities of *Abbeville*, has done me the Favour to ſend me the Copy of an Anſwer to Father *Labbe*, which his Father deſign'd to Print. It is a learned and ingenious Piece. I hope I ſhall find an occaſion to publiſh ſome Fragments thereof.

(*B*) *Some Geographical Books.*] The Scholiaſt (*i*) upon *Apollonius* mentions a Book of *Pytheas*, intitled γῆς περίοδος, *the Circuit of the Earth*. The Abridgment of *Artemidorus* the *Epheſian*, printed with the Ancient Geographers, names *Pytheas* among thoſe who wrote the Circuit of the World, *periplum* (*k*) *Orbis*. The Deſcription of the Iſle of *Thule* was, in all likelihood, part of that Work. His Book *de Oceano* is quoted by *Geminus*. *Nicolas Sanſon* (*l*) is not the only one who entered the Liſts with *Strabo*, for the ſake of *Pytheas*. We ſhall ſee by and by that *Gaſſendus* undertook very zealouſly the Defence of that Ancient *Marſeillois*.

(*C*) *That in the Iſle of* Thule.] Having proved with ſolid Reaſons, that *Pytheas* publiſhed his Books about the time of *Alexander*, I may reject one of the Arguments which Father *Vavaſſeur* made uſe of againſt *Photius*. I have refuted another in the Article (*m*) *Antony*. *Photius* thinks that *Antonius Diogenes* lived near the Reign of *Alexander the Great*. Father *Vavaſſeur* anſwers to it amongſt other things, that he (*n*) does not believe that the Iſle of *Thule* was very well known at that time. *Antonius Diogenes* was the Author of a Romance, intitled *Incredibilia de Inſula Thule*. It matters not whether that Iſland was not known to the common People, or whether it was not very well known in general; for if a Traveller, ſuch as *Pytheas*, publiſhed a Relation of it, a Romantick Writer might eaſily pitch upon that Iſland to make it the Scene of his Chimerical Narrations. I will not examine whether *Photius* is in the right or not, 'tis enough for me to prove that he has not been well refuted.

(*D*) *Like the* Pulmo Marinus.] *La Mothe le Vayer* (*o*) obſerves, that it is a *Spongious Zoophyte*, upon which the *Italians* have beſtowed a very obſcene Name; and having ſaid that *Pytheas* maintained *that that Matter was the Tie of the Univerſe*, and that he was *ſo Impudent*, *as to ſpeak of it as of a Thing which he had ſeen*, he ſpeaks of *an Anachoret*, *who boaſted that he had been at the very End of the World*, and who ſaid, *that being there, he was obliged to bend his Shoulders, becauſe the Heaven and Earth touched one another at that Extremity.*

(*E*) *Which* Peter Gaſſendus *wrote for* Pytheas.] This was the occaſion of it. When *Peireskius* cauſed the Solſtitial Elevation of the Sun to be obſerved at *Marſeilles* in 1636, the Proportion between the Shadow and the Style of the Dial was compared with what *Hipparchus* (*p*) ſays that *Pytheas* found out. *Gaſſendus* was deſired to write about that Aſtronomical Operation, and to juſtifie *Pytheas* againſt *Strabo*'s Invectives. (*a*) *Voluit rurſus* (Peireskius) *ut quoniam Strabo multa congeſſit adverſus Pytheam, ipſe in gratiam comprovincialis apologiam conſcriberem, purgaremque virum qui primus Thulen inſulam demonſtravit, & quo non habet Occidens totus quem antiquiorem in doctis habeat.* What he wrote thereupon is to be found in the 4th Vol. of his (*b*) Works. He did not forget that *Cleomedes* ſtiles *Pytheas* a Philoſopher; and that *Hipparchus* having cenſured *Eudoxus*, for ſaying, that there is a certain Star which never goes out of its Place, and is the Pole of the World, praiſes *Pytheas* for having taught that the Pole is a place void of Stars, which makes a kind of a Square with the three neighbouring Stars. *Hipparchus*, in imitation of *Eratoſthenes*, inriched his Geography with *Pytheas*'s Diſcoveries; and 'tis no wonder if the latter was miſtaken about the *Tanais*, conſidering the Ignorance of thoſe Times about *Pontus Euxinus*, the *Caſpian* Sea and the *Palus Meotis*. When *Alexander* came to the Banks of the *Caſpian* Sea, it was taken for *Pontus Euxinus*. *Gaſſendus* adds ſeveral other Remarks in *Pytheas*'s behalf. The Reader may have ſeen in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des* (*c*) *Lettres*, that *Olaus Rudbeckius* took warmly the part of that Traveller.

(*F*) *Was miſtaken in his Conjectures.*] He believed that the *Marſeillois* being aſhamed becauſe they could not Anſwer *Scipio*'s Queſtions about *Britain*, and beſides, being ſtirred up by his Advices, reſolved to ſend ſome Body to take a View of that Country, and in order to it, pitch'd upon *Pytheas*, who was a good Mathematician. The Republick of *Marſeilles* was already powerful by Sea, and very much addicted to Trade; they might therefore be deſirous to know whether their Trade might be improved by the Diſcovery of thoſe unknown Countries. *Polybius*'s Objection may be ſolved thereby; it would be no wonder how *Pytheas*, a poor Private-Man, could be at the Charges of ſo long a Journey. Beſides, it may be anſwered, that a Company of Merchants, or a rich Citizen, might have pitch'd upon *Pytheas* to make that Diſcovery, and furniſh him with all Neceſſaries. If *Gaſſendus* had ſaid no more, I ſhould not find Fault with him; but jectures about that Author; nevertheleſs, the reading of his Apology may be of ſome uſe. Our *Pytheas* (G) ought not to be confounded with the *Athenian* Orator of the ſame Name, who lived in the time of *Demoſthenes*.

---

* Πυθέας ἀνὴρ ψευδίστατος ἐξήτασται. Pytheas homo mendaciſſimus inventus eſt. *l.* 1. *p.* 41. Vid. etiam *p.* 44. & *l.* 2. *p.* 71, 79. *l.* 4. *p.* 139.

† Φησὶ δ' ὁ Πολύβιος ἄπιστον καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, πῶς ἰδιώτῃ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ πένητι τὰ τοσαῦτα διαστήματα πλωτὰ καὶ πορευτὰ γένοιτο. Polybius autem id quoque incredibile ait eſſe, privatum hominem, cumque pauperem tantum ſpacii mari terraque obiviſſe. *Strab. l.* 2. *p.* 71.

χ *Id. l.* 4. *p.* 139.

‡ *Apud Geminum Iſagog. ad Phænom.*

⸸ Incolas pro ligno ad ignem uti eo, proximiſque Teutonis vendere. *Plin. l.* 37. *c.* 2.

(*i*) *In. l.* 4.

(*k*) *See Voſſ. ib. p.* 110.

(*l*) *Ub. ſup.*

(*m*) *See the Rem. B.*

(*n*) Suſpicio quoque eſt nondum cognitam vulgo Thulen inſulam de qua illi feruntur inſcripti libri. *Vavaſſor, de Lud. Dict. p.* 148, 149.

(*o*) *Let.* 89. *tom.* 11. *of his Works in* 12. *p.*255.

(*p*) *Apud Strab. l.* 2. *p.* 78.

(*a*) *Gaſſendus in vit. Peiresk. l.* 5. *Oper. tom.* 5. *p.* 327.

(*b*) *Pag.* 524. & *ſeq.*

(*c*) *February* 1685, *p.* 133.

P Y T H I A S, *Ariſtotle*'s Daughter, was married thrice, firſt to *Nicanor*, according to her Father's (*A*) laſt Will, afterwards to *Procles*, who deſcended from *Demaratus* King of *Sparta*, and laſtly to *Metrodorus* the Phyſician, Diſciple of *Chryſippus* a *Cnidian*, and Maſter of *Eraſiſtratus*. The two Sons † ſhe had by her ſecond Huſband, ſtudied Philoſophy under *Theophraſtus*. The Son ſhe had by *Metrodorus* (*B*) was called *Ariſtotle* *. It appears by ſome Sentences which are aſcribed (*C*) to her, that her Father beſtowed a good Education upon her. Note, that her Mother's Name was PYTHIAS.

† *The one was called* Procles, *and the other* Demaratus.

* *Taken from* Sextus Empiricus *adv. Mathem. c.12. p. 51.*

P I T H O M, a City of *Egypt*. It was one β of the two Towns which *Pharaoh* cauſed to be built by the Poſterity of *Jacob*. It is the ſame with *Peluſium*, and with that which *Manetho* calls *Abaris*, if we believe *Marſham* γ. The City of *Abaris* was ſo called δ according to the Ancient Theology. It ζ was in the *Saites Nomos*, Eaſtward of the River *Bubaſtus*. The Beauty of its Situation moved *Saltis*, King of certain Nations who ſubdued *Egypt*, to Inlarge and Fortifie it. He kept in it a Garriſon of 240 thouſand Men. The ſame People intrenched themſelves there after they had loſt the reſt of *Egypt*. They defended themſelves for a long time, but at laſt they capitulated, and obtained the Liberty of going whither they pleaſed. They retired into *Syria*, and ſettled in *Judea* η. One may eaſily perceive by this Diſcourſe of *Manetho*, that he means the *Iſraelites*. He adds θ that *Amenophis*, who reigned over the *Egyptians* about five Ages after, deſired to ſee the Gods, and that a Great Prophet entertained him in the hopes of ſuch an Advantage, provided *Egypt* were purged from all manner of People infected with Leproſy, or other like Infirmities. That ſort of People were gathered together, and amounted to 80 thouſand Men: they were employed in drawing and cutting Stones

β *Exod. ch. 1. v. 8.*

γ *Marſh. Chron.Can. Ægypt. ſacul 8. p. m. 107.*

δ *Manethon apud Joseph. l. 1. cont. Appion. p. 1040.*

ζ *Id. ap. eumd. ib. p. 1039.*

η *Ex eodem ap. eumd. p. 1040.*

θ *Id. ap. eumd. ib. p. 1052.*

but he ſays, that he who enquired about *Britain* of the *Marſeillois*, in the time of the ſecond *Punick* War, which began in the 140th Olympiad, was either *Scipio Africanus*, or the Father or Uncle of that *Scipio*. Which cannot be true, ſince *Dicearchus* had read *Pytheas*'s Travels. *Gaſſendus* ſays, to elude that Proof, that the Words of *Strabo* may bear this Senſe, *viz.* that *Pytheas*'s Relations might have diſpleaſed *Dicaarchus*. But it is certain that this is not *Strabo*'s meaning: his Participle (*d*) πιστεύσας, and the whole force of his Argument are againſt this Explication. *Godefridus Wendelinus*, to whom *Gaſſendus* wrote thoſe things, anſwered his (*e*) Queſtion, *viz. In what Time* Pytheas *lived*, thus, that it was in the Time of *Alexander the Great*: which he proved 1. by *Dicaarchus*'s railing at *Pytheas*: 2. Becauſe *Timaus*, an Enemy of *Agathocles*, was familiarly acquainted with *Pytheas* at *Marſeilles* during his Exile; from whence *Wendelinus* concludes, that *Pytheas* lived before *Agathocles*. But it is a wrong Conſequence; for it does not follow becauſe a Traveller grows familiarly acquainted with a baniſhed Perſon, that he is therefore older than he who baniſhed that Perſon. Beſides, *Wendelinus* makes his Author ſay more than he ſaid; for he refers us to *Pliny* (*f*), who only ſays that *Timaus* believed what *Pytheas* related about Amber.

(*G*) *Ought not to be confounded.*] Father (*g*) *Hardouin* applies to *Pytheas* of *Marſeilles*, what *Plutarch* ſays of one *Pytheas* in the Life of *Demoſthenes*, p. 855; but there is doubt that *Pytheas* mentioned by *Plutarch* in that Place, is the ſame *Athenian* Orator whom he ſpeaks of p. 849. where he ſays, that *Pytheas* told *Demoſthenes* in Jeſt, (*h*) that his Orations ſmelt of Oyl. He ſpeaks of the ſame *Pytheas* in the Life of *Phocion* (*i*), as of a talkative and inſolent Orator, whom *Phocion* was forced to ſnub. *Suidas*, who gives us the ſame Notion of him, tells us, that he made his Eſcape from the Priſon wherein his Creditors kept him, and retired into *Macedonia*. *Plutarch* ſays, that *Pytheas* having fled from *Athens*, went to *Antipater*, and ſerved him as much as he was able with his Harangues. He had then (*k*) a Quarrel with *Demoſthenes* in *Arcadia*, who, tho' a baniſh'd Man, joyn'd with the *Athenian* Ambaſſadors, to oblige the *Gracian* Towns to make a Confederacy againſt *Antipater*, whoſe Cauſe was defended by *Pytheas*.

Plutarch relates in his Precepts about Government, a quick Repartee of *Pytheas*. "And *Pytheas* "the Orator, *ſays he* (*l*), when he oppoſed the "Honours decreed to *Alexander*, anſwered one who "told him, How dareſt thou ſpeak of ſo great "Things, being ſo young? *Alexander*, whom you "make a God by your Decrees, is younger ſtill "than I am."

(*A*) *To* Nicanor, *according to her Father's laſt Will.*] We don't find that Circumſtance in *Sextus Empiricus*; but he ſays, that *Ariſtotle*, after the Death of his Father and Mother, was bred up in the Houſe of *Proxenus*, a Native of *Atarna*, and to requite that good Service, he bred up *Nicanor*, Son of *Proxenus*, and took care that he ſhould learn all manner of good things, and adopted him, and even ordered by his Laſt Will that he ſhould marry his Daughter *Pythias* (*m*).

(*B*) *The Son ſhe had by* Metrodorus *was named* Ariſtotle.] *Pliny* has confounded that Genealogy; for he thought that *Ariſtotle*'s Daughter had a Son, who was *Eraſiſtratus* the Phyſician. *Horum placita*, ſays he (*n*), *Chryſippus ingenti garrulitate mutavit, plurimumque & ex Chryſippo diſcipulus ejus Eraſiſtratus Ariſtotelis filia genitus.* Let us conſider the *Greek* Words of *Sextus Empiricus*. (*o*) Τρίτῳ δὲ Μητροδώρῳ ἰατρῷ, Χρυσίππου μὲν τοῦ Κνιδίου μαθητῇ, Ἐρασιστράτου δὲ ὑφηγητῇ· ᾧ γίνεται παῖς Ἀριστοτέλης. *Tertio autem Metrodoro Medico*, (Pythias filia Ariſtotelis nupſit) *Chryſippi quidem Cnidii diſcipulo, praceptori autem Eraſiſtrati, cui natus eſt filius Ariſtoteles.* It is not very difficult to underſtand thoſe Words; they ſignifie that *Ariſtotle* was the Son of *Metrodorus* the Phyſician, and of *Pythias*; but one may conjecture, that all the Authors who ſpoke of the ſeveral Marriages of *Ariſtotle*'s Daughter, placed not their Words right, and that a Reader who was not attentive enough, might think that their meaning was that *Eraſiſtratus* was born of the Marriage of *Metrodorus* and *Pythias*. Let us ſuppoſe that thoſe Authors ſaid: Τρίτῳ δὲ Μητροδώρῳ ἰατρῷ Χρυσίππου τοῦ Κνιδίου μαθητῇ, οὗ Ἐρασίστρατος, γίνεται παῖς Ἀριστοτέλης. *Tertio autem Metrodoro Medico* (Pythias filia Ariſtotelis nupſit) *Chryſippi Cnidii diſcipulo, cujus Eraſiſtratus* (*p*) diſcipulus, *natus eſt filius Ariſtoteles* We may eaſily apprehend, that a Reader might believe, for want of Attention, that *Eraſiſtratus* was the Son of *Pythias*. How do we know but that *Pliny* made uſe of an Author, who had placed his Words ſo, or in a more deceitful manner? Obſerve the Latin Tranſlation of *Sextus Empiricus*, which I have ſet down: one would think by it that *Eraſiſtratus* was *Ariſtotle*'s Father. However, I ſhould prefer thoſe Conjectures before that of Father *Hardouin* (*q*). He believes that *Eraſiſtratus* was adopted by *Pythias*, as the Emperor *Galba* was adopted by his Step-Mother. He muſt therefore ſuppoſe, that *Eraſiſtratus* was *Metrodorus*'s Son, but *Sextus Empiricus* ſays only that he was his Diſciple.

(*C*) *By ſome Sentences which are aſcribed to her.*] She ſaid amongſt other things, that the beſt Colour that can be ſeen in a Man's Face, is that of Modeſty. (*a*) *Celebrantur quidem multa dicta Pythiades* filia

(*d*) *See the Rem. A.*

(*e*) *Vid. Gaſſend. tom. 6. p. 483.*

(*f*) *Lib. 37. c. 2.*

(*g*) *In Indice Plinii.*

(*h*) *See Ælian. hiſt. div. l. 7. c. 7. He mentions him alſo l. 14. c. 28.*

(*i*) *Pag. 751.*

(*k*) *Plut. in Demoſt. p. 858.*

(*l*) *Plut. de gerenda Repub. p. 804. See alſo Plutarch in Apophth. p. 187.*

(*m*) *Taken from Ammonius in vit. Ariſtotel. init. See alſo the laſt Will of* Ariſtotle *in Diog. Laert. l. 5. n. 12. and the Note of* Caſaubon.

(*n*) *Plin. l. 29. c. 1. p. m. 663.*

(*o*) *Sext. Empir. adv. Mathem. p. 51.*

(*p*) *That Word is very often underſtood when the* Greeks *ſpeak of the Succeſſion of Philoſophers.*

(*q*) *Hardouin. in Plin. ub. ſup. p. 664.*

(*a*) *Pet. Alcyonius in medices legato poſteriore fol. h 1. verſo.*

Stones all along the *Nile*. After they had undergone that Fatigue for some Years, they besought the King to assign a City to them for their Security and Quiet. He granted 'em *Abaris*, which was then deserted, and did before belong to the a Shepherds, and was called the City of *Typhon*, according to the Ancient Theology. They no sooner came into it, but they began to think of taking Advantage of that Place to Revolt; they took care to fortifie it, and chose for their Head a Priest of *Heliopolis*, who changed his Name of *Osarsiphus* into that of *Moses*, they were assisted by the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, whose Ancestors had been in possession of *Abaris*, &c. Their Victories were great and cruel, but at last the King of *Egypt* overcame them, and expell'd 'em out of the Country x. You'll find in *Josephus* the Refutation of those Stories, and some learned Observations of *Marsham* (*Z*) in my Remark.

PITISCUS (*Bartholomew*) Preacher to the Elector Palatin, was born the 24th of *August* 1561, at *Schlauna*, a Village of *Silesia* near *Grunberg*. The Poverty of his Family moved the Minister of that Place, to recommend him to the Lord of that Village, as a Child who was fit to Study, and who deserved to be put in the way of improving himself. That Gentleman undertook to be at the Charges of it, and sent him to the College of *Grunberg*. He exceeded all his School-Fellows in a short time. He was sent to *Breslaw*, being 18 Years of Age, and was there a Preceptor in the House of an Honest Man, who had a very fine Library. He often shut up himself in it with *Amandus Polanus*, which proved a very useful thing to both of them. Having lost his *Mæcenas*, when it was time to go to the Universities, he was so happy as to be assisted by the Liberality of a Protestant † Lady, who maintained, at her own Charges, a certain number of young Men, who studied Divinity. He pitch'd upon the Academy of *Servesta*, by reason of the great Reputation of *Wolfgang Amlingus*, and was there all the Year 1583. The next Year he went into the Palatinate, and having given many Proofs of his Merit there, he was made one * of the Preceptors of Prince ‡ *Frederic* IV. He acquitted himself so well in his Employment, that Prince *Casimir*, Administrator of the Palatinate, made him the Second Preacher of his Pupil, who when he came of Age, was so well pleased with his Preceptor's Sermons, that he made him his First Preacher. *Pitiscus* did gloriously exercise that Employment till he died, which happened the 17th of *July* 1613 ‡. I must not forget that he became (*A*) a very great Mathematician, and published a Book, wherein he shewed that it would be very necessary that Protestants should leave off writing (*B*) Controversial Books

a *That is to say, the Israelites, who, as Manetho says, had subdued Egypt, and whose K. Salis had inlarged and fortified the City of Abaris.*

x *Ex ead. ib. p. 1052. & seq.*

† *The Wife of* Joachim de Berge.

* *It was in the year* 1588. Scultetus *in narrat. Apologet. p. 11.*

‡ *He was Elector since.*

‡ *Taken from Melchior Adam in vit. Theolog. Germ. p. 833. & seq.*

(*b*) *Pag. m. 621.*

(*c*) *Marsh. Chron. Can. Ægypt. sec. 8. p. 107.*

filiæ Aristotelis gravissima, ut appareat eandem ipsam non tam in gremio educatam quam in sermone patris, quo nemo unquam fuit vel acumine præstantior, vel festivitate & lepore politior, vel suavitate conditior. Ex illis autem id etiam accepimus, nullum esse pulchrius coloris genus in facie hominis ingenui quam id quod ob verecundiam superveniret. See *Erasmus* in the (*b*) 8 Book of the Apophthegms.

(*Z*) *And some learned Observations of* Marsham *in my Remark.*] He says (*c*), that the City of the Shepherds called *Abaris* by *Manetho*, is called *Pelusium* by (*d*) another Historian of *Egypt*. *Marsham* is not exact in this: that Historian said only, that the maim'd and infirm People, that were turned out of *Egypt*, retired to *Pelusium*, and joyned with 380 thousand Men whom *Amenophis* had left there. I shall observe, that *Josephus* (*e*) took Advantage of the Difference that is between *Manetho* and *Charemon*, as to the Place to which those maim'd and leprous People were sent. *Marsham* adds, that *Ptolomæus Mendesius* (*f*) made mention of the City of (*g*) *Abaris*, and that the Fables about *Typhon* belong to that City. The Lake *Serbonis*, as he goes on, where (*h*) *Typhon* hid himself, and the City of *Heropolis*, where (*i*) he was Thunder-struck, were not far from those Parts. The Name πιθὼν, or πιθὼμ, given to one of the Towns built by the Children of *Israel*, alluded to that of *Typhon*. The *Egyptians* used to call *Typhon* by the Name (*k*) of *Seth*, hence it is that they called the City of *Typhon*, *Sethron*. The *Sethroites Nomos* took its Name from that City. What *Josephus* says is not therefore true, that the City of *Abaris* was built in the *Saites Nomos*, for it was situated on the Eastern Banks of the River *Bubastus*, and that *Nomos* was situated in the Western part of the *Delta*. It is therefore better to follow (*l*) *Africanus*'s *Manetho*, quoted by *Syncellus*; for according to that Citation, that People took *Memphis*, and built a Town in the *Sethroites Nomos*. Let us conclude, that the City of *Abaris*, that of *Sethron*, and that of *Pithom*, which is mentioned in *Exodus*, are the same with that which the *Grecians* call *Pelusium*. So says *Marsham*.

(*A*) *He became a very great Mathematician.*] He published in Latin Five Books of Trigonometry, in 1599, which were re-printed with some Additions in 1612. That Work contains 6 Books of Astronomical Problems; a Book *Problematum Geodæticorum sive agro plano metiendo ac dividendo: problemata geographica:* a Book *Problematum Gnomonicorum ac architectonicorum, in quo se ait præcipua architecturæ militaris mysteria reserasse* (*m*). *Tycho Brahe* did very much esteem *Pitiscus*'s Capacity in the Mathematicks, and wished that the number of Mathematician Preachers was greater, for he believed that it would give 'em a more solid Judgment, and put an end to several Disputes. Here are his Words: (*n*) *Doctissimi illius Bartholomæi Pitisci de triangulis acutum & compendiosum libellum lubens accepi: rogoque ut illi ex me gratias agas. Optarem, plures ejusmodi concionatores reperiri, qui Geometrica gnaviter callerent: forte plus esset in iis circumspecti & solidi judicii, rixarum inanium & logomachiarum minus. Si is mihi aliquando scripserit; & de iis studiis mecum contulerit: inveniet responsorem non invitum.* That Wish of *Tycho Brahe* is grounded upon a very good Reason, but it is liable to some Inconveniencies. A pompous and florid Eloquence is necessary to Preachers: a dry and close way of Reasoning, like that of Mathematicians, is not proper for them, and would not make such an Impression upon their Hearers, as the State of Man requires. Note, that *Pitiscus* learned of (*a*) himself all that he knew of the Mathematicks.

(*B*) *That the Protestants should leave off Writing Controversial Books one against another.*] In the Year 1608, the Ecclesiastical Senate of the Elector Palatin deliberated about the (*b*) means of putting a stop to the sad Disputes of the Protestant Divines. *Scultetus*, Preacher to his Electoral Highness, and some others were of Opinion, that it was for the Advantage of the Church, that for the time to come the Reformed should make neither Apologies, nor Antilogies, nor any such like Pieces of Controversie; that it was not possible to say or to write any thing but what had been said or written a

---

(*d*) *Named* Charemon. *Joseph. l. 1. cont. Appion. p. 1057. alleges his Words.*

(*e*) *Joseph. ub. sup.*

(*f*) *Ptol. Mendesius ap. Euseb. præp. Evang. l. 10. c. 12. p. 497. A.*

(*g*) *He calls it* Ἀυάρις.

(*h*) *Herod. l. 3. c. 5.*

(*i*) *Steph. Byzant. in* Ἡρῶ.

(*k*) *Plut. de Iside p. 357. D.*

(*l*) Rectius ex Manethone Africanus. *Marsh. ub. sup. p. 108. He quotes* Syncellus *p. 61. a.*

(*m*) *See Vossius de scient. Mathem. p. 306. & alibi.*

(*n*) *Tycho Brahe Epist. ad Conradum Assachum ap. Melch. Adamum in vitis Theolog. p. 840.*

(*a*) Illud verò mirandum, quod homo Theologus, in Mathematum studiis, nullo, nisi se magistro, eo usque progressus est, ut editis scriptis, disciplinæ illius gloriam magnis Matheseos professoribus præripuerit. *Melchior. Adam. ib.* (*b*) Quænam tristissimis Theologorum Evangelicorum certaminibus medicina reperiri queat. *Scultet. narrat. apologet. p. 45.*

great

Books one againſt another. There was a Conſultation about that Subject, after which he was charged with that Work. He (C) publiſhed ſome other Books.

PLANTEVIT-LA-PAUSE (*John*), in Latin *Plantavitius Pauſanus*, Biſhop of *Lodeve*, was born in the Caſtle of *Marcaſſargues*, a Houſe belonging to his Mother, in the Dioceſs of *Nîmes*. He was very learned in the Knowledge of the Oriental Languages, as it appears from the Books (*T*) he publiſhed. He was not only born a Proteſtant, but he had been alſo Miniſter of the Church of *Beziers* *. He turn'd Catholick in the Year *1604*, and was preſently ſent for to Court, where *Henry the Great* careſſed him very much. He went to *La Fleche*, and performed a new Courſe of Divinity under the Jeſuits. He left that Place in *1609*, to go to *Rome* †. He was one of the Biſhops of *Languedoc*, who ‖ ingaged in the Rebellion of Mr. *de Montmorency*. *Moreri* has (*Z*) committed ſome Faults.

PLATINA (*Bartholomew* γ) Author of a Hiſtory of the Popes, flouriſhed in the XV. Century. He was born in the Year *1421*, in a (*A*) Village called *Piadena*, between *Cremona* and *Mantua*. His firſt Profeſſion was that of a Soldier μ; he followed it a conſiderable time, and then he applied himſelf to Study, and made a conſiderable Progreſs in it. He went to *Rome* ‡ in the time of ⸸ *Calixtus* III. and having got Cardinal *Beſſarion's* Acquaintance, he obtained ſome ſmall Benefices of *Pius* II. and then the Place of Apoſtolick Abbreviator. *Paul* II. Succeſſor of *Pius* II. turn'd all the Abbreviators out of their Places †, without any regard to the Money they had laid out to buy that Employment, or to the Remonſtrances of *Platina*, who humbly beſought him to Order, that their Cauſe ſhould be judged by the Auditors of the *Rota*. The Pope was offended at the Liberty they took, and returned (*B*) a very haughty Anſwer. The poor Men being deprived of their Places,

great while ago; that the Confeſſions of Faith, with their Expoſitions, were ſufficient for any one who ſincerely inquired after Truth; that there was no Example of ſuch obſtinate and eager Diſputes among the Prophets and Apoſtles; that ſuch Books increaſed Differences inſtead of terminating them, and that the Satyrical Sharpneſs of the Authors of thoſe Books, made profane Men Laugh, and was a Matter of Triumph for the Papiſts, and inſpired a great many People with Irreligion. This is expreſt more at large, and with greater Energy in the Latin Words. (*c*) *Nec componi, ſed multiplicari controverſias iſtis contentionibus: paucos veritatis inquirendæ, gloriolæ vanæ aucupandæ gratiâ, multos in arenam diſputandi deſcendere: Diabolum hoc agere, ut totus Spiritus Theologicus, & quicquid ferè* DEI *providentia donorum huic ſeculo contulit, contentionibus impendatur: ut Fratres ſtylo Satyrico ſe mutuò exagitent & deforment, utque adeò per ejuſmodi ſcriptiones boni à vocationis ſuæ officiis avocentur, mali in capitali, quo ab antagoniſtis diſſident, odio firmentur; denique mutuis iſtis convitiis, quibus libri inter ſe litigantium ſcatent, creari profanis riſum, Pontificiis jubilum & magnæ auditorum parti omnis religionis contemtum.* It was reſolved in that Aſſembly, that our *Pitiſcus* ſhould pathetically and gravely repreſent thoſe things in a publick Book. He performed it (*d*) very well, and (*e*) exhorted the Proteſtants to re-unite themſelves againſt the common Enemy, and to lay aſide all Diſputes *de Perſona Chriſti & de Cœna Domini*; he ſhewed them that they might eaſily live in a perfect Union, tho' they differed about the Senſe of ſome Paſſages of the Scripture. That Book did more harm than good, the Divines of *Saxony* and *Tubingen* took up Arms every where, and maintained with an extream eagerneſs, that the *Lutherans* could make no Peace with thoſe that deny the Oral Manducation. (*f*) *Verax & hic fuit, quod proverbii locum obtinuit, ſapientis effatum:* Sæpè optimè cogitata peſſimè cadunt. *Vix enim lucem publicam aſpexerat pia exhortatio illa, cùm quaſi claſſicum cecinissent noſtri, ad arma undique concurritur in Saxoniâ & Sueviâ, magnoque ſtudio & labore orbi Chriſtiano demonſtratur, oralis manducationis in Euchariſtiâ patronos non poſſe pacem colere cum Reformatis. Scultetus* was extreamly deſirous to ſee the Lutherans and Reformed re-united. He exhorted the Divines of *Wirtemberg* to it *viva voce*, and in Writing; he (*g*) repreſented to them the Miſchiefs which ariſe from Diſcord, the Contempt of the Miniſters, and the Joy of the Papiſts. But it was to no purpoſe, for he was anſwered, that as for Political Friendſhip it was never refuſed to the Reformed, and would never be refuſed to them for the Time to come, but that Theological Friendſhip would never be granted them. (*h*) *Fruſtra omnia: Reſponſum enim: ſe in amicitiam politicam nos ſemper recepiſſe, recepturoſque deinceps, in Theologicam, hoc eſt, fraternitatem Chriſtianam nunquam.*

(*C*) *He publiſhed ſome other Books.*] Moſt of 'em in *High-Dutch*: but the Book he wrote againſt a Jeſuit of *Mentz*, with this Title *Anti-Roſarium*, is in Latin. See Mr. *Baillet's* (*i*) *Anti's*.

(*T*) *The Books he publiſhed.*] Here are the Titles of ſome of 'em. *Florilegium Biblicum, Heb. Lat.* at *Lodeve* 1645. *Florilegium Rabbinicum, Heb. Lat. cum Bibliotheca Rabbinica, ibid.* in the ſame Year. *Theſaurus Synonymicus Hebræo-Chaldæo-Rabbinicus, ibid.* in the ſame Year. An Hebrew Lexicon. *Colomeſius* (*k*) ſpeaks of a Book of *Michael Beraud*, Miniſter of *Montauban*, about Juſtification againſt that Author.

(*Z*) Moreri *has committed ſome Faults.*] I. It does clearly appear from the Atteſtation which I have quoted, that *Plantevit* made his Abjuration at *Beziers*, and not at *Bourges*. Good *Moreri* miſtook without doubt, the Meaning of the Latin Word *Biterrenſi*, and took it to be the ſame with *Biturienſi*. II. I fancy that by the ſame Miſtake he tells us, that that Prelate *retired to the Caſtle of* Margon, *in the Dioceſs of* Bourges, *and died there the* 28th *of* May 1651. III. It cannot be ſaid that a Prelate *behaved himſelf with great Prudence* from the Year 1625 to the Year 1648, when it is certain that he declared for the Rebels in the Year 1632. That Omiſſion is leſs excuſable than that of *Plantevit's* Miniſtry, and of his Studies at *La Fleche*, and of ſome other Facts of which there is not the leaſt Footſtep in *Moreri's* Dictionary. IV. Thoſe Words, *he made a particular Study* of Divinity *in the College of* Foix *at* Toloſe, are captious and very improper; for they would make one believe, that the College of *Foix* is a Houſe wherein Sciences are taught, which is not true,

(*A*) *He was born in the Year* 1421, *in a Village called* Piadena.] I don't find any Author that mentions that Year, but ſince *Jacobus Bergamas* and *Maſſæus* (*l*) place his Death in the Year 1481, and *Raphael Volaterranus* (*m*), and *Leander Albertus* (*n*) affirm that he died being ſixty Years old, it follows that he was born in the Year 1421. Thoſe who ſay (*o*) as *Moreri* does, that he was born at *Verona*, are miſtaken: here is the Proof of it. *Idem fecit Theodorus Hexarchus Ravennas cui quidem in magiſtratu mortuo non ita multo poſt Joannes Platina ſucceſſit. Hunc ego crediderim dediſſe nomen meo natali ſolo quod Platina appellatur in agro Cremonenſi poſitum.* Theſe are the very Words of *Platina* (*p*). The *Italians* don't call that Village *Platina*, but *Piadena*: as it appears from the *Italian* Tranſlation (*q*) of a Journey into *Italy*, written in Latin by *Andreas Schottus*. I believe that *Platina* was ſo called from the Place of his Birth: the Name of his Family was *Sacchus*, or *Saccus*.

(*B*) *Returned a very haughty Anſwer.*] That Pope's Anſwer does very much ſavour of Antichriſtianiſm: he plainly declared that all Right, and all the Laws depended

---

* *See the Atteſtation he gave to Fitz Simon, inſerted in the Britannomachia of that Jeſuit, p.* 122. *where he is falſly named* John de Plantavil.

† *See the ſame Atteſtation.*

‖ *See the Paſſage of* Rivetus *in* Jeſuita Vapulante *quoted by* Colomeſius Biblioth. Orient. *p.* 182.

γ *Not* Baptiſt, *as he is called by* Jacobus Bergamas, Leander, Albertus, Floridus Sabinus, *&c. See the Proofs of it in* Voſſ. de hiſt. Lat. *p.* 589. *See alſo the Rem.* H *at the end.*

μ *Volater. l.* 21. *p.* 777.

‡ *Jovius. elog. c.* 19.

⸸ *Not* Calixtus II. *as* Moreri *ſays.*

† *Platina in Paulo* II. *fol. m.* 350. *verſo.*

(*c*) *Id. ib.*

(*d*) *His Book was written in* High-Dutch.

(*e*) *Id. ib. p.* 45.

(*f*) *Id. ib.*

(*g*) Expoſitis malis, quæ ex mutuis Evangelicorum digladiationibus orirentur, atheiſmo auditorum, contemptu miniſtrorum verbi, jubilo Papiſtarum, *Id. ib. p.* 72. *ad ann.* 1616.

(*h*) *Id. ib.*

(*i*) *Tom.* 6. *p.* 361.

(*k*) *Colom. Bibl. Orient. p.* 182.

(*l*) *In Chronic. They ſay that he died of the Plague.*

(*m*) *Comm. Urban. l.* 21. *p.* 777.

(*n*) *In deſcript. Ital. p. m.* 626.

(*o*) *Hofman. in voce* Platina, *& Cave in Cartophyl. Eccleſiaſt. Edit. Lipſ. p.* 369. *are cenſured upon that Account by* Daniel Will. Mollerus, Diſſert. de Platina *p.* 4. *Sir Thomas Pope Blount* Cenſura Author. *p.* 339. *ſets down a long Paſſage of* Boiſſardus *in* Iconib. *where* Platina *is called* Veronenſis.

(*p*) *In vit. Cononis fol. m.* 104. *That Pope reigned in the Year* 686.

(*q*) Da Cremona à Mantoua ſi va per una ſtrada piana e diritta ove ſi trova Piadena Patria di Bartolomeo Platina. *My Edit. of* Vicenza 1622. *fol.* Pianeda.

Places, did for some Days whatever they could to obtain Audience of the Pope, but they were denied with the greatest Contempt. Which moved *Platina* to write a (C) Letter to him, wherein he acquainted him, that they were ready to go into Foreign Countries, and to exhort the Princes to call a Council, in order to examin whether the Abbreviators had been justly deprived of their Places. His Letter was look'd upon as an Act of Felony. He was imprisoned and kept in Irons, and left in that Condition four Months, being exposed (D) to a thousand Miseries. Afterwards he was set at Liberty, at the Request of Cardinal *Francis de Gonzaga*, and was ordered not to go out of *Rome*. He lived quietly in it for the space of three Years, and then he fell again into a new and more cruel Persecution. The Pope had been made to believe that *Callimachus* had conspired against him, and that *Platina* was one of his Accomplices. Several Persons were imprisoned, and put to the Rack upon that Account. *Platina* was as severely used as the rest. That Conspiracy proved a *Chimera*, yet not one Prisoner was set at Liberty; for they had been ashamed (E) to acknowledge, that several Persons of Merit had been cruelly treated upon an ill-grounded Suspicion. When it appeared that the Accusation of Treason was too ill-grounded to insist upon it, they came (F) to the Accusation of Heresie, which vanished away as the other. The Prisoners were not set at Liberty

depended upon his Will. Here are the *Latin* Words of *Platina*. (a) *Tentarunt tamen ii ad quos res ipsa pertinebat hominem è sententia dimovere: atque ego certe qui horum de numero eram rogando etiam ut causa ipsa judicibus publicis (quos Rotæ auditores vocant) committeretur. Tum ille torvis oculis me aspiciens, ita nos inquit ad judices revocas? ac si nescires omnia jura in scrinio pectoris nostri collocata esse? Sic stat sententia, inquit: loco cedant omnes, eant quo velint, nihil eos moror: pontifex sum, mihique licet pro arbitrio animi aliorum acta & rescindere & approbare.*

(C) *Which moved* Platina *to write a Letter to him.*] You'll see the Contents of it in the next Words: *Ego vero*, says he (b), *tanta ignominia excitus quod mihi ac sociis meis coram non licebat, id agere per literas institui. Scripsi itaque epistolam his verbis. Si tibi licuit indicta causa spoliare nos emptione nostra justa ac legitima, debet & nobis licere conqueri illatam injuriam injustamque ignominiam. Rejecti à te ac tam insigni contumelia affecti dilabemur passim ad reges, ad principes, eosque adhortabimur ut tibi concilium indicant, in quo potissimum rationem reddere cogaris cur nos legitima possessione spoliaveris.*

REFLECTIONS on that Letter, which shew the Character of *Platina*.

The Character of *Platina* may be known from this Letter: it appears by it that he was too impatient, and too much conceited, but at the same time, a sincere Man; for since he was pleased to acquaint the Publick with his Conduct, tho' it was not agreeable to his Duty, one may reasonably suppose that he loved to write Truth. It is certain, that a Subject who is turned out of his Place by his Master, has no right to threaten him that he will complain of him to some other Princes, that he may right himself. The Pope is a Sovereign in *Rome*, with respect to the suppression or establishment of certain Employments, and cannot be subjected to a Council in that respect. Besides, the Pope could not but be extremely offended at *Platina*'s Menaces about a Council. He treated the Pope as a young Boy, when he is told that his Tutor shall know of it. Besides, I should be glad to know, whether the Suppression of a College of Secretaries deserves so great a Bustle, and is worth the calling of a Council. But this is the Character of such Men, to fancy that there is nothing wherein the World is so much concerned, as what concerns 'em. *Platina* did not much trouble himself about other Abuses; he would have the Council chiefly to mind the Loss which the Apostolical Abbreviators had lately sustained.

(D) *Exposed to a thousand Miseries.*] For (c) he was in the middle of the Winter, without a Fire, in a Tower which lay open to all sorts of Winds.

(E) *To acknowledge that several Persons of Merit*, &c.] Of all the Defects of Men, Vanity is, perhaps, the Cause of most Crimes committed by them. How many Men are there who begin an Unjustice, being fully persuaded that they act justly? They soon perceive they were mistaken, but their Pride not permitting them to acknowledge their Fault, they go on in their Unjustice, lest any Body should come to know that they began it without Reason. Every Body had rather save his Reputation that that of his Neighbour: from whence come the numberless Shifts and Cavils of Informers, who know they are guilty of Calumny, and are afraid of being convicted of it. Here is a Pope (d) who for a false Point of Honour, persisted to Persecute those who were found Innocent, notwithstanding his Suspicions. See the Article *Experiens*, Rem. *A* and *B*.

(F) *They came to the Accusation of Heresie.*] So says *Platina*, *Neque hoc quidem contentus Paulus quos paulo ante conjurationis & majestatis accersierat, eosdem mutata sententia ob divulgatam fabulam hæreseos accusat* (e). *Pomponius Lætus* was apprehended at *Venice*, and carried to *Rome*. He was accused of changing the Names of young Men, and giving them a Heathenish Name instead of a Christian. 'Tis pretended that he did so, to inspire young Men with a greater Desire of Honour and Virtue; but he was contented to answer, What's that to you or to the Pope, if I have a mind to go by the Name of *Fennel*, provided it be without any Malice? *Rogatus cur nomina adolescentibus immutaret, ut homo liber erat, quid ad vos, inquit, & Paulum si mihi fæniculi nomen indo, modo id sine dolo ac fraude fiat. Amore namque vetustatis antiquorum præclara nomina repetebat quasi quædam calcaria quæ nostram juventutem æmulatione ad virtutem incitarent* (f). Besides, those Prisoners were accused of having embraced the Sect of *Plato*, of disputing in a doubtful manner about the Immortality of the Soul, and the Existence of God, and of valuing Paganism too much. (g) *Multa nobis objicit* (Paulus) *sed illud potissimum quod de immortalitate animorum disputaremus, teneremusque opinionem Platonis ..... in dubium, inquit Paulus, disputando Deum vocabatis...... Præterea vero Paulus crimini nobis dabat, quod nimium gentilitatis amatores essemus.* To which they answered, 1. That if they loved *Plato*, they did but imitate the Great St. *Augustin*. 2. That all the Divines and Philosophers of that Time disputed about the same Truths, and called them in Question, in order to find the Certainty of them; for it is one of the Laws of Dispute, not to take for certain what is in question, but to suppose for a time the uncertainty of it, in order to inquire without any prejudices into the Reasons and Grounds of its Belief (h). 3. That according to St. *Augustin*, Obstinacy in maintaining one's Errors makes one to be a Heretick, but as for them, they had always submitted to the Discipline of the Church. *Platina*, in particular, represented the Innocency of his Actions; that he had never forgot to confess his Sins and communicate once a Year, and that he never uttered a Word against the Apostles Creed, or that savour'd of Heresie. *Nullum mihi facinus impingi potest, non furtum, non latrocinium, non sacrilegium, non depeculatus, non parricidium, non rapina, non simonia. Vixi ut Christianum decebat: confessionem & communionem in anno semel præsertim intermisi nunquam. Nil ex ore meo excidit quod contra symbolum esset, aut hæresim saperet.* He observes, that no Body appear'd so fond of Pagan Antiquities as the Pope, who gathered together all the Ancient Statues to adorn his Palace (i), &c. Notwithstanding that Apology, the Pope set a Mark of Ignominy upon the Name *Academick*, and declared Hereticks all those who, for the Time to come, should mention the Word *Academy*, either in Jest or Earnest. (k) *Veteres Academicos sequebamur, novos contemnentes qui in rebus ipsis nil certi ponebant. Paulus tamen hæreticos eos pronunciavit qui nomen Academiæ vel serio vel joco deinceps commemorarent. Juncta est hæc ignominia Platoni, ipse se tueatur.* I have read in more than one Place, but I cannot tell where, that

that

(a) In *Vita Pauli* II. *fol. m.* 358. *verso.*

(b) *Ibid.*

(c) Revinctus compedibus & quidem gravissimis media hieme sine foco, celsa in turri ac ventis omnibus exposita coerceor mensibus quatuor. *Platina ub. sup. fol.* 351.

(d) Christophorus Veronensis Pauli Medicus ad me veniens, bono inquit animo te esse jubet Paulus: ac de se bene sperare brevique liberum futurum: sciscitor quando id fore speraret. Respondet homo liber audientibus omnibus qui tum aderant: non ita cito fieri posse ne levitatis & sævitiæ argueretur pontifex, quod illos quos tanto tumultu concitato cepisset ac torsisset, statim veluti innoxios dimitteret. *Ib. fol.* 358.

(e) *Ibid.*

(f) *Platina ib. fol.* 358. *verso.*

(g) *Ibid. fol.* 359.

(h) In dubium, inquit Paulus disputando Deum vocabatis. Quod quidem omnibus Philosophis & Theologis nostrorum temporum objici potest qui & animos & Deum & omnes intelligentias separatas disputandi ac veri inveniendi causa in dubium plerumque vocant. *Ib. See the Art.* Maldonat.

(i) Cum nemo eo hujus rei studiosior esset, quippe qui & statuas veterum undique ex tota urbe conquisitas in suas illas ædes quas sub Capitolio extruebat congereret. *Ibid.*

(k) *Ibid. fol.* 359. *verso* & *fol.* 360.

Liberty before (G) the Year's End. The Pope entertained *Platina* with the hopes of a good Settlement, and ſo kept him from going out of *Rome*. He expected in vain, for the ſpace of two Years, the Effect of thoſe Promiſes, and then the Pope died of an Apoplexy [*]. *Sixtus* IV. his Succeſſor, made *Platina* Library-Keeper of the Vatican [†]. *Platina* found himſelf, by that means, in his Element. He lived very quietly till the Year 1481, he died then of the Plague [‖]. He left to *Pomponius Lætus* the Houſe he had built upon Mount *Quirinal*, with the Grove of Laurels, out of which the Poetical Crowns were taken [‡]. I ſhall give the Catalogue (H) of his Writings. M. *Daniel William Mollerus*, Profeſſor in the Univerſity of *Altorf*, has publiſhed

that Pope was ſo great an Enemy to Learning, that he forbad to pronounce the Word *College* or *Academy*. Thoſe who ſaid ſo were groſly miſtaken: *Paul* II. did not condemn thoſe who ſhould mention the Word *Academy* in the Senſe of a *College* or a Houſe wherein Sciences are taught. He only condemned the *Sceptical* and *Pyrrhonian* Spirit of the Wits of his Time, who under pretence of Philoſophizing in the way of *Plato*, the Founder of the Ancient Academy, brought every thing in Queſtion, and grew dangerous with reſpect to the Foundations of the Goſpel.

(G) *Not ſet at Liberty before the Years end.*] *Trithemius* is thereby convicted of a Lye, for ſaying that *Platina* was ſet at Liberty only by *Sixtus* IV. after the Death of *Paul* II. (a) *Multas à Paulo Papa* II. *calamitates ſuſtinuit, adeo ut bonis omnibus & dignitate ſpoliatus poſt capulei ſuſpenſionem in carcerem crudeliſſime detruſus, uſque ad mortem ipſius Pauli detentus ſit, qui à Sixto mox liberatus, &c.* When an Author writes the Hiſtory of his own Misfortunes, we ought to truſt him, and not believe that he wants our Amplifications. *Trithemius* ſhould have followed that Maxim, and conſulted the Life of *Paul* II. written by the ſame Perſon whoſe Elogy he made: he might have known exactly how long he was a Priſoner, and many People would not be deceived by him, as they are ſtill. *A Paulo* II. *in carcerem conjectus, menſeſque quatuor ipſe detentus eſt, donec à ſucceſſore Sixto* IV. *liberatus* (b).

(H) *I ſhall give the Catalogue of his Writings.*] The moſt conſiderable is the Hiſtory of the Popes, from St. *Peter* to *Sixtus* IV. to whom he dedicated it. It is variouſly ſpoken of: the Proteſtants like it well enough, and have placed that Author in the Catalogue of the Witneſſes of Truth (c). See the Paſſage of *Illyricus*, which I ſhall quote by and by. Some Roman Catholicks accuſe him of want of Sincerity and Diligence. Nevertheleſs, *Panvinius* did not ſcruple to publiſh that Hiſtory, with Notes of his own, and to add to it the Lives of the Popes from *Sixtus* IV. to *Pius* IV. *Cicarella* went on, and added to it the Lives of the Popes from *Pius* V. to *Clemens* VIII. That Book of *Platina* was printed firſt of all at *Venice* in the Year 1479. *in folio.* (d) *Olearius* was therefore miſtaken, who believed that the *Nuremberg* Edition 1481. is the firſt. You will find this Remark (e) in Mr. *Mollerus*'s Diſſertation, with the Liſt of ſeveral other Editions. That which I make uſe of, is not mentioned by him; it is a *Lyons* Edition 1512. in 8o. Theſe Words are to be found at the end of it: *Excellentiſſimi hiſtorici Platinæ in vitas ſummorum Pontificum uſque ad Julium* II. *Ponti. Maxi. præclarum opus fœliciter explicit. Ludun. impreſſum à Gilberto de Villiers Borbonnio: impenſis honeſtiſſimi viri domini Vincentii de Prothonariis & Conſtantini Fradin. Anno domini milleſimo quingenteſimo duodecimo. Die vero* XXII *menſis Februarii.* A Reader might be deceived by the beginning of that Diſcourſe: one would think that *Platina* lived to the Time of *Julius* II. yet it appears by ſome Latin Verſes printed the ſame Year, and in the ſame Printing-Houſe, that *Platina* died under *Sixtus* IV. *Bartholomew Ariſtophilus*, Author of a Latin Poem inſerted in the Collection of the Funeral Verſes publiſhed to the Honour of *Platina*, ſays in his ſmall Preamble, that having ſucceeded by *Sixtus*'s Choice, to the Place of Library-Keeper, which *Platina* enjoyed, and finding himſelf lodged in the ſame Room where *Platina* lived, he felt, *&c.* Mr. *Mollerus* has not forgot the Liſt of ſome *German*, *Italian* and *French* Tranſlations of that Book of *Platina*. He ſpeaks of a *French* Tranſlation printed at *Paris* in 1519. *in fol.* but ſays nothing of a later Tranſlation, made by Mr. *Coulon*, and publiſhed at *Paris* in 4o. 1651. Here is the Paſſage of *Illyricus*, which I have promiſed: (f) *Etſi* Platina *turpiter & impudenter* Papis *adulatus ſit: tamen nimia ipſorum turpitudine ac malitiâ coactus aliquando, etiam ſubindicat* Babyloniæ Meretricis *nefanda ſcelera. In Marcellino queritur* Paparum *ſcelera eo excreviſſe, ut vix apud* Deum *miſericordiæ locum reliquerint: avaritiam, ſuperbiam, neglectum* Doctrinæ, *& Religionis ſimulationem, mores etiam in prophanis deteſtandos, propalam eſſe, ut inde laudem quærere videantur. In Pontificibus poſt milleſimum annum, ſubinde repetit,* Omnem pietatem & ſanctitatem à Papis ad Cæſares migraſſe. I ſhould willingly ſubſcribe to the Judgment which *Robert Chreyghton* made of that Work of *Platina*. *Platinam*, ſays he (g), *auctorem ſiccum & ſtrigoſum ſæpe verba, ſæpe ſenſus, multoties rerum experientia, nonnunquam integritas deſtituunt. Et quod magis miremur nunquam lapſus eſt gravius quam in Eugenii vita, ſub cujus temporibus floruit.*

Here are the Titles of the other Books of *Platina*. *De naturis rerum: epiſtolæ ad diverſos: de honeſta voluptate & valetudine: de falſo & vero bono: contra amores: de vera nobilitate: de optimo cive: Panegyricus in laudem Beſſarionis: oratio ad Paulum* II. *de pace Italiæ componenda & bello Turcico indicendo: de flosculis linguæ Latinæ.* *Gryphius* printed at *Lyons* in 1541, in 8o, at the End of *Cælii Apicii de re culinaria libri decem*, this other Book: *P.* (h) *Platinæ Cremonenſis viri undecunque doctiſſimi de tuenda valetudine, natura rerum & popinæ ſcientia ad ampliſſimum D. D. B. Roverellam S. Clementis Preſbyterum Cardinalem libri decem.* That Work was unworthy of that Author, and I don't wonder that *Sannazar* ridiculed it by this Epigram;

> *Ingenia & mores vitaſque obituſque notaſſe*
> *Pontificum, arguta lex fuit hiſtoriæ.*
> *Tu tamen hinc lautæ tractas pulmenta culinæ;*
> *Hoc Platina eſt ipſos paſcere pontifices.*

The Edition of *Lyons* 1541, came out after thoſe of *Cologne* 1529 and 1537, in 8o. The *Italian* Book which I have ſeen quoted with the Title of *B. Scacchi Cuoco ſecreto di Papa Paolo* II. *opera, dove ſi tratta di diverſe vivande, &c. con le figure in* 4o. *Venet.* 1570, is not a Tranſlation of *Platina*'s ten Books *de tuenda valetudine & popinæ ſcientia*. That *Italian* Book is quoted otherwiſe by *Lanzius*: *Extat*, ſays he (i), *memorabilis liber artis Apicianæ* de culina & architriclini officio di M. Bartholomeo Scappi cuoco ſecreto di Papa Pio V. qui nunc præfectus eſt *(ait* (1) *ille)* noſtris intimis coquis, non ſine ejuſdem privilegio & approbatione inquiſitorum hæreticæ pravitatis, *Venetiis editus anno M. D. L X X I, ſed & ante hunc Bartholomæum extant Platinæ, Suetonii Pontificii de popinæ ſcientia libri x. ad Cardinalem Rovarellam.* It appears that *Lanzius* was perſuaded that his *Bartholomew Scappi*, named by others *Bartholomew Scacchi*, is different from *Platina*. He is in the right, for the Work of *B. Scappi* contains a Relation of the Funeral Obſequies of *Paul* III. at which the Author aſſiſted. Note, that 'tis a large Quarto divided into ſix Books, where all the ways of dreſſing Fleſh and Fiſh, *&c.* are treated of: they have not been ſparing of Figures (‡).

As to the Hiſtory of *Mantua* compoſed by *Platina*, Mr. *Mollerus* (k) affirms that *Lambecius* publiſhed it in the Year 1674. But he owns that he could never get a Copy of it, and that *Martin Difenbachius* (l) maintains, that that Work never came out in Print. The Original of that Hiſtory of *Mantua* was left by the Author himſelf to *Gaudentius Merula*, who ſent it to *Oporinus*, a Bookſeller of *Baſil*, to get it printed. *Oporinus* died before he could print it, and left it to the Eldeſt Son of his good Friend *Theodorus Zwingerus* (m). It is certain that *Lambecius* publiſhed it with Notes at *Vienna* in 1675 in 4o. The 10th *Giornale de Letterati* gives an Abſtract of it, and tells us that that Work is divided into 6 Books, and not into 7, as *Poſſevinus* (n) affirms, or into 3, as *Voſſius* (o) believed, and that *Lambecius*, who maintains againſt *Trithemius*, *Angelus Roccæ*, *Raphael Volaterranus*

---

[*] *Taken from Platina in vit. Pauli* II.

[†] *The Library of the Vatican was ſet up by that Pope.* Jovius *ib.*

[‖] *See the Rem. A. Letter I.*

[‡] *Jovius ib.*

(a) *Trith. de Script. Eccleſ.* Boiſſardus *ſays the ſame thing ap.* Pope Blount, *Cenſ. Author. p.* 339.

(b) Boſius de comparanda prudentia civili, *p.* 377. *of the* 2. *tom. of the Treatiſes* de ratione ſtudiorum *collected and commented by the learned* Crenius, *at* Leyden 1696.

(c) *See Simon Goulart. in Catal. teſtium veritatis col.* 194.

(d) *In abaco Patrolog. p.* 68.

(e) *He might have ſaid that* Labbæus de ſcript. Eccl. *tom.* 1. *p.* 174. *has committed the ſame Miſtake with* Olearius.

(f) *Illyricus l.* 19. *Catal. teſtium verit. ap.* Pope Blount *ub. ſup. p. m.* 337.

(g) *Robert. Creyghton, not. ad Sylveſtri Sguropuli Hiſt. Concilii Florentini Sect.* 5. *c.* 2.

(h) *They have put a P. inſtead of a B.* Mr. Mollerus *p.* 7. *obſerves that in the Catalog. of* Thuanus's *Library p.* 119. *part* 1. *We read* Joh. Bapt. Platina, *and p.* 182. *part* 2. Petri Platinæ. *But it is not the Fault of thoſe who made that Catalogue, but of thoſe who printed* Platina's *Works.*

(i) *Orat. cont. Italiam p. m.* 845, 846.

(1) *M. Freher. Comm. ad Conſtant. Donat.*

(‡) *This I had from the* Mazarin *Library.*

(k) *De Platina p.* 26.

(l) *De Henrico* VII. *Imp. p.* 47.

(m) *Difenbachius ib. apud Mollerum p.* 27.

(n) *In Apparatu ſacro.*

(o) *De Hiſt. Lat. p.* 582.

‡ Intitled Disputatio circularis de Platinis. Altdorf. [illegible]

published a curious ‡ Book, which was very useful to me for the Composition of this Article. He observes, that *Andrew Corbinus* has † made three *Platina's* of one; for he speaks of *Platina* the Orator, *Platina* the Historian, and *Platina* a Father of the Church. He observes also, that *Barthius* (I) thinks to have found out a very Criminal Mystery, because *Platina* has not mentioned the Resurrection of CHRIST, nor his Ascension. *Varillas* has committed (K) some Faults.

† In [illegible] Historiæ fol. 104. n. 10. & pl. 105. n. 4.

PLOTINUS, a *Platonick* Philosopher, flourished in the III. Century. He was very much above common Philosophers, and his Ideas were very singular and extraordinary. He was ashamed of being lodged in a Body; and therefore took no Pleasure in saying what * Countrey, or what Family he was of. His Contempt for every thing Material that was in him, was the Reason why he would never (A) suffer his Picture to be Drawn; and had it not been for a Man who Drew it by Memory, his Disciples had been without the satisfaction they long'd for. I believe that

* Nevertheless we know that he was born at Lycopolis, a City of Egypt. Eunapius in Plotino.

ranus, Boissardus and *Vossius*, that *Platina's* Name was *Baptist*, and not *Bartholomew*, is refuted by the Pope's Brief to be found in the Vatican Library. 'Tis the Brief wherein *Platina* is declared to be Keeper of that Library. He is named *Bartholomew* in it. That Proof was unknown to *Vossius*. Mr. *Wharton* (p) observes that *Richard Flemyngus*, who knew *Platina* very well, and bestowed great Encomiums (q) upon him, calls him *Bartholomew*.

(p) In Append. ad Cave hist. litt script. Eccles. p. 153.

(q) In libro 1. Lucubrationum Constantinopol.

(I) *That* Barthius *thinks to have found out a very Criminal Mystery.*] Here are *Mollerus's* Words: (a) Improbitatis *alicujus Platinam accusatum ad* Casp. Barth. animadvers. in Guil. Briton. lib. 6. Philipp. p. 459. *provocare solent, quippe ubi verba reperire liceat sequentia Augusti hoc dictum* (*nempe* melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium, *de quo vid.* Macrob. in jocis Augusti lib. 2. c. 4.) *illustravit renascentibus literis* B. Platina in primo suorum Pontificum nempe Domino & Deo nostro Jesu Christo. *Qui improbe tamen hoc & profane, quod vita servatoris obituque utcunque commemoratis, gloriosissimam resurrectionem è mortuis & ascensionem in cælum, ne uno quidem verbo attigit. Caussa facile à sagacibus hominibus odoranda.* *Mollerus* does not grant that *Platina* supprest the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ, *Sed tamen Platinam*, says he, mortis & resurrectionis Christi *meminisse ex principio statim vitæ S. Petri inspecto apparebit ubi verba occurrunt ista:* post Christi mortem & resurrectionem completis jam diebus Pentecostes Spiritum S. accepere Discipuli. You see how he proves that *Platina* mentioned those two Mysteries; notwithstanding, he suspects that this Author had an ill Design, under pretence, that the Chapter which concerns the Life of Christ, contains nothing touching the Resurrection and Ascension of the Messias. He mentions, without any Refutation, the suspicion which some have had, that *Platina* designed thereby to increase the Glory of the Popes. *Certum autem est in vitæ Christi descriptione neque resurrectionis è mortuis neque ascensionis in cælum mentionem ullam esse injectam, non tam ob brevitatis caussam, ut aliqui suspicati sunt, quam ut nonnullorum ex opinione, insignior insequentes Pontifices gloria maneret* (b). I confess, that all I can apprehend herein is, that several People make themselves ridiculous, by their affecting too great a penetration. They look for Political Views in the most simple and most indifferent Things. I should be glad to know how it can be any Advantage to the Popes, that *Platina* mentioned the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ, not in the Chapter wherein he treats of Jesus Christ, but in the next Chapter, which treats of St. *Peter*? I believe *Platina* would be very much surprised, if he knew that such Subtleties are ascribed to him, which are so unworthy of his Country.

(a) Moller. [illegible] p.

(b) Id. ib.

(K) Varillas (c) *has committed some Faults.*] I. He says that *Platina* was born at *Cremona*. II. It is not true that Cardinal *Bessarion* put *Platina* upon Writing the Lives of the Popes. III. Nor that that Work was written before the Time of *Paul* II. Those two Falsehoods are clearly refuted by the Epistle Dedicatory, where *Platina* says twice, that he wrote the History of the Popes by order of *Sixtus* IV. *Tu itaque Theologorum ac Philosophorum princeps Maxime Pontifex hac hominum utilitate motus simulque dignitati ecclesiasticæ consulens, non frustra* MANDASTI *ut res gestas Pontificum scriberem .... si quid emolumenti ex hac scriptione nostra perceperint, tibi soli Pontifex optime gratias agant, cujus sanctissimo* IMPERIO *libenter* OBTEMPERAVI. IV. It is not true that *Paul* II. *made him his Secretary*; *Pius* II. gave him that Place, and *Paul* II. took it away from him.

(c) In the Anecdotes de Florence p. 171.

(A) *Why he would never suffer his Picture to be Drawn.*] *Amelius* his Disciple desired it of him, but it was in vain: Is it not (d) enough, answered he, to drag every where with us that Image in which we have been shut up by Nature: do you think that we must, besides, transmit to future Ages an Image of that Image, as a Spectacle worthy of their Attention? How Great is that Thought! None but little Souls will deny it. Madam *Des Houlieres* has made some admirable Verses (e) about the Vanity which induces Men to have their Pictures drawn. The Elevation and Depth of her Morality is incomparable; a Lady who thinks so nobly should have lived in the Age of *Plotinus*, our's was not worthy of her: the Men of this Age have too mean Souls, they set too great a value upon the Body, and the Goods of Fortune. Madam *Des Houlieres* herself has (f) yielded to the Temptation of having her Picture Drawn; She was pleased to see her self grown young again by the Pencil of Mrs. *Cheron*, and to think that she would not be unknown in that respect when she ceased to be. She speaks thus of Mrs. *Cheron*, who Drew her. "She has at last restored my first "Colour to me; Posterity will know, by the help "of her Art, the Presents which Nature was "pleased to bestow upon me: and I may hope that "with such a help, I shall be able still to do some "Honour to our Time, whilst I shall wander about "the shady Banks. Yes, I may flatter my self of "it: to please and last for ever are the Fate of her "Works.„ Perhaps it will be said, that to grow young again in a Picture and in *Effigie* is a very small thing; and that to rejoyce at this Thought, that future Ages will not be ignorant that one has been Young and Beautiful, is to content oneself with a very Chimerical Honour. But who knows that better than the Lady whom I speak of? Is it not from thence that she takes the nicest part of her Reflection? Here is the Sense of the last Verses of her Poem. "How could I pretend to cure Mortal Men "of that inveterate Error, which they are so fond "of, if I, who condemn it, have much ado not to "fall into it? That Picture, of which *Apelles* might "have been Jealous, fills me, against my Will, with "a flattering Expectation, which I could not "see in others without Anger. How weak is Humane Reason so much boasted of! How little can "we relie upon it! We are always Vain, False and "Unjust, and we exclaim in all our Discourses "against Passions, Weaknesses and Vices, to which "we yield every Day.„ This does very much set off the Victory which *Plotinus* got over so general a Weakness; and all true Philosophers ought to rejoyce that so noble a Triumph was reserved for one of their great Hero's. 'Tis true, that *Plotinus* was Drawn, but he knew nothing of it: *Amelius* brought an excellent Painter into the Auditory. That Painter look'd upon *Plotinus* as long as he would, and Drew him after the Image he had drawn of him in his Head: the Picture was very like, *Amelius* took care that all the Strokes that wanted mending, should be corrected (g). Here is another Triumph of *Plotinus*. He would (h) never tell the Day nor the Month wherein he was born. The Reason of it is, that he did not desire that the Day of his Birth should be celebrated with Feasts and Sacrifices. He did not fail to celebrate in that manner that of *Socrates* and that of (i) *Plato*. He knew well how to despise the Smoak of an Immortal Fame.

(d) Οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ φέρειν ὃ ἡ φύσις εἴδωλον ἡμῖν περιτέθεικεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδώλου εἴδωλον συγχωρεῖν αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦν πολυχρονιώτερον καταλιπεῖν ὡς δή τι τῶν ἀξιοθεάτων ἔργων. Quasi vero non satis hanc imaginem ferre sit quam natura nobis ab initio circumdedit: etiam censes imaginis hujus imaginem diuturniorem insuper posteris ut opus spectaculo dignum relinquendum? *Porphyr. in vita Plotini init.*

(e) *They are in the* Mercure Gallant *of* Nov. 1693.

(f) *She was still alive when I wrote this. She died the* 17 *of* Feb. 1694.

(g) *Idem Porphyr. ib. p.* 2. *C.*

(h) *See* Porphyr. *in the Life of* Plotin.

(i) *See the same Life.*

A SIGN of a Cocquet.

Not knowing whether I shall find a better opportunity to make use of a Remark which I have read in *Fureteriana*, I shall set it down here. (k) "One may easily know Women that are *Coquets* by "their

(k) *Fureteriana, p.* 171. *of the Dutch Edit.*

that out of the ſame Principle, he refuſed to make uſe of (B) many things which were look'd upon as very good for the Health: but it was for another Reaſon that he rejected the uſe of Gliſters, which he was adviſed to take as a good Remedy for the Cholick; he thought that it was neither becoming †, nor ſuitable to the Gravity of an old Philoſopher to make uſe of ſuch a Remedy. He began very early to appear very ſingular in his Taſte and Manners; for being eight Years of Age, when he went already to School, he would go to his Nurſe, and uncover her Breaſt to Suck, which he did very greedily. He left it off, when he had been Chid for it, as a troubleſome Child. Being 28 Years of Age, he appeared extremely deſirous to ſtudy Philoſophy: he was recommended to the moſt famous Profeſſors of *Alexandria*; but he did not like 'em, and uſed to come from their Lectures very Melancholick. One of his Friends knowing the Reaſon of his Diſtaſte, thought that the beſt Remedy for it was to carry him to the Lectures of *Ammonius*. He gueſt right; for as ſoon as *Plotinus* heard that Philoſopher, he confeſt to his Friend that he was the Man he would have. He was eleven Years under that excellent Maſter, and became a great Philoſopher. But the great Learning he had acquired, inſpired him with an eager deſire of encreaſing it, and of knowing what the *Perſian* and *Indian* Philoſophers ſaid. He took hold of an Occaſion which offered itſelf, when the Emperor *Gordian* went to make War againſt the *Perſians* *: he followed the *Roman* Army, and repented of it without doubt; for he had much ado to ſave his Life, when the Emperor had been kill'd. He was then 39 Years of Age. The next Year he came to *Rome*, and read Lectures of Philoſophy there. 'Tis true, that he taught what he had heard of his Maſter *Ammonius*; but he imitated not *Erennius* and *Origen* his School-Fellows, who having promiſed, as well as he, not to impart to the Publick the beſt things they had learned of *Ammonius*, kept not exactly their Promiſe. As for him, he was ten Years at *Rome* without compoſing any Book, and when he had compoſed twenty, he communicated them only to ſuch Perſons, whoſe Judgment was known to him. He was in the 50th Year of his Age, when *Porphyrius* became his Diſciple. Such a Diſciple could not but keep him buſie. *Porphyrius* did not reſt ſatisfied with ſuperficial Anſwers; he would have all Difficulties to be throughly explained to him: *Plotinus* was therefore obliged to write ſome Books, that he might treat his Subjects more (C) exactly. He compoſed 24 Books during the ſpace of ſix Years that *Porphyrius* was with him, and thoſe 24 Books, together with 21 which he had compoſed before the Arrival of *Porphyrius*, and together with the 9 which he writ after his Diſciple had left *Rome*, make up in all 54 Books. They are divided into ſix (D) *Enneades*, and run upon very abſtruſe Matters. One may obſerve in them three different Ages (E) of the Mind of their Author.

† *Κωλικῇ δὲ νόσῳ πολλάκις πιεζόμενος οὔτε κλυστῆρος ἀνέσχετο, οὐκ εἶναι πρὸς τοῦ πρεσβύτου λέγων ὑπομένειν τὰς τοιαύτας θεραπείας.* Proinde cum ſæpe colico vexaretur morbo, ſemper clyſteres renuit, negans decere ſenem curationes ejuſmodi. *Porphyr. in vita Plotini p. 1. inſtead of* colico *the Tranſlator ſhould have ſaid* cœliaco.

* *In the Year* 243.

"their Dreſs, the Company they keep at Home, "their Servants, and their way of Speaking; but "they may be known alſo by the ſeveral Copies of "their Pictures which they cauſe to be made. One "of thoſe Women, who had been Drawn by "Mrs. *le Hay*, cauſed five Copies of her Picture "to be made. Good Lord, ſaid a Gentleman, why "does that Woman get ſo many Pictures? Mrs. *le* "*Hay* anſwered him pleaſantly, *Quoniam multiplicatæ* "*ſunt iniquitates ejus.*"

(B) *Of many things which were look'd upon as very good for the Health.*] He never made uſe of any Preſervative, nor of the Bath, and never eat of the Fleſh of tamed Beaſts (a). He eat little (b), and abſtained very often from Bread, which together with his ſtrong Meditations kept him from ſleeping well.

(C) *To write ſome Books, that he might treat his Subjects more exactly.*] It is almoſt impoſſible to determine any Queſtion with meer Conferences or Verbal Diſputes. One may eaſily put the Change upon another, and have it put upon one's ſelf, and the Beginning may be forgotten before one comes to the End. Therefore I don't wonder that *Porphyrius* reduced his Maſter to the neceſſity of explaining himſelf in Writing. *Plotinus* owned, that it was the beſt way to inſtruct a Diſciple throughly; but he found it alſo very neceſſary to hear Objections, and exerciſe himſelf by way of a Conference, before he took Pen in Hand. This is what he anſwered to a Man, who complained of *Porphyrius*'s frequent Interrogations and Replies. (c) *Niſi dubitationes interrogante Porphyrio diſſolvamus, commentari oratione perpetua quicquam in librum non valebimus.* He diſputed three Days together about the Doubts which *Porphyrius* propoſed to him, concerning the manner how our Souls are united to our Bodies.

(D) *Divided into ſix* Enneades, *and run upon very abſtruſe Matters.*] The Order, Diviſion and Titles of *Plotinus*'s Works, are to be aſcribed to *Porphyrius*. They concern moſt of 'em the ſubtileſt Notions of Metaphyſicks, and it ſeems that that Philoſopher differed not much from *Spinoza* in ſome things. There is ſcarce any Age wherein the Doctrine of *Spinoza* has not been taught. That impious Man has only the unhappy advantage of being the Firſt, who reduced it into a Syſtem according to a Geometrical Method. What did *Plotinus* mean, when he writ two Books to prove, (d) *Unum & idem ubique totum ſimul adeſſe?* Did he not teach thereby, that the Being which is every where, is one and the ſame thing? This is what *Spinoza* would be at. *Plotinus* examines in another Book, whether there are many Souls, or One only: *Utrum omnes animæ una ſint.* He applied himſelf very much to the Study of Ideas; he wrote a Book to examine whether there are any Ideas of ſingular Things, and another, wherein he proved that Intellectual Objects are not out of the Underſtanding, ὅτι οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ νοῦ τὰ νοητά, *quod intelligibilia non ſint extra intellectum.*

(E) *Three different Ages of the Mind of their Author.*] The firſt and laſt Books he wrote are much inferior to the others. One may perceive in the Firſt a Strength that is not come yet to its full Growth, and in the Laſt, a Strength which began to Decay; but one may ſee in the Middle Writings, a Strength that was come to its higheſt Degree. Thus we have here Three Orders of Books, 21 in the Firſt, 24 in the Second, and 9 in the Laſt. Of thoſe Nine, the Five firſt were leſs weak than the other Four; ſo true it is, generally ſpeaking, that the Mind undergoes the ſame Viciſſitudes with the Body: The Age of an Author (e) may be almoſt as eaſily known by the Strokes of his Pen, as by the Features of his Face. Here are *Porphyrius*'s Words according to the Latin Tranſlation. *Quemadmodum verò conſcripti ſunt alii quidem in ætate prima, alii verò in ipſo vigore vitæ, alii denique defeſſo jam corpore; ſic ferme libri vim ſimilem ipſi declarant. Primi namque unus atque viginti, ſi cum proximè ſequentibus conferantur, leviorem vim habere videntur, nondum ſatis conſtans robur habentem. Qui vero medio tempore compoſiti ſunt, virtutis florem præferunt ad ſummum uſque vigentem. Taleſque ſunt quatuor & viginti (exceptis quibuſdam paucis) perfectiſſimi. Ultimi denique novem remiſſiorem jam referunt facultatem; idque poſtremi quatuor magis quam antecedentes quinque declarant.* This Tranſlation was made by *Marſilius Ficinus.* That

---

(a) Οὔτε τὰς θηριακὰς ἀντιδότους λαβεῖν ὑπέμεινε, μηδὲ τῶν ἡμέρων ζώων τὰς ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τροφὰς προσίεσθαι λέγων. λουτροῦ δὲ ἀπεχόμενος. Neque theriaca antidota unquam accepit, cum nec ex animalium quoque manſuetorum corporibus capere etiam ſe diceret. Abſtinebat & balneis. *Porphyr. ib. p.* 1.

(b) *Id. p.* 6. *ſub. fin.*

(c) *Porphyr. ib.*

(d) Τὸ ἓν πανταχοῦ ὅλον εἶναι ἓν καὶ ταὐτόν. *Porphyr. p.* 4. *C.*

(e) *Mr.* Baillet *in the* 1. *tom. of the* Jugemens des Savans *p.* 381. *has many curious things about this.*

Author. His way of compoſing (F) did very much favour of his great Singularity, and therefore a faithful Friend was very neceſſary to him to reviſe his Writings. He choſe *Porphyrius* to do it, rather than *Gentilianus Amelius*, who had been his Diſciple 24 Years, and whom he very much eſteemed, as you may ſee in † another Place. The Eſteem which the *Romans* had for *Plotinus* is incredible. He had ſome Diſciples in the very Senate; and ſome Senators, not contented to go regularly to his Auditory, reſign'd the Magiſtracy to live a Philoſophical Life. He inſpired ſome Perſons of the Fair Sex with a ſtrong Inclination for the Study of Philoſophy. A Lady § would have him to Lodge in her Houſe, and ſhe, as well as her Daughter, took great delight in hearing him. He had the Reputation of being ſo learned and virtuous a Man, that ſeveral Perſons of both Sexes, intruſted him, before they died, with their Eſtates and Children, Sons and Daughters, as if he had been a kind of Guardian Angel *. He refuſed not to be at that Trouble. He had often the Patience to be preſent when Guardians gave up their Accounts. He was the Arbitrator of a thouſand Law-Suits, with ſo much Equity and Honeſty, that he had not one Enemy for the ſpace of 26 Years that he lived in *Rome*. Thoſe of his Profeſſion proved not all ſo juſt to him; for a Philoſopher ‡ of *Alexandria*, who affected the Firſt Rank, did his utmoſt to expoſe him to Contempt, and even made uſe of Magick to deſtroy him. I ſhall ſay in the Remarks by what means the Magical Operations (G) of that Man proved ineffectual; and occaſionally I ſhall ſay ſomething of *Plotinus*'s Familiar Spirit, and of the ſurpriſing (H) Sagacity which is aſcribed to him. The Emperor *Gallienus* and the Empreſs *Salonina*

† *In the Art. Amelius.*

§ *Her's and her Daughter's Name was Gemina.*

* Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἀποθνήσκειν μέλλοντες τῶν εὐγενεστάτων, φέροντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν τέκνα ἄῤῥενάς τε ὁμοῦ καὶ θηλείας, ἐκείνῳ παρεδίδοσαν μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης οὐσίας, ὡς ἱερῷ τινι καὶ θείῳ φύλακι. Multi quinetiam viri multæ & mulieres generis nobilitate pollentes cum morti jam propinquarent, filios ſuos tum mares tum fœminas una cum omni eorum ſubſtantia Plotino tanquam ſacro cuidam divinoque cuſtodi tradebant atque commendabant. *Porphyr. ib.*

‡ *His Name was* Olympius.

That Learned Man had no ſooner ended the Tranſlation of *Plato*'s Works, but he was told by *John Picus Mirandula*, that *Coſmo de Medicis* deſired to have *Plotinus* tranſlated. *Marſilius* knew nothing of it, becauſe *Coſmo* would not aſk him the Verſion of thoſe two Authors at one time, and thought it more reaſonable to let him know his Deſire, when he had finiſhed *Plato*'s Tranſlation. *Marſilius* undertook that new Work, and made an End of it. He has not only tranſlated *Plotinus*, but he has alſo made ſome *Summaries* and *Analyſes* upon each Book (f). This is what goes by the Name of *Marſilius Ficinus*'s Commentaries. That Word is fallacious on this occaſion; for one would expect ſome Critical Notes upon the *Greek* Text, and ſome Explications of the difficult Paſſages and intricate Thoughts of the Author: this is what is meant by a Commentary. But the Signification of that Word is quite different here. I thought myſelf obliged not to leave my Reader in the Obſcurity of that Equivocation, as *Moreri* has done.

(F) *His way of compoſing did very much favour of his great Singularity.*] He never read again what he had compoſed; he formed his Letters very ill, and diſtinguiſhed not his Syllables; his Orthography was not at all exact; he was only attentive to things, and Thoughts; and perſiſted as long as he lived in the ſame Courſe. But here is a very admirable thing. His Meditation was ſo ſtrong, that he placed in his Head a whole Work from the Bginning to the End, and followed ſo cloſely what he had meditated, that he made no manner of Alteration in it in Writing. One would have thought, that the Inward Original of his Work was the Rule of his Pen, with the ſame punctuality as a Written Original is the Rule of a Copiſt. He never loſt the ſight of his Meditation, when he was interrupted for ſome Buſineſs: he took cognizance of that Affair, and examined and ended it without leaving off the Ideas of his Work; ſo that after the departure of thoſe who had interrupted him, he needed not read the laſt Lines of his Writing, to know where he was and to reſume the Series of his Thoughts. His Ideas had been all along preſent to his Mind; therefore he uſed to write on without looking upon his Paper for the Place where he ſtopt, and made the Connexions as well as if he had not ſtirred out of his Place (a).

(G) *By what means the Magical Operations of that Man proved ineffectual.*] He found by Experience that his Malefices returned upon him, which obliged him to confeſs to his Friends, that *Plotinus* had a Soul endowed with an extraordinary Force, ſeeing it retorted upon his Enemies the Darts which they ſhot at him. What is moſt admirable, is, that *Plotinus* perceived the Magical Devices contrived againſt him, and the Effect which they produced upon the Author of 'em. *At this very Moment*, ſaid he to his Friends, *the Body of* Olympius *is folded as a Purſe, and his Members bruiſe one another.* *Porphyrius*, who relates this as a certain Fact, endeavours to perſuade it by this Suppoſition: he ſays that *Plotinus* was under the Protection of a *Genius* ſuperior to that of other Men, and that he was none of thoſe who are called *Dæmons*, but of thoſe who are called *Gods*. He ſays, that an *Egyptian* Prieſt conjured, in the Temple of *Iſis* at *Rome*, the Familiar Spirit of *Plotinus*, and that he perceived that the Spirit who preſented himſelf was a God, and not a meer Dæmon; that immediately he congratulated (b) *Plotinus* upon that excellent Prerogative; that he prepared himſelf to aſk that Spirit ſome Queſtions, but he vaniſhed away preſently, becauſe a common Friend of theirs, who was brought to the Spectacle, ſtifled the Birds that were given him to keep. *Plotinus* knowing that his Familiar Spirit was of ſo eminent an Order, directed with greater Application the ſight of his Underſtanding towards him. He compoſed a Book about Familiar Spirits, in which he carefully inquired into the Cauſe of their Differences. I obſerve all thoſe things for two Reaſons: Firſt, that one may ſee here a ſmall Pattern of the Platonick Doctrine concerning the *Genius*'s: Secondly, that one may know that the Doctrine of Guardian-Angels, ſo much ſpoken of in the Church of *Rome*, and which is a Practical Doctrine, and attended with all the Train of Religious Worſhip, is much ancienter than the Chriſtian Religion. There is no Syſtem more proper to ſet up the Doctrine of the *Platoniſts* duly rectified, than that of Occaſional Cauſes. I don't know what will happen; but I am apt to think that ſome time or other, Philoſophers will be forced to lay aſide Mechanical Principles, unleſs the Wills of ſome Intelligences be aſſociated with them; and truly there is no Hypotheſis more capable of giving an Account of Events, than that which admits of ſuch an Aſſociation. I mean chiefly ſuch Events as go by the Names of Caſualty, Fortune, Good Luck, Ill Luck; Things, the Cauſes whereof are, without doubt, regulated and determined by ſome General Laws unknown to us, which 'tis likely are only Occaſional Cauſes, like thoſe which cauſe our Souls to act upon our Bodies. See Mr. *Dodwell*'s Learned Diſſertation (c) about the *Genius*, or Fortune of the Emperors. To return to *Plotinus*, I ſhall obſerve, that the Superiority of his Tutelar *Genius* filled him with an extreme Confidence. *Amelius* deſiring him to aſſiſt at his Devotions, I mean, to the Sacrifices he offered upon a Solemn Day: *Plotinus* anſwered, *They (d) ought to come to me, but I ought not to go to them.* No Body could apprehend, nor durſt aſk him the Reaſon of ſo proud an Anſwer. Did ever any Body hear of ſuch a bold Theology?

(H) *Of the ſurprizing Sagacity which is aſcribed to* Plotinus.] A very honeſt (e) Widow who lived

(f) *His Latin Tranſlation and his Commentaries were reprinted without the* Greek *at* Baſil 1559. *fol.*

(a) *See Porphyr. in it. Plotini.*

f Ploti- s's FA- ILIAR PIRIT.

(b) Μακάριος εἶ θεὸν ἔχων τὸν δαίμονα, καὶ οὐ τοῦ ὑφειμένου γένους τὸν συνόντα. Beatus es, ô Plotine, qui habeas pro Dæmone Deum, neque ex inferiori genere iis ducem ſortitus familiarem. *Porphyr. ib.*

(c) *Prælect.* 2. *ad Spartiani Hadrianum p.* 174. *& ſeq.*

(d) Ἐκείνους δεῖ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἔρχεσθαι, οὐκ ἐμὲ πρὸς ἐκείνους. τοῦτο δ' ἐκ ποίας διανοίας οὕτως ἐμεγαληγόρησεν, οὔτ' αὐτοὶ συνεῖναι δεδυνήμεθα, οὔτ' αὐτὸν ἐρέσθαι ἐτολμήσαμεν. Illos decet ad me, non me ad illos accedere. Qua vero mente tam excelſa de ſe loqueretur neque intelligere ipſi potuimus, neque auſi ſumus interrogare. *Porphyr. ib.*

(e) *Her Name was* Chione.

Salonina had a very great respect for him; and had it not been for the opposition of some jealous and malicious Courtiers, he had obtained what he demanded, *viz.* that a Town of *Campania* should be rebuilt, and yielded to α him with its whole Territory. He designed to settle there a Colony of Philosophers, and to put into practice the Ideal Laws of *Plato's* Republick. Some envious Men accused him of having inriched himself with the Thoughts of *Numenius*: but *Amelius* took Pen in Hand to refute that Accusation. *Longinus*, who suffered himself to be pre-possest against that great Philosopher, did afterwards value his Writings very much, tho' he confesses that he found (I) some very obscure things in 'em. He writ against his Treatise of Ideas, and against *Porphyrius's* Answer to maintain that Treatise. *Plotinus* had several Illnesses in the last Years of his Life, an Inflammation in his Throat, which was so swell'd, that it hindred him from speaking, Ulcers in his Hands and Feet, and a great Weakness of Sight. When he found himself in that condition, he left *Rome*, and went into *Campania*, to one of his Friends Heirs, who furnished him with all Necessaries; and he had the Comfort to know, that *Castricius* β, whose Estate was in the Neighbourhood, would let him want nothing. He died as Noble a Death as a Heathen Philosopher could do; for these were his dying Words, † *I use my utmost endeavours to bring that which is Divine in me, to that which is so in the Universe.* He died in the 66th Year of his Age, the 3d of the Emperor *Claudius* II. that is in the 270th Year of the Christian Æra. There was very good News (K) of the State of his Soul. *Amelius*, who consulted the Oracle of *Apollo*, received it γ, and imparted it to his Friends.

PLOTINA (*Pompeia*) the Wife of the Emperor *Trajan*, is mightily praised by some Writers. She was not handsome, δ and it appears by her Medals, that she had more Gravity than Charms in her Face; but she was very Prudent and Modest. *Trajan* married her (A) before he was adopted by *Nerva*. What she said, when she first entered into the Emperor's Palace, is very remarkable: going up the Stairs, she ζ turned to the People, and said *She came in* (B) *just such as she desired to go out.* Her Conduct was such, during the Time she reigned η, that no Complaints

in his House with her Children, had lost a Neck-Lace; *Plotinus* called for all the Servants, and having well considered them, There is he that stole the Neck-Lace, said he, pointing at one of them. The Servant denied the Fact, notwithstanding the Lashes that were given him; but at last he confest it, and restored what he had stolen. *Plotinus* foretold the Fate of his Scholars; he said that *Polemo* would be a Man of an Amorous Temper, and would not live long. Those two things happened as he foretold 'em. *Porphyrius* had resolved to kill himself; *Plotinus* guest at it, and went immediately to him, and dissuaded him from it (f). To conclude, tho' *Plotinus* had very much studied Astrology, he minded (g) not its Predictions, but perceived the Vanity of them, and refuted Astrologers very often.

(I) Longinus . . . . . . *confesses that he found very obscure things in them.*] He was very desirous to have all the Books of *Plotinus*; and to have 'em correct, he desired *Porphyrius* to send him his Copy; but at the same time he wrote to him these following Words. *Hoc equidem tibi tum præsenti, tum procul absenti, tum habitanti Tyrum semper significavi, me scilicet non multa admodum Plotini librorum argumenta capere: ipsam vero scribendi formam intelligentiarumque frequentiam & quæstionum dispositionem admodum philosophicam me amare supra modum atque venerari* (h). This Passage alone sufficiently shews the exquisite Judgment and Penetration of *Longinus*. It can't be denied, that most of the things that Philosopher examines, are incomprehensible; nevertheless we see in his Works a sublime, fruitful and vast Genius, and a close Method of Reasoning. If *Longinus* had been a false Critick, and a Man of no great Parts, he would not have so easily discover'd *Plotinus's* Obscurity. This is no Paradox. There's none who complains less of the Obscurity of a Book, than those whose Thoughts are confused, and whose Penetration is shallow.

(K) *Very good News of the State of his Soul.*] *Apollo* was so warm'd with a Poetical Rapture, when *Amelius* consulted him concerning the State of his dead Master, that his Answer contained fifty Verses. *Porphyrius* gives us this Exposition of it. *Apollo* declared that *Plotinus* had been peaceable, gracious, and vigilant; that he continually elevated his pure Soul towards God; that he loved God with all his Heart; that he disingaged himself from this miserable World, as much as possibly he could; and that lifting up his Soul with all his might, by the several Degrees mentioned by *Plato*, to the supreme Deity which surpasses all Understanding, he had been enlightned by it, and enjoyed the Vision of that supreme Being, not by the help of Ideas, but in a manner, which is beyond all Understanding. (a) Ἐφάνη ἐκεῖνος ὁ μήτε μορφὴν μήτε τινα ἰδέαν ἔχων, ὑπὲρ δὲ νοῦν καὶ πᾶν τὸ νοητὸν ἱδρυμένος. *Ipsi protinus coruscavit Deus ille nec formam nec ideam aliquam habens, sed super intellectum universumque intelligibile in se ipso consistens.* *Porphyrius* stops here to tell us, that in his 68th Year he was once honoured with that Vision; that the (b) End to which *Plotinus* directed all his Thoughts, was to unite himself with that great God, who fills up the Universe, and that he obtained that End four times, not in Power only, but by an ineffable Efficacy, during the space of six Years that he (*Porphyrius*) had been acquainted with him. Have we not here the Unitive way so much spoken of by the Mysticks? May not one say, that they took it from the *Platonists*? Don't we see likewise in this place the Seeds of *Quietism*? But to return to the Oracle. *Plotinus* had this Advantage, that when he was in the wrong, the Gods enlightned him so, that it might be said, that he wrote his Books by the Rays of that Celestial Light which illuminated his Mind. Thus much for what concerns this Life. After his Death, he went to the Assembly of the Blessed, where Charity, Joy, and the Love of Union with God reign; he was with the three Judges of the other World, *Minos*, *Radamanthus*, *Æacus*, not to give an Account of his Actions, but to Converse with them, and with the other Gods who visit them: In a Word, he enjoyed a happy Life. I make no Excuse for the length of these Remarks. I suppose no Body will be displeased to find in this Place, not only what concerns the Person of *Plotinus*, but also what concerns his Opinions, so far as a general Notion requires it.

(A) *Before he was adopted by* Nerva.] Which appears by these Words of *Pliny's* Panegyrick. *Idem estis invicem*, says he to *Trajan*, *quod fuistis, probatis ex æquo, nihilque vobis felicitas addit, nisi quod scire cœpistis quam bene uterque vestrum felicitatem ferat.* And a little after, speaking of *Plotina* and *Marciana*, he takes notice, that they lived in the Emperor's Palace with the same Modesty, as if they had been still in a private Condition. *Neque enim unquam periclitabuntur esse privatæ, quæ non desierunt.*

(B) *Just such as she desired to go out.*] *Moreri* has spoiled this Thought of *Plotina*; he says, *that she protested, when she entered first into the Palace, that she was ready to go out of it whenever it should be required.* This was not her Meaning: she desired that the Grandeur of her Fortune should not change her Manners, and that when she should be obliged to quit

---

α *It was to be called* Platonopolis.

β *He was one of his Disciples.*

† Ἤδη πειρᾶσθαι τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν θεῖον ἀνάγειν πρὸς τὸ ἐν τῷ παντὶ θεῖον . . . ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Equidem jam annitor, quod in nobis divinum est ad divinum ipsum quod viget in universo redigere, spiritumque his verbis emisit. *Porphyr. in vita Plot.*

γ *Taken from* Plotinus's *Life written by* Porphyrius.

δ *Tristan. comment. hist. tom. 1. p. 428.*

ζ *Xiphilin. in Trajan.*

η *Id. ib.*

(f) *Porphyr. p. 8.*

(g) *Id. p. 10.*

(h) *Idem Porphyr.*

(a) *Porphyr. in vita Plot.*

(b) Τέλος γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ σκοπὸς ἦν τὸ ἑνωθῆναι καὶ πελάσαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ. ἔτυχε δὲ τετράκις που, ὅτε συνήμην αὐτῷ, τοῦ σκοποῦ τούτου, ἐνεργείᾳ ἀρρήτῳ καὶ οὐ δυνάμει. Finis namque Plotino signumque erat quò aciem mentis intenderet propinquare conjungique ipsi Deo omnibus ubique præsenti: quater autem dum cum ipso versaretur hunc finem est assecutus, non potentia duntaxat, inquam, sed actu quodam ineffabili consecutus. Id. i

Complaints were made of her. She refused ‡ the Title of *Augusta*, so long as her Husband refused that of *Father of his Country*. The Advices * she gave *Trajan*, proved wonderfully advantageous to the Provinces, since a great many Exactions and Disorders were by that means redress'd. The Friendship between her and *Marciana*, *Trajan*'s Sister, is no inconsiderable Sign of her Wisdom and good Temper; for generally there's nothing but Quarrels and Factions between (C) the Wives and Sisters of Princes. She was with *Trajan* when he died at *Selinus* in *Cilicia*, the 117th Year of *CHRIST*, and ‡ she carried her Husband's Ashes to *Rome*, being accompanied by *Tatian* and *Matidia*, *Trajan*'s Niece. She did many good (D) Offices to *Hadrian*, and procured him the Empire. The World was always so full of Slanderers, that *Plotina*'s Modesty, and (E) so many other good Qualities, could not preserve her from some ill Suspicions. It was thought that she was in Love (F) with *Hadrian*, and all his great Preferments were ascribed to that Passion. Some maintain that *Trajan* did not adopt (G) him, but that *Plotina* concealed his Death, and made some Body imitate a languishing Voice, that it might be thought that *Hadrian* was declared Son and Successor to that Prince. It does not appear that she ever had any Children. When she died, *Hadrian*, who always appeared very thankful (H) for her Favours, expressed his Grief several ways. He put on Mourning for nine Days, he made some Hymns for her, and built her a Temple *, he placed her amongst the Goddesses †. He had already built her a Palace at *Nimes* §. We know nothing of *Plotina*'s Family, or Birth-place; and 'tis very strange that the Historians of those Times should be so negligent, as to take no notice of them. Nay, they have not mentioned neither the Time of her Death. Mr. *de Tillemont* ‡ fancies he has found something in *Dion*, from which one may conclude, that she died in the Year 129; but I would advise no Body to believe it, till he shews for what Reason he pretends to draw this Conclusion. *Moreri* can't prove what he says, that *Plotina* died in the Year 122. What he adds of *Hadrian*'s building her *a Temple, a Palace and an Amphitheater* at *Nimes*, cannot be more easily proved. *Spartian* speaks only of a ‡ *Basilica*, without taking any notice whether *Plotina* was then alive or no.

‡ *Plinius in Panegyr.*

* *Aurel. Victor. epitom. in Juliano.*

‡ *Spartian. in Adriano c. 5. p. m. 51.*

* *Xiphilin. in Adriano.*

† *There are some Inscriptions in Gruterus's* Thesaurus, *where mention is made of the Priests of the Goddess Plotina,* Sacerdos Divæ Plotinæ. *See* Tristan's *Comment. tom.* 1. *p.* 430.

§ *Spartian in Adrian. c. 12. p. m. 110.*

‡ *Hist. des Empereurs in the Life of* Hadrian, *p. m.* 425.

‡ Per idem tempus in honorem Plotinæ Basilicam apud Nemausum opere mirabili extruxit. *Spart. ib.*

POITIERS

quit that Post, she should find in herself the same Disposition and Moderation, which she had when she took possession of the Imperial Palace. This Wish is worthy of a great Soul, and concerns a thing which seldom happens, *Honores mutant mores.*

(C) *Factions between the Wives and Sisters of Princes.*] Let's hear what *Trajan*'s Panegyrist says about it. *Nihil est tam pronum ad simultates quam æmulatio, in feminis præsertim: ea porro maxime nascitur ex conjunctione, alitur æqualitate, exardescit invidia, cujus finis est odium. Quo quidem admirabilius existimandum est quod mulieribus duabus in una domo, parique fortuna, nullum certamen, nulla contentio est: suspiciunt invicem, invicem cedunt, cumque te utraque effusissimè diligat, nihil sua putat interesse utram tu magis ames; idemque utrique propositum, idem tenor vitæ, nihilque ex quo sentias duas esse.* No better Notion can be given of the Merit of two Princesses. *Pliny* knew admirably well how to describe Characters, and had reason to think that this Concord was a Happiness, for which he ought to compliment *Trajan*; for Sovereigns are generally unhappy at Home, however Happy they may be Abroad, if they have a Mother, a Wife, a Sister, a Mother-in-Law, a Daughter, *&c.* under the same Roof: they'll give them more trouble than the Government of their States, nay, half this Number will do it. But when I consider that some Panegyrists, now adays, represent Princesses not as they were, but as they should have been, according to the sublime Ideas of an Orator, I say, when I consider this, I am apt to think that *Pliny* went beyond the Truth.

(D) *She did many good Offices to* Hadrian.] 'Twas she who (a) got him married to *Trajan*'s Niece, and (b) procured him a Government in the time of the Expedition against the *Parthians*, afterwards the second (c) Consulship, and at last the Empire (d).

(E) *So many other good Qualities.*] *Pliny* opposes, as often as he can, the Perfections of *Trajan* to the Imperfections of other Princes. He doth not forget Marriage, and says, that many illustrious Men have dishonoured themselves upon that Account; but as for *Trajan*, 'twas one of the most glorious Passages of his Life. *Multis illustribus dedecori fuit aut inconsultius uxor assumpta, aut retenta patientius, ita foris claros domestica* (e) *destruebat infamia, & ne maximi cives haberentur hoc efficiebat quod mariti minores erant. Tibi uxor in decus & gloriam cedit. Quid enim illa sanctius? Quid antiquius? Nonne si Pontifici Maximo deligenda sit conjunx, aut hanc, aut similem (ubi est autem similis) elegerit? Quam illa nihil sibi ex fortuna tua nisi gaudium vendicat? Quam constanter non potentiam tuam, sed ipsum te reveretur! .... Eadem quàm modico cultu, quàm parca comitatu, quàm civilis incessu!* In one of his (f) Letters, he calls her a most holy Wife. *Injungis mihi jucundissimum ministerium, ut ad Plotinam sanctissimam fœminam literæ tuæ perferantur.*

(F) *It was thought that she was in Love with* Hadrian.] *Dion* does plainly say so. Ἐξ ἐρωτικῆς φιλίας, says he in one place, and in another, ἐρώσης αὐτῷ διαφερόντως. See how malicious the World is: a Woman can't shew her Affection to a Man, and endeavour to load him with Honours and Riches, but they conclude she loves him criminally. The difference of Age is so far from silencing the Satyrists, that it rather provokes them. They pretend, that when a Woman is in her Decay, a Grand-Mother, if you will, her Eagerness to raise a young Man, is a more certain sign of a Criminal Commerce, than if she was but Twenty. She would not express so much Affection in her old Days, will a Satyrist say, if she did not think herself obliged to pay for the Nights, which her Gallant might have spent more agreeably elsewhere; she would not be so forward to serve and recommend a Man, and lay out Money for him, if she did not desire that the Sport should continue. In a Word, he thinks of these Verses of *Juvenal*:

> *Cum* (g) *te summoveant qui testamenta merentur*
> *Noctibus, in cœlum quos evehit optima summi*
> *Nunc via processus, vetulæ vesica beatæ.*

(G) Trajan *did not adopt him.*] *Dion* (h) says that *Apronian* his Father, who was Governor of *Cilicia*, told him, that the Death of *Trajan* was concealed for some Days, that the Intrigue of the Adoption might the better succeed; and that the thing was known by the Letter of that Prince to the Senate, which was not Signed by him, but by *Plotina*, a thing that had never happened before. See how Mr. *Dodwell* refutes *Dion* in his learned Lectures upon (i) *Spartian*. *Dion* is not the only Author who said this. *Nec desunt*, says another (k), *qui factione Plotinæ mortuo jam Trajano Adrianum in adoptionem adscitum esse prodiderint, supposito qui pro Trajano fessa voce loqueretur.* How difficult is it to confute a probable Slander!

(H) *Appeared very thankful.*] *Tristan* says (l), that *Hadrian left great Legacies to* Plotina *by his Will, if he should die first, which I learn, says he, from the Law,* Si Augustæ legaveris, ff. de legat. & fideicommiss. *lib.* 2. *which thus relates this matter.* Si Augustæ legaveris, & ea inter homines esse desierit, deficit quod ei relictum est, sicuti divus Hadrianus in Plotina, & proxime Imperator Antoninus in Faustinæ Augustæ

(a) *Spartian. in Adriano, c. 2. p. 23.*

(b) *Id. c. 4. p. 38.*

(c) *Id. p. 40.*

(d) *Id. p. 46.*

(e) *Com-* *are with* *his what* Tacitus *ays Chap.* *4. of the 3* *ook of his* *Annals,* t valida ivo Au- usto in emp. ortuna, a domi mprospe- fuit ob mpudici- am filiæ neptis uas urbe pulit. e He- sa Rem.

(f) *The 28. of the 9. Book.*

(g) *Juven. sat. 1. v. 37.*

(h) *In Adriano init.*

(i) *Pag. 538.*

(k) *Spartian. c. 4. p. 45.*

(l) *Comment. hist. tom. 1. p. 430.*

POITIERS (*Diana de*) Miſtreſs to *Henry* II. and Daughter (*A*) of the Count *de St. Vallier*, made an ill uſe of her Favour, either to heap up Riches, or to bring into Places, or exclude ſuch as ſhe thought fit. Her Age occaſioned a Belief that ſhe could not thus captivate a young Prince, without (*B*) the help of Magick. But ſome judicious Perſons don't believe it, and make very good Reflections (*C*) upon the power of an old Curtezan: They obſerve amongſt other things the Amorous Temper (*D*) of *Diana*. The greateſt Scandal proceeded from the

perſona conſtituit, cum ea ante inter homines eſſe deſiiſſet quam teſtator decederet.

(*A*) *And Daughter of the Count* de St. Vallier.] His Name was (*m*) *John de Poitiers*, and he deſcended from a very ancient Family; for one *Aymar de Poitiers* " (*n*) thus called, whether becauſe he deſcen" ded from the Counts *de Poitiers*, or for ſome " other Reaſon, married about the Year 1184, the " Heireſs of the Houſe of *Valentinois*, in conſideration " of the Aſſiſtance he had given to her Mother, " who was a Widow, againſt the Biſhop of *Valence*, " who was her great Enemy .... The ſame *Aymar* " had from *Raymond*, Earl of *Toulouſe*, his Relation, " the County of *Diois*, about the Year 1190, ſo that " theſe two Counties remained two hundred Years " in the Houſe of *Poitiers*, and were poſſeſſed by " ſeven ſucceſſive Counts. *Lewis* II. the laſt of 'em, " having no Male Iſſue, nor much Affection for " *Charles de St. Vallier*, his Uncle by his Father's " Side, who was to ſucceed him, and being very " much in Debt, by his ill Management and Debau" cheries, made over and conveyed theſe two Coun" ties to *Charles*, Dauphin of *France*, and his Suc" ceſſors, for a hundred thouſand Gold Crowns, on " Condition, that they ſhould remain inſeparably " united to *Dauphiné*. After his Death, which was " in the Year 1419, *Lewis*, the Son of *Charles de* " *St. Vallier*, would take on him the Titles and " Poſſeſſion of 'em; but the Dauphin, being then " King, obliged him to yield up all his Pretenſions " to him for a yearly Rent of ſeven thouſand Flo" rins to him and his Heirs for ever." As for *St. Vallier*, *Diana*'s Father, he was arreſted, as being concerned in the Rebellion of the Conſtable *Charles de Bourbon* and would have been beheaded in *Greve*, if his Daughter, in order to ſave his Life, had not granted the laſt Favour to *Francis* I. *Mezerai* ſpeaks of it thus in his large Hiſtory. (*o*) St. Vallier *had his Pardon on the Scaffold in* Greve, *by reaſon of the Beauty of his only Daughter* Diana. And in another place, ſpeaking of the ſame *Diana*, he ſays, (*p*) " The Charms of her Beauty were ſo powerful " ſince the Year 1524, that all the Court interced" ed for her Father, who was convicted of the Re" bellion of *Charles de Bourbon*, ſo that King *Francis* " ſent him his Pardon on the Scaffold." It cannot be concluded from theſe two Paſſages, that the Chaſtity of the Daughter was a Sacrifice offered to *Francis* I. to obtain her Father's Pardon. But here is a third place, where the Hiſtorian ſpeaks plainly of this propitiatory Victim. (*q*) " *St. Vallier* was " tried and condemned to loſe his Head; but as he " was in *Greve* on the Scaffold, he received his Par" don inſtead of the fatal Stroke. It was ſaid that the " King ſent it to him, after he had got from his " Daughter *Diana*, who was then 14 Years of Age, " the moſt precious Thing ſhe had. A ſweet Ex" change to thoſe who prefer Life to Virtue, or who " place their Honour in the Glory of enjoying a Fa" vour, which is more envied than it is innocent." The Author of the *Galanteries des Rois de France* does not ſpeak ſo roundly, but what he ſays is ſufficient to underſtand what he means. I ſhall ſet down his Words, becauſe they contain ſome Particulars relating to the Hiſtory of *Diana*. " She was, *ſays* " *he* (*a*), the Daughter of *John de Poictiers*, *Seigneur* " *de St. Vallier*, who placed her very young to the " Counteſs of *Angouleme*. Afterwards ſhe went into " the Service of Queen *Claudia*, as a Maid of Ho" nour. *St. Vallier*, who hoped that the Charms " of his Daughter would procure him ſome Pro" tection at Court, was not deceived in it; for it " may be ſaid, that ſhe ſaved his Life by her pri" vate Contrivances. He had a Hand in the Rebel" lion of the Conſtable *de Bourbon*, and was ſo un" fortunate as to be taken. He was tried and con" demned to be beheaded. *Diana* was ſo ſtruck " with this News, that ſhe thought nothing was to " be omitted in order to free her Father from ſuch " a preſſing Danger. She threw herſelf at the King's " Feet, melting in Tears, and begg'd of him her " Father's Life. She appeared ſo beautiful and ſo " moving to that Prince, that ſhe obtained her Re" queſt, and inſpired him with Love. She preſer" ved that Conqueſt till the fatal Journey the King " made into *Italy*; and that Prince endeavoured to " conceal his Unfaithfulneſs from the Counteſs *de* " *Chateau-Brian*, for whom he always had a great " regard."

(*B*) *Without the help of Magick.*] *Thuanus* ſeems to believe it. (*b*) *Diana ..... amiſſo viro, is fuit Ludovicus Brezæus magnus Normanniæ Seneſcallus, cum jam inclinata eſſet ætate, philtris & magicis, ut creditur, artibus adeo ſibi animum Henrici devinxit, ut nunquam alienata voluntate ad exitum uſque vitæ in amore illo conſtanter perſeveraverit.* *Mezerai* gives an exact Account of all the Reaſons which gave occaſion to believe that this Woman made uſe of Enchantments, and yet does not ſeem to be perſuaded of it. " (*c*) As the fineſt Features of her Face " vaniſhed away, the Charms of her Wit and her " Addreſs increaſed to ſuch a Degree, that at 35 " Years of Age, when ſhe ſhould have preferred " Virtue to Beauty, ſhe abſolutely conquered the " Heart of King *Henry*; and becauſe People, in or" der to make Favourites odious, and excuſe the " baſeneſs of the Princes, who become their Slaves, " are uſed to ſay that their Affection has been ex" torted by Magical Charms, ſome gave out that " ſhe had bewitched him with Philtres. Indeed it " was a ſad thing, to ſee a young Prince fond of a " Woman, who had a Face diſcoloured and full of " Wrinkles, a Head that grew gray-hair'd, lan" guiſhing, and ſometimes Blood-ſhot and running " Eyes, in a Word, who was ſaid to be the baſe " Remains of many others; and one might very " well wonder, that neither Time, nor Honour, nor " wiſe Counſels, nor any other Object among ſo ma" ny great Beauties he might have pitch'd upon, " could bring him off from her. But it is neither " a new thing, nor a wonderful one, to ſee a Man " thus bewitched without any Inchantments: there " are many (*d*) Inſtances of it, and 'tis no difficult " thing to give ſome Reaſons for it." Thoſe Reaſons will be ſeen in the following Remark.

(*C*) *Good Reflections upon the power of an old Curtezan.*] Here is the ſequel of the Paſſage I have juſt now quoted out of *Mezerai*. " Not to menti" tion thoſe unknown Qualities, like thoſe of the " Load-Stone, which meeting in ſome Perſons do " cloſely unite them; 'tis obſerved, that Phlegma" tick People are conſtant in their Love, tho' they " are not ſo in their Deſigns and other Paſſions; " And therefore a cunning and crafty Woman is no " leſs dangerous to a young Man, who begins to be " acquainted with the World, than a Rock to an " ignorant Pilot. Beſides, the Suſpicions he enter" tained of his Wife's Honeſty, made him more " fond of another Woman. Laſtly, in point of Love, " as well as in point of War, the Stratagems of old " People are not leſs to be feared, than the Strength " and Vigour of the young, and therefore 'tis no " wonder if he fell into the Snares of ſo experi" enced a Woman." *Ovid*, (*e*) who was ſo great a Maſter in the Art of Love, might have afforded *Mezerai* another Reaſon, and perhaps that Hiſtorian would not have omitted it in a Latin Hiſtory. A Woman, who is the *baſe Remains of many others*, has been in a good School, ſhe can do her Exerciſes much better, and knows how to play her Game to the beſt Advantage. However it be, this Hiſtorian rightly obſerves that there are many Inſtances of the great Power of an old Curtezan. See the Marginal Note *d*.

(*D*) *The amorous Temper.*] " The Love of a young " King for a Woman of 40 Years of Age, who " had two or three Children by her Huſband, might " well be called an Enchantment without Charms. " ..... The King loved her becauſe ſhe was very " ſenſible of Love, and her Temper prompted her " ſome-

---

(*b*) *Thuan. l. 3. p. 55. ad ann.* 1547.

(*c*) *Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, at the Beginning of* Henry II. *p.* 1058. *of the 2 vol. in folio.*

(*d*) *See* Caligula *Rem. H.* Cyrus *Rem. F.* and Dellius *Rem. A.* *See alſo the Articles* Lais *and* Lamia.

(*e*) Nec quotus annus eſt, nec quo ſit nata requiret Conſule, quæ rigidus munera Cenſor habet. Præcipue, ſi flore caret, meliuſque peractum Tempus, & albentes jam legit illa comas. Utilis, ô juvenes, aut hæc, aut ſerior ætas; Iſte feret ſegetes, iſte ſerendus ager. .... Hoc quoque militiæ eſt: hoc quoque quærit opes. Adde, quod eſt illis operum prudentia major: Solus & artifices qui facit, uſus adeſt. Illæ munditiis annorum damna rependunt: Et faciunt curâ, ne videantur anus. Utque velis, Venerem jungunt per mille figuras: Invenit plures nulla tabella modos. *Ovidius de arte amandi l.* 2. *p.* 151.

(*m*) *And not Aymar, as* Mezerai *calls him, Hiſt. de* Henry II. *at the Beginning.*

(*n*) *Mezerai, Hiſt. de Charles VI. p.* 578. *of the 2 vol. in fol. ad ann.* 1418.

(*o*) *Tom.* 2. *p.* 936. *ad ann.* 1523.

(*p*) Hiſt. de Henry II. *at the Beginning, p.* 1058. *of the 2 Vol.*

(*q*) *Mezerai, Abregé Chronol. vol.* 4. *p. m.* 520. *ad ann.* 1523.

(*a*) *Tom.* 1. *p.* 195. *See in the Rem.* F. *a Fault that he has committed.*

the common Report, that ſhe had yielded * to the Deſires of *Francis* I. to (E) ſave her Father's Life; ſo that People could not ſee, without Indignation, that a Woman, who had been a Concubine to the Father and the Son ſucceſſively, ſhould have the chief Authority in the Kingdom. It is a Chimerical Fancy to pretend (F) that *Henry* the Second's Intimacy with that Woman went no farther than Friendſhip. She was known at Court for a long time, by the Name of *Grande Seneschalle*, and then by that of Dutcheſs of *Valentinois*. She went by the firſt of thoſe two Names,

“ ſometimes to look elſewhere for the heighth of “ Pleaſure, as ſhe found in him the heighth of Riches and Honours. „ They are *Mezerai's* (*f*) Words, which give me occaſion to compare, in this point, *Henry* II. with a Man, who, in all other things, was infinitely ſhort of that Prince's Merit. We read in *Suetonius*, that *Caligula*, in the Flower of his Youth, fell deſperately in Love with *Cæſonia*, who was not young, and had had three Children by her Husband; but then ſhe was a Woman of a moſt laſcivious Temper. *Ovid*, one of the greateſt Maſters in that Art, intimates plainly enough, that ſuch a Temper ſerves a voluptuous Man inſtead of many other things, and that as the Inſenſibility of a Chaſt Woman is an inconveniency, the Eagerneſs of a lewd Miſtreſs gives a wonderful reliſh. 'Tis the unhappy Cauſe of the Unfaithfulneſs of Husbands.

Odi (*h*) *quæ præbet, quia ſit præbere neceſſe,*
Siccaque de lana (*i*) *cogitat ipſa ſua.*
Quæ datur officio, non eſt mihi grata voluptas;
Officium faciat nulla puella mihi.
Me voces audire juvat ſua gaudia feſſas,
Utque morer memet ſuſtineamque roget.
Aſpiciam Dominæ victos amentis ocellos,
Langueat, & tangi ſe vetet illa diu.

What has been ſaid, ſhews that *Mezeray* hit the matter: the lewd Temper of *Henry's* Miſtreſs ſupplied her want of Youth.

(*E*) *To ſave her Father's Life.*] Beſides what has been ſaid upon this Subject in the firſt Remark of this Article, I ſhall obſerve a Circumſtance mentioned by *Thuanus*, concerning the Fright of the Count *de St. Vallier*. That unhappy Man being brought to the Place of Execution, was ſtruck with ſuch a Conſternation, that he fell dangerouſly ill. He was let Blood ſeveral times, but this, and the good News of his Pardon, could not recover his Spirits and cure him. *St. Vallier's* Fever became afterwards a Proverb. (*k*) *Diana . . . . patrem habuit Joannem Pictavienſem Sanvalerium, qui Caroli Borbonii conjurationis particeps, cum apud Sacerdotem ſecreto rem confeſſus eſſet à Sacerdote delatus, & ad mortem damnatus eſt: cum ad ſupplicium duceretur ex pavore in tam acutam febrem incidit, ut venia in gratiam filiæ, quæ pulchritudine ſua multorum procerum benevolentiam demeruerat, à Franciſco impetrata vix ad mentem & ſanitatem ſæpius miſſo ſanguine reduci potuerit, unde Sanvaleriana febris apud nos in proverbium abiit.* Some ſay (*l*), *That he ſaw Death ſo near him, and was ſo frighted at it, that when he was brought back to his Houſe* (*m*), *a continual Fever ſeized him ſo violently, that he died of it. Thuanus* tells us, that *St. Vallier* was accuſed by the Prieſt, to whom he had confeſt his Conſpiracy. But moſt Hiſtorians ſay, that two Gentlemen of *Normandy*, who were concerned in the ſame Plot, diſcovered it to *Francis* I. Some (*a*) will have it, that in this they followed the Inclination, which is ſaid to be natural to their Countrymen: others ſay, that their Confeſſor made a ſtep, which obliged them to reveal that Secret. *Varillas* ſticks to this laſt Opinion. “ *Matignon* and “ *d'Argouges*, ſays he (*b*), having confeſt at *Eaſter* “ to a Curate of their Country, that they had a “ hand in a Conſpiracy againſt the State, he or- “ dered them to diſcover it to the King; and he “ himſelf ſet out immediately to acquaint *Breze*, “ Great Senechal of *Normandy*, with it. *Matignon* “ and *d'Argouges*, who thought they were undone, “ took Poſt, and overtook the King at *Saint Pierre* “ *le Monſtier*, where they threw themſelves at his “ Feet, and obtained their Pardon, by making an “ exact Diſcovery of what they knew of the Con- “ ſtable's Negociation with the Emperor. „

(*F*) *To pretend that* Henry *the Second's Intimacy . . . . . . went no farther than Friendſhip.*] I wonder how *le Laboureur* could ever bring himſelf to believe ſuch a Chimera. I ſhall ſet down his Words, which contain a curious Paſſage concerning the Origin of that Paſſion, and it will appear that he owns at leaſt that our *Diana* was one of *Francis* the Firſt's Miſtreſſes. “ He was further prompted to go thi- “ ther, *ſays he* (*c*), *ſpeaking of a Running at the Ring,* “ *which* Henry II. *took great delight in*, by his Love “ to his Miſtreſs *Diana de Poitiers*, Dutcheſs of *Va-* “ *lentinois*, who was the firſt Object of his Inclina- “ tions, and had given him ſome Briskneſs. 'Tis “ ſaid that King *Francis*, his Father, who firſt “ loved that Lady, having one Day, after the Death “ of his Son the Dauphin *Francis*, expreſſed ſome “ Grief to her, for the little Briskneſs he perceived “ in Prince *Henry*, ſhe told him, that he wanted to “ be in Love, and that ſhe would make a Gallant of “ him. The King, whoſe Affection was divided “ between her and the Dutcheſs *d'Etampes*, gave “ his Conſent to it; but tho' the Court was then “ very Licentious, we ought to believe, that no- “ thing paſt between 'em that might occaſion any “ Slanders, and that the Imprecation and Curſe ut- “ tered againſt *Ruben* (*d*), was thrown into *Henry's* “ Chamber out of a Calumny: nay (*e*), it is not “ certain that *Diana de Poitiers* ſuffered that this “ Friendſhip ſhould go beyond a noble Eſteem and “ a meer Gallantry. To prove this, 'tis to be ob- “ ſerved, that ſhe had had ſome Children by her “ Husband *Lewis de Breze*, Count *de Maulevrier*, Se- “ nechal of *Normandy*; and *Henry* II. left behind “ him ſome Legitimate and Natural ones, but it does “ not appear that he had any by her. „ The Proof alledged by *le Laboureur* is of no force; nay, it is inſignificant, and even makes againſt him; for at this rate he ſhould not have ſaid, that the *Affection of* Francis I. *was divided between* Diana de Poitiers *and the Dutcheſs* d'Etampes. We don't find that this Prince, who was the Father of many Children, had ever any by *Diana*, who was not ſo old when he loved her, as when ſhe was *Henry* the Second's Miſtreſs. I don't alledge againſt this Proof, the great Age of *Diana*, according to *Varillas*, when the Dauphin began to be in Love with her; I don't think ſhe was near ſo old as that Hiſtorian will have it. But I ſhall only ſay two things; Firſt, That *Diana* might have grown Barren before ſhe was 40 Years of Age by a great Lewdneſs: Secondly, That it frequently happens that Widowers and Widows, who had Children by their firſt Marriage, get none when they are married together.

If one had a Mind to deny the Inceſt, it were better to go about it as *Varillas* did; it were better to deny that *Diana* lay with the Father, than to deny it of the Son. However it be, let us ſee what *Varillas* ſays. (*f*) “ I expect to be blamed “ for having ſaid nothing of the pretended Inceſt “ of the ſame Dutcheſs of *Valentinois*, with the Fa- “ ther and the Son, that is, with King *Francis* I. “ and King *Henry* II. But to this I anſwer two “ things: Firſt, That of all the Authors of thoſe “ Times, whom I have ſeen in the King's Library, “ in a Collection divided into thirty ſeven Volumes, “ I have not found any Catholick Writer who men- “ tions that Inceſt, and that the Catholicks have “ been as careful to ſay nothing of it, as the Calvi- “ niſts appeared eager and paſſionate in giving a “ particular Account of it. Beſides, the ſame Cal- “ viniſts don't agree in their Satyrs; for ſome will “ have it, that this Dutcheſs, who was then known “ only by the Name of *Diana de Poitiers*, yielded “ to the Deſires of King *Francis* I. only to ſave by “ the loſs of her Virginity, the Life of *St. Vallier*, “ her Father, who was to loſe it upon a Scaffold, “ for being an Accomplice in the Rebellion of the “ Conſtable *de Bourbon*; and others affirm that ſhe “ proſtituted herſelf to the Conſtable *de Montmo-* “ *rency*, Chief Miniſter and Favourite of *Francis* I. „ If he goes upon no better Grounds as to this, than in what he adds concerning the Reaſon why the Calviniſts hated the Dutcheſs *de Valentinois*, he has loſt his Cauſe; for it is an abſurd thing to alledge the (*g*) Laſt-Will of the Dutcheſs, as the true Reaſon of their Hatred, and not the cruel Perſecution which they ſuffered under a Reign, in which every thing was managed according to the Caprices of that Woman. This is certainly the Sophiſm *à non cauſa pro cauſa.*

---

* *See the Rem. A.*

(*f*) *Abregé Chron. tom.* 4. *p.* 644. *ad ann.* 1547.

(*h*) *Ovid. ub. ſup.*

(*i*) *See Martial, Epig.* 51. & 105. *l.* 11.

(*k*) *Thuan. ub. ſup.*

(*l*) *Father Anſelme, Palais de l'honneur p.* 555.

(*m*) *See the Rem. B.*

(*a*) Fran…cus Lu…ttia pro…ctus ad …anum …etri Mo…tallerien…s . . . ap…ulit . . . . …i duo …orbonii …omeſtici …atione …ormani (quæ na…o vulgo … parum …da notari …let) Ar…gius ac …atigno …orboni…n cum …a fare …nveniſſe …que ad…rſus …anciſ…m mul…moliri …dicant. …carius 17. *n.* … *p.* 530.

(*b*) *Varil-*… Hiſt. … Fran…is I. *l.* 4. …269.

(*c*) *Addit.* … *Me-* …*res de* …*lelnau* … 1. *p.* …5.

(*d*) *See the* 49 *Chap. of Geneſis v.* 4.

(*e*) *This nay is needleſs here, ſince the Author ſays nothing that is of more validity than what goes before.*

(*f*) *Varillas, Preface to the Hiſtory of* Henry II.

(*g*) *By which ſhe diſinherited the D. of* Bouillon, *her Son in-Law, in caſe he ſhould embrace the new Religion.*

Names, becauſe ſhe had been married to *Lewis de Breze*, Great Seneſchal of *Normandy*, by whom ſhe had two Daughters (*G*), whom ſhe married very advantageouſly. As for the other Name, ſhe took it, becauſe *Henry* II. gave her the Dutchy of *Valentinois*. I don't think that when ſhe ſet up in oppoſition to the Dutcheſs *d'Etampes*, in the Reign of *Francis* I. ſhe was ſo old (*H*) as *Varillas* will have it. We are

(*G*) *Two Daughters, whom ſhe married very advantageouſly.*] *Frances de Brezé*, the Eldeſt, (*h*) married in 1538, *Robert de la Mark*, IVth of that Name, Duke of *Bouillon*, Sovereign Prince of *Sedan*, who was made Marſhal of *France* in 1547. *Louiſe* (*i*) *de Brezé*, the other Daughter of the Great Seneſchal, was married to *Claudius de Lorraine*, Duke *d'Aumale*, Brother to the Duke of *Guiſe*, who was killed by *Poltrot*. *Varillas* is very much out here. (*k*) He ſuppoſes, that in the Beginning of *Henry* the Second's Reign, the Dutcheſs *de Valentinois* and Cardinal *de Lorraine*, mutually endeavoured to unite their Intereſts, in order to keep up and increaſe their Credit, and that the Cardinal upon ſuch a proſpect, propoſed to marry the Prince of *Joinville* his Eldeſt Brother, with the Eldeſt *Daughter* of the Dutcheſs: which not ſucceeding, the Dutcheſs was obliged to be contented to marry her Eldeſt Daughter to the Duke *d'Aumale*, the Cardinal's younger Brother; after which ſhe married (*l*) her ſecond Daughter to the Son of the Marſhal *de Fleuranges*, Prince of *Sedan*. *Varillas* confounds Times and Things; for the Eldeſt Daughter of *Diana* married *Robert de la Mark*, Prince of *Sedan*, in (*m*) the Year 1538. Would *Henry Robert de la Mark*, their Son, have married (*n*) in 1558 the Daughter of the Duke of *Montpenſier*, if his Mother had married under the Reign of *Henry* II? I ſay nothing of *Antoinette de la Mark*, Siſter of *Henry Robert*, who was married to *Damville*, ſecond Son to the Conſtable *de Montmorency*, in the Year 1558, according to *Varillas* (*o*); for, becauſe he obſerves that ſhe *was almoſt Marriageable*, he might get out of my Objection, and I don't know what Age that Lady was of at that time. Having deſired a Friend (*p*) to conſult Mr. *d'Hozier*, who has a vaſt Knowledge of Hiſtory and Genealogies, I have been informed that *Frances de Brezé*, Eldeſt Daughter of *Diana de Poitiers*, was married in 1538 to *Robert de la Mark*, and that *Louiſe de Brezé*, her ſecond Daughter, was married to *Claudius de Lorraine*, Duke *d'Aumale*, in (*q*) 1546; for William de Poitiers, *her Uncle, mentions her, as being that Prince's Wife in the Laſt-Will he made the 12th of* March 1546. Preſident *de la Place* obſerves, that the Duke *d'Aumale* married under the Reign of *Francis* I. by ſuch a Token that the King would not ſuffer the Bride (*r*) *to be dreſt like a Princeſs on her Wedding Day*. Which ſhews the Miſtakes of the Modern Author of the Life of Admiral *de Coligny*. He ſuppoſes, that the Conſtable *de Montmorency* having attained again to the top of Favour after the Death of *Francis* I. had a mind to marry *Coligny* to the Heireſs of *Laval*. *Coligny* did not like the Match, and put in his Brother *d'Andelot* for it. The Conſtable thinking that *Coligny* had refuſed it, becauſe he was in Love with the Lady *de Brezé*, deſired that young Lord (*ſ*) *to forbear viſiting that Lady ſo frequently, or to do it at leaſt with a Deſign to try whether ſhe would be of her Mother's Humour*. Nevertheleſs, the Viſits continued to be as frequent as before. That Author having related ſeveral Intrigues, tells us, that *Diana* having two Daughters (*t*) to marry, look'd out for ſome Husbands, who might help her to keep up her Credit, and ſhe caſt her Eyes upon the Prince of *Joinville*, and ſpoke to the Cardinal *de Lorraine* about it. He adds, (*a*) that *Coligny* repreſented to that Prince, that it was no Honourable Match for him, and put him out of Conceit with it, and that afterwards, *Diana* married her Daughter to the Duke *d'Aumale*, younger Brother to that Prince. See the Remark *Q*. I admire the many Particulars mentioned by this Author, and his vaſt Commentaries upon a few Words of *Brantome*. He is a faithful Imitator of *Varillas*, an Hiſtorian who will ſpoil a great many Authors, if it be not prevented. But omitting his Hiſtorical Miſtakes, I ſhall only obſerve that *Diana* had no Daughters to marry, when *Henry* II. her Lover, came to the Crown the 31ſt of *March* 1547; for, as I have already ſaid, the eldeſt of her two Daughters was married in the Year 1538, and the youngeſt in the Year 1546.

(*H*) *So old as* Varillas *will have it.*] I ſhall ſet down his own Words, which concern the Year 1544. "(*b*) *Diana de Poitiers* was the Dauphin's "Miſtreſs, as the (*c*) Dutcheſs was loved by the "King; but this was the only thing wherein they "were alike. The Dutcheſs had never been ſo beautiful as ſhe was then: ſhe had loſt nothing of the "Luſtre, which procured her the Reputation of being the greateſt Beauty in *Europe*, in the Opinion "of the niceſt Judges, and even of the Emperor himſelf: but *Diana* had ſcarce any of thoſe Charms, "which ſaved her Father's Life one and twenty "Years before. The Dutcheſs was but one and thirty "Years of Age, and it was ſuſpected that *Diana* "was near ſixty Years old; for the care that was "taken to know her Age, by enquiring where ſhe "was Chriſten'd, proved ineffectual. . . . . The Dutcheſs . . . . . ſpoke freely of *Diana*, whereas *Diana* concealed under feigned Demonſtrations of "Reſpect and Complaiſance, her Vexation for the "Slight that was put upon her. The Dutcheſs's "Freedom made her ſay upon a certain Occaſion, "that ſhe was born the ſame Day that *Diana* had "been married. Theſe Words were the more offenſive, becauſe they might be true, and reflected "upon *Diana* as if ſhe had been uncapable of inſpiring any Love, ſince it was known that ſhe had "been a long time (*d*) without finding a Husband. "Nevertheleſs, ſhe concealed her Reſentment as "long as the King enjoyed a perfect Health; but "when ſhe perceived that his Majeſty began to "decline, ſhe hinted to the Dutcheſs, that the Time "was coming on when ſhe would be revenged on "her." I cannot tell from whence this Author had theſe Stories, but I very much queſtion the Truth of 'em. I heard one Day a certain Perſon argue againſt it in the following manner. In the I. place, ſaid he, if *Diana de Poitiers* had been 40 Years of Age when her Father was tried, 'tis not likely that the Hiſtorians would have repreſented her as a Tid-bit for *Francis* I. A married Woman and a Widow will be more eaſily accounted handſome at 40 Years of Age, than a Maid of the ſame Years. The latter will be ſooner called an old Maid, than the former will be called an old Woman, and thro' an ill effect of Prejudices, ſhe is not look'd upon as ſo good a Fortune. II. *Mezeray* ſays, (*e*) that *Diana* was but 14 Years of Age, when ſhe ſaved her Father's Life; which is much more likely than to ſay that ſhe was 40. The Exchange of a Criminal's Life for an old Maidenhead, is not ſo eaſily apprehended by the Readers, as when they are told (as they are by *Mezeray*) that this Exchange was made by one that was but 14 Years of Age; and the Fault of King *Francis* may be better excuſed by it. III. If *Diana* had been near 60 Years old in 1544, ſhe muſt have been 75 Years old when *Henry* II. died, that is, on the Day of the famous Turnament, in which that Prince received a Wound of which he died, he took (*f*) White and Black for his Livery, *on account of the handſome Widow he ſerved*: Would an old Woman of 75 Years have been ſerved as a handſome Widow? Would the Proteſtants, to whom ſhe was ſo violent an Enemy, and who revenged themſelves upon her by their Satyrical Books, have forgot her great Age? A young King deſperately in Love with an old Woman of 70 Years, lies ſo open to be ridiculed, that *Henry* II. would have been banter'd and rail'd at in the moſt inſulting manner, on account of his old Miſtreſs, if the Dutcheſs of *Valentinois* had been of ſuch an Age. The Silence of the Satyrical Writers, who only ſay, that *Diana* was between 40 and 50 Years of Age, ſeems to me a very ſtrong Reaſon againſt *Varillas*. But this is not the main part of the Objection: what *Brantome* ſays in his *Memoires des Dames Galantes* was more inſiſted upon. He ſays (*g*), that two Years after the Death of that Prince, the Enemies of the Dutcheſs of *Valentinois* courted her Friendſhip. She muſt therefore have lived at leaſt 77 Years: how comes it then that, according to *Brantome* (*h*), ſhe died being 70 Years and a half old? IV. One can hardly believe that the Dutcheſs *d'Etampes* was but 31 Years of Age in 1544: if this were true, ſhe muſt have been but 13 when *Francis* I. made a Miſtreſs of her. But not

---

(*h*) *Anſelme, Hiſt. des Officiers de la Couronne p.* 179.

(*i*) *Idem, Palais de l'honneur p.* 448.

(*k*) *Hiſt. de* Henry II. *l.* 1. *p.* 44, 49. *ad ann.* 1547.

(*l*) *Ibid. p.* 47.

(*m*) *Anſelme ub. ſup.*

(*n*) *Id. ib.*

(*o*) *Ub. ſup. l.* 7. *p.* 361.

(*p*) *Mr.* Janniçon *Advocate in the Council.*

(*q*) *'Tis perhaps by reckoning the Beginning of the Year from* Eaſter.

(*r*) *Commentaires de l'état de la religion & republique fol.* 59. *verſo edit.* 1565.

(*ſ*) *Vie de Gaſpard de Coligny. Book* 2. *p.* 87. *edit.* 1686.

(*t*) *Ibid. p.* 102.

(*a*) *Ibid. p.* 106.

(*b*) *Varillas, Hiſt. de François I. liv.* 11. *p.* [illegible] *Dutch Edit.*

(*c*) *That is, the Dutcheſs d'Etampes.*

(*d*) *This is not true. See the Rem. P.*

(*e*) *Abreg. Chronol. Tom.* 4. *p.* 520. *This agrees with what he ſays in the* 2 *Vol. of his large Hiſtory, p.* 1058. *that Diana got the Dauphin's Love at* 14 *Years of Age.* La Planche *in his Hiſt. of Francis* II. *ſays much the ſame. In her younger Years, ſays he p.* 14. *ſhe redeem'd her Father's Life with her Maidenhead, and afterwards, to the misfortune of France, became King Henry's Miſtreſs, being far advanced in Years.*

(*f*) *Brantome, Eloge de Henri* II. *p.* 39. *of the* 2 *Tome.*

(*g*) *Tome* 2. *p.* 328.

(*h*) *Ibid.* 228.

are told very remarkable things about the great (I) Resolution she shewed after the Death of *Henry* II. and about the Continuance of (K) her Beauty. She was a mortal Enemy to the (L) Protestants; and doubtless, the Religious Zeal of such a Woman, was one of the most remarkable parts of the Comedy that is acted upon the

not to insist upon this, I further observe, that she was Maid of Honour to the Lady Regent, before the King fell in Love with her; and I question whether at that Time, when the Education of Children was not so forward as it is in our Age, a Maid of 12 Years would have been qualified to be a Maid of Honour to the Lady Regent. V. I own, that Jealousie prompts the Court Ladies, as well as others, to use passionate Expressions, and to tell strange Lyes; but when a Woman knows that her Enemies have an Eye upon her, she will take care not to say any thing that is palpably absurd, and she will forbear telling gross and impertinent Lies. The Dutchess *d'Etampes* took quite another Course, if she said that she was born on the Day that *Diana de Poitiers* was married. Every Body knew at Court, at what Time the Dutchess had lost her Honour: the Return of King *Francis* from *Spain* was too remarkable a thing to be easily forgotten. Now this was the very Time when *Mademoiselle de Heilli* began to set up for a Gallant Woman. The Court did not less remember the Pardon that was sent to *St. Vallier* on the Scaffold; and consequently they knew when *Diana* lost her Honour, and they were not ignorant that those two Ladies began to play the same Game not long one after another. Wherefore, since it was known to the whole Court, that *St. Vallier's* Daughter had not been married to the great Senechal of *Normandy* (i), till *Francis* I. had lain with her, the Dutchess *d'Etampes* would have been a mad Woman, if she had said what we read in *Varillas*, *I was born on the same Day that* Diana *married*; for it had been an easie thing to prove it an Imposture and a silly Jest. We shall see in the Remark *P*, that all these Reflections are not well grounded.

(i) *This is not true: See the Rem. P.*

The Author of the *Galanteries des Rois de France* has adopted all these Mistakes of *Varillas*, and made 'em worse, by referring to (k) the Year 1547 what the other had referred to the Year 1544; which occasions many new Falsities. *Mademoiselle de Heilli* was but 10 Years, when the King lay with her. *St. Vallier* obtained his Pardon in 1526. *Epernay* and *Chateau-Thierry* were taken, and the Treatise of *Creſpy* was made after the Year 1546. Here follows another Fault of that Author. He says, (l), that the Love which King *Francis* conceived for *Mademoiselle de Heilli*, at his Return from *Spain*, made him *insensible with respect to all the Persons of the Court, and that Diana, who had been married a long time to* Lewis de Brezé, *Senechal of* Normandy, *endeavoured to ease her Grief for the Inconstancy* of that Prince, *considering that the Dauphin gave her several Marks of Love.* You must know that *Henry* II. was but 8 Years of Age when his Father returned from *Spain* in 1526. You must further know, that he was not Dauphin till the Year 1536, and that *Diana* was a Widow when the Dauphin fell in Love with her. From this you may judge, whether the Author of the *Galanteries* is an exact Writer.

(k) *Tom.* 1. *p.* 204. *Edition of* 1695.

(l) *Pag.* 187.

(I) *The great Resolution she shewed after the Death of* Henry II.] *Brantome* gives an Account of it. (m) "When *Henry* II. was a dying, the Dutchess "of *Valentinois* was ordered to retire to her House "at *Paris*, and to come no more into the King's "Chamber, lest she should disturb his Godly "Thoughts, and because some bore her an ill Will. "She retired, and then a Messenger was sent to her "to ask of her some Rings and Jewels that belonged to the Crown. She immediately asked him, "is the King dead? No, Madam, replied he, but "he can't live long. Well, said she, I will have my "Enemies to know, that I am not afraid of 'em, "and will not obey them as long as he is alive. "I have still an undaunted Courage; but when he "dies, I will not live after him, and tho' my Life "be never so bitter, I shall think it sweet in comparison of my loss, and therefore, whether my "King be dead or alive, I am not afraid of my Enemies. That Lady shewed herself very generous: "but some will say that she did not die, tho' she "said she would. 'Tis true: however, she came "very near Death; and I think it was well done "of her not to die, in order to let her Enemies "know that she did not fear them, and that if she "had seen 'em tremble and humble themselves in "her Presence, she would not do the same. And "indeed, she appeared so stout and resolute that "they could never vex her: nay, two Years after, "they courted her more than ever, and were Friends "again; as it is usual with Great People, whose "Friendship and Enmity are of no long continuance, and whose Differences are quickly made "up. It is not so with us inconsiderable People; "for we must either fight and die, or put an end "to our Quarrels by a very nice Agreement, and "after all we are never the better Friends."

(m) Dames *Galantes*, *Tom.* 2. *p. m.* 327.

What *Brantome* says, that *Great People are easily reconciled*, and that the Little ones are very eager in their Quarrels, puts me in mind of what was said to a *Parisian*, during the Wars between the Houses of *Orleans* and *Burgundy*. (a) "Whilst this "War lasted, things were carried on with such a "heat, that after many Sieges, and the destruction "of many Towns, the Peace was concluded on at "*Auxerre*. For, as the Duke of *Burgundy* told a "*Parisian*, who went to meet him, *We, that are* "*descended from the Royal Blood, grow angry one with* "*another, whenever we have a mind to it, and in like* "*manner, we make a Peace whenever we have a mind* "*to it.* *Monstrelet* further says, that a *Burgundian* "was of Opinion, *that it was a great folly to kill* "*one another for the sake of Princes, who are reconciled whenever they please.*"

(a) *Rouillard, Hist. de Melun p.* 5**.

(K) *And about the Continuance of her Beauty.*] (b) "I saw, *says* Brantome, the Dutchess of *Valentinois* "as beautiful, at threescore and ten Years of Age, "and as fresh and lovely as when she was but thirty; and therefore 'tis no wonder if she was beloved by one of the greatest and most valiant "Kings in the World. This I may freely say, without doing any Prejudice to the Beauty of that "Lady; for whenever a Lady gains the Love of a "King, 'tis a sign that she is a most accomplish'd "Person: besides, Beauty, which is a Present of "Heaven, ought to be enjoyed by the Demi-Gods. "I saw that Lady half a Year before she died: she "was still so Beautiful, that none but a hard-hearted Man would have been insensible to her Charms, "tho' sometime before she had broke one of her "Legs in the Streets of *Orleans*. She rid then as "dextrously as ever she did; but her Horse fell. "One would have thought, that the great Pains she "felt, would have made some Alteration in her "Face; but on the contrary, her Beauty, and her "Charming and Majestical Air were the same "as before. She had a very white Skin without "any Paint; only 'tis said that she drank every "Morning some Broth, with potable Gold and other "Drugs in it. I think, if that Lady had lived an "hundred Years longer, she had never been an old "Woman; her Face was so well formed, and her "Body of such a good Temper and Constitution. "'Tis pity such a fine Body should lie under the "Ground."

(b) *Brant. Dames Galantes tom.* 2. *p.* 228.

(L) *A mortal Enemy to the Protestants.*] *Beza* ascribes the cruel Persecution which the Protestants suffered under the Reign of *Henry* II. to the Counsels of three Persons, *viz.* the Cardinal *de Lorraine*, the Dutchess of *Valentinois*, and the Marshal *de St. André*. The Cardinal, says he (c), *had the King's Conscience at his Disposal.* The Dutchess *was in possession of his Body, not without suspicion of Witchcraft, since she had lived in a very bad Reputation, and had nothing in her that might reasonably (if there is any Reason in such Passions) win the Heart of such a Prince. Those three Persons, who continually endeavoured to make him believe these two things, that the Protestants were Enemies to the Kingly Power, and great Lovers of Confusion, and that the right way of making amends for all the Vices, in which they themselves indulged him, was to exterminate the Enemies of the* Romish *Religion, did so work upon him, that from the very Beginning of his Reign, he made it his business to persecute and destroy the Churches, as his late Father had done before him.* Here is a Passage out of *Brantome*. (d) *But above all, she was a very good Catholick, and hated the Protestants very much. Which is the reason why they hated and slandered her.* But *Varillas*'s Words are very remarkable. "(e) She declared in the principal Articles of her Will, which

(c) *Histoire Ecclesiastique l.* 2. *p.* 68.

(d) *Brant. Eloge de Henry II. in the* 2 *tom. of his Memoirs, p.* 9.

(e) *Histoire de Henri II. l.* 1. *p.* 36. & 37.

the Stage of the World. *If there is any thing in Brantome's* Memoirs, that is not only inſipid, but alſo execrable, 'tis the Baſeneſs he is guilty of in praiſing this Dutcheſs, and the (M) exceſſive Complaiſance of *Henry* II. *Thuanus* is far from being guilty of ſuch a baſe Flattery: he does not (N) ſpare the Conſtable *de Montmorency*, who, notwithſtanding all his Haughtineſs, cring'd to that lewd Woman. *Mezeray* (O) did not act the Part of a Flatterer. She has been praiſed * for not revenging her ſelf of the Dutcheſs *d'Etampes* as much as ſhe might have done after the Death of *Francis* I. The great Riches ſhe got proved very uſeful to her after the Death of *Henry* II. She made uſe of 'em to pacifie the Queen Mother, and ſhe retired to her fine Seat at *Anet*; not without receiving †, as 'tis ſaid, a ſevere Reprimand from *Catherine de Medicis*. That Queen was amazed, when *Tavannes* offered to cut off the Noſe of the Dutcheſs of *Valentinois*: *She told him, that he would undo himſelf by it*; and he anſwered, that he would willingly die *to put an end to Vice, and to the Miſfortune of the King and his Kingdom* ‡. To conclude, I ſhall examine what ſome ſay, that her (P) Virginity ſaved her Father's Life, and I'll produce

“ ſhe made when ſhe was moſt in Favour, and which ſhe did not revoke when ſhe died ten or twelve Years after, that ſhe was ſo zealous for the Catholick Faith, that if the Dutcheſſes *d'Aumale* and *de Bouillon*, her Daughters, ſhould forſake it upon any pretence whatſoever, and embrace a new Sect, ſhe deprived them of her Eſtate, and gave it to the Hoſpitals of the Places where the ſeveral parts of it lay. If one of her Daughters only renounced the Catholick Faith, ſhe gave her Share to her Siſter; and if her Relations were not careful to execute her Laſt Will, ſhe applied herſelf to the Parliament, and intreated them by the good Offices ſhe had formerly done 'em with *Henry* II. to ſupply the Fault of her Relations. „ This Hiſtorian obſerves, that this Article of her Will was not executed; the Dutcheſs of *Bouillon* made an open Profeſſion of the Reformed Religion, and yet had an equal Share of her Mother's Eſtate with the Dutcheſs *d'Aumale*. *Varillas* takes occaſion from hence to commend the Generoſity of the *Guiſes*. *So true it is*, ſays he, *that the Houſe of* Guiſe *has ſometimes performed ſome generous Actions, which are not to be found in the Princes of other Houſes.* He quickly (g) overthrows the Foundation on which he builds this Encomium. I ſhall ſet down another Paſſage, which clearly ſhews how much the Dutcheſs hated the Proteſtants. (h) “ She durſt not explain her Thoughts to *d'Andelot*; for tho' ſhe made no ſcruple, for the ſpace of twenty Years, to live an unchaſt Life, contrary to the Laws of the Goſpel, yet ſhe had ſuch a nice Conſcience, that ſhe would not ſo much as ſpeak to thoſe who were ſuſpected of Hereſie. „ What Extravagance! I deſire the Readers to make their Reflections upon this odd Zeal, which is ſo common.

(M) *In praiſing ...... the exceſſive Complaiſance.*] If *Brantome* had ſaid only that the Dutcheſs of *Valentinois* had a great deal of Courage, that ſhe was ſtill handſome at 70 Years of Age, and that ſhe was a good Horſe-woman, no Body would find fault with him for it. But 'tis an intolerable thing that he ſhould ſay, “ That ſhe (i) never adviſed the King to any thing but what was Great, Noble and Generous. .... (k) That ſhe was very Mild, Charitable to the Poor, Devout and Pious, for which reaſon ſhe had a Grave for her Device... ..... as living only in God, *and that* the *French* ought to wiſh, that their Kings may never have a worſe Favourite than ſhe was. (l) The great and vaſt Preſent, which the King made to the ſaid Dutcheſs of *Valentinois* at his coming to the Crown, upon the Confirmation of all the Officers of *France*, as 'tis uſually practiſed in the Beginning of a new Reign, was thought a very ſtrange thing. The Money, that was raiſed by it, amounted to a prodigious Sum, becauſe King *Francis* had reigned a long time. Such a King might very well make ſuch a Preſent to ſuch a Lady; for it was a caſual Forfeiture, which made no part of his Revenues, Demeſnes, Subſidies or Taxes, and our former Kings were very free of ſuch things, as I have it from good Hands, and were blamed when they did not diſpoſe of 'em in favour of their Servants. They uſed to do it; but our late Kings keep 'em for themſelves, and Farm them to ſupply their Neceſſities. Beſides, this Lady did not make an ill uſe of that Money, for ſhe built that fine Houſe at *Anet*, that will be for ever an Ornament to *France*. „ One cannot read this without Indignation: the Praiſes beſtowed upon her by *Francis de Billon*, on account of (a) her being a Woman of her Word and Beneficent, are ſtill leſs offenſive.

(N) Thuanus ...... *does not ſpare the Conſtable* de Montmorency.] I ſhall ſet down his own Words, which are more energical than a Tranſlation would be. (b) *Hæc violenta & acerba regni initia, ſub miti & moderato principe & qui alieno potius quam ſuo ingenio uteretur, facile Miniſtris tributa ſunt, ſed præcipue Dianæ Pictavienſi ſuperbi & impotentis animi feminæ, apud quam plurimum gratia valebant Lotharingi fratres & Santandreanus. .... Hujus feminæ arbitrio omnia regebantur, & Momorantius ipſe ut auctoritatem & potentiam quam apud regem obtinebat incolumem tueretur morem gerere, & prudentiam ad turpe obſequium flectere ſatagebat, peſſimo exemplo ſummi imperii ad impotentis feminæ libidinem proſtituti, quæ poſtremo ut jam in homines ſic & ærarium quod hominibus imperat poteſtatem arripuit, expulſo Joanne Vallo ſanctioris ærarii quæſtore, & in ejus locum ſuffecto Blando Rupicuriano homine ſuo.* He mentions afterwards many other Extorſions (c) which that Blood-ſucker made uſe of to ſatisfie her Avarice. *Mezeray* (d) obſerves, that the King *changed immediately the whole Court to pleaſe that crafty Woman.*

(O) *Mezeray did not act the part of a Flatterer.*] Speaking of the poſture of Affairs after the Death of *Henry* II. he expreſſes himſelf thus. (e) “ The Dutcheſs of *Valentinois* made no long Stay at Court after *Bertrandi, Keeper of the Seals*: She was turn'd out when *Olivier* came in, whom ſhe had expell'd, and ſhe was ſhamefully obliged to reſtore the Keys of the King's Cloſet, and the Jewels of the Royal Family, which were given to the Queen reigning. However, this was not done to pleaſe *Olivier*, but to ſatisfie the juſt Reſentment of *Catherine*, who could no longer ſuffer, without diſgracing herſelf, a Woman who had robb'd her of the King's Affection. We may gueſs that this Princeſs did not let her go without reproachful and injurious Words. The Duke *d'Aumale*, her Son-in-Law, obtained that ſhe ſhould not receive a worſe Uſage, and that ſhe ſhould keep the vaſt Wealth ſhe had got by the forfeited Eſtates of Criminals, and the Sale of Benefices, and by many other unlawful means, becauſe ſhe promiſed to make him her only Heir. But ſhe was forced to give the Queen-Mother her fine Seat of *Chenonceaux* upon the *Cher*. „ This is a mollified Extract (f) out of *La Planche*.

(P) *That her Virginity ſaved her Father's Life, and I'll produce ſome Dates.*] I have been informed by Mr. *d'Hozier*, that ſhe married the Great Seneſchal of *Normandy* the 29th of *March* 1514. And therefore *Mezeray* advances a great falſity, when he ſays, (g) that the King ſent *St. Vallier's* Pardon, *after he had got from his Daughter* Diana, *who was then 14 Years of Age, the moſt precious thing ſhe had.* Doubtleſs he means, that ſhe granted her Virginity to *Francis* I. he is therefore miſtaken in two things: he did not know that ſhe was at leaſt 20 Years of Age in 1523, and that ſhe had been married 8 or 9 Years. 'Tis plain, his Words are only a Paraphraſe upon thoſe of *La Planche*, which I have quoted (h). He gives the following Judgment about that Hiſtorian. Regnier de la Planche, ſays he (i), *was the Son of the Lieutenant General of* Poitiers, *a cunning Man, and of a quick Wit, but malicious, and imbued with* Calvin's *Opinions, and beſides, a Confident of the Marſhal* de Montmorency, *and conſequently an Enemy to the* Guiſes. 'Tis no wonder if a Man

---

* *Varillas, Hiſtoire de* Henry II. *l. 1. p. m.* 33, 34.

† *See the Rem. O.*

‡ *Memoires de Tavannes apud le Laboureur, addit. to Caſtelnau tom. 2. p.* 573.

(g) *He ſays p.* 49. *that* the Cardinal *de Lorraine* who neglected nothing, took care to get ſome Clauſes inſerted in the Contract *of the Count d'Aumale*, which were ſo advantageous to *that Count*, that he inherited afterwards the beſt part of the Succeſſion of his Mother-in-Law.

(h) *Varillas, ibid. b.* 7. *p.* 301. *ad ann.* 1558.

(i) *Eloge de* Henry II. *p.* 9.

(k) *Ibid. p.* 11.

(l) *Ibid. p.* 10.

(a) *See the Book intitled*, Le fort inexpugnable de l'honneur du ſexe feminin conſtruit par François de Billon Secretaire *printed in the Year* 1555. *fol.* 170.

(b) *Thuan. hiſtor. l.* 3. *p.* 58.

(c) *See* Lewis de Reinier Sieur de la Planche *in his Hiſt. of* Francis II. *p.* 14.

(d) *Hiſtoire de France tom.* 2. *p.* 1058. *ad ann.* 1547.

(e) *Ibid. tom.* 3. *p.* 6.

(f) *Page* 15. *&* 16. *of the Book intitled*, Hiſtoire de l'eſtat de France, tant de la Republique que de la Religion, ſous le regne de François II.

(g) *Mezerai, Abregé Chronol. tom.* 4. *p.* 520. *ad ann.* 1523.

(h) *In the Rem. H, letter e.*

(i) *Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, tom.* 3. *p.* 26.

duce ſome Dates, which will compoſe the Differences of ſome Hiſtorians. 'Tis a ſhameful thing that they ſhould diſagree in Matters of Fact, ſo Modern as thoſe are.

What has been ſaid in a Book printed at *Baſil* in the Year 1698, that the Duke of *Guiſe had a mind to marry* (Q) *Diana de Poitiers*, is not true. It is one of thoſe Miſtakes ſo common in Converſation; thoſe who have the beſt Memory, do ſometimes miſtake the Time, the Father for the Son, and the Daughter for the Mother.

POLY-

ſo qualified, did not inquire whether our *Diana* had been married a long time, when ſhe ſaved her Father's Life. Thoſe, who find a Myſtery in the leaſt things, fancy that it was not without Reaſon that *Francis* I. expreſſed himſelf thus in the Pardon he granted to *St. Vallier. Whereas our dear and truſty Couſin, Counſellor and Chamberlain, the* Count de Maulevrier, *Great Seneſchal of* Normandy, *and the Friends and Relations of* John de Poitiers, *Sieur de St.* Vallier, *have moſt humbly ſupplicated and intreated us to take pity on the ſaid* de Poitiers, *Sieur de St.* Vallier, *&c.* Care was taken, ſay thoſe ſpeculative Men, not to mention the Affinity that was between the Great Seneſchal and the Criminal, and not to ſay, that he interceeded for his Wife's Father; leſt it ſhould occaſion ſome Suſpicions and Slanders, conſidering the Youth and Beauty of the Lady, who begg'd her Father's Life. But laying aſide theſe vain Subtilties, I ſhall conſider *Varillas*'s Remark. He has not *found*, ſays he (k), *any Catholick who mentions that Inceſt: the Catholicks have been as careful to ſay nothing of it, as the Calviniſts have been paſſionate in their Accounts of it.* He only mentions the Writers of that Time, *whoſe Works make up thirty ſeven Volumes.* I wiſh I had the time to examine whether there were any Books written by the Catholicks in the Reign of *Francis* I. or in that of *Henry* II. which mentioned this Cauſe of the Pardon granted to *St. Vallier*; and I deſire all thoſe to inquire into the Matter, who are able to do it, or concerned in it. However, *Varillas* cannot deny, that in the XVII. Century the Catholick Writers tell us, that *Francis* I. was in Love with *Diana de Poitiers. Le Laboureur* (l) does not deny it. *Mezeray* ſpeaks of it more clearly than *la Planche*; and I have quoted a Modern Author, who never was a Proteſtant, and who confirms what is to be found in the Proteſtant Hiſtorians. I have ſet down his Words, but I have not obſerved that he falſly ſays, that young *Diana was admitted into the Service of Queen* Claudia, *as a Maid of Honour.* That Queen was the Daughter of *Lewis* XII. ſhe married *Francis* I. the 14th of *May* 1514, and was not a Queen till *January* following. But *Diana* married *Lewis de Brezé* the 29th of *March* 1514, and therefore ſhe was not Maid of Honour to Queen *Claudia*. A (n) Friend of mine has been pleaſed to acquaint me, that ſhe loſt her Husband in 1531, and that ſhe erected to him a ſtately Monument in the Church of *Noſtre-Dame* at *Rouen*; that ſhe died in 1566, at 66 Years and 27 Days of Age, and that ſhe lies buried at *Anet*. Beſides, *Hilarion de Coſte* (o) obſerves, that ſhe died the 26th of *April* 1566. The Reſult of all which is, that ſhe was born the 31ſt of *March* 1500, and that the Dutcheſs *d'Etampes* was ridiculous in making herſelf ſo young, in compariſon of her Rival. This will give me occaſion to rectifie the want of Exactneſs in the Paſſages above-mentioned, concerning the Age of the Dutcheſs of *Valentinois*.

The *Minime* I have quoted, does plainly enough intimate the Inceſt. I ſhall ſet down his Words ſomewhat at large, which contain ſome Particulars belonging to this Article. "(a) After the Death "of *Lewis de Brezé*, her Husband, King *Henry* II. "who was very much in Love with her, gave her "the Title of Dutcheſs of *Valentinois*, which ſhe "enjoyed till the Day on which ſhe died, which was "the 26th of *April* 1566, and ſhe was buried in the "fine Chapel which ſhe had built in her Houſe at "*Anet*, (which the Poets of her Time call'd *Dianet*) "after ſhe had divided her Eſtate between her Second Daughter *Louiſe*, Dutcheſs *d'Aumale*, and "the Children of the Eldeſt. She ordered by her "Laſt Will, that if ſhe died at *Paris*, her Corps "ſhould be carried firſt to the Church of the *Filles* "*Penitentes*, and from thence to *Anet*, and ſhe ſhewed her great Averſion for the pretended Reformed Religion. The Devices of *Diana*, Dutcheſs of "*Valentinois*, were more proper for *Diana*, Dutcheſs of *Angouleſme*. The firſt was a Dart or an "Arrow, (the Symbol of the Arms of Chaſt *Diana*, "Goddeſs of Hunting) with this Motto upon a Ribbon that went round the Dart, CONSEQUITUR "QUODCUMQUE PETIT, *She obtains whatever* "*ſhe asks.* She deſign'd to expreſs by this Device, "how much ſhe was in Favour with *Henry* II. and "the great Aſcendant ſhe had over that Prince, who "could not deny her any thing, and likewiſe over "all the Great Men of this Kingdom, and *Francis* I. "having obtained from him a Pardon for her Father, who by that King's Order, had been taken "up, and condemn'd to be beheaded, for favouring "the Retreat of *Charles*, Duke of *Bourbon*, out of "the Kingdom. The Sentence was not executed "upon him; his Majeſty having ſent him his Pardon at the Requeſt of that Lady..... *Diana* (b) "*de Poitiers* had alſo another Device, *viz.* a Grave, "out of which ſprung an Arrow, ſurrounded with "ſome Boughs and Shoots of a green Tree, with "this Motto, SOLA VIVIT IN ILLO, *She alone* "*lives in it*, meaning, that the only hope of a "Reſurrection makes us live in the loweſt part of "our Graves. This fine Device, and the third, which "was a *Diana* triumphing over Cupid, with this "Latin Inſcription, (1) OMNIUM VICTOREM "VICI *I have vanquiſhed the Vanquiſher of all*, were "not actually practiſed by *Diana* Dutcheſs of *Valentinois*, but by *Diana*, Dutcheſs of *Angouleſme*." Note, That all the Authors I have quoted, miſrepreſent the Favour obtained for *St. Vallier*: it was not ſo great as 'tis thought; the puniſhment of Death was only changed into that of a perpetual and very ſevere Impriſonment. The Pardon was expreſſed in theſe Words: (c) "We make it known that for "theſe Cauſes, and conſidering the ſaid Services, "and particularly that which the ſaid Great (d) "Seneſchal has done us, we have with our certain "Knowledge, full Power and Royal Authority, "changed, and do change the puniſhment of Death "into that hereafter mention'd. That is to ſay, the "ſaid *de Poitiers* ſhall be ſhut up for Life between "four Stone Walls, built above and underneath, "having but one Window to give him Meat and "Drink. In all other things the Contents of the "Sentence pronounced againſt him ſhall remain in "their force, and be entirely executed." If one ſhould infer from thence, that what is ſaid of *Diana*'s Favours beſtowed upon *Francis* I. is falſe, he might be told that the King cauſed a *Superſedeas* to be immediately drawn up, wherein he ordered the Parliament *to keep the ſaid* St. Vallier (e) *where he was*, till he ſhould give further Orders about it. Beſides, *Paſquier* may be alledged, who was perſuaded that (f) *if Death had not prevented it*, St. Vallier *had been reſtored in time to all his Honours.* If it be further ſaid, that the Crime of that Priſoner was one of thoſe, that leaſt deſerve a Pardon, one may anſwer, that the laſt Favour granted by his Daughter, was paid for to its full value; for her Father was involved in a Plot, wherein the King was perſonally concerned. 'Tis what the King declares in his (g) Pardon.

(Q) *That the Duke of* Guiſe *had a mind to marry* Diana de Poitiers.] I find in the 2d Volume (h) of the *Melange Critique de literature*, "That the "Dutcheſs of *Valentinois* occaſioned a Difference "between Admiral *de Coligny* and the Duke of *Guiſe*, "which produced afterwards very diſmal Effects. "Thoſe two Lords playing one Day at Tennis, the "Admiral told the Duke of *Guiſe*, that he *wondered* "*a Wiſe Man, and one of his Quality ſhould be willing* "*to marry a Whore*, meaning that Dutcheſs: the "Duke of *Guiſe*, who loved her, was offended at "his Diſcourſe, declared himſelf his Enemy, and "endeavoured to undo him. So that *the Whore*, as "the Admiral call'd her, or the Quarrel that happened upon her Account, did, perhaps, contribute "more to the *Paris*-Maſſacre than Religion, which "in all likelihood was only a pretence for it. Perhaps, "that *Herodias* ask'd the Admiral's Head........ "(i) I believe this Quarrel did very much contribute to the Maſſacre. What confirms me in this "Opinion is, that ſince the Maſſacre, the Duke of "*Guiſe* was often heard to ſay, that they had done "more than he deſired, and that he deſign'd a "Miſchief to no Body but the Admiral." The Author

(k) Above Rem. F, Letter f.

(l) See the Rem. F.

(n) Mr. Jannicon, *Advocate in the Council at* Paris.

(o) *Eloges des Dames Illuſtres*, tom. 1. p. 519.

(a) *Hilarion de Coſte ib.*

(b) *Id. ib.* p. 520.

(1) *In the Cabinet of Medals of the Library of the Minimes in the* Place Royale.

(c) *See the* Recueil de divers Memoires *printed at* Paris *in* 1623. p. 58.

(d) *A Prieſt having told him that two Gentlemen of* Normandy *had confeſt to him, that they were guilty of a State-Crime, he gave notice of it to the Court, and heard the Depoſitions of the two Gentlemen.*

(e) *That is, in the Priſons of the Palace at* Paris.

(f) *Paſquier, Recherches de la France*, b. 8. c. 39. p. m. 741.

(g) *The ſaid Great Seneſchal* ..... *has diſcovered to us the Plots formed againſt our Perſon, our Children, and our Kingdom.*

(h) *Pag.* 113.

(i) *Ibid.* p. 114.

POLYDAMUS (*Valentinus*) an *Italian* Physician, in the XVI. Century, published not only some * Books of Physick, but also an History, of which *Bembus* speaks † with Contempt.

POLYÆNUS, a *Greek* Author of a Collection of (*T*) Stratagems, was born in *Macedonia*. He dedicated that Work to the Emperors *Antoninus* and *Verus*, when they were engaged in a War with the *Parthians*. He was then a very old Man, and he told them, that if it had not been for his great Age, he would willingly have served upon such an occasion, but that instead of his Service he would present them with something Warlike, *viz.* the Stratagems made use of by the Ancients. I don't know whether *Casaubon* had a better Authority than this, to maintain that *Polyænus* * was a Soldier as well as a Gown-Man; but if he had none but this, I think he does not go upon very good Grounds. What he says that *Polyænus* was an Orator and an Advocate is more certain, for *Suidas* calls him a Rhetor. *Suidas* may be likewise alledged, to shew that *Polyænus* was a Man of War; for he ascribes to him not only a Book concerning the Taking of *Thebes*, but also three Books of *Tacticks*, or of the Art of drawing up an Army in Battalia. Yet this is no convincing Proof that a Man was a Soldier. Is it not an usual thing for several People to write about a thing, tho' they have only the Theory of it? *Suidas* mentions one **POLYÆNUS** a Sophist, a Native of *Sardis*, who lived (*Z*) in *Julius Cæsar*'s Reign, and who published some Pleadings, and three Books of the *Parthian* Triumph, &c. There is a third **POLYÆNUS**, an *Athenian*, quoted in *Eusebius*'s † Chronicle. I can't tell who he was. *Scaliger* β himself knew nothing of him. *Cicero* γ speaks of one **POLYÆNUS**, who was accounted a great Mathematician, but having afterwards embraced the Opinions of *Epicurus*, he maintained that Geometry was false.

POLITIAN (*Angelo*), in Latin *Politianus*, was born at ꝺ *Monte Pulciano* in *Tuscany*, the 14th of *July* 1454. He was one of the most (*A*) learned and polite Writers of his Age. He learn'd the *Greek* Tongue ‡ under *Andronicus* of *Thessalonica*, and made a great Progress in it. 'Tis said that he was bred up a Scholar with *Marsilius Ficinus*, at the Charges of (*B*) *Cosmo de Medicis*. The first

thor of these Words supposes, that the same Duke of *Guise*, who had a mind to marry *Diana de Poitiers*, had frequently declared, that the *Paris*-Massacre had been carried farther than he intended. Which is to confound the Father and the Son; for the Duke of *Guise*, who is here said to have been in Love with *Diana*, had been dead above 9 Years when the Massacre was performed. But the greatest Mistake lies in saying, that the Duke of *Guise*, who had been the Admiral's intimate Friend, fell in Love with the Dutchess of *Valentinois*, &c. than which nothing can be more false. Here is what has occasioned that Mistake. The Admiral advised against marrying the Dutchess's Daughter; which was taken as if he design'd to prevent the Elevation of the *Guises*, and it was one of the Reasons why those two Friends became Enemies. Here follows a Passage out of an Author of that Time. " (*k*) The first Cause of " the late M. *de Guise*'s Enmity was this. The late " M. *de Guise* your (*l*) Father, was desirous that M. " *d'Aumale* should marry the Second Daughter of " the Dutchess of *Valentinois*, to bring your House " into Credit. M. *de Guise*, your Brother, was a" gainst that Marriage, but durst not openly op" pose it, for fear of displeasing the King. Where" upon he applied himself to the Admiral, as being " his particular Friend, desiring him to advise him " what Answer he should make about it, adding, " that he would never consent to it upon any " Terms whatsoever. The Admiral being willing " to ease his Grief, did his best towards it, and af" ter some Discourse on both sides, his Conclusion " was, that it were better to have an Inch of Au" thority with Honour, than a Fathom without Ho" nour, and then they parted. But M. *de Guise* was " so far from approving that Advice, that in order " to exasperate King *Henry* against the Admiral, he " told the Marshal *de Vieille-ville*, who was their " common Friend, that he could never have be" lieved that the Admiral designed to prevent his " Advancement, by advising him against such a " Marriage.,,

It was the more necessary to rectifie this, because some learned Persons might have been deceived by it, and look'd upon it as a curious and secret Piece of History, concerning the Causes of the *Paris*-Massacre. The learned Journalists of *Leipsick* (*m*) who have published an Extract of the *Melange Critique de Literature*, took what has been said above concerning Admiral *de Coligny* and the Duke of *Guise*, who was in Love with our *Diana*, &c. as a very remarkable Matter of Fact. One can never be too careful in preventing some Readers from being imposed upon.

(*T*) *Of a Collection of Stratagems.*] It is divided into 8 Books. *Casaubon* is the first who published it in *Greek*. He added to it some Notes and the *Latin* Translation of *Vulteius*, which had been printed in 1550. There is a better and more correct Edition of it since the Year 1690, published by *Pancratius Maasvicius*, Principal of a College at *Delft*.

(*Z*) *Who lived in* Julius Cæsar's *Reign.*] *Vossius* (*a*) makes *Suidas* say, that this Sophist lived under *Caligula*. *Moreri* and *Konig* place him under the same Emperor; but it is certain that *Suidas* places him under *Julius Cæsar*, ἐπὶ τȣ͂ πρώτȣ καίσαρος γαΐȣ. According to *Charles Stephens*, he lived in *Cæsar*'s and *Mark Antony*'s Time, and this Author will have it, that the Triumph mentioned by *Suidas* was that which *Mark Antony* obtained over the *Parthians*: but he should have said, that it was *Ventidius*'s Triumph (*b*).

(*A*) *One of the most learned and polite Writers.*] The Learned are little divided in their Opinions about *Politian*'s Merit, and perhaps, no Author was ever more unanimously praised. The two *Scaliger*'s have bestowed great Encomiums upon him, which is no small Glory to him. This, and several other Passages in his Praise, may be seen in (*c*) Sir *Thomas Pope Blount*. You may also consult M. *Baillet* (*d*), and *Barthius* (*e*).

(*B*) *At the Charges of* Cosmo de Medicis.] I shall quote *Boissard* for it. *Is sumptu*, says he (*f*), *& promotione Cosmi Florentinorum principis, cum Marsilio Ficino bonis literis institutus est.* I don't know from whence *Varillas* had the following Circumstances. " (*g*) He was a Native of *Florence*, and his Parents " were so poor, that he was obliged to wait upon " *Julian* and *Laurence de Medicis*, when they went " to the College, and to carry their Books, that " he might make use of 'em.,, 'Tis not true that *Politian* was a Native of *Florence*, as *Varillas* and *Bullart* (*b*) affirm: he was born at (*i*) *Monte Pulciano*. Observe 1. That *Cosmo de Medicis* died in the Year 1464, and therefore *Politian* could not have enjoyed the Favours of such a Patron but till he was 10 Years of Age. 2. That *Marsilius Ficinus* was a grown Man when *Cosmo* died; and therefore *Boissard* expresses himself very ill. *Politian* says, in one of his Works, that being very (*k*) young he

---

* See *Lindenius renovatus* p. 1034.

† *Petrus Bembus epist.* 58. *l.* 5. *dated the* 1. *of March* 1545.

* Polyænus scriptor antiquus, elegans, acutus, eruditus & quod ad rem facit haudquaquam ἀπειροπόλεμος, sed qui utramque militiam (sagatam inquam & togatam) secutus est. *Casaub. epist. dedicat. Polyæn.*

† *Euseb. Chron. l.* 1. *apud Vossium de histor. Græcis p.* 404.

β *Notis in eum locum Eusebii apud Vossium ib.*

γ *Academ. quæst. l.* 2.

ꝺ *In Latin* Mons Politianus.

‡ *Vossius de histor. Latin. p.* 628.

(*a*) *De hist. Græc. p.* 227. *See also p.* 480.

(*b*) *Plutarch in* Antonio, *& Valerius Maximus l.* 5. *c.* 10. *mentions Ventidius's Triumph.*

(*c*) *Sir Tho. Pope Blount, censura author. p.* 357.

(*d*) *Baillet tom.* 3. *p.* 88. *& tom.* 4. *p.* 350. *and in the* Jugemens sur les Poetes, *tom.* 3. *p.* 61.

(*e*) *Barthius, advers. l.* 47. *c.* 5.

(*f*) *Boissard. in Iconib. ap. Blount ub. sup.*

(*g*) *Varillas, Anecdot. de Florence, p.* 193.

(*b*) *Bullart. Academ. des sciences tom.* 1. *p.* 277.

(*i*) *Leand. Albert. descript. Italiæ p. m.* 89.

(*k*) *Tenera adhuc ætate. Polit. in fine Miscellan.*

(*k*) Responſe à l'Epiſtre de Charles de Vaudemont Cardinal de Lorraine .... maintenant ſimple gentilhomme de Hainault *printed in* 1565. *See also* Brantome's *Memoirs p. m.* 146. *of the* 3*d Vol. in the Discourse about Admiral* de Chaſtillon

(*l*) *These Words are spoken to Cardinal* de Lorraine. (*m*) *See the* Acta Eruditorum *for* June 1698. *p. m.* 293, 294.

The firſt (C) Work that procured him ſome Reputation, was a Poem upon the Turnament of *Julian de Medicis*. Every Body owned that he had better Succeſs than *Luke Pulci*, an Illuſtrious Poet, who did likewiſe make a Poem on the Turnament of *Laurence de Medicis*, *Julian*'s Brother. The Hiſtory of the Conſpiration of the *Pazzi*, which he wrote ſometime after, was wonderfully cried up †; and being made Profeſſor of the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues at *Florence*, he got ſo much Glory by it, that the Scholars (D) left *Demetrius Chalcondylas*, who was a Native of *Greece*, and a very Learned Man; but his Lectures, if compared with thoſe of *Politian*, were dry and barren. *Politian*'s Reputation increaſed more and more, when he publiſh'd his *Latin* Verſion of *Herodian*, his *Miſcellanea*, and his *Latin* Poems. Had he lived longer, he would have enrich'd the Commonwealth of Learning with many * excellent Compoſures; but he died at (E) Forty Years of Age in 1494. If

† Taken from Paul Jovius Elog. c. 38.

* See the Preface of his Works written by Aldus Manutius. You'll find ſome Paſſages out of it in Geſner's Bibliotheque, f. 45.

he ſtudied the Platonick Philoſophy under *Marſilius Ficinus*, and that of *Ariſtotle* under *Argyropylus*.

(C) *The firſt Work that procured him ſome Reputation, was a Poem upon the Turnament.*] So ſays Paul Jovius: (l) *Politianus à prima ſtatim juventa admirabilis ingenii nomen adeptus eſt, quum novo, illuſtrique poemate Juliani Medicis equeſtres ludos celebraſſet, Luca Pulcio nobili poeta omnium confeſſione ſuperato, qui Laurentii fratris ludicrum equeſtris pugnæ ſpectaculum, iiſdem modis, & numeris decantarat.* Theſe Words intimate, that *Pulci*'s Poem was compoſed before that of *Politian*; and what confirms it is, that *Julian de Medicis* was *Laurence*'s younger Brother. *Baillet* and *Varillas* underſtood thoſe Words in the ſame ſenſe. "(m) *Julian de Medicis* won "the Prize at a Turnament, and was deſirous to "get a Paranymph not inferior to *Luke Pulci*, who "had ſignalized himſelf upon ſuch an occaſion, to "the advantage of *Laurence de Medicis*. *Politian* "undertook it, and as he perceiv'd that *Pulci*'s "Poem was not all of the ſame force . . . . . . he "choſe the fineſt Thoughts of the ancient Panegyricks . . . . . and made ſo fine a Piece, that after "he had read it, *Pulci* had a Mind to ſuppreſs his "out of ſhame and ſpite." *Baillet* (n) relates the ſame thing in different Terms. But if we may believe the ſame *Jovius* in a Book wherein he ſpeaks more largely of thoſe two Turnaments, that of *Laurence* was celebrated after that of *Julian*, and *Pulci* made his Poem after he had ſeen that of *Politian*. (o) *Ejus glorioſi laboris præmium fuit triumphus Politiani divini poetæ carminibus celebratus. Nec* MULTO POST *Laurentius ut fraternis laudibus æquaretur, novum ſpectaculum periculoſiſſimæ pugnæ edidit.* . . . . . . *Hujus quoque ſpecioſiſſimi certaminis memoriam* (p) *Pulcius ipſe Politiani æmulus perjucundo edito poemate ſempiternam fecit.* I don't know that this Author ever ſaid that *Pulci* was ſo aſham'd and vex'd, that he had a Mind to ſuppreſs his Poem. It might very well be an Invention of *Varillas*, as well as the pretended Method that *Politian* pitched upon to outdo a Work that was not yet in being.

(l) Jovius, elog. c. 38. pag. 88.

(m) Varillas Anecdotes de Flor. p. 194.

(n) Baillet, Enfans celebres ch. 27. p. 87, 88.

(o) Jovius in vita Leonis X. lib. 1. pag. m. 15.

(p) Some Lines before he calls him Aloyſius Pulcius. In his Elogia he calls him Luke. There were at that time three Brothers at Florence, who were good Poets, Luke, Lewis, and Bernard Pulci.

(D) *The Scholars left* Demetrius Chalcondylas.] I find this particular in *Jovius*: (q) *Tantos de ſe excitavit clamores favente juventute ut Demetrius Chalchondyles vir Græcus præſtantique doctrina, uti aridus atque jejunus à Diſcipulis deſereretur.* Here is an Inſtance of the exorbitant Liberty that *Varillas* took in his Paraphraſes. When *Argyropilus*, ſays he (r), "left his *Greek* Profeſſorſhip at *Florence*, *Politian* "took Poſſeſſion of it. Being a Man of wonderful "Parts, and leaving nothing unattempted to ſucceed "in his deſigns, he ſo pleas'd his Hearers that he "excluded all the *Greeks* who contended for that "Place. *Chalcondylas*, notwithſtanding his great "Humility, and the little Care he took of his own "Glory, could not brook the Affront that was put "upon his Countrymen. He uſed his Intereſt with "*Laurence de Medicis*, who deſign'd that he ſhould "teach his Children the *Greek* Tongue, and obtain'd "leave to read Lectures in competition, and at the "ſame time with *Politian*, to ſhew which of the "two ſhould have more Hearers. But *Chalcondylas*'s "harſh Accent, which he could never leave off, and "his difficulty to pronounce ſome *Latin* Words, made "him contemptible in compariſon of *Politian*, whoſe "agreeable Tone, and handſome Expreſſions "charm'd every Body. *Laurence de Medicis*, who "deſir'd by all means that *Chalcondylas* ſhould ſtay "at *Florence*, was oblig'd to procure him ſome "Scholars, and endeavour'd to perſuade *Politian* "to be more Civil to him. He undertook ſeveral "times to reconcile 'em, but he found by his own "experience, that it was more eaſy to reſtore "Peace to *Italy*, than between two Learned Men. "However, he prevented an open Rupture between "'em during his Life." This Narrative is grounded upon the following Words of *Jovius*. (a) *Demetrius Chalcondyles* . . . . *ſcholam Florentiæ inſtauravit, deſertam ab Argyropylo, & à Politiano deficientibus Græcis occupatam, ſed ambitioſo, peracrique æmulo, multis bonis, maliſque artibus ſuggeſtus locum, & nomen defendenti Demetrius ceſſit; Latina præſertim facundia inferior, & ob id raveſcente auditorio à juventute deſtitutus, quandoquidem vel apprimè doctus, facilè jejunus, & hebes, laſcivis & delicatis auribus videri poterat: quibus Politiani decantantis, & varios ſpargentis flores, jucunda argutaque vox, & ſalſa comitas mira dulcedine placuiſſet. Sed manſit Demetrio honeſtus gratiæ locus apud Laurentium, vel infeſto, & obliquè ſemper inceſſente Politiano, qui quum neminem è Latinis ſibi parem pateretur, Græcis ipſis eruditior exiſtimari volebat. Diviſit idcirco munera Laurentius, ut æmulationis lites dirimeret, & filii præceptorum contentione ad diſcendum accenderentur.* The Reader will not find in this Paſſage, that *Politian* excluded all the *Greeks* who undertook to diſpute the Chair, nor that *Chalcondylas* look'd upon it as an intolerable Affront, nor that *Laurence de Medicis* procured him ſome Hearers. The laſt Period of *Jovius* ſeems to be obſcure; the Meaning of it is, that *Laurence* divided that Imployment to compoſe the Differences ariſing from Emulation, and to excite in his Children a greater deſire of Studying, by the Diſputes of their Maſters. Methinks thoſe two Motives are hardly conſiſtent. Mr. *Bullart* ſays, (b) that *Chalcondylas was forced to reſign* his Place *to* Politian, *who diſpoſſeſt him of it by his Intrigues and Artifices*, and that Laurence de Medicis *gave 'em different Imployments to . . . . remove the cauſe of ſuch a troubleſome Emulation.*

(q) Paulus Jovius in elog. c. 38. p. m. 88.

(r) Varillas, Anecdotes de Flor. pag. 179, 180.

(a) Paulus Jovius, elog. c. 29. p. m. 69.

(b) Bullart Academ. des ſcienc. tom. 1. pag. 281.

(E) *He died at 40 Years of Age in* 1494.] It was (c) at *Florence* the 24th of *September*. *Volaterran* is more exact in his Computation than *Jovius*: the latter will have it (d) that he was in his 44th Year; the other ſays, (e) he was only 40 Years of Age. Several Authors are miſtaken, as to the time of his Death, which they place in 1509. *Eber* (f) and *Reuſnerus* (g) do ſo, as *Voſſius* obſerves. *Nathan Chytræus* mentions this Epitaph of *Politian*, as having been tranſcribed in St. *Mark*'s Church at *Florence*:

Politianus in hoc tumulo jacet Angelus, unum
Qui caput & linguas, res nova, tres habuit.
Obiit an. 1509. Septemb. 24.

This we find in the 110th Page of the *Variorum in Europa itinerum deliciæ*, collected by *Nathan Chytræus*, in the 2d Edition of the Year 1599. *apud Chriſtophorum Corvinum in* 8; but Father *Mabillon* (h) affirms, that there is no Epitaph on *Politian*'s Tomb. What he further ſays does not differ from *Chytræus*, and he places that Tomb in St. *Mark*'s Church at *Florence*, and *Politian*'s Death in 1509. as does alſo *St. Romuald* (i). *Voſſius* has ſolidly confuted this Date; he alledges a Proof grounded upon this, *viz.* That *John Picus Mirandula*, *Hermolaus Barbarus*, and *Politian* died in the ſame Year. *Palmerius*'s Continuator affirms it; and we have a Letter of *Marſilius Ficinus*, wherein *Politian*'s Death is lamented, as having quickly followed that of *John Picus*. Now every body owns that *John Picus* died in 1494. Theſe are *Voſſius*'s Proofs, to which I add, That *Peter Crinitus*, a Diſciple of *Politian* ſays (k), that the three Learned Men abovemention'd died the ſame Year that *Charles* VIII. made an Irruption into *Italy*, which plainly denotes the Year 1494.

(c) Voſſius de hiſtor. Lat. pag. 629.

(d) Vix quadrageſimum quartum ætatis annum attigerat. Jovius, elog. c. 38. pag. 89.

(e) Deceſſit quadragenarius. Volater. lib. 21. pag. 777. See a Paſſage of Marcilius Ficinus in Voſſius, ib.

(f) In Faſtis apud Voſſium ubi ſupra.

(g) In Diario hiſtorico apud eumd. ib.

(h) Mabill. in Muſeo Ital. tom. 1. p. 178.

(i) Peter de St. Romuald, Abregé Chronol. tom. 3. p. m. 262. ad ann. 1509.

(k) Crinitus de honeſta diſcipl. l. 15. c. 9.

If what is ſaid to have occaſion'd (F) his Death was true, one might ſay, that his (G) Morals were more anſwerable to the Uglineſs of his Face, than to the Beauty of his Wit. Some of his Poems were ſo much admir'd, that ſeveral Learned Men (H) made it their Buſineſs to comment upon them. I muſt not forget that he was * a Prieſt and Canon of *Florence*, and Preceptor † to the Children of *Laurence de Medicis.* He is ſaid to have ſpoke of the (I) Bible with great Contempt, where-

(F) *What is ſaid to have occaſion'd his Death.*] I'll make uſe of *Varillas's* Words. " (l) Death ſurpriſed him at 42 (m) Years of Age. Not being " able to ſatisfy the unchaſte Love he had conceiv'd " for one of his Scholars, he fell into a Fever, and " in the Violence of the Fit he made a Song for the " beloved Object, got out of his Bed, took his Lute, " and fell a ſinging ſuch a moving and doleful Tune, " that he expir'd as he was ending the ſecond Couplet, the ſame (n) Day that *Charles* VIII. croſs'd " the *Alps*, in order to conquer *Naples.* „ Thus *Varillas* has been pleas'd to tranſlate this Paſſage of *Jovius*: (o) *Ferunt eum ingenui adoleſcentis inſano amore percitum, facilè in letalem morbum incidiſſe. Correpta enim cithara, quum eo incendio, & rapida febre torreretur, ſupremi furoris carmina decantavit; ita, ut mox delirantem, vox ipſa, & digitorum nervi, & vitalis denique ſpiritus, inverecundè urgente morte, deſererent.* Some ſay, that not being able to reſiſt the violence of his Love, he broke (p) his Head againſt a Wall. Another Author gives a different Account of the Death of this Learned Man. " (q) " His Death, *ſays he*, was not very edifying. Mr. " *Balzac* ſpeaks of it in the following manner: We " are now certainly inform'd of the Circumſtances " of *Politian's* Death, which have been diſguiſed " by Cardinal *Bembo* in his Epitaph upon him. " As he was ſinging upon a Lute, at the top of a " Stair-caſe, a Song which he had formerly made " for a Young-Woman, with whom he was in Love, " when he came to ſome Verſes that were very " moving, his Lute fell from his Hands, and he " himſelf fell down Stairs and broke his Neck. " That Cardinal ſaid in his Epitaph, that he died " as he was ſinging ſome mournful Verſes upon the " Death of *Alexander* Duke of *Florence*, who had " been wickedly kill'd by his Couſin. „ There is a groſs Falſity in theſe Words; for this *Alexander* Duke of *Florence*, was kill'd 43 Years after *Politian's* Death. The Epitaph (r) upon the latter, made by *Peter Bembo* imports, that he died as he was ſinging ſome doleful Verſes on the Death of *Laurence de Medicis. Bullart* (ſ) advances a Falſity, when he makes Cardinal *Bembo* ſay, that *Politian fell down Stairs as he was ſinging upon his Lute an Elegy he had made on the Death of* Laurence de Medicis. The Verſes of that Cardinal, mention'd by him, ſay nothing of that Fall. What does an Author dream of, when he alledges a Paſſage that is plainly againſt him? 'Tis to be obſerv'd, that ſome ſay, that the Story mention'd by *Jovius* is a meer Calumny. Read theſe fine Words of *Pierius Valerianus.* (t) *Angelus Politianus, nullius ignarus eruditionis, & diſciplinæ, cùm in adverſa Medicorum procerum tempora incidiſſet, inclinantibus jam Petri, quem ipſe literis inſtituerat, rebus, in eam incidit ægritudinem, ut in multis, & variis moleſtiis, cogitationibuſque conſolationem nullam admittere voluerit, atque ita demum dolore, mæſtitiaque confectus expiravit. Quodque illi longè fuit infelicius confiſta in eum turpitudinis fabula maledicentiſſimis obtrectationibus proſciſſus, calumniatuſque eſt, utque ea gens promptiſſima eſt ad inſimulandum in invidiam Petri ipſius ignominioſam aliam mortis voluntariæ cauſam univerſo terrarum orbi magna cum ejus infamia propalavunt.* According to this Account, *Politian* died only of the Grief he conceived for the decay of the Houſe of *Medicis.*

(G) *His Morals were more anſwerable to the Uglineſs of his Face, than to the Beauty of his Wit.*] 'Tis likely that his great Zeal for the Houſe of *Medicis* expoſed him to horrid Calumnies, whilſt the *Florentins*, fond of a Republican Liberty, inſulted that Family in their Exile, and vented all ſorts of Paſquinades. I will not therefore affirm, that *Jovius's* Story is well grounded; but I may boldly ſay, that *Politian* contracted a Pride and Envy, which Learning is but too commonly attended with. We have ſeen, that in order to maintain himſelf againſt his Rival, he indifferently made uſe of lawful and unlawful Means. The following Paſſage will diſcover to us his Envy and Preſumption. (b) *Erat diſtortis ſæpe moribus, uti facie nequaquam ingenua, & liberali, ab enormi præſertim naſo, ſubluſcoque oculo perabſurda, ingenio autem aſtuto, aculeato, occulteque livido, quum aliena ſemper irrideret, nec ſua, vel non iniquo judicio expungi pateretur.* If you had rather have *Varillas's* Paraphraſe upon thoſe Words, read what follows. " (c) He had a very ugly Face, and a very large " and long Noſe; he ſquinted with his left Eye, " and was a pliant and nicely Ambitious Man. He " uſed a great deal of Art to diſguiſe himſelf, " eſpecially with reſpect to thoſe whom he was " moſt Converſant with; he could not bear that " any Body ſhould be praiſed, and equally envied " his Friends and his Enemies. He never liked the " Compoſures of other Men, and hated to be adviſed, tho' he was very free of adviſing others. " It appear'd ſometimes that he was ſenſible of his " Faults, and that he oppoſed Truth meerly out of " Malice; and yet he never owned that he had been " in a Fault. „

(H) *Several Learned Men made it their buſineſs to comment upon them.*] *Nicolas Beraldus* wrote a Commentary (d) upon *Politian's Sylva*, Intituled *Ruſticus*; and *John Murmelius* did the ſame. *Francis Sanchez*, Profeſſor at *Salamanca*, a Grammarian, ſo much praiſed by *Scioppius*, publiſh'd his Notes in the Year 1544 upon the Four *Sylva's* of *Politian. John Alexander Braſſicanus* publiſh'd a Commentary at *Nuremberg* in 1538, upon that which is Intitled *Nutricia. Jodocus Badius* added ſome Notes of his own making to *Politian's* Works, which he publiſh'd at *Paris*, in the Year 1519. in Folio. He likewiſe added to them the Notes of *Francis Sylvius* upon *Politian's* Epiſtles. Thoſe Epiſtles were reprinted in Quarto, for the ſame *Badius*, in the Year 1526. with the ſame Obſervations. *Braſſicanus* makes great Complaints againſt a Plagiary. *Meminit*, ſays he (e), *& Politianus in* Nutritiis, *ubi quidam nugator arrogantiſſimus noſtra ante nos dixit: Expungendus jam & plane radendus è Philologiæ faſtis quoniam, ut Cicero dixit, maluit improbè tollere quàm humaniter ſumere & agnoſcere.* This Complaint ſeems to concern a Man who ſtole Manuſcripts.

(I) *To have ſpoken of the Bible with great Contempt.*] *Ludovicus Vives* is, perhaps, the firſt who taxed him with it: *Angelus Politianus*, ſays he (f), *totam ſacram lectionem aſpernabatur. Melanchthon* expreſſes the thing with greater Energy; for he ſays, that *Politian* having read the Bible but once, complain'd, that he had never ſpent his Time ſo ill. (g) *Melanchthon ait ſemel ſolum ſacras literas legiſſe, dixiſſeque nullum ſe tempus pejus collocaſſe.* Which has been repeated (h) by a thouſand Writers. *Voſſius* (i) denies it as a thing little credible, and alledges two Reaſons for it: 1. That *Politian* was a Prieſt and a Canon of *Florence.* 2. That he preach'd a whole Lent, as it appears from theſe Words: (k) *Cum per hos quadrageſimæ proximos dies enarrandis populo ſacris literis eſſem occupatus, perlegi tamen libros carminum tuorum quos mihi pro ſingulari humanitate tua mutuoque inter nos amore dedicaveras.* Some (l) think that the ſecond Reaſon alledged by *Voſſius*, is a ſolid Confutation of *Melanchthon's* Paſſage; but others value neither of 'em. (m) *Hæc ratio nimis tenuis videbitur iis qui norunt quantopere Atheiſmus ſeu Epicureiſmus ſive libertiniſmus graſſetur inter Sacerdotes non tantum Canonicos & Monachos papales, ſed etiam inter Prælatos, Cardinales, Pontifices.* This is what *Voetius* ſays againſt the firſt Reaſon; and what he ſays againſt the ſecond is contain'd in the following Words: (n) *Quaſi vero poſtilliſtæ coram populo iſtic concionantes ut plurimum abſque lectione ſcripturæ, ex inſpectis legendis, poſtillis, homiliariis, dormi ſecurè, theſauris pauperum concionatorum & ſimilibus myrotheciis prædicare non ſoleant. Prædicavit etiam aliquando coram populo Cæſar Atheorum Vaninus, quod tamen illum è numero profanorum non eximit.* This Author obſerves, that one muſt not think, that *Melanchthon* and *Mornay* cried down *Politian*, being acted by a factious Spirit; for, adds he, *Gabriel Putherbeus*, a paſſionate Author againſt the Proteſtants, taxed (o) *Politian* with the ſame thing. But 'tis fit the Reader ſhould know that Putherwhereupon ſome make it a Queſtion, whether he ought not (K) to be reckon'd an Atheiſt; but others juſtify him, ‡ by denying the Fact. I could eaſily believe what we are told of the Judgment he made (L) of *David*'s Pſalms, and the Odes of *Pindar*. He is alſo charged with being (M) a Plagiary. *George Merula*

---

* *See the Remark I.*

† *Volaterr. l. 21. p. 777.*

(l) *Varillas ubi ſupra pag.* 195.

(m) *It ſhould be* 40.

(n) *This is not true.* Charles VIII. *went over the* Alps, *before the* 24 *of* Sept. 1494.

(o) *Jovius elog. c.* 38. *pag.* 89.

(p) Vulgo fertur obiiſſe Politianum fœdi amoris impatientia capite in parietem illiſo. *Voſſius ubi ſupra pag.* 629.

(q) *Peter de St. Romuald ubi ſupra.*

(r) *It is in* Jovius, *ubi ſupra, p.* 90, 91.

(ſ) *Bullart Academ. tom.* 1. *pag.* 278.

(t) *Pierius Valerianus de litterator. infelic. lib.* 2. *pag.* 70, 71.

(b) *Jovius ubi ſupra pag.* 89.

(c) *Varillas ubi ſupra pag.* [illegible]

(d) *Printed at Paris in the Year* 1518. *See* [illegible] *animadv.* Philol. *parte* 2. *pag.* [illegible] *but inſtead of* Beraldus, *read there* Beraldus.

(e) *Jo. Alexander Braſſicanus Schol. in Petronium.*

(f) *Ludov. Vives de veritate fid. Chriſt. lib.* 2. *pag.* 264. *edit. Baſil.* 1544.

(g) *Voſſius de poet. Lat. p.* 80. *He quotes tom.* 3. *declamationum pag.* 545.

(h) *Mr.* Teiſſier, *among others, in his Additions to the Elogies, tom.* 1. *p.* 11 *but inſtead of quoting* Melanchthon, *he quotes* Vives, *who does not ſay what he mentions.*

(i) *Voſſius ubi ſupra.*

(k) *Angelus Politianus epiſt.* 10. *lib.* 4. *ad Joannem Gottium Raguſinum fol. m.* 106.

(l) *Boxhorn. in monument. illuſtr. vir. apud Pope Blount, cenſ. author. pag.* 359. *Borremanſ. var. lect. pag.* 125.

(m) *Voetius diſput. theolog. tom.* 2. *p.* [illegible]

(n) *Id. ib. pag.* 12[illegible]

(o) *Putherbeus de tollendis & expurgandis malis libris l.* 1.

‡ *See the Rem. I.*

Putherbeus did but tranſcribe *Ludovicus Vives* Word for Word, and that *Du Pleſſis Mornay* (p) alledged the Teſtimony of the ſame *Vives*; and therefore the ſeveral Evidences amount only to one.

M. Crenius has lately imparted to the Publick the Obſervations which his great Reading afforded him concerning this Particular. He does not think the Reaſons alledged by *Voſſius* to be ſolid, and quotes (q) ſome Authorities, whereby it appears, that the Preachers did not much mind the Bible at that Time. What he quotes out of *Ariſtarchus Philoſophicus* (r), a Book little (ſ) known in this Country, is very curious. I have read in *Manlius*'s *Common Places*, taken moſt of 'em from *Melanchthon*'s Lectures, that it was not the Bible but the Breviary, of which *Politian* ſpoke with ſo much contempt. (t) *Politianus Canonicus Florentinus interrogatus an legiſſet horas Canonicas? Dixit ſemel perlegi iſtum librum & nunquam pejus collocavi tempus.*

(K) *Make it a Queſtion whether he ought not to be reckon'd an Atheiſt.*] *Voetius* (v) asks whether *Politian* ought not to be ſuſpected of Indifference in Point of Religion, as *Lucian* was, or of Epicureiſm; and he anſwers that, according to *Mornay*, (w) *Politian* complain'd, that he had never ſpent his Time ſo ill, as when he read the Holy Scripture. He adds, That he does not know how that Critick, and ſome others died; but that if one may gueſs at it from their Studies, they were like the Philoſopher *Averroes*, who ſlighting the Chriſtian Religion, wiſh'd his Soul might be among the Philoſophers. *Note*, That *Mornay* does not ſay what *Voetius* aſcribes to him. Authors are full of ſuch Falſities; which proceeds from their truſting to the Quotations of others, without taking the pains to verify them. I muſt not forget theſe Words of *Peter de St. Romuald*: (x) *Some Writers ſay, that* Politian *profeſs'd Atheiſm privately with* Marcilius Ficinus, *and* Domitius Calderinus *a Prieſt.*

(L) *What we are told of the Judgment he made of* David's *Pſalms, and the Odes of* Pindar.] He did not deny that there are many good and fine things in the Pſalms; but he pretended that the ſame things appeared in *Pindar* with more brightneſs and ſweetneſs. One of his Scholars is ſaid to have related this. Here are *Melanchthon*'s own Words. (y) *Dionyſius Capnio, qui adoleſcens audivit Angelum Politianum, narrabat eum interrogatum aliquando, quid de Pſalmis Davidis ſentiret, & ad quid prodeſſe eorum lectionem judicaret, reſpondiſſe, ſibi vero placere illa antiqua carmina, & continere ea partim honeſta præcepta, partim graviſſimas conciones de providentia & de ſceleratorum pœnis: partim querelas de infirmitate hominum utiles ad frenandos immoderatos impetus: partim hiſtorias ejus gentis. Sed addidit Politianus hanc collationem, res eaſdem dulcius & ſplendidius narrari in odis Pindaricis, ibi pingi Ixionem in rota clamantem,*

Diſcite juſtitiam moniti, & non ſpernere divos.

Ibi deſcribi Bellerophontem propter priores victorias factum inſolentiorem, & vehi Pegaſo intra cælum volantem, id eſt, res non neceſſarias ambitioſe moventem, excuti à Pegaſo & dejici in Ciliciam. Ibi celebrari Pelei caſtitatem, qui expetitus ab Acaſti conjuge, & ab ea falſo accuſatus, & objectus Centauris, ſervatur accepto gladio divinitus. Denique multas imagines pulcherrimas, multas hiſtorias & graviſſima præcepta tradi. Hæc Politiani oratio & ſi ſpecioſa eſt, tamen eſt hominis ignorantis diſcrimen inter genera doctrinarum, inter legem & Evangelium. *Manlius* in the Book above quoted, does not aſcribe this Opinion to *Politian*, but to *Lazarus Bonamicus*. (z) *Lazarus Bonamicus vir doctus cum eſſet interrogatus quomodo ei placeret Pſalterium reſpondit placere ſibi, recitari enim ibi egregias ſententias de providentia: ſed tamen nihilo melius eſſe quam Pindari poëma.* It does not appear from theſe *Latin* Words, that *Bonamicus* preferr'd *Pindar* to *David*, but only that he made 'em equal: And yet the Commentator upon *Gaffarel* affirms, on the Credit of a *German* Divine, that *Bonamicus* ſet a greater value upon *Pindar*, than upon *David*'s Pſalms: *Ejuſdem blaſphemiæ veneno correptus fuit* Lazarus Bon-Amicus *Italus, qui vociferabat* ſe Odas Pindaricas præferre hymnis Davidicis. *Vid. beatus Dn.* Selneccerus *Explicat.* in 1 *Cor.* 8. *p.* 405. (a). He had been ſaying that *Politian* uttered the ſame Blaſphemy. This ſhews that *Melanchthon*, or his Tranſcribers, are not uniform in their Accounts, which is an uſual thing when People go only upon a Hear-ſay. *Peucerus* (b) has inſerted in a Letter what I have quoted above out of *Melanchthon*.

(M) *He was alſo accuſed of being a Plagiary.*] Every Body knows it has been ſaid, that he appropriated to himſelf the Latin Tranſlation of *Herodian* made by *Tiphernas*. *Leo* X. ſaid, that this Calumny had been vented by thoſe who envied *Politian*'s Glory. (c) *Quamquam æmuli eam tranſlationem, uti nos à Leone Pontifice accepimus, Gregorii Tiphernatis fuiſſe dicerent, quod paſſim indoctis fuco, & falſis novorum coloribus interlita alieni ſtyli habitum mentiretur.* This is all that *Jovius* ſays of it: I ſhould be glad to know in what Author *Varillas* found the Particulars contained in the following Narrative. "(d) He "publiſhed a Tranſlation of *Herodian*, which did "not procure him all the Satisfaction he expected "from it, for tho' it was generally admired, a Re"port went about, that *Politian* had found it among "the Papers of the famous *Gregorio de Citta di Caſtello*, which he had bought; and this Report was "grounded upon ſome Conjectures, that were but "weakly confuted. Pope *Leo*, who was then *Poli"tian*'s Scholar, and heard whatever was ſaid *pro* "and *con* at his Father's Table, being deſired twen"ty Years after, by the Academiſts of *Rome*, to "tell 'em what he thought of it, left the thing "doubtful, and owned that the Style of that Tranſ"lation was not at all like the other Works of *Poli"tian*, and favoured much more of the Art and "Flouriſhes that were to be ſeen in the Compo"ſures of *Gregorio de Citta di Caſtello*. However, he "added (as if he had been afraid of having ſaid "too much) that this *Gregorio* had done nothing "that came up to the Tranſlation of *Herodian*.,, I am apt to believe that the Author of this Narrative went only upon *Jovius*'s Words, which he inlarg'd upon and paraphras'd, at Pleaſure, as if he had been writing a Romance. However, he did not underſtand 'em, for the Art and Flouriſhes that were obſerved in that Verſion, were not aſcribed to *Tiphernas*, but to *Politian*. If *Leo* X. had ſpoken about it, as *Varillas* will have it, *Jovius* (e) would not have rejected that Accuſation as a thing that deſerved no Credit. Note, that the beſt Criticks reject it; they find the ſame Spirit and the ſame Character in every Part of that Tranſlation. *Tiphernas* was not able to produce (f) ſuch a Maſter-piece. It had been an eaſier thing for *Politian* to Tranſlate the whole Work, than to give ſuch a Form to the Tranſlation of another.

It is more difficult to clear him of ſome other Thefts; for what can one Anſwer for him to theſe Words of *Budæus*? (g) *Plutarchus in eo libro, quem de Homero compoſuit; qui liber nondum Latinus ex profeſſo factus eſt, licet Politianus, vir ille quidem excellentis doctrinæ, ſed animi non ſatis ingenui, ex eo libro rerum ſummas ad verbum tranſcribens, quaſique flores præcerpens, non erubuit id opus pro ſuo edere, in quo nullam præterquam tranſcribendi ac vertendi operam navaverat.* *Budæus* told a Story, which has been printed, and we find in it a notable Trick of *Politian*. The thing is this. That Profeſſor ſet forth with an Emphaſis in his Auditory, many things as his own, which he had from *Herodotus*. *John Laſcaris*, who was one of his Hearers, took him aſide and reproved him for his Boldneſs. I could never have believed, anſwered *Politian*, that ſuch a *Græcian* as you are, ſhould have been Ignorant of the Artifice that is made uſe of in order to get the Eſteem of the Publick. You are three or four, at moſt, among my Hearers, who have read *Herodotus*. What's that in compariſon of that Crowd of Scholars, who applaud and extol me to the Sky? I am apt to believe that you will not be ſo malicious as to undertake to prejudice 'em againſt me; and I think it would be to little purpoſe if you went about it. I ſhall ſet down the Original Words. (h) *Non poſſum mihi temperare, quin tibi nunc referam, quod Budæus noſter de Angelo Politiano quondam nobis domi ſuæ narrare ſolebat, idque ſe ex Jano Laſcare, qui Politiani fuerat*

(p) *Mornay, Verit. de la Relig. ch.* 18. *fol. m.* 316.

(q) *Thomas Crenius animadv. Philolog. & Hiſt. part.* 4. *pag.* 21. *& ſeq. Leyden* 1698.

(r) *Written by* Henry Erneſtius *Counſellor to the K. of* Denmark, *and printed at* Hamburg *in* 1678. *in* 8.

(ſ) *Admodum raro &* inde hic paucis noto. *Crenius ib. p.* 25.

(t) *Joannes Manlius in Locorum Communium Collectaneis titulo de ſatisfactione p. m.* 99.

(v) *Voet. diſp. theol. Tom.* 1. *p.* 205.

(w) De Politiano refert *Pleſſeus in libro de veritate religionis Chriſtianæ,* quod diceret nunquam ſe bonas horas ſuas pejus collocaſſe quam in lectione Scripturæ. *Id. ibid.*

(x) *Peter de St. Romuald ub. ſup.*

(y) *Melancth. in Epiſtola ad Adamum Cratonem præfixa Exegeſi Nicolai Aſclepii Barbati de antiquo & profundo conſilio Dei.*

(z) *Manlius ub. ſup. titulo de veteri & novo Teſtamento p.* 81.

(a) *Gregorius Michael, præpoſitus Regius Flensburgenſis, notis in Jacobi Gaffarelli curioſitates p.* 110.

(b) *Peucerus epiſt. ad Chriſt. Carlowitz. See Saldenus de libris p.* 434.

(c) *Paulus Jovius ub. ſup. p.* 88.

(d) *Varillas ub. ſup. p.* 195.

(e) *Paulus Jovius elog. c.* 117. *p.* 259.

(f) Henry Stephens *did very much criticize it. Conſult* M. Crenius *ub. ſup. p.* 52. *& ſeq.*

(g) *Budæus annot. in Pandectas fol. m.* 151. *verſo.*

(h) *Franciſcus Duarenus operum p.* 1478. *edit.* 1584. *apud Colomeſium in opuſcul. c.* 31. *p. m.* 65.

Merula (N) was one of his Adverſaries. Some ſay that he was very much abus'd (O) by the Poet *Marullus*. He has been rightly placed in the Catalogue of Illuſtrious Children; but *Varillas*, who is the occaſion of it, (P) is wrong in his Chronology.

æqualis, crebro audiviſſe confirmabat. Cum enim Politianus Florentiæ Interpretationem Homericæ Iliados in magna celebritate aggrederetur, non ſine ingenti oſtentatione quæ de Homeri Poemate perſcripta ſunt ab Herodoto, auditoribus ſuis è ſuggeſtu recitabat, quo tempore Herodoti liber Græcè ſcriptus, à nullo adhuc converſus in linguam Latinam, nec Typographorum formis excuſus erat. Itaque Laſcaris, qui tum honoris cauſa auditorum numerum augebat, cum paucis quibuſdam aliis Græcè doctis hominibus, qui non ignorarent unde omnia, quæ pro ſuis recitaverat, hauſiſſet. Is igitur paulo poſt ad hominem converſus, eumque ſalutans, Dic mihi quæſo, inquit, Politiane, quo me Herodoti Opus inſigne, quod ante tot ſæcula conſcriptum eſt, in tanto cœtu ut tuum recitaſti? Cui mox ſubridens Politianus, Nunquam, inquit, putaſſem, Jane, hominem Græcum adeo ejus artificii rudem & ignarum eſſe, quo apud multitudinem exiſtimatio & fama comparari ſolet. Quaſi vero, inquit, non ſatis intelligam tres aut ad ſummum quatuor fortaſſis vos hic adeſſe, quibus Herodoti libros aliquando inſpicere contigerit. Sed quoniam hic ſit turba nobis applaudentium & in cœlum Laudibus ferentium vides, apud quos ſi exiſtimationem noſtram (quod minimè ſpero) vel tantillum lædere volueritis, Oratio profeſſoris veſtra non multum fidei ponderiſque habitura eſt.

I muſt not forget what concerns his *Miſcellanea*. He ſhewed them to his Friends in Manuſcript, which was the reaſon why this Work was very much talk'd of before it was printed; but a Story went about, that *Politian* had ſtolen many things from a Compilation, entitled *Copiæ Cornu*, and made by *Nicolas Perotus*: It was ſaid that the Duke of *Urbino* had lent him the Original, thinking it would be a thing acceptable to *Laurence de Medicis*. When *Politian* heard this News, he put off the Publication of his Work. In the mean time, the Book of *Nicolas Perotus* came out, and put an end to the Slander; for thoſe who compared it with *Politian's Miſcellanea*, did not find that the latter had ſtolen any thing from the other. *Politian* gives a large Account of this towards the End of the Book. I ſhall only ſet down ſome of his Words. (*i*) *Fit concurſus. Eſt in manibus* (Copiæ Cornu). *Effunditur. Excutitur. Quid multa? Calumnia me liberat. Vidiſſes continuo nonnullorum vultus lugubre quiddam tacentes . . . . . & erubeſcentes. . . . . . . Tantum conſiterit in præſentiarum, non idem ſpectâſſe me, quod ejus voluminis autorem, nec par utrique deſtinatum præſtitumque faſtigium. Quod ſi locos eoſdem pro re natâ forte uterque tractavimus, (id autem incidere alicubi fuit neceſſe), craſſior tamen inter nos, quàm inter Pyramum Thysbenque paries.* Notwithſtanding this, *Heresbachius* (*k*) called him a great Thief. Note, that *Politian* (*l*) complained that ſome Plagiaries had ſtolen from him, and he threatned to purſue them in order to recover his own.

(*N*) George Merula *was one of his Adverſaries.*] He was Profeſſor in the College of *Milan*: "He "(*m*) did not ſpare *Politian*, tho' the latter had ac"quired a ſufficient Reputation to ſtand upon his "own bottom. He ſhewed him, that though Na"ture had beſtowed upon him all the neceſſary "Qualifications to become a Learned Man, yet ſhe "had not made him ſuch. He obſerved to him above "thirty conſiderable Faults, which had eſcaped "him, and told him in a charitable Way (as he "ſaid) that whoever pretends to keep the firſt "Rank in the Commonwealth of Learning, muſt "have read and ſtudied more than all the reſt to"gether. . . . . (*n*) *Politian* was the greateſt Gainer "by his Death. He had publiſhed the firſt Century "of his *Miſcellanea*, and *Merula* being offended at "the Boldneſs of the Word *Century*, threaten'd to "alledge a World of Paſſages and Authorities, to "juſtifie the contrary to what was contained in it; "but he had only time to draw a rough Draught "of his Project." The laſt part of this Narrative is grounded upon *Jovius's* (*o*) Words; but I don't know what Authority may be alledged for the firſt. Obſerve, that *Politian* (*p*) wrote very ſharp Letters to *Merula*, and ſeem'd to deſire that *Ludovicus Sforza* would permit his Adverſary to publiſh his Critical Remarks.

(*O*) *Abuſed by the Poet* Marullus.] This we read in *St. Romuald*. Marullus, ſays he (*q*), *uſed him very ill under the Name of* Mabilius: which may ſignifie two things; either that *Marullus* took the Name of *Mabilius* in the Verſes he made againſt him, or that he gave it to *Politian*. I have lately peruſed his Poems, and found nothing in 'em under that Name: Nor is there any thing in *Politian's* Poem, to make one believe that this Monk is in the right. I find among his Poems ſome cutting Epigrams *in Mabilium Novatum Insubrem*, in which there is nothing whereby it may appear that they are levell'd at *Marullus*. And indeed, how can the Epithet *Insuber* agree with him, ſince he was a Native of *Conſtantinople*? Tho' I have not read the Poems of this *Mabilius*, I believe *Politian* was very much abuſed in ſome of 'em; for I find that *Politian* reviles him at a ſtrange rate, as it will appear from the following Verſes:

Si (*a*) *jam carmina noſtra te Mabili*
Urgent ad laqueum miſer crucemque,
Ne quæſo propera mori, tuum ne
Fraudes carnificem ſuo lucello:
Namque eſt percupidus tui, ac libenter
Is tantum tibi dempſerit Laborem.
Quid? noſtin hominem? negas: at idem eſt
Aurem qui ſecuit tibi ſiniſtram.

Mabilius jeſted upon *Politian*, becauſe his Neck was not ſtrait. The latter replied in the following manner:

Sed quid te cruciat reflexa colla
Si interdum gero? num parum videtur
Si pronos ſtatuis tuos cinædos,
Si pronum ſtatuent miſer Mabili
Mox te carnificis manus, velut nunc
Pronum te ſtatuunt Mutoniati.

Hard Words are ſtill thicker in the following Verſes:

Heres relictus à parente ſordido
Ille impudicus, temulentus aleo,
Spurcus, lutoſus, pedecoſus, hiſpidus,
Pannoſus, unctus, horridus, caprimulgus,
Edax, ineptus, inſolens Mabilius
Uno expatravit patrimonium die,
Gula belluante, &c.

Politian imitated the horrid Licentiouſneſs of *Catullus* and *Martial*, a ſort of Men, who made an ill uſe of a (*b*) Maxim of the Stoicks,

——— *Apud quos*
Nomen adeſt rebus, nominibuſque pudor.

He carried this Imitation too far in ſome other Poems, particularly in his (*c*) Invective againſt an Old Woman, who had loſt all the Signs of Youth, excepting Lewdneſs. That Satyrical Piece contains moſt of the Thoughts that are to be found in (*d*) two Odes of *Horace*, and thoſe Thoughts are there expreſſed more at large. The laſt Verſes are full of Obſcenities, the more offenſive, becauſe immediately after there are two very devout Hymns to the Holy Virgin. The wrong placing of thoſe Hymns ought not to be imputed to the Poet; 'tis the Fault of thoſe who got his Works printed. But to return to *Mabilius*, I ſhall obſerve, that his Epitaph is to be found among *Politian's* Verſes:

Flecte viator iter, fetet nam putre Mabili
Hac fovea corpus conditur atque animus.

If this be not a good Proof againſt *Peter de St. Romuald*, it ſeems at leaſt to be a ſign that he is miſtaken; for *Marullus* ſurvived *Politian* ſome Years. But I will not inſiſt upon this Reaſon; for an Epitaph affords an Opportunity of uſing ſo many injurious Words, that ſeveral Poets have falſly ſuppoſed that their Adverſaries were dead, in order to make uſe of ſuch a common Topick. I will not diſſemble, that a very learned Man, who made ſome Notes upon *Sannazarius's* (*e*) Poems, is of Opinion that *Marullus* and *Mabilius* mentioned by *Politian*, are one and the ſame Perſon.

(*P*) Varillas . . . . *is wrong in his Chronology.*] "*Politian* (*f*) was a Man of ſo wonderful a Ge"nius, that the like had not been ſeen ever ſince "*Ovid*. When he was but twelve Years of Age, "he made ſuch fine Verſes, that one would have "thought they had been compoſed in *Alexander's* "or *Auguſtus's* Time. And when he had a mind "to ſurpriſe the Learned, and to give out his Pro"ductions for ſome Fragments of *Anacreon* or *Ca"tullus*, which he had lately found out in ſome "old Manuſcripts of the Library of the Houſe of "*Medicis*,

---

(*i*) *Politian. in fine Miſcellan. apud Thomaſium de plagio literario p.* 235.

(*k*) Heresbachius in præfat. librorum ſuorum de re ruſtica furaciſſimum vocat Politianum, atque in Panepiſtemone aliorum non intellecta congeſſiſſe. *Thomaſius ib. p.* 235, 236.

(*l*) *Id. Polit. ib. ap. eumd. p.* 234.

(*m*) *Varillas ub. ſup. p.* 192.

(*n*) *Id. ib. p.* 193.

(*o*) Politiano obiter vehementi metu liberato, cum in miſcellaneam ejus centuriam cohortes & alas quas impetu obruerent emiſſurus eſſe diceretur. *Jovius elog. c.* 37. *p.* 87.

(*p*) *See the* 11 *Book of* Politian's *Letters.*

(*q*) *St. Romuald ub. ſup.*

(*a*) *Politianus lib. Epigrammatum.*

(*b*) [illegible] ens ſine circuitu omnia efferat.

(*c*) *It begins thus,* Huc huc Iambi arripite mi jam mordicus Anum hanc furenti Percitam libidine Tentiginoſam, catulientem ſpurcidam:

(*d*) *The 8th Epode* in anum libidinoſam, *and the 12th of the ſame Book* ad mulierem fœdam & anum.

(*e*) *See the Notes upon* Sannazarius p. 22[illegible] *Amſterd.* 168[illegible].

(*f*) *Varillas ub. ſup. p.* 1[illegible] nology. I have ſomething to ſay (Q) againſt Moreri. Thoſe who ſay, that Baſſo, or Baſſus, was the Name of Politian's Family, are miſtaken. Menage † alledges a Letter of M. Magliabechi to prove that his Name was Cino, and not Baſſo. He is called Meſſer Agnolo de Montepulciano in Machiavel's Hiſtory * of Florence; and we read in a Speech of Majoragius, that he changed his Name Angelus de Monte Policiano into that of Angelus Politianus. Sannazarius ‡ in two Satyrical Epigrams he made againſt him, calls him Pulicianus, alluding to the Word Pulex, a Flea.

POLITIAN (*Giovanni Angelo*), a Native of the ſame Town with the foregoing, taught Logick at *Poitiers*, about the Beginning of the XVIIth Century. *M. Daillé* was one of his Scholars †. He wrote two Controverſial (Z) Books againſt Cardinal *Bellarmin*, his Country-man; which makes me think that he renounced Popery, and turn'd Proteſtant.

POLITIAN (*Antony Laurentin*) was Profeſſor of Logick β in the Univerſity of *Piſa*. He was at *Padua* in the Year 1604, as it appears from the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Second γ Edition of his Dialogue *de riſu*, to which he annexed his Treatiſe *de cælis eorumque motibus*, and his Book *de natura Logicæ*. His Mother was deſcended from the Family δ of *St. Agnes*, to whom the Inhabitants of *Monte Pulciano* pay a great Veneration ζ.

POMPONATIUS (*Peter*) was born at *Mantua*, η the 16th of *September* 1462. He was a Man of ſo ſmall a Stature, that he wanted but little of being

" *Medicis*, the beſt Judges were impoſed upon by " him." M. *Baillet* (g) relates the ſame thing more at large in his *Hiſtory of Illuſtrious Children*, in which he places our *Politian* with great Reaſon; for tho' what *Varillas* ſays of him were not true, we know that *Politian* was very young when he made his *Greek* Verſes, which, in the Judgment of the Criticks (h), are better than the Latin Poems he compoſed long after. But here is a Chronological Fault. " (i) A Marriage was propoſed to *Virginia* " *de' Urſini*, between her Daughter, who was but " twelve Years of Age, and *Laurence de Medicis*, " the Eldeſt Son of *Peter*, who was not yet fifteen. " . . . . The Wedding was not celebrated with " great Pomp, becauſe the Circumſtances of the " Time did not allow of it. However, there were " many *Epithalamiums*, among which, that of *Po*- " *litian*, whoſe Verſes were worthy of *Auguſtus*'s " Age, tho' he was not older than the Bridegroom, " was beſt approved. Some few Days after, young " *Laurence*, hearing of *Colligne*'s Approach, was ob- " liged to leave his dear Spouſe, and to get on " Horſe-back, in order to learn the Art of War un- " der the Diſcipline of his Father-in-Law." *Laurence* was born in the Year 1448; and therefore *Politian* was four Years older than he. *Machiavel* (k), who is a more credible Author than *Varillas*, ſays, that the Wedding of *Laurence de Medicis*, and *Clarice de' Urſini*, was celebrated with a very magnificent Pomp after the Peace, that is, when the War, which *Colligne* made with the *Florentines*, was fully ended. He does not ſet down the Year of that Marriage, which is a great Fault in an Hiſtorian; but it may be inferred from his Narrative, that it was in the Year 1471. *Laurence* was therefore 23 Years of Age. Thus you ſee how little *Varillas* minded Chronology. He places all the chief Exploits of (l) *Colligne*'s War after the Death of *Peter de Medicis*, the Father of *Laurence*. He might have ſeen in *Jovius* (m) that the Peace was made before the Death of *Peter de Medicis*.

(Q) *Something to ſay againſt* Moreri.] I. Theſe Words are not exact, Laurence de Medicis *kept at* Florence Angelo Politian, *who was already a Prieſt*; for they give us to underſtand, that it was the firſt Favour *Politian* received from the Houſe of *Medicis*. Which is not true: we have ſeen above (n) that he ſtudied at the Charges of *Coſmo*, Grandfather of *Laurence*. II. *Moreri* ſhould not have ſaid *that* Laurence *made him Tutor to the Children of* Coſmo de Medicis; for he put his own Children under his (o) Tuition. If a Man ſhould give a Tutor to his Grandfather's Children, it would be a very rare thing. III. John de Medicis, *who was afterwards* Pope Leo X. was the Son of this *Laurence*, and not of *Coſmo*. IV. In order to ſay that *Politian wrote thoſe fine* Greek *and* Latin *Epiſtles, which are ſo much commended by the Learned*, the Publick ſhould have ſeen ſeveral *Greek* Letters of that Author; but if I am not very much miſtaken, there is but one in the Collection of his Letters. The following Words of *Volaterranus*, which *Moreri* read in *Voſſius* (p), were probably the occaſion of his Miſtake: (q) *Mihi ſolebat Epiſtolas cum Græcas tum Latinas ſcribere ſed ſermone vernaculo plures quod frequenter faciebat occupatus, ne naſutus aliquis ſtilo offenſus impræmeditato, præjudicata jam de eo opinione abſcederet.* Whereupon, without any farther conſideration, he fancied that we have ſome *Greek* Letters of *Politian* in Print. Obſerve by the by, the great Caution of *Politian*. He knew that he was famous for the Politeneſs of his Style, and that in order to keep up his Reputation, nothing ſhould come from him but what was elaborate. But becauſe his Occupations did not permit him to beſtow a great deal of Time upon the compoſition of his Letters, he reſolved to write often in *Italian*; for 'tis likely he dealt with his other Friends as he did with *Volaterranus*. Such is the Slavery of thoſe, who have the Reputation of Writing fine Letters; they dare not write familiarly and careleſly to their Friends. They know their Letters will be ſeen, and deſpiſed, unleſs they be written in a polite Style. *Balzac* did often groan under that heavy Yoak, and I have read that an ingenious Man envied the Happineſs of his Attorney, who might without any fear begin his Letters thus, *I have received yours: This is to let you know.* The *Manutius*'s, and the Latin Writers of the ſame Rank, found themſelves reduced to the ſad neceſſity (a) of beſtowing ſeveral Months upon a Letter. I am not therefore ſurprized at what we have juſt now ſeen in the Words of *Volaterranus*. 'Tis to be obſerved, that this Slavery reaches ſometimes as far as Converſation (b). But to return to *Moreri*. V. It cannot be ſaid that *Politian had a ſhare* in the Calamity of the Houſe of *Medicis*, *in which all the Men of Letters that were at* Florence, *found themſelves involv'd*; for he died whilſt *Peter de Medicis* was ſtill Maſter in his Country. 'Tis true, ſome think he vexed himſelf, when he foreſaw that this Lord would not be able to maintain himſelf, conſidering what Courſe things were ready to take: However, *Jovius* is of Opinion, that he was a happy Man, (c) becauſe he died before the Fall of that Family. VI. We are not told that he fell into Deſpair, *becauſe he could not win the Love of a Lady*. He is ſaid to have had a more vicious Paſſion, as we have ſeen (d) above. Don't mind the Paſſage of *Peter de St. Romuald*. VII. It cannot be ſaid that *Jovius* believes thoſe Stories; he only mentions them, without affirming them, and makes uſe of the Word *ferunt*. He is only to blame for not adding, that it was an uncertain Report; for he knew, without doubt, that People were divided in their Opinions about it; which is a ſufficient Reaſon for an Hiſtorian, when he ſays, *ſuch a ſlandering Report went about*, to add, *but ſome look'd upon it as a Calumny*. VIII. *Ludovicus Vives* does not ſay what (e) *Moreri* fathers upon him.

(Z) *Two Controverſial Books againſt Cardinal* Bellarmin.] One of 'em is intitled *Philoſophia Euchariſtica* being a Dwarf θ; but he was endowed with excellent Parts, and accounted one of the greateſt Philoſophers of his Age. He taught Philoſophy at *Padua* with a wonderful Reputation, having the famous *Achillini* for his Antagoniſt, whoſe puzzling Objections would have often confounded him, had it not been for his Skill in ſhifting them off (*A*) with a witty Jeſt. During the dreadful War in which the *Venetians* were engaged againſt the League of *Cambray*, he removed to *Bologne*, where he taught Philoſophy. Tho' he κ was married thrice, he never had but one Daughter, to whom he gave twelve thouſand Ducats for her Portion λ. I know that he did not Die μ in the Year 1512, as *Moreri* will have it; but the Time of his Death is unknown to me: I only know that ſome ſay he * attained to a great old Age, and ‡ others, that he died of a Retention of Urine in the 63d Year of his Life. His dead Body was removed to *Mantua*, where Cardinal *Hercules de Gonzaga* had it decently buried †. That great Philoſopher was brought into Trouble by the Monks, on account of (*B*) his Book concerning the Immortality of the Soul, and was ſuſpected of Impiety. The Clamours raiſed againſt him, and the

---

† See his Origines Italiennes at the Word Poliziano, & the 14th Chap. of his Anti-Baillet.

* Towards the end of the 8th Book p. m. 419.

‡ The 66 and 67 of the 1 Book.

† See M. Daillé's Life p. 4.

β See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Dialogue de riſu.

γ The 1ſt came out at Francfort. I make uſe of that of Marpurg 1606. in 8o.

δ Ant. Laurent. Politianus de riſu p. m. 144.

ζ Leand. Albert. deſcript. Italiæ p. 89.

η Lucas Gauricus in Schemat. tract. 4. fol. 57. verſo.

(g) Baillet, Enfans celebres p. 89. 90.

(h) Græcis vero quæ puerum ſe conſcripſiſſe dicit, ætatem nimis prudenter appoſuit ſuam. Tam enim bona ſunt ut ne virorum quidem Latina æque bene ſcripſiſſe putem. *Jul. Cæſar Scaliger poët. l. 6. p. m.* 740.

(i) Varillas ib. p. 40.

(k) Machiav. Hiſt. Florentine l. 7. p. m. 289.

(l) See his 2d Book of the Anecdotes de Florence.

(m) Jovius in vita Leonis X. l. 1. p. 14.

(n) In the Rem. B.

(o) See the 2d Letter of the 4th Book of Politian's Letters pag. m. 94.

(p) Voſſius de Hiſtor. Lat. p. 618.

(q) Volaterr. l. 21. p. 777.

(a) See Scioppius de ſtilo hiſtorico p. m. 61, 62.

(b) You'll find the following Words in the Menagiana p. 164. of the 1 Dutch Edition, upon occaſion of a Converſation of ſome learned Men. Every Body ſtrived . . . . to ſpeak well, for, contrary to what is now practiſed, People took care to ſpeak correctly, and to avoid Faults, when they met to Diſcourſe together. At laſt every Body being gone, *Balzac* and I happened to be alone. Then he took me by the Hand, and told me, now that we are alone, let's ſpeak freely, and without fearing to be guilty of a Soleciſm. (c) Eo præpropero vitæ exitu profecto felix fuit quod imminentem convulſæ Medicæ domus ruinam effugerit. *Jovius p.* 89. (d) *In the Rem.* F. (e) *'Tis the ſame thing that* Voetius *aſcribes to* Mornay *in the Rem.* K.

Books

ſtica de potentia & voluntate Dei ex tertio libro Bellarmini de Euchariſtia, expoſita & refutata, Amberg 1604. in 4o. And the other, *Philoſophiæ ſeu potius Sophiſticæ Euchariſticæ Bellarmini pars altera refutata*, Amberg 1606. in 4o.

(*A*) *His Skill in ſhifting them off with a witty Jeſt.*] This I find in *Jovius*. *In coronis*, ſays he (*f*), *conſeſſuque doctorum, quum exercitatione perutili ad prætoriam porticum diſputaretur, ita mirus evadebat, ut ſæpe ancipiti, & cornuto Achillini enthymemate circumventus, ſuperfuſo facetiarum ſale, adverſarii impetum, ex illis gyris, & mæandris explicatus eluderet.* Nothing can be more convenient in a Diſpute than this Talent of *Pomponatius*: If you are not able to anſwer an Argument, if you find it puzzling and inſoluble, you may eaſily get off with a witty Jeſt; all the laughing Men will be of your Side, and your Adverſary will be confounded. (*g*) *Solventur riſu tabulæ, tu miſſus abibis.* 'Tis upon ſuch an occaſion that this Maxim proves true,

> (*h*) *Ridiculum acri*
> *Fortius & melius magnas plerunque ſecat res.*

I knew a Profeſſor of Philoſophy, who made himſelf dreaded only upon that Account. He was a Man of no Depth, and would have been eaſily confounded in a Publick Diſputation, had it not been for his Jeſts and ſcurrilous Anſwers, which ſet the Aſſembly a laughing. The ſtrongeſt Objections came to nothing by that Means, and he was ſo fully perſuaded that it was the beſt way of anſwering a puzzling Argument, that he made uſe of it, even when he might have made a ſerious and ſolid Anſwer. But after all, Men of Senſe don't reſt ſatisfied with ſuch a Method; they laugh as well as others, but they adjudge the Victory to thoſe who deſerve the Honour of it. *Jovius* obſerves, that *Achillini* prevailed in a Diſputation by the inſuperable ſtrength of his Doctrine; tho' *Pomponatius*, his Antagoniſt, made the Aſſembly merry with his Jeſts, and uſed many ſly Tricks. (*i*) *Æmulum in corona veteratoriè diſputantem, & riſum ſalſa dicacitate ſæpius excitantem, ipſo invicto doctrinæ robore ſuperabat.* I muſt obſerve by the by, that *Pomponatius* made uſe of his Talent like a cunning Man, (*k*) to get the Scholars of *Achillini*, who was a plain Man, and unfit for Intrigues.

(*B*) *Brought into Trouble by the Monks, on account of his Book concerning the Immortality of the Soul.*] Theſe are *Jovius*'s Words: (*l*) *Exorto bello Veneto, poſt Achillini mortem Bononiæ profeſſus eſt; ubi cucullatos ſacerdotes contra ſe in caput, & nominis famam vehementiſſimè concitavit; edito ſcilicet volumine, quo animas poſt corporis mortem interituras, ex ſententia Ariſtotelis probare nitebatur; ſecutus Aphrodiſæi placita, cujus dogmate ad corrumpendam juventutem, diſſolvendamque Chriſtianæ vitæ diſciplinam, nihil peſtilentius induci potuit.* *Jovius* acts the part of an Hiſtorian, and of a Judge: he ſays not only that *Pomponatius* endeavouring to prove, that the Soul of Man is not Immortal, according to *Ariſtotle*'s Opinion, expoſed himſelf to the Perſecutions of the Monks, but alſo, that it is the moſt pernicious Doctrine that ever was, and the moſt proper to corrupt Youth and Chriſtian Morality. He is certainly much more in the right, when he keeps within the Bounds of an Hiſtorian, than when he ſets up for a Judge; for it is not at all material, whether *Ariſtotle* believed the Mortality of the Soul, or whether, according to the Principles laid down by him, one cannot well prove that it is not Mortal. And therefore if *Pomponatius* maintained only, that any one who ſticks to *Ariſtotle*'s Principles, muſt needs own that it dies with the Body, his Opinion is not pernicious, provided he acknowledges the Immortality of the Soul: but he expreſly and formally acknowledges it. He examines *Ariſtotle*'s Hypotheſis, he declares what may be ſaid for or againſt that Hypotheſis; he brings in the Philoſophical Reaſons that were alledged at that Time, to prove that the Soul is Mortal or Immortal; he obſerves wherein the Strength or the Weakneſs of the Arguments lies on both ſides, and then he concludes, that there being no demonſtrative Reaſon for the Mortality or Immortality of the Soul, that Queſtion ought to be looked upon as a Problematical one. Now, ſays he, ſince it belongs to God to decide the Problematical Queſtions about which Men diſpute, let us enquire whether he teaches us that our Souls are Immortal, and let us keep to his Deciſion, as a definitive and infallible Sentence. Afterwards, he proves by the Old and New Teſtament, that there is a future Life, and declares that his Faith is grounded upon that. Theſe are his Words: (*a*) *His itaque ſic ſe habentibus, mihi* (*ſalva ſaniori ſententia*) *in hac materia dicendum videtur, quod quæſtio de immortalitate animæ eſt neutrum problema, ſicut etiam de mundi æternitate: mihi namque videtur quod nullæ rationes naturales adduci poſſint cogentes animam eſſe immortalem, minuſque probantes animam eſſe mortalem, ſicut quamplures Doctores tenentes eam immortalem declarant . . . . . quapropter dicemus ſicut Plato 1. de Legibus certificare de aliquo cum multi ambigunt ſolius eſt Dei; cum itaque tam illuſtres viri inter ſe ambigant, non niſi per Deum hoc certificari poſſe exiſtimo . . .* (*b*) *Quapropter dico quod ante donum vel adventum gratiæ, multifariam per Prophetas, & bona ſupernaturalia hanc quæſtionem Deus terminavit, ut manifeſtè per vetus Teſtamentum eſt videre; noviſſimè autem per Filium, quem conſtituit hæredem univerſorum, per quem fecit & ſæcula, eam quæſtionem dilucidavit, ſicut ſcribit Apoſtolus epiſt. ad Hebræos . . . . .* (*c*) *Quantò lux diſtat à lucido, & veritas à vero, & quantò cauſa infinita eſt potior effectu finito, tantò efficacius hoc demonſtrat immortalitatem animæ; quare ſi quæ rationes probare videntur mortalitatem animæ, ſunt falſæ & apparentes, cum prima lux, & prima veritas oſtendant oppoſitum, ſi quæ vero videntur probare ejus immortalitatem, veræ quidem ſunt & lucidæ, ſed non lux & veritas; quare hæc ſola via inconcuſſa & ſtabilis eſt, cætera vero ſunt fluctuantes . . . .* (*d*) QUARE INDUBIE (*e*) *ipſam immortalem eſſe aſſerendum eſt: verùm ea non via incedendum eſt quà hujus ſeculi ſapientes inceſſerunt, qui cum ſapientes ſe dixerant ſtulti facti ſunt, quiſquis enim hac via procedet ut exiſtimo ſemper incertus & vagus fluctuabit.* How can ſuch a Man be accuſed of Impiety? How can he be taxed with denying the Immortality of the Soul? At this rate one might affirm, that all Divines bring into Queſtion the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Reſurrection, and in general, all the Doctrines which they ground only on Revelation, without pretending that they are diſcovered to us by the Light of Reaſon. The Holy Scriptures being once acknowledged to be the Word of God, will as effectually produce the Belief of the Immortality of the Soul, as a Geometrical Demonſtration. *Jovius* gives a very wrong Judgment of that Work of *Pomponatius*. Had he ſaid in general, that the denying of the Immortality of the Soul deſtroys Morality, he would have ſaid a thing which is look'd upon as a common Notion, tho' ſome are of Opinion it is not ſo certain as it ſeems to be; for, ſay they, if we conſider what ſort of Life the Chri-

ſtians

θ Erat puſillus corpore homuncio quodammodo nanus. *Id. ib.*

κ *Id. ib.*

λ *Id. ib.*

μ *See the Rem. B towards the end.*

* Obiit ſenio confectus. *Id. ib.*

‡ Sexageſimo tertio ætatis anno ſtranguria oborta Bononiæ fato functus eſt. *Jovius in elog. c. 71. p. m. 165.*

† *Id. ib.*

(*f*) *Paulus Jovius, in elog. c. 71. p. m. 164.*

(*g*) *Horat. ſat. 1. l. 2. verſu ult.*

(*h*) *Id. ſat. 10. l. 1. v. 14.*

(*i*) *Jovius ib. c. 57. p. 134.*

(*k*) Ipſo Pomponatio acri æmulo inſidioſa ambitione ſcholam ejus depopulante. Erat enim à ſumma ingenii ſimplicitate ambiendi, adulandique prorſus imperitus. *Id. ib.*

(*l*) *Jovius ub. ſup. c. 71. p. 164.*

(*a*) *Petrus Pomponatius de immortalitate animæ c. 15. & ult. p. m. 124.*

(*b*) *Id. ib. p. 125.*

(*c*) *Id. ib. p. 126.*

(*d*) *Id. ib. p. 128.*

(*e*) *Note, that his laſt Chap. is intitled,* In quo ponitur ultima concluſio in hac materia, quæ ſententia mi videtur indubie ſuſtinenda.

Books publiſhed againſt his Tract, did not make him alter his Opinion: he made ſeveral Replies, and inſtead of giving Ground, (C) went on ſtill, keeping to his firſt Corrective, *viz.* that the Divine Authority of the Scripture was the Foundation

ſtians live, their Lewdneſs, Slanders, Cheats, and whatever they do to get Money and Preferments, or to ſupplant their Competitors, we ſhall find that they could not be worſe, tho' they did not believe a future State. It will be found, generally ſpeaking, that they only forbear doing ſuch things as are attended with Infamy, or a capital Puniſhment: two Curbs, which would put a ſtop to the Corruption of an impious Man, *cæteris paribus*, as well as to theirs. But this is a Subject that requires a particular Treatiſe.

When I conſider that *Pomponatius* did publickly acknowledge, that we cannot be ſure of the Immortality of the Soul by the Light of Reaſon; I don't know what to think of the Diſtinction which he is ſaid to have made before his Judges. The thing is related by *la Mothe le Vayer* in the following manner, "(g) Such a Dexterity proved very "ſucceſsful to *Pomponatius*. That Philoſopher having declared with a Peripatetical Liberty, that he "did not believe the Immortality of the Soul, was "proſecuted by the Inquiſition; but he was ſet at "Liberty by virtue of this Explanation, that he did "not *believe* it, properly ſpeaking, ſince he *knew* "it *demonſtratively*, as he explained himſelf in a "long Diſcourſe to ſome Judges, who had been for"merly his Scholars, and who proved favourable "to him." I ſhould rather think that he diſtinguiſhed between Faith and Science, than between Science and Opinion, that is, he confeſſed to them that he had no Demonſtration of the Immortality of the Soul; but that he believed it as an Article of Faith revealed in the Scripture, and decided by the Councils. However it be, 'tis ſaid, he was not ſorry that his Book ſhould be confuted, and that he wiſh'd, the Poyſon that was in it might be deſtroyed by the Antidote of *Javellus*'s Anſwer. This the Jeſuit *Antony Sirmond* obſerves againſt a Man, who had publiſhed in *France Pomponatius*'s Tract without that Anſwer. (i) *Quem repugnante autore neſcio quis curioſus, aut impius, novis typis juſſerat in lucem exire ſolitarium & ſine reſponſione Javelli, quam ipſe Pomponatius ſcriptâ ad eum epiſtolâ ita olim comprobârat, ut palàm rogaret edici, ſe quoque ſuffragante, perſperſum libro ſuo venenum hoc antidoto niſi diluatur, peſtiferum eſſe, ac toti humano generi extimeſcendum.* I think this Philoſopher bethought himſelf too late of this Charitable Office; for he maintained his firſt Book twice againſt *Niphus*, and once againſt *Ambroſe*, Archbiſhop of *Naples*. This you'll find in the ſame *Sirmond* (k); but he ſays nothing of the Book publiſhed by *Contarinus*, in the Year 1516, againſt that of *Pomponatius*, which appeared very ſolid to that Philoſopher. (l) *Edidit juvenis adhuc (trigeſimum enim tertium ætatis annum tunc agebat) librum contra judicium Petri Mantuani doctoris ſui . . . . . . argumenta autem illa firma ad probandum & gravia fuiſſe, opuſque totum valde elaboratum perſpicitur, quia acutiſſimus ille phyſicus in libro quo defendit opinionem illam ſuam acriter oppugnatam ab eo quem inſtruxerat, tradit eum librum & doctiſſimum omnium & uberrimum eſſe qui omni tempore materiam illam perſecuti ſunt: additque videri prorſus eum divina opera & manu fabricatum fuiſſe.* Why then did he not Wiſh that this Anſwer of *Contarinus* ſhould be printed, for the Time to come, with his Treatiſe, as we are told that he wiſh'd ſuch a thing as to *Javellus*'s Anſwer? *Niphus* wrote againſt *Pomponatius* by *Leo* the Tenth's Order. On the contrary, others ſay, that *Pomponatius* compoſed that Tract, only to pleaſe that Pope; which is confuted by *la Mothe le Vayer*. I ſhall ſet down ſomewhat at large what he ſays upon this Subject; there are ſome things in it whereby the Text of this Remark will be illuſtrated. (m) "I need not enlarge upon theſe (n) Conſiderations, "ſince every Body may ſee what thoſe two great "Adverſaries, *Pomponatius* and *Niphus*, wrote upon "this Subject above a hundred Years ago. Where"upon I muſt adviſe my Reader to place among "the idle Fancies of *Poſtel*, a Man who is known "to have had very dangerous Intervals, what he "aſſerts that *Pomponatius* engaged in that Diſpute "only to pleaſe the Supreme (1) Pontif, of whom "he ſpeaks very diſreſpectfully. For, on the con"trary, 'tis certain that *Niphus* was pitch'd upon by "Pope *Leo* X. to whom he dedicated his Book, as "one of the moſt learned Men of his Time, and "beſt qualified to defend a Cauſe as far as it can be "defended. And indeed it muſt be confeſs'd, that "he did all that could be done for a Cauſe which "lay open to great Diſadvantages, being confin'd, "by a mutual Agreement, within the Bounds of "Peripatetiſm; and therefore *Pomponatius* Jeſts "upon him, ſaying, that he imitated a Phyſician "of *Milan*, who ordered all ſorts of Graſs that "grew in a Meadow, to be put into a Bath, in "hopes that ſome of 'em would prove beneficial "to his Patient: that in like manner *Niphus* had "made uſe of all ſorts of Arguments, tho' never "ſo weak and ſophiſtical, to know whether ſome "of 'em would be ſatisfactory. The beſt of all is, "that the Queſtion was only about *Ariſtotle*'s Opi"nion, which, after all, cannot be more prejudi"cial to Truth, than what he ſays of the Eternity "of the World, or the Quinteſſence of the Hea"vens, two Opinions that are laugh'd at in the "Schools." *Spondanus* having ſaid, that all Philoſophers were forbidden by *Leo* X. to teach that the Soul of Man is Mortal, and but one in all Men, obſerves, that 'tis thought *Pomponatius* occaſion'd that Bull. (p) *Occaſionem autem prædictæ de philoſophis ſanctioni dediſſe dicitur* Petrus Pomponatius *Mantuanus, Jovii in philoſophiâ præceptor: qui enarrans Ariſtotelem & Averroëm Bononiæ, animam poſt corporis mortem interituram ex ſententiâ Ariſtotelis probare conatus, juventutem valdè corruperat; ſe eo tuens quod philoſophicè loqueretur, ſed aliter, cùm Chriſtianus eſſet, ſentiret.* Thoſe Words are not exact; for *Spondanus* ſuppoſes that *Pomponatius* taught, as *Averroes* did, that all Men have but one Soul in ſome reſpects, than which nothing can be more falſe. If you read his Book, you'll find, that having laid down the Opinion of *Averroes* in the 3d Chapter, he declares in the very Beginning of the 4th, that it is abſurd and monſtrous, and that he does not think it neceſſary to confute it, becauſe *Thomas Aquinas* has ſo fully ſhewn the extravagancy of that Opinion (a), that the *Averroiſts* are not able to make any further Reply: he has ſo entirely overcome them, ſays he, that the only thing they can do is to give him hard Words. And therefore, referring his Readers to *Thomas Aquinas*, he only ſhews, that *Averroes* could not find that Chimerical Notion in *Ariſtotle*. (b) *Quamvis hæc opinio tempeſtate noſtra ſit multùm celebrata, & fere ab omnibus pro conſtanti habeatur eam eſſe Ariſtotelis, mihi tamen videtur quod nedum in ſe ſit falſiſſima, verum inintelligibilis, & monſtroſa, & ab Ariſtotele prorſus aliena: imo exiſtimo quod tanta fatuitas nunquam fuerit nedum credita, verùm excogitata: Et primo quidem de ejus falſitate nihil novi intendo adducere, ſed tantùm lectorem remittere ad ea quæ Latinorum decus Divus Thomas Aquinas . . . . ſed quoad ſecundum hæc paucula quæ mihi plenam fidem faciunt adducere ſtatui, videlicet hoc alienum eſſe ab Ariſtotele, verùm hoc eſſe figmentum, & monſtrum ab Averroe confictum.* Nevertheleſs, it may be ſaid that he was one of thoſe who occaſion'd the Bull of *Leo* X. of which he made no great Account. It was read and approved by the Fathers of the Council of *Lateran*, in the 8th Seſſion, in the Month of *December* 1513, and he wrote his Book concerning the Immortality of the Soul (c) in the Year 1516. From whence we may infer by the by, that *Moreri*, *Konig*, and ſeveral others are miſtaken, who place his Death in the Year 1512. According to the Calculation of his Nativity, mention'd by *Gauric*, he was born in the Year 1462. But according to *Jovius*, he died in the 63d Year of his Life, and therefore he muſt have died in 1525. *Freherus* (d) ſays, that he flouriſh'd in 1530, which is a Miſtake.

(C) *He made ſeveral Replies, and inſtead of giving Ground, went on ſtill, keeping to his firſt Corrective.*] Having no other Book of *Pomponatius* but his Treatiſe *de immortalitate animæ*, I am not able to give a Chronological Hiſtory of the Diſpute that was occaſion'd by it. All that I can do is to make uſe of what I find in *M. le Noble*. I don't take the Account he gives of it to be altogether exact, and I perceive ſeveral Omiſſions in it; but I am apt to believe that the things contained in it are true, and I muſt be contented with what he ſays, ſince I can have no better Information. "(e) That Tract "(f) made

(o) You'll ſee the Words of that Bull towards the end of the Rem. E in the Article of Spinoza.

(g) *La Mothe le Vayer, Dialogue de la diverſité des religions p. m.* 294, 295. *'Tis the laſt of the* 5 *Dialogues of* Oraſius Tubero.

(h) Animam eſſe immortalem eſt articulus fidei, ut patet per Simbolum Apoſtolorum & Athanaſii. *Pomponatius ub. ſup. p.* 126.

(i) *Antonius Sirmondus de immortalitate animæ p.* 1, & 2. *His Book was printed at Paris in the Year* 1635, *in* 8.

(k) *Id. ib. in appendice p.* 19, & 20.

(l) *Johan. Caſa in vita Gaſparis Contarini p. m.* 124.

(m) *La Mothe le Vayer, de l'immortalité de l'Ame, p.* 135, 137. *of the* 3 *Vol. of his Works in* 12.

(n) *That whether Ariſtotle teaches the Immortality of the Soul.*

(1) *Lib.* 1. ...orb. ...ord.

(p) *Spondanus Annal. Eccleſ. ad ann.* 1513. *n.* 20. *p. m.* 308.

(a) Tam luculenter tam ſubtiliter adverſus hanc opinionem invehitur, ut ſententia mea nihil intactum, nullamque reſponſionem quam quis pro Averroe adducere poteſt impugnatam relinquat; totum enim impugnat, diſſipat, & annihilat, nullumque Averroiſtis refugium relictum eſt, niſi convitia & maledicta in Divinum & Sanctiſſimum virum. *Pomponat. ub. ſup. p.* 8. & 9.

(b) *Id. ib.*

(c) Finis impoſitus eſt huic tractatui per me Petrum filium Joannis Nicolai Pomponatii de Mantua die 24 menſis Septembris anno Chriſti 1516. Bononiæ. *Pomponat. ib.*

(d) *In Theatro p.* 1441.

(e) *Le Noble, Tableaux des philoſophes tom.* 2. *p.* 80.

tion on which he grounded his Belief of the Immortality of the Soul. His Tract de (D) *Incantationibus* was also accounted a very dangerous Book. He did not ‡ want Apologists; but the only thing that some alledge in his Justification is, that he renounced (*E*) his Atheism. If the Charge of Impiety laid upon him was only grounded

‡ See the Rem. E.

" (*f*) made a great Noise, and when it came out " at *Venice*, *Pomponatius* adds, that the Monks, whom " he denotes by the Word *Cucullati*, raised great " Clamours against his Doctrine ..... (*g*) Those " *Cucullati* inveighed in their Sermons against *Pomponatius*, as against a downright Heretick, caused " the Reading of that Treatise to be forbidden by " the Patriarch, whom that Philosopher calls a Man " of a most Holy Life, but very ignorant in Philosophy and Divinity; and afterwards, by a Decree " of the Senate, the Sale of it was prohibited ... " .... A Man of Letters ..... wrote against that " Treatise with great Moderation ..... (*h*) *Pomponatius* composed an Apology in Answer to that " Author: in the two first Books of that Apology, " he confuted all the Arguments alledged against " his Doctrine, and proved again, that *Aristotle* did " not believe the Immortality of the Soul, and that " it could not be proved by Natural Reasons. In " the third Book he very much blames the violent " Anger of Brother *Ambrose* of *Naples*, of the Order of the Hermits of St. *Augustin*, who had been " made Bishop some few Days before. He complains, that preaching his Lent Sermons in the " Cathedral Church of *Mantua*, he had spoke very " injuriously of him from the Pulpit, calling him " publickly an heretical and impious Man, who did " not believe the Resurrection and the Immortality " of the Soul. He therefore declares, that he believes that the Souls are Immortal, and that he is " ready to Die in defence of that Truth; but that " he is fully persuaded of it, because God hath " revealed it to Men, and not because the Light of " Reason teaches it, and that if Brother *Ambrose* " will give him good Reasons for the contrary, he " is ready to hear him. „ Afterwards he says, that the Patriarch of *Venice* wrote to *Peter Bembo*, who was at *Rome*, *to desire him to get that Tract concerning the Immortality of the Soul, condemn'd by the Pope. Bembo* read it, *and tho' he found nothing in it contrary to Truth, yet according to the Duty of his Place, he communicated it to the Master of the Apostolical Palace, who having read it, was of* Bembo's *Opinion, that it contain'd nothing but what was agreeable to the Doctrine of the most celebrated Doctors of the Christian Religion* (*k*).

" (*l*) Afterwards, as 'tis usual to grow hot by " much Disputing, and to carry things too far, (*m*) " he maintains and endeavours to prove, that the " Immortality of the Soul is repugnant to Natural " Reason, and that nothing can be more injurious " to Faith, than to pretend to prove it by Natural " Arguments. ...... (*n*) When *Pomponatius* had " made this Apology, a new Book, written by *Augustin Niphus* a Philosopher, came out against his " first Treatise concerning the Immortality of the " Soul. *Pomponatius* answered it by another Tract, " intitled *Defensorium*, wherein he shews *Niphus*'s " Ignorance, further proves what he had advanced, " and at last concludes that Work with these " Words: If Christ is raised from the Dead, we shall " likewise rise, and if we rise, the Soul is Immortal. But it is certain that Christ is raised; therefore 'tis true that the Soul is Immortal. This is, " says he, the only solid Argument whereby the " Immortality of the Soul can be proved: whoever " is not contented with it, does not deserve the " Name of Christian, and does not know the excellency of Faith, which ought to have the first " place in all our Reasonings, and is alone sufficient " to lay down in a solid manner what cannot be " maintain'd any other way. „

We shall see by and by, that *M. le Noble* censures some of these Thoughts of *Pomponatius*.

(D) *His Tract* de incantationibus *was also accounted a very dangerous Book.*] It appears from it, that he believed nothing of what is said about Magick and Witchcraft, and he lays great stress on I know not what Virtues that some Men have had, whereby they produced miraculous effects. He alledges many Instances of it; but his Adversaries don't allow that they are true, or free from Magick. Here is a Passage of *Theophilus Raynaud*. (*o*) *Exempla quæ ad specialem aliquorum hominum proprietatem individualem ad miros effectus præstandos, præsertim sanationum, à Pomponatio adduntur, vel fabulosa sunt, vel Magica, ut Andreas Laurentius capite* (*p*) *lib.* 4. *contendit. Ridiculè autem Zacutus* (*q*) *dicta q.* 14. *inter magnos autores quibus fidem abrogasse piaculum propè esse dicit, numerat Pomponatium in Opere de Incantationibus, exempla illa recensentem.* He refers us to his *Theologia Naturalis*, wherein the following Words against that Book of *Pomponatius* are to be found. (*r*) *Nec minor Pomponatii culpa, qui* (*s*) *idem conatus in opere de incantationibus ad extremum tamen subjicit opus suum correctioni Ecclesiæ, à qua ut rectè suprà divinavit* (*t*) *Carpentarius aliud expectare non potuit, quàm unam lineam à principio ad finem usque ductam. Ita enim factum est, collocato ante aliquot annis, inter reprobata, illo opere, in quo Buccaferr. l. de divinat. per somnium lect.* 29. *ait asseri à Pomponatio, multa falsa, & multas ac magnas nugas.* A Fellow Jesuit of *Theophilus Raynaud*, expressed himself with greater force. (*v*) *Pomponatii de Incantationibus opusculum certè miratus sui tam diu toleratum ab Ecclesia; nunc recens & meritò in Romano Indice damnatur; verissimum enim quod ab Antonio Mirandulano* (*x*) *scriptum, hoc opere Pomponatium, se nec philosophum bonum, nec quod fœdius Christianum bonum exhibuisse, cum effectus omnes mirificos cælorum influxionibus adscribit, adeò ut velit & religiones & leges easumque latores ab iis dependere. Quod prorsus impium. Pomponatius* speaking of the Cures that are ascribed to the Virtue of Relicks, said a thing which at first seems to be offensive, but one might give it a very good Turn according to the common Hypothesis. He affirms, that (*w*) the Bones of a Dog would as effectually produce a Cure, if the sick Person, who relies on the Virtue of those Relicks, formed the same Imagination concerning those Bones, as concerning the Bones and Ashes of Martyrs. The Controversial Writers of the Church of *Rome* being not able to deny, that some supposititious Relicks have wrought Miracles, as 'tis pretended, say, that the good Intention of those who have recourse to them, procured 'em such a Reward from God.

(*E*) *The only thing that some alledge in his Justification is, that he renounced his Atheism.*] *Helidæus*, a famous Physician of *Forli*, said, that his Master *Pomponatius* was an Atheist. *John Wierus* hopes that this Philosopher did not die in that Condition. (*a*) *Pomponatium ante redditum spiritus extremi halitum resipuisse ex singulari Dei miseratione, nec permansisse* ἄθεον, *sperare volo. Talem etenim fuisse, à clarissimo medicinæ ornamento D. Helidæo Forolivienfi, ejus olim discipulo non semel auditum est. Voetius* tells us that *Gratarolus* made an Apology for *Pomponatius*, and is so equitable as not to follow the Stream. (*b*) He owns, that most of the Catholick Writers, and some Protestant Authors, call that Philosopher an Atheist, and lays some stress upon the Remark of the Apologist, that the Opinion of *Pomponatius* about the Mortality of the Soul, concern'd only *Aristotle*'s Hypothesis. He should have said, that this is a plain Proof of that Author's Innocency, unless he design'd to hide his pernicious Doctrine under that Cover. *Voetius* alledges that Restriction. (*c*) Gul. Gratarolus Medicus Italus (*quem propria scripta uno volumine in* 8. *Basileæ edita, & testimonium* Bezæ in epistolis, *ut &* in dedicatione libelli *cujusdam, aliorumque prætereà doctorum virorum suffragia, quorum familiaritate Basileæ & alibi usus est, à Pietatis zelo commendant*) *eum contra calumniatores tuetur, & piè pro eo tempore vitam cum morte commutasse scribit: in* epistol. dedicator. *Operibus Pomponatii anno* 1567. *Basil. editis præfixa...... Illud penitus considerandum, quod respondet: Eum ex mente Aristotelis negasse animæ immortalitatem: quod, ut illi cum aliis philosophis ac Theologis ita judicantibus commune fuit* (Plutarcho, Galeno, Aphrodisæo, Justino Martyre, Theodoreto, Origene, Nysseno, Nazianzeno, Cajetano in 3. de Animâ) *sic non debet hic fraudi esse: nisi probari posset illum sub hoc schemate subdolè & tutò voluisse hunc Atheismum spargere in animos auditorum. Nisi itaque alia ex dictis, scriptis, factis ejus certior demonstratio suppetat, utique in benigniorem partem, immo in optimam accipienda sunt illa, quæ ille pro modulo & conditione sua de Fato, Providentia Dei, & prædestinatione conscripsit: in quibus si non rei dignitati, & solidis Theologis per omnia satisfaciat, saltem hoc præstat, ne* nigra

(*f*) That is, the Tract concerning the Immortality of the Soul.

(*g*) Id. ib. p. 81.

(*h*) Id. ib. p. 82.

(*k*) Id. ib. p. 83.

(*l*) Id. ib. p. 84.

(*m*) That is, Pomponatius *in his Apology*.

(*n*) Id. ib. p. 85, 86.

(*o*) *Theoph. Raynaudus de stigmatismo sacro & profano sect.* 2. c. 4. p. m. 321, 322.

(*p*) The [illegible] of the 1. Book de [illegible]

(*q*) [illegible] of the 1. B. [illegible] medicorum principum historia.

(*r*) Id. in Theolog. naturali, distinct. 4. quæst. 1. art. 4. n. 14. [illegible] 2[illegible], [illegible]

(*s*) That is, to reject what is said of the [illegible] operations.

(*t*) That is, [illegible] in Alcin.

(*v*) Mart. Delrio, disquisit. Magicar. l. 1. c. 3. p. m. 22.

(*x*) Lib. 4. de singulari certamine.

(*w*) Pomponatius dicere non verebatur in [illegible] acquisita ex veneratione Ossium Divis ascriptorum, si essent ossa canis & tanta & talis de eis haberetur imaginatio non minus subsequeretur sanitas. Jo. Wierus de præstigiis Dæmon. l. 5. c. 1[illegible] p. m. [illegible] He puts the 2 Books of Pomponatius de Incantamentis [illegible] 12.

(*a*) Wierus, [illegible] lib. 5. in cap. [illegible] operis p. m. [illegible]

(*b*) [illegible] Disput. Theol. 1. p. 1[illegible]

(*c*) Id. ib. p. 1[illegible]

grounded on his Book concerning the Immortality of the Soul, no Accusation was (F) ever more impertinent, and a more signal Instance of the unjust Prepossession

nigra Atheismi nota illi tam peremptoriè inuratur. Hæc ego in re dubia, postquam omnia ejus opuscula præsertim modo nominata videre contigit: qui ante multos annos ex lectione solius tract. de Incantationibus *(ubi placitis Avicennæ & Averrois nimis adhærescens, in supernaturalibus quibusdam satis misere fluctuat) & ex communi aliorum judicio sinistram magis de illo opinionem conceperam.* I must not omit the Epitaph made by one on this Philosopher. (†) *Hic sepultus jaceo. Quare? nescio: nec si scis aut nescis curo. Si vales, bene est: vivens valui. Fortasse nunc valeo. Si aut non, dicere nequeo.*

(F) *If the charge of Impiety . . . . . . no Accusation was ever more impertinent.*] In the first place, to assert, that the Principles of *Aristotle* lead us to believe that the Soul is Mortal, is at most, a Personal Injury. Whoever says so, is, at most, guilty of doing an Unjustice to a Man, who was Preceptor to the Conqueror of *Asia*, and the Founder of a most flourishing Sect. But how can it be call'd an Impiety? In the second place, since *Aristotle* is Dead, and consequently cannot give an Account of his Faith, and clear the Equivocations that are in his Books, any one may be allowed to declare against him, if he finds in his Writings, as many or more plausible Reasons, to shew that he taught the Mortality of the Soul, than to shew that he taught its Immortality; and therefore nothing can be more harmless, than to convert the Opinion of *Aristotle* on this great Point into a Problem, and to maintain the Affirmative or Negative, according as the Reasons alledged by him for or against the Immortality of the Soul, make a greater Impression. If any one does not take his Sense right, he does him an Unjustice; but after all, it is only a *Material* Injury, which *Aristotle* would be obliged to forgive, by imputing it to his want of Exactness, and to his Variations and Contradictions. (*d*) *The most* (*e*) *famous of all his Interpreters, and many others after him, as the two* Gregory's, Lescot, Cajetan *and* Simon Portius *have acknowledged, that* the Mortality of the Soul *was a thing altogether necessary, according to the Doctrine of that Philosopher.* And therefore he must needs have advanced some Maxims, which afford a fair pretence to ascribe to him such an impious Doctrine. 'Tis therefore a most ridiculous thing to assert, that none but an impious Man can have such Thoughts of *Aristotle*'s Doctrine; and consequently, the pretended Impiety of *Pomponatius* would be grounded on a gross Illusion. Nay, he could not be suspected, with any shew of Reason, of any Design prejudicial to the Memory of that Ancient Philosopher. In the third place I observe, that one may assert, not only that it appears from his Works, that he did not believe the Immortality of the Soul, but also that his System, such as the Schoolmen have been pleased to explain it, and such as it is explained to this Day in the Universities, cannot afford any proofs of the Immortality of the Soul, and affords many Arguments for the contrary. For in short, the main part of that System is, 1. That Natural Bodies are made up of two Substances, one whereof is call'd Matter, and the other Form: 2. That the Form of all Natural Bodies, Man only excepted, is a corruptible Being, which never fails to be destroyed when the Compound perishes, that is, whenever a Stone, a Tree, a Dog, &c. are converted into Natural Bodies of another Kind. From whence it necessarily results, that those who follow this System, can give no proofs of the Immortality of the Soul; for in order to it, they should make it appear, that it is Immaterial: but how can they shew it, since they own, that the Souls of Brutes, tho' endowed with the Faculty of Feeling, Discerning, and Desiring, are Material Beings? 'Tis to be observed that in *Pomponatius*'s Time, they knew of no Philosophical System but that of *Aristotle*, so that to assert, that the Immortality of the Soul could not be proved by the Principles of that Philosopher, and to assert that it could not be proved by Philosophical Reasons, was one and the same thing. This goes a great way towards excusing, and even justifying *Pomponatius*; the rather, because the Platonick, or any other Sect, did not afford better Proofs. *Descartes* is the only Philosopher who laid down very solid Principles concerning this Subject. He says, that all thinking Substances are distinct from Matter, from whence it necessarily follows, that the Soul of Man is a Spirit, or a simple indivisible Being, and consequently Immortal. No *Cartesian* will scruple to say, that the Principles of the old Philosophy cannot afford one good Proof of the Immortality of the Soul. Were it not an extravagant thing to maintain, that a *Cartesian* who says so is an Impious and Atheistical Man? Why then was *Pomponatius* so ill used? It will be said, that a *Cartesian* acknowledges that his System affords a demonstrative Proof of the Immortality of the Soul, whereas *Pomponatius* acknowledged no System that afforded such an Argument. Such a difference cannot be admitted, but by supposing that this Philosopher rejected the *Cartesian* System, tho' he knew it; but he knew nothing of it, and therefore his Fault lies only in not inventing a System, according to which whatever thinks is Incorporeal and Spiritual. This is the Fault of a great many Orthodox Men, and consequently a chimerical one. I further add, that tho' he had rejected the Supposition whereby whatever Thinks is distinct from Matter, he had done nothing but what is done at this Day by Men of great Parts, who relying intirely on the Authority of the Holy Scripture, as *Pomponatius* did, cannot be justly charged with Irreligion. Lastly, I observe, that nothing can be more unworthy of a Divine, than to cry down a Philosopher as an impious Man, because he declares, that in order to free our Minds from the Uncertainty of Human Reason, we ought to rely on the Word of God, as containing (*g*) the true Foundation and most certain Proofs of the Immortality of our Souls. This is what *Pomponatius* did, for which he was cruelly persecuted by the Monkish Tribe. What a shameful and horrid thing was this!

I go farther, and say, that the *Cartesians* themselves, who are convinc'd of the Immortality of the Soul, because the Principles of their Philosophy appear evident to them, act the part of Wise Men, when they advise their Readers to have recourse to Faith, as (*h*) *an anchor of the Soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entreth into that without the Veil*, that is to ground their belief of this Doctrine on the Authority of GOD, which is the true Remedy of our Uncertainties, and supplies the obscurity of our Reason. For if they have right Notions of things, they ought to know, that what appears evident to them, does not appear so to many other Philosophers, who oppugn it. I have read in a Book of M. *Arnauld*, that *Gassendus*'s Reply to *Descartes* made (*a*) many disbelieve at *Naples*, the Immortality of the Soul, because *Gassendus* used all his Skill to enervate the Arguments of *Descartes*, concerning that Doctrine; which shews, that the *Cartesian* Principle is not evident to every body. Nay, 'tis certain that if Ignorant People made use of common Sense, they could never be sure of the Immortality of their Souls, whilst they see that the greatest Philosophers don't agree about it. Were an Ignorant Man to blame if he argued in this manner? If *Descartes*'s Arguments were evident, *Gassendus* could not oppugn them, so as to satisfy many People; for if *Gassendus* had writ a Book to prove, that the Whole is not greater than its Parts, and that if things equal be taken from things equal, the remainder will not be equal, no Body would have been persuaded of the truth of those Assertions: and therefore since *Gassendus*, and many other great Philosophers, want no Followers, when they oppose *Descartes*'s Doctrine, they must needs oppugn a Doctrine that is not evidently true; there is therefore some Obscurity in it, it appears true to some, and false to some others: how can I then resolve the Matter, being no Scholar, and having no Skill in Disputes? Some of those Great Men must needs be mistaken, and therefore whatever Party I side with, I run the hazard of being in an Error. People should argue thus, when they see that Learned Men are divided in their Opinions. But if they should do so, how would they get out of their Uncertainties? There is an effectual way for it, as to the Immortality of the Soul, which is to have recourse to the Light of Revelation. And therefore if a *Cartesian* should imitate *Pomponatius*, he ought to be accounted a wise Man. 'Tis well done of him to maintain stoutly the truth of his Principle, and to answer, to the utmost of his Power, those

† Konig. biblioth. p. 654.

(*d*) *La Mothe le Vayer, de l'immortalité de l'ame pag. m.* 139.

(*e*) *Alexander Aphrodisæus.*

(*g*) Hæc sola via inconcussa & stabilis est, cætera verò sunt fluctuantes. *Pomponat. de immort. animæ cap. ult. p. m.* 125.

(*h*) *Heb.* vi. 19.

(*a*) *See the Remark G.*

poſſeſſion of thoſe who perſecute the Philoſophers. For he did not queſtion the Immortality of the Soul; on the contrary, he maintained that it was a moſt certain Doctrine, and that he was fully perſwaded of it. He only aſſerted, that the Natural Reaſons alledged for it, are not ſolid and ſatisfactory. Now, tho' a good Uſe (G) may be made of the Opinion he oppoſed, and tho' the Philoſophers, who make

thoſe who Object, that Subſtances diſtinct from Matter are, perhaps, of ſuch a Nature as to be able to preſerve their Exiſtence without having any Thought, and that therefore Spirituality is not a neceſſary proof of Immortality: for if the Life of the Soul conſiſts in Thought, 'tis certain, that a total Ceſſation of Thought would be a true Death of the Soul, and therefore the Soul might die without ceaſing to be a Spiritual Subſtance, as Dogs die without ceaſing to be a Corporeal Subſtance: but after all, if he adviſes his Neighbour to relie on the Word of God, he is to be commended for it. Note, that *Scaliger* the Father, one of the greateſt Wits of his Time, and who was never accounted a Libertin, acknowledged, as *Pomponatius* did, that 'tis a Matter of Faith to know whether there is a Future Life. It has been always ſuſpected or believed, ſays he (*b*), but 'tis ſtill a Matter of Diſpute to this very Day.

I ſhall conclude with ſome Paſſages of a Diſpute that laſted ſome Years between a Miniſter of *Rotterdam* and a Miniſter of *Utrecht*. The firſt (*c*) owns, " That tho' he believes that Matter is not capable of " any Senſation or Knowledge, yet he has no *diſtinct* " *Idea* and no *clear Perception* of that Truth, and can- " not prove it to thoſe who deny it. What I perceive " in it, *ſays he*, is confuſed and undiſtinct...... " (*d*) Can *M. Saurin*, and his Rational Collegues ſay " in Conſcience, that they have a clear Perception " and a diſtinct Idea of the Immortality of the " Soul? Are not theſe Propoſitions clear in appea- " rance, that *whatever has a Beginning ought to have* " *an End*; that a Being, whoſe Duration is divided " by Moments, Days and Years, cannot be Eternal, " becauſe it would be Infinite, and that Infinite Du- " ration would contain an infinite Number of Mo- " ments, and yet there would be but an Infinite " Number of Days and Years; and therefore there " would be as many Months and Years as Moments, " which is a palpable Abſurdity. An impious Man " ſays, theſe are clear Perceptions, and they ap- " pear to him to be ſo." The Deſign of this Miniſter is ſomewhat like *Pomponatius*: he will have us to miſtruſt our Reaſon, and to depend on the (*e*) Authority of God. Here follows his Adverſary's Anſwer: (*f*) " I anſwer, that I have a clear Per- " ception and a diſtinct Idea of the *Immortality of* " *the Soul*. I know that the Soul is a Spiritual and " Indiviſible Subſtance, which can only be deſtroy- " ed by Annihilation: I know that there is a Provi- " dence, a ſupreme Juſtice, a ſupreme Felicity, a " natural Morality, in ſhort, a great many Truths, " which have a neceſſary connexion with the Im- " mortality of the Soul, and conſequently they " would be Chimerical Notions, if the Soul was " Mortal: Muſt a Chriſtian Philoſopher be leſs Or- " thodox than *Plato*? Muſt he give the preference " to *Epicurus*, when he draws up a Parallel of the " Ancient Philoſophers? .... (*g*) Mr. *Jurieu* " confutes himſelf, when he ſays that *thoſe Percep-* " *tions are clear in appearance*: For if they are only " clear in appearance, nothing can be concluded " from them in Favour of thoſe that are really " clear."

I ſhall make ſome ſhort Obſervations upon theſe Words of *M. Saurin*. I. *M. Jurieu* does plainly ſuppoſe, that in order to have a *diſtinct Idea* and a *clear Perception* of the Spirituality of the Soul, we muſt clearly apprehend, *that Matter is not capable of any Senſation or Knowledge*. How comes it then, that Mr. *Saurin* leaves this unanſwered? Should he not have ſaid, that he has a diſtinct Idea and a clear Perception, whereby he knows, that an extended Subſtance cannot have any Senſation. II. 'Tis not ſufficient to know, that the Soul *cannot be deſtroyed but by Annihilation*; for the ſame may be ſaid of Extenſion, and yet Trees and Beaſts are Mortal. Mr. *Saurin* ſhould therefore have expreſſed himſelf thus, " I know that the Soul cannot ſubſiſt " without Thought; the diſtinct Idea I have of a " Spiritual and indiviſible Subſtance ſhews me, " that if it were deprived of Thought, it would " ceaſe to exiſt." III. *Plato* and *Epicurus* are improperly alledg'd; for he ſuppoſes that Mr. *Jurieu* is not ſo Orthodox as *Plato*, and that he prefers the Doctrine of *Epicurus* to that of the other Ancient Philoſophers; which is falſe. He acknowledges the Immortality of the Soul, but he has not a clear Idea and a diſtinct Perception of it: he means, that his Idea of it is not ſo evident, as that whereby we know the Properties of Numbers, and the connexion of a Local Preſence with the Extenſion of Matter. Do you think that *Plato*'s Idea of the Immortality of the Soul was as clear as that? When a Man declares, that he does as the generality of Mankind do, that is, that his Perſuaſion goes farther than his Evidence, the Charge of Unbelief laid upon him is a falſe Accuſation. He cannot be accuſed of Heterodoxy, ſince he believes what ought to be believed; all that can be ſaid againſt him is, that he does not act like a Philoſopher. IV. The Diſtinction between Ideas apparently and really clear, is inſignificant; for the Clearneſs of Ideas does neceſſarily imply a Relation to our Minds, and is never ſeparated from Appearance; they are always ſtyled or denominated clear from Appearance. An Object may be true, tho' it appears falſe; but an Idea, which appears obſcure, is neither really nor apparently clear; and therefore, if the clear Ideas of the Immortality of the Soul are inconſiſtent with Ideas that are apparently clear, Mr. *Jurieu*'s Objection is good, ſo far is he from confuting himſelf, as his Antagoniſt would have it. V. Mr. *Saurin* is very much to blame for not anſwering the Objection: he might have confounded Mr. *Jurieu* in that reſpect, who falſly ſuppoſes that thoſe who ſay, that *whatever has a Beginning muſt have an End*, go upon this, that an infinite Duration would contain as many Months and Years as Moments. He ſuppoſes that they look upon it as a great Abſurdity. But he ſhould have known that the Atheiſts aſſert, that the Duration of Matter had no Beginning, and will never End: and therefore they don't look upon the neceſſity of admitting an infinite Number of Moments, and an infinite Number of Months, Years and Ages, &c. as a good Reaſon to reject a Doctrine.

(G) *Tho' a good uſe may be made of the Opinion he oppoſed, and tho' the Philoſophers who...... enforce the humane Proofs .... ought to be commended.*] What I have to ſay upon this, cannot be better, nor more clearly and nobly expreſt than in the Words of a Divine, who was a Follower of *Deſcartes*, and therefore I ſhall make uſe of no other Commentary upon the Text of this Remark. " (*h*) 'Tis " ſaid that the Reading of *Gaſſendus*'s Works, led " ſome Perſons at *Naples*, into the Error of *Epicu-* " *rus*, concerning the Immortality of the Soul. It " muſt be confeſt, that the Inſtances of that Phi- " loſopher, againſt the Metaphyſical Meditations of " *Deſcartes*, may lead young People, not well con- " firmed in the Chriſtian Faith, into that pernicious " Error, becauſe he uſed all his Skill to ſhew, that " Reaſon affords no ſolid Arguments to prevent our " believing, that there is no other Diſtinction be- " tween the Soul and the Body, than between a " thin and ſubtle Body and a groſs one. On the " contrary, I know that ſome pious Perſons are of " Opinion, that what *Deſcartes* wrote upon that " Subject, ought to be look'd upon as an Effect of " God's Providence, who was willing to put a ſtop " to the Propenſity, which many People of theſe " latter Times ſeem to have for Irreligion, by a " Method ſuited to their Diſpoſition. They are a " ſort of Men, who will admit nothing but what " may be known by the Light of Reaſon; they are " altogether unwilling to begin with Faith; they " look upon moſt of thoſe, who profeſs themſelves " pious Men, as weak minded People; and 'tis im- " poſſible for them to have any Senſe of Religion, " becauſe they are poſſeſt with this Notion (which " in moſt of 'em is an effect of their corrupt Mo- " rals) that whatever is ſaid of another Life, is " only a Fiction, and that the Soul dies with the " Body. It ſeems therefore, that the moſt effectual " Means to remove the greateſt Obſtacle to the Sal- " vation of thoſe Men, and prevent the ſpreading " of that Contagion, was to make 'em ſenſible of " their

---

(*b*) *Thus I render ſomewhat freely theſe Words*, Cæterum eſſe alterum eſſe ab hoc eſſe adeo neſcimus ut quotidianis vel ſuſpicionibus vel perſuaſionibus res etiam num ſit controverſa, ſola fide res agatur. *Scaliger adverſus Cardanum exercit.* 307. c. 33. p. m. 990.

(*c*) *Jurieu, Religion du Latitudinaire p.* 393.

(*d*) *Id. ib. p.* 394.

(*e*) *Note, that he does not require we ſhould know that Authority by a clear and diſtinct Idea, that is, that we ſhould evidently know that God has revealed ſuch and ſuch things to us.*

(*f*) *Saurin, Juſtification of his doctrine p.* 457.

(*g*) *Id. ib. p.* 458.

(*h*) *Difficultez propoſées à Mr. Steyaert 9. part p. 81. & 82.*

make it their Buſineſs to enforce the Humane Reaſons, alledg'd for the Immortality of the Soul, ought to be commended and incouraged; yet ſince they are only Philoſophical

“their great Miſtake, in thinking that 'tis a Piece of weakneſs to believe the Immortality of the Soul. Now have we not Reaſon to believe that God, who diſpoſes of his Creatures as he thinks fit, and makes humane Means ſubſervient to his Providence, deſign'd to reclaim thoſe Unbelievers, by forcing them to miſtruſt the Certainty of their Notions, when he raiſed a Man ſo well qualified to work upon 'em, a Man who had an extraordinary Penetration to dive into the moſt abſtracted Sciences, who wholly applied himſelf to Philoſophy, who openly profeſs'd himſelf free from all Prejudices, and by that very thing found out a way to convince the moſt incredulous, (if they will but open their Eyes to ſee the Light) that nothing can be more contrary to Reaſon, than to aſſert, that the Soul periſhes with the Body. But how did he make it appear? By laying down from clear Principles, and ſuch as are only grounded on Natural Notions, which Men of Senſe cannot but acknowledge, That the Soul and the Body, that is, what thinks and what is extended, are two Subſtances wholly diſtinct, ſo that 'tis impoſſible that Extenſion ſhould be a Mode of a thinking Subſtance, and Thought a Mode of an extended one. This being well proved, (as 'tis in *Deſcartes*'s Meditations) no Libertin, if he has any Juſtneſs of Thought, can remain convinced, that the Soul dies with the Body. For, *&c.* (a).„

This long Paſſage of Mr. *Arnauld* ſhews what Advantage may accrue to Religion from the Hypotheſis oppoſed by *Pomponatius*: it may be made uſe of againſt ſome Libertins, who will ſee before they believe, and who deſpiſe the obſcure Arguments alledged by Divines. Nothing can more effectually reclaim thoſe Men, than to convince 'em of the Immortality of the Soul; 'tis an Inlet to the right Way, and this firſt Step may be attended with happy Conſequences. *Pomponatius* could not work upon 'em in that manner, he would rather have confirmed them in their Error, and conſequently his Hypotheſis is more prejudicial than advantageous in order to convert that ſort of Men; and indeed he would be more praiſe-worthy, if, inſtead of giving himſelf ſo much trouble to examin the Arguments of the Peripateticks, he had endeavoured to find out better Proofs of the Immortality of the Soul, than thoſe which ſeem'd weak to him. 'Tis to be obſerved, that Mr. *Arnauld* alledges this particular Fact concerning *Deſcartes* and *Gaſſendus*, to ſhew that the Inquiſitors of *Rome* are no diſcerning Men. “The Cenſors of *Rome*, *ſays he* (b), little minded the Advantage of Religion, when they put into their *Index* that Book of *Deſcartes*, wherein he proves the Immortality of the Soul by Philoſophical Arguments, more ſolidly than was ever done; and when they put into it none of *Gaſſendus*'s Works, nor even that wherein he endeavoured might and main, to confute thoſe Arguments: which is to deprive thoſe, who have no Faith, of all humane Means to free themſelves from their Prejudices againſt that important Truth. Is it not to permit the ſwallowing of the Poyſon, and hinder the taking of the Antidote? This they have done again, by putting into the *Index* another piece of *Deſcartes* concerning the ſame Subject. For one of his Followers, who forſook him as to his Metaphyſical Notions, having maintain'd in a Placart, that, were it not for Revelation, one might believe, that Thinking is only a modification of Matter; *Deſcartes* thought himſelf obliged to confute ſuch a dangerous Doctrine, and ſhew the Abſurdity of it; and yet this Book is prohibited in the *Index* with this Title, *Notæ in programma quoddam ſub finem Anni* 1654. *in Belgio editum*; without condemning the Placart at the ſame time. Once more, this is to permit the poyſoning of one's ſelf, and at the ſame time to forbid the uſe of a Counter-poyſon.„

I have quoted in the Remark *C* an Author, whoſe Cenſure upon *Pomponatius* wants ſome reſtriction. Theſe are his Words. “(c) Whereby *Pomponatius* carried things too far, and did not a little favour the Opinions and Inclinations of the Libertins. Nay, one can hardly forbear calling him an inſolent Man, for ſaying, that whoever goes about to prove the Immortality of the Soul by Philoſophical Arguments, *does not deſerve the* Name of a Chriſtian; for on the contrary, there is nothing more proper to diſpoſe the Pagans to hearken to the Goſpel, than to prove beforehand, that Reaſon teaches us the Immortality of the Soul, and that therefore Men muſt endeavour to make themſelves Happy after this Life. Whereas, nothing would more effectually prevent the Converſion of Idolaters and Libertins, than their believing that the Soul is Mortal, according to the Light of Reaſon (d) .... (e) Theſe are the (f) Words that have been cenſured, for it is ſo far from being true, that whoever undertakes to prove the Immortality of the Soul, does a thing unworthy of a Chriſtian, that on the contrary, nothing is more proper to confirm him in the Truth of his Religion, than the Agreement of Reaſon and Revelation, tho' the Doctrines reveal'd ought to keep the firſt Rank. I was therefore in the right to ſay, that *Pomponatius* was guilty of great Inſolence, in aſſerting that a Man, who alledges any Arguments beſides thoſe taken from Revelation, to prove the Immortality of the Soul, does a thing unworthy of a Chriſtian.„

I will examine this Cenſure. The Words of *Pomponatius*, as they are in Mr. *le Noble*'s Book, may be taken in this Senſe, that a Chriſtian, who endeavours to ſhew that both Reaſon and Revelation teach the Immortality of the Soul, does a thing prejudicial to Faith, and makes himſelf unworthy of the Name he bears. But I think that thoſe Words, in *Pomponatius*'s Book, ſignifie, that a Chriſtian who has recourſe to any Arguments beſides God's Authority, becauſe Faith, without the help of the Light of Nature, is not ſufficient to remove his Uncertainty, does an Injury to Revelation, and acts contrary to the Principles of a true Chriſtian. Such is my Conjecture about the true Senſe of *Pomponatius*'s Words: Having not his Apologies by me, I cannot be poſitive about it, and muſt be contented with Probability. What was the State of the Queſtion between him and his Adverſaries? It was, whether he deſerved to be accounted an Heretical and Impious Man, becauſe he ſaid, that the Philoſophical Reaſons alledged for the Immortality of the Soul, are not ſolid Proofs, and that this Doctrine cannot be well proved but by Revelation. The Queſtion was not therefore to know what Judgment ought to be made of thoſe, who undertake to reclaim the Libertins fond of *Lucretius*, and full of Contempt for the Word of God. The Queſtion was not to know, whether thoſe who alledge Philoſophical Arguments againſt the Unbelievers, and endeavour to reclaim them by that Method, the only one that can work upon 'em, do an injury to Faith, and make themſelves unworthy of the Name of a Chriſtian. The Queſtion was about thoſe Chriſtians, who have recourſe to the Light of Nature for their own uſe, and to ſupply their perſonal wants, a ſort of wavering Men, who know not whether they ought to prefer Revelation to Reaſon, or at leaſt, don't relie on God's Authority, unleſs it be confirm'd by Philoſophical Arguments. Whoever ſays, that ſuch Men are injurious to Faith, and don't act like Chriſtians, does not make a wrong Judgment of 'em, and does not deſerve the Cenſure I examine in this Place; for, properly ſpeaking, thoſe Men are not yet Chriſtians, they offer to believe the Doctrine of future Rewards and Puniſhments, provided you give 'em better Proof than thoſe of the Goſpel. God's Authority is not ſufficient to them, they will have the Promiſes of the Scripture to be confirm'd by the Light of Reaſon, otherwiſe they give no Credit to them. If the thing be as I fancy it is, all my Readers will own that *Pomponatius* was cenſured without Reaſon: but the Cenſure paſt upon him would be well grounded in the firſt Senſe above-mention'd.

I don't deny that he might have been told, that he was not a fit Man to convert thoſe who believe the Mortality of the Soul, and look upon the Goſpel as a meer humane Book, and that therefore his Philoſophy was not ſo uſeful as that of his Adverſaries. Had he been ſincere, he would have own'd this, and acknowledged, that unleſs he imitated thoſe Phyſicians, who, to perſuade their Patients to take a Drug, make 'em believe that there is

(a) Mr. Arnauld adds here a ſhort and good Explication of what he intended to prove.

(b) Difficultez à Monſieur Steyaert, ub. ſup. p. 85.

(c) That is, what Pomponatius ſays, that nothing can be more injurious to Faith than to prove it by natural Arguments.

(d) Le Noble, Tableau des philoſophes tom. 2. p. 84, 85.

(e) Id. ib. p. 85.

(f) That is, thoſe that are to be ſeen above in the Rem. C at the end of Mr. le Noble's Quotation.

loſophical Arguments, every Body ought to be allowed to diſpute about 'em, and to ſay what he thinks of 'em. The Anſwer he made to this Objection, that the Doctrine of the Mortality of the Soul (H) would induce Men to all manner of Crimes, is remarkable. I don't know whether we ought to believe what ſome Authors ſay, that this Work was condemned (I) to be burnt by the *Venetians*, and diſowned by the Author himſelf. One cannot excuſe the Boldneſs (K) of a *Lutheran* Civilian, who maintains, that this Philoſopher read publick Lectures againſt the Immortality of the Soul, and that he was an infamous Magician, who publiſh'd ſome impious things about the occult Virtue of Sorcery and Imagination. To

more Virtue in it than there is, he could not have maintain'd againſt impious Men, that the Mortality of the Soul is certainly contrary to the Light of Reaſon. Perhaps he would not have diſapproved the Charitable Method of the Philoſophers, who ſhould imitate thoſe Phyſicians; he would have been contented to ſay, that he was rather for a perfect Sincerity; but after all, he might have told his Adverſaries, that as to the Reſurrection, and ſome other Doctrines, they were obliged to deal with impious Men, as he would have done as to the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.

(*H*) *The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul would induce Men to all manner of Crimes.*] This is the laſt thing that *Pomponatius* objected to himſelf. His Anſwer is, (*a*) that ſince Man does naturally deſire to be Happy, and hates Miſery, it is enough, in order to make an honeſt Man of him, to ſhew him that the Happineſs of our Lives conſiſts in the Practice of Virtue, and Miſery in the Practice of Vice. He adds, that thoſe who teach the Mortality of the Soul make way for the moſt perfect Virtue, which is practiſed without Hopes of Reward, or fear of Puniſhment. (*b*) *Quare perfectius aſſerentes animam mortalem melius videntur ſalvare rationem virtutis quàm aſſerentes ipſam immortalem, ſpes namque premii, & pœnæ timor, videntur ſervilitatem quandam importare, quæ rationi virtutis contrariatur.* He ſays alſo, that bruti'h People ought to be told that their Souls are Immortal, and that 'tis likely ſome Authors taught it without believing it, in order to curb the Licentiouſneſs of that ſort of Men. (*c*) *Exiſtimandum eſt multos viros ſenſiſſe animam mortalem, qui tamen ſcripſerunt ipſam eſſe immortalem: ſed hoc feciſſe ex pronitate virorum ad malum, qui parùm, aut nihil habent de intellectu, bonaque animi non cognoſcentes, nec amantes, tantùm corporalibus incumbunt: Quare hujuſmodi ingeniis neceſſe eſt eos ſanare, ſicut & medicus ad ægrum, & nutrix ad puerum ratione carentem ſe habent.* Theſe Obſervations do not remove the Difficulty, and are but weak Solutions. What follows is more reaſonable, being grounded upon Experience. He ſays, that many Knaves and profligate Men believe the Immortality of the Soul, and that many good Men did not believe it. (*d*) *Neque univerſaliter viri impuri ponunt mortalitatem, neque univerſaliter temperati immortalitatem: Nam manifeſtè videmus multos pravos homines credere, verùm ex paſſionibus ſeduci, multos etiam viros ſanctos & juſtos ſcimus mortalitatem animarum poſuiſſe. Plato namque 1. de repub. dicit Simonidem Poëtam virum divinum & optimum fuiſſe, qui tamen eam mortalem aſſeverat: Homerus quoque ut Ariſtoteles 2. de anima refert, exiſtimavit ſenſum ab intellectu non differre: quæ autem fuerit Homeri dignitas quis ignorat? Hippoc. quoque & Galen. viri doctiſſimi & optimi hujus perhibentur opinionis; Alexander Aphrodiſæus, magnus Alfarabius, Abubacher, Avempace, ex noſtratibus quoque Plinius Secundus, Seneca, innumerique alii hoc ſenſere; Seneca namque lib. 7. Epiſtolarum ad Lucilium epiſt. 54. quæ incipit, Longum mihi comitatum dederat mala valetudo, manifeſtiuſque in de conſolatione ad Martiam affirmat, ipſam eſſe mortalem: multoſque alios ſtudioſos & viros doctiſſimos* (*e*) *connumerat ejuſdem opinionis fuiſſe.*

(*I*) *Was condemned to be burnt by the* Venetians, *and diſowned by the Author himſelf.*] *Theophilus Raynaud* ſays ſo. (*f*) *Venetos illud opus addixiſſe ignibus, nec de immortalitate ſed* de mortalitate animæ *fuiſſe inſcribendum tradit Sylveſter* lib. 5. de Strigimagis cap. 5. *expoſtulans quod à ſe approbatum eum librum dixiſſet Pomponatius, quod negat ſe unquam cogitaſſe.* He had been ſaying, that *Pomponatius* himſelf condemned his own Book, but that the Reaſons which moved him to it are variouſly reported, ſome aſcribing it to a Deſire of ſecuring his Reputation, others pretending that he did it to pleaſe his Friends, and others out of a Principle of Conſcience. (*g*) *Pomponatius, mutata mente, opus ſuum de eo argumento improbaſſe dicitur, variantibus ſententiis, an id amicorum precibus dederit, an famæ ſuæ ac nomini caverit, an ex animo audierit Eccleſiam, & palinodiam cecinerit, ut conſcientiæ faceret ſatis.* He had been ſaying alſo, that all the Books, wherein 'tis affirmed that the Immortality of the Soul cannot be proved by Philoſophical Arguments, (*h*) ought to be deſtroyed; for he pretends they make way for an abſolute negation of that Immortality. This Aſſertion of his is not ſo equitable, as what he owns that the Philoſophers, who were condemn'd by a Biſhop of *Paris* in the Year 1227, and by *Leo X.* in the Council of *Lateran*, were not ſo abſurd as to maintain, that the Soul is Immortal and Mortal abſolutely ſpeaking, Immortal according to Divinity, and Mortal according to Philoſophy. He explains the true Senſe of their Doctrine: they abſolutely acknowledged the Immortality of the Soul on account of Revelation, without which they had believed it to be Mortal. *Animam ergo abſolutè videntur agnoviſſe immortalem, quod ita aperte ferant fidei ſcita; quamvis niſi de animæ rationalis perpetuatione fide doceremur, ſolaque naturali ratione conſulta, negaturi fuiſſent immortalitatem.* This he acknowledges particularly in favour of *Pomponatius*, and quotes a Book wherein this Reſtriction was proved, *viz.* the Book which Cardinal *Contarini*, a Scholar of that Philoſopher, wrote againſt his Maſter. (*i*) *Non abſolutè ac ſimpliciter, mortalem animam cenſuiſſe videtur* (Pomponatius) *ſed duntaxat ſi ratio nuda conſuleretur, ut liquet ex opere Contareni Cardinalis,* de immortalitate, *conſcripto adverſus Pomponatium, ipſius quondam Contareni in Philoſophicis Magiſtrum. Nec aliud cenſuerim voluiſſe illos ejuſdem ævi Philoſophiſtros, damnatos à Lateranenſi Concilio ſub Leone X. & alios longè antè à Stephano Pariſienſi Epiſcopo, anno 1277, vel potiùs 1227, in reſcripto quod extat* tomo 5. Bibl. Margarini pag. 1319. *æquè damnatos, quod aſſererent, animam rationalem, ſecundùm fidem eſſe immortalem; at ſecundùm Philoſophiam, eſſe mortalem.* *Boccalini*, according to his uſual Cuſtom, jeſts upon this Diſtinction of *Pomponatius*. (*k*) He ſuppoſes 1. That this impious Man being condemned to be burnt by *Apollo*, proteſted, that he believed the Mortality of the Soul only as a Philoſopher. 2. That *Apollo*, having regard to that Proteſtation, ordered the Executioner to hang him only as a Philoſopher.

We have ſeen above (*l*) how his Book was uſed, and that it was not burnt.

(*K*) *The Boldneſs of a* Lutheran *Civilian.*] His Name is *Godelman*: Theſe are his Words. (*m*) *Petrus Pomponatius Mantuanus philoſophus & Epicureiſmi defenſor magnuſque nefarius in Academiis Italiæ publicè contra animæ immortalitatem diſputavit: ſcripſit de fato & de incantatione libros, in quibus de verborum magicorum, imaginum, characterum, & imaginationis occulta poteſtate impiè ſatis diſputavit.* In the 1. place, 'tis not true that *Pomponatius* did publickly Diſpute againſt the Immortality of the Soul in the Univerſities of *Italy*. Such a thing cannot be charged upon him but by Virtue of the Sophiſm, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*. He maintain'd, that *Ariſtotle*'s Hypotheſis afforded no Proof for the Immortality of the Soul, and he anſwered all the Arguments of thoſe, who pretended to prove by the Doctrine of that Philoſopher, that our Souls are Immortal; but he did not abſolutely maintain the Mortality of the Soul. 'Tis plain therefore, that this *Lutheran* is neither exact nor equitable. 2. A good Author will not ſay that *Pomponatius*, who was a notorious Magician, denied the Immortality of the Soul. Men are ſo fully perſuaded, that if there are any Devils, the Soul is Immortal, and commonly ſuppoſe ſuch a connexion between thoſe two Doctrines, that whoever is not willing to be accounted Extravagant, will never charge any Body with Epicureiſm and Magick, without making ſome Reflections upon ſuch a Paradox. He muſt expect, that the Readers will be ſurprized at it, and that ſuch

(*a*) *Pomponat. ub. ſup. c.* 14. *p.* 120.

(*b*) *Id. ib. p.* 121.

(*c*) *Id. ib. p.* 120.

(*d*) *Id. ib. p.* 119.

(*e*) *It is certain that* Seneca *plainly lays down the Mortality of the Soul in thoſe two places; but I have not obſerved that he gives a Liſt of thoſe who were of that Opinion.*

(*f*) *Theoph. Raynaudus de malis & bonis libris n.* 43. *p. m.* 26.

(*g*) *Id. ib.*

(*h*) *Iste libri in doctrina reprobe fermen vitiati fu ſtione digni ha habet. Id. ib.*

(*i*) *Id. ib. n.* 42. *p.* 25, 26.

(*k*) *Bocca lin. Rag gua li di Parnaſ centur.* 1. *c.* 90. *p. m.* 30

(*l*) *In the Rem. C. lett.*

(*m*) *Godel mannus l.* 1. *c.* 8. *de Mag apud Ch Christian Fromma num de Faſcinati one lib.* 1. *part* 2. *ſect.* 3. *c. p. m.* 32

To conclude, he was so bent upon resolving Difficulties, that he minded neither Sleep, nor Eating, nor Drinking, nor Spitting; it made him almost Mad, and ridiculous to every Body. He himself (L) informs us of these Particulars.

PONCET (*Maurice*) Doctor * of Divinity in the University of *Paris*, † *Profest* **Benedictin** *in the Abbey of* St. Pere *at Melun*, where he was born, *and Curate of* **St. ASPAIS** in the same Town, and then of *St. Peter des Arsis at Paris*, was one of the famous Preachers of the XVI. Century. He preached with the greatest Boldness against the Disorders of the Court of *Henry* III. We have seen α above that he was carried to *Melun* for some Invectives he made from the Pulpit the 26th of *March* 1583, against a new Fraternity of Penitents instituted by that King. The Passage I have quoted out of *Peter Matthieu*, is to be found in the same Terms in the *Journal of* Henry III, with the Answer (A) mentioned in this Article, which *Poncet* is said to have made to the Duke of *Epernon*. Others say, he made it to the (B) Duke of *Joyeuse* at γ another Time; which seems to me (C) more likely. *Poncet* was afraid of δ being confin'd to the Castle of *Loches*, as he had been threatned some time before; and therefore he was well pleased when he was only confin'd to *St. Pere's* Abbey at *Melun*. He did not continue long under such a Disgrace; for he ξ had leave to return to *Paris*, *and to be there Curate of* St. Peter des Arsis: *but he preached still with his usual Boldness, and persisted in that Resolution till his last Breath.* He died the 23d of *November* 1586 ‡. He (D) publish'd something, and

* Du Verdier Vau Privas, Bib. Franc. p. 882.

† Rouillard, Antiquitez de Melun p. 527.

α In the Rem. N. of the Art. Henry III.

γ When the D. of Joyeuse's Wedding was celebrated.

δ Rouillard ub. sup.

ξ Id. ib. p. 528.

‡ Id. ib.

such a Combination will puzzle and confound 'em. An Author, who does not foresee such a thing, must needs be very stupid; and if he foresees it without giving himself the trouble to clear that Difficulty, he knows but little what he does. We may therefore conclude, that *Godelman* is very much to blame. In the 3. place, he confutes himself; for he complains of a Tract of *Pomponatius*, wherein all the Effects commonly ascribed to Magick, or to a Pact with the Devils, are ascribed to other Causes; and therefore in the same Period he accuses him of Magick, and of having writ a Book against the Existence of Magick. An Author, who writes in such a manner, is inexcusable, when he does not make such an Observation as this: *Pomponatius* was a Cheat; he believed and practised Magick, but he wrote against it, for fear of being known to be a Magician.

(L) *He himself informs us*, &c.] Being not able to reconcile some Maxims of *Aristotle* with Free-Will, he cries out, This is what vexes me, this is what keeps me from Sleeping, and makes me Mad. (a) *Ista sunt quæ me premunt, quæ me angustant, quæ me insomnem & insanum reddunt.* He says, that like another *Prometheus* fastened to Mount *Caucasus*, he is continually tormented with Grief. (b) *Perpetuis curis & cogitationibus rodi, non sitire, non famescere, non dormire, non comedere, non expuere, ab omnibus irrideri.* He would be more excusable, if the cause of his Anguish was not so unreasonable; but for a Man to vex and torment himself, in order to reconcile another Man with Reason, is a thing that cannot be excused. If a Divine endeavours, tho' he should lose his Health, and even his Life by it, to reconcile the Scripture to Truth, when they seem to disagree, it is a commendable and heroical Action; there being such an Agreement, one may reasonably hope to find it out. But how can any Body flatter himself with such hopes, with respect to the Opinions of a private Man subject to Error, and who drinks it as Fishes drink Water?

(A) *The Answer* .... *which* Poncet *is said to have made to the Duke of* Epernon.] *Poncet* having been arrested, that Duke went to see him, (b) and told him smiling, " Master, they say you make " People to laugh at your Sermons; which is very " wrong, for a Preacher ought to edifie his Hearers, " and not make 'em laugh. Sir, replied *Poncet*, I " would have you know that I preach nothing but " the Word of God, and that no Body comes to " my Sermons to laugh, unless they be wicked and " atheistical People: and truly, I never made so " many to laugh as you made cry. A bold An" swer for a Monk to a Lord of that Quality, and it " was found very much to the purpose. „

(B) *Others say that he made it to the Duke of* Joyeuse *at another Time.*] Here follows a Passage, wherein *le Laboureur* mentions the same thing, and adds a Reflection to it as good as the Repartee of our *Benedictin*. " (c) At that Time (d) there were " some bold Preachers, who did not except from " the number of Sins the cruel or loose Maxims " of the Cabinet. Dr. *Poncet*, among others, an " eloquent and very zealous Man, boldly compre" hended Kings and Great Men within the Extent " of his Mission; and *Brantome* says, that one Day " he grew so hot about the Political Axiom, *Who* " *knows not how to Dissemble, knows not how to Reign,* " that he made no scruple to assert, *They were the* " *Words of a downright Atheist, and the direct Way* " *for Kings and Princes to go to the Devil, and turn* " *Tyrants. He was,* adds *Brantome*, *one of the bold*" *est Preachers that ever got into a Pulpit. One Day* " *the Duke of* Joyeuse, *when his Wedding was cele*" *brated with an extraordinary Pomp and great Char*" *ges, meeting him in the Street, told him, Mr.* Pon" cet, *I never knew you before, and am glad to meet* " *you now; for I have often heard of you, and that* " *you make People to laugh at your Sermons.* Poncet " *answered him as coldly as the other spoke to him an*" *grily. Sir,* said he, *'tis not improper for me to* " *make 'em to laugh, since you make 'em to cry so much,* " *by reason of the great Charges of your noble Wedding,* " *which the People have been at. The Duke was* " *forced to go away, tho' he had a great mind to strike* " *him; but if he had touched him never so little, the* " *People, who are fond of such bold Preachers, and* " *were then gathering, would have done some scanda*" *lous thing to him and his* Retinue; *for that Monk* " *was very well belov'd at* Paris. This was a deadly " Hit, whereby the Duke of *Joyeuse* learn'd, that an " honest Priest, who prefers the Publick Interest to " his own, is like an unruly Horse, whom the " brightness of Grandure makes more furious, and " who ought to be cautiously approach'd, for fear " he should kick. Every Body laugh'd at it, and " the Duke's best Friends, who pitied him, blam'd " him for having thus engag'd a Monk in the Streets, " having so many Dignitaries at his Disposal, who " would have taken it as an Honour to be jested " upon by him, and promised themselves some Ad" vantage by it. „

(C) *Which seems to me more likely.*] For 'tis agreed, that being taken up he was afraid of being sent to *Loches*, as he had been threatn'd with. Would a Man, who was under such an Apprehension, as he himself confess (e), have made such a blunt and disobliging Answer to the Favourite of his Prince? It is a great deal more probable that he made it, when he enjoyed a full Liberty, and in the middle of a Street, where he knew the Inhabitants of *Paris* would have boldly repell'd any Insult offered to him. We ought therefore to keep to *Brantome*'s Account, and at the same time observe, how carelesly the Memory of such Events is preserved by Historians, and consequently how they differ in their Accounts of 'em.

(D) *He published something.*] Three Books concerning Ecclesiastical Oration by way of Contemplation, *Paris* 1568. in 8o. A Remonstrance to the *French* Nobility, concerning the Happiness which the King procures to his People, and how he ought to be instructed to Govern them well, *Paris* 1572. in 8o. A Funeral Oration pronounced the 31st of *August* 1574, in the Church of *Brecy le Buisson*, at the Burial of *Messire Eustace de Conflans*, Viscount *d'Aulchy*, *Paris* 1574. in 8o. A Discourse concerning the Advice given to *Messire Peter de Gondy*, Bishop of *Paris*, about the Proposal made by him to the Divines, concerning the Translation of the

(a) Pomponat. de fato l. 3. c. 7.

(b) Id. ib.

(b) Journal de Henry III. ad ann. 1583. p. m. 67. See also Peter Matthieu Hist. des derniers troubles p. 15.

(c) Le Laboureur addit. aux Memoires de Castelnau tom. 2. p. 58, 59.

(d) That is, under the Reign of Henry III.

(e) See the *Antiquitez de Melun*, p. 527.

and 'tis very likely his way of preaching was (E) ſomewhat Comical, and like that which Father *Andrew* was ſo fond of in the next Century.

PONTIUS (*Conſtantin*), burnt in Effigie at *Seville* in 1559, was called *Conſtantin de la Fuente*, in Latin *Conſtantinus Fontius.* Some Body took one Letter for another, a *P* inſtead of an *F*, which is the Reaſon why this Doctor is much more known by the Name of *Conſtantin* (A) *Pontius*, which does not belong to him, than by his true Name. However it be, he was a Man of great Merit, Doctor of † Divinity, Canon of *Seville*, and Preacher to *Charles* V. He followed *Philip* II. into *England*; and doubtleſs it was in that Country, that he reliſh'd the Doctrine of the Proteſtants, for which he was apprehended by the Inquiſition, and condemn'd to be burnt. He did not live till the *Auto de fe*, on which he was to be expoſed to the Publick View. The *Spaniſh* Hiſtorians do commonly ſay that he kill'd himſelf; others will have it, that he died of Sickneſs; but 'tis agreed on all Hands, that the Inquiſition produced an Effigies, which repreſented him, and was burnt on the Day * of the *Auto de fe.* Many ſay, that he was Confeſſor to *Charles* V. and that he attended him on his Death-bed to the laſt Breath; but I have ſhewed in another Place, that he was only his Preacher, and that he was impriſoned before the Death of that Emperor. He wrote (B) ſome Books, which the *Spaniſh* Inquiſition put into the *Index* without any Exception ‖: He is mention'd in the Martyrology of the (C) Proteſtants.

Beza †,

Bible into the Vulgar Language, *Paris* 1578, in 8o. *Meditations familieres ſur l'hiſtoire de l'incarnation, Rheims* 1574 in 8o. (*f*).

(E) *That his way of Preaching was ſomewhat Comical.*] I have three Reaſons to think ſo: for 1. The Words he is ſaid to have ſpoke in his Sermon, that was the occation of his Confinement, are far from being grave. That *Petit Tendron*, (young Laſs) that was kept ready for the revelling of the Penitents, is very Comical. 2. 'Tis agreed on all hands, that the Favourite, who received ſuch a ſharp Anſwer from *Poncet*, cenſured him for making his Hearers laugh. Laſtly, *James Roulliard* his Countryman and Panegyriſt, wards off the Blow in ſuch a manner, as makes me think, that he deſign'd to Anſwer thoſe who found fault with *Poncet* for acting the part of a Jeſter in the Pulpit. "Beſides "his Learning and Piety, known to every Body, "*they are* Roulliard's (*a*) *Words*, he had this parti"cular Talent, that he freely preached againſt the "Vices of his Age, preferring the Truth of the "Word of God before the Threatnings of Great "Men, and the daily Danger of his Life. 'Tis ſaid "he had ſuch a pleaſant Delivery, that what the "moſt unjudicious laugh'd at, was look'd upon by "the Wiſeſt as a great Piece of Art, that the Sharp"neſs of his Cenſures might go down the better, "and that he might the longer keep up his Mini"ſtry, which was ſo uſeful to the Church: where"as, had it not been for that, the furious Courti"ers, or ſome ſilly People would have endeavoured "to undo him.„ You ſee this Advocate dares not deny, that *Poncet*'s Sermons made People laugh. How then can one doubt that his Sermons were ſomewhat Comical? Had he boldly, but gravely, cenſured the Diſorders of the Court, the Pleaſure he would have afforded his Hearers, tho' never ſo great, had never made any Body laugh.

(A) *By the Name of* Conſtantin Pontius.] *Thuanus* calls him ſo, and ſo does Father *Paul* (*c*), who was not reproved for it by *Pallavicini*, tho' he took notice of ſome of his Miſtakes concerning that *Spaniard*.

(B) *He wrote ſome Books.*] A Summary of the Chriſtian Doctrine, printed in *Spaniſh* at *Antwerp*. Six Sermons on the firſt Pſalm of *David*, printed in the ſame Language, and at the ſame Place in (*d*) 1556. A large Catechiſm. The Confeſſion of a Sinner. Some Commentaries on the Proverbs, the Eccleſiaſtes, the Song of Songs, and *Job*. *Don Nicolas* (*e*) *Antonio* ſeems to believe, that the Sermons were not made on the 1ſt Pſalm, but on the 50th, and that they are the ſame with the Confeſſion of a Sinner; but he is miſtaken: that Confeſſion is a Prayer ſomewhat ſhorter than a Sermon, it is in the Proteſtant Martyrology (*f*).

(C) *He is mention'd in the Martyrology of the Proteſtants.*] We find there *that* Egidius, Conſtantin Fontius *and* Varquias *were the firſt, who diſcovered the Darkneſs of* Spain *almoſt at the ſame time*(*g*). They were call'd the *Three Pillars of Truth:* they preached at *Seville* with great Zeal and Succeſs. *Egidius* was nominated by *Charles* V. to the Biſhoprick of (*h*) *Tortona*; but the Inquiſitors were ſo vexed at it, that, to prevent his being made a Prelate, they ſeverely perſecuted him for a long time. During that Perſecution *Fontius* was in the *Low-Countries* Preacher and (*i*) Confeſſor to *Charles* V. "(*k*) Being "returned to *Seville*, after the Death of *Egidius*, he "reſumed his Office with great Courage; and the "Affection the People had for him was ſtill the "ſame. Notwithſtanding the Weakneſs of his "Body, he continued to diſcharge the Duties of "his Office, keeping up himſelf with the uſual "Remedies God gives us to recover the Health and "Strength of the Body. He had ſeveral Encoun"ters with the Prieſts and Monks, and with *Waldes* "Archbiſhop of *Seville*, and Preſident of the In"quiſition. And tho' his Enemies were furiouſly "exaſperated againſt him, yet he ſo dexterouſly "warded off all their Blows, that they could not "bring him to make an open Confeſſion of his "Faith, that they might have a better hold of him. "But at length God prevailed upon him in the fol"lowing manner to make a full Declaration of his "Truth, putting a ſtop to all his Subtleties and "Shifts, which he had made uſe of againſt his "Conſcience.„ The Diſcovery was made by his Books coming into the Hands of the Inquiſitors, notwithſtanding the great Care he had taken to conceal them. "(*l*) They found among other Books, "a large one written with his own Hand, wherein "he treated of the following Doctrines, as the In"quiſitors declared by their Sentence, which was "publickly pronounced, *viz.* Of the State of the "Church; of the True Church, and the Church of "the Pope, whom he call'd Anti-Chriſt; of the "Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and the Invention "of the Maſs, wherewith he ſaid the World was "bewitch'd, by reaſon of their Ignorance of the "Holy Scripture; of Man's Juſtification; of Pur"gatory, which he call'd a Monkiſh Invention to "feed the Belly; of the Pope's Bulls and Indul"gences; of the Merit of good Works; of Con"feſſion, and ſeveral other Points. That Book be"ing produced, the Inquiſitors ask'd him whether "it was his own Hand-Writing: he anſwered them "without any Tergiverſation, that the whole Book "was written with his own Hand, and maintain'd "the Truth of what was contain'd in it, ſaying, "you need not take further pains to look for Evi"dence againſt me, you have an ample Declaration "of my Faith: deal with me as you'll think fit. "He continued afterwards two Years in Priſon, "where he fell ſick by reaſon of his bad Diet, (tho' "he was little concern'd for it) and of the Grief "he conceived for the diſperſion of the Church, "and alſo becauſe the Sun made his Priſon as hot "as a Furnace; ſo that at laſt, a Looſeneſs, attend"ed with the Gripes, occaſion'd his Death . . . . . . "His Enemies ſpread a Report that he had made "away with himſelf, by cutting one of his Veins "with a piece of Glaſs, to avoid the ignominious "Puniſhment he was to undergo. The Children "ſung Songs about it, which had been made by the "Members of the Inquiſition. On the Day appoint"ed for the Triumph, his dead Body was taken "up, covered with Straw, like a Phantom, and "cloathed, and then it was ſet on a Chair, hold"ing up one Hand, and laying the other upon

the

---

† *Nicol. Antonii, Biblioth. Script. Hiſp. tom.* 1. *p.* 196.

* *See Nicol. Antonii ib.*

‖ *Conſtantinus de la Fuente Autor condenado: todas ſus obras en qualquier lengua, y eſpecialmente la* Confeſſion del Pecador. *Ind. libr. prohib. p. m.* 225.

(*f*) *Taken from du Verdier Vau-Privas Bibl. Franc. p.* 852.

(*a*) *Pag.* 627. *of the Antiquitez de Melun.*

(*c*) *Hiſt. du Concile de Trente l.* 5. *p.* 425. *edit.* 1629. *in* 4o.

(*d*) *Epit. Biblioth. Geſner.*

(*e*) *Bibliot. Script. Hiſp. tom.* 1. *p.* 196.

(*f*) *In the* 8*th Book fol.* 507. *verſo & ſeq.*

(*g*) *Hiſtoire des Martyrs Book* 8. *fol.* 505. *verſo, edit.* 1582. *in fol.*

(*h*) *It ſhould be* Tortoſa.

(*i*) *The Spaniſh Hiſtorians deny that he was Confeſſor. See the Rem.* R *of the Art.* Charles V.

(*k*) *Hiſt. des Martyrs fol.* 505. *verſo.*

(*l*) *Ibid. fol.* 505.

Rabus, who calls him *Constantin Pontius*, and who says that he was for a long time Confessor to *Charles* V. did not well remember the Circumstances he had read in that Martyrology. I have read a Latin Discourse † concerning the Life and Death of that *Spaniard*, wherein he is call'd *Constantinus Pontius*. The Publisher of that Discourse says, that it was written by *Reginaldus Gonsalvius Montanus Hispanus*. I find in it that *Pontius* had been a loose Man in (*D*) his Youth, but that he mended his Life, and took a right Course, tho' he was still faulty in one thing, that was a kind of a Blot; for being a Man of a very lively Wit, he gave himself too much Liberty in his Jests. Many of his witty Sayings went about. His sharpest Railleries were commonly levell'd at the Hypocrites and sorry Preachers of their Time. He perfectly learn'd, without any Master, *Latin*, *Greek*, and *Hebrew*, and whatever is necessary to make a good Preacher. He was Master of all the Beauties of his Mother-Tongue, and preached so eloquently, that an incredible number of Hearers flock'd to his Sermons *. People had much ado to find any convenient Place three or four Hours before he came into the Pulpit. He was free from Avarice and Ambition, and refused a rich Canonship that was offered him at *Toledo*: his Refusal was attended (*E*) with a Jest. After the Death of Doctor § *Giles*, being appointed, Refusal to Preach in the Cathedral, he did it before he had recovered his Health; but he happened to be so weak in the middle of his Sermon, that he was obliged to do a thing (*F*) which had never been seen before. The Director of the House of Doctrine having founded there a Lecture of Divinity; our *Constantin* was charged with it, (*G*) and performed it very well ‡. You'll see in the Remark *C* the Catastrophe

“ the Chair, as artificially as such a thing could be “ contrived.”

The Latin Author quoted by me in the following Remarks, does also acknowledge that *Pontius* eluded the Proceedings of the Inquisition, by his cunning Answers; but that he at last gave over all his Subterfuges, when they shewed him his Manuscript. (*a*) *Raptus ad Inquisitoriam arcem, etsi ex controversiis præcedentibus omnium adversariorum animos habebat vehementer exulceratos, tamen acutissimis suis responsis omnes eorum cavillos facilè, more suo, eludens, ad apertam fidei confessionem, ex qua periculum, ut ipsi exoptabant, crearetur, trahi non poterat: atque evasisset tandem, ut sæpè anteà, ipsorum manus, ni mirabili quadam Providentia sua artificio rotundam confessionem veritatis suæ, Deus ab invito & modis omnibus tergiversante extorsisset.* ..... (*b*) *Viso hoc libro Constantinus interrogatus ab Inquisitoribus, an propriam manum agnosceret, quum per multos dies, conquisitis undique subterfugiis, conatus illorum elusisset, agnoscens porro Dei voluntatem, quæ omnem tergiversandi amplius occasionem sibi præcidisset, agnosco (inquit) manum meam, ac proinde fateor, me ista omnia scripsisse, quæ & vera esse ingenuè profiteor.*

(*D*) *Had been a loose Man in his Youth.*] Here are the Words of the Latin Author: (*c*) *Juventutem quidem transegit pro studiosorum juvenum libera educatione non admodum laudatam, sed quæ, quo minùs, quod ætatis subsequutum est, quàm laudatissimum extiterit, haud impedimento fuerit. Probatos enim satis mores, ut erat ingenio mirè festivo, & in jocis peracuto, una subinde jocandi licentia vel in provectiore ætate corrumpebat.* Perhaps, the Faults of his Youth had never been objected to him, had he not had extraordinary Gifts, which exposed him to Envy; but having got a great Reputation by his Eloquence and Learning, he could not avoid those Reproaches. His Friends persuaded him to dispute for a Canonship (*d*) in the Metropolitan Church of *Seville*; and his Competitor bethought himself of raising Personal Objections against him, and carefully took up all the School-Boy's Tricks that might make him asham'd, and in general, whatever he had done amiss in his Youth, certain Marriages, the Irregularity of his Ordination, &c. (*e*) *Competitor & eruditione & authoritate, & ipsâ demum gratia Capituli Constantino nullo modo comparandus, ad exceptiones personales conatus omnes convertens suscitavit ei ineptias omnes juventutis suæ, contracta videlicet, antequam sacris initiaretur, matrimonia, neque ritè sacris initiatum, neque rectè atque ordine Magisterii & doctoratus insignia accepisse.* It were to be wish'd, that young Men, who hope to make themselves Eminent, would remember such Examples. It would be a Restraint upon 'em; they would be afraid of being upbraided with the Follies of their Youth, in the midst of their Glory. Those, who excuse such Faults, will nevertheless say, that it were better to want no such Indulgence. Such Faults are a subject of Mortification, which an Enemy knows how to improve to his Advantage.

(*E*) *His refusal was attended with a Jest.*] The Chapter of *Toledo* sent some Deputies to him, to desire him to fill up the Place of Preacher in the Metropolitan Church. *Constantin* answer'd, that he was very thankful for that Honour, and would endeavour to shew his Acknowledgment; but that he would do nothing that might disturb the Repose of his Ancestors. (*f*) *Cæterum parentum avorumque suorum ossa ante multos annos sepulta conquiescere, se vero nolle quicquam admittere, occasione cujus à sancta illa quiete interturbarentur.* To understand this Jest, the Reader must know, that the Chapter of *Toledo* had then a great Quarrel with the Arch-Bishop *Siliceus*, (*g*) a Man of mean Extraction, who had been raised to that great Post by Favour. That Prelate persecuted the chief Canons, (*h*) and disgraced them publickly, under pretence that they were descended from *Jewish* Families. He caused several Inquiries to be made, that were ignominious to the Memory of many Persons, who had been buried a hundred Years before, and by that means he disturbed the Repose of the Dead. *Pontius*'s Jest runs upon this. (*i*) *Ea occasione neque à centum annis sepultis parcebatur, inquirente malo archiepiscopo, & quidem sub pretextu religionis, in parentes, avos, atavos canonicorum, eosque ad originum rationes pessimè è suis sepulchris revocante. Eas non minus impias quàm stultas contentiones, ex sua ipsius vocatione occasione arrepta, Constantinus tempestivè admodum illo conciso Laconismo perstringebat.* The Reader will not be displeased to know by the By this Passage of the History of *Siliceus*.

(*F*) *To do a thing which had never been seen before.*] He had some Wine and Water brought to him once or twice, and drank in the Pulpit to recover his Spirits. The great Esteem he was in, and the Authority he had got, made every Body excuse the Novelty of such a Spectacle. (*k*) *Delatus in templum viribusque adeo exhaustus, ut in medio concionis filo uno atque altero limphati vini haustu vires ad pergendum in concione reficeret, novam neque unquam anteà visam licentiam summâ viri tum gratia, tum authoritate, qua pollebat, excusante.*

(*G*) *And performed it very well.*] The Lectures he made upon some Books of the Scripture were admirable, if one may believe my Latin Author. I shall set down his Words, that the Reader may be more fully acquainted with the Circumstances of the Writings of that reform'd *Spaniard*. (*l*) *Accepit primo Salomonis libros, Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, & Cantica canticorum, atque his mirabili eruditione explicatis, librum Jobi est aggressus, quem ultra medium interpretando perduxit. Extant ipsius in hos libros prælectiones omnes manu scripta opera Bab. diligentissimi cujusdam ex auditoribus excerpta, quas cum vulgaverimus, deprehenso quanto intervallo post se relinquat eos omnes, qui hactenus in eos libros quippiam ediderunt, de summa viri eruditione certius judicari poterit.* You see there was a Design to publish that Work, and it was actually printed. See the Remark *B*.

---

† [illegible]

‡ It is a [illegible]

* Concionabatur ut plurimum octava hora, tanto erat populi concursu, ut quarta, sæpe etiam tertia noctis hora vix in templo inveniretur commodus ad audiendum locus. *Hispanicæ inquisit. secret. p.* 254.

§ *The same who is call'd* Egidius *in the Rem. C.*

‡ *Taken from* Hispan. inquis. secretiora p. 251. & seq.

(*a*) *Hispanicæ inquisitionis secretiora p. m.* 252.

(*b*) *Ibid. p.* 254.

(*c*) *Hispanicæ inquisitionis secretiora p.* 253.

(*d*) Canonicatus Concionalis seu (ut vocant) Magistralis. *Ibid. p.* 252.

(*e*) *Ibid. p.* 251.

(*f*) *Ibid. p.* 255.

(*g*) Qui ex aratro & glebis, neque virtute, neque eruditione, sed (si ita dici licet) fortunæ potius temeritate ad summam totius Hispaniæ, secundum regem ipsum, dignitatem convolarat. *Ib. p.* 255.

(*h*) *Ibid.*

(*i*) *Ibid. p.* 256.

(*k*) *Ibid. p.* 258.

(*l*) *Id. ib.*

and 'tis very likely his way of preaching was (E) somewhat Comical, and like that which Father *Andrew* was so fond of in the next Century.

PONTIUS (*Conſtantin*), burnt in Effigie at *Seville* in 1559, was called *Conſtantin de la Fuente*, in Latin *Conſtantinus Fontius*. Some Body took one Letter for another, a *P* instead of an *F*, which is the Reaſon why this Doctor is much more known by the Name of *Conſtantin* (A) *Pontius*, which does not belong to him, than by his true Name. However it be, he was a Man of great Merit, Doctor of † Divinity, Canon of *Seville*, and Preacher to *Charles* V. He followed *Philip* II. into *England*; and doubtleſs it was in that Country, that he reliſh'd the Doctrine of the Proteſtants, for which he was apprehended by the Inquiſition, and condemn'd to be burnt. He did not live till the *Auto de fé*, on which he was to be expoſed to the Publick View. The *Spaniſh* Hiſtorians do commonly ſay that he kill'd himſelf; others will have it, that he died of Sickneſs; but 'tis agreed on all Hands, that the Inquiſition produced an Effigies, which repreſented him, and was burnt on the Day * of the *Auto de fé*. Many ſay, that he was Confeſſor to *Charles* V. and that he attended him on his Death-bed to the laſt Breath; but I have ſhewed in another Place, that he was only his Preacher, and that he was impriſoned before the Death of that Emperor. He wrote (B) ſome Books, which the *Spaniſh* Inquiſition put into the *Index* without any Exception ‡: He is mention'd in the Martyrology of the (C) Proteſtants.

† *Nicol. Antonii, Biblioth. Script. Hiſp. tom.* 1. p. 196.

* *See Nicol. Antonii ib.*

‡ *Conſtantinus de la Fuente Autor condenado: y todo ſu libro aſſi en qualquier lengua, y eſpecialmente la* Confeſſion del Pecador. *Ind. libr. prohib. p. m.* 229.

Bizart,

Bible into the Vulgar Language, *Paris* 1578, in 8o. *Meditations familieres ſur l'Hiſtoire de l'incarnation, Rheims* 1574 in 8o. (*f*).

(*f*) *Taken from du Verdier Vau-Privas Bibl. Franc. p.* 852.

(E) *That his way of Preaching was ſomewhat Comical.*] I have three Reaſons to think ſo: for 1. The Words he is ſaid to have ſpoke in his Sermon, that was the occaſion of his Confinement, are far from being grave. That *Petit Tendron*, (young Laſs) that was kept ready for the revelling of the Penitents, is very Comical. 2. 'Tis agreed on all hands, that the Favourite, who received ſuch a ſharp Anſwer from *Poncet*, cenſured him for making his Hearers laugh. Laſtly, *James Roulliard* his Countryman and Panegyriſt, wards off the Blow in ſuch a manner, as makes me think, that he deſign'd to Anſwer thoſe who found fault with *Poncet* for acting the part of a Jeſter in the Pulpit. "Beſides "his Learning and Piety, known to every Body, "*they are* Roulliard's (*a*) *Words*, he had this parti"cular Talent, that he freely preached againſt the "Vices of his Age, preferring the Truth of the "Word of God before the Threatnings of Great "Men, and the daily Danger of his Life. 'Tis ſaid "he had ſuch a pleaſant Delivery, that what the "moſt unjudicious laugh'd at, was look'd upon by "the Wiſeſt as a great Piece of Art, that the Sharp"neſs of his Cenſures might go down the better, "and that he might the longer keep up his Mini"ſtry, which was ſo uſeful to the Church: where"as, had it not been for that, the furious Courti"ers, or ſome ſilly People would have endeavoured "to undo him." You ſee this Advocate dares not deny, that *Poncet*'s Sermons made People laugh. How then can one doubt that his Sermons were ſomewhat Comical? Had he boldly, but gravely, cenſured the Diſorders of the Court, the Pleaſure he would have afforded his Hearers, tho' never ſo great, had never made any Body laugh.

(*a*) *Pag.* 627. *of the Antiquitez de Melun.*

(*A*) *By the Name of* Conſtantin Pontius.] *Thuanus* calls him ſo, and ſo does Father *Paul* (*c*), who was not reproved for it by *Pallavicini*, tho' he took notice of ſome of his Miſtakes concerning that *Spaniard*.

(*c*) *Hiſt. du Concile de Trente l.* 5. *p.* 425. *edit.* 1629. *in* 4o.

(B) *He wrote ſome Books.*] A Summary of the Chriſtian Doctrine, printed in *Spaniſh* at *Antwerp*. Six Sermons on the firſt Pſalm of *David*, printed in the ſame Language, and at the ſame Place in (*d*) 1555. A large Catechiſm. The Confeſſion of a Sinner. Some Commentaries on the Proverbs, the Eccleſiaſtes, the Song of Songs, and *Job*. *Don Nicolas* (*e*) *Antonio* ſeems to believe, that the Sermons were not made on the 1ſt Pſalm, but on the 50th, and that they are the ſame with the Confeſſion of a Sinner; but he is miſtaken: that Confeſſion is a Prayer ſomewhat ſhorter than a Sermon, it is in the Proteſtant Martyrology (*f*).

(*d*) *Epit. Biblioth. Geſner.*

(*e*) *Bibliot. Script. Hiſp. tom.* 1. *p.* 196.

(*f*) *In the 8th Book fol.* 507. *verſo & ſeq.*

(*C*) *He is mention'd in the Martyrology of the Proteſtants.*] We find there *that* Egidius, Conſtantin Fontius *and* Varquias *were the firſt, who diſcovered the Darkneſs of* Spain *almoſt at the ſame time*(*g*). They were call'd the *Three Pillars of Truth*: they preached at *Seville* with great Zeal and Succeſs. *Egidius* was nominated by *Charles* V. to the Biſhoprick of (*h*) *Tortona*; but the Inquiſitors were ſo vexed at it, that, to prevent his being made a Prelate, they ſeverely perſecuted him for a long time. During that Perſecution *Fontius* was in the *Low-Countries* Preacher and (*i*) Confeſſor to *Charles* V. "(*k*) Being "returned to *Seville*, after the Death of *Egidius*, he "reaſſumed his Office with great Courage; and the "Affection the People had for him was ſtill the "ſame. Notwithſtanding the Weakneſs of his "Body, he continued to diſcharge the Duties of "his Office, keeping up himſelf with the uſual "Remedies God gives us to recover the Health and "Strength of the Body. He had ſeveral Encoun"ters with the Prieſts and Monks, and with *Waldes* "Archbiſhop of *Seville*, and Preſident of the In"quiſition. And tho' his Enemies were furiouſly "exaſperated againſt him, yet he ſo dexterouſly "warded off all their Blows, that they could not "bring him to make an open Confeſſion of his "Faith, that they might have a better hold of him. "But at length God prevailed upon him in the fol"lowing manner to make a full Declaration of his "Truth, putting a ſtop to all his Subtleties and "Shifts, which he had made uſe of againſt his "Conſcience." The Diſcovery was made by his Books coming into the Hands of the Inquiſitors, notwithſtanding the great Care he had taken to conceal them. "(*l*) They found among other Books, "a large one written with his own Hand, wherein "he treated of the following Doctrines, as the In"quiſitors declared by their Sentence, which was "publickly pronounced, *viz.* Of the State of the "Church; of the True Church, and the Church of "the Pope, whom he call'd Anti-Chriſt; of the "Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and the Invention "of the Maſs, wherewith he ſaid the World was "bewitch'd, by reaſon of their Ignorance of the "Holy Scripture; of Man's Juſtification; of Pur"gatory, which he call'd a Monkiſh Invention to "feed the Belly; of the Pope's Bulls and Indul"gences; of the Merit of good Works; of Con"feſſion, and ſeveral other Points. That Book be"ing produced, the Inquiſitors ask'd him whether "it was his own Hand-Writing: he anſwered them "without any Tergiverſation, that the whole Book "was written with his own Hand, and maintain'd "the Truth of what was contain'd in it, ſaying, "you need not take further pains to look for Evi"dence againſt me, you have an ample Declaration "of my Faith: deal with me as you'll think fit. "He continued afterwards two Years in Priſon, "where he fell ſick by reaſon of his bad Diet, (tho' "he was little concern'd for it) and of the Grief "he conceived for the diſperſion of the Church, "and alſo becauſe the Sun made his Priſon as hot "as a Furnace; ſo that at laſt, a Looſeneſs, attend"ed with the Gripes, occaſion'd his Death ...... "His Enemies ſpread a Report that he had made "away with himſelf, by cutting one of his Veins "with a piece of Glaſs, to avoid the ignominious "Puniſhment he was to undergo. The Children "ſung Songs about it, which had been made by the "Members of the Inquiſition. On the Day appoint"ed for the Triumph, his dead Body was taken "up, covered with Straw, like a Phantom, and "clouthed, and then it was ſet on a Chair, hold"ing up one Hand, and laying the other upon

the

(*g*) *Hiſtoire des Martyrs Book* 8. *fol.* 505. *verſo, edit.* 1582. *in fol.*

(*h*) *It ſhould be* Tortoſa.

(*i*) *The Spaniſh Hiſtorians deny that he was his Confeſſor. See the Rem. K. of the Art.* Charles V.

(*k*) *Hiſt. des Martyrs fol.* 505.

(*l*) *Ibid. fol.* 5

Moreri, who calls him *Conſtantin Ponce*, and who ſays that he was for a long time Confeſſor to *Charles* V. did not well remember the Circumſtances he had read in that Martyrology. I have read a Latin Diſcourſe § concerning the Life and Death of that *Spaniard*, wherein he is call'd *Conſtantinus Pontius*. The Publiſher of that Diſcourſe ſays, that it was written by *Reginaldus Gonſalvius Montanus Hiſpanus*. I find in it that *Pontius* had been a looſe Man in (*D*) his Youth, but that he mended his Life, and took a right Courſe, tho' he was ſtill faulty in one thing, that was a kind of a Blot; for being a Man of a very lively Wit, he gave himſelf too much Liberty in his Jeſts. Many of his witty Sayings went about. His ſharpeſt Railleries were commonly levell'd at the Hypocrites and ſorry *Preachers* of their Time. He perfectly learn'd, without any Maſter, *Latin*, *Greek*, and *Hebrew*, and whatever is neceſſary to make a good Preacher. He was Maſter of all the Beauties of his Mother-Tongue, and preached ſo eloquently, that an incredible number of Hearers flock'd to his Sermons *. People had much ado to find any convenient Place three or four Hours before he came into the Pulpit. He was free from Avarice and Ambition, and refuſed a rich Canonſhip that was offered him at *Toledo*: his Refuſal was attended (*E*) with a Jeſt. After the Death of Doctor ‖ *Giles*, being appointed Refuſal to Preach in the Cathedral, he did it before he had recovered his Health; but he happened to be ſo weak in the middle of his Sermon, that he was obliged to do a thing (*F*) which had never been ſeen before. The Director of the Houſe of Doctrine having founded there a Lecture of Divinity; our *Conſtantin* was charged with it, (*G*) and performed it very well ‡. You'll ſee in the Remark (*C*) the Cataſtrophe

† [illegible] Fol.

§ It is a Work intitled [illegible] ſecretiora, [illegible] at Heidelberg [illegible] per [illegible] Urbanus, Anno [illegible].

* Concionabatur ut plurimum octavâ hora, tanto etiam populi concurſu, ut quarta, ſæpe etiam tertia noctis hora vix in templo inveniretur commodus ad audiendum locus. *Hiſpanicæ inquiſit. ſecret. p.* 254.

‖ *The ſame who is call'd* Egidius *in the Rem. C.*

‡ *Taken from* Hiſpan. inquiſ. ſecretiora p. 251. & ſeq.

" the Chair, as artificially as ſuch a thing could be " contrived."

The Latin Author quoted by me in the following Remarks, does alſo acknowledge that *Pontius* eluded the Proceedings of the Inquiſition, by his cunning Anſwers; but that he at laſt gave over all his Subterfuges, when they ſhewed him his Manuſcript. (*a*) *Raptus ad Inquiſitoriam arcem, etſi ex controverſiis præcedentibus omnium adverſariorum animos habebat vehementer exulceratos, tamen acutiſſimis ſuis reſponſis omnes eorum cavillos facilè, more ſuo, eludens, ad apertam fidei confeſſionem, ex qua periculum, ut ipſi exoptabant, crearetur, trahi non poterat: atque evaſiſſet tandem, ut ſæpè anteà, ipſorum manus, ni mirabili quadam Providentia ſua artificio rotundam confeſſionem veritatis ſuæ, Deus ab invito & modis omnibus tergiverſante extorſiſſet. . . . . .* (*b*) *Viſo hoc libro Conſtantinus interrogatus ab Inquiſitoribus, an propriam manum agnoſceret, quum per multos dies, conquiſitis undique ſubterfugiis, conatus illorum eluſiſſet, agnoſcens porro Dei voluntatem, quæ omnem tergiverſandi amplius occaſionem ſibi præcidiſſet, agnoſco* (*inquit*) *manum meam, ac proinde fateor, me iſta omnia ſcripſiſſe, quæ & vera eſſe ingenuè profiteor.*

(*D*) *Had been a looſe Man in his Youth.*] Here are the Words of the Latin Author: (*c*) *Juventutem quidem tranſegit pro ſtudioſorum juvenum liberâ educatione non admodum laudatam, ſed quæ, quo minùs, quod ætatis ſubſequutum eſt, quàm laudatiſſimum extiterit, haud impedimento fuerit. Probatos enim ſatis mores, ut erat ingenio mirè feſtivo, & in jocis peracuto, una ſubinde jocandi licentia vel in provectiore ætate corrumpebat.* Perhaps, the Faults of his Youth had never been objected to him, had he not had extraordinary Gifts, which expoſed him to Envy; but having got a great Reputation by his Eloquence and Learning, he could not avoid thoſe Reproaches. His Friends perſuaded him to diſpute for a Canonſhip (*d*) in the Metropolitan Church of *Seville*; and his Competitor bethought himſelf of raiſing Perſonal Objections againſt him, and carefully took up all the School-Boy's Tricks that might make him aſham'd, and in general, whatever he had done amiſs in his Youth, certain Marriages, the Irregularity of his Ordination, &c. (*e*) *Competitor & eruditione & authoritate, & ipſâ demum gratia Capituli Conſtantino nullo modo comparandus, ad exceptiones perſonales conatus omnes convertens ſuſcitavit ei ineptias omnes juventutis ſuæ, contracta videlicet, antequam ſacris initiaretur, matrimonia, neque ritè ſacris initiatum, neque rectè atque ordine Magiſterii & doctoratus inſignia accepiſſe.* It were to be wiſh'd, that young Men, who hope to make themſelves Eminent, would remember ſuch Examples. It would be a Reſtraint upon 'em; they would be afraid of being upbraided with the Follies of their Youth, in the midſt of their Glory. Thoſe, who excuſe ſuch Faults, will nevertheleſs ſay, that it were better to want no ſuch Indulgence. Such Faults are a ſubject of Mortification, which an Enemy knows how to improve to his Advantage.

(*E*) *His refuſal was attended with a Jeſt.*] The Chapter of *Toledo* ſent ſome Deputies to him, to deſire him to fill up the Place of Preacher in the Metropolitan Church. *Conſtantin* anſwer'd, that he was very thankful for that Honour, and would endeavour to ſhew his Acknowledgment; but that he would do nothing that might diſturb the Repoſe of his Anceſtors. (*f*) *Cæterum parentum avorumque ſuorum oſſa ante multos annos ſepulta conquieſcere, ſe vero nolle quicquam admittere, occaſione cujus à ſancta illa quiete interturbarentur.* To underſtand this Jeſt, the Reader muſt know, that the Chapter of *Toledo* had then a great Quarrel with the Arch-Biſhop *Siliceus*, (*g*) a Man of mean Extraction, who had been raiſed to that great Poſt by Favour. That Prelate perſecuted the chief Canons, (*h*) and diſgraced them publickly, under pretence that they were deſcended from *Jewiſh* Families. He cauſed ſeveral Inquiries to be made, that were ignominious to the Memory of many Perſons, who had been buried a hundred Years before, and by that means he diſturbed the Repoſe of the Dead. *Pontius*'s Jeſt runs upon this. (*i*) *Ea occaſione neque à centum annis ſepultis parcebatur, inquirente malo archiepiſcopo, & quidem ſub pretextu religionis, in parentes, avos, atavos canonicorum, eſque ad originem rationes peſſimè è ſuis ſepulchris revocante. Eas non minus impias quàm ſtultas contentiones, ex ſua ipſius vocatione occaſione arrepta, Conſtantinus tempeſtive admodum illo conciſo Laconiſmo perſtringebat.* The Reader will not be diſpleaſed to know by the By this Paſſage of the Hiſtory of *Siliceus*.

(*F*) *To do a thing which had never been ſeen before.*] He had ſome Wine and Water brought to him once or twice, and drank in the Pulpit to recover his Spirits. The great Eſteem he was in, and the Authority he had got, made every Body excuſe the Novelty of ſuch a Spectacle. (*k*) *Delatus in templum viribuſque adeo exhauſtus, ut in medio concionis filo uno atque altero limphati vini hauſtu vires ad pergendum in concione reficeret, novam neque unquam anteà viſam licentiam ſummâ viri tum gratia, tum authoritate, qua pollebat, excuſante.*

(*G*) *And performed it very well.*] The Lectures he made upon ſome Books of the Scripture were admirable, if one may believe my Latin Author. I ſhall ſet down his Words, that the Reader may be more fully acquainted with the Circumſtances of the Writings of that reform'd *Spaniard*. (*l*) *Accepit primo Salomonis libros, Proverbia, Eccleſiaſten, & Cantica canticorum, atque his mirabili eruditione explicatis, librum Jobi eſt aggreſſus, quem ultra medium interpretando perduxit. Extant ipſius in hos libros prælectiones omnes manu ſcriptæ opera Bab. diligentiſſimi cujuſdam ex auditoribus excerptæ, quas cum vulgaverimus, deprehenſo quanto intervallo poſt ſe relinquat eos omnes, qui hactenus in eos libros quippiam ediderunt, de ſumma viri eruditione certius judicari poterit.* You ſee there was a Deſign to publiſh that Work, and it was actually printed. See the Remark *B*.

(*a*) *Hiſpanicæ inquiſitionis ſecretiora p. m.* 252.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 254.

(*c*) *Hiſpanicæ inquiſitionis ſecretiora p.* 253.

(*d*) Canonicatus Concionalis ſeu (ut vocant) Magiſtralis. *Ibid. p.* 257.

(*e*) *Ibid. p.* 251.

(*f*) *Ibid. p.* 255.

(*g*) Qui ex aratro & glebis, neque virtute, neque eruditione, ſed (ſi ita dici licet) fortunæ potius temeritate ad ſummam totius Hiſpaniæ, ſecundum regem ipſum, dignitatem convolarat. *Ib. p.* 256.

(*h*) *Ibid.*

(*i*) *Ibid. p.* 256.

(*k*) *Ibid. p.* 258.

(*l*) *Id. ib.*

taſtrophe of his Life, and in the laſt Remark, a Story he told *Cardan*, which (*H*) concerns Apparitions.

POQUELIN (*John Baptiſt*) a famous Player, known by the Name of **MOLIERE**, the Son of a *Valet de Chambre*, Tapeſtry-maker to the King, was born at *Paris* about the Year 1620. He went thro' his School-Learning under the Jeſuits in *Clermont-College*. He was deſign'd for the Bar, but *after he had made an end of his Study of the Civil Law, he pitch'd upon the Profeſſion of a Player, having a very* † *ſtrong Inclination for the Stage, and bent his Mind altogether that way.* His firſt Play was *l'Etourdi*, which he expoſed to the Publick View at *Lyons* in the Year 1653. *Being ſometime after in* Languedoc, *he offered his Services to the Prince of* Conti, *who received him very kindly, gave an Allowance to his Company, and took him into his Service, as well for himſelf, as for the States of* Languedoc. Having ſpent the Carnaval at *Grenoble* in the Year 1658, *he went and ſettled at* Rouen, *where he ſtaid all the Summer; and having made ſeveral Journeys to* Paris *privately, he had the good Luck to pleaſe the King's Brother, who granting him his Protection, and making his Company his own, introduced him in that Quality to the King and the Queen Mother.* That Company *began to appear before their Majeſties and the whole Court* the 24th of *October* 1658, upon a Stage ſet up on purpoſe *in the Hall of the Guards of the old* Louvre, and were well approved, ſo that *His Majeſty gave Orders for their Settlement at* Paris. *The Hall of the* Petit Bourbon *was granted them, to act by turns with the* Italian *Players.* ‡ In *October* 1660 the Hall of the *Royal Palace* was granted them. *Moliere* obtained a Penſion of a thouſand Livres in 1663. His Company was altogether in his Majeſty's Service in the Year 1665, and he continued all the remaining part of his Life to give new Plays, which were very much applauded. His laſt Comedy was *Le Malade Imaginaire*, and it was acted a fourth time on the 17th of *February* 1673, and he (*A*) died the ſame Day. This is what I have taken from his Life, prefixed to his Works. Perhaps I have done a needleſs thing, for that Book is more known and read than this Dictionary will ever be, and therefore what I tranſcribe out of that Life will be no new thing to any Body. I have been told of a thing by ſeveral People, which is not to be found in it, *viz.* that he turn'd Player only to be near an Actreſs, with whom he was very much in Love. Let the Reader gueſs whether this Particular was omitted becauſe it was not true, or for fear of doing him ſome prejudice,

† *See the Rem. G.*

‡ *See the Rem. H.*

(*H*) *A Story he told* Cardan.] If what *Cardan* ſays be true, our *Conſtantin* ſpoke of Apparitions, not upon a Hear-ſay, but as an Eye-witneſs. (*a*) *Vigebat olim in Hiſpania hæc ars,* (Necromantia) *publiceque docebatur in Salamantica academia, nunc vero publicis legibus ſublata eſt. Unde ibi aliqua adhuc artis experimenta ſuperſunt. Narrabat mihi Don Conſtantinus Fontanus Hiſpanus theologus, & ab exomologeſi Principis Philippi Hiſpaniarum, dum in Vagliadolit civitate Hiſpaniæ, in domo typographi, quæ male ob ſtrepitus audiebat nocturnos, diverſaretur, prima nocte incubum ſenſiſſe: ſed cum olivas nigras in cœna comediſſet, naturale exiſtimaſſe, cum incubus inter morbos numeretur. Sequenti nocte ſuper lecto videt auditque feles concertantes, quod quanquam durum videretur, quia tamen eſſe poterat, & hoc naturale eſſe duxit. Tertia autem nocte cum nondum dormitum iſſet, de hiſque differeret, tubæ vocem quaſi in aure audivit. Exiſtimans ſibili ſpeciem eſſe, pueros videbat, qui ibi aſtabant ridentes: tum vox illa cubiculum circumire cœpit, perfectoque circuitu ſub lecto ſe abdidit, ibi diu ſtrepens, cum nihil videretur.* What *Cardan* ſays of the Magick Schools, which had been in *Spain*, was affirm'd by a Magician mention'd by *Thuanus*. See the Remark *I* in the Article *Tireſias*.

(*a*) *Card. de ſubtilitate l. 19. p. 591. edit. Lugdun. 1580. in 8.*

(*A*) *And he died the ſame Day.*] The chief Perſon repreſented in *Moliere*'s laſt Play, is a Sick Man who pretends to be Dead. *Moliere* repreſented that Perſon, and conſequently was obliged in one of his Scenes to act the part of a dead Man. It has been ſaid by a great many People, that he expired in that part of his Play, and that when he was to make an End of it, in order to ſhew that 'twas only a Feint, he could neither ſpeak, nor get up, being actually dead. This Singularity was look'd upon as very wonderful, and afforded the Poets a plentiful Matter for witty Conceits and ingenious Alluſions; which in all probability was the Reaſon why that Story was ſo much credited. Nay, ſome gave a ſerious Turn to their Thoughts, and made many Moral Reflections upon that Incident. But the truth is, *Moliere* did not die in ſuch a manner: he had time enough, though very Sick, to make an end of his Part, as it appears from this Paſſage of his Life. " (*b*) The 17th of *February* 1673, on which *le* " *Malade Imaginaire* was acted a fourth time, " he was ſo much troubled with his Defluxion, " that he had much ado to act His Part; he made " an end of it with great Sufferings, and the " Spectators were ſenſible that he was not far from " being what he acted. When the Comedy was over " he went home, and was ſcarce got to Bed, when " his continual Cough increaſed ſo violently, that " one of the Veins of his Lungs broke. He no " ſooner found himſelf in that Condition, but he " bent all his Thoughts upon Heavenly things; and " immediately he loſt his Speech, and in half an " Hour's time was ſtifled by the great quantity of " Blood that ran out of his Mouth. „ But I muſt inform the Reader, that if ſome other Writers are to be credited, *Moliere* was not able to hold out till the Play was over. " (*d*) *Moliere* . . . . . died in a " very ſurpriſing manner. He had been indiſpoſed " for a long time; which was aſcribed to the Trouble his Wife gave him, but more ſtill to his " great Labour. One Day being to act *Le Malade* " *Imaginaire*, a new Piece at that time, and the laſt " he had made, he was taken very ill before he began it, and was like to put it off on account of " his Illneſs. Nevertheleſs, conſidering the great " number of Spectators, and being unwilling " to ſend 'em away, he ſtrain'd himſelf, and acted " his part almoſt to the End, without perceiving " that his Illneſs increaſed upon him. But when " he came to that part of the Play, wherein he " counterfeited a dead Man, he happen'd to be ſo " weak, that 'twas thought he was really dead, and " they had much ado to make him ſtand up. They " adviſed him to go to Bed, but he choſe rather " to make an end; and the Play being far advanced, he thought he could go thro' it without much " prejudice to himſelf. But his Zeal for the Publick " was attended with a ſad Conſequence; for as he " was ſpeaking of *Rheubarb* and *Sena*, in the Ceremony of the Phyſicians, ſome Blood came out of " his Mouth, at which the Spectators and his " Friends being very much frighted, he was immediately carried home, and his Wife followed him " into his Chamber, pretending to be very much " afflicted. But every thing proved ineffectual; he " died in a few Hours, having loſt all his Blood, " that came out of his Mouth in great plenty. „ The Poets, as I have already ſaid, took hold of that occaſion to ſhew their Wit: they handed about a great many ſmall Pieces: " But (*e*) of all thoſe " that were made upon *Moliere*'s Death, none was " better approved than theſe four *Latin* Verſes:

" *Roſcius*

(*b*) Vie de Moliere *prefixed to his Works. I make uſe of the* Bruſſels *Edition* 1694.

(*d*) *See the Book intitled,* La fameuſe Comedienne, ou hiſtoire de la Guerin, auparavant femme & veuve de Moliere, p. 38, 39.

(*e*) *Vie de Moliere, fol.* * 3.

prejudice. Many are of Opinion, that his Plays exceed or equal (B) the nobleſt Performances of that kind in Ancient *Greece* and *Rome*. 'Tis no wonder that he did ſo well ſucceed in deſcribing the Jars of married People, and the Uneaſineſs of Husbands that are Jealous, and have Reaſon to be ſo; for 'tis ſaid, he knew (C) it by Experience as well as any Man in the World. This is what I find in a printed

“ *Roſcius hic ſitus eſt triſti Molierus in urnâ,*
“ *Cui, genus humanum ludere, ludus erat.*
“ *Dum ludit mortem, Mors indignata jocantem*
“ *Corripit, & mimum fingere ſæva negat.*

I add a French Epitaph (f) to thoſe *Latin* Verſes:

Cy gît qui parut ſur la Scene
Le ſinge de la vie humaine,
Qui n'aura jamais ſon égal,
Qui voulant de la Mort, ainſi que de la Vie,
Eſtre l'imitateur dans une Comedie,
Pour trop bien reüſſir, y reüſſit fort mal,
Car la Mort en eſtant ravie,
Trouva ſi belle la copie,
Qu'elle en fit un original.

(f) *It is in the 4. Tome of the* Mercure Galant *for the Year 1673. There are in it ſeveral other ſuch Pieces, with a Funeral Oration in Proſe, which is ſomewhat waggiſh.*

(B) *Exceed or equal the nobleſt Performances of that kind in Ancient* Greece *and* Rome.] Mr. *Perrault* diſpleaſed many People by contradicting thoſe who ſay, that no Modern Author can be compared with *Homer* and *Virgil*, *Demoſthenes* and *Cicero*, *Ariſtophanes* and *Terence*, *Sophocles* and *Euripides*. This Diſpute has occaſioned on both ſides many Books, which contain very good things. But we have not ſeen hitherto an Anſwer to Mr. *Perrault's Parallele*, nor do we know when it will come out. I think I may ſay that among the Productions of the Pen, there are few things, wherein ſo many People have acknowledged the Superiority of our Age, as in the Comical Pieces. Perhaps the Reaſon of it is, that the Beauties and Niceties of *Ariſtophanes* are not known to all thoſe who are ſenſible of *Moliere's* Wit and Charms; for it ought to be granted, that in order to paſs a right Judgment upon the Comick Poets of *Greece*, it were neceſſary to be throughly acquainted with the Faults of the *Athenians*. There is a Ridicule common to all Times and People, and a Ridicule peculiar to certain Ages and Nations. Some Scenes of *Ariſtophanes*, which appear dull to us, did, perhaps, wonderfully pleaſe the *Athenians*, becauſe they knew the thing he ridiculed. Perhaps, 'twas a Fault altogether unknown to us, a Ridicule conſiſting in ſome particular Facts, and in a tranſient and common Taſte of that Time, of which we can have no Notion, tho' we are able to read the Originals. Theſe Obſtacles don't permit us to admire that Poet according to his Merit, neither in *Greek* nor in *Latin*, nor in the *French* Verſions, tho' never ſo faithful and polite. *Moliere* is not liable to this Inconveniency, we know what he aims at, and eaſily diſcover whether he deſcribes well the Ridicule of the Age we live in; when he ſucceeds in any thing, it cannot eſcape us. Nay, he ſeems to be more copious than *Ariſtophanes* and *Terence*, as to thoſe Thoughts and nice Railleries, of which all Ages and polite Nations are ſenſible. This is a very conſiderable Prerogative; for it cannot be ſaid, that our Age has not a true Reliſh of the fine Paſſages of the Latin Poets. If you ſhew ſome Thoughts of *Horace*, *Ovid*, *Juvenal*, &c. to ingenious Ladies in old *French*, if you tranſlate 'em faithfully, tho' never ſo courtly, they'll tell you that thoſe Thoughts are fine, delicate and nice. There are ſome Beauties of Wit in Faſhion at all Times: one would think that *Moliere* is more copious in that reſpect than the Ancient Comick Poets. He has ſome Beauties that would vaniſh away in a Tranſlation, or in a Country of a different Taſte from that of *France*; but he has many others that would be preſerved in all ſorts of Tranſlations, and approved whatever the Taſte of the Readers might be, provided they underſtood the Eſſence of a good Thought. See the Article *Amphitryo* (a).

(a) *Rem.* B.

(C) *That he knew by Experience* the Uneaſineſs of Husbands that are Jealous, or have Reaſon to be ſo.] I have read in a ſmall Book printed in the Year 1688, “That (b) *Moliere* was leſs praiſed than his Wife was courted; *that ſhe was* the Daughter of the deceas'd Mrs. *Bejard*, a Country Actreſs, who made many young Sparks of *Languedoc* happy when her Daughter was born. And therefore, *adds the Author*, it were a very difficult thing to know who was her Father among ſo many Galants: all that we know of it is, that her Mother affirm'd, ſhe never admitted any but Perſons of Quality, except *Moliere*, and that therefore her Daughter was of a very noble Blood. And indeed the only thing ſhe recommended to her all along, was to proſtitute herſelf to none but the beſt ſort of People. *Moliere* was thought to be her Father, tho' he married her afterwards; but the Truth of it is not well known. . . . (c) *Moliere* married young Mrs. *Bejard* ſometime after he had ſettled his Company at *Paris*: He made ſome Pieces for the Stage, and among others *La Princeſſe d'Elide*, wherein his Wife, who acted the Part of the Princeſs, (d) ſhone ſo brightly, that he had all the Reaſon in the World to repent his having expoſed her in the middle of all the ſprightly Youth of the Court. For ſhe was hardly got into the Room, where the King gave that Entertainment, but ſhe fell deſperately in Love with the Count *de Guiche*, and the Count *de Lauzun* fell deſperately in Love with her. . . . . (e) *Moliere* was made ſenſible, that the great care he took to pleaſe the Publick, kept him from obſerving how his Wife behaved herſelf, and that whilſt he made it his Buſineſs to divert every Body, every Body made it their Buſineſs to divert his Wife. Jealouſy awaken'd his Tenderneſs, which had lain aſleep by reaſon of his Application to Study: he immediately went and made great Complaints to his Wife, telling her in a reproachful manner, how carefully he had brought her up, how he had ſtifled his Paſſion, how he had behaved himſelf towards her, more like a Lover than a Husband, and that to reward him for ſo many Kindneſſes, ſhe made him ridiculous to the whole Court. His Wife fell a Weeping, and confeſt to him, that ſhe had had an Inclination for the Count *de Guiche*; but ſhe ſwore, that the only Fault ſhe was guilty of conſiſted in the intention: ſhe added, that he ſhould forgive the firſt Fault of a young Woman, who for want of Experience will be apt to make ſuch Steps; but that the Kindneſs ſhe was ſenſible he had for her, would prevent, for the Time to come, her being guilty of ſuch a Weakneſs. *Moliere* being perſuaded of her Virtue by her Tears, begg'd her pardon a thouſand times for the Anger he had expreſs'd, and gently repreſented to her, that a good Conſcience was not ſufficient to preſerve one's Reputation, but that one ſhould take care to do nothing that may occaſion ill Reports, eſpecially in an Age wherein People are ſo apt to think ill, and ſo little diſpoſed to judge favourably of things.„ (f) She quickly began again *her old Trade more openly than ever*. . . . . “(g) *Moliere* being inform'd of his Wife's Behaviour by ſome People, who were willing to make him uneaſie, renewed his Complaints with more violence than he had done before, and even threatned to get her confin'd. That Woman being provok'd to the higheſt Degree with his Reproaches, wept and fell into a Swoon. Her Husband, who was extremely fond of her, repented of having put her into that Condition, and did his beſt to recover her Spirits, intreating her to conſider, that nothing but Love was the occaſion of his Anger, and that ſhe might be ſenſible of the great Power ſhe had over him, ſince, notwithſtanding all the Reaſons he had to complain of her, he was ready to forgive her, provided ſhe would be more cautious for the time to come. One would think that ſuch an extraordinary Husband ſhould have made her ſenſible of her Fault, and brought her off from her ill Courſe; but his Kindneſs produc'd a quite contrary Effect. She thought ſhe had a fair Opportunity of parting with him, and therefore ſhe ſpoke in a high Strain, and told him, that ſhe knew well enough from whom he had thoſe falſe Stories; that ſhe was weary of being every Day accuſed of a thing ſhe was not guilty of; that he might think of a Separation, and that ſhe could no longer endure a Man, who was always intimate with Mrs (h) *de Brie*, who lived in their Houſe, and had never left it ſince they were married. The care that was taken to pacifie *Moliere's* Wife, proved ineffectual:

(b) *Hiſtoire de la Guerin auparavant Femme & Veuve de Moliere* p. 6.

(c) *Ibid.* p. 12.

(d) *Ibid.* p. 14.

(e) *Ibid.* p. 15.

(f) *Ibid.* p. 18.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 19.

(h) *She was an Actreſs belonging to the Company, which* Moliere *found ſettled at* Lyons *the firſt time he acted there. He fell in Love with that Woman, and was reciprocally loved by her, and got her into his Company.* Hiſtoire de la Guerin p. 8.

printed Book, out of which I shall set down * some Passages. What is most strange is, that there has been a Report that his Wife † was his own Daughter. He made Verses with a wonderful ‡ facility; but he took too much liberty (C*) in inventing

“ fectual: From that very Moment she conceived an extreme Aversion for him; and when he had a Mind to make use of the Privileges of a Husband, she treated him with the utmost Contempt. At last she carried things to such an extremity, that *Moliere*, who began to perceive her wicked Inclinations, consented to the Separation she continually desired since their Quarrel; so that without a Decree of Parliament, they agreed to cohabit no longer together. But *Moliere* could not resolve upon it without doing himself a great violence; and if his Reason made him look upon his Wife as a Woman unworthy of the Caresses of an honest Man, by reason of her ill Conduct, his Tenderness made him sensible, that he would hardly be able to see her without enjoying the Privileges of a Husband. One Day as he was thinking upon it in his Garden at *Auteuil*, one of his Friends, call'd *Chapelle*, who came to walk there by chance, accosted him, and finding him more uneasie than he used to be, ask'd him several times the Reason of it. *Moliere* being somewhat asham'd of shewing so little Constancy under a Misfortune, that was so much in Fashion, held out as much as he could; but having then his Heart full, a thing well known to those that have been in Love, he yielded to the desire of easing himself, and ingenuously confest to his Friend, that the Grief wherewith he was overwhelm'd, proceeded from his being obliged to use his Wife as he did. *Chapelle*, who thought he was above things of that Nature, jeered him, and told him he wondered that a Man, who knew so well how to represent the weak side of other Men, should be guilty of a Weakness he blamed every Day, and shewed him, that the most ridiculous of all was to Love a Woman, when her Love is not reciprocal. For my part, added he, I must needs tell you that if I was so unhappy as to find myself in such a Condition, and if I was fully persuaded that the Woman I Love grants some Favours to others, I should have such a Contempt for her, that it would infallibly cure my Passion. You have a satisfaction you could not have if she was your Mistress; and Revenge, which commonly succeeds Love in an injured Lover, may make amends for all the Uneasiness your Wife gives you, since you need only get her shut up: and this will be a sure way to quiet your Mind. *Moliere*, who heard his Friend quietly enough, interrupted him, and ask'd whether he had ever been in Love. Yes, replied *Chapelle*, I have been in Love, as a Man of Sense ought to be; but I should not have been so much troubled for a thing which my Honour should have required from me, and I am asham'd to see you so uncertain. I perceive, replied *Moliere*, that you have never been a true Lover, and that you took the Figure of Love for Love itself. I will not alledge many Examples, whereby you might know the Power of that Passion, but shall only give you a faithful Account of the Perplexity I am in, to make you sensible how little a Man is Master of himself, when Love has got an ascendant over him. Wherefore, in Answer to what you say, that I have a perfect Knowledge of Mens Hearts, as it appears by the publick Descriptions I daily make of 'em, I confess that I have made it my chief Study to know their weak side; but if I have learn'd that the Danger may be shunn'd, Experience has taught me that 'tis impossible to avoid it: I judge of it by myself. „ Afterwards he gives an Account of his Marriage, and after some Reflections, he adds: (a) “ I am therefore resolved to live with her as if she was not my Wife. But if you knew the Anguish I am in, you would pity me: my Passion is come to such a pitch, that I cannot forbear being concern'd for her; and when I consider that 'tis impossible for me to overcome my Affection for her, I am apt to fancy, that, perhaps, she finds it no less difficult to conquer her Inclinations to be a Cocquet, and I am more disposed to pity her than to blame her. You'll say that none but a Poet can Love in such a manner; but 'tis my Opinion, that there is but one sort of Love, and that those who have never been so Nice are perfect Strangers to true Love. . . . (b) Don't you wonder that my Reason should serve only to make me sensible of my Weakness, without being able to conquer it? I must needs tell you, replied his Friend, that you are more to be pitied than I thought: but I hope Time will cure you; and I beseech you to use your endeavours towards it. „

Such was the Fate of that Wit. In the midst of the Acclamations of the whole Court, shining with Glory, and admired in *France* and in Foreign Countries, he was tormented with a thousand Domestick Griefs. His Marriage deprived him of his Honour and Quiet: Nay, he could not have the satisfaction of hating his Cross, I mean the Person who was the Cause of so much Vexation. He might have been told, *Physician, cure thyself: Moliere*, you give so much Diversion to the Publick, can't you divert yourself? You laugh at every Body, you give very good Advice to the poor Cuckolds, why don't you make use of it yourself? Perhaps he said a thousand times, as *Horace* (c) did, I had rather be accounted the meanest of all Authors, than have so much Wit, and live such an uneasie Life.

(C*) *Too much liberty in inventing new Words and new Expressions.*] Take notice, that I only blame the Excess of his Liberty; for I don't deny that he was often very happy in the Use of it, and that it proved useful to our Language. He introduced some Phrases and some Words, that are very pleasant; and if any Grammarian should think otherwise of it, he should deserve no better Treatment than that Ancient Grammarian, who censured the Poet *Furius* for inventing some Words which shorten'd the Discourse, and had no Harshness in them that might offend nice Ears. Read this Passage of *Aulus Gellius*. (d) *Non hercle idem sentio cum Casellio vindice grammatico, ut mea opinio est, haud quaquam inerudito. Verum hoc tamen petulanter insciteque; quod Furium veterem poetam dedecorasse linguam Latinam scripsit hujuscemodi vocum fictionibus, quæ mihi quidem neque abhorrere à poetica facultate visæ sunt, neque dictu profatuque ipso tetræ aut insuaves esse; sicuti sunt quædam alia ab illustribus poetis ficta durè & rancidè. Quæ reprehendit autem Casellius Furiana, hæc sunt; quod terram in lutum versam* lutescere *dixerit, & tenebras in noctis modum factas* noctescere, *&c.* I must observe, that there is no better Forge for new Words than the Stage; for when it produces any Novelty in the Language, that is well approv'd, a World of People will immediately take it up, and spread it far and near by their frequent Repetitions. It cannot reasonably be denied that good Authors have a right to Forge new Words, for otherwise Languages would always remain poor, barren and weak. See *Vossius* (e) and many other (f) Writers upon this Head. It ought therefore to be granted, generally speaking, that *Moliere* had a Right to enrich his Dramatick Pieces with new Terms: all that can be said against him is, that he misused his Right; for it ought to be remembred, that the Writers of such Pieces are not sensible of the Poverty of a Language, as those who write upon Dogmatical Subjects. *It ought to be confest*, says Mr. *Arnauld* (g), *that we are more sensible our Language wants Words, when we treat of Sciences, than when we speak or write about common things.* This he says in a Preface, wherein he justifies the Liberty he took to invent the Words *Philosophisme*, *Philosophistes* and *Advertance*. 'Tis certain, that a Comick Poet is not so excusable for inventing new Words as a Philosopher. The latter is forced to it by an indispensable Necessity. Read this Complaint of *Lucretius*:

Nec (h) me animi fallit, Graiorum obscura reperta
Difficile inlustrare Latinis versibus esse,
(Multa novis verbis præsertim cum sit agendum.)
Propter egestatem linguæ, & rerum novitatem;
. . . .
Nunc (i) & Anaxagoræ scrutemur Homœomeriam.
Quam Græci memorant, nec nostra dicere lingua
Concedit nobis patrii sermonis egestas.

'Twas not by reason of the Rules of Quantity that he wanted Words; for those who wrote Philosophical Books in Prose did likewise complain of it.

---

* *See the Rem. C.*

† *See the Rem. C.*

‡ *See the 9 Satyr of Despreaux.*

(a) Ibid. p. 28.

(b) Ibid. p.

(c) Prætulerim scriptor delirus inersque videri, Dum mea delectent mala me vel denique fallant, Quam sapere & ringi. Horat. l. 2. epist. 2. v. 126.

(d) Aulus Gellius l. 18. c. 11. p. m. 494, 495.

(e) Vossius institut. orator. l. 4. c. 1. p. m. 442.

(f) Theophilus Raynaud de malis ac bonis libris n. 427. p. m. 243. quotes many of 'em.

(g) Arnauld, Preface to the 5. denonciation de peché philosophique.

(h) Lucretius l. 1. v. 137.

(i) Ibid. v. 830.

inventing new Words and new Expreſſions; nay, he was very (D) often guilty of Barbariſms. You'll find in Mr. *Baillet* * what Judgment ought to be made of his Talent.

Some pretend, that the Glory of Invention does not belong to *Moliere*, and that he made a good uſe of the (E) Comedies acted by the *Italians* at *Paris*. Thoſe are in the wrong who ſay that Mr. *Deſpreaux* changed his Note after the Death of that great Comedian: if we may believe ſome ignorant Criticks, he praiſed him in his Life time, and blamed him when he was in his Grave. The Truth is, that he continued to commend him after his Deceaſe, only he found fault with him (F) for humouring too much thoſe that ſate in the Pit; which is a reaſonable Cenſure in ſome reſpects, but unjuſt in the main. Father *Bouhours*'s Verſes in *Moliere*'s Praiſe †, are the beſt that ever he made, if we rely upon ‡ *Menage*'s Judgment. I don't

it. (k) *Quanta verborum nobis paupertas, imo egeſtas ſit, nunquam magis quam hodierno die intellexi. Mille res inciderunt, cum forte de Platone loqueremur, quæ nomina deſiderarent, nec haberent: quædam vero cum habuiſſent, faſtidio noſtro perdidiſſent. Quis autem ferat in egeſtate faſtidium?* Obſerve by the by, the two Cauſes of the Poverty of Languages mention'd by *Seneca*: one is, that ſome Words have not yet been found out; the other is, that many grow out of uſe. 'Tis alſo to be obſerved, that the *Romans* when they wrote nothing but Epigrams, (l) complained that they wanted Words; from whence we may conclude, that *Moliere* was ſenſible of the ſame want, and therefore he might well have recourſe to Invention. Laſtly, I obſerve, that the Birth of one Word is (m) commonly the Death of another. Which holds true, particularly in *France*; and therefore it can't be expected that our Language ſhould ever ceaſe to be poor.

(D) *He was very often guilty of Barbariſms.*] I might give a hundred Inſtances of it, but I ſhall confine myſelf to two, which I take out of a Piece prefixed to his Works in ſome Editions, wherein he thanks the King. He gives a wonderful Turn to it, and perhaps 'tis the beſt ſmall Piece that ever he wrote. Mind theſe four Verſes: he ſpeaks to his Muſe:

Vous pourriez aiſément (z) *l'étendre,*
Et parler des tranſports qu'en vous ſont éclater
Les ſurprenans bienfaits, que ſans les meriter
Sa liberale main ſur vous daigne repandre.

The Author's meaning is, that his Muſe received great Favours, tho' ſhe did not deſerve them; but according to the Grammatical Senſe, thoſe Verſes ſignifie, that tho' the King did not deſerve thoſe Favours, yet he beſtowed them upon *Moliere*'s Muſe. And therefore this is a barbarous Expreſſion. Here is another Inſtance:

Les Muſes ſont de grandes prometeuſes,
Et comme vos ſœurs les cauſeuſes
Vous ne manqueriez pas ſans doute par le bec.

The Author means, that his Muſe would be like her Siſters, who are full of Talk; but according to the literal Senſe the plain and only Meaning of thoſe Words is, that ſhe would prove a very prattling Muſe, tho' her Siſters are of a quite contrary Humour. By a *Barbariſm*, I don't mean an Expreſſion or a Word taken from another Language, and unknown to the *French*, but a Diſpoſition of Words againſt the Rules, which is look'd upon as Barbarous by our beſt Grammarians.

There is in the ſame Poem *Marquis repouſſable*; which is a barbarous Word. There is alſo *prevenant amas*, another barbarous Term; for the Word *prevenant* is only uſed in the figurative Senſe, and does not denote a Man, who goes before others.

(E) *And that he made a good uſe of the Comedies acted by the* Italians *at* Paris.] I ſhall not ſcruple to quote an Anonymous Book for this: it is printed and therefore ſufficient to juſtifie what I advance; for I am only to prove that ſome will have it, that the *Italian* Comedies acted at *Paris* were *Moliere*'s Original. Read the following Paſſage: *Arlequin* is brought in ſpeaking thus: “(a) If the *Italian* Players had never appeared in *France*, perhaps *Moliere* had never been what he was. I know he was perfectly acquainted with the old Comick Poets; but after all, he had his firſt Notions from our Stage. You know that his *Cocu Imaginaire* is *il Ritratto* of the *Italians*: *Scaramouche* interrupted in his Love, produced his *Facheux*: his *Contre-temps* are only *Arlequin*, *Valet étourdi*, and ſo with moſt of his Pieces: and in theſe latter Times, is not his *Tartuffe* our *Bernagaſſe*. 'Tis true, he excell'd in his Characters, and his Comedies are ſo full of Senſe, that they ſhould be read to young People as ſo many Inſtructions, to give 'em a true Notion of the World. And yet thoſe excellent *Italian* Originals produce nothing now.„

(F) *For humouring too much thoſe that ſate in the Pit; which is a reaſonable Cenſure . . . . . but unjuſt.*] *Moliere* was dead when Mr. *Deſpreaux* praiſed him in (b) one of his Epiſtles, as much or more than in (c) the Satyr he had inſcribed to him. 'Tis therefore a great piece of Unjuſtice to ſay, that he praiſed him out of Policy, and for fear of being bantered by him upon the Stage, if he ſhould ſay nothing to his Advantage, or if he ſhould venture to Criticize him. But, will ſome ſay, he criticized him when he had nothing to fear, and therefore the Suſpicion entertained of him ſeems to be well grounded. I am not of that Opinion; I believe that if he had made his *Art Poetique* in *Moliere*'s Life-time, he would have inſerted in it the Cenſure contained in the following Verſes. It was, in a manner, eſſential to his Subject; there is in it a very judicious Obſervation, which ſhould be an inviolable Rule, if Comedies were only made to be printed; but becauſe they are chiefly deſigned to appear on the Stage in the preſence of all ſorts of People, 'tis not juſt to require they ſhould be adapted to Mr. *Deſpreaux*'s Taſte. Theſe are his Words:

Eſtudiez (d) *la Cour, & connoiſſez la ville,*
L'une & l'autre eſt toujours en modeles fertile.
C'eſt par là que Moliere illuſtrant ſes écrits
Peut-eſtre de ſon Art eût remporté le prix;
Si moins ami du peuple en ſes doctes peintures,
Il n'euſt point fait ſouvent grimacer ſes figures,
Quitté pour le bouffon, l'agreable & le fin,
Et ſans honte à Terence allié Tabarin.
Dans ce ſac ridicule où (1) *Scapin s'envelope,*
Je ne reconnois plus l'Auteur du Miſanthrope.

He blames *Moliere* for endeavouring to pleaſe not only Men of a nice Judgment, but alſo the People. *Moliere* had ſome Reaſons for it, and might have ſaid what *Arlequin* anſwered in a like Caſe. (e) “Thoſe Jeſts, ſaid I to him, (to *Arlequin*) are pleaſant enough in your Plays; 'tis pity they are not equally good. I own it, replied he, but they pleaſe ſeveral young People, who come to our Play-Houſe only to Laugh, and who Laugh at any thing, and very often without knowing why. Our Plays are frequently acted before ſuch People, and if our Jeſts were not ſuited to their Capacity, our Stage would be very often empty. I am ſorry, ſaid I to him, that you have almoſt left your old Pieces off; they were well approved by Men of Senſe, they contain'd many things of good uſe in Morality, and I dare ſay, that your Stage was a place where Vice was ſo effectually ridicul'd, that every Body found himſelf inclined to love Virtue meerly out of Reaſon. Should we act none but our old Pieces, replied he, our Play-Houſe would be little reſorted to, and I'll tell you what *Cinthio* told *St. Evremont*, that good Actors would be ſtarved notwithſtanding their excellent Plays.„ It ought to be obſerved, that Players are at great Charges, and that Plays are no leſs deſign'd for the Diverſion of (f) the People, than for the Diverſion of the Senate; and therefore they muſt be adapted to the Taſte of the Publick, in order to draw in a great many People; for if they ſhould only contain ingenious, nice and exquiſite Thoughts, the Actors would be ruined by them, and they would be of no uſe to the people.

* *Jugem. ſur les poetes, t. 5. n. 1520.*

† *You'll find 'em in the 5 vol. of Menage's Obſervations upon the French Language, p. 15.*

‡ *Ibid. p. 12.*

(k) *Seneca epiſt. 58. init. p. m. 261.*

(l) *See Pliny the Younger epiſt. 18. l. 4.*

(m) *Juſt as in the productions of Nature,* generatio unius eſt corruptio alterius.

(z) *That is, your Compliment.*

(a) *A nameleſs Book divided into 3 Dial. printed at* Paris *and in* Holland *in the Year 1695. p. 6. of the* Dutch *Edition.*

(b) *The 7th.*

(c) *The 2d.*

(d) *Deſpreaux,* Art Poetique, *Canto 3. p. m. 144.*

(1) *One of* Moliere's *Plays.*

(e) *A nameleſs Book p. 4, & 5.*

(f) *Mind theſe Words of* Terence *in his Prologue to his* Andria. Poeta quum primum animum ad ſcribendum appulit, Id ſibi negotii credidit ſolum dari Populo ut placerent quas feciſſet fabulas.

don't know whether the *Italians* like *Moliere's* Plays, translated into their Language, by one * of their Countrymen settled in *Germany*. It is more difficult in a Work of this Nature than in others, to preserve all the Beauties of an Original in a Translation. What I have said of *Moliere's* Inclination for the Stage, is to be found with (*G*) new Circumstances in a Book of Mr. *Perrault*. The Readers will not be displeased to know what became of the Company of Players (*H*) headed by *Moliere*, when that excellent Actor came to die: it may be of great use to know his Merit.

PORCIA, the Daughter of *Cato Uticensis*, had such a noble Soul, that she was not corrupted by the (*A*) ill Examples of her Mother and of her Aunts, but only imitated the Virtues of her Father. She applied herself very much to the Study of Philosophy, and gave convincing proofs of her great Courage; for perceiving that *Brutus*, her Husband, was preparing himself for a great Enterprize,

A GENERAL Observation against those who criticize this Dictionary.

This is what may be said, not only against those who Criticize *Moliere*, but also against those who find fault with many other Books, because they don't consider the several uses they are designed for, and because there are many things in 'em which they could wish the Author had left out. What do I care for that, says one? What is it to me, says another, that such a one had a bad Wife? To what purpose so many Quotations, so many merry Thoughts, so many Philosophical Reflections, *&c*? Such are the Complaints of those who criticize this Dictionary: but they'll give me leave to tell 'em, that they want the most necessary Notion to pass a right Judgment upon this Work. They don't consider that it ought to be of some use to all sorts of Readers, and that if it had been intirely fram'd according to the Taste of the nicest Judges, it would go out of its natural Sphere. I would have 'em to consider, that if I had kept to their Notions of Perfection, my Book would indeed have been very acceptable to them, but then many others had been displeased with it, and it had remained in the Dust of the Booksellers Warehouses? What a poor thing would two or three large Folio's be for most Readers, if there was nothing in 'em but what may please those who pretend to Gravity, and to an exquisite Taste, and who would have the most copious Subjects explain'd the shortest way? They may, if they please, make such a Reflection as *Socrates* (*h*) made at the sight of a Fair; but the thing will nevertheless be as it ought to be.

(*G*) *Inclination for the Stage is to be found with new Circumstances in a Book of Mr.* Perrault.] *Moliere* is one of the illustrious Men, whose Pictures have been ingraved by Mr. (*a*) *Begon's* Care, who has also procured to the Publick their Historical Encomiums. Mr. *Perrault*, who wrote those Encomiums, says, (*b*) *that* Moliere *was born with such an Inclination for the Stage, that it was impossible to prevent his turning Player. He had scarce made an end of his Studies, wherein he did very well succeed, that he joyned with several young Men of his Age and Inclination, and resolved to form a Company of Players, to act in the Provinces of the Kingdom. His Father .... made use of all his Friends to dissuade him from it*, and not being able to prevail upon him by their Remonstrances, and the Promises they made him in his Name, *he sent to him the* Master *in whose House he boarded the first Years of his Studies...... but the Master was so far from persuading him to leave the Profession of a Player, that young* Moliere *prevailed upon him to imbrace the same Profession ..... Having formed his Company, he went and acted at* Rouen, *and from thence he removed to* Lyons, *where having pleased the Prince of* Conti, *&c*. The remaining part of the Elogy is very curious.

(*H*) *What became of the Company of Players headed by* Moliere, *when that excellent Actor came to die.*] What I find upon this Subject in a Book of Mr. *Chappuzeau* is as follows. Before that Company was settled in the Royal Palace, they discovered their Merit at *Paris* in the *Fossez de Nesle*, and in St. *Paul's* Ward, at *Lyons*, and in *Languedoc*. They were justly accounted the best Country-Players. The *Bejar's*, two Brothers, and *du Parc* were some of the chief Actors. *Du Croisy*, who headed a Country-Company, and *la Grange*, a very good Player, joyned with them. They acted for some time in the Hall of the *petit Bourbon*, by an Agreement with the *Italian* Players, who had been already settled there. Afterwards the Theater of the *Royal Palace* was open'd to them, where they acted till the beginning of *Lent* 1673. *Moliere* happening to die at that time, four Players of his Company joyned with that of the *Hotel de Bourgogne*, and because those that remained were not in a capacity to go on, the King was pleased to make but one Body of the Company (*c*) of the *Marais*, and of that of the *Royal Palace*. Mr. *Colbert* was order'd to pitch upon the best Actors of those two Companies, and to form out of 'em a fine Company, that should be call'd the King's Company. It was settled in the *Hôtel du Roy*, in the Street call'd *Rue* (*d*) *Mazarine*, and they began to appear in Publick upon a *Sunday*, the 9th of *July* 1673. The Players were forbidden to Act upon the Theater of the *Royal Palace* and upon that of the *Marais*. Note, that *Moliere* who was the first Orator of the Company of the *Royal Palace*, resign'd that Place to *la Grange* six Years before he died (*e*).

(*A*) *The ill Examples of her Mother and of her Aunts.*] *Cato Uticensis* was unfortunate in his Relation to the Fair Sex; his Star proved in that respect very unlucky and malignant. He had two Uterin Sisters, call'd *Servilia*: one of 'em was *Brutus's* Mother, and suffered herself to be debauch'd (†) by *Julius Cæsar*, (*f*) and 'twas the Talk of the whole Town. The other was married to *Lucullus*, and proved so Lewd, that her Husband put her away. She retired to her Brother's, who was so kind as to take her into his House, and carry her along with him in his Travels. It was no glorious thing for him to have such an infamous Woman in his House, nor convenient to take care that she should not go on in her ill Course. *She* (*g*) *was not by a great deal so ill spoken of as she had been before, when it appeared, that she willingly submitted to* Cato's *Custody and strict way of Living, following him in his Flight: nevertheless*, Cæsar *did further reproach him with this Sister of his*. *Attilia*, *Cato's* Wife, was so Lewd, that her Husband was obliged to part with her, having had (*h*) two Children by her. He married a second Wife, whom he afterwards yielded to *Hortensius*; and he married her again when she was a Widow and *Hortensius's* Heiress: which afforded *Cæsar* a fair opportunity of criticizing *Cato's* Life (*k*). Besides, *Cato* being of Age to Marry, courted a Maid who had been contracted to *Metellus Scipio*. Her Name was *Lepida*. The Contract was broke, so that being at liberty to marry, she answered *Cato's* Desires, and was betrothed to him. But at last, *Metellus Scipio* being sorry that he had broke his Ingagement, left nothing unattempted to recover *Lepida*, and succeeded in his Design (*l*). "(*m*) At which *Cato* was very much "incensed, and resolved to go to Law about it; "but his Friends persuaded him to the contrary. "However, he was so moved by his Heat of Youth "and Passion, that he writ Iambicks against *Scipio*, "which had all the Wit and Satyr of *Archilochus*, "without his Impudence and Scurrility. After this "he married *Attilia*, the Daughter of *Sorranus*, "which was the first, but not the only Woman he "ever knew; in this much less happy than *Lælius*, "the Friend of *Scipio*, who in the whole Course of "so long a Life, never knew but one Woman." The last part of this Passage is needless, with respect to the Text of this Remark; but it contains a Matter of Fact so curious, that I thought the Reader would be glad to know it. Is there any Man at this Day, of *Lælius's* Quality, and intimately acquainted with the General of an Army, who, like him, during the Course of a long Life, never knew any Woman but his Wife? Nay, is there any young Man of *Cato's* Quality, who keeps himself Chast till he gets into the Nuptial Bed? These Particulars are therefore very extraordinary, and deserved that I should lengthen the Quotation.

(B) *She*

---

* *His Name is* Nicolas di Castelli, *and he styles himself Secretary to the Elect. of Brandenburg. He publish'd that Version at his Charges in the year 1698. at* Leipsick *in 5 vol. in 12.*

(*h*) Quam multis rebus ego non egeo? *How many things there are, said he, which I don't care for?* Vide Erasmum in apoph. *p. m.* 168.

(*a*) *Intendant of Justice and Marine.*

(*b*) *Perrault, of Illustrious Men p.* 79.

(*c*) *It was settled in 1673, and call'd the King's Company.*

(*d*) *Otherwise call'd the Fossez de Nesle.*

(*e*) *Taken from a Book intitled le* Theatre François. *Mr.* Chappuzeau *is the Author of it.*

(†) *She did also prostitute her Daughter to him.*

(*f*) Οὕτω μὲν [illegible] Usque adeo Servilia fuit in Cæsarem pervagatus amor. *Plutarch. in Bruto p.* 985.

(*g*) *Id. in Catone minore p.* 785.

(*h*) *A Son and our* Porcia.

(*k*) *Taken from Plut. in Catone minore p.* 770, 784.

(*l*) *Plut. ibid. p.* 762.

(*m*) *Id. ib.*

prize, ſhe thruſt a (B) Knife into her Body, to ſhew by her patiently bearing the Pain, that ſhe could hold her Tongue, and conſequently that ſhe deſerved to be intruſted with her Husband's Secret. He imparted it to her, whereby ſhe came to know that there was a Deſign to kill *Cæſar*. But if ſhe raiſed herſelf then much above her Sex, ſhe appeared like other Women on the Day of the Execution; for ſhe was tranſported with ſuch a violent Uneaſineſs, that ſhe (C) fell into ſeveral Swoons, and was thought to be dead. We don't know what ſhe did, nor what ſhe ſaid when ſhe heard of the Succeſs of that Enterprize, and during the War in which her Husband found himſelf engag'd with *Cæſar*'s Friends; but we know that having accompanied him to the Sea-ſide, and expreſs'd a great Conſtancy, ſhe could (D) not forbear ſhedding Tears at the ſight of a certain Picture, and that ſhe put an end to her Life with great (E) Courage, when ſhe heard that *Brutus* had killed himſelf. Note, that when ſhe married him, ſhe was the Widow of

(a) *Id. in Bruto p.* 989.

(B) She thruſt a Knife into her Body to ſhew, &c.] “(a) *Porcia* being addicted to Philoſophy, a great Lover of her Husband, and full of Courage and Prudence, reſolved not to inquire into *Brutus*'s Secrets before ſhe had made this Trial of herſelf: She turn'd all her Attendants out of her Chamber, and taking a little Knife, ſuch as they uſe to cut Nails with, ſhe gave herſelf a deep Gaſh in the Thigh, upon which follow'd a great Flux of Blood, and ſoon after violent Pains, and a dangerous Fever, occaſion'd by the Anguiſh of the Wound. Now, when *Brutus* was mightily afflicted for her, ſhe in the heighth of all her Pain ſpoke thus to him: I, *Brutus*, being the Daughter of *Cato*, was given to you in Marriage, not like a Concubine, to partake only in the common Civilities of Bed and Board, but to bear a part in all your good, and all your evil Fortunes: And for my part, when I look upon you, I find no Reaſon to repent the Match; but from me, what Evidence of my Love what Satisfaction can you receive, if I may not ſhare with you in bearing your moſt hidden Griefs, nor be admitted to any of your Counſels that require Secrecy and Truſt? I know very well that Women ſeem to be of too weak a Nature to be truſted with Secrets; but certainly, *Brutus*, a virtuous Birth and Education, and a Converſation with the Good and Honourable, are of ſome force to the forming our Manners, and ſtrengthning our natural Weakneſs. And I can boaſt that I am the Daughter of *Cato*, and the Wife of *Brutus*; in which two great Titles, tho' before I put too little Confidence, yet now I have try'd myſelf, and find, that even againſt Grief and Pain itſelf I am invincible. Which Words having ſpoke, ſhe ſhewed him her Wound, and related to him the whole Trial that ſhe had made of her own Conſtancy: At which he being aſtoniſh'd, lifted up his Hands to Heaven, and begg'd the Aſſiſtance of the Gods in his Enterprize, that he might live to be a Husband worthy of ſuch a Wife as *Porcia*. So having comforted his Wife he left her.„ *Valerius Maximus* (a) is ſhorter in his Account, and ſuppoſes other Circumſtances, for he affirms, that ſhe knew her Husband's Deſign before ſhe wounded herſelf. He adds, that ſhe wounded herſelf the very ſame Day that *Cæſar* was aſſaſſinated, and that ſhe did it to try whether ſhe would be ſo courageous as to put an end to her Life, if *Brutus*'s Attempt ſhould be attended with an ill Succeſs. Obſerve how Hiſtorians vary about the moſt memorable Adventures.

(a) *Valerius Maximus l.* 3. *c.* 2. *n.* 15. *p.m.* 254.

(C) She was tranſported with ſuch a violent Uneaſineſs, that ſhe fell into ſeveral Swoons, and was thought to be dead.] The only Deſign of *Plutarch* in the particular Account he gives of that Accident, is to ſhew *Brutus*'s Intrepidity. Theſe are his Words. “(b) In the mean while there came one in all haſte from *Brutus*'s Houſe, and brought him News that his Wife was dead: For *Porcia* being extreamly diſturb'd with expectation of the Event, and not able to bear the greatneſs of her Cares, could ſcarce keep herſelf within Doors, and at every little Noiſe or Voice ſhe heard, leaping forth, and ſtarting ſuddenly, like one of the mad Prieſteſſes of *Bacchus*, ask'd every one that came to the *Forum*, What *Brutus* was doing? and continually ſent one Meſſenger after another to enquire. At laſt, after long expectation, the Strength of her Body could hold out no longer, but overcome with her Doubts and Fears, ſhe fainted away. She had not time to betake herſelf to her Chamber, for as ſhe was ſitting amongſt her Women, a ſudden want of Spirits, and a great Stupidneſs ſeiz'd her, and her Colour chang'd, and her Speech was quite loſt. At this ſight her Women made a great and lamentable Outcry, and many of the Neighbours running to *Brutus*'s Houſe, to know what was the Matter, the Report was ſoon ſpread abroad that *Porcia* was Dead; tho' ſhe recover'd in a little while, and came to herſelf again. When *Brutus* received this News, he was extreamly troubled, nor without Reaſon, yet was not ſo carried away by his private Grief, as to neglect the Publick Concern.„

(b) *Plut. ub. ſup. p.* 990.

(D) Having accompanied him to the Sea ſide . . . . ſhe could not forbear ſhedding Tears.] *Plutarch*'s Narrative contains ſome things that are to *Porcia*'s Honour, and therefore it will not be improperly inſerted in this Place. “(c) *Brutus* began to deſpair of any good Event of ſuch Proceedings; and reſolving to leave *Italy*, paſſed by Land through *Lucania*, and came to *Elea* by the Sea-ſide. From hence it was thought convenient, that *Porcia* ſhould return to *Rome*: ſhe was overcome with Grief to part from *Brutus*, but ſtrove as much as was poſſible to conceal it; but in ſpight of all her Manly Reſolutions, a Picture which ſhe found there accidentally betray'd it. The Story of it was the Parting of *Hector* from *Andromache*, when he went to engage the *Greeks*, giving his young Son *Aſtyanax* into her Arms, and ſhe fixing her Eyes upon him, with an earneſt and affectionate Look. As ſoon as ſhe ſpy'd this Piece, the Reſemblance it bore to her own Concern made her burſt out into Tears, and ſeveral times a Day ſhe walk'd where that Picture hung, to gaze at it, and weep before it. Upon this occaſion, when *Acilius*, one of *Brutus*'s Friends, repeated out of *Homer* theſe Verſes, wherein *Andromache* ſpeaks to *Hector*,

“*Be careful*, Hector, *for with Thee my All*,
“*My Father, Mother, Brother, Husband fall.*

“*Brutus* ſmiling, replied, But I muſt not anſwer *Porcia*, as *Hector* did *Andromache*,

“*Mind you your Wheel, and to your Maids give*
“*Law.*

“For tho' the natural Weakneſs of her Body hinders her from acting what only the Strength of Men can perform, yet ſhe has a Mind as valiant and as active for the good of her Country, as the beſt of us. This Relation is in the Memoirs of *Brutus*, written by *Bibulus*, *Porcia*'s Son.„ That *Bibulus*, who proceeded from *Porcia*'s firſt Marriage, wrote (d) *a ſmall Book concerning the Exploits of the* Romans. There was at leaſt (e) another Child by that Marriage.

(c) *Id. ibid. p.* 994.

(d) *Id. ib. p.* 989.

(e) *Id. in vita Catonis minoris p.* 771. *A.*

(E) She put an end to her Life with great Courage, when ſhe heard that Brutus *had killed himſelf.*] Thoſe, who don't underſtand *Latin*, will find hereafter in a Paſſage of *Plutarch* the Senſe of this Apoſtrophe of *Valerius Maximus*: (f) *Tuos quoque caſtiſſimos ignes Porcia, M. Catonis filia, cuncta ſæcula debita admiratione proſequuntur: Quæ cum apud Philippos victum & interemptum virum tuum Brutum cognoſceres, quia ferrum non dabatur, ardentes ore carbones haurire non dubitaſti, muliebri ſpiritu virilem patris exitum imitata. Sed neſcio an hoc fortius, quod ille uſitato, tu novo genere mortis abſumpta es.* *Plutarch* relates the ſame thing, and quotes *Valerius Maximus* and another Author; but he further ſays, that there was a Letter under *Brutus*'s Name, whereby it appeared, that *Porcia* reſolved to die, becauſe ſhe was not aſſiſted in her Sickneſs. . . . . . “(g) As for *Porcia*, his Wife, *Nicolaus* the Philoſopher, and *Valerius Maximus* write, That being

(f) *Valer. Maximus l.* 4. *c.* 6. *p. m.* 394, 395.

(g) *Plut. in Bruto in fine p.* 1009.

of *Bibulus*, by whom she * had Children. If President *du Vair* had known it, he would not have ascribed (*F*) to her an Answer, which probably belongs to another **PORCIA**, Sister to *Cato Uticensis*, † and Wife of one *Domitius Ahenobarbus*, and who was doubtless endowed with noble Qualities, since ‡ *Cicero*, *Lollius* and *Varro* wrote an Encomium upon her. She died before *Cæsar* had been kill'd.

PORCIUS (*Marcus*) one of the greatest Men among the Ancients, commonly known by the Title of **CATO THE CENSOR**, was born at

" desirous to die, but being hinder'd by her Friends, " who continually watch'd her from killing her- " self, she snatch'd some burning Coals out of the " Fire, and shutting them close in her Mouth, " stifled herself, and died. Though there is yet " extant a Letter of *Brutus* to his Friends, in " which he laments the Death of *Porcia*, and ac- " cuses them for neglecting her so, that she de- " sired to die, rather than languish with her Di- " sease. So that it seems *Nicolaus* was mistaken in " the Time. For this Epistle (if it indeed is Au- " thentick, and truly *Brutus's*) gives us to under- " stand the Disease, and the Love of this Lady, " and the Manner of her Death. „

(*F*) *President* du Vair . . . . *would not have ascribed to her an Answer.*] One of the Decrees pronounced by that President concerns a Suit in Law in the Parliament of *Provence*, between a Woman, who had married again nine Months after her being a Widow, and the Relations of her first Husband. She was deprived, by virtue of that Decree, (*a*) *of the things left her by her Husband's Last Will, and of her Nuptial Advantages, for having married again before the Year of her Mourning was out.* Mr. *du Vair* alledges a great many Sentences out of the Pagan Authors, and the Ancient Fathers against second Marriages, and says, that our *Porcia* declared, that a virtuous Woman never marries but once. (*b*) Dido *being intreated to marry again, wishes that she may rather die. . . . . . . Nevertheless, being afterwards persuaded to it, and deploring her Misfortune, she says*, & quo solo sidera adibam, Extinctus pudor, *as believing, with great Reason, that those who married twice, were neither honest nor happy. And therefore, as we read in* Tertullian, Fortunæ muliebri coronam non imponebat nisi univiræ. *Which agrees with the Saying of the celebrated* Porcia, Brutus's *Wife*, Fœlix & pudica matrona non nubit nisi semel. That *Porcia* could not have said this, without condemning herself, since *Brutus* was her second Husband. I am apt to think, that Mr. *du Vair* was led into this Error for want of a due Attention in reading *St. Jerome*'s Words. They are not exact, and besides, they contain a Falsity, and therefore they may very well occasion a Mistake; but after all, the Answer in Question is not ascribed to *Porcia*, *Brutus*'s Wife, in the Words of that Father. *St. Jerome* having mention'd *Martia*, *Cato*'s (*c*) younger Daughter, who would never Marry again, adds, that *Brutus* married *Porcia*, who was (*d*) a Maid, and that *Cato* married *Martia*, who was (*e*) not a Maid; and that accordingly *Martia* did not scruple to leave *Cato*, in order to Marry *Hortensius*, whereas *Porcia* would not live without *Brutus*. Afterwards *St. Jerome* mentions *Porcia* the younger, who made the Answer we have seen in Mr. *du Vair*'s Passage. (*f*) *Martia Catonis filia minor cum quæreretur ab ea, cur post amissum maritum denuo non nuberet, respondit, non se invenire virum, qui se magis vellet, quàm sua. Quo dicto ostendit divitias magis in uxoribus eligi solere, quàm pudicitiam, & multos non oculis, sed digitis uxores ducere. Optima sanè res, quàm avaritia conciliat. Eadem cum lugeret virum, & matronæ ab ea quærerent, quem diem haberet luctus ultimum: ait, quem & vitæ. Arbitror, quæ ita virum quærebat absentem, de secundo matrimonio non cogitabat. Brutus Porciam virginem duxit uxorem, Martiam Cato non virginem: sed Martia inter Hortensium Catonemque discurrit, & sine Catone vivere Martia potuit, Portia sine Bruto non potuit. Magis enim se unicis viris applicant fœminæ, & nihil aliud nosse, magnum arctioris indulgentiæ vinculum est. . . . . Portia minor, cum laudaretur apud eam quædam bene morata, quæ secundum habebat maritum, respondit: Felix & pudica matrona, nunquam præterquam semel nubit.* One cannot well apprehend what he means by *Porcia* the younger, *Porcia minor*, for the ancient History does not mention two Daughters of *Cato Uticensis*; and if it mentions two *Porcia*'s, 'tis to inform us, that one of 'em was *Cato*'s Sister, and the other his Daughter. At this rate, the latter should have been *Porcia* the younger, *Porcia minor*; but she could not have declared against second Marriages so severely as *St. Jerome* relates it. Some will have it that he means the other *Porcia*, *Cato*'s Sister. (*g*) *Meminit Hieronymus (Porciæ Domitio nuptæ) adversus Jovinianum, qui tale ejus dictum celebrat.* But why should he call her *Porcia minor*? 'Tis more likely that he means one *Porcia*, younger Sister of *Brutus*'s Wife, and, perhaps, confounding his Notions, he calls *Porcia minor* the same Woman, whom he calls *Martia* a little before. We must remember, that *Martia*, Wife of *Cato Uticensis*, was with Child (*h*) when her Husband parted with her in favour of *Hortensius*. Perhaps, she was delivered of a Daughter, who is indifferently call'd *Porcia minor* or (*i*) *Martia*, tho' it was not usual for Daughters to go by their Mother's Name. Perhaps, *St. Jerome*, for want of Attention, changed the two Names of one Woman into two Persons. What is certain is, that the Answer he ascribes to *Martia* is of the same Nature with that which he ascribes to *Porcia* the younger. It was of some use to him to distinguish 'em; for he was very willing to increase the number of such Examples. He alledges those of *Annia*, and of *Marcella* and *Valeria*. The first answered, that she would not Marry again; for, said she, if I should get a good Husband, I should be afraid of losing him, and if I should get a bad one, I should find it a very hard case, having been so kindly used by my first Spouse. *Marcella* answered, I am so well satisfied with having been married once, that I don't want to be married again. *Valeria* was contented to answer, that her first Husband was still alive as to her. (*l*) *Anniam cum propinquus moneret, ut alteri viro nuberet; esse enim ei & ætatem integram, & faciem bonam: nequaquam, inquit, hoc faciam. Si enim virum bonum invenero, nolo timere, ne perdam: si malum, quid necesse est post bonum pessimum sustinere? . . . . Marcella major rogata à matre sua, gauderet ne se nupsisse, respondit; ita valde, ut amplius nolim. Valeria Messalarum soror, amisso Servio viro, nulli volebat nubere. Quæ interrogata cur hoc faceret, ait sibi (m) semper maritum Servium vivere.*

'Tis to be observed, that if these Maxims afforded a copious Subject to the Advocates, who pleaded against the Widow concern'd in Mr. *du Vair*'s Decree, she afforded them more Matter still by her hastily marrying again, in the ninth Month of her Widowhood, and without waiting for the end of *Lent*. " She not only transgresses, *said the Advocate* (*n*), her private Mourning, and despises the " Memory of her late Husband and Benefactor, but " she does also defile the Time appointed for a " publick Penitence, she breaks the Laws of the " Church, and scandalizes every Body. But why " so hastily? If you could not stay till the end of " a Year already so far advanced, why didn't you " stay at least till the end of *Lent*, which was al- " ready half gone. Perhaps, the Heat of Youth " transported you, and as *Tertullian* says, *despumare istis nuptiis sanguinis fervorem oportuit.* Such " an Excuse could hardly be admitted from a young " Maid, in the Flower of her Age. Tho' as St. " *Jerome* says, *libido majorem in virginibus patiatur* " *famem, dum dulcius putat omne quod nescit.* And " will an old Woman alledge it, after she has been " twenty five Years married to a Man, who was " seventy Years old when he died? How came " you then to contain yourself during your Hus- " band's Life, when the Title of Wife, and the Co- " ver of Marriage gave you more Liberty, and the " sight of an old Man raised in you a greater " Lust? „ Many Civil Laws were thundered out against her; but she alledged against 'em (*o*) the Canon Law, and the Indulgence of the Pope's Decrees. 'Tis a scandalous thing, that some Injunctions of the Civil Law should have been enervated by the Canon Law, to countenance the Abuses of Marriage.

(*A*) Was

---

* *See the End of the Rem. D.*

† *Plut. in Catone Utic. p.* 778. *F.*

‡ *See Cicero epist. ad Atticum* 47, & 48. *l.* 13.

(*a*) *Oeuvres du Sieur du Vair p.* 859. *Edit. of* Geneva 1617. *in* 8.

(*b*) *Oeuvres du Sieur du Vair p.* 820.

(*c*) *Such a Daughter of* Cato *is not mention'd by the Pagan Authors.*

(*d*) *This is false: she was* Bibulus's *Widow.*

(*e*) Plutarch *says no such thing.*

(*f*) *Hieronym. l.* 1. *advers. Jovinianum p. m.* 36.

(*g*) [illegible] *dict.* [illegible] *Mat. p.* 715.

(*h*) *Plut. in Caton minore p.* 771.

(*i*) *The Author of the Scholia upon St.* Jerome *ad locum supra relatum, is of Opinion, that this* Martia *was so called because of her Mother.*

(*l*) *Hieronymus ub. sup.*

(*m*) *Accordingly an Ancient Author says, that* vidua luctus pro marito erat. *Which* Lucan *did first transfer to the Wife of* Pompey, *saying,* perfusa lachrymis & habet pro conjuge luctum. *Du Vair ubi supra p.* 820.

(*n*) *Id. ib. p.* 813.

(*o*) *Ibid. p.* 820, 854.

at * Tusculum, in the Year of Rome (A) 519. He began to bear Arms at 17 Years of Age, and ſhewed not only much Courage, but alſo a great contempt of Pleaſures, and even of (B) the Conveniencies of Life. He was a Man of an extraordinary Sobriety, and no bodily Exerciſe ſeem'd to him unworthy of him; for at his Return from his Campaigns, he betook himſelf to Plow his Ground, but did not neglect to cultivate his Mind, eſpecially in order to ſpeak well, a Talent neceſſary to him, ſince he pleaded many Cauſes in the Neighbouring Towns; which he did ſo generouſly, that he would never receive any Reward for it. The Diſcourſes of a *Pythagorean* † Philoſopher, which he heard at *Tarentum*, when that Town was re-taken by *Fabius Maximus*, in whoſe Army he ſerv'd, did very much ſtrengthen his Inclination for Temperance. *Valerius Flaccus*, who had a Country Seat near *Cato's*, was deſirous to ſee that young Man of whom he was told ſo many remarkable things; and finding that it was a good Plant which wanted only to be cultivated and tranſplanted into better Ground, he perſuaded him to come to *Rome*. *Cato* was eſteem'd in that City, and having ſuch an officious Patron as *Valerius Flaccus*, quickly raiſed himſelf. He was firſt of all elected Military Tribune, afterwards they made him Queſtor, and then by degrees he came to be || Conſul and * Cenſor. No Man was ever better qualified than he for the Office of Cenſor, nor did better diſcharge the Duties of it. He made uſe of his Severity, Eloquence and exemplary Life, to put a ſtop to the Luxury and other Vices of the *Romans* ‡: which was the Reaſon why it has been ſaid, that he was not leſs ſerviceable to the ‡ Republick of *Rome*, by ſetting up againſt Immorality, than *Scipio* by his Victories over the Enemies. It was well known that he would exerciſe the Cenſorſhip with the utmoſt Rigour; which was one of the Reaſons why the Patricians croſs'd him when he ſtood for that Office; but that ſame Reaſon moved the People to prefer him to all his Competitors. This Circumſtance (C) is admirably repreſented by the beſt Latin Hiſtorian, together with

* *Frasc. Nep. in fragmento vitæ Catonis, Plut. in Catone majore init. pag. 335.*

† *His Name was Nearchus.*

|| *In the Year of Rome 558.*

* *In the Year of Rome 569.*

‡ *Taken from Plut. in vita Catonis Majoris.*

‡ *See the Paſſage of* Seneca *in the Rem. B.*

(A) Was born . . . . . . in the Year of Rome 519.] Here is the Proof of it, (q) *Anno poſt conſul primum fuerat* (Q. Maximus) *quam ego natus ſum.* They are *Cato's* Words in a Book of *Cicero*. But the *Faſti Conſulares* place the firſt Conſulſhip of *Fabius Maximus* in the Year of *Rome* 520. All the Dates ſpecified in the ſame Book ſhew, that the Latin Words I have quoted ought to be read thus. See *Grevius's* Edition, where you'll find a Note of *Vincent Contarinus*, and another of *Charles Langius*, which clear the Matter. I infer from the Poſition of that Year, that *Livy* and *Plutarch* are miſtaken, when (r) they ſay that *Cato* pleaded his Cauſe at 86 Years of Age, and accuſed *Sergius Galba* four Years after. He died at 85 Years of Age, for it was in the Year of *Rome* 604, under the Conſulſhip of *Lucius Marcius*, and *Manius Manilius*, which was 85 Years before *Cicero's* Conſulſhip, as (ſ) *Cicero* obſerves. *Corradus* is a little miſtaken upon this Paſſage. He ſays (t), that *Cato* was born 7 Years after the Conſulſhip of *Claudius Cento* and *Sempronius Tuditanus*, which falls in with the Year of *Rome* 513; and that he was in his 30th Year under the Conſulſhip of *Cornelius Cethegus* and *Sempronius Tuditanus*, that is in the Year of *Rome* 549. This Computation is wrong, any Body may ſee that there are only 29 Years from the Year of *Rome* 520 to the Year 549. *Corradus* obſerves a little farther (v), that *Cato* was born in the Year 521, and that being dead in the Year 604, he lived at leaſt 85 Years; which is a wrong Calculation. Some Pages after (w) he ſays, that *Cato* died in the Year 605, at 85 Years of Age, being born in the Year 521. Which does not rectifie the Computations. However, we may ſay that he lived to that Age, for *Cicero* affirms it in expreſs Words. (x) *Annos quinque & LXXX. natus exceſſit è vita cum quidem eo ipſo anno contra Ser. Galbam ad populum ſumma contentione dixiſſet, quam etiam orationem ſcriptam reliquit.* *Cato* did not only write down that Pleading againſt *Galba*, but alſo (y) inſerted it in his *Origines*. *Pliny* (z) denotes the time of *Cato's* Deceaſe too indeterminately: *Circa captas*, ſays he, *Carthaginem & Corinthum . . . . ſupremum is diem obiit.* Thoſe two Towns were conquered in the Year 608. I don't find that he ſays in his 19th Book, as *Glandorpius* (a) will have it, that *Cato* died at 85 Years of Age: I only find there, that he (b) died a Year after he had perſuaded the *Romans* to begin the third Punick War. The 29th Book ſhould have been quoted, where theſe Words are to be found, (c) *hic Cato DCV. anno urbis noſtræ obiit, LXXXV. ſuo.* *Paterculus* agrees with this as to the Year of *Rome*, for he (d) ſays, that *Cato* died three Years before the Deſtruction of *Carthage*. I will not cenſure *Moreri* for placing *Cato's* Deceaſe in the Year of *Rome* 605, but I think it ſomewhat ſtrange, that the Fault he has committed in ſaying, that it was *during the ſecond Punick War*, has not been mended (e) hitherto.

(B) A great contempt of Pleaſures, and even of the Conveniencies of Life.] I ſhould be too prolix, ſhould I mention whatever is to be found in Books upon this Subject; and therefore I ſhall only ſet down a Paſſage of *Seneca*, whereby it appears, that *Cato* was contented with one Horſe for himſelf and Baggage, and look'd after him himſelf. (f) *M. Cato Cenſorius (quem tam reip. hercule profuit naſci quam Scipionem: alter enim cum hoſtibus noſtris bellum, alter cum moribus geſſit) canterio vehebatur, & hippoperis quidem impoſitiis, ut ſecum utilia portaret. . . . . . O quantum erat ſæculi decus, imperatorem triumphalem, cenſorium (& quod ſuper omnia hæc eſt) Catonem, uno caballo eſſe contentum, & ne toto quidem! Partem enim ſarcinæ, ab utroque latere dependentes, occupabant. Ita non omnibus obeſis mannis, & aſturconibus, & tollutariis præferres unicum illum equum, ab ipſo Catone defrictum?* He had Slaves enough to do it for him, but he rather choſe to ſave them that trouble. 'Twas his Inclination: he plowed (g) the Ground, dreſs'd like his Slaves, and then ſat down at Table with them, eating of the ſame Bread, and drinking of the ſame Wine. *Seneca* might have mention'd a thing more remarkable ſtill than what he relates. " (h) When he enter'd " upon the Government of *Sardinia*, though his " Predeceſſors there uſed to require Tents, Bed- " ding and Cloaths upon the Publick Account, and " to charge them heavily by furniſhing Proviſions " and Entertainments for a great Train of Ser- " vants and Friends: He, on the contrary, by his " Frugality ſhew'd an incredible Difference, for in " nothing wanted he the Contribution of the Pub- " lick; nay, he would walk without a Coach to " viſit the Cities, and with one only of the com- " mon Town-Officers, who carried his Garment, " and a Cup to offer Sacrifice in. „

(C) *This Circumſtance is admirably repreſented by the beſt Latin Hiſtorian, together with his Elogy.*] This Paſſage of *Livy* is ſo fine, that I can neither forbear to ſet it down at length, nor be ſo bold as to tranſlate it. (i) *In hoc viro* (M. Porcio) *tanta vis animi ingeniique fuit, ut quocunque loco natus eſſet, fortunam ſibi ipſe facturus fuiſſe videretur: Nulla ars neque privatæ, neque publicæ rei gerendæ ei defuit. Urbanas ruſticaſque res pariter callebat. Ad ſummos honores alios ſcientia juris, alios eloquentia, alios gloria militaris provexit. Huic verſatile ingenium ſic pariter ad omnia fuit, ut natum ad id unum diceres, quodcunque ageret. In bello manu fortiſſimus, multiſque inſignibus clarus pugnis: idem poſteaquam ad magnos honores pervenit, ſummus imperator: idem in pace, ſi* jus

(q) *Cicero de Senect. c. 4. p. m. 392.*

(r) *Titus Livius l. 39. p. m. 752. Plut. in Catone Majore p. 341. 345.*

(ſ) *Cicero in Bruto p. m. 109.*

(t) *Corradus in Brutum Cicer. p. 109.*

(v) *Ibid. p. 110.*

(w) *Ibid. p. 150.*

(x) *Cicero ibid. p. 349.*

(y) Quam rationem in Origi- es ſuas etulit aucis an- e quam ortuus it an di- us an enſibus. . ib. p. 5.

(z) *Plin. 14. c. 4. m. 124.*

(a) *Glan- rp. in nomaſt. 714.*

(b) *Plin. 9. c. 13. 197.*

(c) *Id. lib. . c. 1. 658.*

(d) *Pater. l. 1. 13.*

(e) *I write this in* March 1701.

(f) *Seneca epiſt. 87. p. m. 333.*

(g) *Plut. in Marco Catone p. 337. See alſo Valerius Maximus l. 4. c. 3. n. 12.*

(h) *Idem Plutarch p. 339.*

(i) *Livius l. 39. p. m. 762.*

with his Elogy. The Inſcription of the Statue (D) erected to him, was a glorious Teſtimony of his Reforming Inclination. He expreſſed a great Indifferency for the Erection (E) of Statues, and in general, for Praiſes †; nevertheleſs, he highly commended himſelf ‡, and was willing that People ſhould ſee in his Books the great Encomiums he beſtowed on himſelf. He made a great many Speeches, and inſerted (F) ſome of 'em in his *Roman* Hiſtory. That Hiſtory, and the Work he wrote β concerning the Art of War, are not extant. He compoſed ſome Books γ of Agriculture, and was very particular in the Deſcription of that Art *. He wrote alſo ſomething concerning Rhetorick, and 'tis likely he was the

jus conſuleres, peritiſſimus: ſi cauſa granda eſſet, eloquentiſſimus: nec ii tantum, cujus lingua vivo eo viguerit, monumentum eloquentiæ nullum extet. Vivit imo, vigetque eloquentia ejus, ſacrata ſcriptis omnis generis. Orationes & pro ſe multæ, & pro aliis, & in alios. Nam non ſolum accuſando, ſed etiam cauſam dicendo fatigavit inimicos, ſimultates nimio plures & exercuerunt eum, & ipſe exercuit eas. Nec facilè dixeris, utrum magis preſſerit eum nobilitas, an ille agitaverit nobilitatem. Aſperi procuIdubio animi, & linguæ acerbæ, & immodicè liberæ fuit, ſed invicti cupiditatibus animi, & rigidæ innocentiæ, contemptor gratiæ, divitiarum: in parſimonia, in patientia laboris periculique ferrei propè corporis, animique, quem ne ſenectus quidem, quæ ſolvit omnia, fregerit: qui ſextum & octogeſimum annum agens cauſam dixerit, ipſe pro ſe oraverit, ſcripſeritque, nonageſimo anno Sergium Galbam ad populi adduxerit judicium. Hunc, ſicut omni vita, ita tum (cenſuram) *petentem premebat nobilitas: conſenſerantque, præter L. Flaccum, qui collega in conſulatu fuerat, candidati omnes, ad dejiciendum honore eum, non ſolum ut ipſi potius adipiſcerentur, nec quia indignabantur novum hominem cenſorem videre, ſed etiam quod triſtem cenſuram, periculoſamque multorum famæ, & ab læſo à pleriſque, & lædendi cupido expectabant. Etenim tum quoque minitabundus petebat, refragari ſibi qui liberam & fortem cenſuram timerent, criminando. Et ſimul L. Valerio ſuffragabatur: illo uno collega caſtigare ſe nova flagitia, & priſcos mores revocare poſſe. His accenſi homines, adverſa nobilitate non M. Porcium modo cenſorem fecerunt, ſed etiam collegam ei L. Valerium Flaccum adjecerunt.*

(D) *The Inſcription of the Statue erected to him.*] " (k) The People did like his Cenſorſhip wondrous " well; for ſetting up a Statue for him in the " Temple of the Goddeſs of Health, they put an " Inſcription under it, not of his Warlike Feats " and Triumphs, but ſuch a one as ſignified, That " this was *Cato* the Cenſor, who by his good Di" ſcipline and Ordinances reclaim'd the *Roman* " Commonwealth, when it was declining and ſu" pinely tumbling into Vice." *Cornelius Nepos* obſerves, that *Cato*'s Severity put a ſtop to the Luxury which had already crept into the Commonwealth. (l) *Cato Cenſor cum eodem Flacco factus, ſeverè præfuit ei poteſtati. Nam & in complures nobiles animadvertit, & multas res novas in edictum addidit, quare luxuria reprimeretur, quæ jam tum incipiebat pullulare.*

(E) *A great Indifferency for the Erection of Statues.*] The following Words of *Plutarch* are to be found next to thoſe I have quoted in the Remark *D.* " Now before this Statue Honour was done to him" ſelf, he us'd to laugh at thoſe who lov'd ſuch " kind of things, ſaying, They were not ſenſible " that they glory'd chiefly in the Workmanſhip of " Engravers and Painters, but that the Citizens " bore about his faireſt Image in their Breaſts. " When any ſeem'd to wonder at him, that he " ſhould have never a Statue, when many ordina" ry Perſons had one; I wou'd, ſaid he, much ra" ther be ask'd why I have not one, than why I " have one." *Ammianus Marcellinus* (a) mentions this noble Anſwer. Note, that *Plutarch* in another place (b) of his Works, ſhould not have ſaid abſolutely, that *Cato* would not ſuffer that a Statue ſhou'd be erected to him.

(F) *And inſerted ſome of 'em in his* Roman *Hiſtory.*] He wrote that Hiſtory in his old Age, and divided it into 7 Books. The firſt contain'd the Actions of the Kings of *Rome*; the ſecond and the third contain'd the Origin of all the Towns of *Italy*; for which Reaſon 'tis thought he intituled the whole Work *Origines*. In the fourth he deſcribed the firſt *Punick* War; and in the fifth he deſcribed the ſecond, which he did ſummarily. He deſcribed in the ſame manner the following Wars, to the Pretorſhip of *Sergius Galba*, who conquered the *Luſitani*. He mention'd things without naming thoſe who had done 'em. He took notice of the Rarities that were to be found in *Spain* and *Italy*, and ſhewed a great deal of Learning and Exactneſs (c). Obſerve theſe Words of *Cornelius Nepos*, (d) *ab adoleſcentia confecit orationes: Senex hiſtorias ſcribere inſtituit*; and at the ſame time remember that *Cicero* (e) ſays, that *Cato* went about that Work the very ſame Year that he died. Which affords a very good Reaſon to criticize *Livy* (f), who ſuppoſes that *Lucius Valerius*, Tribune of the People, making a Speech againſt *Cato* in the Year 558, quoted his *Origines*. *Cato* was then but 49 Years of Age, from whence it ought to be inferred, that he had not writ that Book yet, and that *Livy*, who is doubtleſs the Author of the Speeches related by him, forgot to reconcile his Suppoſitions with Chronology. He affords an Argument againſt himſelf, for he obſerves in (g) another place, that *Cato*'s Speech for the *Rhodians*, made in the Year 587, had been inſerted in the 5th Book of the *Origines*: which ſhews, that thoſe *Origines* had not been publiſh'd when the Tribune *Valerius* made a Speech againſt *Cato*. It were in vain to ſuppoſe many Editions of that Work, ſome larger than others, ſince no Ancient Author intimates any ſuch thing, and beſides, the firſt was only made when the Author was far (h) advanced in Years. Father *Noris* (i) found fault with *Livy* upon this Account: *Voſſius* (k) had ſaid before that Cardinal, that he believed *Livy* was miſtaken, in ſuppoſing that the Tribune (l) of the People made an Objection to *Cato* which he took out of his *Origines*. Obſerve, that we read in the Epitome of the 49th Book of *Livy*, that *Cato*'s Speech againſt *Galba* was to be found in the *Origines*. But he made it the laſt Year of his Life: See above (m), what I have quoted out of *Cicero*. He publiſhed above 150 Speeches, very much commended by *Cicero* (n), tho' he obſerves, that no Body read 'em. Doubtleſs, they were uſed a hundred Years after *Cato*'s Death, as we uſe now a Days the Speeches that were made in the States of the Kingdom of *France*, or at the opening of the Audiences in the XVI. Century. A Freed Man of *Cicero* criticiz'd with great ſubtlety, *Cato*'s Speech for the *Rhodians*; but ſee in *Aulus Gellius* (o) the Anſwer that was made to his Criticiſms.

Let us conſider theſe Words of *Cornelius Nepos*, *atque horum bellorum duces non nominavit, ſed ſine nominibus res notavit.* The Commentators upon *Pliny*, without excepting Father *Hardouin*, knew nothing of this Paſſage. *Pliny* obſerves, that *Cato*, who had omitted the Names of the Generals in his Annals, mention'd the Name of an Elephant. (p) *Certe Cato, cum Imperatorum nomina Annalibus detraxerit, eum* (elephantum) *qui fortiſſime præliatus eſſet in Punica acie, Surum tradidit vocatum.* Read this Note of Father *Hardouin.* (q) *Auctoris mentem aſſequi cum minime poſſent Plinii editores, hanc poſtremam vocem corruptam rati ſcripſere,* cum Imperatorum nomina annalibus deſcriberet, *contra fidem codicum Reg.* 1. 2. *cæterorumque melioris notæ, a ſcriptoris mente longiſſime aberrantes, cujus hæc ſententia eſt: Cato, inquit, imperatorum Punicorum nomina annalibus ſuis apponere neglexit: idem tamen, quod nomen elephanti eſſet, qui tunc fortiſſime præliatus, referre operæ pretium duxit.* He thought that *Cato* had only omitted the Names of the *Carthaginian* Generals; he would not have thought ſo, if he had remembred the Words of *Cornelius Nepos*.

Note, that the Fragments of *Cato*'s *Origines* publiſh'd by *Annius Viterbienſis*, are accounted a ſuppoſititious Piece; but thoſe which have been collected by *Riccobonus*, and printed at the end of his Treatiſe of Hiſtory, are genuine. They have been inlarged the firſt *Roman* who writ upon that Subject †. He was accuſed ſeveral times, and always defended himſelf (*G*) with great Force; he was ſo ſure of his Innocence, that an Action being brought againſt him, he offer'd to ſubmit to the Judgment of one of his Enemies. He was no Friend to the Phyſicians, and did not approve the Studies that (*H*) were moſt in vogue among the *Græcians*: nevertheleſs, he ſtudied

---

† *Plutarch* ibid. p. 347.

‡ *Id. ib. & p.* 344. *B.*

β *Plinius in præf. Vegetius l.* 1. *c.* 8.

γ *They are ſtill extant.*

* *Plut. ib. p.* 351.

(k) *Plut. ubi ſupra p.* 347.

(l) *Cornel. Nepos in fragmento vitæ Catonis p. m.* 384.

(a) Cenſorius Cato .... interrogatus quamobrem inter multos nobiles ſtatuam non haberet, malo, inquit, ambigere bonos quamobrem id non meruerim, quam, quod eſt gravius, cur impetraverim muſſitare. *Amm. Marcell. l.* 14. *c.* 6. *p. m.* 21.

(b) *Plut. in præcept. reip. ger. p.* 820. *B.*

(c) *Taken from Cornel. Nepos ub. ſup.*

(d) *Id. ib.*

(e) *See the Rem. A lett. z.*

(f) *Livius l.* 34. *p. m.* 5..

(g) *Id. lib.* 45. *p.* ..

(h) *Cornel. Nepos ubi ſupra.*

(i) *Noris Cenotaph. Piſan. p.* ..

(k) *Voſſius de Hiſt. Lat. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *p.* 21.

(l) *His Name was not Oppius, as Voſſius affirms.*

(m) *In the Rem. A letter z.*

(n) *Cicero in Bruto p. m.* 11.

(o) *Aulus Gellius l.* 7. *c.* 3.

(p) *Plin. l.* 8. *c.* 5. *p. m.* 14.

(q) *Hardouin. in Plin. tom.* 2. *p.* 25.

inlarged by *Auſonius Popma*, and added by him (*r*) with Notes to the other Writings of *Cato*.

(*G*) *He was accuſed ſeveral times, and defended himſelf . . . . and offer'd to ſubmit to the Judgment of one of his Enemies.*] "(*s*) But neither did he himſelf 'ſcape ſcot-free in his managery of Affairs; for if he gave his Enemies but the leaſt Hold, he was ſtill in Danger, and ready to be brought to Juſtice: for he is reported to have eſcap'd at leaſt fifty Indictments, and one above the reſt, which was the laſt, when he was fourſcore and ſix Years old, about which time he had this remarkable Saying, *That it was hard for him who had liv'd contemporary with others a great while ago, to plead now before a new Race of Men.* Neither did he make this the laſt of his Law-Suits; for four Years after, when he was fourſcore and ten, he accus'd *Servilius Galba*: So that he arriv'd (we ſee, as *Neſtor* did) to three uſual Ages of Man, and that in continual Action." Theſe Words of *Plutarch* want to be mended, for 'tis not true that *Cato* lived ſo long, and it had been better to uſe the preciſe Number 44, as it is in *Pliny*. *Cato primus Porciæ gentis*, ſays he (*t*), *tres ſummas in homine res præſtitiſſe exiſtimatur, ut eſſet optimus Orator, optimus Imperator, optimus Senator: quæ mihi omnia, etiamſi non prius, attamen clarius fulſiſſe in Scipione Æmiliano videntur, dempto præterea plurimorum odio, quo Cato laboravit. Itaque ſit proprium Catonis, quater & quadragies cauſam dixiſſe, nec quemquam ſæpius poſtulatum, & ſemper abſolutum.* *Aurelius Victor* (*v*) made uſe of the ſame Number 44, wherein he is more exact than in what he ſays, that *Cato* being 80 Years of Age, ſet up for *Galba*'s Accuſer. He ſhould have ſaid, *being 85 Years of Age*: See the Remark *A*. *Moreri* is ſtrangely miſtaken, when he ſays, that *Cato*'s Enemies *proſecuted him above four hundred times.* I muſt not forget theſe Words of an Ancient Author. (*w*) *Cato ſextum & octogeſimum annum agens, dum in rep. tuenda juvenili animo perſtat, ab inimicis capitali crimine accuſatus, ſuam cauſam egit. Neque aut memoriam ejus quiſquam tardiorem, aut firmitatem lateris ulla ex parte quaſſatam, aut os hæſitatione impeditum animadvertit. Quia omnia iſta in ſtatu ſuo æquali ac perpetua induſtria continebat. Quin etiam in ipſo diutiſſime actæ vitæ fine diſertiſſimi oratoris Galbæ accuſationi defenſionem ſuam pro Hiſpania oppoſuit.* There are two Faults in this Paſſage, for *Cato* was not 86 Years old, when he pleaded the firſt of the two Cauſes mention'd by *Valerius Maximus*; and he was *Galba*'s Accuſer in the ſecond, and not obliged to clear himſelf of *Galba*'s Accuſations: the latter wanted but little of being condemn'd, and would have undergone that Puniſhment, had he not raiſed the Compaſſion of the People (*a*).

To make an end of what I am to ſay upon the Text of this Remark, I need only quote *Valerius Maximus*, whoſe Words run thus. (*b*) *Cato ſuperior ſæpenumero ab inimicis ad cauſæ dictionem vocatus, nec ullo unquam crimine convictus: ad ultimum tantum fiduciæ in ſua innocentia repoſuit, ut ab his in quæſtionem publicam deductus, Ti. Gracchum, à quo in adminiſtratione reip. ad multum odium diſſidebat, judicem depoſceret. Qua quidem animi præſtantia pertinaciam eorum inſectandi ſe inhibuit.*

(*H*) *He was no Friend to the Phyſicians, and did not approve the Studies that were moſt in vogue among the* Græcians.] I ſhall quote *Plutarch*, who having ſaid, that *Cato* was diſpleas'd to ſee the three Philoſophers deputed by the *Athenians*, ſo well approved at *Rome*, and that he adviſed the Senate to ſend 'em home immediately, goes on thus. (*d*) "Yet this he did not out of any Anger (as ſome think) to *Carneades*; but becauſe he wholly deſpis'd Philoſophy, and out of a kind of Pride, ſcoff'd at the *Greek* Muſes and Literature: For indeed he wou'd uſe to ſay, That *Socrates* was a prating ſeditious Fellow. . . . . And to fright his Son from any thing that was *Greek*, he us'd a much harſher Tone than was uſual with one of his Age, pronouncing, as it were, with the Voice of an Oracle, That the *Romans* would certainly be deſtroy'd, when they were once to be infected with *Greek*, tho' Time ſhew'd the Vanity of this his *wayward Saying*; for in truth, the City of *Rome* grew never greater than when they entertain'd the *Greek* Learning; nor had he an Averſion only to the *Grecian* Philoſophers, but the Phyſicians alſo; for having, it ſeems, heard how *Hippocrates* ſhould ſay when the King of *Perſia* ſent for him, and would have fee'd him even with ſeveral Talents, That he would never aſſiſt Barbarians, who were Enemies to the *Grecians*; he affirm'd, that this was now become a common Oath to be taken by all Phyſicians, and ſo enjoin'd his Son to have a care and avoid them; for that he himſelf had written a little Treatiſe, whereby he gave Preſcriptions, and cur'd thoſe who were ſick in his Family." If you deſire to ſee the very Words of *Cato*, read this Paſſage of *Pliny*. (*e*) *Mox à ſævitia ſecandi urendique, tranſiſſe nomen in carnificem, & in tædium artem omneſque Medicos: quod clariſſime intelligi poteſt ex M. Catone, cujus auctoritati triumphus atque Cenſura minimum conferunt: tanto plus in ipſo eſt. Quamobrem verba ejus ipſa ponemus. Dicam de iſtis Græcis ſuo loco, Marce fili: quid Athenis exquiſitum habeam, & quod bonum ſit illorum litteras inſpicere, non perdiſcere, vincam. Nequiſſimum & indocile genus illorum: & hoc puta vatem dixiſſe: Quandocumque iſta gens ſuas litteras dabit, omnia corrumpet. Tum etiam magis, ſi Medicos ſuos huc mittet. Jurarunt inter ſe barbaros necare omnes Medicina. Et hoc ipſum mercede faciunt, ut fides iis ſit, & facile diſperdant. Nos quoque dictitant barbaros, & ſpurcius nos, quam alios opicos, appellatione fœdant. Interdixi tibi de medicis.* This may ſerve to confute thoſe who ſay, that *Carneades*'s Speech againſt Juſtice, was the chief Reaſon that moved *Cato* to adviſe the Senate to ſend away immediately thoſe *Athenian* Praters. I knew a Man of great Parts, who thought that *Cato* gave that Advice, becauſe *Carneades* had undermined the Foundations of the *Roman* Policy, and diſcovered a Myſtery, which was the Baſis of the Power and Glory of that ambitious Republick. Thoſe who governed it, made People believe that Reaſon and Uprightneſs were the Rule of their Actions; but *Carneades* ſpeaking againſt Juſtice, alledged this Proof amongſt others, (*f*) That the *Romans* would be obliged to return into Huts, if they would be Juſt, that is, reſtore what they had invaded. I believe *Cato* was diſpleas'd with this Argument, and clearly ſaw the Conſequences of it; but I am perſuaded that more powerful Reaſons incenſed him againſt thoſe *Athenian* Deputies, *&c.*

Here I muſt take notice of a Falſity that is to be found in *Agrippa* and *Montagne*, and which has been learnedly confuted by Mr. *Drelincourt*, Doctor of Phyſick. *Romani quondam ſub Catone Cenſorio medicos omnes & urbe tota, & tota Italia pepulerunt, eorum funeſta mendacia, crudelitatemque averſati.* They are *Agrippa*'s (*g*) Words: *Montagne* expreſſes himſelf thus (*h*), *The* Romans *had been ſix hundred Years without any* Phyſicians, *and having tried 'em, expell'd 'em from* Rome *by the help of* Cato the Cenſor. Many Modern Writers might be quoted who ſay the ſame. *John Langius* (*i*), a *German* Phyſician, affirms, that *Cato* the Cenſor cauſed the *Greek* Phyſicians to be forbidden to come to *Rome*. *Gaſpar à Reies* (*k*), a *Spaniſh* Phyſician, ſays, that *Cato*'s Opinion that all the *Greeks* and *Egyptians* ſhould be turn'd out of *Rome*, was approved without any Contradiction, and that all the Phyſicians of *Rome* being Natives of *Greece* or *Egypt*, were involved in the Decree pronounced by the Senate purſuant to the Deſires of that ſevere Cenſor. He adds (*l*), that this Proſcription was made in the Year of *Rome* 590, and laſted till the Reign of the firſt Emperors. But this is all groundleſs; for it cannot be proved that *Cato* uſed his Intereſt with the Senate or the People to obtain that Decree, or that there was ſuch a Decree in his Time. On the contrary, we read in *Pliny*, who of all Ancient Authors may be moſt eaſily quoted to the diſadvantage of the Phyſicians, that the Senate baniſh'd died the *Greek* Tongue; but 'tis faid he went about it in his (I) Old Age. He lived a * long Life; and preferved a great Strength of Body and Mind to the laft. Being a Man of a ftrong Conftitution, he wanted Women in his Old Age, and becaufe he could not (K) conceal, as much as he defired, his keeping a Concubine, he married again. His fecond Wife was not of the fame Quality with him. We fhall fee what ‡ Anfwer he made to his Son, who complain'd of it. 'Tis faid that this Under-match did not (L) prove fo advantageous to him as he expected. He was a good Husband, and a good † Father, and no lefs exact in keeping his Family in a good Order, than in reforming the Diforders of the Town. Some great Statefmen are not able to put their Domeftick Affairs upon a good Foot, and have a better Succefs and lefs Trouble in the Adminiftration of Publick Affairs, than in the Management of their Families. *Cato* was not like 'em, he underftood

---

† See [illegible]

(*r*) At [illegible] in 8.

(*s*) Plut. in Cat. vita p. 345.

(*t*) Plin. l. 7. c. 27. p. 47.

(*v*) Galbam octogenarius accuſavit, ipſe quadragies quater accuſatus, glorioſe abſolutus. Aurel. Victor. de vir. illuſtr.

(*w*) Val. Maximus l. 8. c. 7. [illegible] p. m. [illegible], 678.

(*a*) Cicero in Bruto p. 165.

(*b*) Valer. Maximus l. [illegible] c. 7. [illegible] p.

(*d*) Plut. in Catone [illegible] p.

(*e*) Plin. l. 29. c. 1. p. 557, 558.

(*f*) Omnibus populis qui florerent imperio & Romanis quoque ipſis qui totius orbis potiuntur, ſi juſti velint eſſe, hoc eſt ſi aliena reſtituant ad caſas eſſe redeundum, & in neceſſitate ac miſeriis jacendum. *Carneades apud Lactant. l.* 5. *c.* 16. *p.* 341.

(*g*) *Agrippa de vanit. ſcientiar. c.* 83. *p. m.* 196.

(*h*) *Montagne Eſſays Book* 2. *c.* 37. *p. m.* 788.

(*i*) *Langius epiſt. Medic.* 2. *l.* 2. *p.* 482.

(*k*) *Gaſpar à Reies in elyſio jucund. quæſt. Campo quæſt.* 1. *n.* 13. *p. m.* 11.

(*l*) *Id. ib. p.* 12, 13.

* *See the Rem. A.*

‡ *In the Rem. K.*

† *See the Rem. N towards the end.*

---

nifh'd 'em a long time after *Cato*'s Deceafe. (m) *Et cum Græcos* (antiqui) *Italia pellerent*, fays he, DIU POST CATONEM, *excepiffe Medicos.* The Meaning of this Paffage feems to be, that all the *Greeks*, except the Phyficians, were expell'd from *Italy.* 'Tis the Senfe the learned Mr. *Drelincourt* (n) puts upon it; but 'tis certain, thofe Words are to be underftood otherwife; they fignifie, that the Phyficians were particularly comprehended in the Expulfion; for had they been excepted, *Pliny* would have had no occafion to alledge the Reafons fo exactly mention'd by him to juftifie *Cato*, and the Severity of the *Roman* Senate. *Non deferam Catonem*, they are his Words in the following Page, *tam ambitiofæ artis invidia à me objectum, aut Senatum illum qui ita cenfebat.* It appears from the Dictionaries (o) about the Civil Law, that the Word *excipere* very often fignifies not *to except* or *to exclude*, but *namely and exprefly to include.* Note, That *Pliny* fhould not have faid, that the City of *Rome* was without Phyficians for the fpace of fix hundred Years. Mr. *Drelincourt* fhews the contrary in a Speech he delivered (p) in *July* 1671. 'Tis a very good Apology for the Phyficians, and it has been reprinted twice. See alfo *Gafpar* (q) *à Reies.*

(I) *'Tis faid he* ftudied the *Greek* Tongue *in his Old Age.*] I make ufe of thefe Words, *'tis faid*, becaufe there are fome Authorities *pro* and *con.* *Cato*, one of the Interlocutors in *Cicero*'s Dialogue *de Senectute*, declares, that he began to learn the *Greek* Tongue in his Old Age. (r) *Quid, quod etiam addifcunt* (Senes) *aliquid? ut Solonem verfibus gloriantem videmus, qui fe quotidie aliquid addifcentem fenem fieri dicit: ut ego feci, qui Græcas litteras fenex didici. Quas quidem fic avide arripui, quafi diuturnam fitim explere cupiens.* Let us confider this Paffage of *Plutarch*: (ſ) "He is faid to have learn'd "*Greek* late, and when he was pretty Old; and "that as to his Rhetorick, he profited a little by "*Thucydides*, but much more by *Demofthenes*: And "indeed his Writings are handfomly mix'd both "with *Greek* Sayings and Hiftories; nay, many of "them tranflated Word for Word, are interwoven "with his own Apophthegms and Sentences." This Paffage does not favour *Cicero*, and one might infer from it, that *Cato* was not fo Old when he learn'd the *Greek* Tongue. What I am going to fay is ftill more proper to fhew that he learn'd it much fooner than 'tis thought. *Plutarch* confutes thofe who faid, that there was ftill a Speech of *Cato* deliver'd in *Greek* before the *Athenians.* *'Tis not true*, fays *Plutarch* (a), *for he fpoke to the* Athenians *by an Interpreter, tho' he might have made his Harangue in* Greek, *if he had been willing.* *Cato* was not then 45 Years of Age. Some Hiftorians fay, that being Prætor in *Sardinia*, he was taught the *Greek* Tongue by *Ennius.* (b) *In prætura Sardiniam fubegit ubi ab Ennio Græcis literis inftitutus.* This *fubegit* of *Aurelius Victor* is an Untruth, which *Moreri* did not perceive. *Sardinia* was already conquer'd when *Cato* was fent thither in the Quality of Prætor. *Moreri* fays, he conquered it in the Year 556. Mrs. *le Fevre* (c) places that Prætorfhip in the Year 555, and therefore *Cato* was then but 36 Years of Age, and confequently it cannot be faid that he learn'd the *Greek* Tongue in his Old Age, or the Teftimony of *Aurelius Victor* ought to be rejected. I fhall quote (d) hereafter fome Words of *Cicero*, whereby it appears that our *Cato* had no *Greek* Learning.

(K) *He could not conceal . . . . his keeping a Concubine, he married again.*] The following Paffage out of *Plutarch* is a good piece of Hiftory. "(e) Having loft his own Wife, he married his "Son to the Daughter of *Paulus Æmilius*, who was "Sifter to *Scipio*; fo that being now a Widower "himfelf, he made ufe of a fmall Girl, who came "privately to him; but the Houfe being very lit- "tle, and a Daughter in-Law alfo in it, the In- "trigue was quickly difcovered; for the young "Wench feeming once to pafs by a little too bold- "ly to *Cato*'s Bed-Chamber, the Youth, his Son, "though he faid nothing, feem'd to look a little "grim upon her; the old Man perceiving it a lit- "tle offenfive, without finding any Fault, or fay- "ing a Word, away he goes, as his Cuftom was, "with his ufual Company to the Market: Among "the reft, he call'd aloud to one *Salonius*, a Clerk "of his, and ask'd him whether he had married "his Daughter?" The Conclufion was, that *Cato* defired to have that Maid, and the Match was *quickly ftruck up.* . . . . "Now whilft this fame "Marriage was in hand, *Cato*'s Son, taking fome "of his Friends along with him, went and ask'd "his Father, for what Offence he brought in a "Mother-in-Law upon him; but *Cato* prefently "cried out, Soft and fair, good Son, what thou "do'ft is agreeable enough to me, nor do I find "any Fault with it; only I defire to have many "Children, and to leave the Commonwealth more "fuch Citizens as thou art. . . . . . *Cato* had a Son "by this fame fecond Venter, to whom, from his "Mother, he gave the Sir-name of *Salonius.*" This *Cato Salonius* was the Father of *Marcus Cato*, the Father of *Cato Uticenfis.*

(L) *This Undermatch did not prove fo advantageous to him as he expected.*] St. *Jerome* being to prove, that thofe who marry a poor Wife to be quiet at Home, don't obtain their end, alledges the Example of *Cato.* The Severity of that Cenfor could not free him from the ill effects of his Wife's Pride, tho' fhe was a Woman of a mean Extraction. (g) *M. Cato Cenforius habuit uxorem Actoriam Paulam, humili loco natam, vinolentam, impotentem, & (quod nemo poffet credere) Catoni fuperbam. Hæc ideo dico; ne quis putet fi pauperem duxerit, fatis fe concordiæ providiffe.* I don't find that *Cato* had above two Wives. But this Paffage of St. *Jerome* cannot be underftood of the firft, and therefore ought to be underftood of the fecond, tho' *Plutarch* does not call her *Actoria Paula*, and fays, fhe was the Daughter of one *Salonius.* He gives us the following Account of *Cato*'s firft Marriage. "(h) He married a Wife "more Noble than Rich; being of Opinion never- "thelefs, that both of them fo qualified, are ufu- "ally Haughty and Proud: But yet that thofe of "Noble Blood, wou'd be more afham'd of bafe "things, and confequently more obedient to their "Husbands in all that was fit and handfome for "them." From whence we may infer, that he was refolved to bear the Pride of his Wife, whether fhe was Noble or Rich; but that he hoped a Wife of a good Family would make him lefs uneafie than a Rich one: He took other meafures in his fecond Marriage, he pitch'd upon a Wife of no Birth and no Fortune, and yet fhe proved Proud and Paffionate: fo eafie it is to be deceived, and to make a wrong guefs about fuch a thing. See the Remark *G* in the Article of *Aventinus.* A famous Author quotes that Paffage of St. *Jerome*, in one of his Books, wherein he difapproves the Cuftom of requiring from the Students in Divinity and the Minifters, that they fhall Marry the Widows or Daughters of the Paftors whom they are to fucceed. He fays, that fuch a Condition is fomewhat Tyrannical, (i) and that it were better to leave 'em at liberty to chufe a Wife with a pretty good Portion. *Ut non probo*, fays he (k), *illius patris inftitutum*, (*videatur* **Plutarch.** *in Demetr.*) *qui ut perfuadere poffet filio, vetulam locupletem* ſtood Oeconomicks as well as Politicks, and found the way to confine his Servants (M) to the moſt ſtrict Silence. One would think that he was to blame for ſuffering them to lie † with his Maids for a certain ſum of Money which they were to pay him; but he had ſome Reaſons for it. He was more liable to Cenſure upon another Account, I mean for his eagerneſs to improve (N) his Eſtate, and increaſe his Revenues; for he was guilty of the worſt ſort of Uſury. I have mention'd, in * another place, the Speech he made for the preſervation of the Law, whereby Women were forbidden to wear Fineries; I have alſo pointed, in the ſame place, at a Speech which ſhews, that he knew how to briſk-up the majeſty and gravity of his Diſcourſes. We ſhould have a wrong Notion of him, ſhould we think that Auſterity was the only Character of his Speeches and Converſations; for he knew how to intermix 'em with Railleries and

---

(m) *Plin. l.* 29. *c.* 1. *p.* 668, 669.

(n) *Drelincurt. Apologia Medica p.* 47. *edit.* 1693.

(o) *See Father* Hardouin *upon this Paffage of* Pliny.

(p) *In the Univerfity of* Leyden.

(q) *Ubi fup. n.* 17.

(r) *Cicero de Senectute c.* 8. *p. m.* 406. *See alfo c.* 1. *p.* 386. *& Valerius Maximus l.* 8. *c.* 7. *n.* 1.

(ſ) *Plut. in Catone Majore p.* 337.

(a) *Plut. ub. fup. p.* 343.

(b) *Aurel. Victor de viris illuft. p. m.* 70.

(c) *Anna Tanaquilli Fabri filia in Aurel. Victor ib.*

(d) *In the Rem. V. lett. d.*

(e) *Plut. ubi fupra p.* 350.

† See the Remark M.

* In the Remark B. of the Article Pretextatus.

ſem uxorem ducere, ex Euripidis Phœniſſis occinebat: Ubi lucrum ſuadet, reluctetur licet natura uxorem ducatis: *ita neque conſultum paſſuri, ut reſpectu unius miſericordiæ, pauperem uxorem domum ducat. Nam licet poëta Græcus exiſtimet,* ſponſam ſine dote non habere loquendi libertatem: *talis tamen ſæpe deprehenditur procaciſſima eſſe, atque marito ſuo quam immorigera; imo nec abſimilis Alteriæ Paulæ, quam (teſtis eſt Hieronym. lib. 1. in Jovin.) cum Cenſorius Cato,* &c. There may be ſome Reaſon in what he ſays.

(M) *Found the way to confine his Servants to the moſt ſtrict ſilence.*] The following Paſſage ſhews how he behav'd himſelf towards his Slaves. (m) "He "purchas'd a great many Slaves out of the Captives taken in War, but chiefly he bought up "the young ones, who were capable to be (as it "were) broken and taught like little Whelps and "Colts; but none of theſe ever went into another Man's Houſe, except ſent either by *Cato* "himſelf, or his Wife. If any one of them were "ask'd what *Cato* did, they anſwer'd, Nothing "that they knew of. When a Servant was at "home, he was oblig'd either to do ſome Work, "or Sleep; for indeed *Cato* lov'd thoſe moſt, "who us'd to lie down often to take a Nap, accounting them more docile than thoſe who ſate "up much, and more fit for any thing, when they "were refreſh'd with a little Slumber. Being "alſo of an Opinion, That Servants would take the "greateſt pains imaginable to ſatisfie their Venery, he ſet a certain price to be paid by thoſe "who conſorted with his Bondwomen, but wou'd "ſuffer none to be concern'd with any others abroad. At firſt, when he was but a poor Soldier, he wou'd not be difficult in any thing "which related to his Diet, but look'd upon it "as a pitiful mean thing, to quarrel with a Servant for the ſake of his own Belly; but afterwards, when he grew richer, and made any "Feaſts for his Friends and Comrades, preſently "when Supper was done, would he with a *Leathern Thong* ſcourge thoſe who had waited and "dreſs'd the Meat careleſly. He always contriv'd "too, that his Servants ſhould have ſome difference one among another, always ſuſpecting "and fearing a good Underſtanding between 'em. "Now thoſe who had committed any thing worthy of Death, he accordingly puniſh'd, if in the "Opinion of their Fellow-Servants they were "found guilty.,, This Paſſage contains ſeveral Particulars, whereby it appears, that *Cato* was a Man of great Senſe and great Ability. His finding out a way to prevent his Servants divulging what paſs'd in his Houſe, is a greater Exploit than one can think. Such a thing is near as difficult as to find out the Philoſophers Stone: beſides it is of great advantage; for can there be a greater Slavery, than to be afraid of the prattling of one's Servants? 'Tis to be a Slave in one's own Houſe. This is admirably well expreſs'd by *Juvenal*.

(m) Plut. ubi ſupra pag. 348.

(a) *Taceant illi, ſed prodere malunt*
Arcanum, quam ſubrepti potare Falerni,
Pro populo faciens quantum Lauſella bibebat.
Vivendum recte cum propter plurima, tunc his
Præcipue cauſſis, ut linguas mancipiorum
Contemnas: nam lingua mali pars peſſima ſervi.
Deterior tamen hic, qui liber non erit, illis
Quorum animas & farre ſuo cuſtodit, & ære.

a) Juven. at. 9. . 115.

Cato had not ſo much reaſon as many other *Romans* to be afraid of the Indiſcretion of his Slaves; but he look'd upon their Silence as a thing that was requiſite in a well order'd Houſe. He is not to blame for hating their Sprightlineſs; for commonly the more lively and ingenious Foot-men are, the greater Knaves they are. When the Miniſters of a Prince don't love one another, ſome keep a watchful Eye over the Conduct of others, they dread one another, and their Maſter is thereby better ſerved, and leſs betrayed. The ſame may be ſaid, in proportion, concerning private Families, where there are a great many Servants; and it may be inferr'd from thence, that *Cato* acted according to his uſual Prudence, when he cunningly fomented Diſcord among his Domeſticks. He cannot be ſo well excuſed for permitting them to lie with his Maids for a certain Price. It was a natural conſequence of his forbidding them to ſport out of his Houſe; but at preſent ſuch a Regulation would not be approv'd; there is no Houſe of Honour where ſuch a Sport is allow'd; and Maids are turn'd out whether they play their lewd Tricks at home or abroad. As for the Men, 'tis requir'd they ſhould keep themſelves chaſte, at leaſt within Doors.

(N) *His eagerneſs to improve his Eſtate . . . . he was guilty of the worſt ſort of Uſury.*] "(b) But "being, after all, much given to an extravagant "deſire of Gain, he look'd upon Agriculture rather as a Pleaſure than Profit; reſolving therefore to lay out his Money in laſting and ſolid "things, he purchas'd Ponds, Hot-Baths, Grounds "full of Fullers-earth, Paſtures and Wood, whereby a great Revenue flow'd in unto him, and "ſuch a one (he us'd to ſay) as *Jupiter* himſelf "could not hurt. He was alſo given to a moſt "blameable Uſury in his Traffick by Sea; and "that thus: He would that thoſe whom he put "out his Money to, ſhou'd have many Partners: "Now when the number of them and their Ships "came to be fifty, he himſelf would put in "but one Share; for which *Quintion*, whom he "had made a Freeman, and who traded and "ſail'd along with the ſaid Adventurers, was "to be his Factor; ſo that thus there was "no danger of loſing his whole Stock, but "only a little Part, and that with a Proſpect of "great Profit. He likewiſe lent Money to thoſe "of his Slaves who would borrow any, with "which they bought alſo other young ones, "whom, when they had taught and bred up at "his Charges, they wou'd ſell again at the Year's "end; but ſome of them *Cato* would keep for "himſelf, giving juſt as much for them as another "had offer'd. To incline his Son to be of this "kind of Temper, he wou'd uſe to ſay, *That it* "*was not like a ſolid Man to leſſen an Eſtate, but* "*rather like a weak Widow.* But a farther Argument of *Cato*'s avaricious Humour, was, when "he took the boldneſs to affirm, *That he was moſt* "*wonderful, nay, a Godlike Man, who left more* "*behind him than he received.*,, Theſe are wrong Maxims: His Advice and his Example, in this reſpect, were very pernicious to his Son, and did not anſwer the Care he had taken to bring him up, like a good Father. He himſelf taught him Learning, tho' he had a Slave who taught many others: "(c) But he thought not fit, as he himſelf ſaid, "to have his Son reprimanded by a Servant; or "pull'd, it may be, by the Ears, when found "tardy in his Leſſon: Nor would he have him "owe to a Servant the obligation of ſo great a "thing

(b) Plut. ubi ſupra pag. 349.

(c) Plut. ibid. pag. 348.

and agreeable Strokes: He had (O) many witty Sayings; his Converſation might have pleaſed young People; he talk'd freely at Table with his Friends, and had always ſome merry Thoughts. He was then very well pleaſed to hear 'em diſcourſe of the Merit of Illuſtrious Men, but would not ſuffer that the Wicked ſhould be well or ill ſpoken of. I muſt not forget the Judgment he made of Kings, whom he took to be inferior (P) in Merit to the Great Men who had flouriſhed in a Republican State. I muſt alſo take notice of the Opinion he entertain'd of Women (Q) guilty of Adultery: He believed they were all Poiſoners. The Puniſhment he inflicted upon a *Roman* Senator for * kiſſing his Wife in the preſence of his Daughter, was ſtill more rigid, for he ſtruck him out of the Liſt of the Senators merely upon that Account. 'Tis ſaid (R) that he would not have grown young again; a Thought very worthy of his great Senſe.

* *See the Remark O. towards the end.*

" thing as his Learning; wherefore he himſelf " (as we were ſaying) taught him his Grammar, " Law, and Fencing: Nor did he only ſhew him " too how to throw a Dart, to fight with other " *Arms*, and to Ride; but even to play at Fiſty-" Cuffs, to endure both Heat and Cold, and to " ſwim over the moſt rapid and rough Rivers. " He ſays likewiſe, That he wrote Hiſtories in " great Characters, with his own Hand, that ſo " his Son, without ſtirring out of the Houſe, " might learn the Experience and Virtuous Ex-" ploits of his Forefathers: Nor did he leſs ab-" ſtain from ſpeaking any thing obſcene before " his Son, than if it had been in the preſence of " thoſe ſacred Virgins which we call *Veſtals*." See the Margin (d).

(O) *He had many witty Sayings.*] (e) *Plutarch* has collected many of 'em: I ſhall only mention one, uſing *Balzac's* Paraphraſe and Prologue. " The very Cenſors, Madam, tho' Sadneſs ſeem'd " to be one of the Functions of their Office, did " not altogether lay aſide all manner of Raillery. " They were not always bent upon Severity; and " the firſt *Cato*, that troubleſome and intolerable " honeſt Man, ceaſed ſometimes to be trouble-" ſome and intolerable. He had ſome glimpſes " of Mirth, and ſome intervals of good Humour. " He dropt now and then ſome Words that were " not unpleaſant; and you may, Madam, judge " of the reſt by this. He had married a very " handſome Wife, and Hiſtory tells us, That ſhe " was extremely afraid of the Thunder, and lo-" ved her Husband very well. Thoſe two Paſſi-" ons prompting her to the ſame thing, ſhe al-" ways pitch'd upon her Husband as a Sanctuary " againſt Thunder, and threw herſelf into his " Arms, at the firſt noiſe ſhe fancied ſhe heard " in the Sky. *Cato*, who was well pleaſed with " the Storm, and very willing to be careſs'd more " than uſually, could not conceal his Joy: He " revealed that domeſtick Secret to his Friends, " and told 'em one Day, ſpeaking of his Wife, " that ſhe had found out a way to make him love " bad Weather, and that he never was ſo happy " as when *Jupiter* was angry (a)."

It will not be improper to obſerve at what time he ſaid this; it was during his Cenſorſhip, when he degraded the Senator *Manlius*, who, 'tis likely, would have been made Conſul the Year following, and was only degraded for giving a Kiſs (b) to his Wife in the Day time, and in the preſence of his Daughter. Some are of Opinion, That at *Rome*, and in ſome other Countries, 'tis neither becoming nor prudent, for a Husband to careſs his Wife in the ſight of his Children; nevertheleſs, they believe that *Cato* was too rigid, and that he made the Education of Children too difficult: They take it to be a piece of Injuſtice, that the Senator *Manlius* ſhould have paid ſo dear for ſuch a Kiſs. *Plutarch* taxes *Cato* with too great a Severity, but at the ſame time he blames *Manlius*. Theſe are his Words. (c) " *Cato* de-" priv'd a *Roman* Senator of the Senatorial Dig-" nity, becauſe he kiſs'd his Wife in his Daugh-" ter's preſence, wherein he was a little too rigid. " But if it be (d) a ſhameful thing, as certainly " it is, to kiſs and embrace one another in the " preſence of others; it is more ſhameful ſtill to " abuſe and chide one another, to ſport with a " Wife in private, and then to reprove and give " her hard Words before every body."

(P) *The Judgment he made of Kings, whom he took to be inferior in merit, &c.*] (e) " King *Eu-" menes* being come to *Rome*, the Senate gave " him a very good Reception, and the greateſt " Men of the Town ſtriv'd to make much of him. " But *Cato* appear'd unwilling to do the ſame, " and did not care to ſee him. Whereupon a " Friend of his told him, I wonder you ſhun " King *Eumenes*, who is a very good Prince, and " a great Friend to the *Romans*. To which he " anſwer'd, I have nothing to ſay againſt it: " however, this I muſt needs ſay, that a King is " by his Nature a Ravenous Beaſt; and there ne-" ver was a King, tho' never ſo commendable, " that deſerv'd to be compar'd with *Epaminondas*, " *Pericles*, *Themiſtocles*, *Manius Curius*, or *Amilcar*, " ſurnamed *Barca*." Which puts me in mind of what I have heard ſome *Engliſh* Gentlemen ſay, that Royalty is a very chargeable thing, and that many Soldiers and Ships would be maintain'd with what is neceſſary for the Maintenance of a King. 'Tis certain that a King's Expences, merely for the Civil Liſt, are prodigious. How many Guards and Officers muſt be kept in Pay? One Volume would not be ſufficient to explain all the Offices belonging to the Court of the Emperor of *Conſtantinople*; and any one who reads the *State* † *of France*, and finds ſo many uſeleſs Men in it, the twentieth part whereof would be ſufficient to ſerve the King, muſt needs own, that that very thing would be a burthen upon the People. The ſame Superfluities are to be ſeen, in proportion, in all Monarchical Governments; and if it had been ſaid, that they may be of uſe to imprint a reſpect in the Inferiors, and to give Foreigners a great Notion of the Power of a Prince, *Cato* would have anſwer'd, That that very thing ſhewed that Kings are ſuch as he deſcribed them.

(Q) *The Opinion he entertain'd of Women guilty of Adultery: He believed they were all Poiſoners.*] *Quintilian* ſays, This Judgment was an Authority that might be alledged by an Advocate pleading againſt an Adultereſs, who is accuſed of being a Poiſoner. (f) *Si cauſſam veneficii dicat adultera, non Marci Catonis judicio damnata videatur, qui nullam adulteram non eandem eſſe veneficam dixit?* *Quintilian* is in the right to think that this Sentence of *Cato* was of ſome weight in the Cauſes ſpecified by him; but, generally ſpeaking, it is not to be admitted. If it be true, that a Husband has been poiſoned, and that his Wife had committed Adultery, thoſe who think ſhe is guilty of her Husband's Death, go upon ſtrong Preſumptions, and may lay great ſtreſs upon her Adultery; but it would be wrong to infer, without any Exception, that ſince a Wife is not faithful to her Husband ſhe will poyſon him. Many ſuch Women are kind to their Husbands, and take care of them when they are Sick. In a word, they would by no means poyſon 'em, tho' they were of a Croſs Humour: and therefore *Cato's* Maxim is overſtrained.

(R) *That he would not have grown young again.*] The Words aſcribed to him by *Cicero*, upon this Subject are admirable. (g) *Quo quidem me* (h) *proficiſcentem haud ſane quis facile retraxerit, neque* tam-

(d) *Cato* *practis'd a very fine Maxim, which* Juvenal *deſcribes thus* Nil dictu fœdum viſuque hæc limina tangat, Intra quæ puer eſt. Procul hinc, procul inde puellæ Lenonum, & cantus pernoctantis paraſiti. Maxima debetur puero reverentia: ſi quid Turpe paras, nec tu pueri contempſeris annos, Sed peccaturo obſiſtat tibi filius infans. *Juven. ſat.* 14. v. 44. *See alſo* Plato *in the* 5 *Book* de legibus.

(e) *Plut. ubi ſupra pag.* 340. *& in apophth. pag.* 198.

(a) *Balzac, Diſcours à Madame la Marquiſe de Rambouillet, pag. m.* 49, 50. of his *Oeuvres diverſes.* (b) *Plut. ibid. pag.* 345. (c) *Id. in præceptis conjugalibus, pag.* 139. *D. E.* (d) Εἰ δὲ αἰσχρὸν ἐστὶν (ὥσπερ ἐστὶν) ἑτέρων παρόντων ἀσπάζεσθαι καὶ περιβάλλειν ἀλλήλους. Sed tamen ſi eſt (ut profecto eſt) turpe conjuges in præſentia aliorum blandiri, oſculari, & amplecti ſeſe invicem. *Id. ib.*

(e) *Plut. in Caton. pag.* 34.

† *'Tis a Book reprinted very often.* ' Codinus (*they are* Vigneul-Marville's *words, p.* 70. *of the* 3 *Volume of his* Melanges) ' *in his Account of* ' *the Ceremonies* ' *obſerved* ' *at the* ' *Table of* ' *the Emperors of* ' Conſtantinople, ' *makes* ' *me ſweat* ' *at the* ' *ſight of* ' *ſo many* ' *Myſteries.*

(f) *Quintil. inſt. orat. lib.* 5. *cap.* 11. *p. m.* 244.

(g) *Cicero de ſenect. cap. ult. p. m.* 452.

(h) *That is, to the place whither the Souls repair when they leave their Bodies.*

Senſe. What he told a Nobleman, whom he ſaw coming out of a Bawdy-Houſe, favours (S) of a looſe Morality; but he might have excuſed himſelf by alledging this Axiom, that out of two Evils the worſt ought to be avoided. 'Tis a Miſtake to ſay, that he introduced (T) among the *Romans* the Cuſtom of kiſſing their Kinſwomen, to know whether they had drunk Wine. He was both

tamquam (i) *Pellam recoxerit, & ſi quis Deus mihi largiatur, ut ex hac ætate repueriſcam, & in cunis vagiam, valde recuſem: nec vero velim, quaſi decurſo ſpatio, ad carceres à calce revocari: quid enim habet vita commodi? quid non potius laboris? ſed habeat ſane; habet certe tamen aut ſatietatem, aut modum; non lubet enim mihi deplorare vitam, quod multi & ii docti ſæpe fecerunt, neque me vixiſſe pœnitet: quoniam ita vixi, ut non fruſtra me natum exiſtimem: & ex vita ita diſcedo, tamquam ex hoſpitio, non tamquam ex domo: commorandi enim natura diverſorium nobis, non habitandi dedit.* Obſerve the Coherence of the Maxims of that Great Man. He was not ſorry that he had lived, he believ'd he had acted a glorious Part upon the Stage of the World, and yet he would not go through it again, (k) if a God ſhould offer it him; and he does not inſiſt upon a Reaſon, which he took to be a true one, *viz.* That this Life is liable to a thouſand Inconveniencies, and has very few Conveniencies.

(S) *What he told a Nobleman whom he ſaw coming out of a Bawdy-Houſe, ſavours of a looſe Morality; but he.*] I think *Horace* is the only Perſon who mentions this Particular,

Nil (l) *medium eſt. Sunt, qui nolint tetigiſſe, niſi illas,*
Quarum ſubſutâ talos tegat inſtita veſte:
Contrà, alius nullam, niſi olenti in fornice ſtantem.
Quidam notus homo cùm exiret fornice, Macte
Virtute eſto, inquit ſententia dia Catonis.
Nam ſimul ac venas inflavit tetra libido,
Huc juvenes æquum eſt deſcendere, non alienas
Permolere uxores.

That is, as M. *Dacier* renders it, "People don't "know how to keep a Medium. Some don't "care to meddle with any Women, but ſuch La-"dies as wear Long Robes trim'd with Purple. "Others are only for Common Women. Where-"upon 'tis ſaid, that the Divine *Cato* ſeeing a "Man of Quality coming out of a Bawdy-Houſe, "told him: Well done, dear Sir, go on; thi-"ther you ought to go, when you are inflam'd "with Love, inſtead of debauching your Neigh-"bour's Wife." Here follows Mr. *Dacier*'s Note upon *Macte virtute eſto:* (m) "They are the "Words of *Cato* the Cenſor, who ſeeing a Man "of Quality coming out of a Bawdy-Houſe, prai-"ſed him, and exhorted him to do always ſo; "but obſerving afterwards that he kept there "continually, he told him, *Friend, I praiſed you* "*for going thither ſometimes, but not for making* "*your conſtant abode in that place. Adoleſcens, ego* "*te laudavi quòd interdùm huc venires; non quod* "*hic habitares.*"

(T) *'Tis a Miſtake to ſay that he introduced among the* Romans *the Cuſtom of kiſſing their Kinſwomen, to know.*] There is no doubt that the *Romans* (a) forbad Women the uſe of Wine, and that to prevent their drinking of it in private, they introduced the Cuſtom for Men to kiſs their Kinſwomen; but 'tis not true that *Cato* eſtabliſh'd that Law or that Cuſtom. We read in *Pliny* (b) that one *Egnatius Mecenius*, who kill'd his Wife, becauſe ſhe had drank Wine, was acquitted by *Romulus*. VVe read the ſame thing in *Servius*, upon the 737 Verſe of the 1ſt Book of the *Æneid*. The Abſolution of that Husband ought not to be look'd upon as a ſtrange thing, ſince by the Law of *Romulus* the Puniſhment of a Wife for her Crimes was left to the Diſcretion of the Husband and Relations; and the two greateſt Crimes ſhe could be guilty of, were to be unfaithful to her Husband, and to drink Wine. *Romulus*, when he eſtabliſh'd that Law, was perſuaded that a Woman guilty of Adultery would attempt any thing; and that the drinking of Wine was the beginning of Adultery. This you may ſee in (c) *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus.* 'Tis highly probable, that the firſt King of *Rome* followed therein the old Laws of *Italy*, among which none was more ancient than that whereby Women were forbidden to drink Wine; for we find that King *Faunus* whipt his Wife to death, becauſe ſhe drank ſome, contrary to Cuſtom. (d) *Sex. Clodius in eo libro quem Græcè ſcripſit, refert Fauni hanc uxorem fuiſſe: quæ quia* CONTRA MOREM, *decuſque regium clam vini ollam ebiberat, & ebria facta erat, virgis myrteis à viro uſque ad mortem cæſa.* *Plutarch* mentions this, as you'll ſee hereafter, in a Place where I correct a Fault, which, as far as I can remember, the Criticks have taken no notice of.

From what has been ſaid, it ought to be infer'd, That *Cato* the Cenſor was not the Author of that Law I have been ſpeaking of; and therefore there is a great Miſtake in theſe Words of *Lomeierus:* (e) *Apud Romanos mulieres paſſim oſculo ſalutabantur à propinquis, quo explorarent, an contra legem temetum olerent. Inſtitutum hoc erat Catonis teſte Plinio*, lib. 14. cap. 13. This he ſays in his Diſſertation concerning Kiſſes. He has quoted *Pliny*, without giving himſelf the trouble to conſult him; for if he had conſulted him, he would have found that *Pliny* cites *Cato*, not as having introduced thoſe Cuſtoms, but only as a Writer, who mention'd them. (f) *Cato* (ſcripſit) *ideo propinquos feminis oſculum dare, ut ſcirent an temetum olerent. Hoc tum nomen vino erat, unde & temulentia appellatur.* I think *Lomeierus* took what he ſays from *Kempius*, whoſe Words he read with little Attention. He has vented a Falſity for want of underſtanding the Words of that Writer; and another, tho' he underſtood 'em. *Kempius* affirms, That Women were forbidden the uſe of Wine by *Cato*'s Authority; and that afterwards the Men began to kiſs their Kinſwomen, to know whether they acted contrary to the Law. (g) *Poſtmodum Succeſſu* (h) *temporis cum ex auctoritate M. Catonis vinum mulieribus interdictum eſſet, primùm viri cognatarum os cœperunt oſculari, ut odor indicium faceret, ſi bibiſſent.* Affinibus & propinquis oſculari eas jus eſt, ut ſobrias comprobent, *inquit* Arnobius Lib. II. adverſus gentes. *Vinum enim mulierem bibiſſe perindè erat, ac ſi in adulterio ac gravi crimine deprehenſa, capitali ſupplicio plectenda eſſet, ceu* Plinius *habet* Libro *XIV. Hiſtor. Nat. cap.* 13. 'Tis plain that the Quotation out of *Pliny*, at the End of this Paſſage, does not concern the beginning of it; and yet *Lomeierus* made uſe of it to prove what he tranſcribed from *Kempius*, at the beginning of the *Latin* Words I kave juſt now quoted.

Here is the Fault, which, as I have ſaid, has not been obſerved in *Plutarch*'s Text. That Hiſtorian having ask'd why the *Roman* Ladies carried no Myrtle into the Chappel of the Good Goddeſs, tho' they uſed all other ſorts of leaved Branches, anſwers, that the Reaſon of it was, becauſe that Goddeſs had been married to a Man, who whipp'd her with a Rod of Myrtle, when he came to know that ſhe had drunk ſome Wine. (i) Πότερον (ὡς οἱ μυθολογοῦντες ἱστοροῦσι) Φαυλίου μὲν ἦν γυνὴ τοῦ μάντεως, οἴνῳ δὲ χρησαμένη κρύφα, καὶ μὴ λαθοῦσα, ῥάβδοις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκολάσθη μυρσίνης. That is, as *Xylander* renders it, *An credendum eſt fabulæ, quæ perhibet Faulii cujuſdam aruſpicis uxorem cùm clàm poto vino non feſelliſſet, à marito virgis myrteis fuiſſe caſtigatam.* The *Greek* Word φαυλίου, ought to be changed into φαύνου; for not only the Author quoted by *Lactantius* (k) affirms, that the Good Goddeſs had been married to *Faunus*, &c. but *Plutarch* (l) obſerves it alſo in the Life of *Cæſar*. The *Latin* Tranſlator might have boldly corrected that Paſſage, but inſtead of rectifying it, he ſpoils it, and tranſlates it wrong. He ſuppoſes that *Plutarch* anſwer'd, that Myrtle was not carried into the Chappel of the Goddeſs, becauſe the Wife of one *Phaulius* had been whipp'd, &c. This is not the ſenſe of the Original; *Plutarch* does not de-both a great Orator and a profound (F) Civilian; two Qualities which ſeldom meet together, as well as thoſe of Eloquent Preacher and * Learned Divine. You'll ſee in one of the Remarks †, in what Degree *Cato Uticenſis* deſcended from him.

(i) See the Remark C. in the Article Pelias, concerning the Miſtake that is here.

(k) See the end of the Remark K. in the Article Tullia.

(l) Horat. ſat. 2. lib. 1. v. 28.

(m) Dacier upon this Paſſage of Horace, tom. 6. pag. 130, 131 Dutch Edition.

(a) See Aulus Gellius, *lib.* 10. *cap.* 23. & Tertullian *in apologet. cap.* 6.

(b) *Plin. lib.* 14. *cap.* 13.

(c) *In the 2d Book of the Roman Antiquities cap.* 26. *p. m.* 93.

(d) *Lact. lib.* 1. *cap.* 22. *See alſo Arnobius lib.* 5. *pag.* 155. & *Plutarch ubi infra.*

(e) *Lomeier genial. dierum parte* 1. *p.* 357.

(f) *Id. ib.*

(g) *Martinus Kempius diſſert.* 16. *de oſculis pag. m.* 637.

(h) *The Author had quoted the Canon-Law, and menion'd ſeveral things that happen'd after* Cato: *judge therefore whether his* Poſtmodum, &c. *is rightly placed.*

(i) *Plut. in quæſt. Romanis p.* 268. D.

(k) *See above Letter d.*

(l) Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ νύμφην δρυάδα Φαύνῳ συνοικήσασαν. Romanam nympham Dryada Fauno nuptam. *Plut. in Cæſare pag.* 711.

** See the Remark V.*
† At the end of the Remark R.

POR-

note a Man who may be call'd ſlightingly, *quidam*, *a certain Man*; he ſays, That the Woman whip'd by her Huſband was the ſame that was worſhip'd at *Rome* by the Name of *Good Goddeſs*. *Amyot* avoided this laſt Miſtake, which is the moſt conſiderable. *Boxhornius* (m) made no Obſervation upon *Xylander*'s Tranſlation of thoſe Words.

What I have ſaid concerning the Cuſtom of the *Romans*, who kiſs'd their Kinſwomen, wants a further Explanation. *Plutarch* explains it very well, and it appears from the Account he gives of it, that the Women went and kiſs'd their Kinſmen, when they met 'em. This is a remarkable Circumſtance, which the other Writers have wholly omitted. “Why, *ſays he*, (n) do Women kiſs the Mouth of their Kinſmen? Is it becauſe, as moſt think, Women being forbidden to drink Wine, a Cuſtom was introduced, that they ſhould kiſs the Mouth of their Kinſmen, when they met 'em, that thoſe who had drunk ſome might be convicted of it? or for the Reaſon (o) alledged by *Ariſtotle* the Philoſopher . . . . or rather, that Privilege was granted to the Ladies, as a thing that redounded to their Honour, when it appear'd that they were related to many honeſt Men: or becauſe Men were not allow'd to marry their Kinſwomen, the latter were permitted to make much of 'em, ſo far as to kiſs 'em, which was the only Sign of Kindred amongſt 'em; for heretofore they did not marry Women related to them, as now 'tis not lawful for them to marry their Aunts and Siſters, and 'twas a long time before they were allow'd to marry their Couſins.”

I need not examine whether the Reaſons alledged by *Plutarch* are very ſolid; I ſhall only conſider the Facts mention'd by him, which are worth knowing. It plainly appears from his Words, that the Women kiſs'd the Men publikly, as they met 'em either in the Streets, or elſewhere. Civility requir'd that the Men ſhould not begin firſt, for it would have look'd as if they had ſome Suſpicion that their Kinſwomen had drunk Wine. The Women were to preſent their Mouths, and that very thing was a ſign they were not guilty. Their Innocence had been doubtful, had they not boldly and readily offered to kiſs the Men. Such a Cuſtom at this Day would occaſion many new Thoughts, and a world of witty Conceits and ſorry Jeſts. A wiſe Mother would not be very willing that the Couſins of her Daughters ſhould have the Privilege of knowing whether they ſmell of Wine. 'Tis to be obſerv'd, that *Propertius* told his unfaithful (p) Miſtreſs, in a reproachful manner, that ſhe pretended to have more Kinſmen than ſhe had, that ſhe might not want Kiſſes,

Quin (q) etiam falſos fingis tibi ſæpe propinquos
Oſcula ne (r) deſint qui tibi jure ferant.

I ſhall conclude this Remark, as I have begun it, that is, with cenſuring a Fault concerning *Cato*. *Kempius* ſays, that he publiſh'd a Law whereby married People were forbidden to kiſs one another in the preſence of their Daughters, and he quotes *Plutarch* for it. But *Plutarch* ſays no ſuch thing: we have ſeen above (ſ) what he ſays upon that Subject. (t) *Nihilominus tamen parcè inter veteres maritale oſculum, & non niſi admodum circumſpectè, ac remotis arbitris, ne liberi ſcilicet inde furtivis amorum illecebris ſtimularentur, M. Catonem (u) Cenſorinum Stoicæ diſciplinæ addictum, edicto prohibuiſſe, ne Maritus conjugem deoſcularetur in præſentia filiæ, Manliumque, quem omnium opinio Conſulem deſignabat, Senatu ejeciſſe, quod uxorem coram filia nubili exoſculatus eſſet,* *Auctor eſt* Plutarchus in Catonis vitâ pag. 346. 'Tis not true, that *Cato* enacted any Law, or cauſed it to be enacted on that Account. He puniſh'd *Manlius* by the ſole Authority of his Office, which could not ſerve for a Precedent: the Cenſors who ſucceeded him were not obliged to imitate him. I find no other Example of ſuch a Puniſhment, and 'tis very likely a great many People uſed the ſame Liberty that *Manlius* took. The Laws can hardly extend to ſuch Prohibitions; all that can be done, is to give good Advice, and make People afraid of being Cenſur'd. I think *Clemens Alexandrinus* did not blame *Cato*'s Severity. See how he adviſes (a) married People to forbear kiſſing one another in the preſence of their Servants.

(F) *He was both a great Orator and a profound Civilian.*] See (b) *Valerius Maximus*, and (c) *Quintilian*, or rather, this fine Paſſage of *Cicero*, whereby it appears, that *Cato* excell'd in many things. (d) *Quid Marco Catoni præter hanc politiſſimam doctrinam tranſmarinam, atque adventitiam defuit? num quia jus civile didicerat, cauſas non dicebat? aut quia poterat dicere, juris ſcientiam negligebat? at utroque in genere & laboravit, & præſtitit: num propter hanc ex privatorum negociis collectam gratiam tardior in republica capeſſenda fuit? nemo apud populum fortior, nemo melior ſenator, idem facile optimus imperator: denique nihil in hac civitate temporibus illis ſciri, diſcive potuit, quod ille non tum inveſtigarit, & ſcierit, tum etiam conſcripſerit.* Thoſe who have been endowed with the nobleſt Talents of Rhetorick, and the moſt profound Knowledge of the Laws have been ſo few, that ſuch a Conjunction may well be look'd upon as one of the moſt eminent and extraordinary Qualities of our *Cato*. I am not ignorant that *Cicero* (e) endeavours to prove, that none can be a great Orator without being an univerſal Man. *Illud eſt*, ſays he (f), *hujus inſtitutæ ſcriptionis, ac temporis, neminem eloquentia, non modo ſine dicendi doctrina, ſed ne ſine omni quidem ſapientia florere unquam, & præſtare potuiſſe. Etenim cætera ferè artes ſe ipſæ per ſe tuentur ſingulæ: bene dicere autem, quod eſt ſcienter, & perite, & ornate dicere, non habet definitam aliquam regionem, cujus terminis ſepta teneatur. Omnia quæcunque in hominum diſceptationem cadere poſſunt, bene ſunt ei dicenda, qui hoc ſe poſſe profitetur, aut eloquentiæ nomen relinquendum eſt.* I know likewiſe that he maintains, that *Lucius Craſſus* and *Marc Antony* the Orator, two of the moſt Eloquent Perſons of their Time, were not ignorant Men, as ſome (g) believed; and, on the contrary, that they had a great deal of Learning: but he himſelf owns (h) that Experience is againſt him; and if he had not confeſs'd it, he might have been eaſily convicted of his Error by ſome Examples. Would he have ſaid, that *Demoſthenes* might be accounted a Learned Man, if compared with *Ariſtotle*? Would he have ſaid, that *Ariſtotle* might have compoſed as good Orations as thoſe of *Demoſthenes*? To ſpeak the truth, the Talents of Eloquence, and a vaſt Erudition, do ſeldom meet together. This may be obſerved now, as it was in former Times. The moſt famous Preachers, generally ſpeaking, have no great Skill in the Oriental Languages and critical Learning, and are not very profound Divines. See the new (i) Letters againſt *Maimbourg*'s Hiſtory of *Calviniſm*, where you'll find what ſome Perſons, well qualified to judge of this Matter, have ſaid about it. To which I add the Teſtimony of the Abbot of *Saint Cyran*: *You have ſhewed me by Experience*, ſays he (k) to a Jeſuit, *what I have heard ſay ſeveral times, that it is a very difficult thing to be both a good Preacher and a very Learned Man.* Dr. *Huarte* maintains, that Learning and Eloquence do not belong to the ſame Faculty of the Soul; that the firſt belongs to the Underſtanding, and the ſecond to the Imagination. See the ninth and tenth Chapters of his *Examen de Ingenios*. *Imperialis* (l) confutes him as well as he can, and does not prove his Aſſertion. 'Tis certain, that the Divine Providence diſtributes its Gifts in ſuch a manner, that they are commonly ſeparated. Thoſe who have receiv'd the Gift of obtaining Victories don't know how to improve them; and thoſe who might improve a Victory, are not qualified to obtain it. Thoſe who excel in the Knowledge of Languages, and Matters of Fact, are not Maſters of Reaſoning.

It

(m) *He publiſh'd, with Notes* Plutarch's *Tract de* quæſtionibus Romanis, *in Greek and Latin, in the Year 1637. in 4.*

(n) *Plut. in quæſt. Romanis, p. 265.*

(o) Viz. *That the Trojan Ladies having burnt* Æneas's *Fleet, pacified the Men by their Embraces and Kiſſes.*

(p) *Cynthia and not Phryne, as Kempius,* ubi ſupra pag. 635. *falſly ſuppoſes.*

(q) *Propert. eleg. 6. lib. 2.*

(r) *There is in the printed Copies* nec deſunt: *I follow* Gebhardus's *Correction.*

(ſ) *In the Remark O.*

(t) *Kempius ubi ſup. diſſert.* 15. *pag.* 615.

(u) *It ſhould be* Cenſorium. *'Tis not true that this* Cato *was addicted to the Sect of the* Stoicks. Kempius *confounds him with* Cato Uticenſis *his Great Grandſon.*

(a) *Clemens Alexandr. Pædagog. lib.* [illegible] *p. m.* [illegible]

(b) *Val. Maxim. lib.* [illegible]

(c) *Quintil. Inſtit. lib. 12. cap.* [illegible] *p. m.* [illegible]

(d) *Cic. de Orat. lib.* [illegible] *He had been ſaying that the* [illegible] *fol.* 55. *A.* Quid vero ille M. Cato? nonne & eloquentia tanta fuit quantam illa tempora, & quæ illa ætas in hac civitate ferre maximam potuit, & juris civilis omnium peritiſſimus?

(e) *In libris de Oratore.*

(f) *Cicero de Oratore lib. 2. init. fol. m.* 71. *B.*

(g) *Id. ib.*

(h) Et in noſtra civitate, & in ipſa Græcia quæ ſemper hæc ſumma duxit, multos & ingenio, & magna laude dicendi ſine ſumma rerum omnium ſcientia fuiſſe fateor. *Id. ibid. C.*

(i) *Pag.* 224. *& ſeq.*

(k) *St. Cyran in his Cenſure* [illegible] *Pere Garaſſe.*

(l) *Jo. Imperialis in Muſeo Phyſico lib. 2. cap. 7.*

PORSENA (*Christopher*) Look for **PERSONA**.

PORTUGAL (*Alfonso* **VI. of that Name, King** of) was born the 28th of *August* 1643. **He was** hardly **Seven Years of Age** when he discovered some grains of Folly. The disorder of his Mind did not lessen his Ambition, only it shewed itself more openly; for Prince *Dom Theodosio*, Eldest Brother of *Alfonso*, dying the 15th of *May* 1653, *Alfonso* did not dissemble his Joy. He made it appear that he spoke in earnest when the very first Day of his Brother's Illness, he said, he wish'd it would prove Mortal, since he would get a Crown by it. He took Possession of that Crown under his Mother's Regency * the 15th Day of *November*, 1656. He discover'd more and more his ill Qualities: He made no account of his Governour's Advice: He drew his Sword against any Body that came first in his way, and if he did not kill 'em 'twas not his fault: He ran about the Streets in the Night with a parcel of Rakes: He committed a thousand Violences (*A*), and played a thousand Mad Tricks in Bawdy-Houses, and boasted of it the next Day, as of a Glorious Action. All the Means that were used to bring him off from those ill Courses proving ineffectual, 'twas resolv'd to remove from him the Persons who spoil'd him, and they were carried away by main force out of his Apartment. He was very angry at it, and left *Lisbon* to go to *Alcantara*. To prevent the ill Consequences of this Retreat, the Queen was obliged to put the Government of the State into his Hands; which was done at *Lisbon* with the requisite Ceremonies, the 23d of *June* 1662. From that time three or four great Lords, who had engrossed that young Prince, used their utmost endeavours to bring the Queen (*B*) into disgrace, and succeeded so well in it, that she was forced to execute, in *March* 1663, a Design which perhaps was not so deeply rooted in her Heart, as she pretended, I mean, her Design of leaving the World to mind only her Salvation. After she had retir'd into a Country-Seat, the King indulg'd his bad Inclinations more than ever, so far as to make no Account of the Outside (C) of Religion; which shews, that his very

It cannot be denied, that if *Bochart* did very much exceed *M. Claude* in Learning, he was much inferior to him in urging Difficulties, resolving Controversial Objections, and diving into the bottom of a Theological or Philosophical Dispute. *Balzac* was a little surpriz'd when he saw a solid Discourse published by Father *Faure*, a great Preacher (*o*).

(*A*) *Committed a thousand Violences*, &c.] The Relation (*p*) which affords me this Article, informs me, (*q*) that he ran about the Streets with those Rakes; that they got into Scandalous Places, where they did a thousand Violences to Women; that he never went out with them in the Night, but the next Day one might hear many tragical Stories; that he was dreaded every where as a wild Beast; that tho' he saw Prostituted Women in their own Houses, some were brought to his Palace; and that he boasted of such mighty Doings with them, that he was not believ'd. After the Queen Mother's Retreat he formed two (*r*) Companies, one of Foot, and the other of Horse, which he call'd, *The little and great Patrol, consisting of the most profligate Men in the Kingdom.* He went out every Night with them, and attack'd every Body he met in his way. *His Attendants had generally their Swords drawn, to be more ready to obey his Orders; and the better to surprise People, they blacken'd them, lest the brightness of the Steel should discover their Design. Those who came back with bloody Swords, were highly commended by the King.* (*ſ*) "His Debauchery was as exorbitant "as his Fury; either he went to Lewd Women, "or they were brought to him in a Country-House "near *Alcantara*; and his Favourites indulg'd "him in it, because there was a Report that he "was Impotent.„

(*B*) *Used their utmost Endeavours to bring the Queen into Disgrace.*] They were not in the wrong to believe, that the Queen design'd to set the Crown on the Head of her Second Son; for in the Reasons alledg'd to shew the Nullity of the Marriage, which are printed at the end of the Relation, 'tis said, "That considering the Incapacity and Impotency of King *Alfonso*, the "Queen his Mother, who was fully perswaded of "it by a private Consultation of her Physicians "about it . . . . resolved, during her Regency, "to put the Scepter into the Hands of the Infant "her Second Son.„ *Alfonso* revenged himself: "He (*a*) was well pleased to hear all the *Queen's* "Actions reflected upon in his Presence.„ Some People met at Night under the Queen's Window, "at a time when she used to shut up herself, in "order to say her Prayers, and broke her Windows, and gave her such injurious Words, that "'tis not fit to write 'em down.„ Upon a Day of the Conception of the Holy Virgin, the King, (*b*) in the Presence of the whole Court, "went "by the Queen, who sate in her Gallery, "without paying her the usual Civility.„ On the Day that she left the Court, the King seem'd to be very well pleas'd, and (*c*) having accompany'd her to the Country-Seat she had pitch'd upon, he left her at the Door of the first Room, without shewing her any Civility. "He return'd "to *Lisbon* in the Night on Horseback, being "very chearful, and coming up to the Coaches "of the Ladies he met, he told them many undecent things.„ Not long before she died, she acquainted her two Sons with the Condition she was in: the Infant wept, (*d*) "but the King "was so far from being mov'd with it, that he "banter'd his Brother for his Tenderness, and "opposed his Design of setting out immediately.„ 'Tis certain that Queen had a great many Vexations on account of her Son *Alfonso*. 'Tis the Fate of most Sovereigns, and 'tis not the least Misery that attends them. Of all Men Sovereigns stand most in need of Children, and no Men are more vexed by them than they are. When they have no Children, they see many Intrigues carried on, to give 'em a Successor, or excessive Honours paid to another Family. When they have Children, they are tormented with Jealousy, when they see the Rising-Sun adored. They are sometimes very happy, if they are suffer'd to reign till they die of a Natural Death: the Saying (*e*) *Filius ante diem patrios inquirit in annos*, may be particularly applied to them.

(*C*) *To make no Account of the Outside of Religion.*] (*ſ*) "He had so little respect for Religion, "that without any Reason he heard Mass in his "own Chamber upon the Week Days, whilst he "was in Bed, and at an unseasonable Hour. Upon "Holy-Days he never went to his Chappel till he "had din'd, which was the reason that Mass was "never ended in his Chappel, but when they "were singing Vespers in the other Churches: "And because he could not dispense himself from "hearing Sermons, he order'd the Preachers to "make 'em short. Some, refusing to obey, were "banish'd, and others would not preach. However, some were so bold as to exclaim against such very (*D*) Favourites could not govern him. They were, for ſome time, three or four; but at laſt the Count *de Caſtelmelhor* ſupplanted the reſt, and ſecured his Intereſt, by alledging the Diſcovery (*E*) of a horrid Conſpiracy. The Infant * *Dom Pedro* was ſuſpected of a Deſign to make himſelf King, and was ſo vexed that he left the Court, after the King had made his Publick Entry at *Liſbon*, with his Spouſe, the 29th of *Auguſt* 1666. The Queen-Mother died the 28th of *February* in the ſame Year. The New Queen was a *French* Princeſs †, but of the Houſe of *Savoy*. She prevailed with the Infant, by her Intreaties, to return to *Liſbon*, where he had a great deal of Vexation. The King gave her alſo a great deal of trouble, upon many occaſions; and from that time there was nothing but Complaints and Broils. The Removal of the Count *de Caſtelmelhor*, upon the repeated Solicitations of the Infant, did not advance the Affairs of that Prince. The recalling of *Antonio de Souſa de Macedo*, Secretary of State, proved ſuch a terrible Blow to the Queen, that ſhe reſolved to ſee no Body but the King, *who ſaid nothing to her but what was offenſive and undecent*. That Secretary of State had very much offended the Queen, and had been deprived of his Office at her Solicitation; but he was reſtored in an inſulting manner. The Infant reſolved to turn him out at any rate, and went to the ‡ Palace with ſuch a ſtrong Guard, that the Secretary relying no longer upon the King's Protection, left the Court. Afterwards the King was prevail'd upon to order that the States ſhould meet the firſt of *January* 1668; but before the Day came on, the Queen made uſe of a terrible Expedient: ſhe retired into a Convent the 21ſt of *November* 1667, and acquainted the King that ſhe deſign'd to return into *France*; and declared to the Ladies who accompanied her, that her Marriage had never been conſummated: She mention'd it in her Letter to her Husband. Thus an Action for Impotency (*E*Δ) was brought againſt *Dom Alfonſo*, a Prince who ſo much boaſted of his || Amorous Exploits. Aſſoon as he had read the Queen's Letter he went to the Convent, and would have cauſed the Gates to be broke open, if the Infant had not prevented it. The next Day he told his Brother, *in a great Paſſion, and in very undecent Words, that he was more a Man than People thought*. The Queen declared before ſeveral Counſellors of State and Officers of the Crown, the Reaſon of her Retreat, and that ſhe deſign'd to get her Marriage declar'd null. She writ

---

* *Her Name was* Louise Frances de Gusman. *Her Husband, who being Duke of* Braganza, *became King of* Portugal *in* 1640. *died the* 6th *of* Nov. 1656. *See concerning this Revolution an Anonymous Book printed at* Paris *in* 1689, *with this Title,* Histoire de la Conjuration de Portugal. *It was written by the Abbot* Vertot, *and is as much esteem'd as the* History of the Revolutions of Sweden *publish'd by him in* 1695.

(*o*) See the Dissertation printed at the end of the Socrate Chretien p. m. 11. & seq.

(*p*) *The Title of it may be seen in the Margin of the Text of this Article.*

(*q*) Pag. 19.

(*r*) Ibid. pag. 91, 92.

(*ſ*) Ibid. pag. 95.

(*a*) Ibid. pag. 85.

(*b*) *Ibid. pag.* 86.

(*c*) *Ibid. pag.* 90.

(*d*) *Ibid. pag.* 110.

(*e*) *Ovid. Metam. lib.* 1.

(*ſ*) *Relat. pag.* 97.

* *He was the King's only Brother.*

† *Her Name was* Mary-Frances-Elizabeth, *and ſhe was born the* 21 *of* June 1646, *from the Marriage of* Charles Amadeus *of* Savoy, *Duke of* Nemours, *with* Iſabella de Vendome, *Daughter to the Duke of that Name, natural Son of* Henry IV.

‡ *In* October 1667.

|| *See the Remark* A.

" ſuch Diſorders; but it was to no purpoſe, be" cauſe others made their Zeal inſignificant by " their baſe Flatteries.„

(*D*) *His Favourites could not govern him.*] Doubtleſs they had ſenſe enough to know on the one ſide, that nothing could more endanger his Crown than his Contempt of Holy Ceremonies; and, on the other, that an outward Devotion was the beſt way to conceal his Irregularities. It was therefore their Intereſt to inſpire him with ſuch a Policy; and therefore ſince they did not make him a conſtant Attendant upon the publick Exerciſes of Devotion, and did not teach him to put on a devout Countenance at ſuch Hours, we may very well believe that they could not do it. They had been certainly very ſtupid, had they permitted a young Prince, ready to comply with their Will, to draw upon himſelf the hatred of the Preachers, by ſuch an unpleaſant and mortifying Order, as that of making ſhort Sermons. Was it not to wound them in the moſt ſenſible Part? Some choſe rather (*g*) to be Baniſh'd, or not to preach at all, than to obey that Order. There is another thing wherein that Prince had no regard for the Preachers. He laugh'd at Comets in the moſt extravagant manner. Here is a Paſſage out of the abovemention'd Relation. " At that " time there appeared a Comet: the King being " told that it foretold the Death of Kings, or " a change in their States, gave it a thouſand hard " Words from his Terraſs, call'd it a thouſand " Names, and fired a Piſtol at it.„ It was an eaſy thing to draw his Horoſcope, conſidering what ſort of Men he exaſperated, and the great Follies he committed.

(*g*) *See the foregoing Remark.*

(*E*) *And ſecured his Intereſt, by alledging the Diſcovery of a horrid Conſpiracy.*] The pretended Diſcovery of a great Plot, is a piece of Craft frequently neceſſary to prevent Conſpiracies, or to get one'sſelf rid of ſuſpected Perſons. 'Tis no matter tho' no body be Convicted: An Alarm has been rais'd, and due Meaſures have been taken to keep People in awe. The Count *de Caſtelmelhor* (*h*) " made the King believe, that there " was a Deſign to take away his Crown, and at " the ſame time ſpread a Report, that he had " diſcovered that Conſpiracy by a Divine Reve" lation.„ He accuſed the Queen, the Duke of *Cadaval*, and ſeveral other Perſons, who were out of Favour. " It was therefore reſolved, that " an Enquiry ſhould be made into the pretended " Conſpiracy .... That Enquiry laſted a long " time, either to ſhew that they proceeded im" partially in the Matter, or to ſtrike a greater " Terror into the accuſed Perſons, by exaggera" ting the pretended Diſcoveries that were made " every Day..... Tho' the Information laid " no Charge upon the Accuſed, ſome pretended " that they were not Innocent; but the Judges " ſhewed an unſhaken Integrity, and moſt of 'em " acquitted the Innocent. The Accuſed deſired " to know what they were accuſed of, but a Copy " of their Accuſations was denied them. And " tho' that Information ſhould have been declared " null, as containing no Proofs againſt thoſe that " were accuſed, yet it was preſerved, by the In" tereſt of the Favourites, as a Hand ready to " ſtrike a Blow upon another occaſion on the " Heads of the Perſons accuſed.„ It was a nice Piece of Policy.

(*h*) *Relat.* p. 100.

(*E*Δ) *An Action for Impotency was brought againſt* Dom Alfonſo.] The Queen's Confeſſor had begun to carry on an Intrigue ſome Months before with M. *de Schomberg*, and confeſs'd to him the perplexity that Princeſs was in. The King's Impotency was one of the firſt things that were revealed to him. (*a*) " The Queen being no longer " able to live under the Conſtraint which the " King's Brutality and the Favourite's Cruelty re" duc'd her to, diſcover'd to Father *de Ville*, her " Confeſſor, that ſhe was extremely deſirous to " acquaint the Count *de Schomberg* with all her " Misfortunes, and the Apprehenſion ſhe was in " of ſomething worſe; that the Duke of *Beaufort* " and the Biſhop of *Laon* had recommended to " her to repoſe an entire Confidence in him; ſo " that ſhe was perſwaded he was the only Man " that could allay her Grief, and afford her the " means of getting glorioully out of the ſad Con" dition ſhe was in. That Jeſuit, who was very " faithful to his Miſtreſs, and behav'd himſelf " with great Diſcretion and Prudence in the midſt " of

(*a*) *Memoires de Mr. Fremont d'Ablancourt pag.* 319, 320.

writ to the * Chapter of the Cathedral Church of [illegible], and desir'd them to take Congnizance of that Affair. It was immediately propos'd to marry her to the Infant. The Brief for a Dispensation was not long a coming. In a word, They made such dispatch, in all respects, that on the 23d of November 1667, Dom Pedro took Possession of the Royal Palace, and the 2d of April following married Mademoiselle d'Aumale, for so she was to be call'd still. The Chapter had declar'd (F) the Marriage null the 28th of March foregoing. I have forgot to say, that when Dom Pedro took Possession of the Palace, he secur'd the King's Person, who, on the same Day, sign'd a Writing, whereby he acknowledged that he resign'd the Kingdom to his Brother, of his own Motion. The States of the Kingdom declared Dom Pedro Regent of the Kingdom. He might have been proclaim'd King, and have added to the Royal Authority wherewith he was Invested, a Title which is of great use, even when another Man is possess'd of the whole Monarchical Power. *Spain* made a prudent use of this Revolution, to conclude † a Treaty of Peace, which the League concluded in 1667, between *France* and *Portugal* might have prevented, had not a Peace been necessary to a Kingdom which had lately got another Master by such Proceedings. This is what I have taken from a Book || printed at *Amsterdam*. I don't pretend (G) to warrant the truth of it; and if I had some authentick and private Memoirs of the contrary Party, I would produce them without any partiality, for or against *Dom Alfonso*, that the Readers might be the better able

* *The Archbishoprick was then vacant.*

† *It was concluded the 13th of Febr.* [illegible] *de l'*[illegible] *Bassed.* [illegible] *t. p. 467.*

|| *Intituled*, Relation des troubles arrivez dans la Cour de Portugal, en l'année 1667, & 1668.

"of so many Dangers, approv'd the Queen's Design, and imparted it to the Count *de Schomberg*; "and because they had a mutual Esteem one for "another, he gave him a particular Account of "the Queen's Trouble, according to the Order he "had receiv'd, and his own Inclination. He also "told him, that the Report about the King's Impotency was but too true; and that it was to be "feared the Consequences of it would prove dismal; that a private Door had been lately contriv'd "in the Queen's Chamber; and that the Bed had "been placed in such a manner, that one might "get into it through that Door, without being "seen by those that were in the Chamber, and "that it was to be feared some Body would come "in that way, to supply the King's Weakness." This is what I find in the (*b*) Memoirs of M. *Fremont d'Ablancourt*, who was very well acquainted with the Affairs of the Court of *Portugal*. The Queen's Confessor, and that (*c*) of the Infant *Dom Pedro* did very much contribute to the Revolutions of that Country (*d*).

It must be confess'd, that few Persons have been in a more deplorable Condition than that Queen before the Revolution: for (*e*) "the next "Day after she married King *Alfonso* . . . . it "appear'd that things did not go on so pleasantly between two Persons of their Age as one "might have hoped. At first this was only perceived by those who had the nearest access to "them; but by degrees the thing went farther, "and began to lay the foundation of a third "Cabal in that Court, whereof the two weakest, "as it commonly happens, sided against the "strongest, and at last triumph'd over it . . . . "(*f*) The king was not more kind than he had "been before his Marriage, he went on in his "old way, and gave every Day new Vexations "to the Queen, so far as to declare he was in "love with the first Lady of her Chamber. . . . "The Count *de Castel Melhor*, his Favourite, having (*g*) gained one of the Queen's Women, "whom she trusted most, had only an outward "respect for that Princess; so that the King and "his Favourite, abating some Civilities they "shewed her in publick, made it appear that "they cared little for her in private. Such an "odd Conduct gave the Queen occasion to mistrust them, and to suspect that they were contriving pernicious Designs against her; but the "more she had reason to complain, the more she "was cautious in expressing her Resentment, "not knowing whom to trust . . . . *France*, "from whence she was lately come, was still in "her Mind; and the Desire she had of doing "what was expected from her took up all her "Thoughts, and therefore she was more willing "to dissemble her Grief, than to seek a Remedy "for it. But tho' her Unhappiness was very "great, she was uneasie upon another account; "for she could not bear the Injustice that was "done to the Infant, and, upon all occasions she "endeavour'd to restore him to the King's Favour." How unhappy was this Queen! she was both a Wife and a Maid, she had an impotent and a brutish Husband, she was afraid of his ill Designs, she mistrusted every body, she saw a Prince whom she esteem'd, and who (*h*) loved her, cruelly Persecuted. The King of *Portugal* had some particular Reasons to be Civil and Complaisant to his Spouse; he was obliged to act like an Insolvent Debtor, who endeavours to pacify his Creditors by his Humility and great Civility: *Qui nummos non gestat in bursa, mel saltem habeat in bucca.* He should at least have given good Words; but, on the contrary, he abused his Spouse, not considering that he could not make amends for his abusive Language. Most Husbands, in a like case, are humble and complaisant, they endeavour to shew the falsity of the Proverb, *That one Misfortune is always attended with another Misfortune.* This is also the usual Practice of unfaithful Wives; they do whatever they can, by their Flatteries and Submission, to make their Husbands easy with their Horns.

(*F*) *Had declared the Marriage null.*] Their Sentence imports, That the two Parties had done their best to consummate the Marriage, without being able to succeed in it, and that the whole Fault was to be ascribed to the Husband. I shall set down their own Words somewhat at length. "(*i*) It appears, that during that (*k*) time, having endeavour'd both of 'em to consummate "the Marriage they could not effect it, tho' they "used their endeavours towards it, by reason of "the Prince's Impotency, which proceeds from "an Infirmity which he had when he was a Child, "and which is now altogether incurable. Which "may be sufficiently made out by means approv'd "of in Law; so that the Impotency is at least "morally certain: and therefore there is no "need of an Inspection or a better Proof, such as "that of three Years, or any other time. This "whole Matter having been examin'd with some "other Acts in conformity to the Laws, we judge "the Marriage between the said Most Serene Prince "and Princess, to be contracted *de facto*, and not "*de jure*, and we declare it to be void, and that the "said Prince and Princess may dispose of themselves as they shall think fit, and divide their "Estates according to the Tenor of their Contracts."

(*G*) *I don't pretend to warrant the truth of it.*] Who hears but one Side hears nothing: I should be very glad to see an Answer of the Count *de Castelmelhor* to the Author of the Relation. There is one thing which I don't understand: If the Follies of *Dom Alfonso* had been such as they are represented by that Author, they could not have been unknown to the Ambassadors or Envoys of the Most Christian King; and if they knew them, they could not be ignorant that this Prince was in-

(*b*) *They were printed in* 1701.

(*c*) *He was also a Jesuit.*

(*d*) *See the same Memoirs, pag.* 322. & *seq.*

(*e*) *Fremont d'Ablancourt ubi supra pag.* 294.

(*f*) *Ibid. pag.* 295.

(*g*) *Ibid. pag.* 296, 297.

(*h*) *The Infant considered, that if the* project of the Queen-Mother had been executed, *he would be now in possession of a thing which he valued more than the Crown, and that he would not have the vexation to see so beautiful a Princess* (the Queen married to Dom Alfonso) *so unworthily used.* Ibid. pag. 254.

(*i*) *Relat. pag.* 218.

(*k*) *That is the space of sixteen Months.*

able to judge of the whole Matter. That Prince was ſo far from appealing from the Sentence, whereby he was declared Impotent, that he acquieſced in it *viva voce*, and by Writing. The new married Couple having lived together for ſome time, demanded the Pope's Diſpenſation, out of Precaution, to confirm that which the Cardinal *de Vendoſme*, Legate *à Latere* in *France*, ſent 'em before they married. The Pope granted their Requeſt. 'Tis certain that the Queen alledg'd great Motives (*H*) of Conſcience to get her Marriage diſſolved *; and that it were an unreaſonable thing to put a malicious Conſtruction upon the

* *Taken from the ſame Relation.*

in a Condition wherein private Men are not allowed to diſpoſe of their Eſtates. Thoſe who are guilty of ſuch Follies, uſe to be ſhut up, or at leaſt they are put under the Guardianſhip of their Relations. How comes it then that the Miniſters of *France* did not acquaint the King their Maſter, when the Marriage of *Dom Alfonſo* was on foot, that he was a Madman, and, beſides, ſuſpected of Impotency? It has been ſaid, that Princeſſes are Victims ſacrificed to the Intereſt of the State; which was never truer than with reſpect to Mademoiſelle *d'Aumale*. The Favourites of (*a*) *Dom Alfonſo* ſuborned a Woman to make her ſay, that the King had got her with Child: but ſhe ſwore afterwards that it was falſe. The Author of the Relation (*b*) lays a great ſtreſs upon that Woman's Oath; but he had no reaſon for it: what ſhe ſaid ought not to be minded; for ſince ſhe could tell a Lye at the ſollicitation of a Favourite, ſhe might as well tell a Lye againſt a Prince who was a Priſoner, and near to be depoſed. Such Retractations ſhould not be admitted as an Evidence: whoever will be (*c*) ſuborned to ſay a thing, may as well be ſuborned to deny it.

(*a*) *Relation p.* 96.

(*b*) *Pag.* 248.

(*c*) *Confer quæ ſupra in the Article* Calvin *Remark R.*

(*H*) *Alledged great Motives of Conſcience to get her Marriage diſſolved.*] This wants to be explain'd; otherwiſe one would be apt to think, that the Queen miſtruſting her Temper, and not being able to oppoſe the Inclinations of Nature, had a Mind to make uſe of the lawful Remedy, which ſhe did not find in the Perſon of *Dom Alfonſo*. In a word, one would be apt to think, that ſhe had not the Gift of Continence; and that ſhe wanted a Husband for fear of tranſgreſſing the Laws of Chaſtity. But it would be a wrong Interpretation of the Motives of Conſcience alledged by her. 'Tis therefore neceſſary to explain the Matter, in order to prevent the falſe Judgments of the Readers.

1. *Dom Alfonſo*, notwithſtanding his Impotency, was a very unchaſte and lewd Man; and therefore he was guilty of Sin in that reſpect, and brought the ſame Guilt upon the Queen; for the looſeſt Caſuiſts are agreed, that without certain Conditions, which were wanting in *Alfonſo*, 'tis a piece of Lewdneſs in a Husband to come near his Wife, and in a Wife to permit it. This cannot be more particularly explain'd: 'Tis not likely that a Perſon of her Rank, whoſe Steps are expoſed to the publick View, would have engaged, without an extreme neceſſity, in a Suit wherein an hundred things, contrary to Modeſty, were to be diſcuſs'd.

2. The Queen knew that the King and his Favourite would never conſent to *Dom Pedro*'s Marriage; and therefore ſince the King was not in a Capacity to get Children, ſhe could no longer diſſemble, without expoſing the Kingdom of *Portugal* to diſmal Revolutions, which ſhe thought herſelf obliged to prevent, not only out of love for that Kingdom, but alſo out of Conſcience.

3. Whenever the King had a Mind to Sport with a Young Woman, he made uſe of a Forerunner; one of his Favourites broke the Ice, and then the Prince did his beſt to get in through the Breach. He deſign'd to uſe the Queen in the ſame manner; and therefore the Queen was obliged in Honour and Conſcience to get herſelf rid of ſuch a Husband.

Thoſe three things want to be proved, and therefore I ſhall ſet down what I find in (*d*) the *Reaſons alledged for the Invalidity of that Marriage*.

(*d*) *Relat. pag.* 251.

What follows concerns the firſt Point. “Conſcience continually dictated to Her Majeſty, that after a tedious Experience of ſixteen Months, ſhe was obliged to part with the King, without deſiring to make a longer tryal, eſpecially conſidering that being fully ſenſible of his incurable Impotency, and having frequently conſulted her Confeſſor about it, to manage that important Affair with greater Secrecy, the ſame Confeſſor having maturely conſidered the thing, and what he was to ſay about it, declared before God, that he believed Her Majeſty was no longer obliged to do Violence to her Conſcience, by cohabiting with the King.” As to the ſecond Head, I refer the Reader to the 252 Page of the Relation.

What concerns the third Head is contain'd in the following Words. The Queen ſaw her Honour, (*e*) *which was always dearer to her than the Crown and her own Life*, “expoſed to great dangers, and had very good Reaſons to think ſo. Tho' it be never ſo neceſſary to mention them, yet Virtue and Modeſty will not allow me to ſay more of the Matter than what is abſolutely neceſſary to give a right Judgment of it. One of thoſe Reaſons was, that tho' the King knew he would never be able to get any Children, yet he expreſs'd a very great deſire of getting ſome, to be (*f*) reſtor'd to the Throne by that means, and to put an end to the common Report of his Impotency, which made him more uneaſy than his own Weakneſs. And therefore the more he was ſenſible of his Impotency, the more he endeavour'd to ſhew the contrary, by proſtituting himſelf to all ſorts of Women, hoping to maintain himſelf by that means, and to vex his Brother to Death, whom he mortally hated, becauſe he ſaid, and was ſure, that His Majeſty would never get any Children, by reaſon of his Impotency. The other reaſon is, That the Queen was not ignorant of what was then kept ſecret, and which the Judges came to know ſince, by the Declaration of the Perſons concern'd, *viz.* That when the King had a mind to lie with a Maid, not being able to do it himſelf, by reaſon of his Impotency, he cauſed her to lie in his Chamber, and in his own Preſence, with one of his Favourites, to make the thing more eaſy to him; tho', after all, he did not ſhow himſelf more a Man than before, as it appears from the Depoſitions of thoſe concern'd in it, who have ſworn it upon the Holy Goſpel. And what made the Queen moſt apprehenſive, that the King, without any regard to his Honour and Conſcience, had ſuch a Deſign upon her, was her being continually ſollicited, in the King's Name, towards the latter end of *April*, 1667, by his moſt intimate Favourites *Enrigo Enriguez de Miranda*, and the Count *de Caſtelmeglior*, with the Marchioneſs his Mother, Lady of Honour to Her Majeſty, to remove in the Night from her Appartment, (where the King had made hitherto no difficulty to come to her) into that of His Majeſty to lie with him, (*a*) contrary to the ancient Form, and the uſual Cuſtoms of the Palace, and without any apparent neceſſity. And becauſe the Queen declin'd it ſeveral times, with all poſſible gentleneſs, alledging for her Reaſon, not that which made her moſt apprehenſive, (for notwithſtanding this new Uneaſineſs ſhe would have complied with the King's Will, having always been very ſubmiſſive to him) but Modeſty, which will not allow a Woman of Honour, much leſs a Princeſs and a Queen, to make, without any neceſſity, ſuch an extraordinary Alteration, which doubtleſs would have occaſion'd ſeveral Reflections upon Her's and the King's Reputation; the King fell into ſuch a Paſſion, that in the Night of the ſame Day he had a mind to drag her out of her Bed into his Apartment. But after many Threatnings and hard Words, holding

(*e*) *Ibid. pag.* 252.

(*f*) *This a very improper Word for King* Alfonſo *had not been dethron'd yet.*

(*a*) *Compare with this the Rem. E towards the end, where mention is made of another device, which made the Queen uneaſy.*

the (I) deep Melancholy which appear'd in her Face, aſſoon as ſhe was ſenſible of her Huſband's Weakneſs. *Dom Alfonſo* was ſent into the Iſle of *Terceira*, where he continued many Years: But there being ſome Reaſon to fear that the Enemies of the State would reſcue him from that Place, in order to raiſe Troubles in the Kingdom, he was removed to the Caſtle of *Cintra*, ſeven Leagues from *Lisbon*, where he died of an Apoplexy, the 12th of *September* 1683 ι.

The Queen of *Portugal*, formerly his Wife, followed him ſoon after; for ſhe died θ at *Palhavam*, the 27th of *December* 1683, being in the 38th Year of her Age. Her only Daughter the Infanta of *Portugal* was born the 6th of *June* 1669, and contracted to the Duke of *Savoy* in 1679. That Marriage was made publick in the Council of State of *Portugal*, on the 5th of *September* γ. The States of the Kingdom were aſſembled to ratify it, and to derogate from a Law, whereby the Princeſſes of the Royal Family, who marry Foreign Princes, are (K) excluded from the Crown γ. Notwithſtanding which, this Marriage was broke before the Duke of *Savoy* ſaw the Infanta: ſhe died without having been married. The Queen her Mother took great Care of her Education: δ *ſhe wrote with her own Hand ſome Advices* for the Infanta, *which were found after her Death*, and are very fine. They may be ſeen at length in the *Mercure Galant* ζ for the Month of *May* 1684. King *Dom Pedro* married in 1687, a Daughter of the Elector *Palatin*, who died * in the Year 1699, aged 33 Years. Many Particulars are to be found in the Memoirs of *M. Fremont d'Ablancourt*, printed in 1701, concerning *Dom Alfonſo*'s Reign, the Diſſolution of his Marriage, his Depoſition, *&c.*

POZZUOLO, in Latin *Puteoli*, a Town in the Kingdom of *Naples*, has now but ſome few inconſiderable Remains of its ancient Luſtre. It was § built by the *Samians*, in the fourth Year of the 64th Olympiad, which was the 232 Year of *Rome*. It was call'd *Dicæarchia* κ. It did belong, for ſome time, to the Inhabitants of *Cumæ* λ, who made it their Harbour. The *Romans* conquer'd it θ, during the ſecond Punick War, in the Year of *Rome* 538, and put a ſtrong Gariſon in it. They made it ‡ a Colony twenty Years after, and changed its Name into that (A) of *Puteoli*. 'Twas one of the beſt (B) Ports they had upon that Sea. It became very conſiderable ¼ for the beauty of the publick Structures that were raiſed in it, I mean its Temples, Circus's, Theaters, and Amphitheaters. The Country-Houſes which the moſt wealthy Citizens of *Rome*, and *Cicero*, among the reſt, built near that Town, contributed more ſtill to make it famous †. Some ſay its (C) Purple was more valued than that of *Tyre*. I ſhall

ι Taken from the Mercure Galant for Oct. 1683.

θ Mercure Galant for Feb. 1684. pag. 124.

γ Taken from the Paris Gazette.

δ Mercure Galant for May 1684. pag. 24, &c.

ζ Pag. 25, &c.

* See l'Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe, for Sept. 1699. pag. 480.

§ Euſeb. in Chron.

κ By contraction Dicarchia. The Latin Poets made uſe of that Word, even when it was call'd Puteoli.

λ Strabo, lib. 5.

θ Livius, lib. 24.

‡ Id. lib. 32. & 34. See alſo the Inſcription mention'd by Andreas Schottus, in itinerario Italiæ parte 3.

¼ See the Antiquities of Pozzuolo, written by Scipio Mazzella.

† Id. ib.

"holding a Dagger in his Hand, he told her, that "ſhe muſt reſolve upon it in 24 Hours; and then "if ſhe refuſed to comply with his Deſires he "ſwore he would drag her, or get her drag'd by "four Footmen. The Queen was ſenſibly afflicted at it; and therefore the next Day ſhe "order'd her Confeſſor to complain of it to the "Count, and to deſire him to prevent it, proteſting, that ſhe had rather die than do what "the King deſir'd, or any thing unworthy of her. "This, together with the Fear that was imprinted "in the Queen's Mind, is the reaſon why ſhe "never thought herſelf ſafe ever ſince, whilſt ſhe "remain'd expos'd to a danger which ſhe could "not ſo well avoid at another time as ſhe did "then; eſpecially conſidering, that the Woman "whom Her Majeſty ſhould have truſted moſt "upon ſuch an occaſion, *viz.* her Lady of Honour, was the ſame whom ſhe had moſt reaſon "to miſtruſt, by reaſon of the Advice ſhe had "given her, becauſe ſhe was the Mother of the "King's Favourite, and openly expreſs'd a great "deſire that the Queen ſhould get Children by "any means whatſoever, in order to make hers "and her Son's Fortune, having ſaid, in expreſs "Words, to the Confeſſor, in a Conference they "had together upon that Subject, to perſuade "him to prevail with the Queen to change her "Bed and Apartment, that it would be only for "five or ſix Nights, and then ſhe aſſured him, "that the King would go to the Queen as he did "before."

(I) *The deep Melancholy which appeared in her Face.*] If any one asks how I come to know that the Queen was melancholy, he needs but read the following Paſſage that is to be found among the Reaſons alledged for the Invalidity of that Marriage. "(c) The firſt time the King lay with the "Queen, which was three or four Days after ſhe "arrived in *Portugal*, that Princeſs was ſo ſenſible "of his Impotency, tho' ſhe was ignorant of "things of that nature, that her Confeſſor, who "perceiv'd ſhe was very melancholy, and ſuſpected the truth of what was ſaid, having taken "the liberty to ask her, out of Confeſſion, with "all due Modeſty and Civility, whether there was "any ground for what was reported, or whether "ſhe might quickly expect to ſee ſome Fruits of "her Marriage; She anſwer'd him (as may be "ſeen in the Writings) in ſuch a manner as made "him ſenſible of what ſhe thought already of the "ſtate of her Marriage, and of the King's Inability to get Children." I have a mind to ſee a Book (d) lately come out.

(K) *And to derogate from a Law whereby the Princeſſes . . . . . are excluded.*] 'Tis call'd, *The Law of Lamego.* It was made by *Dom Alfonſo Henriquez*, the firſt King of *Portugal*, in the States General aſſembled at *Lamego*, after the Victory he obtain'd over five Mooriſh Kings at the Battle of *Urica*, in the Year 1139. 'Tis enacted by that Law, that the Princeſſes of the Royal Blood, who marry Foreigners, cannot ſucceed to the Crown. 'Tis by virtue of that Law, that the Dukes of *Parma* were excluded from the Crown of *Portugal*, tho' they are deſcended from the Princeſs *Mary*, eldeſt Siſter of *Catherine*, Grandmother to King *Dom Pedro* (e).

(A) *Into that of* Puteoli.] Either becauſe of the great number of Wells, or by reaſon of the ill Smell of the hot Waters (f).

(B) *One of the beſt Ports.*] The Merchantmen of *Alexandria* had their Storehouſe there, as it appears from theſe Words of *Seneca*. (g) *Subito hodie nobis Alexandrinæ naves apparuerunt, quæ præmitti ſolent & nunciare ſecuturæ claſſis adventum; tabellarias vocant. Gratus illorum Campaniæ adſpectus eſt: omnis in pilis Puteolorum turba conſiſtit . . . . In hoc omnium diſcurſu properantium ad litus, magnam ex pigritia mea ſenſi voluptatem.*

(C) *Some ſay its Purple was more valued than that of* Tyre.] *Scipio Mazzella* ſays ſo, and quotes *Pliny* for it: 'Tis certain that *Pliny* does not ſpeak of the Purple, but of a kind of Vermilion

(c) Relat. pag. 25.

(d) *I have been told juſt now, that the Hiſtory of that Princeſs, written by Father* d'Orleans *a Jeſuit, has been publiſh'd at* Paris *in* May 1696. *Thus I ſaid in the 1ſt Edition; and now I hear that this Hiſtory has been reprinted at* Amſterdam, *and yet I have not been able to ſee it.*

(e) *I have taken this from a* Paris *Gazette of the Year* 1679.

(f) *Strabo lib.* 5.

(g) *Seneca epiſt.* 77. *init. Compare what* Suetonius *ſays in* Auguſt. *c.* 98.

I shall say nothing of its Baths; every Body knows they (D) were very famous, and they are so to this Day. *Augustus* § and *Nero* + sent new Colonies thither. It was ‡ burnt down by *Alaric*, in the 410th Year of the Christian *Æra*, and by *Genseric* in the Year 455. *Totila* took it 90 Years after, or thereabouts; and it was then dismantl'd, and so furiously ransack'd, that it remain'd uninhabited for the space of sixteen Years. The *Greeks* having rebuilt it, it recover'd itself by degrees, so that it was a good Place when *Romuald* II, Duke of *Benevento*, made himself Master of it in the Year 715, and destroy'd it with Fire and Sword. It was plunder'd by the *Hungri* in the X. Century. After several Revolutions, it fell at last into the Power of *Alfonso* of *Arragon*, King of *Naples*, in the XV. Century. Earthquakes made strange Devastations in that Town, at several times, especially in the Year 1538 *. The Place wherein *Gassendus* mentions them, will give me occasion to observe a (E) Mistake of his Abbreviator. I shall also take notice of an Oversight of (F) *Benjamin Tudelensis*.

§ *Frontin. de Colon.*

+ *Tacit. Annal. lib.* 14.

‡ *Scip. Mazzella ibid.*

* *Taken from the same Scipione Mazzella.*

PRAT (*Antony du*) Chancellor of *France*, and then Cardinal, in the Reign of *Francis* I, was born at *Issoire* in *Auvergne*. 'Tis agreed, that he was a Man of great Abilities, but not that he was a Good Man. He is blamed, among other things, for the *Concordate* that was made between *Leo* X and *Francis* I, in the Year 1516. 'Tis said, that by that means he introduced into the Kingdom a (A) pernicious Usage, whereby the Choice of Bishops was transferr'd to the Court; which

tion with some Purple in it. These are *Mazzella's* Words: (a) *E da gli antichi tenuta in gran stima la purpura, che si faceva in Pozzuolo, che per la bontà & eccellenza sua avanzava quelle di Tiro, de Getulico, e dil Laconico, ch' erano purpure pretiosissime. Di che Plin. nel* 35. *lib. al* 6. *capo della purpura parlando così scrive. Quare Puteolanum potius laudatur, quam Tyrium aut Getulicum, unde pretiosissima purpura.* He should have considered, that the Word *Puteolanum* is to be referr'd to *Purpurissum e creta argentaria*, which *Pliny* had been speaking of: Women (b) used it for a Paint.

(D) *Its Baths . . . . were very famous.*] See the Treatise of *John Elisius*, a Physician, *de Balneis Puteolanis*, corrected and enlarged by *Scipione Mazzella*; it is printed at the end of the Antiquities of *Pozzuolo*. There are in it some *Latin* Verses written by *Alcadinus* in Praise of those Baths. *Alcadinus* was born at *Syracusa*, and his Father sent him to *Salerno* to Study there, where he made so great a Progress in Philosophy and Physick, that he was quickly made Professor of those two Sciences. He acquired so great a Reputation in Physick, that several Princes desired to have him. He cured the Emperor *Henry* VI. who fell dangerously Sick in the Kingdom of *Naples*, and ever since he was very well beloved by that Emperor, who bestowed many Presents upon him. After *Henry's* Decease he was Physician to the Emperor *Frederick* II. and made, at his request, the Verses I speak of. He flourish'd in the Year 1191, and lived 52 Years (c). He does not appear in *Thomas Bartholinus's* Catalogue of Physicians, who have been Poets.

(E) *A Mistake of his Abbreviator.*] *Gassendus* says, that Earthquakes do sometimes produce Mountains in the Continents, and Islands in the Sea. As to the Mountains, he alledges what happen'd near *Pozzuolo*, in the Year 1538. *Mirabilius videri potest*, says he (d), *enasci ex opposito non modo in Continentibus montes, sed etiam in medio mari Insulas. Nam de Montibus quidem facit fidem Puteolanus ille, quem Simon Portius* (1) *ita describit, ut fuerit una nocte ad plusquam M. passuum altitudinem, ex pumicibus, cineribusque congestus; id nempe sub finem Septembris, anni* M. D. XXXVIII. Tho' *Bernier* was a Man of Learning, he mistook a Word in this Passage, the sense of which is very plain. He did not consider that *Puteolanus* ought to be referr'd to *terræ motus*, but he made an Author of it. *What is no less surprising*, says he (e), *is to see some Mountains of Pumice-stones and Ashes come out in one Night in the middle of a Continent, as* Puteolanus *relates.* Which puts me in mind of the *Hexameron rustique*, wherein *la Mothe le Vayer* observes, that *du Pinet* (f) . . . . *made two Roman Gentlemen of two pieces of Marble*, and that *Coeffeteau* (g) says Captain *Corfinius*, instead of the Town of *Corfinium*.

(F) *The Oversight of* Benjamin Tudelensis.] He says not only that the Town *Puteoli* was call'd *Surrentum* in former times, but also that it was built by *Tsinsan Hadar Ezer*, who betook himself to flight for fear of King *David*. (h) *Ulterius profectus sui Puteolos quondam Surrentum dictam, urbem magnam, quam olim condidit Tsinsan Hadar-Ezer, quum metu Davidis regis (in pace quiescentem) aufugisset.* Those two Falsities have been taken notice of by *Mazzella* (i), and (k) *Constantin l'Empereur*, and afterwards by (l) *Pineda*, who observes, that this *Tsinsan Hader* is mention'd in the second Book of *Samuel* chap. 8. v. 3. and that the Suppositious *Joseph*, Son of *Gorion*, tells the same fabulous Story in the third Chapter of his first Book. This shews the Spirit of the *Jewish* Nation, and even of all others. Every one of 'em fancies, that their Great Men have performed many things in the remotest Countries. *David*, whose Name was unknown in *Italy* till the *Romans* read *Josephus*, and who lived about 300 Years before the Foundation of *Rome*, did so fright *Romulus*, if *Benjamin* may be credited, that this Founder of *Rome* dug out a Way of fifteen Miles under the Mountains near *Puteoli* to hide himself. (m) *Hinc per milliaria quindecim sub montibus iter conficitur. Operis author est Romulus, qui Romam condidit, atque hæc omnia fecit cum sibi à Davide Israelitarum rege & Joabo exercitus duce metueret. Alia etiam cum supra, tum infra montes urbis Neapolis extruxit.* Here follows the Note of *Constantin l'Empereur*: it contains an Exclamation, which is not too vehement considering the Impertinence of that Rabbin. (n) *Quis ad tantum stuporem non obstupescat? coætaneos facit Davidem & Romulum, quum trecentis circiter annis post Davidem regnare cœperit. Quod in dubium vocari non potest; sed ex diversis historicis constat, & passim à Chronologis observatum, quorum verba repetere necesse non est in tanta luce. Huic parallelum est, quum Romulum talparum more in terram ac longissimas specus se recepisse fingit, sive eas metu Davidis, qui ante aliquot secula mortem obierat, excavasse scribit. Quis ad hujusmodi non stomachetur? si nos ita aberraremus, quam superbe nobis Judæi insultarent.*

(A) *That he introduced*, by the Concordate, *a pernicious usage.*] I design to quote some Authors upon this Subject, and I begin with the Words of a *Jansenist*: (o) "Chancellor *Antony du Prat*, Cardinal, Archbishop of *Sens*, Bishop of *Alby*, *Valence*, *Die*, and *Gap*, and Abbot of *Fleury*, assembled (p) in the Convent of the *Great Augustins* at *Paris*, the Bishops of his Province, who attended the Court, and caused some Ordinances to be read, which he had made for the Explanation of the Christian Doctrine, and for the Discipline of the Church, against the Errors of *Luther*, which made a great Noise in *Europe* at that time. . . . That Prelate (q) never resided in any of his Dioceses, and never performed any Episcopal Function, except that Ordinance against *Martin Luther*, *Philip Melanchthon*, *Oecolampadius*, and *Zuinglius*; for *Calvin* and *Beza* were not yet talk'd of. This good Prelate is said to have abolish'd the *Pragmatick Sanction*, that is, the

pure

(a) *Scipione Mazzella Antichità di Pozzuolo pag.* 6. &c. *edit. Napol.* 1595. *in* 8.

(b) *Quinque istas buccas tam belle purpurissatas habes. Plautus in Truculent. act.* 2. *sc.* 2. *v.* 35. *See also the same* Plautus *in Mostell. act.* 1. *sc.* 3. *v.* 101.

(c) *Taken from Scipione Mazzella de balneis puteolanis pag.* 260.

(d) *Gassendus Physicæ sect.* 3. *membro* 1. *lib.* 1. *c.* 6. *pag.* 50. *oper. tom.* 2.

(1) *Epist. de cons. agri Put.*

(e) *Bernier, Abregé de la Philosophie de Gassendi tom.* 5. *pag.* 127. *Lyons* 1684.

(f) *See the Article of* du Pinet.

(g) *In the* 12 *Chapter of the* 2d *Book of his Translation of* Florus.

which was the right way to beſtow Mitres upon Men more Worldly and Vain, than Learned and Virtuous. But it may be anſwer'd, That the

" pure Obſervation of the ancient Canons in the " Church of *France*, and to be the Author of the " *Concordate* between King *Francis* I. and *Leo* X. " whereby the Apoſtolical Diſcipline has been de- " ſtroy'd in *France*, Canonical Elections have been " aboliſh'd, and the *Gallican* Church brought un- " der a deplorable Slavery." The Archbiſhop of *Ambrun* took that Chancellor's Part, and endeavour'd to make the *Janſeniſts* odious to the Court; as if by diſapproving the *Concordate* they envied the advantages that accrue to His Majeſty from it: *They endeavour*, ſays he (*a*), *to deprive his Crown of a great advantage: they exclaim in the tenth Page of the firſt Libel againſt the* Concordate *that was made between* Francis I. *and Pope* Leo X. That good Prelate, *ſay they, ſpeaking of Chancellor* du Prat, *Cardinal and Archbiſhop of* Sens, is ſaid to have aboliſh'd the *Pragmatick Sanction*, that is, the pure Obſervation of the ancient Canons, *&c.* . . . . *They bear an ill will to that Great Man, becauſe in a Council he held in his Province of* Sens, *in the Year* 1528, *he forbad the Tranſlations of the Bible into the Vulgar Language.* Theſe Words were criticized by a Perſon, who wonder'd (*b*) he ſpoke of *the* Concordate *in a manner ſo unbecoming his Chancellor.* "He ſhould have learn'd from the moſt " famous Hiſtorians, and the verbal Proceſſes of " the Clergy of *France*, what Opinion the Biſhops, " the Parliaments, and good Men have always had " of that Treaty. He ſhould not have been igno- " rant, that for a long time publick Prayers were " made in many Churches, to beg of God that it " ſhould be aboliſh'd, by the Reſtoration of Cano- " nical Elections, as it appears from ſeveral Ri- " tuals, ſuch as that of *Vannes*, printed at *Lyons*, " and another of *Clermont*, printed in 1608, by " order of the late Cardinal *de la Rochefoucaut*. " Laſtly, ſince he ſets a great Value upon the Au- " thority of the Archbiſhop of *Paris*, he ſhould " at leaſt have ſpoke of it as that Prelate does in " the Life of *Henry IV.* wherein he ſays, *pag.* 229. " that the General Aſſembly of the Clergy, held " at *Paris* in 1599, *made a long Remonſtrance to the* " *King, whereby the Prelates intreated him not to* " *take upon him to nominate to the Biſhopricks, Ab-* " *bies, and other Benefices, with Cure of Souls.* " And he ſhould not have appeared leſs knowing " than a Prince like *Henry* IV, bred up in Hereſy, " and in the War, who notwithſtanding anſwer'd " the Clergy, as the Archb. of *Paris* tells us, *that* " *he acknowledged the truth of what they had told* " *him concerning the nomination to Benefices, but that* " *he was not the Author of that Abuſe.*" I ſhall add another Paſſage. (*d*) *'Tis not true*, that the Writers of *Port-Royal have reaſon to bear an ill-will* to Chancellor *du Prat*, *becauſe* he forbad the Tranſlations of the Bible into the Vulgar Language in the Council of *Sens*, of the Year 1528. "for he " never made ſuch a Prohibition, being contented " to forbid only the Printing of the Sacred Books, " without the Authority of the Ordinary: which " does not concern the Verſion of *Mons*, that " was approved by the Ordinary of the Place " where it was printed. 'Tis not true neither, " that 'tis a Fault not to ſpeak of Cardinal *du Prat* " as of a *Great Man*, and that the Author of the " Dialogue is to blame for ſpeaking of him as he " does, ſince none that is never ſo little acquain- " ted with our Hiſtory, can deny that no Man was " more cried down than he was by the Writers of " his Time. *Belcarius*, Biſhop of *Metz*, calls him " *Bipedum nequiſſimum*, and accuſes him of having " bribed ſome Judges to condemn to Death the " Sieur *de Semblance*. Probably 'tis upon him that " *Budæus* beſtows the ſtrange Encomium that is at " the beginning of the 260 Page (1) of his Book " Intituled *Forenſia*."

'Tis certain that the *Concordate* was attended with many Abuſes in the Collation of Benefices: hence it is, that upon the Complaints of the three States of the Kingdom aſſembled at *Orleans*, in the Year 1560, a Regulation was made, which might have put things in a very good way, if it had been obſerved. It runs thus, "All Archbiſhops " and Biſhops ſhall be, for the time to come, up- " on a Vacancy, elected and nominated, *viz.* the " Archbiſhops, by the Biſhops of the Province, " and the Chapter of the Archiepiſcopal Church; " the Biſhops, by the Archbiſhop and Biſhops of " the Province, and the Canons of the Epiſcopal " Church, together with twelve notable Gentle- " men elected by the Gentry of the Dioceſe, and " twelve notable Citizens, who ſhall be likewiſe " elected in the Town-Houſe of the Archiepiſco- " pal or Epiſcopal City. All which being con- " vened upon a certain Day, by the Chapter of " the vacant See, and aſſembled in the foreſaid " manner, ſhall agree in the Choice of three Per- " ſons duly qualified according to the Holy Ca- " nons and Councils, and of thirty Years of Age " at leaſt, whom they ſhall preſent to us, that we " may elect one of the three for the vacant Arch- " biſhoprick or Biſhoprick." I ſhall ſet down the Words of a Commentator, to give the Reader a Notion of the Evils which 'twas thought that Ordinance would remedy. "(*e*) If the Divine " and Humane Laws had been obſerved by thoſe " who profeſs them, or whoſe buſineſs it is to " put 'em in execution, this Article would cer- " tainly be needleſs; for the things mention'd " in it were regulated by the ancient Laws and " holy Ordinances, as they are here. But the " Calamities of the Time, the Boldneſs, Avarice, " and the Credit of Great Men had corrupted " and altered every thing; and the Miſchief " would have daily encreaſed, had not our ju- " dicious Prince, or thoſe who aſſiſt him, pre- " vented it. Ignorant and fooliſh Men were " poſſeſs'd of the beſt Benefices and the nobleſt " Dignities and Prelatures, by Favour, Friendſhip, " and Money; and becauſe, for want of Capacity " and Experience they were not able to diſcern " Good from Evil, and knew not how to diſtin- " guiſh Virtue from Vice, they acted exactly ac- " cording to their mean Knowledge. Nay, ſome- " times they were appointed Biſhops before they " were intirely form'd in their Mother's Womb; " the ill Effects of which have been felt in all Chri- " ſtendom. The poor afflicted People could not " forbear murmuring, being govern'd by ſuch " Men, or their Lieutenants and Vicars of the " ſame Stamp with their Maſters, who laid into- " lerable Burdens upon them, tho' they themſelves " did not care to touch 'em with one of their Fin- " gers; 'till the Lord open'd the Eyes, the Heart, " and the Mouths of the People to ſee and com- " plain, and of Princes to hear, and of the King " to judge with Equity and Uprightneſs. I think " we have reaſon to hope from *Charles* IX, our " King, what the Augurs or Soothſayers ſaid of " *Auguſtus*, in whoſe Reign the whole Monarchy " was ſo well govern'd, and enjoy'd all manner " of Proſperity and Happineſs. It appears by " this Article, that good and honeſt Men, well " skill'd in Learning, ſhall receive a Reward for " their Labours; the Ignorant ſhall be rejected and " laid aſide, and young People will be encourag'd " to appear on the noble Stage of Virtue; Suck- " ing Children will be no longer rais'd to Eccleſi- " aſtical Dignities, a Burden too heavy for their " weak Shoulders, eſpecially in what concerns Re- " ligion, which requires that none ſhould be ap- " pointed to teach it but ſuch as are Honeſt, " Chaſte, and Holy, and whoſe fleſhly Luſts are " extinguiſh'd thro' Age, or the Love of God. " For to appoint for the Government of the Church " ignorant Men and Children, who are not able to " govern themſelves, is a ſtrange and extravagant " thing, and no leſs contrary to all Divine and " Humane Laws, than if one ſhould appoint a Pupil " to be Guardian of another Pupil, and a Blind- " Man to lead another Blind-Man. . . . . The " good King *Lewis* XII perceiving ſuch a Fault " among his Clergy ſaid, that Aſſes had a better " Time than Horſes; for Horſes, added he, gallop " to *Rome* in queſt of Benefices, but many Aſſes " are provided with them. Which is the reaſon " why they have been expoſed by ſeveral Paſ- " quinades and famous Libels; and the following " Verſes have been made upon the loſs of the E-

(*a*) *Requête préſentée au Roi par l'Archevêque d'Ambrun pag.* [illegible] *of the ſame Volume.*

(*b*) *Remarques ſur la Requête de l'Archevêque d'Ambrun, pag.* [illegible] *of the ſame Tome.*

(*c*) Quintin, *in his Speech to the Clergy, in the general Aſſembly of the States of the Kingdom in* 1561 *ſpoke with great Vigour for the reſtoration of the Elections.* See *Preſident de la Place, Hiſt. de l'Etat de la Religion & Republique, fol. m.* 143. *verſo & ſeq.*

(*d*) *Ibid.*

(*e*) *Joachim du Chalard*, Advocate in the great Council, *Sommaire expoſition des Ordonnances du Roi Charles* IX *fol.* 7. *verſo, Paris* 1558

(1) *Lib.* 3.

ſwer'd, that the (B) Church was not better ſerved in the time of the Elections, than it was under the *Concordate*. I can hardly believe what is ſaid by ſome Hiſtorians, that Cardinal *du Prat* (C) expreſs'd a deſire of being made Pope. Some Authors

lections againſt thoſe who have uſurp'd them, and thoſe who are unworthily poſſeſs'd of Church-Preferments.

“ *Au temps paſſé l'Eſprit Saint eſliſoit*
“ *Ceux, dont faiſoit l'Egliſe eſtre ſervie.*
“ *En ce temps-là, vertu fruit produiſoit;*
“ *Car les eleus eſtoyent de ſainte vie.*
“ *Mais maintenant les mondains par envie*
“ *Ont uſurpé la ſainte election,*
“ *Dont s'en enſuy humaine affection:*
“ *Et par ainſi tous vices proceder*
“ *Sont des Paſteurs, qui nous ſont concedez*
“ *Par les chevaux, par la pille, & par dons.*
“ *Trop mieux vauldroit les elire à trois dez;*
“ *Car à l'hazard ils pourroyent eſtre bons.*

If I write the Article of *Genebrard*, as I hope I ſhall, I'll mention the Book (a) he publiſh'd, to ſhew the neceſſity of reſtoring Canonical Elections. He call'd the *Concordate* a Myſtery of Iniquity.

(B) *The Church was not better ſerv'd in the time of the Elections.*] It appears from the jeſt of *Lewis* XII, mention'd in the foregoing Remarks, that there were many Abuſes under the *Pragmatick Sanction*, and before the *Concordate*. The Archbiſhop of *Ambrun* maintains, (b) *that the Concordate has remov'd the Abuſes, the Simony, and the Cabals which formerly prevailed in the Elections.* An Abbot Commendatory does very much enlarge upon thoſe Diſorders. “(c) A great Lady was ſaying one Day, in my hearing, that ſhe heard King *Francis* ſay, that the chief Reaſon which moved him to make the *Concordate* with Pope *Leo*, in order to aboliſh the Elections of Biſhops and Abbots, and of ſome Priors, was becauſe thoſe Elections were attended with many Abuſes among the Monks; for without any regard to a Man's Abilities and Learning, which were then very rare in Monaſteries . . . they elected, moſt times, the Merrieſt Fellows, the greateſt Whoremongers and Tiplers, the greateſt Lovers of Dogs and Hawks, in a word, the greateſt Debauchees, that they might have the Liberty to live a looſe and diſorderly Life, under ſuch Abbots and Priors, who were bound by an Oath to indulge them in their Debaucheries. The worſt of all was, that when they could not agree in their Elections they frequently fought and wounded one another; nay, ſometimes their Quarrels were attended with Murder: in ſhort, they made a greater Noiſe, and formed more Cabals and Factions, than there are at the creation of the Rector of the Univerſity of *Paris*, which I have ſeen formerly; I don't know whether it be ſo ſtill. Beſides, ſome elected a ſilly Monk, who wanted Courage and Reſolution to keep 'em to their Duty, and threaten'd him, when he pretended to Severity. Others elected a poor Wretch, who ſtole their Money and ſtarved his Monks, which occaſion'd great Complaints, and the impoveriſhing of the Abby. . . . In a word, there were many other Abuſes in thoſe Elections, which I paſs over in Silence. Beſides, that great King conſidering the many Services of his Nobility, and not being able to Reward them with the Revenues of his Demeſns, and the Money ariſing from Taxes, (for the whole was neceſſary to carry on his long Wars) he thought it more proper to beſtow upon them ſome Abbies, and other Church-Preferments, than to leave 'em in the hands of the Monks, a ſort of Men, ſaid he, good for nothing but Eating and Drinking, Gaming, making Bow-ſtrings and Ferret-Bags, catching Rabbets, whiſtling to Linets, and living an idle and diſorderly Life; and therefore it was then a common Saying, *As Idle as a Prieſt or a Monk*; and likewiſe, *As Covetous and as great a Whoremonger as a Prieſt or a Monk*, as the *Italians* ſay, *Pretri; fratri Monachi & pulli, mai non ſon ſatulli.* . . . (d) 'Tis to be obſerved, that if the Elections have been attended with Abuſes among Monks, thoſe of Biſhops have not been more regular; for when a Man had a mind to be made a Biſhop, he bribed the Canons and other Dignified Men with Money or great Promiſes: ſo that it was rather a downright Simony, than a lawful and Holy Election, in imitation of many Popes of thoſe Times, who bribed the Cardinals in order to get their Votes. There were alſo great Tumults and Factions in the Chapters, ſo far as to beat and kill one another, as it was formerly practiſed in *Germany*; for the Canons were fighting Men, as they are ſtill, and made uſe of Swords, as well as of the Breviary. The Biſhops lived a very diſorderly Life in thoſe Times, they reſided in their Dioceſes more than they do now, for they never left 'em; but then they minded nothing but Dogs, Hawks, Feaſts, and Whores, of whom they had a Seraglio, as I have been told of one, who pick'd up young and handſome Girls of Ten Years of Age, and had 'em bred up and down in ſeveral Villages (as Gentlemen do with Dogs) in order to make uſe of 'em when grown up. They were allow'd to live ſuch a ſcandalous Life; for they were ſo much dreaded that none would have been ſo bold as to Cenſure 'em for it. I might ſay a great deal more upon this Subject, but I will not raiſe a Scandal. Our preſent Biſhops (ſaid a Great Man to me) are more diſcreet, or at leaſt more cunning Hypocrites, and know better how to conceal their Vices. God forbid that what I have ſaid of the ancient and modern Biſhops ſhould be underſtood of all; for in former Times many of 'em were Good and Holy Men, as there are ſtill, and there will be many, with God's Bleſſing, who loves and never forſakes his People.”

(C) *That Cardinal* du Prat *expreſs'd a deſire of being made Pope.*] The Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* took care to repreſent to the Archbiſhop of *Ambrun* what *Laurence Capelloni* relates concerning the Death of *Antony du Prat*. “(e) *Clement* VII. *ſays that Author*, being dead, Cardinal *du Prat* had ſuch an extravagant deſire of being made Pope, that he made bold to tell the King, that it was in his Power to raiſe him to the Holy See. The King being willing to ſee how far his Ambition would carry him, gave him leave to go on. The Cardinal added, That if His Majeſty would be pleaſed to uſe his Intereſt with the College of Cardinals, in order to make him Pope, he would be contented with the Name, and the King ſhould have the Power. The King perceiving the exceſſive Ambition of that Man, and conſidering the great difficulties of ſuch an Enterprize, which could not be executed without vaſt Sums of Money, anſwer'd him, Faith, Mr Chancellor, the Cardinals are ſo greedy, that I have no mind to ſatisfy their Greedineſs. The Cardinal replied, That if the King approv'd of the Deſign, he would find Four hundred thouſand Crowns to put it in execution. The King told him, For what I know, Sir, you have the Sum you mention; but I have no mind to concern myſelf with ſuch a Project. This Anſwer made the Cardinal ſenſible that he was to blame not ſo much for having expreſſed his Ambition, as for having diſcover'd his great Riches. He grew ſo Melancholy upon it, that he fell Sick, and his Illneſs, which was inconſiderable at firſt, increaſed very much, when he was told, that the King knowing that he kept his Bed, had order'd his Goods and Money to be ſeiz'd, telling thoſe who complain'd of it in the Cardinal's Name, that he dealt with him as he had adviſed him to deal with others: So that, ſays that Hiſtorian, the Cardinal died, God knows how, (*Dio ſa come*) very uneaſy about it.” It will not be improper to add, that thoſe Gentlemen intimated to that Prelate, that he could not doubt of the truth of that Story, ſince he had approved the Book wherein it is to be found. *Such was*, ſay they (f), *the Death of that Great Man, of whom one cannot give an ill Character, without offending the Archbiſhop of* Ambrun. *And yet 'tis obſervable, that this Story is mention'd in the Lives of the Cardinals, written by* Aubery, *and printed for* Soly, *in* 1645, *with an authentick Approbation of*

MES-

(a) *It was burnt by the Hangman. See the* 11 *Diſſertation of* Natalis Alexander in Selecta hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ capita, *Seculi* 15 & 16.

(b) *In his Petition to the King againſt the Verſion of* Mons, *pag.* 272, 274. *of the* 4*th Vol. of the Pieces relating to that Verſion.*

(c) Brantome's *Memoirs Tom.*1. *in his Diſcourſe upon* Francis I. *pag.* 251. & *ſeq.*

(d) *Brantome, ibid. pag.* 255.

(e) *Remarques ſur la Requeſte à l'Archevêque d'Ambrun pag.* 272.

(f) Ib

Authors ſay, that he pretended to be Sick of a Retention (*D*) of Urine, in order to get out of a danger. 'Tis not likely that his Ignorance of the *Latin* Tongue (*E*) ſhould have been ſo great as *Jonſton* will have it. It has been obſerved, that he was a great Lover of young Aſſes (*F*) Fleſh, and that others loved it in his Imitation.

He

MESSIRE GEORGE D'AUBUSSON, *wherein he declares, that the* Truth of Hiſtory *is exactly repreſented* in that Book; *and therefore 'tis ſomewhat ſtrange that his great Employments ſhould ſo quickly make him forget his firſt Studies.*

Varillas (*a*) gives us *Capelloni's* Narrative, without citing him, and obſerves that *du Prat grew ſo big, that his Table was cut hollow to make room for his Belly.* He adds, that this Cardinal, “(*a*) after he had been in a languiſhing Condition for half a Year, died the 9th of *July* 1535, (*b*) and to make a kind of Satiſfaction to his Cathedral Church of *Sens*, into which he never went, tho' he had been a long time Archbiſhop of that Place, he deſir'd to be buried in it.„ We are told another Story, which is more diſadvantageous to *Francis* I. than that of *Capelloni*. I ſhall ſet it down to ſhew how little ſuch Narratives ought to be minded; for there is hardly any greater Sign of Falſity, than when a thing is differently related, and applied to different Times and Perſons. “(*c*) It was a Peccadillo of the Court, like that of King *Francis* I. to trick Cardinal *Marcellus* out of his Money. *Melanchthon*, who ſays he was very well acquainted with that Cardinal, relates the thing in the following manner: *The King having receiv'd ſome Letters from* Rome, *ſpread a Report that Pope* Paul *was dead. He ſent for that Cardinal, whom he knew to be an Ambitious Man, and very deſirous to be made Pope, and told him that piece of falſe News. The Cardinal repreſented to the King how much it concern'd him and his Kingdom that the next Pope ſhould be a good Friend to him. 'Tis certainly ſo, replied the King; what if we ſhould make you Pope? The Cardinal approved the Motion. This cannot be done without Money, ſaid the King, and I have not the neceſſary Sums to carry on ſuch a Project. The Cardinal offer'd him Two Tuns of Gold. That's enough, ſaid the King, I'll add to it ſomething of my own.* The next Letters that came from *Rome*, brought Advice that the Pope was ſtill living, and had not been Sick. The Cardinal told the King of it, and demanded his Money. The King's Anſwer was, *I'll chide my Ambaſſador for writing to me falſe News*: as for the Money, he ſaid, *If the Pope be not dead, he will die.„* The Author who relates this Story, quotes a Book of (*d*) *Melanchthon*, which I have not, and therefore I cannot tell whether he is exact; but I find in another Work of *Melanchthon*, a thing that ſeems to keep a Medium between this Story and that of *Capelloni*. (*e*) *Rex Galliæ, pater Franciſci, indigebat ſubito pecunia. Itaque per alium quendam ad ſuum Cancellarium ex Roma, & per poſtam mittit ei literas, ſignificans Papam eſſe mortuum. Lectis literis, mox properat Cancellarius ad Regem, ei nunciaturus tanquam aliquid novi. Rex legit literas, ſimulans ſe neſcire, & interrogat quid ſibi ſit faciendum? Reſpondit Cancellarius, conſultiſſimum eſſe mittere Romam Legatum, & aliquem conſtituere Papam, qui ſit à partibus regis Galliæ. At Rex: ad eam rem opus eſt pecunia, ſicut dicitur: Nulla pecunia eſt ſatis magna, aſpiranti ad Pontificatum. Cancellarius dicit, ſe adhuc habere duas thonnas auri; utrum ſufficerent? Reſpondit Rex: Bene eſt, & ego aliquid pecuniæ addam. Cura igitur unam thonnam auri perferri ad me. Poſtquam eam Rex acceperat, ſubornat alium nuntium afferentem ei literas, Papam adhuc vivere, & non eſſe mortuum. Egregium ſanè inventum, quo quaſi cornicum oculos confixit, & avarum per ſuam avaritiam decepit.* According to this Paſſage 'twas not *Francis* I. who trick'd his Chancellor out of his Money, but another King of *France*, Father to *Francis*. But becauſe the Father of *Francis* I. was no King, it ſhould be ſaid that *Melanchthon* means *Henry* II, Father to *Francis* II; but can *Francis* II be rightly denoted by the bare Name of *Francis*? *Manlius* did no Honour to his Maſter, by publiſhing a Narrative, wherein the Perſons are ſo ill denoted. Let the Reader obſerve how differently the three Stories mention'd by me have been related.

(*D*) *That he pretended to be Sick of a Retention of Urine.*] “(*f*) How many Perſons could I name, whoſe Sickneſs ſaved their Lives, as formerly *Auguſtus's*? How many have avoided Death, only becauſe their great Infirmity made every body believe that they were near their Grave! (1) *Multis mortem diſtulit morbus, & ſaluti illis fuit videri perire.* Cardinal *du Prat* was releaſed out of Priſon in the Reign of *Francis* I, for fear he ſhould die of a Retention of Urine, having impoſed upon his Phyſicians by drinking privately the Water he made. And we have ſeen a Favourite of *Henry* III, who did ſo well ſucceed in pretending to be a dying Man, in order to let ſome hard Time ſlip away under the Reign of *Henry* IV, that he liv'd thirty Years under the late K. in perfect Health.„ I fancy *La Mothe le Vayer* took one Man for another. If I am not miſtaken, no Author ſays, that our *du Prat* was impriſon'd; but 'tis reported that (*g*) *Cardinal* de la Balue *bethought himſelf of drinking his Urine that he might be ſet at liberty, as if he had been ſick of a Strangury.* They are *La Mothe le Vayer's* Words: He quotes the Life of *Lewis* XI. written by *Peter Matthieu*, his Quotation is right (*h*). And tho' it is not impoſſible that two Miniſters of State ſhould make uſe of the ſame Device in different Times, I dont think that the two Stories related by that Author are true: 'twas ſtill an eaſier thing for him to confound the Time and the Perſons he ſpeaks of. Many others have done it, and will do it for the time to come.

(*E*) *His Ignorance of the* Latin *Tongue ſhould have been ſo great as* Jonſton *will have it.*] That Author wrote a little Book, intitl'd, *Naturæ conſtantia*, wherein he pretends to prove, that the World does not grow worſe and worſe. Among other Inſtances of the Ignorance of former Ages, he alledges our *du Prat*, who thought that *Moloſſus* ſignified a Mule, and that the *Latin* Word for a Mule was *Muletus*. *Placet hic adjicere*, ſays he (*i*), *& exemplum* du Prat *Epiſcopi & Cancellarii Galliæ; qui cum in literis ab Henrico VIII, Angliæ Rege ad Franciſcum I, Gallarum Regem ſcriptis, iſta verba*, Mitto tibi duodecim moloſſos, *offendiſſet, mulos per moloſſos intelligi exiſtimavit, & poſt animadverſo errore, moloſſos ſe pro* muletis *accepiſſe, duplicata inſcitia ſubjunxit.* 'Tis to be obſerved, that *Jonſton* cites no body for this, tho' in other places he very carefully quotes his Authors for the moſt trifling things. Some aſcribe this Slander to *Beza*, as it appears by the following Words. “(*k*) Perhaps it will be with Cardinal *de Birague's* Ignorance, as it was with that of Cardinal *du Prat*, who, according to *Beza*, when King *Francis* I. had receiv'd twelve *Engliſh* Bull-Dogs from *Henry* VIII. (the Letter imported *duodecim Moloſſos*) ask'd the King one of the Mules ſent to him from *England*; and being told by the King that they were Bull-Dogs, he excuſed himſelf ſaying, he thought there was in the Letter *duodecim Muletos*. But, after all M. (2) *Aubery*, who has writ a very faithful Hiſtory of the Cardinals, ſhews that this Ignorance which *Beza* aſcribes to Cardinal *du Prat*, is a meer Calumny; and he proves it by the Teſtimony of *Feron*, who calls him a very Learned and Famous Civilian; of *Sadolet*, who pitch'd upon him to cenſure his *Latin* Works, and of *Auton*, who praiſes him for his eloquent Speech which he made in *Latin* before the Emperor *Maximilian*.„

I don't know whether *Beza* has this Story in any of his Works; but I know that it is to be found in (*l*) a Book of *Henry Stephens*.

(*F*) *That he was a great lover of young Aſſes-fleſh.*] He was like *Mecænas*, in this reſpect, who was the firſt that brought Aſſe's fleſh into vogue. (*m*) *Pullos earum* (aſinarum) *epulari primus Mecænas inſtituit, multum eo tempore prælatos onagris: poſt eum*

interiit

(*a*) *Hiſt. de François premier, B.* 7. *pag.* 241 *of the* 2d Dutch *Edition.*

(*a*) *Id. ib. pag.* 242, 244.

(*b*) *It appears from the Epitaph of that Chancellor mention'd by* Frizon, *pag.* 574. 575. *of the* Gallia purpurata, *that he died the* 9. *of July* 1535, *aged* 72 *Years.*

(*c*) *Jeremiah de Pours, Divine Melodie du Saint Pſalmiſte B.* 5. *pag.* 1030.

(*d*) *He quotes* Dom. p. 3. fol. 171.

(*e*) *Joannes Manlius in locorum communium Collectaneis ex lectionibus Philippi Melanchthonis excerptis pag.* 575. *edit. Francof.* 1568. *That Book might be intitled* Melanchthoniana.

(*f*) *La Mothe le Vayer, Diſcours de la Santé pendant la maladie in the* 8*th Vol. of his Works pag.* 154, 156.

(1) *Sen. epiſt.* 78.

(*g*) *La Mothe le Vayer Letter* 42. *in the* 10*th Vol. of his Works, pag.* 310.

(*h*) *These are* Peter Matthieu's *Words, l.* 10. *n.* 3. *p. m.* 424. He drank his Urine ſo privately that 'twas thought he would die of a Strangury. The King order'd him to be viſited, the Phyſicians gave him over, *&c.*

(*i*) *Jo. Jonſtonus de Naturæ conſtantia p.* 73. *edit. Amſtel.* 1632.

(*k*) *Naudé* Dialogue *de Maſcurat p.* 426. *See alſo Father* Garaſſe, *p.* 641. *of his* Doctrine curieuſe.

(2) *Tom.* 3. *pag.* 355.

(*l*) *In the* 29. *Chapt. of his* Apology for Herodotus *p. m.* 334.

(*m*) *Plinius lib.* 8. *cap.* 43.

He was a great Perſecutor of the Proteſtants: Some of 'em ſay, that for a Puniſhment he died in Deſpair. A famous Hiſtoriographer * ſuppoſes, that he was cruelly tormented by the Remorſes of his Conſcience, becauſe he remembred that he had introduced ſeveral Innovations, whereby the People were oppreſſed. I ſhall ſet down † *Beza's* Epitaph upon him.

PRETEXTATUS (*Papyrius*) made himſelf famous at *Rome* from his younger Years for concealing a Secret which his Mother had a mind to know. This Story is mention'd in the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary, but all the Wit of it has been left out; and therefore I ſhall give a more faithful (*A*) Account of the thing. I ſhall alſo direct the Reader to the firſt Author of the Story, better than

interiit aſſertitas saporis. After the Death of that Favourite People grew weary of that Fleſh. *Meibomius* obſerves, that the ſame thing was ſeen in the Time of *Antony du Prat.* (*n*) *Simile quid de Antonio Pratenſe, Galliæ Cancellario, refert Johannes Bruyerinus lib. xxiii. de re cibaria cap. xx. Ætate noſtra, inquit,* Antonius Pratenſis, Galliæ Cancellarius, imitator extitit Mæcenatis in eo genere eſcæ (*carnis nempe aſininæ*) quam aviditſimus, verum & cum ipſo gratia quoque illius carnis ſepulta eſt (*o*). That Book of *Meibomius* being ſomewhat ſcarce, I hope the Reader will not be diſpleas'd to find here ſeveral particular Facts mention'd by that Author, whereby it will appear, that Men bring their Taſte into Slavery, out of Flattery, and that a Favourite can bring into Faſhion not only ſuch Cloaths as he likes, but alſo ſuch Meats as ſuit with his Palate. (*p*) *Potuit vero* (Mæcenas) *&* *gulæ tantum aut peculiaris ſibi appetitus gratia cibo illo veſci cœpiſſe familiarius: quem deinde ob ipſius auctoritatem alii, quaſi aſſentatione quadam, cariorem & in pretio habuere, donec ab obitu Mæcenatis rurſum viluſceret, quod uſu venire in ejuſmodi rebus fere ſolet. Sic* acipenſerem *Plinius refert lib. ix. cap. xvii. nullo in honore fuiſſe ſuo, id eſt, Trajani tempore: quem tamen Serenus Sammonicus apud Macrobium Saturn. lib. iii. cap. xvi. docet, tum apud antiquos fuiſſe in pretio, tum poſt Plinium ſuo ævo gratiam ejus ad epulas quaſi poſtliminio rediiſſe. Sic Horatius* rhombum & ciconiam *nullo in cibis uſu fuiſſe ſcribit, antequam id docuiſſet vir prætorius, ſive is fuerit, dubitantibus Acrone & Porphyrione, Aſellius, ſive Rufus, aut Sempronius. Et addit,* mergos, *vile alias cibi genus, ſi quis aſſos dixerit futuros ſuaves, juventutem Romanam pravi docilem id facile credituram. Verſus ſunt Serm. lib. ii. Sat. ii.*

Tutus erat rhombus, tutoque ciconia nido,
Donec vos auctor docuit prætorius. Ergo
Si quis nunc mergos ſuaveis edixerit aſſos,
Parebit pravi docilis Romana juventus.

Nec diſſimile quid contigit ſuperiori ſeculo Romæ. De Hadriano VI. *enim Pontiſ. Max. narrat Paulus Jovius* (*a*) &c.

(*G*) *That for a Puniſhment he died in Deſpair.*] *Henry Stephens* having mention'd a Lieutenant-Criminal, (who died *diſtracted, after he had uttered ſeveral Blaſphemies againſt God*) adds, (*b*) "Chancellor *du Prat* died alſo a miſerable Death, "notwithſtanding his fine *Hoſtel-Dieu* (of which "King *Francis* I. ſaid, that it was not large enough "to contain all thoſe whom he had reduced to "Beggary); for he died at *Nantouillet*, his Country-Seat, having his Stomach eaten up with "Worms, and uttering Blaſphemies againſt God, "with great Impatience, occaſion'd by the violent "Pain he felt, and (as ſome ſay) by the Vexation "he had to ſee his Trunks ſealed up, ſo that he "ſaid, See what it is to ſerve a King with Body, "and Soul. This *du Prat* was the firſt who "thought fit that the Parliament ſhould take cognizance of Hereſies, becauſe he ſaid, they are "attended with Blaſphemy. 'Twas he likewiſe "who gave the firſt Commiſſions to put to Death, "thoſe who oppos'd the Church of *Rome*, being "weary of the long Proceedings in *Berquin's* Trial.

(*A*) *Give a more faithful Account of the thing.*] The Senate not being able to put an end to a matter of great Moment, that was under Debate, put it off till the next Day, and ordered that the thing ſhould be kept ſecret, till they had made a Decree about it. Young *Papyrius*, who had followed his Father into the Senate, according to the Cuſtom of that Time, being aſk'd by his Mother what had been done in the Aſſembly, anſwer'd, that every body was order'd to be ſilent about it, and that therefore he would ſay nothing of it. This Anſwer increaſed the Lady's Curioſity. The young Boy being more importun'd than before, was oblig'd to tell her a Lye, in order to make himſelf eaſy, without diſobeying the Senate. He told his Mother, that this Queſtion had been debated, Whether it would be more advantageous to the Republick, to allow a Huſband to have two Wives, or a Wife to have two Huſbands. The Lady being amazed at his Diſcourſe, went out haſtily to acquaint the other Women with it; ſo that the next Day a whole Crowd of 'em appear'd at the Gate of the Senate-Houſe, intreating the Aſſembly, with Tears in their Eyes, that they would rather ordain, that a Woman ſhould have two Huſbands, than that a Man ſhould have two Wives. The Senators were ſurpris'd to ſee thoſe Women make ſuch an uproar; but young *Papyrius* explain'd the thing to 'em, telling 'em what Device he had made uſe of to ſatisfy his Mother's Curioſity. The Senate admir'd him for it, and order'd, that for the time to come he ſhould be the only Boy allowed to be preſent in the Aſſembly. This is the Origin (*c*) of the Surname *Prætextatus.* We find this Story in *Aulus Gellius*: I ſhall ſet down the following Words of that Author. (*d*) *Secretum rei & ſilentium deberi puer affirmans animum ejus ad inquirendum everberat. Quærit igitur compreſſius violentiuſque. Tum puer, matre urgente, lepidi atque feſtivi mendacii conſilium capit. Actum in ſenatu dixit, utrum videretur utilius magiſque è republica eſſe, unuſne ut duas uxores haberet, an ut una apud duos nupta eſſet. Hoc illa ut audivit, animo compaveſcit: domo trepidans egreditur: ad ceteras matronas deſert quod audierat. Perveniunt ad ſenatum poſtera die matrumfamilias caterva, lacrymantes atque obſecrantes orant una potius ut duobus nupta fieret, quàm ut uni duæ. Senatores ingredientes in curiam, quæ illa mulierum intemperies & quid ſibi poſtulatio iſthæc vellet, mirabantur. Puer Papyrius in medium curiæ progreſſus, quid mater audire inſtitiſſet, quid ipſe matri dixiſſet, rem, ſicuti fuerat, denarrat. Senatus fidem atque ingenium pueri deoſculatus conſultum facit, ut poſthac pueri cum patribus in curiam ne introeant, niſi ille unus Papyrius.* *Macrobius* tranſcrib'd this almoſt Word for Word; but he added to it a Circumſtance that is not to be found in *Aulus Gellius*: He ſays, that the Senators (*e*) look'd upon the boldneſs of thoſe Women as an ill-boding Prodigy, at which they were amazed.

The Author of the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary has committed two Faults. 1. He ſuppoſes (*f*) that *Papyrius* told his Mother, that the Senate had ordered that a Man ſhould have two Wives. That Author ſhould have ſaid, that he made her believe it had been debated, whether this would be more advantageous to the Republick, than to order that a Woman ſhould have two Huſbands. 2. He ſuppoſes, that thoſe Women begg'd *of the Senate that Women ſhould have the ſame Advantage that was granted to Men the Day before, and that each of 'em might be allow'd to have two Huſbands.* This Account makes the Story inſipid, and deprives it of its Pleaſantneſs: nay, it repreſents thoſe Ladies as altogether ignorant of their true Intereſt; for what could they get by asking ſuch a thing? Is it not manifeſt, that, all things duly conſider'd, they had been rather in a worſe than in a better Condition, if each Man might have had two Wives, and each Woman two Huſbands? The beſt thing they could hope for was, to be upon the ſame Terms; for if each of them might have ſaid, *I have two Huſbands*, ſhe might alſo have ſaid, *I have 'em with another.* Are two Halves than has been done by the Writer of that Supplement: the thing is (B) somewhat important.

---

* *Mezeray, Abr. Chronol. tom. 4. p. m. 584. ad ann. 1535.*

† Antonio Pratenſi, Cancellario Galliarum, inter obeſos obeſiſſimo. Ampliſſimus vir hic jacet. *Beza Poemat. pag. 94. edit. tertiæ.*

(*n*) *Joh. Henricus Meibomius in vita Mæcenatis c.26.p.155*

(*o*) *I have verified that Quotation out of* Bruyerinus: *it is right, only inſtead of lib.* xxiii. *it ſhould be lib.* xiii.

(*p*) *Idem pag.* 155, 155.

(*a*) Meibomius *mentions here what I have quoted in the Remark L of the Art.* Hadrian VI

(*b*) Henry Stephens's *Apology for Herodotus chap. 26. p. m.* 310.

(*c*) Ei puero poſtea cognomentum honoris gratia inditum prætextatus, ob loquendi tacendique in ætate prætextata prudentiam. *Aulus Gellius lib.* i. *c.* 23.

(*d*) *Lib.*

(*e*) Utna parva re prodigium illam verecundi ſexus impudicam inſaniam paveſcebant. *Macrob. Saturn. lib.* i. *c.* 6. *p. m.* [illegible]

(*f*) *At the word* Papyrius.

PRICE (*John*) flourish'd in the XVII. Century. † *He was a Native of England, and a very Learned and Judicious Man. After he had travel'd a long time, he retir'd to* Florence, *where he turn'd Catholick.* . . . *He* ‖ *died at* Rome *in the Year* 1676. He publish'd (A) several Learned Books, and ‡ *left behind him a Commentary upon the*

Halves more than a Whole? I know one may think of several Cases wherein it would be an advantage to them; but upon other Accounts, and in several other Cases, which one may easily think of, the disadvantage would counterbalance, and perhaps exceed the Advantage.

(B) *'Tis somewhat important to direct the Readers to the first Author.*] Notwithstanding the Authority of *Aulus Gellius*, I should be apt to think that it is an idle Story; but I cannot believe it, when I consider that the Grave *Cato* the Censor mention'd it in a Speech. And therefore the better to inable the Readers to pass a right Judgment upon this Matter of Fact, 'tis not sufficient (a) to acquaint 'em that *Macrobius* mentions it, for such a Compiler of Witty Sayings and Stories as he is, does not deserve to be much credited. Witty Sayings and Stories are frequently forged in one's Closet. Those who invent 'em, being unwilling to lose their Labour, publish 'em, and ascribe them to certain Persons who lived at such a time, omitting none of the Circumstances that may perswade the truth of 'em. When those Inventions are diverting, and afford Matter for Slander, they take Root in one's Memory, and go from Mouth to Mouth. They are collected, and often reprinted; but good Judges will only commend the Wit that is in them, without taking them for true Matter of Fact. This is the Judgment that ought to be made of several Stories and Witty Conceits, mention'd by *Macrobius*; and therefore his Authority is very inconsiderable, as to that Uproar of the *Roman* Ladies. *Aulus Gellius*, whom he transcribes, is a more credible Writer, for he lived nearer the time when the thing is said to have happen'd; and yet all those who quote no other Author but him upon this occasion, are no discerning Men. *Cato* should be quoted for this Story, since *Aulus Gellius* had it from him: He does not quote the very Words of that Censor, because he had not then the Original, but he gives the Sense of 'em. *Historia*, says he (b), *de Papirio Prætextato dicta scriptaque est à M. Catone in oratione, qua usus est ad milites contra Galbam, cum multa quidem venustate atque luce atque munditia verborum. Ea Catonis verba huic prorsus commentario indidissem, si libri copia fuisset id temporis, quum hæc dictavi. Quod si non virtutes dignitatesque verborum, sed rem ipsam scire quæris, fermè ad hunc modum est.* There is some probability that this Story is true, since the Grave *Cato* mention'd it in a Speech that was publish'd. I am not ignorant that this Censor jested now and then (a); but it was neither a proper Time, nor a fit Place for a Man of his Character to tell a Jest. Perhaps it will be objected to me, that *Livy*, who mentions another Commotion of the *Roman* Ladies, says nothing of this; but it may be answer'd, that perhaps he gave an account of it in the Books of his History that are not extant. I shall observe, by the bye, that the other Commotion was occasion'd by the Law, whereby Women were forbidden to wear any Ornaments. There was a Design to suppress it. Some Tribunes desir'd it should be kept up; others were against it. Our *Cato*, who was Consul that Year (b), made a vigorous Speech (c) for the Preservation of that Law, and against the liberty Women took of running in Crowds, and making a great uproar in the Streets. Nevertheless the Law was repeal'd: the Tribunes who opposed it were oblig'd to consent to it, when they saw their Houses beset by those mutinous Women. (d) *Capitolium turba hominum faventium adversantiumque legi complebatur. Matronæ, nulla nec auctoritate, nec verecundia, nec imperio virorum, contineri limine poterant: omnes vias urbis, aditusque in forum obsidebant: viros descendentes ad forum orantes, ut florente republica, crescente indies privata omnium fortuna, matronis quoque pristinum ornatum reddi paterentur. Augebatur hæc frequentia mulierum indies; nam etiam ex oppidis conciliabulisque conveniebant. Jam & consules prætoresque, & alios magistratus adire & rogare audebant. Ceterum minime exorabilem alterum utique consulem M. Porcium Catonem habebant, qui pro lege, quæ abrogabatur, ita disseruit.* . . . . . . (e) *Hæc quum contra legem proque lege dicta essent, aliquanto major frequentia mulierum postero die sese in publicum effudit, unoque agmine omnes tribunorum* (f) *januas obsederunt, qui collegarum rogationi intercedebant; nec ante abstiterunt, quam remissa intercessio ab tribunis esset. Nulla deinde dubitatio fuit, quin omnes tribus legem abrogarent, anno vigesimo post abrogata est, quam lata.*

AN OBSERVATION *upon the manner of citing Authors.*

I shall observe, by the bye, that the way of quoting Authors is so faulty, that it were to be wish'd some Rules were laid down for it. The most inconsiderable things may be brought into a Method; and if there was a Method for the manner of quoting Authors, it would prevent several Abuses. If any one undertook to lay down such Rules, he should tell us how far a Writer may be allowed to add something of his own to the Matters of Fact related by him. We have seen that *Macrobius* amplified the Story we read in *Aulus Gellius*. A *Spanish* Jesuit has added more to it, for he affirms, that on that Day the Senators came later than usually from the Assembly, and that it was the reason why *Papyrius*'s Mother ask'd him what Business took 'em up so long. (g) *Como el negocio era pesado, y los votos no se concertavan, salieron aquel dia los Senadores algo mas tarde de su consejo de lo que solian: lo qual fue occasion para que la madre del Papyrio le preguntasse, porque causa se havian detenido tanto en el Senado.* He supposes the Boy answer'd, that the thing under Debate was to be kept Secret till it should be determin'd. These Circumstances are not to be found in *Aulus Gellius*, nor in *Macrobius*: However, I think that if there is any fault in advancing them, 'tis but a small one; and the *Spanish* Author seems to me more inexcusable for quoting not only those two ancient Writers, but also *Alexander ab Alexandro*, *Volaterranus*, and *Charles Stephens*.

(A) *Publish'd several Learned Books.*] He put out at *Paris*, in 1635, *Apuleius*'s Apology, with Notes in 4to, and in 1646, *Annotationes in Evangelium Matthei*, in 4to, and *annotationes ad Epistolam Jacobi*, in 8vo, and in 1647, *Acta Apostolorum ex scriptura, Patribus, Græcisque ac Latinis scriptoribus illustrata*, in 8vo. His Notes *in Psalmos & in plerosque alios libros Novi Testamenti*, were printed at *London* in 1660 in Folio. His Commentary upon *Apuleius*'s Metamorphosis was printed at *Tergow* in the Year 1650 in 8vo. " (h) He intended to re-" print *Apuleius*'s Apology, with many new Notes " of his own, and to publish *Aulus Gellius*, upon " whom he had writ many Observations, *Avienus* " *de oris maritimis*, and several Corrections upon " *Hesychius*, whose Index he inserted at the end " of *Apuleius*'s Metamorphosis; I mean the Index " of the Authors alledged by *Hesychius*. But his " Sight being grown very weak, he says, in one of " his Notes, that he thinks he will not be able to " perform his Designs.„ The Notes of that Writer upon *Apuleius*'s Metamorphosis are so long, that whereas the Text contains only 262 Pages, they take up 734 Pages, and are printed in a smaller Letter than that of the Text. The Author declares (i) his Design was to fill his Notes with new and good Things; which was no easy Task, since he wrote after so many other Commentators. He adds, that he observes what *Apuleius* took from *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, and *Sallust*, and particularly from *Virgil*, and some other Writers, and what *Ammianus Marcellinus*, *Sidonius*, St. *Jerom*, and St. *Augustin* took from him; that, above all things, he has endeavour'd to print the Text as like the Original as ever he could, and that he has corrected about 300 Places, only by way of Conjecture.

---

* *Colomiés, Bibl. choisie pag.* 142. *Amsterdam* 1699.

† *Id. ib. pag.* 141.

‡ *Id. ib.*

(a) *Macrobius is the only Author quoted in the Supplement to* Moreri's *Dictionary.*

(b) *Aulus Gellius ubi supra.*

(a) *See* Balzac, Oeuvres diverses, *in his dissertation de la conversation des* Romains, *p. m.* 35.

(b) *That is, the Year of* Rome 558.

(c) *See his* Oration *in the 34th Book of* Livy, *at the beginning.*

(d) *Titus Livius lib.* 34. *init. p. m.* 621.

(e) *Id. ib. pag.* 625.

(f) *That is, of* Marcus *and* Publius *Brutus Tribunes of the People, who opposed their Colleagues, who design'd to prevent that the* Lex Oppia *should be abrogated.*

(g) *Juan de Torres, primera parte de la Philosophia moral de principes, lib.* 1. *pag.* 59. *edit. of* Barcelona 1598.

(h) *Colomiés, Bibl. choisie pag.* 142. *Amst.* 1699.

(i) Dedimus operam ut & apposita & nova afferremus: rem post tot alios haud adeo in proclivi sitam. *Jo. Priceus in præfat.*

the Epiſtles of Pliny *the Younger, that will be ſhortly Printed.* He has been praiſed by very (B) Learned Men. He made a conſiderable ſtay at *Paris*, and publiſh'd ſome Books in that City; but he * left it in 1646, and return'd into *England*. *Sarravius* ſays †, he had reaſon to be angry with *France*, and that he was a Man ‡ who deſerved to be admired on account of his Learning and great Conſtancy in Adverſity.

PRIDEAUX (*John*) Biſhop of *Winchester*, and a very eminent Divine, was born in 1578, at *Stafford* in *Devonſhire*. He was admitted into *Exeter*-College at *Oxford*, in the Year 1596, where he made a great Progreſs in a very little time. His ſtrong Conſtitution enabled him to apply himſelf very much to ſtudy; and having an excellent Memory he quickly reaped the Fruits of his Labours. He diſtinguiſh'd himſelf by his Subtilty in Diſputing, and was made Fellow of *Exeter*-College in 1601. He ſucceeded Dr. *Holland* in the Rectorſhip of that College, and was admitted Doctor of Divinity. He was made *Regius* Profeſſor of Divinity when Dr. *Abbot* was promoted to the Biſhoprick of *Saliſbury*. He diſcharged the Duties of his Rectorſhip with ſo much Prudence and Politeneſs, that many Students reſorted to *Exeter*-College, where they made ſo great a Progreſs by his wiſe Remonſtrances, and the good choice of their Tutors, that many of 'em proved an Ornament to the Church and State. He continued in that Imployment 11 Years, or thereabouts. He was no leſs careful in diſcharging the Duties of his Profeſſorſhip; which he did with great Learning, expreſſing an inviolable Fidelity to the King and the Church of *England*. He exerciſed that Profeſſorſhip ſomewhat above 27 Years. He was five times Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity of *Oxford*, and was made Biſhop of *Winchester* in the Year 1641. He died the 29th of *July* 1650, being 72 Years of Age ||. He publiſh'd (*A*) ſeveral Books. I need not ſay, that he ought not to be confounded with (*B*) another **PRIDEAUX**, who put out a Second Edition of the *Marmora Arundelliana*.

PRIEZAC

jecture, having but one Manuſcript in his Hands. 'Twas the ſame Manuſcript which he gave to the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and that Prelate beſtow'd it upon the *Bodleian* Library. He had *Colvius*'s Edition with *Caſaubon*'s Notes written with his own Hand, and the Edition of *Vicenza*, of the Year 1488. He takes it to be the moſt ancient, next to that of *Rome* in 1472. and follows it in many Places preferably to the later Editions. Here are two Editions of *Apuleius* omitted by *M. Fabricius* (*k*); the moſt ancient Edition mention'd by him is that of *Venice* 1493.

(*B*) *He has been praiſed by very Learned Men.*] " (*l*) *Price* is praiſed by *Sarravius* in his Letters, " by Archbiſhop *Uſher* upon St. *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, " by *Heinſius* in an Epiſtle to *Charles Dati*, by " Mr. *Selden* more than once in the ſecond Book " *de Synedriis Ebræorum*, by *Voſſius* in his *Harmonia* " *Evangelica*, by *Morus* in his Notes upon the New-" Teſtament, by *Redi* in his Tracts of the Genera-" tion of Inſects, but particularly by *Axenius* upon " *Phedrus*." *Sarravius* obſerves, that *Price* complain'd that *Salmaſius* had treated him with Contempt. In order to pacify him *Sarravius* preſented him with a Book of *Salmaſius*. (*m*) *Unicum quod ſupererat* (exemplar) *donavi doctiſſimo viro tuique ſtudioſiſſimo Jo. Priceo, ut eum placarem aliquo modo conquerentem, quod in Miſcellis Defenſionibus contemptim à te eſſet habitus.*

(*A*) *He publiſh'd ſeveral Books.*] He wrote an Apology for *Caſaubon contra Andream Eudæmon-Johannem*, printed at *Oxford* in 8. in the Year 1614. His *Hypomnemata Logica, Rhetorica, Phyſica, tyrocinium ad ſyllogiſmum legitimum contexendum, &c. Heptades Logicæ, &c.* came out in the ſame Town; as alſo *Lectiones decem in totidem Religionis capita: lectiones 22. Orationes 13. conciones 6. & oratio ad Jacobum Regem: orationes 9. inaugurales in promotione Doctorum: Faſciculus controverſiarum Theologicarum: Theologiæ Scholaſticæ Syntagma, & Conciliorum Synopſis: Manuductio ad Theologiam Polemicam: Iſagoge ad omnigenæ hyſtoriæ lectionem*, and ſeveral others. I omit the Books he wrote in his Mother-Tongue.

(*B*) *Another* **PRIDEAUX**, *who put out a ſecond Edit. of the* Marmora Arundelliana.] His Chriſtian Name was *Humphrey*, and he was Student of *Chriſt-Church* in *Oxford*. He ſhews a great deal of Learning in the Book he publiſh'd in that Town, in the Year 1676, with this Title, *Marmora Oxonienſia ex Arundellianis, Seldenianis aliiſque conflata.* 'Tis a Book in Folio. He inſerted in that Work what Mr. *Selden* had publiſh'd at *London* in 1628, with this Title, *Marmora Arundelliana.* This Book of Mr. *Selden* contain'd an Explication of part of the Marbles which the Earl of *Arundel* cauſed to be brought from the *Levant*. *Prideaux* inſerted alſo in his Work *Lydiat*'s Notes upon ſome of thoſe Marbles: but what he wrote of his own is the moſt conſiderable part of that Book; for he Reviſed and Commented upon, *recenſuit & perpetuo commentario explicavit*, not only the Inſcriptions of the Marbles of the Earl of *Arundel*, but alſo thoſe of ſeveral other Monuments of the ſame Nature beſtowed upon the Univerſity of *Oxford*. 'Tis to be obſerved, that Mr. *Selden* explained only the Inſcriptions of 29 *Greek* and 10 *Latin* Marbles. He pitch'd upon thoſe which ſeem'd to him moſt conſiderable among many others; for the *Arundelian* Marbles amounted to about 250. They were brought to *London* in 1627, and placed in the Garden of *Arundel*-Houſe. *Thomas Howard*, Earl of *Arundel*, had been at great Pains and Charges to get 'em, and ſent a very Learned Man into the *Levant* for that end. (*a*) *Ea* (marmora) *illuſtriſſimus Comes, dum in Italia degeret, (quæ ei altera patria erat,) ex antiquarum Aſiæ, Græciæ, & Italiæ urbium ruinis, operâ Doctiſſimi viri Gulielmi Pettai in hac re uſus, ſummis impenſis conquiſivit. Græcorum pleraque è Smyrna habuit, ea ibi* (1) *Gaſſendus (ſi fides ipſi hac in re habenda ſit) narrat operâ Peireskii ſui primo detecta erutaque fuiſſe, perſolutis quinquaginta Aureis per Sampſonem quendam illius negotia Smyrnæ procurantem; ſed cum inde convehenda eſſent, Turcarum fraude Sampſone in carcerem conjecto, ibi detenta erant, donec ea illuſtriſſimus Arundelliæ Comes majori pretio per Pettæum redempta cum aliis, quæ per eundem procuratorem collegerat, Londinum in hortum Palatii Arundelliani, anno Dom. noſtri 1627. curavit tranferenda.* *Henry Howard*, Earl of *Arundel*, his Grandſon, beſtowed them upon the Univerſity of *Oxford*; and thoſe who had the like Monuments did the ſame in his Imitation. (*b*) *Quæcunque Vir immortalitate digniſſimus Thomas Arundeliæ Comes, legatione quaſi ſolenni eam ob rem inſtitutâ, infinitis impenſis, & repetito ſæpius capitis periculo eruditiſſimi Viri Gulielmi Pettæi, cui procuratio ea demandabatur, Europâ, Aſiâque excuſſis, in Britannias noſtras deduxerat, Nepos ejuſdem, tanto Avo non inficiandus, æternitati & Muſis hic loci demum conſecrabat: reliquiſque quotquot fuere eruditæ antiquitatis Patronis autor extitit, ut ad tanti Auſpicis morem, quæcunque apud ſe laterent ex temporum naufragio Tabulæ, ibidem appenderent.* The firſt Word of this Paſſage ſignifies that the Grandſon beſtowed upon the Univerſity of *Oxford*, all the Marbles that his Grandfather got; but it is not true: he only gave one half of 'em, and ſome few more, the reſt being loſt when the Earls of

* *Sarrav. epiſt.* 169. *pag.* 172.

† Ille in Angliam heri repatriavit ergaGalliam noſtram peſſime, nec immerito, animatus. *Id. ibid.*

‡ *Idem epiſt.* 157. *pag.* 162.

|| *Taken from Freherus's* Theatrum, *pag.* 550. *He quotes* Antony Wood's Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis.

(*k*) *Joh. Albertus Fabricius in biblioth. Latina pag.* 137.

(*l*) *Colomiés ubi ſupra pag.* 143, 144.

(*m*) *Sarravius epiſt.* 144 *pag.* 150.

(*a*) *Humphridus Prideaux præf. ad Marmora Oxonienſia.*

(1) *In vita Peireskii lib.* 4. *ad an.* 1627.

(*b*) *Idem dedicat. init.*

PRIEZAC (*Daniel de*) * *Counſellor of State in Ordinary, born in the Caſtle of* Priezac *in* Limoſin, was choſen, in the Year 1639, † *to fill up the only Place that was left among the Forty Members* of the *French* Academy. He wrote ſeveral (*Z*) Books, and died in the Year 1662.

PRYNN (*William*) an *Engliſh* Civilian, made himſelf very much talk'd of during the Civil Wars of *Charles* I. and the Parliament. He was a very inconſtant and fiery Man. He declared ſo violently againſt the Epiſcopal Clergy, that he expoſed himſelf to an ignominious Puniſhment; for he was condemn'd to have (*A*) his Ears cut off: which was executed, and proved advantageous to him, when the War broke out between the King and the Parliament. He was look'd upon as a glorious Confeſſor of the Good Cauſe, who had ſuffer'd for the pure Goſpel. He was Member of the Houſe of Commons, and expreſs'd a great Animoſity againſt the Royaliſts; nevertheleſs, either thro' Inconſtancy, or a private Diſcontent, he grew Milder afterwards, and was Impriſon'd. He wrote a ſmall Piece in (*B*) his Confinement, wherein he repreſented to the Parliament, that they ought not to bring the King to his Trial; and that the Army which oppreſs'd the Liberty of the Parliament, was directed by the Counſels of the Jeſuits. He had before publiſh'd a Book, wherein he exhorted the Parliament to exterminate (*C*) all the Independants. If it be true that he ſaid what is aſcribed to him, concerning the Perſon

of *Arundel* left their Houſe in the time of the Civil Wars. Mr. *Prideaux* ſays ſo in his Preface; and therefore his wrong Account may be rectified by himſelf. (*c*) *Arundelliana* (marmora) *plura quam centum & triginta numerantur; Hæc tamen vix ultra dimidiam partem eorum conficiunt, quæ inſigniſſimus Arundelliæ Comes collegerat; cætera, cum tempore nuperrimi belli civilis incendii in hortis Arundellianis Londini, pulſis inde dominis, diu neglecta jacuerint, aut furtim ſurrepta, aut ſervorum negligentiâ corrupta, aut à* (*d*) *Lapicidis ad reficiendas ædes adhibita in magnum rei literariæ damnum amittuntur.* This ſhews that M. *Vigneul Marville* does not go upon a falſe Report, when having mention'd thoſe Marbles he adds: " (*e*) 'Tis a deplorable thing, that " during the Civil Wars of *England*, moſt of thoſe " Marbles were made uſe of for the repairing of " Doors and Chimneys. This will not encourage the " Curious to be at ſuch great Charges.,, I would inlarge upon the Importance of thoſe Marbles, were it not that they make up an Article in the Supplement to *Moreri*'s Dictionary, and in the *Journal des Savans* of the 25. of *April* 1678. Note that *Humphrey Prideaux* tranſlated into *Latin* a Tract of *Maimonides de jure pauperis & Peregrini apud Judæos*, printed with his Notes at *Oxford* in the Year 1679, in 4*to*.

(*Z*) *He wrote ſeveral Books.*] " (*f*) His printed " Books are, *Les Obſervations contre le livre de* " *Melroſe, intitulé*, Philippe le Prudent. *Vindiciæ* " *Gallicæ*. Three Volumes concerning the Privi-" leges of the H. Virgin. *Diſceptatio legitima, in* " *controverſia mota inter Apoſtolicæ Cameræ cognitorem,* " *Actorem; & Eminentiſſimos Cardinales Barberinos,* " *excellentiſſimumque urbis Romæ Præfectum; Defen-* " *ſores.* One Volume in 4*to* of Political Diſcourſes. " He is now (*g*) writing a ſecond Volume.,, Note, That the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ* is an Anſwer to the *Mars Gallicus* of *Janſenius*.

(*A*) *Condemn'd to have his Ears cut off.*] A Miniſter of *Baſil* ſeems to ſay, that he was alſo condemn'd to be tranſported into *America*; but 'tis more likely he meant, that he was condemn'd to ſpend the remaining part of his Life in a Dungeon. Theſe are his Words: (*h*) *Author noſter* Prynnus, Baſtwicus & Burtonus, *trium Facultatum Doctores, quod contra iſtam tyrannidem hiſcere auſi fuiſſent auribus mutilati, extra anni ſoliſque viam expulſi ſunt quo longa tabe perimerentur.* Here follows a Paſſage of M. *Baillet*, wherein we find at what Time, and in what Place *William Prynn* had his Ears cut off. It contains alſo ſome other Particulars, and therefore I ſhall ſet it down at length. " (*a*) There is " indeed an *Anti-Arminianiſm* of *William Prynn*; but " the Title does not ſo much concern the *Arminians* " themſelves, as the nature of their Doctrines. The " Deſign of his Work is only to ſhew, that the " Doctrine of abſolute Predeſtination, ſuch as the " *Calviniſts* teach it, has been conſtantly believed " by the Chriſtian Church. This *Prynn* ſeems to be " the ſame with that famous Enemy of the Biſhops " of *England*, and particularly of the unfortunate " *William Laud*, (*b*) Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. He " had his Ears cut off by the common Executioner, " in the *Palace-Yard* of *Weſtminſter* the 30 of *June* " 1637, for his Tragedy concerning the breaking " of the Sabbath, and the State of the Biſhops; and " being fined Five thouſand Pounds, with a Phy-" ſician named *Baſtwick*, and a *London* Miniſter " named *Burton*, was clap'd up in a Priſon, where " he was to remain the reſt of his Days. But he " was ſet at liberty (*c*) when *Charles* I. was put to " Death, and even was a Parliament-Man. He " wrote ſince a prodigious number of Books, moſt " of 'em in his Mother-Tongue; and was made " Keeper of the Records in the *Tower* of *London*. " He died about eighteen or nineteen Years ago.,,

(*B*) *A ſmall Piece in his Confinement.*] It is to be found in a Collection of ſeveral Pieces, publiſh'd by a Royaliſt in the Year 1649, with this Title, *Sylloge variorum Tractatuum, Anglico quidem idiomate & ab Auctoribus Anglis conſcriptorum, ſed in linguam Latinam tranſlatorum; quibus Caroli Magnæ Britan. Franciæ & Hiberniæ Regis innocentia illuſtratur, & parricidium injuſtiſſimè & immaniſſimè in illum perpetratum, à Pſeudo-Parliamento & perduelli exercitu luce clarius declaratur. Acceſſit Reſponſum pernéceſſarium ad declamationem ſeu provocationem M. Joannis Cooke: Auctore I. V. A. R.* That Piece of *William Prynn* is Intituled, *Breve Memento ad præſens Non-Parliamentarium conventiculum, tangens ipſorum præſentes intentiones & proceſſus ad deponendum & ſupplicio afficiendum Carolum Stewardum legitimum ſuum Regem: per Guilielmum Prynnium, Armigerum, membrum Domus Communium, & captivum ſub exercitus Tyrannide: qui, ut apparet, arma fert contra Domos Parlamenti, ſuos quondam Dominos: quarum membra nunc violenter capit & detinet captiva, durante ipſorum illegali licentia.* He who tranſlated it into *Latin* obſerves, that 'tis the Work of a Man not (*d*) well-affected towards the King.

(*C*) *To exterminate all the Independants.*] He dedicated that Book to the Houſe of Commons. I have it tranſlated into *Latin*, and printed in 1649. The Author of that Tranſlation was a *Swiſs* Miniſter, named *Wolfgang Meyer*. The Title runs thus: *Guilielmi Prynn Angli Armigeri Aulæ Lincolnienſis, Fulcimentum Gladii Chriſtianorum Regum, Principum & Magiſtratuum: Quo ipſorum Hæreticos, Idololatras, Schiſmaticos, Sectarum Authores, & Blaſphemos, pro criminis gravitate puniendi authoritas, jus ac poteſtas teſtimoniis Veteris ac Novi Teſtamenti, edictis & praxi Chriſtianorum Imperatorum, Regum, Statuum & Magiſtratuum: ſanctionibus item & ſtatutis Regni Angliæ: conſenſu denique optimorum tam veteris, quàm recentioris Eccleſiæ Doctorum, & Politicorum, contra hodiernos Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ turbatores, veterum Donatiſtarum, & Monaſterienſium Anabaptiſtarum æmulos, ſolidiſſimè vindicatur.* *Prynn* alledges in that Book all that can be ſaid for the Power of the Sword againſt Errors; he brings in Arguments, Authorities, Cuſtom, the Deciſions of Doctors, the Confeſſions of Faith, &c. Father *de Sainte Marthe*, a *French Benedictin*, made no ſmall uſe of that Book, to ſhew that the Edict of *Nantes* was lawfully repeal'd. See his Anſwer to the Complaints of the Proteſtants, or the Extract which

* *Pelliſſon Hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe p. m. 151.*

† *Ibid. pag. 219.*

(*c*) *Id. in præfat.*

(*d*) *The Author ſays, two Pages after, that he has read all the Inſcriptions but one, viz. that of a Marble, one half of which was made uſe of by a Maſon, and the Letters of the other half are defaced.* Alterâ à Lapicida quodam ad reficiendum locum in Palatio Arundelliano adhibitâ.

(*e*) *Vigneul Marville Mêlanges tom.* 2. *pag.* 301, 302. *Dutch Ed.*

(*f*) *Pelliſſon Hiſt. de l'Academie Franc. pag.* 354.

(*g*) *Mr.* Pelliſſon *wrote this in the Year* 1652.

(*h*) *Wolfgangus Meyerus S. Th. D. & Verbi divini in Eccleſia Baſil. Miniſt. Senior, epiſtola dedicator. Fulcimenti Gladii.*

(*a*) Baillet. *in the* 1 *Tome of the* Anti. *pag.* 426.

(*b*) *Here is a Paſſage of Dr.* Smith, *in vita Camdeni, p.* 50. *Illo (Archiepiſcopo Laudo) in carcerem detruſo,* Gulielmus Prinnius, ob ſeditioſos libellos ſtigmate inuſtus, in D. Archiepiſcopi ſcrinia, tum ut ſi quicquam, quod ſceleri criminibuſque objectis aliqualem induceret colorem, occurriſſet, inde excerperet, tum ut quantum erat documentorum quod Viro innocentiſſimo iiſdem diluendis, cum pro Tribunali ſiſtendus eſſet, de capite dicturus, uſui eſſe potuerit, quoque auferret, animo malevolo involavit. *See the Article* Camden, *Remark M*

(*c*) *He had been releaſed before, and was a Member of the Houſe of Commons*

(*d*) Quam injuſtè, perfidè, perjurè, crudeliter hæc geſta ſint in Unctum Domini, auctor hujus ſcripti quamquam omnium minime Regi obnoxius liberrimè & fideliſſimè exponit.

Person who set *London* on (*D*) Fire, he was a great Visionary. He wrote a vast number of Books, (*E*) that shew his great Reading. He * died the 24th of *October* 1669, aged 69 Years.

PRIOLO (*Benjamin*) in *Latin Priolus*, Author of an History of *France*, from the Death of *Lewis* XIII, to the Year 1664, was Born at *Saint Jean d' Angeli*, the first of *January* 1602. He descended from the (*A*) *Priuli* or *Prioli*, an Illustrious Family, which has afforded some Doges to the Republick of *Venice*. He was but fifteen Years of Age when he lost his Father and Mother, which doubtless encreased the Obstacles he met with in the Course of his Studies: those Obstacles did not abate, in the least, his eager Desire of being a Learned Man. His Inclination for Learning was * so great, that he spent whole Days and Nights in Reading without any Interuption. He Studied first at *Orthez*, and then at *Montauban*, and afterwards at *Leyden*. He improved himself by *Heinsius*'s and *Vossius*'s Lectures in this last Town, and bestow'd three Years in Reading all the *Greek* and *Latin* Poets and Historians. Being desirous to see and consult *Grotius*, he took a Journey to *Paris*, and then went to *Padua*, by reason of the great Reputation of *Cremoninus* and *Licetus*, of whom he throughly learned the Opinions of *Aristotle*, and of the other ancient Philosophers. He returned into *France*, from whence he went again into *Italy*,

which M. *Cousin* (*e*) has given of it. In the Year 1643, *Prynn* began to oppose the Independants, who thought that the Suppression of Episcopacy would prove insignificant, and even prejudicial, if People were to submit to the Synodal Government of the Puritans. *Vossius* wrote the following Words to *Grotius* in *September* 1644. (*f*) *Unum est in quo non satis conveniat illis, qui se Episcopis opponunt. Multi omnem regendæ Ecclesiæ potestatem penes presbyterale collegium esse volunt. Alii vero ajunt hoc jugum gravius Episcopali. Quare contendunt, singulis id committendum Ecclesiastis, ut secundum Dei verbum, populum doceant, & gubernent. Atque sic ab Episcopalibus & Presbyteralibus (sicuti vocant) distincti, independentes nuncupantur. Vinius, cujus magna adeo in Parlamento est authoritas, prioris esse sententiæ dicitur; sed multi hac parte ei adversantur, qui cætera convenire videntur. Estque plurimorum id judicium, utcunque infracta omni Regis potestate, & abolito Episcopatu, geminum agerent triumphum, eos inter sese mox commissum iri; quia multi non à Presbyterii potestate minus, quam Episcoporum abhorreant.* Here is an Instance of Mens Inclination to run into Extreams. Part of those who hated Episcopacy were against the Presbyterian Synods, and pretended that it was a more intolerable Yoke than that of the Hierarchy. *Prynn* stoutly opposed them, and was for inflicting a corporal Punishment upon them. See his *Fulcimentum gladii*.

(*D*) *Concerning the Person who set* London *on Fire.*] If the following Words had not been printed, I would not insert 'em in this Place. " (*b*) This Thought . . . . . puts me in mind of " *William Prynn*'s Extravagance . . . . That Mad" man maintain'd to a Gentleman of my Acquain" tance, from whom I have it, that Pope *Alexan" der* VII had set *London* on Fire in the Year 1666, " and that he came into *England* in the disguise " of a Coal-man. „

(*E*) *A vast number of Books that shew his great Reading.*] I find the following Passage in *Witte*'s *Diarium*. (*i*) GUIL. PRYNNE, Anglus, *Swainswica-Somersetensis, Collegii Orielensis Oxoniæ Commensalis, Artium Baccalaureus. . . . . . Libri quos varii admodum, Theologici nimirum, Historici, Politici & Polemici argumenti conscripsit ad* 170; *adversaria potius quam opera nuncupari merentur, adeoque* (*k*) *ipsum pene Tostatum æquasse videtur. . . . . Libros à se conscriptos moriens Hospitio Lincolniensi quod Londini est, legavit, qui voluminibus* XXXVII. *in fol. & 4. continentur.* I shall set down a Passage of *Schoockius*, whereby it appears that *Prynn* was praised for his great Reading, and that he was a rigid Puritan, who could not so much as endure the drinking of Healths. (*l*) *Is est qui augusto elogio ab eodem* (D. Voetio) *condecoratur in disput.* de ebrietate, *& quidem secundum hanc formulam:* Diffusæ eruditionis Jurisconsultus Gul. Prynne, (*m*) cum generis nobilitate tum rara pietate conspicuus, in Tract. Anglico, adversus *Salutes* conscripto. *Liber hic Prynnii (de quo viro ante aliquot annos tam amplus rumor per Britanniam & Belgium fuit) si respondeat ejusdem Tractatui de Spectaculis, (nam hunc solum vidi) dixerim, diffusam eruditionem Authoris (licet hic ipse à D. Voetio ostentetur ut* nobilis) *respondere scopis dissolutis, atque servire confirmando dicto vulgato, quod eam solam vim fortem esse agnoscit, quæ fuerit unita. Fueritne vero Prynnius pius solus Deus novit, quum D. Voetius quando favet, nimis quam liberalis sit in titulo illo concedendo. Certe, hoc non possum cognoscere ex ejusdem libro de Spectaculis, nisi pariter Pharisæi pii fuerint agnoscendi, eo, quod* cuminum & anethum decimarent.

(*A*) *He descended from the* Priuli *or* Prioli, *an Illustrious Family, which has afforded some Doges to the Republick of* Venice.] *Antony* PRIOLI, Nephew to *Laurence* and *Jerom Prioli*, Brothers, and Doges of *Venice* one after another, came very young into *France*, under the Reign of *Henry* II, with an Ambassador of the Family *Lauredano*, his Uncle by the Mother's Side. He fell in Love with a Daughter of a Gentleman of *Saintonge*, who was at *Paris* about a considerable Law-Suit. He married her, and having carried her to *Venice*, they were both so unkindly received by the Republick, and their Relations, that the Dissolution of their Marriage was a thing resolved upon. It would have been declar'd Void according to the Laws, had not the Ambassador, who represented in *France* the Body of the Republick, sign'd the Contract; for which he was Censur'd by a Decree of the Year 1554: and it was Voted, That *Antony* and his Posterity should be excluded from all Offices in the Senate. This ill Success moved him to leave *Venice*, and having secur'd his Effects he return'd to *France*, and settled in his Wife's Country, at *Saint Jean d' Angeli*. He got many Children: *Mark*, the Eldest, was the Father of *Julian*, and *Julian* was the Father of *Benjamin*, who makes the Subject of this Article. *Julian* ruin'd himself by his Four Marriages, and the Expences he was at in the War, being the first Officer of the Regiment *de la Force*. *Benjamin* was his Son by his fourth Wife. He put his Father's Name under the Cut engrav'd by the Famous *Pitau*, and prefix'd to his History of *France*: That Cut may be had still at the Image-Sellers. The Inscription runs thus, *Benjaminus Priolus Santo. Juliani F. Eques Venetus, Rerum Gallicarum Scriptor florentissimus.* Which shews *Sorbiere*'s Mistakes concerning the Father of *Benjamin Priolo*.

That Family did very much encrease, and was Naturalized in the Reign of *Charles* IX. They entirely embrac'd the Reformed Religion under *Henry* IV, and there has been several (*a*) eminent Ministers of that Family. They were sollicited by a Letter (*b*) from the Doge *Leonard Donato* to return to *Venice*, but did not care to do it, being well settled in *France*. They troubled themselves no more about *Venice*; but it may be proved by a Passage out of the Book Intit'led, *Recherches de la Noblesse*, printed at *Montauban* in 1616, that they always pretended to be originally come from *Venice*. The Author of that Book, who was a Gentleman of *Bearn*, call'd *la Roque*, says, that the *Prioleau's* (so he (*c*) writes their Name) of *Saintonge* and *Aunix* did not come from *Venice*, as several of 'em pretended, in several Records under the Reign of *Henry* III, but that they are ancient Gentlemen, who had a mind to derive their Pedigree from the *Venetians*,

---

* *Witte in Diario Biographico.*

* *Tanta fuit in illo discendi intemperies, ut noctes diebus continuaret evolvendo quidquid voluminum edidit Romana aut Græca vetustas. Joannes Rhodius de vita Benjamini Prioli p. 3.*

(*e*) *In the* Journal des Savans *of the 26. of* April 1688. *See also the* Hist. des Ouvrages des Savans *for* March 1688. *pag.* 384.

(*f*) *Vossius, epist.* 462. *p. m.* 409. *col.* 1.

(*b*) *Le Grand Hist. du divorce de Henri VIII. Roi d'Anglet. pag.* 82. *of the Continuation of the 2 Part.*

(*i*) *Ad* 24. *Oct.* 1669.

(*k*) *This* adeo *does not make a right conclusion; for* Tostatus's *Works are not like* Adversaria.

(*l*) *Martin. Schoockius exercitat. variarum p.*302. *edit.* 1663. *in* 4.

(*m*) *The Edition of that Dispute* de ebrietate *which I make use of ('tis that of* 1667. *in the* 4. *Vol. disput. selectar. pag.* 503.) *has only,* Diffusæ lectionis Jurisconsult. Gul. Prynn in tractatu &c.

(*a*) *A Nephew of Benjamin was Minister of the Church of* Niort.

(*b*) *Dated the* 15 *of* Apr. 1608.

(*c*) *I have it from very good hands, that some Ministers in those Parts writ their Name* Prioleau. *But it ought to be observed that the Pronunciation being the same in the greatest part of* France, *whether that Name be written* Priolo *or* Prioleau, *and it being a hard matter in the French to be very nice and exact, 'tis no wonder that the Name of that Family should have been differently spelt.*

Italy, to get himſelf acknowledged (BΔ) by the *Prioli* as one of their Relations. He applied himſelf to the Duke of (CΔ) *Rohan*, who was then in the Service of the *Venetians*, and ſo inſinuated himſelf into his Favour, that he became one of his moſt intimate Confidents. The Duke ſent him twice into *Spain* upon important Negotiations, and left to his Diſcretion the Management of † all particular Affairs, whilſt he commanded the Troops of *France* in the *Valteline*, and in the Country of the *Griſons*. M. *Priolo* was in all the Battles, and ſhewed his Courage both on Foot and on Horſeback. Being uncertain of his Fate after the Death of that Duke, he retired to *Geneva*, being lately married to * *Elizabeth Micheli* of a very Noble Family. He bought a Country-Seat at *Saconne* near *Geneva*, where he reſted after the Toils and Fatigues of his foregoing Life. The Duke of *Longueville* being named Plenipotentiary of *France* for the Treaty of *Munſter*, and being deſirous

† In Rhætia & Tellina valle, cùm Gallicis armis præeſſet Rohanius, Priolus omnia pro nutu verſavit. Præliis variis illic cum Germanis & Iberis certatum ubique interfuit; pugnavit eques, & pedes. *Id. ib. pag.* 4.

* Cùm ante trimeſtre uxorem duxiſſet Elizabetham Michelium, illuſtri genere, ſcilicet atavis editam princi[illegible] & [illegible] Venetis, unde Principes non pauci. *Id. ibid.*

---

ans, becauſe their Name was like that of the Noble *Prioli* of *Venice*. Tho' this Paſſage contains a Falſity, it does irrefragably confute the *Sorberiana*. The Falſity I ſpeak of does manifeſtly appear by the good Succeſs of *Benjamin Priolo*, in making out his Extraction from the *Prioli* of *Venice*. The Genealogical Memorial preſented by him having been examin'd, the Republick order'd that a Patent ſhould be drawn up, which he receiv'd from M. *Grimani*, Ambaſſador in *France* in the Year 1660, with a Gold Chain and Medal worth three hundred Piſtoles. By that Patent the Senate acknowledged him to be a Noble *Venetian* Knight. The Arms of the *Prioli* are blazon'd and added to the Seal, and round about, *Non data, non conceſſa, ſed adnata, ſenatus decreto*. The Title is alſo in *Latin*, and the reſt in *Italian*. M. *Priolo* receiv'd at the ſame time a congratulatory Letter from *Lawrence Prioli*, Proveditor of the Sea, who was then the Head of the Family.

It ought to be obſerv'd, that the Republick of *Venice* take no notice of the Baſtards of Noblemen. Their very Fathers will not own them, and even forſake them; for 'tis not the Cuſtom of the Noble *Venetians* to have private Miſtreſſes: they apply themſelves to Curtezans, and club for the keeping of one; by which means they avoid being Jealous one of another. But if the Curtezan gets a Child none of 'em owns it (*d*).

(BΔ) *He went again into* Italy *to get himſelf acknowledged by the* Prioli, *as one of their Relations.*] So I Paraphraſe the *Latin* Words of *John Rhodius*, (*e*) *In Italiam reverſus eſt, quærendis apud Venetos originis ſuæ primordiis.* The Author adds, That the Senate of *Venice* gave him a very kind Reception, and made him a Knight, but without admitting him to the Prerogatives of his Family, the Laws of the Republick not permitting it, becauſe he deſcended from one *Antony Prioli*, who had married a Foreigner out of *Venice*. (*f*) *Blandè acceptus à Senatu, factus eques, ſed excluſus generis ſui prærogativa, quoniam Antonius Priolus ejus avus paternus, qui Princeps fuit Reip. Venetorum, non potuit legitimum matrimonium extra urbem & cum extera contraxiſſe ſalvis patriæ legibus.* That Author is in the wrong to ſay, that *Antony Prioli* was a Doge; and he ſhould not have ſaid, that he was *Benjamin*'s Grandfather, but his Great-Grandfather. He is alſo miſtaken as to the Time; the Patent whereby the Senate own'd *Benjamin* to be related to the *Prioli* of *Venice*, was not granted before the Year 1660. What he ſays in the Concluſion of his Elogy, that M. *Priolo* (*g*) took Orders after the Death of his Wife, is a great Falſity.

The two following Paſſages will confirm what I have ſaid in the foregoing Remark. M. *Priolo*, ſpeaking of the Town of *Saint Jean d'Angeli*, makes this ſmall Digreſſion: (*h*) *Ibi mea infantia vagiit, hic aerem primum hauſi. Hæc terra, mihi atavis Venetis, iiſque illuſtribus, neſcio quo caſu, primum tacta. Si decora meæ gentis à me intermiſſa ſunt, forſan nepotibus inſtaurabuntur; & Sant-Angelium olim me alumno gaudebit.* You ſee that he publickly boaſts of his *Venetian* Extraction, as he does alſo in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Work to the Republick of *Venice*, *O Patria*, ſays he, *ô vaſti pelagi dominatrix! agnoſce tuum civem, vel ſolo nomine Prioli tibi dilectum.*

ADVERTISEMENT to the Readers once for all.

I beſeech the Readers to mind what I am going to ſay. There is a very remarkable Difference between other Hiſtorical Dictionaries and mine. I am not contented, as 'tis commonly practis'd in thoſe Dictionaries, to give a general Account of a Man's Life; but I collect, as much as the few Books I have can permit me, the moſt curious and remarkable Paſſages, the Judgments that have been made of thoſe I ſpeak of, and the Faults that have been committed on their Account. I Examine, I Prove, I Confute, as there is occaſion. But when I have no Proofs to confute a Falſity, I am forced to leave it without a Confutation; and my Silence in that reſpect, is not a Sign that I warrant the Truth of the Facts mention'd by me. The Authors whom I quote, ought to be anſwerable for what they advance. It is enough for me to confute the Falſities that are known to me, and to be always diſpoſed to confute thoſe I ſhall diſcover by the help of others, and by my own Enquiries. None can do me a greater Pleaſure than to impart to me the Proofs and Explanations that are neceſſary to rectify (*i*) the Miſtakes inſerted in this Work, upon the Credit of Authors. I ſhall always be ready to do whatever Juſtice and Truth require. I can be poſitive about it: I know my own Thoughts, and I have given ſome Inſtances of it. For example, I have been very glad to be put in a Capacity of ſhewing the Impoſture or Illuſion of the Author of the *Sorberiana*, in what he ſays concerning the Father of *Benjamin Priolo*, &c. I muſt make another Obſervation: A Falſity diſadvantageous to an Honourable Family would be ſlighted, if it were only to be found in a ſmall Inconſiderable Piece of no long Continuance; but if it be inſerted in a large Volume, eſpecially in a Folio Book call'd a Dictionary, it makes one more uneaſy. For the Alphabetical Order of this ſort of Books does ſo ſhorten the Enquiries of the Curious, that every Body will have 'em in ſmall Libraries, as well as in great ones, even tho' they are not good; and therefore 'tis to be feared, that what is contain'd in them will be believ'd every where and laſt for ever. But it ought to be conſider'd, at leaſt as to this Work, that my bare relating what has been ſaid by another, does not multiply the Number of Authorities. Should I relate a Thing without quoting any body for it, I ſhould ſet up for a new Evidence; but ſince I quote the very Words of the Authors, whoſe Names I put in the Margin, what I ſay is only grounded upon their Authority. A tranſient Piece, a ſmall Book, whoſe Title ends with *ana*, a heap of ſeveral undigeſted Collections found in *Sorbiere*'s Cloſet, and containing looſe Diſcourſes of Converſation, do not become more weighty and conſiderable becauſe they are quoted in a large Volume. They are ſtill what they were before, and nothing elſe. 'Tis to be obſerv'd, that of all things that make the Subject of common Converſations, there is none that is leſs to be depended upon than what is ſaid about the Origin of Families. For when a Man raiſes himſelf, Envy on the one hand, or Flattery on the other, do quickly forge obliging or diſobliging Falſities, which ſpread up and down; but with this difference, that ſatyrical Falſities ſpread more and are ſooner credited than flattering Lies.

(CΔ) *He applied himſelf to the Duke of* Rohan.] *John Rhodius*'s Expreſſion, (*a*) *Incidit illic in infelicem Rohanii Ducem*, ought to be rectified. It ſeems to ſignify, that M. *Priolo* was beholden to Chance for his firſt Acquaintance with the Duke. The truth is, that his Family had been in the Duke of *Rohan*'s Intereſt, and that the Duke of *Soubiſe*, Brother to the Duke of *Rohan*, was his Godfather. Take notice, that he was not admitted into the Duke's

(*d*) Taken from a Manuſcript Memorial.

(*e*) *Johannes Rhodius de vita Benjamini Prioli p.* 4.

(*f*) *Id. ib.*

(*g*) Ipſe pater ſe [illegible] adduxit, rerum humanarum & ſeculi pertæſus, pervicacis ingrati. *Id. ib. pag.* 7.

(*h*) *Priolus de rebus Gallicis lib.* 2. *n.* 37. *pag.* 284.

(*i*) *This muſt be likewiſe underſtood of my own Miſtakes.*

(*a*) *Joh. Rhodius ubi ſupra pag.* 4.

ſirous to carry him thither, as a Man whoſe Parts and Counſels would be of great uſe to him, M. *Priolo* reſolved to (D∆) leave *Geneva* and to ſettle at *Paris*. He ſtaid half a Year at *Lyons*, where he had ſeveral Conferences with Cardinal *Barberini* about Controverted Doctrines; the Reſult of which was, that he, his Wife, Children and Domeſticks abjured the Proteſtant Religion, and immediately received the Communion from the Cardinal's Hands. He did not enjoy a long reſt at *Paris*, for the Civil War quickly broke out, and he engaged in the Faction of the Malecontents, which occaſion'd the Ruin of his Fortune †. This is what I find in a *Latin* Piece written by *John Rhodius*, and printed at *Padua* in 1662. The following Particulars come from another Hand. Being dazzled with the Prince's Glory, with whom he had ſided, he neither minded the many Favours which the Queen-Mother beſtowed upon him, nor the great Promiſes of Cardinal *Mazarin*, which was the Cauſe of his Misfortune: He was forced to retire into *Flanders*, his Eſtate was Confiſcated, and his Family Baniſh'd. Having regain'd the King's Favour, he reſolv'd to live a Retir'd Life, and to follow his Study. It was then, (*A*) and to drive away his Melancholy, that he wrote with great (*B*) Impartiality, a Hiſtory which has been reprinted ſeveral times: The beſt (*C*) Edition is that of *Leipſick* 1686. He was put again upon Negotiations;

† Taken from Rhodius, ubi ſupra.

Duke's Family, as his Phyſician, and that he was not afterwards his (*b*) Secretary, as we are told in the *Sorberiana*. I have been informed, that all the time he was in that Poſt he was only very great with the Duke, and never had any Skill in Phyſick, but ſuch as one may get by a general Study of Philoſophy.

(D∆) *M.* Priolo *reſolved to leave* Geneva, *and to ſettle at* Paris.] The attentive Reader will eaſily perceive the Incoherency of this Narrative: 'Tis a Fault of *Rhodius*, which I will mend. That Author has made it appear, that 'tis an eaſier thing to write the Hiſtory of an Illuſtrious Man in good *Latin*, than to prevent great Gaps and Omiſſions. Is it not a very incoherent Narrative to ſay, that a Man went and ſettled at *Paris*, because the Duke of *Longueville* had a Mind to carry him to *Munſter*, without informing his Reader whether or no he accepted his Propoſal? (*c*) *Longavillanus Dux ad conventum Monaſterienſem cum ſumma poteſtate de pace Legatus iturus, et Priolum invitavit, eius operâ & conſiliis uſurus in tam arduo negotio. Hinc illi decretum Geneva relicta irrevocabilem pedem Lutetiæ figere, quò totam familiam . . . . deduxit. Lugduni ſex menſes remanſit. . . . . . Non diu tranquille Lutetiæ egit, cùm derepentè ſtudia partium exarſere, & bella civilia cæpta.* To fill up that Gap I muſt obſerve that M. *Priolo* ſet out from *Geneva* to go to *Munſter*, according to the Duke's Deſire. He was there about a Year, and then he return'd to *Geneva*, from whence he went into *France*, in order to ſettle at *Paris*. Being at *Munſter* he contracted a ſtrict Friendſhip with the Nuncio *Chigi*, who was afterwards Pope *Alexander* VII. He wrote to him a Congratulatory Letter in *Latin*, when he heard that he had been made Pope, and received from him a very devout Anſwer, with ſome Medals, &c. The Duke of *Longueville* was ſo well ſatisfied with his Services, that he aſſign'd him a Penſion (*d*) of 1200 Livres upon the Principality of *Neufchatel*; and not long before he died he preſented him with 1200 Crowns, as the laſt Token of his Affection (*e*).

(*A*) *It was . . . to drive away his Grief that he wrote . . . the Hiſtory of* France.] He repreſents himſelf as a Man perſecuted by Fortune, and declares that he went about that Hiſtory to drive away his Melancholy. (*f*) *Inter maximas ærumnas natus eſt hic fœtus, quem linēturus eram, ſi licuiſſet. Paſſim notabuntur veſtigia minus alacris animi. Quid reſpondeam, non habeo. Humanæ imbecillitatis ingens patrocinium neceſſitas. Non fama, ſed requies mihi quæſita, fallendis innumeris tædiis, ipſe me damnavi in hanc arenam.* If his Life written by himſelf was to be Printed, we ſhould find in it a very particular Account of his great Troubles. 'Tis one of the Books he promiſed to publiſh, as we ſhall ſee hereafter (*g*).

(*B*) *He wrote with great impartiality, a Hiſtory.*] What I have quoted out of it in the Article of the Marſhal *de Guebriant*'s Widow, is ſufficient to ſhew, that the Author made bold to publiſh Things that might offend Great Perſons. Any one who reads what he ſays of the Dutcheſs of *Longueville*, will be convinced of his boldneſs. *Patin* went upon a fallacious Probability, when he wrote theſe Words: (*a*) *M.* Frioleau, *who was formerly Secretary to the Duke of* Rohan, *has writ the Hiſtory of* France *in* Latin, *from the Death of the late King*, in gratiam Mazarini. *His Book is entitled* Conatus Hiſtorici: *it will be full of Flattery, but it is a material thing in the Age we live in.*

Sorel did not paſs the ſame Judgment upon that Hiſtory, but rather had a contrary Opinion of it (*b*). The Author was ſo far from being a Flatterer, that having obtain'd the King's Licenſe, he thought it neceſſary, before he made uſe of it for the Impreſſion of the whole Work, to ſee how the chief Perſons of the Court would like the Liberty he took: and therefore he publiſh'd firſt (*c*) the Subſtance of his Hiſtory in one Book, keeping the freedom of his Pen under ſome Reſtraint; and yet ſome Miniſters thought he was too free, and declared that they would oppoſe the Impreſſion of his Work, unleſs it was caſtrated by ſuch Examiners as they ſhould appoint. M. *Priolo* made his Remonſtrances to the King, who gave him leave to get his Hiſtory Printed at (*d*) *Charleville*: which was performed in the Year 1665, and the Book was publickly ſold in *France* (*e*). That Edition is a Quarto Book, and is not entitled *Conatus Hiſtorici*, but *Benjamini Prioli ab exceſſu Ludovici XIII. de rebus Gallicis Hiſtoriarum libri XII.** It was Reprinted once at *Utrecht*, and twice at *Leipſick*.

I muſt obſerve, that this Hiſtory is quoted in the Life of Cardinal *Mazarin*, written by *Aubery*; in the Life of the Prince of *Conde*, and in ſome other Pieces. I am ſure that if it had been written in *French* with the ſame Sprightlineſs and Strength, it would have been printed above ten times. It would very much pleaſe thoſe who are for the modern Taſte; for it is full of thoſe Characters and Deſcriptions which are now ſo much in vogue: The Phraſes of *Tacitus* are very frequent in it, and ſeem to come in of themſelves. I ſhall ſay nothing of ſeveral private Intrigues, mention'd by the Author, who had 'em from the firſt Hand. It appears by the Works of Count *Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato*, and by the Memoirs of the Regency, that he was employed in ſome Negotiations.

(*C*) *The beſt Edition is that of* Leipſick 1686. (*f*)] For there are ſome Letters in it which the Author ſuppreſs'd in the Edition of *Charleville*; and very good Alphabetical Tables, and beſides, very curious and inſtructive Notes. There is alſo in that Edition a *Latin* Tranſlation of what was ſaid of that Work in the (*h*) *Journal des Savans*. M. *Gallois* took ſuch an ingenious Turn to expreſs his Thoughts about it, that tho' the Author had ſome Reaſon to be Diſſatisfied, he had no good pretence to Complain: ſo true it is, that ſome Railleries are offenſive, and yet one dares not appear to be offended at 'em. The *Latin* Tranſlator has not preſerv'd the Niceneſs of the Raillery in every part of his Verſion; and I dare ſay, he has not only enervated but alſo falſified the laſt Period. Let the Reader judge of it. The Words of the Journaliſt run thus: (*i*) *Had I not purpoſed to forbear giving my Opinion about the Books mention'd in this Journal, perhaps the Style of this Hiſtory would be the thing I ſhould*

(*b*) Patin *ſays, he was.*

(*c*) *Rhodius ubi ſupra pag.* 4, & 5.

(*d*) *It was paid him till that Prince died.*

(*e*) *Taken from the abovemention'd Memorial.*

(*f*) *Benjamin. Priolus, lectori ad calcem hiſtoriæ.*

(*g*) *In the Remark D.*

(*a*) Patin, Lett. [illegible] pag. [illegible] of the II Vol. It is dated the 14 of Sep. 1655.

(*b*) See Sorel's Bibliotheque Françoiſe, pag. [illegible] 35[illegible] Par. 16[illegible].

(*c*) At Paris by Cramoiſi 1662.

(*d*) A Town belonging to the Duke of Mantua, ſituate on the Maeſe, between Sedan and Charlemont.

(*e*) *Taken from the Memorial abovemention'd.*

(*f*) *It is in 8. and the* [illegible] *of that Town.*

(*h*) Of the 22. of Feb. 1666.

(*i*) Journal des Savans of the 22. of Febr. 1666. pag. 159, 1[illegible].

ons; for in the Year 1667 he was order'd to go to *Venice* upon a private Buſineſs, as it appears from a Credential Letter that was found among his Papers, drawn up by M. *de Lionne*. He could not make an end of that Journey, for he died of an Apoplexy at *Lyons* in the Archbiſhop's Palace. I advanced upon a Hear-ſay, in the firſt Edition, that he died in the Hoſpital of *Lyons*; but I mend that Fault in this Second Edition; and I do ſincerely proteſt, that I ſaid ſo only according to the Thoughts of thoſe from whom I had it at *Geneva*. I had no reaſon to believe that they were not rightly informed; and as they expreſs'd their Eſteem for that Author, they alledg'd that Particular only as an Inſtance of the Miſfortune of Men of Letters. It was out of Pity to him, and to ſhew the Injuſtice of the Time, that they alledg'd it upon occaſion of *Pierius Valerianus's* Book *de Infelicitate Litteratorum*, which ſome Body in the Company had mention'd. I do alſo leave out the Paſſage I had quoted out of the *Sorberiana*. I have been fully inform'd, that *Sorbiere* was groſly miſtaken, as it will appear from the Remarks * I point at. I would have Confuted him in the firſt Edition †, had I had then the neceſſary Informations. M. *Priolo* left behind him Seven Children, who (CΔΔ) loſt, by his Death, the Penſions he enjoyed; but his Name kept 'em up, and they kept it up in their Turn, and have been well ſettled for a long time. I can't tell whether the Books he (D) deſign'd to publiſh will ever be printed. 'Tis pity they have not been publiſh'd. I ſhall ſet down ſome (DΔΔ) of his Maxims, and the Judgment he made

I ſhould leaſt find fault with. Compare this with the *Latin*: *Ita ut niſi omnino propoſitum eſſet abſtinere à librorum judiciis, de quibus in his Ephemeridibus nonnullæ* (k) *ſolent proferri, diceretur fortaſſe, ſtylum hujus hiſtoriæ ejus eſſe generis, in quo vix quicquam occurrat quod correctionem mereatur.* According to the Tranſlator, M. *Gallois* ſays, that *Prioli's* Style is of ſuch a nature, that there is hardly any thing in it that deſerves to be mended. But he is far from ſaying ſo: his Meaning is, that the Hiſtory he ſpeaks of does not ſo much deſerve to be cenſur'd on account of the Style, as upon other Accounts: And therefore his Words ſhould have been rendred thus; *In ſtylo hujus hiſtoriæ pauciora quam in cæteris omnibus fortaſſe reprehenderem.* The Author was not ſurpriſed, that ſome ſevere and even devout Perſons were diſpleaſed with the Specimen of his Work; he took it to be a ſign of the Merit of his Performance: *Procul tetrici & moroſi,* ſays he (l), *immo devoti. Tales me carpſerunt lectio primo meo libro. Eorum flagello patientiam induiſi, Boni argumentum talibus diſplicere.* He owns (m) that he never was in a School, or in an Academy. Why then, will ſome ſay, does he acknowledge in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Doge and Senate of *Venice*, that he is beholden to the Univerſity of *Padua* for his beſt Inſtructions? *Illa veſtra Antenorea altrix mei, dulcis Artium parens .... me ſuis præceptis imbuit .... hæc me docuit à celſa mentis arce deſpicere errantes, & ex veris cauſis ſcire, ſub quantis tenebris jaceret mortalium dies.* I anſwer, that he does not contradict himſelf; his Meaning is, that he learn'd all his *Latin* of himſelf, without the help of any School-maſter; but he does not ſay ſo as to the Sciences; he acknowledges that the Profeſſors of *Padua* have been his Maſters.

There ſeems to be a more real Contradiction between him and *Rhodius*; and yet they may be reconciled, by ſuppoſing (n) that *Priolo* was ſent to *Orthez*, and to *Montauban*, to go through his Claſſical Learning; but that he never minded the Rules of his Maſters, and learned *Latin* by another Method.

(CΔΔ) *Left behind him Seven Children, who loſt .... the Penſions he enjoyed .... and have been well ſettled.*] Cardinal *Mazarin* left him, by his Laſt-Will, an Annuity of 1500 Livres, aſſign'd upon the whole Legacy of Duke *Mazarin*; and when the King granted him a Licenſe to print his Hiſtory in 1661, he gave him a Penſion of 2000 Livres. Which appears from the *State of France*, publiſh'd at that time, in the Liſt of Men of Letters. Tho' his Family loſt this noble Income, they found ſome other Helps. The Court took care of 'em. The eldeſt Son was placed in the Finances by M. *Colbert*, and raiſed himſelf very much. The younger Brother was made a Life-Guard, not being yet twenty Years of Age. He is (p) now an Exempt in the firſt Troop. Of the five Daughters three are Nuns, and the two others keep the firſt Rank among the Gentlewomen belonging to two of the moſt conſiderable Dutcheſſes of the Court. The eldeſt Nun was a Prioreſs in the Royal Monaſtery of *Chaillot*, and was named by the King in 1692 to eſtabliſh the Rule that is now among the Ladies of the Royal Houſe of *Saint Cir* near *Verſailles*. She is the Spiritual Founder of it (q).

(D) *The Books he deſign'd to publiſh.*] The following Words are to be found in the laſt Page of his Hiſtory: *Opera Benjamini Prioli brevi edenda. Vitanda in vita, ſeu de ſtultitia humanæ gentis, Lib. IV. Quæſtionum naturalium, ſeu de re plantaria veterum & recentiorum, Lib. III. Opus Emunctum, triginta annorum Meditatio, quod jam celebratur ſub apertiori titulo, & falſo nonnulli ſibi aſſcripſerunt. De Vita & Geſtis Henrici Rohannii Ducis. De Vita & Moribus Cæſaris Cremonini. Vita Benjamini Prioli. Judicium de Scriptoribus Græcis & Latinis. Epiſtolarum Senilium ad Maximos Europæ Proceres centuria ſingularis.*

'Tis very likely the Life of that Author will be prefix'd to a Book made (a) according to the Maxims that have been found among his Papers, which form a natural Image of the Heart of Man according to the various Events of Humane Life.

(DΔΔ) *I ſhall ſet down ſome of his Maxims.*] Man, ſaid he, is only poſſeſs'd of three things, the Soul, the Body, and Wealth; which are continually expos'd to three ſorts of Snares: the Soul is expos'd to the Snares of Divines, the Body to the Snares of Phyſicians, and Wealth to thoſe of Lawyers and Attorneys. *Rhodius* expreſſes it thus: (b) *Cùm tribus tantùm homo conſtet, anima, corpore, & bonis: tres inſidiatores illis perpetuo imminere: adulterinos Theologos animæ per laqueos conſcientiæ injectos, nihil ad bonos mores, & ſolidam pietatem: medicos corpori, per pharmaca noxia, cùm ruſticatio, diæta, & mens hilaris, ſola morbis opitulentur: bonis rabulas forenſes, per litium articulos & formulas, cùm per arbitros idoneos amputandæ ſint radices, creſcentibus ſine fine familiarum malis.* A Wiſe-man ought not to be too forward, if he has a mind to ſucceed at Court: a good Judgment and Submiſſion are the only Means of obtaining one's Deſires. (c) A Man ought not to make himſelf too familiar with any Body; that is, he ought to reveal nothing but what he deſigns to make publick: for can any Thing be more abſurd than to pretend that others will be more faithful to you than you have been to yourſelf? A Man who frequents the Court, ought particularly to avoid falling into the Snares of the Fair Sex. (d) *Cavendum præſertim in aulâ à fallacibus feminarum vinclis: omnes nugaces eſſe, infidas, & judicii modicas, nunquam eodem tenore mentis & animi.* Lewdneſs is the Fulneſs of all Evils: it hurts the Soul, the Body, and one's Reputation; and what is moſt made of *Cicero*, and *Livy*, and the (D△△) moſt celebrated Writers of ancient *Rome*.

---

* *Viz. The Remarks AΔ and BΔ of this Article.*

† *See the Remark BΔ towards the end.*

(k) *One does not know what that Adjective rejects, and whatever ſenſe be put upon it, it cannot be that of the Original.*

(l) *In his Advertiſement to the Reader at the end of the Book.*

(m) Etſi ullas Scholas nec Academias unquam viderim, & nullo niſi me præceptore uſus ſim, nemo tamen me temere debet arbitrari niſi Latini ſermonis beneperitus. *Ibid.*

(n) *I have been aſſur'd that it was ſo.*

(o) *It has been printed.*

(p) *I write this in* r.1701.

(q) *Taken from the abovemention'd Memorial.*

(a) *By his Son.*

(b) *Jo. Rhodius ubi ſupra pag. 6.*

(c) Nulli ſe facere nimis ſodalem oportere, id eſt, nihil revelare, niſi quod publici juris eſſe velis. Nam quid ineptius quàm putare aliquem tibi magis fidum, quàm tibi ipſe fuiſti. *Id. ibid.*

(d) *Id. ib.*

PRISCILLIAN, a *Spaniſh* Hereſiarch, lived in the Fourth Century. He was endowed with very fine (A) Qualities; he had a quick Wit, and a great deal of Eloquence and Learning: He was Laborious, Sober, and free from Avarice. A greedy deſire of Knowledge, which prompted him in his Youth to ſtudy † Magick, made him hearken to the Rhetor *Helpidius*, and to a Lady who * had embraced ſome Errors of the *Gnosticks*. He was infected with them, and uſed his utmoſt Skill (B) to ſpread them. He drew in

moſt ſenſible to debauch'd Men, it affects their Purſe. 'Tis a Piece of Folly to marry, unleſs a Man be bound in a ſpecial manner to prevent the Extinction of his Family: We have much ado to govern ourſelves, why then ſhould we undertake to govern what is moſt ungovernable. *Rhodius* expreſſes thoſe Maxims better than I do. (e) *Scortationem ultimum malorum, indecoram, noxiam, probroſam; animum, corpus, famam, & quod magis diſſolutum hominem afficit, crumenam lædentem. Quæcunque uni venditat ſui corporis jura, cuilibet ſine diſcrimine ſui copiam facit. Uxorem ducere, inſanum; ſi eos excipias, qui propagando ſanguini hoc debent ſuis penatibus: vix potens humana vis ſe regere, adſciſcit difficillimum quod regat, ut qui remigiis vix lembum ſubigit, remulcum adjungit.* He abhorred Lying to ſuch a degree, that he could not hear of it without falling into a great Paſſion, and he exhorted his Children, above all things, to avoid that Fault, and to live a Pious Life. Every Chriſtian, ſaid he, ought to hate Lying; and a Gentleman ought to be free from it, tho' he be not a Chriſtian. He mortally hated thoſe who laugh'd at the Scripture. (f) *Mendacium ita averſabatur, ut ad ſolam mentionem excandeſceret, nihil prius veritate & pietate in Deum, liberis commendans. Omnem Chriſtianum à mendacio alienum eſſe debere; nobilem autem, etiamſi Chriſtianus non ſit. In deriſores Scripturæ Sacræ, quorum hoc ſeculum feraciſſimum, inexpiabili odio flagrabat.* He was a great obſerver of Juſtice, but little minded the outſide of Religion (g). Which puts me in mind of *Montagne*, who, tho' no very Devout Man, proteſts, that he (h) had naturally an averſion for a Lye.

(D△△) *I ſhall ſet down . . . . the Judgment he made of* Cicero *and* Livy, *and the moſt celebrated.*] He was no great Admirer of *Cicero*: he admired *Livy*, and found him ſo inimitable that he reſolved to imitate *Tacitus*. He was extremely fond of *Seneca*, and preferr'd *Lucan* to *Virgil*, and the Tenderneſs of *Catullus* to the Majeſty of *Horace*. *Rhodius*, his good Friend, and his Panegyriſt, wonders at the Oddneſs of his Taſte. (i) *Senecam deperibat: neſcio quo malo genio M. Tullium ingentem virum, Romanæ eloquentiæ patrem, non admiratus eſt: cæteros ad unguem tenebat. Tit. Livium inimitabilem prædicabat, ideoque deſperans, nobis poſteriſque Tacitum repræſentavit. Lucanum præferebat Virgilio: quis hoc credat? & teneras Catulli amationes Horatianæ majeſtati.* 'Tis certain that this Judgment is wrong; for a Man who prefers *Livy* to *Tacitus*, ſhould place *Cicero* above *Seneca*, and *Virgil* above *Lucan*. The Eloquence and Character of *Cicero*, *Livy*, and *Virgil*, are much of the ſame (‡) kind. Thoſe Authors don't affect to be bright; they caſt, without any Affectation, a Light which adorns the whole Work, without dazling the Reader, as that of ſome other Writers do, who, inſtead of letting every Ray paſs through its proper Medium, have recourſe to a kind of Dioptrick, in order to reunite an infinite number of Rays, that they may caſt a greater Light. 'Tis their chief Study: 'Twas the Method of *Seneca*, the two *Pliny*'s and *Tacitus*. *Lucan*, in like manner, toils and labours hard to expreſs himſelf extraordinarily, and to appear great and lofty. It muſt be confeſs'd, that they were Men of vaſt Parts, and perhaps they would have taken a more natural Courſe, if they had lived in the time of *Cicero*, *Livy*, and *Virgil*; but they began to Study when the true Taſte began to be depraved. It was with the *Romans* as it is with thoſe who are uſed to drink excellent Wines; their Taſte grows dull, nothing will ſerve their turn but Brandy, or the ſtrongeſt Liquors. A majeſtick, natural, and uniform Eloquence grew inſipid when People were uſed to it: they were for witty Strokes and Flights; the Day-light was not ſufficient for them, they wanted Flaſhes of Lightening. The *French* begin to be Sick of the ſame Diſtemper. *Seneca* and *Tacitus* complied with the common Taſte: they were afraid of being ſlighted if they ſhould write as the Authors of the Golden Age. However it be, their Style is quite different from that of *Livy*. How comes it then that *Priolo* did ſo much admire that Hiſtorian and *Seneca* at the ſame time? How could he prefer *Lucan* to *Virgil*, and *Seneca* to *Cicero*? There is no Uniformity in ſuch a Judgment: But one muſt not diſpute about Taſtes. We muſt be contented with the Matter of Fact. I ſhall ſet down M. *Priolo*'s Words relating to *Livy*; (k) *De me equidem dixero, ſi quis ævi priſci inflexit ſenſus, fuit ille Livius, quem unicum ſcriptorem Romanum imperium tulit majeſtate ſuâ dignum. Ita ſpiritus & quaſi voces repræſentabat, ut & agere eadem & loqui credas dicendi genere non anxio, ſed limpido, & quod me torquet, non imitabili. . . . . Ego deſperatione (l) Livianæ imitationis nulli me addicere decrevi.* What follows concerns his Admiration for *Seneca*. (m) *Ego M. Tullium magni ſemper feci; ſed ſi hodie viveret, ſtylum immutaret. Seneca, qui eum ingenio & judicio longiſſime ſuperavit, uſus eſt dicendi genere auribus ſui temporis accommodato, nec de imitatione Tulliana unquam cogitavit, jactatæ puritati arenam ſuam ſine calce præferens. Certè mirari ſatis non poſſum eorum ingenia, qui quicquid altum ſpirat, inflatum & tumidum appellant. Tales Lucanum, tales Statium ſuæ cenſuræ ſubjiciunt.* I ſhall likewiſe ſet down what he ſays concerning his Imitation of *Tacitus*. (n) *Profiteor me furem eſſe notæ rapacitatis, habeo piceatas manus, omnia rapio. Taciti & aliorum audax prædo, crudas ejus paginas in opus meum propello. Poteram adſcito fuco diſſimulare, non curavi. Niſi centonibus ſtylum animes in deſita lingua, quid niſi languidum & emortuum expectandum?* His Style was criticiſed by the Jeſuit *Coſſard*; and, if I am not miſtaken, this ſharp Reply was levell'd at him. (o) *Meum ſtylum abruptum, inæqualem, immo, (ut verbis ejuſdem ſcioli utar) nullum; ſcatere paginam centonibus & furtis. Scias, ô blenne, quiſquis es, familiares mihi à puero antiquos ſcriptores, in aula & in caſtris aliquando lectos, nunc ſeſe offerre non vocatos, & abhinc quadraginta annis nequidem eos libaſſe, & dictaſſe totam hanc Hiſtoriam inter ambulandum, ne litura quidem imperata: tantum abeſt, ut bis aliquid unquam ſcripſerim.* We learn from the laſt Words of this Paſſage, how that Hiſtory of *France* was compoſed. The Author dictated it, as he was walking, and made no Raſures in it: Which is a very extraordinary Thing.

(A) *He was endowed with very fine Qualities.*] *Sulpicius Severus* expreſſes it thus: (a) *Ab his* (Agape quadam non ignobili muliere, & rhetore Helpidio) *Priſcillianus eſt inſtitutus, familia nobilis, prædives opibus, acer, inquietus, facundus, multa lectione eruditus, diſſerendi ac diſputandi promptiſſimus: felix profecto, ſi non pravo ſtudio corrupiſſet optimum ingenium, prorſus multa in eo animi & corporis bona cerneres. Vigilare multum, famem, ſitim ferre poterat, habendi minime cupidus, utendi parciſſimus.*

(B) *He uſed all his Skill to ſpread them. He drew in . . . . . Women.*] I ſhall quote again

Sul-

---

† Idem vaniſſimus & plus juſto inflatior profanarum rerum ſcientia, quin & Magicas artes ab adoleſcentia eum exercuiſſe creditum eſt. *Sulpicius Severus ſacræ hiſt. lib. 2. p. m. 153.*

* *That Rhetor and that Lady were inſtructed by one* Mark *an* Egyptian. *'Tis falſly ſaid in* Moreri's *Dictionary, that this* Mark *inſtructed* Priſcillian.

(e) *Id. ib.*

(f) *Id. ib. pag. 7.*

(g) Juſti & æqui ſervantiſſimus, religionis parum, quæ quidem in externis actibus verſatur. *Id. ibid. pag. 5.*

(h) *See the 17 Chapt. of the 2d Book of his Eſſays, pag. m. 579, 580.*

(i) *Jo. Rhodius ubi ſupra pag. 7.*

(‡) *Setting aſide the difference which depends 1. on the Characters of the Subjects treated by them. 2. on Proſe and Verſe.*

(k) *Priolus ad lectorem in limine hiſtoriæ fol. m. c 4 verſo.*

(l) *He ſays that he endeavour'd in vain to imitate* Livy. Buchananus Titum Livium præſtare nobis conatus eſt; certè vigeſies à capite ad calcem antequam ad ſuum opus ſe accingeret, lectitaſſe perhibetur. . . . . Buchananus, illius equidem ſimia eſt, tantum ab eo diſtans, quantum ſimia ab homine. *Id. ibid.*

(m) *Id. ib. fol. c 4.*

(n) *Id. ib. fol. c 4.*

(o) *Id. ib. in præf.* C c 4

(a) *Sulpicius Severus ſacr. hiſtor. lib. 2. pag.* 15.. 15

in many People, eſpecially Women, who flocked to him: Nay, ſome Biſhops followed his Sect. That Poyſon having crept into many Towns, great Endeavours were uſed to put a Stop to it. A Synod met * at Sarragoſſa, at which the Biſhops of *Aquitain* ‡ aſſiſted. *Priſcillian* and all his Adherents were condemn'd for refuſing to appear in it, and the Secular Power was made uſe of to expel them from all the Towns. Thoſe Hereticks were ſo little concern'd at it, that they made *Priſcillian* a Biſhop. He left *Spain* with *Inſtantius* and *Salvianus*, two Prelates of his Party, in order to go to *Rome* and juſtify himſelf to the Pope. As they went through *Aquitain*, they got many Diſciples. *Euchrocia*, the Wife (C) of the *Rhetor Delphidius* ‖, received them into her Country-Houſe, and was ſo charm'd with *Priſcillian* that ſhe follow'd him every where. Many other Women were ſeduced by thoſe Hereticks, and left all to accompany them in their Journey. The Pope refuſed to hear them, and ſo did St. *Ambroſe*; but the Imperial Court was more Indulgent, and granted them a Reſcript, importing, that their Churches ſhould be reſtored to them. They return'd into *Spain*, where they had ſo great an Intereſt, that *Ithacius*, their Accuſer, being ſummon'd to give an Account of his Conduct, as a Diſturber of the Peace of the Church, fled into *Gaul*. He ſo exaſperated the Tyrant *Maximus* againſt thoſe Sectaries, that they were ordered to repair to the Council of *Bourdeaux*. *Inſtantius* was condemn'd in it. *Priſcillian* deſir'd to be referr'd to *Maximus*,

* *In the Year* 381.

‡ *Among others Delphinus Biſhop of Bourdeaux. Vide Alteſerram, rerum Aquitanicarum l.* 3. *c.* 5. *pag.* 224.

‖ *De quo vide Alteſerram ib. c.* 2. *p.* 215, 217. *&* *Auſonium in Profeſſor. n.* 5.

Sulpicius Severus for it. (b) *Is ubi doctrinam exitiabilem aggreſſus eſt, multos nobilium, pluresque populares authoritate perſuadendi & arte blandiendi allicuit in ſocietatem. Ad hoc mulieres novarum rerum cupidæ, fluxa fide, & ad omnia curioſo ingenio, catervatim ad eum confluebant. Quippe humilitatis ſpeciem ore & habitu prætendens, honorem ſui & reverentiam cunctis injecerat. Jamque paulatim perfidiæ iſtius tabes, pleraque Hiſpaniæ pervaſerat: quin & nonnulli epiſcoporum depravati, inter quos Inſtantius & Salvianus, Priſcillianum non ſolum conſenſione, ſed ſub quadam etiam conjuratione ſuſceperunt.* I ſhall further ſet down *Maimbourg*'s Paraphraſe upon thoſe Latin Words. " (c) That " Hereſiarch being ſenſible on the one hand, " and knowing by his own Experience, that " Men are naturally very much enclined to " Voluptuouſneſs, which occaſion'd a general " Corruption of Mankind before the Flood; " and knowing, on the other hand, the weak " ſide of People, eſpecially of Women, who " are eaſily impoſed upon by a ſhew of Piety, " pretended to ſo much Holineſs that there " never was a greater Hypocrite than that Impoſtor. And indeed no Man did ever appear " leſs fond of the World, for which he affected " to expreſs a great Contempt in all things, by " his mean Cloaths, his Behaviour, and his Converſation, by his modeſt and humble Look, " the Auſterity of his Life, and his great Charity to the Poor, talking of nothing but Penitence, Faſting, Watchings, Prayers, and the " Contempt of all worldly Things, in order to " be perfectly united to God. So that he was " quickly accounted, all over *Spain*, a great Servant of God, and a Man of a wonderful Holineſs, and admired upon that Account. Women who are more eaſily deluded by ſuch " deceitful Appearances, and whoſe natural Curioſity makes 'em fond of Novelty, and extraordinary Things, eſpecially in Point of Religion, flock'd to him to be directed by him, " tho' he was as yet but a Lay-man. Being, " moreover, Learned, and having the Talent of " Perſuading, and inſinuating himſelf into Mens " Minds, by his nice and ingenious Flatteries, " he quickly found himſelf the Head of a great " Party in moſt Provinces of *Spain*, not only " among Women, and the common People, but " alſo among Perſons of Quality and Eccleſiaſticks, ſome of whom were Biſhops, who, " like others, adhered to him as a Saint."

(C) Euchrocia, *the Wife of the Rhetor* ..... *and many other Women* .... *left all.*] We are told that they began with the Spirit, and ended with the Fleſh. *Euchrocia* was at firſt charmed with the outward Devotion and pious Diſcourſes of that Heretick; but by degrees he charm'd her with ſomething elſe, he lay with her and got her with Child. If it be ſaid that the Latin Words, which I ſhall quote by and by, ſignify that he lay with *Procula*, *Euchrocia*'s Daughter, I will not obſtinately deny it: perhaps 'tis the beſt Senſe that can be put upon thoſe Words. The outward Devotion which *Priſcillian* had affected for a long time, did not make him forget that young *Procula* was preferable to her Mother. (d) *Iter eis præter interiorem Aquitaniam fuit: ubi tum ab imperitis magnifice ſuſcepti, ſparſere perfidiæ ſemina, maximeque Eluſanam plebem, ſane tum bonam & religioni ſtudentem, pravis prædicationibus pervertere: à Burdigala per Delphinum repulſi, tamen in agro Euchrociæ aliquantiſper morati, infecere nonnullos ſuis erroribus. Inde iter cæptum ingreſſi, turpi ſane pudibundoque comitatu, cum uxoribus atque alienis etiam fœminis, in quis erat Euchrocia, ac filia ejus Procula: de qua fuit in ſermone hominum, Priſcilliani ſtupro gravidam, partum ſibi graminibus abegiſſe.* It was well (e) for *Delphidius* that he died Young; for he had not the Misfortune to ſee the Debauchery of his Daughter, and the Execution of his Wife. Every Body knows that *Euchrocia* and *Priſcillian* were put to Death at the ſame time (f). A Panegyriſt of *Theodoſius* inveighed againſt that Cruelty in an eloquent manner: he did not ſpare *Maximus*, who had condemn'd to Death the Wife of an illuſtrious Poet, becauſe ſhe was accuſed of being too Devout. (g) *De virorum mortibus loquor, cum deſcenſum recorder ad ſanguinem feminarum, & in ſexum cui bella parcunt non parcè ſævitum? Sed nimirum graves ſuberant, invidioſæque cauſæ ut unco ad pœnam clari vatis matrona raperetur. Objiciebatur enim, atque etiam exprobrabatur mulieri viduæ nimia religio, & diligentius culta divinitas.* Some wonder how *Priſcillian* could draw in ſo many Devout Women, ſince his pretended Devotion was attended with ſuch an offenſive Lewdneſs. He confeſt (h) at his Trial that he had ſome Lewd Meetings with Women in the Night-time, and that he was ſtark Naked when he pray'd. But others ſay, that he drew in the Fair-Sex by that very thing: 'tis *Maimbourg*'s Opinion. I ſhall ſet down again his Paraphraſe upon the Words of *Sulpicius Severus*. " (i) When People are prepoſſeſt with an Opinion of a Man's Holineſs, they will blindly ſubmit to all his Orders, and look upon all his " Deciſions as ſo many Oracles, eſpecially when " they indulge the Inclinations of corrupt Nature: and therefore that Profligate Wretch " found it no difficult thing to perſuade his Followers, that when the Spirit, which comes " from God, was perfectly united to them by a " certain Form of Prayer which he taught them, " they might lawfully give a full Scope to the " Luſts of the Fleſh; and that God was not offended at it, ſince the Fleſh does not proceed " from him, but from the ill Principle, as well " as Marriage. By virtue of that abominable " Doctrine, the Women who did not love their " Husbands left 'em againſt their Will (1), and " Husbands did likewiſe leave their Wives, of " whom they were weary; and all of 'em, and in

(b) *Id. ib. pag.* 163.

(c) *Maimbourg, Hiſtoire du Pontificat de St. Leon lib.* 1. *pag.* 44, 45. *Dutch Edit. He quotes the Words of Sulpicius Severus in the Margin.*

(d) *Sulp. Severus ubi ſupra pag.* 165.

(e) Minus malorum munere expertus Dei, Medio quod ævi raptus es, Errore quod non deviantis filiæ, Pœnaque læſus conjugis. *Auſonius in Profeſſor. n.* 5. *p. m.* 160.

(f) *Sulpic. Severus ubi ſupra pag.* 170.

(g) *Latinus Pacatus in Panegyrico Theodoſio dicto, c.* 29. *p. m.* 509.

(h) Nec diffitentem obſcœnis ſe ſtuduiſſe doctrinis, nocturnos etiam turpium fœminarum egiſſe conventus, nudumque orare ſolitum, nocentem pronunciavit. *Sulpic. Severus ib. pag.* 170.

(i) *Maimbourg, ubi ſupra pag.* 45, 46.

(1) *Sever. l.* 2.

Maximus, which was granted him. His Enemies followed him to the Court, and proſecuted him ſo warmly, that he was condemn'd * to Death †. I ſhall mention the Character of *Ithacius*, (D) the chief Promoter of *Priſcillian's* Death, and the Conſequences (E) of that Severity. St. *Martin*, Biſhop of *Tours*, refuſed to Communicate with the Biſhops who put *Maximus* upon ſuch violent Proceedings; and becauſe he ſuffered, at laſt, that an Act of Communion with them ſhould be extorted from him, he was very ſorry for it the remaining part of his Life; and believed that it was the Reaſon why he did no longer exert the Gift of Miracles ſo powerfully as he had done before. Some (F) other Biſhops imitated him, in not admitting *Ithacius* and his Adherents to their Com-

“ in general all his Followers, pray'd together as he did, as if they had been in the State of Innocency, and then defiled themſelves with all ſorts of Pollutions. Such is commonly the End of new Doctrines, Enthuſiaſms, and new ways of Praying, more Fanatical than Myſterious, of ſome Men who pretend to be extraordinarily enlighten'd, and who, beginning with the *Spirit* to deceive the World, do ſeldom fail to end with the Fleſh. ”

(D) *The Character of* Ithacius, *the chief Promoter of* Priſcillian's *Death.*] That *Spaniſh* Biſhop was a looſe and impudent Man, and ſacrificed every thing to his Paſſions. He plainly ſhewed that he was not acted by the Love of Truth, and that his violent Perſecution of thoſe Hereticks proceeded only from a Principle of Vanity. The firſt Steps he made engag'd him to go through it: he was fond of obtaining a compleat Victory, and of ſhewing his great Intereſt and Authority; the loſs of his Cauſe would have been intolerable to him: he left nothing unattempted in order to Triumph by the favour of the Secular Power. And becauſe he was afraid of being thwarted in his Deſign by wiſe and judicious Men, he was ſo impudent and malicious as to accuſe of Priſcillianiſm thoſe whom he did not like. Whoever Faſted, or applied himſelf to the reading of pious Books, was cried down by that violent Perſecutor as an Accomplice of that Sect. He was ſo bold as to accuſe St. *Martin* of favouring thoſe Hereticks, becauſe he exhorted him to leave off his Proſecution, and entreated *Maximus* not to ſhed the Blood of thoſe Sectaries. Such are the Devices of moſt of thoſe who charge others with Hereſy: they are renewed in every Age, and yet the World is impoſed upon by them to this very Day, as if they had never been practiſed before. *Sulpicius Severus* deſerves to be highly commended for ſaying that the Priſcillianiſts were not more unacceptable to him than their Accuſers. (*a*) *Secuti etiam accuſatores Idacius & Ithacius Epiſcopi: quorum ſtudium in expugnandis hæretici non reprehenderem, ſi non ſtudio vincendi plus quam oportuit certaſſent. Ac mea quidem ſententia eſt, mihi tam reos quam accuſatores diſplicere. Certe Ithacium nihil penſi, nihil ſancti habuiſſe definio. Fuit enim audax, loquax, impudens, ſumptuoſus, ventri & gulæ plurimum impertiens. Hic ſtultitiæ eo uſque proceſſerat, ut omnes etiam ſanctos viros, quibus aut ſtudium inerat lectionis, aut propoſitum erat certare jejuniis, tanquam Priſcilliani ſocios aut diſcipulos, in crimen arceſſeret. Auſus etiam miſer eſt, ea tempeſtate Martino epiſcopo, viro plane Apoſtolis conferendo, palam objectare hæreſis infamiam. Namque tum Martinus apud Treveros conſtitutus, non deſinebat increpare Ithacium, ut ab accuſatione deſiſteret: Maximum orare, ut ſanguine infelicium abſtineret: ſatis ſuperque ſufficere, ut epiſcopali ſententia hæretici judicati eccleſiis pellerentur.* St. *Martin's* Interceſſion proved ſo powerful, that whilſt he was at *Triers*, thoſe Hereticks were not brought to their Trial (*b*); but aſſoon as he went away, ſome Biſhops gain'd *Maximus*, and prevail'd with him to break his Word to him. *Priſcillian* was condemn'd to Death, and then *Ithacius* being fully ſatisfied, deſiſted from his Accuſation, that is, he did not appear againſt him before the Judges, when the Sentence came to be confirm'd. A groſs Artifice, which *Sulpicius Severus* does juſtly laugh at. (*c*) *Ceterum Ithacius videns quam invidioſum ſibi apud epiſcopos foret, ſi accuſato, etiam poſtremis rerum capitalium judiciis aſtitiſſet (etenim iterari judicium neceſſe erat) ſubtrahit ſe cognitioni fruſtra callida jam ſcelere perfecto. Latinus Pacatus* uſes thoſe bloody Biſhops as they deſerved, and ſhews the Scandal they occaſion'd by laying their unclean and bloody Hands upon Sacred things. He cries down the Iniquity of the Tyrant *Maximus*, who cheriſh'd and ſupported ſuch Prelates. (*d*) *Quid hoc majus poterat intendere accuſator ſacerdos? fuit enim, fuit & hoc delatorum genus, qui nominibus antiſtites, revera autem ſatellites, atque adeo carnifices, non contenti miſeros avitis evolviſſe patrimoniis, calumniabantur in ſanguinem, & vitas premebant reorum jam pauperum. Quin etiam cum judiciis capitalibus aſtitiſſent, cum gemitus & tormenta miſerorum auribus ac luminibus hauſiſſent, cum lictorum arma, cum damnatorum frena tractaſſent, pollutas pœnali manus contactu ad ſacra referebant, & cæremonias quas inceſtaverant mentibus, etiam corporibus impiabant. Hos ille* (*e*) *Phalaris in amicis habebat, hi in oculis ejus, atque etiam in oculis erant: nec injuria, à quibus tot ſimul votiva veniebant, avaro divitum bona, cruento innocentium pœna, impio religionis injuria.*

There is another thing to be obſerved in *Ithacius*, wherein the moſt violent Accuſers are like him. No Biſhop would have found it a more difficult thing than he, to give an Account of his Conduct, and yet he was the warmeſt in defaming and proſecuting others. This is a prodigious Diſorder, as it has been obſerv'd by the Heathens, who ſay (*f*) that Innocence is the moſt neceſſary Qualification of an Accuſer. But thoſe who ſet up for Accuſers are generally the leaſt concern'd for it. There is a Man whoſe Books are full of Abſurdities, Contradictions, Profanations, and dangerous Paradoxes and Hereſies, and yet he has charged many People with Hereſy; and had he had a *Maximus* at his Diſpoſal, we ſhould have heard of nothing but of Men Depoſed, Proſcribed, Anathematized, to ſay no worſe. 'Tis likely thoſe irregular and unjuſt Proceedings will laſt as long as the World.

(E) *The Conſequences of that Severity.*] “That Execution occaſion'd many Diſorders; for the Capital Puniſhment of that Hereſiarch gave a new Strength to his Hereſy. He was magnificently Buried by his Followers, and honour'd like a Martyr; and thoſe who had him condemn'd, making an ill uſe of their Intereſt at Court, perſecuted Good Men with Impunity. Whoever (1) Faſted and loved a retir'd Life was immediately ſuſpected by them; whoever was more Sober and Regular than they, was a Guilty Perſon. Thoſe who did not pleaſe them were immediately accounted Priſcillianiſts, eſpecially when their Death was like to be acceptable to the Prince, or to fill his Treaſure with their (2) Spoils; for they deprived Men of their Lives and Eſtates according to their Fancy, and preſerv'd the Tyrant's Friendſhip by Calumnies, and Cruelties, and other Actions like his (*g*). ”

(F) *Some other Biſhops imitated him.*] “(*h*) What was moſt deplorable, was a kind of a dangerous Schiſm occaſion'd in *Gaul* by this Action of *Ithacius*. For, on the one hand, a Biſhop of great Authority, call'd *Theognoſtus*, having highly condemn'd it, and afterwards ſeparated from his Communion, was follow'd therein by moſt Biſhops, who thought, as well as he, that they could not Communicate with a Man who had diſhonour'd his Character and the Church, by defiling himſelf with the Blood of thoſe whoſe Death he had procured. But, on the other hand, many Biſhops, prevail'd upon by *Ithacius*, whoſe Accomplices they were, or

“ who

---

* *In the Year* 385.

† *Taken from Sulpicius Severus, Hiſtor. Sacr. lib.* 2.

(*a*) *Sulpicius Severus ubi ſupra pag.* 168, 169.

(*b*) Quoad uſque Martinus Treveris fuit, dilata cognitio eſt: & mox diſceſſurus egregia authoritate à Maximo elicuit ſponſionem, nihil cruentum in reos conſtituendum. Sed poſtea Imperator per Magnum & Rufum epiſcopos depravatus, & à mitioribus conſiliis deflexus, cauſam præfecto Evodio permiſit, viro acri & ſevero. *Id. p.* 169.

(*c*) *Id. ib. pag.* 170.

(*d*) *Lat. Pacat. ubi ſ*

(*e*) *That is, the Ty* Maximus overcome by Theodoſius.

(*f*) Cognoſce quam multa e oportet in eo alterum accuſet. Primum integritatem atque innocentiam ſingularem. Nihil eſt enim quod minus ferendum ſit, quam rationem ab altero vitæ repoſcere eum, qui non poſſit ſuæ reddere. *Cicero in Verrem* 1 *fol.*

(1) *Sulp. Sever. in vita S. Mart.*

(2) *Pacat. in Panegyric.*

(*g*) *Flechier, Hiſtoire de Theodoſe, B.* 3. *p.* 303. *ad ann.* 384. *Paris in* 12. 16

(*h*) *Maimbourg ubi ſupra, pag.*

Communion. *Ithacius* was not uneaſy at it during the Life of *Maximus* his Protector; but when he loſt that Support, he was puniſh'd for his Fault. Pope (G) *Leo* was not ſo nice as St. *Martin*, for he approved *Priſcillian's* Execution. *Maimbourg* makes uſe of a Diſtinction, which is not very far from being * ridiculous. I don't examine whether thoſe † Hereticks believ'd and practis'd whatever is imputed to them; I ſhall only ſay, that it ſeems one of their Opinions has been condemn'd, which has been approved (H) in St. *Auguſtin*.

PRO-

* *See the Remark G.*

† *See Moreri's Dictionary of the Dutch Edition, in the Addition to the Article of Priſcillian.*

" who approved what he had done, ſided with " him, and finding themſelves powerfully ſupported by the Prince, who favoured *Ithacius*, " met at *Triers* in a kind of a Council, or rather " in a Conventicle, where he was abſolved, and " declared Innocent by a formal Sentence." We are told afterwards how St. *Martin* refuſed to Communicate with them, till he was made ſenſible, that by complying he ſhould obtain from *Maximus* a Revocation of the (a) *Order, whereby all the Priſcillianiſts, that ſhould be found, were to be put to the Sword.* St. Martin (b) *did not approve that Hereticks ſhould be put to Death, and was afraid that many of the beſt Catholicks would be involved in that Slaughter, becauſe thoſe who, by reaſon of their modeſt and mortified Look, ſeem'd to be more regular than others, were accounted Priſcillianiſts, without making any diſtinction between Hypocrites and true devout Men.* And therefore being of Opinion, that of two Evils he was to chuſe the leaſt, he (c) yielded for a ſhort time to the violence offered to him, and aſſiſted with thoſe Biſhops *at the Ordination of* Felix *Biſhop of* Triers .... *The very next Day he went away very Melancholy, and very ſorry that ſuch an Ordination had been made; and perceiving that the Gift of Miracles, which* (1) *God had beſtowed upon him, did not exert itſelf ſo often as it did before, he endeavour'd to make up that Loſs by his Penitence. As for the Schiſm occaſion'd by* Ithacius, *it did not laſt long, becauſe* Maximus *his Protector having been defeated ſome time after by the* (2) *great* Theodoſius, *and kill'd by the Soldiers at* Aquileia, *he was forſaken by all the Biſhops of his Party, and Baniſh'd: he died in his Baniſhment.*

(G) *Pope* Leo .... *approved* Priſcillian's *Execution.*] *Maimbourg* (d) acknowledges, that Hereticks had not been puniſh'd with Death till then; but he maintains, *that they may be juſtly treated with that Severity, as it has been frequently practiſed ſince.* And not to mention, ſays he, " thoſe who have proved in their Writings, " that it is not only Lawful, but very Proper to " uſe them ſo; one needs only read what St. *Leo* " wrote upon this Subject, when giving the neceſſary Orders to proceed in *Spain* againſt " *Priſcillian's* Hereſy, he Praiſes *Maximus* for " that Action, and ſays: (3) *That the Rigour " and Severity of his Juſtice againſt that Hereſiarch " and his Followers, whom that Prince put to " Death, has been very ſerviceable to the Clemency " of the Church. For tho' ſhe is contented with " the mild Judgment pronounced by the Biſhops a" gainſt obſtinate Hereticks, according to the Canons, " and tho' ſhe is not for bloody Executions, yet ſhe " is very much aſſiſted and ſupported by the ſevere " Conſtitutions of the Emperors, ſince the fear of " ſo ſevere a Puniſhment moves ſometimes the Here" ticks to have recourſe to the Spiritual Remedy, in " order to cure the mortal Diſtemper of their Hereſy " by a true Converſion."* *Maimbourg* ſays, (e) that the greateſt Fault of *Ithacius* was *to apply himſelf to a Secular Court in a Cauſe merely Eccleſiaſtical*, and to procure the Death of thoſe Hereticks to the utmoſt of their Power, *which is contrary to the Laws of the Church; and therefore*, ſays he, *when the Clergy implore the Aſſiſtance of Princes and Magiſtrates againſt 'em, they always proteſt they do ſo earneſtly wiſh for their Amendment, that they don't deſire they ſhould be puniſh'd with Death, but rather that they ſhould find Mercy, leaving it however to the Judges to act according to the Laws, for the good of the Church and State.* This is a fallacious and comical Diſtinction; 'tis at leaſt a thing ſo contrary to the Gravity of a Tribunal, which acts ſeriouſly, that none can think it ſtrange that the Inquiſition ſhould be ridiculed upon that Account. You require of Princes that they ſhould make Laws againſt Hereticks; you highly commend them when they appoint a Capital Puniſhment for them; you deliver up to them thoſe whom you declare to be Hereticks: You therefore, properly ſpeaking, are the Cauſe of their Death. When you tell the Magiſtrates, that you are not for their being put to Death, you act a Comical Part (f). Why don't you aſk the ſame Favour for Aſſaſſins? For you ſay, that a Heretick is worſe than a Poiſoner and a Murderer. *Ariſtotle's* Maxim, *Poſito uno abſurdo multa ſequuntur*, was never truer than in the preſent Caſe. The Abſurdity of maintaining that Men ought to be puniſh'd with the Sword for their Opinions, is attended with a thouſand Abſurdities; and thoſe who advance it fall into a thouſand Contradictions. 'Tis to be obſerved that the Inquiſitors condemn People to Death, and are not contented to declare that a Man is a Heretick (g).

(H) *One of their Opinions .... which has been approved in St.* Auguſtin.] Theſe three Things are certain, 1. St. *Auguſtin* believes that Man is invincibly determin'd to Evil by his natural Corruption, or to Good by the Holy Spirit. 2. That Doctrine deprives Man of Free-will, taking this Word for the Liberty of Indifference. 3. St. *Auguſtin's* Doctrine has been ſolemnly approv'd by the Church. Now we ſhall ſee that the Priſcillianiſts were condemn'd becauſe they deſtroy'd Free-will, (h) *by ſubmitting Man's Will to a fatal neceſſity, which it cannot oppoſe.* That is to ſay, they were condemn'd becauſe they deſtroy'd Free-will, taking that Word not (i) for the Faculty of acting Voluntarily, and with an agreeable Propenſity, but for the Power of chuſing between two Contraries: and therefore they were condemn'd for a Doctrine that was approv'd in St. *Auguſtin*. Let us conſider how Pope *Leo* confutes them. " (4) If it be lawful to believe and " teach that Doctrine, Virtue ought no longer to " be rewarded, nor ought Vice to be puniſh'd; " and all Humane and Divine Laws may be violated with Impunity, becauſe it will never be " poſſible to give Judgment in favour of good " Actions, or againſt Wickedneſs, if the Will is " overcome by a fatal neceſſity." (k) *Now can any body doubt*, I uſe (l) ſtill *Maimbourg's* Words, without adopting all that he ſays, *Whether St.* Leo *believed what we are obliged to believe, viz. that Grace does ſo influence our Minds as to lay no neceſſity upon us, and that it does not in the leaſt deprive us of our Free-will or Liberty of Indifference, by virtue of which we may chuſe one of two things that are contrary, and do good by Grace, or Evil of our ſelves.* I eaſily believe that they differ'd from St. *Auguſtin* in explaining the Cauſes which determine the Will; but they muſt needs have agreed with him in this Point, that the Principle which moves it does not allow it to ſtop or go back, or turn aſide. But the Reaſons alledg'd by Pope *Leo* to confute thoſe Hereticks are grounded upon that very thing: 'tis therefore certain, that when he condemn'd their Doctrine he refuted St. *Auguſtin*, and that he could not approve the Doctrine of that Father, without adopting what he had rejected in the Priſcillianiſts. I don't examine whether he argues right; I only ſay, that all the Proofs he builds upon Rewards and Puniſhments, Laws and Judgments, would be wrong againſt that Sect, if they were not good againſt St. *Auguſtin's* Syſtem. Take notice that St. *Leo* argues from the Conſequences of the Doctrine of a fatal Neceſſity; and that he does not ſay that thoſe Hereticks acknowledged thoſe Conſequences: which ſhews, that he argued againſt the Doctrine itſelf, independently of the Principle on which they grounded it, and of the Conſequences they actually drew from it. I make this Obſervation, becauſe it confirms the Text of this Remark.

(a) *Maimbourg ubi ſupra pag.* 50.

(b) *Id. ib.*

(c) *Id. ib. pag.* 50. *where he quotes the words of* Sulpicius Severus *Dial.* 3. Satius æſtimans ad horam cedere, quam his non conſulere quorum cervicibus gladius imminebat.

(1) *Sever. ibid.*

(2) *Iſid. de vir. ill. c.* 2.

(d) *Maimb. ib. pag.* 55.

(3) Profuit diu iſta diſtrictio Eccleſiaſticæ lenitati, quæ etſi ſacerdotali contenta judicio cruentas refugit ultiones, ſeveris tamen Chriſtianorum Principum Conſtitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad ſpirituale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium qui timent corporale ſupplicium. *S. Leo Ep.* 93. *ad Turib.*

(e) *Ibid. pag.* 57.

(f) *See Jurieu, Apologie pour la reformation, tom.* 2. *pag.* 251, 257. *edit. in* 4.

(g) *See Jurieu ib.*

(h) *Maimbourg ubi ſupra p.* 55.

(i) *It cannot be ſuppoſed that any Heretick did ever deprive Men of that Faculty.*

(4) Quod ſi id credi liceat, & doceri, nec virtutibus præmium, nec vitiis pœna debebitur. Omniaque non ſolum humanarum Legum, ſed etiam divinarum Conſtitutionum decreta ſolventur: Quia neque de bonis, neque de malis actibus ullum poterit eſſe judicium, ſi in utramque partem fatalis neceſſitas motum mentis impellit. *S. Leo, epiſt.* 93.

(k) *Idem Maimb. ib. pag.* 66.

(l) *I made uſe of his Tranſlation of the words of* St. Leo *ib. p.* 65, 66.

In

PRODICUS, a Native α of *Julis* in the Isle (*A*) of *Cea*, one of the *Cyclades*, Contemporary with *Democritus* and *Gorgias Leontinus*, and Disciple of *Protagoras*, was one of the most celebrated Sophists of *Greece*. He flourish'd in † the 86th Olympiad, and had, among other Scholars, *Euripides*, *Socrates* β, *Theramenes* γ, and *Isocrates* δ. He did not scruple to teach in private at *Athens*, tho' he was sent thither with the Character of an Ambassador by his Countrymen, who ζ had before confer'd several other Publick Employments upon him; and tho' one would have thought that the Glory he had got by Haranguing the *Athenians* on the Day of his Publick Audience, should have made him keep his Talent for the like Occasions. *Plato*, who frequently mentions, and even praises him, tho' not without * Irony, the darling Figure of *Socrates*, his great Interlocutor, intimates, that the Desire of getting Money moved *Prodicus* to keep School; and 'tis certain he got a great deal by that Trade. *Philostratus* || seems to be of *Plato*'s Opinion; for he says, that *Prodicus* loved Money, and spent it for his Diversion. He went from Town to Town making a shew of his Eloquence; and tho' he did it in a (*B*) mercenary manner he received great Honours at *Thebes*, and greater still at *Lacedæmon*. His Declamation of fifty (*C*) Drachms, πεντηκοντάδραχμος, was very much talk'd of: Some Learned Men say it was so call'd, because each Hearer was oblig'd to give him ‡ fifty Drachms, which make above four *French* Crowns.

Prodicus

(*A*) *In the Isle of* Cea.] *Suidas* says in express Words that *Prodicus* was born in that Island, ἀπὸ Κέω τῆς νήσου, and calls him Κεῖον, as he had been call'd by (*m*) *Plato*, (*n*) *Dionysius Halicarnasseus*, (*o*) *Plutarch*, (*p*) *Diogenes Laertius*, &c. From Κέως comes (*q*) Κεῖος, and by Contraction Κῖος, which the *Latins* have express'd *Ceus*, *Ceius*, or *Cius*. *Menage* (*r*) censures *Marsilius Ficinus* with great Reason, for rendring Πρόδικος Κεῖος in *Plato*, *Prodicus Chius*. *Amyot* has done the same in his Translation of the Life of *Isocrates*. The *Latin* Translator of *Philostratus* has committed the same Fault; for he calls *Prodicum Chium* the same Person whom (*a*) *Philostratus* calls Πρόδικον Κεῖον. The *French* Translator was doubtless more careful to consult the *Latin* Translation of *Philostratus*, than to examine the *Greek* Text; for he renders it, *Prodicus, a Native of* Chio. *Caseneuve* (*b*), who blames him for it, and censures him for some other Mistakes, takes no notice of two, for which he deserves to be reproved. The *Greek* Words run thus: Προδίκου δὲ τοῦ Κίου ὄνομα τοσοῦτον ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ ἐγένετο ὡς καὶ τὸν Γρύλλου Ξενοφῶντα ἐν Βοιωτοῖς δεδεμένον ἀκροᾶσθαι διαλεγομένου, καθιστάντα ἐγγυητὴν τοῦ σώματος. The *French* Translator renders those Words in the following manner. *Prodicus a Native of* Chio, *and Son of* Grillus, *was so much esteem'd, that being a Prisoner in* Bœotia, Xenophon *was Bail for him that he might hear him.* 1. *Xenophon* and not *Prodicus* should have been call'd the Son of *Gryllus*. *Caseneuve* says so himself, page 43; and yet when he censures the Version, page 42, he says the Translator *should have said*, Prodicus, a Native of *Chio*, and Son of *Gryllus*, &c. 2. 'Twas *Xenophon* and not *Prodicus* who was a Prisoner; and yet any body who reads that Translation, will think that *Xenophon* was Bail for the Prisoner *Prodicus*. Tho' *Caseneuve* was not ignorant that this Sophist was not a Native of the Isle of *Chio*, he knew not what Countryman he was; for he says he was born *in the Isle of* Cio, *now call'd* Standia. Which is not true; for he was born in the Isle of *Cea*, or *Ceos*, now call'd *Zea*. *Moreri*, who makes him a Native of the Isle of *Cos*, was led into that Mistake by some Writers, who had more Learning than he. *Erasmus* calls him *Coum*, page 394, of his *Adages*. *Charles Stephens* does the same in his Dictionary, which has not been mended by *Lloyd* nor *Hofman*. They have not mended neither what he falsly ascribes to *Suidas*, *viz.* that he made *Prodicus* a Native of the Isle of Chio. *Menage* (*d*) thinks that a Fault has crept into the first Chapter of the third Book of *Quintilian*, where *Prodicus* is call'd *Chius*. I have not found that Fault in the Editions I have consulted. *Maucroix* in his Translation of the great *Hippias*, printed at *Paris* in 1685, says, that *Prodicus* was born in the Isle of *Cos*. Father *Goulu* committed the same Fault in the *French* (*e*) Translation of *Socrates*'s Apology.

(*B*) *In a mercenary manner.*] See *Philostratus* (*f*) and *Plato*. The latter says, (*g*) that Young-Men of the Richest and Noblest Families being inticed by *Prodicus*, *Gorgias*, *Polus*, and *Hippias*, gave 'em a great deal of Money, and besides promised them to be very thankful, whilst they neglected to be Instructed by their Fellow-Citizens, who would have taught 'em for nothing.

(*C*) *The Declamation of fifty Drachms.*] I make use of the Word *Declamation*, without depriving myself of the Liberty of using another Term, if there is occasion for it. The Word ἐπίδειξις in *Plato* and *Suidas* seems to signify a Harangue, wherein the Author displays all his Rhetorick, intending to signalize himself both on Account of the Importance of the Matter, and by reason of the great Concourse of Hearers. Those who render ἐπίδειξιν ποιεῖν, *specimen edere*, have not a wrong Notion of the thing; for they give us to understand, that an Orator makes a shew of all his Strength, as if he was to produce a Master-piece. I think this is the Reason why the brightest Orations, *viz.* those that contain a Panegyrick or an Invective, have been ascribed by the Rhetoricians to the Demonstrative kind, ἐπιδεικτικόν. However it be, there is some difficulty about the ἐπίδειξις πεντηκοντάδραχμος of *Prodicus*. *Suidas* says, that *Prodicus* is the first who made it, and does not tell us what it was: nevertheless *Vossius* (*h*) makes him say, that all those who had a mind to hear that Orator gave him fifty Drachms, that is, four *French* Crowns, and two *Spanish* Reals. 'Tis very likely that *Vossius* depended upon (*i*) *Cresollius*, and went no farther. He makes use of the same valuation of Money as that Jesuit does; but whereas in the Book of the Jesuit the Sum of four Crowns and two Reals paid to *Prodicus* by each Hearer, is only an Explication of *Suidas*'s Words, or a Consequence drawn from them, 'tis in *Vossius* a formal Testimony of *Suidas*. Judge how Cautious one ought to be in reading ordinary Authors, since such a Man as *Vossius* takes such a Liberty. Let us see what he had said in (*k*) another Book. He had related as a Matter of Fact taken from *Aristotle*, that when *Prodicus* perceiv'd that his Hearers did not mind what he said, he us'd to propose to them something relating to his Art, which he would not teach for less than fifty Drachms. The Passage of (*l*) *Aristotle* seems capable of two Senses; one is, that *Prodicus* had an Oration full of such lively Strokes, that some of 'em were sufficient to drive away the Drowsiness of the Hearers; the other is, that he had a Treatise of Rhetorick, which contain'd many Secrets fit to excite the Attention of the Hearers, tho' they were never so weary. According to the first Sense he had made an Oration which he kept for such Hearers as gave him fifty Drachms; and according to the second Sense he had a Collection of good Remedies to keep his Hearers from Sleeping, which he imparted to none but those who gave him that Price. Which puts me in mind of a (*m*) famous Professor of Philosophy among the Protestants of *France*, who would not teach certain Sophisms unless he was paid according to the Price he set on them. *Vossius* keeps to the first Sense in one of his Books, and to the second in another. It were no easy

thing

α *Suidas.*

† *Euseb. in Chron.*

β *Plato in Menone pag.* 425.

γ *Suidas.*

δ *Plutarch & Dionysius Halicarnassens, in the Life of Isocrates.*

ζ *Plato in Hippia maj. pag.* 1245.

* Dionysius Halicarnasseus *in his Letter to* Pompey *blames* Plato *for speaking ill of* Prodicus, *and of several others.*

|| *In vita Sophist. l.* 1. *pag.* 500.

‡ *Hofman* in Prodico *says only* 5 *Drachms.*

(*m*) *In Protagora & passim alibi. He says* in Hippia Majore *pag.* 1245. *that Prodicus came* ἐκ Κέω ex Cea Insula.

(*n*) *In vita Isocr.*

(*o*) *In vita Isocr.*

(*p*) *In Protagora.*

(*q*) *See Wolfius in Isocrat. vitam, & Menage in Diog. Laert. pag.* 419.

(*r*) *Ibid.*

(*a*) *In vit. Sophist. pag.* 449.

(*b*) *Caseneuve, commentaire sur les epistres de Philostrate, pag.* 42.

(*d*) *Menag. in Laert. pag.* 419.

(*e*) *It is in the* 2 *part of* Phyllarchus's *Letters. See pag.* 581.

(*f*) *In vit. Sophist. pag.* 483.

(*g*) *Plato in Apolog. Socr. pag.* 15, 16. *& in Theage pag.* 93.

(*h*) Quam orationes ejus fieri solerent, illud arguit, quod qui audire eum vellet, is, Suida teste, quinquaginta drachmas persolveret, hoc est quatuor coronatos Gallicos, ac duos super regales Hispanicos. *Vossius de Rhetor. natura pag.* 63.

(*i*) *Cressoll. theatr. Rhetorum l.* 3. *c.* 5. *pag.* 178.

(*k*) *Vossius institut. Orator. l.* 3. *c.* 2.

(*l*) Τὸ δ' ἐστὶν, ὅπερ ἔφη Πρόδικος, ὅτε νυστάζοιεν οἱ ἀκροαταί, ἐμβάλλειν τῆς πεντηκονταδράχμου αὐτοῖς. Hoc autem est, ut dixit Prodicus, cum dormitant auditores, inferre aliquid demonstrationis quinquaginta drachmarum ipsis. *Aristot. Rhetor. l.* 3. *c.* 14.

(*m*) *David Derodon.*

Prodicus must needs have had a very Eloquent (*D*) Stile, since he was so much followed, tho' he had a † disagreeable Voice. 'Tis said that *Xenophon* (*E*) being a Prisoner in *Bœotia*, and desiring to hear him β, satisfied his Curiosity, having found a Man who was Bail for him. Few Harangues have been so much quoted, or have occasion'd so many Applications, as that wherein our Sophist feign'd (*F*) that Virtue and Voluptuousness, disguised like Women, came to *Hercules* and strove to gain him. The *Athenians* put him * to Death as a Corrupter of Youth. Had it been no other Corruption than that mention'd by *Aristophanes* γ in one of his Comedies, when he said, *That Man has been spoiled by reading of Books, or by* Prodicus, *or by the Conversation of great Talkers*, the Punishment would have been too severe; but 'tis somewhat likely he was accused of teaching his Scholars (*G*) Atheism. I don't know whether any Author besides *Plutarch* says, that he was a Man of a (*H*) weak and sickly Constitution.

PRODICUS, a Heretick of the Second Century δ, the Founder of the Sect of the *Adamites*, followed the abominable Opinions of *Carpocrates*, to which he added (*A*) the publick Copulation of both Sexes; for he order'd that Women should be

thing to determine which of the two is the truest, considering that *Aristotle* and *Suidas* have affected to be very short upon that Subject: but *Plato* acquaints us, that *Prodicus*'s ἐπίδειξις πεντηκοντάδραχμος was rather a Lecture than an Oration. *Socrates* complains, in a Bantering way, that he is not able to discourse well of the nature of Names, because he had not heard the ἐπίδειξις of fifty Drachms, which, according to *Prodicus*, discover'd the whole Mystery, he (*n*) had only heard that of one Drachm, τὴν δραχμιαίαν. *Cresollius* did not understand this last Word: He took it to be the same thing in *Plato* with what was call'd before πεντηκοντάδραχμος. (*o*) *Plato qui rem eamdem memorat, ea causa δραχμιαίαν ἐπίδειξιν nominavit.* Mrs. *le Fevre*, in her Notes upon *Aristophanes*'s Comedy, Intitled *The Clouds*, pag. 235, had a better Notion of the thing. *Prodicus*, says she, *was an extraordinary vain Man, and had so good an Opinion of his own Learning, that he never taught any thing* gratis. *He had some Discourses ready made of all Prices, from an Obole to a Drachm.*

(*D*) *A very Eloquent Stile.*] This may be prov'd by the Testimony of many grave Authors. *Maximus Tyrius* (*a*) says, that the Beauty of Expression, καλλιλογίαν, was *Prodicus*'s true Character. According to *Marcellinus* (*b*), he made an exact choice of his Words. *Themistius* says, that his Orations were full of Ornaments and Charms, πολυειδεῖς τε καὶ χάριτας ἡδονῆς. I think *Naudæus* (*c*) had no good reason to place him among the Sophists, who made Speeches upon any Subject proposed to them, without any Preparation. The quite contrary may be inferr'd from what we read in the Lives of the Sophists written by *Philostratus*, pag. 487, that *Gorgias* was the first who went thro' that Trial, and that he did it to drown the Glory *Prodicus* had acquired by going from Town to Town, where he spoke elaborate Speeches. Being willing to go farther than that Orator, whom he (*d*) laugh'd at on account of his frequent repeating the same Pieces, he resolved to try what he could do without Preparation. We need not doubt that the beautiful Stile of *Prodicus*'s Speeches was attended with subtil Thoughts, and that he contributed, at least as much as any body else, to the *Athenians* forbidding the Sophists to plead Causes. They could no longer bear (*e*) that the Subtilties of those Men should make that appear Just which was Unjust: See the Proverb, Προδίκου σοφώτερος, *more Knowing than* Prodicus. *Erasmus* was mistaken in believing that this Proverb was not meant of *Prodicus* the Sophist, but of another. See how he is censur'd for it in *Caseneuve*'s Notes upon *Philostratus*'s Letters, pag. 42, 43. See also *Aristophanes in Nubibus*. Notwithstanding the Railleries of that Poet it may be inferred from what he says, that our Sophist was accounted a Man of a great deal of Wit and Learning.

(*E*) Xenophon *being a Prisoner.*] *Charles Stephens* did not understand that Passage of *Philostratus*. He explains it as if that Author had said, that *Prodicus* was so considerable a Man, that *Xenophon* being apprehended in *Bœotia*, obtain'd leave to go home, because *Prodicus* was Bail for him. *Lloyd* and *Hofman* have kept in that Mistake of *Charles Stephens* Word for Word.

(*F*) *Than that wherein* Prodicus *feign'd that Virtue.*] I make use of the Word *Harangue*, not only because *Philostratus* gives me that Notion of it, but also because *Prodicus*'s Profession leads one to it. 'Tis likely that such a Fiction was the Subject of his Declamations. However, 'tis true that *Xenophon* (*f*), who gives us the Substance of it, speaks of it as of a Piece written concerning *Hercules*, ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους. What Mr. *Charpentier* says of it is more particular, *In the Book*, says he, *which* the Learned *Prodicus wrote concerning the Life of* Hercules. *Suidas* tells us, that it was a Book Intitled ὧραι, *the Hours*: nevertheless, that Work of *Prodicus* may be call'd a Harangue. I have said that this Fiction has been frequently quoted, and has occasion'd many Explications; and I have good Reasons to say so. *Cicero* (*g*), *Quintilian* (*h*), and *Maximus Tyrius* (*i*) speak of it; but *Silius Italicus*, quoted by *Moreri*, says nothing of it. He feigns something like it in Honour of *Scipio Africanus*. (*k*) *Lucian* also has imitated that Fiction. Among the Moderns I shall only quote *Henry Stephens*, who mentions it in his Exhortation prefixed to the (*l*) *Greek* Translation of the Catechism of *Geneva*.

(*G*) *Of teaching his Scholars Atheism.*] *Sextus Empiricus* (*m*) places him among Atheists. *Cicero* does the same, tho' not so directly; for he says that *Prodicus* affirm'd that humane Gratitude had occasion'd the Belief of the Existence of the Gods. Which is no less contrary to sound Theology, than if one should say, as some have done, *Primus in orbe Deos fecit timor*, Fear has brought Religion into the World: or, as others would have it, Religion was invented by wise Politicians to keep People in awe. *Cicero* shews, that *Prodicus*'s Opinion is destructive of Religion. (*n*) *Quid? ii qui dixerunt totam de Diis immortalibus opinionem fictam esse ab hominibus sapientibus Reipub. causâ, ut quos ratio non posset, eos ad officium religio duceret, nonne omnem religionem funditus sustulerunt? Quid Prodicus Chius? qui ea quæ prodessent hominum vitæ Deorum in numero habita esse dixit, quam tandem religionem reliquit?*

(*H*) *Of a weak and sickly Constitution.*] *Plutarch* observes, that when a Publick Imployment is to be conferr'd, the Vigour of a Man should be consider'd, and not his Age; and that therefore a stout old Man ought not to be dispensed with it, as it was reasonable to excuse *Prodicus* in his Youth. 'Tis upon this occasion that he acquaints us with that Man's Infirmity. He joins him with a Man (*o*) so lean and so weak, that the Passage deserves to be set down. (*p*) *And therefore as he who would advise the Sophist* Prodicus, *or the Poet* Philetas, *who were both young, but thin, lean, and sickly* (*q*), *and kept their Bed the greatest part of the time, to concern themselves with publick Affairs, would be a senseless Brute; so would those be, who should forbid such Old Men as* Phocion, Massinissa *an* African, *and* Cato *a* Roman *to exercise Publick Offices.*

(*A*) *To which he added the publick Copulation of both Sexes.*] Here are *Theodoret*'s Words. (*r*) Οὗτος προφανῶς λαγνεύειν τοῖς Καρποκράτους προσέθηκε δόγμασι. *Hic ad decreta Carpocratis adjecit palam & publicè scortari.* The only Proof *Theodoret* alledges for it is, that *Prodicus* order'd the Community of Women, that is to say, that in the Meals which

---

† [illegible] Philostr. pag. 496. See also Vitis in Prolog. pag. 230.

β Philostr. pag. 496.

* [illegible] Athenis hausta cicuta mortuus est, quod juvenes corrumperet. Suid.

γ Id. ibid.

δ See the Remark A in the Art. Adamites.

(n) Νῦν δ᾽ οὐκ ἀκήκοα, ἀλλὰ τὴν δραχμιαίαν. Plato in Cratylo pag. 255.

(o) Cresollius ubi supra.

(a) Dissertat. 7. init.

(b) In the Life of Thucydides, who says that he imitated, τὴν τοῦ Προδίκου ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀκριβολογίαν.

(c) Syntag. de studio liber. p. 87. In the Collection of Dissertations de studiis instituendis printed in 1645. where there is Prodicum Chium. The last Fault is, without doubt, Naudæus's.

(d) Ἐμπίπτων τῷ Προδίκῳ ἑωλά τε καὶ πολλάκις εἰρημένα ἀγγέλλοντι ἐπαφῆκεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ καιρῷ. Philostr. p. 482.

(e) Id. ib.

(f) Lib. 2. de memor. Socratis.

(g) Cicero, officior. l. 1. c. 32. epistol. 12. ad famil. l. 5.

(h) Quintil. lib. 9. cap. 2.

(i) Maxim. Tyr. Orat. 4. init.

(k) Lucian. in Somnio.

(l) Berchet in his Scholia upon that Passage of Henry Stephens, makes Prodicus a Native of the Isle of Cos, or of the Isle of Chios, & since he says that he was a Man summæ auctoritatis, he shews that he ran into the Mistake of Charles Stephens's Dictionary.

(m) Sext. Empir. advers. Mathem.

(n) Cicero de natura Deorum lib. 1. circa fin. p.m. 170

(o) See the Article Philetas.

(p) Plut. an seni sit gerenda respublica p. 791. E.

(q) Νέος μὲν, ἰσχνὸς δὲ καὶ νοσώδης καὶ τὰ πολλὰ κλινοπετὴς δι᾽ ἀῤῥωστίαν ὄντως. Integra quidem ætate verum graciles & ob infirmitatem valetudinis crebro decumbentes. Id. ib.

(r) Theod. hæret. fabul. l. 1. c. 6.

be common: so that at a Publick Feast every Man took the first Woman he lighted upon after the Candles had been removed; and that α Lewdness was accounted the Mystical Ceremony of the Initiation. Those that are not the most Pious are struck with Horror, when they see that so soon after the Death of the Apostles, the Doctrine of the Mystical Union, which ought to be among the Faithful, was understood of the carnal Copulation of Men and Women, and that those Hereticks durst affirm, that the true Participation of Mysteries consisted in that. What could be expected from such a Man as *Prodicus*, who believed that Humane Souls were β sent into Bodies, not in order to be punish'd, but to pay Homage to the Angels, who had created the World, by all manner of Sensuality? *Prodicus*'s Followers boasted α that they had the secret Books of *Zoroaster*, and maintain'd ‡ that God was not to be pray'd to, and that no Man should expose himself ‖ to Martyrdom by confessing the Truth.

PRUDENTIUS (*Aurelius Prudentius Clemens*) a Christian Poet (*A*) was born in the Year 348. It was in *Spain*; but 'tis disputed (*B*) whether it was at *Calahorra*, or *Saragoza*, or in another Town of that Country. Those who say that he was made (*C*) Consul, are grosly mistaken: they should only have said, that he had a very

which the ancient Christians call'd Ἀγάπαι, every Man should enjoy a Woman, as Chance should bring 'em together in the darkness of the Room. This they call'd Communicating, and being initiated into the Mystery. I don't find that *Theodoret* had any reason to ascribe this additional Doctrine to *Prodicus*, since *Clemens Alexandrinus*, on whose Credit he speaks, imputes (*a*) the whole Matter to *Carpocrates*; for having mention'd upon a meer Hear-say, and not as a thing to be found in their Writings, the infamous Custom of removing the Candles and lying one with another, he says that *Carpocrates* should have establish'd those Laws for Dogs, Hogs, and Goats: and therefore he did not believe that *Carpocrates* had left 'em to the Care of some of his Successors; for instance, to *Prodicus*. Thus *Theodoret* alledges an Author who is against him. That Author observes, that the Men, before they went to those Feasts, (*b*) acquainted the Women, whom they had a Mind to lie with, that they made choice of 'em. Which is likely enough: The Passions are too ingenious to be unactive on such occasions, and to refer the whole Matter to Chance. The *Carpocratians* knew therefore, pretty near, who should fall to their share, and were not wholly in the Case mention'd by a *Roman* Poet.

Mox (*c*) *juniores quærit adulteros*
Inter mariti vina: neque eligit
Cui donet impermissa raptim
Gaudia luminibus remotis:
Sed jussa coram non sine conscio
Surgit marito: seu vocat institor,
Seu navis Hispanæ magister,
Dedecorum pretiosus emtor.

I must add, that *Theodoret* is not so exact as he should have been in quoting *Clemens Alexandrinus* about another Circumstance. He makes him say of *Prodicus*, what is properly and directly said of some others, and cannot be applied to *Prodicus* but in general, and with several indirect Arguments.

(*A*) *Was born in the Year* 348.] Which appears from these Words:

Hæc (*d*) *dum vita volans agit*
Inrepsit subito canities seni,
Oblitum veteris me Saliæ Consulis arguens
Sub quo prima dies mihi.

The meaning of which is, that he was born under *Salia*'s Consulship; but we find that the Consuls of the Year 348, were *Flavius Philippus*, and *Flavius Sallia*, or (*e*) *Salles*. Those who make him flourish (*f*) in the Year 380, are as much mistaken as those who make him flourish (*g*) in the Year 430.

(*B*) *'Tis disputed whether it was at* Calahorra, *or at* Saragoza, *or in another Town of that Country.*] *Aldus Manutius*, *Sixtus Senensis*, *Possevin*, and some others, make him a Native of *Saragoza*; but *Mariana* (*h*) maintains that he was born at *Calahorra*. They alledge for the first Opinion (*i*) the Hymn *in honorem sanctorum decem & octo Martyrum Cæsaraugustanorum*, which begins thus:

Bis novem NOSTER *populus sub uno*
Martyrum servat cineres sepulchro:
Cæsaraugustam vocitamus urbem
Res cui tanta est.

We read the following Passage in the same Hymn:

NOSTER (*k*) *est quamvis procul hinc in urbe*
Passus ignota dederit sepulchri
Gloriam victor, prope litus altæ
Forte Sagunti.
NOSTER, *&* NOSTRA *puer in palæstra,*
Arte virtutis, fideique olivo
Unctus, horrendum didicit domare
Viribus hostem.

Prudentius speaks of St. *Vincent*, who was born at *Saragoza*. A like Proof is alledged for the second Opinion; for these two Verses are to be found in the Hymn (*l*) *in honorem sanctorum Martyrum Hemiterii & Chelidonii Calagurritanorum*:

Hoc (*m*) *bonum salvator ipse, quo fruamur, præstitit*
Martyrum cum membra NOSTRO *consecravit oppido.*

And in the very Hymn for the Martyrs of *Saragoza* we read this:

NOSTRA (*n*) *gestabit Calagurris ambos*
Quos veneramur.

Mariana made use of those two Passages; but the (*o*) Author who wrote against him, shews, that if they afforded a good Proof, they would be insignificant for that very reason, because they cannot be solid, but the Passages brought for the contrary Opinion must be so too. In a word, Those Reasons prove too much, and consequently prove nothing. He confutes *Mariana*'s and *Aldus Manutius*'s Arguments reciprocally one by another, and says, that tho' *Prudentius* was not born at *Saragoza*, nor at *Calahorra*, he might call 'em *nostra*, because they were situated in *Hispania Tarraconensis*, his Native Country. He confirms his Opinion by two Remarks, (*p*) One is taken from these words concerning *Tarragona*:

O (*q*) *triplex honor, o triforme culmen*
Quo NOSTRÆ *caput excitatur urbis*
Cunctis urbibus eminens Hiberis.

The other is grounded upon this, that *Prudentius*, who says many things of *Merida*, where St. *Eulalia* was born, does not call it *nostra*; because, says he, it was not in *Hispania Tarraconensis*, but in *Hispania Lusitanica*. He is mistaken about those Words, *nostra puer in palæstra*: he (*r*) understood them of *Valencia*, (*s*) where St. *Vincent* suffer'd Martyrdom; but 'tis plain they are meant of *Saragoza*, where he was born and bred up.

This Critick is better at pulling down than at building; for when he goes about to prove that *Salia* in the *Asturias*, is *Prudentius*'s Birth-place, he alledges no good Reason for it, tho' he shows a great deal of ingenious Learning. His chief Argument is built upon these Words, (*t*) *oblitum veteris me Saliæ Consulis*. He (*v*) pretends, that if *veteris* refers to *consulis*, there would have been two Consuls call'd *Salia*, one before the other, and *Prudentius* must have been born under the Consulship of the first. But 'tis not true that there was one *Salia major* and one *Salia minor*, as there was one *Scipio Africanus major*, and one *Scipio Africanus minor*. This Objection would have some Force, if *Prudentius* was very exact in the choice of his Words. But, after all, if we referr *veteris* to a Town, as *Pedro Mantuano* will have it, what will become of the Word *Consulis*? His saying (*w*) that it signifies a Year, will never be a satisfactory Explication.

(*C*) *That he was made Consul, are grosly mistaken.*] *Aldus Manutius* (*x*) calls him *Vir Consularis*, and *Massalia*

α *Theodor. Hæret. fab. l.1.c.6. & l.5.c.27.*

β *Id. l.5.c.19, & 20.*

α *Clem. Alexand. Strom. l.3. pag. 434.*

‡ *I shall observe in the Remark H of the Art. Zoroaster, that the Words of* Clemens Alexandrinus *are equivocal.*

(*a*) *Stromat. l.3. pag. 430.*

(*b*) *Μεμελετηκότας δὲ ἐς τὴν τοιαύτην ἀγάπην τὴν κοινωνίαν, μεθ' ἡμέραν ἤδη παρ' ὧν ἂν ἐθέλωσι γυναικῶν ἀπαιτεῖν τὴν τῆς Καρποκρατείου (οὐ γὰρ θεμιτὸν εἰπεῖν θείου) νόμου ὑπακοήν.* Meditatos autem in ejusmodi agape communionem, interdiu jam, à quibus velint mulieribus exigere Carpocrateæ (divinæ enim nefas est dicere) legis obedientiam. *Ibid.*

(*c*) *Horace Od. 6. l. 3.*

(*d*) *Prudentius in prologo operum.*

(*e*) Onuphrius *in the 3. Book of the* Fasti *shews by an Inscription that his Name was* Sallea.

(*f*) Sixtus Senensis *is censur'd for it by Father* Labbe *de script. Eccl. to. 2. p. 794.*

(*g*) *Bibliot. Hisp. p. 205*

(*h*) *Marian. Hist. Hisp. lib. 4. c. 17.*

(*i*) *Tis the 4. of the Book* Περὶ στεφάνων.

(*k*) *Prudent. ib. hym. 4. v. 57.*

(*l*) *Tis the 1. of the Book* Περὶ στεφάνων.

(*m*) *Id. ib. hym. 1. v. 115.*

(*n*) *Id. ib. hym. 4. v. 31.*

(*o*) *Petro Mantuano, advertencias à la historia de Juan de Mariana pag. 82. & seq.*

(*p*) *Id. ib. pag. 85.*

(*q*) *Prudent. hym. 6. v. 142.*

(*r*) *Petro Mantuano ubi supra p. 84, 85.*

(*s*) *A Town in Hispania* Tarraconensis.

(*t*) *See the Remark A.*

(*v*) *Id. ib. pag. 87.*

(*w*) *Id. ib. pag. 90.*

(*x*) *Aldus in vita Prudentii.*

a very conſiderable * Office. He was 57 Years of Age when he betook (D) himſelf to write Poems upon Matters of Religion. He had been an Advocate, and then a Judge, afterwards a Soldier, and at laſt he had a noble Employment at Court. He does not deny that he was a looſe Man in his Youth †. There is more Zeal for Religion ‡ than Poetical Ornaments in his Works. He did not always obſerve the Rules of Quantity; beſides, he does not appear (E) Orthodox in all his Opinions: the Liberty he took in ſaying, that few People are damn'd, would not be born with at this Day. It might be of ſome uſe to him to anſwer the

Maſſalia Conſul. His Miſtake proceeds from his wrong underſtanding of the Letters *V. C.* added to the Names of *Prudentius*, and from reading in his Manuſcript *oblitum veteris Meſſalia conſulis arguens*, whereas it ſhould be *me Saliæ*. The two Letters *V. C.* ſignify *Vir Clariſſimus*, as *Alciatus* (y) obſerves, and not *Vir Conſularis*, a Title that was grown out (z) of uſe at that time. Here follows a Paſſage of M. *du Pin*. " (aa) moſt Authors have " not underſtood this (bb) Paſſage, and ſome, as " *Aldus Manutius*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, *Poſſevin*, and " even Father *Labbe* thought he had been Con" ſul of a Town call'd *Meſſalia*, which Father " *Labbe* (cc) Fancies to be *Marſeilles*. 'Tis an " overſight. They took the Name of the Conſul " *Salia*, who was Conſul with *Philippus* in 348, " for the Name of a Town, and aſcribed to *Pru*" *dentius* the Title of Conſul, which belongs to " *Salia*, under whoſe Conſulſhip *Prudentius* came " into the World." The Author who Criticizes *Mariana*, (dd) confutes *Antonius Nebriſſenſis*, who thinks that *Prudentius* was born under *Meſſalia's* Conſulſhip: he ſhews there was no Conſul of that Name, from the beginning of *Dioclesian's* Reign till the Empire of *Anaſtaſius*. He confutes *Aldus*, who believed that *Prudentius* had been Conſul of (ee) *Meſſalia*: he ſhews there is no ſuch Conſul in the *Faſti Conſulares*, and that the ancient Authors never mention'd a Town call'd *Meſſalia*. There was indeed a Town call'd *Maſſilia*, and now *Marſeilles*. But, ſays he, ever ſince the Diviſion of the Empire under *Conſtantin*, it was an uſual thing to elect a Conſul at *Rome*, and another at *Conſtantinople*, or both at *Rome*, and then both at *Conſtantinople*; and ſometimes two at *Rome*, and two at *Conſtantinople* at the ſame time; but it does not appear that any of the Weſtern Conſuls did ever reſide at *Marſeilles*. 'Tis ſufficient to ſay, that if *Prudentius* had been Conſul he would have ſaid ſo in the Paſſage that may be ſeen at the beginning of the following Remark.

(D) *He was 57 Years of Age when he betook himſelf, &c. He had been an Advocate, &c.*] He himſelf gives us an Abridgment of his Life, without forgetting the Lewdneſs of his Youth.

Per (a) quinquennia jam decem,
Ni fallor fuimus; ſeptimus inſuper
Annum cardo rotat, dum fruimur ſole volubili.
Inſtat terminus, & diem
Vicinum ſenio jam Deus adplicat.
Quid nos utile tanti ſpatio temporis egimus?
Ætas prima crepantibus
Flevit ſub ferulis: mox docuit toga
Infectam vitiis falſa loqui, non ſine crimine:
Tum laſciva protervitas,
Et luxus petulans (heu pudet ac piget!)
Fœdavit juvenem nequitiæ ſordibus ac luto.
Exin jurgia turbidos
Armarunt animos, & male pertinax
Vincendi ſtudium ſubjacuit caſibus aſperis.
Bis legum moderamine
Frenos nobilium reximus urbium:
Jus civile bonis reddidimus, terruimus reos.
Tandem militiæ gradu
Evectum pietas Principis extulit,
Adſumptum propius ſtare jubens ordine proximo.

He bethought himſelf ſomewhat late, tho' not (b) too late, of renouncing the Vanities of the World, and making pious Verſes. It may be a Queſtion, whether his publiſhing the Debaucheries of his Youth will be advantageous to all his Readers. A young Debauchee, who may anſwer thoſe that reprove him, Prudentius, *that pious and devout Poet, did as I do when he was young, I'll do as he did when I come to be 57 Years*, makes a very bad Anſwer, and yet it appears to him ſolid, and lulls him aſleep in his Sins.

(E) *He does not appear Orthodox in all his Opinions,*] He poſitively ſays, that the Damn'd have a Reſting-Day every Year, and that it is the Day on which our Saviour came out of Hell. How came he to know that?

Sunt (c) & ſpiritibus ſæpe nocentibus
Pœnarum celebres ſub Styge feriæ,
Illa nocte, ſacer qua rediit Deus
Stagnis ad ſuperos ex Acheronticis:
. . . .
Marcent (d) ſuppliciis Tartara mitibus,
Exſultatque ſui carceris otio
Umbrarum populus liber ab ignibus:
Nec fervent ſolito flumina ſulphure.

He affirms in another place, that God damns few People.

Quæſitor (e) ille ſolus
Animæque corporiſque,
Enſiſque bis timendus
Prima ac ſecunda mors eſt.
Idem tamen benignus
Ultor retundit iram,
Pauciſque non piorum
Patitur perire in ævum.

He is very much blam'd for deſiring not the Glory of Heaven, but the State of a Man, whoſe Sufferings are not exceſſive. He ſays he will be contented, provided his Soul be not caſt into the deepeſt Dungeon of Hell; and deſires no better Fate (f) after the Reſurrection.

Multa (g) in theſauris Patris eſt habitatio, Chriſte,
Diſparibus diſcreta locis. non poſco beatâ
In regione domum: ſint illic caſta virorum
Agmina, pulvereum quæ dedignantia cenſum
Divitias petiere tuas: ſit flore perenni
Candida virginitas, animum caſtrata reciſum.
At mihi Tartarei ſatis eſt ſi nulla miniſtri
Occurrat facies, avidæ nec flamma Gehennæ
Devoret hanc animam, merſam fornacibus imis.
Eſto: cavernoſo, quia ſic pro labe neceſſe eſt
Corporeâ, triſtis me ſorbeat ignis Averno:
Saltem mitificos incendia lenta vapores
Exhalent, æſtuque calor languente tepeſcat.
Lux immenſa alios, & tempora vincta coronis
Glorificent: me pœna levis clementer adurat.

Dr. *Perkins*, a Proteſtant Divine, ſays 'tis an (h) impious Prayer, and that it ought not to be aſcrib'd to *Prudentius*. He is not the only one who thinks that 'tis a Piece added to his *Hamartigenia*. However it be, *Victor Giſelinus*, a Catholick Writer, does very much diſapprove that Prayer in a (i) Work that is very much commended by *Poſſevin* (k). 'Tis to be found as a genuine Piece in the moſt exact (l) Editions; whereas ſome Verſes that are accounted Suppoſititious have been left out. You will not find in *Heinſius's* Edition as in that of *Sichardus*, the third *Strophe* of the Hymn (m) falſly entitled, *Ad incenſum cerei Paſchalis*. That Title and that Strophe not being in the beſt Manuſcripts have been left out as ſuppoſititious Pieces. The Prayer that is at the end of the *Hamartigenia* would likewiſe have been expunged, if there had been any Reaſons to believe that it was not genuine. But here is a Hereſy of which he cannot be cleared by denying the thing: He believed the Materiality of the Soul.

Reſciſſa (n) ſed iſta (o) ſeorſum
Solvunt hominem perimuntque:
Humus excipit arida corpus,
Animæ rapit aura LIQUOREM.

The following Verſes make it plain that he means a Material Subſtance by *Animæ liquorem*.

(p) Non occidet, inquit,
Interior qui ſpirat homo: luet ille perenne
Supplicium, quod ſubjectos male rexerit artus.
Nec mihi difficile eſt LIQUIDAM *circumdare flammis*
Naturam, quamvis PERFLABILIS *illa feratur*
Inſtar Noti: capiam tamen, & tormenta adhibebo.

Mr.

---

* *See the Remark D.*

† *See Ibid.*

‡ Melior omnino Chriſtianus quam poeta meo judicio. *Lilius Gregor. Gyraldus Dialogiſmo 25. pag. 905. See alſo the ſame Gyraldus in poet. hiſtoria pag. 290.*

(y) See Father Chamillard upon Prudentius, pag. 1.

(z) *Ibid.*

(aa) Du Pin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt. tom. 4. p. 6. of the Dutch Ed.

(bb) That is, oblitum veteris me Saliæ, &c.

(cc) *See his Diſſertat. de ſcriptor. Eccleſ. tom. 2. p. 793.*

(dd) *Pedro Mantuano ubi ſupra p. 86, 87.*

(ee) *It ſhould be Maſſalia.*

(a) *Prudent. in prologo operum.*

(b) Nam ra numquam eſt bonos ores via, Quem eniter ccaſſe ne eſt nocens. neca in amemn. 2. v. 2. p. m. 2.

(c) *Prudent. hymn. 5. Cathemer. v. 125. p. m. 21.*

(d) *Id. ib. v. 133.*

(e) *Id. ib. hymn. 6. v. 89. p. 24*

(f) *See the Bibliothequ. Univerſelle tom. 12. p. 186, 187.*

(g) *Id. in hamartigenia ſub fin. p. 227.*

(h) Dictum impium & non tribuendum Prudentio ait noſter Perkinſius *Rivet. crit. ſacri l. 3. c. 26. p. 1123. tom. 2. operum.*

(i) *In his Notes upon* Prudentius

(k) *See Rivet ubi ſupra.*

(l) *For inſtance, that of* Nicolas Heinſius.

(m) *'Tis the 5. of the Cathemerinon.*

(n) *Prudent. hymn. 10. Cathemerin. v. 9.*

(o) *That is the Body and the Soul.*

(p) *Id. contra Symmach. lib. 2. v. 184.*

the Objections of the *Marcionites* concerning (*F*) the Origin of Evil. There are many Editions (*G*) of his Works. His Books againſt *Symmachus* were written before the Victory obtain'd over *Radagaiſus* in the Year 405, and after that which *Stilicon* obtain'd over *Alaric* near *Pollentia* in the Year 402. He mentions † the latter, and ſays nothing of the other, tho' his Subject requir'd it.

PSAM-

M. *le Clerc* (*q*) obſerves, that theſe Words of *Prudentius*, *Animâ rapit aura liquentem*, do naturally ſignify the Materiality of the Soul, and that *an Epicurean would not expreſs himſelf better*. It is certain, that this Verſe and the three foregoing explain a Doctrine (*r*) which is to be found in the Books of ſeveral Pagan Authors concerning the Characters of Death. It is, ſaid they, the Reſolution of a Compound into its Principles, each of which returns to the Place from which it came, the Body into the Earth, the Soul into the Air or the Æther. If we conſider how *Lucretius* expreſſes himſelf on this Head, it will appear that *Prudentius* might be look'd upon as his Abridger.

Denique (*ſ*) *cœleſti ſumus omnes ſemine oriundi,*
Omnibus ille idem Pater eſt, unde alma liquentes
Humorum guttas Mater cum Terra recepit
Fœta parit nitidas fruges, arbuſtaque læta,
Et genus humanum
. . . .
. . . .
. . . .
Cedit item retro de Terra quod fuit ante,
In terras: & quod miſſum 'ſt ex Ætheris oris,
Id rurſum Cœli rellatum templa receptant:
Nec ſic interimit mors res, ut Materiai
Corpora conficiat, ſed cœtum diſſupat ollis.

But tho' thoſe two Poets agree in their Expreſſions, their Notions are quite different. The Return of the Soul to its Principle was a true Death, according to *Lucretius*, but not according to all other Heathens, and leſs ſtill according to *Prudentius*, who ſoon after (*w*) explains himſelf ſo poſitively that one cannot doubt of his believing the Immortality of the Soul.

I deſire I may be allowed to ſay, that Dr. *Perkins*'s Judgment ſeems too ſevere to thoſe who have a regard to Equity and Charity. They think that this Poet was willing to be deprived of Happineſs in Heaven, and to ſuffer a moderate Puniſhment after this Life, becauſe he look'd upon himſelf as a Man unworthy of the ſupream Beatitude. Is ſuch an Humility impious? May not one call it a Sacrifice of himſelf to the Divine Juſtice?

(*F*) *The Objections of the* Marcionites *concerning the Origin of Evil.*] In order to ſhew that the Philoſophers are not the only Men who mention thoſe Objections, I ſhall ſet down a long Paſſage of a Learned Divine. "(*y*) The *Manichees* and the "*Marcionites* raiſed an Objection againſt the Orthodox mention'd by (*z*) *Prudentius* in its full "Strength, *viz.* That if the God who Governs the "World was not pleaſed with Vice he would pre"vent it, ſince he is not ignorant of the Corrupti"on of Men, and is able to prevent it. They pre"tended that 'tis one and the ſame thing, to do "Evil or to ſuffer it if one can hinder it. *Pru"dentius* anſwers, in the firſt place, that God is "not pleaſed with Vice, ſince he has appointed a "Remedy for it, and ſaves thoſe who abſtain from "it. But, replied thoſe Hereticks, a Man cannot "Sin againſt God's Will, ſince He is the Maſter of "his Heart, and enclines it as he thinks fit. Our "Poet, in order to reſolve this Difficulty, has only "recourſe to Free-Will, without which there can "be neither Vice nor Virtue. He very much en"larges upon it, and proves his Aſſertion by the "Example of our firſt Parents, of *Loth* and his "Wife, of *Noemi*'s Daughters in Law, and of Bro"thers, one of whom, as we daily ſee, loves Vir"tue, and the other gives up himſelf to Vice. To "which he adds this general Maxim:

"*Omnibus una ſubeſt natura; ſed exitus omnes*
"*Non unus peragit, placitorum ſegrege formâ.*

"All Men are of the ſame Nature, but all of 'em "have not the ſame Fate, becauſe all of 'em have "not the ſame Will. It appears from what has "been ſaid above, that *Prudentius* believed that "Men are born Corrupt; but what he ſays here "ſhews, he did not believe that ſuch a Corruption "did neceſſarily determine them to Evil. He adds, "that God has appointed Rewards and Puniſh"ments, becauſe Men may be Good or Bad as they "pleaſe. If the *Manichees* had further objected "to him, that it had been better if there had been "no Free-Will, and no Happineſs beſtowed as a "Reward; and if Men had been neceſſarily Happy, "by being neceſſarily determin'd to the Love of "Virtue, than to make 'em ſuch a diſmal Preſent "as Liberty, whereby moſt of 'em become un"happy for ever? I ſay, if the *Manichees* had ob"jected ſuch a thing to him, perhaps he would "have made uſe of the Principle abovemention'd, "*viz.* that few People are damn'd. How do we "know but *Prudentius* came to have ſuch a Thought "by reaſon of that Objection, which might eaſily "come into his Mind?"

(*G*) *Many Editions of his Works.*] That of *Aldus* at *Venice* 1502, in 4. is not the firſt, as he pretended. That of *Deventer* went before it (*e*). Some ſay he put out two Editions, but there is ſome Reaſon to believe, that they ſay ſo without any Ground for it (*f*). M. *du Pin* (*g*) mentions the *Antwerp* Edition 1540 *in* 8. *which contains the Notes of* Antonius Nebriſſenſis, *and* Sichardus. I have an Edition of *Antwerp* in 8. with the Notes of thoſe two Authors, but it is of the Year 1546. The Epiſtle Dedicatory written by *Sichardus*, is dated from *Baſil* in *March* 1537. *Geſner* in his Bibliotheque (*h*) mentions an Edition of *Baſil* by *Cratander* 1527, with *Sichardus*'s *Scholia*, and another Edition of *Baſil* by *Henricus Petrus*. Father *Labbe* (*i*) follow'd the *Antwerp* Edition of *Plantin* 1564, with *Theodorus* (*k*) *Pulmannus*'s Notes and Corrections, and *Victor Giſelinus*'s Commentary. The two Books againſt *Symmachus* were printed at *Paris* in 1614, with *Grangæus*'s Notes: Mr. *du Pin* calls him wrong, *Gangræus*. He ſays the laſt Edition of *Prudentius* is that of *Amſterdam* 1667, *with* Heinſius'*s Notes and Corrections*. He ſhould have ſaid *Nicolas Heinſius*, leſt the Work of the Son ſhould be aſcribed to the Father. I think he might have mention'd the Edition *in uſum Delphini* by Father *Chamillard* at *Paris* 1687. *Moreri* ſays there is an *Amſterdam* Edition of *Prudentius* 1670, with the Notes of *Nicolas Heinſius*, and the Author's Life: I have not been able yet to know whether it be true. I have only the Edition of the Year 1667, in 12, printed by *Daniel Elzevier*, without the Life of *Prudentius*: It (*l*) is in *Sichardus*'s Edition. As for the Edition *Variorum*, publiſh'd by *Weitzius*, it was printed at *Francfort* or *Hanaw*, and not at *Hannover*, as M. *du Pin* ſays.

The Reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here Father *Chamillard*'s Judgment about thoſe who have writ upon that Author. (*m*) *Giſelinus ſectatus eſt tantum ea quæ omnium erant facillima & minime ſcitu neceſſaria, lapſus in multis etiam & hallucinatus. Nebriſſenſis hæret in Prudentio magis, ſed eſt brevior & ſingula delibare ſatis habet, quæ ad fabulam, hiſtoriam & penitiorem ſcriptoris cognitionem requiruntur, omittit. Quid quod Apotheoſim, Hamartigeniam, duos contra Symmachum libros qui ſunt præ cæteris tamen digniſſimi qui legantur non attigit* . . . . *Heinſii va*riæ lectiones in Prudentium *adſperſis interdum lectiſſimis notulis perquam eruditæ ſunt & accuratæ ut ab Heinſio profectas facile noris* . . . . . *Weitzius qui cum editas hactenus in Prudentium notas collegiſſet, addidit etiam ſuas, eaſque minime contemnendas, hoc uno cæteris ſuperior quod veterum autorum locos indicet, ac eos præcipue ſacræ ſcripturæ quos Prudentius operi ſuo intexuit. Mitto Jacobum Spiegelium qui commentariolum edidit in oden Prudentii inſcriptam* omnis hora, *ejus enim in illam notæ non ſolum ſunt propter nimiam prolixitatem moleſtæ, verum etiam minutis quibuſdam ac pene puerilibus nugis ab ipſa grammatica repetitis refertæ. Mitto etiam Adamum Siberum, Georgium Remum, Adamum Theodorum Siberum, Andream Wilkium: quorum alii verba ſex interdum aut ſeptem protulerunt, in hymnos tres aut quatuor totos, alii in unum duntaxat, ut merito ab interpretum Prudentii numero ſint expungendi. Aliter ſentiendum de Scholiis Iſonis quæ quamvis admodum bre*-

via

---

† *Prudent. in Symmach. lib.* 2. *v.* 695. *& ſeq.*

(*q*) *Le Clerc, Biblioth. Univerſelle tom.* 12. *pag.* 155.

(*r*) *See in the Article* Amphiaraus *what I have quoted out of* Epicharmus.

(*ſ*) *Lucret. l.* 2. *v.* 990.

(*w*) *And alſo in ſome other Books See Mr.* Le Clerc, *ubi ſupra.*

(*y*) *Bibliotheque Univerſelle tom.* 12. *pag.* 182. *& ſeq.*

(*z*) *Theſe are his words:* Si non vult Deus eſſe malum, cur non vetat? inquit. Nil refert auctor fuerit factorque malorum. Anne opera in vitium ſceleris pulcherrima verti, Cùm poſſit prohibere, ſinat? quòd ſi velit omnes Innocuos agere Omnipotens, nec ſancta voluntas Degeneret, facto nec ſe manus inquinet ullo. Condidit ergo malum Dominus, quod ſpectat ab alto, Et patitur, fierique probat, tamquam ipſe crearit. Ipſe creavit enim, quod, cùm diſcludere poſſit, Non abolet, longoque ſinit graſſarier uſu. *Prudent. in hamartig. v.* 540. *p. m.* 217.

(*e*) *Nicolas Heinſius in præfat. Prudentii.*

(*f*) *Ibid.*

(*g*) *Du Pin ubi ſupra pag.* 5.

(*h*) *Fol.* 125.

(*i*) *Labbe de ſcript. eccleſ. tom.* 2. *p.* 252.

(*k*) *He calls him* Pulmanius Cranenburgius. *Mr.* du Pin *calls him* Pulman Graffenbourg. *He has committed two Faults, for beſides that he ſhou'd have ſaid* Cranenbourg, *('tis a ſmall Town in the Dutchy of* Cleves, *where* Theodorus Pulmannus *was born) he ſhould not have expreſs'd himſelf ſo as to make one think that it was the Author's Surname.*

(*l*) *Written by* Aldus Manutius.

(*m*) *Stephanus Chamillard è Societate Jeſu, præfat. ad Prudentium in uſum Delphini.*

PSAMMITICHUS, King of *Egypt*, 640 Years before the Birth of *CHRIST*, was the Son of *Necus* whom *Sabacus*, King of *Æthiopia*, cauſed to be put to Death when he invaded *Egypt*. The Son would have had the ſame Fate, had he not made his eſcape into *Syria*. He was recall'd when *Sabacus* retir'd into his Country, and was one of the Twelve Great Lords who govern'd *Egypt* λ. Each of 'em had his Portion, but they acted in Concert, or rather like Partners, or Collegues, than like Neighbouring Princes ‡. *Pſammitichus* drew upon himſelf the Envy of all the reſt, either becauſe the μ Wealth he got by the Duties laid upon Merchandizes, enabl'd him to make Alliances with Foreigners, or becauſe they were afraid he wou'd be King of the whole Country, as it had been foretold by an (*A*) Oracle. Wherefore they confin'd him into Marſhy Places, where perhaps he had remain'd all his Life-time, had he not been inform'd that many Foreigners, who had made a Deſcent into *Egypt*, deſtroy'd all the flat Country. They were *Ionians* and *Carians*. Being told that they were Men (*B*) of Braſs, he conceiv'd great hopes by reaſon of an Oracle deliver'd to him. He went to ſee what it was, and having engag'd thoſe Foreigners to ſtay with him, he made himſelf Maſter of all *Egypt* by their means. He ſhewed himſelf very thankful, and * gave 'em ſome Lands near the *Nile*, below the Town of *Bubaſtus*. From that time he always had Foreigners in his Pay, and even † gave 'em the Precedency above the Soldiers of his own Nation in the War he made againſt *Syria*; at which the *Egyptians* were ſo incenſed, that Two hundred thouſand Men left him. They went (*C*) and ſettled in *Æthiopia*, and made a briſk Anſwer (*D*) to the Reaſons he alledg'd to perſuade 'em to return into their Country. He left nothing unattempted to make up that Loſs, and particularly applied himſelf to make Trade flouriſh: he was kind to Foreigners, and granted 'em all manner of Protection, putting a ſtop to the Barbarity exerciſed upon them in the foregoing Reigns. He made an Alliance with the *Athenians*, and ſome other *Greek* Nations, and would have his Children learn their Diſcipline ||. He cauſed alſo β many Children to be Inſtructed by the *Carians* and *Ionians*, whom he had placed on the Banks of the *Nile*; and it was the firſt time that Men ſpeaking a different Language from that of *Egypt* ſettled in that Country. By which means, as γ *Herodotus* ſays, the Curious who, in proceſs of Time, travell'd in *Egypt*, found there ſeveral People who underſtood them, and were their Interpreters. I have examin'd, in another δ Place, whether the Town of *Naucratis* was built under the Reign

λ *Herodot. l. 2. c. 152.*

‡ *Ibid. c. 147.*

μ *Diodor. Sicul. l. 1. c. 66.*

* *Herod. l. 2. c. 154.*

† *Diodor. Sicul. ib. c. 67.*

|| *Id. ib.*

β *Herodot. l. 2. c. 154.*

γ *Ibid.*

δ *In the Article* Naucratis.

via ſint quidquid eſt tamen gravioris modi ſolvunt. He commends very much *Fabricius*'s Notes upon five Hymns of *Prudentius*, and thoſe of *Eraſmus* upon the two laſt Hymns of the CATHEMERINON.

(*A*) *As it had been foretold by an Oracle.*] The Oracle told 'em, that he who ſhould make his Libations in a Braſs Cup ſhould have the whole Kingdom to himſelf. It happen'd on the laſt Day of a ſolemn Feſtival, the Twelve Kings being in the Temple of *Vulcan* ready to make their Libations, that the Prieſt who was to give 'em the Golden-Cup which they uſed for that Ceremony, miſtook the Number, and brought only eleven Cups. *Pſammitichus* being the laſt of all, and having no Cup, pull'd off his Cask, and us'd it for the Libations. The other Kings remembring the Oracle would have kill'd him, to prevent the Effect of it, had they not certainly known that he had no hand in the Prieſt's Miſtake (*a*). I don't know how to excuſe *Athenæus*; he (*b*) makes *Herodotus* to ſay, that the *Egyptian* Prieſts drank out of Braſs Cups, and that it does not appear that the Kings themſelves, when they ſacrificed in Publick, made uſe of a Silver Cup; ſo that *Pſammitichus*, who was the youngeſt King, made his Libations with a Braſs Cup, whilſt the others made 'em with Silver Cups. If you read the 151 Chapter of the ſecond Book of *Herodotus*, you'll ſee that *Athenæus* relates the Matter very unfaithfully. His Tranſlator is no leſs unfaithful in the tranſlation of his Words: here is the *Greek*, Ψαμμήτιχον δ᾽ ὖν νεώτερον ὄντα τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων χαλκῇ φιάλῃ σπεῖσαι, τῶν ἄλλων ἀργυρέαις σπενδόντων. The Tranſlator renders it thus, *Itaque Pſammetichum aliis regibus poſteriorem libaſſe argentea phiala, ſuperiores autem ænea.*

(*B*) *That they were Men of Braſs.*] *Pſammitichus* being reduced to a low Condition by the Envy of the other Kings, conſulted an Oracle of *Latona* in the Town of *Butis*, which was accounted the beſt in all *Egypt*. He was anſwer'd that Revenge would come to him by the Sea, when Men of Braſs ſhould be ſeen. The Pirates who had Landed in *Egypt* were arm'd from Head to Foot: ſuch arm'd Men had never been ſeen in that Country; and therefore 'twas thought they were Men of Braſs, and *Pſammitichus* was informed of it. He began then to have a good Opinion of the Oracle, to which he had given (*c*) no Credit. 'Tis pity *Herodotus*, whoſe Relations are ſo charming, did not live in another Age, or was not ſenſible of the difference between a Hiſtory and a Piece of Poetry. In the latter, things muſt not be unfolded without a Miracle; the Reader muſt be ſtruck with Admiration at any rate: but Hiſtorical Events ought to be attended with Simplicity; and if a judicious Reader does not find it in an Hiſtorian, he may very well believe that the Author has inſerted wonderful Fictions in the room of it. I wonder *Herodotus* left any Gleanings after him. He knew nothing of the Oracle mention'd by *Polyænus* (*d*). The God *Hamon* adviſed King *Tementhes* to beware of Cocks. A *Carian* informed *Pſammitichus* that no Nation before the *Carians* had ſet Creſts upon their Helmets. This was ſufficient to make *Pſammitichus* raiſe a great many *Carians*.

(*C*) *They went and ſettled in* Æthiopia.] *Strabo* (*e*) ſays they were under the Dominion of a Queen, to whom the Iſle of *Meroe* did belong, and that they inhabited near that Iſland the Province of *Teneſis*, and an Iſland above that of *Meroe*. *Pliny* (*f*) quoting *Ariſtocreon* mentions the ſame Fugitives, and a Town call'd *Eſar*, which they inhabited for the ſpace of Three hundred Years. What he ſays of its Situation does not agree with *Ptolemy* nor with *Strabo*'s Account.

(*D*) *And made a briſk Anſwer to the Reaſons.*] At firſt *Pſammitichus* ſent to them their Captains to perſuade 'em to return into their Country; and then he himſelf went to them: he exhorted them to conſider, that they forſook their Country, their Wives and Children. They unanimouſly anſwer'd him, ſtriking their Shields with their Lances, *We ſhall never want a Country as long as we are able to handle theſe Arms, and we ſhall never want Wives and Children, as long as we can make uſe of theſe things.* When they ſpoke the laſt Words they were ſo impudent as to ſhew their Nakedneſs. (*g*) *Precibus ad ſententiæ mutationem eos ſolicitans, templa, patriam, uxores, liberos, recordari jubet. Tum univerſi haſtas clypeoſque pulſantes, contentâ voce reſpondent, quoad arma in poteſtate habeant facilè ſibi patriam reperturos; reductis quoque tunicis genitalia oſtentant, nunquam ſibi uxores aut liberos defore, quamdiu his ſint inſtructi, dictitantes.*

(*E*) *Reign'd*

(a) *Herod. l. 2. c. 151.*

(b) *Athen. lib. 6. pag. 231.*

(c) *Herod. ib. c. 152.*

(d) *Polyænus Stratag. l. 7. n. 3.*

(e) *Lib. 15. pag. 530. l. 17. pag. 541.*

(f) *Lib. 6. c. 30.*

(g) *Diodor. Sicul. lib. 1. c. 67. p. m. 59.*

Reign of *Psammitichus* by some Inhabitants of *Miletus*. That Prince reign'd (E) 54 Years, and died ζ in the third Year of the 40 Olympiad, leaving η his Kingdom to his Son *Necus*. He was buried at *Sais*, where he was born, the chief Town of the lower *Egypt*, θ in the Temple of *Minerva*, where ι the *Saitans* buried all their Kings. He was the λ first King of *Egypt* who drank Wine: he order'd that the μ Springs of the *Nile* should be look'd for; and in order to know which was the most ancient People in the World, he caused two Children to be brought up, so as to hear no Body speak; and because when they came to be two Years old they spoke a Word which signified *Bread*, in the *Phrygian* Language, the *Egyptians* were obliged to give over their Pretension to the greatest Antiquity, and to yield, in that respect, to the *Phrygians* ν. No Siege did ever last a longer time than that which *Psammitichus* laid to the Town of *Azotus* ξ, for it held out 29 Years. The taking of that Town was not so glorious to him, as the Dexterity wherewith he stopt a Torrent that was like to overflow his Kingdom. The *Scythians* having defeated the *Medes* ruled in *Asia*, and were marching towards *Egypt*. *Psammitichus* met 'em in *Palestine*, and by his Presents and Entreaties persuaded them to go back; and it was then that some of 'em plunder'd the Temple of *Venus Urania* at *Ascalon* ο. *Moreri* and the Continuators of his Dictionary made but little Account of that King, since instead of inserting in his Article such things as belong to him, which, as we have seen, are neither few nor common, they have only fill'd it with things that concern his Successors.

PTOLEMY, King of *Egypt*, the Eleventh of that Name, was surnamed *Auletes*, by reason of his great Inclination to play on the Flute. He succeeded his σ Father towards the beginning ‡ of the 175 Olympiad, and in the Year of *Rome* 673. He laid heavy Taxes upon *Egypt*, in order to pay the vast Sums he wanted, to get and preserve the Friendship of the *Roman* People; which made him odious: and besides being despised by his Subjects, by reason of his suffering the Isle of *Cyprus* to be subdued by the *Romans*, he was expell'd from the Kingdom. He went to *Rome*, and demanded, for a long time, that the Publick would Protect him, and enable him to recover his Dominions. He met with many Oppositions in his Negotiation, and at last having no hopes he left *Rome*, and went to *Ephesus*, where he obtain'd some Letters, whereby *Gabinius* was order'd to restore him to his Kingdom, wherein he happily succeeded *. I have said, in another † Place what became of *Berenice* the eldest Daughter of that King; and here I shall observe, that *Arsinoe* (Z) his younger Daughter reign'd for some time: but, properly speaking, 'twas the famous *Cleopatra*, his other Daughter, who succeeded him. If any one desires a more particular Account of the Life of that King, he may read his History publish'd at *Paris* in 1698, by M. *Baudelot de Dairval*.

PUCCIUS (*Francis*) born at *Florence* of an Illustrious Family, forsook the Church of *Rome* when he came to examine the Disputes about Religion, which arose in *France* in *Calvin*'s Time: He was then at *Lyons*. He went into *England* and studied Divinity at *Oxford*, and then at *London*: afterwards he removed into *Swisserland*, where he had a Dispute with *Socinus* about the State of the First Man. One would infer from thence, that he was accounted an Orthodox Man by the *Protestants*; but it was not so: the Magistrates of *Basil* expell'd him for his Opinions. He return'd to *London*, where he was Imprison'd on account of his Doctrine. Being set at liberty he removed into the *Netherlands*, and challeng'd *Socinus* to a Verbal Dispute. They disputed several times in *Poland* in the Presence of the Church of *Cracow*, but could not agree. Whereupon *Puccius* breaking with the Sectaries of that Country, followed some Persons who (A) studied Magick, and went with them to *Prague*, where he return'd into the

Roman

(E) *Reign'd 54 Years.*] *Herodotus* (a) says so: *Eusebius* makes him Reign only 44 Years, and *Moreri* 58 Years.

(Z) Arsinoe *his younger Daughter reign'd for some time.*] Here I perform the Promise I made (b) to supply *Moreri*'s Brevity. I say then that *ARSINOE* (c) stole away from the Palace, whilst the necessary Preparations were making to attack *Julius Cæsar*, who had the young King in his Power. She went to the *Egyptian* Army, and commanded jointly with *Achillas*; and a Quarrel quickly arising between her and *Achillas*, each of 'em being willing to have the whole Command, she had him kill'd by the Eunuch *Ganymede* (d). But *Cæsar* having set the young Prince at liberty, *Arsinoe* was oblig'd to yield to her Brother. After the Victory of *Cæsar* and the Death of young *Ptolemy*, *Cæsar*, (e) for the Security of *Cleopatra*, order'd that *Arsinoe* should leave *Egypt*. *Appian* (f) informs us, that *Megabyzus* a Priest of *Diana* received her into his House as a Queen; and he was like to be punish'd with Death upon that Account, when *Mark Antony*, out of Complaisance to *Cleopatra*, caused *Arsinoe* to be kill'd at *Miletus*. *Cleopatra* released him at the Request of the *Ephesians*.

(A) *Who studied Magick.*] The Author I have quoted uses these Words: (g) *In comitatum se dedit aliquorum magis studiosorum quibuscum Pragam pervenit.* 'Tis best to consult *Socinus*, who speaks of it more at large (h). He says that *Puccius* being condemn'd by the Arbitrators of the Dispute he had with him at *Cracow*, would not confess that he had been worsted; but no Body would hear him: the Synod of the *Unitarians* did not vouchsafe to read his new Writing. *Socinus* adds, that he receiv'd from him an *Italian* Book concerning (i) the Seal set to the Scripture. *Puccius* said, that every thing was Incomprehensible in that Divine Book, and that the only way was to wait for the coming of the Two Men mention'd in the eleventh Chapter of St. *John*'s Revelation; that they would explain all the Mysteries of the Bible, and that no Disputation was to be made use of before their coming to compose Differences about Matters of Religion. He believ'd those two Men would quickly appear, because he reckon'd the 1260 Days of the Reign of the Beast for so many Years, and because, according to his Computation, that Reign began with the Council of *Nice*. He expected (k) a considerable Employment under the Ministry or Mission of those Two Men; and whilst he flatter'd himself with those Hopes, he grew acquainted with two *Englishmen* in the Retinue of the Palatin *Laski*, who was returning from

an

ζ Calvisius, Helvicus, &c.

η Herod. l.2.c.158.

θ Strabo l.17.p.551.

ι Herod. l.2.c.169.

λ Plutar. de Isid. pag. 353.

μ Athen. l.1.p.345.

ν Herod. l.2.c.2.

ξ Ibid. c.157.

ο Id. l.1.c.105.

σ His Name was Ptolemy Lathurus.

‡ See Calvisius ad hunc annum.

* See the Article Berenice.

† Ibid.

(a) Herod. l.2.c.157.

(b) In the Article Arsinoe.

(c) Cæsar de Bello civili l.3. sub fin. Lucanus l.10. sub fin.

(d) Hirtius de Bello Alexandr. circa init. p.m. 378.

(e) Ibid. p.m. 395.

(f) Appian. de bell. civil. lib. 5.

(g) Hoornbeek, Apparat. ad controvers. Socinianas pag. 52.

Roman * Communion. This doth not prevent faying, that he was (*B*) burnt at *Rome*. He was Mafter of no Science, (*C*) and gave himfelf up to Fanaticifm. But the Principal Doctrine that he was fond of, was that good People (*D*) fhould be fav'd, even tho' they were Pagans. Mr. (*E*) *Baillet* fpeaks of him.

PUTEANUS (*Erycius*) Author of a (*A*) vaft Number of Books, was born at *Venlo* in *Guelderland* the 4th of *November*, 1574. He ftudy'd firft at *Dort*, from whence he went to *Cologne* to learn Rhetorick, and to go thro' a Courfe of Philofophy in the College of the Jefuits: After which he was a Student of the Law at *Louvain*. He took his Batchelor's Degree in *June* 1597, and profited much by the Lectures of *Juftus Lipfius*, who conceiv'd a great Efteem and particular Friendfhip for him. He went into *Italy* in the Year 1597, and ftaid

an Embaffy into *England*. One of them was a Phyfician, the other had been a Magician, and they were both Catholicks; but they promis'd a fpeedy and general Reformation, which God would make in Chriftendom by their Means. They boafted of a familiar Converfe with the Angels. The Phyfician neither faw nor heard any thing, but wrote down punctually what his Companion faid that he faw and heard. *Socinus*, and feveral others, advis'd *Puccius* not to follow thofe two Perfons; but they could not diffuade him. He went to *Prague* with them, and reunited himfelf to the *Romifh* Church, on which Occafion he wrote a long Letter to *Socinus*, wherein he affured him, That an Angel, who us'd to appear to one of thofe Gentlemen, apply'd himfelf directly to him, and pufh'd him on to abjure his Errors. (*a*) *Statim autem fere ut Pragam pervenit, factus eft Papifta, & miniftros pontificios adiens, fua ab Ecclefia Romana olim defectionis veniam, convenienti fatisfactione exhibita, impetravit. Ac mox hue ad amicos & præfertim ad me, ad quem hac de re bene longas literas dedit, de fuo, ut ipfe loquitur, ad Catholicæ Sanctæque Dei Ecclefiæ gremium reditu diligenter fcripfit, afferens, fe verbis unius ex illis Dei Angelis, qui fociis illis fuis refponfa dare folent, ad fe nominatim loquentis, monitum atque impulfum id feciffe, diuturnumque errorem fuum tandem agnoviffe.* *Socinus's* Letter, in which thefe Words are found, was written in the Year 1586, not long after *Puccius* was return'd to Popery. As for what remains, he was a Merchant at *Lyons* when he began firft to relifh the Proteftant Doctrines: His Nobility admitted of that Profeffion without any Difgrace, according to the Principles of the *Italians*. I fay, his Nobility, for 'tis affirm'd that he was of the Family of the *Pucci*, which has afforded three Cardinals. (*b*) *Seias eum ante plures annos, cum Lugduni, quamvis ex nobili admodum familia, quæ etiam tres Cardinales habuit natus, ut patriæ ipfius adeoque totius noftræ Etruriæ mos fert, mercaturam exerceret, exorientibus illis de religione in Gallia diffidiis, quæ necdum fopita funt, ftatuit, mercatura relicta, fe totum ftudio Sacrarum Literarum tradere, ut quid fentiendum in noftra religione effet, dilucide cognofcere poffet.*

(*B*) *That he was burnt at* Rome.] 'Tis faid (*c*) the Archbifhop of *Saltzburg* caus'd him to be feiz'd and fent to *Rome*. This Man might have been fupported by the Inquifitors, becaufe he furnifh'd them with a Pretence to declaim againft the Principles of the Proteftants. *Puccius* returning into the Bofom of the Catholick Church, may the Controverfifts fay, after he had endeavour'd to fix among thofe who were feparated from it, in *France*, *Switzerland*, *England* and *Poland*, is a convincing Proof, That when any one has abandon'd the Principle of Authority, and put himfelf on that of Examination, he can find no Ground to rely on any where; he skips from one Party to another, and not being able to find any fure footing, he is oblig'd, like *Noah*'s Dove, to return to the Ark again. This is a Topick which two (*d*) Modern Authors have lately infifted upon (†), when they return'd into the *Roman* Communion; but 'tis only a meer Blaze, for the way of Authority neceffarily leads every particular Man to be a *Mahometan* in *Turky*, a Heathen in *China*, and always of the National Religion.

(C) *He was Mafter of no Science, and gave himfelf up to Fanaticifm.*] This is the Character that *Voetius* gives of him. (*e*) *Fr. Puccius natione Italus Filidinus inftar cothurni omnium aut nullius religionis, nullus eruditionis literariæ, philofophiæ, fcripturariæ, molitus eft libellum Goudæ in Hollandia anno* 1592. *editum & Clementi VIII. dedicatum, quo afferit univerfalem reftitutionem, & fidem naturalem in Deum, per quam omnes falvari poffint. Fanatico illi errori* (*jactat enim revelationes* rat. 120. pag. 94.) *mox publica fcripta oppofuerunt, ex Reformatis* Francifcus Junius, *ex Lutheranis* Lucas Ofiander, *ex Pontificiis* Nicolaus Serrarius. *De hominis iftius univerfali ἀπαιδευσίᾳ ex fcriptis, de ingenio & moribus ex* epiftolis Socini *judicare poteris* Epift. 5. *quæ eft ad* Matth. Radecum *Secret. Gedanenf. Puccius prior Socinum fatis farcaftice perftrinxerat in collatione de Mortalitate, quæ poftea typis edita fuit in* 4.

(*D*) *That good People fhould be fav'd.*] *Tobias Pfannerus* attributes this Opinion to him, on the Credit of two Perfons whom he quotes. (*g*) *Francifcus Puccius Filidinus, Romæ quidem poftea nefcio qua de caufa combuftus, ignorantiam & incredulitatem Evangelii, vel defectum Baptifmi ad falutem nulli obeffe* (ftatuit) *modo ftudeat vitæ inculpatæ, quoad externos mores, nec præfracte quicquam neget: ineffe omnibus naturaliter hanc facultatem, ut poffint & velint falvi fieri, etiam abfque ferutinio quæftionum Theologicarum; ut Ofiander* (1), *& poft hunc Joh. Ludovicus Hartmannus* (2), *teftantur.*

(*E*) *Mr.* Baillet *fpeaks of him.*] He tells us, that *Luke Ofiander* publifh'd a Book in the Year 1593, againft one *Francis Puccius*, and that it may be the fame Book which is Entituled, *Anti-Puccius*. He adds thefe Words: " (*h*) *Francis Puccius* feems to me to be the Author of " *Puccianifm*; that is to fay, of a new Sect which lafted " but a little while, and remains bury'd under the Stones " which were caft at it by the *Calvinifts*, *Lutherans*, " and Catholicks. Going a little farther back, I find " that this *Puccius* may be the fame with *Francefco* " *Pucci* of *Florence*, who retir'd to *Bafil*, and had fome " Difpute with the Arch-Heretick *Socinus*, in the Year " 1577, concerning the State of the firft Man before " his Fall, and who maintain'd the Immortality of all " Creatures, and confequently of Man by the Creation. " But I won't fay that this *Florentine* (*i*), is the fame " with *Francis Puccius Filidinus*, of whom Mention is " made in the firft Clafs of the Index of Authors, and " Books, condemn'd under the Name of the Council of *Trent*; wherein 'tis remark'd, that this Man " falfely took on him the Name of *Pucci*." Note, that there is an *Anti-Puccius* quoted, which was writ by *Fauftus Socinus*; but that is not the Title of the Book, 'tis only quoted fo for Brevity's fake. That Work confifts of four Parts; it contains, 1. A Difcourfe of *Puccius* concerning the Immortality of all Creatures before Sin. There are ten Thefes in it, each of which contains one of the ten Arguments, on which he grounded his Paradox. 2. *Socinus*'s Anfwer to thofe Thefes. 3. The Rejoinder of *Puccius* to the Anfwer. 4. The Reply (*k*) of *Socinus*; 'tis very long and elaborate. All this is under the Title *De ftatu primi hominis ante lapfum difputatio*, in the fecond Volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*.

(*A*) *Author of a vaft Number of Books.*] See the Catalogue of them in *Valerius Andreas*'s Bibliotheque, and in the *Theatre* of *Ghilini*; but 'tis more compleat in Mr. (*l*) *Witte*. They moft of them fmall Tracts, and never any Man feem'd more perfuaded of the Truth of the Maxim of a *Greek* Poet. (*m*) *That a great Volume is a great Evil.* 'Tis eafie to multiply the Number of ones Books, if we will publifh all that we write. Our *Puteanus* was guilty of this Fault, he printed even the Collection (*n*) of the Teftimonies, which he gave to his Scholars. Mr. *Colomies* has publifh'd a thing which cannot be better plac'd than here. " (*o*) Dr. *Voffius* " told me, That *Moret*, a famous Printer at *Antwerp*, " reproaching *Erycius Puteanus*, *Lipfius*'s Succeffor, that he " writ only fmall Books, the latter anfwer'd him, That " *Plutarch*, and feveral others among the Ancients, did fo " as well as he. *Moret* immediately reply'd, Do you " believe that your Books, which I can't fell, are as " good as *Plutarch*'s? This made *Puteanus* angry, and " immediately he went out of *Moret*'s Shop." See Mr. *Baillet* in the firft Tome of the *Judgments of the Learned*, p. 447. Read alfo thefe Words of the fecond Tome. (*p*) *'Tis true that this* Puteanus *pafs'd for a Tattler, and a great Writer of little Books, but he was otherwife a very learned Man.*

* *Idem* [illegible] *pag.* 11.

(*a*) Socin. Ibid.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 379.

(*c*) Ab Archiepifcopo Salifburgenti captus tandem & Romam miffus, in rogo periit. Micrælius, Syntagm. Hift. Eccle. pag. 860.

(*d*) Mr. Pa- n & M. de *Ferfe.*

(†) *I write this in* 1696.

(*e*) Gisb. Voetius *Difputat. Theolog. tom.* 2. p. 234, 235.

(*g*) Tob. Pfannerus, Syft. Theolog. Gentilis p. 495.

(1) Ofiand. Cent. XVI. lib. II. cap. 46. cit. ib.

(2) J. L. Hartman. Hift. Conc. Tom. IV. Period. 6. Peric. 16. Exerc. 67. (pag. 701.)

(*h*) *In the firft Tome of the* Anti, *n.* 33. *p.* 233. *See alfo p.* 371.

(*i*) *'Tis certain that he is the fame.*

(*k*) *intitl'd* ad Defenf. Fr. Pucci Refponfio.

(*l*) Witte, Memoriæ Philofophorum p. 567, & feq.

(*m*) *See Mr.* le Fevre *in the Lives of the* Greek *Poets, p.* 141, 142. *He attributes this Thought to the Poet* Callimachus. *Here are the Words of* Callimachus, *as they are related by* Athenæus, *in the Beginning of the third Book.* Τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ. Magnum librum parem effe dicebat magno malo.

(*n*) *See the little Book call'd* Erycii Puteani Martyremata Academica five doctrinæ & probitatis teftimonia. *It was printed at* Leyden, 1618.

(*o*) Colomies *Opufcules*, p. 124, 125. Utrecht *Edition*, 1669.

(*p*) P. 272.

ſtaid ſome time with *Juan Fernando de Velaſco*, Governor of the *Milaneſe*; after that he went to *Padua*, and lodg'd at the famous † *Pinelli*. They took him from thence in 1601, to make him Profeſſor of Eloquence at *Milan*. He gain'd a great deal of Reputation in that Employ, inſomuch that he was honour'd with the Office of Hiſtoriographer to his Catholick Majeſty; and in 1603 the City of *Rome* admitted him and his Poſterity into the Number of their Freemen and Patricians. He took his Degree of Doctor of Law at *Milan*, *more ritùque majorum* §. He took a Wife alſo there in the Year *, 1604, and had a great many Children. He prais'd (*B*) her, and them, very much in his Letters. He remov'd to *Louvain* in 1606, to ſucceed to the Chair of the Profeſſorſhip, which *Juſtus Lipſius* had fill'd with ſo much Glory. He was very much conſidered in the *Low-Countries*, and had the Titles of Hiſtoriographer to the King of *Spain*, and Counſellor to the Arch-duke *Albert*. He was alſo Governor of the Caſtle of *Louvain* *. He (*C*) dy'd in 1646, and was bury'd in a Chappel where none had been bury'd before him: 'Twas that of St. *Charles Borromeo*, in the Church of St. *Peter at Louvain* ‡. He was a Man of Merit and Learning, and had a great (*D*) Commerce of Letters. He affected to ſcatter in his Works what we call Flaſhes of Wit; this ſucceeded ſometimes, but on many Occaſions his Witticiſms were not natural, but a meer playing upon Words. He publiſh'd a Book intitl'd (*E*) *Statera Belli & Pacis*, which made a great

† *Moreri falſely ſuppoſes that* Pinelli *liv'd at* Milan.

§ *That is to ſay, according to the ancient Ceremonies.*

* [illegible] *call'd* Mary Magdalen Catherine de la Tour, *Taverna*.

* *Taken from* Valerius Andreas *Bibl. Belgic.* p. 206, 207.

‡ Vita Erycii Puteani in [illegible] Epiſt. Poſthum.

(*B*) *He prais'd his Wife and Children very much.*] There is nothing more agreeable than a good Wife, ſays he in a Letter, to a Friend. I ſpeak by Experience, mine always appears to me Young and Fair; for altho' ſhe has had ſeveral Children, ſhe keeps the Charms of her Face. (*a*) *Illa mihi ſemper juvencula, ſemper pulchra; quia & ætatis florem, & formæ decus, toties jam puerpera ſervat. Imo illa mea bona eſt, & qualem ex Apiculâ naſci Simonides voluit. Opportunè hic igitur illud Theognidis uſurpem:*

Οὐδὲν Κύρν' ἀγαθῆς γλυκερώτερόν ἐστι γυναικός.
Μάρτυς ἐγώ, σὺ δ' ἐμοὶ γίγνου ἀληθοσύνης.

Vin' & Latinè dicam?

Nil uxore bona, Cyrne, eſt jucundius: hujus
Cum tibi ſim teſtis, tu mihi teſtis eris.

This is what he wrote in 1626. This would not have ſatisfy'd the Deſire of a *Roman* Poet. *Puteanus*'s Wife appear'd ſtill Young and Handſome, becauſe ſhe was ſo ſtill: the Buſineſs is to appear ſo, when one is no more ſo. The Poet's Wiſh was thus:

Candida (b) *perpetuo reſide, Concordia, lecto,*
Tamque pari ſemper ſit Venus æqua jugo.
Diligat illa ſenem quondam: ſed & ipſa marito,
Tunc quoque cum fuerit, non videatur anus.

He writes in another (*c*) Letter, in 1617, that ſhe had brought him four Sons and four Daughters, and that he had loſt three Boys. He ſeems ſatisfy'd with his having Daughters (*d*), and gives a Reaſon for it. He had Male Children after that. His Son *Fauſtus* (*e*) bore Arms, which did not laſt long; for he became a Bare-footed *Carmelite* (*f*) at the end of two Years, that he might imitate his Brother *John Stephen*, who had taken the Habit of the Jeſuits. *Puteanus* ſpeaks alſo of two other Sons, of which one called *Juſtus*, was Secretary to the Arch-biſhop of *Compſa*, Apoſtolical Nuncio; the other, nam'd *Maximilian*, ſtudy'd at home (*g*).

(*C*) *He dy'd in the Year* 1646.] Mr. *Bullart* doth not ſuppoſe this, for (*h*) he ſays that *Puteanus*, born on the fourth of *November*, 1574. Dy'd, aged ſeventy Years, after he had been Profeſſor of Hiſtory at *Louvain* near forty Years. This is to ſay downright, that he dy'd in 1644. *Lorenzo Craſſo* (*i*) is much in the wrong in placing his Death in 1624; he is miſtaken for want of giving ſufficient Attention to theſe Words of *Ghilini*; (*k*) *L'anno* M. DC. XXIV. *fù il Puteani da malattia oppreſſo, percio ſcriſſe queſto Epitaffio da metterſi ſopra la ſua ſepoltura.* 'Tis plain that this only ſignifies, that he was very ill then. The Sieur *Witt* (*l*) places *Puteanus*'s Death in the Year 1646, and the ſeventy firſt of his Life; he ſhould have ſaid the ſeventy ſecond. He places it in the ſame Year, 1646, in the (*m*) Abridgment which he gives us of this Profeſſor's Life. *Valerius Andreas* is the Author of that Abridgment, and therefore we may depend upon it.

Since the firſt Edition of this Dictionary, I have conſulted the Life of *Puteanus* prefix'd to his Poſthumous Letters, publiſh'd by his Son-in-Law, and I find there that he dy'd the ſeventeenth of *September*, 1646, in the Caſtle of *Louvain*.

(*D*) *And of a great Commerce of Letters.*] This appears by the Letters which he has publiſh'd, and yet more by this Paſſage of Mr. *Bullart*. (*n*) *To conclude, 'twas this Learning that made him conſiderable in the chief Courts of* Europe, *and which oblig'd almoſt all Princes, Learned Men, Ambaſſadors of Kings, and Generals of Armies, to give him ſome Tokens of their Friendſhip and Eſteem by their Letters, of which there were found above ſixteen thouſand in his Study, put in Order.*

This Diviſion of his (*o*) Works into five Tomes ſhews us that the ſecond Tome comprehends his Letters, that is to ſay, *Epiſtolarum Atticarum apparatus, nimirum promiſſi*. This comprehends three hundred Letters. *Miſſus ſecundus*, three hundred alſo. *Bellaria*, as many. *Deliciæ adoptivæ*, one hundred. *Epiſtolarum Atticarum Centuria ſingularis & nova. Epiſtolarum Atticarum apparatus novus*, this contains four hundred Letters *Apparatus Poſthumus in quattuor Centurias diſtributus.* A Collection of Letters which he writ to Mr. *de Zuylichem*, and *Daniel Heinſius*, publiſh'd at *Leyden* by *Boxhornius* in the Year 1647. Add to them the fifth, ſixth and ſeventh Centuries of Poſthumous Letters, printed at *Louvain*, 1662, by the Care of *Xiſtus Antonius Milſer* (*p*) his Son in Law, who had alſo printed, in the ſame Place and Year, the four preceding Centuries. See Mr. *de Vigneul Marville* (†).

(*E*) *A Book call'd* Statera Belli & Pacis, *which*, &c.] This Book was publiſh'd during the Negotiation of a Treaty between his Catholick Majeſty and the *United Provinces* in 1633. The Author adviſ'd to Peace, and ſhew'd that the Continuation of the War would be very prejudicial to the *Spaniſh Netherlands*. He ſpoke very clearly of the Advantages which the Enemies had already gain'd, and of the Victories which they might expect. *Voſſius*, his good Friend, and the moſt Pacifick Man in the World; I mean, the fartheſt from certain Authors, who to animate the People to a War, ſet before them a thouſand artificial Deſcriptions of their Forces, and of the Enemies Weakneſs, was troubled that *Puteanus* ſhould bring himſelf into trouble by publiſhing a Work of a quite contrary Nature. (*q*) *His diebus haud lætus accepi, optimum, & diſertiſſimum virum Erycium Puteanum, in periculum, aut certè moleſtias aliquas incidiſſe. Scripſit Stateram Belli, & Pacis, quo nonnullis de partium ſuarum impotentia prelatis, complures offendit. Noſti factum Hiſpanorum, & Principum aures, quorum nec hi, neque illi veritatem accipere ſuſtinent. Itaque niſi noſſem multos ei in aula Bruxellenſi, quo vocatus eſt, amicos eſſe; niſi quoque ingenium, & eruditionem illius æſtimari ſcirem, ſiniſtri aliquid vererer. Nunc optima non omnino deſpero. Utinam non aliud audire cogatur, quam quod olim in ſimili ferè negotio, a Phalaride ajunt fuiſſe dictum* (‡) *Simonidi.* Μέλλει σοι Μ [illegible]. He communicated his Uneaſineſs to a Phyſician of *Dort*, who anſwer'd him, that *Puteanus* had acted imprudently, and that ſuch a Fault would not be pardon'd in *Holland*. (*r*) *De Cl. Puteano quod ſcribis, valde me percuſſit, quamvis tale quid metuerem, cùm legiſſem ſtateram, doctè magis quam prudenter ſcriptam. Accepi ab eo literas, ſtatera jam edita, quam tamen præter morem ſuum non miſit. Eam Catzius Hagæ (ubi impreſſam* (ſ) *quoque noſti, nec hoc noſtro melius) ex conventu ordinum, ubi cum plauſu excepta, attulit, & mihi legendum tradidit. Deus bone! quàm bonus ille Belga, tam malus Politicus. Non hic ferremus, qui talia de nobis, quæ ille de Rege, de importuna Archid. legatione, & ſimilia. Ac niſi amici omnia pro illo, eſt quod metuamus vicem optimi, & elegantiſſimi ingenii.* He adds, That he was ſummon'd to *Bruſſels*, and that he continu'd under Examination; that the Preſident *Roſe* was his Enemy, but that ſome other conſiderable People protected him, and that it was hop'd that their Protection would ſave him. Without doubt every body will be glad to ſee the Names of thoſe Protectors. 'Tis a Part of the Hiſtory of *Puteanus*.

Ob

(*a*) Eryc. Puteanus. Epiſtolar. ſelectarum apparatus. Epiſt. 10. Centuriæ 4. p. m. 10.

(*b*) Martial. Epigr. 13. lib. 4.

(*c*) *'Tis the 65th of the firſt Century.* p. 26.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 27, 28.

(*e*) *See the 28th Letter of the 4th Century. 'Twas writ in the Year* 1626.

(*f*) *See the 55th Letter of the ſame Century. 'Twas writ in* 1628.

(*g*) *See the ſame Letter.*

(*h*) Bullart, *as below.*

(*i*) Lor. Craſſo, Iſtoria de Poeti Greci, p. 193.

(*k*) Ghilini, Teatro d'huomini letterati, Vol. 2. p. 73.

(*l*) In Diario Biographico.

(*m*) In Memoriis Philoſoph. p. 565. Konig *quotes this Book, and yet places it in* 1644.

(*n*) Bullart Academie des Scienc. Tom. 2. p. 220.

(*o*) *Before his poſthumous Letters printed at* Louvain, 1662.

(*p*) *He was Knight of the Order of Chriſt, and Governor of the Caſtle of* Louvain.

(†) *In the* 2d *Tome of his Miſcellanies*, p. 368. Rotterdam *Edition.*

(*q*) Voſſii Epiſt. 199. p. m. 218. *This Letter is dated in* July 1633.

(‡) *It ſhould be Steſichoro.*

(*r*) Joh. Beverwyck. Epiſt. ad Voſſium. 'Tis [illegible] p. m. 111, 112. *'Tis dated the 8th of July* 1633.

(ſ) *This was not the firſt Edition; for 'twas printed firſt in the Spaniſh Netherlands in 4to.*

great Noiſe, and 'twas thought 'twould ruin him. Nevertheleſs, 'tis a Work which evidences that he underſtood the true Intereſts of his Catholick Majeſty better than thoſe who medled only with Affairs of State. They falſely attributed to him a Satyr againſt (F) King *James*. 'Tis affirm'd that he did very great Service to the King of *Poland* *. Thoſe who

Ob amicos quos plurimos habet, nihil illi periculi fore putabat. Sibi addictiſſimum habet, Varambonum Archiepiſcopum Cæſarienſem Infanti à ſacris, Chiffletium Medicum, qui plurimùm apud Ser. Inf. poſſunt, & alios, ſed infeſtum Roſam Præſidem Hiſpanis obnoxium, & pauci ut dicitur, adverſum, qui etiam cauſa eſſe putatur, cur decem jam menſibus, nulla ex Hiſp. litera ad me venerit. Infans quoque Cardinalis, qui jam in Burgundia, non minùs quàm Eugenia, illi benè volunt. Deum rogo, & benè faciant, neque ob [illegible] *hanc gravius animadvertant in virum candoris melle penitus imbutum.* The Buſineſs terminated according to the Deſires of this Phyſician. I muſt not forget to tell you that an anonymous Author writ againſt this Work of *Puteanus*: That Anſwer was entitul'd (*a*) *Anti-Puteanus, ſive Politico-Catholicus ſtateram Puteani induciis expendentis alia ſtatera expendens.* I have a little Book (*b*) which contains *Puteanus's Statera*, and the anonymous Anſwer, with two Letters that contain the Judgment of an *Hollander* on that Anſwer. The Author of theſe Letters ſuppoſes that the anonymous Author was a (*c*) Church-man, and even a Monk (*d*), and laughs at him for ſaying, That (*e*) Courage and Prudence were only to be found in the Catholick Church; that the Revenues of *Holland* were drain'd; that its People groan'd under the heavy Taxes; that its Troops were Cowardly; that its Victories had been rather prejudicial than advantageous; that the King of *Spain* could well enough ſpare thoſe Towns he had loſt; that the *Dutch* got their Victories by Treachery, and that they had given much more for them than they were worth. To morrow, ſays his Critick, he'll tell us that 'tis advantageous for *Spain*, to have our Troops encamp in the Heart of *Brabant*, for the Fields will become more fruitful by the Dung our Horſes will leave behind. (*f*) *Nec minus ridiculus eſt, cum tributis & exactionibus ſupra quam fas eſt Batavos premi queritur, qui iſtos cenſus ſe Dominis ſuis debere, & felicitatis ſuæ ac fortunarum non niſi ſpicilegium eſſe credunt* .... *Verum enimvero, quam lepide fatuus eſt hic ſcriptor, cum milites Federatorum* timidos lepores *vocat, cum Batavos* pugnam ſemper declinare *ſcribit*: victorias nobis magis nocuiſſe, quam profuiſſe. *Illane ſcribere non veretur poſt cladem Turnhautanam & Flandricam? An & tunc Henrici Bergii culpa terga vertit Hiſpanus? Et quando quæſo Regi Hiſpaniarum ac ſuis perſuadebit, Sylvam Ducis, Veſaliam, Venloam, Ruræmundam, Trajectum ad Moſam, expugnata ad Scaldim & alibi caſtella, victam Bercam nobis nocere? Regem vero ſuo commodo iis carere? quia non ſine magnis impenſis ea vicimus. Dicet propediem, utile eſſe Brabantis, exercitus noſtros in ipſo pene Brabantiæ meditullio ſtare & in hoſtico ali, ut ab equorum multitudine ſtercorati agri uberiorem ſegetem ferant.* (*g*) The Author of that Anſwer has been known a long time to be *Barlæus*. I have alſo another little (*h*) Book, which beſides the *Statera Belli & Pacis*, and the *Anti-Puteanus*, contains a Politick Diſſertation of *Puteanus De induciis Belgicis*, a Letter of *Lipſius*, with Notes (*i*) on that Letter, and ſome other little Treatiſes. *Lipſius*'s Letter was writ from *Louvain* the third of *January*, 1595, to a great Lord, who ask'd him, *Bellumne an potius induciæ expediant Regi Hiſpaniarum cum Gallo, Anglo, Batavo?* 'Tis full of Malice againſt *Holland*, and of Maxims of refin'd Politicks (*k*). The Author of the Notes refutes them ſolidly, and calls himſelf *Juſtinus Bonafidius Mont*. He treats *Lipſius* very hardly. See the Complaints the (*l*) Jeſuit *Petra Sancta* made of him.

The Event ſhew'd that *Puteanus* was in the right; for if *Spain* had concluded a Peace, or a Truce, with the *United Provinces*, in 1633, it would have avoided a great many Uneaſineſſes and Loſſes, and would have been perhaps in a more flouriſhing Condition at this time. I don't pretend to excuſe this Profeſſor, he had better have kept within his own Sphere; 'tis imprudent to publiſh all ſorts of Truths; but we muſt not imagine that his Book brought any thing new to *Holland*, they knew well enough the ill Condition of the *Spaniſh Low-Countries*. 'Tis the firſt thing that the Politicians inform themſelves of, in Relation to their Enemies; and the People generally believe more than is true.

However that be, this Profeſſor did not ſufficiently conſider the Words of *Salluſt*, which he put at the Beginning of his Book, and which ſhew'd him ſo plainly the Reaſons why 'tis dangerous to adviſe Princes. They have other People enough to conſult; the Future is unknown to the wiſeſt Heads; and bad Advice is very often follow'd with good Succeſs; ſo true is it, that Fortune diſpoſes of all things according to her Fancy. 'Tis *Salluſt* who ſpeaks thus: *Scio ego*, ſays (*m*) he, *quam difficile atque aſperum factu ſit, conſilium dare regi, aut imperatori; poſtremo cuiquam mortali, cujus opes in excelſo ſunt: quippe cum & illis conſultorum copiæ adſint; neque de futuro quiſquam ſatis callidus, ſatiſque prudens ſit. Quinetiam ſæpe prava magis, quam bona conſilia proſpere eveniunt: quia pleraſque res fortuna ex lubidine ſua agitat.* Princes repent a thouſand times of having follow'd the Advice of good Heads; becauſe things often fall out, which make them judge, that if they had taken another Courſe, they would have done ſome very notable thing. Thoſe they have to do with commit Faults that one would not think them capable of. A good Counſellor does not rely upon thoſe Faults, and therefore he diſſuades from thoſe Enterprizes which a Fool or a raſh Fellow propoſe; but it falls out that thoſe unforeſeen Faults, or ſome unexpected Accidents, would have render'd the Enterprize infallibly ſucceſsful, if they had engag'd in it. The ſureſt way is not to be forward in giving Advice about the publick Affairs, of which *Salluſt* knew the Reaſons very well.

(F) *A Satyr againſt King* James.] The Title is *Iſaaci Caſauboni Corona Regia, id eſt, Panegyrici cujuſdam verè aurei, quem Jacobo I. Magnæ Britanniæ, &c. Regi, fidei defenſori delinearat, fragmenta ab Euphormione inter ſchedas τυ μακαριτυ inventa, collecta, & in lucem edita* 1615. *pro officina regia Jo. Bill Londini.* Mr. *Almeloveen* lent me the Book (*n*) in 1693. 'Twas then very ſcarce, but Mr. *Thomaſius* has printed it ſince in his *Hiſtoria Sapientiæ & ſtultitiæ Humanæ*. Nothing can be more Satyrical; the worſt of Princes was never worſe treated by an ill-natur'd Writer, than the good King *James* was by the fierce *Scioppius*; for we muſt not doubt that *Scioppius* was the Author of that bloody Piece. I ſhall quote one who tells us that *Puteanus* publickly denied that he was the Author of it. (*o*) *Non potuit ſatyricorum manus effugere Jacobus Britanniæ Rex, utut doctiſſimus & laudatiſſimus Princeps: cui ſub ſpecie Panegyrici Poſtumi à Caſaubono ſcripti, cujus quaſi fragmenta inter ſchedas ejus reperta, per inſignem nequitiam, continuo myc̄teriſmo horrenda flagitia objiciuntur. Lepide alioquin ſcriptus liber eſt; cui titulus,* Caſauboni Corona Regia, &c. ..... *Refertur in Georgii Richteri vitâ Epiſtolis ejus præfixâ pag.* 21. *è Colloquio cum Erycio Puteano accepiſſe Richterum, quod Puteanus ejus libelli autor habitus fuerit: cujus rei verò famam ille invixè declinans velut Apologiæ loco ſcriptum quoddam exhibuerit, cui nomen, Perjurium* RUFFI & GIBBOSI, *præfatus, quo delatorum ſuorum virulentiæ ac ſiniſteritati ſatis fuiſſe obviatum exiſtimaverit.* Theſe Words of Mr. *Morhoff* were not rightly underſtood in the Extract that was given of his Book. (*p*) "We may put into this Claſs alſo, "the Satyrs which attack the Honour of the moſt virtuous Perſons, as that which is called *Caſauboni Corona Regia*, &c. which was attributed without any Reaſon to Mr. *Du Puy*, and which lays enormous Crimes to the Charge of *James* the Firſt, King of *England*, from which Mr. *Du Puy* has ſufficiently clear'd him in his *Perjurium Ruffi & Gibboſi*." Here are two Faults. I. Without doubt the Author of this Extract thought that *Erycius Puteanus* was the famous *Peter du Puy*, whoſe Life was written by Mr. *Rigault*. When one ſays Mr. *Du Puy*, without any Addition, ſpeaking of Books and Learned Men, he ought to mean him who was the King of *France*'s Librarian, that wonderful Man who, together with his Brother, afforded ſuch Aſſiſtance to Men of Letters, and who held ſuch learned Conferences. II. 'Tis not true that the Author, of whom *Morhoff* ſpeaks, juſtifies King *James* from thoſe egregious Crimes which are imputed to him in that Satyr; he only juſtified himſelf from having writ that wicked Libel, and ſhew'd the Malice of thoſe that ſlander'd him. We will quote a curious Paſſage. (*q*) *They attribute to* John Barclay *a very biting Satyr writ againſt* James, *King of* Great Britain, *call'd* Corona Regia; *in which, under the ſpecious Title of Panegyrick, he very briskly attacks the Reign of* Henry VIII. *the Birth and Celibacy of Queen* Elizabeth, *but eſpecially the Birth and Actions of* James, whom

---

(*a*) See the Anti of Mr. Baillet, tom. 2. p. 156.

(*b*) Printed Cosmopoli, apud Bravium patriæ veritatis & pacis amantissimum, in 12mo.

(*c*) Impense cavet, ne alius esse videatur quam ex sacrorum ordine. Barlæus Epist. 514. p. 458. Tom. 1.

(*d*) Videtur cucullus galeam induisse, aut galea cucullum, ita amice conjurant, & ex eodem ore jam Theologo jam milite digna audis. Idem Ep. 212. p. 451.

(*e*) In Principe Auriaco nec fortitudinem, nec prudentiam agnoscit, hac fretus ratione, quia Catholicus non est. Audi verba: Ad. num 90. In sola Ecclesia Catholica vera est fortitudo & prudentia. Id. Ib. p. 452.

(*f*) Id. Ib. p. 454.

(*g*) *These two Letters are the* 213, *and the* 214*th of* Barlæus.

(*h*) *Printed at* Leyden. Elzevir, 1633. *in* 12*mo.*

(*i*) Notæ [illegible] politicæ [illegible] Justi Lipsii Epistolam.

This Letter of Lipsius had been answer'd before in the year 1618, by John Gael, *Advocate at the* Hague. (*l*) *In the Remark B of the* Article Lipsius.

* *See the Remark H.*

(*m*) Sallust. Orat. 2. ad Cæsarem de republ. ordinanda, init. p. m. 55.

(*n*) *'Tis a Book in* 12mo *of* 127 *Pages.*

(*o*) Morhofii Polyhist. l. 1. c. 8. p. 78.

(*p*) Bibliotheque universelle, tom. 13. p. 23.

(*q*) Bullart, *Academy of Sciences, tom.* 1. *p.* 198.

who would ſee the Praiſes which ſeveral learned Men have given him, and the Honours which ſome Princes did him, need only read the *Cenſura* of (G) Sir *Thomas Pope Blount*, and the *Academy* (H) of *Bullart* *. One of the principal Friends he had at *Milan* was Secretary of the Council, whoſe Name was *John Baptiſt Saccus*. I ſhall ſpeak ſomething of the manner after which *Puteanus* educated (I) a young Girl in whom that Friend had ſome Intereſt. As ſhe was an *Italian*, he did not permit her to follow the *Flemiſh* Cuſtoms,

* See alſo Mr. Baillet, Jugemens des Savans, tom. 3. n. 653. p. 26.

whom he mauls by a Diſcourſe as ingenious as it is injurious. Curioſity has carry'd that Book over all Europe, and that Prince finding himſelf Painted in ſuch black Colours, got all his Allies to make a ſtrict Enquiry after the Author. And there being ſome Suſpicion of Erycius Puteanus, *Profeſſor of Eloquence in the Univerſity of* Louvain, *the Arch-Duke* Albert *cauſ'd an Information to be brought againſt him, but he was found innocent.*

(G) *The Cenſure of Sir* Thomas Pope Blount.] But blot out theſe Words. (a) *Inter præcipua Galliæ ornamenta dum viveret, merito ſuo ſemper habitus eſt* Erycius Puteanus. They are quoted from *Caſaubon's* Preface to the *Hiſtoria Auguſta*; but 1. our *Puteanus* was not a *Frenchman*. 2. He was not very much known when *Caſaubon* publiſh'd that Book (b). 3. He lived more than forty Years ſince that Book of *Caſaubon's* was publiſh'd.

(H) *And the* Academy *of* Bullart.] You'll find this there. (c) "'Twas this great Learning which having " gain'd the Heart of *Urbane* VIII. inclin'd him to " ſend him his Picture, in a Gold Medal of great " weight, and ſome Copies of his Works. 'Twas the " ſame Learning that oblig'd the Cardinal *Frederic Borromeo* to receive him into his Palace when he re" turn'd to *Milan*, and to give him part of the Re" licks of his Uncle St. *Charles Borromeo*, which that " learned Man gave to the Collegiate Church of St. *Peter* in *Louvain*. 'Twas this Learning that made him " be tenderly belov'd by the Count *de Fuentes*, Gover" nor of *Milan*, and after that by the Arch-duke *Albert*, who when he had plac'd him in the Chair of " *Juſtus Lipſius*, receiv'd him alſo with Honour into the " Number of his Counſellors. To conclude, 'twas " his Learning that made him conſiderable in ſeveral " Courts of *Europe* (d)...... He had the Honour to " ſave the King of *Poland's* Life, by the explaining of " an Enigmatical Writing form'd in unknown Cha" racters, which no body could either read or under" ſtand, and which contain'd a deteſtable and horrid " Conſpiracy againſt that Prince.

We find the following Words relating to this laſt Head, at the beginning of his Poſthumous Letters. (e) *Ejus ingenio ac ſolertia conjurationem Polonicam detectam & ſic impeditam fuiſſe tanti momenti fuit ut omne præmium ſuperarit. Verba Patris* HERMANNI HUGONIS *qui Marchioni* SPINOLÆ *à ſacris confeſſionibus erat, æſtimanda hic ſunt*: mea cautio erit, ut REX POLONIÆ ſciat, cui ſalutem debeat ſuam, ut PHARAONIS liberalitatem imitetur in JOSEPHUM aut ASSUERI gratitudinem in MARDOCHÆUM. POLONIA *quidem recepit hoc ab illo beneficium, ſed in univerſum orbem Chriſtianum extenſum eſt, quod quale quantumque ſit* BOHEMIA & *turbæ inde natæ ſatis declararunt.*

(I) *After which* Puteanus *educated a young Girl.*] He writ to his Friend that he would not ſuffer her to let her ſelf be kiſs'd; that, ſays he, is dangerous for *Italian* Girls. Our *Flemiſh* ones may do it without any hazard or detriment; they don't underſtand that there are any Love-Leſſons in Ogling and Kiſſes; but thoſe of your Country know very well the Conſequences of it, and for this Reaſon I have taught her our Language, and all our Cuſtoms, except that of kiſſing. Perhaps you might think that I magnifie this, unleſs I ſhould quote his own Words. I therefore do it, and you'll find that I have contracted his Meaning. (f) *De puella veſtra quid ſcribam? Valet, viget, jam matura viro, jam plenis nubilis annis. Mores & linguam quoque noſtram diſcit, tamen oſcula non libat. Sic eam habeo, uti educata eſt. Scis tu, ut confringi vas cito Samium ſolet. Pudica quidem Belgarum oſcula, ſed tamen oſcula: & inſinuentur multo honeſtius, quam figantur. Abhorrere illa ab hoc ritu debet, & ſi pudicitiæ alumna eſſe velit, illæſum uſque quoque verecundiæ florem ſervare. Neſciunt noſtræ virgines ullum libidinis rudimentum oculis aut oſculis ineſſe, ideoque fruuntur. Veſtræ ſciunt. Si noſtra eſſe hæc quoque incipiet, particeps candoris noſtri erit, & caſtæ immunitatis capax.* *Kempius* quotes this Paſſage in his learned and curious Compilation *de Oſculis*, and refers us to a Profeſſor of Philoſophy at *Leyden*. This Profeſſor treating of Temperance, one of the four Cardinal Virtues, propoſes this among other Queſtions; (g) *Is the Cuſtom which is allow'd to Strangers in the* Low-Countries, *and elſewhere, to kiſs other Peoples Wives, Widows and Maidens, when they pay them a formal Viſit, conformable to the Laws of Chaſtity?* He anſwers, That that Cuſtom is very ancient; but that ſeveral Wiſe Men among the Ancients look'd on it as a little Unchaſte. He quotes *Socrates*, who would have People abſolutely abſtain from it, there being nothing which ſtirs up the Fire of Love ſo much as Kiſſes. He quotes *Seneca*, (h) as ſaying that a Maiden was accuſed of Impudence, becauſe ſhe receiv'd a Kiſs. He ſays, That the Ancients were perſuaded that kiſſing made a (i) briſk Attack on Chaſtity, and proves it by theſe Words of *Ovid*,

> *Oſcula qui ſumpſit, ſi non & cætera ſumpſit,*
> *Hæc quoque quæ data ſunt perdere dignus erat.*

His Concluſion is, That Ceremonial Kiſſes are not contrary to Chaſtity, provided they are given without any further Deſire, and that we muſt not think that every body is ſo eaſily mov'd, that *Civil Kiſſes* may not be altogether honeſt. (k) *Neque exiſtimandum eſt, omnium eſſe tam pronam & irritabilem ad libidines naturam, quin citra violationem caſtitatis, ac citra libidinem ullam, id genus mediorum, officii teſtandi cauſa, adhiberi poſſit.* This Determination, and the Reaſon on which 'tis grounded, are ſolid and good; but what can be more fooliſh than the Quotation out of *Ovid*, for the Verſes of that Poet concern only the Kiſſes of Lovers? This Profeſſor is to be blam'd for quoting them on ſuch a Subject. He ſhould have laid aſide the Learning that is in his Theſis, and kept to the Difference of Climates, like *Puteanus*. Thoſe Familiarities which are dangerous in *Italy*, are very little or not at all ſo in the Northern Countries. This is certainly the Meaning of the *Louvain* Profeſſor; for he had no thoughts of a Farewel Kiſs, or of a Kiſs upon the Return of a long Journey. There is no probability that on ſuch Occaſions he would have excepted his young *Italian* Maid. There were other Occaſions enough, in which he might preſcribe her a particular Rule, and in which ſhe might have experienc'd what *Horace* (l) ſays, according to the Knowledge (m) of her Nation.

The *Leyden* Profeſſor hath not ſtrain'd what he ſays of *Socrates*, (n) *Socrates apud Xenophontem abſtinendum eſſe in totum ab iſta oſculandi conſuetudine cenſet: quia nihil, inquit, ad amorem incendendum acrius eſt oſculo*; for that ancient Philoſopher has expreſs'd himſelf on that in the livelieſt manner imaginable. *Critobulus*, ſaid he (o), *is more raſh than if he had flung himſelf on the Point of a Sword, or leap'd into the Fire*, for he *had the Boldneſs to kiſs* a fine Face. Is that ſo great a Raſhneſs? ſays *Xenophon* to him. "Truly " I fancy I could very eaſily expoſe my ſelf to the " ſame Danger. Ah unfortunate! ſays *Socrates*, Do " you know what follows after kiſſing a fine Face? " Don't you loſe your Liberty? Don't you become a " Slave? Don't you engage in exceſſive Expences to " obtain a deſtructive Pleaſure? Don't you find your " ſelf unable to do good, and conſtrain'd to follow thoſe " things which you would deſpiſe if your Reaſon was " not corrupted? O God! ſaid *Xenophon*, this is to " attribute a ſtrange Power to kiſſing. Are you aſto" niſh'd at it? ſays *Socrates*. Don't you ſee little Spi" ders whoſe Bite is ſo venomous, that it cauſes " ſtrange Pains, and makes People loſe their Sen" ſes? I know it very well ſaid *Xenophon*; but thoſe " Creatures ſpit out their Poiſon when they bite. " Do you think, added *Socrates*, that Love-Kiſſes " are not venomous, becauſe you don't ſee the Poi" ſon? Know that a fair Woman is an Animal " more dangerous than Scorpions, becauſe they can't " hurt unleſs they touch us; but Beauty wounds " us without coming near us. What way ſoever we " perceive it, it ſhoots out its Venom, and perverts " our Underſtandings. Perhaps 'tis for this Reaſon " that the *Cupids* are repreſented with Bows and Ar" rows, becauſe a fair Face wounds us from afar. I " adviſe you then, *Xenophon*, when you ſee any Beau" ty ſtom, which he would not have thought dangerous if ſhe had been born at *Louvain*.

(a) *Pope* Blount, Cenſura Authorum, p. 689. Edit. Lon. 1690.

(b) *'Twas printed at* Paris, 1603.

(c) Bullart Academie des Scienc. tom. 2. p. 220.

(d) *What I ſuppreſs here is found in the Remark D.*

(e) Vita Erycii Puteani in limine Epiſt. poſthum.

(f) Erycius Puteanus, Epiſt. ad Joh. Baptiſtam Saccum, apud Martinum Kempium Diſſertat. 16. de oſculis, n. 6. p. 626.

(g) Quæritur an Adven gibus ditatis, quæ ſem peram eſt ſpecie, bene conveniat cepta ſit apud noſtrates Belgas, que matronæ, conſuetudo, qua peregrini oſcula figunt alienis uxoribus, viduis, & virginibus quando humanitatis cauſa ſalutant? Adrianus Heereboord, Exercitat. Ethic. 43. p. m. 173.

(h) Apud ſapientiſſimum Senecam, Virginis ſacerdotem *ſiccitatis ſaid Sacerdotium* petentis, de arguitur impudentia (*it ſhould be* impudicitia) quod oſculo ſit tata fuiſſet. lib. II. *That is the State of the Queſtion. See Seneca's Controverſ. 2. lib. 1.*

(i) Oſculo pudicitiam virginis delibari cenſebant veteres, unde illud Ovidii. Id. Ibid.

(k) Id. Ib.

(l) Oſcula quæ Venus quinta parte ſui Nectaris imbuit. Hor. lib. 1. Ode 13.

(m) Neſciunt noſtræ virgines... veſtræ ſciunt. *See above, Letter f.*

(n) Heereboord, *ubi before.*

(o) Xenophon de Memorab. Socratis. lib.

"ry to fly without looking behind you: and as for you, " *Critobulus*, I think it would be proper for you to " be abſent a whole Year, for that will be time little " enough to heal your Wound." Can any Morality be more worthy of a great Philoſopher than this? Our good Caſuiſts would not judge it too ſevere, nor find any Hyperbole in the (*a*) Compariſons of *Socrates*. The Maxims of an ancient *Roman* had no leſs Rigour. He had a Freed-man whom he lov'd very much, and a Maid who began to grow marriageable. He knew that this Freed-man had kiſs'd her, and puniſh'd him ſeverely, tho' there was ſomething which might be urg'd as an Excuſe in the Circumſtances of that Fault; but he had no regard to that, nor to the Friendſhip which he had for the Criminal, he conſider'd only the Conſequences of the Puniſhment. It is not ſaid whether he was ſatisfy'd with the ordinary Puniſhment of a Kiſs, which was (*b*) whipping; there is a probability that he was not: However it be, we know that his chief Motive was to let the Damſel underſtand, that even in reſpect of kiſſing ſhe ſhould keep her ſelf a Virgin for her Husband, and preſerve the firſt Flower for him. *Valerius Maximus* expreſſes himſelf finely on this Subject. (*c*) *Quid P. Mænius? quam ſeverum pudicitiæ cuſtodem egit! In libertum namque gratum admodum ſibi animadvertit, quia eum nubilis jam ætatis filiæ ſuæ oſculum dediſſe cognoverat, cùm præſertim non libidine, ſed errore lapſus videri poſſet. Ceterùm amaritudine pœnæ, teneris adhuc puellæ ſenſibus, caſtitatis diſciplinam ingenerari magni æſtimavit. Eique tam triſti exemplo præcepit, ut non ſolum virginitatem illibatam, ſed etiam oſcula ad virum ſincera perferret.* *Penelope* would not have thought this Morality too ſevere: See the Remark K of her Article. We have ſpoken of a *Florentine* Lady who manag'd her ſelf after this Rule, and of a Law which ſuppos'd the ſame Maxim. This Law is no longer in *France*, but 'tis not abrogated at *Naples*. Half the Donations of the Man who is contracted, and dies before the Conſummation, belongs to the Woman if ſhe gave him a Kiſs, but otherwiſe ſhe has nothing. This ſhews that ſhe has no longer any Firſt-Fruits (*d*) to beſtow, and that therefore ſhe ought to be indemnify'd? Theſe are Maxims unknown to a great many Nations, that judge of Things quite otherwiſe, and don't ſet them at ſo high a Rate. We'll quote the Author of the *Saint-Evremoniana*. *A Kiſs, which in* Turky, Italy *and* Spain, *is the Beginning of Adultery, at* Paris *is only a ſimple Civility; and if that* Perſian *Gentleman, who made ſo many myſterious Voyages to get three Kiſſes of the* Fair Cyrus, *had been at* Paris, *he would not have valu'd that Pleaſure ſo much as he did. There are no Viſits now in which there are not Kiſſes, but they are like Mony, which we value juſt as we pleaſe; and as Kiſſes are a Merchandiſe which coſts nothing, and does not wear out, and is always plentiful, no body is ſparing of 'em, and few are greedy of them* (*e*). What I am going to quote out of *Montagne* is not of the ſame ſort, for that Author conſider'd only Kiſſes of Civility; but as what he ſays is an Evidence of the Cuſtom of his Time, I may join it to the Words of the *Saint-Evremoniana*. The Reader will diſtinguiſh where there is Occaſion. (*f*) " Scarcity gives a Reliſh to Meat. " Thus the Manner of Salutations, which is particular to our Nation, takes off by its facility the Pleaſantneſs of Kiſſes, which *Socrates* ſays, are ſo powerful and dangerous to ſteal our Hearts. 'Tis a diſagreeable Cuſtom, and injurious to the Ladies, to " hold out their Lips to every one who has three " Footmen in his Retinue, how odd ſoever he be.

" *Cujus* (1) *livida naribus caninis,*
" *Dependet glacies, rigétque barba:*
" *Centum occurrere malo culilingis.*

" and we our ſelves don't get much by it; for as the " World is at preſent, we muſt kiſs fifty ugly Ones for " three that are handſome; and for a tender Stomach, as " ſuch of my Age have, one bad Kiſs is too much for a " good one". We have ſeen before, in a Paſſage of *Eraſmus*, what concerns the Cuſtom of *England*. We'll ſee here what *Kornmannus* ſays concerning ſome Towns in *Germany*: (*g*) *Apud Germanos in multis locis oſculatum vidi Coloniæ Agrippinæ, Tubingæ* (*h*), *&c. Ubi nefas grande creditur ſi juvenis ad puellam veniens ipſam non oſculetur, & amplexetur: at in aliis locis contrarium obtinet: ſi enim quis apud nos in choreis puellam oſculetur indignata prorumperet. Quam vice? &c. at in occultis & ubi nemo videt bene patiuntur, imo per totam noctem non ſemel ferre recuſant: nam poſt factum oſculum nihil reliqui manet, quod cernatur: tantum de abſterſione agitur.*

The Remark of the Author of the *Saint-Evremoniana*, That in ſome Countries a Kiſs paſſes for the Beginning of Adultery, would make ſome Commentators quote an hundred Paſſages. They would not forget the Words of *Achilles Tatius*, where Kiſſes are call'd fine Preludes, nor thoſe wherein they are conſider'd as ſuch a powerful Bait, that People are more aſtoniſh'd that they are not follow'd by the whole Game, than that the other Advances were in vain. (*i*) Μέχρι τινὸς ἐπὶ τῶν φιλημάτων ἑστήξομεν, φιλτάτη; καλὰ τὰ προοίμια. προσθῶμεν ἤδη τι καὶ ἐρωτικόν. *Quousque tandem chariſſima Leucippe, baſiis inſiſtemus? Specioſa quidem certe initia hæc ſunt, verum aliquid etiam ex iis quæ ab amantibus expetuntur, addamus.* (*k*) Οὐδέν σε ἠδυνήθην εἰς ἀφροδίτην κἂν μίαν, οὐ δέησις, οὐ χρόνος, οὐχ ἡ τῶν σωμάτων συμπλοκή. ἀλλὰ, τὸ πάντων ὑβριστικώτατον, περιπλεκόμενος, καταφιλῶν, ἀνέστης ὡς ἄλλη γυνή. *Quid, quod animum tuum non modo non pellexerunt preces meæ, ut ſemel ſaltem mihi morem gereres: ſed ne ullum quidem idonei temporis opportunitas, aut mutuus complexus, aut aliud quidpiam apud te pondus habuerunt. Quinimo, quod omnium contumelioſiſſimum eſt, e complexu meo,* EX IPSIS DISSUAVIATIONIBUS *æque diſcedis atque alia mulier.* But I may very well be allow'd to Comment on theſe Words of the *Saint-Evremoniana*, That *a Kiſs is a Merchandiſe which does not wear out*. A Man who had not run thro' a Courſe of Philoſophy, and yet was us'd to inform himſelf of the Reaſons of every thing, ask'd a Phyſician one Day, why certain Statues of Braſs bear the Marks of (*l*) the Kiſſes which are given them, and that no ſuch thing was ever perceiv'd on the Face of the moſt famous Curteſans? The Phyſician told him, That the Statues were expos'd for many Ages to the Devotion of a prodigious number of People, but that the Duration of Beauty is very ſhort. He was not ſatisfy'd with this, but ſaid, That the Difference between the Hardneſs of the Braſs and the Softneſs of the Fleſh ought to make a Compenſation, and ſo much the more, becauſe the Kiſſes of Reſpect which are given to the Idols are very ſuperficial, and don't come near the forcible Impreſſion of the others. The Phyſician was ſenſible of theſe two Diſparities, and gave another Reaſon; which was, That whatever the Rubbing takes off from the Statue, is loſt for ever, whereas what is loſt in living Bodies is reſtor'd by their Nouriſhment: That Man was very well ſatisfy'd with this ſecond Anſwer. The rigid Readers may ſay theſe are Trifles, but muſt there be no Trifles in ſuch Volumes as theſe? Muſt not the Reader find from time to time a Place, where he may reſt, I mean, ſome things that are not ſerious.

To conclude, I muſt needs ſay, That *Puteanus* was much in the right, not to breed an *Italian* Girl as they did the *Flemiſh* ones. All muſt act, in ſuch an Affair, according to Cuſtom; neither the Law of Nature nor that of Nations include this Part of Education: The Diverſity of Climates and Opinions is the beſt Rule here. We ſhall ſee in another Place (*m*) what a Profeſſor of *Groningen* has remark'd in a Work, in which he has drawn the Parallel of ſome Cuſtoms, which the (*n*) Rigoriſts condemn'd, and of ſome others which they allowed of.

QUEL-

(*a*) Confer cum Achille Tatium lib. 2. pag. 79.

(*b*) Si aliene feminæ oſculum infuſum rationis ſe verere vindicare, nonne quit illud puncto temporis fecerit, incomparabili horarum ſpatio verberatur, & ſuavitas voluptatis exiguæ diuturno dolore punitur? Auguſt. de Civit. Dei lib. 21. cap. 11.

(*c*) Valer. Maximus, lib. 6. cap. 1. n. 4. p. m. 513.

(*d*) Quia ex oſculo vir capit gaudium, & ſponſa verecundiam, & quod Sponſus oſculando videtur quaſi cœpiſſe caſtrum. Alii eam aſſignant rationem, quia oſculum eſt actus carnis, & pro medietate eſt quaſi corrupta caro. Kempius, diſſert. 15. de oſculis pag. 607.

(*e*) *Saint* Evremoniana, pag. 271. Dutch *Edition*, 1701.

(*f*) Montagne's *Eſſays*, B. 3. Chap. 5. p. m. 171. (1) Mart. Epig. 7.

(*g*) Kornmannus de linea Amoris, p. m. 180. 190.

(*h*) Thom. Lanſius apud Kempium Diſſert. 16. p. 654. *has given the Lie to* Kornmannus *about* Tubingen.

(*i*) Achilles Tatius lib. 2. pag. 107.

(*k*) Id. lib. 5. p. 347.

(*l*) Lucret. *l*. 1. *v*. 317. Tum portas propter ahena Signa manus dextras oſtendunt attenuari Sæpe ſalutantum tactu, præterque meantum.

(*m*) *In one the Remarks of the Article* Saint Aldegonde.

(*n*) *Note that this Name is not that which is given them by the Proteſtants of* Holland; *for they call them* Preciſians.

Q.

QUELLENEC (*Charles de*) Baron of *Pont* in *Bretagne*, made a great Figure, under the Name of *Soubiſe*, among the Proteſtants, in the Reign of *Charles* IX. He took the Name of *Soubiſe* in 1568, when he marry'd *Catherine de Parthenai*, the only Daughter of *John de Parthenai*, Lord of *Soubiſe*. We ſhew * in another Place ſome of the Conjunctures in which he evidenc'd a great deal of Courage, and how he defended himſelf againſt thoſe who committed the *Paris* Maſſacre, under whom he was forc'd to fall at laſt. The Curioſity of ſome of the Court Ladies, in reſpect to his naked Body, which was laid, with the others, before the *Louvre*, has already been taken notice of. The Proceſs of Impotency (*A*) which was enter'd againſt him, and which will

* In the Article Soubiſe (John de Parthenai.)

(*A*) *The Proceſs of Impotency enter'd againſt him.*] *Thuanus* ſays expreſly, That 'twas his Mother-in-Law, and not his Wife, who enter'd the Proceſs. Mr. *Varillas* ſays the ſame thing in his two Editions of *Charles* the Ninth. *Mezeray*, not conſidering the Conſequences, has ſaid of the Wife what *Thuanus* ſaid of the Mother-in-Law. I have taken him up for it, (*a*) for the Honour and Glory of *Catherine de Parthenai*; for altho' a Woman may enter ſuch a Proceſs without blemiſhing her Honour, yet 'tis better not to do it, eſpecially conſidering the Youth of the Heireſs of *Soubiſe*. There are certain Actions (*b*) which are no Sin, and don't imprint any Note of Infamy. However, becauſe 'tis better to let them alone than to do them, they have ſomething which tarniſhes the Reputation; ſo that an Hiſtorian ought to take great Care not to impute them to thoſe who did them not. He is not allow'd to be unexact, and to confound the Mother with the Daughter, or one Siſter with another. Beſides a celebrated Hiſtorian ought to be very exact, he is a Publick Source; he is like an Archive, and has a great many Tranſcribers all the World over. How many wiſe People (*c*) are there that won't think themſelves deceiv'd if they follow *Mezeray*.

I have ſaid ſomething in another Place which may ſerve as an Excuſe to the Lady *Soubiſe*; and certainly what ſhe did againſt her Son-in-Law needs an Apology. A time of Perſecution, ſuch as ſhe liv'd in, was not proper for ſuch Proceedings. A Church under Trouble and Arms at the ſame time, and which is in that Condition, in Order to maintain the Reformation of Doctrine and Manners, ought not, under pretence of Impotency, to draw a young Husband before Judges of a contrary Religion. 'Tis certain, that in all times and Places, Proceſſes of this Nature bring very little Honour to thoſe that enter them; and whether they arrive to the getting a new Husband, or not, they are always an Object of Raillery and Contempt as long as they live, and not without Reaſon; for the Steps they take are ſo contrary to Modeſty, a Virtue which is the Crown and Ornament of that Sex, and without which they can't ſhare in Human Glory, that no body can have any Reſpect for a Woman who takes ſuch a Courſe.

Without going out of the Bounds of Indulgence, we may ſay here of thoſe Women, what was ſaid, tho' a little too rigorouſly, againſt the Widows which marry. I ſhall uſe Mr. *de Vair*'s own Terms. (*d*) *St.* Jerome *ad Marcellam*, ſays that *ſecundas nuptias non appetimus, ſed concedimus, by a certain Indulgence, which is not altogether exempt from Blemiſh, as if he ſhould ſay with the Law*, indulgentia quos liberat notat...... (*e*) *In what Terms ſoever the Saying of the Apoſtle be expreſs'd*, juniores viduæ nubant, *we muſt conceive that 'twas ſaid by way of Indulgence to the Incontinence of ſome Women*, ut maritum potius accipiant quam diabolum, & ſciant ſibi non tam maritos datos quam adulteros imputatos, as *St.* Jerome ſays, ad Salvinam. *Now as St.* Cyprian *ſays*, aliud eſt ad veniam ſtare, aliud eſt ad gloriam pervenire. *There is a great deal of difference between ſaying, That their Incontinence ſhall not be imputed to them for a Sin, and to ſay that it ſhall be imputed to them for Grace.* This is the moſt favourable Judgment that can be made of theſe Pleaders in Matters of Impotency, conſidering the Manner of proceeding they muſt *follow*.

I. 'Tis much to confeſs publickly, That one cannot contain ones ſelf. Now every Woman who enters ſuch a Proceſs, declares before all the World, That ſhe has this Defect: She delivers an Act (*f*) which remains with the Publick Notaries, and which affords a Subject of Raillery to thoſe who are inclin'd to be pleaſant, and of Fear to a new Husband. For if he be oblig'd to take long Voyages, or has a long Sickneſs, how ſhall he rely on the Virtue of a Wife who has confeſs'd her Incontinence to the whole World?

II. The Interrogatories they muſt anſwer before the Judges, are ſo nice and troubleſome for a Woman of Honour, that none can have a good Opinion of a Maid who can paſs thoſe Bounds, and anſwer to ſuch Queſtions. I ſay a Maid, becauſe thoſe who accuſe their Husbands generally pretend to be ſuch; and they muſt needs do it when it is their firſt Marriage, as 'tis generally. An Advocate ſtrangely puzzled ſuch a Complainant once: He ask'd her, in the Preſence of ſeveral People, whether her Husband had careſs'd, kiſs'd and embrac'd her. She anſwer'd Yes. And you ſay, quoth he, That this is not enough; what would you have more? If you have your Maidenhead, as you pretend, you ought not to know that your Husband is Impotent; and if you do know it, 'tis a ſign that you have try'd what another Man can do? He put her ſo hard that ſhe bluſh'd, and ſaid ſhe could not anſwer to ſuch puzzling Queſtions. (*g*) *Erumpit interdum inverecunda intemperies mulierum . . . Erumpit inquam impudens, & in facie erubeſcentium populorum, genialis tori revelat & denudat arcana, & de mariti frigiditate conqueritur, allegans hanc ſufficientem & evidentem repudii vel divortii cauſam, quod ſemivir eſt, & inutilis matrimonio, qui non eſt promptus ad coitum. Eleganter quidem Gaufridus de Heroum villa, familiaris meus, unius talium in cauſa hujuſmodi confudit audaciam. Cum enim ei patronus datus eſſet à judice celebraturo ut putabatur divortium, & mulier generoſa audientibus amicis & ſuffragatoribus, advocato ut ſit diligentius merita cauſa ſua exponeret, ſcrutatus eſt ab ea vir prudens, an alium maritum quandoque habuerit. Quod cum illa negaſſet, quæſivit iterum an adhuc virgo eſſet, dicens: hoc ſibi inquiſitu, & ſcitu perneceſſarium, ne à diſcreto judice caperetur occaſione aliqua in ſermone. Illa vero hoc (verecunde tamen, eo quod ſibi non bene credebatur) aſſeruit. Et ille, an ſimul de noctu dormire conſueverint, & ſe invicem oſculari & amplexari maritus & ipſa, inquiſivit. Quæ omnia cum illa fateretur: unde ergo, inquit patronus, noſti virgo pudiciſſima, prudentiſſima, pudoratiſſima, quod efficacem tecum virum non impleverit, & totius matrimonii jura non perſolvit? Quis te docuit, quid ſit coitus, ut eum tecum coiſſe neges, inter tot oſcula, tot amplexus, qui te pro libitu quoties voluit pertractavit licentia maritali? Nam & quædam animantia certum eſt ſe invicem oſculando miſceri. Alia ſe tenuiter tangendo concipiunt. Et ſunt qui ſuo gravidante calore, ab aere temperato impragnantur, & pariunt. Hic illa tandem erubuit, hoc ſolum dicens, ſe quid ad hujuſmodi captiones hiſceret, non habere.*

III. They muſt reſolve to ſuffer an Inſpection of the Secret Parts. Other Proofs are too weak, for this Reaſon the Judges have Recourſe to this, and order an Inſpection; they cauſe the Woman to be inſpected, to ſee whether ſhe be deflour'd. Where is the Shame of thoſe who dare begin a Proceſs which has ſuch Conſequences? With what Impudence muſt they be arm'd? There was an Advocate of the Parliament of *Paris*, in the Reign of *Lewis* XIII. who wrote ſtrenuouſly againſt the inſpection, and uſed two Arguments, one is, that it is Immodeſt, the other, that it is Uncertain. *This is*, ſays he, (*h*) *the firſt thing that is now order'd in ſuch Caſes, when the Marriage has been contracted with a Maid, who being inſpected, and reported to be an undefil'd Virgin, all the Proof of the Husband's Impotency, and his Condemnation*

(*a*) *In the Remark C of the Article* Parthenai (Catherine de)

(*b*) *Certain Qualities are nam'd in the Schools*, perfectio ſimpliciter ſimplex *Ev'ry Quality* melior ipſa quam non ipſa, *is of that Species.*

(*c*) Franciſcus Quelletrius Dux è Britannia, cui ab uxore Catharina Parthenia Subizia impotentiæ accuſato divortium intentabatur. Huber, Hiſt. Civil. tom. 2. p. 353.

(*d*) Du Vair *p.* 820. *of his Works*, Geneva *Edit.* 1617.

(*e*) Id. Ib. p. 824, 825.

(*f*) *Note, that I do not mean that they make ſuch a Confeſſion in proper Terms; we know that they generally ſpeak only of the commendable Deſire they have of getting Children, but the Publick is not ſatisfy'd with that, they generally put another Conſtruction upon it.*

(*g*) Joan. Sareſ-enſis in Policratico, ſive de nugis curialium, & veſtigiis Philoſophorum, lib. 8. cap. 11. pm. 504, 505.

(*h*) Vincent Tagereau, *Diſcourſe of the Impotency of Men and Women*, Ch. 4. *p.* 57. *Edit. of* Paris 1612.

will give me occaſion to quote ſome Paſſages of a Book publiſh'd in the Year 1615, was the

tion are grounded upon it . . . . . (a) Such an Inſpection is very indecent, and not becoming the Modeſty which a Woman ought to have, and therefore 'tis odious, and ſhe ought to avoid it, there being nothing more commendable in a Woman than Modeſty. Gratia verecundiæ mulieris ſuper aurum, *Eccleſ. 7. eſpecially in her who calls her ſelf a Virgin,* quæ ſeipſam debet erubeſcere, & nudam videre non poſſe, *ſays St* Jerome Epiſtola citata ad Lætam. De Inſtitutione filiæ; *and St.* Ambroſe *in his 64th Epiſtle,* Nihil ſanctius in virgine quam verecundia, *and in the firſt Book of Offices,* Eſt pudicitiæ comes verecundia, *and again, in the firſt Chapter of the Book of the Inſtitution of a Virgin.* In virgine eſt dos quædam verecundia, taciturnitate cognoſcitur, *ſo that ſhe who complains of her Huſband's Impotency, and, in order to a Separation, ſuffers Men to ſee, pry into, and handle thoſe Parts which Nature would have to be hid, ought to be look'd on as impudent, and without Shame . . . . (b) A Woman (ſays* Herodotus *at the Beginning of his Hiſtory) puts off Shame with her Smock. And St.* Cyprian, De habitu virginum, tract. 2. Simul cum amictu corporis pudor ponitur. Pliny, *in the ſeventeenth Chapter of the ſeventh Book of his Natural Hiſtory, ſays, that the Bodies of drown'd Men always float on their Backs, with their Faces upwards; but Women with their Bellies and Faces downwards, as if Nature, careful of their Honour, would hide that which could not modeſtly be ſeen.* Quaſi pudori defunctarum parcente Natura. *Nay, this putting off of Cloaths, and Denudation, was formerly a Puniſhment, as* Nicephorus *ſays, in the eighth Chapter of the ſeventh Book of his Hiſtory; and* Tacitus, libro de Moribus Germanorum, *ſpeaking of the Puniſhment of Adulterous Women. For this only Reaſon ſeveral have look'd on theſe Inſpections as evil, and reprov'd them. St.* Ambroſe *in the ſame Epiſtle 64, reproving* Syragrius, *Biſhop of* Verona, *for ordering that a Nun, who was accus'd of Unchaſtity, ſhould be ſearch'd, uſes theſe Words:* Quid ſibi velit, & quò ſpectet quod Obſtetricem adhibendam credideris non poſſum advertere; itane ergo liberum erit accuſare omnibus, & cùm probatione deſtiterint, petere genitalium ſecretorum inſpectionem? & addicentur ſemper ſacræ virgines ad hujuſmodi ludibria, quæ & viſu & auditu horrori & pudori ſunt? Quæque in alienis auribus ſine damno pudoris reſonari non queunt, ea poſſunt ſine ejus tentari veredia (c)? *By which it appears, That this great Man abhorr'd to hear theſe things only ſpoken of; ſo far was he from approving them, adding, That he had never read that Maids uſed to be inſpected. We don't find that the* Romans, *who were ignorant of nothing that belong'd to good Manners, us'd this means to convict their Veſtals who were accus'd of Inceſt, tho' they were very ſevere in their Enquiries after and in the Puniſhment of that Crime . . . . (d) From whence we may conclude, That the* Romans *did not in thoſe doubtful Caſes inſpect the Women to be ſatisfy'd, and draw Proofs of their Virginity or Corruption, as is done now adays; whether they judg'd that ſuch a Proof was uncertain, and not ſufficient to rely upon, or whether they rejected it as undecent, and contrary to a Woman's Modeſty; which was ſo much in eſteem with them, that the ſame* Valerius, *in the firſt Chapter of the ſecond Book, ſpeaking of* Spurius Carvilius, *who put away his Wife becauſe ſhe was barren,* ſays, *that they would not let her be touch'd or ſearch'd.* Quò matronale decus, munimento verecundiæ tutius eſſet, in jus vocanti corpus ejus attingere non permiſerunt, ut inviolata manus alienæ tactu relinqueretur. *In which they were not like thoſe, who immediately, upon a Proceſs of Separation, order that the Woman ſhall be inſpected, tho' they might begin in a more decent manner with the Inſpection of the Huſband, and the Wife might be ſearch'd, if there was Occaſion for it, without going ſo faſt, or cauſing them to be ſearch'd at the ſame time, and without any Interval, that they may the ſooner be Separated; as if it was a thing that requir'd great haſte, and that it could not be deferr'd without the Publick being very much concern'd at it.*

IV. The Congreſs muſt be reſolv'd upon, for almoſt all other means of diſcovering Impotency are inſufficient. Now no body can comprehend, that a Woman, who hath not loſt all Shame, can think without Horror on the Circumſtances of ſuch a Congreſs; for after the Parties have taken an Oath, (e) *that they will endeavour ſincerely, and without Diſſimulation, to Conſummate the Marriage, without any Let or Hindrance on either ſide,* and after *the Viewers* have ſworn, *That they will make a faithful Relation of what ſhall paſs at the Congreſs,* they *retire into a Chamber, where the Man and the Woman are ſearch'd again, the Man to know whether he hath no Ailing . . . . . the Woman, to conſider the Condition of her privy Parts, and by that means to know the difference, before and after the Congreſs . . . . In (e) ſome Proceſſes, as that of De (f) Bray) the Parties are view'd naked, even from the Crowns of their Heads to the Soles of their Feet,* etiam in podice, *to know whether they have any thing about them that may advance or hinder the Copulation. The privy Parts of the Man are waſh'd with warm Water (to what purpoſe?) and the Woman put for ſome time into an half Bath. This done, the Man and the Woman go into one Bed in the Day time, the Men-Viewers being preſent, who remain in the Chamber, or retire (if both or one of the Parties require it) into ſome Wardrobe or adjacent Gallery, the Door being half open. As for the Matrons, they keep about the Bed, and the Curtains being drawn, 'tis the Man's Buſineſs to do his Duty, and prove his Power, by carnally knowing his Wife, &c. . . . . . To conclude, the Parties having been ſome time in Bed, as an Hour or two, the Viewers being call'd, or coming of their own accord, and opening the Curtains, inform themſelves of what has paſs'd between them, and viſit the Woman again, to know* an facta ſit emiſſio ubi, quid, & quale emiſſum. *This is not done without a Candle, and Spectacles for thoſe who uſe them, nor without very naſty and abominable Enquiries; and then they make their Verbal Proceſs of what was done at the Congreſs, or rather of what they would have, which they deliver to the Judge, who is in the Hall, or ſome other Chamber of the Houſe, with the Proctors and Practitioners of the Eccleſiaſtical Court, waiting the End of this Action.* This is not all, the Huſband is permitted to call the Viewers if he ſucceeds. Here is another Paſſage of this *Pariſian* Advocate. (g) De Bray, *who is ſo much talk'd of, and whoſe Caſe has been printed,* ſiniſtrum tantum habebat teſticulum ex defectu naturali, *and at the firſt Congreſs (having gone thither twice in ſeveral Days)* arrexerat ſufficienter ad coeundum, ac ſubſtantiam ſeroſam & aquoſam extra vas emiſerat, quæ non poterat dici verum ſemen, ſed non intromiſerat, *according to the Report of* (2) *three Phyſicians, three Chirurgeons, and three Matrons, who were preſent. The Judges, without minding the natural Defect, order'd that* De (3) Bray *ſhould come to the Congreſs again, before they came to a definitive Sentence, if he thought fit to do it; which was as much as to ſay, that he had not done enough; and having declar'd that he would not go, and that his Wife had hinder'd him twice when he was there, he was ſeparated for want of a perfect Conſummation, there being no Proof in the Proceſs of the Virginity of his Wife. And 'tis remarkable, that when he went to the Congreſs* (4) *the ſecond time, the Judges adviſ'd him, if he could perfect the Work, to call the Viewers, that they might ſee and teſtify it. By which 'tis plain, that they don't conſider in theſe Caſes whether the Man* arrigit ſufficienter ad coeundum; *but they require a viſible Performance (a moſt indecent thing!)* Had not this Lawyer Reaſon to maintain (i) That the Congreſs is not only *more proper to ſuppreſs the Truth, than to bring it to light,* but alſo that *'tis Immodeſt and Brutiſh?* Has he not Reaſon to oppoſe to the Impudence of thoſe who demand it, the Remainder of Shame which is ſeen in Bawdy-Houſes? *The common Women themſelves,* ſays he, (k) *ſhut and hide themſelves.* Eſt aliqua etiam proſtitutis modeſtia (*ſays the ſame* Seneca) & illa corpora publico objecta ludibrio aliquid, quo infelix patientia lateat, obtendunt, adeo quodam modo lupanar verecundum eſt: *and* Ovid.

Ignoto Meretrix corpus junctura Quiriti,
Oppoſita populum ſubmovet ante ſera.

He quotes (l) alſo theſe fine Words of St. *Auguſtin,* *Opus ipſum quod libidine peragitur, non ſolum in quibuſque ſtupris ubi latebra ad ſubterfugienda hominum judicia requiruntur, verùm etiam in uſu ſcortorum (quam terrena Civitas licitam turpitudinem fecit) quamvis id agatur quod ejus Civitatis nulla lex vindicat, devitat tamen publicum etiam permiſſa & impunita libido conſpectum: & verecundia naturali, habent proviſum Lupanaria ipſa ſecretum, faciliuſque potuit impudicitia non habere vincula prohibitionis, quam impudentia removere latibula illius fœditatis. Quid concubitus conjugalis qui ſecundum matrimonialium præſcripta tabularum procreandorum fit cauſa liberorum? nonnè & ipſe, quamvis ſit licitus & honeſtus, remotum ab arbitris cubile conquirit? nonnè omnes famulos, atque etiam Paranymphos, & quoſcumque ingredi qualibet neceſſitudo permiſerat, antè mittit foras quam vel blandiri conjux conjugi poſſit? Nec ipſi filii, ſi qui jam inde nati ſunt, teſtes fieri permittuntur.*

These

(a) Ibid. p. 58.

(b) Ibid. p. 60.

(c) You'll find in Mr. Du Pin's Biblioth. tom. 2. p. 378. Dutch Edition, an exact and true Abridgement of this Letter of St. Ambroſe to Syagrius.

(d) Ibid. p. 63.

(e) Ibid. p. 123.

(e) *This appears by the Report of the firſt Congreſs, dated April 21, 1578.*

(f) *Then a Treaſurer. See Brantome's Vol. of the Gallant Ladies, p. m. 97, 98.*

(g) Tagereau. Ibid. p. 30, 31, 32.

(2) *This Report is on the 5th of Apr. 1578.*

(3) *In the Ordinance of the 14th May following.*

(4) *This appears by the Report and Verbal Proceſs of the laſt Congreſs.*

(i) *See the 7th Chap. of his Treatiſe.*

(k) Ibid. p. 153, *he quotes p. 157, theſe Verſes of* Martial, *Epig. 35, (and not 91ſt as he takes it.)* Et meretrix abigit teſtem veloque ſeraque, Raraque Summenii fornice rima patet.

(l) Id. p. 154, 155, *quoting the 18th Chap. of the 14th* Book de Civitate Dei.

the true Cauſe why they were ſo curious. *Thuanus* doth not tell us that the Queen Mother would ſee, by the naked Body of this Baron, whether the Proceſs was well or ill grounded. Our other famous Hiſtorians do not ſay ſo neither. However, it might be true that

Theſe are the Proceedings which the Heireſs of *Soubiſe* was to undergo, when ſhe was at Law with the Baron *du Pont*. They would wrong the Memory of the illuſtrious Mother of the Duke *de Rohan*, that Heroine who ſignaliz'd her ſelf at the Siege of *Rochelle*; if it were true, that in the prime of Youth, Modeſty did not prevent her entering ſuch an Action againſt her Husband, as oblig'd her to act ſuch a Part. 'Tis for this Reaſon I took great pains to excuſe her, by laying all this Contrivance upon her Mother. I have endeavour'd alſo to excuſe her Mother. When I ſaid, that in thoſe times they were to undergo ſuch Proceedings, I had regard to the Arreſt of the Parliament of *Paris*, which (a) *forbad, on the 18th of Feb. 1677 the Judges Eccleſiaſtical and Civil to order, for the time to come, any Proof of Congreſs, in the Cauſes of Marriage.* 'Tis ſtrange that ſo many wiſe Heads ſhould be ſo long before they thought of aboliſhing this Law. “(b) There are more Diſſolutions of Marriages within theſe hundred Years, ſince the introducing of the Congreſs into *France*, than were ever ſeen before. 'Tis for this Reaſon that the Parliament of *Paris*, at laſt judging that the Congreſs was an Enemy to Chaſtity, and that 'twas not a true Sign of a Man's Virility, abrogated it the 18th of *Febr.* 1677, by a ſolemn Decree.” Theſe are the Words of an able Phyſician, who had ſaid before, (c) “That the Congreſs, which had been formerly aboliſh'd by the Emperor *Juſtinian*, as contrary to Chriſtian Purity, was re-eſtabliſh'd by ſome curious People of our Age: For 'tis the Infamy of our Sexes, and the Diſhonour of our Times: I don't believe that we can find in Hiſtory any Examples of it but what are ridiculous. 'Tis a Law which offends Modeſty; 'tis too hard and ſevere on the Man. It expoſes to the publick View thoſe Parts which Nature deſign'd to hide with a great deal of Care; and a Man muſt have ſome Witneſſes, which he avoids when he follows the Laws of Nature; for what a Shame is it to ſhew that at Mid-day, which we have a care to hide in the very Night? 'Tis only a Pretence for a Divorce, and an Effect of the Laſciviouſneſs and Impudence of Women. They have produc'd in the Minds of the Judges the Thought of a Trial as uncertain as 'tis immodeſt: Perhaps there is not one Man of a thouſand, who could come off victorious from this publick Congreſs.” There has been a Complaint of this Abuſe a long time. The Advocate I have quoted, and who liv'd at the Beginning of the ſeventeenth Century, ſets forth very pathetically the Injuſtice of this Cuſtom; and ſeeing the Diſorder encreaſe, he endeavour'd to oppoſe it. *And foraſmuch*, ſays he, (d) *as the Separations for Impotency are more frequent now than they ever have been, altho there are not more Men impotent now than formerly, which have been always rare (thoſe at leaſt in whom one may perceive any Token by the Search, whether the Defect be natural or accidental) and of ten Separations we ſhall hardly find one, where they have been able to diſcern an Impotency in the Man by Inſpection; which makes a World of People admire and grumble at it: I have enquir'd with the greateſt Diligence from whence this can proceed.* He obſerves that very few People favour'd thoſe Diſſolutions of Marriages. (e) *Not being able to believe that there can be ſo much Impudence, and ſo little Conſcience in him, or her who complains, that they ſhould demand a Separation without any Reaſon; as ſoon as ſuch Proceſſes are enter'd, they haſten to the Condemnation of the Party who is accus'd of Impotency. And if 'tis a Man, and he refuſes out of Shame, or for ſome other Reaſon, to accept of the Congreſs, or does not ſucceed in it, they declare him Impotent; ſaying, that if they were in the ſame Caſe, they would exert their Strength and Vigour. But, perhaps they would find it a difficult thing, if they ſhould happen to be under the ſame Circumſtances, by reaſon of the Fear, Vexation, Hatred and other Difficulties which neceſſarily attend ſuch an Act, and hinder the Execution of it.* He gives us a great many Particulars on this Head, which are very curious and rational, and which I ſhall ſet down, without fearing that Wiſe Men will take it amiſs; for can any one be offended to find here what a grave Author publiſh'd by Authority at *Paris* (f) above eighty Years ago, and the only Deſign of which is to inſpire Horror for theſe unlawful and immodeſt Cuſtoms. (g) “'Tis a ſtrange and almoſt incredible thing, that ſuch an Act that was blam'd by the Pagans for its Filthineſs, and for being againſt Nature (that is to ſay, againſt Modeſty, which, according to St. *Auguſtin*, is naturally in all Men) ſhould be receiv'd amongſt Chriſtians, and by Churchmen, who ſhould have more Modeſty than other People. 'Tis true, 'tis not long ſince they began to uſe this Method, being firſt introduc'd, as may be ſuppos'd, by ſome impudent Man, who being proſecuted for a Separation, demanded a Congreſs, (boaſting that he would there ſhew his Vigor) which was permitted, there being more Appearance than Reaſon for it. Perhaps it was allow'd alſo, to prevent Women from undertaking ſuch Proceſſes, leſt they ſhould be oblig'd to perform ſuch an unſeemly Act. But it has ſerv'd neither to diſcover the Truth concerning Men, nor to prevent Women from their Proſecutions. On the contrary, they are become bolder, knowing very well that the Performance requir'd at the Congreſs, to prevent a Separation, depends on them, no Man whatſoever being able to do it without their Conſent, either voluntary or forc'd; and that 'tis a ſure and infallible way of gaining their Cauſe and being ſeparated: And which is worſe, they have introduc'd the Cuſtom of ordering a Congreſs, when a Man is ſu'd for Impotency, omitting or neglecting the ancient Forms, inſomuch that Men are compell'd by Impriſonment to ſubmit to a Congreſs, if they refuſe to do it freely, or do not conſent to a Separation; a thing ſo abſurd, that one would hardly believe it, if one did not ſee it. Now this Cuſtom being introduc'd without any good Reaſon, ought neither to be follow'd nor continu'd. *Quod enim non ratione introductum eſt, ſed errore primum, deinde conſuetudine obtentum eſt, in aliis ſimilibus obtinere non debet. l. Quod non ratione. De legibus & ſenatus-conſultis.* Beſides the Shame which accompanies the Congreſs, ſufficient to hinder the Execution, its Circumſtances render it impoſſible, *viz.* The Fear which a Man has of ſo many People that ſee, ſearch and handle him, on whoſe Report his Reputation depends, nay his Ruin or Preſervation; as alſo of failing in that which he has undertaken, and which is of ſo great Importance to him. The Vexation of being proſecuted upon ſuch an account, which renders him the Town-talk, and Laughing-ſtock of every body. The Hatred alſo which he has for his Wife, for bringing him to that, inſtead of procuring his Honour and Quiet. Add to this the Conſtraint put upon him, by confining him into a Priſon if he won't go to the Congreſs, or conſent to the Separation. All theſe things are true Remedies of Love, and formally contrary to its principal Work and Action, which requires Secrecy, Aſſurance, Friendſhip, and a Mind not ruffled by Shame, Fear, Hatred, and Vexation, which infallibly render the Effect and Execution of the Congreſs very difficult, and even impoſſible; as *Ambroſe Pare* obſerves in his Works, Book 28, of the ſixth Edition, where he treats of the *Report of the Impotency of Men and Women*: 'Tis not in the firſt Editions. And a Man muſt be without Shame and Apprehenſion of any thing, and worſe than a Beaſt, who can perform the Congreſs, notwithſtanding all theſe Hindrances; conſidering alſo (as St. *Auguſtin* ſays, in the XIVth Book *De Civitate Dei*, the XXIIId Chap.) that Copulation doth not depend only on our Will, *&c.*

Mr. *Venette* is too much a Gentleman to take it ill, if I believe that what he ſays of *Juſtinian* is falſe. I have heard very learned Lawyers ſay, That there is no Signs of the Congreſs in the old Civil Law, and that 'tis an Abomination invented in the laſt Ages. We'll quote *Vincent Tagereau* again. (h) “Now altho' Marriage, in its firſt Inſtitution, and by the Evangelical Law, be inſeparable, unleſs one of the Parties dyes, or at leaſt ſo as that the Parties ſeparated may marry again; and 'tis not found that the *Jews*, *Greeks* or *Romans*, with whom Divorces were uſual, had any Laws concerning the Marriages of the Impotent; except the *Athenians*, who had one made by *Solon*, by which 'twas allow'd. That a Woman who was marry'd to an impotent Husband might cohabit with any one of her Husband's Relations; and the *Romans* another, made by the Emperor *Juſtinian*, near 1300 Years after the Foundation of *Rome* (there being none before) by which he firſt of all allow'd the Women, rather by Favour, than Reaſon, and contrary to the Divine Law, to be divorc'd from their impotent Husbands, and to put them away; as he

(a) *Venette as below. p. 579. See the* Journal des Savans *of the 9th of* July, 1677. *p. 508.* Dutch *Ed.*

(b) Nicolas Venette, *Doctor of Phyſick, Royal Profeſſor of Anatomy and Surgery, and Dean of the College of Phyſicians at* Rochelle. *p. 578, 579, of his* Tableau de l'amour conjugal. *7th Edit. 1696. This Edition is larger and more Correct than the preceding ones. The Author has added a Preface to it, which deſerves reading. I have quoted him in the Article* Joubert, *Remark C.*

(c) Id. p. 577.

(*d*) Tagereau *as above. p. 7, 8.*

(*e*) Ib. p. 9, 10.

(*f*) *The ſecond Edition of* Tagereau's *Book, which I uſe of, is the Year* 1612, *the firſt is of the Year* 1611.

(*g*) Id. Ib. *p.* 159, &c.

(*h*) Tagereau *p. 4 and 5.*

that she cast her Eyes on those naked Bodies with the same Intent; and there are (B) some Books wherein she is accus'd of it, and even of having order'd the Body of the Baron *du Pont* to be look'd for among all the (B A) rest. I shall say, in one of the Remarks, why I give that Gentleman the (C) Name of *Quellenec*.

The

" he made many other Laws in Favour of the Women, by the Persuasion of the Empress *Theodora*, who " rul'd him, and made him do what she pleas'd, as the " same *Bodin* says in that Place of his *Republick*, which has " been quoted (a), and in the second Chapter of the " fifth Book. However, the Canonists, in imitation " of *Justinian*, have allow'd the same Liberty to the " Women, if their Husbands should prove Impotent; " so that they may be marry'd to another after their " Separation, permitting the same also to those Hus- " bands whose Wives are too strait, which *Justinian* " had not done, there being hardly any such Women to " be found.

The Advocates, who pleaded for .... in 1677, maintain'd (b) *That the Congress has no Foundation neither in the Authority of the Laws, nor in the Opinions of the Doctors; that neither in the Civil nor in the Canon Law, there is no mention made of the Inspection or Congress; that 'tis only practis'd in* France, *and not above sixscore Years ago; that the ancient Books afford us only two ridiculous Precedents for it.*

'Tis likely Mr. *Venette*'s Error proceeds from a Transposition of Ideas, which has confounded the Knowledge of *Justinian*'s Law. He would no longer permit that the Ripeness of Males should be decided by an Inspection of their Privy-Parts. He fix'd it to the Age of fourteen Years, whether they were vigorous or not, and look'd on what had been practis'd 'till that time as a very immodest thing. He thought himself (c) oblig'd to exceed the Modesty of the *Romans*, who forbad the Regulation of the Ripeness of the Girls by Inspection; but they made no such Prohibition with respect to the Boys.

Theodoret did very much inveigh against the Laws of *Plato*, which ordain'd (d) not only that young Girls and Women advanc'd in Years should practise naked all the Exercises proper for Men, but also that some Inspectors, in order to judge whether the Persons of either Sex were Marriageable, should make them strip themselves. (e) Τὴν δὲ τὸ τῶν γάμων χρόνου ξυμμετρίαν δικαστὴς σκοπῶν κείσθω, γυμνοὺς μὲ τοὺς ἄῤῥενας, γυμνὰς δὲ ὀμφαλοῦ μέχει θεώμενος τὰς γυναῖκας. *Judex vero inspiciens judicet quænam ætas celebrandis nuptiis conveniat: eamque ob rem nudos mares, nudasque umbilico tenus feminas inspiciat.* Equity requir'd from *Theodoret* that he should not pass over in silence the Caution of the Legislator, with respect to the Girls, who were only to be naked to the Navel. *Theodoret*, I say, should have oppos'd *Plato*'s Law, as it was thus limited; whereas he exclaims against it, as if there had been no Limitation in it. He alledges out of hand the Saying of King *Candaules*'s Wife, That a Woman puts off Modesty at the same time she puts off her Shift; from whence he concludes that this Philosophical Legislator taught the Women who were contracted to be void of all Shame. (f) Τοιγαροῦν ὁ φιλόσοφος τὰς νυμφευομένας γυμνοῖ τῆς αἰδοῦς, καὶ ἀναίδειαν ἐκδιδάσκει. *Quare Philosophus pudore sponsas exuit, & impudentiam docet.* *Theodoret*'s way of reasoning on this Occasion has not all the Exactness or Preciseness of a strict Logician; but what he says against *Plato*'s Institution concerning Dances and Shews, at which both Sexes might assist naked, is just: he pretends that it was the Ruin of Modesty, and a School of Lasciviousness. Οὐ γὰρ τῷ μόνον εἰς ἀναίδειαν ἐπαιδοτριβοῦντο γυμνούμεναι καὶ γυμνουμένους ἄνδρας θεώμεναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὰς ἀλλήλαις ἀφορμὰς προεξένουν ἀκολασίας, ἡ γὰρ δὴ γυμνῶν σωμάτων ἡ θεωρία, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς ἔρωτας ἐκθέσμους ἐρεθίζειν (g). *Non modo enim ad impudentiam erudiebantur nudatæ, nudosque viros spectantes, sed multas invicem incontinentiæ occasiones præbebant; Nudorum enim corporum aspectus ad nefarios amores & viros & feminas provocabat.* This confirms the Remarks I made in another Place (h) against the Custom of the *Lacedemonians*. But we must say that *Plato*'s Laws were not put into Execution like those of *Lycurgus*; they were mere notional Laws, which, as *Theodoret* observes (i), were not so much as receiv'd in the Country of that Philosopher; and therefore it can't be said that *Justinian* was oblig'd to suppress the Abuses which this Father of the Church condemn'd.

We'll end this Digression with a Passage of the *Menagiana*, which informs us that this Abuse of the Congress was not then so frequent. Those who are pleas'd with the Suppression of Scandals, will read this with Edification. " (k) An Official, in the Time of Mr. *de* " *Gondy*, whose Name I don't well remember, told me, " that during forty Years that he had been in that Post, " he had only order'd the Congress but once; 'twas to " a Miller, and as he perform'd his Duty very well, " his Wife told him, *Jacob*, why did not you do " as well at home, and then we should not have had the " trouble to come here?

(B) *There are some Books wherein she is accus'd of it.*] *John Lætus* Professor at *Franeker* (l) says, that the Queen gave Orders that the Body of *Soubize* should be look'd out, a Gentleman who was thought to be Impotent, and that when it was found, she gaz'd upon his Privy-Parts and laugh'd very heartily in the Presence of many Ladies. " *Subisii* nobilis qui frigidæ & minimè " ad procreandum sobolem aptæ naturæ esse dicebatur " *cadaver* jussit investigari *Regina*, inventum (m) *pudenda illius, cum suarum pedissequarum numeroso comitatu,* " *non sine magno & effuso risu inspexit*". Could a thing of this Nature be unknown to *d'Aubigné*? and if he had known it, would he have omitted it in his History? His Silence will certainly decide the Business so much the more, because he observes that (n) *The Ladies view'd* Soubise, *to see whether he was uncapable of Marriage, because there was a Process against him upon that account.* Mr. *Varillas* would not have conceal'd this Action of the Queen Mother, for he doth not spare her in things of lesser or greater Importance. Speaking of the Siege of *Rouen*, he says, (o) That *the Queen Regent was blam'd for carrying the King her Son into the Forts as soon as they were taken, as if she had a Design to use the Eyes of that Prince to slaughter; and that People found Fault with her for having too curiously view'd the Body of a young Woman who had dress'd her self in Man's Cloaths, to encrease the Number of the Defenders: which shews that People will forgive nothing to the great ones.* Another Professor of *Franeker* (p) maintains, that the Queen search'd *Soubise*'s Impotency very curiously.

(B A) *And even of having order'd the Body of the Baron* du Pont *to be look'd for among all the rest.*] This is an aggravating Circumstance which I won't warrant; let him who vents it answer for it: 'Tis a Protestant Writer. (q) *Rex, Regina, fratres & Regius comitatus frequens sub vesperam Lupara egrediuntur, stragis illius per urbem effusa conspicienda causa. Subizius vir nobilis, frigida & minimè ad procreandam sobolem apta natura esse dicebatur: illius cadaver jussit investigari Regina, & pudenda illius, cum suarum pedissequarum numeroso comitatu, inspicit, non sine magno & effuso risu.*

(C) *The Name of* Quellenec.] So Mr. *Varillas* calls him in the second Edition of his History of *Charles* IX. Now as that Edition was rectify'd, according to the Remarks of (r) Mr. *d'Hosier*, one of the greatest Genealogists in *France*, there is no doubt but that the Baron *du Pont*, who marry'd the Heiress of *Soubise*, must be call'd so. This Name is very much disfigur'd in most Historians, which probably has been occasion'd by a Fault in the Impression. They who printed *Thuanus*'s History, put *Quellevetum Pontium* instead of *Quellenecum Pontium*; hence it is, that *Mezeray* calls this Baron *Quelleve-Pontivy*: which contains two Faults; for *Pontivy* was a Lord of the House of *Rohan*. This last Fault is not to be found in *Mezeray*'s Chronological Abridgment, but only in his large History. I must observe by the by, that he whom he call'd *Charles* in his large History, is call'd *Francis* in the Abridgment. *Thuanus* and the second Edition of *Varillas*, give the Name of *Charles* to the Baron *du Pont*, and therefore it seems to me to be his right Name. *Varillas* in the first Edition us'd the Word *Knellevé*. It was still the Fault of *Thuanus*'s Printers: If *Varillas* made some Alteration in the Orthography of the Word, 'tis likely he did it because he remember'd that several noble Families of *Bretagne* put a K to their Names. A famous Author (s) has not long since call'd him *Franciscus Quelletrus, dux è Britannia*.

(D) And

(a) That is in the third Chapter of the first Book.

(b) Journal des Savans, as above.

(c) Pubertatem autem veteres quidem non solum ex annis, sed etiam ex habitu Corporis in masculis æstimari volebant. Nostra autem Majestas dignum esse castitate nostrorum temporum existimans, bene putavit: quod in feminis etiam antiquis impudicum esse visum est, id est, inspectionem habitudinis corporis, hoc etiam in masculos extendere. Et i... nostra ...fta Con...tione ...mulga... pubertatem in masculis ... deci... quartum an... com... ...um illico initium accipere disposuimus: antiquitatis normam in feminis bene positam, in suo ordine relinquentes, ut post duodecim annos completos viripotentes esse credantur.

(d) Theodor. Græc. affect. l 9. p. m. 615. (e) Id. Ib. p. 616. (f) Id. Ib. Id. Ib. (h) *In the Article* Lycurgus. (i) *As above, p.* 615.

(k) Menagiana, *p.* 191, 192, *of the first* Dutch *Edition.*

(l) Compend. Hist. univers. *p. m.* 424. *He quotes* de statu Religionis in Gallia. *We shall see in the following Remark the Words of the Author whom he quotes.*

(m) *This Word plac'd there makes a Solecism.*

(n) D'Aubigné, *Hist.* *Tom.* 2. *p.* 545.

(o) Varillas's *Hist. of* Charles IX *l.* 4. ad ann. 1562.

(p) Cujus cadaver cum reliquis ante Regiam projectum a Regina ejusq; puellis diligenter, si nota impotentiæ appareret, inspectabatur.

(q) Commentar. de statu religionis & Reipubl. in regno Galliæ, part 4. Fol. m. 39. verso.

(r) *See the Letter publish'd by Mr.* Larroque *in his Animadversions upon* Varillas.

(s) Huber. Hist. Civil. Tom. 2. p. 353. *printed at* Franeker *in* 1692.

The Paſſages which I have ſet down in the firſt Remark of this Article, have diſpleas'd ſeveral People. Tho' I was always perſuaded that they took the thing wrong, yet I was almoſt reſolv'd to leave out thoſe Paſſages in this ſecond Edition; and it was the Advice of ſome Perſons, for whom I have a very great Eſteem: but ſome other Perſons, of no leſs Merit than they, diſſuaded me from it, and told me that the Reaſons I have given of my Conduct are a ſufficient Excuſe. I'll follow their Advice, and I'll ſet down (D) thoſe Reaſons; to which I ſhall add one Inſtance, taken from the Approbation which *Juſtus Lipſius* gave to the Book of an Advocate, who in a Cauſe (E) concerning the Diſſolution of a Marriage ſee'd himſelf oblig'd to relate ſeveral obſcene things, and even ſported more than the Neceſſity of the Subject requir'd. If any one is not ſatisfy'd with what I alledge for my Juſtifica-

(D) *And I'll ſet down thoſe Reaſons.*] I don't know whether any body remembers ſtill the two ſmall Pieces that came out in 1697: one was entitl'd *The Judgment of the Publick . . . . . . upon the Critical Dictionary*, and the other *Reflexions upon . . . . . . the Judgment of the Publick*, &c. 'Tis in the laſt of theſe two Pieces that the Apology, which I was advis'd to inſert here, is to be found. Here follows what I anſwer'd to the Animadverter. “(a) We may add to the three Inſtances which he alledges, what he has ſaid againſt the Article, wherein I have ſet down ſome Paſſages out of a Book of *Tagereau*. He could not chuſe a worſe Subject of Complaint; for I'll ſhew, in a proper time, that I had very good Reaſons to inſert in my Work what I have ſaid of the Congreſs. I might ſay as an Hiſtorian, that *Quellenec* was accus'd of Impotency, and that it was his Mother-in-Law, and not his Wife, who enter'd the Action againſt him. Truth oblig'd me to make that Remark in Favour of an Heroine of our Party. As a faithful Hiſtorian, it was my Duty to Criticiſe thoſe who caſt a Blot upon that Lady, ſuppoſing that ſhe ſu'd her Husband upon ſuch an Account in the Flower of her Age. This is to declare that I don't think it a commendable thing for a Woman to engage in ſuch Proceedings. Every Author has the Privilege of ſhewing the Reaſons of his Opinion; and therefore as a Commentator on my own Text, I might, nay I ought to ſet forth the Proofs of the Opinion which I had advanc'd, and conſequently relate what *Tagereau* had publiſh'd againſt the Practice of thoſe Times: We would appear wiſer than our Forefathers, but we are not ſo wiſe. That Advocate, in the Parliament at *Paris*, eaſily obtain'd a Licence to publiſh a Book, in which he laid open all the Filthineſs of the Congreſs: But great Clamours are rais'd in *Holland* againſt an Author who only tranſcribes ſome Paſſages out of that Book. Is not this a Reſpect of Perſons, which betrays an ill turn of the Mind, or a corrupt Heart? But will ſome ſay, this Advocate ſet forth thoſe things only to oblige the Judges to ſuppreſs ſuch a Practice, which was contrary to Modeſty and ſubject to Iniquity. But don't I declare with the utmoſt Indignation that this Practice was infamous, becauſe it deſtroy'd the Principles of Shame, the moſt pretious Cauſe of Chaſtity? Can any one take the right ſide with more Zeal than I have done in this Article? Beſides, as an Hiſtorian, have not I the Right to relate a Cuſtom which was a long time practis'd in the Diſtrict of the Parliament of *Paris*, and which is not aboliſh'd every where elſe? Certainly the manner of proceeding in Civil and Criminal Cauſes belongs to Hiſtorical Facts; and if there be any thing ſingular in it, many Travellers and Writers of Relations are very careful to be inform'd of it. What a Pleaſure had it not been for *Pietro della Valle* to find a Book in *Perſia* which might have inform'd him of a very odd Cuſtom, as well as *Tagereau* could inform him of the Ceremonial of the Congreſs? I ask whether the verbal Proceſſes of the Viewers and Matrons in certain Cauſes, are things to be rejected when one goes about to make an exact Collection of all the Uſages and Cuſtoms of a Nation? *Furetiere*, who did not write an Hiſtorical Dictionary with Comments, but a Grammatical one, made uſe of thoſe Proceſſes. Did any body find fault with him upon that account? Dr. *Menjot* . . . . who was a true honeſt Man, has put a great many laſcivious things in his Diſcourſe concerning the *Furor uterinus*, and Barrenneſs. 'Twould be a ridiculous thing to Cenſure him for it, ſince, as a Phyſician, he had a privilege to do it; his Subject requir'd or allow'd of it. Now, I ſay, that a Compiler, who Relates and Comments, has all the Privileges of a Phyſician and of an Advocate, *&c.* according as there is Occaſion; he may uſe their verbal Proceſſes, and the Terms of their Profeſſion. If he relates the Divorce of *Lotharius* and *Tetberga*, he may give an Abſtract of *Hincmar*, Archbiſhop of *Rheims*, who writ down all the Impurities which were prov'd whilſt the Proceedings laſted. One ought never to judge of a commenting Hiſtorian before one be well acquainted with the Laws of Hiſtory, and the Privileges of a Commentator. If thoſe Gentlemen had read the Commentary which *Andrew Tiraquellus* writ on the Laws of Marriage, they would have ſeen there a great many Obſcenities. Yet he was a Counſellor in the Parliament of *Paris*, and one of the moſt illuſtrious Men of the laſt Century, as well for his Knowledge as for his Virtue.”

(a) Reflexions ſur un imprimé qui a pour titre *Jugement du public*, &c. pag. 3 & 4.

(E) *The Approbation which* Juſtus Lipſius *gave to the Book of an Advocate, who in a Cauſe concerning the Diſſolution of a Marriage*] *Sebaſtian Roulliard*, one of the moſt learned Advocates of the Parliament of *Paris*, pleaded in the Year 1600 for a Gentleman, who had been accuſed of Impotency by his Wife. She had gain'd her Cauſe before the Official of *Sens*, and afterwards before the Delegates of the Primacy of *Lyons*. The Husband appeal'd from their Sentence, and obtain'd ſome Commiſſaries from the Apoſtolical See to give a final Determination in the Matter. *Roulliard*, his Advocate, publiſh'd *A Capitulary, ſhewing That a Man born without any viſible Teſticles, but having all the other Marks of Virility, is capable of matrimonial Duties.* The Gentleman was born ſo, and 'twas on this Imperfection that his Wife grounded her Suit for Impotency. He maintain'd that he had conſummated the Marriage, (b) *not by the ridiculous Means which ſhe ſuppoſed, but by the natural Effort of his Sex.* He demanded that ſhe might be inſpected, (c) *and for a convincing Proof, and the moſt frequent that can be practis'd on ſuch Occaſions, he offer'd to accept the Congreſs, to ſhew, &c.* The Judges had neither order'd a Congreſs nor an Inſpection, the Woman having declar'd that (d) either of them offended her Modeſty. From theſe Offers of the Husband *Roulliard* drew what Conſequences he thought moſt proper, and diſcourſed at large of the Uſe of the Teſticles, according to the Doctrine of the Philoſophers, and the Obſervations of the Anatomiſts. He did not trouble himſelf with Paraphraſes and cover'd Speeches, but he us'd the Terms of Art with the greateſt Liberty; and ſometimes mix'd with his Diſcourſe ſome Latin Verſes which were very obſcene; but the Application he made of 'em was very ingenious. He ſeems to be all along upon a ſerious Tone, and yet the whole Book is full of Drolleries and merry Thoughts. He ſent a Copy of it to *Juſtus Lipſius*, who anſwer'd him thus. (e) *Ita, ita, venit ad nos libellus tuus, Deum immortalem, venuſtus, lepidus, & pro ipſâ re libellus . . . .* (f) *Sed ò te (auſim dicere?) nequam! Novios, Pomponios, Titinnios, Petronios, quidquid hoc genus Atellanas, Mimos, Satyras ſcripſit, vincis aut aquas. Imo uno vincis, quòd Salvo pudore & probitate jocaris. Quid jocaris? ſeriò loqueris, & de illo quod Græci* Neceſſarium *vocant, neceſſariò, atque id apud judices, agis. Meum & meorum riſum! quâ fronte, quàm ſubſtrictâ aure, Caſſii & Catones veſtri hæc audiunt? . . . . Extra jocum, argutus tuus libellus & in re ſeriâ, nec ſeriâ, ſeriò doctus.* In another Letter he proteſts that he has prais'd *Roulliard*'s Capitulary without any Irony, that he had not the leaſt Thought of reflecting on the Author's Morals, and that he knew well enough that they were unblameable, and of the greateſt Purity. (g) *Ego te, cum Varrone hoc dicam, modo ſcænatili totigerim! ἀδ' ὡς ὄναρ. Joci fuerunt innoxii, puri, & niveos dicam, quia & frigus, credo, habuerunt. De moribus tuis ne mihi verbum, ſcio ſanctos eſſe: aut ſcripta tua mihi mentiuntur, character ille interioris mentis.* Note that *Lipſius* had already begun to ſet up for a Bigot, and yet he judg'd very well and charitably of *Roulliard*'s Capitulary. I don't know whether the Wife's Advocate publiſh'd his Writings; but had he been never ſo grave, he could not have avoided a thouſand groſs Obſcenities: his Caſe, or his Anſwer to *Roulliard*, would inform us of ſeveral Circumſtances of that Proceſs. I know very little of it. See the Margin. (h).

(b) Roulliard Capitulare, p.

(c) Ibid. p. 9.

(d) Ibid. p. 40.

(e) Lipſius Epiſt. 66. Centur. ad Germanos & Gallos p. m. 697.

(f) Id. Ib. p. 698.

(g) Id. Ep. 75. ejuſd. Centur. p. 707.

(h) It ap- pears f- thoſe *Letters of* Lipſius, *that* Roulliard *pleaded for a Baron, and wa* *Cauſe. I gueſs that it was on that Occaſion that* Julian P *Advocate in the Parliament of* Paris, *publiſh'd his Treatiſe* de ſolu matrimonii ob defectum teſtium non apparentium. *See the laſt Pa- ragraph of this Remark E.*

ſtification, he is deſir'd to conſider that it would have been very needleſs to have omitted theſe Paſſages of Tagereau in my ſecond Edition; for his Book is not ſcarce, and is to be found entire in an alphabetical Collection, and conſequently in a Work which is extremely like my Dictionary. Lawrence Bochel, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, has inſerted it at length † in the third Tome of his Bibliotheque of the French Law, at the Letter S. under the

† I came [illegible] of this by Mr. Marais, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.

I muſt take notice, that *Roulliard* and *Tagereau* were not of the ſame Principles. The Intereſt of the Cauſe which *Roulliard* had in Hand, mov'd him to maintain, that the Practice of the Congreſs and Inſpection was lawful; ſo that, ſays he, (a) "all thoſe concurring Circumſtances were a ſufficient Motive for the Judges to order the Congreſs, which the ſaid Appellant offer'd to ſubmit to, ſince he affirm'd to have had Carnally to do with his ſaid Wife, and in ſuch a Caſe, *ſtandum eſt verbo viri, qui dicit ſe uxorem cognoviſſe cap. continebatur de deſponſat. impub.* conſidering that the Man is the Head of the Woman, and ought to have that Prerogative over her; beſides, if he has a legal Preſumption for him that he has known his Wife, *gloſſ. cap. inſpicimus de regul. in 6. cap. literas è de preſumpt.* …… At leaſt to make that Preſumption void, the Midwives muſt depoſe the contrary, and that by the Inſpection of the Wife, they have found her a Virgin, *cap. propoſuit è de probat.* Now this is ſo far from being mention'd in the Proceſs, that on the contrary, after ſeveral Shiftings, ſhe has acknowledg'd ſhe has been deflour'd by her Husband; and, becauſe ſhe pretended it had not been done by a Manly Effort, which an Inſpection would have decided, ſhe would never conſent to it, nor the Judges order it, notwithſtanding the preſſing Inſtances of the Appellant. …… (b) As for the Congreſs, which the ſaid Lady pretends to reject on account of Modeſty.

> " *Ah ſi cubitum locus exigit, omnibus illum*
> " *Deliciis imple, & ſit procul inde pudor.*

"For Duelling is, indeed, forbidden to prevent Revenge by Offenſive Weapons; but not between a Husband and his Wife, whoſe half-ſweet and half-ſow'r Trial tends only to renew Peace and Love. However, in the preſent Caſe *bellum juſtum*, as *Livy* ſays, *quia neceſſarium*, and Neceſſity renders that lawful, which would be unlawful in it ſelf. …… (c) The Congreſs is the moſt uſual and certain proof that can be us'd in a Caſe of Impotency, witneſs *Lucian* in his *Eunuch. Nec inimicum videri debet probationis genus quod ſolum eſt*, ſays *Quintilian* in his ſeventh Declamation; at leaſt the Biſhops Courts in *France* have admitted it, and the Court has Authoriz'd it by ſeveral Decrees, particularly that of the 20th of *January*, 1597. made againſt one, who being accus'd of wanting Teſticles, would not ſubmit to it …… (d) Certainly the beſt Precaution that can be uſed is to come to an actual Trial: *enim de veritate dubitari poteſt, quoties cum incertis experimenta conveniunt, æquumque eſt non ſemper auribus ſed & oculis credere*: eſpecially when we are induc'd to it by a deſire of Peace, which will better excuſe a lawful Copulation, though made in Publick, than all Clandeſtine Doings can juſtify an unlawful Divorce. Otherwiſe 'twould be an abſurd thing to admit, for the Verification of Adultery, the Evidence of one who ſhould ſay that he has ſeen, ἄρθρα ἐν ἄρθροις, and likewiſe that in order to avoid the ſuppoſition of a Child, the Civil Laws ſhould permit the Inſpection of a Woman; and yet, that to juſtifie the Validity of a Marriage (which is a thing much more important) one ſhould be unwilling to ſee, *impactum Thyrſum horto in cupidinis*.

Theſe Reaſons, and ſeveral others which he produces, are far from being ſo good as *Tagereau*'s Arguments. I fancy, that if *Roulliard* had been ſome Months after to plead for a Woman, who had refus'd to ſubmit to the Inſpection and Congreſs upon a Motive of Modeſty, he would have us'd the ſame Arguments and Maxims as *Tagereau*, and refuted himſelf very well. 'Tis the Fate of Advocates, they muſt Reaſon ſometimes after one manner, and ſometimes after another, according to the variety of the Cauſes which they are to Defend; and note, that they quote the ſame Authorities upon quite contrary Subjects. You have ſeen how *Tagereau* oppoſes St. *Cyprian*'s Authority, and that of St. *Ambroſe*, againſt the Practice of Inſpection, and you'll ſee that *Roulliard* cites the ſame Authors to maintain it. (e) "'Tis to no purpoſe to ſay, that his Wife, pretending to Modeſty when 'tis too late, and upon an occaſion when it is not neceſſary, objects that ſhe would be aſham'd to have her ſecret parts inſpected, and to go to the Congreſs, for ſhe muſt be forc'd to it, ſince ſhe has brought things to ſuch a Paſs.

> " *Quam bene diſpoſitum terris ut dignus iniqui*
> " *Fructus conſilii, primis autoribus inſtet.*

"I add, that in ſuch Caſes the Inſpection is uſed, ſo that it cannot be ſaid that there is any Injuſtice in requiring that which is practis'd by the common Law: For we learn from St. *Cyprian* in his Epiſtles, and from St. *Auguſtin* and St. *Ambroſe*, that in Caſes relating to the Defloration of Virgins, Inſpection has been always made uſe of. *Roulliard* us'd a Trick of his Profeſſion. The Fathers he quotes condemn the Practice of the Inſpection, and therefore it was practis'd: He quotes them to prove that Cuſtom, and ſuppreſſes the reſt; that is not fair: The Authority of an Evidence ought not to be cut into two; ſo that here we may apply the Maxim of the Civilian *Celſus*, (f) *Incivile eſt niſi tota lege perſpecta, una aliqua particula ejus propoſita judicare vel reſpondere.*

There is one thing in which theſe two Lawyers agree, that is to deplore the multitude of Proceſſes which were enter'd againſt Husbands on account of Impotency. (g) Her Relations …….. have unjuſtly …….. "prompted her to ſue for a Diſſolution of her Marriage, by reaſon of his pretended Impotency, and other falſe Stories which it had been better for her to conceal,

> " *Quam protinus urbi*
> " *Pandere res alta ſylvâ & caligine merſas.*

"'Twas the Misfortune of the Appellant, that the Corruption of the Age has given a free Courſe to theſe Proceedings, *dedit hanc contagio labem, & dabit in plures*; whereas for the ſpace of 1200 Years, in which Modeſty appear'd in the Faces, and was rooted in the Souls of the Women of *France*, there were ſcarce ſo many Suits upon ſuch an account as there are now …… (h) The Appellant, deploring the Misfortune of this Age, in which the Women on very ſlight pretences get themſelves divorc'd and ſeparated from their Husbands, repreſents to you this Complaint of *Tertullian, Ubi eſt illa felicitas matrimoniorum quæ per ſexcentos ferme annos nulla repudium domus ſcripſit? at nunc in fœminis præ auro nullum eſt leve memorum, præ vino nullum eſt liberum oſculum, repudium vero quaſi votum eſt, & matrimonii fructus*; a thing of very pernicious Conſequence, as well to the publick as to private Perſons. This is what *Roulliard* ſays; compare it with *Tagereau*'s Words which you have ſeen above.

If any Body asks me to what purpoſe are all theſe Paſſages of *Roulliard*? I Anſwer, 1. That they prove that the moſt venerable Tribunals have permitted the Advocates to expreſs themſelves plainly on obſcene Matters. 2. That they ſhew how far the approbation of a great (i) Critick, which I have alledg'd as an Example, extended. 3. That they confirm ſome of *Tagereau*'s Obſervations, or ſerve to give ſome light to the Matter, by the conflict of the Arguments *pro* and *con*. If any one replies, that I have not the ſame Liberty as the Advocates; I reply in my turn, that I ought to be allow'd to mention the Reaſons which an Advocate has alledg'd. The Nature of my Work, which is made up of Hiſtory, and of a critical Commentary, requires it. If any one would now a Days give us a Collection of Cauſes, and go back ſo far as thoſe which were pleaded in the beginning of the XVII Century, he might very well publiſh the Subſtance of *Roulliard*'s *Capitulary*, and in the very Terms of the Author. He might perhaps think it more proper to ſubſtitute the Modern Language in the room of the old *French*; but no body can juſtly blame thoſe who alledge for a Proof the very Words of an Original, rather than a Verſion. This is the method I have preſcrib'd to my ſelf.

Since the Impreſſion of this, a Gentleman (k) of Worth hath inform'd me, 1. That the Baron *d' Argenton*, (l) who Married *Magdalen de la Chatre*, was the Perſon for whom *Roulliard* publiſh'd his *Capitulary*. One may know by that, what theſe Words of *Lipſius*'s Letter to that Advocate ſignifie. *Quid autem ille Baro? te patrono vir erit, aut fiet?* …… *Unum tamen etiam quæro, vel te augure (m) Cominæos nobis radicula hæc propagabit? Cui tamen favere me fateor, ob ſacrum illud nobis nomen. Illius autem miſereor, quæ tua opera fortaſſe Tantali aliquo fato contabeſcet.* 2. That there is an Edition of *Roulliard*'s *Capitulary* larger than that which I made uſe of. Mine is an 8vo. and only of 47 Pages; the other is a large Book in 12s, and contains 139 Pages. *There is in Page*

(a) Roulliard, ut ſupra, p. 39.

(b) Ib. p. 41.

(c) Ibid. p. 43.

(d) Ibid. p. 44.

(e) Roul- [illegible] a- [illegible] p. 42.

(f) Leg. incivile 24. D. de legibus.

(g) Roulliard, Ibid. p. 5, 6.

(h) Ibid. p. 46.

(i) Juſtus Lipſius.

(k) *Mr.* Marais *Advocate in the Parliament of* Paris.

(l) Lipſius ubi ſupra. p. 698.

(m) *Every one knows* Philip de Comines *was Baron d'* Argenton.

the Word *Separation*. No body found fault with him for having adopted the whole Book of *Tagereau*; why then ſhould I be blam'd for quoting only ſome Paſſages out of it? If it be ſaid that People are more nice now than they were then, I ſhall refute this Objection in an Explication at the End of this Work, and in the mean time I ſhall obſerve, that I have acquainted my Readers, that the Book I have quoted was printed in the Year 1612. Ought any one to be ſurpriz'd or offended becauſe the Style of ſuch a Work is not faſhionable? I add, that Obſcenities take Place even now in Cauſes of this Nature (*F*) in a full Court; and that the Judges, tho' they are Divines, don't reform that Uſage: they cannot do it. See the Margin β.

As the Epoch of Cuſtoms that have ſomething particular and extravagant in them, is a thing that the Curious are glad to know, I thought it not improper to ſet down here what Authors have told us (*G*) concerning the Epoch of the *Congreſs*.

QUETIF

139 a Sonnet by the Author, and in another Page without any number this Epigram.

Ad Lectorem.

Hæc ſi ſcripta putes parum ſeverè
Fruſtra te mihi præbeas ſeverum.
Nam quis ſchemate ni Thalaſſionis
Innumerare queat Thalaſſionem?
Ergo quamlibet obſtrepente Momo
Fas ſit porrigier manu pudica
Quod ſolum datur auribus pudicis.

(F) *Obſcenities take Place in Cauſes of this Nature in a full Court.*] Here is a Paſſage of a Letter written by Mr. *Bourſault* to the Biſhop of *Langres*. (*a*) "I have "often wonder'd, that my Lords the Biſhops ſhould "ſuffer the Judges of their Courts to be Prieſts, or that "the Doors are not ſhut up when a Cauſe is pleaded, "by reaſon of the plain things that are ſpoken there, "which generally dwindle into Obſcenities. I never "had the Curioſity to go thither, but I have heard it "ſpoken of by ſo many different Perſons, and all that they "have told me ſeem'd ſo free, that probably Modeſty is "baniſh'd from thoſe Tribunals. I deſire no other E"vidence for it than the Subject which gave occaſion "to theſe Verſes:

" *Dans une Officialité*
" *Ces jours paſſez une Soubrette,*
" *Paſſablement belle & bien faite,*
" *Et d'une robuſte Santé;*
" *Avec la Bienſéance ayant fait plein Divorce,*
" *Dit qu'un vieux Médecin l'avoit priſe par force,*
" *Qu'il falloit ou le pendre, ou qu'il fût ſon Mary:*
" *Et comment, dit le Juge, a-t-il pû vous y prendre?*
" *Vous êtes vigoureuſe, il falloit vous deffendre;*
" *L'avoir égratigné, déviſagé, meurtry:*
" *J'ay, Monſieur, luy répondit-elle,*
" *De la force quand je querelle;*
" *Mais je n'en ay point quand je ry.*

" Within theſe few Days an *Abigail*
" To th' Biſhop's Court was brought.
" Handſome enough, and pretty tall;
" And ſtrong, as all there thought:
" Having with Modeſty made a full Divorce,
" She ſaid an old Doctor had ta'en her by force;
" And I will have him Hang'd, ſaid ſhe,
" Unleſs my Husband he will be.
" How could he take you? ſays the Judge; my Friend,
" You're ſtrong enough, and could your ſelf defend.
" You ſhould have ſcratch'd and claw'd him too;
" Yes, Sir, quoth ſhe, that I can do
" In Quarrels well enough;
" But truly, Sir, not when I laugh.

All that can be done is only to prevent the Exceſs: But as long as there are any Law Suits about Adultery, Impotency, keeping of Baſtards, or the Reparation of Womens Honour, the Judges muſt neceſſarily hear ſome Obſcenities. (*b*) An Advocate of *Paris* did very much exclaim againſt the Cuſtom of Pleading, at the time of the Carnaval, the *merry Cauſe*, as they call it. But if that Abuſe was taken away, there would ſtill remain many Cauſes, which only differ from it more or leſs.

(G) *What Authors have told us concerning the Epoch of the Congreſs.*] We have ſeen that of its Abolition in the Diſtrict of the Parliament of *Paris*. It may be certainly fix'd on the 18th of *February* 1677; but that of its Original is uncertain. There are ſome Authors who ſay that it did not begin 'till the Middle of the 16th Century, and that the Ancients did not make uſe of it. I have refuted the Phyſician who thought that *Juſtinian* had aboliſh'd it. That Emperor (*c*) "in the Code (1) "*de repudiis*, ſays, that if a Husband and his Wife have "lived two Years together, (*c*) without conſummating "the Marriage, it ought to be diſſolv'd. In the twen"ty ſecond Novel (*d*) he prolongs the Time of two "Years to three, reckoning from the Day of the Celebra"tion of the Marriage. That Novel adds a remarkable "Reaſon; from which we may learn, that we ought "not to force Nature, by a trial that is not only ſhame"ful but ſometimes too haſty: *edocti namque ſumus ex* "*iis quæ ante hoc provenerunt, quoſdam amplius quam* "*biennium temporis non valentes, poſtea potentes oſtenſos* "*miniſtrare filiorum procreationi.* This is all that we "find in the Civil Law concerning the Accuſation of "Impotency; neither the Inſpection nor the Congreſs "appear in it. The Canon Law agrees with the "Civil, and all its Deciſions in that Matter are con"tain'd in two different Kinds...... (*e*) Nevertheleſs "it has introduc'd another ſort of Proof, which is the "Inſpection; it has been receiv'd by ſeveral Conſtitu"tions, and particularly by the Chapter, *litteras de fri*"*gidis*; but two conſiderable Reflections ought to be "made on it. The firſt...... the ſecond..... that "after the Inſpection, if it be favourable to the State of "Marriage, there is no occaſion to confirm it by any "other Proof. This is the Determination of the Gloſs "on the Chapter *propoſuiſti de probationibus*; and as for "the Inſpection they proceed in it in this manner: The "Husband is inſpected firſt; if he appears to be potent "they go no farther, and the Woman is oblig'd to be "ſilent, and they ſpare her Modeſty againſt her Will, "which ſhe has already too much blemiſh'd. But "when, after the Inſpection of the Husband, there is "ſome doubt about his Ability, the Woman is inſpect"ed, provided ſhe has not been marry'd before. The "Canon (2) *Requiſiſti* goes further, and ſays, that af"ter an Inſpection favourable to the Husband, he can"not be unmarry'd tho' he ſhould confeſs his Impo"tency..... Theſe are all the Proofs that we find in "the Civil and Canon Laws concerning the Accuſations "of Impotency. In the Civil Law the *Triennium*; in "the Canon Law the Affirmation of the Parties, with "that of ſeven of their Relations, and at the utmoſt "Extremity the Inſpection of the Parties; the Laws "require no more, do not in the leaſt mention the "Congreſs....... (*f*) The Congreſs, without doubt, "owes its Original to ſome raſh young Fellow, who "demanding it, the Judges being ſurpriz'd at the No"velty of the thing, thought at firſt that he ought not "to be refus'd; ſo that as one Precedent gives occaſion "for another, the Error of the Congreſs was inſenſibly "eſtabliſh'd. Thus all the Authors (3) who have treat"ed of this Matter ſpeak of it, and among the reſt *An*"*tony Hotman* a famous Advocate in the Parliament "of *Paris*, towards the end of the laſt Century. He "ſays that that Practice was not eſtabliſh'd when he "writ, but forty Years before...... The Books of the "Ancients furniſh us but with two Examples to ſup"port it, and they are both equally Ridiculous; one is "in *Lucian*, who tells us that one *Bagoas* deſiring to "be admitted into an Aſſembly of Philoſophers, as "ſome doubted whether he was a Man, ſome body ſaid "that he ſhould make ſuch a Trial: a Propoſal be"coming the Impudence with which that Author ſo "often reproaches the falſe Philoſophers. The other "Example is in *Peter Ancharanus*, on the Chapter *Litteræ* "(4) where he ſays, that a certain Official of *Venice*, to "try an impotent Man, ſhut him up with a debauch'd "Woman, on whoſe Report he unmarry'd him. *An*"*charanus* does not ſay that this is an Example to be "imitated; neither was it follow'd in his Country, nor "in any other Parts of *Italy* no more than in *Spain* or "the *Netherlands*. All Nations allow only of Inſpecti"on in a Cauſe about Impotency; and we don't find by "the Writings of their Lawyers that the Congreſs is in "uſe among them".

The

β *The Bibliotheque of the French Law, written by Bouchel, was reprinted at Paris in 1667. See the* Journal des Savans *of the 16th of May 1667, p.m. 196.*

(*a*) Bourſault, Lettres nouvelles, *p.* 173, 174. Dutch *Edition.*

(*b*) *Call'd* Martin Huſſon. *See his Book* de Advocato, *printed at* Paris *in* 1666: *the* Journal des Savans *of the 25th of* Apr. 1666, *ſpeaks of it, p.* 178. Dutch *Edition.*

(*c*) [illegible]

(*d*) [illegible]

(*e*) Journal du Palais, Ib. p. 24.

(2) [illegible] 33.

(*f*) Ib. p. 25.

(3) Vincent Tagereau. Antony Hotman. Peleus. Anne Robert.

(4) [illegible]

(*c*) Journal du Palais, *5th Part, p.* 23. (1) *L.* 10.

QUETIF (JAMES) a *Pariſian*, and a Monk of the Order of St. *Dominick*, was accounted a learned Man. He publiſh'd (*Z*) ſome Books, and had ſpent a great deal of time in compoſing the *Bibliotheque* of the Writers of his Order, when he dy'd at *Paris* in the Convent of the *Reforme*, in St. *Honore* Street, the 2d of *March* 1698, being 80 Years of Age*.

QUILLET (CLAUDIUS) a Native of *Chinon* in *Touraine*, was one of the good *Latin* Poets of the XVII. Century. I have mention'd in another †a Place the Occaſion which oblig'd him to retire into *Italy*. I now add *a, that being at *Rome*, and frequenting the Houſe of the *French* Ambaſſador, who was the Mareſchal *d'Eſtrées*, he was made Secretary (*A*) of the Embaſſy. I don't know for what Reaſon he was angry with Cardinal *Mazarin*; but 'tis certain that he ſpoke (*B*) very ill of that Eminence in a Poem which he publiſh'd in the Year 1655. The Cardinal receiv'd the Inſult with a great deal of Mildneſs, and was ſo eaſily ſatisfy'd with (*C*) the Excuſes of the Author, that he promiſed him an Abby. The Poem I ſpeak of contains ſome things (*D*) which Mr. *Baillet* condemns very

The Chronological Calculation that we have juſt now ſeen, as taken from a Book of *Antony Hotman*, is more indeterminate than 'tis reported to be. Theſe are the Words of that Author. (*a*) *The Argument which is taken from the Practice of times paſt, to Authorize the Congreſs, cannot be trac'd up farther than thirty or thirty five Years. And there is a great deal of Probability that it was introduc'd not ſo much by an Order of the Judges, as by the Conſent of the Parties offering to do it; in which Caſe 'tis ſaid*, nullas eſſe judicis partes. l. ſi convenerit. De jud. *And this Practice (with Submiſſion to better Judgments) ought not to be authoriz'd by Cuſtom; on the contrary, if it has been tolerated in former times, 'tis better to amend it, as has been done in ſeveral like Caſes.* As for the Congreſs, ſays he, in another Place (*b*), "Introduced about 35 or 40 Years ago, altho' it ſeems at "firſt ſight that it may ſerve for the clearing up the "Truth, in a Cauſe of a Man's Impotency, and (as we "may ſay) rectifie the Fault which might have been "made in the Inſpection; nevertheleſs the Action being "duly conſider'd, is not only Immodeſt and Brutiſh, but "alſo Uſeleſs, by reaſon of its Circumſtances, which "render the effecting and Execution of it impoſſible". The Author who ſpeaks thus dy'd in 1596; but I don't know the true Date of his Book: (*c*) I have only the *Paris* Edition 1610, and therefore I cannot fix the Epoch which I look for. All that I can ſay is, that admitting the Evidence of this Advocate, we cannot carry it up higher than the Year 1540. You ſee that he maintains the ſame thing as *Tagereau* did, he declares plainly againſt the Congreſs, and alledges a great many things which are to be found in *Tagereau*'s Treatiſe. He ſurpaſſes him alſo with reſpect to Obſcenities; ſo that we have here a new and illuſtrious Example of the Liberty of expreſſing ones ſelf ſmuttily when the Subject requires it, and when one endeavours to ſuppreſs an Abuſe that is very contrary to publick Modeſty. 'Tis ſaid that *Hotman* writ that Book (*d*) *to ſerve a Kinſman who had appeal'd from the Congreſs*, and who loſt his Cauſe. *Roulliard* Reproaches him with it in the Edition of his *Capitulary* in Twelves. The loſs of that Cauſe ſhould have been imputed to the Judges and not to the Advocate, who brought ſo many Arguments againſt that new Cuſtom that he deſerv'd the Judges ſhould give it for him. He did not forget to ſay that the Proceedings at the Congreſs afford Matter for a thouſand fooliſh Diſcourſes in all ſorts of Company. (*e*) "The "wiſeſt Men have always been for the mildeſt and "leaſt ſhameful Remedies; whereas they ſeem now a "Days to have forgot all Honour and Modeſty, in or"der to favour a brutiſh Impudence; and what is more "ſhameful ſtill, the Men have in ſome Trials inſpected "the Women, and the Women have been admitted to "inſpect the Men, which has been the Reaſon of ſo "much Deriſion and Mockery, that ſuch Proceedings "have ſerv'd for pleaſant Stories and merry Diſcourſes "in many Places; whereas what belongs to Juſtice "ought to be treated ſeriouſly, and with Fear and Re"verence". Among ſeveral other Reaſons he alledges this, (*f*) that the Inſpectors *have never reported*, mulierem fuiſſe carnaliter à viro cognitam, *at a Congreſs; but 'tis ſaid that once or twice the Woman cry'd out as if her Husband hurted her, which the Aſſiſtants hearing, adviſ'd the Parties to agree and go home together, which they did, and the Woman never complain'd afterwards: which is as much as to ſay, that the Parties being agreed after the Proceſs was begun, and the Inſpection made, they were told of this Expedient, by means of which it appear'd that the Woman did not complain without Reaſon, being yet a Virgin, and reported to be ſuch, and that the Husband was not in the wrong for maintaining alſo that he was not Impotent; and the Report of the Integrity of the Woman was look'd upon as Truth, and ſo both were ſatisfy'd.* He condemns the Inſpection as much as the Congreſs, without making any mention (*g*) of the many Alterations that were made afterwards in the Edict of the Pretor *de ventre inſpiciendo*.

(*Z*) *He publiſh'd ſome Books.*] Theſe are the Titles of them. *Concilii Tridentini Canones, editio aucta, cui acceſſit index accuratus Legatorum, Patrum, & Oratorum, item index librorum prohibitorum, à Paris 1666, in 12. Hieronymi Savonarolæ Epiſtolæ ſpirituales & aſceticæ ex Italico in Latinum verſæ. Item vita Savonarolæ à Joanne Franciſco Pico cum notis. Compendium revelationum Savonarolæ & additiones quibus varia ad hanc vitam acta, Epiſtolæ, diplomata, inſtrumenta publica, ſcriptorumque monumenta, Apologiæ, &c. referuntur* (*h*), at *Paris* in three Volumes in Twelves. *Petri Morini Pariſienſis opuſcula & Epiſtolæ primum edita*, at *Paris* 1675, 3 Volumes in Twelves. See the *Choice* (*i*) *Letters* of Mr. *Simon*, about *Peter Morin*, and this Edition of his *Opuſcula*.

(*A*) *Was made Secretary of the Embaſſy.*] (*k*) "This "Place was contended for by Mr. *de Lionne*; but *Quillet* "carry'd it, and *de Lionne* put himſelf into the Service of "Cardinal *Mazarin*, for want of a better Employment, "and at *Quillet*'s refuſal, who choſe the worſt, as the "Event has verify'd it: for one dy'd without raiſing "himſelf higher, and the other has been promoted to "the chiefeſt Places in the State". Theſe Particularities are Curious if they be true.

(*B*) *That he ſpoke very Ill of that Eminence.*] You'll find in the Continuation of the *Menagiana* (*l*) what he ſaid againſt that Cardinal.

(*C*) *Was ſo eaſily ſatisfy'd with the Excuſes.*] This deſerves to be ſet down at length, out of the Continuation of the *Menagiana*. "The *Callipidia* (*m*) of Mr. *Quil*"*let*, diſguis'd under the Name of *Calvidius Lætus*, is "a very fine *Latin* Poem. Being ſomewhat Diſcon"tented he inſerted in it ſome Verſes againſt Cardinal "*Mazarin*, and his Family. He printed that Book in "*Holland*. The Cardinal being inform'd of it, ſent to "Mr. *Quillet* to come and ſpeak to him, and inſtead of "ſhewing any Reſentment, he only complain'd very "mildly of the little Regard he had for him in that "Poem. You know, added he, that I have had an "Eſteem for you a long time, and if I have done no"thing for you, 'tis becauſe importunate People get all "my Favours; but I promiſe you that the firſt Abby "which ſhall be vacant ſhall be for you. Mr. *Quillet*, "affected with the Cardinal's Goodneſs, threw himſelf "at his Feet, ask'd his Pardon, and promis'd to cor"rect his Poem in ſuch a manner as would pleaſe him; "praying at the ſame time, that he might dedicate it "to him, which the Cardinal granted. Accordingly he "printed the ſecond Edition corrected, in 8vo, at *Paris* "1656, and dedicated it to the Cardinal, who a little "while before had given him a conſiderable Abby; but "Death prevented his enjoying of it long. The firſt E"dition, which is the moſt ſcarce, was Printed at *Ley*"*den* in Quarto 1655, that of *Paris* is larger.

(*D*) *Contains ſome things which Mr.* Baillet *condemns very much*] (*n*) "This Abbot being deſirous to teach "the Art of getting fine Children, has endeavour'd to "reduce all the Precepts of his new Art into four Books "in *Latin* Verſe, Entituled *Callipædia*. Tho he does "not tell the Publick from whence he had ſo many Ra"rities, yet it appears, that for (*o*) an Abbot he knew "more of the Matter than the moſt experienc'd Laymen, "and that he was able to teach Nature it ſelf. . . . . "(*p*) 'Tis ſaid, that there are ſome things in it finely "touch'd; but that it contains ſome Deſcriptions con"cerning Generation, which are very infamous, and "unbecoming a Man who has any Senſe of Modeſty,

SINCE

---

* Taken from a Letter of Mr. [illegible].

†a In the Article of Grandier.

*a Sorberiana p. 173. Dutch Edition.

(*a*) Antony Hotman's firſt Treatiſe on the Diſſolution of Marriage for the Impotency and Frigidity of the Man or the Woman, p. 59.

(*b*) Id. in the ſecond Treatiſe, p. 58.

(*c*) See the Remark B of the Article Robert.

(*d*) Journal of the Palace, as before, p. 20.

(*e*) Antony Hotman's firſt Treatiſe, p. 63.

(*f*) Id. in the 2d Treatiſe, p. 63.

(*g*) Journal of the Palace, as above, p. 20.

(*h*) See the Journal des Savans of the 20th of January, 1676, p. 23. Dutch Edition.

(*i*) At the 241. p. & ſeq.

(*k*) Sorberiana at the Word Quillet. p. m. 173.

(*l*) Page 131, 132 Dutch Edition.

(*m*) Page 130, 131.

(*n*) Judgement on the Poets, Tom. 5. p. 61.

(*o*) According to the Menagiana above, Letter m, he was not an Abbot when he *made that Poem.*

(*p*) Ibid. p. 62.

very much. The Abbot Quillet wrote ſome (E) *other Books, which have not been publiſh'd.*

QUINTUS CURTIUS RUFUS, compos'd an Hiſtory of Alexander. It is ſo fine, and ſo well written, that thoſe are in the wrong who take it to be the Work of an Author that liv'd (A) *in the middle Ages; but there is ſome Reaſon to wonder that no body*

“ and that he ſeems thro' the whole Work to make a “ Pride of his reading of *Petronius*, and therefore the “ Praiſes which *Coſtar* beſtowed on the *Callipædia*, in a “ Letter to the Author (1), muſt be look'd upon as “ meer compliments of Civility.

SINCE the firſt Edition of this Dictionary I have read the (a) *Callipædia* Printed at *Paris* in the Year 1656. This is the Title of it, *Cl. Quilleti Callipædia ſeu de pulchra prolis habendæ ratione poema didacticon. Cum uno & (b) altero ejuſdem Authoris carmine.* The Preface mentions the things that were added to the *Paris* Edition, which are more in number than thoſe that were left out. 'Tis a very fine Piece as to the Verſification; The reading of *Lucretius* appears much more in it than that of *Petronius*. Thoſe, who told Mr. *Baillet* that the Author ſpeaks very freely of what concerns Generation, were not miſtaken; but it is not true, that this is unbecoming a Man who has any Senſe of Modeſty; for the Abbot *Quillet* ſays nothing but what is to be found in many Books of Phyſick written by grave Authors. I don't know whether he had any other Maſters, but I am ſure that the Reading of the moſt ſerious Writers is ſufficient to teach one all the Precepts that he preſcribes. He is call'd *Abbas Dudavillanus* at the end of the Licence, and *Abbas, D. S.* in the Epiſtle Dedicatory.

(E) *Some other Books, which have not been publiſh'd.*] The Abbot *de Marolles* having mention'd (c) the *Callipædia*, and ſome other *French* and *Latin* Verſes which *Quillet* had preſented to him, goes on thus. *He had compos'd another large Poem in* Latin, *Entituled* Henricias, *in Honour of King* Henry *IV. but I don't know whether that Work, and his Tranſlation of all the Satyrs of* Juvenal *into* French *Verſe, will ever appear in Print; ſince the Editions of the beſt Poems, written by the moſt excellent Poets, muſt be paid for now-a-days; and thoſe that have been Printed, which are very many even in* Latin, *are ſcarce read now. I ſhall forbear making an enumeration of 'em; the Reader would be ſurpriz'd at it.* I believe the following Paſſage of *Coſtar* is to be underſtood of the *Henricias*. (d) “ I am ſorry you have taken from me the “ Words *Convoiter* (to Covet) and *Convoitiſe* (Covetouſneſs or Deſire;) for I would make uſe of 'em “ very much to the purpoſe, in order to expreſs the “ great Deſire I have to ſee the continuation of your “ Divine *Latin* Poem, the beginning of which you have “ been pleas'd to ſend me. If the remaining part is “ like the beginning, that Poem is as much beyond the “ fine *Callipædia*, as the fine *Callipædia* is beyond all the “ Works of that Nature which our Age has produc'd. “ What a pleaſure will it be for me, Sir, if you keep “ your Word, and bring me four thouſand Verſes as “ fine as thoſe which I have juſt now read.

(A) *Who take it to be the Work of an Author that lived in the middle Ages,*] Here is a Paſſage of *Guy Patin*. (e) “ Are you ſure that *Quintus Curtius* lived “ under the Empire of *Tiberius*? Some ſay it was under “ that of *Auguſtus*, by reaſon of his fine *Latin* Style, “ and others place him in the Reign of *Veſpaſian*, for “ which they have ſome reaſon. I had heretofore a “ Maſter, who pretended that his Hiſtory was but a “ Romance: He acknowledged the Beauty of his Style; “ but he ſaid there were groſs Miſtakes in it about “ Geography ...... That ſame Maſter told us, that the “ Author of that Book was a Learned *Italian*, who “ wrote it about 300 Years ago. That *Quintus Curtius* was never quoted by any Author, and that it was “ a Fictitious Name. That the River *Indus*, the River “ *Ganges*, and ſome other parts of the *Indies*, are mention'd in that Hiſtory, tho' they were unknown to the “ Ancients who lived before *Ptolemy*, who is the firſt “ and the oldeſt Author that ſpoke of *China* under the “ Name of *Sina* .... This is a Controverſie .... “ which I hope will be determin'd in the fine Book of “ the late Mr. *Voſſius* concerning the *Latin* Hiſtorians, “ which is now Printing in *Holland*”. I ſhall make ſome Animadverſions upon thoſe Words. 1. It is not true that the *Indus*, the *Ganges*, and ſome other parts of the *Indies* were unknown before *Ptolemy*. *Strabo*, who lived under the Empire of *Auguſtus*, and *Pliny*, who lived under that of *Veſpaſian*, ſpeak of thoſe two Rivers; now *Ptolemey* lived in the Reign of *Marcus Aurelius*. 2. What ſort of Argument is this? *Quintus Curtius* mentions ſome Rivers *unknown to the Ancients who lived before Ptolemy; therefore his Hiſtory was forged about the middle of the XIV. Century.* Can it be denied, that in the very *Age of Ptolemy* one might have ſpoke of the Rivers and Provinces mention'd by him? 3. Since *Quintus Curtius* did not uſe the Word *Sina* to denote *China*, there was no reaſon to obſerve that no body had made uſe of that Word before *Ptolemy*. Take notice that *Patin*'s Letter is dated the 15th of *September*, 1650, and that in a Letter of the 13th of *June* in the ſame Year, he ſpeaks like a Man who had read *Voſſius*'s Book. How comes it then that he ſpeaks of it here as of a Book that is in the Preſs? For the reſt, *Guy Patin*'s Maſter was not miſtaken, when he ſaid that Quintus Curtius *had not been quoted by any of the Antients*. Such a Silence cannot be ſufficiently wonder'd at; 'tis a very ſingular misfortune. That Hiſtorian has this common with ſeveral others, that we know not where he was born, and where he lived, and that his Book has been lamed and corrupted; but perhaps he is the only Author of great Merit, who has not been quoted (f) by any body during ſo many Ages. *Acidalius* was ſomewhat Angry at it. *Illa autem*, ſays he (g), *vix omnino quemquam calamitas extra Curtium afflixit, ut reliquorum ſcriptorum nemo mentionem ejus uſquam, vel uno verbo, certam dico mentionem, & indubitatam faciat, ad unum omnibus tacentibus, quaſi de compacto ut conſpiraſſe videantur ad ſupprimendum hominis nomen, ad famam prorſus opprimendam. In hoc quis non indoleat? quis non miretur & indignetur?* Father *le Tellier* wonders at that Silence, and takes it to be the Reaſon why ſome have been of Opinion, that this Hiſtory is the Work of a Modern Author. (h) *Hic mirari cum Acidalio licet ſingulare Curtii fatum quod ſcriptor Nobiliſſimus, & nihilo primis inferior, non ſolum communi illa temporum injuria duobus truncatus libris, aliis quoque locis mutilus, plurimis depravatus ad nos pervenerit: verum etiam, quod nulli forte præterea contigit, tam multis ætatibus ignotus latuerit, ſic ut ante ſæculum à Chriſto nato decimum nemo omnium repertus ſit qui vel per tranſennam Curtii hiſtorici, ſcriptave ab illo hiſtoriæ mentionem injecerit. Quæ res, opinor, nonnullos adduxit ut ſuſpicarentur non genuinum Curtii ac vetuſtum, ſed ſuppoſititium recentioris cujuſquam ſcriptoris fœtum eſſe, qui poſt renatas litteras, felici veterum imitatione eximiam ſcribendi facultatem adeptus, opus hoc ſuum Romano ſub nomine prodire voluerit.* It might be inferr'd from thoſe Words that they begun to quote that Hiſtorian in the X. Century; and yet that Commentator *in uſum Delphini* names no body that mentions him before the XV. Century; for *Antony Panormita* is the moſt ancient Author that he alledges in the Catalogue of the *Teſtimonia*, that concern *Quintus Curtius*. That Catalogue is much larger in *Freinſhemius*; yet it contains no Author that lived before *Panormita*. I don't know why the Abbot *de la Roque*, in his *Journal des Savans* of the 18th of *April*, 1678, makes (i) Father *le Tellier* ſay, *That* Quintus Curtius *has not been placed among the Hiſtorians by any Body before the XV. Century*. It is certain, that this Jeſuit does not mention the XV. Century, but the X. I have ſet down his Words. The Argument he makes uſe of againſt thoſe, who pretend that this Hiſtory of *Alexander* was forged ſince the Reſtoration of Learning, is not a convincing one. He ſays that *Gaultier* wrote a Poem, Intituled, *Alexandreis*, which in many places is only made up of *Quintus Curtius*'s Words put into Verſe, and that this Poet lived in the XII. Century. (k) *Quorum conjecturam vel una refellit Gualteri Belgæ Alexandreis, jam inde uſque à duodecimo æræ Chriſtianæ ſæculo condita, ex unius ſæpe Curtii vocibus in verſum redactis.* But it might be anſwer'd, that a Modern Author, deſigning to write a Hiſtory of *Alexander*, and to publiſh it as the Work of *Quintus Curtius*, made uſe of *Gaultier*'s Poem, and put into Proſe all the Paſſages that he liked. As for me, who cannot believe that any learned Man of the XV. Century has been able to write in ſo good a Style, and ſo like the Ancient way of Writing, as that of *Quintus Curtius*, I need no other reaſon to convince me, that the Author of that Hiſtory liv'd before *Suetonius*; and therefore I approve of thoſe, who blame *Angelus Decembrius* for ſaying, that *Quintus Curtius* took (l) many things from *Arrianus*. I know that body ſhould have mention'd it before ‡ the XV Century. One ought to be leſs ſurpriz'd to find ſome incredible things in it, than not to find more of them. Nay, the Author was ſo cautious as to prevent the Reproach of Credulity (B), which he had reaſon to be afraid of. It had been better ſtill, if he had related fewer Prodigies, and if he had oftner intimated that he did not believe all the Stories mention'd by him. I have ſaid in another Place that the reading of his Book recover'd a King of *Naples* from his Illneſs. We have an excellent *French* Tranſlation * of his Work. The learned *Freinſhemius* wrote a fine Commentary upon that Hiſtorian, and a Supplement to the two firſt Books, and to ſome other Places that are loſt. Father *Michael le Tellier*, a Jeſuit, ſhews in his Preface ‖ that 'tis more likely he liv'd in the Reign of the Emperor *Claudius* than in that of *Veſpaſian*. In taking notice of *Moreri's* (C) Miſtakes, I ſhall have occaſion to mention ſome other things. Cardinal *du Perron* was too great an Admirer (D) of *Quintus Curtius*.

---

(1) *'Tis the 250th Letter of Coſtar's ſecond Tome, p.* 598, 599.

(a) *Mr.* Bourdelot *has been pleas'd to ſend it me.*

(b) *Thoſe 2 Poems are an Epiſtle* ad Eudoxum *in Hexameter Verſes, and an Elegy* in obitum Petri Gaſſendi.

(c) *In the enumeration of thoſe who preſented him with Books.*

(d) Coſtar Lettre à l'Abbé Quillet: *'tis the 250th of the ſecond Tome, p.* 598.

(e) Patin, *Letter* 44. 186, 187. *of the firſt Tome.*

(f) *This is more than what I have ſaid of* Petronius *and* Quintus Calaber *in their Articles.*

(g) Valens Acidalius Animadv. ad L. 4 Curtii.

(h) Michael le Tellier, in præfat. ad Q. Curtium in uſum Delphini.

(i) *The Abbot* de la Roque *having ſaid what I have quoted, and ſome other things, goes on thus.* After this Remark, Father le Tellier examins, &c. *Which ſhews that he imputes to him all that he had been ſaying.*

(k) Michael le Tellier ubi ſupra.

(l) Græcorum & Arriani conſtat Hiſtoria, ex quorum fontibus hic ſcriptor .... opus [illegible] excudit. Ang. Decembrius de politia literaria.

Nothing

that *Iſaac Pontanus*, a Learned Man, did very much approve *Decembrius's* Opinion; but he was not infallible. *Nos quoque*, ſays he, (a) *poſt Decembrium aliquot ad varios datis epiſtolis .... idem adſtruximus ac demonſtravimus poſt ævum Trajani & Adriani claruiſſe, & Taciti inſuper maximi Authoris imitatorem eſſe, ejuſque non ſemel verba ac dictionem expreſſiſſe, & uſum ſubinde in vocibus quæ non niſi ab authoribus ejus ævi uſurpantur.* *Pontanus* ſays that *Quintus Curtius* flouriſh'd after the Emperor *Hadrian*: How comes it then that in two other (b) Letters he endeavours to ſhew that the Paſſages of that Author, which ſome apply to *Auguſtus*, and others to *Claudius* or *Veſpaſian*, ought to be underſtood of *Trajan*?

I ſhall conclude this Remark with a Paſſage of *Vigneul-Marville*. Some Criticks, ſays he (c), “ are of Opinion, that the Name of *Quintus Curtius* was forged by an *Italian* Wit, who compos'd that Hiſtory, or that Romance about 300 Years ago. I don't know what Proof they have for it; that which is certain is, that none of the Ancients mention it: But granting this to be true, is it not a wonderful thing, that a Man, who was a good *Latin* Writer, and who had Writ a Book, that was able to Immortalize his Name, if he had made himſelf known, ſhould have been willing to Sacrifice his Glory to that of an imaginary *Quintus Curtius*, who could not enjoy it? A Learned Man would make me believe heretofore, that the Name of that Author, who was an *Italian*, is to be found Latiniz'd in that of *Quintus Curtius*. It may be ſo, but who will explain that Emblem? 'Tis too late now to do it.

(B) *The reproach of Credulity, which he had reaſon to be afraid of.*] I take this from *la Mothe le Vayer* in his Judgment about the Chief Hiſtorians, pag. 204. of the 3d Tome of his Works in Twelves. He ſays that *Arrianus is one of the moſt cautious Hiſtorians in relating Prodigies*; but that *Quintus Curtius* “ is more cautious ſtill. We need no other Proof for it, than what they ſay of one or two miraculous Fountains, which ſprung up as ſoon as *Alexander* had incamped near the River *Oxus*. *Arrianus* tells us, that one was a Fountain of Oil, and the other of clear Water, without raiſing any ſcruple about the Truth of ſuch a Story in the Minds of his Readers. (1) *Quintus Curtius*, who ſays nothing of the Spring of Oil, relates, that as they were digging ſome Wells, they found a Spring in the King's Tent, which having been obſerv'd ſomewhat late, occaſion'd a Report that it was a new one: *Alexander* (d) himſelf being not unwilling that People ſhould believe it was a Divine Favour, and a Gift from Heaven. That I may clearly ſhew with what Circumſpection that Hiſtorian uſed to relate things, the Truth of which might be queſtion'd, I ſhall ſet down the Words which follow the Account he gives of a Dog, who ſuffer'd all his Limbs to be cut to pieces, rather than to let go his hold of a Lion. (2) *Equidem*, ſays he, *plura tranſcribo, quàm credo. Nam nec affirmare ſuſtineo de quibus dubito, nec ſubducere quæ accepi.* Theſe Words muſt be applied to that Paſſage of the ſame Book, wherein 'tis ſaid, that during *Ptolemy's* Sickneſs, a Serpent ſhew'd *Alexander* in his ſoundeſt Sleep the Herb that might cure him. For when an Hiſtorian makes it appear that he does not deſign to impoſe upon the Credulity of his Readers, he may write any thing, as I have already ſaid, ſpeaking of *Livy*.

(C) *In taking notice of* Moreri's *Miſtakes, I ſhall have occaſion*] I. He had no good reaſon to repreſent *Quintus Curtius* as a *Roman* Knight. That Title is not given to *Quintus Curtius* mention'd by *Cicero*, nor to *Quintus Curtius* mention'd by *Tacitus*, nor to *Quintus Curtius* ſpoken of by *Suetonius*, who are three Perſons, one of whom was our Hiſtorian, as ſome Learned Men will have it. II. The Excellency of his Style is not a good reaſon to doubt *whether he is not more ancient than* Livy; on the contrary it may move one to think that he did not live before *Livy*, but at the ſame time. It is an eaſier thing to find a harſh Style beyond *Livy's* time, than in the Age wherein he lived. Is it not the Golden Age of the *Latin* Style? III. 'Tis not true, that *Quintus Curtius*, in the 10th Book, or elſewhere, makes *a Digreſſion about the Facility of his Age*. *Moreri* ſhould have ſaid *about the Felicity*. I take notice of this only to ſhew his Careleſſneſs: He tranſcrib'd without any Judgment even the Faults of Impreſſion. This had crept (e) into a Paſſage of *la Mothe le Vayer*, and he faithfully tranſcrib'd it, tho' it was an eaſie thing to perceive how it was to be mended. IV. *Suetonius* does not ſay that *Quintus Curtius Rufus, a great Rhetor*, liv'd in *Tiberius's* time. What he ſaid concerning that Rhetor is not extant, and 'tis only by a Liſt which was found in a Manuſcript that we came to know that he ſpoke of him. Perhaps (f) *Voſſius* is not miſtaken in conjecturing, from the Age of thoſe who precede and follow that Rhetor in that Liſt, that he liv'd in *Tiberius's* time; but this does not prove that *Suetonius* plac'd him in the Reign of that Emperor. V. *Moreri* ſhould not have aſſerted that *Quintus Curtius Rufus*, mention'd by *Suetonius*, is the ſame *Curtius Rufus* ſpoken of by (g) *Tacitus*. The latter was the Son of a Gladiator, and attain'd to the Conſulſhip, without having (h) taught Rhetorick. VI. *Moreri* is very much in the wrong *to wonder that* Quintilian, *who mentions all the conſiderable Hiſtorians in the tenth Book of his Inſtitutions, written under the Empire of* Domitian, *ſhould ſay nothing of* Quintus Curtius's *Hiſtory*. What *Moreri* aſcribes to *Quintilian* is falſe; he ſpeaks but of four Hiſtorians at moſt, and therefore his Silence is of no uſe to thoſe who alledge it as a Proof, that *Quintus Curtius* had not yet publiſh'd his Book. (i) *Quod argumentum .... validius ſemper mihi viſum eſt, quam quod à Quintiliani ſilentio petunt adverſarii. Quaſi vero hiſtoricorum catalogum Fabius texuerit, qui quatuor admodum ex iis appellavit: ſuperſtites autem, in quibus eſſe potuit Curtius conſulto prætermiſerit.* VII. We may therefore reckon as a new Fault what is ſaid in theſe Words, (k) *which cannot be excus'd but by ſuppoſing that this Work had not yet been publiſh'd in his time.* All theſe Faults are to be found in (l) *la Mothe le Vayer*. VIII. *Raderus* did not write a Supplement to *Quintus Curtius*, but a Commentary. I ſhall ſay nothing of *Moreri's* wrong (m) Quotations. I muſt obſerve by the by, that the Supplements of *Chriſtopher Bruno* came out in the Year 1545. That Author taught Philological Learning at *Munich*, and Dedicated his *Quintus Curtius* to the Duke of *Bavaria*. *Poſſevin* (n) and *James Gourdon* (o) affirm, that *Quintianus Stoa* had ſupplied what is wanting in *Quintus Curtius*; but *Freinſhemius* (p) never ſaw that Supplement. Others (q) maintain, that *Quintianus Stoa* made none. I add what *Colomies* obſerves about the Edition of *Quintus Curtius, Lugduni apud Paulum Frellon*, 1615, in 12. That Edition, ſays he, “ (r) Which is little known, has this peculiar to it; beſides the common Supplements aſcribed to *Chriſtopher Bruno*, a Monk of *Bavaria*, it contains ſome others tranſcribed from a Manuſcript of the Library of *St. Victor*, by *John Maſſon*, Archdeacon of *Bayeux*, Brother to *Papyrius Maſſon*, who is well known to the Learned. Thoſe Supplements, the Author whereof could not be found out by the two *Maſſons*, were written by *Francis Petrarch*, if we believe *Scaliger* in the ſecond *Scaligerana*: *In Bibliotheca S. Victoris*, ſays he, *primus liber Q. Curtii erat, ſed deprehendi eſſe compoſitum à Petrarcha.*” I further add, that *Vaſſan* writ one Day to *Goldaſtus*, that the firſt Book of *Quintus Curtius* would quickly come out. (ſ) *Eſt in manibus, Pap. Maſſonii liber ille* 1. *Quinti Curtii hactenus deſideratus, quem ubi primum publicaverit tibi exhibebo.*

(D) *Cardinal* du Perron *was too great an Admirer of* Quintus Curtius.] “ (t) One Page of *Quintus Curtius* is “ worth

---

‡ *See in the Remark A Father le Tellier's Words, and the Reflection I made upon them.*

* *Made by* Vaugelas.

‖ *Ad Q.* Curtium, in uſum Delphini.

(a) Joh. Iſacius Pontanus, epiſt. ad Wicquefortium. *To the 55th of those that Mr.* Matthæus *publiſh'd at Leyden in the Year 1695.*

(b) *Written to* Voſſius, *viz. the 58th and 59th of the ſame Collection of Mr.* Matthæus.

(c) Vigneul Marville Melang. to. 2. pag. 301. Dutch Edit.

(d) *The Words of* Quintus Curtius, lib. 7. c. … *are remarkable.* … ipſo …rnacu- …regis …ſpectus fons …m quia …de no- …erant …ito …ſtiſſe …erunt, …que …credi …it do- …n Dei …fuiſſe.

(e) *It is in my Edition in* 12 *of* la Mothe le Vayer's *Works*, Paris 1681. *page* 197. *of the 3d Tome.*

(f) Voſſius de hiſtor. Latinis *pag.* 152.

(g) Tacitus Annal. l. 11.

(h) *Before he was promoted to any Dignity he was in the Service of the Governor of* Africa. Tenuis adhuc & obſcurus obtinenti Africam comes hæſerat. *Plin. epiſt.* 27. l. 7.

(i) Mich. le Telier ubi ſupra.

(k) *That is* Quintilian's *ſilence.*

(l) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 197, 198.

(m) Moreri *quotes* Pliny *epiſt.* 7. *it ſhould be epiſt.* 27. & Voſſius *lib.* 2. *it ſhould be lib.* 1.

(n) *In Biblioth. Selecta.*

(o) In Chronol. Cap. 20 n. 31. apud Freinſhem Proleg. c. 3.

(p) Freinſhem. Ibid.

(q) La Mothe le Vayer ubi ſupra, p. 199.

(r) Colomies Bibliotheque choiſie, p. 184, 185.

(ſ) *See the 31ſt Letter in the Collection of the Letters written to* Goldaſtus, *and publiſh'd in* 1688.

(t) Perroniana *at the Word* Stiles, *p.m.* 307.

(1) Lib. 7.

(2) Lib. 9.

Nothing can more effectually bring a Man off from the exceſſive Admiration he might have for him, than the Remarks which Monſieur *le Clerc* publiſh'd, and Entitul'd, *Judicium de Quinto Curtio.* They are at the end of his Book *de Arte Critica*, and they do manifeſtly ſhew ſeveral great Faults of that great Hiſtorian, his Ignorance of Aſtronomy and Geography, his Contradictions, his wrong Deſcriptions, his ill Taſte in the choice of Matters, his Careleſneſs in dating the Events, *&c.* The greateſt part of thoſe Faults might be found in moſt Ancient Hiſtorians, if one would take the Pains, or was ſufficiently qualified to Criticize them ſeverely. I don't know but it might be ſaid, that his Ignorance of certain things, is a Proof that he did not live in theſe latter Times; for if a Man of the XIVth or XVth Century had been able to write that Hiſtory of *Alexander*, he muſt have had more Talents than were neceſſary to compoſe it in the firſt Century: He muſt have had eminent Qualities, and he muſt have ſpent his Life in Study. Could ſuch a Man be ignorant of what every body knew then, that the Moon is not eclips'd both when it is new and full? But this * is one of *Quintus Curtius*'s Ignorances.

QUINTILIAN (MARCUS FABIUS) was Born at β *Calagurris* in *Spain.* 'Tis ſaid, that he was brought to *Rome* γ by *Galba*, and it is certain that he taught Rhetorick in that City with great Reputation. He was the firſt δ who taught it there publickly, being paid for it by the State. He was ε diſcharg'd from that laborious Profeſſion, after he had exercis'd it for the ſpace of twenty Years. He had *(A)* ſeveral Domeſtick Afflictions, which had like to have exhauſted his Conſtancy, and which forc'd him to complain of his cruel Fate. He lamented above all things the Death of a Son of ten Years of Age, who was a very hopeful Child †. He was not contented to give Rules to ſpeak well; but he alſo ſhew'd his Eloquence at the Bar: He †‡ pleaded for Queen *Berenice* in her Preſence, and was accounted ſo good an Advocate, that ſome Perſons writ down his Pleas *(B)* to ſell 'em to the Bookſellers. Some are of Opinion, *(C)* that he was made Conſul: It is more certain, that

---

" worth 30 pages of *Tacitus.* ..... *Quintus Curtius* is " the beſt *Latin* Author; he is ſo polite, and ſo neat; " and what is admirable, is, that notwithſtanding his " Subtilties he is clear, eaſie and intelligible. I place " *Florus* next to him, he is ſo florid, and ſo elegant. Mr. " *de Tyron*, who was an excellent Man to judge of an Au" thor's Style, gave the firſt Rank to *Quintus Curtius* ". I had rather praiſe that Hiſtorian with ſome Reſtriction, as *Famianus Strada* did. *At Q. Curtio*, ſays he, (a) *quamquam iis virtutibus exornato, quibus conſtat aut heroicis eum temporibus vixiſſe, aut dignum fuiſſe qui viveret, non defuère, qui objicerent quaſiti interdum medicamenta candoris, & numerorum uſum paulo intemperantiorem.* *Balzac* (b) taxes a Modern Author with the ſame fault, and uſes the very ſame Words of that Jeſuit. I mention this by the by, to diſcover a ſmall piece of Thievery.

(a) Famian. Strada, proluſion. Academ. lib. 2. proluſ. 3. p. m. 266.

(b) *In a* Latin *Letter to Mr.* Silhon. *p. m.* 194.

(*A*) *He had ſeveral Domeſtick Afflictions, which ..... forced him to complain.*] The Death of his Wife, who was but nineteen Years of Age, made him inconſolable. He praiſes her very much. (c) *Omni virtute quæ in fœminas cadit functa, inſanabilem attulit marito dolorem ..... illi dolori quem ex matre optima atque laudem omnem ſupergreſſa, paucos ante menſes ceperam gratulor.* She left him two Sons, whereof one died at five Years of Age, and the other at ten. The latter was the Eldeſt, and had extraordinary Gifts: beſides Fortune begun already to put him in the way to Dignities; a Man who had been Conſul had adopted him; and another, who was Prætor and his Uncle by his Mother's ſide, deſign'd to make him his Son-in-Law. *Tene conſulari nuper adoptione ad omnium ſpes bonorum patris admotum, te avunculo prætori generum deſtinatum, te omnium ſpe Atticæ eloquentiæ candidatum ſuperſtes parens tantum ad pœnas amiſi?* *Quintilian*'s Affliction was very great by reaſon of ſo many Loſſes; he reſolv'd to leave off Writing, and to throw into the Fire what he had already compos'd; he was afraid of being taxed with little Affection and Tenderneſs, if he ſhould make uſe of his Tongue to any other purpoſe, than to inveigh againſt Heaven. He did not forget to ſay, that there is a malicious and jealous Being, who will not ſuffer hopeful Children to live long. I muſt ſet down his own Words, that the Reader may ſee how far the wiſeſt Heathens let looſe their Impatience. (d) *Tunc igitur optimum fuit, infauſtum opus, & quicquid hoc eſt in me infelicium literarum, ſuper immaturum funus conſumpturis viſcera mea flammis injicere, neque hanc impiam vivacitatem novis inſuper curis fatigare. Quis enim mihi bonus parens ignoſcat, ſi ſtudere amplius poſſum? ac non oderit hanc animi mei firmitatem, ſi quis in me eſt alius uſus vocis, quàm, ut incuſem deos, ſuperſtes omnium meorum? nullam terras deſpicere providentiam teſter? ſi non meo caſu, cui tamen nihil objici, niſi quod vivam, poteſt: at illorum certè, quos utique immeritos mors acerba damnavit.* ...... (e) *Juro per mala mea, per infelicem conſcientiam, per illos manes numina doloris mei; has me in illo vidiſſe virtutes ingenii, non modò ad perſpiciendas diſciplinas, quo nihil præſtantius cognovi, plurima expertus, ſtudiique jam tum non coacti, (ſciunt præceptores.) ſed probitatis, pietatis, humanitatis, liberalitatis; ut prorſus poſſit hinc eſſe tanti fulminis metus; quòd obſervatum ferè eſt, celerius occidere feſtinatam maturitatem; & eſſe neſcio quam, quæ ſpes tantas decerpat, invidiam; ne videlicet ultra quàm homini datum eſt, noſtra provehantur.* Neverthele ſs he chang'd his Mind as to his Work; he went on with it, and made an end of it.

(c) Quintil. præfat. l. 6. p. m. 267.

(d) Id. Ib.

(e) Quintil. præfat. l. 6. p. m. 268.

(*B*) *Some Perſons writ down his Pleas, to ſell 'em to the Bookſellers.*] There were at that time ſome Men at *Rome*, who could write a whole Speech with a Short-Hand, tho' the Orator ſpoke never ſo faſt. That Art is, at preſent, better known and practiſed in *England* than in any other Country. Thoſe who took the pains to write in that manner what they heard at the Bar, did not always do it out of Curioſity, but ſometimes out of Avarice. They were willing to get ſome good Pieces to ſell them to the Bookſellers. The Authors were ſometimes the worſe for it; for they obſerv'd, that the Writer had forgot ſome good things, and the Works, that were thus handed about under their Names, were but imperfect Pieces. This was our *Quintilian*'s Caſe, as he himſelf tells us, having mention'd a Plea, which a youthful Ambition prompted him to impart to the Publick. (f) *Id eſt in cauſa Nævii Aprun iani ſolùm quæſitum, præcipitatane eſſet ab eo uxor; an ſe ipſa ſua ſponte jeciſſet. Quam actionem equidem ſolam in hoc tempus emiſeram, quod me ipſum feciſſe ſeductum juvenili cupiditate gloriæ fateor. Nam cætera, quæ ſub nomine meo feruntur, negligentia excipientium in quæſtum notariorum corrupta, minimam partem mei habent.*

(*C*) *Some are of Opinion that he was made Conſul.*] They ground their Opinion upon theſe Words of *Auſonius.* (g) *Quintilianus conſularia per Clementem ornamenta ſortitus, honeſtamenta nominis potius videtur quam inſignia poteſtatis habuiſſe.* *Vinetus* ſays hereupon, that *Marcus Arricinius Clemens*, and *Titus Flavius Clemens* having had for ſome time a great Share in *Domitian*'s Favour, loſt it to ſuch a Degree, that he caus'd them to be put to Death. He does not know which of thoſe two *Clemens*'s procur'd to *Quintilian* the Honour ſpoken of by *Auſonius*; but, ſays he, it was not the Ordinary Conſulſhip; for the *Faſti* make no mention of it, and therefore it was but a ſubrogated Conſulſhip (h). *Vinetus* might have conjectur'd, that it was *Flavius Clemens*, as it will appear hereafter. The Paſſage of *Auſonius* is confirm'd by theſe Verſes of *Juvenal.*

(i) Unde igitur tot
Quintilianus habet ſaltus? exempla novorum
Fatorum tranſi: felix, & pulcher, & acer,
Felix, & ſapiens, & nobilis, & generoſus
Appoſitam nigræ lunam ſubtexit alutæ:
Felix, orator quoque maximus & jaculator,
Et ſi perfrixit, cantat bene. diſtat enim, quæ

Sidera

that he was Preceptor to the (D) Grand-Sons of *Domitian's* Siſter. It is not certainly known whether he was the Son, or (E) the Grand-Son of the Orator mention'd by *Seneca* the Father. Seve-

Sidera te excipiant modo primos incipientem
Edere vagitus, & adhuc à matre rubentem.
Si fortuna volet, fies de rhetore conſul,
Si volet hæc eadem, fies de conſule rhetor.

We learn at leaſt from this Paſſage, that *Quintilian* got Riches and Honours; but *Juvenal* intimates, that luck contributed to it as much or more than his Merit. If the 32d Letter of the 6th Book of *Pliny* was written to our *Quintilian*, there is no reaſon to think that *Juvenal* was in the right, when he repreſented that Teacher of Rhetorick as an Opulent Man. *Pliny* ſays, that the Perſon, to whom he writes (a), had no great Eſtate; he does not believe that he can equip his Daughter as ſhe ſhould be, ſince ſhe was to be Married to a Man of Note; and therefore he preſents her (b) with a conſiderable Sum, that ſhe may go to her Huſband in a good Equipage. (c) *Cum tamen ſit nuptura honeſtiſſimo viro, Nonio Celeri, cui ratio civilium officiorum neceſſitatem quandam nitoris imponit, debet ſecundum conditiones mariti, veſte, comitatu augeri: quibus non quidem augetur dignitas, ornatur tamen, & inſtruitur.* It might be ſaid, that the Father of that Maid is not our *Quintilian*; for, it ſeems, that *Pliny* would have mention'd the Advantage of having been his Diſciple, if he had writ to his Profeſſor. Beſides, it might be ſaid, that *Quintilian* (d) having loſt his Wife, and two Sons, repreſents himſelf as a Man, whom the Gods had depriv'd of all his Family. Nay, he ſays (e) that his Wife died at 19 Years of Age, and left him two Sons. Would he have expreſs'd himſelf thus, if he had had alſo a Daughter by her? But theſe Reaſons are not demonſtrative. Perhaps *Quintilian* married a ſecond Wife, and had by her the Daughter that *Pliny* ſpeaks of. Perhaps his Eſtate decreas'd after the 7th Satyr of *Juvenal*. Beſides, that Poet might look upon him as a rich Man, if compar'd with the other Rhetors; and *Pliny* might think that he had but an indifferent Eſtate with reſpect to the Family, into which young *Quintiliana* was going to be Married. It is certain that he had been (f) one of *Quintilian's* Scholars; but he might very well write to him without mentioning ſuch a thing.

(D) *Preceptor to the Grand-Sons of* Domitian's *Siſters.*] He ſays ſo himſelf: (g) *Cum mihi Domitianus Auguſtus ſororis ſuæ nepotum delegaverit curam, non ſatis honorem judiciorum cæleſtium intelligam, niſi ex hoc quoque oneris magnitudinem metiar.* *Moreri* does not tranſlate theſe Words right, when he ſays, that Domitian *intruſted* Quintilian *with the Education of his Nephews.* *Barthius* (h) would be guilty of the ſame Fault, if by the Word *Nepotes* he did not underſtand *Grand-ſons*, as 'tis very likely he does: Nevertheleſs he is miſtaken. He, who wrote the Contents of the Chapters of *Quintilian's* Works, ſays that that Rhetorician taught the Sons of *Domitian's* Siſter; which is to pretend to know more of the matter than *Quintilian* himſelf: But, will ſome ſay, where ſhall we find thoſe Grand-ſons of *Domitian's* Siſter? I anſwer, that 'tis very likely they were the two Sons of *Flavius Clemens*, Couſin-German to that Prince. He deſign'd (i) them publickly to be his Succeſſors from their Infancy, and gave one of them the Name of *Veſpaſian*, and to the other that of *Domitian*. 'Tis therefore probable, that he gave them the beſt Maſter that was then at *Rome*, I mean *Quintilian*. If it be objected to me, that *Flavius Clemens* married *Domitian's* Siſter, and conſequently that his Sons were not the Grand-ſons of that Emperor's Siſter: If *Philoſtratus* be alledg'd againſt me, who ſays, that the Wife of *Flavius Clemens* was (k) *Domitian's* Siſter: I anſwer, that *Philoſtratus* is leſs to be credited than *Dion*, who only ſays, that ſhe was related to that Prince. (l) Τὸν Φλάβιον Κλήμεντα ὑπατεύοντα καίπερ ἀνεψιὸν ὄντα καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ αὐτὴν συγγενῆ ἑαυτοῦ Φλαβίαν Δομιτίλλαν ἔχοντα κατέσφαξεν ὁ Δομιτιανός. *Fabium Clementem conſulem (etſi patruelis ejus erat & Flaviam Domitillam Domitiani conſanguineam uxorem habebat) morte affecit.* Moreover, I ſay that *Domitilla*, *Domitian's* Siſter, was not alive when *Flavius Clemens* was put to Death; and yet *Philoſtratus* tells us, that the Wife of that *Flavius* was Baniſh'd after the Death of her Huſband. He is therefore miſtaken, when he ſays ſhe was *Domitian's* Siſter. We read in *Suetonius* (m) that *Veſpaſian* had but three Children by his Wife *Flavia Domitilla, viz. Titus, Domitian* and *Domitilla*, and that he loſt his Wife and Daughter before he was Emperor. I ſuppoſe that *Domitilla*, *Veſpaſian's* Daughter, left a Daughter who was Married to *Flavius Clemens*. According to this ſuppoſition the Sons of *Flavius Clemens*, who had *Quintilian* for their Tutor, are the Grand-ſons of *Domitian's* Siſter, as *Quintilian* ſays it in expreſs Words. The time that paſſed between the Death of *Domitilla*, and the Empire of *Domitian*, was long enough to maintain, that the Grand-ſons of *Domitilla* were of a ſufficient Age to be taught by *Quintilian* under that Empire, for I may very well be allow'd to ſay, that *Veſpaſian* loſt his Daughter a long time before he came to be an Emperor, which happen'd when he was 60 Years of Age. (n) The Inſcription *Flavia Domitilla Imp. Cæſaris Neptis* ought to be underſtood, as *Triſtan* obſerves, not of a Daughter of *Veſpaſian*, but of a Daughter of *Domitilla*, *Titus's* Siſter. Laſtly, I ſay that he, who beſtow'd the Conſulſhip upon *Quintilian*, was call'd *Clemens*: But he did it to reward *Quintilian* for his Tutorſhip, which appears from *Auſonius's* deſign in mentioning this. Therefore either the Father of *Quintilian's* Pupils, or one of thoſe Pupils, muſt needs have beſtow'd that Reward upon him; from whence I conclude, that the Pupils of that Rhetorician were the Sons of *Flavius Clemens*, and conſequently that this *Flavius* was married to a Daughter of *Domitian's* Siſter. I wonder that neither (o) *Caſaubon*, nor *Marcilius* (p), who Criticis'd him, took no notice of *Philoſtratus's* miſtake; both of 'em approve what he ſays, that the Wife of *Flavius Clemens* was *Veſpaſian's* Daughter, and that ſhe was alive when that *Flavius* was kill'd. This is plainly contradicted by (q) *Suetonius*.

(E) *Whether he was the Son or the Grand-ſon of the Orator mention'd by* Seneca.] That Orator muſt have lived under the Empire of *Auguſtus*, for (r) *Seneca* the Father ſpeaks of him as of a Man, who was already Dead, and whoſe Reputation was extinct. But *Quintilian* was very young, when *Domitius Afer*, who died under *Nero's* Empire, was already (s) an old Man: It is therefore an unreaſonable thing to make him the Son of a Man, who flouriſh'd in the Reign of *Auguſtus*. It were better to ſay, that he was his Grand-ſon; but perhaps one might fear an Objection grounded upon his mentioning (t) his Father as being an Orator, without ever ſpeaking one Word of his Grandfather. There are ſome Criticks (u), who don't aſcribe the Declamations Publiſh'd by *Pithœus* to the Grandfather of *Quintilian*, nor to his Father. Thoſe Declamations, ſay they, do not ſavour of the Age of *Auguſtus*; and 'tis not at all likely, that the productions of *Quintilian*, mention'd by *Seneca*, ſhould be ſtill extant, when ſome others Works of the ſame time, and much more elaborate, have been loſt. They obſerve that, according to *Seneca*, the Reputation of the Orator *Quintilian* (w) died with him. If they infer from thence, that he Publiſh'd no Books, they don't argue right; for there are many Authors, whoſe Glory dies before them, or, at leaſt, with them. I muſt not forget to make this Obſervation: *Quintilian's* Father pleaded ſome Cauſes, and therefore he liv'd at *Rome*, ſay ſome; why then is it ſaid in *Euſebius's* Chronicle, that *Galba* brought him to *Rome* from *Spain*? Was it an uſual thing for a Man ſettled at *Rome* to leave his Children in a Province? Mr. *de Tillemont* (x) ſhews, that this is not a convincing Objection; but he acknowledges the miſtake of *Euſebius's* Chronicle. He ſays, that it is not true, that *Galba* brought *Quintilian* to *Rome* in the Year 69; and he alledges this Reaſon for it, *viz.* that *Quintilian* heard *Domitius Afer* at *Rome*, who died in the Year 59. Note, that Mr. *de Tillemont* does not make uſe of a good Argument; for he quotes a (y) Paſſage, which imports not that *Quintilian* heard *Domitius Afer* plead, but that a certain Plea of that Author was very much eſteem'd. He ſhould have quoted (z) another Paſſage. He will not have *Martial's* omiſſion to be urg'd, and I confeſs it cannot be look'd upon as a demonſtrative Proof; however, it affords a very ſtrong Objection againſt thoſe, who ſay, that *Quintilian* was a *Spaniard*. *Martial* took great delight in mentioning the Illuſtrious Men of *Spain*, and in obſerving that they were born in *Spain*. Would he have forgot to make the ſame Obſervation concerning ſo famous a Man as *Quintilian* was? Would he have expreſs'd himſelf ſo as to make one believe that *Quintilian* was born at *Rome*, rather than that he was not?

---

deſierat occidiſſet. *Philoſtr. in vita Apollonii lib.* 8. (l) Xi- in *Domitiano pag. m.* 236. (m) *Sueton. in Veſpaſ. c.* 3.

(n) *It is in* Gruterus, *pag.* 355.

(o) *Caſaub. in Sueton. Domit. c.* 15.

(p) *Theodorus Marcilius in Sueton. lib.*

(q) *In Veſpaſiano cap.* 3.

(r) *Seneca controv. lib.* 5. *in præf.*

(s) Domitio Afro quem adoleſcentulus ſenem colui. *Quintil. lib.* 5. *c.* 7. *pag.* 212.

(t) *Id. lib.* 9. *c.* 3. *pag.* 432.

(u) *See* Faber's *Notes on* Seneca's *Controverſies ubi ſupra.*

(w) Quorum fama cum ipſis extincta eſt. *Seneca ubi ſupra.*

(x) *Tillem. hiſt. des Emp. tom.* 2 *p.* 873. 874. *edit. of* Bruſſels.

(y) *He quotes the* 1ſt *Chapter of the* 10th *Book of* Quintilian, *where theſe Words are to be found.* nobis pueris inſignes pro Voluſeno Catulo Domitii Afri, Criſpi Paſſieni, Decimi Lælii orationes ferebantur.

(z) *That which I have ſet down above, Letter* t.

Several Criticks aſcribe to that Orator the *(F)* Declamations publiſh'd by *Ugolinus Parmenſis*, and afterwards by *Petrus Pithoeus*; but the *Inſtitutiones Oratoriæ* are generally look'd upon as a Work of *Quintilian*. *Poggius (G)* found out the Manuſcript in a manner that is worth relating. It had been a great loſs for the Commonwealth of Learning, if *Quintilian*'s Works had been deſtroy'd, for he is an Excellent Author; and it were to be wiſh'd, that all thoſe who write Books, would firſt of all read him with great Attention. I am ſorry I have been too late ſenſible of the uſefulneſs of ſuch a Reading. Mr. *de la Fontaine*, who was a very good Judge, commended very much that Rhetorician. See in his Poſthumous * Works, the Verſes he ſent to the Biſhop of *Avranches*, *when he preſented him with Quintilian's Works Tranſlated by* Horatio Toſcanella. Mr. *Nicolle* the Father, and the Abbot *de Pure*, have given us a *French* Tranſlation of that Author. The moſt correct Edition *(H)* of *Quintilian* is that of Mr. *Obrecht*. The Dialogue *de cauſis corruptæ eloquentiæ* is to be found in it, as in all the other Editions, tho' all the Criticks don't believe that *Quintilian* is the Author of it; many aſcribe it to *Tacitus*, and it is commonly Printed with the Works of that Hiſtorian. That which is certain is, that our Author wrote a Book † *de cauſis corruptæ eloquentiæ*. I think it is loſt, and I make no doubt that it was as excellent in its kind, as the other Pieces that are extant. I have not given a full account of his Merit. I muſt further add, that he appears a very honeſt Man by his Works, and that there is a great deal of good Morality in them. Some blame him for praiſing too much the Emperor *Domitian*, and tho' he did it only by the by, †† and very nicely, they will not forgive him that Fault, which ſeems, without doubt, to be very great to thoſe, who have read the Hiſtory of that wicked Prince. Had I had Mr. *Dodwell*'s *⁎ *Annales Quintilianei*, this Article had been better; but thro' a misfortune of which I often complain, I mean that I am depriv'd of the moſt neceſſary Books, I have not been able to Peruſe that Work.

QUINTIN (John) Profeſſor of the Canon Law at *Paris* in the Sixteenth Century, was a Native of *Autun*. He neither wanted Learning nor Genius. At firſt he liked the new Opinions, as they were call'd, and declar'd his Mind ſo plainly about it, that he was forc'd to run away *(A)* from *Poitiers*; but his Temporary *(B)* Faith

---

Quintiliane (a) vagæ moderator ſummæ juventæ,
Gloria Romanæ Quintiliane togæ.

Let the Readers judge of it: but I muſt obſerve, that this Paſſage of *Martial* does not prove that *Quintilian* was a Native of *Rome*; and that thoſe, who *(b)* inferr'd from a Paſſage of *Trebellius Pollio* that he was a Citizen of *Rome*, argu'd wrong. *(c) Fuit autem*, viz. Poſthumius the Younger, *(quod ſolum memoratu dignum eſt) ita in declamationibus diſertus, ut ejus controverſiæ Quintiliano dicantur inſertæ, quem declamatorem Romani generis acutiſſimum, vel unius capitis lectio prima ſtatim fronte demonſtrat.* Theſe Words of *Trebellius Pollio* ſignify only, that *Quintilian* was a *Latin* Rhetor. He is there mention'd not in oppoſition to the Provincial Writers, † but to the *Greeks*.

(F) The Declamations publiſh'd by Ugolinus Parmenſis.] He only publiſh'd 136. *Pithoeus* made a new Edition of 'em in 1580. which was more correct, and inlarg'd with nine Declamations, which had never been Printed. *Voſſius* obſerves this in *(d)* one of his Books; but in another he makes no diſtinction at all. *(e) cujus declamationes (XLV à Tideo Ugolino primum editas, ex veteri codice reſtituit P. (f) Pythæus.* *Moreri* tranſcribes the wrong Paſſage of *Voſſius*. I muſt not forget to ſay, that *Voſſius* is to blame for not taking notice of the time wherein *Ugolinus Parmenſis (g)* lived, and for omitting that *Peter Ayrault* publiſh'd *(h) Quintilian*'s Declamations, before they were publiſh'd by *Peter Pithoeus*. He boaſts of it in his Treatiſe concerning the Paternal Power. *Quintilian*, ſays he, *(i) whom I have publiſh'd again firſt, and the Learned* Pithoeus *after me.*

(G) Poggius *found out the Manuſcript in a manner*] 'Twas in the Abby of *St. Gall*, during the Council of *Conſtance*. *Quintilian*'s Works, which were at that time in *Italy*, were horribly lam'd: *Ita lacerum, ita circumciſum, ut nulla forma, nullus habitus hominis in eo recognoſceretur.* You may judge, that the News of this Diſcovery occaſion'd a great Joy. *Poggius* gave immediately Notice of it: the Letter that he writ on that occaſion was never Printed; it is at the end of a Manuſcript of *Quintilian* in the Library of *Milan*, as we are inform'd by Father *Mabillon*, who gave us this curious Fragment of that Letter. *(k) Fortuna quædam fuit, cum ſua, tum maxime noſtra, ut cum eſſemus Conſtantiæ otioſi, cupido inceſſerit viſendi ejus loci, quo ille recluſus tenebatur. Eſt autem monaſterium ſancti Galli, prope urbem hanc millibus paſſuum viginti. Itaque nonnulli animi laxandi, & ſimul perquirendorum librorum, quorum numerus maximus ibi eſſe dicebatur, gratia eo perreximus. Ibi inter confertiſſimam librorum copiam, quos longum eſſet recenſere, Quintilianum reperimus, adhuc ſalvum & incolumem, plenum tamen ſitu, & pulvere refertum. Erant enim in bibliotheca libri illi, non ut eorum dignitas poſtulabat, ſed in teterrimo quodam & obſcuro carcere, fundo ſcilicet unius turris, quo ne vitæ quidem damnati detruderentur . . . . . Reperimus præterea libros tres primos & dimidiatum quarti C. Valerii Flacci Argonauticôn; & expoſitiones, tanquam thema quoddam, ſuper octo Ciceronis orationibus Q. Aſconii Pediani eloquentiſſimi viri, de quibus ipſe meminit Quintilianus. Hæc mea manu tranſcripſi, & quidem velociter, ut ea mitterem ad Leonardum Aretinum & Nicolaum Florentinum; qui cum à me hujus theſauri adinventionem cognoviſſent, multis à me verbis Quintilianum per ſuas litteras quam primum ad eos mitti contenderunt.* In order to know the ſad condition that *Quintilian* was in before that Diſcovery, we need only read one *(l)* of *Petrarch*'s Letters. One *Gaſparinus* of *Bergamo*, who taught Philological Learning at *Milan*, was very much to be pitied; *(m)* for he took a great deal of Pains about that wretched Manuſcript, before a better one could be found out. I muſt take notice of a miſtake in *Varillas*. " *Poggio*, ſays he, *(n)* " had the good Fortune to light upon the Inſtitutions, " and the nineteen firſt Declamations of *Quintilian*, as " he was ferreting in a Shop of a *German* Grocer, who " was going to (†) make Cornets of 'em. They who " know that it was the only Copy extant, will be for " ever indebted to *Poggio* for that Diſcovery". Mr. *de Larreque* has made it appear, that it is not true that this was the only Copy extant. Theſe are his Words, " *(o)* How great ſoever that *(p)* loſs might have been, it " had not been irrecoverable. A fine Manuſcript of that " *Roman* Rhetor, above 500 Years old, which is to be " found in the large Library of *Oxford*, would have " made up that Loſs, as well as many others of a conſiderable Antiquity, that are at *Cologne*, and at *Berne*, " as I have been lately inform'd by the Learned Mr. " *Grævius*; and ſuppoſe thoſe had met likewiſe with an " unmerciful Grocer, that Loſs might have been ſupplied ſtill by thoſe that are to be found in the Library " of the moſt Chriſtian King; there are fourteen or fifteen of them, if the Catalogue that I have ſeen is not " falſe".

(H) The moſt correct Edition . . . . . . is that of Mr. Obrecht.] It was publiſh'd in two Volumes in Quarto at *Strasburg* in the Year 1698. He has mended the Text *(q)* in many places with the help of Manuſcripts, or by his own Conjectures. He has not done like other Criticks, who place in their Notes, or at the end of the Book, the various Readings which they like beſt, and leave in the Text thoſe which they believe to be falſe; but he gives the Text as he thinks it ought to be read. Mr. *Salo*, in the Year 1665, adviſed thoſe who publiſh the Ancient Authors, to do the ſame. See his *Journal (r) des Savans* of the 16th of *March* 1665.

(A) To run away from Poitiers.] Preſident *la Place* informs us of it in this manner: " *(ſ)* Many having " heard the Speech of the ſaid *Quintin*, were amaz'd at it, " expecting no ſuch thing from him, becauſe he had been formerly

---

(a) *Martial epigr. 90. lib. 2.*

(b) *Cittanæ* in *Plinium epiſt. 54. lib. 2. pag. m. 150, 151.* n *one of them*

(c) *Trebellius Pollio in Poſthumio juniore pag. 160. tom. 2. hiſtor. Aug. ſcriptor.*

(†) *As in theſe Words of* Pliny *Chap. 12. Book 2.* Rationum quidem defectus utriuſque (*Solis ac Lunæ*) primus Romani generis in vulgus extulit Sulpicius Gallus. . . . . Apud Græcos autem inveſtigavit primus omnium Thales.

(d) *Voſſius in inſtitutionibus oratoriis lib. 1. c. 11. p. m. 198, 199.*

(e) *Idem de Rhetorices natura pag. 105.*

(f) *It ſhould be* Pithœus.

(g) *He lived in the XVth Century.* Philelphus *ſpeaks of him. See* Reineſius *epiſt. 63. ad Daumium pag. 167.*

(h) *At* Paris *in the Year* 1563.

(i) *Ayrault p. m. 271. See alſo his Diſſertation de la nature & mutation des loix, pag. m. 189.*

(k) *Mabillon in Muſeo Italico, tom. 1. parte 1. p. 211.*

Faith (B) was not proof againſt a long Perſecution. He quickly accepted of a good Benefice, that was given him in the Order of the Knights of *Malta**; and when he return'd from that Iſland, where he had been a Domeſtick to the Great Maſter, he was made Profeſſor of the Canon Law at *Paris* in the Year 1536. That which made him moſt ſpoken of, was the Speech he made in the Name of the Clergy during the Aſſembly of the States at *Orleans* in *December* 1650. He demanded that thoſe of the new Religion ſhould be proceeded againſt with the utmoſt Severity; which would be more ſurprizing, if it had not been a thing practis'd for many Ages: But tho' that bloody Spirit had prevail'd never ſo long, many could not forbear wondering that a Clergyman ſhould have taken upon himſelf to demand (C) ſuch a thing. *Quintin* did not foreſee, that the Leaders of the Proteſtants would ſhew a great deal of vigour in that Aſſembly; much leſs did he foreſee, that he would be extremely ſenſible to the Animadverſions that ſhould be made upon his Speech. Had he foreſeen thoſe things, he would without doubt have kept at *Paris*, and had rather choſen to explain ſome Decretals to his Scholars, than to give ſome Leſſons of Cruelty to the King, his Maſter, in the preſence of the three States of the Kingdom. Admiral *Chatillon* (D) complain'd ſo openly of *Quintin*'s Speech, that the King, and the Queen Mother, ſent for that Orator, to call him to an account for what he had ſaid. His Anſwer was, that he had only followed the Orders and Memoirs of the Body, whoſe Spokeſman he had been. The Proteſtants were not ſatisfy'd with that Anſwer †; he was oblig'd to declare before the Aſſembly of the States, that he did not deſign to reflect on Admiral *Chatillon*: but he was much more vex'd at the (E) Railleries and Cenſures, that were diſpers'd againſt his Declamation. He could not bear that

" formerly ſuſpected, and even proſecuted on account " of Religion, and forc'd to retire from *Poitiers*, for having made a Speech in publick quite different from " that which he had juſt then made". **Beza** (a) ſays the ſame thing.

(B) *His Temporary Faith.*] **Beza** (b) ſpeaks of him thus: " Some Years before, another Scholar, whoſe " Name was *Quintin*, a Native of *Autun*, had likewiſe " kept great ado; but being forc'd to retire, he was ſo " far from perſevering, that on the contrary he took " quite another way: and, at laſt, being a famous " Doctor of the Canon Law in the Univerſity of *Paris*, " and having got a ſubſtantial Benefice of the Order " of the Knights of *Rhodes*, he ſet up for a Perſecutor". That Hiſtorian mentions many other Perſons whom he look'd upon as Men, who had receiv'd the Seed *into Stony (c) places*, and among the Thorns: they had heard the Word, and *anon with Joy receiv'd it*; but they had no Root in themſelves, they laſted but for a while, ſo that *Tribulation or Perſecution ariſing becauſe of the Word, by and by they were offended; the care of this World, and the deceitfulneſs of Riches* choaked the Word, and they became unfruitful.

(C) *To demand ſuch a thing*] *Quintin* having demanded that all the Inhabitants of the Kingdom ſhould be oblig'd to be Catholicks; that the *Non-Chriſtians*, that is, the Hereticks ſhould not be (d) *admitted into the Converſation and Company of the Chriſtian Subjects*; and that (e) *for the time to come, all Hereticks ſhould be forbidden to deal in any Commodity (whether it were Books, or any other thing,)* added theſe dreadful Words. (f) " And therefore our Requeſt is Juſt, Reaſonable, Holy " and Catholick, and grounded upon the expreſs Command of God, who injoins you, Sir, to grant it us, " repeating the ſaid Command in ſeveral Places, and at " ſeveral times. He ſpeaks of the Idolaters and Gentiles, " Strangers to the Law: Hereticks among Chriſtians " are accounted to be ſuch. Theſe are the Words of " the ſaid Law of God; Be ſure not to contract any " Friendſhip, Confederacy or Marriage with them; don't " ſuffer them to inhabit the Country; take no pity on " them, beat them, ſtrike 'em to Death. Here follows the Reaſon of that Command, leſt they ſhould " make thee Sin againſt me, if thou believeſt their Opinions; which will be an Offence and a Scandal, that " will raiſe my Fury againſt thee, and ſoon after I ſhall " deſtroy thee. Sir, and you Madam, avoid thoſe " horrible and dreadful Threatnings, for the Salvation " of your Souls, and the Preſervation of your Scepter. " This is, Sir, what your Clergy of *France* propoſe, " and repreſent to your Majeſty in all Simplicity, Obedience, Humility and Submiſſion, concerning the Honour and Service of God in your Kingdom, and for " the Extirpation and Abolition of what is contrary to " it, to wit, of Sects and Hereticks. The whole Matter " is more fully and particularly diſcuſs'd and handled in " their Memorial, to which we expect an Anſwer". *Quintin's* Speech is to be found intire in the Hiſtory of Preſident *la Place*. 'Tis plain, that *the (g) moſt humble and devout Orators of the Clergy* were for ſhedding Blood, if it was neceſſary, ſince they minded the King of *Moſes*'s Order and Threatnings; beſides, *Quintin* had already ſaid in expreſs Words, that his (h) *Majeſty being ſtrong, and Arm'd with Iron*, ought to oppoſe the Hereticks, that *in order to it, and for no other end, God had put the Sword into his Hands, to protect the Good, and puniſh the Wicked; and that none can deny that a Heretick is capitally Wicked, and conſequently ought to be puniſh'd capitally, being liable to the Sword of the Magiſtrate.*

The French Clergy were more cunning 125 Years after; for in a Speech they made to the King ſome Months before the Revocation of the Edict of *Nantes*, they declar'd that they did not deſire his Majeſty ſhould make uſe of his Power for the Extirpation of the Hereticks. After all, this is no very cunning Artifice, and I don't know whether the too ingenuous plainneſs of the Year 1560, ought not to be preferr'd to the Diſſimulation of the Year 1685. Read theſe Words of Mr. *Claude*. " (i) " Whilſt the thing was only preparing, the true Authors of the Perſecution did not conceal themſelves, " but us'd their endeavours to make the King appear in it. ... ... (k) When things came to the laſt " Extremity, and to open Force, they conceal'd themſelves as much as they could, and made the King appear in his whole extent. There was nothing to be " heard then, but this ſort of Diſcourſes, *The King will* " *have it ſo, the King is reſolv'd upon it, the King goes* " *farther than the Clergy deſire*. By theſe two means " they have been ſo cunning as to aſcribe to themſelves " the leaſt violent part of that Perſecution, and to charge " the King with the moſt odious part.

(D) *Admiral* Chatillon *complain'd ſo openly.*] He had been ſo plainly pointed at in ſome Paſſages of that Speech, that every body caſt his Eyes upon him: beſides, he had been deſcrib'd in a very offenſive manner; and it was plain enough, that there was a deſign to load him with Infamy, and to undo him. Here is one of thoſe Paſſages. " (l) In the firſt " place, we beſeech you, Sir, that if any broacher " of old Hereſies would impiouſly bring in and renew any Sect already condemn'd (as are *in univerſum* all thoſe of this deplorable and ſeditious " Time,) and in order to it petitions for a Church, and " permiſſion of Inhabiting this Kingdom, (as ſome of " your Provinces have lately done, with great Impudence, in the particular States) that ſuch a Petitioner " be accounted and declared a Heretick, as being a favourer of Hereticks; and that he be proceeded againſt " as ſuch, according to the rigour of the Canonical and " Civil Conſtitutions, *ut auferatur malum de medio noſtri*". Here is another Paſſage, " (m) *Gainas*, Captain-General of the Emperor *Arcadius*'s Forces in the " Year 410, or 412, plotting againſt the Crown of his " King, and deſigning to dethrone him, found no better " way to conceal his ill Will, and to hide his Treaſon, " than to demand of him a Church in the City of *Conſtantinople*, to pray, as he ſaid, and to Sing with his " Brethren, who were all Hereticks, as are now a-days " thoſe Petitioners for Churches".

(E) *Vexed at the Railleries and Cenſures*, &c] The Author of the Commentaries *De ſtatu Religionis & Reipublica in regno Gallia*, does not poſitively ſay, that thoſe Railleries, and the Paſquinades that were poſted up in ſeveral Places againſt *Quintin*, occaſion'd his Death (n); he aſcribes it to that, or to the uneaſineſs of his Conſcience. Preſident *la Place* and *Varillas* don't uſe ſuch an Alternative, and the former has not omitted the Rea-that Mortification, and his Affliction was ſo great, that he fell Sick, and died of Grief about the beginning of *April*, 1561. He was buried at *Paris* in the Church (*F*) of *St. John of Lateran*. I ſhall ſet down the Titles (*G*) of his Works. *Peter Ramus* choſe him to be one of the Judges of his Diſputation againſt *Govea* in the Year 1543. but *Quintin*, and the other * Judge choſen by *Ramus*, would not concern themſelves in that Affair, when they ſhould have pronounc'd the Sentence †.

---

* Thuan. ... lib. ... cap. 9. pag. 610.

† Commentaires de l'Etat de la Relig. & Republique B 4. fol. 152. Thuanus lib. 27.

(a) Beza ...

(b) Id. ib. pag. 63.

(c) Matth. ... 20.

(d) La Place ubi ſupra fol. 139. verſo.

(e) Ibid. ... 140.

(f) Ibid. ... 141.

(g) They ... Quintin's Words, ... fol.

(h) Ibid.

(i) Plaintes des Proteſtants, pag. 130.

(k) Ibid. pag. 131.

(l) La Place ubi ſupra fol. 135. verſo.

(m) Ibid. fol. 136. verſo.

(n) Paſſim vero in eum dicteria jactari, libellos affigi: ille denique palam irrideri: tandemque ſeu contumeliarum illarum impatiens, ſeu malè geſtæ rei conſcientia in morbum delapſus vitam cum morte commutavit. Fol. 87.

QUINTUS (CALABER) a *Greek* Poet, liv'd (*A*) in the fifth Century, if we may rely on the Conjectures of ſome Learned Men. He compos'd a large Supplement to the *Iliads*, which contains the Hiſtory of the *Trojan* War from *Hector*'s Death, 'till the Deſtruction of *Troy*. Cardinal *Beſſarion* was the firſt who made (*B*) that Poem known. He found it in the Church of St. *Nicolas* near *Otranto*; and this is the reaſon why the Author was call'd *Quintus Calaber*. Others being more exact, call him *Quintus*, or rather *Cointus Smyrnæus*; for they think he was of *Smyrna*. Thoſe, who ſay he taught (*C*) the Youth there, ſeem to me to have no

Reaſons that were alledged in *Quintin*'s Vindication. Theſe are his Words: " (*a*) Some ſaid, that thoſe who " blamed him upon that account, did not conſider that " his Leſſon was written down for him, which he read " all along, without any Geſtures or Motions uſual to " thoſe who make Speeches; and that the chief Pre- " lates, ſome Cardinals, and others, were Witneſſes and " Comptrollers of what he read. However he died " four Days after, being vexed to ſee ſeveral Pieces pub- " liſh'd againſt him". Now, let us ſee what *Varillas* ſays. The zealous Calviniſts " (*b*) were not ſo mode- " rate; for they publiſh'd ſuch a bloody Libel againſt " *Quintin*, divided into three Parts; the firſt of which " contained the groſs Ignorances, the ſecond the mani- " feſt Calumnies, and the third the malicious Omiſſions " of that Speech; that the Doctor being more touchy " than he ſhould have been, went to Bed after he had " read that Libel, and roſe no more". If *Varillas* had read that Libel, he would not have call'd it a *bloody* one: 'Tis a Writing of three Pages by way of Remonſtrance to the Queen, which was not preſented to her, and which *came but into few hands*. It is to be ſeen at length in *Beza*'s (*c*) Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of *France*, and it does not at all look like a Libel or a Satyr, but rather like a Writing belonging to a Proceſs, that is brought before the Judges, according to the uſual Style and Formalities. There is ſcarce any thing in it beſides the Heads of the Complaints, and theſe Words were added under the Calumnies: *We deſire that theſe Accuſations ſhould be proved againſt us, being ready to undergo Puniſhment, upon Condition that the Accuſers, for want of Proof, ſhall be puniſh'd according to the heinouſneſs of the Crimes falſly imputed to us.* 'Tis very likely, that the mortal Grief of that Author proceeded from ſome other Writings. *Thuanus* uſes the Plural Number, (*d*) and obſerves that *Quintin* was otherwiſe a good Man, and had formerly been zealous for the Reformation of the Church. There was no medling then with the Proteſtants; they had too many good Writers on their ſide. Here's a Man, who loſt his Life for having raſhly declaimed againſt them. He may be added to thoſe whom I have mention'd in the Article of *Hipponax*.

(*F*) *Of St. John of Lateran*,] His Epitaph is to be ſeen there (*e*) in theſe Words:

Quintinus Doctor, librorumque Helluo ſummus,
Dum nulla dapis alterius tentatur orexi,
Dumque fidem pro qua calamo pugnavit & ore
Fortiter, affligi videt, acrius & dolet, ex hoc
Orbe, invitus, non invitis, migrat amicis.
Obiit nona Aprilis 1561.

Obſerve, that whereas others aſcribe his Death to the Grief he conceiv'd for the abuſive Reflections that were made upon him; the Author of his Epitaph aſcribes it to his being ſenſibly affected with the Affliction of the Church. This is a Subterfuge which a falſe Zeal has made long ago very common.

(*G*) *The Titles of his Books.*] *Melita Inſulæ deſcriptio. Tractatus de ventis, & nautica buxula ventorum indice. Scholia in Tertulliani librum de præſcriptionibus hæreticorum* (*e*). *Repetitæ Prælectiones Capituli de multa providentia, de præbendis & dignitatibus, & Cap. novit. de judiciis.* The Plurality of Benefices, and the Ariſtocracy of the Chriſtian Religion, are the Subject of this laſt Book. *Octoginta quinque Regulæ ſeu Canones Apoſtolorum, cum vetuſtis Joannis Monachi Zonaræ ſcholiis Latine modo verſis. Speculum Sacerdotii. Synodus Gangrenſis explicata commentariolis ex Gratiani diſtinctione trigeſima. Hæreticorum Catalogus & Hiſtoria ex Gratiano.* He tranſlated into *Latin* the *Syntagma Canonum Græcorum*, written by *Matthew Blaſtares*, a Monk. That Tranſlation was never printed, it is in the Library of the *French* King (*g*).

(*A*) *Lived in the fifth Century, if we may rely upon the Conjectures.*] *Rhodomanus* (*h*) is in the right to ſay, that he did not live before the great Conqueſt of the *Roman* People: for he brings in the Sooth-ſayer *Calchas*, foretelling that *Æneas* ſhould reign in *Italy*, and that his Poſterity ſhould extend their Empire from the Eaſt to the Weſt.

(*i*) Ἐκ τοῦ δ᾽ αὖ γένος μετόπισθεν ἀνάξειν,
Ἄχρις ἐπ᾽ ἀντολίην τε καὶ ἀκάματον δύσιν ἐλθεῖν.
. . . . . *Ejuſque exinde progenies regnet,*
Donec ad ortum & occaſum inſuperabilem imperii fines extendat.

Beſides he mentions (*k*) the Exerciſes of the *Circus*, as they were uſed under the *Roman* Emperors. One may be therefore perſuaded, that he did not live before the firſt *Cæſars*: But this being too general to ſatisfie an Inquiſitive Perſon, a more limited Conjecture has been drawn from his Style: *Rhodomanus* thinks, that the Character of his Muſe is ſo like that of *Tryphiodorus*, and *Coluthus*, &c. that 'tis very likely they lived at the ſame time. (*l*) *Character ipſe carminis* γραμματικώτερον *elaboratus oſtendit, eum Coluthi* (*qui ad quintum Chriſti nati ſeculum poëma lepidiſſimum de Helenes raptu conſcripſit*) *aliorumque illa ætate vigentium, æqualem aut vicinum fuiſſe. Enimvero ſi dictionem Cointi, Coluthi, Tryphiodori, Muſæi, (illum dico, qui Leandri Heruſque amores cecinit) & Nonni, ad examen Criticum vocaris, ſimillimam & ferè eandem ſermonis ideam ſtructuræque rationem deprehendes: unde ætate quoque propinquos inter ſe fuiſſe ratiocineris.* What *Rhodomanus* adds, that the Name *Cointus*, of a *Latin* Original, ſhews, that this Poet was made a *Roman* Citizen, is but a weak Confirmation of what he had ſaid juſt before; for, tho' that Poet had lived before *Cicero*, he might have been honoured with the Freedom of *Rome*. *Reineſius* (*m*) has a good Reaſon to laugh at thoſe, who pretend that he lived under one of the Emperors of the Family *Julia*. They ground their Opinion on the Oracle of *Calchas*, and they pretend that *Nero* being the laſt of the Family of the firſt *Cæſar*, that Poet muſt have lived at fartheſt under the Empire of *Nero*. This is a wrong way of drawing Conſequences. At this very Day our Poets might bring in *Calchas*, foretelling ſuch a thing, tho' the *Roman* Empire has been diſmembred long ſince. *Cointus* needed not conſider the Emperors, who pretended to be deſcended from *Æneas*: It was enough for him, that the City built by *Romulus*, who was deſcended from *Æneas*, did rule or had ruled from Eaſt to Weſt.

(*B*) *Is the firſt, who made that Poem known.*] Here is a Paſſage of *Conſtantin Laſcaris*. *Poeſis autem Homericiſſimi Quinti jam multo tempore omnibus ignota fuit, & tanquam extincta: ſed propius Beſſarion Nicænus Cardinalis Tuſculani, ille ſane quam bonus & vere doctus, & ut Homericè dixerim, ſimilis Deo vir, aliaque plurima in nos, & hanc ex Apulia cum ſervaſſet, volentibus tradidit, quam & ipſe olim deſiderabam* (*n*). Very few Authors had mention'd that Poem (*o*): And therefore we ought the leſs to be ſurpriz'd that *Quintus Curtius* has not been mention'd for ſo many Ages. The firſt Edition of our *Cointus* is that of *Aldus Manutius*: It was full of Faults (*p*).

(*C*) *That he taught the Youth at* Smyrna.] Here is *Rhodomanus*'s Argument. Since our *Cointus* ſays, that he fed the Muſes Sheep in the fine Garden of *Smyrna*, it ought to be inferr'd from it, that he was Maſter of a famous School on that Coaſt of *Ionia*. It was no mean School; for he ſays that his Scholars were illuſtrious: He was therefore one of thoſe Profeſſors of Philoſophy and Eloquence, who were call'd Sophiſts. This is the Subſtance of *Rhodomanus*'s Argument. I ſhall ſet down his own Words at length. (*q*) *Ex indicio iſto, quod de ſe ipſe facit, Muſarum oves in liberali Smyrnæ horto ſe paviſſe teſtatus ſcholam in Ionia littore iſto nec infrequentem nec incelebrem habuiſſe Poetam noſtrum, colligere eſt. Nec triviale magiſterium id fuiſſe apparet inde, quod oves ſuas, id eſt diſcipulos, nobiles ſeu fama illuſtres,* (περικλυτὰ) *epitheto ſatis emphatico, appellat, unde ſi divinare licet, id tandem elicimus, Cointum fuiſſe ex profeſſione illorum, quos Sophiſtas, id eſt philoſophiæ & eloquentiæ*

---

* *A Diſciple of Ramus, Named John à Beaumont.*

† *See Joan. de Launoy De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, cap. 15. p. m. 72. and the Remark Y of the Article Ramus.*

(*a*) *La Place ubi ſupra fol. 151. verſo.*

(*b*) *Varillas Charles IX. tom. 1. pag. 18. Dutch Edit.*

(*c*) *Tom. 1. pag. 137.*

(*d*) Sane ob id mordacibus libellis ac dicteriis peritus tantum dolorem cepit, ut contracto inde morbo paulo poſt deceſſerit, homo alioqui minime malus, ſed Decretalis Juriſquam verum agendarum peritia clarior, & qui ſerio de emendanda Eccleſia aliquando cogitaverat. *Thuanus lib. 27.*

(*e*) *Vide Doujat. ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) *Epit. Biblioth. Geſneri.*

(*g*) *Doujat. Prænot. Canon. lib. 5. cap. 8.*

(*h*) *Laurent. Rhodomannus, in præfat. ad Cointum Smyrnæum.*

(*i*) *Cointus Smyrnæus lib. 13. pag. 195. m. 6.*

(*k*) *Ibid.*

(*l*) *Rhodomannus, fol. verſo.*

(*m*) *Tom. Reineſius, epiſt. 67. ad Rupert. pag. 553.*

(*n*) *Conſtant. Laſcaris in Grammatica, apud Lorenzo Craſſo, Iſtoria de' poeti Greci, pag. 456.*

(*o*) Hujus præter unum atque alterum è Græcis, & quidem recentioribus, nemo in ſcriptis ſuis mentionem facit. *Rhodoman. in præfat.*

(*p*) *Geſner in Bibliotheca, fol. 575.*

(*q*) *Rhodom. ubi ſupra fol. †† 2. verſo.*

no good grounds for it. The Learned *Reinesius* pretends he ought not to be diſtinguiſh'd from a (D) Grammarian call'd *Corintus*, of whom there is a Book concerning the Dialects. The beſt Edition of (E) *Quintus Calaber's* Poem is that of *Rhodomannus*. Some Criticks admire Cointus; others ſpeak of him with great Contempt. See the Paſſages quoted by *Lorenzo Craſſo* *, and Mr. *Baillet's* † *Jugemens des Savans*. One *Udenus Niſielius* praiſes him for ſome things, and blames him for ſome others. See his *Progymnaſmata*; 'tis an *Italian* Book.

QUIRINUS (PUBLIUS SULPICIUS) Conſul * in the Year of *Rome* 742, was born at *Lanuvium*, † and was not of the Patrician Family *Sulpicia*. The Services he did *Auguſtus* with great Zeal and Application, eſpecially in the War, were the only cauſe of his Advancement. After his Conſulſhip he had the Command of an Army in *Cilicia* β, in order to ſubdue a γ Nation, which δ was accounted the moſt unconquerable of that Country. He ζ overcame them by Famine, for which he had η the Honour of a Triumph. Some place this in the time wherein our Saviour was born, and believe, that tho' there was then another Governor in *Syria*, yet *Auguſtus*, in conſideration of the Glory which *Quirinus* had acquir'd, gave him a ſpecial Commiſſion for the Taxation mention'd by St. *Luke* θ; for 'tis not queſtion'd, that he who is call'd *Cyrenius* in the κ Scripture, is the ſame with our *Quirinus*. The Eſteem *Auguſtus* had for him, did eminently appear when he made him Governor to *Caius Cæſar* his Grandſon after the Death of *Lollius*, who had been in that Poſt. We have ſeen in another λ Place what difference *Tiberius* made between thoſe two Governors of *Caius Cæſar*. *Quirinus's* Marriage with *Æmilia Lepida*, is a very good proof of the conſideration he was in; for ſhe was at firſt deſign'd μ for *Lucius Cæſar*, *Auguſtus's* Grandſon.

quentia magiſtros, Grammaticos, qui Poëtarum interpretes erant, & juventutis ſcholaſticæ doctores; florens adhuc Græcia magnificabat. Quid enim aliud per Muſarum hortum & oves, præter quam ſcholam, & diſcipulos in ea doctrina & eloquentiæ ſtudiis addictos, intelligi exiſtimemus? He had ſaid a little before: (a) *Cum tota ejus vita ignorantiæ tenebris involuta ſit, patria tamen ſola vindiciis inde aſſerta eſt. Nam libro XIV. & hanc & vitæ quodam modo genus exprimit; ubi ſe Muſarum ovibus paſcendis Smyrnæ operam dediſſe profitetur.* Here is a ſurprizing Inſtance of Diſtraction. I muſt firſt ſet down the *Greek* Works of *Cointus*: They are not in the 14th Book, as *Rhodomannus* ſays, but in the 12th; and they contain an Invocation of the Muſes, occaſion'd by the Ennumeration of thoſe, who were ſo courageous as to get into the wooden Horſe.

Τούς (b) μοι νῦν καθ᾽ ἕκαστον ἀνειρομένῳ σάφα μοῦσαι
Ἔσπεθ᾽, ὅσοι κατέβησαν ἔσω πολυχανδέος ἵππου.
Ὑμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσάν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θῆκατ᾽ ἀοιδὴν,
Πρίν μοι ἀμφὶ παρειὰ κατασκίδνασθαι ἴουλον,
Σμύρνης ἐν δαπέδοισι περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι.

Quos mihi nunc ſingulatim exquirenti, Muſæ perſpicuè
Recenſete quotquot in multicapacem equum conſcenderunt.
Nam vos omnigenum animo meo carmen indidiſtis,
Antequam mihi circa genas lanugo ſpargeretur,
In campis Smyrnæ inclytas oves paſcenti.

'Tis plain, the Author tells the Muſes that they made him a Poet, when being as yet beardleſs, he fed Sheep in the Fields of *Smyrna*. How can this ſignifie, that he taught the Youth, that he had a famous School, and illuſtrious Scholars? How could a Boy, who had as yet no Beard, exerciſe ſuch a Profeſſion? How could *Rhodomannus* be ſo heedleſs, tho' he ſpent many Years upon that Poem, tho' he tranſlated it into *Latin*, and made an Abridgment of it in *Greek* and *Latin* Verſe? Where did he find that *Cointus* boaſts of having fed (c) the Muſes Sheep? Now let us ſee the Lazineſs of another Learned Man. (d) *Nunc veriſimilius Smyrnæum nuncupant: quia ipſe lib.* xiv. *dicat, ſe* περικλυτοῖς *ſive illuſtribus Muſarum ovibus Smyrnæ paſcendis operam dediſſe: ex quo ſi de patria haud certo colligitur, ſaltem videmus ſcholam non infrequentem præſtantium diſcipulorum habuiſſe Smyrnæ.* *Voſſius*, without taking the Pains to conſult *Cointus*, tranſcribed what he found in *Rhodomannus's* Preface: He took out of it the wrong Quotation of the 14th Book, and the falſe Gloſs of the Muſes Sheep, with the whole Conſequence which that Tranſlator drew from it. He, and other Learned Men, have done the like a thouſand times. I wonder that *Reineſius* ſhould approve ſuch an Explication of thoſe Verſes of *Cointus*: He will have it alſo, that it appears from them that this Poet was a School-maſter at *Smyrna*. *Convenit autem*, ſays he (e), *ut quod maximè, Grammatico, qualis fuit Corintus, ludimagiſtri officio fungi & docere pueros, quod noſter de ſe profitetur (f) l. 11. verſibus dulciſſimis: neque falſi ſunt viri docti imprimis* Parrhaſius, *& diligentiſſimus ejus recenſitor ac interpres* Laur. Rhodomannus, *qui eos de inſtitutione ſcholaſtica apud Smyrnenſes interpretati ſunt.* What he ſays in the next Words is better grounded: He rejects the Opinion of thoſe, who pretend that *Cointus* deſign'd only, by thoſe Verſes, to boaſt of his following *Homer*. (g) *Dubitoque igitur quenquam ita ſimplicem eſſe, qui* Smyrnæ oves paſcere idem eſſe ac Homerum ſequi, quem bona pars Smyrnæum cenſuit, *credere velit, aut ita perſpicacem qui duo iſta eadem eſſe videre poſſit. Mihi quidem tam beato eſſe nondum contigit, & habeo pro violenta & à ſenſu Poëtæ alieniſſima eam expoſitionem.* As for me, I believe the whole Myſtery lyes in an Imitation of *Heſiod*. Read theſe Words of *Tanaquillus Faber*. (h) Heſiod *became a Poet, as he was feeding his Sheep: I hope you'll believe him; for he ſaies ſo himſelf: And thoſe, who ſaid it after him, ſaid it only upon the Credit of that Poet, or upon the Report of the Shepherds of* Bœotia, *to whom that Adventure appear'd ſo wonderful, that they made a Song about it, which is loſt.* *Cointus*, if I am not miſtaken, meant that the Muſes had done him the ſame Favour, as they had done to *Heſiod* (i). To conclude, I ſhall obſerve, that *Volaterran*, and ſome others, make him a *Roman*, without any ſhew of Reaſon; and that *Geſner* (k) was in the wrong to fancy that *Volaterran* does not ſpeak of the ſame Poet, whoſe 14 Books *derelictorum ab Homero* were publiſh'd by *Aldus*. That Fault has not been mended by thoſe, who abridged *Geſner's* *Bibliotheque*. Like him, they made two Articles of *Quintus Poeta Romanus*, mention'd by *Volaterran*, and of *Quintus Calaber*, printed by *Aldus*.

(D) *From a Grammarian call'd* Corintus.] Theſe are *Reineſius's* Words: (l) *Fuit* Corintus *Grammaticus, cujus libellum* de dialectis *ad Studioſum quendam juvenem ſcriptum habemus editum cum adpendice H. Stephani, eumque citat* Joh. Petrus Nunneſ. not. ad Phrynichum Sylburg. ſpicil. ad Herod. Betuleius not. ad Lact. l. 1. c. 6. Joh. Talenton. l. 2. rer. recondit. cap. 19. *è cujus vero nomine* κόριντος *amiſſa una literula vel prætervisa à primo deſcriptore exiit* κόϊντος. It muſt be confeſs'd, that the Word κόριντος might eaſily have been changed into κόϊντος; and that (m) a Grammatical Genius does very much appear in this Author's Poem. *Reineſius* does fully prove it. He obſerves, that the Grammarian *Corintus* lived after *John Philoponus*, in the VI or VII Century; and that he cannot be later, ſince he was quoted by *Tzetzes*. I am amazed at this; for there is a vaſt ſpace of Time between the VII Century, and that wherein (n) *Tzetzes* lived. (o) *Fuit autem poſt Johannem Gramm. Alexandrinum, d. Philoponum, teſte ipſo in* proœm. l. de dial. *inter mediæ ætatis Græcos ſeculo ſexto ſeptimove, quibus Græcia etſi à politia degeneraſſet plurimum, viros tamen doctos & memorandos aliquos aluit. . . . Pauci ſunt, quos nominare poſſumus iſtorum temporum:* Johannes Stobæus, Georgius Piſides, Theophyl. Simocates, Thomas & Coprogenius magiſtri, Euphronius, Moſchopulus, Chœroboſcus, Demetrius Triclinius, Georg. Syncellus, Euſtathius, *& extremo octavi* Photius, *& qui ex ejus doctiſſimis epiſtolis noti ſunt: prioribus inter memoratos etiam adcenſeri debet* Corintus *iſte. Fuiſſe in æſtimio & non inferiorem tempore quàm determinavi inde apparet, quod laudantur a* γραμματικωτάτῳ Tzetze in Chiliad. *&* comm. ad Lycophr. *ubi de Machaone.*

(E) *The beſt Edition . . . . is that of* Rhodomanus.] I have not that of *Hanaw* 1604, mention'd in the Catalogue of the *Bodleian* Library; but I have that of 1614, *ex officina Aubriana*. It contains the whole Performance of *Rhodomanus* upon that Author, and *Claudius Dauſquejus's* Notes in *Quintum Calabrum, Tryphiodorum &* Colu-

(h) *Tanaq. Faber, Vie des poëtes Grecs, pag. m.* 10.

(i) *Confer quæ ſupra in the Article Æſchylus, Remark C.*

(k) *In Bibliotb. fol.* 575. *where he ſets down* Volaterran's *Words.*

(l) *Reineſius ubi ſupra pag.* 591.

(m) Non autem niſi τρίβωνα quendam Grammaticum & conſummatæ peritiæ literatorem iſta Paraleipomena ſcripſiſſe patet inprimis ex accurata & curioſa valde locorum deſcriptione, quæ diligentius multo enarrat, quam aliquis de vulgo Poëta taceret, ut cum *&c.* *Reineſius ibid.*

(n) Tzetzes *lived at the end of the* XII. *Century. See* Nicolas Gerbelius's *Preface upon* Tzetzes.

(o) *Id. ib. pag.* 592.

ſon. She was unfortunate in her Marriage; *Quirinus* divorced her, and *(A)* many Years after he accuſed her of ſeveral Crimes for which ſhe was condemn'd to Baniſhment. This Proceeding of *Quirinus* appeared ſo ſtrange, that People begun to pity *(B) Lepida*, tho' ſhe was infamous and guilty. The Victory he obtain'd over her was publickly abhorred, and they did not fail, on that Occaſion, to compare his mean Birth with the noble Extraction of that Lady. He had alſo render'd himſelf odious by his ſordid way of ſpending his old Age in the midſt of a plentiful Eſtate. He died in the Year of *Rome* 774; and at *Tiberius*'s Deſire they made him a publick Funeral χ. If any one deſires to know whether he ought to be call'd *Quirinus*, or †† *Quirinius*, he needs only read *Ryckius*'s Notes on *Tacitus*'s Annals, *pag.* 57. *Joſephus* calls † him Κυρήνιος, *Cyrenius*, and ſays that he was a Man, who had gone thro' all Employments, and one of the moſt illuſtrious of thoſe Times.

χ Sueton. [illegible] cap. [illegible]

†† He is call'd in moſt Editions of Tacitus.

† Joſeph. Antiq. Judaic. lib. 18. cap. 1. pag. 616.

Coluthum. One *Jodocus Valarans* made a Tranſlation of *Cointus* in Proſe, which was printed at *Lyons* in 1541. *Bernardin Baldus* made another.

(A) He divorc'd her, and many years after he accuſed her of ſeveral Crimes.] He accuſed her of having ſuppoſed that ſhe had had a Child by him. She might have had a great Motive for ſuch a Suppoſition; for he was very rich, and had no Children. The other Accuſations were about Adultery, poiſoning, and conſulting the Diviners concerning the Imperial Family. (a) *At Romæ Lepida, cui ſuper Æmiliorum decus L. Sulla ac Cn. Pompeius proavi erant, defertur* ſimulaviſſe partum ex P. Quirino divite, atque orbo. *adjiciebantur* adulteria, venena, quæſitumque per Chaldæos in domum Cæſaris, *defendente ream Manio Lepido fratre. Quirinus poſt dictum repudium adhuc infenſus, quamvis infami ac nocenti miſerationem addiderat.* It appears from the beginning of this Paſſage, that *Æmilia Lepida* was great Grand-daughter of *Sylla* and *Pompey*. She was not the better for it. I wonder that *Suetonius*, who wrote after *Tacitus*, ſhould mention but one Accuſation: He only ſays, that *Lepida* was accuſed of attempting to poyſon her Husband. (b) *Condemnatam & generoſiſſimam fœminam Lepidam, in gratiam Quirini conſularis praedivitis, & orbi, qui dimiſſam eam e matrimonio poſt vigeſimum annum veneni olim in ſe comparati arguebat.* This Omiſſion of *Suetonius* is attended with another Fault; for he ſays, that ſhe was condemned 20 years after ſhe had been divorc'd. He is not exact in his Chronology. I prove it thus: That Lady was condemn'd in the Year 773. There had been a Deſign to marry her to *Lucius Cæſar*, *Auguſtus*'s Grand-Son, and therefore it muſt be ſaid, that ſhe did not marry *Quirinus* 'till after the Death of that young Prince. But he died in the Year 755, according to Arch-biſhop *Uſher*'s, and Father (c) *Noris*'s Calculation; or in the Year 756, according to *Petavius*; or in the Year 757, according to (d) *Valeſius*. 'Tis not likely that *Quirinus* ſhould have divorc'd her before he had lived a year with her; and therefore it is not true, that in 773 ſhe had been divorc'd 20 Years. The Commentators on *Suetonius* take no notice of this Difficulty, tho' it deſerved to be clear'd. Father *Noris* (e) had Reaſon to find fault with Arch-biſhop *Uſher* for ſaying, on the one hand, that *Lucius Cæſar* died in the Year 755; and on the other, that *Lepida* was married to *Quirinus* in the Year 753. Theſe two things are inconſiſtent, ſince it is undeniable that *Quirinus* married after the Death of *Lucius Cæſar*: Will any Body ſay, that there was a Deſign to marry a Woman to the Emperor's Grand-Son, who had been left, or put away by *Quirinus*? The Learned *Uſher* fell into this Miſtake, becauſe he truſted *Suetonius*, that is, becauſe he thought *Suetonius* had exactly computed the Years between *Lepida*'s Divorce, and her Trial. He ſhould not have had ſo good an Opinion of him. I muſt not forget, that *Tiberius*, after the Condemnation of this Woman, declared at laſt that he was certainly inform'd by *Quirinus*'s Servants, that ſhe had endeavour'd to poiſon her Husband. (f) *Dein tormentis ſervorum patefacta ſunt flagitia, itumque in ſententiam Rubellii Blandi, a quo aqua atque igni arcebatur: huic Druſus adſenſit, quamquam alii mitius conſuiſſent, mox Scauro qui filiam ex ea genuerat, datum, ne bona publicarentur. Tum demum aperuit Tiberius,* compertum ſibi etiam ex P. Quirini ſervis, veneno eum à Lepida petitum. We ſhall ſee, that in all likelyhood *Lepida* was juſtly condemn'd.

(B) People began to pity Lepida, *tho' ſhe was infamous and guilty.*] If it cannot be ſaid, that *Tacitus* reflected too much upon *Tiberius*, much leſs can it be affirm'd, that he was willing to ſpare him. Seeing therefore he acknowledges, that *Lepida* (g) was guilty, and had loſt her Reputation, we may very well believe that the thing was notorious. He does not deny, that *Tiberius* made ſome Steps during that Tryal, whereby it appear'd, that he was deſirous that *Lepida* ſhould be puniſh'd; but he owns, that one might ſuſpect from ſome other Steps, that he had a mind ſhe ſhould go unpuniſh'd. (h) *Haud facile quis diſpexerit illa in cognitione mentem Principis, adeo vertit ac miſcuit iræ & clementiæ ſigna.* The worſt that can be ſaid is, That *Tiberius* promoted under hand the Verification of the Crimes of which *Lepida* was accuſed. This cannot be call'd an Oppreſſion of Innocence, an Unjuſtice, a Tyranny, &c. Let us conclude, that the Lady deſerv'd the Puniſhment ſhe ſuffer'd. Nevertheleſs the People expreſs'd their Indignation againſt the Authors of the Tryal, and openly complain'd, with horrid Imprecations, that ſo illuſtrious a Lady was ſacrificed to *Quirinus*. She had moved the People with the Complaints ſhe made during the Celebration of the publick Games; and beſides, *Quirinus* had render'd himſelf odious. This was the great Point; for they who draw upon themſelves the hatred of the People, prompt 'em to favour and cheriſh the Perſons whom they attack, tho' they have no Merit, and even tho' they be very guilty. (i) *Quirinus quamvis infami ac nocenti miſerationem addiderat.* . . . . . (k) *Lepida ludorum diebus, qui cognitionem intervenerant, theatrum cum claris feminis ingreſſa, lamentatione flebili* majores ſuos *ciens*, ipſumque Pompeium, *cujus ea monumenta, & adſtantes imagines viſebantur, tantum miſericordiæ permovit, ut effuſi in lacrymas,* ſæva & deteſtanda Quirino *clamarent,* cujus ſenectæ atque orbitati, & obſcuriſſimæ domui, deſtinata quondam uxor L. Cæſari, ac divo Auguſto nurus, dederetur. The Puniſhment inflicted upon *Lepida* did but increaſe (l) the hatred of the People againſt *Quirinus*.

(a) *Tacitus Annal. lib.* 3. *cap.* 22.

(b) *Sueton. in Tiberio cap.* 49.

(c) *See Father Noris*'s Cenotaphia Piſana, *page* 258, & 260.

(d) *In notis ad excerpta Dionis page* 90. *See Noris ibid. pag.* 259.

(e) *Noris ibid. pag.* 258.

(f) Tacit. Ann. lib. 3, cap. 23.

(g) Quamvis infami ac nocenti. *Id. ib. cap.* 22.

(h) *Id. ib.*

(i) *Id. ib.*

(k) *Id. ib. cap.* 23.

(l) Sed ceteris haud læta memoria Quirini erat, ob intenta, ut memoravi, Lepidæ pericula ſordidamque & præpotentem ſenectam. *Id. ibid. cap.* 48.

RACAN

R.

RACAN (HONORAT DE BEUIL, MARQUIS DE) the Son of a Knight of the King's Orders, was born at *la Roche Racan in Touraine* † in the Year * 1589. He was the King's § Page in the Year 1605. and as he begun then to make Verſes, he got himſelf acquainted with *Malherbe, of whom he learn'd whatever he knew of the* French *Poetry . . . . This Acquaintance and Friendſhip with* Malherbe *laſted 'till he died, which happen'd in* 1628 ‡. He was admitted into the *French Academy*, when it was founded, in which he caus'd a Diſcourſe § againſt Learning to be read the 9th of *July*, 1635. If he had been at *Paris*, he would have ſpoken it himſelf; but he was in his Province. He publiſh'd that Diſcourſe *with ſome of his Poems* ††. He died in the Year 1670. and was ſucceeded in the Academy by Mr. *de la Chambre*, Rector of *St. Bartholomew's*. He happen'd one Day to make a Quatrain exactly like that of a Poet *(Z)* whom he thought he had never read. I ſhall ſay in another ‡ place, that he was extreamly ſenſible to the Favours of the Ladies.

RADZIWIL (NICOLAS) IV. of that *(A)* Name, Palatin of *Vilna*, Great Marſhal and Chancellor of *Lithuania* in the XVI Century, was a very illuſtrious Man. He travell'd almoſt all over *Europe*, and was ſo expert in bodily Exerciſes, that no Gentleman of his

(Z) *Like that of a Poet, whom he thought he had never read.*] Mr. *Menage* tells us a great many Particulars, which deſerve to be ſet down in this place. " (a) I " have often heard Mr. *Chapelain* ſay, That he and Mr. " *d'Andilli* had made that ſame (b) Verſe, without " knowing that it was *Malherbe's*. And whilſt I am " writing this Remark, I underſtand by Mr. *Furetiere*, " that the ſame thing has happen'd to him. I have " likewiſe heard often Mr. *Corneille* ſay, That he had " made, in his *Polyeuctes*, theſe two famous Verſes con- " cerning Fortune,

" *Et comme elle a l'éclat du verre,*
" *Elle en a la fragilité.*

That is,

" *And as ſhe has the Luſtre of bright Glaſs,*
" *So ſhe the Brittleneſs has too,*

" without knowing that they were Mr. *Godeau's*; for " they were made firſt of all by Mr. *Godeau*, Biſhop of " *Vence*, in his Ode to Cardinal *Richelieu*, fifteen Years " before Mr. *Corneille* made 'em in his *Polyeuctes*. It is " no uncommon thing thus to hit on the Thoughts and " Expreſſions of others. *Porphyrius* in a Fragment of " his Book concerning *Philology*, quoted by *Euſebius* in " the third Chapter of the tenth Book of his *Præparatio Evangelica*, mentions one *Aretades*, who had writ- " ten a whole Treatiſe of ſuch Hits. . . . . . I ſay, " it is a pretty common thing thus to hit upon the " ſame Thought and Expreſſion of another Man; eſpe- " cially when one has formerly ſeen the ſame Thought " and the ſame Expreſſion, as Mr. *d'Andilli*, Mr. *Cha-* " *pelain*, and Mr *Furetiere*, had certainly ſeen that Verſe " of *Malherbe*, and Mr. *Corneille* thoſe two Verſes of " Mr. *Godeau*; for it often falls out, that a thing re- " mains in our Mind, when the Author of it is forgot- " ten. But what happen'd to Mr. *de Racan* is very ex- " traordinary. In the Year 1608, being in Garriſon at " *Calais*, he made theſe four Verſes at 19 Years of " Age:

" *Eſtime qui voudra la mort épouventable,*
" *Et la face l'horreur de tous les animaux;*
" *Quant à moy je la tiens pour le poinct deſirable*
" *Où commencent nos biens, & finiſſent nos maux.*

" Some time after being at *Paris*, and repeating thoſe " Verſes as his own to his Friend *Ivrante*, his Friend " told him, that he ſhould not impoſe upon him, that " he knew very well thoſe Verſes were the firſt " *Quatrain* of *Mathieu's* Book, intitled, *Les Tablettes* " *de la vie & de la mort*. Mr. *de Racan*, who had ne- " ver ſeen that Book, denied obſtinately, and for a con- " ſiderable time, that *Mathieu* had made thoſe Verſes, " 'till *Ivrante* brought *Mathieu's* Book, and ſhew'd " him the Verſes, at which Mr. *de Racan* was not a " little amazed. I don't queſtion the Truth of this Sto- " ry, being fully perſuaded that Mr. *de Racan*, who " told it me often in the Preſence of ſeveral People, is " a very ſincere Man. But I doubt very much of what " *Leonardo Salviati* ſays, in the firſt Book of his *Avver-* " *timenti della Lingua Italiana*, that a Poet of his time, " who had never ſeen Cardinal *Bembo's* Sonnets, had " made ſome exactly like them". You ſee that Mr. *Menage* makes a great difference between *Racan's* Adventure, and thoſe of the other Poets, whom he names: He finds ſomething in the firſt that is more extraordinary. I ſhould judge otherwiſe of it, if I was to ſay what I think of it. Few People are ignorant, that well bred Children are taught ſome Moral and Pious Maxims; and that Care is taken, even before they can read, to make 'em get by heart ſome Sententious Staffs of Verſes. The Proteſtants pitch upon ſome Paſſages of *David's* Pſalms; or, as the Catholicks do, upon ſome Quatrains of *Pibrac*, or of another (c) Poet of the ſame Nature, which are never wanting in any Country. Without doubt little *Racan*, when he was but 5 or 6 Years of Age, heard his Governeſs, or his Mother, repeat ſome of thoſe fine Quatrains, or ſome of *Mathieu's*, which are generally bound up with *Pibrac*. The Traces that were imprinted on his Brain, ſunk in, and remain'd ſo ſeveral Years; afterwards they appear'd again, and ſeem'd to him an Object intirely new, without rouſing up the Remembrance of the Author, or of the Book, which had occaſion'd them. He therefore thought himſelf to be the Author of thoſe four Verſes, tho' at the bottom they were only an imperfect Reminiſcence. If a Man would carefully examine himſelf, he would find, upon a thouſand Occaſions, that what he takes to be his own Invention, is a thing that he has heard or read; but he did not remember that Circumſtance. Here follow ſome Verſes of *Moliere*, which confirm what I have ſaid concerning the Education of Children: 'Tis a Cenſure of a Cocquet: A Father ſpeaks to his Daughter:

Voilà (d), voilà le fruit de ces empreſſemens,
Qu'on vous voit nuit & jour à lire vos Romans:
De colibets d'amour vôtre tête eſt remplie,
Et vous parlez de Dieu bien moins que de Clelie.
Jettez moi dans le feu tous ces méchans écrits,
Qui gâtent tous les jours tant de jeunes eſprits:
Liſez moi comme il faut, au lieu de ces ſornettes,
Les quatrains de Pibrac, & les doctes Tablettes
Du Conſeiller Matthieu, ouvrage de valeur,
Et plein de beaux dictons à reciter par cœur:
La guide des pécheurs eſt encor un bon livre,
C'eſt là qu'en peu de tems on apprend à bien vivre,
Et ſi vous n'aviez leu que ces moralitez,
Vous ſçauriez un peu mieux ſuivre mes volontez.

That is,

See, ſee the Fruit of having in your hands,
And reading Day and Night naughty Romances.
Your Head is fill'd with nothing but Amours,
And Clelia, *than your God, takes up more hours.*
Burn all thoſe wicked Books, caſt them away;
For they ſpoil ſeveral young Folks every Day.
Inſtead of Trifles, pray, read, as you ſhould do
Pibrac's *Quatrains, the learned* Tablettes *too*
Of Councellor Matthieu; *a Book of Worth,*
Full of good Sayings, fit to be brought forth.
The Guide of Sinners, *a good Book likewiſe,*
By which you'll learn to live well, if you're wiſe.
If you had read thoſe Moral Things, I ſay,
You'd better know my Will how to obey.

(A) *IV. of that Name*] *Jagello* being converted to Chriſtianity, and having united *Lithuania* his Country to the Crown of *Poland*, which had been conferr'd upon him, created a Lord, called *Radziwil*, Palatin of *Vilna*, who, after his Example, was become a Chriſtian. This Palatin took the Name of *Nicolas* at his Baptiſm, and order'd that for the time to come, all the eldeſt Sons

---

§ Peliſſon Hiſt. de l'Academie Franç. pag.
* Speaking in the Remark that he was 19 Years of Age in the Year 1608.
† Vie de Malherbe pag.
‡ Ibid. pag. 6.
§ Peliſſon ubi ſupra pag. 103.
†† Ibid.
‡ In the Remark F. of the Article Termes.

(a) Menage, obſervations ſur Malherbe, pag. He has inſerted all this in the Anti-Baillet, tom. 2. p.

(b) That is, d'arbitre de la paix, de foudres de la guerre, which is in Malherbe's Paraphraſe upon the 145 Pſalm.

(c) There is a Book intituled, Le miroir de vertu & le chemin de bien vivre. 'Tis a Collection of *Chriſtian and moral Quatrains* by Peter Habert, *Counſellor and Secretary to the King*.

(d) *Moliere, Sganarelle ou le cocu imaginaire ſcene* 1.

Age equall'd him in it. He had a great ſhare in the Love and Eſteem of King *Sigiſmund Auguſtus*; he was made Captain of his Guards, and Commanded his Armies three times in *Livonia*, where he obtain'd a ſignal Victory over the *Germans*, whereby they loſt that Province, which was ſubjected to *Poland*. He brought the Archbiſhop of *Riga*, and the Great Maſter of the Knights of *Livonia* to the King, and deliver'd to him in a full Senate the Seal of that Order, and the Croſs which the Great Maſter wore about his Neck. That noble Expedition crown'd him with Glory. When he was ſent Ambaſſador to the Court of *Charles* V. and of *Ferdinand* King of the *Romans*, he was Godfather to the Arch-Duke *Erneſtus*. He died in the Year 1567. and was carried to his Grave upon the *(B)* Shoulders of his four Sons †. I muſt not forget that he embrac'd the Proteſtant Religion, and that he caus'd the Bible to be Printed in the *Poliſh* Language. He made a very *(D)* briſk Anſwer to *Lippoman* the Apoſtolical Nuncio, who had given him ſome reproachful Words. The Clergy of *Vilna* being not willing to permit the Miniſters to preach in the Churches, he made 'em preach in the Court of his Houſe, over againſt St. *John's* Church *. The firſt Synod of the Reformed was held under his Protection at *Vilna* in *December* 1557 ‡. He had a ° Wife, who was no leſs zealous than he to ſettle the Reformation §. There was at that time one *Chriſtopher RADZIWIL*, who embrac'd the Proteſtant Religion; and, 'tis ſaid, that the Diſcovery of ſome Monkiſh *(E)* Impoſtures occaſion'd his Change. Others call ‖ him *Nicolas*, and ſay he was Couſin-German to him, who makes the ſubject of this Article, and Brother of *Barbara Radziwil*, who Married *Sigiſmund Auguſtus*, King of *Poland*, and who died the 12th of *May*, 1551. They obſerve, that the Church which he caus'd to be built for the Reformed in the City of *Vilna*, of which he was Palatin, was honour'd with a fine Privilege by King *Stephen Battori* in the Year 1579. and that he died the

‖ *See the Remark E at the end.*

Sons of his Family ſhould be call'd *Nicolas*. He liv'd above a hundred Years (*a*). *Nicolas* the IId. his only Son, Palatin of *Vilna*, ſerv'd the Republick gloriouſly under ſix Kings ſucceſſively. He died being 99 Years old (*b*). *Nicolas* III, the eldeſt of his four Sons, Palatin of *Vilna*, was made a Prince of the Empire, by the Emperor *Maximilian* I. and died full of Glory, being above 70 Years of Age (*c*). *George Radziwil* his Brother, Palatin of *Kiovia*, Marſhal of the Court, Caſtellan of *Vilna*, and great General of *Lithuania*, was the Father of *Barbara Radziwil*, the ſecond Wife of King *Sigiſmund Auguſtus*. He died in the Year 1565 (*d*). *John Radziwil* his Brother, the youngeſt of the four Sons of *Nicolas* II. was made a Senator of the Kingdom by King *Sigiſmund* I. He was afterwards Caſtellan of *Troci*, and at laſt Great Marſhal of *Lithuania*. He took a Journey to *Rome* under the Pontificate of *Julius* II. (*e*) He left an only Son, who is *Nicolas Radziwil* IV, of that Name (*f*), who makes the Subject of this Article.

(*B*) *And was carried to his Grave* (g) *upon the Shoulders of his four Sons.*] You'll ſee their Names and Dignities in theſe *Latin* Words; (*h*) *Quatuor filios, itidem bello inclytos, nec deteriores ingeniis* (*qui, ut inquit Valerius Maximus patriæ rem non ſuam augere properabant*) *reliquit. Nicolaum Hieroſolymitana peregrinatione clarum; Georgium, Vilnenſem primò, deinde Cracovienſem Epiſcopum, & S. R. E. Cardinalem; Albertum ſupremum M. D. L. Marſaleum, & Staniſlaum Samogitiæ Toparcham: qui cum plurimis lachrymis, patre pro concione laudato funerateque ampliſſime, propriis manibus Urnam Mauſoleo inferre non erubuerunt.* Thuanus (*i*) obſerves, that thoſe four Sons return'd into the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and that *Albert* Married a Daughter of the Duke of *Curland*. He places the Death of *Nicolas Radziwil* on the 28th of *May* 1565. *Bucholcerus* does the ſame in his *Index Chronologicus*. Note, that *David Chytraus* (*k*) ſays the ſame thing as *Thuanus*. The Paſſage which I have quoted out of *Simon Staravolſcius*, informs us, that *Nicolas Radziwil*, the Eldeſt Son of our *Nicolas Radziwil*, made himſelf famous by his Voyage to *Jeruſalem*. Which obliges me to ſay, that the ſame Author obſerves in another Book, (*l*) that *Thomas Treterus* a Canon of *Warmia*, tranſlated into *Latin* the Relation of † *Nicolas Chriſtopher Radziwil's* Voyage to *Jeruſalem*. That Voyage was made in the Year 1584. This *Nicolas Chriſtopher Radziwil* gave a Relation of it in four Letters in the *Poliſh* Language. I have ſeen the *Latin* Tranſlation Printed at *Antwerp* in the Year 1614. in Folio. The Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Treterus* the Tranſlator is dated in the Year 1601. He who made that Journey, * died in the Month of *February* 1616. and was buried in a Pilgrim's Habit in the College of the Jeſuits at *Nieſwiez*. He was made a Prince of the Empire, and left four Sons ††, from one of which, if I am not miſtaken, Prince *Staniſlaus Albert Radziwil* deſcended, who was ** *Duke of* Olyka *and* Nieſwiez, *Chancellor of the Great Dutchy of* Lithuania, and the Author of a Panegyrick upon Our Lady of *Czeſtochovia*. He flouriſh'd when Mr. *le Laboureur* publiſh'd a Relation of a Journey into *Poland*, that is, in the Year 1647.

(*C*) *He cauſed the Bible to be printed in the* Poliſh *Language.*] *Nicolas Oleſnicki*, as I have ſaid (*m*) elſewhere, eſtabliſh'd the Reformed Religion in *Pinczovia* at *Stancarus*'s Inſtigation. A School was likewiſe ſet up in the ſame Place, which prov'd a Nurſery of learned Men. *John Laſcus, George Blandrata, Francis Liſmanin, Martin Crovicius, Peter Statorius, George Schoman, Gregory Pauli, Brelius, Triceſſius*, and ſome others, made it flouriſh to ſuch a degree, that (*n*) *Pinczovia* was look'd upon as a new *Athens* in *Poland*. There it was that thoſe learned Men tranſlated the Bible into the vulgar Tongue. Their Tranſlation was printed at *Breſte* in *Lithuania*, at the Charges of our *Nicolas Radziwil*. He was Governor of that Royal City, and ſet up a Printing-houſe in it. The Pſalms of *David*, a Collection of *Canticles*, and ſome other Works of the ſame Nature, were printed in the ſame Town, and contributed very much to the Converſion of the People. Here are the Words of my Author: (*o*) *Ibi* (Pinczoviæ) *à Viris illis piis & doctis univerſa Biblia Sacra in Linguam vernaculam tranſlata, ſumptibus Nicolai Radzivilii Palatini Vilnenſis Principis Magnificentiſſimi & Fortiſſimi renaſcentis veritatis vindicis impreſſa ſunt Breſtia Lithuanorum. Huic enim urbi Regia Præfectus datus erat, in qua comparatam privato ære officinam typographicam condiderat, & illi Wojewoda Cracoviâ evocato commiſerat. Ibidem exſcriptus fuit liber Pſalmorum & hymnorum aliique ejus notæ, quorum lectione populus a Romanis ſuperſtitionibus ad veram Dei colendi rationem revocabatur.* That Author obſerves (*p*) that this Bible was printed off in the Year 1563, and that it was the firſt *Poliſh* Tranſlation of the Scripture. He adds, that another Tranſlation came out in the Year 1572, made by *Simon Budnaus*; and that a Verſion of the New Teſtament by *Martin Czechovicius* was printed five Years after. *Note*, That if we believe (*q*) *John Latus*, the Tranſlators of the Bible printed at *Nicolas Radziwil's* (*r*) Charges, were but five, *viz. Orſacius, Zazius, Triceſius, James Lubelſcius*, and *Statorius*.

(*D*) *He made a very briſk Anſwer to* Lippoman.] I am ſure my Readers will be glad to find here part of that Anſwer. (*ſ*) *Apoſtaſia cum ei non ſine convicio à* Lippomano Pontificis Legato *exprobraretur, eidem docta* Apologia *reſpondit, fidei ſuæ rationem dedit, inter alia vero*: Certum tibi eſſe volo, ſic me nunc doctiſſimorum virorum videndorum deſiderio teneri, ut ſi ſcirem me eos, aut alios etiam ex præcipuis illis qui ſunt in Germania, Melanchthones, Brentios, poſſe in mea poſtulata aliquomodo pertrahere, in eo vel præcipuè, non ſervitoris tantum mittendi laborem conferendum, ſed etiam omnes opes facultateſque meas eſſe mihi experiendas putarem quos quia per inſignem malitiam hæreticos appellas, omnium Hæreticorum, quos orbis terrarum habet, maxime Hæreticus es. The Letter he receiv'd from *Lippoman*, and his Anſwer to it (††) were printed at *Koningsberg*, in the Year 1556.

(*E*) *That the Diſcovery of ſome Monkiſh Impoſtures occaſion'd his Change.*] When the Reformation began to be eſtabliſh'd in *Lithuania*, this *Chriſtopher Radziwil* being very ſorry (*t*) *that a Prince of his Houſe had embrac'd it, went to* Rome, *and paid all imaginable Honours*

(*a*) *Simon Starovolſcius in Sarmatiæ bellatoribus, pag.* 163, 164.

(*b*) *Id. ib. pag.* 165, 166.

(*c*) *Id. ib. pag.* 167. *& ſeq.*

(*d*) *Id. ib. pag.* 169, 170.

(*e*) *Id. ib. pag.* 171, 172.

(*f*) *Id. id.*

(*g*) Filiorum humeris elatus fuit. *Id. ibid. pag.* 174.

(*h*) *Id. ib. pag.* 173.

(*i*) *Thuan. lib.* 38. *pag.* 709.

(*k*) *David Chytræus in Saxonia lib.* 21. *ad ann.* 1565. *pag.* 558. *edit. Lipſ.* 1602.

(*l*) *Starovolſc. in centum Polonorum elogiis pag.* 70, 71.

(†) *The ſame with the eldeſt Son of our* Radziwil.

(*) *Staravolſc. in bellator. Sarmatiæ pag.* 176.

(††) *Id. ib.*

(**) *Le Laboureur, Relation de Pologne part* 3. *pag.* 25.

the 27th of *April* 1584, that *Nicolas* and *Christopher Radzivil*, his two Sons, persever'd in the Religion in which he had bred them up, and that their Posterity (F) carefully preserved that Sacred *Depositum* *.

RAIMARUS (NICOLAS) an Astronomer of the XVIth Century. See URSUS.

RAYNAUD (THEOPHILUS) one of the most famous and learned Jesuits of the XVIIth Century, was born at *Sospello* † in the County of *Nice*; but because he lived in *France* the greatest part of the time, he went (A) for a *Frenchman*. His Life was very long, and attended with several Disgraces; (B) nevertheless he would never be persuaded to leave his Society, and to associate himself with another Commonalty, tho' he was offer'd great Advantages elsewhere. He was extremely Laborious, and lost but little time either in Eating, or

mage to the Pope. The Pope being likewise willing to gratify him, presented him with a Box full of Relicks when he went away. Being return'd home, and the News of these Relicks being spread Abroad, some Monks came to him some Months after, and told him that there was a Man possess'd with the Devil, that the wicked Spirit had been conjured in vain, and that hitherto all the Exorcisms had proved ineffectual. They begg'd of him that he would lend the precious Relicks he had brought from Rome, for the Relief of that poor Man. The Prince readily granted their Request. The Relicks were carried into that Church with a solemn Pomp, and a Procession of all the Monks. At last they were placed upon the Altar, and on the day appointed an innumerable multitude of People crowded in to see the Show, and after the usual Exorcisms the Relicks were made use of. At that very moment the pretended Devil went out of the Body of that Man, with the usual Gestures and Grimaces. Every Body cry'd out a Miracle; and the Prince lifted up his Hands and Eyes to Heaven, to return Thanks that he had brought a thing so holy, and which could do such Wonders. But some few days after, as he was full of Admiration, and transported with Joy, extolling the virtue of his Relicks, he perceived that a young Gentleman of his House, who had the keeping of that rich Treasure, smiled, and made some Gestures, whereby it appear'd that he derided his Discourse. The Prince grew angry, and would know the reason of his Derision. The Gentleman being assured that no harm should come to him, told the Prince in private, (a) "That "upon his return from *Rome*, he lost the Box of Relicks, which he had the keeping of, and that not daring to speak of it, for fear of being punish'd, he got "one like it, and fill'd it with little Bones of Beasts, and "such Trifles as he could get that were like the Relicks "which he had lost. So that seeing so much Honour "paid to that vile heap of Filth, and even that they ascribed to it the virtue of driving away the Devil, he "had a good reason to wonder at it. The Prince gave "Credit to what he said, but being willing to be more "particularly inform'd of the Cheat, he sent for the "Monks the next day, and desired them to enquire, whether there was any other Demoniack who wanted the "assistance of his Relicks. Some few days after they "brought him another Man possess'd with the Devil, "who acted the same part with the first. The Prince "order'd him to be exorcized in his Presence; but because all the Exorcisms, that are commonly made use "of on such an occasion, prov'd ineffectual, he told the "Monks, that he would have that Man to stay in his Palace 'till the next day, and that they should retire. "After they were gone, he put the pretended Demoniack "into the hands of his *Tartarian* Grooms; who at first "exhorted him to confess the Cheat, as they were order'd to do: but because he obstinately persisted in it "with horrid and furious Gestures, six of 'em laid on "him with Whips and Scourges, and put him into such "a Condition, that he was forc'd to implore the Prince's "Mercy, who forgave him, as soon as he had confess'd "the truth. When the Night was over, the Prince sent "for the Monks, in whose Presence the poor Fellow "threw himself at his Feet, and protested that he neither was, nor ever had been possess'd with the Devil; "but that those Monks had persuaded him to counterfeit a Demoniack. Immediately the Monks desired "the Prince not to believe what he said, and told him "that it was a Trick of the Devil, who spoke through "that Man's mouth. But the Prince answer'd, that if "his *Tartars* had been able to force the Devil to tell the "Truth, they would be able to extort it from the Mouth "of the Monks. So that the Monks finding themselves "press'd so hard, confess'd the Imposture, and said, "that they had done it with a good Intention, and to prevent the Progress of Heresie. But the Prince thanked "God with all his Heart, that he had been graciously "pleased to discover such an Imposture to him, and suspecting a Religion, that was supported with such "diabolical Devices, tho' they went by the name of *pious* "*Frauds*, he declared, that he would no longer depend "upon any Body for his Salvation, and betook himself to "the Reading of the holy Scriptures with a wonderful "assiduity; and having spent half a Year in Reading "and Praying, he made a wonderful Progress in Piety, "and in the Knowledge of the Mysteries of the Gospel: "And then he and all his Family made an open Profession of our Religion, in the Year 1564." These are the Words of Mr. *Drelincourt*, Minister of the Church of *Paris*, in the Answer he publish'd in the Year 1662, to the Letter which Prince *Ernestus*, Landgrave of *Hesse*, had writ to the five Ministers of *Paris*. Mr. *Drelincourt* adds, (b) *Your Highness may think of it, as he pleases; but I protest, as if I was before the Throne of God, that this Story was told me in this manner by the Minister of Prince* Janusius Radziwil: *Nay, he gave me in Writing part of what he told me, and explained to me viva voce.*

Regenvolscius (c) calls him *Nicolas Radziwil*, whom the discovery of a Monkish Imposture fully determin'd to forsake the Popish Religion in the Year 1564; but he says nothing neither of the Journey to *Rome*, nor of the Relicks. He only says, That the Monks of (d) *Czenstechowit* had suborn'd a pretended Demoniack, whilst *Nicolas Radziwil* was on his Pilgrimage, which he had vowed after a great Victory obtain'd over the *Moscovites*.

(F) *Their Posterity carefully preserved that sacred* Depositum.] *Nicolas* RADZIWIL, Palatin of *Novogrod*, was the Father of *George*, who died Castellan of *Troki* in the Year 1614, and left no Children. *Christopher* RADZIWIL, Brother to this *Nicolas*, was Palatin of *Vilna*, and died in the Year 1604. He left two Sons, *Janussius* and *Christopher*. *Janussius*, Duke of *Bierze*, and Castellan of *Vilna*, died in the Year 1621, being forty two Years of Age. He left by his Wife, who was the Elector of *Brandenburg*'s Daughter, a Son call'd *Bogeslaus*. His Brother *Christopher*, Palatin of *Vilna*, and Great Marshal of *Lithuania*, died the 19th of *September*, 1640, at fifty five Years of Age, and left an only Son, whose Name was *Janussius*, and who was Great Chamberlain of *Lithuania*. This *Bogeslaus* and this *Janussius* RADZIWIL, first-Cousins, were both alive, and made profession of the Protestant Religion, when the Author, (e) whom I quote, was writing this Book, about the Year 1650. The *Gazettes*, in the beginning of the Year 1681, told us, That the Princess *Ludovica* RADZIWIL, at fourteen Years of Age, married Prince *Lewis*, second Son of the Elector of *Brandenburg*, at *Koningsberg*, the 7th of *January*, 1681; that she was the only Daughter of the late Prince *Bogeslaus*, and that she was possess'd of a Dutchy in *Lithuania*, which contains above forty Leagues on the Frontiers of *Livonia*, and two strong Places. She was a Protestant, but after the Death of Prince *Lewis* of *Brandenburg*, she married again in 1688, to a Son of the Elector Palatin, and turned a Roman Catholick. There had been some Discourse of marrying her to Prince *James*, Son of *John Sobieski*, King of *Poland*.

(A) *He went for a* Frenchman.] *Alegambe* says positively, that he was a *Frenchman*; (f) *Natione Gallus, patria Cespitellensis*. These Latin words contain what is called in the Schools *contradictio in adjecto*; for *Cespitellum* or *Sospitellum* is undeniably in *Italy*. See *Baudrand* on those two Words. Father *Oldoini* censures *Alegambe* for this Fault, and places our *Theophilus* among the Writers born in *Liguria*. *Soprani* places him amongst 'em likewise (g). They are more in the right than *Sotuel*, who expresses himself doubtfully. *Natione Gallus*, says he (h), *an potius Italus? patria Cespitellensis in Comitatu Nicaensi.*

(B) *Attended with several Disgraces; nevertheless he would never be persuaded.*] Here are *Sotuel*'s words: (i) *Vocationis suæ religiosæ tenacissimus, quamvis & utilia & honorifica extra societatem ei promitterentur à Principibus, si hanc inter aspera quæ subinde patiebatur, deserere vellet, nunquam eos auscultare voluit.* See hereafter (k) the Passage of *Monconys*, and that (l) of a Jansenist.

(b) *Id. ib. pag.* 362.

(c) *Regenvolsc. ibid. pag.* 145.

(d) *See le Laboureur's Relation of Poland, part* 3. *pag.* 18. & *seq. concerning the miraculous Image of the holy Virgin, which is honoured in that place.*

(e) *Regensvolsc.* ubi supra, *pag.* 145, 146.

(f) *Alegambe, Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jesu pag.* 431.

(g) Oldoinus *and* Soprani *have publish'd the Catalogue of the Authors of that part of* Italy.

(h) *Natan. Sotuel. Biblioth. Script. Societ. pag.* 757.

(i) *Id. ib. pag.* 758.

(k) *In the Remark I.*

(l) *In the Remark H.*

or hearing (G) devout Women. His great pleasure was to write Books, and carefully to perform the Functions of his Character. He compoſed a prodigious number of Books: Some of 'em were cenſured by (D) the Inquiſition; which ſenſibly afflicted him. He diſcharged his Anger upon the *Dominicans*, in a Book * wherein he gather'd a vaſt number of Things out of their Writings, which had not been cenſured, tho' they deſerved it. The Quarrels he had with the *Dominicans*, and other People, produced many injurious and biting Pieces; for it cannot be denied that he had a very ſatyrical Wit. The Jeſuits themſelves (DD) confeſs ſomething of it. He died † of an Apoplexy at *Lyons*, the laſt of *October*, 1663. The Writers of the *Bibliotheque* of the Jeſuits don't agree about (E) his Age; and therefore I ſhall not determine whether he lived 79 Years, as Mr. *Gallois* aſſerts, in a Work that will afford me ſome Paſſages concerning the (F) Character of that Jeſuit. He was very

(C) *Either in Eating, or hearing devout Women.*] He was a very ſober Man, and did not ſit at Table above a quarter of an Hour; and when, by reaſon of his great Age, he might have converſed with Women without any danger and ſuſpicion, he would not hearken to them, but in caſes of Neceſſity, and told them in a few words what he had to ſay. I only tranſlate *Sotuel's* words. *In victu valde abſtinens*, ſays he (a), *paucis & communibus ſemper uſus cibis, vix amplius uno quadrante babat menſæ. Puritatis amator ſummus mulierum colloquia cum erant neceſſaria, etiam ſenex, paucis verbis definiebat.* He wiſh'd that all other Eccleſiaſticks would imitate him in that, as he teſtifies in his Book *De ſobria alterius ſexus frequentatione*. But, generally ſpeaking, the Directors of Conſciences don't like that Morality; they are ſeldom weary of the Company of devout Women, if one may judge of it by their long and frequent Converſations with them.

(D) *Some of them were cenſured by the Inquiſition.*] He took ſo much Pains to have the Cenſure taken off, that he at laſt obtained leave to reprint them, provided they ſhould be Corrected (b). The Inquiſition cenſur'd three of his Treatiſes, viz. (c) *de Martyrio per peſtem*; *de Communione pro mortuis*; and *de confixione librorum*. As Men have different Notions of Things, 'tis no wonder that this Jeſuit took ſuch a Diſgrace to Heart, tho' other Writers are ſo little afraid of it, that ſometimes they are glad to hear that their Works have been put into the *Index*, or that the Inquiſitors are diſpleaſed with them. 'Tis very often a ſign that a Book is good. See what an ingenious (d) Man hath lately ſaid upon occaſion of the Cenſure paſt upon the *Acta Sanctorum*.

(DD) *The Jeſuits themſelves confeſs ſomething of it.*] They ſay he could not bear any thing, and that he did not ſpare Father *Bollandus* his Fellow-Jeſuit, and his good Friend, who had done him good Services, and had only made him angry for maintaining a different Opinion about a Biſhop of *Lyons*. If all the angry and paſſionate Expreſſions of our *Theophilus* had not been ſuppreſſed, *Bollandus* would have been very ill treated in the ſecond Edition of the *Indiculus ſanctorum Lugdunenſium*. Father *Papebroch* has reveal'd this little Myſtery. *Ita factus erat Theophilus*, ſays he (e), *ut neminem contradicentem ſibi patienter ferret, & niſi præſentes adfuiſſemus, cum prælo iterum pararetur Indiculus ſanctorum Lugdunenſium, neque mature aliquis admonuiſſet, inveniretur ibi acriter perſtrictus P. Joannes Bollandus in S. Anemundo Lugdunenſi Epiſcopo, ſub regimine S. Bathildis occiſo, quia ad 26 Januarii eundem ſtatuerat cum S. Delfino contra Theophili ſententiam, cui alias Bollandus amiciſſimus erat, & in curanda operum ipſius impreſſione Antverpiæ meritus de illo optime.*

(E) *Don't agree about his Age.*] *Alegambe* ſays (f), That Father *Theophilus* was admitted into their Order in the Year 1602, at 16 Years of Age; but, according to (g) Father *Sotuel*, it was in 1592, and at the ſame Age. And therefore, ſince he died in 1663, he lived 77 Years, according to Father *Alegambe*, and 87 according to Father *Sotuel*. But if he had lived 87 Years, this Expreſſion of Father *Sotuel* would be wrong, *Octogenario major . . . . migravit ad Dominum*: it is only proper for thoſe, whoſe Life did not much exceed 80 Years. Mr. *Gallois* ſeems to me more credible than thoſe two Jeſuits, when he ſays (h), that Father *Theophilus* lived 79 Years. 'Tis a ſtrange thing that the Jeſuits themſelves, who made it their buſineſs to write Elogies upon the Writers of their Society, ſhould not be able to tell us how long one of the moſt famous of 'em lived.

(F) *Concerning the Character of that Jeſuit.*] It was not poſſible to ſpeak more pertinently of the Edition of all the Works of that Author, than the Abbot *Gallois* has done in the *Journal des Savans*, of the 14th of *March*, 1667. That Edition conſiſts of 19 Volumes in Folio, and it came out at *Lyons* in the Year, 1665. That ingenious Journaliſt having ſhewn in a few Words the Contents of each Volume, gives his Judgment about them in the following manner. "(i) It appears by the "Works of this Author, that he was bold and peremptory, and that he had a quick Imagination, and a prodigious Memory. Thoſe natural Endowments, together with an undefatigable Application to ſtudy from his younger Years, 'till he was 79 Years old, at which Age he died, had made him one of the moſt learned Men of his time. But he was too biting and too Satyrical; for which Reaſon many People hated him. His Style, tho' otherwiſe very neat, ſeems to be obſcure, becauſe he affects to uſe hard Words and Terms taken from the *Greek*. He has alſo ſometimes ſome odd Thoughts, as when being to treat of the Goodneſs of our Saviour in a Chapter of the IId Volume, he intitles it *Chriſtus bonus, bona, bonum*. His great reading affording him a vaſt number of things on all ſorts of Matters, he often rambles from the Subject in hand; as in his Treatiſe *de Roſa benedicta*, a conſiderable part of which is taken up in examining after what manner *Lent* was kept in the Primitive Church. One may alſo obſerve that he did not give a free Scope to his Genius, being contented to mention what he had read in the ancient Authors and often uſing their own Words to expreſs what he might perhaps have ſaid better than they. Nevertheleſs his Works are worthy of Eſteem, and very uſeful to thoſe who apply themſelves to Divinity and Preaching". The following Words of the ſame Abbot concern particularly the 15th and 16th Volumes, intitled *Heteroclita Spiritualia* "(k) This Author ſpeaks of ſeveral ſuſpected Cuſtoms, which, thro' an exceſſive Zeal or thro' Remiſneſs, have been introduc'd into the Worſhip of God, and of the Saints, into the good Works that are done to relieve the Souls in Purgatory, into the uſe of the Sacraments, and into all other pious Exerciſes. He examines all thoſe doubtful Acts of Devotion with great Severity: He condemns ſome, and approves others; and what he ſays is attended with many learned Obſervations taken from the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory and the Fathers. He did particularly excel in treating ſuch Matters; for, being ſharp and ſatyrical, he never had a better Succeſs than when he exercis'd his critical Wit". Let us further ſee what he ſays concerning the Pieces that have not been inſerted in the 19 Volumes. (l) *They have been left out for ſome particular Reaſons. The Apologies againſt* Hurtado, *which he intitled* Depilationes, *becauſe that Monk belongs to an Order, call'd in* Italy Peloſi, *are not to be found in this Collection: Nor the Book, wherein he inquires whether a Man may confeſs his Sins by Letters; nor that which is intitled* Hipparchus, *wherein he examines whether it be a lawful thing for a Monk to trade. They have alſo left out the Treatiſe* de Immunitate Cyriacorum a cenſuris, *againſt the Jacobins, and that which is intitled* Religio Beſtiarum, *wherein the Predetermination of the Thomiſts is confuted, and another written againſt Father* Combefis. *There are ſome other Treatiſes of this Author wanting in this Collection, which may eaſily be known by the Catalogue of his Works, which he printed ſeveral times. He deſign'd to make one Volume of all thoſe Pieces, and intitle it* Apopompæus, *a Name which the Jews gave to the Victim which they loaded with Curſes, and ſent into the Wilderneſs; but Death prevented his Deſign.* Father *Sotuel* ſays, that the 20th Volume, intitled *Apopompæus*, was actually printed after the Author's Death (m).

I muſt further add another Paſſage of the Abbot *Gallois* (n) *The moſt remarkable pieces of the 7th Volume, intitled* (o) Marialia, *is the ſecond Treatiſe, wherein the Author vindicates the Devotion of the Scapulary; and the fifth, which is ſufficient to ſhew his great Learning, and the Fruitfulneſs of his Wit. For being to preach upon the ſeven ſolemn Anthems, which the Church ſings before* Chriſtmas, *and which begin with an* O; *he took only that Letter for the Subject of his Sermon; and that Subject, tho' never ſo barren, afforded him a thouſand fine things, of which that Treatiſe is made up.*

---

* *Intitled* De immunitate Cyriacorum a cenſuris.

† [illegible] *Sotuel, Bibliotheca Script. Societ. Jeſ.* pag. [illegible] This does not ſeem to agree with the Paſſage of *Alegambe*, in the Remark (E).

(a) *Sotuel ibid.*

(b) Poſtea ab auctore emendata, ab eadem ſacra congregatione anno 1659. recudi permiſſa ſunt & libere diſtrahi. *Id. ib pag.* 759.

(c) *Id. ib.*

(d) *The Author of the* Lettres hiſtoriques, March 1696. *pag.* 245.

(e) *Papebroch elucidat. hiſt. actorum in controverſia Armeniaca cap* 7. *in fine pag.* 110.

(f) *Alegambe ubi ſupra.*

(g) *Sotuel ubi ſupra, pag.* 757.

(h) Gallois, *Journal des Savans of the* 14th *of* March, 1667. *pag. m.* 127.

(i) *Gallois, ibid.*

(k) *Gallois, ib. pag.* 125, 126.

(l) *Id. ib. pag.* 126.

(m) Tomum [illegible] quem *Apopompæum* vocari [illegible] derunt [illegible] poſt obitum Theophili, ſine approbatione ſuperiorum Societatis, unde illum tanquam partum legitimum non agnoſcit. *Sotuel ubi ſupra pag.* 759. *I have a Copy of that Apopompæus, and there in the Title Page*, Tomus vigeſimus & poſthumus per Antonium de[illegible]geſtus, nunc primum in lucem prodit [illegible] ſumptibus Annibalis Sangoyski [illegible] 1669.

(n) *Gallois, ibid. pag.* 118, 119.

(o) *Beſides all the Treatiſes it contains concerning the Perfections or the Worſhip of the Virgin.* Id. ibid. pag. 118.

very much Esteem'd by (G) Dr. *Patin*, and some are of Opinion that he praises him too much, and that the Censure he passes (G 2) upon his Style is not well grounded; for 'tis not true

(G) *Very much esteem'd by Dr. Patin.*] "(a) *Martinus Schookius*, who has writ many books . . . . is as learned as those ancient Sophists, who used to write and dispute about every thing that can be known. He and *Conringius* in *Germany* are the most learned Men in *Europe* in that sort of Learning and Composures. Father *Theophilus Raynaud* exceeded them both; for he was a Jesuit, and understood his *Romish* and *Loyolitical* Theology extraordinarily well; but had it not been for that, and the Respect he had for his Superiors, he would have broke loose, and might have done more than three others, upon any Subject whatsoever: For besides his great Learning and wonderful Memory, he gave to all his Books a Character of Perfection, which none but a great Master could give". Here is another Passage. (b) *If you see Father* Theophilus, *pray give him my Service, and ask him when we shall see his Answer to a Book printed against him at* Amsterdam, *in* 8vo, *and intitled,* Antidotus duplex contra duplex venenum *&c.* 8°. Hispali, 1667. *The Printer has suppress'd or disguis'd the Name of the Town; for it has been printed in* Holland, *and not at* Seville. *I have sent him a Copy, for which he thanked me, and inform'd me that he would quickly answer it. I have many Letters of that honest Father, and am one of his Friends, and I am proud of it; for he is a very learned Man,* in genere multiplici. *I wish he would publish several Pieces that he has by him: There is a great deal of Learning in all his Books.* These Praises are the more considerable, because they are bestow'd by a Man, who was more inclin'd to dispraise than to commend, and who spoke freely of the Faults which he thought he had found in the Writings of that Jesuit. I must quote him again. (c) *The Author of the* Sanctus Georgius Cappadox *is an extraordinary and most learned Man; only he sits up for a Fishmonger on* Easter-Eve, *and affects to write in a manner that is out of use: Nevertheless all his Books are good,* est enim vir multijugæ eruditionis ac infinitæ lectionis, *as* Grotius *said of the late* Salmasius. *Father* Raynaud's *Style* redolet Lipsianum, quo tamen est multo deterior: *There is no body now that writes so, except it be Dr.* Blondel, *our Dean; who, tho' one of the most learned Men in the World, affects that kind of Barbarousness,* & eadem scabie laborat cum Tertulliano Lipsianus seu Lipsiomimus vel Lipsio minus, qualis aliquando fuit Erycius Puteanus, Petrus Gruterus, Theophylus Raynaudus, & pauci alii quos fama obscura recondit. I confess I cannot apprehend upon what Grounds *Patin* taxes that Jesuit with affecting a broken and obscure Style, and using many of those obsolete Expressions call'd *Archaisms*. I have read several of his Books, and I find that his Style is rather prolix than short, and that it is free from the Faults that are observed in *Lipsius*'s Style, and in that of his Imitators. It is true, that Father *Raynaud* does not write politely; but if his Style is rough and barbarous, 'tis not because he affects old *Latin* Phrases, like those of *Plautus*, or *Grecisms* (d), which make the Delight of some learned Men; 'tis rather because he uses a great many Words borrow'd from the Schoolmen. Nay, I observe that he blamed one of his Adversaries for having used some *Greek* Words: he was answer'd that 'twas not for him to speak of *Greek*, since he was ignorant of that Language. (e) *Mira hominis Buccafatidi audacia, cæcus cum sit, vult de coloribus judicare, & cum prorsus idiota sit Græci idiomatis, judicare de vocibus Græcis . . . . . quid vis apparere* ferularius Mag. *in utraque lingua? etsi enim* Latinam *bene calleas, at* Græcam *prorsus ignoras.* His Antagonist confesses that he understands the *Latin* Tongue very well; but such a Confession is of no (f) great weight, since it was made by a Man, who was Guilty of Solecisms in every Page. (g) *Barbararum lexeon, & solæcismorum tanta ubertas est in Hurtadi opere, ut si tenui diligentia adhibita, notare grammaticas ejus stribiligines liberet, totum pene ejus volumen esset exscribendum. Vix tres lineas exarat, quin solæcismis adeo pinguibus contaminet, ut miserationem moveat.* (h) *Thomas Hurtado . . . . . vix unquam emisit periodum qui non sordeat stribiligine aliqua grammatica, & indigna colaphizatione Prisciani.* Four Examples of it are to be found in the same Page. *Deus expavescit nos: opus bene executum: debet populus magis exhortari ad communionem: agendum esse de tactis.* There is at the (i) end of the Book a List of his Solecisms. Father *Raynaud*'s Adversary made but a weak Answer. I imitate the Fathers, said he, (k) *Nonne in multis patribus inveniuntur similes non ita vigorosæ in latinitate locutiones?* And he says (l) that *John Bojani drew up a List of above 545 Barbarisms of Petrus Blesensis.*

(G 2) *Some are of Opinion that Dr.* Patin *Praises him too much, and that the Censure he passes upon his Style is not well grounded.*] "(m) *Theophilus Raynaud* gave to all his Works a Character of Perfection, which none but great Masters can give. This Judgment of Dr. *Patin* is not altogether true. The Character of Perfection, which none but great Masters, (such as *Petavius* and *Sirmondus*) can give, was wanting in *Theophilus Raynaud*. His designs were odd, his Learning without choice, and his Style, tho' good in it self, was often spoil'd with Childish Affectations. Besides, the Author was an unpolite Man, and had no *Urbanity*."

I have already (n) refuted Dr. *Patin's* Opinion of Father *Raynaud's* Style; but I have something else to say upon this Subject. That Jesuit observes that few People complained of the Coarseness of his Style. The only Censurer he names is one *Camerarius*, who blamed him for using a harsh and bumbastick Style, intermix'd with barbarous Words, and for imitating *Petronius* and *Apuleius* rather than the *Ciceronians*. (o) *Non defuit, qui mei styli squalorem opponeret. Arguebat sanè Gulielmus Camerarius præfatione ad suam (ut inscripsit)* Antiquitatis de novitate victoriam, *quod stylus scriptionum mearum scaber esset ac tumens: quod voces passim barbaras, & a nitore & lenitate Tullij alienas adhiberem: Et quod Petronio potius ac Apulejo, tumidis & inflatis scriptoribus, quam probatæ latinitatis, stylique puri ac nativi Magistris, inter scribendum inhæserim.* I shall not mention what he answer'd in his Vindication, but only point at the Book which he wrote in his defence. (p) *Dissertatio hujus & aliarum Camerarij calumniarum depulsoria, edita est hoc titulo,* Non causa ut causa, subjuncta vera causa; Elenchus sophismatis Gulielmi Camerarij Scoti. *In lucubratione à* pag. 16. *quam ridicula sit hæc criminatio, & quam absurdum sit voces è Nizolij Ciceroniana pinacotheca anxie sublegere, in Didacticis præsertim scriptionibus, (cujusmodi ferè sunt omnes nostræ, eæque nominatim, adversus quam Camerarij æstus inferbuit,) plenè & accuratè demonstratur.* I add that he continues to refute his Adversary in the same place, out of which I have taken this Passage. His main Argument consists in the Quotations of several Fathers of the Church, who did not much trouble themselves about the Elegancy of their Style. He says (q) that St. *Augustin* was very careless of it, and he refers us to *Bernard Vindinus*'s *Prolegomena ad Criticum Augustinianum castigatum*, where there is a Chapter concerning St. *Augustin*'s Solecisms and Barbarisms. After all he does not own that *Camerarius*'s Censure is well grounded, and leaves it to the Judgment of unprejudic'd Readers. (r) *Videor vanissimam & ineptissimam criminationem obtrivisse multo pluribus quam necessitas postulabat. An verò Stylus scriptionum mearum, adeò vel jaceat, vel horreat, quam sibi fingit Camerarius cujus fuit hæc criminatio, pronuncient alij, affectu quo ille ducebatur liberi.* If any one should say that I have unjustly censur'd Dr. *Patin*, I appeal likewise to all the Readers duly qualify'd, who will peruse the Works of this Jesuit with an unprejudic'd Mind. If they look into them, and read some Pages here and there, I am sure they will not say that he imitated *Lipsius*, and that he may be compar'd with *Peter Gruterus*, and *Erycius Puteanus*, as *Patin* will have it. I believe they will say that his Style is neither polite nor agreeable; but they'll deny that it is concise, full of dark *Ellipses*, and obsolete Phrases, and very much affected. Any Reader well skill'd in the Critical Art, will easily perceive that the Author I speak of wrote hastily, that he was very careless of his Style, that he did not correct his Works, and consequently that his printed Words and Phrases may be look'd upon as a faithful Copy of his Minutes; and that the first Effusions of his Pen were also the first Effusions of his Mind: So that his bad *Latin*, whether it be too ancient or too new, ought not to be accounted an Affectation, or an Artifice, but a natural Production. He was a Man of a vast Memory; he had read in his Youth the Classical Authors, and afterwards, with greater Application, the Ecclesiastical Writers, the Philosophers, and the Modern Divines. His Memory being full of the Phrases of all those Authors, readily supplied his Pen; so that without much thinking, sometimes a Word of *Plautus* came out, or an Expression of *Lucretius*, *Petronius*, *Aulus Gellius*, *Apuleius* or *Macrobius*; sometimes an Expression of *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, St. *Hilary*, or *Sidonius Apollinaris*, sometimes

---

(a) [illegible] Letter [illegible] of the [illegible] Volume.

(b) Id. Letter 100. pag. 12[illegible] of the same Volume. See also the 3[illegible] Letter, pag. 2[illegible] of the same Volume.

(c) Idem Letter 155. pag. [illegible] of the same Volume.

(d) Mr. Gilles [illegible] taxes him with affecting to use words derived from the Greek.

(e) Thomas Hurtado [illegible] pag. 453.

(f) See Hurtado, ib. pag. 10.

(g) Leodeg. Quintinus apud Hurtado ibid. pag. 437.

(h) Idem apud eundem p. 10.

(i) Stellar. [illegible] pag. 437.

(k) Ibid. pag. 439.

(l) Ibid.

(m) *Vigneul Marvile, Melanges d'Histoire, tom.* 1. *pag.* 303. *Rotterd. Edition,* 1700.

(n) *In the foregoing Remark.*

(o) *Theoph. Raynaud. Syntagm. de libris propriis* p. 6. *Apopompæi col.* 2.

(p) *Id. ib.*

(q) *Id. ib. pag.* 8. *col.* 2.

(r) *Id. ib. pag.* 10. *col.* 1.

true that he imitated *Lipſius*, that he hunted after old Words, and that he was fond of dark and antiquated Phraſes; which has been the fault of ſome Authors, for which they have been juſtly Cenſured by Men of Judgment. I give * ſome Inſtances of it. *In...
He

times an Expreſſion of St. *Bernard*, or of the Commentators upon *Lombard*, or of the Angelical Doctor, *&c.* But the common and moſt uſual Words offer'd themſelves more frequently, and he took what came out firſt; and conſequently his Style is not affected; old Words and barbarous Expreſſions came into it naturally, but not in great Numbers, and the Author took no Care to correct and poliſh his Style: He left it ſuch as he found it, when he read over his Writings. But if I was miſtaken in this, at leaſt the main part of my Cenſure would be unqueſtionable; for there were never two Authors more unlike in point of Style, than *Theophilus Raynaud* and *Juſtus Lipſius*. The latter affected to end his Periods at every Line, and to leave out ſeveral Words, which the Reader was to ſupply and gueſs at. But the Jeſuit is rather diffuſe than conciſe, and not at all obſcure for want of Words: His Periods are long and full.

A Cenſure upon thoſe who affect to make uſe of old Words.

'Tis ſtill a greater piece of Injuſtice to compare him with *Peter Gruterus*; for this *Gruterus* was not a Man who dropp'd obſolete Words but now and then: He heaped them up upon one another with a ridiculous Affectation, and took as much Pains to gather thoſe old Rags as *Bembus* and *Manutius* did to write politely. I cannot tell whether ſuch an Affectation betrays more Vanity than want of Judgment; but it is certain that thoſe who affect ſuch a Style, fancy that their Readers will have a great Opinion of their Learning, and admire 'em the more for it. Men of Senſe have always condemn'd this Humour. The Jeſts which *Phavorinus* made uſe of againſt a young Man, who was a great Lover of old Words, are admirable. If you will not be underſtood, ſaid he to him, why don't you hold your Tongue? And if you love Antiquity, pleaſe your ſelf by living a good Life as our Anceſtors did; but ſpeak as Men do now. (*a*) *Favorinus philoſophus adoleſcenti veterum verborum cupidiſſimo, & pleraſque voces nimis priſcas & ignotiſſimas in quotidianis communibuſque ſermonibus expromenti, Curius, inquit, & Fabricius, & Coruncanius antiquiſſimi viri noſtri, & his antiquiores Horatii illi trigemini, plane ac dilucide cum ſuis fabulati ſunt: neque Auruncorum, aut Sicanorum, aut Pelaſgorum, qui primi incoluiſſe Italiam dicuntur, ſed ætatis ſuæ verbis locuti ſunt. tu autem proinde quaſi cum matre Evandri nunc loquare, ſermone abhinc multis annis jam deſito uteris, quod ſcire atque intelligere neminem vis, quæ dicas. Nonne, homo inepte, ut quod vis abunde conſequaris, taceres? ſed antiquitatem tibi placere ais, quod honeſta & bona & ſobria & modeſta ſit, vive ergo moribus præteritis; loquere verbis præſentibus.* He concludes with a Precept of *Julius Cæſar*, (*b*) that obſolete Words ought to be ſhun'd as a Rock. The Emperor *Auguſtus* was much of the ſame Mind; (*c*) he could not bear that *Tiberius* ſhould uſe any old Words, and he call'd *Mark Antony* a mad Man (*d*) becauſe he affected to be rather admir'd than underſtood. We read in *Aulus Gellius* (*e*) that an Advocate of his time was hiſs'd, becauſe he uſed unintelligible Words. There aroſe in the XVIth Century a certain Faction of Grammarian Antiquarians, whom the moſt Learned Men oppos'd with all their Might, to prevent their Growth, and the Corruption of the *Latin* Tongue. *Paſſeratius* made a Speech on purpoſe againſt that Faction. (*f*) *Exorti ſunt*, ſays he, *his annis viginti proximis, non diſſimili laborantes inſania, novi quidam Antonii, utinam minus multi, quorum cauſſa, ne quid diſſimulem, hanc præfatiunculam inſtitui. Si quidem me facturum operæ pretium putavi, ſi iſtum animi morbum vel arte aliqua perſanarem, quod in iis difficillimum eſt, qui ſic ægrotare malunt quam valere, vel aliqua ex parte imminuerem: idque ſaltem aſſequerer ne hac apud noſtros latius ſerpat contagio.* Afterwards he ſays, that nothing appear'd too ancient to thoſe, whom he had a mind to reclaim; and that they endeavour'd to find out ſome Words older than the Verſes of the *Salii*. (*g*) *Sordent nobis Tullius, Cæſar, Terentius: Valerii Antiatis, Cincii, Cælii, Piſonis, Fabii Pictoris, Quadrigarii, Siſennæ annales requirimus. Unde tam delicatum faſtidium? Cato, & Varro, vix ad ſtomachum faciunt: vix aviditatem noſtram explent primi Conſulum faſces, & faſtorum incunabula: Decemvirales tabulas, leges regias, Saliare carmen, icta cum Sabinis fœdera, Fecialium jura formulaſque tranſcendimus, ut penetremus in ſermonem Aboriginum, tanquam ſimus cum Egeria Numa, aut cum Evandri Carmenta loquuturi.* Thoſe Men had willingly blotted out a *Ciceronian* Phraſe in their Compoſures, to put in the room of it an Expreſſion taken from *Pacuvius*'s Fragments, or found in

Verſibus (i) quos olim Fauni vateſque canebant,
Cum neque Muſarum ſcopulos quiſquam ſuperarat
Nec dicti ſtudioſus erat.

They deſerv'd to be call'd (*h*) *mortuaria gloſſaria*. *Horace* complain'd (*i*) of ſuch a Humour; which I obſerve to ſhew, that the Depravations of Taſte revive from time to time. *Paſſeratius* was not the only Man who exclaim'd againſt thoſe falſe Antiquarians: I have mention'd in another Place of this Dictionary a Satyrical Piece, wherein they were ridiculed, and their Condemnation may be found in Father *Cauſſin*'s Rhetorick (*k*). I could name many (*l*) other Learned Men, who could not bear that fondneſs for old Words, and who revived the Complaints made againſt *Salluſt*. If they did not ſpare that Ancient Hiſtorian, they muſt needs have been more incens'd againſt the Moderns. (*m*) *Quid, quod à quibuſdam Salluſtianis verbis tanta ſollicitudine inter priſci ſermonis maceriem & ruinas conquiſitis, & in illa ipſa tam laudata compoſitione nonnulla prolatu & intellectu ſunt nota, quædam putidinſcula & pumicata, quædam ita ſcrupea, ut in ea vox impingat ſe tanquam in ſaxea fragmina vetuſtatis.* They are the Words of a very Polite Writer. He had already declar'd, that Words grown out of date ought to be avoided. (*n*) *Pertimeſcunt* (verba humilis dicendi generis) *ſociari verbis rubiginoſis, ſpinoſis, nimium reconditis & abſtruſis, tum intermortuis & conclamatis,*

Quæ (o) priſcis memorata Catonibus, atque Cethegis
Nunc ſitus informis premit, & deſerta vetuſtas.

But take notice that this Polite Author is too rigid a Cenſurer of the Hiſtorian *Salluſt*, and truſt rather to *Paſſeratius*, who has very well diſtinguiſh'd the exceſſive Affectation of the Moderns (*p*) from *Salluſt*'s Licence. I am not ignorant that *Aſinius Pollio* found fault with *Salluſt* (*q*) for uſing too many old Words, but perhaps, inſtead of being ſo ſevere a Critick, he ſhould have thanked him for the pains he had been at to revive ſome Words, and prevent their Loſs in the *Roman* Language. We ſhould wiſh that our great Authors would do the ſame Office to many obſolete *French* Words. If they vouchſafed to make uſe of them, they would put a ſtop to Preſcription, young Writers would be encourag'd to uſe them, and it would preſerve the Copiouſneſs of the Language. *Virgil* did ſo, and *Horace* adviſ'd to do the ſame:

Obſcurata (r) diu populo bonus eruet atque
Proferet in lucem ſpecioſa vocabula rerum
Quæ priſcis memorata Catonibus.

That is, "He'll revive ſome Words that have been Dead "long ago, and he'll bring into Light again thoſe expreſſive and energical Terms that were in uſe in the "time of *Cato* and *Cethegus*, and which lye at preſent "buried under the Ruins of Antiquity". See the Margin (*ſ*).

I don't believe, that there are now many People in *France* like thoſe whom *Paſſeratius* had a mind to reclaim. However, I have read the following Words in a Book Printed in the Year 1685. "(*t*) There is a ſort "of Learned Men, whom I ſhould ſuſpect, as thoſe "who interven'd in the Petition of the late Dr. *Blondell*. Thoſe Men ſpend their Lives upon *Seneca* and "*Plautus*, to find out ſome Archaiſms, in order to make "ſome Moral Theſes that are unintelligible, and proof "againſt all Vocabularies". This Dr. *Blondel* is one of the Authors whom Dr. *Patin* compared with *Theophilus Raynaud*, which is an unjuſt compariſon; for the Books of

---

(*a*) *Aulus Gellius lib.* 1. *cap.* 10.

(*b*) *Id.* quod à C. Cæſare excellentis ingenii ac prudentiæ viro, in primo de Analogia libro, ſcriptum eſt, habe ſemper in memoria atque in pectore, ut tamquam ſcopulum, ſic fugias inſolens verbum. *Id ib.*

(*c*) *Sueton. in Auguſto cap* 86.

(*d*) M. quidem Antonium ut inſanum increpat; quaſi ea ſcribentem quæ mirentur potius homines quam intelligant. *Id. ibid.*

(*e*) *Aulus Gellius lib.* 11. *cap.* 7.

(*f*) *Paſſerat. præfat. in Cicer. epiſtolam ad Hirtium & Cæſarem pag. m.* 171.

(*g*) *Id. ib. pag.* 175.

... *lib.* 2. *epiſt.* 2. (*p*) *Paſſerat. præf. in Catilinam Salluſtii pag.* 1... (*q*) Aſinius Pollio in libro quo Salluſtii ſcripta reprehendit, ut nimis priſcorum verborum affectatione oblita. *Sueton. de illuſtr. Gram. cap.* 10. (*r*) *Horat. epiſt.* 2. *lib.* 2. *v.* 115. (*ſ*) Propriis (verbis) dignitatem dat antiquitas, namque & ſanctiorem & magis admirabilem faciunt orationem quibus non quilibet fuerat uſurus: eoque ornamento acerrimi judicii P. Virgilius unicè eſt uſus . . . . . utendum modo nec ex ultimis tenebris repetenda. *Quintil. lib.* 8. *cap.* 3. *pag. m.* 364, 365. (*t*) *Factum pour Maiſtre* Nicolas Pol... . . . *ou diſſertation ſur les Peripneumonies pag.* 203. See the Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres, January 1686. *pag.* 34.

He vex'd the Janſeniſts, and they did not (H) ſpare him in their turn. His Enemies ſpread abroad ſtrange Reports about the manner of his Death; which (I) are mention'd and refuted by *Monconys*. I have ſomething to ſay (K) againſt *Moreri*. To conclude,

of that Jeſuit may be very well underſtood without the help of *Nonnius Marcellus*, or *Lauremberguis*'s *Antiquarius*, or even *Calepinus*. Neither is it true, that he ſtuff'd his Books with *Greek* Words. It was an uſual thing among the moſt Learn'd Philologers. *Caſaubon* is an inſtance of it in his Letters. *Balzac* (a) did not approve that Cuſtom.

(H) *The* Janſeniſts *did not ſpare him in their turn.*] *His Eighteenth Volume* (b) *contains the pieces which he wrote againſt Father Gibieuf, M. Arnauld, M. de Launoi, and ſome other Authors. It cannot be denied that he often expreſs'd too much bitterneſs againſt them. Wherefore it is ſaid, that he had reſolved to leave out many things in thoſe Works, if Death had not prevented it.* These laſt Words of the Journaliſt are only an officious Lye; for 'tis not at all likely, that the laſt Edition of Father *Raynaud*'s Works ſhould not be conformable to his Intention. Read the following Paſſage of a Janſeniſt, who obſerves that our Jeſuit died without giving any Satiſfaction to thoſe whom he had ſo much abus'd. (c) " Father *Theophilus Raynaud* was a (d) *Savoyard*, who " having been admitted into the Order of the Jeſuits at " 16 Years of Age, died in their Society, being above " 80 Years old. He was like once to leave them, be" cauſe he had been very ill us'd, *inter opera quæ ſubinde patiebatur, &c.* ſay the Jeſuits themſelves in the " Catalogue of their Writers. He could not expect it " ſhould be otherwiſe, ſince he had written ſeveral " Books againſt the irregular Life of the Society, ſuch " as that which is Intituled, *Theopoli Eugenii Protocataſtaſis ſeu primi Societatis Jeſu ſtatus reſtauranda*, " wherein he gives a Plan of a Reformation, to reſtore " his Order to their firſt Purity; and another Intituled, " *Hipparchus, &c.* againſt the Trading Humour which " prevailed every where in his Society. They diſown like" wiſe a Treatiſe, *de exſolutione a voto*, which, ſay they, " was not approv'd by his Superiors, and contains ſome" thing concerning St. *Ignatius*, which is not true; as " alſo what he writ in his Book againſt *Julius Clemens Scotus*, an *Italian*, who had left the Order of the Je" ſuits, that the Declarations upon the Conſtitutions of " the Jeſuits were not made by St. *Ignatius*, but by Fa" ther *Lainez*, the ſecond General. 'Tis likely that one " of the two firſt Books occaſion'd his being impriſon'd " by the Jeſuits for a conſiderable time. He was free " and bold in his Opinions, biting and ſatyrical in his " way of Writing, and had a great conceit of himſelf; " as it appears from what he ſaid, when he mention'd " the commendation that an Heretical Writer had given " him, *That it was the only truth that Man had ever* " *ſpoke*. What he did in the Year of his Jubilee is alſo " a ſingular thing. He celebrated a very pompous Maſs, " and a Jeſuit getting into the Pulpit, made his Pane" gyrick in his Preſence. That Father was certainly a " Man of prodigious reading. Twenty Volumes in Fo" lio of his Printed Works ſhew how eaſily he could " write. It were to be wiſh'd he had writ with Judg" ment, Prudence, Modeſty and Charity, and only out " of Love for Truth. The World had not ſeen ſo ma" ny Books full of Invectives and extravagant Calumnies " againſt many private Perſons, ſuch as the infamous " Libel, Intituled, *Arnaud de Breſſe reſuſcité dans Arnauld de Paris*, nor the Book full of falſities and bitterneſs, " which he publiſh'd againſt the whole Order of St. *Dominick*, with this Title, *De immunitate Autorum Cyriacorum a Cenſura: Diatriba Petri a valle Clauſa S. T. D.* " This Work was condemn'd at *Rome*, and many others, " as thoſe, *De Communione pro Mortuis: De Martyrio per peſtem: De cenſura bonorum & malorum librorum*; and " the 20th Volume, which his Friends Printed after his " Death..... This Father died at *Lyons* of an Apoplexy " the laſt Day of *October*, 1663, without ever giving " any Satiſfaction for the Slanders, injurious Words and " Calumnies that are ſo frequent in many of his Books.

(I) *His Enemies ſpread abroad ſtrange Reports ...... which are ...... refuted by* Monconys.] The following Paſſage is ſomewhat long; but 'tis no matter: There are ſome things in it which perhaps the Relator did not believe. (e) " When I told (f) him that I was a Native " of *Lyons*, he immediately ask'd me ſome News about " the Death of Father *Theophilus Raynaud*. I told him " that I happen'd to be at *Lyons* when he died, and " that my Brother, who was come from *Paris*, when " he was cut for the Stone, had often Diſcours'd with " me about him. He then ſhew'd me a Letter of Fa" ther *Henſchenius*, whoſe Library I had ſeen at *Antwerp*, wherein he acquainted him, that the Jacobins " had ſpread a Report in *Flanders* and at *Rome*, that " Father *Theophilus* ſaid a mad Maſs; that the Jeſuits had " depriv'd him of the Sacraments; that he run up and " down their Convent of *Lyons*, crying out like a " damn'd Man, *Phlegiton ſuper me*; and that having been " buried *Sepulturâ aſini*, he had been found unburied " the next Day, his Body being livid all over, becauſe " the Devils had beat him all Night. I told him that it " was a groſs Calumny and a ſilly Report; for the good " Man had left off ſaying Maſs for a Fortnight out of " Weakneſs, and communicated every Day. He had " made three general Confeſſions to Father *du Lieu* the " Week that he died. Nay, the very Morning of the " Day that he departed this Life, which happen'd laſt " Year on *All Saints Eve*, having had ſeveral Warnings " of it, he took his leave thrice of the Brother who " helped him to dreſs himſelf, aſſuring him that he " would give him no more trouble; and returning from " the Chappel, where he had heard Maſs and Com" municated, he told a Brother whom he met, that he " had begg'd of God that he might be in Heaven on " *All Saints* Day, and a Moment after, about half an " Hour after the Communion, as he was going into his " Chamber, he expir'd into the Arms of another good " Brother. Thus he fulfill'd his Prophecy, that he " ſhould Die in his Caſſock, and in his Chamber, which " he lov'd ſo well, that no Perſecution could bring him " off from the State of Life he had pitch'd upon in his " younger Years, having never left the Solitude of his " Cell for the ſpace of ſixty Years, but to do ſome cha" ritable Works, as for inſtance to confeſs the meaneſt " Peaſant at any time. I told him that the Church of " *Lyons* had perform'd a ſolemn Service for him in St. " *Juſtus*'s Chapter, where a Council was held; that the " Carmelites and Carthuſians had done the like at *Lyons*, " and that the Congregation of the Gentlemen of *Lyons* " had ſaid the Office in their Chappel, and had aſſiſted " at his Obſequies in a Body. I told him, that my Bro" ther himſelf, who did not eaſily believe Revelations, " had often told me, that when Father *Theophilus* was " in great trouble at *Avignon*, on account of his Book " *de Negotiatore Religioſo*, a barefooted Carmelite having " recommended him to the Prayers of a Carmelite Nun, " who is accounted a Holy Woman at *Avignon*, with" out telling her his Name; that Nun anſwer'd him, " that the Perſon for whom he deſir'd her Prayers, " was one of the moſt Learned Men of the Church, and " very acceptable to God; but that in order to exerciſe " his Virtue, and increaſe his Merit, our Lord had mor" tified him in that very thing, of which he was moſt " fond, *viz.* in his Books, whereof the whole Glory " and Reward were reſerv'd for him after his Death; " and that then all the Provinces of the World would " eagerly ſeek for them. As I perceiv'd that he heard " me with a great deal of Pleaſure, I added what the " Prior *Jugeact* of *Lyons* had told me of Father *Theophilus*'s Modeſty, which his Adverſaries ſhould imi" tate, *viz.* that he had refus'd the Biſhoprick of " *Geneva*, when the Nephew of the Bleſſed (*Francis de Sales*) came to die; that *Don Felix* of *Savoy*, and " the whole Senate of *Chambery*, having obtain'd the " conſent of Duke *Charles Emanuel*, Father *Theophilus* " was the only Man that oppos'd it, which he did ſo " earneſtly that they were forced to deſiſt. This the " ſaid Prior told me he was certainly inform'd of; and " that he himſelf was a Witneſs of an Act of a moſt " heroical Vertue; for having orders from the late Arch" biſhop of *Bourdeaux*, and ſome others, to offer ſome " Benefices and a Yearly Penſion of two thouſand Li" vres to Father *Theophilus*, with a City Security at *Lyons*, if he would but write in favour of a certain " Doctrine; Father *Theophilus* kiſſing his Caſſock, an" ſwer'd Mr. *Jugeact* in theſe fine Words, that he had " rather die under Perſecution in that Habit, than " live an eaſy Life and be wanting in the Fidelity he " had vowed to God". If the Monks don't ſcruple to ſpread ſuch Reports againſt a Jeſuit, 'tis no wonder if they have publiſh'd ſo many falſe Stories concerning the Death of *Luther, Calvin, &c.*

(K) *I have ſomething to ſay againſt* Moreri.] I. The beſt part of what he ſays being taken Word for Word from the *Journal* (g) *des Savans*, he ſhould have acquainted the Readers with it. It is an omiſſion for which he deſerves to be call'd a Plagiary, and theſe Words of *Pliny* may be applied to him: (h) *Obnoxii profecto*

(a) [illegible]

(b) [illegible]

(c) [illegible]

(d) [illegible]

(e) [illegible]

(f) [illegible]

(g) *The ſame which I have quoted in the Remark* F.

(h) *Plinius in præfat.*

clude, Father *Theophilus Raynaud* has often disguis'd (*L*) his Name in the Titles of his Books.

The *Carmelites* praise him very much, and made * a Funeral Solemnity for him, in all the Convents of their Order, in the Year 1663. by reason of the Book he had written concerning the *Scapulary*, which one of 'em publish'd (*M*) with many Alterations. He put out a Catalogue of his Works, which was very acceptable to the Curious. It is a very good Piece in its kind: It was printed by it self; but it was since prefix'd to the 20th Volume of his Works, which is entituled *Apopompæus*. One may find in that Catalogue the Occasion and Subject of each Book of that Writer, and the Names of those who writ against them, what was replied by Father *Theophilus*, and such like particulars, very pleasing to those who love the History of Books and Authors. It were to be wish'd that a Chronological Order had been more carefully observ'd in it. We find in that Catalogue, that such a Book is the first that the Author publish'd; another the second, the third, and so on; but neither the Year, nor the Place of the Impression, nor the Number and the Dates of the several Editions appear in it. Those, who thought that the Bookseller, who undertook to Print all the Works of that Jesuit in 20 Volumes in Folio, would (*N*) be ruined by it, were very much mistaken.

RAMUS

perfecto animi & infelicis ingenii est deprehendi in furto malle, quam mutuum reddere. II. It is not true that *Father Theophilus intended to Intitle the Collection of his Books Apopompæus, which is the Name the Jews gave to the Victim, which they loaded with Curses, and sent into the Wilderness; but it was not thought proper to make use of such a Title.* The Title *Apopompæus* was only intended for the Collection of some Pieces, which the Author did not insert in his 19 Volumes. We have seen above Mr. *Gallois*'s Words, which are so plain, that I cannot apprehend how *Moreri* could mistake the Sense of 'em. That Jesuit should have lost his Wits, if he had been willing that all his Works should be thus Intitu'ed. He kept that Title for some forbidden Pieces, as Father *Sotuel* informs us; which shews that *Moreri* is Guilty of a new Omission. III. The Works of *Theophilus Raynaud* have not been Printed in the Year 1667, the Edition of 'em was finish'd in 1665. *Moreri* fell into this mistake, because that Collection is mention'd in the *Journal des Savans* of the 14th of *March* 1667. This should oblige the Journalists always to set down the Year of the Impression. They did not do it at first, especially when they were afraid of discovering thereby that they spoke of a Book which had lost the Grace of Novelty. IV. It is not true, that our Jesuit lived in the XVIth Century. This Fault is only to be found in the second Edition made in *Holland*.

(*L*) *Has often disguis'd his Name in the Titles of his Book.*] This will afford matter to Mr. *Baillet* in the fine Collection we expect from him, about the Authors who have appear'd in Print under false Names. He doubts (*a*) whether our Jesuit took the Name of *Anselmus Solerius* in the Book *de pileo, cæterisque capitis tegminibus*; but since that Book is to be found in the 13th Volume (*b*) of the Works of that Father, we may be sure that he is the Author of it. *Placcius* (*c*) is in the wrong to believe that it came out at first without any Name, in the *Lyons* Edition 1655. in Quarto, dedicated *ad Petrum de Macerat*; but that in the *Amsterdam* Edition 1671. in Twelves, it was Printed with the Name of *Anselmus Solerius Cimmeliensis*. It is certain that in the *Lyons* Edition of 1655. the Author call'd himself *Anselmus Solerius Cemeliensis*, dedicating his Book *ad Petrum de Maridat*. So that it appears that *Placcius* was ignorant of several things upon this Head: He did not know the Names that appear'd in the first Edition: *Macerat* is a meer Chimera; *Maridat* is the true Name of a Councellor in the great Council: *Anselmus Solerius* (*d*) *Cemeliensis* was a false Name under which our *Theophilus* conceal'd himself. The same *Placcius* charges him, without any Reason, with a kind of contradiction (this I observe by the by) about the Chronicle of *Flavius Dexter*. (*e*) *Illud* (Chronicon) *ab ipso* (*f*) BIVARIO, vel VIVARIO *confictum credidere* Gabriel Pennottus & Matthæus Raderus, *contra quos ipse tamen Apologiis sese binis defendit quas approbant* Carolus Visch *Bibl. Cisterciensis*, p. 114. & Th. Raynaud. *de mal. & bon. lib. pag.* 139. *sibi fere contrarius pag.* 164. They are *Placcius*'s Words: he pretends that our Jesuit having approv'd, *pag.* 139. the Apologies of the *Spanish* Monk, disapproves them, *pag.* 164. But there is no such thing: he despises them plainly enough, *pag.* 164. and more clearly still, *pag.* 139. (*g*) *Flavii Dextri Chronicon nuper vulgatum, suppositum fuisse Dextro, latè contendit Gabriel Pennotus* in Canonicorum Regularium historia. *Quamvis enim, ipso S. Hieronymo teste, ratum sit, Flavium Dextrum scripsisse Chronicon quod eidem D. Hieronymo inscripserit; tamen hoc Chronicon nuper vulgatum, illud ipsum esse genuinum, cujus S. Hieronymus meminit, multa sunt quæ dissuadent. Nec quæ adversùs libri illius suppositionem proferunt Bivarius commentator ac defensor, & Melchior Inchofer* lib. pro epistola Deiparæ ad Messanenses à cap. 41. ad 46. *explent revera legentis animum.* This is what he says, *pag.* 139; and the following Words are to be found, *pag.* 164. (*h*) *Flavii Dextri Chronicon quod nuper prodiit, magna excitavit dissidia. Aliquod Chronicon verè fuisse à Dextro conscriptum, constat, cùm S. Hieronymus ejus sibi à Dextro inscripti meminerit; sed an id quod nuper prodiit, sit verum illud Dextri Chronicon, controversia est. Multi hoc Chronicon esse suppositum ab aliquo, cui honor gentis suæ cordi esset, contendunt, & acriter Pennotus* in Canonicorum Regularium historia. This Jesuit took the Name of *Stephanus Emonerius* (*i*) when he wrote against *Barnes* in favour of Equivocations; and that of *J. Heribertus Cemeliensis* in his *Latin* (*k*) Treatise concerning Eunuchs; and that of *Leodegarius Quintinus Heduus* writing against *Hurtado*, &c. This *Hurtado* was a *Spanish* Monk, who got the Book that is mention'd (*l*) by *Patin*, printed at *Amsterdam*: There are (*m*) some Jests in it upon the Titles of Father *Raynaud*'s Books. But, by his Favour, those Titles were sometimes ingenious: Who would not read a Work intitled, *Heteroclita Spiritualia, & anomalia pietatis*? which is the Title of the 15th and 16th Volumes of the Works of that Jesuit. What! will some say, are there *Heteroclites* in Religion as well as in Grammar? are there *Anomalies* in it as well as in the Moon?

Some have been of Opinion that *Amadæus Guimenius*, whose Works have made so great a Noise on account of their loose Morality, was no other than Father *Theophilus*. Father *Baron* went upon that Supposition (*n*) in all the second Part of his *Manuductio ad moralem Theologiam*; *but having since understood that the Book of* Amadæus, which he refuted, *was written by a* Spanish *Author he retracted in his Preface. And certainly*, adds Mr. Gallois, *Guimenius's Book has but little Affinity with Father* Raynaud's *Style*. Note, that it was by other Means that it came to be known that this Piece was written by the Jesuit *Moya*, Confessor to the Queen of *Spain*.

(*M*) *Publish'd with many Alterations*] How can one trust posthumous Works, and Manuscripts that come from remote Countries? How can we be sure that nothing has been added to or cut off from them, since a Manuscript of Father *Raynaud* was so much alter'd by a Carmelite during the Author's Life, and very near him? This Jesuit had displaid all his Learning to maintain the *Scapulary* of *Simon Stock*; but the chief of those concerned, were not satisfied with his Performance: for which Reason they mangled some parts of his Book most wretchedly, and made some Additions to it. He express'd his Indignation for it in the following Words. (*o*) *Hoc opusculum* (Scapulare Stochianum illustratum & defensum) *quale Parisiis è meo M. S. prodiit anno 1654. apud Antonium Padelore, abjudico tanquam spurium & alienum; Irruit enim in illud Leo, à quo miserè deformatum est, dicam discerptum & laceratum. Recisa plerisque locis, me inconsulto, multa; addita ex mente interpolatoris alia, quæ planè improbo. Titulus ipse libri, (ut ab ipso limine fieret perversionis exordium,) immutatus est; ita ut quod Hincmarus senior juniori exprobrabat, admissa in ipso aditu cespitatione, non potuerit expectari progressio felicior. Hiat passim oratio, ob prætermissionem vel recisionem unius aut alterius voculæ, menda ubique densa. Sic rependitur gratia.*

(*N*) *Would be ruin'd by it, were very much mistaken.*] For that Edition sold very well, and when it is to be found compleat in the Auctions of *Holland* and *Germany*, they commonly bid high for it. So that the Printer did not deserve to be placed in a certain List mention'd

(*a*) In the List placed at the end of his Book, intituled, Auteurs deguisez.

(*b*) See Sotuel. ubi supra pag. 758.

(*c*) Placcius de anonymis n. 1214. pag. 120.

(*d*) Note that this Word signifies a Native of Cemelia. It was an Episcopal City, which has been ruin'd long ago. The Episcopal See has been united to that of Nice. See Theophilus Raynaud de [illegible] propriis pag. m. 20.

(*e*) Placcius in Pseudonymorum Catalogo n. 294. pag. 185.

(*f*) A Spanish Monk of the Order of Citeaux. He publish'd the Chronicle of Flavius Dexter with a Commentary at Lyons, in 1627.

(*g*) Theoph. Raynaudus de malis ac bonis libris n. 220. p. m. 139.

(*h*) Ibid. n. 296. pag. 164.

(*i*) In the Article Barnes. [illegible]

(*k*) [illegible] at Dijon [illegible] 4to. [illegible]

(*l*) [illegible]

(*m*) [illegible] Preface [illegible] Amsterdam [illegible]

(*n*) Gallois, Journal des Savans of the [illegible] of April 1680. pag. m. 93.

(*o*) Tom. [illegible] Raynaud [illegible] pag. [illegible] m. 72. [illegible] m. 73.

RAMUS (PETER) in *French de la Ramée*, was one of the moſt famous Profeſſors of the XVIth Century. He * was born in a Village of *Vermandois* in *Picardy*, in the Year 1515. His Grand-father retir'd into thoſe Parts, having loſt all he had, when the Place of his Birth was burnt, in the (A) Territory of *Liege*, by the Duke of *Burgundy*. He was forc'd to make and ſell Coals all the reſt of his Life, in order to get his Livelihood. He left a Son, who got his by being a Labourer †, and who was the Father of our *Ramus*: A Man who proved the Sport of Fortune; for his Life was a perpetual riſing and falling. Being ‡ but eight Years of Age he went to *Paris* out of a deſire of learning ſomething, and being forc'd to leave that City by reaſon of his Poverty, he went thither again as ſoon as he could; and finding no way to ſubſiſt, he left it a ſecond time: but his paſſion for Study was ſo great, that, tho' he had been unfortunate in thoſe two Journeys, he went a third time to *Paris* with deſign to look for a Place. He was maintain'd there for ſome Months by one of his Uncles; after which he was forc'd (B) to be a Servant in the College of *Navarre*. He ſerved his Maſters in the Day time, and ſpent the greateſt part of the Night in his Study §; and the progreſs he made in it was ſo conſiderable, that when he took his Maſter of Arts degree, he ‖ engaged to maintain a Doctrine quite contrary to *Ariſtotle*, about any thing that (C) ſhould be objected to him. But I muſt obſerve ¶, that before this he had gone through a Courſe of Philoſophy, which laſted three Years and a half. He very well anſwer'd the Objections that were made againſt him for a whole Day: Which Succeſs made him reſolve to examine more narrowly *Ariſtotle*'s Doctrine, and to oppoſe it more vigorouſly. But the perfecting of Logick was almoſt the only thing he minded; and he made his Reading, and even

---

tion'd by Mr. *Catherinot*. As I was ending this Article, ſays he (a) "the Reverend Father *de Foucroy*, a "*Paris* Jeſuit, but an Inhabitant of *Bourges*, where he "has been near 50 years teaching and writing Books, "told me that one might make a pretty large Volume "of the Catalogue of thoſe, who have intirely ruin'd "their Bookſellers by their Books. I ſhall ſpeak of this "another time". Which puts me in mind of this Paſſage of *Stephen Paſquier*. "(b) I cannot forbear complaining at this time of the Calamity of this Age "which has produc'd ſuch a Plenty of reputed or untimely Authors. Any pitiful Scribler will have his firſt "Thoughts to come to Light; leſt, being too long ſhut "up, they ſhould grow muſty. I think theſe Verſes of "*Jodelle* are very pat to the purpoſe:

"*Et tant ceux d'aujourd'huy me faſchent,*
"*Qui dès lors que leurs plumes laſchent*
"*Quelque trait ſoit mauvais ou bon,*
"*En lumiere le vont produire,*
"*Pour ſouvent avec leur renom,*
"*Les pauvres Impriments deſtruire.*"

That is,

I'm plagued now-a-days with Men,
Who have no ſooner laid aſide their Pen,
But what they've writ, be it good or bad,
In hopes of ſome Renown,
Muſt be publiſh'd; and thus, Egad!
The Printer's quite undone.

(A) *Burnt in the Territory of* Liege.] This neither agrees with *Moreri*, nor with Mr. *Teiſſier*. The firſt ſays, that *Ramus's Grandfather had been forc'd to leave* Burgundy *during the Wars, and that he retir'd into* Vermandois. The latter ſays, (c) *That* Peter Ramus *was deſcended from a noble Family, originally of the City of* Evreux; *for his Grandfather being expell'd from his Country, and depriv'd of his Eſtate by the* Burgunders, *fled into* Vermandois. Thus, according to *Moreri*, *Ramus*'s Grandfather was a *Burgunder*; but, according to Mr. *Teiſſier*, he was a *Norman*. I am ſure he was neither of 'em; he was of the Country of *Liege*. Here's the Proof of it (d) *Parentes Rami agricolæ fuerunt pauperrimi. Avus certe, ut ipſe commemorat in Præfatione Regia ſuæ profeſſionis, in Eburonum gente familia in primis illuſtri fuit: ed patria a Carolo Burgundionum duce capta, & incenſa, in Veromanduorum agrum profugus, ob paupertatem carbonariam artem exercuit.* All good Geographers will tell you that the *Eburones* and the Inhabitants of the Country of *Liege* are one and the ſame People.

(B) *To be a Servant in the College of* Navarre.] I follow the account of *Banoſius*, and not that of *Joſeph Scaliger*. The latter ſays that *Ramus* was a Servant when he went to *Paris*. (e) *Ramus ad annum uſque decimum nonum, ne quidem primas notas didicerat, inſerviebatque Dom. de la Broſſe* (f) *Lutetiam deductus tantum famulus profecit maximo diſcendi deſiderio percitus, at quamvis repugnante ingenio tardo, rudi & ſtupido, repugnante, quod majus eſt, inſtitutione ſera, labore & diligentia in id litterarum decus pervenerit, quò perveniſſe vix credibile ſit, ita ut anno trigeſimo contra Ariſtotelem ſcripſerit meliori ſtylo quam poſterioribus anni.* I can ſcarce believe what the great *Scaliger* tells us: "Tis not at all likely that *Ramus* was (g) 19 Years of Age before he learn'd to read, nor that he had a dull and heavy Wit. However it be, 'tis not true that he was 30 Years old when he began to write againſt *Ariſtotle*; for his Book was condemn'd after many Concertations the 10th of *May*, 1543. He was then but 28 Years of Age; and therefore I am more inclined to believe *Banoſius*, who ſays that *Ramus* being eight Years of Age, took a Journey to *Paris* of his own motion, &c. (h) *Anno ætatis ſuæ circiter octavo ſponte Lutetiam venit, & inde bis abductus violentia temporis, bis eodem tamen, quam libet reflantibus ventis reverſus, & ardenti diſcendi ſtudio incenſus, ab Honorato Carpenterio avunculo victum per aliquot menſes perexiguum accepit, ut artes addiſceret: deinceps neceſſitate coactus multos annos duram ſervitutem in collegio Navarræ ſervivit. Sed quum interdiu dominis ſuis fidelem operam præſtitiſſet, nocte, Cleanthis Philoſophi exemplo non diſſimili, oleo & lucerna diſciplinarum lumen brevi tempore tantum ſibi comparavit, ut artium liberalium laurea ſit donatus.* But here is a ſtrong Proof againſt *Banoſius*, which I take from *Ramus*'s own Words, as they are related by *John Freigius*: (i) *Confiteor vitam mihi totam acerbiſſimis fluctibus jactatam eſſe. Puer vix è cunis egreſſus duplici peſte laboravi: juvenis invita modiſque omnibus repugnante fortuna Lutetiam ad capeſſendas artes ingenuas veni, inde bis abductus violentia temporis, bis eodem tamen quamlibet reflantibus ventis reverſus, atque eo ardentiore diſcendi ſtudio incenſus, quò vehementius prohibebar.* If *Ramus* had been but eight Years of Age, when he went to *Paris*, would he have uſed the Word *juvenis*? Ought he not to have ſaid *puer*? and would he have failed in it?

(C) *To maintain a Doctrine quite contrary to* Ariſtotle, *about any thing that ſhould be objected to him.*] *Taſſoni* looks upon it as an intollerable piece of boldneſs: *Ma più audace*, ſays he (k), *fù la prova di Pietro Ramo, autore per altro poco degno d'eſſere nominato. Queſto dovendo ſecondo l'uſo di Parigi ſoſtener concluſioni prima che foſſe creato Maeſtro, per bizzarria d'ingegno, propoſe queſta ſola a qualunque voleſſe argumentare, dando libero campo a tutti.* Quæcunque ab Ariſtotele dicta ſint, falſa, & commentitia eſſe. *La quale havendo eccitati contra di lui tutti gl'ingegni, tutte le profeſſioni, tutte le ſcuole; egli nondimeno con tanta prontezza, e ſottigliezza di riſpoſte la difeſe, che fe rimaner confuſa, e ſtupita la Città di Parigi: E ben ne' ſuoi libri appariſcono ancora i ſegni della ſua audacia.* The beſt of all is, that he owns that the Reſpondent maintain'd his Aſſertion with ſo great Subtilty, that every Body was amaz'd at it. Let us ſee how *Freigius* relates the Matter. (l) *Lutetiæ magiſterii titulum ſuſcepturus, pro more & conſuetudine ſcholarum liberam diſputandi copiam examinatoribus facere cogebatur. Problema igitur ſumpſit: Quæcunque ab Ariſtotele dicta eſſent, commenticia eſſe. Attoniti novitate & inſolentia problematis Magiſtri noſtri, cùm authoritatem Ariſtotelis (qua tanquam ſcuto, ſeſe ad omnes inſultus munire conſueverunt) ſibi ereptam viderent, irrito conatu per diem integrum, Magiſtrandum (ut barbari barbare vocant) oppugnarunt. Ex hoc fortuito ſucceſſu anſam deinceps ſerio & libere in Ariſtotelem animadvertendi & inquirendi arripuit.*

(D) Occa-

(g) Mr. Teiſſier ſo quoting Scaligerana 1 *lays only nine years*.

(h) Banoſius, *ubi ſupra p.* 3.

(i) *Johannes Thomas* Freigius, *in vita Petri* Rami *p.* 7. *ex* Schecſiano *epilogo* Rami.

(k) *Aleſſandro Taſſoni*, *Penſieri diverſi lib.* 10. *c.* 3. *p.* 375.

(l) Freigius *ubi ſupra pag.* 9, 10.

even his Lectures of Eloquence, ſubſervient to it *. The two firſt Books he publiſh'd, viz. his *Inſtitutiones Dialecticæ*, and his *Ariſtotelicæ Animadverſiones*, occaſion'd great (D) Troubles in the Univerſity of *Paris*.

It was neceſſary that *Francis* I. ſhould concern himſelf with it, bringing the Cauſe before him, which was depending in the Parliament of *Paris*, between *Ramus* and *Govea*. Some Judges were aſſign'd to the Parties to pronounce Sentence in the Difference between them,

Govea

(D) *Occaſion'd great Troubles in the Univerſity of Paris.*] The Profeſſors of *Paris*, who admir'd *Ariſtotle*, ſhould have refuted *Ramus*'s Books in their Writings and Lectures; but inſtead of keeping within the Bounds of an Academical War, they proſecuted that *Anti-Peripatetick* before the Judges, as a Man who undermined the Foundations of Religion. They raiſed ſo many Clamours, that the Cauſe was brought before the Parliament of *Paris*; but as ſoon as they perceived that it would be examin'd equitably, and according to the uſual Forms, they got it remov'd from that Tribunal by their Intrigues, and brought it before the King's Council. (a) *Ubi Ariſtotelicæ Animadverſiones lectæ erant, cum Petrus Ramus repente non ad humanam aliquam, & literis conſtitutam diſputationem ab Academia vocatur, ſed ad Prætoris tribunalis capitalem contentionem per certos homines falſo Academiæ nomine rapitur, novoque & ante hunc diem inaudito crimine accuſatur, quod Ariſtoteli repugnando Theologiam & artes enervaret. Hac enim oratione Ariſtotelica actio inſtituta eſt. Hinc Ariſtotelicorum clamoribus agitatus ad ſummum Pariſienſis Curiæ conſilium traducitur: deinde cum legitimo judicum more res agi, atque apertius inquiſitionis fraudis invidia percipi videretur, novis artibus a Senatu Pariſienſi ad regiam cognitionem disjicitur.* The King order'd (b) *that* Antony Govea, *who had offer'd to impugn and refute the ſaid Books, and the ſaid* Ramus, *who maintain'd and defended them, ſhould chuſe and nominate on both Sides, two worthy Men well skill'd in the Greek and Latin Tongues, and in Philoſophy.* Purſuant to this Ordinance, *Govea* and *Ramus* choſe each of 'em two Perſons: *Peter Danes* and *Francis Vicomercat* were choſen by *Govea*; and *John Quintin*, Doctor of the Canon-Law, and *John de Beaumont*, Doctor of Phyſick, were choſen by *Peter Ramus*. The King choſe *a fifth, who was* John de Salignac, *Doctor of Divinity*. Here are the Contents of the Letters Patents. "(c) Before whom the ſaid *Govea* and *Ramus* have been "heard in their Diſputes and Debates, 'till the ſaid *Ramus*, in order to put a ſtop to the Buſineſs, enter'd an "Appeal; which we being inform'd of, iſſued out our "Letters to our Provoſt of *Paris*, or his Lieutenant, to "compel the ſaid *Govea* and *Ramus* to end their Diſputes, that the ſaid Information might be given us "by the ſaid Cenſors, notwithſtanding the ſaid Appeal, or any other whatſoever. Purſuant to which "Letters the ſaid *Govea* and *Ramus* have appeared again before the ſaid Cenſors, and the ſaid *Ramus* perceiving that he could not defend the ſaid Books, "declared he would diſpute no longer, and ſubmitted "to the Cenſure of the above-mention'd Judges; but "when they would have proceeded in it, the ſaid *Quintin* and *Beaumont* declared that they would be no longer "concern'd in the matter. Whereupon the ſaid *Ramus* "was ſummon'd and requir'd to chuſe and name two "others, which he refus'd to do, and wholly ſubmitted "to the three others; who having examin'd and conſider'd the whole matter, were of Opinion that the "ſaid *Ramus* was a raſh, arrogant and impudent Man, "for rejecting and condemning the Logick receiv'd by "all Nations, which he himſelf was ignorant of, and "that his Ignorance plainly appear'd from his reproving "*Ariſtotle* in his Animadverſions. Moreover they added, "that he had an ill Intention, ſince he blamed *Ariſtotle* "for many things which that Philoſopher never thought "of, and that the ſaid Animadverſions were full of Lies "and Slanders; ſo that the good of Learning requir'd, "that the ſaid Book ſhould be wholly ſuppreſt; and "likewiſe the other above-mention'd Book Intitled, "*Dialecticæ Inſtitutiones*, as containing in like manner "many Falſities." Here follows the Purvieu of the Ordinance. "(d) We declare that having ſeen the ſaid "Advice, and had other Advices and Deliberations about it "with many learned and notable Men, we have condemn'd, "ſuppreſs'd and aboliſh'd, and do condemn, ſuppreſs "and aboliſh the aforeſaid two Books, the one Intitled *Inſtitutiones Dialecticæ*, the other *Ariſtotelicæ Animadverſiones*, and we have forbidden and do forbid all Printers "and Bookſellers of our Kingdom, Countries, Territories "and Lordſhips, and all our other Subjects, whatever "condition they may be of, to Print the ſaid Books, or "cauſe them to be printed, to publiſh, ſell or diſperſe "them in our ſaid Kingdom, Countries, Territories and "Lordſhips, upon pain of Forfeiting the ſaid Books, and "of Corporal Puniſhment, whether they be Printed in "our ſaid Kingdom, Countries, Territories and Lordſhips, or in any other Place not being under our Dominion. We likewiſe forbid the ſaid *Ramus* to read "the ſaid Books, and to get them written or tranſcrib'd, "publiſh'd or diſpers'd in any manner whatſoever, or "to read any Lectures of Logick or Philoſophy, without expreſs leave from us; as alſo not to uſe ſuch "Slanders and Invectives againſt *Ariſtotle*, or any other "Ancient Author commonly receiv'd and approv'd, or "againſt our ſaid Daughter the Univerſity, and the Members thereof, upon the above-mention'd Pains; and "therefore we order and command, *&c.*"

He who hears but one ſide, hears nothing; and therefore it will not be improper to hear the Account which a Friend of *Ramus* publiſh'd of the whole Proceeding. *Ramus* to obey the King's Command, appear'd before the five Judges, tho' three of 'em were his great Enemies. The Diſpute laſted two Days. He maintain'd that the Logick of *Ariſtotle* was imperfect, ſince it contain'd no definition nor diviſion. The two Judges he had choſen declared the firſt Day in Writing, that a (e) definition is neceſſary in every regular Diſputation; the three others declared in Writing, (f) that Logick may be perfect without definition. The next Day they acknowledged in Writing, that Diviſion is neceſſary in Logick; but when they ſaw that *Ramus* inferr'd from thence that he was in the right to condemn *Ariſtotle*'s Logick, becauſe it was not divided, they put off the Buſineſs 'till another time; and perceiving that they had ſo intangled themſelves, that they could not come off with Honour, they declar'd that the Diſputation ought to be renew'd, and that what had been done thoſe two Days, ſhould be look'd upon as nothing. *Ne non damnaretur Ramus, novum conſilium initur ut ab initio tota diſputatio retexatur, & adhuc injudicata indiceretur, proque nihilo haberetur* (g). *Ramus* made great complaints of ſuch a Proceeding, wherein the Judges not only made it appear that they intended to condemn him, but alſo diſanull'd their own Judgment; He excepted againſt them, and enter'd an Appeal, which was declared Null by *Francis* I. who order'd that the five Judges ſhould give a definitive Sentence in that Cauſe. The two Judges choſen by *Ramus* retired, being unwilling to be preſent at the Judgment (h), as meer Witneſſes to the Injuſtice intended againſt him. The three others gave Sentence as they were led by their Paſſion, and care was taken to prepoſſeſs the King with falſe Reports, that he confirm'd their Judgment. (i) *Hæc omnia Regis, licet omnium Regum & humaniſſimi & literarum amantiſſimi, tamen per falſas & improbiſſime conſictas calumnias inducti, auctoritate confirmantur.* Note, that the King declared in his Letters Patents, that *Ramus did wholly ſubmit* to thoſe three Judges, after the other two had deſiſted. Which is falſe, if we may believe the Author whom I quote; for having ſaid that the two Judges gave over the Proceedings, he adds that *Ramus* did the ſame, and that the three others condemn'd him without hearing him. (k) *Idemque Ramus ipſe non ſine ſtomacho, cum a tribus illis contumelioſe illuderetur, fecit, & ſe tempora ſperare dixit, quibus tales judices de ſuo facto nequaquam parem eſſent voluptatem percepturi. Ita vi* [illegible] *vel certe hominum quorumcunque opinione ad tempus oppreſſa cauſa eſt. Condemnantur igitur triumvirali ſententia, non modo indicta, ſed incognita plane cauſa, animadverſiones Ariſtotelicæ.* Take notice that the thing is thus related, not in an Anonymous Book, but in a piece which *Omar Talon* dedicated to the Cardinal of *Lorrain*. If we give Credit to it, we muſt look upon what is ſaid by *Peter Galland* as a meer Fable. He tells us, that *Francis* I. being informed of the continual invectives of a certain Sophiſt againſt *Ariſtotle, Cicero*, and *Quintilian*, was reſolved to ſend him to the Gallies, but that *Caſtellan* adviſed him to uſe another ſort of Puniſhment; which was to engage that Sophiſt in a Diſpute, wherein the Silence he would be reduced to, would plainly diſcover his Folly. The King approved that Expedient, and when he heard of the Confuſion that Man had been in, he was contented with that Puniſhment. 'Tis *Ramus*, whom *Peter Galland* means; but we muſt remember that he was his great Enemy. (l) *Cum in hac ſchola*

ante

(a) *Audomarus Talæus in ſua ad Carolum Lotharingium Cardinalem Academia, apud Launoium de varia Ariſtotelis Fortuna pag.* 47, 48. *edit. Paris.* 1653.

(b) *They are the words of the King's Letters Patents, dated the* 10th *of May* 1543. See Launoi de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, pag. 51, 52. *Thoſe Letters are to be found in the Bibliotheque Françoiſe of Du Verdier Vau-Privas at the word* Pierre de la Ramée.

(c) *That is, before the* 5 *Judges, viz. he whom the King nominated, and thoſe who were choſen by the Parties.*

(d) *See* Launoi ib.

Govea had all the Advantage he could deſire: Ramus's Books were prohibited all over the Kingdom, and the Author was forbidden to teach Philoſophy. His Enemies expreſs'd an extraordinary (E) Joy for it. This happen'd in the Year 1543. The Year following [*] the Plague raged at Paris, and occaſion'd the diſperſion of the Scholars of the College of Prele: But Ramus being perſuaded by his Friends to teach there, had quickly a great many Hearers. The Sorbonne endeavour'd to have him expell'd from that College, but could not ſucceed in it: He was maintain'd in his place of Principal by a Decree of the Parliament [†]. The Cardinal of *Lorrain* proved ſo good a Patron to him, that he obtained from *Henry* II. the liberty [a] of Writing and Speaking in the Year 1547, and the Royal Profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy and Eloquence in *July* 1551. The Parliament of *Paris* had before this maintain'd him in the liberty of adding Philoſophical Lectures to thoſe of Eloquence [β]. That Decree had put an end to many Perſecutions, which *Ramus* and his Scholars had been expoſed to. They had been vexed and proſecuted *(F)* ſeveral ways, both before the Academical and the Civil Judges [γ], during the Winter [δ] of the Year 1551. He was no ſooner made *Regius* Profeſſor, but he ſhewed a new deſire of perfecting the Sciences, and went about it with more eagerneſs, notwithſtanding the Hatred of his reſtleſs Enemies, who were ſo mad as to pretend that his manner of pronouncing the Letter Q together with his *(G)* Collegues, was an Innovation, for which he deſerv'd to be proſecuted. They carried their Attempts ſo far, that he was obliged to abſcond. He went to *Fontainebleau*, with the King's *(H)* leave, where he concealed himſelf [ζ], and continued his Geometrical and Aſtronomical Studies

ante annos octo Sophiſta famoſus Muſis iratis natus, gloriæ popularis ſiti inexplebili præceps, Ariſtotele, Cicerone & Quintiliano petulanter & ignoranter vexatis, nullum finem in quemvis auctorem claſſicum debacchandi facturus videretur, priuſquam præſentem literarum ſtatum labefactaſſet, & ad ſuam libidinem pervertiſſet, permulti doctrina & virtute conſpicui homines audaciam tam prodigioſam indigniſſime tulerunt. Cumque de eo apud regem ita conqueſti eſſent, ut ille, pro ſua perpetua in literas & literarum Profeſſores benevolentia, hunc indignabundus ad remum damnatum triremibus addicere ſtatueret. Regis animum facetis leporis ſuavitate emollitum, ad mitiorem ſententiam traduxit. Sophiſtam nugantem & inepte philoſophantem ab humaniſſimo Rege nullo capitali ſupplicio puniendum eſſe. Verum cum doctis hominibus coram gravibus diſceptatoribus in diſputationis certamen commiſſum, argumentis convincendum, & ratione aliqua leviore ad ſanitatem reducendum. Quorum ſententia cum illum Rex ineptiis, impudentiæ & temeritatis damnatum, ſilentique pœna multatum vidiſſet, facile acquievit, neque acerbius quicquam in eum ſtatuit.

(E) *Expreſs'd an extraordinary Joy for it.*] They made a greater noiſe about it in proportion, than the moſt Vain-glorious Princes for the taking of a great Town, or the obtaining a moſt important Victory. The Sentence of the three Judges was publiſh'd in Latin and French in all the Streets of *Paris*, and in all the Parts of *Europe* whither they could ſend it. Some Plays were acted with great Pomp, wherein *Ramus* was abuſed a thouſand ways among the Acclamations and Applauſes of the *Ariſtotelians*. (a) *Triumphus de tam nobili victoria mirificus agitur, triſtis illa & horrenda Triumvirûm ſententia impreſſis & Latina & Gallica oratione libellis, non modo per hujus urbis compita, ſed per orbis terrarum loca omnia, quò expectari* (b) *potuit, promulgatur. Ludi magno apparatu celebrantur, ubi ſpectantibus & plaudentibus Ariſtotelæis, omni ludibrii & convitii genere Ramus afficitur.*

(F) *They had been vexed and proſecuted ſeveral ways.*] I don't give the Particulars of thoſe Vexations, which you may read in (c) *Freigius*: I ſhall only ſay, that when *Ramus*'s Enemies came to perceive that the other Complaints made no great impreſſion, they accuſed him of perverting the Youth with the Seeds of Hereſie and Scepticiſm. (d) *Unius primum accuſationem graviſſimam audivit, Ramum Academicum nominantis, & inaudita calumnia deſcribentis, humanarum divinarumque rerum hoſtem & inimicum, qui de humanis diviniſque legibus addubitaret, deque iis dubitare diſcipulos ſuos doceret: qui lubricos Divi Auguſtini locos ſuis auditoribus ad effrenatam & impiam libertatem proponeret, qui (quò facilius incautis animis abuteretur) omnes Logicas diſputationes tolleret.*

(G) *His manner of pronouncing the Letter* Q *together with his Collegues.*] Amongſt other Abuſes, the Royal Profeſſors mended that, which had crept into the Pronunciation of the *Latin*. Some Eccleſiaſticks complied with that Reform, tho' the *Sorboniſts* were diſpleaſed with that Innovation. But a benefic'd Man was very ill uſed by them upon that account; for they got him deprived of his Revenues. He made his Application to the Parliament; and the Royal Profeſſors being afraid that he would ſink under the Credit of the Faculty of Divinity, for being ſo bold as to pronounce the *Latin* Tongue according to their Reform, thought themſelves oblig'd to aſſiſt him: They went to the Court, and repreſented ſo lively the Shamefulneſs of ſuch a Trial, that the accuſed Perſon was acquitted. (e) *Quas novas turbas innovata pronunciatio peperit! Sub annum milleſimum quingenteſimum quinquageſimum, cum Profeſſores regii ſinceriorem Latinæ linguæ pronunciationem ſenſim introducere cœpiſſent, moleſtè ferebant cum alii tum præſertim Sorbonici inveteratam loquendi conſuetudinem Gallorum improbari, ut quæ pueri didiciſſent, ſenes perdenda fateri cogerentur: in primis verò de ſono ipſius literæ Q. ambigebatur: regiis ſic, uti debet, cum ſequente u pronunciantibus, Quiſquis, Quamquam: Sorbonicis verò conſuetudine vernacula, Kiskis, Kankam. Jam cum ſacris addictum hominem ob genuinam pronunciationem ampliſſimis proventibus Sorbonici ſpoliandum curaſſent, & lite coram Senatu Pariſienſi conteſtata, ne miſer ille ob grammaticam hæreſin (ut illi vocabant) theologicis fructibus jure excideret, periculum eſſet: profeſſores regii, & inter hos Petrus Ramus facto agmine in Curiam convolant, & judicii inſolentiam præfati, quod Jureconſulti de legibus regiis diſputare ſoliti, ad grammaticorum leges dijudicandas ſeſe demiſiſſent, judices ita commoverunt, ut ſententiis ſuis non modò ſacerdotem abſolverent, ſed & impunitatem de Grammatica pronunciatione diſputandi tacito aſſenſu in perpetuum ſtabilirent. Ergo Kis & Kalis, & Kantus, & Kiki, & ſimiles Gotiſmi & barbariſmi erant in Pariſienſi Academia ante regios profeſſores uſitati: quos barbariſmos ſi collega aliquis imitari nollet, acerbè & contumelioſè accipiebatur, quod collegii conſuetudinem violare diceretur. E ſchola regia tum primum Quis, Qualis, Quantus, Mihi, Latinè & Romanè ſonuerunt, & pudor fuit regiis Profeſſoribus tanquam regis ipſius voci palàm reclamare.* This is ſuch a ſtrange and incredible thing, that I did not think fit to omit any one Word of the Author who relates it. He maintains another immediately after, which I am more amazed at, and I would fain ſee the Monuments of it in the Archives; otherwiſe I would not adviſe any Body to give an intire Credit to it, any more than to the Trial about *Kankan* and *Kiskis*. The thing is this: The publick Authority was made uſe of to force many Doctors of *Paris* to renounce this Aſſertion, which they obſtinately maintain'd: *Ego amat* is as good a Phraſe as *Ego amo*. I'll quote *Freigius* for it. (f) *Incredibile propè dictu eſt, ſed tamen verum & editis libris proditum, in Pariſienſi Academia Doctores extitiſſe, qui mordicus tuerentur ac defenderent, Ego amat, tam commodam orationem eſſe, quàm Ego amo; ad eamque pertinaciam comprimendam conſilio publico opus fuiſſe.* Notwithſtanding my Incredulity, I ſhall obſerve that there happen'd many things in the XVIth Century in the Faculty of Theology at *Paris*, at which they bluſh now when they think of 'em. They were laugh'd at for it to ſome purpoſe.

(H) *He went to* Fontainebleau *with the King's Leave, &c.*] I wiſh *Freigius* had not omitted the Circumſtances of *Ramus*'s Retreat; I wiſh particularly he had mention'd the time: but perhaps if he had ventur'd to ſet down the Year, he would not have been more ſucceſsful, than when he ſaid that *Ramus*'s *Animadverſiones* were condemned (g) in the Year 1545; and that the Author was forbidden to meddle with Philoſophy; but that *Ramus* being reinſtated by King *Henry* (h) at the Sollicitation of the Cardinal of *Lorrain*, made a Speech in the Year 1546, *De ſtudiis Philoſophiæ & Eloquentiæ conju-*

(e) *Id. ib.* pag. 24.

(f) *Id. ib.*

(g) *Id. ib. pag.* 14.

(h) Henri II. *did not begin his Reign 'till the Year* 1547. Ramus was *deprived in* 1543.

dies by the help of the Books he found in the King's Library. But when it came to be known that he was there, he did not think himſelf ſafe, and was forced to abſcond in ſeveral other Places *. In the mean time his Library was plunder'd in the College of *Prele*. But the Peace being concluded between *Charles* IX. and the Proteſtants, in the Year 1563, he was reſtored to his Place, wherein he maintain'd himſelf with great Vigour, and endeavour'd chiefly to make Mathematical Learning flouriſh; which he did 'till the ſecond Civil War in the Year 1567. He was then obliged to leave *Paris*, and to put himſelf under the Protection of the Hugonots †. He was in their Army at the Battel of *St. Denys*. The Peace was made ſome Months after, and here aſſumed his Profeſſorſhip; but foreſeeing that the War would ſoon begin again, and being unwilling to be expoſed to a new Storm, he ask'd the King's leave to go and ſee the *German* Univerſities, which was granted him. He made that Journey in the Year 1568, and receiv'd great Honours where-ever he came ‡. He return'd into *France* after the third War §, in the Year 1571, and was cruelly Maſſacred at *Paris* on St. *Bartholomew*'s Day. He was, without doubt, a great (*I*) Orator, a Man of univerſal Learning, and endow'd with excellent Moral Qualities, free from (*K*) Avarice, Sober, Chaſt, Religious, and zealous for the reform'd Religion: But he was ſomewhat obſtinate, and of a contradicting Humour; and ſome will have it that he robbed ‖ *Viete* of his Inventions. He ſhew'd a (*L*) great firmneſs in his Misfortunes. He was not well beloved

[illegible]. However it be, he clearly intimates that the King not daring to protect *Ramus* openly, ſent him to *Fontainbleau* to ſecure him from the Fury of his Enemies. (*a*) *Paucis menſibus per reliqua Geometriæ myſteria perviſſet, niſi curſus induſtriæ per fatalem quandam calamitatem abruptus fuiſſet. Acceptis igitur à rege literis, ad regiam Fontebellaquei bibliothecam profectus, mathematicos ſuperiorum temporum prælectiones ab initio plenius & uberius retractavit & conſideravit.* . . . . . . (*b*) *Hæc meditantem ſolitudo cervorum ac ſylva diutius retinere non potuit. In Italiam tum cogitavit, quo ipſum Bononia honorifice invitarat. In Germaniam viſitans ipſis illis mathematum amoribus chariſſimam ſæpe reſpexit, ſed vis omnibus terror mortis intentus ac pavor, rumor etiam Pralei ſui indignis modis direpti, tum bibliotheca chariſſimis quibuſque rebus ſpoliata ac depopulata, ad regiam Vincennarum propius urbem revocarunt: quin alia vis etiam gravior accidit ut e Vincennis per invia itinera profugiendum eſſet, & ſubinde variis in locis deliteſcendum: in fuga tamen & latebris otium lucemque reperit.* (*c*) *Baneſius* informs us that *Ramus* retir'd to *Fontainebleau* during the firſt War of Religion, that is, in the Year 1562.

(*I*) *A great Orator.*] I deſire no other Proof for it than this Teſtimony of *Brantome*, which contains a thing not to be found any where elſe. Here are his words, wherein he mentions the learned Men maintain'd by *Henry* II. " (*d*) *Galandius Torticolis* was a great Man in " Oratory; but *Ramus* his Enemy exceeded him. *Ramus* was a moſt eloquent Orator, and there have been " few like him; for his Eloquence was attended with an " extraordinary graceful Delivery. Having turn'd Huguenot ſome Years after, and being in the Prince's and " the Admiral's Retinue, in their Journey to *Lorrain*, " and the *Reiſters*, whom they had ſent for, refuſing to go into *France*, unleſs they had ſome Mony " given 'em; the Huguenots made a gathering for them, " and *Ramus* a Speech, which affected them ſo much, " that they were prevailed upon to go into the Heart of " *France*, where they did great Miſchief."

(*K*) *Free from Avarice, Sober, Chaſt.*] (*e*) He refuſed ſome Profeſſorſhips, which might have been very profitable to him, and choſe rather to be a Teacher in the College of *Prele*, where he had no publick Salary. He would not accept the Preſents that his Pupils were willing to make him (*f*), and he maintain'd ſome Scholars at his own Charges (*g*). He refuſed to go into *Poland*, tho' he was promiſed to be well rewarded for the Encomiums he ſhould beſtow upon the Duke of *Anjou*. His Anſwer was, that Eloquence ought not to be a mercenary Thing, and that an Orator ought to be a Man of Probity. (*h*) *Inter cætera referam quod cuidam reſpondit, qui in Poloniam legatus, Ramo, ut ſecum proficiſceretur ad Henrici, qui nunc eſt, Galliarum regis laudes decantandas, magno pretio perſuadere conatus eſt. At vero, ait, oportet Oratorem non tantum dicendi peritum, ſed virum bonum eſſe: nec viri boni lingua venalis eſſe debet.* We learn from theſe Words a remarkable thing, *viz.* that *Monluc* was deſirous to make uſe of *Ramus*'s Eloquence, in order to dazzle the *Poliſh* Nobility, that they might be the more willing to elect the Duke of *Anjou* for their King; for it is not to be queſtion'd, that he who made the above-mention'd Propoſal to *Ramus*, was the ſame *Monluc*, Biſhop of *Valence*, who did ſo well ſucceed in his Negotiations about the Election of *Henry* III. and who, amongſt other means, made uſe of the Eloquence of ſome Perſons, who in their Verſes and Harangues extolled to the Skies the noble Qualities of the Duke of *Anjou*. He took care to avoid the Snare mention'd in a Maxim of *Horace* (*i*).

Ramus was a Man of an exemplary Temperance; he (*k*) was contented with boiled Meat, and eat but little at Dinner; he was twenty Years without drinking Wine, and began to drink ſome only by the Preſcription of the Phyſicians; he lay upon Straw, and roſe very early; he ſtudied all Day (*l*); he lived a ſingle Life that was not ſo much as ſuſpected of any Impurity, and took great care to avoid obſcene Converſations. *Cœlebs vixit caſtiſſime, ab ſcortationis non tantum crimine, ſed etiam ſuſpicione ſemper immunis: colloquia obſcœna, utpote quæ bonos mores corrumpunt, tanquam toxicum fugiebat* (*m*).

(*M*) *A great firmneſs in his Misfortunes.*] Any Body but he would have retired from *Paris* after the thundering Decree of *Francis* I. which his Adverſaries did ſo inſultingly boaſt of; but he kept ſtill in the College of *Prele*, and let 'em bawl as much as they would. He anſwer'd none of the Pieces that were publiſh'd againſt him. If it be ſaid that he durſt not do it, becauſe the King order'd him to be ſilent about Matters relating to Philoſophy; I anſwer, that if he had not been Maſter of his Paſſions, he would have gone out of the Kingdom, to enjoy the liberty of vindicating himſelf. Of all things in the World Silence is perhaps the moſt difficult for an Author, who is attack'd and ſlander'd by every Body; and yet this is a thing which *Ramus* was capable of. Here are the words of an Author, who has very well expreſs'd it. (*n*) *Adverſus contumelias Doctorum quamlibet & eruditorum hominum perpetuum ſilentium juraverat. Nil Goveano, Gallandio, Perionio, Turnebo reſpondit: nil ingenii & doctrinæ per univerſam Germaniam principi Melanchthoni reſpondit: nil aliis Germanis, nil Italis nonnullis reſpondit. Cumque divulgatus per orbem terrarum Gallica & Latina lingua probris eſſet natatus, publicis ludis ignominioſiſſime traductus: conſtricta lingua, vinctis manibus prohibitus quicquam de philoſophia vel publice vel privatim dicere, ſcribere, cogitare etiam (ſi menti tantum potuiſſet imperari) prohibitus eſſet: adverſus tantas tot acerbitatum plagas, unicum patientiæ remedium adhibuit, in animoque ſemper illud habuit*: Grata ſuperveniet, quæ non ſperabitur hora. That Author has forgot a Circumſtance, which would have very much ſet off *Ramus*'s Triumph, I mean the Power he had over himſelf to be ſilent. That Profeſſor recover'd, four Years after, the Liberty of writing and ſpeaking about Philoſophy: He ſays ſo himſelf in the firſt Speech he compoſed after he had been made *Regius*-Profeſſor. (*o*) *Miſero Rex Henricus, Hercules videlicet Gallicus, adfuit, meque quarto abhinc anno ad poſtulationem Caroli Lotharingi Cardinalis, & manibus & lingua ſolvit, ſolutoque Eloquentiæ & Philoſophiæ docendæ, exercendæ, illuſtrandæ poteſtatem fecit.* Here are ſome other Proofs of his Conſtancy. The firſt time he explain'd his Logick in the College of *Cambray*, the Emiſſaries of his Enemies left no Stone unturn'd to vex him to the higheſt degree, and to force him to leave off reading his Lecture: They hiſs'd and houted at him; they clap'd their hands, and ſtamp'd with their Feet. But all was in vain; he was not daſh'd out of Countenance; he ſtop'd now and then 'till the houting was over, and made an end of his Lecture by Snatches. They were aſtoniſh'd at his Unconcernedneſs, and prov'd afterwards leſs inſolent for that very reaſon. (*p*) *Anno 1552. cùm in Cameracenſi ſcholâ frequentiſſimo audito-*

rio

(*a*) *Freigius ibid. pag.* 21.

(*b*) *Ibid. pag.* 28.

(*c*) *Banoſius in vita Rami pag.* 20.

(*d*) *Brantome, Memoires des hommes illuſtres, tom.* 2. *pag.* 55.

(*e*) *Tho. Freigius ubi ſupra pag.* 35.

(*f*) *Id. ib.*

(*g*) Solebat in patriam proficiſcens bonæ indolis juvenes pauperes ſuis ſumtibus fovere, eoſque in Academia Prælea bonis informabat diſciplinis: ex quorum numero plerique ſuperſunt viri doctiſſimi. *Banoſius ubi ſupra pag.* 14.

(*h*) *Id. ib. pag.* 13.

beloved by the Miniſters; for he made himſelf in ſome manner the Head of a Party to alter the Diſcipline of the reform'd Churches. His Deſign was fruſtrated, and even defeated (M) in a National Synod. I could mention many other things relating to him, were it not that I avoid repeating what may be found in *Moreri's* Dictionary, and in the large Collections of Mr. *Teiſſier*: Beſides, I have not been able to conſult a Book * which I had formerly, and which contains a great many Particulars. I ſhall make ſome ſmall Obſervations upon the Narratives (N) of thoſe two Authors, wherein the Reader will find ſome matters of Fact clear'd.

He

ea ſuam dialecticam auſpicaretur, ab aemulis clamores, ſtrepitus, ſibili ingentes per ſummam petulantiam excitari coepere. Hac inſolentia nihil ipſe permotus, cum ſe oratorem praeſtitit, ut multum diuque licet obſtrepentibus adverſariis, per intervalla tamen clamorum, incredibili conſtantia, nec minore cum gloria peroravit. Qua ejus virtute conterriti inimici, in poſterum minus ei fuere moleſti. He was inſulted in the like manner (a) at *Heidelberg*, and with no better Succeſs, whilſt he read Lectures there in the Year 1568. Which ſhews that he had made himſelf odious to ſeveral People in *Germany* as well as in *France*, for having been ſo bold as to write againſt *Ariſtotle*. It muſt be confeſs'd that he had done it a little too haughtily, and that he had ſhewed too great an Affectation of depriving that Philoſopher of all his Glory: He took from him, as much as ever he could, the Works that are aſcribed to him; and when he acknowledged him to be the Author of ſome of 'em, he condemn'd the Doctrine contain'd in them, and went ſo far as to inveigh againſt that Philoſopher by the Care he took to make an odious Deſcription of his Vices and Actions (b). See the two Speeches which *Perionius* publiſh'd in the Year 1544.

His deſign was . . . . defeated in a National Synod.] He deſign'd to introduce a Democratical Government into the Church: He pretended that the Power of the Keys, conferr'd by *Jeſus Chriſt* upon the People, ought to be committed to the Conſiſtories no farther than as it is expedient, that they ſhould firſt of all deliberate about the things in queſtion, and give their Judgment about 'em; which muſt afterwards be propoſed to the People, and cannot be enacted into a Law, unleſs it be confirm'd by the Votes of the Heads of the Families. He ſaid that this was the only way to preſerve the Church from Oligarchy and Tyranny. His Opinion was examin'd in a National (c) Synod, who rejected it. *Beza* uſed his utmoſt Endeavours to have that Eccleſiaſtical Democracy condemned, which in Truth would occaſion a World of Confuſion, and a meer Anarchy. He was afraid that if *Peter Ramus* ſhould refuſe to acquieſce in the Judgment of the Synod, it would cauſe many Broils; for he look'd upon him as a great Shuffler. Here are his Words: (d) *Pſeudodialecticus ille, quem* [illegible] *jampridem docti multi cognominarunt, contentionem non parvam excitavit de tota Eccleſiaſtica* [illegible]*, quam inquit Democraticam eſſe oportere, non Ariſtocraticam, ſola* προβουλεύματα *presbyterio relinquens. Synodus ob eam cauſam Nemauſi ineunte Majo coacta, cui etiam interfui, dogma iſtud plane, meo judicio, abſurdum & pernicioſum, refutatis contrariis omnibus argumentis damnavit, cui ſi cum ſuis paucu*l*is ille obſequatur, bene erit: ſin minus, certe turbas dabit homo ad turbanda optima quaeque comparatus.* *Ramus* was not ſo imprudent as to require that the Diſcipline ſhould be aboliſh'd; he oppoſed (e) only the Juriſdiction of the Conſiſtories and Synods; he pretended that the People were to judge of the Doctrine, chuſe their Miniſters, excommunicate, and abſolve. Some ſuſpect that he inſiſted upon this, to introduce into the Church the Power of the *Demagogues* of *Athens*, or of the *Tribunes* of *Rome*; for, being a very eloquent Man, he might have excited in the Aſſembly of the People ſuch Paſſions as he would have had 'em poſſeſs'd with. *Ille neſcio quem adeò Chriſtianum populum ſomniat ut ſemper à Spiritu ſancto regatur, ſolaque* προβουλεύματα *presbyterio relinquens, nihil vult ratum haberi, niſi quod praeſens populus rogatis expreſſiſque ſuffragiis decreverit, quod ni fiat, clamitat Oligarchiam ac Tyrannidem invehi in Eccleſiam, nihil interea Ochlocratiam reformidans, in qua nimirum ipſe, & ejus ſimiles dominentur. Contendunt iidem quibuſvis etiam* ἰδιώταις *prophetandi partes in Eccleſia concedendas, huc detorto Pauli loco ex cap. prioris ad Cor.* 14. (f)

(N) *Obſervations upon the Narratives of* Moreri *and* Mr. Teiſſier.] I. I have already obſerved (g) their Miſtake concerning the Country of *Ramus*'s Grandfather. II. They take Notice of a Fault of *Thuanus* without mending it. That great Man ſuppoſes (h) that *Peter Ramus* having taught Philological Learning, Philoſophy, and the Mathematicks in the College of *Preſle*, and afterwards in the Royal College, forged (i) at laſt a falſe Philoſophy in oppoſition to *Ariſtotle*. He is miſtaken; *Ramus* begun firſt of all to write againſt *Ariſtotle*, as has been ſaid (k) above. III. What they ſay of the Foundation of a Profeſſorſhip for the Mathematicks is true; but their Narrative would make one think, that *Ramus* paid five hundred Livres every Year during his Life, to him who fill'd the Mathematical Chair. I don't believe it. 'Tis likely his Intention was, that after his Death that Sum ſhould be taken from his Revenue, to be paid to the Profeſſor, who ſhould be choſen according to the Terms he had preſcribed. His laſt Will was publiſh'd by (l) *Banoſius*: He made it the (m) firſt of *Auguſt*, 1568, being ready to travel in order to ſee the foreign Univerſities. He order'd by that Will, that out of the yearly Rent of 700 Livres which he had in the Town-Houſe of *Paris*, five hundred ſhould be applied for the Salary of a Profeſſor, who ſhould teach, for the ſpace of three Years, Arithmetick, Muſick, Geometry, Opticks, Mechanicks, Aſtronomy and Geography in the Royal College; and he appointed *Frederick Reiſnerus* to be the firſt Profeſſor who ſhould have that Salary. *Paſquier*, in his *Recherches*, has committed ſo childiſh a Fault about this very thing, that I dare not take notice of it. (n) *That Learned Man*, ſays he, *after forty five Year's Labour, had got five hundred Livres a Year, by his good Huſbandry, which he received from the Town Houſe of Paris, out of which he left a hundred Livres to his Uncle by the Mother's Side, a hundred more to a Nephew the Son of his uterin Siſter, and the five hundred Livres that remain'd to him who ſhould be judged the fitteſt Man for the Mathematical Chair.* Here is an Inſtance of thoſe Diſtractions, which I have mention'd in (o) another Place: This is worſe than if one ſhould ſay, in caſting up an Account, 3 times 7 make 22. *Paſquier* ſpeaks of a Sum of 500 Livres; he takes from it one hundred on the one ſide, and one hundred on the other, and yet he finds ſtill 500 Livres: He reads this over and over again without perceiving his Miſtake. If he did not commit that Blunder, it muſt be imputed to the Corrector of the Preſs. I muſt further obſerve, that *Ramus* was but 53 Years of Age, when he made his Will; how then ſhall we find the 45 Years of his Labour and good Huſbandry? Father *du Breul* (p) ſays, that *Ramus* left only fifty Livres by his Will for the Mathematical Profeſſor. IV. *Moreri* is in the right, when he ſays, that *we read in Beza's Letters, that* Ramus *had a mind to retire to* Geneva, *where he deſir'd to be Profeſſor of Philoſophy.* The two Letters *Beza* wrote to him are remarkable, and plainly ſhew that there was no great Friendſhip between them. The firſt is dated the 30th of *September*, 1569. *Beza* anſwers the Complaints of *Ramus*, and at the ſame time declares to him, that he condemn'd his Logick, and his inveterate Diſeaſe of cenſuring the greateſt Men, and that he approved his Adverſaries. (q) *Illud ego multis ſaepe dixi, & ad teipſum ſcripſi non temere, ut tu putas, neque vel* [illegible] *vel illo, ita me bene Deus amet, maledicendi ſtudio, ſed quoniam tuum iſtud in ſummis omnibus & extra omnem judiciorum aleam poſitis ſcriptoribus reprehendendis cacoethes probare nunquam potui, ac ne nunc quidem poſſum. . . . . Miror autem a me requiri quod tam multi doctiſſimi viri tam accurate & verbis & ſcriptis praeſtiterant, quibus ſummo conſenſu tuas in Ariſtotelem animadverſiones prorſus diſplicuiſſe non ignoras. Cum iſtis ſi ferre non potes ut à te diſſentiam, tuo ſane judicio fruere.* Theſe are the ſweet Things that *Beza* writ to him. He complains in the other Letter that *Ramus* did not acquaint him with his deſign of being Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the Academy of *Geneva*, and he takes it for a ſign of Diſtruſt (r). He gueſs'd right; for certainly *Ramus* did not expect that *Beza* would favour him, and he had no reaſon to expect it. However, *Beza* made him ſome Compliments, and writ to him in a civil manner; but after all, he told him that there was no Profeſſorſhip for him at *Geneva*; all the Places were fill'd; the Funds appointed for the Salaries of the Profeſſors could not be augmented, and the Academy was reſolved to admit no other Syſtem but that of *Ariſtotle*. (ſ) *Duo tantum ob-*

ſtant

---

nem, & abſolutionem. *Simler. in vita Bullinger. fol.* 45. (f) *Beza epiſt.* 68. *of the ſame date as the other.* (g) *in the Re-* rk A. (h) *Thuan. lib.* 52. *pag.* 1078. *ad ann.* 1572. Spondanus *commits the ſame fault, ad ann.* 1572. *n.* 15.

(i) [illegible]

(k) *In the Remark D.*

(l) [illegible]

(m) *And not the* [illegible] *as Paſquier ſays,* [illegible] *l.* 9. *c.* 19. *p. m.* [illegible]

(n) *Paſq. ibid.*

(o) *In the Article* Caton, *Remark* C.

(p) *Antiquitez de Paris, pag.* 568. *Paris Edit.* 1639 *in* [illegible]

(q) *Beza, epiſt.* 34.

(r) Mihi non ex te ipſo tuum hoc de ornanda noſtra ſchola conſilium, quam ex amicis intellexiſſe, minime id quidem quòd aliunde quam alio rogari velim, ut homines ambitioſi ſolent, ſed quòd inde conjiciam te nonnihil de meo in te animo dubitare coepiſſe. *Id. epiſt.* 36. *It is dated the firſt of* December, 1570.

(ſ) *Id. ib.*

He publiſh'd many Books; you may ſee the Catalogue of 'em in Mr. *Teiſſier*. His Hand was ſcarce legible, and gave a great deal of trouble to the Printers *. His Sect did (O) flouriſh for

ſtant quæ minus quàm optat, & noſtrum collegium aliqui vehementer caperet, commode nunc confici poſſe videatur. Unum, quòd nullus nunc ſit in ſchola vacuus locus, noſtrorum vero tenues adeo ac penè nullæ ſint facultates, ut nec augere poſſint profeſſorum numerum, nec conſtitutis antea ſtipendiis, quæ ſane perexigua ſunt, quicquam adjicere; alterum, quòd nobis certum ac conſtitutum ſit & in ipſis tradendis Logicis, & in cæteris explicandis diſciplinis ab Ariſtotelis ſententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere. Hæc ad te ingenuè ſcribo ex vetere formula. Inter bonos bene agier oportet. Here is a remarkable thing. When *Ramus* might have had an honourable Employment out of the Kingdom, he refuſed it ſeveral times; and when he was deſirous to have one at *Geneva*, he could not get it. V. Mr. *Teiſſier* tells us, (a) *After the Death of* Romulus Amaſæus, *the City of Bologna offer'd him a thouſand Ducats, if he would ſucceed him in his Place. The King of* Poland *endeavour'd to have him at* Cracow. John, *King of* Hungary, *ſent him word that he would give him the Management of the Univerſity of* Weiſſemburg. Thoſe words of Mr. *Teiſſier* anſwer the Latin words of *Banoſius*. (b) *Nulla eſt Chriſtiani orbis natio quæ Rami ſapientiam non amaverit, & præmiis invitando redimere ſtuduerit. Amiſſo enim Romulo Amaſæo, qui mille ducatorum ſtipendio in celeberrima Bononienſi Academia docuerat, Aloyſius Papius totius Academiæ conſenſu illum in demortui locum evocavit. Ab Andrea Dudithio Imperatoris legato Cracoviam eſt invitatus. Joannes Rex Pannoniæ Albæ Juliæ adminiſtrandæ magna propoſita mercede præficere voluit, & chirographo Regio obſignavit.* The following Cenſure does not therefore concern Mr. *Teiſſier*, but *Banoſius*. *Romulus Amaſæus* died in the Year 1558. many Years after Pope *Paul* III. had removed him from his Profeſſorſhip of *Bologna*. *Ramus* was not therefore invited to come and fill the Place that was vacant by the Death of *Romulus*, *Banoſius* ſhould have ſaid that this Profeſſorſhip was offer'd him, when *Amaſæus* left it to go to *Rome* in order to teach the Grand Son of Pope *Paul* III. But if it was not offer'd him till after the death of *Amaſæus*, it ſhould have been ſaid only, that he was offer'd a very honourable and profitable Employment at *Bologna*, the very ſame that *Amaſæus* had had formerly. For the Reader is deceived, when he is told that *Ramus* refuſed the Chair vacant by the Death of *Romulus Amaſæus*; the meaning of it is, that *Romulus Amaſæus* died a Profeſſor at *Bologna*, which is falſe. VI. Mr. *Teiſſier* is miſtaken, when he ſays that *Ramus was baniſh'd by virtue of the Judgment* which the Commiſſioners of *Francis* I. gave againſt him. He was only forbidden to concern himſelf with Philoſophy; and immediately he betook himſelf to teach Claſſical Learning in the College of *Prele*. I fancy theſe Latin words of *Omer Talon* deceived *Moreri*, or the Authors whom he tranſcribed. (c) *Auctori Animadverſionum & Inſtitutionum toto Philoſophiæ regno velut aqua & igni, gravi etiam pœna addita, interdicitur, ne unquam vel ſcribendo, vel docendo in ullam Philoſophiæ partem ingrederetur.* Some body fancied, for want of Attention, that *Ramus* was baniſh'd from the whole Kingdom of *France*, without minding that he was only baniſh'd from the whole Empire of Philoſophy, *toto Philoſophiæ regno*. VII. *Moreri* adds, that *he was accuſed of Hereſy, on account of a Book Intituled* de Religione Chriſtiana, *which was Printed at* Francfort *ſome time after his Death*. That Book was not known during the Author's Life; the Original (d) was preſerv'd, when his Library happen'd to be plunder'd, and it was ſent into *Germany*, where *Banoſius* got it Printed (e) in 1576. I think we may challenge all the Friends of *Moreri*, to prove that *Ramus* did ever ſuffer any Perſecution on Account of that Book. *Ramus*'s Enemies had ſome other Proofs of his being a Proteſtant: A Publick Speech, an Action of his which favour'd of (f) an *Iconoclaſt*, and the Anſwer he made to one, who ask'd him, why he went ſo ſeldom to Maſs, were ſufficient to convict him. (g) *Hujus zelo inflammatus, publica concione Pariſienſis ſcholæ monachos graviter admonuit, ut puriorem Theologiam ex Evangelio, relictis Sophiſtarum lacunis, diſcerent. Idola gymnaſii Pralei amoveri & recondi juſſit ne conſpicerentur. Miſſæ autem raro intererat. Interrogatus vero hac de re a viro graviſſimo, ſtrenue reſpondit, E toto Vetere Novoque Teſtamento nihil quidquam magis à noviſſimis Chriſtianis depravatum & corruptum eſſe, quam ſecundum mandatum Legis & Cœnæ Sacramentum, ut homo in utroque per ſpeciem religionis in exſecrabilem idololatriam laberetur.* He abſconded during the firſt Civil War; he follow'd the Prince of *Condé* in the ſecond, and made an open Profeſſion of *Calvin*'s Doctrine in *Germany* during the third. He receiv'd the Communion (h) at *Heidelberg* with the Reform'd. He ſaid among other things in a Publick Speech at *Baſil*, that he had been ſo happy as to compoſe it in the ſame place where *Calvin* had written his *Inſtitution*. (i) *Inter Academiæ Baſilienſis hoſpites Joannes Calvinus præcipue commemorandus eſt lumen Galliæ, lumen Chriſtianæ per orbem terrarum Eccleſiæ, lumen in hoc (in quo hæc meditor commentorque) hoſpitio præcipue perſpectum: hic enim tanti luminis faces (ut Catharina Petita lectiſſima matrona ſanctitate ſingularis ingenii mirifice capta tum Calvini, mox etiam Rami hoſpita ſæpe ac jucunde mihi narravit) primum ſunt incenſæ: hic illuſtres illæ Chriſtianæ Inſtitutionis cœleſteſque vigiliæ ſunt exaratæ & elaboratæ.* Laſtly, being return'd into *France* after the firſt Peace, he obtain'd from *Charles* IX. a ſpecial permiſſion of profeſſing the new Religion, with a conſiderable Salary. (k) *Impetrat ergo à Rege ſtipendia perampla, ut non tantum privato ſtudio artes meditando ſcribendoque illuſtraret, ſed etiam ut, ſublatis impedimentis, reformatæ Religionis ſanctiſſimo exercitio in poſtremum liberius frueretur.* VIII. Mr. *Teiſſier* (*) ſays that *Ramus learnt Philoſophy of himſelf, and without a Maſter*. But *Ramus* himſelf acquainted the Publick, that he had gone through a Courſe of Philoſophy in the Colleges, which laſted three Years and a half according to Cuſtom. (l) *Cùm tres annos ſexque menſes, inquit, in Philoſophiæ ſcholaſtica ex Academiæ noſtræ legibus poſuiſſem: Logicis Organi libris cognoſcendis, diſputandis, meditandis (ex omnibus enim Ariſtotelicis libris Logici præcipue toto triennii tempore clamantur & reclamantur) cùm, inquam, tempus illud ita tranſegiſſem, & jam ut abſolutus artium ſcilicet magiſter, philoſophica laurea donatus eſſem: ſubducta ætatis meæ ratione, &c.* IX. See Num. four of this Remark, and then you may judge (m) whether *it appears by two Letters that* Beza *writ to him in* 1570. that he intended to retire to *Geneva*, and that *Beza ſhewed him a great Kindneſs*.

(O) *His Sect did flouriſh.*] It was unknown in *Spain* and *Italy*, and it made but a ſmall progreſs in *France*, but it thrived very much in *England* and *Scotland*, and more ſtill in *Germany*, which appears from the many Books which ſeveral *German* Peripatetick Philoſophers publiſhed againſt the *Ramiſts*. Nay, ſome of 'em thought themſelves oblig'd to mention the Reaſons of the Growth of that Sect, for they could not abide that its progreſs ſhould be alledg'd as a mark of its profeſſing the Truth. (n) *Et miramur adhuc quid rei ſit, cur. . . . ea* (contra quam ſcribimus) *philoſophandi ratio locum inveniat hoc ſeculo in pleriſque Germaniæ provinciis, etiam in iis, de quibus id nunquam quiſquam vel metuere vel ſperare potuiſſet? Non eſt ſane cauſa hujus per Germaniam & Angliam etiam ac Scotiam incrementi (nam in Italia, Hiſpania & Gallia etiam ipſa plane obſcura eſt philoſophiæ Rameæ fama) ſed hæc cauſa eſt, quod cauſam optimam commode non agimus.* Thoſe Words are taken from a Chapter of *Keckerman*, wherein (o) he judiciouſly cenſures the method of the *Ramiſts*. That Author praiſes (p) very much a piece which *David Pareus* publiſh'd againſt 'em in 1589. I have ſaid in (q) another place that this excellent Divine had no great eſteem for their Founder. *Keckerman* complains very much of the *Ramiſt Henningus Rennemannus*, who did furiouſly inveigh againſt *Beza* and *Zacharias Urſinus* on *Ramus*'s Account. He mentions likewiſe another *Ramiſt*, a haughty and paſſionate Writer, whoſe Name was *Caſpar Pfaffradius*. (r) *Scimus* Philoſophos Rameos *quodam eloquentiæ faſtu plerunque in alios (magiſtri ſui indole) deſpumare: exempla ſunt in luce: ex quibus unum illud proferam, quod & recens eſt, & præ reliquis inſigne,* M. Henningi Rennemanni Saxonis, *qui pro Ramea Philoſophia Diſſertationem ante annos circiter tres* (ſ) *ſcribere non potuit, quin maledicam linguam ſtringeret non tantum in Clariſſimum Philoſophum* Philippum Scherbium, *ſed & eos viros, qui Eccleſiam Chriſti adverſus Papatus furores, & Heterodoxorum ſophiſmata tot, tantis, tam tota Europa ſuſpiciendis ſcriptis juverunt. . . . . .* (t) *Clariſſimum dico Theodorum Bezam, cujus ille Epiſtolas de* P. Ramo *ſcriptas, velut anathematicas liviдè exagitat; & item ſummum illum atque admirabilem æque Philoſophum ac Theologum* Dominum Zachariam Urſinum, *piæ memoriæ cujus de* P. Rami *Dialectica & Rhetorica ſcriptum ad voluntatem Friderici 3. Electoris Palatini principis, merito certe, ſi quiſquam unquam princeps, cognomentum* Pii *adepti, judicium, furentem vocat* Rami exercitationem. *Paſquier* ſays, (u) *Ariſtotle's Philoſophy has been baniſhed from the Univerſities that are in the Dominions of the Landgrave of* Heſſe, *and they have imbraced that of* Ramus.

* Scripſitam enim litteris pinxerit, ut in legendis ipſius ſcriptis typographis moleſtus. Ferrin a S. Romualdo, Threſor ... in continuatione Chronici Ademari, pag. 344.

(a) Teiſſier, Addit. to the Eloges, tom. 1. pag. 373, 374.

(b) Banoſius in vita Petri Rami pag. 6. See alſo Freigius in vita ejuſdem, pag. 36, & 41.

(c) Audomar Taleus ... apud Launoium de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, pag. ...

(d) Banoſius ubi ſup. pag. 25.

(e) The Edition I make uſe of is of Francfort 1594. and Ramus his Life prefixed to it, which ſerves for an Epiſtle Dedicatory, to Philip Sidney, is dated the 1ſt of January, 1576.

(f) He removed all the Images from the College of Prele, and hid them. See the following Quotation.

(g) Banoſius ubi ſup. p. 19 & 20.

(h) Con... Heidelber...

(*) Teiſſ... ubi ſupra, pag. ...

(m) Teiſſier ubi ſupra.

(n) Kecker-man. in Præcogn. Logic. tract. 2. c. 3. pag. 133.

(o) See it in the Preface to the Book of Kecker-man.

(p) Ibid. cap. 6. pag. 157.

(q) In the Article Pareus.

(r) Idem Kecker-man ubi ſup. cap. 5. pag. ...

(ſ) This Book of Kecker-man was Printed in 1599.

(t) Ibid. pag. 17...

(u) Paſquier ubi ſupra, pag. ...

for ſome time. I ſhall make a Remark againſt (P) *Paſquier*, in which you'll ſee ſomething concerning *Mercerus*.

RANGOUZE, a *French* Author in the Reign of *Lewis* XIV. whoſe good Qualities are unknown to me; for ſuch a Name cannot be given to the Induſtry, wherewith an Author knows how to make his Epiſtles Dedicatory and his Flatteries turn to a good account. Not but that ſuch an Induſtry, tho' very bad, morally ſpeaking, may keep a conſiderable Rank among thoſe Qualities (*A*) which are ſaid to be good, whether they be natural or acquir'd. *Rangouze* was endow'd with it in (*B*) an eminent Degree, as it will appear by my Remarks.

RAPHE-

mus, *and thoſe who ſtudy Logick call themſelves* Ramiſts. Theſe Words of *Scaliger* ſhall be my laſt Proof, (*a*) *Ramus was a learned Man, but he is too much eſteem'd.....* *Ramus magnus fuit vir, ſed magni nimis fit.* *Ramiſm* was like to be introduc'd into the Univerſities of *Holland*, if *Scaliger* and ſome others had not prevented it. *Cujus* (Ramiſticæ Philoſophiæ) *introductioni in Academias Belgii cordatiores & intelligentiores fortiter obſtiterunt, quos inter Joſephus Scaliger ſui ſæculi Phœnix eminuit* (*b*). I find in a Letter (*c*) of *Iſaac Pontanus*, written in 1619. that the Profeſſors of *Harderwick* adviſ'd the Univerſity of *Leyden* to permit that *Ramus*'s Logick, or that of *du Moulin*, ſhould be indifferently taught.

I Have been informed (*d*) that *Ramiſm* flouriſhes in *Swiſſerland* to this Day, and is countenanc'd by the Magiſtrates of *Bern*; ſo that the Profeſſors of Philoſophy at *Bern*, and at *Lauſanne*, are obliged to teach no other Logick but that of *Ramus*; and if they dictate any thing taken from *Claubergius*, or from *the Art of Thinking*, they do it only under *Ramus*'s Auſpices, and as it were to explain his Doctrine.

(*P*) *A Remark againſt* Paſquier.] He obſerves (*e*), that *la Fon* complains (*f*) *that one* Ramus *and* Mercerus, *who had gone aſtray from the Ancient Religion*, were at the Head of the Party, which oblig'd the Parliament of *Paris*, in 1654, to refuſe the Requeſts of the Jeſuits. His Anſwer is, that *neither* Ramus *nor* Mercerus *were particulary concern'd in it.* He adds (*g*), that *Mercerus was ſo far from being a caballing Man, that he underſtood nothing but* Hebrew *Books, upon which he por'd continually; being a great Man in the Knowledge of that Language, in which he ſurpaſs'd the* Jews *in the Opinion of the moſt Learned, but a perfect Stranger to the Affairs of the World.* Afterwards he goes on thus: The Jeſuits *caus'd* (*h*) Verſoris's *Plea to be Printed in the Year* 1595. *That Man intending to render the Univerſity odious, gives out, not that* Mercerus, *but that* Ramus *and* Gallandius *had made themſelves Sollicitors of that Cauſe; but this appear'd ſo unlikely, that it was look'd upon as an incredible thing, by reaſon of the open Enmity which had been between them all along, and which laſted 'till they died. An Enmity, which* Rabelais, *the* Lucian *of our Age, in the Preface to his 3d Book, and after him that ingenious Poet* Joachim du Bellay, *in one of his moſt celebrated Poems, jeſted upon in ſome Places that are thought to be the fineſt Pieces of their Works. Beſides,* Gallandius *was all along a Roman Catholick.* *Paſquier* forgot the beſt way of refuting that Plea, which is, that (*i*) *Gallandius*, *Ramus*'s Adverſary, had been dead five Years, when *Verſoris* pleaded the Cauſe of the Jeſuits. *Rabelais* is not well quoted; *Paſquier* ſhould have quoted the Preface to the 4th Book.

(*A*) *Among thoſe Qualities, which are ſaid to be good, whether they be natural or acquir'd.*] All Languages may be ſaid to be more or leſs barren; which does particularly appear with reſpect to ſuch things as are depriv'd of the Perfection that belongs to them. If that Perfection be a moral Virtue, thoſe things are ſaid to be bad, if it be a Phyſical Virtue, they are alſo accounted bad. On the other hand thoſe things are indifferently call'd good, that have the Moral Virtue of their kind, and the Phyſical Virtue that belongs to them. An unjuſt Judge is call'd an ill Judge; and ignorant Painter is call'd a bad Painter; a wiſe and equitable Judge is ſaid to be a good Judge; and he who can make fine Pictures is ſaid to be a good Painter. Here we are ſenſible, that we (*k*) want Words, ſince we are oblig'd to make uſe of the Words *good*, and *bad*, or *ill*, to denote a thouſand things of a very different Nature. 'Tis therefore no wonder, that I ſhould place the Induſtry of the Sieur *Ragouze* in the number of good things, tho' I don't allow it to be a Moral Virtue. It is a good thing in the ſame Senſe, as we ſay a good Memory, a good Sight, a good Hearing, a good Smell, *&c.* when thoſe Faculties have the Perfection which Nature intended for them. Every Science, without excepting that of Tricking and Cheating, is a kind of Perfection: A Subtle Wit is a Natural Advantage, as Stupidity and Fooliſhneſs are great Imperfections. Morally ſpeaking, the Science of Cheating is neither good nor bad, but Phyſically ſpeaking it is a very good Quality, an Advantage, a Perfection. The Simplicity of a Man, who can neither Cheat others, nor avoid being Cheated, is, Phyſically ſpeaking, an Imperfection, and a bad Quality. If the Art of Cheating be reduc'd into Practice, it becomes, Morally ſpeaking, a very ill thing, and a Crime fit to be Puniſh'd; but when ſome Robbers are broke upon the Wheel, whoſe Induſtry, and other Natural Qualities, had attain'd to the higheſt degree of Perfection in their kind, we admire for all that the Phyſical Good that was in them; and we abhor only the ill uſe they made of it. We may therefore ſay in general, that the Art of growing Rich, either in the Finances, or by Trading, is a good thing, and a Natural Advantage, which deſerves to be eſteem'd, when ſeparated from the ill uſe Men may make of it. The ſame ought to be ſaid of a Man's Induſtry, who grows Rich by the productions of his Pen, and by the Art of Dealing in Epiſtles Dedicatory and Books, which he ſends up and down. It cannot be denied that ſuch a Man has a ſort of Wit, and a kind of Sagacity and Diſcerning, which is a natural Perfection, that may be admired in ſome Reſpects, tho' it ought to be deſpiſed and condemned by reaſon of its ill Conſequences. Equitable Men do not equally cenſure that ſort of Authors; they don't pour all the Satyrical Strokes, which *Furetiere* collected in (*l*) his *Somme dedicatoire*, upon thoſe, who having a great Family, and no Eſtate, or Penſion from the Publick, cannot maintain themſelves any other way than with the help of their Pen. This ſerves to excuſe the Multitude of their Dedications, and 'tis not ſo much a Wonder that their Works ſhould be divided into many Tomes dedicated to ſo many different Perſons, and that the ſecond Editions ſhould be dedicated to New *Mæcenas*'s, as 'tis that they ſhould be able to maintain honourably their Wives and Children with their Pen, and that the Subſiſtence of a large Family ſhould depend altogether upon it. A very ingenious Man has laid down a Rule in Vindication of thoſe, who apply themſelves to trifling Things, which reaches the Authors whom I am ſpeaking of. Theſe are his Words: (*m*) *Beſides, it is well known that we have ſometimes very ſolid Reaſons to apply our ſelves to ſome things that don't appear to be ſolid, and that a private and unknown Duty prevails often without any injuſtice upon a publick and notorious one. That Man whom you blame, has perhaps good reaſon to believe, that in order to recover his Health, which is very much impair'd, to ſecure himſelf from Poverty, to maintain his Family, whoſe only ſupport he is, it is better for him to compoſe Songs than Moral and Political Treatiſes. If it be ſo, I make bold to ſay that he is oblig'd to write Songs out of a Moral and Political Principle, and 'tis a great piece of Injuſtice to blame the Occupations of other Men, without knowing their Motives and Circumſtances.*

(*B*) Rangouze *was endowed with it in an eminent Degree.*] *Coſtar* ſupplies me with the Proof of it. (*n*) "I am far from intending to make a Compariſon with "the *Sieur de Rangouze*, whoſe Eloquence has procur'd "him fifteen or ſixteen hundred Piſtoles within theſe "eight Months, and who may be ſtyled the *Cherilus* "of our Age in Proſe. *Cherilus incultis qui verſibus* "*& male natis Retulit acceptos regale numiſma Philippos.* According to the Goſpel . . . . a Tree is good "that bears ſo good Fruit. The Tree of the Garden "of the *Heſperides*, ſo much talk'd of by the Poets, "was not ſo valuable, ſince according to a *Greek* Scholiaſt of great Authority, it bore golden Apples only "in its Seaſon, and not all the Year round". Here is another Witneſs, to wit, *Mademoiſelle de Scuderi*. She ſpeaks of an Author, (*o*) *who had three Epiſtles ready made for the ſame Book, for three Perſons very different in Quality and Merit; being reſolved to uſe that which would turn to the beſt Account, and imploying a third Perſon to manage the Buſineſs: and accordingly he dedicated the Book to him who paid moſt for it, tho' he was a Man of leſs Merit than the other two.* She ſays afterwards, that an

---

(*l*) *It is printed at the end of the Roman Bourgeois. You'll find a kind of a Latin tranſlation of it in the Preface to the 3d Tome.* Obſervationum ſelectarum ad rem literariam ſpectantium, *printed at Hall in* 1701.

(*m*) *Peliſſon, Diſcours ſur les Oeuvres de Mr. Sarrazin, pag m.* 39. *&* 40.

(*n*) Coſtar, *the* 50*th Letter of the* 2*d part, pag.* 115.

(*o*) *Mademoiſelle de Scuderi, Converſations ſur divers ſujets, tome* 1. *in the Dialogue that is at the beginning.*

RAPHELENGIUS (FRANCIS) born in [*] *Flanders* the 27th of *February*, 1539, made himſelf famous for his great Knowledge of the Oriental Languages. After he had begun his Studies at *Ghent* [†], he loſt his Father; and his Mother oblig'd him to betake himſelf to Trade: but his Maſters having ſent him to *Nuremberg*, and thoſe in whoſe Houſe he lived allowing him time enough to ſatisfie his Inclination for Learning, he ſet himſelf again to Study. Being return'd into *Flanders* he found an opportunity to go to *Paris*, where he made a great progreſs in the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Languages. The Civil Wars of *France* forc'd him to retire from *Paris*, and he went into *England*, and taught *Greek* for ſome time in the Univerſity of *Cambridge*. He return'd afterwards into the *Low-Countries*, and was Corrector of the Preſs at *Antwerp*, in the Houſe of the famous *Christopher Plantin*; who was ſo well pleas'd with his Learning and Honeſty, that he made him his Son-in-Law [‡] in the Year 1565. *Raphelengius* did him great Services as to his Printing, eſpecially with reſpect to the Edition (*A*) of the famous Bible call'd the *Antwerp* Bible. *Plantin* being remov'd to *Leyden*, to be farther from the Troubles, left his Printing-Preſſes under the direction of his Son-in-Law; but when he return'd to *Antwerp*, in 1585, *Raphelengius* on the contrary went to *Leyden* with all his Family. He took care of the Printing-Houſe that his Father-in-Law had there; and made himſelf ſo recommendable, that the Curators of the Univerſity conferr'd upon him the *Hebrew* Profeſſorſhip. He diſcharg'd the Duties of it to his Honour, and ſpent part of his time in the Study of the *Arabick* Tongue, and even compos'd a Dictionary [§] in that Language. He had ſcarce made an end of it when he died, the 20th of *July*, 1597. He had been wiſhing for Death three Years before; for he ſtruggled with two Domeſtick (*B*) Enemies that were very troubleſom to him; one was his Grief for the Loſs of his Wife, and the other a Palſie [‖].

RAPIN

an Author, who is dead, having prepared an Epiſtle, which might be look'd upon as a great Panegyrick, ſuppreſs'd it, when he heard that the Perſon, to whom he intended to dedicate his Book, was out of Favour. She adds, that a Man of Dauphine *having made a Panegyrick upon Cardinal de* Richelieu, *and finding him dead at his Arrival, turn'd it into a Panegyrick upon the Queen mother,* Anne *of* Auſtria. *I know alſo that an Author, who had very much and very juſtly praiſed a Man that was alive, deprived him of all the Praiſes he had beſtowed upon him, tho' that Man had done nothing that deſerved it; only he died without being able to reward that Author according to his Expectation. All theſe Inſtances are very ſingular. But I have been told a pleaſant Story of one* Rangouze, *who made a Collection of Letters, and cauſed them to be printed, without numbering the Pages. So that the Binder placed at the beginning of the Book ſuch a Letter as the Author thought fit; and by that Means, all thoſe whom he preſented with his Book, finding their Names at the beginning of it, thought themſelves the more oblig'd to him for it. This ſeems to me a very odd thing, and that Man was as fond of dedicating Books as an eminent Phyſician of* Italy, *who having writ upon the Aphoriſms of* Hippocrates, *dedicated each Book of his Commentaries to one of his Friends, and the Table of the Contents to another.* Now let us ſee what *Sorel* ſays: (*a*) *Rangouze*'s Letters may very well be call'd *golden Letters*. "Since he "boaſted to write none for leſs than twenty or thirty "Piſtoles; for he ſeldom made any but for Perſons of "the higheſt Quality, and who were able to pay well "for them. They were all a kind of a ſhort Encomium upon thoſe to whom they were directed, con"taining an Account of their fineſt Qualities and moſt "remarkable Actions, and many Compliments for thoſe "who afforded him but little Matter to inlarge upon. "We have ſeen ſome ingenious People wonder how "that Man, who was no Scholar, had been able to "write ſo many different Letters upon Praiſes that "were almoſt alike. I don't ſcruple to take notice of "him; becauſe his Books may however ſerve to inform "thoſe, who are ignorant of the Characters and For"tunes of the great Men of the Kingdom.

(*A*) *With reſpect to the Edition of the famous Bible, call'd the* Antwerp Bible.] I ſhall uſe the Words of *Meurſius*, to ſhew how far *Raphelengius* contributed to it: (*b*) *In horum editione incredibile quantos labores Raphelengius ſuſtinuerit, dum accuratiſſime ſingula recognoſcit; Annotationibus, ubi opus erat, illuſtrat; verſionem interlinearem adornat; Grammaticam Hebræam, ex optimis quibuſque Grammaticis, cum judicio & cura collectam, addit; Epitomen Theſauri linguæ Hebrææ Santis Pagnini infinitis vocibus auget, & innumeris locis emendat; quod ſatis teſtimonio Benedicti Ariæ Montani, inter Prolegomena præmiſſo, patet. Multa iiſdem annis ad ornamenta librorum, quos ſocer excudebat, præcipue in linguis Orientalibus, corrigendo, illuſtrandoque, præſtitit; quamvis raro nomen ſuum adſcribi pateretur.*

(*B*) *He ſtruggled with two domeſtick Enemies.*] *Moreri* is guilty of the Sophiſm call'd *à non ſufficienti enumeratione partium*; which is the leaſt thing that he can be reproach'd with; for it might be ſaid that he has neither wholly nor partly expreſs'd the Thought of the Author quoted by him. Let us compare his Words with thoſe of *Meurſius*. *He died*, ſays he, *of Grief for the Loſs of his Wife.* Thus he renders theſe *Latin* Words. (*c*) *Mors quam toto triennio præ tædio amiſſæ uxoris & paralyſi afflictatus ſæpe optaverat, virum optimum humanis exemit.* It does not appear by this Paſſage that the Loſs of *Raphelengius*'s Wife created ſuch a Grief in him as occaſion'd his Death; it appears only that the Grief he conceiv'd for her Loſs, together with a Palſie, made him often wiſh for Death for the ſpace of three Years. If it be ſaid, in *Moreri*'s Vindication, that this Grief might have occaſion'd a Palſie, and that therefore he might very well reduce the two Cauſes mention'd by *Meurſius* into one; I anſwer, that a Copiſt ought never to give his own Thoughts and Conjectures as Matters of Fact that are to be found in the Authors to which he refers us. But not to dwell on theſe trifling Things, I proceed to a more important Obſervation. *Raphelengius* regretted the Loſs of his Wife, and thought himſelf an unhappy Man becauſe he ſurvived her; which ſhews that he loved her, and that his Marriage had been very comfortable to him: It was therefore a a very happy Marriage. Now mind the conſequences of that happy Marriage, to wit, three Years of a kind of Deſpair. What muſt we think therefore of an unhappy Marriage, ſince a happy one is attended with ſuch a thing? But let us not argue in this manner according to the Law of Contraries. Let us rather ſay, that an unhappy Marriage is attended with great Advantages. The Perſon that ſurvives the other is not afflicted in the leaſt; his Widowhood is a State of Tranquillity and Pleaſure. So that, inſtead of conſidering only the Miſeries of this Life, we muſt conſider the mixture of Good and Evil, which is allotted to Man. We muſt remember the two Casks of *Homer*, of which I ſpeak (*d*) in another place. It ought to be ſaid, that what comes down upon Earth is a mixt Liquor; but in ſuch a manner, that the good and bad Drink come in one after another. If you begin with the one, you end with the other. If you have been happy when Married, you are unhappy being a Widower; but if you have been unhappy in your Marriage, your Widowhood is a ſtate of Happineſs for you. I don't deny, that in ſome reſpects the two Liquors are mix'd and confounded together as to their inſenſible parts, ſince there is ſcarce any Pleaſure but what is immediately attended with ſome Trouble; but it is certain, that in other reſpects the Fate of Man is in a Glaſs, wherein the good and bad Liquor are placed as it were in ſeveral Stories. I have inquir'd in (*e*) another place, whether the quantity of the bad Liquor exceeds the quantity of the good one. I ſhall ſay no more of it; but however I muſt obſerve, that thoſe who ſhould alledge the Marriage of *Raphelengius*, to ſhew that Good exceeds Evil, might be miſtaken in their Calculation. He enjoy'd the Company of his Wife 29 Years, and felt the Anguiſhes of Widowhood only three Years. He had therefore, will you ſay, a greater ſhare of Happineſs than of Miſery.

(*a*) *Sorel, Biblioth. Franc. pag. m.* 119.

(*b*) *Meurſius, Athen. Bat. pag.* 140.

RAPIN (*Nicolas*) was Provoſt-Marſhal and a Poet, two things that are ſeldom to be found in one and the ſame Perſon. He committed but few faults as a Poet; but he committed ſome in the Adminiſtration of Juſtice, which were ſo Enormous, that had it not been for the Credit of his Patrons, he would have been puniſh'd (*A*) with Death. He was a Man of Parts, and did not ſuffer himſelf to be Corrupted by the *Leaguers*. He follow'd * *Henry* III. when that Prince fled from *Paris*, and wrote many Verſes againſt the Faction of the Sixteen. He had a great ſhare in the ingenious (*B*) Satyr call'd the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne*. After the Death of his Son, upon whom he had beſtow'd all his Employments †, he retired to *Fontenai-le-Comte*, the Place of his Nativity, and died (*C*) in the Year 1609. I ſhall mention ſome Circumſtances of his Death, which ſeem to me (*D*) to be very curious. He was buried without any Pomp; but, ſome ſay, it was not according to

ſery. This Conſequence will be denied. A Man, who for the ſpace of three Years is ſo tormented with Pains and Sorrows, that he often wiſhes Death would come to his Aſſiſtance, ſwallows a greater quantity of the bad Liquor, than he had ſwallow'd of the good one for the ſpace of 30 Years. For you muſt not fancy, that the Marriage of this Man was Wine without any mixture during 29 Years. Not to mention the Croſſes and Sorrows that proceeded from other Cauſes, let us conſider only the ill ſide of his Marriage. Thoſe, who are extreamly afflicted for the Death of their Wives, did not always live with them without any miſunderſtanding. Beſides, the more they love 'em, the more they are afraid when they fall ſick. Don't tell me, that at this rate it were better for them to hate their Wives; for I ſhall anſwer, that their unconcernedneſs at their Wives being in danger of Death, does not equal the dreadful Evils of conjugal Hatred. Nay, it might be ſaid, that if on the one ſide they are not afraid that they will die, they are afraid on the other ſide that they will not die. Now that Fear is ſufficient to counter-ballance that Good. I wonder we don't find in the Works of the Ancients a *Dilemma* expreſs'd differently from that of (*a*) *Bias*, for inſtance in this manner. Either you'll love your Wife, or you will not love her: If you love her, you'll be always afraid of loſing her; if you don't love her, you'll be always afraid that ſhe will not die. This *Dilemma* is not better than that of *Bias*; for, without examining the other Faults, it would be ſufficient to ſay, that, according to the uſual Courſe of all Ages, conjugal Love and Hatred are not carried ſo far. Some few Inſtances ought not to make one afraid of having an uneaſie tenderneſs, or a vexing antipathy. One may very well hope to enjoy the preſent time, as moſt Husbands do, without making one ſelf uneaſie about the Time to come.

(*A*) *Had it not been for the Credit of his Patrons, he would have been puniſh'd with Death.*] I have but one Authority for it; the Reader may think of it as he pleaſes. " (*b*) Thoſe of *Fontenai* are all naught, and ſo is " Mr. *Rapin*, whoſe Life I have ſaved: He is the " Son of a Prieſt. He was Mayor of *Fontenai*, and " cauſed ſome Proteſtants to be maſſacred; ſo that at the " time of the extraordinary Seſſions, he was proſecuted by " all the Inhabitants of his Town, both Catholicks and " Proteſtants, and by all the Nobility of the Lower " *Poitou*. I was the only one who oppoſed it; he had " corrupted me by his Verſes, and he knew very well " that I was a Man of great Intereſt. He is beholden to " me for his Life, next to Preſident *du Harlay*, ſo that he " loves the Proteſtants now.

(*B*) *A great ſhare . . . . . . in the* Catholicon d'Eſpagne.] We find in Mr. *du Puy*'s Notes, which were publiſh'd with that Satyr, in 1677. that the Speech of the Archbiſhop of *Lyons*, that of *Roze*, and that which d'*Engoulevent* was to deliver, were made by *Rapin*. If it be ſo, (*c*) *d'Aubigné ſhould not have gone about to undeceive thoſe, who aſcribed the whole* Satyre Menippée *to that fine Wit; to tell us afterwards, that he made only ſome Verſes that are in it* (*d*): *Perhaps he ſaid ſo, becauſe in the Works of* Rapin, *printed in 4to at* Paris, 1610, *there are but three Latin Epigrams that make part of the* Catholicon. This Reflection of the Author of the Notes is a ſolid one.

Mr. de *Vigneul Marville*, who has collected many curious Things concerning the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne*, obſerves that *Paſſerat* and *Rapin* made the Verſes of the Second Part, which was intituled, *Abregé des Etats de la ligue convoquez à Paris au dixième Fevrier*; that the ſame *Rapin* made the Speech of the Archbiſhop of *Lyons*, and that of Doctor *Roſe*; and that he *made a Collection of all the other Speeches, which he added to the* (*e*) Catholicon d'Eſpagne, *under the Title of* Satyre Menippée; *and that 'tis upon this Ground that many have aſcribed the whole* Catholicon *to him* (*f*).

(*C*) *And died in the Year 1609.*] (*g*) Boterius, the (*h*) *French Mercury*, and the (*i*) Continuator of *Thuanus*, mention his Death on that Year. Father *Garaſſe*, whom I ſhall quote by and by, ſays, that in the Month of *December* 1608, he was preſent at Mr. *Rapin*'s Death, who had been for ſome Weeks in a languiſhing Condition. Now, becauſe *Moreri* ſays, that *Rapin* died the 15th of *February* 1608. I fancy *Garaſſe* meant, that that Ingenious Man fell Sick in *December* 1608, and died ſome Weeks after. If this be his meaning, what he ſays is a Confutation of *Moreri*, not as to the Day, but as to the Year of *Rapin*'s Death. However it be, I ſide with thoſe that place his Death in the Year 1609. Nevertheleſs, I ſee that many (*k*) exact Writers are of *Moreri*'s Opinion.

(*D*) *Some Circumſtances of his Death . . . . . very curious.*] Here is a long paſſage of Father *Garaſſe*, the Reader may judge of it as he thinks fit. " (*l*) In the " Month of *December* 1608. I happen'd to be preſent " in (*m*) *Poitiers* at Mr. *Rapin*'s Death, who having " lived a pretty looſe Life for the ſpace of 74 Years, " indulging his Youthful Paſſions, and following the Humour of the Times, whereby he got into dangerous " Acquaintance, died in the Hands of four Fathers of " our Society, after he had been for ſome Weeks in a " languiſhing condition; expreſſing a wonderful Joy, " becauſe he was ſo happy as to depart this Life in the " preſence of thoſe whom he had Perſecuted all his Life " time, without knowing them. After he had confeſt, " which he did with a very lively Senſe of his Sins, before " he receiv'd the Holy Sacrament, the Room wherein " he died being full of the moſt eminent Perſons of the " Town, he made the following general Confeſſion of " his paſt Life. 1ſt, That he had never been a Huguenot, and had never waver'd in his Belief, tho' he had " familiarly convers'd with the Huguenots, and very " much hated the Jeſuits. 2dly, That he had lived a very licentious Life, and did not believe that God could " have found him better diſpos'd at any other moment " of his Life. 3dly, That the only good thing he remember'd to have done from his younger Days, was " his preventing the Teaching of Atheiſm at *Paris*; and " then looking towards our Fathers, he told them the " Story in ſhort. He ſaid there was in his time a Raſcal at *Paris*, an unknown Man, and of a reſtleſs and " factious Spirit, who having got himſelf familiarly acquainted with thoſe ſeven fine Wits, that made up the " Set, or *Pleiad* of the Poets, of which *Ronſard* was " the chief, began to ſpread ſome pernicious and abominable Maxims againſt the Deity, which had already " ſtagger'd ſome of thoſe Wits, foraſmuch as our Souls " are more ſuſceptible of Evil, than of good Impreſſions. When I perceiv'd, ſaid *Rapin*, that ſome were " charm'd with the Novelty of that Doctrine, four of " us ſtood up againſt that impious Man, and ſettled the " wavering Minds of the other three, and of ſeveral others whom that wretched Fellow had ſpoil'd by his " Converſation. *Ronſard* was the firſt, ſaid he, who ſiding " with me, exclaim'd againſt him, and wrote that fine " Poem againſt the Atheiſts, which begins thus:

> " *O ciel, ô terre, ô mer, ô Dieu Pere commun, &c.*

" *Turnebus* made a fine Speech againſt him, and *Sainte* " *Marthe* an excellent Poem in Iambick Verſes, intituled, In Mezentium, without naming him, be" cauſe he was a profligate Raſcal, whoſe Name would " have defiled one's Writings. We did not give over, " ſaid *Rapin*, 'till we had got that infamous Man condemn'd to Death by a Decreee of Parliament; and accordingly he was hang'd and burnt in the Place " of *Greve*. Had it not been for us, ſaid he, perhaps *France* would be a Sink of Atheiſm at this preſent time; eſpecially if he had been countenanc'd by " us to introduce his Maxims. Such were the laſt " words of *Rapin*."

(*E*) *That*

(*a*) *See the* Article *Bias*.

(*b*) *Scaliger*, in *Scaligeran.* Rapin. *pag.* 201.

(*c*) *Notes on the* Catholicon *pag.* 385. *Edit.* 1696.

(*d*) *D'Aubigné*, *tom.* 3. *l.* 3. *ch.*

(*e*) *In the Title of the* part *of the Work written by* le Roy, *Canon of Rouen.*

(*f*) *Vigneul Marville*, *Melanges d'Hiſtoire et de littérature*, *tom.* 1. *pag.* 201.

(*g*) *Rodolph. Boterius de rebus in Galliâ geſtis Commentar. lib.* 15. *pag.* 567. 568.

(*h*) *Tom.* 1. *pag.* 408.

(*i*) *Lib.* 2. *in fine.*

(*k*) *Baillet*, *Jugem. ſur les poëtes*, *tom.* 4. *pag.* 192. *The Author of the Notes upon the Catholicon ubi ſupra.*

(*l*) *Garaſſe*, *Doctrine curieuſe*, *B.* 2. *pag.* 124. & *ſeq.*

(*m*) *Moreri is therefore miſtaken*, *when he ſays that* Rapin *died at* Tours.

to his last (E) Intention. He had been a great Enemy to the (F) Protestants, and afterwards to the * Jesuits. *His † Friends bestowed this Elogy upon him, that he was the most Learned Soldier, and the most Valiant Counsellor in the World.* You'll find some other things in *Moreri*.

RAPIN (RENATUS) a famous Jesuit, who profess'd the fourth Vow, was born at *Tours*, in the Year 1621, and was admitted into the Society in the Year 1639. He taught Classical Learning for the space of nine Years ‡. He shew'd by some *Latin* (A) Pieces, that he was able to treat the finest Subjects with a great deal of Art and Eloquence. He excell'd in the *Latin* (B) Poetry; and having at last ventur'd to write in *French*, he succeeded in it to Admiration. He composed in that Language several Treatises of Literature, and several pious Books, which met with a good Reception. The Treatises of Literature having been publish'd at several times, were collected into one Body, and printed at *Paris* in 1684, in two Volumes in *4to*, and at *Amsterdam* in two Volumes in *12mo*, in the Year 1686. There are very long Extracts of 'em in the *Bibliotheque Universelle*, and in the *Acta Eruditorum*, pag. 192 and 261, *& seq.* of the Year 1686. The pious Treatises were most of 'em printed together at *Amsterdam* in 1695. Some are of Opinion that he is too peremptory, for a Man who seems to have more Judgment and Delicacy than * Learning. He died at *Paris* the 27th of *October*, 1687. His Elogy † came out the Month following: It is short and well turn'd, and it was written by Father *Bonhours*. He is represented there as being endowed with all the best Qualifications that an honest Man and a Christian can have. We find there, among other things, that *his Zeal for Religion, and for the Honour of his Society, prompted him above twenty Years ago to undertake a great Work, to which he applied himself constantly, tho' he could not expect to see it publish'd, and that God enabled him to finish before he died.* That great Work is the History of *Jansenism*. Father *Rapin* was one of the most dangerous Adversaries of that Party: He attack'd them in their weak (C) side in a *Latin* Book which he publish'd

* See the Remark D.

† Garasse, *Doctrine curieuse*, pag. 1010.

‡ See Nathanael Sotuellus, *Biblioth. Script. Societ.* p. 717.

* See the Passage of the Menagiana in the Remark F.

† His Article in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary is taken from thence. See an Abstract of that Elogy in the Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans, Novemb. 1687. pag. 412. See also Rabutin's 13th and 32d Letters of the 2d Part, and the 128th Lett. of the 3d Part.

(E) *That it was not according to his last Intention.*] I shall quote again Father *Garasse*. The late Mr. *Gaucher de Sainte Marthe*, says he (a) "made a glorious, and "true Encomium upon Mr. *Rapin* his good Friend, in "which he says, that *Delatus est Fontenaium, & modico funeris apparatu, quemadmodum Testamento præscripserat, sepultus*; but it is necessary for *Rapin*'s Honour to know the Story exactly, as it happen'd, and "I have been an Eye-witness of it. It is therefore "true that the late Mr. *Rapin*, being upon his Death-Bed, in the extraordinary cold Winter of the Year "1608. had made his Will, before he confess'd to Father *James de Money*, wherein he order'd, that his "Body should be carried from *Poitiers* to *Fontenai*, in the "same manner as that of *Budæus* was carried from *Sainte Avoye street*, to the Convent of the *Celestins*, *viz.* without Torches, without any Pomp, and without any "Company, upon a Waggon cover'd with black Cloth, "only with a Boy walking before it with a Bell and "a Lanthorn in his Hands. But having been told that "such a Burial might be ill construed, and would confirm several People in the Opinion they had entertain'd of his being a Libertine in point of Religion, "he changed his Mind, and made a Codicil, wherein "he revok'd his first Intention, and instead of his Cook, "whom he had appointed the Executor of his Will, he "desired Father *Francis Solier*, who was present, and "who was to preach all the Lent at *Fontenai*, in the "Year 1609. to order Matters so that he might have "a decent Burial, as 'tis practis'd among the Catholicks, with the usual Prayers and Suffrages, upon "which he seem'd to put a great Trust. 'Tis true, that "by the Fault of his Heirs, his Codicil was not exactly executed according to his Desires; but his Death, "his Confession, his Tears, and the Story which I have "related in the second Book, shew that he died a very "good Catholick.

(F) *A great Enemy to the Protestants.*] We have already seen what *Joseph Scaliger* says of it: but the following Words contain a more formal Proof; for we find there that the Protestants having made themselves Masters of *Fontenai*, in the Year 1570, refused to comprehend the Mayor *Rapin* in the Capitulation: however they suffer'd him to make his Escape. The Besieged (b) "being summon'd to surrender, had no sooner demanded that their Lives should be saved, and that they "should come out with Arms and Baggage; but it was "granted them by *Soubize*, who commanded in the "absence of *la Nouë*, 'till they should know what was "resolved in the Council of *Rochelle*; and the Capitulation was faithfully observed by the Protestants, who "permitted them to go to *Niort*, whither they brought "the News of the Surrender, which happen'd the 28th "of *June*, without consulting the Mayor *Rapin*. He "was so much hated by the Protestants, either because "he had formerly declared against them, or because at "his Persuasion *Landereau* had sided with the contrary "Party, that every Body look'd for him to put him to "Death. When the Town had surrendred, and his "Friends had left it, he disguised himself in the Habit "of a Servant, and lurk'd in the House of a poor Woman; from thence he sent to *Cressonniere*, and desired "of him that he might come out of it. *Cressonniere* "got him safely conducted out of Town, and then he "retir'd to *Niort*.

(A) *By some* Latin *Pieces.*] Here are the Titles of some of 'em: *Serenissimæ Reipublicæ Venetæ trophæum ob debellatum Turcam & restitutam Societatem Jesu.* Paris 1657, in fol. *Trophæum famæ Eminentissimo Cardinali Mazarino*, ib. 1657, in fol. *Lacrymæ* (c) *in alumni sui Alphonsi Mancini tumulum nepotis ejusdem Cardinalis*, ibid. 1658, in fol. *Pacis triumphalia ad Em. Cardinalem Mazarinum*, ibid 1659, in fol. *Pax Themidis cum Musis*, ib. 1659, in fol. *Pacifer Delphinus*, ibid. in fol. To which may be added his *Elogium Francisci Foucquet defuncti*, ib. 1669.

(B) *He excell'd in the* Latin *Poetry.*] Besides the Pieces mention'd in the foregoing Remark, see his *Ecloga Sacra cum dissertatione de carmine pastorali*, printed at *Paris*, 1659, in *4to*. and his *Christus patiens carmine heroico*, printed in the same Place, in 1674, in *12mo*. But above all, see his *Hortorum libri IV. quibus addita est disputatio de universa hortensis cultura disciplina.* That Work printed in *4to* at *Paris* (d) in 1665, was reprinted there in *12mo*, in 1666. It was very much (e) praised in the *Journal des Savans*. Consult Mr. *Baillet* (f), who has collected a great many curious Remarks relating to Father *Rapin*, consider'd as a Poet, most of which are glorious to that Jesuit. See also the 9th *Journal des Savans*, of the Year 1682, which mentions the Collection (g) of all the Poems of Father *Rapin*.

THERE are some People, who say that he has been too much flatter'd in Mr. *Baillet*'s *Jugements*, and that the Jesuits pretend that his Verses do not come up to the Delicacy and Purity of those of Father *Commire*, nor to the Loftiness and Majesty of those of Father *de la Rue*, nor to the Easiness and Neatness of those of Father *Cossart*, to say nothing of Father *Hoschius* and Father *Vallius*; and that his *Gardens* are the best of his Poems. They were Reprinted at *Naples*, and translated into *English* by *J. Evelyn*: That Translation was dedicated to my Lord *Arlington*, and printed at *London* in 8vo. 1673.

(C) *He attack'd the* Jansenists *in their weak* (h) *side.*] His Book (i) is intituled *Dissertatio de nova doctrina, seu Evangelium Jansenistarum.* I confess I have not read it, and I think the most Learned Men in foreign Countries may say the same; but a Learned Man told me which way Father *Rapin* went about it. He supposes a Jansenist, who goes into the Country of the Infidels to preach the Gospel to them, and who does sincerely teach his System about Grace, *viz.* that the greatest part of Mankind have been predestinated to everlasting Punishments from all Eternity, and the rest to the Glory of Heaven; that God, the Author of that absolute Predestination, being not willing to want some Pretences to colour his Decrees of Damnation, declares to Men that 'tis in their Power to obtain Salvation; that in order to it they need only obey his Commands: He threatens them, he exhorts them; but at the same time he

(a) Garasse ubi supra, Book 7. p. 922, 923.

(b) *La vraie & entiere histoire des troubles*, Book 13. fol. 387. edit. of Rochelle, 1573.

publish'd in 1658. The *Jansenists* raised many Clamours against an Anonymous Letter which he put (D) out since the Peace of the Church, as they call it. It is a pleasant thing to find that Jesuit plac'd among the (E) Physicians in some *Bibliotheques.* The Circumstances of his Quarrel with (F) his Fellow Jesuit, *Francis Vavasseur,* have not been well related in the *Menagiana.* His Enemies endeavour'd to expose him to the Indignation of the late Prince of *Condé,* by the malicious Turn they gave to his *Traité du Sublime* *.

R E C K-

he knows very well that 'tis impossible for them to do what he commands, that they cannot obey him for want of that efficacious Grace, which he refuses to all Men, excepting his Elect, and without which they cannot mend their Lives, and even have a good Thought. Father *Rapin* supposes that the Infidels hearing such a Gospel, are strangely surpriz'd at such a Description of God, and ask why he sends Preachers to those, whom he knows to be uncapable of converting themselves, unless he bestows upon 'em a Grace, which he is obliged to refuse 'em, by reason of his eternal Decrees. Father *Rapin's* Jansenist answers, that God uses such a Method, to render Men more inexcusable, and more obnoxious to Hell Torments. He is answer'd that such a Motive is not worthy of an infinitely good Being; that it may be said still that none is bound to do an impossible thing, and that a Lawgiver inflicts no Punishments, but by supposing that the Transgressors of the Laws might have observed them: Hence it is, that Franticks are not punish'd. One may easily guess what a *Molinist,* who knows how to turn a Thought to his Advantage, may say *pro* and *con,* having began the thing as I have related it. But besides many other good Answers, he might be told, that if a Jansenist was to preach to the Infidels of *Japan* or *China* for the first time, he would not be such a Fool as to begin with the Doctrine that denies Man's Free Will, or with that of absolute Predestination. He would preach as the Pelagians do, (which is approved by one of our most rigid (a) Predestinarians) and he would put by his Jansenism till his *Neophytes* stand no longer in need of Milk, and are capable of a solid Nourishment. They are Mysteries which ought to be discover'd to none but those that are initiated.

(D) *An Anonymous Letter which he put out.*] It is written to Cardinal *Cibo,* and dated (b) in *July,* 1680. A *French* Translation of it came out in *Holland,* in 1684 dated the 30th of *August,* 1683. See what the Author (c) of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* says of it. As for what concerns the Complaints of the Jansenists against that little Book, see among other Works the 8th Volume of the *Morale pratique.* You will find there also, (d) that Father *Estrix,* a *Flemish* Jesuit, is the Author of the Book intituled, *De fraudibus Hæreticorum,* which came out under the false Name of *Francis Simonis;* and that (e) *Father* Rapin *is so well pleased with that Book that he has translated it into* French, *and* that, *to give it more Authority, he has dedicated it to the Archbishops and Bishops of* France, *with a Preface, wherein he acknowledges that the Works of* Francis Simonis, *written in Latin, and printed at* Cologne, *have given him occasion to write his Book, and served him as Memoirs for the Composing of it.* That Work of Father *Rapin* is intituled, *Artifices des Heretiques:* It was printed at *Paris* in 1681, and re-printed the same Year in the Low-Countries. See the *Critique generale* (f) *de l'Histoire du Calvinisme.*

(E) *That Jesuit plac'd among the Physicians.*] He is not call'd a Physician in the new Edition of *Vander Linden's de Scriptis Medicis* (g); but his *Hortorum libri,* and then in general all his Works, *Opera omnia. Lugduni Batavorum,* 1672, in 12*mo* are placed in it. I shall say nothing of *Bartholinus,* who has inserted that Jesuit in his Catalogue (h) of such Physicians as have been Poets; for he does not say that he was not a Jesuit: But I cannot pass over in silence what has been already observed by Mr. *Baillet.* These are his words: "(i) Mr. *Koni-*
"*gius* . . . . divides Father *Rapin* into two, and says,
" 1. *Henricus Rapinus quatuor libros hortorum, anno* 1671.
" *edi curavit.* Afterwards he speaks of *Nicolas Rapin*
" of *Poitou,* the Great Provost of the Constable's Ju-
" risdiction, whom I have mention'd in another place;
" and then he adds, 2. *Renatus Rapinus Medicus anno*
" 1659. *claruit. Opera ejus Medica prodierunt anno*
" 1672. *Extant ejusdem Ecloga sacra, item, Hortus E-*
" *pigrammatum.* See the 678th Page. What he calls
" Books of Physick, is nothing else but the four Books
" about Gardens, whose Title he had only seen in the
" *Utrecht* Edition, that came out in the Year mark'd
" by him. One may easily find out the cause of his o-
" ther Mistakes. Some other Foreign Authors, as Mr.
" *Beughem* in *Holland,* and Mr. *Lipenius* in *Germany,* have
" also placed Father *Rapin* among the Physicians. But
" they cannot be taxed with any Error, as long as they
" are not mistaken about the Name, the Person, and the
" Work of the Author, and don't explain themselves a-
" bout his Profession. My intent was not to censure Mr.
" *Konigius* for a fault of exactness; he has done nothing
" on this occasion, but what is usual with the Writers of
" *Bibliotheques,* who speak of Foreign Books which they
" have not seen. On the contrary, I design'd to shew
" by this Instance, that those, who undertake such Works,
" are very excusable, because they cannot avoid falling
" into such like mistakes."

(F) *The Circumstances of his Quarrel with . . . . . . Vavasseur.*] I shall set down the whole Passage of the *Menagiana,* because it confirms a thing, which I have touch'd upon in the Text of this Article. "(k) Father
" *Rapin* was not sufficiently qualify'd to make a Parallel
" of *Virgil* and *Homer.* *Tanaquellus Faber,* whom he
" intended to convert at that time, supplied him with
" the Greek Passages quoted by him. After he had read
" his *Parallel of Aristotle and Plato,* at the first President
" *de la Moignon's,* I told him I had found but one fault
" in it, to wit, that speaking of the *Colophonian* Woman,
" whom *Plato* loved, he had said that she was young;
" whereas 'tis said in the Greek Epigram, wherein men-
" tion is made of her, that the God of Love had plac'd
" himself in her Wrinkles. Whereupon the Abbot *Tale-*
" *mant* said, That the Father was very excusable, because
" he did not believe that so wise a Man as *Plato*
" would have been in Love with an old Woman. Father
" *Rapin* made very good Latin Verses, but he had no
" great Learning. He had a great Quarrel with Father
" *Vavasseur,* and bought off the whole Impression of
" that Father's Book *de Epigrammate,* by the Authority
" of the first President, in order to suppress it, so that it
" is grown very scarce." What is said here of *Vavasseur's* Book *de Epigrammate* is false, and has been rectified in the 2d Edition, thus: (l) *He fell out with Father* Vavasseur *on account of his* Reflections on *Aristotle's* Poetick, *which he caused to be printed by* Muguet, *without putting his Name to that Book. Father* Vavasseur, *who was not well pleased with him, publish'd soon after some* Remarks upon those Reflections, *in which he treats very ill the Author of the Reflections, pretending not to know him. Father* Rapin *made a great noise about it, and openly complain'd of the Proceeding of his fellow Jesuit, who answered that it was his own fault, and that if he had declared himself to be the Author of the* Reflections, *he had never writ against him. It was found expedient, in order to reconcile those Fathers, to suppress the* Remarks *of Father* Vavasseur, *which was done by the Authority of the first President* de la Moignon; *so that that Book, which was printed by* Billaine, *in* 1675, *and which contains but* 141 *Pages, is grown very scarce.* See the *Critique generale* (m) of *Maimbourg's* History of *Calvinism,* where you will find something about that Conflict, and about another (n) Quarrel of Father *Rapin.* I shall further observe two things. (o) *Because Father* Vavasseur *had made two large* (p) *Books of Epigrams, he was not well pleased with these Words of Father* Rapin *in his Reflections upon* Aristotle's *Poetick,* that (q) it is so rare a thing to make admirable Epigrams, that it is enough to have made some few in one's Life time; *and this is it which prompted him to write against that Book of Father* Rapin. *I had this particularity from him.* They are Mr. *Menage's* words. The second thing I am to observe is, that Father *Rapin,* in the new Edition of his *Reflexions,* did not correct all the Faults censured by his Fellow-Jesuit: he was contented to correct some few, and retain'd some that are not tolerable. He affirms in the First Edition (r), that *Homer* never said any impious thing; he affirms it still in the other Editions, tho' his Censurer had proved to him that *Homer* has written (s) many *prophane Falsities,* and many *infamous Impostures against the Respect and Veneration he owed to his Gods:* Nay, he had quoted Father *Rapin* himself (t), as witnessing the same. I shall observe by the bye, that the Critick did not take notice of all the Faults that are to be found in the Reflections on *Aristotle's Poetick,* and that if he had been willing to Criticize the other Works of that Writer, he would have found many things in them that were liable to Censure. See the Remarks *A* and *T* of *Aristotle's* Article.

* *You'll find something in the relation in the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, March 1686 pag. 356. This Work had been mention'd in the Nouvelles of February 1686, pag. 237.*

(a) See Mr. Jurieu's Book, Intituled, *Jugement sur les methodes d'expliquer la grace.*

(b) See the *Morale pratique des Jesuites* tom. 8. pag. 97.

(c) In January 1686 pag. 97. & seq.

(d) Page 90.

(e) Ibid. pag. 51.

(f) Letter 3. pag. 302. of the 2d Edition.

(g) See Lindenius renovatus p. 938. It is said there that the Hortorum libri have been reprinted in 4to. at Paris in 1661. and 1666. and at Leyden in 12mo. in 1666, and 1668. and Utrecht in 12mo. in 1672.

(h) Thom. Bartholin. de Medicis Poetis pag. 6.

(i) Baillet, Jugemens sur les poetes, tom. 4. pag. 293. n. 1554.

(k) *Menagiana* pag. 60, 61. of the 1st Edit. of Holland.

(l) *Menagiana* pag. 83 of the edition of Holland.

(m) In the 4th Letter.

(n) That which he had with Father Maimbourg.

(o) Menage. Anti-Baillet tom. 1. p. 338.

(p) You'll find at the end of the Book de Epigrammate of the Paris Edit. 1672. three pretty small Books of Vavasseur's Epigrams. He published, in 1675, an Appendix to the 3d Book, and the 4th Book sometime after.

(q) These words are to found in the Anti-Baillet, ibid. pag. 335.

(r) Rapin, reflex. sur la poëtique en general n. 9. p. 20.

(s) Vavasseur, remarques sur les nouvelles reflex. p. 21. & seq.

(t) See Rapin ibid. n. 25.

RECKHEIM, a County, a Fief, and an immediate State of the Empire, has the right of voting in the College of the Princes both in the General and Circular Diets. It belongs to the Circle of *Westphalia*, and comprehends a Town and many Villages. Its Soil is very fruitful, and it is pleasantly situated in a fine and well inhabited Country upon the *Maese*, two Leagues from *Maestricht*, between the Territories of *Juliers*, *Liege* and *Fauquemont*. It receives Toll-mony upon the *Maese*, and they coyn Gold, Silver, and Brass in it. The Castle, which is the Residence of the Counts, is one of the finest, largest, and most magnificent in *Germany*. Those, who are now in Possession of it, belong to the House of † *Aspermont-Linden*, a very illustrious and ancient House, and are descended from the Counts of *Aspermont* in *Lorrain*, whose County consisted of almost three hundred Villages. I shall give a short Account of their (A) Genealogy, and of the present State of the Branch of the Counts of *Reckheim*.

† The French Writers say Aspremont, which is a corruption of the true Orthography.

REGIUS (URBAN) was a Learned Man of the XVIth Century. He was born at *Langenargen*, upon the Lake of *Constance*, and began his Studies at *Lindaw*; from whence he went to *Friburg* in *Brisgaw*, where he continu'd them the more successively, because he lodged in the House of (A) the famous *Zazius*, and was very much belov'd by him. He went afterwards to the University of *Basil*, and then to that of *Ingolstad*, whither many Scholars resorted, by reason of the great Reputation of *John Eccius*. He read private Lectures there, and appear'd so well qualify'd for the Direction of the Youth, that many Gentlemen intrusted him with the whole Conduct of their Sons, without excepting the Care of what concern'd their Expence. It prov'd an impossible thing for him to regulate it: Those young Men ran into Debt *, in the Taverns and Shops, and because he was Security for them, and did not receive from their Parents the Mony that he ask'd for, he turn'd in a manner Bankrupt. Being press'd by the Creditors, and having not wherewithal to satisfie them, he thought of stealing away; but some Officers being come to *Ingolstad* at that time to raise Men, he yielded up his Books and all his things, and listed himself. The new rais'd Men were muster'd, and the Professor *Eccius*, who was present at the Review, knew *Regius* among the Soldiers: He went to him, and being inform'd of the Reason which had mov'd him to list himself, he promis'd to serve him, and did it so effectually, that he reconcil'd him to the Muses. He threaten'd those indebted Scholars with the Prince's Indignation, if they did not disingage him. *Regius* went on in his Studies, and made so great a Progress in the Sciences, that he receiv'd at *Ingolstad* the Oratory and Poetical Crowns from the very Hands of the Emperor *Maximilian*. Some time after he was promoted to the Professorships of Rhetorick and Poetry in the same University. Whilst he was a Professor he wrote γ, in the Year 1516, some Letters by the Duke of *Bavaria*'s Order, to invite *Erasmus* to *Ingolstad*; which did not succeed. Having taken to the Study of Divinity, he was so charm'd with it that he made it his only Business. He got thereby some Dispositions for *Lutheranism*; but he found himself perplex'd, when *Eccius* his Master and his Benefactor came to have

* *Modum in vestitu & victu ubique excedere. Melch. Adam. ubi infra p. 22.*

γ *See the 17th and 18th Letters of the 2d Book of* Erasmus's *Letters.* Erasmus *thanked and praised him. See the 19th Lett. of the 2d Book, and the 57th of the 18th.*

(A) *A short Account of their Genealogy, and of the present State of the Counts of* Reckheim.] The Name of the first Count of *Aspermont* was *Sigisfridt*; he liv'd in the Year 660. He descended from the Princes *d'Est* in *Italy*. A younger Brother of that Family, descended from that *Sigisfridt*, and whose Name was *Arnold*, settled in *Holland* in the Year 1120, and possess'd there the Lordship of *Linden*, which his Descendents enjoy'd a long time. One of 'em, call'd *Herman*, purchas'd the County of *Reckheim*, about the Year 1550. He was General of the Troops of *Ernestus* of *Bavaria*, Elector of *Cologne*, and Father of *Ernestus*, Count of *Aspermont* and *Reckheim*, who was born in the Year 1583, and was Chamberlain and Colonel of the Emperors *Matthias* and *Ferdinand* II. He married *Anne Antoinette*, Daughter of *Henry* Marquiss *de Gouffier-Bonnivet*, by whom he had a Son nam'd *Ferdinand*. This *Ferdinand* was born in 1611, and married *Elizabeth*, Daughter of *Egon*, Count of *Furstemberg*, and of *Anne Mary*, Princess of *Hohenzolleren*, and had by her four Sons, and eight Daughters, *viz.*

Francis Gobert Count of *Reckheim*, Bishop of (a) *Choir*, and Canon of the Metropolitan Churches of *Cologne* and *Saltzburg*, and of the Cathedral of *Strasburg* †.

(a) *In the Country of the* Grisons.

† *See the Article* Tilli.

Ferdinand, General of the Armies of H. I. M. who by his first Marriage with *Charlotte*, Daughter of *Lewis George*, Prince of *Nassaw Dilembourg*, and of *Anne Augusta* Princess of *Brunswick*, had but one Daughter nam'd *Charlotte Gobertine* Canoness of *Munsterbilsen*, whose 8 Descents are *Aspermont-Reckheim*, *Gouffier*, *Furstemberg*, *Hohenzolleren*, *Nassaw*, *Sayn*, *Brunswick* and *Denmark*. He has married for his second Wife *Juliana* Daughter of *Francis Rakoczi* Prince of *Transylvania*, and Grand-Daughter of *George* the Younger, *George* the Elder, and *Sigismund*, all Princes of *Transylvania*. He has a Son by her, whose Name is *Joseph Gobert*.

Charles, Canon of the Metropolitan Church of *Cologne*, and of the Cathedrals of *Strasburg* and *Liege*.

Frederick, *Great-Cross* of the Order of *Malta*, and Commander of *Tobel*, *Steinfurt* and *Munster*.

Anne Mary, the Wife of Count *Wenceslaus* of *Althann*, Counsellor of H. I. M. Grand Judge of *Moravia*, Governor of the Province of *Glatz*, and Ambassador Extraordinary in *Sweden* and *Poland*.

Eleonora, Princess Abbess of *Munsterbilsen*.

Anne Salome, the Wife of *Lewis* Count *de Souches*, Major-General of the Armies of H. I. M. and his Counsellor of State.

Ernestina who was Married first to *John George* Count of *Collonitsch*, Chamberlain to H. I. M. and then to *Octavius* Count of *Cauriani*, the Emperor's Chamberlain, and Counsellor of State.

Anne Antoinette, the Wife of *Claudius* Count *de Tilly*, Lieutenant-General of the United Provinces of the *Netherlands*.

Mary Frances, the Wife of *Charles* Count of *Aspermont-Linden*, Counsellor of State in the Country of *Liege*, and Governor of the Marquisate of *Franchimont*.

Alexandrina and *Petronilla*, first of all Canonesses of *Remiremont*, and afterwards Ursuline Nuns at *Metz*.

The Counts of *Aspermont-Reckheim* bear Quarterly, in the 1st and 4th Gules with a Cross Or, which is *Aspermont-Linden*; in the 2d and 3d Or with a Lion Gules, which is *Reckheim*; and upon the whole Azure with an Eagle Argent, which is the Ancient *Aspermont* or *Este* (b).

(A) *He lodged in the House of the famous* Zazius, *and was much beloved by* (c) *him.*] He chose in *Zazius*'s Library all the Books which he thought proper for the Improvement of his Studies, and transcrib'd all the Marginal Notes which that Learned Professor had written upon them. Thus that young Scholar spent a great part of the Night. *Zazius*, who Slept but little, and got up sometimes to Walk, and to allay the Trouble of his want of Sleep, surpris'd him as he was transcribing those Notes, and told him (d) in a loving manner, you are stealing the Fruits of my Watchings. Sometimes he found him asleep, and then he would lay huge Volumes on his Shoulders 'till he wak'd. (e) *Aut si quando somno ad candelam oppressum & inclinato in mensam capite dormitantem offendisset: juris volumen grande unum atque alterum humeris impositum reliquit, donec excitaretur.* I mention those little things, because I know that have a Quarrel with *Luther*. Whereupon he resolv'd to leave *Ingolstad*, and to retire to *Augsburg*, where he prov'd a useful Man against Popery. He founded a Reformed Church there, and spread from thence into *Suabia* the new Opinions, as they were call'd. He sided (*B*) with *Zuinglius* for some time; but afterwards he profest himself a good Lutheran. *Eccius* went to him at *Augsburg*, and conferr'd with him to bring him back to the Church of *Rome*; but he did not succeed in it. Nay, there arose a Paper-War betwixt 'em, which *Regius* maintain'd vigorously, tho' his Antagonist might reproach him with Ungratefulness. The Affairs of the new Party did not always prevail in the City of *Augsburg*; there was a time when *Regius* was forc'd to leave it, and to abscond in several Places; but he was gloriously recall'd, and married in a good Family of *Augsburg*. His Dispute (*C*) with a Woman that was an Anabaptist, had something very singular in it. He lived in that City 'till the Year 1550,

that several People are extreamly well pleas'd to see such Marks of the kindness of a Professor, or of the diligence of a Scholar

(*B*) *He sided with* Zuinglius . . . . . *but afterwards he profest himself a good Lutheran.*] Here is what *Zuinglius* writ to him in the Year 1526. (*a*) *In Eucharistia re gratulor vobis, te nostrum esse factum. Verum gratiam meretur novitas: brevi enim spero omnes qui adhuc obstrepunt tropum, qui nullo negotio videri vobis debebat, verum esse ac sententiæ nostræ simplicitatem ac claritatem.* They conferr'd together about Original Sin in the same Year, and we have still (*b*) the Letter which *Zuinglius* wrote to *Regius* about that Point. *Luther* knew that those two Men had the same Opinions, and was very sorry for it. (*c*) *Dolet mihi valde nobilissimum virum Oecolampadium tam ludicris & nihili cogitationibus in hoc barathrum prolapsum; pulsat eum sathanas: Dominus eripiat eum. Urbanus Regius in idem malum vel inclinat, vel jam cecidit: Dominus servet suos.* *Luther* says in another Letter, that he had been inform'd, that *Regius* design'd to write against him. (*d*) *Præterea Urbanus Regius minari dicitur in me scripta, scilicet Oecolampadium & Zuinglium tantos viros (ut sentit) non vult offendere: sic mutatus est ab illo.* We learn from this Passage, that *Regius* appear'd at first what he appear'd to be at last, that is, a good *Lutheran*. He forsook *Zuinglianism* in the Year 1528. See the Letter (*e*) wherein *Luther* expresses a great Joy for it, and recommends him to the Markgrave of **Brandenburg**. The Conversation he had with *Regius* at **Coburg** in the Year 1530. made a great Impression upon him. *Regius* came out of it full of Admiration for *Luther*, which he exprest in a Letter. (*f*) *Cum Saxoniam peterem Coburgi integrum diem solus cum Luthero, viro Dei, transegeram: quo die nullus mihi in vita fuit jucundior. Talis enim ac tantus Theologus Lutherus, ut nulla secula habuerint similem. Hic magis execror stultitiam & arrogantiam Carolostadianorum, qui sibi placent, quasi Luthero queant conferri, cujus umbram non assequuntur, cum omni eruditione quam jactant. Semper mihi magnus fuit Lutherus: at jam mihi maximus est. Vidi enim præsens & audivi, quæ nullo calamo tradi possunt absentibus.* *Luther* on the other side was very well pleas'd with that Conversation, and *Regius*'s Learning, whose Conversion seem'd to him a considerable piece of News, which he ought to impart to his Friends. He writ the following Words to *Wenceslaus-Lincus*. (*g*) *Urbanum Regium quoque resipuisse, credo te nosse, & contra hostes Sacramentarios strenue nobiscum certare.*

(C) *His Dispute with a Woman that was an Anabaptist, had something very singular in it*] (*h*) The Magistrates of *Augsburg* put the Laws in execution against the Anabaptists, whereby Sectaries are forbidden to meet in Conventicles and to perform the Exercise of their Religion; they were Banish'd and Imprison'd. There was a Woman of good Family, who boasted in Prison, that if she had a Conference with *Regius*, she would prove to him, that the Cause of the Anabaptists was very good; she was therefore sent for to Dispute with him in a full Senate. She appear'd there with the Equipage of a Prisoner, that is, with her Hands Chain'd, and her Feet in Irons. She alledg'd abundance of Passages out of the Holy Scripture, to maintain her Opinions. *Regius* answer'd her, and clearly shew'd the true Sense of those Passages. But he could not undeceive her; she continued in her Errors, and spoke to the Minister thus: *Here is without doubt, Brother* Urban, *a very strange way of disputing. You sit upon a soft Cushion among the Burgomasters, and you speak like an Oracle, and as it were from* Apollo's *Tripod. But as for me, I am prostrated upon the Ground, and forc'd to plead my Cause in Irons. Sister*, reply'd *Regius*, *there is nothing in it but what you deserve, since after you have been freed from the Slavery of the Devil thro'* Jesus Christ, *you have been willing to undergo that infamous Yoak again. A furious Spirit makes you appear with such Liveries, for an Example to others.* That Woman was at last banish'd from the Town. Here are the *Latin* Words. (*i*) *Ipsa tantum abest, ut monitis locum dederit: ut pertinaciter etiam Urbanum hisce fuerit adorta:* Egregia enim verò, Urbane frater, hæc disputandi ratio est inter me & te. Tu in molli culcitra ad latera Consulum assidens, quasi ex Apollinis tripode proloqueris: ego misera humi postrata, ex duris vinculis causam dicere cogor. *Ad hæc Urbanus:* Nec verò, *inquit*, injuria, soror: ut quæ semel è servitute diaboli per Christum in libertatem asserta, tua sponte iterum cervicem turpi jugo submisisti: & istis te ornamentis vesanus ostentat genius, aliis in exemplum. *Senatus itaque, cùm laterem se lavare videret; contagium illud exilio mulctavit, urbeque expulit.*

That Woman wanted no Wit: she made a very judicious Reflection, and season'd it with a great deal of Salt; but she had too great a Confidence, or rather she was too rash. She believ'd, that if she should dispute with a Minister of the prevailing Religion, and before the Judges who had already condemn'd Anabaptism, and imprison'd those who taught it, she might persuade the Justice of her Cause. To hope for such a thing, 'tis not enough to be in the right, one must besides hope for an extraordinary Assistance of the Divine Spirit; for, according to the usual course of things, it does not appear that a Prisoner for Religion can confound such Adversaries as speak to him with the greatest Contempt, and who have on their side an outward Pomp, and all the Company prepossest against him. I know very well, that that Woman did not maintain a good Cause; but I believe, that if she had maintain'd as good, or even a better Doctrine than that of *Regius*, she would have been cast, in such Circumstances as she was in. The Match was not even; the Arms were too unequal. *Regius* sat in an honourable Place, and was surrounded with Marks of Favour; he spoke for a Cause protected by the Sovereign, and against a Cause persecuted by the Sovereign. His Antagonist was a Woman loaded with Chains, and in the posture of a Criminal already Condemn'd. A very good Reason alledg'd by that Woman in such Circumstances would not have ballanc'd a very indifferent one alledg'd by *Regius*, with all the weight and emphasis of a Man sitting on the Bench of the Burgomasters, and on a kind of Tribunal. Shall I quote *Euripides*, who says, that the Words of a Man in favour have a greater force than if they were spoken by an unhappy and miserable Man?

Τὸ δ' (*k*) ἀξίωμα κἂν κακῶς λέγῃ τὸ σὸν,
Πείσει· λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰὼν,
Κἀκ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτὸς, ὐ ταὐτὸν σθένει.

That is, according to *Ennius*'s Translation (*l*),

Hæc tu etsi perversè dices, facile Achivos flexeris.
Nam quum opulenti loquuntur pariter atque ignobiles,
Eadem dicta, eademque oratio æqua non æque valet.

Shall I quote these Verses of *Plautus*?

Centum (m) doctum hominum consilia sola hæc devincit dea,
Fortuna, atque hoc verum'st proinde ut quisque fortuna utitur,
Ita præcellet, atque exinde sapere eum omnes dicimus.

Shall I quote these fine Words of *Pliny* the Younger? (*n*) *Quàm multum interest, quid à quoque fiat, eadem enim facta claritate vel obscuritate facientium, aut tolluntur altissime, aut humillime deprimuntur.* Shall I heap up many other such Quotations? No: I omit all those common Topicks, and I shall only observe, that if *Regius* had disputed against a Priest at *Ingolstad*, in quite different Circumstances from the Dispute of *Augsburg*; if he had been in Chains, *&c.* and if the Priest had sat on a Cushion among the Senators, *&c.* this Affair would have

---

(*a*) Zuinglii Epist. lib. 1. pag. 83. apud Melch. Adamum ib. p. 73.

(*b*) Pag. 171 of Zuinglius's Letters.

(*c*) Luther. tom. 2. Epist. pag. 326. apud Melch. Adam. ubi supra.

(*d*) Idem Lutherus ibid. pag. 330. apud Melch. Adam. ib.

(*e*) It is in Seckendorf. Histor. Luther. lib. 2. pag. 122. n. 5.

(*f*) Melch. Adam. ubi sup. p. 78.

(*g*) Luther. tom. 2. Epist. pag. 2... apud Melch. Adam. ib. pag. 67.

(*h*) Melch. Adam. ib. pag. 73.

(*i*) Id. ib.

(*k*) Hecuba ad Ulyssem apud Euripidem in Hecuba v. 293. p. m. 20.

(*l*) Apud Aulum Gellium lib. 11. c. 4. p. m. 286.

(*m*) Plautus in Pseudolo, act. 2. sc. 3. v. 12.

(*n*) Plinius epist. 24. lib. 6.

1530, when a Diet was held there. He then enter'd into the Service of the Duke of Brunswick, who made him Superintendant of the Churches of the Country of Lunenburg, and had (D) a very great Esteem for him. He exercis'd his Talents for the good of the Cause in several Synods, and wrote many (E) Books. He died at Zel in May 1541, in the same manner, as he had often wish'd, that is, almost suddenly *. I must not forget that his † Wife understood the *Hebrew* Tongue very well. He publish'd a Conversation which he had with her about the Characters of the Messias apply'd to Jesus Christ. He had ‖ 13 Children by her. I shall make a Remark upon the Names (G) of that Minister.

REIHING

have ended with *Regius*'s Banishment, or something worse. He had been look'd upon as a Caviller, who wrested the Holy Scriptures; and the Priest had been admir'd as a faithful Interpreter of the Word of God.

(D) *Had a very great Esteem for him.*] Being ask'd, whether he had bought any thing of great Value, and of a new Fashion, as the other Princes had done, he answer'd: (a) *I have brought an incomparable Treasure, which will be of great use to my States, and which I prefer to all sorts of Delights.* He meant *Regius*. And when, in the Year 1535, the City of *Augsburg* requested of him that he would restore them that Divine, he declared (b) that he could as well part with his Eyes as with him. He bestow'd good Pensions upon him, and the Superintendency of all the Churches in his Territories (c).

(E) *He wrote many Books.*] They have been collected into three Volumes; the two first contain what he publish'd in *Latin*, and the other what he wrote in High *Dutch* (d). The latter has been translated into *Latin*, if I am not mistaken; for I find in the Catalogue of the *Bodleian* Library, *Vita & opera* (Urbani Regii) *latine reddita per Ernest. Regium.* Norib. 1562. *Melchior Adam* observes, that *Ernestus* Regius, the Author's Son, Collected all those Works, and Publish'd them at *Nuremberg*, divided into several Tomes. He mentions particularly the Book, in which our *Urban* had collected the harsh Phrases, and those that are exact. The first are only proper to sow Discord, and the latter to promote Piety and Concord. Prince *Ernestus* of *Brunswick* set him upon that Collection, which was an instance of his Prudence and Piety, for blunt and sharp Expressions are like the Teeth of *Cadmus*'s Dragon, a seed of War among Brethren. This is *Melchior Adam*'s Reflection. (e) *Extat inter alios liber ejus, in quo annotatæ sunt* horridiores formæ loquendi, *& monstrantur propriæ* ac concinnæ, *utiles pietati ac concordiæ. Has admonitiones scribi princeps Ernestus Luneburgicus voluit: qua in re sapientiam & pietatem ejus agnoscimus. Ut enim ex dentibus draconis, in Cadmæa historia, nata est soboles armatorum inter se dimicantium: sic ex improprio sermone dissensiones opinionum in docentibus & in populo nascuntur.* This is little minded by the Formulary-Makers, when they are more devout than judicious, or more passionate and vain than truly devout. They are perfect Strangers to Prudence and Moderation, they set up for *Rigorists* (f). Note, That (g) *John Freder*, of *Pomerania*, publish'd a Work of *Regius*, after his Death, intituled, *Loci theologici ex Patribus & Scholasticis neotericisque collecti.*

(F) *He died . . . . in the same manner as he had often wish'd.*] (h) He was not sick above three hours, and had all along wish'd not to die of a long Sickness. (i) *Nactus est genus mortis, quale sæpe in votis habuit; citum & placidum; cum semper deprecaretur diuturnos languores & longas morborum periodos.* He is not the only (k) Man, who wish'd for such a Death, and who was serv'd according to his Wishes.

(G) *A Remark upon the Names of that Minister.*] The Name of his Family (l) was *King*; but finding it too lofty, and knowing that it would occasion several Jests, he changed it into that of *Regius*. As for the Name *Urban*, it was given him when he was christen'd, because the Women, who carried him to Church, could not tell the Name his Mother had a mind he should have. She desir'd he should be Christned by the Name of the Saint that was mark'd in the Kalendar on the Day he was born in. The good Women forgot it as they went: The Curate finding they were uncertain about it, told them that St. *Urban*'s Day was near: Which was the Reason why he was call'd *Urban*. I shall observe occasionally, that among all Nations there are many Families, who bear the Name of a Dignity, as King, Prince, Duke, Marquiss, Count, Baron, &c. They seldom think of changing it, tho' it affords continually Matter for silly Jests and childish Allusions. But I believe our *Lutheran* Doctor is not the only one, who disguised his Name, to avoid such an Inconveniency. There are some Men every where, whose Name is *Regis* or *Regius*; a disguised Name, if I am not mistaken, for the Reason I have mention'd. I have said (m) in another Place, that I wonder'd that those Families who have an odious or ridiculous Name, did not leave it. And I add here, that there are some who have not now the obscene Name which they had formerly. Read these Words of *Menage*: "Hauteclair. The Name of "a Family. That Name was given in *Henry* the II's "Time to a Master of the Requests, nam'd *Couillart*, "upon a pleasant Occasion. That Master of the Re"quests went often to the *Louvre*. One Day as he "was knocking at the Door of the King's or Queen's "Closet, the Usher ask'd him his Name; but he durst "not tell it plainly, because of its Obscenity. The Usher "not understanding him, or pretending not to under"stand him, bad him tell his Name *haut & clair*, "(plainly and clearly) which occasion'd his being call'd "afterwards *Hauteclair*. I have this Story from Mr. "*du Puy*, who had it from *Thuanus*, who in the 8th "Book of his History, *pag* 26. of the *Geneva* Editi"on, mentions that Change of Name, only by these "Words: *Negotium datum P. Altclaro, Libellorum Supplicum* "*Magistro, qui pudendo olim cognomine insignitus fuit, ut* "*negotium Regium*, &c". He had said in the 1st Edition of his *Origines*, *that the* Beauharnois *of* Orleans *have also changed their Name of* Beauvit, *because of its Obscenity, into that of* Beauharnois; but in the second Edition he says 'tis a meer Story.

I foresee, that those, who shall remember a Remark of Mr. *de Vigneul Marville*, when they come to read what I have said in the Article of *Feuardentius*, will object to me that I should not have wonder'd that People don't leave their ridiculous or odious Names. They'll maintain that they have not the Liberty to do it, and they'll alledge these Words of the *Melange d'Histoire & de Literature*: (o) *As for what Mr.* de la Roque *says, that since the Ordinance of* Amboise *of the 26th of* March *1555, none is allowed to change his Name, without the King's Permission; it ought to be observed that a long time before that Ordinance no Body chang'd his Name without being authoriz'd for it.* Mr. *de Vigneul Marville* proves this by the Example of the Barber of *Lewis* XI. and sets down the Words of that Prince's Patent, whereby he commands that *Oliver le Mauvais*, (the Bad) who was his Barber, *and his Posterity be for the time to come Sirnam'd* le Dain . . . . *and that it shall not be lawful for any body whatsoever to call them by the said Sirname* le Mauvais; *which Name we have taken from them and abolish'd, and do actually take away and abolish by these Presents.* That Patent is dated in *October*, 1474, and was registred in the Parliament of *Paris* the 30th of *January* (p) 1474. If those, who would make this Objection against me, think it to be solid, they don't know how to judge well of things. I answer in the first place, that the Expression I made use of ought to be understood as this, *I wonder that loose and debauch'd People are not afraid of the Prejudice they do to their Health and Reputation.* These Words, though spoken in the present Tense, do nevertheless take in past Ages as well as that in which they are spoken; and therefore my way of expressing my self to shew that I wonder'd that People did not part with odious or ridiculous Names, concerns no less the time, which preceded the Ordinance mention'd by Mr. *de la Roque*, than the time that follow'd it. Now it is certain that before that Ordinance was made, some People parted with their Names, or changed and disguised them. Mr. *de la Roque* quotes Mr. *Menage*, who *says that* William le Rat, *being displeased, as 'tis thought, with his Name, which is that of an Insect, Sirnam'd himself* Lesrat; and that *John Dorat, Regius Professor of the* Greek *Tongue, chang'd his Name of* Disnemandy . . . . *which was the ancient Name of his Family, into that of* Dorat *or* Daurat. It were an absurd thing to pretend that they had the King's Permission for it. Mr. *de Vigneul* does not say so. *I am apt to believe*, says he (q), *that before the Ordinance of* Amboise, *many Persons took upon themselves to change their Names, without having Recourse to the King; and perhaps the Physician nam'd* Sansmalice (without Malice) *changed his Name into that of* Akakia, *without a Patent from* Francis *the* Ist; *but then it was a meer*

Transla-

---

* Taken from Melchior Adam in vitis Theolog. p. 90 & 91.

† Micrælius, in Syntagm. Histor. Eccles. pag. m. 778.

‖ Melch. Adam. ib. pag. 74.

(a) Allatum esse a se thesaurum sorte ducatuum incomparabilem quem omnium amœnitati anteponat deliciarum. Melch. Adam. ib. pag. 78.

(b) Perinde ut oculos suos & Urbanum se amittere nolle. Id. ibid.

(c) Id. ib. & pag. 79.

(d) Micrælius, Syntag. Hist. Eccles. pag. m. 778.

(e) Melch. Adam. ubi supra pag. 79. 80.

(f) Note, that general terms, and such as are void of condescendence, are [illegible] words.

(g) Id. ib. pag. 80.

(h) Idem, pag. 79.

(i) Id. ib.

(k) See the Article Valla (George.)

(l) Majores ejus Regum cognomine insignes fuerunt: sed cum id fastuosum & jocis aptum ex rege regius factus est ut ipse dictitare solitus. Melch. Adam ib. pag. 70.

(m) In the Article Feuardentius, Rem. (A).

REIHING (JAMES) Profeſſor of Divinity at *Tubingen*, was born at *Augsburg* in the Year 1579, of one of thoſe Ancient Families call'd *Patrician*. He perform'd his Studies at *Ingolſtad*, and his Maſters were very much pleas'd with the progreſs he made in them *. Having attain'd the Age, in which the Ancient *Romans* had a Man's Gown given 'em, he made a Vow to take the Habit of a Jeſuit, if he ſhould recover of a dangerous Sickneſs that he labour'd under. He recover'd, and perform'd his Vow, tho' his Mother oppos'd it. He made his Noviciate at *Landsberg* †, and became afterwards very famous in his Order. He taught Claſſical Learning at *Inſpruck*, and Philoſophy and Divinity at *Ingolſtad*; which he did with ſo good Succeſs, that the General *Aquaviva* thought him worthy of the Doctorſhip of Divinity. He was promoted to it at *Dilingen* ‡; and from that time he found himſelf poſſeſs'd with a new Zeal for the Defence of the Church of *Rome*: So that his Superiors gave him in the Quality of *Aulick* Preacher to *Wolfgang William* Duke of *Newburg*, who had (*A*) newly forſaken the Proteſtant Religion, and they charg'd him to write againſt that Religion. He was thinking Night and Day upon ſuch Arguments as might entirely overthrow the Confeſſion of the Lutherans; but becauſe his Adverſaries alledg'd continually the Scripture againſt him, he thought himſelf oblig'd to conſult that Holy Book, and to keep to it, in order to take from it the Arms that he wanted to maintain that Combat. That Study made him ſenſible that he defended an ill Cauſe, and therefore he quitted his Employment, and retir'd (*B*) to the Court of *Wirtemberg*, where he embrac'd Lutheraniſm. He was made Profeſſor of Divinity at *Tubingen*, Preacher in Ordinary, and Director of a College. He diſcharg'd the Duties of thoſe Places with great Capacity, and publiſh'd ſome Books

Tranſlation of a French Word into a Greek one. Thus the ſame Author, whom they would alledge againſt me, acknowledges that People changed their Names, notwithſtanding the Patent of *Lewis* the XIth; and indeed we ought to believe that it was drawn up for his Barber, not that he might be permitted to change the Name of his Family, but that People ſhould not continue to call him by that Name. He was very much hated in the Kingdom, and conſequently People would have taken Pleaſure in croſſing his Deſign of parting with a Name that he was aſham'd of. This was the Motive of that Patent: It did not therefore ſerve as a Rule in many other Caſes, in which the Publick was not concern'd. Now if under Pretence of a *Greek* Tranſlation, one might, without any danger, ſubſtitute the Name *Akakia* to that of *Sans malice*; much more was it lawful to ſubſtitute one Name in the room of another, when the difference between thoſe two Names conſiſted only in the Inſertion, Tranſpoſition, or omiſſion of ſome Letters. 2dly, I ſay, that Experience is favourable to me, ſince many famous Authors have taken a new Name, without being authoriz'd for it by the Sovereign. 3dly, I add that 'tis likely the Ordinance of the 26th of *March* before *Eaſter*, 1555, tended only to prevent the Uſurpations of Nobility, or ſome other Fraud, and therefore when a Man had no other deſign than that of *Regius*, he was not concern'd by that Ordinance. 4thly, I further ſay, that probably it was not better obſerved, than that of the States of *Blois*, in the Year 1559, whereby *all Gentlemen* (*a*) *were forbidden to ſign any Act and Contract with any other Name but that of their Family, upon the Penalty of being made void* . . . . *That Article has not proved ſo effectual as it was expected; for many People, inſtead of obſerving it, have formally acted againſt it; which I have obſerved in the authentick and publick Acts.* Laſtly, I anſwer, that if the Ordinance of *Amboiſe* was well obſerved, one might nevertheleſs wonder that People don't part with their odious or ridiculous Names, becauſe they may obtain the King's Permiſſion (*b*), if they will aſk for it; and we find among other Inſtances in Mr. *de la Roque*'s Book, that (*c*) *James Miette* [Crumb] a mean and comical Name, and ſuch as may occaſion many ſilly Jeſts, *had a Patent from* Henry *the* IVth, *in* March 1603 . . . . *which permitted him to change his Name into that of* Lauberie.

(*A*) *Who had newly forſaken the Proteſtant Religion.*] *Martin Rauſcherus*, who made *Reihing*'s Funeral Oration, ſays nothing that may induce us to believe that that Jeſuit contributed to make the Duke of *Newburg* change his Religion. *Theophilus Spizelius* (*d*), and Father *Alegambe* (*e*), are alſo ſilent about it. Thoſe three Authors ſay only, that ſoon after that Prince had changed his Religion, Father *Reihing* was made his Preacher. Nevertheleſs ſome Writers affirm, that that Jeſuit was the great Converter of the Duke of *Newburg*, and prevail'd with him by worldly Intereſts. Here are the Words of a Journaliſt in the Extract of one of Mr. *Leti*'s Works. (*f*) "The Princes of the Houſe of *Newburg* were Pro-"teſtants formerly; but a Jeſuit, whoſe Name was "*James Reihing* found the way to make one of 'em "Change his Religion, by ſome (1) pretty good Poli-"tical Reaſons, which may be ſeen in the Author. "But that which is ſurprizing is, that the Converter "himſelf embrac'd afterwards the Proteſtant Religion, "to repair in ſome meaſure the breach he had made in "it, by ſeparating the Duke of *Newburg* from its body. "The Abbot *Pacichelli*, and *Baccati*, Secretary to the "then Pope's Nuncio at *Cologne*, who are quoted by "our Author, aſcribe that Change to an *occulto giudicio* "*di Dio*; but the Proteſtants may eaſily apprehend, that "a Man who ſtudies Controverſies, may change his "Opinions, and believe that the Proteſtants are in the "right; as a Prince from a Proteſtant turns Catholick "out of Intereſt. The one is not more ſtrange than "than the other; and there is no Reaſon to ſay on this "occaſion with an Actor of the *Filli di Sciro*:

"*Le vie de gli Dei*
"*Sono oſcure & ritorte:*
"*Ch'il crederebbe? in ſomma*
"*E il cielo un Laberinto, in cui ſi perde*
"*Chiunque va per iſpiarne i fati.*"

(*B*) *And retir'd to the Court of* Wirtemberg.] *Spizelius* is guilty of a great Omiſſion; for he does not ſet down the Year of his Retreat. That Fault has not been committed in *Reihing*'s Funeral Oration; but the Printers of the Sieur *Witte* have ſo much falſified that Date, that it can be of no uſe to me. They ſay, that *Reihing* having made his Eſcape from the Duke of *Newburg*'s Court, came to that of *Wirtemberg* (*g*) in the beginning of the Year 1601. They left out, without doubt, *vigeſimi*; for I find in another Author (*h*) that he ſtole away from the Duke of *Newburg* the 5th of *January* 1620, and went to that Prince's Mother at *Hochſtett*, and from thence to *Ulm*, and then to *Stutguard*, and at laſt to *Tubingen*, where he abjur'd Popery, and Preach'd about the motives of his Converſion the 2d of *January* 1621. I find here ſome confuſion, when I compare *Paul Freherus*'s Narrative with that of *Rauſcherus*; for according to the latter, the new Comer was examin'd a whole Week, and then was ſent to *Tubingen*, where his Name was regiſter'd in the Book of the Rector of the Univerſity. If he arriv'd at *Stutgard* in the beginning of *January*, and if he underwent there an examination that laſted a Week, before he ſet out for *Tubingen*, as *Rauſcherus* affirms, he did not Preach at *Tubingen* about the Motives of his Converſion on the 2d of *January*, as *Freherus* affirms. I believe there are two Faults of Impreſſion in *Freherus*'s Account; and that in order to rectify them, it muſt be ſaid that *Reihing* left the Court of the Duke of *Newburg* the 5th of *January* 1621, and Preach'd at *Tubingen* the 22d of *January* in the ſame Year. Don't wonder at the long Examination he was oblig'd to undergo. The Proteſtants miſtruſt a Jeſuit very much, and the condition they were in at that time in *Germany*, made ſuch a miſtruſt neceſſary. Beſides, it is a very rare thing to ſee a famous Jeſuit quit his Order to turn Proteſtant; and therefore ſuch a rarity is look'd upon as a kind of Prodigy, and is thought to deſerve a careful Examination, that one may know whether it be a good Preſage, or the forerunner of Evil. The Duke of *Wirtemberg* being inform'd that Father *Reihing* was come to change his Religion, conven'd his Divines, and order'd them to examine him well. They acted the part of Catholicks, and for a whole Week pro-

* *He ſtudied in the College of the Jeſuits. Taken from Spizelius, in templo honoris reſerato, p. 91, 92.*

† *Rauſcherus in laud. funebri Reihingi apud Witte memor. Theol. pag. 8—.*

‡ *Id. ib. pag. 8 8.*

(*g*) Venerat ſub auſpicium ineuntis anni ſupra milleſimum ſexcenteſimum primi in aulam. *Martinus Rauſcherus in laudat. funebri Reihingi apud Witte, memor Theolog. p.* 903.

(*h*) *Paulus Freherus, in Theatr. virorum illuſtr. pag.* 431.

Books that met with a good Reception. The Jeſuits made uſe of all ſorts of (C) Promiſes and Enticements to bring him back again, but all was in vain; he ſlighted their Flatteries, as well as the Slanders (D) that were ſpread againſt him. He fell Sick of a Dropſy in the ſixth

propos'd to that Father the Difficulties that are objected againſt the Proteſtants. He anſwer'd them in ſuch a manner as ſhew'd that he had very carefully compar'd the two Religions. (a) *Juro vobis Auditores: tota illa, quæ res ſeriò utrinque acta eſt, aſſiduè, ex in omnibus, & quidem cardinalibus fidei noſtræ articulis depromſit & exhibuit fundamenta, ut neminem non in admirationem ſui converteret: Sacræ etiam Scripturæ teſtimonia, quibus noſtrorum ſententia firmari ſolet, ita in numerato habebat, ita illi præcipui textus erant in mundo, ac ſi totam ætatem in ſcholis noſtris inſumpſiſſet. Quæ profectò non rudem & novitium, ſed aliquem in hac militia veteranum arguebant.* After he had undergone ſuch a Trial, he was thought worthy of Adoption, and they ſpoke to him the Words of *Priamus* (b) to *Sinon.* (c) *Soluto conventu latum ex aula carmen accipit.*

Quiſquis es, amiſſos hinc jam obliviſcere Grajos:
Noſter eris.

(C) *The Jeſuits made uſe of all ſorts of Promiſes.*] The more the Proteſtants boaſted of the Converſion of ſo famous a Man, the more the Jeſuits were ſorry for the Loſs of him. He had acquir'd the Eſteem of the Society (d) by his good Life, Eloquence and Learning; and therefore the whole Order was afflicted at his change of Religion, and they left no Stone unturn'd to regain him. Father *Keller* promiſed him all ſorts of Advantages, and a full Liberty of returning to the Jeſuits, or of being a Canon, or of living a ſecular Life. He ingaged his Word that his Superiors would ratifie whatever he ſhould promiſe him. (e) *Quam lautas ille* (Kellerus) *fecit pollicitationes? quam pingues conditiones & propter quas vel vadimonium deſeri poſſet, Reihingo obtulit? videlicet optionem illi permiſerat, utrum Lojolæ familia manere, an verò in Canonicum aut Laicum ſe componere eligeret: dummodo ad ſinum Romanæ Eccleſiæ rediret. Proferebat hanc in rem chartam puram, quam Itali biancam vocant, cui inſcriberet, quicquid animo collibitum eſſet ſuo: nec de approbatione Superiorum dubitaret.* *Conrad Reihing*, a Jeſuit, who was Rector of a College at *Augsburg*, and Brother to our *Reihing*, wrote to him continually, and exhorted him to return into the boſom of the Church (1); many other Jeſuits did the ſame. *Chriſtopher Grenzing*, his Provincial, was the firſt who endeavour'd to bring him back; he promiſed him that the Society would be merciful to him. (f) *Quid dicam de literis Chriſtophori Grenzing Provincialis, qui primus ex omnibus à fuga illum retrahere tentavit cum hoc monito: quod* Societas redeunti viſcera miſerationis & benignitatis recludat? *Mutius Vitelleſchi*, General of the Jeſuits, took care to let him know, with a thouſand Proteſtations of Sincerity, that he would be received with open Arms, and that he would not be dealt with as *Mark Antony de Dominis* had been, but in a moſt cordial manner. *Reihing* did not truſt to thoſe Promiſes, or rather he was ſo fully perſuaded that the Church of *Rome* was not a good Church, that he perſever'd conſtantly in the Proteſtant Religion. The Jeſuit, *George Stengelius*, confeſs'd in ſome printed Pieces, that the loſs of ſuch a Man was very prejudicial to the Society. (g) *Nec diſſimulavit hoc ipſum Georgius Stengelius, qui in ſcriptis ſuis hactenus publicatis, non uno loco conqueritur,* ingens diſceſſione Reihingi Societati ſuæ vulnus eſſe inflictum. There is ſcarce any religious Order that has afforded fewer Proſelytes to the Proteſtants, than that which *Reihing* quitted: This conſideration increaſed the Affliction of the Jeſuits inſtead of leſſening it. The following Words will ſhew you how much the Proteſtants triumph'd on account of ſuch a ſingularity. (h) *Quod quidem factum, quam illuſtre, quàm admirabile, quam inſperatum rarumque nobis acciderit, ne commovere quidem vos opus eſt. Clericum Regularem, & Societatis Ignatianæ Patrem ad caſtra tranſire Evangelicorum, contra quos hactenus omni impetu ſteterat: ſive ut latinè dicam,* Jeſuitam fieri Lutheranum, *res eſt imprimis memorabilis, & in tabulas æternitatis referenda. Res, cujus prædicatio, multorum adhuc ſeculorum ingenia, ipſamque poſteritatis memoriam fatigabit. Res, quam nemo* (i) *hodie aut fando acceperit, aut oculorum fide fuerit arbitratus.* *France* has afforded very few ſuch Examples: There was one in the Year 1647, when *Jarrige* turn'd Proteſtant.

(D) *The Slanders that were ſpread againſt him.*] They publiſh'd ſome Verſes againſt him in the *German* Language, wherein he was horribly defamed, and ſome Letters were diſperſed in the Towns and Courts of *Germany*, to repreſent him as a profligate Man. They call'd him a Paraſite, who had preferr'd good Cheer and good Wine to a pious and ſolitary Life: They charged him with having been a great Courtier to the Ladies, and they pretended he had been ſo much in Love with a Maid, that he debauch'd and got her with Child: they added, that the ſwelling of her Belly having diſcover'd her Crime, he ran away to avoid Infamy and Puniſhment. (k) *Circumvolitarunt vernacula lingua infames rythmi, & calumnioſæ literæ, aulas, urbes, oppida perniciosiſſime pererrarunt. Narrarunt, aulæ Palatinæ paraſitum: gynacei aſſeclam: argenteos orbes, exquiſita fercula, & liquorem illius Dei, qui olim Indos expugnavit, præ lectione, præ oratione, præ ſolitudine amaſſe: vitæ cælibis quietem deliciis prætuliſſe: Floræ & Veneris, non Societatis Sacerdotem fuiſſe: ſalacitatis libidine pruriiſſe: ſpecioſam puellam impudicè deperiiſſe: inclinaſſe virginem, & infami compreſſu gravidaſſe: cumque illa uteri bulgam plus æquo intumeſcentem celare non poſſet, deſerto vadimonio, mali facinoris infamiam, & pœnas metuentem erupiſſe.* *Reihing* confuted thoſe Slanders by a fine (l) Apology, which he ſent to the Court of *Wirtemberg*. There happen'd a thing which proclaimed his Innocence. The Duke of *Bavaria* ſent three Deputies to that Court, to wit, *Henry de Stein*, the Civilian *Faber*, and Father *Keller*, a Jeſuit and Rector of the College of *Munich*. They had Orders to demand that that Deſerter ſhould be deliver'd up to them, and they enumerated all the Crimes that were laid to his Charge. The Duke of *Wirtemberg* anſwer'd them, that (m) if *Reihing* was guilty of thoſe Crimes, they might juridically proceed aginſt him, and that he would appoint ſome upright Judges to try him without any partiality; but that if the Proſelyte was innocent, Juſtice and Equity required that he ſhould be allow'd to live quietly in the Profeſſion of that Religion, which ſeem'd the beſt to him. If it ſhould happen, added the Duke, that my two Preachers ſhould quit their Religion, I would not ſtir out of my Chamber upon ſuch an account. “*Subjunxit hoc mantiſſæ loco generoſiſſimus Princeps.* Quod ſi fors hodie eveniret, utrunque Aulæ meæ Concionatorem à Religione ſua deficere: eorum cauſâ, ne pedem quidem unicum extra limen promoverem (n).” Father *Keller* had at that time a Conference with *Reihing*, and reproach'd him with thoſe Irregularities, which had occaſion'd ſo many Songs and Satyrical Letters. *Reihing* vindicated himſelf upon all thoſe Heads, and even took an Oath for his Juſtification in the Preſence of three Deputies of the Duke of *Bavaria*. “(o) *Memores reſponſi iſtius, quod tibi commitibuſque tuis, in præſentia virorum honoratiſſimorum, manu pectori admota, & ſublatis in cœlum oculis catapultæ inſtar retorſit.* Ego, *inquiebat ille*, in conſpectu Cœleſtis illius Arbitri hic conſiſto, qui quæ nos gerimus, auditque & videt. Coram divina ejus Majeſtate agnoſco me peccatorum non infimum; ſed hunc teſtem invoco, vacare me culpa omnium, quæ imputantur, probrorum: fallentem vindicet, qui nunquam fallitur.” *Keller* having not been able to prevail with his old Fellow-Jeſuit, retired and told him, Eve *has been the occaſion of your Fall.* His Meaning was, that the Deſire of marrying had induc'd *Reihing* to renounce his Order and Popery. All the Accuſations were at laſt reduced to this; the other vaniſh'd away; but they obſtinately maintain'd that Love was the only Motive that had made him imbrace the Proteſtant Religion. They added, that after he had married, and got many Children, he found himſelf ſo clogg'd, that he wanted Courage to return into the Boſom of the Church, and departed this World to go into Hell. This is what *Alegambe* reproaches him with. (p) *Prolapſus in turpes amores, ordinem, fidemque transfuga deſeruit, factus errorum magiſter: ductâ dein domum pellice pro uxore, ſuſceptis compluribus liberis, ita miſer implicatus eſt, ut ad veritatis confeſſionem redire non ſuſtineret. Sic in æternam mortem occubuit.* This is a common place ſo trivial and ſo much worn out, that I wonder People are not weary of making uſe of it. It has been turn'd a thouſand different ways, and ſome paſſionate Men have choſen to alledge it againſt the Proteſtants in general, rather than againſt the Proſelytes. They ſay, that the firſt thing (q) the Proteſtants do in favour of a Monk or Prieſt, who embraces their Religion, is to procure him a Wife; 'tis the Cement wherewith they incorporate him into their Sect, and make him conſtantly adhere to it. They know that ſuch Birds of Prey cannot be better allured or ſixth Year of his Converſion, and was choak'd (E) with a Cathar ſome time after *. New Lies were ſpread (F) about his Death. I ſhall give you the Catalogue of (G) his Writings.

(a) *Martinus Rauſcherus ubi ſupra pag.* 903.

(b) *Virgil. Æneid. lib.* 2. *v.* 148.

(c) *Rauſcherus ib. pag.* 905.

(d) *See the Fragment of a Letter of the Jeſuit* John Agricola *Chaplain to the Count* de Tilli *in the Army: I ſay, ſee that Fragment* in oratione funebri Reihingi apud Witte ubi ſupra pag. 898, 899.

(e) *Rauſcherus ib. apud Witte pag.* 912.

(1) *Id. ib. pag.* 913.

(f) *Rauſcherus ib. pag.* 913.

(g) *Ibid. pag.* 899.

(h) *Id. ib. pag.* 904.

(i) *That Author had without doubt forgot the Converſion of* Haſenmullerus: *I have mention'd it in the Article* Jarrige.

(k) *Rauſcherus ubi ſupra pag.* 905.

(l) *Id. ib. pag.* 906.

(m) [illegible] criminis, quorum reum poſtularent, deſertoremque, veritate [illegible]rentur: fas eſſe, & poteſtatem ipſis in Aula adverſus eum lege ac judicio experiundi, habituros judicem neutri parti obnoxium, ſed ex æquo & bono jus dicentem. Sin autem &c. *Id. ib. pag.* 906.

(n) *Id. ib.*

(o) *Id. ib. pag.* 906. *This is an Apology of the Orator to Father Keller.*

(p) *Alegambe ubi ſupra. Note, that* Sotuel *has wholly ſuppreſs'd this Article of* James Reihing.

(q) *Compare with this the new Letters againſt* Maimbourg's *Hiſtory of* Calviniſm, *pag.* 49[illegible].

R E I-

or tamed, than by ſuch a piece of Fleſh. What a groſs Fancy is this! I only mention it as an inſtance of the brutiſhneſs of ſome Controverſiſts. (a) *Quinetiam auſim dicere eos ſtudioſius multò laborare in quærenda quamprimum, & fucati conjugii glutine alliganda unicuique transfugæ concubina, quam in emendanda vitæ præteritæ ratione ac moribus. Illud quippe certò credunt non poſſe id genus accipitres vel efficacius acceſſiri, vel melius cicurari, quam ſi ejuſmodi carnis illicio ineſcentur.* Father *Reihing* had without doubt foreſeen that things would be brought to that paſs, and that he would be expoſed to ſuch Railleries, if he ſhould marry; but he overcame that fear, and had a greater regard for the Doctrine of the Apoſtle of the Gentiles, who will have the Biſhop to marry, and who reckons the Prohibition of Marriage among the Doctrines of the Devil. He therefore married the next Year, and choſe in his Native Country a (b) Wife whom he had never ſeen. She was a choice Woman, and of a very good Family, handſom, ſober, and adorn'd with all ſorts of Virtues. (c) *Altero, poſtquam in hanc urbem venit, anno, cùm Tarſenſis Apoſtoli mandatum animo ſecum verſaret, quo* EPISCOPUM *unius Uxoris* Virum *eſſe* juſſit, *& quo nomine ipſe ille Gentium Doctor doctrinam matrimonio interdicentium appellaret, animum ad conjugium appulit, exemploque ſuo vetus illud Euripidis comprobavit*: Fatalem viro fœminæque torum eſſe.

Obſerve, that *Reihing* and the Author of his Funeral Oration, explain the Words of St. *Paul* as a Precept: They pretend that the Apoſtle commands the Miniſters of the Goſpel to marry, and to take but one Wife. This would be certainly the meaning of St. *Paul's* Words, if they were underſtood literally, that is, according to the Rules of Grammar; for the terms, which denote the Marriage of the Biſhop with one Wife, are as much govern'd by the word *muſt* (d), as thoſe that denote the Biſhop's blameleſs Life, Sobriety, Prudence, Gravity, Modeſty, Equity, Moderation, and Unintereſtedneſs. As therefore it were abſurd to pretend that St. *Paul* leaves it to the liberty of the Miniſters to be ſober, modeſt, blameleſs, *&c.* or not; ſo it is abſurd to pretend that he leaves it to their choice to marry a Wife, or to marry none; I ſay, this is abſurd, if we ſtick to the literal Senſe, and if we ſuppoſe that St. *Paul* did actually obſerve Grammatical Rules. I don't mean a rigorous Exactneſs, ſuch as is obſerved in the Articles of a Treaty of Peace, wherein all the Expreſſions are narrowly conſider'd, to prevent the Abuſes that might ariſe from an Equivocation, or the Omiſſion of a Particle. I don't mean neither the rigid Exactneſs of thoſe ſcrupulous pedantick Grammarians, who had rather ſpend three hours in mending a Period, than let it paſs with ſome careleſneſs. I mean a method of explaining one ſelf neatly and clearly, as a Man of Senſe would do in a Letter to a Tutor, containing ſome Directions. If he ſhould write to him, *I will have my Children to ſay their Prayers twice a Day, to go to Church twice a Week, to forbear Swearing and Quarrelling, to be dutiful to their Mother, and to go every Monday to the Play-Houſe*, he would take all theſe ſeveral Things as ſo many Injunctions; he would not think that 'tis left to his Diſcretion to carry his Pupils every Monday to the Playhouſe, or not: For in ſuch a caſe, he muſt ſuppoſe that there is no Connexion between theſe words, *I will*, and *to go to the Playhouſe*; and that the Father of his Pupils made uſe of another Verb, as to this laſt thing, and ſaid for inſtance, *And I give you leave to carry them to the Playhouſe every Monday.* It muſt be therefore granted, that if a Sophiſt ſhould obſtinately maintain, that whatever St. *Paul* ſays concerning the Qualifications of a Biſhop is obligatory, it would be no eaſie thing to confute him; and that one would be obliged to beg of him not to take it ill, that one ſhould depart (e) from the Grammatical Strictneſs: Since it is not likely that the Apoſtle deſign'd to exclude from Epiſcopacy thoſe, who would live a ſingle Life, though they were endow'd with all the Talents requiſite for the performance of Epiſcopacy. Which ſhews, that too ſcrupulous an adherence to the literal Senſe of the Scripture, would very often prove the cauſe of many Illuſions, and that there are many Caſes in which the Interpreters ought to remember the Axiom, *Summum jus ſumma injuria.* This ſhews at the ſame time, that we ought to do, not what the Apoſtles command, according to the Grammatical Senſe, but what common Senſe teaches us they intended to command. St. *Paul*, according to the Grammatical Rules, commands the Biſhops to marry; but Reaſon ſhews us, that he intended only to forbid them Polygamy. We muſt therefore ſtick to this. *Reihing* and others are in the wrong to find in St. *Paul's* Words an injunction to marry; they contain only a permiſſion: But their miſtake is much more excuſable than the intolerable boldneſs of forbidding Clergymen to marry. The Chriſtian People will never be able to juſtifie before God, the baſe compliance whereby they have permitted that the Laws of St. *Paul* ſhould be abrogated, though never ſo plain, ſo clear, and ſo intelligible. They have been ſeverely puniſh'd for it, by the overflowing Lewdneſs wherewith their Families have been polluted, and they are not yet free from it. I muſt obſerve by the bye, that the Holy Scripture has been handled by the Chriſtians much after the ſame manner as *Juſtinian's* Code. They are well pleaſed when the Common-Law agrees with the Written Law; but if the Common-Law ſerves their turn better than the Written-Law, they can very well diſpence with the want of Conformity. Chriſtianity has not been for many Ages a Country that governs it ſelf by the Written Law.

(E) *Choak'd with a Cathar ſome time after.*] Here is a new Omiſſion of *Spizelius*: He neither ſets down the Day nor the Year of *Reihing's* Death. To ſupply that Omiſſion, I ſhall obſerve that he departed this Life (f) the 5th of *May*, 1628. He went to the Bath according to the Phyſician's Preſcription, and having lain down to take ſome reſt, he fell aſleep, and never awaked again. His Panegyriſt calls it a happy Death, ſuch as *Auguſtus* wiſh'd for himſelf and his Friends. (g) *Ultimum noſtrum omniumque mortalium votorum nactus, euthanaſiam, quam ille orbis Regnator Auguſtus olim ſibi ſuiſque exoptavit.*

(F) *New Lies were ſpread about his Death.*] It was made publick, before he died; his Dropſie was ſaid to be an effect of the Divine Vengeance; his dying without receiving the Communion, occaſion'd ſeveral malicious Reflections; they maintain'd, that at the approach of his laſt Hour (h) he was cruelly tormented by the Remorſes of his Conſcience: Laſtly, they gave out, that upon the point of Death he had made a Recantation in the preſence of the Neighbours. It is expedient to obſerve theſe Things, becauſe they ſhew the blindneſs and fury of human Paſſions, which are the fruits of Credulity and falſe Zeal, and the Plague and Deſtruction of Reaſon. (i) *Vidimus volantes è vicinia chartas, immò ab Allobrogibus uſque in manus noſtras pervenerunt literæ, quæ eum in ſuprema vitæ meta poſitum, Evangelium ejeraſſe, & in præſentia Vicinorum, ipſiuſque D.* PREGIZERI *palinodiam ceciniſſe loquerentur. O linguæ! ô calami! ô animorum effrons nequitia! Pudor & verecundia quò receſſiſtis? Aliter tu loqueris Reverende Pregizere.*

(G) *The Catalogue of his Writings.*] His firſt Book was printed at *Cologne* in the Year 1615. it was Intituled *Muri civitatis ſanctæ, hoc eſt fundamenta* XII. *religionis Catholicæ quibus inſiſtens Sereniſſimus Princeps Neoburgicus, Lutheraniſmo abdicato in Eccleſiam pedem intulit.* He was then a violent Papiſt. *Balthazar Meiſnerus, Fabricius Baſſecourt*, and *Matthias Hoë* wrote againſt him. (k) *Meiſnerus è theſibus ſcalam centum & quadraginta gradus altam fabricavit, quâ* MUROS BABYLONIS ROMANÆ, ET CONFICTA PAPISTICÆ RELIGIONIS FUNDAMENTA *demoliebatur. Baſſecourtus* TUBA DEI *armatus*, AD SUBVERTENDOS MUROS *Eccleſiæ Romanæ progreſſus, eos velut illa Hierichuntis mœnia uno clangore diſſlare & ſolo æquare eſt aggreſſus. Ultimus Matthias Hoë* Enchiridion *oppoſuit, in quo Romanæ fidei nebulæ clariſſima Scripturarum luce diſcutiebantur.* He publiſh'd a Reply to the two firſt, printed at *Newburg* in 1617. Here is the Title of it: *Excubiæ Angelicæ Civitatis Sanctæ pro defenſione* XII. *fundamentorum Catholicorum Balthaſari Meiſnero præconi Lutherano, & Fabricio Baſſecourt, Tibicini Calviniano oppoſitæ.* His Reply to *Matthias Hoë* was only publiſh'd in the *German* Language: Here is the Title of it expreſs'd in Latin, *Enchiridium Catholicum Manuali D. Hoë oppoſitum.* Let us ſee the Titles of the Books he publiſh'd, after he had embrac'd the Confeſſion of *Augsburg.* *Laquei Pontificii contriti; quibus, adjuvante* DOMINO, *liberatus, Liberatori ſuo Ter Opt. Max. libenter meritò publicas gratias in Academia Tubingenſi dicere voluit.* Tubingæ 1622 *in 4to.* Germanicè, ibidem *eodem anno in 4to.* *Diſſertatio de vera Chriſti in terris Eccleſia, adverſus larvatum Jeſuitam Dillinganum*: ibid. 1622. *in 4to.* *Araneorum opera, quas contra laqueos Pontificios contritos*

texturam

* [illegible]

(f) *Rauſcherus ib. pag.* 916. *Spizelius, Spec. hiſtor. Eccleſ. p. m.* 553. *places his Death wrong in the Year* 1624.

(g) *Rauſcher, ibid.*

(h) *Horrendis conſcientiæ morſibus mortalitatis limen jam vicinus infeſtari cœpit. Ibid. p.* 917.

(i) *Idem ib.*

(k) *Ibid. pag.* 905.

REINESIUS (THOMAS) one of the most Learned Men of the XVIIth Century, was born at * *Gotha*, a Town of *Thuringia* in *Germany*, (*A*) the 13th of *December*, 1587. He was a Physician by his Profession, but he applied himself very much to the Study of Literature, wherein he excell'd most. He had already practis'd Physick in some other Places †, when he settled at *Altemburg*, to be the Physician of that Town. He lived there many Years, and was made Burgomaster. At last, having been honour'd with the Dignity of Counsellor of State to the Elector of *Saxony*, he went to reside at *Leipsick*, where he died the 14th of *February* ‡ 1667 γ. He had often refused to be made a Professor (*B*), because he was afraid his Collegues would prove intolerable, and 'tis very likely that if he had accepted of any such Employment, he would have had many Quarrels; for he could not avoid falling out with a Professor of *Leipsick*, tho' they lived at a considerable distance from one another. It

texturam improbam suspenderunt Georgius Stengelius, Simon Scheitenreisser, & Laur. Forerus. Stilo Reisingi dejecta: Ibid. 1623. in 4to. Apologeticus pro dissertatione sua, de Ecclesia Christi: ibidem 1624. in 4to. He publish'd in the *German* Language (*z*) a Retractation of the Book he had written against *Matthias Hoë*.

(*A*) *Was born . . . . the 13th of* December, 1587.] Tho' I had seen this Date in large Letters under *Reinesius*'s Cut prefix'd to one (*a*) of his Books; yet I did a little suspect it, considering that the Journalists of *Leipsick* (*b*) say he died the 14th of *February*, 1667, being 70 Years old. Those Gentlemen are very exact, and no body could be better inform'd of the true Age of that Learned Man. Besides, I saw that *Andreas Carolus* Abbot of St. *George*, in the Dutchy of *Wirtemberg*, observes, that he lived above 70 Years. (*c*) *obiit Thomas Reinesius Septuagenario major.* This cannot be said of a Man, who dyes in his 80th Year. But I was no longer uncertain about it, when I read the Letter (*d*) wherein *Reinesius* says, that his Masters had advised him above 70 Years ago, to peruse frequently the Dictionaries. This he writ the 10th of *February*, 1665; which is a good Confirmation of the Date that is under his Print.

(*B*) *He had often refused to be made a Professor, because he was afraid his Collegues would prove intolerable.*] I find this Particular in his first Letter (*e*) to *Gaspar Hoffman*, Professor of Physick at *Altorf*. That Professor had writ to him (*f*) that he had been exposed, for the space of 30 Years, to the Clamours and Slanders of envious Men, and obliged to maintain some violent Assaults. *Reinesius* answer'd him, that he was likewise persecuted by some cross-grain'd jealous Men, and that there was so little true Friendship left in the World, and so little Equity and Order in the Commonwealth of Learning, that he had conceal'd himself the greatest part of his Life to avoid the Storm. (*g*) *Me quoque circumstrepunt & adfligunt turba æmulorum, invidorum susurri, semidoctorum impudentia judicia. His enim heu! execrandis moribus hodiè vivitur, ut de Bonis judicent pessimi, de artibus imperiti, in literis dominentur thrasones; omnia sint fucata, & genuinarum amicitiarum nihil ferè restet; quas intemperies seriò deploravi semper, & ut declinarem ista passiva,* βιώσας *maximam partem* λέληθα. He goes on, and says, I have often refused the Professorships that were offer'd me, because I thought I could not bear the ill Humour of some Persons with whom I must have lived, and I have rather chosen to stay here, though I don't live a very easie Life. He was then Physician of the Town of *Altemburg*. (*h*) *Nominatus toties ab Academicis, vocatusque à Principibus ad munus docendi publicum; repugnavi, socio uno alteroque è nostratibus (non enim sum* πολύφιλος*) consilii, voluntatibus utrorumque, quòd mores incommodos nonnullorum, cum quibus vivendum esset, tolerare posse non considerem, & mansi in statione, nec ipsa satis commodâ.* Here is part of the Inconveniencies which he does enumerate. My mentioning of them is not needless on this Occasion; for they are things that belong to the History of his Life. (*i*) *Quid enim hoc decennio* Altenburgi Curiensia *&* Gerana (*k*) *transmittam, etsi & illic sat fuerit nubilorum) non expertus sum, in quo non tentatus? Post triste spectaculum expilatæ domûs amisi intra semestre tres jucundissimos filios, suavissimam conjugem, incomparabilem fœminam; solùm animus* DEO *nixus & invictus mihi superest, cum tantillo boni nominis, & quantum satis est frugali opum.* Λιτῶς μὲν ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ. *Trinâ vice, me Physico,* τὸ λοιμῶδες ἐπιδήμιον *hanc urbem adflavit . . . . . Conjugium, quod ante triennium secundum inivi, est incommodius, quam speraveram, & multis rei familiaris tricis, quas tamen deprecatus fui, me involvit, &, quod caput est, sterile; quò malo tristius nihil obvenire poterat antè liberis orbato,* ϗ ὅλῳ ἀπειρισάτῳ. It ought to be observed that some ill affected Persons had sent to *Hoffman* several Quires of *Reinesius*'s *Variæ lectiones*, whilst they were printing, in hopes (*l*) that *Hoffman* would write against that Work: but the Event prov'd contrary to their Expectation; for *Hoffman* finding himself prais'd in that part of the Book that was sent to him, laid aside the Resentment (*m*) he had conceived against *Reinesius*, by whom he thought to have been offended, and wrote a very obliging Letter to him. I think I may say, that the sharpest Quarrel *Reinesius* ever had, was that which he had with *Rivinus*, Professor at *Leipsick*. *Reinesius* declares he had not been the Aggressor, and had only answer'd the injurious Words of that Critick. Nevertheless the latter made his Complaints to the Magistrates, and left no Stone unturn'd to prevent the printing of *Reinesius*'s Answer. Can any thing be more unjust? (*n*) *Nunquam odio habui hominem; sed calumniatorem & projectissimæ protervia accusatorem ferre non debui tamen. Etiamnum hodie crepant nutantque subsellia Judicum apud Nos, ad quos me, stulte querens de injuriis quas Ipse prior intulisset, deferebat, neque suæ famæ satis cavens, dum meam maculare intenderet* ὑπὸ πολλῆς σκυθρωπίας ϗ ὑψηλαγορίας . . . . *Defensionem meam, quam à provocantis impudentia imposita mihi necessitas excusat, in amicorum sinu deposui* . . . . . (*o*) *Dixit, quæ voluit; æquum est ut audiat quæ nolet. . . . . Ex eo vero, quod apologiam meam iis adhibitis machinis, mendaciis etiam, supprimere annisus fuit, malam causam fovere judicatus est dudum, & designasse facinus, quod æternam nomini ejus inussit notam. Voluit nimirum ut ipse de me censor sedere posset, sed* ἀνυπεύθυνος; *voluit ut liceret sibi in me quidvis; mihi ne quidem hiscere contrà.* The Apology of *Reinesius* was printed, notwithstanding the Aggressor's Opposition. This I find in a Letter written the 7th of *August*, 1653. See also the Letter (*p*) which *Reinesius* wrote to *Bosius* the 18th of *January*, in the same Year.

What I have said of the Misfortunes that *Reinesius* complain'd of, seems to be the common Fate of Learned Men. The History of their Lives and their Letters do commonly shew that they have been ingaged in troublesome Quarrels, attended with the Virulency of Jealousie, Calumny, Anger, and a thousand other shameful Passions. One would think, that of all Men Scholars are most apt to make themselves and others uneasy. Which must needs create a Contempt and Hatred for Learning, or at least make one lose the good Opinion one might entertain of it. Ignorant People fancy, that if they had spent all their time in reading, they would have learn'd to moderate their Passions, and to cure themselves of several Faults, which incline them to behave themselves unjustly towards their Neighbours. But they would have other Thoughts, if they knew that the most Learned Men abuse and persecute one another, and complain of their sad Destiny. From whence we may draw this Conclusion, that there is nothing so difficult to be acquir'd as the Tranquillity and Uprightness of the Mind. A continual Study of good Books seems to be a most proper Means to acquire that Treasure; and yet it seldom procures it, and very often produces a quite contrary Effect. *Horace* had a very wrong Notion, when he spoke these Words: *It is enough for me to beg of God that he would preserve my Life, and bestow Riches upon me; and then I shall be able to procure to my self the Tranquillity of the Mind.*

Quid (q) sentire putas? quid credis, amice, precari?
Sit mihi, quod nunc est, etiam minus: ut mihi vivam
Quod superest ævi, si quid superesse volunt Di:
Sit, bona librorum & provisæ frugis in annum
Copia: ne fluitem dubiæ spe pendulus horæ.
Sed satis est orare Jovem, qui donat, & aufert.
Det vitam, det opes: æquum mi animum ipse parabo.

He was grosly mistaken: the thing, for which he thought he stood in no need of God's Assistance, was what he could less expect from his Ability, and the first he

(y) *At Tubingen, in the Year* 1613.

(a) *His Letters ad* Hoffmannum & Rupertum *printed at* Leipsick *in the Year* 1660.

(b) *Acta erudit. Lips.* 1682. *pag.* 92.

(c) *Andreas Carolus memorab. Eccles. lib.* 7. *ad ann.* 1667. *pag.* 409.

(d) *Reines. epist.* 29. *ad Joannem Vorstium pag.* 61.

(e) *It is dated from* Altemburg *the* 10th *of* October, 1638.

(f) *See* Reinesius's *Letters, ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum pag.* 1.

(g) *Ibid. pag.* 6.

(h) *Ibid.*

(i) *Ibid. pag.* 7.

(k) *He means by* Curiensia *his being Physician to the Town of* Hoff *(in* Latin Curia*) in* Voightland; *and by* Gerana *the like Employment at* Gera, *a Town in the same Country, which belongs to the Lords of* Plaven, *whose Family-Name is* Reussen, *in* Latin Rutheni.

it was at first a Quarrel about some Points of Literature, * which turn'd afterwards into a Law-Suit. I can't tell whether *Reinesius* left any Children behind him; but I know that in 1658, he complain'd that he had lost his first Wife, and all the Children he had by her; and that his second Wife, whom he had been married three Years, was barren †. This was the greatest, but not the only Inconveniency of his second Marriage. He had a share in the Liberality of *Lewis* XIV. to the most famous learned Men in *Europe*. The Sum that was sent him, was attended with a very obliging Letter of Mr. *Colbert*, for which he express'd his Acknowledgment by dedicating to him his Observations on the Fragment of *Petronius*, in the Year 1666. They, who can judge of a Point of Literature, have no sooner read some Pages of his Writings, but they place him above those Philologers, who have only a good Memory, and reckon him among those Criticks, who go beyond their reading, and know more things than Books have taught them. The Penetration of their Wit makes 'em draw Consequences, and affords them Conjectures, which lead them to the discovery of hidden Treasures. By that Means they clear the darkest parts of Erudition, and extend the Bounds of the Knowledge of Antiquity. *Reinesius* was one of those Criticks, and made it his chief Business to find out what others had not said. If his Supplements to *Vossius*'s Treatise *de Historicis Græcis* are ever printed, the Reader will wonder how *Vossius*, who made so fine and so large a Collection, could omit so many things. It appears from *Reinesius*'s printed Letters, that he was consulted like an Oracle; and that he answer'd very learnedly the Questions that were proposed to him, and that he was very well vers'd in the Knowledge of the ancient Families of *Rome*, and in the Study of Inscriptions. There is a very fine Elogy upon his Merit, and his learned and political Works in the Epistle § Dedicatory of the second Edition of *Casaubon*'s Letters. Some Divines have laid to his Charge, that he had a particular Religion *(C)* made up of such things as seem'd to him best in other Religions. I shall set down *(D)* the Titles of most of his Works.

* *See the Remark B.*

† *See the same Remark.*

§ *Written by Mr Grevius, and dated from Amsterdam the 31st of August, 1667. It is quoted in* Moreri's *Dictionary, and nothing else is quoted in it, tho' it does scarce mention any of the things related in the Article of* Reinesius.

REMON

he should have besought *Jupiter* to bestow upon him; for it is much more easy to get Riches and Honours by one's Industry, than a quiet and contented Mind. If it be said, that Riches and Honours depend upon a thousand things which we cannot dispose of at Pleasure, and that therefore it is necessary to pray God that he would turn them to our Advantage; I answer, that the Silence of Passions, and the Tranquillity of the Mind depend upon a thousand things, which are not under our Jurisdiction. The Stomach, the Spleen, the Lymphatick Vessels, the Fibres of the Brain, and a hundred other Organs, whose Seat and Figure are hitherto unknown to the Anatomists, produce in us many Uneasinesses, Jealousies and Vexations. Can we alter those Organs? Are they in our Power (a)?

(C) *Have laid to his Charge that he had a particular Religion.*] A Divine of *Wirtemberg*, whom I have quoted above, affirms that *Reinesius*, who went to the Lutheran Churches, and communicated with the Lutherans, spoke so ill of their Divines, and of their Doctrine, and Liturgies, that he was worse than a profess'd Adversary. From whence he concludes, either that he was of the Religion of prudent Men, or that he favour'd it; for he openly declared that he followed a certain Religion in certain Points, and another Religion in other Points. (b) *Tam sinistrè sensit, tam scabiosè locutus est, de Doctoribus & Professoribus harum* (Lutheranarum) *partium, imò de ipsa doctrina, de symbolicis libris, de dogmatibus in iisdem contentis, ut vix quisquam ex manifestis adversariis taliter fecerit. Probari hæc possunt ex Epistolis, quas an. 1654. vel circiter, Coloniæ Brandenburgicæ publicavit, ubi contemptim* Formularios *vocat Theologos* F. C. *amplexos;* D. *Majorem Seniorem*, Grandionem, *qui applausores nullos in N. habeat; alios nominat* Archiperecidas. *& ita conseq. Religioni Prudentum procul ambiguo addictus erat Sycophanta, vel eidem certè favebat, apertè fassus, hoc se in una Religione, aliud in alia sequi.* That Divine had explain'd in another Place what he meant by the Religion of prudent Men. Here is the Substance of his Discourse. (c) A *Dutch* Man said one Day, that the Religion of *Grotius* was that of Learned Men. Being ask'd what Religion it was; he answer'd, they believe what they please. *Hulseman* (d) ask'd, whether *Grotius* meant that one ought to follow the Opinions of prudent Men, and he believes this is the Religion of prudent Men, which is known but to few Persons, and very much boasted of in *France*, and particularly in *Holland*. Hereupon (e) *Mullerus* a Divine of *Hamburg*, and (f) *Kromaier*, a Divine of *Leipsick*, held it for a certain thing that *Grotius* had follow'd the Religion of prudent Men, which is a mixture of many Religions, and is made up of several Doctrines suited to one's Taste and Interest. It is call'd the Religion of prudent Men, because the wise Men of this World pitch upon it with great Prudence, as they think, and keep it as long as they please; it is also call'd the Political and Philosophical Religion. It goes by the first of those two Names, because the Politicians make choice of it; for they are Men who will be free in that Point, and who turn themselves all manner of ways. It is styl'd Philosophical, because it frees a Man from the Obligation of believing; and 'tis well known that a Philosopher submits to no Human Authority, and will not swear to the Words of any Master. *Liber homo Philosophus nullius addictus jurare in verba Magistri.* The Author mentions two other Epithets; he says, (g) that this Religion of prudent Man is call'd *Eclectick*, or *Eclogistick*. I wonder he said nothing of the Sect of the *Eclectick* Philosophers founded by *Potamon* of *Alexandria*, who lived in the time of *Augustus*. Those Men were neither Platonists, nor Stoicks, nor Peripateticks, nor of any other particular Sect; but they took out of every one of 'em what they lik'd best, and left the rest. Such is the notion of the Religion ascrib'd to *Reinesius*. It was a Religion of choice, a Mosaic Work, a Work made up of in-laid Pieces. There are more People than is commonly believ'd, who form such a Religion to themselves, and do not boast of it. They might be call'd in *Latin* (h) *Miscelliones*.

(D) *The Titles of most of his Books.*] Here are some concerning Physick: *De vasis umbilicalibus eorumque ruptura observatio singularis*, at Leipsick, 1624. in 4to. *Chimiatria, hoc est Medicina nobili & necessaria sui parte, Chimiâ, instructa & exornata*, at *Gera* in *Voigtland*, 1624. in 4to. The following Books concern Literature: *De Deo Endovellico*, Altemburg, 1637. Ἱστορούμενα *linguæ Punicæ contra Vitum Wolfrum*, Altemburg, 1637. *Variarum lectionum libri tres*, ibid. 1640. in 4to. *Defensio variarum lectionum*, Rostoch, 1653. in 4to. *Epistolæ ad Casparum Hoffmannum, & Christ. Ad. Rupertum*, Leipsick, 1660. in 4to. They have printed, after his Death, *Epistolæ ad Johannem Vorstium*, at *Coln* in *Brandenburg*, 1667. in 4to. *Epistolæ ad Nesteros patrem & filium*, Leipsick, 1670. in 4to. *Epistolæ ad Christianum Daumium*, Jëna, 1670. in 4to. *Epistolæ ad Jo. Andream Bosium*, Jëna, 1700, in 12mo. *Syntagma inscriptionum antiquarum cumprimis Romæ Veteris quarum omissa est recensio in vasto Jani Gruteri opere, cujus istihoc dici possit supplementum, cum commentariis absolutissimis* (i), Leipsick, 1682. in folio. *Dissertatio Critica de Sibyllis Oraculis* (k), Jëna 1685. in 4to. I can say nothing about some other Books which Mr. *Konig* ascribes to him. I am afraid he confounds together those that have been Printed, and those that have not been Publish'd. He ascribes to him *glossarium vocum barbaricarum: censuram nonnullorum in Salmasii exercitationibus Plinianis, Commentarium in Inscriptiones Gruteri. Variarum Lectionum libros sex.* Ἱστορούμενα *Medicinæ, vel successiones & vitas Medicorum*, and several other Works. *Moreri* pretends, that *Reinesius made himself known by his Six Books of* Variæ Lectiones, *that he has also written a Censure upon* Salmasius's Exercitationes *on* Pliny *or* Solinus, *and some Commentaries on* Gruterus's *Inscriptions* (l). I can't agree with him in this; for there are only three Books of *Variæ Lectiones* Printed; and I know nothing of *Reinesius*'s Book, Intituled, *Censura exercitationum Plinianarum Salmasii*. I don't find it

(g) *Andreas Carolus lib. 6. cap. 32. pag. 97.*

(h) Miscelliones appellantur qui non certæ sunt sententiæ, sed variorum mixtorumque judiciorum. *Festus Pompeius.*

(i) *See the* Acta Eruditorum, 1682. *pag.* 80. *& seq.*

(k) See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres* July, 1685. *art.* 5.

(l) *Confer the* Jugemens des Savans, *tom.* 3. *pag.* 461, 462.

REMOND * (FLORIMOND DE) Counsellor in the Parliament of *Bourdeaux*, towards the latter end of the XVIth Century, signalized himself by some violent **(A)** Books against the Protestants. He had been a *Huguenot* in his younger Days; but if we may believe him, he was rescued † *from the Mouth of Heresy* by a Miracle, of which he was an Eye-witness in the Year 1566. *Moreri*, who mentions it, knew not the Place where that Comedy was acted: He says § that a Woman, call'd *Nicole Obri*, a Native of *Vervins*, was exorcized at *Laudun*. He is mistaken, it was at *Laon*: I have said in another place ‖ that Father *Labbe* has committed the same Fault. There is some Reason to believe that *Florimond de Remond* studied under *Peter Ramus*, in the College *de Prele* at *Paris*: Which I observe only to have an Opportunity to mention what he says **(B)** concerning the Book intitled *de tribus Impostoribus*. *Boterenius* ‡ places his Death in the Year 1602, and *Moreri* in the Year 1600. Some will have it that he is not the Author of the Books **(C)** that are ascribed to him.

mention'd in the Prefaces to his Posthumous Works. I don't question but that he was well qualified to write such a Book, and to cut out as much work for *Salmasius*, as for *Barthius*; but I don't know whether he had such a design, and if he had, I dare say the performance of it has not been made publick. The Inscriptions commented upon by *Reinesius* are different from those of *Gruterus*. Lastly, *Moreri* says nothing of many Books that have been publish'd. If his Article of *Reinesius* was corrected, there would remain but two or three Words of his.

I must desire the Readers to take notice that the Booksellers have prefix'd *Reinesius's* Name to a Book, of which he did not write one Line. Mr. *Witte* mentions this, lest *Reinesius* should be look'd upon as a Plagiary: (a) *Exiit quoque Lipsiæ an. 1679. sub ejus nomine*, Schola Jure-Consultorum Medica, Relationum libris aliquot comprehensa, quibus principia Medicinæ in jus transsumta ex professo examinantur. *Verum autem Author & titulus iste est*; *Fortunati Fidelis de Relationibus Medicorum libri IV. in quibus ea omnia, quæ in forensibus ac publicis causis Medici referre solent, plenissimè traduntur, studio D. Pauli Ammanni, Lipsiæ 1674. Hoc indicare volui, ne Vir Cl. præter meritum Plagiariis adscribatur.* Mr. *Witte* has forgot a material Circumstance, viz. that the Book intituled *Fortunati fidelis, &c.* was printed (b) at *Palermo* in the Year 1602. in 4to. That Edition is quoted in *Lindenius Renovatus*, *pag.* 275. under the Name of *Fortunatus Fidelis*; but the Author did not know that the *Schola Jurisconsultorum, &c.* printed at *Leipsick* in the Year 1679. is the same with that of *Fortunatus Fidelis*, for he ascribes it to *Reinesius*, *pag.* 1023. I fancy the *Leipsick* Edition, 1674. differs only from that of 1679. as to the Title; and that *Reinesius's* Name was put to it, to make it sell the better.

(A) *By some violent Books against the Protestants.*] He publish'd a Book, Intituled, *Erreur populaire de la papesse Jeanne*. I have the *Bourdeaux* Edition 1594. the Author puts his Name to it, which shews that 'tis not the first; for the first came out without his Name. *As it was never my Design*, they are *Florimond de Remond's* (c) Words, *to get some Reputation by those inconsiderable productions of my Brain, (it were to pretend to build a solid Glory upon a sandy Foundation) so I have endeavour'd to avoid Shame. Which moved me to suppress my Name, because it could not keep a rank among so many learned Men, wherewith* France *abounds. But since that Author has put a quite contrary Interpretation upon the laudable fear that restrain'd me, I have been willing to open the Curtain, and appear in Publick; and yet I will out of kindness for him suppress his Name, since he has so weakly answer'd my Arguments.* This he says, concerning a (d) Minister of *Bearn*, what had writ something against the Anonymous Book of the Popular Error about Pope *Joan*: which was the Reason why the Author publish'd a second Edition of it well revis'd, and *undertook a longer and more serious Work*; it was that concerning *Antichrist*. *Vignier* says (e) that he made use of the second Edition of the *Antichrist*, and of the *Antipope Joan*, *revis'd, corrected, and enlarged by the Author, and Printed at* Paris *by* Abel l'Angelier. 1599. He is mistaken as to the *Antipope Joan*; for the *Paris* Edition 1599. was at least the third. *Cooke* is still more mistaken, for he says (f) that Book was first written in *French* in the Year 1602. *Sagittarius* (g) mentions only the *French* Edition of *Bourdeaux* of the same Year. The third Book of *Remond* did not come out 'till after his Death; it is Intituled, *The History of the Birth, Progress and Decay of Heresy in this Age, divided into eight Books.* The sixth Book was to contain an account of the Schism of *England*; they found only the Title of it among the Papers of the Author: He compos'd first (h) *the seventh and the eighth, which were more necessary, because they contain'd the History of what had happen'd in* France. *Francis de Remond*, his Son, who took care to get that Work Printed, and Dedicated it to *Paul* V. supplied (i) the sixth Book. *Sagittarius* observes, (k) that *Florimond de Remond*, or rather the Jesuit *Richeome*, writ the History of the Birth, Progress and Decay of Heresy in three Volumes; he quotes the *French* Edition of *Paris* 1605. and that of 1624. This Account is not exact, for the Edition of 1605. contains only one Volume, and 'tis the only one that was written by *Remond*; the other two were compos'd by *Claudius Malingre*, Historiographer of *France*, and Printed at *Paris* in 1624. That Work of *Remond*, and *Malingre's* Continuation, have been (l) Reprinted several times, sometimes in *French*, and sometimes in *Latin*. The two other Works of *Remond* have been likewise Translated into *Latin*. Note, that he publish'd at *Bourdeaux* in 1594. the *French* Translation he had made of *Tertullian's* Treatise *de Corona militis*, and of the same Father's Discourse *ad Martyres*. Note also, that *Baronius*, some other Writers of the same Party, do very much and commend his Books of Controversy.

(B) *What he says concerning the Book Intituled* de tribus Impostoribus.] " (m) Have we not seen a detestable Book forg'd in *Germany*, tho' Printed in another " Country, at the very same time that Heresy acted its " part, which sowed this Doctrine with this horrid Title, *Of the three Impostors*, &c. ridiculing the three " prevailing Religions, which alone acknowledge the " true God, viz. the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mahometan. That Title was sufficient to shew, that it " was a production of Hell; and that the Age which " brought forth such a Monster, was a very wicked one. " I would not have mention'd it, if *Hosius* and *Genebrard* had not spoken of it before me. I remember, " that when I was a young Boy, I saw a Copy of it in " the College *de Prele* in *Ramus's* Hands, who was an " eminent Man for his Learning, and who confounded " himself with his Inquiries into the Mysteries of Religion, which he coupled with Philosophy. That " wicked Book was handed about among the most " Learned, who were desirous to see it". They are *Remond's* Words. If he had known, that that wicked Book was talk'd of under the Empire of *Frederick* II. (n) would he have been so bold as to ascribe the production of such a Monster to the XVIth Century? Perhaps he would, for his only design was to render Lutheranism odious *per fas & nefas*. Most People father (o) the pretended Book *de tribus Impostoribus* upon *Aretin*; they put it therefore upon *Italy*, and not upon *Germany*.

(C) *Some will have it, that he is not the Author of the Books that are ascrib'd to him.*] Mr. *Sagittarius* supplies me with two Passages in a Book Printed in 1694. *Florimundus Ramundus, Vasco, senator parliamenti Burdegalensis, sub cujus nomine Ludovicus Richeomus, Jesuitici Sodalitii Theologus, Gallice scripsit* Errorem popularem de Johanna Pseudo-pontifice, dicta Papissa, *Latine postea versum* (p). This, he says, pag. 683. Let us see what he says, pag. 820. *Florimundus Ramundus*, sive potius cujus stylo usus est, *Ludovicus Richeomius* Soc. J. qui *de ortu, progressu & interitu hæreticorum hujus temporis* Tomis III. commentatus est. I proceed to a Book Printed in 1687. (q) " But upon the whole matter it " is first very much doubted, whether he was at all the " Author of those Books that passed under his Name. " For many have said, that F. *Richeome*, a Jesuit, writ " them, and borrow'd the Name of a Councellor of " Parliament, to give his Work the more Credit. Perhaps it was thought necessary to set a Writer of some " Name in opposition to Mr. *de Thou*, whose History " was writ with too much Sincerity to be acceptable " to that Order. *Peter Matthieu* in his History says " positively, that it was believ'd that F. *Richeome* was " the Author of the Books that went under the Name " of *Florimond de Raimond*. *Vignier* in his *Theater of Antichrist*, and *Rivet* in his Answer to the Jesuit, say " the same thing; and these were the Men that writ " soon after *Florimond's* Book appear'd. *Blondel* was

" also

* *Florimond de Remond.*

† *De l'origine & progrès de l'heresie*, Book [illegible], pag. 902.

§ Moreri at the word Florimond de Raymond.

‖ In the Article Laudun, Remark C.

‡ Rodolph. Boterenius, comment. de rebus in Gallia gestis lib. [illegible] pag. 91.

(a) *Witte in Diario biographico ad ann.* 1667. fol. Yyy 3.

(b) I have been inform'd of this by a Letter of Mr. Bourdelot, first Physician to the Dutchess of Burgundy.

(c) Page 303. of his *Erreur populaire*, edit. of Bourdeaux 1594.

(d) He denotes him only by these two Letters R. T.

(e) Vignier, theatre de l'Antechrist in the Table of the Authors.

(f) Cooke, dialogue de la Papesse Jeanne, pag. 2. I make use of the French Translation made by John de la Montagne.

(g) Sagittar. introduct. in hist. Eccles. pag. 683.

(h) See the Preface to the Histoire de la naissance, &c. de l'heresie.

(i) I was forced to work hard, and to write in haste, that I might publish it as soon as ever I could. Ibid.

(k) Sagittar. ibid. pag. 820.

(l) [illegible]

(m) Flor. de Remond, de la naissance de l'Heresie, Book 2. ch. 16. pag. 236.

(n) See the Article Aretin (Remark [illegible].)

(o) Ibid.

(p) Sagittarius ubi supra pag. 683.

(q) Barnes, a Defence of the Reflections on Varillas, p. 26.

him, whereof the moſt conſiderable is *the Hiſtory of the Birth, Progreſs and Declenſion of the Hereſy of this Age.* He was the unfitteſt Man in the World to ſucceed in ſuch an (D) Undertaking.

“ alſo of the ſame Mind.” *Theſe are the Words of a Doctor, who is now an Illuſtrious Prelate in England.* It is certain, that theſe following Words are to be found in a Work of Vignier: (a) *Matthieu the King's Hiſtoriographer ſays in his Hiſtory of the King, that he does not think that the Book concerning Antichriſt was written by the ſaid* Remond, *but by the Jeſuit* Richeome. It is no leſs certain, that *Rivet* having mention'd what *Florimond de Remond* acknowledges to *Calvin's* Honour in his Hiſtory of the Birth of Hereſy, adds this: (b) *I have been willing to ſet down here the Words of an Enemy, and perhaps of the Jeſuit* Richeome, *to whom* Peter Matthieu *aſcribes* Remond's *Antichriſt*. I have found the Paſſage of *Peter Matthieu*; here it is: “ (c) The Aſſembly began with declaring that the Biſhop of *Rome* “ was the Antichriſt, foretold in the Word of God. “ 'Tis a long time ſince the Miniſters have taught this “ Doctrine in their Writings, and in their Sermons, and “ the Catholicks have taught the contrary. *Florimond* “ *de Remond*, or, as I think, *Richeome* a Jeſuit under “ that Name, has more inlarg'd upon that Subject than “ any body elſe, and collected by way of *Antitheſis* “ whatever belongs to the true Antichriſt, and to the “ pretended one”. I leave it to the Readers to judge whether this is a ſufficient ground to lay down as a certain matter of Fact, that all the controverſial Books that have been publiſh'd under the Name of *Florimond de Remond* had been written by *Richeome*. But here's another Teſtimony of one of the Authors, who confuted Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm. *I cannot give any credit*, ſays he (d), *to* Florimond de Remond, *having been told by a Counſellor of the Parliament of* Bourdeaux, *call'd* Lewis le Maſſip, (*an honeſt Man, with whom I have been intimately acquainted, having lodged at his Houſe at* Bourdeaux *in 1650, where I attended the Court, and having kept Correſpondence with him for ſome Years by way of Letters*) *that it was a conſtant Tradition in that Country, that* Remond, *who was a Member of their Parliament, had had three conſiderable Advantages*: 1. To grow old without being gray-hair'd: 2. To build without Mony: 3 To write without Learning; becauſe the Jeſuits ſupplied him with whatever is to be found in his Hiſtory of the beginning and declenſion of Hereſy.

(D) *He was the unfitteſt Man in the World to ſucceed in ſuch an Undertaking.*] Hiſtory, generally ſpeaking, is the moſt difficult compoſure that an Author can undertake, or one of the moſt difficult. It requires a great Judgment, a noble, clear and conciſe Style, a good Conſcience, a perfect Probity, many excellent Materials, and the Art of placing them in a good Order, and above all things the power of reſiſting the inſtinct of a Religious Zeal, which prompts one to cry down what he thinks to be falſe, and to adorn and imbelliſh what he thinks to be true. From this ſhort and exact Deſcription of the Talents, that make up the Character of a good Hiſtorian, one may eaſily perceive, that *Florimond de Remond* could not ſucceed in his deſign of Writing the Hiſtory of the beginning and progreſs of Lutheraniſm and Calviniſm. It was a great Subject, one of the greateſt Revolutions that have been ſeen in Chriſtianity. Reaſons of State had crept into it, and were combin'd with the Intereſts of Religion; which made up a mixture that increas'd the Hiſtorian's Labour, and requir'd great Application, and a Mind wholly free from Prejudices. I don't examin whether our *Remond* had Learning, Judgment, and Wit enough, and a good Style to treat well ſo important a Subject, and I am willing to ſuppoſe, that in that Reſpect he was far leſs contemptible than he is repreſented to be by his Adverſaries, but had he had no other Faults than thoſe, which his Zeal for the Catholick Religion, and his hatred againſt the Proteſtants produced in him, he ſhould have acknowledg'd that he undertook a thing that was above him. He ſtumbled in his Preliminaries; he did like thoſe who go about to build a Houſe, (e) before they caſt up the Expence they muſt be at, to know whether they are able to ſpend ſo much. He neglected the Precept which the moſt skilful Maſters have ſo wiſely recommended, to wit, to pitch upon a Subject adapted to one's Capacity, and to make a long trial of one's Ability:

> *Sumite* (f) *materiam veſtris, qui ſcribitis, æquam*
> *Viribus, & verſate diu, quid ferre recuſent,*
> *Quid valeant humeri.*

The chief thing he ſhould have done, was to examin his Conſcience, but in all probability 'twas what he neglected moſt; He did not think of ſounding his Heart, and asking himſelf very ſeriouſly, can I publiſh ſuch Truths as are diſadvantageous to the Catholicks, and advantageous to the Huguenots? *They hate me, and I hate them; they have abus'd me, and I have abus'd them. I have publiſh'd ſome Controverſial Books, which they have refuted, and I have replied; can I be ſure that I ſhall not be overcome in the leaſt by Paſſion, Zeal and Reſentment, and that I ſhall never tell a Lie in favour of my Cauſe?* They, who have read his Hiſtory with ſome attention, may ſay without any Raſhneſs, that he did not conſult himſelf about thoſe things, or that he did not follow the dictates of his Conſcience. He repreſents the Proteſtants as guilty of all ſorts of Injuſtices, and the Catholicks as very wiſe and innocent Men; and he ſeldom relates any thing without uſing injurious Epithets, and outrageous Words againſt the Hereticks. His Quotations ſignify but little; for he alledges either Men of his Party, and who, moſt of 'em, had ſome Diſputes with the Miniſters, or ſome Proteſtants, as he found them quoted in the Writings of thoſe Men. Such an Hiſtorian muſt neceſſarily be a Slave to Pious Frauds, or deluded by himſelf, and conſequently the unfitteſt Man in the World to write the Hiſtory of the beginning and growth of the Proteſtant Religion, and the fitteſt to tranſgreſs againſt the two (g) great Laws of his Profeſſion; for there are ſome Falſities he does not ſcruple to publiſh, and there are ſome Truths he dares not publiſh. An Hiſtorian, who deſigns to write ſuch a Hiſtory, ſhould be told, as *Phaeton* was,

> *Magna* (h) *petis, Phaëton, & quæ non viribus iſtis*
> *Munera conveniunt, nec tam puerilibus annis.*

I know ſome Perſons, who could wiſh we had ſome Hiſtories of that important Revolution written neither by a Roman Catholick, nor by a Proteſtant. They fancy that Intereſt, Zeal and Hatred ingage a Writer to exaggerate, or to ſuppreſs, to extenuate, or to diſguiſe things according as they may ſerve, or prejudice the Honour of his Party. They wiſh therefore, that *Thucydides*, or *Livy*, might have given us the Hiſtory of the Events, which *Florimond de Remond* promiſes us in the Title of his Work. They wiſh thoſe Illuſtrious Authors might have done it, not ſo much by reaſon of their Eloquence and great Judgment, as becauſe they were Heathens, and might have been Neuters between the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtianity; ſo that they would have related without any Prejudice and Impartiality, what was to be praiſed or blamed in the Conduct of the Papiſts, Lutherans and Calviniſts. But I don't know whether they might have kept an exact Neutrality; for Popery being more agreeable to Paganiſm than the Proteſtant Religion, they might have been prepoſſeſs'd againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*. An Hiſtorian can never ſtand too much upon his guard; and 'tis almoſt impoſſible for him to be altogether free from Prejudices. There are ſome Forms of Government, and ſome Moral and Political Maxims, which he likes or diſlikes. This moves him to favour one Party rather than another, even when he writes the Hiſtory of an Ancient Nation, or of a remote Country. Suppoſe a Man writes in our Days the Hiſtory of an *Indian* King, who died two or three hundred Years ago, after he had been dethron'd, you'll be apt to believe that no Intereſt can hinder him from being a ſincere Writer; and yet if he is an Enemy to Monarchy, and approves the Rebellion of Subjects, he'll uſe a thouſand ſhifts and diſguiſes to render the Memory of that Monarch odious, and to juſtify the Civil Wars which pull'd him down from the Throne. An Hiſtorian, who is an Enemy to Rebellion, would take a quite contrary courſe. Which is the reaſon why there are ſo few Hiſtories wherein the naked Truth appears, and that are free from ſome Marks of the Hiſtorian's Anger or Diſcontent, or from his Satyrical Strokes againſt ſome living Perſons. He meets with them in his way, whilſt he writes the Hiſtory of the *Indies*. All Readers cannot gueſs whom he means; but ſome gueſs at it, and he knows very well that ſome will. You may judge whether we can truſt the Modern Hiſtorians, ſince *Livy* himſelf could not be altogether impartial between the Proteſtants and the Catholicks, by reaſon of a certain general Conformity. The beſt Advice that could have been given to *Florimond de Remond*, had been

Qualifications requiſite for a good Hiſtorian.

(a) [illegible] Vignier, [illegible]

(b) Rivet, [illegible]

(c) Matthieu [illegible] Henry IV. [illegible]

(d) John Bapt. de Rocoles, [illegible] Calviniſme pag. 285.

(e) See St. Luke's Goſpel chap. 14 v. 28.

(f) Horat. de arte Poet. v. 38.

(g) Quis neſcit primam eſſe hiſtoriæ legem, ne quid falſi dicere audeat, deinde ne quid veri non audeat, ne qua ſuſpicio gratiæ ſit in ſcribendo, ne qua ſimultatis? *Cicero de orat. lib. 2. fol. m. 74. A.*

(h) *Ovidius Metam. lib. 2. v. 54.*

dertaking, conſidering the Hatred he had conceived againſt the Party wherein he had been brought up, which a Miracle, as he pretended, had obliged him to forſake. But that Hiſtory, tho' never ſo bad, has been quoted by a great many other Writers, and 'tis a ſurpriſing thing to find in many Books ſeveral Matters of Fact very conſiderable and of great Conſequence, for which the Reader is referr'd not to any Authentick Pieces, but to *Remond's* Teſtimony. Some ſay he did very ill diſcharge the Duties *(E)* of his Office in the Parliament of *Bourdeaux.* The Proteſtants taxed him * with a very great partiality againſt them. *Varillas* was a little mortified *(F)* when he was oblig'd to confeſs he had tranſcribed that Author.

* *See the Remark E.*

R E-

to tell him that he ſhould continue to write Controverſial Books, wherein an Author may be allow'd to appear Paſſionate; and not to ſet up for an Hiſtorian, it being an Employment that does not agree with a zealous Catholick, and which he ſhould have left to lukewarm and indifferent Men. I am likewiſe of Opinion, that a zealous Huguenot ſhould be adviſ'd not to write the Hiſtory of Calviniſm, or Lutheraniſm, or that of the Edict of *Nantes*, or any ſuch like. They ſhou'd tell him, You are exaſperated, you have conceiv'd a great hatred againſt the Perſecutors, you are full of an ardent Zeal for your Cauſe, you would give us not a Hiſtory, but a piece like an Advocate's Plea; you would only blame the contrary Party, and praiſe or juſtify yours; this you could not do without omitting ſeveral things, and publiſhing many Falſities. Write therefore ſome other Book, if you deſign to do ſomething that way for the publick good.

But here is a new Reaſon why ſo few Men can write a good Hiſtory. They who are able to overcome all Prejudices, could not appear altogether impartial without expoſing themſelves to the Indignation of the People; (the word *People* has a large Extent, and takes in a great many Perſons that are Graduate and have Titles of Honour) they would be look'd upon as falſe Brethren, Prevaricators, and perfidious Men. Was not *la Popelinere* like to be cruſh'd to pieces, for having related ſome things in his Hiſtory of the Troubles under *Charles* IX. otherwiſe than he ſhould have done in the Opinion of many? I ſhall ſpeak of it in his Article in the Supplement to this Dictionary. Several People could wiſh that an Hiſtorian of their Party would imitate thoſe that play at Picket, who keep only good Cards, and lay out the bad ones.

Why I ſaid that Probity ought to be an Ingredient of the Character of an Hiſtorian.

Perhaps ſome will wonder that I ſhould aſſert that an upright Conſcience, and a perfect Probity, are neceſſary to an Hiſtorian, and it will be ſaid that an ingenious Man may write a good Hiſtory as well as a good Speech, and a good Tragedy, without thoſe Qualifications; I ſhall therefore prove my Aſſertion: In order to it, I obſerve that Truth being the Soul of Hiſtory, it is an eſſential thing for an hiſtorical Compoſition to be free from Lies; ſo that though it ſhould have all other Perfections, it will not be a Hiſtory, but a meer Fable and Romance, if it wants Truth. It is not ſo with a Poetical or Rhetorical Piece. From whence I conclude, that none can be well qualified to write a good Hiſtory, unleſs he be ſuch an Enemy to Lying, that his Conſcience does not permit him to tell Lies even to the Advantage of his Religion, and deareſt Friends, nor to the Diſadvantage of an impious Sect, and of his moſt implacable Perſecutors. I underſtand by Lying, not only the Invention of a falſe Thing, but alſo the Suppreſſion or Addition of certain Circumſtances, that may ſerve to juſtifie others, or to lay ſomething to their Charge. Thoſe, who have not ſuch an upright Conſcience, and ſuch a Probity, will be guilty of a Fraud in writing Hiſtories, ſometimes to pleaſe thoſe from whom they expect good Offices, and ſometimes for fear of diſobliging ſome Perſons, who might hinder 'em from obtaining Penſions. What has been ſaid of the Orator, is ſtill more neceſſary to an Hiſtorian: He ought to be defined, *Vir bonus narrandi peritus, an honeſt Man, who knows how to relate things.* And yet you ſhall ſeldom ſee any Body inquire, whether the Author of an Hiſtory is a good Man. The uſual Queſtion is, Whether he be a Man of Wit and Judgment? Whether he has a fine Style? Whether he pleaſes the Reader? And according as the Anſwer is, People will either buy his Book or not buy it. They ſhould at leaſt imitate thoſe, who in their Enquiries about the Character of Witneſſes, begun with their Riches, and (a) ended with their Honeſty.

Protinus (b) ad cenſum, de moribus ultima fiet
Quæſtio: quot paſcit ſervos, quot poſſidet agri
Jugera, quam multa magnaque paropſide cœnat?

They ſhould at laſt inquire whether the Author is an honeſt Man. *Mr.* *** begins with ſuch a Queſtion, when they ſhew him in a Bookſeller's Shop the Relation of a Voyage, the Memoirs of ſuch a one, *&c.* Here's a Book, ſay they to him, very well written, very curious, and that ſells well. But, ſays he, do you know the Author of it? Is he a vain and ambitious Man? Does he love Pleaſure? Could he appear in a good Dreſs, without getting three or four hundred Crowns from the Bookſeller that he made uſe of? I ſhould be glad to know that before all things; for the Writer of a Relation, if he be a vain Man, and deſigns to be well paid for his Copy, will not ſcruple to ſtuffer into it all the Lies that may pleaſe the Reader, and ſet off the Author.

(E) That he diſcharged very ill the Duties *of his Office.*] Conſult Dr. *Burnet* in his *Defence of the Reflections on Varillas*, where you will find theſe words: *(c)* Florimond de Remond *was as little eſteem'd in the Quality of a Judge, as he deſerves to be for his Writings; for the Character that was given of him, was no leſs ſevere than pleaſant:* Judicat ſine conſcientia, libros ſcribit ſine ſcientia, & ædificat ſine pecunia: *He judges without Conſcience, he writes* Books *without Knowledge, and builds without Mony.* If you read the laſt Pages of the *French* Edition, you'll find an Extract of a Letter with a Preamble, that deſerve to be tranſcribed. Here they are: *(d) So many Complaints were made about his Malignity and Injuſtice towards the Proteſtants, in his Life-time, that no Credit can be given to his Teſtimony againſt 'em. 'Tis an eaſie thing for an unjuſt Judge to become a paſſionate Hiſtorian; nay, one muſt be more hard-hearted to commit an injuſtice as a Judge, than to write a Falſhood as an Hiſtorian. But here is the Extract I have mention'd.* "*There is a Book* "*intituled,* Plaintes des Egliſes Réformées au Roi, ſur "pluſieurs injuſtices qui leur ſont faites. *It was printed* "*in* 1597, *without the Author's Name. They complain,* "*among others, of* Florimond de Raymond, *who, during* "*the Troubles of* 1572, *having been taken in a Journey* "*by a Party of the Proteſtants, who made him pay a* "*Ranſom of* 1000 *Livres, never loſt any occaſion to get* "*himſelf reimburſed, and had that Sum paid him ten or* "*twelve times, as he himſelf boaſted of it. Afterwards,* "*being appointed to report the Caſe of a Proteſtant Widow, whoſe Husband has been kill'd in cold Blood by a* "*Roman Catholick, he helped him to make his Eſcape, ſo* "*that the Murtherer remain'd unpuniſh'd. We find alſo* "*at the latter end of the ſame Book, that a Proteſtant* "*Maid having been buried in the Churchyard of the Catholicks at* Bourdeaux, *there came out a Decree, at Re-* "mond's *Sollicitation, by which it was order'd, that the* "*Body of that Maid ſhould be taken up, and denied Burial, together with all the Bodies of the Proteſtants that* "*had been buried there for the ſpace of ten Years* †."

(F) Mr. Varillas *was a little mortified, when he was obliged to confeſs that he had tranſcribed that Author.*] Dr. *Burnet (e)* criticis'd him for having denied that the Marriage of the *(f)* Prince of *Wales* with the Infanta of *Spain* had been conſummated, and repreſented to him, that *he had writ a little more artificially, if he had ſet over againſt this, on the Margent, ſome Citations of a Letter, or Recital, which would have coſt him nothing, and have been full as true as his other Citations are.* His Anſwer contains this among other things, *(g)* that *ſuppoſing he had poſitively affirm'd that* that Marriage *was not conſummated*, it would not be a Fiction of his own, and that *he could alledge a good Authority for it,* meaning *Florimond de Remond.* He declares, that conſidering how partially the *Engliſh, German, Italian,* and *Spaniſh* Writers had writ about the Schiſm of *Henry* VIII. he had *been (h) obliged to pitch upon a* French *Author, and that he caſt his Eyes upon* Florimond de Raimond. *He was Counſellor in the Parliament of* Bourdeaux; *he had a Wife and Children; he had no particular Reaſon to alter the Truth: The Calviniſts were in his time in the heighth of their Power; he had no occaſion to be diſpleaſed with them; and he ſpent ſo much time upon his Hiſtory of the Birth, Progreſs, and Declenſion of Hereſie, that he died before it was*

made

(a) *It is commonly ſaid, to denote a covetous Age, that a Father, who deſigns to marry his Son, inquires firſt whether ſuch a Maid is rich, whether ſhe is handſome, and at laſt whether ſhe is honeſt.*

(b) *Juven. ſat.* 3. *v.* 140.

RESENIUS (PETER) *Counſellor and Profeſſor at Copenhagen*, was born there the 17th of *June*, 1625. His Father, and his two Grand-fathers had been Biſhops of *Sealand*. He was made Sub-principal of the College of *Copenhagen* in 1646; and having reſigned that Employment the Year following, he travell'd into foreign Countries. He ſtudied Philological Learning and the Civil Law, for the ſpace of four Years, in the Univerſity of *Leyden*, and then he went into *France*, *Spain* and *Italy*. He was a whole Year at *Padua*, where he applied himſelf chiefly to the Study of the Civil Law. He was elected Counſellor of the *Germanick* Nation there, and Vice-Syndic of the Univerſity, and in that quality he made a harangue in the Senate of *Venice*, and obtain'd a Privilege for that Univerſity. 'Twas only long of him that he was not made a Knight of *St. Mark*. He left *Padua* after he had taken his Degree of Doctor of Law the 11th of *September*, 1653. He return'd into *Denmark* by the way of *Germany*, and married the 8th of *July*, 1655. He was made Profeſſor of Moral Philoſophy, in the Univerſity of *Copenhagen* the 15th of *November*, 1657, and then Conſul of the ſame City, and Counſellor in the Supreme Council, and at laſt Preſident of *Copenhagen*, and Counſellor of Juſtice. He had a Grant of Nobility the 8th of *January*, 1680, and was made Counſellor of State the 6th of *May*, 1684. He had a very fine Library, which he beſtowed upon the Univerſity of *Copenhagen*: The Catalogue of it was printed * in 1685. He publiſh'd alſo (Z) many Books.

REVEREND-DE-BOUGY (JOHN) Marquis *de Bougy*, and Lieutenant-General in the *French* Armies, under the Reign of *Lewis* the XIVth, diſtinguiſh'd himſelf upon many Occaſions by his great Courage and Ability, and by a conſtant Adherence to the Service of his King, when ſo many others join'd with the Rebels in the † laſt Civil War. He was a Proteſtant, and of an β ancient and noble Family in the lower *Normandy*, and the γ youngeſt

* At Copenhagen in 4to.

† Taken from the Journal of his Life, written by himſelf and prefixed to the Catalogue of his Library.

β In 1649, and the following Years.

γ A Memorial imparted to the Author.

made publick. His Children took care to get it printed: it met with a very good reception; there have been ſeveral Editions of it, and ſince not one Proteſtant has undertaken to confute it within theſe fourſcore Years, no more than the Books concerning Antichriſt *and Pope Joan, written by the ſame Author; I had ſome reaſon to believe that if they did not approve of it, it was at leaſt indifferent to them.* Dr. *Burnet* did eaſily run down the Authority of ſuch a Voucher: He (a) ſhewed that *Florimond de Remond lived far from* England, *and from the knowledge of* Engliſh *Affairs*, and (b) that *a Man ſees in every period of his Hiſtory, ſo much of a malignant Spirit againſt the Reformation, that this gives a juſt Prejudice againſt all that he ſays* . . . . . . and beſides, that *that part of his Hiſtory, which relates to the Affairs of* England, *is not ſo much as pretended to be writ by him: For the contrary is expreſly intimated in the Preface, and his Son ſeems to claim the praiſe of that to himſelf.* Nay, *it is very much doubted whether he was at all the Author of thoſe Books that paſſed under his* Name; for many have aſcribed them to Father *Richeome*. He adds, (c) that *Florimond de Remond never paſs'd in* France *for an Author of any Note, either for Judgment or Sincerity*; and that he was accounted an unjuſt Judge. The Doctor goes on, and ſays, Mr. *Varillas, who, perhaps a Year ago, would have reſented it, as the greateſt Indignity that could have been done him, if it had been ſaid that he did nothing but copy ſuch an Author, and that he was only his Eccho, is now glad to fly to ſo poor a Shift; for which he is, as I hear, ſo much cenſured in* Paris, *that it is perhaps too great a Cruelty in me to urge this Matter too far.* He jeers him for having obſerved that *Remond* had a Wife and Children. *It is not eaſy*, ſays the Doctor *, *to find out the Force of this Argument: but a Man muſt riſe above the Vulgar, as much as Mr.* Varillas, *to comprehend his lofty Strains. If to have Wife and Children makes a Man a good Writer, one may conclude without any further Inquiry, that Mr.* Varillas *has neither. Here is alſo a new Argument for the Marriage of the Clergy, that has never been yet thought on; yet an ordinary Capacity cannot comprehend why this ſhould have made* Florimond de Remond *a good Writer, and why it had not the ſame Effect on Mr.* de Thou. At the end of the *French* Edition this Critick tells him † that the Proteſtants publiſh'd their Complaints againſt the furious Animoſity which *Remond* expreſs'd againſt them: This was ſufficient to prepoſſeſs him when he went about to write their Hiſtory; but beſides, he had not forgot that he had been their Priſoner, and ranſom'd by them. Is it not therefore a ſhameful thing for *Varillas* to maintain that he *had no occaſion to be diſpleaſed with them?* But if any Hiſtorian ſhould bluſh to alledge the only Authority of ſuch a Voucher as *Remond*, in giving an account of the Schiſm of *England*; it is a moſt ſhameful thing for *Varillas* to do ſo, ſince he ſet up for a Writer, well furniſh'd with rare, authentick, private, and unknown Manuſcripts.

I muſt obſerve that there is a Falſity in *Varillas*, that was not taken notice of. He pretends that the Books concerning *Antichriſt* and Pope *Joan*, written by *Florimond de Remond*, have not been refuted. If he had caſt his Eyes upon the Title Page of the (d) *Theatre de l'Antechriſt*, and upon *Alexander Cooke's* (e) Dialogue, he might have ſeen the contrary. I muſt alſo obſerve that the Reaſon he alledges, grounded upon his Hiſtorian being a married Man, is not a contemptible one; for it is more natural to believe that a Layman was free from Prejudices in writing the Hiſtory of the Enemies of his Church, than 'tis natural to expect ſuch a thing from a Clergy-man. And therefore *Varillas* might be perſuaded that *Florimond de Remond* was leſs to be ſuſpected than a Monk, or a Prieſt. I confeſs this Reaſon is as good for *Thuanus*; but ſince he writ nothing about *Henry* the VIII's Schiſm, how could *Varillas* make uſe of him? He might therefore have defended himſelf as to this Head.

(Z) *He publiſh'd alſo many Books.*] Here is the Liſt of 'em, (f) *Edda Snorronis Sturleſonii triplici linguâ Iſlandicâ & Latinâ: quarum Iſlandica primitiva eſt, reliqua autem interpretationes. Præfixa etiam prolegomena de triplici ratione docendi Ethicam: Item de Edda Scriptoribus, partibus & aliis ſimilibus. Impreſſum eſt hoc opus in quarta quam appellant forma, Anno M. DC. LXV. Edda Sæmundiana pars dicta* HAVAMAAL, *complexa Ethicam Odini: eſtque & Iſlandicè & Latinè impreſſa, in quarto, ut vocant, anno M. DC. LV. Edda Sæmundiana* VOLUSPA, *continens Philoſophiam Danorum, Norvegorumque antiquiſſimam: eſtque impreſſa in quarto, anno M. DC. LXV. item anno M. DC. LXXIII. additis Gudmundi Andreæ Iſlandi annotationibus. Inſcriptiones Havnienſes, Amagrienſes & Uraniburgicæ, Latina, Danica & Germanica; una cum addita narratione de Tychone Braheo diverſiſque ipſius & ſororis ipſius Sophiæ Braheæ epiſtolis, edita in quarto, anno M. DC. LXVIII. Jus aulicum vetus Regum Norvegorum, dictum* HIRDSKRAA: *Item jus aulicum vetus Regum Danorum dictum* VITHERLAGSRET, *linguâ triplici, originali Iſlandica, interpretibus Danica, atque Latina, addita quoque annotationes. Impreſſio facta Havniæ anno M. DC. LXXIII. Havniæ delineatio topographica in ære expreſſa, unà cum brevi partium & locorum enarratione, Danicè & Germanicè impreſſa Havniæ, anno M. DC. LXXIV. Samſoæ deſcriptio & delineatio cum figuris. In folio. Havniæ anno M. DC. LXXV. Friderici II. Hiſt. Danicè in fol. cum figuris, Haf. an. M. DC. LXXV. Lexicon Iſlandicum Gudmundi Andreæ Iſlandi, cum præfatione de ejuſdem vita: in forma quarta Havniæ, anno M. DC. LXXXIII. Leges Cimbricæ Valdemari ſecundi Regis Danici, Germanicè, interprete Erico Krabbio, equite Danico. In præfatione addita eſt narratio de ordine equeſtri Dannebrogico: item de novo corpore Juris Danici: nec non de genealogia ejuſdem Erici Krabbii. Havniæ in quarto, anno M. DC. LXXXIV. Leges civiles & eccleſiaſticæ Chriſtiani Secundi in quarto, Havniæ anno M. DC. LXXXIV. Havniæ & Riparum jus urbicum. In 12. Havniæ, eodem anno M. DC. LXXXIV.*

(A) *He was . . . . of an ancient and noble Family.*] He was the Son of *Michael* REVEREND DE BOUGY, and Grandſon of *Olivier* REVEREND DE BOUGY, and Great-Grandſon of *Michael* REVEREND DE-BOUGY. The two latter are mention'd in *Mezeray's* Hiſtory, as we ſhall ſee by and by. The Printed Books ſay nothing of their Predeceſſors; but the Writings of the Family go higher, though

(a) Burnet, a Defence of the Reflexions, pag. 24.

(b) Ibid. pag. 25, 26.

(c) Ibid. pag. 27.

(*) Ibid. pag. 29.

(d) That [illegible]

(e) It was tranſlated out of Engliſh into French by John de la Montagne.

(f) Vita Reſenii, fol. D ij verſo

youngeſt of ſixteen Brothers or Siſters. He got into the Regiment of Guards as a Cadet at twelve Years of Age, and afterwards he raiſed himſelf by degrees; for he was ſucceſſively a Cornet, Captain of the Light-Horſe, Colonel of Horſe ε, &c. He was Cornet of the *Gendarmes* ζ of Marſhal *de Gaſſion*, who conceived ſo great (B) an Affection and Eſteem for him, that this very thing is enough to convince us of his Bravery, and other military Virtues. He proved very thankful; for he eſpouſed the Intereſts of that Marſhal ſo zealouſly, that Cardinal *Mazarin* could never bring him off. His Eminence was very preſſing upon him on that account, when he went to Court in order to mend what the Marſhal's Vivacity and Boldneſs had ſpoiled η. The Cardinal was more ſucceſsful in his Endeavours to gain (C) M. *de Bougy* after *Gaſſion*'s Death. He perform'd great and important Services during the Civil War, and his good Conduct and Fidelity were ſo well known, that he was θ *choſen to Command in chief the Troops that ſhould remain with the* King; *which he did ſo ſucceſsfully, that after he had beat the* Rebels, *who undertook to prevent his going over the* Loire *at* la Charité, *and being enter'd into* Berri, *he forc'd their Commander to abandon the City of* Bourges, *where the* King *was receiv'd ſoon after.* He had before *Commanded in Chief* at the Siege of *Chateau-Portien*; *which oblig'd the* King *after the taking of that Place to make him Governor of it . . . . . He ſignaliz'd himſelf by the taking of* Mas d'Agenois . . . . . *and at the retreat of* Saint Andras, and on ſeveral other Occaſions; *in one of which, being Lieutenant-General, after he had fought with great Valour to the laſt Extremity, he was taken Priſoner* ι in the Year 1653. He was permitted κ to go to Court upon his Parole, and having been exchang'd he return'd into *Guienne*, where he married in 1654. *Mary de la Chauſade de Callonge*, a very rich Heireſs, by whom he left (D) but one Son. The Queen-Mother, and Cardinal *Mazarin* concern'd themſelves very obligingly (E) with that Marriage, and did not forget to mention the good Services (F) of the Lady's Father. He ſerv'd in *Catalonia* the ſame Year under the Prince of *Conti*, and the Years following till 1657. when he was oblig'd to ask leave to go to *Montpellier*, that he might be cured of a Defluxion in his

tho' they are ſomewhat imperfect, the Houſe having been plunder'd once, and burnt another time during the Civil Wars of the XVIth Century (a). *Mezeray* reckons one (b) *Bougy* among the Lords that join'd at *Caen* the Duke of *Montpenſier*, whom *Henry* III. had ſent into *Normandy*, to prevent the deſign of the *Leaguers* upon that Province. This *Bougy* was the Father of *Oliver Reverend-de-Bougy*, whom the ſame Hiſtorian mentions in theſe terms: (c) "*Caen* had been loſt, if the Reſolu-
" tion and good Conduct of *Oliver Reverend-de-Bougy*,
" a Gentleman of that Country, who happen'd to be
" there, had not put a ſtop to that Irruption. He goes
" courageouſly into the Street, ſends for his Friends, ſtirs
" the Inhabitants, and in the mean time foreſeeing that
" the Enemies intended to ſhut up the Gate of the Bridge,
" he orders immediately one of his Men to go and nail
" a piece of Wood to it. So that whilſt the Enemies
" endeavour to ſhut it, and the more haſte they make,
" the leſs they perceive the hindrance, he arrives there-
" upon with fifteen or twenty Men animated by his Ex-
" ample. They are ſurpriz'd and troubled at his co-
" ming; and becauſe they cannot ſhut the Gate cloſe,
" one of thoſe who attended him, call'd *la Reviere Re-*
" *nouf*, thruſting himſelf with no leſs Boldneſs than
" Courage into the Gap, ſhoots *la Motte-Corbiniere* in the
" Head with a Piſtol, and by his Death cauſes his De-
" ſign to miſcarry. The Town grew more ſenſible of
" the danger they were in, when it was over; and
" the King gave this Character of *Bougy*, that his Fide-
" lity, of which he had already many Proofs, had ſaved
" on this occaſion all the *Lower Normandy*.

(B) *The Marſhal* de Gaſſion *conceiv'd ſo great an Affection and Eſteem for him*.] 'Tis well known that he died of the Wound he had receiv'd at the Siege of *Lens*, as (d) *he was ſhaking one of the Stakes of a Palliſado. He received a Muſquet-ſhot in the Head, which threw him down; but he was immediately taken up by his Couſin* Gaſſion, *and by the Marquiſs* de Bougy, *the only Perſons who had followed him*. They carried him back into the Trenches. He got himſelf carried to *Arras*. Mr. *de Bougy* (e) accompanied him thither. *The Marſhal gave him his* (f) *Sword, as he was a dying, telling him that he thought he was the only Man in* France *beſt qualify'd to wear it after him*. The Marſhal's Regiment was divided between his Couſin Mr. *de Gaſſion*, and the Marquiſs *de Bougy*.

(C) *the Cardinal was more ſucceſsful in his Endeavours to gain Mr.* de Bougy.] Having ſent for him to Court, as ſoon as he heard of the Marſhal's Death, he told him: *I offer you a Friend in the room of him, whom you have loſt: I have been ſo well pleaſed with your conſtant Fidelity to that Marſhal, that I deſire you would ſhew the ſame to me, and I engage to be your Friend.* Mr. *de Bougy* return'd ſuch an Anſwer as the Cardinal deſir'd, and proved ſo faithful to him, that when his Eminence went out of *France*, he accompanied him to the Frontiers. *I'll come again, and I'll make your Fortune*, ſaid the Cardinal to him; but when he return'd, he told him that his being a Proteſtant was an Obſtacle to it (g).

(D) *By whom he left but one Son.*] To wit, *John James* REVEREND-DE-BOUGY, who was born in 1655. and commanded nine Years the *Regiment Colonel*. He left the Service on account of his Religion, and retir'd into *Holland*. He lives at the *Hague*, where he is very much conſider'd, and indeed he deſerves it. He loſt his only Son ſince he came from *France*. He has only two Daughters left by *Elizabeth de Bar de Camparnau*, whom he married in 1674. She is deſcended by the Mother's ſide from that famous *Reniers*, whoſe Quarrel with *Veiſins* was attended with very remarkable Circumſtances. They are to be found in *Thuanus* (h) and *Mezerai* (i). This laſt Hiſtorian obſerves that he was Lieutenant of the Princes in *Querci*. The Family of *Bar de Camparnau* is a very noble one. It is mention'd in ſeveral Books, eſpecially in the Hiſtory of the Siege of *Montauban* (k).

(E) *The Queen-Mother and Cardinal* Mazarin *concern'd themſelves very obligingly with that Marriage.*] The Marquiſs *de Bougy* was the Bearer of a Letter, which that Queen writ to *Mademoiſelle de Callonge*, to deſire her to receive him as one that came from her. She added, *the Services of your deceaſed Father engage me to ſee you ſettled: I don't think that I can help you to a better Match* (l).

(F) *The good Services of the Lady's Father.*] It was *James de la Chauſade Baron de Callonge*. He had been Governor of *Montpellier* during the Wars of the Duke of *Rohan*, to whom he was nearly related. 'Twas he, who ſpoke in the Name of the *Reformed*, when the Peace was concluded before *Montpellier*. See *du Pleix*'s Hiſtory, *Girard* in his Life of the Duke of *Epernon*, *Baſſompierre*'s Memoirs, the Life of the Duke of *Montmorenci*, and ſeveral other Authors. The King's Patent for erecting the Barony of *Callonge* into a *Marquiſate*, imports, that this *James de la Chauſade* had been *Colonel of a Regiment of Foot for the King's Service in* Holland, *that he had made himſelf conſiderable by his Valour and Experience in Military Affairs, and by many glorious Actions, eſpecially at the time of the Commotions in* Guienne, *under the Duke of* Epernon's *Government, during which he brought to* that Duke *at two ſeveral times conſiderable Succours of Gentlemen Volunteers, which did not a little contribute to keep up* his Majeſty's *Authority, and to curb the Factions; that at the Battel of* Avein *he took the Enemy's Cannon, after he had broke through and routed them with his Regiment, conſiſting of twenty Companies, and that leſt his Glory ſhould be confin'd within the Frontiers of this Kingdom, he follow'd the Duke of* Candale *into* Turkey *to fight the Enemies of the Chriſtian Name, where he blew up the Gate of* Agliman *with a Petard, and was one of the firſt who enter'd that Place Sword in Hand, after having ſignaliz'd himſelf on ſeveral*

ε ibid.

ζ ibid.

η ibid.

θ The King's Patent for the erection of the Marquiſate of Bougy.

ι ibid.

κ Imparted Memorial.

(a) Memorial imparted to me.

(b) Mezerai, hiſt. de France tom. 3. pag. 776. édit. 1685.

(c) Id. ib. in the Life of Henry IV. pag. 1097, 1098.

(d) The Abbot de Pure, vie du Marechal de Gaſſion, tom. 4. pag. 309. ad ann. 1647.

(e) The ſame Memorial.

(f) It is kept in the Family to this Day.

(g) ibid.

(h) Tuan. lib. 75. pag. 107 ad ann. 1572.

(i) Mez ubi ſupra pag. 259.

(k) [illegible] parted Memorial.

(l) ibid.

his Breaſt. He got that Illneſs for having been a whole Night upon the Hills, where he was cover'd with Snow in his Sleep. He found no eaſe at *Montpellier*, and finding none neither at *Bourdeaux*, he went to his Country-Seat at *Callonge*, where he died in the Year 1658, being 40 Years of Age. He was regretted by every body. The King, the Queen and Cardinal *Mazarin* did his Widow the Honour to write to her ſome Letters of Conſolation. He would have made a greater Fortune, if he had been a Roman Catholick: He received ſeveral Letters from the Queen, and from the Cardinal, wherein they exhorted him to change his Religion, and to remove by that Means a great Obſtacle to his Advancement: They offer'd him a Marſhal's Staff, and a Government that would be left to his choice, provided he would be a Convert. His Anſwer was, *That if he could reſolve to betray his God for a Marſhal's Staff, he might betray his King for a leſſer advantage, and that he could do neither of 'em, being contented to ſee that his Services were acceptable, and that his Religion was the only Reaſon why he was not rewarded for them* *. The King had erected the Lordſhip of *Bougy*, ſituated in the Lower *Normandy*, into a *Marquiſate*; but becauſe it is held of ſeveral Lords, ſo many Oppoſitions were form'd againſt the regiſtring of the Letters Patents, that they prov'd ineffectual: Which was the Reaſon why that Erection was transferr'd to the Barony of *Callonge*; which depends immediately on the King. The Patent was drawn up in *November*, 1667, and regiſtred in the Chamber of Account the 9th of *September*, 1669. I have read it, and I found in it a large Accounts of the Services which the Marquis *de Bougy* did to the King. They conſiſted not only in warlike Actions, but alſo † in Negotiations. You'll find here ſome (G) of the moſt glorious Paſſages of his Life. He received among other Wounds five Musket-ſhots.

REZ (ANTONY DE) Eſq; Advocate in the Parliament of *Paris*, was the Son of *Antony de* REZ, Counſellor-Secretary to the King, and was born at *Paris* in the Year 1630. His Merit will beſt appear by two Elogies that have been γ ſent to me. I make no doubt that all diſcerning Men will own they are ſo well written, that they may ſerve as a Model. The firſt is larger (*A*) and contains more Particulars. The ſecond is a Piece of great weight; for

ral other Occaſions (a). *Mademoiſelle de Callonge*, his other Daughter, died at the *Hague* ſome (b) Months ago, in a very far advanc'd Age. She had never been married. She was a Perſon of an exemplary Piety and Virtue, and underſtood *Hebrew* (c) very well: She came out of *France* on account of her Religion when the Edict of *Nantes* was revok'd. *Mezerai* (d) mentions one *Callonge* among the Proteſtant Lords of the Province of *Guienne*, who took up Arms in *Charles* the IXth's Reign.

(G) *Some of the moſt glorious Paſſages of his Life.*] At the Battel of *Rocroi* he commanded the Company of *Gaſſion's Gendarmes*, and tho' he had a Foot bruiſed with a Musket-ſhot, he broke through a Battalion of the Enemies, where his Horſe was killed under him with ſeveral thruſts of Pikes and Swords (e). They are the very words of the King's Patent above-mentioned. In the Year 1650. *He threw himſelf into the Town of* Saint Quintin *with* 500 *Horſe*, and by that means broke the *Spaniards* deſign *upon that Place, which was in great Danger*. Afterwards, when *they beſieged the Town of* Guiſe, *the Advice he gave to place* 1200 *Musketeers in the Wood, to cut off the Paſſage of the Proviſions for the Beſieged, and the great Ability wherewith he himſelf executed that Enterprize*, was one of the Cauſes why that Siege was rais'd (*f*). The Court having reſolv'd to quit *Paris* in 1651. when the Prince of *Condé* had diſcover'd his ill Deſigns, the Queen ſent immediately for Mr. *de Bougy*, who was in *Flanders*, and when ſhe ſaw him come into her Chamber with his Boots on, ſhe cry'd out, *Here's* Bougy, *my Fear is over*; and then ſhe told him, that ſhe had ſent for him to intruſt him with the King's Perſon, and herſelf. Accordingly he carried them to *Fontainebleau*. Take notice that he was then but a Marechal de Camp, and that there were many Officers at Court in higher Stations; (*g*) but the Queen did not truſt every body, or rather ſhe miſtruſted almoſt every body. Mr. *de Bougy* (*h*) at his ſetting out from *Flanders* had order'd a Detachment of Horſe to follow him, and then went Poſt. As ſoon as he had conducted the Court to *Fontainebleau*, he was inform'd, that the Prince's Troops were marching towards *Gien*, to poſſeſs themſelves of it. Whereupon he diſpatch'd a Courier to the Torops of *Flanders*, who had been order'd to follow him, and deſired them to make all the haſte they poſſibly could. The Courier met them as they were taking their Quarters. After they had ſeen the Order, they only baited, and then continued their March. They were no ſooner arrived, but Mr. *de Bougy* put himſelf at the Head of 'em, and being entered into *Gien*, he order'd the Gate on the ſide of the Prince's Troops to be open'd, and charged them ſo briſkly, that he routed them, and took three General Officers Priſoners. As he was purſuing the flying Enemy, he perceiv'd a young Boy frighted, and ask'd him what was his Name; and being told that he was the Son of one of the chief Magiſtrates of *Bourges*, *Will you*, ſaid he to him, *carry a Letter to your Father; the Queen looks upon him as one of her moſt faithful Servants.* The Boy promis'd to deliver it, and immediately Mr. *de Bougy* acquainted that Magiſtrate that he had juſt now beat the Prince's Troops, and was marching to *Bourges*. In the mean while the Prince of *Conti* had got into that Town, and aſſembled the Magiſtrates to oblige them to declare for him. The young Boy arrives, the Prince of *Conti* laughs at the Letter, and takes it for a Stratagem, and ſteps into another Room, to draw up the Anſwer he would have them return to Mr. *de Bougy's* Letter. Whilſt he was writing it, ſome wounded Soldiers arrive, who confirm the Truth of that News; whereupon the Magiſtrates declar'd to him that he muſt retire; and that they will remain faithful (*i*). The Prince (*k*) retired to *Mouron*, and from thence into *Guienne*. Mr. *de Bougy* was *order'd to purſue him under the Conduct of the Count* de Harcourt, *who having permitted him to go with* 500 *Horſe over the River* Né *in* Saintonge, *and over a very large and dangerous Moraſs, behind which* the Rebellious Troops *lay to the number of* 4000 *Horſe, and* 500 *Foot, he took two of their beſt Quarters, and brought with him near* 500 *Troopers or Officers.* At the Siege of *Capdequiers*, in *Catalonia* where he was Lieutenant-General, the Troops that gave the Aſſault, having been repulſed from the Breach, he took a Halberd from a Serjeant, mounted the Breach firſt, and animated the Soldiers by his example. He was wounded there with a Musket-Shot, and notwithſtanding his Wound he held out 'till the Town was taken. He had the Government of it given him, tho' ſuch a way of rewarding Huguenot Officers was not in Faſhion at that time (*l*).

(*A*) *The firſt is larger, and contains more particulars.*] Here it is ſuch as it came to my Hands; I thought I could neither alter nor curtail it without ſpoiling it. "*Antony de Rez* betook himſelf to the Bar from his "younger Years, and pleaded his firſt Cauſe at ſixteen "Years of Age. After he had been ſome time in the "inferior Courts to learn the way of proceeding, he "appear'd in the Parliament with great Glory, being "ſtill very young. He ſoon diſcover'd all the Noble "Talents, whereby he was ſo glorioſly diſtinguiſh'd "afterwards; a ready, quick and penetrating Wit; a "noble, plain and natural Eloquence; a polite and charming "Delivery; a *Ciceronian* Jeſting; a certain way of "inſinuating himſelf, which gain'd him the Love of "every Body; a Sincerity which appear'd in his Look, "and in all the Features of his Face; a probity, that "was proof againſt the moſt tempting Briberies; an "agreeable and ſolid Erudition grounded upon Reaſon, "Juſtice and Humanity, more than upon Books; in a "Word, all the fine qualities of an honeſt and great Man. "All ſorts of People reſorted to him; the Men of Quality "were pleas'd with his good Mien, Affability and "Gentleman-like Behaviour: Thoſe of the meaner ſort "were for it is taken from a Speech (B) spoken in the Parliament of Paris by an Advocate General.

---

* *Taken from the above-mention'd Memorial.*

† *Here are the Words of the Patent.* During all that time, having as great an Opinion of his Prudence, as of his Valour, we imploy'd him likewise in several important Negotiations, particularly with the Duke of *Modena*, when he declared for us, and join'd his Army with ours in 1648.

‖ *The Patent for the Erection.*

γ *By Mr. Marais Advocate in the Parliament of* Paris.

(*i*) *Taken from the ſaid Memorial.*

(*k*) *Letters Patents.*

(*l*) *From the ſaid Memorial.*

RHODOMAN (LAURENCE), was born in the Year 1546, in the Village of * Sassowerf belonging to the Counts of Stolberg in the Upper Saxony. Those Counts perceiving in him a great Disposition for Learning, maintain'd him in † the College of Ilfeld. He was there six Years, and made so great a Progress under Michael Neander ‖, that he appear'd afterwards well qualified to be the chief Teacher in the best (A) Colleges, and in some famous Universities. He distinguish'd himself particularly by his great Skill in the Greek Tongue. The best Judges ¶ admired his Greek Verses. Scaliger did not (B) like his Latin Poetry. He succeeded very well in his Latin Translation of Diodorus Siculus. At last he was made Professor of History in the University of Wittemberg, where he died the 8th of January, 1606. You'll find here the Catalogue of his (C) best Works. He obtain'd the Honour of Poet Laureate. Nicolas RHODOMAN, § his Son, has publish'd something.

RHO.

* Rhodomannus, Epist. dedicat. Quinti Smyrnæi. Quenstedt de patr. illustr. pag. 319.

† These Ancestors had founded it in the Monastery of that Name by the Advice of Luther and Melanchthon. See the Epistle Dedicatory prefix'd to the Quintus Calaber of Rhodoman.

‖ See the same Epistle Dedicatory, and the Preface to his Translation of Diodorus Siculus.

¶ See the Remark B.

§ Konig. Biblioth. pag. 689.

“were also desirous to have him for their Advocate, because they knew he was a Man of Honour, obliging, and ready to hear every body. He discharg'd his Duty most faithfully, and with the greatest exactness, even in the least things. The Magistrates of all Ranks, being persuaded that nothing but Truth could come out of his Mouth, heard him with Pleasure, lov'd to see him, and honour'd him with a particular Affection. Tho' he was full of Business, his great Order enabled him to go through it. He was concern'd in most considerable Causes; he defended most eloquently that of the Princes of Lorrain, relating to the Donation of Mademoiselle de Guise, and afterwards he maintain'd the Validity of her last Will. All his Combats were attended with so many Victories, if a Client wanted an Advocate, the Court nominated him by a superior Order, and intrusted him with such Causes as were given over. The great Affairs increas'd, and became easy in his Hands, the most knotty Difficulties vanish'd away as soon as he handled them, and the Judges, being put in a safe way by him, gave their Judgment without any fear of being mistaken. We have seen what he was at the Bar: He was yet more amiable in Conversation. There was never a more affectionate, sincere, and officious Friend, a better Father, and a better Husband. He lived an innocent and virtuous Life, attended with briskness and gayety: His Wit supplied him immediately with a thousand ingenious Inventions to divert himself after his great labours: He was never weary of himself, and those, who happen'd to be with him, were never weary of his Company: He was that universal Man, whom Mr. Pelisson describes to us in his Preface to Sarrazin, an excellent Orator of the Bar, a judicious Chamber-Counsellor, a kind Father and a kind Husband in his Family, a pleasant and useful Friend: In short, he was adorn'd with all the natural and acquir'd Knowledge, that can satisfie the Mind of Man. He wanted only to live longer: but he died of a malignant Fever, in the middle of a most glorious Career, being forty three Years of Age, the 7th of February, 1694. after a Sickness that lasted seven Days. He left two Children, a Son and a Daughter, by Magdalen du Four his Wife.”

(B) *The second Elogy . . . . . is taken from a Speech spoken in the Parliament of* Paris.] Here is the continuation of the Words you have read in the foregoing Remark: “M. de Harlay, who was then Advocate-General, and Spokesman at the opening of the Parliament in the same Year, did remember him ten Months after his Death, and proposed him as a model to all his Brethren in these Words very glorious to his Memory. (a) *To moderate the true Liberty of your Profession we must tell you again, that it is not an easie undertaking, and a thing that requires no great Labour: it is the fruit of a continual Study, or rather of a continual Attention upon our selves, and of an exact practice of many Virtues. Thus one of your Brethren, whom an untimely Death has lately taken away from us, acquired the Esteem of the Publick, and the love of all those who knew him, and attain'd in an Age not far advanced to the Reputation and Practice of the most consummate Advocates. Adorn'd with those outward Advantages, which none but Nature can give, he shewed in his Countenance the Character of Probity and Modesty, which appear'd in his whole Conduct. You have seen him from his first beginning bear gloriously the weight of the greatest Actions, and defend the most difficult Causes with no less Politeness than Sobriety. Attentive to all his Duties, zealous for his Clients, civil to his Brethren, respectful to the Magistrates, he made it appear by signal Proofs, that if sometimes the Necessity of your Ministry, or the express Orders of your Superiors,* oblige you to speak for Imposture and Calumny, you may be the *Defenders of a Crime without acting against your Honour and your Conscience, and even use the hardest words, without transgressing the most exact Rules of Decorum and Civility. But 'tis not enough to pay outwardly this melancholy Duty to his Memory, nor to hear with pleasure the Praises he so justly deserves; his Example ought to excite you to imitate his Virtues, and to lay upon us by your Conduct a continual Obligation to spend these solemn Days in publishing your Praises, without being forced to censure any faults contrary to the Duties of your Profession, and which are so rare among you to our great Satisfaction.*

(a) Discours prononcé à la S. Martin 1694. sur la liberté.

(A) *To be the chief Teachers in the best Colleges, and* &c.] Here is what he himself says: (b) *Itaque in his, cum Dei benedictione, progressus feci, ut nobilium inde puerorum & illustriss. principum informationi neque inutiliter neque infructuose applicarer; Scholarum etiam bene constitutarum administrationi debine præficerer.* The Places, where he taught, are mention'd in his Funeral Programma; (c) *Docuit* Walcenrodi, *docuit* Ienæ, *docuit* Stralesundi, *docuit denique* Wittebergæ, *atque ita docuit ut eruditione, sedulitate ac dexteritate secundus haberi nemini debeat.* He was Professor of the Greek Tongue at *Jena*, for the space of seven Years, and Professor of History at *Wittemberg*, for the space of four Years (d).

(B) *Scaliger did not like his* Latin *Poetry.*] He spoke the following Words in Conversation: (e) *Rhodomannus doctissimus in Poësi Græca, sed in Latina imperitus & infelix. . . . . Bonum Diodorum Siculum edidit; a pretty Man,* qui latuit, *as* Leopardus, *who was a good Grecian. I have writ so many Letters about* Rhodomanus *into* Germany, *that they have been shown to the Duke of* Saxony, *who sent for him from a trivial School in* Pomerania *to* Wittemberg: *He is a very ugly and clownish Man. . . . He is a Poet and a good* Grecian; *he has publish'd a* Chronology, *wherein he makes it his Business to contradict me and every Body else. There are very foolish things in his Book. Chronologers have committed abundance of Mistakes;* Rhodomanus *dotes in his old Days: He pronounces as* Vulcanius *does. Rhodomanus carmina Latina non bene scribit, sed Græca bona; bonus est Græcus in Poesi.*

NOTE, That *Scaliger* has confounded our *Laurence Rhodoman* with one *Laurence Codoman* (f), who is the Author of four Books of *Chronology*, which he added to his Annals of the Holy Scripture, printed at *Wittemberg* in 1581. 'Tis a very common thing for the most learned Men to make a *quid pro quo* in Conversation, and when the Names of Authors differ only in some Letters, such a Mistake may be easily committed. This is the Case of *Scaliger*.

(C) *The Catalogue of his best Works.*] He translated into *Latin* the *Greek* Poem of *Cointus Smyrnæus*, or *Quintus Calaber*, concerning the taking of *Troy*, and added some Corrections to it. As for the Commentaries he had made upon that Author, I don't believe they have been printed; *Moreri* and others say, without any Ground for it, *that they are very much esteem'd.* I make use of an Edition (g) of that Work, in which there are two *Greek* and *Latin* Poems of *Rhodoman*: the one is intitled ΙΛΙΑΣ ΜΙΚΡΑ, and contains an Abridgment of the *Iliads*, and of *Quintus Calaber*: The other, intitled ΤΡΩΙΚΑ, contains an Epitome of the *Trojan* War, *ex variis auctoribus decerpta.* There is also the Oration, in which *Dion Chrysostom* maintains that *Troy* was not taken, with *Rhodoman*'s Latin Translation, and some *Scholia*. Here are the Titles of some other Books: (h) *Historia vitæ & doctrinæ Martini Lutheri carmine heroico descripta.* (i) *Descriptio Historiæ Ecclesiæ sive populi Dei Politiæ ejusdem & rerum præcipuarum, quæ in illo populo acciderunt, Græco carmine, cum versione Latina è regione textus Græci,* Francof. 1581. *in* 8vo. *Poësis Christiana, id est, Palestina seu Historia sacra Græco-Latina libris* IX. Marpurgi 1589. Francof. 1590, 1630. *in* 4to.

Argo-

RHODOPE, a famous Curtezan, contemporary with *Æsop*, and his Fellow-Slave, was born in *Thrace* *. *Xanthus* the *Samian* carried her into *Egypt*, where *Charaxus*, a Merchant of *Mitylene* †, and *Sappho*'s Brother, grew so much in Love with her, that he bought her for a great Sum of Mony. By that Means ſhe was made a free Woman; and becauſe ſhe was very beautiful, and the Town of *Naucratis*, where ſhe ſettled, was full of rich and voluptuous Men, ſhe got a great Eſtate by driving the Trade of a Curtezan ‡. However we muſt not believe that ſhe got ſo much by it, as to be able to build one (*A*) of thoſe Pyramids, that have been reckon'd among the ſeven Wonders of the World. *Herodotus* calls it a fabulous Story. What is (*B*) ſaid of her Shoe is not better grounded. *Athenæus* § is of Opinion that the Curtezan *Dorica*, Miſtreſs to *Sappho*'s Brother, has been confounded with *Rhodope* by *Herodotus*.

RICCI (MICHAEL ANGELO) made a Cardinal by Pope *Innocent* XI. the firſt Day of *September*, 1681, was born at *Rome* in 1619. He was a lover of the Mathematicks, and made a great progreſs in that Science, as it appears by his Treatiſe *De maximis & minimis*, which has been reprinted twice or thrice. He wrote two learned Diſſertations, one of which is inſerted in the Works of Cardinal *Brancaccio*, and the other in *Carlo Dati*'s Epiſtle *ad Philalethes*. He applied himſelf afterwards very earneſtly to the Study of Divinity. He has been praiſed by ſome very famous Authors, as *Gaſſendus*, *Renatus Franciſcus Sluſius*, Cardinal *Pallavicini*, *Fabretti*, *&c.* He had a very conſiderable Library ‖. He went through ſeveral Employments, before he was made a Cardinal; and, amongſt others, through that of Secretary of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relicks, and that of Conſultor of the Holy Office. He was poſſeſs'd of thoſe Employments in 1678. when he approved the Book of the Biſhop of *Condom*. I mean his *Expoſition de la Doctrine Catholique*.

RICHER, or **RICHIER** (PETER) ¶ *a Carmelite, and a Doctor of Paris*, imbraced the Proteſtant Religion, and retired to *Geneva*, where he was admitted into ζ the holy Miniſtry in the Year 1556. to be ſent to the Sieur *Villegagnon* in *America*. He was then η above fifty Years of Age. He embark'd λ at *Honfleur*, the 19th of *November* in the ſame Year, with another Miniſter, whoſe Name was *Chartier*, and with ſome other Perſons, whom the Church of *Geneva* judged to be proper for *Villegagnon*'s Deſign: He μ arrived at the iſle of *Coligni* the 10th of *March*, 1557, and preach'd there the very ſame day before *Villegagnon*, π who all the time *joined his Hands, lifted up his Eyes to Heaven, fetched great Sighs*, *&c.* which filled the whole Congregation with admiration. Some few Days after they adminiſtred

* Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 135.

† A Town in the iſle of Lesbos.

‡ Taken from Herodotus, ibid. c. 135.

§ Athen. lib. 13. Pag. 596.

‖ Taken from Prosp. Mandoſius Biblioth. Rom. cent. 5. p. 344, 345.

¶ Thevet, Coſmograph. Univerſelle Book 21. c. 2. f. 909.

ζ John de Lery, hiſtoire d'un voiage de l'Amerique ch. 1. pag. m. 6.

η Id. ib.

λ Id. ib. ch. 2. p. 8

μ Id. ib. ch. 6. p. 55.

π ibid. pag. 5[illegible].

Argonautica. Thebaica, Ilias parva: Lipſ. 1588. *in* 8*vo*. *Tabulæ Etymologiæ Græcæ*: ibid. 1590. *in* 8*vo*. *Memnonis Hiſtoria de Republica Heracleenſium, & rebus Ponticis Eclogæ: ſeu excerpta & abbreviatæ narrationes in Sermonem Latinum tranſlatæ*: Helmſtadii 1591. *in* 4*to*. *Epithalamia ſacra*: Ienæ 1594, *in* 4*to*. *Ex Memnone, de Tyrannis Heracleæ Ponticæ Cteſia & Agatharchide excepta hiſtoria Græcè & Latinè partim ex Laur. Rhodomani interpretatione*: Genevæ 1593. *in* 8*vo*. *Theologiæ Chriſtianæ tyrocinia, carmine Heroico Græco Latino in V. libros digeſta*: Lipſiæ 1597, *in* 8*vo*. His *Germanis* was not printed when he died: It is very much commended in his Funeral Programma. (*a*) *Imprimis opus illud auro contra æſtimandum, quod de origine, moribus ac rebus geſtis veterum Germanorum Græcè ſcripſit, & Germanidem inſcripſit. Quod opus unicum tale eſt, ut animum atque ingenium hominis excellentem, charitateque patriæ mirifice flagrantem, abundè oſtendat.* Witte (*b*) reckons it among the printed Books of *Rhodoman*, but does not ſay in what Year it was printed at *Wittemberg*.

(*A*) *To build one of thoſe Pyramids.*] *Pliny* does not ſeem to doubt of it; but perhaps he believed nothing of it, and expreſſed himſelf as he did, only that he might have an occaſion to ſet forth ſome Subtilties. He ſays, that the heighth and magnificent Structure of the Pyramids is not that which ought to be moſt admired in that Wonder of the World; the greateſt Miracle (he goes on) lyes in this, that a Woman of Pleaſure ſhould have got ſo much Wealth, as was ſufficient to raiſe that Pyramid which is moſt eſteem'd. (*c*) *Hæc ſunt pyramidum miracula: ſupremumque illud, ne quis regum opus, miretur minimam ex his, ſed laudatiſſimam, a Rhodope meretricula factam. Æſopi fabularum Philoſophi conſerva quondam & contubernalis hæc fuit, majore miraculo tantas opes meretricio eſſe conquiſitas quæſtu.* That Tradition was but a Romantick Story of the *Greeks*. *Herodotus*, though a Credulous Author, rejects it. He (*d*) maintains, that the Pyramid, whoſe Conſtruction was aſcribed to *Rhodope*, was built many Years before the Reign of *Amaſis*, in which that Curtezan lived. He adds, (*e*) that tho' ſhe had got a great Eſtate, ſhe would not have been able to pay the immenſe Charges of that Building. He proves it by a very good reaſon. We know, ſays he, what the Riches of that Woman amounted to; for the Iron Spits, which ſhe Conſecrated in the Temple of *Apollo* at *Delphi*, and for which ſhe ſpent the tenth part of her Eſtate, are to be ſeen there ſtill. Thoſe Spits were deſigned for the roaſting of Oxen. The Heathen Prieſts were not very nice; the ſmell of Gain was very acceptable to them, though the Cauſe of it was never ſo ſtinking: And *Veſpaſian* might have learn'd of them this Maxim, (*f*) *Lucri bonus eſt odor ex re qualibet.* They heartily received the Offerings of Strumpets, and conſecrated them among the moſt celebrated Monuments of the Devotion of People; whereby they immortalized the Crimes of thoſe Curtezans, according to their Deſires. *Rhodope* gave away the tenth part of her Booty for the making of Spits, that ſhe might raiſe to her ſelf an eternal Monument in *Greece*. (*g*) Ἐπεθύμησε γὰρ Ῥοδῶπις μνημήϊον αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καταλιπέσθαι, ποίημα ποιησαμένη τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ τυγχάνει ἄλλῳ ἐξευρημένον. καὶ ἀνακείμενον ἐν ἱρῷ, τοῦτο ἀναθεῖναι ἐς Δελφοὺς μνημόσυνον ἑωυτῆς. τῆς ὦν δεκάτης τῶν χρημάτων ποιησαμένη ὀβελοὺς βουπόρους πολλοὺς σιδηρέους, ὅσον ἐνεχώρεε ἡ δεκάτη οἱ, ἀπέπεμπε ἐς Δελφούς. οἳ καὶ νῦν ἔτι συννενέαται, ὄπισθε μὲν τοῦ βωμοῦ τὸν Χῖοι ἀνέθεσαν, ἀντίον δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νηοῦ. *Quum enim optaret memoriam ſui in Græcia relinquere, fecit opus quod ab alio excogitatum non eſt neque donatum, idque donavit in templo Delphico monumentum ſui. E decima enim ſuarum opum tot è ferro verua ad boves torrendos fecit, ad quot facienda ſufficeret decima ipſa: quæ Delphos miſit: quæ nunc quoque poſita ſunt è regione templi, poſt aram quam Chii donaverunt.* The Law (*h*) of the *Jews* did not allow of ſuch an Impurity.

(*B*) *What is ſaid of her Shoe.*] One Day as ſhe was Bathing, and her Maids kept her Cloaths, an Eagle ſtoop'd down upon one of her Shoes, and carried it away, and let it fall upon *Pſammitichus*'s Lap. That Prince was then ſitting upon his Tribunal, to adminiſter Juſtice. He admired the Beauty of that Shoe, and the Conduct of that Eagle, and order'd that the Lady, who had been robb'd of her Shoe, ſhould be look'd for all over *Ægypt*. They found her, and brought her to him, and he married her (*i*). I don't believe it, tho' Fortune is ſometimes pleaſed with ſuch Sports: (*k*) ἡ τὰ παράδοξα καὶ τὰ ἀδόκητα φιλοῦσα ἐργάζεσθαι τύχη, *inopinatorum atque inexpectatorum amans fortuna.* *Rhodope*, *Æſop*'s Fellow-Slave, would have been well contented to marry that monſtrous Man. What a wonderful alteration, if ſhe had married a great Monarch, and if ſhe had been one of thoſe,

Quales (l) ex humili magna ad faſtigia rerum
Extollit, quoties voluit fortuna jocari?

Obſerve by the by, that Wit may prevent the ill Effects of Uglineſs, with reſpect to a fine Woman. *Æſop*, tho' the ugliest of all Men, (*m*) moved *Rhodope*'s Heart.

(*f*) Juven. Sat. 14. v. 204. See Suetonius in Veſpaſiano c. 23.

(*g*) Id. Herodotus ib.

(*h*) Non intres mercedem meretricis, aut pretium canis in domum Dei tui in quocunque voto, quia abominatio eſt utrunque apud Dominum Deum tuum. Deuteron. cap. 23. v. 18.

(*i*) Taken from Ælian. var. Hiſt. lib. 13. cap. 33. See alſo Strabo, l. 17 pag. 556.

(*k*) Ælianus ibid.

(*l*) Juvenal. Sat. 3. v. 39.

(*m*) Herodot. ubi ſupra c. 134.

administred the Lord's Supper, ς and *John Cointa*, formerly a Doctor of *Sorbonne*, made an Abjuration of Popery. *Villegagnon* made admirable Prayers, * *and received the Bread and the Wine from the Minister's hand upon his Knees.* The hopes grounded on those Expressions of Zeal did soon vanish away, for he and *Cointa* began to Dispute † soon after with *Richer* and *Chartier* about the Eucharist. The latter was sent back to *Geneva*, to acquaint *Calvin* ‖ with that Dispute, to whose Judgment *Villegagnon* declared he would submit. But he pull'd off the Mask before the coming γ of *Calvin's* Answer: He declared himself a Papist soon after δ the Communion of *Whitsunday*; and, if he had been able, he ζ would have ill-treated *Peter Richer*, and the other *Genevois*: but he was contented to command them to retire, which they did. I speak of this more largely in ξ another place. They embark'd θ the 4th of *January*, 1558, and after having been reduced to very great ι Streights, they arrived at last in the Harbour of *Blavet* in *Bretagne*, μ the 26th of *May*. *Richer* was made afterwards Minister of the (*A*) Church of *Rochelle*, and publish'd a piece against (*B*) *Villegagnon*. Nothing can be more ridiculous than to make him the Head of the Sect of the *Richerians*, and to say that that pretended Sect was tainted with *Nestorianism*: And yet a famous Jesuit (*C*) has been so bold as to affirm it. He adds, that *Richer* infected the (*D*) Inhabitants of *Annonai* in *Vivarez* with his Errors. I have mention'd in another Place, * a Letter which that Minister wrote from *America*.

ς Id. ibid. pag. 69.
* Ib. p. 66.
† Ib. p. 67.
‖ Ib. p. 68.
γ Ib. p. 56.
δ Id. ib. See also Beza hist. Ecclesiast. l. 2. p. 160.
ζ Leri, ib. pag. 85.
ξ In the Article Villegagnon.
θ Idem chap. 21. pag. 141.
ι Jean de Leri one of 'em made a description of them. Ibid. chap. 21. & 22.
μ Idem pag. 375.
* In the Remark F. of the Article Leri.

RICIUS

(*A*) Richer *was made afterwards Minister of the Church of* Rochelle.] "(*a*) At that time *Peter Richer* being return'd from *America*, where he had suffer'd very much under the Tyranny of *Villegagnon*, a most wicked and wretched Apostate, came to *Rochelle*, where he found about fifty Persons, who had been gather'd together in the Lord by the Ministry of *la Fontaine* and *la Place*, whom I have mention'd in the History of the preceding Year. He did so much incourage and strengthen that small Flock in a little time, that a Consistory and the whole Discipline were established there; and God was pleased to favour that first beginning, so that in a little time a great part of the Town join'd themselves to the Church of the Lord, forsaking the Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*. From that time the Lord prepared that Place to make it sustain hereafter the most violent Assaults of its Adversaries". He was still living when *John de Leri* printed his Relation, that is, in the Year 1577. For in the Description of the Miseries of their Voyage he speaks thus: "(*b*) As to Mr. *Peter Richer*, now a Minister of the Church of *Rochelle*, he'll tell you that he lay all along, and was so weak that he could not lift up his Head to pray to God; but he invok'd him with great Ardour in that Condition". Note, That *Moreri* is mistaken, when he says that *Richer* was Minister at *Geneva* after his Return from *America*. Note also, That Mr. *Vincent* (*c*), who sets down *Beza's* Words, and who adds, that they *gave* Poupeliniere *occasion* (1) *to call* Richer *the Father of the Church of* Rochelle, has observed that what *Beza* says *of the Establishment of a Consistory in that Year* 1558, *may be justified by the Registers of that Church*; but he is so far from saying that *Richer* was made Minister of that Place, that he declares (*e*) that the Minister appointed there, when the first Consistory was settled, was call'd *Fayet*. 'Tis true, he says that in the Year 1561, that Church had two Pastors, to wit, *Fayet* and *de l'Isle*. The latter is our *Richer* (*f*).

(*B*) *And publish'd a Piece against* Villegagnon.] The Book intituled, *A Refutation of the Lies and foolish Stories of* Nicolas Durand, *call'd the* Chevalier de Villegagnon, and printed in 1562, in 8*vo*. was not written by *James Spifame* under *Peter Richer's* Name, as *du* (*g*) *Verdier Vau-privas* affirms; it was written by the Author, whose Name is prefixed to it. We find this Title in the Epitome of *Gesner's Bibliotheque*. (*h*) *Petri Richerii Apologetici libri duo, contra Nicolaum Durandum qui se Vilagagnonem vocat, quibus illius in pios Americanos tyrannidem exponit, & negotium Sacramentarium tractat. Geneva* 1561, *in* 4*to*. To which you may add these Words of *John de Leri*. "(*i*) But because, when *Villegagnon* return'd into *France*, not only *Peter Richer* painted him in his true Colours, but also some others treated him as he deserved, I shall say no more of him, for fear of tiring the Readers". If you desire to have a Proof of *Moreri's* taking little Care to examine what he advanced; you need only consider that after he has given us a good Character of *Villegagnon*, he refers us (*k*) to his Life, written by *Richer*, a Work wherein *Villegagnon* must needs be represented as a wicked Man.

(*C*) *A famous Jesuit has been so bold as to affirm it*.] Consult the Tables of Father *Gaultier*, where you'll find that the 63d Chapter of the 16th Century, is intituled DE RICHERIANIS, DUCE *Petro Richerio*. He says (*l*) that *Peter Richer* taught in *America* before *Villegagnon*, that CHRIST as a Man ought not to be worship'd. This is one of the Proofs alledged by that Jesuit, when he maintains that the Calvinists renew the impious Doctrines of *Nestorius*. *Calvini vestigiis*, says he (*m*), *insistit Petrus Richerius in Americam ab eo missus anno* 1557. *quiam & præsente Domino Villagagnono prædicat, & coram Notario publico Francisco Alberico mordicus tuetur Jesum Christum in carne humana non esse adorandum. Tuetur, inquam, dum respondet ad interpellationem sibi per eum factam ejusdem D. Villagagnoni nomine, utpote causam exigentis cur Jesum Christum adorare nolit. Horum nobis omnium fidem facit tum epistola ejusdem Villagagnoni ad Ecclesiam Christianam data, tum ea quam octavo Julii anno* 1560. *ad Magistratum Genevensem scripsit, tum annexa ejusdem Notarii testificatio, quam diei decimaquarta Maii anni* 1559. *nota obsignavit; tum altera testificatio die octavo Junii* 1558. *data subscriptaque a D. Petro a Falcilla, quem D. Villagagnonus ad Ministrum Richerium* 27 *Decembris* 1557. *miserat, rationem ejusmodi doctrinæ sciscitaturum: ubi asserit se, dum à Ministro Richerio quæreret, cur inter orandum non diceret*, Gloria Patri & Filio & Spiritui sancto, *&c. responsum plane nullum accepisse: dum autem denuntiaret conqueri D. Villagagnonum, quod nullam unquam ad Jesum Christum precationem dirigeret, hoc se a Ministro responsum habuisse, hæreticum illum arbitrandum esse, qui necesse duxerit orare Jesum Christum* (3). *Num hac loquendi formula uti potuisset Minister Richerius, si credidisset in carne humana Jesu Christi aliam non esse hypostasim, subsistentiam aut personam, nisi Verbi Divini?* You may apply to the pretended Sect of the *Richerians* what I have said in the Article of the *Bezanites*. *Spondanus* (*o*) says that some of *Richer's* Sectators were so impious as to deny the Resurrection. But when I consider that Mr. *Vincent*, in the above-quoted Book, does scarce mention *Peter Richer*, I can't forbear laughing at the Boldness of those, who represent as the head of a Party a Man, who made so little a Figure. I must observe that many (*p*) Divines among the Calvinists are of Opinion that the Humanity of CHRIST *in abstracto*, ought not to be worship'd. If *Peter Richer* maintain'd nothing else, he needed not fear to be accounted a Heretick among those of his Party.

Note, That *Varillas* (*q*) goes farther than *Spondanus*; for he affirms that *Peter Richer* taught, that eternal Life is only promised to the Souls of Christians, and that they shall be happy only with respect to their Souls, and that therefore the Lord's Supper having not been instituted to supply their Wants, there was no need to use it frequently. I fancy he only taught, that the Sacrament of the Eucharist being not appointed for the use of the Body, it was not necessary that the Flesh of CHRIST should be contain'd in it. This was his Opinion, which his Enemies alter'd and misrepresented as they thought fit.

(*D*) *Infected the Inhabitants of* Annonai . . . . *with his Errors*.] He does not mention the time: It was doubtless before the Voyage into *America*. (*a*) *Probè novi hunc Petrum Richerium fuisse illum ipsum, qui urbi Annonensi in Vivariensi provincia malorum plurimorum author fuit. Cum enim in eam, se Catholicum simulans, esset ingressus, imò & menses aliquot in concionibus ea simulatione usus, tandem ubi se in præcipuorum civium, qui illum sæpe convivio exceperant, amicitiam insinuatum vidit, cordis sui pestem aperuit; primùm quidem privatim, deinde verò è pulpito pleno ore in Sacramenta invectus, ac nominatim in Realitatem Eucharisticam. Quod ubi animadvertunt Magistratus, dum in eum inquirunt, ecce evanescit homo nequam, majorem tamen urbis partem erroribus*

(*a*) Theod. Beza hist. Ecclesiast. lib. 2. pag. 129. 140. ad ann. 1558.

(*b*) Leri, Hist. du Voyage de l'Amerique ch. 22. pag. m. 368.

(*c*) Vincent, Recherches sur les commencemens & les premiers progrès de la reformation de la ville de la Rochelle, p. 27, 28.

(1) Poupel. l. 5. in the beginning.

(*e*) Vincent ubi supra pag. 44.

(*f*) Peter Richer Sieur de l'Isle. Id. ib. pag. 27.

(*g*) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franc. pag. 620.

(*h*) Epitome Biblioth. Gesn. pag. m. 682.

(*i*) Leri ubi supra ch. 6. pag. 74.

(*k*) Moreri at the word Villegagnon.

(*l*) Gaulterius tab. Chron. pag. m. 802.

RICIUS (Paul) a converted Jew, was a *German*, and flouriſh'd in the XVIth Century. He was Profeſſor of Philoſophy at *Pavia*, and acquired a great Reputation by it, and the Eſteem of many learned Men, who recommended him ſo effectually to the Emperor *Maximilian*, that he was ſent for by that Prince, and made one of his Phyſicians. He publiſhed ſeveral (A) Books againſt the *Jews*, and concerning ſome other Matters. He is very much praiſed for his Sincerity, Honeſty, Moderation, and Learning *. See his Elogy in a Letter (B) of *Eraſmus*, quoted here-under. The famous *John Eckius* was one of his Adverſaries: the Subject of their Diſpute was this Queſtion, *viz.* Whether the Heavens (C) are animated. *Ricius* maintain'd that they are, and advanced ſome Opinions that were looked upon as Paradoxical.

RYER (Andrew du) Sieur *de Malezair*, Gentleman in Ordinary of the King's Chamber, and Knight of the Holy Sepulcher, lived in the XVIIth Century. He made a conſiderable ſtay at *Conſtantinople* for the King's Service, and afterwards he was Conſul of the *French* Nation in *Ægypt*. He got a great Knowledge of the *Turkiſh* and *Arabick* Languages, as it appears (Z) by his Writings. He was Born at † *Marcigni*, a little ‡ Town on the *Loire* in the Frontiers of *Forez*.

RYER (Peter) a *Pariſian*, was admitted β into the *French Academy* in *Faret's* room, the 21ſt of *November*, 1646. He made a great many *French* Tranſlations, and ſome Dramatick γ Pieces. Moſt of the Authors tranſlated by him are *Greek* or *Latin*: as for the *Greek*, he only put (*) the old Tranſlations into new *French*, or follow'd the *Latin* Tranſlations: and as for the ancient *Latin* Authors, he often miſtook (A) their Senſe. Which he did also

eruditus illaqueatam relinquens. I have mention'd that Paſſage, as being part of *Ricker's* Life.

(A) *Several Books againſt the* Jews, *and concerning ſome other Matters.*] Here are the Titles of ſome of 'em. *Philoſophica, prophetica ac thalmudiſtica pro Chriſtiana veritate tuenda, cum juniori Hebræorum Synagoga diſputatio. De ſexcentis & tredecim Moſaicæ ſanctionis ſeu pentateuchi edictis. Farrago ex Thalmudæorum codice excerpta, ad petitionem Maximiliani Cæſaris. Iſagoge in Cabaliſtarum ſeu allegorizantium eruditionem cum epiſtola contra Stephani Presbyteri Cabalæ obtrectatoris epiſtolam. De modo orandi in nomine tetragrammato. De novem doctrinarum ordinibus, & totius peripatetici dogmatis nexu compendium. Statera prudentum. Concluſiones quibus Ariſtotelem triplicem doctrinæ ordinem exercuiſſe, & totius ejus dogmatis nexum dijudicare poteris.* He did not forget the common Subject for the Declamations of that time; for he made an Oration to excite the *Germans* to ingage in a War againſt the Turks, *in virulentam immaniſſimamque Turcarum rabiem, ad principes, magiſtratus, populoſque Germaniæ oratio (a).*

(B) *See his Elogy in a Letter of* Eraſmus.] 'Tis the laſt of the 1ſt Book, and it is dated the 10th of *March*, 1516. Theſe Words are to be found in it: (b) *Paulus Ricius ſic me proximo colloquio rapuit, ut mira quadam me ſitis habeat, cum homine ſæpius ac familiarius conſerendi ſermonem. Præter Hebrææ linguæ peritiam, quantum ille tenet philoſophiæ, quantum Theologiæ: tum quæ animi puritas, qui diſcendi ardor, qui docendi candor, quæ diſputandi modeſtia? Mihi ſanè vir ille primo ſtatim guſtu placuit olim Papiæ, cum illic philoſophiam profiteretur: nunc propius intuito magis etiam placet. Is demùm verè mihi videtur Iſraelitam agere, ſuoque cognomini pulchrè reſpondere: cujus omnis voluptas, omnis cura, omne otium ac negotium, in divinis eſt literis. Dignus nimirum animus, cui otium contingat quàm maximè honorificum.* Ricius ſent him his Treatiſe concerning the *Cabala*, and the Thanks he receiv'd for it are very glorious to him; for it appears by it that this Proſelyte had defended the Cauſe of one of his Friends cruelly ſlander'd, and had kept at the ſame time within the Bounds of Moderation, and abſtain'd from injurious Words. (c) *Arriſit animus iſte Gratiis & amicitiæ natus, qui tanto ſtudio tuetur hominis eruditiſſimi innocentiam, adverſus impudentiſſimos ſycophantas. Arriſit denique te, hoc eſt abſoluto veroque philoſopho, digna moderatio: quâ ſic fortiter patrocinaris amico, ut a conviciis in adverſarium temperes, reputans quid te, quàm quid illo dignum eſſet.*

(C) *Whether the Heavens are animated.* Ricius *maintain'd that they are, and advanced.*] A Proteſtant Divine obſerves that *Ricius's* Opinions favour'd the Principles of Magick, and yet that his Books *de cœleſti agricultura* had been approved and praiſed by the Divines of *Bologna, Padua, Ferrara* and *Pavia*. (d) *Paulus Ritius dum cœlorum animationem & Cabaliſticam ſuam Arithmanticam per decem enumerationes tradit, magiæ principia non parum promovet in commentariis ſuis ad librum R. Joſeph Caſtiliens. qui* porta lucis *dicitur, & tamen libros illos de cœleſti agricultura magnifico elogio approbarunt Academia Theologia Bononienſis,* &c. *John Eckius* did not follow the Steps of thoſe *Italian* Divines; for he maintain'd (e) that the Doctrine, which teaches that the Heavens are animated, is ridiculous, execrable, and contrary to Faith. *Claudius Eſpencæus*, of whom I learn this, knew not upon what Reaſons that Cenſure was grounded; for he had not ſeen *John Eckius's* Book, and knew no more of it than what he had found in *Ricius's* Confutation of it, of which he gives us a ſhort *Analyſis*. He ſays (f) that Author maintain'd three things. 1. That the Doctrine, which teaches that the Heavens are animated, does not belong to Divinity; for it can neither be proved nor confuted by the Principles of Religion: Hence it is that Divines are divided about that Problem. 2. That this Opinion agrees better with the Words of the Prophets, than the contrary Doctrine. 3. That (g) Reaſon leads us to believe that the Heavens are not inanimate Beings. *Eſpencæus* examines *Ricius's* Arguments, and confutes them, and at laſt declares that it is more ſafe to deny than to affirm that the Heavens have a Soul. The Reader will not be diſpleaſed to know upon what occaſion he publiſh'd his Book (h) *de cœlorum animatione*. They had a mind to print at *Paris* an Edition of all the Works of Cardinal *Contarin*; but the Divine, who was to give his Approbation, ſcrupled to do it, becauſe he found (i) that the Author affirms that the Heavens are animated. He conſulted *Claudius Eſpencæus*, who anſwer'd him that he look'd upon it as an inconſiderable Difficulty, and ſoon after remembring that he had collected ſeveral things about that Queſtion, he put 'em together and publiſh'd them (k).

Obſerve that among the School Divines and Philoſophers, the Queſtion is only to know, whether the immediate Mover of the Celeſtial Spheres is a Soul properly ſo call'd, and *forma informans*. It is the Opinion of ſome, and it is commonly rejected; but as for the Opinion of thoſe, who admit of moving Intelligences, as *aſſiſtent forms*, it is almoſt generally received; and truly I don't ſee how one can be without 'em, and I fancy the *Copernicians* will fall into it ſooner or later in relation to their Planets. Father (l) *Daniel*, and Mr. (m) *le Clerc* have objected ſome Difficulties againſt their Syſtem, which puzzle them very much. Sir *Iſaac Newton*, and others have ſo ſtrongly aſſaulted the Hypotheſis of the *Vortices*, that the General Laws of Motion are not ſufficient to account for the *Phænomena*. A particular Direction of an intelligent Being would come in very ſeaſonably.

(Z) *As it appears by his Writings.*] He printed at *Paris* in 1630, a *Turkiſh* Grammar. Four Years after he publiſh'd in the ſame City his *French* Tranſlation of *Guliſtan*, or *The Empire of the Roſes*, written by *Sadi* the Prince of the *Turkiſh* and *Perſian* Poets. But his chief Tranſlation is that of the *Alcoran*, which has been printed ſeveral times. He publiſh'd it after he had been a Conſul for the *French* Nation in *Egypt*; which appears by the honourable Teſtimonial which the Conſuls of *Marſeilles* gave him the 12th of *February*, 1633, and which may be ſeen at the end of that Tranſlation.

(A) *He often miſtook the Senſe* of the ancient Authors. *Which he did alſo.*] (n) The leſs faulty of his Tranſlations, *in the Judgment of many Perſons, is that of* Cicero's *Works, tho' he ſkipped many Places which he did not underſtand, eſpecially in the Orations, and tho' in order to come off and to fill up the Gaps, he put in the room of 'em ſeveral inſignificant and nonſenſical things, that are only fit to dazzle and perplex young Readers (o).* Theſe Words in the

Hexaalſo ſometimes in his Tranſlation of the Modern Authors, I mean of Thuanus and Scaliger. 'Tis thought his Tranſlations would be better than they are, if he had been better (B) paid by the Bookſellers; but becauſe they gave him but a ſmall matter for every Sheet, he was forc'd to make all the haſte he could, that he might be able to maintain his Family. He died in the Year * 1658. There is ſomething about him in the (C) Menagiana: you'll find it in the Remarks.

---

* *Taken from Melchior Adam in vitis Medicor. pag.* 9, 10.

† Marcinicenſis. *See Colomies, Gallia Orient. pag.* 163.

‡ *See Baudrand voce* Marcinicum.

β *Pelliſſon, hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe, p. m.* 229.

γ *See the Liſt of 'em in the Hiſtory of the* French *Academy, pag.* 356, 357. *and in Mr.* Baillet's *Jugemens ſur les poetes, n.* 1486.

(f) *Id. ib.*

(g) *Id. ib. c.* 8. *p.* 70.

(h) *It was printed at* Paris *in the Year* 1571.

(i) *In the firſt Book of* Contarin de animæ immortalitate, *printed at* Venice *in* 1525.

(k) *See the Preface of that Treatiſe of* Claud. Eſpencæus.

(l) *In his* Voiage du monde de Deſcartes.

(m) *In his Phyſicks.*

(n) *Baillet. Jugemens des Savans tom.* 4. *pag.* 549.

(o) *The Author adds, that* Father *l'Eſcalopier* does often complain of the Faults he committed in his whole Tranſlation of *Cicero*.

RIGORISTS. So they call in the *Spaniſh Netherlands* the Janſeniſts, the Fathers of the Oratory, and in general thoſe whoſe Maxims are † moſt oppoſite to looſe Morality. A Man of *Prateolus's* Character might make a Sect of thoſe Caſuiſts, to inſult the Church of *Rome* about her Diviſions. They are falſly accus'd ‖ *of commanding their Penitents to eat Hay, and young Maids to put on wet (Z) Shifts, which, as 'tis ſaid, occaſions the Death of ſome of 'em.*

RIMINI

Hexameron ruſtique are levelled at him, if I am not miſtaken: "(p) He, who tranſlated *Cicero's* fine Treatiſe *de amicitia* into *French*, has not been more lucky in his Tranſlation of theſe Words, *Agrigentinum doctum quemdam virum*, which he renders thus, *a Learned Man call'd* Agrigentinus, without minding that *Cicero* ſpeaks of *Empedocles Agrigentinus*, whom he denotes by the Name of *Agrigentum*, a Town of *Sicily*, where he was born. Beſides there was never a Man of Letters, whoſe proper Name was *Agrigentinus*. The ſame Writer in his Tranſlation of *Valerius Maximus*, Chap. 1. Example 4. Page 6. renders *vitio tabernaculum captum*, thus, *the Tabernacle had been touch'd by chance*, inſtead of ſaying, *they had been wanting in the Ceremonies that are to be obſerv'd, when they take the place of the Auguries call'd Tabernacle.* For want of underſtanding theſe Words, *tabernaculum captum*, as they ought to be underſtood in that Place, and for want of knowing the Practice of the Augurs, he thought this ought to be expounded according to the Cuſtom of the Jews, amongſt whom none but the Levites were allow'd to come near the Tabernacle,". To this I ſhall add a Paſſage out of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*: "(a) Mr. *Teiſſier* takes Notice of ſome Faults in Mr. *du Rier's* Tranſlation: Here is one amongſt others. *Thuanus* ſpeaking of *John Revius*, who died in the Year 1553. ſaid *annos cum ſeculo numerabat*; which ſignifies that *Revius* died at 53 Years of Age. Mr. *du Rier* ſays on the contrary, *that he died a hundred Years old.* If he committed ſuch Faults in his Tranſlating a Modern Author, whoſe Meaning may be more eaſily underſtood, than that of the Ancients; one may very well believe, that he is often out in his Tranſlation of *Cicero*. And indeed Father *l'Eſcalopier* in his Commentary on the Books *de Natura Deorum*, cenſures continually poor (b) Mr. *du Rier's* Tranſlation". I have obſerv'd another Fault which Mr. *Teiſſier* takes notice of. *Thuanus* ſays, (c) *Hulrico Hutteno equiti Franco . . . . . quadamtenus comparandus.* *Du Ryer* renders thoſe Words thus, *He may be compared in ſome manner with* Heutin *a* French *Knight*, and Mr. *Teiſſier* ſays upon it, (d) Hutten *was a* German *born in* Franconia, *and not a* French-man, *as Mr.* du Ryer *ſays, who did not underſtand the true Signification of the Word* Francus. Mr. *Teiſſier* has overlook'd ſuch a like miſtake in the Article of *Duaren*. (e) *Eaque* (Duareni Opera) *Cujacius ipſe plurimi ſemper fecit, cùm ex quatuor Franciſcis qui eadem ætate eandem ſcientiam profitebantur, unum Duarenum ſibi placere, cæteros jus tantum deliguriré diceret.* Thoſe Words of *Thuanus* have been render'd by *du Ryer* in this manner. *Nay,* Cujas *himſelf valued much* Duaren's *Works, and ſaid, that of the four* French *Profeſſors, who taught the ſame Science at the ſame time, he liked none but* Duaren. What a miſtake to fancy that *Franciſcus* is the Name of a Nation, and not a Chriſtian Name. *Thuanus's* meaning is this: there were at the ſame time four Profeſſors of the Civil Law, whoſe Chriſtian Names were *Francis*, and *Duaren* was the only one of the four whom *Cujas* eſteem'd. The three others were *Francis Baudouin*, *Francis Hotman* and *Francis Roaldes*. I have found many other Faults in *Thuanus's* Verſion. Here follows an overſight which *Colomeſius* obſerv'd. "(f) Mr. *du Ryer* . . . . has very much obliged Pious Souls, by tranſlating thoſe Pſalms (g) into our Language with ſo much Politeneſs. Only there is one place, wherein I wiſh he had minded the *Latin* a little better. 'Tis in page 17. &c. of the ſecond Edition, where Mr. *du Ryer's* Tranſlation runs thus; *and as if I was ſtill a Child at a hundred Years of Age, tho' never ſo old and broken, I do ſtill the Actions of a Child.* He ſhould have render'd the *Latin* Words thus; *and as if I was a hundred Years old, I do at the Age I am in all the Actions of a Child.* If thoſe Pſalms were compos'd by *Antony* King of *Portugal*, Mr. *du Ryer's* Miſtake cannot be excus'd; for 'tis certain, that poor Prince was not ſixty four Years old when he died".

(B) *If he had been better paid by the Bookſellers.*] You'll find the following Words next to thoſe I have ſet down out of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*. "(h) Which ſhould teach many mean Authors, who know no more *Latin* than what they learn'd at School, not to venture upon Tranſlations. It requires more Capacity than one can think, and Men that will not do it to get a livelihood. This I ſay, without alluding to this Paſſage of *Richelet's* Dictionary, pag. 110. of the (i) ſecond Part. *The late du* Rier *wrote to get Bread, that is, only to maintain himſelf*". Here are two Paſſages of Mr. *Baillet*. (k) *And therefore 'tis believed that his Learning and Skill in Languages were but inconſiderable; and that the Bookſellers, who maintained him, did not allow him time enough to perfect any thing.* This is the firſt Paſſage: the ſecond is ſtill more diverting. "(l) Such Writers, who are reſolved never to go back, or who by their choice, or by reaſon of the ill Circumſtances they are in, find themſelves neceſſitated to go forward, whatever obſtacle they meet with, would think themſelves maim'd if they ſhould cut off any thing from their Writings. And particularly thoſe whoſe Subſiſtence depends upon the weight and meaſure of their Writings, would be afraid of loſing a Penny, if they ſhould ſtrike a needleſs or ill placed Word out of their Works. This was the reaſon why *William Xylander*, *Lewis Dolce*, *John Baudoin*, *Peter du Ryer*, and many other Mercenary Writers, and ſuch as receive a Salary from Bookſellers, thought themſelves oblig'd to lengthen and inlarge their Writings as much as ever they could: ſo that to preſerve their Lives they were not unwilling to ſpoil their Reputation, ſome by Tranſlating for half a Crown, or a Crown a Sheet, and others by making four hundred long Verſes for four Livres, and as many ſhort ones for two Livres, as Mr. *Furetiere* (1) ſays". See what I have ſaid of *Caraun* (m).

(C) *Something about him in the* Menagiana.] "(n) I think Mr. *du Ryer* was a Native of *Paris*. He was like *Xylander*, *qui fami magis quam famæ inſerviebat.* He tranſlated to get Mony, and died before he had made an end of the Tranſlation of *Thuanus's* Hiſtory. To avoid Expences, he liv'd out of *Paris* farther than the *Piquepuces*, where he lodged with his Wife and Children. I went once to ſee him with ſome Friends. He treated us with Cherries gather'd in a little Garden he had. He made a Tragedy, Intituled, *Alcyonée*, which is an admirable Piece, and may be compar'd with the beſt pieces of *Corneille*. There are ſome wonderful Verſes in it, and it is very well underſtood. *Mondory* acted his part very well in it.

M. DE *Vigneul Marville*, pag. 196. of the 1ſt Volume of his *Melanges*, mentions a Viſit that he and ſome others paid to *du Ryer*, and ſays, that the Collation they had, which conſiſted of Milk, Cherries, freſh Water and brown Bread, made 'em lament the Fate of that excellent Man.

(Z) *To put on wet Shifts.*] I don't think that any Caſuiſt, who is a Man of Senſe, tho' never ſo ſevere, preſcribes ſuch a Penance to a young Maid, tho' it were neceſſary to ſuppreſs a violent Temptation to Lewdneſs; but there are ſome Men whoſe rigid Morals ſpoil their Judgment to ſuch a degree, that 'tis not unlikely ſome young Maids, who reveal'd too many Frailties at a Confeſſion, have had ſuch a Remedy preſcribed them; and ſince St. *Francis* of *Aſſiſi* thought it expedient for him to get a Woman of Snow, he might very well have preſcribed a wet Shirt to others.

I

---

* And not in 1656. as Moreri ſays.

† The Method of thoſe Gentlemen is called Rigoriſm.

‖ See the Difficulties propos'd to Mr. Steyaert. 1. part. pag. 31.

(p) Hexameron ruſtique, pag. 27, 28.

(a) Nouvelles de la Repub. des lettres, October 1684. art. 2. p. 774. in the Extract of the Elogies taken from Thuanus, and commented by Mr. Teiſſier.

(b) Note, that l'Eſcalopier criticiſes only the Tranſlation of the Books de natura Deorum.

(c) Thuan. lib. 13. p. 271. ad ann. 1554.

(d) Teiſſier Addit. to the Elogies, tom. 1. pag. 91.

(e) Thuan. lib. 23. p. 471. ad ann. 1559.

(f) Colomeſius, Biblioth. choiſie, pag. 145.

(g) That is. Pſalmi confeſſionales inventi in ſcrinio Antonii Portugalliæ Regis. Lutetiæ 1595. 16.

RIMINI (GREGORY of) in Latin *Gregorius Ariminenſis*, is known by that Name, becauſe he was born at *Rimini*, (*Ariminum*) a Town of *Italy*. He taught in the Univerſity of *Paris* * with great Applauſe. He was one of the moſt Subtil School-men of the XIVth Century, and the Subtilty of his Wit prompted him to addict himſelf much more † to the Party of the *Nominaliſts* than to that of the *Realiſts*. He was an Auguſtin Monk, and was made General of his Order at *Montpellier* in 1357. He had been the chief Profeſſor of the Auguſtins in the Convent of *Rimini* in the Year 1351. He died at *Vienna* in *Auſtria* in 1358. His chief Works are ſome Commentaries on the Maſter of the Sentences, and on St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles. He was no leſs recommendable for the Holineſs of his Life than for his Learning and great Parts, and he is reckon'd among thoſe that have been beatified ‖. I muſt ſay ſomething of his Opinions. He vigorouſly oppos'd ‡ the Divines, who aſſert that by the Almighty Power of God two contrary Propoſitions concerning one and the ſame thing may be true at the ſame time. I don't apprehend how he durſt queſtion ſuch a Doctrine as this, which is an unavoidable conſequence of the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. He came much nearer the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin* § as to Freewill, than moſt Divines of his times; nay, he maintain'd that an invincible (*A*) Ignorance does not juſtify a Man. But he taught

I Have read a Memorial printed at *Delft* in 1696, and containing *a ſhort Anſwer to the three Accuſations of* Janſeniſm, Rigoriſm, *and* Innovation. The Author having laid down in it the Maxims of Jesus Christ, goes on thus. "(a) If thoſe that are call'd *Rigoriſts*, have more "rigorous Maxims, a Conduct harder to Fleſh and Blood, "and a Severity which exceeds that wholeſome Severity, they deſerve to be puniſh'd. But if it be true, "on the contrary, as it is certain and evident, that the "Weakneſs of moſt Chriſtians forces them to be content"ed with much leſs, and to comply with humane Frail"ty in the Application of thoſe holy Rules; it is a great "Injuſtice and a puniſhable Calumny to cry 'em down "as Men, whoſe Maxims are cruel and extreamly ſe"vere: and it is more certain ſtill, that they who op"poſe what they call *Rigoriſm*, oppoſe the Goſpel . . . . "It is therefore true, that *Rigoriſm* is a meer Phantom, "wherewith they ſcare People to undo good Men, and "the true Servants of Jesus Christ. M. *Steyaert* ac"knowledges it himſelf in his *Theſes* on the Rituals pub"liſh'd within theſe few Years. His Teſtimony cannot "be ſuſpected; he ſays there, that *thoſe who endeavour to* "*obſerve the Rules of the Church in the direction of Souls,* "*are thoſe who are call'd* Rigoriſts, *and that he knows* "*no others*. . . . . . (b) It is certain, on the contrary, "that the Looſeneſs oppoſite to that *Rigoriſm*, is but "too real. (c) M. *Steyaert* acknowleges it in his "*Theſis* of *Moral Divinity mended*. For after having "proved it by the Words of Pope *Alexander* the VIIth, "which I have ſet down, he adds: What would cer"tain Men do, or what would they not do, if they "could alledge any ſuch thing againſt *Rigoriſm*; where"as in order to prove it, they have nothing to produce "but ſome idle Stories, as Hay, and wet Shirts, pre"ſcribed for a Penance.

(*A*) *Nay, he maintain'd that an invincible Ignorance does not juſtifie a Man.*] M. *Arnauld* makes this Obſervation in the 9th part of the Difficulties propoſed to M. *Steyaert*. 'Tis upon occaſion of a Decree of Pope *Alexander* the VIIIth, which condemns 31 Propoſitions; the ſecond whereof is this: (d) *Tametſi detur ignorantia invincibilis juris naturæ; hæc in ſtatu naturæ lapſæ operantem ex ipſa non excuſat à peccato formali*: that is to ſay, "Tho' there is an Ignorance of the Law of Nature, that "is invincible, yet in the State of corrupt Nature that "Ignorance does not clear from a formal Sin thoſe who "do what is forbidden by the Law of Nature". M. *Arnauld* mentions afterwards three Opinions. The firſt is (e) *that a humane Action is not a formal Sin, if he who does it, does not know that he commits a Sin.* He aſcribes this Opinion to the Jeſuits, and affirms that they (f) *pretend to ſay nothing but what is reaſonable; becauſe 'tis agreed on all hands, as they ſuppoſe, that an invincible Ignorance juſtifies a Man, and that he is reputed to be invincibly ignorant of the ſinfulneſs of what he does, when he has no ſuch thought in the doing it.* The ſecond Opinion is, that of "(g) many Divines, who, leſt thoſe "falſe Subtleties ſhould overthrow this important Max"im, that the Ignorance of the Law of Nature does "not juſtify a Man, which has been acknowledged by "the Heathens themſelves, and is laid down in the Ca"non Law in theſe Words, *Ignorantia juris omnibus* "*adultis damnabilis eſt*, maintain that it ought not to be "look'd upon as invincible, abſolutely ſpeaking, becauſe "that Law is ſuch, that Man was made capable to "know it, and would have known it, if he had conti"nued in the State wherein God had placed him; that "in the State he is in, his knowing only the firſt Prin"ciples of it, and his Ignorance of the reſt, which he "may however know with the Aſſiſtance of Grace, is "a conſequence of Original Sin. Which, according "to St. *Thomas*, is ſufficient to ſay, that Men are "obliged to do what they cannot do without Grace, "tho' that Grace, without which they cannot do it, "be given to ſome out of Mercy, and be denied to o"thers out of Juſtice, as a Puniſhment of a preceding "Sin, if it were but Original Sin. Nothing can be "more formal than what the Angelical Doctor teaches "upon that Subject, 1. 2. *qu.* 2. *Art.* 5". According to this ſecond Opinion, (h) *which has been entertain'd by moſt of the Ancient Divines*, the Ignorance of the Law of Nature *did never juſtify any Body, becauſe it could not be looked upon as invincible.* "(i) The 3d Opinion "is that of *Gregorius Ariminenſis*, of *Eſtius*, and other "Divines, who taking the Word *invincible* in another "Senſe, don't ſcruple to aſſert that the Ignorance of "the Law of Nature does not juſtify a Man, even when "it might be look'd upon as invincible. For, ſay they, "it may be call'd *invincible* with reſpect to humane "Means, ſuch as Inſtruction, of which many People "have been depriv'd, eſpecially among the Infidels . . . . "(k) Thoſe, who taking the Word *invincible* in this "Senſe, have acknowledg'd that a vaſt number of Hea"thens have been invincibly Ignorant of many Duties "of the Law of Nature, ſhould neceſſarily have ſaid, "that the Ignorance of the Law of Nature does not "clear Men from Sin, even when it may be called "Invincible, with reſpect to the want of Humane, "and even Divine Means, when God does not af"ford thoſe, that would be immediately neceſſary to "overcome that Ignorance. We have ſtill ſome "*Theſes* publickly aſſerted in our Days at *Rome* in the "School of the Auguſtins, wherein this Propoſition is "to be found: *Ignorantia invincibilis juris naturalis non* "*excuſat à peccato. Ex Gregorio in* 2. *Sent. diſp.* 29. "*qu.* 1. *art.* 2. *in reſp. ad arg. ubi ait. Ad probationem:* "*Secundum omnes Doctores non imputantur homini quæ* "*ex ignorantia ſimpliciter invincibili committuntur: dico* "*quod illud eſt intelligendum de ignorantia quæ non eſt* "*peccatum nec pœna peccati, cujus ille ſit vel fuerit reus.* "*Quod probat ex S. Aug. in Ep. ad Sixtum. Ignoran*"*tia enim invincibilis eſt pœna peccati Originalis, cujus* "*omnis homo naſcitur reus.* So that 'tis not very "long ſince they publickly aſſerted at *Rome*, that an in"vincible Ignorance does not clear Men from Sin, and "no body was offended at it; nor was it believ'd that "they who aſcrib'd that Opinion to St. *Auguſtin*, and "to *Gregorius Ariminenſis*, one of his moſt faithful Diſ"ciples among the School-men, impos'd upon that Fa"ther. *Eſtius* did alſo teach the ſame Doctrine in ex"preſs Words." M. *Arnauld* adds (l) that the Difference between the two laſt Opinions *is but a Diſpute about Words*, and that *at the bottom each of them does perfectly agree with the general Maxim of the Canon Law, and the Doctrine of St.* Auguſtin *againſt the* Pelagians, *and that of St.* Bernard *againſt* Abelard; *that whatever is done againſt the Law of Nature is a Sin, in whatever manner one may be Ignorant of it, becauſe 'tis always a Puniſhment of ſome Sin, as St.* Auguſtin *ſays in his Letter to* Sixtus. *But the firſt Opinion, which is that of the Jeſuits, does totally overthrow the Maxim of the Canon Law, and the Doctrine of holy Men, by generally aſſerting on one hand that an invincible Ignorance does always juſtify Men; and on the other by ſtretching ſo far the Word* invincible *whenever they pleaſe, that if they would ſpeak ſincerely, they ſhould ſay that a Sin of Ignorance is never a* formal *Sin, but only a* material *one.*

* Elſſius in Encomiaſtico Auguſtiniano pag. 247.

† Id. ib.

‖ Ex eodem ibid.

‡ See Fonſeca on Ariſtotle's Metaphyſicks, lib. 4. cap. 3. pag. m. 651.

§ See the Scholaſtica Orthodoxa of Paul Ferry pag. 304, 447.

(h) Ibid. pag. 241.

(i) Ibid.

(k) Ibid. pag. 242.

(l) Ibid. pag. 243, 244.

taught a thing, which was objected to *Deſcartes*, and which would be very ſcandalous, if a favourable Interpretation was not put upon it; for he taught (B) that God can lie or deceive

I thought fit to mention all theſe things, not only becauſe they afford us a ſhort and uſeful Inſtruction about a very difficult and important Subject; but alſo becauſe they diſcover to us that our *Gregorius Ariminenſis* did not uſe any Evaſion and Subterfuge. He dived into the bottom of a Doctrine, he perceived the moſt natural Conſequences of a Principle, and owned them boldly, without ſeeking any equivocal or mitigated Expreſſions. I do not ſay this, to condemn thoſe who endeavour to ſoften what they think might offend the Readers. They may have a good deſign, and ſome matters are ſo difficult and intricate, that we may very well excuſe thoſe, who uſe ſometimes a different method to explain them. The Queſtion about Sins of Ignorance is one of that kind: it is ſurrounded with Precipices on all ſides. 'Tis therefore no wonder, if thoſe, who walk in ſuch a way, do ſometimes turn aſide, or go back. They grant one thing, and then they oppoſe it: they give with one hand, what they take away with another. They will grant, (a) *That an invincible Ignorance juſtifies Men*, and then they will alledge a great many Examples taken from the holy Scripture, to ſhew that the Sins of Ignorance do not excuſe Men; and the neceſſary reſult of thoſe Quotations muſt be, either that the Ignorance of moral Duties was never invincible, or that though it be invincible, it does not excuſe a Sinner. If you conſider narrowly all their Arguments, you'll find that after they have (b) ſuppoſed that Ignorance is never a Sin, but when it is not invincible, they leave, properly ſpeaking, no Caſe, wherein that (c) Ignorance is invincible; for, they ſay, it may be overcome with reſpect to the Paſſion of JESUS CHRIST (d), even when it has never been heard of. They pretend, that if a Savage of *America* is ignorant of the matters of Fact contained in the New Teſtament, it is his fault, becauſe he has not put himſelf in a diſpoſition that may move God to reveal to him the Myſteries of Salvation, and has made himſelf unworthy of that heavenly Favour. Ask 'em this queſtion; Can he have that good Diſpoſition that you ſpeak of? Can he make a good uſe of the Light of Nature? They'll anſwer you, that he can, if he will. If you ask 'em whether he may have ſuch a Will? I think they'll anſwer you that he cannot, but that it is (e) only *a moral Impotency, which is nothing elſe but the ill diſpoſition of his Will*, and a conſequence of the Corruption wherewith the Children of *Adam* are born. This is at the bottom the ſame Doctrine with that of our *Gregory*, and I think it were better to ſay plainly, as he does, that an invincible Ignorance can be no Excuſe, when it proceeds from Original Sin, and is a Puniſhment for it. 'Tis true, that this Doctrine is liable to ſome Inconveniencies; for it ſeems to lead one by degrees to this Aſſertion, *Frenzy and Madneſs can be no Excuſe, ſince they ought not to be excluded from the Evils, which have been introduced by Sin, and which ſerve as a Puniſhment for Sin*. But the firſt Opinion, mention'd by Mr. *Arnauld*, is alſo liable to (f) many Inconveniencies. The Queſtion is not to chuſe an Opinion free from all Intricacies, or a very intricate one. But the Queſtion is to chuſe one of two Extreams, whereof one is contrary to Philoſophical Notions, and the other to the Theological Syſtems.

(B) *He taught that God can lie and deceive us.*] *Deſcartes* laid down, as the only Foundation of humane Knowledge, the perſuaſion we ought to have that God can neither be deceived, nor deceive others. They objected againſt him (g), that, according to *Gregorius Ariminenſis*, and ſome other Schoolmen, God may ſay ſome things that are contrary to his Thoughts and Decrees, as when he commanded *Jonas* to preach in *Ninive*, that it would be deſtroyed in 40 days. If he harden'd and blinded *Pharaoh*, if he ſent a lying Spirit into ſome Prophets, how do you know, ſaid they to *Deſcartes*, that he cannot ſeduce us? May he not deal with us as a Phyſician deals with ſick Perſons, and as a Father deals with Children? They are often deceived wiſely, and for their good. Could we look upon Truth, if God preſented it to us naked? (h) *Si Deus puram nobis oſtenderet veritatem quis eam oculus, qua mentis acies ſuſtinere valeat?* *Deſcartes* anſwer'd, (i) That we muſt diſtinguiſh between God's way of ſpeaking, accommodated to Man's Capacity, and to the Truths that have a relation to Mankind, and the way of ſpeaking that relates to abſolute Truths. The firſt way of ſpeaking is very frequent in the Scripture; but the laſt ought to be that of Philoſophers. *Pharaoh*'s hardneſs of Heart, and ſuch like things, do not denote a poſitive Action of God; it was only a privation of Grace. It is plain, ſays he, that I did not mean ſuch Lies as conſiſt in Words, but the inward and formal Malice that is to be found in Deceit. The Decree againſt *Ninive* was only Comminatory, and depended upon a Condition. However, I do not blame thoſe (k) who ſay, that God may, by the Miniſtry of his Prophets, declare ſome Lies free from all manner of malicious Deceit, and like thoſe of Phyſicians, who, to cure their Patients, make 'em believe ſome things that are falſe. Moreover, I confeſs, that the natural Inſtinct, which God has given us, does ſometimes deceive us really; for the Nature, which God has given us for the preſervation of our Body, moves the Hydropicks to do a thing that is prejudicial to them, that is, to drink; but I have ſhewn in my 6th Meditation how this can be reconciled with God's Goodneſs and Veracity.

I muſt obſerve by the by, that the Objection remains, notwithſtanding this Anſwer; for when a Man is forc'd to confeſs that a general Maxim, which he had laid down as the foundation of a certain and demonſtrative Doctrine, admits of many Exceptions, he ſhakes it to that degree, that it can no longer fix our Uncertainties, and there is no Caſe wherein a Sceptick may not uſe *Deſcartes's* Diſtinction. If I were deceived, will he ſay, by the Ideas, which repreſent to me Matter as an extended Subſtance, it would be a Deceit free from all manner of Malice, and perhaps it would be uſeful to me in the State I am in, which in ſome reſpects is a true State of Infancy or Sickneſs, whilſt my Soul is united to my Body. A *Verbal* Lie is not better than an *Ideal* Lie, and cannot be ſeparated from it; for Men ſpeak only to excite ſome Ideas in the Minds of thoſe who hear them; and may I not ſuppoſe that all ſorts of Ideas relate, not to abſolute Truths, but to ſuch Truths as have a relation to Mankind?

I muſt alſo obſerve by the by, that there are certain Things and certain Expreſſions in the Scripture, that will always confound the deepeſt Metaphyſicians. We have here an inſtance of it. See how *Deſcartes* was run down by the Hypotheſis which *Gregorius Ariminenſis* pretended to ground on the Scripture. One may eaſily gueſs that he was ſtrangely ſurpriſed, when he ſaw that the thundering Arguments that fell upon him, came from a place from which he expected it leaſt. He thought he had built upon a Rock, for he had built upon the Infallibility of God. He expected, without doubt, to have the Approbation of Divines as to that fundamental Part of his Hypotheſis, and he was ſure at leaſt that no Paſſages of the Scripture would be alledged againſt him: And yet the Storm fell upon him from that very place; and it was ſo violent that he was forced to yield. So vain are the Thoughts and Hopes of Men! But on the other ſide, we may very well wonder that *Deſcartes* made ſo weak a Reſiſtance. His quick Surrender is a ſign that he was not at all acquainted with Books of Divinity. If he had been verſed in that Reading, he might have known a great many Explications and Solutions of thoſe Scripture Paſſages that *Gregorius Ariminenſis* built upon, and they might have afforded him a method of Diſputing, whereby he might have come off. 'Tis likely ſome will ſay that I am miſtaken, and that he could not well make uſe of that method; for he was only for evident Reaſons, and always preferr'd what is clearer to what is leſs clear. Now the Paſſages that were objected againſt him out of the Holy Scripture, are infinitely clearer than the Explanations and Gloſſes of the Commentators; which is the reaſon why he laid down his Arms ſo ſoon. I can anſwer this Objection, and I ſay before hand, that this great Philoſopher ſhould at leaſt have inſiſted more than he did on the nature of the Expreſſions made uſe of by the Holy Writers, to accommodate themſelves to the Capacity of the People. Vulgar Minds being not able to raiſe themſelves to the moſt perfect Being, it was neceſſary that the Prophets ſhould bring down God to Man, and make him ſtammer with us, as a Nurſe ſtammers with a Child, whom ſhe ſuckles. Hence it is that there are ſo many Expreſſions in the Scripture, importing that God repents, that he is angry, that he will inquire whether a thing has happened, that he will alter his mind if Men obey, or do not obey him, and a thouſand ſuch things, that are inconſiſtent with infinite Perfection. *Deſcartes* did not fail to ſhew what difference there is between thoſe Expreſſions, and thoſe of a true Metaphyſician; but he touch'd too ſlightly upon it, and loſt all the Advantage he might have drawn from it; for he yielded notwith-

ſtanding

(a) *See the Preface of the Supplement to the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words*, Compel them to come in, *fol.* ** 4. *verſo & ſeq.*

(b) *See Mr.* Saurin's *Reflexions ſur les droits de la conſcience, pag.* 16.

(c) *That is, as to the Doctrines and Facts that concern Religion.*

(d) *Saurin ibid. pag.* 15.

(e) *Ibid. pag.* 16.

(f) *See the Difficultez propoſées à Mr.* Steyaert *ubi ſupra pag.* 244. *& ſeq.*

(g) *See the ſecond Objections againſt* Deſcartes's *Meditations, pag. m.* 66.

(h) *Object. ſecunda contra Meditat. Carteſii, pag. m.* 66.

(i) *See* Deſcartes's *Anſwer to the ſecond Objections, pag. m.* 75, *&* 76.

deceive us. They made a great noise in *Holland* against a Minister, who had said the same thing, (G) but with some Restrictions that Corrected it.

R I T-

standing, to the the Pretension of *Gregorius Ariminensis*, he should not have done it; he should have affirmed constantly, that the Passages of the Scripture, wherein it is said that God does sometimes deceive, ought never to be literally understood, and ought to be expounded, as those that say that he repents, and which ascribe to him some other humane Frailty. He should have shewn at large, that a Philosopher ought not to have a regard to those Passages of the Word of God, wherein the greatness of the Supreme Being is to be represented. Mr. *Regis* was very sensible of this: I will lay down as a Maxim, says he, (a) "That whenever I design to speak of God exactly, I must not consult my self, nor speak according to Custom, but raise my Mind above all Creatures, to consult the vast and immense Idea of the most perfect Being: So that I may be allow'd to say in a Moral Treatise, That *God has repented, that he is angry, &c.* But those and such like Expressions cannot be allowed me in a Treatise purely Metaphysical, in which one must speak exactly."

Let us remember, that if the Scripture does often represent God under popular, and consequently very false Notions, to accommodate it self to the Capacity of those, for whom God design'd the Revelation; it affords us in other places the Lenitive that we may want. I mean the Description of the Infinite Being in his immutable and most perfect Majesty.

(G) *They made a great noise in* Holland *against a Minister, who had said the same thing, but with some Restrictions that Corrected it.*] I mean Mr. *de Wolzogue*. He was Professor and Minister of the *Walloon* Church at *Utrecht*, in the Year 1666, when a Book came out, intituled, *Philosophia S. Scripturæ interpres, Exercitatio paradoxa.* It appear'd a very pernicious Piece to the Orthodox Divines, and worse than a Socinian Book. Mr. *de Wolzogue* was one of those who confuted it; but he was so unlucky in his Performance, that they made as much or more noise against his (b) Confutation, than against the Book he had confuted. Here is one of the things that gave the greatest Offence. "(c) I am to prove in the third place, that God will not deceive any body: though I need not take much pains to prove it. When God says a thing, it is sufficient to make us apprehend that he will not deceive Men. I say, that he *will* not deceive, lest one should think that he cannot do it, if he would. For as any one, who goes about to deceive another, is reputed to be in some measure above him in that respect, and to surpass him either in Address, or Strength, or in some other Faculty whatever it be; and because God's Wisdom, and Power, and all his other Attributes are infinite; 'tis plain that the Creatures, even the most perfect of them, because they are finite, as being Creatures, may be led into Error by the infinite Creator. But I deny that he *will* do it. For we can scarce think of an intention to deceive, without believing that there is some Malice in it, whereby we endeavour to impose upon the Person, whom we dare not assault without Cunning and Deceit; or that there is a weakness of Mind, which makes one doubt of a good Success without it. Each of those two things betrays a great Imperfection: they must not be therefore ascribed in the least to him, whom we look upon as a most perfect Being." They, who wrote (d) against Mr. *de Wolzogue*, made a great uproar about this Proposition, *God might deceive others, if he would.* It is certain that it sounds ill, and though the Explanation the Author added to it, reduced it to the common Opinion of the Orthodox Divines, that 'tis impossible God should deceive any Body, yet it had been better for him to abstain from those offensive Words, which at the bottom were of no use to the Question in hand, and were a meer needless Parenthesis. It seems to me that Men in cold Blood would not have carried their Censure farther; only they might have added to it, that an Author, who appears so much addicted to *Descartes*, ought not to use a great compass of Words in order to say that God cannot deceive. He ought to so say in one word. They, who express themselves thus, *the Reprobate might love God, if they would, but their Corruption is so great, that they cannot be willing to love him,* say at the Bottom the same thing with those, who affirm roundly, that 'tis impossible the Reprobate should love God. This last Proposition being shorter, is preferable to the other. In like manner, since it is a shorter Expression to say, *God cannot deceive*, than to say, *He might deceive, if he would; but he is so holy, that he cannot have the will to deceive*; why did M. *de Wolzogue* use so many Windings and Turnings in his Discourse? However it be, there is more reason to wonder that the Censure was not wholly confined within those Bounds, than to see that the Sieur *de Labadie*, who in the Name of the *Walloon* Church of *Middelburg*, accused M. *de Wolzogue* in the *Walloon* Synod, durst accuse him of Heterodoxy for saying that God cannot have the will to deceive us. "(e) Mr. *de Labadie* disputes against me, in his *Latin* Books, as an Error contrary to the Scripture, not what I said that God might deceive us if he would, but what I added to it, that God cannot have the will to deceive us. He pretends, that I have not said enough, and affirms that God *will* and *can* deceive. He objects the Scripture against me, and asks, *What will Wolzogue say to the History related in the 22d Chapter of the 1st Book of Kings, and especially to the words of the 22d Verse?* And the Lord said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold the Lord has put a lying Spirit into the Mouth of all these thy Prophets, and the Lord has spoken Evil concerning thee. *When God willed and commanded that Ahab should be seduced, and put a lying Spirit (for so* Junius *and* Tremellius *speak) must he be charged with weakness of Mind or Malice?*" See the Margin (f). I shall set down another Passage, whereby it will appear that the Adversaries of M. *de Wolzogue* were not offended at *Labadie*'s Temerity. 'Tis a very long Passage; but since it contains a Doctrine, whereby the censured Proposition is clear'd and explain'd in a solid manner, the Reader will not think it strange to find it here. Here are therefore Mr. *de Wolzogue*'s Words in the Preface to a Collection of (g) *Judgments*, which he publish'd in 1669.

"(h) The main Objection, and which makes the greatest Noise, is what I have said, that God can deceive us, if he will. For it seems my meaning is, that God can deceive us. But I think there is nothing more harmless than what I have said, and that it will be found to be very Orthodox, if it be carefully examin'd. For if there be any thing to be said against it, it must be in the Sense, or in the Words. As for the Sense, I lay down that 'tis impossible God should ever deceive any Body, as 'tis impossible he should Lie or deny himself; this I have said in express Words in several Places of my Book; I made it the Foundation of my whole Dispute, and I think it is so important a Truth, that I believe we can have no assurance of any thing in the World, nor of our Salvation without it. Nevertheless, in order to explain the Nature of Deceit, I distinguish the will of Deceiving from the qualifications necessary to perform that Deceit. The will of Deceiving, is always Sinful, and contains properly the Imperfection that is in Deceit; but the Qualifications that might serve to put that Deceit in Execution (k) are good, and contain always some perfection. Let us consider two Men, one of which is stupid and malicious, and the other a virtuous and able Man: It may be said of the first, that he is desirous to deceive some body, but that he has not Wit enough for it; 'tis not for want of Will, but for want of Power. On the contrary it will be said of the second, that he has all the Wit that is requisite to impose upon simple People, but that he is too honest to do it. Now if we apply this to God, it is most certain that he will not Deceive, he cannot have such a Will, he is too perfect for it, being Perfection it self; but as for the qualities requisite for the Execution of a Deceit, such as Wisdom and Power, without doubt God is endow'd with them; not that he can at any time make use of his Wisdom and Power to perform a Deceit, for this still supposes a Will to deceive; but he has however the Wisdom and Power requisite for the execution of a Deceit; and 'tis in this Sense I say, that God can deceive if he will. But that he cannot will it; that is God cannot deceive, not for want of Wisdom or Power; but by reason of the Perfection of his Will. So that these Words, *God can deceive if he will*, ought to be Paraphras'd thus, *God has all the qualifications necessary for the execution of Deceit*; he is wise, powerful and constant; he has whatever might serve for the performance of a deceitful Design, if he was willing to deceive; but it is impossible for him to have such a Wit; it is also impossible that he should use his Power for the execution of a Deceit; from whence I conclude, that 'tis impossible he should deceive any body. The meaning of which is, that God is most wise and powerful. Who will deny it? But perhaps

" w

(a) Regis, [illegible] de la Philosophie, [illegible] pag. [illegible] edit. of Amst. [illegible]

(b) It is intituled, De Scripturarum interprete adversus Exercitatorem paradoxum libri duo, and was printed in 1667.

(c) Wolzogue, Apologie pour le Synode de Naerden, part. 4, pag. 160.

(d) See Mr. Vander Weyen, [illegible] of the Book [illegible] proves [illegible] Regnum [illegible] Reformatorum [illegible] in [illegible] de Interprete Scripturæ. Mr. Vogel [illegible] and [illegible]

(e) Wolzogue ubi supra, pag. 156, 157.

(f) Note, that M. de Wolzogue observes afterwards, that he gave M. de Labadie notice of that oversight in the Synod of Naerden, and since that time, adds he, he has mended his Opinion, having observed that it was an Impiety to say that God will and does effectively deceive Men.

(g) That is, Jugemens de plusieurs Professeurs & Docteurs en Theologie qui prononcent Orthodoxe le livre de Louys de Wolzogue de l'Interprete de l'Ecriture.

(h) Wolzogue, Avant-propos des Jugemens, &c.

(k) Compare with this what I have said in the Remark A of the Article Rangouze.

RITTANGELIUS (JOHN STEPHEN) a converted Jew, was of *Hamburg* in *Germany*, and lived in the XVIIth Century. He was Professor of the Oriental Languages in the University of *Koningsberg*, and publish'd (*A*) some Books, which shew that he was Zealous for the Christian Religion, and a learned Man. He design'd to publish some other Books, and in order to it he made a Journey to *Amsterdam*; but his Manuscripts were torn to pieces by some Privateers, who took the Ship in which he had embark'd. He himself relates this Adventure in the Epistle Dedicatory of his *Jezirah*. Some say he was born a Jew. The Journalists of *Utrecht* * affirm it positively; but others say, that *being a Roman Catholick he turned Jew, and afterwards Protestant*. They are the words of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, in *August*, 1699. *page* 212. But (*B*) some are of Opinion

"it will be said that there is some harshness in the "Words. Suppose there was, is it such a Crime as de"serves all the Noise that is made about it? If all harsh "and offensive Words were struck out of the Books of our "Divines, there would be many erasures in them. *Cal*"*vin* himself would not be free from Censure about the "Doctrine of Predestination. But as for the Doctrine "in question, I maintain that the Scripture says more "of it than I do. It says, 1 *Kings* 22. that *the Lord* "*has put a lying Spirit in the Mouth of the false Prophets*. "In the 20th Chapter of *Jeremiah*, verse 7. *O Lord* "*thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived*. And in "*Ezekiel* 14. 9. *If the Prophet be deceived, when he has* "*spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that Prophet*. "Did I advance any thing that seems at first so strange "as this? I am not ignorant of the Sense that is put up"on those Passages, and I wish they would have ad"mitted that which I put upon my Assertion, without "charging me with the appearance of harshness that is to "be found in the words. That which is surprizing, "is, that M. *de Labadie* maintains that God *can* and *will* "deceive, and that he has deceived: he finds fault with "me because I said only that God *can* deceive if he *will*, "but that he cannot *will* it; and yet none of our Zea"lots reprove him for it."

M. *de Wolzogue's* Adversaries were not satisfied with that Explication. M. *Vogelsang* confuted it with great Contempt and Indignation, and observed, among other things, that 'tis likely *Descartes* took from the Schoolmen his distinction between the *Power* and the *Will* to deceive; as if that Power was a kind of Perfection, whereas the Will to deceive is an Imperfection. He will have it that *Descartes* (*a*) hunted after the Glory of Invention, by digging up the Ordures of the Schoolmen; and he quotes a Passage of the fifth Chapter of the fourth Book of *Aristotle's Topicks*, where it is said that the Faculty of doing moral Evil is in God, and in a good Man. He alledges also these words of *Thomas Aquinas*, which explain that Passage of *Aristotle*. (*b*) *Deus peccare non potest, quia est omnipotens. Quamvis Philosophus dicat in quarto Topicorum, quod potest Deus & studiosus* (vir probus) *prava agere. Sed hoc intelligitur vel sub conditione, cujus antecedens sit impossibile, ut puta, si dicamus quod potest Deus prava agere si velit. Nihil enim prohibet conditionalem esse veram, cujus antecedens & consequens est impossibile; sicut si dicatur, si homo est asinus, habet quatuor pedes. Vel, ut intelligatur, quod Deus potest aliqua agere, quæ nunc prava videntur, quæ tamen, si ageret, bona essent. Vel loquitur secundum communem opinionem gentilium, qui homines dicebant transferri in Deos, ut Jovem & Mercurium.* He maintains that *Thomas Aquinas* made himself ridiculous, by pretending to justifie that Opinion of *Aristotle*. He is very severe upon him: I shall only mention what he says upon the last Point. (*c*) *Quod ultimo loco hariolatur, Aristotelem forte sic locutum fuisse* juxta communem opinionem Gentilium, qui homines dicebant transferri in Deos, ut Jovem & Mercurium; *quam hoc plane frivolum est? Etenim, juxta communem Gentilium opinionem, Dii non modo facultatem habebant mala vel turpissima perpetrandi, sed & promptam sane voluntatem. Quapropter eorum poetæ furta Numinum & imposturas, & rixas, & pugnas, & mutuorum odiorum rancores, & libidines & adulteria vulgo decantavere. Quod plane contra Philosophi scopum & mentem est, qui mala perpetrandi voluntatem Deo penitus abrogat, etsi facultatem prava faciendi concesserit.* He adds (*d*) some other Passages of the Scripture to those that were quoted by M. *de Wolzogue*, and shews how they are to be understood. See the Margin †.

(*A*) *And publish'd some Books*.] He had said in his Notes upon the Book (*e*) *Jezirah*, that the Chaldaick Paraphrase on the Scripture affords very good Arguments against the *Jews* and the *Anti-Trinitarians*. Whereupon a *Socinian* fell upon him in a Book he publish'd under the Name of *Irenopolita*. *Rittangelius* answer'd it, and intitled his Answer *Libra veritatis*, and dedicated it to *John Casimir*, King of *Poland*. M. *Vander Waeyen* (*f*) caused it to be reprinted at *Franeker* in 1698. with another Treatise of the same Author concerning the Ceremonies of the *Passover*. He reprinted also in the same Place, in the Year 1699. *Rittangelius's* Book *de veritate Religionis Christianæ*, which contains a large Collection of Passages, (*g*) shewing that the ancient *Jewish* Church believed the Mystery of the Trinity, and the Eternal Divinity of the *Messias*. M. *Wagenseil* (*h*) has publish'd some Letters, which *Rittangelius* wrote to a *Jew*, and which seem to him to be excellent. M. *du Voisin*, who refuted the Book of the pretended *Irenopolita*, has not been so succesful in it as the Christian Proselyte: 'Tis the Opinion (*i*) of M. *Vander Waeyen*. I must add that some of those, who don't like *Rittangelius's* Principles, did no sooner hear that there was a new Edition of his *Libra veritatis*, but they publish'd a Manuscript written long before, and intitled *Bilibra veritatis & rationis*, &c. To which they added the Dissertation *de verbo Dei*, which had occasion'd *Rittangelius's* Work. Consult the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (*k*).

Rittangelius publish'd at *Koningsberg* in 1652. his *German* Translation of the Prayers, which the *Jews* make in their Synagogues on the first Day of every Year, and dedicated it to the Elector of *Brandenburg*. We read in the Epistle Dedicatory, dated the 31st of *May*, 1652. that he had been sick about a Year, and that he had little hopes of recovering; that he had often desired to have some choice Disciples committed to his Care, that the Talent he had received of God might not die with him, but be transmitted to others; that he could not obtain this Favour, and therefore notwithstanding his great Illness, he had translated some *Jewish* Prayers into the *German* Language. He takes notice in his Preface of several Faults committed by *Kircher*, *Cappel*, *Scaliger*, *Vechner*, *Vorstius*, *Constantin l'Empereur Slegovotius*, and *Schickardus*, in translating some *Hebrew* Passages (*l*). The Journal, which I have quoted, informs us of his Infatuation. (*m*) *In eo merito a cordatioribus Theologis reprehendendus, quod ubique fere jactat, ne apicem quidem ullum vel literam in Novo Testamento reperiri, quem non ex Hebræorum antiquitatibus desumtum demonstrare ipse possit, & quidem, ut ipse loquitur*, non opinionibus, (quia opinio versatur circa illa, quæ se aliter habere possunt) sed auctoritatibus omnium seculorum, tam Judaicæ, quam Christianæ Ecclesiæ & Antiquitatis. He said there is not a jot in the New Testament, but what is taken from the *Jewish* Antiquities.

(*B*) *Some are Opinion that he never profest Judaism*.] A Manuscript Letter dated the 10th of *September*, 1701. has been imparted to me, out of which I shall extract some Passages that will please the Curious.

The Author of the Letter was particularly acquainted with our *Rittangelius*. He observes, 1. That *Hornius*, *Wagenseil*, and several other Writers affirm, that he had been, and was perhaps born, a Jew. 2. That the Anonymous Author of the *Bilibra veritatis* affirms, (*n*) That *Rittangelius* having been bred up in the Church of *Rome*, embraced the Religion of the Jews, who, as 'tis said, Circumcised him at *Hamburg*; and that afterwards he was Baptized at *Dantzick* by Mr. *Nigrinus*, and profess'd himself a Christian. 3. That *Christopher Hartknoch*, Professor at *Thorn*, (*o*) says, That *Rittangelius* being born a Christian, as 'tis said, and being initiated into the Christian Religion through Baptism, embraced Judaism, and was Circumcised at *Hamburg*; that afterwards he turn'd Papist, and then Calvinist, and at last Lutheran; that, against Custom, he was made Professor extraordinary of the Hebrew Tongue, in the University of *Koningsberg*, without any Preliminary Disputation for it; that he was favour'd therein by the Great Marshal, and that a Quarrel arising between *Latterman* and *Mislenta*, he sided with *Latterman*.

The Author of the Letter makes in the first place a Remark upon the Uncertainty that may be observed in those ſion that he never profeſs'd *Judaiſm*. He was ſtill living the 5th of *May*, 1651. for 'tis the Date of the Epiſtle Dedicatory * prefix'd to one of his Books.

---

* *Biblioth. librorum novorum mens. Sept. & Oct. 1697. pag. 675.*

(*a*) *Solet Cartesius e putidissimis antiquorum philosophorum atque scholasticorum* [illegible] *ineptiarum sordibus excrementa præcipue* [illegible] *sæpenumero deligere, ut de placitis olfactis & meritis sepultis oblivione, furtivitatis* [illegible] *gloriolam subripiat. Reinerus Vogelsangius, Theol. D. M. & S. S. Theologiæ Professor in Ecclesia & Gymnasio Sylvæ-ducensi. ad præfat. Lud. Wolzogii necessaria respons. pag. 49.*

(*b*) *Thomas Aquinas 25. quæst. art. 3. apud Vogelsang. ibid. p. 51.*

(*c*) *Vogels. ibid. p. 52.*

(*d*) *Ibid. pag. 69.*

† *Note, that the Walloon Synod declar'd* Wolzogue's *Book to be Orthodox.*

(*e*) *'Tis a Book, which the Jews ascribe to the Patriarch* Abraham. *Others ascribe it to* Rabbi Akiba. Rittangelius *made a Translation of it with some Notes, which was printed at* Amsterdam, *in* 1642.

ROBERT (*John*) Profeſſor of the Civil Law in the Univerſity of *Orleans*, the Place of his Birth, in the XVIth Century, was eſteemed (*A*) for his Works. *Annæus* † **ROBERT**, his Son, Advocate in the Parliament of *Paris*, publiſh'd ſome Books relating to the Civil Law, that (*B*) are valued. See the ‖ Letter which *Paſquier*

thoſe Writers, and upon their various Accounts; from whence it follows, that if ſome of 'em are not miſtaken, the others muſt needs relate ſome Falſities. Afterwards he gives an Abſtract of a Letter, which a Senator of *Dantzick* writ to him the 22d of *April*, 1700. That Abſtract imports, that Mr. *Hartknoch*, (ſpeaking without doubt of the ſame *Nigrinus*, to whom he aſcribes the baptizing of *Rittangelius*,) ſays (*a*) that *Nigrinus*, being a *Lutheran*, turn'd *Calviniſt*, and was a Preacher at *Dantzick*, and then turn'd *Papiſt* at the Suggeſtion of the *Capuchin Valerian Magnus*; and that before that time he had ſaid many things agreeable to the Principles of the *Socinians* concerning the Birth of JESUS CHRIST. That Senator was deſired to inquire whether there was any Monument of the pretended Baptiſm conferred upon *Rittangelius* by *Nigrinus* at *Dantzick*; and he was told, that ſuch a Ceremony would have been performed with great Pomp, and regiſtred in the Archives of the Church, conſidering the Merit and Learning of that new Chriſtian. His Anſwer was, That *Nigrinus* was invited, in 1630, to be Paſtor of the Reformed in St. *Peter's* Church at *Dantzick*; and that the Office of baptizing being appropriated to the Deacons in that City, excluſively of the Paſtors, *Nigrinus* could not have baptized *Rittangelius*. He had no time to inquire, whether he contributed to the Converſion of that Proſelyte. From all theſe things the Author of the Letter concludes, that *Rittangelius* was neither baptized nor re-baptized at *Dantzick*: Which proves, ſays he, that thoſe are miſtaken, who ſay he was born, or made himſelf a *Jew*. I wonder, continues he, that ſo many famous Writers have neglected to inquire into the Truth of the Matter; which had been no difficult thing for them during *Rittangelius*'s Life, who, as he had many Friends, had alſo many Enemies. They have been contented to tranſcribe one another, and to publiſh a looſe Report, without giving themſelves the Trouble to examine whether it was well grounded, or not.

He ſays, that being in *Pruſſia* in the Year 1649, and the two Years following, and having lodged for ſome Months in the Houſe of Mr. *Ahaſuerus Brand*, Great Marſhal, and one of the four Counſellors of the Regency, he had an Opportunity to know *Rittangelius*, and to contract a very ſtrict Friendſhip with him. The Great Marſhal was his Patron, and uſed to invite him to Dinner. He and ſeveral other Perſons of Honour and Probity told the Author of the Letter, that *Rittangelius* was born a Roman Catholick in the Fortreſs of *Forcheim* in *Franconia*, in the Dioceſs of *Bamberg*; that having ſtudied Humane Learning, he went to *Conſtantinople*, where he very much converſed with the *Rabbins* for the ſpace of twelve Years; that, at his Return, he imbraced the Reformed Religion, and then removed to *Koningsberg*, where the Elector of *Brandenburg* made him Profeſſor Extraordinary of the *Hebrew* Tongue, none but the *Lutherans* being at that time allowed to be Profeſſor Ordinary in that Univerſity; that no body believed he was born a *Jew*, but that ſome ſuſpected he had been one.

The ſame Author of the Letter ſays, that one day the Baron of *Eulenburg*, Son-in-Law to the Great Marſhal, bantered *Rittangelius* about Circumciſion, being at Table at his Father-in-Law's, who was ſorry for it; that *Rittangelius*, being very much aſhamed, excuſed himſelf modeſtly, and complained that they had ſuch thoughts of him contrary to all Truth. After Dinner the Author of the Letter expreſs'd to him his Trouble for the Affront he had received. *Rittangelius* melting in Tears, and fetching very deep Sighs, proteſted to him that he had not been circumciſed. The ſame Author affirms, that a Miniſter of *Elbing*, venerable for his Probity and Learning, afforded him a good Proof of it. The unfortunate *Rittangelius* was married to a Woman, who (*b*) abuſed him, and was ſupported in her Humours by her Relations, who lived at *Elbing*. That Miniſter uſed his utmoſt Endeavours to make 'em Friends, and was a Witneſs of the violent Paſſion of the Wife, from which he drew a good Argument againſt the common Opinion of her Husband's being circumciſed; for he argued thus: That Woman, during her Paſſion, vented impudently whatever might contribute to the diſhonour of her Husband; but ſhe never reproach'd him with being circumciſed; therefore he is not circumciſed.

The Author of the Letter adds another Reaſon. It does not appear, ſays he, that any of *Rittangelius*'s Adverſaries upbraided him with ſuch a thing in any of their Books during his Life. Yet they were many, and ſome of 'em ſhewed a great deal of Spite. He did not ſpare them, and briſkly attack'd ſeveral famous Authors in his Writings; and, among others, (*c*) *Miſlenta* the Pillar of *Lutheraniſm* at *Koningsberg*, and the *Buxtorfs*, whom he charged with a groſs Ignorance of the *Hebrew* Tongue.

Laſtly, The Author of the Letter thinks, that ſeveral People entertain'd ſuch Suſpicions of *Rittangelius*, becauſe he only converſed with the *Jews* during his Stay at *Conſtantinople*, and becauſe he look'd like a true *Rabbin*. But this does not prove that he imbraced *Judaiſm*. Perhaps he made the *Jews* believe, he would do it, to make 'em the more willing to teach him their Learning, and then he went away without keeping his Word (*d*).

(*A*) *Was eſteem'd for his Works.*] He publiſh'd *Sententiarum juris libri* 4. Paris 1557. *Recepta juris civilis lectiones libri* 2. Orleans 1567. *Animadverſionum juris civilis libri* 3. Paris 1580. *Cujas* wrote againſt this laſt Book, under the Name of *Mercator*. *Robert* made a Reply, intituled, *Notarum libri* 3. *ad Jacobi Cujacii Mercatoris notarum libros* 3. printed at *Orleans* in 1583. He writ alſo a Book againſt a Miniſter call'd *Robert Maſſon*. That Work being tranſlated into *French*, was printed at *Paris* in 1569. See *Du Verdier*'s (*e*) *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*.

(*B*) *Some Books relating to the Civil Law that are valued.*] His four Books *rerum judicatarum* are very much eſteem'd. 'Tis a Collection of the Decrees of the Parliament of *Paris*, or of the Great Council, &c. concerning very conſiderable Matters. The Reaſons of the Advocates are mention'd at large, and learnedly. It is a continued Series of learned and choice Quotations. I would ſay no more of it, were it not that I remember that among thoſe, who ſay, that the Paſſages of *Tagereau*, which I have quoted in the Article *Quellenec*, give ſome Offence; ſome go upon this falſe Suppoſition, that that Writer was a Man of no Authority, and an unknown Perſon; and that he is the only Author, who has been ſo raſh as to write in ſuch a manner. I hope they'll be no longer offended, if I ſhew them, that this Scandal is grounded on a Miſtake about a Matter of Fact; which was one of the Reaſons that moved me to make it appear in the ſecond Edition of the Article *Quellenec*. 1. That *Tagereau*'s Diſcourſe is not an (*f*) unknown Piece. 2. That another (*g*) Advocate of *Paris* was as free in his Expreſſions as he. I add here, with the ſame Intent, that is, for the Edification of thoſe Gentlemen, that *Annæus Robert*, one of the moſt famous Advocates of that ſame Parliament, went beyond thoſe two, and even in a Book dedicated to the Great *Achilles de Harlai*, firſt Preſident of that auguſt Senate. The 10th Chapter of his 4th Book *rerum judicatarum* runs upon a Proceſs about Impotency brought to the Parliament of *Paris* by way of Appeal. That Parliament confirm'd by a Decree (†) the Sentence of the Eccleſiaſtical Judges, who had order'd a *Search* and a *Congreſs*; which the Husband not liking, had appeal'd to the Parliament. His Advocate repreſented the Abomination of ſuch Proceedings. He did, in ſome meaſure, what happens in great Revolutions of State,

Ggg when

* *See the Remark A towards the end.*

† *And not Andrew, as Konig ſays.*

‖ *It is in the* [illegible] *Book, pag.* 555, &c. *of the* 2d *Tome.*

(a) *Ibid. pag.* [illegible]

(c) *A Doctor of Divinity.*

(d) *Taken from a Letter* Scripta a Medico Germano T. L. K. ad Medicum Hollandicum P. B.

(e) *Page* 753.

(f) *It was inſerted in the* Bibliotheque du Droit François, *a Work reprinted at* Paris *in the Year* 1657.

(g) *Sebaſtien Rouillard.*

(†) *The* 20th *of* January 1587.

quier writ to him. *Lewis* ROBERT, his Son, Advocate in the ſame Parliament, died very young, and had already acquired a great Reputation. See *James Gutherius*'s *Choartius major, vel de orbitate toleranda.* This Treatiſe is to be found at the end of the Book *de Jure Manium*: The Author addreſs'd it to *Annæus* ROBERT, and comforted him as well as he could. I have mention'd in another Place *Peter* ROBERT, one of the moſt illuſtrious Advocates of the Parliament of *Paris*, in the Reign of *Henry* II. and I ſhall ſpeak of him (C) again. I don't know whether the Profeſſor of *Orleans* and he were of the ſame Family.

ROBERVAL, Profeſſor of Mathematicks at *Paris*, contemporary with *Des Cartes*, and his great Enemy. See the *Sorberiana*, and Mr. *Baillet* *.

ROCCO (GIROLAMO) was ſo great a Maſter in the Art of Writing, that he deſerves to be mentioned. He was a *Venetian*, and lived in the beginning of the XVIIth Century. The Duke of *Savoy* (T) expreſs'd a great Eſteem for him.

ROCHE.

when (a) the Laws are overturn'd for a little time, in order to make 'em laſt a long time. He diſpenſed with the Rules of Modeſty, for the good of Modeſty. He made an impudent Deſcription of a Search, to make one abhor it, and endeavour the Extirpation of a moſt impudent Abuſe. *Tagereau* was animated with the ſame Spirit; but *Robert* gave himſelf a freer Scope, because he wrote in *Latin*. (b) *Visitis ad perpetuam rei deteſtationem, quam à jure & judicio exſulare convenit, viſitationem (ſpectaculum nunc publica dignum) verbis repræſentari! Parcite pudicæ aures, ſi quid in re obſcœna labitur verecundiæ ſermonis modeſtia. Puella reſupina jacet cruribus hinc inde diſpanſis. Proſtant pudenda corporis partes, quas natura ad delicias generis humani velavit. Has & matronæ (quæ obſtetrices anus ſunt) & medici inſpiciunt, pertractant, diducunt: Magiſtratus vultu compoſito riſum diſſimulat: Matronæ præſentes venereum uſum obitum refricant: Medici pro ætatis diſcrimine, hic vires priſtinas reminiſcitur, ille animo æſtuante inani ludicri ſpectaculo paſcitur: Chirurgus aut ferramento fabrefacto (id ſpeculum matricis vocari ſolet) aut cereo & fictitio Priapo aditus Venereos tentat, aperit, reſerat: Puella jacens titillatione veſana prurit: Ut etiam ſi virgo viſitari cœperit, inde tamen non incorrupta recedat.* Modeſty, continues he, (c) does not allow me to ſay more of it. Afterwards he obſerves, that ſuch a Practice might be tolerated, notwithſtanding its Shamefulneſs, if it was a good way to find out the Truth of the Matter; but he maintains, that it is a deceitful way, and thereupon he heaps up many obſcene Things. The whole Chapter is full of ſuch Thoughts and Expreſſions, and nothing can be more laſcivious, than the Paſſage wherein the Wife's Advocate exhorts the poor Husband to a Love-fight, and deſcribes to him the Sweets that one may enjoy in the Field of Battel. There had been ſuch a Cauſe in the Parliament of *Paris* ſome Years before: Which I obſerve only to acquaint the Reader, that *Antony Hotman*, Brother to the famous *Francis Hotman*, declared againſt the *Congreſs*, and was extreamly (d) free in his Expreſſions. The Book he publiſh'd upon that Subject is intituled, *Traité de la diſſolution du Mariage par impuiſſance & froideur de l'homme ou de la femme*; *A Treatiſe concerning the Diſſolution of Marriage, by reaſon of the Husband's, or the Wife's Frigidity*; and was printed ſeveral times. I think the firſt Edition came out in the Year 1581; and that it was in the ſame Year that one of his Kinſmen was proſecuted to have his Marriage diſſolved, under Pretence of Impotency. It is certain that *Roulliard* ſays, that *Antony Hotman* compoſed that Treatiſe only to favour one of his Relations, who was impotent. Take notice, that this Brother of *Francis Hotman* made a great Figure among the Advocates, and was preferred, by the *Leaguers*, to the Office of Advocate-General in the Parliament of *Paris*. Let no Body think therefore that *Tagereau* is the only Author, whom I could have quoted; for I might have alledged the moſt celebrated Advocates. I muſt not forget that the Work of *Annæus Robert* has been tranſlated and publiſhed in *French* by an (e) Advocate. I have not that Tranſlation; but I think that the above-quoted *Latin* Paſſage, and many others, are not expreſs'd in it ſo nakedly, as in the Original, and yet that they are very obſcene.

I have read, in *Beza's Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of* France, that an Advocate's Wife, in whoſe Houſe the Proteſtants had ſeveral Meetings at *Paris*, made her ſelf (f) a Priſoner in the *Chatelet*, with her two Daughters, to convince the World of the Falſity of the Report, that had been ſpread about the Lewdneſs of thoſe Aſſemblies. "(g) The Court . . . . . . cauſed the two Daughters to be ſearched by ſeveral Surgeons and Midwives, and at ſeveral times. But all the Searchers, except an old Matron, declared them to be Virgins; nor did that Matron poſitively affirm, that they had been corrupted by the approach of a Man; and, at laſt, ſhe begg'd their Pardon, after they had been ſet at Liberty, declaring how, and by whom ſhe had been bribed". *Beza* does not ſeem to condemn the Trial which they ſubmitted to; and indeed, they found themſelves in ſuch circumſtances as might excuſe them for expoſing themſelves to a Search notwithſtanding Modeſty, and the Danger they ran, becauſe the Searchers might well be ſuſpected of unfair Dealing. I ſhall ſay nothing of the uncertainties of ſuch a Proceeding; but after all, if thoſe Gentlewomen had refus'd to be Searched, they had confirmed thereby the Depoſitions of the falſe Witneſſes. The Queſtion was to confute the Informations which the Preſident *Saint André* had cauſed to be drawn up, wherein two Witneſſes affirm'd, that in an Aſſembly (upon *Thurſday* in the Holy Week) made up of a *great number of Men, Women and Maids, about twelve a Clock at Night . . . . . after they had Preached, and eat a Pig inſtead of the Paſchal Lamb, and after they had put out the Lamp that gave them Light, every Man fell upon a Woman, and that among other Women, they* (the two Witneſſes) *ſaw the ſaid Advocate's Wife, and her two young and handſom Daughters, one of which happening to meet one of 'em* (one of the Witneſſes) *he knew her two or three times for his Share* (h). Theſe Informations made a great Noiſe, and were ſhewn to the Queen Mother (i).

(C) *And I ſhall ſpeak of him again.*] This *Peter Robert* was (k) a *Pariſian*. *Loiſel* ſpeaks of him thus. "He (l) was more eſteem'd than the others "abovementioned, not that he was more Learned "than they, for I believe he was inferior to "them in that Reſpect; but he had a noble Preſence, "a good Voice, and a fine Delivery, and was "more valued for his Natural Parts, than for his "Study. He made himſelf famous particularly by two "Pleadings: the firſt was that which he made for "Preſident *d'Oppede*, concerning the Inhabitants of "*Cabrieres* and *Merindol*; the thing is ſo well deſcribed "by *Thuanus*, that I need not dwell upon it. "The late M. *Clement du Puy* had been firſt intruſted "with that Cauſe; but falling Sick of the Sickneſs "of which he died, Preſident *d'Oppede* apply'd "himſelf to *Robert*, whom he daily informed "of what he ſhould ſay. The other Reaſon of "*Robert*'s Advancement, was, that turning Proteſtant, "he was employ'd by the Prince of *Condé*, Grand-Father "of this preſent Prince, to declare his Innocence: "From that time he was always made "uſe of by thoſe of that Religion; which coſt him "his Life, for he was kill'd on St. *Bartholomew*'s "Day."

(T) *The Duke of* Savoy *expreſs'd a great eſteem for him.*] The following Paſſage is to be found in a Book, Intituled, *La Sage & delectable Folie*, written by *J. Marcel*. "(m) I ſhould be too tedious, "ſhould

---

* *Baillet, Vie de Deſcartes, tom. 2. p. 504. where he ſays that there are two faults in the 2d Volume of Merſenne. See also his Traité des Auteurs deguiſez, Pag. 145.*

(a) Leges ſemper ut eſſent, aliquando non fuerint, *ſaid an ancient* Roman.

(b) *Annæus Robertus, rerum judicatarum lib. 4. cap. 10. pag. 780. edit. Genev. 1620. in 8vo.*

(c) Plura dicere vetat pudor. *Id. ibid.*

(d) *See the Remark G of the Article* Quellenec.

(e) *Called* Tournet. *I have it from Mr.* Marais, *with ſome other particulars.*

ROCHEFOUCAUD (ALEXANDER DE LA) Abbot of *St. Martin* †, Brother to the Count *de Randan*, who was killed at the Battel of *Issoire*, and to *Francis* Bishop of *Clermont*, who was since Cardinal, engaged unluckily in the Imposture of *Martha Brossier*, who pretended to be possess'd by the Devil. I have said, in her Article, that the Parliament of *Paris* having at last ordered her to be carried to *Romorantin* by the Provost, forbad her Father to let her go out of that Place without leave from the Judge. Notwithstanding that Prohibition, the Father and his Daughter went with our Abbot into *Auvergne*, and then to *Avignon*. Tho' the Parliament ‖ of *Paris* summon'd the Abbot twice, and ordered at last that the Revenues of his Benefices should be seized for Contempt of the Court, this Crew proceeded in their Journey, and went to *Rome*, γ *thinking that* the Woman possessed by the *Devil would act her part much better on that great Stage, and find more credulous People in that Place, which is the Fountain of Belief.* The Bishop ‡ of *Clermont* was so much suspected of having suggested this foolish Design to his Brother, that he was likewise deprived of his Ecclesiastical Revenues. *Henry* IV. being well inform'd of the wicked Designs that were brooding, ordered Mr. *de Sillery* and Cardinal *d'Ossat* to discover the Plot, and to prepossess the Pope against that Crew, before they should act their part. They carefully executed his Order; besides, Cardinal *d'Ossat* (Z) prevailed with the Jesuits to side with him; so that the Abbot of *St. Martin*, at his arrival at *Rome*, found himself deprived of the chief Assistance he relied upon. The Jesuits forsook him, and the Pope, who had been forewarn'd, did nothing contrary to the Sentence given by the Parliament of *Paris* against that pretended Demoniack. The Abbot was obliged to implore *Henry* the Fourth's Clemency for himself and his Brother. *Not long after he fell sick, and 'twas said that he died of Grief, for having undertaken so long a Journey to make himself despised.* Martha *and her Father, being forsaken by every Body, took Sanctuary in the Hospitals* §.

† Mezerai, Abreg. Chronolog. ad ann. 1599. pag. [illegible]

‖ Thuanus lib. 123. circa fin.

γ Mezerai ibid.

‡ Thuanus ibid.

§ Mezerai ubi supra. Thuanus speaks of it thus: Ita fabula de Martha a Spiritu obsessa somno evanuit, ipso Sammartino qui spe sua falsus in aula illa despectus esse cœperat, ex mœrore mox mortuo, & Martha patreque ejus ex xenodochiorum stipe miseram vitam vix tolerantibus.

RODON (DAVID DE) or rather **DERODON** (DAVID) Professor of Philosophy, first at *Die*, and then at *Orange*, and at last at *Nimes*, was a Native of *Dauphiné*. He was one of the most subtil Logicians in *France*, and few *Spanish* or *Irish* School-men exceeded him in what concerns the Universals, *Entia Rationis*, and the airy and abstracted Speculations of the Categories, and the Dependencies of the Syllogistical form. But if he equall'd in this the most refined Logicians of the Schools, he far exceeded them in his Physicks; for he imbraced the Opinion of the Moderns and the Hypothesis of Atoms, to explain, as *Gassendus* did, many Natural Effects by Mechanical Principles. His Body of Philosophy sold very well, and the Printer got a great deal by it, especially by the Abridgment of it; for the long Scholastick Disputes contain'd in his large Work, discouraged many Readers. *Derodon* wrote a Book *de Supposito*, wherein he openly declared for *Nestorius*, against St. *Cyril*; not by admitting two Persons, but by maintaining that *Nestorius* did not admit of 'em, and that St. *Cyril* confounded the two Natures of CHRIST. Wherein he only followed the footsteps (*A*) of a Gentleman of *Provence*, whom doubtless he had been acquainted with, and who forsook the Church of *Rome* to turn Protestant. This Opinion of *Derodon* is an (*B*) incident of the famous Dispute between two Ministers of

" should I name all the Princes who have been liberal " and kind to the *Virtuoso's*; and therefore I shall only " mention what concerns *Rocco Girolami* of *Venice*, a " very good Arithmetician, and so excellent a Writer, " that I don't think any Man in his time exceeded " him. He Dedicated a Book Engraven upon Copper-" Plates to his Highness of *Savoy* in the Year 1603. " adorned with several sorts of Characters, Cyphers, " and excellent Strokes. That great Prince having " seen it, rewarded the Industry of the Author, by " putting with his own Hands a Gold Chain worth " 125 Crowns about his Neck". The Author mentions the same Reward in another place of his Book, *viz.* in the Chapter (*a*) Intituled *La folie des Ecrivains*. Perhaps the Reader will not be displeased to find here the Names of some Persons, who, as he says, excell'd in that Art. " We have seen, (they are his Words) (*b*) " many fine Writers, who have " Published Books of several sorts of Characters, as " in *France*, *le Gagneur*, *Lucas*, *Josserand*, and o-" thers; in *Italy*, *D. Augustin* of *Sienna*, *M. Martin* " of *Romagna*, *Camillo Buonadio* of *Piacenza*, *Cresci* " a *Milanese*, *Curione* a *Roman*, *Palatin*, *Verune*, " and others, with M. *Antonio* a *Genoese*, who in " the Year 1606. made a Book containing several " sorts of Letters and Characters, Dedicated to the " Prince of *Mantua* and *Montferrat*.

(Z) *Cardinal* d'Ossat *prevailed with the Jesuits to side with him.*] He spoke particularly to Father *Sirmond*, Secretary to their General (*c*); and having shewed him the King's Orders, he represented to him, that it was to be feared the Attempt of the Abbot would prove an obstacle to the recalling of the Jesuits, because he and the Bishop of *Clermont* had studied amongst 'em. Afterwards he represented to him the Rashness of such an Undertaking, and how prejudicial it would be to the Church, if the Supreme Courts of the Kingdom should fall out again with the Pope. Those Reasons produced a very good Effect.

(*A*) *Wherein he only followed the Footsteps of a Gentleman of* Provence.] His Name was *Giles Gaillard*. He turn'd Protestant about the Year 1630. and retired to *Orange*, where he made a Panegyrick upon Prince *Frederick Henry*. He took care to publish the Motives of his Conversion. See the Book he Intituled *Le Proselyte Evangelique*. The following Passage, concerning his Book *de Supposito*, is to be found in a Letter of *Sorbiere* to *Vossius* written in the Year 1646. when he sent him the Copy he had been presented with by the Author. (*d*) *Illi* (Ægidio Gailliardo nobili Gallo) *nuper venit in mentem nescio quid circa Nestorium, quasi perperam in Ephesina Synodo fuerit livore Cyrilli hæreseos insimulatus damnatusque; eaque de re edidit librum, cui titulus est* De Supposito. The Postscript to this Letter is remarkable; for it informs us (*e*) that one of the most learned Ministers was of the same Opinion.

(*d*) See the 432d Letter, among those that were written to Vossius, pag. 285.

(*e*) Audio Joh. Croium in eadem esse sententia in qua Gaillardus noster.

(*B*) *An incident of a famous Dispute.*] This will appear by a long Passage of M. *Saurin*, one of those two Disputants. " (*f*) M. *Jurieu* is a wonderful " Man: An Error will be purified by going thro' " his Channel, and what is Heresie in another Man, " is an Orthodox Doctrine in him, by vertue of " his violent, and impetuous Zeal. In his first Apo-" logy which he Published after the Synod of *Ley-*

(*f*) Saurin, Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu, pag. 867. & seq.

" *den*,

of Holland, and which is not * ended yet. I shall say something of it in the Remark
and

* *I publish'd it in the Year 1690 when I was about the first Edition of this Work; but I must say now, that this Controversie was ended long after.*

"*don*, he gives us the History of the rise and growth of that pernicious Cabal of Socinians, or Men inclined to Socinianism, to whom all Religions are indifferent, and who are half Atheists, in which he involves all those whom he has a mind to Sacrifice to the hatred of the Publick. He relates several particulars concerning that Cabal, to have a fair Pretence of enumerating his Virtues and noble Exploits. Among the Characters of Heresie, which he has discover'd in some Divines, he reckons their Approbation of *Derodon*'s Book, Intitled *De Supposito*, which he styles twice in half a Page *the wretched Book De Supposito*. He informs us that this wretched Book was burnt at *Toulouse*: A great Sign of Reprobation in a Book! I confess that Author had been suspected of some Errors: Perhaps he gave occasion to those Suspicions, by departing from the Opinions commonly receiv'd, and carrying his Philosophical Liberty a little too far. He was sometimes brought into Trouble for his Doctrine; but he came off with Honour. I saw him at *Geneva* in the Year 1664, where he was a Refugee, after he had been Banish'd from *France*, for having writ a Book, Intitled, *Le Tombeau de la Messe*. I often discoursed with him about several Matters, and always found him very Orthodox. He died at *Geneva* in the same Year 1664, if I am not mistaken, not long after I set out from thence for *Holland*. I was informed that his Death had been very edifying, and that he had made a Confession of Faith that was approved. But whatever the private Opinions of that Philosopher might be, or whatever he might have said in Conversation, or writ in other Books, his Treatise *De Supposito* is not answerable for them, but only for the Errors contained in it. When a Man is suspected, he ought to be narrowly observed, and all his Words ought to be scanned, *ne lateat anguis in herba*; but his Orthodox Opinions must not be changed into Errors, nor all his Errors into Heresies. The Design of this Reflection is not fully to justifie the Treatise *De Supposito*; but to excuse it, being condemn'd by a Man who himself stands in need of Excuse and Pardon. One can hardly guess what M. *Jurieu* finds fault with in that Book, unless it be the same Liberty of condemning the Title of *Mother of God*, bestowed upon the Holy Virgin, which he himself takes in one of his Pastoral Letters. That Philosopher explains the Word *Suppositum* in a very Orthodox manner, both with respect to divine and humane Persons. In his Explication of the Person of Christ after his Incarnation, he pitches upon the Opinion that is commonly received, and least liable to ill consequences, and the Cavils of Hereticks. 'Tis true, that he sides with *Nestorius*, against *Cyril* and the Fathers of the Council of *Ephesus*, from whom he thinks *Eutyches* had his Heresie. But if this be an Error, 'tis only in a matter of fact; and a Book cannot be accounted pernicious upon such an account. What Poison is there then in that unfortunate Book? it lyes only in the Author's Aversion for the Title of Θεοτόκος, *Mother of God*, and his reflecting upon *Cyril*, and the Divines of his Party, whom he looks upon as the Patriarchs (*a*) of Idolatry. The Censurer of this Philosopher is not so severe in his Judgment of 'em, but his Opinion is the same as to the Doctrine. He spares those, who have introduced the Word in question into the Church; but he uses that Word without any Mercy. In his Opinion *Cyril* was no Idolater, and his fault lyes only in a wrong Zeal; but this fatal Word Θεοτόκος has occasion'd Idolatry, and even the Nestorian Heresie. I must set down once more the very Words of our Divine so zealous for Orthodoxy, and particularly for the Anti-Nestorian Orthodoxy.

The Author inserts in this place a large extract of the Pastoral Letters of his Adversary, wherein the Title of *Mother of God* is condemned as the Cause of Idolatry, and then he goes on thus. "(*b*) The Author of the Book, Intitled *De Supposito*, says nothing at the bottom that goes beyond this. For if M. *Jurieu* pretends that this Philosopher absolutely refused to call the Holy Virgin *Mother of God*, it will be said that he did it in the same Sense that M. *Jurieu* himself does it. The contrary cannot be proved by his Book. And since that Author acknowledges one only Person as well as two Natures in Christ, and according to the Principles of his Philosophy, *actiones & passiones sunt Suppositorum*, a Maxim which he often repeats; there is reason to believe that he did not deny that the Holy Virgin was the Mother of him, who is God, and a Divine Person. Accordingly he calls her the Mother of Christ, having acknowledged that Christ is but one Person, both God and Man, and even a Divine Person, whose personality does properly reside in the Word. What great difference is there then between the niceness of this Philosopher, and that of our Divine? Why is the former an Heretick, and the latter Orthodox, when they think and speak the same thing about the same Matter? . . . . . As for me, I have openly declared against the niceness of the Philosopher, and of the Divine. I persist in this Declaration; I don't approve their Boldness, and the Singularity of their Opinions; I condemn their Errors; I blame them both, but I Anathematise neither of 'em . . . . . I have sometimes admired *Derodon*'s Zeal, a Protestant, Anti-Papist and Anti-Idolatrous Zeal. He calls all the Reformed Ministers Angels of *Laodicea*, and lukewarm Pastors, because we are not willing to Excommunicate *Cyril*, and the Fathers of the Council of *Ephesus*. This is a very extraordinary Zeal for a Philosopher; but M. *Jurieu* is too indulgent, for he excuses *Cyril* and the Fathers of the Council of *Ephesus*, who introduced Idolatry. *Derodon*'s System is more coherent than that of M. *Jurieu*. *Derodon* places *Cyril*, and the Fathers of the Council of *Ephesus*, among the Idolaters, whose Fathers they are. M. *Jurieu* distinguishes the Fathers from the Children, tho' he charges the former with being the cause of the Idolatry of the latter. All the difference between *Derodon* and M. *Jurieu* lyes in this: according to *Derodon*, *Cyril* and the Fathers of the Council of *Ephesus* acted and argued consequentially, they were Idolaters, and established Idolatry; whereas, according to M. *Jurieu*, those Fathers who composed an Oecumenical Council, introduced the greatest of all Idolatries, without being Idolaters.

Mr *Jurieu*'s Reply is very long, and made up of many pieces. I shall only set down some Passages out of it, that concern *Derodon*. "(*c*) *Derodon*'s Book *De Supposito* is scarce, and I had not seen it, when I publish'd a loose Sheet with this Title, *Idée des Sentimens de M.* Saurin; and therefore what I have said of it in that small Piece ought not to be minded. *Derodon*'s Book has been since imparted to me by an illustrious Friend: Having perused it, I have not found any formal Heresie in it, but a prodigious Rashness, and a violent desire of making *Cyril* odious, and defaming the Council of *Ephesus*. Besides, his Quotations are unfaithful, his Explications unfair, and his Proofs sophistical: And therefore I believe that Book deserved to be burnt, as it was by a Decree of the Parliament of *Toulouse*; for to cry down as Hereticks those who maintain'd the holy Mysteries, is an infallible way of bringing those Mysteries into Contempt. The Author was one of those Latitudinarians, who appeared above forty Years ago in the Southern Provinces; and it seems, that *Petit*, Professor of Divinity at *Nimes*, favoured them. At least, one may infer it from the Extracts produced out of him by M. d' *Huisseau*, a great Latitudinarian, in Vindication of his Book, intituled, *De la Reunion du Christianisme*. *Derodon*, in order to promote the common Interest of his Sect, makes it his business to render the Ancients odious and contemptible. . . . . (*d*) *Derodon*, the greatest, and perhaps (*e*) the first Enemy of *Cyril* among the Moderns, was a silly Sophist, ignorant of Antiquity: He was Professor of Philosophy, and took a great Pride in his Subtilty. But learned and wise Men know what is a Man subtil in the Peripatetick way: Such a one is a Sophist; which was also *Derodon*'s Character. He had a mind to distinguish and immorta-
" lize

(*a*) *See in the Remark L of the Article* Nestorius, *whether it be true, that the Words* Mother of God, *have occasion'd the Worship paid to the holy Virgin.*

(*b*) *Idem Saurin, ibid. pag.* 570.

and I will not omit the ſpecious **Accuſation (C) of Ignorance**, in Matters relating to Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity, brought in againſt that Philoſopher. He ſet up for a Controverſiſt, and ſo exaſperated his Adverſaries, that they obtain'd a Decree from the King, whereby he was baniſh'd the Kingdom * in the Year 1663, if I am not miſtaken. He retired to *Geneva*, where he died two Years after, or thereabouts. Thoſe of his Party were not always pleaſed with his Doctrine, and he was brought into trouble upon that Account, † but he came off with Honour. I don't know whether

" ize himſelf by ſetting up againſt *Cyril*, and the " Council of *Epheſus*. He writ his Book deſignedly, " to ſhew that he was an *Eutychian*, that is, that he " confounded the two Natures; and to prove, on the " contrary, that *Neſtorius* was a very orthodox Man. " This Work is mightily cried up by our Latitudi- " narians. The firſt time I ſaw it, it was in M. " *Papin*'s Hands, who praiſed it as an excellent Book. " M. *Saurin* has often beſtowed the ſame Encomium " upon it in my Preſence; which ſhews, that thoſe " two Men are thoroughly unacquainted with Eccle- " ſiaſtical Matters. *Derodon* was a Man of the " ſame Character, and undertook to write upon a " Subject that he was ignorant of. He took or ſtole " what he ſays againſt *Cyril* from a Friend whom " he often mentions, and who had writ a compleat " Hiſtory of the Diſputes of *Cyril* and *Neſtorius*, which " was to be publiſhed: This he does not ſcruple to " confeſs . . . . . (a) Beſides his Ignorance, he was " guilty of Malignity; for nothing can be more ma- " licious and unfair than that Man's diſpute againſt " *St. Cyril.*

I ſhall make no Reflections upon this; for 'tis likely Mr. *Saurin*'s Reply will come out before I make an end of this Work; and the Readers will find in that Reply (b) the raſh Judgments and other Faults of Mr. *Jurieu* fully laid open. I ſhall only ſay, that 'tis not at all likely that *Derodon* intended to favour the pretended Faction of the *Latitudinarians*; for he maintains *Neſtorius*'s Cauſe, not by looking upon him as the Defender (c) of the moral Union of the Word with the Human Nature, but by conſidering him as an Orthodox Man, with reſpect to the Hypoſtatical Union; and he impugns *Cyril*, only becauſe he looks upon him as the Author of the *Eutychian* confuſion of the two Natures. Without doubt he only deſigned to vex the Papiſts, and make 'em aſham'd of their oppreſſing the Memory of Innocent Men, whilſt they extol to the Sky a Heretick, who had the ſecular Power, the Emperor's Favour, and the prevailing Cabal of a Council on his ſide. Nay, if one had a mind to carry Charity ſomething farther, one might affirm, that his only Deſign was to protect Innocence, by making it appear that *Neſtorius* is wrongfully accounted an Heretick. A Man who impugns St. *Cyril*, cannot be ſaid to be a malicious Man; no ſuch thing can be neceſſarily inferr'd from it. Perhaps no Party-leader did ever leſs deſerve to be tenderly uſed: he behaved himſelf with ſo much Violence and Fury, that he deſerves no Thanks for having maintain'd Truth, ſuppoſing he maintain'd it; if he found it, 'twas only by chance and accidentally. Some unruly Horſes, who do not break their Heads againſt the Walls of a Stable, becauſe their Fury moves them towards a Door, which happen to be half open, are a faithful Picture of ſome Doctors who light upon Orthodoxy, notwithſtanding a thouſand violent Paſſions wherewith they are tranſported. All the common Places alledged by Mr. *Jurieu* to juſtify St. *Cyril*, and to condemn *Neſtorius*, may ſerve to juſtify the latter, and condemn the former. I could eaſily give a Specimen of it.

(C) *The ſpecious Accuſation of Ignorance.*] " (d) " 'Tis highly probable, that he had not ſeen the Acts " of the Council of *Epheſus*; the bare Title of his " Book is ſufficient to make one ſenſible of it. *Diſ-* " *putatio de ſuppoſito; in quâ plurima hactenus inau-* " *dita de Neſtorio tanquam Orthodoxo, & de Cyrillo* " *Alexandrino, aliiſque Epiſcopis in Synodum Epheſi* " *coactis tanquam hæreticis*; and in the 71ſt Page of " his Book he ſays, *Rem novam & hactenus inaudi-* " *tam jam demonſtrandam ſuſcipimus &c. Scilicet* " *Cyrillum Alexandrinum & alios Epiſcopos qui tertio* " *Concilio Oecumenico interfuerunt fuiſſe hæreticos, &* " *Authores hæreſis Eutychianæ.* What a prodigious " Ignorance and Boldneſs is this! If this Man had " but caſt his Eyes upon the Authors of the Fifth " Century, eſpecially upon the Acts of the Council " of *Epheſus*, would he have ſaid, that the Accu- " ſation brought againſt *Cyril*, of being the Author " of the *Eutychian* Hereſie, which confounds the " two Natures, is a thing unheard of? He was re- " proached with it by all the *Neſtorians*, and many " others who were not *Neſtorians*; by *John* Biſhop " of *Antioch*, who Excommunicated *Cyril* as con- " founding the two Natures, and aſcribing to the " Divine Nature all the Infirmities that belong on- " ly to the Human Nature of Chriſt." The Author alledges ſeveral other ſuch Proofs, whereby it appears that St. *Cyril* was accuſed of that Hereſie, and concludes with theſe Words, (e) *And therefore his telling us that his Accuſation againſt* Cyril *is a new Diſcovery, and a thing unheard of, betrays a great Ignorance, and an intolerable Vanity.*

If I had *Derodon*'s Book I would give my Opinion about this Particular; but ſince I have it not, I ſhall only ſay, that the Words quoted out of it by his Cenſurer do not prove what he brings 'em for. They ſhew that *Derodon* undertook to prove, as a thing unheard of, not that St. *Cyril* was accuſed of being the Author of *Eutyches*'s Errors; but that St. *Cyril*, and the other Fathers of the third Oecumenical Council, were Hereticks, and brought in Eutychianiſm: Which weakens (f) the Arguments alledged for the Ignorance of that Philoſopher, and ſhews that his Cenſurer perverts, or does not underſtand the ſtate of the Queſtion. If it be a miſtake, it ought to be excuſed, conſidering the perplexity he muſt needs have been in, being to act the part of an Apologiſt for thoſe very Men, whom he had ſeverely cenſured. Conſider, that this Man being to anſwer the Biſhop of *Meaux*, gave a hideous Deſcription of the primitive Fathers, and being to anſwer Mr. *Saurin* was obliged to commend thoſe ſame Fathers. How can ſuch a Man be maſter of his Thoughts? Can an Author, beaten at his own Weapon, and who cannot defend himſelf but by confuting and contradicting himſelf in a moſt wretched manner; I ſay, can ſuch an Author be anſwerable for an over ſight? Neceſſity has no Law; this is what he may plead for himſelf: But ſuch an Apology will not ſatisfy the juſt Complaints of the Publick; all the Readers may very well tell him, *Whom do you take us for? Muſt we be ſo ſhamefully impoſed upon? When you cannot anſwer an Adverſary but by ſuppoſing that the Fathers were Heretical, you charge 'em with Hereſie; and becauſe at a Years end it is neceſſary for you that they ſhould be Orthodox, in order to get rid of another Adverſary, you make 'em ſound in their* **Doctrine**: *Is it not a very unfair and ſhameful thing?*

Here follows Mr. *Saurin*'s Anſwer, to clear *Derodon* of the Ignorance charged upon him. " (g) Mr. " *Jurieu* makes it appear, that he has not ſeen *De-* " *rodon*'s Treatiſe *De Suppoſito*, or that he hopes no " body will ſee it; for the Author has collected ma- " ny Teſtimonies and Hiſtorical Facts, to confirm his " Accuſation againſt *Cyril* and the Council of *Ephe-* " *ſus*. He quotes *Ibas* Biſhop of *Edeſſa*, *Gennadius* " Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, *Theodoret* Biſhop of " *Cyrus*, *John* Archbiſhop of *Antioch*, and a- " bove forty Eaſtern Biſhops, who charged *Cyril* " with the Hereſie of *Apollinaris*, and objected to " him that he made the Divine Nature of Chriſt " paſſible, by confounding it with his Human Na- " ture. The Author therefore was not ignorant of " this, and when he ſpeaks of *Cyril*'s Hereſie, and " *Neſtorius*'s Orthodoxy, as of a thing unheard of, " it is with reſpect to the latter Ages, and not with " reſpect to the Age that *Cyril* and *Neſtorius* liv'd in: " Nay, he mention as a thing unheard of, not the " Queſtion, which of thoſe two Patriarchs was a " Heretick, or an Orthodox Man, but the Anſwer

" he

* For having publiſhed a Book intitled, Tombeau de la Meſſe.

† See the Remark B.

(a) Jurieu ibid. pag. 281. 282.

(b) It came out in 1697 with this Title, Juſtification de la doctrine du Sieur Saurin … contre deux libelles de Mr. Jurieu l'un intitulé Idée des ſentimens &c. & l'autre le Religion du Latitudinaire. See pag. 13. 341. & ſeq.

(c) Note … Mr. Jurieu … pag. … the … the Latitudinarian … againſt Cyril …

(d) Id. … pag. 27 … U … of the … which … are ſo … f. … 279.

(e) Id. ib. pag. 281.

(f) There is a very great difference between maintaining that a whole Council is Heretical; and maintaining, that a private Man was formerly accuſed of Hereſie. The firſt Aſſertion may be advanced as a thing unheard of, without pretending that the charge laid upon that private Man is a matter of Fact not known before.

(g) Saurin, Juſtification de ſa doctrine contre deux libelles de Mr Jurieu pag. 346.

whether the Synods or Conſiſtories were offended at his denying, that the Conſervation of Creatures is a *(D)* continual Creation.

He had been a *Roman* Catholick; which is the reaſon why *Theophilus Raynaud* calls him a Deſerter of Faith, for 'tis he that is *(E)* meant in the Paſſage I quote out of his *Haplotheca*.

ROHAN (RENATA DE) Daughter * of *Lewis de Rohan* IV. Seigneur *de Guemené*, was the accidental cauſe of a Murder, which was like to occaſion many Diſorders at the Court of *France*, ſoon after the *(A)* Death of *Francis* II. She was the Widow of *Francis de Rohan*, Seigneur *de Gié*, and courted by the Count *de Laval* †. The Baſtard *de Bueil*, Son to the Count *de Sancerre*, and ‖ *one of the moſt renowned Braves of the Duke of* Guiſe, *deſigning to oppoſe that Courtſhip, was not contented to become the Count's Rival, but beſides, inſolently gave out that this Widow, after a promiſe of Marriage, written and ſign'd with her own Hand, had granted him the laſt Favours. Perhaps he only intended to put* Laval *and his other Rivals out of conceit with that Lady; but* Laval *was of Opinion, that it was an Affront (B) that required a ſhed-*

ding

* Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grands Officiers*, pag. 56.

† Renatus de Laval, Seigneur de Loué.

‖ Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles* IX. tom. 1. pag. 8.

he makes to it, by juſtifying *Neſtorius*, and condemning *Cyril*.

(D) Is a continual Creation.] He denied a Doctrine, which tho' very common among the *Spaniſh* and *Iriſh* Schoolmen, is very evident. We muſt reject the cleareſt Notions, or acknowledge that a Being made out of nothing by the infinite Power of the Creator, cannot have any cauſe of Exiſtence in itſelf; and therefore it cannot continue to Exiſt but by the ſame Power that produced it at firſt: It is therefore created in each moment of its duration, that is, it exiſts in each moment, only becauſe God continues to have the ſame Will that he had, when that Being began to exiſt.

This act of the Divino Will cannot ceaſe to create whilſt it ſubſiſts, ſince it did create in the firſt moment that Creatures began to exiſt. *Derodon*'s Objections may be eaſily confuted: they are much the ſame with thoſe propoſed by *Bernier* (a). A profeſſor (b) of Philoſophy in the Academy of *Puylaurent*, wrote a Treatiſe againſt *Derodon* upon that Subject, and ſolidly confuted him. That Profeſſor had ſeveral Quarrels with him at *Nimes*, and I have heard ſay, that he had a hand in a Book intitul'd, *L'impieté decouverte*, which was publiſh'd againſt *Derodon*. I have alſo been told, that M. *Claude*, who was then Miniſter of *Nimes*, lent a helping hand to the Enemies of that Philoſopher, by Writing, or at leaſt Correcting that Work. It is an abſurd thing to ſay, with *Gaſſendus* and *Derodon*, that God contributes to the preſervation of Creatures by preventing their Deſtruction. Could any thing deſtroy them, ſince there are but two ſorts of Beings in the Univerſe, *viz.* God and the Creatures? Such a care would be as needleſs as the watchfulneſs of a Shepherd againſt Wolves in a Country where there are no Wolves, and even where there could be none. It were in vain to ſay that a Body deſtroys another Body, that Fire deſtroys Wood, that a Man kills another Man, *&c.* for this is not a deſtruction of Creatures, but only a change of Modifications: Modes are not accounted the ſubject of Creation, but the Subſtances in which they reſide.

(E) 'Tis he that is meant in the Paſſage I quote.] Having ſaid that the ſubtil *Scotus* is falſly accuſed of admitting a kind of real diſtinction between the Divine Eſſence and its Attributes; he adds, that he had lately diſcourſed at *Orange* with an Apoſtate, who alledged the Authority of *Scotus* to maintain a new Blaſphemy. (c) *Placuit hanc crambem obiter hic recoquere, quia his ipſis diebus Arauſicæ Spurcus* FIDEI DESERTOR *blaſphemiam novam Scoti autoritate tegere eſt auſus.* That Blaſphemy was, that the three Perſonalities of the Trinity are Modes of the Divine Eſſence properly ſo call'd. He obſerves, that this Innovator, who quoted *Scotus* in his Preſence, had not made uſe of his Authority in his Diſputation *de Suppoſito*. 'Tis a ſign he meant *Derodon*. Here's another Proof of it: (d) *Perperam tam craſſus error, ſimplicitatem divinam & puriſſimam actualitatem exſcindens tanti viri* (Scoti) *ſuffragio calumnioſè captato munitus eſt ab eo, quem retuli ſpurco fidei deſertore male Rotundo.* This laſt Word is a manifeſt alluſion to *Derodon*'s Name. Three Years after he made uſe of the ſame Quibble in another Book, wherein he refuted *Derodon*, who maintained that the Work intitled *Theſaurus*, and aſcribed to *St. Cyril*, was not that Father's. (e) *Eidem S. Cyrillo ſuppoſititium eſſe opus quod inſcribitur* Theſaurus *contendit ſpurcus hæreticus, autor diſputationis de ſuppoſito, quam nuperrime ementito nomine loci ſuoque ſuppreſſo, homo male teres atque* ROTUNDUS *edidit Arauſicæ. In ea diſputatione, quæ eſt una jugis hæreſeon & atrociſſimarum calumniarum lepra, nebulo qui in S. Cyrillum maxime rabit, abjudicat ei opus Theſauri.*

(A) Soon after the death of Francis *the Second.*] *Varillas* (f) ſays, that it was three Days after the death of that Prince; but he is miſtaken, having not carefully conſidered *Thuanus*'s Words. (g) *Triduo poſt de Vicedomini Carnutum morte allatum eſt . . . . . in idem tempus incidit Buellii . . . . . cædes.* If he had minded what goes before, he might have ſeen that this *triduo* refers to the 21ſt (h) of *December*, on which Day a Reſolution was formed, the Subſtance whereof is to be found in the foregoing Words of that Hiſtorian. According to this account, the News of the *Vidame*'s Death came to *Orleans* the 24th of *December*. But *Francis* II. died the 5th of the ſame Month, and therefore there had been more than three Days between the King's Death, and the Baſtard's Murther. Tho' I take notice of this fault, I am not ignorant that it is very inconſiderable; but 'tis fit the Readers ſhould know what leads a Writer into an Error. I don't pretend that the *Vidame* of *Chartres* died 15 or 16 Days after the King; I only mean, that if we keep to *Thuanus*'s Account, we muſt judge of it in that manner: But I would adviſe no body to give Credit to that Hiſtorian in this particular. My reaſon is, that *Thuanus* follows Preſident *de la Place*, whoſe Chronology is not at all exact upon this Head. For the account he gives runs thus: *Francis* II. dies the 5th of *December*, 1560; the King of *Navarre* reſigns the Regency to the Queen-Mother; a Regulation is agreed upon the 21ſt of *December*; three Days after, the Death of the *Vidame* of *Chartres* is heard of; the greateſt Difficulties being removed by that Regulation, the holding of the States is reſolved upon, notwithſtanding the Proteſtations of part of the Deputies; Cardinal *de Lorraine* endeavours to get a Commiſſion, in order to make a Speech in the Name of the three States of the Kingdom; he does not ſucceed in his Deſign; hereupon the Baſtard *de Sancerre* is killed; laſtly, the States meet on the 13th of *December*. This is the model that *Thuanus* goes by, which is of no uſe to fix the Day on which the *Vidame* died, nor that on which the Baſtard was kill'd.

(B) That it was an Affront that required a ſhedding of Blood.] This is the Reſult of the unhappy Maxims of the Point of Honour, conſidering how indulgent the Judges are to thoſe who ſtain a Woman's Reputation by their Slanders. If you proſecute a downright Calumniator, or an indiſcreet bragging Fool upon ſuch an account, they'll come off with a Denial or a Retractation. This is what moves a Duelliſt to right himſelf. The Baſtard expected it, and without doubt (i) truſted to his Courage and Skill more than to the Juſtice of his Cauſe; for can any one ſay with any Juſtice, even without telling a Lie, that he has obtained ſuch Favours? But he was attacked in ſuch a manner, that he could not defend himſelf.

(a) See Bernier's Book printed at Amſterdam in 1685, and intituled, Traité du libre & du volontaire.

(b) He was a Phyſician, call'd John Bon; his Body of Philoſophy has been printed.

(c) Theoph. Raynaud. Hoplothec. ſect. 2. ſerie 1. cap. 6. pag. 89. That Book was printed at Lyons in the Year 1650.

(d) Id. ib. pag. 90.

(C) Thoſe

ding of Blood; and becauſe his Eſteem for the Baſtard was not great enough to do him the Honour to fight him, he took an Opportunity to kill him at Orleans. The * Conſtable *Montmorency* approved that Murther, and begg'd *Laval's* Pardon: On the contrary, the Houſe of *Guiſe* urged that the Murderer ſhould be puniſh'd; and their Credit did ſo prevail in the Council, that the King of *Navarre, in whoſe Palace* Laval *had taken Sanctuary, was obliged to procure his Eſcape in the Night.* Afterwards his Eſtate was Confiſcated †. Thoſe, who ſay (G) that the Conſtable proſecuted the Murtherer, becauſe he was of his Family, are not miſtaken. Our *Renata* married *Renatus de Laval* β; and *John de Laval*, Marquis *de Neſle*, was her third Husband.

ROHAN (ANNE DE) the Daughter of *Renatus de Rohan* and *Catherine de Parthenay*, Heireſs of the Houſe of *Soubiſe*, was no leſs Illuſtrious for her Piety and great Parts, than for her Noble Extraction. She was Siſter to the Duke of *Rohan*, the Pillar of the Proteſtants during the Civil Wars, in the Reign of *Lewis* XIII. I have ſaid in another place ʒ, that ſhe bore the Hardſhips of the Siege of *Rochelle* with an heroical Conſtancy; and that, for the ſpace of three Months, ſhe lived upon Horſes Fleſh and four Ounces of Bread every Day. The Hiſtorian δ who informs us of this Particular, adds, That ſhe and her Mother refuſed to be comprehended in the Capitulation, and remained Priſoners of War. He beſtows this Encomium upon her, That *ſhe was celebrated for her exemplary Piety among thoſe of her Religion, and for her Learning which was uncommon in one of her Sex.* She made very good Verſes: The Excellent (T) Poem ſhe wrote upon the Death of *Henry* the Fourth is a Proof of it. What is ſaid of her Skill in (Z) the *Hebrew* Tongue is very remarkable. She died a Maid at *Paris* the 20th of *September*, 1646, in the ſixty ſecond Year of her Age. Mrs. *Schurman* wrote ſome Letters to her, which may be ſeen in the Collection of her Works.

* Id. ib.

† Id ib.

β Father Anſelme ibid.

ʒ In the Article of Catherine de Parthenay.

δ Hiſt. du Duc de Rohan, Paris 1666.

ROY

(G) *Thoſe, who ſay.*] **President de la Place** is (a) one of them; *Loüe*, ſays he, was ſupported by the Conſtable, *becauſe the ſaid Lady was grand Neece to the ſaid Conſtable, and the ſaid* Loüé *was deſcended in a direct maſculine Line from the Conſtable* Matthew Montmorency, *as well as the ſaid Conſtable.* *Thuanus* makes the ſame Obſervation concerning *Renatus de Laval*: (b) *Unde magna rurſus inimicitiarum ſeges inter Guiſianos & Momorantios orta eſt, cum illi Sancerra Comiti adeſſent, hi Lavalium uti ex Matthæi Momorantii Equitum Magiſtri ſtirpe profectum tuerentur.* I cannot apprehend why *Varillas*, who had ſaid in the firſt (c) Edition of his Life of *Charles* the Ninth, *That the Count* de Laval *was of the Houſe of Montmorency*, ſtruck it out in the ſecond. I eaſily apprehend why he left out, that this Count *was Brother-in-Law to the* Chatillons; for it is a plain Falſity: But the other Fact agrees with the Genealogy of the Houſe of *Montmorency*, publiſhed by (d) *du Cheſne*.

(T) *The excellent Poem ſhe wrote.*] *D' Aubigné*, who was ſparing of his Praiſes, inſerted part of it at the end of his Hiſtory, and prefixed theſe Words to it: *Anne de Rohan, Princeſs of* Leon, *and of all thoſe who write well at this time, will ſpeak better than I. She expreſſes her ſelf thus:*

> Quoi? faut-il que Henri, ce redouté Monarque,
> Ce dompteur des humains, ſoit dompté par la
>   Parque?

I would not have mention'd thoſe two Verſes, were it not that they afford Matter for a Criticiſm. M. *Peliſſon* having ſaid, (e) *That it was one of* Malherbe's *Maxims, that the Adjectives ending with an* e *Maſculine, ought never to be placed before, but after a Subſtantive; whereas thoſe that have a feminine Termination, may be placed before or after, as one thinks fit; that one may ſay for inſtance* ce redoutable Monarque; *or,* ce monarque redoutable; *and, on the contrary, that one may ſay* ce monarque redouté, *but not* ce redouté monarque; I ſay, Mr. *Peliſſon* having ſaid this, goes on thus: *I have not pitch'd upon this Example without Reaſon, and at Random; for I have often heard Mr.* de Gombauld *ſay, that before this Obſervation had been made,* Malherbe *and he walking one Day together, and diſcourſing of ſome Verſes of* Anne de Rohan, *one of which was,*

> Quoy faut-il que Henri, ce redouté Monarque.

Malherbe *told him ſeveral times, that he did not like the end of that Verſe, without being able to give any Reaſon for it; which made him think of it very attentively, and having immediately found out the reaſon of it, he imparted it to* Malherbe, *who was as much pleaſed as if he had found a Treaſure, and afterwards made a general Rule of it.* Now here is an Obſervation of *Menage* not very well grounded. *M. de Gombauld*, ſays he (f), *did alſo frequently diſcourſe with me of that Converſation he had with* Malherbe, *but not altogether in the ſame manner as M.* Peliſſon *relates it: for he always told me, that 'twas he who perceived that* redouté Monarque *was wrong. However that Rule, whether it be* Malherbe's *or* Gombauld's, *is altogether falſe:* (g) He proves it by ſeveral Examples, and ſhews that *Malherbe* himſelf did not keep to it, ſince he ſaid in two places *aſſeuré Secours*. But this is not the thing I would be at. I maintain, that *Menage* underſtood M. *Peliſſon's* Words, as if they ſignified that it was *Malherbe*, and not *Gombauld*, who found out the Reaſon why the Verſe in queſtion was faulty; for had he not underſtood them in that Senſe, he would not have ſaid, *this Rule, whether it be* Malherbe's *or* Gombauld's. The plain meaning of which is, that this Rule was found out by *Malherbe*, according to Mr. *Peliſſon's* Account, and by *Gombauld*, as *Menage* was told by *Gombauld* himſelf. But it is more plain ſtill, that Mr. *Peliſſon* aſcribes the Diſcovery to the latter, and not at all to *Malherbe*: Will any Body wonder, that ſometimes a *Latin* Author ſhould not be underſtood for want of Application; ſince M. *Menage* did not underſtand a *French* Author, though he expreſs'd himſelf very intelligibly?

(Z) *What is ſaid of her Skill in the* Hebrew *Tongue,* &c.] She read the Old Teſtament in that Language; and inſtead of ſinging Pſalms at Church in *French* Verſe as others did, ſhe meditated upon them in *Hebrew*. (h) *Hanc illuſtriſſimam & ſapientiſſimam Principem Hebraicis Literis haud leviter fuiſſe tinctam teſtis fuit αὐτόπτης Rev. Pærens, dum Pariſiis degeret; quotieſcunque enim ipſam adiret, Vet. Teſtamenti caput aliquod Hebraicè legentem inveniebat, & quod mirere ne in Eccleſia quidem hocce ſtudium deſeruit, cum etiam illic, dum Hymni Davidici decantarentur, ipſa interim Hebraico idiomate mente pſalleret.* Mr. *Colomies*, who mentions this, alledges an Authority for it in the Margin, which is worth (i) tranſcribing.

(a) De l'Etat de la Relig. & Repub. lib. 9. towards the end.

(b) Thuanus ubi ſupra.

(c) Tome 1. pag. 8. Dutch Edit.

(d) [illegible] p. 19.

(e) Hiſt. [illegible] Acad. [illegible] 178.

(f) Obſervations ſur les poeſies de Malherbe, pag. 302.

(g) Ibid.

(h) Colomeſius in Gallia Orientali, pag. 165.

(i) Hujus in Hebraicis peritiam firmat Phil. Aquinas Epiſtola Præfat. in capitula Patrum, à ſe ex Hebræo in Gallicum ſermonem verſa. Id. ibid.

(A) An-

ROY (JAMES LE) Baron of the Holy Empire, and Lord of *St. Lambert*, originally deſcended from an ancient (*A*) and noble Family of *France*, got a great Reputation by the Works he publiſhed. He was born at *Antwerp* the 28th of *October*, 1633. As ſoon as his Age permitted him to Travel, Baron * LE ROY, his Father, ſent him to the moſt famous Univerſities of *Europe*, and at his return reſigned to him the Places he was poſſeſs'd of at the Court of *Bruſſels*. Our Baron did ſo punctually diſcharge the Duties of thoſe Places, that the Marquis *de Caracene*, Governor of the *Low-Countries*, ſent him into *Spain* to inform his Catholick Majeſty, *Philip* the Fourth, of the State of his Government. Having worthily performed his Commiſſion, he returned into the *Netherlands*, and could not agree with the Marquis *de Caſtel Rodrigo*, Governor of that Country; wherefore he reſolved to lay down his Employments, and retired to his Seat near *Antwerp*. Had it not been for this, he would have raiſed himſelf to the moſt conſiderable Civil Offices; but the Commonwealth of Learning would have loſt by it; for he had not been at leiſure to write ſeveral good Books (*B*) that have been publiſh'd. See the Remark *B*.

There is ſomething in that Remark which concerns Mrs *Bourignon*, and at which her Friends have been offended. I ſhall examine what one (*C*) of them ſays in anſwer to my Remark.

RON-

(*A*) *Ancient and noble Family.*] The Anceſtors of Baron *le Roy* left *France*, to follow *Philip* the Good, Duke of *Burgundy*, and ſettled in the *Low Countries*.

PHILIP *le Roy*, Knight-Banneret, Seigneur *de Broucham*, &c. the Father of him who makes the Subject of this Article, (*a*) bought of the Lady *Margaret Bandewyns* the Lordſhip of *Chapelle St. Lambert*, the 15th of *December*, 1654. He was made free Baron of the Holy Empire by a Patent of the Emperor *Leopold*, dated from *Luxemburg* the 30th of *May*, 1671. He was then Counſellor to his Catholick Majeſty in the Supreme Council of the Finances of the *Low Countries* and *Burgundy*.

(*B*) *Several good Books that have been publiſh'd.*] The firſt Book he undertook to write in his Retirement, was the *Notitia Marchionatus Sacri Romani Imperii*, which was Printed at *Amſterdam* in Folio in the Year 1678. See the *Nouvelles* (*b*) *de la Republique des Lettres*. He publiſh'd afterwards in the ſame City, in the Year 1683, a Piece intituled, *Achates Tiberianus, ſive gemma Cæſarea, antiquitate, argumento, arte, hiſtoria prorſus incomparabilis, D. Auguſti apotheoſin, Imp. Cæſ. Tiberii, Auguſtaque Juliæ Domus ſeriem & iconas, genteſque bello captas repræſentans, notis hiſtoricis illuſtrata*, in Folio. See the *Acta* (*c*) *eruditorum*, and the *Journal* (*d*) *des Savans*. He printed, in 1693, at *Amſterdam*, a Book in Folio with this Title, *Topographia Hiſtorica Gallo-Brabantiæ, qua Ramondua oppida, municipia & dominia illuſtrantur, atque Monaſteria, Nobiliumque Fratoria, Caſtellaque in æs inciſa exhibentur*. That Book contains a very particular Account of that part of the *Low-Countries* called the *Walloon Brabant*; and if we had ſuch a Deſcription of all *Europe*, it would be extremely uſeful and inſtructive. I add, that he has Commented upon the Chronicle of *Balduinus* of *Aveſnes*, and that he is (*e*) now Commenting upon that of *Albericus*, a Monk of *Trois Fontaines*, which has never been printed, and the Publication whereof has been wiſhed for a long time. He has lately put out (*f*) a ſmall Book of 13 Pages, intituled, *Prædictio Anthoniæ Bourignon de vaſtatione urbis Bruxellarum per ignem*, wherein, after a ſhort deſcription of the Miſery that Town was expoſed on the 13th of *Auguſt*, 1695, when the *French* bombarded it, he mentions what has been ſaid concerning *Antoinette Bourignon*, in the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary, and theſe Words of one of her Letters. (*g*) *I don't ſee how I can ſtay at* Bruſſels, *tho' I had full Liberty to do it; nor could I ſtay long in it,* SINCE BRUSSELS IS TO BE DESTROYED BY FIRE, *if I have had a right Viſion, as I told you at* Maſuriel's *Houſe*. The Spirit which revealed this burning to Mrs. *Bourignon*, did not well fix the time; for ſhe fancied, in the Year 1666, that *Bruſſels* would be ſhortly burnt down, and yet it was not bombarded 'till 29 Years after.

Since the firſt Impreſſion of this Article, Baron *le Roy* has publiſh'd, *Caſtella & Prætoria Nobilium Brabantiæ, Cœnobiaque celebriora ad vivum delineata æriquе inciſa . . . . . cum brevi eorundem deſcriptione.* At *Antwerp*, 1696, in *Folio*. And (*h*) *L'Erection de toutes les Terres, &c. The Erection of all the Seats, Lordſhips and Families of* Brabant, *that have Titles of Honour, proved by Extracts of original Patents.* Such a Book ſhould be printed about each Province of *Europe*, whereby one might know thoſe, who boldly aſſume the Title of Marquis, or Count.

(*C*) *I ſhall examin what one of* Mrs. *Bourignon's Friends ſays in anſwer to my Remark.*] His Anſwer is to be found in a *Letter concerning myſtical Authors*, printed (*i*) a Year ago with the *Theologie réelle vulgairement dite la Theologie Germanique*. The anonymous Author, who has publiſh'd this, quotes my Words, and then adds: " (*k*) No, by your Leave, " laying aſide all manner of Equivocation, there was " no time neither well nor *wrongly fixed* in the " Prediction, as you intimate: Beſides, it was " not a verbal Revelation, as you give to under- " ſtand, in order to make it ſuſceptible of a Fal- " ſity as to the time; but it was viſual, and conſe- " quently of ſuch a Nature, as to fix no time in " expreſs Words. Nor did Mrs. *Bourignon* fancy, " that *Bruſſels* would be burnt down in a ſet time, " ſooner or later; but nothing being determined up- " on that Point, no time being fix'd or excluded, " this Undetermination was the true Reaſon why " ſhe did not think her ſelf ſecure from that Danger " at any time, and had a provident Care at all times." He adds, *That, in the ſame manner, the Lord and his Apoſtles having foretold in general his ſecond coming, exhorted the Chriſtians to be watchful at all times, leſt they ſhould be ſurprized; whereupon a profane Man might have had a better Pretence than our Author, to ſay as he does,* " *The Spirit, which revealed that ſecond Coming to them, did not well fix the time; for they fancied, ſeventeen hundred Years ago, that it ſhould happen in their Life-time, and yet no ſuch thing has been ſeen hitherto.*" *St.* Peter *tells us, that the profane Men of his time argued already in that manner.* Thus the anonymous Author criticizes my Remark: I'll make it appear that he lyes under a great Illuſion.

I obſerved, that the Spirit *did not fix the time well*, and this Author owns that it fixed no time. What can I deſire more? Is it not manifeſt, that whoever does not fix a time, does neither fix it right nor wrong; and that therefore one may ſay he did not fix it well? My Aſſertion is therefore true; and 'tis certain, at leaſt, that Mrs. *Bourignon* drew a falſe Conſequence from what had been revealed to her *viſually*. She concluded from it, that *Bruſſels* would be ſhortly deſtroyed by Fire; for ſhe believed that the Permiſſion ſhe had to ſtay in that Town, would ſerve her but for a little time; I ſay, ſhe came to think ſo, by reaſon of the *viſual Revelation* we are told of. As ſhe reſolved to leave a Town which ſhe thought was ready to be burnt, ſhe

would

---

* *Philip le Roi, Seigneur de Ravels Broucham, & de St. Lambert in Brabant. See the Remark A.*

(*a*) *Topographia Gallo Brabantiæ pag.* 185.

(*b*) For September 1685. *art.* 5. *pag. m.* 1004.

(*c*) *Acta Erudītor. Lipſienſ.* 1684. *pag.* 255

(*d*) *Journal des Savans of the* 19th *of* March 1685.

(*e*) *In the Year* 1696.

(*f*) *At* Amſterdam 1696.

(*g*) *Theſe Words are taken from a Letter written from* Ghent *to* M. de Cort *the* 15th *of* January 1666. *'Tis the* 12th *of the* 3d *part of a Book, intitled* Tombeau de la fauſſe Theologie.

RONSARD (PETER DE) a famous *French* Poet, of a Noble Family

would doubtless have advised all those, who had been willing to be directed by her, to do the same; she would therefore have given that Advice to all the Inhabitants of *Brussels*, if they had been her Disciples. Now, how strangely had they been deluded, if they had followed her Direction! A great many People, who could not live above 10, 15, 15 or 20 Years, had left their Birth place for fear of being destroyed by a Fire that was to fall 20 Years after. They had been imposed upon by false Prophecies: for a Revelation, though true in it self, because it exhibits only some Images, becomes fallacious and deceitful when applied to Times or Places that do not belong to it. If the revealing Spirit does not deceive, the Person who receives the Revelation will nevertheless deceive by his false Applications; and therefore Mrs. *Bourignon's* Apologist, without being aware of it, inables us to conclude, that she has been a false Prophetess in this Point. It were better to have no Revelations at all, than to receive Prophecies that are not understood, and whose wrong Explication moves one to make useless Steps. If Mrs. *Bourignon* had been quiet in the Places which she thought would be intirely burnt down, she would have lived there the remaining part of her Life, without seeing that Prediction fulfilled: for she died 15 years before *Brussels* was bombarded. She was therefore afraid without any reason, and she removed out of a panick Fear. I would not have you to think, that I grant to her Apologist, that the visual Revelation he speaks of (†) *was evidently verified by the Event*. The bombarding of *Brussels* has no greater Connexion with the Vision of that Woman, than with the Dreams of other People. I think it will be granted me, that most people do sometimes see a Town on Fire in their Dreams. When we dream that a House is set on fire, 'tis commonly that which belongs to us: If we dream that a Town sinks in the Water, or is devoured by Flames, 'tis commonly a Town that is best known to us, that wherein we were born, or where we make our Abode. I therefore venture to say, and I think those who mind their Dreams will not charge me with Rashness for it, that many Citizens of *Brussels* have seen that Town on fire in a Dream; and even that some of 'em dream'd (*a*) that it was bombarded. Must such Dreams be accounted Prophetical? Visions of this kind in the Head of devout people, are more suspicious than in the head of worldly people; for a devout Person fancies, when he is awake, that the Corruption of a great Town will draw Fire from Heaven upon it. Now people do commonly see, when they are asleep, what they have thought of being awake. I omit, that according to Mrs. *Bourignon's* Prophecy, *Brussels* was to be destroyed by Fire: 'Tis plain, this denotes a total Destruction, and therefore 'tis not the bombarding of the Year 1695. That Town was not destroyed by it; only some Houses were ruined or damaged. It grew finer and more magnificent some few Years after; and the Inhabitants were so little concern'd for the Damage, occasion'd by the Bombs, that when they heard that the Treaty of *Riswick* was carried on successfully, they freely owned they had rather be bombarded three or four times, than see the end of War, which brought in Mony amongst 'em so plentifully.

The best thing alledged by the anonymous Writer, is the Prediction of the Apostles, concerning the last coming of the Son of God. They preached it as (*b*) being ready at hand, and yet that Prophecy has not been fulfilled these seventeen hundred Years. The Solution of this Difficulty may be seen in the Commentaries upon the Scripture. I shall only say, that this was never look'd upon as a sufficient Reason to justifie those, who, in the following Ages, foretold things that did not come to pass. They have always been accounted false Prophets, or false Interpreters of the *Apocalypse*. Why should I be the only Man not allowed to make use of the same Argument against those who pretend to foretell things to come? 'Tis well known, that those who are ingaged to vindicate the new Prophets, answer the Objections, as this anonymous Writer does, at the Cost of the true Prophets mention'd in the Scripture. We have not forgot yet the Pastoral Letters of the Author he speaks of some Pages before, who, says he, (*c*) *will have many Chimerical Prophets of all Ages to be truly inspired, and expects still that his Party will be restored in France by way of Inspiration*. It was in vain for him to alledge the Prophets of the Old Testament, in order to justifie the pretended Prophets of *Dauphiné*: Wise and pious People following the Dictates of Reason, declared against them; and when the time fixed by him for the Deliverance was expired, they maintained that his prophetical Inspirations were false. They were not afraid that the Prediction of the second Coming of CHRIST, alledged by the anonymous Writer, would be objected against them. I proceed in this Matter as those Gentlemen did, and as it has been the constant Practice of the most grave Divines, whenever any Fanaticks arose, whose Prophecies were confuted by the Event.

I must answer another Complaint of Mrs. *Bourignon's* Apologist. He says, that I seem to *take a great delight in reflecting upon her*, and very much enlarges upon it. He adds, that I frequently refer my Readers to a Libel of M. *de Seckendorf*; whereupon he quotes a long Passage of M. *Thomasius*, Professor at *Hall*, whereby it appears that M. *de Seckendorf* was blinded by his Passion when he writ against that Woman. I answer in few Words, 1. That none will say I had a mind to *reflect upon her*, but such as are prepossess'd with an infatuating Admiration: Being charmed with the Perfections they think to discover in a certain Person, they can find no fault in him, all his Actions appear holy to them, and they grow very angry with those who are more discerning, and undertake to shew the weak side of such a Person. I have not in the least reflected upon Mrs. *Bourignon's* Zeal and Chastity; I only made an Abridgment of her Life, referring my Readers to a Memorial imparted to me by M. *Poiret*, which our Anonymous Author takes to be advantageous to that Gentlewoman. If I said something of her scolding Humour, and of her great Husbandry, 'tis what Truth required from me as an Historian. I have advanced nothing without a Proof for it; but let the impartial Readers judge of it. I answer in the second place, that among many Quotations out of *Antoinette's* Life and Works, there are hardly above five or six out of M. *de Seckendorf*. Why then does this Anonymous Writer intimate that I entirely depend upon the Authority of that Author? Lastly, I say, that I knew not then what M. *Thomasius* observes concerning the Proceedings of that illustrious *German*. M. *Thomasius* is a Man of Merit, and I have had a long time a great Esteem for him: I need not object any thing against his Remarks, for he charges M. *de Seckendorf* with Curtailing some Passages only in what concerns the Opinions of Mrs. *Bourignon*; but I have only quoted him for a matter of fact, and I have most times confirmed what I take from him by some other Passages. I have no Reason to think that he was blinded by Passion in that respect. After all, if he was so guilty as this Author will have it, would no Body have taken notice of it? Would not M. *Poiret*, whom he has confuted, have writ against him a second time to shew his unfairness?

I shall make no answer to many other Observations of the anonymous Author. His Complaints are very general, and plainly shew that he is too touchy, and wants still to mortifie his internal Senses. The Mortification of the external Senses is not sufficient; one must besides overcome the irascible Appetite. I beseech him to think seriously of it, and I refer him to the Answers I have already (*d*) made, or to this general Observation, that it

(†) Ibid.

(*a*) *Especially since the Ga[illegible] did [illegible] frequent[illegible] mention the bom[illegible] of [illegible]*

(*b*) *For [illegible] ex[illegible] to [illegible] they [illegible] to [illegible] them[illegible] rea[illegible] for it.*

(*c*) *Lettre touchant les Auteurs Mystiques, pag.* 108.

(*d*) *In my* Reflexions sur le Jugement du public, *which he quotes* ubi supra, *pag.* 312, 313.

mily (*A*), was Born in *Vendomois* the ſame Year that *Francis* the Firſt was made Priſo
at *Pavia.* This Circumſtance occaſioned (*B*) ſome unjudicious Reflections. He was lik
to periſh on his Birthday; and the Danger he run was attended with an Incident,
whic

it would be a needleſs and inſignificant thing to anſwer Complaints grounded upon no manner of Proof. If any one raiſes any particular Objection againſt me, and examines ſome Arguments alledged in this Dictionary, I ſhall not deny him an Anſwer: but as to general Complaints, I ſhall only appeal to the equitable Readers.

(*A*) *Of a noble Family.*] *Lewis de* **Ronſard**, his Father, (*a*) was Knight of the Order, and Steward to *Francis* the Firſt, who pitch'd upon him *to attend* Francis Dauphin de Viennois *and* Henry *Duke of* Orleans, *his Sons, into* Spain, *whilſt they were there as Hoſtages for the King their Father.* He married *Joan de Chandrier*, whoſe Family was related to that of *La Trimouille, &c.* and conſequently to that of *Craon*; (*b*) *from whence the Kings of* England *are deſcended, by the Match of the Empreſs* Mathilde: *So that he* (*c*) *made it appear that* Ronſard *was related in the ſixteenth or ſeventeenth Degree to* Elizabeth *Queen of* England. 'Tis ſaid, that *Lewis de Ronſard* was deſcended from one *Baudouin*, a younger Brother of a great Family (*d*), *upon the Borders of* Hungary *and* Bulgaria, who (*e*) brought a Company of Gentlemen to *King Philip de Valois.* Nay, 'tis ſaid (*f*), that *there is a Lordſhip called the Marquiſate of* Ronſart, in the Place (*g*) *where the* Danube *is neareſt to* Thrace. But I think this may be looked upon as one of the Romantick Stories which moſt Noble Houſes uſe to tell of their firſt Founders. They are very fond of deriving their Original from the remoteſt Countries, and from a younger Brother of a Noble Extraction, a brave Adventurer, whoſe fine Exploits were very well rewarded by the Prince in whoſe Service he engaged. If ſuch Stories were only told by three or four Families, one would not be ſo apt to laugh at them. I muſt obſerve, that the Author quoted by me has only turned into Proſe what *Ronſard* ſaid of his Extraction in one (*h*) of his Elegies. *Du Perron* (*i*) told the ſame Story, but inſtead of *Bulgaria* he ſaid *Moravia.* The Collection of the fineſt Pieces of the *French* Poets, printed in 1692. contains (*k*) a Life of *Ronſard*, wherein 'tis ſaid he *originally came from* Hungary *and* Bulgaria: If it be not an Abſurdity, 'tis at leaſt a Falſification; for the Tradition of that Family aſſigns but one native Country to their Anceſtors, *upon the Borders of* Hungary *and* Bulgaria. They are the Words of *Claudius Binet*: Thus you ſee how Writers run into miſtakes, when they change the Terms of the Originals, whether it be in order to be ſhorter, or becauſe thoſe Words are thought to be too old. The word *Borders* ſhould not have been left out here.

(*B*) *Some unjudicious Reflections.*] "(*l*) *Peter* "*de Ronſard* was Born of *Lewis*, and *Joan de Chandrier*, in the Caſtle *de la Poiſſonnerie* . . . . "upon a *Saturday* the 11th of *September*, 1524; "on which day King *Francis* was made Priſoner "at *Pavia*. 'Tis a queſtion whether *France* was "more Unfortunate by the King's Impriſonment, "than happy by ſuch a Birth, which was remarkable, like that of many other great Men, by ſuch "a memorable Event. Thus the Birth of the great "*Alexander* was ſignalized, and as it were lighted "by the Flames which conſumed the Temple of "*Diana* at *Epheſus*." What a fine Compenſation is this! Was not *France* well Indemnified for the Impriſonment of her King, a Misfortune which was like to occaſion the Ruin of the Kingdom, and which actually occaſion'd a long Series of ſhameful and diſmal Loſſes to the Nation; I ſay, was not *France* well indemnified, ſince a Wit was born on that very Day, who adorned her with thouſands of Verſes by way of Sonnets, Madrigals, Stanza's, Hymns, Odes, *&c.* This Thought of *Claudius Binet* could not be tolerable but in a Poem of a Panegyriſt; and yet Men of Senſe would cenſure it as an inſipid Hyperbole. Doubtleſs this was the Reaſon why *du Perron* did not make uſe of it in his Funeral Oration of *Peter Ronſard*. What ſhall we ſay then, when we ſee it in Proſe in a piece of Hiſtory, I mean, in the Life of *Ronſard*? But what ſhall we ſay of *Thuanus*, that grave, that venerable Magiſtrate, who very ſeriouſly ſet forth the ſame thought in a general Hiſtory, which is a Maſter-piece? *Natus erat,* (Petrus Ronſardus) ſays he (*m*), *eodem quo infeliciter à noſtris ad Ticinum pugnatum eſt, anno, ut ipſe in Elegia ad Remigium Bellaqueum ſcribit, quaſi Deus jacturam nominis Gallici eo prælio factam & ſecutum ex illo veluti noſtrarum rerum interitum tanti viri ortu compenſare voluerit.* Take notice that *Thuanus* does not ſay that *Ronſard* was Born on the ſame Day that the Battel of *Pavia* was fought: He only ſays, that Poet was Born in the ſame Year. But *Claudius Binet*, who wanted ſomething more wonderful, affirms, that he was Born on the ſame Day. He betrays himſelf, he diſcovers his Lie; for he marks the 11th Day of *September*, 1524, as being the Birth-day of his Poet; and every Body knows that *Francis* the Firſt was beaten at *Pavia* the 24th of *February*, 1525. However, *Ronſard* was Born in the ſame Year, according to the way of reckoning at that time; for the Year did not begin then, the 1ſt day of *January*, but at *Eaſter*, and ſo the Battel of *Pavia* was contained in the Year 1524. It cannot be ſaid that there is a fault of the Preſs in *Binet*'s Book; for when he tells us that *Ronſard* died the 27th of *December*, 1585, he ſays, (*n*) that Poet was 61 Years, 3 Months and 16 Days old, and therefore he believed that he was Born the 11th of *September*, 1524. Which gives me occaſion to take notice of a miſtake (*o*) of *Sainte Marthe*; but I confeſs, there is ſome uncertainty in the Matter, whereby he might be excuſed. 'Tis only from a Paſſage of *Ronſard* that we know he was Born the ſame Year that *Francis* the Firſt was taken; at leaſt it is certain that *du Perron* alledged no other Proof againſt thoſe who were not of that Opinion. As to the time of his Birth, ſays he (*p*), "there are "ſeveral Opinions about it. Some think he was "Born in the Year 1522, and that conſequently "he died in his Climacterical Year, as it has been "obſerved of many great Men. Others ſtick to "what he ſays, that he was Born the ſame Year "that the great King *Francis* was made a Priſoner; as the Birth of illuſtrious Men is frequently remarkable by ſuch notale Events. We may "further obſerve, that the taking of that King, "by which *Ronſard* denotes the Year of his Birth, "falls in exactly upon the ſame Day on which we "celebrate the Memory of his Death, which is St. "*Matthias*'s Day (*q*)." This only Proof of *du Perron* will appear weak, if we conſider that *Ronſard* in one of his Poems mentions his Age, which does not ſuit with a Man born in 1524, or 1525. Theſe are his Words:

Tu (*r*) *dis que je ſuis vieil, encore n'ay-je atteint*
Trente & ſept ans paſſez, & mon corps ne ſe plaint
D'ans ny de maladie, & en toutes les ſortes
Mes nerfs ſont bien tendus, & mes veines bien
fortes;
Et ſi j'ay le teint palle & le cheveu griſon,
Mes membres toutesfois ne ſont hors de ſaiſon.

The Poem, wherein he ſpeaks thus, was compoſed ſome Weeks after the Death of the Duke of *Guiſe* (*ſ*), and conſequently in the Spring of the Year, 1563. A Man, who was then but 37 Years old, muſt have been born in 1526, and at this rate *Scævola de Sainte Marthe* were not to blame. 'Tis ſomewhat ſtrange, that our Poet did not well know when he was born.

(*C*) Which

(*a*) **Binet**, *Vie de Ronſard*, in the 9th *Tome* of Ronſard's *Works*, in 12°, *pag.* 113. *Note, That* du Perron, *in the Funeral Oration of* Ronſard, *in the ſame Volume, p.* 189 *does not ſay, that* Lewis de Ronſard *was Steward to* Francis I. *but to* Henry II.

(*b*) *Binet*, *ib. p.* 112.

(*c*) *That is, the* Sieur du Faux *of* Angers, *in his Memoirs. There is, in my Edition,* le Sieur du Faur; *but I find in* la Croix du Maine *that this Author's Name was* Paſcal Robin du

(*d*) *Binet ibid.*

(*e*) *Id. ib. pag.* 113.

(*f*) *Id. ib.*

(*g*) *Ibid. pag.* 112.

(*h*) *The* 20*th. It is inſcribed to* Belleau.

(*i*) *Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard, pag.* 188.

(*k*) *In the* 1*ſt Tome, pag.* 239.

(*l*) *Idem Binet ibid. pag.* 113.

which occaſion'd ſome (C) witty Conceits, that are not more ſolid than thoſe Reflections. He put himſelf at the Head of (D) ſome Soldiers in *Vendomois*, in the Year 1562, and made as great a Slaughter of the Proteſtants as ever he could; which was the Reaſon why ſome ſatyrical Pieces were publiſhed at *Orleans* againſt him,

(C) *Which occaſioned ſome witty Conceits, that are not more ſolid than thoſe Reflections.*] "(a) His Birth day was like to be the Day of his Burial; for as they were going from the Caſtle *de la Poiſſonnerie* to the Parochial Church, to get him Chriſten'd, the Woman who carried him, going over a Meadow, let him fall through inadvertency; but he fell gently upon the Graſs and the Flowers of the Meadow. Beſides, a Gentlewoman, who carried a Veſſel full of Roſe-water and of all ſorts of Herbs and Flowers, as it is uſual, going to take up the Child, ſpilt upon his Head part of that Water, which was a Preſage of the good ſmell which the Flowers of his learned Writings would ſpread all over the Kingdom." This is what the *Italians* call *Concetti*. When *le Pas* wrote the Hiſtory of *Ronſard*'s Muſe, he took care to make ſome Verſes upon that Thought. *He was born, ſays he* (b), *of a Knight of the Order, on the ſame day that* Francis *the Firſt was taken at the* Battel *of* Pavia; *and it has been ſaid to his Glory, that* France *would have been inconſolable on account of ſuch an unfortunate Day, if that ſame Day had not produced ſo great a Man. His Birth Day was like to be that of his Death. A Gentlewoman* (c), *who carried him from the Caſtle* de la Poiſſonnerie, *where he was born, to the Church of the Pariſh, where he was to be Chriſtened, let him fall unawares; but, by good luck, he fell in a Meadow, and upon Flowers, and got no hurt by it, only he was wet all over with the Roſe-water, which they carried, as 'tis uſual, for the Chriſtening.*

Ce ne fut point ſans doute un effet du hazard,
Je croi qu'on peut ſans badinage,
Dire que ce fut un preſage
De la fortune de Ronſard;
Un preſage certain qui fit alors comprendre,
Combien de bonne odeur Ronſard devoit répandre,
Un preſage certain que les neuf doctes Sœurs,
Dont il devoit chanter la gloire,
Pour éterniſer ſa memoire
Luy feroient quelque jour des couronnes de fleurs.

(D) *At the Head of ſome Soldiers.*] I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage of *Beza*. "(d) The worſt of all was, that the Mob broke not only the Images, but alſo ſome Monuments of the Houſe of *Vendome*, that is now the Head of the Houſe of *Bourbon*, which was taken very heinouſly, and not without Reaſon. When the Romaniſts ſaw this, and that part of the Nobility of the Country were gone to the Prince at *Orleans*, and others had thrown themſelves into the Town of *Mans*, they began to keep the Reformed under great Conſtraint. *Peter Ronſard*, among others, a Gentleman, and an excellent *French* Poet, who hired his Tongue, not only to defile his Muſe with all ſorts of Filthineſs, but alſo to Slander our Religion, and thoſe who profeſs'd it, having turn'd Prieſt, reſolved to have a hand in thoſe Quarrels with his Friends. In order to it, having got together ſome Soldiers in a Village call'd *Evaille*, which was his Pariſh, made ſeveral Excurſions attended with Plunder and Murthers". *Spondanus* will have it, that the Nobility of *Vendomois* pitch'd upon the Prieſt *Ronſard* to be their Head; but I had rather keep to *Beza*'s Narrative. However, I ſhall ſet down the Words of that Annaliſt. They contain ſome other things that want to be rectified. (e) *Arma quoque ſumens nobilitas, ducem ſibi elegit Ronſardum, qui inſolentiam profanorum non ferens, multos ex iis male mulctavit: quamquam curionatum Evalliæ tenebat, hoc amoenitatis aut commoditatis captu. Neque enim is erat, qui libertatem ſuam, atque adeo licentiam poeticam ſacerdotalis muneris neceſſitate tamquam compede ad gravitatem ei functione dignam vellet aſtringere: ſed homo generoſus, & a teneris anni inter nobiles pueros Caroli Ducis Aurelianenſis Franciſci I. filii in aula, & poſtea militaribus ſtudiis in Anglia & Scotia innutritus, antequam literis ſub 25. ætatis operam daret, & divinum ingenium ad poeticam appelleret, inter præcipua vitæ oblectamenta etiam armorum curam & amorem retinuerat.* Theſe Words give us to underſtand, that *Ronſard* had a Living only for his Pleaſure, and that he diſcharged the Duties of the Prieſthood perfunctorily. If *Spondanus* had known that this pretended Curate had been in the ſame Poſt at the Court of *Scotland*, that he had in the Houſe of the Duke of *Orleans*, would he have made uſe of this diſtinction, viz. that *Ronſard* was bred up a Page to that Duke, and learned the Art of War under the King of *Scotland*? This wants to be rectified. That young Man was (f) made Page to the Dauphin in the Year 1536, three Days before that Prince died. *Afterwards he entred into the Service of* Charles *Duke of* Orleans, *the King's Second Son, and continued there for ſome time, being very acceptable to his Maſter* . . . . . *who, to give him an occaſion of ſeeing the World, made him Page to* James Stuart, *King of* Scotland, *who came to Marry* (g) *the Lady* Magdalen, *Daughter to* Francis I. *The King of Scotland carried him into his Kingdom, where he continued* (h) *two Years, and half a Year in* England; *and then he returned into France, and applied himſelf to the Duke of* Orleans, *his Maſter, who made him Page of his Stables, and ſent him upon Buſineſs into* Flanders *and* Zealand, *with Orders to go as far as* Scotland, *which he did* . . . . . *At his return from that Journey, being only about 15 or 16 Years of Age, after he had ſerved the Duke of* Orleans *five Years, 'till that Prince died, and afterwards* Henry, *who was ſince King, in the Year 1540. he went in the Retinue of* Lazarus de Baif . . . . . . *who was ſent Ambaſſador to* the Diet of *Spires* (i). It appears from this Narrative. 1. That *Ronſard* did not learn the Art of War in *Scotland*, otherwiſe than he had done in the Service of the Duke of *Orleans*, and otherwiſe than the Pages of Princes learn it. 2. That *Spondanus* expreſs'd himſelf ill, and knew not that our Poet was only 13 or 14 Years of Age when he was in *Scotland*, and that at his return into *France* he was made Page to the Dauphin's Brother. Perhaps it will be objected to me, that *Binet*'s Narrative being full of Faults, ought not to be alledged againſt that Annaliſt; but notwithſtanding this Objection, I believe *Binet* is not miſtaken as to the time that *Ronſard* was made Page to the King of *Scotland*. However, he is groſly miſtaken in his Computation; for if *Ronſard* had been a Domeſtick to the Duke of *Orleans five Years, 'till that Prince died*, he would have ſerved him 'till the Year 1545. and if he had been ſince in the Service of the Dauphin *Henry*, how could he have been in *Lazarus de Baif*'s Retinue, in the Year 1540? But it is true, (k) that *Lazarus de Baif* being ſent Ambaſſador into *Germany* in the Year 1540. took along with him our *Ronſard*, who had made an end of his Service as a Page. However it be, *Varillas* has been deceived by *Spondanus*. "(l) New Puniſhments were invented againſt the Calviniſts of *Vendome*, becauſe the moſt violent amongſt 'em had ſearched the Sepulchres of the Anceſtors of the King of *Navarre*: And the famous Poet *Ronſard*, a Gentleman of that Country, who being weary of the Court, and deſiring to be in better Circumſtances than he was at Home, had accepted the Living

"of

(a) Claudius Binet, ubi ſupra, pag. 114.

(b) Le Pas, Triomphe de la Muſe Amourette, page 182, 183. of the 2d part of the new Works, Dutch Edit. 1687.

(c) Binet does not ſay that the Gentlewoman carried him; he diſtinguiſhes her from the Woman who carried him.

(d) Beza, Hiſt. Eccl. B. 7. pag. 537, 538.

(e) Spondanus, Annal. ad ann. 1562. num. 16. p. m. 1, 622.

(f) Binet, ubi ſupra, pag. 115.

(g) He Married her at Paris in January 1537.

(h) Du Perron, Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard, pag. 193. ſays that he was two Years and a half in Scotland.

(i) Taken from Claudius Binet, pag. 115. & ſeq.

(k) See the Verſes of Antony de Baif in Mr. Menage's Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault. pag. 196.

(l) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX. tom. 1. pag. 171. Dutch Edit. ad. ann. 1562.

him, wherein it was ſuppoſed that he was a Prieſt. He defended himſelf (E) in Verſe, and denied that he was inveſted with ſuch a Character. What is cer-tain, is, that he had ſome Benefices *in Commendam*, and among others the Pri-ory of *St. Coſmus* near *Tours*. He died there the 27th of *December*, 1585. and had but an indifferent Burial; but twenty four Years after a noble Monument (F)

" of *Evailles*, took up Arms again which he had " born in *Scotland* and *England*. Afterwards he " excuſed himſelf for it, ſaying in a pleaſant man-" ner, that not being able to defend his Pariſhio-" ners with St. *Peter*'s Key, for which the Calvi-" niſts had no Reſpect, he took St. *Paul*'s Sword, " and putting himſelf at the Head of the Neigh-" bouring Gentry, kept his Church and his Pariſh " from being plunder'd ". You ſee he falſly ſup-poſes that *Ronſard* bore Arms in *Scotland* and *England*.

(E) *He defended himſelf in Verſe, and denied that he was a Prieſt*.] The Miniſter *Chandieu* and *Florent Chretien* were the Authors of the Pieces publiſhed againſt him at *Orleans*. The firſt appeared under the diſguiſe of *A. Zamariel B. de Mont Dieu*, and the ſecond under that of *Francis de la Baronnie* (a). Father *Garaſſe* ſpeaks of 'em in the following manner. " (b) Thoſe two Men gave him a ſevere " Reprimand, which is Intitled, *la Metamorphoſe de* " *Ronſard en Pretre, ou le Temple de Ronſard*. They " accuſed him, among other things, of having " taught Atheiſm.

" *Je t'ay veu diſcourir tout ainſi qu' Epicure*
" *Qui attachoit au ciel un Dieu qui n'a la cure*
" *De ce qu'on fait en bas, & en parlant ainſi*
" *Tu monſtrois que de luy tu n'avois grand ſou-*
(e), &c.

" But *Ronſard* made a ſolid Anſwer to their " ſcurrilous and impertinent Language in a Poem, " Intitled, *Des miſeres du temps*, in which he pro-" teſts, &c.". *Garaſſe* is miſtaken: the Poem Intitled, *Des miſeres du temps*, is not an Anſwer to *Zamariel* and *la Baronnie*. The Piece publiſhed againſt them by *Ronſard* in his vindication, came out with this Title, *Reponſe aux injures & calomnies de je ne ſçai quels predicantereaux & Miniſtreaux de Geneve*. The reaſon that moved the Proteſtants to make Verſes againſt that Poet, is imperfectly related by *Binet* and *Varillas*. One of them ſays, that they abuſed him, to revenge themſelves for the Poems he had writ againſt them; the other affirms, that they cenſured him by reaſon of his Warlike Exploits. Thoſe two Reaſons ſhould have been put together; for 'tis certain they fell upon him, becauſe he had made uſe of his Pen and Sword againſt 'em with great Fury. Here follow *Binet*'s Words. This (c) " obliged *Ronſard* to oppoſe that " new Opinion, and to arm the Muſes in the De-" fence of *France*, publiſhing his Remonſtrances, " which were thought ſo proper to confute the " Enemies of the Catholick Religion, that the King, " and the Queen his Mother, gratified him for " it; as did alſo Pope *Pius* V. who wrote to him " a Letter of Thanks: which was the reaſon why " thoſe of the new Religion fell upon him, and " publiſhed a very Satyrical and Biting Poem a-" gainſt him, which they called *le Temple de Ronſard*, wherein they painted his Life as it were in " Hangings. They made alſo ſome Anſwers to " his Remonſtrances with this Title, *La Metamorphoſe de Ronſard*, the Authors of which were " one *A. Zamariel* and *B. de Mont-Dieu* both Mini-" ſters. He ſufficiently points at the latter in theſe " Verſes of his Anſwer to him, comparing him " to *Siſyphus*,

" *Qui remonte & repouſſe aux enfers un rocher*,
" *Dont tu as pris ton nom*."

Binet divides one Author into two, *A. Zamariel B. de Mont-Dieu* is but one Man. I proceed to *Varillas*'s Words. (d) *This occaſioned the terrible Sa-tyr which* Florent Chretien, *at that time a* zealous *Calviniſt, and Preceptor to the Prince of* Navarre, *wrote under the Name of the Miniſter* de la Baronnie *againſt the ſame* Ronſard; *and the Anſwer of the latter, wherein he ſhewed that Indignation would enable him to make finer Verſes than Nature, tho' he had a wonderful Genius for Poetry* (e). He is in the wrong to ſay, that *Florent Chretien wrote under the Name of a Miniſter*, and to believe that none but he publiſhed Satyrs againſt *Ronſard*. We have ſeen that he ſays after *Beza* and *Spondanus*, that this Poet was a Curate; but their miſtake will appear by the following Verſes.

Or (f) *ſus mon frere en Chriſt, tu dis que je*
ſuis Preſtre:
J'atteſte l'eternel que je le voudrois eſtre,
Et avoir tout le chef & le dos empeſché
Deſſous la peſanteur d'une bonne Eveſché:
Lors j'auroy la couronne à bon droit ſur la teſte,
Qu'un raſoir blanchiroit le jour d'une grand
feſte,
Ouverte, large, longue, allant juſques au
front,
En forme d'un Croiſſant qui tout ſe courbe en
rond.

Does not *Ronſard* plainly deny, in theſe Verſes, that he was a Prieſt? And if he had been one, would he have been ſo bold as to deny it? Something may be ſaid, in order to excuſe the Miniſters, who gave him that Title. He had been ordained, and performed Eccleſiaſtical Functions in the Quire in Sacerdotal Habits: He himſelf informs us of it.

Mais (g) *quand je ſuis aux lieux où il faut faire*
voir
D'un cœur devotieux l'office & le devoir,
Lors je ſuis de l'Egliſe une colonne ferme,
D'un ſurpelis ondé les eſpaules je m'arme,
D'une haumuſſe le bras, d'une chape le dos,
Et non comme tu dis faite de croix & d'os:
C'eſt pour un Capelan, la mienne eſt honorée
De grandes boucles d'or & de frange dorée:

. . . .

Je (h) *ne perds un moment des prieres divines:*
Dés la pointe du jour je m'en vais à matines,
J'ay mon breviaire au poing, je chante quelque-
fois,
Mais c'eſt bien rarement, car j'ay mauvaiſe voix.
Le devoir du ſervice en rien je n'abandonne,
Je ſuis à Prime, à Sexte, & à Tierce, & à
None.
J'oy dire la grand' Meſſe, & avecques l'encens
(Qui par l'Egliſe eſpars comme parfum ſe ſent,)
J'honore mon Prelat des autres l'outrepaſſe,
Qui a pris d'Agenor ſon ſurnom & ſa race.
Apres le tour finy je viens pour me r'aſſoir.

This was the reaſon why the Proteſtants believed that he was a Curate. *Menage* (i) fancies that a Miniſter, whoſe Name was *de Mont-Dieu*, wrote againſt *Ronſard*; but he is miſtaken; 'tis only a diſguiſe under which the Miniſter *Chandieu* appeared when he publiſhed that Piece. M. *Baillet* (k) thinks that *Florent Chretien* aſſumed that falſe Name. *Colomies* (l) has no reaſon to ſay that *la Croix de Maine* knew not *in his Bibliotheque, Page* 88. that *Florent Chretien wrote againſt* Ronſard, *under the Name of* Francis de la Baronnie. I have mentioned, in (m) another Place, the Anſwer made by

(a) See Garaſſe's Doctrine curieuſe p. 126. & 1022. & *la Croix du Maine pag.* 88.

(b) *Garaſſe ibid. pag.* 126. 127.

(c) *Binet ubi ſupra, pag.* 138. 139. *See alſo the Funeral Oration by* du Perron, p. 197. *where no other reaſon is to be found but that alledged by* Binet.

(F) was erected there to his Honour. He was cruelly Tormented with the Gout, and, 'tis ſaid, he got it (G) by his Debaucheries. His Works are full of gallant Verſes, wherein we find that he had * three chief Miſtreſſes. The laſt was only (H) an Amuſement to him, and a Poetical Subject. Beſides, it is to be obſerved that he often made Love-Verſes at the requeſt of ſome Lords of the Court; ſo that they contained a Deſcription of their Paſſions, and not of his own. The

* See the Remark H.

by *Ronſard*, when he was charged with an *Act of Paganiſm*.

(F) *A noble Monument was erected there to his Honour.*] *Joachim de la Chetardie*, Counſellor Clerk in the Parliament of *Paris*, being Prior of St. *Coſme*, 20 Years after *Ronſard's* Death, could not endure that the Tomb of that Illuſtrious Poet ſhould not be (c) diſtinguiſhed from others, and ſhould want an Inſcription. Wherefore, when he got the Monaſtery repaired, he cauſed a Marble Tomb to be erected, and adorned it with an (b) Epitaph, and a Statue of *Ronſard* made by an excellent Sculptor. (c) *Cum magni Ronſardi cineres populari loculo, mutos & illiteratos jacere videret, melior æquiorque illis qui eis optimis exuviis ditati ſunt, tamdiu manes eſſe neglectos non tulit, ac Ronſardum illum . . . . . Chetardius marmoris alta ſtrue, ſtatua ad viventis ſimilitudinem veriſſime expreſſa à Phidia Lutetiano donavit, brevi nota & elogio.* Theſe *Latin* Words reflect upon *Ronſard's* Relations, as if they had taken no care to preſerve his Memory; but it is certain that *Gallandius* cauſed a pompous Funeral to be made for him in *Boncourt-College*, of which he was Principal. (d) *Teſtamento condito quo hæredem ſcripſit Johannem Gallandium juventutis Pariſienſis optimum moderatorem, cujus hoſpitio tum Lutetiæ eſſet, familiariſſime utebatur, qui dignam tanti viri memoriæ gratiam rependens ei exequias perhonorifice poſtea in ſchola Becodiana ſua parentavit.* Here follows a deſcription of that Funeral. “(e) M. “*Galland*, whoſe Affection for him was not bu“ried in the ſame Grave, doing what *France* was “bound to do, cauſed great Preparations to be “made in *Boncourt*-Chappel, where his Funeral “was celebrated in a ſolemn manner upon a *Mon“day*, the 24th of *Febuary*, 1586. The Service ſet to “Muſick, and attended with all ſorts of Inſtru“ments, was Sung by the choiceſt Singers, the “King's Muſicians being ordered to be there; for “the King lamented the Loſs of ſo great a Man, “who was an Ornament to his Kingdom. I “ſhould be too long, ſhould I make a particular “Deſcription of the Funeral Orations, Encomiums “and Verſes, that were made upon that occaſion, “and conſecrated to his Memory, and of the Lords, “who, (together with that generous Prince *Charles* “*de Valois*, attended by the Duke of *Joyeuſe*, and “the moſt Reverend Cardinal his Brother, to whom “*Ronſard* was related,) honoured that Funeral Pomp “with their Preſence; at which the moſt conſide“rable Members of the Parliament of *Paris*, fol“lowed by the greateſt Wits of *France*, were “pleaſed to aſſiſt. In the Afternoon M. *du Perron* “pronounced his Funeral Oration with great Elo“quence; and there was ſuch a vaſt Concourſe of “Hearers, that Cardinal *de Bourbon*, and many o“ther Princes and Lords, were obliged to go away, “being not able to crowd in.

(G) *'Tis ſaid he got it by his Debaucheries.*] He was a well-ſhap'd Man, ſtrong and vigorous; and beſides, having a great deal of Wit, and a great Inclination for a voluptuous Life, one may eaſily gueſs he improved the Opportunities of ſporting with the fair Sex. He deſtroy'd his ſtrong Conſtitution by his looſe Life, as *Thuanus* obſerves: (f) *Verum homo ut ingenio ſic forma & corporis robore inſignis cum vita ſoluta licentioſe nimis genio indulgeret, valetudinem firmiſſimam debilitavit, acerbiſſimis arthriticis doloribus extrema ætate conflictatus.* He was very deaf; and the Author of his Life owns, that this Infirmity came upon him, among other Reaſons, becauſe (g) *being in Germany, he was forced to drink ſuch Wines as are to be found there, moſt of which are Sophiſticated.* This is a Miſtake; for there are excellent Wines in *Germany*; and if *Ronſard* had drank 'em moderately, they had done him no harm. The Authors of the Pieces publiſh'd againſt him at *Orleans*, repreſent him as a Man who had been a great Debauchee.

(g) Binet, ubi ſupra, pag. 117.

Tu (h) m'accuſes, Cafard, d'avoir eu la verolle;
Un chaſte Predicant de fait & de parole
Ne devroit jamais dire un propos ſi vilain:
Mais que ſort-il du ſac? cela dont il eſt plein.

(h) Ronſard, ubi ſupra, pag. 86.

. . . .

Tu (i) te plaints d'autre part que ma vie eſt
laſcive,
En delices, en jeux, en vices exceſſive:
Tu mens meſchantement, ſi tu m'avois ſuivy
Deux mois, tu ſçaurois bien en quel eſtat je vy.

(i) Id. ib. pag. 93.

(H) *The laſt Miſtreſs was only . . . . a poetical Subject.*] Let us ſee firſt of all what we are told of his two firſt Miſtreſſes. “(k) *Ronſard* falling “in Love with a handſome Woman of *Blois*, whoſe “Name was *Caſſandra*, on the 21ſt of *April*, in “a Journey he made to *Blois*, where the Court “was, being then (l) twenty Years of Age, re“ſolved to ſing his beloved Object, as well on “account of her Beauty, as by reaſon of her “Name. He was ſmitten as ſoon as he ſaw her, “which he plainly intiminates by this Motto “(†) ΩΣ ΙΔΟΝ ΩΣ ΕΜΑΝΗΝ.” The Verſes he made upon that Miſtreſs were thought ſomewhat obſcure; wherefore *he reſolved to deſcribe in a more eaſy Style his Paſſion for* Mary, *who was a handſome Maid of* Anjou. *He often denotes her by the Name of* Pin de Bourgeuil, *becauſe it was the Place where ſhe lived, and where he ſaw her firſt, happening to be there with his Friend* Baif. *He loved her very much after he had courted* Caſſandra *ten Years, whom he left out of Jealouſy.* It appears therefore from this Paſſage, that *Ronſard* Sung the Praiſes of his *Mary* in the Year 1544, and yet *Binet* (m) had been ſaying that *Ronſard* had publiſhed an *Epithalamium* on the Marriage of M. *de Vendome* and *Joan d'Albret*, Queen of *Navarre*, and then that he had made two other Poems before he fell in Love with *Caſſandra*. This Marriage was in 1548. It is ſaid in *Ronſard's* Life, printed in the Collection of the fineſt Pieces of the *French* Poets, which came out in 1692, that he fell in Love with *Caſſandra* at *Blois*, being in the Service of the Duke of *Anjou*. There was no Duke of *Anjou* at that time. Here follows the Hiſtory of his third Love. (n) “He “ended his Works with his Sonnets upon *Helena*, “whoſe Virtues, Beauty, and great Accompliſh“ments, were the laſt and moſt worthy Subject “of his Muſe: The laſt, becauſe he never had the “Happineſs to ſee her 'till he was an old Man; “and the moſt worthy, becauſe this Lady was, “by her Quality, Virtue and Reputation, above “thoſe, whom he loved in his younger Years. “He was more familiar with them, than with the “laſt, whom he honoured and praiſed, inſtead of “courting her. Witneſs the Title he gave to his “Praiſes, imitating *Petrarch* in that reſpect, who “being one day praiſed in the Queen Mother's Pre“ſence, on account of his chaſte and modeſt Poetry, “her Majeſty adviſed him (*Ronſard*) to write in the “ſame Style, as being more ſuitable to his Age, “and

(k) See what has been ſaid of Malherbe in the Remark B of his Article.

(l) Binet, ubi ſupra, pag. 129.

(†) They are Theocritus's Words, which Virgil renders thus in his 8th Eclogue, ut vidi ut perii.

(m) Binet, ibid. pag. 133.

(n) Id. ib. pag. 142, 143.

The Remembrance of it made (H△) him uneasie; for he remembred at the same time that he got nothing by it; and that the Reward due to him had been bestowed upon others. He was not so unfortunate as to the Poems he inscribed to *Charles* the Ninth; for he (H△△) was well paid for them. He prosecuted *Joachim du Bellay*, to recover some Odes (I) which had been cunningly

" and the Gravity of his Learning. Thus *Ronſard* " having, as he thought, an Opportunity of con- " ſecrating his Muſe to a Perſon of great Merit, " took the Queen's Advice for a Permiſſion, or ra- " ther a Command to addreſs himſelf to one of " her Maids of Honour, of a very ancient and no- " ble Family of *Saintonge*; and he continued to " praiſe her almoſt to the end of his Life: And " becauſe her Wit did frequently afford him Mat- " ter to exerciſe his Muſe, he conſecrated a Foun- " tain to her in *Vendomois*, which goes by her " Name to this very day.

The Collection of the fineſt Pieces of the *French* Poets, both ancient and modern, printed at *Paris* in the Year 1692, contains the Life of *Ronſard*, wherein I have found a Fault, which wants to be rectified. (a) *He ſung* Helena de Sugeres, *a Maid of Honour to the Queen, and deſired Cardinal* du Perron *to write a Preface, in order to prefix it to his Gallant Poems; in which he intreated him to ſay, that he loved that Maid in an honeſt way. The Cardinal anſwered him, that inſtead of a Preface, he ſhould put the Picture* (1) *of* Helena de Sugeres *to his Book. Du Perron* being but a young Man when *Ronſard* died, 'tis not likely that this great Poet would have deſired him to write a Preface for him. The Truth is, that he deſired no ſuch thing of any Body: 'Twas the Lady, who made ſuch a Requeſt to Cardinal *du Perron*. If you read the *Perroniana* at the word *Gournay*, you'll find theſe (b) Words in it. *This is what I told* Mrs. de Surgeres *one day, who deſired me, at* Mr. de Rets's, *to put an Epiſtle to* Ronſard's *Works, whereby it might appear, that he had not an unchaſte Love for her. I told her, inſtead of ſuch an Epiſtle, 'tis but putting your Picture to it.*

(H△) *The Remembrance of it made him uneaſy . . . . . he remembred that he had got nothing by thoſe Poems.*] I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage of *Binet* to prove this. " (c) He often told me, that he " had made many amorous Verſes and Maſquerades " at the Requeſt of ſome great Men, meaning, that " he had often ſtrain'd his Muſe without any Satiſ- " faction; others having got the Reward he de- " ſerved: Which was the Reaſon why he prefix- " ed theſe Verſes of *Virgil* to his Works, *ſic vos* " *non vobis*, &c. It is well known for whom he " wrote the Amours of *Callirea*, a very handſome " Lady of the Court, of the noble Family of *Atry*, " ſirnamed *Aquaviva*, as he ſufficiently intimates " by the Sonnet, which begins thus, *La belle eau* " *vive*. It is alſo known for whom he made the " Verſes concerning (d) *Aſtrea*, who was likewiſe " a very handſome Lady of the Court, whoſe " Name is very much imbelliſh'd by the meer Al- " teration of a Vowel". It appears from theſe Words, that *Ronſard* was not ſo uninereſted as an honeſt Man ought to be. It had been a glorious thing for him, if he had ſhewed himſelf leſs mercenary: 'Tis a Fault that prevails among Poets, and I wonder that *Binet* ſhould have been ſo ingenuous as to acquaint the Publick with the Complaints that *Ronſard* made to him in private, for not being rewarded. However it be, this ſhews that a Man may write very paſſionate Verſes, without being in Love with the Perſon who is the Subject of thoſe Verſes. I think this may be more eaſily done by a Man who has (e) a Miſtreſs.

(H△△) *He was well paid for the Poems he inſcribed to* Charles *the IXth.*] That Prince, (f) " be- " ſides his yearly Penſion, made him ſome Pre- " ſents. 'Tis true, he ſaid ſometimes in jeſt, that " he was afraid of loſing his *Ronſard*, and that " too much Wealth would make him idle, adding, " that a good Poet ought not to be fatten'd no " more than a good Horſe, but only kept in good " Caſe. Nevertheleſs he was always very liberal " to him, and would have continued ſo, if he had " lived; for he was not ignorant that Poets have " a kind of Sympathy with the Grandeur of Kings, " and are apt to take Fire, being ſenſibly affected " when their Labours and Merit are not ſufficient- " ly rewarded, as he complains of it in ſeveral " Places". The latter part of this Paſſage confirms what has been ſaid in the foregoing Remark concerning *Ronſard's* mercenary Humour, and therefore I have not left it out, as I would have done, had it not been for that Reaſon. *Brantome* mentions this Policy of *Charles* the IXth, as may be ſeen in *Daurat's* Article. 'Tis the moſt effectual way of keeping the Poets buſie: If they were too rich, they would be apt to deſpiſe their Trade. *Charles* the IXth was therefore in the right to deal with the Poets, as if they had told him, *Give us neither Poverty nor Riches, feed us with Food convenient for us.* The Temper he obſerved, is perhaps the greateſt Bleſſing that can be wiſh'd for the Commonwealth of Learning; for ſome Authors would not have publiſh'd ſeveral good Books, if they had lived in Plenty: Others would have been more accurate in their Compoſures, had they not been ſo poor. The great Poverty of ſome Authors has occaſion'd a Multitude of bad Books, which the Publick are peſtered with. A moderate Income would have inabled them to poliſh their Works; but the preſſing Neceſſity of a Man, incumbred with a great Family, and perſecuted by a Creditor, whom he puts off 'till he be paid for his Copy, and gratified for his Epiſtle Dedicatory, obliges him to write ſo haſtily, that he has no time to lick up his Works into the beſt Shape. 'Tis to be obſerved, that there are ſome ſuch Works which 'tis better to have, than to be wholly deprived of 'em. For Inſtance, 'twas better to have *du Ryer's* Tranſlations, than none at all of the Authors tranſlated by him: And therefore, if we ſuppoſe that *du Ryer* would have lived an idle Life, if he had been rich, 'twas better for the Publick, that he had no more than was neceſſary to maintain him. When a Writer deſigns to raiſe his Fortune, he endeavours to write well; but he has no ſooner obtained his End, than he grows remiſs. This is what may be obſerved in Preachers: They are thought to preach better (g) before they are Biſhops, than after they have attain'd to that Dignity. Which puts me in mind of an ingenious Repartee. A great Prince of our time, deſigning to beſiege a Town, was told, that it would be defended by a Mareſchal of *France*, and did not alter his Reſolution upon that account, ſaying, that *a Governor, who is not yet Mareſchal of* France, *is more to be feared, than one who is ſo already.*

(I) *To recover ſome Odes which had been cunningly*, &c.] This is a remarkable Suit, and I don't Queſtion, that *Ronſard* proſecuted it as warmly, as others would do to recover an Inheritance. The Hiſtorian ſpeaks of it with great caution, being tender of the Plaintiff's and Defender's Reputation: The latter acted the moſt odious part before the Judges, and the other was laughed at by them. I ſhall ſet down the whole Narrative of *Binet*. " (h) " When *Caſſandra's* Amours, and the Four Books of " Odes, which *Ronſard* promiſed in imitation of " *Pindar* and *Horace*, were much talk'd of; it being " a common thing for Wits to be jealous one of " another, *du Bellay*, who had alſo ſung his *Olive* " in ningly ſtolen from him; but afterwards they agreed, and were Friends again. He would have had a better Succeſs in his amorous Verſes, had he not ſo carefully imitated the ancient Poets: The too frequent uſe of their Fables made him Harſh (K) and Obſcure. Nay, he ſometimes took the liberty, as they did, to uſe ſome (L) obſcene Expreſſions, and in general was guilty of many Profanations, and inſerted too many Pagan Notions in his Poems, which nevertheleſs were paid (M) with Sacred Things.

(a) *Recueil des plus belles pieces, tome* 1. *pag.* 141, 142. Dutch *Edit.*

(1) *Becauſe ſhe was ugly.*

(b) *See the Remark* B. *in the Article* Gournay.

(c) *Binet, ubi ſupra, pag.* 141, 142.

(d) *She was a Lady of the Houſe* d'Eſtrée.

(e) *'Tis but fancying that the Lady for whom he makes Verſes, is his beloved Object.*

(f) *Binet ibid. pag.* 143.

(g) [illegible]

(h) [illegible]

" in an amorous Strain, went about to compoſe " ſome Odes like thoſe of *Ronſard*, which he got " into his Hands without his Knowledge. He made " ſome, which, together with ſeveral Sonnets, he pub- " liſh'd with the Title of a Collection of Poems, to " prevent *Ronſard*. The latter conceived a reaſona- " ble Jealouſie againſt *du Bellay*, ſo far as to indite " him in order to recover his Papers. They were " adjudged to him; and then the Quarrel was over. " *Ronſard* deſired *du Bellay* to go on with his Odes, by " which means they became greater Friends than ever, " being of Opinion that ſuch an Ambition ſhews a " generous Soul, and that if Men, jealous of Glory, " grow quickly angry, they are alſo eaſily recon- " ciled.

(K) *Made him harſh and obſcure.*] The Obſcurity of his Works was complain'd of at that very time, which was the reaſon why ſome of his Friends Commented upon them. *Caſſandra*'s Amours were Commented upon by *Muret*: The Firſt Book of his Love for *Mary* was Commented upon by *Remi Belleau*, and the Second by *Nicolas Richelet*: His Sonnets upon *Helena*, the Five Books of his Odes, and his Hymns, were Commented upon by the ſame *Richelet*; and *Claudius Garnier* did the ſame upon all the Pieces of the Ninth Part of his Works. (a) *Beſides ſeveral Pieces of the Firſt Part*, Peter de Marcaſſus *Commented upon the* Franciade, *which makes up the third, the* Bocage Royal *which makes up the Fourth, the* Eclogues, Maſcarades, *and* Cartels, *which make up the Fifth, the* Elegies *which make up the Sixth, and the* Poems *which make up the Eighth.* *John Beſly*, the King's Advocate at *Fontenay le Comte*, Commented (b) upon the Hymns. Poor *Ronſard* is put to a Non-plus in the *Parnaſſe Reformé*, on account of the impenetrable Obſcurity of his Works, without the help of a good Commentary. His *Je ne ſuis point ma guerriere Caſſandre*, &c. is particularly alledged againſt him. Do you believe ('tis a Queſtion put to him) (c) *that your* Caſſandra, *for whom you made* that Sonnet, *had ſuch a good* Opinion *of it? Do you think that the* Dolope Soudart, *the* Myrmidon, *the* Corebe inſenſé, *and the* Gregeois Penelée, *were very well known to her; and was it a ſmall matter for a Woman to be put to the trouble of unfolding all the Fables relating to the Siege of* Troy?

(a) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les poemes, tom. 3. n. 1325. pag. 371.

(b) Colomeſ. obſervat. ſacr. pag. 94.

(c) Parnaſſe reform. p. 91, 92. Dutch Edit.

Ronſard's Obſcurity and Harſhneſs would be more excuſable, had he been the firſt who improved the *French* Poetry; but he ſaw it full of Charms, and near its Perfection in *Marot*'s Writings, which might have been a great help to him. I ſhall ſet down Monſieur *de la Bruyere*'s Opinion. (d) " One " would think from *Marot*'s Turn and Style, that he " writ after *Ronſard*: There is hardly any diffe- " rence between him and us, but in ſome Words. " *Ronſard*, and the Authors contemporary with him, " did the *French* Style more harm than good; they " kept it from arriving to Perfection, and were " like to hinder it from ever attaining to it. 'Tis " ſurprizing that *Marot*'s Works, which are ſo eaſy " and natural, did not make *Ronſard*, who was full " of a Poetical Spirit, a greater Poet than *Ronſard* " and *Marot*. But how could they produce ſuch an " Effect in a Man whoſe Taſte was ſo depraved, " that he look'd upon 'em as a Heap of Dirt with " ſome Grains of Gold in it? He (e) had *conſtantly in his Hands*, as we are told by the Author of his Life, *ſome* French *Poets ..... eſpecially ....* John le Maire de Belges, *the* Roman de la Roſe, *and* Marot's *Works, which he call'd, as* Virgil *did thoſe of* Ennius, *a Dunghil, out of which, as it were by an induſtrious waſhing, he took many Grains of Gold.* That Waſhing would not have appear'd very induſtrious to Monſieur *de la Bruyere*, he would have ſaid that *Ronſard* took the Earth, and threw off the Gold.

(d) La Bruyere, Caracteres, in the Chap. intituled, des ouvrages de l'Eſprit, p. m. 82.

(e) Binet, Vie de Ronſard, p. m.

(L) *Some obſcene Expreſſions.*] I ſhall only give one inſtance of it alledged by Monſieur *Menage* in a place, wherein he finds fault with him for uſing obſcure Fables. *No Fables*, ſays he (f), *ought to be made uſe of, but ſuch as are known to every body.* Ronſard, *who made uſe of ſome that are only known to the Learned, and only to be found in the Scholiaſts, ſuch as that which he mentions in theſe Words of the 21ſt Ode of the 2d Book out of the Scholiaſt upon* Nicander,

Ny les fleurons que diffama
Venus, alors que ſa main blanche
Au milieu du Lis renferma
D'un grand Aſne le roide manche,

was accounted a Pedant, inſtead of a Learned Man. Here follows a Note of *Nicolas Richelet* upon thoſe four Verſes of *Ronſard*. (g) " This we find in " *Nicander's Alexipharmaca.* One can hardly ap- " prehend how it can be underſtood of the Lilly, " which the ſame *Nicander* calls in another place " *Venus*'s Delight. And indeed our Author ſeems " to doubt of it, ſpeaking a ſecond time of the Lil- " ly in that ſame Ode; for it were needleſs to ſpeak " twice of the ſame Flower. *Nicander* ſays that this " Flower, whatever it be, undertook one Day to " contend for Beauty with *Venus*, who out of ſpite, " and to revenge her ſelf, ſhut up the privy Parts of " an Aſs in its Leaves.

"——Τότ' ἀπέσυγεν, ἀφρὼ
" Οὕνεκ' ἐειδμαίνεσκε χροιῆς ὕπερ, ἐν δὲ
" νυθείοις
" Ἀργαλέην μεσάτοισιν ὀνείδειν ἐπέλασσε
" Δεινὴν βρωμήεντος ἐπαλδήσασα κορύ-
" νην."

That Commentator does not complain of the Obſcenity of the Text.

(f) Menage, Obſervat. ſur Malherbe, pag. 531.

(g) Richelet, upon the 2d Book of Ronſard's Odes, p. m. 306.

(M) *Which nevertheleſs were paid with ſacred Things.*] Conſult *Sorel*, who ſays that *Ronſard*'s Odes, (h) " written to any ones Praiſe, are an imitation of " *Pindar*, and that the reſt, which are indifferent, " are moſt of 'em taken out of *Anacreon*; ſo that " there is ſcarce any thing to be found in 'em, but " that perhaps to Morrow we ſhall be nothing but Duſt, " that we ought to enjoy our ſelves whilſt we may " do it, and drink and indulge the Love of Women; " which betrays a Man, who does not believe the " Immortality of the Soul. His Hymns contain ve- " ry few Precepts of Virtue: Some are only a meer " repetition of what is to be ſeen in *Homer* and other " Poets, as his Hymns upon *Calais* and *Zethes*, " and *Caſtor* and *Pollux*; which is very improper, " for what ſignifies it to ſing the Praiſes of thoſe " chimerical Heroes? His Hymn concerning *Hercules* compared with Chriſt, both as to his Birth " and Labours, cannot excite any Devotion; for " thoſe remote and far fetch'd Applications are fitter " to make one Laugh, than to produce in us a Re- " pentance of our Sins." He gives the Subſtance of that Hymn, and then he adds, (i) " I had ra- " ther lay aſide intirely the Fables of the Heathens, " than pretend to mend 'em by applying them " in ſuch a manner to Holy Myſteries. 'Tis a dan- " gerous

(h) Sorel, *Remarks on the 13th Book of the* Berger extravagant, *pag.* 648.

(i) *Id. ib. pag.* 650.

Things. People are very much divided in their Opinions about his Works, as may be ſeen in M. *Baillet* *. See alſo *Sorel's* †Remarks upon the *Berger Extravagant*, wherein you'll find many curious and ſolid Criticiſms upon that Poet. I muſt not forget what has been obſerved, that he did not well ſucceed in mending *(N)* his own Works; he left out the beſt Things: which is a troubleſome Fault, and ſome other Writers have not been free from it. I muſt alſo take Notice,

that

" gerous thing to ſuffer ſuch Subjects to be handled by the Poets. If you examine the Matter " narrowly, you'll find that the Myſteries of our " Religion are Prophaned by ſuch a method; for " the Relations are only ſuperficial. What a ſhameful thing is it to refer *Jupiter*'s Adultery to the " Incarnation of the Eternal Word? At this rate it " muſt be ſaid, that the Holy Virgin is repreſented " by *Alcmena*, and then the Angel *Gabriel*, who " declared the Conception, and the Holy Ghoſt that " wrought it, muſt be repreſented by *Mercury*. " Wretched Poet! If you deſign to explain in ſuch a " manner what we are told of *Hercules*, mind what " you do; for there are ſuch abominable Thoughts " concealed under it, that my Pen drops from my " Hands when I think of 'em. Perhaps you'll ſay, " that you have not meddled with them: But will " not every Reader, if he has never ſo little Subtilty " in him, be deſirous to know all the Relations contain'd in your Fable? Beſides, is not the Compariſon between *Hercules* and Chriſt execrable in every part of it." I muſt not forget that he ſays ſomething to excuſe that Poet. " (a) I have alſo ſeen ſome moral Reflections upon the *Roman de la Roſe*, wherein the moſt lewd Things contain'd in that Romance were explained, with relation to our Creation and Redemption, and Eternal Life. There are ſome execrable Thoughts " in that Book; however I believe the Author was " a well-meaning Man, and acted therein according " to the Simplicity of the time he lived in. And I " make no doubt that *Ronſard* had a very good Intention in his *Hercule Chretien*, but his Performance did not anſwer his Hopes. As for his other " Hymns, for inſtance, concerning Eternity, Juſtice, " the Devils, and others of the like nature, he " brings in ſeveral Deities, which he ſhould have " left to the *Greeks*." When he criticiſes the Hymns about the Four Seaſons of the Year, which are the Maſter piece of that Poet, if we may depend upon (b) his Funeral Oration, and *Paſquier* (c), he obſerves a great many Faults in 'em, and even a groſs Contradiction. *Tho' Fictions wholly depend upon a Writer's Fancy, the ſame Poet ought not to have two different Opinions in one and the ſame Work, and yet in a following Hymn, which muſt needs have a dependance upon the firſt, ſince the four Hymns are coupled together,* Ronſard *ſays, that* Nature *perceiving that* Time, *her Husband, was no longer fit for amorous Embraces, tho' ſhe did whatever lay in her Power, to excite in him a deſire of Sporting with her, fell in Love with the Sun, with whom ſhe lay, and got by him the Four Seaſons. Thus we have here another Birth* (d). Nor does he forgive him for telling his dear (e) *Helena, that ſhe muſt not forget upon* Aſh-Wedneſday *to come and take ſome Aſhes from his Heart, which the Fire of Love has conſumed.* He was very much in the right to condemn many other Prophanations of our Poets, and the Rewards beſtowed upon 'em. The worſt of all, ſays he (f), " is, that ſome beneficed Men of " this Age have writ in ſuch a Style more freely than " others; as if they had been allowed to play with " Holy Things, becauſe they had the Adminiſtration of 'em. They were look'd upon as Men, " who took more care of their Bellies than of their " Flocks, and becauſe they ſpoke in a prophane " manner, Lay-People were ſo bold as to do the ſame, " which did great Prejudice to Religion. I know " but too many ſtill, who are not yet inveſted with " Eccleſiaſtical Dignities, but deſire to be promoted " to them, tho' their only Talent conſiſts in writing impious and lewd Things. They are Court-Flies, buzzing in the Palaces of Princes, and continually importuning them, becauſe 'tis thought " here that a Benefice is the fitteſt Reward that can " be beſtowed upon a Poet. What an abominable " cuſtom, to give Eccleſiaſtical Preferments to Men, " who would not be Rewarded, had they not been " Pimps to their Maſters, as it appears from their " amorous Verſes, made in order to indulge the diſorderly Paſſions of Princes and Kings. 'Tis true " that St. *Gelais* was a Biſhop, that *Deſportes* was " an Abbot, and that *Ronſard* had (g) ſome Benefices, and that he deſired the King to add a Croſier " to his Lyre, as if a Biſhoprick had been a true " Reward for his Poems, tho' it ought to be conferr'd on none but thoſe who are Holy in their " Words and Actions. However I will not blame " all thoſe Men upon that account, for I do piouſly " believe, that they wrote thoſe looſe Poems in " their Youth, and that they have ſince made Penance " for 'em.

Theſe laſt Words agree, as to *Ronſard*, with what M. *Baillet* ſays of him. (h) " I ſhall do a good Office to *Ronſard*'s Memory, by informing the Publick, that in the laſt Years of his Life, he condemn'd the unchaſt and looſe Poems he had made. " Nay, he began then to reform his Muſe, reſolving to write only Chriſtian Poems the remaining " part of his Days. Not contented to ſecure his " Conſcience for the time to come, he was deſirous " to expiate his paſt Sins, by ſuppreſſing ſeveral " Pieces he had made in his Youth, and leaving " out all the Paſſages he did not approve in thoſe " that were not wholly bad. But it may be ſaid, " that he did it more like a Father, who cannot diveſt himſelf of his Tenderneſs for his Children, " than like an incorruptible Judge." M. *Menage* (i) alledges theſe Words of *Binet* againſt it: (k) *Perſiſting in the Reſolution* of Loving and Serving one of the Maids of Honour to the Queen, *he praiſed her almoſt to the laſt moment of his Life.* *Thuanus* obſerves, that *Ronſard* made ſome Verſes (l) even when he was a dying, and that they were pious and tolerable Verſes. I have read in *Brantome*, that *Chatellard*, a *French* Gentleman, who was Beheaded in *Scotland* for loving the Queen, and making an attempt upon the Honour of that Princeſs, had no other *Viaticum* or Preparation for Death, than the reading of a Poem of *Ronſard*; which plainly ſhews, that he took it to be a very pious Piece. (m) *Being brought to the Scaffold, he took* Ronſard's *Hymns into his Hands, and for his Eternal Comfort, read out the Hymn concerning Death, which is a very fine one, and fit to make one leſs afraid of dying, having no other godly Book, nor any Miniſter or Confeſſor.*

(N) *He did not well ſucceed in mending his Works.*] In order to make a very inſtructive Commentary upon theſe Words, I ſhall ſet down a long Note of M. *Menage*. " (n) It often falls out that the " ſecond Thoughts of the Poets are not ſo good as " the firſt, as (o) *Binet* very judiciouſly obſerves, " ſpeaking of *Ronſard*'s Verſes. *Some*, ſays he, *are* " *of Opinion, that ſeveral Paſſages which he has* " *mended in his Works, are not ſo agreeable as* " *they were at firſt; for it happens ſometimes,*

" *eſpecially*

---

* *Baillet, Jugemens ſur les poetes, 5. part. n. 1335.*

† *Upon the 13th Book, pag. 647. & ſeq.*

(a) *Id. ib. pag. 652.*

(b) *Thoſe who have ſeen his Hymns about the four Seaſons, (and I think there are few in this Congregation but have had that Curioſity) will doubtleſs confirm my Opinion of 'em, and acknowledge that 'tis almoſt impoſſible to peruſe them, without being charm'd with 'em, and confeſſing that there is a Soul and a Genius in 'em, which affects and tranſports both the Readers and Hearers.* Du Perron, Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard, pag. 198. 199. (c) *Paſquier, Recherches, book 7. ch. 11. pag. m. 646.* (d) *Sorel, ubi ſupra, pag. 653, 654. He had been mentioning another Fiction of* Ronſard, *about the Birth of the Four Seaſons.* (e) *Idem, Remarks upon the 14th Book, pag. 733.* (f) *Id. ib. pag. 738, 739, 740.*

that the common-place of the (C) Jeſts upon Poets for being badly lodged, was uſed againſt *Ronſard*.

ROQUETAILLADE (*John de la*) in Latin, *de Rupeſciſſa*, a *Franciſcan* Fryar, in the Convent of * *Aurillac*, of the Dioceſs of *St. Flour*, made himſelf Famous in the XIVth Century; as well for the Liberty he took of Exclaiming againſt (A) the Vices of the Clergy, and the Oppreſſion of the People, and Diſperſing menacing Predictions, as for his long Impriſonment, which was the Puniſhment of his Bold-

* See the Remark A at the end.

ecially in Poetry, that the firſt Fury is more natural, and if the File be too much uſed, inſtead of clearing and Poliſhing, it ſpoils the Grain. Paſquier, in his (a) Reſearches, has made the ſame Obſervation. *A Great Poet*, ſays he, ſpeaking of *Ronſard*, *but a very bad Judge of his own Works; for about Two or Three Years before his Death, being weaken'd with Old Age, and afflicted with the Gout, Melancholy, and continual Sickneſs, the Poetical Vein, which before kept him good Company, having almoſt forſaken him, he cauſed all his Poems to be Printed in one great Volume, whoſe general Oeconomy he Reform'd, and cut out of his Works many beautiful Inventions, and changed ſome Verſes intirely, and in ſome others he put in other Words, which were not ſo emphatical as the firſt; having, by this means, totally Deface'd, in ſome places, the Beauty of his Poems, not conſidering that tho' he was the Father, and by conſequence, look'd on himſelf to have an abſolute Authority over his Compoſitions; yet he ſhould have reflected, that Old and Melancholy Age was an unfit Judge of the Flights of a vigorous Youth.* But nothing proves this Truth ſo well as the Example of *Taſſo*, who Changed for the worſe, his Poem of *Hieruſalem*. It's a long time ſince *Taſſo* was Reproached with this. I have by me a Book called *Il Duello dell' Ignoranza, & della ſcienza*, which was Printed at *Milan* in 1607; and I find there, That this great Poet was blamed for leaving out ſome of the moſt Beautiful Paſſages *nella Gieruſalemme conquiſtata*, and putting in their place things ridiculous. The Author obſerves ſome of theſe Paſſages, after which he ſpeaks thus, (b) *a' quali tutti graviſſimi, e giocondiſſimi avvenimenti ſoſtituiſce il Taſſo coſe tali, che ſe con ſemplice intelligenza debbono prenderſi, ſono ſi frivole, che niente più, e ſe ci è dentro qualche miſtero, egli ci è involto con tante ambagi, ch'à ſottrarnelo non baſterebbe l'iſteſſo Edippo.* The Author that furniſhes me with this Paſſage, is call'd *Don Coſtantino de' Notari Nolano della Congregatione Caſſinenſe*. I have touched in another place upon the Faults one may fall into by Corrections,

(C) *The Common place of the Jeſts upon Poets for being badly lodged, was uſed againſt* Ronſard.] His Condition in this reſpect, was worſe than to lodge in a Garret, ſince 'tis ſaid, That he was poſted like a Lanthorn on a High Tower, or like Sentinels who watch all Night, leſt any Houſe ſhould be on Fire. 'Tis added, that there is ſtill a Monument of that ſad Lodging, ſince the Tower in which he was lodged is ſtill call'd by his Name. This is certainly what he did not expect; none deſires to become immortal by ſuch means, and any body would be very unwilling to have this Thought of *Horace* apply'd to him.

(c) *Exegi Monumentum ære perennius,*
Regalique ſitu Pyramidum altius.

The Author whom I am to produce, ſpeaks in the following manner. (d) *Ronſard, they ſay, not daring to attack* Rabelais, *whilſt alive, in Writing, tho' they often quarrelled at* Meudon *in the Houſe of the Princes of* Lorrain, *writ only an Epitaph againſt him, in which he abus'd him very much, becauſe* Rabelais *look'd on him only as a poor miſerable Poet, inſomuch that he thought himſelf very happy to lodge in a Watch Tower, which is at this time called* Ronſard's *Tower*, at Meudon; *from whence he went to the Caſtle, where he often met Mr.* Francis Rabelais, *who did not ſpare him; for after all, tho' he was not ſo good a Poet as he; yet he was born a Poet as well as a Phyſician,* (1) *Incomparably more knowing than that Prince of the Poets of his time, and underſtood Railing much better.* The Book from which theſe Words are taken, was Printed at *Paris*, 1697: The Author has not (e) put his Name to it. He had practis'd Phyſick 50 Years, and yet was Poor; his ill Fortune had made him Satyrical, and he imploy'd his time only in Criticiſing. This appears by his Supplement to the *Hiſtory of Phyſick*, by his *Antimenagiana*, and by the little Book he Publiſh'd under the falſe Name of *Pepinacourt*, with the Title of *Reflexions, penſees, & bons mots anecdotes*. He dy'd at *Paris* the 18th of *May*, 1698.

(A) *Of exclaiming againſt the Vices of the Court of* Rome, &c.] I am of Opinion, That to Comment upon theſe Words, I can do nothing more to the purpoſe than to ſet down a long Paſſage out of *Froiſſard*. (f) *There was a Friar Minor, full of Learning in the City of* Avignon, *who was called Fryar* John de Roquetaillade, *whom the Pope caſt into the Priſon of the Caſtle of* Baigneux, *for Predicting wonderful things that were ſoon to come to paſs, and eſpecially to fall upon the Prelates and Preſidents of the Church, for their great Luxury and Pride; and alſo upon the Kingdom of* France, *and all the Great Men of Chriſtendom, for their great Oppreſſions of the Common People. And the ſaid Fryar* John *would prove what he ſaid out of the Apocalypſe, and the Ancient Books of the Holy Prophets, which were diſcover'd and open'd to him, by the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt; ſo that he ſaid many things which it was difficult to believe. Some of them came to paſs at the time foretold by him, which he did not predict as a Prophet, but out of the Scriptures, and by the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, who had given him Underſtanding to Declare and Explain all the Ancient Prophecies, to Proclaim to all Chriſtians the Year and the time they were to come to paſs. And he made on this Subject many Learned Books, one of which was written in* 1346, *which contained many wonderful and incredible things; ſome of which have already happen'd*——— (g) *In my Youth, Pope* Innocent, *who then reigned in* Avignon, *kept this Fryar in Priſon. This Fryar, (as he ſaid, and as I have often heard ſay in many places not Publick but Private), had put forth, and continued to put forth many Predictions of remarkable Events that were to happen in* France, *and which are already verify'd; as the taking of King* John *Priſoner; and he often ſaid, and ſhew'd by ſtrong Reaſons, that the Church was to ſuffer much, becauſe of the Luxury of thoſe who had the Government of it. And then when I ſaw him in Priſon, I was told in the Pope's Palace, of an Example he had given to the Cardinal of* Oſtia, *alias of* Arras, *and to the Cardinal of* Auxerre, *who had been to ſee him, and reprove him for his Words.* This Example is the Apologue or Fable, which you may (h) ſee here below. *Why do not you read*, continu'd (i) he, *the Life of* St. Sylveſter, *and how the Emperor* Conſtantine *gave him the Tythes of the Church, and upon what Conditions. He did not ride about with 2 or 300 Horſes, but kept himſelf cloſe in* Rome, *and lived ſoberly with thoſe of the Church.* This Fryar declared to them, that the Change which he predicted and denoted by the Apologue, would quickly come to paſs: *Inſomuch*, adds the Hiſtorian, *that very often the Cardinals were aſtoniſhed at it, and would willingly have put him to Death, if they could have found, as they could not, any juſt cauſe to have coloured the Action: ſo they let him live as long as he could, but durſt not let him out of Priſon, for fear he ſhould lead the People into an Error, by his profound Predictions, drawn from his own Interpretations of the Scripture. Nevertheleſs, many things, (as ſome ſay, who have better obſerved his Predictions than I have) which he foretold in Priſon, and which he proved by the Apocalypſe, came to paſs: The true Proofs with which he armed himſelf, ſaved him often from being Burnt; and beſides, there were ſome Cardinals who had pity on him, and were not ſo hard upon him as they might have been.*

We will make two Obſervations upon the Diſtinction menton'd by *Froiſſard*. He ſays, That this Fryar did not predict what was to come as a Prophet, but only as a Perſon who had received from the Holy Ghoſt the underſtanding of Prophecies. This is only a *quæſtio de Nomine*, or a Diſpute about Words: However it ſeems to me, that the Privilege of this Fryar equal'd, and even ſurpaſs'd that of the Prophets; for the Prophets did not always know what God Couched under the ſignificative Images of what was to come to paſs, and by conſequence, a Perſon to whom God reveals the true Senſe of thoſe Prophetical Signs, receives a more particular favour. And therefore neither ſuch Man nor his Favourers, ought, under pretence of Modeſty, to make any Difficulty to call this Favour the Gift of Prophecy. If a man ſhould pretend to Expound the Revelation of St. *John*, only by the aſſiſtance of what may be gathered from a ſerious Examination of the Scriptures, it were another matter; but when he perſuades himſelf that he underſtands the *Apocalypſe* only by the help of the Holy Ghoſt; when

(f) Froiſſ. vol. 1. c. 211.

(g) Idem. vol. 1. c. 21. apud eundem. ib. p. 450.

(h) *In the Remark D.*

(i) Id. ib.

Boldneſs (*B*). Some People ſay that the Event juſtify'd his Predictions; but other aſſure us, (*C*) that the quite contrary came to paſs. He did not properly give him ſelf out for a Prophet, but for one who had obtained of God the Knowledge of the Secrets of the *Apocalypſe*, and other Prophecies of the Scripture. See in the Remark *A*, a large Paſſage out of *Froiſſard*. Great notice was taken of the Apologue, (*D*) which he made uſe of to ſhew, That the ſame Princes who had en riched the Church of *Rome*, would bring Her back again to Her Ancient Pover

I ſay, he ſpeaks thus to his Readers; (*m*) *I can ſay, That God in the way opened my Eyes in ſuch a manner, that it has given me more Conſolation than I can expreſs: for after having conſulted the Eternal Truth a hundred times with a profound Humility, and a great Attention, at laſt I was anſwer'd*; He declares himſelf at the bottom, to be a Perſon raiſed by God to diſcover Future Events: is not this to call ones ſelf effectually a Prophet, or more than a Prophet? This is my firſt Obſervation: the next is this; That all Authors do not agree, that *John de Roquetaillade* did not pretend to the Spirit of Prophecy. Read the following words of (*n*) an Author who has writ the Life of *Innocent* VI. *Circa idem tempus*, (i. e. *in* 1356.) *inſurrexit quidam frater ordinis Minorum de conventu Aureliaci diœceſis ſancti Flori, dicens ſe habere SPIRITUM PROPHETIÆ, qui de futuris dicebat & in ſcriptis redigebat multa, vocatus Frater Johannes de Rupeſciſſa, qui quia potius vaticinator quam PROPHETA merito erat cenſendus, ad dictum Innocentium fuit adductus, &c.* It is certain that this Fryar declared openly in his Writings, That he did not ſpeak as a Prophet. See what I ſhall quote below, (*o*) out of a Journaliſt.

(*B*) *Long Impriſonment, which was the puniſhment of his Boldneſs.*] *Froiſſard* tells us, That the Pope kept this Fryar in Priſon in the Caſtle of *Bagnols*. Another Writer aſſures us, That about 1356, this pretended Prophet was ſent to *Innocent* VI. who impriſoned him, (*p*) and never after gave him his Liberty. But this was not his firſt Impriſonment; for in 1345, he was impriſoned in the Convent of *Figeac* by order of Fryar *William Farmena*, Miniſter of the *Franciſcans* in the Province of *Aquitain*. This is to be ſeen in the beginning of the Revelations of this Prophet. Where it is alſo to be ſeen that he reduced them into Writing, at the requeſt of Cardinal *William Curti*. It will be worth the while to give you his very words. (*q*) *Ego frater Johannes de Rupeſciſſa ordinis fratrum Minorum Provinciæ Aquitaniæ, provinciæ Ruthenenſis, & conventus Aurelhiaci, ad mandatum veſtrum deſcripſi ſeriem notabilium eventuum futurorum mihi in carceribus apertum, prout melius & verius potero recordari. Modus revelandi fuit iſte. Cum anno Domini milleſimo trecenteſimo quadrageſimo quinto multis diebus fierem vinctus ferro in carcere luti in conventu Figiaci ſtupens & mirans quare cum tanta crudelitate miſſus eſſem per fratrem Guillermum Farmena tunc miniſtrum Aquitaniæ in carcerem, &c.* It may well be concluded from theſe words, That he was not Honour'd with the Gift of Revelation till he was a Priſoner; which excites my Curioſity to know for what reaſon he was impriſoned. Some ſay, it was becauſe of his Hereſies; (*r*) but the Writers that were nearer his time, ſay, He was only impriſon'd becauſe he fore-told the near approach and coming of *Antichriſt*, and advanced many things that diſpleaſed the Popes and Princes; for he maintain'd, That their Ambition, Pride and Avarice, were the cauſe of the Evils he fore-told. *Alciatus* places him among thoſe who have ſuffered for uſing a certain Method of maintaining Religion. They give out Prophecies, and 'tis the Principal means by which they endeavour to fright thoſe Perſons, whom by other means they cannot induce to ſerve God: (*s*) *Sunt & qui vaticinia ſe ſcire profiteantur, hocque potiſſimum modo, quos verbis ad cultum & pietatem inducere neſciunt, terrere conantur, quod merito Hercule in malam rem Johanni de Rupeſciſſa Symmiſtæ veſtro vertit. Cum enim ſe a Deo admonitum univerſalis Judicii affirmaret, cumque mundi finem adeſſe conclamaret, quia dictis ejus res non reſponderunt, Avinione ab Urbano quinto captus in cuſtodia manſit.* This Fryar having prophecy'd that the End of the World was at hand, was impriſon'd by *Urban* V. becauſe the Event did not anſwer his great Threats. *Alciatus* has committed a Chronological Fault: It was *Innocent* VI. the Predeceſſor of *Urban* V. who impriſon'd *Roquetaillade*.

(*C*) *The Event juſtify'd his Predictions; but others aſſure us, the quite contrary came to paſs.*] We have obſerv'd already, that *Froiſſard* does give Evidence that many things fore-told by this Fryar, came to paſs. The Author of the Life of *Innocent* VI. does not deny it; but he adds, that in many other things the Predictions of this Fryar proved falſe, from whence he reaſonably infers, that he was not a Prophet. (*t*) *Licet in dictis & ſcriptis ſuis reperta fuerint multa quæ proceſſu temporis contigerunt, propter quæ plures ſibi fidem dabant, tamen etiam multa defecerunt; & ſic apparebat quia non erat vere Propheta, quia in illo, ſi talis fuiſſet, nullus fuiſſet defectus.* I do not much wonder that it was believed that he fore-told ſome Truths; for, firſt, thoſe who exclaim againſt publick Diſorders, and affirm that God will ſpeedily revenge the Oppreſſed People, and chaſtiſe the Pride, Avarice and Luxury of the Great ones, are favourably heard by the Multitude, who interpret every thing to the Honour of the Prophet, it ſuiting well with their Genius; nay, they force themſelves to believe what is fore-told, and gloſs on it according to what they earneſtly deſire. In the ſecond place, the World has been always ſo expoſed to War, Famin, Peſtilence, &c. that whoſoever at any time will fore-tell dreadful Events, and terrible Scourges of the Anger of God, will hit upon Truth. But to run down at once all the Favourers of this Fryar, we need only make an Obſervation, (*Viz.*) That the principal Points of his Prophecy proved falſe. He fore-told (*u*) the total deſolation of the Clergy; the coming of an Angel, who in quality of the Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt, would reform all things, and convert the Infidels; a Peace that ſhould continue upon Earth about a Thouſand Years. He ſaid thoſe things would quickly come to paſs, which have proved great Lies; for nothing like it came to paſs in the Age in which he liv'd, nor in the ſucceeding Ages to this Hour. (*x*) I ſhall ſet down what we find in a very good Chronicle. (*y*) *Joannes de Rupeſſa Minorum ordinis inſignis Theologus tempeſtate hac præter ea, quæ in ſententiarum libros accurate docteque ſcripſerat, in carcerem truſus multa de futuris tanquam Propheta ſcribere præſumpſit, videlicet de duobus Antichriſtis, & de eccleſiæ conciliatione & de converſione omnium gentium ad ſidem Chriſti, & alia multa, quæ in januis adeſſe affirmabat. Et hæc a domino Jeſu Chriſto ſibi revelata fuiſſe conteſtabatur, quæ non modo non evenere, ſed oppoſitum in omnibus fuiſſe conſtat. Hujuſmodi autem pronoſticatores multi ab initio decepti fuere. Quibus ſatius fuiſſet ſilere, quam talia temere loqui.*

(*D*) *The Apologue which he made uſe of to ſhew that the ſame Princes.*] He ſpoke it when the Cardinal of *Arras*, and Cardinal *d'Auxerre* went to ſee him in Priſon, to Cenſure him. Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornay* draws from hence a Proof of the Oppoſitions that were made to *Antichriſt*: let us ſee how he abridges the long recital of *Froiſſard*: (*z*) "The ſum is, That "the Church was like a beautiful Bird, which ſhould "be hatched without Feathers, and not being able to "fly, ſhould be in danger of ſtarving; that other Birds "had pity on her, and cover'd her with their Feathers; Kings and Princes enriched her with Lands, "and honour'd her above meaſure: upon this, ſhe "grew proud, and ſeeing her ſelf grown up, ſhe "thought that ſhe had no more need of them, but "began to pick at them with her Beak, and ſcratched them with her Claws; and to quarrel with "Emperors and Princes: that the Birds thereupon, "reſolv'd to re-take their Feathers, and ſo Princes would reaſſume their Gifts and Demeſnes, "and compel her to cry Mercy: The Emperor, and "other Chriſtian Princes would ſtrip her of all, if ſhe "grew proud again. Mr. *du Pleſſis* ſays, That this *Apologue of the Bird has its Foundation in the Apocalypſe*, cap. 17. where it is ſaid: (1) That Kings ſhall give their Power and Authority to the Beaſt, or Whore; *but afterwards they* ſhall hate, and worry her, and ſhall eat her Fleſh, and burn her in the Fire. (2) *Wolfius* has inſerted in his firſt Tome all theſe Paſſages of *Froiſſard*, and has added a Figure of the Bird of the Apologue. It is to be obſerv'd that *Roque-*

(m) Jur'eu Preface in the Accompliſſement des Propheties, tom. ***.

(n) Autor primæ vitæ Innocentii VI. vulgatæ a Baluzio, p. 342. tom. 1. vitarum Paparum Avenionenſium.

(o) In the Remark F.

(p) Ad dictum Innocentium Papam fuit adductus per quem fuit carceribus mancipatus, in quibus permanſit per totum tempus ipſius. Id. ibid.

(q) Joh. de Rupeſciſſa init. Revelationum apud Baluzium not. ad vitas Paparum Avenion. pag. 947.

(r) Quod autem ſunt nonnulli recentiores qui ob hæreſim in vincula conjectum dixerunt, non ita antiquiores qui nonniſi ob prophetias de Anti-Chriſto proxime venturo captum volunt. Spondan. ad an. 1356. n. 20 p. m. 540.

(s) Andreas Alciatus Epiſt. contra vitam Monaſticam pag. 65. 66.

He Composed several (*E*) Books, some of which are Printed, you'll find (*F*) two of 'em in the Appendix of the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum.* We are told (*a*) that he was a great Divine, and a good Philosopher. I know not whether he dy'd in Prison or not; but I believe that those who say (*G*) he was burnt, are mistaken. *James Podera* (β) says he was buried at *Villefranche*, in the Diocess of *Lyons*, in a Convent of his own Order. *Raynaldus* who (*H*) endeavoured to take advantage of a Prophecy of this Friar, has been solidly refuted by *Baluzius*.

RORARIUS (*Jerôme*) Nuncio of *Clement* VII. at the Court of *Ferdinand* King of *Hungary*, has Composed a Book (γ) which is worth Reading. He undertakes to demonstrate that Brute Beasts have not only Reason, but that they make better use of it than Men. The occasion which moved him to write that Book is Curious, and very Singular. He had been Discoursing with a Learned Man, who affirmed that *Charles* V. did not equal *Otho*, or *Frederick Barbarossa*. There needed no more to make *Rorarius* conclude that Beasts are more Reasonable than Men, and he undertook immediately to Compose (*A*) a Treatise upon this Subject. It was at the time that *Charles* V. made War against the League of *Smalcalde*. This Book is not ill writ, and it contains a great many singular Facts concerning the Industry of Beasts, and the Malice of Man. Those which concern the

Roquetaillade Prophecied that this Impoverishment of the Church was near at Hand; but he was Deceived. See *Coeffeteau* (*b*) in his Answer to the Book of Mr. *Du Plessis*. The same thing is still Prophecied about the end of the XVII Century.

(*E*) *He Composed several Books.*] Besides his Prophecies, there's a Book of his *de Consideratione quintæ essentiæ*, another *de familiaritate philosophiæ*, another called *vade mecum in tribulatione*, and a Commentary *super prophetiam Cyrilli eremitæ Presbyteri.* Mr. *Baluzius* (*c*) speaks of this last Book, as if there were a Manuscript of it in the King's Library; he says the others are to be found (*d*) in Manuscript in Mr. *Colbert's* Library. Observe that the Work *de Consideratione quintæ essentiæ rerum omnium*, was Printed at *Basil* (*e*) in 1561. It is said so in the Abridgment of *Gesner* (*f*), and it's given out there by a Mistake of an Hundred Years, That this Author lived about the Year 1240. I have quoted in another place (*g*) *Naudæus*, who has made mention of this Book of *Joannes de Rupescissa*. There goes about, under the Name of this Apocalyptical Friar, a Book *de Confectione veri lapidis Philosophorum*, Printed at *Basil* in 1561.

(*F*) *Two of 'em in the* Appendix ... rerum expetendarum.] This is a Book that was Printed at *London* 1690. The Author of the *Bibliotheque Universelle* speaks much of it in his Nineteenth (*h*) Volume. Here is what he says of *Roquetaillade*. (*i*) "They have Inserted "here 2 Works of this Friar; the first called *A Copy* "*of the Prophecy of Friar* John de Roquetaillade, *of* "*the Order of the* Franciscans, *of the Province of* Guienne, *Warden of* Rhodes, *and Advocate* (*k*) *of* Orleans, *Prisoner at* Avignon, *the 8th Year of the Pontificate of* Clement VI. *in the Prison called* Soldan, "*in the Month of* November, 1349. The other "Work of this Friar is (*l*) his *Vade mecum in tribulatione*. In this Book which he calls *Libruneulus*, he "declares, That he is not a Prophet as those "who have received immediate Revelations from "God, and who say when they Denounce them, "*Thus saith the Lord*; but that God had given him "the Talent of seeing by the Scripture (†) "things to come: He points at some of his "Books, wherein he says, he had exactly set down, "and observed some Events, and it appears that "he Composed this in 1356. Afterwards he "Proposes twenty Explications of the Apocalypse, "which he calls *intentiones*. In the first he foretels that the Pope shall subdue all the World, "which shall look upon him as their Pastor: A "Prediction which is quite contrary to that of our "Protestant Interpreters of the Apocalypse, who "are not more Happy in their Predictions than "Friar *John*; and some of them are more Blamable in that they would engage Princes to make "War without end, that their Conjectures may "take effect. Our Friar at least, *non erat intentionis faciendi guerras*, and would make use only "of Spiritual Arms; whereas some of our *Roquetaillades* of these Days would oblige by Force "*Erroneous Consciences* to make Profession of their "Opinions, without believing them.

(*G*) *Those that say he was Burnt are mistaken.*] "Some "(*m*) say that at last he was burnt. These are the words of Mr. *du Plessis*, who puts in the Margin, *Petrus Premonstratensis in Cronico quod inscribitur Biblia pauperum.* *Baluzius* rejects this and says, (*n*) he knows not from whence *Cæsar Nostradamus* had (*o*) it, That this Friar was burnt publickly at *Avignon*, in 1362, by the Pope's Order. What *Froissard* has writ is a solid Refutation of this Lye, tho' we had not the Testimony of those, (*p*) who say that he was buried at *Villefranche* in a Convent, where he had made his Profession of the Rule of St. *Francis*.

(*H*) Raynaldus, *who endeavoured to take advantage of a Prophecy of this Friar, has been solidly Refuted.*] He apply'd it to the Election of *Urban* VI. (*q*) Odoricus Raynaldus, *an.* 1379. n. 12. *refert insigne, ut ille vocat, vaticinium viri religiosi Joannis e Rupescissa inventum inter monumenta Avenionensia, ex quo multum adjuvari putat causam Urbani.* The Prophecy is, that the See of *Rome* (*r*) shall be Vacant 18 Months, and that in the Time of the Conclave there shall be so great a Battle between the People, and the Tyrants of *Italy*, and so great an Effusion of Blood, that it will be thought the End of the World is come. Now by the just Judgment of God, an Anti-Pope shall be Chosen, according to the Suggestions of a Deceiver, who shall have Two Tongues, *ad suggestionem unius bilinguis falsarii.* This Deceiver, according to *Raynaldus*, was the Cardinal of *Amiens*. But Mr. *Baluzius* shews us two things; the first, (*s*) that the Prophecy does not relate to the time when *Urban* VI. was Chosen Pope; the second is, that if it concerned that time, it would be more contrary to *Urban* VI. than to the pretended Anti-Pope *Clement* VII. He shews by the Commentary of *Roquetaillade* upon the Prophecy of *Cyril*, that the Vacancy of the Papal Chair during a Year and a half, has Relation to the time that Anti-Christ shall appear. Here is the Character of that time. The Kings of *France* and *England* shall then Fight against the Infidels in the *East*. This does in no manner agree with the time of the Schism of *Urban* VI. and *Clement* VII. Observe that this Friar acknowledges that the Anti-Pope shall be Elected (*t*) to the Dishonour of *Jesus Christ*, and of the true Pontif, and that Anti-Christ shall support the Cause of the Anti-Pope. *Illud scandalum* (*u*) *erit majus quia Antichristus partem Antipapæ sustinebit.* From this 'tis manifest, that he did not hold the Pope to be Anti-Christ.

(*A*) *To compose a Treatise upon this Subject.*] There are two Epistles Dedicatory in the Beginning of this Book; one to the Bishop of *Arras*, dated *March* 1. 1547. the other to Cardinal *Christopher Madrucio*, Bishop of *Trent*. This piece remained almost a Hundred Years in the dark Recesses of Libraries. At last *Naudæus* had it Printed in *France*, and Dedicated it to Messieurs *du Puy*. His Epistle Dedicatory is dated from *Paris*, *April* 9. 1645. That Book was Re-printed in *Holland* (*x*) more than once. I do not know for what reason it is put among the Books of Physick, in *Lindenius Renovatus*. I am sure I shall be accused of producing sometimes Proofs without Necessity; but the Readers would be in the Wrong to say so, as to what I have advanced, touching the Motive

(*a*) Trithemius de Script. eccles.

(β) Jacob. Podera in hist. Provinciæ Sancti Bonaventuræ p. 315, 322, apud Baluzium, not. ad vitas paparum Avenionensium, p. 934.

(γ) Rorarius, quod animalia bruta ratione utantur melius homine, lib. 1. p. 47. edit. Amstelod. 1654.

(*b*) Coeffeteau, reponse au Mystere d'iniquité, p. 1078.

(*c*) Baluz. not. ad vitas Paparum Avenion. p. 931.

(*d*) id. ib. p. 932.

(*e*) The Oxford Catalogue takes notice of the Basil Edition, 1561.

(*f*) Epit. Biblioth. Gesneri, p. m. 451.

(*g*) In the [illegible] of the Article Albertus Magnus.

(*h*) From p. 331. to p. 354.

(*i*) Bibliot. Univers. Tom. 19. p. 338.

(*k*) The Latin p. 432. append. Fasc. has Custos Ruthenensis & Carcerarius Aurelianensis. This last word signifies a Public and [illegible] of Orleans. [illegible] Judicious signifies some Deputy equivalent to the Don Procurator among the Benedictines or Carthusians; but I don't know what the Mendicants call [illegible] but it's not *Advocate.* (*l*) Ibid *p.* 349. (†) *The second Continuator of* William de Nangis, apud Dacher. Spicil. tom. 11. 822. *says that this Friar being asked about future things by the Arch-Bishop of* Toulouse, *an.* 1356. *Answered*, Ego sicut unus [illegible] & abhominabilis peccator ea quæ dico, non dico de capite [illegible], nec sum propheta, sed tantum per intelligentias Prophetarum. *He answered several things, whereof most did not come to pass.* *See Mr. Brown's Prologue in the Appendix of the* Fasciculus rerum expetendarum.

(*m*) Du Plessis ubi supra.

(*n*) Baluzius, ubi sup. p. 932.

(*o*) Cæsar Nostradamus in historia Provinciæ. p. 411.

(*p*) Jacobus Podera apud Baluzium ib.

(*q*) Baluz. ibid. p. 1160, 1161.

(*r*) Baluz. ibid.

(*s*) id. ib. and p. 1459.

(*t*) In contumeliam Christi & veri Pontificis. *Joh. de Rupescissa apud Baluz.* p. 1162.

(*u*) Idem apud eundem. p. 1459.

(*x*) *I make use of the* Amsterdam *Edit. of* 1654. *in* 12.

the induſtry of Beaſts, put under great Difficulties both the Followers of *Deſcartes* (B) and *Ariſtotle*. The firſt deny that Beaſts have any Soul; the latter maintain that they are endowed with Senſe, Memory, and Paſſions, but not with Reaſon. 'Tis pity that the Opinion of *Deſcartes* ſhould be ſo hard to Maintain, and ſo far from Likelyhood; for it is (C) otherwiſe very Advantageous to Religion, and this is the

Motive of *Rorarius*'s Book. If I did not quote his own Words, I ſhould give occaſion to think, That I have framed the Idea of a Chimecherical Writer to divert my Reader. For what can be imagined more Comical and Extravagant, than a Man who takes Pen in Hand to place Mankind below Beaſts, for no other reaſon, but becauſe a Learned Man takes it ill that *Charles* V. ſhould aſpire to the Univerſal Monarchy, without having the Qualities of *Otho* the Great, or of *Frederick Barbaroſſa*? It is therefore very neceſſary that I ſhould prove what I have ſaid above. *Eram, Illuſtriſſime Princeps*, (they are *Rorarius*'s Words) *paucis ante diebus, ubi de Cæſare ſermo habebatur; & fuit doctiſſimus aliquis vir, qui diceret, neſcire quo colore clens Chriſtianum orbem ditionis ſuæ facere niteretur. Haberet in ſe ſaltem quo cum Othonibus, aut Frederico Ænobarbo conferri poſſet. Movit* (*fateor*) *mihi ſtomachum, dignum immortalitate Principem illis poſtponi: qui licet inſignes fuerint, ſi tamen in unum omnes congerantur, hujus magnitudini non ſufficiant. Itaque in mentem mihi venit animalia bruta ſæpe ratione uti melius homine, idque duobus libellis oſtendi* (*y*). He did not content himſelf with one ſingle Declaration: He had already obſerved this in another Epiſtle Dedicatory. (*z*) *Scripſeram libellos duos, in quibus oſtenderam animalia bruta ſæpe ratione uti melius homine; idque feceram, ut quorundam impudentiam, anne potius dementiam retunderem; qui maximi omnium Imperatorum Caroli Quinti ſplendorem intueri non valent.* Read the reſt of this Epiſtle, you'll find there a Man very partial to *Charles* V. and a great Flatterer. There are many more like him in the World.

(*B*) *Put under great difficulties both the Followers of* Deſcartes, &c .... Ariſtotle.] This needs no Proof, with reſpect to the *Carteſians*; there's no Body but knows that it is difficult to prove how meer Machines can do what Animals do. Let us only prove that the Peripateticks will find it very hard to give good Reaſons for what they aſſert. Every Peripatetick, when he hears it affirmed, That Beaſts are only *Automata*, or Machines, preſently Objects, That a Dog that is beaten for falling foul upon a Diſh of Meat, touches it no more when he ſees his Maſter threatning him with a Stick. But to ſhew that this Phænomenon cannot be explained by him that propoſes it; it's enough to ſay, That if the Action of this Dog is attended with Knowledge, the Dog muſt neceſſarily reaſon: He muſt compare things preſent with things paſt, and from thence draw a Concluſion: He muſt needs Remember both the blows that were given him, and why he has received them: He muſt needs know, That if he ſhould fall foul upon the Diſh, which ſtrikes his Senſes, he ſhould do the ſame Action for which he was beaten, and Conclude, That to avoid a new beating he muſt abſtain from that Meat. Is not this true Reaſoning? Can you explain this Act by the ſimple Suppoſition of a Soul that has Senſe; without reflecting upon its Acts; without Remembrance; without comparing two Ideas; without drawing any Concluſion? Examine well the examples (*a*) which are heaped together, and which are Objected to the Carteſians; you'll find they prove too much, for they prove that Beaſts compare the end with the means, and that on ſome occaſions they prefer what is Honeſt before what is Profitable; In ſhort, That they are guided by Rules of Equity and Gratitude. *Rorarius* ſays there have been Horſes that have refuſed to leap their Mothers; others, who having done it unwittingly, being deceived by the Artifice of their Groom, afterwards knowing what they had done, have thrown themſelves down a Precipice. (*b*) *Teſtantur literarum monumenta, fuiſſe gregis cuſtodem, qui equum ut matrem iniret, nunquam inducere potuerit; & quoniam ambo eximia ſpecie erant, fraude tamen illuſiſſe, velatis oculis, ne matrem videret: Detracto poſtmodum operimento, & agnito cum matre concubitu, petiiſſe prærupta, & ſe patrati ſceleris reum precipitem dediſſe. Maris hæc virtus; alibi fœminæ: ſiquidem in Reatino agro equa lacerato prius auriga, qui flagitii auctor fuerat, eundem exitum habuit.* What he and other Authors relate of the Diligence of Dogs, in procuring aſſiſtance to their Maſters, and Revenging their Death, &c. are things abſolutely inexplicable according to the Hypotheſis of the *Ariſtotelians*; ſo that all their diſpute againſt the Diſciples of *Carteſius*, is Labour in vain. There is no need of any thing, but of the dexterous Management which *Pereira* made uſe of. You grant ſaid he, (*c*) to his Adverſaries, that Animals do many things which much reſemble what the Rational Soul does, and yet that their Soul is not Rational. Why then do you forbid me to maintain that they do many Things, which much Reſemble what a Senſitive Soul does, tho' their Soul be not Senſitive? I do not wonder in the leaſt, that neither *Carteſius*, nor any of his Diſciples ever made uſe of a Paſſage in the *Code* of *Juſtinian*, (*d*) where it's ſaid that Beaſts are incapable of doing any Injury, becauſe they want Senſe; it is clear that the word *Senſus* in that place is taken for Deſign and Underſtanding.

(*C*) *Very advantageous to Religion.*] What induces the Carteſians to ſay that Beaſts are *Automata*, is, That according to their Maxims, all Matter is incapable of thinking. They do not content themſelves to ſay, That only Spiritual Subſtances are capable of Reflections; but they maintain that every Thought, whether you call it Reflection, Meditation, drawing of Conſequences, or whether it be called Senſation, Imagination, Inſtinct, is of ſuch a Nature, that the moſt ſubtil and perfect Matter is incapable of it, and that it can only be found in Incorporal Subſtances. By this Principle there's no Man but may convince himſelf of the Immortality of his own Soul: Every one knows that he thinks, and conſequently if he reaſons after the Carteſian manner, he muſt own that his Thoughts are diſtinct from his Body: From whence it follows, That in this reſpect he's Immortal; For the Mortality of Creatures conſiſts only in this, That they are compoſed of many parts of Matter, which ſeparate one from another. This is a great advantage to Religion; but it will be almoſt impoſſible to preſerve it by Philoſophical Reaſons, if it be granted that Beaſts have a Material Soul which Periſhes with the Body; a Soul whoſe Senſations and Deſires are the cauſe of the Actions which we ſee them do. See the Remark F. The Theological advantages of *Carteſius*'s Opinion concerning Beaſts being meer *Automata*, do not ſtop there. They diffuſe themſelves over many Important Principles, which cannot be ſufficiently maintained, if Beaſts are allowed to have a Senſitive Soul. If St. *Auguſtin* maintained theſe Principles, tho' he granted this ſort of Soul in Beaſts, and if he did not find himſelf much perplexed about the Connexion of theſe two Things, he was more Fortunate than Wiſe. *From* (*e*) *the Principles which he has carefully Examined, and Solidly Eſtabliſhed, it manifeſtly follows*, That Beaſts have no Soul, as *Ambroſius Victor ſhews* (*f*) *in his Sixth Volume of Chriſtian Philoſophy*. The Author, who affords me theſe Words, ſuppoſeth *That the Holy Doctor knowing too well how to diſtinguiſh the Soul from the Body, to think that there were Corporal Souls*, admitted a Spiritual (*g*) Soul in Beaſts. Now here is a Scantling which he gives us of the Principles of St. *Auguſtin*, which are Incompatible with this Soul of Beaſts (*h*); *That a Creature, which has not Sinned, can never ſuffer any Evil; but according to him Pain is the greateſt of Evils, and Beaſts ſuffer Pain. That the more Noble thing cannot have for its End the leſs Noble; but according to him, the Soul of Beaſts is Spiritual, and more Noble than the Body, and yet they have no other End than the Body. That what is Spiritual is Immortal, and the Soul of Beaſts, tho' Spiritual, is ſubject to Death. There are many ſuch like Principles in the Works of St.* Auguſtin, *from whence it may be concluded that Beaſts have no ſuch Spiritual Soul as he admits in them.* I am not fully perſuaded that St. *Auguſtin* believed that the Soul of Beaſts is an Incorporal Subſtance; but be it as it will, the ſecond Principle which is given us here for an Example, is incompatible with the Doctrine of this great Doctor; for that which Knows, is more Noble than that which does not Know: But St. *Auguſtin* allowed Senſe at leaſt to the Soul of Beaſts; therefore he believed it more Noble than the Body; therefore he maintained on the one ſide, That the more Noble thing cannot have for its

end

(*y*) Rorarius, epiſt. dedicat. ad Malatiſtum Cardinalem.

(*z*) Idem, epiſt. dedicat. ad Epiſcopum Atrebatenſem.

(*a*) *See in* Lipſius epiſt. 50. centur. 1. miſcellan. *ſeveral ſurprizing Actions of Elephants. This letter is a Commentary by way of Examples upon the words of* Pliny, *which I will quote in the Remark D. See concerning Horſes the ſame* Lipſius cent. 3. ad Belgas ep. 56. *and concerning Dogs.* cent. 1. ad Belg. ep. 44.

(*b*) Rorarius, lib. 2. p. 72.

the only reaſon which hinders ſome People from quitting it. It is not ſubject to the moſt dangerous Conſequences of the common Opinion. It is a long time ſince it has been Maintained that the Souls of Beaſts (D) are Rational. The Philoſophers

and the leſs Noble; and on the other ſide, That the Soul of Beaſts, being more Noble than their Body, has an other end than their Body. This, you'll ſay, is of ſmall importance to Religion. But you are Miſtaken, will ſome Anſwer; for all the Proofs of Original Sin, drawn from Sickneſſes and Death, which Children are ſubject to, fall to the Ground, if you ſuppoſe that Beaſts feel: They are ſubject to Diſeaſes and Death, and yet they never Sinned. And therefore you argue wrong, when you ſay *little Children Suffer, and Die, therefore they are Guilty*; for you ſuppoſe a Falſe Principle, which is contradicted by the Condition of Beaſts, viz. *That a Creature, which never Sinned, can never ſuffer any Ill.* This is nevertheleſs a moſt clear Principle, which flows neceſſarily from the Ideas we have of the Juſtice and Goodneſs of God. It is agreeable to the immutable Order, from which we clearly apprehend that God never departs. The Souls of Beaſts confound this Order, and overthrow thoſe diſtinct Ideas: It muſt therefore be granted, That the *Automata* of *Carteſius*, favour the Principles by which we judge of the Infinite Being, and by which we maintain Orthodoxy. Read what follows.

" (i) Religion was drawn into the Cauſe (k), thro' the Hopes that the Anticarteſians had conceived to ruin by it the Machines of *Carteſius*; but it is Impoſſible to expreſs the advantage, which accrued from thence to his Diſciples. For they believe that they have Demonſtrated, That by allowing Beaſts to have a Soul capable of Knowledge, all the Natural Proofs of the Immortality of the Soul are deſtroyed. They have ſhew'd, That their Opinion had not more Obſtinate Enemies than the Impious and Epicureans; and that a greater Spite cannot be done to thoſe bad Philoſophers, than by depriving them of all the falſe Reaſons, which they borrow from the Souls of Beaſts, to draw a Concluſion, That there is only more or leſs difference between them and us. It is certain, That there are none who affect more than thoſe People, to make Beaſts come near Men in Perfection. Thus the Sectators of *Deſcartes*, have by this means Intereſſed Religion in their Cauſe: But they are not Contented with this Reaſon. They have raiſed themſelves to the Nature of God, to find out Invincible Arguments againſt the Knowledge of Beaſts; and it may be ſaid, they have found very good ones. The Author of the *Recherche de la verité*, has given us the Plan of it in ſeveral places of his Work. Father *Poiſſon* of the Oratory has profoundly Treated the Argument, which is Grounded upon this Principle of St. *Auguſtin*, *that God being juſt, Miſery is a neceſſary Proof of Sin*; from whence it follows, That Beaſts not having Sinned are not ſubject to Miſery: But they would be ſubjected to it, if they had any feeling; therefore they have none. You'll find after theſe Words the extract of (l) a Book, which ſhews, That if Beaſts have a Knowing Soul, (m) *it follows*, 1. *That God does not Love himſelf*; 2. *That he's not Conſtant*; 3. *That he is Cruel and Unjuſt.* He would not Love himſelf; for he would have Created *Souls capable of Knowledge and Love, without obliging them to Know and Love him.* He would have Created them to be in a ſtate of Sin, and by conſequence he would have diſpenſed them with the Law of Order, which is a Supreme and Indiſpenſable Law. The ſtate of Sin is to fix upon Creatures, as one's ultimate end: This is what the Souls of Beaſts do, according to the common Opinion. According to the ſame Opinion theſe Souls are Annihilated, when Beaſts die: Where is then the Conſtancy of God? He Creates Souls, and Annihilates them ſpeedily. He does not deal ſo with Matter: He never deſtroys it. He therefore preſerves the leſs perfect Subſtance, and deſtroys the more perfect. Is this the part of a wiſe Agent? The Souls of Beaſts never ſinned, and yet they are ſubject to Pain and Miſery, and to all the Irregular Deſires of Creatures, which have ſinned. How do we treat Beaſts? We make them tear one another in pieces for our Diverſion; we Kill them for our Nouriſhment, and Ranſack their Bowels during their Lives, to ſatisfy our Curioſity; and we do all this by vertue of the Dominion that God has given us over them. What a diſorder is it, That an Innocent Creature ſhould be ſubject to the Caprices of a Criminal one? There's no Caſuiſt that believes that there is any ſin in baiting of Bulls, or in hunting or fiſhing, to deſtroy Animals, or in killing of Flies, as *Domitian* did. Is it not Cruelty and Injuſtice to ſubject an Innocent Soul to ſo many Miſeries? The Opinion of *Carteſius* frees us from all theſe Difficulties. I will give a Liſt of ſome pieces, which have been Publiſhed in favour of this Opinion.

A Preface of Mr. *Schuyl*: It is at the beginning of the Latin Tranſlation of *Deſcartes*'s Treatiſe of *Man*. A Treatiſe of *Antony le Grand*, (n) *Diſſertatio de carentia ſenſus & cognitionis in brutis.* A Letter of Mr. (o) *de Cordemoi*, *to a Learned Jeſuit*, Printed in 1668. A Treatiſe of the Souls of Beaſts, Printed in 1676, at *Lyons*, writ by *Dilly*, a Prieſt of *Ambrun*. Philoſophical Conferences by Mr. *Rohault*. The Notes of Father *Poiſſon*, upon the Method of *Deſcartes*. The *Brutum Carteſianum* of *Arnoldus Geulinex*. This is a Poſthumous Work, which was Publiſhed in 1688, by Mr. *Langenhert*, a good Carteſian, but not in what concerns the Souls (p) of Beaſts; tho' he has put in a Geometrical Form the Reaſons which prove that Beaſts have no Feeling. Many Diſciples of *Deſcartes* leave him as to his Doctrine of *Automata*. Mr. *Craanen*, Profeſſor of Philoſophy, and afterwards of Phyſick at *Leyden*, has been a great Stickler for this Philoſopher, and has ſuffered for him; and what perhaps is more wonderful, he would not forſake his Doctrine about the *Glandula Pinealis*; But he Laughed at thoſe, who hold that Beaſts have no feeling. Mr. *Regis*, one of the moſt Famous Carteſians in theſe times, went not ſo far: He was Contented to ſay, That (q) *whatever Inclination he may have to give to Beaſts a Soul diſtinct from the Body, he had rather ſuſpend his Judgment in that reſpect.* One might place the Book of Father *Pardies*, about the Knowledge of Beaſts, among thoſe that have been Publiſh'd to maintain *Deſcartes*'s Opinion; for the Reaſons of the Carteſians are propoſed in it, with their utmoſt Strength, and very Weakly Refuted. I believe nevertheleſs that he was not Negligent in the ſecond Part of his Work, and that he did all that was poſſible to maintain the Antient Opinion: But having alſo done all that he could do to repreſent faithfully, and in their beſt Colours, the Reaſons of the New; He has made ſome ſuſpect, that he had no real deſign to Confute *Carteſius*. Here is the Judgment of one of his Order: (r) *There is nothing more ſeducing than the Expoſitions made by Father* Pardies, *in his Book called*, De la connoiſſance des beſtes, *of the Knowledge of Brutes, where Painting Carteſianiſm in its ſtrongeſt and livelieſt Colours, he goes ſo far as to Convince his Readers, that there is no need of a Soul to Walk, Drink, Eat, &c. but alſo to Speak, and to Speak as long as a Preacher in a Sermon of an Hour, or a Lawyer in a long Plea. This Book has made the Author, among the Peripateticks, to paſs for a Prevaricator, who at the bottom was a Carteſian, notwithſtanding the Pains he has taken in the ſecond Part of his Book, to Refute Carteſianiſm, and to Defend the Antient Philoſophy, as to the Souls of Beaſts.*

(D) *That the Souls of Beaſts are Rational.*] All that I had to ſay upon this, might have been put in the Remarks of the Article *Pereira*; but I had a mind to avoid Prolixity in that Place. We may reckon *Strato* and *Æneſidemus* among thoſe, who have maintained that the Souls of Beaſts are Rational; for they taught that Senſe could not ſubſiſt without Underſtanding. (ſ) *Idem eſſe* αἴσθησιν, καὶ διάνοιαν (1), *ſenſum & cogitationem, opinio fuit tum Stratonis Phyſici, qui Theophraſti auditor* (2) *fuit; tum Æneſidemi, qui* (3) *in Pyrrhonia introductionem conſcripſit. De utroque teſtis nobis Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathematicos* (4). *Voſſius* without doubt would have cited *Plutarch*, if he had called to mind this paſſage. (t) Καίτοι Στράτωνός γε τοῦ φυσικοῦ λόγος ἐστὶν, ἀποδεικνύων ὡς οὐδ᾽ αἰσθάνεσθαι τοπαράπαν ἄνευ τοῦ νοεῖν ὑπάρχει. *Stratonis etiam Phyſici extat oratio, qua ſine intelligentia ſentiri omnino nihil poſſe demonſtrat.* It is ſaid that *Parmenides*, *Empedocles*, *Democritus*, and *Anaxagoras*, taught that all Beaſts are Rational. (u) *Ab hac opinione qui beſtiæ ſenſus creduntur expertes, ad alteram venio: ſecundum quam, ut Sextus Empiricus* (5) *ait*, οὐδέν ἐστιν ζῶον ἄλογον, ἀλλὰ καὶ νοῦ, καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν.

(i) Nou- [illegible] de la Republ. des [illegible] March 1684. p. 23, 24. (k) Viz. the [illegible] concerning the Souls of Beaſts.

(l) [illegible] (m) Nouv. Rep. [illegible] p. 25.

(n) [illegible] *this Author* [illegible] *the Book* [illegible] p. 171. 1684. Edit. 1686. *In one of the Letters of Monſ. Arnauld to Father* Mallebranche *we find that* le Grand *is a Fran-* [illegible] *Friar.* (p) *This Letter was Anony-* [illegible] *but* [illegible] Deſcartes, Tom. 2. p. 541. [illegible] *ſays it was of Mr.* Cordemoi. (p) *See the Journal of* Leipſick, *Novemb.* 1688. p. 624. (q) Pierre Sylvain Regis, Syſteme de Philoſophie, *lib.* 7. *part* 2. *tom.* 5. p. 126. Lyons 1691. *in* 12. (r) Suite du voiage du monde de Deſcartes, p. 9. & 10. edit. Amſter. 1696. (ſ) Voſſius de origine & progreſſu idololatriæ, *lib.* 3. c. 41. *init. p. m.* 938, 939. (1) Senſus & cogitatio men[illegible] (2) Laert. lib. 5. in Stratone. (3) Laert. in Pyrrho.

(4) Cap. de homine, ſive *p.* 201. edit. Aurelian. (t) Plutarch. de ſolertia animalium, *p.* 961. A. (u) Voſſius ubi ſupra *p.* 940. (5) Pyrrhoniarum Hypotypoſ. *lib.* 2. *c.* 5.

ist

phers of the Schools are very much miſtaken, if by Rejecting that, they perſuade themſelves

ter adeo: nullum eſt animal rationis expers; ſed omnia ſunt intelligentiæ, & ſcientiæ capacia. Hanc ſententiam Parmenidi, Empedocli, & Democrito, tribuit Stobæus in Eclogis Phyſicis (u). Anaxagoras quoque interdum in hanc opinionem incurrit: teſte Ariſtotele lib. 1. de anima cap. 11. (v); ubi agnoſcit quidem, non uno loco dicere, mentem eſſe ejus cauſam, quod recte, & pulchre ſe habet; ſed alibi, tradere, τὸν νοῦν εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν τῇ ψυχῇ· ἐν ἅπασι γὰρ ὑπάρχειν αὐτὸν τοῖς ζώοις, καὶ μεγάλοις, καὶ μικροῖς, καὶ τιμίοις, καὶ ἀτιμοτέροις. Idem eſſe mentem, & animam: mentem enim omnibus ineſſe animalibus, tam parvis, quam magnis; tam vilioribus, quam honeſtioribus. I paſs by the common Opinion of the Ancients, viz. That Living Bodies contain a Soul, which is part of the Soul of the World. I grant that the Natural Conſequence of this Opinion is, That the Souls of Beaſts and Men are of the ſame Nature; but this does not prove that Beaſts are actually Rational: For one might Maintain that the Portions of the Soul of the World, that are united to certain Bodies, loſe the Faculty of Reaſoning. And ſince the Sticklers for the Doctrine of the Soul of the World, never Taught that the Souls of Plants were Rational; they muſt needs have believed that their Doctrine did not engage them to Maintain, That Beaſts argue. Let us therefore paſs by this Opinion, tho' *Virgil* alledged it as the fitteſt means to explain all that he had ſaid of the Qualities of Bees.

> *His (x) quidam ſignis, atque hæc exempla ſecuti,*
> *Eſſe apibus partem divinæ mentis, & hauſtus*
> *Æthereos dixere: Deum namque ire per omnes*
> *Terraſque, tractuſque maris, cœlumque profundum:*
> *Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum,*
> *Quemque ſibi tenues naſcentem arceſſere vitas.*
> *Scilicet huc reddi deinde, ac reſoluta referri*
> *Omnia: nec morti eſſe locum; ſed viva volare*
> *Sideris in numerum, atque alto ſuccedere cœlo.*

It is better to ſpeak of *Philo*, who made a Book, wherein he maintained that Beaſts are Rational: (y) Περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα, *de eo quod bruta animilia ratione ſint prædita.* In another place (z) I have ſpoken of the Opinion of *Galen*; but ſee here a more formal Proof of it. (a) *An animantia quæ dicuntur bruta, prorſus expertia ſint rationis, nondum ſatis liquet. Fortaſſis enim, tametſi non habeant eam Rationem, quæ juxta vocem intelligitur, nobiſcum communem, quam vocant enuntiativam; certe eam, quæ ſecundum Animam accipitur, quam Rationem appellant affectuum capacem, habent nobiſcum communem, licet alia magis, alia minus.* Tho' *Lactantius* declares in ſome Places, That God (b) has not granted Beaſts a Rational Faculty; yet he maintains in his Treatiſe *De ira Dei*, that excepting Religion Beaſts imitate Men in every thing, and participate of the advantages of Human Nature. The difference is only in *more* or *leſs*. (c) *Solus* (homo) *ſapientia inſtructus eſt ut religionem ſolus intelligat, & hæc eſt hominis atque mutorum vel præcipua, vel ſola diſtantia; nam cætera quæ videntur hominis eſſe propria, etſi non ſint talia in mutis, tamen ſimilia videri poſſunt.... Quid tam proprium homini quam ratio, & providentia futuri? Atqui ſunt animalia, quæ latibulis ſuis diverſos, & plures exitus pandant; ut ſi quod periculum inciderit, fuga pateat obſeſſis; quod non facerent, niſi ineſſet illis intelligentia, & cogitatio. Alia provident in futurum.* We are not for all this to Believe that he maintained that the Souls of Beaſts are Spiritual and Immortal; for at that Time the Connexion between *Thought* and *Spirituality*, was not clearly ſeen. Doth not *Arnobius* manifeſtly affirm, That Human Souls, of their own Nature are Mortal, and that they ſhall totally Periſh in the Torments of Hell, and could not continue always in Heaven, were it not by the Grace of God? Does not he aſſert that a Simple and Immortal Nature is incapable of Pain? He felt ſome; therefore he did not believe that his Soul was an Immortal, Immaterial, and Spiritual Being. (d) *Homo prudentiæ non pravæ*, ſays he, ſpeaking of *Plato*, *& examinis judiciique perpenſi, rem inenodabilem ſuſcipit, ut cum animas dicat immortales, perpetuas, & corporali ſoliditate privatas, puniri eas dicat tamen, & doloris afficiat ſenſu. Quis autem hominum non videt, quod ſit immortale, quod ſimplex, nullum poſſe dolorem admittere? quod autem ſentiat dolorem immortalitatem habere non poſſe? Nec tamen ejus auctoritas plurimum à veritate declinat.... Non eſt abſone ſuſpicatus jaci eas in flumina torrentia flammarum globis, & cœnoſis voraginibus tetra. Faciuntur enim, & ad nihilum redactæ, interitionis perpetuæ fruſtratione vaneſcunt. Sunt enim mediæ qualitatis, ſicut Chriſto auctore compertum eſt, & interire quæ poſſint Deum ſi ignoraverint vitæ, & ab exitio liberari, ſi ad ejus ſe minas atque indulgentias applicuerint.* He Confutes the Platonicks, who ſaid, That the Soul of Man has a Celeſtial Origin (e), that it is Immortal, and Incorporal: his Chief Argument is, That there is but little difference between our Souls and thoſe of Beaſts. (f) *Vultis tumore depoſito cogitationibus tacitis pervidere animantia nos eſſe, aut conſimilia cæteris, aut non plurima diverſitate diſtantia? Quid eſt enim, quod nos ab eorum indicet ſimilitudine diſcrepare? vel quæ in nobis eminentia tanta eſt, ut animantium numero dedignemur adſcribi?* He Examins the Preeminence of Man above other Creatures, and he ſays it is inconſiderable: He particularly affirms that Men do not ſurpaſs Beaſts in Reaſon. (g) *Sed rationales nos ſumus, & intelligentia vincimus genus omne mutorum. Crederem iſtud veriſſime dici, ſi cum ratione & conſilio cuncti homines viverent, ſervarent officiorum tenorem, abſtinerent ab illicitis ſeſe, negotia turpia non adirent, neque quiſquam pravitate conſilii, atque ignorantiæ cæcitate contraria ſibimet atque inimica depoſceret. Vellem tamen ſcire quænam ſit hæc ratio, per quam ſumus potiores animalium generibus cunctis: quia nobis domicilia fecimus, quibus poſſimus hyemalia frigora, & æſtatis flagrantias evitare? Quid? animantia cætera hujus rei providentiam non habent?* We may therefore reckon *Arnobius* among thoſe, who hold that the Souls of Beaſts are Rational. It is from him, without doubt, That *Lactantius* learned to put no other difference between them and Man, but Religion. Some Philoſophers have envied this Privilege of Men; for they ſaid that Beaſts have a Religion. *Xenocrates* the Carthaginian ſaid, that they knew God. *Democritus* muſt needs have been of his Opinion, if he reaſoned Conſequently: This is at leaſt the Pretenſion of *Clemens Alexandrinus*. (h) Καθόλου γ' οὖν τὴν περὶ τοῦ Θείου ἔννοιαν Ξενοκράτης ὁ Καρχηδόνιος οὐκ ἀπελπίζει, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις· Δημόκριτος δὲ, κἂν μὴ θέλῃ, ὁμολογήσει διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν δογμάτων· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πεποίηκεν εἴδωλα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις προσπίπτοντα, καὶ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις ἀπὸ τῆς θείας οὐσίας. *Ut ſummatim quidem dicam, Xenocrates Carthaginienſis non ſpem omnium abjicit, quin etiam in rationis expertibus animantibus ſit Dei notitia. Democritus autem, etſi nolit, confitebitur per dogmatum conſequentiam: fecit enim eaſdem imagines in homines incurrentes, & in animantes rationis expertes, ex divina eſſentia.* *Pliny* places Religion among the Moral Vertues of Elephants. *Maximum eſt Elephas*, ſays he (i), *proximumque humanis ſenſibus: quippe intellectus illis ſermonis patrii, & imperii, & imperiorum obedientia, officiorumque, quæ didicere, memoria: amoris, & gloriæ voluptas: imo vero, (quæ etiam in homine rara,) probitas, prudentia, æquitas, religio quoque ſiderum, Soliſque ac Lunæ veneratio. Auctores ſunt, in Mauritaniæ ſaltibus ad quendam amnem, cui nomen eſt Amilo, miteſcente Luna nova, greges eorum deſcendere: ibique ſe purificantes ſolenniter aqua circumſpergi, atque ita ſalutato ſidere in ſilvas reverti, vitulorum fatigatos præ ſe ferentes. Alienæ quoque religionis intellectu, creduntur maria tranſituri non ante naves conſcendere, quam invitati rectoris jurejurando de reditu. Viſique ſunt feſſi ægritudine, (quando & illas moles infeſtant morbi) herbas ſupini in cœlum jacientes, veluti tellure precibus allegata.* (k) *Dion* Relates part of theſe things. Can one believe that the Diſciples of *Plato*, who looked upon Brutes to be probably immortal, with reſpect to the Soul, as *Paganinus Gaudentius* obſerves, ſhould take Reaſon from them? (l) *Quod ſi dicas apud Platonicos ſolas animas rationales eſſe immortales, reſpondebat Alcinous non eſſe id prorſus exploratum. Nam poſtquam dixit animas rationales ſecundum Platonem eſſe immortales, mox ſubjungit:* (1) Utrum verò & irrationales, ambiguum eſſe videtur: *& quamvis ipſe ſentiat eſſe probabile eas eſſe mortales, indicat tamen id inter Platonicos non fuiſſe certum.* I ſay nothing of *Solomon*, who ſeems to ſay, formally, *(m)* That the Souls of Beaſts and Men, are of the ſame Nature; for we ought not to take his Words as they ſound, we ought to give them a better Senſe: (n) but it may be granted us on good Grounds, that many of the Rabbins believed that Beaſts have a Rational Soul.

The famous *Maimonides* believed without doubt, that they reaſon; for he gives them a kind of Free-Will.

(u) Pag. 93. edit. Plantin.

(v) Cont. 51.

(x) Virgil. Georg. lib. 4. v. 219.

(y) Euſeb. Hiſtor. eccleſ. lib. 2. cap. 18. p. m. 59.

(z) In the article *Pereira*.

(a) Galenus in exhortat. ad Art. lib. ſtud. initio, apud Ant. le Grand de carentia ſenſus pag. 10.

(b) Cæteris animantibus quoniam rationalem iſtam vitam non attribuit. *Lactant.* de opificio *Dei*, cap. 2. p. m. 574.

(c) Id. de ira Dei, cap. 7. pag. 529.

(d) Arnobius, adverſus Gentes, lib. 2. pag. m. 52.

ſelves, they ſhall avoid the ill Conſequences of the Opinion (F) that gives Beaſts a ſenſitive Soul. Theſe Gentlemen want neither Diſtinctions, nor Exceptions, nor Boldneſs to decide, that the Acts of this Soul do not exceed certain Bounds, which they

Will. Mr. *Arnauld* had good reaſon to object againſt him, that from thence it would follow, that they might be Rewarded or Puniſh'd after Death. If I relate ſomewhat at length what precedes this Reflection of Mr. *Arnauld*, it is becauſe of certain Facts which ſhew us the Opinion of ſome Jews about Animals. This great Rabbin (a) *Explains five Opinions touching Providence, which are all, as he believes, as Ancient as the Prophets.* (b) The Fourth of theſe Opinions extended the Providence of God to every thing, and did not deny the Free Will of Men. *Maimonides* lays its many Inconveniencies againſt the Followers of this Opinion. (c) *They ſaid that it was a Work of the Wiſdom of God, that there were Men who, tho' they had never ſinned, were born with many Defects, and that it was better to be ſo than not be at all. We do not comprehend, ſays this Jewiſh Doctor, what Goodneſs there could be in this, ſed nos iſtam bonitatem non intelligimus.* (d) "When "they were asked what Juſtice there was in the death "of Beaſts, what ſin they had committed, and why "God would (ſince his Providence extended to all) "have an innocent Rat pull'd in pieces by a Cat? "They anſwer'd, God had order'd it ſo; but that "he would recompence that Rat in another World. "It is very ridiculous that there ſhould be a Heaven "for Rats. But this Rabbin himſelf occaſion'd this "Folly, when he gave a Will to irrational Animals "as well as to Men: *omnia pariter animantia irrationalia moventur ſua voluntate*: for if they have a Will "it would be hard to give a Reaſon why they ſhould "not be capable of Good or Evil, Rewards and Puniſhment."

The *Socinians* do not go ſo far as *Maimonides*; they do not give Beaſts a Will properly ſo called, nor a Free Will; they do not allow them to be capable either of Virtue or Vice, or of Puniſhment or Reward, properly ſpeaking. They ſay, nevertheleſs, that Reaſon, Liberty and Virtue are found in them imperfectly and analogically; and that in ſome manner they are worthy of Reward or Puniſhment. If you will not believe me, read the following Paſſage. (e) *Quia homo inter animantia ſolus ratione proprie dicta præditus eſt, in illum etiam ſolum tum voluntas, tum virtus & vitium, tum denique præmium & pœna cadit. In bruta tamen animalia cadit aliquid ſingulis iſtorum analogum, in ea præſertim, quæ ſunt perfectiora, & diſciplinæ alicujus capaciora. Eſt enim in illis primum aliqua facultas rationi reſpondens, quam nonnulli rationem inferiorem vocant, quâ non de rebus modo jucundis, ac utilibus quodammodo ratiocinantur, & de ratione illorum adipiſcendorum diſpiciunt; ſed etiam viam ſibi a Deo præſcriptam, ſeu rectam quandam vivendi rationem naturæ ſuæ conſentaneam, quæ honeſtati analoga eſt, agnoſcunt. Inde ſequitur facultas altera, voluntati quodam modo reſpondens, in qua nonnihil eſt libertatis. Hinc aliquid etiam virtuti & vitio ſimile, ſeu recte & prave factum: quorum illud eſt, cum bruta naturæ ſuæ ductum ſequuntur, hoc cum a naturali via exorbitant. Unde tandem etiam aliquid præmio aut pœnæ, & huic quidem maxime ſimile. Unde beſtias etiam a Deo* (f) *punitas, aut pœnas certas lege illis conſtitutas, cernimus: qua de re legatur Socinus in Anti Puccio. Quemadmodum ergo rationem humanam* κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *& proprie hoc nomine appellamus, & brutis eam adimimus (dicimus enim irrationalia ſeu ratione carentia) ita & cætera omnia. Rurſus quemadmodum improprie & per analogiam rationem brutis tribuimus, ita & cætera omnia.* I know not whether *Gulielmus Pariſienſis*, one of the greateſt Genius's of his Age, cou'd avoid going a little beyond this Opinion; for it is ſaid, (g) he taught that the Souls of Beaſts are ſpiritual; and 'tis not certain that ever he retracted this Opinion. See the Citation *i* of this page.

To come to the Moderns, I ſhall obſerve that *Valla* (h) and (i) *Antony Cittadinus* acknowledged Reaſon in Beaſts. *Stephen Paſquier* has writ a fine Letter upon this Opinion. This Letter is the firſt of the Tenth Book. *Montagne* is for this Opinion, and ſeems to believe that *Raimundus Sebunus*'s Apology is in part that of Beaſts. *Charron* has follow'd him in this, as well as in many other things. (k) A Phyſician of *Rochelle* having writ againſt *Charron*, was confuted in his turn by one of the beſt French Pens that has writ of Philoſophy: I mean Mr. *de la Chambre*, Phyſician to Mr. *Seguier*, Chancellor of *France*. The Phyſician of *Rochelle* (l) reply'd; his Antagoniſt did the ſame, and intitl'd his Book *Traité de la Connoiſſance des Animaux, &c. a Diſcourſe on the Knowledge of Beaſts, wherein all that has been ſaid pro and con is examined*. I obſerve by the by, that *Isaac Voſſius* (m) is of Opinion, That in reſpect of Language, the Condition of Beaſts is better than ours, becauſe they communicate ſooner, and probably more happily their Thoughts than we. (n) A *German* Criticiſes upon that. We ſhall ſee the Opinion of *Sennertus* in the Remarks *D* and *E* of his Article: I will quote there ſome Modern Authors, who believed that the Souls of Beaſts are Spiritual.

(F) *The Ill Conſequences of the Opinion that gives Beaſts a ſenſitive Soul.*] There's nothing more diverting, than to ſee with what Authority the Schoolmen put limits to the Knowledge of Beaſts. They will have it, that they know only particular and material Objects, and that they only love what is profitable and agreeable; that they cannot reflect upon their Senſations and their Deſires, nor draw Conſequences. One would think that they have ſearched more exactly into the Faculties and Acts of the Souls of Beaſts, than the moſt expert Anatomiſts into the Entrails of Dogs. Their Temerity is ſo great, that if they had found out Truth by chance, they had made themſelves unworthy of Praiſe and even of Pardon. But let us give them Quarter; let us grant them all that they ſuppoſe: what do they hope for from it? Do they fancy, that by this means they ſhall obtain from any body that can reaſon, that it ought to be granted, That the Soul of Man is not of the ſame Species with that of Beaſts? This is a Chimerical Pretention. It is evident to any one that can judge of things, that every Subſtance that has Feeling, knows that it has it: and it would not be more abſurd to maintain, That the Soul of Man knows actually an Object without knowing that ſhe knows it; than it is abſurd to ſay, That the Soul of a Dog ſees a Bird without perceiving that ſhe ſees it. This ſhews that all the acts of the ſenſitive Faculty are, of their own nature, and by their own Eſſence, reflexive upon themſelves. Father *Maignan*, who, notwithſtanding his Learning, has remain'd in the Errors of the Schools, as to the Souls of Beaſts, owns nevertheleſs that in order to feel a thing, one ought to know the Senſation one has of it. *Id quod vocamus ſentire*, ſays he, *non eſt ſine cognitione ejus rei quæ dicitur ſenſibilis: cum autem nihil externum ſit per ſe ſenſibile; ſed tantum per ſuam actionem; adeoque actio ejus ſit primario ſenſibilis: & cum inſuper nos non dicamur alicujus agentis actionem ſentire, ſi ea dum in nobis ſit, omnino lateat nos; conſequenter id quod vocamus ſentire, non eſt ſine cognitione actionis, quæ ſit in nobis ſentientibus; imo quia ſentire nihil aliud ex parte ſentientis dicit, præter eam cognitionem; conſequens eſt ipſum ſentire, quatenus ſe tenet ex parte ſentientis, conſiſtere in eo quod eſt agnoſcere ſe pati; quod coincidit cum eo quod eſt agnoſcere actionem in ſe receptam, ſeu paſſionem ſuam* (o). It muſt then be ſaid, That the Memory of Beaſts, is an Act that makes them remember what is paſt, and which tells them that they remember it. How then can it be ſaid, that they have not the power of Reflecting upon their Thoughts, nor of drawing Conſequences? But once more let us not diſpute upon that; let us give theſe Philoſophers leave to build their Suppoſitions very ill: let us only make uſe of what they teach.

They ſay, That the Soul of Beaſts receives all the Objects of the five external Senſes; that among thoſe Objects ſhe judges that ſome are convenient for her, and others hurtful; and that by a conſequence of this Judgment, ſhe deſires thoſe that are convenient, and abhors the others; and that in order to enjoy the Object ſhe deſires, ſhe tranſports her Organs to the Place where it is, and that in order to fly from the Object which ſhe hates, ſhe withdraws her Organs from the place where it is. I conclude from all this, That if ſhe doth not produce ſo noble acts as our Soul, 'tis not her fault, or becauſe ſhe is of a Nature leſs perfect than the Soul of Man; it is only becauſe the Organs ſhe animates do not reſemble ours. I ask of theſe Gentlemen, if they would allow that one ſhould ſay, That the Soul of a man is of another Species at the Age of Thirty Five years than at the Age of one Month; or, that the Soul of a Phrenetick, or a Blockhead, or a doting Old Man, is not ſubſtantially as perfect as the Soul they preſcribe: but all this confuſed and impenetrable talk ſignifies nothing towards the Eſtabliſhing of a Specifick (F) difference between the Souls of Men and Beaſts; it is ſcarce probable, they can invent a better Explication

---

(b) Arnauld, ib. pag. 235.

(c) Arnauld, p. 236.

(d) In ib.

(e) John Crellius, Ethicæ Christianæ, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. m. 65. 66.

(f) Vide infra, pag. 2609.

de orig. & progr. idol. l. 3. c. 41. p. 940. (i) In. l. 1. Analyt. c. 3. apud eundem, ib. (k) Chanuet *in his Orations againſt* Charron.

(l) *His Reply is intitl'd*, De l'Inſtinct & de la connoiſſance des animaux, Rochelle, 1646 in 8.

(m) Iſaacus Voſſius de poematum cantu & viribus Rythmi, p. 65.

(n) Joh. Cyprianus, in Hiſtoriæ Animalium confirmatione, p. 2.

(o) Emmanuel Maignan, Philoſophia naturæ, cap. 24. n. 2. p. m. 527. *See alſo* Caſimirus *of* Toulouſe, Atomi Peripateticæ, tom. 4. pag. 70. *where he ſets down in few words, the definition of Father* Maignan, *and this of Cajetan*, Senſus eſt objecti in organo formaliter ſuſcepti dignotio, *and approves them.*

Soul of a Man of excellent Parts. They would without doubt reject this Opinion as a groſs Error; for it's certain, that the ſame Soul which in Children does only Feel, Reaſons in a grown Man; and the ſame Soul which makes a Man of Parts to be admir'd, would only dote in an Old Man, extravagate in a Fool, and feel in a Child. We ſhould be guilty of a groſs Error, did we believe, that the Soul of Man is only ſuſceptible of Thoughts which are known to us. There is an infinity of Senſations, Paſſions, and Ideas, of which this Soul is very capable, tho' it be never affected with them during this Life. If it were united to Organs different from ours, it would think otherwiſe than it does at preſent, and its Modifications might be far more noble than thoſe we have. If there were ſubſtances, which in organiz'd Bodies had a train of Senſations, and other Thoughts far more ſublime than ours, could it be ſaid that they are of a more perfect Nature than our Soul? No, without doubt; for if our Soul was tranſported into thoſe Bodies, it would have the ſame train of Senſations, and other Thoughts far more ſublime than ours. This is eaſie to be apply'd to the Soul of Beaſts. It will be granted that it feels Bodies; that it diſcerns them; that it deſires ſome, and abhors others. This is enough: It is therefore a Subſtance that thinks, it is therefore capable of Thought in general; it can therefore receive all ſorts of Thoughts; it can therefore Reaſon; it can therefore know what is Honeſt; the Univerſals; the Axioms of Metaphyſicks; the Rules of Morality, &c. For as Wax can receive the impreſſion of one Seal, it manifeſtly follows, that it may receive the figure of any Seal; it muſt likewiſe be granted, that ſince a Soul is capable of one Thought, it is capable of any Thought. It would be abſurd to Reaſon thus, *This piece of Wax has only receiv'd the Impreſſion of three or four Seals; therefore it cannot receive the Impreſſion of a Thouſand. This piece of Pewter has never been a Plate; therefore it can never be, and it is of another nature than that piece of Pewter which I ſee there.* They reaſon no better, who diſpute thus, *The Soul of a Dog has never had but Senſations, &c. therefore it is not capable of the Ideas of Morality, or of the Notions of Metaphyſicks.* From whence comes it that a piece of Wax bears the Impreſſion of a Prince, and the other does not? it is becauſe the Seal is apply'd to the one and not to the other. This piece of Pewter was never a Plate; but it will be one, if you caſt it into the Mould of a Plate. Caſt the Soul of this Beaſt into the Mold of Univerſal Ideas, and of the Notions of Arts and Sciences, I mean, unite it to a well choſen Humane Body; it will become the Soul of a Man of parts, and be no more that of a Beaſt.

You may ſee therefore that it is impoſſible for the School Philoſophers to prove, that the Souls of Men and Beaſts, are of a different Nature. Let them tell me a thouſand and a thouſand times, *That Man's Soul does reaſon, and know Univerſals and Virtue, and that Beaſts know nothing of the matter.* We Anſwer them, *Theſe differences are only accidental, and are no marks of a ſpecifick Difference.* Ariſtotle *and* Cicero, *at the Age of one Year, had never had more ſublime Thoughts than a Dog, and if they had lived in the ſtate of Infancy Thirty or Forty Years, the Thoughts of their Souls had never been any thing but Senſations and little Paſſions of Play and Eating: it is therefore by accident, that they have ſurpaſſed Beaſts; it is becauſe the Organs on which their Thoughts depended have acquired ſuch and ſuch Modifications, to which the Organs of Beaſts do not arrive. The Soul of a Dog in the Organs of* Ariſtotle *or* Cicero, *would not have failed to acquire all the Knowledge of theſe two great men.*

This Conſequence is very falſe; ſuch a Soul does not reaſon, does not know Univerſals, therefore it's of a different Nature from that of a great Philoſopher: for if this Conſequence were good, it would follow that the Soul of little Children is different from that of Men. What do you dream of, you peripatetick Philoſophers, when you pretend that if the Souls of Beaſts do not reaſon, they are ſubſtantially leſs perfect than Souls that Reaſon? You ought firſt to prove, that the want of reaſoning in Beaſts, proceeds from a real and internal Imperfection of the Soul, and not from the Organick Diſpoſitions on which it depends; but this is what you can never prove: for it is clear, that a Subject which is capable of the Thoughts which you allow in the Souls of Beaſts, is capable of Reaſoning and of any other Thought; from whence it reſults, that if it doth not actually Reaſon, it is becauſe of certain accidental and external Obſtacles, I mean, becauſe the Creator of all things has fix'd every Soul to a certain train of Thoughts, by making it depend on the Motions of certain Bodies. This is the Reaſon why Sucking Children, Mad-men and Frenticks do not reaſon.

One cannot, without Horror, think of the ill Conſequences of this Doctrine: *The Soul of Man and the Soul of Beaſts do not differ ſubſtantially; they are of the ſame Species, the one acquires more Knowledge than the other: but theſe are only accidental Advantages, and depending on an arbitrary Inſtitution.* This Doctrine neceſſarily flows from what the Schools teach about the Knowledge of Beaſts. It follows from thence, that if their Souls are material, and mortal, the Souls of Men are ſo likewiſe; and that if the Soul of Man is Spiritual and Immortal, the Soul of Beaſts is ſo too. Horrible Conſequences! turn which way you will. For if to avoid the Immortality of the Soul of Beaſts, you ſuppoſe that the Soul of Man dies with the Body, you overthrow the Doctrine of another Life, and the Foundations of Religion. If to preſerve to our Souls the privilege of Immortality, we extend it to thoſe of Beaſts into what an Abyſs do we fall? Will there be for them an Heaven and a Hell? Will they go from one Body to another? Will they be annihilated, as Beaſts die? Will God create continually an infinite number of Spirits, to plunge them again ſo ſoon into their firſt Nothing? How many Inſects live but a Day? Do not fancy that it's ſufficient to create Souls for Beaſts which we know; thoſe that we do not know are far the greater number. The Microſcopes diſcover them to us by thouſands in a ſingle drop of Water, and many more would be diſcover'd if we had more perfect Microſcopes. And let no Man ſay that Inſects are only Machines; for one might better explain by this Hypotheſis, the Actions of Dogs, than the actions of Piſmires and Bees. There is, perhaps, (o) more Wit and Reaſon in the inviſible Creatures, than in the largeſt. We are now going to take a view of the vain efforts of the Schools, to eſtabliſh a ſpecifick difference between the Souls of Men and Beaſts.

(o) See the words of Pliny Cited in the Article Menage.

(F) *A Specifick Difference between the Souls of Men and Beaſts.*] They ſay, That the Soul of Beaſts is a material Form, but that the Soul of Man is a Spirit which God has Created immediately. But how do they prove that? I ſuppoſe they only argue upon the Principles of natural Reaſon, without having recourſe to Scripture or the Maxims of Religion; and I ask them a good Proof to ſhew that the Souls of Beaſts are corporal, and ours not? They will alledge and ſet before me the Beauty and extent of Humane Knowledge; the ſmallneſs, groſsneſs and obſcurity of the Knowledge of Beaſts; and they will conclude, that a corporal Principle is capable of producing the Knowledge of Beaſts, but not the Reflections, Reaſonings, univerſal Ideas, Ideas of Honour and Honeſty, which are found in the Soul of Man; and that by conſequence this Soul ought to be of an Order ſuperior to Matter, and ought to be a Spirit. I will not ſay now that they aſſert raſhly, That the Soul of Beaſts does not Argue, and that it has no Idea of what is honeſt. Let us lay aſide this Objection, and only ſay, that it is a thouſand times more difficult to ſee a Tree, than to know the act by which we ſee it; ſo that if a material Principle is capable of knowing an Infinite number of outward things, it will be far more capable of knowing its own Thoughts, and of comparing them together and multiplying them: therefore the Reflections, and Concluſions, and Abſtractions of Man require no nobler a Principle than Matter. A Learned Peripatetick is of our ſide; let us hear him ſpeak; his Confeſſion will be more perſuaſive than my Objections. "If (p) you once admit, *ſays he*, "that all that is wonderful in the actions of Beaſts, "may be done by means of a material Soul; "will you not preſently go a ſtep farther, and ſay, that "all that paſſes in Man may be alſo done by a mate-"rial Soul? If you once grant that Beaſts, with-"out any ſpiritual Soul, can think, act with a "deſign

(p) Pardies, de connoiſance des Betes. 49. p.12 & ſeq.

tion than what they have given hitherto. The Author, who has well Confuted the Opinion of *Descartes* concerning the Souls of Beasts, would have done us a singular favour.

"design, fore-see things to come, remember what is "past, make use of Experience by the Reflection they make upon it; why will you not "grant that Men are capable of exercising their "Functions without any Spiritual Soul? After all, "the Operations of Men are no other than those "which you ascribe to Beasts: If there be any difference, it is only in degrees; and so all that you "can say will only be, that the Souls of Men are more "perfect than those of Beasts, because Men remember better than they, think with more reflection, "and fore-see things with more certainty; but "you cannot say that their Souls are not material. "You'll say perhaps, That in Men there are some "Operations that cannot suit with Beasts, nor proceed from any other Principle than a Spiritual "Soul: And those Operations are Universal Knowledge, that Ratiocination, whereby we learn one "thing from another; and the Ideas we have of Infinity, and of Spiritual Things which do not fall "under the Senses. But those who deny that there "is any Knowledge in Beasts, do not deny for all "that, that those Thoughts and Reasonings are in "us, since we our selves are conscious of them: So "that they have always the same Right which you "have to prove the Existence of the Rational Soul. "But besides, they add, that all those Operations "which you look upon to be so extraordinary, differ only in degrees from the Operations which "you attribute to Beasts. And certainly, it seems "that to act with a design, to improve by Experience, to fore-see things to come (which you grant "to Beasts) ought to proceed no less from a Spiritual Principle than what is found in Man. For "after all, what is an Universal Knowledge, but a "Knowledge which suits with many things that are "like, as the Picture of a Man would suit with all "the Faces that should resemble it? What is "a Reasoning, but a Knowledge produced by another Knowledge, as we see that a Motion is produced by another Motion? Certainly, if it be "once granted, That Thought, Intention, and Reflection may proceed from a Body animated with "a material Form; it will be a very difficult thing "to prove, That the Reasonings and Ideas of Man "cannot proceed from a Body animated likewise "with a material Form.

I desire all my Readers to take notice of the ill Condition the School-men are in, as to the Doctrine of the sensitive Soul. They alledge against *Descartes* the most surprising actions of Beasts; they chuse them on purpose, the better to confound him; but afterwards they find that they are gone too far, and have supplied their Adversary with Weapons to destroy the Specifick difference which they endeavour to prove between our Souls and those of Beasts. They could wish that one should forget all the Examples of Cunning, Precaution, Docility, and Knowledge of things to come, which they have set forth with so much Pomp, in order to shew that Beasts are not meer Machines; they could wish that one should mind only the gross actions of an Ox intent upon feeding: But 'tis too late to require such a thing; those very Examples are made use of to confound them, and to prove against 'em, That if a material Soul is capable of all those things, it will be able to do whatever we observe in Man's Soul: Only a greater degree of Subtilty must be supposed in the Souls of Beasts. Can one forbear supposing, That the Soul of a Dog or of an Ape is less gross than that of an Ox? In a word, if nothing but a Spiritual Soul can produce the actions of a dull witted Clown; I'll maintain against you, That nothing but a spiritual Soul can produce the actions of an Ape; And if you say that a material Principle is able to produce whatever is performed by Apes; I'll maintain against you, that a material Principle may be the cause of whatever is performed by stupid Men, and that provided Matter be subtiliz'd, and disintangl'd from all gross Particles, Phlegms, &c. it may be the cause of whatever the most understanding man can do.

QUE-STION ...cerning ...liberty ...Souls ...Beasts.

Some Authors insinuate, That since the Soul of man is endowed with Free-Will, and that of Beasts is depriv'd of it, there must needs be a specifick difference between them, and one must be spiritual and the other material. The Jesuit *Theophilus Raynaud*, publish'd in 1630 (a) a book then intituled, *Calvinismus Bestiarum Religio*. His chief (b) Design was to prove that the Doctrine of the Dominicans brings men to the Condition of Beasts, by depriving them of Free-Will. (c) *Hæc ipsa est ac caput primarium Calvinismi,* [illegible] *Calvinismum esse religionem bestiarum, quod ponit* [illegible] *in maxime* [illegible] *homini* [illegible] *dignitate* [illegible] *At* [illegible] *prelamine,* [illegible] *ratione* [illegible] *per libertatem.* [illegible] *liberationem* [illegible] *per Calvinismum.* He supposes that the liberty of indifference is the Character, whereby men are distinguished from Beasts; for as to the Liberty, which consists only in being free from Constraint, or in *Spontaneity*, the School-men can say that Beasts are deprived of it. I must shew that it is not true, that a Soul endowed with Free-will is of another kind than a Soul that is not free. The Souls of little Children and mad men are deprived of Free-will, and yet they are of the same Species with those that are most free. To which may be added, that those who maintain the liberty of indifference, say, that it will cease after this Life, and yet they acknowledge that a Human Soul is the same substance upon Earth as in Heaven or Hell. 'Tis therefore manifest, That the liberty of indifference is not an essential Attribute of Creatures, but a Gift, or an accidental favour bestowed upon them by the Creator. And consequently the Souls that are not gratified with it, are not of a different Species from those that receive it. This Argument is therefore very wrong: The Souls of Beasts are deprived of Free-will, but the Souls of Men are not; therefore the Souls of Beasts are material, and the Souls of Men are spiritual. I go farther, and I say that those, who admit of a sensitive Soul, have no good reason to assert, That Beasts are not free Creatures. Don't they say, that they do a thousand things with great pleasure, being directed by the Judgment they make of the usefulness of Objects, whereby they are prompted to unite themselves to those Objects? If Liberty consists only in being free from constraint, and in a *Spontaneity* preceded by the discerning of the Objects, is it not an absurd thing to deny the liberty of Beasts? Has not a hungry Dog the power of abstaining from a piece of meat, when he is afraid of being beaten, if he does not abstain from it? Is not this to have the power of acting or not acting? Doubtless his abstinence proceeds from his comparing his Hunger with the blows of a Stick, which he judges to be more intolerable than Hunger. If you observe all the humane actions that are ascrib'd to a liberty of indifference, you'll find that a man does never suspend them, or never chuses one of the two contraries, but because having compared the Reason, *pro* and *con*, he is thereby more inclin'd to suspend his action than to act, or has more inducements for one action than for another. Let us further hear the Jesuit, who writ against the *Cartesians*. "(d) It is "no easie thing thus to separate Reasoning from "Thought; and I think it may be easily proved, that "when a Substance is capable of thinking, it is also "capable of reasoning; that it has a Will, and a free "one; and in a word, that it can act like Men. "The ancient Philosophers, and even the Fathers of "the Church, have proved that we have a Free-"Will by this general Argument; That whatever is "capable of Knowledge, can know Good and Evil, "that is, what is good or bad for it, and consequently, that by considering those two Objects, it can "compare them together, deliberate, and resolve to "chuse the one and reject the other, wherein the "use of our liberty consists. This is so true, that "the definition of liberty taken in general, which we "use still to this day, is this, *Facultas agendi cum* "*ratione*, the faculty of acting with Knowledge, "which is the signification of these words, *cum ratione*.

One of the best Arguments that are alledged for the liberty of Man, is taken from the punishment of Malefactors. All Societies are agreed to punish them exemplarily, and even to extend, in some cases, the punishment to their dead Bodies: They are deprived of Burial, and exposed to the publick view upon Wheels and Gibbets. If Man did not act freely, if he was determined by a fatal and unavoidable Ne-favour, if he could have cleared (G) the common Opinion from the great Difficulties that attend it. Mr. *Leibnitz*, one of the greateſt Wits of *Europe*, being ſenſible

---

(a) See Baillet Vie de Descartes, tom. 1. p. 11?.

(b) He disputes against Calvin, but he does it to conclude against the Dominicans, whom he pretends to be like Calvin as to that Doctrine, what he concludes against Calvin.

(c) *Calvinismus bestiarum Religio*, distrib. 2. p. m. 25.

(d) *Pardies* ubi supra n. 25. pag. 104, 105. *Note that* p. 113. *he alledges for an instance a Dog, who had learned* to sing his Part with his Master. *He quotes Horarius* oratione peculiari de ratione brutor. *He should have quoted* Rorarius, quod animalia bruta utantur ratione melius homine. Lib. 1. pag. 2.

ceſſity to have a certain train of Thoughts, Robberies and Murders ſhould not be puniſh'd, and no Advantage could be expected from the puniſhment of Criminals; for thoſe who ſhould ſee the dead Body of a Malefactor upon a Wheel, would not be leſs ſubject than before to that prevailing power, which deprives them of the uſe of Liberty. This Argument for a Free-will is not ſo ſtrong, as it ſeems to be; for tho' Men are perſuaded that Machines have no feeling, they will give 'em a hundred Blows with a Hammer, when they are out of order, if they think to ſet them right by ſtarting a Wheel, or another piece of Iron. They would therefore cauſe a Pickpocket to be whipp'd, tho' they knew that he has no Free-will, if Experience had taught them that the whipping of People keeps them from committing certain actions. However, if this Argument for a Free-will has any force, it will manifeſtly ſhew, that Beaſts are not deprived of liberty (e). They are puniſhed every day, and they mend their faults by that means. *Ochinus*, in the beginning of his *Labyrinths*, examines all the Reaſons, which make us believe that we act freely, and ſays among other things againſt that which is taken from the puniſhments inflicted upon Malefactors, that if the Judges were ſure that the hanging of a Horſe, who kills a Man, and the leaving him a long time upon the Gallows in the Highway, would hinder other Horſes from doing miſchief, they would uſe that puniſhment, whenever a Horſe maims or kills any body (f). 'Tis likely he did not know that in ſome Countries they make uſe of ſuch Sights, to keep Beaſts in awe. *Rorarius* was an Eye-witneſs of it; he ſaw two Wolves hanging upon a Gibbet in the Dutchy of *Juliers*, and he obſerves, that it made a greater Impreſſion upon the other Wolves, than the Mark of a red hot Iron, the loſs of one's Ears, *&c.* upon Thieves. He ſays alſo that 'tis uſual in *Africa* to nail ſome Lions to a Croſs, in order to terrify others, and that the People find ſome benefit by it. (g) *Solent in Africa crucifigere leones, ſi qui deprehendantur urbes obſidere, quod in ſenecta faciunt: quoniam ad perſequendas feras vires non ſuppetunt; cujus pœnæ metu, licet urgeat fames, deſinunt: & nos ab Agrippina Colonia Duram verſus equitantes, in illa vaſta ſylva, vidimus duos caligatos lupos, non ſecus quam duos latrones furcæ ſuſpenſos: quo ſimilis pœnæ formidine à maleficio reliqui deterreantur. At inter homines quotidie reperiuntur, quibus ob admiſſa furta tergus virgis cæſum, abſciſſæ auriculæ, ſignatæ genæ, truncata altera manus, erutus oculus, nec adhuc a furtis ſe continere poſſunt, donec laqueus vitæ finis extiterit.*

(G) *If he could have cleared the common Opinion*, &c. The Book (h) Intitl'd, *Le Voyage du Monde de* Deſcartes, has been very much eſteem'd, and not without reaſon. It contains very great difficulties objected to the *Carteſians* in an agreeable and lively manner, and very well urged. Thoſe which concern the Machinal Souls of Beaſts, are, I think, the beſt that can be propoſed. The Author ingenuouſly confeſſes, that the Peripateticks ſhewed at firſt no great ſkill in attacking that great Paradox of *Deſcartes*, and that the *Carteſians* drew ſome advantage from it. He makes uſe, with great dexterity, of the ill conſequences that may be drawn from that Paradox; for he ſhews that the Arguments of the *Carteſians* move us to think, that other Men are meer Machines. This is perhaps the weakeſt ſide of that Carteſian Opinion, and it confirms a very judicious Thought that one may have about the nature of human Knowledge. It ſeems that God, who beſtows it, acts like the common Father of all Sects, being not willing that any of 'em ſhould intirely triumph over another, and ſink it without recovery. A Sect, tho' put to its laſt ſhifts, will always recover, if it ceaſes to ſtand upon the defenſive, in order to act offenſively by way of diverſion and retortion. The combat of Sects is always like that of the *Greeks* (i) and *Trojans* the Night that *Troy* was taken: they overcome one another by turns, as they happen to change their way of fighting. A *Carteſian* has no ſooner run down a School-man's Opinion about the Souls of Beaſts, but he finds that he may be beaten with his own Weapons, and that his Adverſary may ſhew him that he proves too much, and that if he will argue conſequently, he muſt give over ſome Opinions; which he cannot do without making himſelf ridiculous, and admitting manifeſt Abſurdities: For is there any Man that dares affirm that he is the only Perſon that thinks, and that all other Men are meer Machines? Would not he be look'd upon as more extravagant than Mad Men, or thoſe that are removed from all Human Society? This Conſequence of that Carteſian Doctrine is a ſad mortification; it is like a Peacock's Legs, whoſe uglineſs gives a check to the vanity which the beauty of his Feathers had inſpired him with. However, it muſt be confeſt that the whole advantage of Father *Daniel* againſt *Deſcartes's* Opinion conſiſts in the Objections that he raiſed, and not at all in the Anſwers that he made to the Objections of the *Carteſians*. He does not deny that their Queſtions are very puzzling; but he maintains that in their turn, they are not leſs perplexed by the Queſtions that are put to them, and that (k) *good Repriſals* may be made upon them. You muſt not expect to find in his Book the Solution of the Phyſical, Moral and Theological difficulties, that are propoſed to the Peripateticks about the Souls of Beaſts; he is contented to anſwer, that if there are ſome things in their Opinion that cannot be comprehended, there are ſome likewiſe in *Deſcartes's* Hypotheſis. (l) The definition of the Soul of a Beaſt, *a Subſtance capable of ſenſation*, that is, of Seeing, Hearing, *&c.* is as clear as the Carteſian definition of a Spirit, *a thinking and Reaſoning Subſtance*. They are Father *Daniel's* Words, which he proves afterwards as well as can be. A little before he had ſaid (m) that the Soul of a Beaſt is neither Matter nor a Spirit, but *a middle being between both*, which is not *capable of Reaſoning or thought, but only of Perception and Senſation*. If he ſays nothing that is more ſatisfactory, 'tis not for want of ability, but the nature of the Subject does not permit it.

He muſt give me leave to ſay, that his Hypotheſis cannot be maintain'd, and that no difficulty can be reſolved by it. Theſe two words, *Matter, Spirit*, ſeem at firſt ſight to admit of a *Medium*; but if the thing be narrowly look'd into, it appears that they may be reduced to a contradictory oppoſition. 'Tis but asking whether a Subſtance, that is neither a Body nor a Spirit, is extended or not. If it be extended, there is no reaſon to diſtinguiſh it from Matter; and if it be not extended, I deſire to know why it ſhould be diſtinguiſh'd from a Spirit: for the Notion of a Subſtance, that has no extenſion, ſuits with the Notion of a Spirit, and we cannot apprehend that this Notion can be divided into two different kinds, ſince the Specifick Attribute aſſign'd to the one, will never appear inconſiſtent with the other. If God can add (n) Thought to an unextended Being, he may likewiſe add it to another Being that is unextended, there being nothing but extenſion that ſeems to us to make Matter uncapable of thinking; at leaſt we clearly conceive, that an unextended Subſtance which can feel, is alſo capable of reaſoning; and conſequently, if the Soul of a Beaſt is an unextended Subſtance capable of ſenſation, it is alſo capable of reaſoning; It is therefore of the ſame kind with the Soul of Man, and not a middle Being between a Body and a Spirit. Here's a Queſtion put by Father *Daniel*. (o) *Will the* Carteſians *deny the poſſibility of this ſort of Beings, capable only of Senſation? What's become of the Reſpect which their Maſter endeavoured to inſpire into them for the Almighty Power of God, who, he ſays, can order it ſo, that a Triangle ſhall not have three Angles, and that two and two ſhall not make four; and yet cannot produce a Being, that has only Senſations?* This Queſtion might puzzle a Man, who ſhould have made a Vow never to depart from any of *Deſcartes's* Opinions; but it does not appear that any *Carteſian* will be ſuch a Slave to him, and I am ſure that *Deſcartes* would never have ſeriouſly affirm'd, that God can make two feet of Wax ſuſceptible of three or four Figures, and uncapable of all others. Whatever Opinion *Deſcartes* may have had about this, his Followers will never think they are wanting in the reſpect they owe to God, if they ſay, that *a Being only capable of Senſation*, is not more poſſible than a piece (p) of Wax only Suſceptible of a ſquare Figure. As for what concerns a *Being, that ſhould have only Senſations*, they'll think it very poſſible; as it is poſſible that a certain piece of Matter ſhould be always round, if God would for ever hinder the tranſpoſition of its Particles. Father *Daniel* will give me leave ſenſible of thoſe difficulties, has given us ſome hints, which (*H*) deſerve to be conſidered. I ſhall mention part of what he ſays upon this Subject, were it only to propoſe

---

(e) *Obſerve the Queſtion of Franzius Hiſt. animal. ſacra parte* 1. *c.* 2. p. m. 16. *Quæri autem poſſet an non ponenda ſit rationalis anima in brutis*—*cum Geneſ.* 9. *v.* 5. Deus ipſe vindicare velit ſanguinem hominis in brutis ſi quando effuderint ſanguinem humanum. *He alſo quotes* Exodus 12. v. 28. *and* Leviticus 20. v. 15, 16. *where God orders that Brutes ſhould be puniſh'd.*

(f) *I have not now by me that Book of* Ochinus; *I quote what I remember he ſays: perhaps I do not exactly tranſlate his words; but I am ſure that I ſet down his meaning.*

(g) *Rorarius* ubi ſupra, lib. 2. p. 109.

(h) *Father* Daniel *a Jeſuit, is accounted the Author of that Work.*

(i) Nec ſoli pœnas dant ſanguine Teucri: Quondam etiam victis redit in præcordia virtus, Victoresque cadunt Danai. *Virgil. Æneid.* lib. 2. v. 366.

leave to obſerve, that he did not perceive that it is not the ſame thing to ſay, firſt, *a being only capable of Senſation*, and then, *a being that has only Senſation*. The poſſibility of the firſt is unconceivable; and the poſſibility of the ſecond is manifeſt. But as a piece of Wax, in which God ſhould always hinder the Tranſpoſition of the Particles, would be of the ſame Species with a piece of Wax, the change of whoſe Extremities would continually produce a new Figure; it may likewiſe be ſaid that a Subſtance, which God ſhould always confine within the bounds of Senſations, would be of the ſame Species with a Subſtance that ſhould arrive to Reaſoning.

It remains for me to ſhew the inſufficiency of Father *Daniel's* Hypotheſis. 1. We want a Syſtem, that proves that the Souls of Beaſts are Mortal: But this cannot be proved by ſuppoſing a middle Being between a Body and a Spirit; for ſuch a Being is not extended: It is therefore Indiviſible; nothing but Annihilation can deſtroy it: Diſeaſes, Fire and Sword cannot hurt it; and therefore it is in that reſpect of the ſame Nature and Condition with Spirits, and Humane Souls. 2. We want a Syſtem whereby it may appear that there is a Specifick difference between the Souls of Men and thoſe of Beaſts: But this middle Being does not prove it; for if the Soul of a Beaſt, being neither a Body nor a Spirit, has nevertheleſs ſome Senſations, the Soul of Man will be able to Reaſon, tho' it be neither Body nor Spirit, but a middle Being between both. 'Tis a more difficult thing for a Being deſtitute of Senſe to arrive to the Perception of a Tree, than for a ſenſitive Being to acquire the Faculty of Reaſoning. 3. We want a Syſtem, that gives an account of the ſurpriſing Skill of Bees, Dogs, Apes, Elephants, &c. and you talk of ſuch Souls in Beaſts, as have only Senſations, without (*a*) thinking and reaſoning. If you think well of it, you'll be ſenſible that ſuch a Soul is not ſufficient to explain the *Phænomena*. Father *Daniel* Confeſſes it in another place of his Book, where he ſeems to allow the *Peripateticks* no other Advantage but that of Poſſeſſion: For having mention'd the Difficulties that are to be found in the Opinion of the *Carteſians* concerning Beaſts, he adds: (*b*) *It cannot be denied that the Peripateticks have alſo ſeveral Difficulties to reſolve; but tho' they were much more conſiderable than they really are, as long as the Carteſians have nothing to ſay that is more Satisfactory or more Intelligible, we ought to keep to this, and argue upon this Head, as a great Miniſter of State did twenty five Years ago, upon the whole Body of Philoſophy. He was adviſed not to get his Son to learn the ancient Philoſophy, becauſe there was nothing in it but Fooleries. I have been told alſo, ſaid he, that there are many Fooliſh and Chimerical things in the new one; and therefore continued he, ſince I am to chooſe the ancient or the new Fooleries, I think the ancient ought to be preferr'd before the new.* Perhaps *Nihuſius* (*c*) argued in the ſame manner.

(*H*) *Has given us ſome hints, which deſerve to be conſidered.*] (*d*) He approves the Opinion of ſome Moderns, who think that Animals are Organized in the Seed; and beſides he believes (*e*) that Matter alone cannot conſtitute a true Unity, and that therefore every Animal is united to a Form, which is a ſimple, and indiviſible Being. Moreover he ſuppoſes (*f*) that this Form never leaves its ſubject; from whence it reſults, that properly ſpeaking, there is no Death nor Generation in Nature. He (*g*) excepts the Soul of Man from all this; he lays it aſide, &c. This Hypotheſis (*h*) frees us from ſome difficulties. There's no longer any need to anſwer the preſſing Objections raiſed againſt the Schoolmen. The Soul of a Beaſt, ſay their Adverſaries, is a ſubſtance diſtinct from the Body; it muſt therefore be produced by Creation, and deſtroyed by Annihilation: Heat (*i*) muſt therefore have the power to Create Souls, and to (*k*) Annihilate them, than which nothing can be more abſurd. The Anſwers of the Ariſtotelians to this Objection do not deſerve to be mention'd, and plainly ſhew that it is unanſwerable. They don't come off better, when they are urged to ſhew the Reaſonableneſs of a continual Production of an almoſt infinite number of Subſtances, which are totally deſtroyed a few days after, tho' they are far more Noble and Excellent than Matter, which never loſes its Exiſtence. Mr. *Leibniz's* Hypotheſis removes all thoſe difficulties; for it induces us to believe, 1. That God in the beginning of the World Created the Forms of all Bodies, and conſequently all the Souls of Beaſts. 2. That thoſe Souls have Subſiſted ever ſince, being inſeparably united to the firſt Organized Bodies in which God placed them. The Tranſmigration of Souls becomes needleſs in this Hypotheſis, without which there would be a neceſſity to admit of it. I ſhall ſet down part of Mr. *Leibniz's* Diſcourſe, that my Readers may ſee whether I have taken his Senſe right. “(*l*) Here the *Transformations of Swammerdam, Malpighius*, and *Leeuwenhoeck*, ſome of the moſt excellent Obſervators of our time, came to my Aſſiſtance, and made me more eaſily believe, that Animals, or any other Organized Beings, do not begin to exiſt when we think they do, and that their ſeeming Generation is only an unfolding, and a kind of Augmentation. I have obſerved that the Author of the *Recherche de la verité*, Mr. *Regis*, Mr. *Hartſoeker*, and ſome other able Men are not far from this Opinion. But the greateſt Queſtion remains ſtill, viz. what becomes of thoſe Souls or Forms after the Death of the Animal, or the Deſtruction of the Organized Being. This is the moſt perplexing thing; becauſe it does not ſeem reaſonable that Souls ſhould remain needleſly in a Chaos or confuſed matter. This made me think at laſt that the only way left is to ſay, that not only the Souls, but alſo the Animals themſelves, and their Organized Machines are preſerved, tho' the Deſtruction of the groſs Particles has reduced them to a ſmallneſs, that is as Imperceptible, as it was before they were Born. And indeed no Body can exactly fix the true time of Death, which may paſs a long time for a meer ſuſpenſion of viſible Actions, and at the bottom is never any thing elſe in meer Animals: As it appears from the *Reſuſcitations* of Flies drowned, and then Buried under Pulverized Chalk, and many ſuch like, which ſufficiently ſhew that there would be many other *Reſuſcitations*, traced up higher, if Men were able to put again the Machine in Order. . . . . It is therefore Natural that the Animals having been always alive and Organized (as ſome Perſons of great Penetration begin to acknowledge) ſhould always continue ſo. And ſince there is no Birth, nor a quite new Generation of Animals, it follows that there will be no final Extinction of 'em, nor an intire Death taken in a ſtrict Metaphyſical ſenſe; and conſequently that inſtead of the Tranſmigration of Souls, there is only a Transformation of the ſame Animal, according as its Organs are differently folded, and more or leſs open and unfolded.

I ſhall obſerve occaſionally that ſome are of Opinion that the Primitive Subject, to which our Soul is united, goes out of our Body together with it, when we come to Die. M. *Poiret* thinks ſo, and believes that *Moſes* upon the day of the Transfiguration, appear'd with the true Body that attended his Soul at his departure from this Life; that is, as he explains it, when that bleſſed Soul left the Cover, which wrapped up the ſubtle Body to which it was united. He calls the dead Body a Cover, and Ruſt, with reſpect to the true Subject, that is united to the Soul. Theſe are his Words: (*m*) *Cum Deus ſit conſtans in ſuis operibus, maxime in præcipuis, & quoad fundamentaliora, condideritque mentes quaſdam, humanas nempe, corporibus annexas; probabile non eſt, id opus vel per aliquod tempus ex toto interrumpi atque deſtrui: & ex hiſtoriis ſacris habemus, Moſen, cujus cadaver omnino cecidit, cum Elia apparuiſſe Apoſtolis Chriſtum in transfiguratione radiantem ſpectantibus: id quod ſine corpore, cui mens fuerit juncta, fieri non poterat. Nonnulli ad corpus ex aere aſſumptum recurrunt: at quid ni id ex ipſo Moſis corpore (& ſic de cæteris) eſſet, portio nempe materiæ illius internæ ſpiritualioris, ſubtilioris & purioris, quæ depoſito cadavere, ſeu tegmine vel cortice aut ſcabie vel rubigine quadam, exhalaret, & menti adhuc unita, ejus regimine, ſecundum Dei placitum, dirigeretur?* He has Publiſh'd ſome Objections, that were ſent him from *Sedan*. It was objected to him among other things, (*n*) that the example of *Moſes* proves nothing; becauſe that great Prophet could not have been

(*a*) I uſe here the word Thinking for a kind of Perception, and not in the general Notion of Des Cartes.

(*b*) Suite du voiage du monde de Deſcartes, pag. 105, 106.

(*c*) See the Remark H of this Article.

(*d*) See M. Leibniz's Memorial inſerted in the Journal des Savans of the 27th of June 1695, pag. 444. Dutch Edit.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 445.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 447.

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 448.

(*h*) Bernier, in his [illegible]

(*l*) Journal des Savans, ubi ſupra pag. 449.

(*m*) Poiret, Cogitat. rational. de Deo, anima & malo, in appendice n. 1. pag. 611. edit. Amſtelod. 1685.

(*n*) Idem Reſponſ. ad primas object. pag. 696.

poſe my Doubts. But to return to *Rorarius*, I think he was Born at *Pordenone* (I) in *Italy*. I wiſh I had read the Plea (α), which he compoſed for Rats. It was Printed in the Country of the *Griſons* in the Year 1548. There is ſomething like it in the Works (β) of Preſident *Chaſſanée*. I ſhall make an end here (γ) of the Collection, whereof you have ſeen the principal Part in the Article of *Pereira*.

I am informed from ſeveral Hands that many Perſons, who love Dogmatical Hiſtory, have approved the Collections, which I have Publiſh'd in the Remarks of this Article. Nay, ſome would be glad that I ſhould Publiſh ſome others, if any new ones ſhould come into my Hands. This makes me take the Liberty to add here ſome (K) ſupplements,

been ſeen by the Apoſtles, unleſs a great deal of Matter had been added to that, which went out of his dead Body with his Soul. Now if it had been neceſſary to give him above one half of a new Body, one may very well ſay that the Matter, with which he appeared on that day, was all new. M. *Poiret* anſwered (n) that the ſubtle Matter, which goes out of the Body with the Soul, is indeed too thin to ſtrike upon our Senſes; but that we may ſee it, when God aſſiſts us in an extraordinary manner. He was told that ſome Schoolmen admit of a *Quinteſſence*, which ties a human Soul to the Organs formed out of the four Elements, and ſerves it as a Vehicle, when it leaves the Body. They ſay alſo that this Vehicle is the ſubject of the Torments, which the Reprobate endure after the Reſurrection. (o) *Obſervo opinionem viri docti non multum diſcrepare a quorundam Scholaſticorum placitis, qui præter quatuor elementa neſcio quam quintam eſſentiam venire in compoſitionem humani corporis opinantur, quæ ſit veluti medium quoddam vinculum, quo incorporeus & immortalis animus cum terreno ac mortali corpore copuletur: aliter enim ſi res eſſet, nulla videretur eſſe proportio & convenientia inter corpus & animam rationalem: & illam quidem quintam eſſentiam naturæ cœleſtis eſſe volunt, eamque ferre animum quando per mortem è corpore migrare cogitur, & in ea pœnas apud inferos luere ſceleribus ſuis promeritas.* M. *Poiret* (p) anſwered that he had nothing to do with the Schoolmen's Notions. See the Margin (q).

There are ſome things in M. *Leibniz*'s Hypotheſis, that are liable to ſome difficulties, tho' they ſhew the great extent of his Genius. He will have it, for Inſtance, that the Soul of a Dog acts independantly upon outward Bodies; (r) *that it ſtands upon its own Bottom, by a perfect Spontaneity with reſpect to itſelf, and yet with a perfect* Conformity *to outward things. . . . That its internal Perceptions ariſe from its Original Conſtitution, that is to ſay, Repreſentative (capable of expreſſing Beings out of itſelf, with reſpect to its Organs) which was beſtowed upon it from the time of its Creation, and makes its individual Character.* From whence it reſults, that it would feel Hunger and Thirſt at ſuch an Hour, tho' there were not any one body in the Univerſe, and tho, *nothing ſhould exiſt but God and that Soul.* He explains (ſ) his Thought by the Example of two *Pendulums* that ſhould perfectly agree: That is, he ſuppoſes that according to the particular Laws, which put the Soul upon Action, it muſt feel Hunger at ſuch an Hour; and that according to the particular Laws, which direct the motion of Matter, the Body which is united to that Soul muſt be modified at that ſame Hour, as it is modified when the Soul is Hungry. I'll forbear preferring this Syſtem to that of Occaſional Cauſes, till the Learned Author has perfected it. I cannot apprehend the Connexion of Internal and Spontaneous Actions, which would have this Effect, that the Soul of a Dog would feel Pain immediately after having felt Joy, tho' it were alone in the Univerſe. I underſtand why a Dog paſſes immediately from Pleaſure to Pain, when being very Hungry, and eating a piece of Bread, he is ſuddenly ſtruck with a Cudgel; but I cannot apprehend that his Soul ſhould be ſo framed, that at the very moment he is beaten, he would feel pain, tho' he were not beaten, and tho' he ſhould continue to eat Bread without any trouble or hindrance. Nor do I ſee how the *Spontaneity* of that Soul ſhould be conſiſtent with the ſenſe of Pain, and in general with all unpleaſing Perceptions. Beſides, the reaſon why this Learned Man does not like the Carteſian Syſtem, ſeems to me to be a falſe Suppoſition; for it cannot be ſaid that the Syſtem of Occaſional Cauſes brings in God acting by a Miracle (t), *Deum ex machina*, in the mutual dependency of the Body and Soul: for ſince God does only intervene according to general Laws, he cannot be ſaid to act in an extraordinary manner. Does the internal and active virtue Communicated to the Forms of Bodies, according to Mr. *Leibniz*, know the train of Actions which it is to produce? By no means; for we know by Experience that we are Ignorant whether we ſhall have ſuch and ſuch Perceptions in an hour's time. It were therefore neceſſary that the Forms ſhould be directed by ſome external Principle in the production of their Actions. But this would be *Deus ex machina*, as well as in the Syſtem of Occaſional Cauſes (u). To conclude, as he ſuppoſes with great reaſon, that all Souls are Simple and Indiviſible, one cannot apprehend how they can be compared with a *Pendulum*, that is, how by their Original Conſtitution they can diverſify their Operations, by uſing the ſpontaneous Activity, beſtowed upon them by their Creator. One may clearly conceive that a ſimple Being will always act in an uniform manner, if no external Cauſe hinders it. If it was Compoſed of ſeveral Pieces as a Machine, it would Act different ways, becauſe the peculiar Activity of each piece might change every Moment the Activity of others: But how will you find in a ſimple Subſtance the cauſe of a change of Operation?

(I) *He was Born at* Pordenone *in* Italy.] Here is the reaſon I have for it. He ſays that *Sacillum* is near the place of his Birth. *Proximum eſt patriæ meæ Sacillum oppidum (in quo doctiſſimus Franciſcus Amaltheus publico ſtipendio humaniores litteras profitetur, cujus ſub ductu pueritiæ meæ rudimentum depoſui) amœnum flumine.* This Parentheſis is not needleſs; for we learn from it where our *Rorarius* began his Studies, and that the (x) three Brothers, who made the Name of *Amaltheus* ſo Famous, were not the only Perſons of that Name, that were Learned. It is certain that *Sacillum* is not far (y) from *Portus Naonis*, or *Pordenone*, as the Italians call it, or *Portenau*, as the Germans name it (z). The Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Rorarius*'s Book to the Biſhop of *Arras*, is dated from *Portus Naonis*; and there was a Phyſician of the ſame Town, whoſe Name was *Nicolas* RORARIUS. He wrote a Book Printed at *Venice*, in 1566, and 1572. and Intitled *Contradictiones, dubia & paradoxa in libros Hippocratis, Celſi, Galeni, Aetii, Æginetæ, Avicennæ cum eorundem conciliationibus.* We find theſe Words concerning that Writer in *Lindenius Renovatus*. *Nicolaus Rorarius Utinenſis Medicus, vixit circa A. C. 1563. Renatus Moreau de V. S. in Pleurit.* The meaning of which is not that he was a Native of *Udine*, but only that he practiſed Phyſick there. And therefore *Konig* has committed a Fault, when he ſays, *Rorarius* (Nicol.) *de Portunnone, Utinenſis collegit conciliationes contradictionum in ſcriptis Medicorum anno* 1566. The Omiſſion of the word *Medicus* after *Utinenſis* would make one believe that this Phyſician was Born at *Udine*, and that *de Portunnone* was a Sirname of his Family. *Doni* Dedicated one (a) of the Chapters of his *Ramo della Zucca* al S. Gregorio Rorario da Pordonone.

(K) *Makes me take the liberty to add here ſome Supplements.*] I ſhall name firſt of all the Authors, who believe that Beaſts have Rational Souls. I don't think that any body has carried the thing farther than the Philoſopher *Celſus*; for deſigning to confute the Chriſtians, who ſay that all things were made for the uſe of Man, he endeavours to ſhew that Beaſts are not leſs Excellent than Men, and even that they ſurpaſs them. He aſcribes (b) to them (c) a form of Government, and the obſervation of Juſtice and Charity. He pretends that Ants converſe one with another. (d) *When they meet one another*, ſays he, *they converſe together; hence it is that they never loſe their way. They are therefore endowed with Reaſon in all its degrees; they have naturally the notions of ſome Universal Truths; they have the uſe of Speech; they have the knowledge of Accidental Things, and know how to* expreſs

---

(α) *Oratio pro Muribus adverſus Nicolai Boſſi edictum. Auguſtæ Rhetiæ* an. Phil. Gilhard. *Draudius Biblioth.* pag. 1591.

(β) *See Thuanus, Lib.* 6. *pag.* 125.

(γ) *See the Remark D.*

(n) Id. ib. pag. 695.

(o) Ibid. pag. 696.

(p) Ibid. pag. 697.

(q) *The Anonymous Platoniſt, who writ* Philoſophia vulgaris refutata, *Printed in* 1690. *ſays that* Ockam, Maironi, Antonius Mirandulanus, Garbius, & Licetus *will have the Soul of Man to be made up of two Subſtances*, alia immaterialis quæ a Deo creatur, alia materialis ex traduce propagatur, &c.

(r) Journal des Savans *of the 4th of July* 1695. pag. 457.

(ſ) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans, *February* 1696. pag. 274. 275.

(t) Ibid.

supplements, tho' I am not Ignorant that many Readers will not much care for them, and will look upon 'em as meer Excrescencies. They will not say so of the

express them. He affirms that some Beasts "(a) know the Secrets of (b) Magick; so that Men cannot Boast of it as of a Privilege peculiar to them. He speaks of it in this manner. *If a Man is proud of his Knowledge of the Secrets of Magick, Serpents and Eagles, know more of it than he. For they have many Antidotes against Poisons and Diseases, and they know the Virtue of some Stones for the Cure of their little ones; which Men value so much, that when they find some of 'em, they think to have found a Treasure.* . . . . (c) Afterwards designing to shew at large, that Men, under pretence of Knowing the Deity, ought not to pretend upon that account that they are above all Mortal Beings, since there are some Irrational Animals, who have a clear and distinct Idea of it; whilst the most Subtil Men, whether they be Grecians or Barbarians, have so many disputes about it; he adds: *If any one pretends to raise Man above other Animals, because he is capable of knowing the Deity, and receiving the Idea and Impression of it; let him know that there are many among them, who may Boast of the same Advantage: And that upon good grounds. For can any thing be more Divine than to Foresee and Predict things to come? Now other Animals, especially Birds, are in that respect the Masters of Men; and the Art of our Diviners consists only in Understanding what those Animals teach them. Birds therefore and other Animals qualified for Divination, to whom God discovers things to come, give us the Knowledge of 'em by Signs and Symbols: Which shews that they have Naturally a more frequent and more strict Commerce with the Deity than we have; that they exceed us in Knowledge, and are dearer to God than we. The most Knowing Men say also, that those Animals Converse together in a more Holy and Noble manner than we do, and that they understand their Language; which appears from this, that after they have told us that the Birds say they will go to such a place, and do there such a thing; they shew us those Birds going thither, and actually doing what they said they would do. As for the Elephants, there is no Creature that shews a more Religious respect for Oaths, or a more invislable Fidelity: Which doubtless proceeds from no other cause than their Knowledge of him.*" This has been refuted by *Origen* in his Book against *Celsus*.

Salmasius is one of the Moderns, who believe that Brutes are endowed with Reason. He says (d) that the Examples, which may be alledged for it, are so many that one might fill up a Book with them. *Osiander* does not approve this Opinion. See his Notes upon *Grotius*'s Book *de jure belli & pacis*, in the Chapter wherein he rejects the definition (e) of the Law of Nature, adopted by *Justinian* in the 1 Book of the *Institutes*. That definition lays down that Men and Beasts have a share in the Law of Nature. Most of those, who approve it, go upon this Hypothesis, that Beasts are not deprived of the use of Reason; but most of those, who reject that Notion of the Law of Nature, go upon the contrary Hypothesis. *Osiander* (f) is one of 'em, and he commends *Grotius* for not approving *Justinian*'s definition, wherein, says he, he was guided by *Laurentius Valla*, *Francis Connanus*, *Dominicus Sotus*, and many others. We shall see by and by a Tenet of *Grotius*, which *Osiander* has Condemned, concerning the Principle of certain Actions of Beasts, that seem to proceed from Reason. *John Antony Cappella*, a Neapolitan Physician, Publish'd (g) in 1641. *Opusculum paradoxicum quod ratio participetur a brutis*, which I have not read; and therefore I cannot say which way he goes about to prove it. I am better acquainted with Dr. *Willis*'s Opinion. He pretends that the Souls of Brutes are composed of Organs, and that they have the same Figure and Extent with the Bodies they inform; only they are not so thick, and their Parts are so thin that they cannot be seen, and would easily be scattered, if the Bodies of the Animals did not keep 'em together. (h) *Ista particularum subtilium congeries, sive anima, quæ sese latius explicans, & particulas suas aliis crassioribus insinuans, & intertexens corpus fabricat, juxta figuram & dimensionem istius corporis exactè conformatur, ipsi coextenditur, & tanquam capsulæ, aut vaginæ ad amussim adaptatur, totum ac singulas partes ejus actuat, vivificat, & inspirat; porro lethum, ipsamet anima, e se statim dissolvit, tenuesque in auras evanescens abit, a corpore continenti, in subsistentia sua & esse conservatur. Ita quidem Anima, tenuissima licet, corporea, corporis quasi spectrum, sive larva umbratilis videtur: Parva hæc simul cum corpore ex materia ejus disposita emergens, hypostasin, sive subsistentiam suam, non minus quam corpus, juxta Ideam, sive Typum sibimet ex naturæ lege præstitutum accipit; quamvis autem corpori intime unitur, ejusque velut subtegmen existat, tamen utpote subtilissima, & quasi filo admodum prætenui consistens, sensibus nostris percipi nequit, at solummodo ab effectis & operationibus suis dignoscitur.* He ascribes (i) to those Souls a kind of Reason, which he explains Analytically. He says that there is such a Soul in Man, and besides, a Spiritual one, and pretends to explain by those two Souls the Conflict which we are conscious of within our selves, and which other Philosophers explain by the Superior and Inferior Faculties of one simple and spiritual Substance, which they call the Rational-Soul (k). But this way of Explaining the conflict between Reason and the sensitive Soul is not satisfactory; for every body is conscious to himself, that the Principle which desires sensual Pleasures, is the same in number with the Principle that thwarts such desires, and which overcomes it sometimes, but is most times overcome by it. If we had two different Souls really distinct one from another, we should not observe this Unity of Principle. If it be said that one of 'em produces its Sentiments and Passions in the other; I answer that it follows from thence that there are two Substances in each Man, which have the same desires. But no Man did ever perceive two such distinct Principles. Besides, if a Material Soul could Communicate a sensual Desire to the spiritual Soul of Man, the Body would do it likewise; and consequently Beings are multiplied without Necessity, by ascribing to each Man a Body, and two Souls, one of which is Sensitive, and the other Rational. But to proceed, Dr. *Willis* observes that Sir *Kenelm Digby* was of *Descartes*'s and *Pereira*'s Opinion about the Souls of Brutes (l) *Pereira . . . . bestias omni cognitione, seu perceptione carere affirmavit; quem in nupero hoc seculo πόδα πόδι sequuti sunt Viri Clarissimi*, Cartesius, Digbæus, *cum aliis, qui* brutorum animas, *quantum fieri possit, ab humana discriminare præ se ferentes, eas non modo corporeas, & divisibiles, sed etiam mere* passivas *asseruerunt*. Afterwards he shews what difference there is between *Descartes*'s Opinion, and that of Sir *Kenelme Digby*, and he says that the latter does not deprive Beasts of Sensations and Memory. It is not true therefore that his Opinion was the same with that of *Pereira*, and *Descartes*: Why then did the Doctor say it was? (m) *Digbeius . . . . insuper adjecit, effluvia quadam tenuissima e corpore sensibili delibata, non modo sensoria exteriora afficere, verum & interiores recessus subingredientia, sese spiritibus immiscere, eosque in varias fluctuationes agendo, &* sensus *&* motus locales *diversimodos producere; porro ex his atomis extrinsecus ita partes nervosas, ac cerebrum ipsum subeuntibus, haud tantum actiones extemporaneas procedere; verum ex iisdem in corpore sentiente relictis, ac intra cerebri loculos reconditis, prioresque configurationes retinentibus, rerum antea actarum ideas in* memoria *residuas constitui.* We may therefore conclude, that Sir *Kenelme Digby* is none of those, who maintain that Beasts are meer Machines. Mr. *Locke* believes that they are endowed with Reason. The following Words will shew you wherein he places the difference between Men and Beasts. "(n) This I think I may be positive in, that the Power of *Abstracting* is not at all in them, and that the having of general Ideas is that which puts a perfect distinction betwixt Man and Brutes; and is an Excellency, which the Faculties of Brutes do by no means attain to. For it is evident, we observe no Footsteps in them of making use of General Signs, for Universal Ideas: From which we have Reason to imagin, that they have not the Faculty of Abstracting, or making General Ideas, since they have no use of Words or any other general Signs.---(o) And therefore I think we may suppose, that 'tis in this that the Species of Brutes are Discriminated from Men; and 'tis that

(a) Ibid. pag. 185.

(b) He means natural Magick.

(c) Ibid. pag. 183, 184.

(d) See Osiander upon ...hnsia, pag. 213.

(e) Jus naturale est quod natura omnia animalia docuit. Nam jus istud non humani generis proprium, sed omnium animalium, quæ in cœlo, quæ in terra, quæ in mari nascuntur. — Videmus etenim cetera quoque animalia illius juris perita censeri. Institut. lib. 1. tit. 2.

(f) Osiander ...or. in ...r. Grotii de jure belli & pacis, pag. ...6. &

(g) Nicolo Toppi Biblioth. Napolet. pag. ...

(h) Thomas Willis de Anima brutorum ... parte 1. cap. 2. pag. m. 15.

(i) Id. ib. cap. 6. pag. 91, 92.

(k) Id. ib. cap. 7.

(l) Idem. cap. 1. pag. 5, & 6.

(m) Id. ib pag. 7.

(n) Locke, An Essay concerning Humane Understanding, Book 2. chap. 11. §. 10, 11. 'Tis an excellent Work, which deserved to be translated into French, as well as it has been Translated by Mr. Coste.

(o) Ibid. Sect. 11.

the Obſervations I deſign to make upon (L) M. *Leibniz*'s Reflections, which have

“ that proper difference wherein they are wholly Separated, and which at laſt widens to ſo vaſt a diſtance. For if they have any Ideas at all, and are not bare Machines, (as ſome would have them) we cannot deny them to have ſome Reaſon. It ſeems as evident to me that they do ſome of them in certain Inſtances reaſon, as they have Senſe; but it is only in particular Ideas, juſt as they receive them from their Senſes. They are the beſt of them tied up within thoſe narrow Bounds, and have not, as I think, the Faculty to inlarge them by any Kind of Abſtraction.

SOME Authors, who have aſcrib'd the actions of Brutes to an External Principle.

There is in the *Nouvelles* (a) *de la Republique des lettres*, an Abſtract of a Book Intitled, *Eſſais nouveaux de Morale*, which was Printed at *Paris* in 1686. The Author, who denies on the one ſide that Beaſts are endowed with the Faculty of Reaſoning, confeſſes on the other ſide that their Actions are directed by (b) an *External Reaſon*, and that *the Reaſon and Wiſdom, which governs them, is more excellent and ſure than that of Man .... The Reaſon*, ſays he (c), *which Operates in Beaſts, is not in them ....'tis, as* St. Thomas *ſays after all the Antient Fathers, the Soveraign and Eternal Reaſon of the Supreme Being, who preſerves his Works, and directs them to the ends for which he Created them, with the ſecret Springs he has put in them, which are variouſly determin'd, to produce a thouſand ſorts of different Motions, according to their ſeveral Wants.* Add to this the following words of Mr. *Bernard*: “ (d) The Philoſophers, who are moſt earneſt in aſſerting that Beaſts are meer Machines, muſt ingenuouſly confeſs that they perform ſeveral Actions, the Mechaniſm whereof they cannot explain. The ſhorteſt way would be to ſay in general, that God, who was willing that their Machines ſhould ſubſiſt for ſome time, has thro' his infinite Wiſdom diſpoſed their parts agreeably to ſuch an Intention. I think I have read ſomewhere this Aſſertion, *Deus eſt anima brutorum*: this Expreſſion is ſomewhat Harſh; but it is ſuſceptible of a Reaſonable Senſe. *Grotius* ſays that ſome Actions of Beaſts, wherein they give over their Private Intereſt in favour of others, proceed from an External Intelligence. (e) *Cæterarum animantium quædam utilitatum ſuarum ſtudium, partim fœtuum ſuorum partim aliorum ſibi congenerum reſpectu, aliquatenus temperant: quod in illis quidem procedere credimus ex principio aliquo intelligente extrinſeco, quia circa actus alios, iſtis neutiquam difficiliores, par intelligentia in illis non apparet.* Gaſpar *Zieglerus*, in his Note upon that paſſage, finds fault with *Grotius* for not Explaining more clearly his Thoughts about the Nature of that External Principle: If it be the Divine Providence, ſays he, *Grotius* lies open to the Satyrical Streaks of Dr. (f) *Juan Huarte*, who ſhews that a Philoſopher ought not to explain *Phænomena* by the immediate Operation of God. He quotes (g) two Writers, who have aſcribed all the Skill of Brutes to a Natural Inſtinct, and he approves their Opinion. *Oſiander* did very much inlarge in his Confutation of *Grotius*, and he ſays among other things, that this External Principle muſt be God himſelf, or an Angel, or the Univerſal Form of *Averroes*, and that none of thoſe three Suppoſitions can be admitted (h). My mentioning *Averroes*, puts me in mind that he admitted an External Principle of Human Knowledge common to all particular Underſtandings, and which Influences alſo Beaſts and Stones; but ſince he acknowledged that this Influence is Fruitleſs with reſpect to Beaſts and inſenſible Creatures, becauſe it falls upon a Matter ill diſpoſed, it cannot be ſaid that he aſcribed more Perfection to Beaſts than the Schoolmen do. (i) *Averroes lib. 3. de anima cap. 5. unum facit omnium hominum intellectum, re ab animæ ſubſtantia ſeparatum, ſed ſingulis conjunctum per inſidentes phantaſiæ imagines; etiam equo, & aſino, lapidi, & metallo, aſſiſtentem, ſed citra fructum, quia materies ſit inepta.* M. *de Vigneul Marville* (k) tells us, that there was a certain Philoſopher at M. *Rohault*'s Conferences, who in order to explain how Beaſts being meer Machines, *Act nevertheleſs, as if they had a Soul*, made uſe of the Hypotheſis of the *Comte de Gabalis*, that is, he ſuppoſed that ſome Elementary Spirits make it their buſineſs *to put in Motion all the Machines* of Beaſts, *according to the rules of Mechanicks*. He gave ſo ingenious a turn to his Diſcourſe, that Mr. *Pequet* told him, that (l) *if his agreeable Syſtem was not true, it was however bene trovato*. I make no doubt that ſome People will be pleaſed with it: But if I was to diſpute about it, I could eaſily ſhew that it is inſufficient to explain the *Phænomena*, and that in ſome reſpects it is more intricate than that of *Deſcartes*. The difficulty, which makes the Carteſians moſt uneaſy, does not conſiſt in ſaying that Beaſts do readily move a thouſand different ways, but in ſaying that they expreſs Love, Hatred, Joy, Jealouſy, Fear, Grief, &c. The Syſtem of thoſe Elementary Spirits is of no uſe to explain this, ſince 'tis pretended that they put in motion the Springs of Beaſts only to procure to themſelves an agreeable Amuſement. They would not be therefore ſuch fools as to undergo Hunger, Cold, or Pain. It were therefore neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that none of thoſe Paſſions is to be found in Beaſts, and then all the Difficulties return again; or elſe it muſt be ſaid that thoſe Spirits are Condemned to direct the Machines of Brutes, in order to expiate their Sins, by ſuffering all the Paſſions which the Peripateticks aſcribe to Beaſts: which is againſt the Suppoſition of the *Gabaliſt* Philoſopher. I omit ſeveral other Difficulties as great as theſe, which may be raiſed againſt that Syſtem falſly ſaid to be *bene trovato*.

You'll find in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (m), that M. *Vallade*, Author of a Philoſophical Diſcourſe concerning the Creation and ordering of the World, has explained the moſt ſurpriſing Actions of Brutes by Mechanical Laws. The ſame *Nouvelles* (n) inform us, that M. *de la Bruyere* was Criticiſ'd for aſſerting *that Beaſts are nothing but Matter*. There is in the fine Book of *Don* (o) *Francis Lami*, about the Knowledge of ones ſelf, an Explanation, (p) wherein the Author ſhews that *there is no ſolid reaſon to aſcribe Knowledge and Immortality to the Souls of Beaſts; whereas it cannot be reaſonably denied that Human Souls have both.* That Explanation is worth reading, eſpecially, becauſe it contains a Solution of the moſt perplexing difficulty of the Carteſian Syſtem; for Don *Lami* ſhews that any Body may be Convinced by very ſtrong Arguments, that other Men are not meer Machines: And yet the *Anti-Carteſians* draw ſuch an Inference, if it be true that Brutes are made up of Organs ſo well contrived, that they may do without Knowledge whatever they do. If God, ſay they, was able to form ſuch a Machine, he might alſo make others that would perform all the Actions of Man, and conſequently we could not be ſure that any other Man thinks beſides us. Father *Gilbert*, Regius Profeſſor in the Univerſity of *Toulouſe*, is one of thoſe who have Publiſh'd ſome Books (q) againſt the Opinion of the Carteſians about the Souls of Beaſts. Note, that this Opinion has been aſſerted in a Courſe of Philoſophy taught (r) at *Paris*, in the College *of the four Nations*, and afterwards Printed in the ſame City in the Year 1695. with this Title, *Inſtitutio Philoſophica ad faciliorem veterum ac recentiorum Philoſophorum lectionem comparata.* It contains 4 Volumes in 12. What concerns the Senſitive Soul is to be ſeen in the third Volume from Page 271. to Page 292. I don't queſtion that Dr. *Bayle*, a Phyſician and Profeſſor of the Liberal Arts at *Toulouſe*, has imbraced *Deſcartes*'s Opinion upon this Head in his Phyſicks, which he has lately Publiſh'd in 3 Volumes in Quarto (s).

I could make a long Supplement upon what I have ſaid above, concerning M. *Peires*'s Opinion; but I had rather ſupreſs it, and only point out a Writer (t), who made a very Learned Collection relating to the Doctrine of the Platoniſts, about the Etherial Matter, which attends Souls at their Entrance into Bodies, and at their going out of them.

(L) *Of the Obſervations which I deſign to make upon* M. Leibniz's *Reflections.*] I declare firſt of all, that I am very glad I have propoſed ſome ſmall Difficulties againſt the Syſtem of that great Philoſopher, ſince they have occaſion'd ſome Anſwers, whereby that Subject has been made clearer to me, and I have more diſtinctly diſcover'd the wonderful part of it. I look now upon that Syſtem as an important Conqueſt, which enlarges the Bounds of Philoſophy. We had only two Hypotheſes, that of the Schools, and that of the *Carteſians*: The one was a way

(a) In October 1686, pag. 1196, & ſeq.

(b) Nouveaux eſſais de morale, pag. [illegible]

(c) Ibid. pag. 32.

(d) Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres Oct. 1700. pag. 419, 420.

(e) Grot. de jure belli & pacis proleg. n. 7.

(f) In the 7th Chapter of his Examen de Ingenios para las Sciencias.

(g) Nos enim brutorum inſtinctum ad inſtinctum referimus naturæ, cum Sperlingio noſtro l. 1. inſtit. phyſ. cap. 6. qu. 3. & cum [illegible] *Joh. Frid. Hornio* de ſubject. jur. nat. c. 6. *Ziegler* in prolegomena *Grotii* pag. 5.

(h) *Oſiander* ubi ſupra, p. 48. & ſeq.

(i) *Voſſius* de origine & prog. idol. lib. 3. cap. 42. p. m. 952.

(k) Melanges d'hiſt. & de litterature, tom. 1. pag. 100. & ſeq. Rouen 1700.

have been publiſh'd in the Journal of Mr. *Baſnage*; for thoſe *Remarks* are a
Natural

way of Influence of the Body upon the Soul, and of the Soul upon the Body; the other was *a way of aſſiſtance, or occaſional* cauſality. But here is a new Acquiſition, a new Hypotheſis, which may be call'd, as Father *Lami* ſtyles it (a), *a way of pre-eſtabliſh'd harmony*. We are beholden for it to Mr. *Leibniz*, and 'tis impoſſible to conceive any thing, that gives us a nobler Idea of the Power and Wiſdom of the Author of all things. This, together with the advantage of removing all Notions of a miraculous Conduct, would move me to prefer this new Syſtem to that of the *Carteſians*, if I could conceive a poſſibility in the way of *pre-eſtabliſh'd Harmony*. I deſire the Reader to take notice, that tho' I confeſs that this way removes all Notions of a miraculous Conduct, yet I don't retract what I have ſaid formerly, (b) That the Syſtem of Occaſional Cauſes does not bring in God acting miraculouſly. I am as much perſuaded as ever I was, that an Action cannot be ſaid to be miraculous, unleſs God produces it as an Exception to the general Laws; and that every thing, of which he is immediately the Author, according to thoſe Laws, is diſtinct from a Miracle properly ſo call'd. But being willing to clear this Diſpute from as many things as I can poſſibly, I conſent it ſhould be ſaid that the ſureſt way of removing all Notions that include a Miracle, is to ſuppoſe that created Beings are actually the immediate Cauſes of the effects of Nature. I will therefore lay aſide what I might anſwer to that part of Mr. *Leibniz*'s Anſwer. I will alſo ſuppreſs all the Objections which are not more contrary to his Opinion, than to that of ſome other Philoſophers. I will not therefore inſiſt upon the Difficulties that may be raiſed againſt this Suppoſition, That a Creature can receive from God the power of moving it ſelf. They are very great, (c) and almoſt unanſwerable; but Mr. *Leibniz*'s Syſtem dos not lie more open to them than that of the *Ariſtotelians*. Nay, I don't know whether the *Carteſians* would ſay, That God cannot communicate to our Souls a power of acting. If they ſay ſo, how can they own that *Adam* ſinned? And if they dare not ſay ſo, they weaken the Arguments, whereby they endeavour to prove, that Matter is ſuſceptible of no manner of activity. Nor do I believe that it is more difficult for Mr. *Leibniz* than for the *Carteſians*, or other Philoſophers, to free himſelf from the Objection of a fatal Mechaniſm, which deſtroys human Liberty. Wherefore waving this, I ſhall only ſpeak of what is peculiar to the Syſtem of the *pre-eſtabliſh'd Harmony*.

I. My firſt Obſervation is, That it raiſes the Power and Wiſdom of the Divine Art above whatever can be conceiv'd. Fancy to your ſelf a Ship, which having neither Senſations, nor Knowledge, and being not directed by any created or uncreated Being, has the Power of moving it ſelf ſo exactly as to have always a favourable Wind, to avoid Currents and Rocks, to caſt Anchor where it ought to be done, and to retire into a Harbour preciſely when there is occaſion for it: ſuppoſe ſuch a Ship ſails in that manner for ſeveral Years, being always turn'd and ſituated as it ought to be, according to the ſeveral changes of the Air, and the different ſituation of Seas and Lands; you will acknowledge that God, notwithſtanding his infinite Power, cannot communicate ſuch a Faculty to a Ship; nay, you will ſay that the nature of a Ship is not capable of receiving it from God. And yet what Mr. *Leibniz* ſuppoſes about the Machine of a Human Body is more admirable and ſurpriſing than all this. Let us apply his Syſtem concerning the Union of the Soul with the Body to the Perſon of *Julius Cæſar*.

II. We muſt ſay according to this Syſtem that the Body of *Julius Cæſar* did ſo exerciſe its moving faculty, that from its Birth to its Death, it went through continual Changes, which did moſt exactly anſwer the perpetual Changes of a certain Soul which it did not know, and which made no impreſſion upon it. We muſt ſay that the Rule, according to which that Faculty of *Cæſar*'s Body exerted it ſelf, was ſuch that he would have gone to the Senate upon ſuch a day, and at ſuch an hour; that he would have ſpoke there ſuch and ſuch Words, *&c.* tho' God had been willing to annihilate his Soul the next day after it was created. We muſt ſay that this moving Faculty did punctually change and modify it ſelf according to the volubility of the Thoughts of that ambitious Spirit; and that it was affected preciſely in a certain manner, rather than in another, becauſe the Soul of *Cæſar* paſs'd from a certain Thought to another. Can a blind Power modify it ſelf ſo exactly by virtue of an Impreſſion, communicated Thirty or Forty Years before, and which was never renewed ſince, and which is left to it ſelf, without ever knowing what it is to do? Is not this much more incomprehenſible than the Navigation I ſpoke of in the foregoing Paragraph?

III. The Difficulty will be greater ſtill, if it be conſider'd that the Machine of man contains an almoſt infinite number of Organs, and (d) that it is continually expoſed to the Shock of the Bodies that ſurround it, which by an innumerable variety of ſhakings, produce in it a thouſand ſorts of modifications. How can it be conceived that this *pre-eſtabliſh'd Harmony* ſhould never be diſorder'd, but go on ſtill during the longeſt life of a Man, notwithſtanding the infinite varieties of the reciprocal action of ſo many Organs upon one another, which are ſurrounded on all ſides with infinite Corpuſcles, ſometimes hot and ſometimes cold, ſometimes dry and ſometimes moiſt, and always acting and pricking the Nerves a thouſand different ways? Suppoſe the multitude of Organs and external Agents be a neceſſary Inſtrument of the almoſt infinite variety of Changes in a human Body; will that variety have the requiſite juſtneſs? Will it never diſturb the Correſpondence of thoſe Changes with the Changes of the Soul? This ſeems to be altogether impoſſible.

IV. 'Tis in vain to have recourſe to the power of God, in order to maintain that Brutes are meer Machines; 'tis in vain to ſay that God was able to make Machines ſo artfully contriv'd that the Voice of a Man, the reflected Light of an Object, *&c.* will Strike them exactly where it is neceſſary, that they may move in a certrin manner. This Suppoſition is rejected by every body, except ſome *Carteſians*; and no *Carteſian* would admit of it, if it were to be extended to Man, that is, if any one ſhould aſſert, that God was able to form ſuch Bodies as would machinally do whatever we ſee other Men do. By denying this, we do not pretend to limit the Power and Knowledge of God; we only mean that the nature of things does not permit, that the Faculties, imparted to a Creature ſhould not be neceſſarily confined within certain bounds. The actions of Creatures muſt be neceſſarily proportion'd to their Eſſential State, and performed according to the Character that belongs to each Machine; for according to the Axiom of the Philoſophers, (e) whatever is receiv'd, is proportion'd to the capacity of the Subject that receives it. We may therefore reject M. *Leibniz*'s Hypotheſis as being impoſſible, ſince it is liable to greater difficulties than that of the *Carteſians* about the Souls of Brutes. He puts a perpetual Harmony between two Beings, which do not act one upon another; but if Servants were meer Machines, and ſhould punctually obey their Maſters commands, it could not be ſaid, that they do it without a real action of their Maſters upon them: for their Maſters would ſpeak ſome Words, and make ſome Signs, that would really ſhake and move the Organs of the Servants.

V. Now let us conſider the Soul of *Julius Cæſar*, and we'll find the thing more impoſſible ſtill. That Soul was in the World without being expoſed to the Influence of any Body or Spirit. The power it had receiv'd from God, was the only principle of the actions it produced at every moment: And if thoſe Actions were different from one another, it was not becauſe ſome of 'em were produced by the Concourſe of ſome Springs, which did not contribute to the production of others; for the Soul of Man is ſimple, indiviſible, and immaterial. Mr. *Leibniz* owns it: and if he did not acknowledge it, but on the contrary, if he ſhould ſuppoſe with moſt Philoſophers, and ſome (f) of the moſt excellent Metaphyſicians of our Age, that a Compound of many material parts placed and diſpoſed in a certain manner, is capable of thinking; his Hypotheſis would appear to me for that very thing abſolutely impoſſible, and I could refute it ſeveral other ways, which I need not mention, ſince he acknowledges the Immateriality of the Soul, and builds upon it. I return to the Soul of *Julius Cæſar*, and I'll call it an (g) immaterial *Automaton*, and will
compare

(a) Dom. Franc. Lami, re. Connoiſſance de ſoi même, pag. 226. edit. 1699.

(b) See the Memorial which Mr. Leibniz, has cauſed to be inſerted in the Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans, July 1698. pag. 344.

(c) See Mr. Sturmius in the firſt Tome of the Phyſica electiva ſive hypothetica (whereof an Extract is to be found in the Journal of Leipſick 1697. pag. 4..&

(d) *Obſerve, that according to Mr.* **Leibniz,** *what is active in every ſubſtance, ought to be reduced to a true Unity. Since therefore the Body of every Man is compoſed of many Subſtances, each of them ought to have a Principle of action really diſtinct from the Principle of each of the others. He will have the action of every Principle to be ſpontaneous. Now this muſt needs vary their effects,* ad infinitum, *and confound them. For the impreſſion of the neighbouring Bodies muſt needs put ſome conſtraint upon the natural ſpontaneity of every one of them.*

(e) Quidquid, recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipitur.

(f) Mr. Locke *for inſtance.*

(g) Mr. Leibniz *uſes this expreſſion* ubi ſupra, pag. 338. *The Soul,* ſays he, *is a moſt exact immaterial* Automaton.

Natural and neceſſary Conſequence of a Paſſage of the firſt Edition of this Article. I hope they will occaſion the clearing of a Subject, which is not leſs difficult than important.

ROSE

compare it with an Atome of *Epicurus*; I mean an Atome ſurrounded with a *Vacuum* on all ſides, and which would never meet any other Atome. This is a very juſt Compariſon, for this Atome on the one hand, has a natural Power of moving it ſelf, and exerts it without any aſſiſtance, and without being retarded or hindred by any thing; and on the other hand, the Soul of *Cæſar* is a Spirit, which has receiv'd the Faculty of producing Thoughts, and exerts it without the influence of any other Spirit, or of any Body. It is neither aſſiſted nor thwarted by any thing whatſoever. If you conſult common Notions, and the Ideas of Order, you will find that this Atome can never ſtop, and that having been in motion in the fore-going moment, it will continue in it at this very moment, and in all the moments that ſhall follow it, and that it will always move in the ſame manner. This is the conſequence of an Axiom approved by M. *Leibniz*: Since (a) *a thing does always remain in the ſame ſtate wherein it happens to be, unleſs it receives ſome alteration from ſome other thing*; (b)——— *I conclude, ſays he, not only that a Body which is at reſt, will always be at reſt; but alſo that a Body in motion, will always keep that motion or change, that is, the ſame ſwiftneſs, and the ſame direction, if nothing happens that hinders it.* Every one clearly ſees that this Atome, whether it moves by an innate Power, as *Democritus* and *Epicurus* would have it, or by a power receiv'd from God, will always move in the ſame Line equally, and after an uniform manner, without ever turning aſide, or going back. *Epicurus* was laugh'd at, when he invented the motion of *declination*; it was a precarious Suppoſition which he wanted to get out of the Labyrinth of a fatal neceſſity, and he could give no reaſon for this new part of his Syſtem. It was inconſiſtent with the cleareſt Notions of our Minds; for 'tis evident that an Atome, which deſcribes a ſtrait Line for the ſpace of two days, cannot turn away at the beginning of the third, unleſs it meets with ſome Obſtacle, or has a mind, all of a ſudden, to go out of its Road, or contains ſome Spring which begins to play at that very moment. The firſt of theſe Reaſons cannot be admitted in a *Vacuum*. The Second is impoſſible, ſince an Atome has not the Faculty of Thinking. And the Third is likewiſe impoſſible in a Corpuſcle that is a perfect unity. I muſt make ſome uſe of all this.

VI. *Cæſar*'s Soul is a Being to which Unity belongs in a ſtrict Senſe. The Faculty of (c) producing Thoughts is a Property of its Nature, which it has receiv'd from God. If the firſt Thought it produces is a Senſe of Pleaſure, there's no reaſon why the Second ſhould not be likewiſe a Senſe of Pleaſure; for when the total cauſe of an effect remains the ſame, the effect cannot be altered. Now this Soul at the ſecond moment of its exiſtence, does not receive a new Faculty of thinking; it only preſerves the Faculty it had at the firſt moment, and it is as independent from the concourſe of any other cauſe at the ſecond moment as it was at the firſt; it muſt therefore produce again at the ſecond moment the ſame Thought it had produced juſt before. If it be objected that it ought to be in a ſtate of change, and that it would not be in ſuch a ſtate, in the caſe that I have ſuppoſed; I anſwer that its change will be like the change of the Atome: For an Atome, which continually moves in the ſame line, acquires a new ſituation at every moment; but it is like the preceding ſituation. A Soul may therefore continue in its ſtate of change, if it does but produce a new Thought like the preceding. But ſuppoſe it be not confined within ſuch narrow bounds, it muſt be granted at leaſt, that its going from one Thought to another implies ſome reaſon of affinity. If I ſuppoſe that in a certain Inſtant the Soul of *Cæſar* ſees a Tree with Leaves and Bloſſoms, I can (d) conceive that it does immediately deſire to ſee one that has only Bloſſoms, and then one that has only Leaves; and that it will thus ſucceſſively produce ſeveral Images ariſing from one another; but one cannot apprehend the poſſibility of the odd changes of Thoughts, that have no affinity with, and are even contrary to one another, and which are ſo common in Mens Souls: One cannot apprehend how God could place in the Soul of *Julius Cæſar* the Principle of what I am going to ſay. He was without doubt pricked with a Pin more than once, when he was ſucking; and therefore according to Mr. *Leibniz*'s Hypotheſis, his Soul muſt have produced in it ſelf, a Senſe of Pain after the pleaſant ſenſations of the ſweetneſs of the Milk, which it had enjoy'd for the ſpace of two or three Minutes. By what Springs was it determin'd to interrupt its Pleaſures, and to give it ſelf all of a ſudden a ſenſe of Pain, without receiving any intimation of preparing it ſelf for ſuch a Change, and without any new alteration in its Subſtance? If you run over the Life of that *Roman* Emperor, every Page will afford you Matter for a ſtronger Objection than this is.

VII. The thing would be leſs incomprehenſible, if it were ſuppoſed that the Soul of Man is not one Spirit, but rather a Multitude of Spirits, each of which has its Functions, that begin and end preciſely as the changes made in a Human Body require it. By virtue of this Suppoſition it ſhould be ſaid, that ſomething analogous to a great number of Wheels and Springs, or of matters that ferment, diſpos'd according to the changes of our Machine, awakens or lulls aſleep for a certain time, the action of each of thoſe Spirits; but then the Soul of Man would be no longer a ſingle Subſtance, but an *Ens per aggregationem*, a heap of Subſtances juſt like material Beings. We are about a ſingle Being, which produces in it ſelf ſometimes Joy, ſometimes Pain, &c. and not about many Beings, one of which produces Hope, another Deſpair, &c.

In theſe Obſervations I have only cleared and unfolded thoſe, which Mr. *Leibniz* has done me the Honour to examin; and now I ſhall make ſome Reflections upon his Anſwers.

VIII. He ſays, that (e) *The Law of the Change which happens in the Subſtance of an Animal tranſports him from pleaſure to pain, at the very moment that a Solution of continuity is made in his Body; becauſe the Law of the indiviſible Subſtance of that Animal, is to repreſent what is done in his Body, as we experience it, and even to repreſent in ſome manner, and with reſpect to that Body, whatever is done in the World.* Theſe words are a very good Explication of the grounds of this Syſtem, they are, as it were, the Key, and unfolding of it; but at the ſame time they are the very things at which all the Objections of thoſe, who take this Syſtem to be impoſſible, are levelled. The Law Mr. *Leibniz* ſpeaks of, ſuppoſes a Decree of God, and ſhews wherein this Syſtem agrees with that of Occaſional Cauſes. Thoſe two Syſtems agree in this point, that there are ſome Laws, according to which the Soul of Man is *to repreſent what is done in the Body of Man, as we experience it*. But they diſagree as to the manner of executing thoſe Laws: The *Carteſians* ſay, that God executes them: Mr. *Leibniz* will have it, that the Soul does it; which appears to me impoſſible, becauſe the Soul has not the neceſſary Inſtruments for ſuch an Execution. Now tho' the Power and Knowledge of God be Infinite, he cannot perform with a Machine deprived of a certain piece, what requires the concourſe of ſuch a piece. He muſt ſupply that Defect; but then this Effect would be produced by him and not by the Machine. I ſhall ſhew that the Soul has not the Inſtruments requiſite for the Execution of the Divine Law, we ſpeak of, and in order to it I ſhall make uſe of a Compariſon.

Fancy to your ſelf an Animal Created by God, and deſign'd to Sing Continually. He will doubtleſs Sing at all times; but if God will have him to Sing a certain Set of Tunes, he muſt neceſſarily put it before his Eyes, or Imprint it upon his Memory, or diſpoſe his Muſcles in ſuch a manner, that according to the Laws of Mechaniſm, a certain Tune will always come after another, agreeably to the Order of the Tablature. Without this one cannot apprehend that this Animal can ever follow the whole Set of the Notes appointed by God. Let us apply this to Man's Soul. M. *Leibniz* will have it, that it has received not only the Power of producing a continual Series of Thoughts, but alſo the Faculty of following always a certain Set of Thoughts, which anſwers the continual Changes that happen in the Body. This Set of Thoughts is like the Set of Notes preſcribed to the Singing Animal above mention'd. Can the Soul Change its Perceptions or Modifications at every Moment, according to ſuch a Set of Thoughts, with-

out

(a) *Memorial inſerted in the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans *ubi ſupra pag.* 331

(b) *Mr.* Leibniz, *ibid. declares that he acknowledges the truth of this Axiom; nay, ſays he,* I maintain that it is favourable to me, and indeed it is one of the things I build upon.

(c) *This I ſay, according to Mr.* Leibniz's *Syſtem.*

(d) *I ſpeak thus by way of conceſſion; That is to ſay, I will not take advantage of the Reaſons which hinder us from conceiving that a created Spirit can of himſelf frame any Ideas.*

ROSE (*William*) Preacher to *Henry* III. and Bishop of *Senlis*, the most violent *Leaguer* that was in *France*. See the Notes upon the *Catholicon d'Espagne* *; to which you may add this Circumstance, that he refused to pull off his Episcopal Habits, when the Parliament of *Paris* condemned him to make an *Honourable Amand*; and that he made it in his *Pontificalibus* the 5th of *December* 1598 †. Mr. *de Launoi* is very much to blame for having bestowed α so many Encomiums upon that Prelate, without censuring him in the least. 'Tis a scandalous thing.

ROSES, a Town of *Catalonia*. It was only an Abbey β, when *Charles* V. built there a Town and a Fortress, Thirty five *Toises* from the Sea, in an open Country. That Town has the *Mediterranean* Sea on the *South*, the Plain of *Lampurdan* and a Pond on the *West*, and the *Pyrenees* on the *East* and *North*. It is fortify'd with five Bastions lin'd with Free-stone. It remain'd faithful to the King of *Spain*, when all *Catalonia* revolted to *France* in the Year 1640. *Du Plessis-Pralin* laid siege to it in 1645, and took it 57 Days after the opening of the Trenches; for which he was made Marechal of *France*. The *Spaniards* having almost recover'd all *Catalonia* during the Civil War of *France*, could not for all that re-take *Roses*. They kept it Block'd up Nine Months, and reduc'd the Garrison to an Extreme Famine; but they retir'd upon the approach of the *French* Succours. This happen'd in 1653. *Roses* was restored to 'em by the *Pyrenean* Treaty, in 1659, and they lost it (*Z*) in the Year 1693. The Bay of *Roses* is above four Leagues in compass, and begins at the end of the *Pyrenean* Mountains, at the Castle of the *Trinity*, and ends much about the little Town of *Empurias*. It has no Ports, being only a shallow Road which neither Ships nor Gallies can come to for want of Water. But between the Castle of the *Trinity* and the Town, there is a small Hollow, where great Ships may stay for some time upon a Necessity. A League and a half beyond the Castle, as one goes towards *Roussillon* and out of the Bay, there is a γ Burrough call'd *Capdequiers*, which depends upon the Government of *Roses*, and has a pretty good Harbour δ.

ROSIER. ε(*Hugh Sureau du*) in Latin, *Hugo Sureus* || *Rosarius*, was a famous Minister of the Church of *Orleans*, under the Reign of *Charles* IX. He was Born † *Rosoy* in *Tierache*, in the Province of *Picardy*. He was imprison'd at *Orleans*, in the Year 1566, being suspected (*A*) of having Publish'd a Book full of Seditious Maxims. But he

out knowing the Series of the Notes, and actually thinking upon them? But experience teaches us, that it knows nothing of it. It were at least necessary, that in default of such a Knowledge, there should be in the Soul a Set of particular Instruments, each of which would be a necessary cause of a certain Thought. They should be so placed and disposed as to operate precisely one after another, according to the Correspondence *pre-establish'd* betwixt the Changes of the Body and the Thoughts of the Soul. But it is most certain, that an immaterial, simple, and indivisible Substance, cannot be made up of such an innumerable multitude of particular Instruments placed one before another, according to the Order of the Tablature in question. It is not therefore possible that a Human Soul should execute that Law.

M. *Leibniz* (*a*) supposes that the Soul does not distinctly know its future perceptions, *but that it perceives them confusedly*, and that *there are in each Substance* (*b*) *Tracks of whatever happens, and shall happen to it; but that infinite Multitude of Perceptions hinders us from distinguishing them*——*The present state of each* Substance, is a natural consequence of its preceding State ——— (*c*) *The Soul, tho' never so simple, has always a Sentiment composed of many Perceptions at one time; which answers our end as well as if it was composed of pieces, like a Machine. For each fore-going perception has an influence upon those that follow, agreeably to a Law of Order, which is in Perceptions as well as in Motions*—— (*d*) *The Perceptions that are to be found together in one and the same Soul at the same time, including an infinite multitude of little undistinguishable Sentiments that are to be unfolded, we need not wonder at the infinite variety of what is to result from it in time. This is only a consequence of the representative nature of the Soul, which is to express what happens, and what will happen in its Body, and in some manner in all other Bodies, by the Connexion and Correspondence of all the parts of the World.* I have but little to say in answer to this: I shall only observe, that this Supposition, if it be clear'd, is the right way of resolving all the Difficulties. M. *Leibniz*, thro' the penetration of his great Genius, has very well conceiv'd the whole extent and strength of the Objection, and what remedy ought to be applied to the main Inconveniency. I don't question but that he will smooth the rough part of his System, and teach us some excellent things about the Nature of Spirits. No body can travel more usefully than he in the intelligible World. I hope that his Explanations will remove all the Impossibilities, which I have found hitherto in his System, and that he will solidly resolve my Difficulties, and even those (*e*) of Father *Lami*; and these Hopes made me say before, without designing to pass a Compliment upon that Learned Man, that his System ought to be look'd upon as an important Conquest.

Here is a Difficulty which he will doubtless remove: Whereas according to the Supposition of the *Cartesians*, there is but one general Law for the Union of all Spirits with Bodies; he will have it, That God gives a particular Law to each Spirit: From whence it seems (*f*) to result, that the Primitive Constitution of each Spirit is specifically different from all others. Don't the *Thomists* say, That there are as many *Species* as *Individuums* in the Angelical nature?

(*Z*) *And they lost it in the Year* 1693.] The Marechal and Duke of *Noailles* Besieg'd it about the latter end of *May*, and oblig'd the Governor *Don Pedro Robi* to Capitulate the 9th of *June*. The Castle of the *Trinity*, at the Entrance of the Bay of *Roses*, and within Cannon shot of the Place, was taken four Days after.

(*A*) *Being suspected of having Publish'd a Book full of Seditious Maxims.*] *Beza* gives an Account of that Libel. "(*g*) At that (*h*) time, *says he*, there "came out a Book printed under-hand at *Lyons*, "without the Name of the Author, and Printer, "and Intitul'd, *La Defense Civile & Militaire des* "*Innocens, & de l'Eglise de Christ*, written without "doubt by a Wicked and Seditious Person. The "said Book falling into the Hands of some Honest "Men, all means were used to know from whence "it came, but it was in vain. Only there was a "strong suspicion, that *Charles du Moulin*, a famous Civilian, and Advocate of the Parliament "of *Paris*, who was then at *Lyons*, and had sided "with the Protestants from the time of King *Henry*, was the Author of it; having always be"fore, and ever since appear'd a very fantastical "Man. But he denied it with great Oaths, right or "wrong. *Lyons* was then in the Hands of the Protestants: *Soubise* who commanded in it, enjoined the Ministers to examin that Book, and they gave their Judgment about it in the following Words. "(*i*) We, Ministers of the Word of God, in the "Reformed Church of *Lyons*—— having invoked "the Name of God, and seen a certain Book lately Printed, and Intituled, *La Defense Civile &*

---

* [illegible] upon the *Catholicon d'Espagne*, pag. [illegible] & seqq. edit. 1696. See also pag. 67.

† Thuanus, [illegible] pag. [illegible]

α Launoi in Histor. Collegii Navarr. pag. 1019. & seq.

β Baudrand *in Rhoda*.

γ *It was formerly a strong Place.*

δ *Taken from a Relation of the Siege of Roses Publish'd in* 1693.

ε *Some call him* des Rosiers.

|| Thuanus *says* Sorellus, Roserius lib. 34. p. 687. & Sorellus Rosarius, lib. 52. pag. 1088.

† La Croix du Maine, pag. 173.

(*a*) Ibid. pag. 337.

(*b*) This is [illegible]

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 339.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 340.

(*e*) *They are in the* 2d *Discourse of Self-knowledge, from* pag. 225. *to* pag. 243. *Paris* Edit. 1699.

(*f*) *There never were two Men, who had the same Thoughts, I will not say a Months together, but even two Minutes. The Principle of Thought must therefore have a particular Rule and Nature in every Man.*

(*g*) Beza, Histoire Ecclesiast. *Book* 11. pag. 244.

(*h*) *That is in the year* 1563.

(*i*) Beza Ibid.

he was set at liberty, because they could not Convict him of it. He and another Minister

" Militaire des Hommes & de l'Eglise de Christ, do " arrest and certifie, That it is full of a false and " wicked Doctrine, being in some points the same " with that of the Anabaptists, and inducing Men " to sedition and Rebellion, and to disobey Kings " and Princes against the express Command of God; " so much the more, because the Author of it makes " an ill use of many Passages and Examples of the " Holy Scripture, which he wrongfully applies to " his Opinions, against their true Sense and meaning, " as we are ready to make it appear by the Word " of God. For which reason we desire that the said " Book be wholly supprest, that Men may not be " infected with such a Seditious and Pestilential " Doctrine. Pursuant to this Censure, *Sorbise* order'd (a) That all those who had this Book, should bring it to him within 24 Hours, and that all those who should sell it, or hand it about, should be hanged without any Tryal; and he had it burnt by (b) the common Hang-man in the four principal places of the Town, the 12th of *June*, 1563. (c) *Thus things went as to this Book*, Says *Beza*: " And several Years " after, *du Rosier*, a Minister of *Orleans*, who was " not then at *Lyons* but at *Orleans*, and knew no " more what was done at *Lyons* than what passed in " the *Indies*, was accus'd of being the Author of it. " And accordingly he was Arrested, and sent Prisoner " to *Paris* with great noise, as if the Protestants " approv'd that Doctrine. But God would " have it that the Truth should quickly come out, " tho' *du Rosier* had powerful Enemies, particularly " *Birague*, who some Years after was undeservedly " made Governor of *Lyons*. *Thuanus* mentions in a few Words, the Proceedings relating to this Book; but he observes (d) that it was fallly ascrib'd to the Civilian, *Charles du Moulin*. *Deckherus* has misrepresented the Title of that Book. *Eodem*, (superiori seculo) says he, (e) *non expresso Authoris nomine vulgatus libellus* de potestate principis *Lugduni combustus*, &c. One of those who Publish'd some Animadversions upon *Deckerrus*, express'd himself in a doubtful manner upon occasion of those Words; which he should not have done: He was uncertain whether that Book was different from that which was Printed at *Paris* in 1589, with this Title, *Traité de la puissance des Rois contre le Roy de Navarre*. Had he known that *du Moulin* had been (f) dead long before the Right of the King of *Navarre* came to be spoken of, he would have said positively, that those two Books were very different one from another: Here is a *non liquet*, which is not much to his Honour. (g) *An vero iste tractatus idem sit de quo Cl. Deckherus pag.* 338. *loquitur tanquam Lugduni combusto, & falso adscripto Carolo Molinaeo J. C. sed quem alii tribuunt* Hugoni Sorello Roserio, *non mihi liquet*.

I must take notice of some Faults of *Davila*. He says, that in the Year 1566, a Minister Born at *Orleans*, preach'd a Seditious Sermon, after he had Publish'd a Book wherein he maintain'd that the *French* ought to obey the King no longer, and might lawfully Kill him, since he was an Idolatrous Prince. (h) *Nè erano meno ardite le penne de gli Ugonotti di quello, che si fossero l'armi, perche in questo medesimo tempo un Ministro, nativo di Orliens, andava seditiosamente predicando contro alla podestà del Re, & havea anco stampato un libro, nel quale sosteneva, che il popolo Francese non era piu in obligo d'obbedire al Re, per esser egli diventato idolatra, & per questa ragione contendeva ancora, che si potesse lecitamente ammazzare; dalla quale empia, e diabolica semente è poi successivamente derivata in altri tempi, & in altre persone, quella pestifera dottrina, che con horribile perversione d'ogni legge divina, & humana ha insegnato a gli huomini ad insanguinarsi le mani sotto pretesto di pietà, e di religione, nelle viscere de i Re legitimi, constituiti sopra gli huomini per rappresentanti di Dio.* 'Tis plain he means the Minister *du Rosier*, who was imprison'd that Year, under pretence of a Seditious Libel. But 1. That Minister was not a Native of *Orleans*. 2. He did not preach against the King's Power; for if his Sermons had been Seditious, it had been no difficult thing to Convict him of Rebellion. *Birague* his Enemy, who caus'd him to be imprison'd, as being the Author of a Libel, would not have been cast for want of Proofs: Had he had none as to the Book, the Sermons would have afforded him some, which had been sufficient to Prosecute him. And therefore since that Minister was set at liberty, 'tis manifest his sermons were not such as *Davila* represents them to be. I cannot believe that the Book, which was burnt at *Lyons*, taught that the killing of Kings was a lawful thing: Had it contain'd such an execrable Doctrine, the Ministers who censur'd it, would have thundered more terribly against it than they did. I confess that *la Croix du Maine*, a Protestant Author, says, That *du Rosier* writ a *French* Book amongst others, (i) *wherein he endeavours to shew that it is lawful to kill a King and a Queen, who will not imbrace the Reformed Religion, and side with the Protestants*: But I believe he said this without having read the Libel, that was Burnt by *Soubise*'s Order, and if I am not mistaken, he goes only upon the credit of the Authors quoted by him. *See, says he, The French History of our time of the last edition enlarged by* John le Frere de Leval, *and* Belleforest *in the* 2d *Volume of his great Annals of* France, *fol.* 16.., 1563, &c. *Varillas*, who certainly would not have extenuated the Heinousness of that Libel, speaks of it as of a Book levell'd at the Monarchical Authority. But there is a vast difference between this and teaching that Kings may be lawfully murdered. I must set down the whole Passage of that Historian. " (k) *Soubise*, before his Departure (l), caused a Seditious " Book lately come out, to be Burnt by the " Hang man. The *Calvinists* ascrib'd it to the famous " Civilian *Charles du Moulin*; which they did " probably out of spite against him, because he was " the only *French*-man, who adhered to the Lutheran " Sect, and refused to join with them: for *du* " *Moulin*'s Style and Character did not appear in that " Book. It was, properly speaking, a Satyr against " all Christian Monarchies, which he pretended to " overthrow by several Passages of the Holy Scripture " curtail'd or wrested to another Sense. The " Catholick Writers say that it was written by a *Calvinist* " Minister; that it was not their first Attempt " of that kind against the Authority of Kings; " and that three Years before in 1560, they held a " Synod at *Chalons* upon *Saone*, wherein they declared " that the equality of Conditions was the " most certain Privilege of the Gospel-Liberty purchased " by the Blood of Christ. But that Synod is " not to be found in the Collection (m) of the Twenty " six first Synods held in *France* by the pretended " Reformed. There is nothing to be seen about it " any where, except in the Writings of their Adversaries; " besides, 'tis not likely that their Ministers " should have taken upon themselves, without " consulting *Calvin*, to lay down, as the Foundation " of their Religion, a Paradox so well Confuted in " *Aristotle*'s Morals, and so dangerous, that it tended " to the Destruction not only of *Calvinism*, but also " of all Civil Societies. This Passage does not contain many things that the *French* Protestants can complain of; on the contrary they may praise the Equity of that Author, who justifies 'em very well. But his Marginal Note has been a Snare to some Learned Men. Their Fault, tho' very excusable, is of great Moment. I call it an excusable Fault; because a *French* Reader will be apt to take that Note in the same sense that was put upon it in the *Acta Eruditorum*, unless he uses great attention. Any one that reads that Marginal Note of *Varillas*, will presently think that he saw among the Manuscripts of *Lomenie* the Acts of the Synod, which the Protestants have not inserted in the Collection of their 26 first Synods. The Learned Authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* understood it so. This Sense does a great deal of Wrong to the Reformed: For were it true that there is in the Collection of their Synods, among the Manuscripts of *Lomenie*, a Synod held in 1560, which declar'd for the equality of Conditions; One would be apt to believe that they made a Decision about it in the Year 1560. which afterwards they thought fit to suppress with all the Acts of that Assembly. It is therefore expedient that every Body should know that the Word *it* in the Marginal Note refers to the word *Collection*, and not to the word *Synod*. *Varillas* means that he has seen among the Collections of *Lomenie*, the Collection of the 26 First Synods held by the *French* Protestants, and that he has not found in it the Synod of the Year 1560, which declared, as 'tis said, That Men ought to be all equal. The

Authors

(a) Ibid. pag. 245.

(b) Id. ibid. pag. 246.

(c) Id. ib.

(d) Quem nonnulli, sed falso, Carolo Molinaeo J. C. alii Hugoni Sorello Roserio tribuebant. Thuan. lib. 31. p. 68. ad an. 1563.

(e) Deckher. de scriptis adespotis, pag. 338.

(f) He died in the year 1566.

(g) Petrus Baelius, epistola ad Almeloveenium de scriptis adespotis ad calcem tractatus Deckherri pag. 371. edit. 1686.

(h) Davila, delle guerre civili di Francia, lib. 4. pag. m. 160. ad ann. 1566.

Miniſter diſputed in the ſame (B) Year with two Doctors of Divinity, of the Faculty of *Paris*, in the Houſe of the Duke of *Nevers*, at the inſtance of the Duke of *Montpenſier*, who was in hopes that this Diſpute would bring back the Dutcheſs of *Bouillon* his Daughter to the Catholick Church; but he was baulk'd in his Expectation. *Du* ‡ *Roſier* redeem'd his Life during the *Paris* Maſſacre, by Abjuring his Religion; and being immediately made uſe of to Exhort the King of *Navarre*, the Prince of *Condé*, &c. to imbrace the Roman Communion, and having had all the Succeſs that the Court of *France* could wiſh for, he was thought a very fit Man to make a Converter of him. He was therefore Imployed as ſuch in ſeveral Places of *Paris*, and the Court was ſo well pleaſed with the Progreſs he made, that he was ſent with the Jeſuit *Maldonat* to *Metz*, where there was a Plentiful Harveſt. He harangued and *(C)* exclaim'd againſt the Schiſm, but he was not perſuaded of the Truth of what he ſaid: For ſome Miniſters having found an Opportunity to ſpeak to him in Private, and to make him ſenſible of the Heinouſneſs of his Fault, he ſeem'd to be well diſpoſed to Mend it, and accordingly he left *Maldonat*, and retired to *Heidelberg*, where he Profeſt himſelf a Proteſtant again. He could never recover the Eſteem he had been in before he changed his Religion; and he would have been not only very much Deſpiſed, but alſo reduced

‡ This may be ſeen in Thuanus l. 52. pag. 1088.

Authors of the **Acta Eruditorum** make him ſay the quite Contrary. (1) *Ex* Manuſcriptis Lomenianis *decretum Synodi à Reformatis* Catalauni (i) *habitæ allegat, quo contra regiam poteſtatem ſtatuerint, æqualitatem* conditionis humanæ inter potiſſima privilegia libertatis Evangelicæ eſſe, quam Chriſtus ſuo ſanguine veris Chriſtianis promeruerit.

(B) *Diſputed——with two Doctors of Divinity.*] The Duke of *Montpenſier* was of Opinion that the Dutcheſs of *Bouillon* would Renounce Calviniſm, if ſhe was willing to hear Dr. *Vigor*: Nay, he conſented that the Miniſter *Spina* ſhould be preſent at it. In order to pleaſe him the Duke of *Bouillon* and Admiral *Coligni* agreed upon a Conference, which was to be held in his Houſe the 1ſt of *July*, 1566. *Spina* and *Barbaſte*, Miniſter of the Queen of *Navarre*, came thither on the appointed Day. They were ask'd, whether they intended *to Pray according to the Cuſtom of the Reformed Churches, before they ſhould begin* the Conference: They anſwered that they were reſolved upon it, and becauſe they perſiſted in that Reſolution, the whole Project was broke; and they went away having Rejected all the Expedients that were Propoſed, to prevail upon them not to make any Prayer. Dr. *Ruzé* told 'em that if they intended to Pray, he *would go out and make Water in the mean time.* He Propoſed to them to make only a mental Prayer, or to go and Pray in a Neighbouring Houſe. All theſe Propoſals were Rejected, and ſo there was no Conference *(d)*. People did not fail to ſay that *they had declined the Diſpute*: The Admiral maintain'd the contrary before the King and Queen, and that they would be ready at all times to meet the Doctors, and to defend the Confeſſion of their Churches by the Scripture. Whereupon the Duke of *Nevers* begg'd of their Majeſties that the Conference might be renew'd. The Conditions were agreed upon: Dr. *Vigor* and Dr. *de Sainctes* on the one ſide, and the Miniſters *Spina* and *Sureau* on the other began the Diſpute in his Houſe the 9th of *July*, 1566. and went on with it for ſeveral Days. Some Hiſtorians affirm that *Hugh* (a) *Sorel* was then put out of Priſon: *Mezeray* (b) and *Varillas* ſay ſo: Theſe are the Words of the latter. *(c)* The Duke of *Montpenſier* was of Opinion, that the beſt way to bring back again the Dutcheſs of *Bouillon* his Daughter to the Communion of the Catholick Church, "was a Publick Conference of two Doctors with two Miniſters; and it began at *Paris* in *Nevers-Houſe*. The Doctors were *Simon Vigor*, afterwards Arch-Biſhop of *Narbonne*, and *Claudius de Sainctes*, afterwards Biſhop of *Evreux*. The two Miniſters appointed for that Diſpute were *John de l'Eſpine*, whom I have already mention'd, and *Charles Barbaſte*, who had been a Carmelite: But *Barbaſte* being not in a Condition to come to the Conference, the Calviniſts took from thence occaſion to demand that *Hugh Sorel des Roſiers* ſhould be put in his place. *Des Roſiers* was a Miniſter, who had been Impriſon'd for Writing a Libel concerning the Authority of Magiſtrates, wherein he pretended that it was a lawful thing to deſtroy a Sovereign of a Contrary Religion. He deſerved at leaſt to be Condemn'd to a perpetual Impriſonment for ſuch a Crime; but he obtained his Pardon by the Sollicitations of thoſe of his Party, and by the Credit of the Duke of *Montpenſier*. It was thought Expedient that the Dutcheſs of *Bouillon* ſhould have no occaſion to complain, under pretence that ſhe could not have the two Miniſters, whom ſhe took to be the beſt Diſputants; and the Diſputation (2) was managed without any Heat, out of reſpect to the Illuſtrious Perſons that were preſent at it. But notwithſtanding this Moderation the Catholicks and the Calviniſts gave out that they had the Advantage. Nor did the Event clear the truth of the Matter; for if on the one ſide &c. It ſeems from the Printed Account of the Miniſters, that *du Roſier* had been ſet at Liberty, before there was a talk of making him one of the Diſputants. For when they heard that *Vigor* was Sick, and that *Sainctes* was gone from *Paris*, they were afraid that the Conferences being interrupted would remain ſo too long; and therefore they deſired to go Home, and repreſented *(d)* that they happen'd to be at *Paris only accidentally; that* Spina *was come thither to go into* Anjou; *and that the other, who was Miniſter of the Church of* Orleans, *had been lately put out of Priſon, having been carried to* Paris *laſt* June, *upon a falſe Accuſation of the Enemies of God's Church, who charged him with being the Author of a Wicked and Pernicious Book, Written againſt the Obedience that is due to Kings and Princes; and that therefore it was a great Inconveniency for him to make a long ſtay in a Town whither he was come againſt his Will. Claudius de Sainctes* got (e) that diſpute Printed.

(2) *It has been Printed.*

(d) Actes de la conference, pag. 325.

(e) *In the Year* 1568. *according to all the Bibliographers that I have conſulted. There is no likelihood that it is the firſt Edition: The relation of the Miniſters had appeared two Years before.*

(C) *He harangued and exclaim'd againſt the Schiſm, but*] *Beza* in his Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of *France*, gives an account of it in the following Words. The Marechal *de Rets* Governour of the Country call'd *Meſſin*, "*(f)* tried another way, and ſent for *du Roſier*, a Miniſter who had changed his Religion, and who was attended by a Spaniſh Jeſuit, whoſe Name was *Maldonat*: This Jeſuit was accounted the moſt Learned and the moſt Subtil Man of his Order. As for *du Roſier*, he had done at *Paris* all that he could do to pervert others, ſo far as to Print his Abjuration, and other Books full of Falſities, and which ſhewed an Ill Conſcience; whereas before, he had the Reputation of a Learned Man, as he really was, and had been choſen to Diſpute at *Paris* with Dr. *Vigor* and Dr. *de Saintes*. When that Man changed his Religion, it proved a great Scandal to many People: He endeavoured afterwards to mend the buſineſs as well as he could; but he never had ever ſince a ſound Judgment, nor an upright Conſcience, and at laſt he Died of the Plague at *Francfort*, with his Wife and all his Children. But to return to our Hiſtory, thoſe two Men being come to *Metz*, and moſt of the Proteſtants being compell'd to repair to the Biſhop's Palace upon a Sunday, *du Roſier* made a long Speech to them about the Succeſſion of Biſhops, which he ſaid was the mark of the True Church. *Beza* adds, (g) that *du Roſier being convinced of his Fault in his own Conſcience, and adviſed by good People to mend his Condition, deſired ſome help to get out of the Mire; which was granted him, and that Poor Wretch was conducted to the Church of* Heidelberg, *where he acknowledged his Faults, and Publiſhed a ſmall Treatiſe contrary to thoſe he had Printed at* Paris. Now, let us ſee what a Slandering Miniſter, who changed his Religion, ſays of him. "(h) They were very much afraid that *du Roſier* would too much inſiſt upon that (i) Point:

(f) Beza, hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *Book* 16. *p.*475.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) *That is, the Miniſters of Sedan.*

(i) *That which concerned the Vocation of the Miniſters.*

ced to great Neceſſity, had he not found a place of Corrector * in Andrew Wechel's Printing-Houſe at Francfort. He died of the Plague (D) in that Town with his whole Family. When he took a Journey to Metz, † he was deſired to go to Sedan, to convert the ſame Dutcheſs of Bouillon, who had occaſion'd his Conference with two Catholick Doctors; but he could not prevail upon that Lady. I ſhall ſpeak of (E) his Writings.

He is ſaid to have been a Man of a wrangling Humour, and Fond of particular Opinions, and he ſowed (F) Seeds of Diſcord in the Church of Orleans, by keeping Correſpondence with ſome Fanaticks; ſo that it was to be feared that the French Churches would have been ſadly Divided, if the Peace had been of any continuance, and if the Maſſacre had not prevented a Schiſm.

ROTAN (John Baptiſt) Miniſter of Rochelle, was very much Eſteem'd for his Parts and Learning; but he was ſuſpected of having (A) Betrayed his Party, by countenancing Henry IV. in his deſign of turning Catholick. 'Tis ſaid that he promiſed

"And therefore ſome Perſons of Sedan went to him "at a place call'd Chemery, and made him believe "(for he was a Timorous, Inconſtant, and Credulous Man) that if he return'd to Paris with Maldonat, he would certainly be put to Death, and "that the Duke of Bouillon had been informed of it; "which was Falſe. Moreover, they told him that "Maldonat had given a hint of it, ſaying that he "had ſtill ſomething of a Heretick; and they pre"vailed ſo far upon him, that he left that Jeſuit "without taking his leave of him, and retired into "Germany. They ſupplied him with Money for his "Journey, and afterward they made ſeveral Gathe"rings for him, which amounted to above 250 "Livres (k). I remember, ſays he, in another "Book," (l) That it was the firſt Crime they charged "du Roſier with, when he ſeem'd to have a mind to "ſeparate from them, and to return into the Pale "of the Catholick Church. But when they ſaw "that this and ſome other common Faults, as his "being a Mumper, a Liar, and a Man of no Reſo"lution, were not ſufficient to run him down; ſome "of 'em went about to caſt a Blemiſh upon his "Wife's Chaſtity, giving out that ſhe had proſtitu"ted herſelf to ſome Canons of Orleans: A thing "not to be credited for the Reaſon, which I had ra"ther leave to the conſideration of thoſe, who have "ſeen and known her, than Publiſh them in "Print.

(D) *He died of the Plague*] We have already ſeen it in a Paſſage of Beza, and Philip Lonicerus ſays it likewiſe. (m) *Ex improviſo ſiquidem anno ſuperiori, in ipſis Vindemiis, peſte Rempublicam noſtram tunc infeſtante, ex hac vita, non ſine magno doctorum virorum, quibus ille notus erat, tuoque cum primis dolore, ex hac miſera vita, una cum uxore ſua, in cœleſtem illam avocatus eſt.* Thus he ſpeaks to John Fichard Syndic of the City of Francfort, in an Epiſtle Dedicatory prefixed to a Poſthumous piece of our Sureau, viz. the Latin Tranſlation of a Book (n) of John Corras. If Lonicerus had dated that Epiſtle, we might know in what Year du Roſier died. The Year of my Edition, which is 1588, is of no uſe to me. It is certain that this Miniſter did not die the Year before: He was already dead when Beza Publiſh'd his Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of France in 1580. Here follows another Paſſage of Lonicerus, wherein du Roſier is very much Praiſed. (o) *Quæ ſit humanarum rerum fragilitas, Fichardé clariſſime, ſuperiore anno præmatura ſua morte, etiam noſter ille Hugo Surœus, non ſine doctiſſimorum virorum ſuſpiriis, teſtatus eſt. Qui cum laudatiſſimæ Andreæ Wecheli, viri optimi & humaniſſimi, Typographiæ ſtrenuam navaret operam, talem ſua induſtria, quam excelsâ, non ſolum Latinæ & Græcæ, verum etiam Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ linguæ notitia ornabat, laudem conſequutus eſt, ut omnibus bonis & doctis viris eſſet gratiſſimus.*

I find in the Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheca, (p) that the Latin Tranſlation of Corras's Book was Printed at Francfort in 1579. apud Andream Wechelum. If it be the firſt Edition, it muſt be ſaid that du Roſier died in the Autumn of the Year 1578. The Author of the Notes upon the Confeſſion de Sancy (q) places his Death in the Year 1575.

(E) *I ſhall ſpeak of his Writings.*] He Publiſh'd ſeveral Books in French, if we may believe la Croix du Maine (r), who mention but two of 'em, viz. that which concerns the killing of Kings, and a Treatiſe concerning his Confeſſion of Faith, with an Abjuration of his Huguenotiſm, &c. Printed at Paris in 1573. We have ſeen above that he Publiſh'd a piece about his return to the Reformed Church. He had Publiſh'd ſome Controverſial Books at Orleans, before the Paris Maſſacre, as it appears from the Annotations of Gentianus Hervetus mention'd (s) by la Croix du Maine. If Konig had ſaid that Hugo Sureau Tranſlated into Latin an Arreſt of the Parliament of Toulouſe, he would not be liable to Cenſure; but he made uſe of this Expreſſion, (t) *edidit arreſtum Parlamenti Tholoſani in caſu admirabili matrimoniali An. 1588.* Which contains two Faults. 1. It does not appear from it whether Sureau is the Tranſlator or the Author, or meerly the Publiſher of that Arreſt. 2. Sureau could not put out ſuch a Piece in the Year 1588, for he was then no longer Living. There is a vaſt number of ſuch Faults in the Bibliographers.

(F) *He ſowed Seeds of Diſcord in the Church of Orleans.*] The Author of the Memoirs Intitled, *de Statu Religionis & Reipublicæ in regno Galliæ*, which are aſcribed to John de Serres, gives the following Character of him. (u) *Vir non ineruditus, (Rozarius) ſed fœdiſſimo lapſu oſtendens quid ſit infirmitas humana, & quam periculoſum etiam ſit, pacato tempore, dum nullo hoſte urgemur, indulgere inſanientis noſtræ rationis commentis, ut certam exploratamque veritatem ſempiternis principiorum firmamentis cœlo & terra firmiorem, in dubium pro arbitratu noſtro revocemus: quo curioſæ licentiæ morbo Rozarius laborabat, corrupto quodam more & ambitione de Eccleſiæ ſucceſſione, diſciplina, & de aliis etiam Religionis capitibus ſuperciliose diſputans, ſeque ſuis collegis hac in re excellentiorem importuno quodam ſtudio exiſtimans. Non obſcurarum enim turbarum ſemina in Eccleſia Aurelianæ inſeminarat, dum ſeſe cum novorum commentorum architectis, phanaticis ingeniis familiarius conjungeret: unde, niſi periculoſæ tranquillitatis incommoda, novo hoc remedii genere Deus præcidiſſet, magnæ & periculoſæ turbæ in Eccleſiis Gallicis erant haud dubie exundaturæ.* Another Writer of that time has theſe Words: (x) "One du Roſier, a Miniſter, a Man of a ready "Wit, but Reſtleſs and Inconſtant, being made a "Priſoner about a Day's Journey from Paris, as he "was running away, began to waver and ſoon after "changed his Religion.

(A) *He was ſuſpected of having Betrayed his Party*] D'Aubigné ſays (y) that *the Miniſter Rotan, a Piedmontois* (z), *a Profound Divine and a Subtil Philoſopher*, had a mind to be a Courtier, and thought that the third Party, which was formed ſometime after the Death of Henry III. would open a Breach, thro' which he might come in to Buſineſs. He joyned with Morlas, who had the ſame Proſpect, and then both of 'em Concerted with du Perron how they might engage the King to turn Catholick. They were kindly treated by the Directors of the Finances, which occaſion'd the coming of others into their Faction. *Rotan and Morlas diſputed about ſeveral points againſt* du Perron *in the King's preſence, and deſignedly yielded to him, who was a Man of prodigious Learning; ſo that ever ſince the Siege of* Rouen *he inſinuated himſelf into the King's Favour by his eaſy and charming Eloquence.* ——*Whereupon, each of 'em giving an opportunity to his Friend, they began to profeſs the change of Religion.* Note that Rotan began to reliſh a Court Life, when he was there to follicit (a) *the Payment of ſome Money, which he had lent, or rather cauſed to be lent by others, at* Geneva, *for the Troops raiſed by* Sancy. This ſhews that he did not confine himſelf to the Functions of his Character, and that he medled with Political Affairs: and therefore 'tis leſs to be wondred at, that as ſoon as he was acquainted with the Court, he reſolved to raiſe himſelf, by preferring his Worldly Intereſts to his Religion. (b) He was deputed

* See the Remark D.

† See Thuanus ubi ſupra.

(k) Matthew de Launay, Declaration & Refutation des fauſſes ſuppoſitions, fol. 139.

(l) Defenſe de Matthieu de Launay contre les fauſſes accuſations, fol. 37.

(m) Phil. Lonicerus, epiſt. dedicat.

(n) The Arreſt of the Parliament of Toulouſe, againſt the pretended Martin Guerre; which Arreſt, Corras, who reported the cauſe, adorned with a large Commentary.

(o) 'Tis the beginning of the Epiſtle Dedicatory.

(p) Pag. m. 425.

(q) Pag. 470, 471. edit. 1699.

(r) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Françoiſe, pag. 173.

miſed to ſuffer himſelf to be worſted in a Diſpute with *du Perron*, in the preſence of that Prince, in the Year 1593; but the Remorſes of his Conſcience, or Vanity obliged him to pretend to be (*B*) Sick, that he might avoid entring the Liſts. It is farther ſaid, that he continued to be a Prevaricator all the reſt of his Life, and that he and *de Serres* (*C*) deſign'd to go about a Deceitful Project in a National Synod; but they died before that Synod was held. *Rotan* taught Divinity * at *Rochelle*, and Publiſh'd a Controverſial (*D*) Book, concerning the Euchariſt, and another † wherein he Confuted the Reaſons, which *Cayet* had alledged for his Converſion. There is ſome reaſon to believe that he had been (*D* △) Miniſter of the Church of *Geneva*. He had been admitted Doctor of Divinity at *Heidelberg*, in the Year 1573. *Zanchius*, who performed the Ceremony, ſays that *Rotan*

---

deputed to *Mante* with ſeveral others, to repreſent to the King the Grievances of the Proteſtants; but he got himſelf choſen to diſpute againſt *du Perron*. *He had promiſed to act the Part of a cunning Prevaricator, and being ready to do it, it happen'd that Vanity or Fear made him ſo waver that he choſe rather to pretend to be Sick; and* Berault, *a Miniſter of* Montauban, *took his Place. The diſpute was very ſharp on both ſides about the ſufficiency or inſufficiency of the Scripture, and the Words of St. Paul in his 2d Epiſtle to Timothy; and the Conference was broke by the Eccleſiaſticks.*

(*B*) *To pretend to be Sick, to avoid entring the Liſts.*] We have juſt now ſeen that *d'Aubigné* ſays ſo: I ſhall now ſet down a paſſage of the Hiſtory of the Edict of *Nantes*, from which it appears that *Rotan*'s Conduct was approved in a National Synod. "(*c*) "*Rotan*, a Famous Miniſter, was ſuſpected of having "conſented to thoſe Artifices, whether he was really prevailed upon in hopes of ſome Favours, or "only pretended to approve them, in order to get "himſelf deputed; becauſe it was an Honourable "Commiſſion. So that the Conference began, and "*du Perron* appear'd in it as a Man ſure of obtaining a compleat Victory by his Adverſary's Colluſion. The diſpute ran upon the Sufficiency of the "Scripture, and the Explication of the 16th Verſe "of the 3d Chapter of the 2d Epiſtle of St. *Paul* "to *Timothy*. But *Rotan*, either out of Honour "or Conſcience, not daring to be ſo baſe as 'twas "ſaid he had promiſed to be, pretended to be Sick, "and ſo got out of the Lurch. *Beraud*, a Miniſter of *Montauban*, took his place; but the Conference did not laſt long, when they ſaw that they "were Diſappointed in their Hopes. The Clergy "found out a way to break it, without ſeeming to "decline it; and the Miniſters offered to renew "it, whenever they ſhould be deſired to do it. But "becauſe notwithſtanding thoſe Offers, the Clergy "boaſted of having had the Advantage of the Miniſters; *Beraud* and *Rotan* got their Proceedings "approved by the National Synod, that was held at "*Montauban* the Year following. *Rotan* was ſheltered under *Beraud*'s Protection, and this Approbation put an end to the Suſpicion that was entertain'd of him, as if he had been a Prevaricator. It doth not clearly appear from this Account, nor from that of *d'Aubigné*, whether *Rotan* pretended to be Sick after ſome Conferences, or before any Conference; and therefore I ſhall ſet down the Words of another Hiſtorian, that the Readers may have a more diſtinct Knowledge of the Matter. Among thoſe Deputies, ſays he (*d*), "there were ſeveral "Miniſters, and amongſt others one *Rotan* a *Griſon*, "who being ſtill at *Rochelle*, boaſted that he would "overcome the Catholick Doctors in a Diſputation, "and he believed it; and to ſhew that it was his Opinion, he had a great many Books carried from *Rochelle* to *Mante*: Wherein he was very much aſſiſted "by the Sieur *du Pleſſis* Governour of *Saumur*—— "(*e*) On the appointed day, the ſaid Sieur *du Perron*, and the Miniſter *Rotan*, after ſome Preambles, "wherein they proteſted that they acted only out of "zeal for Truth, began to treat" of the ſufficiency of the Word of God. That Hiſtorian gives the ſubſtance of the Objections and Anſwers, like a partial Man againſt the Proteſtants, and then Concludes thus, (*f*) Rotan *was then a little confounded, and began to Praiſe the ſaid Sieur* du Perron, *and then the Aſſembly was diſmiſt for that Day.* Rotan *appear'd no more at the Conference:* Berault *a Miniſter of* Montauban *took his place, who the Six following days was carried by the ſaid Sieur* du Perron, per omnes locos Dialectice, *about the Word* ὠφέλιμος, *to make Wiſe. Hiſtory, Poetry, Mathematicks, Philoſophy, Phyſicks, Morals, Metaphyſicks, Scholia's, and Commentaries were brought in right or wrong by* Berault*: but he could never make it out that that Greek Word ſignifies or includes Sufficiency. And indeed after he had praiſed the ſaid Sieur* du Perron, *he gave to underſtand that he had not prepared himſelf for a diſpute. Thus ended the Conference, and the Miniſters of the pretended Reformed Religion return'd into their reſpective Provinces.*

(*C*) *He and de Serres —— about a deceitful Project.*] I have only read this in *d'Aubigné*: He ſhews how the Court made uſe of addreſs to pervert the Miniſters, and then he ſays: (*g*) *the Power of the Court appear'd particularly in the Miniſters* Rotan, Serres, Cahier, Morlas, *and* de Vaux. *The whole Myſtery of thoſe Practices, and particularly of thoſe of* Mante, *was laid open by the latter, who confeſt his Prevarication to ſeveral Eminent Perſons with horrid cries.* D'Aubigné was one of thoſe Perſons. *After he had*, ſays he (*h*), *Truſted his Confeſſion to my Boſom, with great Sighs, he put into my Hands three Bonds; one of 2500 Crowns, and the other two ſomething leſſer, which I reſtored to his Heirs.* In the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy* he brings in *Cahier* relating all theſe things, and affirming what (*i*) he (*d'Aubigné*) durſt not affirm, about the Circumſtances of *de Vaux*'s Death. (*k*) Being in this Perplexity, (they are *Sancy*'s Words) "I perceived M. *Cahier* walking in "the Court. I went to him and ask'd him what "was become of the Miniſter *de Vaux*. Sir, ſaid "he, that Wretch having promiſed many fine "things to the Biſhop of *Evreux*, and received ſome "Money from him in order to perform his Promiſe, wanted Courage to do it, and went from "hence into his Country, crying and ſaying that "God's Cauſe had been Betrayed by him and five of "his Friends, whom he pointed at without naming "them. He added, that God would be Merciful "to him, and that he was going Home to give up "his Soul into his hands, as ſoon as he ſhould come "to *Millaud*. However, he offer'd to write a Letter to the Biſhop of *Evreux*, by a truſty Friend, "whereby the Biſhop would diſcover to him the Prevarication of the Conference of *Mantes*, and the other Preparations of *Roban* (*l*) and *de Serres*, who, "you know, did early promiſe their perfidious Aſſiſtance. The Huguenots were ſuch Fools as to refuſe "his offer, ſaying that Chriſt's Kingdom ought not to "be Eſtabliſh'd with Craft and Fraud. —— (*m*) I ask'd "*Cahier* what cover *Roban* (*n*) and *Serres* could "make uſe of to juſtify themſelves? The two firſt, "anſwered he, need no cover; for they are "covered with Earth. I'll tell you how. As ſoon "as they heard of *de Vaux*'s Confeſſion, they incouraged one another, and got themſelves Elected "for the National Synod of *Montpellier*, being reſolved to venture all, and to try whether they "could get ſomething by the Confederates before they "ſhould make their Retreat. But it fell out unluckily that they died at the opening of the Synod. The Author of the Notes upon the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy*, obſerves (*o*) that this is the National Synod held at *Montpellier*, in *May* 1598. againſt which *Reboul* wrote in 1600. the Satyr Intitled, *Actes du Synode Univerſel de la Sainte Reformation.*

(*D*) *And Publiſh'd a Controverſial Book concerning the Euchariſt.*] It was Printed at *Rochelle*, and Intitled *Traité Orthodoxe de l'Euchariſtie*. Dr. *Julius Cæſar Bulenger* refuted it in a Book Printed at *Paris*, for *Frederick Morel*, in 1598. in 8. He refers the Reader to it in the Preface of his Catholick Anſwer to *du Pleſſis Mornay*'s Book upon the Euchariſt.

(*D* △) *There is ſome reaſon to believe that he had been Miniſter of the Church of* Geneva.] For we find in *Melchior Adam* (*p*) that he was one of the three (*q*) Miniſters, who went from *Geneva* to *Bern*

* Cum Rotanum renuntiarem (Anno Domini) publice praeſtantem & dignum Baptiſtam Rotanum Rhætum, doctum & eloquentiſſimum Doctorem, qui feliciter Theologicam rexerat. *Melch. Adam.* [illegible] pag. 316.

† *Printed* at Rochelle in 1595.

(*c*) Hiſtoire de l'Edit de Nantes tom. 1. B. 3. p. 112. ad ann. 1593.

(*d*) Peter Victor Cayet, Chronologie Novenaire, tom. 2. fol. [illegible] verſo.

(*e*) Idem ibid. fol. 27[illegible] verſo.

(*f*) Idem Cayet ibid. fol. [illegible] verſo.

(*g*) D'Aubigné, tom. 3. Book 5. chap. 1. pag. 655.

(*h*) Idem, pag. 626.

(*i*) *You may ſee it in the Original.*

(*k*) Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, *in the laſt Chapter of the* 2 Book, pag. 547. edit 1699.

(*l*) *It ſhould be* Rotan.

(*m*) Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy ibid. pag. 548

(*n*) *Read* Rotan.

(*o*) Notes ſur la Confeſſion de Sancy, pag. 560.

(*p*) Melch. Adam. in vita Stuckii pag 771. vitar. Theol. German. *Obſerve that he places this in* 1578. *But in* Beza's *Life* pag. 229. *where he relates the ſame thing, he puts* 1588.

(*q*) *The two others were* Beza *and* la Faye.

Rotan ‡ had left his Country 15 Years before for his Religion, and that he bore joyfully the loss of a considerable Estate. *Maimbourg* (E) deserves to be Criticized.

‡ Erasmi, quod propter Domini Jesu Christi curam, annos jam fere quindecim, cum non parva suarum bonorum eorumque non tenuium jactura conjunctum, æquissimo semper animo tulit, imo magnæ gloriæ loco habuit. *Zanchius Epist. lib. 2. pag. 603.*

ROTTERDAM, is one of the most considerable Towns in *Holland*, it stands upon the *Maese*, very conveniently for Trade. There is no doubt that it took its Name from its Situation at the Mouth of the *Rotte* ‡. 'Tis not known at what time it began to be Built, but 'tis well known that about the Year 1270, it was Erected into a City; for it was surrounded with Ramparts, and endowed with Privileges ‡. Nothing has made it more Famous than its being the place, where (A) the Great *Erasmus* was Born: A Glory, to which it has not been

in 1588, to assist at a Synod, which was convened on account of the Disputes raised by *Samuel Huberus* and *Claudius Auberi*. I have spoke in another place (q) of this *Samuel Huberus*, and now I shall say, that this *Claudius Aubert* was Professor of Philosophy at *Lausanne*, and that going out of his Sphere, and taking upon him to Dogmatize, he taught *viva voce*, and in Writing that the Righteousness of Man is an Inherent Quality. The Synod Condemned that Opinion, and obliged *Auberi* and his Adherents to acknowledge that they Imbraced the Doctrine contain'd in the Confession of Faith of the Churches of *Swisserland* and *France*, viz. that we are justified by Faith as by an Instrument, wherewith we take hold of JESUS CHRIST our Righteousness. *Claudius Alberius Triuncurianus cum suis, recepta doctrina & in confessione tam Gallicana quam Helvetica comprehensa, de nostra ad tribunal Dei justificatione per fidem tamquam instrumentum, quo Christus, justitia nostra apprehendatur, professus sit se penitus assentiri* (r). I shall occasionally observe, that he only submitted in words to the Decisions of that Synod. I have a Book, Publish'd in the Year 1591. by one *Antony Lescaille*, wherein I find that Dr. *Gryneus* spoke thus in an Assembly held at *Basil* in *December* 1590. upon occasion of the Differences of this *Antony* with *Constant* and *Couet* Ministers of the French Church: " (s) that there was one " *Auberi*, who had heretofore writ a Book, which " had been afterwards Condemn'd at *Bern*, and who " had Subscribed to some Positions, which after- " wards he did not keep to. That going thro' " *Basil*, and returning to it as he came from *Franc-* " *fort*, he had sowed his Errors in several Houses; " but none was so bold as to maintain them, except " *Lescailles*, to whom the said *Aubery* had left a " piece of his own making. And therefore he will " give notice of it to the Magistrates of *Bern*, that " the said *Aubery* may be Punish'd. This *Lescaille* was an Illiterate Layman, who took upon him to Dogmatize, and put into the hands of his Ministers (t) a piece concerning good Works. *Beza* spoke to him thus in *August*, 1591: (u) " Heark ye, you have " not written that piece: *Aubery* is the Author of it, " tho' he denied it at *Bern* against his Conscience. " *Lescaille* answered, 'tis a Book of my own Com- " posing, and M. *Aubery* never saw it such as it is: " I don't deny that I have learn'd of him, and of " others, some things that are in it. *Beza* said, 'tis " an ill Book. *Lescaille* answered, I don't pretend " that 'tis all good: If any one shews me by the " word of God that there is any harm in't, I'll be- " lieve it. *Beza* went on and said, *Aubery* has " written an ill Book, and you Praise it. *Lescaille* " answered, I like very well what I understand in " M. *Aubery*'s Book; but I will neither approve nor " condemn what I don't understand.

(q) *In the Remark D of the Article Hunnius.*

(r) Melch. Adam. ib.

(s) La doctrine ancienne du premier, deuxiéme, troisiéme & dernier Jugement —— par A L P D D G G H pag. 50. 51.

(t) Ibid. pag. 27.

(u) Ibid. pag. 92. 93.

(E) Maimbourg *deserves to be Criticized.*] These are his words. " (x) What have they not said to " cast a Blot upon the Memory of *Sponde* (*Spon-* " *danus*) Lieutenant General at *Rochelle*, *Salette* " Counsellor to the King of *Navarre*, *Morlas* Coun- " sellor of State, and Super-intendant of the Maga- " zins of *France*, *du Fay*, *Clairville*, *Rohan*, and " many other Famous Ministers, who having been " very Honest Men, whilst they lived amongst 'em, " and the most considerable Persons of their Consi- " story, became all of a sudden by a very strange " change Profligate Wretches, and the worst of Men, " for having Abjured Calvinism. He supposes in this passage, 1. That *du Fay* was a Minister. 2. That there was a Minister call'd (y) *Rohan*. 3. That those two pretended Ministers made an Abjuration of the Reformed Religion. Which is all False. They were look'd upon as False Brethren; but it does not appear that *Rotan* and *du Fay* died Papists. See the Notes upon the *Confession Catholique de Sancy*, pag. 357. and 358. of the Edition of 1699.

(x) Maimbourg, *Preface of the History of the League.*

(y) *He was deceived by a fault of Impression, which crept into the* Confession Catholique de Sancy.

(A) *Than its being the place where the great Erasmus was Born.*] If *Homer* had been as much esteem'd in his Life time, as he was after his Death, many Cities would have aspired in vain to the Glory of having produced him; for the City, which had that advantage, would have given undeniable Proofs of it, before the length of time could have afforded any other Town matter to contend about it. This is the reason why there are no disputes about the place where *Erasmus* was Born. The great Reputation he acquired during his Life has prevented such Contestations. The City of *Rotterdam* was early sensible of the Glory, that accrued to it from being the Birth-Place of *Erasmus*: Whilst things were fresh in Men's Memory, they took care to prevent their being deprived of it, and to make the thing unquestionable. There was a necessity for them to think early of it, for such a Birth as that of *Erasmus* might in time have been covered with a thick darkness, since his Mother, a Woman of a mean Extraction, went to *Rotterdam* with a design to Conceal the Birth of her Child. As for his Conception, the City of *Tergow* lays a just claim to it, and looks upon it as no small advantage. A Burgo-Master (z) of this Town undertook to prove that *Erasmus* was Born in it, and only bred at *Rotterdam*. But 'tis to no purpose for him to maintain such a thing; the contrary appears from the Registers of the Convent of *Stein*, and every Body believes that *Erasmus* was Born at *Rotterdam* and not at *Tergow*. We find these words in a Letter of the Burgo-Masters and Counsellors of *Tergow*, inserted in *Guicciardin*'s Description of the Low-Countries Translated from the Italian: (a) *Oriundus etiam hac urbe magnus ille Desiderius Erasmus, Goudæ enim conceptus & utero gestatus*, ROTERODAMI (*quo cum ad pariendum vicina esset mater secreta de causa contulerat*) IN LUCEM EDITUS EST. They shew in the Library of *Tergow* a Head of *Erasmus*, which may be look'd upon as a Publick Monument of their not believing that he was Born there; for the Inscription, that is about that Head, imports that he was Conceived at *Tergow* and Born at *Rotterdam*. M. *Almeloveen* has lately renewed the dispute of those two Towns by a curious Incident (b): He pretends that *Erasmus* is rather a Citizen of *Tergow* than of *Rotterdam*, because according to the Laws, a place where a Child happens to be Born by chance, is not accounted his Native Country. If a Woman being upon a Journey is brought to Bed in a Town, if she does not design to Settle there, and makes her abode in another place, her Child is not accounted a Citizen of that Town, and the place where his Parents are settled is look'd upon as his Native Country. At this rate *Erasmus* should rather be call'd *Goudanus* than *Roterodamus*; for his Father and Mother lived at *Tergow*: And if his Mother did not Ly-in at *Tergow* but at *Rotterdam*, 'twas a meer accidental thing. She absconded to save her Honour, and went to a Neighbouring Town only for some days to Ly-in privately (c).

I shall observe by the by that some French Authors, grounded upon an Antiquated Right, I mean the Ancient Geography, and the old division of Gaul mention'd in *Julius Cæsar*'s Commentaries, went about to prove that *Erasmus* was their Country-Man. *Robert Cenalis* (d) Bishop of *Avranches* said positively that *France* is *Erasmus*'s Native Country, and that it is very much obliged to him, *utpote homini in Gallia nato*. *Erasmus* favoured this Pretension; for he said sometimes (e) that he was Born in Gaul, and look'd

Amstel. 1694. (c) *See the Letter of a Civilian call'd Mr.* *Written to Mr.* Almeloveen, *upon this, and inserted in the* nitates Theologico. Philologicæ. (d) Histor. Gallic. l. 30. 39. 44. (e) Et pristinam illam laudem nostræ liæ. Nihil enim vetat eumdem ditione Germanum esse, terum Cosmographorum descriptione Gallum. *Erasmus* *lib.* 11.

been inſenſible; for the Inhabitants of that City took care (B) to Honour the Memory of that great Man, which is ſo glorious (C) to them. *Rotterdam* is the Seat of the Admiralty of the *Maeſe*.

ROVENIUS (*Philip*) a Titular Archbiſhop, and Apoſtolical Vicar in the United Provinces, was born at *Deventer* *. He Publiſh'd ſeveral Books, and one amongſt others, *de Republica Chriſtiana*, Printed in the Year 1648. I ſhall quote a Paſſage out of it, to ſhew the ſtrange (Z) Jargon of ſome devout Women, which he does ſeverely condemn.

RUA

look'd upon the Learning of *Budæus*, a French Man, as a thing very Glorious to his own Country. Some Germans were jealous of this Conceſſion, and humbly begg'd of *Eraſmus* not to ſuffer that the French ſhould appropriate him to themſelves. (r) *Ne patiar me Gallis plus me aſſerat, ſed ingenue fatear Batavum eſſe Germaniæ partem, videlicet ne tanta gloria fraudentur.* His anſwer, which is very modeſt, comes to this that he was born upon the Borders of *Gaul* and *Germany*, but ſomewhat nearer the former. *An Batavus ſim nondum mihi ſatis conſtat. Hollandum eſſe me negare non poſſum, et in parte natum ut ſi Coſmographorum picturis credimus magis vergat ad Galliam quam ad Germaniam, quanquam extra controverſiam eſt totam eam regionem in confinio Galliæ Germaniæque eſſe.* Hence it is, that in (s) another Letter, he neither ſays that he is a *French-man*, nor denies it; looking upon it as a problematical thing. *Gallum eſſe me nec affirmo, nec inficior, ſic natus ut Gallus ne an Germanus ſim anceps haberi poſſit.*

(B) *To Honour the Memory of that Great Man.*] The City of *Rotterdam* order'd, 1. That the Houſe wherein *Eraſmus* was Born, ſhould be adorn'd with an Inſcription, whereby all the Inhabitants, and all Foreigners might be inform'd of ſuch a glorious Prerogative. 2. That the College, wherein Latin, Greek and Rhetorick are taught, ſhould be call'd *Eraſmus*'s College, and Conſecrated to him by an Inſcription upon the Frontiſpiece. 3. That a Wooden Statue ſhould be erected to him in the Year 1549. Another Statue of Stone was put in its place in the Year 1557. the *Spaniard* having overthrown it in 1572. The Inhabitants ſet (x) it up again, as ſoon as they were freed from their Tyranny; and at laſt a (y) braſen one was erected in 1622, which is admired by good Judges. It ſtands in the great place of the City, near a Canal, upon a Pedeſtal, adorn'd with Inſcriptions, and ſurrounded with Iron Rails. Thoſe ſeveral Statues were made by Degrees of a more valuable matter; wherein *Eraſmus* was dealt with as the Deities of Ancient *Rome*: for not only the Offerings of private Perſons were at firſt none of the moſt conſiderable,

Nunc (z) *te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus, at tu*
Si fœtura gregem ſuppleverit aureus eſto;

but alſo thoſe of whole Towns and Nations were made in the beginning with mean and common Things.

‖ *Fictilibus crevere diis hæc aurea templa.*

Moſt Travellers ſpeak of the Statue of *Eraſmus*, when they Publiſh an account of what they have ſeen in the *United Provinces*. M. *Joli* (a) a Canon of *Paris*, having mention'd that Statue, and the Houſe wherein *Eraſmus* was born, adds, That *the great Reputation of that Man makes thoſe two things, which are little of themſelves, the moſt conſiderable of the Town; tho' they cannot be ſaid to be little and inconſiderable, ſince* (b) Sebaſtian Munſterus *tells us in his Coſmography, that* Philip, *King of* Spain, *Son to the Emperor* Charles V. *being come to* Rotterdam, *in the Month of* September, *of the Year* (c) 1545. *That Statue was erected* (d) *upon the account of his Arrival, and that ſome Verſes made in his Honour, were put into the Hands of* Eraſmus, *to be preſented to him; which being done, the King,* Mary, *Queen of* Hungary, *and all the Princes, who accompanied them, out of love for the Memory of ſo great a Man, went, and viſited with reſpect, the Houſe and the Chamber where he was Born.* *Monconis* (e) ſays not ſo much of it, being contented to obſerve the poſture of the Statue, and to ſet down the Inſcriptions of the little Houſe. He ſays, *That* Eraſmus *invented* (f) *the uſe of Turf, and Sails to ſerve for all Winds, as thoſe of Boats and Yachts*: Which does not ſeem to me to be more true, than what he had ſaid before, that *the Schelde and the Rhine being met together, paſs by* Rotterdam, *enter part of it, and beſides, get into the Town thro' two great Canals.* But M. *Bullart* (g) confirms the Paſſage, which I have quoted out of M. *Joly*; for he ſays, *That when* Philip II. *made a ſolemn Entry into the Town of* Rotterdam, *as being the Sovereign Prince of the* Netherlands, *the Senate cauſed the Statue of* Eraſmus *to be placed, as their greateſt Ornament, over againſt the Houſe where he was Born, dreſs'd in his Eccleſiaſtical Habit, holding a Pen in his Right Hand, and preſenting to the Prince with the Left a Paper, with theſe Words in it.*

Sereniſſimo Hiſpaniarum Principi D. Philippo
à Burgundia Deſiderius Eraſmus
Rotterodamus.

Rotterodamus ego non inficiabor Eraſmus,
Ne videar cives deſeruiſſe meos.
Ipſorum inſtinctu, Princeps clariſſime, ſalvum
Ingreſſum precor ad limina noſtra tuum,
Atque hunc quo poſſum ſtudio, commendo popellum
Maxime præſidiis Cæſare nate tuis.
Te Dominum agnoſcunt omnes, te Principe gaudent,
Nec quicquam tota charius orbe tenent.

M. *Joli* might have quoted, upon this occaſion, a more Authentick Author than *Sebaſtian Munſterus*; for he might have quoted the *Spaniſh* Relation of the Voyage of *Don Philip* Prince of *Spain*, written by *Juan Chriſtoval Calvete de Eſtrella*. I muſt obſerve that in the Year 1672, the Mob having made an Inſurrection in moſt Towns of the Province of *Holland*, *Rotterdam* was for ſome days, at their Diſcretion, and during that Anarchy, the Statue of *Eraſmus* was remov'd from its place, as a thing that favour'd of Popery. The Mob carried it into a Publick Houſe, and took into Conſideration whether it ſhould be melted down. The Magiſtrates of *Baſil* did no ſooner hear of it, but they order'd ſome Merchants of their Town to deſire their Correſpondent in *Rotterdam*, to buy that Statue at a certain Price. The Correſpondent went upon a Bargain, and might have had it, had it not been for a ſmall difference in the Price. He gave an Account of his Commiſſion, and received a new Order to give the Magiſtrates their own Price; but they changed their Mind, and reſolved neither to ſell or to melt down that Statue, but to ſet it up again in the ſame place; which they did ſome time after. The Merchant, who had a Commiſſion to buy it for the Magiſtrates of *Baſil*, gave me this Account within (h) theſe two days.

(C) *Which is ſo glorious to them.*] Moſt of thoſe who write ſomething concerning *Eraſmus*'s Life, take notice of the glory he has procured to his Native Country. *Du Verdier* (i) *Vau-Privas*, and *Bulart* (k) begin with ſuch an Obſervation in their Encomium upon that Youth of *Rotterdam*. The Words of (l) *Rhenanus* upon this occaſion, are too fine not to be inſerted in this place. *Natus eſt*, ſays he, ſpeaking to the Emperor *Charles* V. *abavi tui Friderici* III. *Aug. primis Imperii annis ad quintum Calend. Novembris, Roterodami in Hollandia tua inferioris Germaniæ Provincia, quam olim Batavi poſſederunt, nunc magis notam ſtudioſis omnibus ob unius indigenæ Eraſmi incunabula, quàm veterum incolarum memoria quamlibet bellico robore præſtantium. Hoc alumno Roterodamum oppidum ſe ſemper jactabit, & doctis erit commendatum.* I might quote many Authors, who in order to heighten the glory of *Rotterdam*, join theſe two things together; that *Eraſmus* was Born in it, and that they have erected a Statue to him.

(Z) *The ſtrange Jargon of ſome devout Women.*] You may ſee in the following Paſſage, what he ſays of ſome Nuns, who affected ſome particular Exerciſes of Devotion and Spirituality. (m) *Non raro etiam ſuperbiam aliquam conjunctam habent, ut ambulent in magnis, & mirabilibus ſuper ſe, ut vileſcant illis ordinaria pietatis exercitia approbata ab Eccleſia, vel à Patribus commendata: nihil crepent niſi uniones cum Deo, cum uniantur proprio (ſi non pejori) ſpiritui: jactent tranſubſtantiationes myſticas, cordis concentrationes: potentiarum, imo omnis ſui eſſe, annihilationem, connubium eſſentiæ creatæ & Divinitatis: ſpiri-*

tuale

* Valerii Andreæ Biblioth. Belgica, p. [illegible]

(f) Franciſco Carro del Bachiller Rod. Nicol. Antonii Biblioth. Hiſpan. tom. [illegible] p. 157.

(g) Acad. des Sciences, vol. 2. pag. 162.

(h) I write this the 28th of July, 1699.

(i) Proſopogr. tom. 3. p. 2389.

(k) Acad. des Sciences, tom. 2. p. 159.

(l) Epiſt. præfixa Operibus *Eraſmi*. See alſo Quenſtedt pag. 121. of his Dialogue de patriis illuſtrium doctrina & ſcriptis virorum.

(m) *Philip. Rovenius* de Repub. Chriſtiana lib. 1. cap. 43. p. 278.

Principi offerebat. (e) Voiag. part. 2. p. 129, 130.

of Monconis are found in a Book Printed in 1692.

Theatro Belgico. *See the Place that relates to* Roterdam.

Æneas Silvius *mentions the Turf in a Book which he Pub-*

. See Martinus Schoockius de Turffis, pag. 3.

RUA (*Peter*) a Learned *Spaniard*, who taught Philology at *Soria*, (*A*) the Place of his Birth, lived in the XVIth Century. He Publiſh'd three very Learned and Curious Letters ‡ againſt *Antony de Guevara*, wherein he confuted a vaſt number of Falſities Publiſh'd by that Author, and the ridiculous ſhift that he made uſe of. This you may ſee (*B*) in a Paſſage of *Andreas Schottus*. *Moreri* (*C*) has committed a very great Blunder.

RUARUS (*Martin*) a Socinian Miniſter, was Born at *Krempen* * in *Germany*. He was infected with the Socinian Hereſies by *Erneſtus Sonerus*, Profeſſor at *Altdorf*, who taught them privately, and he grew ſo fond of 'em, that he choſe rather to loſe his Patrimonial Eſtate than to renounce that Sect. He § was eſteem'd both at Home and Abroad for his Judgment, Learning, and good Life. He was made Rector of the College of *Racovia*, and then Miniſter of the *Socinians* at *Dantzick*, both in the Town, and in the Burrough of *Straſſin*, and he died in that Office, in the Year || 1657, being 70 Years old. † He was already poſſeſt of it in the Year 1635, as it appears from (*D*) *James Ogier's* Travels. He Writ (*E*) ſome Pieces, which have been Printed. The famous *Calixtus* left no ſtone * unturn'd to Convert him, at the Conference of *Thorn* in the Year 1646, but he could not prevail with him.

RUFFI (*Antony de*) Counſellor in the Seneſchal's Court of *Marſeille*, where he was Born, diſcharg'd the Duties of his Office with great Integrity, and a very extraordinary Conſcienciouſneſs. Beſides, he apply'd himſelf to Hiſtorical Inquiries with a wonderful Diligence and Patience, as it appears from his Hiſtory of *Marſeilles*, Printed in 1642, and re-printed with || large Additions in the Year 1696, in two Volumes, in Folio. He was but 35 Years of Age, when it came out the firſt time. An Office of Counſellor of State was beſtow'd upon him in 1654, as *a Teſtimony* of

tuale Sacramentum inſeparabilitatis, ſomnium omnium affectionum, abſorptionem & liquefactionem in amplexu ſponſi, triplicem animæ hierarchiam, orationem in quiete paſſiva, ebrietatem ſpiritualem, cordis ſilentium, meditationes negativas, uniones ſupereſſentiales, puteum & gurgitem annihilationis, amorem Deificum, transformantem, unientem, ſtringentem, amplexantem, ſuavitatem cor auferentem, ſugentem ſponſi ubera, ruminantem collum, abſorbentem enthuſiaſmum, inſenſibilitatem & oblivionem omnium inducentem abyſſalem cum Deo identificationem, confricationem Deificam, incendentem & conſumentem cor: elevationem ad ſuavitatem cœleſtem ex infernali languore, introverſionem ſuper cœleſtem, caliginem & umbram Dei, allocutiones internas, elevationes incognitas, extenſiones & applicationes amoroſas, animæ ſuſpenſiones, deliquium, ſuſpiria, mortem ſenſuum & omnium affectuum, ecſtaſim continuam, juſtitiam ratiocinii, cordis contactum & patefactionem, liquefactionem, influxum, inflammationem, aſſultus qui ferri nequeant, penetrationes ad intima, vulnerationes, conſtrictiones, alligationes inſeparabiles, aſpectus penetrantes & oblectantes, voces tremulas, murmura columbina, guſtus ſuaviſſimos, odores gratiſſimos, auditus melodiæ cœleſtis, hypermyſticas Dei & animæ perichoreſes, impudentiam ſpiritualem, aſpirationes Myſanthropicas, ignem ſine carbone, flammam ſine corpore, holocauſtum meridianum in viſcerali & medullari penetrabilitate, contactum mirabilem & ſuaviſſimum, obſcuræ noctis gaudia & caliginem. Hæc & ſimilia ſeſquipedalia verba in nova pietatis ſchola inter ſponte electos Magiſtros, & diſcipulas curioſas, adeo frequenter tenero proferuntur palato, ut intimis in viſceribus ſentiantur (*a*).

(*A*) *At* Soria, *the Place of his Birth*.] One would think, at firſt ſight, that *Andreas Schottus*, and *Don Nicolas Antonio* do not at all agree. The one ſays, (*b*) *Petrus Rhua Numantinus primum Abulæ, poſt Numantiæ in patria annos plurimos ad extremam uſque ætatem bonas litteras docuit*; and the other, (*c*) *Petrus Rua, Orienſis, Abulæ primum, mox in patria urbe juventutem humanioribus imbuit literis ad extremam uſque ætatem*: But at the bottom they ſay the ſame thing. *Soria*, which was built near the Ruins of *Numantia*, is call'd *Numantia* by ſome, and amongſt others by *Andreas Schottus*.

(*B*) *This you may ſee in a Paſſage of* Andreas Schottus.] Here it is. (*d*) *In quo egregie verſatum fuiſſe teſtantur* Epiſt. 3. *Hiſpanice ſcriptæ, eruditionis plenæ, & humanitatis ſatis copioſæ: quibus Ant. Guevarræ* (*qui tum ſolus doctrinæ, & eloquentiæ arcem tenere videbatur*) *errores, mendaciaque in hiſtoriis antiquorum, veteribuſque monumentis lapidum, & nummorum explicandis, egregie refellit. Valde ut mirer Gallos, Guevarræ epiſtolas converſas* Aureo *titulo decoraſſe, manibuſque ita tenere ſolitos, ut pro oraculis circumferant, quæ tot mendaciis, quot verſibus ſcatere dicuntur.* Rhua *itaque de tot millibus multa indicavit, facemque prætulit, ne quis poſthac credulus in errorem induceretur. Epiſt. 1. numiſmatum inſcriptiones, & confinxiſſe, & ridicule explicaſſe, in Chronologia & magiſtratuum dignitate turpiter hallucinatum. Epiſt. 2. erraſſe in hiſtoria Rom. temporum ratione, locorumque nominibus, ſolenne illud ſuum ſervando, audacter ut omnia pronunciet, quaſi poſteris imponere velit, aut credens omnes et temere aſſenſuros audito illo Pythagoreorum* αὐτὸς ἔφα, *contrarium oculos confixit, citans identidem, & prodigioſe nomina propria hiſtoricorum, cudenſque arbitratu ſuo, ad hanc diem inaudita. De numiſmatis inepta & vetera leges; ut & de legibus Rom. & legum auctorib. de lege Julia Poppæa, Cornelia, Falcidia, aliiſque: de medicina & empirica. Tertia epiſtola ut mole ſua ita rerum pondere ceteris major eſt. Cum enim Guevarra omnem antiquitati fidem derogare niteretur, epiſtola quadam, quo ſua mendacia tegeret, velaret, vel tueretur; cum a ſacris literis diſceſſeris, omnia incerta fabuliſque plena affirmat. Refellit virum diſerte* Rhua *ex Athenagoræ apologia pro Chriſtianis, & hoc eſſe omnem artium labefactationem, fidemque ut ſocietatis humanæ, ita & ſcientiarum vinculum è medio tollere.* This is a curious Supplement to the Article of *Guevara*.

(*C*) Moreri *has committed a very great Blunder*.] He ſays, *Peter Rhua* wrote a Treatiſe *De Leg. Julia, Poppæa, Cornelia, Falcidia, &c. de Medicina & Empyrica*; and he quotes Father *Schottus's* Book for it. What a prodigious miſtake is this? Does not that Father clearly ſay, not that *Rhua* wrote a Treatiſe upon thoſe Subjects, but that the Deſign of his Second Letter was to ſhew the Falſities of *Guevara* upon ſeveral other Matters, and particularly upon thoſe? Beſides, the *lex Julia*, and the *lex Poppæa*, are not two Laws, but one and the ſame Law. Father *Schottus* ſays ſo plainly enough; he puts no *Comma* between *Julia* and *Poppæa*.

(*D*) *From* James Ogier's *Travels*.] That Author was at *Dantzick* in 1635, in the Retinue of Count *d'Avaux*, Ambaſſador of his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty. He ſays, that being in a Bookſeller's Shop, one *Ruardus* (he ſhould have ſaid *Ruarus*) came to him, with whom he diſcours'd in Latin for two Hours, and then in French. *Aggreſſus me eſt quidam N. Ruardus, quocum per duas horas collocutus ſum Latine, ac deinde Gallice, qui me ad ædes ſuas adeundas invitavit. Didici poſtea ab aliquo, eum eſſe Arianorum Paſtorem: ſunt quippe Gedani hujuſmodi homines, qui clam congregantur, inſcio vel diſſimulante Senatu* (*e*).

(*E*) *He writ ſome pieces*.] He writ ſome Notes upon the Catechiſm of the *Socinian* Churches of *Poland*, which were Printed in the Edition of that Catechiſm publiſh'd in 1665. They are alſo to be found in the Edition of 1680. He made ſome other Notes upon the ſame Work; but they have not been publiſh'd (*f*). There are two Centuries of his Letters: The 1ſt was Printed at *Amſterdam* for *David Ruarus*, the Author's Son, in 1677, with a Preface of *Joachim Ruarus*, *David's* Brother. The 2d was Publiſh'd in 1681. for the ſame *David*, who

‡ *Antonius* in Biblioth. Hiſp. [illegible]

* A Town in Holſtein.

§ Ob eruditionem, pietatemque præſtantiam, morumque integritatem, in magno & apud illos & alios eruditos fuit pretio. *Mollerus Iſagoge ad hiſt. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ*, part. 3. pag. 136.

|| Id. ib.

* Nulli ut popularem hunc ſuum in viam revocaret, pepercit operæ, ſed pertinaciam ejus, ſuperare non potuit *Mollerus* ibid. p. 107.

|| See the Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans, June 1697.

(*a*) *Doctor Stillingfleet hath gathered out of the Myſtical Authors ſome ſuch Phraſes. See his Tract of the Fanaticiſm of the* Romiſh *Church*. p. m. 240. 307. & ſeq.

(*b*) *Andr. Schottus*, Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 567.

(*c*) *Nicol. Anton.* Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. to. 2. p. 187.

(*d*) *Andr. Schottus* ibid.

(*e*) Carl. Ogier, [illegible] 218, 219.

(*f*) Ex [illegible] Biblioth. Antitrin. pag.

of the Eſteem he was in for his *Learning and great Merit*. I ſhall alledge an Inſtance of (*A*) the tenderneſs of his Conſcience, which will give me occaſion

to

who added a Preface to it. Thoſe Letters (*c*) are very curious. Some took him to be the Author (*d*) of the *German* Tranſlation of the New Teſtament, made at *Racow*, and Publiſh'd in the Year 1630; but 'tis a miſtake. (*e*) *Quas falſi mihi conſtat, cum ex Crellio* (*t*) [illegible] *Johann. Crellio & Joach. Steg*[illegible] *Senioris* [illegible], *tum ex indicio Filii, quem* [illegible] *reliquit, cognominis, Amſtelodami viventis, a* [illegible] *eam credi a Chriſtoph. Oſtorodo* [illegible] *aliqui*, [illegible] *autem eſſe a tota Societate*, [illegible] *parente ſuo, ac præfationem tandem a Crellio additam, A. 1684.* [illegible]

(*A*) *Of the tenderneſs of his Conſcience.*] This appears "from the Reſtitution he made to a Perſon, "whoſe Cauſe he had reported. He was afraid he "had not beſtowed a ſufficient time upon the Examination of that Cauſe, and that he had contributed to the loſs of it by his Careleſsneſs; and "he was ſo far from ſeeking any Excuſes, which "Self-love never fails to ſuggeſt, that he condemn'd himſelf, and made uſe of a Prieſt of "the Oratory to reſtore the Sum which that "Perſon had loſt. Perhaps it may be ſaid that "the niceneſs of the Judge proved more favourable to the Perſon concern'd, than a more ſevere "and ſtrict Examination of his Cauſe would have "been. This great probity was authentically acknowledg'd by the Parliament of *Provence*, in an Arreſt given in the Year 1655, at the Suit of the "King's Attorney General. This is what we find in M. *de Ruffi's* (*f*) Elogy immediately after theſe Words: *Whenever he ſate upon the Bench, his Mind was taken up with the Deſcription of that Court of Juſtice mention'd by the Royal Prophet in one of his Pſalms: God is preſent in the Aſſembly of the Gods; being in the middle of 'em, he judges them;* ſtetit in Synagoga Deorum, in medio autem Deos dijudicat: *Being poſſeſt with the Sentiments, that ſuch a Thought can inſpire, he weigh'd every thing in the Scale of the Sanctuary: Fleſh and Blood, the dangerous ſeductions of Friendſhip, and the power of Intereſt never made him ſwerve from the Path of Juſtice; he omitted nothing to be informed of the Truth: His firmneſs in protecting Innocency, and puniſhing Wickedneſs was as great as his Penetration; and he never gave his Opinion, nor pronounced a Sentence, without ſeriouſly conſidering whether it would be approved, at the laſt Day, before the Throne of God.*

It was not a needleſs thing for me to obſerve that theſe Words are to be found immediately before thoſe wherein it is ſaid, that he reſtor'd a certain Sum to a Perſon who had loſt his Cauſe. This will give me occaſion to make an important Reflection. The Author of the Elogy means without doubt, that M. *de Ruffi* had examin'd the Cauſe with his uſual exactneſs; but that his great conſcientiouſneſs made him fear that he had been a little careleſs. This Author does certainly give us to underſtand that the Scruples of that Judge were grounded upon the Informations he had receiv'd ſince the Cauſe had been judged. In a word, the thing ought to be underſtood in this manner. The Counſellor, who reported the Caſe, did it with a very great Application and Integrity; but after it had been decided, he found out, I do not know how, that the Party who had been caſt, had a better Right than he thought. He therefore came to think that if he had more carefully examin'd all the Writings, he would have made a more favourable Report, and thereupon he condemn'd himſelf, and reſolv'd to make a Reſtitution. This ſhews that he had a very tender and ſcrupulous Conſcience; which could not be ſaid of him, ſhould we ſuppoſe that he was ſenſible of an affected Careleſsneſs, and of ſome Lazineſs and Impatience. For in ſuch a caſe a Man, who reports a Cauſe, is certainly guilty; his Ignorance cannot excuſe him: and tho' he feels ſome Remorſe, 'tis not a Proof of a tender Conſcience; for a Man may have a hard Conſcience and yet be ſenſibly affected with ſuch inward Remorſes. But I ſuppoſe by virtue of the Expreſſions made uſe of by the Elogiſt, that Mr. *de Ruffi* could not blame himſelf for any ſuch thing. He intended to make a very fair report; he neglected nothing that he thought neceſſary, and he knew that in many other Cauſes the ſame application had been ſufficient. The only thing therefore that he blamed himſelf for, was his believing that he had done all that a good Reporter ought to do, having found out at laſt that he might have reported the caſe better than he had done. Since he was uneaſie in his Mind upon ſuch an account, he would have been uneaſie, tho' he had known that it was hardly poſſible, humanly ſpeaking, to do better, and that his Ignorance was invincible. What I am going to ſay will ſhew you the Reaſon, why I make theſe Obſervations upon M. *de Ruffi's* Conduct.

Some Pieces have been Printed in *Holland* within theſe ten (*g*) Years about the rights of an erroneous Conſcience. The Authors who maintain'd that Ignorance can be no Excuſe, have inſtanced upon ſome Holy Men, who have been extremely afflicted for what they have done with a good intent, thinking to ſerve God, and who believ'd they ſtood in need of God's Mercy, &c. Such Examples, generally ſpeaking, prove nothing at all; for a Man of a tender Conſcience, and full of Love for Virtue, will grieve even for a Fault that is purely *Material*, I mean commited with an invincible Ignorance. If a Phyſician ſhould come to know by a Revelation, that the Remedy he has preſcrib'd to a Sick Perſon, has been the occaſion of his Death, tho' according to all the rules of his Art, he was to preſcribe it; he would heartily grieve for it, if he was a conſcientious and charitable Man. He would make amends for it to the beſt of his power, by relieving the Family of the Deceaſed, reduced to great Poverty by his Death. And yet he would be very innocent before God; for I ſuppoſe that his Ignorance was invincible, and ſuch as it ought to be, to excuſe a Man according to the moſt rigid (*h*) Divines. The ſame muſt be ſaid of a Judge who has occaſion'd the loſs of a Cauſe, when no Humane Knowledge was able to diſcover the Truth. He would certainly grieve, if he ſhould know that the Party condemn'd was in the right, and would make up the Damage if he was a Man truly conſcientious and of a ſtrict Virtue. The Author of the Encomium upon M. *de Ruffi*, has given us an Inſtance of it. Such a Grief therefore and ſuch Reparations ought not to be alledged, in order to prove, That an unaffected Ignorance cannot excuſe a Man. The more we are pious, the more we'll grieve for the *material* Faults we have committed out of Ignorance. The Conſcience becomes then more ſevere than God himſelf, whether it be out of Humility or Precaution. A thouſand Inſtances might be alledged to ſhew that an Innocent Man will grieve, make up a Damage, Reſtore, &c. If a good Man hears that his Horſe has lamed ſome body, is he not concern'd for it? Does he not pay ſometimes the Chirurgeon, who takes care of the poor Wretch? And if he be a Man of a ſcrupulous Conſcience, is he not afraid that God will call him to an account for his careleſsneſs, and for keeping ſuch a Horſe? and yet all judicious Caſuiſts will acknowledge the innocency of that good Man, if they know that his Horſe has done ſuch a Miſchief without any fault of his. If an Orator ſhould be at a ſtand, and by ſuch an unvoluntary Misfortune ſhould prejudice his Neighbour, would he not be vexed at it? If he ſhould beg of God that he would forgive him, and if he went about to make up the damage, could we conclude from it that he has committed a ſin; and can we call that a Moral Fault, which is only a Phyſical Imperfection, as independent upon our Reaſon and Liberty, as the weakneſs of the Eyes ſuddenly dazled by too great a light? I ſuppoſe the Orator has neglected nothing that he thought neceſſary to remember his Speech. But let us keep to the Ignorance of Honeſt Judges. The firſt Preſident of the Parliament of *Paris*, made a Speech at the opening of that Court in 1693, wherein he repreſented (*i*), *That tho' the Judges think they have done their beſt to have a full knowledge of a Cauſe, yet ſometimes they commit an Injuſtice, when they fancy they pronounce a very juſt Sentence, which has been ſeen in M.* de Langlade's *Caſe; for the Judges notwithſtanding their great Capacity, and the care they took to clear the Matter, condemn'd an innocent Man; for which they endeavour'd to make amends by their Arreſt.* From whence it appears, That thoſe Judges, tho' honeſt and careful of their Duty, were concern'd for their Miſtake, and made amends for it. If they had dy'd, before they came to

know

(*g*) [illegible] in Septemb-er 169[illegible].

(*h*) *I have ſaid in another place, that they acknowledge, properly ſpeaking, no invincible Ignorance in religious matters: but they are not ſo rigid in relation to Matters of Fact, and Human Diſcipline.*

(*i*) Mercure Galant *for* Novemb. 1693. p. 3[illegible].

to debate a Queſtion concerning the Ignorance, whereby a Man may be excus'd, and to examin the Anſwers that may be made to the Compariſons taken (*B*) from Judges, who give an Unjuſt Judgment without knowing it, or from Phyſicians, whoſe (*C*) Remedies prove mortal, notwithſtanding their Honeſty and Learning. Our

Poſi

know that they were miſtaken, being conſcious to themſelves of having done their beſt to find out the Truth, could they have fear'd any thing from the Divine Juſtice? Can it be ſaid that they were oblig'd to overcome ſuch Obſtacles as were invincible with reſpect to them? See the Author of the *Commentaire Philoſophique* (a), who has ſo fully prov'd, that in ſome caſes an innocent Man may be condemn'd, and a guilty one acquitted without any Sin, that the Learned Miniſter of *Utrecht* (b) who writ againſt him, left this Doctrine untouch'd.

(*B*) *To examin the Anſwers* —— *to the Compariſons taken from Judges.*] How can it be ſaid, will ſome object to me, that ignorant Judges deſerve to be excus'd, ſince they occaſion ſo many Diſorders? Don't you know that they are puniſh'd? For if application be made to the Sovereign, or to a Superior Court, their Judgments are reverſed, they are cenſur'd, and ſometimes degraded. *'Tis the uſual courſe of Humane Juſtice.* Now if Princes puniſh in ſuch a manner thoſe that are ignorant of their Laws, how can it be ſaid that God will not puniſh thoſe that are Ignorant of his Word? This Compariſon is not therefore advantageous to thoſe who preach up Toleration. To this I muſt anſwer three things.

I. Should a Judge, thro' a groſs Ignorance, take the wrong way in a Cauſe, that may be eaſily determin'd, he would doubtleſs deſerve to be degraded, not as being an ill Man, if he had followed the dictates of his Conſcience (c) with an intent to be juſt to the Parties concern'd, but as being unqualify'd for ſuch an Employment; and if thoſe, who degrade him, knew the uprightneſs of his Heart, they would declare that he is a good, conſcientious, and juſt man, and that he only wants Learning. Juſt as if an Ambaſſador ſhould diſmiſs his Secretary, whoſe Hand is not very legible, tho' he knows his faithfulneſs and Capacity. This would be no Blot upon his Honeſty, no Reflection upon his Wit; he is only diſmiſt becauſe the Ambaſſador wants a Man, who writes a good Hand. Let us compare two Judges one with another, the one is very Learned, the other is a Man of indifferent Parts; and both are equally honeſt. If one of 'em be for the Affirmative, and the other for the Negative, according to the Dictates of their Conſcience, having uſed all the Induſtry and Application they are capable of in order to know the Truth; and if the ſuffrage of the more Learned is juſt, and the ſuffrage of the other unjuſt, I maintain that the one does not exceed the other in Uprightneſs. I grant that he is a more knowing Judge, and better qualify'd for his Employment, becauſe the Qualities of a good Judge take in Knowledge and Integrity; but he is not a Man of greater Probity, nor more zealous for Juſtice.

II. We are told of *an uſual courſe* of puniſhing ignorant Judges; but I don't know whether there are any inſtances of it. There is nothing more common than to ſee the Judgment of an inferior Court reverted by a Superior Court; but the inferior Judges are neither turn'd out nor cenſur'd, unleſs it does plainly appear that they have been guilty of Bribery, Partiality, or at leaſt of a very great Ignorance. And if it be ſuppoſed that they have determin'd a Cauſe according to their Knowledge, tho' it be never ſo ſmall, their Superiors are contented to rectify their Judgment. I ſhould be glad if any one would alledge an Inſtance of a Judge, degraded for want of Learning, tho' at the ſame time he was look'd upon as a conſcientious and incorruptible Man, very much intent upon Study, and very careful to examin a Cauſe. I am perſuaded that the Puniſhment of Judges is always grounded upon this Suppoſition, that they have been brib'd, or have acted out of Paſſion, or are guilty of a voluntary Ignorance. But here is a very pregnant Inſtance to confirm the Opinion laid down in the *Commentaire Philoſophique*. "(d) Tho' we "pretend to be innocent, it does not follow that the "Judges are unjuſt, for it is not a thing inconſiſtent "with Courts of Judicature, made up of Men, who "may be deceiv'd, and deceive others, that an Innocent Perſon ſhould be condemn'd, and a Guilty "one acquitted by a Juſt Judge. It often falls out, "that in Civil and Criminal Cauſes, the Judges are "divided in their Opinions when the caſe is doubtful; and as all of 'em may be directed by the "Law, it may be that all of 'em are juſt, whether "they acquit or condemn, giving their judgment "according to the Dictates of their Conſcience. "(f) When King *Henry* II. your Predeceſſor, was "inform'd, that *Peliſſon*, Preſident in the Parliament "of *Chambery*, which at that time did belong to "*France*, had been depriv'd of his Office by "Arreſt of the Parliament of *Dijon*, at the Suit of "*Tabouet* the King's Attorney, and that the Cauſe "being ſince brought to the Parliament of *Paris*, "by virtue of ſome Letters of Evocation, he had "been acquitted, and the ſaid Attorney condemn'd, "he juſtify'd all the Judges, notwithſtanding their "contrary Opinions, ſaying, that ſome had given "their Judgment according to Conſcience, and others according to the merit of the cauſe.

III. We muſt keep to the true ſtate of the Queſtion. The Author of the *Commentaire Philoſophique*, compares together thoſe who are miſtaken in a Law-Suit, and thoſe who are miſtaken in Controverſies about Religion; but he ſuppoſes that neither of 'em can be excuſed unleſs they have heartily and ſincerely us'd their utmoſt Endeavours to find out the Truth. When he ſays that in ſome Caſes the Judges condemn an Innocent Perſon, and acquit a Criminal, without any Guilt; he goes upon this Suppoſition, that they do whatever they can, and whatever the Laws preſcribe to them in order to come to the true knowledge of the matter of fact, and that they have been led into an Error meerly by the intricacy of the Cauſe, acting all along according to the Dictates of their Conſcience. If any ſuch Judges have been degraded by their Superiors, tho' they were thought to be equally Learned and Honeſt, and if ſuch a Degradation ſeems to be lawful to Wiſe Men, there is ſome reaſon to draw from thence ſome Conſequences, in order to prove that God will puniſh Ignorant Men notwithſtanding their ſincerity. But if the thing is quite otherwiſe among Men, what will become of theſe Conſequences? I think one may be allow'd to draw quite contrary Inferences from it, and this amongſt others; ſince Kings do not puniſh thoſe who, notwithſtanding all their Application and Honeſty, cannot avoid being miſtaken in their Judgment about a very intricate Cauſe; much more will God, who is infinitely Good and Juſt, bear with thoſe who are not able to unfold the true ſenſe of a Paſſage of the Scripture.

I muſt further obſerve two things: One is, That a Judge of a very groſs Ignorance, can hardly be accounted a good Man; for this ſuppoſes that he has neglected to inſtruct himſelf, (e) and that his Lazineſs is inexcuſable, or that he has given up himſelf to Pleaſures. A Man who behaves himſelf thus in the exerciſe of ſuch an Office, cannot have (f) a right Conſcience, and if ſuch a Man is degraded, it cannot be ſaid that he has been puniſh'd for his ſincere and unvoluntary Ignorance. The ſecond thing I have to ſay is, That I advance all thoſe Obſervations only as Doubts and Probabilities, which may be examin'd, without pretending to aſſert the Doctrine of the *Commentaire Philoſophique*. And to ſhew my Readers that I am far from extenuating the Faults of a Judge, which proceed only from Ignorance, I ſhall ſet down a thundring Judgment againſt them. The firſt Preſident *de Lamoignon* (g) "would have "thought himſelf deficient in the moſt eſſential part "of his Office, if he had not taken care to have as "much Knowledge as Uprightneſs. And therefore "he uſed to ſay, that there is no great difference "between a Wicked Judge and an ignorant one. "The Firſt knows at leaſt his Duty, and is ſenſible "of his Injuſtice; but the other does neither know "the Good nor the Miſchief he does: The one "is conſcious of his Faults, and is more inexcuſable; "but the other ſins without any remorſe, and is "more incorrigible. But they are equally Guilty, "with reſpect to thoſe whom they condemn thro' "Error or Malice. A Man does not leſs feel his "Wound, whether he be wounded by a Mad-man "or a blind one; and it matters little whether one "be undone by a Man, who deceives him, or by "a Man who is deceiv'd.

(*C*) *From Phyſicians, whoſe Remedies prove Mortal*

not-

(a) In the Supplement page [illegible] & ſeq. & p. [illegible] & ſeq. to p. [illegible], ſee alſo Montaigne's *Eſſays*, lib. 3. chap. 13. p.m. [illegible]

(b) See M. Saurin's *Book*, intitled Reflexions ſur les droits de la conſcience, Utrecht, 1697.

(c) Suppoſing ſuch a Judge can be ſaid to have a very upright Conſcience. See above Letter g.

(d) *Richeome*, Plainte Apologetique au Roi *Henri* IV. pour les Jeſuites. p.m. 182.

(f) [illegible]

RUFFI lived 82 Years. It does not appear from the * *Elogy*, which I have quoted, in what Year he was Born, nor in what Year he Died: Such (*D*) an Omiſſion cannot be juſtified. *Lewis Antony de RUFFI* his Son had a hand in the Additions of the Second Edition of the Hiſtory of *Marſeilles*.

RUFINUS, a Favourite of the Emperor *Theodoſius*, † " was a *Gaul*, Born " in the Province of *Aquitania* ||, of an indifferent Extraction, but of a lofty " Mind. He was a ſupple, inſinuating and polite Man, well qualified to divert a " Prince, and even to ſerve him. He came to the Court of *Conſtantinople*, where " he got Friends and Patrons: He made himſelf known to *Theodoſius*, and had the " good Fortune to pleaſe him. He ſo well Improved the beginning of his For- " tune, that he was in a ſhort time Promoted to conſiderable Imployments. The " Emperor made him High Steward (1), admitted him into all his Councils, Ho- " nour'd him with his Friendſhip and Confidence, and at laſt raiſed him to the " Conſulſhip with his own Son *Arcadius*. That Man maintain'd himſelf as he had " had been advanced, rather by his Addreſs than by his Virtue. His Ambition in- " creaſed with his Fortune: He endeavoured to inrich himſelf with the ſpoils of " thoſe, whom he deſtroyed by his Calumnies (2). Whoever had an extraordi- " dinary Merit, and was in a Condition to contend with him, could not fail to " be his Enemy. Nevertheleſs being afraid of loſing the Prince's Affection, unleſs " he preſerved his Eſteem, he appear'd Modeſt and Unintereſted. He cover'd " his ill Counſels with the pretence of Juſtice or Policy, and knew ſo well how " to ſet off his good qualities, and conceal the ill ones, that the Emperor, tho' " never ſo knowing and jealous of his Authority, was often Deceiv'd and Go- " vern'd by him, without perceiving it. The principal (3) Lords of the Court " could not ſee the Elevation of this Favourite, without being offended at it —— " They Conſpired againſt him, and reſolved to undo him": But their Enterpriſe (*A*) occaſion'd

withſtanding their Honeſty and Learning.] I ſhall not dwell long upon this. Should a Phyſician, will ſome ſay, come to think that *Arſenick* is a good Remedy, and give it to his Patients, and ſo ſend 'em *apace into another World*, he would be juſtly puniſh'd in this Life, and in that which is to come, though he ſhould plead an unvoluntary Ignorance. This is the Image of an Hereſiarch. I anſwer that 'tis impoſſible, Morally ſpeaking, that there ſhould be ſuch a Phyſician; and therefore ſuch an Example ought not to be alledged. No Man can believe that *Arſenick* is a good Remedy, unleſs we ſuppoſe him like thoſe, who fancy that they are Kings, or made of Butter, and that therefore they muſt not come near the Fire. Such People are kept within ſight, or ſhut up by their Relations: No Body conſults them in a fit of Sickneſs, or about a Law Suit to follow their Advices. If it be ſuppoſed that a Chymiſt may ſincerely believe, that he knows how to Prepare *Arſenick* ſo as to make a good Remedy of it; one may give a very good Judgment about his Ignorance. Either he has Experienced the Virtue of that Remedy, or he has not Experienced it. If he has made no ſuch Experiment, we muſt ſay either that he does not believe what he ſays, or that he is Mad. If he has made the Experiment, and yet perſiſts in the ſame Opinion; one may certainly affirm that he is a Wicked or a Mad-Man. A ſincere Ignorance ſuppoſes that a Man has made it is buſineſs to examin a thing with an earneſt deſire of Knowing the Truth of it, and without being acted by Avarice, Pride, or any deſign of Cheating. *Hereſiarcks* cannot be reaſonably compared with that imaginary Phyſician, who Kills ſo many People, unleſs they have ſeen the Eternal Damnation of their firſt followers. If ſuch a ſight did not Convert 'em, they muſt needs be Mad, or ſpeak againſt their Conſcience; and in both caſes they ought to be deliver'd to the Secular Power; In the firſt caſe to be ſhut up in a Publick Houſe for Mad-men, and in the ſecond, to ſuffer the Puniſhment which thoſe deſerve, who Blaſpheme againſt God whom they know. No body deſires that ſuch People ſhould be Tolerated.

As to the Puniſhment that a Phyſician ſhould deſerve before God, if he ſhould give *Arſenick* to his Patients, the thing may be thus determin'd. If he was a Mad-man, he will be judged as a Mad-man: If he was not Mad, he will be judged according as his Ignorance has been voluntary or unvoluntary. Now by a voluntary Ignorance we muſt underſtand ſuch an Ignorance as proceeds from Lazineſs, or from ſome other fault, which may be mended.

(*D*) *Such an Omiſſion cannot be juſtified.*] *Paul Jovius, Scævola de Sainte Marthe*, and many other Elogiſts have often committed the ſame fault. Were they afraid that a date would ſpoil the Harmony of a Period? Or had they a mind to be ſhort? How vain would ſuch Excuſes be! If they went upon ſuch Ridiculous Reaſons, why didn't they put in the Margin what they ſhould not have Omitted? I am ſure that upon ſome Occaſions they have been ſilent, becauſe they did not know in what Year their Hero was Born or Dead. The Author of M. *Ruffi*'s Encomium cannot be excuſed upon ſuch an Ignorance. But will ſome ſay in his Vindication, does he not ſay that the Hiſtory of *Marſeilles* was Printed when the Author was but 35 Years of Age? Does he not ſay that the Author lived 82 Years? Is it not an eaſy thing to infer from thence, that he was Born in the Year 1607, and that he Died in 1689. I anſwer in the Negative, becauſe he does not tell us that the Hiſtory of *Marſeilles* was Printed in 1642, and that date is neither to be ſeen in the Epiſtle Dedicatory, nor in the Preface, nor in the King's Licence, nor in any other part of the *Prolegomena*: And therefore we want another Book to know the Year in which that Author was Born or Died. It is therefore a Fault: for a Reader ſhould not be ſo much as obliged to turn to ſome other Pages of the ſame Book upon ſuch an occaſion. Much leſs ought an Author to impoſe upon us the neceſſity of conſulting another Book.

(*A*) *Their Enterpriſe occaſion'd their own Ruin, and*] They, who conſpired againſt him, were (*b*) *Timaſus* and *Promotus*, *who had lately Commanded the Army, and done Important Services* —— Tatian, *who had Govern'd all the Eaſt in the abſence of* Theodoſius —— *and* Proculus, Tatian's *Son*, *Governour of* Conſtantinople, *a young, bold and daring Man.* Rufinus *being informed of all their Deſigns, prepoſſeſt the Emperor in his behalf, and repreſented to him*, (*c*) That the Favours he daily received from his Majeſty made him Odious to the whole Court; that tho' he was never ſo careful to prevent the Murmurs of thoſe, who Envied him, new Cabals and Factions were daily form'd againſt him; that he muſt needs ſink, unleſs he be ſupported by the ſame Hand, that raiſed him; that he was ſenſible of his want of Merit, and gloried only in the kindneſs his Majeſty had for him, and in expreſſing his acknowledgment for it all the Days of his life. *Having thus ingaged the Emperor to Protect him, he made it his buſineſs not only to avoid being Surpriſed, but alſo to deſtroy his Enemies* —— *Being in Council with* Promotus, *he had ſeveral Conteſtations with him.* (*d*) *The Emperor went out, and then their diſpute began again: Both of 'em maintain'd their Opinions, and grew hot upon it.* Rufinus *ſpoke ſome offenſive words; whereupon* Promotus *fell into a Paſſion, and gave him a Box on the Ear.* —— *The Emperor, to whom* Rufinus *immediately Complain'd, was very angry at it. He openly declar'd*, that he would no longer ſuffer ſuch Diviſions and Intrigues, and the Authors of 'em; that he would teach 'em to live Peaceably, and to conſider thoſe whom

---

* See the Elogy of Ruffi in the Hiſtory of Marſeilles 1696, written by his Nephew *Antony Ruffi*, a Religious of the Abbey of *Lerins*.

† Flechier, hiſtoire de Theodoſe, B. 4. pag. 433. Paris 1680. in 12.

|| Born at *Elusa* according to *Claudian*. 'Twas then the Metropolis of the Countrey now called *Armagnac* in *Gaſcony* properly ſo called.

(1) *Zozim.* l. 4. Ambr. Ep. 53.

(2) Claudian. l. 1. contra Ruff.

(3) Zoz.

(*b*) Flechier, hiſtoire de Theodoſe, Book 4. pag. 434. ad ann. 391.

(*c*) Id. ib. pag. 435. ad ann. 392.

(*d*) Zoz l. 4.

occaſion'd their own Ruin, and confirm'd him in his Power. He was Baptized with (B) great Pomp in the Year 394. The Spite he conceived againſt *Stilico*, who was above him after the Death of *Theodoſius*, put him upon Treacherous Deſigns, whereby he undid himſelf. * *He took advantage of his Maſter's Weakneſs; he Imbroiled the Empires and the Emperors by his ſecret Practices with the* Huns, *the* Goths, *and the* Alans, *and went about to make himſelf Sovereign, or at leaſt Independent upon his Maſters and his Enemies.* He was kill'd † in the Year 395. See *Moreri*. His Death put an end to *Claudian*'s Doubts about Providence; they vaniſh'd away aſſoon as he heard of the Fall of that inſolent and unjuſt Favourite. I ſhall make ſome Reflections (C) upon his words; which will give me occaſion to inquire whether

* Flechier, ibid. pag. [illegible].

† But according to Mr. Flechier ibid. pag. 437. in the Year 397.

whom he had an Affection for; and that if they continued to be jealous of *Rufinus*, he would raiſe him ſo far above them, that they would be forced to Reſpect and perhaps to Obey him. *That Prince, who knew how to make himſelf Fear'd, when there was a neceſſity for it, ſpake theſe words ſo warmly, that from that time no body durſt Murmur. He turn'd* Promotus *out of the Court, and almoſt at the ſame time he made* Rufinus *Prefect of the* Pretorium. *The new dignity of this Favourite, and the Emperor's protection, on which he entirely relied, inabled him to revenge himſelf more eaſily of his Enemies.* Promotus *did not live long after his Diſgrace, for having received Orders to go and joyn the Army, and to March towards the Baſtarnæ, who were Plundering* Thrace, *he was kill'd in an Ambuſh, by a Party of thoſe Barbarians: Several People accuſed* Rufinus *of that Treachery.* Proculus's (2) *Death was not leſs Diſmal. That Miniſter had him accuſed of ſeveral Crimes, bribed the Commiſſioners appointed to Try him, obliged them underhand to Condemn him to Death, and contrived the Matter ſo that the Pardon, which the Emperor ſent him, came after the Execution. He croſs'd* Tatian (3) *in ſome Domeſtick Concerns, and* Timaſius *would not have been more Fortunate than the reſt, had he not endeavoured to gain the Affection of that Favourite, and made himſelf an Accomplice of his Crimes.*

(2) Zoz. l. 4.

(3) Ambr. ep. 53.

(B) *He was Baptiſed with great Pomp.*] M. *Flechier* has given us a noble Deſcription of it, next to a Preamble, which is a Maſter-piece, and therefore I ſhall ſet down his Words ſomewhat at large. " (a) " *Rufinus*, who govern'd the Empire with an Abſo- " lute Power in the abſence of *Theodoſius*——— " had for a long time Concealed his Vanity and Am- " bition under the appearances of an affected Mo- " deſty: And whether he had a mind that the Em- " peror who loved him, ſhould have a good Opi- " nion of him, or whether he was willing to give " leſs Umbrage to the Courtiers, who envied his " Fortune, he grew every day more Powerful, with- " out ſeeming to be more Proud. He was deſirous " to get Wealth by private means; and tho' he " loved Pomp and Statelineſs, his Avarice gave a " check to his Pride. But when he ſaw that " he could rely upon his Maſter's Affection, " being loaded with the Wealth he had recei- " ved from him, or unjuſtly acquired, he gave a " full ſcope to his Inclinations, and grew Inſolent, " as ſoon as he believed he might be ſo with Im- " punity. He got a great many Creatures, appear- " ed Abroad with a more Magnificent Equipage " than became a private Man, and built more State- " ly Houſes than the very Palaces of the Emperors. " He had taken a particular care to build near the Sub- " urb of *Chalcedon* (4), a Houſe of Pleaſure ſo vaſt, " that one would have taken it for a Town, and ſo " full of Ornaments and Precious Goods, that one " could hardly believe that a private Man had been " able to bear ſuch exceſſive Charges. On the one " ſide they were building a large Church in Honour " of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; and on the other, at a " ſmall diſtance, a Monaſtery was to be ſeen upon " a riſing Ground, which was to ſupply the want of " Clergy-Men in that Church. When thoſe Buildings " were finiſh'd, *Rufinus* reſolved to be Baptized, and " at the ſame time to Celebrate the Dedication of " that New Church with all imaginable Pomp——— " (b) Adding a great deal of Oſtentation and Vain- " Glory to a little Religion, (5) he call'd together " the Biſhops of the ſeveral parts of the Eaſtern " Empire, eſpecially thoſe, who were poſſeſt of the " firſt Sees. Nay, he intreated by repeated Letters, " the moſt Famous Anachorets of *Egypt* to leave " their Solitude, in order to aſſiſt at the Ceremony. " The great Station he was in, in that Empire, " whereof he had the chief Direction under *Arcadi-* " *us*, moved a great many Biſhops to ſet out upon " the firſt Invitation, and to bring along with them " the moſt Holy Men of their Provinces. The Aſ- " ſembly was very numerous. There were in it " three Patriarchs, *Nectarius* of *Conſtantinople*, *Theo-* " *philus* of *Alexandria*, and *Flavian* of *Antioch*. *Gre-* " *gory* Biſhop of *Nyſſa*, *Amphilocus* of *Iconium*, *Paul* " of *Heraclea*, *Dioſcorus* of *Helenopolis*, and many " other Famous Prelates arrived there before the " reſt. The chief Perſons of the Nobility and " Clergy, and an innumerable Multitude of People " reſorted thither, ſome to Honour the Feaſt, others " to make their Court to that Favourite, and ma- " ny to ſatisfy their Curioſity. This Ceremony was " performed in the Month of *September*. The " Church was hung with fine Tapeſtry; the Altar " glittered with Gold and precious Stones. The " Conſecration was made in great Order and with " all poſſible Magnificence. The Service being o- " ver, they proceeded to *Rufinus*'s Baptiſm with the " ſame Pomp. The Patriarch *Nectarius* adminiſtred " it to him, and the Famous *Evagrius* of *Pontus*, who " had been ſent for from *Egypt* with the *Anachoret* " *Ammonius*, received at the coming out of the " Font (6) that Regenerated Man, who did not " long preſerve his Innocency. Thus ended that " Solemnity, which would have been one of the " moſt Holy and moſt Magnificent of the Eaſtern " Church, had it not been attended with a Prophane " Luxury, and had not that Miniſter endeavoured " to get again from the People by his Injuſtice what " he ſeem'd to have ſpent for God upon that oc- " caſion.

(a) Flechier, ubi ſupra pag. 486. ad. ann. 394.

(4) Zozom. l. 8. c. 17.

(b) Flechier, ibid. pag. 488.

(5) Theodoret. l. 1. c. 31. Socrat. lib. 2. c. 5. Pallad. in Lauſiac. c. 4.

(5) Pallad. in Lauſiac.

(C) *Some Reflections upon* Claudian's *Doubts.*] He ſays that the Beautiful Order, which appears in the World, moved him to believe that it is directed by the moſt wiſe Laws of an Infinite God; but that the diſorder, which prevails among Men, the Proſperity of the Wicked, and the Miſery of Good Men, induced him to believe, as *Epicurus* did, that all things had been made by Chance, and that the Gods did not concern themſelves with the Government of the World. At laſt, ſays he, the Puniſhment of *Rufinus* has removed my Doubts; I acquit the Gods; I do no more complain that the Wicked have got ſo much Power; they are only raiſed to fall from a higher place.

Sæpe (c) mihi dubiam traxit ſententia mentem,
Curarent Superi terras, an nullus ineſſet
Rector, & incerto fluerent mortalia caſu.
Nam cum diſpoſiti quæſiſſem fœdera mundi,
Præſcriptoſque maris fines, annique meatus,
Et lucis, noctiſque vices: tunc omnia rebar
Conſilio firmata Dei, qui lege moveri
Sidera, qui fruges diverſo tempore naſci,
Qui variam Phœben alieno juſſerit igne
Compleri, Solemque ſuo: porrexerit undis
Littora; tellurem medio libraverit axe.
Sed cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
Aſpicerem, lætoſque diu florere nocentes,
Vexarique pios: rurſus labefacta cadebat
Religio, cauſſæque viam non ſponte ſequebar
Alterius, vacuo quæ currere ſemina motu
Affirmat, magnumque novas per inane figuras
Fortuna, non arte, regi: quæ Numina ſenſu
Ambiguo vel nulla putat, vel neſcia noſtri.
Abſtulit hunc tandem Rufini pœna tumultum,
Abſolvitque Deos. Jam non ad culmina rerum
Injuſtos creviſſe queror, tolluntur in altum,
Ut lapſu graviore ruant.

(c) Claudian. in Rufin. lib. 1. init.

I have promiſed in (d) the Article of Marechal *d'Ancre*, to mention in this place *Balzac*'s Reflections upon a thought of *Malherbe* like that of *Claudian*: I do now perform my Promiſe. " (e) 'Tis true " that this was a common thing, before it was Re- " formed by the Chriſtian Religion. The Gods " were charged with all the Crimes of Men. The " Divine Providence was every day Indited by ſome " body

(d) See Concini Remark

(e) Balzac, Socrate Chretien p.m. 23

whether all those, who have maintain'd the Orthodox Opinion concerning Providence, have well observed the Rules of a Disputation. *Gabriel Naudé* affirms that

"body, who complain'd that the things of this "World did not go, as he could have wish'd. *Their* "*Poets too frame it an Evidence against God.* This "is an old saying alledged by *Cicero*, and there is "nothing so obvious in the Heathen Poets, as the "Crimes of their Gods, and of Destiny. *Crimen Deorum, Fatorum crimen, &c.* *Corinna* is Sick, and "if she dies of her Sickness, says a Poet who was in "Love with her, the *Death of such a beautiful Woman will be the Crime of the God of Physick.*

"*Tam formosa tuum mortis crimen eris.*

"Nay since the Empire of *Constantine*, and under the "Children of *Theodosius*, there are some Instances "of those Poetical Blasphemies, and of that Prophane "Liberty. If *Rufinus* had not been punish'd for his "Crimes, the Gods would have been looked, as "*Rufinus's* Abettors and Accomplices.

"*Abstulit hunc tandem Rufini pœna* (*a*) *tumultum,*
"*Absolvitque Deos.*

"One of our Poets said something like it, but in "a very Excellent manner, and his Copy exceeds "all his Originals. I take it to be a Master-piece: "'Tis in that Ode, which may be set above the Finest and most Elaborate Odes of the Ancients. "The God of *Seine* speaks to a Favourite, who was "going over the *Pont-Neuf*. I shall add the following words of *Menage* to those of *Balzac*: (*b*) *Ton chomage*, Et le ciel accusé de supporter tes crimes, est resolu de se justifier, (*And Heaven being accused of Favouring thy Crimes, is resolved to vindicate it self*) *is not originally* Claudian's: *Many of the Authors, who lived before him have said the same thing.* Cicero *in the third Book* de natura Deorum: Diogenes quidem Cynicus dicere solebat, Harpalum, qui temporibus illis prædo felix habebatur, contra Deos testimonium dicere, quod in illa fortuna tam diu viveret. *And in another place of the same Book:* Improborum igitur prosperitates, secundæque res redarguunt, ut Diogenes dicebat, vim omnem Deorum ac potestatem. *Martial:*

Nullos esse Deos, inane cœlum
Affirmat Selius; probatque, quod se
Factum, dum negat hæc, videt beatum.

Seneca says in that sense, Deorum crimen, Sylla tam felix: *and an ancient Comick Poet,*

Θεῶν δ᾽ ὄνειδος, τοὺς κακοὺς εὐδαιμονεῖν.

Barthius (*c*) has Collected a great many such Sayings, and has not omitted those that are to be found in Holy Writ (*d*). One may bring under this Head all the Passages of the Ancients, wherein Fortune is reviled, as a blind, inconstant, rambling, and unjust Being, that favours unworthy Persons. I shall only set down one of those Passages out of *Pliny*. (*e*) *Invenit inter has utrasque sententias medium sibi ipsa mortalitas numen, quo minus etiam plana de Deo conjectatio esset. Toto quippe mundo, & locis omnibus, omnibusque horis omnium vocibus Fortuna sola invocatur: una nominatur, una accusatur, una agitur rea, una cogitatur, sola laudatur, sola arguitur, & cum conviciis colitur volubilis, a plerisque vero & cæca etiam existimata, vaga, inconstans, incerta, varia, indignorumque fautrix. Huic omnia expensa, huic omnia feruntur accepta: & in tota ratione mortalium, sola utramque paginam facit. Adeoque obnoxiæ sumus sortis, ut Sors ipsa pro Deo sit, qua Deus probatur incertus.*

It may be said that in all Ages and among all Nations, without excepting the Age we live in, and Christianity, the Prosperity of Wicked Men has occasion'd many Murmurs against God, and raised many Doubts about Providence. On the other side that Objection has been answered at all times and in all Countries; and yet it has been continually Revived: So that what is said of the Palm-Tree may be applied to it, *curvata resurgo*. We ought to be persuaded that it is a false and insignificant Objection; but it will not be improper to examin whether *Claudian* made a good Answer to it.

Perhaps some would tell him; you have not taken the right way; the only answer you should have made to your difficulty, was to consider the vast and immense Idea of the most perfect Being, and to draw this Consequence from it: He is the Author and Governour of all things; and therefore nothing comes to pass but what is directed in a most Wise, Just and Admirable Manner. This is certainly the true way of removing all Doubts: Silence Reason; (*f*) let it acquiesce to Authority: God hath said so, *whatever it be, God has done it, God has permitted it; it is therefore true, just, wisely done, and wisely permitted.* If you enter into the Discussion of each particular Argument, you'll never see an end of the Matter, and after a thousand Disputes, you'll be obliged to have recourse to Authority, and to the immense Idea of the most perfect Being. But since we must come to that at last, let us keep stedfastly to it, mistrusting our imperfect Knowledge, and fully persuaded that the best use of Reason as to those things is not to Reason at all. When a Man engages in a Disputation, he must undertake to shew his Adversary that he is in the wrong; but he must not pretend that his Adversary will acquiesce in his first and second Answers. The Rules of a Disputation require that each Party may be allowed to reply, as often as he can answer an Argument by another Argument, and till the Matter be brought to the first Principles. If I can shew a Man that his Assertion is contrary to the common Notions, and that mine is a natural and necessary consequence of those Notions; I am not obliged to hear him any longer, by virtue of this Axiom, *Adversus negantem principia non est disputandum.* But if I give only a probable Solution of his Objections, and he is able to bring in new Difficulties as probable as my Solution, I cannot require of him that he should acquiesce in my Answers: I must look out for a new Solution of his new Difficulties; and if I can find none that is evident, or that will not admit of a specious Answer, I ought to give over the Dispute without pretending to have got the Victory; otherwise I should imitate the French Converters. About the Year 1680, those Gentlemen offered to enter upon a Conference about Religion with their erring Brethren: They promised to hear their Doubts, and to clear them, and to instruct them in a very cordial manner: But after they had answered two or three times, they could no longer abide to be Contradicted, they would have their Explanations submitted to, otherwise they declared that their Adversaries were Obstinate. It had been better to say so at first: It is a Ridiculous thing to enter into a Discussion, if we will not suffer an Adversary to make a hundred Replies, if he can do it; and if he is able to alledge against the tenth Reply, an Argument as probable as the Objection which he proposed against the main Assertion. Such is the State of Disputations. Your Adversary attacks your Assertion, you answer him; but it often falls out that your answer lies more open to Difficulties than the Assertion it self. You ought therefore to refute his Reply: Your new Answer contains I know not what, that raises new difficulties more plausible than the first; therefore they must be examin'd, and so *in infinitum*, unless you bring in common (*g*) Notions, to non-plus your Antagonist. Such are the Laws of a Disputation; if you have no mind to observe them, 'tis better for you not to enter the Lists, being contented to say, this ought to be believed without Reasoning: God said so; that's enough.

What Laws are to be observed in a Disputation.

This would be an unjust Proceeding, if the State of the Question was this, *Has God spoke?* But it cannot be said to be unjust, when we dispute with Men, who acknowledge the Existence of a most perfect Being, and raise Doubts in their Minds because good Men are Unhappy, and wicked Men live in Prosperity. The only answer, that ought to be made to those Doubting Men, is this. You are persuaded of the Existence of a most perfect Being; you ought therefore to believe that it Governs all things in a most perfect manner: For if you don't draw this Consequence from the Principle which you admit, you are Ignorant of the first Rules of common Sense, and you might as well argue thus; The Sun cannot produce darkness, therefore it has produced it. That it may the better appear that we ought to keep to that short answer, and to the general Principle of the Existence of God, I will shew the Inconveniencies, which arise from a particular Discussion of each Argument. In the first place, it is certain that in such a case you are obliged to answer all the Replies of an Adversary, till you can bring an Argument against him, to which no reasonable Reply can be made: Such are the Laws of a Disputation, as I have already observed. In the second place, it is certain that your particular Arguments will be an-

(*f*) *I was dumb, I opened not my Mouth because thou didst it.* Psalm. 39. ver. 10.

(*g*) *By common Notions I understand in general all the Principles, which the two contending Parties are agreed upon.*

Rufinus has been praised (*D*) by three or four celebrated Historians; but there is no such thing.

RUGGERI † (*Cosimo*) a *Florentine*, introduced himself into the Court of *France* as a great Astrologer, when *Catherine de Medicis* favour'd that sort of People. He was a Man of parts, and had the Reputation of being Learned: Being very bold even to Impudence, he thrusted himself among Persons of Quality, and was a great Intreaguer. *Catherine de Medicis* bestowed upon him the Abby of *St. Mahe*, in the Lower *Bretaigne*. He calculated the Nativity of all the Lords of the Court, and went about it in such a manner as he thought most proper to get Mony from them ‖. At last, he was accounted a Diviner and a Magician, and in the Year 1574, he found himself

forced *in infinitum*, and that the Answers will be no less plausible, as it will appear from this Specimen. Suppose our Poet had acquainted another Man with the Reason, that removed all his Doubts: He would have told him, since *Rufinus* has been punish'd, there is a Providence, whereby all things are wisely and justly govern'd. The Prosperity of that wicked Man did not prove that Providence was asleep, but on the contrary, that it was preparing by degrees a severe Punishment for him; he was rais'd that he might be the better crush'd to pieces by falling from a high place: *tolluntur in altum, ut lapsu graviore ruant*. *Claudian* might have been answered, if you have nothing else to say, the difficulty remains still; tho' your Solution be never so (*a*) ancient, it is not the better for it; whilst you resolve a great Difficulty, you lie open to one that is greater still. Your Particle UT strikes one with horror. You ascribe to a most perfect Being, who is consequently infinitely good, a Motive and a final Cause, which is so far from having any goodness in them, are the most malicious and Tyrannical Character that can be conceiv'd. 'Tis just as if one of our Emperors designing to inflict a capital Punishment upon some of his Domesticks, should make 'em Governors of Provinces, and suffer 'em to exercise all sorts of Extortions, and to suck the Substance of the People, in order to punish 'em more severely. If you had been so bold as to say of *Theodosius* what you say of God, that he raised *Rufinus* to the highest Dignities to crush him the better, and to shew his Subjects his Soveraign Power of raising and depressing Men, he would have had you hanged, as a Satyrical and Insolent Poet. *Claudian* would doubtless be sensible of the heinousness of his UT and of his final cause, and would desire that this Word should not be taken in a strict sense. He would say that Providence had not loaded wicked *Rufinus* with good things, in order to do him more mischief, but in hopes that that Favourite would make a good use of 'em. He would add, that according to the Laws of Nature, the fall of Bodies is so much the greater, as they fall from a higher place, and that therefore *Rufinus*'s Elevation could not but aggravate his punishment, when the ill use he continually made of Heavenly Favours call'd for it. But *Claudian* would be answered that this does not remove difficulties: Hopes are not to be found in the Divine Nature; God most certainly knows whatever shall come to pass; he knew most certainly that *Rufinus* would make an ill use of his Favours; and therefore it (*b*) had been better to prevent him, than to bear his Crimes for many Years, in order to inflict upon him a punishment, which cannot make up the mischief he has done, the oppression of so many innocent Persons, the death of so many People, and the ruin of so many Families. 'Tis but a poor satisfaction for a Province desolated by a Governor, to have him punish'd; it (*c*) continues in the miserable condition it was in before, and sometimes the Guilty Man is the better for it. I don't carry farther the Replies, which our Poet could make; doubtless he could make a great many, and his Adversary would do the same. I suppose that after a long disputation his Adversary would tell him: I believe as well as you, that whatever has happen'd in the case of *Rufinus* is Just, Wise, and perfect in respect to God; but I don't believe it by virtue of your Arguments. The Idea of the most perfect Being is sufficient to those, who know how to make a good use of their Reason. I know some Men, who have read several times *Boetius, de Consolatione Philosophiæ*, and find a great difference between the Objections and the Answers of that Author. *Boethius* was both a great Philosopher, and a very good Man. Groaning under the weight of his Misfortune, and overwhelm'd with Grief, he supposes that Philosophy comes to comfort him. He raises several Objections about Providence: Philosophy answers them as well as she can; but whereas the Difficulties of *Boethius* are fitted to the meanest capacity, the Solutions can hardly be understood without the greatest attention, and the quickest apprehension. Philosophy mistrusts her self, and requires most times that she may be allow'd to wind about, and to trace up things higher; and tho' what she says be never so solid, it happens sometimes that we don't understand it; and if she convinces us, she does it most times without inlightening the Mind. Such is the Opinion of some Persons who have read *Boethius*. They have acquainted me that a most subtil Professor of the XVII. Century, brings in a Heathen, who raises many Difficulties about Providence, and gives him no other expedient, but the assistance of the Divine Grace. (*d*) *Unde Philosophus noster ethnicus tot difficultatibus oppressus, nisi gratia divina animetur, ad cognitionem Dei unius ac infiniti ab universo nunquam assurget.*

Before I make an end of this Remark, I must take notice of the Injustice of some Persons, who fancy that those who reject the Reasons they alledge for a Doctrine, reject the Doctrine it self. There is a very great difference between those two things, and they are easily distinguish'd by equitable and understanding Men, who entertain no ill suspicion of those, who cannot abide that weak and wrong Arguments should be made use of to maintain a Truth. This however may be liable to some abuses; for, (to give an Instance of it) the *Pyrrhonists* under pretence of confuting only the Arguments of the Dogmatists for the existence of God, did actually undermine the Doctrine it self. At first, they (*e*) declared that they follow'd the common Opinion, without addicting themselves to any particular Sect; that they acknowledg'd the existence of the Gods, honour'd them, and ascrib'd a Providence to them; but that they could not abide that the Dogmatists should be so rash as to reason about it: Afterwards they proposed their Objections, which overthrowing Providence, tended to overthrow the Existence of God. See *Sextus Empiricus* (*f*), who instead of grounding his Doubts, as *Claudian* did, upon the Prosperity of Wicked Men, grounds them upon Adversity, and the many Evils that prevail in the World. He alleges an Argument, which has been better express'd than Confuted by *Lactantius*. That Argument may be seen in the Article *Paulicians*: Father *Theophilus Raynaud* has observ'd, that according to *Arnobius*, it is an insoluble one. (*g*) *Posset denique cum Sexto Empirico* Lib. 1. Volum. 3 *Pyrrhonicarum hypothyposeon cap.* 1. *fieri tale argumentum, quod si Deus sit, cum sit bonus infinite, & perfectissimus, nulla in mundo esset malitia aut imperfectio: nam contrarium unum infinitum, destruit totaliter aliud. Cui argumento responsurus Arnobius lib.* 2. *num.* 49. *post multam exaggerationem difficultatis, insolubilem existimare videtur. Alexander autem quem refert & late rejicit Simplic.* 2. *cœli*, in fine, *concedit Deum non posse mala excludere, alioqui ea omnino fuisse prohibiturum. Et verò hoc ipsum argumentum multos Philosophos vexasse, testatur Lactantius libro de ira Dei cap.* 13. *Sed recte respondet* Scot. &c.

(*D*) [*Has been praised by three or four celebrated Historians.*] " (*h*) *Claudian* does very much inveigh a-" gainst *Rufinus*—— and yet *Zozimus*, *Zonaras*, *Eu-*" *tropius*, and *Paulus Orosius* praise him exceedingly. They are *Naude*'s words; he is very much mistaken. (*i*) *Orosius* speaks ill of *Rufinus*, and says nothing in his Commendation: *Eutropius* does not at all mention him; for his History ends with the death of *Jovian*, who liv'd before the Empire of *Theodosius*. I find nothing in *Zonaras* that relates to our *Rufinus*. *Rufinus* mention'd by that Annalist, (*k*) was Consul of *Rome*, when *Pyrrhus* made War against the *Romans*: As for *Zozimus*, he is so far from praising *Rufinus* excessively, that he represents him as a wicked Man: I could prove it out of several Passages of his History, but this will be sufficient. Pagi &

† Mezeray, Abregé Chronol. pag. 253. He calls him Cosmus Roger.
‖ Garasse, Doctrine curieuse, pag. 135.

(*a*) Juvenal Sat. 10. v. 105. Said before him, speaking of Sejanus. Nam qui nimios optabat honores, Et nimias poscebat opes, numerosa parabat Excelsæ turris tabulata, unde altior esset casus, & impulsæ præceps immane ruinæ.

(*b*) Cur omnium crudelissimus tamdiu Cinna regnavit? At dedit pœnas. Prohiberi melius fuit, impedirique ne tot summos viros interficeret, quam aliquando pœnas dare. Cicero de natura Deorum lib. 3. pag. m. 679.

(*c*) Exul ab octava Marius bibit, & fruitur Diis iratis. Juvenal. Sat. 1. v. 49.

(*d*) [illegible]

(*e*) Sext. Empiric. [illegible]

(*f*) Sext. Empiric. ibid.

(*g*) Theoph. Raynaud. [illegible] Theolog. Natural. [illegible]

(*h*) Naude, [illegible]

(*i*) [illegible]

(*k*) Zonar. [illegible] Edit. [illegible] 1670.

felt involved in the Accuſation of *La Mole* (A) and *Coconas*, who among other Crimes were Indicted for Witchcraft againſt the Life of *Charles* IX. He is call'd † *Coſmo* the *Italian* in that Tryal, and he was condemn'd to the Gallies; but the Queen Mother ‡ ſet him at liberty ſometime after. He perſuaded *La Mole* and ſome others, that he could make Wax-Images, ſome of which would inſpire Love into Women, and others make any Body die in a lingring Condition ||. He began in 1604, to ſet up for a Writer of Almanacks, and continued to do ſo every year: They were intermixed with Sentences taken out of the Latin Authors §. He liv'd a long life, and Survived * all the *Italian* Courtiers of *Catherine de Medicis*. He died at *Paris* in the Year 1615, and becauſe he openly and inſolently declared that he dy'd an Atheiſt, his Body was depriv'd of Burial. He had been accus'd in

[illegible] At Roſi [illegible] quidem, qui [illegible] innumerabilium [illegible] pri- vatim extiterit, & univerſæ reipublicæ detrimentum attulerit, [illegible] admiſſis [illegible]. One can hardly conceive how ſuch a Man as *Gabriel Naudæus*, who had a vaſt Reading, and a great Memory, could commit ſo many Miſtakes in ſo few lines.

(A) *In the Accuſation of* la Mole *and* Coconas.] They were two Favourites of the Duke of *Alençon*, Brother to *Charles* IX. who had put their Maſter upon wicked Deſigns, or had been inſtrumental in the execution of them. I am apt to believe that they were falſly accuſed of ſome Crimes; but they deſerved to ſuffer Death for the things that were truly laid to their charge. I'll quote *Mezeray* firſt; and then *le Laboureur*. (a) *They found in* la Mole's *Houſe a Wax Image which one* Coſmo Rugier, *a Florentin, and a great Cheat, had made for him to enchant a Gentlewoman, with whom he was in love: The Queen Mother was willing that People ſhould believe it had been made againſt the King; which he denied all along: Nevertheleſs he was beheaded with* Coconas. *'Tis ſaid that two Princeſſes, who were in love with 'em, ſtole away their Heads, and embalmed 'em in order to keep 'em: One of their Accomplices was broke upon the Wheel, and* Rugier *was ſent to the Gallies. The Queen Mother, who gave credit to Diviners and Sorcerers, had him ſet at liberty ſome time after to make uſe of him.* *Le Laboureur* tells us, that the Queen would have had *Coſmo* hanged, and he does not ſay that 'twas ſhe who ſet that Galley-ſlave at liberty: I call him ſo, tho' I know that he never rowed. (b) "*Tourtai* was condemn'd to be hang'd, and to "be put firſt of all to the Rack—— Being ask'd "whether one *Coſmo*, an *Italian*, knew any thing of "the matter, he anſwered, *That there is an* Italian, "*a black Man, with an ugly* Face, who plays upon "the Inſtruments, wears ſometimes round and ſome- "times Taffety Breeches, and always black Cloaths, "and is a very luſty Man, and very much conver- "ſant with *la Noele*; but he does not know whether "he knows any thing of that enterprize". Theſe Words are explain'd by *le Laboureur* in the following manner. (c) "That *Italian* is *Coſmo Rogieri*, whom "I have already (d) mention'd, and whom the Queen "had placed with the Duke her Son, under pre- "tence of teaching him the *Italian* Tongue, but in "truth to be a Spy upon him; being inform'd or "afraid that a Party was forming to ſet him upon "the Throne after the death of *Charles* IX. prefe- "rably to the King of *Poland* his Brother, whoſe re- "turn into *France*, they deſign'd to prevent. He "confeſt afterwards to ſome body, that after he had "given ſome Advice to the Queen, he found out "that the Faction would be ſo ſtrong by reaſon of "the Hatred which the *Paris*-Maſſacre had occaſion'd, "and becauſe that Prince was ſuſpected of Cruelty, "and the Queen and the Houſe of *Guiſe* would have "again the Government in their hands, that he re- "ſolved to follow his Maſter's Fortune, not doubting "that this Faction would ſucceed in their Attempt, "being ſupported by great Men, and by the Secre- "taries of State, and many Members of the Parlia- "ment He was ſtill more confirm'd in that Opini- "on, when having diſcover'd to the Duke the ſecret "Converſations he had with the Queen, the Duke "truſted him with all his Deſigns, and made uſe of "him to wheedle his Mother with ſome inconſide- "rable things that he reported to her, whereby he "had an occaſion to diſcourſe with her, and dive "into her Thoughts. Thus he was deeply engaged "in that Deſign; but the Queen having diſcover'd "the whole matter, caus'd him to be impriſon'd, as "well as the reſt, and brought to his Tryal. He "bore the Torture with great Reſolution upon "more than fourſcore Heads, and even upon many "which he himſelf had diſcover'd, without confeſſing "any thing relating to the Conſpiracy or the En- "chanted Medals; for he was accuſed of having "made a Medal of King *Charles*, to bring him to "his death, and two more for the Duke of *Alençon* "and *la Mole* his Favourite, who had them ty'd to "their Hats in order to keep up an inviolable Friend- "ſhip betwixt 'em. But they proved very fatal to "*la Mole*, who upon this vain Aſſurance ſet up for "a mighty Man; and he was ſo far from being ſup- "ported by any Friends in his Misfortune that his "own Maſter and good Friend gave Evidence againſt "him. He did not think that our Flowers *de Luce*, "which are ſaid to have been ſent from Heaven, "have a ſupernatural Virtue againſt Charms. If "it be true that *Coſmo* gave away many Charms, "he kept a good one for himſelf againſt hanging. "*Catherine de Medicis* would have had him hanged; "but he would not: She had only the ſatisfaction to "ſee him chain'd, and his Journey to *Marſeilles* "was the only Toil and Fatigue that he went thro. "He got ſome Friends there, who prevail'd with "the Captain of his Galley to take him into his "Houſe; which was never ſo much frequented upon "his account, as it was then by reaſon of that illu- "ſtrious Galley-ſlave. He turn'd it into a School "of Mathematicks and Judicial Aſtrology, having "a Guard, who look'd rather like a Man given him "out of Honour, than in order to obſerve him and "prevent his Eſcape". *Thuanus* ſays, That *la Mole* had a Wax Image prick'd in the Heart, and that *Ruggeri* being proſecuted as a Magician, was ſet at liberty by the Queen Mother. I ſhall ſet down *Thuanus*'s Words and *la Mole*'s Anſwers in the Remark *E*.

(B) *He openly and inſolently declared that he died an Atheiſt.*] Theſe are the Words of the *Mercure François*. (e) *Old age, the Gout and the Stone, having reduced him to a dying Condition, his Friends adviſed him to think of God, and ſent for the Curate of the Pariſh; but he would not ſee him: They brought him ſome* Capuchins; *but he laugh'd at 'em. When he was told that he ſhould duly prepare himſelf to obtain God's Mercy, and be afraid of the laſt judgment, he anſwered: O ye Fools! there are no Devils but the Enemies that torment us in this World, nor any God beſides Kings and Princes who can raiſe us and do us good.* If you prefer the Paraphraſe of a Jeſuit to the plainneſs of this Account, read the following Words. (f) "The "Gout and the Gravel—— like two Satellites of "Death, having ſeized on him, waſted and conſu- "med him; but they left him a ſound and a clear "Judgment to repent of his Sins. Four days be- "fore he died, the Curate of St. *Medard* gave him "a Viſit, and endeavour'd to make him ſenſible of "his Duty; but he would not hear him. Some "honeſt Capuchins were ſent for to try whether "they could work upon him: they came to ſee "him at the requeſt of ſome of his Friends, and "laid before him the ſeverity of God's Judgments, "and the Power and Malice of Satan in the laſt "days of a Man's Life, telling him that he ſhould "think of his Salvation. But he anſwer'd them "with the Tone of a Mad and deſperate Man, You "Fools, get out of my Chamber; I would have you "know that there are no other Devils but our Ene- "mies, who do us miſchief in this World, nor any "God beſides Kings and Princes who do us good: I "have lived in this Belief and I will die in it. They "omitted neither fair words, nor Threatnings to "bring him into the right way; but it was to no "purpoſe: From that time he went on uttering moſt "horrid Blaſphemies, as *Lucilio* (*Lucilio Vanini*) "had in the Year 1598. of having made uſe of Witchcraft (C) againſt the Life of *Henry* IV. and having anſwered the Queſtions that were put to him by *M. de Thou*, he was diſmiſt without any Puniſhment. I ſhall give an account † of this Paſſage, whereby it will appear that this wicked Man was extremely Impudent and very great with the Ladies. Many Reflections might be made upon his minding Aſtrology and Magick, tho' he believed (D) neither a God nor a Devil; for 'tis a general

---

† [illegible] ‡ Mezeray [illegible] pag. [illegible] 1615. § See the Remark A. || [illegible] * Garaſſe, ubi ſupra.

(a) Mezeray, Abrege Chronol. tome 5. pag. 157.

(b) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, tom. 2. pag. 408.

(c) Id. ib. (d) Pag. 401.

(e) Mercure François, tom. 4. p. 46.

(f) Garaſſe, Doctrine curieuſe, pag. 156, 157.

† In the Remark D.

" had done upon the Wool-pile; 'till at laſt he " ended his wretched Life as *Judas* did, *Infelicem* " *Spiritum non emiſit, ſed amiſit.* The noiſe of his " Deſpair was immediately ſpread all over *Paris*; he was curſed by the People, and his Bo-" dy was expoſed in the Fields, as being unwor-" thy of Chriſtian Burial (g).

(C) *Of having made uſe of Witchcraft againſt the Life of Henry IV.*] That Prince being at *Nantes* in the Year 1598. was told that *Coſmo Ruggeri* was guilty of that Crime. There was a report that this Man, being then an Eccleſiaſtick, had a private Cloſet in the Caſtle of *Nantes*, wherein he ſhut up himſelf every day, under pretence of painting, but in truth to prick with a Needle a Wax Image like the King. He gave ſome Hopes that by this means the King would pine away with a lingring Diſeaſe. (h) *Coſmus Rugerius tunc ſacris addictus ad regem delatus fuerat, quaſi ipſius vitæ deteſtandis magiæ artibus perniciem molitus eſſet. Nam in arce Nannetenſi ſpecie pingendi cellam peculiarem habuiſſe, in qua ceream imaginem, quæ regis ſpeciem referebat, diris epodis excantatam cottidie acu figebat, eaque re ſore ſpem fecerat, ut rex mox mortifero languore ſenſim abſumeretur.* The King ordered M. *de Thou*, and another Judge to Inform againſt him. *Coſmo* being juridically Interrogated, anſwered firſt of all the Objection that was made to him, grounded upon his having been put to the Torture for ſuch a thing in the Year 1574. He maintain'd that he had been then falsly accuſed, and that his Innocence had been acknowledged by his Judges; (c) that his being ſuſpected of Magick, was only grounded upon his Skill in Aſtrology; becauſe People thought that he could not foretell ſo many things without the Aſſiſtance of the Devil, tho' he had only foretold them by an exact Knowledge of Nativities. He added that the great Affection he had conceived for the King long ago was ſufficient to clear him from the Crime, charged upon him. He ſaid that after the *Paris*-Maſſacre the Court of *France* took into Conſideration what they ſhould do with the King of *Navarre*, and the Prince of *Conde*, and that *Catherine de Medicis* ask'd him whether he had Calculated their Nativities; and that he anſwered her he had done it, and knew by that means they would occaſion no trouble in the Kingdom. He added that his anſwer prevented the ill Deſigns that were formed againſt 'em; that he had acquainted *la Noue* with it, and deſired him to give 'em notice of it, that for the time to come they might behave themſelves ſo as to Confirm what he had told *Catherine* meerly out of Love for them; ſince ſuch things could not be certainly diſcovered by Aſtrology (d). He concluded with ſaying that he hoped His Majeſty remembring ſo good a Service, would have more regard to it than to the Malicious and Falſe Accuſations of his Informers. M. *de Thou* gave an account of all theſe things to the King: That Prince acknowledged that *la Noue* had told him ſo at that time, and ordered that *Ruggeri* ſhould be ſet at Liberty, and that all Informations againſt him ſhould be Superſeded. The Ladies had already obtained the Pardon of that Wretched Man, who quickly appeared at Court very Familiar with them. (e) *Intermiſſa ulterior in Coſmum inquiſitio & ipſe libertati reſtitutus fuit, & in arctam familiaritatem cum gynæceo venit, cujus favore a Rege, cum hæc diceret, jam gratia in mecano facta fuerat.* M. *de Thou*, mentions a thing, which ought not to be omitted. *Ruggeri*, was ſo Impudent as to ſay that 'twas not he, but a Gardner of the ſame Name, who had been accuſed and puniſh'd in *la Mole*'s time, and he impoſed in ſuch a manner that he had a Penſion of Hiſtoriographer beſtow'd upon him. (f) *Homo impudentiſſimus ac perditiſſimus poſtea auſus eſt palam dicere quæ ad annum* LXXIII. *de Coſmo Rugerio commemorantur, ad ſe minime pertinere, ſed Touanum olitoris cujuſdam cognominis tunc petulanti errore allucinatum eſſe; eoque veſania venit, ut emendicato ſtipendio in aula obtinuerit, ut ſcribendæ hiſtoriæ munus ſibi demandaretur.* That Man's Impudence was very great. The anſwers he made to the two Commiſſioners appointed to examine him at *Nantes*, ſigned with his own hand, were ſtill extant, wherein he acknowledged that he was the ſame *Coſmo Ruggeri*, who had been falſly accuſed, when *la Mole* was tried; but he maintain'd that he had been Gloriouſly acquitted: Whereas 'tis certain that he was Condemn'd to the Gallies. (g) *In his (confeſſionibus) eundem ſe eſſe minime diffitetur, ſed per calumniam accuſatum, & poſtea honorifice, ſicut jam dixi, dimiſſum; in quo rurſum inſigniter mentitus eſt, nam ex archivis Curiæ tridem conſtat, eum poſt quæſtionem ad triremes damnatum eſſe, ſed mirorum in hoc hominum genus prono favore pœnam remiſſam fuiſſe, & cum duceretur, vinculis exemptum in aula ſtatim comparuiſſe.* I muſt further add, that the Commiſſioners having told him at *Nantes*, that Judicial Aſtrology being a thing impious and unworthy of a Chriſtian, he was very much to blame for applying himſelf to it, eſpecially conſidering that he was a Prieſt; he excuſed himſelf as well as he could, and even ſpoke of that Science in a contemptible manner, and ſwore that he had never Calculated any Nativity ſince he was a Prieſt.

(D) *His minding Aſtrology and Magick, tho' he believed neither a God nor a Devil.*] Mark well the Confeſſion he made, when he was a Dying. *There are no other Devils*, ſaid he (i), *but the Enemies who Torment us in this World, nor any God beſides Kings and Princes, who can raiſe us and do us good.* He added, according to *Garaſſe*, (k) *I have liv'd in this Belief, and I will die in it.* If this Addition was made by that Jeſuit, I think it may be juſtified by the Laws of a Paraphraſe; for it is almoſt an undeniable thing, that an Old Man, who dies an Atheiſt, has been an Atheiſt a long time. People don't grow Irreligious upon their Death-Bed, nor even in their Old-Age; on the contrary (l) the greateſt part of the Libertins and Unbelievers renounce their Impiety in their Sickneſſes, and die very (m) Orthodox. 'Tis therefore very likely that *Ruggeri* had been for a long time ſuch as he died. To what purpoſe then did he caſt Nativities, and make Wax-Images, which he diſtributed as ſo many cauſes of Love and Sickneſs? Such things can hardly be reconciled: All thoſe, who mention his Death, make ſuch a Reflection upon it. (n) *He had formerly made People believe———that he knew how to make Images, &c. and* YET *that Atheiſt did not believe that there was any Devil.* (o) *The wiſeſt Men were then* (p) *of Opinion, that he had no Knowledge* of Necromancies, and INDEED THE ISSUE *made it plainly appear.* It is certain that ſince he did not believe the exiſtence of any Spirit diſtinct from Humane Souls, he muſt needs have look'd upon Magick as a thing in which there was no reality; and conſequently his pretending to make Images, which had the Power to Kill, or to inſpire Love, proceeded only from a greedy deſire of getting Money. It is not certain that he knew the Vanity of Aſtrology: A Man of Parts and Learning does clearly perceive that a piece of Wax in the ſhape of a Man or of a Woman, and pricked in the Heart, cannot produce in any body the deſire of Marrying a certain Perſon, or any other Paſſion. He evidently knows that a piece of Wax, which repreſents *Henry* IV. whether it be put near the Fire at *Nantes*, or pricked in ſeveral places in the ſame Town, cannot bring an Hectick and Mortal Fever upon the King at *Paris*. And therefore any Man of Senſe and Learning, who is perſuaded that thoſe Wax-Images have ſuch a Power, muſt needs know that thoſe Effects are produced by an inviſible Spirit, which works Immediately and Phyſically upon certain Perſons, whilſt thoſe Images are in ſuch Circumſtances. *Ruggeri* did not believe that there was any ſuch Spirit, and therefore he knew that thoſe Images had no ſuch Virtue. But it does not ſo evidently appear, that the Celeſtial Bodies are not capable of producing many effects upon Earth. 'Tis well known that ſome Perſons, who were accounted Atheiſts, ſeem'd to be perſuaded of the Influence of the Stars, even with reſpect to the free Actions of Men, and what we call

Fortune,

(g) *Spizelius, Scrutinio Atheiſmi, pag. 13. He is in the wrong to place him among the Atheiſts, that were burnt alive.*

(h) Thuan. de vita ſua lib. 6. ad ann. 1598. pag. 1214. col. 1. C.

(c) Cõs id autem pleriſque ſuſpectum fuiſſe, quod aſtrologiæ peritus certiorem ac ſibi cum paucis cognitam natalium horarum conficiendarum ſcientiam calleret, cujus ope ac ductu cum multa multis prædixiſſet, in eam veniſſe opinionem, quaſi occulta cum malis ſpiritibus familiaritate hæc didiciſſet. Id. ibid.

(d) Id autem non tam ex arte, quam adfectu erga ipſos bene animato feciſſe, quippe cum res ejuſmodi eſſet, ut per aſtrologicæ artis rationem præſtari non poſſet. Id. ib. col. 2. A.

(e) Id. ib. B.

(f) Id. ib.

general Opinion among Chriſtians, that if there are Devils, there is a God, and that thoſe who do not believe the Exiſtence of God, don't believe that there

are

Fortune, or contingent Events. And therefore 'tis not certain that *Ruggeri* was ſenſible of the Vanity of Judicial Aſtrology. However I believe it may be ſaid, conſidering the turn of his Mind (*a*), that he caſt up Nativities, as Impoſtors uſe to do, without giving any Credit to them, and to Trick People out of their Money.

Perhaps it will be Objected to me, that it is as difficult to believe that a certain Planet, ſituated in a certain manner in the Figure of one's Nativity, is the Phyſical Cauſe of the kind Reception a Prince gives to a Man of Fifty Years of Age, who waits upon him at a certain Hour, as to believe that a Wax Image prick'd in the Heart can produce an act of Love in the Soul of a Man a Hundred Leagues off. To which I Anſwer, that this effect of the Planet appears to many People as Chimerical as the Effect of the Image, and I am one of 'em; but I repeat it again, 'tis an eaſier thing to believe the Power of the Planets, than that of thoſe Wax Figures. Not one Learned Man can be alledged, who believed that thoſe Figures inſpire Love, and occaſion Death a Hundred Leagues off by their own Power, and without the Interpoſition of any Spirit; but ſome Men of Learning may be alledged, who believed that without the help of good or bad Angels, the Planets of ones Nativity are the cauſe of his moſt accidental Adventures. 'Tis eaſily conceived that a piece of Wax prick'd at *Nantes*, heated and modified at ones Pleaſure, cannot be the Phyſical Cauſe of any thing at *Rome*; but 'tis known by Experience that, that the Virtue of the Sun produces a thouſand Things upon Earth Phyſically and as a true Cauſe: Which is the Reaſon why People are led into an Error, thinking that that the Operations of the Planets do likewiſe reach the Earth; which being once admitted will carry a Man a great way by degrees, and at laſt they are look'd upon as the Cauſe of every thing.

THAT if Judicial Aſtrology diſcovered Futurity, it would be a kind of black Magick.

I muſt obſerve by the by, that this Illuſion ſhould be more ſeverely repreſt than it is; for were it true that by means of an Horoſcope one may know beforehand the Happineſs or Misfortunes of others, the Circumſtances of their Marriages and Death, &c. were it true for inſtance that *Gauric* diſcovered by an Aſtrological Operation that King *Henry* would be Kill'd in a Duel, Aſtrology ſhould be accounted one of the Magical Arts, and of thoſe ways of knowing things to come, that are grounded on a Pact with the Devil. The pains Aſtrologers are at in caſting up a Nativity, and conſulting the Rules they have laid down upon the diſtinction of the Signs, the properties of the Houſes, the different Aſpects of the Planets, &c. I ſay, their Pains in that reſpect would be like that of Magicians, (*b*) who deſcribe Circles, make many Poſtures in them, utter certain Words, &c. On both ſides what a Man does would be only a ſign of Inſtitution, in whoſe preſence a Bad Angel would act in a certain manner. Any one, who conſiders the thing impartially, will plainly ſee that Magical Ceremonies, a Circle, a Bow, a Wand ſucceſſively pointed to the four Cardinal Points of the Horizon, ſome words uttered, and others written upon a piece of Paper, &c. can no more Cure a Man dangerouſly Sick, than an Horoſcope can diſcover whether a Man will meet with a Happy Match, whether he'll get the Love of ſome Princes, whether he will be Baniſh'd, whether he'll be a Rich Man in Land or Money, and whether he'll Die at Sea or at the Siege of a Town. Which ſhews that an Aſtrologer ſhould be liable to a greater Puniſhment, according as he tells more certainly the Truth of Things to come; for the certainty of his Predictions would be a ſign that he carefully performs the Ceremonies, by whoſe means the Devil ingages to foretell things to come. This further proves that Judicial Aſtrology cannot be a way of foretelling Future Events different from a Sieve, a Looking-Glaſs, Smoak, and many other (*c*) Abominations. From whence I conclude that the indulgence of the Eccleſiaſtical and Secular Courts for Aſtrologers is very much to Blame. There are very good Civil and Canonical Laws againſt that ſort of Men. They have been carefully Collected by a Profeſſor (*d*) of *Padua*, in a Book Publiſhed at *Venice*, in the Year 1662, but they are not put in Execution. Did not *John Baptiſt Morin* Regius Profeſſor at *Paris*, quietly enjoy his Penſions and Offices till he Died, tho' every Body knew he Calculated Nativities, and Boaſted Publickly that he had a wonderful Skill in it (*e*)? Had he ventured to maintain, that Relicks ſhould not be Worſhipp'd, he would have been degraded the very next Day; he would have been ſhamefully Expell'd; and if any conſiderable Perſon had Protected him, all the Clergy would have been in an uproar, and nothing could have Pacified them but the Depoſing of ſuch an Impious Man. But he was ſuffered to Practice all his Life-time, without being Puniſh'd for it, an Art, which muſt needs be Magical, if things to come may be known by it. I obſerve that 'tis a difficult thing to apprehend how they can be known by the Help of the Devil; for tho' the Knowledge of Angels be ſuppoſed never ſo great, it does not ſeem to include the Concatenation of all the Objects that muſt be known, to foretell ſuch and ſuch Things; and it were an Abſurd Thing to ſay that God reveals them to the Evil Spirits, whenever they have a mind to execute the Pact which they have Contracted with Man. The Abbot *Furetiere* (*f*) does very neatly ſet forth this Objection; but he forgets the main difficulty: He does not ſay that Man's free will would be a meer Chimera, if Angels could know a Man's Thoughts ten Years hence, by the Knowledge of the Connexion that is between Natural Cauſes and their Effects.

WHETHER it can well be concluded from the Exiſtence of Devils that there is a God.

Nothing could be more abſurd than to aſk, Whether it be poſſible that *Ruggeri*, who denied the Exiſtence of God, and of Good and Bad Angels, ſhould have believed that his Wax Images had ſome Virtue in them; but it were no abſurd Thing to put this Queſtion to all Atheiſts. 'Tis commonly believed that all thoſe, who deny the Exiſtence of God, do likewiſe deny by a neceſſary Conſequence the Exiſtence of all Spirits, and the Immortality of the Soul. I don't wonder that this ſhould be a Common Opinion; for I think there is no Example (*g*) of the Separation of thoſe two Blaſphemies; I mean that there never was any Atheiſt, who believed the Exiſtence of Devils and the Immortality of the Soul; or that there never was a Man perſuaded of the Truth of Magick, but believed the Exiſtence of God. Some Chriſtians, who are Orthodox in all other Points, cannot believe that Bad Angels concern themſelves with any thing, and reject without any Exception what is commonly ſaid of Magick and Sorcery. If they were contented to ſay that the Exiſtence and Operations of Bad Angels can only be proved from the Scripture, I ſhould not ſo much wonder at their Opinion; for 'tis certain that Reaſon affords great Difficulties againſt the Empire of the Devil, which are grounded on our Notions of God's Wiſdom and Goodneſs: But 'tis a great piece of Temerity, to ſay no worſe, in thoſe who deny that the Devil has any Power, to pretend to Reconcile their Opinion with the Scripture. However it be, the following Conſequence is Falſe and Unjuſt, *you don't believe that there are any Devils, and therefore you don't believe that there is a God.* As for this Conſequence, *you don't believe that there is a God, and therefore you don't believe that there are any Good or Bad Angels*, it ſeems to be very certain; for, as I have already ſaid, no Example can be alledged to diſprove it. Here is another Conſequence, which ſeems to be certain, *there are Devils, therefore there is a God.* The neceſſity of drawing this Concluſion appears ſo evident that 'tis generally affirmed that thoſe, who deny the Exiſtence of Devils, deprive the Orthodox of an undeniable Proof of God's Exiſtence. I confeſs that hitherto I have not ſeen any Body but ſeem'd to me fully perſuaded, that the Exiſtence of the Devil, is a neceſſary and irrefragable Proof of the Exiſtence of God; and you'll ſee no Man, who doubts never ſo little of this (*h*) laſt Truth, but denies that there are any Angels. However, I confeſs I have not a ſufficient Penetration to ſee that ſtrict Connexion, which every Body perceives between theſe two Aſſertions, *There*

(*a*) [illegible] that the King of Navarre's and the Prince of Condé's Horoſcopes [illegible] pointed that they would be [illegible], and [illegible] the [illegible] Aſtrology.

(*b*) See in the 13th Letter of [illegible] a long [illegible] of Magical Ceremonies.

(*c*) See the Alphabetical Catalogue [illegible] in the 37th Chapter of a Book printed at Paris, and afterwards in Holland 1692, intitled, Remarques ou Reflections critiques, morales & hiſtoriques ſur les plus belles & les plus agreables [illegible] I believe the Author [illegible] all this [illegible] of Martin del Rio's [illegible]

(*d*) Don Joſeph Maria Maravigilia Clerk Regular in his Pſeudomantia veterum & recentiorum explosa, ſive de fide divinationibus adhibenda.

(*e*) See the Article of this Morin.

(*f*) See Furetieriana, pag. 199, & ſeq. Edit. of Bruſſels.

(*g*) See hereafter what Reſtriction is put to this in ſpeaking of the Eaſtern Nations.

(*h*) That is, the Exiſtence of God.

are Devils. I shall say something about it. I must take notice of (E) Father *Garaſſe's* Faults.

RUTILIA.

are Devils; therefore there is a God. Laying aside the Scripture, to go upon Metaphyſical Principles, may one not ſay that God has Created no other Spirits but the Soul of Man? If it be ask'd why ſo Powerful a Being has not produced other Beings, it may be inferred, that he was not Pleaſed to do it; he has produced all things with a perfect Liberty, more of one kind and fewer of another: His Will always directed by an Infinite Wiſdom, was the only Rule that he went by. What can one ſay againſt ſuch a Reaſon? Ask an Atheiſt, why he denies the Exiſtence of Devils; he'll give you a Pitiful Anſwer, and if you preſs him hard, he'll be quickly ſilent. Will he ſay that the Univerſe being Infinite and Eternal, the moſt perfect Being, which neceſſarily exiſts, contains nothing that exceeds Man in Knowledge? What! becauſe Man has two Eyes, a Noſe, a Mouth, a Brain, Nerves and Veins, muſt all the Knowledge and Induſtry of Nature fall to his ſhare? Muſt there be no Will, no Underſtanding, no Paſſions, no art of applying Bodies one to another any where elſe? If you could make it out that a free Agent was pleaſed to beſtow Knowledge upon no other Beings but ſuch as have a Brain, you would put me to a ſtand; but you acknowledge no ſuch Cauſe. According to your Principles every thing Exiſts and Acts Neceſſarily; and therefore you cannot tell me why an Impalpable Matter would be leſs Ingenious than that which we call Fleſh and Blood, a Man, a Beaſt, &c. and if you argue right, you ought to believe that ſince the Infinite Being thinks in a Man, it thinks every where elſe; and that if there are many Living Bodies upon Earth, which Love and Hate one another, and ſome of which are oppreſt by others; there are alſo in the Air or elſewhere ſome Material Beings, that Love Man, and ſome that Hate him, and are more Knowing and Powerful than Man. Thoſe will be Good Angels, and theſe Bad Angels. In a word, ſince an Atheiſt cannot deny that there are (a) Wicked, Envious, and Revengeful Beings, which are pleaſed with the Misfortunes of others, and by the application of Bodies produce ſtrange changes in Nature according to their Paſſions, he'll make himſelf Ridiculous if he denies that beſides thoſe Wicked Beings, which are the Objects of his Eyes, there are many others which he does not ſee, and which are ſtill more Malicious and Knowing than Man. And therefore it may be ſaid that if the Univerſe was not the Work of God, it would neceſſarily contain Bad Angels, as it contains Men and Wolves; but ſince it is the Work of God, it is not at all neceſſary it ſhould contain ſuch or ſuch Things, and conſequently the Exiſtence of Devils is not ſo good a Proof of the Exiſtence of God, as 'tis commonly believed. (b). I propoſe this only as a Problematical Queſtion.

Thus it were poſſible, tho' ſuch a thing never happen'd, that ſome Men no leſs Atheiſtical in ſome reſpects than *Ruggeri* was, ſhould nevertheleſs believe that ſome Wax Images with the help of ſome Ceremonies, might inſpire Love, or occaſion Death a hundred Leagues off. They would look upon thoſe Ceremonies only as a ſign of Agreement, whereby a Devil would be determin'd to produce ſome Effects by the Application of Bodies, whoſe Force would be known to him.

A CONSIDERATION upon the Religion of the *Eaſtern* Nations.

I deſire you to take notice that hitherto I have only conſidered the Knowledge we have of the Opinions of the Ancient *Pagans* and Modern *Europeans*; for I confeſs that what is ſaid of the Religion of the *Eaſtern* Nations, does not permit me to uſe the general Expreſſion I made uſe of. We are told (c) that the *Siameſe* acknowledge no Deity, and yet they (d) believe the Return and Apparition of Spirits; they are afraid of the Dead, and practice ſome Ceremonies to Pacify them. (e) *Beſides they offer up Prayers to the good* Genii *almoſt upon all Occaſions, and make Imprecations againſt the Bad ones.* Such Men are well qualified to be Magicians without believing any Deity. The Author of the Relation I have quoted, adds, *that (f) the Indians believe now as the Ancient Chineſe did, that there are Good and Bad Souls every where, on which they have as it were beſtowed the Almighty Power of God.* The meaning of which is that they Acknowledge no Supreme Deity, but an Infinite number of *Genii*, Good and Bad; and therefore they may be both Atheiſts and Magicians. The Notions of the Learned in that Country, are more like thoſe of the *Europeans*; for if on the one ſide they are Atheiſts, they deny on the other the Exiſtence of Spirits and the Immortality of the Soul. (g) *Several Relations of* China *tell us that the Men of Letters, who are the moſt conſiderable Citizens in that Country, look upon Funeral Ceremonies only as Civil Duties, without ſaying any Prayers; that they have no ſenſe of Religion, and don't believe the Exiſtence of God, nor the Immortality of the Soul; and that tho' they pay an outward Worſhip to* Confucius *in the Temples Conſecrated to him, they don't beg of him the Learning which the Letter'd Men of* Tunquin *deſire him to beſtow upon them.* Their outward Worſhip of *Confucius* is therefore a meer Mummery; they conform to it out of Policy. The following Paſſage ſhews that they deny not only a Supreme Intelligence, but alſo Inferior Beings endowed with Intelligence. (h) *By degrees the Men of Letters, that is thoſe who have ſome Titles of Literature, and are the only Perſons that have a hand in the Government, becoming wholly impious, and making no alteration yet in the Style of their Predeceſſors, have changed the Soul of Heaven, and all other Souls into I know not what Ætherial Subſtances, deprived of Knowledge, and ſet up a blind Fate, which in their Opinion, does whatever a moſt Powerful, Wiſe and Juſt Being might do.*

(E) *I muſt take notice of Father* Garaſſe's *Miſtakes.*] I. He ſays (i) that *about Fifteen Days before* Coſmo Ruggeri *Died*, in the Year 1615, a ſmall (k) Book was handed about at *Paris* with this Title, *Hiſtoire épouventable de deux Magiciens eſtranglez par le Diable la ſemaine ſaincte.* (A dreadful Hiſtory of two Magicians Strangled in the Holy Week). But we are told in the *Mercure François* (l) that *Ruggeri's* Death occaſion'd that ſmall Book. There is no doubt that the Author of that *Mercure* is more Exact and Credible than the Author of the *Doctrine Curieuſe*; and therefore all the Moral Reflections of the latter, grounded upon fore-running Reports, are altogether inſignificant. I muſt not forget theſe words of the *Mercure*: (m) *The firſt of thoſe two Magicians was* Cæſar, *that Famous Cheat, who trick'd all the Curious of his time of their Money, to ſhew 'em Devils, and to put 'em in the way of finding ſome Treaſures, and then Laugh'd at 'em. It was reported that he had been Strangled by his Devil, and yet he is ſtill alive being a Priſoner in the* Baſtille. *The ſecond was the Abbot of St.* Mahé. II. *Garaſſe* goes on thus: (n) *It happen'd in the Year* 1574, *that* la Mole *and* Cacouas (o) *being Condemn'd by a Decree of Parliament, as Perſons convicted of Witchcraft and Enchantments upon occaſion of* Charles IXth's *Death,* Coſmo Ruggeri *was involved in their Accuſations, as having lent 'em a helping hand by his Necromancy.* La *Mole* and *Coconas* were Executed during the Life of *Charles* IX; and therefore 'tis not true that they were put to Death *upon occaſion* of his Death. It does not appear that their Witchcraft was levell'd at that Prince's Life, and it cannot be ſaid that they were Convicted of it. Here follows an Extract of *la Mole's* Anſwers when he was put to the Rack. (p) *Being told that he had ſome Wax Images in his Houſe with two holes in their Head, he has anſwered no. Being ask'd about the Wax Image, which is ſaid to have been found in his Houſe, he ſays, O God, I deſire I may Die, if I have made any Wax Image for the King. Being ask'd about the Gold Figures in his Hat, he ſays he knows nothing of 'em. Being again faſten'd to the Buckles and Rings, he ſays that he knows not what he has ſaid. The little Treſtle has been brought in again, and being exhorted to ſpeak the Truth, he ſays, Gentlemen, I know nothing elſe upon the Damnation of my Soul; before the Living God I know nothing elſe. True Eternal God, my God, I don't know whether the Wax Image was made for the King or Queen. Being ask'd where the ſaid Image is, he ſays that the ſaid Image was made for his Miſtreſs, his Country Woman, whom he had a mind to Marry, and that it will appear 'tis the Figure of a Woman, and that the ſaid* Coſmo *has the ſaid Image, and that the ſaid Figure has two thruſts in the Heart. Being interrogated about the King's*

Sickneſs,

(a) *By theſe Beings I mean Mankind.*

(b) *Mr.* Becker *inſiſts very much upon charging Divines with introducing* Manicheiſm *by the Power which they aſcribe to the Devils. He is in the wrong to accuſe them of this, ſince they build upon Scripture. I here conſider things as a Philoſopher.*

(c) La Loubere, Relation de Siam, tom. 1. chap. 22. n. 6. p. m. 501.

(d) Id ib. chap. 20. n. 20. pag. 481.

(e) Id. ib.

(f) Id. ib, ch. 23. n. 8. pag. 508.

(g) Id. ib. chap. [illegible] n. 6. pag. [illegible]

(h) Id. ib. chap. 21. n. 4. pag. 514.

(i) Garaſſe, Doctrine curieuſe, Book 1. ſect. [illegible] p. [illegible]

(k) Id. ib. pag. 154. See alſo Thuanus's Continuator ubi infra.

(l) Ubi ſupra, pag. 47.

(m) Ibid.

(n) Garaſſe ibid. pag. [illegible]

(o) It ſhould be Coconas.

(p) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, tome 2. pag. [illegible]

RUTILIA, a *Roman* Lady Siſter to *Publius Rutilius*, who ſuffered with ſo great conſtancy the injuſtice of his Baniſhment, and Wife of *Marcus Aurelius Cotta*, had a Son who was a Man * of great Merit, whom ſhe loved tenderly, and whoſe Death ſhe bore with great Courage. *Seneca* alledges her (*A*) as an Example. *Cicero* had a mind to do the ſame, but not being ſufficiently informed of the thing, he conſulted about it *Pomponius* (*B*) *Atticus*, who could not ſatisfy his deſire. The

Book

Sickneſs, he ſays put me to Death if Poor la Molle had ever any ſuch thoughts, and deſires that Coſmo ſhould be ſent for, who will ſay there is nothing elſe in it. Being ask'd where the ſaid Wax Image is, he ſays Coſmo has it, and that it was made for a Woman, and he did not deſire Coſmo to do any thing elſe, and that the ſaid Coſmo prick'd it in the Heart. Being ask'd why he prick'd it in the Heart, he ſays he does not know, it never has been brought to him, he deſires it ſhould be removed, and ſays he will ſpeak the Truth. He has been brought to the Fire, and exhorted to ſpeak the Truth about that Wax Image; he ſays God D—— me for ever, if it be for any thing elſe than what I ſay. Here follows likewiſe an extract of the Confeſſions extorted from *Cosmo* by the Torture. (*a*) *Being ask'd about the Wax Image he ſays he knows nothing of it, and that Coſmo, and la Molle are moſt intimate Friends. Being ask'd whether he knows of any Pictures or Characters made againſt the King, he ſays no, and that he was diſcourſing about it with a Captain of the Town, who told him they had broke all the Rings of la Molle; and that he ask'd the ſaid Captain whether they had broke a Ring as big as ones finger, and that if there was any thing, it would be found there: He farther ſays, that he never heard of any Attempt upon the King's life. Being ask'd whether he knew any thing about the Wax Figure, he ſays no, and that if any Body knows any thing of it, 'tis Coſmo.* Thuanus ſays that la *Molle* proteſted that this Wax Image was only deſign'd to inſpire a Woman with Love. (*b*) *Tortus Mola & interrogatus de imaguncula cerea, quam magicis præſtigiis ab ipſo confictam, & acu in corde tactam conſtabat quem in rei uſum id faceret, & cujus opera ad id uteretur: reſpondit, ut puellam quandam in Provincia, quam efflictim deperiebat, hac arte ad mutuo ſe redamandum accenderet, id feciſſe; eaque in re uſum opera Coſmi Rugerii Florentini, qui mox comprehenſus & tanquam maleficus omnino raſus, Reginæ favore, quæ illius & hujuſmodi hominum opera perfamiliariter utebatur, periculo exemptus eſt.* III. *Garaſſe* is not exact in the following Words. (*c*) "This Man having avoided "that danger by his Miſtreſs's Favour, was hurried "on by the itching deſire of being accounted a "great Aſtrologer, and one who had a wonderful "ſkill in that Art; ſo that he made it his Buſineſs "to promiſe Wax Images to all the Curious "Debauchees, to inſpire Love or Hatred; and be"cauſe thoſe two Paſſions are equally fooliſh, he "had a greater Practice in *Paris* than if he had "promiſed Pardons and Plenary Indulgences." This Author in order to prove that *Coſmo* was willing to be accounted a Man of great ſkill in judicial Aſtrology, ſays that he *made it his buſineſs to promiſe Wax Images*. Thoſe Images have been at all times look'd upon as effects or Fooleries of Magick, and do not belong to judicial Aſtrology: They are not reckon'd among *Taliſmans*; and the manner how they are uſed plainly ſhews that their Virtues, whether true or falſe, do not depend upon the Conſtellations. We are told that they muſt be prick'd with Needles, heated with a ſlow Fire, *&c* and great Alterations will happen by that means in thoſe who are the Objects of ſuch Practices. This cannot be Natural; the influences of the Stars cannot produce ſuch effects; 'tis black Magick; 'tis the Devil's Work. The Pagans aſcribed that Practice to none but Witches.

> *Devovet* (*d*) *abſentes, ſimulacraque cerea fingit,*
>
> *Et miſeram tenues in jecur urget acus.*

The *Mercure François* does not ſay, as *Garaſſe* does, that *Coſmo* promiſed Wax Images, *to inſpire Love or Hatred* (*e*). He promiſed Wax Images, (*f*) *ſome to make Women Love thoſe that Courted them, and others to make ſuch Perſons Die in a lingring Condition as one deſired, by uttering their Names and invoking certain Devils.* We are told a pleaſant Story about *Tamerlan*'s Daughters: 'Tis ſaid that their Father would have 'em learn Magick, and that with the help of ſome Images they Facilitated the Conqueſt of the Provinces he deſign'd to Subdue. *Audivi ab aliquibus qui dictum Tamerlanem diu noverant, quod habuit tres filias quas in arte magica fecit inſtrui, in qua mirabiliter profecerunt, quæ incantationes, & exorciſationes, & IMAGINES contra provincias quas ſibi ſubjicere volebat facere conſueverunt, quæ plerumque efficaces fuerunt* (*g*). IV. The following Words are not right: (*h*) *That Wretched Man —— went on with that infamous trade, till the Year 1604, tho' he was an Abbot, indulging the diſorderly paſſions of all the looſe Courtiers. From that Year he began to take another courſe. For he betook himſelf to write Almanacks, ſome under the Name of Quelberus, others under the Name of Vannerus, or the weeping Pilgrim of Savoy.* Garaſſe had put together the making of Wax Images and the ſtudy of Aſtrology, as two things one whereof is the Proof of the other; and then all of a ſudden he tells us that as ſoon as *Coſmo* began to write Almanacks, he left off diſtributing thoſe Images to the looſe Courtiers: in which there is a Contradiction and a wrong Argument. Tho' a Man writes Almanacks, he may be ſtill a Cheat with reſpect to thoſe Images. The *Mercure François* does not agree with *Garaſſe* about all the ſuppoſititious Names prefixed to *Ruggeri*'s Almanacks. Compare the Words of the *Jeſuit* with theſe: (*i*) *Ever ſince the Year 1604 he wrote Almanacks every Year, ſome under the Name of* Querberus *others under the Name of* Vannerus *and the weeping Pilgrim of* Savoy, *which he adorn'd with Verſes or Sentences out of the beſt* Latin *Poets and Orators.*

(*A*) *Seneca alledges her as an Example.*] In the Book he writ during his exile to comfort his good Mother. He exhorts her to imitate our *Rutilia* among other Ladies. *Rutilia*, ſays he (*k*), *Cottam filium ſecuta eſt in exilium, & uſque eo fuit indulgentia conſtricta, ut mallet exilium pati, quam deſiderium: nec ante in patriam, quam cum filio rediit. Eumdem jam reducem, & in Rep. florentem tam fortiter amiſit, quam ſecuta eſt: nec quiſquam lacrimas ejus poſt elatum filium notavit. In expulſo virtutem oſtendit, in amiſſo prudentiam, nam & nihil illam a pietate deterruit, & nihil in triſtitia ſupervacua ſtultaque detinuit. Cum his te numerari feminis volo, quarum vitam ſemper imitata es &c.* The Reader will give me leave to ſet down a paſſage out of Father *Senault*'s Treatiſe *de l'uſage des paſſions*, in a place wherein he explains the Characters of deſire. "Baniſhment is doubtleſs one of the moſt Cruel Pu"niſhments inflicted upon Guilty Perſons: We are "thereby ſeparated from thoſe we Love, and it "ſeems to be a long Death, attended with a little "Life to make us more miſerable. And yet there "was a Mother, who rather choſe to ſuffer the Cru"elty of that Puniſhment than the Violence of de"ſire, and was willing to follow her Son in his "Baniſhment, leſt ſhe ſhould lament his abſence "and wiſh for his return." But how came Father *Senault* to know that becauſe ſhe followed her Son, ſhe was free from the Trouble of wiſhing he might return to *Rome*? To conclude, *Rutilia*'s Son was call'd *Caius Aurelius Cotta*. He was a good (*l*) Orator: He was Baniſh'd during the Quarrels of *Marius* and *Sylla*, and return'd to *Rome* when the party of the latter was uppermoſt. He was made Conſul in the Year of *Rome* 678. 'Tis probable he died two Years after of a Wound that open'd again; which deprived him of the Glory of the Triumph that was decreed for him (*m*). He is not that *Cotta*, who is one of the Interlocutors in *Cicero*'s Books *de natura deorum*, as *Glandorpius* (*n*) will have it.

(*B*) *He conſulted about it* Pomponius Atticus, *who could not ſatisfy his deſire.*] He had a mind to know whether *Rutilia* died before or after her Son. (*o*) *Rutilia vivone C. Cotta filio ſuo mortua ſit, an mortuo? Pertinent ad eum librum quem de luctu minuendo ſcripſimus.* In another Letter he has theſe Words: (*p*) *De Rutilia, quoniam videris dubitare ſcribes ad me cum ſcies, ſed quam primum.* Corradus's Note is too curious not to be inſerted here: (*q*) *Mortuo mortua*

eſt

---

* See the Remark A, towards the end.

(*g*) Theodoricus à Niem, de ſchiſmate, lib. 2. pag. m. 114.

(*h*) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, pag. 156.

(*i*) Merc. François, ubi ſupra, pag. 46.

(*k*) Seneca de conſolatione ad Helviam cap 16. p. m. 787.

(*l*) Cicero, de Oratore l. 1. fol. 60. & in Bruto fol. 109. *See* Corradus in Brutum Ciceronis pag. 310. & ſeq.

(*m*) *Conſule* Sigonius in faſtis Conſul. ad ann. 678. 680.

(*n*) Glandorp. Onomaſt. pag. 144.

(*o*) Cicero, epiſt. 20. lib. 12. ad Atticum.

(*p*) Idem epiſt. 22. ejuſd. libri.

(*q*) Corradus in epiſt. 20. lib. 12. ad Atticum pag. 328. edit. Græviana.

Book † wherein he designs to speak of our *Rutilia* being not extant, we know not whether he had all the Information he wanted, and whether he mention'd her, but 'tis very likely he did. What is remarkable is that we are told he desir'd to be inform'd of some circumstances he had already mention'd || in his Works. Which shews that the greatest Authors forget those very things they have publish'd.

S

SABELLICUS (*Mark Antony Coccius*) was a Learned Man, who flourished towards the latter end of the XV. Century. His Father was a Smith, and he was Born in § a little Town of *Italy* upon the *Teverone*. He applied himself so early to his Studies, that before he had a Beard he kept School at *Tivoli*. Having got some Money by that means, he went to *Rome* in order to improve his Learning by the Lectures of * *Pomponius*, who admitted him into his Academy with the usual Ceremonies, and particularly with the imposition of a new Name, *viz. Sabellicus*. This new Academist reform'd his style in that School, and then he went from *Rome* to *Udine* near *Aquileia*, where he was a publick Teacher, and put out some Books, which proved so advantageous to him that the Magistrates of *Vicenza* knowing his great Capacity offered him twice as great a Pension as what he had: He accepted of those offers and came to *Vicenza* to Teach Philology. But he was soon after invited by the Senate of *Venice*, who offered him two Honourable and profitable Imployments: The one was to write the History of the Republick, and the other to Teach Philological Learning. He went therefore to *Venice*, and was more successful in Teaching his Scholars than in Writing (*A*) the History that he was put upon; for it is full of Flatteries and Lies. He undertook afterwards to compose an Universal History from the beginning of the World, and applied himself to it till he died. This Work has been publish'd, and is not (*B*) much esteem'd. *Sabellicus* died of the (*C*) Pox, being about seventy Years Old. Not trusting his Bastard, he himself caused his Epitaph to be ingraved upon his Tomb-Stone: 'Tis an Inscription (*D*) that is not very modest ∧. He had been Library-Keeper to Cardinal *Bessarion* χ. His Eyes had the same Faculty with those of || *Tiberius*; for when he waked in the Night he could plainly see his Books and his Chamber for some time ǂ. All his Works were Printed at (*E*) *Basil* in the Year 1560. in 4 Volumes in Folio. When he died he Acted like those Fathers

† V. his Book *de consolatione*.
|| See the Remark B.
§ 'Tis call'd in Latin *Vicus Varronis*, or *Vicus Valerius*, see Leander Albertus descriptio Ital pag. m. 221.
* Thus *Paulus Jovius* calls him. 'Tis the famous *Pomponius Laetus*.
∧ Taken from Paul Jovius in elog. viror. doctor. c. 48. pag. 114. 115.
χ Freherus in Theatro pag. 1434.
|| Sueton. in Tiberio cap. 68.
ǂ Pierius Valerianus in Hieroglyph. apud Freherum ubi supra *says that he heard him say so*.

---

est——— quod mirum Ciceronem quaesisse quum in libris oratoriis jampridem scripsisset Cottam ipsum sibi sermonem illum retulisse: quin Atticus etiam dubitabat, quum tamen uterque & Cottam & Rutiliam vidisset.

(*A*) *Was more successful in Teaching his Scholars than in Writing the History——— for it is full &c.*] He was paid to be sincere and exact with respect to his Scholars, but not with respect to History; and therefore he discharged better the Duties of a Teacher than those of an Historiographer. (*a*) *Nec ibi diu mansit, evocante Senatu Veneto, ea conditione, ut civitatis res gestas a fine Justiniani conscriberet, & trecentis aureis in gymnasio profiteretur. In hoc munere perutilem juventuti operam praestitit, quum in altero adulatione parum sobria rerum veritatem adumbrasse videretur. Julius Caesar Scaliger* says that *Sabellicus* confess'd that he publish'd or supprest matters of Fact, as he was directed by the Money he receiv'd from the *Venetians*. Thus I Paraphrase these five Latin Verses:

Venalis (b) item penna Sabellii latronu,
Qui dat, adimitque, ut libitum, cuique quod vult.
Falsa qui rogatus, undenam tot esset ausus:
Monstrans Venetum perditus aureum nomisma,
Te, inquit, quoque lux haec faceret loqui si haberet.

(*B*) *And is not much esteem'd.*] *Paul Jovius* says that things are so crowded in that Work, that they make but little Appearance. 'Tis the usual Fault of those, who undertake to include the History of the whole World in one or two Volumes. Read these Words of *Paul Jovius*. (*c*) *Sed in Enneadibus omnium temporum, ab orbe condito memoriam complexus, uti necesse fuit, ingenti operis instituto festinanter indulgenti, res illustres praeclara cognitione dignissimas perobscura brevitate adeò vehementer offuscavit, ut excitatam uberrimo titulo legentium cupiditatem passim eluserit, quum omnia in acervum angustissimè coarctata, nequaquam certa effigie, sed exiguis tantùm punctis, & lineis annotata designentur.*

(*C*) Sabellicus *died of the Pox.*] *Paul Jovius* does not say in what Year he died; but (*d*) *Vossius* shews that it was in the Year 1506. *Pierius Valerianus* does not affirm that he died of a Venereal Disease; but the description he gives of his Distemper contains several Symptoms, that may be easily accounted for, if we suppose that it was the Pox, as *Paul Jovius* will have it. These are *Valerianus*'s Words: (*e*) *Eò plus infortunij, & aerumnarum pertulit Sabellicus, vir ille scriptorum copia, & elegantia multò clarior, quàm mea ulla possit commendatione crescere, miserabilem vitae finem eum sortitus est, quod putrida, perniciosaque correptus elephantiasi per annos aliquot miserabiliter cruciatus, interclusa vocis via, caeterisque tam spiritus, quam cibi meatibus computrescentibus, gutturisque corruptis omnibus organis, venisque corrosis, non sine cruciabili tormento annos aliquot peregit, eaque tabe demum confectus interiit.* See *Jovius*'s Words in the Margin (*f*). *Vossius* observes that it is said in the List of the Historians of *Udine*, that *Sabellicus* wrote till the Year 1513. which is false, as it appears from two Letters of *Bembus* written in the Year 1506. wherein he mentions *Sabellicus*'s Death. The 5th Letter of the 4th Book (*g*) says that he died the 17th of *April* 1506. The same *Vossius* tells us that *Leander Albertus* testifies that *Sabellicus* lived three Years after he had made an end of his *Enneades*, which reached to the Year 1504. I find in *Leander Albertus* that those *Enneades* reached to the Year 1507. and that the Author died in the same Year. I have consulted not only the *Latin* Translation (*h*) Printed at *Cologne* in 1567. but also the *Italian* Original *Folio* 149. Printed at *Venice* in 4° 1561.

(*D*) *An inscription, that is not very modest.*] If any Body else (*i*) had made it, one might excuse it. Here it is (*k*):

Quem non res hominum, non omnis ceperat aetas,
Scribentem capit haec Coccion urna brevis.
M. Anton. Coccius Sabellicus vivus sibi F.

(*E*) *All his Works were Printed at* Basil *in 1560.*] Before this Edition in 4 Volumes in Folio Printed for *Hervagius*, there had been an Edition in 2 Volumes

(*a*) Paulus Jovius in elog. c. 48. pag. 114. 115.

(*b*) Jul. Caesar Scaliger de regnor. eversionibus, pag. 329. part. 2. poemat. edit. 1591.

(*c*) Jovius ubi supra pag. 115.

(*d*) Vossius de historicis Latin. pag. 67.

(*e*) Pier. Valerianus de literat. infelicitate lib. 1. pag. 28.

(*f*) *Ad septuagesimum fere annum perveniens Gallica tabe ex vaga Venere quaesita non obscure consumptus*, Jovius ubi supra. *See also the Verses of Latomus in* Jovius.

(*g*) Pag. m. 531.

(*h*) Page 22.

(*i*) *Infare quidem & meritum elogium et certe honestius si alieni ingenii pictas inscripsisset*. Jovius ubi supra.

(*k*) See Freherus in Theatro pag. 1434.

thers, who are more fond of their weakeſt Children, than of thoſe who have the beſt Conſtitution. For he deſired (F) his Collegue *Egnatius* to Print a Manuſcript by which he could get no Honour. *Egnatius* got it Printed, and was blamed for it. You'll find a Noble *Encomium* upon *Sabellicus* in † *Jacobus Philippus Bergomas*, who was Contemporary with him. *Moreri* has committed ſome Faults.

SABEUS (*Fauſtus*) Born in the Country of *Breſcia* in *Italy*, was ſo much eſteem'd for his Learning that *Leo X* invited him to *Rome* and made him his Library-keeper. He undertook ſeveral long and painful Journeys in order to increaſe the Library of the *Vatican*, and was ill rewarded for his Pains. He (A) complain'd of it; but his Complaints made no impreſſion upon four other Popes, who kept him in their Service. They gave him no Preferment, which made him renew his Complaints. He died at *Rome* being 80 Years old, under the Pontificate of *Paul* IV. * We have (B) ſome Books written by him. I have ſaid in || another place that he had a hand in the firſt Edition of *Arnobius*.

SAGRA-

lumes in Folio Printed in the Year 1538. for the ſame *Hervagius*; but this contained only the *Enneades*, and the Ten (a) Books of his *Exempla*, with an *Hiſtorica Synopſis*, which carried the *Enneades* to the Year 1538. This Continuation was made by *Gaſpar Hedion*. *Cælius Secundus* (b) *Curio* had the Direction of the Edition Printed in 1560, to which he added a Continuation of the *Enneades* to that Year. The 4th Volume contains moſt of *Sabellicus*'s *Opuſcula*. I ſay moſt of 'em; for they did not inſert in it his (c) Paraphraſe and Notes upon *Suetonius*, nor his Critical Obſervations upon ſeveral Authors. They are divided into two Books, and have been often Printed, and Namely at *Venice* in the Year 1508 in Folio. *Badius* inſerted them in a Compilation of ſuch things in 1511. and *Gruterus* put 'em in the firſt Volume of his *Theſaurus*. (d) To conclude, thoſe who reckon the *Enneades* of that Author among the Books Printed ſoon after the Invention of Printing are groſly miſtaken. *Beughem* mentions an Edition of that Work made at *Mentz* in 1442. (e) *Sabellicus. Hiſtoriæ Enneades Septem.* 'Tis true he doubts of it; but he ſhould have poſitively ſaid it is falſe; for (f) *Sabellicus in* 1442. *was not yet ſeven Years Old, and when he publiſhed thoſe* 63. *Books of his Hiſtory he dedicated them to the Doge of* Venice Auguſtin Barbadigo, *who was not promoted to that Dignity till the Year* 1486.

(F) *He deſired his Collegue* Egnatius *to Print a Manuſcript*—— Egnatius ——— *was blamed for it.*] Here is the Title of that Work. (g) *MARCI ANTONII COCCII SABELLICI de omnium gentium omniumque ſeculorum inſignibus memoriaque dignis factis & dictis exemplorum libri X Quæ ad vitæ mores, prudentiam ſapientiamve comparandam conducunt plurimum. Iccirco quum omnibus qui illo libero beatoque literarum otio perfruuntur, tum vero imprimis qui vel adoleſcentiam in ſcholis, vel populum in concionibus docent utiliſſima ſunt.* 'Tis a Book, to which this thought of *Pliny* may be very well applied: (h) *Inſcriptiones propter quas vadimonium deſeri poſſit. At cum intraveris, dii deæque quam nihil in medio invenies!* We are told in the Title Page that it is a Book very uſeful to thoſe who ſtudy, but chiefly to thoſe who teach Youth, and to Preachers. Indeed it may be of ſome uſe to thoſe, whoſe Buſineſs it is to give ſome Exerciſes to Young Boys. *Egnatius* having publiſh'd that Book was blamed for it: Some taxed him with Inconſtancy, under pretence that there had been a long enmity between him and the deceaſed. They found Fault with him for having perform'd the part of a good Friend by publiſhing that Manuſcript. Others ſaid that he had publiſh'd it only out of Hatred for *Sabellicus*, and that he knew well enough that the impreſſion of ſuch a Book would tarniſh the Glory of the Author. *Egnatius* wrote a (i) Preface in his Vindication, wherein he maintain'd that Conſtancy does not require that a Mortal Man ſhould cheriſh an immortal hatred, and that nothing can be more reaſonable than to free one ſelf from the ſlavery of paſſions. He added that any Body, who has not a braſen heart, would have been moved with the Intreaties of that dying Man, and that he was ſo affected with them that he could not deny him that good Office. (k) *Nos verò cum aliis honeſtiſſimis cauſis adducti, & prius Sabellicum funebri laudatione proſecuti ſumus, & nunc pro virili opus hoc emendavimus. Cujus editionem moriens mihi ad ſe accerſito, & gratam recordationem pietatis in ſe Michaelis Triviſani Nicolai filii, qui ſub eo non parvo tempore meruerat, quique opus hoc literis plenum exſcribendum curarat, commendavit, ut tam obſtinatum, tam durum, tam denique ferreum eſſe putem neminem, quem ſuprema illa vox moribundi hominis, atque adeo ab omni ſuſpicione immunis non emolliſſet: me certe adeo emollit, ut nihil pro humanitatis jure negare homini præſertim jam morienti potuerim majorem hoc facto laudem a bonis ſperans, quam quicquid de me Amafinii, & Rabirii iſti recentes oblatrent attendens.*

(G) *Moreri has committed ſome Faults.*] I. The place, where *Sabellicus* was Born, is not *a ſmall Borough*: Leander Albertus (l) ſays that it is a ſtrong place (m) both by its Situation, and by the Works that have been made in it; and he adds that in 1533. *Lewis Gonzaga* General of *Clement* VII's Troops, beſieged it and was kill'd by a Cannon Ball. II. *Moreri*'s way of refuting thoſe, who ſay that *Sabellicus* deſcended *from the* Coccejan *Family*, is a very bad one. He tells us that *it is likely enough* that *Sabellicus* was the Son of a Smith, *if one conſiders only the Sir-Name* Coccius, *which is only to be found in the Epitaphs and upon the Monument erected to him after his Death.* What an Argument is this? The Sir-Name *Coccius* is only to be found in the Epitaphs, &c. therefore it is likely enough that *Sabellicus*'s Father was a Poor Smith. Here is another falſe Argument. *Moreri* ſuppoſes that if the Sir-Name *Coccius* had belonged to *Sabellicus*'s Family, one might very well believe that he was deſcended from the *Coccejan* Family. What an abſurdity! I muſt obſerve two other Faults relating upon this Head: It is certain that *Sabellicus* took the Sir-Name of *Coccius* in his life time, and that the Inſcription of his Tomb was not made after his Death. He himſelf cauſed it to be ingraved. III. He did not Teach *young Boys in little Boroughs*, but at *Tivoli*, which is an Epiſcopal See. IV. *Moreri* has theſe Words, *we have his* Hiſtoria Enneadum *in* XI. *Books from the beginning of the World to the Year* 1504; than which nothing can be more abſurd. He had read in *Voſſius* (n), that *Sabellicus* made himſelf Famous by his Hiſtory of eleven *Enneades*, that is, by an Hiſtory divided into eleven *Enneades*, and he came to fancy that *Sabellicus* had writ a Hiſtory divided into eleven Books, which contain'd the Actions of the *Enneades*. The Reader muſt know that *Sabellicus* affecting to imitate the Ancients, divided his Hiſtory not into (o) *Decades* as *Livy* did, but into *Enneades*. V. When *Moreri* ſays that the Epitaph, which *Sabellicus* made for himſelf (p) *is reaſonable enough, but modeſt*, he perverts the ſenſe of *Paul Jovius*, and gives a wrong judgment of the thing it ſelf.

Note that many other Authors have alſo miſunderſtood the paſſage of *Voſſius* relating to the *Enneades*. *Zeillerus* tells us that *Sabellicus* wrote the Hiſtory of two *Enneades*: (q) *cujus maxime celebratur hiſtoria Enneadum II.* and *Konig* (r) ſays that he has left us eleven Books of *Enneades*.

(A) *And was ill rewarded for his Pains. He complain'd of it.*] This I prove by the following paſſage. (ſ) *Di che egli agramente ſi querela e duole. Il che pure gli ſucceſſe ſotto quattro altri Pontefici quali con molta ſua ſiniſtra fortuna infelicemente ſervì.*

(B) *We have ſome Boooks written by him.*] Five Books of *Latin* Epigrams, which he publiſhed at *Rome* in the Year 1556. and dedicated to *Henry* II. King of *France*. He was pretty well paid in Money and Cloaths for his Epiſtle dedicatory: *E ne riportò da quella Maeſtà una collana d'oro, dolcento*

ſcudi

---

† Jacob. Philippus Bergomas in Supplemento Chronicorum pag. 335. 336. edit Venet. 1506.

* [illegible] Leonard. Nicodemum addizioni alla biblioteca Napoletana pag. 165.

(l) Leand. Albert. in deſcript. Ital. pag. m. 214.

(m) Caſtellum nunc eſt cum natura loci tum opere muniſſimum. Id. ibid.

(n) Maxime celebratur hiſtoria Enneadum XI. Voſſius ubi ſupra. *Note that the laſt* Ennead *contains only* 2 *Books.*

(o) *Note that he divided his Hiſtory of* Venice. *into Decads. It contains* 3. *whole Decads, and* 3. *Books of the* 4th.

(p) *Perhaps the Printers have left out ſome Words, and* Moreri *had ſaid*, but not very modeſt.

(q) Martinus Zeillerus de hiſtoricis parte 1. pag. 127.

(r) Konig Biblioth. pag. 712.

(ſ) Leonardo Cozzando ubi infra.

SACRATUS (PAUL) a Canon of *Ferrara*, where he was Born in the XVI. Century, was one of thoſe, who applied themſelves to the Politeneſs of the *Latin* Style. He ſucceeded in it, as it appears from his Letters to *Paul Manutius*, *Riccobonus*, *Muretus*, and (C) ſeveral other Learned Men, which he Publiſh'd in the Year 1579. He Dedicated them to *James* SACRATUS his Brother, Biſhop of *Carpentras*. He ſpent ‡ many Years in Studying at *Padua*, and in Travelling. There are two ſhort Diſcourſes at the End of his Letters, wherein he Apologizes for two Prelates, who, contrary to cuſtom, had writ their Mandates in the Vulgar Tongue; which they did, becauſe the greateſt part of the Clergy in their Dioceſes did not underſtand *Latin*. He Compoſed ſome † Books, and Died at (D) Seventy Five Years of Age. *James Sadolet*, Biſhop of *Carpentras* and Cardinal, his * Uncle by the Mother's ſide, took care to inſtruct him.

SADEUR (JAMES) Author of a New Voyage into *Terra Auſtralis*, Printed in *French* in the Year β 1692. His Father's γ *Name was* James Sadeur, *and his Mother's* Guillemette Itin: *They were both Natives of* Chatillon *upon* Bar, *in the Juriſdiction of* Rhetel *in* Champagne, and went with a deſign to ſettle in *America*; *but after nine or ten Months ſtay at* Port-Royal, they took Shipping the 25th of *April*, 1603. to return into *France*. The Wife, fifteen Days after ſhe had Imbark'd, was Delivered of the Boy who makes the Subject of this Article. The Father and the Mother were Caſt-away near Cape *Finiſterre*, where their Ship run aground: The Child was Saved as by a Miracle, and given to an Inhabitant of that Coaſt; and then having again eſcaped from another Shipwrack, he went to Serve a *Portugueſe* δ Lady, and Studied with her Son. He was taken by ſome Pirates in the Year 1623. He was like to Periſh in another Shipwrack; but he was ſaved by a Ship that was going into the *Indies*; and ſuffered a fourth Shipwrack, which occaſion'd his Landing in *Terra Auſtralis*, by ſeveral Accidents which no Body is obliged to believe. The manner how this came to paſs, and how he overcame the Wild Beaſts ready to devour him, and at laſt left that Country after he had been Thirty Two Years in it ζ, and arrived at *Madagaſcar*, is ſo ſtrange that I don't think there are any Fictions more Comical in *Arioſto* and *Amadis*. Accordingly I don't pretend that *James Sadeur* did ever exiſt, and that there is any Truth in his Hiſtory; and if I mention him and his Voyage to *Terra Auſtralis*, 'tis becauſe I ſpoke of him in the Article of *Adam*, and that I may ſay ſomething further concerning the Idle Fancies of *Antoinette de Bourignon*. For you muſt know that *James Sadeur*, who pretends to be an Hermaphrodite, tells us that it was that very thing which preſerved his Life, in a Country where every Body has both Sexes, and where η all the Men of our Continent are call'd Sea Monſters, and have no Quarter given them. *All the* Auſtralians, ſays he θ, *have both Sexes*; *and whenever a* Child *comes into the World having but one Sex, they ſtifle it as a Monſter.* He does not clearly explain (A) how they Beget; but he gives us to underſtand, κ *that Children grow in them as* (B) *Fruits do upon Trees*; *that they* ‖ *live without Luſting one after another, and cannot bear of it without Horror*; *that their Love is neither Carnal nor Brutiſh*; *that they are wholly ſufficient to themſelves, and want nothing to be* Happy. In a word, the Argument alledged by an Old *Auſtralian* in his Book, ſuppoſes that each individual Perſon is the ſole cauſe of the Children that come into the World. He brings him in raiſing difficulties ┼ againſt the Generation, which depends upon two Perſons,

† See the Remark C.

‡ See Sacratus's Letters lib. 1. epist. 13. 15. & lib. 6. pag. 181.

* In the [illegible]

β Note, that this Book had been Printed before at Vannes, in 1676. in 12.

γ Avantures de Jaques Sadeur pag. 2 Dutch Edit. 1692. in 12.

δ The Counteſs de Villa-franca.

ζ Pag. 92.

η Pag. 147.

θ Pag. 59. 62.

κ Pag. 92.

‖ Pag. 69.

┼ Pag. 71

ſcudi del ſole, e una giubba di veluto pavonazzo. He wrote a Book of Coſmography, and had a hand in the Collection Printed at *Francfort*, *in* 1580. with this Title, *Picta poeſis Ovidiana: theſaurus propemodum omnium fabularum poeticarum Fauſti Sabæi Brixiani aliorumque clarorum virorum tam veterum quam recentiorum epigrammatis expoſitarum* (a).

(C) *From his Letters ——— which he Publiſhed in the Year* 1579.] I have not ſeen this Edition: That which I make uſe of is of *Lyons*, 1581. in 16. There was another Publiſhed at *Cologne* in 1583. See (b) *Morhoſius's Polyhiſtor.* The other Works of *Sacratus* are, *ſuper Geneſim liber unus. In Pſalmos Davidis liber unus. In Epiſtolam Canonicam B. Jacobi Apoſtoli liber unus.* See the *apparato* (c) *degli huomini illuſtri della città di Ferrara* written by *Agoſtino Superbi da Ferrara.*

(D) *And Died at Seventy-Five Years of Age.*] According to the Epitaph Ingraved (d) on his Tomb in the Cathedral Church of *Ferrara*, by the care of the Biſhop of *Carpentras* his Brother. The Year of his Death is not mention'd in that Epitaph; which is a great Negligence.

(A) *How they Beget.*] He ſays that (e) *all the time he was* amongſt 'em, *he never could learn how Generation is performed in that Country*, and that (f) *they have ſo great an Averſion for whatever concerns the firſt beginning of Life, that a Year or thereabouts after his Arrival*, two Auſtralians *hearing him ſay ſomething about it, went away expreſſing as much Horror as if he had committed a Crime.*

(B) *As Fruits do upon Trees.*] I have mention'd in (g) another place a Paſſage of *Antoinette Bourignon* (h), wherein ſhe ſays that *Sin has disfigured the Work of God* in Men, *and that inſtead of being Men, as they ſhould be, they are become Monſters in Nature divided into two imperfect Sexes, unable to produce their like alone, as Trees and Plants are produced, which in that reſpect are more Perfect than Men or Women, who cannot Produce without the Help of another, and without Pain and Miſery.* If you except the Conſequences of Sin, the Doctrine of that Woman, and that of the *Auſtralian* Philoſopher, are as like one another as two drops of Water. I wonder neither of 'em perceived that their pretended Superiority of Plants above Man, with reſpect to the Faculty of Engendring, is a Falſe Suppoſition; for 'tis true indeed that each Plant produces its Grain, its Fruit, and its Seed, independently from another Plant of a different Sex; but 'tis not true that it produces another Plant in it ſelf and by it ſelf. What has it then above Man? Does not a Man produce in himſelf, and without the Concourſe of the other Sex, the Seed, which is like the Grain or Kernel in Plants, from which another *Individuum* proceeds? 'Tis true, will ſome ſay; but that *Individuum* will not proceed from that Seed without a Conjunction with the other Sex. But I anſwer, do you think that the Seed of Plants does not want to be received into a Womb that it may become a Plant? Muſt it not be received into the Earth? Has it not as great a dependency upon another Being as the other? 'Tis certain

(a) Taken from Leonardo Cozzando della libraria Breſciana aperta parte 1. p. 109. See alſo Ghilini's Theatro tom. 1. pag. 51.

(b) In the 24th Chap. of the 1ſt Book. pag. 309. 310.

(c) Pag. 16.

(d) Ibid.

(e) Avantures de Jaques Sadeur pag. 60. 92.

(f) Pag. 91.

(g) In the Remark G of the Article of Adam.

(h) Preface to the nouveau Ciel.

Persons, one of which is the Father and the other the Mother. That Old Man concludes that Man cannot be a perfect and compleat Being without both Sexes, because one Sex is not sufficient for Production without the Conjunction of the other. Sadeur did so well apprehend those Principles and their Consequences, that to shew that he understood them, he made use of these words: † *I consider'd how the Supreme Being acts, I was sensible that a Creature could not better resemble him than by Acting as he does, and that an Action performed by the Concourse of two Persons could not be so perfect as those that are performed by one and the same Person.* Thus the Inhabitants of *Terra Australis* are of Mrs. *Bourignon*'s Opinion; and one would be apt to think that *James Sadeur*, whoever he be, seems to intimate that the *Australians* (C) are not Descended from *Adam*, but from an *Androgyne*, who did not fall, as he did, from the State of Innocence. This would be a pretty good Device to impose upon the Censors of Books, and remove the difficulties of a License, if one had a mind to Publish a Pre-Adamitical (D) System. If *La Peyrere* had made use of this Device, he would have avoided a great deal of Trouble. *Cyrano Bergerac* did not wholly neglect it in his Travels in the Sun and Moon. Perhaps the Author of * the History of

† Pag. [illegible]

* See what Judgment Mr. Jurieu makes of him, pag. 19 of his [illegible].

certain that according to Mrs. *Bourignon*'s, and *James Sadeur*'s System, the perfect State of Man would not be like that of Plants in this respect, Man would produce in himself, and by his own Power, not something wherewith to make another Man in another Subject, but another Man. A Plant does not do that; it produces in it self, something out of which, when received into the Earth, another Plant springs. I remember to this purpose to have read the following Verses.

J'ai (a) veu vif sans fantosme
Un jeune moyne avoir
Membre de femme & d'homme
Et enfant concepvoir
Par luy seul en luy mesmes
Engendrer, enfanter
Comme font aultres femmes
Sans oultil emprunter.

They are taken out of a Poem of *John Molinet*, Intitled, *Recollection des merveilles advenues en nostre temps.* Here is an Hermaphrodite more extraordinary than that mention'd by *M. de Beauval*, in his (b) *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans.* The words applied to the Porcupine, *seque jaculo, sese pharetra, sese utitur arcu*, might have been applied to it. *Isaac Vossius*'s (c) Hypothesis, does not reach so far.

But this whole Story of *Molinet* ought not to be Credited. That Monk did not get himself with Child. I don't know whether he was Punish'd; I have only read that he was put into the Hands of Justice, and confined till he was Delivered. Read this Passage of the *Chronique Scandaleuse de* Louis XI. " (d) In the said Year 1478, it came to " pass in *Auvergne*, that a Religious of a Convent " of Black Monks belonging to Cardinal *de Bourbon*, " had both Sexes, and made use of 'em in such a " manner that he happen'd to be with Child: " Whereupon he was Seized, Prosecuted, and " confined till he should be Delivered, that he " might be dealt with afterwards as the Judges " should think fit. " Is it not a strange Carelessness to give no account of the Consequences of this Imprisonment?

(C) *That the* Australians *are not descended from* Adam.] He ascribes many things to them, which suit only with the State of Innocence; for he says they are not (e) ashamed of being Naked, they all Love one another with a sincere Affection, they never Quarrel, they know nothing of Property, they have all things in common with an admirable Uninterestedness, they bring forth (f) without any Pain, they don't (g) Lust one after another, they are Strong and Vigorous, their Health is never alter'd by any Sickness, and they make no great account of Life, in comparison of the Eternal Rest that follows it, which they ardently desire. 'Tis true their Notion of that Eternal Rest is not very Orthodox, for in their Opinion it does not consist in the Beatifical Vision, but in the Privation of a particular and individual Existence. They say that after Death we exist only in general, in an (h) *Universal Genius, who Communicates himself severally to each particular Being, and has the Power, when an Animal Dies, to preserve himself till he be Communicated to another. So that the Genius is extinguish'd by the Death of that Animal, without being destroyed, since he waits only for new Organs, and a new Machine to be Revived.* This is as great a Nonsense as the Soul of the World of some Ancient Philosophers. According to *Sadeur*'s account the *Australians* are not over Religious. They are contented (i) *to Worship the Incomprehensible Being without ever speaking of him; they fancy nothing can be more Offensive to him, than to make his Divine Perfections the Subject of their Discourse; So that it may be said that the main part of their Religion is not to speak of Religion.* This does not savour of the State of Innocence: Man ought to Glorify his Maker by his Words as well as by his Thoughts; and 'tis in vain to say, as the Old *Australian* did, that whoever ventures to speak of God, is like to speak of him otherwise than he should do; for this would prove too much, and it would follow from it that one should never think of the Incomprehensible Being. I shall set down what is to be found upon this Subject in the Book of that Pretended Traveller. He told the (k) Old Man that in *Europe* God *is the subject of the most agreeable and useful Conversations*; and being ask'd, *whether People had the same Notions concerning that Incomprehensible Being*, he *sincerely confest they very much differ'd in their Conclusions from the same Principles, which occasion'd many sharp disputes, frequently attended with a violent Hatred, and sometimes with bloody Wars, and other dismal Consequences. The* Old Man, says *Sadeur*, *replied with great Ingenuity, that if I had not answered him in that manner, he would not have said a word more, and would have had the utmost Contempt for me, being*, said he, *very sure that Men could not speak of an Incomprehensible Thing, without having very different and quite contrary Opinions about it. None,* added he, *but a blind Being can be ignorant that there is a first Principle; but one must be Infinite, as it is, to speak of it exactly: For since we acknowledge that it is Incomprehensible, it follows that we can speak of it only by guess, and that whatever we can say of it may indeed satisfy the Curious, but not* Rational *Persons. And we rather chuse to be wholly Silent, than to run the hazard of venting many Falsities concerning its* Nature.

(h) Pag. 93.

(i) Pag. 83.

(k) Pag. 88.

(D) *A Pre-Adamitical System.*] *Sadeur* says that (l) the *Australians reckon above twelve thousand Revolutions of the* Solstices *from the beginning of their* Republick, *and give out that they derive their Original from a Deity, who with one Breath produced three Men from whom all others are Descended; that according to their account the* Europeans *began five Revolutions after them, and that they give 'em a very Ridiculous Original; for they say that an Amphibious Serpent of a prodigious Bigness, falling upon a Woman in her Sleep, Enjoyed her without doing her any Harm; that the Woman awaked about the end of the Action, and conceived so great an Horror for it, that she threw her self into the Sea.* The Serpent carried her to a Neighbouring Island, where she *repented of her despair*, and was delivered of two Children, the one a Male, and the other a Female, who gave so many Signs of Malice that their Mother was extremely

(l) Pag. 117.

---

acus Vossius comment. in Catul. pag. 287. (d) Chronique daleuse de *Louis XI.* p. m. 386. *See also* Robert Gaguin the 10th *Book of his* Histoire de France fol. m. 284. verso. *He* this *happen'd in a Convent of* Issoire *in* Auvergne. (e) Pag. (f) Pag. 93. (g) Pag. 69.

of the *Sevarambes* made use of it. I shall observe by the by that the Author of *Religio Medici* (E) was in some measure of the Opinion of the *Australians*. I shall occasionally Explain more exactly than I have done in another † place, what concerns (F) *Plato's Androgynes*.

† In the Article of *Adam*.

Allson

extremely Afflicted at it. The Serpent perceiving the trouble she was in, gave her to understand by Signs that he would carry her into her Country, if she desired it. He did it, and then he came back to the little ones, who Coupled and Multiplied. One would think that this is a wretched Allusion to the Fabulous Story of some Hereticks, who said that (a) *Eve* had two Children by the Serpent which Tempted her (b).

(E) *The Author of* Religio Medici *was in some Measure, &c.*] I wish, says he, we could multiply like Trees without any Conjunction, or that some other way of getting Children might be found out; for certainly there is nothing more Foolish and Unworthy of a Wise Man, nothing more shameful and unbecoming the greatness of our Souls than to think, when the heat is over, how far the Impertinence has been carried. Not that I have an aversion for that Charming Sex. On the contrary I am naturally inclined to Love and Admire whatever is Beautiful; Nay, I am extremely pleased with the sight of a fine Picture; were it only that of a Horse. (c) *Mihi satis placeret, si nobis etiam arborum more citra conjunctionem procreare liceat, sive alia quæpiam reperiatur rerum propagandarum ratio, quam coitione illa vulgaris, & trivialis: nihil profecto ineptius est, aut viro sapiente indignius; nihil quod mentis celsitudinem turpius dejiciat, quam si animo jam defervente reputet, quam insigniter ineptierit. Nec tamen hæc ita quæquam interpretari velim, quasi à sexu illo dulcissimo alienatiore animo sim, immo ultro admiror, & amplector, quicquid pulchrum est. Summa cum voluptate eleganti cuipiam picturæ inhæreo, etiamsi equi tantum fuerit.* The Author of the Notes upon this Work of Dr. *Brown*, observes that (d) the Fooleries the Doctor speaks of being necessary to Mankind, it was necessary that Men should be very fond of 'em. He quotes some Passages of St. *Augustin*, wherein things are carried too far; for that Father says not only that the Superior part of the Soul is Degraded and Dethroned by such amorous Imbraces, that a Wise Man is not obliged to Marry, and that those who do it, ought rather to be Admired than Imitated; but also that the Duty they pay to one another without a Motive of Procreation is a Venial Sin. (e) *Conjugalis concubitus generandi gratia non habet culpam; concupiscentiæ vero satiandæ, sed tamen cum conjuge propter fidem thori venialem habet culpam: adulterium vero sive fornicatio letalem habet culpam: ac propter hoc melior est quidem ab omni concubitu continentia, quam vel ipse matrimonialis concubitus, qua fit causa gignendi.* Hæc habet August. *in lib. de bono conjugal. c. 6. in Soliloquiis c. 10. Si, inquit, ad officium pertinet sapientis (quod nondum comperi) dare operam liberis, quisquis hujus rei tamen gratia concumbit, mirandus mihi videri potest, at vero imitandus nullo modo.* The same Commentator alledges St. *Augustin* upon these Words of Dr. *Brown*, *nihil ineptius aut viro sapente indignius.* (f) *Hinc Augustin.* in libro soliloquiorum cap. 10. Nihil, *inquit*, esse sentio, quod magis ex arce dejiciat animum virilem, quam blandimenta fœminea, corporumque ille contactus, sine quo uxor haberi non potest.

(F) *What concerns* Plato's Androgynes.] *Plato* supposes that there were three sorts of Humane Creatures in the Beginning of the World. Some were only Male, others Female, and others both. The latter are the *Androgynes*. Each *individuum* of those three kinds had four Arms, and four Feet, two Faces turn'd one towards the other and placed upon one Neck, two Privy Parts, and so on. They walk'd upright; but when they walk'd too fast they fell upside down. They were Strong and Bold, so that they attempted to make War with the Gods. The Celestial Court held a Council about it, but came to no Resolution in the matter; for had Mankind been destroyed with Thunderbolts, as the Giants were, the Gods would have been losers by it. (g) Who would have Offered up to them Incense and Sacrifices? On the other hand, it was not fit to suffer the Boldness and Insolence of Men. *Jupiter* found out this Expedient; he divided them all into Two: But there arose a great Inconveniency from it; for each half endeavoured to be Re-united to the other, and when they met, they Imbraced one another so tenderly and with so much Pleasure, that they could not resolve to part, and so Died of Hunger. *Jupiter* found out a Remedy for that Disorder: He Transposed the Privy Parts, and so contrived the matter that the Pleasure of their Imbraces ceased after a certain time, and then every Body minded his own Concerns. *Plato* adds that the Males, who are one half of an *Androgyne*, are very much addicted to Women, and that the Females, who are one half of an *Androgyne*, are passionately in Love with Men. He pretends that the Females, who Love other Females without minding the Males, are one half of the Ancient double Females; and that the Males, who are fond of Males, are one half of the Ancient double Males (h). If any one desires to see some Reflections upon what *Eusebius* (i) says, that *Plato* had this Notion of *Androgyne's* from *Moses*, he may consult the Commentary of (k) *Ludovicus Regius*. He confesses that (l) *Mercerus* and *Quinquarbre Royal Professors in* Hebrew *have been of great use to him in it.* He finds that *Marsilius Ficinus* is often mistaken. *I should lose my time,* saith he (m), *should I take notice of all the passages of* Plato *ill Translated by him; he ought rather to be thanked for the Pains he took in mending the Old Translation as well as he could.* ——— (n) *He had no great skill in* Greek *and* Latin, *and has committed many Faults in his Translation of that Author, particularly in things that require the Knowledge of Antiquity and Nature. I have discoursed about it with the Bishop of* Montpellier *and* Turnebus *and* Goupil *Royal Professors, and every one of 'em helped me according to his Ability.* That Bishop of *Montpellier* is the same whom he Praises in the Fiftieth Leaf in these words. *Being in doubt about the Sense of that Passage, I have consulted* Messire G. Pellissier *Bishop of* Montpellier, *a Man very well skill'd in the Knowledge of good Authors, and even of natural Things; and he has been pleased to help me in this Passage and all others, whenever I desired his Assistance.* To divert the Reader he sets down a Poem, that is worth reading. *After such a long and tedious Explication of an important Passage,* says he (o), *before I proceed further, I shall set down a Poem heretofore written upon the* Androgyne, *by* Messire Antony Heroet, *now Bishop of* Digne, *which he inscribed to the late King* Francis, *the Father of good Learning. This I shall do for the Reader's Diversion. I shall willingly mention that Poem, not only on account of its Elegancy, but also by reason of the Friendship and Familiarity I contracted with the Author, whilst I attended at Court upon Chancellor* Olivier, *a very Wise and Learned Man, with whom he used to be* (p). *'Tis true he does not keep to* Plato's *Notion, as any one may see by comparing them, but takes a Poetical Liberty, leaving out what he thinks fit.*

Here is the beginning of that Poem.

Au premier aage que le monde vivoit
D'herbe, de gland: trois sortes y avoit
D'hommes, les deux tels qu'ilz sont maintenant,
Et l'autre double estoit, s'entretenant
Ensemblement tant masle que femelle.
Il faut penser, que la façon fut belle:
Car le grand Dieu qui vivre les faisoit,
Faitz les avoit, & bien s'y congnoissoit.
De quatre bras, quatre pieds, & deux testes
Estoyent formez ces raisonnables bestes.
La reste vaut mieux, pensée que ditte,
Et se verroit plustost peinte qu'escrite.
Chacun estoit de son corps tant ayse,
Qu'en se tournant il se trouvoit baisé:
En estendant ses bras, on l'embrassoit:
Voulant penser, on le contrepensoit:
En soy voyoit tout ci qu'il vouloit veoir,
En soy trouvoit ce qu'il falloit avoir.
Jamais en lieu ses pieds portez ne l'eussent,
Que quand & luy ses passetemps ne feussent.
Si de son bien luy plaisoit mal user,
Facile estoit envers soy s'excuser.
De luy n'estoit fait ne raport, ny compte,
Ne congnoissoit honnestete, ny honte.
Si de son cœur sortoyent simples desirs,
Il y entroit tant de doubles plaisirs,
Qu'en y pensant chacun est incité

(a) Archontici apud Epiphan. hæres. 40.

(b) *See the Remark B in the Article Eve.*

(c) *Thomas Brown*, Religio medici, part. 2 sect. 9. pag. m. 197.

(d) Et si recte ineptias illas ac nugas, quas vir cum muliere agit, quoties feminei voluptate uti decrevit, consideremus, nihil stultius fingi posse reperiemus. Sed ob liberorum procreandorum necessitatem, humanique generis conservationem, Deus proclives nos ad ejusmodi nugas ac voluptates esse voluit. *Annotata ad religion. Medici* pag. 403.

(e) Ibid.

(f) Ibid.

(g) Αἱ τιμαὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἠφανίζετο. Extincto hominum genere humanus deorum cultus venerationque periret. *Plato in convivio* pag. 1185.

(h) *Fac.* from Plato in convivio pag. 1186.

(i) De præp. Evang. lib. 12. c. 7.

(k) He was Regius Professor at Paris, and Translated several Dialogues of Plato into French, and among others the Feast: To which he added a Commentary.

(l) Folio, Paris 1559, in 4.

(m) Fol. 51.

(n) Fol. 52.

(o) Folio 53.

(p) La Croix du Maine says that Heroet, a Native of Paris, was related to Chancellor Olivier.

Aſſoon as this Article was read at *Geneva*, a Perſon, for whom I have a very great Eſteem, was pleaſed to ſend me a Memorial, which I ſhall inſert (*G*) in this Article. It appears from it that a *Cordelier*, who forſook his Order, is the Author of that pretended Voyage into *Terra Auſtralis*. I wonder that *M. Couſin*, who has given us very ſeriouſly an Extract of *James Sadeur's* Chimerical Adventures, in his *Journal des Savans*, knew nothing of the *Vannes* Edition 1676. He thought that the *Paris* Edition Printed for *Barbin*, 1692, was the firſt.

[illegible]

SADDUCEES, a *Sect*, which aroſe among the Jews two hundred (*A*) Years or thereabouts before the Birth of the Meſſias. 'Tis thought that *Sadok*, a Diſciple of *Antigonus Sochæus* was the Founder of it. He and *Baithus*, who was alſo a Diſciple of the ſame *Antigonus*, * put a wrong ſenſe upon the Doctrine of their Maſter: They concluded that there are no Rewards or Puniſhments after this Life from his exhorting them to ſerve God, not like Mercenary Men, who act only in hopes of getting ſomething by it, but like thoſe Generous Servants, who are Faithful and Obedient to their Maſters without expecting any Reward. This fine Maxim not being well underſtood by thoſe two Diſciples of *Antigonus*, occaſion'd their

* [illegible] Willemer in diſſert. philologica de Sadducæis pag. [illegible]

A maintenir, que le felicité
Fut le tel temps, & le ſiecle doré.

(*G*) *A Memorial.——It appears from it that a Cordelier, who forſook his Order, is the Author.*] Here follows part of a Letter written to me from *Geneva*, the 23d of *March*, 1697. "You will not be diſpleaſed to know the true Author of the Relation of *Terra Auſtralis*, which came out under the name of *James Sadeur*. His Name was *Gabriel Foigni*, and he was a *Cordelier* in a Convent of *Lorrain* his Native Country. He came into theſe parts in the Year 1667, and Imbraced our Religion; notwithſtanding which he Lived an irregular Life. At firſt he ſetled in the little Town of *Morges*, where he was the Church Singer; but one Day going to Sing, after he had been Drinking, he did ſome undecent Things at Church, which occaſion'd his being turn'd out. He came hither, and in order to get a Livelihood he went from Houſe to Houſe teaching young Boys, Grammar, Geography, &c. and the *Germans* the *French* Tongue. Sometime after he Married a Woman of the Dregs of the People, who was not accounted ſo Scrupulous as *Lucretia*. Afterwards he bethought himſelf of Publiſhing ſome ſmall Books; and among others an *Almanack* every Year, under the name of the *Great Garantus*, which was commonly very Faulty as to the Computation of Times; a Set of Cards for Heraldry, and the Pſalms of *Marot* and *Beza*, with a Prayer of his own making at the end of each Pſalm, containing only ſome inſipid Compliments to the Deity. Laſtly, the relations of Voyages being very much in Vogue at that time; he Compleated his Works by his *Auſtralia*, as he calls it: He had it Printed here Privately about the latter end of the Year 1676. Our Clergy, who thought that Book contain'd many things contrary to the Holy Scripture, and ſeveral Obſcenities, ſent for the Printer, who declared that *Foigni* had given him the Manuſcript. *Foigni* ſtoutly maintain'd that *James Sadeur* was the true Author of it, and that he had received the Copy from *Bourdeaux*: But at laſt being ſummon'd to appear before the Magiſtrates he confeſt that he had writ that Book to get ſomething, and that *James Sadeur* was a Suppoſititious Name. As a Puniſhment, he was ordered to leave the Town with his Family; but ſome *German* Gentlemen, whom he taught the *French* Tongue, having interceeded for him, he was allowed to ſtay here. But three or four Years after, his Maid being with Child, and he himſelf being Proſecuted upon that account, he went away and retired into *Savoy*, and got into a Monaſtery, where he Died five Years ago.

I ſhall ſet down here what a conſiderable Man told me in the Year 1699, *viz.* That the Relation Printed under the Name of *James Sadeur*, is the work of a Gentleman of *Bretagne*, a great admirer of *Lucretius*, whom he had Tranſlated into *French*, deſigning to Publiſh his Tranſlation. He put out at *Vannes*, in the Year 1676, the Relation of *James Sadeur*. I might reconcile this with the Memorial ſent to me from *Geneva*, by ſuppoſing that the Monk, who forſook his Order, took out of that work the Materials of the *Auſtralia* Publiſh'd by him, or that he Tranſcribed it word for word, and Publiſh'd it as an Original. There are ſome things in that Relation ſo nicely managed, that I can hardly believe that *Foigni* was Maſter of ſo much Art. I have forgot to deſire ſome of my Friends to compare *Sadeur's* Relation with the *Auſtralia*. I am apt to think that there is ſome difference between thoſe two Pieces.

(*A*) *Two Hundred Years or thereabouts before the Birth of the Meſſias.*] The moſt probable Opinion is, that *Sadok*, a Diſciple of *Antigonus Sochæus*, was the Founder of the Sect of the *Sadducees*. Now this *Antigonus* Succeeded *Simon* the Juſt (*a*) in the Chair of the *Sanhedrin*. This *Simon* died in the Year of the World 3662, or according to others 3692. One may therefore believe that *Sadok's* Innovation began to appear in the Year of the World 3700, that is, 248 Years before CHRIST. Thus *M. Willemer* argues in a *Theſis* maintain'd under his direction at *Wittemberg* the 28th of *September* 1680. Some Learned Men are of Opinion that the Hereſy of the *Sadducees* is more Ancient, and that it Sprung from a wrong Senſe put upon the 37th Chapter of *Ezekiel*, whilſt the Prophets *Zachariah* and *Malachi* were ſtill Alive. Dr. *Lightfoot* (*b*), who followed that Opinion in his Commentary upon St. *Matthew's* Goſpel, departed from it (*c*) in his Commentary upon the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, and maintain'd a very different Opinion, *viz.* that the Hereſy of the *Sadducees* did not appear till a long time after *Sadok's* Death. 'Tis to be obſerved that *Joſephus* the firſt time he mentions that Sect, does not repreſent it (*d*) as a New one, but as a Party intirely formed. The time his Diſcourſe refers to is that of *Jonathas* Brother to *Judas Maccabee*; and therefore it muſt be placed 153 Years before CHRIST. He mentions that Sect again about a hundred Years after (*e*), and repreſents it as a very Ancient one. *The Jews*, ſays he (*f*), *had long before divided their Wiſdom or Philoſophy into three Sects, viz. the* Eſſenians, *the* Sadducees, *and the* Phariſees. *Lucas Brugenſis* has a very bold Opinion. He ſays that the College of the *Scribes* Founded by *Ezra* was very Flouriſhing under the *Maccabees*, and that thoſe *Scribes* began then to examine the Queſtion about future Rewards and Puniſhments, becauſe they came to know what the *Greeks* ſaid about it. That inquiry occaſion'd two Sects, that of the *Sadducees* and that of the *Phariſees*: The latter were for the Affirmative, and the others for the Negative. He pretends that the *Jews* believed only temporal Rewards and Puniſhments according to the Law of *Moſes*, and that if the Patriarchs and Prophets had a greater Knowledge, they did not however teach the Doctrine of a future Life as an Article of Faith. According to this Hypotheſis the *Jews* learn'd of the *Greeks* the Immortality of the Soul, and future Rewards and Puniſhments, whereas 'tis commonly believed that the Pagans had thoſe Excellent Doctrines from the Scripture. Here follow the words of *Lucas Brugenſis's*. (*g*) *Quum tempore Maccabæorum plures florerent Scribæ quorum collegium ab Eſdra exordium ſumſerat, qui ſapientiæ ſtuderent, & ut jugo Græcorum ſubjacebant, nonnunquam audirent Græcorum de his rebus (animæ humanæ immortalitate, corporis reſurrectione, æterno bonorum præmiis, & malorum ſuppliciis) fabulas, factum eſt ut cœperint quæſtiones de his rebus in medium afferre, & inter ſe ventilare, atque a ſe mutuo diſſidere, aliis iſta adſtruentibus, qui vocati fuere Phariſæi, aliis negantibus qui Sadducæi. Ante hæc tempora non videtur populus Iſrael quidquam de his rebus doctus fuiſſe, aut quidquam*

(*a*) Hujus Simeonis Juſti diſcipulus ac in cathedra Synedrii ſucceſſor fuit Antigonus Sochæus. *J. b. Helvicus Willemerus in diſſertat. philologica de Sadducæis pag. 23. edit. Wittemb.* 1680.

(*b*) *Lightfoot* hor. hebraic. in Matth. III. 7. p. 236. edit. Carpz. apud Joh. Helvic. Willemer. ubi ſupra pag. 24.

(*c*) Id. hor. Hebr. in actus Apoſt. pag. 123. apud eund. ib. pag. 26.

(*d*) Joſeph. Antiq. lib. 13. c. 9.

(*e*) Ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου τῶν πατρίων. Jam inde a multis retro ſeculis. *Joſeph. ib.* l. 18. c. 2. pag. 617.

(*f*) Joſephus, Book 13. c. 2.

(*g*) Lucas Brugenſis annotat. in Matth. III. 7. apud Willemerum ubi ſupra pag. 28.

their setting up for Party-Leaders. They Founded two Pernicious (B) Sects, which utterly destroyed Religion, and foreseeing † that they would be kill'd, if they ventured to declare Publickly all the Consequences arising from their Principles, they durst not reject the Authority of the Scripture, and only rejected the Traditions. Those who embraced the Sect of *Sadoc*, were call'd *Sadducees*. They made already a considerable figure in the time of *Jonathas* Brother to *Juda Maccabæus*, that is, about the Year of *Rome* 600; for * *Josephus* informs us that there were at that time three Sects among the *Jews*, *viz.* The *Pharisees*, the *Sadducees* and the *Essenians*. He adds ‡ that the *Sadducees* rejected the Doctrine of Predestination, and Taught that Man is the only cause of his Prosperity or Adversity, according as he makes a good or an ill use of his Free-Will. He says § in another place that the *Sadducees* and *Pharisees* had many Qarrels together, and that Rich People sided with the *Sadducees*, but the Mob stood for the *Pharisees*. The latter prescribed many Rites as being transmitted and handed down to them by their Ancestors, tho' they were not Written in the Law of *Moses*: On the Contrary the *Sadducees* rejected all the Doctrines and Usages not contained in the Scripture. We Read in the same passage of *Josephus* that the high Priest γ *Hircanus*, who had been a Disciple of the *Pharisees*, forsook and abused them, having declared for the Sect of the *Sadducees* at the Suggestion of his Favourite *Jonathas*, who was one of 'em. We are told by the same Historian δ that the *Sadducees* did not believe the immortality of the Soul, ζ nor that God concerned himself (C) with Evil either to do it, or to take notice of it. He observes η that the Number of the *Sadducees* was not considerable, but that they were generally invested with the highest Dignities; notwithstanding which they had no great Interest; few things were done according to their Advice, and those who exercised the Magistracy were obliged to Comply against their Will with the Decisions of the *Pharisees*, otherwise they had not been tolerated by the Mob. *Josephus* makes two Observations, which, I think, will give a great light into the matter: One of 'em is that the *Pharisees* θ were not severe in Punishing any Body; the other is, that the *Sadducees* κ shewed a great severity in the Functions of Judicature. Lastly, he says λ that there was no good understanding among them, that they lived like wild Beasts, and that Friends were not better used in their Conversation than if they had been strangers. 'Tis no easy thing to reconcile this with what he says in another place, that this Sect was not beloved by the Mob but by Rich People; for the latter don't like a morose and peevish Humour, and are for introducing the sweets and conveniencies of Life wherever they can. Perhaps one might think that what he says concerning the discord of the *Sadducees* and their Clownish Conversation signifies only ‖ that they accounted it a Virtue to have the Liberty of disputing with their Masters. It was almost an unavoidable Consequence from their Principles, since they boldly rejected the Authority of Tradition, and did not care whether the several Texts of the Scripture had been explained by the Ancients in such a manner or not. This being laid down, a Disciple had as much right to Contradict his Master, as the latter had to Contradict his Predecessor, and so on. The *Sadducees* are often mention'd in the Holy Scripture; but tho' it informs us † that they

† Maimonid.

* Joseph. Antiquit. Judaic. l. 13. c. 9.

‡ Id. ib. & lib. 2. de bello Judaico c. 12. (alias c. [illegible]

§ Id. Antiq. lib. 13. cap. 18. sub fin.

γ He died about the Year of Rome 649

δ Id. Antiq. lib. 18. c. 2.

ζ Id. de bello Jud. ubi supra.

η Id. Antiq. lib. 18. c. 2.

θ Id. Antiq. lib. 13. c. 18.

κ Id. Antiq. lib. 20. c. 7. See the Remark D.

λ Id. de bello Jud. ibid.

‖ Id. Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 2.

de istis publice prædicatum, eo quod lex harum rerum disertam mentionem non faceret, terrenas dumtaxat spes minasque bonis malisque ob oculos ponens. Fuit quidem Patriarcharum & prophetarum non dubia hic fides, quod vel undecimum Caput Epistolæ ad Hebræos testatum facit, sed multa a Patriarchis & Prophetis credita prædictaque fuere quæ ut non proposita atque enarrata, ita nec credenda necessario populo fuere, ut virginitas matris Messiæ, paupertas, passio, mors, resurrectio Messiæ. Videtur clara publicaque hujusmodi rerum æternarum doctrina Messiæ reservata fuisse, interim dum Messias expectaretur quo paratiores forent animi ad excipiendam fidem de rebus hujusmodi invisibilibus, futuris & æternis, permiserat DEUS varias de his opiniones oriri & sapientum synagogas inter se altercationibus discuti. M. *Willemer* (a) does very much dislike this Opinion, and refers the Reader to the Orthodox Divines, who have confuted the *Socinians*, &c. concerning the belief of the *Jews*.

(B) *They founded two pernicious Sects.*] Every Body does not acknowledge that each of those two Disciples founded a Sect: Some Learned Men pretend that the Sect of the *Sadducees* and that of the *Baithuseans* were but one and the same Sect, which went indifferently sometimes by the Name of *Sadok*, one of its Founders, and sometimes by the Name of *Baithus*, the other Founder; but because *Sadok* was more eager than his Collegue in maintaining the party formed by him, his Name was more frequently made use of than that of *Baithus* to denote their followers. Nay the latter rather chose to be call'd *Sadducees* than *Baithuseans*, because *Baithus* being a Bastard, they were afraid it would bring a Blot upon them. This opinion may be seen more at large in a (b) Book of *Carpzovius*. It is the more likely because some Learned Men confess they could never find out wherein the *Sadducees* differ'd from the *Baithuseans*. *Ignosce ignorantiæ nostræ*, they are Dr. *Lightfoot*'s Words (c), *si fateamur nescire nos penitus quid interérat inter Sadducæum, & Baithusæum, an convenirent in eodem, an dissentirent in aliquibus? de Baithusæis apud sacras paginas altum silentium, apud Judaicas mentio frequentissima, & videntur in quibusdam distingui a Sadducæis, ast in quibus obscurius.* The Learned *Maimonides* (d) does plainly intimate that they were only two Names for one and the same thing. Nevertheless some *Rabins* have found a notable difference in it, for they say (e) that the Doctrine of the Resurrection was never denied by the *Baithuseans*, and that (f) the *Sadducees* were much more wicked, and downright Infidels. Nay some (g) will have it that the *Baithuseans* were a Branch of the *Essenians*; but that Opinion has been irrefragably confuted (h)

(C) *Nor that God concern'd himself with Evil, either to do it, or to take notice of it.*] Josephus charges them with this impious Doctrine: These are his Words. (i) Σαδδουκαῖοι —— τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην παντάπασιν ἀναιροῦσι, καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ἐφορᾶν τίθενται: *Sadducæi —— fatum omnino negant, & Deum extra omnem mali patrationem inspectionemque constituunt.* Josephus does not seem to have understood their Opinion, for we shall see (k) hereafter that they believed that God rewards good Men in this World, and punishes the Wicked. They went to St. *John* the Baptist as well as the *Pharisees* (l) to be Baptized by him, when they

(a) Hactenus Brugensis mirum in modum cumulans σοφιστικὰ ἀκυρώματα homine Theologo indigna contra fidem fidelium V. & N. Test. essentialiter eandem. *Willemer, ibid.*

ey denied the Immortality of the Soul, and the exiſtence of Angels and Spi- and that the *Phariſees* believed both, it gives us a worſe Character of the than of the *Sadducees*. I ſhall examine what has been (*D*) ſaid of the Immorality of the latter, and I'll make it appear that no good Proofs can be given for it. Their Virtue would be leſs ſurpriſing than that of a follower of *Epicurus*;

they heard that he Preached Repentance in the Deſerts of *Judea*. The Scripture ſays that (a) they were deſirous to avoid the Evils they thought themſelves threatned with. How then can it be denied that they believed that the Baptiſm of Repentance adminiſtred by St. *John* would appeaſe God's Anger, or procure them ſome Advantage? They did not therefore believe, as *Joſephus* will have it, that God does not concern himſelf with puniſhing Evil. *Saldenus* is in the wrong to find fault with *Voſſius*, because he juſtifies them on that Head. (b) *Ex philoſophis gentium hanc Sadducæorum opinionem* (animam non eſſe immortalem) *amplexi ſunt Epicurei; ſine longe deteriorem. Nam Sadducæi agnoſcebant Deum curare res humanas, quippe cum bonis bene facere in hac vita. Epicurei autem in totum tollebant providentiam divinam.* I cannot tell, ſays *Saldenus* (c), why the great *Voſſius* went about to juſtify ſuch an infamous Sect; for having conſulted many Authors, who have writ Books concerning the Sects of the *Hebrews*, I find every where that the *Sadducees* rejected the Doctrine of Providence. I ſhall only quote *Joſephus*. And then he alledges what is to be found in the 9th Chapter of the 13th Book of the *Jewiſh Antiquities* concerning the Opinion of the *Sadducees* about Predeſtination and Free-Will. It had been better for him to quote the paſſage alledged by me at the beginning of this Remark; for it does not follow because a Man rejects the fatality of Predeſtination and teaches that Men are free to do good or evil, that he denies a Providence. The *Pelagians*, the *Socinians*, in a Word thoſe who have writ with the greateſt vehemency againſt the neceſſity of Humane Actions, maintain at the ſame time that God Governs the World, that he puniſhes Vice and rewards Virtue. 'Tis to be obſerved that *Grotius* thinks that the *Greek* Words of *Joſephus*, which I have quoted, are not correct.

(*D*) *I ſhall examine what has been ſaid of the Immorality of the Sadducees.*] M. *Willemer* (d) charges them with Cruelty, and to prove it he ſays that they induced (e) King *John Hircanus* to perſecute the *Phariſees* violently. He refers us to the 18. Chapter of the 13th Book of the *Jewiſh Antiquities*. I have conſulted that paſſage, wherein I only find what follows. *Hircanus* a Diſciple of the *Phariſees*, and very well beloved by them, loſt intirely their Friendſhip. They conceived a great hatred againſt him, and becauſe upon a certain occaſion they gave him ground to be very angry with them, he forſook their Sect, and imbraced that of the *Sadducees* at the inſtigation of *Jonathas* his Favourite. He aboliſh'd the Ordinances of the *Phariſees*, and ſeverely puniſh'd thoſe who obſerved them. Laſtly, he put an end to the Sedition, which thoſe two Sects had raiſed, and ſpent the remaining part of his Life *in Peace and Felicity*. M. *Willemer* adds that *Alexander Janneus*, being applauded and ſtir'd up by the *Sadducees*, was more Cruel than his Father *Hircanus*, and that having got out of a Thouſand difficulties in which he had been intangled by the *Jews*, he cauſed 800 of the chief Men among the *Phariſees* to be Crucified, and that before they expired, he ordered their Wives and Children to be murdered in their ſight. During thoſe Executions he gave a Noble Entertainment to his Concubines and to the chief Men among the *Sadducees*. This Author refers us to the 22d Chapter of the 13th Book of the *Jewiſh Antiquities*, where I don't find that the *Sadducees* are mention'd in the leaſt. As for the Author of the *Cabbala Hiſtorica* quoted by him, I have not been able to conſult him; but tho' he ſhould ſay what M. *Willemer* alledges out of his Book, can we believe him? Can a Man, who lived at ſo great a diſtance from thoſe times, be credited rather than *Joſephus* who ſays nothing of it? At laſt Queen *Alexandra* by her Husband's Advice and with the aſſiſtance of the *Phariſees* undertook to puniſh the *Sadducees* in order to reſtrain their Turbulent Spirit, but ſhe could not (f) effect it, nor prevent the new Broils which they occaſion'd in the State between *Hircanus* and *Ariſtobulus*; and when *Herod* had rid himſelf of thoſe two Princes, the *Sadducees* made uſe of their intereſt with him to commit all ſorts of Crimes. *Joſephus* in the 17th Chapter of the 16th Book of the *Jewiſh Antiquities* is of Opinion that *Herod* was moved by the *Sadducees* and their impious Doctrine concerning the Fatal neceſſity of all things, to cauſe his Son to be ſtrangled and three Hundred Captains to be ſtoned. This is M. *Willemer's* Account, and he concludes that it has been truly ſaid that the *Sadducees* were very immoral Men, *Epicurus's* Swines, and very pernicious Hereticks. (g) *Ex vero igitur dictum eſt, Sadducæos fuiſſe moribus peſſimis, & Epicuri de grege porcos; ita qui doctrinam pernicioſam omnino hæreticos.* But 'tis certain he draws a wrong Conſequence; for 1. the Matters of Fact on which he builds are not to be found in *Joſephus*, the Author he alledges: 2. Tho' they were true, it would not follow from them that the *Sadducees* wallowed in ſenſual Pleaſures as thoſe do who are call'd *Epicuri de grege porci*. All that could be proved from thence, is that they made an ill uſe of their intereſt with Princes to oppreſs the *Phariſees*, of whom they had great Reaſon to be afraid, ſince that Sect was animated with a ſuperſtitious Zeal, and ſupported by the Mob. I confeſs that ſuch a Conduct is unjuſt; but the like is to be ſeen in all parties, or in all Factions of State or Religion. Thoſe, that teach the Doctrine of Future Rewards and Puniſhments, have not been leſs careful to take hold of favourable Opportunities in order to oppreſs their Rivals. They are not leſs ſevere and cruel in their Counſels; and therefore there would be nothing ſingular, and no Character of diſtinction in the proceedings of the *Sadducees*, tho' the matters of Fact mention'd by the *German* Writer were true. What will he ſay then, if I ſhew that they are falſe or uncertain? Which is not a difficult thing.

'Tis certain that *Joſephus* does not ſpeak in the leaſt of the *Sadducees* in the Chapter, where he tells us how *Herod* cauſed his Sons and three Hundred Captains to be put to Death. He would have made himſelf extremely Ridiculous, if he had ſaid (h) that the Doctrine of thoſe Men concerning the Fatality of all things moved *Herod* to ſuch a Cruelty; for it was a Notorious thing that they rejected the Doctrine of Predeſtination, and whenever he mentions 'em, he obſerves that according to their Principles a Man's Fate depends wholly upon his Free-Will. I don't deny that *Joſippus* (i), ſays that the *Sadducees* occaſion'd the Inſurrection of the *Jews* againſt *Alexander Janneus*, and the Cruelty of that Prince towards that People, becauſe they adviſed him to perſecute the *Phariſees* and their Adherents; (k) but the Teſtimony of ſuch an Author is very inconſiderable, eſpecially when we may oppoſe againſt it the ſilence of ſuch an Hiſtorian as *Joſephus*, who never ſhews any partiality to the *Sadducees*. *Rabbi Abraham* of *Salamanca* is too Modern a Writer to build upon his Authority; and therefore we are not obliged to believe upon his Word what he ſays (l) of the Immorality of thoſe Hereticks. Once more; if they had been cried down for their Debaucheries and Wicked Actions, 'tis highly improbable that *Joſephus*, who ſpeaks of 'em ſo often, would have been wholly ſilent on that Head, and that the only thing mention'd by him concerning their Morals ſhould rather make us believe that they did not live a ſenſual Life. He tells us that they were Men of a Clowniſh and Wild Converſation, who ſhewed no more Civility to their Friends than to Strangers. (m) Σαδδουκαίων δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἦθος ἀγριώτερον, αἵ τε ἐπιμιξίαι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀπηνεῖς ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίους. *Sadducæi vero & inter ſe fera moribus diſcrepantes, & converſatio eorum circa exteros inhumana.* This is not the Character of voluptuous Men; for on the contrary they are very complaiſant one to another, and endeavour to

(d) Willemer, ubi ſupra pag. 44.

(g) Id. ib. pag. 45.

(h) Ipſe Herodes M. id immanem ſæviciam . . . peſſimis Sadducæorum conſiliis ac impia doctrina de neceſſitate omnium fatali impulſus creditur Joſepho lib. XVI. A. J. cap. 45. Id. ib. pag. 44.

(i) *See the Marginal Note of* Genebrard *upon the* 21. *chapter of the* 13. *Book of* Joſephus fol. m. 464. verſo.

(k) *See in* Voſſius de hiſtor. Græcis lib. 2. c. 2. pag. 197. *what a contemptible Writer he is.*

(l) Sadducæi fuerunt improbi peſſimiſque moribus præditi. R. Abraham Salmanticenſis apud Willemer. pag. 44.

(m) Joſeph. de bello Jud. l. 2. c. 7. ſub fin. pag. m. 788. 789.

em; for that part of Religion, which they kept, might have had an influence upon their (E) Lives thro' the Motives of Hope and Fear. However one may very well

make their Conversation agreeable. M. Willemer (a) lays a great stress upon St. John the Baptist's calling the *Sadducees* (b) *a generation of vipers*. He runs back to the first Serpent, that seduced *Eve*. Let him say what he pleases: I need only answer him, that the *Pharisees* were call'd so as well as the *Sadducees*; and therefore if any thing be concluded from it concerning the immoral Lives of those, who denied the Immortality of the Soul, it will no less concern those who believed future Rewards and Punishments. The same may be said of the Leaven, which our Saviour (c) would have his Disciples to beware of: The *Pharisees* are as much concern'd in it as the *Sadducees*.

Take Notice that 'tis the Opinion of many Authors that the *Sadducees* call'd themselves so from a Word, which signifies *Righteousness*. (d) Ἐπονομάζουσι δὲ ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, δῆθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὁρμωμένης. Σεδὲκ γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη. *Sadducæos se a justitia nominant. Sedek enim justitiam significat.* Those, who approve this Etymology, observe that those Hereticks were call'd *Sadducees* (e), because they were fond of being accounted just Men, and others bestowed that *Encomium* upon them. M. *Willemer* (f) cites for this Opinion *Isidorus*, *Beatus Rhenanus*, *Bernard de Breitenbach*, and Dr. *Mountague*. He says 'tis a dispute from what sort of Righteousness those Sectaries were denominated. 'Twas, according to St. *Jerome*, an inherent Righteousness; for they pretended to have acquired it perfectly by the Observation of the Law. Many approve this Opinion of St. *Jerome*. (g) *D. Hieronymus* in Matthæum XXII. Tom. VI. oper. *allegat propriam inhærentem justitiam, de cujus perfectione, ex lege à se observata, fuerint gloriati. Sequuntur eum multi Patrum, plurimique Scholasticorum ut & Mathias Flacius* part. 1. Clav. Script. pag. 1064. *Georgius Fabritius* histor. sacr. lib. X. Num. 432. pag. 584. *Atque Greg.* Lex. S. pag. 236. Others will have it to be a distributive Justice, and are still divided about it; for some say 'tis that which consists in rewarding, and others that which consists in punishing. The former pretend that according to the *Sadducees* Justice is only administred in this World; good Men are rewarded, and Wicked Men punish'd in it, and nothing remains to be done after this Life. The latter say that those Hereticks were very severe in the Administration of Justice, and that they were call'd *Sadducees* upon that Account. (h) *Non-nemo* —— *ob remunerativam justitiam eos justos appellatos statuit*, quod existimarint in hac vita omnem compleri justitiam, h. e. justis bene fieri, malis evenire mala, mortuo autem homine nullum superesse judicium justitiæ. *Punitivam vero justitiam eligit Nicolaus de Lyra* Comment. in Act. V. *ita inquiens*: Dicuntur Sadducæi à Sadech, quod est justitia in Hebræo: nam Sadducæi inter alios Judæos erant in judiciis & punitionibus acerrimi, ut dicitur (i) in Scholastica historia, propterea sibi nomen justitiæ usurpabant. If the Facts, on which this Etymology is grounded, be true, we need not doubt that the *Sadducees* pretended to be good Moral Men, and carefully avoided to live a loose Life. However it be, we have here many Authors, who must needs believe that they were Regular Men; and at the worst all that can be said is, that Authors don't agree about this Subject: But after what has been said, it will be no difficult thing to judge which of 'em are in the right. 'Tis to be observed that one may easily believe that the *Sadducees* were very severe; for since they did not believe that a Malefactor would be punish'd after this Life, 'twas Natural for them to think that he was to be Condemn'd to a very severe Punishment in this World.

I must take notice of some Faults of Mr. *Lloyd*. I think he is mistaken, when he says, 1. That what *Josephus* tells us of their Austerity, ought to be understood of the severe Sentences which they pronounced in administring justice. 2. That according to the same Historian the *Jews* hated them by Reason of that severity, and were more inclined to the *Pharisees*, who shewed a greater Moderation in inflicting Punishments. (k) *Erant enim in maleficos acerbiores in judiciis, & pœnarum mulctis exercendis rigidi, quemadmodum ex hist. Scholast. citat Serrarius, non dissentiente Josepho. Hinc enim repetunt illud elogium, quo morosos, difficiles, minimeque tractabiles pronunciat: adeo ut ab illorum moribus durioribus abhorreret populus, & ad Pharisæos potius propenderent, qui* [illegible], *quod ille dixit*, ἐπιεικῶς πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ἔχουσι. I shall observe upon the first Item, that the description of the rough way of the *Sadducees* is improperly alledged. *Josephus* does not consider 'em as Judges in that place. What he observes (l) in the 8th Chapter of the 10. Book of the *Jewish* Antiquities should have been quoted by *Serrarius*, *Nicolas de Lyra* and several others, and not the *Historia Scholastica*. As to the Second, I say that Mr. *Lloyd* could not be blamed, if he had spoken his own thoughts; but he ascribes to *Josephus* a Connexion of Matters, a reasoning, or a Proposition, termed *causale*, which is not to be found in his Works. Such a Proposition is sometimes false, tho' its parts considered by themselves be true; for this is not sufficient. The (m) Particle, whereby they are connected together, ought not to bring in a Falsity. Mr *Lloyd* did not consider this: Many Authors are guilty of the same Carelesness.

(E) *Might have had an influence upon their Lives thro' the Motives of hope and fear.*] All things duly considered, I don't think that I ought to retract what I have said in another Book: " (n) There was a
" Sect among the *Jews*, which openly denied the
" Immortality of the Soul, *viz*, the *Sadducees*. I
" don't find that notwithstanding so detestable an
" Opinion, they were worse livers than the other
" *Jews*; on the contrary 'tis very likely they were
" more Honest Men than the *Pharisees*, who pretend-
" ed to observe punctually the Law of God." I must only add a short Observation to that passage, *viz*. that the good Life of the *Sadducees* might have been an effect of their believing a Providence; for 'tis thought they believed that God punishes Men in this World for their wicked Actions, and rewards their Virtue. See the Remark G. This Opinion may serve for a Curb and a Spur: it may induce Men to the Practice of Virtue in hopes of a Temporal Happiness, and deter them from Evil thro' the Fear of Temporal Punishments. Nay, it may seem to be a more powerful Motive than the other Doctrine, because good and evil things, when present or near at hand, make a much greater impression, tho' they be inconsiderable, than good or evil things, tho' never so great, that are only viewed at a great distance. This is what may be said by those, who examine this superficially; but those who dive into the thing, judge otherwise of it. They believe that generally speaking the greatest Power of Religion with respect to Virtue consists in the persuasion of Eternal Rewards, and Punishments; and that those who deny the Immortality of the Soul, break the best Springs of Religion. Which may be confirm'd by two Remarks: One is, that 'tis hardly possible to persuade People that they shall prosper upon Earth if they live a good Life, and that they shall be unhappy if they live an ill Life. Every Body thinks he sees every Day a Thousand Instances of the contrary; and can any Doctors, tho' never so eloquent, persuade a thing, which Men think to be contradicted by a continual Series of Experiences? They may indeed tell us in answer to our Objections (o), that we know but little wherein true Prosperity and true Adversity consist, and that Wicked Men are sufficiently punish'd by the Remorses (p) of their Conscience in the midst of their Wealth and Glory, whilst an honest Man is worthily rewarded by the sole possession (q) of Virtue and the Testimony of a good Conscience. They will tell us a Thousand fine things upon this subject, and form in us a kind of persuasion; but it will not be a constant one, and they may be afraid that during our bad intervals, we shall tell 'em what *Brutus* said to Virtue. If you object to me that there is a certain

(a) Willemer. ubi supra pag. 17.

(b) Matt. III. 7.

(c) Ibid. XVI. 6.

(d) Epiphan. Hæres. 14. p. m. 31.

(e) Eo quod justitiæ laudem tum sibi apponerent, tum aliis tribuerent. *Willemerus* pag. 5.

(f) Idem pag. 6.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) Id. ib.

(i) Josephus *should have been quoted.*

(k) Nicolaus Lloydius in Diction. histor. & poetico v. Sadducæi.

(m) [illegible] l'Art de penser 2. part. ch. [illegible] p. m. 175.

(n) Pensées diverses sur les Comètes pag. [illegible]

(o) Neque mala vel bona, quæ vulgus putet: multos qui conflictari adversis videantur, beatos; ac plerosque quamquam magnas per opes, miserrimos si illi gravem fortunam constanter tolerent, hi prospera inconsulte utantur. *Tacit. Ann.* l. 6. c. 22.

(p) Neque frustra præstantissimus sapientiæ firmare solitus est, si recludantur [illegible] mentes, posse [illegible] & ictus; quando ut corpora verberibus, ita sævitia, libidine, malis consultis, animus dilaceretur. *Il. ib.* cap. 6.

(q) Ipsa quidem virtus pretium sibi, solaque late &c. Claudian. *de consul. Mallii init.*

well wonder that they were not (F) Excommunicated, and that they made but one Body of Religion with the reſt of the *Jews*, as the *Janſeniſts* and *Moliniſts* do now with the other Chriſtians of the *Romiſh* Communion. The *Sadducees* ‡ don't appear under that Name in the *Talmud*, but only under the Notion of Hereticks and *Epicureans*. There is little Reaſon to ſay that they admitted only the Five (G) Books of *Moſes*, and that

tain Impreſſion in Men, which frequently rouzes it ſelf, and is very active; it makes one believe contrary to Experience, that Piety is attended with Temporal Bleſſings, and that the Tranſgreſſion of the Law of God is puniſh'd in this World: I ſay, if you object ſuch a thing to me, I anſwer that the Orthodox will feel the activity of that Impreſſion as well as the *Sadducees*, and that being moreover perſuaded of a Future State, Religion will have a greater Influence upon their Lives. Which is my Second Obſervation.

To conclude, I ſay it cannot be denied that if a Man is fully perſuaded that the Divine Juſtice diſtributes Rewards and Puniſhments only in this Life, he may abſtain from Evil, and practiſe Virtue out of a Religious Motive. But then it muſt be ſaid that ſuch an Opinion is ſo unlikely to overcome the Depravation of our Nature, that one may well affirm that the *Sadducees* deſtroyed the true Foundations of Religion, and that the good Life of a *Sadducee* may be look'd upon as a kind of inſtance of the Conjunction of Moral Honeſty with Impiety. *M. Willemer* will grant it, for he ſays that a *Sadducee* not believing the Immortality of the Soul could not be a good Man. (*) *Qui vero a turpiſſimis quibuſque vitiis graviſſimiſque ſceleribus temperarent ſibi, qui per negatam animæ immortalitatem arctiſſime conjuncta huic dogmata corporum reſurrectionem, omnium diſſolicationem, ſempiternam bonorum glorificationem, ac improborum condemnationem affirmare non poterant, ſed pertinaciter inficiabantur.* The Author of theſe *Latin* words proves a Fact by a Reaſoning: ſuch a method is not always ſafe, becauſe Men don't uſe to live according to their Principles. In general, when the Queſtion is about a matter of Fact, Experience ought to be more minded than a Speculative Argument. Take notice of theſe words of *Moreri*, which he had from *M.* ‡ *Godeau*: *'Tis true that if the* Sadducees *were more Impious than the* Phariſees *in their Doctrine, they were not however ſo vain and ſo great Hypocrites, and did not appear ſo Cruel to* JESUS CHRIST. You'll find the ſame Obſervation in *Hofman*'s Dictionary.

(F) *That they were not Excommunicated.*] I begin this Remark with a Paſſage, that contains an Obſervation of *Lucas Brugenſis*. (a) *Mirum igitur videri queat quòd uti ſcribit Lucas Brugenſis* annotation in Matth. *III.* verſ. 7. quanquam errarent Sadducæi, & quidem graviter; nunquam tamen à veteri Synagoga declarati ſint hæretici, h. e. deſertores fidei, aut legis a DEO traditæ, vel ut populi ſeductores, Synagogæ communione ejecti quemadmodum Samaritani Joh. 4. 9 Imo promiſcue verſabantur etiam ipſi Phariſæi & Sacerdotes cum Sadducæis tam in ſacris quam prophanis locis, Act. 4. 1. c. 23. 6. & communia non raro inibant conſilia adverſus Chriſtum ejuſque diſcipulos Matth. 16. verſ. 1. Actor. 5. 1. Denique licebat cuivis, utri vellet parti adhærere. *Verum id tribuendum corruptiſſimis ſeculi illius moribus.* It muſt be confeſt that it was an Exceſſive Toleration; for the Errors of the *Sadducees* did not conſiſt in indifferent Things, but concern'd the moſt Eſſential Doctrines of Religion: The Modern Writers, who are for a Toleration, don't deſire it ſhould be ſo comprehenſive as that of the *Jews*; they don't deſire an Eccleſiaſtical Toleration for all Sects, but are contented with a Civil and Political one. We have ſeen that *M. Willemer* aſcribes the Toleration of the Synagogue for the Sect of the *Sadducees* to the Corruption of thoſe Times. He gives other Reaſons for it, and particularly the care thoſe Hereticks took to comply in all things with the Publick Worſhip: (b) *Magnopere impediebat ejectionem promeritam favor Magnatum plane ſingularis erga Sadducæos. Adjuvabat ingens Sadducæorum, quæ invaluerat, potentia, ac ingenioſa qua abominandam hæreſim tegebant, aſtutia: crebra item ſacrificia, atque reliqua Levitici cultus onera, quæ pro ſalute populi ſe ſuſcipere gloriabantur.* 'Tis certain that the moſt Enormous Diverſity of Opinions as to ſpeculative Doctrines, is more Tolerated than the leaſt diſpute about the Publick Worſhip. Be careful to Practiſe all the outward Duties preſcribed by the prevailing Religion; and notwithſtanding your great Hereſies you'll be leſs Moleſted than if you ſhould oppoſe the outward Worſhip without being guilty of thoſe Hereſies.

I muſt obſerve that a Reform'd (c) Divine, who is very much againſt Toleration, has confuted thoſe, who ſay that Hereticks ought to be Puniſh'd with Death, among other Reaſons by alledging our Saviour's Conduct towards the *Sadducees*. He obſerves that *JESUS CHRIST dealt with them with great Clemency*, and did not blame the Magiſtrates who Tolerated them. See the *Penſées diverſes ſur les cometes* in the 185. Article.

(G) *That they admitted only the Five Books of Moſes.*] *Tertullian* ſays they followed the Hereſy of *Doſitheus*, who rejected the Prophets, and that beſides they were ſo Impious as to deny the Reſurrection. (d) *Taceo ——— Doſitheum, qui primus auſus eſt prophetas quaſi non in Spiritu Sancto locutos repudiare. Taceo Sadducæos qui ex hujus erroris radice ſurgentes, auſi ſunt ad hanc hæreſim etiam reſurrectionem carnis negare.* (e) Origen, (f) St. Jerome, and many other Writers ſay the ſame; I mean, that the *Sadducees* acknowledged no other Books to be Canonical beſides the *Pentateuch*. I have alſo advanced the ſame Opinion in (g) another Work; but now I confeſs that it does not ſeem to me well grounded. There is a Negative Argument againſt it, which appears to me very good. The Holy Scripture never ſays, ſpeaking of the *Sadducees* and their Errors, that they rejected the Prophecies. I confeſs this ſilence is not a convincing Reaſon; but what ſhall we ſay of *Joſephus*, who does not aſcribe to them ſuch a Rejection? One can hardly believe that he would have omitted ſuch a Remarkable and Important Article, even when he obſerves that this Sect rejected the Traditions. Here is a ſtronger Argument: He not only ſays nothing of their rejecting part of the Scripture, in a place where he could not be ſilent about it; but poſitively affirms that when they denied the Authority of the unwritten Traditions, they gave this Reaſon for it, (h) *nothing ought to be accounted Lawful but what is written.* Can an Hiſtorian ſpeak thus of a Sect, that rejects the greateſt part of the Scripture, without being a Mad-Man? I know that a Caviller may ſay (i) that *Joſephus*'s words concern only the written Laws, and conſequently the *Pentateuch*; but I know alſo that this Hiſtorian could not avoid mentioning in that place the Contempt, which 'tis ſaid thoſe Hereticks had for the other Books of the Scripture. *M. Simon* is poſitively againſt thoſe, who affirm that they acknowledged no other Books to be Canonical beſides the *Pentateuch*, and alledges the Teſtimony of *Joſephus*. *That Sect*, ſays he (k), *retained the whole Body of the Scripture according to* Joſephus, *who affirms that the* Sadducees *received* (l) πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα, all the Scripture, *and only rejected the Traditions; and therefore thoſe are miſtaken, who believe that the* Sadducees *kept only the Five Books of* Moſes *in imitation of the* Samaritans. There are many Paſſages in the *Babylonian Talmud*, and in the Writings of the *Rabbins*, (m) whereby it appears that the *Sadducees* acknowledged the *Hagiographa*, and the Prophetical Books of the Scripture to be Divine, and only deſpiſed the Explications of their Doctors. Some think that the *Samaritans* (n) have been confounded with the *Sadducees*, and that it was the reaſon why ſeveral Writers fancied that the latter rejected all the Books of the Scripture beſides the *Pentateuch*, as the *Samaritans* did. But thoſe two Sects ought to be diſtinguiſhed; for the *Jews* had no that therefore CHRIST disputing with them * alledged only the *Pentateuch*. *Arnobius* is the only Author who informs us that according to some (H) they ascribed an Organized Body to God. He relates this in a manner that is somewhat liable to Censure.

---

‡ Huls. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] *Advers.* ſec. IX. p. m. 159.

(*) Willemer. ubi ſupra pag. 41.

(‡) Godeau hiſt. Eccleſ. tom. 1. pag. 126. of the Paris Edition in Folio, 1674.

(a) Id. ib. p. 14, 15.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 15.

(c) Jurieu, Apolog. pour la Reformation tom. 2. pag. 251. edit. in 4.

(d) Tertullian. de præſcript. adverſ. hæret. c. 45.

(e) Origenes tractat. 21. in Matth.

(f) Hieronym. in Matth. c. 22.

(g) *In the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes pag. 532.

(h) Ἐκεῖνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα· τὰ δ' ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν. Oportere eas tantum ſervari quæ ſcripto continentur. *Joſeph. Antiq. lib.* 13. c. 18. *pag.* 454.

(i) Serarius & Petavius *will have it ſo. See* Petavius's *Notes in* Epiphan. ad hæreſ. 14. p. 28.

(k) *Simon*, Hiſt. Critique du vieux teſtament B. 1. ch. 16. p. m. 93.

(l) *I think* M. Simon *would have much ado to find thoſe* Greek *words in* Joſephus. (m) *See the Diſſertation of* John Helvicus Willemer pag. 33, 34. (n) *See the ſame Diſſertation.* pag. 10. & 11.

SAINT-CYRAN (JOHN DU VERGER DE HAURANNE ABBOT OF) one of the Patriarchs of *Jansenism*, was a Native of *Bayonne*. *Moreri* speaks of him ||. I might add many things to what he says, but I put 'em off till another time. He was a very Learned Man, as it appears from his work † against the *Somme Theologique* of Father *Garasse*, and from the Books that he Published against the Jesuits, on which Bishop *Godeau* bestowed an Encomium β at the desire of the Clergy of *France*, in the Year 1646. The Author did not put his Name to 'em; he appeared in the last Books under the Disguise of *Petrus Aurelius* for the reasons mention'd § by his Friends. Few People know that he is the Author

no Communication with the *Samaritans*, and made but one Ecclesiastical Body with the *Sadducees*. Nay sometimes a *Sadducee* (a) was their High Priest, and 'tis not improbable that the High Priest *Caiphas* (b) was one of that Sect.

This Argument would be wrong: The *Sadducees* chose such Books of the Scripture as were not formally contrary to their Errors; they acknowledged them to be Canonical, and rejected the rest as plainly containing the Immortality of the Soul and the Doctrine of the Resurrection. Their Idleness made 'em pitch upon this short way of disputing. *Sadducæi compendio studentes & otio, immo etiam ut effugerent plurium confutationes abjectis & abolitis omnibus prophetarum libris solos quinque Mosis receperunt* (c). I say that such Arguments as this are fallacious: Matters of Fact require to be proved by Arguments grounded upon Facts, and not by Probabilities supported by speculative Reasons. Besides we don't want such Reasons; for Men may so easily invent Subterfuges, Glosses and Distinctions, that they need not reject the Authenticity of a Book, to answer the Arguments alledged against 'em out of it. Don't the *Socinians* profess to acknowledge all the New Testament, and yet it contains more passages against their Errors than the Old Testament against those of the *Sadducees*? Nay, what is more surprising, many Christians, who still acknowledge the Truth of the Holy Scripture, laugh at Magick, (+) and maintain that the Devils have no Power. I must observe that a Modern *Rabbin* questions the Truth of what is said in the Scripture, that the *Sadducees* did not believe any Spirits. It would follow from thence, says he, that they rejected the Pentateuch, wherein Angels are mention'd in several places. (d) *De eo quod Sadducæi dicuntur* (*Act.* 23. 8.) *negasse spiritus, non disputo. Sane ut multi putant sic sequeretur eos negasse legem Mosaicam quæ variis in locis angelorum mentionem facit.* He argues wrong: The *Sadducees* made use of Distinctions in answer to those Passages. See *Willemer* (e), and the Writers quoted by him, and particularly *Grotius* (f). Consult also *Vossius* (g), whom he does not quote. What is certain is, that they practised the Rites of the *Jews*, and profest to believe that by that means God would bestow upon them the Favours he has promised to those who observe his Law, and they would avoid the Curses wherewith the Transgressors were threaten'd. (h) *Promissionibus legis inhiabant, eoque nomine* DEUM *sibi sacrificiis, precibus, jejuniis, aliisque cultus Levitici ceremoniis placare conabantur, ne iratum Numen promissiones amplissimas a populo tolleret.* The Author of these *Latin* words shews against Dr. *Lightfoot*, that the passage of *Malachi* (i) does not suit with that Sect, since they never believed that the Law was to be despised, nor that the Observation of it was insignificant. (k) *Neque Sadducæorum doctrinæ & moribus convenit locus Malach. III. v. 14. nunquam enim professi sunt Sadducæi, legem* DEI *non esse observandam, aut observantiam legis esse frustraneam. Contrarium docet ipse Lightfoot* Hor. Hebr. in Act. Apost. p. 122. quænam, *inquiens*, religio Sadducæi? Orat, jejunat, sacrificat, *observat legem*, & tamen non expectat resurrectionem aut vitam æternam. Quorsum hæc religio? *Ut obtineat scilicet bona temporalia quorum solum promissionem observat ille fassum in lege* nihil rimans ultra literam. The passage of *Malachi* would admirably suit with some *Sadducees*, who might have learn'd from Experience the falsity of the Maxims of their Doctors.

(H) *They ascribed an Organiz'd Body to God. Arnobius relates this in a manner that is somewhat liable to Censure.*] Consider well his words. (l) *Neque quisquam Judæus in hoc loco nobis opponat & Sadducæi generis fabulas tanquam formas tribuant atque os Deo. Hoc enim putatur in eorum literis dici, & ut vel re certa, atque auctoritate firmari: quæ aut nihil ad nos attinent, nec ex aliqua portione quicquam habent commune nobiscum: aut si sunt, ut creditur, socia, quærendi sunt vobis altioris intelligentiæ doctores, per quos possitis addiscere, quibus modis conveniat literarum illarum nubes, atque involucra relaxare.* One of those, who have Commented upon him, Censures him in the following manner. *Nimis confuse Arnobius*, saith he (m), *atque etiam periculose. Nam de libro Veteris Testamenti tanta temeritate loqui impium plane & horrendum. Hoc igitur ait quia Rabbinorum scripta infinitis fabulis jam scatebant—— Summam imperitiam prodit hoc loco Arnobius. Atqui melius Numenius Pythagoreus qui libro de summo bono primo Judæos in iis nationibus numeravit quæ Deum incorporeum existimabant, citatis etiam prophetarum testimoniis atque troporum enodatione, si quando contraria sententiis videbatur elici posse adhibita.* This Censure is not altogether groundless, but it should have been less severe; for *Arnobius* means this. We are not answerable for the idle Fancies of the *Jews*; but there is no harm in the things that are common to us with them, if the Mystical Sense be well understood. He could not deny that according to the Literal Sense of the Scripture God has Hands and Feet, a Mouth, Eyes, &c. He should therefore have told the Heathens that the Truth lies concealed under those Expressions. He shewed himself a dextrous and able Rhetorician by not insisting on that Objection, and telling only his Adversaries in four or five Lines, that the Christians don't ascribe to God any Figure or Organical Composition. Had he been willing to enter upon a more exact discussion of the matter, as *Numenius* did, he would have enervated his Work; for since he was writing an Invective against the *Pagans*, it was not his business to lose any time in answering them. 'Twas better for him to act all along the part of an Assailant; an Author ought to be upon the Defensive as little as he can, when he writes Books of this Nature. To conclude, we find in (n) *Origen* what *Numenius* did in favour of the *Jews*; which shews that the *Pagans* did not neglect the pretended advantages they hoped to draw from those Passages of the Scripture, that seem to ascribe some Imperfection to God. The Christians had recourse to the figurative Sense, and alledged against such Passages those, wherein the Perfection of God is clearly express'd. But *Arnobius*'s work could hardly allow of such a Diversion, which afforded a pretence to answer that the Passages of the Poets ought to be explain'd one by another, and that some of 'em were to be understood in a figurative Sense. It had been an improper thing for *Arnobius* to revive such a Notion: The Commentator, who censures him, was not aware of it.

(A) *Ibn*

(e) Willem. p. 38, 39. (f) Grotius in Matth. cap. 22. v. 23. (g) Vossius de orig. & prog. idol. l. 1. c. 6. (h) Willem. p. 41. (i) *Ye have said, It is vain to serve God: and what profit is it, that we have kept his Ordinance, and that we have walked mournfully before the* LORD *of Hosts?* Malach. chap. 3. ver. 14. (k) Willem. pag. 25.

* Matth. Mark and Luke [illegible]

|| [illegible]

† [illegible]

β See a piece of the Jesuit Vavasseur intituled Antonius Godellus Episcopus Grassensis an eloquens? Acne etiam Scriptor idoneus.

§ In the Dialogue of two Parishioners of St. *Hilary du Mont*, pag. m. 45.

(a) *See* Josephus Antiq. lib. 20. c. 7.

(b) *See the* Vth *Chapter of the* Acts *of the Apostles*, v. 17.

(c) Centur. Magdeburg. Cent. I. lib. 1. cap. 5.

(+) *Mr.* Becker *a Minister of* Amsterdam *maintain'd this Doctrine with great heat in some Books written in the Vulgar Tongue. He was deposed upon that account. He pretended to say nothing contrary to the Scripture.*

(d) Manasse Ben Israel lib. 1. de resurrect. mortuor. cap. 6. pag. 43. apud Willemerum ubi supra pag. 38.

(l) [illegible]

(m) Desid. Heraldus in Arnobium pag. m. 134.

(n) Origen. contra Celsum lib. 1. Heraldus quotes the Passage in Greek.

Author of an (A) Apology for the Bishops, who take up Arms. This Paradox is less surprizing, than that which he maintain'd in his (B) Casus Regius. He died ‡ of an Apoplexy at *Paris*, the 2d of *October* ψ 1643. The Assembly of the Clergy was so much displeased with the Encomium bestowed upon him in the *Gallia Christiana* of Messieurs *de Sainte Marthe*, that they ordered (C) it to be struck out.

Those, who say that he died a Prisoner at *Bois de Vincennes*, are mistaken, and might have avoided that mistake, * if they had taken notice that among his (D) Letters, there are some that were written to *Paris* after he had recovered his Liberty. His Friends pretend || that he was imprisoned in 1637, for no other reason, but because Cardinal *de Richelieu* had a mind to Revenge himself, that Abbot having refused to give his Vote for the dissolution of the Marriage of the Duke of *Orleans* and the Princess of *Lorrain*. If this was the true reason of his Confinement, some other Causes were alledged for it, and Endeavours were used to undo him as a false Doctor: His Trial μ began upon that Foot. But some say

‡ St. Romuald Abregé du thresor Chronol. tom. 3. pag. 453. (ψ) Leure Chronol. tom. 3. p. 377.

* See Leydecker, in histor. Jansenismi pag. 407. & epistolam Christiani Philireni ad Junium Pacolongum pag. 19.

|| See the 5. Volume of la Morale pratique p. 385. See also pag. 415.

μ See L'Esprit de Mr. Arnaud, tom. 1. pag. 279 & seq.

(A) *That he is the Author of an Apology for the Bishops, who take up Arms.*] Consider these words of *M. Joly*. (a) *The Canons of Munster ought to prove their Nobility by fifteen descents, as they say, and they are so fond of it and of their Military Performances, that I have seen an Epitaph upon the Tomb of a Canon, which imports that he died a Captain in the War. Hence it is that they use to get their Pedigrees and Coats of Arms painted in a Cloyster adjoining to the Church, or in some publick Place. This Example, in my Opinion, does not deserve to be imitated no more than those, that were Collected and Inserted in the Book Intitled* l'Apologie de l'Evesque de Poitiers, *in the Year* 1615, *which a Learned Man of that time call'd in a pleasant manner, and not without Reason,* The Alcoran of the Bishop of *Poitiers*; *tho' the Author of that Book, who did not put his Name to it, has been since much talk'd of on account of some other works concerning Piety and the Doctrine of the Church, which are much better.* M. *Joly* would say no more, tho' he meant our *John du Verger*. That Bishop of *Poitiers*, was the Patron of that Learned Man, and resign'd to him (b) the Abby of *Saint-Cyran* in 1620. I have read in a Compiler that *John du Verger* (c) being Principal of a College in his Country, and hearing that this Bishop wanted a Reader or a Library Keeper, offered his Service to him, which the Bishop accepted. *Voetius* did not forget this Warlike Adventure of the Bishop of *Poitiers* in his List of some Ecclesiasticks who took up Arms. That Prelate appears at the end of that Catalogue. (d) *Henricus Ludovicus Rupiposæus Episcopus Pictaviensis non solum arma tractavit, & armato populo armatus præivit, ut Pictavio nonnullos ex Patritiis quibus diffidebat ejiceret: sed etiam Apologiam edidit anno* 1615. *adversus eos qui dicebant, non licere Ecclesiasticis in casu necessitatis ad arma recurrere: sub cujus finem Catalogum bene longum texuit Cardinalium & Episcoporum qui tempore necessitatis arma tractarunt, Joannis Columnæ Legati Gregorii IX. contra Fridericum, Arnoldi Pelgrue Vasconii contra Venetos, Ægidii Albornos Cardinalis Toletani, cum Rege Castiliæ contra Mauros, & contra Ludovicum Bavarum & aliorum complurium, quorum nomina ibidem legi possunt, simulque videri nullam coegisse necessitatem ut viri Ecclesiastici ad id negotium admoverentur; quando laicorum ducum satis larga copia suppeteret.*

(B) *The Paradox which he maintain'd in his* Casus Regius.] I have not read that Book, but 'tis said that he maintain'd in it that there are thirty four Cases, wherein a Man may Kill himself innocently. (e) *Paulo ante* (obitum) *composuerat librum inscriptum* Casus Regius, *ubi attulerat* 34. *casus in quibus quilibet poterat libere se ipsum interficere. Unde unus ex discipulis ejus nomine* Mester *arripuit nuper occasionem se ipsum interficiendi, cum Metensis esset.* Father *Paul* approved the Principles of the Stoicks in this respect; for when he was told that the Pope design'd to have him carried away, he answered among other things, " (f) That if he was taken alive in order " to be carried to *Rome*, the Pope could not think " that a Man has not a greater Power over his Life " than all others put together, and that therefore " he might deprive himself of his Life, rather than " the Pope should have the satisfaction to deprive " him of it in Publick." I don't know whether many People have taken notice of this Maxim of *Fra-Paolo*.

THIS Doctrine of our Abbot was sometimes mention'd in the first Answers to the *Lettres Provinciales* written by *M. Pascal*. " (g) You should " rather think of mending the Doctrine of the " Abbot of *Saint-Cyran*, who was so bold as to say " that we may Kill our Neighbours when we are " moved to it by an inward inspiration, tho' it be " forbidden by the outward Law. You may see " the Proof and the practice of it in the second Page " of the Information, drawn up against him by the " late King's Order, in the Year 1638. The Original is in *Clermont-College*. ——— (h) There " are some Opinions concerning this (i) matter, " which are plainly contrary to the Christian Faith. " ——— (k) Some are repugnant to Morality, " which we call Scandalous, as those of the Abbot " of *Saint-Cyran* (1), who said that we are bound " to Kill a Man, when moved to it by Inspiration, " tho' it be contrary to the outward Law, which " forbids it. Some are against common Sense, " which we call Extravagant and Rash, as that of " the same Abbot, who goes about to prove in his " *Casus Regius*, which you acknowledge to be his " first work, that Men are often bound to Kill themselves; and that this Obligation being one of the " most difficult and important, the performance of " it requires an extraordinary Courage and Firmness. ——— (l) Can those, who teach, *that 'tis* " *a lawful thing to Kill one self,* (2) *and that a Man* " *is often bound to do it,* have a right to determine " when 'tis lawful to Kill one's Neighbour? And " can those, who say, *that we ought to Obey the in-* " *ward Motion,* (3) *which prompts us to Kill a Man,* " *tho' it be forbidden by the outward Law,* declare " at what time the outward Law allows of it, and " gives us a full Power to do it? I dont think that *M. Pascal* made any answer to this Point, tho' he was in a manner forced to it by such frequent Repetitions, and I don't know whether his Silence was ever Objected to him.

(g) Responses aux lettres Provinciales pag. 170. 171. Liege 1658.

(h) Ibid. pag. 341.

(i) *That is, concerning the Killing of a Man.*

(1) *'Tis a piece of his Trial, which is to be seen in* Clermont-College.

(k) Ibid. pag. 360.

(2) *The Abbot of* St. Cyran *in his* Casus Regius.

(3) *A Maxim of the Abbot of* St. Cyran *according to the Deposition of the Witnesses in his Process kept in* Clermont-College.

(C) *That they ordered it should be struck out.*] This I find in *St. Romuald*. " The Son of one of " the Twin Brothers of *Scævola de Sainte Marthe*, " who is lately dead, Publish'd in their Name four " great Volumes in Folio, Intitled *Gallia Christiana*, and mentioning that Abbot, bestowed on him " a great Encomium, as if he had been the most " Orthodox, and the most Holy Man that lived in " our days; but the general Assembly of the Clergy " of *France* ordered it to be struck out by a formal " Decree (m).

'TIS to be observed that (n) *the Prelates, who in their Assembly caused that Encomium to be suppress'd, would not buy any Copy of the* Gallia Christiana, *wherein it was left out.*

(D) *That among his Letters.*] 'Tis a work very much cried up by the *Jansenists*. *M. Arnauld d'Andilly* Publish'd it in 1648, and Dedicated it to the Clergy of *France*. They are Devout Letters, full of Pious Maxims, as we are told; for I have not seen them. *M. Leydecker* (o) has given us some Extracts of 'em, whereby the Reader may have a good Opinion of that work. On the contrary Father *Bouhours* (p) quotes some Fragments of those Letters, ſay that Cardinal *de Richelieu* (E) looking upon him as a Man very well qualified to write againſt the Proteſtants, exhorted him to go about it in his Priſon, and offered to ſupply him with Books and all neceſſary helps. He was not much eſteem'd by the Famous *Grotius* (F); which is not very ſurpriſing; for *Grotius* following the Doctrine of the *Arminians* was not very well diſpoſed to admire ſuch a rigid follower of St. *Auguſtin*. I have ſaid in another place that the Opinion of this *Abbot* about the Council of *Trent* was diſcovered to the Publick by *M. Abelly* in the Life of *Vincent de Paul*, and that the diſcovery of this Secret was acceptable to many People. Which muſt not be ſo underſtood as if the Publick had not known before that ſuch a Thought was aſcribed to that Abbot. I only meant that many were glad to know that the Teſtimony of *Vincent de Paul* appeared in Print; but before that Work of M. *Abelly* came out, one might have read in ſome (G) other Books that the Abbot of *Saint-Cyran* did not very well approve the Council of *Trent*.

(l) St. Romuald Abregé du thresor Chronol. tom. 3. p. m. 452. 453. ad ann. 1643. (m) Vigneul Marville, Melang. tom. 2. p. 23. *Dutch Edit.* (n) Leydecker in histor. Jansenismi pag. 470. & seq. (p) Bouhours, Maniere de bien penser, pag. 345. & seq. *Dutch Edition.* See also the Answers to the Lettres Provinciales, pag. 234. 235. & seq. *Edit.* of Liege 1658.

SAINT-CYRE was one of the brave Men among the Proteſtants under the Reign of *Charles* IX. His Name was (*A*) *Tanneguy Bouchet de Puy-Greſſier*. He was one of the Heads of the Conſpiracy of *Amboiſe*; and after the † Battle of *Dreux* he was ſent to *Orleans* to be Governor of that place upon Advice that the Royal Army deſign'd to beſiege it. He brought the Troops || of *Guienne* to the Prince of *Condé* after the Battle of *St. Denys*, and was kill'd in that of *Moncontour*, being *one of the * oldeſt and braveſt Men in France*. We find a more particular account of his Bravery in *d'Aubigne's* Hiſtory. The Conſternation of the Reformed, ſays he ‡, " was not ſo great, but that they rallied and often charg-
" ed thoſe who preſs'd them hard, tho' they were cloſely purſued by the Com-
" panies of the *Marſhals de Camp*, which had not fought. The chief Glory of that
" running fight ought to be aſcribed to the *Reiſters*; but *Saint-Cyre Puy-Greſſier*
" ought to have a ſhare in it. That old Man having rallied three Troops of
" Horſe in the Wood of *Mairé*, and perceiving that one Charge would ſave the
" Lives of a Thouſand Men, his Miniſter who contributed to this Reſolution
" of his, adviſed him to harangue his Soldiers. Good Men, ſaid he, want no long
" Speech: *Brethren and Friends thus you muſt do*; having ſpoke theſe words, be-
" ing covered with an Armour Silvered over from Head to Foot according to
" the old *French* way, bear-faced, with a Beard as white as Snow, and Aged 85
" Years, he advanced towards the Enemy twenty paces before his Troop, drove all

* In the Remark a.

* D'Avrig. tom. 1. pag. 131.

† Idem pag. 219.

|| Caſtelnau Memoir. l. 6. c. 8.

* They are la Popeliniere's words.

‡ Hiſt. l. 5. c. 17. pag. 257. ad ann. 1569.

Letters, written in a frightful Style. He makes uſe of the Edition of the *Sieur de Preville*, 1655. 'Tis ſaid in *Moreri's* Dictionary that the *Lyons* Edition is one of the fineſt; I don't know whether it be that of 1679. Note that we are told in the Book Intituled *la Morale pratique des Jeſuites*, pag. 413. of the 8th Volume, that *Father* Pintereau *a Jeſuit has only Printed ſome ſcraps under the Name of a Chimerical Gentleman, whom he calls the* Sieur de Preville. You may ſee in the following Pages how the Original Letters of *Janſenius* and the Abbot of *Saint-Cyran* came into the hands of the Jeſuits.

(*E*) *Cardinal* de Richelieu *looking upon him as a Man very well qualified to write againſt the Proteſtants.*] 'Tis ſaid that this Abbot was reſolved to anſwer the Miniſters, who had writ againſt Cardinal *du Perron* about the Pope's Supremacy and the Real Preſence. His Confinement put a ſtop to his deſign: Cardinal *de Richelieu* encouraged him to go on; but the Abbot made anſwer that it was not becoming the dignity of the Church that her Head and her greateſt Myſtery ſhould be defended by a Priſoner. (*a*) *Communis opinio eſt Abbatem Sancyranum, antequam in arce Vincennæ detineretur, meditatum, & aggreſſum etiam vindicias Cardinalis Perronii adverſus heterodoxorum plures, qui in virum jam mortuum inſurrexerant, ulturi quas vivus ſibi plagas inflixerat, & ſuſcepiſſe defendenda quæ Cardinalis immortalitate dignus ſcripſerat de Euchariſtia, & de primatu Petri ab hæreticis maxime laceſſita. Id cum obaudiſſet Cardinalis Richelius, fertur ad id opus, quem currentem putabat, incitaſſe, & pollicitus ſi inchoatam apologiam velles proſequi, curaturum, ne quidquam librorum, & ſubſidiorum deeſſet, quæ ad abſolvendam velles, aut forent neceſſaria; ſed excelſo animo reſponſum a Sancyrano non convenire Eccleſiæ dignitati, illius caput, & myſteriorum maximum ab homine accuſato, qui ſui juris non eſſet, defendi.* M. *Arnauld* ſays only, (*b*) 'tis well known that his Confinement was the only thing that prevented his anſwering the Miniſters, who had writ againſt the Doctrine of the Catholick Church concerning the Euchariſt.

(*F*) *He was not much eſteem'd by the Famous* Grotius.] In order to prove this I ſhall only ſet down a paſſage out of a Letter of *Balzac* to the Jeſuit *Leonard Allemai*. (*c*) *Quam æquo utantur Grotio etiam alieni videre poteris ex his quæ ſubjungo verbis Epiſtolæ, non ita pridem ab eo ſcriptæ, ad optimum & humaniſſimum virum Joannem Cordeſium.* " *Et mihi Aurelius interdum ſufflaminis egere videtur. Nam quorſum tantus Suarezii contemptus; hominis, ſi quid recte judico, in Philoſophiâ, cui hoc tempore connexa eſt Scholaſtica Theologia, tantæ ſubtilitatis, ut vix quenquam habeat parem. Quid attinet Moliniſtarum nomen Societati toties objicere, cum ſi quid Molinæ excideret periculoſius, id poſterioribus Jeſuitarum, præcipuè Leſſii, ſcriptis ſit caſtigatum. Neque vero non nihil etiam ab illâ ſententia periculi eſt, quæ cum concilio Valentino, laudante Aurelio, ſtatuit* quorundam ſalutem Deum nolle, ſi illi quidem nude ut homines ſpectentur."

(*G*) *One might have read in ſome Books.*] It will be ſufficient for me to quote one of 'em, *viz* the *Triumphus Catholicæ veritatis adverſus Novatores*, Printed in 1651. Father *Labbe*, who is juſtly accounted the Author of it, inſerted a Memorial in it containing the dying Words of *Octavius de Bellegarde* Arch-Biſhop of *Sens*. 'Tis ſaid that this Arch-Biſhop ſent to the Pope's *Nuncio* by the Baron *de Renti* this laſt Declaration of his Opinions, that the Pope might be informed of it. One Article of that Piece runs thus: (*d*) " That the Arch-Biſhop of *Sens* ——
" is bound to believe that this whole party is right-
" ly ſuſpected by the Church, knowing that it be-
" gan with an illuſion, which produced among o-
" ther effects a falſe Devotion call'd, *le Chapelet ſe-
" cret du S. Sacrement*, Condemned as ſuch by eight
" Doctors of the *Sorbonne*; and being informed by
" credible Perſons, (1) that the Abbot of *Saint-
" Cyran* ſpoke of the Council of *Trent* as of a po-
" litical Aſſembly, which was not in the leaſt a true
" Council."

(*A*) *Tanneguy Bouchet.*] He deſcended from (*e*) " *John Bouchet* Counſellor in the Parliament of *Pa-
" ris* in the Year 1372. and afterwards admitted
" Preſident into the *Grand Chambre* the 29 of *A-
" pril* 1389. originally of *Auvergne*, who was the Fa-
" ther of *John* Sieur *de Puy Greſſier* in *Poitou*, pa-
" ternal Anceſtor of the Sieurs *du Puy-Greſſier de
" Sante Gemme*, and *de Villiers Charlemagne*, and
" of this *Tenneguy Bouchet*, " whom (*f*) *la Popeliniere*

(*a*) Vincent. Baronius Apolog. Ordinis Prædicatorum tom. 1. pag. 163.

(*b*) Morale pratique des Jeſuites tom. 8. pag. 376. 377.

(*c*) Balzac, epiſt. ſelect. pag. m. 1

(*d*) Triumphus Catholicæ veritatis pag. 159. 160.

(1) See upon this point and ſeveral others what is obſerved in the Sui... Les Reliques de l'Abbé de S. Cyran.

(*e*) Le Laboureur Addit. aux Mem. de Caſtelnau tom. pag.

(*f*) La Pop

“ all the Marſhals de Camp before him, and ſaved many Lives by his Death.” He was not leſs virtuous than Valiant, as he made it appear by (B) puniſhing two perſons guilty of Adultery.

SAINTE-

ſiniere calls wrong *Du Boucher*. The Eldeſt Branch of that Family ended in *Frances Boucher* Lady *de Puy Greffier*, who married *Artus de Coſſé Seigneur de Gonnor* Marſhal of *France*, and in another *Frances Boucher* half Siſter of the former, who married firſt *Antrem de Foix Seigneur d'Eſparoh*, and then *Francis de la Trimouille* Count *de Benaon* (a). I ſhall mention by the by, a ſmall adventure of *Frances de Boucher* the Wife of *Artus de Coſſé*. Her (b) Husband was deprived upon her account of the Office of Superintendant of the Finances, whereby he got the firſt Year wherewithal to Pay all his Debts, and as much Money again as he owed. He carried his Wife to Court in order to wait upon *Catherine de Medicis*. She was a (c) *Country Lady, who had never ſeen the Court*, and who *was ſo ſimple as to thank her Majeſty for the Superintendancy, as a Favour whereby they had been inabled to pay their debts and to get great Wealth. The Marſhal who heard this Compliment, was vexed at it; but the Queen was wonderfully pleaſed with ſuch an ingenuous confeſſion, which might have proved the ruin of her Husband*, if it had been unacceptable to that Princeſs.

(B) *In puniſhing two Perſons, &c.*] The thing is very Remarkable. *Beza* relates it in the following manner. (d) *On the* 26th. *of March* 1563 *the* Sieur de Saint-Cyre, *otherwiſe* call'd Puy-Greffier, *who had been appointed Governour of* Orleans *from the time that the Prince left that Town, a good Man and a great Enemy to Vice, cauſed a new and remarkable Execution to be made in the Perſons of* Deſlandes Sieur du Moulin *formerly Secretary to the King, and of* —— Godard *the Wife of* John Godin *Lieutenant to the Provoſt-Marſhal of* Blois. *Whilſt this Provoſt was in the Army*, du Moulin *debauched his Wife at Orleans, for which Crime he was hanged with her in the place* du Martroy: Which being told at Court appeared ſo ſtrange, *that many were not aſhamed to ſay, that if there was nothing elſe in the Reformed Religion, they would be ſure not to imbrace it.* 'Tis a very ingenuous Reflection: and indeed what can one do in a Religion, which does not refer to God the Puniſhment of Adulterers, but delivers 'em to the Secular Power in order to be puniſh'd with Death? This is ſufficient to put many People out of conceit with a Religion; 'tis worſe than the Condemnation of Polygamy, which kept many Infidels from imbracing Chriſtianity. Leſt any one ſhould ſuſpect the Author I have quoted, I ſhall cite another, who was not a Proteſtant, and who relates the thing in very Majeſtical Words. (e) *Pridie judicium non hujus ſeculi nec tunc ſecundum Franciæ mores, ubi adulterium non puniri magni nominis Juriſconſultus Joan. Faber olim dixit, Aureliani latum eſt contra Landam Molinum, qui Godardam Jo. Godini uxorem dum vir in caſtris eſſet corrupiſſe convictus, ad mortem damnatus eſt, amboque Landa & Godarda in publica platea laqueo ſuſpenſi ſunt, Pigreferio priſci moris ac ſeveritatis viro qui a Condæo urbi præpoſitus fuerat judicium urgente, & graſſantibus vitiis exemplo opus eſſe dictitante; quod tamen in aula adeo male acceptum eſt, ut plerique ſumma impudentia palam teſtarentur ſe a Proteſtantibus ſemper alienos futuros, & vel ob eam cauſam nunquam in eorum verba juraturos eſſe, qui adulteriis hucuſque impunitis nova & apud nos inaudita ſeveritate pœnam capitis ſtatuerent.* Thoſe Courtiers were in the right to ſay that *Puy-Greffier*'s Severity was out of faſhion; nay, the Cavilian *Faber* (f) quoted by *Thuanus* expreſly ſays that it was never heard that any Body had been puniſh'd for Adultery in *France*. Now moſt People would have ſaid in that reſpect, *let* (g) *us beware of innovations.* It muſt alſo be granted that this Severity was not of long continuance among the Proteſtants, according to the Maxim, *nullum violentum durabile.* It laſted longer (h) at *Geneva*; but at laſt it vaniſh'd away: And it may be ſaid in general to the ſhame of Chriſtians, that they have ſuffered the Penal Laws, which many Pagan Nations had enacted againſt Adultery, to be aboliſh'd time out of mind. There is hardly any Crime that goes more unpuniſh'd than that: Thoſe who require that it ſhould be puniſh'd, muſt rather expect to be the talk of the Town, and to be laugh'd at by every Body, than to have a good ſucceſs in their cauſe. I don't pretend to approve in every thing the Penal Laws of the Heathens upon this head; for could any thing be more horrid than the Cuſtom, which *Theodoſius* ſuppreſt at *Rome*? Women guilty of Adultery (i) were Condemned to live in little Cells, and to proſtitute themſelves to all Comers; and to make every one ſenſible that the Puniſhment was executed, ſeveral little Bells were rung during the time of the Execution.

Any one, who compares *Thuanus*'s Words with the Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Briſſonius*'s Book, *ad legem Juliam de adulteriis*, will wonder that this great Hiſtorian ſhould ſpeak of the impunity of Adultery, as he does: for it will appear that *Briſſonius* dedicating his Book the 29. of *September* 1557. to *Chriſtopher de Thou* Preſident in the Parliament of *Paris*, and the Hiſtorian's Father, praiſes him for having cauſed ſome Perſons guilty of that Sin to be puniſh'd. He adds, that this Spectacle was approved by all good Men, which put the Author upon Writing a Commentary on the Law which that Magiſtrate had revived. His Words deſerve to be ſet down. (k) *Superioribus temporibus hæc Satyrici poetæ querela aures noſtras perſonavere,* (l) *Ubi nunc lex Julia dormis? Inſederat videlicet imperitorum animis ridicula quidem, ſed tamen quæ maximam ad nequitiam feneſtram patefecerat opinio, adulterorum in Gallia impunita eſſe peccata, quæ paſſim corruptis moribus ludi jam duci, & in pretio haberi id vitii cœperat. Hanc tu Reipub. pernicioſam opinionem editis non ita dudum de aliquot adulteris exemplis eripuiſti, perfeciſtique, ut non tam puniendi voluntatem, quam accuſatores majoribus noſtris antehac defuiſſe judicemus. Quod ſpectaculum cum maximus bonorum omnium plauſus conſecutus eſſet, hinc me laudum tuarum, ad quas hunc cumulum acceſſiſſe valde gaudebam, recordatione incenſum res ipſa admonuit, ut antiquam de adulteriis coercendis ab Auguſto latam legem, quæ quaſi poſtliminio in uſum rediret, in ordinem digererem, & interpretatione adhibita illuſtrarem.* 'Tis very likely that notwithſtanding all the Applauſes of good Men, *Chriſtopher de Thou* grew remiſs, and that perceiving he could not put a ſtop to the Corruption, he was forced to let things take their uſual courſe. Hence it is that his Son took no notice of that ſhort interruption of Impunity. *Briſſonius* intimates that if there had been Accuſers in former times, the Judges of *France* would have made it appear that they were not unwilling to puniſh Adulterers. Indeed I believe that few People have been accuſed of that Crime; but the difficulty of proving ſuch an Accuſation, and the ſhame that attends thoſe who carry the cauſe, are more than ſufficient to prevent ſuch Suits (m). I have quoted *Montagne* upon this Subject in another (n) Book. It muſt be confeſt that 'tis not ſo much the connivence of the Magiſtrates, or the ſilence of Preachers, as the greatneſs of the Evil, that prevents the Execution of the Laws. A Profeſſor of Philoſophy at *Groningen* publiſh'd in 1663 a Collection of Diſſertations, wherein he ſays that the Divines of *Straſburg* prevailed about 30 Years before with the Magiſtrates to inflict a capital Puniſhment upon Adulterers; and he wiſhes the reformed Divines of the Low Countries would not expreſs ſo much Zeal againſt Dancing, as againſt the too great indulgence for Adultery. He fancies that if they had thundered againſt it, they would have engaged the Magiſtrates, with God's Bleſſing upon their endeavours, to inflict a more ſevere Puniſhment than a Fine. (o) *Qui* (Theologi) *ſi æque fervide a pluribus jam annis detonuiſſent in adulterium, (quod, pro dolor! per totum Belgium pecuniaria duntaxat mulcta expiatur) ex Dei benedictione, dubio procul, jam diu a ſuis Superioribus conſecuti fuiſſent quod ex voto obtigit, ante annos ferme viginti, Theologis Auguſtanæ Confeſſionis, Argentinæ Evangelicam doctrinam annunciantibus: qui, licet non ſubduxerunt Auditoribus ſuis temperatas in nuptiis choreas, a Magiſtratu tamen impetrarunt gladium adulterii vindicem.* Had he been a Miniſter, he would have found the difficulty of ſuch an Advice.

(i) Socrates Hiſt. Eccleſ. [illegible] cap. [illegible] See the Article Briſſon.

(k) Barn. Briſſon. epiſt. dedicat. ſingularis libri ad legem Juliam de adulteriis.

(l) Juven. ſat. 2. v. 37.

(m) *See the new Letters againſt* Maimbourg's *Hiſtory of Calviniſm.* pag. 588. & ſeq.

(n) Ibid. pag. 539.

(o) Mart. Schoockius exercitat. 16. pag. 3[illegible]1.

SAINTE-ALDEGONDE (*Philip de Marnix Seigneur du Mont*) Born (*A*) at *Bruſſels* in the Year 1538. made himſelf Famous by his Imployments and Writings. He fled into *Germany* when the Liberty of conſcience was oppreſt by the *Spaniards* in the *Netherlands*, and was gratified at *Heidelberg* with the Office of Counſellor in the Eccleſiaſtical Council. He return'd (*B*) into his Country in the Year 1572 to make uſe of his Talents for the ſupport of Liberty and the good of the reformed Religion. He was very much eſteem'd by the Prince of *Orange*, to whom he did ſeveral important Services, not ſo much (*C*) by his Sword as by his Words. He was one of the Deputies, whom the States ſent into *England* in 1575. to deſire Queen *Elizabeth*'s Protection. Three Years after he was ſent by the Arch-Duke *Matthias* to the Diet of *Worms*, where he made a (*D*) very fine Speech, and boldly deſcribed the *Spaniſh* Tyranny. He was one of

the

(*A*) *Born at* Bruſſels.] I would not affirm it, if *Melchior Adam* was the only Author that ſays ſo; for I find he adds to it a Falſity, whereby one might be apt to think that he was not rightly informed. He ſays (*a*) that the Father and Mother of *Philip de Marnix* were Natives of *Burgundy*, and retired to *Bruſſels*. Which is not true; *Sainte-Aldegonde* anſwering a Writer, who call'd him *a Foreigner of Burgundy*, ſays, (*b*) *none of my Anceſtors was a Native of* Burgundy, *that I know of; and 'tis a Notorious thing that I was Born, brought up, Educated and Married in this Country. And likewiſe my Father was Born, brought up and Married in it, ſo that except my Grand Father and his Predeceſſors, who were natives of* Savoy, *all my paternal and maternal Anceſtors were born in the Low Countries.* And therefore the reaſon why I affirm that he was Born at *Bruſſels*, is that *Verheiden* (*c*) ſays ſo, without adding any of the Falſities that are to be found in *Melchior Adam*. It ſeems that *Swertius* and *Valerius Andreas* knew not that *Philip de Marnix* was Born in the *Netherlands*: Which is a ſurpriſing ignorance, ſince they knew he had writ ſome (*d*) controverſial Books. Had they known his Native Country, they would have placed him in the Catalogue of the Writers of the *Netherlands*: They don't uſe to leave out the Proteſtant Authors.

(*B*) *He return'd into his Country in the Year* 1572 *to make uſe of his Talents.*] Since *Verheiden* and *Melchior Adam* knew nothing of the circumſtances of his return, it will not be improper for me to ſupply what they have omitted. *Sainte-Aldegonde* (*e*) having left the Low Countries on account of Religion, was admitted ſoon after into the Service of the Elector *Palatine*; but William Prince of *Orange*, who look'd upon him as a Man well qualified for his deſigns, demanded him of the Elector: *Which was granted him firſt of all for two Months, and then for two more, and at laſt for all the time he ſhould want him; only* the ſaid Elector *reſerved to himſelf the liberty of recalling him, when he ſhould think fit.* Sainte-Aldegonde gives this account to ſhew that he followed the Prince of *Orange* only *as his private Miniſter and Servant*, and not *as a Member of the States*, or *to intrude into the Adminiſtration of publick affairs*. And therefore, ſays he, *if I have been imployed in publick affairs either in the Name, and by order of the States*, or *otherwiſe, it was always at his deſire, and to pay him a due obedience as I was ordered by my firſt Maſter.* I will alſo mention what has been omitted concerning the Perſecutions he went thro', before he fled into *Germany*. *I was*, ſays he (*f*), *outlaw'd, baniſh'd, deprived of my Eſtate, and expoſed to the hatred and abuſes of my Friends and Relations; and at laſt I lay in a Priſon for a Year under the Duke of* Alva *and the Commander* Requeſenes; *and during that confinement I pray'd to God every night at leaſt for the ſpace of three Months, as if it had been the laſt night of my life, knowing that the ſaid Duke of* Alva *had twice ordered that I ſhould be put to Death in Priſon.* It was objected to him that the Dutcheſs of *Parma* had been his Miſtreſs; but he anſwered (*g*) that he never had any thoughts of going into the Service of that Lady, and never frequented her Court, *ſince he had in a manner concealed himſelf by reaſon of the violent perſecutions, ever ſince his return from* Geneva *till the beginning of the Troubles.*

(*C*) *Not ſo much by his Sword as by his Words.*] *Melchior Adam*, from whom I have taken the greateſt part of the Text of this Article, is my Author for this. *Quo in loco*, ſaith he (*h*), *non tam fortiter gerendo, quam imitatione* Cyneæ *cordate loquendo, non poſtremum patriæ libertatis propugnatorem ſe declaravit.* He knew how to write and ſpeak well, and was a Scholar and a Man of parts; His Services were particularly memorable on account of thoſe qualifications. 'Twas he who drew up the Formulary (*i*) of the famous Confederacy in the Year 1566. whereby many great Men of the Low Countries engaged to oppoſe the Inquiſition. *Brederode*, who was the Head of that League, (*k*) made him Treaſurer of it. *Sainte-Aldegonde* ſpoke in the Name of the Prince of *Orange* in the Aſſembly of *Dordrecht*, made up of the Deputies of all the Towns. It was in the Year 1572. He made a lively deſcription of the Calamities of the Country, and moved that Aſſembly to oppoſe the Tyrants. (*l*) *Ibidem ejus orator Dominus de Sainte Aldegonde effuſam de principis pio affectu, patriæ neceſſitate, Hiſpanorum tyrannide declamationem pronunciat, ac civitates novo bello contra Regem, regis tamen nomine uſurpato illaqueat.* The *Spaniards* did ſo dread that Orator and Negotiator, that the Duke of *Parma* gave expreſs Orders to obſerve him narrowly in the Conferences held at *Cologne* in the Year 1579. (*m*) *Monens interim ut Coloniam adventantem Philippum Marnixium ——— ſedulo obſervaret, ab eoque uti, ab homine impie callido ſibi præcaveret.* The Proteſtant Readers knowing the Character of the Man, who abuſes *Sainte-Aldegonde* in this laſt paſſage, will never have a worſe Opinion of him. He aſſiſted (*n*) at the Pacification of *Ghent* in the Name of the Prince of *Orange* and of the Nobility of *Holland* and *Zealand* in the Year 1576. He was ſent to *Bruſſels* the Year following; but we ought not to credit what is ſaid by the Hiſtorians of the contrary party, that (*o*) it was to attempt upon the Life of *Don Juan* of *Auſtria*. He was taken (*p*) by the *Spaniards*, at the *Hague* in the Year 1573. and it being feared that ſuch a Priſoner, who was very prejudicial to them, would meet with a very ill uſage, the Prince of *Orange* (*q*) ſent 'em word that he would uſe Repriſals againſt the Count *de Boſſu*. The Year following, *Mondragon* being forced to Capitulate at *Middleburg*, offered to ſet *Sainte-Aldegonde* and three other Priſoners at Liberty, provided the Capitulation he demanded, ſhould be granted him. (*r*) *Se apud Requeſenium effecturum ut captivus Aldegundius (quod avebat Orangius) treſque inſuper alii Aldegundii arbitratu remitterentur in Zelandiam intra ſex menſes.* That Agreement was accepted and executed: Which I obſerve, to ſhew how much our *Philip de Marnix* was conſidered. He was to have the choice of three Priſoners, who were to be ſet at Liberty with him. The States deſign'd (*ſ*) in 1587 to ſend him to the Conferences about a Peace with *Spain*; but having reſolved to continue the War, his Deputation proved a meer Project.

(*D*) *A very fine Speech, and boldly deſcribed.*] *Thuanus* ſays it was Printed and anſwered. (*t*) *Eo à Matthia miſſus Phil. Marnixius Santaldegondanus orationem mire liberam ad VII viros & imperii principes, qui aderant, Nonis Maii habuit, qua deplorato miſerabili Belgii ſtatu, & Albani Auſtriique tyrannide acerbis verbis exagitata Imperii opem imploravit; quippe commune Belgii cum Imperio periculum eſſe, prædixitque fore, ut belli incendium, niſi ſiſtatur, ſe latius ſpargat, & Coloniam, Monaſterium, Emdam, aliaſque vicinas civitates, quas ex Albani conſilio Hiſpani ſub jugum mittere jampridem decreverint, olim complectatur. proinde rogat ——— ad eam orationem publicatam poſtea contraria oratione Calidii Chryſopolytani nomine Lucemburgi edita reſponſum eſt, qua tota in exagitanda Belgarum in Deum*

ac

(*a*) Bruxellis ——— e parentibus *Burgundis* qui eo conceſſerant. Melch. Adam. in vitis Juriſc. pag. 333.

(*b*) Sainte-Aldegonde, Reſponce apologetique au libelle intitulé antidote fol. A 5 verſo.

(*c*) Verheiden in elog. præſtantium aliquot Theolog. pag. 141.

(*d*) *They mention them ſpeaking of* Michael Baius *and the Jeſuit* John David, *who writ againſt* Sainte Aldegonde.

(*e*) Sainte-Aldegonde, Reſponſe apologetique fol. D 3.

(*f*) Id. ib. *in the next leaf to* B 5.

(*g*) Id. ib. fol. D 5.

(*h*) Melch. Adam. in vitis Juriſc. pag. 333.

(*i*) Strada de bello Belgico, decad. 1. lib. 5 pag. m. 203.

(*k*) Brederodius confœderatorum nomine, & Philippum Marnixium ærarium Theſaurarium creat. Id. ib. pag. 2[illegible] ad ann. 1566.

(*l*) De ortu & progreſſu Calvin. reformat. lib. [illegible] ſect. 4 pag. [illegible]

(*m*) Strada ubi ſupra dec. 2 lib. 2 p. 1[illegible]

(*n*) Thuan. lib. 62, p. m. 16[illegible]

(*o*) Strada ubi ſupra lib. 9 pag. [illegible] ad ann. 1577.

(*p*) Id. ib. lib. 7 pag. [illegible]

(*q*) Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

(*r*) Id. ib. lib. 8 pag. 400 ad ann. 157[illegible]

(*ſ*) Idem decad. 2 lib. 9 pag. [illegible]

(*t*) Thuan. lib. 66. pag. [illegible] ad ann. 1578.

the Plenipotentiaries, whom the States ſent into *France* in the Year 1581 to make (E) the Duke of *Alençon* their Sovereign. He was Conſul of *Antwerp* in 1584, when that Town was beſieged by the Duke of *Parma*. In the Year 1593 he conducted into the *Palatinate* the Princeſs || *Louiſe Juliana*, who had been betrothed to the Elector *Frederick* IV †. The Books he publiſh'd were (F) not the leaſt Service he did: Some of 'em concern'd Politicks, and others Controverſy; ſome were Serious, and others Comical: The latter (G) proved moſt uſeful: His very Songs procured a great (H) Advantage to the new Republick. He tranſlated the Pſalms of

|| Daughter to the Prince of *Orange William* I of the Name, † Father of the Elector [illegible] in vit. Jurii conſ. pag. [illegible] & ſeq.

ac principem ſuum rebellione occupatur. Note that this Speech (a) was Tranſlated into *Dutch* Verſe by *Baptiſt Houwart*, and that (b) *Cornelius Looſe*, a Native of *Tergou*, was the Perſon who anſwered it.

(E) *To make the Duke of Alençon their Sovereign.*] *Melchior Adam* has forgot to tell us that *Sainte-Aldegonde* followed that Prince into *England* in the Year 1581. and wrote to the States the falſe News of his Marriage with Queen *Elizabeth*. 'Tis an Example, which M. *de Wicquefort* alledges to the Ambaſſadors, in order to ſhew how cautious they ought to be in Writing News. Sometimes, ſays he (c), "one cannot believe his own Eyes. *Vidit aut vidiſſe putat.* The *Sieur de Sainte-Aldegonde*, who was Agent for the Sates of the Low Countries at the Court of *England* in the Year 1581. being come one Evening into the Queen's Chamber, ſaw her diſcourſing with the Duke of *Alençon*. The Lords and Ladies were at ſo great a diſtance from them that they could have no ſhare in their Converſation: but every Body ſaw a thing, from which one might draw a very great Conſequence. The Queen taking a Ring from her Finger, put it on the Duke's, who quickly went out with great chearfulneſs, as having received an earneſt and a pledge of his Marriage. *Sainte-Aldegonde*, who look'd upon it as a thing of the greateſt importance to his Maſters, gave 'em notice of it by an Expreſs he diſpatch'd that very ſame night. All the Towns of the Low Countries expreſs'd their joy by ringing of Bells, Bone-fires, &c. for a piece of News, that proved falſe. The Queen blamed *Sainte-Aldegonde* for being ſo haſty in giving notice of a thing, the truth of which he might have known in a few hours."

(F) *The Books he publiſhed.*] *Meurſius* gives a Catalogue of 'em: It contains (d) *Theſes aliquot de Eccleſia atque Eccleſiaſticarum traditionum κριτήριον ſeu certa norma. Item de ſacramento cœnæ dominicæ. Reſponſio ad Michaelis Raii regii Profeſſoris Lovanienſis apologiam. Epiſtola conſolatoria ad fratres exules Brabantos, Flandros, Hannones, Arteſios, alioſque Belgas peregrinis in regionibus ob puram Evangelii doctrinam diſperſos. Tractatus de cœna Domini ad Galliarum Regis ſororem Lotharingiæ Duci nuptam. Contra libertinos. Apologetica reſponſio contra anonymum quendam libertinum.* To which may be added, ſays *Meurſius*, ſeveral Pieces publiſh'd at ſeveral times, *admonitiones, declarationes, tractatus, conſilia, diſputationes, conſolationes, interpretationes*, and many anonymous Writings. His deſign was to refute the *Romiſh* Controverſiſts, and to raiſe Enemies to the King of *Spain*. I leave you to judge whether having the Talent of Writing with great facility, he did not publiſh many Pamphlets about the preſent Tranſactions. He did then what Baron *Liſola* did ſince. It has been ſaid that he was lucky in gueſſing the deſigns of the *Spaniards*, and that therefore the Alarms he raiſed were not inſignificant. (e) *Prudentia & hiſtoriæ cognitio quanta in eo fuerit, ſcriptum illud declarat, in quo agit de* Hiſpanorum *ſcopo, ad quem ſua ipſi tela dirigunt; qui Monarchiam ſibi præfigentes, nihil non auſint. In eodem tanquam vates prognoſticis politicis multa prædixit: quæ eveniſſe* Britannia, Polonia, Gallia, *aliæque regiones teſtantur.*

(G) His Comical Books *were moſt uſeful.*] He publiſh'd in *Dutch* the *Roman Hive*, *Alvearium Romanum*, in the Year 1571. and dedicated it to *Francis Sonnius* Biſhop of *Boiſleduc*, one of the chief Inquiſitors of the Low Countries (f). That Book full of Comical Stories was wonderfully applauded by the People, and proved more prejudicial to the Church of *Rome* than a ſerious and learned Book. Nay, 'tis ſaid that many People were undeceived by it: *Eraſmus*'s Collequies had produced the ſame effect: (g) *Hoc ſcriptum —— eſt varietate hiſtoriarum, & acumine ſententiarum refertiſſimum: jocis facetiiſque in Papiſtarum theatrales nugas & fabulas mire conditum: adeo ut lectoribus illorum temporum præcipue, ſingularem attulerit voluptatem: & occaſionem multis præbuerit de religione Chriſtiana ſerio cogitandi. Et hic liber ut populari applauſu acceptus, ſic non ſine fructu plurimorum lectus, plus rei Belgicæ illa tempeſtate in religionis negotio profuit; quam eruditi aliquot commentarii.* He wrote a Book of the ſame Nature in *French*, which was Printed ſoon after he died, with this Title, *Tableau des differens de la religion.* He is very merry in it, and yet alledges very good Reaſons. This Work proved as ſucceſsful as the *Alvearium*. Moſt Stories are the ſame in both. Many People read it with a great deal of Pleaſure, and were more confirm'd in their belief than if they had read the beſt work of *Calvin*. *Thuanus* did not approve this way of handling Controverſy. "I have ſeen, *ſaid he*, (h) *Philip de Marnix de Sainte-Aldegonde* at the Siege of *Paris*, and I lodged three Months in the ſame Houſe with him —— He was a polite Man, but there was no great matter in him. He was (i) Chancellor of *Gelderland*. He ſpeaks of Religion as *Rabelais* did, which is very ill done." *John David* a Jeſuit publiſh'd another *Alvearium* in *Dutch* to confute that of *Sainte-Aldegonde*, which he call'd a moſt (k) pernicious Book. He knew well enough that the moſt dangerous way of Writing againſt a Doctrine is to turn it into Ridicule.

(H) *His very Songs procured a great Advantage to the new Republick.*] I might have cited above *Verheiden* inſtead of *Melchior Adam*, who only tranſcribes him; but I thought it an indifferent thing, provided I ſhould once point out the Original. But I ſhall ſet down here the Words of *Verheiden*. *Ab hoc Viro*, ſaith he (l), *etiam profecta dicitur decantata illa CANTILENA compoſita in laudem PRINCIPIS GUILIELMI Naſſavii, Ad Belgas Tyrannide Albani oppreſſos edita. Quæ quidem Cantilena ita ſcite facta, ita concinno rhythmo moduliſque ſuis eſt attemperata, ut plebis animos mire ad Principis, Libertatiſque Patriæ amorem excitaverit. In hoc igitur SANCI-ALDEGONDIUS ſe alterum quaſi TYRTÆUM, toties a Platone laudatum, oſtendit. Nam cum PRINCIPIS Fortiſſimi laudes, hortamenta virtutis, damnorum ſolatia, ſalutariaque conſilia contineat; magnum ardorem defendendi PRINCIPIS PATRIÆQUE LIBERTATIS populo injecit: adeo ut nihil illis temporibus convenientius prodiiſſe judicare liceat.* He is in the right to ſay that nothing could better fit the circumſtances of the Time, than a pretty Song full of Invectives againſt the Duke of *Alva*, and of *Encomiums* on the Prince of *Orange*. The deſign of erecting ſome Provinces of the King of *Spain* into a Common Wealth required many things, and particularly a Continual Application to prevent the Suggeſtions of thoſe, who might have repreſented that it was almoſt impoſſible to hold out againſt ſo potent a Monarch, that the Charges neceſſary to carry on the War againſt him would very much exceed what he exacted, and that therefore 'twas a great piece of Folly to ſpend (m) one's All rather than bear an Impoſt. This might have been confuted by a Thouſand good Reaſons, and it was of great moment to make the People ſenſible of it both from the Pulpit and in Books: But nothing was more proper for ſuch a deſign than a Song; for 'tis a thing that remains imprinted in the Mind, and every Body, even the Peaſants and Servant-Maids, daily repeat it with great joy and ſatisfaction. And therefore this was one of the moſt important Services of *Philip de Marnix*. Which puts me in mind of the Song about the *Scalado*, which the *Geneveſe* ſing in their Houſes on the Anniverſary day, as a thing almoſt eſſential to that Ceremony. I am ſure that at firſt the Impreſſions made by this Song in the Minds of the People, ſurpaſt all others.

(a) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra pag. 116.

(b) Placc. de Pſeudonym. pag. 172.

(c) Wicquefort, Traité de l'Ambaſſad. Tom. 1. p. m. 129. See alſo Strada ubi ſupra dec. 2. lib. 4. pag. 143. ad ann. 1581.

(d) Meurſ. Athenæ Batavæ pag. 180.

(e) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra pag. 335.

(f) Id. ib. pag. 336.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) Thuana, pag. m. 39.

(i) *I think Thuanus is miſtaken in this.*

(k) Librum peſtilentiſſimum. Valer. Andr. bibl. Belg. pag. 490.

(l) Verheiden in elogiis aliquot Theologor. pag. 145.

(m) Omnia dabant ne decimam darent.

of *David* out of *Hebrew* into *Dutch* Verſe, but that (I) Tranſlation was not made uſe of in Churches. He was about a *Dutch* Tranſlation of the Scripture, when he died at *Leyden* the 15th of *December* 1598 *. He had lately made a journey into *France* for the Prince's affairs. He was not free from (K) Slanders, and

find

(I) *This Tranſlation of the Pſalms was not made uſe of in Churches.*] He affected to uſe none but *Dutch* Words, and acted quite contrary to the other Poets of his Nation, who inſerted in their Books many Words taken from the *French*. His Tranſlation was better than that which was ſung in Churches; nevertheleſs it was not admitted. Thus in *France* the old verſion of *Marot* and *Beza* was prefer'd to that of Mr *Conrart*, which ſome had a mind to introduce. I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of *Melchior Adam*: (a) *Id opus hactenus aliquoties typis publicatum, ſed nunquam communi concionatorum conſenſu eſt receptum: cum contra verſio alterius a tot millibus edificatur. Nimirum*

Pro captu lectoris habent ſua fata libelli.

Here follows another paſſage, whereby it appears that *Philip de Marnix*, the better to introduce his verſion, made it, as much as ever he could, like that which was already uſed. M. *Conrart* had the ſame precaution, but to (b) no purpoſe: People were too much uſed to the Common Tranſlations. (c) *Ante complures annos diſplicuit nonnullis apud Belgas nimis ille a textu Scripturæ per laxiores paraphraſes metricas receſſus: præſertim Pſalmorum* Datheni, *qui ex Pſalmis Gallicis* Maroti & Bezæ *expreſſi erant. Verſavit hac cura inter alios nobiliſſ.* Marnixium *montis* Sancti-Aldegondis *Dominum; qui propterea novam paraphraſin rhythmo-metricam compoſuit, ſtrophis, lineis, ſyllabis, cum* Datheni *Pſalmis, pari paſſu euntem, ut cum illis in templis cantari, aut facile in ſubſtitui poſſet. Sed cum* Datheni *Pſalmi jam memoria a pleriſque tenerentur, non viderunt Eccleſiæ, quomodo commode & abſque aliqua commotione plebis eccleſiaſtica in publicis ſacris hic quicquam loco moveri poſſet.*

(K) *He was not free from Slanders.*] Some inſtances of it may be ſeen in the Words I have quoted out of *Strada*. But here is a more biting Stroke: That Jeſuit having ſaid that *Sainte-Aldegonde* was one of thoſe, who had been ordered to ſeize upon *Dom Juan* of *Auſtria* by a trick or by main force, adds: (d) *Quod ſane facinus etſi non abhorrebat a reliqua vita aut Aldegundii hominis ignominioſiſſime nequam, qui Calvinum puer docentem audierat, ſenex jam alios ipſe docebat: aut Heſii——— tamen an illi re ipſa moliti hoc ſint, ut Auſtriacus multis authoribus exiſtimavit——— affirmare non auſim.* I have a Book Printed at *Cologne* in 1673. with this Title, *De ortu & proceſſu Calviniana reformationis in Belgio: in quo exibentur pacta & fœdera ibidem inita, & demonſtratur nullam eorum à Reformatoribus habitam eſſe rationem, Authore C. L. S. V. V.* *Sainte-Aldegonde* is very ill uſed in it, and the Author ſays among other things, that whilſt he was endeavouring to undo the Catholicks of the *Netherlands* in the Diet of *Worms*, he made it his Buſineſs to perſuade the Ambaſſadors of the Emperor and of the Electors, that the Arch-Duke *Matthias* had been invited by the Inhabitants of that Country to be the protector of the *Romiſh* Religion, which was very much endangered by the Civil War. (e) *Belgas Archiducem Matthiam pro tuenda Catholica Romana religione ad Provinciarum regimen evocaſſe, præſertim cum illa inter civiles heſce tumultus magnis motibus percelleretur.*

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the Author of that Book was diſcovered, tho' he had taken all poſſible care to conceal himſelf. He was baniſh'd upon that Account, and his Eſtate was confiſcated. He lived at *Cologne* under the Protection of the *Pope's Nuncio* in 1678. I only ſay this upon the Credit of the *Italian Journaliſt* (f). If what is ſaid of *Sainte-Aldegonde* in that Book were true, it would be a Trick of an Ambaſſador, which he did not invent, and which is common enough (g). I have another Book intitled, *Antidote ou contrepoiſon contre les conſeils ſanguinaires & envenimez de Philippe de Marnix Sr. de Ste-Aldegonde*, &c. *An Antidote or Counterpoiſon againſt the Bloody and pernicious Counſels of* Philip de Marnix Sieur de Sainte-Aldegonde, *contain'd in a Book publiſh'd by him againſt the Spiritual Zealots, whom he calls in his Language* Geeſtdryvers. *Written by way of a Letter by a* German *Gentleman, a Lover of Peace and of the Belgick Liberty.* The time and place of the Impreſſion and the Printer's Name don't appear in it; but one may know that it came out about the Year 1598. The Author of that Book abuſes *Sainte Aldegonde* in the following manner. (h) "That Counſel puts me upon ſcanning your former Actions, when I call to mind that the States of *Holland* and *Zealand* would not permit you to come into their Territories. You was then in a deſpair by Reaſon of the Murther of the late Prince of *Orange* of Glorious Memory, and becauſe the deſign at the Duke of *Cruwmeſtein* miſcarried. Your Conſcience was very much troubled, as miſtruſting God's Power, till you ſurrendred *Antwerp* in the Year 1585 and not contented with that great piece of Service done to the Duke of *Parma*, you made it your buſineſs in common diſcourſe to Praiſe that Prince, adviſing ſome to make a general Peace, the better to conceal your Fault by the ruin and deſolation of a hundred Thouſand Poor afflicted People; for you preſumed ſo much upon your Ability as to pretend to make the ſaid Duke revolt againſt his Maſter, and by that means to procure a reunion of the 17 Provinces. You boaſted that you had open'd the matter to him in the time of the Parliament of *Beveren*, when you had ſo many private diſcourſes with him in the preſence of all your Collegues, who are venerable Men and ſome of the moſt illuſtrious in the ſaid Town: Which was too great an undertaking for ſuch a Man as you are. I ſhall ſay nothing of your ill Conduct in the Government of that Town, ſince you might have ſupplied it with ſufficient Proviſions and Ammunition for a Siege of ſome Years, conſidering the abſolute Power you uſurp'd in it———(i) The wiſe Prince of *Orange* of Glorious Memory was ſenſible, ſome Years before he died, of your turbulent Spirit, when he removed you by degrees from his Council and Perſon, leſt he ſhould ſometime or other find himſelf in a plunge, like the effects of this deteſtable Advice of yours.

Equity requires that we ſhould hear what *Philip de Marnix* anſwered to that *German* Gentleman. "Since the States General, *ſays he* (k), who would not permit me to come into their Territories, have not continued in their reſolution, but on the contrary have been willing that I ſhould be nearer them, have converſed with me above twelve Years, and imparted to me many deſigns and ſecrets, and even confer'd upon me honourable Imployments, ordering that I ſhould be well uſed, to give me thereby ſome marks of their Affection; don't you ſee that they have by that means cleared me of the Calumnies, which ſlandering Men like you, had invented againſt me, tho' they durſt not open their Mouths in my preſence?———How dare you put a Conſtruction upon what the States have done, quite contrary to their intention? How dare you blame me, becauſe in ſuch a Critical time they thought fit, for ſome particular Reaſons, that I ſhould be abſent for ſome time by reaſon of the ill Reports that were ſpread againſt me; being impoſſible that a Man in ſuch a Poſt as I had, ſhould pleaſe every body. Eſpecially if it be conſidered that a falſe Report went about that I prevented the Reading of the Queen of *England's* Letters at *Antwerp*; at which the *Engliſh* Soldiers were ſo exaſperated, that ſome of 'em ſwore they would kill me: But afterwards being informed of the Truth of the matter, and even that I was going to the Queen in order to clear my ſelf, they changed their mind. If therefore the States for this or ſome other conſideration thought fit that I ſhould be abſent for ſome time, (for the Letters of the States of *Zealand* alledged no other Reaſon but the Reports that went about me) how can you be ſo Impudent as to defame me for a thing which is to my Glory and Honour? Afterwards he gives a long Liſt of the courageous Actions performed by his Order or Counſels ſince the Death of Prince *William*; which ſhews that this Aſſaſſination, which made him very uneaſy, did not throw him into deſpair, and deprive him of the

uſe

* Melch. Adam. in. pag. 314

(a) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra pag. 336.

(b) *Note, that the Church of Geneva and many others have at laſt laid aſide the old verſion of the Pſalms: but the* Walloon *Churches have reſolved to keep it. See the Remark P, in the Article* Marot.

(c) Giſbertus Voetius de Politia eccleſiaſt. tom. 1. pag. 529.

(d) Strada de bello Belg. dec. 1. lib. 9. p. m. 572. 528. ad ann. 1577.

(e) De ortu & proceſſu Calvin. reform. in Belgio lib. 2. ſect. 9. pag. 78. *He quotes* Uytenbogartius, hiſtor. Eccleſ. part 3.

(f) *See the* 6. Giornale de letterati 1678. *in the extract of the Book intitled*, de ortu & proceſſu &c.

(g) *See the Remark A. in the Article* Bellai (*William* du) led that his Retreat was the Life of a Man in diſgrace. He was Extremely perplexed

ge of his Reaſon. He gives a particular Account of his Conduct during the Siege of Antwerp; he proteſts that he oppoſed to the utmoſt of his Power thoſe who were for Capitulating, and that he and his Twenty one Collegues (a) had all their Inſtructions in Writing, when they went out of the Town to Surrender it upon Conditions. He ſays that he made the Enemies believe (b) that they had ſtill Proviſions enough for ſeven or eight Months, ſo that M. Richardot, the ſecond day after he entred into the Town, ſaid when he ſaw what a Condition it was in, that he had never been ſo much Impoſed upon. He is very long in Juſtifying himſelf as to the Praiſes he had beſtowed upon the Duke of *Parma*. He ſays that (c) making a Report to the great Council of what had paſs'd during the Capitulation, he was obliged to ſet forth the Reaſons alledged by the Deputies of the Duke of *Parma*, to remove the Miſtruſt that prevailed among the People. They had enlarged upon the Virtues of that Duke, and made an Abridgment of his Life, to ſhew that on all occaſions he had faithfully kept his Treaties. *Sainte-Aldegonde* related what they had ſaid. Here follows an inſtance of popular Injuſtice, and of the wrong Conſtruction that is put upon things. " (d) " This Diſcourſe made in ſuch an Aſſembly, and " ſpread all over the Town, was conſtrued by ma- " ny, as if what I had related concerning the De- " puties of the Duke of *Parma*, had been my Opi- " nion; ſo that every body was ſaying that I had " extoll'd the ſaid Duke to the Sky: Whereupon " ſome Miniſters, (even ſome of thoſe, whom I took " care to conſult before I did any thing) made me " a ſharp Remonſtrance, as if I had renounced my " Religion and my Party. I confeſs that by an effect " of Humane Infirmity, I was more nettl'd at it " than I ſhould have been, and my Anſwer was at- " tended with ſome marks of Indignation.——And " becauſe I perceived that tho' I had ſatisfied them, " the ſame Report went on ſtill all over the Town, " and that many of thoſe, who Envied and Hated " me, and who retired into *Holland* in Crowds, tri- " umphed over me upon that account, to the preju- " dice of my Reputation; I confeſs I was ſo moved " with it, that in my Apology, without remembring " that I had related thoſe things, as being ſpoken by " our Enemies, I plainly and abſolutely maintain'd " that there was no harm in Praiſing our Enemies, " for ſuch things as are really Commendable, and I " mention'd ſeveral good Qualities of the Duke of " *Parma*. To which I was induced, not only by " reaſon of the ſaid Calumnies, but alſo by the Ne- " ceſſity of the Time, and becauſe I was in his Pow- " er, together with the whole Town; tho' I may " truly ſay that I had ſtill other thoughts". I ſhall mention this new Reaſon, becauſe it diſcovers to us a Weakneſs, an Artifice, and a Corruption, which prevail in all Places and in all Ages. I have always been of Opinion, ſays *Sainte-Aldegonde* (e), " That " nothing can be more dangerous for the Preſerva- " tion of a State in hard and difficult Times, than " to deſpiſe one's Enemy. For as Orators tell their " Scholars that they ought never to fancy that their " Adverſaries want Wit; ſo in point of War 'tis " very dangerous to think that our Enemies are fool- " iſh and careleſs People. And yet many were apt " to entertain ſuch Thoughts, endeavouring to make " every body believe that the Duke of *Parma* was " a Man of no Prudence and Ability in Military " Affairs. An Opinion, Gentlemen, which might " have proved very prejudicial to your State, if " your Prudence had not prevented the ill Effects of " it, by looking for Aſſiſtance every where. Since " my return into *Zealand*, I have ſeldom mention'd " the Duke of *Parma*, except when I was required " to do it, by thoſe who had the Power to Com- " mand me; and then I told them what I thought " of him. Thus much for the Praiſes beſtowed up- " the Duke, which have been laid to my Charge by " ſo many People. Wherein I believe I have done " nothing but what I was obliged to do for the " Preſervation of the Town, and of the Churches " that were in it.

Here you ſee a great difference between thoſe, who are altogether for countenancing popular Opinions, and thoſe who argue Equitably and Solidly. The latter think themſelves obliged in Juſtice and out of a good Policy not to give a wrong account of the Forces, Valour and good Conduct of the Enemy: The former are for telling Impudent Lies about thoſe things. Not but that they are ſenſible that ſuch Lies may be prejudicial in ſome reſpects; but they rather chuſe to indulge by ſuch means their own Paſſions and thoſe of the People; and becauſe they take 'em to be more Advantageous than Detrimental, conſidering the Humour of the Mob, they don't approve Sincerity, and if any one practiſes it, they Impudently charge him with Treaſon.

I omit the Apology relating to the Letter written by *Sainte Aldegonde* to the Lord *de Meetkerke*, concerning a general Peace. He vindicates himſelf by clearing the Matter and ſhewing the drift of his Deſign, and he confeſſes that *ſome falſe and fooliſh Reports went about it*. I likewiſe omit what concerns his being accuſed of neglecting to ſupply *Antwerp* with Proviſions, &c. I think he fully juſtifies himſelf as to theſe Articles. Let us ſee what concerns his being told in a Reproachful manner that he was removed from Buſineſs, and that he made himſelf ſuſpected by Prince *William*. We ſhall ſee in his Anſwer ſeveral particulars belonging to his Hiſtory. (f) " After the Death of the ſaid Elector, and " even after the departure of the (g) King's Brother, " having earneſtly deſired to be diſmis'd, in order to " live a Private Life, his (h) Excellency was pleaſ- " ed to grant my Requeſt, but upon condition that " whenever he ſhould ſend for me, I ſhould be " ready to perform his Orders, which I promiſed " to do. Upon this Promiſe he had a mind to diſ- " patch me to *Bruges*, giving me the Government " of that Town and what depended upon it, (which " was prevented by my Sickneſs, and the ſecret " Practices of thoſe, who invited thither the Duke " of *Arſchot*.) Afterwards he ſent me to *Antwerp*, " having little hopes of preſerving that Town, by " reaſon of the different Inclinations of the Peo- " ple, and the Animoſity they expreſs'd againſt " him, under pretence that he Favoured the *French*. " He got me admitted there into the Council of *Bra-* " *bant*, and ſoon after I was by his means appointed " the Head of the Town, under the Title of Firſt " Burgo-Maſter, ſeeing that I had ſtoutly refuſed " that of *Markgrave*." He ſays afterwards, that this Prince (i) *a Month or Six Weeks before he Died*, ſent for him to *Antwerp*, on account of the Reſolution that was taken to ſend into *France* for Succours. (k) " Ever ſince God was pleaſ- " ed to call him to himſelf, after the Siege of *Ant-* " *werp*, which laſted thirteen Months, during which " time I uſed my utmoſt endeavours to keep it for " the States and the United Provinces, tho' God " was not pleaſed to proſper my Labours, I wil- " lingly laid aſide the Adminiſtration of Affairs, " and no body can ſay that I ſued for any other Im- " ployment directly or indirectly. Much leſs can it " be ſaid that I was turn'd out, ſince I always loved " to live a Retired Life in the Country, till the " ſaid States were pleaſed to call me to *Leyden*, " in order to ſpend my time in a Sacred Study, on " which all my Friends knew that my Mind was al- " together bent. Which is ſo true that this Man, " thro' a kind of Contradiction, ſends me into *Zea-* " *land* to Cultivate my Garden and Improve my " Lands, as I did heretofore for a conſiderable " time.

I ſhall add ſomething out of *Strada*. That Jeſuit acknowledges that *Sainte-Aldegonde* left nothing unattempted for the Defence of *Antwerp*. He repreſents him (l) as a Man well ſtock'd with Methods of leading the Mob. His Adherents, ſaid he, gave out that they knew the Duke of *Parma* would offer very reaſonable Terms, but that he had privately promiſed the Soldiers that they ſhould Plunder the Town. (m) *Aldebant aliqui civium, nempe ex Aldegundii cohorte, ſibi exploratum eſſe, Parmenſem Principem oblaturum quidem conditiones haud ſpernendas, clam tamen ſtipendiorum loco cum Hiſpanis pactum eſſe populationem urbis.* The Magiſtrates (n) ſent out Emiſſaries, who declared all over the Town, that ſome Letters had been received from *France*, importing that the Troops were at laſt in March to come to their Relief. That Hiſtorian obſerves that moſt (o) Citi-

(a) Id. ib. fol. C 2 verſo.

(b) Ibid. fol. C 3 verſo.

(c) Ibid. fol. C 4.

(d) Id. ib. verſo &c.

(e) Id. ib. C 4 verſo.

(f) Sainte Aldegonde ubi ſupra fol. D 2 verſo.

(g) That is, the Duke of Alençon.

(h) That is, William Prince of Orange.

(i) Id. ib. fol. D 4.

(k) Id. ib. verſo.

(l) Aldegundius non conſumptis adhuc quas apprime callebat artibus tractandæ multitudinis, ſpargit in vulgus ſcripturum ſe Parmenſi principi. *Strada lib.* 7. *dec.* 2. *pag.* 423.

(m) Id. ib. pag. 424.

(n) Id. ib.

(o) Pleriqueque Gallicas literas Antuerpiæ natas in Aldegundiano conclavi ſuſpicabant. *Id. ibid.* *pag.* 425.

pleaſed when Complaints were made that he exhorted (L) the States to perſecute the Sects. I have read a Book, wherein 'tis obſerved that he (M) loved Dancing, and that the Scruples of the Preciſiſts may be removed by it. It cannot be denied, without

him ſuſpect thoſe Letters to have been Forged in Sainte-Aldegonde's Cloſet. Whereby he repreſents him as a Man, who uſed his beſt endeavours to Preſerve that Prince. He adds that Sainte-Aldegonde (a) having loſt all Hopes, and being willing to take care of his Intereſt, forwarded the ſending of ſome Deputies to the Duke of Parma. He mentions the Diſcourſe he made to the Duke; he ſays (b) that he had a Conference of four hours with that Prince, at which the other Deputies were not preſent, and that he particularly inſiſted on the Liberty of Conſcience, giving hopes that upon ſuch a Condition Holland, Zealand, and the reſt of the Low-Countries, might ſubmit again to the King of Spain, and that he took it upon himſelf. He pretends that the Duke of Parma, who rejected that Condition, made uſe of ſuch a wonderful Eloquence, that Marnix own'd he had never ſeen a Prince, who ſpoke better. Laſtly, Strada ſays, that he ſeem'd to have altered his Mind ſince that Conference, and more inclined to conclude a Capitulation, and that he Publiſh'd a Book, wherein he not only beſtowed great Encomiums upon that Duke, but alſo declared that one could not bear Arms againſt Philip II. with a good Conſcience. This Confeſſion, continues Strada, of a Man, who had ſo great an Intereſt in his Party, was prejudicial to the Confederates, and they began to ſuſpect Sainte-Aldegonde to ſuch a degree that he was laid aſide. (c) *Quinetiam edito poſtea libello, quum res ab Alexandro patratas, clementiam ejus in victos, in ſervanda fide ſanctimoniam, ceteraſque Imperatorias virtutes, liberali præconio celebraſſet; adjecit inter alia,* Sumi adverſus Philippum Regem arma a ſubditis populis, integra conſcientia, nequaquam poſſe. *Quæ ſane confeſſio non temere inter loquendum prompta, ſed litteris ad memoriam conteſtata, ut erat hominis authoritate inter ſuos, & Calviniana ſapientia longe clariſſimi, Fœderatorum cauſæ momenti plurimum abrogavit, ipſe ſuis offenſus inviſuſque, regendam ad Rempublicam poſtea non acceſſit.*

(L) *That he exhorted the States to Perſecute the Sects.*] I have ſaid more than once, when there was occaſion for it, that it was a hard caſe for the Proteſtant Writers of the XVIth Century to think themſelves obliged to exhort the Magiſtrates to Puniſh Hereticks, whilſt they thought it ſtrange that the Catholick Princes ſhould Perſecute the Proteſtants. Their own Arguments were retorted againſt 'em, and they could hardly come off but by ſuppoſing, as all Parties do, that their Doctrine was true. Sainte-Aldegonde muſt needs have been more Perplexed than many others, ſince he had taken ſo many Journeys, made ſo many Diſcourſes, and writ ſo many Books for a State, which had taken up Arms againſt the Spaniards to free themſelves from the Yoke of the Inquiſition. How many things might have been ſaid againſt him, when he exhorted the Sovereigns of that ſame State to exterminate ſome Sects? Here is an Inſtance of the Perplexity he was in. He ſuppoſes 1. that theſe words were only Objected to him, (d) *'Tis high time, Noble and Venerable Lords, that you ſhould go about to maintain the Honour of God in this World, if you deſire that he ſhould Protect and Defend your Country.* 2. That the Antidote oppoſed againſt that Counſel conſiſts in this: "*Men ought to live quietly one with another,* "*and every body ought to have the liberty of believing* "*what he thinks to be Right, and we ſhould not con-* "*cern our ſelves with it.* Permitte Divis cætera." He quotes the ninth and forty firſt Pages of the *Antidote*; but there is in the ninth Page a Clauſe omitted by him. He is blamed for uſing theſe words, *to ſuppreſs and intirely annihilate that Mortal Poiſon.* 'Tis further ſaid (e) that he thinks it very ſtrange *that there ſhould be ſtill ſome Men ſo tender-hearted as to queſtion whether the Magiſtrates ought to inflict Corporal Puniſhments, and lay a Fine upon thoſe who are guilty of Inſolence in the Service of God.* What he leaves out, pretending to know nothing of it, alters the ſtate of the Queſtion, and removes the difficult part of it. Can ſuch a proceeding be conſiſtent with Sincerity? Is it not an unfair thing to reduce the *Antidote* to a ſingle Propoſition of the forty firſt Page, without conſidering many ſolid Arguments that go before it? In another (f) place of his Work he examins what he had left out in the beginning; but his Examination ſhews the Perplexity he was in.

Note, That he bore an ill will to the Enthuſiaſts long before. See his (g) Letter to Beza written the tenth of January 1566.

(M) *That he loved Dancing, and that the Scruples of the Preciſiſts, &c.*] See Schookius (h), who has inſerted in one of his Books, a Letter (i) written by Sainte-Aldegonde in 1577. to Gaſpar Verheiden, a Dutch Miniſter. That Letter ſeems to me very judicious. I ſhall take two or three Curious Things out of it. The Author affirms that many People were ſo offended, becauſe Dancing was not approved in the Reformed Churches, that it made 'em unwilling to joyn with them, and that many laid aſide their Prejudices againſt the Proteſtants, when they came to know his Opinion and Practice about it. From whence he infers, (k) that too rigid a Morality about ſuch an Exerciſe was ſo far from being Edifying, that it was Scandalous. He ſays that the (l) Prince himſelf was very much Offended when he heard that one could not Dance at a Wedding without incurring the Cenſure of the Church. He thinks that (m) Dancing is a good and commendable thing in the Netherlands, becauſe it keeps People from Drinking or Gaming after Meals. He is not much concern'd becauſe the Zealots have not the ſame Eſteem for him as they had before; for, ſays he, I don't deſire that my Reputation ſhould be grounded upon Superficial Things, but upon Solid ones. (n) *Exiſtimationis certe (quam tu mihi apud pios omnes amiſſam hoc facto eſſe autumas) rationem, ego nunquam in rerum externarum umbris, ſed in ipſis rebus poſitam eſſe ſtatui.* However he approves the Conduct of the Church of Geneva, which, by forbidding Dancing, had ſuppreſt many unbecoming things that were Practiſed every day. It was an uſual thing in thoſe parts to carry Young Maids to the Ball up and down in the Night time, and to vex 'em with Lewd Poſtures. He does not think that one can be preſent at ſuch a Spectacle without a Sin, and much leſs an Actor in it (o) *Ut ego Genevates merito laudandos cenſeam, qui turpiſſima dedecora, quæ quotidie ſine fronte committebantur, hoc uno interdicto, quaſi Tenedia bipenni, reſecuerint. Sed illis erat uſitatiſſimum, quod & hodie eſt multo frequentiſſimum, apud Burgundos, Sabaudos, atque omnes Allobroges, & multos etiam Gallos, puellas virgines intempeſtiva nocte, ſine ullo cuſtode, ad choreas, quocunque vellent abducere, & quamdiu vellent in fœdiſſimis atque obſcœniſſimis geſticulationibus, quovis anni tempore, ſine ulla prope intermiſſione, prætextu chorearum, uſque ad nauſeam fatigare. Quos ego mores vel inſpectare, nedum exemplo comprobare, nefas eſſe duxerim.*

The Reformed Churches, which forbad Dancing, cannot be ſufficiently Praiſed for it; and it were an abſurd thing to fancy that the Miniſters blamed it, only as it is a ſkill in Walking or Leaping. It is a very Lawful Exerciſe under that notion, it is neither Good nor Bad Morally ſpeaking. But the manner of it occaſion'd a thouſand Diſorders, and in the very Room wherein the Ball was kept, it made dangerous Impreſſions upon a Woman's Chaſtity. The Proverb concerning Convents, (p) *as dangerous as a return from* Matines, might have produced another with a ſmall Alteration, *as dangerous as a return from a Ball.*

A DESCRIPTION of the ill Conſequences of Dancing.

To confirm what I have ſaid, that the Proteſtant Churches of France did very wiſely forbid Dancing, I ſhall quote a Paſſage out of a Book written by Lambert Daneau, if I am not miſtaken. The Author maintains (q) that *the Devil never Invented a more effectual way than Dancing to fill the World with Whoredom:* "for if the bare meeting of a Man and "a Woman, Lewd Words, Wanton Songs, and "Feeling, are ſufficient to kindle Luſt, as we have "but too many Inſtances of it every day; one may "judge of the great Inconveniencies that will [illegible] "from the Concourſe of all thoſe things in one and out doing him injuſtice, that he was one of the Illuſtrious Men of the XVI. Century; for he was very Zealous for his Religion, and had a great deal of Wit and Learning: Beſides he underſtood the Civil Law, Politicks, Negotiations, Divinity, *Hebrew*, *Greek* and *Latin*, and many living Languages †.

(a) Confeſſus Aldegondius ſe rem deſperatam publicam vidiſſe, ſibi privatim conſulturum legationem . . . feſtinavit. Id. ibid. pag. 427.

(b) Id. ib. Pag. 412.

(c) Id. ib. Pag. 433.

(d) Sainte-Aldegonde, Reſponce apologetique fol. A 4.

(e) Antidote pag. 10.

(f) Id. Reſponce apologetique [illegible]

(g) [illegible]

(h) Schook. [illegible] pag. 317. [illegible]

(i) In the [illegible] of the Epiſtolæ illuſtrium Belgarum.

(k) Hanc conſuetudinem non modo nullam eſſe in hac importuna moroſitate, & revocata ad humanæ opinionis placitum cenſura, ædificationem, at increbuiſſe etiam ſcandalum. Schook, pag. 318.

(l) I take he means the Prince of Orange.

(m) Imo vero his locis ſanctas duxerim choreas quæ poſt epulas ad infienda ebrioſorum pocula inhibendoſve aleatorum ludos, agitantur cum fructu. Ibid.

(n) Ibid. pag. 319.

(o) Ibid. pag. 320.

(p) See Paſquier, Recherch. de la France Book 8. ch. [illegible] pag. m. [illegible]

(q) [illegible]

SAINTE-CROIX (*Proſper*) made a Cardinal by *Pius* IV. had been Advocate Conſiſtorial and Auditor of the *Rota*. He was *Nuncio* in *Germany*, *Portugal*,

† See Verheiden in elog. [illegible] Theolog. [illegible]

"the ſame place, and in the ſame Perſons, who beſides meet together for their Diverſion. But all "thoſe things are to be found in Dancing; ſo that "it may be ſaid that Dancing is a Compoſition of "all ſorts of Poiſons invented by the Devil, to "hide the fear of God, and kindle all manner of "fleſhy Luſts; that 'tis a Bait for the Eyes and Ears, "and in general for all the Senſes to ſeduce them, "and convey the Poyſon into the Soul thro' their "Channel. —— (a) Upon ſuch an occaſion every "body may chuſe, even in the Arms of Husbands "and Mothers, ſuch Women as they fancy; and "then they take 'em by the Hand, and as if they "were already enjoying their Deſires, they Kiſs, "Embrace and carry them up and down: Young "Men making it their buſineſs to appear Nimble and "Merry, and to Pleaſe Women with a thouſand "Motions; and Women on their part uſing their "Endeavours to do the like. The Men know how "to make 'em Friſk and cut ſuch high Capers, that "the Company may ſee their Legs to the very "Thigh. A Ball is attended with a thouſand Mo-"tions, Glances and Capers; each ſort of Dance "affords new ways of Pleaſing, Seeing and Feel-"ing: And all thoſe things are performed with "great Shouting, and a great deal of Mirth.—— "(b) The Dancers are not the only Perſons liable "to thoſe Inconveniencies, but alſo thoſe who "are meer Spectators, ſince Women have a full "ſight of Young Men, whilſt they play their "Nimble and Merry Tricks; and likewiſe the Men "a full ſight of the Women and Maids, whilſt they "ſhew their Wantonneſs. How great a Power "have the Eyes and the Ears (or rather the Devil, "who makes uſe of thoſe Organs) upon idle Peo-"ple, well Fed and greedy of Pleaſure! —— "(c) But let us ſuppoſe that ſome will dance with-"out having any ill Deſires; can it be ſaid that "they will not excite 'em in others? For they do "every thing that may kindle Luſt, and as St. *Je-"rome* ſays in a like Caſe, they preſent the Poiſon "to any that will take and ſwallow it. Now there "will be but too many diſpoſed to Drink it. A "Maid is pitch'd upon to Dance; which is already "ſufficient to make her fear that ſhe has excited a "fooliſh Deſire in the Perſon, who pitches upon "her. But when he Kiſſes her very tenderly, and "makes much of her, and whilſt he is Dancing, he "redoubles his Efforts; what can ſhe think but "that he does it upon her account, and that the "Fire of Love, which kindles his Luſt, makes him "ſo Nimble. Beſides, that Maid goes up and down "with a Bold and Merry Countenance, and without "any Shame, as it were to ſhew her ſelf to every "Body. But how can ſhe be ſure, that none of "thoſe, who look upon her, will feel an unlawful "Deſire? And if you ſuſpect that you have occaſi-"on'd an ill Thought in a Man, what's become of "your Conſcience, if you are not ſorry for it, and "don't avoid ſuch Meetings? The ſame may be ſaid "of Young Men with reſpect to Women". I ſhould tranſcribe the greateſt part of that Book, if I was willing to mention all the ſtrong Reaſons alledged in it. That Treatiſe was Dedicated to the King of *Navarre*, by the *Miniſters of the Holy Goſpel in the Reformed Churches*. His Court wanted very much to be Reformed in that reſpect, for it was not like that of *Joan d'Albret*. Her Example was alledged to that Prince: (d) "No Body doubts, "Sir, that your Majeſty, beſides the great Parts "and excellent Judgment which God has beſtowed "upon you, having had ſo Good and ſo Holy an "Education from your Infancy by ſuch an Excellent "Queen and Mother, that ſhe was deſervedly call'd "the Wonder of her Age, and remembring the "good Example ſhe gave you, (for ſhe always kept "her Houſe free from ſuch filthy Things, ever ſince "ſhe was call'd to the Knowledge of the Goſpel, "and had the Command of her ſelf,) it is impoſſi-"ble that the Corruption of this Age ſhould prevail "upon you more than Holy Precepts, the ill Ex-"amples of other Courts more than the remem-"brance of that wherein you have been bred up, "and the Allurements of the World more than Piety, "which you have ſuck'd in with your Mother's Milk.

'Tis plain that when Dancing is attended with ſo many Irregularities, it deſerves to be blamed by all thoſe, who write Moral Books. *Sainte-Aldegonde* would not have approved of it. The Count *de Buſſi Rabutin* Condemn'd (e) the uſe of Balls as a very dangerous thing: Reaſon and his own Experience convinced him of it. All the Caſuiſts ought to be *Preciſiſts* or *Rigoriſts* upon this Head. The Philoſopher, who wrote againſt the *Preciſiſts*, declared (f) that he blamed Dancing under this Notion; but he ſaid he did not believe it was of the ſame Nature among the Proteſtants of *Germany*; and that the *Preciſiſts*, who are offended at a Cuſtom, that prevails in that Country, where both Sexes Dance together, ſhould conſider that they don't diſapprove certain Cuſtoms, at which the *Germans* are more like to be Offended. (g) *Si mixti ſaltantium chori, nos ratione Germanorum offendant, næ eos multo magis offenderint promiſcui juvenum & virginum accubitus in nuptiis, maxime oſcula ex more gentis Belgicæ, præ cæteris Hollandicæ, frequentari ſolita. Obteſtor eos, quorum zelus contra choreas forte improbari non poſſet, ſi a ſcientia convenientier dirigeretur, an non multo majus ſcandalum promiſcua & quotidiana hæc* oſcula (*ita loquitur Sueton. lib. 3. cap. 34.*) *præbeant Sarmatis, Cimbris, & Germanis, quam nobis (ſi gentilitios mores diſtinguere noluerimus) præberi poſſint a nuptialibus eorundem tripudiis?* He draws up a Parallel between the cuſtom of Kiſſing and that of Dancing, and maintains that Foreigners will be more Offended at the firſt, than the *Preciſiſts* are at the laſt. (h) *Quam πρόφασιν pro ſuis Batavis excogitaverit hic rigidus Theologus, idemque juratus adverſarius non minus omnigenarum chorearum, quam votorum innoxiorum propinato poculo additorum? Maxime, ſi Cimber, aut Sarmata viderit uxorem illius, convivas ſuos ad oſtium oſculo excipientem & dimittentem. Næ, peregrinus hic conviva, cum Clemente Alexand. lib. 3. Pædag. ejuſmodi oſculum, a graviſſimi licet Paſtoris uxore ex uſu gentis frequentatum, vocaverit* oſculum inceſtum, veneno plenum, ſanctitatem ſimulans, & oſculum impudicitiæ: *ex Ambroſio vero in cap. ult. 2. ad Corinth.* affectus libidinoſi indicium. *Nec eſt, quod adverſarius dicat hoc judicium, ſeu Cimbri, ſeu Sarmatæ, charitatis expers eſſe, quum ipſe longe inclementius judicet de ſaltationibus, quas proclamat eſſe proxima incentiva libidinis, interim non cogitando, per oſcula multo expeditius ingredi libidinem; atque Cimbro, ſeu Sarmatæ, videri proſtitutæ famæ, & pudicitiæ, fœminas eſſe, quæ præſumpſerint hoſpites oſculo excipere.* He concludes that Nations ought to Excuſe one another, and to conſider above all things that an ancient and long Cuſtom may make a thing Innocent in one Country, that is Undecent in another. He inſtances upon *Engliſh* Women walking with other Men than their Husbands. (i) *Quæ ratione oſculi dicta ſunt, applicari poſſunt (k) deambulationibus, quas uxores Anglorum, cum alienis viris inſtituere ſolent, quæ & inter primariæ dignitatis Belgas hoc tempore frequentari incipiunt. Certe offenderint hæ matronas Chriſtianas ad Septentrionem degentes; quæ mirabuntur admodum, hæc & ſimilia citra cenſuram tolerari poſſe ab illis Theologis, quorum zelus quotidie occupari ſolet circa ſaltationes & pocula votiva. Nos vero, citra pulveris jactum, ex omnibus hiſce difficultatibus expedire conſtanter poſſumus, quando docemus, in talibus gentium mores & conſuetudines ante omnia inſpici debere quorum ratione, ut rigidiores quoque Preciſiſtæ Hollandi ſua concedunt ſuavia, Anglicanis matronis prodeambulationes cum maritis non ſuis; ita aliis gentibus mox invidere non deberent ſuas ſaltationes, modo ab iis abſit mollities, & illud τεχνικὸν, ad accendendam libidinem ab otioſis nepotibus excogitatum.*

It

(a) Ibid. pag. 39.

(b) Ibid. pag. 41.

(c) Ibid. pag. 41.

(d) Ibid. [illegible] Dedicatory [illegible] A iij.

(e) *See in the* [illegible] *part of the Retour des pieces choiſies his Letter to the Biſhop of* Autun *concerning Balls and Dancing.*

(f) Nulla ratione tamen patrocinari volo tripudiis modernis, à Bathylli modis non abhorrentibus, atque convenientibus magis Pathico, ſive cinædo, quam homini Chriſtiano. *Mart. Schoockius ubi ſupra pag.* 327.

(g) Id. ib:

(h) Id. ib. pag. 328.

(i) Id. ib. pag. 329.

(k) Henry Stephens *mentions that cuſtom in his* Latin *Apology for* Herodotus.

al, *Spain* and *France*. *Catherine de Medicis* procured him the Arch-Bishoprick of *Arles*, where he prevented with an extreme Severity the Establishment of the Protestant Religion. He died at *Rome* the 4th of *October* 1589, being 76 Years old. I shall speak (*A*) of his Books. At his return from his Nunciature in *Portugal* he procured the knowledge of (*B*) *Tobacco* in *Italy*; which is the reason why that Herb was call'd *Santa croce* α.

SANCTA MAURA, an Island formerly call'd *Leucadia* †, nine Miles β from that of *Cephalonia*. The *Greeks* call it γ still *Leucada*, for properly speaking they call *Sancta Maura* the Fortress, where there was formerly a Monastery of that Name. That Fortress is three Miles distant (*C*) from the Ruins of the Town of *Leucas*, in a place where the Canal between the Isle and the Continent is one League broad. Nevertheless it has δ a constant Communication with the Continent by Reason of a Bridge, and of several Islands joyn'd together by several Bridges. It has also ζ an (*D*) Aqueduct about a Mile long, which serves for a Bridge to those, who go a foot. There are about thirty Villages in the Island: The *Greeks* have a Bishop in it. It abounds with Corn, Wine, Oyl, and several sorts of Fruit, and is about 12 * or 15 Leagues round. The Turks (*E*) made themselves Masters of it in 1479. The *Venetians* took it from them under the Conduct of the Captain General *Pesaro* in 1502. and restored it to them soon after by a Treaty of Peace. They retook it under the General *Morosini* the 23d of *July* 1684. The Pirates of *Sancta Maura* have been much talk'd of: They were the first that made use of Galliots. The *Bacha* of the θ *Morea* went on purpose into that Island in 1675. to burn their small Vessels. *Dureg Bey*, a Famous Corsair of *Lepanto*, had seven or eight Corsairs of *Sainte-Maura* under his Command.

SANCTESIUS (CLAUDIUS) in *French* κ *de Saintes*, one of the chief Controversists of the XVI. Century, was a native of (*A*) *Perche*. He turn'd Canon Regular λ in the Year 1540 in the Monastery of *St. Cheron* μ near *Chartres*, and was sent to *Paris* some time after, where he studied classical Learning, Philosophy and Divinity in the College *of Navarre* ν. He took his Degree of Doctor of Divinity in 1555. and then ‖ applied himself very much to Controversy, and was admitted into the House of Cardinal *de Lorraine* ξ. In the Year 1561, he was one of the Disputants for the *Romish* party in the Conference of *Poissy*, and afterwards one of the twelve Divines whom *Charles* IX sent to the Council of *Trent*. He and *Simon Vigor* disputed with two Ministers in the House of the Duke of *Nevers* in

It may be observed that this Philosopher had not the same Reasons that *Sainte-Aldegonde* had, to write an Apology for Dancing. He protests (*a*) that he never had a mind to Dance; and that if the Magistrates should forbid Dancing, it would not make him uneasy in the least. *Sainte-Aldegonde* could not have said so with any sincerity.

(*A*) *I shall speak of his Books.*] His Book are, *Decisiones Rotæ Romanæ. Gallicarum rerum Commentaria. Epistolæ ad Federicum Nauseam aliosque.* Several Speeches. *Constitutiones laneæ artis a Sixto V. in Urbe erectæ.* The Jesuits of the Roman College have his Treatise, *De Officio Legati*, and one Volume of his Letters in Manuscript (*b*).

(*B*) *Procured the Knowledge of Tobacco.*] Which appears from some Verses of *Castor Duranti*, quoted by *Mandosio*, wherein that Herb is described as an Universal Remedy.

Nomine quæ Sanctæ Crucis herba vocatur, ocellis
Subvenit, & sanat plagas, & vulnera jungit,
Discutit & strumas, cancrum, cancrosaque sanat
Ulcera, & ambustis prodest, scabiemque repellit;
Discutit & morbum cui cessit ab impete nomen,
Calefacit & siccat, stringit, mundatque, resolvit,
Et dentum & ventris mulcet capitisque dolores;
Subvenit antiquæ tussi, stomacoque rigenti
Renibus & spleni confert, ultroque, venena
Dira sagittarum domat, ictibus omnibus atris
Hæc eadem prodest: gingivis proficit atque
Conciliat somnum: nuda ossaque carne revestit:
Thoracis vitiis prodest, pulmonis itemque,
Quæ duo sic præstat non ulla potentior herba.
Hanc Sanctacrucius Prosper quum Nuncius esset
Sedis Apostolicæ Lusitanas missus in oras
Huc adportavit Romanæ ad commoda gentis,
Ut proavi Sancta lignum Crucis ante tulere
Omnis Christiadum quo nunc respublica gaudet,
Et Sanctæ Crucis illustris Domus ipsa vocatur
Corporis atque animæ nostræ studiosa salutis.

A Parallel between Tobacco and the Wood of the True Cross, is a very Extravagant Panegyrick.

(*C*) *Three Miles from the Ruins.*] *Spon* (*c*) Censures *Ortelius* and *Ferrarius for believing as other Geographers do, that* Sancta Maura *is still in the same place with the Town of* Leucas, the Ruins of which are to be seen three Miles from *Sancta Maura*. I don't find in *Ortelius*'s *Thesaurus Geographicus* that the Town of *Sancta Maura*, and that of *Leucas* are in the same Situation; but only that the Isle of *Leucadia* is now call'd *Sancta Maura*. There is nothing in it that deserves to be Censured. *Spon* adds, that the Town of *Leucas* was built *upon a rising Ground a Mile from the Sea, in the narrowest part* of the Canal that was made, when the Isthmus was cut, and that there are not above fifty Miles between that place and the Continent. I confess I cannot apprehend that a Town should be built upon a Canal 50 Paces broad, and yet be a Mile distant from the Sea; for that Canal is in the same place where the *Isthmus* was: But can a Town built upon an *Isthmus* 50 Paces broad be above 50 Paces distant from the Sea? Supposing the *English* Channel to be only 30 *Toises* broad, will it follow from thence that *Dover* and *Calais* are not upon the Sea.

(*D*) *It has also an Aqueduct.*] *Spon* (*d*) who saw that Aqueduct says, that it *serves for a Bridge to those who go on Foot, tho' it be hardly above three Foot broad, and has no Breast-height. Tho' a Man be never so Fearless, he Trembles when he goes over it, especially if he meets any Body that comes from the Place he goes to; for two Men have much ado to go over it abreast.* But Father *Coronelli* says (*e*) *it is a stately* Aqueduct, *built with Stone, and supported by three hundred and sixty Arches.*

(*E*) *The* Turks *made themselves Masters of it in the Year* 1479.] It was under *Mahomet* II. See the particulars of it in that Sultan's Life written (*f*) by M. *Guillet*: They are Curious enough. *Leonard Tocco* Dynaste of *Acarnania* was then Possest of *Sancta Maura*.

(*A*) *Was a Native of* Perche.] I know that according to *La Croix du Maine* and *Moreri*, he was a Native of *Chartres*; but I rather believe *John de Launoi*, who has these words; (*g*) *Claudius Sanctesius ortum habuit in ea Galliæ regione cujus populi nunc Perticenses, Gregorio Turonensi Pertenses, antiquioribus Aulerci Diablintes dicti fuere.*

(*B*) Were

α [illegible]

† [illegible]

β [illegible]

δ [illegible]

ζ [illegible]

* Moreri in the word Sainte de Saintes Letter C.

θ In Greek [illegible]

κ [illegible]

λ [illegible]

μ [illegible]

ν Id. ib.

ξ Id. ib.

‖ And not 1556, as Launoi will have it.

(*a*) Protestationi hoc unum [illegible] adjicio, mihi citra choreas, atque quemquam sive teri sive meti; quam de earum exercitio ne per somnium quidem cogitaverim tota vita, quam exemplo [illegible] illius [illegible] apud Plautum, ex Dei mei voluntate, in qua libenter acquiesco, transigo inter catenatas molestias & curas: unde & ferre possum Magistratuum Edicta, chorearum abolitionem perpetuam urgentia. *Id. ib. p.* 321.

(*b*) Ex Prosp. Mandosio Biblioth. Roman. & Oldoino Athen. Roman.

in 1566 ‡. He was ſo incenſed againſt the Proteſtants that he maintain'd that (*B*) thoſe, whom they had Baptized, were to be Baptized again. He left nothing unattempted to turn 'em out of his Dioceſe, and to get all the Canons of the Council of *Trent* (*C*) admitted into the Kingdom without any Reſtriction. He did not ſcruple to ſay that *Calvin* and *Beza* taught Atheiſtical Notions *. He ſided with the *League* with ſuch a Fury, that he maintain'd that *Henry* III. had been juſtly Aſſaſſinated, (*D*) and that *Henry* IV. deſerved the ſame Puniſhment. The Manuſcript, wherein he aſſerted that Doctrine, was found in his Cloſet, when *Biron* made himſelf Maſter of *Louviers*, and Seized upon that unhappy Prelate. He was not treated like a Priſoner of War, but he was ſent to *Caen* ‖ to be Tried; and becauſe he obſtinately continued to maintain that Pernicious Doctrine, he would have been put to Death, had not Cardinal *de Bourbon*, and ſome other Eccleſiaſticks who were with the King, prevail'd with him to Condemn him to a perpetual Impriſonment. He died ſoon after in his Confinement ‖: It was in the Year 1591. 'Tis to be obſerved that he had ſaid long before in a Book, to ſpite the Proteſtants, that (*E*) Subjects ought never to oppoſe the Ordinances of their Sovereigns. He Publiſh'd a ſmall Piece in 1561. to ſhew that Hereticks ought not (*F*) to be Tolerated. 'Tis a very Ancient Opinion, and very common

‡ The Proteſtants of Normandy had been [illegible]

‖ Taken from Thuanus. See his words in the Remark D.

(*B*) *Were to be Baptized again.*] He himſelf tells us that *Pius* V. having decided that thoſe, who had received Baptiſm among the Innovators, ought not to be Baptized again, order'd his Nuncio to command him and the other Preachers of *Paris* to teach no longer the contrary. That Brief of *Pius* V. is very ſcarce. I ſhall ſet down the words of Doctor *de Launoi*. *Ad annum MDLXXII. Lutetiæ concionabatur, cum Pius V. Pontifex ſtatuit, neque ſimpliciter, neque cum adjectione repetendum eſſe baptiſmum, quem Novatores dediſſent. Id teſtatur in Synodo, quam cum Epiſcopus fuit, anno MDLXXVII. habuit.* Quam, *inquit*, definitionem Pius Pontifex ante quinque vel ſex annos per Breve, ac per internuntium Apoſtolicum dignatus fuit nobis atque aliis, qui tum Lutetiæ Pariſiorum fungebamur concionatorum officio, ſignificare atque inhibere, ne aliter doceremus. *Breve illud vix invenitur* (*a*).

(*C*) *And to get all the Canons of the Council of* Trent *admitted into the Kingdom.*] This I ſhall prove from the words of the ſaid Doctor. *Porro autem*, ſays he (*b*), *in Epiſcopali munere nulli non pepercit labori ac diligentia, ſive ut hæreſim a finibus ſuis exterminaret, ſive ut Tridentini Concilii decreta penitus admitterentur ac ſervarentur.*

(*D*) *That* Henry *III. had been juſtly Aſſaſſinated.*] (*c*) *Captus in opido* (*d*) *Claudius Sanctius Ebroicenſium Epiſcopus famoſus Theologus regiis partibus infeſtiſſimus cum libris & chartis, inter quas ſcriptum repertum eſt, quo parricidium Regis tanquam juſte factum tuebatur, & idem licere in Regem hodiernum defendebat. Itaque non lege belli cum eo actum, ſed Cadomum ſub cuſtodia miſſus, ut in eum Senatus inquireret, & tanquam de perduelli ſupplicium ſumeretur. Nec enim ſacri ordinis prærogativæ in crimine læſæ Majeſtatis apud nos ratio habetur, ſed in convictos, ſive ſacerdotes ſive epiſcopi ſint, tanquam ſolutos ac profanos legum ſeveritas exercetur, parumque res ab executione abfuit: Sanctio jam peracto reo, ut erat pervicaci ingenio errorem præfracte propugnante. Sed interceſſerunt poſtea Cardinalis Borbonius aliique è ſacro ordine, qui cum Rege erant, tenueruntque, ut pro meritis pœna, quam legibus noſtris, ut ipſi fatebantur, meruerat, carceri perpetuo manciparetur, in quo paulo poſt deceſſit. Henry* IV. acted without doubt upon this occaſion according to the Clemency and Generoſity that were Natural to him; but he acted alſo out of a timorous Prudence, which frequently ſhook his great Courage, when he came to obſerve that the Monſter of the League he was to overcome, more fierce and dangerous than *Hercules*'s *Hydra*, would grow more furious and terrible by the Effuſion of his Blood. Wherefore that Prince thought himſelf obliged to uſe Mildneſs in order to Tame and Pacify that Wild Beaſt. Clemency on the one hand and Policy on the other ſaved *Sanctesius* the ſhame of loſing his Life upon a Scaffold, as he deſerved.

(*E*) *That Subjects ought never to* (†) *Oppoſe.*] The Book, wherein he advances this Opinion, was Printed at *Paris*, in 1561. with this Title, *Confeſſion de foi Catholique, contenant en bref la reformation de celle que les Miniſtres de Calvin preſenterent au Roi en l'Aſſemblée de Poiſſi.* The fifty ſeventh Article of that Confeſſion contains theſe Words: "We "hold that Subjects ought to obey their Laws and "Ordinances, to pay Tributes, Impoſts, and other "Duties, and bear the Yoke of Subjection with a "ready Will, *tho' Princes were Infidels, and the* "*Empire of GOD ſhould not be preſerved intire.* "And therefore we deteſt thoſe, who would reject "Superior Powers, ſet up Communities at their "Pleaſure, introduce a confuſion of Goods, and o"verthrow the Order of Juſtice. *We alſo reject* "all Murderers and Aſſaſſins, hired and ſworn to "follow and ſupport Sects, and *thoſe who declare* all "thoſe, who Diſpleaſe or Reſiſt them, *to be wor*"*thy of Death*, and *who get Kings*, Lords, Church"es and Towns, *attack'd under pretence of the word* "*of God.*" The Author undertook to ſhew that the Catholicks went farther than the Proteſtants; for the latter added a Clauſe to the Article, wherein they declared their Opinion about the Obedience of Subjects; (*e*) *Provided*, ſay they, *the Empire of God be preſerved intire.* Tho' this Clauſe has been often Reflected upon, as being too General and Captious, it is very Juſt and Orthodox, if it be rightly underſtood, tho' it may be wreſted to a Pernicious Senſe againſt the Intention of the Authors. But 'tis certain that *Sanctesius* left it out of his Confeſſion only out of Animoſity againſt *Geneva*; and no Man did ever contradict himſelf more Impudently than he did. Which is the uſual Fate of thoſe who argue without Principles, and embrace an Opinion only to differ from their Enemies, and have a pretence to inſult 'em. When that Paſſion is over, and the intereſt of their Party requires another thing, they renounce their firſt Opinions, and eſpouſe quite contrary ones. We have ſome late Inſtances of it.

(*F*) Hereticks *ought not to be Tolerated.*] His Book is Intituled, *Ad edicta veterum Principum de licentia ſectarum in Chriſtiana religione. Item methodus contra ſectas quam ſequuti ſunt primi Catholici Imperatores.* He approves that Hereticks ſhould be put to Death, and declares that if the Fires, which had been lighted in *France* to deſtroy Calviniſm, had not been extinguiſhed, that Sect had not prevail'd. (*f*) *Audivi Severum Sulpitium de Priſcilliani hiſtoria, quaſi tabulam abſolutionis per domos judicum aliquorum circumlatum, cum adhuc in Gallia exercerentur judicia de capite pro religione ex Chriſtianiſſimorum regum edictis, atque ex ea hiſtoria plus damni noſtræ fidei, quam a Calvino libris & emiſſariis illatum. Non enim ultro citroque intrepide commeaſſent, & ad factionem tot homines ſollicitaſſent, ſi conflagratio non fuiſſet temere reſtincta, & a nonnullis quaſi fides publica data religionis & Reipub. perturbatoribus.* The whole ſtrength of his Book is grounded upon Cuſtom and Practice; for he alledges few Reaſons, and none that's good. Whoever impartially compares the Arguments for or againſt Toleration, muſt needs confeſs that he could not have alledged any good Reaſon for Perſecution, tho' he had been a Man of much greater Abilities than he was.

(*a*) Launoius ibid. pag. 770.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 772.

(*c*) Thuanus lib. 101. pag. 412.

(*e*) Confeſſion of Geneva art. 40.

(*f*) Frater Claudius de Sainctes, in Methodo quam ſequuti ſunt principes cap. 13. fol. 112. verſo.

(†) ... are Hereticks, for they take up Arms againſt the Magiſtrates, ... will not Obey them, but are for Planting their Religion with ... Sword, that is only given to the Magiſtrates.

common to this very day, tho' no Doctrine was ever Confuted with more ſolid Arguments *. The Titles of his other Books may be ſeen in the Hiſtory of the College of *Navarre*. *Moreri* and *du Sauſſai* (G) have committed unpardonable Miſtakes. 'Tis to be obſerved that *Sanctesius* confeſs'd he was ſuſpected for ſome

was. The Reaſons for a Toleration have been ſet forth with the utmoſt Evidence by ſome late Writers. See the Prefaces to the Hiſtory of the Edict of *Nantes*; the Book (a) intituled, *Traité de la liberté de conſcience, ou de l'autorité des Souverains ſur la religion des peuples, oppoſé aux maximes de Hobbes & de Spinoſa, adoptées par le Sieur Jurieu dans ſon Hiſtoire du Papiſme, & dans ſon Syſtême de l'Egliſe*; the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words, *Compel them to come in*; and the *Latin* Letter Printed at *Tergow*, in 1689. *M. de Beauval* (b) aſcribed it to *M. Bernard*, a French Miniſter, very well known by his Works, and very well qualified to write a Book that contains ſuch a cloſe Reaſoning; but 'tis certain he is not the Author of it, and 'tis thought that Mr. *Locke* wrote it. But without undertaking to read a long winded Work, one needs only read a ſmall piece written at *London*, in 1685. by an Illuſtrious Magiſtrate (c) of a Town in *Holland*. It is Intituled, *H. V. P. ad B* * * * *de nupero Angliæ motibus Epiſtola, in qua de diverſorum à publica religione, circa divina ſentientium diſſeritur tolerantia.* That Letter was Printed at *Rotterdam*, in 1685. in *Latin*, *French* and *Dutch*.

The Reaſons alledged for Toleration muſt needs be very cogent, ſince all thoſe, who have done their utmoſt endeavours to Anſwer 'em, have been obliged to have recourſe to unfair Means, and to acknowledge that Hereticks ought not however to be puniſh'd with Death (d). Their Malice and Unfairneſs appear by their endeavouring to create a belief, that thoſe who are for Toleration favour the *Socinians*; that they are ill affected towards the Government, and deprive the Supreme Powers of one of the moſt conſiderable Rights that God has given 'em. This is a baſe and unjuſt Proceeding: At this rate one muſt not find fault with the Cruel Decrees, by virtue of which ſo many Proteſtants have been Burnt in *France*, the *Netherlands*, *Spain*, and *Italy*; for the *Socinians* do mightily exclaim againſt thoſe Cruelties. They inveigh no leſs againſt the Papiſts, who have put to Death thoſe, that are mention'd in the Proteſtant Martylogy, than againſt thoſe, who put to Death *Servetus*, *Gentilis*, &c. In a word, one muſt not write againſt the Pope, the Jews and the Turks; for 'tis manifeſt that *Socinus* and his Followers do not ſpare them. If thoſe, who undertake to ſhew that no Penal Laws ought to be Enacted againſt erring Men, are wanting to the reſpect they owe to Sovereigns; if they diveſt the Supreme Powers of one of their moſt conſiderable Rights; our late Apologiſts for Perſecution will be found guilty of that Crime, ſince they maintain that no Blood ought to be ſhed upon account of Religion. Do they not take away from Sovereigns the brighteſt Gem in their Crown? Have they not the Power of Life and Death over Malefactors? Beſides, can it be ſaid that God has put the Sword into the Hands of the Magiſtrates of *Holland*, to puniſh thoſe who Tranſgreſt againſt the firſt Table of the Law, as well as thoſe who Tranſgreſs againſt the ſecond, without reflecting upon 'em, and expoſing them to the Hatred of their Subjects? If this be true, is not their Toleration of Idolatry as great a Crime, as if they Tolerated Murderers and Highway-Men? Beſides, could there be any thing more Ridiculous than to inflict no other Puniſhment than Baniſhment upon Notorious Aſſaſſins and Poiſoners? See the diſpute of *Meſſieurs de Wallemburch* (e) about this Queſtion, Whether ſuppoſing that the Magiſtrates have a Right to puniſh Hereticks, they may put 'em to Death. They reduce their Diſpute with the *Lutherans* to this Queſtion; for they alledge the Famous *Gherard*, who was for Enacting Penal Laws againſt Sectaries, but did not approve that they ſhould be puniſh'd with Death. They clearly ſhew him that 'tis a Frivolous Exception. But in order to ſee the Confuſion of thoſe, who are againſt Toleration, we need only obſerve that they make bold to ſay, that the Sovereigns, who oppoſe the Introduction of a true Doctrine, are very commendable. " (f) I cannot blame the *Swiſs*, " *ſays one of 'em*, who will not permit by any means " the growth of any Sect amongſt 'em. *Holland* " abounds with different Religions. It were to be " wiſh'd that thoſe diſorders had been prevented " from the beginning." The Author of theſe words being a Miniſter, two Abſurdities contain'd in them were objected to him. The Catholick and the Reformed Cantons, was he told, " (g) will not Tolerate New Sects. Is it then upon this account " that you cannot blame them? How little is your " Zeal for the Propagation of your Religion? Is it " not your Duty to wiſh that the Catholick Cantons " would Tolerate the Reformed amongſt them, " and to blame them for refuſing to hear Jeſus " and his Prophets? Truly you are no good Apoſtle of Chriſt." He had been told before: (h) " If your Opinion had been followed in theſe happy Provinces———the Proteſtant Religion had " never prevail'd in it———And if *Spain* had been " always uppermoſt, and had prevented thoſe diſorders from the beginning, you would not live " ſo comfortably in the Habit you wear; for the " Proteſtant Religion would be ſo far from prevailing in this Country, that one would hardly " have a notion of it. Truly the Reformed are " very much beholden to you.

(G) Moreri *and* du Sauſſai *have committed unpardonable Faults.*] I only ſay this of ſome of 'em. I. I have already (i) obſerved *Moreri*'s miſtake about *Sanctesius*'s Country. II. He could not be at the Conference of *Poiſſy* after his return from the Council, ſince he did not go to that Council till after that Conference was held. III. How could *Charles* IX. who died the 30th of *May* 1574, name him to the Biſhoprick of *Evreux*, in the Year 1575? I don't queſtion that our Doctor ſued for that Dignity before that Prince died, and had a promiſe of it; but 'tis certain he did not obtain it till the Reign of *Henry* III. He himſelf ſays ſo; nor does he diſſemble that his Patron (k) told him in a (l) reproachful manner, that he ſued for Biſhopricks in remote Provinces, to free himſelf from the ſlavery of the Court. (m) *Quoniam Chriſtianiſſimi Regis Caroli mors interceſſit, ne qua factione vel gratia mutaretur, quod ſemel Principi placuerat. Quibus potuit precibus apud Reginam matrem, novum Regem, Regiſque fratrem, optimos maximos Principes, & Sanctitatem veſtram, ac fratrum Cardinalium claſſem egit, ut is mihi maneret Epiſcopatus; nec prius quievit, quam accepit promotionis meæ diploma ad te perferri. Quod accidit illis diebus, quibus Avenione, non annis, ſed curis Eccleſiæ ac reipublicæ confectus, agebat* (n) *animam: quaſi moriens hunc mihi cum Epiſcopatu tradidit & commendavit.* This ſhews that his Nomination was expedited at the Court of *France*, and ſent to the Court of *Rome* in *December* 1574; but becauſe he did not receive his Bulls before the Year 1575. *M. de Launoi* was in the right to ſay that he was preferr'd to a Biſhoprick in 1575. Here follow the groſs Miſtakes. IV. The Innovators mention'd by *Moreri* had ſo little Intereſt at the Court of *France*, before *Sanctesius* turn'd Rebel, that if they had undertaken to vent ſome Calumny againſt him, they would rather have done him good than harm. Perhaps they repreſented to *Henry* III. who was no leſs Perſecuted by the League than they, the exceſſes of that Factious Biſhop; but this was no Calumny. V. What an Abſurdity to pretend that they Poiſon'd him? He was no longer in a capacity to do them any Prejudice; for tho' he avoided the Puniſhment of death, he was to be confined in a Priſon the remaining part of his Life. VI. To ſay nothing of his Trial, and of the reaſon why he was thought to deſerve Death, is an unpardonable Omiſſion. *Spondanus* was guilty of the ſame Omiſſion: The Muſe, who preſides over Hiſtory, muſt needs look upon ſuch writers as great Prevaricators. *M. de Launoi* has not committed the ſame Fault; for he names the Author who mentions the Puniſhment of that Biſhop, and he thinks he deſerved it. (o) *Anno* M D XCI. *deceſſit perpetuo mancipatus carceri propter ea, quæ Jacobus Auguſtus Thuanus memoriæ tradidit in Hiſtoriarum libro* CI. *Sic virum tantum, & de Eccleſia* ſome time (*H*) of being inclin'd to Calviniſm; and that he repreſented Cardinal *de Lorraine* as a Faithful (*I*) under Perſecution. He was one of thoſe Divines, who found it a difficult thing to anſwer the paſſages of St. *Auguſtin* alledged by the Proteſtants againſt free Will. Wherefore he leſſen'd the Authority of that Holy Doctor as much (*K*) as he could in his Controverſial Writings about the Doctrine of Grace.

---

* *See the Remark* F.

(a) *Printed at Amſterdam* 1687. *in* 12.

(b) Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans *for* September 1689. art. 2.

(c) Mr. PAETS. *See a ſhort Encomium upon him in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres *for* October 1685. art. 2. pag. 1093. 1094 *of the* 2d. *Edition. That great Man died the* 8th *of* October 1686.

(d) *See the* 8. *Letter of the* Tableau du Socinianiſme.

(e) *See their Book* De unitate Eccleſiæ lib. 6. part. 1. cap. 2. & ſequent. pag. 222. & ſequent. edit. Colon. 1656. in 4.

(f) Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud, tom. 2. p. m. 335.

(g) [illegible]

(h) [illegible] *the Hero of John Calvin.*

(i) *In the Remark* A.

(k) *The* Cardinal de Lorraine.

(l) *Ante omnia me ut regni* [illegible] *quem non ignorem* CAPTASSE [illegible] *Epiſcopatus, ut me in libertatem a ſervitute aulica,* [illegible] *aſſererem.* Card. *Sanct*[illegible] *Epiſt. dedicator.* [illegible] *de Euchariſtia, ad Gregorium* XIII.

(m) *Sanctesius ibid.*

(n) *The* Cardinal de Lorraine *died at* Avignon, *the* [illegible] *of December* 1574.

(o) *Launoi ubi ſupra pag.* 7[illegible]

SALMACIS, a Fountain at *Halicarnaſſus*, which was ſaid to effeminate thoſe who (*A*) drank of, or went into it. The Poets being willing to Account for this ill quality, ſuppoſed that a Nymph, who was paſſionately in Love with *Hermaphroditus*, the Son of *Venus* and *Mercury*, threw her ſelf into that Fountain, whilſt he

ceta olim tam bene meritum periiſſe valde lubentem, niſi promendi cauſa id ipſe poſtulaſſet. I wonder the Miniſters of State ſuffer that ſo many Writers ſhould ſay nothing of the Biſhops Rebellion. Thoſe, who ſhall rebel hereafter, will be apt to think that Hiſtorians will take no notice of it.

Here follow the miſtakes of *Andrew du Sauſſai*. I. He ſays that *Sanctesius* was (*a*) Profeſſor in the Year 1533. in a Monaſtery of Regular Canons. II. He tells us that *Sanctesius* went to the Council of *Trent* before the Conference of *Poiſſy* was held. III. That he aſſiſted in a Provincial Council of *Rouen* in the Year 1576: but that Council was not held before the Year 1581. as *M. de Launoi* informs us (*b*), who adds that *Sanctesius* publiſh'd the Year following a *French* Tranſlation of the Acts of that Aſſembly, which he had (*c*) promoted and directed. IV. That invincible Hero of the *Gallican* Church did not confine himſelf within thoſe bounds, if we believe *du Sauſſai*. He and *Simon Vigor* diſputed with *Spina* and *du Roſier*, two of the chief Miniſters, and got a compleat Victory. That is, the Biſhop of *Evreux* was not contented to aſſiſt at a Provincial Synod in the Year (*d*) 1576. and to put in order and publiſh the Synodal Decrees of his Dioceſe, but engaged alſo in a regular diſputation with thoſe two Miniſters. What an Anachroniſm is here! That Conference was held 8 or 9 Years before *Sanctesius* came to be a Biſhop. V. He died in 1591. and not in the foregoing Year. VI. 'Tis an unexcuſable prevarication to mention the Death of that Prelate, and at the ſame time, to call him *eximius*, without ſaying any thing of his Rebellion, and Abominable Doctrine, and of the infamous puniſhment he was like to undergo. What *du Sauſſai* ſays of him is contain'd in 15. Lines. How many Faults would he have committed, if he had made an *Encomium* of 15 Pages?

(*H*) *Of being enclin'd to* Calviniſm.] He ſays thoſe Suſpicions were grounded on his appearing more moderate, when he engaged in a diſpute in *Nevers*-Houſe, than he ſeem'd to be at the Conference of *Poiſſy*. (*e*) *Ego qui Piſſiaci habebar acrior, & tantum non ſeditioſus, anno ſuperiore in collatione facta cum Spina & Roſeo Miniſtris, credebar mutatus, & paulo momento ad Calviniſmum poſſe impelli, quoniam de priſtina vehementia tantum remiſeram, quantum in domino Vigoreo Calviniſtis infeſtiſſimo Doctore magis ac magis cernebam inflammari & exardeſcere.*

(*I*) *Cardinal* de Lorraine *as a Faithful under perſecution.*] If we may believe *Sanctesius*, that Cardinal was very ſick *of the bruiſe of* Joſeph; he daily afflicted *his righteous Soul*, like another *Lot*, ſeeing the Evils of the Church. He was a dying every day in the midſt of the Tribulations and Anguiſhes he endured for the cauſe of God, and was continually preparing himſelf for Martyrdom, being told every day that there was a deſign upon his Life; and he would ſay ſometimes, Let's go and die with him. (*f*) *Per annos fere ſexdecim a comitatu illuſtriſſimi Principis, ac maximi Cardinalis Caroli Lotharingi, niſi alicujus officii publici cauſa, non receſſi, nec ille me ſtudiorum tantum, ſed ad exteros omnium profectionum, colloquiorum & negotiorum multorum, quæ difficillimis Galliæ temporibus ipſi contra hæreticos inciderunt, me participem fecit, ut tentationum & paſſionum, quibus per tot annos quotidie moriebatur, & omni hora de vita periclitabatur, cui quoties nunciabatur, paratas eſſe inſidias, tam parum timidus, quam nimium eſſe putabatur, ſolebat ad me converſus dicere: Sequaris Sacerdotem Levita; aliquando vero: Eamus, & moriamur cum illo. Cum deſereretur ab intimis, addebat: Socii paſſionum eritis & conſolationis.* Thoſe, who have read in *Mezerai* and other Catholick Writers, that this Cardinal was a Worldly, Proud and Voluptuous Man, that he had a great Power and intereſt (*g*), and violently perſecuted the Proteſtants, will not read this Deſcription of his glorious ſufferings without laughing. In another Book *Sanctesius* begs of God that he would ſtrengthen the Cardinal his Servant, perſecuted for a good Cauſe. (*h*) *Omittam vero libens tum pleraſque illius libelli ineptias, veluti quod invitum ipſe a ſuo ſodalibus hæc pertractare dicit, ac tandem etiam ſuo Cardinali virtutem & conſtantiam in perſecutionibus precatur, quæ quidem non ſine riſu legi poſſunt.* I have often thought of a thing, that would very much perplex the *Aſiaticks*, if they had a mind to take notice of that part of our Hiſtories of the XVI. and XVII. Centuries relating to the Troubles of Religion. Each Church complains that ſhe is under ſufferings, and looks upon her Victories as a means in God's hands to free her from the ſlavery and ſlaughter ſhe was threaten'd with. I need not ſhew that the Proteſtants expreſs themſelves in that manner with reſpect to the Conqueſts of *Guſtavus Adolphus*; but I ſhall make it appear that the Jeſuits did the ſame conſidering the great ſucceſs of the Emperor. In order to it I ſhall ſet down an Extract of a Letter written to *James Reihing* by a Jeſuit, who was Chaplain to the Famous Count *de Tilly*. (*i*) *Rem noſtram, id eſt Catholicorum ——— bene ſe habere hoc decreet bellum, in quo jam quarto anno verſor cum Illuſtriſſimo Comite de Tilli, &c. Erant mira Conſilia noſtrorum Adverſariorum ſed quam mirabilis in altis Dominus! molicbantur nobis internecionem, inciderunt in foveam, quam fecerunt: & ut libenter noſtri hoſtes confitentur, nunquam dediſſent, quod acceperunt, beneficium Vitæ. Ut vel inde pateat, quæ pars furorem, quæ ſequatur æquitatem.*

(*K*) *He leſſen'd the Authority of Saint* Auguſtin *as much as he could.*] The Janſeniſt, who publiſh'd in 1689. ſome Letters written by the Prince of *Conti* to Father *de Champs*, added to them among other things a Diſſertation intitled, *S. Auguſtin juſtifié du ſoupçon ou des apparences de Calviniſme*. I find the following paſſage in it concerning *Sanctesius*. "(*k*) He was one of thoſe, who thought it neceſſary "to maintain at all times an opinion contrary to "that of the Hereticks in order to get a compleat "Victory over them, and who conſidering the fright-"ful part of St. *Auguſtin's* Doctrine concerning Pre-"deſtination more than the Solid Foundation of the "Scripture and Tradition, on which it is grounded, "were too eaſily frighted at that Doctrine. That "Author made bold to ſay, *That* St. Auguſtin *wri-"ting againſt the* Pelagians *with too much heat, did "too haſtily deſpiſe the unanimous Opinion of all thoſe, "who lived before him.* A Man who ſpeaks of St. "*Auguſtin* in this manner, and charges him with "having altered his Opinion three times, does cer-"tainly deſerve to be delivered up to Father *de "Champs*, that he may deal with him, as he thinks "fit. Father *John Martinon*, likewiſe a Jeſuit, who "wrote under the diſguiſe of *Antoninus Moraines*, "was aſhamed of it. *That Author*, ſays he, *will "give me leave to obſerve that it had been better for "him, according to the reſpect that is due to ſo great "a Doctor, if he had conſtantly followed him, giving "ſometimes a favourable ſenſe to his Words, inſtead "of imputing to him ſuch an inconſtancy in his Opini-"ons.*

(*A*) *Thoſe who drank of, or went into it.*] *Strabo* having ſaid that the Fountain *Salmacis* was in *Halicarnaſſus*, adds that it had an ill Name, as having the Power of making thoſe, who drank of it, Voluptuous and effeminate. (*l*) Διαβεβλημένη οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ὁπόθεν, ὡς μαλακίζουσα τοὺς πίνοντας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς: *neſcio qua de cauſa infamis quod ex eo bibentes mollitiem contraherent.* But according to *Ovid* none could

(*g*) See the Article, and particularly the paſſages quoted out of Brantome.

(*h*) Beza, ad Claud. de Xaintes, Apolog. I. init. Oper. tom. 2. pag. 288.

(*i*) Johan. Agricola in epiſt. ad Jacobum Reihingum, apud Henning. Witte, Memoriæ Theologor. in Orat. funebri Reihingi, pag. 912, 913.

(*k*) Lettres du Prince de Conti, ou l'accord du libre arbitre avec la grace de J. Chriſt. pag. 190, 191.

(*l*) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 451.

he was bathing himſelf, and cloſely embraced him; and that her Careſſes and (B) entreaties not being able to move his Heart, ſhe begg'd of the Gods that ſhe might remain for ever in the Poſture ſhe was in. Her Requeſt was granted: Her Body and that of *Hermaphroditus* made but one Perſon with both Sexes. *Hermaphroditus* perceiving that Change, obtain'd from *Venus* and *Mercury* by his entreaties that the Water of that Fountain ſhould have the Virtue of making People effeminate. *Strabo* and *Vitruvius* deny that it had that Virtue, and alledge ſome other * Reaſons for the ill Report that was made of it. 'Tis a miſtake to ſay that this Son of

Venus

could experience ſuch a change without going into it.

Unde (a) ſit infamis, quare male fortibus undis
Salmacis enervet, tactoſque remolliat artus,
Diſcite.

. . . .

Quiſquis (b) in hos fontes vir venerit, exeat inde
Semivir, & tactis ſubito molleſcat in undis.

Strabo makes a judicious reflection upon this. Voluptuous Men, ſays he, in order to clear themſelves aſcribe to the Elements what proceeds only from the ill uſe they make of their Wealth. Good Cheer makes 'em lewd, and they find Fault with the Air and Water; which is a great illuſion. (c) Ἔοικε δ' ἡ τρυφὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων αἰτιᾶσθαι τὰς ἀέρας ἢ τὰ ὕδατα. τρυφῆς δ' αἴτια οὐ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ πλοῦτος, καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς διαίτας ἀκολασία. *Enimvero luxuria hominum videtur in aeris & aquæ temperiem culpam referre; atqui non hæc cauſam luxuriæ præbent, ſed divitiæ & victus intemperans ratio.* According to *Vitruvius* the Fountain *Salmacis* was reported to have that ill quality, not becauſe thoſe, who drank of it, became Lewd and Voluptuous, but becauſe it afforded the Barbarians an opportunity of growing Civil and Tractable, and leaving off their Fierceneſs: For being expell'd by the Colony, which the *Argivi* ſettled in *Halicarnaſſus*, they (d) were obliged to return to that Fountain for want of Water, and ſo they converſed with the Grecians, and grew polite.

(B) *Her intreaties not being able to move his Heart.*] *Hermaphroditus* began to Travel in the World at 15 Years of Age. He was a very handſome Boy; the Nymph *Salmacis* did no ſooner perceive him on the Banks of her Fountain but ſhe fell in Love with him. Tho' her Amourous paſſion (e) made her very impatient, ſhe trick'd up her ſelf and Painted her Face before ſhe went to him. Her Compliment contain'd few needleſs things: If you are not a God, ſaid ſhe to him, you look like one: Happy is your Father, happy are your Mother, your Siſter and your Nurſe, but happier ſtill ſhe, who is, or ſhall have the Honour to be your Wife. If you are a Married Man, be unfaithful to your Wife for my ſake; and if you are not Married, I deſire to become your Wife immediately.

Sed (f) longe cunctis longeque beatior illa eſt,
Si qua tibi ſponſa eſt, ſi quam dignabere tæda.
Nunc tibi ſive aliqua eſt, mea ſit furtiva voluptas:
Seu nulla eſt, ego ſim, thalamumque ineamus eundem.

Theſe Words made the Young Man bluſh; but his Modeſty and his ſilence did not put a ſtop to her violent Paſſion: She ask'd him many Kiſſes, at leaſt ſuch as are given to a Siſter: And at leaſt ſhe was ready to take him by the neck, when he plainly told her that he would run away, if ſhe would not be quiet (g). She withdrew and hid her ſelf in a Thicket, and perceiving *Hermaphroditus* in the Water, ſhe was ſo inflamed with Love that ſhe threw her ſelf into it ſtark naked. She took hold of him, kiſs'd him, and hugg'd him ſo cloſely that he was not able to extricate himſelf: But ſhe could not prevail upon him; he perſiſted in his indifferency.

Veſte (h) procul jacta, mediis immittitur undis,
Pugnantemque tenet, luctantiaque oſcula carpit;
Subjectatque manus, invitaque pectora tangit
Et nunc hac juveni, nunc circumfunditur illac.
Denique nitentem contra, elabique volentem
Implicat ut ſerpens, quam regia ſuſtinet ales.

. . . .

Perſtat Atlantiades, ſperataque gaudia Nymphæ
Denegat: illa premit, demiſſaque corpore toto
Sicut inhærebat, Pugnes licet, improbe, dixit,
Non tamen effugies. Ita dii jubeatis, & iſtum
Nulla dies à me, nec me deducat ab iſto!
Vota ſuos habuere deos.

It was then that the Nymph begg'd of the Gods that ſhe might never be parted from the beloved object ſhe held between her Arms. What ſhe ask'd was granted her; and this was the Origin of *Hermaphrodites*.

Every Body knows the Moral reflections grounded upon that Fable; but every Body does not know the myſtery that ſome have found in it. They pretend that the Ancients meant by it, that the fair Sex ought not to begin the Attack, but leave it to Men, and ſtand upon the defenſive. If the parts were changed, ſay they, there would be a great decay in the Empire of Love. 'Tis true that Women would make Vigorous and Furious Attacks; but Men would make a better defenſe ſtill. See M. *de Fontenelle* in his Dialogue between *Sappho* and *Laura*; the reſult of which is as follows. (i) "Men would defend themſelves too well. When 'tis required that a Sex ſhould make a reſiſtance, 'tis required it ſhould be ſuch as to make the Conqueror reliſh the Victory. A Sex ought not to be ſo weak as to ſurrender immediately, nor ſo ſtrong as never to ſurrender. This is our Character, and perhaps it would not be that of Men. Believe me, after many Reaſonings about Love or any other matter whatſoever, it will be found at laſt that things are well as they are, and that a Reformation would ſpoil all." It were a difficult thing to foreſee what would happen, if the Sex that reſiſts ſhould become the *Aggreſſor*, and if the Sex which Attacks ſhould ſtand upon the defenſive. The conjectures, that may be made upon ſome few haſty advances of the fair Sex, which have proved unſucceſsful, cannot be depended upon. 'Tis likely that ſuch advances have oftner ſucceeded. What is certain is that Men upon a Thouſand occaſions where in they ſtand upon the defenſive, betray a great weakneſs, make but little reſiſtance, and are baſely overcome. Tho' they are convinced that they have been deceived and betrayed, tho' they are reſolved to Revenge themſelves, tho they threaten, and ſwear they will never ſee that unfaithful Woman; yet ſome Flattering Words, ſome Sighs, and one or two Tears will quickly pacify them (k). Being ſenſible that what is required of them is unjuſt and ſhameful, they are reſolved not to grant it; but can they refuſe it, if it be begg'd of them with great importunity, and if they mind the craftineſs and fawning of a Cocquet? 'Tis a great miſtake to depend upon their reſiſtance: If Nature had put 'em upon the defenſive, they would be quickly overcome. 'Tis better that the reſiſting part ſhould be allotted to Women. Let us remember *Moliere*'s weakneſs (l).

As for thoſe, who in order to prove that reſiſtance has not been rightly allotted to Women, maintain that they defend themſelves only by an ill Principle: they ought to be rejected as moroſe and unjuſt Cenſurers: And tho' they ſhould repeat a Hundred times over and over that Women make a reſiſtance only to kindle a greater fire, and excite a more violent deſire, without pretending to a final perſeverance; tho' they ſhould ſay as many times that the Reaſon why they diſpute the ground, is becauſe they are afraid of giving a quick diſguſt, and that therefore their long delay is not very meritorious, they ſhould not deſerve to be heard. Neither they, nor their Verſes (†) ought to be minded. Grant 'em only that nice Men are willing to meet with ſome difficulties, and not well pleaſed when they meet with none, being not like the Man upon whom the following Epigram was made.

Hoc (m) te nomine prædicas beatum,
Gilli, quòd facili fruare amica
Et benigna adeò, ut rogata nondum,
Mox ſupina cadat, pedeſque tollat.
Sed erras nimiùm, miſelle Gilli:
Nam quæ nil penitus negare neſcit,
Opus, non homines, amat puella:
Et quæcunque nimis cadit libenter,
Surgit iſta nimis quoque libenter.

(a) Ovid. Metam. lib. [illegible] [illegible] (c) Strabo [illegible] (d) Deſcendebant aquatum ad [illegible] ſibi fontem, atque ibi in [illegible] tabernis [illegible] Græcorum conſuetudinem & ſuavitatem ſua voluntate reducebantur. Hinc aqua illa, non impudico morbi vitio, ſed humanitatis dulcedine mollitis animis barbarorum eam famam eſt adepta. Vitruvius lib 2. c. 8.

(e) Nec tamen ante adiit, etſi properabat adire, Quam ſe compoſuit, quam circumſpexit amictus, Et finxit vultum, & meruit formoſa videri. Ovid. Met. lib. 4. v. 317.

(f) Id. ib. v. 325.

(g) Poſcenti Nymphæ ſine fine ſororia ſaltem Oſcula, jamque manus ad eburnea colla ferenti, Deſinis? aut fugio, tecumque ait, iſta relinquo. Ovid. ib. v. 334.

(h) Id. ib. v. 357.

Venus and *Mercury* (C) was Born with both Sexes, and that according to *Peter Gregory* 'twas *Mercury* who shewed so much indifference for the Nymph *Salmacis*.

SAMBLANCAI (JAMES DE BEAUNE, BARON DE) Superintendant of the Finances in the Reign of *Francis* I. was Condemn'd to be hanged for imbezling the King's Treasure. That Sentence was executed ‡ the 12 of *August* 1527, but he was declared Innocent some * time after his Death. He was a Native of || *Touraine*. I shall set down somewhat at large (*A*) the circumstances of his Trial, as they are to be found in a Book of *Varillas*.

SAMBLANCAI (WILLIAM DE BEAUNE, BARON DE) the Son of the foregoing, was the Father of four Sons and one Daughter, who made a great Figure in the Court of *France*. I. *James de* BEAUNE, *Baron de* SAMBLANCAI, Viscount of *Tours*, &c. was the Eldest. He was Knight of the Order of St. *Michael*, and Gentleman of the King's Bed Chamber in Ordinary; and left behind him but one Daughter, who was very much talk'd of by Reason of her Beauty and Galantry under the Name of Madam *de* † *Sauve*. The III. Son of *William de Beaune* was known by the Name of *la Tour d' Argi*, and was the Father of *Mary de BEAUNE*, the

‡ Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitain fol. [illegible] where [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible]

* Varillas Hist. de François I. B. 7. p. m. 260.

|| Bouchet ibid. verso

I repeat the Words of M. *de Fontenelle*, *Things are well as they are*. If the Question was about Bodily strength, they should want to be reformed; the resisting part had not been rightly allotted: But since the question is about Attacks upon the Heart, it ought to be the Lot of the Sex, which exceeds the other in Beauty, good Air, and Address.

(*C*) *It was Born with both Sexes and that* ——— *'twas Mercury, who shewed so much indifference.*] A Modern Author says that *Venus* being got with Child by *Mercury*, was delivered of a Child, which had both Sexes. (*a*) *Venerem a Mercurio compressam autumant (poetæ) talem prolem genuisse, quæ sexum utrumque participaret, sicuti apud Ovidium* lib. 4. Metamorph. *videre est, dum scribit.*

Mercurio puerum & diva Cithereide natum
Naiades Ideis enutrivere sub antris,
Cujus erat species, in qua materque paterque
Cognosci possent, nomenque traxit ab istis.

Item;

Nec duo sunt, sed forma duplex, nec fœmina dici,
Nec puer ut possit, neutrumque & utrumque videtur.

Tamen eundem ex Mercurio & Salmacide, una Nympharum Naiadum genitum dicit Petrus Gregorius in Syntagm. Jur. univ. lib. 7. cap. 2. num. 8. There are two things in these Words, which want to be rectified. The two last Verses do not concern the State that the Son of *Venus* was in, before *Salmacis* embraced him; for he had then only the Masculine Sex: They concern the State he found himself in, when the Prayers of *Salmacis* were heard. There is a vast Number of such Proofs in Authors. Here are the Words of *Gregorius Tolosanus*. *Non secus quam & illi nugantur qui cum fabula Ovidii* lib. (*b*) Metamorph. fab. 10. (*c*) *narrant Androgynem factum ex Salmacide una Nympharum Naiadum, & filio Mercurii*. That Civilian had been saying that according to *Plato* all Men were at first *Androgynes*, but being divided into two nothing remain'd of 'em but the Name, which became a shameful one. *Plato* does not say (*d*) that all Men were *Androgynes*, but he observes that this Name was (*e*) opprobrious. He is in the right to say so, for besides that 'tis question'd whether *Hermaphrodites* are not Monsters, that Name is bestowed upon the most infamous Debauchees. *Licet etiam Hermaphroditus is dicatur, qui turpiter & facit & patitur adversus & aversus impudicus, uti docet Suidas in voce* ἑρμαφρόδιτος (*f*). There is a Book Intitled, *l'Isle des Hermaphrodites nouvellement descouverte, avec les mœurs, loix, coustumes & ordonnances des habitans d'icelle*. 'Tis an ingenious Satyr upon the Court of *Henry III*.

(*A*) *The Circumstances of his Trial.*] The King being informed that *Lautrec* had not received the Money design'd for him, sent for *Samblancai*; (*g*) “and instead of calling him his Father, as he used to do, look'd upon him with an ill Eye, and ask'd him why he had not remitted to *Lautrec* the three Hundred Thousand Crowns, which had been promised so positively. *Samblancai* not being yet sensible of the danger he was in, answered with his usual ingenuity, that upon the same day that Assignments for the *Milanese* had been drawn up, his Majesty's Mother came to the Treasure, and demanded the whole Payment of what was due to her, as well in Pensions and Gratifications, as for the Dutchies of *Valois*, *Touraine* and *Anjou*, that were given her: That he represented to her that if he should give her such a great Sum all at once, the King's Treasure would be drained, and the Fund design'd for the Dutchy of *Milan* diverted contrary to what had been ordered by the King that Morning in her presence, and which she had agreed to: But that this Princess persisted in her demand, and threatned to undo him, if he refused to give her whatever she ask'd: And upon his Representing to her that his Life would be in danger, if *Lautrec* found no Money at his Arrival at *Milan*, she replied that her Interest with the King was sufficient to prevent his being prosecuted, and that if he should be call'd to an Account for misapplying the Money design'd for *Italy*, 'twas but saying he (1) had done it by her order. The King, to be better informed of the matter, sent for his Mother, and *Samblancai* repeated the whole Story in her presence; upon which she fell into such a passion, that notwithstanding the respect she owed to her Son, she gave the Lye to *Samblancai*, and desired to be revenged of that Rash Man, who pretended that she was Guilty of High-Treason. But because it would have appeared by the Dates of the Receipts she had left in the King's Treasure, that she had received the Money design'd for *Lautrec*, she confess'd that she had demanded the Payment of her Pensions; but she maintain'd that *Samblancai* had paid her the Money, without telling her that it was to be sent into *Italy*. She denied what *Samblancai* had further said, and so earnestly desired he should be Imprison'd, protesting however that it was only the better to clear her self of the Crime laid to her Charge, that the King was obliged to get him Arrested in the Anti-Chamber. —— (*h*) *Samblancai* was no sooner a Prisoner but (*i*) Commissioners were appointed for his Trial ——— The imbezling of the King's Treasure was the only Crime he was Tried for; and he was Condemn'd to Death, whether because the Judges were afraid of exasperating the King's Mother if they should Vote for a lesser Punishment, or because they were prepossest with an Opinion that a Man cannot have for a long time the management of the King's Money with clean hands. The Execution was publick ——— All Authors don't agree about the Circumstances I have mention'd, and some will have it that *Samblancai* was undone by another Court Intrigue. They say (2) that the Queen's Mother gave him some Receipts written and sign'd with her own hand for the Money she demanded of him; but that the chief (3) Deputy of that Treasurer fell passionately in Love with a Lady belonging to the Queen's Mother, who persuaded him to steal the Receipts of that Princess, which was done; that the Queen's Mother being thereby enabled to undo *Samblancai*, denied that she had received any Money of him, and *Samblancai* not finding the Receipts to convict her, was Apprehended and Condemn'd; that he was publickly Executed; and that the Truth did not come out till the Queen's Mother being a dying revealed it to the King, and beg'd his Pardon for it. Lastly some Manuscripts import that in order to ruin *Samblancai* a vast Sum was demanded of him for the Pressing Necessities of the State; that he excused himself not only because the King's Treasure was empty, but

also

(1) *In the Trial of James de Beaulnes Seigneur de Samblançay, the King's Treasurer.*

(*h*) Varillas ibid. pag. 215.

(*i*) Viz. Chancellor du Prat, *who was beholden for his Fortune to the King's Mother*, President Gentil, *and some other Counsellors who were the Chancellor's Friends.* Varillas ibid. pag. 216. *Belcarius seems to me more credible, who does not say that Chancellor du* Prat, bipedum omnium nequissimus, *was one of the Commissioners but that he chose them.* Belcarius, l. 17. n. 12.

(2) *Towards the latter end of the old Chronicle of* Angers.

(3) *Viz.* Gentil. *who was made afterwards* President.

the Wife of *Anne de Montmorency* Marquis *de Turi*. The IV. was † Chancellor to *Catherine de Medicis*, Bishop of *Puy*, and Abbot ‖ of *Royaumont*. He died in 1565. I have skipp'd the II. because I have so many things to say of him that I design to bestow a Paragraph upon him. The Daughter was Married first (y) to *Louis Burgensis*, first Physician to the King, and *Sieur de Montgauguier*; and then she was the fourth Wife of *Claudius Gouffier*, Marquis *de Boisi*, Duke of *Rouanez*, Master of the Horse to the King. She died without issue. *Brantome* * says that before she was call'd Madam *de Rouanez*, she went by the Name of Madam *de Chateaubriant*. He adds that she was *a great Favourite of Queen* Catherine de Medicis *her Mistress*. He is in the right to say so; *Thuanus* (A) says the same.

RENAUD DE BEAUNE the II. Son of *William*, was Arch-Bishop of *Bourges* and then of *Sens* in the Reign of *Henry* IV. and one of the most Eloquent and Learned Prelates of that time. What made him most remarkable was that he did not depart, as so many other Ecclesiasticks did, from the Laws of the Kingdom concerning the Succession to the Crown. He maintain'd to the last that tho' the King of *Navarre* was a Heretick, the Crown of *France* did lawfully belong to him after the Decease of *Henry* III. In order to maintain this Assertion he set forth in the Conferences of *Surene* ‡ the most specious Reasons that the Law and the Scripture can afford: But his Wit, Eloquence, and Learning did not persuade the Deputies of the League; for besides their being resolved not to yield, whether they could answer the Reasons of the Royalists or not, they were headed by *Peter d'Epinac* Arch-Bishop of *Lyons*, who was not inferior to *Renaud de Beaune* in Wit, Eloquence and Learning, and who alledged as well (B) as he Divine and Humane Laws; so that after

"also because the King owed him above three Hundred Thousand Livres, which afforded a pretence to make him give an Account of his Administration; that he gave it, and because his Papers were in good order, he made it appear that his Majesty owed him the Sum mention'd by him; that the thing had gone no farther, if he had been as great a Politician as he was a great Financier; but that he unseasonably prosecuted those who had unjustly accused him, being not contented with his Glorious Defense, and pretending to receive immediately the Money the King owed him, tho' no Body knew better than he that his Majesty was not able to pay him; that *Samblancai* was the worse for it, because the Ministers not knowing how to get rid of his importunity, bribed a Man of *Tours* called *Prevot*, his Deputy, who stole from him the private Receipts; that when they had in their hands what prevented his being convicted of imbezling the King's Money, he was Arrested, and Commissioners out of the Parliaments of *Paris* and *Bourdeaux* were appointed to try him; that he desired to be tried by his Ordinary, who was the Arch-Bishop of *Tours*, by Virtue of his Letters of Tonsure which he shewed, but that the Arch-Bishop, who was his Son, happen'd to die at that time; that *Samblancai* was (4) Condemn'd to be hanged, and Executed on the 14 of *August* 1523. being 62 Years of Age; that he was carried to the Gallows at *Monfaucon* at one of the Clock in the Afternoon, and that he got his Execution put off till seven a Clock in the Evening, in hopes that the King would send him his Pardon upon the Ladder, as he had sent it to *Saint Vallier* upon the Scaffold; but that the Person, who attended on him, having at last told him that there was (5) no Pardon to be hoped for, he put himself into the Hands of the Executioner, saying that he knew too late that it was better to serve the King of Heaven than the Kings of the Earth, and that if he had done for God what he had done for the King, he had been better rewarded. Nevertheless it appears by the Epigrams of the Famous Poet *Clement Marot*, which contain several particulars of the Life of *Francis* I. not to be found any where else, that *Samblancai* died courageously, and that the Timorousness of the Person, who attended on him to the place of Execution, gave a greater lustre to his Courage."

The first Account of this Author is a Paraphrase upon *Belcarius*, who (a) observes that *Lautrec* fell under the King's Mother's indignation, because he spoke too freely of her Amorous Intrigues. Take Notice of *Genlis*, who according to *Varillas* had been one of *Samblancai*'s Judges, was hanged (b) some Years (c) after.

(A) Thuanus *says the same.*] He says (d) that *Margaret de* (e) *Beaune*, the Wife of *Claudius Gouffier*, Marquis *de Boisi*, Sister to *Renaud de Beaune* Arch-Bishop of *Bourges*, procured very noble Employments to her Brother, because she had a great interest at Court; so far that *Rouanez* was erected into a Dutchy in consideration of her Marriage with the Marquis *de Boisi*. (f) *Commendatione sororis Margaritæ gratiosæ in aula fœminæ, quæ sub id Claudio Gouferio Bossii marchioni & Rodamnæ ob id creato duci magno Franciæ scutifero nupsit, maximis jam tum negotiis adhibitus, etiam Francisci Alenconii Ducis Cancellarius fuit.* This is one of the things Daughters are good for in a Family: They are sometimes the only cause of the Fortune of their Brothers and Relations. Perhaps *Renaud de Beaune*, notwithstanding all his fine qualities, would have remain'd all his Life time in a mean Condition, had not his Sister's interest put him in the way of raising himself, and discovering his Merit. That Historian adds, that the Family of *Beaune* and that of *Thou* had Contracted a very strict Friendship long before; and that after the sad Death of *James de Beaune* Superintendant of the Finances, his Children forsaken by every body at Court and in the City, as it happens on like occasions, found a Sanctuary among the *de Thou's*; that *Renaud de Beaune* lodged for some time in the House of *Augustin de Thou* Grand Father to the Historian, and that from that very time there was a talk of Marrying *Christopher de Thou*, *Augustin*'s Son, to *Margaret de Beaune*, *Renaud*'s Sister; that tho' this Project had no effect, that Lady had always been a Friend to *Christopher de Thou*, and used her Interest for him, when she was in Favour, more than for any Body else, except her Brothers: that she intrusted him with her last Will, as being her particular Friend, many Years before she died. Besides she made him Executor of her Will (g).

(B) *Who alledged, as well as he, Divine and Humane Laws.*] *Thuanus* has inserted in the 106th Book of his History the substance of what was alledged on both sides. *Cayet* (h) relates it more at large, and says (i) among other things that the Arch-Bishop of *Bourges*, who could not deny *that each party alledged several examples, and made use of the Authority of the Scripture to prove their Opinions*, confined himself to this Maxim, that one might have the right understanding of the Scripture, "by invoking the Holy Spirit of God, who gives it to those, who ask for it, and imprints the knowledge of Truth in their minds, *intellectum bonum das petentibus eum.*" He added "that the Voice of Christ and his Apostles was evident, and that Christians were continually told that they ought to fear God, Honour the King, and render to God what is due to him, and to *Cæsar* what belongs to him; that every Soul was to obey the Powers ordained by God—— But that he would no longer confute the passages, and Examples, that had been alledged, notwithstanding which one ought to do what is expresly Commanded in the Word of God." This seems to be his meaning: When the Scripture is made use of to maintain Contrary Opinions, the best way to Extricate one

(y) In Brodeau's Pratique criminelle.

(z) In the Annales d'Aquitaine.

(a) Eam (matrem) ad invisum Lautrecum infestam, quod de ejus impudicitia liberius loquentem saepe, reperit. Belcarius Comment. rerum Gallicar. lib. 17. n. 12. p. 504.

(b) *See his Epitaph in Beza's Juvenilia fol. m. 30 verso.*

(c) Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitaine fol. 281. *says it was about the Year 1538. and that he was President in the Court of Inquests in the Parlament of Paris, and a Native of Italy, and that he was guilty of stealing the Receipts of Treasurer* Foucher, *who had been hanged at* Paris *for want of 'em.*

(d) Thuan de vita sua lib. 3. p.m. 1194.

(e) Mr. le Laboureur, addit. to Castelnau, tom. 1. pag. 322. & *Father* Anselme Hist. des grands Officiers de la Couronne, p. 469. call him Claudius.

aſter many fine Diſcourſes they were obliged to think of (C) another Expedient, *viz.* That the King of *Navarre* ſhould change his Religion. This was the only thing which cut the Gordian Knot. The Pleadings of *Renaud de Beaune* do (D) at this day more Honour to the Clergy of *France*, than they did then good to *Henry* IV. *Thuanus* ſays a remarkable thing of this Prelate, which is, that he was (E) a prodigious Eater. I add * that he was at firſt Counſellor in the Parliament of *Paris*, afterwards Preſident of the Inqueſts, and then Maſter of the Requeſts; after that Biſhop of *Mande*, and Chancellor to the Duke of *Alençon*, Son of *Henry* II. He had an admirable Memory; for Forty Years after he had Learned Humane Learning under *James Tuſanus* and *James Strazel*, he remembred the fine Paſſages which they had taught him in good *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, and apply'd them with a good Grace, and very judiciouſly, tho' the great Affairs that paſſed thro' his Hands might have blotted out of his Memory thoſe old Ideas which he had no leiſure to refreſh †.

The

one ſelf is humbly to implore the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit. And then we may be able to diſcover the Truth, knowing that the expreſs Orders of God ought to be our Rule, and not ſome particular Examples, which ſeem to be an Exception to thoſe Orders. This Maxim ſeems to be reaſonable, but I don't ſee how it can compoſe Differences; for each Party will boaſt that they have implored the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, and will maintain, if the Intereſt of their Cauſe requires it, that Commands ought to be explain'd by Examples, that is, that their Caſe requires that the example of the *Maccabees*, &c. ſhould be imitated, inſtead of conforming to *St. Paul's* Precept, *Let every Soul be ſubject to the Higher Powers.* And therefore it ought to be granted, that whilſt Sovereigns have no better ſupport than the Doctrines of Divines, they reſt upon Weather-Cocks, that turn with every Wind, and uſe the Word of God as a Wax Noſe, to the great Scandal of Good and Pious Souls, and the great ſatisfaction of Prophane Men.

(C) *They were forced to take another Courſe.*] *Maimbourg* does agreeably and neatly relate what he took out of *Victor Cajet.* "The two Heads of "the Deputation on both ſides, *ſays he* (a), two "of the moſt Dexterous and Eloquent Men of their "Age, were Men of too great Abilities, and main-"tain'd their Opinions with too much Wit and "Strength, to come to an agreement in their Diſ-"pute. The Arch-Biſhop of *Bourges* in the three "Speeches he made to prove his Aſſertion, and "to confirm it by confuting the Anſwer made to it, "alledged the ſtrongeſt Arguments to perſuade "the Leaguers of theſe three things, which he "conſtantly maintain'd to the laſt as ſo many un-"deniable Truths. 1. That Men are obliged to "acknowledge for their King the Perſon, to whom "the Kingdom belongs, by the inviolable Right "of a lawful Succeſſion, without any regard to the "Religion he Profeſſes, or to his Morals." 2. That King *Henry* IV. was neither a Heathen nor an Arian, nor a Perſecutor of the Catholick Church, and was reſolved to renounce his Errors, aſſoon as he ſhould be inſtructed in the Truth. 3. That all the *French* ought to acknowledge him, and then unanimouſly endeavour to inſtruct him. The Arch-Biſhop of *Lyons* (b) anſwered, thoſe three Points, and declared that as long as the King of *Navarre* remained an Heretick they would have no Commerce with him. The Arch-Biſhop of *Bourges* replyed with great force; but ſeeing the Leaguers were not to be ſhaken, he told them the King was reſolved to be Converted (c). Here is a Sovereign King, who cannot obtain of his Subjects, that they would have the goodneſs to permit him to ſerve God according to the Light of his Conſcience. It's a ſhame to Chriſtianity to have introduced into the World ſo great a Diſorder. It is the part of Subjects to beg liberty of Conſcience of their Sovereign; but here are Subjects who refuſe it to him.

(D) *More Honour to the Clergy of* France.] The League has furniſhed the Proteſtants with abundance of Killing Arguments againſt the Seditious Maxims of the Court of *Rome*, adopted by an infinity of Lay-Men and Eccleſiaſticks. Theſe Objections would have been ſtronger, if all the Clergy of *France* had followed the Rebellion; but ſince one of the Principal Prelates ſpeaking for a conſiderable part of the Catholicks, maintain'd ſo ſolemnly the Doctrine of Obedience, they fancy there's nothing to be feared for the Future, and that the Acts of the Conference of *Surene* can afford both defenſive and offenſive Arms.

(E) *That he was a prodigious Eater.*] Scarce had he ſlept four Hours (d), but Hunger forced him to riſe and eat his Break-Faſt, which he did regularly at One a Clock in the Morning, or rather ſooner; he repoſed till Four a Clock, and then he went to Eat: He did the ſame at Eight: He Dined at the uſual Hours: He Eat four Hours after: He Eat a large Supper at the ordinary time, and took a Collation before he went to Bed. He did not Eat after the *French* Faſhion; for in Winter he was at leaſt an Hour at Table, and an Hour and a quarter in Summer. For this reaſon he cared not to Dine abroad, and when a great Prince who had often Invited him, and found him always Armed with Excuſes, asked him the reaſon of his refuſal, he gave him this Anſwer, *you do not Eat like a Man, but like a Dog*; that is, you make too much haſte. That Prince promiſed him to remedy this Inconvenience, and was as good as his word, for he ordered his Steward that when this Prelate ſhould be there, he ſhould put a pretty diſtance of time between each Courſe. (e) *Cibum autem ita per otium ſumebat, ut ſumendo horam integram impenderet hieme, æſtate; in qua tardior orexis, horæ etiam quadrantem adderet, & ambulantibus, quales in aula noſtra, cœnis ſummopere offendebatur; adeo ut cum ſæpius a principe primario ad prandium invitaretur, & toties ſe excuſaret, rogatus qui id faceret, facete reſponderit, illum non humano ſed canino more prandium uſurpare, feſtinatas nimis epulas intelligens. Quo intellecto ille eum ſe non ſolum laute quod ſemper faciebat, ſed prolixe accepturum promiſit, & eo invitato ſemper ſtructorem monebat, ut miſſibus apponendis legitimum tempus interponeret.* Another thing in him was very ſingular, that this prodigious quantity of Meat did not make him heavy nor (f) drowzy, nor full of Vapours. He was always well diſpoſed for the Exerciſes of the Mind; as for thoſe of the Body he peformed none, he was even afraid of Walking for fear of exciting his Appetite. (g) *In tanta ciborum, quibus alebatur copia, cum nec membrorum agitatione, nec deambulationibus, ne exuperantem appetitum proritaret, corpus exerceret, naturam ſucco nimio turgentem medicamentis purgantibus crebro adjuvabat, quæ medicæ rei non ignarus domi per homines peritos ſibi parabat. Itaque raro ægrotabat, & quamvis in ſumma corporis pigritia mens ſemper laboraret, nunquam fatigabatur.* What *Thuanus* ſays of this method of Eating at the Court of *France* in haſte, and as it were walking, which did not pleaſe our *René de Beaune*, puts me in mind of a Story I have heard more than once. It's well known that Marſhal *de Turenne* Commanded Armies where were many Forreign Officers. They praiſed the Good Chear of his Table, but could not endure that the Meals ſhould be ſo ſhort, and eſpecially when they obſerved that the *French* Officers were ſcarce riſen from Table, but they began to aſk one another what ſhall we do? Alaſs! Said the Strangers, we were ſo well at Table; you ſeem'd ſo impatient that one would have thought you had ſome great Buſineſs to diſpatch, and now you know not what to do. Why didn't you keep where you where, ſince you don't know how to ſpend the time?

(F) The

---

* Thuan. de vita propria, lib. 1. pag. m. 1194.

† Id. ib.

(a) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, Book 4. p. m. 4..

(b) Ibid. pag. 4..

(c) Ibid. pag. 472.

(d) Thuan. de vita propria, lib. 1. circa init. pag. 1194.

(e) Id. ib.

(f) Nunquam commotior aut ſomnolentior viſus, nulla gravedine aut dolore capitis tenebatur, ſemper æque ſui compos & ad omnia paratus, extra negotia quietem & confabulationes ſectabatur. Id. ibid.

(g) Id. ib.

The Fables he uttered out of the Pulpit, I mean in the Funeral Oration of *Catherine de Medicis*, (F) are so Ridiculous that they would scarce be pardonable in those writers of Romances, who have Published the History of the Fair *Magdelone*, of *Peter de Provence*, of the Four Sons of *Aimon*, and of *Palmerin d'Olive*, &c. *Henry* IV. acknowledged several ways his Fidelity and Services, but above all by the Constancy with which he apply'd himself (G) to surmount the long Difficulties he met with at the Court of *Rome*, about his Translation from the Arch-Bishoprick of *Bourges* to the Arch-Bishoprick of *Sens*.

SAMPSON, a Judge of God's People. I shall not relate his History, it's known to every Body; you may read it in *Moreri*, and more at large in the Dictionary (‖) of the Bible. I'll only observe one thing, which seems to me very singular. Some would have it, that by the words of the Scripture which tell us that the Philistins made him grind, is to be understood that they made him Lye (A) with their Wives that they might have a Race from so brave a Man. The Allegory which *La Mothe le Vayer* found in the Actions of this Hero is more Ingenious than True. He says they † represented the Sceptick Philosopher.

SANCHEZ

‖ Compos'd by Mr. Simon, Doctor of Divinity, and Printed at Lyons, 1693.

† See his Traité Sceptique sur n'avoir pas le sens commun, in the 9th Vol. of his Works pag. 284. & seq.

(F) *The Fables he uttered.*] See here a scantling of them. "(a) At the time that the great Captain *Brennus* led his Army thro' all *Italy* and *Greece*, there were with him two *French* Gentlemen, the one called *Felonius*, and the other *Bono*, who seeing the ill design that *Brennus* undertook after his great Conquests, to go and Seize upon the Temple of *Delphos*, to pollute himself and his Army with the Sacrilege of that Temple, they both retired and went into *Asia*, with their Ships and Men, where they penetrated so far that they came into the Country of the *Medes*, which is near *Lydia* and *Persia*, where having made great Conquests, and obtained many Victories, they Retreated, passing thro' *Italy*, hoping to come back again to *France*. *Felonius* stay'd at a place where *Florence* is now Situated along the River *Arno*: The Situation extreamly pleased him, it being like one that before had Pleased him in the Country of the *Medes*, and he built there a City which is now called *Florence*. His Companion *Bono* built the City of *Bononia*, not far from it: And from that time by reason of the Conquests and Victories that *Felonius* had got in the Country of the *Medes*, he was call'd *Medicus* among his People, the Sir-Name remaining in his Family; as we read of *Paulus* who was called *Macedonicus*, because he had Conquered *Macedonia*, and taken Prisoner King *Perseus*; and of *Scipio* who was called *Africanus* for Conquering *Africa*." *Brantome* from whom I have this Passage presently adds: (b) *I do not know from whence* M. de Beaune *had this History; but it's very probable that before the King, and so great an Assembly as was there at the Queen's Funeral, he would not have alledged it without some good Author.* He had observed before he mention'd this Fabulous Genealogy, that this (c) *Arch-Bishop was as Learned and as Worthy a Prelate as any in Christendom, but that some said of him that he was a Man of no great Belief, and not fit to be weighed in the Scales of Saint* Michael, *who weighs all good Christians at the Day of Judgment, as they say.* The Leaguers gave out that he was an Atheist (d).

Since I have mention'd his Funeral Oration of *Catherine de Medicis*, I shall observe that he also made that of the Duke of *Alençon*, in 1584. "(e) And because in pronouncing this Harangue, which was very indifferent, he put his Hand often to his Beard, the following Distich was made of him:

> "*Quod timet & patulo promissam pectore barbam*
> "*Demulcet Biturix,* (f) *hoc Ciceronis habet.*"

(G) *Constancy with which he applyed himself,* &c.] I do not pretend to say that he withstood those Difficulties without ever yielding: I only mean that having expected a more favourable time, he renewed his Pursuits till he obtain'd his desire. You'll find the Particulars of all this in the following Account of *Mr. Amelot de la Houssaie*. "(g) In 1596, *says he*, the King had writ to the Pope in Favour of *Renaud de Beaune* Arch-Bishop of *Bourges*, to have him Translated to the Bishoprick of *Sens*, and to obtain it for him *gratis*. But (1) the Absolution which this Prelate had given the King in the Abbey Church of St. *Denis*, and the Proposition he had made to the Clergy in the Assembly of *Mantes*, of Creating a Patriarch in *France*, had made him so odious to the Court of *Rome*, that the Pope would not hear of him. Our Cardinal (only then Bishop of *Rennes*) in vain represented to the Pope and Cardinal *Aldobrandino*, *that such a refusal or delay would be interpreted as done, because this Arch-Bishop had taken the King's part, which would not only give Offence to the King, but also to all the Princes, Prelates, Lords, and Gentlemen, who had followed him; and it would be thought that there remained in the Soul of his Holiness some Memory of the past offences and rancours; that the ill Reports that were made of him to his Holiness, were only grounded upon this viz. That the Prelate had found out a shorter way to serve the Catholick Religion, and the Authority of the Holy See, than those had done, who thinking to preserve them had Ruined them both, if they had been believed.* All this did not move them, and the Pope excused himself of his Rigour, by saying that this Affair would never pass in the Consistory, and that the Cardinals would oppose it, and from thence take occasion to think ill of the King himself. (2) The Affair remained thus till the Promotion of *M. d'Ossat*, who in Obedience to the King's Orders, in the first days of his Cardinalship renewed the matter of this Prelate's Translation. (3) But the Pope answered him again with the same Tune and said, *That if he Proposed the Affair to the Consistory he would receive an Affront, being certainly inform'd that there were some Cardinals who would oppose it.* And the Cardinal Nephew added, *that it was not fit for that Prelate that his Affair should be proposed in the Consistory:* (4) By which he gave to understand that there would be some things ript up which would be to his Confusion.——The King seeing the extreme Repugnancy the Pope had to the matter, and that it was not worth the while to make more Instances, resolved at last to follow the Prudent Counsel of the Cardinal of *Florence* ——and he ordered (h) our new Cardinal (i) to tell the Pope, *that tho' he had many Reasons to desire the Expedition of the Arch-Bishoprick of Sens in the Person of the Arch-Bishop of* Bourges; *nevertheless to comply with the Will of his Holiness, he would cease to Importune him any more.* (5) And so the Pope was delivered from this Pursuit, which infinitely displeased him for the Reasons I have given, till the beginning of the Embassy of the Count *de Bethune*, who had Orders to renew it Three Years after. And Cardinal *d'Ossat* laboured so hard with him about it, that they obtained at last the Translation of the Arch-Bishop of *Bourges* to the Arch-Bishoprick of *Sens*, which was Expedited in the Consistory of the 29th of *April*, 1602 (6)."

(A) *Made him Lye with their Wives.*] According to this we might find a new Conformity between his History and that of *Hercules*. Be it as it will, it's certain that the *Hebrew* word which signifies *to grind*, is sometimes taken in an obscene Sense. What the Bible of *Geneva* has Translated in the Book of *Job*, (k) *Let my Wife grind for another*, signifies according to the Vulgar, *may my Wife become the Concubine of another, scortum alterius sit uxor mea.* But some may say, would *Job* say the same thing twice together? For it's clear that

following

(a) Brantome, Memoires des Dames illustres pag. 32. & seq.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 34.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 32.

(d) See the Notes upon the Confession Catholique de Sanci pag. 87. & seq. edit. 1699.

(e) Journal d'Henri III. ad 26. Junii 1584 pag. m. 80.

(f) See Martial epig. 89. lib. 2.

(g) Amelot de la Houssaie, vie du Cardinal d'Ossat p. 25. 26.

(1) Letter 76. & 95.

(2) Lette 92.

(3) In hi Audien of the 13 of Marc

(4) Lett 176.

(h) Am lot ibid pag. 27.

(i) That i d'Ossat.

(5) Lett 183.

(6) Le

SANCHEZ (FRANCIS) Professor of Physick at *Toulouse*, Born at *Braga* in *Portugal*, was Transported in his Infancy to *Bourdeaux* by his Father, who was a Learned Physician. He Travelled into *Italy*, and stayed some time at *Rome*, from whence he return'd into *France*, and studied at *Montpellier*, and took his degree of Doctor of Physick at the Age of Twenty Four. The Wars about Religion having forced him to leave that City, he went to *Toulouse*, where he taught Philosphy Twenty Five Years, and Physick Eleven Years. He dyed Aged something more than Seventy Years. His Life is to be seen (*Z*) in the beginning of his Works *. He was a great Sceptick as I have said in the Remark. He is very much Praised in the *Patiniana* †, where we read that he was *Born of Jewish Parents*, and that he Died at *Toulouse*, being Threescore and Ten Years Old, in the Year 1632.

SANCHEZ (THOMAS) a Spanish Jesuit, Born at *Corduba* in 1551. entred into the Society in the Year 1567. The Austerity of his Life, his Sobriety, his Mortifications, his Application to Study, his Chastity, are Prodigies, if what *Alegambe* ‡ and *Sotuel* ‖ say of him be true. He Died at *Granada*, the 19th of *May*, 1610. and was Buried there β Magnificently γ. His Learning is not to be doubted of; he has given publick Proofs of it in the Great (*A*) Volume that was Printed at *Genoa*, 1592. and in the Four Volumes in *Folio* that were Printed after his Death. It were to be wished that the Work Printed at *Genoa*, and afterwards in many other Towns, had given as great Proofs of δ his Judgment as of his Wit and Learning; for the Temerity he had of explaining an Incredible Number of Filthy and Horrible Questions may produce great Disorders. There has been (*B*) bitter Complaints made of it, and all that has been said for his

‡ In Bibl. Scriptor. Societ. Jesu p. 816.

‖ In eadem Biblioth. pag. 767

β See the Remark C.

γ Idem ibid.

δ See the Passage of Petrus Aurelius at the Beginning of the Remark B.

following words, *may others bow and bend over her, super illam incurventur alii*, signify Prostitution. It's clear that *incurvari* signifies the same thing here as *inclinare se* (*a*) in *Plautus*. This difficulty is nothing; for all Antient Writers both Sacred and Profane afford us an infinity of Examples of such Tautologies. These words of the Lamentations of *Jeremiah* (*b*), according to the Version of *Geneva*, *They have taken the Young People to Grind*, signify, according to the Vulgar, *they have Impudently abused the Youth, adolescentibus impudice usi sunt*. But here is a Passage of St. *Jerome*, quoted by *Brusius*, which will afford me the Proof I want. (*c*) *In tertio decimo commentariorum super Jesaiam cap. 47. ad locum*, Tolle molam, mole farinam, *ita scribit*, (Hieronymus) quia sequitur denuda turpitudinem tuam, etiam mola ab Ebræis figuraliter intelligitur: quod scilicet in morem scorti victorum libidini pateat. Illudque quod in Judicum libro de Samson scribitur, ad molam cum à Philistim esse damnatum, hoc significare volunt, quod pro sobole robustissimorum virorum hoc in Allophylas mulieres facere sit compulsus. *Drusius* (*d*) observes that *Molere* in this obscene Sense signifies the Action of the Male; for which reason he makes a Gloss upon the words of *Job*. *Molere in hoc sensu viro tribui solet. De lingua Latina loquor, in qua notissimum illud*, (*e*) alienas permolere uxores. *Forsan apud Jobum passive sumendum*, molatur alteri, *ab altero, hoc est, ut sensus sit, molat alter uxorem meam*. I think they do not want Reason, who can scarce persuade themselves that the *Philistins*, who were his great Enemies, would have Condemned him to a Punishment so agreeable; for *Sampson* loved Women, and he would have been well kept to perform the Office of a Stallion. There had been nothing to fear but Constraint.

> *Nulla* (*f*) *est tam facilis res, quin difficilis siet,*
> *Quam invitus facias.*

(*Z*) *His Life is to be seen in the beginning of his Works.*] The Author of this Life called *Raimond Delassus* had been his Scholar. The greatest part of the Writings of *Sanchez* are about Physick; they were Printed at *Toulouse* in 4. 1636. There were added to them Four Treatises of Philosophy, which were Re-printed in 12. at *Rotterdam*, 1649. Here are the Titles of 'em: *Quod nihil scitur. De divinatione per somnum ad Aristotelem. In librum Aristotelis Physiognomicôn Commentarium. De longitudine & brevitate vitæ.* The Treatise *quod nihil scitur* (*g*) represents Ingeniously and Subtilly the Vanity of what we call Science, Study, Composition of Books, &c. It was Published before the Edition of all the Work of the Author; for I find in *Barthius* (*h*) that two Dissertations were Re-printed in *Germany*, in the Year 1618; one of *Maturinus Simonius*, an Italian Doctor, *de litteris pereuntibus*; the other of *Francis Sanchez*, a Spanish Doctor, *quod nihil scitur*. *Sanchez* understood Geometry, and (*i*) made some Objections against *Clavius*, which he pretended that Jesuit had not well answered.

(*A*) *In the great Volume Printed at* Genoa.] It treats to the bottom of what concerns Marriage. It's pretended that *Clement* VIII. declared that no Man had examined with more Diligence, nor cleared with more Exactness the Controversies that concern this Sacrament. (*k*) *Vehementer admiratus est subtile hominis acumen, peracre judicium, raram perspicuitatem, singularem & exquisitam in rebus indagandis solertiam, in tradendis facillimam methodum, in evolvendis citandisque Auctoribus exactissimum & plane indefessum studium; serioque pronunciavit, nullum unquam Scriptorem extitisse, qui dubias de Matrimonio controversias uberius & accuratius enodasset.* Among all those Elogies, there is hardly any that does him more Honour than what relates to the exactness of his Quotations. It is a Talent, more rare than People think, and I am very glad that *Nicolas Antonio* is of that Opinion: (*l*) *Celebratur (ne id taceam quod minime vulgare est) inter alias dotes Thomæ diligentia quædam singularis in allegandis fideliter scriptoribus quorum testimoniis utitur.* Several persons have abridged this great Volume *de matrimonio*; some (*m*) disposing the matter according to an Alphabetical Order, others observing the Method of the Author. The other Volumes of *Sanchez* contain either an Explication of the Precepts of the Decalogue, or of Monastick Vows, or many Questions of Law Matters.

(*B*) *Bitter Complaints made of it.*] Here is a Passage of the Abbot of *St.Cyran*: (*n*) *Si de uberrima & subtilissima spurcitiarum omnigenarum ventilatione agitur, nemo unquam eam laudem Thomæ Sanchez eripiet, quin omnium primus Sacramentum matrimonii cum tanta cogitationum sermonisque licentia, imaginatione potius quam judicio duce, versarit, quantam ante ipsum Ecclesia ab initio Christiani nominis nec viderat, nec audierat.* Let us cite these words of a Minister. "It may be, says he (*o*), you have heard "of a great Volume composed by *Thomas Sanchez*, "*de Matrimonio*. You cannot come to any Bookseller's Shop at *Antwerp* or *Liege*, but you may see "the Title of it in great Letters. This Book is the "work of a Jesuit, who treats of all the Cases of "Conscience concerning Marriage. It contains "more Impurity than all the most Infamous *Italian* Books together. See how the Clergy of "*France* speaks of it by the Mouth of one of their "Members. That prodigious Volume (*r*) *Contains* "*a most subtil Examination of all imaginable Impurities; 'tis a Common-Shoar that includes most* "*horrible things not fit to be spoken. It may be called justly a shameful Work, composed with an Enor-*"*mous*

(*i*) Delassus in ejus vita, apud Nicol. Antonium, Biblioth. Script. Hispan. tom. 1. pag. 363.

(*k*) Nat. Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societat. pag. 767.

(*l*) Nicol. Antonius, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hispan. tom. 2. p. 252.

(*m*) *I have an abridgment of it in an Alphabetical order made by* Emanuel Laurence Soares, *a Priest of* Lisbon, *in the Year* 1621. *in* 12.

(*n*) Petrus Aurelius in Vindiciis censuræ.

(*o*) Jurieu, Apologie pur les Reformateurs, ch. 2. p. 150. edit. *in* 4.

(*r*) Petrus Aurel. Vindic. Censuræ Facult.

his Juſtification is (C) weak; and yet there are ſome Caſuiſts, who continue every day to Publiſh ſuch like Impurities †. They have done it a long time, and it's a deplorable thing to ſee that Courtiers, who had their Memories ſtuffed with theſe ſort of filthy accounts, did cite as a common Place-Book * the "*Summa Benedicti*, who is a Franciſcan Doctor, who has writ very well of "all ſorts of Sins, and ſhews that he has ſeen and read a great deal". This Book of *Benedictus* is Tranſlated into *French*: It was Publiſhed in that Language at *Lyons* ‖ in 1584, and at *Paris* in the Year 1602, which might well have been let alone.

SAPPHO

"*mous Curioſity, Horrible and Odious for its diligent* "*Exactneſs, penetrating into moſt monſtrous, filthy,* "*infamous and diabolical Matters. It's impoſſible* "*to apprehend how an Author could be ſo ſhameleſs, as* "*to Compoſe ſuch a Book, ſeeing a Man that has not* "*quite diveſted himſelf of all Modeſty, ſuffers terribly in reading it.* The reſt of the Cenſure is "ſtronger, but I ſuffer too much in Tranſlating "it: 'Tis not an old Cenſure, it was only "made in 1632." I believe 'tis a miſtake to attribute this Cenſure to the Clergy of *France*; for that Aſſembly gave no orders to *Petrus Aurelius* to examine this Work, and to give his Judgment of it in the name of the Clergy. I confeſs that Aſſembly approved the Writings of *Petrus Aurelius*; but notwithſtanding, it is not to ſpeak exactly, to maintain that this Aſſembly ſaid, by one of their Members, all that is found in thoſe Writings: Mr. *Rivet* is contented to aſcribe this Cenſure to the *Sorbonne*, and even that is not exact; for under pretence that this Body of Divines give their Approbation to a Book wherein a certain Author is ill treated, it cannot be ſaid that the *Sorbonne* has Cenſured that Work. That's never ſaid but when the Faculty proceeds in due form againſt a Book, and qualifies the Propoſitions of it. I do not think that ever the *Sorbonniſts* proceeded in this manner againſt *Sanchez*; and if they had done it, I cannot believe that *Theophilus Raynaud* would have dared to deny it, as he does in the following words, (a) *Volo per hanc occaſionem non ſilere, quam iniquè ac maligne* ——— *Thomas Sanches, laceratus ſit a quibuſdam fori* (b) *rabulis, quorum vitæ ſpurcitiam, & fidem heteroclitam, alii jam pridem prodiderunt. Sed & hæretici* ——— *magno hîc zelo concitantur, quod recens admodum petulanter fecit Ludimagiſter Bernenſis Chriſtophorus Luthardus, ad parallelum Calvini cum priſcis hæreticis Simonianis: ſpurciloquia ſua in Sanchem*, MENDACITER *affingens Academiæ Pariſienſi* Be it as it will, let us cite the Miniſter who does not ſpeak exactly. (c) *Hic omittere non debeo & lectori meo invidere, laude digniſſimam Sorbonæ Pariſienſis Cenſuram in Librum Thomæ Sanchez, prout ea habetur in* vindiciis Cenſuræ *a doctoribus Sorbonicis approbatis, & a Petro Aurelio editis. pag.* 517. & *ſeq.* De illo opero Matrimoniali, *inquiunt*, dicere ſpeciatim poſſumus, eſſe opus non gloriandum, ſed pudendum; tàm immani curioſitate, tàm inviſà in rebus ſpurciſſimis & infandis ſagacitate horrendum, ut mirum ſit pudoris alicujus hominem, ea ſine rubore ſcripſiſſe, quæ quivis modeſtioris ingenii vix ſine rubore legat. Portenta iſta ſunt, non ſcripta; animorum inſidiæ, non mentium ſubſidia, incentiva libidinum, ſchola flagitiorum, non honeſtæ diſciplinæ, non ſcientiæ, Chriſtianæ inſtrumenta. Infœlix ſcientia, quæ omnes perdere, paucos juvare nata eſt. Quæ circà ſordes & ſterquilinia volvenda & revolvenda volutatur, ut ejus doctorem jure cum ſcarabæo conferas, vel cum iis qui latrinariam factitant.

(C) *What has been ſaid for his Juſtification is Weak.*] The Cenſurers of this Author may pretend two things: The firſt is, that he could not poſſibly write ſo many particular Impurities, without being Unchaſt himſelf: (d) *Extant inter alia nonnullorum Jeſuitarum de his argumentis ſcripta, in quibus explicantur talia, quæ vix diabolus ipſe, ſtudium omne adhibendo, ſuggerere poſſet: ubi non ſolùm genera, ſpecies, ſed & modos omnes, objecta, ſubjecta, circumſtantias, ita minutatim examinant, ut nemo ſanus ea profecta fuiſſe judicet à mente purâ & caſtâ. Inter quos eminet Thomas Sanchez Hiſpanus Jeſuita, in prolixo tractatu* de matrimonio. The ſecond is, That he could not Communicate to the Publick the Knowledge of ſo many Monſtrous Irregularities, without doing a prejudice to good Manners: It being certain that many are inclined to commit theſe Abominations when they know they are Practiced. Therefore a Man that is wiſe and zealous for the Salvation of his Neighbours, ought carefully to avoid letting them know the Impurities that are diſcovered in the Tribunal of Confeſſion; for we may be aſſured that thoſe who know nothing of the matter, will more eaſily abſtain from it, than thoſe who know the Enormity and Filthineſs thereof.

As to the firſt of theſe two Accuſations, the Friends of *Sanchez* anſwer, That (e) he was a Man of an admirable Virtue and perfect Chaſtity. His immaculate Virginity accompanied him to his Tomb, ſay they, and the Day he was Buried all People thronged in, either to Kiſs or to touch with their Beads his Body covered with Flowers, and ſhining with Virginal Chaſtity. (f) *Ad communis parentis funus* (*ſic eum vocabant*) *advenit Illuſtriſſimus Archiepiſcopus, graviſſimuſque Senatus Regius: confluxere ſacrorum Ordinum viri Religioſi; urbis univerſa Nobilitas, & promiſcuæ plebis innumera multitudo, qui defuncti corpus floribus conſperſum, & eximiâ quadam ſpecie ac virginali nitore micans certatim conabantur vel roſariis contingere, vel oſculis ſuppliciter venerari.* They refer us to ſome Authors, who have praiſed the Purity of his Life. (g) *Ejus innocentiam & vitam puriſſimam exhibent Crombetius l.* 2. *de ſtudio perfect. cap.* 12. & *Joannes Bourghesius l. cui titulus eſt* Societas JESU, Deiparæ *ſacra cap.* 20. This is to tell us that his Mind and Imagination were filled with thoſe filthy Matters, but his Heart and Body were free from that Contagion. Many People think this as hard as for the Hebrew Children to be in the Babylonian Furnace without being Burnt. But after all, it's not impoſſible but that the Horror that might be conceived for thoſe horrible abuſes of Matrimony, and the deſire of Correcting them, might preſerve the Innocence of an Author who ſhould wallow in thoſe Ordures; of an Author, I ſay, whoſe Age, Temper and Education might be powerful Preſervatives againſt the Pollutions of the Fleſh. There is ſome reaſon to think that Authors who dwell too much upon the Explication of the *Priapeia*, and the obſcene Paſſages of *Catullus* and *Martial*, are not very Chaſt; and it's but too certain that there have been ſome Commentators who dwelt upon thoſe Matters too long, and made a deep Scrutiny into them, only becauſe they were Unchaſt. But that is not to be taken for a general Rule; for the ſole deſire of ſhewing a great deal of Reading, and an uncommon Learning, is very capable of engaging an Humaniſt to Comment largely upon the Poets I have mentioned. The firſt reading of thoſe Poems does briskly attack Virtue, eſpecially that of Young Men: By degrees one grows harder; and there are ſome Criticks, who after having read ſeveral times *Catullus* and *Martial*, either to clear up the uſe of ſome Old Cuſtom, or to Comment on them, are no more moved with their impure Expreſſions, than if they read an Aphoriſm of *Hippocrates*. It happens to thoſe Criticks as it happens to Phyſicians and Chirurgeons, who being uſed to filthy Ulcers, after ſome time, find no offence from the ſtink. I Pray God it may happen ſo to Confeſſors, in whoſe Ears are poured out all the Sinks and Naſtineſs of the World. There are but too many of them doubtleſs, whoſe Virtue is overcome, when they hear the Impurities of their Penitents. But this can afford no Conſequence againſt certain Men in particular; ſo that we ſhould be very raſh, ſhould we aſſert that *Sanchez* was not arrived to this Inſenſibility, and that he was infected with the ſtinking Ordures he ſtirr'd with ſo much Application: And after all, he has an Excuſe, which the moſt Chaſt Commentators upon the *Catalect* cannot have; for he may ſay he only put his hand to this ſtinking Work

with

† *See the Cenſure upon a Book of Amadeus Guimenius made by the Faculty of Divinity at Paris, the 3d. of February 1665. They condemn ſeveral Propoſitions, that are only denoted by the firſt words, and cannot be modeſtly Tranſlated into French.*

* Brantome, Dames galantes tom. 1. pag. m. 51. *See alſo pag.* 185.

‖ Du Verdier, Bibl. pag. 651.

(a) Theophil. Raynaudus, de malis & bonis libris, n. 85. p. m. 53.

(b) *In his* Hoplotheca *pag.* 262. *he ſpeaks thus:* Thomas Sanchez à pleriſque fori rabulis ſpurcus audivit, quod in Opere de Matrimonio, librum nonum qui eſt de debito conjugali infecerit ſpurcitiis, & multa chartis commiſerit quæ abſque fœdo ſenſu & verecundiæ contrucidatione, vix legi poſſint.

(c) Andr. Rivetus, Explicat. decalogi, Oper. tom. 1. pag. 1400. col. 2.

(d) Idem Rivetus ib.

SAPPHO.

SAPPHO was one of the moſt renowned Women of all Antiquity for her Verſes and her Amours: She was a Native of *Mitylene* * in the Iſle of *Lesbos*, and lived

with a deſign to purge the World. It's by this, that Endeavours are made to anſwer the ſecond Accuſation, which is more difficult than the firſt.

I have ſaid elſewhere (*) what is alledged to juſtify *Albertus Magnus* in the ſame caſe. His Friends pretend that there ought to be Books, wherein Confeſſors may meet with neceſſary Inſtructions againſt the Diſorders imparted to them: and therefore that a great Doctor like him ought to write upon that Subject. The ſame anſwer is is alſo given for *Sanchez*. The filthy Queſtions, ſay they, which he examins exactly, are very ſerviceable to the Directors of Conſcience. Why ſhould one be Angry with a Phyſician for ſtirring filthy Excrements, in order to procure his Patients health? This Conſideration hindred the Jeſuits from curtailing *Sanchez*. One of them ſays, among other things, that being to judge of a very impure Matter, he could never have reſolved the inſurmountable Difficulties which offered themſelves, without the Solutions of this Author (†). *Fuiſſe autem eam de Matrimonio ſcriptionem neceſſariam, audire memini ex homine & probatorum morum ſeveritate, & eruditione clariſſimo, P. Valerio Reginaldo. Is cum in quadam Provinciali Congregatione, a nonnullis meticuloſis propoſitum eſſet ut opus Patris Thomæ Sanchez de Matrimonio truncaretur ea tractatione, cujus fœtor totis pro tribunalibus a malevolis Cauſidicis contra eum ingeſtus erat; graviter conteſtatus eſt, nihil eſſe in eo opere conſcientiarum duntaxat arbitris conſcripto, quod offenſionem merito moveret. Cum non modo apud Juriſperitos, (Tiraquellum præſertim in legibus Connubialibus,) teterrima abſque neceſſitate ad merum curioſitatis pabulum legantur, ſed etiam apud alios de Matrimonio Scriptores, nec non apud ſummiſtas eadem occurrant; quæ omnia Lybitinæ addicere, & impoſſibile & damnoſum foret. Apud Sanchem certe, quod maxime ſpurcum ac vel lectu fœdum videri poterat, ſibi aliquando ad dijudicandum fuiſſe propoſitum; & niſi ex eo Autore enodationem habuiſſet, ſalebras ſibi inexpedibiles fuiſſe futuras. Itaque non plus offendi quemquam debere, ea fœtidorum dubiorum tractatione ad directionem pœnitentium neceſſaria, quam ſuccenſeamus, cum Medici olida ejectamenta in ægri bonum & curationem emovent.* The Abbot of *St. Cyran* under the Name of *Petrus Aurelius* had refuted beforehand this bad Reaſon. He maintained that this work may do a great deal of harm, but little good. By ſetting before the Eyes of the Publick an infinity of infamous Impurities that are committed in the Nuptial Bed, good Souls are ſcandalized, the Curioſity of others is excited, and the Laſciviouſneſs of others, *&c.* It's better for Directors in ſuch caſes to have recourſe to the living Voice of Doctors, than to a publick Work, where it's hard to find the caſe in queſtion with all its Circumſtances. It muſt be granted this Remark is very ſolid: The *Roman* Catholicks are in the wrong not to imitate the Sects of the Ancient Philoſophy, where the whole Syſtem was never put in Writing: A part being reſerved to be taught by word of Mouth to the beloved Scholars: This was only preſerved by Tradition. The Pope ſhould have forbid the Caſuiſts to Print any thing about the caſes of Luxury; he ſhould have ordered the Matter ſo, that the Inſtruction of the Confeſſors either with reſpect to the Queſtions, or to the Penances upon this Head, might be Communicated from one to the other in private, or at moſt in Manuſcript under the Seal of Secrecy. Let us cite *Peter Aurelius*. (a) *Modeſtiore, fuerunt ſemper Eccleſiaſtici tractatores* ——— *Nec tanti fecerunt ancipitem iſtam & periculoſam conjugalium arcanorum, flagitiorum, piaculorumque ſcientiam. Maluerunt iſta neſciri a paucis, quorum forte intereſſet, quam ſciri a plurimis ad peſtilentiſſimæ curioſitatis illecebram, ad cupiditatum fomitem, ad publicum dedecus, dum promiſcuè, maximis voluminibus, ante ora omnium propoſita, explicantur. Nam & raro uſu venit ut talium nefandorum cognitione ſit opus; & cum uſu venit, tutius viri probi, Eccleſiaſticarum rerum peritiores conſuluntur, qui iſta ex æquo & bono, & ex Eccleſiaſtica diſciplina comparatione dijudicent, quam ex libro quopiam publice noxio aut periculoſo, ubi aliquid generatim tantum, aut obſcure, aut a præſenti negotio remote, ut fere accidit, ſcriptum ſit, quæſtionis fortaſſe diverſiſſima expoſitio privato cujuſque judicio repetatur. Atque ita hactenus obſervarat Eccleſia, donec Thomas Sanchez ſuperiorum ſcriptorum colluviem magis deſtitutamque conſpurcationem ſpectans,* [illegible] *mine, velut CLOACA ingenti, ſordes in ſe undique convolvit.*

The other Reaſons of *Theophilus Raynaud* are not better. He cites (b) long paſſages out of St. *Chryſoſtome*, which prove that this Father of the Church has repreſented to the life the infamous Impurities of his time. He ſhews that St. *Epiphanius* (c) has deſcribed in the ſame manner the Impurities of the *Gnoſticks*, and that St. *Cyril* made uſe of the ſame Liberty to deſcribe thoſe of the *Manichees*. He maintains that *Hincmarus* (d) in his Book about the Divorce of *Lotharius* and *Telberga* ſpoke more Impurely then *Sanchez*. He ſays that the excuſes which St. *Chryſoſtome*, St. *Cyril* and *Hincmarus* made to their Auditors and Readers, may ſerve for an Apology for his fellow Jeſuit. He mentions what (e) *Radulphus Flaviacenſis* obſerved, againſt the falſe niceneſs of thoſe who blamed the obſcene Terms which *Moſes* made uſe of in *Leviticus*. But 'tis ſo eaſy to perceive a great difference between thoſe Examples and the Conduct of the *Spaniſh* Writer, that I ſhall not ſtand upon the Proofs of the weakneſs and emptineſs of that Parallel. Every body eaſily perceives, that the ſame things that are permitted to thoſe who know a fact, which the Enquiries of Hiſtorians, or Juridical Proceedings have manifeſted, ought not to be allowed to thoſe who only knew it by way of auricular Confeſſion. The Ancient Fathers ought to enjoy the Liberty of manifeſting the execrable Deportments of the Hereticks. *Hincmarus* might compoſe a Relation upon the moſt impure Conduct of a Divorced Queen; and when once Vice is atteſted either by Hiſtory or by a Verbal Proceſs, Authors have a Right to mention it if it be to the purpoſe: But as to Vices that are only revealed to the Confeſſors, another Method ought to be taken with them. I paſs by what a great many People would not have omitted; that now a days no Famous Preacher would be ſo bold as to take the Liberty St. *Chryſoſtome* and St. *Cyril* took, and that if any Writer of the Ancient Church is to be imitated on that ſcore, 'tis *Salvian*, of whom *Theophilus Raynaud* cites theſe fine Words. (f) *Quæ quidem omnia tam flagitioſa ſunt, ut etiam explicare ea quiſpiam atque eloqui ſalvo pudore non valeat. Quis enim integro verecundiæ ſtatu, dicere queat illas vocum ac verborum obſcœnitates, illas motuum turpitudines, illas geſtuum fœditates? quæ quanti ſint criminis, vel hinc intelligi poteſt, quod & relationem ſui interdicunt. Nonnulla quippe etiam maxima ſcelera, incolumi honeſtate referentur, & nominari & argui poſſunt, ut homicidium, latrocinium, adulterium, ſacrilegium, ceteraque in hunc modum: ſolæ theatrorum impuritates ſunt, quæ honeſte non poſſunt vel accuſari: ita nova in coarguendâ earum turpitudinum probroſitate res evenit arguenti: ut cum abſque dubio honeſtus ſit qui accuſare ea velit, honeſtate tamen integra, ea loqui & accuſare non poſſit.* Obſerve here the Opinion of *Salvian* touching the Impurities of the Stage one ought to have Honour and Modeſty to Condem them, but one muſt have Impudence to deſcribe them (g). This is the Model which *Sanchez* and many other Caſuiſts ought to have followed. I ſay many others; for he is neither the firſt nor the laſt (h) that writ in that manner. See Mr. *Jurieu* in the Apology for the Reformers in the Chapter I have cited. Let us conclude, that 'tis a thing very blamable and deplorable that there ſhould be ſo many Books of that Nature; but it's infinitely more deplorable that the Impurities they contain ſhould be ſo many real Crimes. The School-Men ſpin things ſo fine, that even in matters of Morality they have debated very needleſs Queſtions and things that never happen; and you ſee continually the Caſuiſts diſtinguiſh between the Practice and the Theory, and propoſe Metaphyſical and imaginary caſes. This probably was one of the Reaſons which made Mr. *Rivet* judge, that the Infamies that are read in *Sanchez* had been invented by that Author; and therefore being at *Aix la Chapelle* with a Jeſuit, he told him he could not ſufficiently wonder that a Man who had made a Vow of Chaſtity, lived in the time of *Alcæus* her Country-Man, and in the time of *Steſichorus*, that is to ſay, (*A*) in the 42 Olympiad, ſix hundred and ten Years before JESUS CHRIST. She Compoſed || a great Number of Odes, Epigrams, Elegies, † Epithalamiums, &c. All her Verſes run upon Love (*B*), and had ſuch Natural and moving Charms that 'tis no wonder if ſhe was called the tenth Muſe ‡. *Strabo* looks on her as a Wonder *, and ſays that never any Woman could come near her in Poetry. There remains (*C*) nothing of ſo many Poems ſhe made but ſome ſmall Fragments

---

* Strabo, lib. 13. pag. 426. Suidas in Σαπφώ.

(*) See the Article Albertus, Remark D.

(†) Theoph. Raynaud. Hoploth. ibid. pag. 362.

(a) Petrus Aurelius in Vindiciis cenſuræ, apud And. Rivetum ubi ſupra.

(b) Th. Raynaud. Hoploth. ubi ſupra pag. 365, 366.

(c) Ibid. pag. 364.

(d) Locus eſt ſtylum demittere in ſpurcitias longe fœdiores quam uſquam apud Sanchem legantur. Theophil. Raynaud. de malis & bonis libris, pag. 53. *See alſo his* Hoplotheca p. 363.

(e) Idem Hoplotheca pag. 364. & de malis libris pag. 56.

(f) Salvianus de providentia, lib. 6. p. m. 199. 200.

(g) *The Words of* Cicero Philip. 2. *againſt* Mark Antony *may be applyed to this Subject.* Tu eo liberior quod ea in te admiſiſti quæ à verecundo inimico audire non poſſes.

(h) Ita factum videmus ante Sanchem, ac poſt eum a quamplurimis ut mirum ſit hunc æſtum efferbuiſſe in unum Sanchem. Raynaud. Hoploth. pag. 364.

|| Suidas voce,
† Servius in Virgil. Dionyſ. Halicarn.
‡ Antholog. lib. 1. cap. 67. Auſonius Epig. 32.
* Θαυμαστόν τι χρῆμα, admirandum quid. Strabo lib. 13. pag. 424.

they, ſhould ſuppoſe ſuch Abominations as were not practiced, I ſee, reply'd the Jeſuit, you have never been a Confeſſor. We hear often more Impure Caſes than thoſe; ſo that 'tis neceſſary that Confeſſors ſhould be provided with directions, according to which they may be enabled to impoſe due Penances. Mr. *Rivet* replyed Smiling, 'tis ſtrange that you ſhould brag ſo much of the Holineſs of your Church, ſince according to your Confeſſion ſuch things are practic'd in it, of which the very Heathens knew not the Name. (*a*) *Hæc ego cum ante aliquot annos bjicerem Jeſuitæ cuidam Aquiſgrani, adderemque me non exiſtimare reperiri exempla talium abominationum, neque valde mirari ab homine cæſtitatem profeſſo fuiſſe excogitata: Regerebat, me nunquam fuiſſe admotum audiendis confeſſionibus, atrociora multò & ſpurciora ſæpiſſimè audiri ab me contentium, ut neceſſarium opus ſit confeſſariis inſtitui ſuper iſtis, ni velint hærere talibus occurrentibus peccatis, juxta quæ eſt injungenda pænitentia. Subridens dicebam, mirum igitur eſſe quod tantopere glorientur de ſanctitate Eccleſiæ ſuæ, in quâ, & ſæpe, ut ille fatebatur, ea perpetrarentur, quæ apud Ethnicos ne nominatata quidem fuerant.* We don't know the Domeſtick privacies of the Ancient Pagans, as we know thoſe of the Countries where Auricular Confeſſion is practic'd; and therefore we cannot tell whether Marriage was ſo brutally diſhonoured among the Pagans as it is among the Chriſtians: But at leaſt 'tis probable that the Infidels did not ſurpaſs in this reſpect many perſons who believe all the Doctrines of the Goſpel. Thoſe for whom the Book of *Sanchez* is writ are ſuch as go to Confeſſion, and ſubmit to the Penances enjoyned them by their Confeſſors. They therefore believe what the Scripture teaches us of Heaven and Hell, they believe Purgatory and the other Doctrines of the *Roman* Communion; and yet you ſee them plunged into Abominable impurities not fit to be Named. I obſerve this againſt thoſe who perſuade themſelves that the Corruption of Manners proceeds from Mens doubting or being Ignorant that there is another Life after this.

(*a*) Rivet. in Decalog. ad verſ. 13. Oper. tom. 1. pag. 1405. col. 2.

(*A*) *In the 42 Olympiad*] This fully confutes the Story of the Amours of *Anacreon* and *Sappho*; for tho' we ought not to place between them an interval or Space of 100 or 120 Years, as Mrs. *le Fevre* does (*b*), yet 'tis true, that their Ages do not well enough agree for a Commerce of Gallantry. We may well ſuppoſe that in the 52 Olypiad *Anacreon* was capable of Love; but ſince the Chronologers place *Sappho* in the 42 Olympiad, we muſt conclude that ſhe was then in her greateſt Reputation, and that ſhe might be about 30 Years Old. Now when ſhe threw her ſelf head-long, ſhe was in Love with a Young Man ſhe hoped to regain: Therefore there is no probability that ſhe lived till *Anacreon* was Born. And one may be well aſſured he never ſaw her nor ever was in Love with her. 'Twas only to give his fancy a full ſcope that *Hermeſianax* ſuppoſed ſhe was Beloved by *Anacreon*. (*c*) Ἐν τούτοις ὁ Ἑρμησιάναξ σφάλλεται συγχρονεῖν οἰόμενος Σαπφὼ καὶ Ἀνακρέοντα, τὸν μὲν κατὰ Κῦρον καὶ Πολυκράτην γενόμενον, τὴν δὲ κατ' Ἀλυάττην τὸν Κροίσου πατέρα ——— Ἡγοῦμαι παίζειν Ἑρμησιάνακτα περὶ τούτου τοῦ ἔρωτος. *In hoc fallitur Hermeſianax qui Sappho coævam Anacreonti fuiſſe putat, cum ea ſub Alyatte Crœſi patre vixerit, Anacreon verò ſub Cyro & Polycrate* ——— *Hermeſianactem per luſum de Anacreontis amore id ſcripſiſſe arbitror.* (*d*) Others by the ſame Poetical liberty handed about ſome Verſes wherein *Anacreon* play'd the Gallant to *Sappho*, and ſhe anſwered him. *Diphilus* a Comick (*e*) Poet introduced *Archilocus* and *Hipponax* courting *Sappho* in one of his Plays. This is the ſame Witty conceit. Mrs. *de Scuderi* has not therefore made uſe of this Anachroniſm without Examples, when ſhe ſuppoſes (*f*) that *Anacreon* courted *Sappho*. If *Sappho* had been ſuch an one as ſhe is Characteriſed in the *Grand Cyrus*, ſhe had been the moſt accompliſh'd Perſon of her Age. The Lady, who made her ſo great a Model of Perfection, went a long time by the Name of *Sappho* in the Ingenious Writings wherein ſhe was ſpoken of. This was to do a great deal of Honour to the Ancient *Sappho*, ſince they gave her Name to a Lady (*g*) who Writ Perfectly well in Verſe and in Proſe, and whoſe Virtue was admired. To conclude, there is Reaſon to think that if *Anacreon* and *Sappho* had ſeen one another in their Youth, they would have fallen in Love one with another, and that we ſhould have had a more certain Account of the intrigues of the Gallant than we have of thoſe of *Alcæus* (*h*). Nay Perhaps they would have Married together, but I don't know whether they would have long agreed; each of them Loved too much his like. I do not know where *Tanaquillus Faber* (*i*) found that *Diphilus* made mention of their Amours; it ſhould be in *Athenæus*, but he ſays nothing of it. I have already ſaid that Mrs. *le Fevre* puts between them the ſpace of a Hundred or ſixſcore Years; but I add that this does not agree with what ſhe lays down, that *Anacreon was Contemporary with Solon, Æſop, Cyrus, Crœſus and Piſiſtratus.* Theſe 2 laſt Remarks are equally againſt (*k*) the Father and the Daughter.

(*b*) Preface to Anacreon.

(*c*) Athenæus lib. 13. p. 599.

(*d*) Chamæleon apud Athen. lib. 13. p. 599.

(*e*) Apud eundem ibid.

(*f*) In the Grand Cyrus.

(*B*) *All her Verſes run upon Love.*] (*l*) *Pauſanias* obſerves that *Anacreon* was the firſt, who after *Sappho* writ ſcarce any thing but Love Verſes, and that *Sappho* (*m*) writ a great many things upon this Subject which did not agree well together. The meaning of it is that ſhe turned this Subject ſo many ways, that ſhe ſpoke of it ſometimes in one manner and ſometimes in another. The ſport pleaſed her. Among other things ſhe had made a Calculation of the ſigns by which one might know an Amorous Perſon; and ſhe had ſo good Succeſs in it that the Phyſician *Eraſiſtratus* (*n*) knew by thoſe ſigns the Diſtemper of *Antiochus*. Every Body knows that this young Prince was deep in Love with *Stratonice* his Mother in Law, and that not daring to diſcover it he pretented to be ſick, and the cauſe of his Trouble being known, his Father parted with her to him: But as often as this Adventure is ſpoken of, People do not think of *Sappho* who afforded the Phyſician the neceſſary Expedients. Thoſe, who intended to denote the Poems of this Woman by their true Character, called them her Fires and her Amours. (*o*) *Spirat adhuc amor Vivuntque commiſſi calores Æoliæ fidibus puellæ.* Plutarch compares her to *Cacus* the Son of *Vulcan*, of whom the *Romans* writ that he caſt out of his Mouth fire and Flame: *What ſhe Sings is a Compoſition of Fire*, ſays he (*p*), *her Verſes are the Expulſion of the Flame ſhe has in her Heart.*

(*C*) *There remains* &c.] The Hymn to *Venus* was preſerved by *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* (*q*), who inſerted it in his Works as an Example of a Perfection he had a mind to Characterize. On the ſame Account, and with the ſame view *Longinus* (*r*) has preſerved to us the Ode to her Miſtreſs. *Catullus* (*ſ*) has Tranſlated part of this Ode: all theſe circumſtances are a pregnant Proof of the ſingular eſteem the Ancients had for her Verſes.

Tanaquillus Faber was reſolved to publiſh ſome Obſervations upon that Ode; but he abſtained from it becauſe he was brought into Tronble for ſome things he had put in his Edition of *Anacreon*. *Ut ne tandem bona fide ἀπο*——— *ſiam*, ſaith he (*t*), *quod ſane haud neceſſe eſt, decrevi nil quidquam ad hoc admirabile odarium dicere. Fuit olim, fateor, cum Sapphonem amabam; ſed ex quo illa me perditiſſima femina pæne miſerum perdidit cum ſceleratiſſimo ſuo congerrone, (Anacreontem dico, ſi neſcis, Lector,) noli ſperare quidquam a me dictum iri, unde aut ipſa, aut ipſius opera, (queis tamen olim in Græcia nil elegantius, nil magis terſum aut venuſtum quidquam extitit,) probari videantur. Itaque quando mihi impoſita fibula eſt, hic lacuna eſto.* The piece which

(*g*) [illegible]

(*h*) [illegible]

(*i*) [illegible]

(*k*) [illegible]

(*l*) Pauſanias lib. 1. pag. 13.

(*m*) Pauſanias lib. 9. p. 171.

(*n*) Plutarch in Demetrio pag. 9[illegible].

(*o*) Horat. Od. 9. l. 4.

(*p*) [illegible] Ipſa autem vere igni mixta loquitur, & per carmina calorem corde conceptum emittit. Plutarchus de amore, pag. [illegible]

(*q*) De coll. loc. verborum c. 23.

(*r*) [illegible]

(*ſ*) See Iſaac Voſſius's commentary upon Catullus pag. 123. [illegible] of Sappho corrected.

(*t*) Tanaq. Faber not. in Longinum pag. 2[illegible].

ments which the *Ancient Scholiaſts* have cited, and a Hymn to *Venus*, and an Ode to one of her *Miſtreſſes*; for you muſt know that her Amorous Paſſion extended even to the (*D*) Perſons of her own Sex, and this is that for which ſhe was moſt cried down. *Suidas* has preſerved the Names of 3 of her ß Miſtreſſes, who ſpoiled her Reputation and defamed themſelves by a ſtrange ſingularity which was imputed to their Commerce. He has alſo preſerved the Names of 3 of her Female Scholars whom ſhe did, without doubt, initiate in her Myſteries. Since *Lucian* does not obſerve ‖ that the Women of the Iſle of *Lesbos*, who he ſays were very Subject to this Paſſion, Learned it of *Sappho*, 'tis better to imagine that ſhe found it already Eſtabliſhed in her Country than to make her the Inventer of it. Be it as it will, *Sappho* always paſſed for a Famous *Tribas*, and ſome think that it was for this Reaſon, that ſome (*E*) Sirnamed her *Maſcula Sappho* †. If her Deſign was to paſs by and neglect the other half of Mankind, ſhe was fruſtrated of her Expectation; for ſhe fell

which he cites (*a*) out of his Notes on *Anacreon*, ſhews us that he was perſuaded that *Sappho* writ this Ode for a Woman ſhe was in Love with. We ſhall ſee in the following Remark that his Daughter was not of this Opinion; yet 'tis a very probable one. To conclude, if there is no better Proof than the above quoted Latin paſſage of this Author, to pretend (*b*) that he ceaſed to eſteem *Sappho*, 'tis to rely upon an ill foundation.

(*D*) *Extended even to the Perſons of her own Sex.*] I cannot blame the Charity of Mrs. *le Fevre* (*c*), who has endeavoured for the Honour of *Sappho* to render the fact uncertain; but I think her too reaſonable to be vexed at us for believing our own Eyes. The Ode which *Longinus* has mention'd, is not in the Style of a Friend writing to a Friend: It ſavours of Love all over, and not of Friendſhip: Otherwiſe, *Longinus*, who was ſo good a Judge, would not have brought it as a Model of the Art with which great Maſters repreſent things: He would not, I ſay, have given us as an Example of that Art, the manner wherewith the Symptoms of an Amorous Fury are collected in that Ode, Τὰ συμβαίνοντα ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς μανίαις παθήματα; and *Plutarch* would not have cited this ſame Ode to prove that Love is a Divine Fury, which cauſes more violent Enthuſiaſms than thoſe of the Prieſteſs of *Delphi*, of the *Bacchantes* and of the Prieſts of *Cibele*. (*d*) Τί τοσοῦτον ἡ Πυθία πέπονθεν ἁψαμένη τοῦ τρίποδος; τίνα τῶν ἐνθιαζομένων οὕτως ὁ αὐλὸς καὶ τὰ μητρῷα καὶ τὸ τύμπανον ἐξίστησιν The Poetical Tranſlation of this is to be found in theſe Verſes of *Horace*, if inſtead of *iræ* you put *amor*.

Non (*e*) *Dindymene, non adytis quatit*
Mentem ſacerdotum incola Pythius,
Non Liber æque, non acuta
Sic geminant Corybantes æra,
Triſtes ut iræ

People were ſo perſuaded in *Ovid*'s time, that *Sappho* Loved Women as Men do; that he makes no difficulty of introducing her making a Sacrifice to *Phaon* of the Female Companions of her Debauchery.

Nec (*f*) *me Pyrrhiades Methymniadeſve puellæ,*
Nec me Lesbiadum cetera turba juvant.
Vilis Anactorie, vilis mihi candida Cydno:
Non oculis grata eſt Atthis, ut ante meis.
Atque aliæ centum quas non ſine crimine amavi
Improbe, multarum quod fuit, unus habes.

. . . .

Lesbides infamem quæ me feciſtis amatæ,
Deſinite ad citharas turba venire meas.

Horace is another Evidence againſt her (*g*) in the Complaints he ſuppoſes ſhe made of the Maids of *Lesbos*, *Et Æoliis fidibus querentem Sappho puellis de popularibus*; for if ſhe had complain'd that the Ladies of her Country envyed her Merit, ſhe would not have choſen the young ones for the Subject of her Complaint: But becauſe ſhe had ſpoke to them of Love, and the greateſt part of 'em were either too ſimple, or, to ſpeak better, too Crafty to be catched, and thoſe who had complyed, had made her infamous; for this Reaſon ſhe complained of the Young Maids. This Verſe of *Ovid*, *Deſinite ad citharas turba venire meas*, ſhews, that the Women of *Lesbos* had done juſtice to her fine Verſes. To conclude, I leave it to a new Father *Sanchez* to decide, whether a Married Woman, who had complied with the Paſſion of *Sappho*, would have Committed Adultery and made her Husband a Cuckold? I do not know whether this queſtion has eſcaped the inexhauſtible Curioſity of the Caſuiſts about Matrimonial Cauſes.

Let us confirm this by the Teſtimony of a great Wit, who did not believe that his Complaiſance for Mrs. *le Fevre* ſhould go ſo far as to approve the Pains ſhe has taken in favour of *Sappho*. After the Death of her Husband, ſays he (*h*), *Sappho, tho' young, renounced Marriage, but not the pleaſure of loving. She had a Soul too paſſionate to be without it; which may be eaſily judged by the tenderneſs all over her Poems, which has put her above all the Poets as to that Point. So finding her ſelf too weak to vanquiſh ſo violent an Inclination as that, ſhe wholly gave her ſelf up to it, and loved all manner of ways, far beyond the bounds which Modeſty naturally preſcribes to her Sex. 'Tis in vain to juſtify her on that Head; it cannot be done but at the expence of Truth: and neither her averſion for the ſhameful Love of* Charaxus, *nor all the Honours ſhe received from the* Lesbians, *of can waſh off a Stain, which all thoſe who have ſpoke her could not diſguiſe, notwithſtanding the Elogies they have given her, and which her own Works Evidence more clearly ſtill. Many beautiful Women are put in the Number of her Miſtreſſes.*

(*E*) *The Sirname of* Maſcula Sappho.] It's not ſo eaſy as it's thought to know truly what *Horace* means by *Maſcula Sappho*; but if he pretended to reproach her with her Love againſt Nature, it's eaſy to know he took the wrong time. The Epithete would be very faint and too far fetched without neceſſity. There are, notwithſtanding, Learned Men who underſtand it ſo. (*i*) *Chabot* places among them the Interpreter of *Juvenal*, and *Porphyrion* an Ancient Scholiaſt upon *Horace*, and gives us *Domitius* for his Author as to the latter. Without doubt he means *Domitius Calderinus*, whoſe Commentary upon *Martial* (*k*) I have not; but according to *Chabot* we find there, that *Porphyrion* has interpreted the Word *Maſcula* both in a proper and figurative ſenſe, *vel quia* Sappho *in poetico ſtudio verſata eſt, in quo ſæpius enituit, vel quia tribas diffamata fuit. Cruquius*, who has publiſhed the old Scholiaſts upon *Horace*, has not publiſhed theſe Words of *Porphyrion*. As for the Interpreter of *Juvenal* cited by *Chabot*, it's reaſonable that we ſhould take him for the Scholiaſt of that Poet; but I do not find that he ſays what is imputed to him: 'Tis *Britannicus* (*l*) who ſays it upon the 47 Verſe of the 2d Satyr. However it be with the Ancient Commentators, 'tis certain, that the Moderns do commonly mention 3 Opinions about the ſenſe of *Maſcula Sappho*. 1. That this Word means that ſhe was a *Tribas*. 2. That it denotes the Inclination ſhe had for the Sciences, inſtead of handling the Spindle and Diſtaff. 3. The Courage ſhe had to precipitate her ſelf at *Leucate*. This laſt Opinion is *Scaliger's* (*m*) and *Turnebus*'s (*n*), which is ſtrongly Confirmed by the following Verſes of *Auſonius* (*o*).

Et de nimboſo ſaltum Leucate minatur,
Maſcula Lesbiacis Sappho peritura ſagittis.

See the Article *Leucate*, and the following Remark.

Thevet rejects the firſt ſenſe, and follows the Second and Third, but not without confounding himſelf Childiſhly. *Horace* and *Auſonius*, ſays he (*p*), *when they call'd this* Lesbian *Woman the* Maſcula, *meant nothing elſe but that ſhe did what was proper for Men, in Compoſing ſo excellent Verſes, or that ſhe had undertaken to get into thoſe beautiful places of* Leucate, *near which the Men durſt not come.* What an Abſurdity to give the Name of *Beautiful*

Places

ß *Ovid. Amoribus, epiſt. Sapph. ad Phaon. See the Remark D.*

‖ Dialog. Meretr. tom. 2. p. 714.

† Hor. epiſt. 19. l. 1. Auſonius cupid. crucif.

(*h*) Longe Pierre, *in the Life of* Sappho *prefixed to the Tranſlation of* Sappho's *Poems into French Verſe.*

(*i*) In Horat. epiſt. 19. l. 1.

(*k*) Chabot *quotes it* in epigr. ad Philænim. l. 7.

(*l*) Tale monſtrum libidinis dicitur Sappho excogitaſſe, unde maſcula eſt appellata ab Horat. in epiſtolis *See* Vinetus *upon* Auſonius Cupid. Crucif. v. 25.

(*m*) In Auſon. Cupid. crucif. & in Virgil. Cirin.

(*n*) Adverſar. l. 10. c. 2.

(*o*) Cupid. Crucif.

(*p*) Thevet ubi infra pag. 226.

fell deſperately in Love with *Phaon*, and did in vain all that ſhe could to make him love her: But he deſpiſed her and Forced her *(F)* by his Coldneſs to throw her ſelf from a high Rock to extinguiſh her devouring Flame. O! *(G)* what a Cruelty! She had been long before the Widow of one of the Richeſt Men of the Iſle of *Andros*, called *Cercala* †, by whom ſhe had a Daughter called *Cleis*. And ſo the Mother of *Sappho* was called. I do not know her Father's Name; for there are ‖ eight aſſigned to her by Authors ‡. She had 3 Brothers, one of which called *Charaxus* § dealt in Wine from *Lesbos* in *Ægypt*, and fell in love there with a Famous Curteſan, by ſome, called *Rhodope*, but *Sappho* calls her *Doricha*. She was very Angry with her Brother *(H)* about this Engagement. It's ſaid that the

place to a dreadful Precipice, whither none went but out of deſpair? This therefore, continues he, is to wrong our Sappho (a), *and to Calumniate her without Reaſon, ſince the Divine Philoſopher Plato admired her for her dexterity and vivacity of Wit, and for her profound Wiſdom, which ſet her, not only above the reſt of her Sex, but alſo above the moſt able Men.* I do not believe that ever *Plato* ſpoke of her profound Wiſdom, and if he had given her that Elogy, it ſhould not be underſtood in the ſenſe of *Thevet*, but in the ſenſe wherein it is taken at this very day among the *Walloons*, and was formerly taken in *France*. The Midwives were called *Sages*, not becauſe of their Virtue, but becauſe they knew many things that other Women knew not. They are called at this Day *femmes ſages* in *Guenne* and *Languedoc*, but in other Provinces, where they ſpeak more exactly the *French*, to avoid the Equivocation, they make uſe of a Tranſpoſition, and call them *ſages femmes*. Tell at this Day a *Walloon*, that he is Happy in his Children, that his Daughters are *ſage*, he'll think you laugh at them, and hee'll tell you they are not, that 'tis not proper for their Sex, and that 'tis enough for a Maid to fear God and underſtand her Buſineſs. Which ſhews that he underſtands, by being *ſage*, to be Learned, to know Latin, &c. The Greek word σοφὸς ſignified ſometimes a knowing Man, and in this ſenſe *Plato* takes it ſometimes, and particularly when he ſpeaks of *Anacreon*. This is what a very good Critick (b) has obſerved. In the ſame manner this Word ought to be underſtood, if *Plato* had made uſe of it in praiſing *Sappho*. Let us conclude with theſe Words of a Commentator upon *Tanaquillus Faber* (c): "It's very "well known why *Horace* and *Auſonius* called her "*Maſcula*, not for her Courage, but in the ſame ſenſe "as γυνὴ ἀνδρεία in *Lucian*, where an Impudent "Woman explains her ſelf, ſaying, ἡ ἐπιθυμία "ἀνδρός ἐστί μοι, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀνήρ εἰμι."

(F) *Forced her by his Coldneſs.*] Mrs. *le Fevre* ſays that *Sappho* could not Command her ſelf from following *Phaon* into *Sicily*, whither he retired that he might not ſee her; and that *during her ſtay in that Iſland, ſhe made the fineſt Verſes in the World*; and that 'tis very probable ſhe made there the Hymn to *Venus*, in which ſhe begs ſo ardently the aſſiſtance of that Goddeſs. Her Prayers were not heard; the ſweet and Tender Verſes ſhe compoſed ſo often (d) on this Subject were to no purpoſe: *Phaon* was Cruel to the laſt Degree. The unfortunate *Sappho* was forced to take a dangerous Leap; for ſo I may juſtly call the Remedy to which ſhe had recourſe, which was to go upon the Promentory *Leucate* and throw her ſelf into the Sea. It was looked on in thoſe days as the true means to cure the Pains of Love and for this Reaſon that place was call'd the *Lovers leap*. Some ſay that *Sappho* was the firſt that made a trial (e) of this way of curing Love: Others ſay, (f) ſhe was the firſt Woman that did it; but that, before her time ſome Men had done it. Many Poets have ſpoke of this deſpair of *Sappho*: One of them (g) having drained himſelf of all the Counſels he could give to an unfortunate Lover, and at laſt referring him to the great Remedy of all Evils, makes uſe of this Expreſſion.

Quod ſibi ſuaſerunt Phædra & Eliſſa dabunt,
Quod Canace, Phylliſque, & faſtidita Phaoni.

See here what *Statius* ſays,

Steſichori que (h) *ferox, ſaltuſque ingreſſa viriles*
Non formidata temeraria Leucade Sappho.

Pliny tells us a Story about the cauſe of *Sappho*'s Love for *Phaon*. It was ſaid that the occult qualities of a certain Herb had excited that Paſſion. Here are the Words of *Pliny*, (i) *Ex his*: He ſpeaks of the different ſorts of *Eryngion*, or hundred Headed Thiſtle, *candidam noſtri centum capita vocant* —— *Portentoſum eſt, quod de eo traditur: Radicem ejus alterutrius ſexus ſimilitudinem referre, raram inveniri: ſed ſi viris contigerit mas, amabiles fieri. Ob hoc & Phaonem Lesbium dilectum à Sappho. Multæ circa hoc non Magorum ſolum vanitates, ſed etiam Pythagoricorum.* That is to ſay, according to the verſion of *du Pinet*, *the Latins call the White Eryngium* Centum Capita —— *and certainly it's a wonderful thing, if what they ſay of this Root be true. For there are ſome that ſay, that the Root of* White Eryngium *(which is very rare) has the Sex of a Man or a Woman: And it's held, that if a Man meets with one that repreſents the Privy parts of a Man, he ſhall be Beloved by Women: And 'tis thought, this made* Sappho *in Love with* Phaon. *And indeed, not only the Magicians, but alſo the* Pithagoreans *ſpeak wonderful things of this Root.* Theſe are idle Stories. *Sappho* was ſo well tempered for Love that ſhe needed no occult qualities of Roots to enflame her.

(G) *O! what a Cruelty!*] The Cruelty of *Phaon* will not ſurpriſe us ſo much, if we reflect that *Sappho* was only a Widow upon the decline, who had never been handſome, who was ill ſpoken of in her Widdowhood, and who made her Flame very publick. A Man that is never ſo little nice, does not Care for ſuch unbecoming Addreſſes, and draws ill Conſequences from them. Add to this, that *Sappho* had not the endearment of Novelty, which often, even with nice People, makes amends for the defect of Beauty and the flower of Youth. *Phaon* knew all ſhe was capable of; the Trees and the Graſs had been her Confidents; and perhaps his flight proceeded more from being ſpent than from indifference. Conſider what ſhe Writes to him by the Pen of *Ovid*.

Hæc quoque laudabas, omnique à parte placebam,
Sed tum præcipue cum ſit amoris opus.
Tunc te plus ſolito laſcivia noſtra juvabat,
Crebraque mobilitas, aptaque verba joco:
Quique, ubi jam amborum fuerat confuſa voluptas,
Plurimus in laſſo corpore languor erat.

. . . .

Invenio ſilvam quæ ſæpe cubilia nobis
Præbuit, & multa texit opaca coma.
Agnovi preſſas noti mihi ceſpitis herbas;
De noſtro curvum pondere gramen erat.
Incubui tetigique locum qua parte fuiſti.

She was not then ſo capable of hearkening to Reaſon, as when ſhe (k) repreſented to a Young Man who courted her for Marriage, that being older than him ſhe would not marry him. The younger *Phaon* had been, the more ſhe would have found her Account in him. If I have ſaid that ſhe was not handſome, it was becauſe I thought might prefer to the Authority of *Plato*, who (l) calls her *the Beautiful Sappho*, the Authority of *Ovid* who makes her ſpeak thus:

Si mihi difficilis formam natura negavit,
Ingenio formæ damna rependo meæ.
Sum brevis. At nomen quod terras impleat omnes
Eſt mihi: menſuram nominis ipſa fero.
Candida ſi non ſum: placuit Cepheia Perſeo.

Mrs. *le Fevre* does not believe *Plato* or *Athenæus*; for ſhe ſays, that *Sappho was not Beautiful, that ſhe was neither tall nor little, that ſhe had a very brown Complexion, and very lively and ſparkling Eyes.* What ſhall I ſay of *Maximus Tyrius*, (m) who pretends that becauſe ſhe was black and little, *Socrates* (n) call'd her Beautiful, by reaſon of the Beauty of her Verſes.

(H) *She was very Angry with her Brother.*] See how *Ovid* tells us this particular.

Arſit inops frater victus meretricis amore,
Miſtaque cum turpi damna pudore tulit.

Paſſim

---

† Suidas in Σαπφώ.

‖ Id. ib.

‡ See the Remark K in the Article Anacreon.

§ Strabo lib. 17. pag. 556. Athen. lib. 13. pag. 596.

(a) Id. ib. pag. 227.

(b) See Mr. le Clerc in the 1. Vol. of his ars critica pag. 194. 195.

(c) Reland ubi infra fol. C. 4.

(d) Καὶ ἕτερος ὁ Φάων ἐστὶν ἐφ' ᾧ τὸν ἔρωτα αὐτῆς ἡ Σαπφὼ πολλάκις ᾆσμα ἐποίησεν. Et ille Phaon eſt, in cujus amorem Sappho ſæpe carmen cecinit. Palæphatus de incred. cap. 49. pag. m. 231. Phaſianinus having read αἷμα inſtead of ᾆσμα made a ridiculous Tranſlation.

(e) Menander apud Strabon. l. 10. pag. 311.

(f) Scaliger in Auſonium Cupid. cruci.

(g) Auſon. Epigr. 92.

(h) Stat. lib. 5. ſilv. 3. v. 154.

(i) Plinius lib. 22. cap. 8. pag. m. 183.

(k) In a Fragment of a Letter quoted by Mrs. le Fevre.

(l) In Phædro p.m. 1214. Athenæus calls her alſo by the ſame Sappho, l. 13. p. 596. & ſo does Plutarch de amore, pag. 762. & Julian the Apoſtate, Epiſt. ad Alypium (

(m) Orat. 8. p. 96.

(n) Idem Plato

the *Mitylenians* did her the Honour (*I*) after her Death, to ſtamp their Money with her Image. Some Authors make mention of another (*K*) *Sappho*.

Mr. *Moreri* found one in *Martial*, * only thro' an extreme Inadvertency. We read in *Ariſtotle* the Proof *Sappho* made uſe of to ſhew that Death is an Evil. The Gods, ſaid ſhe ||, have Judged it ſo, for otherwiſe they would die. There was in the *Prytaneum* of *Syracuſa*, a moſt beautiful Statue of *Sappho*: See what *Cicero* ✝ ſays of it, when he reproaches *Verres* with Stealing it. It was the work of *Silanion*, and probably the ſame that *Tatian* ſpeaks of reproaching the *Gentiles* with the Honour they paid to diſhoneſt Women. See the Citation *l* of this Page.

S A R A H, Siſter and (*A*) Wife of *Abraham*, was his faithful Companion in

Factus inops agili peragit freta cærula remo,
Quique male amiſit, nunc male quærit opes.
Me quoque, quod monui bene multa fideliter, odit;
Hæc mihi libertas, hæc pia lingua dedit.

I leave you to judge what anſwer he might have made, and what weight the Remonſtrances of ſuch a Siſter could have. *Athenæus* obſerves (*a*) that the invectives againſt the Curtezan of *Naucratis*, were grounded upon the exceſſive Sums ſhe got from her Lovers. *Herodotus* calls that Curtezan *Rhodopis*, and (*b*) ſays that *Charaxus*, who had ſpent a great Sum to Redeem her, was ill treated by the Invectives of his Siſter *Sappho*.

(*I*) *Stampt with their Image.*] I ſhall obſerve on this occaſion, that *Lambin* for want of underſtanding a Paſſage of *Pauſanias* (*c*), ſays falſely, That there was in the Citadel of *Athens* a Statue of *Sappho*. *Anacreontis Teii*, ſays he (*d*), *qui majore ex parte res amatorias ſcripſit, ſtatua in arce Athenienſium prima poſt Sapphonem locata eſt.* See the Greek. Ἔστι δὲ τῷ Ξανθίππῳ πλησίον ἕστηκεν Ἀνακρέων ὁ Τήϊος, πρῶτος μετὰ Σαπφὼ τὴν Λεσβίαν τὰ πολλὰ ὧν ἔγραψεν ἐρωτικὰ ποιήσας. It's evident that theſe *Greek* words mean nothing elſe, but that the Statue of *Anacreon* was put near that of *Xanthippus*; the Statue, I ſay, of *Anacreon*, who is the firſt after *Sappho*, who Conſecrated to matters of Love the greateſt part of the things he writ.

I ſhould be glad to know whether *Thevet* is miſtaken or not, when he aſſures us, (*e*) *That the* Romans *Erected in Memory of* Sappho *a Statue of Porphyry richly wrought.* It's *Tanaquillus Faber* (*f*), who has obſerved, that *the* Mitylenians *ſtamped their Money with the Image of this* Heroine, *and by this treated her like a Queen when ſhe was dead.* He cites no Body for it; but Mr. *Reland*, who has made Notes upon (*g*) this work of *Tanaquillus Faber*, quotes this Paſſage of *Julius Pollux*, οἱ μυτιληναῖοι μὲν Σαπφὼ τῷ νομίσματι ἐνεχάραττον, and ſtill obſerves that there are yet ſome Meddals of *Sappho*, which bear the name of the *Mitylenians*, ΜΥΤΙΛΕΝΑΙΩΝ. *Thevet* ſays he (*h*) drew the Picture of *Sappho from an Antient Medal*, which he brought out of the Iſle of *Lesbos*, and that *one like that, with many others, was given to the Baron* de la Garde, *then the* French *Ambaſſador at* Conſtantinople, *by the firſt Phyſician of* Sultan Soliman. *Ariſtotle* obſerves that the *Mitylenians* had payed ſome Honours to *Sappho*, but he does not tell us in what thoſe Honours (*i*) conſiſted. *Tatian* reproaches the *Greeks* with the Statue of (*k*) the Curtezan *Sappho* made by *Silanion*; of that Curtezan, ſays he, who Sung her own Luxury, and was Amorous, even to Madneſs. (*l*) Καὶ ἡ μὲν Σαπφὼ γύναιον πορνικὸν ἐρωτομανὲς ϗ τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἀσέλγειαν ᾄδει. *Et quidem Sappho meretricia muliercula inſano amore capta ſuam ipſa laſciviam cantat.* (*m*) *Pliny* ſpeaks of a Painter called *Leo*, who had drawn the Picture of *Sappho*.

(*K*) *Of another* Sappho.] Mr. *Moreri* ſays there are ſome, *who mention a ſecond Maid of the Name of* Erythræ, *who made Verſes, and that 'tis the Opinion of* Athenæus, *lib.* 13. *Athenæus* does not ſay that this other *Sappho* was a Poet, or that ſhe was Born at *Erythræ*: He ſays that ſhe was of *Ereſſus* (*n*), and by profeſſion a Curtezan, and that ſhe fell in Love with *Phaon*. According to this Opinion the great *Sappho*, the *Sappho* of *Mitylene*, who made ſuch excellent Poems, might, without much trouble, be re-inſtated into a good Reputation; there would be nothing elſe to do but to Tranſport her bad Fame upon the other *Sappho*. The miſchief is, that a lame Paſſage of *Athenæus*, ſeconded as much as you pleaſe by the Evidence of *Ælian* (*o*), is not to ſerve us for a Guide preferably to a thouſand Authorities that are againſt it. Mr. *Lloyd*, and Mr. *Hoffman* adviſe us to diſtinguiſh well between the two *Sappho's*, the one of *Ereſia*, and the other beloved by *Phaon*, as we ſee, ſay they, in *Athenæus lib.* 13. This is Copied out of *Voſſius* (*p*), and is not truer for it; for *Athenæus* ſpeaks there of one *Sappho* only a Native of *Ereſſus*, who was deſperately in Love with *Phaon*: Whether their Love was mutual or no, he gives us no account. *Suidas* might occaſion a doubt, were it not probable that he has divided what ought to remain United. He ſpeaks of two *Sappho's*: What he ſays of the firſt, beyond all doubt belongs to her that Excelled in Lyrick Poetry: What he ſays of the ſecond, *viz.* that ſhe was of *Mitylene* in the Iſle of *Lesbos*, that ſhe threw her ſelf from *Leucate* into the Sea for the Love of *Phaon*, that ſhe played on Inſtruments, and was famous for Lyrick Poetry, does not certainly leſs agree with the firſt. And ſo I ſee no reaſon of any weight to admit two Women of that Name, eſpecially if we muſt diſtinguiſh the one from the other, by the qualities which *Suidas* and *Charles Stephens* attribute to them.

Here is a very abſurd Fault. (*q*) *Canius, a Latin Poet, a Native of* (*r*) Cadis, *and a Friend of* Martial ---*Married two Wives,* Theophila *a learned Woman, but a little too free, and* Sappho, *not ſo well learned, but more reſerved.* ——— Martial *mentions what I write.* lib. 3. epig. 63. & lib. 7. epiſt. 68.

Caſtior hac & non doctior illa fuit, &c.

This is what we read in *Moreri*'s Dictionary. But if we read *Martial*, we find (*s*) that he makes mention of one only Wife of *Canius*, and ſays ſhe was called *Theophila*; that ſhe was Learned and made Verſes that *Sappho* might Praiſe; that the latter was not more Learned than *Theophila*, but that *Theophila* was more Chaſt than *Sappho*. The Verſe which *Moreri* quotes is the laſt of the Epigram. He ſhould not therefore have added an *Etcætera*. This is but a Trifle in compariſon of his overſight in giving to *Canius* a Wife called *Sappho*, leſs Learned, but more Modeſt than *Theophila*. I ſay nothing of two other Faults which are in his Dictionary in the Article *Canius*. He quotes the 19th epig. of the 3. Book of *Martial*, inſtead of the 20th, and *æmulator* is put inſtead of *æmulatur*.

(*A*) *Siſter and Wife of* Abraham.] That's ſo clear by the 20th Chapter of *Geneſis*, that were it not for the ill habit of Sacrificing the natural ſenſe of the words of the Scripture to the leaſt difficulties that ariſe, there could not be two Opinions upon the matter. Let us take right the Circumſtances of the Fact. *Abraham* being come into the Country of the *Philiſtins* made *Sarah* paſs for his Siſter. Whereupon *Abimeleck* taking her to be a Maid, or a Widow, ſo that nothing could hinder him from making her one of his Wives, cauſed her to be brought to him. But knowing by Revelation that ſhe was *Abraham*'s Wife, he reſtored her, complaining of their Lies, which had expoſed him to ſo great a Miſchief. I ſay, *their Lies*, for on the one ſide *Abraham* had ſaid of his Wife, *ſhe is my Siſter*; and *Sarah* had ſaid of her Husband, *he is my Brother*. *Abraham* excuſed himſelf in the firſt place on account of the Fear he was in for his Life, if he had ſaid ſhe is my Wife; in the ſecond place upon this, that ſhe was *truly* his Siſter, *the Daughter of my Father*, ſaid he

---

Thevet ubi ſupra pag. 224. (*i*) Ariſtot Rhetor. l. 2. c. p. 445. Mr. Reland *in his Remarks upon* Tanaquillus ber, *quotes the words of* Ariſtotle. (*k*) Tatian. orat. contra æcos p. m. 168. B. (*l*) Id. ibi C. (*m*) Plin. lib. 35. . 11. pag. m. 235. (*n*) *A Town in the Iſle of* Lesbos.

(c) [illegible] Quam pulcra Sappho Charaxi fratri ſuo mercaturæ gratia Naucratim profecto nave dilectam verſibus ſuis ...ndit, quod multa ...um pecunia emunxiſſet. Athen. lib. 13. cap. 7. pag. 596. (b) Herodot. lib. 2. 135. (c) Ex lib. pag. 23. (d) Lambin. in Horat. Od. 27. l. 1. (e) Thevet, Elog. des ſavans Hommes Tom. 1. pag. 223. edit. 1671. 12. (f) Le ...re, ... des ...et. ...ec. ...m. 23. See Nouv. la Rep. lettres 1700. 461.

* *See the Remark K towards the end.*

|| ἢ ὡς Σαπφὼ ὅτι τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν κακόν· οἱ θεοὶ γὰρ οὕτω κεκρίκασιν· ἀπέθνησκον γὰρ ἄν. Aut quemadmodum Sappho, mori malum eſſe, Dei enim ſic judicarunt: alioqui mortui eſſent. *Ariſtot. Rhetor. l.* 2. *c.* 23. *pag. m.* 445. *E.*

✝ Cicero in Verrem orat. 6. fol. m. 78.

(*o*) Ælian. lib. 12. c. 19. var. hiſt.

(*p*) Voſſius, de poet. Græc. pag. 17.

(*q*) Moreri *at the word* Canius.

(*r*) *As it appears from the 62d Epigram of the 1ſt Book of* Martial, *not quoted by* Moreri.

(*s*) Mart. epig. 68. lib. 7.

in all his Travels. She was already Married to him, when § they retired out of *Ur* of *Chaldæa* to go to *Charan.* The Barrenneſs, with which ſhe was afflicted in her own Country, did not leave her in foreign Countries; and this was it which made her take a Reſolution of giving her Husband a Subſtitute, that ſo ſhe might become a Mother in the Perſon of the Subſtitute, ſince ſhe could not be one in her own Perſon. *Hagar* her Servant, whom ſhe choſe for this Employ, was quickly with Child and paid her with ingratitude *. She deſpiſed *Sarah*; but *Sarah* not being able to bear this Inſolence, uſed ſo fully the full Power her Husband gave her over *Hagar*, that ſhe forced her in a little time to fly out of the Houſe. One may ſee in another place ‡ the Return of this ungrateful Servant and the extremities ſhe was reduced to, when ſhe was turned out a ſecond time. We ſhall not repeat it. It's better to ſay that at laſt, thro' a particular Benediction of God, *Sarah* proved with Child being 90 Years Old, and was brought to Bed of a Son called *Iſaac*. She lived 127 Years ‖. We ought not to forget that ſhe was very Beautiful, and that her Beauty and the Complaiſance ſhe had for her Husband, not

to

he (*), *tho' ſhe is not the Daughter of my Mother.* After this, he endeavoured to juſtify his Wife by ſaying, that he had asked of her a Favour, that whereſoever they went ſhe ſhould declare that he was her Brother. I admire that 'tis not clear to all in this Diſcourſe, that *Sarah* was not *Abraham's* Siſter by the Mother's ſide, but by the Father's ſide. See here my Reaſons.

I. In the firſt place, if *Sarah* had not been the Siſter of *Abraham* in this manner, the Apology of her Husband had only deceived more and more that good Prince, who complained of his former Diſſimulation; for no Man could think by *Abraham's* diſcourſe that ſhe was only his Niece. I leave all People to judge whether *Abimelech* could form any other Ideas from *Abraham's* Apology. It's to no purpoſe to ſuppoſe that *Sarah* was the Daughter of *Haran*, and conſequently the Grand-Child of the Father of *Abraham*; and to add, that a Nephew is ſometimes called (*a*) Brother, and that a Grand-Son is ſometimes called Son; that ſerves to no purpoſe in this Affair, for the Circumſtances require that *Abraham* ſhould uſe the words in the moſt proper Signification; for if he had not, he muſt paſs for a Man who deſign'd to impoſe upon *Abimelech.*

II. Beſides to what purpoſe ſhould he make uſe of this diſtinction, *Daughter of my Father, Daughter of my Mother*, if he meant only that he was the Uncle of *Sarah*? Let us put the caſe that he might have called Siſter, her that was only his Neice; to what purpoſe ſhould he ſay that his Mother was not the Grand-Mother of this Niece? It is, will ſome ſay, to repreſent ingeniouſly the Degree of his Kindred in reſpect of *Sarah.* But why did he uſe the Word *Daughter* in an ambiguous Signification? Why does he not uſe it in its right ſenſe, as I ſuppoſe he did. Beſides, the ingenuity ſpoken of would be very unſeaſonable; it would weaken the Apology of the Patriarch; for it would make the bonds of Kindred appear leſs ſtrong. If it be objected to me, that in my Suppoſition that ſame Ingenuity weakens the Apology more then it ſtrengthens it; I'll give a Reaſon why *Abraham* declared that *Sarab* was not his Siſter by the Mother's ſide. They made a difference between the Marriage of a Man with his Siſter both by the Father and Mother, and the Marriage of a Man with his half Siſter. The *Athenians* (*b*) who permitted the Marrying of the Siſter by the Father, forbad the Marrying of the Siſter by the Mother. *Solon* decided it ſo. On the Contrary *Lycurgus* (*c*) permitted the *Lacedemonians* to Marry the Siſter by the Mother, and not by the Father. Some have ſaid, that as the Community of Blood is more certain between a Brother and a Siſter by the Mother, then between a Brother and a Siſter by the Father; the Permiſſion of *Solon* was, generally ſpeaking, leſs odious (*d*) than the Permiſſion of *Lycurgus.* Will any one ſay, after this, that in my Suppoſition *Abraham* ſaid without any neceſſity, that his Wife was not his Siſter by the Mother's ſide; as in the contrary Suppoſition he would have ſaid to no purpoſe, that his Mother was not the Grand-Mother of *Sarab*?

III. Add to this, that if *Abraham* meant nothing elſe but that his Father *Terah* was the Grand-Father of *Sarah*, he took the Terms of Father and Siſter in a large and leſs proper ſignification. Why therefore did he declare that his Mother was not the Mother of *Sarah.* Was ſhe not, in the ſenſe that he took the Word *Father* in relation to *Terah*; that is to ſay, was ſhe not the Grand-Mother of *Sarah*, juſt as *Terah* was her Grand-Father? Some think to clear the difficulty by ſuppoſing that *Haran* was the Father of *Sarah*, and that he was not the Brother of *Abraham* by the Mother: They aſſign therefore two Wives to *Terah*, and they ſuppoſe he had *Haran* by the one and *Abraham* by the other. And Conſequently if *Sarah* was the Daughter of *Haran*, her Grand-Father was the Father of *Abraham*; but her Grand-Mother was different from the Mother of *Abraham.* I Anſwer, all this falls to the Ground as ſoon as 'tis ſuppoſed that this Patriarch made uſe of the Words *Siſter* and *Daughter* in a large ſignification; for upon this Foot 'tis certain, that the Mother of *Abraham* is Grand-Mother to the Children of *Haran*, whether ſhe engendred *Haran*, or whether ſhe was only the Wife of him who engendred him. As ſoon as you leave the proper and ſtrict ſignification of the Words which denote the Kindred, and that you follow the Cuſtom that is obſerved in Families, the word *Mother* agrees to the Wives in Relation to all the Children of their Husbands, and by Conſequence that of Grand-Mother, with reſpect to all the Children of all the Children of their Husbands: So that if *Abraham* had taken the Terms in a large ſignification, which the ſtyle of Friendſhip or Civility has introduced into Families, he could not have denied, as he did, that his Mother was the Grand-Mother of *Sarab.* Some wiſh they could ſay that he took the ſame Words ſometimes in a proper, and ſometimes in an improper ſignification. But this were to ſuppoſe that he acted the Sophiſter, and impoſed upon the well-meaning *Abimelech*?

IV. The 4th Reaſon is taken from this, *viz.* that it cannot be ſuppoſed upon any good Grounds that *Sarab* was adopted by *Terab.* If it were ſo, *Abraham* might have made uſe of his diſtinction without departing from exactneſs of ſpeaking; for in that caſe his Father might have been called the Father of *Sarab* in a ſignification proper enough. But ſee here what ruins this Evaſion: They have recourſe to it only to avoid the imputation of Inceſt, and they do not avoid it by that; for a Fraternity or Brotherhood, founded upon Adoption, properly ſo called, was no leſs an Obſtacle to Marriage than a Natural Fraternity. According to the Laws (*e*), a Brother who Married his adopted Siſter, Committed an Inceſt, properly ſo called.

V. From whence I draw one of my chief Reaſons. If any thing ſhould determine us not to take in a literal ſenſe the preciſe Declaration of *Abraham*, that *Sarab is truly his Siſter, Daughter of his Father, but not of his Mother*, it wou'd be the inceſtuous Marriage that reſults from this Fraternity. But does not that very thing refute (*f*) thoſe, who ſay that *Sarab* was *Abraham's* Niece? Is it not agreed that this Degree of Kindred renders Marriages Inceſtuous? Our Adverſaries therefore muſt ſeek out Excuſes for the Inceſt of *Abraham.* If they can find any, it will be as well for us as for them; the differences being only of leſs or more, it will not be hard for us to give their Reaſons the Extent that will be needful for us; eſpecially conſidering that *Jacob* made no ſcruple to be Married at the ſame time to two Siſters, which in other times would have been

an

---

§ Genes. 11. 29, 31.

* Genes. 16.

‡ *In the Article of* Agar.

‖ Moreri *falſly ſays* 137.

(*) Genes. 20. 12.

(*a*) Loth, Abraham's *Nephew is call'd his Brother*, Geneſ. 14. 16. *but this Example is of no uſe to thoſe who ſuppoſe that* Sarah *was* Loth's *Siſter; for upon this ſuppoſition* Loth *would be call'd Brother, as being a Brother-in-Law, rather than as being a Nephew.*

(*b*) *See the proofs of it* apud Muretum l. 15. c. 5. variar. lect. & apud Gebhardum in Corn. Nepotem vit. Cimonis. *Conſult the Art.* Cimon Remark D.

(*c*) *See the ſame Authors.*

(*d*) Filia patris (*ſoror, non uterina*) jure conjungebatur Noachidi, quoniam inter gentes ratio conſanguinitatis paternæ non habebatur. *Jarchius apud Heidegg. hiſt. Patriar. tom.* 2. *pag.* 78.

(*e*) Inter fratrem ſororemque nuptias eſſe prohibitas ſive eodem utroque parente, ſive altero tantum nati ſint: verum ſi per adoptionem ſoror ſibi ſit quamdiu manet adoptio, etiam nuptias prohiberi: at ſi per emancipationem adoptio diſſoluta ſit, poſſe inter eos rite iniri connubium. *Juſtinian.* lib. 1. [illegible]

(*f*) See Rivet in Geneſ. exercit. [illegible] Heidegg. hiſt. Patriarch. tom. 2. pag. [illegible] to call her ſelf his Wife but his Siſter, expoſed her (B) to be Twice taken from him,

an Abominable thing. *Clemens Alexandrinus* looks upon it to be ſo ſmall a difficulty, that he ſays it very eaſily, that the Words of the Patriarch (a) teach us that Men muſt not Marry a Siſter by the Mother's ſide. 'Tis certain there are good Reaſons given to juſtify the Patriarch on this head; I ſhall not mention them; you may eaſily find them in other Books. I ſhall only tell thoſe, who would accuſe me of undervaluing the Conſcience of *Abraham* as to the Crime of Inceſt; that before they come to me, they muſt condemn a great many (b) Ancient and Modern Divines, both Catholicks and Proteſtants. I ſet no great Value upon what is found in the Annals (c) of *Eutychius*, that the firſt Wife of *Terah*, Mother of *Abraham*, was called *Jona*, and that his Second Wife, Mother of *Sarah*, was called *Tehevita*: however 'tis a ſign, that there is an Ancient Tradition for the Opinion I have followed.

VI. Here's another Reaſon. If *Sarah* was not the Daughter of *Terah*, but his Grand-Daughter, ſhe muſt be the Daughter of *Haran* or of *Nachor*. But ſhe was neither; I prove it. We find in *Geneſis* (d) that the Wife of *Nachor* was called *Milca*, and that ſhe was the Daughter of *Haran*, Father of *Milca* and *Jiſca*. Since the latter is Named without having the ſame Reaſon to Name her as there was for the other, (for no Husband is aſſign'd to her as to the other) 'tis probable that if *Haran* had had other Daughters, they would have been Named at the ſame time, and above all, *Sarah* would not have been forgotten, ſince mention had been made of her Marriage with *Abraham*. We may then ſafely conclude that *Haran* had only two Daughters, *Milca* and *Jiſca*. This Reaſon is ſo convincing, that it obliges many of our Adverſaries to ſuppoſe that *Sarah* and *Jiſca* are the ſame Perſon. They do no great Honour to the Sacred Hiſtorian. What an admirable Writer would he be, if in three Lines he ſhould give two different Names to a Woman, without telling us that they are only two Names of the ſelf ſame Perſon? See in the 22. Chapter of *Geneſis*, the Liſt of the Children of *Nachor*: You will not find *Sarah* there, and you'll ſee that his Firſt-Born came into the World after *Abraham* went out of his Country; for it was at his return from Mount *Morija*, where *Abraham* would have Sacrificed his Son *Iſaac*, that he heard that *Milcha* had brought forth Eight Children to her Husband *Nachor*, viz. *Huts*, *her Firſt-Born*, &c. Beſides, were it poſſible, that if *Sarah* had been the Daughter of *Haran*, the Scripture ſhould never ſpeak of *Loth*, as of her Brother?

VII It's eaſy to anſwer thoſe who object the words of the Scripture, *Geneſ.* 11. 31. where *Sarah* is called the Daughter-in-Law of *Terah*; for a Married Woman has more regard to the Relations of her Marriage, than to thoſe of her Birth.

(B) *Twice taken from him.*] Theſe two Rapes reſemble one another as much as two drops of Water. In both of them *Abraham* ſuppreſſed his being *Sarah's* Husband; and bid her ſay he was her Brother; and he did it becauſe he was afraid they would Kill him, if they knew he was her Husband, and would be kind to him for her ſake, if they thought he was not her Husband. In both of them the Raviſhers were puniſhed from above, before they could ſatisfy their Paſſion, and ſent her back with Preſents for her Husband, and reproacht him with Lies. The firſt Rape happen'd in *Ægypt* King *Pharaoh*; the ſecond in *Guerar* by *Abimelech* King of the *Philiſtines*. *Sarah* was at leaſt Sixty Five Years Old when *Pharaoh* took her away, and Ninety when ſhe was Raviſhed by *Abimelech*; for ſhe was Ten Years Younger than her Husband (e), and their Voyage into *Ægypt* was after their going out of *Charan*, that is to ſay, after (f) the Seventy Fifth Year of *Abraham*. As to the Voyage to *Guerar*, it was after the foretelling of the Birth of *Iſaac*, that is to ſay, when *Abraham* was a Hundred Years Old. Say what you will, this Hiſtory is a proof that *Abraham* feared Death more than any Conjugal Diſhonour, and that he was far from being a Jealous Husband. He leaves to the paternal care of Providence the Honour and Chaſtity of *Sarah*; but he neglects no Humane means for his own Life. Not to acknowledge therein the Infirmity of Corrupt Nature is to be voluntarily Blind. That Patriarch might have ſaid on this occaſion, *Homo ſum, humani nihil a me alienum puto* (†). Thoſe who believe that the fear of Danger made him Reaſon ill are miſtaken; *there is no fear of God*, ſaid he, (g) *in this Country, and they will Kill me becauſe of my Wife*. He believed therefore that thoſe, who would make no ſcruple to Kill a Man, would make ſome to take away a Married Woman. Yes, he believed it, and not without reaſon. The good of Society, without doubt, more than the Love of Vertue, made the Rape of a Married Woman to be look't on as an Enormous Injuſtice, the ill Conſequences of which Sovereigns themſelves dreaded; but it was not look'd upon as ſo great a Matter, if a great Lord enjoyed a Woman that was not Married, to increaſe the number of his Concubines. And therefore *Abraham* reaſoning ſolidly, might be ſure, that at leaſt the fear of Men would hinder the *Ægyptians* and the *Philiſtines* from taking away his Wife, becauſe he would be a perpetual Witneſs of the Violence done to a Married Woman. The reaſonable Concluſion of this was to be afraid, leſt they ſhould privately Diſpatch him, that they might keep *Sarah*, and yet not be reproached with taking away a Married Woman. This fear is not the worſt paſſage of this Hiſtory. Who does not know the underhand dealings of *David*, in order to deſtroy the Husband of his Miſtreſs? The deſire of being well treated, as being the Brother of the Beautiful *Sarah*, is more blameable than the fear of being Killed. However we ought to abhor the Brutality (h) of *Fauſtus* the *Manichee*, and content our ſelves with what (i) St. *Jerome* ſays of the matter. St. *Chryſoſtom* (k) and St. *Ambroſe* have found here matter for a Panegyrick on the Charity of *Sarah*, who was willing, in favour of her Husband, to expoſe her Chaſtity to the greateſt dangers. (l) *Extrema adiit, ſororem ſe ejus aſſeruit, contenta ſi ita eſſet neceſſe, periclitari pudore potius quam virum ſalute: ut tueretur maritum mentita eſt germanitatem, ne inſidiatores pudoris ejus tanquam æmulum & vindicem uxoris necarent.* Origen was of another Opinion; he found ſo many Scandals in the Litteral Senſe, that he had recourſe to Types and Allegories. *Alioquin*, ſays he (m), *quæ nobis ædificatio erit legentibus Abraham tantum Patriarcham non ſolum mentitum eſſe Regi, ſed pudicitiam conjugis prodidiſſe? Quid nos ædificat tanti Patriarchæ uxor, ſi putetur contaminationibus expoſita per conniventiam maritalem? Hæc Judæi putent & ſi qui ſint amici literæ non ſpiritus.* Others (n) have recourſe to Inſpiration, and pretend that *Abraham* was directed by a Prophetical Spirit. This is the way never to be ſilent. This Remedy ought to be better managed, and never to be uſed but as Extreme Unction. Some (o) apply it to *Sarah* as to her deſiring her Husband to lie with her Servant Maid. As for thoſe who ſay (p) to excuſe *Abraham*, that his Life was ſo neceſſary for the accompliſhment of the Divine Promiſes, that he was obliged to preſerve it at any rate, even at the coſt of his Wife's Honour, they confute themſelves: They alledge for his Juſtification, what is againſt him; for if his Life was neceſſary for the fulfilling of the Divine Decrees, he needed not fear to be Killed, he might be ſure none could do it.

The looſe Caſuiſts and Protectors of Equivocations, take advantage of this Conduct of the Patriarch.

Sſſ

(†) Terent. in Heautont. Act. 1. ſc. 1. pag. m. 112.

(g) Geneſ. 20, 11.

(h) *He accuſed* Abraham, Quod matrimonii ſui infamiſſimus nundinator avaritiæ ac ventris cauſa duobus regibus Abimelech & Pharaoni diverſis temporibus Saram conjugem ſororem mentitus, quod erat pulcherrima, in concubitum venditarit. *Vide Auguſtinum contra Fauſtum*, *l.* 22. *c.* 33.

(i) *He calls it* fœdam neceſſitatem.

(k) Homil. 32. in Geneſ. *See the Remark* A *in the Article* Abimelech.

(l) Ambroſ. de Abrah. c. 2.

(m) In cap. 6. Geneſeos Heidegger. pag. 149. *pretends that* Origen *inſulted and cenſured* Abraham, quod per conniventiam maritalem Saram contaminationibus expoſuerit. *But how could he reproach him with it, ſince he rejects the Literal Senſe?* (n) Paulus Burgenſis apud Heidegg. pag. 149. (o) Joſeph. Antiq. l. 1. c. 10. (p) Apud Heidegger. ubi ſupra.

him, whereby her Chaſtity had ſuffered Shipwrack, if God (C) had not prevented it. A ſingular Providence ſaved her from this Shipwrack, and reſtored her to her Husband, with her Honour ſafe and ſound, beſides the Benefits those two amorous Princes beſtowed on him. This might ſweeten the ſad Experience he had of the Inconveniencies which they find, who carry about with them a Beautiful Wife, which are ſometimes greater, than if they Travelled with an Ugly one. One cannot eaſily clear (D) *Abraham* and *Sarah* in this matter, nor about the buſineſs of *Hagar*; therefore they are in the wrong * who are ſo angry with *Calvin*, for ſpeaking the Truth on this ſubject. We ought to keep at an equal diſtance from the Irreverence of *Fauſtus* † the *Manichee*, and from the ſuperſtitious Flattery of ſome others. The Beauty of *Sarah* had ſomething peculiar in it, which ought not to be forgoten; *viz.* that it continued

* See Rivet in Exercit. [illegible] tom. I oper. pag. [illegible] & Heidegg. Hiſt. patr. tom. I. p. [illegible] & the Remark H of this Article.

† See the Remark B.

ated. See the laſt Anſwer (a) to the *Lettres Provinciales*, that is, the *Entretiens de Cleandre & d'Eudoxe*.

(C) *If God had not prevented it.*] The Scripture does not tell us what Evil hindred *Pharaoh* from Lying with *Sarah*; it (b) ſays only that God *ſtruck him with great Plagues, and all his Houſe.* As to *Abimelech*, it ſays that (c) God threatned him in his Sleep, to kill him with all his Family; but at the end of the Chapter, it ſays, that by *Abraham's* Prayers, God Cured Abimelech, *his Wife, and his Servant Maids*, and that afterwards *they had Children*; for, the Scripture adds, *That the Lord had entirely ſhut up the Wombs of the Houſe of* Abimelech, *becauſe of* Sarah *the Wife of* Abraham. I believe one might rather have killed the Interpreters, than hindred them from making Conjectures upon thoſe Plagues of *Pharaoh*: The Field is more large in this reſpect, then in relation to *Abimelech*; for the Scripture ſeems to denote a ſort of Diſtemper, with reſpect to the latter. But they, probably, have judged of the one by the other; and, as it is likely, that the Perſonal Chaſtiſement of *Abimelech* fell upon the Parts deſigned for Generation, ſince his Wife and his Maid-Servants were Afflicted in thoſe parts, it's believed that it was ſo likewiſe with *Pharaoh* (d). The *Rabbins* ſay, (e) he was Tormented with ſo violent a Gonorrhea, that he had no Pleaſure to think of Women, ſo far was he from being able to Lye with them. They add, That *Sarah* had a Guardian Angel, who ſtruck in ſuch a manner all thoſe ſhe would have him ſtrike, that they had neither the Deſire, nor the Power to come near her; and that it was by means of thoſe Angels that ſhe preſerved her ſelf from the Laſcivious Perſecutions of *Pharaoh*. *Philo* ſays only, (f) That this Prince endured inſupportable Pains, and that he had no other Thought but how to be rid of them. All his Court were whipped with the ſame Scourge, becauſe they had aſſiſted or applauded him in the Rape of *Sarah*. *Eupolemon* ſays (g) that the Plague got into his Houſe, and that the South-Sayers having anſwered, it was for the Rape of a Woman, he reſtored her without touching her. *Joſephus* adds (h) Seditions to the Plague. A Modern Author (i), who bears him an ill Will, refutes him. The reaſon he goes upon is, That a Popular Sedition does not hinder a Prince from diverting himſelf with a Woman, and has, no more than that Plague, a particular relation with the Sin of *Pharaoh*. This Author therefore would have it, that he was afflicted in thoſe Parts that ſhould have been the Inſtrument of his Debauchery, and he confirms his Thought by the Maxim of the Wiſe-Man (k), *per quæ peccat quis per eadem & torquetur.* Be it as it will, it cannot be denyed, but that *Sarah* ſtayed ſome time in the Houſes of her Raviſhers: This is certain, at leaſt, as to the laſt Rape, ſince they had leaſure to find out, that it was upon her account that the Wombs of all the Women in the Court of *Abimelech* were ſhut up. From whence ariſes this ſmall Difficulty? That Prince reſtored *Sarah*, as ſoon as he was ſhew'd in a Dream, that ſhe was the Wife of *Abraham*; he therefore knew nothing of it till ſhe had been ſometime in his Houſe. What did he deſign to do with her, ſeeing he let her alone all the time? Was it for this that he took her into his Houſe? Thoſe who make this Objection, know not the cuſtom of the Eaſtern Princes. They have many Wives, and others are procured to them from time to time: But we muſt not fancy that they Careſs them one after another by turns; there are ſome, whoſe turn never comes, tho' they be moſt Beautiful. *Abimelech* was contented to have *Sarah* into his Houſe, knowing that he could Lye with her when he pleaſed; but God prevented it, before he choſe his time. We may ſay the ſame of *Pharaoh*. I don't ſuppoſe him to have been ſo great a Monarch, as to obſerve the Ceremonies that were practiſed in the Court of *Perſia*, where a Woman (l) that pleaſed the King, was ordered to Waſh and Perfume her ſelf a Year before ſhe was brought to him. I ſhall not therefore inſiſt on the Conjecture of St. (m) *Jerom*, who explains, by this method, the reaſon why *Sarah* was ſometime without doing any thing in the Houſe of *Pharaoh*. But let us ſay of this laſt King, what we have ſaid of the King of the *Philiſtines*; or we may ſay that they were ſtruck with a dangerous Diſtemper the very firſt day they took her. *Joſephus* ſays *Abimelech* was ſo ſick, that his Life was deſpaired of. Others ſpecify the nature of the Evil; (n) they ſay he had ſuch violent Pains in his Genital Parts, that he could not perform the act of Copulation. St. *Chryſoſtom* and St. *Jerom* do not well agree; for (o) the firſt maintains, that it required as great a Miracle that *Sarah* might come out of the Houſe of *Pharoah* Undefiled, as for *Daniel* to be ſafe among the Lyons, and the three *Hebrew* Children in the Fiery Furnace. There's a little difference to be obſerved between the two Narratives of *Moſes*; he ſays expreſly, that *Abimelech* did not come near *Sarah*, but he gives no account whether *Pharaoh* did it or no. *Theodoret* (p) believed that the Sacred Hiſtorian uſed that Precaution, with reſpect to *Abimelech*, to ſtop the Mouth of Slander, becauſe *Sarah* was broughs to Bed the ſame Year ſhe had been with that Prince.

(D) *One cannot eaſily clear* Abraham.] For beſides what we have ſaid above, would it not be an Authority for the perverſe Doctrine of Equivocations, if it was once certain that neither he nor *Sarah* ſpoke an untruth? Thoſe who impugne the ill Morals of *Leſſius* and ſome other Jeſuits, ſay that thoſe Lie who make Anſwers which have no relation to the Intention of him who asks a Queſtion. Thoſe Anſwers, tho' they contain nothing but Truth, do not ceaſe for all that to be Lying; for Example, if a Son of *Cain* had been juridically interrogated who he was, with a deſign to know who was his Father, and had anſwered that *Cain* was his Uncle, he had ſaid nothing but Truth, for his Mother was *Cain's* Siſter; yet his Anſwer had not been exempt from Deceit. The ſame may be ſaid of *Sarah*. *Abimelech* asked her what Relation ſhe had to *Abraham*; he had all the Right imaginable to ask her, for he was King of the Country; his Intention was to know whether ſhe was Married, or no; and it was upon this that he deſigned to regulate his Conduct as to her. She anſwered, *I am* Abraham's *Siſter*; her Husband who had ſuggeſted to her this Anſwer, ſaid on his part, *I am* Sarah's *Brother*. Is it not the ſame thing, as if he had anſwered, the *Relation of Brother and Siſter is the greateſt Relation that is between us*, and would not this Anſwer have been a formal Lye? If one, that knows all the Circumſtances of a great Conſpiracy, ſhould be asked, *What do you know of it?* Should Anſwer, *I know ſuch a thing of it*, which is not the chief Matter of the Conſpiracy, would not he be a Deceiver, would he not be a Liar? For his Answer would be Equivalent to this, *I only know this*. A Commentator ment, at leaſt, till ſhe was (E) 90 Years old. Several Reaſons are given for it. Some ſay, that it was becauſe ſhe had no Children, and becauſe ſhe had (F) renounced all Matrimonial Commerce, after ſhe ſaw her ſelf Barren. In caſe theſe Reaſons do not ſatisfy, there is added to them a particular Providence of God, which, as they ſay, preſerved from all the Attacks of Old Age, the Beauty of *Sarah*, amongſt

---

(a) Pag. 158. & 159. of the Dutch Edit. 1690.

(b) Geneſ. 12. 17.

(c) Geneſ. 20.

(d) *See* Pererius in Geneſ. c. 12. v. 17.

(e) Apud Lyranum citante Saliano pag. 413.

(f) In libr. de Abrah.

(g) Apud Euſebium præp. l. 9. c. 4.

(h) Lib. 1. c. 8.

(i) Salian. tom. 1. pag. 413.

(k) Cap. 11. v. 17.

[illegible] upon *Geneſis* (*), going about to prove that Marriage between Brothers and Siſters was not practis'd in *Abraham's* time, makes uſe of this Remark. *Sarah* anſwering, ſays he, that ſhe was *Abraham's* Siſter, was preſently believed not to be his Wife; therefore, at that time, theſe two Relations were concluded to be incompatible, *viz.* to be both Siſter and Wife. This reaſoning is falſe; for ſuppoſe that theſe Marriages took place in a Country, the Cuſtom there would be, that the Siſter, after her Marriage, would not be called the Siſter of her Husband, but his Wife; ſo that every Siſter, not call'd the Wife of ſuch a one, but only his Siſter, would be looked upon then not to be his Wife. And for this Reaſon, *Abraham* and *Sarah* deceived plainly the *Ægyptians* and the *Philiſtines*, by ſuppreſſing the Relation of Marriage, and ſpeaking only of that of Brotherhood; tho' thoſe Nations were not Ignorant of the Compatibility of thoſe Relations. But it was enough to be deceived by *Abraham*, that they ſhould know that the one ſwallowed up the other, much as the quality of Father abſorbed that of Uncle in the Perſon of [illegible], with reſpect to his Children. In a word, the ſuppreſſion of a Truth is a real Lye, as often as it is deſigned to make the Hearer form a falſe judgment. *Abraham* and *Sarah* are in the caſe. Thoſe who deny that Marriages between Brothers and Siſters, were known among the *Canaanites*, ought to read the Chapter of *Leviticus*, where Marriages in ſuch and ſuch degrees are forbid. Let us not forget that *Iſaac* made uſe of the diſſimulation of his Father upon ſuch a like Principle: he ſaid alſo, for fear of being killed, that *Rebecah* was his Siſter (‡).

(E) *The Beauty of* Sarah — *continued* — *till ſhe was 90 Years old.*] This is proved by the 20 chap. of *Geneſis*, where 'tis ſaid, that *Abraham*, being gone into the Country of *Guerar*, would only paſs for the Brother of *Sarah*; which was the Reaſon why *Abimelech* took her into his Houſe with a deſign to Marry her. The Birth of *Iſaac* had been already foretold this Patriarch: But his Wife was 90 Years old when this happened; therefore &c. I know the Scripture does not ſay, in this Paſſage, that *Sarah* was Beautiful, but 'tis no hard matter to Collect it from the Circumſtances of that Voyage. We find in the 12th Chapter, that the Reaſon which obliged *Abraham* to ſay, in *Ægypt*, that *Sarah* was his Siſter, was, becauſe he ſaw ſhe was Beautiful, and was afraid of being killed, that ſhe might be the better enjoy'd. *Sarah* no ſooner appeared, but ſhe was taken into the King's Houſe. There's no doubt but *Abraham* diſſembled his Marriage in *Guerar* upon the ſame Motive. He himſelf declares, That (a) he was afraid of being killed becauſe of his Wife; he knew therefore ſhe was Beautiful enough to inſpire Love. The event ſpeaks it clearly; for as ſoon as ſhe was ſeen, the King of *Guerar* took her to make her his Wife. It was without doubt for her Beauty; for to ſay with Father *Salianus*, that he took her as a Venerable Widow, who underſtood the Management of a Houſe, and as the Siſter of a Man whoſe Alliance he looked on, to be very Advantageous to him, is a meer Illuſion. It's probable, that *Abraham* went only into the Country of the *Philiſtins* to avoid the Famine that purſued him; it was therefore eaſy for the King of that Country to gain *Abraham* without making himſelf a Sacrifice to a Widow of fourſcore Years of Age. He would have purchaſed, at a dear rate, the Friendſhip of *Abraham*, if *Sarah* had been decay'd as Commonly Women are at that Age. Let us therefore acknowledge as a certain Truth, that ſhe was ſtill a Beautiful Woman. A good Father *Capuchin* (b) of *Paris* imagined pleaſantly that *Abimelec* took *Sarah* only upon a Religious Account: He was, ſays he, a holy King and a Prophet, and took her only to Converſe with her about matters of Devotion and the next life. He thought this Reverend Mother wou'd teach him many things concerning the Kingdom of God. But would he have been Chaſtiſed for ſuch good and Spiritual Intentions? What a ſtrange fancy! Fleſh and Blood, without doubt, would have had a greater ſhare in their Diſcourſes than devotion if he had been let alone.

We ought not to mind the Thought of *Hugo à S. Victore*; the Conſequences of it are dangerous. Let us not open a Breach in the Holy Scripture; Prophane Men would enter into it that way, like Wolves into a Sheep-fold, and commit a thouſand Diſorders. This Author pretends (c) that *Moſes* has not put in its place the taking away of *Sarah* by *Abimelech*, but in a time diſtant from the true time above 30 Years. Nor ought we to have recourſe to the Expedient of thoſe who ſay (d), that 'tis no greater wonder that *Sarah* ſhould have been handſome at 90, than to ſee a handſome Woman at 40 ſo now a days: for, ſay they, Women lived then to be 130 Years, as now about 80. By their leave, they Calculate wrong: Where would they find, according to their Suppuſtation, the Deadneſs of *Sarah's* Womb, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks (e)? Why *did it ceaſe to be with Sarah* (f) *after the manner of Women!* What would become of *Abraham's* Celebrated Faith with reſpect to the Birth of *Iſaac*? Is it ſtrange, at this day, that a Woman at 40, ſhould Conceive? Let us adjuſt their Calculation: 90 Years are to 130 much as 56 to 80. It's therefore with our Beauties of 56 Years that we muſt compare *Sarah*. Now I confeſs that tho' it be very rare that a Woman of 56 ſhould be taken away for her Beauty, much leſs be deſign'd for the Bed of a Sovereign, as a dainty and Royal bit, yet there are ſome for all that, that have Beautiful Remains at that Age. See what I have related elſewhere out of *Brantome* concerning *Joan* of *Arragon* and the Dutcheſs of *Valentinois*. We may therefore ſay, without having recourſe to Miracles, which ought to be kept as much as poſſible for a great neceſſity, that the good Conſtitution of *Sarah*, and her being exempt from lying in and Nurſing, might preſerve her Beauty even to the Age of 90. *Procopius* (g) thinks that when ſhe was made capable of Conceiving, ſhe recovered her loſt Beauty, and that God, by a ſpecial Favour, made her thoſe two Preſents at once. *Procopius* may ſay what he pleaſes.

(F) *Renounced all Matrimonial Commerce.*] Let us cite *Pererius*: (h) *Deinde id accidit Saræ ob ſummam ejus caſtitatem & continentiam, quippe quæ ſtatim ut ſenſit ſe ſterilem & invalidam ad generandum abſtinuit a copula carnali, ut ſupra oſtendimus ſuper illis verbis quæ ſunt in capite* 18. Poſtquam conſenui &c. It will not be improper to ſee on what he grounds his Opinion. He makes uſe of theſe Words of *Sarah*, *Poſtquam conſenui & Dominus meus vetulus eſt voluptati operam dabo* (i)? That is, *After I am waxed old, ſhall I have pleaſure, my Lord being old alſo?* Theſe are two difficulties that *Sarah* raiſed after the Promiſe that was made to *Abraham*, that his Wife ſhould be brought to Bed of a Son the Year following. *Muſt I then*, ſaid ſhe, *notwithſtanding my great Age, receive the Careſſes of my Husband!* this is the firſt Difficulty: *but is not my Husband too old for that!* This is the Second Difficulty. I think we cannot reaſonably deny to this Author that the Words of *Sarah* ſignify, that ſhe and her Husband obſerved a perfect Continence; but all the reſt is nothing but meer Conjecture, *viz.* That they had already above 14 Years agreed on a mutual Abſtinence; that is to ſay, from the time that *Hagar* became the Concubine of *Abraham*. But let us ſuppoſe it to be ſo: We muſt infer from thence, that *Sarah* put an end to Matrimonial Joys when ſhe came to be 75 Years of Age. How comes *Pererius* to draw from this one of his Reaſons, why the Beauty of that Lady was preſerved to 90 Years? (k) *intemperantia Veneris cito mulierem inveterat & vehementer deformat ac turpat.* That is to ſay, *the immoderate uſe of Venereal Pleaſures make Women look Old, and Ugly.* Be it ſo. I leave the diſcuſſion of it to Phyſicians: But does it follow from thence, that a total abſtinence from that Exerciſe puts off old Age, and preſerves the Beauty of Women? No

(a) Geneſ. 20. 11.

(c) Apud Pererium 1. diſput. in Geneſ. c. 20.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Rom. 4. 19.

(f) Geneſ. 18. 11.

(g) Addit Procopius divinitus cum fœcunditate Saræ reſtauratam fuiſſe priſtinam pulchritudinem. Cornel. à Lapide in Geneſ. pag. 149.

(h) Pererius in Geneſ. c. 20. v. 2. Torniellus & Cornelius a Lapide *are of the ſame Opinion.*

(i) Geneſ. 18. 12.

(k) Perer. in Geneſ. cap. 20. diſput. 1.

mongſt other Motives, to try the Faith of (G) *Abraham*. This was little minded by thoſe, who in the heat of their Homilies exaggerated ſo much (G Δ) her Decay, to make the greater Wonder of the Milk that filled her Breaſts. It's pretended † that ſhe had ſo great a plenty of it, that ſhe was forced to take ſeveral Children to Nurſe; and that the day that *Iſaac* was weaned, ſhe gave all the Children of thoſe that came to the Feaſt, her Breaſt to ſuck. They add, That ſhe her ſelf would ſuckle her Son, to remove all ſuſpicions of his being a ſuppoſititious Child. *St. Chryſoſtome* approves * this Thought. There's no probability that this holy Woman died of Grief, when ſhe was told that *Iſaac* was Sacrificed by *Abraham*; and we may boldly place this among the Fables of the *Rabbins* ‖. *Joſephus* ſays, that *Sarah* died a little after the return of her Husband and Son; But, according to his own Calculation, ſhe lived 22 Years longer; for he ſays with the Scripture, that ſhe was 90 Years old when ſhe was brought to Bed of *Iſaac*, and 127 when ſhe died; and on the other hand, he aſſures us, that *Iſaac* was 25 Years old when his Father would have ſacrificed him.

It's here that I muſt ſhew, 1. That *Calvin* is wrongly (H) accuſed of having

---

Logician will find any ſtrength in ſuch ſort of Conſequences, generally ſpeaking, conſidering the great number of things, of which the two Extreams are bad, and pernicious both for the Body and Soul. In particular, the Conſequence here in Queſtion, is ſtrongly impugned by Phyſicians (a). But if we would be ſo Complaiſant, as to grant it to *Pererius*, what Service would it do him in relation to *Sarah*, who, according to him, deprived her ſelf of the Matrimonial right, only at the Age of 75 Years.

(G) *To try the Faith of* Abraham.] This ſeems at firſt ſight to be very ſtrange; for one can ſcarce conceive a greater Temporal Happineſs, then the perpetual Beauty of that which one Loves. What Vows or Wiſhes are ſo favourable to new Married Perſons, as to wiſh that they may never ſeem old one to another?

Diligat (b) ipſa ſenem quondam, ſed & illa marito
Tunc quoque cum fuerit non videatur anus.

But if you conſider it well, you'l find that for a Man who is to Travel with a Family, a Beautiful Woman is no little Burthen; and *Abraham* found it ſo, and may ſerve for an Example. What fears was he not under of being killed, and what mortifying Expedients was he not obliged to have recourſe to? Be it as it will, a Famous Divine of *Zurich* (c) ſpoke in this manner: Puto pulcritudinis Saræ *cauſam non fuiſſe aliam quam ſupernaturale Dei donum & ſpecialem ejuſdem providentiam, qui eam in extrema ſenectute voluit fieri matrem Iſaci, atque ſimul cotem fidei & patientia Abrahami, quæ in hac ob formam uxoris immiſſa tentatione non parum explorata fuit.*

(G Δ) *Exaggerate ſo much her decay.*] St *Chryſoſtome* ſays, That the Rod of *Moſes*, which made Water ſpring out of the Rock, wrought a leſs difficult Miracle, than was done when Milk ſprung out of *Sarah*'s Breaſts. (d) *Non ſic admirabile fuit quod ex petra in deſerto ſcaturierint fontes aquarum quando illam virga Moyſes percuſſit, ſicut de vulva jam emortua puerum naſci, & lactis fontes ſcaturire.* Here are the Words of another Father: (e) *Portabat uterum gravem talis mater quæ inanis ambulare vix poterat——— Marcidæ mammæ quas in vacuos folles ſubducti ſucci detrimenta laxaverant, lactei fontis ubertate tenduntur.*

(H) Calvin *is wrongly accuſed.*] Let us begin with the Word of the Accuſer. (f) *Non eſt prætereundum impie loqui Calvinum qui Saram quaſi lenam & Abraham quaſi adulterum ancillæ ſuæ carpit.* Theſe Words, and many others that follow, are ſo like thoſe of *Cornelius à Lapide*, that there's Reaſon to think *Merſennus* tranſcribed them from him. His Work was Printed in 1623. and that of *Cornelius à Lapide* in 1616. (g) *Carpit hic Calvinus Saram quaſi lenam, Abram quaſi adulterum ancillæ ſuæ Agar.* This Calumny againſt *Calvin* goes yet higher: I have, as much as I could, ſought for the firſt Author of it, but I dare not ſay, I have found him in the Perſon of *Feuardentius*. What is certain is, that this Monk preceded the *Minime* (h), and the Jeſuit (i) whom I have cited. His Accuſation was not well known to *Leonard Coqueus*, who infallibly would have named *Calvin*, and cited the *Theomachia Calviniſtica*, if he had known what is to be found there. He has done neither of them; his Reproaches are indeterminate; they fall in general upon the Hereticks, cites another Work of *Feuardentius*. He ſays that *Fauſtus* the *Manichee* blamed the Conduct of the Patriarch *Abraham*, as a thing that betrayed (k) a great Incredulity, and an ardent Deſire of having Children; and afterwards he adds: (l) *Refert etiam Feuardentius in appendice ad libros Alphonſi à Caſtro contra hæreſes lib. 1. verbo Abraham, quoſdam hæreticos modernos ——— non minus impios fuiſſe in ſanctiſſimum Patriarcham Abrahamum, ut ei crimen adulterii impingant.* Theſe are the Accuſations particularly bent againſt *Calvin*. “(m) *Piiſſimam aviam Chriſti Saram multis vexat contumeliis, multis jactat injuriis:* (1) Sarai rationem alienam a verbo Dei apud ſe quærit. In ipſo progreſſu non leviter peccavit, quod orbitatis impatiens, a verbo Dei diſceſſit. Obrepit deſperatio. Connubii legem pervertit, lectum conjugalem polluendo. Nec culpa etiam vacat Abram, quod ſtulto ac præpoſtero uxoris conſilio obſequutus eſt. Reprehenſione digna eſt Abrahæ facilitas. Utriuſque autem claudicat fides. Dei virtutem non debuit alligare ordini naturæ, vel reſtringere ad ſuum ſenſum. *Et in ſequentibus:* (2) Admittit concubinam quæ inſtar pellicis futura erat. Ad eandem qua ipſa fervebat impatientiam maritum ſollicitat. Vacillat quidem Abrahæ fides, cum à verbo Dei declinans, uxoris impulſu ad remedium prohibitum transferre ſe patitur. Momento uno tentationi ſuccumbit. *Deinde, doloſiſſimo ſchemate utens, id ipſum quod negare ſe de illa fingit, palam adfirmat:* (3) Neque enim domui ſuæ voluit erigere lupanar, nec ancillæ ſuæ productrix, vel mariti lena eſſe——— *O hominem in diſputando vafrum, veteratorem, & malitioſum! Ecquid enim aliud eſt Abra*, uxorem proſtituere, pudicitiam ejus nudare præſidio, pudicitiam prodere (*quod Calvinus palam tribuit Abrahæ*) quam ei lenocinari? *Aut quid*, Conjugii legem pervertere, lectum conjugalem polluere, pellicem viro quærere & ſubminiſtrare, alienam in thorum mariti inducere (*quorum à Calvino inſimulatur Sara*) *quam domi ſuæ lupanar erigere, & mariti lenam eſſe, quod hic ſimulate Calvinus negat & damnat?*” One may obſerve two Frauds in the proceeding of that *Cordelier*. He ſuppreſſes the Expreſſions, wherein *Calvin* Endeavours to extenuate the Fault of *Sarah* and *Abraham*: this is the firſt foul play. He aſſerts impudently, That *Calvin* uſes a ſhameful turn of Sophiſtry, to accuſe, in effect, under a falſe appearance of Negation, this Holy Woman of having been a ——— to her Husband. This is, the ſecond Fraud, and it may be called a dreadful Calumny. The free manner with which *Calvin* judges of the Conduct of the Husband and the Wife, clearly ſhews he uſes no ſhifts or Deviations: He ſpeaks his Thoughts with the greateſt liberty; and makes uſe of all the Right, that Reaſon and Scripture give us of paſſing our Judgment upon the quality of an Action. It's therefore manifeſt, that he ſpeaks ſincerely, when he denies that *Sarah* was a —— &c. This appears further by the Words which follow, and which *Feuardentius* has ſuppreſſed. (n) *Improprie tamen vocatur uxor, quæ præter Dei legem in alienum thorum inducitur. Quare ſciamus hunc concubitum hic illicitum fuiſſe ut inter ſcortationem & conjugium quaſi medius fuerit. Idem omnibus commentis accidit quæ Dei verbo aſſuuntur. Quamlibet enim honeſto tegantur prætextu corruptela ſubeſt, quæ a verbi puritate degenerat, eamque vitiat.* This is the Language of a plain and ſincere Caſuiſt; one may therefore be well aſſured that this is the worſt that *Calvin* had a mind to ſay. Now, he ſays clearly, That the Commerce of *Abraham* and *Hagar* run a middle courſe between he belch'd out the the moſt abuſive words againſt *Sarah*, becauſe ſhe deſired her Huſband to make uſe of their Maid-Servant. 2. That *St. Auguſtin* has not made a good Apology (*I*) for *Abraham*.

---

† See Pererius in Geneſ. c. 21. Salian. pag. 4[illegible] 474.

* Homil. 45. in Geneſ.

‖ Who ſay ſo apud *Toſtatum*. See Salian pag. 489.

(a) See Gaſpar a Reies, Elyſio jucund. quæſt. Campo, quæſt. 36. *where he maintains* quod omnimoda coitus omiſſio magna damna parit præſertim in aſſuetis, in fœminis frequentiſſime, in viris rariſſime & cum minori noxa.

(b) Martial. l. 4. epigr. 13.

(c) Heidegg. hiſt. Patr. tom. 2. pag. 148. *Rivet ſaid the ſame before him.* Oper. t. 1. pag. 277. & Pererius in Geneſ. *ſaid ſo before Rivet.*

(d) Chryſoſt. homil. 46.

(e) Auguſt. Serm. 68. de temp.

(f) Merſennus obſervat. in problemata Veneti n. 119. pag. 165.

(g) Cornel. à Lapide in Geneſ. cap. 16. v. 2. pag. 170. edit. 1623.

(h) *Father* Merſenne.

(i) Cornelius à Lapide.

SARISBERIENSIS * (*Joannes*) an *Engliſh* Man, Biſhop of *Chartres*, was Born about the Year 1110. He went into *France* at the Age of 16 or 17. *He afterwards had a Commiſſion from the King his Maſter, to go and ſtay with Pope* Eugenius *about the Affairs of* England. Some would have play'd him an ill trick in that Court, and falſely accuſed him; but at laſt the Truth came to light, and he ſtaid with *Eugenius*, *with all the Favours* he deſerved. He was ſtill more eſteem'd by the Succeſſor of that Pope, and being recalled into *England*, he received great marks of Eſteem from *Thomas Becket* who was then High Chancellor. This Chancellor wholly governed his Maſter *Henry* II. *and as he wanted aſſiſtance under ſo heavy a Burden*—*he made uſe of the Counſel of* Joannes Sariſberienſis, *eſpecially about the Education of the King's eldeſt Son, and of many young Noble* Engliſh *Lords, whom he had undertaken to Educate in good Manners and Learning. He deſired him alſo to take care of his Houſe, as long as he was in his Voyage of* Guienne *with the King his Maſter.* Being returned from that Voyage, he was made Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, and left the Court to reſide in his Dioceſe. *Sariſberienſis* Accompanied him, and faithfully followed him, when this Prelate was obliged to retire into *France*, and when about ſeven Years after he was recalled into *England*. It is well known that he was Murder'd in his own Archiepiſcopal Church. *Sariſberienſis undertook to ward off a Blow that one of the Aſſaſſins aimed at the Head of his Maſter*, *but*

between Fornication and Marriage. *Feuardentius* has ſuppreſſed this Remarkable paſſage of *Calvin*'s Commentary: (*a*) *Benedictione (quam ſciebat divinitus promiſſam eſſe) potiundæ voto, conjugalem thorum ſponte alteri cedit*—— *ſic laudabile fuit votum Saræ quoad finem vel ſcopum in quem tendebat, ut tamen in ipſo progreſſu non leviter peccarit*—— *Utriuſque autem claudicavit fides, non in ſubſtantia quidem, ſed in medio ipſo (ut loquuntur) vel agendi ratione.*

Obſerve, That Copiers are very apt to magnify things. *Cornelius a Lapide* and *Marinus Merſennus* ſay plainly and abſolutely, That *Calvin* accuſes *Sarah* of ——— and *Abraham* of Adultery. *Feuardentius* was contented to ſay, that the Accuſation was propos'd indirectly, and under a deceitful ſhew of a juſtification.

(*I*) *St.* Auguſtin *has not made a good Apology for* Abraham.] He made uſe of 4 Reaſons. The 1ſt is, That *Abraham* was not induced to this Act by a Motion of ſenſual Love, but to have Children: (*b*) *Uſus eſt ea* (concubina) *quippe ad generandam prolem, non ad explendam libidinem.* The 2d is, That he did it, not to do an injury to his Wife, but to pleaſe her, and to give her the Conſolation that her State of barrenneſs required. The 3d is, That this Conduct was grounded upon the Right, which *St. Paul* ſpeaks of in the 7th Chap. of the 1. Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*: *Likewiſe Man has no Power over his own Body, but the Woman.* There is here no Fault, neither on the Woman's, nor on the Man's ſide; ſhe gives her Maid to her Husband, in hopes of Iſſue, and he takes her on the ſame proſpect. (*c*) *Nulla eſt hic cupido laſciviæ, nulla nequitiæ turpitudo. Ab uxore cauſa prolis ancilla marito traditur, a marito cauſa prolis accipitur; ab utroque non culpæ luxus ſed naturæ fructus exquiritur.* The 4th Reaſon is, That *Abraham* ſent away *Hagar* as ſoon as his Wife would have it ſo. I have cited elſewhere (*d*) the Words of *St. Auguſtin* on this Subject: *Leonard Coquæus*, a Commentator upon that Father, makes no difficulty to refute him. He oppoſes to the firſt Reaſon this Axiom of *St. Paul*, (*e*) *Ill muſt not be done that Good may come*, and the Common Doctrine of the Moraliſts, That a good action requires not only a good Motive, but alſo a matter that is lawful. (*f*) *Ad quod ſit actio honeſta, requiritur non modo bonus finis & reliquæ circumſtantiæ, verum etiam quod ſit circa debitam materiam.* This affords him the Refutation of the Second Reaſon; for if the Commerce of the Patriarch with his Maid was bad in it ſelf, it did not become lawful by the compliance of *Abraham* with the Deſire of *Sarah*: The Counſels or Suggeſtions of a Wife do not clear a Husband as to Unlawful things; which appears clearly by the Fall of our firſt Father *Adam*, who, in vain, alledged the perſuaſions of his Wife. The third Reaſon is not better; for a Wife cannot convey to another the Right, of which *St. Paul* ſpeaks, no more than a Husband can yield to another Man the right of which the ſame Apoſtle ſpeaks. (*g*) *Non poteſt uxor jus illud quod habet in corpus viri transferre in alteram mulierem, ut congreſſum viri ſui cum alia muliere aſſenſu ſuo poſſit facere licitum, ut nec vir poteſt transferre in alterum virum illud jus quod habet in uxorem.* *Leonard Coquæus* ſays nothing on the 4th Reaſon, becauſe he did not look upon it as part of the Apology: But the moſt ſtupid may eaſily perceive, that it only ſerves to ſhew, that the Patriarch was not moved to it by any Impurity. 'Tis a good thing quickly and eaſily to quit an unlawful Engagement, but it does not prove that the Enjoyment was lawful. This Commentator ſuppoſes, that *St. Auguſtin* did not alledge theſe Reaſons as Proofs of the Purity of the Commerce of *Abraham* and *Hagar*, but only as Proofs that refuted the aſſertion of the *Manichees*, who affirm'd that this *Patriarch* was deſperately in Love with *Hagar*, and lay with her only to ſatisfy his Paſſion. He ſuppoſes alſo, that the ſame Father knew very well the Reaſon that cleared *Abraham*, which was, that there was a true Marriage between *Hagar* and her Maſter. He examines afterwards the 3 Reaſons of *St. Ambroſe*. The firſt is taken from this, That *Abraham* lived before the Law of God forbad Adultery. (*h*) *Abraham ante legem Moyſi & ante Evangelium fuit, cum nondum interdictum adulterium videretur, pœna criminis ex tempore legis eſt, quæ crimen inhibuit, nec ante legem ulla rei damnatio eſt.* The 2d is the ſame with the firſt and ſecond of *St. Auguſtin*. The 3d is taken from this, That the Conjunction of *Abraham* and *Hagar* was one of the Types of the Old Teſtament. The Commentator obſerves (*i*), That *Sixtus Senenſis* (*k*) found in the firſt Reaſon of *St. Ambroſe*, two Principles that diſagree with the Common Opinion of Divines; the firſt, That the Action of *Abraham* was an Adultery; the 2d, That Adultery was at that time lawful, ſeeing the Law had not forbid it. He maintains that *Hagar* was the lawful Wife of *Abraham*, and that Adultery was a Crime even before it was forbid by any poſitive Law, ſince it was contrary to the Law of Nature: (*l*) *Erat tamen per ſe illicitum & prohibitum lege divina naturali.* As to the 3d Reaſon of *St. Ambroſe*, he refutes it by this Aphoriſm, that the quality of a Type does not influence any Morality into things, and by conſequence does not take from them what is bad. *Plerunque*, ſays *St. Gregory* (*m*), *res qualibet per hiſtoriam virtus eſt, per ſignificationem culpa, & aliquando res geſta in facto cauſa damnationis eſt, in ſcripto autem prophetia virtutis.* St. *Auguſtin* follows the ſame Principle. *In peccatis*, ſaith he (*n*), *magnorum virorum aliquando rerum futurarum figuram animadverti & indagari poſſe.*

Let us obſerve here 4 things. In the firſt place, *Coquæus* makes *St. Auguſtin* take an unjudicious and unſincere courſe. He knew, ſays he, the true Proof of the Innocence of *Abraham*, and ſuppreſſed it; he contented himſelf with clearing him as to the reproach of being in

(*a*) Calvin. in c. [illegible] v. 5.

(*b*) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei lib. 16. c. 25.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) In the Remark Δ of the Article Agar.

(*e*) Rom. 3. 8.

(*f*) Leonh. Coquæus ubi ſupra pag. 351.

(*g*) Id. ibi.

(*h*) Ambroſ lib. 1: de Abrah. cap. 4. apud Leonh. Coqueum ibid.

(*i*) Leonh. Coqueus ib. p. 352.

(*k*) Sixt. Senenſis bibl. ſanctæ lib. 5. annot. 94. apud Coqueum ibid.

(*l*) Idem Coqueus ibid.

(*m*) Gregor. lib. 3. Moral. c. 16. apud Coqueum ib.

(*n*) Auguſt lib. 3. de doctr. Chriſt. c. 23. apud eund. ib.

but he received it on his Arm: The wound was so great, that the Surgeons, who took care of it very near a Year, dispaired of his Cure. It's pretended that he was Cured by a Miracle of *Thomas Becket. He was made Bishop of* Chartres *at (A) the earnest intreaty of the Province* some Years after; *and he lived in this Episcopal See with the same Manners, and the same Virtue he had always preached and recommended in his Writings.* He died about the Year 1182 *. He composed, among (B) other Books, a Treatise in Latin of the Vanity of the Court. *He was one of the greatest Wits of his Age, and one of the most polite and most able Men in good Literature* †.

SAWICKI (GASPAR) a Jesuit Born at *Vilna* in *Lithuania* in 1542. He entred into the Society at *Rome* in 1566, and after having studied Divinity, he returned into *Poland* and taught Controversy at *Vilna.* He was for 9 Years Prefect of the Novices at *Cracow*, and Superior of the professed House during five Years in the same City. He had in other Places no less Honourable Employments. He was also a Preacher. He followed the Ambassadors of *Poland* into *Muscovy*, and was a great assistance to them during the 3 Years of a close Imprisonment he spent with them. Notwithstanding his great Age, and his Sickness, he was obliged to accept the Office of Procurator of the Jesuits at *Rome*, and acquitted himself very well in it: But as he was returning into *Poland*, he died in a Waggon near *Francfort*

* Taken from the Life of *Joannes Sarisberiensis* prefixed to the *French* Translation of his Book *de Nugis Curialium*.

---

is Love with his Servant Maid. But was this enough? Had not the *Manichees* scope enough to load him with Reproaches, tho' they had granted that he was not in love with his Maid? 'Tis therefore to such Reproaches that *St. Augustin* ought to have answered, and he did certainly do it. He pretended, that supposing the Circumstances, as he supposed them, he could justify a Man who lay with his Wife's Maid. But was there ever a looser Morality than his? Would not one at this Day run down the *Bauni's*, and the *Escobar's*, if they taught that provided a Man thinks only of leaving behind him some Successors, his Wife may desire him to lie with her Maid, and he may follow her Counsel? Do not tell me that *St. Augustin* considers only the Age that *Abraham* lived in; for since he is grounded upon the right which *St. Paul* gives to a Husband over his Wife, and to a Wife over her Husband, he pretends, without doubt, to Account for all times. We have seen in another (a) place what he says of the Action of *Acindynus.* My second Remark is, That the Doctrine of *Calvin* is much purer on this point then that of the Ancient Fathers. He Condemns plainly, without going about the Bush, the Conduct of *Abraham* and *Sarah.* He fetches no Excuse for them from the use of Poligamy already established among the Nations; he says it was not for them to oppose the Law that tyes married Persons one with another. (b) *Nec valet excusatio quod concubinam uxoris loco esse voluerit, quia fixum illud manere debuerat, mulierem viro adjunctam esse, ut essent duo in carnem unam. Tametsi jam polygamia apud multos invaluerat, legem tamen illam qua duo inter se mutuo obligantur convellere nunquam fuit in hominum arbitrio.* Nay, he observes, that the Fall of *Abraham* ought to set us upon our Guard against the Ambushes of *Satan*, who Attacks us, not only by Persons that are manifestly Criminal, but also by good People. (c) *Porro cum Sarai tam sancta mulier instar flabelli, ad eandem qua ipsa fervebat impatientiam maritum sollicitet: hinc discamus quam sedulo nobis agenda sint excubiæ ne qua occulta fraude nos circumveniat Satan. Neque enim improbos tantum & sceleratos subornat qui ex professo fidem nostram oppugnent: sed ut incautos opprimat, clam interdum ac furtim per bonos & simplices nos adoritur.* In the 3d place, I observe that the liberty *Calvin* took of Censuring severely the Action of *Sarah* and *Abraham*, is of much greater use to Christian Morality than the pains the Fathers have taken to justify *Abraham* and his Wife. They have sacrificed the general Interests of Morality to the Reputation of a Private Person: I could almost find in my heart to apply to all those, who are animated with that Spirit, this fine saying (d) of *Cicero: Urbem philosophia proditis dum castella defenditis.* Lastly, I Remark, That *Josephus* supposes a thing, of which the Scripture has not a word; (e) That God Commanded *Sarah* to put *Hagar* in her Husband's Bed. Here is exactly the *Deus ex machina* of the Tragick Poets; and the *ancora sacra* of the Proverb. Many Commentators upon *Genesis* alledge the Authority of this Historian, and observe that *St. Augustin* has insinuated the same thing. (f) *Idem insinuat S. Augustinus lib. 10. contra Faust. c. 32.* There is no *Gordian* Knot but may be broke that way.

(A) *He was made Bishop of* Chartres —— some Years after.] Here is again one of those Writers of Elogies, (g) who neglect the Dates. He could not mark in a more uncertain manner the time of the promotion of *Joannes Sarisberiensis* to that Bishoprick, since the Year of the Death of *Thomas Becket* is not observed by him. Let us supply this Defect, and say that this Archbishop was killed about the end of the Year 1170. This is certain, but it's not agreed in what Year *Joannes Sarisberiensis* was made Bishop of *Chartres. Vossius* (h) says it was in 1164, but he's mistaken. Father *Labbe* (i) who reproves him for it, places the promotion of that Bishop in 1172, and adds, that he died in 1182 and was buried in the Abbey of *Notre Dame de Josaphat.* Father *Oudin* (k) says the same. But *M. du Pin* has not followed their Chronology, except in the Year of his Death. *Joannes Sarisberiensis*, says he (l), *was at last made Bishop of* Chartres *in 1179. and dyed 3 Years after.*

(B) *He composed, among other Books, a Treatise in Latin of the Vanity of the Court.*] This is a much noted Book, and there are many Editions of it. It's title is, *Policraticus, sive de nugis Curialium, & vestigiis philosophorum.* Father *Labbe* (m) tells us that the first Edition is that of *Paris* 1513, and that *Constantin Frandinus* procured it. I make use of the *Leyden* Edition, *ex officina Plantiniana apud Franciscum Raphelengium* 1595. *in* 8. *M. du Pin* looks upon it as an excellent Book (n) "upon the Employs, "the Duties, the Virtues and Vices of Great Men, "and especially of Princes and great Lords; which "contains an Infinity of moral Thoughts, Sentences, "fine passages of Authors, Examples, Apologues, "pieces of History and common Topicks". *Lipsius* says, 'tis (o) a Rhapsody, that contains many pieces of Purple, and Fragments of a better Age. *In quo centone multos pannos purpuræ agnosco & fragmenta ævi melioris. Janus Douza* uses this Author too severely; for he puts him in the Class of Compilers, who take on every hand, and are like *Horace*'s Crow. *Omnium disertissime*, says he (p) quoting the Testimonies of Authors who have said, that a certain Work-man had found out the Secret of making Glass malleable, *Joannes Saresberiensis, quamvis ab exemplis supra dictis in partem nonnihil dissentiens, libro* de Nugis Curialium IV. cap. V. *qui* Policraticus *inscribitur, non quidem de suo, ne quid erres, sed verò de alieno (id quod Corniculæ isti cum fartoribus illis semipriscis, Solino puta, Macrobio, Isidoro, atque aliis ejusdem farinæ mangonibus commune) solens utique, præsertim de Satura Arbitri nostri.* See what *James Thomasius* (q) has answered to this Censure of *Douza.* Note, That this Work of *Joannes Sarisberiensis* has been translated into *French*, and printed at *Paris* in 4°. 1640. with the Title, *Les Vanitez de la Cour.* The Author of the Translation only puts for his Name *D. M.* at the Bottom of his Epistle Dedicatory to the Marquis *d'Asserac.*

His other Books are *Metalogicus, seu tractatus de Logica, Philosophia*, &c. Printed at *Paris* 1610. and *Leiden* 1639. in 8°. *Vita atque passio Sancti Thomæ Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi & Martyris.* A Book of Letters published at *Paris* 1611. in 4°. *Ex Bibliotheca Papyrii Massonis.* Seven other Historical Letters

---

(a) *See the Remarks in the Article* Acindynus (Septimius.)

(b) Calvin. ubi supra v. 1.

(c) Id. ib. v. 2. *See also what he says soon after.*

(d) *See the Article* Francis I. *Remark* N.

(e) Σάῤῥα τοῦ Θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ἐπικλίνει μίαν τῶν θεραπαινίδων. Sara Deo jubente in thalamum ejus adducit unam famularum. Joseph. lib. 1. antiq. c. 11. pag. 19. C.

(f) Cornel. a Lapide ubi supra. *See also* Marsennus ubi supra.

(h) Vossi de histor. Latinis pag. 4

(i) Labbe, dissert. de script. Eccles. tom. 1. pag. 606.

(k) Oudin in supplem. de scriptor. Eccles. pag. 441.

(l) Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles. tom. 9. pag. 15 Dutch Edit.

(m) Labbe ubi supra.

(n) Du Pin ubi supra.

(o) Lipsius in Tacit. Ann. lib. 12.

(p) Janus Douza Præcid. in Petronium lib. 3. cap. p. m. 1595.

(q) Thomas. de plagio literar. pag. 140.

[illegible] upon the Ides, the 10th of January 1608. He Compoſed many Books (Y), wherein inſtead of his own Name he took a Suppoſititious one. I do not believe now that 'tis he, who treated (Z) Eraſmus ill, in a Book Publiſhed under the Name of Gaſpar Cicocius.

SCALA (BARTHOLOMEW) a Learned Man in the XVth Century, was Born at Florence in * 1424. He was the Son of a Miller (A); but he raiſed himſelf by his Induſtry and Learning. He was a Domeſtick of Coſmo de Medicis, afterwards the Florentins (B) raiſed him by degrees to ſeveral conſiderable Imployments, and ennobled him, and placed him in the Senate. He was alſo Secretary † to that Republick. He writ Latin tolerably well for thoſe times, but with ſome Barbariſms β. Politian having Criticiſed on a little Poem of Scala, [illegible] to a Quarrel, which encreaſed much γ by Anſwers and Replies. [illegible] Scala bore him δ already a private Grudge, becauſe many Letters [illegible] in the Name of the Republick had not Pleaſed Laurence de Medicis, who had given orders to Politian to write others. Be it as it will, Scala undertook to write the Hiſtory of Florence, from the Foundation of that City till 1450. His Work comprehends Twenty Books, but he only compleated Five, becauſe Death ſtopped his Career. Yet he lived Seventy Three Years, for he died in 1497. He alſo Compoſed the Life of Vitalian Borromeo, and an Harangue to (C) Innocent VIII § &c. Alexandra SCALA his Daughter was Learned in Greek and Latin, as I ſhall ſhew, and by that means ſhe Married a Learned Greek. Politian Praiſed her much,

† Voſſius de Hiſt. Lat pag. 616.

β [illegible] minime Gratæ, & [illegible] in Miſcellanea Gratiæ, Polit. epiſt. [illegible] & 19. l. 12.

γ See the 12. Book of Politian's Letters. You'll find alſo 5 Letters of Scala in the 5th.

δ [illegible] tem [illegible] qui que literas illum ſæpe tuas publice ſe ipſum rejeciſſe, nobiſque dediſſe formandas, quæ prima odii livoriſque in me tui cauſa extitit. Polit. epiſt. 18. l. 12.

---

ters inſerted by du Chesne, in the 4th Volume of his Collection of the Hiſtorians of France. There are many other Letters of our Author found among thoſe of Thomas Becket, Collected by Father Lupus, and Printed at Bruſſels in 1682. in Two Volumes in 4to. Baleus gives out that this Biſhop compoſed a Comment upon the (a) Brunellus of Vigelli; but a learned Critick denies it (b) for this Reaſon, becauſe that Poem was Dedicated to William de Long-Champ, whom Richard, King of England, made Biſhop of Ely, in 1189, and who died in Exile in 1197. Fifteen Years after the Biſhop of Chartres, who is the Subject of this Article.

(Y) *He Compoſed many Books, wherein inſtead of his true Name.*] That which he Intitled, *Anatomia conſilii editi de ſtabilienda pace Regni Poloniæ, Jeſuitis pulſis*, was Publiſhed in 1611, under the Name of *Gaſpar Cicbocki*. He Publiſhed in the Poliſh Tongue a Dialogue, *Curſoris & Nautæ in quo de violenta Gedanenſium Monialium S. Brigittæ per Hæreticos facta proſcriptione narratio inſtituitur*; and he took the Name of *Lunowski*. He Compoſed under that of *John Golubski*, (c) *Replica rumorum Poſnanienſium ab hæretico Miniſtro per Pruſſiam ſparſorum. Triplica contra duplicam Miniſtri Toruntenſis. Mirabilis concordia, ſeu potius veriſſima rabies Evangelicorum inter ſe, contra Joannem Tuiecki Hæreticum.*

(Z) *That he treated* Eraſmus *ill.*] Father *Theophilus Raynaud* having mention'd ſome things very Diſadvantageous to *Eraſmus*, refers his Reader to *Gaſpar Chicocius*: (d) *Videndus qui varias ejus impietates & adverſus eum judicia ſapientum addenſat Gaſpar Chicocius*, lib. 1. Alloquiorum cap. 19. & 20. *Guy Patin*, who knew Books well, and had a good Library, was ſhort in the matter: 'Tis probable he thought he could hear no News of that Book at *Paris*, ſince he conſulted the Oracle at *Lyons*, I mean the Author himſelf, who had cited *Chicocius*. (e) *Give me leave*, ſays he to his Friend of *Lyons*, *to be a little Importunate with you: When you ſee Father* Theophilus, *try to know of him who* Gaſpar Chicocius *is* lib. 1. Alloquiorum, *who writ againſt* Eraſmus, *and where that Book was Printed.* He gives us no account of any Anſwer. As for me, I ingenuouſly confeſs I never ſaw that Book: Thoſe whom I have conſulted about it, told me that they had never heard of ſuch an Author. I thought it was *Gaſpar Sawicki*, and I affirmed it in the firſt Edition of this Dictionary; but I am now of another Opinion: I find it was a Canon and Curate of *Sendomir*. He is cited in a Book of *Staniſlaus Lubienietski* (f). I have read in *Simon Starovolſcius* (g), that *Gaſpar Cicbocius* Born at *Tarnowicz*, a City of the leſſer *Poland*, was made Maſter of Arts in 1567, and that afterwards he obtained of Cardinal *George Radziwil*, this Canonſhip and Rectory, and that he Compoſed two Books, the one called *Anatomia*, to juſtify the Jeſuits, and the other *Alloquia Oſeciana*, to refute the Errors of Hereticks. This laſt work would have brought a great Miſchief upon him, for he treated the King of *England* very ill in it; But Death freed him from the danger. (h) *Fecit* —— *librum* —— *Alloquia Oſeciana dictum, quo Hæreticorum errores oſtendit ac refutat ſimul, quamvis ſucceſſu parum felici, quod minus honorificam in eo Regis Angli mentionem feciſſet: tuliſſetque ſane multa acerba & gravia, ni mors ſenem opportune liberaſſet.*

(A) *The Son of a Miller.*] *Leander Albertus* gives us an account of it. *Bartholomæus Scala*, ſays he (i), *vir doctus, ut potius Muſarum alumnus, quam inter rotas molarum natus videretur.* Scala writes himſelf, that he was of a low Extraction. (k) *Veni nudus, omnium rerum bonarum egenus ad remp. viliſſimis ortus parentibus, multa cum fide, nullis omnino divitiis aut titulis, nullis clientelis, nullis cognationibus.* Politian having called him (l) *monſtrum furfuraceum*, gives this reaſon for it: *Monſtrum quidem qui ex colluvione monſtrorum compoſitus es: furfuraceum vero in piſtrini ſordibus natus, & quidem piſtrino digniſſimus.*

(B) *The* Florentins *raiſed him.*] Here is what he ſays about it in the above cited Letter: (m) *Coſmus tamen pater patriæ noſtræ me complexus eſt, receptique in familia obſequia. Interea Florentinus populus ad prioratum me evexit, deinde ad vexilliferatum; tandemque & in Senatorium me ordinem equeſtremque collocavit, tanto profecto ſuffragiorum conſenſu, ut nihil eſſe factum unquam popularius multi putarent.* *Politian* would have thought, that he had treated him too well if he had ſaid of him, That *the Cabals did as much towards it as Merit*: He pretends that it was a meer ſport of Fortune (n). *De honoribus quidem nihil eſt quod tibi nimium placeas; vetus enim ludus hic, ut indigni tollantur in altum, videlicet ut hoc quoque ſe poſſe fortuna declaret, cujus tu ſolius opus es.*

(C) *He alſo Compoſed* ——— *an Harangue to* Innocent *VIII.* &c.] The Liſt of his Works, if I am not miſtaken, is pretty compleat in the Catalogue of the *Florentin* writers Compoſed by *Poccianti*, and Printed at *Florence* in 1589. There were then but few of his Writings Publiſhed. Two Learned *Danes* took care to Publiſh the chief of them, *viz.* (o) the *Florentin* Hiſtory, and the Life of (p) *Vitalian Borromeo*. I cannot tell whether the Apologies, which *Marſilius Ficinus* very much eſteemed, and the Letter which he writ upon the Queſtion, *Whether a Wiſe Man ought to Marry* (q), have been Publiſhed. *Apologi centum ad Laurentium Medicem, quos miris encomiis exornat Ficinus in 8. libro epiſtolarum* (r).

( ) *Per-*

(a) [illegible]

(h) Id. ib.

(i) Deſcript. Ital. pag. 70.

(k) Scala, epiſt. ad Ang. Politian. *It is the 16th of the 12th Book of* Politian's *Letters.* Paris 1526. in 4.

(l) Politian, epiſt. 18. lib. 12.

(m) Scala ibid.

(n) Politian epiſt. 18. lib. 12.

(o) Oliger Jacobæus *Publiſhed it in* 4. *It is mention'd in the 4th Journal of* Italy 1677. (p) Chriſtopher Bartholinus *Publiſhed it. It is mentioned in the ſame Journal of* Italy. (q) *This Queſtion was handled by* Heinſius. *See in* Baudii amores *the Letter*, An & qualis viro literato ſit ducenda uxor? *To which is added the Diſſertation of an Anonymous Writer*, De matrimonio literati, an cœlibem eſſe an nubere conveniat? *It is in a Collection of ſeveral pieces, Printed in* 1606. (r) Poccianius, de ſcriptor, Florentinis pag. 24.

much, and was not Satyrical upon the Daughter as he had been upon her Father. The Daughter on her side had no regard to that Quarrel, but answered the Civilities of *Politian* with other Civilities.

SCALA (ALEXANDRA) Daughter and Wife of Learned Men, was her self Learned in *Greek* and *Latin* †. Her Father was the above mentioned *Bartholomew Scala*. I have spoke, in its proper place, of *Michael Marullus* her Husband. *Politian* lived with her in better Intelligence than with her Father. He Praised her often in *Greek*; she answered him in the same Language *. They writ Verses on each side, which were Printed: But what *Marullus* and *Politian* writ to one another, was nothing less than Compliments ‖; it was a War of Erudition, full of Animosity and Injurious words. The reason why *Marullus* Married *Alexandra Scala*, was (*A*) because he would perfect himself in the *Latin* Tongue, if we may believe *Paulus Jovius*: But if we may believe her Husband, she was very Beautiful, and very Vertuous, and why should we doubt that those good Qualities, and the Employments of her Father might make *Marullus* court her for Marriage? It would be a very edifying thing to see this Poet make Verses (*B*) in Praise of his Wife; for we scarce see any now of (*C*) this Nature: Marriage commonly dries up the Poetical Vein, which flowed so abundantly for a Mistress. But it does not appear when he made those Verses on her, that he was her Husband. This Learned *Florentin* Woman died in 1506 β.

SCAMANDER, a River of *Phrygia* near *Troy*. It was also called *Xanthus*, but there was a great difference between these two Names: *Scamander* belonged to Humane Language ξ, *Xanthus* to that of the Gods. This is the Opinion of *Homer*. Some Writers pretend that this Poet (*A*) means that *Xanthus* was the Antient Name of this River, and that *Scamander* was the Modern: Others say, that

† Vossius ibid.

* Id. ib.

‖ Cum Politiano, [illegible] dicunt [illegible] epistolis inter [illegible] exercuerit. Jovius elog. c. 58.

β Vossius ubi supra.

ξ See the Remark A.

(*A*) *Perfect himself in the* Latin *Tongue.*] I shall set down a Passage of *Paulus Jovius*. (*a*) *Nihil jam Græce doctum esse satis ad laudem putabat, nisi tota patrii sermonis facultas Romanæ facundiæ jungeretur*, PROPTEREA *Florentiæ Alexandram eruditi ingenii puellam uxorem duxit.* Mr. *Varillas* Paraphrasing, according to his custom, what he finds in Books, enlarges upon *Paulus Jovius* in this manner: "(*b*) The Love *Marullus* had for the *Latin* "Tongue, made him Marry the Daughter of "*Bartholomew Scala*, who understood and spoke it "admirably well. She taught him so well, that "*Laurence de Medicis* found him capable of Translating the Moral works of *Plutarch*". I have already shewed that *Marullus* made *Latin* Verses before he Married *Alexandra Scala*; and therefore *Jovius* says too much, and *Varillas* instead of rectifying it amplifies it. We may compare his Pen to Spectacles.

(*a*) Jovius elog. cap. 58.

(*b*) Anecd. de Flor. pag. 179.

(*B*) *Make Verses in Praise of his Wife.*] We are not to believe, that all the Verses we find in *Marullus*'s Poems to the Praise of *Alexandra Scala*, were made after he was Married to her; this little Epigram at most can be said to have been written by him after his Marriage (*c*).

Quod tam tota decens, formosaque tota venusta
Rara quidem, sed non unica Scala mea es;
At quod casta, decens, at quod formosa pudica,
Dispeream si non unica Scala mea es.
Nam cum Pieridum reputo commercia sacra,
Jam non ulterius unica, Scala dea es.

But if we consider it well, we shall find no Expression here that signifies any thing of Marriage; *mea Scala* may as well be applyed to a Mistress as to a Wife; and we see that *Marullus* makes use of the same Mark of Tenderness towards *Sappho*,

Hoc Sappho melior mea,
Cujus facta domi dictaque plurima
Prastans ingenium inquinant.

says he (*d*), Praising the good manners which *Alexandra Scala* Learned in the Service of the *Muses*. All the other Verses he made in her Praise, do manifestly relate to the time that preceded their Marriage. There are some wherein he Praises her, (*e*) because at the Age of about Fifteen, she made admirable Verses.

Cum versu referas novem sorores,
Vix lustris bene adhuc tribus peractis,
Cum dulci sale seriisque blandis
Ipsum jam superes puella patrem,
Quo nihil gravius facetiusque est.

In this same Epigram he calls her *mea Scala*; yet one cannot believe that he was then her Husband. Let us see what he says to her Father.

(*c*) Lib. 4. p. m. 80.

(*d*) Epigr. l. 4. pag. m. 71.

(*e*) Lib. 3. pag. 64.

Plus (*f*) *multo tamen, o beate amice, est*
Quod Scalam Latio pater dedisti,
Aucturam numerum novem sororum
Casto carmine, castiore vita.

He was not then his Son-in-Law, when he spoke to him in that manner. That's clear.

(*C*) *We scarce see any now of this Nature.*] There are many Modern Poets, who would look upon themselves to be highly reproached for having prodigally spent their Praises, if they should be told that they have Praised their Wives. They would think that this Expression would have more force, than if it should be said of them, that they Sung Praises from the Scepter to the Shepherd's-Hook, and from the Cedars of *Libanus*, to the Hissop that grows on the Wall. They would believe that this Idea would give their Flatteries the same extent, which is given to Love, in the following Verses (*g*):

Je penserois n'être pas malheureux,
Si la beauté dont je suis amoureux
Pouvoit enfin se tenir satisfaite
De mille amans avec un Favori;
Mais j'enrage que la coquette
Aime encor jusqu'à son mari.

The most gallant Poets among the Antients were not of this Humour. *Ovid* (*h*) extreamly Praises his Wife; *Martial* (*i*) would have Posterity to know that his Wife spoke well, and that she kept him from being sorry that he had left *Rome*. I omit *Statius*, who did so much praise his (*k*).

(*A*) *Means, that* Xanthus *was its Antient Name.*] Let us relate what he says.

Ἄντα (*l*) δ' ἄρ' Ἡφαίστοιο μέγας ποταμὸς βαθυδίνης
Ὃν Ξάνθον καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δὲ Σκάμανδρον.

Contra autem & Vulcanum magnus Fluvius verticibus profundus
Quem Xanthum vocant dii, homines vero Scamandrum.

Here is the Reflection of *Meziriac*: "(*m*) As, says "he, *Vigenere* has well observed upon the *Scamander of Philostratus*, when *Homer* gives two Names "to some things, one according to the Gods, and "the other according to Men; it's to be understood that that of the Gods is the Antient, and "almost forgotten Name, and that of Men the "Modern and most in use." He might have cited the Scholiast (*n*) upon *Homer* to this purpose, and not *Vigenere*. Observe that *Plutarch* (*o*) owns, that *Xanthus* was the Antient Name. He adds, that this River was not called *Scamander* till *Scamander* the Son of *Corybas*, who run Mad out of that it was called *Scamander* before (B) it was called *Xanthus*, and what Etymologies are * related of thoſe two Names. It's pretended that the Waters of that River had the Property of making the Womens Hair that Bathed in it, of a Light Colour (C), and that the *Trojan* Women made uſe of that Property. 'Tis alſo ſaid that the Maids of that Country, as ſoon as they were Betrothed, went thither, (D) to offer their Virginity to *Scamander*, which gave an opportunity to a Young *Athenian* to Enjoy *Callirrhoe*. I do not think that this Ri-

of a fit of Devotion to the *Mother of the Gods*, Drowned himſelf in it. For ſo *Meziriac* (a) explains the *Greek* of *Plutarch*. *Mauſſac* explains it otherwiſe. See the Margin (b).

(B) *It was called* Scamander *before it was called* Xanthus.] *Meziriac* quotes three Authors upon this matter. Theſe are his words: (c) "*Ariſtotle* Book 3. chap. 12. of his Hiſtory of "Animals, ſpeaks thus. Δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σκάμανδρος "ποταμὸς ξανθὰ πρόβατα ποιεῖν, διὸ καὶ τὸν Ὅ"μηρον ἀντὶ Σκαμάνδρου Ξάνθον προσαγορεύειν "αὐτόν. *It ſeems that the River* Scamander *makes* "*ſheep of a Red Colour, and that for the reaſon* "Homer *calls it* Xanthus, *inſtead of* Scamander. "*Antigonus* paradox 73, follows *Ariſtotle* and cites "him. *Ælian* B. 8. chap. 21. *de animalibus*, ſays "the ſame more clearly ſtill. Ὁ δὲ ἐν Τροίᾳ Σκά"μανδρος, ὅτι ξανθὰς ἀποφαίνει τὰς οἶς, "πρὸς τῷ Σκαμάνδρῳ τῷ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἀπὸ "τούτου ἢ τὸν προσβάτων ἐπίκλησιν χρῆσθαι ἔσχε, τὸν "Ξάνθον. *The River of* Troas *called* Scamander, "*becauſe it makes the Sheep rediſh that drink of its* "*Waters, is alſo called* Xanthus, *beſides the* "*Name of* Scamander *it had before*". After this *Meziriac* (d) ſays that the River *Scamander*, according to ſome, owes its Origin to *Hercules*. That Hero being ready to die of Thirſt, *fell a digging the Earth, out of which ſprung the Head of a River, which from thence was called* Scamander, *as if one ſhould ſay* σκάμμα ἀνδρὸς *the digging of a Man*. There is a Scholiaſt (e) who ſays, that the place where *Hercules* digged the Ground yielded ſome drops of Water, becauſe it had been ſtruck with Thunder, as a conſequence of the Prayers which that Hero had directed to *Jupiter*, when he was much diſtreſſed with Thirſt. This Scholiaſt pretends that the River that flowed out of this place was called *Scamander*, becauſe it eaſed *Hercules*, *as if one ſhould ſay* Camander, γενόμενον καμάτου ἄκος αὐτῷ. He adds, That it was called *Xanthus*, becauſe *the* Trojan *Women waſhing their Hair in it, made it light coloured* (f). The Author of the great *Etymologicon* tells us, that *this River* (g) *took its Name from* Scamander *the Son of* Teucer, *who came into* Phrygia *out of the Iſle of* Crete *his Native Country; but that afterwards this River was called* Xanthus, *becauſe the three Goddeſſes, before they ſet themſelves before* Paris *to be Judged by him, went and waſhed themſelves in this River, which made their Hair light coloured.* All this overthrows the Hypotheſis of thoſe, who ſay that the Name *Xanthus* preceded that of *Scamander*.

(C) *Of a light Colour*, &c.] See the Proofs of all this in the preceding Remark. It had alſo the ſame virtue upon Sheep, as may be ſeen by the Three Authorities of *Meziriac*; to which I add theſe words of *Pliny*: (h) *In Bœotia amnis Melas oves nigras* (facit) ——— *rufaſque juxta Ilium Xanthus unde & nomen amni.*

(D) *Offered their Virginity to* Scamander.] I'll relate this Story as we find it in *Vigenere*. "(i) In this River, ſays he, (as *Æſchines* relates in his Epiſtles) Young Maids were wont to "Bath themſelves when they were Betrothed, in"voking the River in theſe words, λάβε μου Σκά"μανδρε τὴν παρθενίαν. *Receive, O* Scamander, "*my Virginity*. This gave an opportunity to *Ci*"*mon* the *Athenian*, who was deſperately in Love "with *Callirrhoe* already promiſed to another, to "hide himſelf in the Shrubs about the River. He "put on a Crown of Ruſhes and Reeds, and when "the Damſel came to Bath, and Sang the uſual "words, he came out of his Ambuſcade, and told "her he willingly accepted of it: And ſo preſently "Deflowred her". 'Tis certain that this is found in (k) one of *Æſchines*'s Letters, and ſo the Citation is exact; but *Vigenere* has not related all that he ſhould have told his Readers. 'Tis neceſſary they ſhould know ſome other Circumſtances to make the moſt Inſtructive Reflections. I ſay then that *Æſchines* does not ſpeak of this Adventure, as of a Hiſtory learned by Tradition, or read in ſome old Chronicle. If he had ſpoke of it in this manner, we might place it among the Novels of *Boccace*. He ſpeaks of it as of a thing almoſt done in his ſight. (l) Ἡμεῖς ἅμα τι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπὶ τὴν γαμουμένην καὶ τὰς ἄλλας χορὰς παρθένων τὸν ποταμὸν λουομένας καὶ τὸ καλὸν τῶν παρθένων, ὡς ἡμῖν ἐξεῖναι ἰδεῖν, ἐθεώμεθα. *Nos una cum cognatis nuptiarum & caeteris turbae comites flumen & lavacra virginum quatenus fas nobis eſſet, ſpectabamus.* His Fellow-Traveller was the Perſon, who committed that Infamous Act; he cenſured him for it, and found that he was Impenitent, and that he alledged for his Excuſe, that many had played the ſame Trick before. 'Tis neceſſary alſo to know the Innocent Simplicity of the Young Maid, who was abuſed: She was fully perſuaded that it was the God *Scamander* who had got her Maiden-Head; for four Days after, ſeeing *Cimon* among thoſe that went in a Proceſſion, ſhe Saluted him with a great deal of Reſpect, and told her Nurſe, There is *Scamander* who got my Virginity. The Nurſe ſet up a great cry, and ſo the matter was divulged. (m) Τέτταρσιν ὕστερον ἡμέραις πομπὴ μὲν ἦν Ἀφροδίτης· ἐπόμπευον δὲ αἱ νεωστὶ γεγαμημέναι· καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν πομπὴν ἐθεώμεθα. ἡ δὲ νύμφη ἰδοῦσα τὸν Κίμωνα ὡς μηδὲν αὐτῷ κακὸν συνειδότα ἅμα ἐμοὶ θεώμενον, προσκυνεῖ τε, καὶ ἀποβλέψασα πρὸς τὴν τροφὸν ὁρᾷς ἔφη, τίτθη, τὸν Σκάμανδρον, ᾧ τὴν παρθενίαν ἔδωκα; καὶ ἡ τίτθη ἀκούσασα ἀνέκραγε, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἔκπυστον γίνεται. *Cum quatriduo poſt pompa eſſet Veneris, & recens nuptae ei pompae intereſſent, nos quoque illam ſpectabamus. Sponſa autem Cimonem conſpicata, ut nullius mali ſibi conſcium, una mecum ſpectantem, honorem ei praebuit: & nutricem intuita, Vides* (inquit) *mea nutrix, Scamandrum, ut virginitatem dedi? quo illa audito, exclamat: itaque facinus divulgatur.* When we conſider that Wit and Learning never appeared with ſo much Luſtre, as in the Age that *Æſchines* lived in, we may the better apprehend the fatal Power of a Falſe Religion. It deſtroys good Senſe, it extinguiſhes the Light of Nature, and transforms Man into a Beaſt. *Callirrhoe*, was Born of (n) an Illuſtrious Family, and was, without doubt, nobly Educated; and yet the Impertinencies of the Poets, Canonized by the Heathen Prieſts, had ſo much corrupted her Judgment, that in good earneſt ſhe believed Rivers were Deities, who Crowned themſelves with Reeds, and could enjoy a Woman. In the Reign of *Tiberius*, an Illuſtrious Lady (o) was not leſs ſimple; ſhe believed ſhe had lain with *Anubis*, and bragged of it as of a great Favour. The Monks, who have played ſo many Tricks with Women, never durſt, that I know of, tell them that ſuch a Saint would lie with them. The Ideas of Purity and Immateriality have always been ſtrictly joyned in Chriſtianity with thoſe of Beatification. But I do not doubt that ſome Devout Maids might be brought to believe it, if it were undertaken. This Maxim (p), *The Corruption of the moſt Excellent Things is the Worſt*, is verifyed by the Example of Religion. There's nothing ſo advantageous to Man, if we conſider either the Mind or the Heart, as to know God rightly: On the other hand, nothing is ſo fatal to him, as not to know him rightly, as the Pagans did. Obſerve what *Homer* ſays, that the Prieſt of *Scamander* was Honoured at *Troy* as a God.

(q) Ὑψήνορα δῖον
Υἱὸν ὑπερθύμου Δολοπίονος, ὅς ῥα Σκαμάνδρου
Ἀρητὴρ ἐτέτυκτο, θεὸς δ' ὣς τίετο δήμῳ.

(l) Æſchines ubi ſupra.

(m) Id. ib. p. 125. A.

(n) Πατρὸς δὲ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν, illuſtri patre nata. *Id ibid. pag.* 125.

(o) See Joſephus, antiq. lib. 18. ch. 4.

(p) Corruptio optimi peſſima.

(q) Homer Iliad. lib. 5. ver. 76.

ver merited the Reputation it has (E) acquired by the help of the Poets; but on the other hand it was more conſiderable than ſome fancy. *Julia* the Daughter of *Auguſtus* had like to have been Drowned in it; *Agrippa* her Husband was very ſenſible of this Danger (F), and ſhew'd his Indignation on this occaſion againſt the *Trojans*, tho' they were not to be reſponſible for it. *Strabo* Criticiſes upon

Hypſenora nobilem
Filium magnanimi Dolopionis qui Scamandri
Sacerdos factus fuerat, Dei vero inſtar honorabatur
à populo.

A REFLECTION upon a Thought of *Cicero*, concerning the Divinity of *Romulus*.

I'll make an Obſervation upon the ſmall effect the light of Learning had againſt the darkneſs of Idolatry. *Cicero* admired the Divinity of *Romulus*, becauſe it was not eſtabliſhed in the days of Ignorance, when it was more eaſy to vent ſuch Fictions, but in an Age when Learning flouriſhed, and had entirely aboliſhed the Antient Barbarity. It ſeems that, from this Principle, he would conclude that neither Fiction nor Impoſture had any ſhare in the belief of the *Romans* concerning the Divinity of *Romulus*. (a) *Magis eſt in Romulo admirandum, quod cæteri, qui dii ex hominibus facti eſſe dicuntur, minus eruditis hominum ſeculis fuerunt, ut fingendi proclivior eſſet ratio, quum imperiti facilè ad credendum impellerentur. Romuli autem ætatem minus bis ſexcentis annis jam inveteratis literis, atque doctrinis, omnique illo antiquo ex inculta hominum vita errore ſublato fuiſſe cernimus.*——— *Ex quo intelligi poteſt, permultis annis ante Homerum fuiſſe quam Romulum, ut jam doctis hominibus ac temporibus ipſis eruditis ad fingendum vix quicquam eſſet loci. Antiquitas enim recepit fabulas fictas etiam nonnunquam incondite. Hæc ætas autem jam exculta præſertim eludens omne, quod fieri non poteſt, reſpuit.* St. *Auguſtin* refutes excellently this Reaſoning. He ſays, 1. there was no place but *Rome* that believed *Romulus* was a God. 2. That ſhe was little, and as it were in her Infancy, when ſhe Embraced this Opinion. 3. That Poſterity was obliged to retain this Faith, to render the City more Flouriſhing, and more capable of Founding a great Empire. 4. That the People that were ſubdued by the *Romans*, did not believe of *Romulus*, what they believed of him at *Rome*; but out of Policy, they ſaid the ſame the *Romans* did. You'll ſee better in the Original words the Thoughts of St. *Auguſtin*. (b) *Cicero propterea dicit divinitatem Romuli mirabiliter creditam, quòd erudita jam tempora fuerunt, quæ falſitatem non reciperent fabularum. Quis autem Romulum Deum niſi Roma credidit, atque id parva & incipiens? Tum deinde poſteris ſervare fuerat neceſſe, quod acceperant à majoribus, ut cum iſta ſuperſtitione in lacte quodammodo matris ebibita creſceret civitas, atque ad tam magnum perveniret imperium, ut ex ejus faſtigio velut ex altiore quodam loco alias quoque gentes, quibus dominaretur, hac ſua opinione perfunderet: ut non quidem crederent, ſed tamen dicerent Deum Romulum, ne civitatem cui ſerviebant, de conditore ejus offenderent, aliter eum nominando quam Roma, quæ id non amore quidem hujus erroris, ſed tamen amoris errore crediderat.* He forgot two principal Anſwers which he might have made. He might have ſaid in the firſt place, That the light of Learning, and the Improvement of the Mind, had not made their way as far as *Rome*, when the Divinity of *Romulus* was propoſed. 2. That this Light, and this Improvement cannot poſſibly hinder ſuch like Fictions from taking Root. Did not *Alexander* paſs for a God? Did they not make Decrees upon this Article of Faith, in all the Learned Cities of *Greece*, when Learning was come to the higheſt pitch? Did not the *Romans*, for all their Learning, believe that the Soul of *Julius Cæſar* (c) was converted into a Star? Did they not erect Temples (d) and Altars to a living Emperor? Could the Philoſophers cure the Crafty Spirit of Flatterers, and the Credulous Spirit of the Mob? If other things than Learning and Science had not prevented it, the Divine Worſhip of *Alexander*, *Cæſar*, *Auguſtus*, &c. had continued as long as that of *Hercules* and *Romulus*.

(E) *Which it acquired by the help of the Poets.*] *Homer* making *Scamander* the Son of *Jupiter*, (e) always repreſents it as a great River, and beſtows on it the Epithet *δινήεις vorticoſus*, *βαθυδίνης profunde vorticoſus*, *βαθύῤῥοος profunde fluens*, and ſuch like exceſſive great Expreſſions. *Pomponius Mela* had reaſon to ſay, (f) that *Scamander* and *Simois* paſs for greater Rivers than they really are. The Moderns ſpeak of them with Contempt. (g) "As to the Rivers *Simois* and *Xanthus*, ſo much "Celebrated by the Poets, which watered the Meadows of *Troy*, we can ſay nothing of them, but "that they are rather little Brooks, where ſcarce "a Loach can live; for in Summer they are dry, "and in Winter a Gooſe can hardly ſwim there. "If we have raiſed any Doubts about thoſe Rivers, "'tis no new thing; for in *Ariſtotle*'s time they "could not be found. Read the 12. Chap. of the "3. Book of the Hiſtory in this manner: *Scamander etiam amnis flavas reddere oves creditur: quamobrem Xanthum pro Scamandro nuncupatum ab Homero autumant.* As if *Ariſtotle* meant that "*Homer* had taken *Scamander* for *Xanthus*; for "*Xanthus* is as much as to ſay *Flavus*. Let the "Queſtion therefore be put whether *Scamander* and "*Xanthus* be the ſame or no?" If the laſt half of this Paſſage had not been full of Faults, I had not quoted it. I find there firſt of all this Falſity, that in the time of *Ariſtotle* the River *Scamander* was not to be found. In the ſecond place, 'tis falſe that the words which are quoted out of *Ariſtotle*, do prove what *Belon* deſigned to prove. Laſtly, he ſhould have ſaid that *Xanthus* and *Scamander* are all one. I do not Criticiſe upon the other half of the Paſſage. *Belon* ſpeaks as an Eye-Witneſs. I will not bring into queſtion his Sincerity, nor give any Credit to *Thevet*, who ſays that *Xanthus* and *Simois* are great Rivers. *I ſhould be ſorry to Contradict ſuch a Man.* They are (h) *Lewis Guion*'s words concerning *Thevet*; *but what I ſay of it* (i), *I have taken it out of* Belon, *a Phyſician of* Mans, *out of the ſecond Book of his Obſervations, and I have often heard him relate it being at* Paris, *to* Poſtel, *whom I familiarly frequented Four Years. Beſides one called* Albert le Bon, *who ſays he was in thoſe parts, and ſtay'd there a whole Winter, perfectly agrees with what* Belon *has writ on that ſubject. I believe* Thevet *never was there, and that what he writ was only by hear-ſay.* But as on the one ſide I do not deny what *Belon* ſays, I am ſure on the other ſide, that thoſe Rivers were not antiently ſo little. Their Waters may have taken another courſe either under the Earth, or otherwiſe: So that tho' the Moderns may ſay, without any Hyperbole, what they aſſert, they cannot engage us to believe that *Pliny* is miſtaken, when he ſpeaks of the *Scamander* as of a Navigable River. (k) *Scamander amnis navigabilis, & in promontorio quondam Sigeum oppidum, dein portus Achæorum, in quem influit* (l) *Xanthus Simoenti junctus, ſtagnumque prius faciens Palæſcamander.* The words of *Strabo* are not leſs Favourable to me: They teach us (m) that the *Scamander* having received the *Simois*, dragged along ſo much Mud and Sand, that they had almoſt filled up the Mouth of the River, and formed Lakes and Moraſſes. This cannot be ſaid of a little Brook or Rivulet, but of Rivers that are pretty conſiderable.

(F) Agrippa, *her Husband, was very ſenſible.*] The Fragments of *Nicolas Damaſcen* (n) tell us that *Julia* had like to have been Drowned there, the Year of *Rome* 738, and that *Agrippa* was ſo angry with the *Trojans* for not having ſent Guides with her, that he Fined them in a Hundred Thouſand Drachms. This Puniſhment was Unjuſt, for they knew nothing of her arrival. Here is, will ſome ſay, a Man who may be put in the number of Cuckolds that have been very obliging and kind to their Wives. If ever a Man was a Cuckold, it was *Agrippa*:

(a) Cicero de Republica lib. 3. apud Auguſtin. de civit. Dei lib. 22. cap. 6. pag. m. 1036, 1037.

(b) Auguſt. ibid. pag. 1037.

(c) *See* Suetonius in Cæſare cap. 88.

(d) Horat. epiſt. 1. lib. 2.

(e) Homer Iliad. lib. 21. [illegible]

(f) Iſte ab Idæ monte demiſſus Scamander eſt, & Simois fama quam natura majora flumina. Pompon. Mela lib. 1. c. 18.

(g) Belon, Singularities Book 2. chap. 6. pag. [illegible]

(h) Louis Guyon, Diverſes Leçons, tom. 1. Book 2. chap. 10. pag. 261.

(i) He had juſt before quoted Belon's words, about the ſmallneſs of these rivulets.

(k) Plinius lib. 5. cap. 30. p. m. [illegible]

(l) Pliny ſhould have ſaid that Xanthus and Scamander are the ſame River.

(m) Strabo, lib. 13. pag. [illegible]

(n) Nic. Damaſcen. [illegible] a Valeſ. edit. [illegible] 418.

upon *Homer* about the Spring of the River (G) *Scamander*. There were other (H) Rivers of the ſame Name. I ſhall not have much to ſay (I) againſt Mr. *Moreri*.

SCHEFFER (JOHN) Profeſſor in the Univerſity of *Upſal*, and one of the moſt Learned Men of his time, was Born at *Strasburg* in 1621. He was not 30 Years old when he went into *Sweden*, where Queen *Chriſtina* gave a favourable reception to all Learned Men. He had already made his Name known (A) by the Works he had publiſhed. The Profeſſorſhip, for which he was called, was given him in the Univerſity of *Upſal* * by the Credit of the Baron *Skytte*. It was the ſame Profeſſorſhip that *Freinſhemius* had exerciſed, and which he left to be the *Queen's* Library keeper; it was, I ſay, the Profeſſorſhip of Eloquence † and Politicks. *Scheffer* gained great Applauſe in this Profeſſorſhip, and was much eſteem'd by the Learned *Chriſtina*, who gratify'd him with a very good Penſion, which ſhe paid him even after ſhe had abdicated her Dominions. He Compoſed, by her order, (B) ſome Works. His Employments multiply'd in time, for he was made Library-keeper of the Univerſity of *Upſal*, *Regius* profeſſor honorary ‖ of the Law of Nature, and Member of an Academy which is only Employ'd in the illuſtration of the *Swediſh* Antiquities. The Works he publiſhed in this laſt Quality are a moſt illuſtrious Proof of his Diligence, and of his Zeal for the Honour of that Nation. He died the 26th of *March* 1679 ½. The Catalogue of his Writings (C) has been Printed more then once.

* It was in the Year 1648.

† It was founded by *John Skytte* in the Year 1625.

‖ Profeſſor juris naturæ ac Gentium.

SCHESTED (ANNIBAL) a *Daniſh* Lord of great Wit and Merit Married a Daughter of *Chriſtian* IV. King of *Denmark*, Siſter of the Counteſs *Eleonor*, of whom I ſhall ſpeak in the Article of Count *Ulefeld*. It is given out a that this Count and Mr. *Scheſted* loved, both at once, the Counteſs *Eleonor*, and that this Rivalſhip was the cauſe of the great hatred that was between them all their life. They were always Contrary one to another; and when Mr. *Scheſted* pleaded the Cauſe of the King who would be divorced from his Wife, the other pleaded for

I take for a certain Evidence of it, the Anſwer that ſhe gave to thoſe who wondred that her Children were ſo like *Agrippa*: I never Cuckold him, ſaid ſhe, till I find my ſelf with Child. (a) *Cumque conſcii flagitiorum mirarentur quo modo ſimiles Agrippæ filios pareret, quæ tam vulgo poteſtatem ſui corporis faceret: ait*; Numquam enim niſi navi plena tollo vectorem. *Suetonius* obſerves that one of the Reaſons why *Tiberius* made ſome difficulty to Marry *Julia*, was becauſe ſhe had been too free with him when ſhe was Married to *Agrippa* (b). How often were the Gallants of that Princeſs put to the Torture? *Pliny* (c) reckons that very thing among the Misfortunes of *Agrippa*. The Cuckoldom of this Favourite is therefore a certain thing: But can his Gentleneſs be well prov'd by the indignation he ſhewed againſt the *Trojans*? I do not believe it; for it's probable his love for *Julia* was not the true cauſe of his Anger; it was an effect of Policy. He was angry, either to make *Auguſtus* believe that he ſeriouſly eſpouſed the Intereſt of *Julia*, or to maintain his Credit. A Subject Married to the Daughter of his Sovereign is not at Liberty to revenge himſelf or not, on thoſe who diſhonour his Wife: Whatever he may be inwardly, he is outwardly obliged to appear on ſuch occaſions Revengeful. Beſides, *Agrippa* knew very well, that the *Trojans* had not grounded their Conduct upon his Diſcontent. And ſo the Contempt they might have ſhewed to his Wife fell upon himſelf; and conſequently he thought himſelf obliged, out of Policy, to puniſh them for it, to teach all Subjects to Fear and Honour him.

(G) Strabo *Criticiſes upon* Homer, *about the Spring of this River*] That Poet ſays, (d) that this River had two Springs, the one Cold, and the other Hot near *Troy*; but *Strabo* aſſures us, (e) that it had only one Spring upon Mount *Ida*, and that this Spring was Cold. He thinks the Cold Spring was deſtroyed, and Conſequently he does not blame *Homer* in this reſpect.

(H) *Other Rivers of the ſame Name.*] There was another River of the ſame Name in *Sicily* (f), near *Ægeſta*, and another in *Boeotia*. The latter was a Monument of the Frailty of the Female Sex. The matter of fact was thus. *Deimachus* the Son of *Eleon* accompanied *Hercules* to the Expedition of *Troy*. The War growing long, he thought it proper to divert himſelf with a young Maid that was much in love with him. She was the Daughter of *Scamander* and was called *Glaucia*. *Deimachus* got her with Child. Sometime after he was killed in a Battle. *Glaucia*, who was afraid ſhe could not hide her Fault, fled to the Protection of *Hercules*, and told him all that had paſſed, and found him a Man full of Compaſſion, who beſides was glad that the race of his Friend was not extinct. He carried her into *Boeotia* with the Son of which ſhe was delivered, and brought her to *Eleon*. This Son was called *Scamander*, and Reigned in the Country. He gave his Name to the River *Inachus* (g).

(I) *I have not much to ſay againſt* Moreri.] 1. According to him, *Caſtaldus* aſſures us, that the *Scamander* is at preſent called *Simois*; but (h) *Ortelius* cites *Caſtaldus* to prove that the Modern Name is *Simoeres*. 2. 'Tis too general an Expreſſion to ſay, that this River *falls into the Ægean Sea*. He ſhould have ſaid, that its Mouth is (i) near the Promontory *Sigæum*. 3. Theſe words *epotaque flumina Medo prandente* are ill placed immediately after theſe, *Herodotus relates, that the Army of* Xerxes *dryed it up*; for there's none but would imagin that this Latin is the Tranſlation of the very words of *Herodotus*: which is falſe. 'Tis *Juvenal* (k) whom he ought to have cited for theſe Latin words. He ought to have cited *Herodotus* (l) cap. 42. lib. 7.

(A) *His Name known by the Works he had publiſhed.*] Theſe three are mention'd in his Elogy (m): *Diſſertatio de varietate navium* Printed in 1643. in 4°. *Agrippa liberator ſeu de novis tabulis*, Printed in 1645 in 12°. *Æliani variæ hiſtoriæ notis illuſtratæ* Printed in 1647. in 8°.

(B) *He compoſed, by her order,* &c.] Queen *Chriſtina* obliged him to Tranſlate out of Greek into Latin the *Strategicum Mauritii*, and to illuſtrate the Philoſophy of *Pythagoras*. That *Strategicum* and *Arriani tactica*, which he cauſed to be Printed in Greek (n) and Latin with Notes, at *Upſal* 1644, were never Printed before. He publiſhed the ſame Year, and in the ſame place, (o) an Eſſay of his Inquiries about the Philoſophy of *Pythagoras*, *De natura & conſtitutione philoſophiæ Italicæ ſeu Pythagoricæ liber prodromus magni operis de Philoſophia Pythagorica, de vita Pythagoræ, & de claris Pythagoricis.*

(C) *The Catalogue of his Writings has been Printed more than once.*] He himſelf prefixed it to his *lectiones Academicæ*, publiſhed at *Hamburg* 1675; and he informed his Reader that the Catalogue of his Books had been added by his Bookſeller to his Political Diſſertations upon *Levy* in 1665. From that time continues he, my Friends have exhorted me from ſeveral places, to publiſh a continuation of it. I do it, the more willingly, becauſe I am certain it contains ſome Works, that are not known in Foreign Countries, and that lie here in the

T t t 2

(a) Macrob. Saturnal. lib. 2. c. 5. p. m. 271.

(b) Juliæ mores improbaret ut quam ſenſiſſet ſui quoque ſub priore marito appetentem quod ſane vulgo etiam exiſtimabatur. Sueton. in Tiber. c. 7.

(c) In tormentis adulteriorum conjugis. Plin. lib. 7. c. 8. pag. m.

(d) Homer Iliad. lib. 22. v.

(e) Strabo lib. 13. pag. 41

(f) See Strabo lib. 13. & Diodorus Siculus lib. 20.

(g) *Taken from* Plutarch in quæſtionib. Græcis pag. 301.

(h) Ortelius in Theſauro Geograph. voce Scamandrus in edit. Hanov. in 4.

(i) Strabo lib. 13. pag. 411.

(k) Juven. Sat. 10. v. 177.

(l) Ἀπέλιπε τὸ ῥέεθρον, οὐδ' ἀπέχρησε τῇ στρατιῇ πινόμενος. Hunc (*Scamandrum*) profluentem ſua aqua deſtituit nec hominibus jumentiſque potantibus ſuffecit. Herodot. p.m. 400.

(m) *Prefixed to his* Miſcellanea *at* Amſterdam 1698.

(n) In 8.

(o) *Likewiſe* in 8.

for the Queen. The Judges pronounced Sentence in Favour of the Wife against the Husband, and the Breach was made up soon after. M. *Wilefeld* Married the Countess *Eleonor*; his Rival Married afterwards one of her Sisters: But his hatred continued, and 'tis said that he gave sad Proofs of it when this Count was ¶ detained Prisoner at *Malmoe* by the *Swedes*. The Chevalier *de Terlon* § tells us, that Mr. *Schested* was made Prisoner near *Copenhagen* by a *Swedish* Party, and that the civility the King of *Sweden* shewed him, made him suspected by the Court of *Denmark*; and on the other side the *Swedes* suspected that he had suffered himself to be taken to have the bettter opportunity of giving an Account at *Copenhagen* of what past in their Camp. This Chevalier says hereupon, That *Annibal Schested* always gave to the King of *Denmark* Evident Proofs of a *great Respect, and of the Zeal and Fidelity that a Prince can expect from the most affectionate of his Subjects.* He was sent Ambassador into *Sweden* after the Treaty of Peace concluded the 27th of *December* 1659. You will find in the Supplement to *Moreri* *, that he dy'd at *Paris* the 23d of *October* 1666, Aged 53 Years, and that he was Plenipotentiary of *Denmark* for the Negotiation of a Treaty of Peace.

SCHILLING (CHRSTOPHER) was one of the Learned Men of the XVI. Century, especially in *Greek* †. He was a Native of *Francestein* in *Silesia*, and taught first at *Hirschberg* in his own Country, and afterwards in the Palatinate, and at last he was admitted Physician in the University of *Padua*. The Reason that made him leave *Hirschberg*, was because he had a Quarrel about the Eucharist with *Balthasar Tilesius*, Minister of that Place; for he inserted in the Catechism which he dictated to his Disciples, certain things which he had of || *Melanchthon*, and which did not please *Tilesius*. The Conclusion of the Quarrel was, that *Schilling* lost his place, as I have already observed in the Article of *David Pareus*. He retired into the Palatinate, and was made Rector of a College, which the Elector *Frederick* III. Founded at that time at *Amberg* in 1566. He was afterwards Rector of the College of *Heidelberg*, from whence, I think, he went away because of some Dispute about precedency. He is an *(Z)* Author.

SCHOMBERG (NICOLAS DE) Cardinal and Archbishop of *Capua* in the XVI. Century, was a *German* of the Noble and Ancient Family of *Schomberg* in *Misnia*. He had been a Dominican Fryer, and it was *Savanarola* who gave him the Habit at Florence ‡ in 1497, and who by his preaching had stirred up in him a desire of entring into that Order; for *Schomberg* Travelled into *Italy* only out of Curiosity. He had several Employments among the Dominicans; he taught Divinity at *Rome* and *Florence*; He was Prior in a Convent of the latter City, and was made Procurator General of that Order by the choice of the Famous *Thomas de Vio* who was General of it, and who is so Famous by the Name of

the Dust by the negligence of my Bookseller at *Upsal*, or for other Reasons. (a) *Quem* (Indicem) *eo libentius juris facio publici quo scio certius, esse quæ sive oscitantia Librarii Upsaliensis, sive causis aliis hic jacent pulvere sepulta, & idcirco alibi ignorantur.* I shall observe by the by, that 'tis of great importance for an Author, that his Works be Printed by a Bookseller who knows how to sell them; for among idle or unskilful Booksellers, the best Books lye upon their hands. There's to be seen a more exact Catalogue of the Works of *Schefferus* in *Suecia literata*; and we have a new one prefixed to a Book sold at *Amsterdam* as Printed in 1698 with the Title of *Joh. Schefferi Miscellanea.* 'Tis divided into four Classes. The 1st. contains what he has writ concerning *Sweden*: I'll only mention the *Upsalia antiqua cujus occasione plurima in antiquitatibus Borealibus & gentium vicinarum explicantur.* This Work was Printed at *Upsal* in 1666. in 8°. The Author has left it to his Heirs, Corrected and enlarged. *De situ & vocabulo Upsaliæ epistola defensoria*, Stockholm 1677. in 8. *Memorabilium Suecicæ Gentis exemplorum liber*, Hamburg 1671, in 8. *De tribus orbibus aureis nuper in Scania erutis e terra disquisitio antiquaria*, Stockholm 1676. in 8. *De antiquis verisque Regni Sueciæ insignibus*, in the same place 1678. in 4. *Lapponia sive Gentis regionisque Lapponum descriptio accurata cum figuris*, Francfort 1673. in 4. This Work was Printed in *English* at *Oxford* 1674. in high *Dutch* at *Nuremberg* the same Year in 4°, and in *French* at *Paris* in (b) 1678. in 4°. It was found very much enlarged in the Closet of the Author. *Suecia literata seu de scriptis & scriptoribus Gentis Sueciæ, opus posthumum*, Stockholm 1680. in 8. There is in it a Catalogue of the *Swedish* Writers and of Foreigners who have writ Books in *Sweden*. It is disposed, not according to an Alphabetical order, but according to Chronology. There's a great defect in the Index, for the Authors are placed in it only according to their Christian Names. The Author perhaps would have mended that Fault, if he had been alive when it was Printed. Mr. *Mollerus* has made a Second (c) Edition of it, and has added many Curious and Instructive Remarks to it; *Hypomnemata*, as he calls them, *hystorico-Critica paucula è pluribus selecta.* The Supplement he has made to the Article of our *Scheffer*, may serve those very much who would know the Circumstances or Dependencies of the Writings of this Professor. The 2d Class of his Writings contains *autores Græcos & Latinos illustratos.* You may see there that he has published, with Notes, the Panegyrick (d) of *Pacatus*, the various Histories of *Ælian*, the Fables of *Phædrus*, the Fragment of *Petronius*, *Justin*, *Hyginus*, *Obsequens*, &c. The 3d Class contains the Miscellanies, that is to say, the work I have already mentioned, *de philosophia Pythagorica*, and his Book *de militia navali veterum*, Printed at *Upsal* 1653. in 4°. which was found (e) with so many Corrections and Additions in the Closet of the Author, that 'tis a new work: *de antiquorum torquibus* Printed at *Stockholm* 1656. in 8°: *de re vehiculari veterum, cum Pyrrhi Ligorii libro ejusdem argumenti ex Italica lingua in Latinam verso & animadversionibus illustrato*, Printed at *Francfort* in 1671 in 4°. *de arte pingendi* Printed at *Nuremberg* in 1669 in 8°. *Index in libros Grotii de jure belli & pacis. Consilium de institutione literaria*, &c. The 4th Class contains the Books not Printed, which consist of Notes upon the Author of the Book concerning the *Pre-Adamites*, of Letters, Harangues, Programma's *Adversaria*, &c.

The Supplement of Mr. *Mollerus* to the 2d Edition of *Suecia literata* takes notice, That there were published after the Death of the Author, *breviarium politicorum Aristotelis*, at *Stockholm* 1684. in 8°. & *Hugo Grotius de jure belli & pacis, in usum Gustavi Adolphi Comitis de la Gardie, enucleatum*, at *Stetin* 1693. in 12°. Observe that *Scheffer*, under the Suppostitious Name of *Constantinus Opellus* (f), Printed a Letter, wherein he Attacks the Book of *Mark Meibomius de Triremium fabrica*, Published at *Amsterdam* 1671. in 4°.

(Z) *He is an Author.*] There is a Collection (g)

¶ See the Remarks in the Article *Wilefeld*.

§ *Memoirs* pag. 141. *Dutch Edit.*

* At the word *Hannibal*.

† See the life of [illegible] pag. [illegible]

|| He had been *Melanchthon's* Disciple at *Wittemberg* for the space of 9. Years.

‡ According to *Seckendorf Hist. Luther. l.* 3. *pag.* 91. It was in the Year 1495.

(a) *Joh. Schefferus* ad lector. benevolum.

(b) *Father* Lubin *is the Author of that version.*

(c) At Hamburg 1698. in 8.

(d) At Stockholm in 1651. & 1668. in 8.

(e) Quos ita auctos mutatos atque commentatos reliquit Schefferus, ut haberi possint pro aliis & novis.

(f) Joh. Mollerus hypomnem. ad Suec. literat. pag. [illegible] of Cardinal Cajetan, Leo X. gave to Schomberg § the Archbishoprick of Capua in 1520. Clement VII. made him one of his most intimate Counsellors, and sent him into France to Negotiate a Peace between Charles V. and Francis I. As he was not a very acceptable Man to France, he had much ado to obtain leave to be at the Conferences of Cambray, where he contributed much to the Peace that was concluded there. Paul III. made him a Cardinal Priest by the Title of Saint Sixtus in 1535. 'Tis said that even before α he was made a Cardinal, he had like to have been Elected Pope in the Conclaves, wherein Hadrian VI. and Clement VII. were chosen. He preached 5 Sermons (A) before Pope Julius II. upon the Temptation of JESUS CHRIST, which were much esteem'd. There are some of his Letters in the * Collection of those of Princes, and one among the rest † upon the Death of Sir Thomas More Chancellor of England. 'Tis said ||, That he was Cousin of the Nun that Married Luther. He died at Rome September 9, 1537. Aged a little more then 65 Years, and was buried in the Convent della Minerva near Cardinal Cajetan his good Friend ‡. Consult the History of Lutheranism by Seckendorf, p. 92. lib. 3. You'l find a fine Elogy of this Prelate prefixed to each of the two Dialogues of *Alcyonius de exilio*.

SCHOMBERG (THEODORICUS DE) a *German* Gentleman, served in the Army of the *Reisters*, which Prince *John Casimir*, Son of the Elector *Palatine* brought into *France*, to the assistance of the Protestants in 1567. and performed a very Courageous Action (*B*) at the passage of the River *Seine*. He continued afterwards to do a great many good Services, till he was killed β at the Battle of *Ivri* in 1590. having given great Proofs of his Valour, and contributed notably to the Victory which *Henry* IV gained.

SCHOMBERG (GASPAR DE) Count of *Nanteuil*, a *German* Gentleman of an Ancient (*A* Δ) Family in *Missnia*, being in *France* during the Wars of Religion, was so much esteemed, that *Charles* IX took him into his Service. He was at first engaged in the Huguenot Party; for while μ he studied at *Angers* in 1562, he put himself at the Head of the Protestants, to hinder the Catholicks from making themselves Masters of that City; but not having succeeded in his Design, he retired to the Prince of *Condé*, who sent him into *Germany* to carry Letters to the Duke of *Deux-Ponts* to hasten the Levies that were expected from him, and to the Landgrave of *Hesse*, to obtain assistance of Men and Money. He became afterwards a Royalist, and hindred very much the Designs of his first Master. He hindred him dexterously in 1568. (*A*) from being succour'd by the Troops of the Prince of *Orange*. He was often sent into *Germany* to make Levies there, and acquitted himself with a great deal of Honour of the Command θ that he had of those Troops. But he was not less fit for the Cabinet than for War, as he evidenced in many Important Negotiations. *Thuanus* γ, who Negotiated with him the Accommodation of the Duke of *Mercœur*, and many Affairs concerning the Edict of *Nantes*, does very much commend him: He assures us, that he was a Man of a great Wit, and of an admirable Prudence, very expert and able in the Affairs of War, dextrous and experienced in Negotiations, of a manly persuasive Eloquence, of a singular Probity, Civil, Magnificent, Officious and obliging to every Body. He gave Evidence of a particular Zeal for the good and Glory of *France*, under 3 Kings one after another, during the space of 35 Years. He loved Learned Men; and to say all in few Words, he did every thing with so much Honour and Disinterestedness that neither the Dignities with which he was invested, nor the great Affairs that went thro' his Hands both in Peace and War, did not prevent his

§ Auberi, Pallavicini did not say it was Clement VII.

α Ex Historia ... dic. Altamura, pag. 271 ad 1521. Rapsodia, Scriptores Cardinal. p. m. 1..

Lettere di Principi, l. 3 fol. 33. Ughellus tom. 6. in Archiep. Capuan.

* Oldoinus, Athen. Roman. pag. 606.

† It is to be found fol. 23. of the 3. Book, Printed at *Venice* in 1581. and fol. 124. *Verso* in the Translation of *Belleforest*.

|| Palavic. Istor. del Concil. l. 3. c. 17. ex relatione Legati Soriani. Mr. Seckendorf, Hist. Luther. l. 3. p. 92. *denies it*.

‡ Altamura ubi supra.

β Thuanus lib. 98. Davila lib. 11.

of his Greek and Latin Poems Printed at *Geneva* in 1580, and some letters (*a*) upon some Questions of Physick, in a Collection of Pieces Printed in 1598 at *Francfort*.

(*A*) *He preached five Sermons.*] He Preached them in 1505 (*b*). They were Printed in 1511. The very next Year they were Re-printed (*c*) at *Leipsick*, where they were also Printed again in (*d*) 1684. because grown very scarce. *Altamura* had no Reason to say that these Sermons were Preached before *Leo* X; for they came out of the Press before the Creation of that Pope.

(*B*) *A Courageous Action at the Passage.*] The Royalists had cast into the Ford *Planks nailed with Circles and Caltrops*, and were in order of Battle on the other side of the River. The Protestants placed Four Hundred *Arquebusiers by the Willows on the Banks of the River, for the guard of those who cleared the Ford with rakes*, Schomberg threw himself into the River a-cross all this, and made so brisk a charge upon the Enemy, that *he killed Forty upon the spot, and brought two Standards to the Prince of* Conde, who having no Order of Knighthood to give him, put about his Neck a Chain worth two Hundred Crowns at the head of the Army (*e*).

(*A* Δ) *Of an Ancient Family in Missnia.*] I Remember to have read the Funeral Oration of *Henry de Schomberg*, Son of this Gentleman pronounced at *Toulouse* by the Bishop of *Usez Peter de Bertier*, who was afterwards Bishop of *Montauban*. I have forgot the Words he made use of to celebrate the High Birth of the deceased: I can nevertheless affirm, that he gave out that his Ancestors had been raised to the most Eminent Employments in *Saxony*, and that they had been of the First Rank for many Ages in those parts. But M. *de Seckendorf* observes that this Family was never raised in *Germany* to the dignity of a Count; and that *Gaspar de Schomberg* was of a Branch Collateral to that of Cardinal *de Schomberg*. See his History of Lutheranism Book 3. p. 92.

(*A*) *He dexterously hindred.*] I shall make use of the very Words of *d'Aubigné*. Near *Soissons*, says he (*f*), "*Gaspard Schomberg* came by the King's "Order to the Prince (*g*), with whom he treated "of a general Composition to assist his Army "with Money, and make 'em return into *Germany*; "but in particular, he managed so well the greatest "part of the Captains, that when the Prince spoke "to them of going to joyn the Prince of *Condé*, "he found them all Cold Divines and bad Partisans, discoursing of the justice of War, without "forgetting the Rights of Kings, and the Affairs "they had in their own Country. *Schomberg* went away

(*f*) D'Aubigné, Histoire universelle, tom. 1 liv. 5. ch. 28. p. m. 482.

(*g*) *That is, to the Prince of* Orange.

his leaving a great many of Debts behind him. He died of a sudden Death in his Coach near *St. Antony's* Gate returning from *Conflans*, where he had assisted at a Council held there by *Henry* IV. to Name Commissioners Executors of the Edict of *Nantes*; which was the 15th of *May* 1599. He had been Naturalized ‡ in 1570, and made some time after Governor of the Upper and Lower *Marche*. He had Married *Jean Chasteigner de la Rochepozai*, Widow of *Henry Clutin Sieur d'Oisel*, Ambassador of *France* at *Rome*, by whom he had (*B*) two Sons and three Daughters. I have been a long time without finding whose Son the young *Scomberg* was, who was killed at the Famous Duel || of *Quelus* and *Entraguet* in 1578. He was one of the Seconds of the latter; and this was the first time that Seconds Fought §: but at last I have found in Father *Anselme*, that he was Brother of our *Gaspar de Schomberg*.

† Father Anselme, Hist. des grands Officiers, pag. [illegible]

‡ Journal de Henri III.

§ Mezerai, Abregé chronolog. tom. 5. pag. 335. ad ann. 1578.

SCHOMBERG (HENRY DE) Son of the foregoing, was Marshal of *France*, and of a much distinguished Merit, not only for his brave Actions, but also for his excellent Qualities. One may see an Account of his Employs and Actions in Mr. *Moreri*, who has Copied them out of Father *Anselme*. He might also have Copied what follows, *viz.* That χ *Henry de Schomberg* was first Married in 1599, to *Frances d'Epinai* ʒ, Sister and Heiress of *Charles* Marquis *d'Epinai* in *Bretagne*; and secondly, in 1631. to *Anne de la Guiche*, Daughter and Heiress of *Philibert de la Guiche*, Great Master of the Ordinance in *France*. He had by his first Wife *Charles de Schomberg*, of whom I shall speak hereafter, and a Daughter who was Married to *Roger du Plessis*, Duke *de la Roche-Guyon*, Knight of the King's Orders, and first Gentleman of the Chamber. By the Second Marriage he had a Posthumous Daughter, who was Baptized at *Paris* the 5th of *March* 1633, and who was Married to *Charles de Rohan*, Duke of *Mombazon*, and Prince of *Guemené*.

χ Page 675. of the 1 tom. of the Pa- [illegible]

ʒ Anselme, Hist. des grans Officiers ubi supra.

SCHOMBERG (CHARLES DE) Son of the foregoing, was Duke of *Haluin* by his Marriage with the Dutchess of that Name, and Marshal of *France*. You may see an Account of his Dignities and Exploits in *Moreri*, Copied word by word out of Father *Anselme* *. He should also have Copied that *Anne* & Dutchess of *Haluin*, his Wife, died of the small Pox at *Nanteuil*, without Children, in *September* 1641 and that he Married again the 24th of *September* 1646, *Mary de Hautefort*, a Tire-Woman to the Queen, and Daughter of *Charles*, Marquis *de Hautefort*, by whom he had no Children. This *Mary de Hautefort* was much Celebrated, for her Virtue, by *Scarron* and other Poets: But a Modern Satyrist (*A*) has given her a furious

& She died the 6th of January 1602.

* Ibid. pag. 257.

" away, having received some Injuries, and even " a Box on the Ear from *Genlis*; and the Prince " was forced to go towards *Strasburg* and sell " his Plate, his Tapestry, his Moveables and his " spare Cloaths, dividing all among the Chiefs, " and giving them (if not what he ought) at " least what he could; and then mortgaged to them " the Principality of *Orange*, and *Monfort*, pro" mising to pay them the Interest and Princi" pal within twelve Years: And he and those, who " were better minded, joyned the Duke of *Deux-*" *Ponts*, who was then preparing for the Wars of " *France*." See Mr. *Varillas* in the life of *Charles* IX. in the Year 1568. but especially *Thuanus* lib. 43, in the same Year.

(*B*) *He had two Sons and three Daughters.*] *Henry*, (of whom I speak in his Article) *Hannibal*, who was killed in the War of *Hungary* against the *Turks*; *Catherine*, who died before her Father, without leaving any Children by her Marriage with *Lewis de Barbançon*, Sieur *de Cany*; *Margaret*, who was not Married, and *Frances* who left Children behind her by her Marriage with *Francis de Daillon*, Count *du Lude* (*a*).

(*A*) *A Modern Satyrist.*] 'Tis the Author of a Book which was Printed at the *Hague* (*b*) in 1687. with this Title: *Memoires de Mr. L. C. D. R. concernant ce qui s'est passé de plus particulier sous le regne du Cardinal de Richelieu, & du Cardinal Mazarin.* 'Tis not well known who writ this Book; 'tis only guessed that it was one who had been Secretary to the Countess *de Soissons*, Neice of Cardinal *Mazarin*. He had, without doubt, a great deal of Wit; but there never was such a Packer of all sorts of Stories, nor such a Compiler of all the Satyrical Rhapsodies of the Taverns and Armies. There's nothing more false than what we read in the first Tome (*c*) of the *Melanges* of *Vigneul Marville* in these Words: " (*d*) From since that time the *Petits* " *Maitres* were not heard of till the time of " Cardinal *de Richelieu*, who kept in his Ser" vice a certain number of bold and resolute Fel" lows, whom he employ'd in the Execution of his " Designs. *Rochefort*, whose Memoirs are pub" lished, was one of 'em." This pretended *Rochefort* was not then in the World, or was but lately born when this Cardinal died. However it be, he says page 93, That the Dutchess of *Chevreuse was apprehensive, lest* la Porte *whom, tho' he was a Taylor by Trade, she had taken into her Bed, should sacrifice her to the* Marechalless *of* Schomberg, *who, after having resisted the King's Addresses, could not, according to common Fame, defend her self from such a mean Person.* Before I mention what the Abbot *Faydit* has published on this Subject, I shall make this little Remark; That the time that's allotted for this Affair, is that which passed between the Death of Cardinal *de Richelieu* and that of *Lewis* XIII. Now at that time the Marshal *de Schomberg* had not Married the Lady in Question; and therefore 'tis an absurd thing to talk of her at that rate. Let us See what the Abbot *Faydit* says.

I confess, says he, " That what determined me, " when I composed my Book (*e*), to set down at " length this Passage of *Celsus*, was only the de" sign I had effectually to comfort, by the Example " of the most blessed Virgin, a most virtuous La" dy, whose Honour was Attacked by a most Un" just and Cruel Calumny. Those who know me, " are not ignorant that I have a long time made " Profession of Honouring an Illustrious Dutchess " and Mareschalless of *France*, who having been in " her Youth, the Ornament and Admiration of the " Court, as well for her Eminent Piety as for her " Beauty and Wit, is become, in her old Age, the " Edification of all the Town by the continual Ex" amples of her Virtues, and the joy of all those " who see her, by the sweetness of her Conversation. " But as there is nothing so pure but what is at" tacked by Calumny, there's an insolent Scribler, " who in a Book full of Falsities, intituled, *Me-*" *moires de M. L. C. D. R.* has had the Impudence " to bespatter with his Venomous Satyr so fine a " life, without considering that this Lady, of " whom he speaks so ill, is the same whom the Poets " (*f*), who are naturally Satyrical, called in her " Youth *Saint Haut*——— He has not been afraid " through the most Treacherous and Ridiculous " of all Calumnies, to give her for a Gallant a Man " she had never saw, nor knew. Going one day to visit

(*a*) Anselme, Hist. des grands Officiers, pag. 248.

(*b*) The Title says, A Cologne, chez Pierre Marteau.

(*c*) Page. 324. of the 2. Edition. of Rouen.

(*d*) That is from the time of Henry. III.

furious blow. *Lewis* XIII. had a great kindness for her, and she suffered a Disgrace (*B*) which rather heightned than diminished her Reputation.

SCHOMBERG (FREDERICK DE) created Marshal of *France* the 30th of *July*, in the Year 1675. was killed at the Famous Passage of the *Boyn* in *Ireland*, the 10th of *July* 1690. He was one of the greatest Captains of his Age, and Commanded Armies under more Kings, and was raised to Eminent Dignities in more Countries than any other. He deserves a long Article, but not having received the Memoirs which I expected, I am forc'd to refer it to another time. He is one of those great Men, whose History ought to be written by an able Pen. I do not doubt but that the Duke of *Schomberg* his worthy Son, has already taken care to procure this Honour to his Family, * and this fine Present to the Common-wealth of Learning.

In the mean time, one may be informed of many things, by consulting the Memoires of Mr. *Fremont d' Ablancourt*, Published in the Year 1701. You'll find an Extract of them in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savant*, for the Month of *November* 1700.

SCHORUS (ANTONY) a Native of † *Hoochstraten* in *Brabant*, was one of the best Grammarians of the XVIth Century. He laboured diligently to introduce into the Schools || *Cicero*'s Latin, and Composed some Works (*A*) very proper

"visit her, I found her a little astonished to see "her self so basely treated in that Impertinent "Book: I could not forbear to tell her, on purpose to Comfort her, that the Blessed Virgin her "self, who was the purest of all Creatures, had "not escaped such like Calumnies; and that a little after her Death, a Famous Writer had the "Impudence to assert, *That she had a Criminal Commerce with a Soldier called* PANTHER, *and* "*that he was the Father of* Jesus Christ. As this "seemed New to her, and besides Comforted her, "she desired me to Transcribe that Passage (*a*)".

I thought I ought not to leave out any thing in this Discourse; for every thing in it seemed to me to be of some use for some or other. I'll add one Observation; which is, that so many Persons ought not to be suffered to have the Boldness to Defame the greatest Names. I know several who groan under the Impunity of this Licentiousness. It would be more tolerable, if those Satyrical Authors were sure of what they Publish; but for the most part they have no certainty of it, and sometimes they know they Lie, and they would obstinately refuse to Retract, if their Calumnies were made Evident. They would not imitate the act of an Honest Man, which is Published in the *Mercure Politique*, for the Month of *December* 1695. Let us Copy the Passage. Here are the words of the Author of that Work: "(*b*) Since I am upon the "Subject of the late Arch-Bishop of *Paris*, I find "my self obliged to say, That I am sorry I have related, (1) what the Author of *L'Esprit de* Mr. *Arnaud*, has said of the Dutchess *de la Meilleraye*. "The Author of that Satyr, who has advanced Indiscreetly, so many Facts that are found to be False, "has put her in the number of some Ladies, with "whom 'tis pretended that this Arch-Bishop had "Criminal Galantries; and yet 'tis certain "that Dutchess never in her life spoke with "that Prelate, as all *Paris* Evidence. I am convinced that Madam *de la Meilleraye* was little concerned at the report of this Chimerical Commerce upon the Credit of an Author, who will "never be accounted Canonical. I am very willing, notwithstanding, for my own Interest, to "disown what I have said, tho' in truth I believed "nothing of it, as I insinuated enough".

(*B*) Lewis *XIII. had a great kindness for her, and she suffered a Disgrace.*] One may see at large this Amour, in the *Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de* France. Cardinal *de Richelieu*, as we are told, was much allarmed at this Passion of the King, tho' Mademoiselle *de Hautefort* had not *the* (*c*) *same Penetration, nor a Wit so capable of Intrigues as the first Mistress* (*d*); he was allarmed, I say, after he *discovered that she was governed by the Counsels of* Mademoiselle de (*e*) Chennerault. He and *St. Mars* (*f*) *pressed the King so much, that he sent Orders to those two Ladies to be gone presently from the Court, and they entered forthwith into a Convent at* Paris: *But the Cardinal would not let them stay long there; he obliged them to retire*; Mademoiselle de Chennerault *into* Poictou, *and* Mademoiselle de Hautefort *to one of her Country Seats, Forty Leagues from the Court.* This Passion of the King was mixt with a deal of Respect, and great Jealousy. (*g*) *He durst not take the least Liberty with that Lady, as may be judged by what I am going to say. One day the Queen having received a* Billet, *of which she was willing to make a Mystery, pinn'd it to the Tapestry of her Chamber, that she might not forget to make an Answer to it: The King coming a little while after, the Queen not being willing the King should see it, Commanded* Madam de Hautefort, *who was her Lady of Honour, to take it and keep it, which she did. The King would needs take it from her, and struggled in a pleasant Humour with her: She not being able to defend her self any longer, put the* Billet *in her Bosom, which proved a Sanctuary to it, for the King durst not seek for it there, and had no more the least Curiosity of seeing it.* That's a Proof of his Respect; here is another of his Jealousy. The Marquiss *de Gevres* was Killed, while all things were making ready for his Marriage with Mademoiselle *de Hautefort*. The King "(*h*) entring some Days after into her "Chamber, found her Praying, and saying the "Office for the Dead. He fancied it was for "the Marquiss *Gevres*, and conceived so strong a "Jealousy, that he would not for six Weeks "hear of her, tho' he himself had proposed the "Match; which may be attributed to the usual "Caprices of Love, which often looks upon, "as an Evil, the things that it has earnestly desired". I desire to be looked upon here, only as a Copyer; for I will not warrant that this Author is exact, as to the bottom of this Affair, and much less, that he has not made Transpositions of Times and Places. I have some Scruple about this Story, in the continuation of the *Menagiana*. (*i*) Madam de Schomberg de Hautefort, *was one of the Ladies, that* Lewis *XIII. used to see; but she was disgusted with the Court, and retired to the* Magdelonnettes. *The Abbot* de la Victoire *going thither to see her, told her, Madam, is it then to Honour the King that you are retired hither?* I make upon this Three Observations. 1. This Lady could never be called *Mademoiselle de Schomberg*; for the latter Name came only by her Marriage with the Marshal *de Schomberg*. 2. Her retreat from the Court was against her Will. 3. 'Tis very odd, that among so many sorts of Convents, she should chuse the *Magdelonnettes*, a place in some manner designed for Publick Pennance. This made me doubt of her retiring thither; but I know from good Hands that she was there.

She was again out of Favour under the Regency of *Anne* of *Austria*. See the Stanza's that *Benserade* made upon that Subject (*k*).

(*A*) *He Composed some Works proper for that Design.*] That which is called *Thesaurus Ciceronianus*, is a Methodical Abridgment of *Robert Stephens*, and of the Observations of *Nizolius*. His Phrases *linguæ Latinæ, ratioque observandorum eorum in authoribus legendis quæ præcipuam ac singularem vim aut usum habent*, were Printed (*l*) at *Basil* in 1550. and afterwards Re-printed (*m*) a great many times. There proper for that Design. A Comedy, which he made (B) his Scholars act at *Heidelberg*, where he taught Humane Learning, was the cause that he was forced to Fly. He Died at *Lausanne*, † in the Year 1551.

---

* *It is different from that of the Marshals, the Schomberg, mention'd in the foregoing Articles. See Seckendorf, Histor. Lutheran. l. 3. p. 91. litera b, where he shews that their Seat was upon the* Rhine, *in the Diocese of* Triers. Theodoric de Schomberg, de quo supra, *was of this Family, if we believe* the State of France, *tom. 2. pag.* 166. *edit.* 1680.

(*g*) Intrig. galantes ibid. pag. 184.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 185.

(*i*) Suite du Menagiana, pag. 379. *Dutch. Edit.*

(*k*) *They are in the 5th Volume of the Collection of the best Pieces of the* French *Poets, Printed in* 1692. *pag.* 187. *of the Dutch Edition.*

(*l*) Epitome bibl. Gesneri pag. 67.

(*m*) *I make use of the* Cologne *Edition* 1595. *in* 8.

(*b*) ...cure histo... & politique, December 169... pag. ...1, 662.

(1) 'Tis in the XIX. ... for August ... 189.

... Intri... ...es ga... ...tes de ... Cour ... France, ...m. 2. ... 183. ...it. 1695.

...) Mrs. ... la ...yette, ...om the ...dinal ...remo... ...d from ...Court.

...e) I ...k it ...uld be ...heme...ult.

...f) In...ig. ga... ...tes ib. ... 186.

SCHOT or SCOT (REGINALD) an *English* Gentleman, Composed a Book, whereof all the Copies that could be found were Burnt *. He endeavoured to shew, that all the accounts of Magicians and Witches are Chimerical. The first part of this Work was Translated into *Dutch*, and Printed in 1609, and made a great Impression upon the Readers. (Z) *Voetius* complains much of it.

SCIOPPIUS ‡ (GASPAR) one of the most Famous Writers of the XVII. Century, was a *German*. His Enemies have Published many shameful Things (A) concerning his Family. He Studied at *Amberg*, and then at *Heidelberg*, and afterwards at *Altdorf*, at the Charges of the Elector *Palatine*. Having made a considerable stay at *Ingolstad*, he return'd to *Altdorf*, and Publish'd some Critical Books, which made him very Proud: He could not forbear admiring himself, because

† Id. ib. & [illegible] in epitom. [illegible] Gerhard [illegible]

* Voet. ubi infra pag. 544.

‡ Voet. Disputat. Theol. tom. 3. pag. 573.

‡ *His true Name was* Schoppe, *but he changed it into* Scioppius, *to bring it to the Italian Pronunciation.*

There was Printed at *Strasburg* (a) in 1549. his Two Books *de ratione discendæ docendæque Latinæ & Græcæ Linguæ*.

(B) *A Comedy was the cause he was obliged to Fly.*] This Comedy was only Acted in his own House, in the presence of few People: Nevertheless the Emperor had notice of it, who gave Orders that this Crime should not go Unpunished. The *Elector Palatin, Frederick* II. having read the Emperor's Letter to him about it, was much troubled; he knew nothing of the matter; but he quickly informed himself of it. *Schorus* made his escape; some of his Scholars were Imprisoned by the Rector of the University. Here is the ground of the Complaint. This Comedy introduced Religion, desiring to be lodged with great Men; they shut the Doors against her; then she Addressed her self to Poor People, who gave her a Lodging. What will People think of the Great ones, said the Emperour, if it be once permitted to decry them upon the Stage as the Persecutors of Religion? You'll find this Relation in the Thirteenth Book of the Annals of *Hubert Leodius*. A Modern Author (b) has cited this, to shew that Comedies may be permitted; and he observes that in *England* and the Low-Countries, the liberty of the Actors was very serviceable to the Introduction of the Reformation: (c) *Sæpe actores quam artificiose perstringunt vitia inveterata publiceque grassantia, quod alii certe vix tanta cum παῤῥησίᾳ auderent. Nec absque fructu: prout contigit circa Reformationis initia in Anglia, uti observavit vir pietate atque doctrina conspicuus Johannes Foxus in Historia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Similiter in Belgio comœdiæ, a viris doctis scriptæ, cum exhiberent quam graphice in Theatro Babylonis turpitudinem, haut parum sub initium Reformationis quam plurimos commoverunt, nec minus cum fructu spectatorum prostituerunt Antichristianam doctrinam, quam Orthodoxam veritatem eidem oppositam asseruerunt.* I must needs say here that in 1558, there was Acted at *Rochelle*, before the King (d) and Queen of *Navarre*, a Comedy, which represented the Abuses of Popery, and the Remedy that might be brought to it out of Scripture. (e) *The Ecclesiasticks made their Complaint to the King of* Navarre *himself*. Mr. *Vincent*, Minister of *Rochelle*, adds to the recital of this Adventure a Solid Reflection. "I do not think, *says he* (f),
"That under pretence of the Historical Account
"I have given, it will be imputed to me, that
"I pretend to Authorise this manner of treating
"things that belong to Religion.—— (g) If it be
"true, as it was loudly said at *Rochelle*, that all this
"came from *Joan d'Albret*, Queen of *Navarre*, who
"would, (h) in her turn, (i) make use of the Li-
"berty of the Stage, to make it tell Truths, which
"the Doctors of the Church of *Rome* justly de-
"served to be told; we cannot at all (k) give
"our Approbation to it. We know that Religi-
"on is too Grave and too Holy to be brought
"upon the Stage upon any pretence whatsoever,
"and that she is too much an Enemy of the World
"and its Vanities to beg Aid of its Ministers.
"Nevertheless, as God is Admirable in all his
"ways, and knows how to draw Good out of Evil
"when he pleases; and as, to correct a Prophet that
"was gone Astray, he made an Ass speak (1): He
"permitted here one of the Stages of the World
"to speak, since the Pulpits were silent; he per-
"mitted, I say, to the Shame of the Doctors of
"that time, that some Comedians, whose pro-
"fession it is to represent Fables, should at that time
"be Doctors of Truth, since the Pastors, whose
"business it was to Preach Truth, taught only Fa-
"bles.

(Z) Voetius *complains much of it.*] The Passage I am about to cite, will serve both for a Proof and a Comment upon this Article. (l) *Reginaldus Scot* (†) *nobilis Anglus magiæ crimen aperte negavit, & ex professo oppugnavit, omnes ejus mirabiles effectus aut ad melancholiam, aliosque naturales morbos, aut ad artem, industriam, & agilitatem hominum figmentis & præstigiis suis illudentium, aut ad stolidas imaginationes, dictorum magorum, aut ad vanas nugas & fictiones eorundem magorum referens. Ejus liber tit.* Discovery of Witchcraft *in Anglia combustus est; quem nominatim etiam perstringit Sereniss. Magnæ Britanniæ* Rex Jacobus in Dæmonologia, *cumque tangit diffusissima eruditione Theologus* Johannes Raynoldus, in cens. lib. Apocryph. tom. 2. prælect. 169 (‖). *In eundem, sed innominatum calamum strinxit eximius & subacti judicii Theologus*, Gulielm. Perkinsius in tractatu de Bascanologia. Pars libri *istius* Reginaldi Scot elenctica *(nam reliqua in editione Anglicana conjurationes continebat) in Belgicum idioma translata est, ante annos aliquot Lugd. Batav. per Thomam Basson: ex illius libri lectione, seu fonte perenni, non pauci ab illo tempore docti & indocti in Belgio fluctuare, & in Magia* σκεπτικίζειν *ac* λιβερτινίζειν, *(ut Libertinis & Semilibertinis infesta est patria nostra) quin ex ignorantiæ sæpe prolabi, ut non inique illis applicari potuerit, quod Sereniss.* Rex Jacobus in Dæmonologia *subdito suo Reginaldo Scot:* esse quasi novos Sadducæos: *cum omnes diabolorum operationes, & apparitiones suaviter exibilant, tanquam aniculorum, aut superstitionis meticulosæ phantasmata ac fabellas.*

(A) *Many shameful things concerning his Family.*] They Published (m) that he was Born in a Village, where his Father was Grave-Maker, *hoc vespillone atque æditua in pago quodam non ignoto, natus est Gaspar Schoppius*; That his Father one day made a Grave too little, and being unwilling to make it longer, he cut off the Feet of the Dead Body. (n) *Hiberno quodam tempore, terra firmiter gelu constricta, sepeliendum acceperat cadaver, cui jam sepulchrum effoderat, sed mensura breviore quam pro mole: ibi vir fortissimus, ne tanto in frigore terra deducenda esset, pedibus cadaver mutilat, & in fossam quam sepulchrum verius recondit.* That having got some Money he went into *Poland*, where he served a Printer; that afterwards he was a Pedlar, and went from Village to Village, as the *Savoyards* do, to sell Small-Wares; that he left off that Trade, and Listed himself a Soldier: that he came back into the *Palatinate* after the Death of *Frederick* III. and obtained there a small Employment (o); that he sold Corn, and gained something by it; that he obtained the Judicature of a small Place, and at the end of the Year Listed himself for the Expedition of *Cologne*, and was made Provost of the Army; that after the Death of the Elector *Lewis*, he return'd to his first Post, and made himself a good Miller; that he was sent to a Town that Mutinied, and Commanded the Soldiers there; that he was a Brewer there; that he was there with his Wife and his Daughter, but would not let them see any Body. His Wife, say they, was a *Hessian*, and had followed into *Hungary*, a Man that kept

(a) Id. epit. ib.

(b) Martinus Schoock, exercit. 27. pag. 507, 508.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 507.

(d) Antony de Bourbon & Joan d'Albret.

(e) Vincent, Recherches sur les commencemens & les premiers progrés de la reformation en la Rochelle pag. 40.

(f) Id. ib. p. 40, 41.

(g) Id. ib. pag. 43.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 42.

(i) *To understand this, the Reader ought to know that the Author had been speaking of a Dramatick Piece acted at* Paris, *in the College of* Navarre, *against* Margaret de Valois *Mother to* Joan d'Albret.

(k) Id. ib. pag. 43.

(1) *Numb.* 22. 28.

Becauſe he was a very (B) Young Author. 'Tis ſaid that one of the early Productions of his Pen, was a Commentary upon the *Priapeia*, for which he was very much hiſſed, * eſpecially, becauſe he Envied the Condition of Sparrows. He made a Journey into *Italy*, and after he had been ſometime at *Verona*, he return'd into *Germany*, from whence he went again into *Italy*, and Publiſh'd at *Ferrara* a * Panegyrick upon the King of *Spain*, and *Clement* VIII. He endeavoured to raiſe himſelf

* [illegible]

with her. The Day after he was killed, ſhe lay with *Rompier*, who afterwards deſpiſed her ſo much, that he made her work like a Servant, without either ſeeing or ſpeaking to her. On the contrary, (*) he made his Maid eat at his Table, and Lay with her. The Daughter, a faithful Companion of her Mother in this Retired ſtate, Married a Rogue, who would have been Executed for the Crime of Beſtiality, if he had not made his Eſcape. In his abſence, his Wife proſtituted her ſelf to another Man, who got her with Child. She was Impriſoned, and if ſhe had not made her eſcape, ſhe had been publickly Puniſhed for her Adultery. (†) *Hæc ne ſeriò indigna eſſet, ſcelerato nupſit homini, qui (honor ſit verecundis auribus) conſtante matrimonio abſ... : cum vacca enim conſueviſſe convictus eſt, & effugiendi cauſa ſupplicii uxore deſerta ſe ſubduxit, qua ſuperſtite ſcelerato illo ac fugitivo, alteri cuidam ſui copiam fecit, ac mox prægnans facta eſt. Ob id flagitium, cum in carcerem conjecta, ſupplicium vix evaſura eſſet, vinculis perfractis in Auſtriam pergit, relicta adulterina apud patrem ſobole. In Palatinatu ſine ditione, deprehenſa ſi fuerit, publicam animadverſionem non evadet.* To conclude, 'tis ſaid that *Scioppius* bragged he was the Baſtard of a Gentleman of *Franconia*, called *Munſter*, and that he went by that Name; but that a Lady of that Noble Family, convicted him of being an Impoſtor, and threatned him for uſing this Quality. (a) *Quoties ſymbolum amicitiæ in adoleſcentum philothecas, quæ mos hodie obtinet, referre ſolebat, totidem literis nomen conſignabat: G. S. a Munſter, etiam ad Scaligeri exemplum, FUIMUS TROES. Donec Ingolſtadii a nobiliſſima ejus gentis matrona convictus eſt; cujus tamen minis nondum abſterreri potuit, quin Italis, ad quos poſtea profectus eſt,* gentilem hominem, *ut Longobardi vocant, ſe Germanum eſſe perſuaderet.*

'Tis certain that *Scioppius* Styled himſelf a Gentleman all his life, and that having got Intelligence of the Calumnies, that the Friends of *Scaliger* had publiſhed, he appeared (b) before the Civil Judges of the Apoſtolical Chamber, to be admitted to prove his Nobility, and his good Conduct; and that the Witneſſes which he brought, having been juridically Interrogated, an Act ſealed by the Apoſtolical Chamber was delivered to him, by which it appeared that the Witneſſes depoſed that he was Born a Gentleman, and in Lawful Wedlock. (c) *Sibi ex publica fama & multorum, qui id ſciri potuerint, teſtimoniis conſtare, Scioppium legitime natum & ex nobili familia oriundum eſſe, tametſi majorum nobilitatem paupertatis injuria prope jam extinctam ejus demum pater virtute ſua geſtiſque honoratiſſimis muneribus & officiis rurſus excitarit.* He dedicated to his Father one of (d) his Books, wherein he ſays (e) nothing elſe of his Anceſtors, but that his great Grand-Father lived 112 Years, and his great Grand-Mother 105. He made a Journey into the *Palatinate* in 1608, to take poſſeſſion of his Father's Eſtate, or rather to obtain a Replyed; for 'tis ſaid the Magiſtrates had ſeal'ed on it, becauſe of the miſdemeanor of the Deceaſed in relation to the Taxes of the Prince upon Beer, and to ſuch like Impoſitions. (f) *Patre mortuo ad matrem adeundæ hæreditatis cauſa veniſſe dicitur, quæ à Magiſtratu eam ob cauſam ſequeſtrata putatur, quod pater ——— publicum vectigal quod de bonis ac cerviſia inferri ærario ſolet, fraudarit, cujuſmodi ibi fures, aut ſaltem Norimbergæ, ſeveriſſime plectuntur.* He denied that he was guilty of ſuch an Imbezelment, and alledged ſome other Reaſons why he could not enjoy his Patrimony (g).

(B) *Becauſe he was a very Young Author.*] Mr. *Baillet*, who places him with great Reaſon in the Catalogue of Famous Children, ſpeaks of him thus. " (h) We may conſider the Love he expreſs'd for " Learning, and his indefatigable Labour, which " God did moſt times reward with a good ſucceſs, " as an example that deſerves to be propoſed to " Young People. (i) *Ottavio Ferrari* a *Milaneſe*, and " a Famous Profeſſor at *Padua*, ſeems to affirm that " he was a very good Scholar in his Younger Years; " and he adds, that being but ſixteen Years of Age " he publiſh'd ſome Books, which deſerved to be " admired by Old Men". Here are the Words of *Ottavio Ferrari*. (i) *Ab ineunte ætate ita totus literis affixus fuit, ut ſexto decimo anno libros vulgaret quos ſenes admirarentur.* In another Speech he beſtows this Encomium upon him: (k) *Adoleſcentem ac pene puerum id ingenii, atque eruditionis ſpecimen dediſſe, ut vix tribus luſtris expletis non unum opus publici juris faceret, quod exactæ ætatis judicium, totiuſque antiquitatis ſolidam cognitionem præ ſe ferret.* But it will be better to judge of *Scioppius* by what he ſays of himſelf. It appears from the following Words, that he was about ſeventeen Years of Age, when he publiſh'd his firſt Book, *viz.* Some Latin Verſes. *Extant typis Heidelbergenſibus impreſſa complura Scioppii carmina anno* 1593. *cum haud etiam ſeptimum decimum ætatis annum compleſſet, antiquaria illa plus ſatis, ſic tamen ut variam eruditionem accurata probatiſſimorum auctorum lectione comparatam paſſim præferant: quo ipſo tempore etiam Dialectica & Rhetorica æquales & convictores ſuos, illuſtres nobileſque adoleſcentes, cum eos a Magiſtris ſuis negligi doleret, docere, auſus eſt* (l). To know how many Books he publiſh'd before he was 24 Years of Age, we need only read the following Liſt. Let us remember that in 1593. he was in his 17 Year, as we have juſt now ſeen. (m) *Veriſimilium libri quatuor. Editi Noribergæ in* 8°. *apud Paulum Kaufmannum Anno* 1595. *Diſputatio de Injuriis apud eundem in* 4°. *Anno* 1597. *Suſpectarum Lectionum libri quinque. Apud eundem in* 8°. *Anno* 1597. *Commentarius de Arte Critica, Noribergæ in* 8°. *apud Valentinum Furmannum Anno* 1597. *Notationes Criticæ in Phædrum cum Rittershuſii in eundem ſcriptorem Commentario editæ Lugduni Batavor. in* 8°. *apud Fr. Raphelengium Anno* 1597. *Libellus de ſua* (n) *ad Catholicos migratione, deque auctoritate Eccleſiæ in ſacra ſcriptura interpretanda. Editus Romæ apud Zannetum in* 8°. 1599. *Epiſtola de variis fidei controverſiis ad primarium quendam Germaniæ Juriſconſultum. Ingolſtadii in* 4°. *apud Angermarium Anno* 1599.

'Tis ſaid that he publiſh'd alſo a Commentary upon the *Priapeia*, whereof the Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from *Ingolſtad* in the Year 1595, and that the Author did not think fit to mention it in the Catalogue of his Works, becauſe his Enemies cried him down for having Commented upon ſuch an obſcene Collection of Verſes. He (o) denied the thing, and maintain'd that this Commentary was a Work of *Goldaſtus*, who by an Egregious Trick had publiſh'd it as a Work of *Scioppius*: However he alledged in his Vindication that *Scaliger* had made ſome Commentaries upon the *Priapeia* and upon *Catullus*, and that *Douza* had made one upon *Petronius*. But he changed the State of the Queſtion; for the true ground of the Accuſation was not that he had Commented upon obſcene Verſes, but that he had (p) ſtuff'd his Commentary with abundance of filthy Things. Beſides he complain'd in that Book, that Men have not received from Nature the ſame ſtrength as Sparrows. His Enemies took him up for it, and he was laugh'd at to ſome purpoſe in the Satyr Intituled, (q) *Hercules tuam fidem.* He did certainly deſerve it. Here is the paſſage. (r) *Cum*

Uuu *Ingolſtadii*

(i) Proluſion. p. ...

(i) Octavius Ferrarius, in proluſione cui titulus Quo pretio viri principes literas ac literatos habuerint.

(k) Id. in proluſione cui titulus Literatorum ſinus.

(l) Oporinus Grubinius ubi ſupra. p. 39.

(m) *Theſe Titles are taken from the* Indiculus *of* Scioppius's *Works prefixed to the* Amphotides Scioppianæ.

(n) Freherus *is therefore miſtaken* pag. 775. *of his* Theatrum, *where he ſays that* Scioppius *turn'd Papiſt in the Year* 1601.

(o) *See the* Amphotides Scioppianæ pag. 102. & ſeq *and his letter* ad Saulum Mercerum *at the end of the* Scaliger hypobolimæus.

(p) Luſus diverſorum in Priapum poetarum libero commentario illuſtravit, quo poſt hominum memoriam, nihil fœdius ab ullo cinædo aut libidini omnium proſtituto in lucem editum fuiſſe, omnes fatentur. *Vita & parentes Gaſp. Schoppii p.* 142.

(q) *Pag.* 59. *See alſo* Merici Caſauboni pietas *pag.* 21.

(r) *Scioppius, commentar. in Priapeia carm.* 25. *pag.* 35, *edit.* 1664. *in* 8.

himself at the Court of *Rome*, and used all his Industry towards it, nevertheless his Fortune was but mean, and he was not well Pleased with it †, notwithstanding the Lofty (C) Titles he bestowed upon himself. Before he Travell'd into *Italy* the first time, he plaid a Trick to *Gifanius*, which I have mention'd in another ‖ place. He turn'd Catholick about the Year 1599. I don't know the Reason why he was so Angry with the Jesuits; but 'tis certain he was their great Enemy, and wrote many (D) sharp Libels against 'em under Suppositious Names. On the other side he Inveighed with the greatest Fury against the

Ingolstadii operam, ubi è regione Musæi mei passerem coitum vicies repetentem, & inde ad languorem datum, ut evolaturus in terram decideret. En sortem iniquam. Hoc passeribus datum; negatum hominibus? Ne qui facinus hujusmodi imitari ausit, fictim ut Picos qui aureos montes colunt, divitiis ille solus superet, Pea militie Plutonis omnes eum [illegible] fœminæ scilicet.

TAKE notice of these two things. 1. Those who took his part, denied that he was the Author of that Commentary on the *Priapeia*. 2. His reflection about the pretended Happiness of Sparrows was inlarged upon, and made worse than it was. To prove the first Head, I shall set down the words of the Author of a small Book, Intituled *de tribus capellis*: He was a Jesuit, as I have said in (a) another place. De Commentario si tibi, Josephe, Scioppius hoc dicat: (b) *Scripsi fateor, commentarium in Priapeia: Sed septenum denum annorum puer, sed in hæreticorum scholis institutus, sed exemplo tuo invitatus. Atque nollem id factum. Et si fas dicere (sed fas) cum illa scribebam,* Optarem nullas tunc habuisse manus. *Quid hoc autem, Burdo, dic, tua fide, ad rem attinet? Num tu idcirco Scaligerum te esse evinces, quia Scioppius nescio quid ineptiarum per ludum atque jocum puer verius, quam adolescens olim chartis illevit, quod nunc ævi consiliique maturior,* vero vultu damnat & opus——— *Hoc igitur tibi si dicat ille, non te elinguem proximus, & Burdonem efficiat? Quid si autem dicat hic Scioppius tibi quod dixit jam alius prius, Non scripsi. Scripsit ea vero, inquit: certe vulgavit* quidem quem dicere nolo, *quia tu illum ignorare non potes.* One would think there are some Obliquities in those Words, that look like an acknowledgment of his Fault; but at the bottom they contain a plain denial of his being guilty of it. Note, that *Scioppius* set so great a value on the *tres capellæ*, that he inserted that piece in (c) one of his Books. As to the second head, I need only quote the Author of the *Censure de la doctrine curieuse*; these are his Words: (d) *Pag. 705. Garasse says, that a small Book came out without the Author's Name, written by one of the new Dogmatists, who considering the indefatigable heat of Pigeons and Sparrows in their fits of Love, made a Vow to renounce Heaven, if God would be pleased to change him into a Pigeon or into a Sparrow.* Garasse *needs not Trouble himself with the Name of this new Dogmatist: 'Tis his good friend* Scioppius, *that wonderful good Man, that great Wit, who makes this Fine and Pious Wish* in Priap. pag. 63. It is certain that these Words of (e) Mr. *Ogier* contain a Calumny against *Scioppius*; for this Vow of renouncing Heaven is not to be found in the place quoted by him.

I think I may say, that if one of *Scioppius*'s Books gave occasion to have an ill Opinion of his Morals, all his Books in general shewed that he was not a Debauched Man; for if he had lost his time in making Love and Drinking, he could not have produced so many Books. They were the Fruit of a great Labour, and required a continual and strong Application to Study and the Conversation of Learned Men. Accordingly we find that he (f) call's the Professors of *Altdorf* and *Ingolstad* to Witness, that the Life he had led was quite different from that of the Youth whom they Instructed. He mentions a Poem that he publish'd to exhort the Rector *Wesenbecius* to suppress the Debaucheries of the Scholars. (g) *Cum* Petrus Wesenbecius Jurisconsultus *Academiæ Rector creatus fuisset, longum Scioppius carmen Noribergæ imprimendum dedit, quo corruptos juventutis mores acerbe describit, ipsumque Rectorem cohortatur, ut disciplinam restituere, frena nimis laxata contrahere, nominatim vero cristatorum pileorum usu & nocturnis commessabundæ juventutis concursationibus interdicere Academicis velit, in contumaces vero & refractatorios severe animadvertat.* He alledges in Epistle Dedicatory, wherein he declared why he had so few Friends, and why the Scholars look'd upon him as a Misanthrope: The Reason of it was because he shun'd their Collations, their Walks and their Drinking bouts, and kept in his Study all day long. (h) *Frequentes istas adolescentibus compotationes ut fugiam suadere mihi potest vel valetudinis ratio, quam diligenter cordi habeo, vel consilium quod à meis præceptoribus neglectus, & ceteroquin ingenio non nimis docili præditus jam olim cepi de studiis plidum diem ab usque mane ad vesperam sine ullo potu & cibo naviter persequendis, vel cura denique quam in majoribus meis imitandis ponere decrevi &c. Aliis itaque pro divinitate & facilitate ingenii sui, ad quæ ego impenso labore meo & indefesso studio adspiro nihil agendo vel commessando consequuntur, per me quidem potare, plurimosque sibi hac comitate sua amicos parare licet: dum mihi vicissim hoc non ægre largiantur, ut quam illi ex cauponis ego ex laboribus voluptatem capiam, & laudem continentiæ, ut ego voco, ut illi, Morositatis, à majoribus meis acceptam & in me transmissam, studiose conservem &c.* He was rightly accounted an ill Man; but his Faults, like those of many other Proud, Satyrical and passionate Learned Men, proceeded from his Mind and not from his Body.

(C) *The Lofty Titles he bestowed upon himself.*] He was made Patrice of *Rome*, Knight of *St. Peter*, Counsellor to the Emperor, Counsellor to the King of *Spain*, Counsellor to the Arch-Duke, (i) Count *Palatin*; and lastly, he took the Title of Count *de Clara Valle*.

(D) *Wrote many sharp Libels against* the Jesuits *under supposititious Names*] 'Tis said in the Book (k) I have quoted several times, that before he changed his Religion, he publish'd some Verses, wherein he called their Society, *Iberam parricidalem cohortem*, and that afterwards he fell violently upon them in a Piece that was seen at *Rome* by several People: *Quos petulantissimo postea scripto quod Romæ plurimi viderunt, & è quo nonnulla hic adferri poterant, petivit.* Mention is made of a Fragment of a Letter, importing, that he said long after his Apostacy, that there were (l) few Learned Persons, and very few Honest Men in that Order. He answers (m) as to the Poem, that he spoke of the Jesuits according to the Notions *Gifanius* had given him of 'em; but he denies that those Verses had been made publick. He also denies (n) the Fragment of the Letter, and only confesses that he does not approve the Conduct of the Jesuits in every thing, and cannot (o) resolve to Court 'em, tho' he acknowledges that God is the Author of their Order, and that it is not only of great use to Christians, but also very necessary; so that he is sure that if they carefully observe their Statutes, Heresy will be quickly destroyed. (p) *Tamen Societatis Jesu institutum ab ipso Deo auctore profectum, totique reipublicæ Christianæ non modo summopere utile, sed omnino etiam necessarium esse credit, cui si convenienter vivant, qui religioso Sacramento ei se obstrinxerunt, propediem fore confidit, ut ad tibicines mittatur, Hæresique lessus fiat, neque cuiquam sine scelere aliter videri posse, persuasum habet.* In order to know whether he altered his Opinion, we need only read these words of Father *le Tellier*. (q) *He* (r) *must not pretend to be the first, who undertook to Convert the Jesuits. The Glory of it is due to his worthy predecessor the Famous* Gaspar Scioppius, *who writ so much upon that matter, making it the Subject of many Libels. 'Tis no wonder that those, who have inherited his implacable Hatred against the Jesuits, should be likewise acted by the Odd and Hypocritical Zeal of that Writer, the most furious Calumniator that ever was, as every Body confesses, and that they should tread in his*

Steps

† *Taken from a Book intituled, Vita & parentes Gasp. Schoppii à Germano quodam contubernali ejus conscripta,* Printed at Leyden with Confutatio fabulæ Burdonum.

(a) *In the Article* Martinan.

(b) Cornelius Denius Brugensis, in capellis p. m. 320, 321.

(c) *In the* Amphotidæ Scioppianæ *which he publish'd in 1611. I make use of that Edition.*

(d) Censure de la doctr. curieuse pag. 190.

(e) *He is the Author of the* censure de la doctrine curieuse de Garasse.

(f) *See the* Amphotides pag. 40. & sequent.

(g) Ib. pag. 40, 41.

the Protestants, and exhorted the Catholick Princes to extirpate them by the (E) most Bloody means. He was not contented to vent his Rage against Scaliger, † Casaubon, du (F) Plessis Mornay, &c. but he attackt the King

Steps to this very day. M. Arnauld, at whom these words were levell'd, inferr'd many things: I shall transcribe some of 'em. "(a) Are you Searchers of Hearts but (?) to decide, that it was thro' an implacable hatred against the Jesuits, that Scioppius gave an ill Character of your Society in several Books, and that if he shew'd any Zeal for the Church, it was only an hypocritical Zeal. If this be allowed, may not any Virtue be cried down as a piece of Hypocrisy? ——— (b) I am not concern'd in the least for Scioppius's Reputation. But since those, who abuse him most, acknowledge that he was a Man of great parts, and a very Learned Critick and Philologer, he deserves I should say something of him, and observe that whereas you do now furiously Inveigh against him, you did formerly bestow great Encomiums upon him. Scioppius had three sorts of Enemies, who cried him down as being too Satyrical and Passionate. The first were the Protestants, whom he forsook to turn Catholick, and particularly Joseph Scaliger, and his Friends, who look'd upon that pretended Prince of Verona as the Hero of their Sect. They were particularly Offended because he wounded their Scaliger in the most sensible part, by shewing that his pretended descent from the Princes of Verona, was an idle Story; and the most judicious Persons are now agreed that he was in the right. His Second Enemies were the Men of Letters; he fell under their Indignation by his too great Fondness for the purity of the Latin Tongue. Perhaps, no Man since the Age of Augustus knew better than he the niceties of that Language. But he was so Critical that he could not endure any word should be taken in a different Sence, from what it had in the best times, and that any other Construction should be put upon it; hence it was that he found Barbarisms and Solecisms in most Authors of that time, who pretended to write good Latin. He would have been serviceable to the Common-Wealth of Learning, had he been contented to observe those Faults in a Civil manner. But he did it too sharply, so far as to say that the taking of a certain word in a certain sense deserved (c) Naticidium. It was doubtless a silly thing, and a piece of Pedantry; but it was no sufficient Reason to give him so many hard Words, and to call him the most Cruel of all Wild Beasts. For those, who took so much Pride, as well as he, in speaking good Latin, might have despised those mean things, and made a good use of his Criticisms. But 'tis well known that Philologers are a sort of Angry People, that are very apt to fall into a Passion for meer Trifles; and that they are as much nettled when accused of being guilty of a Solecism, as if an Honest Man was accused of having betrayed his Friend: And because they know how to give hard Words in a very fine Style, they Inspire many People with their Passions. This is the chief Reason why Scioppius was so much cried down. His free and sharp Criticisms, upon many Authors most esteem'd for their Style, made the greatest part of the Latinists rise up against him. Fathers, you have been his third and last Enemies. But I must observe, that whilst he wrote only against the Protestants, the Scaligers and the Philologers, you heaped up Praises upon him. Nay, you forgave him, tho' he blamed your Method of Teaching Humane Learning; and you did not take it ill that he should be Praised and Esteem'd by Popes, Kings and Emperors. He publish'd a small piece in 1636. wherein to vindicate himself against those who reviled him, he mentions a brief of Urban VIII. to the most Christian King, which is very Glorious to him, and some other Letters of the Emperor Ferdinand II. the Catholick King Philip IV. the Dukes of Florence and Mantua, and some Advantageous Testimonies of Cardinal Bellarmin, and many other Jesuits, who Praise him for his Wit, Learning, Eloquence, Zeal, Virtue, Probity, Integrity, Orthodoxy, Prudence, Wisdom, and great Knowledge of the true sense of the Scripture; who profess to admire him as a Man Famous all over the World, and call him the King of Learned Men, Perillustri viro Gaspari Scioppio eruditorum Regi. Do you think, Fathers, you can easily make the World believe that a Man, whom you have so much commended for so long a time, became all of a sudden the most Wicked Man in the World; and that his Zeal for the Church, which you highly extoll'd, became an odd Hypocritical Zeal, because he declared in some of his Books what he blamed in your Conduct, as so many Persons Eminent for their Piety have done before and after him, such as Arias Montanus, Lanusa, Lewis Sotelo, Diego Collado, Dom John de Palafox, and many others? If he has been too Sharp, and too Passionate, if he has mention'd some matters of Fact too Scandalous, I don't pretend to Justify him in that respect. But unless you give seven or eight pregnant Instances of his Falsities, you must not expect to be believed, when you call him the most Furious Calumniator that ever was."

Mr. Baillet (d) says, that *Scioppius appeared in Print under many false Names, that he might Attack with Impunity not only private Persons of great note, but particularly the whole Body of the Jesuits, against whom he wrote above thirty Treatises, the very Titles whereof are Abominable.* He promises *to unmask him in his Treatise of disguised Authors, and to shew that he took the Names of* Juniperus Anconitanus, Denius, A Fano Sancti Benedicti, Grosippus, Grubinius, Hay, Krigsoeder, Sotelo, Vargas, *and many others.* You'll find in *Placcius* (e) the Titles of a prodigious Number of Books publish'd or made ready for the Press by *Scioppius* against the Jesuits.

(E) *Exhorted the Catholick Princess to extirpate the Protestants by the most Bloody means.*] You need only read the Book he publish'd at *Pavia* in the Year 1619. with this Title, *Gasp. Scioppii Consiliarii Regii Classicum belli sacri, sive Heldus redivivus, hoc est ad Carolum V. imperatorem Augustum Suasoria de Christiani Cæsaris erga Principes Ecclesiæ rebelles officio, deque veris compescendorum Hæreticorum Ecclesiæque in pace collocandæ rationibus.* A (f) Lutheran of *Strasburg* answered it, and his answer is worth reading: It is Intituled, *Tuba pacis occenta Scioppiano belli sacri classico, Salpiste Theodosio Berenico, Norico, historiarum & patriæ studioso.* See also (g) *Justus Meyerus's* Treatise, Intituled, *Juris publici capitalis quæstio, sint ne Protestantes jure Cæsareo heretici & ultimo supplicio afficiendi, contra sanguinarium Casp. Scioppii Classicum.* You may see likewise the Book Intituled *Cancellaria Hispanica*, wherein you'll find some (h) Extracts of that Book of *Scioppius*. Note, that he boasts of having been the chief promoter of the Catholick League, which proved so prejudicial to the Protestants in *Germany*. Having publish'd a List of his Exploits, to inform the Publick how he has exerted the (i) Talents he had received from God, he reckons in the 7th place, (k) *Fœdus Catholicum in Germania, cujus primum auctorem & actorem fuisse Scioppium, literis ipsius Cæsaris manu conscriptis, & Trevirensis Electoris testimonio doceri potest: sicut etiam Comes Tillius in poculi aurati, quod ei donavit, inscriptione, fœderis illius primum auctorem appellat: qui scyphus apud Benedictinos Weingartenses etiamnum servatur.*

(F) *Against* ——— du Plessis Mornay.] He endeavours to Ridicule (l) him in his (m) *Alexipharmacum regium felli draconum & veneno aspidum sub Philippi Mornæi de Plessis nupera Papatus historia abdito oppositum, & Seren. D. Jacobo Magnæ Britanniæ Regi, strenæ Januariæ loco muneri missum*, with so great a Fury, that I don't think a sharper Piece can be written against an Author. I could, says he (n), make a pretty large Volume of the Solecisms, Barbarisms, and other Faults, which I have found in the (o) *Mystery of Iniquity*; but I will spare the Calvinists the Grief of seeing their

(a) Morale pratique, tom. 8. pag. 116.

(b) Ibid. pag. 119.

(c) See the passage quoted hereafter in the Remark F.

(d) Baillet, Jugemens des Savans vol 3. pag. 407.

(e) Placcius, de Anonymis pag. 9. c. 248. n. 67. 68.

(f) Matth. Berneggerus, Professor of History.

(g) Professor of the Civil Law at Strasburg.

(h) Adjecti sunt sub finem Flores Scioppiani ex classico belli sacri.

(i) Talenta Christi Gaspari Scioppio ad negotiandum credita.

(k) See the Book Intituled Gasp. Scioppius de pædia humanarum ac divinarum literarum, pag. 25.

(l) Among other things for exhorting King James to make War against the Pope.

(m) 'Tis a Book in 4. of 79 Pages Printed at Mentz in 1612.

(n) Pag. 32.

(o) That is, in the Latin Edition.

King (G) of *England*, without any regard; which was the Reaſon why the Ambaſſador of that Prince, at the Court of *Spain*, made uſe of violent means againſt that Inſolent Writer, who afterwards boaſted (H) of the Wounds 'twas thought he had receiv'd upon that occaſion. Going through *Venice* in the Year 1607, he had a Conference with Father *Paul*, and endeavour'd by Promiſes and Threatnings to bring him over to the Pope's Party. Which, and perhaps ſome other Reaſons, occaſion'd his being Impriſon'd for ſome Days. He was (I) reproach'd with it, but the Circumſtances of his Impriſonment were not well repreſented. One of the things he moſt pretended to, was to write a fine Latin Style. He found

Hector deſerving not only the correction of *Caſaubon*, the Head of the Pedants, *Alpha Cathedrariorum*, but alſo to be whipp'd by the meaneſt School-Maſter, *quem quicumque virgator alius virgidemia afficeret, & multiplicem jactura natis expiare culpam cogat.*

(G) *The King of* England, *without any Regard.*] See among other Books his *Eccleſiaſticum auctoritati Sereniſſimi D. Jacobi Magnæ Britanniæ Regis oppoſitum*. Printed in the Year 1611. & *his Collyrium regium Britanniæ Regi graviter ex oculis laboranti muneri miſſum*, Printed the ſame Year. But ſee particularly his (a) *Corona Regia*; for I maintain ſtill that (b) he is the Author of it. *Ferrarius*, who praiſed him ſo much, taxes him with a great Fault, *viz.* with having ſatyriſed all ſorts of People, without ſparing the Supreme Powers, and Crowned Heads. (c) *Cum quæ de ejus ingenio, doctrina, immenſiſque in re literaria laboribus inſitiari non poſſet, quæ eſſent totius Orbis teſtimonio comprobata, vertis accuſationem nimiamque ejus ingenii aſperitatem, judiciumque ſubauſterum, omnibuſque infeſtum arguebat. Nam ne ipſis quidem Regibus ſupremiſque poteſtatibus unquam pepercisse, cum nimia, ac pene Cynica detrahendi libidine omnes ordines non ſolum multo ſale defricaret, ſed in omnem verborum etiam prætextatorum amaritudinem effuſus, ipſa literarum capita viroſque ſuperum cultu reverendos totis voluminibus conſcinderet, aſperiſque facetiis jocum ac ludibrium faceret.* He was ſo inſolent as to abuſe King *Henry* IV. in a moſt outrageous manner in his *Eccleſiaſticus*; which was the main Reaſon why that Book was burnt at *Paris*. See the Continuator of *Thuanus*'s Hiſtory in the 5th Book, pag. 314. upon the Year 1612.

(H) *Boaſted of the Wounds.*] I have already quoted the Book, wherein he ſhews how he had exerted his Talents: He ſays in that Book, that the Servants of the Engliſh Ambaſſador ſet upon him at *Madrid*, in the Year 1614. and that they cryed out, thinking they had killed him, well, well, we have at laſt made away with that great Papiſt. (d) *Sicariorum undecim de familia Oratoris Anglici, qui cùm anno 1614. Madriti Scioppium multis vulneribus, ut rebantur, confoſſum pro mortuo relinquerent, ita ſibi per viam rem præclare geſtam gratulantes audiebantur:* Euge, jam tandem magnum illum Papiſtam jugulavimus. *Qua de re typis deſcripta extat Narratio, quæ* Legatus Latro *inſcribitur.* Mr. *Colomiés* has Publiſh'd a Letter, wherein *Scioppius* declares that he has been perſecuted by the Proteſtants, and that they have ſhot him, and given him ſeveral Thruſts, ſo as to believe they had kill'd him; but that, though he had render'd himſelf Odious to the Hereticks, for having ſtoutly maintain'd the Spiritual Authority of the Pope, he ſhould think himſelf to be a more pernicious Heretick than *Luther* and *Calvin*, if he ſhould write according to *Baronius*'s Principles, in favour of the pretended Power of the Pope over the Temporalities of Kings. (e) *Io per difender l'Apoſtolato del Papa ho ſcritto tanti libri, quanto forſe niſſun altro, e fui perſeguitato da Proteſtanti, che mi tirarono delle archibugiate, e ſtoccate, & mi laſciarono per morto. Ma Dio mi guardi che non mi metta mai a dir una parola ſola in difeſa del Dominato, con che mi farei maggior heretico che Lutero e Calvino, ſi como piu volte con voſtra D. Reverendiſſima mi ſono dichiarato, e ſpero di morir buon Catolico Romano a diſpetto della Corte Romana e di tutti i ſuoi adulatori.* It appears from the laſt part of this Paſſage, that *Scioppius* was not well pleaſed with the Court of *Rome*. He had been ſaying, (f) that it is neceſſary *Baronius* ſhould be diſcredited, as an Enemy to Sovereignty, and to acknowledge that the Annals of that Cardinal contain many Falſities, and that a Benedictin Monk had obſerved two thouſand (g). *Scioppius* ſpoke otherwiſe, when he wrote againſt King *James* his *Eccleſiaſticus*, that was burnt at *Paris*. He glories in the diſgrace of his Book, and ſays that his *Effigies* was hanged in *England*, in a Farce that was acted before the King. Nay, he ſays the Proteſtant League declared, that the publick good required *Scioppius* ſhould be put to death; which was the Reaſon why the Ambaſſador of his Catholick Majeſty ſent him to *Milan*. Here follows the Sixth Article of the account he gives of his Adminiſtration. (h) *Contemtus mortis: cujus ſpecimen eſt Eccleſiæ & Sedis Apoſtolicæ defenſio. 1. Contra Gallos a quibus Eccleſiaſticus ejus publicè crematus fuit, quem tamen librum Cardinalis Bellarminus, aliique magni Theologi ſummis tulerunt laudibus. 2. Contra Regem Angliæ, cujus librum quatuor diverſis libris editis profligavit: qui propterea ſcripto publico remedium et violentum fuit comminatus, ejuſque libros in foro exurendos curavit. In Mimo tandem, ſeu Comœdiæ ludicro coram ſe acto perſonam ejus induci fecit, hancque in ipſum pœnam ſtatui, ut faucibus fune eliſis (i) animam per inferiorem gutturem exploderet: velut in* Hæretici Elenchomeni *præfatione videre eſt. 3. Contra Principes Proteſtantes fœderis Hallenſis ſocios, qui Rotemburgi in concilio decreverunt, ipſis Scioppio ſublato omnino opus eſſe: quæ oratori Hiſpanico D. Baltaſari Zunicæ cauſa fuit, ut eum Germania relictâ Mediolanum concedere juberet, Inſubriæque Præſidi ſalutem ejus literis accuratiſſime commendaret.*

(I) *He was reproach'd with it, but the Circumſtances of his Impriſonment were not well repreſented.*] We muſt keep to Brother *Fulgentius*'s Narrative. "(k) When thoſe Quarrels, *ſays he*, were made up at *Venice*, *Gaſpar Scioppius* arrived there, a Man well known in the World by his many Books. He came from *Rome* in his way to *Germany*, as he ſaid, whither he was going to carry a Book injurious to the Republick, and to get it Printed there, with ſome other Pieces full of impious things, as that of a Dominican Monk, call'd *Thomas Campanella*—— (l) Whether it was upon that account, or for ſome other unknown Reaſon, 'tis certain, that he fell into Diſgrace, and was Arreſted by a Publick Order three or four days. Before he was Impriſon'd he had a Conference with the Father, in which they diſcourſed a long time about Learning, and particularly about the Doctrine of the Stoicks, which he pretended to retrieve, and to ſet in its due light, together with many other Learned Thoughts of his own; adding to it ſeveral things relating to State-Affairs, and particularly to thoſe of the Proteſtants of *Germany*. And then taking the Father aſide, he repreſented to him, that the Pope was a powerful Man, being a great Prince, and that therefore ſome Misfortune would certainly happen to him, ſince the Pope thought he had been very much offended by him; and that he would have cauſed him to be kill'd, had he been willing to revenge himſelf in that manner. But that the Pope deſign'd only he ſhould be taken alive, and carried to *Rome*. Nevertheleſs *Scioppius* offered to reconcile him to the Pope, with as much Glory and Honour as he cou'd deſire; adding, that he was impowered to treat with ſome Princes of *Germany*, even about their Converſion. The Father anſwered that he had done nothing at which his Holineſs ſhould be offended (m) —— (n) That he was obliged to him for his good Intention; but that he was reſolv'd to ſtick to the Publick Intereſt, ſince he had undertaken the defenſe of the Common-wealth, being fully perſuaded

(a) *See the Article* Puteanus, *Remark* F.

(b) *See* Forerus in Mantiſſa Anti-anatomiæ Jeſuiticæ pag. 63.

(c) Octavius Ferrarius in literatorum funere.

(d) Gaſp. Scioppius Pædia humanarum ac divinarum literarum pag. 26.

(e) *A Letter of* Scioppius *to Father* Fulgentius, *Theologer of the Republick of* Venice. *It is dated from* Padua *the* 9th *of* June 1636. *Mr.* Colomies *has inſerted it in his* Obſervationes ſacræ *pag.* 6. & ſeq.

(f) So bene che egli per ignoranza ed inadvertenza ſcriſſe molte coſe falſiſſime; di tal maniera che un Padre di San Benedetto, mio allievo, dice di haver raccolto due mila errori di ſuoi Annali, ed jo giudico che importi non poco, che queſt' huomo ſia diſcreditato, come nemico della giuridittione di tutti i Sourani Principi, li quali volſe ancora *in temporalibus* ſoggettare al Papa, Ibid pag. 8.

(g) [illegible] Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, Avr. [illegible]

(h) Scioppius, in Pædia pag. 25.

(i) *See* Meric Caſaubon pietas, pag. 23.

(k) Vie du Pere Paul pag. 191. *Leyden* 1661.

(l) Ibid. pag. 192.

(m) *The Words which I leave out contain the Paſſage concerning Self-murder, which I have ſet down in the Article* Saint Cyran.

(n) Vie du Pere Paul, pag. 193.

found many Barbariſms in the Writings of the Modern Authors, moſt eſteem'd for their Eloquence, and did not ſpare the moſt Eloquent (K) Writers of Ancient *Rome*. He deſerved, as he was a Grammarian, the † odious Title that was given to *Diogenes* as a Philoſopher. He had ſo many Enemies, that at laſt he was afraid he ſhould not be ſafe in any place. Tho' he kept himſelf quiet at *Padua*, and was taken up with (L) Apocalyptical Chimera's, wherewith he troubled Cardinal *Mazarin*, he was afraid of ſome attempt upon his Life. Which might make one believe that there was ſome ground for what was ſaid, that he intended to

† [illegible]

“ ded of the Juſtice of their Cauſe. What *Scioppius* ſaid about killing the Father, or carrying him to *Rome*, ſeem'd very ſtrange, and almoſt incredible; but what happen'd ſoon after, made it appear that he knew what he ſaid, and that ſuch Deſigns had been formed againſt the Father long before. Being ſet out from *Venice*, he wrote a Satyrical Diſcourſe, wherein mentioning his Conference with the Father, he declared that he knew him to be a Learned and (a) Courageous Man.”

It appears from this account, that the Friends of *Scaliger* were groſly miſtaken, when they Publiſh'd that *Scioppius* went to *Venice* ſoon after the Senate's Proclamation againſt thoſe who had Aſſaſſinated Father *Paul*; and that *Scioppius* was Arreſted upon a Suſpicion that he had a Hand in the Aſſaſſination. (b) *Venetiam profectus eſt. Promulgata erat paulo ante capitalis ſententia in ſicarios aliquos (aſſaſſinos vocant) qui Paulum illum Servitam, cujus ſcriptum pro aſſertione juris Venetæ Reip. in manibus omnium verſatur, aggreſſi fuerant, & vulnera aliquot, quæ tamen lethalia præter mentem eorum non eſſent, inflixerant. Eo ergo tempore in urbem cum veniret, juſſu magiſtratus in carcerem deductus eſt, quaſi rei hujus conſcius, aut qui alterius eo explorator veniſſet.* Such a Falſity muſt needs have been prejudicial to *Scaliger*'s Cauſe; the more, becauſe he and his Friends made it appear upon ſome other Heads, that they were not well informed of what concern'd *Scioppius*. Had they conſulted *Lingelſheim*, they might have known that *Scioppius* was not Arreſted on account of *Fra-Paolo*'s Aſſaſſination; but only becauſe he had raiſed ſome Suſpicions, by reaſon of the haughty and threatning words he had ſpoke in a Converſation with that *Servite* (c). *Scioppius* ſays he was Arreſted, upon Information that he was the Author of a Book injurious to the Republick of *Venice*; and that he was going to Negotiate againſt em in the Pope's Name with ſome Princes of *Germany*. (d) *Fidem habuerunt* Julio Adolpho Weiteriſhemio, *homini Saxoni, qui* ——— *clam ad eos detulit* Scioppium *auctorem eſſe libri cujuſdam pro Pontifice adverſus ipſos ſcripti & Monachii typis impreſſi, hoc titulo*, Nicodemi Macri Romani cum Nicolao Craſſo Veneto diſceptatio, &c. (*quod quidem opus perpetuo ſale ac facetia diffluens, & eruditionis varietate admirabile, præ quo ivo tuus Villiomarus nec hiſcere auderet, multi docti viri non niſi a Scioppio proficiſci potuiſſe perſuaſum habebant*) *& tunc quoque Pontificis miſſu ad Principes quoſdam in rempublicam ipſorum inflammandos in Germaniam proficiſci.* 'Tis certain that *Scioppius* writ that Book: *Rhodius* and *Placcius* (e) are miſtaken in aſcribing it to a Profeſſor of *Bologna* call'd *Aſcanius Perſius*. See the (f) *Viſiera alzata* of *Peter James Villani* of the Academy of the *Humoriſts, Geniali, & Infecundi*.

(K) *And did not ſpare the moſt Eloquent Authors of Ancient* Rome.] “ (g) The Accuſer of *Cicero*, *ſays* Balzac, about whom you deſire to be informed, is the dreadful *Scioppius*. He has publiſhed a Book at *Milan*, in which he accuſes *Cicero* of Improprieties and Barbariſms. There is but one Copy of it in *France*, and *Meſſieurs du Puy* lent it me when I was at *Paris*. This Injuſtice done to *Cicero* would prove a Conſolation to *Scaliger*, if he return'd into the World. But I expect that the ſame *Scioppius* will ſhortly put out another Book, wherein he'll undertake to prove that *Cato* was a wicked Man, and *Julius Cæſar* a wretched Soldier.” When he was but Twenty Years of age, he thought that *Phædrus* ſavoured ſometimes (h) of the Barbarouſneſs of *Thrace* his Native Country. 'Tis therefore no wonder, that he ſhould accuſe (i) *Scaliger*, *Lipſius*, *Caſaubon*, *Thuanus*, *Poſſevin* (k), *Voſſius*, *Strada*, &c. of Incongruity of Speech. His Criticiſms are ſometimes well grounded, but not always. See what the (l) Learned *Borrichius* wrote againſt him in *Voſſius*'s and *Strada*'s Vindication. (m) A Jeſuit of the College of *Rome* made an Apology for the latter, but I don't know whether it has been Printed. Thoſe who affirm magiſterially that certain Phraſes are meer Barbariſms and Soleciſms, do very much expoſe themſelves; for how often have they been told, that the Words and Expreſſions, which they condemn'd, are to be found in Claſſical Authors! (n) The difficulty of ſuch Diſputes will plainly appear to thoſe, who will be at the pains to examin the Books of *John Voſſius*, *De Latinitate merito aut falſo ſuſpecta*; thoſe of *Chriſtopher Cellarius*, *De Latinitate mediæ & infimæ ætatis*, & *De barbariſmis & idiotiſmis ſermonis Latini*; and thoſe which *Voſſius*, *Borrichius*, &c. have publiſhed upon that Subject. But to return to *Scioppius*, I muſt obſerve that he promiſed a Book, intitled, *Hercules Coprophorus*, wherein he had collected a vaſt number of Barbariſms and Solecisms: there he intended (o) to ſhew the Faults of *Julius Cæſar Scaliger*'s Style. Mind theſe words of *Lambecius*; they fully repreſent the cavilling Humour of that Critick. (p) *Homo, ut notiſſimum eſt, ingenii maligni, & oris maledicentiſſimi, qui propter præſtantiſſimorum & de re literaria optime meritorum virorum invidas ac injurioſas calumniationes, merito* Canis *Grammaticus appellatur.* See the Margin (q).

His Boldneſs in criticizing the Style or the Expreſſions of *Cicero*, will be leſs ſurprizing, if it be conſider'd, that that Father of Eloquence has been Cenſured by ſuch Men at all times. Their Number is incredible. See the Preface to the Book intitled, *Cicero a calumniis vindicatus*, written by *Andreas Schottus*: 'Tis a very curious Tract; the 8th Chapter is an Anſwer to thoſe who pretend that *Cicero* is guilty of Solecilms.

(L) *Apocalyptical Chimera's, wherewith he troubled Cardinal* Mazarin.] Here is a Particular not ſo well known as others. *Naudé*, in order to refute thoſe who complain'd that the Cardinal did not anſwer all the Letters that were written to him, ſays, “ (r) That the Office of Firſt Miniſter in *France* ——— is like a Net, in which Mad, Melancholy, Hypochondriac and Extravagant Men are catch'd; like a Rock, on which the Ship of Fools (*navis illa narragonia ſive Stultifera Brenii*) ſplits, and like a Load-ſtone, to attract all the Viſionaries that are in the Kingdom. So that if the firſt Miniſter was obliged to read all the Chimerical Deſigns, all the extravagant Propoſals, and all the ridiculous and impertinent Advices of thoſe Men, he would not have time enough to read and examin them, tho' he ſhould lay aſide his moſt ſerious Affairs to mind none but thoſe. ——— (s) I have known within theſe five (t) Years, three Men of great Virtue, and extraordinary Learning: The Firſt, who is *Cattius*, a Canon of the City of *Arras*, maintains, That there is a Mountain of Gold in *Paleſtine*, which the Holy Scripture promiſes to Chriſtians, when they have conquer'd the *Turks*; and that God will have a Temple to be built to him at *Jeruſalem*: He has got the Plan of that Temple engraved, with all the Proofs and Explications of his Opinion, taken from Holy Writ. The Second, is *Scioppius*, whoſe Name is well known all over *Europe*. He pretends that no Father or Doctor of the Church did ever underſtand the Holy Scripture, or more certainly know the End of the World, and the Myſteries of St. *John*'s Revelation than he. The Third, call'd Doctor *Clombi*, is now buſie to get a general Council aſſembled, wherein the Pretenſions of the King of *France* to *Navarre* and *Franche Comte*, may be decided in his favour, and has drawn up all the Decrees and Canons

(a) ...vita & parentes Gasp. Scioppii pag. 115.
(b) Ibid. pag. 150, 151.
(c) Sciop... pium Mo... ...ci jam ...ſe & in... ...tranſitu ...ju civit... ...ſi Venetæ ...ſceptum ...ana ...carceratio... ...ne, cum Paulum Servitam ...inſolentius ...ac minaci... ...ter allocu... ...tus ſuſpe... ...um ſefe... ...ciſſet. Lingelſheim epiſt. 86. ad Bongarſium. It is dated the 7th of November 1607.
(d) Oporinus Grubinius ubi ſupra pag. 162, 163.
(e) See Placcius de Anonymis & Pſeudonymis in appendice pag. 33.
(f) That Book is mention'd in the Acta Eruditor. for June 1695, pag. 263.
(g) Balzac, Let... ...12. to Chapelain ...2. ...ted the ...of A... ...il 1637.
(h) See ...fferus ...the life ...Phædrus.

...Author is miſtaken in the Preface, wherein he calls Scioppius ...rad, inſtead of Gaſpar. (i) *See his* Scaliger Hypobolimæus, ...*the Tract* de ſtilo hiſtorico. (k) *A Phyſician who wrote a* ...*of the Houſe of* Gonzaga, &c.

(l) *In the Appendix of the Book intitl'd*, Olai Borrichii cogitationes de variis Latinæ linguæ ætatibus & ſcripto ...Voſſii de vitiis ſermonis, *Printed at* Copenhagen 1675. *in* 4to.
(m) *Call'd* Pierucci. *See* Borrichius ib. pag. 268.
(n) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres, *for* May 1701 pag. 517.
(o) *See his* Alexipharmacum regium.
(p) Lambecius apud Magirum. eponymolog. Critico pag. m. 742.
(q) Mr. Grævius *does very well deſcribe the Satyrical Humour of* Scioppius *in his Preface to the Works of* Daniel l'Ermite, *Printed at* Utrecht *in* 1701.
(r) Naudé Dialogue de Maſcurat p. 454.
(s) Ibid. pag. 455.
(t) *That Book of* Naudé *was written in* 1649.

to retire into *Holland*, and expreſs'd a Deſire of returning into the pale of the (M) Proteſtant Church. Authors don't agree about the Year wherein he died; but

“Canons, which ought to be made for that purpoſe. I have ſeen part of the Writings which thoſe three Men have ſent to the Cardinal to ſupport their Chimerical Deſigns by his Authority; and I do certainly know that if the Cardinal had been ſo unjudicious as to mind 'em, they would have cut out more Work for him than his beſt Secretary could have diſpatched. And becauſe every body pretends to be a Politician, fooliſh and extravagant Men muſt needs be more numerous among thoſe of that Profeſſion than among others: Which does likewiſe multiply the number of Advices, Counſels, Deſigns, Memoirs, and ſuch like Pieces, which are not leſs impertinent than others, not leſs proper to make a Miniſter loſe his time, if he was ſo ſimple as to mind them. And yet becauſe they don't do it, and their Experience and Knowledge of Affairs enable them to know immediately, *quid ſolidum crepet*; thoſe Hypochondriac and Melancholy Gentlemen take from thence occaſion to blame them, and to ſay that they don't Anſwer important Letters, for they look upon their Follies as things of great Moment, *juxta illud*,

“*Quiſquis amat ranam, ranam putat eſſe Dianam.*

“That they neglect great Affairs, and the means of getting Money, making a Peace, and ſaving the Kingdom, to mind trifling things, and to play with Monkeys. And it happens, by reaſon of their many Complaints and Clamours, that a poor Miniſter, whoſe Buſineſs gives him no breathing time, is accuſed of not diſcharging the Duties of his Office, of too much indulging his Pleaſures, of neglecting the Letters and Advices he receives, and of being unworthy of ſuch a Poſt: In ſhort, if they were to be credited,

“*Collige ſarcinulas dicet libertus & exi,*
“*Jam gravis es nobis.*„

Several Readers will doubtleſs blame me for not leaving out what does not belong to *Scioppius* in this long paſſage; but I refer them to many other Readers, who will be very well pleaſed with *Naudé*'s Reflections contain'd in it.

Such was the Fate of *Scioppius*: After he had ſpent many Years in Criticizing, Biting and Defaming every Body, he applied himſelf to the Prophecies of the Holy Scripture; he lookt for the Key of 'em, and (a) flattered himſelf that he had found out St. *Peter*'s Key, which no body had diſcovered till then. Weary of ſo many Engagements, and of the many Blows he had given and receiv'd, he ſhut up himſelf in that Dungeon, he fixed upon that Work, and gave himſelf that Task for his Old Age. A happy Man, if he wholly left off his Satyrical Humour, and had no deſire of exciting People to great Revolutions, by telling them that the Promiſes contain'd in the *Apocalypſe* would be ſhortly fulfill'd. All thoſe who undertook ſuch a Task, did not ſtay, as he did, 'till they were weary of their Slanders: On the contrary, ſome made their Weapons ſharper by it, and grew more Satyrical; others deſign'd only to excite Paſſions, and to ſtir the People. You'll find a Scheme of *Scioppius*'s Work in a Letter written by him from *Padua* the 20th of *February* 1642. It appears from it, that great things were to happen in a ſhort time, and that he brought the Art of Prophecying into a Syſtem. *Quatuor libellos*, ſays he (b), *iſtis indicibus ſeu titulis jam confectos habeo.* 1. *Fons ſapientiæ intento digito monſtratus, hoc eſt, Ecloga ex Sacra Scriptura & ſanctis Patribus de Sacra Scriptura ſtudio, ejuſque ſtudii neceſſitate, utilitate, adjumentis & temporibus.* 2. *Clavis ſcientiæ ad aperienda regni cælorum myſteria propediem conſummanda, hoc eſt; ſpecimen Exegeſeos Propheticæ in Pſal.* 45. 3. *Annunciatio regni Chriſti ac populi Chriſtiani in orbem terræ futurum uſque ad noviſſimum annorum & expeditionem Gog & internecionem ejus.* 4. *Syſtema artis prophetandi, continens ejus artis finem, officia, materiam ſubjectam & inſtrumenta, exemplo Galeni in ſyſtemate artis Medicæ.*

(M) *A Deſire of returning into the pale of the Proteſtant Church.*] M. *Arnauld* could not believe it. (c) “There is one thing that would give a very ill Opinion of *Scioppius*, if it were true: *viz.* That he had a mind, in his old days, to enter into Articles with the *Dutch*, about his Religion, and that accordingly he writ to *Leyden* that he would turn Proteſtant, if they would receive him. But this is ſo unlikely, that the bare Authority of *Hornius* is not ſufficient to make us believe it. He expreſſes in all his Books ſo great a Zeal for the Catholick Religion, and ſo great an Averſion for Hereticks, that 'tis highly improbable he intended to return to his firſt Religion. Beſides, he was a Man of ſo great parts, not to mention his Noble Birth, that if he had entertain'd ſuch Thoughts, he would have found but too many Proteſtant Princes ready to receive him with open Arms, without being obliged to aſk a Livelihood of the Profeſſors of *Leyden*, whom he had very much offended by his hard uſage of *Joſeph Scaliger*, their Hero and their Idol. This is all that I could ſay, not having *Hornius*'s Book by me. But I have juſt now receiv'd the whole paſſage of that Author, which I have inſerted at the bottom of the Page, becauſe the bare reading of it is ſufficient to give no credit to it; it is ſo full of Paſſion and Fury againſt the Catholicks in general, and *Scioppius* in particular, accuſing the former of a Barbarous Deſign of Murdering all the Proteſtants, and the latter, of being the promoter of that cruel Reſolution„. Here follows the Paſſage that was ſent to M. *Arnauld*: I take it from the (d) 186 Page of *George Hornius*'s *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, continu'd and commented upon by M. *Leydecker*. *Nunquam res* Evangelicorum *in majori priùs erant diſcrimine, quam poſt illam Bohemiorum calamitatem.* Jeſuitæ *enim jam quaſi* parta *de* Univerſa Germania, *imo omnibus* Evangelicis, *victoriâ, inſolenter triumphabant, ac nil niſi cædem Proteſtantium ſpirabant, quodam flagitioſiſſimo* Grammatico, & *ob ſcelera* Altorfi *Noricorum commiſſa infami*, Gaſpare *Schoppio, ex Palatinatu ſuperiore Neagora oriundo, ſed indigno, qui tam præſtanti nationi apud poſteros accenſeatur, (ſive, ut ſe apellari Italice malebat,* Scioppio) *homine in apoſtaſiam prolapſo, claſſicum canente &* totale excidium *Proteſtantium promittente, ac ſuadente: qui tamen nihil niſi* miſerabilis *literator fuit, ut opera ejus* inepta & maligna *oſtendunt, ac extrema ſenecta, ſcriptis Patavio, ubi præ* Jeſuitarum, *vitæ ejus inſidiantium, metu deliteſcebat,* Leidam *literis, tranſitionem iterum ad Evangelicos offerebat, ſi in gratiam reciperetur, ſed rejectus* Apoſtata *contemtuſque ob vanitatem fuit.* I have hardly read any Author, who mentions this Deſign of *Scioppius*, without quoting *Hornius* for it. Which makes me apt to think that no other Authority can be alledged; and I doubt this is not ſufficient in a Fact of ſuch a nature. I have heard a Learned Lutheran ſay, that *Scioppius*'s Letters upon that Subject have been in *Boeclerus*'s hands. But why then were they not Publiſh'd; for 'tis well known that many People look upon *Hornius*'s Narrative as a meer Fable? 'Tis at leaſt an Indiſcretion, which deſerved to be cenſured by the Academical Senate. One cannot ſay that the moſt Illuſtrious Univerſity of *Leyden* rejected *Scioppius*'s Offers, without doing them wrong. Such a Conduct would have been contrary to Humane Prudence and Chriſtian Charity. It had been a glorious thing for the Proteſtants to regain ſuch a Man; beſides, muſt not the Church open her Arms at all times to her revolted Children? Muſt ſhe not, like the good Shepherd, fetch all the Sheep that are gone aſtray? Much more would ſhe be guilty, if ſhe ſhut up the Door againſt the Sheep, that are willing to return into the Sheep-fold. Was it an impoſſible thing for *Scioppius* to repent? Could it be certainly detemnin'd that his Requeſt was a Cheat? However, they might have prevented his doing any Miſchief. Take notice, that he obſerves in his Letter to *Voſſius*, that the Prophetical Books he deſign'd to Publiſh, contain'd nothing contrary to the Church of *Rome*. He gives to underſtand, that he acknowledges the Injuſtice and Uſurpation of the Court of *Rome*, but he ſays nothing whereby it appears that he intended to retire among the Proteſtants. (e) *Vix autem ſperare audeo, fore ut quicquam iſtorum in Italia edendi venia mihi detur, non quod quicquam in eis vel decretis Romanæ Eccleſiæ de fide, vel bonis moribus adverſetur, ſed quod mores Curiæ Romanæ omnes Eccleſiæ leges jam olim in poteſtatem ſuam perduxerint,* nec but I think his Death ought (N) to be placed in the Year 1649. It cannot be denied that he was a very Learned Man; and had he had as much Moderation and Probity as he had Learning and Wit, he would be justly reckon'd one of the Heroes of the Common-Wealth of Learning. His Application to Study, his (O) Memory, the multitude of his Books, the quickness of his Parts, his Eloquence, and his Ascendant over his Enemies are surprising things: But his Victories cost him dear, for he was (P) strangely Abused; nay, he mistrusted sometimes his dreadful Pen. He

---

(a) Me jam exegeſi ſeu prophetia Scripturæ (quam S. Petrus vocat) plus quingenta folia explevisse, ea ipſa clave ad aperienda ejus myſteria uſum quam idem Apoſtolus nobis reliquit vix tamen à quoquam adhuc intellectam. Scioppius epiſt ad Voſſium. *'Tis the* 334 *among the Letters written to* Voſſius p. m. 225.

(b) Sciopp. epiſt. ad Voſſium pag. 225.

(c) Morale pratique tom. 3. chap. 6. pag. 129, 130.

ne jam cuiquam fas sit quicquam tale dicere aut scribere, quale ipsi Pontifices in D. Bernardo, Brigitta & Catharina Senensi non modo vere recteque dictum esse, sed etiam pro saluberrimo fidelium dogmate religiose observari voluerunt. 'Tis a very Civil Letter, and *Scioppius* seems to repose a great Confidence in *Vossius*.

(N) *His Death ought to be placed in the* (a) *Year 1649.*] It will appear from the following Words of M. *Baillet*, that few People know when *Scioppius* departed this Life. This uncertainty would have vexed him, had he foreseen it, when he made so great a noise all over *Europe*. " (b) I have not " been able to know hitherto in what Year he died. " *Patin* (1) the Father says it was in 1649. *Lambecius* (2) tells us he was writing Books still in " 1652. Others seem to say that he lived beyond the " Year 1660. M. (3) *Galois* speaking of him in " 1664, says he had been lately dead. M. (4) *Konig* Writing in 1678. has these Words, *Paucis abhinc annis vivere desiit*". To which I add, that others place his Death in (c) the Year 1663. Of all those Writers *Patin* is the only one who hits right; for 'tis certain *Scioppius* died in the Year 1649. *Ferrarius* speaks of him, as of a Man who was no longer alive, in a Speech (d) which he delivered (e) in the Sixteenth Year of his Professorship at *Padua*. But he began to be a Professor in that University in the Year (f) 1634. and therefore he said so in 1650. From whence it ought to be concluded that *Patin* was not wrongly informed about the Year in which *Scioppius* died, when he wrote the following passage the 13th of *July* 1649. " (g) This " Year proves fatal to many Men of Letters: Since " M. *Hofman*'s and M. *Pietre*'s Decease, we have " also lost M. *des Yveteaux*, who had been the late " King's Preceptor; M. *Justel*, Secretary to the " King, a Learned Man, who did formerly belong " to the Marshal *de Bouillon*. Besides, *Vossius* and " *Spanheim* are dead in *Holland*; *Paganinus Gaudentius* in *Italy*, and likewise *Gaspar Scioppius*, who " wrote about 43 Years ago a very Infamous Book " against the incomparable *Joseph Scaliger*. This " *Scioppius* was a Lutheran in his Youth; he turn'd " Catholick by Reading *Baronius*'s Annals, as he " said: And then he went to *Rome*; where he was " a Domestick to Cardinal *Madrucio*. He had a " mind then to turn (h) Jesuit; but the Society were " of Opinion that it was better for him to remain " a Lay-Man, and that he could do them greater " Services, which he did in Writing against *Scaliger*. " He made some Journeys for them to *Germany* " and *Venice* in a disguise (i). And then he had a " Pension from the Emperor: But at last he declared himself an Enemy to the Emperor and " the Jesuits, and went to *Padua* for the safety of " his Person, where he lived secure from so many " Enemies, having obtain'd a Pardon for his past " life from the Republick of *Venice*. He is suspected to be the most considerable Author " of many small pieces Publish'd against the Jesuits within these 15 Years, and among others of the " *Anatomia Societatis, & de Stratagematis Jesuitarum*. He formerly told one of his Friends, who " is also mine, that Cardinal *Baronius* writ some " Letters to him, when he was in *Germany*, wherein " he exhorted him to turn Catholick, and promised " him to procure him a (k) Cardinal's Hat; and " that *Baronius* himself hoped to be made Pope after *Paul* V.

(O) *His Application to Study, his Memory, the multitude of his Books ——— his Ascendant over his Enemies.*] *Ferrarius* tells us that he studied Night and Day; that the fourteen last Years of his Life he kept himself shut up in a little Room, and that his Conversation with those that went to visit him, run only upon Learning; that like another *Ezra* he might have restored the Holy Scripture, if it had been lost; and that he repeated many passages of it for several hours with such a Memory, that those who heard him could not sufficiently admire him, especially considering that he drew from them very Remarkable Doctrines, and such as were unknown to the most Learned. The Number of his Works exceeded the Number of his Years. *Ferrarius* having mention'd the Interest he had with the Popes and several Princes, and the publick Employments bestowed upon him, goes on thus (l) *Donec inanium pertæsus in se ipsum recederet, & partim Mediolani, partim in hac Urbe* (m) *victitaret, æternum libris bona fide posteritatis negotium transigeret. Eos libros in ore famæ in commendatione omnium versari. Quumque per omnes fere disciplinas capax ingenium circumtulerit, duo tamen in ipso sine exemplo satis exprimi, nedum laudari posse, judicii vim in aliorum scriptis æstimandis, & ad latinæ orationis censuram exigendis miram, atque exactam, tantam vero sacrarum literarum peritiam, quantam fortasse nullus ad hanc diem, quantamque nemo credat, qui illam auribus non usurparit. Ut, quod olim de Esdra dictum est, deperditos linguæ sanctæ Codices solus reparare potuerit. Scilicet usque ad extremam senectam, nuntio rebus humanis remisso, noctu diuque in sacrarum literarum commentatione incredibili labore versatum, ut ipsum adeuntibus per plures horas uno veluti spiritu infinita sacræ paginæ loca inusitata memoriæ felicitate stupentibus, atque attonitis repræsentaret, atque ex ipsis divinæ sapientiæ penetralibus arcana etiam doctissimis ignorata exprimeret. Nimirum cum rarò alias prodire in publicum soleret, extremis temporibus quatuordecim annos domo, ac ferme angusto cubiculo clausum diebus noctibus jungentem lucubrare perpetuo solitum, cumque à doctis inviseretur, ne unquam à literis abscederet variis, ac festivis de re literaria sermonibus profundæ eruditionis fructus uberrimos communicare consuevisse, hunceque ipsi ludum, hoc otium, hoc laborum levamen semper fuisse. Nec mirum si ætate exacta plures libros à se confectos, quam annos numeraret, ejusque opera vel magnam Bibliotecam instruere possent, ipse viva ac perambulans Bibliotheca merito appellaretur.*

The ascendant he had over his Adversaries is a kind of Prodigy. I have quoted above a passage out of M. *Baillet* in his Tract concerning Famous Children, wherein that Author confesses (n) that *God did most times reward* his indefatigable Labour *with great Success*. The sequel of that Passage runs thus: (o) *God permitted not that his excessive Labours should occasion his Death, or prejudice his Health; but would have him live in the World for the space of twenty* (p) *Olympiads and perhaps more, for the Execution of his designs, and the exercise of many People.*

(P) *For he was strangely Abused; nay, he mistrusted &c.*] Soon after the Publication of the *Scaliger hypobolimæus* some outrageous pieces came out against him. *Baudius* took *Scaliger*'s part in Verse, and *Heinsius* (q) in Prose. Another Author made a Bloody Satyr, Intitled, *Vita & parentes Gaspari Schoppii*. *Scaliger* did not remain Idle: He publish'd *confutatio fabulæ Burdonum* (r) under the Name of *Janus Rutgersius*, which he denoted only by the initial Letters *J*. R. *Barthius* came in for one, and wrote three Satyrs against *Scioppius*, which I have mention'd in another (s) place. Here follow the Titles of some other pieces against the same Man. *Alberti de Albertis Lydius lapis ingenii, spiritus ac morum Gaspari Scioppii. Ejusdem vindiciæ generales adversus famosos Scioppii libellos in Jesuitas*, Munich 1649. in 12. *Henrici Wottoni Epistola de G. Scioppio cui propter argumenti similitudinem etiam alia adjecta sunt*, Amberg 1637. One of the chief Writers for

(l) Octavius Ferrarius, in prolusione cui titulus Funus literatorum.

(m) *That is, at Padua.*

(n) Baillet, Enfans celebres pag. 243.

(o) Ibid. pag. 245.

(p) *Mr. Baillet in the 3. Volume of the* Jugem. des Sçavans pag. 475. *says he lived above 80. Years: 'Tis certain he lived but 73.*

(q) *'Tis he who made the Satyr Intituled,* Hercules tuam fidem sive Munsterus hypobolimæus, *and another piece Intituled,* Virgula divina sive Apotheosis Lucretii Vespillonis.

(r) *See* Thomasius prætat in orationes Mureti, pag. 24.

(s) *In the Article* Barthius Remark Q.

---

others say he was a Jesuit, and that he left that Order. See Baillet, Jugem. t. 3. n. 535. pag. 476. *'Tis a mistake.* See Amphot. Sciopp. pag. 169. (i) *This seems to be false: The journey he made into* Germany *since he turn'd Catholick, was the Year* 1607. *when he was arrested at* Venice *for some days. He appear'd in* Germany *with Pomp, and as being in the Service of the Arch-Duke.* (*See* vita & parentes Gasp. Schoppii pag. 155, 156.) *Nay he dined at* Amberg *with the Prince of* Anhalt *Governor of the* Palatinate, *and was kindly used by him. See* Amphot. Sciopp. pag. 129, 130. (k) *See* Amphotides Scioppianæ pag. 169.

He had the whole † Bible at his Fingers end. 'Tis not true that he would ne (Q) ſuffer his Picture to be drawn. He left behind him ſeveral Manuſcripts (R) which are very much Commended. I have not been able to find the Elogies of *Julius Cæſar Capaci*, wherein he is Honourably mention'd. There are two Printed Books under the Name of *Andreas* SCIOPPIUS, *Gaſpar's* (S) Brother. 'Tis a ſuppoſititious Name.

If any one deſires to know how earneſtly *Scioppius* applyed himſelf in his Youth to get an exact knowledge of the Latin Tongue, he needs only read his *Scalig. Hypobolimæus* Folio 401. Being told that the Reading of the Ancient Poets wa dang-

for the Jeſuits againſt him was Father *Laurence Forerus*, who publiſh'd *Grammaticus Proteus, arcanorum Societatis Jeſu Dædalus dedolatus, & genuino ſuo vultu repræſentatus: acceſſit auctarium animadverſionum in Gaſparis Scioppii Eccleſiaſticam aſtrologiam*, Ingolſtad 1636. *in* 8. *Appendix ad Grammaticum Proteum quid de relatione Alphonſi de Vargas ſit ſentiendum*, in the ſame place and in the ſame Year in 8. *The Jeſuits*, (they are M. *Baillet's* Words (a)) "repreſent him as the greateſt Knave, and the "moſt profligate Man in the World, and as the "Plague of the Common-Wealth of Learning and "of Humane Society. And indeed the greateſt "Men of that time complain'd of him, both Ca"tholick and Hereticks, and even the Deiſts, and "all of 'em were for running him down, becauſe he "Attack'd every Body, and defamed the moſt Ho"neſt Men with as much Pleaſure as Impudence, "and ſpared neither Quality nor Merit". *Ferrarius* (b) who praiſed him ſo much, acknowledges that he was forced to hear very unpleaſant Stories.

I have ſaid that he did not always truſt his Pen: The thing is this. A pretender to great matters in the Common-Wealth of Learning took delight in abuſing *Scioppius*, and placing him in the loweſt Rank of Men of Letters. Nay, he threaten'd to write a Book againſt him, whereby it would appear to all the World that he was a meer *Ignoramus*. *Scioppius* ſent him word that he ſhould hold his Tongue, and that if he continued to vex him he ſhould be proſecuted, not before the Muſes, but before the Magiſtrates; that *Scioppius* laying down his Learned Arms, would uſe no other Writings but ſuch as the Records at *Bologna* might afford him; that he would take care to get a Copy of the Information and Sentence, whereby that Man was Convicted of ſeveral Crimes. Theſe are, ſaid he, the Arms I ſhall make uſe of, if he continues to be troubleſome to me. When that Man heard that Menace, he gave over the deſign of Writing againſt *Scioppius*, but continued to ſpeak ill of him. *Nicius Erythræus* relates the thing very handſomely; the Reader will be glad to find here his own Words. (c) *Cum de ſingulis, detrahendi gratia, maledice contumelioſeque loqueretur, Gaſparem vero Scioppium, qui in literaria Rep. in primis ordinibus numeratur, imi ſubſellii virum, atque inter literatos proletarios, ut ita dicam, referendum eſſe ajebat; quem ille Scioppium, quoniam in quodam libello ſua tempora, quaſi literatis viris non amica, modeſte reprebenderat, cæpit contumeliis omnibus lacerare, atque palam eum infantem, rudem, & omnino omnis eruditionis expertem atque ignaram aſſerere, minitarique, ſe libro edito ejus inſcitiam palam omnibus facturum. At Scioppius miſit illi, qui diceret, ſi ſibi amplius moleſtus eſſet, non ſe pugnaturum cum eo eloquentiæ doctrinæque armis, ſed dictis teſtium, ac ſententiis judicum, in publicas tabulas relatis, quibus Bononiæ, malorum facinorum arguitus, evictus, ac condemnatus fuiſſet; his ſe armis curaturum, ut ejus projecta ad detrahendum bonis viris audacia infringeretur, ac retunderetur. His auditis, a ſcribendi contra illum ſententia deſtitit, ſeque tantum intra verba continuit.* This may be look'd upon as a very mortifying thing for *Scioppius*. Properly ſpeaking *Zoilus Ardelio* Triumphed over him; for when a Man of Letters in a diſpute about Learning applies himſelf to Magiſtrates, Bailiffs and Attorneys, 'tis a ſign he miſtruſts his Pen and his Learning. He changes the ſtate of the Queſtion; he is afraid of an Engagement, he dares not fight his Antagoniſt (d).

(Q) *That he would not ſuffer his Picture to be drawn*] *Thomas Bartholinus* ſays that *Scioppius* would never ſuffer his Picture to be drawn or engraved, tho' his Friends deſired it, and he thinks he refuſed it becauſe he was afraid of Enchantments. But becauſe he is miſtaken (e) as to the Fact, his Conjecture ought not much to be minded. However I ſhall ſet down his Words, which contain ſome other Examples that are more certain. (f) *Adduci nunquam potuit*, Caſpar Scioppius, *quamquam ſæpe ab amicis rogatus, ut effigiem ſuam coloribus pictorum vel æri cælatorum committeret. Neſcio an faſcini metu, quod adverſariorum, quos & magnos & multos habuit, præſtigias timeret. Hinc ei bellum cum Accio Poeta, voluminum non imaginum certamina exercere. Certe nec Paleottus, nec Velſerus* (g) *nec* Pinellus, *Viri magni ſe vivos depingi voluerunt, ſicut* Calceolarius *in Muſeo prodidit. Bartholinus* might have added to the Three Examples of *Calceolarius* a King (h) of *Lacedemon*, the Philoſopher (i) *Plotinus*, and a Famous (k) Engliſh Divine, &c.

(R) *Several Manuſcripts that are very much commended.*] Read theſe Words of *Morhoffus*: (l) *Libri Scioppiani ἀνέκδοτοι multi, atque inter illos ejus* Theſaurus, ſive abſolutiſſimi de lingua Latina Commentarii *apud Joh. Michaelem Pieruccium, Profeſſorem Patavinum, latitant, neque hunc in diem lucem, cum indignatione eruditorum, vident; de quibus legendus eſt Gregor. Let.* Ital. regnante part 3. lib. 3. pag. 325, *Magna hujus libri expectatio apud literatos eſt, & qui viderant, ita commendant, ut in illo genere nil ſimile a quoquam ſcriptum illis eſſe videatur.* That *Pieruccius* is probably the ſame upon whom *Scioppius* beſtowed ſo many Encomiums in his Letter to *Voſſius*, and who wiſh'd he might have been Profeſſor of Philoſophy in *Holland*. *Scioppius* took him into his houſe, and made him his Univerſal Heir (m).

(S) *Andreas* SCIOPPIUS, Gaſpar's *Brother——is a ſuppoſititious Name.*] 'Tis thought (n) that the Jeſuit *Garaſſe* is the Author of two Satyrs, one of which is Intituled, *Andreæ Scioppii Caſparis fratris Horoſcopus Anticotonis, ejuſque Germanorum Martillerii, & Hardivillerii vita, mors, cenotaphium, Apotheoſis* (o): and the other, *Andreæ Scioppii Caſparis Fratris Elixir Calviniſticum, ſeu lapis Philoſophiæ reformatæ a Calvino Genevæ primum effoſſus, dein ab Iſaaco Caſaubono Londini politus, cum teſtamentario Anticotonis codice nuper invento* (p). M. *Baillet* (q) does very well obſerve that *Gaſpar Scioppius* had no Brother, that writ any thing; but that *in point of Satyr* the pretended *Andreas* deſerved to be *Gaſpar's* Brother. The Son of *Iſaac Caſaubon* made the ſame Obſervation. *Peream*, ſays he (r), *niſi meruerit hic homo quiſquis ſit, ut Gaſparis Schoppii frater credatur eſſe.* He had been ſaying, *Certum eſt tale illud eſſe ſcriptum ut ipſe Gaſpar Schop. illius author eſſe potuerit: adeo mendaciis & calumniis refertum eſt, adeo plenum maledictis & conviciis*, &c. Soon after he ſpeaks of a Satyr written by *Gaſpar Scioppius*, as *Eudæmon-Joannes* (ſ) acknowledges. That Satyr is Intituled, *Holofernis Kriſſœderi Landſperga Bavari reſponſio ad epiſtolam Iſaaci Caſauboni, Regii in Anglia Archipædagogi pro viro clariſſimo Gaſpare Scioppio* (t). *Caſaubon* is accuſed in it not only of being Ignorant of the Latin Tongue, but alſo of being a Pimp, a Whoremonger, an Adulterer, and a Thief, and ſomething worſe ſtill: (v) *Ille meo patri, quem ſcit ipſe ſpectatiſſimæ ſemper integritatis fuiſſe, ſtupra, furta, lenocinia, adulteria, (hæc ipſa enim crimina illi impingit, & alia quoque vel dictu fœda) audet objicere? mirum mihi videtur & incredibile, niſi quod Schoppium cogito.* The Reading of that Book, if *Scioppius* (w) may be

† See Ferrarius's Words in the Remark O.

(a) Baillet, Jugem. des Sçav. vol. 1. pag. 476, 477.

(b) Ita multorum in ſe odia concitaſſe, ut amaras ipſe quoque hiſtorias audire cogeretur belliſque pluſquam civilibus Muſarum pacem inquietaret. *Ferrar. ubi ſupra.*

(c) Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. 1. p. 241. *He ſpeaks of one* Zoilus Ardelio. *'Tis doubtleſs a ſuppoſititious Name.*

(d) *Compare with this what is ſaid in the Remarks D and E of the Article* Thomas.

(p) *Printed at* Antwerp *for the Heirs of* Martin Nutius *in* 4. (q) Baillet, *in the* 1. tome *of the* Anti, pag. (r) Mericus Caſaubonus in pietate, pag. 18. (ſ) C lib. 2. pag. 125. (t) *Printed at* Ingolſtad, 1615 (v) Meric. Caſaubon ibid. pag. 21. (w) Scribit hic nebulo patrem meum poſtquam legeret hunc ſuum libellum, ex deſperatione vitæ renunciaſſe, atque inde vivere deſiiſſe. Id. ibid. pag.

dangerous for Young People, and being desirous to learn Latin from the best Authors, without doing any prejudice to his Chastity, he made use of a Remedy, which (I) deserves to be mention'd.

SCOT,

he believed, brought a Melancholy upon *Casaubon* of which he died. *Meric Casaubon* (a) refutes this by his Father's Journal, whereby it appears that *Casaubon* despised that Satyr. Having read the Infamies contain'd in it against himself, his Father, and his Wife, he wrote in his Journal that he gloried in suffering with his Family all those opprobrious things for the sake of JESUS CHRIST. His Son observes in the Margin, that there is nothing in that Libel of *Scioppius* against his Mother. He accuses that Satyrical Writer of Atheism, and proves it in the following manner. *Scioppius* has collected the finest Passages of the Scripture, wherein we are forbidden to speak ill of our Neighbours; and that the Tract wherein he has inserted them is a violent Satyr: His design was therefore to shew yet he laught at the Scripture. (b) *Quum intenderet alios inaudito exemplo calumniari, & omni convitiorum genere prosequi, congerit præcipuos è S. Scriptura locos quibus vetamur aliis ullam omnino contumeliam facere, aut convitium dicere: nonne ut omnibus palam faciat, quo loco Dei mandata habeat homo perditus, atque Deo ipsi (horresco referens) illudat?* The following Words of M. *Baillet* (c) may be added to that Latin passage. *Casaubon* (1) "calls "him the most cruel of all wild Beasts, and pre- "tends in another Book of his (2) that *Scioppius* "was a profest Enemy to God, and that he had "found in one of his Works execrable Blasphe- "mies against the Divine Authority of the holy "Scripture". But 'tis to be observed that those Blasphemies are only strain'd Expressions about the Authority, which the *Roman* Catholicks pretend the Church has received from God to explain the Scripture. *Ducit hodie familiam*, they are *Casaubon*'s Words, (d) *inter hujus generis hæreticos hostis Dei certissimus Scioppius; in cujus Ecclesiastico leviter inspecto, multas legi superioribus diebus adversus τὰς θεοπνεύστους Scripturas, blasphemias longe dirissimas.*

After this digression I return to Father *Garasse*, and I say he could not have pitch'd upon a more proper Brotherhood. M. *Baillet* (e) observes that *there was in the beginning of our Age one* Andrew SCIOPPIUS *in* Saxony *a Lutheran; but I cannot believe*, adds he, *that he was* Gaspar's *near Relation*. I have nothing to say upon this Subject: I only know that our *Scioppius* calls (f) *Conrad Schoppius*, (a Learned Man, who was still living in 1633.) his Cousin German. He (g) taught Rhetorick at *Berne*, and had been Professor of Eloquence and Poetry at *Heidelberg* (h). I would not affirm that *Conrad* SCHOPPIUS a Taylor of *Francfort* (i), one of the chief Authors of the Insurrection which happen'd in that Town in the Year 1614. and Beheaded two Years after (k), was not related to *Gaspar*. There has been a Minister, call'd *Conrad* SCHOPPIUS, who Publish'd (l) some Latin Sermons.

(I) *He made use of a Remedy, which deserves to be mention'd.*] It consisted in mortifying his Body by a strict Diet. He fasted whole days in *Germany* poring upon his Books; and when he came to *Rome*, he wholly abstain'd from Wine, Meat, Eggs, and Fish: he made but one Meal in a day, and eat but very Common Things and in a small quantity, half a Cabbage, a little Rice, a small piece of Cheese, a Pear or an Apple; and both in Winter and Summer, he had no other Bed (m) than two Boards, two Blankets, and a Pillow. This is certainly an excellent Remedy for the Cure of Incontinence, when a Man does sincerely desire to be Chast. Those, who pretend that it is not very effectual, and that Marriage is the only true Remedy, are such as never tried it, or don't much care to resist Luxury; and therefore their Testimony is of no great force. Here follow *Scioppius*'s Words. (n) *Cum primis ineuntis adolescentiæ meæ annis veteres scriptores, & in primis poëtas legere cuperem, & viros autem doctos audirem, qui arma pruriginis*, hoc est, *obscena illa poëtarum carmina isti præsertim ætati propter periculum etiam atque etiam cavenda dicerent; excogitavi rationem, qua cum minimo meo damno aut periculo utilitates, quæ ex lectione illa peti possent, perciperem* —— *Ego qui Inferiat illas poëtarum contemnas tam, &, ut ait Lucretius, mox sine parte periculi percipere cuperem, temperantiæ & abstinentiæ clam me colligandum præbui. Nam ut Terentius ait,* sine Cerere & Baccho friget Venus: *sive ut ante ipsum Euripides:*

> Ἐν πλησμονῇ τοι Κύπρις, ἐν πεινῶσι δ' οὔ.
> Saturis adest Venus, non esurientibus.

Monstrum scilicet habetur libido sine gula (*ait Tertullianus*) —— (o) *In libidinem ebullire, res laterum est ac virium.* Vires autem, ne infirmitas forsan perdat militiam, cibis excitantur. Scitis, *ait ille*, quid tentare soleat humanam satietatem. *Toto itaque biennio sic in Germania vixi, ut integros dies avidus, siccus ac jejunus in studendo consumerem, omnimoque prandia ignorarem. Veni postea in Italiam; ubi cum plerosque omnes scriptores veteres tam Græcos, quam Latinos, diligenti lectione contrivissem, excerpsissemque sedulo omnia, quæ ad corrigendos ordinandosque mores & affectus & ad vitam quam tranquillissime agendam usui fore visa essent* —— *Non modo his, quod in seculo sibi non probari Plato ostendit, sed etiam semel in die saturum fieri, & vino carere nolle, non satis eo dignum esse deprehendi, qui sibi legendis sapientiæ magistris illis operæ pretium fecisse videretur* —— *Quare ne in legendis istis oleum & operam perdidissem, tamquam germanus* Stoicus *quique ad vitam potius, quæ didicisset, quam ad disputationes referenda conferret, vinum aqua ex præfluente Tiberi hausta mutavi, quod* ignem scilicet *ut Plato ait,* igni addendum non putarem: *tum carnes in perpetuum à mensa mea proscripsi, non solum* (3) *διὰ τὴν νωθρίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κρεοφαγίας ἐγγινομένην, sed etiam ἀσκήσεως χάριν καὶ τοῦ μὴ σφριγᾶν περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια τὴν σάρκα, ut idem Clemens loquitur, cum verissime a S. Hieronymo dictum sit:* Esum carnis esse seminarium libidinis. *Sed etiam piscibus & ovis culina ac mensa mea interdixi, quod hac quidem* (4) *συπτικὰ plus satis experimento didicissem, piscium vero esu majorem etiam, quam carnium, voluptatem capere solerem: quare dimidiato caule & aliquantulo oryzæ cum piro aut pomo & casei frustillo contentus, ipsas viginti quatuor horas durare soleo, eadem opera jentans, prandens, cœnans ac comissans.* Take notice that he says (p) that before he had read Father *Coster*'s Books, he practic'd most of those things only to live in Conformity to Reason, but after he had read 'em, he directed them to God. 'Tis also to be observed that he believed the Reading of some Books could excite the most drowsy Tempers. He reckon'd among those Books some Commentaries of *Saliger* and their Text. (q) *Vos autem capulares illi, vieti, edentuli, & jam diu Acheronti debiti, si jam vos opus perdere & tamquam caballos in clivo non facere pudet, ut Satyrion compendi faciatis, familiaris hujus mei auctores, in eosdemque notas legite,*

> (r) Accendi queis frigidus ævo
> Laomedontiades aut Nestoris hernia possit.

And because he took hold of every opportunity to insult that great Man, he tells him in a reproachful manner that he slighted his Father's Judgment, in Commenting upon some Authors. I shall set down his Words, that the Reader may see that Men of great Virtue and Learning, tho' belonging to the same Family, are divided in their Opinions about obscenities. (s) *Cum pater tuus obscenos & immemorabiles Ausonii, Martialis, similiumque poëtarum versus negarit a Critico censendos, atque adeo ne legendos quidem omnino, aut audiendos, sed detestandos & flammis expiandos, & pro signis Priapi, adeoque pro libris honori ejus scriptis, sanctorum imagines a nobis habendas esse contenderet* —— (t) *Tu exortus es homo sanctissimus & castitatis ac pudicitiæ exemplar atque specimen, qui non modo illum ipsum censura patris tui notatum Ausonium, sed hoc etiam Burdigalensi Triphallo nihilo deteriùs mutoniatos Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium, & Priapeiorum versuum scriptores, magna temporis curaque impensa a te recensitos, castigatos, nec pœnitendis (ut gloriaris) commentariis illustratos*

(a) Ibid. pag. 16.

(b) Ibid. pag. [illegible]

(c) Baillet, Jugemens des Savans vol. 4. pag. 376.

(1) Rhet. Casaubon. in Epistol.

(2) M. Casaub. Pietas, in Burm. p. 1. 9. M. [illegible] in Ap. [illegible] Baroni. sect. 33. pag. 133. edit. Geneve 1663.

(e) In the 1. Vol. of the Anti. pag. 311.

(f) See the 23. letter of the 1. Book Supplementum Epistolarum of Gaspar Scioppius.

(g) See the Epistle Dedicatory of Freinshemius's Commentary upon Quintus Curtius.

(h) See the Verses he made for Philip Pareus: They are Prefixed to the Lexicon Criticum of the same Pareus.

(i) See the [illegible]

(o) Sciopp. ib. verso.

(3) Non solum propter hebetudinem, quæ ex carnium esu generatur, sed etiam exercitationis gratia, & ne caro nimis perpruriscat ad Venerem.

(4) Pruriginem commoventia.

(p) Id. fol. 250. verso.

(q) Id. ib. fol. 272. verso.

(r) Juven. Sat. 6. v. 325.

(s) Sciopp. ibid. fol. 281. verso.

(t) Ibid. fol. 282.

[illegible] Idem. lib. 9. pag. 658. (l) Draudius mentions them in his Bibliotheca classica. (m) Cubitus —— asseres sine ulla culcitra tantum duabusque lodicibus instructi. Scioppius [illegible] fol. 251. (n) Idem in Scalig. hypobolim. fol. 250.

SCOTUS (*MICHAEL*) a Learned Man, and a great Lover of Mathematicks and Astrology, lived in the XIIIth. Century. He was well beloved by the Emperor *Frederick* II. to whom he Dedicated all his Books. He has been placed in the Catalogue of Magicians, and we are told ‡ that he frequently invited several People to Dine with him, without getting any thing for them; but when his Guests sat down at Table, he forced the Spirits to bring him Meat from all parts, and when it was come he told the Company, *Gentlemen, this comes from the Kitchin of the King of* France, *and this from the Kitchin of the King of Spain, this comes from* England, &c. *Merlin Coccaie* took pleasure ‖ in describing his Enchantments. The Poet *Dante* (*A*) adopted the Common Error. *John Baccon* an *English* Carmelite, and β *the Prince of the* Averroists, is more to be credited: He quotes γ *Michael Scotus* as a great Divine. *Pitseus* who (*B*) commends him very much, is also a more credible Author. However it be, 'tis said that this pretended Magician foresaw how he (*C*) should die, and foretold the place where the Emperor *Frederick* II. should loose his Life. I shall say something of (*D*) his Books.

SCULTETUS (*Abraham*) Professor of Divinity at *Heidelberg*, and Author of many (*E*) Books, was Born at *Grunberg* in *Silesia* the 24th of *August* * 1566. and after he had Studied there till the Year 1582, he was sent to *Breslaw* to make further Improvements. He was quickly recall'd from thence, because his Father, who had lately lost all that he had ζ by the burning of *Grunberg*, was no longer able to maintain him in a College, and design'd to make him learn a Trade. The Young Man did not like it, and in order to pursue his Studies went in quest of a Tutorship. He found a good one in the House of a Burgo-Master of η *Freistad*; which gave him an opportunity to hear *Abraham* θ *Bucholcerus* Preach. He made a Journey into *Poland* in the Year 1584, and the Year following went to *Gorlitz* in *Lusatia*, where he staid above Two Years, going λ constantly to the publick Lectures, and reading private ones to others. He Acted those two parts in the University of *Wittemberg* in 1588, and 1589. and then in that of *Heidelberg* till he was admitted Minister in the Year 1594. He exercised his Ministry, in a † Village of the *Palatinate* for some Months, and then he was invited

‡ Marcel. [illegible] of the [illegible] fol. pag. 155 [illegible] ann. 1643.

‖ Naudé Apologie des grans hommes ch. 17. pag. m. 496.

β Id. ib.

γ Part 3. sentent. distinct. 13.

* And not 1556 as Freherus theatr. pag. 424 affirms. He says in the following Page that Scultetus died the 24. of October 1625. Aged 59. Years. 'Tis a wrong Calculation.

ζ [illegible]

θ [illegible]

† [illegible] Heidelberg.

---

illustratos emittere & adolescentibus commendare auderes. Hoc, satis scio, nullo modo patri tuo probare posses.

(*A*) *The Poet* Dante *adopted the Common Error.*] These are his Words in the 20th *Canto* of his *Inferno*.

Quell' altro, che ne' fianchi è così poco,
Michele Scotto fu, che veramente
Delle Magiche frode seppe il gioco.

(*B*) Pitseus, *who commends him very much.*] He (*a*) *says in express Words,* that tho' Michael Scotus *was accounted a Magician by the Mob and by Ignorant People,* wise Men past another Judgment upon him. (1) *Prudentum tamen & cordatorum hominum longe aliud fuit judicium, qui potius perspicax ejus in scrutandis rebus abditis admirabantur ingenium, laudabant industriam, quam reprehendendam judicabant curiositatem, inspiciebantque hominis scientiam, non suspicabantur culpam.*

(*C*) *Foresaw how he should die, and foretold the place where the Emperor,* &c.] This I find in a Commentator upon *Dante*. *Michael Scotus*, says he (*b*), "lived in the Reign of the Emperor *Frederick* II. "and foretold the place where he should die, which "he said would be *Florence*. Wherein the said "Emperor was deceived by reason of the Ambi"guity of the Words; for he did not die at *Flo*"*rence*, the chief Town of *Tuscany*, but in a Castle "of *Apulia* call'd *Fiorenzola*. That Magician fore"saw that he himself should die by the fall of a "Stone, that should break his Head. Which came "to pass; for one day being at Church bear"headed to Worship the Body and Blood of JESUS "CHRIST, the Rope fastened to the Bell that was "Ringing, threw a stone upon his Head, and imme"diately he thought he should die, which he did "suddenly".

(*D*) *Something of his Books.*] He wrote a Treatise about Physiognomy, and a Book containing several Questions upon *Sacrobosco*'s Sphere, and a History of Animals (*c*). He should have been mention'd by (*d*) *Vossius* on Account of the second Book; but that Author says nothing of him. The Treatise about Physiognomy was Written at the Request of the Emperor *Frederick* II. I have it in *Italian*: The Title runs thus: *Physionomia laqual compilo Maestro Michael Scotto, a prieghi di Federico Romano Imperatore, huomo di gran scienza: & è cosa molto notabile, e da tener secreta però che l'è di grande efficacia, & comprende cose secrete della natura bastantie ad ogni Astrologo: & è diviso in tre parti.* It was Printed at *Venice per Marchio Sessa*, in 1533. 'Tis a Book in 8. consisting of seven Sheets.

(*E*) *And Author of many Books.*] I have said in the Text of this Article that he taught Scholars in his Lodgings being still a Scholar. The Lectures he Read to them upon Morality and the Sphere at *Heidelberg*, occasion'd the Printing of a Book, that was explain'd in some illustrious Schools. (*e*) *In eadem Scholâ meâ privatâ Auditoribus petentibus doctrinam Morum & Siderum explicabam; unde mihi Ethicorum libri duo, Sphæricorum libri tres confecti, qui non ita multò post publicati, & in aliquot Illustribus Scholis fuerunt enarrati.* *Samuel Huberus* being call'd to *Wittemberg*, in the Year 1593, made an Oration *de dissidiis in religione*. *Scultetus* confuted it, without putting his Name to his Confutation. (*f*) *Scholia & Notas in illam sed sine nomine edidi, in quibus homini crassos errores in Logicâ, crassiores in Grammaticâ, crassissimos in Theologiâ commonstro.* He composed at the same time, 1. an *Analysis* of the Works of the Fathers, which was Printed some Years after, and Intitled (*g*) *Medulla Patrum*. 2. An *Isagoge Historica* in *V. T. libros*, together with an *Analysis* of *Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Dionysius Halicarnassæus*, &c. He lost that Work and several others after the Battle of *Prague*, and particularly the History of the Reformation (*h*). He took a Journey into *Silesia* in 1594, and returning to *Heidelberg* he went thro' *Gorlitz*, (*i*) where he made a Funeral Oration for *Laurentius Ludovicus*, which was Printed, and afterwards inserted by *Melchior Adam* in his lives of the Philosophers. This *Laurence* had been (*k*) *Melancthon*'s Scholar, and Principal of a College at *Gorlitz*. *Martin Mylius*, who succeeded him, (*l*) desired *Scultetus* to pay that Duty to his old Master. *Scultetus* Publish'd (*m*) in 1611. an Exposition of the Gospels for the Sunday, which was Translated out of *German* into several Languages, and put into the (*n*) *Index librorum prohibitorum* at *Rome*. He Publish'd two Sermons he had Preach'd in the Synod of *Dort*, two other Sermons Preach'd by him at *Heidelberg* in the secular Year of the Reformation, and that which he had Preach'd at *Prague* against Idols. Take notice that he did not lose all his Annals of the Reformation; for he Publish'd the two first *Decads* before he went into *Bohemia* with the Elector his Master. I find that he wrote *Idea concionum in Esaiam, Epistolas D. Pauli ad Romanos & Hebræos & Psalmos Davidis, & observationes Grammaticæ, Logicæ, Historicæ, & Theologicæ in historiam Jesu Christi nati, educati, baptizati & tentati, & in historiam concionum & miraculorum Jesu Christi, & de precatione tractatio logica & Theologica, & Joannes Baptista logice descriptus*

(*a*) Naudé Apolog. des grans hommes chap. 17. pag. 498.

(1) Pitseus 1. volum. de rebus Anglicis.

(*b*) Grangier *in his French Commentary upon* Dante's Inferno *pag.* 254, 255.

(*c*) *See* Naudé ubi supra. pag. 496.

(*d*) Vossius de scient. Mathem.

(*e*) Scultetus in narrat. apologetica de curriculo vitæ pag. 21.

(*f*) Id. ib.

(*g*) That Work contains [illegible] Parts, which came out one after another.

(*h*) Id. ib.

(*i*) Id. ib. pag. 21.

(*k*) Id. ib. pag. 16.

(*l*) Id. ib. pag. 28.

(*m*) Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

(*n*) Id. ib. pag. [illegible] It was [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] 1613.

ected by the Elector *Palatin* to be one of his Preachers. I ſhall ſpeak of (B) a Conference he had with *Samuel Huberus*. He was appointed Miniſter of St. *Francis's* Church at *Heidelberg* in 1608. And two Years after he was admitted into the Eccleſiaſtical Senate. He was ſeveral times employed to viſit the Churches and Schools of the *Palatinate*; and notwithſtanding thoſe Avocations, he wrote ſome Books which requir'd great Labour. He follow'd the Prince of *Anhalt* into the War of *Juliers* in 1615, and ſettled Eccleſiaſtical Affairs in thoſe parts, with great Prudence and Vigilance. He attended the Prince *Palatin Frederick* V. in his Journey into *England*, in the Year 1612, and got himſelf acquainted with the moſt Learned Men of that Country. He went to the Court of *Brandenburg*, in 1614. the Elector *John Sigiſmund*, who was ready to renounce Lutheraniſm, having ſent for him to conſult him about it. He † very well performed the Commiſſions that were given him in ſuch a juncture. Being return'd to *Heidelberg*, he accepted the Office of Court Preacher, having very good Reaſons for it; but he laid it down in 1618, being appointed Profeſſor of Divinity. He was ſoon after deputed to the Synod of *Dort*, and endeavoured at firſt to reconcile the contending Parties; but perceiving that it was in vain, he ſtoutly maintain'd the Doctrines of the Calviniſts. He Preach'd at *Francfort* the Year following, during the ſitting of the Electoral Diet; for his Maſter appointed him Preacher to the Deputies he ſent thither. He follow'd that Prince into *Bohemia*, and being gone into *Sileſia*, after the fatal Battle of *Prague*, he reſolved to return to *Heidelberg*, in order to exerciſe the Functions of a Profeſſor. He was no ſooner arriv'd there, but all Academical Exerciſes ceaſed: The Enemies being near the Gates, moſt Profeſſors fled away. He retired to *Bretten*, and then to *Schorndorf*, in the Dutchy of *Wirtemberg*, from whence he went to *Embden*, in *Auguſt* 1622. The King of *Bohemia*, his Maſter, approv'd that the City of *Embden* ſhould offer him a Miniſter's place. *Scultetus* * accepted of it, but he did not continue long in it, for he died the 24th of *October* || 1625. He was Married (C) three times, and left but one Daughter behind him. No Man was ever (D) more cruelly ſlandered by his Enemies.

† *Profectus ſum Berlinum ibique* [illegible] *egi, prout* [illegible] *ad mentem uſque* [illegible] *et. II. 16*

* Taken from a Book of *Abraham Scultetus* intitl'd, *de curriculo vitæ.... Narratio Apologetica*, Printed at *Embden* 1625. in 4to.

|| *Paul Freher. in Theatr.* pag. 425. but according to *Witte* in his *Diarium* it was in 1624.

ſcriptus. See (a) *Freherus's Theatrum.* He had a hand in the Greek and Latin (b) Edition of St. *Athanaſius*, and of the Councils of *Nice* and *Epheſus*; to which, he added a ſhort Hiſtory of the Seven Univerſal Councils, and his Tranſlation of Twenty Greek Sermons (c). I ſhall ſay nothing of his German Books (d) againſt a Jeſuit of *Mentz*, againſt M. *de Neer's* Apoſtacy, and againſt the Confeſſion of *Cologne*, &c. See again *Freherus's Theatrum.*

(B) *A Conference he had with* Samuel Huberus.] In the Year 1606 he was ſent to *Newſtad* to confer with a (e) Mathematician, who had been employ'd to Finiſh and Publiſh a (f) Book of *Rheticus*, and who put off from day to day the Publication of that Work. He went in the Name of the great Council, to Diſcourſe with him about what was to be done to make an end of that Edition. He found *Samuel Huberus* at *Spire*, in the Inn where he lay. That Man was preparing a Book for the next *Francfort* Fair, and no ſooner knew who *Scultetus* was, but he propoſed to him a Diſpute about Controverſies in Religion: It was accepted, and laſted from Nine a Clock in the Morning 'till Three in the Afternoon, in the preſence of the Lutheran Miniſters. It ran upon the Doctrine of Predeſtination (g). *Scultetus* came off (h) at laſt by an Argument, which was a kind of a perſonal Jeſt. I'll prove to you, ſaid he to *Huberus*, that you don't belong to the true Church: She is certainly among the Reformed, or among the Lutherans, or among the Roman Catholicks. But you have left the Communion of the Reformed, you have been expell'd from that of the Lutherans, and you write againſt the Roman; therefore, &c. The Diſpute went on quietly, for the two chief qualities of a good Diſputant met in *Huberus*; he patiently heard his Antagoniſts, tho' never ſo prolix, and meekly bore their hard words. (i) *Acta & peracta ſunt omnia tranquillè: Neque enim diſſimulandum eſt: quæ duæ virtutes in Diſputatore primæ ſunt, eas ambas me in Hubero deprehendiſſe, patientiam adverſarium prolixè ſua explicantem audiendi, & lenitatem etiam aſperè dicta preferendi.* He maintain'd (k) that all Men are Elected, and perplexed *Hunnius*, who denied the Election of ſome Perſons. (l) *Primum laudo Huberi ratiocinationem qua Ægidium Hunnium Witembergæ conſtrinxerat, qui nec Huberi generalem, nec Reformatorum ſpecialem electionem agnoſcere voluit.*

(C) *He was Married three times, and left but one Daughter behind him.*] His Firſt Wife was *Catherine Bergia*, whom he Married at *Heidelberg* in *November* 1594 (m). He loſt her the 25th of *March* 1605, (n) and continued ſixteen Months a Widower, (o) being ſo ſickly, that he thought his Health required he ſhould have ſome Body to take care of it. He therefore Married *Catherine Lorichia* the Widow of Dr. *Rhodingus*, and having loſt her the 20th of *October* 1607, he Married another Widow the 18th of *July* 1608 (p), by whom he had a Daughter, the 1ſt of *December* (q) 1609, who, together with her Mother, were the Companions (r) of his Exile at *Embden*, in the Year 1624.

(D) *No Man was ever more cruelly ſlander'd by his Enemies.*] He expreſſes himſelf thus in his *Narratio Apologetica. Dentatis ſcriptis, infamibus Theſibus, contumelioſis anagrammatiſmis, picturis, cantilenis, in nomen, in famam, in doctrinam meam involarunt, perindeque omnis generis convitiis in me debacchati ſunt, ac ſi ego unus eſſem qui omnem Iſraelem turbarim & ſolem, quod dicitur, ex univerſo mundo ſuſtulerim.* I can't tell whether there was any ground for thoſe Slanders, but I believe the free acceſs he had to Princes, made him odious to ſeveral People; and that the uneaſineſs of ſome, and the joy of others, after the Misfortune of the Elector *Palatin* in *Bohemia*, brought to light the ill effects of Envy. The Court Preacher was attacked when thought to be under Diſgrace, and the Ice being once broke, every body fell upon him; the Firſt Satyrs made way for others; it was like a Snow-ball that gathers more and more. He (s) was accuſed of having adviſed the Elector *Palatin* to accept the Crown of *Bohemia*: The Miſeries that followed that Enterpriſe were charged upon him; it was objected to him, that inſtead of diſcharging the Duties of his Profeſſorſhip at *Heidelberg*, he had acted the part of an Intriguing Man, and an Iconoclaſt in *Bohemia*; and that he ſhew'd himſelf an Atheiſt by approving the Union of the Kingdoms of *Hungary* and *Bohemia*: he was blamed for having Perſecuted the Catholicks, the Lutherans and the Unitarians; and it was given out that he had loſt his Maſter's Favour, and all his Employments, after the Battle of *Prague*. This was diſperſed by Word of Mouth, and

(a) Freher, theatr. pag. 425.
(b) Printed for Commelin 1601.
(c) Scultet. ubi ſupra pag. 35.
(d) Id. ib. pag 8..
(e) Call'd L. Valentinus Ot-ho.
(f) *I think* ...ma ca-non triangulorum. See Voſſius de ſci... Ma-them. pag. ...
(g) Taken from Scultetus ubi ſupra pag 32,33.
(h) Tandem abſolvi me argumento in ſpeciem quidem ſed ...ipſa minime jocoſo, quo docui Huberum non eſſe Eccle... veræ filium. Id. ib. pag. 33. (i) Id. ib. (k) *See the* ...mark D *in the Article* Hunnius.
(l) Id. ib.
(m) Scultet. ubi ſupra p. 29.
(n) Id. ib. pag. 44.
(o) In viduitate ſedecim menſes vixi, quibus corpuſculum meum cùm non uno morbo attentaretur, valetudinis curatricem quæſivi. Id. ibid.
(p) Id. ib. pag. 45.
(q) Id: ib: pag. 47.
(r) Id. pag. 23. 45.
(s) Id. ib. pag. 76, 77

nemies. I have ſaid in another * place, that he did not approve that the Proteſtants ſhould write one againſt another. What he obſerves in Anſwer to a Man, who accuſed him of having raiſed a (E) Sacramental War in the *Palatinate*, is a remarkable thing. I could eaſily believe he would have made a better Apology for himſelf, as to his being accuſed of Inducing the King, his Maſter to accept

and in writing in the Courts of Princes, and in the Univerſities and Towns. He was four Years without juſtifying himſelf; but at laſt he took Pen in hand for his vindication, in imitation of St. *Baſil*. (a) *Hæc dicta, ſcripta, decantata per Regum, per Principum aulas, per Academias, per urbes & oppida: Quæ niſi reprimerem, famæ meæ prodigus jure merito haberer. Quod ſi quis quærat: Cur in quartum annum reſponſum, ad tam atroces calumnias diſtulerim? is hoc à me audiat: imitatum me fuiſſe Baſilium illum Magnum, qui cum undique appeteretur, adeò perturbatus fuit, ut non veritus ſit ſcribere Epiſtolâ ſeptuageſimâ nonâ*, parum aliquando abfuiſſe, quin de omnium hominum fide & ſinceritate dubitaret: *indixit autem ſibi ipſi ſilentium in tertium uſque annum, ne quid præcipitanter effunderet: poſtea varias apologias texuit.* Obſerve, by the by, that thoſe Words of St. *Baſil* are wonderful. Men are ſo eaſily prepoſſeſt by ill Reports, or ſo blindly adapt their Actions to the Intereſts of Calumniators, that there is ſometimes ground to believe that Equity and Uprightneſs are wholly baniſh'd from this World. *Scultetus* (b) Anſwers, 1. That he had no hand in the deliberation whether the Elector *Palatin* ſhould accept the Crown of *Bohemia*; only he Confeſſes that he preach'd a Sermon (c) wherein he Congratulated him for accepting the Offer of the *Bohemians*; and encouraged him by the words of the Lord, to behave himſelf valiantly in that Enterprize. 2. That *Frederick Balduinus*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Wittemberg*, who (d) blamed him for leaving his Church and his Profeſſorſhip, had a Collegue who went to preach in the Country of *Brandenburg* contrary to the Prince's Edicts. 'Tis approving at home what one condemns abroad, tho' the Domeſtick Action be much more inexcuſable than that of the Foreigner; for, adds *Scultetus*, I follow'd my Elector's Orders with the Conſent of the Univerſity. (e) *Magnum crimen profectò, ac indubiè, Balduino judice, majus longè eo, cui D. Meiſnerus Balduini collega obnoxius: cui è Saxoniâ in Marchiam ire, contra Sereniſſ. Electoris Brandeburgici edictum, in Gynæceum Electorale irrepere, ibidem concionari nulla religio fuit. Hæc, quæ nullo colore defendi poſſunt, probat domi Balduinus: foris autem in me culpat: quòd Principem meum, cujus in ſervitio concionatorio adhuc vivebam, volentem, jubentem, conſentiente Academiâ, in Boëmiam ſequutus ſum.* 3. That (f) the New King of *Bohemia* promiſed to all his Subjects a free exerciſe of their Religion, and kept his Word to them; that he took only for his own uſe, the Church of the Citadel of *Prague*, out of which he removed all the Idols. *Scultetus* owns that he adviſed him to it, and could not be at reſt till he had obtained it. He maintains that he acted in that reſpect like a good Chriſtian. He ſays that as ſoon as the Sermon he had preach'd upon that Subject, came to be Publiſh'd, the Lutherans and the Papiſts made a dreadful noiſe every where, which was ſuppreſt by a Learned Anſwer of *Theophilus Moſanus*. 4. That when he ſaid, (g) in his Sermon upon the Alliance renewed between *Bohemia* and *Hungary* the 15th of *April* 1620. that this Confederacy was acceptable to God, ſince all thoſe who entred upon it profeſt the ſame Faith; he only meant the Reformed and the Lutherans, and not the Papiſts, Anabaptiſts and Arians. He complains (h) that (i) *Luke Oſiander* having read that Sermon, openly (k) maintain'd in a publick Diſputation, that *Scultetus* was an Atheiſt, ſince he made no difference between Lutheraniſm, Calviniſm and Popery. 5. He Proteſts that he never excited the King his Maſter to Perſecute the Papiſts and the Lutherans, and that they have not been Perſecuted. (l) *Circumferuntur varii libelli de Reformatione Boëmicâ, partim Latinâ, partim Germanicâ linguâ ſcripti: quibus ſi fides habenda; in Boëmiâ, me inſtigatore, Pontificii duriter afflicti: Lutherani magno numero ejecti: ipſi proceres Regni de libertate religionis ſuæ ſunt periclitati.* He refers the Reader (m) to a German Book, wherein it was plainly made out, That this Perſecution was a Chimerical thing; and takes advantage (n) of the Contradictions of thoſe, who had mention'd that Revolution of *Bohemia* in their Writings. He ſpeaks (o) of a Letter handed about under the Suppoſititious Name of a Man of *Antwerp*, wherein he was deſired to recommend the Doctrine of Ubiquity to the King his Maſter. He does not deny (p) that being conſulted about the Reformation of the Churches immediately ſubject to the King, he Anſwer'd, That the King's Religion might be Eſtabliſh'd in 'em, ſince the People deſir'd it, and the Prieſts were not qualify'd to explain the Scripture. 6. He ſhews, that after the Battle of *Prague*, he did not loſe his Maſter's Favour, as his Enemies gave out. In order to colour that Lie, they invented ſeveral Reaſons of his Diſgrace, ſo far as to Accuſe him of a heinous Crime. (q) *Unde haud difficulter colligere eſt cujus ſpiritus filii fuerint: qui, me Uratiſlaviâ vix digreſſo, diſſeminare hoc in orbem Germaniæ non dubitarunt: me omni gratiâ Regis excidiſſe; officio motum eſſe. Et ut res colorem haberet; pro ſuâ quiſquam libidine cauſas finxit: alius, conſilia mea de ſuſcipiendo regno Boemico: alius, demolitionem ſtatuarum & idolorum Pragenſium: alius (quod Deus æternùm averruncaſſit) atrox aliquod crimen.*

The Libellers Perſecuted him in his very Exile. He was inform'd from good hands, (r) in the Year 1624, that the Secretary of a certain Prince had affirm'd in the *Lower Saxony*, and even at the Court of the King of *Sweden*, that *Scultetus* had departed this Life towards the latter end of the Year 1623. three days after he had Publiſh'd a Book full of Abſurd and Heterodox Opinions, which moved the Magiſtrates of *Embden* to ſuppreſs it. Some body writ into the Country of *Brandenburg* that he had fore-ſeen it long ago: and yet there never was any ſuch Book. A Dutch Piece was Publiſh'd the Year following, which contain'd a Deſcription of the Devaſtations made in *Eaſt Frieſland* by *Mansfeld*'s Troops. The Author having vented his Spleen againſt the States General, and ſome Illuſtrious Perſons, attack'd *Scultetus* particularly, and accuſed him of having thanked God, in the Pulpit, for the Irruption of thoſe Troops. And yet it was a notorious thing, that he had only thank'd him for the Retreat of thoſe furious Soldiers; which was Atteſted in a Book written to confute that Libel.

I ſhall make no Excuſe for the length of this Remark, being perſuaded that all Men of Senſe will grant that there are no Collections of greater uſe than thoſe which ſhew the Impudence of Libellers, and the Credulity of thoſe who read their Books. It is of great concern for the Publick good, to make it appear by many plain Inſtances, that Paſſionate Men will vent any Lyes againſt the Honour of their Neighbours, and that the People will give Credit to them. Tho' you ſhew the Abſurdity and Contradictions of thoſe Satyrical Writers, they perſiſt in their Boldneſs, and new Calumniators will ſet up again. Tho' you put to the Bluſh thoſe, who have been ſo raſh and ſo ſilly, as to believe a Thouſand Fabulous Stories maliciouſly and groſly Forged, they'll proſtitute their Belief the very next Day. And therefore one can never Collect too many things like thoſe which I have Compiled.

Take notice that I don't pretend to juſtify *Scultetus* in all reſpects. I make no doubt, that he was guilty of the Fault, which a Court Divine does ſeldom avoid. I fancy he concern'd himſelf too much with Political Affairs, and mention'd too often the Temporal Intereſts in his Sermons. He was ſomewhat haſty in adviſing the deſtruction of Images, not conſidering that his Maſter was not ſufficiently ſettled upon his Throne to undertake ſuch an Innovation. But how can it be help'd? Men are blinded by the firſt Favours of Fortune; they fancy, that ſince the Kingdom of God is concern'd in the caſe, a good Succeſs will be attended with further Succeſſes, as in the time of *Joſhua*, and that there is nothing like making haſte.

(E) Of having raiſed a Sacramental War in the Palatinate.] Here follow ſome further Slanders againſt *Scultetus*, which he rejects as horrid Lies. A certain Apoſtate, ſays he (s), has given out, that

---

* In the Article *Piſtorius*.

(a) Id. ib. pag. 77.

(b) Id. ib.

(c) Pro concione Majeſtati ipſius gratulatus, illamque verbis Domini è Joſuâ petitis ad id, quod ſuſceperat fortiter agendum, cohortatus ſum. Id. ibid. pag. 78.

(d) In libello quodam Germanico, quem de idolis ſcripſit. πολυπραγμοσύνης damnat, qui Eccleſiæ & Academiæ Palatinæ obligatus, in Boemiam cum Rege meo profectus ſim. Id. ib.

(e) Id. ib. pag. 78.

(f) Id. ib.

(g) Id. ib. pag. 81.

(h) Id, ib. pag. 83.

(i) *Profeſſor of Divinity at* Tubingen, *and Chancellor of the Univerſity.*

(k) Quibus fundamentis jactis Oſiander publicis theſibus me ATHEUM proclamat. Id. ibid.

(l) Id. ib. pag. 86.

(m) Id ib.

(n) Id. ib. pag. 87.

(o) Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

(p) Id. ib.

(q) Id. ib. pag. 93.

(r) Id. ib. pag. 99.

(s) Sc

ib. pag

cept the Crown of *Bohemia*, if that Enterpriſe had proved ſucceſsful. In ſuch a caſe there had been no Neceſſity for him (*F*) to deny the *Fact*, he would have been bleſt and admir'd for his Prudence: Men do commonly judge of things by the Event.

SEBONDE † (*Raymundus*) Profeſſor of (*A*) Phyſick, Philoſophy and Divinity at *Toulouſe* in the XVth. Century, was a Native of *Barcelona*. He was eſteem'd for his Parts and Learning, and wrote ſome Books, whereof the moſt conſiderable is that which is Intitl'd, *Theologia naturalis, ſive Liber creaturarum*. 'Tis likely, that Book does not favour of the Notions of a Vulgar and pre-poſſeſt Author, ſince *Montagne* ſet a great (*B*) value upon it. He Tranſlated it (*C*) into *French*, and

that ‡ excited a Sacramental War in the *Palatinate*, in the Year 1603. No body ever heard of ſuch a War, but only of a little Diſpute about Euchariſtical Phraſes, between the Profeſſors of the Univerſity, and the Miniſters of the Church. 'Tis well known, continues he, that the Doctrine of the Sacraments was purged from the Romiſh Idolatry, and cleared from Scholaſtical Phraſes by *Zuinglius* and *Oecolampadius*; and that the Loſs which the Canton of *Zurich* ſuſtain'd in the Fight, wherein *Zuinglius* was kill'd, broke the League lately concluded between ſome Cantons of *Swiſſerland*, the City of *Strasburg*, and the Landgrave of *Heſſe*. Whereupon *Martin Bucer* being too timorous, was afraid that the whole Party would ſink, unleſs he ſtrengthned, with a new Alliance, the Towns of the *Upper Germany*, and particularly *Strasburg*, where he taught. He caſt his Eye upon the Potent Duke of *Saxony*, and the better to gain him, he endeavour'd to make every body believe that *Luther*'s and *Zuinglius*'s Opinions concerning the Lord's Supper, were the ſame in the main, and that a meer Diſpute about Words had prevented their Agreement. He further ſaid, that it was better to uſe *Luther*'s than *Zuinglius*'s Expreſſions, becauſe the latter ſpoke too meanly of the Euchariſt, and the other in a ſublime manner. He inſpired the ſame Thoughts into *Calvin* (*a*), who had fled from *France* to *Strasburg*. This Intrigue of *Bucer* brought in the Lutheran Expreſſions into the Towns of the *Upper Germany*, eſpecially after the diſmal Concordate of *Wittemberg*. The Divines, who taught in *Saxony* under the Elector *Chriſtian*, uſed themſelves to thoſe Phraſes of Conſubſtantiation, *phraſibus illis ſynuſiaſticis aſſueverant*; ſo that being expell'd after that Prince's Death, and retiring into the *Palatinate*, they took the Miniſters, who uſed *Zuinglius*'s Expreſſions in that Country, to be Heterodox: Which occaſion'd a Diſſention; but it was ſo happily and ſo quickly ſuppreſs'd, that from that time the Divines of the Univerſity, and others, lived with a better Underſtanding. The Apoſtate had given out, That the Elector *Palatin* cauſed a Book, written upon that Quarrel, to be Burnt. *Scultetus* (*b*) calls it a Lie. One may very well preſume, that he ſpeaks Truth; for tho' it be a great piece of Boldneſs, to affirm that a Prince has cauſed a Book to be Condemn'd, when 'tis Falſe; 'tis ſtill a greater piece of Impudence to deny it, when it is True.

A Man well acquainted with the Secret Hiſtory of the Church, might inform us that Journies and Conferences about Religion are moſt times undertaken for a Temporal Concern. *Bucer*'s Conduct affords an Inſtance of it: I have mention'd another like it taken from *Scultetus* in the Article of *Beza* (*c*). We are told that *Bucer* repented of having mediated the Formulary (*d*) of the Concord. (*e*) *Bucerus dixit ſe pœnas dare quod cauſam publicam homo privatus voluiſſet componere, & tam multa prava dogmata conciliare.* *Peter Martyr*, who heard him ſay ſo in *England*, told *Bullinger* of it; *Daniel Toſſanus* had it from *Bullinger*, and *Pezelius* from *Daniel Toſſanus*, in the preſence of *Scultetus*, who inſerted it in the Hiſtory of his Life.

(*F*) *In ſuch a caſe there had been no Neceſſity for him to deny the Fact.*] Some ſevere, and ſometimes too moroſe Criticks, take delight in exclaiming againſt Preachers, who encourage others to make War, without conſidering that they are the Miniſters of the Prince of Peace. A Preacher will patiently bear ſuch a Cenſure when the War proves very ſucceſsful: but ſince the Enterprize of the Elector *Palatin*, *Frederick* V. was attended with great Misfortunes; it was an unpleaſant thing for a Church-man to be told, in a reproachful manner, that he had engaged him in it. If a Divine Preaching before him, had exhorted him to undertake that War, alledging the moſt proper Texts of the Scripture, and particularly theſe words of the Pſalmiſt, (*f*) *Accingere gladio tuo ſuper femur tuum potentiſſime, &c.* he would have been Proud of it, if the new King, well ſettled upon the Throne of *Bohemia*, had ſecured the Peace of *Germany*, and Liberty of Conſcience from the ill Deſigns of the Court of *Vienna*. But that Enterprize prov'd Unfortunate, and then no body was willing to confeſs he had adviſed it: ſo much Men are afraid of the wrong cuſtom of judging of things by the Event. I call it wrong; for on a Thouſand Occaſions, there is more Prudence in thoſe who do not Succeed, than in thoſe who have a good Succeſs. How many ill-concerted Enterpriſes have proved Succeſsful? And how many well laid Deſigns have proved Fatal? Nay, it frequently falls out, that a great Deſign carried on according to the beſt Rules of Policy, ſucceeds by unforeſeen means, and ſuch as no body depended upon. However it be, the Poſture of Affairs was ſuch in *Germany*, when endeavours where uſed to beſtow a Crown upon the Elector *Palatin*, that Prudence required one ſhould venture a great deal. By runing no hazard, there was ground to fear a Slavery, which includes all ſorts of Miſery under the Popiſh Domination; but if the Revolution of *Bohemia* had been well ſupported, the Proteſtants had been uppermoſt. And therefore it was particularly, by reaſon of his Profeſſion, that *Scultetus* ſhould have been aſhamed if he had given ſuch Advices.

(*A*) *Profeſſor of Phyſick*, &c.] I follow *M. de Mauſſac*, who gives him all thoſe Titles in his *Prolegomena* upon *Raymund Martini*. *Sciendum eſt*, ſays he, *Raymundum Sebonde nec Dominicanum, nec in Hebraicis aliiſque linguis Orientalibus valde verſatum fuiſſe, quamvis eum ex Judæo Chriſtianum nobis repreſentet Michael à Monte* toto capite Apologiæ ——— *Sed tantum Hiſpanum & Barcinonenſem atque in Academia Toloſana Medicinæ Profeſſorem, Philoſophiæ, ſacræque ſcientiæ, eoque gradu illic inſignitum.* I find in the Abridgment of *Geſner*'s *Bibliotheque* the Title of a Book (*g*), which is a Dialogue, *inter Raimundum Sebundium Artium, Medicinæ ac Theologiæ Profeſſorem & Dominicum Seminiverbium*. I have juſt now peruſed that Apology for *Sebonde*, to know whether the Author repreſents him as a Jew converted to Chriſtianity, and I have not been ſo lucky as to find any thing about it; but becauſe I have not read every Line of it, I don't pretend to deny in all reſpects what *M. de Mauſſac* affirms. I ſhall only ſay that *Montagne* ſays little of *Sebonde* in that long Apology, except in the beginning. Note, that *Geſner* (*h*) calls him *Sebeyde*, and ſays in the Margin, he is alſo call'd *Sabunde*. The Title prefixed to the Prologue of the *Liber creaturarum* in the *Strasburg* Edition 1496. has this laſt Name: *Compoſitus a venerabili viro magiſtro Raymundo de Sabunde in artibus & medicina doctore, & in ſacra pagina egregio Profeſſore.*

(*B*) *Set a great value upon it.*] See the following Remark, and the Remark *D*.

(*C*) *He Tranſlated it into* French.] I ſhall relate the Hiſtory of that Tranſlation: It may be of ſome uſe to know *Sebonde*. " (*i*) *Peter Brunel* (*k*), *ſays the* " *Tranſlator*, a Man accounted very Learned in his " time, having been for ſome time at *Montagne* in my " Father's Company, with ſome other perſons of his " Character, preſented him at his departure with " a Book, Intitled, *Theologia naturalis, ſive liber* " *creaturarum Magiſtri Raymondi de Sebonde*. And " becauſe the *Italian* and *Spaniſh* Languages were " very familiar to my Father, and that Book is " written,

† See the end of the Remark *A*.

(*a*) Hence it was, probably, that Calvin in his Catechiſm and elſewhere, made uſe of Phraſes, which ſeem to imply a ſubſtantial preſence of the Body of our Lord.

(*b*) Eſſe … tem vel … me, vel … aliis … iniſtris … alatinis, … ab omnibus con… dim … iptum … quod … er hac … publica- … quod … eniſſimi … ctoris … Vul- … fue- … conſe- … um; … ego … ſter … , … id … eratus … ſtata … lanter … mat. … ibid. … , 41. Re… M. That … ſay, of … tem- … in … d. ib. … 25.

(*f*) *Pſalm* 45.

(*g*) *The ſame with* Viola animæ.

(*h*) Geſner. in Bibliotheca.

(*i*) *Montagne, Eſſays* B. 2. ch. 12. p. m. 184.

(*k*) *It ſhould be* Bunel.

and made an Apology for it *(D)*, which is the longeſt Chapter of his Eſſays. Few People have known exactly in what time *Sebonde* lived, and who he was. *Montagne* wonders how ſuch an Author could remain in ſo great an Obſcurity: *All that we know of him,* ſays he †, *is that he was a* Spaniard, *and profeſt Phyſick at* Toulouſe *about Two Hundred Years ago.* *Scaliger* ſays in a Letter * written in 1606, that *Sebonde* lived at *Toulouſe* Two Hundred and Thirty Years before, or thereabouts. Which does not well agree with *Trithemius* β, who places the Death of this Phyſician in the Year 1432. I have obſerved in another γ place, the other miſtakes of *Scaliger* concerning that Man. He took him to be a Dominican Monk, and aſcribed to him a Book againſt the Jews, Intitled, *Pugio fidei*, of which *Raymund Martini* is the Author. Our *Sebonde* was not very well known to *Gabriel Naudæus*, a Man of a Prodigious Memory, and who had a vaſt knowledge of Books and Manuſcripts; for || ſpeaking of what *Scaliger* ſays concerning *Galatinus* and *Sebonde*, he does not obſerve any fault in it. What concerns the other *(E)* Writings of our *Sebonde* may be ſeen in a Remark.

SEDULIUS (CAIUS CÆLIUS, or CÆCILIUS) Flouriſh'd *(A)* in the Vth Century. He was ‡ a Prieſt, and wrote a Poem, Intitled, *Paſchale Carmen*, and a Book in Proſe upon the ſame ſubject, Intitled, *Paſchale Opus*. Thoſe

"written in a kind of *Spaniſh* with *Latin* Terminations, he hoped my Father might make uſe of it with a little help, and recommended it to him as a Book very uſeful, and ſuited to the time when he gave it him, which was when the New Doctrine of *Luther* began to be in Vogue. —— (a) My Father, ſome Days before he died, having lighted by chance upon that Book, under a heap of uſeleſs Papers, ordered me to Tranſlate it into *French*. 'Tis an eaſy task to Tranſlate ſuch Authors, when there is little to do but to repreſent the Matter; but when a Book is written with great Politeneſs and Elegancy, the Tranſlation of it is a difficult Undertaking, eſpecially into a Language that has not the ſame force. It was a very ſtrange and new Employment for me; but being then at leiſure, and willing to obey the beſt Father that ever was, I did my beſt to compaſs it; which Pleaſed him wonderfully, and he ordered the Tranſlation to be Printed, which was executed after her Death". *La Croix du Maine* places that Impreſſion in the Year 1569. Thoſe *Dialogues* (b) concerning the Nature of Man (ſo he Intitles the Book of *Raymond Sebonde*, Tranſlated by *Montagne*) *have been Printed at* Paris *for* Gabriel Buon, *in* 1569, *and for* Giles Gourbin *in the ſame Year*. *Du Verdier* (c) does not mention the ſame Title, nor ſo ancient an Edition. Theſe are his words: *Le livre des creatures.* Raymond Sebon *is the Author of it: That Book contains Three Hundred and Thirty Chapters, and was Printed at* Paris in 8. *for* Giles Gourbin *in* 1581. *I have ſeen*, continues he, *another Tranſlation of the ſame Book in very Old* French. Theſe laſt words ſhew he does not mean *John Martin*'s Tranſlation (d) Publiſh'd in 1551. There is another reaſon for it, *viz.* That *John Martin* and *Montagne* did not Tranſlate the ſame Book. The Book Tranſlated by *John Martin* contains 7 Dialogues. But the Book Tranſlated by *Montagne* is not written by way of a Dialogue: It is divided into Three Hundred and Thirty Chapters, as *du Verdier* obſerves; and 'tis certain there is but one Man, who ſpeaks in the Book, that contains Three Hundred and Thirty Chapters. From whence we may infer that *La Croix du Maine* does not well quote the Title of *Montagne*'s Tranſlation, and that the Dialogues of *Sebonde* are the ſame Book with the *Theologia Naturalis*; for it appears from the very Title of the Tranſlation that it contains the ſame things. The Title runs thus: (e) *La Theologie naturelle de Raymond Sebond compriſe en ſept dialogues intitulez autrement, de la nature de l'homme.* See hereafter the Titles of the Books of that Doctor.

(D) He made an Apology for it.] He himſelf (f) tells us what moved him to it. "I thought the Notions of that Author were very fine, the Contexture of his Diſcourſe very cloſe, and his Deſign very pious. And becauſe many People read that Book, and particularly the Ladies, to whom we ought to be more Serviceable, I have often had occaſion to help 'em, by anſwering two main Objections raiſed againſt that Author. His deſign is Noble and Bold, for he pretends to prove all the Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion by Philoſophical Arguments". This occaſion'd the two Objections which *Montagne* undertook to Anſwer. Some ſaid (g) *that the Chriſtians prejudice themſelves by pretending to build their belief upon Humane Arguments, ſince it is the work of Faith, and of Divine Grace.* Others ſaid (h) that *Sebonde's Arguments were weak and unfit to prove his Aſſertion, and undertook to confute 'em eaſily.* *Montagne* thought himſelf obliged to Anſwer (i) the former gently and reſpectfully, becauſe it ſeem'd to him that there was a Pious Zeal in their Objection: But, ſays he (k), the others *ought to be handled more roughly, for they are more Dangerous and Malicious than the firſt.* The Method he took, was *to deprive 'em of the weak Arms of their Reaſon*, by ſhewing them the Emptineſs and Ignorance of Men, and the Divine Majeſty, *to which alone belongs Knowledge.* Thoſe, who know *Montagnes*'s Character, may eaſily gueſs that he gave himſelf a large ſcope. The judgment he makes of the Arguments alledged by his Author, is too edifying not to be inſerted in this place. *To ſpeak the Truth*, ſays he (l), *I find*, he proves the Doctrines of Chriſtianity by natural Reaſon, *ſo ſucceſsfully, that I think no body can go farther than he upon that Subject, and that none did ever equal him* —— *I ask'd formerly* Hadrian Turnebus, *a very knowing Man, what that Book was: He anſwered, that he thought it might be a Quinteſſence drawn out of* Thomas Aquinas; *and indeed that vaſt Genius, full of Learning, and of an admirable ſubtilty, was the only Man capable of ſuch Notions* —— *I know*, Montague goes on (m), *a Man of Note bred up a Scholar, who confeſt to me, that he had been reclaim'd from his Unbelief, by* Sebonde's *Arguments.* Every body has not ſo good an Opinion of that Book as *Montagne*. Father *Theophilus Raynaud* (n) ſpeaks of it with contempt; and a Lutheran (o) Profeſſor laugh'd at *Comenius*, for ſaying (p) that *Sebonde* has ſo demonſtratively prov'd whatever concerns the Knowledge and Glory of God, and the Knowledge and Salvation of Man, that nothing can be alledged againſt it. That Profeſſor maintains that in many things, which are not very obſure, that Spaniard argues pitifully, and he alledges, as an Inſtance of it, the Explication of the Cauſes, which produce Diſcord among Men.

(E) The other Writings of our Sebonde.] His other Works are (q) *Quæſtiones diſputatæ. Viola animæ per modum dialogi de hominis natura tractans ad cognoſcendum ſe, Deum & hominem, & omne debitum quo Deo obligatur & proximo. Coloniæ apud Henricum Quentel* 1501. in 4to. The Dialogues *de Natura Hominis*, Printed at *Lyons* in 1568, are probably the ſame Book with the *Viola Animæ*; the latter differs from the *Theologia Naturalis*, only as to the Method. Which clearly appears from the bare Conſideration of the following Title: *Theologia naturalis, ſive liber Creaturarum, ſpecialiter de homine & de natura ejus in quantum homo, & de his quæ ſunt ei neceſſaria ad cognoſcendum ſe ipſum & deum, & omne debitum ad quod homo tenetur & obligatur tam Deo quam proximo.* The Author was one of thoſe Men, who, when they have Publiſh'd a Book which pleaſes them, or for which they are eſteem'd, produce it from time to time under different ſhapes, like thoſe Cooks, who ſerve the ſame Meat dreſt ſeveral ways. Every Body that I know of, ſays, that the firſt Edition of the *Theologia Naturalis* is that of *Paris* 1509; but I have one of *Strasburg* in Folio, Printed in a Gothick Letter, in the Year 1496.

(A) Flouriſhed in the Vth Century.] Some think he

---

† *Eſſays*, l. 2. ch. 12. p. 158. of the 3. tome, Par. 1659. in 12.

* 'Tis the 211.

β See Mauſſac's Prolegomena prefixed to the Pugio fidei.

γ In the Remark C of the Article Martini.

|| Naudæus in Bibl. Biogr. Polit.

‡ *See the Remark C towards the end.*

(a) Ibid. pag. 185.

(b) Bibliot. pag. 329.

(c) Bibliot. pag. 872. *upon the word* Michael de Montagne.

(d) Ibid. pag. 720.

(e) Id. id.

(f) Montagne ubi ſupra pag. 186.

(g) Ibid. pag. 187.

(h) Ibid. pag. 187.

(i) Pag. 187.

(k) Pag. 201.

(l) Pag. 186.

(m) Pag. 201.

(n) Prolegomen. Theolog. nat. n.

(o) Jacob Thomaſius, Præfat. 77. Leipſ. 1681.

(p) Comenius, de uno neceſſario, c. pag. 4

(q) See the Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque.

those two (B) Works are extant. He is said to have writ a Commentary upon St. Paul's Epistles, but it ought rather to be ascribed to one SEDULIUS a Scotch-man (C) who was much younger. We are told that a Fault of a Transcriber, the word *Hereticis*, instead of *Heroicis*, made our Poet (D) Odious, and that the Hatred conceived

he made his Poem under the Reign of *Theodosius* the Younger, and *Valentinian* III. It is said so (a) in the Manuscript of *Petrus Pithoeus*, and in another Ancient Manuscript mention'd by Archbishop *Usher* (b). If it be so, he flourished about the Year 435. Father *Sirmond* (c) found in the best Manuscripts of *Gennadius*, that *Sedulius* died in the Reign of the Emperors above mention'd. Nevertheless Archbishop *Usher* places him above the Year 470. The Reason alledged by him, *viz.* That *Sedulius*'s Work was found scatter'd among his Papers, and (d) put into a good Order, and Publish'd by the Consul *Turcius Rufius Asterius*, is not a convincing one; for that *Asterius* might very well be the same with him that was Consul with *Protogenes* in the Year 449. And tho' it were granted to Archbishop *Usher*, that 'tis he who was Consul with *Præsidius*, in the Year 494: yet there will be no necessity to grant him what he says, since there might have been some Years between the death of *Sedulius*, and the time when his Book was put into order, and imparted to the Publick (e). There is in the Old Editions of the *Carmen Paschale*, an Epistle Dedicatory in Verse, from which it should be inferr'd, that this Work was Dedicated to the Emperor *Theodosius* I; but 'tis very likely that this Epistle belong'd to a more Ancient Poem, and that it was improperly prefixed to this, by reason of the conformity of the Matter. 'Tis Archbishop *Usher*'s, and (f) Father *Labbe*'s Opinion. However it be, 'tis not doubted that *Sigebert* is mistaken, who says, that *Sedulius* flourished in the Empire of *Constans* and *Constantius*; that is, between the Year 340, and the Year 350. 'Tis also thought that *Albertus Stadensis* is in the wrong, to place him about the Year 378 (g). What is certain is, that this Poem of *Sedulius* came out before *Pope Gelasius* made his Decree, and consequently before the Year 496, in which that Bishop of *Rome* died; for that Work of *Sedulius* is mention'd (h) in that Decree.

(B) *Those two Works are extant.*] The *Paschale Carmen, id est, de Christi miraculis libri* (i) *quinque*, has been often Printed with the Epistle Dedicatory to the Priest *Macedonius* and without it. The *Paschale Opus*, which is also divided into five Books, and Dedicated to the same *Macedonius*, was Publish'd at *Paris* by *Franciscus Juretus* in 1585, from *Pithoeus*'s Manuscript. 'Tis the First Edition. Note that the Priest *Macedonius* exhorted the Author to put the *Paschale Carmen* into Prose: And therefore *Sigebert* is mistaken, who says that the Prose was Publish'd before the Verses. (k) *Sedulius Episcopus ad Macedonium Presbyterum scripsit libros de miraculis Veteris & Novi Testamenti, quos postea sub metrica lege redactos prætitulavit Paschale carmen.* We have also some other Poems of *Sedulius*: The First Edition of his Poetical Works is that of *Aldus Manutius* 1502. The best is that of *Paris* 1624, in the Eighth Volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. See Father (l) *Labbe* and Doctor (m) *Cave*.

(C) *To one* SEDULIUS *a Scotch-man, who was much younger.*] Mention is made of one *Sedulius Episcopus Britannia*, who, together with *Fergustus* a Scotch Bishop, assisted at a Council held at *Rome* in the Year 721. *Baleus*, *Simler*, and some others, call that *Sedulius* Bishop of the Southern Scotch, and say he writ the Canons of a Council held at *Rome*. The Subscriptions in the Printed Books run thus: *Sedulius Episcopus Britanniæ de genere Scotorum, & Fergustus Episcopus Scotiæ Pictus huic constituto a nobis promulgato subscripsimus* (n). *Hepidannus* (o) a Monk of *St. Gall* mentions one *Sedulius* a Scothman, under the Year 818. *Sedulius Scotus clarus habetur.* 'Tis to him that Father *Labbe* (p) ascribes the *Collectaneum sive explanatio in omnes epistolas S. Pauli*, Printed first at *Basil* in 1528. and then inserted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. 'Tis but a Rhapsody made up of several Extracts of *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *St. Jerom*, &c. *Aubertin* (q) ascribes it to Bishop *Sedulius*, who, together with *Fergustus*, assisted at a Council of *Rome* under *Gregory* II. or *Gregory* III. Here follow the Reasons alledged by Father *Labbe*. That manner of Commenting upon the Scripture, (r) does very much savour of the IX. Century, and it seems that the Author of that *Collectaneum in Paulum*, wrote likewise the *Collectaneum in Matthæum*, which is to be found in the Library of the Jesuits of *Paris*, written upon very fine Parchment, and with a very fair Hand, above Seven or Eight Hundred Years old. Were it true that the *Collectaneum in Matthæum*, and the *Collectaneum in Paulum* were written by one and the same Author, it would afford us a convincing Proof against the Learned Archbishop *Usher*, who pretended that the *Collectaneum in Paulum* was the Work of the same *Sedulius*, who wrote the *Carmen Paschale* in the Vth Century; for the Author of the *Collectaneum in Matthæum*, quotes not only the Poet *Sedulius*, but also Pope *Gregory* I. *St. Isidorus*, *Arculfus*, and *Beda*, who flourished in the VIII. Century (r). If what M. *Du Pin* (s) affirms, were true, *viz.* That the Author of the *Collectaneum in Paulum* quotes *Pope Saint Gregory* and *Beda*; Father *Labbe* would be very much to blame for not alledging that Reason against Archbishop *Usher*, and I should very much wonder that this Primate of *Ireland* should say, that the Poet *Sedulius* wrote the Commentary upon St. *Paul*'s Epistles. I don't wonder that he said so, tho' doubtless he was not ignorant that the Jesuit *Justiniani* (u) observes, that the Author of that *Collectaneum in Paulum* transcribed some words from the 21st Chapter of the 19th Book of St. *Gregory*'s *Moralia* upon *Job*; for knowing that this Jesuit says, that those words were transcribed without naming St. *Gregory*, *cujus verba transcripsit tacito ejus nomine*, he might have thought that *Sedulius* did not transcribe from St. *Gregory*, but that this Pope transcribed from *Sedulius*. He was not obliged to be of *Justiniani*'s Opinion, who does not think it likely that St. *Gregory* took something from *Sedulius*: (x) *Nec verisimile videatur Gregorium ea à Sedulio mutuatum esse, cum plane Gregoriani styli simplicitatem redoleant qui more suo hæc Apostoli verba non tam ad scribentis mentem, quam aptè ad mores informandos explicat.* What has been said shews that M. *du Pin* is mistaken.

It were not sufficient to know that *Sedulius*, the Author of that Commentary upon St. *Paul*, is a different Man from *Sedulius* the Poet; 'tis further necessary to know whether the latter was a Scotch-man. Many affirm it, but I don't find they alledge good Reasons for it. The Inscription of an excellent Manuscript in the Abby of *Fulde*, *Sedulii Scoti Hiberniensis in omnes Epistolas Pauli collectaneum*, which Archbishop *Usher* alledges as a very good Argument, can be of no force, whilst one may believe with great probability, that the Author of that *Collectaneum* is not the Poet *Sedulius*. *Tho. Trithemius* says, that these words *Sedulius Scotigena*, are prefixed to a Book of Letters, he'll never prove the Affirmative of this Question. It should be prov'd first of all that *Sedulius* the Poet is the Author of those Letters. In a word, since the Ancient Authors never said that our *Sedulius* was a Scotch-man, what may be found about it in the following Ages ought not to be minded. One might lay some stress upon it, if there had been no *Sedulius*, that was a Scotch-man; but since 'tis certain that there has been one or two, 'tis no difficult thing to apprehend that the Poet was confounded with one of 'em. See Father *Labbe* (y).

It were to be wish'd that he had made as many Discussions upon each Ecclesiastical Writer, as upon the Poet *Sedulius*. I must observe by the by, that he has very well confuted those, who pretend that our Poet was a Bishop. He alledges the silence of the Ancients; he shews that *Gennadius*'s Testimony is insignificant: *Gennadius*, says he, *Salvian*, *Prosper Aquitanus*, and some others, have been improperly styled Bishops by several Authors. The Title of *Antistes* bestowed upon *Sedulius* was bestowed upon Priests. *Dexter*'s Chronicle, wherein mention is made of *Sedulius*, *Episcopus Oretanus* in the Year 428. is a Supposititious Book. *Isidorus Hispalensis* would not have stiled *Sedulius* barely a Priest, if he had been a Bishop in *Spain* (z).

(D) *Made our Poet Odious, and that the Hatred conceived against him extended.*] 'Tis said that *Paul* II. conceived a great Hatred against the Poets, by reason of that Fault of the Transcribers, and that many Professors of the Canon Law, for the same Reason, look'd upon all sorts of Poems as Heretical Works.

What

(r) Ex Labbe ib.

(s) Du Pin ubi supra.

(u) Benedict. Justinianus in 1. ad Corinth. cap. 6. v. 5. apud Labbe ib. pag. 337.

(x) Idem apud eundem pag. 338.

(y) Labbe ubi supra pag. 330.

(z) Ex eodem pag. 331, 332.

ceived against him extended to all other Poets. *M. du Pin* * says he is *a Man of parts*, that (*E*) *there is a Noble turn in his Poem, that his Thoughts are Poetical*, and his *Verses Tolerable*. What *Moreri* says of him wants to be new Moulded from the beginning to the end.

SEGLA (*William de, Sieur de Cairas*) was Counsellor in the Parliament of *Toulouse* towards the beginning of the XVIIth. Century. 'Twas he, who made a Report of a Criminal Process, which has been placed among the Tragical (*A*) Histories of that time, and for the clearing of which *M. de Verdun*, first President in the Parliament of *Toulouse*, took all possible care. The Parties accused were at last Convicted, and Punish'd according to their Deserts: And because *William de Segla* was thoroughly acquainted with that Cause, that † President entreated him to Publish it. The Latin Letter he received from him was prefixed to the Book Publish'd by him, which contains, besides an Account of the proceedings, a Hundred and Thirty One (*B*) Learned Observations. The Family of *Segla* continues still at *Toulouse*, where they have some Offices in the Parliament.

SEYMOUR

What a ridiculous thing would this be! (†) *Veteres librarios indiligenter scripsisse, vel ex Tullii, Strabonis, Hieronymi, & aliorum querelis patet. Unde multi gravissimorum virorum errores emanarunt: quod hoc duntaxat exemplo probasse mihi sufficiat. Cum in prima parte Decreti, distinct. 15. c. 3. hæc Gelasii Pontificis verba*, Item venerabilis viri Sedulii Paschale opus, quod heroicis versibus descripsit, insigni laude præferimus, *depravata essent, & pro* heroicis, *librariorum incuria, legeretur*, hæreticis, *mendum hoc, Paulum secundum, Pontificem maximum ad Poetarum capitale odium perduxit, & plurimis aliis, Legum Professoribus, imposuit, ut omnia poemata, quamvis sacra, heretica esse duxerint; ut Pierius Valerianus, in oratione* pro Sacerdotum barbis *scriptum reliquit. O rem ridiculam, Cato, & jocosam.* Others apply this to Pope *Hadrian* VI. Read the following passage, and compare it exactly with *Boissieu*'s Words. (*a*) *Unum adhuc addam, unde pateat, quæ damna plerunque depravati Codices afferant. In Canonibus à Gratiano* digestis, dist. 15. *Ubi recitatur insigniter salutare Decretum Gelasii, hæc sententia est:* Venerabilis viri Sedulii Paschale opus, quod heroicis descripsit versibus, insigni laude proferendum. *Ibi vulgata ante hæc exemplaria pro* heroicis, hæreticis *habuére.* "*Quod bonis quibusdam* "*Canonistis suspicionem movit, Poëmata omnia esse* "*heretica, Poëtasque inter pios, etsi sacra tractent,* "*neutiquam annumerari*". *Id quod* Hadriano *illi Batavo, qui Caroli V. Præceptor fuerat, adeò persuasum fuit, ut nullum hominum genus majori prosequeretur odio, quam Poetas. Et adhuc aliqui, ut Pie-* "*rius clarissimus affirmat, non mali alioqui præsules,* "*depravata illius loci lectione inducti, neminem sa-* "*cerdotio dignum arbitrantur, qui unquam in Par-* "*nasso somniarit*". By comparing those two passages one with another, there is ground to suspect that one of those two Authors quoted *Pierius Valerianus* without reading him; for if what concerns *Paul* II. is to be found (*b*) in that Writer, how comes it that *Philippus Carolus* says nothing of it? Why does he only mention *Hadrian* VI? Take notice that what he says of this last Pope does not prove that the word *hæreticis* instead of *heroicis* made him hate the Poets. He only says that *Hadrian* VI. being fully persuaded that they were unworthy of being placed among Pious Men, hated them to the highest degree. And therefore I don't pretend to prove by the Testimony of that Author, that what *Boissieu* says of *Paul* II. is related of *Hadrian* VI. The proof I bring for it is a Passage probably occasion'd by a careless and hasty reading of *Philippus Carolus*'s Words. (*c*) *Ajunt eum* (Hadrianum) *nullum hominum genus majore prosecutum fuisse odio quam poetas, eo quod in antiquis exemplaribus Canonum à Gratiano digestorum legatur decretum Gelasii in hæc verba:* Venerabilis viri Sedulii Paschale opus, quod hæreticis descripsit versibus, &c. *cum ibi* heroicis *legi debere jam pridem monuerint viri eruditi.*

I suspect the Truth of this Account, and am apt to take it for a Story forged by the *Italian* Humanists, to ridicule the Enemies of good Literature. However I don't deny that a Fault of a Transcriber has often occasion'd great disorders. But I know that *Paul* II. and *Hadrian* VI. had some other Reasons for hating the Poets; and I cannot apprehend that Ignorance should be able to make one and the same Person Act so contrary to good Sense as to hate the Poets for the Reason alledged here, and yet to reverence Pope *Gelasius*: for it ought to be observed that the Decree into which the Word Heretick crept instead of *heroicis* contains an Encomium upon *Sedulius*'s Poem. 'Tis also to be observed that we are not told that this mistake did lessen in the least the Veneration that Pontif was in.

(*E*) *That he is a Man of parts, that there is a Noble turn in his Poem, &c.*] I shall add to *M. du Pin*'s Testimony *Borrichius*'s own Words, whereof M. *Baillet* (*d*) gives us the sense. (*e*) *Dictio* Sedulii *facilis, ingeniosa, numerosa, perspicua, sic satis munda (si excipias prosodica quædam delicta). Venantius Fortunatus* bestows some Encomiums upon our Poet.

Quod (*f*) *tonat Ambrosius, Hieronymus atque coruscat,*
Sive Augustinus fonte fluente rigat,
Sedulius dulcis, quod Orosius edit acutus,
Regula Cæsarii linea nata sibi est.

And in another place:

Majestatis (*g*) *opus metri canit arte Juvencus,*
Hinc quoque conspicui radiavit lingua Sedulî.

See some other Encomiums in Father *Labbe* (*h*).

(*A*) *Among the Tragical Histories of that time.*] There is an Account of it in the (*i*) *Mercure François*. *Violante de Bats* a Native of *Spain*, and a very lewd Woman, consented to the Assassination of her Husband, being Angry with him, because he would not allow her the Liberty of receiving her Lovers, the chief of which was an *Augustin* Monk Professor of Divinity in the University of *Toulouse*. His Name was *Peter Arias Burdeus*, and he was Born at *Granada* in *Spain*. He, and a Counsellor in the *Senechal*'s Court were the chief Contrivers of the Assassination. That Woman's Husband was kill'd with seventeen Blows in *July* 1608. *Burdeus* being Convicted of Adultery and Murder was Condemn'd to be Beheaded and Quartered, which was Executed in *February* 1609. *Violante* was likewise put to Death with some of her Ruffians. *Burdeus*'s Adultery " (*k*) was proved against him by a sufficient " Number of Witnesses, *viz*. by a Woman who " maintain'd to him and to *Violante*, that she had " seen 'em in the very Fact in the Wood of the " Farm of *Launaques*, belonging to a Convent of " Nuns; and by another, who maintain'd that she " had seen 'em going into the said Wood by themselves. There were also some other Witnesses, " one of which had seen 'em Kiss one another in " a Lascivious manner, being sat down at Table in " his Garden in one of the Suburbs of the Town. " The other had seen 'em twice in a Chamber for " the space of two hours——— That Crime was " also call'd a Sacrilege, there being some ground " to suspect that he had lain with *Violante* in a Confessionary in St. *James*'s Church; for two Witnesses " deposed that he had been two full hours in the " said Confessionary with a pretty tall Gentlewoman, such as *Violante* was. Besides, there was a " Spiritual Incest and Adultery in the case, because " *Violante* was his Daughter of Confession, whom " he own'd to have Confess'd two or three times in " Our Lady's Chappel in the Cloyster of the Convent of the *Augustins*. As for what concerns " the Murder, the Common report, &c.

(*B*) *Learned Observations.*] They are intermixed with the most curious Passages of the Ancient Authors, as it was practiced at that time. Those, which concern the disorders occasion'd by Love, and the Artifices of Curtezans, have not been forgotten. That Book was Printed at *Paris* in 1613. in 8. *Cra-*

---

* [illegible] tom. 4. pag. m. [illegible]

† In 1611. Mr. de Verdun was then first President in the Parliament of Paris.

(†) Dionys. Salvagnius Boessius not. ad poëma Ovidii in Ibid. pag. m. 127.

(a) Philippus Carolus, in dissertat. de Criticis p. 17, 18. *It is prefixed to his Notes upon* Aulus Gellius *Printed at* Nuremberg *in* 1663.

(b) *I have consulted the dissertation of* Pierius Valerianus pro sacerdotum barbis, *and I have found at* pag. 24. *of the* Paris *Edition* 1531. apud Christ. Wechel, *the sense of the whole quotation of* Philippus Carolus, *but nothing concerning* Paul II.

(c) Autor anonymus notar. ad Sannazarii Poemata epigr. 4. lib. 3. pag. 237. edit. Amstel. 1689.

SEYMOUR (*Anne*, *Margaret*, and *Joan*) three Siſters Illuſtrious for their Learning in *England* in the XVI. Century. They made a Hundred and Four Latin Diſtichs upon the Death of *Margaret de Valois* Queen of *Navarre*, and Siſter to *Francis* I. which were ſoon after Tranſlated into *Greek*, *French*, and *Italian*, and Printed at *Paris* in 1551. with this Title, *Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre*. *Nicolas Deniſot* *, who had (*A*) been Tutor to thoſe three Learned Ladies, made a Collection containing the Tranſlations of their Diſtichs, and ſome other Verſes both in their Praiſe, and upon the Death of the Queen of *Navarre*, and Dedicated it to (*B*) *Margaret de Valois* Dutcheſs of *Berry*, Siſter to *Henry* II. The (*C*) unexactneſs of thoſe, who mention'd that Collection, occaſion'd my affirming in the *Project* of this Dictionary, that the Diſtichs were a different Work from the Epitaphs on the Queen of *Navarre*. I mend that Fault now, and I do ingenuouſly confeſs, I have diſcovered the Falſity of my Conjectures by reading the *Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre*. Which ſhews that a Man ought not to be too foreward, in giving out his Conjectures about Matters of Fact. 'Tis much better to ſuſpend ones Judgment till one ſees all the Writings. I retract what I have † ſaid againſt *M. Joli*, and *M. Moreri*; and I do particularly acknowledge that they are excuſable, for calling thoſe three Siſters **PRINCESSES**, for they might have ſeen that Title prefixed to the Collection Publiſh'd at *Paris* by *Deniſot*; but I maintain ſtill they were not Princeſſes. They have been Praiſed by many Authors, particularly by (*D*) *Ronſard* and (*E*) *Nicolas de Herberai Sieur des Eſſars*, ſo well known by his *French* Tranſlation of

* He ſtyled himſelf Conte d'Alſinois, Alſinois Comes in Latin, as Chancellor de l'Hoſpital calls him.

† All theſe Faults have been acknowledged in the Extract of a Letter dated the 23, of March 1693. inſerted in the *Courier Galant* for *April* 1693.

an Counſellor in the Parliament of *Toulouſe*, who made a report of the Proceſs of the Man, who thro' an Impoſture, pretended to be *Martin Guerre*, had before Publiſh'd a like Commentary upon a Proceſs and a Sentence.

(*A*) Deniſot *who had been Tutor.*] *Ronſard* deſerves to be quoted upon this Head, tho' his Phraſes favour of the Barbarouſneſs of his Age.

Deniſot (a) ſe vante heuré
D'avoir oublié ſa terre,
Et paſſager demeuré
Trois ans en voſtre Angleterre,
Et d'avoir cogneu vos yeux,
Où les Amours gracieux
Doucement leurs fleſches dardent
Contre ceux qui vous regardent:
Voire & d'avoir quelquefois
Tant levé ſa petiteſſe,
Que ſous l'outil de ſa vois
Rabota voſtre jeuneſſe,
Vous ouvrant les beaux ſecrets
Des vieux Latins & des Grecs,
Don't l'honneur ſe renouvelle
Par voſtre Muſe nouvelle.

Ron- rd ubi ra pag. 6.

The Ode, that contains theſe Verſes, was Printed in the Collection of the Diſtichs; but *Ronſard* made many Alterations in it afterwards. I make uſe of the laſt Editions.

(*B*) *Dedicated it to* Margaret.] Chancellor *de l'Hoſpital* did not forget that circumſtance in the following Verſes, which he made for that Learned Princeſs.

Et tibi judicium, tibi doctas Delius aures
Prabuit, ac regale referſit pectus honeſtis
Artibus: eximiam raranque in Principe laudem.
Tantum nulla decus tulit unquam regia virgo.
Innumeros hac cauſa viros, ut condere carmen
Utque ſuos vellent tibi conſecrare labores
Impulit: hac fuit iis ſcribendi cauſa poetis,
Virginibuſque tribus veſtigia preſſa terendi.
Atque hic longinquis ſua cœpit prima Britannia
Aureus incrementa liber ſermone Latino.
Inde per Euripos & formidabile nautis
Invadens ſpatium Belgas devenit & urbem
Pariſiam, novus hoſpes iit perque ora manuſque.
Res placuit noſtris argumentumque poetis:
Continuoque alii maternâ vertere linguâ,
Græcâ alii, atque Italâ, mox & nova jungere verſis
Collibuit, juſtique voluminis addere formam.

(*C*) *The unexactneſs.*] *Ronſard* calls the Diſtichs of thoſe three Siſters a *Chriſtian Song*. *Richelet* who Commented upon him, obſerves that they were *Chriſtian Diſtichs*. Neither of 'em ſays any thing, whereby it may appear that thoſe Diſtichs concern'd the Deceaſed Queen of *Navarre*. Chancellor *de l'Hoſpital* intimates no ſuch thing neither. Who would have thought that they were Epitaphs upon a Queen? What do Poets commonly put into ſuch pieces but extravagant Flatteries? Can any thing be more remote from *Pibrac*'s Quatrains, or *Michael Verin*'s Diſtichs, than the Tears of Poets upon the Graves of Great Perſons? I (*b*) thought therefore that thoſe Diſtichs Styled *Chriſtian* were Moral Sentences, and not Funeral Elogies, and laviſh'd Incenſe. Others would have been deceived in it as well as I. But ſince I have ſeen that Work, I muſt acknowledge that there are more Chriſtian and Moral reflections than Poetical Praiſes, in ſome Verſes of thoſe three Illuſtrious Siſters.

(*b*) See the Project of this Dictionary pag. 364, 365.

(*D*) *Particularly by* Ronſard.] His Ode (*c*) for thoſe three *Engliſh* Ladies contains this Praiſe among others, that if *Orpheus* heard 'em, he would be their Scholar.

Mais (d) ſi ce harpeur fameux
Oyoit le chant des Serenes,
Qui ſonne aux bords eſcumeux
Des Albionnes arenes,
Son Luth Payen il fendroit,
Et diſciple ſe rendroit
Deſſous leur chanſon Chreſtienne,
Dont la voix paſſe la ſienne.

. . . .

La ſcience auparavant
Si long tems Orientale
Peu a peu marchant avant.
S'apparoiſt occidentale;
Et ſans jamais ſe borner
N'a point ceſſé de tourner,
Tant qu'elle ſoit parvenuë
A l'autre rive incognue.
Là de ſon grave ſourcy
Vint aſſoler le courage
De ces trois Vierges icy,
Les trois ſeules de nôtre âge.
Et ſi bien les ſceut tenter,
Qu'ores on les oit chanter
Mains vers jumeau, qui ſurmonte
Les noſtres, rouges de honte.

(*c*) 'Tis the 3, of the 5 Book.

(*d*) Ronſard B. 5. of his Odes pag. m. 617.

I ſhall occaſionally obſerve that *Richelet*, who made a Commentary upon *Ronſard*'s Odes, did not underſtand the laſt Verſe but one. 'Tis plain that *mains vers jumeau* ſignifies the Hundred Diſtichs of thoſe three Ladies, or thoſe Verſes which they made two and two by themſelves, in Imitation of *Cato* and *Michael Verin*: And yet the Commentator found the thing very obſcure. He thinks that *jumeau* ſignifies *like one another, becauſe*, ſays he, *they are Siſters; or 'tis an Alluſion to the Tops of Mount* Parnaſſus, *which are double, whither the Poets go to learn how to make well a Verſe, which he calls* jumeau, *as if one ſhould ſay* Parnaſſian. You may judge whether the Commentators upon the Antients Poets do not frequently deceive us, ſince thoſe who undertake to explain the Poets of their time and of their own Country, are liable to ſuch miſtakes. I could eaſily ſhew that *Muret*, who Commented upon ſome Poems of *Ronſard*, did not always rightly underſtand his *French* Words.

(*E*) *Nicolas de Herberai.*] The Praiſes he beſtows upon the three *Engliſh* Siſters are contain'd in a Letter he writ to them, which was prefixed to the Collection of Epitaphs upon Queen *Margaret*.

ceived againſt him extended to all other Poets. *M. du Pin** ſays he is *a Man of parts, that* (*E*) *there is a Noble turn in his Poem, that his Thoughts are Poetical,* and his *Verſes Tolerable.* What *Moreri* ſays of him wants to be new Moulded from the beginning to the end.

SEGLA (*William de, Sieur de Cairas*) was Counſellor in the Parliament of *Toulouſe* towards the beginning of the XVIIth. Century. 'Twas he, who made a Report of a Criminal Proceſs, which has been placed among the Tragical (*A*) Hiſtories of that time, and for the clearing of which *M. de Verdun*, firſt Preſident in the Parliament of *Toulouſe*, took all poſſible care. The Parties accuſed were at laſt Convicted, and Puniſh'd according to their Deſerts: And becauſe *William de Segla* was thoroughly acquainted with that Cauſe, that † Preſident entreated him to Publiſh it. The Latin Letter he received from him was prefixed to the Book Publiſh'd by him, which contains, beſides an Account of the proceedings, a Hundred and Thirty One (*B*) Learned Obſervations. The Family of *Segla* continues ſtill at *Toulouſe*, where they have ſome Offices in the Parliament.

SEYMOUR

* Du Pin [illegible] tom. 4. pag. m. 11.

† In 1611. Mr. de Verdun was then firſt Preſident in the Parliament of Paris.

What a ridiculous thing would this be! (‡) *Veteres librarios indiligenter ſcripſiſſe, vel ex Tullii, Strabonis, Hieronymi, & aliorum querelis patet. Unde multi graviſſimorum virorum errores emanarunt: quod hoc duntaxat exemplo probaſſe mihi ſufficiat. Cùm in prima parte Decreti, diſtinct. 15. c. 3. hæc Gelaſii Pontificis verba,* Item venerabilis viri Sedulii Paſchale opus, quod heroicis verſibus deſcripſit, inſigni laude præferimus, *depravata eſſent, & pro* heroicis, *librariorum incuria, legeretur,* hæreticis, *mendum hoc, Paulum ſecundum, Pontificem maximum ad Poetarum capitale odium perduxit, & plurimis aliis, Legum Profeſſoribus, impoſuit, ut omnia poemata, quamvis ſacra, heretica eſſe duxerint; ut Pierius Valerianus, in oratione* pro Sacerdotum barbis *ſcriptum reliquit. O rem ridiculam, Cato, & jocoſam.* Others apply this to Pope *Hadrian* VI. Read the following paſſage, and compare it exactly with *Boiſſieu*'s Words. (*a*) *Unum adhuc addam, unde pateat, quæ damna plerunque depravati Codices afferant. In Canonibus à Gratiano* digeſtis, diſt. 15. *Ubi recitatur inſigniter ſalutare Decretum Gelaſii, hac ſententia eſt:* Venerabilis viri Sedulii Paſchale opus, quod heroicis deſcripſit verſibus, inſigni laude proferendum. *Ibi vulgata ante hac exemplaria pro* heroicis, hæreticis *habuêre.* " *Quod bonis quibuſdam* " *Canoniſtis ſuſpicionem movit, Poemata omnia eſſe* " *heretica, Poetaſque inter pios, etſi ſacra tractent,* " *neutiquam annumerari* ". *Id quod* Hadriano *illi Batavo, qui Caroli V. Præceptor fuerat, adeò perſuaſum fuit, ut nullum hominum genus majori proſequeretur odio, quàm Poetas. Et adhuc aliqui, ut Pie-* " *rius clariſſimus affirmat, non mali alioqui præſules,* " *depravata illius loci lectione inducti, neminem ſa-* " *cerdotio dignum arbitrantur, qui unquam in Par-* " *naſſo ſomniarit* ". By comparing thoſe two paſſages one with another, there is ground to ſuſpect that one of thoſe two Authors quoted *Pierius Valerianus* without reading him; for if what concerns *Paul* II. is to be found (*b*) in that Writer, how comes it that *Philippus Carolus* ſays nothing of it? Why does he only mention *Hadrian* VI? Take notice that what he ſays of this laſt Pope does not prove that the word *hæreticis* inſtead of *heroicis* made him hate the Poets. He only ſays that *Hadrian* VI. being fully perſuaded that they were unworthy of being placed among Pious Men, hated them to the higheſt degree. And therefore I don't pretend to prove by the Teſtimony of that Author, that what *Boiſſieu* ſays of *Paul* II. is related of *Hadrian* VI. The proof I bring for it is a Paſſage probably occaſion'd by a careleſs and haſty reading of *Philippus Carolus*'s Words. (*c*) *Ajunt eum* (Hadrianum) *nullum hominum genus majore proſecutum fuiſſe odio quam poetas, eo quod in antiquis exemplaribus Canonum à Gratiano digeſtorum legatur decretum Gelaſii in hæc verba:* Venerabilis viri Sedulii Paſchale opus, quod hæreticis deſcripſit verſibus, &c. *cum ibi* heroicis *legi debere jam pridem monuerint viri eruditi.*

I ſuſpect the Truth of this Account, and am apt to take it for a Story forged by the *Italian* Humaniſts, to ridicule the Enemies of good Literature. However I don't deny that a Fault of a Tranſcriber has often occaſion'd great diſorders. But I know that *Paul* II. and *Hadrian* VI. had ſome other Reaſons for hating the Poets; and I cannot apprehend that Ignorance ſhould be able to make one and the ſame Perſon Act ſo contrary to good Senſe as to hate the Poets for the Reaſon alledged here, and yet to reverence Pope *Gelaſius*: for it ought to be obſerved that the Decree into which the Word Heretick crept inſtead of *heroicis* contains an Encomium upon *Sedulius*'s Poem. 'Tis alſo to be obſerved that we are not told that this miſtake did leſſen in the leaſt the Veneration that Pontif was in.

(*E*) *That he is a Man of parts, that there is a Noble turn in his Poem, &c.*] I ſhall add to *M. du Pin*'s Teſtimony *Borrichius*'s own Words, whereof M. *Baillet* (*d*) gives us the ſenſe. (*e*) *Dictio* Sedulii *facilis, ingenioſa, numeroſa, perſpicua, ſic ſatis munda (ſi excipias proſodica quædam delicta). Venantius Fortunatus* beſtows ſome Encomiums upon our Poet.

> *Quod* (*f*) *tonat Ambroſius, Hieronymus atque coruſcat,*
> *Sive Auguſtinus fonte fluente rigat,*
> *Sedulius dulcis, quod Oroſius edit acutus,*
> *Regula Cæſarii linea nata ſibi eſt.*

And in another place:

> *Majeſtatis* (*g*) *opus metri canit arte Juvencus,*
> *Hinc quoque conſpicui radiavit lingua Seduli.*

See ſome other Encomiums in Father *Labbe* (*h*).

(*A*) *Among the Tragical Hiſtories of that time.*] There is an Account of it in the (*i*) *Mercure François. Violante de Bats* a Native of *Spain*, and a very lewd Woman, conſented to the Aſſaſſination of her Husband, being Angry with him, becauſe he would not allow her the Liberty of receiving her Lovers, the chief of which was an *Auguſtin* Monk Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Toulouſe*. His Name was *Peter Arias Burdeus*, and He was Born at *Granada* in *Spain*. He, and a Counſellor in the *Seneschal*'s Court were the chief Contrivers of the Aſſaſſination. That Woman's Husband was kill'd with ſeventeen Blows in *July* 1608. *Burdeus* being Convicted of Adultery and Murder was Condemn'd to be Beheaded and Quartered, which was Executed in *February* 1609. *Violante* was likewiſe put to Death with ſome of her Ruffians. *Burdeus*'s Adultery " (*k*) was proved againſt him by a ſufficient " Number of Witneſſes, *viz.* by a Woman who " maintain'd to him and to *Violante*, that ſhe had " ſeen 'em in the very Fact in the Wood of the " Farm of *Launaques*, belonging to a Convent of " Nuns; and by another, who maintain'd that ſhe " had ſeen 'em going into the ſaid Wood by them- " ſelves. There were alſo ſome other Witneſſes, " one of which had ſeen 'em Kiſs one another in " a Laſcivious manner, being ſat down at Table in " his Garden in one of the Suburbs of the Town. " The other had ſeen 'em twice in a Chamber for " the ſpace of two hours——— That Crime was " alſo call'd a Sacrilege, there being ſome ground " to ſuſpect that he had lain with *Violante* in a Con- " feſſionary in St. *James*'s Church; for two Witneſſes " depoſed that he had been two full hours in the " ſaid Confeſſionary with a pretty tall Gentlewo- " man, ſuch as *Violante* was. Beſides, there was a " Spiritual Inceſt and Adultery in the caſe, becauſe " *Violante* was his Daughter of Confeſſion, whom " he own'd to have Confeſs'd two or three times in " Our Lady's Chappel in the Cloyſter of the Con- " vent of the *Auguſtins*. As for what concerns " the Murder, the Common report, *&c.*

(*B*) *Learned Obſervations.*] They are intermixed with the moſt curious Paſſages of the Ancient Authors, as it was practiced at that time. Thoſe, which concern the diſorders occaſion'd by Love, and the Artifices of Curtezans, have not been forgotten. That Book was Printed at *Paris* in 1613. in 8. Cu-

ras

(‡) Dionyſ. Salvagnius Boeſſius not. ad poema Ovidii in Ibid. pag. m. 127.

(*a*) Philippus Carolus, in diſſertat. de Criticis p. 17, 18. *It is prefixed to his Notes upon* Aulus Gellius *Printed at* Nuremberg *in* 1663.

(*b*) *I have conſulted the diſſertation of* Pierius Valerianus pro ſacerdotum barbis, *and I have found at* pag. 24. *of the* Paris *Edition* 1531. apud Chriſt. Wechel, *the ſenſe of the whole quotation of* Philippus Carolus, *but nothing concerning* Paul II.

(*c*) Autor anonymus notar. ad Sannazarii Poemata epigr. 4. lib. 3. pag. 237. edit. Amſtel. 1689.

(*d*) Baill Jugem les poe tom. n. 119

(*e*) Bot rich. differt. poetis. pag. 75

(*f*) Venant. For tunatus epig. 8. apud Phil. La be ubi ſupra p 326.

(*g*) Id. tio lib. de vita Sancti Martini apud ibid.

(*h*) La ib. p.

(*i*) To 1. fol verſo ſeq. ad ann. 16

(*k*) Seg Hiſt. tr gique, 14. &

SEYMOUR (*Anne, Margaret,* and *Jean*) three Sisters Illustrious for their Learning in *England* in the XVI. Century. They made a Hundred and Four Latin Distichs upon the Death of *Margaret de Valois* Queen of *Navarre*, and Sister to *Francis* I. which were soon after Translated into *Greek*, *French*, and *Italian*, and Printed at *Paris* in 1551. with this Title, *Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre. Nicolas Denisot* *, who had (*A*) been Tutor to those three Learned Ladies, made a Collection containing the Translations of their Distichs, and some other Verses both in their Praise, and upon the Death of the Queen of *Navarre*, and Dedicated it to (*B*) *Margaret de Valois* Dutchess of *Berry*, Sister to *Henry* II. The (*C*) unexactness of those, who mention'd that Collection, occasion'd my affirming in the *Project* of this Dictionary, that the Distichs were a different Work from the Epitaphs on the Queen of *Navarre*. I mend that Fault now, and I do ingenuously confess, I have discovered the Falsity of my Conjectures by reading the *Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre*. Which shews that a Man ought not to be too foreward, in giving out his Conjectures about Matters of Fact. 'Tis much better to suspend ones Judgment till one sees all the Writings. I retract what I have † said against *M. Joli*, and *M. Moreri*; and I do particularly acknowledge that they are excusable, for calling those three Sisters **PRINCESSES**, for they might have seen that Title prefixed to the Collection Publish'd at *Paris* by *Denisot*; but I maintain still they were not Princesses. They have been Praised by many Authors, particularly by (*D*) *Ronsard* and (*E*) *Nicolas de Herberai Sieur des Essars*, so well known by his *French* Translation of

* He styles himself Conte d'Alsinois, Alsinoius Comes in Latin, as Chancellor de l'Hospital calls him.

† All these Faults have been acknowledged in the Extract of a Letter dated the 23. of March 1693. inserted in the *Courier Galant* for April 1693.

ra Counsellor in the Parliament of *Toulouse*, who made a report of the Process of the Man, who thro' an Imposture, pretended to be *Martin Guerre*, had before Publish'd a like Commentary upon a Process and a Sentence.

(*A*) Denisot *who had been Tutor.*] *Ronsard* deserves to be quoted upon this Head, tho' his Phrases savour of the Barbarousness of his Age.

Denizot (*a*) *se vante heuré*
D'avoir oublié sa terre,
Et passager demeuré
Trois ans en vostre Angleterre,
Et d'avoir cogneu vos yeux,
Où les Amours gracieux
Doucement leurs flesches dardent
Contre ceux qui vous regardent:
Voire & d'avoir quelquefois
Tant levé sa petitesse,
Que sous l'outil de sa vois
Rabota vostre jeunesse,
Vous ouvrant les beaux secrets
Des vieux Latins & des Grecs,
Don't l'honneur se renouvelle
Par vostre Muse nouvelle.

(a) Ron- rd ubi ra pag.

The Ode, that contains these Verses, was Printed in the Collection of the Distichs; but *Ronsard* made many Alterations in it afterwards. I make use of the last Editions.

(*B*) *Dedicated it to* Margaret.] Chancellor *de l'Hospital* did not forget that circumstance in the following Verses, which he made for that Learned Princess.

Et tibi judicium, tibi doctas Delius aures
Prabuit, ac regale refersit pectus honestis
Artibus: eximiam raranque in Principe laudem.
Tantum nulla decus tulit unquam regia virgo.
Innumeros hac causa viros, ut condere carmen
Vique suos vellent tibi consecrare labores
Impulit: hac fuit iis scribendi causa poetis,
Virginibusque tribus vestigia pressa terendi.
Atque hic longinquis sua cœpit prima Britannia
Aureus incrementa liber sermone Latino.
Inde per Eurypos & formidabile nautis
Invadens spatium Belgas devenit & urbem
Parisiam, novus hospes iit perque ora manusque.
Res placuit nostris argumentumque poetis:
Continuoque alii materna vertere lingua,
Græca alii, atque Itala, mox & nova jungere versis
Collibuit, justique voluminis addere formam.

(*C*) *The unexactness.*] *Ronsard* calls the Distichs of those three Sisters *a Christian Song*. *Richelet* who Commented upon him, observes that they were *Christian Distichs*. Neither of 'em says any thing, whereby it may appear that those Distichs concern'd the Deceased Queen of *Navarre*. Chancellor *de l'Hospital* intimates no such thing neither. Who would have thought that they were Epitaphs upon a Queen? What do Poets commonly put into such pieces but extravagant Flatteries? Can any thing be more remote from *Pibrac*'s Quatrains, or *Michael Verin*'s Distichs, than the Tears of Poets upon the Graves of Great Persons? I (*b*) thought therefore that those Distichs Styled *Christian* were Moral Sentences, and not Funeral Elogies, and lavish'd Incense. Others would have been deceived in it as well as I. But since I have seen that Work, I must acknowledge that there are more Christian and Moral reflections than Poetical Praises, in some Verses of those three Illustrious Sisters.

(*D*) *Particularly by* Ronsard.] His Ode (*c*) for those three *English* Ladies contains this Praise among others, that if *Orpheus* heard 'em, he would be their Scholar.

Mais (*d*) *si ce harpeur fameux*
Oyoit le chant des Serenes,
Qui sonne aux bords escumeux
Des Albionnes arenes,
Son Luth Payen il fendroit,
Et disciple se rendroit
Dessous leur chanson Chrestienne,
Dont la voix passe la sienne.

. . . . . .

La science auparavant
Si long tems Orientale
Peu à peu marchant avant,
S'apparoist occidentale;
Et sans jamais se borner
N'a point cessé de tourner,
Tant qu'elle soit parvenuë
A l'autre rive incognuë.
Là de son grave sourcy
Vint affoler le courage
De ces trois Vierges icy,
Les trois seules de nôtre âge.
Et si bien les sceut tenter,
Qu'ores on les oit chanter
Mains vers jumeau, qui surmonte
Les nostres, rouges de honte.

I shall occasionally observe that *Richelet*, who made a Commentary upon *Ronsard*'s Odes, did not understand the last Verse but one. 'Tis plain that *mains vers jumeau* signifies the Hundred Distichs of those three Ladies, or those Verses which they made two and two by themselves, in Imitation of *Cato* and *Michael Verin*: And yet the Commentator found the thing very obscure. He thinks that *jumeau* signifies *like one another, because*, says he, *they are Sisters; or 'tis an Allusion to the Tops of Mount* Parnassus, *which are double, whither the Poets go to learn how to make well a Verse, which he calls* jumeau, *as if one should say* Parnassian. You may judge whether the Commentators upon the Antients Poets do not frequently deceive us, since those who undertake to explain the Poets of their time and of their own Country, are liable to such mistakes. I could easily shew that *Muret*, who Commented upon some Poems of *Ronsard*, did not always rightly understand his *French* Words.

(*E*) *Nicolas de Herberai.*] The Praises he bestows upon the three *English* Sisters are contain'd in a Letter he writ to them, which was prefixed to the Collection of Epitaphs upon Queen *Margaret*.

(*b*) *See the Project of this Dictionary* pag. 364, 365.

(*c*) *'Tis the* 3. *of the* 5 *Book.*

(*d*) Ronsard B. 5. *of his* Odes pag. m. 617.

of *Amadis de Gaule.* 'Tis ſomewhat ſtrange (F) they ſhould be ſo little known at this day.

SELEMNUS, a River of *Achaia*, had been a very Handſome young Shepherd. The Nymph *Argyra* fell ſo paſſionately in Love with him, that ſhe came out of the bottom of the Sea to go and lie with him. But when the prime of *Selemnus*'s Beauty vaniſhed away by Age, the Nymph left off going to him. The young Man died of Grief for it, and was Metamorphos'd into a River by the Goddeſs *Venus.* That Change did not Cure him of his Paſſion: *Venus* was obliged to take it upon her; ſhe granted him the Favour of forgetting that Nymph. 'Tis ſaid that from that time that River had an admirable Virtue; the Perſons of both Sexes who bathed themſelves in it, loſt the Remembrance of the beloved Object *. *Pauſanias* is in the right to ſay, That if the Water of that River had ſuch (A) a Virtue, it would be more valuable than great Sums of Money.

SELVE (*John de*) Firſt Preſident in the Parliament of *Paris*, under the Reign of *Francis* I. See his Article in *Moreri*'s Dictionary. I ſhall only add to it three or four Particulars, imparted to me by M. *Baluze*, whereby it may be rectified and illuſtrated. 'Tis not true that this Preſident was originally come from the *Milaneſe*: He was Born in (A) *Limouſin*; and 'tis very likely that he and his Anceſtors

(F) *They ſhould be ſo little known at this day.*] I ask'd ſome Engliſh-men very Learned and well verſed in the Knowledge of Books and Authors, what they knew of thoſe three Illuſtrious Ladies: They anſwered me they knew nothing of 'em. I had the ſame Anſwer from *Paris*, tho' I conſulted ſome perſons, who are hardly equall'd by any body elſe in the Knowledge of ſuch things. Thoſe three Illuſtrious Ladies muſt needs be quite unknown, ſince M. *Juncker* ſays nothing of 'em in (a) the Catalogue of Learned Women, lately Publiſhed by him. He quotes *Pitſeus* ſometimes; and therefore ſince he does not ſpeak of thoſe three Siſters, 'tis a ſign *Pitſeus* does not ſpeak of them neither. A Friend of mine had aſſured me before, that neither *Baleus* nor *Pitſeus*, who have ſo fully treated of the Writers of that Learned Nation, ſay nothing of thoſe three Siſters.

(A) *Had ſuch a Virtue, it would be more valuable.*] We muſt not believe whatever the Poets and Writers of Romances make amorous People ſay; the Deſcriptions of their Sufferings are Hyperbolical: however, it muſt be granted, that Love is an unexhauſtible cauſe of Miſeries and Diſorders. 'Tis a very neceſſary Paſſion for the Preſervation of living Creatures: 'Tis the Soul of the World with reſpect to them; nay, 'tis certain that the Divine Providence has annexed a thouſand Charms and Pleaſures to ſo neceſſary a Paſſion; but on the other hand it is attended with a thouſand Troubles. How many People can neither Eat, nor Drink, nor Sleep, and loſe their Wits upon that Account? The Number of thoſe who Die of it is greater than 'tis thought: Thoſe who Hang themſelves for it, are indeed ſcarce; however ſome do it. This concerns thoſe whoſe Love is not anſwer'd. As for thoſe who are as much beloved as they love others, they pay dear for their Pleaſures; for not to ſay, that their Reaſon is diſordered, and that their Paſſion is frequently contrary to their true Intereſt, whereby they are expoſed to a vaſt Number of Troubles; does not bare Jealouſie, which commonly attends their Paſſion, make 'em ſufficiently Unhappy? Can there be a more lamentable and dreadful Condition than that of Jealous People? Whether their Jealouſie be well or ill grounded, 'tis all one; their Torment is never the leſſer; they are no leſs perſecuted by the Chimera's and Phantomes of their Imagination; the Fire wherewith they are waſted and conſumed, is not more tolerable for it: and therefore it may be ſaid, that if there was a River that would Cure Lovers, it would be more valuable than Gold. Theſe are *Pauſanias*'s words. (b) Εἰ δὲ μέτεστιν ἀληθείας τῷ λόγῳ τιμιώτερον χρημάτων πολλῶν ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ Σελέμνου. *Quod niſi commentitium eſſet, quantavis pecunia videri poſſet ea Selemni aqua precioſior.* One ſhould ſay of that Water, ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ; but then Gold ſhould not be mention'd next to it, without being much depreſs'd in compariſon of Water. See the Margin (c). *Zuccolo* makes a very natural Deſcription of the fury of Jealouſy, when he introduces in his Dialogues, a Man extremely greedy of the ſweet Pleaſures of Love, and yet reſolved not to mind 'em, provided his beloved Object be not kind to any body elſe. (d) *Non hò già cuore di sì gagliarda lena, che baſti a reſiſtere a quel reo veleno di Geloſia,*

Che, mentre con la fiamma il gelo meſce,
Tutto il Regno d'Amor turba, e contriſta.

Siami altiera, e ſdegnoſa la mia Delia, purche non rivolga corteſe, e pia lo ſguardo ſoave altrove: mi ſia ſcarſa de ſuoi favori: avara delle ſue gratie, che tuttavia,

——*Un piu gentile*
Stato del mio non è ſotto la Luna,
Si dolce è del mio amaro la radice.

Ma non poſſo già ſoffrire, che i begli occhi ſereni, i quali acceſero nel mio petto fiamma ineſtinguibile d'Amore, habbiano a riſchiarare il foſco d'Horatio co'i raggi della lor luce.

Si nieghi a me, purche a ciaſcun ſi nieghi;
Che, purche altrui non ſplenda il mio bel Sole,
Ne le tenebre ancor viurò beato.

But becauſe he cannot expect ſuch a thing, he vexes himſelf, and eaſes his Grief only by Curſing Jealouſie as a Monſter that came out of Hell. (e) *Ma, ſe il mio male rimane affatto ſenza rimedio, non mi ſi tolga almeno, ch'io sfoghi in qualche modo il mio cordoglio co'i lamenti, e co'i pianti.*

O ſorella di morte, onde veniſte,
D'invidia figlia, fiero, horribil moſtro,
Che fai miei giorni lagrimoſi, e triſti;
Tornati a l'infernale, oſcuro chioſtro,
Che troppo co' tuoi morſi il ſen m'apriſti,
Onde il venen, la piaga, e'l dolor moſtro.

I have read in a Book Printed with the (f) Satyr upon Hermaphrodites, that a Lady having ſung (g) *with a melancholy Tune*, and made it appear by her Look, (h) *That her Heart was ſorrowful*; ſome Body ask'd her what made her ſo melancholy; and that *inſtead of anſwering, ſhe ſpoke the words of* Ludovico.

Che dolce piu, che piu giocondo ſtato,
Saria, di quel, d'un amoroſo core:
Che viver piu felice, & piu beato,
Che ritrovarſi in ſervitu d'amore,
Se non foſſe ciaſcuno ſtimulato,
Da quel ſoſpetto rio, da quel timore,
Da quel martir, da quella freneſia,
Da quella rabia detta gelozia.

Doubtleſs the Torments of Jealouſy obliged a Poet of the ſame Country, to make a (i) Sonnet, wherein he tells his Confeſſor, If you deſign to puniſh me for the Faults I have commited out of Love, enjoin me to fall in Love again, for there is no greater Pain than that.

Se pur brami punir l'anima errante,
Fa ch'io torni ad amar, che fra mortali
Non v'è pena maggior ch' eſſer' amante.

(A) *He was born in* Limouſin, *and 'tis very likely he and his Anceſtors were Natives of* Tulle.] Here are my Reaſons for it. I ſhall uſe the very Words of the Learned Man, who has been pleaſed to impart to me a Memorial for this Article. " (k) *John de Selve* was a Native of *Limouſin*: " There is no Difficulty in it. The Proof of it " may be ſeen at the Beginning of the Treatiſe " *de Beneficio*; beſides, the ſame is confirm'd by " *Gabriel Lurbam*, in his Book concerning the " Illuſtrious Men of *Aquitain*. But 'tis not known

" from

---

* Ex Pauſania lib. 7 pag. 229.

(a) 'Tis an Appendix to the Tract de Ephemeribus ſive Diariis eruditorum, Publiſh'd by him at Leipſick in 1692. in 12.

(b) Pauſan. l. 7. p. 229.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS upon Jealouſy.

(c) *To underſtand this, one muſt read theſe verſes of* Pindar, Od. 1. Olymp. *Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου.* Optima quidem eſt aqua: & aurum, velut ignis noctu ardens, coruſcat eximie inter ſuperbificas divitias.

ſtors were Natives of *Tulle*, the Chief Town of the lower *Limouſin*. A (B) Book, of which he is not the Author, is Fathered upon him; and 'tis without any good Reaſon that an Hiſtorian Accuſes him of having (C) corrupted the Memoirs of *Philip de Comines*. His true Name was (D) *John de* SALVA. Thoſe, who made the Elogies of the Firſt *Preſidents of Paris*, "† place his Death in *Auguſt* 1520. But *John Bertaud*, who made and Printed his Epitaph in that ſame Year, informs us, that he was buried at *St. Nicolas du Chardonnet* the Eleventh of *December*. That Epitaph is not upon his Tomb, but another very Modern."

SENGEBERE (*Polycarp*) a Civilian in the XVIIth Century, was a Native of *Brunſwick*. He wrote a (E) Book againſt *Salmaſius*. * "He diſputed with one *Macquin* in the Univerſity of *Angers*, for a Profeſſorſhip of the Civil-Law." *Menage*, who had been his Scholar, *did not forget to ſerve him on that occaſion; but* Macquin *was preferr'd to him, becauſe he was more Learned than he. Nevertheleſs, by reaſon of his Merit, and becauſe he was a Man of Abilities, the Magiſtrates of* Angers *beſtowed upon him a Yearly Penſion of a Hundred Crowns to keep him in their Town; and M.* de Boiſleve, *jointly with ſome others, gave him as much, ſo that he had Six Hundred Livres a Year.* There was a Deſign to accuſe him of having Bribed his Judges; but *Menage* was his Defender. Thoſe, who have Publiſh'd ſome Memoirs ‖ for *Menage*'s Life, ſay he pleaded ſeveral Cauſes in the Parliament of *Paris*, *one among others for* M. Sengebere, *who had a Mind to Divorce his Wife on account of Adultery.* 'Tis very ſtrange that he ſhould ſay nothing of it (F) ſpeaking of that

† Memorial imprinted by M. Baluze.

* Menagiana pag. 94 of the 1ſt Dutch Edition.

‖ They are prefixed to the continuation of the *Menagiana*.

"from what Town of *Limouſin* he came. There is Reaſon to believe he was born at *Tulle*, the chief Town of the lower *Limouſin*. What makes me think ſo is, that I find in an Old Record of the Year 1431. *John de Salva*, named among the Chief Inhabitants of that Town; and his Poſterity continues ſtill in that Town, but they go by the Name of *La Selve*. 'Tis very likely that the Deſcendants of the Firſt Preſident, who live ſtill at *Tulle*, changed their Name into that of *Selve*, made famous by his great Reputation. Beſides this ſtrong Conjecture, I find in the Enqueſt of Nobility by Meſſiere *Chriſtopher de Leſtang*, Biſhop of *Carcaſſonne*, and Commander of the King's Orders, made in the Year 1617. that the Firſt Preſident was the Son of *John de Selva*. Which perfectly agrees with *John de Salva*, mention'd in the Year 1431. ſince there are not a hundred full Years from that Year to the Year 1529, when the Firſt Preſident died. Beſides, the ſame Enqueſt informs us, that *Margaret de Selve*, his Siſter, was Married to *Peter de Juyé* an Inhabitant of *Tulle*.

"From whence 'tis eaſie to infer, that the Genealogy of the Houſe of *Selve*, Printed in the Elogies of the Firſt Preſidents of *Paris*, is not right, particularly in ſaying, that the Grandfather of the Firſt Preſident, was a Gentleman of the *Milaneſe*.

(B) *A Book, of which he is not the Author, is Fathered upon him.*] "(a) He is commonly ſaid to be the Author of the Treatiſe *De Beneficio*. But *John Bertaud* (b) informs us that 'tis not he but his Brother who is the Author of it. *Adde ſe. recor. Do. Joannem de Salva ſenatus Parrhiſini principem: cujus frater Joannes de Salva inter reliquos quum primis honorius, ſicuti probitatis ſuæ facile dedit documentum quum de beneficio inſignem tractatum edidit.*

(C) *'Tis without any good Reaſon that an Hiſtorian accuſes him of having corrupted the Memoirs of* Philip de Comines.] "(c) What *Belcarius* advances in his Hiſtory, Book 7. Chap. 10, does not ſeem to me likely, *viz.* That the Firſt Preſident *de Selve*, who, ſays he, was ignorant of the Hiſtory of *Lewis* XI, and *Charles* VIII his Son, corrupted and curtailed in ſeveral places, the Memoirs of *Philip de Comines*. For the Firſt Edition of thoſe Memoirs came out in 1524. But the Firſt Preſident was hardly at leiſure then to Print Books, and particularly other Peoples Works. Beſides, the Editions agree with ſeveral Ancient Manuſcripts, as it has been obſerved by M. *Godefroy* in his Preface to thoſe Memoirs.

(D) *His true Name was* John de SALVA.] "(d) So he is call'd in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to *John Raulin*'s Epiſtles Printed at *Paris* in 1521. *Robertus Raulin Joanni de Salva Pariſienſis ſenatus primo præſidi.* And in the Epiſtle, alluding to his Name, he ſays among other things, *te natura Salvum fecit, ut alios abſque improperio ſalvos faceres.* And in the Epigram Printed next to the Epiſtle Dedicatory:

"*Aſtruit ante obitum nullum cenſura Salonis*
"*Salvum. Te talem primulum ortus habet.*

"In the Relation of the Conference held at *Madrid* in the Year 1525, in order to get *Francis* I. releaſed; he is call'd *John de Salva*, in a Copy made at that time which I have by me. 'Tis true, that the Word *Salva* has been daſhed out ſince, and the word *Selve* has been put into the Margin.

"In the Treaty of Marriage between *Hercules d'Eſte* the Son of *Alphonſus*, with *Renata* of *France*, made at *Saint Germain en Laye* the 19th of *February* 1527. that Preſident, who was *Renata*'s Attorney, is call'd *Johannes de Salva*, in an old Copy of that time, which I have likewiſe by me.

"*John Bertaud* a Native of *Perigord*, Publiſh'd in the Year 1529, three Books *de cognatione ſacerrimi Joannis Baptiſtæ*; wherein making an enumeration of the famous Canoniſts and Civilians, particularly of thoſe of *Aquitain*, he ſays: *Adde ſe. recor. Do. Joannem de Salva ſenatus Parrhiſini principem.* And in the Epiſtle to *Francis de Marſillac*, Firſt Preſident in the Parliament of *Rouen*, who had Married a Daughter of the Firſt Preſident *de Salva*, he ſays: *fideliſſima uxor tua Magdalena à Salva.* The ſame made an Epitaph upon the Firſt Preſident *de Salva*, wherein making an Abridgement of his Life, he begins with theſe Verſes:

"*Salva domus dedit hanc, qui Salvos fecit utique*
"*Oppreſſos miſera conditione reos.*"

(E) *He wrote a Book againſt* Salmaſius.] Here follows a piece of *Menage*'s Converſations. "(e) *Sengebere* my Maſter in the Civil-Law writ againſt *Salmaſius*'s Book *de Mutuo*: The Sheets were ſent to *Salmaſius* as they were Printing, and he writ to me that *Sengebere* gave him no hard words, but that his Railleries were as ſharp as injurious Words. He acquainted me, at the ſame time, that he would anſwer that Book. But *Sengebere* cleared the matter better than he, and he made no Anſwer."

(F) *'Tis very ſtrange that he ſhould ſay nothing of it, ſpeaking of that Suit.*] He ſpeaks of that Law-Suit with great Ingenuity, and without any Deſign of Concealing the weak ſide of his Maſter. "(f) *Sengebere*, Doctor of the Civil-Law at *Angers*, having Accuſed and Convicted his Wife, who was a very handſom Woman, of Adultery, got her confined to a Convent, and took a Concubine in her room. A Jeſter happening to be in a Company where they were Diſcourſing of his caſe, ſaid in a pleaſant manner:

(a) The ſame Memorial.

(b) In the Book mention'd at the beginning of the laſt Paragraph of the Remark D.

(c) The ſame Memorial.

(d) Ibid.

(e) Menagiana pag. 287. of the 1ſt *Dutch* Edition.

(f) Ibid. pag. 137.

that ſuit; for it ſeems he could not forget, upon ſuch an occaſion, to mention the Service he had done to his Maſter.

SENNERTUS (DANIEL) an Eminent Phyſician, was Born the 25th of *November* 1572 at *Breſlaw*, where his Father was a Shoe-Maker. Being ſent to the Univerſity of *Wittemberg* in 1593, he made a great Progreſs in † Philoſophy and Phyſick. He viſited the Univerſities of *Leipſick*, *Jena*, and *Francfort* upon the

" ſince he had a mind to have a Whore, he might " as well have kept his Wife ". If *Menage* pleaded for the Husband upon that occaſion, one can hardly apprehend why he did not ſay ſo, when he related that *Sengebere* carried the Cauſe. He did not forget to ſay upon a leſs important Subject (*) that he had been his defender, *viz.* when there was a deſign to accuſe him of having bribed the Judges of the diſpute about a Profeſſorſhip. Which is not very intelligible, for he had been caſt. Is it cuſtomary for thoſe, who carry the Cauſe to accuſe the Perſon who loſes it, of having bribed the Judges? Would not ſuch an Accuſation concern the Judges rather than the Perſon accuſed of having bribed them? Is not a Judge, who ſuffers himſelf to be bribed, more guilty than the Briber? That Paſſage of the *Menagiana* ought therefore to be rectified; and inſtead of theſe words, *there was a deſign to accuſe him of having bribed the Judges*, it ſhould be, That there was a deſign to accuſe him of having endeavoured to bribe 'em. The Judges would not have been concern'd in that Cauſe; they would not have been forced to ſide with *Sengebere*: and it may very well happen that a Man, who caſts his Adverſary, is willing to carry his Triumph further, and load him with Confuſion, by ſhewing that he intended to have recourſe to Fraud and Bribery.

I have ſaid in another place, that ſome could wiſh this Pleading of *Menage* had been Printed. He was an Advocate very well qualified to ſucceed in ſuch a Cauſe. He might have ſaid many things fitly applyed and handſomely turn'd: and ſince the Wife was convicted, and her Beauty, tho' never ſo great, could not ſave her; 'tis to be preſumed that the Proofs of the Husband were as ſtrong as the Advocate could have wiſh'd. It was a great Advantage for his Advocate, and a circumſtance the more favourable, becauſe it afforded a ſuperiority very proper to confound the Common Topicks alledged by the Wife's Advocate. When a Cauſe about Adultery is doubtful, the Advocate who pleads againſt the Husband, ſpeaks in an inſulting manner, and ridicules him unmercifully; at which the Advocate, who pleads againſt the Wife, is a little ſurpriſed. But why do I ſay when ſuch a Cauſe is doubtful? I ſhould have ſaid even when it (a) is not doubtful. I ſhall quote *M. Chevreau* for it, who gives us the following Account of a Gentleman, who had Married a Young Woman. " (b) Ever ſince ſhe has been poſſeſt of " the beſt part of his Eſtate by Virtue of that " Donative, ſhe minds nothing but fine Cloaths and " good Cheer, and expreſſes a great Contempt or " Indifference for all the Careſſes of her Old Hus- " band.

" *Hinc dolor, hinc lachrymæ,*

" But there is ſomething more afflicting for the " good Old Man; and if you deſire to know it in a " few Words, for Men of his Age

" *Eſt indeclinabile cornu.*

" He has undeniable Proofs, as any Geometrical " Demonſtrations can be, that ſhe has made him a " Cuckold, and that his Wife, whom he uſed to call " his Treaſure, was only a Treaſure of Iniquity. Tho' " his Relations adviſed him not to make the " thing publick, he has only conſulted his An- " ger, being reſolved to get her confin'd to a Nun- " nery, by the ſame Sentence that ſhould make the " Donative void. He has mightily ſollicited, and " produced many Writings againſt her, and even " mortgaged an Eſtate in Land in order to Exe- " cute his Project. The Lady has pitch'd upon " an Advocate, who expreſſes himſelf with a won- " derful eaſineſs, and is not Covetous in the leaſt, " being as Rich as he is Voluptuous; and 'tis ſaid he " never pleads a great Cauſe for a handſome Lady, " but he has an Enjoyment for it. He mightily " exaggerated the Noble Birth, and the Perſonal " Merit of that Lady; her Virtue appearing by " her very look; the Intolerable Jealouſy of her " Husband grounded upon Dreams, and the fearfulneſs and ridiculouſneſs of the Old Man. The " Cauſe was put off in *September* till after St. *Martin's* Day. The two parties are gone, the Gen- " tleman to his Village, and the Lady to the Houſe " ſhe is poſſeſt of by the Contract of her Mar- " riage. In the mean time a Nephew of the Old " Gentleman gave him a viſit to know the par- " ticulars of his Law ſuit, of which he had but an " imperfect Account, tho' he had been told that the " Advocate of the Young Lady had abuſed him in " a moſt inſulting manner ". The Nephew adviſed him to put an end to that ſuit by a good Reconciliation, and even told him that it had been better if he had not begun it. He alledged himſelf for an example, and did not forget his Brother's Conduct. *My Brother, and I,* ſaid he (c), *don't much care to dive into things, that would vex us, if we ſhould find them out; nor does it appear to us that the greateſt Happineſs of a Husband conſiſts in being a ſhrewd diviner. We only aim at a quiet life; and 'tis our Opinion, that a Man who continually ſuſpects his Wife, muſt needs take an ill Courſe. The Remonſtrances of a Jealous Husband are ſuſpected, his Prohibitions frequently exaſperate a Wanton Woman, pre-poſſeſt with this Opinion that ſtolen Waters are the ſweeteſt: And we could never apprehend that a Tutoring Husband ſhould prove more acceptable than a Tyrannical one. Violent means betray a bruitiſh Temper; and whoever has recourſe to the Law, muſt expect to be laugh'd at by the Judges, who are wiſer in a like caſe, and take care that a Court of Juſtice ſhould not Ring with their Wives Galantry, which they conceal even from their Confeſſors. Indeed, if the Judges were to take Cognizance of all ſuch Diſorders, the Parliaments, Preſidials, Bayliwicks, and inferior Courts would not be ſufficient for it; beſides, ſuch proceedings are very chargeable, and Lawyers and Attorneys would quickly grow the Richeſt Men in the Kingdom at our coſt.* Here follows part of the Reply. " (d) I muſt needs " tell you, replyed the Uncle, that the laſt Plead- " ing of my unfaithful Wife's Advocate broke my " Heart: had he been credited, I ſhould have been " Accounted the moſt fooliſh and the moſt wicked " Man in the World. I muſt further tell you, that " I was no ſooner come out of the Court, but I " heard a confuſed voice of Book-ſellers and Shop- " keepers asking me whether I would Buy, *le Cu-* " *rieux impertinent: le Cocu imaginaire*, and *Horn-* " *combs*: Nay a wretched Shop-Boy, followed me " to the loweſt ſteps of the Court, playing, thro' " a ſilly Alluſion, upon a *Cornemuſe* (a Bag-Pipe). " When I came there all the Shop-Keepers cried " out with a Common conſent, *Horn-combs*; and I " was forced to bear a Thouſand ſilly Jeſts ". The Nephew made uſe of thoſe Circumſtances to perſuade the Husband to a Reconciliation; and offered to be a Mediator between him and his Wife, to put an end to their Quarrel (e). Perhaps the Old Man would not have been ſo lucky as *Sengebere*, who got his Wife confined to a Nunnery. His Demands muſt have been very juſt, and doubtleſs his Right was very plain, ſince he carried the Cauſe. But if we conſider the Puniſhment inflicted upon his Wife fully Convicted of Adultery, it will appear ſo ſlight, that one may cry out as in *Juvenal's* time, (f) *ubi nunc lex Julia? dormis? what's become of the* Roman *Laws*, the Laws of (†) *Auguſtus*, *Conſtantin* and *Juſtinian*? The firſt was leſs ſevere than the ſecond; for the *lex Julia* did not Condemn Adulterers to Death: but by the Law of *Conſtantin* that Puniſhment was inflicted upon them. *Juſtinian* moderated it as to Women, being contented to Condemn 'em to be whip'd and ſhut up in a Nunnery: Nay, he allowed Husbands to take 'em again at two Years end; and if they died before that time, or were not willing to have 'em again, their Wives were Condemn'd to be ſhaved, and to take the Monaſtical Habit, and to ſpend the

† *In ſtudiis philoſophicis ita profecit ut anno 1597. die 3. Maii.* [illegible] *lauream philoſophicam inter 98. candidatos quartus* [illegible] *fit. Vita Sennerti in limine operum.*

(*) *See the Text of this Article.*

(a) *This is not repugnant to what I have ſaid; for it will be true ſtill that the Wife's Advocate is leſs to be feared, when the Husband's right is more evident.*

(b) Chevreau Oeuvres meſlées pag. 52. & ſeq.

(c) Ibid. pag. 57.

(d) Ibid. pag. 58.

(e) Chevr. ibid. pag. 60.

(f) Juven. Sat. 2. v. 37.

(†) *The* lex Julia de adulteriis *aſcribed by many Learned Men to* Auguſtus *and not to* Julius Cæſar.

the *Oder*, and then went to *Berlin* in 1601. to learn the Practice of Phyſick; but he quickly returned to *Wittemberg*, where he took his Degree of Doctor of Phyſick the 10th of *September* in the ſame Year, and at a Year's end he was made Profeſſor of the ſame Faculty. He was the firſt, who introduced the ſtudy of Chymiſtry into that Univerſity, and he got (*A*) a great Reputation by his Works and (*B*) Practice. He had three Wives, and got no Children by the two laſt; but he had ſeven by the firſt. He died of the Plague at *Wittemberg* the 21ſt of *July* 1637 *. Some Adverſaries roſe up againſt him becauſe he took the Liberty to Contradict the Ancients; but none of his Opinions was leſs approved than what he Advanced concerning the Origine of Souls. He believed that the Seed of all living (*C*) Creatures is animated, and that the Soul of that Seed

* Taken from his Works. See alſo his Funeral Oration delivered by *Auguſtus Buchnerus*. It is in *Witte's Memoriæ Medicorum* pag. 88, & *ſeq*.

the remaining part of their lives in that Condition. (*c*) *Primus Conſtantinus capitis pœna adulterii crimen vindicandum conſtituit* (1) ——— *Capitalem autem pœnam Juſtinianus in maſculis probat, mulierem verò verberibus cæſam in monaſterium detrudi præcipit, data poteſtate marito intra biennium, ſi hoc exiſtimaverit eam inde revocandi, quo tranſacto, aut viro præmortuo, eam raſo capite, monaſtico habitu amiciri, & illic omni vitæ tempore manere* (2) *jubet*. That ſeverity was abated by degrees, and in ſome (*b*) Provinces an Adultreſs was allowed one half of the Eſtate purchaſed by her Husband. Pope *Honorius* III. reform'd that Scandalous Cuſtom. (*c*) *Apud Rupellenſes* ——— *jam olim invaluere nonnullæ conſuetudines, quarum duo capita à jure, & honeſtate publica abhorrentia damnavit Honorius III. P. in Epiſtola decretali ad Majorem & Burgenſes de Rupella. Primum fuit* ——— *Alterum fuit, ut mulier ob adulterium non amitteret lucrum mediæ partis omnium bonorum per virum quæſitorum conſtante matrimonio: conſuetudinem emendavit Pontifex, quoad proderat mulieribus adulteris*.

'Tis to be obſerved that the Jeſt, mention'd by *Menage* (*d*), is faulty, as moſt witty ſayings are. If it be ſtrictly examin'd, it will be found to imply a falſity; for in Mens Opinion the unfaithfulneſs of a Wife is a diſgrace to the Husband. The keeping of a Concubine is not liable to ſuch a Conſtruction, and does not require that a Man ſhould have the ſame regard for her as for a Wife; and therefore *Sengebere*'s choice did not run between like Inconveniences, as the Jeſter ſuppoſed.

(*A*) *A great Reputation by his Works.*] They are many, and have been often Printed in *France* and *Italy*. The laſt Edition, if I am not miſtaken, is that of *Lyons* 1676. It is divided into Six Volumes in Folio. The foregoing Editions were only divided into Three Volumes (*e*).

(*B*) *And by his Practice.*] Sick People had recourſe to him from all parts, and he denied no Body his Aſſiſtance. He took what they gave him for his pains, and exacted nothing; nay, he reſtored to the Poor (*f*) what they gave him. The Plague raged at *Wittemberg* above ſeven times whilſt he was a Profeſſor in that Town; but he never went away, and never refuſed to aſſiſt ſick People. The Elector of *Saxony*, whom he cured of a long ſickneſs in 1628. made him one of his Phyſicians in Ordinary, and yet allowed him the Liberty of living at *Wittemberg*. Many Dukes, Princes, Counts and Gentlemen were the better for his Remedies and Preſcriptions in their ſickneſſes. *Nicolas Sapieha* Great Standard-bearer of *Lithuania*, not knowing what to do to recover his Health, applyed himſelf to the Phyſicians of *Padua*. They adviſed him to put himſelf into *Sennertus*'s Hands (*g*). Accordingly he took a Journey to *Wittemberg*, and went home again perfectly recovered. (*h*) *Polonus* ——— *non vidit tantum atque coram admiratus* SENNERTUM *eſt; ſed mactus ingenii beneficio etiam, cùm vidiſſet, diſceſſit. Ut intelligeret, nil ſupra verum narraſſe famam: & pauciora propemodum retuliſſe: expertus noviſſimè opitulatorem feliciſſimum; quem Medicæ eruditionis principem ſalutaverat ante*.

(*C*) *That the Seed of all living Creatures is animated.*] The difficulties he found in other Opinions made him ſtick to this. The Common Doctrine of the School-Men (*i*) ſeem'd to him abſurd, *viz*. That Subſtantial Forms are not produced; for they ſay, the Attribute of being produced belongs to a Natural compound and not to its parts. He did not like *Avicenna*'s Opinion, that there is a Celeſtial Intelligence appointed for the Formation of Souls, which makes uſe of Seeds only as of an Inſtrument. (*k*) *Avicennas animas viventium non à parentibus, ſed à quadam formarum datrice, ſeu ut Scaliger Exerc. 97. loquitur formarum promicondâ intelligentiâ quam Colcodeam nominat, provenire ſtatuit, docetque cæleſtem hanc mentem uti ſemine tanquam inſtrumento ad producendam animam vegetantem & ſentientem*. Nor did he approve (*l*) *Fernel*'s Opinion, that the Heavens form Humane Souls, and ſend them into a well prepared Matter. He derided, not without Reaſon, the Common Opinion of the School-Men, that Subſtantial Forms are taken out of the Power of Matter, *educuntur è potentia materiæ*. He rejected the plaſtick Virtue which (*m*) many have aſcribed to the Seed; and therefore he thought there was a neceſſity to follow the Opinion of ſome Ancient and Modern Authors, that the Soul is in the Seed before the Organization, and Forms that admirable Machine, we call a living Body. He quotes (*n*) two fine Paſſages, one out of (*o*) *Galen*, and the other out of (*p*) *Titelmanus*, which contain a deſcription of the Art that is obſerved in Plants and Animals. *Titelmanus* takes the uſual way of Generations, to be a more amazing thing than the firſt production of Animated Beings; and indeed, one may more eaſily conceive that God ſhould immediately produce Plants and Animals, than one can conceive that the Seed ſhould have the Virtue to produce an Organized Body, a Machine ſo induſtriouſly contrived, that in Compariſon of it, all the Works of the Mathematicians are but mean and childiſh Inventions. (*q*) *Quod hæc humani corporis diſpoſitio ex operatione eſt virtutis, quæ latet in paterno ſemine (fœdiſſima, & vix nominanda ſubſtantia, quam abſque abominatione nemo conſpicit) quodque in eo tam præclara lateat virtus, corpus tam admirabile ſic efficiendi ac fabricandi, quòd tota iſtius admirabilis diſpoſitionis efficacia in illo realiter inexiſtat, id nobis meritò in immenſum aggravat pondus conſiderationis noſtræ, id prorſus ſtupidos & attonitos reddit, cogitque exclamare nos, & voce apertà confiteri, quod non ſolùm ipſe magnus ſit in ſemetipſo, neque ſolum magnus in magnis, ſed & in abjectiſſimis, contemptibiliſſimiſque & minimis glorioſus*. *Galen* could not Apprehend what is the Ordinary Cauſe of ſuch an excellent Work; but *Sennertus* fancies that the Souls contain'd in the Seed have, each of 'em in its kind, the Faculty and Induſtry of Organizing matter. (*r*) *Etſi vero Galenus cauſſam, unde illa omnia fiant, ſe invenire poſſe deſperavit, nihilque hac in re vel probabile reperire ſe potuiſſe, atque ideo magnâ triſtitiâ affectum eſſe teſtatur*, lib. de fœt. format. cap. 6. *tamen ſi conſideraſſet, iſtas operationes animæ cujuſque ſpeciei proprias eſſe, non ita difficulter cognoſcere potuiſſet, ab anima in ſemine latente iſtas operationes provenire*. I had rather ſay, as *Galen* does, that we are altogether in the Dark about it, than aſcribe to a Soul hid in a ſmall Egg, the Ability that is requiſite to form the Body of an Ant, the Body of a Chicken, &c. *Sennertus* does very well confute the Hypotheſes different from his; but he admits of certain things, which are Incomprehenſible. He ſays (*ſ*) that Humane Souls have no quantity, and that they are indiviſible, and yet that each of 'em can produce its kind; that is, that the Soul of a Dog can produce many other Souls of Dogs. This would be a true Creation, and a more difficult Work than the Converſion of the Seed into an Organized Body. Had he known the Hypotheſis, which has been Invented ſince he died, I believe

---

Auguſtus Buchnerus in orat. funebri Sennerti, apud Witmemor. Medicor. pag. 97. (*i*) Toletus, Conimbricenſes ii, apud Sennertum de generat. viventium, cap. 1. pag. . tom 1. edit Lugd. 1676.

(*k*) Sennert ib. cap. 2.

(*l*) Fernelius, lib. 1. *de abdit. rerum cauſis pluribus in locis*, acriter defendit omnem animam à cœlo proficiſci, & à cœlo animam omnem in materiam præparatam & idoneam immitti. Id. ibid. pag. 124.

(*m*) Vide Jacobum Schegkium lib. 1. de plaſt. ſeminis facultate, apud Sennert. ib. cap. 5. pag. 127.

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 130.

(*o*) Galen. lib. 3. de uſu part. cap. 10.

(*p*) Franc. Titelmanus lib. 8. Phyſ. c. 11.

(*q*) Titelmanus ib. apud Sennertum ubi ſupra.

(*r*) Sennert. ibid.

(*ſ*) Sennert. ibid. pag. 132. col. 1. & 2.

Seed produces Organization. He has been accuſed of Blaſphemy and Impiety (D) becauſe

WHETHER the general Laws of Motion are ſufficient for the Organization of Bodies.

believe he would have heartily Embraced it; I mean, the Hypotheſis mention'd by me in another (a) place, which has afforded many fine Hints to the Illuſtrious Mr. *Leibniz*; 'Tis that of the Modern Philoſophers, who having diſcovered with the help of Microſcopes that there are Animals in the Seed, think that living Bodies are Organized from the beginning of the World before they are Born. Which leads them to this thought, That ever ſince the firſt Original of things, the Souls have been United to the ſame Organized Bodies, and that Generation or Birth is only the Extenſion or Growth of the *Individuum*, which is the Primitive and continual Subject of the Soul; that this Subject is not deſtroyed by Death; that it loſe only the Particles of Matter wherewith it grew up; that it recovers new ones in another Birth, *&c.* This Hypotheſis removes the great Difficulties that occur in aſſigning the cauſe of Organization. To have recourſe to God as to the immediate Cauſe is not to Philoſophize. To have recourſe to the general Laws of Motion is but a Poor Solution; for ſince 'tis agreed by all Sects, that thoſe Laws cannot produce, I will not ſay a Mill or a Clock, but the courſeſt Tool that is in a Smith's Shop, how could they produce the Body of a Dog, or even a Roſe and a Pomgranate? To have recourſe to the Celeſtial Bodies or to Subſtantial Forms is a pitiful ſhift. We want a Cauſe which has an Idea of its Work, and knows how to form it: Thoſe two things are requiſite in thoſe who make a Watch and build a Ship; much more are they neceſſary in the Cauſe of the Organization of living Bodies. 'Tis certain the Celeſtial Bodies have no Idea of a Humane Body, and know not how it ought to be formed. The Peripateticks own that the Subſtantial Forms of Plants and Beaſts know not how Matter ought to be modified, to give it the Organs that are in a Tree or in a Chicken; and therefore they are not the cauſe of that Organization. Thoſe who ſay they are the cauſe of it, tho' they know not the Contrivance of that Work, are a thouſand times more Abſurd than thoſe, who ſhould ſay a Man can make a Clock without thinking of it, without having an Idea of it, and without knowing what he does. This Objection ſhews the falſity of *Sennertus*'s Opinion; for he would not have ſaid that the Souls he admitted in the Seed of Plants and Animals, had an Idea of all the Organs of Plants and Animals, and knew how to Frame and Place 'em in their proper Places. And therefore it had been a great help to him, if he had been told that there Organized *Individuum*'s in the Seed; for 'tis more eaſy to conceive that a Soul United to ſuch *Individuum*'s may be the Cauſe of their Growth, than 'tis to apprehend that it can Organize a drop of Liquor, and change it into the Body of a Dog.

I know ſome underſtanding Men, who pretend to comprehend that the General Laws of Motion, tho' never ſo ſimple and ſo few, are ſufficient to make a *Fœtus* grow, provided it be already Organized. But I confeſs I cannot well apprehend it. It ſeems to me, that a ſmall Organized Atom cannot become a Chicken, a Dog, a Calf, *&c.* unleſs an Intelligent Cauſe directs the motion of Matter that makes it grow; a Cauſe which has an Idea of that little Machine, and knows how to extend and encreaſe it in a due Proportion. I think it will be granted me that 'tis not more eaſy to conceive that the Laws of Motion are the only cauſe of the Building of a little Houſe, than 'tis to conceive (b) that they change it into a large Palace, in which each Room, each Door, each Window, *&c.* keep the ſame Proportions obſerved by the Builder of the little Houſe. If thoſe two things are equally difficult, why ſhould we believe that the Laws of Motion, which cannot Organize a ſmall Particle of Matter, will be able, if it be Organized, to change it into an Animal a Thouſand times bigger, all the Proportions being duly obſerved in an almoſt Infinite Number of Organs of different Nature, ſome of which are ſoft, others fluid, others hard, *&c*? I ſhould therefore think it likely that the Growth of a *Fœtus*, tho' Organized ever ſince the beginning of the World, is directed by a particular Cauſe, which has an Idea of that Work and knows how to enlarge it; as an Architect has an Idea of a Building and knows how to enlarge it, when he executes a Plan ready made, which he lays upon his Table. A great many People will grant me that Animals are unfolded and nouriſhed in Matter, and receive their Growth by the Direction of a Providence; but they'll ſay that God (c) Directs all thoſe things. I declare to them that they go from the State of the Queſtion; for we don't enquire into the firſt Cauſe, and the general Author of all things; we enquire into the ſecond Cauſe and the particular Reaſon of each Effect. To aſſign no other Cauſe than God in this Inquiry, does not become a Philoſopher. Suppoſe there were ſome Rational Inhabitants in the Planets, and they ſhould come down into one of our Houſes, and diſcover the uſe of Rooms, Windows, Doors, Bolts, *&c.* and at laſt they ſhould be contented to admire the Providence of God, who has raiſed ſuch a convenient Building for Men, would they not be rightly Accounted Ignorant? They would not know that this Houſe was Built by Men, and that a Humane Architect directed the Situation of the Stones, Boards, *&c.* according to the uſes he deſign'd them for. 'Tis true, Man receives that knowledge from God; but God is not the Natural and immediate Cauſe of that Building. The ſame ought to be ſaid of Trees and Animals; their Machines depend upon the particular direction of a Second Cauſe, which has received from God the Knowledge and Induſtry that are requiſite for ſuch a Work. The difficulty lies in aſſigning that Second Cauſe. Some will have it that the Subſtantial Form of each mix'd Body is a Spirit, on which God has beſtowed the knowledge that is neceſſary to produce the Temper and Effects of that mix'd Body. Dr. *Henry Moor* (d), who believed the Pre-exiſtence of Souls, was of Opinion, that being United to Matter, they themſelves frame an Organized Body to reſide in it. That Hypotheſis may be confuted by our Ignorance of what ought to be done, in order to put together Nerves, Veins, Bones, *&c.* It might be anſwered that the Soul forgets all thoſe Ideas, as ſoon as her Lodging is finiſh'd, becauſe the courſeneſs of the Organs of a Humane Body breaks the Communication ſhe had before with very ſubtil occaſional Cauſes. But I had rather ſuppoſe that the Soul does not direct the Motions neceſſary for the growth of a *Fœtus*; I had rather aſcribe that direction to another Spirit. If any one had a mind to rectify the Suppoſitions of *Avicenna*, he might ſay that there is a Created Intelligence, which preſides over the Organization of Animals, and makes, as it were, a kind af a general Manufacture of 'em, having a vaſt number of Workers under its direction, ſome for the Bodies of Birds, others for the Bodies of Fiſhes, &c. juſt as in our Towns there are many Trades-Men; ſome make Watches, others make Cloaths, &c.

(D) *Of Impiety, becauſe he taught that the Souls of Beaſts are not Material.*] He (e) rejects the Opinion of thoſe, who maintain that they are not of a more noble Nature than the Elements, and he ſays, that they are by their Nature as Immortal as the Souls of Men; ſo that if the latter do not Periſh with their Bodies, as others do, 'tis thro' (f) a ſpecial Favour of the Creator. He could not deny that he aſcribed an Incorporeal Nature to the Souls of Beaſts; for he acknowledged that they are not produced from Matter, and he Laugh'd at the School-Mens *Eduction*: But he would not ſay that they are Immortal. *Freitag* (g), who writ againſt him with great Fury, did not fail to object to him that his Doctrine was Impious and Blaſphematory: Which was the reaſon why a Book was Publiſh'd (h) in his Vindication, with this Title. *De origine & natura animarum in brutis ſententia clariſſ. Theologorum in aliquot Germaniæ Academiis, quibus ſimul Daniel Sennertus à crimine blaſphemiæ & hæreſeos à Joh. Freitagio ipſi intentato abſolvitur.* *Freitag* applied himſelf to all the Univerſities in Chriſtendom, and to all the Lovers of Orthodoxy, exhorting them not to ſuffer thoſe pernicious Innovations. He ask'd the Divines, whether they would bear that Impious Opinion, which aſcribed Immortality to the Souls of Beaſts, which revived the Doctrine

(a) In the Article Rorarius.

(b) Note, *that I own there is this difference between the enlarging of a Houſe and the growth of a* Fœtus *that the Organs of the* Fœtus *are Moulds thro' which a new Matter may be filtrated and diſtributed. A little Houſe has no ſuch thing.*

(c) M phorus Carter a Strig Groni in the Chap of his Treat parts tir. & legitimo, having jected al the caſes that are alledged of the mation of our Souls aſcribes to God. Sennertus ubi ſupra cap. 12. pag. confutes him.

(d) Henr. Morus animâ l. c. 4.

(e) Sennert. ubi ſupra cap. 9. p. 13

(f) Abs qua divi voluntat & peculiari erg homines grata ſi fuiſſet formæ humanæ non minus peri turæ quam b torum. cap. 14. pag. 14

(g) A P ſian and Profeſſor of Philo phy at Groningen.

(h) At Francfort 1638. in 8. Lindeni renovat pag. 2

becauſe he taught that the Souls of Beaſts are not Material; for his Adverſaries pretended that it was the ſame thing as if he had taught that they are no leſs Immortal than thoſe of Men. He rejected that Conſequence; he durſt not ſay, as others do, that the Souls of Brutes (E) ſubſiſt after the Death of the Subjects

Doctrine of the Tranſmigration of Souls, &c. (a) *Admirentur ne Theologi impiam illam de actu formarum emiſſivo, quo animis brutorum talis aſſignatur eſſentia & ſubſtantia, qui extra propriam quam informant materiam, alibi ſubſiſtere & exiſtere poſſint, opinionem? qua Metempſychoſis reducitur, Palingeneſia aſtruitur, & poculum animabus immortalitatis comparatur. Ferentne commentum de generatione formarum corruptibilium ex nihilo, è diametro ſacræ ſcripturæ adverſum & inimicum?* He ſuppoſes that the greateſt part of the Profeſſors of *Wittemberg* were willing to ſtifle thoſe Monſters; and that the great Intereſt of their Collegue prevented their riſing up againſt him. *Non ignoro Reverendos & celeberrimos Theologiæ in Academiâ Witebergicâ Profeſſores, cæteroſque Clariſſimos Profeſſores & Philoſophos, paucis de fece Sennertianâ, qui ab ipſius auſpiciis dependent, & ſputa Sennerti lingunt, quod ejus promotione gaudeant, exceptis, non tantum diſſentire, ſed & omni conatu id velle, ut errores hi in ipſâ herbâ ſupprimantur, verum ita cohiberi quod adverſus iſtum Vejovem Sennertum magnatum quorundam favore fultum ſubnixumque vix mutire & hiſcere auſint* (b). *Sennertus* complain'd that *Freitag* imputed to him ſuch Conſequences as he did not acknowledge. *Malitia verò eſt*, ſays he (c), *quod paſſim opiniones mihi affingit, quæ mihi nunquam in mentem venerunt. Inter quas non poſtrema eſt, quod ſcribit, me ſtatuere beſtialium animarum immortalitatem. Pro bono Viro Freitagium non habebo, donec monſtraverit locum, in quo ſtatuerim, animam canis, equi, bovis, leonis, anſeris, anatis, corvi, & ſimilium brutorum eſſe immortales, & poſt mortem ſupereſſe. Conſequentia verò, quibus id è meis opinionibus extorquere vult, nulla ſunt. Etſi enim inſectorum, & ſponte natorum formæ corpore organico ad ſenſum diſſoluto in materia inſtar ſeminis ſeſe habente aliquandiu conſiſtere poſſint: tamen immortales non ſunt, ſed ſuo tempore abolentur. Neque ideò animæ brutorum ſunt immortales, quia ex nihilo à Deo creatæ ſunt. Neque enim immobilis, ut putat regula eſt, quod aliquid quod ſemel fuit, in nihilum redigi nequeat. Longè rectius J. C. Scaliger, exerc.* 307. *ſect.* 20. *ſcribit &c.* It may be that *Sennertus*, tho' a Man of great Parts, did not perceive that the Conſequences aſcribed to him, did naturally reſult from his Principle; but 'tis more likely that he perceived them, but durſt not own them, *propter metum Judæorum*. And therefore he rather choſe to be accounted a Man, who did not argue well, than to expoſe himſelf to the Conſequences of the Doctrine of the Immortality of Beaſts. However it be, any Philoſopher who pretends to argue Conſequentially, will rather ſay, That he knows not what the Souls of Beaſts are, than maintain on one ſide, that they are produced out of Nothing, independently upon Matter, and on the other, that they are not created Beings, and that they are annihilated as ſoon as Brutes ceaſe to live. Such was *Sennertus*'s Opinion: His Apologiſt (d) poſitively declares that the Souls of Beaſts are made out of Nothing, and yet that they are not Created. He quotes *Dannhawerus* (e), who alledged the *ſpecies intellectuales* to ſhew that whatever is made out of Nothing, is not a Created Being. He quotes *Thummius* (f), who alledged the Habits of the Soul to prove the ſame thing. Thus the Peripateticks elude every thing with Arguments *ad hominem*. *Freitag* does continually object to *Sennertus*, that he believes the Immortality of the Souls of Beaſts; he falls into a Poetical Enthuſiaſm to exhort all manner of Beaſts to ſhout with Joy; he pretends that our Phyſician revives the idle Fancies of *Paracelſus*, who taught that all Souls return'd into the World from time to time. (g) *Plaudite, ait, oves & boves, lupi & ſcarabæi, & veſpæ & quicquid uſpiam crabronum eſt.*

Vita equidem veſtris animis à funere reſtat,
Reſtat & in corpus poſſe redire novum.
Forſitan animæ quod obivis eſſe poteſtis,
Dum triplicis mundi flamma reſolvat opus,
Dicitque quæ vobis ſtatio & fortuna ſuperſit,
Cum ruat in priſcum machina trina Chaos?

Subjicit. Hi ſcilicet ſunt fructus floreſque novæ doctrinæ à Paracelſo profectæ, quam Chriſtiani etiam (proh pudor!) ſere amplecti non erubeſcunt, quæ ſtatuitur formas rerum præter humanam corruptibilium, officio informationis functas, eſſentiam & exiſtentiam ſuam ſervare, ubi Paracelſus addit eas ire ad Orcum & Iliadum ſuum, & quotannis aut certo temporibus redire in mundi theatrum, & aſſumpto fabricatoque corpore perſonam ſuam pro ævo ſibi deſtinato ſuſtinere, eaque depoſita viciſſim ad ſuos ibi avos & proavos immortali quiete beatos redire. *Sperlingen* (h) anſwers in few words, That it is neither his nor *Sennertus*'s Doctrine: And therefore he tacitly confeſſes they know not how to draw from a Principle the Conſequences ariſing from it, and that they aſcribe a very ſtrange Conduct to God, *viz.* That he has ordered an almoſt infinite number of Incorporeal Subſtances to be Created, which he quickly Annihilates. Heat produces every year a prodigious number of little Animals, which live no longer than the Heat laſts. Is it not a very ſtrange thing that ſo many Spiritual Souls ſhould be annihilated, becauſe there happens ſome alteration in the Organs of Animals? 'Tis to be obſerved that the School Philoſophers have made uſe againſt the Carteſians of the Arguments alledged by *Dannhawerus* and *Thummius*. They brought in ſome Inſtances, to ſhew that ſome things are produced out of Nothing, and yet are not properly Created. The Accidents of Matter afforded them thoſe Inſtances; but the Carteſians anſwered, that thoſe Accidents are not Beings diſtinct from the Subject in which they are: And therefore the Arguments made uſe of to prove that Subſtantial Forms would be Created Beings, cannot be retorted. The Carteſians reduce all the Alterations of Matter to Local Motion, and pretend that the Motion of a Body is the Body it ſelf, as it receives Exiſtence with new Relations. They muſt therefore acknowledge that Matter, conſidered as being in Motion, is Created, and that God alone can produce Motion; for none but God can Create. But the School-Men have recourſe to ſome other Examples; they ask whether the free Acts of a Man's Soul are diſtinct from the Soul. If they are diſtinct from it, they are a Being produced out of Nothing, and yet not Created; and therefore it may be ſaid that Subſtantial Forms are not Created. If they are not diſtinct from it, a Man's Soul, conſidered as having Ill Thoughts, muſt be Created: And therefore 'tis not the Soul that Forms an ill act of her Will; for ſince it is not diſtinct from the ſubſtance of the Soul, and ſhe cannot be the cauſe of her own Exiſtence, it plainly follows, that ſhe cannot be the cauſe of any of her Thoughts. She is not therefore anſwerable for willing Ill Things *hic & nunc*, no more than for Exiſting *hic & nunc*. The Carteſians know not how to Anſwer that Objection: The Perplexity they are in brings in again the Doctrine of Subſtantial Forms, and all the Chimera's of the Schools, becauſe the Arguments alledged by them prove too much. Such is the fate of Diſputes: They ſpring again out of their Aſhes; the Party ready to lay down their Arms find at laſt ſome Retorſion, whereby they recover their Ground, and diſpute it as before.

(E) *As others do, that the Souls of Brutes Subſiſt.*] *Joannes Scotus Erigena* (i) maintain'd not only that they are not Material, but alſo that they preſerve their life after the death of Brutes. *John Lippius* Profeſſor of Divinity at *Straſburg* taught the ſame thing. Dr. *Henry Moor* believes they ſubſiſt out of the Body, and thinks it probable enough that

(h) Mendacium eſt, brutorum animas nobis immortales & poſt mortem ſuperſtites eſſe. Mendacium eſt, nobis animas illas ubique eſſe, & abſque omni in mundo vagari materia. Mendacium eſt, nobis ortum ac interitum hominum & brutorum unum eundemque eſſe. Mendacium eſt, nobis bruta & homines formâ ſimiles & materiâ pares eſſe. *Ibid. pag.* 210.

(i) Subſtantiam incorpoream docuerunt *Joannes Scotus Erigena, lib.* 3. *de diviſione naturæ, n.* 41. . . . *Joan. Lippius* . . *in Myſtaphyſica magna lib.* 2. *c.* 1. *pag.* 386. . . . *ille*, adverſus Baſilium & Gregorium Nyſſenum diſputans, vitam ſeparatas à corpore non amittere; *hic*, quoque ſejunctas in aere exiſtere atque modo aliquo operari opinatur, forte cum univerſo olim in nihilum redigendas. *Joan. Cyprianus, Hiſtor. animal. continuat. pag.* 24.

hanne Sperlingen, Phyſ. Prof. P. *Wittemberg* 1638. *in* 8.
) Sperlingen pag. 182. *of the Book, the Title of which I have*
now ſet down. (e) Dannhawerus, in Collegio Pſych. diſ-
(f) Thummius in Diſputat. de traduce. (g) Sper-
ubi ſupra pag. 206, 207.

Subjects which they have animated. His Opinion about the cause of Metals and Minerals was somewhat singular; he believed they are (F) formed by Intelligent and Spiritual Beings.

SENNERTUS,

that they continue to live in that State, but dares not affirm it: Only he alledges reasons pro and con (a). I have verified what a Professor of *Leipsick* ascribes to him. (b) *Morus & superstites* (*animas brutorum*) *& in corpora alia remeare tradit cap.* 2. (c). That Professor tells us a curious thing, *viz.* That a certain Man had taught few years before, that if Man had not sinn'd, Brutes had never died, and that they shall be raised with Men, to be Transported into Heaven; which is the Opinion of the Turks. (d) *Absurdissime omnium M. B. Semigentilis & semi Christianus ante paucos annos cum monstrosis opinionibus aliis etiam hanc protulit, bruta nisi peccavisset homo, moritura non fuisse, atque eadem tamen licet nunc moriantur, cum hominibus olim resuscitanda, & ab hoc centro mundi ad liberiora cœli spatia transferenda; quod somnium olim Muhammedo à Turcis hodie creat, teste est* Joh. Andreas in libro de Confusione Sectæ Muhammeticæ. He observes that according to *Taurellus*, the Souls of Beasts are Spiritual, and yet die with their Bodies. Perhaps *Taurellus* argued Incoherently for fear of exposing himself; he rather chose to prejudice his Reason than his Fortune. Or perhaps he and *Sennertus* came to believe, out of a Principle of Religion, that God destroys the Souls of Beasts, that none may subsist for ever but those of Men. Perhaps it was the Opinion of the most Eminent Rabbin that flourish'd in the XVIIth Century; for being to prove that the Souls of Brutes do not subsist after this Life, as Mens Souls do, he does not alledge any Reason taken from the Internal Constitution or Essence of those Souls. He makes use of an odd Argument: We often Dream, says he, that we see dead People; but we never see in a Dream any Animal after its Death, tho' it has been familiarly Bred in our Houses. *Spizelius* rejects this Logick with great reason; but he should likewise have denied the Fact. A great many People may contradict the Rabbin; they Dream a thousand times of their dead Dogs and Horses. (e) *Satis ineptè Menasse Ben Israel* lib. I. de Resurr. Mort. cap. IX. *contendit*, Animam hominum, non brutorum esse superstitem ex eo, quod sæpe de illis somniemus qui jam diu è vita excessere, tamen nunquam somniemus de ulla bestia, quæ mortua sit, etiamsi nobis familiaris ac domestica fuerit. Take notice that the pretended Blasphemies charged upon *Sennertus*, by a Physician and Professor of Philosophy at *Groningen*, were not look'd upon as an ill Doctrine by the *German* Divines. *Non negandum est, post Franzii librum* (f) *hunc aliquoties editum Theologos Lipsienses, Rostochienses, Basileenses, Regiomontanos quinquaginta abhinc annis de animâ bestiarum interrogatos, inclinasse magis in Danielis Sennerti opinionem, cui asserenti animas brutorum olim ex nihilo creatas, & hodie etiam alterius quam elementaris naturæ esse, blasphemiam & hæresim* Johannes Freitagius Professor Medicus Groningæ *intentaverat. Enim verò & eosdem nominatos Theologos legimus in Responsis suis candide disceptationem de naturâ elementari ejus animæ à se ad Philosophos devolvisse, eorumque libertati permisisse* (g).

I shall make a Reflection before I conclude this Remark. Tho' *Sennertus* said that the Souls of Brutes do not Subsist after this Life, as Humane Souls do, he laid down a Doctrine, whereby it plainly appears, that the Souls of Beasts are of the same Species with those of Men. The difference of their Fate, as to Duration, does not proceed from the difference of their Perfections, but from the free-will of the Supreme Master, who is a cause wholly External. Medals and Money are an Image of the Conduct which that Physician ascribes to God. Medals are stamp'd to last for ever; Money is coin'd to last till a new Order to the contrary; for after a certain time it is cried down, and melted and converted into other Species: And yet Medals and Money are made of the same Metal. According to *Sennertus* a Humane Soul is like Medals, and the Soul of a Brute is like Money. This is a dangerous Opinion; it would follow from thence that we cannot be sure of the Immortality of our Souls but by Revelation. *Honoratus Fabri*, a Jesuit, who uses *Sennertus* with the utmost Contempt, and taxes him with grounding his Doctrine upon frivolous Objections and Answers, maintains that this Opinion is somewhat Impious. (h) *Ad rationes n. 2. & 3. adductas nonnulla reponit,* (Sennertus, Hypomen. 4. c. 10.) *quæ nemo sapiens refellere dignetur: v. g. vult, animam rationalem ex natura & indole sua immortalem non esse, sed tantum ex voluntate ac decreto Dei; sed contrarium demonstravit, & hoc nonnihil impietatis sapit: præterea vult semen decisum divina benedictione carere, ac proinde animam, quæ ipsi inerat, interire; si hæ nugæ non sint, nusquam invenies* —— *Denique quod adducit ex scriptura crescite & multiplicamini* —— (i) *plusquam inane est* —— *sed hæc mittamus, sinamusque hominem, ut egregium medicum, ita vix mediocrem Philosophum, & prorsus Catholicum* (k). But notwithstanding his great contempt for the Philosophy of that Physician, he takes his Objections against the common Opinion of the School-Men, concerning the Souls of Brutes, to be un-answerable. He approves none of the Hypotheses confuted by *Sennertus*; and all that he says comes to this, that the Souls of Beasts are not produced anew, that they are not absolute Beings, but a *Resultance* of a certain Mixture of the four Elements (l). This is an absurd Opinion, which might lead one to say the same of Humane Souls.

(F) *He believed that* Metals *are formed by intelligent and spiritual Beings.*] He did not say what his Antagonist imputed to him, that a Stone produces another Stone, and a piece of Gold another piece of the same Metal; but he said that some Spirits, whose abode was unknown to him, and who keep only in certain places, thrust themselves into Mines and Quarries, where they produce the several sorts of Fossiles that are to be found in 'em. Let's see how he expresses himself: He invented not this Opinion; many Learned Men have had the same thought. (m) *Malitiosè & illud mihi affingit; quasi statuam in lib. de consens. & dissens.* cap. 9. *quod lapis lapidem, gemma gemmam, metallum metallum generet. Neque enim tam stultus sum, ut credam, hunc adamantem, hanc crystallum, hoc aurum generare alium adamantem, aliam Chrystallum, aliud aurum, sicut planta una aliam, aut bos bovem,* (*hæc enim generatio solum viventium est*) *generat. Hæc verò mea, Anshelmi Boetii, & aliorum doctorum Virorum mens est, omnia metalla, lapides, gemmas, quæ hactenus è terra eruta sunt,* & *adhuc eruuntur, omnia in prima creatione secundum individua creata non esse, sed fodinas gemmarum & metallorum quod alleg. loc. pluribus historiis probavi, iterum repleri: & esse quosdam spiritus formam architectonicam metallorum* & *gemmarum in se continentes, qui in terra, quisque secundum suam speciem, producant metalla, lapides, gemmas, iisque figuram, colorem, & alia propria accidentia tribuant, & hos spiritus in fodinas* & *matrices gemmarum* & *metallorum sese diffundere, atque ista metalla & gemmas producere. Idque esse formas metallorum multiplicari, dixi. E quibus autem sedibus & locis spiritus illi proveniant, nobis ignotum est, ut pote ignorantibus quanam globi terreni in terra constitutio sit. Hoc certum est, spiritus istos non ubivis terrarum reperiri, sed in quibusdam saltem locis.* This seems to be Absurd; but if it be considered, 1. That a good Philosopher must assign another Cause of the *Phænomena* than God's Will: 2. That neither the Earth nor the Elementary Qualities of *Fossiles*, nor their Substantial Forms, seem capable of any Effect, that requires a certain disposition of Parts: I say, if this be considered, and besides that one cannot apprehend that the Laws of Motion should be able to place the Particles of Matter exactly as they ought to be in order to make Gold, a Diamond, an Emerald, &c. or to chuse those that are fit for it, that Opinion of *Sennertus* seems to have some Probability in it. Can the virtue of Bodies, and the general Laws of Motion make any thing in

our

(a) Henr. Morus de anima, l. 2. c. 6. n. 105. p. m. 106.

(b) Joan. Cyprianus ubi supra.

(c) *He should have added* lib. 2. pag. 90.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Substantiam incorpoream docuerunt... *Nicolaus Taurellus* ... *in libello de vita & morte quæst. altera, proposit.* 1 v... brutorum animas à morte superesse negat. *Id. ibid.*

(f) Spizelius, in Scrutinio Atheismi pag. 125.

(g) *That is*, Historia animalium sacra, *written by* Wolfgang Franzius *Doctor of Divinity, where these words are to be found* cap. 2. p. m. 14. Sciendum est *animum bruti non esse spiritum*, *incorporeum*, qualis est nostra mens, invisibilis & immortalis, alias quoque bruta essent immortalia. (g) Joh. Cyprianus ubi supra pag. 27.

(h) Hono ratus Fa bri, Tr. de generat. homini lib. ... propofit. 170. pag. 531. edit. Norimberg. 1657.

(i) He says in another place: Bonus Sennertus frustra se torquet & recurrit ad suum Crescite & multiplicamini; frustra alios ignorantiæ accusat, rerum istarum Philosophicarum satis imperitus. Id. lib. de generat. animal. proposit. 66. pag. 178.

(k) I think it should be Acatholicum.

(l) See his 5. Book De generat. animalium proposit. 56. & seq. pag. 164. & seq.

(m) Daniel Sennertus, epistola ad Joh. Sperlingen: It is in Sperlingen's Tract, Intitled, Defensio tractatus de origine formarum.

SENNERTUS (*Andrew*) Profeſſor of the Oriental Languages in the Univerſity of *Wittemberg* his Birth-place, Publiſh'd a great (*Z*) many Books, whereby it appears, that he Learnedly and Worthily diſcharged the Duties of his Profeſſorſhip. He exerciſed it † 51 Years, and died the 22d of *December* 1689, being 84 Years of Age *. He learn'd ‖ the Arabick Tongue of *Golius* at *Leyden*, and found out a very good Method to teach it. Dr. *Pocock*, who was an extraordinary good Judge, α gave him that Encomium. He has been commended for many other things in his Funeral Oration, and particularly for this, *viz.* That his Charity and Temperance procured him the advantage of attaining to a great Old Age, with the Vigour of the Body and Mind, that is neceſſary to a ſtudious Man, and a Profeſſor β.

SERBELLON, an Italian Family, which has afforded many Men of Note, as will appear hereafter. According to Fabulous γ Genealogies, it derives its Original from *Cordubellius*, the Head of the *Spaniards* in the time of *Scipio Africanus*. We are told, that ſome Ages ago, it was divided into Three Branches, becauſe Three Brothers left *Burgundy*, where their Family flouriſh'd, and one of 'em went to the Kingdom of *Valencia*, the other to *Naples*, and the Eldeſt to *Milan*. The Spaniſh Branch removed long after into *Sardinia*, where it continues to this Day. That of *Naples* is extinct, or has been reunited to that of *Milan*, which made a greater ſhow than the reſt, and is ſtill conſiderable δ. The Perſons I am going to ſpeak of deſcended from it.

† *Witte, Diar. biograph. tom. 2. p. 175.*
* *Id. ib.*
‖ *Conradus Samuel Schurzfleiſchius orat. funeb. Andreæ Sennerti p. 91 edit. Witt. 1697.*
α *Id. ib.*
β *Id. ib. pag. 94.*
γ *Gio. Pietro de Creſcenzi nel ſuo Anfiteatro Romano apud Prioratum, Scen. d'huom. illuſtri.*
δ *Priorato ibid.* and obſerve that his Book was Printed in 1659.

SERBELLON (*John Peter*) was the Father and Uncle of ſeveral Illuſtrious Perſons. He Married in 1506. *Elizabeth Rainoldi*, a Woman of a Noble and Ancient Family in *Milan*, and Aunt of *John Baptiſt Rainoldi*, Preſident of the Senate of that Town. He had by her Five Sons and Two Daughters: one of the two Daughters was a Nun; the other Married the Count *de Macagno*. *Gabriel* his Eldeſt Son, was a very great Captain. I ſhall beſtow an Article upon him. The Second, whoſe Name was *John Baptiſt*, took Orders, applied himſelf to the Court of *Rome*, was made Biſhop of *Caſſano* in *Calabria*, where he did not reſide, becauſe he was employ'd in many important Intrigues at *Rome*, and was appointed by *Pius* IV. Governor of the Caſtle of *St Angelo* during his whole Pontificate. The Third Son of *Peter Serbellon* was call'd *Fabricius*: I ſhall alſo beſtow an Article upon him. The Fourth Son was *John Antony*, who was Biſhop of *Foligno*, and then of *Novara*, and the firſt Cardinal whom Pope *Pius* IV. made in the Year 1560. He was Governor of ſeveral Towns in the Eccleſiaſtical State, Legate of *Peruggia* and *Romagna*, Biſhop of *Oſtia* and *Velletri*, and Died Dean of the Sacred College in 1591. He was a cunning Politician, who had a Hand in the moſt ſecret Negotiations of the Court of *Rome* under *Pius* IV. *Pius* V. *Gregory* XIII. and *Sixtus* V. Being Couſin to *Pius* IV. he eaſily obtain'd ſome Privileges for the College of Doctors at *Milan*. He found it more difficult to get 'em Confirm'd by *Sixtus* V. who was reſolved to ſuppreſs 'em; but at laſt he carried his Point, and even got thoſe Privileges amplified. The laſt Son concern'd himſelf only with his Domeſtick Affairs. Our *Serbellon* had a Siſter call'd *Cecil*, who was Married in 1485, to *Bernard* (*A*) *de Medicis*. She had Six (*B*) Sons and Seven Daughters ε.

SERBELLON (*Gabriel*) Eldeſt Son of the fore-going, was a famous Warrior in the XVI Century. He was Knight of *Malta*, and great Prior of *Hungary*. He gave good Proofs of his Valour when he defended *Strigonia* againſt the *Turks*, and ſignaliz'd himſelf ζ at the famous Paſſage of the *Elbe*, and at the Battle that was fought immediately, in which *Charles* V. obtain'd ſo great a Victory over the Duke of *Saxony*. He was Lieutenant General of the Imperial Army. He had the ſame Poſt in *Italy* in the Army of the Marquiſs *de Marignan* his Couſin, during the War of *Siena*, and that place Surrendred to him at laſt. He had before ſubdued η *Saluſſes* in *Piedmont* for the Emperor *Charles* V. After the taking of *Siena*, he took ſome

ε Taken from Count *Gualdo Priorato, Scena d'huomini illuſtri.*
ζ In 1547.
η In 1552.

---

our Shops, and Laboratories without our direction? Could they make a Shoe, a Glove, a Needle, if Men did not meddle with them? How then can one believe that they produce without any direction a vaſt number of Things, a thouſand times more difficult than our Clocks?

(*Z*) *Publiſh'd a great many Books.*] You'll find a Catalogue of 'em in the Second Volume (*a*) of *Witte's Diarium Biographicum*, out of which I ſhall only Tranſcribe the following Lines: *Athenæ & inſcriptiones Wittenbergenſes. Diſſertatio de quatuor linguæ Ebraicæ ætatibus. Scrutinium religionum, de religionum varietate, & una ſola Chriſtiana & vera. De principio religionis in genere, & Chriſtianæ in ſpecie. De punctorum vocalium Ebr. neque cum literis, neque cum verbo Dei coævitate; de Urim & Tummim.*

(*A*) *Bernard de Medecis*]. *Priorato* ſeems to approve (*b*) thoſe, who ſay that this *Bernard* was of the Family of *Medicis*, which has obtain'd the Supreme Power at *Florence*; but many other Writers call the Family of *Pius* IV. by the Name of *Medequin* and not by that of *Medicis*.

(*B*) *She had ſix Sons, and ſeven Daughters.*] *John James* the Eldeſt Son, was the famous Marquis *de Marignan*, one of the greateſt Captains of his Age. The Second, who was made Cardinal by *Paul* III. was elected Pope in 1559, and took the Name of *Pius* IV. Two other Sons of *Cecil Serbellan* were Marquiſſes of *Marignan* one after another, after the Death of their Eldeſt Brother. Their Brother *Gabriel* ſerved in the Armies of *Charles* V. with great Courage: The Younger Brother died a Child. Of the Seven Daughters, none but two, *viz. Margaret* and *Clara*, remain'd in the World; the other five were made Nuns. *Margaret* Married the Count *Gilbert Borromeo*, and was the Mother of St. *Charles Borromeo*. *Clara* was the Wife of Count *Mark* (*c*) *Altaemps*. I have mention'd in another (*d*) place, a Cardinal, who proceeded from this Marriage.

Page 172, 173.
Ber-
do
lla no-
liſſimi
milia de
dici,
ſi era
ſcritto
habita-
da Fio-
nza in
lano
me ſcri-
Ber-
dino
rio.

(*c*) *Taken from Count* Gualdo Priorato Scen. d'huomini illuſtri.
(*d*) *In the Article* Altaemps.

ſome other Towns in *Tuſcany*, which refuſed to acknowledge the Houſe of *Medicis*; and being made General of the Holy Church, both by Sea and Land, under the Pontificate of *Pius* IV. he recovered *Aſcoli*, built ſeveral Fortreſſes in the Eccleſiaſtical State, fortify'd the Caſtle of *St. Angelo*, re-built *Civita Vecchia*, and performed many other things of that nature; for he was a very good Engineer, which was the Reaſon why, after the Death of *Pius* IV. the King of *Spain* ſent him into the Kingdom of *Naples*, and into *Sicily*, to take a view of all the Places, and order what he ſhould think fit. Being gone occaſionally into the Iſle of *Malta*, he drew the Plan, and laid the Foundations of the New Town †. The Duke of *Alva* would have him with him in the famous Expedition of the *Netherlands* ‖. *Serbellon* was General of the Artillery, and went conſtantly before to make the Ways ready; ſo that he had a great ſhare in the glory of that famous March, one of the moſt remarkable Operations that ever was ſeen in that kind. Tho' the Engineer *Paciotti*, whom the Duke of *Alva* obtain'd of the Duke of *Savoy*, directed the Conſtruction of the Citadel of *Antwerp*; yet 'tis certain, that *Serbellon* was the Chief Supervisor of that Work β. He return'd ſome time after into *Italy*, and was at the Battle of *Lepanto*, where he got a great glory. He was there Captain General of the Artillery, and Commander of a Squadron of Spaniſh Galleys. He was ſo much for giving Battle, that he made *Dom Juan of Auſtria* reſolve upon it. The Year following he commanded in *Sicily*, and was made Viceroy of *Tunis*. The *Turks* having taken *Goulette*, beſieged him with ſo many Troops in *Tunis* γ, where the Citadel he was building was not yet finiſh'd, that after they had been repuls'd in four ſeveral Aſſaults, at laſt they took the Place with main Force. He was made Priſonner, and carried to *Conſtantinople*. He was exchanged *(A)* for 36 Turkiſh Officers taken at the Battle of *Lepanto*. When he arrived at *Milan*, his Birth-place, in 1575, that City expreſſed their Joy publickly for his Arrival. He was Leutenant-General of the Marquis *d'Aimonte*, Governor of the *Milaneſe*, the two following Years, that is, he govern'd that Country alone; for the Governor durſt not ſtay in it by reaſon of the *Plague*. Afterwards *Serbellon* received Orders to repair to the *Netherlands*, to Command there immediately under *Dom Juan* δ. He brought thither two Thouſand Men raiſed in the *Milaneſe*. That Prince had a great Eſteem for him, and called him Father. He entruſted him with the Care of haſtening, as much as he could, the Conſtruction of the Citadel of *Namur* ε; but they fell *(B)* ſick both of 'em, which put a ſtop to the Work. *Dom Juan*, who was only in the 33d Year of his Age, died of his Sickneſs; *Serbellon*, tho' above Seventy Years old, recovered of his ζ. He had a great ſhare in the *(C)* taking of *Maeſtricht*, and return'd into *Italy* towards the latter end of the Year 1579. He had been choſen to Command the Army which *Philip* II. intended to ſend into *Portugal*, to ſeize on that Kingdom as ſoon as Cardinal *Henry* ſhould die; but he could not Crown his glorious Life with that great Exploit, for he died in *January* 1580, being ready to go into *Spain* η. One of his Sons was kill'd at the Siege of *Tunis* θ.

† Ex Priorato ubi ſupra.

‖ In 1567.

β Ex Strada de bell. Belg. 1. Dec. l. 6. & 7.

γ In 1571.

δ In 1574. See Thuanus lib. 58.

ε Ex Priorato ubi ſupra.

ζ In 1578.

η Ex Strada ubi ſupra lib. 10.

SERBELLON (*Fabricius*) Brother to the Fore-going, was General of the Pope's Troops in the Country of *Avignon*, during the Civil Wars in the Reign of *Charles* IX. He was at firſt Captain of a Company of Ordinance, and Governor of *Pavia* for the Emperor *Charles* V. Afterwards he exerciſed the Office of Commiſſary General of the Army in *Piedmont*, and in the Year 1560, he was appointed Governor of the State of *Avignon*, by Pope *Pius* IV. and General of his Armies ϑ. He violently ſided with the Catholicks againſt the Proteſtants, and was horribly hated and dreaded by the latter, by reaſon of the Cruelties he exerciſed *(A)* in *Orange*, wherein he was furiouſly

θ Ex Priorato ibid.

ι Thuan. lib. 58. pag. 76.

κ Priorato ubi ſupra.

(A) He was Exchanged for Thirty ſix Turkiſh Officers]. *Gregory* XIII made that Exchange. (a) *Nec multo ante redierat Gabriel Serbellonius ex Tunetana captivitate in libertatem aſſertus à Gregorio XIII. commutatione captivorum qui navalis victoriæ reliqui Adriana mole attinebantur, charum in primis Auſtriaco ac partibus caput, exactaque non magis ætatis quam diſciplinæ militaris exemplum.*

(a) Strada l. 10. dec. 1.

(B) They fell ſick both of 'em.] (b) *Strada* obſerves upon this occaſion, that the Symptoms being the ſame, all the Phyſicians, excepting that (c) of the Duke of *Parma*, affirm'd that *Dom Juan* would recover, and that *Serbellon* would die. And yet the latter was on the mending hand when the other died; whereupon *Pennoni* was as much admired as he had been laugh'd at. He might have been look'd upon as an inconſiderate Man, by reaſon of the Old Age of *Serbellon*, of whoſe Life he did not diſpair, and becauſe he gave *Dom Juan* over, notwithſtanding his Youth and Quality; but ſince the Duke of *Parma* was to ſucceed *Dom Juan*, *Pennoni*'s Freedom is not much to be wondred at.

(b) Id. ib.

(c) Hippolytus Pennonius.

(C) In the taking of Maeſtricht.] *Priorato* ſays he took that Town, and was the firſt who got into it. I durſt not ſay ſo, the thing being not likely, conſidering the Age of that great Captain. It were the Action of an Adventurer; for we muſt remember that *Maeſtricht* was taken by ſtorm. *Priorato* is guilty of a ſurpriζing Omiſſion; for he ſays nothing of *Serbellon*'s firſt Journey into the *Netherlands*; and tho' he aſcribes to him the Conſtruction of the Citadel of *Antwerp*, which was Built in his firſt Journey, it plainly appears that he did not know that the Duke of *Alva* brought with him *Gabriel Serbellon*; he mentions the Citadel of *Antwerp* only, after having mention'd *Serbellon*'s Journey in 1577, and the taking of *Maeſtricht*. *Thuanus* mentions one Count *Cernellon*, Knight of *Malta*, and Prior of *Hungary*, who is the ſame with our *Gabriel Serbellon*, and yet he diſtinguiſhes 'em; for having ſaid, (d) that the Duke of *Alva* cauſed the Citadel of *Antwerp* to be built, being adviſed to it by *Chapin Vitelli* and Count *Cernellon*, who had taken a View of that Place, he obſerves that the firſt who Commanded in the Citadel was *Gabriel Serbellon*. *Cum arcis cuſtodia primo cum idoneo præſidio attributa eſſet Gabrieli Serbellonio Mediolanenſi ſpectatæ virtutis Duci, cujus aliquoties a nobis ſupra facta mentio eſt.* 'Tis certain he denotes two Perſons, and that he, whom the Duke of *Alva* conſulted, and ſent to ſee the place, was *Gabriel Serbellon*: (e) *Antuerpiæ arcem fundabat, Paciotti Machinatoris ingenio, Serbellonii judicio.*

(d) Th… lib. … pag. …

(e) Str… lib. 7.

(A) The Cruelties he exerciſed in Orange.] Having promiſed

riouſly ſeconded by the Commanders (*B*) of the *French* Troops. *Pius* V. kept him in the ſame Offices his Predeceſſor had beſtowed upon him in that Country; but *Serbellon* did not continue long in 'em: He went home in 1566. and being gone to *Rome* towards the latter end of the ſame Year, to take upon him the chief Command of the Church, he died in the Houſe of the Cardinal his Brother. He had Married *Frances Maleſpina* Siſter to the Marquis *de Malgrado* ‖.

‖ *Id. ib.*

SERBELLON (JOHN) the Sixth Son of *John Baptiſt Serbellon*, Count *de Caſtillon*, and Lord of *Romagnano*, was a great Captain in the Service of the King of *Spain* in the XVIIth Century. He was a Native of *Milan*. He performed his firſt Military Exploits in the Year 1616. Being informed at *Rome* of the Preparations that were making in the *Milaneſe* againſt the Duke of *Savoy*, he immediately repaired to Count *John Peter* his Brother, Colonel of Horſe, General of the Artillery, and Governor of *Gattinara*. He applyed himſelf ſo punctually to the Service, that he made it appear he was born for the War, and would raiſe himſelf in time. His Brother having been kill'd at *Verceil*, as he was taking a view of that place, he had his Regiment given him. He encreas'd in that Poſt the eſteem he was in. He was wounded with a Muſket ſhot at the Siege of *Verceil*, and loſt his Rigement ſome † time after; but the ſame Duke of *Feria*, who had reform'd that Regiment, gave him another of Three Thouſand Foot in 1620. during the Troubles of the *Valteline*. The Proteſtants and the Catholicks being come to blows in that Country, our Count *Serbellon* was ordered to go and ſupport the Catholicks; and 'tis likely he did not uſe the Proteſtants too gently, ſince the Governor of *Milan* was well pleaſed with his Zeal and Conduct, and gave a good Character of him to the Court. Nevertheleſs he was reformed, when the *Valteline* was depoſited into the hands of *Gregory* XV; but the Troubles beginning again in that Country, *Serbellon* was ſent thither again, having * the ſame Poſt, and fuller Commiſſions; and the oppoſition he made againſt the *French* Troops was very well approved, as it appeared by the Offices beſtowed upon

† In 1618.

* In 1624.

promiſed in another place to mention thoſe Cruelties in this Article, the beſt thing I can do is to ſet down the Words of an (*a*) Author who is accounted a good Catholick. He informs us that *Fabricius Serbellon a Gentleman of* Milan, *of an Ancient Family and of great Experience, who gave himſelf over to moſt Vices that prevail among his Country Men, as he was endowed with their Virtues,* joyn'd with the Catholicks of *Provence*, whom the Counts *de Sommerive*, *de Suze*, *de Carces*, &c. had gathered together, and perſuaded them (*b*) to make an Attempt upon *Orange*. He inveſted that Town when the whole Garriſon was gone out, and taking Advantage of that Favourable Juncture, he gave an Aſſault as ſoon as his Battery had made a Breach wide enough. During the Aſſault *the Catholicks, that were left in* Orange, *open'd a Gate to him. He went in thro' it, and his Men were at firſt contented to kill every Body they met in Arms; but afterwards they renewed the examples of the moſt refined Cruelty invented formerly by Tyrants. Thoſe, who were ſo unhappy as to avoid their firſt Fury, were made ſenſible of their Death, being kill'd with many gentle Blows. Some were thrown headlong upon Stakes, Halberds, Swords and Pikes. Some were hung on the Chimneys and burnt with a ſlow Fire. They took delight in cutting the Privy Parts, and their Fury ſpared neither Children, nor old and ſick People, nor the Reapers, tho' the latter had no other Arms than their Sickles. Women and Maids did not come off with the loſs of their Honour, and then being proſtituted to black Guards; for they were ſhot to Death and hung upon the Windows. The Boys were kept to compleat the Abomination, and the Ladies, who rather choſe to die than to ſatisfy the lewdneſs of the Victors, were expoſed ſtark Naked to the publick view with Horns thruſt into thoſe Parts, which Modeſty does not permit to Name. Some of both Sexes were larded with Slips of Paper cut out of the* Geneva *Bibles. The very Catholicks, who open'd the Gate, were not ſpared: A place being appointed for them, and being told that they would be ſafe in it with their Wives and Children, they were all cut to pieces. There were only a Hundred and Nine Soldiers in the Caſtle, who not being able to defend it, deſired to Capitulate. Their demands were granted them; but as ſoon as they came out, they were ſurrounded; and thoſe who were not thought worthy of being kill'd by the Soldiers, were thrown headlong from the Top of the Rock. When the Plunder had been ſecured, the Victors pull'd down the Walls of* Orange; *and* Serbellon *being perſuaded that it would be a piece of Madneſs to leave ſo near the Country of* Avignon *a conſiderable Town, the Sovereign whereof was a Calviniſt, ſet Fire to it, which quickly Conſumed the Biſhop's Palace, and three Hundred Houſes with thoſe, who had concealed themſelves in 'em. The burning had gone on, had it not been for an extraordinary Rain, which put it out in a Moment, notwithſtanding the care of thoſe who ſtirr'd Fire.* D'Aubigné (*c*) had ſaid long before, that the Catholick Hiſtorians mention'd what he relates concerning the Cruelties exerciſed at *Orange*. Doubtleſs he meant *Thuanus*, who (*d*) relates the whole matter as fully as *Varillas* and *Beza* (*e*); but he had ſome Reaſons not to Name him. It will be granted me that the Hiſtorian, whoſe Words I have tranſcribed, is a writer of greater Authority *ad hominem*, conſidering the time he wrote in.

a) Varil-
…hiſt. de
Charl IX.
Vol. 1
pag. 201.
203.

b) The
…h of
June
1562.

(*c*) D'Aubigne Vol. 1. pag. 204.

(*d*) Thuan. l. 31. pag. m. 627.

(*e*) Beza Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 12. pag. 262.

(*B*) *The Commanders of the French Troops.*] 'Tis obſerved in the Relation (*f*) of the ſacking of *Orange*, that the Caſtle, the Biſhop's Palace, and ſeveral other Places were ſet on Fire, and part of the Walls pull'd down at the ſollicitation of the Count *de Suze*. He ſatisfied his Avarice as well as his Cruelty; for he *took part of the beſt Booty*, and furniſh'd his Houſe with it. Theſe are the Men, on whom private People beſtow ſo many Panegyricks, by Reaſon of their pretended Zeal for Religion and the Glory of God: The *Monlucs*, the *Tavanes*, the *Suzes* and the *Guiſes* will be Bleſs'd for ever among the Votaries of the Church of *Rome*; but what did they do for their Religion but get Wealth, Plunder and Domineer? Was this a Service done to God, for which they deſerved to be rewarded? (*g*) *O curas hominum, ô quantum eſt in rebus inane!*

(*f*) Beza ibid.

(*g*) Perſius, Sat. 1. init.

(*A*) *Againſt the French Troops.*] I don't follow my Author in every thing, to avoid advancing ſome Falſities. *Priorato* will have it, that the following things happen'd in 1624, and 1625. 1. *Serbellon*'s Regiment was ſet on Foot again. 2. He ſo exactly kept the Poſts he had been truſted with in the *Valteline*, that the Marquis *de Cœuvres*, who commended the *French* Troops, could never get an Inch of ground on that ſide. 3. *Serbellon* being ſent againſt the Duke of *Savoy*, beſieged and took *Nice de la Paglia*. 4. He return'd to his former Poſts in the *Valteline*, where Colonel (*h*) *Papenheim* Commanded in his abſence. 5. The Duke of *Rohan* ſucceeded the Marquis *de Cœuvres*, and could make no Progreſs no more than he by Reaſon of *Serbellon*'s Vigilance. 6. *Serbellon* being recall'd to *Milan* upon more urging Buſineſs, left the Command to *Guaſco* Colonel of Horſe. 7. The Duke of *Rohan* being informed of that change, advanced as far as *Gravedone*, 8. *Serbellon* was immediately

(*h*) *He, who was kill'd at the Battle of* Lutzen.

upon him: He was made Counſellor in the ſupreme Council of *Spain* in 1625, Commiſſary General in the *Milaneſe* in 1627. General of the Artillery and Governor of *Montſerrat* in 1628. He ſerved under the Marquis of *Spinola* at the Famous Siege of *Caſal*; and ſome Years † after he went into *Germany* to ſerve in the Quality of Captain General of the Artillery under the Duke of *Feria*. From the Death of that Duke till the Arrival of the Cardinal Infant, he had the chief Command of the Army in *Alſace*. He performed wonders at the Battle of (*B*) *Nortlingen*, which the *Swedes* loſt the ſixth of *September* 1634. and having followed the Cardinal Infant into *Flanders*, he ſettled Winter Quarters in the Biſhoprick of *Liege*, and the next ‖ Spring obtain'd leave to go home. He did great Services to the King of *Spain* againſt the Duke of (*C*) *Rohan* in the *Valteline*, whilſt they were raiſing in *Germany* the Army he was to Command. It was thought more proper to ſend him into *Catalonia*, where he Commanded the Cavalry (*D*) in the Year 1637. He form'd a very Noble deſign, which was to beſiege *Leucate*, the taking whereof would have made *France* very uneaſy; but he was forced to raiſe the Siege. He receiv'd many Wounds as he was diſcharging the Duties of a good General; and he was hardly recover'd from his Wounds, when he fell ſick without any hopes of recovery. He died at *Perpignan* the Twenty firſt of *February* 1638. He had Married *Donna Luiſa*, Daughter of the Marquis *John Jerome Marin*, deſcended from *Thomas Marin* Duke of *Terranova*. He had ſeveral Children by her: The Eldeſt was made Marquis *de Romagnano* by his Catholick Majeſty *.

SERRONI (HYACINTHUS) firſt Arch-Biſhop of *Alby*, lived in the XVIIth Century. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique* † *des lettres*; but mend (*Z*) two Faults in it. See alſo *Moreri*'s Dictionary.

SERVILIA

mediately ſent back to ſtop him, and obliged him upon the news of his return to ſet Fire to the Palace of the Duke *d'Alviti*, and to Retire for fear of engaging ſo brave a Captain. The Hiſtorian, having mention'd all theſe things, adds, that for an acknowledgment of all thoſe Services, *Serbellon* was made Counſellor in the ſupreme Council of *Spain* in *July* 1625. It cannot be denied that there are ſome Falſities in this Account. The Duke of *Rohan* did not Command in the *Valteline* at that time. The Marquis *de Cœuvres* was there ever ſince *France* made uſe of Forcible means in 1624. till the Execution of the Treaty of Peace in 1627. The Duke of *Rohan* was then buſy enough in *France*, being engaged in the Wars of Religion. As for what concerns *Serbellon*'s reſiſtance, which was ſo great, according to *Priorato*, that the Marquis *de Cœuvres* could never get an Inch of Ground, I will not alledge againſt it the Hiſtories which mention that Marquis's Progreſs; for I might be anſwered that *Priorato* does not mean the whole *Valteline*, but only a certain part of it, into which poſſibly the *French* Troops could not penetrate. But to ſpeak the Truth, this would be but a Poor ſhift, and little grounded upon the Author's (*a*) Expreſſions. I can Convict him by his own Words of having confounded the time: And indeed when he relates in another (*b*) Work what happen'd in the *Valteline*, he places the Duke of *Rohan*'s Excurſion to *Gravedone* in the Year 1636. He is in the right as to that.

(*B*) *At the Battle of* Nortlingen.] He was Poſted upon a riſing Ground, which the Council of War, held the day before the Battle, took to be of the greateſt Importance for the Succeſs of that great day. The *Swedes* had the ſame Opinion of it, ſince they uſed their utmoſt endeavours to poſſeſs themſelves of that Poſt; but they were always vigorouſly repulſed by *Serbellon*. Therefore he had the Satisfaction to hear the Cardinal Infant ſpeak theſe Words to him, in the preſence of the King of *Hungary*, *Conde por Dios y vos tenemos la vittoria* (*c*).

(*C*) *Againſt the Duke of* Rohan.] This belongs to the Years 1635, and 1636. The Author is in the Right, with reſpect to that time, to ſay that the Duke of *Rohan* and Count *Serbellon* acted in the *Valteline*: But I doubt whether he gives a faithful Account of what they did; for he ſuppoſes that there being three Bodies of Troops for *France*, the Duke of *Rohan*, who Commanded one of thoſe Bodies, endeavoured to joyn the two others, which might have proved very prejudicial to the Spaniards; and that the Count prevented that Conjunction. This is falſe, if we depend upon the Hiſtory (*d*) of the Duke of *Rohan*, wherein we are told that he had all his Troops by him; but that he was ſo Poſted, that he had the *Germans* on one ſide, and the *Spaniards* on the other. *Fernemont* (*e*) Commanded the *Germans*; *Serbellon* Commanded the *Spaniards*. The Duke beat the *Germans* three times one after another; and then attack'd *Serbellon*, who was advantageouſly Intrench'd at *Morbeigne*, and beat him. *Priorato* ſays nothing of it. But one can hardly doubt of it, conſidering that this Hiſtory of the Duke of *Rohan*, eſpecially what concerns his Exploits in the *Valteline*, is all grounded upon Memoirs, which ſeem to be very good. But we need not have recourſe to Memoirs. Does not *Priorato* in another Book (*f*) mention the Defeat of the *Germans*, and ſay that *Serbellon* was ſoundly beaten at *Morbeigne*? His own Teſtimony is ſufficient to confute whatever he ſays in his Encomium upon *Serbellon* with reſpect to the Duke of *Rohan*. I muſt not forget what he ſays concerning *Fernemont*, viz. that (*g*) he fell out with *Serbellon*, becauſe he did not give him his due Titles in a Letter.

(*D*) *Commanded the Cavalry.*] This ought not to be ſo underſtood, as if he had Commanded that Army in chief, for 'tis certain he was under the Duke of *Cardonna*. 'Tis true the preſence of that Duke did not leſſen the Authority of the Commander of the Cavalry during the Siege of *Leucate*, for he was not there in Perſon; and there was (*h*) a *French* Relation, wherein to confute thoſe who had given out that *he had been kill'd in the Field of Battle*, 'twas poſitively ſaid *he had not been in the Battle, and that in imitation of the Catholick Kings he was contented to be the Spiritual and Inviſible Head of that Army, reſerving to himſelf the Title of General, but leaving the Functions of that Office to* Serbellon. *Priorato* does not expreſs himſelf clearly enough: Any Body would infer from his Expreſſion (*i*), that the Count had none above him but the Court of *Spain*.

(*Z*) *Mend two Faults in it.*] You'll find in that Book that this Prelate was Born the Third of *Auguſt*: It ſhould be the Thirtieth. You'll find alſo there that the Biſhop of *Pamiers* was his Nephew; which is not true. The Author ſhould have ſaid the Abbot *de Camps* inſtead of that Biſhop. That Abbot is an Illuſtrious and very Learned Man, who has made a very Noble Collection

---

† In 1631.

‖ In 1635.

* Ex Gualdo Priorato ubi ſupra.

† For January 1687. Pag. 113.

(*a*) Governava il Conte Sorbellone con tanta prudenza, accuratezza, e vigilanza tutti i Forti DI QUELLE PARTI, che con quanti tentativi faceſſe il Marcheſe di Coure Generale allhora di Francia IN QUELLE PARTI, non pote mai auvanzar nè pure un palmo, tanto erano ben cuſtoditi i detti poſti.

(*b*) Hiſtor. delle guerre di Ferdinando &c. l. 11.

(*c*) Priorato ibid.

(*d*) *Printed at* Paris *in* 1666. *and in* Holland *in* 1667. *in* 12.

(*e*) Other call him, Forne-mont.

(*f*) Hiſtor. delle gu erre di Ferdinando &c.

(*g*) Ibid. l. 10 pag. 117.

(*h*) Merc Françoiſ tome, pag. 5

(*i*) Fu chiamat dal Re Iſpagna, e fatto Maſtro Campo Genera dell' eſe cito di C talogna. Nel pa d'Italia

in quelle parti hebbe il commando ſopra tutti i Generali capi da guerra di quell' eſſercito——— benche prima combattimento haveſſe fatta inſtanza per altri ſei mila mini, o almeno quattro, fu dal Conte Duca Privato del mantenuto con lettere affettuoſe in ſperanze grandi, ma mai ſoccorſo d'un ſolo fantacino. *Scena d'huom. illuſtri.*

SERVILIA, Siſter by the Mother's ſide † to *Cato Uticenſis*, was Married firſt to *Marcus Junius Brutus*, by whom ſhe had *Brutus*, who murdered *Julius Cæſar*; and then to *Decimus Julius Silanus* ‡, who was Conſul in the Year of *Rome* 691. She did not behave her ſelf like a virtuous Woman; for ſhe was *Julius Cæſar's* Miſtreſs, and improved (*A*) that opportunity to Enrich her himſelf with the Spoils of miſerable People; but beſides, ſhe proſtituted one of her Daughters to her Lover. Her Brother *Cato* was very much ſurpriſed when they made (*B*) him read a Letter Written by her. She pretended to be deſcended || from *Servilius Ahala*, who kill'd *Spurius Melius* who had raiſed ſome Factions at *Rome* in the Year 316.

SERVILIA, Siſter to the foregoing, and *Lucullus's* Wife, was ſtill more Lewd than ſhe. See the Remark *A* in the Article *Porcia*. *Lucullus*, who had divorced *Clodia*, a Woman extreamly diſſolute, and infamous for her Inceſt with her Brothers, was not much better for Marrying *Servilia*; for abating Inceſt, ſhe was not in the leaſt (*C*) inferior to Lewd *Clodia*. Her Husband conſtrain'd himſelf as much as he could out of reſpect to his * Brother-in-Law; but at laſt he could bear his Wife no longer, and Divorced her.

SEVERUS *(CORNELIUS)* a Latin Poet in *Auguſtus's* Reign. I mention him only

lection of the moſt curious Medals that can be found, as it appears by the Book, Intitled, *Selectiora numiſmata in ære maximi moduli e Muſeo Illuſtriſſimi D. D. Franciſci de Camps, Abbatis S. Marcelli, & B. Mariæ de Siniaco, conciſis interpretationibus per D. Vaillant D. M. & Cenomanenſium Ducis Antiquarium illuſtrata.* It was Printed at *Paris* in the Year 1693. in 4. *M. Vaillant*, who is ſo Famous for his great ſkill in Medals, ſpeaks of that Abbot in the following manner at the beginning of that Book. *Nummos veteres ex omni materia, omnique modulo ſummâ curâ multiſque ſumptibus collegit undique multis ab hinc annis Illuſtriſſimus ABBAS DE CAMPS, tam proſpero ſucceſſu, ut rei nummariæ ſtudioſis omnibus, Principibus etiam non paucis opulentior in eâ re tandem evaſerat: hi ſiquidem nummos habent permultos, ille verò numiſmata maximi moduli mole, cælaturâ, raritate, eximia, in quibus Imperatorum ſeriem, ſi paucos excipias, cernere licet, ut & res ab eis præclarè geſtas, & quidquid in hiſtoriâ Romanâ legitur auguſtius. Ab amicis ſæpe invitatus, ut quæ privatæ ſtudens, tum utilitati, tum voluptati ſibi comparaverat, in publicum commodum transferret, annuit comiter votis amicorum, ipſe tamen diverſis negotiorum generibus implicatus ea in ære prius, prout extant in ipſis exemplaribus, accuratè inciſa, explicanda mihi poſt-modùm tradidit.* If you conſult the Abbot *de la Roque* (*a*) in the Extract of a Diſſertation of the Abbot *de Camps* upon a *Greek* (*b*) Medal of *Antonius Caracalla*, you'll find the following Words in it (*c*) ". The Curious of "*Rome* and *France* have taken great Pains to ex-"plain it, and have been divided in their Opini-"ons about the truth and ſingularity of the Games "repreſented upon it. The Abbot *de Camps*, who has "a greater ſkill in Medals than one would think, "conſidering his Age, and his great Occupations, "is of Opinion that 'tis a ſhew of *Funambuli* or "Rope-dancers: Whereupon he propoſes his Con-"jectures full of Wit, and of a profound Learn-"ing—— (*d*) Having thus cleared with great "Wit and Learning the true ſenſe of the Reverſe "of that Medal, he examines why there are ſome "*Funambuli* on the Reverſe of a Medal of *Ca-"racalla*, and what Reaſon moved the *Cyzicenians* "to offer 'em to him". We are told in another place, upon occaſion of a *Canon Burdigalenſis ex M. S. Codice vetuſtiſſimus*, which is in his Hands, that he has alſo enquired after ſcarce Manuſcripts. "(*e*) This Council was never Publiſh'd. We are "obliged for it to the Abbot *de Camps*, who mak-"ing a diligent ſearch into every thing that may "illuſtrate the Hiſtory of the Suffragancy of *Alby*, "which he is Writing, has inſerted it at length "in that Hiſtory. He took it out of a Manuſcript "of Councils and Tracts of Ancient Fathers, "whoſe Antiquity, &c". 'Tis not to be doubted that he undertook to write the Hiſtory of the Suffragancy of *Alby* on Account of our *Hyacinthus Serroni*, with whom he was very great, but not his Relation. In the *Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres* I went upon a hear ſay; which was the Reaſon why I was miſtaken in this particular. Whilſt I mend that Fault, I am glad it appears that notwithſtanding my Miſtake, I aſcribed nothing to the Abbot *de Camps*, but what the Arch-Biſhop his Patron thought him worthy of. This is the ground of my Commentary upon this Article.

(*A*) Julius Cæſar's *Miſtreſs, and improved —— to Enrich her ſelf; but beſides ſhe proſtituted one of her Daughters.*] See the Remark *A* in the Article *Porcia*, and the Article *Caſſius*, to which theſe Words of *Suetonius* may be added. (*f*) *Ante alias dilexit* (Cæſar) *M. Bruti matrem Serviliam: cui & proximo ſuo conſulatu ſexagies HS. margaritam mercatus eſt: & bello civili ſuper alias donationes, ampliſſima prædia ex auctionibus haſtæ minimo addixit. Cum quidem pleriſque vilitatem mirantibus, facetiſſime Cicero,* Quo melius, *inquit,* emtum ſciatis, Tertia deducta eſt: *exiſtimabatur enim Servilia, etiam filiam ſuam Tertiam Cæſari conciliare.*

(*B*) Cato *was very much ſurpriſed, when they made him read a Letter Written by her.*] *Plutarch* having ſaid that *Julius Cæſar* gave orders to prevent *Brutus's* being kill'd in the Battle of *Pharſalia*, adds the following Words (*g*). "And this he is believ'd "to have done out of a Tenderneſs to *Servilia*, "the Mother of *Brutus*; for *Cæſar* had, it ſeems, "in his Youth, been very intimate with her, and "ſhe paſſionately in Love with him: And conſi-"dering that *Brutus* was Born about that time, "in which their Loves were at the higheſt, *Cæ-"ſar* had ſome Reaſon to believe that he was begot "by him. There goes a Report too, that when "ſome great and weighty Matters, concerning the "Conſpiracy of *Catiline*, which had like to have "been the Deſtruction of the Common-Wealth, "were debated in the Senate; *Cato* and *Cæſar*, "tho' differing in their Opinions, were placed "near to one another: In the middle of the De-"bate a little Note was delivered to *Cæſar* "from without, which he took and read ſilently "to himſelf. Upon this *Cato* cried out aloud, and "accus'd *Cæſar* for holding Correſpondence, and "receiving Letters from the Enemies of the Com-"mon-Wealth: Many of the Senators being much "concern'd, and the Houſe in an Uproar, *Cæſar* "deliver'd the Note, as he had receiv'd it, to "*Cato*, who reading it, found it to be a lewd Let-"ter from his own Siſter *Servilia*, and threw it "back again in Rage to *Cæſar* with theſe Words, "*Keep it to your ſelf, you Sot.* And the Senate that "had been interrupted, fell afreſh to the Buſineſs "that was before them; ſo publick and notorious "was *Servilia's* Love to *Cæſar*.

(*C*) *Abating Inceſt ſhe was not in the leaſt inferior to Lewd* Clodia.] *Plutarch* expreſſes her diſſolute life in very Emphatical Words (*b*) Τῆς δὲ Κλωδίας ἀπηλλαγμένος, ὔσης ἀσελγοῦς ϗ πονηρᾶς, Σερουϊλίαν ἔγημεν, ἀδελφὴν Κάτωνος, οὐδὲ τοῦτον εὐτυχῆ γάμον. ἓν γὰρ οὐ προσῆν αὐτῷ τῶν Κλωδίας κακῶν μόνον, ἡ τῶν ἀδελφῶν διαβολή· τἆλλα δὲ βδελυρὰν ὁμοίως οὖσαν ϗ ἀκόλαστον ἠναγκάζετο φέρειν αἰδούμενος Κάτωνα. τέλος δὲ ἀπεῖπεν. *Repudiata autem Clodia, laſciva & improba muliere, Serviliam duxit Catonis ſororem: quæ item nuptiæ parum fauſtæ fuere. Una enim carebat ſola Clodiæ macularum infamia ex fratribus: cætera pariter flagitioſam & impudicam ut ferret Catonis reverentiâ vim intulit ſibi. Poſtremò tolerare eam non valuit.*

(*A*) Some

---

† Plut. in Catone minore init. pag. 759.

‡ Id. ib. pag. 769. See alſo Cicero in Bruto pag. m. 354.

|| Plut. in Bruto init. pag. 984.

* Cato Uticenſis.

(*a*) In the Journal des Savans of the 29. of November 1677. pag. 309. Dutch Edit.

(*b*) Which repreſents on the Reverſe ſome Spectacles and publick Games very ſingular and hitherto little underſtood. Id. ibid.

(*c*) Id. ib. pag. 310.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 312.

(*e*) Journal des Savans of the 20. of November 1679 pag. 317. Dutch Edit.

(*f*) Sueton. in Cæſare cap. 50.

(*g*) Plut. in Bruto pag. 986. *See alſo the ſame Author in* Catone minore pag. 770.

(*b*) Plutarch. in Lucullo p. 517. E.

only to take notice of ſome Miſtakes in (A) *la Popeliniere*, *Andreas Schottus*, &c. See *Moreri*'s Dictionary †: I ſhall (B) alſo obſerve ſome Miſtakes of his.

SEVERUS (SULPICIUS) Flouriſh'd towards the beginning of the Vth Century. He was Illuſtrious for his Birth, and Eloquence, and more (C) ſtill for his Virtue. After he had appear'd with great Luſtre at the Bar, he Married very advantageouſly *, and quickly loſt his (D) Wife, and then he turn'd Prieſt. 'Tis certain he was a Native of the (E) Province of *Aquitain*; but one may doubt ‖ whether he was Born in the Dioceſe of *Agen*. The firſt Edition of his Works is (F) little known. His Hiſtory may be ſeen in *Moreri*'s Dictionary, and in *M. du Pin*'s *Bibliotheque*; and therefore I ſhall not dwell upon it.

He

(A) *Some Faults of la Popeliniere, Andreas Schottus, &c.*] *La Popeliniere* confounds that Poet with the Orator *Caſſius Severus*, for which he was reproved by *Voſſius* (a); but *Voſſius* ſhould not have quoted him *in ſua Hiſtoria*: He ſhould have ſaid *in ſua Hiſtoria Hiſtoriarum* to remove the Ambiguity; for the thing in queſtion is to be found in the *Hiſtore* (b) *des Hiſtoires*, and not in the Hiſtory of the Civil Wars: Tho' one might eaſily ſuſpect that *la Popeliniere* committed that Miſtake in this laſt Book, ſince the Modern Hiſtorians make ſometimes Digreſſions or Reflections, which give 'em occaſion to ſay what they know of Antiquity. *La Popeliniere* is not exact in what he ſays of *Cornelius Severus*: He tells us that he was an Hiſtorian, a great Orator, and an Epick Poet. The Ancient Writers repreſent him as a Poet, but they ſay nothing of his being an Hiſtorian or an Orator. 'Tis true ſome Verſes of his making are to be found among (c) the Fragments taken from ſeveral pieces of Oratory; but he, who collected all thoſe Fragments, ſays nothing whereby it appears, that *Cornelius Severus* profeſt Rhetorick or the Art of Oratory. Nevertheleſs this very thing, if I am not miſtaken, led *Crinitus* into that Error, and then *la Popeliniere*, who had it from him. *Crinitus* (d) gives it as a certain thing, that *Cornelius Severus* ſpent many Years in making Declamations, whilſt *Aſinius Pollio*, *Pompeius Silo*, *Areſlius Fuſcus*, *Sextilius Hena*, *Caſtius Pius*, *Porcius Latro*, and *Aufidius Baſſus* exerciſed the ſame Profeſſion. They are exactly part of thoſe mention'd by *Seneca*, who has collected their Rhetorical Flouriſhes. *La Popeliniere* names four of thoſe Declamers with *Cornelius Severus*, going upon the ſame ground, *viz.* That *Seneca* has inſerted ſome Verſes of that *Cornelius* in his Rhapſodies.

Andreas Schottus is partly guilty of the ſame Miſtake, for in his Tract *De claris apud Senecam Rhetoribus*, he mentions *Cornelius Severus* as one of 'em. Nay, he has committed a Fault in the very beginning of his account of *Severus*, for he applies to him what ought only to be underſtood of *Sextilius Hena* a Spaniſh Poet in *Seneca*. That Spaniſh Poet had made a Poem which began with this Verſe,

> *Deflendus Cicero eſt, Latiaque ſilentia linguæ.*

Cornelius Severus gave a better turn to that thought by ſaying,

> *Abſtulit una dies ævi decus, ictaque luctu*
> *Conticuit Latiæ triſtis facundia linguæ.*

Whereupon *Seneca* ſays he will not commend his Country-Man for having made a very good Verſe upon *Cicero*'s Death, ſince it had produced a much finer one, *viz.* that of *Cornelius Severus*. On the contrary *Schottus* makes him ſay, that he will not commend his Country-Man *Cornelius Severus*, for having made, &c. ſince it had produced a much finer one, *viz.* that of *Cornelius Severus*: Which would be odd, and is not the Author's meaning. Beſides, 'tis not true that *Cornelius Severus* was a Spaniard; nor has that Jeſuit placed him in (e) the Catalogue of the Ancient Writers of his Nation.

Voſſius in one (f) of his Books ſays, that the Old Scholiaſt (g) upon *Perſius* quotes this Verſe of our *Severus*, *Pinea frondoſi dum murmurat Apennini*; but in another (h) Book he aſcribes it to the Ancient Scholiaſt upon *Horace*, which is a miſtake.

(B) Moreri's *Dictionary*: *I ſhall alſo obſerve ſome Miſtakes of his.*] I. *Quintilian* ought never to be quoted in *French* by the name *Fabius*: It is an Ambiguous and Barbarous way of quoting him. II. The two *Seneca's* ſhould not have been confounded. He, who wrote the *Controverſiæ* is the Father of the Author of the Letters to *Lucilius*; and yet *Moreri* quotes them as being one and the ſame Perſon. III. *Moreri* ſhould have quoted the 79th Letter of *Seneca*, and not the 69th. IV. He ſhould have quoted the *Suaſoriæ*, and not the *Controverſiæ*. V. He ſhould have ſaid *Severus* and not *Severo*, in the Verſe of *Ovid* quoted by him. VI. This quotation *Seneca, in Contr. ſua 6.* is faulty in three Reſpects. He ſhould have put a full ſtop after *ſua*, and quoted the 7. *Suaſoria*, and not (i) the 6. & *Contr.* ſhould have been left out. But this is requiring too many things of *Moreri*; he did not much care to inquire whether there is any difference between *Seneca*'s *Controverſiæ* and *Suaſoriæ*. Some Readers will think that one of *Seneca*'s Books is Intitled *Controverſiæ Suaſoriæ*; a Miſtake which may be eaſily known, by the bare looking into good Editions.

(C) *And more ſtill for his Virtue.*] Read theſe words of *Gennadius*, (k) *Vir genere & litteris nobilis, & paupertatis atque humilitatis amore conſpicuus*: But particularly read theſe Verſes of *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola*,

> *Teſtis* (l) *adeſt docto mirabilis ore Severus,*
> *Et totâ Chriſtum cordis virtute ſecutus,*
> *Inſignis mundi titulis, ſed clarior illâ*
> *Quâ mundum temſit ſanctæ virtute fidei,*
> *Nobilitate potens, ſed multò extentius idem*
> *Nobilior Chriſti cultu, quam ſanguinis ortu.*

(D) *And quickly loſt his Wife, and then*, &c.] Which appears by a Letter *Paulinus* writ to him. (m) *Tu frater dilectiſſime, ad Dominum miraculo majore converſus es, quia ætate florentior, laudibus abundantior, oneribus patrimonii levior, ſubſtantiâ facultatum non egentior, & in ipſo adhuc mundi theatro, id eſt fori celebritate diverſans, & facundi nominis palmam tenens, repentino impetu diſcuſſiſti ſervile peccati jugum, & lethalia carnis & ſanguinis vincula rupiſti. Neque te divitiæ de matrimonio familiæ conſularis adgeſtæ, neque poſt conjugium peccandi licentia, & cælebs juventus ab anguſto ſalutis introitu, & arduo itinere virtutis, in mollem illam & ſpacioſam multorum viam revocare potuerunt.*

(E) *'Tis certain he was a Native of the Province of* Aquitain.] *Gennadius* (n) ſays ſo; but the thing is ſtill more certain from theſe words of *Sulpicius Severus*: (o) *Sed dum cogito me hominem Gallum inter Aquitanos verba facturum, vereor ne offendat veſtras nimium urbanas aures ſermo ruſticior.* This Paſſage is taken from a Dialogue, the Interlocutors whereof are *Poſthumian*, *Sulpicius Severus*, and *Gallus*. Take notice of *Gallus*'s Compliment: He tells the other Interlocutors, that he is afraid being a *Gaul*, that his Language will appear Harſh and Barbarous to the nice Ears of the *Aquitains*. He looks upon himſelf as a (p) Gooſe among Swans. At that time the *Aquitains* were the Flower, the Ornament and Glory of *Gaul*, in point of Wit and Learning. The beſt Poets, the beſt Rhetoricians, and the moſt excellent Orators of the Roman Empire were to be found in *Aquitain*. I except the Greeks, and I ſpeak only of thoſe, who wrote in *Latin*. This was the reaſon of the Modeſty of that Interlocutor. See the Catalogue of Illuſtrious *Aquitains* by *Alteſerra* (q).

(F) *The firſt Edition——is little known.*] The Abbreviators of *Geſner*'s *Bibliotheque*, Father *Labbe*, *M. du Pin*, &c. who mention ſo many Editions of that Author, ſay nothing of the firſt. It was Publiſh'd

---

† Upon the word *Severus*.

* See the Remark D.

‖ He ſays that *Phœbadius* Biſhop of *Agen* was his Biſhop: Which does not prove that he was Born in that Dioceſe.

(a) Voſſius, de hiſtor. Latinis, pag. 109.

(b) Pag. 324.

(c) *In Seneca the Father* Suaſor. 2. & 7.

(d) De Poet. Lat. c. 57.

(e) Bibliothecæ Hiſpanicæ tom. *II.*

(f) Voſſius de poetis Latinis, pag. 33.

(g) *That Scholiaſt quotes this Verſe*

(h) Id. de hiſt. Lat. pag. 109. ad Sat. 1. v. 95.

(i) Voſſius de poet. Lat. p. 33. quotes the 6.

(k) Gennadius, de Script. Eccleſ. c. 19.

(l) Paulinus lib. 5. de vita Sancti Martini.

(m) Idem epiſt. 7.

(n) Severus Presbyter cognomento Sulpicius Aquitanicæ Provinciæ. Gennadius ubi ſupra.

(o) Sulpicius Severus de vita S. Martini, lib. 3.

(p) Argutos inter ſtrepere anſer olores. Virgil. eclog. 9. v. 36.

(q) Ant. Dadinus Alteſerra Rerum Aquitanicarum libri quinque.

He has been Cenſured for ſome things by *Poſſevin* β, but much leſs than *Sigonius* who Commented upon him. *Guibert* Abbot of *Gemblours* is very much miſtaken in ſaying, That after St. *Martin*'s death, our *Sulpicius Severus* was promoted to the Biſhoprick of *Beziers*, notwithſtanding his Reluctancy to it, for 'tis certain he continued a Prieſt all his Life time. There has been one *Sulpicius* among the Biſhops of *Beziers*; but that Biſhop was raiſed to that See One Hundred and Ninety Years after St. *Martin*'s death γ.

SFORZA, an illuſtrious Family, derives its Original from a Country-Man of * *Cotignola*, who became one of the chiefeſt and moſt valiant Captains of his Age: His Name was (*A*) *Giacomuzzo*; but according to the cuſtom of the Peaſants of thoſe parts, the two firſt ſyllables of his Name were left out, and he was only call'd *Muzzo*. He left the Plow and Liſted himſelf, and quickly got the Reputation of a deſperate Soldier. He ſpoke of nothing but of Devaſtations and Ranſackings, and would get by force whatever he had a mind to. Which was the reaſon why he was Sirnamed † *Sforza*, which became afterwards the Proper Name ✠ of his Poſterity. I muſt not forget that he was alſo Sirnamed *Attendolo* ||. See the firſt Remark of this Article. The Famous *Braccio* was his Fellow Soldier, under the General *Alberic de Barbiano*. At firſt they Loved one another, as if they had been Brothers; but their Emulation or Jealouſy turn'd at laſt into Enmity. Ever ſince they always Embraced contrary Parties, ſo that when one of 'em was made General of the Troops of a Prince or Republick, the other had the like Imployment in the State that was at War with that Prince or Republick. They ſold their Flatterers, who had a mind to gain the Favour of *Giacomuzzo*'s Poſterity. This is what *Leandro Alberti* ſays. *Auvenga che alcuni cercando di acquiſtar gratia, ſcrivono altrimente* (g). If I am not miſtaken, ſome Flatterers, even in the Life time of our *Sforza*, extoll'd his Birth, and denied what was publickly known; for tho' it be infinitely more Glorious to raiſe one ſelf to a great Fortune by Noble Exploits, notwithſtanding the meanneſs of one's Extraction, than to attain by the ſame means to the higheſt Dignities with the help of a Noble Birth; yet moſt People are unwilling to be upbraided with the Obſcurity of their Original. Moſt of thoſe, who raiſe themſelves from the loweſt to the higheſt Degree, are at laſt more willing not to be accounted Ignoble, than to be look'd upon as Men, who have overcome by their Merit the Obſtacles of a mean Extraction. They are very glad when they are ſaid to be deſcended from very illuſtrious Anceſtors, and when care is taken to make every body forget the mean Condition they were Born in. They are ſeldom of *Agathocles*'s mind, who being made King (h) would be ſerved at Table not only in Plate, but alſo in Earthen-ware, to let every Body know that he was a Potter's Son.

lish'd by *Matthias Flacius Illyricus*, who put to it only the firſt Letters of his Name; which was the reaſon why a Catholick Writer beſtowed ſome Praiſes upon him, for which he was ſorry, when he came to know that the Editor was a Lutheran. This I find in a Satyrical piece of Father *Vavaſſeur* againſt Biſhop *Godeau*. *Iſto ferme pacto*, ſays he (a), *quamvis minùs turpiter, utpote unus ac privatus, atque in cauſa leviore, clariſſimus ſe ſcriptor deceptum ſenſit, & doluit. Cùm enim mirificis laudibus extuliſſet eum, qui primus perelegantes Sulpitii Severi libros edidiſſet in lucem, neque theſaurum hunc, quam teneret ſolus, invidiſſet diutius literatis ac doctis; cumque cum propter tantum beneficium, tum maximè modeſtiæ nomine ſuſpiceret, quòd celaſſet nomen, literas modò, M, & F, adſcripſiſſet: intellectum eſt poſteriùs, Matthiam Flaccium eſſe ejuſmodi, hominem non ſolùm non modeſtum, qui hoc modeſtiæ cauſa non feciſſet, ſed etiam impurum & nequam hæreticum, qui in centurias Magdeburgenſes multa de ſuo, non tacito nomine, contuliſſet. Ut dictum nollet præpoſterus laudator, & cum bona, ſed falſæ de altero opinionis, & ridiculæ credulitatis ſuæ pœniteret.*

The largeſt Commentary we have upon our *Severus*'s *Hiſtoria ſacra*, is that of *Chriſtian Schotanus*, Printed in Folio at *Franeker*, 1664.

(*A*) *A Country man of* Cotignola——*His Name was* Giacomuzzo.] That Name is made up of two Chriſtian Names, *James Muzzo* contracted into one: His Sirname was *Attendolo*. 'Tis not agreed on all hands that he was a Country-man's Son: *Sanſovino* ſays he was the Grandſon of a Gentleman call'd *John Attendolo*, Father of *Michelin*, Captain of the Republick of *Venice*. He adds, that *Michelin* the Father of our *Sforza* Married *Polyxena de Sanſeverino*, and had two Siſters, one of which was the Wife of *Ugolin* Count *de Centona*, and the other was Married to *Martin Caraccioli* Count *de Santangelo*, Brother to the Great Marſhal of *Naples* (b). We read in *Jovius* that *Sforza* was a Man of a good Family, *honeſta familia* (c). But *Leandro Alberti* going upon the Teſtimony of a (d) writer Born at *Cotignola*, ſays that *Giacomuzzo* was a Boor, and actually digging the Ground, when he fell a conſidering whether he ſhould Liſt himſelf, as ſome of his Friends adviſed him. He flung his Spade upon a Tree, and ſaid he would be a Soldier if it ſtuck to it. It ſtuck to the Tree, and he Liſted himſelf. (e) *Muzzo lavorando la terra con la zappa indotto da alcuni compagni, la gittò ſopra un'albero, promettendogli che ſe la rimanea ſopra quello, d'andar co loro alla guerra, la qual vi rimaſe, & così andò con loro, come dinota Pietro M. Caranto con molti altri ſcrittori.* The ſame Author (f) obſerves, that ſome Writers, to ingratiate themſelves with the *Sforza*'s, pretended that *Giacomuzzo* or *Muzzo* was not the true Name of that Man; but that he was call'd *Mutio*, and deſcended from *Mutius Scævola*; and they deny what is ſaid of his Spade. They were

Fama (i) eſt fictilibus cænaſſe Agathoclea regem,
Atque abacum Samio ſæpe oneraſſe luto,
Fercula gemmatis quum poneret horrida vaſis,
Et miſceret opes pauperiemque ſimul.
Quærenti cauſam, reſpondit: Rex ego qui ſum
Sicaniæ, figulo ſum genitore ſatus.

He pretended with good reaſon to heighten his Glory, by ſhewing that he was the Artificer of his own Fortune. There are ſome Panegyriſts in our Days, who acknowledging on the one Hand, that their Hero was a Man of a moſt Noble Extraction, obſerve on the other, that this Luſtre of his Family did not contribute to his high Preferments. So true it is, that the recommendation of Relations is thought to weaken the Proofs of the Merit of thoſe who are raiſed by that means. Here follows a Paſſage of the Funeral (k) Oration of *Francis de Harlay* Arch-biſhop of *Paris*. "Such Noble Talents could "not be Buried in Obſcurity, and there was no occaſion to aſk, how came he that was Born ſo great "to arrive at greatneſs? He was not beholden to "favour for his Elevation. His Family, tho' never "ſo Noble, and ſo much Reſpected, was not then in "thoſe happy Circumſtances, wherein the Star of "living Fathers pours down favourable Influences upon Children; wherein Children, Born "with Merit, have the advantage of diſcovering "it ſooner than others, and of being more worthily Rewarded for it; and wherein thoſe, who "are leſs favoured by Nature than Fortune, need "only have a good Conduct to receive the Favours, "which the Credit of their Families cannot fail to "procure to them. But the Perſon we ſpeak of

"was

β Poſſev. bibl. ſelect. tom. 1. p. m. [illegible].

γ Ex Alteſerra, rerum Aquitanic. lib. [illegible] cap. 8. pag. 116.

* *A ſmall Town of* Romagna *between* Imola *and* Faenza.

† *Some ſay* Alberic de Barbiano *gave it him, after he had ſeen him boldly repulſe an Injury that was done him.*

|| *Taken from* Leandro Alberti deſcrittione di tutta Italia fol. 317. verſo & 318. *Venice* 1561.

(g) Id. ib. fol. 318.

(h) Plut. in apophthegm. pag. 176.

(i) Auſonius epigr. 8. p. m. 9.

(k) *Delivered in the Metropolitan Church of* Paris, *by Father* Gaillard *a Jeſuit, the 23d of* November 1695. *See Page* 16, *and* 17. *of the Dutch Edition.*

their Services very dear, and took care (B) to keep up the War, it being the beſt way they could pitch upon to ſatisfy their exorbitant Ambition. *Sforza* commanded the Troops of Queen *Jean* in the Kingdom of *Naples*, whilſt *Braccio* commanded thoſe of *Alfonſo* of *Arragon*. Both of 'em died in that War. *Sforza* marching to relieve the Town of *Aquila*, Beſieged by *Braccio*, was drowned (C) at the Paſſage of the River *Aterno*; and *Braccio* was kill'd ſome time after in the Fight, wherein he was engaged near *Aquila*, againſt Queen *Jean*'s Troops, commanded by a Son of *Sforza*, and againſt the Pope's Troops. *Sforza*'s Body was not found out. His Rival was not much more Fortunate with reſpect to Burial; for the Pope ordered that the Body of *Braccio*, who was Excommunicated, ſhould be Buried without the Walls of *Rome* in a Prophane Place †. *Sforza* had been *Gonfalonniere* of the Holy Church, and made Count of *Cotignola* by Pope *John* XXIII. He was poſſeſt of *Cotignola* for a Payment of the Salary the Church owed him, which amounted to Fourteen Thouſand Ducats *. He left a numerous (D) Family behind him; his Poſterity continues to this day. He was a ſtrong Man, and very free, and (E) did not care to make good Cheer. 'Tis ſaid he was one of thoſe || who lay

† Taken from *Jovius in Elogia virorum bellica virtute illuſtrium lib* 2. *pag. m.* 192. & *ſeq.*

* Taken from *Leandro Alberti ubi ſupra.*

|| See the Remark *E*.

" was not raiſed by ſuch means. Being more animated by the Example of his Relations to deſerve Dignities, than help'd by their Intereſt to attain to them, he himſelf was the Author of his Fortune." However it be, I fancy *Giacomuzzo* was not much inclin'd to imitate *Agathocles*, and that his Deſcendants were ſtill leſs willing to mind the Advantages that might accrue to them, from deriving their Original from a Man, who notwithſtanding the meaneſt Condition he was in, found the way to become ſo great a Man. What makes me think ſo is, that ſome Writers, in order to make their Court, Publiſh'd very Pompous Genealogies. But I am apt to believe that ſome made it their buſineſs to repreſent the Extraction of our *Sforza* meaner than it was. People run into extreams upon ſuch an occaſion (a).

(B) *They took care to keep up the War.*] *Jovius* does very well obſerve that part of the Character of thoſe two famous Generals, and is in the right to ſay that it was a baſe Trick, and a perfect Trade. (b) *Qui ab initio fraterna charitate inter ſe conjuncti, pari ſpe, parique induſtria, & paribus inſignium, laciniarumque coloribus militantes, uſque adeo inclaruere, ut fatali demum ambitione atque ſuperbia diducti, diverſas militiæ ſectas de nomine conderent, ac æmulatione gloriæ atque potentiæ, ex amicis hoſtes facti, ex adverſo ſemper arma tractarent; qua diſſenſione potius quam ſimultate opimis ſtipendiis ſummiſque honoribus clari, atque opulenti evadebant; quum ſeſe infami aſtu, promercalique militia principibus Italiæ & liberis civitatibus venditarent, bellaque alere quam finire mallent; quod uterque de fortuna ſua immodice ſperandum putaret, & nihil impervium vividæ virtuti, generoſe & fortiter agentibus arbitrarentur.* This Ambitious and Mercenary Spirit is the Fault of moſt Generals, who are not Sovereigns; but when they are Soldiers of Fortune, and in the Pay of a Prince whoſe Subjects they are not, they are more apt to be guilty of that ſort of Treaſon, which conſiſts in not depriving a vanquiſhed Enemy of all reſources, that the War may be kept up. They hope no Peace will be made, whilſt neither of the Parties get a conſiderable Advantage; and therefore they don't care to improve a Victory, and Contrive the matter ſo, that the Enemies do quickly make up their Loſſes.

(C) *Was drowned at the Paſſage of the River* Aterno.] 'Tis the Ancient Name of that River, now call'd *Peſcara*. That General periſh'd in it the 3d of *January* 1424, at 54 Years of age, if we believe *Collenuccio* (c), and ſeveral other Hiſtorians; but I have ſeen in a (d) Genealogy of the Houſe of *Sforza*, that he was drowned the 3d of *January* 1426, being 56 Years old.

(D) *He left a numerous Family behind him; his Poſterity continues to this Day.*] He was Married Three times; firſt to *Antonia Salimbeni*, Widow of the Lord *de Cortona*, who brought to him *Montegione*, *Montenegro*, *Ripa*, *Bagno*, and *Cluſi*. His Second Wife was Siſter to *Pandolfo Alopo*, a Neapolitan, Great Chamberlain of the Kingdom of *Naples*. His Third Wife was *Mary de Merciano*, Daughter of the Count *de Seſſa*. He left Fifteen Children behind him. *Charles*, one of the Sons, was Archbiſhop of *Milan*. Another called *Alexander* Married *Conſtantia*, Daughter of *Galeazzo Malateſta*, and was Lord of *Piſauro*. Another named *Boſo* Married *Eleonora Aldobrandini*, Counteſs *de Santa Fiore* (e). The latter was *Sforza*'s Son by his firſt Wife, and all the *Sforza*'s that are now alive, are deſcended from him. The Head of that Family was made Knight of the Orders of the King of *France* in 1675, and Married by Proxy in *October* 1678, *Louiſe Adelaide de Damas*, Daughter of the Marquis *de Thiange*, and Niece to Madam *de Montespan* (f). He was Sixty four Years of Age: His Spouſe was but 19; and ſet out from *Paris* the 27th of *April* 1679, to go to him in *Italy*. The following Paſſage relating to him, is to be found in the *Mercure Galant*. " (g) The Bridegrom is well ſhaped, tho' ſomewhat advanced in Years. He is a Man of an agreeable Humour, and of a ſolid Wit. He is Duke of *Onano* in St. *Peter*'s Patrimony, and of *Segni* in the *Campania di Roma*, Count *de Santa Fiore*, in the Territory of *Siena*, and Sovereign of *Caſtel Arquato* in *Lombardy*, and of *Sforzeſca* in the ſame Patrimony of St. *Peter*. Beſides all thoſe Seats the Duke *Mario Sforza*, his Father, poſſeſt the Dutchy of *Valmontone* in the *Campania di Roma*. He ſold it to the Lords *Barberini* for Eleven Hundred Thouſand Roman Crowns." As for the other Children of our *Sforza*, I need not ſpeak of 'em; I ſhall only beſtow an Article upon him, who became Duke of *Milan*. Take notice that *Alexander Sforza*, Lord of *Peſaro*, was the Father of *Conſtans* who ſucceeded him. *John*, (h) Son of the latter was poſſeſt of the Lordſhip of *Peſaro*, and Married to *Lucretia Borgia*, Daughter of Pope *Alexander* VI. and then to the Daughter of *Matthew Tiepoli*, a Venetian Senator. *Francis Maria della Rovere*, Duke of *Urbino*, ſucceeded this *John Sforza* in his States (i).

(E) *A ſtrong Man, and very free, and did not care to make good Cheer.*] He was very different in all this from his Rival *Braccio*, as *Jovius* obſerves. (k) *In Braccio aſtuti & efficacis ingenii vis ardens eminebat; in Sfortia autem naturæ ſimplicitas, nullo fuco, nulloque literarum ſubſidio ſubnixa; apertique animi conſtans, & indomitus vigor laudabantur; in robuſto præſertim corpore ad ferendos labores geſtandaque arma prævalido. Braccius habitu corporis proximus delicato, ſplendore vitæ rerumque omnium apparatu ſumptuoſo, mirè gaudebat, utpote qui vel cum injuria alienæ pecuniæ appetens & profuſus eſſet. Ex adverſo Sfortia ad delitias rudis & agreſtis, frugi diſciplina, convictu ſubitario & plane militari, contemptuque prorſus omnis luxuriæ lætabatur; utpote qui valida potius quam decora arma, proceros & peracres generoſa ſobolis equos vir equitandi peritiſſimus, vera imperatoriæ dignitatis inſtrumenta eſſe putaret, nec quicquam ad inanem ſpeciem exquiſiti ornatus oſtentare conſueſſet.* Perhaps ſome will think that *Sforza*'s Clowniſh way, and his Averſion for Luxury, may be alledged to ſhew the Falſity of what has been ſaid of his and the Queen of *Naples* Amours; but this would be an ill grounded Objection, ſince 'tis certain he loved Women, and was a very ſtrong Man, which was no ſmall Bait for that Princeſs. She loaded him with Favours. (l) *Coſtui* ——— *fondò la grandezza della ſua famiglia, non ſolamente col nome, chiamandola Sforza, ma col Stato; percioche fatto Generale de gli eſſerciti di Giovanna* 2. *Regina di Napoli, con la quale ſi dice, che hebbe da fare, hebbe in dono da lei, Benevento,* lay with the Queen of *Naples*. *Francis Sforza* who makes the Subject of the following Article, was the chief Heir † of his Valour and Fortune. * *He had him by a Woman of Pleaſure, who followed the Army*; her Name † was *Lucia Terzana*.

(a) *See the Remark A in the Article* Touchet.

(b) Paulus Jovius ubi ſupra pag. 192, 193.

(c) Pandulphus Collenutius hiſtor. Neapolit. lib. 5. pag. 408 edit. Latinæ Dordr. 1618. in 8.

(d) *It is in the* Mercure Galant *for* November 1678. pag. 164. *of the Dutch Edition.*

(e) *Taken from Sanſovino ubi ſupra.*

(f) *See the* Mercure Galant *for* November 1678. pag. 164. *in the Genealogical Table.*

(g) Ibid. pag. 166.

(h) *Not he Lambald his Natural Son, as* Leandro Alberti *obſerves, ubi* ſupra.

(i) *Taken from Sanſovino ubi* ſupra.

(k) Paulus Jovius ubi ſupra.

(l) Sanſovino ubi ſupra.

SFORZA (*Francis*) Natural Son of *Giacomuzzo Attendolo*, who makes the Subject of the fore-going Article, made ſtill a greater Fortune than his Father. He was created β Count of *Tricarico* at Thirteen Years of Age by *Ladiſlaus* King of *Naples*, and was early accounted a great Warrior. He Defeated γ the Troops Commanded by *Braccio*, which diſputed the Paſſage of the *Peſcara*; but that Advantage proved of no uſe to him, for his Father having been drowned in that River, the Deſign of raiſing the Siege of *Aquila* was laid aſide. *Francis Sforza* was δ then but 23 Years of Age. He was confirm'd by Queen *Joan* in all the Dignities, and in the Poſſeſſion of all the Lands ſhe had beſtowed upon *Giacomuzzo*, and received Orders from that Princeſs to make himſelf ready for the Siege of *Naples*. He very much contributed to the Reduction of that Town, and then to the Victory obtain'd near *Aquila* over the Troops of *Braccio*, the 2d of *June* 1425 ε. Pope *Martin* V. ſent him againſt *Nicolas Trincio*, Lord of *Foligno*, and he forced him to accept of a Peace upon the Conditions he propoſed to him. Afterwards he ſerved the Duke of *Milan* both againſt the *Florentins* and the *Venetians*, and ſignaliz'd himſelf on ſeveral occaſions ζ. He did alſo many Services to Queen *Joan*; and when ſhe died, which happened in 1435, he applied himſelf to *Renatus d'Anjou*, whom ſhe had made her Heir. That Prince was Unhappy, and oblig'd to yield to his ill Fortune. But *Sforza*, who had no leſs Induſtry than Courage, never wanted means to ſupport himſelf. He made himſelf Maſter of ſeveral places in the *March of Ancona*, and even uſurp'd ſome States belonging to the Church. Whereupon he was Excommunicated η by Pope (*A*) *Eugenius* IV. who, beſides, had recourſe to Temporal Arms and Confederacies, whereby θ *Francis Sforza* loſt the *March of Ancona* in 1444. He quickly recover'd himſelf by the gain of a Battle, in which the Son of *Picenini* and Cardinal *de Fermo*, the Pope's Legate, were taken Priſoners ι. I ſhould be too long, ſhould I give a particular Account of all the Wars wherein he was ingaged; and therefore I ſhall only ſay, that by the Treaty of Peace concluded the 22d of *November* 1441. it was agreed that he ſhould Marry the Natural Daughter of the Duke of *Milan* κ. Accordingly he Married her, which made way for a great Fortune; for he became Duke of (*B*) *Milan* after the Death of his Father-in-law. That Succeſſion did belong λ to a Prince of the Houſe of *France*, and yet it fell to *Francis Sforza*, who was μ favour'd therein by *Lewis* XI. He poſſeſt that State till he died, and Govern'd it with great Moderation, being accounted one of the greateſt Princes of *Italy*. It has been ν *ſaid of him that no Uſurper*

* Varillas Hiſt. de Louis XI. B. 2. pag. 138.

‖ See the Genealogical Table of the Houſe of Sforza, p. 161 of the Mercure Galant for November 1676. Dutch Edit.

ε It was fabricated for the Queen in January, 1425.

ζ Ex eodem Collenucio ibid. pag. 409, 410.

α See the Book intitl'd Ritratti & elogii di Capitani illuſtri pag. 131. Rome 1636.

β Spondan. ad an. 1442. n. 11.

γ Vianoli, hiſtoria Veneta tom. 1. pag. 598.

κ Id. ib. pag. 599.

λ Id. ib. pag. 590.

μ See Varillas Hiſt. de Louis XI. B. 2.

ν Id. ibid.

ξ Varillas ibid. pag. 140.

Benevento, Manfredonia, Baroli, & Trani con più di 20. *caſtella*. See the Margin (‖).

(*A*) *Whereupon he was Excommunicated by Pope* Eugenius IV.] It was a great alteration; for the ſame Pope had given him formerly the keeping of the *March of Ancona*, the Dignity of *Gonfalonniere* of the Church, and a Commiſſion to make War againſt *Nicolas Fortebraccio*, who had invaded ſeveral Places in the Eccleſiaſtical State. *Sforza* did very well diſcharge the Duties of that Commiſſion, and defeated the Troops of *Fortebraccio* at *Tivoli*. Note, that afterwards this Pope, the *Venetians*, and the *Florentins* gave him the Command of their Troops, when they declared War againſt the Duke of *Milan* (*b*).

(*B*) *He became Duke of* Milan.] *Philip Maria Viſconti*, who poſſeſt that Dutchy, died in *April* 1447, leaving no other Child behind him, but a Natural Daughter Married to *Francis Sforza*. Many laid a Claim to that Succeſſion. The Emperor *Frederick* III. maintain'd that this Dutchy was devolved to the Empire, ſince the laſt Duke had left no lawful Iſſue. *Alfonſo* King of *Naples* alledged the Laſt Will of that Duke, who had made him his Heir. The Duke of *Orleans* alledged his being related to him, for he was the Son of *Valentina*, Siſter to that Duke. *Francis Sforza* grounded his Pretenſion upon the Duke's Adoption, to which he added the Right of his Wife (*c*). During thoſe Contentions, the *Milaneſe* thought they had a favourable Opportunity to ſet up a Republick. Wherefore they Elected Twelve Magiſtrates, whom they call'd the Conſervators of Liberty, and tore the laſt Will of the late Duke, and gave the Command of the Troops to *Francis Sforza*, to (*d*) continue the War with the *Venetians*. The laſt Point was very Unpolitical, and Inconſiſtent with their Deſign of Eſtabliſhing a Republican Government. They were not ſenſible that there is nothing more favourable (*e*) to thoſe, who have a mind to ſway a Scepter, than to put the Sword into their Hands. That Captain-General of the *Milaneſe*, got ſeveral great Advantages over the Republick of *Venice*. His Reputation was the more encreaſed by it; and doubtleſs it was the Reaſon why the *Milaneſe* deprived him of new occaſions of ſignalizing himſelf: They divided and leſſen'd his Troops that he might not form any conſiderable Enterprize. He underſtood the meaning of it, and found out an Expedient very ſuitable to his Ambition. He made a Propoſal of Peace to the Republick of *Venice*. (*f*) *Doppo queſti avvenimenti monſtrò inclinatione lo Sforza à riconciliarſi coi Veneti; moſſo à ciò principalmente dai trattamenti che riceveva dai Milaneſi troppo aſpri; e come di geloſi della di lui potenza ingrati, e ſpiacevoli, mentre con la diviſione delle ſue genti, e con lo ſcemamento deb' eſercito gli andavano tarpando l'ali per impedirgli il volo alla Ducale altezza; onde fu ſpedito da eſſo à Venetia Clemente Tealdino Secretario, che ſi trovava prigione con Almorò Donato nella Rocca di Cremona a proporre la trattatione della pace.* His Propoſals were approv'd of, and a Treaty was concluded, whereby the Republick engaged to aſſiſt him with Men and Money, in order to make himſelf Maſter of the Town and Dutchy of *Milan*; and it was agreed upon, that all the Conqueſts, as far as the River *Adda*, ſhould belong to the Republick of *Venice* (*g*). As ſoon as the Duke of *Savoy* heard of that Confederacy, he reſolved to aſſiſt the *Milaneſe*, but the Troops he ſent 'em were cut to pieces by *Sforza* before they joyn'd thoſe of the *Milaneſe*; and then he made it his Buſineſs to ſtreighten that great City (*h*). The *Venetians* being apprehenſive that he would ſubdue it, broke with him, and Confederated with the *Milaneſe*. Nevertheleſs he perſued his Point; he made an Agreement with the Duke of *Savoy*, and confirm'd the Alliance between him and the *Florentins*. He hindred the *Venetians* from ſuccouring *Milan*: A Famine, and the Diviſions of the *Milaneſe*, and their

Queen Joan, *ſhe made him High Conſtable of the King-*

(*a*) *Taken from the* Ritratti & elogii di Capitani illuſtri pag. 132. Rome 1646 (*b*) *See* Spondanus's Annals. ad ann. 1447. (*c*) Leand. Albert. deſcript. Italiæ p. 678. editionis Lati. 1567. in fol. (*d*) Vianoli hiſt. Veneta tom. 1. pag. 604.

(*e*) Ben convenendozi la ſqada à quella mano che vuole ſcettro. Vianoli ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Id. ib. pag. 605, 606.

(*g*) Id. ib. pag. 605.

(*h*) Id. ib. pag. 607.

ſurper was ever a better Sovereign. He was certainly endowed with many good Qualities, and tho' he had never (C) ſtudied, he promoted Learning, ſpoke with as much Eloquence as an Orator, and argued about Political Affairs with a wonderful Solidity. The Animoſity wherewith (D) he went about to deſtroy the whole Faction of *Braccio*, appeared too implacable. He died the 8th of *March* 1466, aged Sixty Five Years *. He left Fifteen Children behind him, ſome lawfully begotten, and others not; but his Poſterity was (E) wholly Extinct in 1535. The Condition, upon which he deſign'd to Marry his Son to the Daughter of the Marquiſs of *Mantua*, has (F) ſomething ſingular in it.

SFOR-

Spite againſt the *Venetians*, brought that great Affair to an end; they ſubmitted, and received him into their Town the 26th of *February* (*) 1450, and acknowledged him for their Duke (†). Thus the Meaſures that City and ſeveral other Neighbouring Towns had taken to ſet themſelves at Liberty, after the death of *Philip Maria Viſconti*, vaniſhed into Smoak. *Spondanus* rightly obſerves, that many Towns of *Italy* fell at that time into Slavery, becauſe they were too fond of avoiding it; for many Factions ſtarting up, they were ſometimes for a certain Form of Government, and ſometimes for another, and when one of the Factions was uppermoſt, they cruelly treated the contrary Party. Was it not making way for Slavery? (a) *Mediolanenſes ſervandæ per ſe libertatis impotentes erant; & ut in his fieri mos erat civitatum Italicarum, illam tueri quærentes, mutuis diſſenſionibus, ac diverſis regiminis mutationibus, crudelitatibuſque faciliorem ſervituti viam ſternebant.* That Annaliſt obſerves, that the Mob of *Milan* kill'd the *Venetian* Ambaſſador, becauſe the Succours promis'd by the Republick had not got into the Town; and he adds that the *Venetians* did cunningly put off the Relief of it, in hopes that the *Milaneſe* would ſubmit to their Domination (b).

(C) ***Endowed with many good Qualities, and tho' he had never ſtudied, he promoted Learning, ſpoke with as much Eloquence.***] He expreſs'd upon ſeveral occaſions, his Grief for his want of Learning: His Liberality towards Learned Men was grounded upon his great Deſire that they ſhould write his Actions, and immortalize his Name. He took care to procure that Honour to his Father by the Pen of a famous Writer; but his own Hiſtorian was more famous ſtill, and went about that Work with an extreme diligence. I mean *John Simoneta*, who wrote the Hiſtory of *Francis Sforza* in 31 Books, and declares he advances nothing but what he had ſeen, or was very ſure of. His work was ſent to the Preſs at *Milan* in 1479, and reaches from the Year 1424, to 1466 (c). Here follows a Paſſage of *Jovius*, which proves the Text of this Remark. (d) *In hunc hominem præter invictum corporis atque animi robur, ſumma etiam dona, quæ tribui poterant, natura contulerat, perſonæ ſcilicet dignitatem eximiam; os probum. & in omni congreſſu aſpectum ſine ſuperbia ſuis pariter atque hoſtibus venerabilem, ſic, ut cuncti in eo ſæpius concionante facundiam abſoluto oratore parem admirarentur, eoque plenius, quòd nullas attigiſſet literas; & nihilo ſecius in omni civili militarique negocio, efficacis prudentiæ, divinique judicii vim expeditam & incredibilem afferret. Sed literarum decus, quum ſeſe ejus expertem ingenuo pudore ſæpe dolens fateretur, liberaliſſimè tuebatur. Juſtæ ſi quidem & veræ laudis, quæ viventi ornamento eſſet, & tranſiret ad poſteros, erat avidiſſimus. A Joanne Simoneta namque inſigni hiſtorico, & à Philadelpho poeta percelebri res ſuas bello paceque geſtas perſcribi celebrarique jubebat, ſicuti etiam patris vitam Leodorix Cribellus ejus juſſu antea perſcripſerat.* He had been ſaying that *Francis Sforza* govern'd the *Milaneſe* for the ſpace of Sixteen Years, with ſo much Wiſdom, Juſtice and Mildneſs, and kept himſelf (e) ſo free from all manner of Vice, that he was accounted the beſt Sovereign of that time. But *Nauclerus* (f) ſays that his Love of Women made kim commit ſome Injuſtices in his Old Days.

(D) ***The Animoſity, wherewith he went about to deſtroy the whole Faction of* Braccio.**] He had ſubdued it, but being afraid that the Son of *Picinni* might revive it again, he undertook to deſtroy him; and the better to ſucceed in it, he pretended to love him, and Married him to one of his Daughters. Afterwards he deliver'd him to *Ferdinand* King of *Naples*, who, contrary to his Word, and all the Rights of Hoſpitality, caus'd him to be Beheaded in a Priſon. This is a horrid Crime; *Jovius* condemns it in very expreſs words. (g) *Fuere qui ei* (Franciſco Sfortiæ) *inexorabilis odii notam inurerent, quòd perſequendæ Braccianæ factionis nunquam obliti, Jacobum Piccinini filium ſummæ ſpei ducem, ſub quo Bracciana arma refloreſcere poſſe viderentur, nequaquam ſyncera fide in generum aſciverit; ſcilicet ut eo vinculo pignoreque deceptum, ad teterrimam necem Ferdinando Neapolitano regi proderet. Ab eo enim rege contra fidem refricata veterum offenſionum memoria, ut impiger in carcere per Aethiopem ſervum averſa ſecuri mactatus eſt, ſingulari quidem cum infamia amborum principum, qui vindictæ libidinem ſacroſanctæ fidei & hoſpitalis menſæ religioni prætuliſſent.*

(E) ***He left Fifteen Children behind him (h), ſome lawfully begotten, and others not; but his Poſterity was wholly Extinct in 1535.***] His firſt Wife was *Polyxena Ruffa*, who made him Lord of three Towns and above Twenty Caſtles. His Second Wife, as has been ſaid above, was the only Daughter of the Duke of *Milan*. The Son who ſucceeded him was call'd *John Galeazzo Maria* SFORZA (i). I have ſaid in another (k) place how he was kill'd. His Son *John Galeazzo* SFORZA, who ſucceeded him, was then but Four Years of Age, and *Ludovic Sforza* his Uncle, Son of *Francis*, took care of his Education. You may ſee in another (l) place how he periſh'd in 1444. His Son was excluded from the Succeſſion by the Intrigues of *Ludovic Sforza*, who got himſelf declar'd Duke of *Milan*, and obtain'd the Imperial Inveſtiture, which his Predeceſſors could never obtain: that Inveſtiture extended to Natural Children, in caſe the Lawful Iſſue ſhould fail. (m) *Is poſtquam à Maximiliano Imperatore novi principatus auctoritatem obtinuiſſet, magna cum ſolemnitate totiuſque civitatis gratulatione Ducatus inſignia cepit, die qui D. Theodoro martyri feſtus habetur, anno à C. N. MCCCCXCV. Primus ex Sfortia gente Mediolanenſis Ducatus titulum ac dignitatem jure nactus eſt, quoniam anteriores auctoritatem principatus ab Sacro Imperio Romano hactenus impetrare non potuerant. Fuit autem in formula Ludovici non ſolum de filiis juſtis ut invicem ſibi ſuccedendi jus haberent, comprehenſum, ſed etiam de nothis, uti ego vidi, ſi juſtos non extare contingeret.* He was depriv'd of his States in 1499 by *Lewis* XII. King of *France*, Grandſon to *Valentina Viſconti*, Daughter of *John Galeazzo* Duke of *Milan*. He raiſed ſome Troops in *Swiſſerland*, and the Year following return'd into the *Milaneſe*, and recovered moſt places of that Dutchy; but the *Swiſs* delivered him to the *French*, and from that Day till he died, which happen'd in 1508, he was kept in a Priſon. *Lewis* XII. poſſeſt the *Milaneſe* for ſome Years, but loſt it in 1512, and *Maximilian* SFORZA, *Ludovic*'s Son, recovered it. He could not keep it after the Victory which *Francis* I. obtain'd over the *Swiſs* in 1515. at the Battle of *Marignan*, and was forced to Surrender. He was ſent into *France*, where he died. *Francis Sforza* his Brother was Eſtabliſhed in 1522. Duke of *Milan*, by the Power of a League, which had overcome the *French*. He did not enjoy that State quietly nor without interruption, being ſometimes expell'd by the *French*, and then reſtor'd by *Charles* V, and ſometime ill uſed by that Emperor, who at laſt admitted him into his Favour in the Year 1530. From that time he peaceably enjoy'd his States till the Year 1535, in which he died. He was the laſt of all thoſe who deſcended from *Francis Sforza* I. of that Name (n). *Charles* V. poſſeſt himſelf of the *Milaneſe*, and few Years after, he inveſted his Son *Philip* II with it. The terms of the Inveſtiture take in *Philip* II. and all his Poſterity both Males and Females for ever, accordin to the Order obſerved in the Hereditary Succeſſions of States, that may fall to Women.

(F) ***The Condition, upon which he deſign'd to Marry his Son to the Daughter of the Marquiſs of* Mantua,**

ha

---

* Spondan. ad ann. 1466. n. 6. p. m. 109.

(*) Vianelli ſays, 1449.

(†) Id. ib. pag. 613. 614.

(a) Spondanus ad ann. 1449. n. 7. pag. m. 9.

(b) Id. ib.

(c) See Voſſius de hiſtor. Latin. p. 625

(d) Jovius ubi ſupra lib. 3. pag. 222.

(e) Adverſus omnem vitiorum intemperiem. Id. ib. p. 221.

(f) Hic etſi cunctos prudentia & felicitate principes ſui temporis excelluiſſet, in ſenectute tamen mulierum ardore deceptus nimium prævaricatus eſt. Nauclerus generat. 49. pag. m. 970.

(i) Id.

(k) In the Article Lampugnano.

(l) In the Article Arragon (Iſabella of)

(m) Le Albertus in deſcrip Italiæ p 610.

SFORZA (CATHERINE) Grand-Daughter of the *foregoing*, was a Lady of great Courage; but ſhe did an Action which ſavoured much more of a Man's Boldneſs than of a Woman's Modeſty. Her Subjects having made themſelves Maſters of the Caſtle of *Rimini*, ſhe gave 'em her Children as Hoſtages to recover it; and then ſhe threaten'd with Death thoſe, who had occaſion'd the Inſurrection. They anſwered her, that they would kill her Children; whereupon ſhe

be ſomething ſingular in it.] I have ſaid in another place, that according to the Agreement that was made between him and *Lewis Gonzaga* Marquis of *Mantua*, his Son *Galeazzo* was to Marry *Dorothy*, that Marquiſs's Daughter, *provided it ſhould appear that ſhe had no Crooked Back, nor any other imperfection in her Body at 14 Years of Age.* By Virtue of that Agreement, he ſent ſome Phyſicians to inſpect the naked Body of *Dorothy*; but the Marquis would not ſuffer it. A very Learned Civilian being conſulted about that Queſtion, maintain'd, that *Francis Sforza* was in the Right. Many People are ſurprized at his Anſwer. Read the following Paſſage of *Camerarius* in his Hiſtorical Meditations. " (a) Many wonder how *Franciſcus Aretinus*, a famous Civilian, undertook to prove that *Francis Sforza* Duke of *Milan* was in the right to require that *Dorothy* Daughter of *Ludovic* Marquis of *Mantua*, Contracted to *Galeazzo* the Son of that Duke, ſhould be viewed Naked by ſome Phyſicians he had ſent for that purpoſe, to know whether there was any deformity in her Body: That on the contrary the Marquis was in the wrong to refuſe ſuch an Inſpection, offering only to ſhew 'em his Daughter dreſs'd in the Petticoat, which *Galeazzo* had ſent her". *Camerarius* had read this particular in *Tiraquellus*, whom he quotes. I ſhall ſet down *Tiraquellus*'s own Words, whereby it will appear that *Philip Decius*, a Famous Civilian, approved *Aretinus*'s Opinion. *(b) Proinde non recte fortaſſis pleriſque videbitur conſuluiſſe vir alioquin doctiſſimus autorque graviſſimus Fran. Are. conſ.* 142. *ex facto proponitur quòd illuſtris in tertio, & iterum in quarto dubio ejuſdem conſ. cum omnibus nervis contendit probare Franciſcum Sfortiam Ducem Mediolani jure petiiſſe, ut Dorothea filia Ludovici Marchionis Mantuæ Galeatio ipſius Ducis filio deſponſata, nuda a quibuſdam Medicis a ſe miſſis conſpiceretur, ut hinc detegeretur, ſi qua puellæ eſſet deformitas: contra Ludovicum hoc ipſum injuria recuſaſſe, ſed tantum filiam obtuliſſe videndam, Cotta (ſic enim appellas) quam ad eam Galeatius ipſe miſerat, coopertam. Cujus tamen conſilium probat* Philip. *Dec. in d. ca. propoſuiſti in* 2. *notab. An tamen bene uterque ſenſerit, aliorum ſit judicium.* *Tiraquellus* durſt not decide whether thoſe two Civilians were in the Right; and yet he Comments in that very place upon a Law, which he reduces to theſe Terms, *Let the bethroded Couple diſcover their Deformities one to another; however, let 'em not ſtrip their themſelves ſtark Naked, and particularly let the Woman forbear doing it.* (c) *ſuam quiſque deformitatem futuro marito, aut uxori detegito. Ne tamen ſe propterea præſertim. fœmina nudato.* He had been ſaying, that if Women have any Bodily Imperfection, that is not known, they ought to acquaint with it thoſe, whom they are to Marry. (d) *Illud fœminas ipſas monemus, ut ſi qua in eis ſit occulta deformitas, ei certe cui nubere velint, non re quidem, id eſt corporis nudatione, ſed verbis adaperiant, propter eam maxime (e) rationem quæ à nobis dicta eſt cum de viris in hujus capitis initio loqueremur.* It ſeems therefore, that to avoid Contradicting himſelf, he ſhould have altogether condemn'd the Opinion of the Civilian *Franciſcus Aretinus*. It may be anſwered in his Vindication, that there are ſome particular Caſes or eſpecial Agreements which diſpenſe with the Law, and that therefore he would not interpoſe his Judgment about the Conduct of *Francis Sforza* and the Marquis of *Mantua*. He might have thought that there were ſome circumſtances in the Caſe, which made the thing Problematical. 'Tis very likely *Francis Sforza* meant by the Words of his Agreement with *Dorothy*'s Father, that ſhe ſhould be ſearch'd, but that it was not expreſly ſaid ſhe ſhould be ſeen ſtark Naked. Had this Clauſe been expreſt, the Marquis of *Mantua* would have broke his Word by refuſing what the Duke required; and if it was not expreſs'd, he might ſay he never meant that his Daughter ſhould be inſpected as the Duke would have it. Wherefore the Reaſons *pro* and *con* might have been ſpecious, and prevented *Tiraquellus*'s deciding the matter. He was not ignorant that 'tis more neceſſary for Sovereign Princes than for Private Perſons to know whether there are any unknown Imperfections, that may make one fear a Woman's Barrenneſs. *Francis Sforza* deſign'd to Marry his Son to the Daughter of *Lewis Gonzaga*; and therefore it highly concern'd him that ſhe ſhould want nothing: And 'tis well known that there are many Cuſtoms contrary to the Common Practice in Favour of Princes.

I ſhall occaſionally obſerve, that he alledges a vaſt Number of things upon this Subject, and is ſometimes miſtaken. He is in the wrong to ſay, (f) that in Ancient times Maids, that were to Marry, went to the Temple of *Fortuna Virilis*, where they pull'd off their Cloaths, that it might be known whether there was any Imperfection in their Bodies. *Du Boulay* gives a better Account of that Cuſtom. He ſays that on the firſt Day of *April* " (g) the *Roman* Ladies being Crown'd with Myrtle offered a Sacrifice to *Venus*, after they had perfectly waſh'd themſelves. *Ovid* mentions the cauſe of that Cuſtom in the 4th Book of the *Faſti*: He ſays that *Venus* drying one day her wet Hair upon the Banks of a River, the Satyrs perceived her Stark Naked, of which ſhe was ſo aſhamed, that immediately ſhe covered her ſelf with Myrtle, which was Conſecrated to her ever ſince, and this occaſion'd the Celebration of that Feaſt. Upon that ſame Day the Maids that were ready to be Married, Sacrificed to *Fortuna Virilis* with a little Perfume and Frankincenſe, and ſtript themſelves Stark Naked before the Goddeſs, ſhewing her all the Imperfections of their Bodies, and beſeeching her not to diſcover 'em to their future Husbands". He has omitted a circumſtance, *viz.* That the Ladies before they waſh'd themſelves, ſtript the Goddeſs *Venus*, and waſh'd her. Here follow the Words of the *Roman* Poet, who informs us of all thoſe Ceremonies.

Rite (b) Deam Latiæ colitis matreſque nuruſque:
Et vos, quis vittæ longaque veſtis abeſt.
Aurea marmoreo redimicula ſolvite collo:
Demite divitias: tota lavanda Dea eſt.
Aurea ſiccato redimicula reddite collo:
Nunc alii flores, nunc nova danda roſa eſt.
Vos quoque ſub viridi myrto jubet illa lavari:
Cauſſaque, cur jubeat, (diſcite) certa ſubeſt.
Litore ſiccabat rorantes nuda capillos.
Viderunt Satyri turba proterva Deam.
Senſit, & appoſita texit ſua corpora myrto.
Tuta fuit facto: voſque referre jubet.
Diſcite nunc, quare Fortunæ thura Virili
Detis eo, calida qui locus humet aqua.
Accipit ille locus poſito velamine cunctas;
Et vitium nudi corporis omne videt.
Ut tegat hoc, celetque viros, Fortuna Virilis
Præſtat: & hoc parvo thure rogata facit.

That Cuſtom of the *Roman* Virgins, ſo ill related by *Tiraquellus*, was a Trick wholly contrary to the ſincerity he adviſes Women to, in the Preliminaries of a Marriage. They applyed themſelves to *Fortuna Virilis*, as others made their addreſs to the Goddeſs *Laverna*, and begg'd of her that ſhe would conceal the Faults they were guilty of.

(i) *Pulcra Laverna*
Da mihi fallere, da juſtum ſanctumque videri,
Noctem peccatis & fraudibus objice nubem.

In a Word, that Practice of the *Roman* Ladies was a very bad one, tho' it was not ſo Abominable as that of the *Ægyptian* Women, who ſhewed their Nakedneſs to *Apis* for the ſpace of forty Days.

(a) Camerarius, Meditat. Hiſtoriques tom. 1. li. 3. ch. 14. pag. m. 165. I make uſe of Goulart's French Tranſlation.

(b) Tiraquellus in legem 4. connubial. n. 18. pag. m. 81.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 87.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) See that Reaſon towards the latter end of this Remark.

(f) Sed & legimus olim in templum Fortunæ virilis ventitare mulieres ſolitas, quæ nuptui debantur: & corpore nudato, ne quo vitio aut labe eſſent affectas explorari ſolere. Id. ibid. n. 11. pag. 82.

(g) Du boulay, Threſor des antiquitez Romaines pag. 516.

(b) Ovidius Faſtor. lib. 4. pag. m. 74.

(i) Horat. epiſt. 17. lib. 1.

ſhe turn'd up her Coats, and told 'em, here is wherewithal (A) to get others: Cruel Men, deſtroy the Innocent Hoſtages that are in your Hands; I conſent to it, provided I inflict upon you ſuch a Puniſhment as your Wickedneſs deſerves ‡. She was the Natural Daughter of *Galeazzo Maria Sforza*, and Married

This Ox was the chief Deity of the *Egyptians* (a) Ἐν δὲ ταῖς τετταράκοντα ταύταις ἡμέραις μόνον ὁρῶσιν αὐτὸν αἱ γυναῖκες, κατὰ πρόσωπον ἱστάμεναι, & δεικνύουσιν ἀνασυράμεναι τὰ ἑαυτῶν γεννητικὰ μόρια. *Per XL. illos dies fœminæ duntaxat ipſum (Apim) vident, ante faciem ejus conſtitutæ, elevatiſque peplo inguina oſtentant.* What an Abominable Notion had they of the Gods, whom they made the Spectators of ſuch things! It was not only offending againſt Modeſty, but alſo an Impious thing; and I make no doubt, that all the *Romans*, who knew the Rules of a Modeſt Education, Condemn'd the Ceremonies practic'd on the firſt Day of *April*. One may, without reading *St. Jerome*, approve what he ſays to ſhew that we ought to be aſhamed of our own Nakedneſs. (b) *Scio præcepiſſe quoſdam, ne virgo Chriſti cum eunuchis lavet, nec cum maritatis feminis: quia alii non deponant animos virorum: aliæ tumentibus uteris præferant fœditatem. Mihi omnino in adulta virgine lavacra diſplicent, quæ ſe ipſam debet erubeſcere, & nudam videre non poſſe.* 'Tis not enough to Condemn the Impudent practices Authorized by the (c) Laws of *Lycurgus*; one ought to Condemn the very anniverſary Cuſtoms mention'd by *Ovid*: And if the difference between the Duke of *Milan* and the Marquis of *Mantua* was to be decided, it were much better to Praiſe the Marquis than the Duke. The Complaints of *Luigi Groto Cieco d'Adria* ought to be look'd upon as meer Witty Conceits. He exclaims againſt the vaſt difference between all other Purchaſes and Marriage. If a Man Buyes a Houſe, he will ſee every corner of it from the Cellar to the Garret; and yet he does not confine himſelf to it for the reſt of his Life: He may ſell it again, or let it, if he does not like it. The only thing, ſays *Luigi Groto*, a Man cannot part with, when he has purchaſed it, is that about which we ſtrike a Bargain without examining it. (d) *Tutte le coſe ſi conſiderano prima che ſi comprino. Le caſe ſi mirano, gli ſtromenti ſi odono, le popone ſi annaſano, il vino ſi guſta, il panno ſi tocca, le fuſa ſi maneggiano, le caraffe ſi palpano d'ogni parte ſe ſon intere, i leuti s'abbracciano, le ſtringhe ſi ſtendono, i legni ſi miſurano, le ſcarpe ſi calzano, i cavalli ſi cavalcano, le vacche ſi ſcegliono, e in ſomma tutte le coſe ſi provano con quel ſenſo, con cui le habbiamo a goder prima, che ſi conchiuda il mercato. Le mogli ſole, che non ſi poſſano mai più rifiutare in vita, con cui biſogna ſtar ſempre fino alla morte, ſi prendono a chiuſi occhi, a gatt'orba, e come ſi dice, gatta in ſacco. Ne pur ſi provano, perche non riuſcirebbono al parragone. Ne pur ſi moſtrano, perche ſe ſi vedeſſero ſi ſprezzerebbono prima, che ſi pigliaſſero.* This Man would introduce into our Contracts of Marriage the cuſtom of the *Taxilla*, (e) an Ancient Nation among the *Indians*, or that of the old *Romans* when they bought Slaves; a cuſtom which the Emperor *Auguſtus* made ſubſervient to his unlawful Love, as has been ſeen in the Article of *Fulvia*.

I have promiſed above to mention the Reaſon alledged by *Tiraquellus*, why a Man and a Woman, who deſign to Marry, ſhould diſcover their Bodily Imperfections to each other. A Husband, ſays he, who does not declare 'em in due time, runs the Hazard of being hated by his Wife when ſhe comes to know 'em: 'Tis in vain for him to hope that ſhe will not perceive 'em; People that lie together in the ſame Bed muſt needs find 'em out. Contempt, Hatred and Horror will be the Conſequences of ſuch a diſcovery; and then the Wife will think of ſome other Men. (f) *Si vir quiſpiam qui ſe matrimonio velit addicere, quicquam latentis vitii aut deformitatis in corpore habeat, id in primis uxori quam ducturus eſt, detegat, ne ſi jam conſummato matrimonio reſciſcat (neque enim illam qua cum dies noctesque verſaris diu latere poteſt———) te contemnat, deteſtetur, abhorreat: proindeque alios petulanter ſectetur.* Let no Man Fancy, (*Tiraquellus* goes on) that he'll have a Wife like that, who being Married to one who had a ſtinking Noſe, did not complain of it, becauſe ſhe thought all Men had the ſame defect: There are but two ſuch inſtances mention'd by Ancient Authors; and none but a Mad-Man will expect ſuch a thing now a Days. (g) *Et ſane futurum adeo neminem inſanum reor qui noſtris præſertim temporibus, ipſam conjugem uxorem ſe his ſimilem inventurum, cuique ipſe doloſe ſuum illi vitium non patefaciat.* This is what he ſays to perſuade a Man to conceal none of his Imperfections, and to imitate the (h) Philoſopher *Crates*, and the (i) Father of the Emperor *Galba*. He uſes the ſame Arguments as to Women, which he confirms by this, that Marriage is a kind of purchaſe, and that Juſtice requires the Buyer ſhould be informed of the latent Faults of what he Buyes. He proves all this by many Authorities.

I don't know what was the Iſſue of the difference between the Duke of *Milan* and the Marquis of *Mantua* about *Dorothy*'s Marriage. I can't tell whether any Expedient was found out to ſatiſfy the Duke; but I find in *Sanſovino* (k) that *John Galeazzo Maria* the Son of our *Francis Sforza* had two Wives: One of 'em was *Suſanna Gonzaga*, and the other *Bonna* of *Savoy*. The Abbot *de Marolles* (l) affirms that *Suſanna Gonzaga*, the Daughter of *Lewis* Marquis of *Mantua*, was Married to *Galeazzo Maria Sforza* Duke of *Milan*. The ſame *Sanſovino* ſays (m) in another place, that *Dorothy Gonzaga*, Daughter of *Lewis Gonzaga* Marquis of *Mantua*, was Married to *Galeazzo Maria Sforza* Duke of *Milan*. 'Tis very likely that thro' a miſtake he is frequently liable to, he calls the ſame Perſon *Suſanna* in one place, and *Dorothy* in another. From whence it ought to be inferr'd that, according to him, the Son of *Francis Sforza* was Married to a Daughter of the Marquis of *Mantua*; which would prove that the difference was made up, and the Marriage accompliſh'd. But then it might be ſaid, that *Sanſovino*, who is no exact Writer, ſpeaks of a Marriage in general, tho' the thing went no farther than a Bethroding.

(A) *Here is wherewithal* (n) *to get others.*] This is a Modeſt Tranſlation of the following Words. *Illa magno & virili animo ſublata veſte nudanque ventre, En inquit, quo poſſim liberos iterum procreare.* The Author, from whom I have this, and whom I have quoted in the Margin of this Article, had been relating the Action of a *Lacedemonian* Woman, who ſeeing her Sons run away from a Fight, ſhew'd 'em her Nakedneſs, and aſk'd them whither they would get in again into the ſame Belly out of which they came when they were Born, or whether they expected ſhe ſhould put 'em under her Gown, that the Enemies who purſued them, might not ſee 'em. This Queſtion of hers was attended with ſuch a ſmart Reflection upon their want of Courage, that they return'd to the Fight and got the Victory. He quotes the Apophthegms of the *Lacedemonian* Women, Collected by *Plutarch*; but all theſe Circumſtances are not to be found in that Author: He only (o) ſays, that a Woman of *Lacedæmon* ſhew'd her Belly to her Sons when they ran away, and aſk'd them whether they had a mind to get into it again. The other particulars are a Fabulous Addition of *Balthazar Bonifacius*. I call it Fabulous, tho' it is to be found in *Juſtin*, with reſpect to other Women, *viz.* the *Perſian* Women, when *Cyrus* engaged in a deciſive Battle againſt *Aſtyages* King of the *Medes*. (p) *Pulſa itaque cum Perſarum acies paulatim cederet, matres & uxores eorum obviam occurrunt: orant in prælium revertantur: cunctantibus, ſublata veſte, obſcœna corporis oſtendunt, rogantes num in uteros matrum vel uxorum velint refugere. Hac repreſſi caſtigatione, in prælium redeunt: & facta impreſſione, quos fugiebant, fugere compellunt.* A (q) Commentator obſerves that *Tacitus* mentions a thing like this concerning the Women of *Germany*; which is not true: The difference between that Fact and that of the *Perſian* Women is great enough to make it a different thing. The Women mention'd by *Tacitus* uſed only Entreaties, and ſhewed nothing but their Breaſt. (r) *Memoria proditur, quaſdam acies inclinatas*

---

‡ Taken from Balthaſar Bonifacius Hiſtor. Ludicræ lib. 6. cap. 11. pag. 177. He quotes the 8 Book of Michael Bruto's Hiſtory of Florence.

(a) Diodor. Siculus lib. 1. pag. m. 54. cap. 85. See the Hexameron ruſtique pag. m. 91.

(b) Hieronym. epiſtola ad Lætam de inſtitut. filiæ epiſtol. lib. 2. pag. m. 264.

(c) Montagne in the 3. Book of his Eſſays ch. 5. pag. m. 129. & ſeq. ſeems to excuſe Lycurgus.

(d) Lettere famigliare del Cieco d'Hadria pag. m. 35.

(e) Strabo lib. 15. p. m. 491. *ſays that among them, when a Man could give no Portion to his Daughter, he carried her to the Market-place, and gathered the People together by ſound of Trumpet. If any Body offered to Marry her, ſhe ſtript her ſelf backwards to the Shoulders and then forwards.*

(f) Tiraquellus ubi ſupra n. 1. pag. 79.

(o) Plut. in apophthegm. Lacæn-
rum p.
241.

(p) Juſti-
lib. 1. ca-
6. p. m.
20. *See
alſo* Plu-
tarch de
virtutibus
mulierum
pag. 246.

(q) Ber-
negger. i-
Juſtin. ib-

(r) Tac-
de Germ.
cap. 8.

Married to *Jerom Riario* (B) Lord of *Forli*, and *Imola* β by whom she had among other Children, *Octavio Riario*, who was Lord of the same States, γ which he held of the Holy See. She had the Government in her Hands, as being her Son's Gardian δ, and used it to her Glory, during the Tumults occasion'd by the *French* Expedition into *Italy* in 1494. and the Years following. She privately (C) Married ζ *John de Medicis*; and it was one of the Reasons why she did many Services to the Florentins, and to *Ludovic Sforza* Duke of *Milan*, well affected towards the *Medicis* η. She defended her self with great Courage in the Fortress of *Forli* against the Duke of *Valentinois* Son of *Alexander* VI. in the Year 1500; but not being able to resist the violent Assaults of his Troops she was made a Prisoner and sent to *Rome*, where she was confined to the Castle of *St. Angelo* θ. It was upon this (D) occasion, if we believe some Writers, that she shewed her Nakedness; but they are mistaken. She was set at Liberty soon after κ by the Intercession of *Ives d'Allegre*. A *French* Historian commends her very much: He χ says she was very handsome, and *a Widow at 22 Years of Age, having an only* * *Son in the Cradle, and that the Inhabitants of* Imola *and* Forli *were so Happy under her Administration, that they had no occasion to Lament the loss of her Husband.* He observes that this only Son of hers was but 14 Years old in 1494 ‖. He enlarges upon the Military Qualities she discovered during the Siege of *Forli*. Take notice that she did not recover her States. The Duke of *Valentinois* was invested with 'em, and they were re-united to the Holy See after the Death of *Alexander* VI. †. I shall make a Reflection upon the Scruples, which hindred the Continuator (E) of *Moreri*'s Dictionary from mentioning the Immodest

clinatas jam & labantes à feminis restitutas, constantia precum & objectu pectorum, & monstrata cominus captivitate, quam longe impatientius feminarum suarum nomine timent: adeo ut efficacius obligenter animi civitatum quibus inter obsides puellæ quoque nobiles imperantur. It were an unjust thing to say that I am a rambling Writer, and that I make Digressions to fill up my Page; for I only take notice of such mistakes as I meet in my way, after having Censured *Balthasar Bonifacius* for advancing a Falsity. His Books and those of many other Writers are full of things, which the Authors quoted by them say nothing of. If I had a mind to swell my Compilation by bringing in things by Head and Shoulders, should I forget to Censure the same *Bonifacius*, for mentioning the Action of *Catherine Sforza*, in a Chapter (a) wherein he was only to alledge some Proofs of the Physical Virtues of the *muliebre pudendum*. Is that Action well connected with the other Accounts heaped up by him, which concern I know not what Faculty of driving away Hail, laying Storms, and frighting Lions? I suspect he is guilty of a much greater oversight; I think he falsifies the main parts of the Narrative of the Historian quoted by him: It is quite different in the Supplement to (b) *Moreri*'s Dictionary.

(B) *Married to* Jerom Riario.] She brought him the Lordship of *Imola* for her Portion: *Galeazzo Sforza* had made himself Master of it, taking Advantage of the Quarrels, which arose in 1472. between *Tadeo Manfredi* Lord of *Imola* and his Son. *Jerom Riario*, Nephew to *Sixtus* IV. did very much imbellish that Town (c).

(C) *She privately Married* John de Medicis.] That Marriage was known in time. *Catherine Sforza* had by that second Husband *John de Medicis* who was the Father of *Cosmo de Medicis*, the first Duke of *Tuscany*. *Boccalini* has a Witty Conceit about it. He feigns that *Catherine Sforza* having declared (d) that she had the Courage to shew that part of her Body, whereby she took upon her self to get other Children, desired, that since she had been very much commended by all Historians for that Action, *Apollo* would be pleased to assign her a proper place upon *Parnassus*. The Judges were divided in their Opinions; some of 'em look'd upon it as a brutish piece of Lewdness. (e) *Ad alcuni atto disfacciatezza, e di bruta impudicitia parve quello, che così nobil signora haveva racconsato.* *Apollo* Judged that a Regular Observation of Modesty did belong to private Women; but that Princesses were obliged upon some occasions to shew their Virility. A Counsellor voted in this manner: The place, out of which *John de Medicis*, Father of the Great *Cosmo*, came, did certainly deserve to be exposed to the Publick view. (f) *Ben degno di esser veduto da ogn' uno era quel luogo, donde era uscito il famoso Campione Giovan de' Medici padre di quel gran Cosimo, &c.*

(D) *It was upon this occasion, if we believe some Writers, that she shewed her Nakedness* —— *but they are mistaken.*] *Thomas Porcacchi* confutes those Authors in his Marginal Notes upon *Guicciardin*'s History: He shews that the Lady did that Action, when her Husband was kill'd. These are his Words: (g) *Hanno scritto alcuni, che Madama Caterina trovandosi assediata nella Rocca di Forlì dal Valentino, & havendo egli, per indurla ad arrendersi, minacciato d'amazzarle i figlivoli, se non si arrendeva; ella con animo costante alzatasi i panni dinanzi, gli mostrò le parti vergognose, dicendo d'haver le forme da stamparne de gli altri: il che pero si vede discordar da questo autore, che dice come la Rocca fu presa incontinente, che dentro ella vi fu ritirata: & è chiaro, che non hora, ma quando fu da Lodovico Pansecco amazzato il Sig. Girolamo Riario marito di lei, ella fece questo atto.* Honest *Hilarion de Coste* durst not relate the thing, as it happen'd: He leaves out all the Impudence of that Action, in order to multiply the Number of his Heroins. He is mistaken as to the time, if *Porcacchi* is in the right. That *Minime* expresses himself thus: "(h) *Catherine Sforza*, the Wife of *John de Medicis*, the "most Courageous and Valiant Lady that ever was "seen in *Italy*, gave (i) her her own Name, when "she was Christen'd. That magnanimous Heroin, "the worthy God-Mother of Queen *Catherine*, "gave a Proof of her Valour and Courage, when "she was Besieged by *Cæsar Borgia* Duke of *Valentinois* in the Fortress of *Forli*; for being "threaten'd by that Cruel Tyrant and Monster "of Nature, with the Death of her Children, if "she refused to Surrender, she boldly appear'd upon "the Walls, and laugh'd at the Rodomontades of "that Captain, laying her hand upon her Gown, "and telling him that she was Young enough to "get others".

(E) *The Scruples, which hindred the Continuator of* Moreri's *Dictionary.*] He is infinitely more Cautious than the Monk; for he says that Lady was contented to answer that *she might make up* the loss of her Children, and that *it would bring an unavoidable Calamity* upon the Rebels. Do what you can; you'll never be able to shew that he has discharged the Duty of an Historian, and that he has not neglected it in such a manner as is Inexcusable; for he says nothing of what was done by *Catherine Sforza*; and yet it was an Action so singular and so extraordinary, that it could not be past over in silence. Perhaps it will be said that the thing was so Impudent, that chast Ears would have been offended at it; and that instead of representing her as a most illustrious Woman, she would have been exposed to the Contempt of the Readers. Those two Excuses are insignificant: If the first was a good one, a vast number of Words should

---

β *Thom. Porcacchi in his Notes upon Guicciardin lib. 4. fol. 19. verso.*

γ *Guicciardin lib. 4. fol. 20. verso.*

δ *Id. ib.*

ζ *Id. lib. 5. fol. 104. verso.*

η *Id. ib.*

θ *Id. ib. fol. 126.*

κ *Id. ib.*

(g) Porcacchi, *Notes upon* Guicciardin lib. 4. fol. 126.

(h) Hilarion de Coste, Elog. des Dames tom. 1. pag. 224.

(i) *That is, to* Catherine de Medicis, *who has been Queen of* France.

Immodeſt Action of that Lady; and I ſhall obſerve an overſight of the (F) Tranſlator of a Book of *Lewis Guicciardin*.

SFORZA (ISABELLA) may be placed among Learned Women. She lived in the XVI. Century. Some of her Letters may be ſeen in the Collection (Z) Publiſh'd at *Venice* by *Hortenſio Lando* in 1540; and among others a Letter of Conſolation, which ſhe writ to *Bonna Sforza*, late Widow of the King of *Poland*, and that which ſhe writ to *Margaret Bobbia* in vindication of Poetry

SICYON, a Town in *Peloponneſus*, and the moſt Ancient Kingdom that ever was in *Greece*. *Ægialeus* is ſaid * to have been the firſt King of *Sicyon*, and we are told that he began to Reign Seventy Four Years before the Birth of *Abraham*. *Zeuxippus* was the laſt King: He was the Twenty Sixth, and Reign'd Thirty Two Years. The form of the Government was changed after his Death: The Prieſts

* *Euſebius* in Chron. [illegible] *ſays that Abraham was Born the* 52 *Year of the Reign of* Europs, *ſecond King of* Sicyon, *who ſucceeded* Ægialeus, *whoſe Reign had laſted* 52. *Years.*

ſhould be ſuppreſs'd in our Language, ſuch as *Naked*, *Nakedneſs*, *Adultery*, *Fornication*, and a thouſand more which excite obſcene Ideas. At this rate the Bible ſhou'd be Corrected, and the Writers inſpired by God, wou'd be liable to Cenſure; for they mention the Nakedneſs of *Noah* (a), and of the Apoſtles (b), and did not ſcruple to expreſs themſelves Naturally and without a compaſs of words, upon ſuch occaſions, wherein one ſhould have a regard to Chaſt Ears, according to the Principles I confute. Thoſe, who underſtand the *Hebrew* Tongue, are not ignorant that *Moſes* made uſe of a vulgar word to denote (c) the Mortal Blow the *Madianite* Woman had received. (d) *Tu fortaſſe, ut ſunt ferè hypocritæ, verbo tetrici, rebus obſcæni, ne ipſum quidem Moſen iſtâ notâ immunem abs te dimiſeris; cum alibi ſæpius, tum etiam ubi Phineæ haſta, quâ parte mulierum transfixerit, ſiqua fides Hebræis, aperte narrat.* The ſecond Excuſe is worſe ſtill, and would be of no uſe but to a writer of Romances. I confeſs that if ſuch an Author pitch'd upon *Catherine Sforza* to be his Heroin, and the ſubject of an Hiſtory, like ſo many ſorry pieces that come out every day, which contain a thouſand Fables and Chimeras, beſides true matter of Fact; I ſay, ſuch an Author might omit the Faults of that Lady: But an Hiſtorian ought not to do it, he is obliged to repreſent the ill Qualities of People: Juſtice requires that what is blameable ſhould be actually blamed; and whoever conceals the Faults of great Perſons, or (e) extenuates them, Impoſes upon the World in ſeveral reſpects. We are thereby deprived of a Knowledge that belongs to us, and induced to make an ill uſe of our Approbation. If our *Catherine* committed a Fault, is it not reaſonable ſhe ſhould ſuffer for it in ſome meaſure, by the Judgment which the Readers will paſs upon it? And if all Hiſtorians imitated the Writer I ſpeak of, would not Men be deprived of the fear of Poſterity, which is a mighty Curb to keep 'em to their Duty, and one of the greateſt Advantages that can be reap'd from Hiſtory? Will you ſay that there was a neceſſity to paſs over in ſilence ſuch a piece of Impudence, leſt it ſhould be imitated by others? But for the ſame reaſon all the Lewd and Diſorderly Actions of Mankind ſhould be omitted by Hiſtorians, and they ſhould be meer Panegyriſts. The Profeſſion of an Hiſtorian ſhould be forbidden, and all Nations ſhould uſe it as the Jews uſed Painting. All Hiſtorians ſhould be ordered to confine themſelves to the enquiry of Natural Things, and not to meddle with Humane Life. *Pliny* would not have been much againſt ſuch an Order; for the care that was taken to write Annals in order to diſcover Mens Crimes, whilſt the works of Nature remain unknown, was look'd upon by him as a very Pernicious Thing. (f) *Mira humani ingenii peſte, ſanguinem, & cædes condere annalibus juvat, ut ſcelera hominum noſcantur mundi ipſius ignaris.* Perhaps it will be ſaid that the Author of the Supplement thought he was to expreſs himſelf, as if he had told a Story in the preſence of the moſt Virtuous Women in the World. This is a wrong Notion: Thoſe, who maintain that every word, which cannot be ſpoken before a Virtuous Woman, ought to be baniſh'd from a Book, are miſtaken. 'Tis a Maxim of over-nice and preciſe Women; which you will eaſily grant, if you conſider never ſo little the difference between a Converſation and a Book. An Honeſt Woman will be juſtly Offended, if any one tells her an Obſcene Story; but ſhe will not blame an Hiſtorian for relating it, provided he abſtain from filthy Words: An Hiſtorian ſpeaks to the Publick, and not to ſuch or ſuch a Woman in particular; and therefore what he ſays is not Offenſive, as it would be, if it was related in a Converſation or in a Letter. In theſe two laſt Caſes he would not have an advantageous Notion of the Modeſty of thoſe to whom he ſpeaks or writes; and that is it that gives Offence. They would apply the conſequence perſonally to themſelves; but none applies to himſelf in ſuch a manner what concerns only the Publick. We are obliged to hear what we are told, or to read the Letters that are written to us; but every body may read or lay aſide a Printed Book. Laſtly, I obſerve that the Writers of Dictionaries need not be ſo reſerved, ſince they ought to be clear and preciſe in the Explication of Things.

(a) Geneſ. chap. 9.

(b) John XXI. 7.

(c) Num. XXV.

(d) Miltonus in defenſione pro ſe contra Alexandrum Morum p. m. 75.

(e) *See the Remark* A *in the Article* Domitia.

(f) Plinius lib. 2. cap. 9. pag. m. 152.

(F) *An overſight of the Tranſlator of a Book of* Lewis Guicciardin.] I don't know that Tranſlator's Name; but I know that he has Tranſlated ſeveral *Italian* Books into *French*. He himſelf ſays ſo in his Preface to *L'hore di recreatione di M. Lodovico Guicciardini, Patritio Fiorentino.* That Book of *Lewis Guicciardin* is a Collection of Stories, Sentences and Witty Sayings. He did not forget our *Catherine Sforza*. He ſays ſhe did what I have related above in the Citadel of *Forli*, when her Husband had been kill'd. (g) *Ma la Conteſſa animoſa non mutando faccia, alzataſi toſtamente i panni davanti con fiero ſguardo diſſe loro: E non vi pare egli ſtolti ch'io habbia le forme da farne delli altri?* The Tranſlator renders thoſe *Italian* words thus: *But the Courageous Counteſs, without altering her Countenance, turn'd up her Coats, and told 'em with a proud Look, Don't you think you Fools, that I have ſtill Beauty enough to get others?* Nothing can be more Abſurd than to make her ſay upon ſuch an occaſion *I have ſtill Beauty enough.* If it was ſaid in the foregoing Words, that ſhe unmask'd her ſelf to ſhew her Face, there would be ſome Juſtneſs and Coherency in her Diſcourſe; but there is none at all if it be compared with what ſhe had been doing. The Author cannot be excuſed upon account of Modeſty; for had he had ſuch a Motive, he would have omitted or wrapp'd up that Action, inſtead of relating it as plainly as he does. His miſtake proceeds from not knowing that the word *Forme* in that place ſignifies *Moulds*. This Ignorance has occaſion'd a ſtrange diſorder in the ſequel of the Diſcourſe.

(Z) *The Collection Publiſh'd by* Hortenſio Lando.] *Christofano Bronzini* has recourſe to that Collection, being obliged to confute one of the Interlocutors of his Dialogues, who ſays that few Women can write a few Words. His Anſwer is, (h) *Sono ſtate tante, che paſſano le centinaia; e tanto degne di lode, che ſe voi vedeſte le lettere loro (che con tanto ſudore, con tanta diligenza, e ſpeſa furono raccolte dal Sign. Hortenſio Lando; & à perſuaſione, e preghiere di Ottavian Raverta, eletto poi Veſcovo di Terracina,) date in luce, e ſtampate da Gabriel Giolito, l'anno* 1549. *vi chiarireſte, con quanta eloquenza, con quanto artificio, con quanta oſſervanza, & bella maniera di dire, elle ſapeſſero porre in carta altro, che quattro parole.* Beſides his referring to that Collection, he took ſome Letters out of it, and inſerted 'em in his Work; particularly with reſpect to our *Iſabella Sforza*. You'll find there the Letter ſhe writ to *Bobbia*. To conclude, ſuch a work as that of *Hortenſio Lando*, did very well deſerve I ſhould mention ſome Circumſtances of it; and therefore I hope the moſt ſevere Criticks will excuſe me for taking the liberty

(g) L'hore di ricreatione di Lodov. Guicciardini fol. 290. verſo edit. of Paris 1584. in 12.

(h) Christofano Bronzini, della dignita e nobilta delle donne, giornata quarta pag 40.

Prieſts were inveſted with the Supreme Authority. That Kingdom laſted (*A*) Nine Hundred and Sixty Two Years; it ended when *Heli* was High-Prieſt and Judge of the † *Jews*. The Worſhip which the *Sicyonians* paid to *Bacchus*, was one of the moſt Ridiculous (*B*) parts of the Pagan Religion.

SILANION, a Famous Sculptor, flouriſh'd in the time of *Alexander* the Great, * about the 114. Olympiad. He was an ‖ Athenian, and got a great skill in his Art without β being taught by any Body. The Statue of *Sappho*, that of one *Satyrus* δ, who often carried the Prize at the *Grecian* Games, that of another Athlet call'd *Demaratus* γ, and that of *Apollodorus* (*Z*) a Sculptor, who was hardly Pleaſed with his own Works, were accounted his beſt Pieces. *Vitruvius* ζ ſays he wrote a Tract, wherein he explain'd the Rules of Symmetry.

SYLVIUS (FRANCIS) Profeſſor of Eloquence, and Principal of *Tournay*-College at *Paris*, towards the beginning of the XVI. Century, was a Native of *Amiens*, where his Father *Nicolas du Bois* was ‡ a Gamlet-worker. *Nicolas* had Fifteen Children, Eleven Sons and Four Daughters. *Francis* was the third; and being bred up a Scholar, he became a Learned Man and ſettled at *Paris*. He Latinized his Name according to the Cuſtom of thoſe times. He ſent for two of his Brothers, and taught 'em Claſſical Learning: One of 'em call'd *John* was made Canon of *Amiens*, and Curate of *Moneteaux*; the other, whoſe Name was *James*, became a very Learned Phyſician, as we ſhall ſee in the following Article. *Francis Sylvius* found a great Barbarouſneſs in the Colleges; but he made it his Buſineſs to reſtore the uſe of good *Latin*, and was one of the greateſt Promoters of Polite Learning in *France*. He directed the Scholars to the beſt *Latin* Authors, and ſo earneſtly recommended to them the reading of *Cicero*, that 'twas not long of him, if

† August. de civit. Dei l. 18. c. 19.

* Plinius lib. 34. cap. 8. pag. m. 119.

‖ Pauſan. lib. 6. cap. 4. p. 361.

β Plin. ib.

γ Pauſan. ibid.

δ Id. ib. cap. 14. pag. 487.

ζ Vitruv. præf. lib. 7.

‡ Chez i panni & ungolari biſto.

Renat. Moreau in vita Jacobi Sylvii.

berty to ſet down *Bronzini*'s Words ſomewhat at large.

(*A*) *That Kingdom laſted Nine Hundred and Sixty Two Years.*] It laſted three Years leſs, if we believe St. *Auguſtin* (*a*). A Commentator (*b*) upon that Father has committed two faults in few words. He ſays, that according to *Euſebius*, that Kingdom laſted Eight Hundred and Sixty Two Years, and he adds that if the Years be caſt up, they'll amount to Nine Hundred and Seventy Two. 'Tis certain *Euſebius* (*c*) mentions a duration of Nine Hundred and Sixty Two Years, and that the Addition of the Years of each King of *Sicyon* makes but Nine Hundred and Sixty Two Years. *Euſebius* reckons from *Abraham*'s Birth, and ſuppoſes that Patriarch was Born in the 22d Year of *Europs*, the ſecond King of *Sicyon*, who ſucceeded *Ægialeus*, and Reign'd Fifty Two Years, and that the Kingdom of *Sicyon* ended in (*d*) 889. Make an Addition, and you'll find the ſecond Fault I have Cenſured.

(*B*) *Was one of the moſt ridiculous parts of the Pagan Religion.*] They Worſhipp'd *Bacchus* under ſuch an Obſcene Name, that none but Impudent People can pronounce it in a free Converſation. *Clemens Alexandrinus* does juſtly blame the Heathens for ſuch a Turpitude. (*e*) Διόνυσον δὲ ἤδη σιωπῶ τὸν χοιροψάλην. Σικυώνιοι τοῦτον προσκυνοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικείων τάξαντες τὸν Διόνυσον μορίων ἔφορον αἴσχους καὶ τῆς ὕβρεως σεβάζοντες ἀρχηγόν. *Bacchum enim jam taceo pudendi contrectatorem. Eum adorant Sicyonii, qui Bacchum membris præficiunt muliebribus tanquam turpitudinis ac fœditatis inſpectorem, & quaſi libidinis colant præfectum.* M. *Coſtar* writing in Proſe, took a more than Poetical Liberty, when he made uſe of thoſe words of *Clemens Alexandrinus* to explain ſome Verſes of *Horace*. Such a liberty did not go unpuniſh'd; *M. de Girac* did ſeverely Banter him for it under the following Irony. "(*f*) I will not imitate him in his ill Humour; "on the contrary, I find he has been very ſucceſsful in his Explication of theſe Verſes of the ſame "Poet (*g*),

"*Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus*
"*Vidi docentem, credite Poſteri,*
"*Nymphaſque diſcentes, & aures*
"*Capripedum Satyrorum acutas.*

"*I did not think fit*, ſays *M. Coſtar* (*h*), *to write* "*to you a Pleaſant Thing concerning* Bacchus's *Scholars, leſt my Letter ſhould fall into other Hands than* "*yours. But now I will be bolder, because I fancy* "*this Paper will be more ſecret. I have read in* "Clemens Alexandrinus, *that* Bacchus *was Worſhip'd among the* Sicyonians *under the Name of* "χοιροψάλαν (i), *which ſignifies.* ——— *If it be* "*ſo, don't ask me what he was doing* in remotis *with* "*thoſe Beautiful Nymphs. Certainly, none of 'em* "*could come off: He felt 'em all one after another;* "*this was the Leſſon he gave 'em. I think, Sir,* "*they wanted no Pocket-Book to write it down. Pray,* "*let me know by the firſt opportunity what you think* "*of it, &c. I am ſorry I was not there, for I fancy* Bacchus *was a jolly Doctor, and 'twas worth ones* "*while to ſee him act ſuch a Part. He had an Honeſt Fellow for his Tutor, a Man of good Example, who ſets forth very fine Moral Reflections in* "Euripides's Cyclopes. I don't ask M. *Coſtar* what "he would have done with thoſe Nymphs: But "if he had lived at that time, we ſhould not have "known ſuch fine things. However, I hope he'll "excuſe me for leaving out two or three words, "which none can be ſo Impudent as to write or "utter, than *Bacchus*'s Maſter or his Diſciple, I "mean, *Silenus*, and M. *Coſtar*". *Menage* knowing that the *Latin* word *Porcus*, and the *Greek* word χοῖρος, ſignified that part of a Woman, which Modeſty does not permit to Name, made uſe of that Erudition to give us (*i*) the Etymology of the Epithet, under which *Bacchus* was Worſhip'd at *Sicyon*.

Iſaac Voſſius advances an Etymological Conjecture grounded upon the Obſcenities, over which *Bacchus* preſided. *Non ab hoc* (*k*) *Orthagora*, ſays he (*l*), *nomen Orthagoriæ eſt arceſſendum, ſed vero a numine ſalaciſſimo, ut exiſtimo. Nullus dubito quin Bacchus, ipſe aliquando dictus ſit Orthagoras. Antequam enim ille hortorum cuſtos Lampſaci naſceretur, notum eſt Bacchum comiteſque ejus curam locorum muliebrium habuiſſe. Hinc fit ut nontantum* ἰθύφαλλον *ipſum vocarint, verum etiam idem ſignificantibus vocabulis,* ὄρθον, ὀρθανὴν, & ὀρθαγόραν. *Sane apud Ariſtophanem* ἐκκλησιαζούσαις, *cum juvencula hortatur anum prurientem, ut vocet Orthagoram, id non niſi de hoc dæmone peculiato videtur intelligendum, uti ad illum locum fuſius oſtendemus.*

(*Z*) *That of* Apollodorus *a Sculptor, who was hardly pleaſed with his own Works.*] What *Pliny* ſays upon this is very Remarkable, and ſhews *Silanion*'s great skill in his Art. (*m*) *Silanion Apollodorum fudit, fictorem & ipſum, ſed inter cunctos diligentiſſimum artis, & inimicum ſui judicem, crebro perfecta ſigna frangentem, dum ſatiari cupiditate artis non quit, & ideo inſanum cognominatum. Hoc in eo expreſſit, nec hominem ex ære fecit, ſed iracundiam.* Theſe words have been well enough underſtood by *du Pinet*; but he is ſtrangely miſtaken in the ſequel of this Paſſage. His Tranſlation runs thus: "*Silanion* made "the Statue of of *Apollodorus*, who was alſo a "Sculptor, and very much Eſteem'd. But he was "ſo intent upon his Art, that he never liked his "own Work; ſo that moſt times, he broke very "Noble Pieces out of Spite, after he had made an "end of 'em, thinking he could never do a thing "well

(*i*) Quindi χοιροψάλης, *Conni contrectator*, cognome di Bacco preſſo à Sicionii, ſecondo lo teſtifica Clemente Aleſſandrino nell' Ammonizione alle genti: il qual cognome viene anche da Eſchilo attribuito à Bacco. *Menag. Origini della Ling. Italiana, in voce* Potta, *pag.* 383.

(*k*) *An Hiſtorian mention'd by* Strabo, Ælian *and* Philoſtratus.

(*l*) Iſaac. Voſſius in Pompon. Melam. l. 2. c. 2. p. m. 133.

(*m*) Plin. lib. 34. cap. 8. pag. m. 126.

if that Roman Orator was not look'd upon as the only Model of a good (A) Style *. 'Tis true, that before he gave ſuch Advices, he himſelf had been taught † bad Latin, as it appears from ſome of his Compoſures. He Publiſh'd (B) ſeveral Books. I muſt not forget a thing that is very glorious to him: He procured an Edition of *Martial* (C) cleared from many Obſcenities, that the Youth might improve themſelves by the reading of that Poet without endangering their Morals.

* *Ex ed. ibid.*

† See the Remark C.

SYLVIUS (*James*) Brother to the foregoing, was one of the moſt famous Phyſicians of the XVI. Century. He was Born at *Amiens* in 1478, and went thro' his School-Learning at *Paris* under *Francis Sylvius* his Brother. He learn'd of him, and Taught in *Tournay*-College the Latin Tongue with much greater Purity, than it had been taught long before; which was the Reaſon why his Writings were ſo much taken notice of, becauſe of the Elegance of the Style. Having an Inclination to the Study of Phyſick, he was contented to learn ſome Hebrew of *Vatablus*, and reſolved to learn Greek and Latin perfectly, in order to qualify himſelf for that Study. 'Tis true, he applied himſelf likewiſe to the Mathematicks, and made ſo great a Progreſs in that Science, that he invented ſome Machines, which he preſented to the *Provoſt of Merchants*, and to the *Echevins* of *Paris*. When it was time for him to apply himſelf wholly to Phyſick; he ſtudied it in the Original Authors, and ſo far engaged in the reading of *Hippocrates*, and *Galen*, that he ſpent all his time in Examining and Tranſlating thoſe two Authors. Which made him ſenſible of the uſefulneſs of Anatomy; and he applied himſelf to it ſo earneſtly, that his Skill in it was as great as the Age he lived in could permit. He ſtudied Pharmacy with the ſame eagerneſs, and made ſeveral Journies to ſee the Remedies produced by different Countries. Being return'd to *Paris*, he betook himſelf to

read

“ well enough: Which was the Reaſon why many call'd him a Mad-man. *Silanion* intending to ſhew it, made a Statue of Anger, in a Woman's Cloaths, inſtead of *Apollodorus*. „ I think there is a miſtake in theſe words of the Tranſlator *in a Woman's Cloaths inſtead of* Apollodorus. I don't believe this is *Pliny*'s Meaning; but only that *Appollodorus*'s Statue appear'd ſo Paſſionate and Cholerick, that one would have taken it to be the very Figure of Anger. See the Epigrams of the *Anthologia*, quoted by Father *Harduin*, (a) upon a Thought like that of *Pliny*. This Miſtake of *du Pinet* is inconſiderable, if compared with thoſe that follow. Read firſt the Latin Words of *Pliny*. (b) *Et Achillem nobilem. Item Epiſtaten exercentem athletas: Strongylion Amazonem, quam ab excellentia crurum Eucnemon appellant, ob id in comitatu Neronis Principis circumlatam. Item fecit* (c) *puerum, quem amando Brutus Philippenſis cognomine ſuo illuſtravit. Du Pinet* renders 'em thus: “ He made alſo an *Achilles* very much eſteem'd, and *Epiſtbates*, who exerciſed the Wreſtlers. He made alſo *Strongylion* an *Amazon*, which he Sirnamed *Eucnemos*, that is, *Fine Legg'd*; which the Emperor *Nero* eſteem'd ſo much, that he had it commonly carried along with him. He made alſo a Statue of a young Boy, ſo Beautiful, that *Brutus* of *Philippopoli* in *Romania*, fell in love with it, and it was called by his Name. „ You ſee he aſcribes to *Silanion* all the Works mention'd in the Paſſage out of *Pliny*, whereas he ſhould only have aſcribed to him the two Firſt. The two others belonging to a famous Statuary, whoſe Name was *Strongylion*. He is mention'd in the 1ſt and 9th Books of *Pauſanias* (d): the Tranſlator took *Strongylion* for the Name of an *Amazon*, whoſe Statue had been made by *Silanion*. Beſides, he was in the wrong to think that that Statue was Sir-nam'd *Fine Legg'd* by the Sculptor that made it; *Pliny* does not ſay ſo. Laſtly, If he had a Mind to be underſtood, he ſhould not have mention'd one *Brutus* of *Philippopoli* in *Romania*, but *Brutus*, who periſh'd at the Battle of *Philippi*, the ſame who Murder'd *Julius Cæſar*.

(a) Harduin. in Plin. tom. 5. pag. 126

(b) Plin. ubi ſupra.

(c) Martial. epig. 77. lib. 2. & epigr. 51 lib. 9. & epigr. 171. lib. 14. *mentions that Statue of a Child, which* Brutus *loved.*

(d) Pauſan. lib. 1. pag. 97. & lib. 9. pag. 767. edit. 1696.

That the Remark contain'd in this Article, may ſerve as a Supplement to the Collections I have made in another place, concerning thoſe who are never pleaſed with their Productions, and ſpoil 'em by much reviſing them; I ſhall add to what *Pliny* ſays of *Apollodorus*, the Words of the ſame Author, wherein he does ſo well expreſs the ſame Fault of the Sculptor *Callimachus*. (e) *Ex omnibus autem maxime cognomine inſignis eſt Callimachus, ſemper calumniator ſui, nec finem habens diligentiæ, ob id Cacizotechnos appellatus, memorabili exemplo adhibendi curæ modum. Hujus ſunt ſaltantes Lacænæ; emendatum opus, ſed in quo gratiam omnem diligentia abſtulerit. Protogenes* a Painter was as nice as the Sculptors *Callimachus* and *Apollodorus*. We have ſeen in another place what Judgment *Apelles* made of him; and I add here, that this Judgment was approved by *Cicero*. I ſhall ſet down his own words, becauſe they may ſerve as an Inſtruction to the Writers, who are never weary of Mending their Compoſures. They know not that every thing ought to be kept within due Bounds. (f) *In omnibus rebus videndum eſt quatenus. Etſi enim ſuus cuique modus eſt, tamen magis offendit nimium, quam parum. In quo Apelles pictores quoque eos peccare dicebat, qui non ſentirent, quid eſſet ſatis.*

(e) Plin. ubi ſupra pag. 131.

(f) Cicero de Oratore fol. m. 130.

(A) *Not long of him, if that Roman Orator was not look'd upon as the only Model of a good Style.*] *Renatus Moreau* expreſſes this in very fine Words, in his Life of *James Sylvius*. I ſhall not ſet 'em down, but only the Epigram made upon *Sylvius* by *William Ducheri*, as I find it in the ſame Life.

FRANCISCI SYLVII RHETORIS TUMULUS.

Quod nunquam potuit multorum exercitus olim
Barbariem Francis finibus exigere;
Illud militibus ter centum Syvius egit,
Quo duce habet regnum lingua Latina ſuum.
Rem vero aggreſſus majorem, ut clarior eſſet
Romani princeps Tullius eloquii.
O mortem properam, Lacheſiſque breviſſima penſa!
Re prope confecta Sylvius oppetiit.

(B) *Several Books.*] *Progymnaſmatum in artem Oratoriam Centuriæ tres.* Some Commentaries upon Twenty One Orations of *Cicero*, upon his Tract *de Senectute*, and his Paradoxes, and upon the Letters of *Politian*, and ſome other Illuſtrious Men (g). This laſt Work has been re-printed ſeveral times. The Third Edition is of the Year 1526. He Dedicated it to *Euſtache de Croy*, Biſhop of *Arras*, whom he had taught for the ſpace of Four Years at *Louvain*; from whence it may be inferr'd, that he had ſome Employment in that Univerſity.

(g) Geſner. in Biblioth.

(C) *An Edition of* Martial *clear'd from many Obſcenities.*] Father *Vavaſſeur* would not deprive our *Sylvius* of the glory of being the Firſt, who curtail'd *Martial*, tho' the ſame thing was objected to the Jeſuits, and he might have turn'd it to their Advantage. Theſe are his Words. (h) *Quod unicam feciſſemus primi rem tantam, tam utilem omnibus, tam neceſſariam juventuti, eaque nobis ſolida & integra laus & propria maneret, cœpiſſe vel ſic de virtute ac morum diſciplina bene mereri. Sed eſt qui hanc nobis lauream præripuerit, antequam etiam nati, ut ſic dicam, eſſemus. Anno enim ſuperioris ſæculi decimo quarto Franciſcus quidam Sylvius, Ambianus, in Academia Pariſienſi qui tum degeret ac literas publice profiteretur, quaſi Augiæ ſtabulum purgaturus, hunc ſe laborem Herculeum ſuſcepiſſe declarat, horrida quidem & inſolenter ac barbare ſcripta epiſtola, facile ut appareat potiorem ei curam fuiſſe morum quam Latini ſermonis; ſed ex qua tamen intelligatur, &c.* Afterwards he

gives

(h) Vavaſſor de Epigrammate, pag. 255. & ſeq.

read Lectures, whereby he got a great deal of Money, of which he (*A*) was too greedy. He explain'd in two Years time, a whole Courſe of Phyſick taken from *Hippocrates* and *Galen*; and his Reputation was ſo great, that People reſorted to him from all Parts of *Europe*. But before he was ſo well known, he was very much thwarted by the *Paris* Phyſicians, who took it very ill, that a Man who had taken no where his Doctor's Degree, ſhould undertake to teach Phyſick in the Chief Town of the Kingdom. Whereupon he went to *Montpellier* in 1530, to take his Degree: He was there for ſome time, and then left the Place in order to return to *Paris*, without being admitted Doctor. He was not willing to be (*B*) at the Charges. Going by *Lyons*, he Publiſh'd there, at the requeſt of two * Phyſicians, a Diſputation *de vini exhibitione in Febribus*. 'Tis the Firſt Book he Printed. Being come to *Paris*, he endeavour'd to reconcile himſelf with the Phyſicians, that he might have leave to teach; and he Publiſh'd a *French* Grammar, which coſt him a great deal of pains: That Book was to be follow'd by another, which never came out, wherein he treated of the Origin of the *French* Tongue. He was admitted Batchelor (*C*) of Phyſick in *June* 1631. and it appears by the Records of the Faculty, that in the Year 1535, he taught in *Triequet*-College, whilſt *Fernel* taught in *Cornouaille*-College; but the latter had but few Auditors, whereas *Sylvius* (*D*) had a great many, becauſe he made Diſſections, and taught Botanicks, and the Preparation of Remedies, which *Fernel* did not do. *Vidus Vidius*, Profeſſor of Phyſick in the Royal College, being invited into *Italy* in the Year 1548, none was thought better qualify'd than *Sylvius* to fill up his Place. He was uncertain for

* *Symphorien Champier*, & *Jerome Du-Mont*.

gives us the Title of that Edition. *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton lectoris caſtimonia dignorum liber: ubi omnia Veneris illius deſpuenda quaſi irritamenta, quibus paſſim ſordidatam lectorum nares corrugabat, accurata Franciſci Sylvii Ambianatis diligentia deletili ſpongia deterſa ſunt & eluta.* He alſo gives us the Title of the Epiſtle Dedicatory. *Reverendum in Chriſto Patrem D. Nicolaum Conſturanum; & D. Hadrianum Henoncurium, Horeſtea amicitiæ ferrumine conferruminatos Franciſcus Sylvius Ambianas ſalute plurima impetitur.* He tells us that this Epiſtle Dedicatory is written in a very barbarous Style, and quite different from that which the Author had ſome time after. *Reſpondet inſcriptioni fœdæ & ridicule etiam informis quæ ſequitur epiſtola, quem ſermonem tamen ſuum Sylvius, quod vix credas,* (a) *Montauſeri, aliquot poſt Annis ita emendavit, ut à ſe totus diverſus & alius planè ſcriptor eſſe videatur.* The Concluſion of the Epiſtle runs thus: *Sylvio veſtro qui literarum haſce bonas ſegetes ab illis officium linguæ turpitudine multa ſuperantibus diſcriminavit, plauſibiliter adplaudite.* Laſtly, he ſays that *Martial* was not ſufficiently curtail'd, and that he has ſeen ſome very obſcene words in that Edition. *Vidi ego hunc ipſum librum à Jacobo Kerverio, Chriſti anno 1535. publicatum, hac inſcriptione quam modo poſui, hac epiſtola quæ caſtiſſima & ſanctiſſima omnia promitteret, nudis tamen & prætextatis aliquot vocibus ſpurcum atque infamem.*

(*A*) *Of which he was too greedy.*] A prodigious Avarice blaſted many good Qualitities of our *James Sylvius*. He had ſo many Scholars, that he ſhould not have narrowly minded whether each of 'em paid him; and yet he was ſo rigid about it, that he made a horrid noiſe, when they did not pay him exactly five (*b*) Pence *per* Month a piece. He fell once into ſo great a Paſſion, becauſe (*c*) one or two of his Scholars had not brought him his Monthly Money, that he ſwore he would leave off reading Lectures, if the other Scholars did not turn 'em out, or force 'em to pay him. He lived a very ſordid Life; he gave nothing but Bread to his Servants, and had no Fire all the Winter. He plaid at Foot-ball, and uſed to carry a Log upon his Shoulders from the Ground-floor to the Garret, to keep himſelf warm; and he ſaid the Heat he got by ſuch an Exerciſe did him more good than a Fire. 'Tis no wonder if he got a great deal of Money, living ſuch a ſordid Life, and if he hid his Gold under Ground. He had a Houſe in *St. Marceau*'s Suburb, where, 'twas ſaid, he had hid 500 Ducats: Some maintain'd they had ſeen 'em in a Red Purſe; which was confirm'd by a Magician, who deſired to have one half of that Treaſure for his pains of directing to it: But tho' they ſearch'd and dug the Ground, they did not find a Penny. When the Houſe in which *Sylvius* had lived, in *St. James*'s Street, was (*d*) pull'd down, in order to be re-built, the Maſons found ſome Piſtoles in it, and 'twas thought many more had been hid in it (*e*). *Buchanan* (*f*) made a Diſtich by way of Epitaph, when *Sylvius* was ſo angry, that he was for turning out the two poor Scholars who had not paid him. We are told, (*g*) that on the Funeral day, that Diſtich was poſted up to the Church-door by ſome of his Hearers. It runs thus:

> *Sylvius hic ſitus eſt, gratis qui nil dedit unquam,*
> *Mortuus & gratis quod legis iſta, dolet.*

Henry Stephens (*h*) Tranſlated it into *French* Verſe, thus:

> *Ici git Sylvius auquel onq en ſa vie*
> *De donner rien gratis ne prit aucune envie,*
> *Et ores qu'il eſt mort, & tout rongé de vers,*
> *Encores ha depit qu'on lit gratis ces vers.*

Another Satyrical Piece was Publiſh'd againſt him, wherein he was tax'd with Avarice in a pleaſant manner: *Moreau* aſcribes it to *Henry Stephens*. That Libel was a Dialogue, intitl'd *Sylvius ocreatus*, and the Author of it took the Name of *Ludovicus Arribavenus Mantuanus*. *Sylvius* call'd for his Boots a little before he died, to ſit by the Fire ſide, and expired Booted. Whereupon the Author of the Satyr feign'd that *Sylvius* had put on his Boots to croſs the *Acheron* without a Boat, and without paying any thing for the Ferriage. He was alſo bantered in that Book, for loving to talk in a Shoemaker's Shop; which was ſomewhat ſtrange for a Man ſo Learned, and ſo little Sociable. One of his Scholars call'd *John Melet*, made an Anſwer to that Satyr, under the fictitious Name of *Claudius Burgenſis* (*i*).

(*B*) *He was not willing to be at the Charges.*] *Renatus Moreau* heard an Old Phyſician of *Montpellier* ſay, That *Sylvius* promiſed the Profeſſors of that Univerſity to bring a vaſt number of Students from all parts of the Kingdom, if they would admit him into their Society *gratis*; and that his Propoſal not being accepted, he reſolved to return to *Paris*, to deſire the Faculty to give him leave to teach.

(*C*) *He was admitted Batchelor of Phyſick.*] The Records of the Faculty, which prove this Fact, irrefragably confute thoſe, who ſhould ſay after *Ranchin* (*k*), that *Sylvius* was a Phyſician at *Montpellier*; for ſince he was made Batchelor of Phyſick after his Journey to *Montpellier*, 'tis undeniable that he was not admitted Doctor at *Montpellier* before he return'd to Paris: Beſides, 'tis certain he did not leave *Paris* ſince he took his Batchelor's Degree in that Univerſity. (*l*)

(*D*) Sylvius *had a great many.*] He Publiſh'd for the Uſe of his Scholars, the Practice of *Mark Gattinaria*: 'Tis ſaid that Nine Hundred Copies were Sold off in One or Two Days, and that the Bookſeller was oblig'd to make a Second Edition (*m*). A Poet (*n*) who made his Epitaph, ſays, that a Thouſand Eyes were fixed upon him, when he read his Lectures:

> *Quem certa methodo medicis de rebus agentem,*
> *Aſſiduè in ludo totius principe terræ,*
> *Mille acri aſſiduè ſpectabant luminaq; viſu.*

(*e*) Ex Renato Moreau in ejus vita.
(*f*) *Henry Stephens*, ibid.
(*g*) Scæv. Sammarthanus in Elog. pag. m. 27.
(*h*) Ubi ſupra.
(*i*) Ex Renato Moreau ubi ſupra.
(*k*) In Catalogo Doctor. Monſpel.
(*l*) Moreau ibid.
(*m*) Moreau in vita Sylvii.
(*n*) J. Vavræus, apud Moreau ibid.

Moreau

for the ſpace of two Years, whether he ſhould accept that Employment; but at laſt he accepted it in 1550, and continued in it 'till he died, which happen'd the (E) 13th of *January* 1555. 'Twas the Seventy Seventh Year of his Life ‡. He was Buried in the Burying-place (F) of poor Scholars. He never was Married, and ſeem'd to have an Averſion to Women. He took more care to clear his Style from the Barbarouſneſs that prevail'd in the Schools, than to leave off his (G) Rough and Wild way. He was ſo addicted to *Galen's* Opinions, that he obſtinately maintain'd his Errors; and Judicial (H) Aſtrology was the only thing wherein he departed from him. I ſhall ſay (I) ſomething of his Writings. He had a great (K) Quarrel with *Veſalius*.

SIMON or **SIMONIS** (*Theodorus*) was Born * at *Bercheſtede* in *Holſtein*. See the Remark I in the Article of *Janſenius*, to which you may add what follows. *Fromond* || maintains, that this Man being ſet at Liberty, Abjur'd his Hereſies at *Louvain*, and that *Janſenius* gave him wherewithal to pay his Charges in the Tavern, and to make his Journey. He further ſays, that he had forſaken his Order at *Magdeburg* before he came to *Louvain*. I ſhall ſpeak of the Anſwer that was

Moreau underſtands it of Five Hundred Auditors, and quotes *Sylvius* himſelf, who ſays, he had but four Hundred, (a) *auditoribus circiter quadringentis*. If it be ſo, *Moreau* ſhould not have ſaid that *Sylvius's* School might be compared with that of *Theophraſtus* (b), who had two Thouſand Scholars. *Henry Stephens* (c) mentions only two or three Hundred Scholars of *Sylvius*.

(E) *The* 13th *of* January 1555. *'Twas the 77th Year of his Life*] *Renatus Moreau* quotes Five Authors for it, *viz. Mizauld*, *Paſchaſius Gallus*, *Arrivabenus* (d), *Claudius Burgenſis*, and *La Croix du Maine*. But he obſerves, at the ſame time, that *Sainte* (e) *Marthe* and (f) *Geſner* ſay, that he lived only Sixty Three Years; that *Du Breul* (g) places his Death on the Firſt Day of *February* 1554; and that according to *Nancelius* and *Rouville*, he flouriſhed in 1557, and 1560. My Edition of *Du Breul* of the Year 1639 in 4to. places *Sylvius's* Death in the 63d Year of his Life, and on the 10th of *January* 1554 *Moreri*, *Merlinus* (h), and *Freherus* (i) have committed the ſame Miſtake with *Sainte Marthe*.

(F) *In the Burying-place of poor Scholars.*] He ordered it ſo by his Will. That Burying-place is before *Montaigu* College. The Funeral was performed with great Pomp: The Univerſity were preſent at it, and the Phyſicians put on their Scarlet Gowns. The Name of that Burying-place puts me in mind of a Tract written by *Sylvius*, in favour of poor Scholars: It is intitl'd, *De victus ratione facili ac ſalubri pauperum Scholaſticorum.* He preſcribes them a Diet, which, ſays he, God has put into his Heart to Publiſh; and he enters upon ſuch a Detail as would make the Men of our Age laugh, who are leſs tractable than thoſe of *Sylvius's* time. He adviſes the Scholars, who awake in the Night, to Cough and Spit ſtoutly, and gives 'em ſeveral little Expedients to keep themſelves Warm in Bed. *Ut citius incaleſcas pedes etiam in nates reduces, in lectum inſpira.* 'Tis likely he knew the Benefit of 'em by his own Experience.

(G) *His Rough and Wild way.*] He ſeldom Jeſted, and ſeldom departed from his Gravity; and when he had a Mind to appear more ſociable, by ſome witty Conceit, he did it ſomewhat uncouthly. Here's the only Merry Thought that is told of him: He ſaid one Day, *That he had parted with Three Beaſts, his Cat, his Mule, and his Maid.*

(H) *Judicial Aſtrology was the only thing*] It had never been ſo much in vogue both at Court and in the Town, as in *Sylvius's* time; (k) and yet he oppoſed it ſtoutly, whenever there was occaſion for it. One Day after he had railed bitterly at the Aſtrologers, he told his good Friend *Turnebus* (l), that he had often run over the whole Almanack in the beginning of the Year, and ſet down *Fair Weather* whereever there was *Rainy Weather*; *Wind* inſtead of *Calm*; *Cloudy Weather* inſtead of *Clear Weather*; and that he found by the Event, at the Years end, that he had been a much better Aſtrologer than they.

(I) *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his Writings.*] The Chief Books he wrote are, *Methodus medicamenta componendi ad uſum medicorum concinnata. Libri de medicamentorum ſimplicium delectu in Pharmacopæorum gratiam conſcripti. Caſtigationes & emendationes in Joannem Meſuaeum.* His Books of Anatomy were Publickly explain'd by the Profeſſors of *Paris*. His Treatiſe *De Menſibus Mulierum*, was the Text on which *Lewis Duret* read Publick Lectures. The ſame Tract, and another *de Generatione Hominis*, were Tranſlated into *French* by *William Chretien*, Phyſician to *Henry* II. His Tracts of Anatomy and Pharmacy have been Tranſlated into *French*, and Re-printed ſeveral times. They are probably the ſame that were publickly explain'd by one of the moſt Zealous Scholars of *Veſalius*; which is much, conſidering how violently (m) he, and *Veſalius* hated one another. There is an (n) Edition in Folio of *Sylvius's* Works, Publiſhed by *Renatus Moreau*, who prefixed to it the Life of that great Man, out of which I have Extracted this Article. That Life is ſo well Written, that it were to be wiſh'd, the Work (o) from which it was taken, was Printed. Next to it there are many Encomiums upon *Sylvius*, collected out of divers Authors, whereby it appears that he was in great Eſteem.

(K) *A great Quarrel with* Veſalius.] The latter gave *Sylvius* the greateſt Trouble that ever he had. *Sylvius's* Excellency lay in Anatomy, and he was preparing a Work upon that Subject, which he look'd upon as his Maſter-piece. Whereupon *Veſalius* Publiſhes in 1541, his *Opus Anatomicum*, ſo well done, and with ſo many fine Cuts, that every body admires it. *Veſalius* had been *Sylvius's* Scholar for the ſpace of Three Years, which is another Vexation; the Scholar ſupplants his Maſter. Beſides, he writes againſt *Galen*, and not only charges him with many Faults, tho' perhaps without Reaſon, but plainly ſhews ſome of his Errors. How could *Sylvius* bear this, being look'd upon as the Reſtorer and Firſt Interpreter of *Galen*? He maintain'd that *Galen* had writ nothing but what was true, and indulged his Anger to ſuch a Degree, that he continually inveighed againſt his Antagoniſt. (p) *Sylvius ita exarſit in iras tantoque odio commotus eſt in Veſalium, primo ut nihil a Galeno ſcriptum prolatumque eſſe contenderet quod veritati non eſſet conſentaneum; ſecundo ut nulla habita ratione ætatis & gravitatis ſuæ, impetu quodam mentis ſervilione elatus anſam declamandi in* Veſalium (*quem* Veſanum *appellabat*) *ſingulis diebus arriperet, & contumelioſius exciperet, quam vel ipſe propter prudentiam longa rerum experientia comparatam, vel* Veſalius *ob laudabile ſuum inſtitutum ad utilitatem publicam deſtinatum mereretur.* The Emperor's Phyſicians, and even ſome Courtiers, who hated *Veſalius*, becauſe of his Preſumption and Merit, threw Oil into the Fire. That Quarrel produc'd many Books, and the Progreſs of it may be known by reading *Sylvius's* Book *in Veſanum*; *Veſalius's* Letter *de China radice*; a Piece of *Francis Puteus in Veſalium*, another of *Renatus Henerus in Sylvium*; *Fallopius's* Anatomical Obſervations, and *Cuneus's* Apology againſt *Puteus*.

---

‡ Taken from his Life prefix'd to his Works, and written by *Renatus Moreau*.

* *Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ, parte 4. pag. 108.*

|| *Lib. Fromont. das Criſi Deſperatæ cauſæ Papinis, cap.* 15 pag. 284.

(a) Præfat. libri de officiis.

(b) Diog. Laert. in ejus vita.

(c) Ubi ſupra.

(d) *See above the Remark A.*

(e) In Elog. pag. m. 27.

(f) In 2. Catal. libr. Galeni.

(g) In Antiquitat. Pariſ.

(h) In Lindenio renovato.

(i) In Theatro. Virorum eruditione claror.

(k) *Note, that inſtead of* and yet, *one might ſay*, and therefore. *This ſort of things have two Faces.*

(l) Turnebus, epiſt. ad Cardinal. Lotharingum, præfixa Opuſc. Plutarchi de Orac. defectu.

was (*Y*) made to this Account. Some might think that a certain Impious Book concerns our (*Z*) *Simonis*; but 'tis not true. He changed his Name into that of *Philippus Cosmius* ✝.

SIMONIDES, a Jambick Poet, was Born at || *Minoa* a Town of the Isle of *Amorgos* † one of the *Sporades*. If we believe *Suidas*, he flourish'd 406. Years after the taking of *Troy*; but 'tis very likely he is not so Ancient. He is quoted by *Athenæus*, *Julius Pollux*, *Ælian*, and some other Authors. He made a very Ridiculous (*A*) Satyr against Women.

SIMONIDES, one of the best Ancient Poets, was a Native of *Cea*, an Island of the *Ægean* Sea. He flourish'd still in the time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition, that is, about the 75. Olympiad. He exercised his Talent upon several sorts of Poems; but he succeeded (*A*) chiefly in Elegies. 'Tis said that he was (*B*) preserved twice from

✝ Biblioth. [illegible] pag. [illegible]

|| Stephan. Byzant. voce Ἀμοργός.

† Strabo lib. 10. sub fin.

(*Y*) *Of the Answer that was made to this Account.*] I shall not repeat (*a*) what concerns *Simonis*'s Journey to *Louvain*, and his Conferences with *Jansenius*. I shall only say, that after he had left that Town, he writ a Piece, *de falsis principiis fidei pontificiæ ejusque Idololatria*, which he sent to *Jansenius* in 1631. It contain'd the motives of his Conversion, and he hoped that *Jansenius* would answer him; but he was mistaken: Whereupon he writ a Letter (*b*) to him, which he Publish'd, wherein he earnestly desired to have an answer from him. That Letter contains the History of his Imprisonment: It was inserted in a Book (*c*) of *Voetius*, in the Year 1635. Whereupon *Fromond* thought himself obliged to speak of *Simonis*, in his answer to that Book of *Voetius*. He gave a very unfaithful Account of the Matter, if we may depend upon the Answer that was made him. See the Apologetical Letter which *Simonis* inscribed to him: It is prefixed to his Treatise *De statu & religione propria Papatus adversus Cornelium Jansenium Episcopum Iprensem*, Printed at *Leyden* in 1638. He maintains that *Fromond* falsified and supprest several Circumstances of the Fact; he denies that he had abjured the Catholick Religion at *Louvain*; he owns that he was for sometime in the Order of the *Premonstratenses*, but that he left it before he (*d*) made any Vow.

(*Z*) *That a certain Impious Book concerns our* Simonis.] Some, who know in general that *Simonis*'s Name is in the Title of such a Book, and that *Theodorus Simonis* was successively a Lutheran, a Papist, a Lutheran and a Socinian, and that he was Rector of a Socinian College in *Poland*, and that the Book in question was Printed in *Poland*, might think that this Book was Written by that *Socinian*, for the time is not always minded. This is the Subject of this Remark. Those, who desire to know something of that Impious Book, need only read the following Passage of *Spizelius*: (*e*) *De Atheismo in Polonia, ex Atheo libello, Cracoviæ anno* 1588. *tit*: Simonis religio, authore incerto edito, *judicium fieri poterit in quo præter portenta innumera hæc quoque verba reperiuntur*: Credo in tria, Cœlum, Terram, & Cœli formam, in Cœlum patrem, atque Creatorem omnium. In terram omnium matrem, atque nutricem, & in Cœli formam omnia sentientem, & intelligentem. Ede itaque, bibe, lude, jam Deus figmentum est.

(*A*) *He made a very Ridiculous Satyr against Women.*] He supposed that their Souls had a different Original, according to the Diversity of their Humours: that the Souls of some Women came from Horses, Foxes, or Apes, &c. and that the Souls of others proceeded from the Sea, or the Earth, &c. *Ælian* quotes what he said concerning Women, who loved to Paint, and trick up themselves: He derived their Souls from Horses. (*f*) Καὶ ὁ Σιμωνίδης δὲ ἐκ παντοδαπῶν θηρίων λέγων τὰς γυναῖκας γενέσθαι τε, ϗ διαπλασθῆναι, φησὶν ἐνίας ἐκ τῶν ἵππων τὸ τι φιλόκοσμον ϗ φιλόμυρον συντετυχηκέναι κατ' ἐκείνας φύσιν: *Quin & Simonides fabulans ex diversis bestiis natas & conformatas esse mulieres, nonnullis earum ornatus & unguentorum studium ex equorum naturâ innatum esse scribit*. I omit the Greek Verses that follow in *Ælian*, and I shall only set down the conclusion of that Passage in Latin. *Talis quidem uxor præbet se spectaculum aliis jucundum, sed viro nocet suo: Nisi ille fuerit aut rex, aut vir præpotens. Hujusmodi uxor oblectare quem queat.* The meaning of which is, that such a Woman is a pleasant sight to other Men, but very prejudicial to her Husband, unless he be a King or a great Lord. You'll find in *Stobæus* (*g*) not only the same Verses mention'd by *Ælian*, but also many more out of the same Work of *Simonides*. That Poet was very near as Unjust as the *Italian* Author (*h*), who maintain'd that Women have no Souls. To conclude, if I ascribe to this *Simonides*, and not to that mention'd in the following Article, the Verses quoted by *Ælian*, I do but follow *Leo Allatius*'s Opinion (*i*).

(*A*) *He succeeded chiefly in Elegies.*] *Quintilian* says so. (*k*) *Simonides tenuis (l), aliequi sermone proprio & jucunditate quadam commendari potest: præcipua tamen ejus in commovenda miseratione virtus, ut quidam in hac eum parte omnibus ejusdem operis autoribus præferant. Dionysius Halicarnassæus* acknowledges, among other Virtues, that *Simonides* had the Talent of moving, and places him in that respect much above *Pindar*. (*m*) Σιμωνίδου δὲ παρατήρει τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τῆς συνθέσεως τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, πρὸς τούτοις καθ' ὃ βελτίων εὑρίσκεται ϗ Πινδάρου τὸ οἰκτίζεσθαι μὴ μεγαλοπρεπῶς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκεῖνος παθητικῶς. *Simonidis vero observa nominum delectum, compositionis accuratam rationem; ad hæc, in quo etiam multo melior est ipso Pindaro, miserationem commovet, non ut ille magnifice, sed suo ipse more pathetice.* When *Horace* has a mind to denote Lamenting Muses, he uses an Expression which represents our Poet.

Sed (n) ne relictis, Musa procax, jocis
Cea retractes munera næniæ.

Catullus (*o*) may be also quoted for the same thing. One of the most Famous Works of *Simonides* was Intitled (*p*) *Lamentations*. I have said in another (*q*) place, that he carried the Prize of the Elegy from *Æschylus*.

(*B*) *Preserved twice from a Mortal danger.*] One Day he Supp'd at *Scopas*'s House, who was a considerable Man for his Noble Birth, and great Riches. After he had recited the Poem he had made for a set Price in that Man's Honour, wherein he inserted an Encomium upon *Castor* and *Pollux*, he was told that he should receive one half of the Price agreed upon, and that he might, if he thought fit, ask the other half of the (*r*) *Tyndarides*, on whom he had bestowed as many Praises as upon *Scopas*. Soon after he was inform'd that two Young Men stood at the Door and desired to speak with him. He went out and saw no Body. In the mean time the Room, where he had left *Scopas* and the other Guests, fell down, and they were all kill'd. *Cicero* relates this in very fine Words. (*s*) *Dicunt quum cœnaret Crannone in Thessalia Simonides apud Scopam fortunatum hominem & nobilem, cecinissetque id carmen, quod in eum scripsisset, in quo multa ornandi causa poetarum more in Castorem scripta, & Pollucem fuissent, nimis illum sordide Simonidi dixisse, se dimidium ejus ei quod pactus esset pro illo carmine, daturum, reliquum à suis Tyndaridis, quos æque laudasset, peteret, si ei videretur. Paulo post esse ferunt nunciatum Simonidi, ut prodiret, juvenes stare ad januam duos quosdam, qui eum magnopere evocarent, surrexisse illum ipsum, prodisse, vidisse neminem. Hoc interim spatio conclave illud, ubi epularetur Scopas, concidisse, ea ruina ipsum oppressum* cum

(*a*) See ... Article ... Jansenius.

(*b*) Dated ... 12. ... 1633.

(*c*) ... Papa ...

(*d*) ... pag. ...

(*e*) Spizelius, in ... 44.

(*f*) Ælian. ... lib. 16. ... 24. ... 341.

(*g*) Stobæus serm. 71. de vituperio mulierum fol. m. 252. verso.

(*h*) See Vigneul Marville's Melanges tom. 1. pag. 16, 17.

(*i*) Allat. de Simeon. scriptis pag. 206, 207.

(*k*) Quintil. instit. orator. lib. 10. c. 1. p. m. 468.

(*l*) Concerning this simplicity of Simonides. See M. le Fevre Abregé de la vie des poetes Grecs pag. m. 38.

(*m*) Dionys. Halic. de veter. scriptor. cens.

(*n*) Horat. Od. 1. lib. 2.

(*o*) Paulum quid lubet adlocutionis mœstius lacrymis Simonideis. Catull. epigramm. 39.

(*p*) See M. le Fevre ubi supra p. 39.

(*q*) *In the Article* Æschylus. (*r*) *That is*, Castor *and* Pollux. (*s*) Cicero de Oratore lib. 2. fol. 87. D. *See also* Phædrus, lib. 4 fab. 24.

for the ſpace of two Years, whether he ſhould accept that Employment; but at laſt he accepted it in 1550, and continued in it 'till he died, which happen'd the (E) 13th of *January* 1555. 'Twas the Seventy Seventh Year of his Life †. He was Buried in the Burying-place (F) of poor Scholars. He never was Married, and ſeem'd to have an Averſion to Women. He took more care to clear his Style from the Barbarouſneſs that prevail'd in the Schools, than to leave off his (G) Rough and Wild way. He was ſo addicted to *Galen*'s Opinions, that he obſtinately maintain'd his Errors; and Judicial (H) Aſtrology was the only thing wherein he departed from him. I ſhall ſay (I) ſomething of his Writings. He had a great (K) Quarrel with *Veſalius*.

SIMON or **SIMONIS** (*Theodorus*) was Born * at *Berchestede* in *Holſtein*. See the Remark *I* in the Article of *Janſenius*, to which you may add what follows. *Fromond* || maintains, that this Man being ſet at Liberty, Abjur'd his Hereſies at *Louvain*, and that *Janſenius* gave him wherewithal to pay his Charges in the Tavern, and to make his Journey. He further ſays, that he had forſaken his Order at *Magdeburg* before he came to *Louvain*. I ſhall ſpeak of the Anſwer that was

† Taken from his Life prefix'd to his Works, and written by Renatus Moreau.

* Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, parte 4. pag. 608.

|| Lib. Fromondi Criſis Deſperatæ cauſæ Papatus, cap. 15. pag. 284.

Moreau underſtands it of Five Hundred Auditors, and quotes *Sylvius* himſelf, who ſays, he had but four Hundred, (a) *auditoribus circiter quadringentis*. If it be ſo, *Moreau* ſhould not have ſaid that *Sylvius*'s School might be compared with that of *Theophraſtus* (b), who had two Thouſand Scholars. *Henry Stephens* (c) mentions only two or three Hundred Scholars of *Sylvius*.

(E) *The 13th of* January 1555. *'Twas the 77th Year of his Life.*] *Renatus Moreau* quotes Five Authors for it, viz. *Mizauld*, *Paſchaſius Gallus*, *Arrivabenus* (d), *Claudius Burgenſis*, and *La Croix du Maine*. But he obſerves, at the ſame time, that *Sainte* (e) *Marthe* and (f) *Geſner* ſay, that he lived only Sixty Three Years; that *Du Breul* (g) places his Death on the Firſt Day of *February* 1554: and that according to *Nancelius* and *Rouville*, he flouriſhed in 1557, and 1560. My Edition of *Du Breul* of the Year 1639 in 4to. places *Sylvius*'s Death in the 63d Year of his Life, and on the 10th of *January* 1554. *Moreri*, *Merlinus* (h), and *Freherus* (i) have committed the ſame Miſtake with *Sainte Marthe*.

(F) *In the Burying-place of poor Scholars.*] He ordered it ſo by his Will. That Burying-place is before *Montaigu* College. The Funeral was performed with great Pomp: The Univerſity were preſent at it, and the Phyſicians put on their Scarlet Gowns. The Name of that Burying-place puts me in mind of a Tract written by *Sylvius*, in favour of poor Scholars: It is intitl'd, *De victus ratione facili ac ſalubri pauperum Scholaſticorum*. He preſcribes them a Diet, which, ſays he, God has put into his Heart to Publiſh; and he enters upon ſuch a Detail as would make the Men of our Age laugh, who are leſs tractable than thoſe of *Sylvius*'s time. He adviſes the Scholars, who awake in the Night, to Cough and Spit ſtoutly, and gives 'em ſeveral little Expedients to keep themſelves Warm in Bed. *Ut citius incaleſcas pedes etiam in nates reduces, in lectum inſpira.* 'Tis likely he knew the Benefit of 'em by his own Experience.

(G) *His Rough and Wild way.*] He ſeldom Jeſted, and ſeldom departed from his Gravity; and when he had a Mind to appear more ſociable, by ſome witty Conceit, he did it ſomewhat uncouthly. Here's the only Merry Thought that is told of him: He ſaid one Day, *That he had parted with Three Beaſts, his Cat, his Mule, and his Maid.*

(H) *Judicial Aſtrology was the only thing.*] It had never been ſo much in vogue both at Court and in the Town, as in *Sylvius*'s time; (k) and yet he oppoſed it ſtoutly, whenever there was occaſion for it. One Day after he had railed bitterly at the Aſtrologers, he told his good Friend *Turnebus* (l), that he had often run over the whole Almanack in the beginning of the Year, and ſet down *Fair Weather* whereever there was *Rainy Weather*; *Wind* inſtead of *Calm*; *Cloudy Weather* inſtead of *Clear Weather*; and that he found by the Event, at the Years end, that he had been a much better Aſtrologer than they.

(I) *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his Writings.*] The Chief Books he wrote are, *Methodus medicamenta componendi ad uſum medicorum concinnata. Libri de medicamentorum ſimplicium delectu in Pharmacopæorum gratiam conſcripti. Caſtigationes & emendationes in Joannem Meſuaum.* His Books of Anatomy were Publickly explain'd by the Profeſſors of *Paris*. His Treatiſe *De Menſibus Mulierum*, was the Text on which *Lewis Duret* read Publick Lectures. The ſame Tract, and another *de Generatione Hominis*, were Tranſlated into *French* by *William Chretien*, Phyſician to *Henry* II. His Tracts of Anatomy and Pharmacy have been Tranſlated into *French*, and Re-printed ſeveral times. They are probably the ſame that were publickly explain'd by one of the moſt Zealous Scholars of *Veſalius*; which is much, conſidering how violently (m) he, and *Veſalius* hated one another. There is an (n) Edition in Folio of *Sylvius*'s Works, Publiſhed by *Renatus Moreau*, who prefixed to it the Life of that great Man, out of which I have Extracted this Article. That Life is ſo well Written, that it were to be wiſh'd, the Work (o) from which it was taken, was Printed. Next to it there are many Encomiums upon *Sylvius*, collected out of divers Authors, whereby it appears that he was in great Eſteem.

(K) *A great Quarrel with* Veſalius.] The latter gave *Sylvius* the greateſt Trouble that ever he had. *Sylvius*'s Excellency lay in Anatomy, and he was preparing a Work upon that Subject, which he look'd upon as his Maſter-piece. Whereupon *Veſalius* Publiſhes in 1541, his *Opus Anatomicum*, ſo well done, and with ſo many fine Cuts, that every body admires it. *Veſalius* had been *Sylvius*'s Scholar for the ſpace of Three Years, which is another Vexation; the Scholar ſupplants his Maſter. Beſides, he writes againſt *Galen*, and not only charges him with many Faults, tho' perhaps without Reaſon, but plainly ſhews ſome of his Errors. How could *Sylvius* bear this, being look'd upon as the Reſtorer and Firſt Interpreter of *Galen*? He maintain'd that *Galen* had writ nothing but what was true, and indulged his Anger to ſuch a Degree, that he continually inveighed againſt his Antagoniſt. (p) *Sylvius ita exarſit in iras tantoque odio commotus eſt in Veſalium, primo ut nihil a Galeno ſcriptum prolatumque eſſe contenderet quod veritati non eſſet conſentaneum; ſecundo ut nulla habita ratione ætatis & gravitatis ſuæ, impetu quodam mentis ſervidiore elatus anſam declamandi in* Veſalium (*quem* Veſanum *appellabat*) *ſingulis diebus arriperet, & contumelioſius exciperet, quam vel ipſe propter prudentiam longa rerum experientia comparatam, vel* Veſalius *ob laudabile ſuum inſtitutum ad utilitatem publicam deſtinatum mereretur.* The Emperor's Phyſicians, and even ſome Courtiers, who hated *Veſalius*, becauſe of his Preſumption and Merit, threw Oil into the Fire. That Quarrel produc'd many Books, and the Progreſs of it may be known by reading *Sylvius*'s Book *in Veſanum*; *Veſalius*'s Letter *de China radice*; a Piece of *Francis Puteus in Veſalium*, another of *Renatus Henerus in Sylvium*; *Fallopius*'s Anatomical Obſervations, and *Cuneus*'s Apology againſt *Puteus*.

(q) Of

(a) Præfat. libri de officiis.

(b) Diog. Laert. in ejus vita.

(c) Ubi ſupra.

(d) See above the Remark A.

(e) In Elog. pag. m. 27.

(f) In 2. Catal. libr. Galeni.

(g) In Antiquit. ut. Paris.

(h) In Lindenio renovato.

(i) In Theatro Virorum eruditione clarorum.

(k) Note, that inſtead of and yet, one might ſay, and therefore. This ſort of things have two Faces.

(l) Turnebus, epiſt. ad Cardinal. Lotharingum, præfixa Opuſc. Plutarchi de Orac. defectu.

(m) See the Remark K.

(p) Ren. Moreau in vita Sylvii.

was (Y) made to this Account. Some might think that a certain Impious Book concerns our (Z) *Simonis*; but 'tis not true. He changed his Name into that of *Philippus Cosmius* γ.

SIMONIDES, a Jambick Poet, was Born at || *Minoa* a Town of the Isle of *Amorgos* † one of the *Sporades*. If we believe *Suidas*, he flourish'd 406. Years after the taking of *Troy*; but 'tis very likely he is not so Ancient. He is quoted by *Athenæus*, *Julius Pollux*, *Ælian*, and some other Authors. He made a very Ridiculous (A) Satyr against Women.

SIMONIDES, one of the best Ancient Poets, was a Native of *Ceos*, an Island of the *Ægean* Sea. He flourish'd still in the time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition, that is, about the 75. Olympiad. He exercised his Talent upon several sorts of Poems; but he succeeded (A) chiefly in Elegies. 'Tis said that he was (B) preserved twice from

γ *Biblioth. Antitrinit. pag.* [illegible]

|| *Stephan. Byzant. voce Ἀμοργός.*

† *Strab. lib. 10. sub fin.*

(Y) *Of the Answer that was made to the Account.*] I shall not repeat (a) what concerns *Simonis*'s Journey to *Louvain*, and his Conferences with *Jansenius*. I shall only say, that after he had left that Town, he writ a Piece, *de falsis principiis fidei pontificiæ ejusque idololatria*, which he sent to *Jansenius* in 1631. It contain'd the motives of his Conversion, and he hoped that *Jansenius* would answer him; but he was mistaken: Whereupon he writ a Letter (b) to him, which he Publish'd, wherein he earnestly desired to have an answer from him. That Letter contains the History of his Imprisonment: It was inserted in a Book (c) of *Voetius*, in the Year 1635. Whereupon *Fromond* thought himself obliged to speak of *Simonis*, in his answer to that Book of *Voetius*. He gave a very unfaithful Account of the Matter, if we may depend upon the Answer that was made him. See the Apologetical Letter which *Simonis* inscribed to him: It is prefixed to his Treatise *De statu & religione propria Papatus adversus Cornelium Jansenium Episcopum Iprensem*, Printed at *Leyden* in 1638. He maintains that *Fromond* falsified and supprest several Circumstances of the Fact; he denies that he had abjured the Catholick Religion at *Louvain*; he owns that he was for sometime in the Order of the *Premonstratenses*, but that he left it before he (d) made any Vow.

(Z) *That a certain Impious Book concerns our Simonis.*] Some, who know in general that *Simonis*'s Name is in the Title of such a Book, and that *Theodorus Simonis* was successively a Lutheran, a Papist, a Lutheran and a Socinian, and that he was Rector of a Socinian College in *Poland*, and that the Book in question was Printed in *Poland*, might think that this Book was Written by that *Socinian*, for the time is not always minded. This is the Subject of this Remark. Those, who desire to know something of that Impious Book, need only read the following Passage of *Spizelius*: (e) *De Atheismo in Polonia, ex Atheo libello, Cracoviæ anno* 1588. *tit*: Simonis religio, authore incerto edito, *judicium fieri poterit in quo præter portenta innumera hæc quoque verba reperiuntur*: Credo in tria, Cœlum, Terram, & Cœli formam, in Cœlem patrem, atque Creatorem omnium. In terram omnium matrem, atque nutricem, & in Cœli formam omnia sentientem, & intelligentem. Ede itaque, bibe, lude, jam Deus figmentum est.

(A) *He made a very Ridiculous Satyr against Women.*] He supposed that their Souls had a different Original, according to the Diversity of their Humours: that the Souls of some Women came from Horses, Foxes, or Apes, *&c.* and that the Souls of others proceeded from the Sea, or the Earth, *&c.* *Ælian* quotes what he said concerning Women, who loved to Paint, and trick up themselves: He derived their Souls from Horses. (f) Καὶ ὁ Σιμωνίδης δὲ ἐκ παντοδαπῶν θηρίων λέγων τὰς γυναῖκας γενέσθαι τε, καὶ διαπλασθῆναι, φησὶν ἐνίας ἐκ τῶν ἵππων τό τε φιλόκοσμον καὶ φιλόμυρον συντεχθῆναι κατ' ἐκείνας φύσει: *Quin & Simonides fabulans ex diversis bestiis natas & conformatas esse mulieres, nonnullis earum ornatus & unguentorum studium ex equorum naturâ innatum esse scribit.* I omit the *Greek* Verses that follow in *Ælian*, and I shall only set down the conclusion of that Passage in Latin. *Talis quidem uxor præbet se spectaculum aliis jucundum, sed viro nocet suo: Nisi ille fuerit aut rex, aut vir præpotens. Hujusmodi uxor oblectare quem queat.* The meaning of which is, that such a Woman is a pleasant sight to other Men, but very prejudicial to her Husband, unless he be a King or a great Lord. You'll find in *Stobæus* (g) not only the same Verses mention'd by *Ælian*, but also many more out of the same Work of *Simonides*. That Poet was very near as Unjust as the *Italian* Author (h), who maintain'd that Women have no Souls. To conclude, if I ascribe to this *Simonides*, and not to that mention'd in the following Article, the Verses quoted by *Ælian*, I do but follow *Leo Allatius*'s Opinion (i).

(A) *He succeeded chiefly in Elegies.*] *Quintilian* says so. (k) *Simonides tenuis (l), alioqui sermone proprio & jucunditate quadam commendari potest: præcipua tamen ejus in commovenda miseratione virtus, ut quidam in hac eum parte omnibus ejusdem operis autoribus præferant.* *Dionysius Halicarnasseus* acknowledges, among other Virtues, that *Simonides* had the Talent of moving, and places him in that respect much above *Pindar*. (m) Σιμωνίδου δὲ παρατήρει τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τῆς συνθέσεως τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, πρὸς τούτοις καθ' ὃ βελτίων εὑρίσκεται καὶ Πινδάρου τὸ οἰκτίζεσθαι μὴ μεγαλοπρεπῶς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκεῖνος παθητικῶς. *Simonidis vero observa nominum delectum, compositionis accuratam rationem; ad hæc, in quo etiam multo melior est ipso Pindaro, miserationem commovet, non ut ille magnifice, sed suo ipse more pathetice.* When *Horace* has a mind to denote Lamenting Muses, he uses an Expression which represents our Poet.

Sed (n) ne relictis, Musa procax, jocis
Ceæ retractes munera næniæ.

Catullus (o) may be also quoted for the same thing. One of the most Famous Works of *Simonides* was Intitled (p) *Lamentations*. I have said in another (q) place, that he carried the Prize of the Elegy from *Æschylus*.

(B) *Preserved twice from a Mortal danger.*] One Day he Supp'd at *Scopas*'s House, who was a considerable Man for his Noble Birth, and great Riches. After he had recited the Poem he had made for a set Price in that Man's Honour, wherein he inserted an Encomium upon *Castor* and *Pollux*, he was told that he should receive one half of the Price agreed upon, and that he might, if he thought fit, ask the other half of the (r) *Tyndarides*, on whom he had bestowed as many Praises as upon *Scopas*. Soon after he was inform'd that two Young Men stood at the Door and desired to speak with him. He went out and saw no Body. In the mean time the Room, where he had left *Scopas* and the other Guests, fell down, and they were all kill'd. *Cicero* relates this in very fine Words. (s) *Dicunt quum cœnaret Crannone in Thessalia Simonides apud Scopam fortunatum hominem & nobilem, cecinissetque id carmen, quod in eum scripsisset, in quo multa ornandi causa poëtarum more in Castorem scripta, & Pollucem fuissent, nimis illum sordide Simonidi dixisse, se dimidium ejus ei quod pactus esset pro illo carmine, daturum, reliquum à suis Tyndaridis, quos æque laudasset, peteret, si ei videretur. Paulo post esse ferunt nunciatum Simonidi, ut prodiret, juvenes stare ad januam duos quosdam, qui eum magnopere evocarent, surrexisse illum ipsum, prodisse, vidisse neminem. Hoc interim spatio conclave illud, ubi epularetur Scopas, concidisse, ea ruina ipsum oppressum* cum

(g) Stobæus serm. 71. de vituperio mulierum fol. m. 252. verso.

(h) *See* Vigneul Marville's Melanges tom. 1. pag. 16, 17.

(i) Allat. de Simeon. scriptis pag. 206, 207.

(k) Quintil. instit. orator. lib. 10. c. 1. p. m. 468.

(l) *Concerning this simplicity of* Simonides. *See* M. le Fevre Abregé de la vie des poëtes Grecs pag. m. 38.

(m) Dionys. Halic. de veter. scriptor. cens.

(n) Horat. Od. 1. lib. 2.

(o) Paullum quid lubet adlocutionis mœstius lacrymis Simonideis. Catull. epigramm. 39.

(p) *See* M. le Fevre ubi supra p. 39.

(q) *In the Article* Æschylus. (r) *That is*, Castor *and* Pollux. (s) Cicero de Oratore lib. 2. fol. 87. D. *See also* Phædrus, lib. 4 fab. 24.

from a Mortal danger, and that it was for a reward of his Virtue. The Invention of Local (C) Memory is aſcribed to him. He is one of thoſe Poets, whoſe Vein and Memory laſted a long time; for at 80 Years of Age he diſputed the (D) *Prize of Poetry*, and † carried it, and boaſted ‖ of having the beſt Memory of any Man in the World. He lived ſtill * above ten Years longer. 'Tis ſaid that the Deſtruction of his Tomb by a General of the *Agrigentins* did not (E) remain

‖ [illegible] 759. A.

cum ſuis interiſſe. Valerius Maximus (a) relates the ſame thing, but he is guilty of an inexcuſable Omiſſion; for he does not ſay why *Caſtor* and *Pollux* did that good Service to *Simonides*. *Solinus* (b) aſcribes to *Pindar* what all other Writers aſcribe to *Simonides*. *Salmaſius* (c) ſuſpects that *Solinus* took this courſe to conceal his Robberies, I mean, to make People believe that he was not a meer Tranſcriber of *Pliny*. *Quintilian* (d) calls this Apparition of the *Tyndarides* a Fable, becauſe that Poet, who doubtleſs would not have deprived himſelf of ſo great a Glory, does not mention it in his Works. He obſerves that Authors do very much differ as to the Perſon in whoſe Honour *Simonides* made that Poem: Nor did they agree about the Town where the Entertainment was given. He tells us that the Perſon, whom *Simonides* Praiſed, was a Victorious Wreſtler. (e) *Cum pugili coronato carmen, quale componi victoribus ſolet, mercede pacta ſcripſiſſet: abnegata ei pecuniæ pars eſt, quòd more poetis frequentiſſimo digreſſus, in laudes Caſtoris & Pollucis exierat.* The Omiſſion of this particular in *Cicero* is very prejudicial to *Simonides*; for one would think he made improper Digreſſions, and that he was ſo imprudent as to obſcure the Glory of the Man, who bought his Panegyrick, by inſerting in it an Encomium upon the Gods. But if we conſider that *Simonides* was to celebrate the Victory of a Wreſtler, the Objection vaniſhes away, and 'tis plain that (f) *Caſtor* and *Pollux* were to have a ſhare in his Praiſes, which are not a wrong Digreſſion, but a neceſſary Epiſode. I muſt obſerve that M. *de Girac* makes a wrong Criticiſm upon *Quintilian*. *That Learned Rhetorician*, ſays he (g), *would not have made uſe* of a Negative Argument, *if he had read in* Callimachus *that* Simonides *himſelf mentions that Adventure in Words full of gratitude towards his Deliverers.* 'Tis certain that *Quintilian* might have ſaid what he ſays, notwithſtanding *Callimachus*'s Verſes. There is a vaſt difference between what a Poet relates in his Poems, and what others make him ſay in their Writings.

Here follows the other Miracle. *Simonides* having Landed found the dead Body of an unknown Man upon the ſhore, and buried it. That unknown Man warn'd him in a Dream, not to take Shipping again the next Day; *Simonides* followed his Advice, and the Ship ſunk. He made a Poem upon that Adventure. (h) *Longe indulgentius Dii in poeta Simonide, cujus ſalutarem inter quietem admonitionem conſilii firmitate roboraverunt. Is enim cùm ad litus navem appuliſſet, inhumatumque corpus jacens ſepulturæ mandaſſet, admonitus ab eo ne proximo die navigaret, in terra remanſit: Qui inde ſolverant, fluctibus & procellis in conſpectu ejus obruti ſunt. Ipſe lætatus eſt, quòd vitam ſuam ſomnio, quam navi, credere maluiſſet. Memor autem beneficii, elegantiſſimo cum carmine æternitati conſecravit, melius illi & diuturnius in animis hominum ſepulchrum conſtituens, quam in deſertis arenis ſtruxerat.* He did not think that Humanity required any thing from him beſides the burying of the dead Body; but being ſo well rewarded for that Favour, he went farther, and put this Glorious Epitaph upon the Tomb of that unknown Man.

Οὗτος (i) μὲν Κείοιο Σιμωνίδου ἐστὶ σαωτήρ,
Ὃς καὶ τεθνειὼς ζῶντι παρέσχε χάριν.
Hic quidem Cei Simonidis eſt ſervator,
Qui & mortuus vivo retulit gratiam.

(C) *The Invention of Local Memory is aſcribed to him.*] It will not be improper to obſerve upon what occaſion he Invented it. When *Scopas* and his Gueſts were kill'd by the fall of the Room, they were ſo diſfigured that they could not be known one from another. And yet there was a neceſſity to know them; for every one of thoſe, who deſign'd to bury 'em, had a mind to perform that Duty to his Kinſman. *Simonides* removed the Difficulty: Remembring in what place each Gueſt ſat down at Table, he was thereby enabled to tell their Relations which of 'em was to be Buried by his Kinſman. Afterwards, conſidering how neceſſary Order is to preſerve the Ideas of Objects, he Invented the method of annexing them to certain Places, that is, he was the inventer of Local Memory. This we read in *Cicero*, (k) *Non ſum tanto ego, inquit, ingenio, quanto Themiſtocles fuit, ut oblivionis artem quam memoriæ malim, gratiamque habeo Simonidi illi Chio, quem primum ferunt artem memoriæ protuliſſe. Dicunt enim quum cœnaret*—— (l) *Quos quum humare vellent ſui, neque poſſent obtritos internoſcere ullo modo, Simonides dicitur ex eo quod meminiſſet quo eorum loco quiſque cubuiſſet, demonſtrator uniuſcujuſque ſepeliendi fuiſſe. Hac tum re admonitus inveniſſe fertur, ordinem eſſe maxime, qui memoriæ lumen afferret. Itaque iis qui hanc partem ingenii exercerent, locos eſſe capiendos, & ea quæ memoria tenere vellent, effingenda animo, atque in his locis collocanda: ſic fore, ut ordinem rerum locorum ordo conſervaret, res autem ipſas rerum effigies notaret, atque ut locis pro cera, ſimulacris pro literis uteremur.* That Author obſerves in another (m) place that *Simonides* had a very good Memory. Theſe Words of *Philoſtratus* give a great Notion of it: (n) Apollonius *being a Hundred Years Old had ſtill a better Memory than* Simonides *ever had in his greateſt Vogue; and he uſed to ſing a Canticle which that Poet had made in Praiſe of Memory, wherein he ſays that every thing Fades and Vaniſhes away in time, whereas time never grows Old, and always remains the ſame, with Memory that goes along with it.* It has been ſaid that *Simonides* took ſome Remedies to get a good Memory, which produced the intended Effect (o).

(D) *At 80 Years of Age he diſputed the Prize of Poetry.*] This he mention'd in one of his Poems. (p) *Simonides vero Poëta octogeſimo anno & docuiſſe ſe carmina, & in eorum certamen deſcendiſſe ipſe gloriatur: nec fuit iniquum, illum voluptatem ex ingenio ſuo diu percipere, cùm eam omni ævo fruendam traditurus eſſet.*

(E) *The Deſtruction of his Tomb*—— *did not remain Unpuniſh'd.*] *Phœnix* General of the *Agrigentins* being at War with the *Syracuſans*, (q) pull'd down *Simonides*'s Tomb, and built a Tower with the Materials of it: It happen'd that the Town was taken thro' that part of the Wall where the Tower was Built. *Callimachus* brought in *Simonides* complaing of that Impious Action, and ſaying that *Phœnix* had not been afraid of *Caſtor* and *Pollux*, who, added he, preſerved me from the fall of a Houſe. (r) *Suidas*'s negligence cannot be ſufficiently wondred at; for he does not Name the Town, where a Tower was built of the Stones of *Simonides*'s Tomb. But becauſe he ſays that a General of the *Agrigentins* cauſed that Tomb to be demoliſh'd, and the Tower to be built, we have ſome Reaſon to think that it was at *Agrigentum*. Unleſs one had rather ſay, that *Phœnix* having Conquered *Syracuſa*, and being Beſieged in it, cauſed a Wall to be Fortified by the Building of a Tower, and that *Syracuſa* was re-taken, thro' that place. 'Tis likely *Simonides* died at *Hiero*'s Court. A very Learned Chronologer places the Death of the Poet a Year before that of the Prince. (ſ) *Utriuſque obitus contiguos, ut ita dicam, in annos incurrit, Simonidis quidem in annum mundi* 3516. *Hieronis autem* 3517. *apud P. Petavium lib.* 13. de doctrina temporum. *Petavius* (t) follows *Diodorus Siculus*, who

(a) Valer. Maximus lib. 1 cap. 8. n. 7. in ext.
(b) Solin. cap. 1. pag. m. 15.
(c) Salmaſ. exercitat. Plin. tom. 1. pag. 53.
(d) Quanquam mihi totum de Tyndaridis fabuloſum videtur, neque omnino hujus rei meminit uſquam poeta ipſe, profecto non taciturus de tanta ſua gloria. *Quintil. lib.* 11. *cap.* 2. *pag. m.* 517.
(e) Id. ib.
(f) *They were in a manner the Patrons of Wreſtlers.*
(g) Girac, Replique a Coſtar ſection 53. p. m. 465. *He quotes the words of* Callimachus *mention'd by* Suidas.
(h) Valer. Maximus lib. 1. c. 7. n. 3. in ext. *See alſo* Cicero de Divinatione lib. 1. fol. 308 C.
(i) Tzetzes Chiliad 1. hiſtor 24. *He quotes one* Ariſtides. *See* Voſſius de hiſtor. Græcis lib. 3. c. 30. pag. 331. *where he mends a paſſage of* Tzetzes.

[illegible]
* Suidas makes him live 89 Years and not 99. as Gyraldus doet. di 9. hiſt. poet. pag. 463.
(k) Cic de Oratore lib fol. 85. *See alſo* Quintil ubi ſup
(l) *You may ſee the foregoing Remark the words I skip here.*
(m) Cic to Tuſculan. qu lib. 1. f 249. C.
(n) Philoſtr. *in the life* Apollo B. 1. ch. *See the ſame in* vitis Sophiſtar. lib. 2. Proclo.

(o) Scriptores varii memorant Cyrum regem & Simonide lyricum & Hippiam Eleum——ideo valuiſſe memoria q epotis quibuſdam remediis id impetrarunt. Amm. Marc lib. 16. l. 5. pag. m. 116. (p) Valer. Maximus lib. 8. 7. n. 13. in ext. (q) Διαλύει τὸν τάφον τοῦ Σιμωνίδου μ ἀπηνῶς τε καὶ ἀνοίκτως. Simonidis ſepulchrum cum ma contemptione & crudeliter diſſolvit. Suidas in Σιμωνίδης m. 741, 742. (r) *Taken from* Suidas ibid. (ſ) Leſcalopier Ciceron. de natura Deorum lib. 1. pag. 84. (t) Petavius, rationario temporum parte 1. lib. 3. c. 6. p. m. 135

main Unpuniſh'd. His anſwer to a Prince, who aſk'd him the Definition (F) of God, has been very much talk'd of: I mean, his anſwer to *Hiero* Tyrant of *Syracuſa*, to whoſe Court he went, notwithſtanding his great Age, being prompted to it by his Covetouſneſs, for he † loved Money, and knew that *Hiero* was a Liberal

† See the Remark N.

who ſays that *Hiero* died the Second Year of the 78. Olympiad; and therefore he believed that *Simonides* died the firſt Year of the (a) ſame Olympiad. But becauſe he places (b) the beginning of the Olympiads in the Year of the World 3209, he muſt needs have placed the Death of *Simonides* in the Year of the World 3517.

(F) *His anſwer to a Prince, who aſk'd him the Definition of God, has been very much talk'd of.*] *Hiero* Tyrant of *Sicily* deſired that Poet to tell him what God is. The Poet anſwered him that it was not a Queſtion that could be immediately anſwered, and that he wanted a whole day to think upon it. When that Term was over, *Hiero* aſk'd the anſwer; but *Simonides* deſired two days more to conſider of it. This was not the laſt delay he aſk'd: Every time he was ſummon'd to give his Anſwer, he aſk'd for half a longer time. The Tyrant wondring at it, deſired to know the Reaſon of it. I do ſo, anſwered *Simonides*, becauſe the more I examin the matter, the more it appears to me obſcure. *Cicero* expreſſes it in the following manner. *Nec ego nunc ipſe aliquid afferam melius: ut enim modò dixi, omnibus ferè in rebus, & maximè in phyſicis, quid non ſit, citiùs, quam quid ſit dixerim. Roges me, quid aut quale ſit Deus: auctore utar Simonide: de quo cùm quæſiviſſet hoc idem tyrannus Hiero, deliberandi cauſſâ ſibi unum diem poſtulavit. Cùm idem ex eo poſtridie quæreret, biduum petivit: cùm ſæpius duplicaret numerum dierum, admiranſque Hiero quæreret cur ita faceret,* Quia quantò, *inquit*, diutius conſidero, tanto mihi res videtur obſcurior. *Sed Simonidem arbitror (non enim poeta ſolùm ſuavis, verùm etiam ceteroqui doctus, ſapienſque traditur) quia multa venirent in mentem acuta, atque ſubtilia, dubitantem quid eorum eſſet veriſſimum, deſperaſſe omnem veritatem* (c).

A Jeſuit, who writ a Commentary upon *Cicero*'s Books *de natura deorum*, does not blame *Simonides* for being ſo reſerved, and wiſhes the Ancient Poets and Philoſophers, and the Hereticks had imitated him. (d) *Quæ* Tertullianus *inſcitiæ, alii modeſtiæ dederunt. Atque utinam veteres philoſophi, & poëtæ, quique illos conſecuti ſunt Hæretici, hac in parte tam verecundi, quàm Thales, aut Simonides, fuiſſent: nunquam profectò adeò abſurda, impia, & blaſphema Divinæ Naturæ affinxiſſent, nunquam impegiſſent in fœdiſſimos errores, in quos per ſummam impudentiam præfidentes homunculos videmus, & dolemus impegiſſe. Nimirum tenemur omnes magno quodam ſciendi ſtudio, cognoſcendi verò numinis, multò majore: ex quo Deum quidem à nobis cognoſci velle licet intelligere; ſed intra fines præſtitutos, & intra columnas, quibus ſuo ipſe quaſi digito inſcripſit,* Ne plus ultra: *ſunt enim divinis in rebus adyta quædam, in quæ Magnus Deus noluit nos penetrare: quod ſi quis temeritate, & confidentiâ ſui elatus porro pergit, ac perrumpere hoc ſacrarium attentat, quò penitiùs ingreditur, eò denſiores illi tenebræ offunduntur, ut vel ſic, & Divinæ Naturæ majeſtatem imperveſtigabilem, & humanæ mentis imbecillitatem, ſi quid ſapit, agnoſcat, ac confiteri cum Simonide cogatur.* Quantò diutiùs conſidero, tantò mihi res videtur obſcurior. *Quemadmodum de ſpecu quodam Coricio narrat Pomponius Mela, qui primùm jucundâ quadam amœnitate allectat adeuntes ad ſe, donec altiùs, atque altiùs ingreſſos tandem horror quidam ac Majeſtas numinis illic inhabitantis pedem referre compellat.* Afterwards he alledges a Remarkable (e) Paſſage of *St. Auguſtin.* A *French* Author look'd upon *Simonides*'s Modeſty as a pious Action, and took from thence occaſion to inveigh againſt the boldneſs of the *Eunomians.* Remember, ſays he, (f) the *Picus* Modeſty of *Simonides*, "who having aſk'd but one day of King *Hiero*, to diſcourſe of the Divine Eſſence before him, aſk'd him afterwards two days, and then three, proteſting that the more he thought upon it, the more he found it difficult to perform his Promiſe. For my part, I make no doubt that this Humble acknowledgment of his Ignorance was more acceptable to the Supreme Being, tho' *Simonides* was a meer Heathen, than the boldneſs of *Eunomius*, and of that kind (f) of *Aëtius*, who followed him, and boaſted of comprehending God as fully as he himſelf did." *Du Pleſſis Mornay* in the (g) Chapter, wherein he proves by Reaſons and Authorities that 'tis impoſſible to comprehend God, did not forget *Simonides*'s anſwer. He obſerves (h) without quoting any Body, that this Poet *taught very well that God is Wiſdom it ſelf.* He ſays in another (i) place, that *Ariſtotle in his Metaphyſicks mentions and commends the known anſwer of* Simonides *to* Hiero, *importing in ſhort that none but God is a Metaphyſician, that is, can ſpeak of things that are above Nature.*

I have peruſed *Ariſtotle*'s Metaphyſicks, and cannot find that paſſage quoted by that Philoſopher as being an anſwer of *Simonides* to *Hiero.* But I find the following Words in the 2. Chapter of the 1. Book. (k) Διὸ ϗ δικαίως ἂν ἐκ ἀνθρωπίνη νομίζοιτο αὐτῆς ἡ κτῆσις. πολλαχῇ γὰρ ἡ φύσις δούλη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν. ὥστε κατὰ Σιμωνίδην, Θεὸς ἂν μόνος τοῦτ' ἔχοι γέρας. ἄνδρα δ' ἐκ ἄξιον μὴ ζητεῖν τὴν καθ' αὑτὸν ἐπιστήμην. *Quocirca merito, ejus poſſeſſio non humana exiſtimari poteſt. Multis enim in rebus ſerva natura hominum eſt. Itaque ut Simonidi placet, ſolus Deus hunc ſibi honorem vindicat. At non decet virum eam ſcientiam, quæ ſibi congruit, non quærere.* Thoſe words amount to this: The knowledge of the firſt Principles is ſo ſublime, that it might be reaſonably ſaid, that the Poſſeſſion of it does not belong to Man; and therefore according to *Simonides*, that Poſſeſſion is the Priviledge of God only: But it were an unbecoming thing for Man not to endeavour to know himſelf, or to neglect the knowledge that concerns him. I fancy, that if I had lived in *Ariſtotle*'s time, I ſhould have found his thought clearer than it is: However, I can find nothing in it, whereby it may appear that he commends or approves *Simonides*'s Opinion, and I have read ſome Commentators who affirm that he confuted it. *Fonſeca* making a Paraphraſtical Note upon thoſe words of *Ariſtotle*, puts in the Margin *Refutatio ſententiæ Simonidis.* Here are the Words which anſwer that Summary. (l) *Adeo compertum eſt hanc ſcientiam non eſſe humanam poſſeſſionem, ut inde ſumpſerit Simonides poeta ſui erroris occaſionem. Monebat enim iis tantùm ſcientiis dandam eſſe hominibus operam, quæ cum mortali vita congruerent; proinde hanc ſcientiam, quæ de divinis rebus inſtituitur, relinquendam eſſe Deo, diviniſque ſubſtantiis, quod ſit ſupra humanum captum. Cui inepto conſilio, & virilis animi magnitudine indigno reſpondet Ariſtoteles.* He will have it (m) that *Ariſtotle* Condemns a like thought of *Simonides* in another place, and that this Poet is hinted at in the following Words: (n) Χρὴ δὲ ἐ κατὰ τὰς παραινοῦντας, ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα, ἐδὲ θνητὰ τὸν θνητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀπαθανατίζειν. ϗ ἅπαντα ποιεῖν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν κατὰ τὸ κράτιστον τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ. *Neque nos oportet humana ſapere ac ſentire, ut quidam monent, cum ſimus homines: neque mortalia, cum mortales: ſed nos ipſos, quoad ejus fieri poteſt, à mortalitate vindicare, atque omnia facere, ut ei noſtri parti, quæ in nobis eſt optima, convenienter vivamus.* If this be true, this Sentence ought to be placed among thoſe of *Simonides*: Since we are but Men, our knowledge can be but Humane; and ſince we are Mortal, we ought to be contented with the knowledge of things Mortal. We ſhall ſee another miſtake of *Du Pleſſis Mornay.* The firſt conſiſts in affirming that the abovemention'd Saying of *Simonides* was approved by *Ariſtotle.*

We find in *Plato*'s (o) *Protagoras*, that that Saying was to be found in a Poem inſcribed to *Scopas*, Son of *Creon* the *Theſſalian.* It was not therefore an anſwer to King *Hiero*: And 'tis to be obſerved that the thing ſpoken of in that place is not Science but Virtue; and therefore it might be ſaid, that *Ariſtotle*'s Application is not right, or that our Poet made uſe of the ſame thought ſometimes with reſpect to Moral, and ſometimes in Relation

---

(a) Id. ib. pag. 5. p. m. 151.

(b) Suidas ſays that Simonides lived till the 78. Olympiad.

(c) Cicero de nat. Deorum lib. 1. pag. 81. edit. Leſcaloperii.

(d) Leſcaloperius in Ciceron. de nat. Deorum. lib. 1. pag 84, 85.

(e) Certe hoc eſt Deus, quod & cùm dicitur, non poteſt dici: cùm æſtimatur, non poteſt æſtimari: cùm comparatur, non poteſt comparari: cùm definitur, ipſâ definitione creſcit. Auguſtin. Sermone de tempore 109. apud Leſcaloperium ibid. pag. 85.

(f) La Mothe le Vayer, Letter 116. pag. 26. of the 12. Vol. edit. in 12.

(f) Theodor. hær. fabul.

(g) 'Tis the 1. Chapter of his Book concerning the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

(h) Ibid. fol. m. 15.

(i) Ibid. ch. 20. fol. 256 verſo. There is in the Latin Edition of that Book of Du Pleſſis p. m. 446. Ariſtoteles tritum illud Simonidis ad Hieronem laudat, *de rebus*, inquit, *quæ præter naturam Deo ſoli credendum.*

(k) Ariſtotel. Metaphy. lib. 1. cap. 2. pag. m. 644. E.

(l) Fonſeca in Ariſt. metaphyſ. lib. 1. cap. 2. pag. m. 99. 100.

(m) Id. ib. *See alſo* Theophilus Raynaud, Theol. natur. pag. 1.

(n) Ariſtot. moral. lib. 10. cap. 7. p. m. 102. H.

(o) Plato in Protagora p. 235. E.

Liberal Prince. Some Divines would not blame him (G) for being ſo Modeſt as to ſay, that he could not give a definition of God. His anſwer to a King of *Lacedæmon* produced the ſame Effect (H) as that of *Solon* to *Crœſus*. Another anſwer is aſcribed to him very (I) like that of the Philoſopher, who boaſted that he carried about him all that he had. What he anſwer'd (K) to *Hiero's* Wife, ought not to be taken in a Literal Senſe; it was rather a Jeſt than a Serious Notion. He acknow-

lation to Intellectual Qualities. *Plato* is very particular in his diſcuſſion of ſome Verſes, wherein *Simonides* ſaid, (a) that 'tis a difficult thing to become a perfectly Honeſt Man, and that *Pittacus* was very much miſtaken in ſaying, that 'tis a difficult thing to continue an Honeſt Man. (b) *Χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι. Difficile eſt bonum manere.* One of *Plato's* Interlocutors maintains that thoſe words of *Simonides* are contradictory. Another maintains they are not, and underſtands 'em in this ſenſe: 'Tis a difficult thing to become an Honeſt Man, and impoſſible to continue ſo always; and therefore *Pittacus* is miſtaken, for he ſuppoſes 'tis poſſible for a Man to perſiſt in the practice of Virtue: Had he not believed the poſſibility of it, he would not have ſaid that it is a difficult thing. This Explication is proved by a Sentence of *Simonides*, inſerted in the ſame place, which imports (c) that God alone is always Good.

(G) *Some Divines would not blame him for being ſo Modeſt.*] A Proof of this may be ſeen in the foregoing Remark; but the famous *Peter Charron* Theologal of *Condom*, is ſtill more formal in one of his Works (d), to which I refer the Reader.

I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage of *Arnobius* to this purpoſe. (e) *O maxime, ô ſumme rerum inviſibilium procreator! O ipſe inviſe, & nullis unquam comprehenſe naturis! ——— Prima ——— tu cauſa es, locus rerum ac ſpacium, fundamentum cunctorum quæcunque ſunt, infinitus, ingenitus, immortalis, perpetuus, ſolus, quem nulla delineat forma corporalis, nulla determinat circumſcriptio, qualitatis expers, quantitatis, ſine ſitu, motu, & habitu, de quo nihil dici & exprimi mortalium potis eſt ſignificatione verborum: qui, ut intelligaris, tacendum eſt; atque, ut per umbram te poſſit errans inveſtigare ſuſpicio, nihil eſt omnino mutiendum.* The Commentators (f) upon *Arnobius* ſhew that the moſt Orthodox Fathers have confirm'd what he ſays. Thoſe, who have Commented upon theſe words of *Minucius Felix*, (g) *Nobis ad intellectum pectus anguſtum eſt: & ideo ſic eum* (Deum) *digne æſtimamus, dum inæſtimabilem dicimus. Eloquar quemadmodum ſentio, magnitudinem Dei, qui ſe putat noſſe, minuit: qui non vult minuere, non novit. Nec nomen Deo quæras:* Point out a vaſt number of Paſſages out of the Ancient Fathers, wherein they agree with *Arnobius* upon that point. The Jeſuite *Leſcaloperius* alledges thoſe very words of *Minutius Felix*, to confirm the Remark he had made, that the Wiſeſt and Modeſteſt Philoſophers confeſs every where, that God is not only Inviſible and Inexpreſſible, but alſo Inintelligible. (h) *Sapientiſſimi quique ac modeſtiſſimi philoſophorum Deum ἄγνωστον,* non intelligibilem, *ἀειδῆ minime ſpectabilem, ἄρρητον καὶ ἀνεκφώνητον* indicibilem, &, *ſi fas,* invocabilem, innominabilem, *ubique confitentur, at nihil hunc in locum afferri poteſt illuſtrius, quam quod habet Minutius Felix.*

(H) *Produced the ſame Effect as that of* Solon (i) *to* Crœſus.] *Pauſanias* ſitting at Table with *Simonides*, ordered him to ſpeak ſome Sentence. *Remember*, anſwered he, *that you are a Man.* This ſaying appeared ſo Inſipid to *Pauſanias*, that he did not mind it; but when he happen'd to be in (k) a place of Refuge, where he ſtruggled with an intolerable Hunger, and out of which he could not come, without running the hazard of being put to Death, (a Misfortune he brought upon himſelf by his Ambition) he remembred the words of that Poet, and cried out three times, *Oh! Simonides, what you told me was very judicious.* (l) Τηνικαῦτα ἐμνήσθη τοῦ Σιμωνίδου, καὶ ἐξεβόησεν εἰς τρὶς, ὦ ξένε Κεῖε, μέγα τι ἄρα χρῆμα ἦν ὁ λόγος σου, ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπ' ἀνοίας οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ᾤμην εἶναι. *Tunc in mentem ei venit Simonidis, & ter magna voce exclamavit: O Cee hoſpes, magnum quiddam in tuo ſermone inerat, ego vero inani perſuaſione eram adductus, ut eum nullius momenti putarem.* 'Tis certain that nothing would be more Mortifying and Inſtructive, than to think ſeriouſly and like a Philoſopher that one is a Man. This Notion comprehends all the Weakneſs, Miſery and Inconſtancy that can be thought of.

(I) *Very like that of a Philoſopher, who boaſted that he carried about him all that he had.*] 'Tis ſaid that *Simonides*, in order to free himſelf from Poverty, rambled about the great Towns of *Aſia*, where he Sung for Money the Praiſes of Conquerors. Being grown Rich by that means, he took Shipping for the Iſle of *Ceos*, his Native Country. The Ship was caſt away: Every Body ſaved himſelf with whatever he could carry. *Simonides* took nothing, and being ask'd the reaſon of it, he anſwered (m), *'Tis becauſe all that I have is with me.* Many Paſſengers were drowned ſinking under the weight of what thay had a mind to Save. Thoſe who Landed, were Plundered by Highwaymen: Every body went to *Clazomenæ*, a Town not far from the place where the Ship was caſt away. A Citizen, who loved Learning, and had read *Simonides's* Poems with great Admiration, knowing him, afforded him all Neceſſaries, whilſt the reſt where forced to beg in the Streets. The Poet meeting them, told 'em his Anſwer was right (n).

(K) *What he anſwered to* Hiero's *Wife.*] That Princeſs deſired to know whether it was better to get Learning than Riches. *Simonides* anſwered her, That Riches were better than Learning; for, ſaid he, I ſee every day Learned Men waiting upon Rich People (o). We muſt not believe that he valued Silver and Gold more than Knowledge; but he made uſe of a nice Railery to blame ſo many Men of Letters, who court Rich People, and endeavour to get ſome Preſents from them. He himſelf was concern'd in his own Jeſt, ſince he was at the Court of *Syracuſa*, thro' a motive of Intereſt, and upon many other occaſions had made it his buſineſs to mend his Condition by the Liberality of others. It might be ſaid alſo, that he preferr'd Riches to Learning, conſidering the advantage that accrues from them. 'Tis manifeſt, that Riches are more proper than Learning to procure Temporal Advantages, and whatever is moſt earneſtly wiſh'd for in Humane Life. In this ſenſe it were true literally, that 'tis better to be Rich than Learned. I muſt not forget the Reflection that was made upon the Proof alledged by *Simonides*. It has been ſaid that 'tis the part of Phyſicians to viſit ſick People, and that for the ſame reaſon 'tis requiſite Learned Men ſhould frequently viſit thoſe that are Rich. Here are two Witty Sayings of an Ancient Philoſopher. Some body was ſaying that he always ſaw the Philoſophers reſort to Rich Mens Houſes; *Ariſtippus* anſwered him, (p) *Don't Phyſicians go to ſick People, and yet no body would rather chuſe to be Sick than to be a Phyſician.* Upon an other occaſion *Diogenes* as'd him, *Why do Philoſophers viſit Rich People, and how comes it that Rich People don't viſit the Philoſophers?* His anſwer was, (q) *'Tis becauſe the Philoſophers know what they want, but Rich People don't know it. Eraſmus* clears that thought in the following manner: The Philoſophers are not ignorant that one can't live without Money, and therefore they ask ſome of Rich Men; but if Rich Men knew that they want Learning, they would be more careful to make their Court to the Philophers. I omit *Eraſmus's* Moral Reflection; it may be ſeen in theſe *Latin* words. (r) *Philoſophi ſciunt abſque pecunia vivi non poſſe: itaque petunt eos qui quod opus eſt dare poſſunt. Quòd ſi divites æquè intelligerent ſe egere ſapientia, multo magis tererent philoſophorum limina. Miſerior enim eſt egeſtas animi quàm corporis: atque hoc miſerius egeni ſunt divites quòd non intelligant, quàm pretioſa quamque neceſſaria re careant.*

(L) That

(a) Ὅτι ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν, χερσί τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόῳ τετράγωνον, ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένον. *Difficile eſſe virum vere bonum fieri, manibus pedibuſque & mente ad amuſſim quadratis. Id. ibid.*

(b) Id. ib. p. 216. *A.*

(c) Ὅτι θεὸς ἂν μόνος ἔχοι τοῦτο γέρας. Quod ſolus Deus hoc munere frui dignus ſit. *Id. ib. pag.* 237. *D. See alſo* pag. 239. *C.*

(d) Peter Charron, Des trois veritez, Book 1. ch. 5.

(e) Arnob. l. 1. pag. m. 17.

(f) See Elmenhorſtius *upon this paſſage of* Arnobius pag. m. 28, 29.

(g) Minut. Felix pag. m. 143.

(h) Leſcalop. ubi ſupra pag. 2.

(i) See Herodotus lib. 1. c. 86.

(k) See Cornelius Nepos *in the Life of* Pauſanias.

(l) Ælian. var. hiſtor. lib 9. c. 41. See *alſo* Plutarch in conſolat. ad Apollonium pag. 105. *A.*

(m) *Mecum inquit mea ſunt cuncta. Phædrus ubi infra.*

(n) *Taken from* Phædrus fab. 21. lib. 4.

(o) Ariſtoteles Rhetoric. lib. 2. c. 16. p. m. 438.

(p) Diogen. Laertius in Ariſtippo l. 2. n. 70.

(q) Id. ib. n. 69.

(r) Eraſm. in apophthegm. l. 3. in Ariſtipp. n. 10. pag. m. 186.

acknowledged that he could not (L) deceive filly People. Some Verfes, wherein he cenfured a Maxim of *Pittacus*, were thought * very difficult. It appears from the Examination of thofe Verfes that he was none of thofe fevere Criticks, who Praife nothing but what feems to them perfectly Good, and who cenfure the leaft Faults. He was infinitely more Tractable, and could † bear Humane Imperfections. He was well enough pleafed, provided a Man was not too Wicked. There would be no end, faid he, of cenfuring thofe who are guilty of Follies, and I don't look upon Earth for a Man of an unblameable Life: There is no fuch Man; and I fhall never Praife any body at that rate. 'Tis enough for me that a Man be tolerably good and free from Crimes ‖. He was of Opinion that Men fhould ufe all the things of this Life as a Sport **, and mind nothing ferioufly. Tho' the chief Character of his Poetry was a kind of a moving and foftning Sweetnefs, he made himfelf dreaded by (M) his fharp Invectives. No body denies that he was an Excellent Poet; and if it be confidered that he reconciled two Princes ╋ extremely Incenfed, and actually at War one againft another, it will be confeft that all his Merit did not confift in making very good Verfes. He had doubtlefs many other Qualities, which made him a confiderable Man; but one cannot excufe (N) his Avarice, and his being a Mercenary Writer. His Glory muft needs fall upon that account; I mean they are Shadows, which inftead of

* See the Remark [illegible] towards the end. ‖ [illegible] [illegible] sunt [illegible] & ille quisquis malus non eft, nimiumve iners. *Plato in Protag. pag.* 240.

(L) *That he cou'd not deceive filly People.*] *Erafmus* did not forget, in his Collection of Apophthegms, *Simonides*'s anfwer to thofe who ask'd him, why he did not endeavour to get fomething from the *Theffalians*, fince he was fo careful to get what he could in other Countries: (a) *Thofe Men*, faid he, *are too filly to be deceived by me.* I fhall fet down the whole Paffage of *Erafmus*, becaufe it contains a good Reflection. (b) *Idem* (Simonides) *quum cæteros laudando venaretur, ut aliquid darent, interrogatus cur non & Theffalos captaret, Stupidiores funt, inquit, quàm ut a me falli poffint. Qui quærunt cui imponant, ad ftupidos eunt. At qui tam erant ftupidi, ut non fentirent ingenium poematum illius, nec tangerentur amore nominis in pofteros tranfmittendi, non poterant ab illo falli.* *Erafmus* is in the right: Thofe, who have a mind to deceive others, look for Fools; but thofe, who are too ftupid to be fenfible of the Beauties of a Poem, or to defire a long Fame, were not fit to be deceived by *Simonides*. A thought of *Gorgias Leontinus* may be applied to this Subject. He defined Tragedy (c) a Deceit, wherein the deceiver is more juft than he, who does not deceive, and he who is deceived is more knowing than he who is not deceived. Whereupon *Daniel Heinfius* makes this Obfervation. (d) *A tantis viris poffe decipi, paucorum eft: & illorum fere tantum, qui præftantiam eorum, fi non affequi re ipfa, mente ac intellectu æftimare ac complecti poffunt, qui cum aliquo judicio decipiuntur.* I have faid in the Article of *Agefilaus*, that a great Captain complain'd that his Enemies were fo filly, that he could not fucceed in his Stratagems againft 'em. I have faid alfo in another place, that *Balzac* was of Opinion that the Maids of his Village were too filly to be deceived by a witty Man.

(M) *Made himfelf dreaded by fharp Invectives.*] *Timocreon* was his (e) Enemy: He was one of the (f) Ancient Comick Poets, and confequently he knew how to give Injurious Words, and did it with an immoderate Licenfe:

Eupolis (g) *atque Cratinus, Ariftophanefque Poetæ,*
Atque alii, quorum Comœdia prifca virorum eft,
Si quis erat dignus defcribi, quòd malus, aut fur,
Quod mœchus foret, aut ficarius, aut alioqui
Famofus; multâ cum libertate notabant.

He made a Comedy (h) againft *Simonides*; and therefore one may very well believe he did not fpare him: Neverthelefs, fome Verfes are ftill extant, wherein he confeffes that he had been a Sufferer, and we have his Epitaph made by *Simonides*. It is very Injurious. (i) *Id non impune feciffe* (Timocreontem) *colligo ex carminibus ejufdem Timocreontis nondum editis, qui in femetipfum Simonidis dicacitatem accufat, & plane vituperat metro Trochaico pentametro:* Καλὰ μετιθεὶς τῆς λέξεως, dictionibus fcilicet tranfpofitis.

Κηΐα μὲ προσῆλθε φλυαρία ἐκ ἐθέλοντα,
Οὐκ ἐθέλοντά με προσῆλθε Κηΐα φλυαρία.
Cœa me nugacitas importuna loquacitas invitum,
Invitum me invafit Cœa importuna loquacitas.

Extatque hodie num Simonidis Epigramma in Timocreontis fepulchrum, quo injurias fibi illatas ultus probe fuiffe fibi vifus eft.

Πολλὰ (i) φαγὼν, καὶ πολλὰ πιὼν, καὶ πολλὰ κάκ' εἰπὼν
Ἀνθρώπους κεῖμαι Τιμοκρέων Ῥόδιος.
Cum multa comederim & multa biberim, multa mala dixerim
Hominibus, jaceo Timocreon Rhodius.

(i) Athenæus lib. 10. p. 415.

(N) *One cannot excufe his Avarice, and his being a Mercenary Writer.*] I know what he anfwered thofe, who ask'd him why he was fo Covetous in his Old Days; becaufe, faid he (k), I had rather leave fomething to my Enemies after my Death, than want the affiftance of my Friends during my Life. This Anfwer is not altogether amifs; for there is nothing one ought more carefully to avoid than to be Chargeable to any body, or to depend upon the Difcretion and Caprices of others: But *Simonides* fhould not have been afraid of it; he might have avoided that Misfortune, without being fo intent upon getting Money. Another anfwer, lefs tolerable than the firft, is afcribed to him. *Plutarch* does not approve of it. " (l) For not only,

" Venus *to Old Men is averfe,* ——
" As *Euripides* has it; but their Appetite alfo to their
" Meat and Drink is for the moft part dull, and as
" one would fay, toothlefs; fo that they have but
" little Guft and Relifh in them. They ought there-
" fore to furnifh themfelves with Pleafures of the
" Mind, not ungenerous or illeberal, as *Simonides*
" faid to thofe, who reproach'd him with Covetouf-
" nefs, that being by his Years depriv'd of other
" Pleafures, he recreated his Old Age with the only
" Delight he took in heaping up Riches. But the
" Political Life, or the Management of the Com-
" mon-Wealth has in it Pleafures exceeding great,
" and no lefs honourable; being fuch, as 'tis pro-
" bable the very Gods do only, or at leaft chiefly
" Injoy themfelves in; and thefe are the Delights
" which proceed from doing good, or being bene-
" ficial to many, and performing what is honeft
" and laudable ". Had I curtail'd this Paffage, I fhould have left out fome things, that may be of fome ufe to the Readers. His way of living was fomewhat fordid, as (m) *Chamæleon* rightly obferved. (n) Ὄντως δὲ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς κίμβιξ ὁ Σιμωνίδης καὶ αἰσχροκερδὴς ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησίν. *Fuit autem revera præparcus Simonides & quæftus vel turpis avidus, ut ait Chamæleon.* Read this paffage of *Ælian*. (o) Οὐκ ὤκνησέ γε Σιμωνίδης βαρὺς ὢν ὑπὸ γήρως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικέσθαι· ἦν μὲν γὰρ καὶ φύσει φιλάργυρος ὁ Κεῖος· προύτρεπε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ πλέον ἡ τοῦ Ἱέρωνος φιλοδωρία φασί. *Neque Simonidem impedivit fenectus profunda, quo minus ad eum veniret. Erat enim Ceus aviditfimus pecuniæ, magifque* ipfum

(k) Stobæus ferm. 8. fol. m. 55.

(l) Plut. an feni fit gerenda refpubl. pag. 786.

(m) *He writ the Life of* Simonides.

(n) Athen. lib. 14. pag. 656.

(o) Ælian. var. hiftor. lib. 9. cap. 1.

Id. Heinfius ib. (e) Suidas in Τιμοκρέων. (f) Id. ib.
Horat. fat. 4. lib. 1. init. (h) Suidas ibid. (i) Leo Alla-
de Simeonum fcriptis pag. 213.

of setting off the finest Parts of his Picture, make 'em Dark and Ugly. Of all the Sayings that are ascribed to him, I shall only mention this: He said *, that Necessity was a thing which the Gods themselves would not oppose. His Father *Leoprepes* has been quoted for a good (O) Advice he gave to two young Men. Tho' † *Gyraldus*'s Collections are very good, they don't equal those of *Allatius* ‡ concerning our *Simonides*. He gives us the Titles of all his Poems, as far as they can be known by the Ancient Monuments that are extant; but he says nothing of *Simonides*'s *Egg*, mention'd by M. *Blondel* ¶ the Architect. M. *Blondel* is mistaken: He has confounded *Simonides* with *Simmias Rhodius*.

SIMONIDES, Son of the Daughter of the foregoing, was a Native of the Isle of *Ceos*: Some think he was Sirnamed (A) *Melicertes*. He flourished before the Peloponnesian War, and writ three Books of Genealogies, and three Books of Inventions ‖. I shall take notice of some small Faults (B) in *Moreri*'s Dictionary. Tho' there

ipsum commovit Hieronis propensus ad largiendum animus, ut fama est. He had always something to say in his Vindication, when he was desired to tell why he was so sparing; but his Answers, as has been seen above, were far from being satisfactory. Whilst he was at *Syracusa*, the King supplied him plentifully with every thing that was necessary for his Maintenance. He sold the greatest part of it, and alledged for his Reason, (a) that he had a Mind to shew his Frugality, and *Hiero*'s Magnificence: Which was a poor Subterfuge.

He has been blamed for being the First Mercenary Poet: Which, I think, ought not to be understood as if the Poets, who lived before him, had slighted all manner of Rewards. I believe they had an Eye to the Presents and Liberalities of those, for whom they sung, and they made heavy Complaints against those ungrateful Men, who gave 'em nothing, or less than they expected. How then shall we understand these reproachful Words of *Callimachus*?

(b) Οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω
Τὴν μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλλίχου νέπους.
Non enim mercenariam alo
Musam, ut Ceus ille Hyllichi nepos.

My Muse, says he, is not Mercenary like that of *Simonides*. The latter was taxed with the same Fault by (c) *Anacreon*; and 'tis thought *Pindar* level'd a like Stroke at him, when he spoke of a certain time when the Muses were not yet Mercenary.

ἁ (d) μοῖσα γὰρ ὐ φιλοκερδής
πω τότ' ἦν, ὐδ' ἐργάτις,
ὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι
μελίφθογγοι ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας,
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα,
μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.

These Greek Verses are thus Paraphrased by *Benedictus*. *Nondum enim Musa lucri amans erat, nec quemadmodum operarii operam mercede locabat. Neque a Terpsichore Lyricorum magistra dulces cantilenæ, molli vocis sono pronunsiandæ, suaque suavitate adblandientes, atque argenti in fronte mentionem facientes vendebantur.* If it be so, we must suppose that *Simonides* introduced an Innovation, which consisted in making Verses for a set price. He would not sing upon Trust, nor rely on the Generosity of his Heroes: He would have, first of all, his Wages agreed upon; and, perhaps, he desired sometimes to be paid before hand, or, at least, took an Earnest. However it be, he does not deserve to be placed among the Inventers of good Things, but among those who have depraved or corrupted good Customs. He dishonour'd the Muses by his Mercenary Spirit, and occasion'd a (e) Proverb ignominious to him. We are told (f) that he used to say; I have two Trunks, one for Salaries, and the other for Favours; I open 'em from time to time, and I always find the Trunk of Salaries Full, and that of Favours empty. He needed not wonder at it; for since he did nothing *gratis*, he could not pretend to free Gifts, but only to be paid according to the Agreement he had made with his Heroes. Perhaps, he intended to excuse the Precautions he used, and his meaning was this: I got two Trunks ready, one for what I should receive by way of Gift, and the other for what I should receive by way of Payment: I never found any thing in the First, and therefore I have set a Price to my Poems: It has turn'd to a good account; the Trunk for Payments is always full. Some will have it, that by the Trunk for Favours, he meant Thanks: if so, his meaning would be, that the Trunk of Thanks was of no use to him; when he look'd into it, he found nothing that could serve his turn (g).

We read in *Phedrus*'s Fables, that *Simonides* rambled about the Towns of *Asia* to get Money by singing the Praises of Conquerors. There is in the Printed Copies (h) *Mercede accepta laudem victorum canens*; but several Criticks maintain, it should be *pacta* instead of *accepta*, because he used to make a Bargain before hand. Which appears from another (i) Passage of the same *Phedrus*, and from a Story mention'd in *Aristotle*'s Rhetorick. A Man, who got the Prize of the Race, desired *Simonides* to make a Triumphal Song upon that Subject: The Poet not being satisfied with the Reward offered to him, answered he could not treat that Subject worthily; for that Victory had been obtain'd in a Race with Mules, and he pretended that a Mule did not afford Matter for an Encomium. He had a better price offered him, and then he made the Poem according to that Man's Desire (k).

(O) *His Father* Leoprepes, *has been quoted for a good Advice he gave.*] Two good Friends ask'd him which was their best way to preserve their Friendship. You must never be angry, said he, one with another at the same time; but one of you must respect the Anger of the other (l). 'Tis a very judicious Advice.

(A) *That he was Sirnamed* Melicertes.] They are mistaken. This is not *Suidas*'s meaning; but *Vossius* ascribes it to him, when (m) he says that *Simonides* the Grandfather, was Sirnamed *Melicertes*.

(B) *Some small Faults in* Moreri's *Dictionary.*] I shall also take notice of those, which concern the other *Simonides*. I. *Moreri*, says that *he was esteem'd in the 65th Olympiad*, and that he died in the 88, being Eighty Nine Years Old. This is a wrong Calculation. *Simonides* was at least Twenty Years of Age when he was esteem'd; and therefore according to *Moreri*, he should have been Born in the 60th Olympiad: From whence it follows, that he should have died 112 Years old, or thereabouts, if he had lived till the 88th Olympiad. If *Moreri* shews himself a sorry Arithmetician in that respect, he makes it appear also, that he knew not how to transcribe right the (n) Author quoted by him; for that Author places the Birth of *Simonides* in the 56th Olympiad, and his Death in the 78th Olympiad: Which makes up 89 Years of Life, that he gives him. II. *Moreri* mentions one *Simonide de Melece* (they are his *French* words) *more ancient* than the Lyrick, who, in all likelihood, invented four Letters of the Greek Alphabet. Here is a very childish Oversight; for these Words *Simonide de Melece* are the Translation of these, *Simonides Melicus*, which signify *Simonides* the Lyrick Poet: *Moreri* found 'em in *Vossius*. I could wish for the Honour of *Vossius*, that these two Lines were not to be found in the 14th Page of his Tract concerning the Greek Historians. *Simonides Melicus qui temporibus belli Medici vixit, quatuor vel quinque literas alphabeto finito adjecit, atque ita illud primus absolvit.* He refers this to the 29th Olympiad: But one there were † many *Simonides's*, I think it would be a difficult thing to Name any of 'em (C) that lived before *Phalaris.*

---

* Ἀνάγκῃ δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται. Cum necessitate neque Dii pugnant. Suidas in ἀνάγκῃ pag. 741.

† Gyrald. dial. 9. de poet. histor. pag. 402. & seq.

‡ Allatius de Simeonum scriptis p. 167. & seq.

¶ In his Compara- … Pindare … This … having observed in the … Publisher in French by a Dutch … on the Work of M. Blondel at Amsterdam 1716.

‖ Taken from Suidas.

(a) Ὅπως εἶπεν ἥτε Ἱέρωνος μεγαλοπρέπεια περιφανὴς ᾖ, καὶ ἡ ἐμὴ κοσμιότης. Ut perspecta sit inquit, & Hieronis magnificentia & mea temperantia. Athen. lib. 14. pag. 656.

(b) Callimach. in fragm. pag. 337. Edit. Græv. 1697.

(c) *See* Tzetzes Chil. 8. num. 228.

(d) Pindar. Od. 2. Isthm. pag. m. 675.

(e) *See* Erasmus *upon the Proverb* Simonidis cantilenæ Chil. 2. centur. 9. n. 12.]

(f) Plut. de curiositate pag. 520.

(g) See Rittershusius upon Phædrus pag. 18.

(h) Phædrus fab. 21. lib. 4.

(i) Simonides … victoria laudem cuidam pyctæ ut scriberet CERTO condixit PRETIO. Id. ib. 24. lib. 4.

(k) Ex Aristot. rhetor. lib. 3. c. 2.

(l) Ælianus ibid. lib. 4. c. 24.

(m) Simonides Ceus ex filia nepos fuit Simonidis Lyrici, cognomento Melicerta qui memoriæ artem invenisse dicitur. Vossius de histor. Græcis lib. 4. c. 6. p. 4

(n) Vit. Suidas.

SYNERGISTS. So they call'd in the XVI Century ſome *German* Divines, who thinking that *Luther's* Hypotheſis about Free-will was too harſh, taught that Men are not Converted by the Divine Grace, without the Concourſe of their Will. This was the Fifth Schiſm * that aroſe among the *Lutherans*. *Melanchthon* laid the Foundations of it; for *Villarinus*, *Strigelius*, and ſome other Divines, who had a great regard for his Authority, conſidered ſome Phraſes which they found in his Books, whereby it appear'd that he aſcrib'd a great Power to Man's Will. Wherefore they maintain'd that the Power of Free-will concurr'd with the Grace of God in the Converſion of a Sinner. *George Major*, *Paul Eberus*, *Paul Crellius*, and *Pizenius* were alſo the chief Defenders of that Opinion ‖, and were Perſecuted by the Faction of *Illyricus*. 'Tis certain that *Melanchthon* did not (A) like the rigid Method of *Luther* and *Calvin* about the Doctrine of Grace, and it were in vain

one can't apprehend what he means by his *Bellum Medicum* at that time. Beſides, when in the 55th Olympiad (a) he mentions *Simonides*, who makes the Subject of the foregoing Article, he calls him a Lyrick Poet, and aſcribes to him the Invention of Four Letters. Whereby the Reader is induced to believe, that he mentions the ſame Poet twice, and that he makes him flouriſh from the 29th Olympiad till the (b) 75th. I confeſs he obſerves in the 14th Page, that *Simonides*, placed by *Euſebius* in the 29th Olympiad, cannot be he that was Born at *Ceos*; but why then does he call 'em both Lyrick Poets, and aſcribe to them the Invention of Four Letters? But to return to *Moreri*. III. He ſays that *Simonides* the Younger *was the Son of a Siſter* of the other *Simonides*. He ſhould have ſaid *the Son of a Daughter*. He ſtumbled in a good way, ſince he miſunderſtood theſe words of *Voſſius*, (c) *Simonides Junior, Simonidis Lyrici è filia nepos.* IV. *Moreri* ſhould not have aſcribed ſome Poems to him, ſince *Suidas* aſcribes none to him, and *Voſſius* durſt not reckon him among the Poets. (d) *Ambigo an & in poetis ei ſit locus.* V. Why does *Moreri* aſcribe to him *a Treatiſe concerning things lately Invented*? Does *Suidas*, or any other Writer mention that Circumſtance? Were it not an abſurd thing to ſay, that *Polydorus Virgil* writ a Book, wherein he mentions thoſe who had lately invented ſome things?

(C) *Any of 'em that lived before* Phalaris.] I have read a thing in *Voſſius*'s Letters, which gives me occaſion to make this Remark. *Voſſius* being uneaſie on account of his Friend *Puteanus*, who was brought into Trouble for a Political Book, (e) wiſhes his Enemies may be contented to tell him what *Phalaris* told *Simonides*, *Mind only the Muſes.* Doubtleſs there is here a ſlip of Memory: I thought at firſt, that *Voſſius* had ſaid *Phalaris* inſtead of *Hiero*; from whence I concluded that *Simonides* concern'd himſelf with a Court Intrigue, that was like to bring him into Trouble: But at laſt, I have found out wherein the Miſtake lies. *Voſſius* put in *Simonides* inſtead of *Steſichorus*, whom *Phalaris* exhorted to meddle no more with State-Affairs, and to mind only his Muſes: (f) Μέλοιεν δέ σοι μουσῶν εὔκλεεῖς πόνοι. *Cura tibi ſint præclara muſarum ſtudia.*

(A) Melanchthon *did not like the rigid Method of* Luther *and* Calvin.] *Balduinus* gave a good Proof of it, when he Publiſh'd an Abſtract of a Letter which *Melanchthon* writ to *Calvin*, the 11th of *May* 1543. *Calvin* had Dedicated to him his Book (g) *de ſervitute humani Arbitrii.* Here is part of the Letter wherein he thanks him for it. (h) *Malim te illam tuam excellentem eloquentiam in aliis materiis magis propriis Eccleſiæ conſumere quam in queſtione περὶ τῆς ἀνάγκης. Habebam amicum Tubingæ doctum hominem Franciſcum Stadianum, qui diſcere ſolebat ſe utrumque probare, evenire omnia ut divina providentia decrevit, & tamen eſſe contingentiam: ſed ſe hæc conciliare non poſſe. Ego cum hypotheſin hanc teneam, Deum non eſſe cauſam peccati nec velle peccatum; poſtea contingentiam in hac noſtra infirmitate judicii noſtri admitto, ut ſciant rudes Davidem ſua voluntate ultro ruere. Et eundem ſentio cum haberet Spiritum ſanctum, potuiſſe eum retinere & in ea lucta aliquam eſſe voluntatis actionem. Hæc etſi ſubtilius diſputari poſſunt, tamen ad regendas mentes hoc modo propoſita, accommodata videntur. Accuſamus ipſi noſtram voluntatem cum labimur: non quærimus in Dei conſilio cauſam. E contra cum nos erigimus ſcimus Deum & velle opitulari & adeſſe luctantibus.* Μόνον θέλησον *(inquit Baſilius)* καὶ θεὸς προαπαντᾷ. *Excitatur ergo cura in nobis & laudatur Dei immenſa bonitas, qui & promiſit auxilium, & præſtat ſed petentibus.* Every body knows that *Calvin* and *Caſtalio* were like Fire and Water with reſpect to thoſe Doctrines. Now *Melanchthon* being at *Worms* in 1557, writ a very obliging Letter to *Caſtalio*, which was a kind of a Symbol of Fraternity about the Doctrine of Predeſtination. (i) *Porro cum ex eo (ut ſcis) conventu amiciſſime ſcripſiſſet ad Caſtalionem, & ejus ſententiam neſcio quam de prædeſtinatione & libero arbitrio ſuam eſſe ſignificaret: ſcire potuiſti, & quam damnaret tuam in eo viro vexando intemperiem, & quam ne tum quidem probaret omnia tua paradoxa.* They are *Balduinus*'s Words to *Calvin*; and 'tis to be obſerved, that he declares to him, he knows not wherein *Caſtalio*'s Opinion conſiſts. This Ignorance proceeded from two Cauſes: one was, that *Caſtalio*'s Book had been ſuppreſs'd; the other, that *Balduinus* did not much care to examin the Doctrine of Predeſtination. He confeſſes he does not underſtand it. (k) *Equidem arcanam illam περὶ ἀνάγκης quæſtionem non excutio, neque Caſtalionem —— unquam vidi vel audivi, ac ne per literas quidem unquam ſum allocutus —— neque quod de ea quæſtione ſcripſit (nam & id ſupprimi pro tuo imperio juſſiſti) unquam legi: neque quod de fatali neceſſitate diſputas ſatis intelligo, & in meis ad Minucium annotationibus nuper non diſſimulavi mihi non liquere* (l).

Let's ſee what *Beza* anſwer'd to that part of *Balduinus*'s Book. Firſt, he denied that *Melanchthon* had writ (m) ſuch a Letter to *Caſtalio*: His Reaſon for it was, that all the Books of *Melanchthon*, and the very Letter produced by *Balduinus*, ſhewed that this *German* Divine differr'd from *Calvin* only in his way of expreſſing himſelf. In the ſecond place, he alledged a Fragment of that Letter, to prove that there was a perfect Agreement between *Melanchthon* and the Divines of *Geneva* as to the Doctrine. (n) *In rebus ipſis quàm inter illum & nos convenerit, unde tandem meliùs quàm ex ipſius teſtimonio probabitur? Sic ergo ſcribit in iis literis quarum tu ipſe partem citaſti:* Quum autem & honorifico me teſtimonio ornaris, & de tota re non ſolùm piè, ſed etiam eloquenter diſſerueris, de utraque re, videlicet de mea gratitudine, & de ipſa diſputatione coram nos, ut ſoliti ſumus quoties unà fuimus, prolixè colloqui poſſe optarim. Etſi enim, tantum vel ingenii vel doctrinæ mihi non arrogo quantum tribuis, & nos in primis in Eccleſia agnoſcere noſtram imbecillitatem decet, tamen benevolentia erga me tua vehementer delector, tibique gratiam habeo quòd in ſcripto luculento (*loquitur autem de Calvini libris de libero arbitrio adverſus Pighium ſcriptis*) tamquam in illuſtri poſitam loco extare ſignificationem amoris erga me tui voluiſti. *An hæc verba ſunt, Balduine, hominis à Calvino diſſentientis?* Thirdly, he taxed *Balduinus* with a great Falſification; and to prove his Charge againſt him, he alledged a Period Maliciouſly left out of *Melanchthon*'s Letter. That Period runs thus: (o) *Hæc non ſcribo ut tibi tradam quaſi dictata homini & eruditiſſimo & peritiſſimo exercitiorum pietatis: & quidem* SCIO HÆC CUM TUIS CONGRUERE, *ſed ſunt* παχύτερα, *& ad uſum*

† See *Voſſius de Poetis Græcis*, pag. 84.

* *Micrælius Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* pag. m. 865.

‖ *Ex eodem ibid.*

(i) Balduin. ibid. pag. 138.

(k) Id. ib.

(l) *He ſpeaks thus*, pag. 141. Me unum qui talia non tracto, nec fortaſſe intelligo, in Gallia exagitas.

(m) De Philippi vero literis quicquid garris falſiſſimum eſt. Bezæ reſponſ. ad Balduin. pag. 230. tom. 2. oper.

(n) Id. ib.

(o) Id. ib.

vain to alledge, as a Proof of his being of the ſame Opinion with them upon that Head, the great Praiſes he beſtowed upon their Piety; for he was a Man who knew very well how to avoid the ill Conſequences of Prepoſſeſſion. He believed that Men (B) may be in an Error thro' a good Motive. What I ſhall ſuggeſt thereupon

uſum accommodata. Beza's firſt Obſervation is not ſolid; He himſelf affords us the Refutation of it; for in a Book, wherein he did not think of *Balduinus*, and was not aware of ſaying nothing that might ſerve that Adverſary, he ingenuouſly confeſſes that *Melanchthon* had Cenſured the Divines of *Geneva*, as if they had introduced the Fatality of the Stoicks. (a) *Baſileæ vero Caſtellio* ——— *non obſcure Pelagianiſmum tuebatur. Quinetiam hic de rebus ita ſcribere cœperat Philippus, ut quamvis antea Calvini adverſus Pighium libro diſerte ſubſcripſiſſet, tamen Genevenſes quaſi Stoicum Fatum invehentes notare quibuſdam videretur.* These words of *Beza* plainly ſhew, that neither all the Books of *Melanchthon*, nor the very Letter he writ to *Calvin* (I mean the Letter, out of which *Balduinus* quoted a Paſſage) could refute thoſe who maintain'd that he had writ a Letter of Approbation to *Caſtalio*. The ſecond Part of *Beza*'s Anſwer has no force in it; for the Praiſes *Melanchthon* beſtowed upon *Calvin*, do not prove that he was of his Opinion. He was ſo moderate, civil and equitable, that he did Juſtice even to thoſe who maintain'd ſuch Opinions as he did not approve. Tho' he was prepoſſeſt in favour of Free-will, he could diſcern the great Parts, and the Piety and Eloquence which *Calvin* diſcovered in maintaining the contrary Opinion; and he praiſed him upon that account. I ſhall enlarge (b) hereafter upon this Thought. What *Beza* ſays in the third place is his beſt Remark, and yet 'tis not very ſolid. He juſtly exclaims againſt *Balduinus*, and calls him a Falſifier: The omiſſion of that Period ſhews *Balduinus*'s Unfairneſs; he would not have left it out, had he not been afraid of doing himſelf ſome Prejudice by producing it. And therefore he deſign'd to impoſe upon his Readers, and to carry the Cauſe by a Trick and *dolo malo*. But I muſt obſerve, that on this occaſion, *Balduinus* ſhewed as little Wit as Sincerity; for he might eaſily have perceived that the Period he left out was not prejudicial to him. When a Man declares that he admits an Active and even an Antecedent Concourſe of the Will, and that he wiſhes no body would write Books to maintain the Neceſſity of Humane Actions, he ſhews plainly enough that he is not of *Calvin*'s Opinion. Now this is what *Melanchthon* had declared in the Words alledged by *Balduinus*: And therefore if he declares afterwards, that he does not advance thoſe things, as if *Calvin* wanted to know 'em, and that he thinks they agree at the bottom with *Calvin*'s Doctrine, tho' they are not propoſed with the Subtilty of that Divine, but in a plain and more popular manner; I ſay, if he takes ſuch a Courſe, 'tis plain he does it out of Civility and Compliment, to diveſt himſelf of the odious Appearance of a Man, who takes upon himſelf to Adviſe and Cenſure others. Every Body knows there is a Civil way of putting People in mind of their Duty, which conſiſts in telling them they are not ignorant that ſuch and ſuch things ought to be done, and that they don't want to be told of it. I cannot ſufficiently wonder how *Beza* could maintain againſt *Balduinus*, that *Melanchthon*, and the Divines of *Geneva* had the ſame Notion about the Doctrine concerning Free-will. This he maintain'd in the Year 1563. He knew what he had writ (c) ſince in the Life of *Calvin*; he was not ignorant of the Diſputes of the Synergiſts (d) mention'd by *Balduinus*. But what will not a Man do in the Heat of a Diſpute? (e) *En quo diſcordia cives?*

I fancy the Readers will not be diſpleaſed to know what *Balduinus* replied. He was ſilent as to the Omiſſion of the Period, finding no other way to hide his Shame; but as to the reſt, he anſwered haughtily, and in a few words, *Nihil quicquam impudentius dici aut fingi poteſt quam quod jam contendis, hac tota in re Philippum idem quod vos, & vos idem quod Philippus ſentire. Nam etſi nonniſi poſtremis ejus libris & ſententiis ſtandum eſſe dicam, tamen quæ poſtremo ad articulos Flacianos ſcripſit, an cum doctrina in hoc genere veſtra plane conſentit* (f)?

(B) *That Men may be in an Error through a good Motive.*] A Haughty and Cholerick Divine will be ſo exceſſively fond of his Opinions, that he thinks none can oppoſe them without acting againſt common Senſe, or the Dictates of his Conſcience. But a Modeſt, Humble, and Moderate Divine, and of a Phlegmatick Temper, as *Melanchthon* was, takes a different courſe. Tho' he rejects an Opinion as being Falſe and Dangerous, yet he ſhews his Equity to thoſe who maintain it: He acknowledges, not only their other excellent Qualities, for which he commends 'em, but alſo does not ſcruple to own that they have very ſpecious Reaſons to maintain it. He will not therefore break with them, nor looſen the Bonds of Fraternity, whilſt the Diſſenſion is confined within certain Bounds. From whence it appears that neither *Melanchthon*'s Letters to *Calvin*, nor the Praiſes he beſtowed upon him in Printed Books, can prove that they agreed in the Doctrine of Free-will. All that can be inferr'd from thence is, that he was ſo equitable as to diſtinguiſh theſe two things one from another, *Calvin*'s Doctrine, as he conſider'd it, and that ſame Doctrine as *Calvin* himſelf conſidered it. He thought that Doctrine made God the Author of Sin; but he knew that *Calvin* did not teach it under that Notion, and would have look'd upon it as an abominable Tenet under that Conſideration. He was not ignorant that it appear'd to *Calvin* under the Appearance of a Syſtem, grounded upon ſeveral Paſſages of the Scripture, and tending to maintain the Rights of God's Providence, and thoſe of the Diſpenſation of the New Law. He was not ignorant that the Doctrine of Free-will appeared to *Calvin* under a monſtrous ſhape, as deſtructive of Providence, and directly contrary to St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and to the glory that redounds to God from Mens Salvation. And therefore, tho' *Melanchthon* did not approve *Calvin*'s Opinion, yet he believed that it was grounded upon a Motive worthy of a good Man, and a Zealous Servant of God: Notwithſtanding their different Notions, they agreed in this Maxim, That of two Opinions, that which is moſt conſonant to the Scripture, and to the Glory of God, ought to be preferr'd to the other. Their perfect Agreement in this Point, occaſion'd their Diſcord; for, by virtue of this Maxim, *Calvin* embrac'd the Doctrine of Neceſſity, and *Melanchthon* that of Free-will. One of 'em believed that the Supreme Empire of God, and the Rights of a Providence, worthy of the Infinite Being, required an abſolute Predeſtination. The other believed that the Goodneſs, Holineſs and Juſtice of the Supreme Being required we ſhould be free in our Actions. Such were their Principles. Both of 'em aim'd at the ſame thing, *viz.* at the greateſt Glory of God, but through different Ways. Was this a ſufficient Reaſon for 'em not to own one another (g) for Brethren, and Fellow-Labourers in the Lord's Vineyard?

I foreſee it will be Objected to me, that thoſe different ways ſhould have obliged thoſe two Divines to Anathematize one another, ſince *Melanchthon* ſhould have believed that under pretence of aſſerting the Rights of the Divine Authority, *Calvin* deſtroyed the Goodneſs, Holineſs and Juſtice of God, by making him the Author of Sin; and on the contrary, *Calvin* ſhould have maintain'd, that under pretence of preſerving thoſe three Divine Attributes, *Melancthon* overturn'd Providence and the Empire of God, by aſſerting that Man has a Free-will. But I ſhall give a very good Solution of this thereupon will give me occaſion to examin the (C) Anſwer, that was made to a Paſſage in the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe Words, *Compel them to come in.*

(a) Beza in vita Calvini ad ann. 1555 oper. tom. 3. pag. 376.

(b) *In the following Remark.*

(c) *See one of the Marginal Quotations above in this Paragraph.*

(d) Audiveras paulo antequam hæc ſcriberes in Saxonia inter Illyricum & Victorinum magnam fuiſſe quæſtionem περὶ αὐτεξουσίου ἢ συνεργίας. Tu Illyricum qui tecum ſentit, ferre non potes: Victorinum qui Melanthonem ſequitur non oppugnas. Balduin. ubi ſupra, pag. 141.

(e) Virgil. ecl 1. v. 72.

(f) Reſponſ. ad Calvinum & Bezam pro Franc. Balduino fol. [illegible] verſo.

(g) *Note, that I don pretend to extend this Noti- on to all the Se that sho agree in the gene Maxim o aiming a God's Glory.*

Sal R 15,

this difficulty. If *Calvin* had argued thus, *Not being able to preſerve all the Attributes of God, I give over part of 'em, that I may preſerve the reſt, and I rather chuſe to Sacrifice the Moral Virtues, to the Phyſical ones, than the Phyſical to the Moral, I rather chuſe to make him a powerful Maſter than a good one;* he would deſerve to be Anathematized by all Men. But he maintain'd on all occaſions, that by aſſerting the Supreme Authority of God, he pretended not to ſtrike in the leaſt at his Goodneſs, Holineſs and Juſtice. And therefore *Melancthon* had been very unjuſt, if he had imputed to him ſome Conſequences, which at the worſt proceeded only from his Doctrine, ſince *Calvin* diſowned them; which he did in theſe Words. (a) *Ubique in ſcriptis ſuis clamitat* (Calvinum) *quoties de peccato agitur, non miſcendum eſſe Dei nomen: quia in Dei naturam non niſi perfecta rectitudo & æquitas competit. Quam putida igitur calumnia eſt, hominem de Eccleſia Dei bene meritum, crimine hoc involvere, quaſi Deum faciat authorem peccati? Docet quidem ubique nihil fieri niſi volente Deo.* Interea quæ ſcelerate fiant ab hominibus Deum arcano judicio ita moderari aſſerit, ne quid affine habeat hominum vitiis. Summa doctrinæ ejus eſt, Deum mirabiliter, & modis nobis incognitis, in quemcumque vult finem omnia dirigere, ut æterna ejus voluntas prima ſit rerum omnium cauſa. Cur autem velit Deus quod nobis videtur minime conſentaneum, fatetur eſſe incomprehenſibile. Ideoque nimis curioſe & audacter inveſtigandum eſſe negat: quoniam judicia Dei ſint abyſſus multa, & myſteria quæ modulum noſtrum ſuperant, reverenter adorare conveniat potius, quam excutere. Interea principium illud retinet, Quamvis nos ratio conſilii lateat, ſemper tribuendam eſſe Deo juſtitiæ laudem: quia ejus voluntas ſumma ſit æquitatis regula.* Warm and Paſſionate Men will not be ſatisfied with ſuch a wiſe Anſwer; but *Melancthon*, who was a lover of Peace, and whoſe great Equity and Modeſty enabled him to diſcover the weak and the ſtrong ſide of the Opinions he approved or rejected, was always diſpoſed to do Juſtice to *Calvin*. Every Body ſhould imitate that equitable Divine. Tho' you ſhould clearly prove againſt a Predeſtinarian, that his Syſtem is neceſſarily attended with this Conſequence, Therefore God is the Author of Sin, you ſhould be contented with this Anſwer as to his Perſon: I ſee, as well as you, the Connexion of my Principle with that Conſequence, and my Reaſon that ſees it, does not afford me a ſufficient Knowledge to make me underſtand how I am miſtaken in ſeeing it; nevertheleſs, I am fully perſuaded, that God finds in the Infinite Treaſures of his Power and Wiſdom, a certain and moſt infallible way of breaking that Connexion, tho' it be unknown to me, and it exceeds the extent of my Knowledge. A Chriſtian ought chiefly to ſubmit to God's Authority. This is the ſenſe of *Calvin*'s Words, which we have juſt now ſeen. *Melancthon*, and any other Divine, who aſſerts Man's free Will, would be the more to blame for not being ſatisfied with this Anſwer, becauſe they are forced to have recourſe to ſuch an Explanation; for when they have any ſincerity, they acknowledge that the manner of reconciling God's Providence, and his Preſcience with Man's free Will, (b) is Incomprehenſible to them. Thus they are driven into the ſame Precipice into which they drove others; they take Refuge in their turn in the Incomprehenſibility of God's Nature, with reſpect to the Weakneſs of Humane Reaſon.

'Tis therefore a great Subject of Scandal to ſee the Diviſions occaſion'd by the diſputes about Grace. Every ſect Taxes the other with teaching Impious things and horrid Blaſphemies, and carries Animoſity to the higheſt degree; and yet, 'tis about ſuch Doctrines that a mutual Toleration ſhould quickly take place. Thoſe, who are againſt Toleration might be excuſed, if they could clearly prove their Opinions, and anſwer all Objections after a convincing manner; but that Men ſhould Anathematize, Baniſh and Hang thoſe that Diſſent from them, tho' their beſt Solution is God's Incomprehenſibility, is a thing altogether inexcuſable. *Melancthon* was more Humane. He did not believe that thoſe, who deny free Will, are unworthy of being look'd upon as God's Servants; he excuſed 'em on Account of the obſcurity of the Matter, and the Goodneſs of their Motives.

Nothing would be more uſeful than to make ſerious Reflections upon what is to be found concerning that Controverſy in a (c) Book of the Biſhop of *Salisbury*.

(C) The anſwer, that was made to a Paſſage in the Philoſophical Commentary.] I think one of the Reaſons why *Melancthon* expreſs'd ſo great a Moderation and Civility about this diſpute, was his conſidering that the Method God thought fit to uſe, was choſen by him among Infinite others equally worthy of the moſt Perfect Being. Now this Conſequence ariſes from that Conſideration, *viz* that a Man may be miſtaken in explaining Theological Doctrines, without aſcribing any thing to God that is prejudicial to his Perfections: for thoſe are miſtaken, who imbrace an Hypotheſis not conſonant to what God has actually done; but if it be agreeable to one of the other Methods he might have choſen, it aſcribes to God a Conduct altogether worthy of him. Let us clear the matter by an Example. Let us ſuppoſe that *Solomon*, who uſed to ſend (d) Enigms to the King of *Tyre*, writ to him a Letter in Cyphers, wherein he argued about a State Affair. Let us ſuppoſe that *Titius* and *Mevius* being ordered to decypher that Letter, did not make uſe of the ſame Key: One of 'em took for an A what the other took for an O, and ſo with the other Figures. *Titius* found out *Solomon*'s Intention, and conſequently *Mevius* departed from it; nevertheleſs *Mevius* found out ſo reaſonable and ſo Coherent a ſenſe, that *Solomon's* Wiſdom appeared as much by it as by that of *Mevius*. It might have been Objected to *Mevius*, that he aſcribed ſome things to *Solomon* Inconſiſtent with the uſual courſe of Prudence; but he might have anſwered, that *Solomon* being a Man of a vaſt Genius, dived ſo far into Political Affairs, as to find out things that were above the Capacity of other Men. And therefore, would he have ſaid, what ſurpriſes us in the preſent caſe, ought to be look'd upon as an effect of his extraordinary Wiſdom. A like Objection might have been raiſed againſt *Titius*, and he would have anſwered it the ſame way. The great Genius of that King of *Jeruſalem* would have ſerved for a New Key to reſolve the particular Difficulties in the Explication of the Cyphers. None but he could have determin'd whether *Titius* had been more lucky or knowing than *Mevius*; but perceiving on the one hand, that *Mevius* aſcribed to him a ſublime Reaſoning, and on the other, that if there remain'd any Difficulty in it, it was removed by a ſuppoſition very Glorious to his Wiſdom, he might have been as well pleaſed with *Mevius* as with *Titius*, and might have told them: One of you makes me think what I have thought, and the other what I might have thought with an equal Glory.

It will be granted me, that this is an Image of the fate of Aſtronomers, who explain the Celeſtial *Phænomena* by oppoſite Syſtems. Thoſe *Phænomena* are like an Enigmatical Letter, delivered by God to be Decyphered by Aſtronomers: Some take the Motion of the Earth, and others its Reſt, for their Key. The Syſtems of *Ptolemy*, *Copernicus*, and *Tycho Brahe*, tho' never ſo different, explain the *Phænomena*; and yet there is but one that is true. This was M. *Marion*'s (e) meaning, when he ſaid that *Copernicus's Syſtem was an Opinion true in Art and falſe in Nature*. But as all the followers of thoſe Syſtems are agreed in admiring in the Work the Infinite Power and Wiſdom of the Author of it, they are not afraid of Offending God if they ſhou'd be miſtaken. They think that if he does not perform thoſe things as they fancy he does, he might do it without any prejudice to his Perfections, and that

(a) Cal- inus in revi re- ſponſione diluen- nebu- nis cu- ſdam ca- nnias m. 737. tatise. Theologi- is.

) Beza tells them, at they ve no her an- er when y are ss'd rd, I ve quo- d his ords in e Re- rk H of e Article aſtalio.

(c) M. de Beauval has given an extract of it in his Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans Oct. 1699. pag. 435. & ſeq. and alſo Mr. Bernard in his Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres, for Auguſt 1700. pag. 155. & ſeq.

(d) Joſeph. antiq. Jud. lib. 8. c. 2. fol. m. 215.

(e) *In one of his Pleadings.* See Mr. Arnauld, Difficult. propoſées a M. Steyaert part. 9. pag. 101.

SIRIS, a River of *Italy*, at the Mouth of which there was a Town call'd SIRIS,

having an Infinite Knowledge, he has the Ideas of Infinite Plans of the World, all Beautiful and worthy of the most Wise and most Perfect Being. I am sure that a Copernician, after much exclaiming against *Ptolemy*'s System, and the Perplexities of so many Circles and Epycycles, and the insignificancy of the prodigious Swiftness of the Firmament, *&c.* will confess, if he minds it, that all the Faults he observes in that Hypothesis might be made up by some Advantages, not to be found in the simple Mechanism of the Motion of the Earth. Whoever considers the Idea of an Infinite Knowledge, will see the possibility of such a Compensation; he will perceive that Man is not the only Being, for whom such great Spectacles are design'd. He'll be sensible that the inconceivable Rapidity of the Celestial Spheres might be of a wonderful use, with respect to some parts of the Universe, placed beyond the reach of our sight; in a word, that if *Ptolemy*'s System is false, yet it is possible, and consequently worthy of the Creator's Wisdom; for if it was unworthy of it, it would not be possible. I don't think that any Astronomer, who is conscious to himself, that he prefers that System to all others, because all things duly considered, he believes it to be more consonant to God's Choice, would be afraid of appearing before the Judge of the World with such an Opinion, tho' it should prove false. I think he would expect that the Copernician and he should receive an Answer, much like that which I have supposed *Solomon* would have made to *Titius* and *Mevius*. Few People will deny this (a); but if the Question was about a point of Divinity, many Doctors wou'd deny it. I fancy *Melancthon* wou'd be none of 'em, as to the Systems concerning Free-will, and Necessity. He wou'd suppose that the False is probable, possible, and not contrary to God's Perfections.

Laying aside the Doctrinal part of those Questions, I shall mention a fact, which the Laws of History allow me to take notice of; and if I add some Criticisms to my Narrative, I shall do nothing that exceeds the bounds of this Dictionary. A Minister of *Utrecht*, in his Reflections upon the *Philosophical Commentary*, has confuted the following Passage as well as he could. " (b) Here is a hint that may " serve to remove the Phantoms and Panick Fears, " wherewith Divines have been so long troubled in " point of Error; for 'tis certain that the reason " why Men find so many Arguments, which seem to " be of an equal solidity to maintain Truth and " Falsehood in Controversies about Religion, is that " most Falsities that appear in 'em are as possible as " the Truths. In effect, we all suppose that the " Revelation depends upon a free decree of God; " for he is not necessitated by his Nature to make Men " or any other Being. And consequently he might " (if he had been willing,) have produced nothing, " or produced a World different from this; and if " he had design'd to place Men in it, he might have " directed 'em to his end, by Methods quite con" trary to those he has pitch'd upon, and equally " worthy of the most perfect Being; for an Infinite " Wisdom has Infinite ways of Manifesting it self, " that are all worthy of it. Which being so, 'tis " no wonder if Divines find as many Arguments to " maintain Free-will as to impugn it; for we have " Ideas and Principles to apprehend and to prove that " God could make Man a free Creature, and forbear " bestowing upon him a Liberty of *Indifference*, as " it is call'd; and the same may be said of many o" ther Contradictory Propositions. 2 *Tom. suppl.* " *chap.* 24. *pag.* 308, 310 ". The Reflections upon this Passage, as far as they concern the present Subject, consist first in this Interrogation: (c) *Who told him that we have Ideas and Principles to apprehend and to prove, that God could make Man a free Creature, and forbear bestowing upon him a liberty of* Indifference? I believe *M. Saurin* wou'd not have us'd such a Question, if he had considered that for the space of one Hundred and Fifty Years, a vast number of Books have been Publish'd all over *Europe*, for and against Liberty, in which each Party make unanswerable Objections. He would have confest then that we have *Ideas and Principles to apprehend*, &c. Let him give himself the trouble to peruse some Books written by the *Arminians, Calvinists, Molinists,* or *Jansenists*, and he'll see that those Ideas and Principles are very plentiful in Mens Minds. He adds, (d) *that there are contradictory things, repugnant to God's Nature, and consequently impossible ——— that God could not Create Bodies without Extension and three Dimensions, nor Spirits without being endowed with the faculty of Thinking.* These words are Insignificant; for the Commentator said nothing, whereby he intimates that there are not some things absolutely Impossible: To what purpose then does *M. Saurin* observe, that the Attributes, which constitute the Essence of a Creature, cannot be separated from it? Did the Commentator doubt of that Truth? If God, (*M. Saurin* (e) goes on,) *has not made Man endowed with a Liberty of* Indifference, *our Philosopher can't know whether he could have created him with that Liberty; and whether that Liberty is not as Contradictory as a square Circle, or an independant Creature.* I don't understand this well enough to confute it; but I think that *Melancthon* being to answer such an Instance, would have been contented to say: I don't love to use subtilties upon this Subject, I follow the Notions of the People, I believe God has freely Created every thing, and I wonder a Minister calls such a Truth (f) into Question: His intimating that the Liberty of Indifference is as Contradictory as a Square Circle is still more strange to me, since he affirms a little after, (g) *that 'tis impossible God should produce intelligent Creatures, without giving 'em some Laws.* The Laws God gave to *Adam* were attended with Promises and Threatnings: Which clearly shews that it was in *Adam*'s Power to obey or disobey. The most Rigid Divines, *St. Augustin* and *Calvin* expresly Teach, that Men have lost their Free Will only because *Adam* made an ill use of it in the Terrestrial Paradise. I desire no more to be certain that 'tis possible for God to bestow a Liberty of Indifference upon Men. Had he not bestowed it upon *Adam*, all our Systems of Religion wou'd come to nothing: From whence I conclude, that God gave him such a Liberty; now every Body knows the Maxim, *Ab actu ad potentiam valet, consequentia.* But I conceive he might have determin'd his Will to good things, in such a manner, as never to Waver between Good and Evil; and therefore the Hypothesis of Man's Liberty and that of Necessity appear possible to me. This is what I think *Melancthon* might have answered. I think also he would have taken it ill, that the Author of the Reflections upon the Philosophical Commentary should not declare his Opinion, but be contented with a *If God*, &c. a Wavering Phrase, from which one may infer, that the Privation of Free Will is Contradictory: For if it should follow from God's Creating *Adam* without a Liberty of Indifference that 'tis a Liberty which implies Contradiction; others will maintain, that if he had Created him with that Liberty, it would result from it, that the Determination to one of the Contraries wou'd be as impossible as a Square Circle. I omit what the Author of the Reflections says against the Commentator, who Advances that the Proofs of a false thing are sometimes as good as the Proofs of a true one. What *M. Saurin* answers to it is full of needless things; for 'tis needless in a dispute to prove to an Adversary what he does not deny. The only thing that does not seem insignificant is his saying, that (h) *the Reasons which determine us to the choice of a Religion, ought to be Moral Demonstrations:* But that very thing is of no use in the Controversy about Free-will mention'd by the Commentator; for since each Party pretends to such Demonstrations, 'tis referring us to Equivocal Signs.

Here follows another Passage of the Commentary. " (i) What do they do then, when the Re-

" velation

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Id. ib. pag.

(f) *The Truth is call'd in question by these words; If God has not made Man endowed with a Liberty of Indifference.*

(g) Id. ib. pag. 33

(h) Id. ib. pag. 3

(i) Id. ib. pag. 3

(a) *If the Question was only to foretell Eclipses, and other* Phænomena, *to satisfy our Curiosity, or for the use of Life, one might be free to chuse a System: Different Hypotheses might be reconciled with the same* Phænomena; *or if one had an ill Success, it were but a Mistake attended with no ill Consequence. Whether we follow* Ptolemy's *System, or* Tycho Brahe's, *or* Kepler's, *or* Copernicus's, *it signifies but little as long as we do not positively affirm a thing of which we have not a Mathematical certainty. But 'tis not so with Systems of Religion.* Saurin ubi infra pag. 335. (b) Saurin, Reflex. sur les droits de la conscience pag. 323. (c) Id. ib. pag. 324.

SIRIS, went ſucceſſively by ſeveral (A) other Names. That Town was ſaid to have been built by the *Trojans*, and to prove it, they ſhewed there a Statue of the *Trojan Minerva* *. It was ſhewn ſtill in *Strabo*'s time, as a Miraculous Image; for it look'd downwards, and the Reaſon given for it is, that the Goddeſs conceived a great Horror, when the *Ionians* took the Town, and ſhewed no reſpect for that Statue Many Inhabitants fled to that *Minerva*, and implored the Clemency of the Conquerors, as in a place of Refuge which they thought to be inviolable; but the Enemies had no regard to their Intreaties, and they were Barbarouſly pull'd out of that Sanctuary †. The Goddeſs had not the Courage to ſee ſuch an Irreverence; which was the Reaſon why ſhe caſt her Eyes downwards. It was not the firſt time that a dreadful Spectacle made her turn her Eyes another way: She had done it before at *Troy* || when *Caſſandra* was Raviſh'd. The Author, from whom I have theſe Particulars, makes a judicious Reflection upon (B) the many Statues, which the *Trojans* were ſaid to have Conſecrated ſince their diſperſion. *M. de Marolles* Abbot of *Villelain* (C) made the ſame Obſervation on

* Strab. lib. 6. pag. 18.

† Id. ib.

|| Id. ib.

" velation is doubtful about ſome Points? Some explain it by one Syſtem, and others by another. " Granting that one of thoſe Syſtems is Conſonant " to the Method which God has actually pitch'd upon, " it does not follow that the other Syſtem is not " Conſonant to what he might have done with the " ſame Glory and Wiſdom he has diſcovered by doing another thing, ſince we conceive that God " might have done things otherwiſe than he has " done 'em, a Thouſand different ways, all worthy " of his Infinite Perfections: Otherwiſe, he wou'd " not be a free Being, and wou'd not differ from " the God of the Stoicks, Subject to an avoidable " Fate, a Doctrine little better than Spinoziſm. " And conſequently no falſe Syſtem can be Pernicious, but when a Divine builds it upon Notions which he believes to be contrary to God's " Word, and unbecoming his Majeſty. But I think " there are no ſuch Divines in the World. 2. " *Tom. Suppl. chap.* 24. *pag.* 310, 311 ". *M. Saurin* comparing thoſe Words with another Paſſage, wherein the Commentator ſays, *he will not take Advantage of the Compariſon of a Prince, whoſe vaſt Empire ſhould contain many Nations, that have different Laws, Cuſtoms and Languages*, thinks (a) that the Commentator juſtifies not only all the Sects of Chriſtianity, but alſo thoſe of Paganiſm. I wonder he did not perceive that his Adverſary (b) confines himſelf to the Syſtems grounded on the different ſenſes put upon the Scripture. Here follows another Paſſage, at which you'll be ſurpriſed. *God might have done things otherwiſe than he has done 'em, a Thouſand different ways, all worthy of his Infinite Perfections.* M. *Saurin* (c) having quoted a Second time thoſe words of the Philoſophical Commentary, confutes them with a diſtinction between the Eſſential parts of Religion and thoſe that are not Eſſential; and then he ſays: (d) " The Author makes no ſuch Diſtinction; he uſes " an Univerſal Propoſition, *God might have done* " *things otherwiſe than he has done 'em, a Thou-* " *ſand different ways*, and what is remarkable is " that among thoſe different ways he reckons " thoſe, that have been contrived by the Hea- " then Poets and the *Chineſe* Philoſophers; for " he will juſtify all the Syſtems of Religion, that " have been invented by Doctors, and received by " the People. In order to prove his Aſſertion, he " alledges the Liberty of God. *Otherwiſe*, ſays " he, *he wou'd not be a free Being, and wou'd not* " *differ from the God of the Stoicks, ſubject to an* " *unavoidable Fate, a Doctrine little better than* " *Spinoziſm.* Were this Conſequence right, God " would have the moſt dreadful Liberty of *Indif-* " *ference* that can be imagined. He might Lie and " Perjure himſelf, when he Swears by himſelf: he " might Command us to Hate him, and forbid us " to Love him: He might Command us Trea- " chery, and Perjury, in a word all ſorts of " Crimes: In ſhort, he might turn all Virtues " into Vices, and all Vices into Virtues ". Theſe few Words are ſufficient to refute thoſe Reflections: mind this Clauſe, ALL WORTHY OF HIS INFINITE PERFECTIONS. It ſhews with the utmoſt Evidence that God's Liberty does not conſiſt in being able to act right or wrong, wiſely or imprudently; but in having the Power of chuſing among Infinite Plans, equally beautiful and good, ſuch as he thinks fit. Can this ſignify that he might have introduced the falſe Worſhips ſung by the Heathen Poets? Are they worthy of his Infinite Perfections?

(a) Id. ib. pag. 129.

(b) What they ſo … when … THE … ABOVE … RELIGION … doubtful … ſome … Comment. … Philoſoph.

(c) Saurin … ſupra. pag. 327.

(d) Id. ib. pag. 329.

Id. ib. pag. 330.

(A) *Went ſucceſſively by ſeveral other Names.*] *Cluverius* (e) will tell you it was call'd *Leuternia*, *Polieum*, *Heraclium*. He ſays that the *Tarentini* having built *Heraclea* three Miles above the Mouth of the River *Siris*, removed thither the Inhabitants of *Siris*; ſo that from that time the Town of *Siris* was only the Port of the Town of *Heraclea*. According to *Stephanus Byzantinus* the Town of *Siris* was call'd *Policum* by the *Trojans*; but according to *Tzetzes* it was call'd *Polieum*, before it went by the Name of *Siris*. It may be infer'd from *Lycophron*, *Strabo*, and *Tzetzes*, that *Leuternia* was its firſt Name (f).

(e) Cluver. Ital. Antiq. lib. 4. cap. 15. pag. 736. Ep tom. Bunon.

(f) Cluver. ibid.

(B) *A judicious Reflection upon the many Statues.*] 'Tis a piece of Impudence, ſays he, to pretend, not only that a Statue did formerly caſt its Eyes downwards, but even, that ſuch a Statue may be ſeen to this Day. 'Tis ſtill a greater Impudence to mention many ſuch Statues brought from *Troy*. They pretend at *Rome*, at *Lavinium*, at *Luceria*, and at *Siris*, to have the *Minerva* of the Trojans; and what is ſaid of the Trojan Women is applied to ſeveral other places: and therefore tho' the thing be not impoſſible, it does not appear credible. (g) Ἰταμὸν μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸ οὕτω μυθεύειν ὥς τι μὴ μόνον καταμύσαν φαινόμενον, καθάπερ καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἰλίῳ ἀποστραφῆναι κατὰ τὸν Κασάνδρας βιασμὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταμύον δείκνυσθαι. Πολὺ δὲ ἰταμώτερον τὸ τοσαῦτα ποιεῖν ἐξ Ἰλίου κεκομισμένα ξόανα ὅσα φασὶν οἱ συγγραφεῖς· καὶ γὰρ ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἐν Λαουινίῳ καὶ ἐν Λουκερίᾳ καὶ ἐν Σιρίτιδι Ἰλιὰς Ἀθηνᾶ καλεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖθεν κομισθεῖσα· καὶ τὸ τῶν Τρωάδων δὲ τόλμημα περιφέρεται πολλαχοῦ, καὶ ἄπιστον φαίνεται, καίπερ δυνατὸν ὄν. *Enimvero protervum eſt fingere, ſimulacrum aliquod non modo viſum fuiſſe connivere, ſicut imaginem Minervæ Ilii ferunt oculos avertiſſe cum violaretur Caſſandra: ſed fabulæ adjicere, ſimulacrum etiamnum connivens conſpici. At multo etiam protervius eſt ea ab Ilio allata fabulari, quæ ſcriptores ponunt. Nam & Romæ, & Lavinii, & Luceriæ, & Siritidi Minerva habetur Iliaca quaſi ab Ilio allata: & facinus mulierum Trojanarum multis adſcribitur locis, eoque fides ei derogatur cùm fieri tamen potuerit.* I have ſet down the Greek for the Satisfaction of thoſe, who are never pleaſed, only they ſee the Original Words, and likewiſe to diſpenſe my ſelf from a ſtrict Tranſlation of that Paſſage. *Strabo*'s Reflection is very judicious; for if the Variations of Hiſtorians are not a certain Character of Falſity, they afford at leaſt a juſt pretence to ſuſpend ones Belief: And when ſeveral Towns pretend to have the ſame Miraculous Image, 'tis a ſtrong preſumption that all of 'em falſely boaſt of it, and that the ſame Trick and the ſame Intereſt moves 'em to ſet up their Traditions.

(g) Strabo lib. 6. pag. 182.

(C) *The Abbot of* Villelain *made the ſame Obſervation.*] Theſe are his Words. " (h) As they were " ſhewing (i) her the Head of *St. John* the Baptiſt, which

(h) Marolles, Memoires pag. 132. ad ann. 1641.

(i) *He means the Princeſs* Mary Gonzaga, *who was then at* Amiens.

on Account of the frequent Multiplication of the ſame Relicks. I have obſerved in another γ place *Floruſ*'s miſtake about the River *Siris*.

SIXTUS IV. Made Pope in the Year 1471. had been General of the *Cordeliers*, and his Name was *Franceſco della Rovere*. He was Born the 22d of *July* 1414. at *Cella* * a Town of the *Rivera di Genoa*, five Miles from *Savona*. One of his Hiſtorians ‡ aſcribes to him all ſorts of good Qualities, great Learning, an Ardent Charity for the Poor, a great Liberality to the Princes oppreſs'd by the *Turks*, an admirable exactneſs in getting Juſtice duly Adminiſtred, and a great care of repairing the Ruins of *Rome*, and adorning that Town. He does not diſſemble the Faults for which he was blamed. 1. His committing many Injuſtices (*A*) in favour of his Creatures. 2. His raiſing a War in *Italy* very improperly. 3. His Excommunicating *Laurence de Medicis*. 4. And then exerciſing all manner of Hoſtilities againſt the *Florentins*. He does not charge him, as others do †, with knowing and having a hand in the Conſpiracy of the *Pazzi*. He ſays nothing of the diſſolute Life of the Cardinals who were in favour under that Reign, one of which, as many believe, is denoted (*A* △) in ſome Verſes

" which the People reverence as one of the moſt " conſiderable Relicks in the World; after ſhe " had kiſs'd it, ſhe bad me come near and do the " ſame. I conſidered the Shrine and what was " in it: I kiſs'd it as others did, being contented " to ſay with all poſſible Gentleneſs, that it was the " fifth or ſixth Head of *St. John* the Baptiſt, which " I had the Honour to kiſs: At which her Highneſs was a little ſurpriſed, and cou'd not forbear " ſmiling. The Sacriſtan or Treaſurer, who alſo " took Notice of what I ſaid, replied, he cou'd " not deny that ſeveral others were mention'd " (for perhaps he had been told that the ſame " Head was to be ſeen in *St. John*'s Church at " *Lions*, at *St. Jean de Morienne*, at *St. Jean d'Angeli* in *Saintonge*, at *Rome*, in *Spain*, in *Germany* " and in ſeveral other places) but that the Head he " ſhewed was the true one. And to prove the " Truth of his Aſſertion, he deſired us to obſerve " the hole that was in the Scull of that Relick " above the Right Eye, pretending it was the " ſame hole that *Herodias* made in it with a knife " when the Head was brought to her in a Diſh. " I think, ſaid I, the Goſpel does not mention " ſuch a particularity; but perceiving he was re- " ſolved to maintain the Contrary, I yielded very " reſpectfully: And without entring into a farther " Examination of the matter, and alledging the Au- " thority of *St. Gregory Nazianzen*, who ſays that " all the Bones of *St. John* the Baptiſt were burnt " in his time by the Donatiſts, in the Town of *Sebaſtia*, and that nothing remain'd of 'em but a " ſmall part of the Head, which was carried to *Alexandria*, I was contented to tell him that the " Authority of ſo venerable a Church as that of " *Amiens*, was ſufficient to Authorize ſuch a be- " lief, tho' it was not above Four Hundred Years " Old, and tho' it was no Article of Faith. " People get many Repreſentations of that Holy " Relick, and the Honeſt Prieſt was very well " ſatisfied". The Author (*a*) of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* ſpeaking of a Book written about the Holy Winding Sheet, mention'd this Paſſage of the Abbot of *Villeloin*, and alledged theſe Words of *Charles Patin*, (*b*) *I am ſorry to ſee ſo often* the Picture of the Virgin drawn by *St. Luke*; *for 'tis certain People are miſtaken about moſt of 'em, it being unlikely that St.* Luke *ſhou'd have drawn ſo many Pictures of the Virgin*.

(*A*) *Many Injuſtices in favour of his Creatures.*] " (*c*) He was more indulgent to his Friends than " any other Pope, and he is blamed for having " done and granted many things upon their Ac- " count *præter fas juſque*, againſt all Humane and " Divine Laws". The three Cardinals of his firſt promotion were (*d*) *Peter Riario of* Savona, *whom he brought up being a young Boy, with his Brother* Jerome (*not without Myſtery*) *and* Julian *his Brother's Son*, *who was afterwards* Julius II. He beſtowed great Benefices upon *Peter*, a Man *ſo Luxurious and Prodigal, that he ſeem'd to be Born to throw away Money, having ſpent during the two Years of his Cardinalſhip Two Hundred Thouſand Crowns for his Ordinary, and when he died he owed Sixty Thouſand Crowns, and left many rich Houſe-hold Goods, departing this World all over Rotten by Reaſon of his Debaucheries at* (*e*) 28 Years of Age. " (*f*) 'Tis he, whoſe prodigious " Prodigality has been deſcribed by *Baptiſta Fulgoſius* (1), which he carried ſo far as to give " his Whore *Tireſia* Pattins ſet off with Pearls. " *Baptiſta Mantuanus* (2) made alſo the following " Verſes upon him, wherein he repreſents him Sa- " luted by *Jupiter* in Hell.

" *At tu impiume caput cui tanta licentia quondam*
" *Fœmineos fuit in coitus, tua furta putabas*
" *Hic quoque prætextu mitræ impunita relinqui?*
" *Sic meruit tua fœda Venus, &c*".

We ſhall ſee hereafter that *M. Jurieu* applies thoſe (*g*) Verſes to Pope *Sixtus*, tho' he had read in *Du Pleſſis* that they were made upon the Cardinal I ſpeak of. *Coeffeteau* does not deny the diſſolute Life of that Cardinal, and adds that *Sixtus was not more lucky in his choice of* Jerome, *if the Hiſtorians are to be credited, excepting that he was not given to Senſuality, being only fond of Hunting.* Jerome *being made Prince of* Imola *and* (*h*) Friuli *by the Pope, Married the Baſtard of the Duke of* Milan, *and upon Account of that Marriage*, Sixtus *gave a Cardinal's Hat to* Aſcagno, *the Duke's Son.* Sixtus *raiſed alſo* Leonard, *his Brother's Son, and Married him to a Baſtard of King* Ferdinand, *and made him Governor of* Rome. *When the Nephew died, he raiſed in his Room another Nephew Brother* ——— *of Cardinal* Julian, *and made him Prince of* Sorra *and* Senegaglia. *This Second Nephew Married* Joan, *Daughter of* Frederick de Monteſeltro *Duke of* Urbino, *by whom he had* Francis Maria, *who after the Death of his Uncle* Ubaldino, *who died without Male Iſſue, ſucceeded by Adoption to the Dutchy of* Urbino (*i*). *Du Pleſſis* writ an Abominable thing in the following Words. " (*k*) *Sixtus*, who deſign'd to raiſe his dear *Jerome*, had a mind to make himſelf Maſter of " *Florence*; but *Laurence* and *Julian de Medicis* " were an obſtacle to it. He practiſed upon " *Francis Pazzi*, who was the leader of the contrary " Faction, to attempt upon their Lives; and in " order to carry on the thing with greater ſafety, " he ſent to *Florence Raphael Riario* Cardinal of " *St. George*, a young Man and *Jerome*'s Nephew, " to Encourage the Conſpirators. Accordingly up- " on a *Sunday* they fell upon the *Medicis* in " the middle of the Service in *St. Reparada*'s Church. " *Julian* was kill'd; *Laurence* was wounded, and " the Church Wardens carried him into the Veſtry, " *&c*".

(*A* △) *One of the Cardinals that were in Favour, as many believe, is denoted in ſome Verſes of* Baptiſta Mantuanus.] You have ſeen in the foregoing Remark four Latin Verſes of that Poet, which concern the Cardinal *Pietro Riario*, if we believe *M. Du Pleſſis*. He is not the only Author who applies them to him: Others pretend they ought to be underſtood of Pope *Sixtus*. But the better to judge of the whole matter, 'tis neceſſary to conſider the Reflections which an Ingenious Perſon has been pleaſed to ſend me. Here

---

γ In the Article *Pyrrhus*, Remark G.

* *Ghilini, Teatro parte* 1. *pag.* 93. *Rivet* is miſtaken in his Remarks upon the *Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité* 2. *part. pag.* 622. where he makes him a Native of *Albizola*.

‡ See the Life of *Sixtus* IV. at the end of *Platina* [illegible] *edit. Lugd.* 1512.

(*a*) *For* Sept. 1685. art. 5. p. 999. *He examines whether it be an imprudent thing to multiply thoſe things.*

(*b*) Relations hiſtoriques pag. 221. *Lyons* 1676.

(*c*) Du Pleſſis Mornai, ex Volaterrano & Onuphrio, *in his* Myſtere d'iniquité, pag. 555.

(*d*) Du Pleſſis ibid.

(*e*) Volaterran. lib. 22. p. m. 818.

(*f*) Du Pleſſis ib.

(1) Baptiſt. Fulgoſ. dict. & factor. memorabil. l. 9.

(2) Baptiſt. Mantuan. in Alphon. l. 4.

(*g*) Simon Goulart *in his continuation of the* Catalogus teſtium veritatis, *does likewiſe apply them to* Sixtus, *and alſo what has been ſaid there of the great expences of* Cardinal Peter Riario. Gretſer in examin. Myſterii Pleſſ. pag. 544. *takes advantage of this Variation.*

(*h*) *It ſhould be* Forli.

(*i*) Coeffeteau, Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité, pag. 1209.

(*k*) Du Pleſſis ubi ſupra, pag. 556.

Verſes of *Baptiſta Mantuanus*. Nor does he mention the abominable Lewdneſs, to which ſome ſay that Pope lent a helping Hand. They will have it that he granted a Petition, wherein he was deſired to permit the exercice of Sodomy, during three Months in a Year. I have inquired into (*B*) the Origin of this Fact.

Here they are. "(*a*) In order to underſtand thoſe Verſes of *Mantuanus*, in the 4th Book of his Poem, Intitled *Alphonſus*, we muſt know that in that Work, which is only a deſcription of *Alphonſus's* going thro' Hell, the Poet repreſents the ſtate of ſeveral Souls, ſome of which were Condemn'd to Eternal Torments, and others to thoſe of Purgatory. He feigns that *Alphonſus*, Son of *John* II. and Grand-Son of *Henry* III. Kings of *Caſtile*, going with his Father and Grand-Father from Purgatory to the Terreſtrial Paradiſe, heard a long Dialogue between the Soul of a Pope in Purgatory, and a Devil call'd *Jupiter*, who tormented her. The Pope's Soul diſcovers her quality in theſe Verſes:

" *Apud ſuperos ego templa tenebam*
" *Vaticana, dabant Reges his oſcula plantis.*

"The Devil, in one of his Replies, ſpeaks to him thus, *At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam, Femineos fuit in coitus*, &c. from whence it follows, that the laſt Verſes ought to be underſtood of a Pope. The Queſtion is, Whether they concern *Sixtus* IV? The Commentator *Badius* ſays, he found in the Margin of the Copy he made uſe of this Annotation *S. P. or. Minorum* in two places, *viz.* over againſt theſe Verſes:

" *Prima ſono vox languenti, miſerere dolentum,*
" *Et ſine, clamabat feſſos ſpirare parumper.*

"And Eighty Verſes after, over againſt this:

" *At tu implume caput*, &c.

"From whence it appears, ſays he, that Pope *Sixtus* is meant by them, tho' he will not warrant the Truth of it: *nam Sixtus*, they are his words, *inter bonos numeratur Pontifices. Verum nullus malus purgatorio infertur, purique tam pauci decedunt, ut nihil purgandum ſecum ferant, opera enim illorum ſequuntur illos.* The ſame Commentator upon the Verſes: *At tu implume caput*, adds, that the Poet not having ſpecified the Pope, he dares not ſpecify him neither, notwithſtanding the Marginal Note. And three Lines after explaining this Verſe, *At niſi feminea tandem prece motus olympi Rex afferret opem*, &c. by *feminea prece*, words which the Devil uſes out of Contempt, he underſtands *Divæ Virginis cui*, ſays he, *ſi de Sixto quarto loquitur, ſtudioſus admodum fuit, ejuſque conceptionis diem celebrari indixit. Badius* entangled himſelf for want of minding Chronology. Properly ſpeaking, thoſe Verſes cannot be underſtood of Pope *Sixtus*, ſince *Alphonſus*, who is the Hero of the Poem, dying on the 5th of *July* 1468. remain'd in Purgatory, according to *Mantuanus*, till the taking of *Negropont* by *Mahomet* II. the 12th of *July* 1470. after which the Poet ſuppoſes that *Alphonſus* goes from Purgatory to the Terreſtrial Paradiſe, and from thence to Heaven, where he arrived on *Eaſter-Day*, the Year following 1471. and conſequently near four Months before *Sixtus* was made Pope, and above thirteen Years before he died. 'Tis therefore more reaſonable to believe that *Mantuanus* deſign'd to make in general a deſcription of a Proud and Voluptuous Pope, who however having obtain'd before his Death the Remiſſion of his Sins, by the Virgin's Interceſſion, *Feminea prece*, was Condemn'd in the other World, not to Hell Torments, as ſome Authors have raſhly affirm'd, but only to thoſe of Purgatory. This is what the Devil himſelf owns, whom the Poet introduces ſpeaking to that Pope in theſe words:

" *At niſi feminea tandem prece motus olympi*
" *Rex afferret opem, cum jam ſuſpiria raucus*
" *Ultima vix traheres, & mors incumberet ori,*
" *Noſter eras, ego jam ſtratum tibi molle parabam*
" *Larga ubi terrenas intrat ſentina cloacas,*
" *Par meritis locus ille tuis, Deus iſte malorum*
" *Fautor, ut antiquis viduatam civibus aulam*
" *Et noſtro mæſtam exilio repararet, in aſtra*
" *Colluviem vulgi humani, paſſimque volentes*
" *Hic levat*, &c.
" *Sic illi placet, & placeat, mihi forſitan olim*
" *Non impune feres, & non ſine vulnere multo*
" *In loca pervenies quondam mea.*

"I don't deny that the Poet, who was naturally ſomewhat Satyrical, has inſerted in his Deſcription ſome ſtrokes relating to the diſorderly Life of ſome Popes and Prelates, whoſe Memory was ſtill freſh. Some curious Perſons have exerciſed their Wit in making their Applications. Some have ſaid that the Author meant *Sixtus* IV. and others that he meant *Paul* II. At leaſt, I find in the Edition of *Bologna* in Folio, of the 11th of *June* 1502. over againſt theſe Verſes, *Prima ſono vox languenti miſerere dolentum, Et ſine, clamabat*, &c. this Marginal Note *Papa P.* And lower over againſt the Verſe, *At tu implume caput*, there is in the Margin of the ſame Edition *F. P. or. minorum*, which ſome render, *Frater Petrus ordinis Minorum*, viz. *Peter Riario a Cordelier*, and afterwards a Cardinal, Nephew to Pope *Sixtus*. I confeſs there is nothing in theſe laſt Verſes but what ſuits that Cardinal; but becauſe 'tis certain the Poet brings only two Interlocutors into his Dialogue, *viz.* a Pope, whoever he be, and a Devil call'd *Jupiter*, it follows that a third cannot be admitted, and conſequently that this Conjecture, tho' never ſo probable, vaniſhes away.

There is another thing, whereby it may be proved that *Baptiſta Mantuanus* did not mean Pope *Sixtus*, viz. that he commends him very much in the ſame Work, wherein he deplores the Corruption of his Age. He Praiſes him ſo far as to ſay, that if that Corruption had not been ſo great as to be paſt Curing, that Pope might have Cured it.

(*b*) *Poſtquam rerum te Roma potentem*
Fecit, & obſcuro jubar hoc reſplenduit orbi,
Exanimis virtus, ſcelerum ſub mole ſepulta
Reſpirare parum viſa eſt, & tollere frontem;
Et niſi tot vitiis hæc ſecula noſtra fuiſſent
Depravata, hoc i poterant rectoris habenæ
Errantes frenare rotas, ſed tantus equorum
Impetus aurigam ſuperat, fruſtraque retractans
Lora gubernator ſine lege per invia fertur,
Propterea ſortem doleo mitiſſime Patrum
Sixte tuam, fueras annis melioribus aptus,
Eſt tibi quæ tanto ſatis eſt in principe virtus.

(*B*) *I have inquired into the Origin of this Fact.*] In the Year 1686, M. *Jurieu* Publiſh'd his *Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme*, wherein he ſays among other things, (*c*) that *Sixtus* IV. *was more Debauched and Vicious than one can think, and a Popiſh writer ſays of him, that a Petition was preſented to him, by the Family of the Cardinal of* Santa Lucia, *that they might be permitted to perform the act of Sodomy during the three hoteſt Months of the Year*, June, July, *and* Auguſt. *He wrote under the Petition*, I grant it. *'Tis for him* (*d*) *that* Baptiſta Mantuanus, *who lived at that time, made theſe Verſes.*

At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam
Fæmineos fuit in coitus: tua furta putabas
Hic quoque pretextu mitræ impunita relinqui,
Sic meruit tua fœda Venus: ſic prodiga in omnem
Nequitiam, ad virtutis opus tua avara libido,
Illa Dioneæ Cythereia munera conchæ,
Illa pudicitiam quibus impugnare ſolebas,
Et noctes emere & nudæ indulgere paleſtræ.

The Poet introduces a Devil ſpeaking to Sixtus *IV. in Hell, and telling him that his Mitre and Bald Pate will not prevent his being Puniſh'd for his Luxury, and*

(*b*) Bapt. Mantuanus de calamit. ſuorum tempor. lib. 3.

(*c*) Jurieu, Prejug. legitim. tom. 1. pag. 246.

(*d*) *Mr.* Zuinger *Profeſſor of Divinity at* Baſil, *affirms the ſame thing, pag.* 135. *of his* tractatus de feſto corporis Chriſti *Printed in* 1685.

Fact, and I ſhall ſay in the Remarks what I think of it. It is highly (C) improbable. If *Sixtus* IV. had granted ſuch a Petition, he would have fallen ſhort of the

and Lewdneſs, and for the Veneral Sports, upon which he beſtowed ſo many Days and Nights. He quotes for the Petition *Weſſelus Groningenſis. Tractatu de Theſauro Eccl. ſ. Indulg.* I have been told that a very Honeſt Man, and a very good Proteſtant, having read that particular, went to *M. Jurieu* in his Study, and deſired him to ſhew him the Author, who relates ſuch a monſtrous thing; and that *M. Jurieu* ingenuouſly confeſt to him that he had him not, but that it is to be found in many good Writers. That Honeſt Man went away very well ſatisfied with that Anſwer. For my part, I confeſs I ſhou'd not have been contented with it: The Author of the *Prejugez* ſhou'd have quoted *Du Pleſſis Mornay* from whom he had that Paſſage; in a word, he ſhou'd have added to the Quotation, *and Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſt. d'Iniquité pag.* 557. But notwithſtanding this Addition, I wou'd have made further Inquiries; for we want to be inform'd how *Du Pleſſis* came to know that *Weſſelus* relates ſuch a thing. It is ſo ſtrange and ſo improbable, that one ought not to believe it without ſeeing it. I have therefore endeavoured to find out that Book of *Weſſelus*, and not being able to get it, I have look'd for the Anſwers that were made to *Du Pleſſis*. *Coeffeteau*'s Anſwer ſeems to me weak; for he only excepts againſt the Witneſs, becauſe he was a Heretick, and becauſe ſuch a Diſpoſition ſhews his great Impudence. It is ſufficient for the Reader, ſays he (a), " to know that *Weſſelus* was a Heretick. Beſides, 'tis a piece of Impudence to write ſuch a thing, nor can it be imagin'd that any Man ſhou'd have been ſo profligate as to think of what he imputes to Pope *Sixtus*, and to the Cardinals of *St. Sixtus*, and *Santa Lucia*. I cannot apprehend how a Gentleman could write down ſuch filthy things." This Anſwer of *Coeffeteau* ſhews that he owns the thing to be in *Weſſelus*, whereby he grants to *Du Pleſſis* whatever he could deſire. The Jeſuite *Greiſerus* came off much better; he denies that *Weſſelus* ſaid ſuch a thing, and proves it (b). 1. Becauſe his Treatiſe of Indulgences quoted by *Du Pleſſis*, and Publiſh'd by *Goldaſtus* a good Calviniſt, contains nothing relating to the Petition preſented to the Pope. 2. Becauſe *Flacius Illyricus*, who took out of *Weſſelus*'s Works whatever he thought conducible to his Deſigns, did not mention what concerns that Petition. From whence it plainly follows, that neither *Flacius Illyricus*, nor *Goldaſtus*, two Men throughly verſed in the Knowledge of ſuch Books, found in any Library a Manuſcript of *Weſſelus*'s Works, that contain'd the Fact mention'd by *Du Pleſſis*. The only Authority that remains, is therefore that of *Baleus*, who having related that particular (c), quotes for it the Book of Papal Indulgences, written by *Weſſelus* of *Groningen*. Not being willing to ſtop here, I further look'd into the Reply to *Coeffeteau*, made by a very Learned (d) Miniſter, who had as much reading as any Man in his time. Tho' he knew what *Greiſerus* had anſwered, he replies nothing to it, which ſhews that *Greiſerus* did not tell a Lie, in what he affirm'd concerning *Goldaſtus*'s Edition, and *Illyricus*. From whence it ought to be concluded, that 'tis only upon *Baleus*'s Credit, that we are inform'd that *Weſſelus* mention'd the Petition in Queſtion.

Which being ſo, I ſay that none will mention again ſuch a Petition, but a wretched Rhapſodiſt, who tranſcribes and heaps up without any Judgment, whatever he finds in the Writers of his Party; for if the Author of the *Prejugez* had conſidered what he did, he would have foreſeen that ſuch a Petition would be denied, and he wou'd have made himſelf ready to maintain the Truth of it. But then he would have quickly found out that the thing could not be maintain'd, and if he had been a Wiſe Man, he had wholly laid aſide that Objection. Let us ſuppoſe an Adverſary, who attacks him upon that Account. Prove to me, will he ſay, that *Sixtus* IV. granted the Exerciſe of Sodomy for three Months to thoſe who Petition'd him for it. M. *Jurieu* will anſwer that *Weſſelus* of *Groningen* affirms it in his Book concerning Indulgences. 'Tis not true, will the Adverſary reply; here is that Book of *Weſſelus*, Publiſh'd by a Proteſtant, but that Fact is not to be found in it. *Illyricus*, another Proteſtant, who had ſo much peruſed *Weſſelus*, did not find it neither: And therefore you Calumniate *Weſſelus*. No, will M. *Jurieu* ſay, I don't Calumniate him, for *Baleus* aſcribes to him the thing in Queſtion. But the Adverſary will anſwer, if you had common ſenſe, could you believe that the Authority of a Writer, ſo much cried down and deteſted by the Church of *Rome*, will counterballance *Illyricus*'s Silence, and *Goldaſtus*'s Edition? Why not, will M. *Jurieu* reply. The Papiſts have ſtruck that Paſſage out of *Weſſelus*'s Book, and therefore *Illyricus* and *Goldaſtus* could not find it; but *Baleus* had a Copy that was not curtailed. I maintain, will the Antagoniſt ſay, that *Baleus* made uſe of a Copy, into which a Man, who was not better than he, foiſtered that Paſſage, if *Baleus* himſelf was not the Impoſtor; and after all, you are to ſhew me a Manuſcript of *Weſſelus*, which you may oppoſe to *Goldaſtus*'s Edition. I don't know what *M. Jurieu* could reply; and therefore he is like thoſe imprudent Accuſers whom *Cicero* (e) laugh'd at, who have nothing to ſay when their Aſſertions are denied. Every Wiſe Man will grant that the believing of a Crime is not ſufficient to charge any Body with it, and that one muſt be in a capacity to prove it to thoſe who deny it. Tho' you believe never ſo much that *Sixtus* IV. was guilty of ſuch an Abomination, you will not affirm it in a Book, if you are a Man of Judgment, and if you have no better Proofs than *M. Jurieu*. To conclude, I don't pretend that theſe Critical Obſervations concern M. *Du Pleſſis Mornay*: He wrote in a time when Men were not ſo Nice; and *Goldaſtus*'s Edition (f) was unknown to him.

I had almoſt forgot to obſerve, that none but a very Ignorant or Unſincere Man can maintain that *Weſſelus* was a Papiſt. If he had been a Papiſt, would *Luther* have beſtowed this Encomium upon him? (g) *Prodiit en Weſſelus, vir admirabilis ingenii, rari & magni ſpiritus, quem & ipſum apparet eſſe vere theodidactum, quales prophetavit fore Chriſtianos Eſaias: neque enim ex hominibus accepiſſe judicari poteſt, ſicut nec ego. Hic ſi mihi antea fuiſſet lectus, poterat hoſtibus meis videri Lutherus omnia ex Weſſelo hauſiſſe, adeo ſpiritus utriuſque conſpirat in unum,* &c.

Note, That M. *Saldenus* a Dutch Miniſter at the *Hague*, affirms, that according to *Agrippa*, the Permiſſion I have been ſpeaking of, was granted to a Cardinal by *Sixtus* IV. *Idem hic Sixtus, teſte Agrippa, Cardinali cuidam maſculæ Veneris uſum certis menſibus ſecure indulſit* (h). *Agrippa* ſays no ſuch thing.

(C) *It is highly improbable.*] My Deſign is not to extenuate the Vices of thoſe, who are ſaid to have preſented that Petition; on the contrary, I aggravate them: For, I maintain, that if thoſe Men had been ſo wicked as to preſent it, and make uſe of the permiſſion granted them, they were too profligate to mind ſuch a permiſſion. You may be ſure that ſuch Men would not forbear plunging themſelves into Vice, till the Pope had granted their Petition. Beſides, was it neceſſary to draw up a Petition in Form, and to expect an Anſwer to it in Writing? Was it not ſufficient to whiſper it in the Ear, without diſcovering ſuch an abominable Impudence to ſeveral Perſons? The moſt profligate Men do commonly obſerve a *Decorum*, when they cannot offend againſt it without acting needleſly, or to their prejudice. If that Pope had a Mind to grant a Privilege, he might have done it by word of Mouth, without expoſing his Reputation. If he grants it in Writing, the Conſcience of the Petitioners will not be more at reſt for it, and he runs the hazard of being Convicted of an Abominable Action by his own hand. Will a profligate Man, if he has any Cunning, commit ſuch a Fault?

I muſt not forget an Obſervation that is proper enough to ſhew the falſity of that Story. 'Tis ſuppoſed that the Family of the Cardinal of *Santa Lucia* ask'd leave *to perform the act of Sodomy during* the

(a) Coeffeteau, Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité, pag. 1107.

(b) et in illo libro (de indulgentiis *Papalibus*) prout tomo primo monarchiæ Goldaſticæ a Goldaſto Calviniſta evulgatus eſt; nullum penitus de hac inexpiabili enormitate verbulum reperitur; nec, quod mireris, Illyricus in Catalogo ejus meminit, eo loco, ubi ex operibus Weſſeli, ea, quæ ad ſuum forum facere credebat, excerpſit. Gretſerus. in examin. Myſterii Pleſſæani, pag. 545.

(c) Cent. 8. cap. 50.

(d) Andrew Rivet. *See the ſecond part of his Book* pag. 625.

the Prudence and Virtue which *Clement* VII. diſcovered, when he thought that *the three hoteſt Months in the Year, viz. June, July, and Auguſt.* There is in it a Miſtake in matter of Fact, which makes the whole Story ſuſpected: 'Tis ſuppoſed that lewd People in *Italy* are more Tormented with their Paſſion during the greateſt Heat, than at any other time; which is a falſe Suppoſition. If you conſult Phyſicians, they'll tell you, that of all the Seaſons of the Year, Men are leſs inclined to Venery in Summer, becauſe the Heat weakens and enervates them. (*a*) *Coitum promulieres æſtate magis appetunt, quia ſemen earum frigidum tunc calore temporis contemperatur, ac movetur, in viro autem fit exhalatio, conſumptio, ac debilitas a calore aſſiduo: hyemis vero frigore vigoratur, & vegetior ac fortior redditur, ideoque magis appetunt viri hyeme, quam mulieres.* If thoſe, who tell this Story, had pitched upon *March, April* and *May*, it had been more likely. We are told in the *Menagiana* of a Woman, who confeſt ſhe would not ingage to be chaſte in *May*, tho' ſhe pretended to overcome the Temptations of the Fleſh all the other Months of the Year. In *France* the Month of *May* is accounted the ſtrongeſt in that reſpect: And becauſe all the Effects of the Spring are earlier in *Italy*, the Month of *April* muſt needs be there what the Month of *May* is in other Countries. I would not have any Conſequences drawn from what we obſerve in Plants and Animals; they might be unexact, becauſe Man's Induſtry affords him a Thouſand Remedies againſt the ſeverity of the Winter, which are unknown to Vegetables, and Beaſts: However, I ſhall take notice of what the Naturaliſts obſerve, that the Spring is the (*b*) uſual time of Generations.

Nam (*c*) *ſimul ac ſpecies patefacta'ſt verna diei,*
Et reſerata viget genitalis aura Favoni;
Aëria primum volucres te, Diva, tuumque
Significant initum percuſſa corda tua vi:
Inde feræ pecudes perſultant pabula læta,
Et rapidos tranant amnes; ita capta lepore,
Illecebriſque tuis omnis natura animantum
Te ſequitur cupide, quo quamque inducere pergis:
Denique per maria, ac monteis fluvioſque rapaceis,
Frondiferaſque domos avium, campoſque virenteis,
Omnibus incutiens blandum per pectora amorem,
Efficis, ut cupide generatim ſæcla propagent.

What you have juſt now read out of the *Menagiana*, was quoted by me without Book: I had not then time to look for the Page; I have found it ſince, and tho' I did not forget the Senſe of the Author, I am ſenſible that I omitted ſome Circumſtances, that deſerved to be mention'd. Here follows the whole Paſſage. “ (*d*) One day as we “ were diſcourſing of the Effects of the Month of “ *May*, which heats anew, not only the Earth, “ and what's on it, but alſo revives Love in the “ very bottom of the Water; after a great deal of “ talk about that Subject, the Marchioneſs *de C---* “ *L---* Mother of the Marchioneſs *de S*—— “ told me, I'll ingage to be Chaſte in all the Months “ of the Year, but I cannot be ſure of it in *May*. „ A Phyſician, who continued the Work of *Laurence Joubert* about Popular Errors, examins this Queſtion: (*e*) *Whether this Saying be right, Don't ſport much with Women, but drink hard in the Months that have no* R. He diſapproves that Rule no farther than as it excludes the Month of *May*; a Month, ſays ſhe (*f*), *the moſt devoted to Love: And I could eaſily believe that in Ancient times People did not Marry in* May, *not ſo much out of Jealouſy, or for fear of getting bad Wives, according to the Poet's ſaying,* Maio nubunt malæ, *as by reaſon of the fury of Love, which is then ſo violent in Women, that they can hardly be ſatisfy'd, and therefore they may think of other Men, to be as* Marte viri, Maio mulieres. He had made uſe of theſe words in the fore going Page: “ (*g*) If therefore the Spring “ is the moſt proper time for ſuch a Sport, it “ ſeems unreaſonable to abſtain from it in all the “ Months that have no R, ſince the Spring begins “ only about the latter end of *March*, and laſts all “ *April* and *May*, which has the true Qualities of “ Heat and Moiſtneſs; and 'tis then that the Pleaſantneſs of the Seaſon fills all ſorts of Animals “ with Love.

“ *In furias ignemque ruunt, furor omnibus idem.*

“ At this rate the Spring, which is the beſt time of “ the Year for ſuch Performances, would paſs away “ without 'em. „ The Doctrine of *Rodericus à Caſtro* above mention'd, is that of the Ancient Naturaliſts. One of the Properties of Summer, according to *Heſiod*, is to weaken the Males, and kindle a greater Love in Females.

Τῆμος (*h*) πιόταταί τ' αἶγες, καὶ οἶνος ἄριστος,
Μαχλόταται δὲ γυναῖκες, ἀφαυρότατοι δέ τοι ἄνδρες
Εἰσίν.
Tunc pingueſque capræ, & vinum optimum,
Salaciſſimæ vero mulieres, & viri imbecilliſſimi ſunt.

The Poet *Alcæus* (*i*) was of the ſame Opinion. *Ariſtotle* ſuppoſes it to be true, (*k*) and inquires into the Reaſons of it: The Moderns, who ſo much criticize the Ancient Naturaliſts, have nothing to ſay againſt 'em upon that point. M. *Venette*, a famous Phyſician, follows their Opinion, and expreſſes himſelf fully to that purpoſe. (*l*) “ The “ great Heat, *ſays he*, of *July* and *Auguſt*, together with our fiery temper, deſtroys our Natural Heat, waſtes our Spirits, and weakens all the “ parts of our Bodies. It produces a great deal of “ Choler, and many ſharp Excrements, which “ make us weak and faint. If we have then a mind “ to ſport with Women, our ſtrength fails us immediately; and tho' at firſt our Paſſion enables “ us to make ſome efforts, we quickly find our ſelves “ ſo weak and ſo exhauſted, that 'tis impoſſible for “ us to be ſtout Champions. And if we have a “ mind to loſe all our ſtrength, and to be ſick, we “ need only ſport frequently with Women. On “ the contrary, Women are much more laſcivious “ in Summer time. Their Cold and Moiſt temper “ is mended by the ſcorching heat of the Sun—— “ Truly thoſe amorous Paſſions are not well divided. Whilſt Women are fiery, we are languiſhing. Their Paſſion no ſooner begins to appear, “ but ours vaniſhes away, as if Nature intended “ to teach us, that the exceſs of Love is wholly prejudicial to Mens Health. „ This Reflection of M. *Venette* puts me in mind of a Paſſage in *Pliny*, wherein, I thought he acknowledged a Providence (*m*) of Nature in ſuch a diviſion of Paſſions; but having more narrowly conſidered it, I find it ought not to be underſtood in that Senſe: Nay, it ſeems to me that *Pliny* has committed a Fault, which perhaps no body took notice of; and therefore I ſhall ſet down his Words. (*n*) *Urinam ciere præcipue traditur* (ſcolymos) *ſanare lichenas & lepras ex aceto. Venerem ſtimulare in Vino, Heſiodo & Alcæo teſtibus: qui florente ea cicadas acerrimi cantus eſſe, & mulieres libidinis avidiſſimas, viroſque in coitum pigerrimos ſcripſere, velut providentia naturæ hoc adjumento tunc valentiſſimo.* It ſeems to me that *Pliny* did not apprehend *Heſiod*'s and *Alcæus*'s meaning; for thoſe two Poets ſay nothing of the Virtue of the *Scolymos*: They only ſay that 'tis a Plant, which Bloſſoms during the greateſt Heat of the Summer, and when Graſs-hoppers ſing moſt, &c. They deſcribe the Summer by thoſe two Marks, and by ſome others, but without pretending that there is any Relation between 'em as between a Cauſe and its Effect.

To Conclude, we may very well ſay, that thoſe, who mention'd the Petition in queſtion, did wrongly chuſe the three Months of the Diſpenſation. They pitched upon the three hoteſt Months in the Year, whereas they ſhould have pitched upon any other Month. The *Spaniards* wou'd not have made ſuch a choice, as it appears from theſe words of the Continuator of *Laurence Joubert*. (*o*) Celſus *ſeems to have Learnedly concluded this Chapter, when he ſays,* (*p*) *that amorous Exercißes are not dangerous and pernicious in Winter, that they are very wholſome in the Spring, and neither good in the Summer nor in the Autumn, tho' more tolerable in the Autumn. For one ought wholly to forbear it in the Summer, if it be*

(*h*) Heſiod. opera & dier. v. 585.

(*i*) See Proclus in Heſiod. ibid. Conſult Menage in Diog. Laertium lib. 2. pag. 352. and Father Hardouin in Plinium tom. 4. p. 205, 206.

(*k*) Ariſtot. problem. ſect. 4 quæſt. 26.

(*l*) Venette, Tableau de l'Amour conjugal pag. 180, 181. edit. 1696.

(*m*) *As if Nature had deſign'd thus to divide the Seaſons of Love, to prevent the ill Conſequences of exceſs.*

(*n*) Plin. l. 22. c. 22. p. m. 205, 206.

(*o*) Bachot ubi ſupra pag. 302, 303.

(*p*) Venus tum (*hieme*) non æque pernicioſa eſt—— Neque æſtate vero, neque autumno utilis Venus eſt. Tolerabilior tamen per autumnum: æſtate in totum, ſi fieri poteſt, abſtinendum eſt. Corn. Celſus, l. 1. c. 3. p. 33, 34.

Fact, and I ſhall ſay in the Remarks what I think of it. It is highly (C) improbable. If *Sixtus* IV. had granted ſuch a Petition, he would have fallen ſhort of the

and Lewdneſs, and for the Venereal Sports, upon which he beſtow'd ſo many Days and Nights. He quotes for the Petition *Weſſelus Groningenſis. Tractatu de Theſauro Eccl. ſ. Indulg.* I have been told that a very Honeſt Man, and a very good Proteſtant, having read that particular, went to *M. Jurieu* in his Study, and deſired him to ſhew him the Author, who relates ſuch a monſtrous thing; and that *M. Jurieu* ingenuouſly confeſt to him that he had him not, but that it is to be found in many good Writers. That Honeſt Man went away very well ſatisfied with that Anſwer. For my part, I confeſs I ſhou'd not have been contented with it: The Author of the *Prejugez* ſhou'd have quoted *Du Pleſſis Mornay* from whom he had that Paſſage; in a word, he ſhou'd have added to the Quotation, *and Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſt. d'Iniquité pag. 557.* But notwithſtanding this Addition, I wou'd have made further Inquiries; for we want to be inform'd how *Du Pleſſis* came to know that *Weſſelus* relates ſuch a thing. It is ſo ſtrange and ſo improbable, that one ought not to believe it without ſeeing it. I have therefore endeavoured to find out that Book of *Weſſelus*, and not being able to get it, I have look'd for the Anſwers that were made to *Du Pleſſis*. *Coeffeteau*'s Anſwer ſeems to me weak; for he only excepts againſt the Witneſs, becauſe he was a Heretick, and becauſe ſuch a Dipoſition ſhews his great Impudence. It is ſufficient for the Reader, ſays he (a), "to know that *Weſſelus* was a Heretick. Beſides, 'tis a piece of Impudence to write ſuch a thing, nor can it be imagin'd that any Man ſhou'd have been ſo profligate as to think of what he imputes to Pope *Sixtus*, and to the Cardinals of *St. Sixtus*, and *Santa Lucia*. I cannot apprehend how a Gentleman could write down ſuch filthy things." This Anſwer of *Coeffeteau* ſhews that he owns the thing to be in *Weſſelus*, whereby he grants to *Du Pleſſis* whatever he could deſire. The Jeſuite *Gretſerus* came off much better; he denies that *Weſſelus* ſaid ſuch a thing, and proves it (b). 1. Becauſe his Treatiſe of Indulgences quoted by *Du Pleſſis*, and Publiſh'd by *Goldaſtus* a good Calviniſt, contains nothing relating to the Petition preſented to the Pope. 2. Becauſe *Flacius Illyricus*, who took out of *Weſſelus*'s Works whatever he thought conducible to his Deſigns, did not mention what concerns that Petition. From whence it plainly follows, that neither *Flacius Illyricus*, nor *Goldaſtus*, two Men throughly verſed in the Knowledge of ſuch Books, found in any Library a Manuſcript of *Weſſelus*'s Works, that contain'd the Fact mention'd by *Du Pleſſis*. The only Authority that remains, is therefore that of *Baleus*, who having related that particular (c), quotes for it the Book of Papal Indulgences, written by *Weſſelus* of *Groningen*. Not being willing to ſtop here, I further look'd into the Reply to *Coeffeteau*, made by a very Learned (d) Miniſter, who had as much reading as any Man in his time. Tho' he knew what *Gretſerus* had anſwered, he replies nothing to it, which ſhews that *Gretſerus* did not tell a Lie, in what he affirm'd concerning *Goldaſtus*'s Edition, and *Illyricus*. From whence it ought to be concluded, that 'tis only upon *Baleus*'s Credit, that we are inform'd that *Weſſelus* mention'd the Petition in Queſtion.

Which being ſo, I ſay that none will mention again ſuch a Petition, but a wretched Rhapſodiſt, who tranſcribes and heaps up without any Judgment, whatever he finds in the Writers of his Party; for if the Author of the *Prejugez* had conſidered what he did, he would have foreſeen that ſuch a Petition would be denied, and he wou'd have made himſelf ready to maintain the Truth of it. But then he would have quickly found out that the thing could not be maintain'd, and if he had been a Wiſe Man, he had wholly laid aſide that Objection. Let us ſuppoſe an Adverſary, who attacks him upon that Account. Prove to me, will he ſay, that *Sixtus* IV. granted the Exerciſe of Sodomy for three Months to thoſe who Petition'd him for it. M. *Jurieu* will anſwer that *Weſſelus* of *Groningen* affirms it in his Book concerning Indulgences. 'Tis not true, will the Adverſary reply; here is that Book of *Weſſelus*, Publiſh'd by a Proteſtant, but that Fact is not to be found in it. *Illyricus*, another Proteſtant, who had ſo much peruſed *Weſſelus*, did not find it neither: And therefore you Calumniate *Weſſelus*. No, will M. *Jurieu* ſay, I don't Calumniate him, for *Baleus* aſcribes to him the thing in Queſtion. But the Adverſary will anſwer, if you had common ſenſe, could you believe that the Authority of a Writer, ſo much cried down and deteſted by the Church of *Rome*, will counterballance *Illyricus*'s Silence, and *Goldaſtus*'s Edition? Why not, will M. *Jurieu* reply. The Papiſts have ſtruck that Paſſage out of *Weſſelus*'s Book, and therefore *Illyricus* and *Goldaſtus* could not find it; but *Baleus* had a Copy that was not curtailed. I maintain, will the Antagoniſt ſay, that *Baleus* made uſe of a Copy, into which a Man, who was not better than he, foiſtered that Paſſage, if *Baleus* himſelf was not the Impoſtor; and after all, you are to ſhew me a Manuſcript of *Weſſelus*, which you may oppoſe to *Goldaſtus*'s Edition. I don't know what *M. Jurieu* could reply; and therefore he is like thoſe imprudent Accuſers whom *Cicero* (e) laugh'd at, who have nothing to ſay when their Aſſertions are denied. Every Wiſe Man will grant that the believing of a Crime is not ſufficient to charge any Body with it, and that one muſt be in a capacity to prove it to thoſe who deny it. Tho' you believe never ſo much that *Sixtus* IV. was guilty of ſuch an Abomination, you will not affirm it in a Book, if you are a Man of Judgment, and if you have no better Proofs than *M. Jurieu*. To conclude, I don't pretend that theſe Critical Obſervations concern M. *Du Pleſſis Mornay*: He wrote in a time when Men were not ſo Nice; and *Goldaſtus*'s Edition (f) was unknown to him.

I had almoſt forgot to obſerve, that none but a very Ignorant or Unſincere Man can maintain that *Weſſelus* was a Papiſt. If he had been a Papiſt, would *Luther* have beſtowed this Encomium upon him? (g) *Prodiit en Weſſelus, vir admirabilis ingenii, rari & magni ſpiritus, quem & ipſum apparet eſſe vere theodidactum, quales prophetavit fore Chriſtianos Eſaias: neque enim ex hominibus accepiſſe judicari poteſt, ſicut nec ego. Hic ſi mihi antea fuiſſet lectus, poterat hoſtibus meis videri Lutherus omnia ex Weſſelo hauſiſſe, adeo ſpiritus utriuſque conſpirat in unum, &c.*

Note, That M. *Saldenus* a Dutch Miniſter at the *Hague*, affirms, that according to *Agrippa*, the Permiſſion I have been ſpeaking of, was granted to a Cardinal by *Sixtus* IV. *Idem hic Sixtus, teſte Agrippa, Cardinali cuidam maſculæ Veneris uſum certis menſibus ſecure indulſit* (h). *Agrippa* ſays no ſuch thing.

(C) *It is highly improbable.*] My Deſign is not to extenuate the Vices of thoſe, who are ſaid to have preſented that Petition; on the contrary, I aggravate them: For, I maintain, that if thoſe Men had been ſo wicked as to preſent it, and make uſe of the permiſſion granted them, they were too profligate to mind ſuch a permiſſion. You may be ſure that ſuch Men would not forbear plunging themſelves into Vice, till the Pope had granted their Petition. Beſides, was it neceſſary to draw up a Petition in Form, and to expect an Anſwer to it in Writing? Was it not ſufficient to whiſper it in the Ear, without diſcovering ſuch an abominable Impudence to ſeveral Perſons? The moſt profligate Men do commonly obſerve a *Decorum*, when they cannot offend againſt it without acting needleſly, or to their prejudice. If that Pope had a Mind to grant a Privilege, he might have done it by word of Mouth, without expoſing his Reputation. If he grants it in Writing, the Conſcience of the Petitioners will not be more at reſt for it, and he runs the hazard of being Convicted of an Abominable Action by his own hand. Will a profligate Man, if he has any Cunning, commit ſuch a Fault?

I muſt not forget an Obſervation that is proper enough to ſhew the falſity of that Story. 'Tis ſuppoſed that the Family of the Cardinal of *Santa Lucia* ask'd leave *to perform the act of Sodomy during* the

(a) Coeffeteau, Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité, pag. 1407.

(b) Et in illo libro (de indulgentiis *Papalibus*) prout tomo primo monarchiæ Goldaſticæ a Goldaſto Calviniſta evulgatus eſt; nullum penitus de hac inexpiabili enormitate verbulum reperitur; nec, quod mireris, Illyricus in Catalogo ejus meminit, eo loco, ubi ex operibus Weſſeli, ea, quæ ad ſuum forum facere credebat, excerpſit. Gretſerus. in examin. Myſterii Pleſſæani, pag. 545.

(c) Cent. 8. cap. 50.

(d) Andrew Rivet. *See the ſecond part of his Book* pag. 625.

the Prudence and Virtue which *Clement* VII. diſcovered, when he thought that

the three hoteſt Months in the Year, viz. June, July, and Auguſt. There is in it a Miſtake in matter of Fact, which makes the whole Story ſuſpected: 'Tis ſuppoſed that lewd People in *Italy* are more Tormented with their Paſſion during the greateſt Heat, than at any other time; which is a falſe Suppoſition. If you conſult Phyſicians, they'll tell you, that of all the Seaſons of the Year, Men are leſs inclined to Venery in Summer, becauſe the Heat weakens and enervates them. (a) *Coitum porro mulieres æſtate magis appetunt, quia ſemen earum frigidum tunc calore temporis contemperatur, ac movetur, in viro autem fit exhalatus, conſumptio, ac debilitas à calore admiſſa: Hyemis vero frigore vigoratur, & vegetior ac fortior redditur, ideoque magis appetunt viri hyeme, quam mulieres.* If thoſe, who tell this Story, had pitched upon *March, April* and *May*, it had been more likely. We are told in the *Menagiana* of a Woman, who confeſt ſhe would not ingage to be chaſte in *May*, tho' ſhe pretended to overcome the Temptations of the Fleſh all the other Months of the Year. In *France* the Month of *May* is accounted the ſtrongeſt in that reſpect: And becauſe all the Effects of the Spring are earlier in *Italy*, the Month of *April* muſt needs be there what the Month of *May* is in other Countries. I would not have any Conſequences drawn from what we obſerve in Plants and Animals; they might be unexact, becauſe Man's Induſtry affords him a Thouſand Remedies againſt the ſeverity of the Winter, which are unknown to Vegetables, and Beaſts: However, I ſhall take notice of what the Naturaliſts obſerve, that the Spring is the (b) uſual time of Generations.

Nam (c) ſimul ac ſpecies patefacta'ſt verna diei,
Et reſerata viget genitalis aura Favoni;
Aëriæ primum volucres te, Diva, tuumque
Significant initum percuſſæ corda tua vi:
Inde feræ pecudes perſultant pabula læta,
Et rapidos tranant amnes; ita capta lepore,
Illecebriſque tuis omnis natura animantum
Te ſequitur cupide, quo quamque inducere pergis:
Denique par maria, ac monteis fluvioſque rapaceis,
Frundiferaſque domos avium, campoſque virenteis,
Omnibus incutiens blandum per pectora amorem,
Efficis, ut cupide generatim ſæcla propagent.

What you have juſt now read out of the *Menagiana*, was quoted by me without Book: I had not then time to look for the Page; I have found it ſince, and tho' I did not forget the Senſe of the Author, I am ſenſible that I omitted ſome Circumſtances, that deſerved to be mention'd. Here follows the whole Paſſage. “ (d) One day as we “ were diſcourſing of the Effects of the Month of “ *May*, which heats anew, not only the Earth, “ and what's on it, but alſo revives Love in the “ very bottom of the Water; after a great deal of “ talk about that Subject, the Marchioneſs *de C---* “ *L---* Mother of the Marchioneſs *de S*—— “ told me, I'll ingage to be Chaſte in all the Months “ of the Year, but I cannot be ſure of it in *May*.„ A Phyſician, who continued the Work of *Laurence Joubert* about Popular Errors, examins this Queſtion: (e) *Whether this Saying be right, Don't ſport much with Women, but drink hard in the Months that have no* R. He diſapproves that Rule no farther than as it excludes the Month of *May*; a Month, ſays ſhe (f), *the moſt devoted to Love: And I could eaſily believe that in Ancient times People did not Marry in* May, *not ſo much out of Jealouſy, or for fear of getting bad Wives, according to the Poet's ſaying,* Maio nubunt malæ, *as by reaſon of the fury of Love, which is then ſo violent in Women, that they can hardly be ſatisfy'd, and therefore they may think of other Men, to be as* Marte viri, Maio mulieres. He had made uſe of theſe words in the foregoing Page: “ (g) If therefore the Spring “ is the moſt proper time for ſuch a Sport, it “ ſeems unreaſonable to abſtain from it in all the “ Months that have no R, ſince the Spring begins “ only about the latter end of *March*, and laſts all “ *April* and *May*, which has the true Qualities of “ Heat and Moiſtneſs; and 'tis then that the Plea- “ fatneſs of the Seaſon fills all ſorts of Animals “ with Love.

“ *In furias ignemque ruunt, furor omnibus idem.*

“ At this rate the Spring, which is the beſt time of “ the Year for ſuch Performances, would paſs away “ without 'em.„ The Doctrine of *Rodericus à Caſtro* above mention'd, is that of the Ancient Naturaliſts. One of the Properties of Summer, according to *Heſiod*, is to weaken the Males, and kindle a greater Love in Females.

Τῆμος (h) πιόταταί τ' αἶγες, καὶ οἶνος ἄριστος,
Μαχλόταται δὲ γυναῖκες, ἀφαυρότατοι δέ τοι ἄνδρες
Εἰσίν.
Tunc pinguiſque capræ, & vinum optimum,
Salaciſſimæ vero mulieres, & viri imbecilliſſimi ſunt.

The Poet *Alcæus* (i) was of the ſame Opinion. *Ariſtotle* ſuppoſes it to be true, (k) and inquires into the Reaſons of it: The Moderns, who ſo much criticize the Ancient Naturaliſts, have nothing to ſay againſt 'em upon that point. M. *Venette*, a famous Phyſician, follows their Opinion, and expreſſes himſelf fully to that purpoſe. (l) “ The “ great Heat, *ſays he*, of *July* and *Auguſt*, together “ with our fiery temper, deſtroys our Natural Heat, waſtes our Spirits, and weakens all the “ parts of our Bodies. It produces a great deal of “ Choler, and many ſharp Excrements, which “ make us weak and faint. If we have then a mind “ to ſport with Women, our ſtrength fails us immediately; and tho' at firſt our Paſſion enables “ us to make ſome efforts, we quickly find our ſelves “ ſo weak and ſo exhauſted, that 'tis impoſſible for “ us to be ſtout Champions. And if we have a “ mind to loſe all our ſtrength, and to be ſick, we “ need only ſport frequently with Women. On “ the contrary, Women are much more laſcivious “ in Summer time. Their Cold and Moiſt temper “ is mended by the ſcorching heat of the Sun—— “ Truly thoſe amorous Paſſions are not well divided. Whilſt Women are fiery, we are languiſhing. Their Paſſion no ſooner begins to appear, “ but ours vaniſhes away, as if Nature intended “ to teach us, that the exceſs of Love is wholly prejudicial to Mens Health.„ This Reflection of M. *Venette* puts me in mind of a Paſſage in *Pliny*, wherein, I thought he acknowledged a Providence (m) of Nature in ſuch a diviſion of Paſſions; but having more narrowly conſidered it, I find it ought not to be underſtood in that Senſe: Nay, it ſeems to me that *Pliny* has committed a Fault, which perhaps no body took notice of; and therefore I ſhall ſet down his Words. (n) *Urinam ciere præcipue traditur* (ſcolymos) *ſanare lichenas & lepras ex aceto. Venerem ſtimulare in Vino, Heſiodo & Alcæo teſtibus: qui florente ea cicadas acerrimi cantus eſſe, & mulieres libidinis avidiſſimas, viroſque in coitum pigerrimos ſcripſere, velut providentia naturæ hoc adjumento tunc valentiſſimo.* It ſeems to me that *Pliny* did not apprehend *Heſiod's* and *Alcæus's* meaning; for thoſe two Poets ſay nothing of the Virtue of the *Scolymos*: They only ſay that 'tis a Plant, which Bloſſoms during the greateſt Heat of the Summer, and when Graſs-hoppers ſing moſt, &c. They deſcribe the Summer by thoſe two Marks, and by ſome others, but without pretending that there is any Relation between 'em as between a Cauſe and its Effect.

To Conclude, we may very well ſay, that thoſe, who mention'd the Petition in queſtion, did wrongly chuſe the three Months of the Diſpenſation. They pitched upon the three hoteſt Months in the Year, whereas they ſhould have pitched upon any other Month. The *Spaniards* wou'd not have made ſuch a choice, as it appears from theſe words of the Continuator of *Laurence Joubert*. (o) Celſus *ſeems to have Learnedly concluded this Chapter, when he ſays, (p) that amorous Exerciſes are not dangerous and pernicious in Winter, that they are very wholſome in the Spring, and neither good in the Summer nor in the Autumn, tho' more tolerable in the Autumn. For one ought wholly to forbear it in the Summer, if it be poſſible.*

(h) Heſiod. opera & dier. v. 583.

(i) See Proclus in Heſiod. ibid. Conſult Menage in Diog. Laertium lib. 9. pag. 352. *and* Father Hardouin in Plinium tom. 4. p. 205, 206.

(k) Ariſtot. problem. ſect. 4 quæſt. 26.

(l) Venette, Tableau de l'amour conjugal pag. 180, 181. edit. 1696.

(m) *As if Nature had deſign'd thus to divide the Seaſons of Love, to prevent the ill Conſequences of exceſs.*

(n) Plin. l. 22. c. 22. p. m. 205, 206.

(o) Bachot ubi ſupra pag. 302, 303.

(p) Venus tum (*hieme*) non æque pernicioſa eſt—— Neque æſtate vero, neque autumno utilis Venus eſt. Tolerabilior tamen per autumnum: æſtate in totum, ſi fieri poteſt, abſtinendum eſt. Corn. Celſus, l. 1. c. 3. p. 33, 34.

that (C△) ſome Ladies deſir'd he would permit 'em to do an Unlawful thing. 'Tis ſaid that *Sixtus* died in the Year 1484. of the Grief he conceiv'd, when he heard (D) that a Peace was concluded between the Duke of *Ferrara* and the *Venetians.* He loved the War, and he has been look'd upon as the Diſturber of the Repoſe

poſſible. The Spaniards ſeem to have better obſerv'd this common (a) Saying, than we have, by excluding May, and reckoning only Three Months: Junio, Julio, y Auguſto, Dieta olgueta & quatre nudios in braguetta.

If any one ſhould ſay that ſome Reaſons, well known at *Rome* to debauched People, did perhaps occaſion the asking of a Diſpenſation *for the three hotteſt Months in the Year,* he ſhould deſerve no Anſwer. Such a general Diſcourſe ought neither to be examin'd nor minded; and unleſs a better Reaſon be alledged, the firſt who mention'd that Petition, will juſtly be accounted one of thoſe Satyrical Writers, who know not how to obſerve the Rules of Probability. We may apply to him (b) theſe words of an Ancient Father, *voluntatem eum habere mentiendi, artem fingendi non habere*: he is very willing to tell a Lie, but he does not underſtand the Art of Lying. This does not concern *Weſſelus*; for firſt, 'tis not known whether he mention'd that Petition; that Fact is not to be found in his Books that are extant: And it may be preſum'd that if he ſaid ſomething of it, 'twas upon the Credit of others. He quoted ſome body, or at leaſt he made uſe of this Clauſe, *fama eſt, fertur, It has been reported, 'tis ſaid,* &c. However it be, I declare I don't take him to be the firſt Author of that Story. Many Controverſiſts have been impoſed upon by the Name of ſuch a Wiſe and Eminent Divine; but ſince they knew not how he ſpoke of it, whether he gave ſome proofs of it, or none at all, whether it was upon a hear-ſay, or upon the Teſtimony of grave Men, they have been too haſty in their Judgment, and in their Quotations. 'Tis particularly about Libels diſperſed againſt ſuch Perſons as *Sixtus* IV. that one ought to be cautious. He had diſturbed the publick Peace of *Italy*; he had Excommunicated the Republicks of *Venice* and *Florence*, and engaged in a violent War with both. There was a great Corruption in his Court; his Relations made themſelves Odious by their Ambition and Debauchery: And therefore it was to be expected that many Paſquinades would come out (c) againſt him. Any *Venetian* or *Florentin*, skill'd in the Art of Slandering, could not fail to pleaſe his Sovereigns and his Fellow-Citizens, by uſing his Talent againſt the Pope. He might expect that his Satyrical Strokes, whether true or falſe, would be very acceptable: 'Tis a Conſolation for thoſe who fear or hate a Prince, to ſee him abuſed in Libels; they believe every thing, and therefore Satyrical Writers do not much care to obſerve the Rules of Probability, being ſure to make People believe the groſſeſt Lies. Which they are particularly ſure of, when they can juſtly charge others with ill Actions: Thoſe Truths ſerve as a falſe Conduct (d) to the Falſities that go along with them. This Obſervation might be of Uſe at all times to thoſe, who are not willing to confound well-grounded Slanders with malicious Calumnies. But to ſpeak only of *Sixtus* IV. I obſerve that if there was any ground for the Petition in queſtion, *Weſſelus* would not be the only Writer that ſaid ſomething of it. How could he have found out what was unknown to the Satyrical Writers of *Venice* and *Florence*?

(C△) Clement VII. *diſcovered, when he thought that ſome Ladies deſired he would permit 'em to do an Unlawful thing.*] This Particular may be ſeen in a Chronicle; 'tis not a Story preſerved by Tradition. It may be found in the Annals of *Aquitain*, Publiſh'd (e) ſeveral times by *John Boucher*, who lived at that time. He ſpeaks of an Interview between *Clement* VII. and *Francis* I. at *Marſeilles* in 1533. "(f) During that Interview between the "Pope and the King, where all the Blood of "*France* was, and many Princes and Lords, and "alſo the Queen of *France* and her Retinue, there "was a common Report, that a pretty Trick had "been plaid to three Ladies of the Queen, who "were Virtuous, Chaſte, and Devout Women. "Thoſe three Ladies, who were all Widows, having a weakly and ſickly Conſtitution, deſired to "have a Licenſe from the Pope to eat Fleſh upon "prohibited Days; and in order to it, they made "their Application to the Duke of *Albania*, his "near Relation, who promiſed to ſpeak to the "Pope about it, and then ſent for 'em to come "to the Pope. This Duke, who was very familiar with thoſe Ladies, having a mind to give "ſome ſport to the Pope and to the King, told the "Pope, Holy Father, there are three Widows young enough to get Children, whom I take "to have ſome Luſtful Temptations, becauſe they "have deſired me to beg of you that they may be "allowed to make uſe of a Man when they want "one. How, Couſin, ſaid the Pope, it were againſt "God's Commandment, from which I can diſpenſe "no body? I beſeech you, Holy Father, *reply'd the* "*Duke*, to hear 'em, and to make this Remonſtrance "to them. Whereupon the Ladies came into the "Hall where the Pope was, and after they had kiſſed his Feet, one of 'em told him, Holy Father, "we have deſired the Duke of *Albania* to beg a favour of you, and to repreſent to you our Age, and "weak Conſtitution. Daughters, *ſaid the Pope*, "your Requeſt is not reaſonable, for I ſhould act "againſt God's Commandment. The Widows not "knowing what the Duke of *Albania* had told him, "anſwered, Holy Father, be pleas'd to give us ſuch "a Diſpenſation, three times in a Week, at leaſt in "Lent. How, *reply'd the Pope*, muſt I give you "leave to commit Fornication? I ſhould be damn'd "if I did it. Whereupon the Ladies were ſenſible, that there was ſome Jeſt in the matter; and "one of 'em told him, We beg a Diſpenſation to "eat Fleſh upon prohibited Days. The Duke of "*Albania* told 'em, I thought, Ladies, you meant "live Fleſh. The Pope perceiving the Jeſt, ſmiled, and told the Duke, Couſin, you make the "Ladies bluſh; when the Queen comes to hear of "this, ſhe'll be diſpleas'd with it. The King, the "Queen, and the Princes, were immediately told "of it, and liked the Humour very well." You'll find this Adventure in *Brantome*'s Memoirs, towards the end of the Second Volume (g) of his *Dames Galantes*, where it is related more at large than in the Annals of *Aquitain*. *Brantome* knew not that this Story was to be found in that Book; for he concludes thus: (h) *I have been told the Names of theſe three Ladies*, viz. *The Lady* de Chateau-briant, *the Lady* Chaſtillon, *and the Widow of the Bayliff of* Caen, *all very virtuous Women. I have this Story from the Old Courtiers.*

(D) *Of the Grief he conceived when he heard that a Peace.*] He had declared War againſt the Republick of *Venice*, in favour of the Duke of *Ferrara*, and had a mind to keep it up; but his Allies forſook him, and made a Peace without conſulting him. The Grief he conceived upon it increaſed his Gout, and carry'd him off within Five Days. What a Vicar of the Prince of Peace, who ſays in his Goſpel, *Bleſſed are the Peace-Makers*, (i) *Quum pacem a ſociis præter ejus voluntatem & conſenſum fieri conſpiceret, ex animi uti putatur dolore, podagra inſuper aggravante qua in ultimis annis maxime laborabat, in quintum diem expiravit.* He deſerved the Epitaphs, which the Poets (k) made upon him.

I will not forget a fine Paſſage of *Alcyonius*. (l) *Ad id adductus videri poterat Ferdinandus a Xyſto Pont. Max. qui & officii Pontificii, & religionis & Dei oblitus non ſecus in Italia bella excitare ſolebat atque illa Aſia aut Africa provincia eſſet, in qua Turcæ & Pœni regnarent, non pars Europæ ex flore clariſſimorum virorum conſtans, cujus princeps eſſet pontifex maximus qui moderatiſſime & ſapientiſſime clavum tanti imperii tenere & gubernacula Reip. tractare in maximo curſu & fluctibus deberet. Dein eodem Xyſto ſi non ſuaſore & impulſore certe approbatore Veneti terra & aquis arma intulerunt Herculi Ferrarienſi Princi-*

(a) *Viz. that which I have mention'd above.*

(b) *'Tis obſerved in the 9. Volume of the* Morale pratique des Jeſuites p. 159. *that this ſaying was applied to the* Jeſuite Briſacier.

(c) Non modo omnes Italiæ potentatus in eo (*Venetos*) concitavit, ſed etiam veluti Clemens 6. alias fecerat, illos execravit, interdixit, & omnibus dignitatibus privavit. Nec quoad vixit, illis abſolutionis beneficium impendere voluit. Ex quo multos detractores habuit. Nauclerus gener. 50. fol. m. 979.

(d) *Note, that on the other hand this mixture of Truths and Falſities is favourable to thoſe who make an Apology for Perſons that are defamed; for when the Writer of a Libel is convicted of Falſhood upon ſeveral Points, he becomes ſuſpected of Calumny in every thing elſe.*

(e) *He ſays* Fol. 270. verſo *edition of* Poitiers 1557. *that they were Printed at* Poictiers *the third time in the beginning of the Year* 1535.

(f) Bouchet Annales d'Aquitaine fol. m. 267.

Repose of *Italy*. *Agrippa* ſays a thing of him (E) which deſerves to be mention'd. You may ſee in * *Moreri* that it has been ſaid that this Pope got himſelf admitted into the Houſe of *la Rovere*, which was very Illuſtrious in *Piedmont*. That Family was in Poſſeſſion of a ſtrange (F) Prerogative. All Authors are agreed that *Sixtus* IV. was a Learned Man. He took his Doctor's Degree at *Padua*, and read publick Lectures at *Bologna*, *Pavia*, *Siena*, *Florence* and *Perugia*. Afterwards he was promoted to ſeveral Dignities: He was made firſt of all Provincial of the Province of *Liguria*, and then Procurator General of his Order at the Court of *Rome*, afterwards Vicar General of *Italy*, and at laſt General of the Cordeliers. After thoſe Preferments he received a Cardinal's Hat. He got a great Reputation by (G) his Works, and being raiſed to the Papal See he made it appear that he was ſtill a Lover of Learning; for he ſet up the Library of the *Vatican*, and gave the Direction of it to the Learned *Platina*, and allowed a Yearly Penſion to ſeveral other Perſons, who were to help him in taking care of the Books, and tranſcribing *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Hebrew* Manuſcripts †. He ordered β the ſame *Platina* to write the Hiſtory of the Popes. It has been obſerved that he proved more Liberal to his Siſters Sons than to his Brothers Sons, and that among his Siſters Sons he particularly favoured (H) *Peter* and *Jerome Riario*. Which wou'd not be an odd thing, as 'tis thought, but rather a very Natural one, were it true that he was their Father, as ſome writers will have it. He was the firſt γ who Inſtituted the Feaſt of the Conception and Preſentation of the Holy Virgin, and likewiſe that of St. *Anne* and St. *Joſeph*, and that of *Francis*

* Upon the word *Rovere*.

† Taken from *Ghilini teatro d'huomini letterati* tom. 1. pag. 93.

β *Platina epist. dedicat. ad Sixtum* IV.

γ *Vita Sixti IV. ab eodem Platina fol. m.* 364.

Principi (a). Take notice that I have been inform'd by M. *de la Monnoie*, that the Firſt of the Three Epitaphs, which I have mention'd above, after *Du Pleſſis Mornay*, does not concern Pope *Sixtus*, and that it contains two Verſes of *Sannazarius* againſt Pope *Alexander* VI; that one ought to read *Sextum* and not *Sixtum*, and that *Sannazarius* did rather praiſe *Sixtus* than blame him, as it appears from this Epigram againſt the ſame *Alexander*. *Viſuram ſe iterum Sixtum cum Roma putaret, Pro Sixto Sextum vidit & ingemuit.*

(E) Agrippa *ſays a thing*.] *Du Pleſſis* relates it thus. *Among the Pimps of theſe latter times*, ſays Agrippa, *Sixtus* IV. *was moſt remarkable, who built a Noble Bawdy-houſe at* Rome ——— *The Curtezans of* Rome *pay a Giulio every Week to the Pope, and this Yearly income does ſometimes amount to above Twenty Thouſand Ducats; and that Office is ſo particularly appropriated to the Chief Eccleſiaſticks, that the Rent of Pimping is reckon'd part of the Revenues of the Church.* *For*, ſays he, *I heard formerly the Computation made in the following manner: He has two Benefices, a Living of Twenty Ducats, a Priory of Forty, and three Whores in the Bawdy Houſe, who bring him Twenty Giulio's every Week* (b). Thoſe, who deſire to ſee *Agrippa*'s Words, need only read the following Paſſage. *Sed & recentioribus temporibus Sixtus Pontifex Maximus Romæ nobile admodum lupanar extruxit ——— Multi alii magiſtratus ——— in civitatibus ſuis lupanaria conſtruunt foventque, nonnihil ex meretricio quæſtu etiam ærario ſuo accumulantes emolumenti: quod quidem in Italia non rarum eſt, ubi etiam Romanæ ſcorta in ſingulas hebdomadas Julium pendent Pontifici, qui cenſus annuus nonnunquam viginti millia ducatos excedit, adeoque Eccleſiæ procerum id munus eſt, ut unà cum Eccleſiarum proventibus etiam lenociniorum numerent mercedem. Sic enim ego illos ſupputantes aliquando audivi; Habet, inquientes, ille duo beneficia, unum curatum aureorum viginti, alterum prioratum ducatorum quadraginta, & tres putanas in burdello, quæ reddunt ſingulis hebdomadibus viginti* (c).

(F) *A ſtrange Prerogative.*] It was a right over the Virginity of the Maids, whom their Vaſſals Married. A Cardinal of that Houſe threw into the Fire the Patent of that Privilege. *Cotal* (d) *coſtume de pagani & da gentili, fu gia in Piemonte, & il Cardinale Illuſtriſſimo Hieronimo della Rouere mi diceva haver egli ſteſſo abbrucciato il privilegio, che havea di cio la ſua Caſa* (e). They are the Words of an Author, who lived in the beginning of the XVII. Century. See the Margin (†).

(G) *By his Works.*] Here follow the Titles of 'em. *De ſanguine Chriſti liber: De futuris contingentibus: Commentaris de Potentia Dei: De Conceptione B. Virginis: Contra errores cujuſdam Carmelitæ Bononienſis qui aſſirmabat Deum ſua omnipotentia, damnatum hominem ſalvare non poſſe.* He writ alſo a Book to ſhew that *Thomas Aquinas* and *Scotus*, who differ ſo much in words, are at the Bottom of the ſame Opinion (f).

(H) *He particularly favoured* Peter *and* Jerome Riario. *It wou'd not be an odd thing ——— were it true that he was their Father, as ſome Writers will have it.*] " (g) He had nine Nephews, *viz.* five, " whoſe Name was *de la Rovere* as well as his, " and they were the Sons of his three Brothers de" ceaſed, and four who went by the Names of *Ria*" *rio*, *Baſſo*, and *Sanſoni*, the three Families into " which his Siſters, and one of his Neeces, had been " Married ——— (h) It was not barely the exceſs " of the Pope's Ambition that made it intolerable, " ſince it was Attended with a kind of oddneſs, " grounded neither upon his Intereſt nor upon Pro" bability; for tho' 'twas likely that *Sixtus* wou'd " ſhew more kindneſs to the five Nephews I have " juſt now mention'd, than to the other four, who " were only related to him by his Siſters Side; " tho' he had all the Reaſon in the World to do " it, and tho' *Julian* the Eldeſt of 'em all was en" dowed with all the wonderfull Qualities, which " made afterwards his Pontificate ſo Famous under " the Name of *Julius* II. 'tis certain he never " cou'd obtain of his Uncle that he ſhould appear " like the head of the Houſe of *la Rovere*, or " perform the Functions of Cardinal Nephew, " or that his Brother or his three Couſins ſhou'd " have what was denied him. In a word, *Sixtus* ap" pear'd all along more kind to his Siſters Chil" dren, eſpecially to thoſe of the Eldeſt, who had " two Sons, *viz.* *Peter* and *Jerome Riario*. *Peter* " had been a Cordelier as well as his Uncle, and " perhaps deſerved upon that Account to have a " greater ſhare in his Uncle's Affection. He was " made Cardinal on the ſame day that *Julian* " was; but he had this Advantage above him, " that he was declared Cardinal Nephew, and ob" tain'd the Biſhoprick of *Treviſo*, which *Julian* " had demanded. Afterwards the moſt conſidera" ble Benefices, that came to be Vacant, were " beſtowed upon him; and he became ſo Powerful " that he had a greater Train than the reſt of " the Sacred College ——— (i) His Brother *Je*" *rome* ——— whom the Pope deſign'd to make " his chief Heir, &c ". Machiavel will tell us that *Peter* and *Jerome Riario* were call'd *Sixtus*'s Nephews, only to conceal the Relation of Paternity under ſuch a Name. *Fu queſto Ponteſice*, ſaith he, (k) *il primo che cominciaſſe a moſtrare quanto un Ponteſice poteva, & come molte coſe chiamate per*

(a) Petrus ... ponius ... nelice ... gro ... teriore ... l. 1. ... rio.

(b) Ibid. ... 557.

(c) Agrip- ... de va- ... te ... tiar. ... tom. ... Ope- ... pag.

(d) The ... been ... ing of ..., which ... Holme ... ng of ... land ... eſta- ... 94.

(e) Boni- ... Van- ... ni, ... erti- ... ti Po- ... tom. ... pag.

(f) Taken from Ghilini, Teatro parte 2. p. 94.

(g) Varillas Anecd. de Florence pag. 67.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 68.

(i) Id. ib. pag. 69.

(k) Machiavelli delle hiſtorie Fiorentine lib. 7. pag. m. 289.

(†) Mr. Pars Miniſter *of* Katwick *ſays in a Dutch Book*, I... ..., Katwijkſe outheden, *that is* antiquities *of* Katwic, pag. ... *that ſome Lords in* Holland *(he Names ſome of 'em) had* ... *a Privilege, and that it was ſuppreſt by the States who gave* ... *Money for the ſuppreſſion of it.*

Francis of Aſſiſi. He Canonized Bonaventura ‖, and appointed him a Feaſt ‡ among thoſe of the Apoſtolical Palace. He reſtored a Devotion invented by St. Dominick, which was interrupted, viz. that of the Roſary and the Pſalter of the Holy Virgin †. 'Tis a miſtake to ſay that he was the firſt who ordered that the Jubile ſhou'd be Celebrated once in 25 Years. That Ordinance was made by Paul II. his Predeceſſor in the Year 1470. He only confirm'd it, and was the firſt who put it in Execution in the Year 1475 §. Polydorus Virgil places him among the Inventers of things, whereby he does him little Honour, for he aſcribes to him the firſt (I) Creation of many Offices that were bought: Which occaſion'd a diſorder that encreaſed daily. All Authors are not agreed that this Pontif was a Man of a mean (K) Extraction. If he was, he may be properly alledged to confirm what I have ſaid in another place, that the moſt Haughty and daring Men may be Born among the dregs of the People; for his Haughtineſs was very great: The Florentins found it ſo by Experience; for they cou'd not be reconcil'd to him, but by ſubmitting ¶ to the moſt ſhameful Humiliations. The Satiſfaction he required of 'em was very mortifying. 'Tis in vain for Father Bonanni to ſay that John Michael Brutus has no Reaſon to complain of the hard Anſwer that was made by that Pope to their Deputies: What he relates and what he confeſſes is a ſufficient Proof of the great Mortification they went thro' ‖.

‖ Ibid.

‡ Bonanni in numiſm. Pontificum tom. 1. pag. 91.

† Id. ib.

§ Id. ib. pag. 98.

¶ In the Year 1480.

‖ See Bonanni ubi ſupra pag. 101, & ſeq.

SMIGLECIUS

per l'adietro errori, ſi potevano ſotto la Pontificale autorità naſcondere. Haveva tra la ſua famiglia Piero e Girolamo, i quali (ſecondo che ciaſcuno credeva) erano ſuo figliuoli, nondimeno ſotto altri più honeſti nomi gli palliava. John Michael Brutus affirms that Sixtus begot thoſe two Boys when he was but a Cordelier, and had 'em bred up under the Name of his Nephews to conceal his Fault. (a) *Ab eo cum adhuc ageret in Franciſcanorum familia liberos ſuſceptos fuiſſe: ac quo minor Parentis infamia eſſet, propinquorum honeſtiori nomine liberaliter quidem & honeſte, ſed non tamen in ſpem tantam educatos.*

Some ſay he was neither the Father nor the Uncle of *Peter* and *James Riario*, and that they were only his Minions. *Coeffeteau* put that ſenſe upon the Parentheſis of a Paſſage above quoted, which contains theſe three Words, *not without Myſtery*. Theſe are *Coeffeteau's* Words. (b) Du Pleſſis *pretends there was an Abominable Myſtery in that Love, which is a thing that a Man of Honour ſhou'd have no thought of.* I own it, replies *Rivet*, " (c) in
" order to approve it, and much leſs to delight
" in it; but an Honeſt Man may take notice of
" it, and deteſt it in a ſinful Man, and it will no
" more defile his Imagination than the Words of
" the Scripture concerning the Sodomites, or thoſe
" of *St. Paul* ſpeaking of the Heathens, in the firſt
" Chapter of his Epiſtle to the Romans. Certainly
" *Volaterranus's* Words, together with that extra-
" ordinary Indulgence, may raiſe a ſuſpicion in the
" moſt Charitable Perſons; for ſpeaking of thoſe
" two Men, he ſays, *Petrum à puero, una cum Hiero-*
" *nymo fratre, SIBI educaverat.*

(I) Polydorus Virgil ——— *aſcribes to him the firſt Creation of many Offices that were bought.*] See the 2d Chapter of the 8th Book *de inventoribus rerum*, out of which I ſhall ſet down the following Paſſage. " *Pius* II.——— following the Example
" of *John* XXII. Created ſome Abbreviators, and
" made it an Office, which was bought as well
" as the reſt. Afterwards *Paul* II. being a con-
" ſcientious Man turn'd out thoſe Blood-Suckers;
" but *Sixtus* reſtored them as ſo many Servants
" neceſſary to a Maſter, who is reſolved to get
" Money by any means whatſoever. Nay, he did
" ſomething worſe, for he ſet up a band of Solli-
" citors, Recorders and Promoters, without whom
" no Bulls cou'd be drawn up, that being examin'd
" by ſeveral Perſons they might not be ſo eaſily
" Corrupted and Falſified. At laſt he appointed
" Nine Comptrolers or Superviſors of the Treaſury,
" to whom he gave a Salary, that their Offices
" might be the better Sold. Nor was he fruſtra-
" ted in his Expectation; for an Office that was
" Sold before for five Hundred Ducats, Sold moſt
" times for one, two, or three Thouſand Ducats by Rea-
" ſon of that Salary. This gain proved ſuch a bait
" to *Innocent* VIII. who ſucceeded *Sixtus*, that
" he appointed an Office of Secretaries———
" and encreaſed their Number. *Alexander* VI.
" appointed the Collectors of Briefs to the Num-
" ber of Fourſcore. I leave you to judge whether
" among ſo many Recorders and Writing Men
" there is any want of Serjeants, whoſe Faces (as
" the Poet has it) are always pale with Hun-
" ger, and who greedily feed upon the People:
" To whom we may add the Griffins, thoſe who
" ſo well know how to Shear Sheep, I mean No-
" taries and Scriveners who ſuck Poor Peoples Sub-
" ſtance, whom *Nicolas* III. turn'd out being a-
" fraid they wou'd deſtroy the whole Sheep-Fold".
I need not inform the Reader, that this Invention of *Sixtus* IV. is blamed, not only as an unlawful means of getting Money, but alſo as a very ill Example which makes way for greater Miſchiefs. I might ſay many things upon it, if I wou'd make Political Reflections; but I don't pretend to that. I rather chuſe to quote another Writer, who mentions the ſame Conduct of *Sixtus* IV: it will appear from his Words, that it was grounded upon the deſire of Aggrandizing one of his Nephews. " (d) The only thing that remain'd to be
" done by *Riario*, in order to compleat his Settle-
" ment, was to get ground in *Umbria*, from whence
" he might have eaſily penetrated into *Romagna*
" and perhaps into *Tuſcany*; but having no Troops,
" and wanting a great deal of Money to raiſe ſome,
" his Uncle did not ſcruple to ſell the Offices of
" the Chancery and of the Court of *Rome*, which
" had been the Reward of Virtue and Ability under
" the foregoing Popes. He Created five Colle-
" gues, thro' whoſe hands all the diſpatches of the
" Datary were to go ſucceſſively, and Nine new
" Offices in the Apoſtolical Chamber, which were
" bought very dear. He neither conſidered the
" ſhameful Trade he was going to introduce, nor
" the Honeſt Liberty of which he deprived the
" Court of *Rome*, nor the Inconveniences that
" wou'd ariſe from putting an end to the In-
" duſtry of the moſt refined *Italians*, by taking
" from them Offices freely given, which kept up
" their Emulation. He encreaſed the old Taxes,
" and laid new ones: He alſo ordered extraordinary
" Tithes to be paid.

(K) *All Authors are not agreed that this Pontif was a Man of mean Extraction.*] He was ſo, if we believe *Machiavel*, (e) and many ſay his Father was a Fiſher-Man. Their Proof for it wou'd be a weak one, ſhou'd they go upon the Authority of *Panvinius*, who obſerves that the Inhabitants of the Village, where he was Born, do hardly get their Livelihood any other way but by Fiſhing; for that Hiſtorian ſays on the other ſide, that the Family of that Pope was none of the moſt inconſiderable in the Town of *Savona*, and that it was a Branch of the Houſe *della Rovere*, one of the moſt Ancient in *Piedmont*. (f) It appears by ſeveral Letters of that Pope, that he Pretended to be a Native of *Savona*; and 'tis obſerved that he was Born by chance in the Village of *Cella*, becauſe his Father and Mother had fled thither during the Plague that raged at *Savona*. 'Tis further ſaid, that Family bore the Arms (g) of the Houſe *della Rovere* before *Sixtus* was Born; which is alledged by ſome, to confute thoſe who ſay, that the Lords of that Family beſtowed their Name and their Arms upon Pope *Sixtus*. *Francis Carriere* ſays ſo in his

(a) Jo. Michael Brutus hiſtor. Florent. lib. 7. pag. 187. apud Jo. Zuingerum de feſto corporis Chriſti pag. 133.

(b) Coeffeteau ubi ſupra pag. 1205.

(c) Rivet, Remarques ſur la reſponſe au myſtere d'iniquité part. 2. pag. 623. *Note that he is miſtaken in calling Peter and Jerome Riario by the Name of* la Ruere. M. Zuinger ubi ſupra *has committed the ſame Fault:* Ad Petri Ruerii, *ſays he*, quem pro Cinædo habuerit Sixtus & Hieronymi fratris ſui, (*it ſhou'd be* ejus) poſtulationes &c.

(d) Vari las Anec de Flor. pag. 72.

(e) Hu modi b ſſima & vile conditione. Machiavelli ubi ſupra.

(f) See Bonanni numiſmat Pontific. Roman tom. 1. pag. 91.

(g) *They are ſpeaking Arms viz. the kind of Oak which the Latins call Rob the Itali ans Rov re or R vere, the Fr* Rouvre.

SMIGLECIUS (MARTIN) a Native of *Lemberg* in *Poland*, turn'd Jeſuit at *Rome* in the Year 1581. where he ſtudied with great Application and good Succeſs. Being ſent back into *Poland*, he taught Philoſophy at *Vilna* Four Years, and Divinity ten Years. He was Rector of ſeveral Colleges, and Superior of the Profeſs'd Houſe at *Cracow*. He died at *Kaliſs* after a long Sickneſs the 26th of *July* 1618. at 56 Years of Age. He ſhew'd an Admirable Patience in his Adverſity, eſpecially during the Sickneſs which Conſumed him by Degrees *. He applied himſelf very much to Controverſy both againſt the Proteſtants and the Unitarians, as it appears from (*Y*) his Books. His Logick (*Z*) is very much eſteem'd; It was Printed in Two Volumes in 4*to*. at *Ingolſtad* in the Year 1618.

SOCINUS (MARIANUS) a Famous Civilian, was Born at *Siena* the 4. of *September* 1401. He taught the Canon Law at *Padua* and then at *Sciena*: It appears from his † works that he underſtood it perfectly. He received in his Country all the Honours due to his great Merit. He was deputed by his Country Men to Pope *Pius* II. who made him Advocate Conſiſtorial, and gave him a Thouſand Marks of a particular Eſteem. He was a (*A*) little Man, but of a ſtrong Conſtitution: He had a more Univerſal Knowledge ‖ than any other Man in his time. 'Tis ſaid that one day he eaſily check'd (*B*) *Politian*'s Vanity. What he anſwered to thoſe, who ask'd him why he left off reading Lectures, ſince he was (*C*) Married, is a Curious thing. He died at *Siena* the 30. of *September* 1467. See his Encomium in the Letters of *Pius* II β. He left ſeveral Children behind him, and among others (*D*) a Son, who exceeded him.

SOCINUS (MARIANUS) Grand Son ζ of the foregoing, was not leſs Famous than his Grand-Father in the Profeſſion of the Law. He was Born at *Siena* the 25th of *March* 1482, and having taken his Degree of Doctor of the Civil Law at *Siena* at 21 Years of Age, he taught that Science there for many Years, and then he was call'd to *Piſa*, where he taught it ſeven Years. He was recall'd to *Siena*, from whence at a Years end he went to *Padua* to be Profeſſor of the ſame Science. From that place he removed to *Bologna*, to fill up the Chair that was Vacant by the return of *Alciatus* to *Pavia* in 1540. The Penſions and Privileges beſtowed

* Taken from *Sotvel Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 592, 593.

† See the Remark *D* at the end.

‖ *Æneas Silvius epiſt.* 112. *lib.* 1. *apud Panzirol. ubi infra.*

β Taken from his Life written by *Panzirolus*, *in libro* 3. *de claris legum Interpretibus*, *c.* 35. *pag. m.* 456. & *ſeq.*

ζ He was the Son of *Alexander* SOCINUS the Son of *Marianus*. To diſtinguiſh theſe two *Marianus's*, the firſt is Sir-Named *Senior* and the Second *Junior*.

his Expoſition of the Prophetical Symbols of *Malachi* an *Iriſh* Man. Father *Oldoini* has Collected ſeveral Reaſons to prove that our *Franceſco della Rovere* was of a Noble Family, and that he turn'd Cordelier of his own motion, and not becauſe Poverty put him upon looking for a Livelyhood at the expence of others (*a*). See Father *Bonanni*'s Hiſtory of the Popes by Medals, and compare with this the Remark *A* in the Article *Julius* II.

(*Y*) *As it appears from his Books.*] I omit thoſe he Publiſh'd in his Mother Tongue, ſome of which (*b*) are written againſt the *Arians*; and I ſhall only ſet down the Titles of thoſe he put out in Latin, as I find 'em in Father *Alegambe*. (*c*) *Latine edidit* de Zachariæ Prophetæ pro Chriſti divinitate illuſtri teſtimonio, *adverſus Fauſti Socini Anabaptiſtæ cavillationes*. *Vilnæ* MDXCVI. *in* 4. Nodum Gordium, *ſeu*, de Vocatione Miniſtrorum. *Cracoviæ* MDCIX. *in* 4. Nova Monſtra novi Arianiſmi. *Niſſæ* MDCXII. *in* 4. Verbum Caro factum, *ſeu*, De Divinâ Verbi Incarnati Naturâ, *contra novos Arianos*. *Cracoviæ* MDCXIII. *in* 4. Refutationem vanæ Diſſolutionis Nodi Gordii de Vocatione Miniſtrorum, *contra Joannem Volkelium Miniſtrum Arianum*. *Ib.* MDCXIV. *in* 4. De erroribus novorum Arianorum, *lib.* 11. *contra Valentinum Smalcium*, *Ibid.* MDCXV. *in* 4. De Chriſto vero & naturali filio Dei, ejuſque pro nobis ſatisfactione, *adverſus Valentinum Smalcium Arianum*, *lib.* 11. *Acceſſit* Reſponſio ad refutationem C. errorum Smalcio objectorum. *Ibidem* MDCXV. *in* 4. De Baptiſmo, *adverſus Hieronymum Moſcorovium Arianum*, *lib.* 1. *Ibidem eodem anno ac formâ.* De Ordinatione Sacerdotum in Eccleſiâ Romanâ, *contra Jacobum Zaborovium Calvinianum Miniſtrum*. *Cracoviæ* MDCXVII. De Notis Miniſtrorum. *lib.* 11. *contra eundem*. MDCXVII. Vanam ſine viribus iram Miniſtrorum Evangelicorum. *Coloniæ apud Antonium Boëtzerum* MDCXI. *in* 16. Refutationem Epicherematis miſſionem Miniſtrorum Evangelicorum propugnantis. MDCXII.

(*Z*) *His Logick is very much eſteem'd.*] (*d*) "*Smiglecius* a Poliſh Jeſuit was one of the laſt Logicians, who wrote upon *Ariſtotle*'s Logick with the greateſt Subtilty and Solidity. He dived into the bottom of that Science with a clearneſs and exactneſs, hardly to be found in any other Author. His Logick is a fine Work". This Teſtimony of a Fellow Jeſuit will not appear a flattering one to thoſe, who are capable of judging of ſuch a Book. The *Engliſh* have done juſtice to that Work; it has been Reprinted in their Country.

(*A*) *He was a little Man.*] *Æneas Silvius* his Country Man, who was Pope by the Name of *Pius* II. ſpeaks of it thus. (*e*) *Nihil ei præter formam natura invidit. Homuncio eſt, naſci ex mea familia* (*f*) *debuit cui parvorum hominum eſt cognomen.*

(*B*) Politian's *Vanity.*] That great Critick, who ſhou'd have been contented with the Reputation of an excellent Philologer, pretended alſo to be a Civilian of the firſt rank. He ſaid one day that he cou'd make better Lectures of the Civil Law than the Famous *Accurſius*; but our *Socinus* nonpluſs'd him by the firſt Queſtion he put to him. (*g*) *Semel etiam Angelum Politianum virum græcis latiniſque literis impenſè eruditum, cum Senis in Juris civilis interpretationibus ſe vel Accurſium ſuperaturum jactabundus gloriaretur, leniter correxit, ab eo enim interrogatus Angelus, quis eſſet in jure ſuus hæres, ob imperitiam obmutuit, ac pudore ſuffuſus ſuæ audaciæ pœnas dedit* (1).

This ſeems to me a Fabulous Story, for *Politian* was but 15 Years of Age, when *Socinus* died.

(*C*) *Since he was Married.*] His anſwer was, I have got a Wife; and being told that *Socrates* did not leave off his Lectures after he was Married, 'tis, replied he, becauſe *Xantippe* was an ill humour'd Woman, and perhaps ugly, whereas I have got a handſome and complaiſant Wife: (*h*) *Uxore ductâ, cum docendi munus intermiſiſſet, interrogatus, cur id non continuaret, ſe conjugem duxiſſe reſpondit*; (2) *cum verò replicaretur, Socratem nunquam philoſophiam ob uxorem deſeruiſſe, ſubjecit, illum moleſtam, & fortè turpem Xantippem, ſe autem formoſam, & obſequentem habere.*

(*D*) *He left behind him* ——— *a Son* ——— *who* (*i*) *exceeded him.*] Viz. *Bartholomew* SOCINUS, Born at *Florence* the 25th of *March* 1437. He taught

a) Bonan. ubi ſupra p. 92.

b) See Alegambe & Sotvel. Bibli. oth. Script. Soc. Jeſu.

c) Alegambe ib. pag. 331. col. 2.

d) Rapin Reflexions, ſur la Logique, § 8. p.m. 393.

(*e*) Æneas Silvius, epiſt. 112. lib. 1. apud Panzirol. de claris legum Interpretib. lib. 3. c. 35. pag. 438.

(*f*) Pius *II. was of the Family* Piccolomini.

(*g*) Panzirolus ibid. pag. 457.

(1) Corraſ. lib. 3. miſcell. cap. 16.

(*h*) Panzirolus ubi ſupra.

(2) Tiraquell. in 2. l. connubia gloſ. 1. part 2. n. 25. Æneas Sylvius, de dictis & factis Alfonſi Regis, lib. 3. c. 27.

(*i*) Eo provectus eſt ut patrem ſuperavit. Panzirol. ibid. lib. 2. c. 126. pag. 276.

beſtowed upon him, at *Bologna* were ſo conſiderable, that he wou'd not leave it, tho' he had very great offers made him in ſeveral other Univerſities. He Married *Camilla Salvetta* at *Siena*, and loſt her after he had been Married Forty Six Years. Having been uſed for a long time to lie with a Woman, he cou'd not be without it; ſo that he *(A)* gave up himſelf to Lewdneſs, whereby he got ſome Diſtempers, which proved ſo troubleſome to him, that at laſt the violence of the Remedies he uſed conſumed his Strength, and occaſion'd his Death the 19th of *Auguſt* 1556 *. If we believe *Panzirolus* †, he had Thirteen Children, two of which only, *viz.* *Celſus* and *Philip* out lived him. *Celſus* who was Profeſſor of the Canon Law at *Bologna*, obtain'd there the Profeſſorſhip of the Civil Law after his Father's Death, and left it. *Panzirolus* ſhou'd have known that *Marianus* left behind him a third Son, call'd *Lælius* SOCINUS, the *(B)* firſt Author

taught the Civil Law at *Siena*, and then at *Piſa* in 1474. Having a greater Reputation than all the Civilians of his time, he was call'd to *Ferrara*, where he was a Profeſſor four Years; and then he performed the ſame Function at *Bologna*, from whence he return'd to *Piſa*, being offer'd a Penſion of a Thouſand Ducats. There aroſe a great Emulation between him and *Jaſo Mainus*: They grew ſo hot in their Diſputes, that *Laurence de Medicis* went to *Piſa* on purpoſe, to have the Pleaſure of ſuch a Spectacle. He removed ſeveral times from one Univerſity to another, and at laſt a kind of Paralyſy in the Tongue having deprived him of his Speech, he was only a Chamber Counceller. He died at *Siena* in 1507 *(a)*. He had more Learning than Virtue, for he lived a Debauched Life, and made ſo many fooliſh Expences, that he was Buried at the Publick Charges. *(b) Illiberalibus verò moribus inſignem doctrinam maculaſſe dictus eſt, qui chartarum, & aleæ ludo ſupra modum deditus, non modo debitis lectionibus quandoque auditores fraudaſſe, ſed inſomnes etiam noctes turpiter egiſſe dicitur. Eo vitio paternis opibus conſumptis, & univerſis, quam docendo, & de jure reſpondendo plurimam coegerat, pecunia effuſa, ad extremam inopiam deductus eſt, uſque adeo ut nec quod funeri ſuppeteret, poſt ſe reliquiſſe dicatur. Eam ob cauſam ſemper egens undique pecuniam avarus conquirere cogebatur.* His Memory fail'd him upon two remarkable Occaſions. *(c) Memoriæ imbecillitate bis inter orandum excidit. Primo cum anno MCCCCXCII. a Republica Senenſi Alexandro VI. Pont. Max. ſua civitatis nomine gratulatum miſſus in prima prope oratione, quam illi Angelus Politianus dictaverat, defecit, quod ubi Pontifex deprehendit, manum ſublevans ſatis ſibi notam viri virtutem eſſe dixit, cumque Advocati Conſiſtorialis titulo honeſtavit. Idem iterum illi Venetiis contigit, ubi dum apud Auguſtinum Barbadicum Reipublicæ Principem dicere conatur, excidentibus quæ antea excogitaverat, nihil exprimere potuit.* His Conſultations, and thoſe of his Father, have been collected into Four Volumes. *(d)* Beſides, each of 'em wrote many other Books, that are Printed.

(A) He gave up himſelf to Lewdneſs.] *(e) Apud eos* (Bononienſes) *Camillam uxorem LXIII. annum agentem amiſit, quicum annis XLVI. vixerat. Poſtea uxori aſſuetus parum continenter vixiſſe dicitur; unde contracto morbo non ſemel ægrotavit, ac demum dum præſentaneis remediis ſibi mederi conatur, potentium pharmacorum vi oppreſſus LXXIIII. ætatis anno deceſſit.*

(B) *Call'd* Lælius SOCINUS, *the firſt Author of the Socinian Sect.*] He *(f)* was Born at *Siena* in 1525. Being deſign'd for the Civil Law by his Father, he began early to look for the Foundations of that Science in the word of God, and by that Study he came to diſcover that the Church of *Rome* taught many things contrary to the Revelation. Deſigning to dive more and more into the true Senſe of the Holy Scripture, he ſtudied *Greek* and *Hebrew*, and even *Arabick*, and quickly left *Italy* to go into a Proteſtant Country. Fear contributed alſo to that deſign; for he knew that Private Opinions in matters of Religion were not Tolerated in his Country. He began to Travel in 1547. and ſpent four Years in going thro' *France*, *England*, the *Netherlands*, *Germany*, and *Poland*; and then he ſettled at *Zurich*. He made himſelf known to the moſt Learned Men of that time, who expreſs'd their eſteem for him in their Letters to him: But having diſcovered, by the Doubts he propoſed to them, that he was inclined to the *Arian* or *Photinian* Hereſy, he made himſelf very much ſuſpected; *Calvin* gave him very good advice about it in 1552. *(g) Quod pridem teſtatus ſum, ſerio iterum moneo, niſi hunc quærendi pruritum mature corrigas, metuendum eſſe, ne tibi gravia tormenta accerſas.* *Socinus* making a good uſe of that Advice, and more ſtill of *Servetus*'s Execution, took care not to diſcover his Thoughts but in a proper time and place, and behaved himſelf ſo dexterouſly, that he lived among the great Enemies of his Opinions, without being in the leaſt Injured by them. An Example, that is propoſed in his Nephew's Life to thoſe, who expoſe themſelves raſhly to Martyrdom, being ſometimes more greedy of a great Reputation, than truly Zealous for Truth. *(h) Sciant, quos nimia veri libertas in pericula ſæpe intempeſtiva præcipitat, ipſam illam, quam propugnant, veritatem in circumſpectæ prudentiæ lenitate, quam in effreni zelo plus habere præſidii. Ut qui ultro ſuis diſcriminibus occurrunt, magis ad privatam laudem, quam ad publici emolumenti rationem feſtinare videantur.* He found ſome Diſciples, who reſpectfully heard his Inſtructions: They were *Italians*, who wandred up and down in *Germany* and *Poland*. He alſo communicated his Errors to his Relations in ſome Writings he ſent to 'em at *Siena*. He took a Journey into *Poland* after his *(i)* Father's Death, and obtain'd from the King ſome Letters of recommendation to the Doge of *Venice*, and the Duke of *Florence*, that he might be ſafe at *Venice* all the time his Affairs ſhou'd require his ſtay there; for he intended to inherit his Father's Eſtate, and to ſettle the matter with his Relations. It was about the Year 1558, that he Travelled into *Poland*. *(k) Circa annum 1558, & 1559. literis Poloniæ atque Bohemiæ Regum muniri voluit, ut ſecurius in urbe Veneta cum amicis de patrimonio agere poſſet. Tunc profecto patuit apud pleriſque Germaniæ atque Poloniæ proceres, ipſoſque adeo Reges, quantum is gratia potuerit. Summo enim ſtudio in ejus cauſa apud Ludovicum Priulum Venetiarum, atque Coſmum Hetruriæ Duces certatum eſt.* His Family was diſperſed at that time: They were ſuſpected of Hereſy: His Brother *Camillus* was Impriſon'd; ſome others fled away, and his Nephew *Fauſtus* was one of 'em. *Lælius* return'd into *Swiſſerland*, and died at *Zurich* in *May* 1562. *Fauſtus* was then at *Lyons*, and ſet out immediately when he hear'd that his Uncle was dead. He arrived at *Zurich* before any of *Lælius*'s Papers had been convey'd away; he took Poſſeſſion of 'em, and made uſe of 'em afterwards *(l)*.

Some other Circumſtances are to be found in the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*. *Lælius* SOCINUS Born in 1525, began to confer about matters of Religion in the Year 1546, with above Forty Perſons. They privately met in the Territory of the *Venetians* *(m)*, and brought into queſtion particularly the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of CHRIST's Satisfaction. *Ochinus*, *Valentinus Gentilis*, and *Paul Alciatus*, aſſiſted at thoſe Conferences. They were diſcovered: Some of thoſe Innovators were apprehended, and condemn'd to Death; the reſt fled away. The Chronology of that Author is not right, for *Ochinus* left *Italy* about the Year 1542. *Zanchius* ſays that *Lælius Socinus* endeavoured to infect him with his Heretical Notions, not by maintaining them in expreſs words, but propoſing them as Doubts and thor of the Socinian Sect. *Alexander* SOCINUS Son of the ſame *Marianus*, and Father of *Fauſtus* SOCINUS, of whom I am going to ſpeak, died very (*A*) Young,

---

* *Taken from Panzirolus ubi ſupra, lib. 2. cap. 161. pag. 338. & ſeq.*

† Ibid. pag. 341.

(a) Taken from Panzirolus ubi ſupra, pag. 75. & ſeq.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 279.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 280.

(d) *Printed* at Venice *in* 1579.

(e) Panzirolus ibid. pag. 341.

(f) Bibliotheca Antitrinitar. pag. 18.

(g) See the Life of Fauſtus Socinus prefix'd to the 1. Volume of the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.

(h) Ibid.

(i) His Father, as I have ſaid before, died at Bologna in 1556.

(k) Vita Fauſti Socini pag. 2.

(l) Taken from the Life of Fauſtus Socinus.

(m) Circa annum 1546. inſtituerat cum ſociis ſuis iiſdem Italis, quorum numerus quadragenarium excedebat, in Veneta ditione, collegia colloquiaque de religione, in quibus potiſſimum &c. Biblioth. Antitrinit. pag. 18.

and by way of a Diſpute. He adds, that *Lælius* underſtood very well *Greek* and *Latin*, and was a Man of an unblamable Life. (*a*) *Fuit is Lælius, nobili honeſtaque familia natus: bene Græce & Hebraice doctus; vitæque etiam externæ inculpatæ: quorum rerum cauſa mihi quoque interceſſerat cum illo non vulgaris amicitia; ſed homo fuit plenus diverſarum hæreſium: quas tamen mihi nunquam proponebat, niſi diſputandi cauſa: & ſemper interrogans, quaſi cuperet doceri.* 'Tis certain, that when *Zanchius* wrote thoſe words, *Lælius* had (*b*) made a Paraphraſe upon the firſt Chapter of St. *John's* Goſpel full of Photinianiſm. He alſo wrote a Dialogue in 1554, againſt the Book Publiſh'd by *Calvin* to ſhew that Hereticks ought to be puniſh'd with Death. *Calvinus* and *Vaticanus* are the Interlocutors of that (*c*) Dialogue: Some aſcribe it to *Caſtalio*; but others, as (*d*) *Cloppenburg* and (*e*) *Hornbeck* aſcribe it to *Lælius Socinus*. He is ſaid alſo to be the Author of the Book, Intitled, *de Hæreticis capitali ſupplicio non afficiendis*, that was Publiſh'd (*f*) under the fictitious Name of *Minus Celſus Senenſis*; and there is more reaſon to aſcribe it to him, than to *Fauſtus Socinus*. Some (*g*) pretend that *Lælius* is the Author of a Book, Intitled, *Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius de hæreticis gladio coercendis*, Publiſh'd againſt *Calvin*, and endeavour to prove it againſt *Placcius* by the Teſtimony of the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*. *Placcius* (*h*) aſcribes that Dialogue to *Caſtalio*, and refers us to *Calvin's* Life, where, ſays he, *Beza* boaſts of having confuted that Book of *Caſtalio*; but 'tis certain *Beza* makes no mention there of a Piece, Intitled, *Dialogus Lælius*. He only ſpeaks of a *Farrago*, which he aſcribes to *Caſtalio*, and againſt which he wrote a Book. What he calls *Farrago*, is Intitled, *De Hæreticis, an ſint perſequendi, & omnino quomodo ſit cum eis agendum, Lutheri & Brentii, aliorumque multorum tum veterum tum recentiorum ſententiæ. Liber hoc tam turbulento tempore perneceſſarius, & cùm omnibus, tum potiſſimum principibus & magiſtratibus utiliſſimus, ad diſcendum, quodnam ſit eorum in re tam controverſa, tamque periculoſa, officium*; and contains the following Pieces, MARTINI BELLII *præfatio, in qua quid ſit hæreticus, & quidnam cum eo agendum ſit, demonſtratur.* MARTINI LUTERI *ſententia, in qua apertè oſtenditur, hæreticorum punitionem ad magiſtratum non pertinere.* JOANNIS BRENTII *de Anabaptiſtis, & cæteris qui hæretici habentur, ſententia, quæ idem docet. Aliorum authorum, tum veterum, tum recentiorum eadem de re ſententiæ. Baſilii Montfortii refutatio eorum, quæ pro perſecutione dici ſolent.* I ſhall take notice of another ſmall Negligence in *Placcius*; for he refers us to a Book (*i*) of *Hoornbeek*, wherein he only mentions the Dialogue between *Calvinus* and *Vaticanus*. A Learned *German* (*k*) whom I have quoted, alledges this Teſtimony of *Placcius*, and does not rectify it: He alſo alledges *M. Teiſſier*, who only ſays *pag.* 238. of the 1. *Volume* of his Additions to the Elogies taken from *Thuanus*, that *Caſtalio is the Author of a Book Publiſh'd under the Name of* Martin Bellius, *in which he endeavours to prove that Hereticks ought not to be Puniſh'd.* Thus here are two Authors quoted, the laſt of which does not ſay what is imputed to him, and the other is miſtaken: But let's ſee whether the Objection raiſed againſt the latter is a ſolid one. 'Tis objected againſt *Placcius*, that *Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius de hæreticis gladio coercendis*, is aſcribed to *Lelius Socinus* in the *Bibliotheque* of the *Antitrinitarians*. (*l*) *Verum in Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* ——— *pag.* LXIV. & XX. *ille tractatus Lælio Socino tribuitur, allegata in hanc ſententiam auctoritate Johannis Cloppenburgii & Hornbekii.* Conſult the 64th Pape of that *Bibliotheque*, and you'll find that 'tis thought *Lælius Socinus Senenſis* took the Name of *Minus Celſus Senenſis* in a Book, *de Hæreticis non capitali ſupplicio afficiendis.* Conſult the 20th Page, and you'll find that the Dialogue between *Calvinus* and *Vaticanus*, wherein 'tis aſſerted that the Power of the Sword ought not to be extended to Hereticks, is aſcribed to *Lælius Socinus* by *Cloppenburg* and *Hoornbeck*. I need not ſay that there is little exactneſs in this Account. As for what concerns the other Writings of *Socinus* the Uncle, ſee the ſame *Bibliotheque*.

I muſt not forget a Paſſage of *Hoornbeck* quoted in it, whereby it appears that *Melanchthon* had conceived an eſteem for *Lælius Socinus*. That Paſſage will confirm what has been ſaid above of *Lælius's* deſign to take a Journey to *Venice*. (*m*) *Uti Zanchium, quamdiu cum eo viveret, mirifice fefellit Lælius: ſimiliter bono viro Philippo Melanthoni, quocum triennium egit familiariter, adeo impoſuit, ut Philippus pro eo tanquam optimo viro a.* ciↃ IↃ lviii. *interceſſerit tum ad Imp. Maximilianum* II. *tum ad Poloniæ regem Sigiſmundum ut horum nomine Lælius Legati vicem Venetiis obire, eaque ratione paternam hæreditatem, ſibi, ob conſuetudinem cum Proteſtantibus in Germania, interclusam adire tutius poſſet.* Father *Maimbourg* has committed ſome Faults, which ought to be obſerved. *Lælius Socinus*, ſays he (*n*), *and* Matthew Gribaldus, *joyn'd* Gentilis *in* Poland. He had been ſaying, that *Gentilis* being ſent for by *Blandrata*, went into *Poland*, after he had privately left *Geneva*. Now you muſt know, that *Gentilis* having left *Geneva*, ſometime after he had made an Honourable Amand on the 2d of *September* 1558. acted ſo many (*o*) parts before he went into *Poland*, that 'tis probable he went not thither till about the Year 1560. The Socinian Hiſtorians place that Journey (*p*) in the Year 1562, or 1563. and therefore he did not make it with *Lælius Socinus*; for the latter was in *Poland* about (*q*) the Year 1558. *Maimbourg* adds, (*r*) *that as* Gentilis *and* Lælius Socinus *were returning thro'* Germany *and* Swiſſerland *into* Italy, *teaching their Doctrine every where*, Socinus *died at* Baſil, *and* Gentilis *was apprehended by the Magiſtrates of* Berne. *Socinus* died at *Zurich* the 16th of *May* 1562, and *Gentilis* did not leave *Poland* till the Year 1566.

(C) Alexander SOCINUS ——— *the Father of* Fauſtus SOCINUS *died very Young, being accounted*, &c.] He was admitted Doctor of the Civil Law at *Siena* in 1530. He had before maintain'd, during five Days at *Padua*, and during two Days at *Siena*, Three Hundred *Theſes* with great Succeſs. After he had been made Doctor he explain'd the *Inſtitutes* in his Country, and then he was call'd to *Padua* to be Profeſſor in Ordinary. The Quarrels, that aroſe between him and the other Profeſſors, obliged him to return to *Siena*, where he continued to make Publick Lectures. He went to *Macerata* in 1540, to teach the Civil Law in the Univerſity lately Founded there, where he died the 26th of *April* 1541 (*s*). He had Married *Agnes Petrucci* Daughter of *Burgeſio Petrucci*, and of *Victoria Piccolomini*. This *Petrucci* having ſucceeded his Father *Pandolphus*, who had been the Head of the Republick of *Siena*, could not keep his Poſt long, being turn'd out by a contrary Faction, and died ſoon after. *Victoria Piccolomini* his Widow, Siſter, Niece or Couſin to many great Lords, bore that Misfortune with great conſtancy, and lived Fifty Six Years after the death of her Husband, in the conſtant practice of the Virtues moſt eſſential to her Sex. Her Daughter, brought up by ſuch a Mother, anſwered her Education, and was Married to *Alexander Socinus* a Young Man of great (*t*) Parts. Theſe are the Father and Mother of *Fauſtus Socinus*. (*u*) *Relicta vidua Victoria animum, quem in prioris faſtigii ſplendore nunquam ſuſtulerat, tam iniqua rerum viciſſitudine frangi non permiſit. Itaque annis quinquaginta ſex, quibus mariti vitæ & communi fortunæ ſuperfuit, ſingulari modeſtia & ſpectata integritate ac pudicitia vidui ſtatus ſolitudinem toleravit. Filiam agnetam, quam, ut tanto genere dignum erat, ſanctiſſimis moribus imbuerat, Alexandro Socino in matrimonium dedit, patricio quidem juveni, ſed tamen privato. Is fuit Fauſti noſtri pater.* Had *Panzirolus* known how *Fauſtus Socinus* turn'd his

(*a*) Zanchius, in præfat. libr. de tribus Elohim, apud Biblioth. Antitrinit. pag. 19.

(*b*) He wrote it in the Year 1561. Biblioth. Antitrin. pag. 21.

(*c*) It was Re-printed in Holland in 1612. with ſome other pieces of the ſame Nature. The following it was Printed in Dutch in the ſame Country. Ibid pag. 20.

(*d*) In præfat. compendioli Sociniani confutati.

(*e*) In Summa controverſ.

(*f*) In the Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum pag. 21. The 2d Edition of that Work placed in the Year 1584. But Placcius de Pſeudon. pag. 175. mentions an Edition in 1577. Chriſtlinge in 8, which does not ſeem to be the firſt.

(*g*) Joh. Albertus Faber, Decade decad. num. 25.

(*m*) Hoornbeck, Summa controverſ. lib. 7. pag. 442. edit. 1653.

(*n*) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de l'Arianiſme, *Book* 12. pag. 351, 352. *Dutch Edit.*

(*o*) *See his Article.*

(*p*) *See the Article* Alciatus.

(*q*) *See the Life of* Fauſtus Socinus pag. 2.

(*r*) Maimbourg ibid. pag. 361.

(*s*) *Taken from* Panzirolus ubi ſupra pag. 341.

(*t*) Alexander ſubtilitatum & pater ejus Marianus Junior Juriſconſultorum principes vocati ſunt. *Vita Fauſti Socini, initio.*

(*u*) Ibid.

(*h*) Placcius de Pſeudonymis pag. 161. (*i*) Summa controverſ. pag. 563. *of the 2d Edition, and* 442 *of the firſt.* (*k*) Joh. Albertus Faber. *His* Decas decadum *was Printed in* 1689. (*l*) Joh. Albertus Faber ubi ſupra.

young, being accounted a Learned Civilian. We have ſome (*D*) Works of his Father.

SOCINUS (*Fauſtus*) Grandſon of the foregoing, and the Chief Founder of a very ill Sect that goes by his Name, and which notwithſtanding the Perſecutions, flouriſh'd a (*A*) conſiderable time in *Poland*, was Born at *Siena* the 5th of *December* 1539. He ſtudied but little in his Youth; he only had a Tincture of Claſſical Learning, and learned only the Elements of Logick. The Letters his Uncle writ to his Relations, whereby they and * their Wives were imbib'd with many Seeds of Hereſy, made an Impreſſion upon him; ſo that he fled away as the reſt, when the Inquiſition began to perſecute that Family. He was at *Lyons* when he heard of his Uncle's death, and immediately ſet out to take Poſſeſſion of all the Writings of the Deceaſed. He return'd into *Italy*, and became ſo acceptable to the Great Duke, that the Charms of the Court, and the Honourable Imployments beſtowed upon him, hinder'd him for the ſpace of Twelve Years from remembring that he had been look'd upon as the Man, who was to put the laſt Hand to the Syſtem of Samoſatenian Theology, whereof his Uncle *Lelius* had drawn but a rough Draught. At laſt, the ſearch after the Goſpel Truths appearing to him more valuable than the Delights of a Court Life, he voluntarily left his Country, and went into *Germany* in the Year 1574, nor did he care to return, tho' he was deſired to do it by the great Duke. He was three Years at *Baſil*, where he ſtudied

his Studies, he wou'd not have uſed the following words. (*a*) *Ex eo* (Alexandro) *& Agnete ex Burgheſia Pandulfi Petrucci Senarum Principis nepte natus, Fauſtus praeclari ingenii Juvenis parentum veſtigia ſecuturus eſſe ſperatur.*

(*D*) *Some Works of* Marianus Socinus.] The Catalogue of the *Bodleian* Library mentions a *Conſilium in materia monetaria*, Printed at *Cologne* in 1591. He is ſaid to be (*b*) the Author of *Bartolus*'s Diſtinctions, Printed at *Venice* in 1564, and we are told that his Conſultations afforded the Book of the common Opinions of the Doctors, Publiſh'd by one *Muſculus*.

(*A*) *And which notwithſtanding the Perſecutions, flouriſhed a conſiderable time in* Poland.] *Sigiſmund Auguſtus* granted Liberty of Conſcience to the Sects which forſook the Church of *Rome*. They made no ſeparate Bodies at firſt; but when the Evangelicks came to know the Opinions of the *Unitarians*, they would no longer Communicate with them, which occaſion'd two different Communions. That Rupture began at *Cracow* by the care of *Gregory Pauli*. The *Unitarians* had ſeveral Churches in *Poland* and *Lithuania*, ſome in (*c*) great Towns, and others in the Country Seats of Gentlemen. They eſtabliſh'd their Metropolis at *Racovia*, in the little *Poland*: There they had a Yearly Synod, there they erected a College, and ſet up a Printing-Houſe. Some Catholicks ſent their Children to that College; and ſome joyn'd with thoſe Hereticks. Some Proteſtants did the ſame, and a vaſt number of Books came out of the Printing-Houſe of *Racovia*, and were diſperſed in Foreign Countries. This Proſperity was interrupted in 1638; for ſome Scholars of the College of *Racovia* having broke a Wooden Croſs ſet up in a High way, the Diet of *Warſaw* ordered that the College ſhould be demoliſh'd, the Church of *Racovia* ſhut up, the Printing-houſe of the *Unitarians* deſtroy'd, and the Miniſters and Teachers Baniſh'd (*d*), which was executed. Sometime after the Judges of *Lublin* deſtroy'd the Church of *Kiſlin* and that of *Bereſc* in *Volinhia*, under Pretence that the Miniſters of *Racovia*, and the Teachers of the College had fled thither. The Diet of the Year 1647 Baniſh'd *Jonas Slichtingius* for Publiſhing a Book intitl'd, *Confeſſio Chriſtiana*, and that Book was Burnt by the Hands of the Executioner. But notwithſtanding thoſe Misfortunes, the *Unitarians* performed their Religious Exerciſes in many places of that Kingdom, till the Year 1658. They were then Expell'd upon Pretence that ſome of 'em had put themſelves under the Protection of the King of *Sweden*, who had Conquered the greateſt part of *Poland*. However that Reaſon was not alledged in the Edict of Baniſhment, for fear of offending the *Swedes*, who had ſtipulated a general Amneſty for all the Subjects of the King of *Poland*, who adhered to them during the Invaſion. Their Baniſhment was only grounded upon their Doctrine; it being alledged, that in order to draw God's Bleſſing upon the Kingdom, 'twas neceſſary to Baniſh thoſe, who denied the Divinity of the Eternal Son of God. They were therefore ordered to depart from it upon pain of Death: All their Eſtates were Confiſcated, all Perſons were forbidden upon the ſame Penalty, to give 'em any Aſſiſtance, or any Mark of Affection in their Exile. (*e*) *Quum Sueci Poloniam invaſiſſent, & pleraque ejus loca occupaſſent, ita ut & provinciae multae miſſis legatis Regi Suecorum ut victori ſeſe ſubjicerent, & exercitus ipſi cum Ducibus ſuis eidem ſeſe adjicerent, quia ex Unitariis nonnulli etiam ad Suecorum patrocinium & protectionem confugerant, quamvis multi eorum nullam cum Suecis inirent ſocietatem, poſt Suecorum diſceſſum, omnes ii quos Arianos vocant, publica regni conſtitutione, 1658. non praetextu perduellionis, ne Sueci, qui per tractatus amneſtiam iis qui ipſis adhaeſerant pacti ſunt, offenderentur, ſed directe ob religionem, ob id quod Jeſu Filii Dei praeaeternam, quam vocant, Deitatem non agnoſcant, extorres acti ſunt, ut ſcilicet Deus hiſce blaſphemiis amotis, omnia proſpera iſti regno tribueret: ita ut niſi patria excederent, accuſati poenae capitali ſubjicerentur: bona quoque eorum fiſco publico ſunt applicata: & vetitum ne quiſquam eos ullo modo juvare, vel extra ſolum patrium exſulantes, aliquo benignitatis ac benevolentiae indicio proſequi audeat, alioqui eidem cum ipſis poenae obnoxius futurus* (*f*). The Socinians never recover'd from that ſevere Blow: They diſperſed themſelves as well as they could in *Tranſylvania*, *Sileſia*, *Pruſſia*, &c. There is a great Fault in thoſe Latin Words, for they intimate a great Falſity, *viz.* That the Eſtates of the *Unitarians* were Confiſcated; and they ſay nothing of their being permitted to ſtay two Years in the Kingdom to ſettle their Affairs. 'Tis an uſual thing for thoſe, who complain of their Sufferings, to ſuppreſs whatever might make their Perſecution look leſs violent than it was. And therefore in order to repreſent the true ſtate of the thing, I ſhall give another Account of it contain'd in the following Paſſage. " (*g*) Becauſe, during the laſt " War of the *Swedes* in *Poland*, it was found out " that the Arians, or Socinians intending to raiſe " themſelves over the Ruins of the State, kept " Intelligence with *Ragotski* Prince of *Tranſylvania*, " who attack'd that Kingdom at the ſame time; " the Catholick Lords, in the general Diet of " *Warſaw*, in the Year 1658, took hold of that " Opportunity to exterminate that abominable Hereſy out of *Poland*, which might bring ſtill greater Calamities upon the State. The Lutheran " and Calviniſt Deputies, who were in that Diet, " being apprehenſive that a Law Enacted againſt " thoſe Hereticks might be a Preſident againſt " themſelves, and that in time they would be treated in the ſame manner, joyn'd together in order to oppoſe it. But becauſe their Number was " very ſmall, if compared with the Catholicks, and they ſtudied Divinity three Years with great Application; and having embraced a Doctrine very different from that of the Proteſtants, he undertook to maintain and ſpread it; and in order to it, he wrote a Book (B) *de Jeſu Chriſto Servatore*. He Diſputed at *Zurich* with *Francis Puccius*, in the beginning of the Year 1578. The Differences occaſion'd by the Ill Doctrine of *Francis David*, about the Honours and the Power of the Son of God, cauſed a great Diſturbance in the Churches of *Tranſilvania*. *Blandrata*, a Man of great Authority in thoſe Churches, and at Court, ſent for *Socinus*, whom he took to be a Perſon well qualify'd to pacify thoſe Troubles. He lodg'd him in the ſame Houſe with *Francis David*; but the latter could not be undeceiv'd, and maintain'd his Opinion ſo openly and ſo boldly, that he was impriſon'd. He died ſoon after; and *Socinus* was ill ſpoken of upon that account, tho' 'tis affirm'd he had no hand in the Counſels that were given to the Prince of *Tranſilvania*, in order to oppreſs *Francis David*. He retir'd into *Poland* in the Year 1579, and deſir'd to be admitted into the Communion of the Unitarians; but becauſe he differ'd from them in ſome Points, and would not be ſilent, he met with a repulſe. Nevertheleſs, he writ in favour of their Churches againſt their Enemies. The Book he wrote againſt *James Paleologus* afforded his Enemies a Pretence to exaſperate the King of *Poland*; and yet that Book was nothing leſs (C) than Seditious. But tho' the bare reading of that Book was ſufficient to Confute the Informers, *Socinus* thought it expedient to leave *Cracow*, after he had been there Four Years, and to take Sanctuary in the Houſe of a Poliſh * Lord. He lived above three Years under the Protection of ſeveral Lords of the Kingdom, and

---

* *His inter quoque, ſuggerente veritatis miras artifice Laelio, ejus ſemina ſparſerit, eaque longis illi et terrarum ſpatiis divulſi, tam efficaci ſtudio fovebat, ut nonnullorum uxores ignotus aliis & abſens in partes traxerit.* Vita Fauſti Socini p. 2.

(*a*) Panzirol ibid. pag. 147.

(*b*) Scripſit diſtinctiones Bartoli, quas Venetiis A. MDLXIV edidit, & Socino vindicavit Simon Schardius. Etiam ex ejus conſiliis collectae ſunt communes Doctorum opiniones, editae ab Eraſmo Muſculo Hanoienſe. Hoornbeek, Apparatu ad Socinian. controverſ. p. 50.

(*c*) *Such as* Cracow, Lublin, *and* Novogrod.

(*d*) *I ſhall quote an Author in the Remark* L, *who denies that all thoſe things were contain'd in the Decree of the Diet.*

(*e*) *Taken from the Preface to the* 1. *volume of the* Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.

(*f*) *The ſame Preface, pag.* * 2.

(*g*) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de l'Arianiſm. l. 12. pag. 375, 376. *of the 4th Tom. Dutch Edition.*

" they were not depriv'd of their Liberty, and beſides they did not love the Arians, having more than once before demanded that they ſhould not be Tolerated in *Poland*, a Law was at laſt Enacted with a common Conſent againſt Arianiſm; and the Arians and Socinians comprehended under the ſame Name, were obliged to Abjure their Hereſy, or to depart the Kingdom within two Years, allowed them to ſell their Eſtates. That Law, which was afterwards Confirm'd in the other general Diets, was none of thoſe that loſe by degrees the force that was given 'em in the heat of a Zeal conceived from time to time againſt Publick Diſorders. It was executed, and is ſo to this Day. "

Leſt any one ſhould think that the Jeſuit *Maimbourg* has falſify'd this part of his Hiſtory, to praiſe the King and the States of *Poland* for having obſerved a kind of Moderation, I muſt acquaint the Reader that ſome Socinian (a) Writers ſay, that the Edict of the Year 1658, allowed them three Years to ſell their Eſtates, and that afterwards one of thoſe three (b) Years was taken from them; ſo that the 10th of *July* 1660 was the Day appointed for their departure. There's hardly any thing more lamentable than the Deſcription they make of the Miſeries they were expoſed to from the Year 1648, till they left *Poland*. They ſuffered a Thouſand Inſults; they could not Sell their Eſtates but at a very low rate, and their Miſery was aggravated by all ſorts of Artifices. They don't forget the Infraction of perpetual and irrevocable Edicts, and of the Royal Oaths, by virtue of which, they had been Unmoleſted near One Hundred Years: Much leſs do they forget to obſerve, that the Clergy moved the States of the Kingdom to ſuch an Infraction, and King *John Caſimir* to break the Oath he had taken ten Years before. (c) *Cœpit id primum odium Theologicum & furor vulgi; vis deinde confecit ſacerdotalis occupata autoritate Comitiorum, reſciſſis, projectis, ſpretis, pro omnium Diſſidentium pace ac ſecuritate, quâ annis admodum centum gaviſi ſumus inviolati, ſeveriſſimis legibus, graviſſimis ſtatutis, pactis, fœderibus, promiſſis quæ omnium ordinum ſanctiſſimo ſcito & conceptiſſimo Regum, hujus nominatim & quidem ter repetito jurejurando, ſæpè & nuperrimè erant religioſiſſimè & ampliſſimè renovata, aſſerta, atque confirmata; ut vim juris obtinerent inviolabilis atque æterni.* Two Pages after, they ſet down the Oath taken by the King, in 1648, and then they ſay (d): *Decimo poſt anno, octavo videlicet quinquageſimo menſe eodem, Papali plerique faſcino incantati, Ordines Regni, ac fidei ſuæ, honoris ac conſcientiæ religioſiſſimis nexibus obligatæ turpiter obliti, perculſis qui rectè ſentiebant violentis clamoribus & minaci turba, Sanctiſſimam & Saluberimam pacis legem, tot Comitiorum cautionibus, pactis, fœderibus, ſtipulationibus, tot Regum à Sigiſmundo Auguſto continua ſerie ſuccedentium, publicis Sacramentis firmiſſimè conſtitutam, & nuper adeo tam ſollicitè ac ſolemniter conſtabilitam nobiſcum proſcribunt, noſque hoc feriunt, & natali ſolo exterminant diro decreto.* In order to know the Vexations they were under before the Revocation of the Edicts, you need only read the Latin Paſſage I am going to quote. It will appear from it, that the King and the Republick of *Poland* ſtruck many Blows one after another, before they came to the laſt Extremities. *France* took the ſame courſe (e) againſt the Proteſtants. It appears alſo from the ſame Paſſage, that the Unitarians aſcribed all the Calamities of *Poland* to the Perſecution which the Sects, ſeparated from the Church of *Rome*, had ſuffered in that Kingdom, contrary to the Publick Faith. (f) *Poloniam deinde infauſto omine commemorant, patriam noſtram; quæ dum non tantum nobis, ſed etiam Evangelicis, & aliis, contra juris jurandi & fœderum fidem, templa adimit, exercendæ religionis libertatem labefactat, & variis preſſuris ob diverſum in ſacris ſenſum, infeſtam ſeſe præbet; vindicem Dei manum in ſe provocavit, & iis ſeſe cladibus & calamitatibus involvit, quarum necdum finem videmus ullum: quæ quamdiu ſartam tectam cuivis ſervavit conſcientiæ & religionis libertatem, altiſſima pace, & omnium bonorum felicitate cumulata floruit; ſed ubi vinculum illud, æquali lege omnes de rebus divinis diſſentientes continens, ſolvi cœpit, omnia.*

In pejus ruere, & retro ſublapſa referri.

Thus they ſpeak in a Writing which they preſented to the States of the Province of *Holland* in the Year 1654.

(B) *A Book* de Jeſu Chriſto Servatore.] 'Tis a Diſpute againſt a Miniſter (g) of *Paris*, who being come to *Baſil*, in his way to *Francfort*, lodged in the ſame Houſe with him. That Book was Printed in 1595, by a Diſciple of the Author. *Socinus*'s Name was put to it; 'twas the firſt time his Name appeared in his Works. (h) *Diſputationem illam edidit poſtmodum Socini amicus & ſequax, Elias Arciſſevius, Polonus, An* MDXCV. *præfixo, quod nunquam ante factum in aliis ſcriptis fuerat, Auctoris nomine.* I ſhall ſay (i) by and by, why he was ſo long without putting his Name to his Books.

(C) *Was nothing leſs than Seditious.*] He ſo fully condemns the Subjects who take up Arms againſt their Prince, and the Proteſtant Divines who ſaid that it was lawful to oppoſe thoſe who oppreſt the Liberty of Conſcience, that perhaps the greateſt Sticklers for the Arbitrary and Deſpotical Power of Sovereigns never ſpoke more poſſitively. He ſpeaks rather like a Monk, who endeavour'd to make the Proteſtant Reformation odious, than like an Italian Refugee. Theſe are his words: (k) *Veſtris belli gerendi Chriſtiano populo conceſſionibus factum eſt, ut contra ipſum magiſtratum Chriſti nomine gaudens populus arma capere non dubitaverit, vobis non modo aſſentientibus, & approbantibus, verum etiam ſuadentibus, atque impellentibus, & libris præterea editis, id & poſſe, & debere fieri publice conteſtantibus, ac contendentibus. Teſtis eſt hodie eorum quæ dico orbis ipſe terrarum, qui hæc fieri aut vidit, aut certiſſima*

---

* *Chriſtophorus Moorſtinius Pamlikovii Dominus.*

) *See* two *Letters* inted the end the ſtoria forma- nis Po- nicæ, g. 278. ſeq

) Ibid. g. 294.

) Hiſtor. formac. lonicæ, g. 290.

) Ibid. g. 293.

(e) *That is before the revocation of the Edict of* Nantes *in* 1685.

(f) Apologia pro veritate accuſata, adverſus edictum Ordinum Hollandiæ pag. 40.

(g) *Call'd* James Couet. *He has been Miniſter of the French Church at* Baſil.

(h) *Hoornbeeck in Apparatu ad controverſ. Socinianas, pag.* 91.

(i) *In the Remark* E.

(k) *Socin. in libro de Magiſtratu, adverſ. Paleologum, part.* 1. *p.* 144, 145. apud Hoornbeck ibid. p. 58.

tiſſima

and even Married a Woman of a good Family. He loſt her in the Year 1587, at which he was (D) extremely Afflicted; and to compleat his Affliction, he was deprived of the Yearly Income (E) of his Patrimony by the Death of *Francis de Medicis* Great Duke of *Florence*. The ſatisfaction he had to ſee his Doctrine approved at laſt by many Miniſters, was very much troubled in 1598. for he received a Thouſand Inſults at *Cracow*, and his Friends had much ado to reſcue him out of the Hands of the Mob. He loſt his Houſhold-goods, and ſome of his Manuſcripts, the loſs of which he (F) extremely Lamented. He loſt, among others, that which he had writ againſt the Atheiſts. To avoid * the like Dangers for the time to come, he retir'd to a Village about Nine Miles diſtant from *Cracow*, where he ſpent the remaining part of his Life in the Houſe of *Abraham Blonski* a Poliſh Gentleman. He died there the Third of *March* 1604 †. His Sect was ſo far from dying with him, that it very much Encreaſed; but ſince it was expell'd from *Poland* in 1658, it is very much decay'd as to its viſible State: I expreſs my ſelf ſo, becauſe moſt People are perſuaded that it has made an inviſible Progreſs, and grows daily more numerous; and 'tis thought, conſidering the preſent ſtate of things, that *Europe* would be amazed to appear Socinian in a little time, if Potent Princes made a Publick Profeſſion of that Hereſy, or only order'd that thoſe, who profeſs it, ſhould enjoy the ſame Advantages as others do. 'Tis the Opinion of many People, which makes 'em uneaſie. But others pretend there is nothing to fear, and that Princes will never embrace

a

tiſſima fama accepit, ſed teſtes potiſſimum ſunt duæ nobiliſſimæ provinciæ Gallia, & Germania inferior, quæ civili ſanguine jam diu madent, atque redundant, eo quod perſuaſum ſit, ex certis quibuſdam cauſis populo, ſeu populi parti, adverſus dominum & principem ſuum Bellum gerere licere. Itaque hac ætate noſtra ab iis, qui Chriſtianos ſe eſſe præ cæteris jactant, per ſpeciem Chriſtianæ Religionis aſſerendæ, id fieri vidimus, quod barbari atque efferati homines facere exhorreſcunt, ut ſcilicet contra proprios reges arma ferant. Et tamen (ſi Deo placet) eos, qui ob prædictam ſive in ipſa acie, ſive alibi ceciderunt, & obtruncati ſunt, in martyrum Chriſti numerum referri, publice audivimus. O ſeculum! Hi nimirum ſunt, ut dixi, veſtrarum belli gerendi conceſſionum fructus. Egregii vos ſcilicet magiſtratuum defenſores eſtis, qui populos contra magiſtratum, id eſt reges ſuos armatis, dum, magiſtratu jubente, bella juſte geri poſſe docetis. Rege enim tyranno facto (quod quid ſit, quilibet ſuo modo interpretatur) non regem amplius, ſed populum ipſum, ſive aliquos ex regni proceribus magiſtratum eſſe, vulgus hominum, vobis ipſis indicantibus, vel certe annuentibus, contendit, quibus auctoribus, ex veſtra diſciplina, tyrannum illum, ut ipſi putant, ejuſque vim armis repellere, cumque eo aperte bellum gerrere non dubitant. Unde quot ingentia mala neceſſario proficiſcantur plus ſatis jam experientia novimus, quæ miſere deplorari magis quam apte verbis explicari poſſunt. *Hoornbeek* having quoted this long Paſſage, adds a ſhort confutation to it, and obſerves (a) among other things, that ſuch a malicious Reflection upon the Conduct of the *Dutch* againſt *Philip* II. might have been alledged by the States General, when they expell'd the Socinians in the Year 1598. I wonder that *Cocceius*, who quotes another Paſſage out of that Book of *Socinus*, knew not that this Heretick did particularly condemn the Wars of the *Dutch* againſt *Spain*. *Cocceius*'s Words deſerve to be inſerted here: It appears from them, that in 1654, the Socinians did very much commend the Conduct which *Socinus* had ſo much blamed in 1581. (b) *Socinus contra Palæologum* p. 261 *dicit:* Ex quo intelligi poteſt, quam præpoſterè ii ſe gerant, qui arma adverſus eos, qui dominantur, capiunt, ut (quemadmodum ajunt ipſi) Dei cultum & religionem tueantur. *Ita Socinus A. C.* 1581. *locutus eſt. Neque eſt, puto, qui credat, eum non harum provinciarum proceres deſignaſſe. Nunc Eques laudat ſcilicet Illuſtrium Ordinum pro præſumpta iſta libertate conſcientiæ geſtum bellum, & Deum hanc præclaram Rempublicam elegiſſe dicit, ut illius libertatis, imò licentiæ, ſedes eſſet.* But I muſt obſerve by the by, that Informers are a ſort of Men that will do any thing; for *Socinus* (c) was Accuſed to the King of *Poland* as being the Author of a Seditious Libel: And yet *Socinus* openly condemn'd in that Book all the Writers, who ſay that Subjects may take up Arms, and ſet up for Judges of this Queſtion, Whether a Prince is a Tyrant or not?

I don't think that any Socinian has hitherto maintain'd, That it is Lawful to take up Arms againſt ones Prince; the reaſon of it is, that they have had no occaſion to juſtify their Sect upon that Head. It has ſtill its Virginity in that reſpect, and is not like many others, which might ſay as the Curtezan in *Petronius*, *Nunquam memini me Virginem fuiſſe, &c.* 'Tis likely the Socinians have not been in proper Conjunctures to imitate them.

(D) *He loſt* his Wife, *in the Year* 1587, *at which he was extremely Afflicted*] His Grief was ſo violent that his Health was impaired by it: He could not ſtudy for ſome time, not being able to recover his ſtrength. His Wife, ſome Months before ſhe died, was delivered of a Daughter, who was Married to a Poliſh Gentleman, by whom ſhe had ſeveral Sons and Daughters. (d) *Filiam Agnetem ſuſtulit circa Pentecoſtem anni* 1587, *ætatis* 48, *ex qua, cum poſt mortem patris Staniſlao Wizowatio Equiti Polono nupſiſſet, nepotes neptesque etiamnum ſuperſunt. Eodem anno in Septembre amiſit uxorem Eliſabetham: quem caſum viro luctuoſum & acerbum gravis ægritudo corporis excepit: adeo quidem pertinax, ut per aliquot menſes ſtudiorum uſum interciperet.*

(E) *Deprived of the Yearly Income of his Patrimony, by the death of* Francis de Medicis.] During the Life of *Iſabella de Medicis*, Siſter to the great Duke, and Wife of *Paul Giordano de Urſini*, the Inquiſitors endeavoured, in vain, to get that Heretick depriv'd of his Eſtate. When ſhe died, the Great Duke himſelf took care to protect him. He ſent him word to return into *Italy*, and aſſured him that if he would not return, he would let him enjoy his Income, and only recommended to him, not to put his Name to his Books. This was certainly a very great Favour in a Country where the Court of *Rome* is ſo powerful. (e) *Ne qua calamitatis ſpecies abeſſet, eadem fere tempeſtate, per mortem Franciſci Magni Ducis Hetruriæ, fructus bonorum ejus, quem quotannis ex Italia capiebat, penitus ipſi fuit ereptus. Sane aliquanto ante, criminatorum acerbitate ac minis Pontificum, bona ejus in periculum venerant. Sed Iſabellæ Mediceæ Magni Ducis Hetruriæ ſororis, quæ Paulo Jordano Urſino, quem ſupra memoravimus, nupta fuerat, dum vixit, enixo ſtudio, & poſtea ipſius Franciſci Magni Ducis benevolentia, factum eſt, ut illo ſuperſtite annuos ex iis reditus Socinus caperet. Adeo nondum illic meritorum ejus exoleverat memoria, ut literis ac precibus, damnati & exulis, pridem deſtituti ac ſæpe repudiati, principes difficillima in re gratificarentur. Humaniſſimis quoque literis compellatus, & in poſterum quoque bono animo eſſe juſſus eſt, quamdiu vita illis ſuppeteret, dum ne in libris edendis nomen ſuum publice extare pateretur. Sed tunc illos principes infeſtum Socini fatum abſtulerat.*

(F) *Manuſcripts, the loſs of which he extremely Lamented.*] The Scholars of *Cracow* having ſtirr'd up ſome of the Mobb, they got into *Socinus*'s Houſe; they took him half naked out of his Chamber, tho' he was ſick; they carried him along the Streets; they cryed that he ſhould be Hang'd; they beat him, and

---

* *Cum ad tam barbarum furoris exemplum minæ quoque accederent, Cracovia Luclaviciam migravit, in pagum ultima ſua habitatione atque obitu nobilem, novem circiter milliaribus Cracovia diſſitum; ubi aliquot annos, uſus menſa & ædibus viri nobilis Abrahami Blonſcii, vicinus Stoinio vixit. Vita Fauſti Socini fol.* ** 3.

† Taken from the Life written by Samuel Przypcovius a Poliſh Gentleman. It is prefixed to the firſt Volume of the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.

(a) Hoornbeeck ibid. pag. 59.

(b) Cocceius in examine Apologiæ Equitis Poloni, pag. 141.

(c) Stephanus tunc Regnum Poloniæ obtinebat. Ejus aures accuſator imbuit ſeditioſi contra Magiſtratum ſcripti criminatione. Indignum eſſe, ſi authori vago atque exuli Italo impune abeat hæc audacia. Libellus contra Palæologum deſignabatur. Qui licet aliud non poſtularet innocentiæ teſtimonium, quam ſui lectionem, declinari tamen periculum placuit. Vita Fauſti Socini, fol. ** 2 verſo.

(d) Vita F. Socini ibid.

(e) Ibid.

a Sect, which does not approve (G) *War, and the Exerciſe of Magiſtracies. That very thing, ſay they, will always prejudice Private Men againſt Socinianiſm; for few People can Renounce* (H) *Ambition, and give over a Military Life. To be convinced of it one needs only conſult Experience, and conſider what is daily*

and a Profeſſor had much ado to get him out of the Hands of thoſe Raſcals. His Houſe was Plunder'd, he loſt his Goods; but he particularly lamented the loſs of ſome Manuſcripts, which he would have redeem'd at the price of his Blood. (*) *Anno 1598, commota per Scholaſticos infimæ plebis fæce, æger tunc & forte curandæ valetudini intentus, extrahitur è cubiculo ſeminudus, & per forum ac celeberrimas plateas, deſpuentibus ad ſupplicium pleriſque contumelioſe rapitur. Tandem in illa furentium colluvie peſſime mulctatus, à M. Valovita Profeſſore Cracovienſi ægre furenti multitudini eripitur. Direptas tunc ſarcinas & ſuppellectilem, quæque alia rapi potuere, longe minori dolore tulit, atque ſcriptorum quorundam jacturam irreparabilem, quam ipſius vitæ impendio ſeſe redempturum fuiſſe ſæpe profeſſus eſt. Periit ibi una inſignis contra Atheos liber, quem refellendis ingenioſis magni cujuſdam Viri commentis ſuſceperat.*

(*) Bib. [illegible] p.

(G) *Princes will never embrace a Sect, which does not approve War.*] How many Sovereigns make a Trade of their own Subjects, as a Private Man deals in Horſes and Sheep? They raiſe Troops not to defend their Frontiers, or to Attack their Enemies, but to make 'em ſerve other Princes for Money. They are very well pleaſed to have many Subjects always ready to Liſt themſelves upon the firſt beating of a Drum, they get a great deal by it; and therefore they don't deſire by no means that they ſhou'd turn Socinians: their Treaſury wou'd be the worſe for it. On the other ſide, moſt Sovereign Princes love to make Irruptions into the Neighbouring States, or to Confederate with other Princes who are at War; and 'tis of great Moment for them that it ſhou'd be known, that whoever Attacks them will not do it with Impunity. Nothing therefore cou'd be more inſignificant than to Command Men, who are engaged not to bear Arms out of a Principle of Religion. There goes a Story, which perhaps is only a meer Jeſt, *viz.* That the King of *Poland* being Attack'd by the Rebellious *Coſacks* and by the *Tartars*, and wanting all his Subjects to oppoſe the Enemies, ſent word to the Socinians to take up Arms. They anſwered, that their Conſcience did not allow them to ſhed Humane Blood, nor to do any Harm to reaſonable Creatures. Whereupon, it was propoſed to them to go to the Army without putting any Shot in their Muſkets: They were told that they wou'd make a ſhew; which wou'd prove of ſome uſe, becauſe their Enemies wou'd be more Afraid: But they had much ado to like that Expedient. See the end of the next Remark.

I have it from very good Hands, that the *Poliſh* Gentlemen of the Socinian perſuaſion went to the War, when the Laws of the Kingdom required it, and even that ſome of 'em profeſt a Military Life, without being obliged to it out of a Neceſſity of obeying the Laws of the Kingdom: Their Sect did not approve their Conduct in the laſt caſe.

(H) *Few People can renounce Ambition, and give over a Military Life.*] Thoſe, who Love War, are innumerable, and Acted by very imperious Motives. Gentlemen are Animated by the only deſire of raiſing themſelves, and acquiring Glory, or, beſides, by a deſire of ſupplying their Wants. The Soldiers are Animated by Lazineſs and Debauchery: They hope to be Idle the greateſt part of the time, they hope to Pillage and Plunder and to have plenty of good Wine and many Debauched Women. In every Town thoſe, who are qualified to pretend to Offices, ſue for them with great earneſtneſs, and leave nothing unattempted to obtain them. As ſoon as there is a Vacancy, you immediately ſee many Competitors, who have long before open'd the way by their Suits and Liberalities: Which plainly ſhews, that the deſire of Honours and Dignities is very quick and general. From whence it ought to be concluded that the Socinian Religion cannot ſuit a whole Nation nor the greateſt Number; it is only Adapted to ſome Perſons of a particular Temper: And if it be true, that a Pope hearing that the Proteſtants puniſh'd Adulterers and Fornicators, Cried out, (a) that their Religion wou'd be of no long Continuance, it may be affirm'd that his Prognoſtication wou'd have been more juſt, if he had applied it to a Sect of Men, who will neither bear Arms nor exerciſe any Office.

WHETHER the rejection of Myſteries is a good way to get many Followers.

I deſire I may be allowed to impart to my Readers an Obſervation that was made in my hearing againſt thoſe, who ſay that all the *Italians*, who forſook Calviniſm to ſet up a new Arianiſm, deſign'd to Form a greater Party than that of the Reformers of *Germany* and *Geneva*. 'Tis ſuppoſed that tho' they did not doubt of Myſteries, they pretended to oppoſe them, in order to have many Followers. (b) The Captivating of ones underſtanding to the belief of three Perſons in the Divine Nature, and of a God-Man, is a heavy Yoke for Reaſon: Chriſtians are therefore very much eaſed when freed from ſuch a Yoke; and conſequently 'tis probable that vaſt crowds will follow a Man, who removes ſo great a Burthen. Hence it was, that thoſe *Italians*, who fled into *Poland*, denied the Trinity, the Hypoſtatical Union, Original Sin, abſolute Predeſtination, *&c.* They thought that ſince *Calvin* ſhaking off the Neceſſity of believing all the incomprehenſible things contain'd in Tranſubſtantiation, brought over many People to him, they wou'd make a greater Progreſs ſtill, if they rejected all the inconceivable Doctrines which that Reformer had kept. But it may be anſwered, that they had been very ſilly and unworthy of the *Italian* Education, if they had made uſe of ſuch a Cheat. The Speculative Myſteries of Religion are little troubleſome to moſt People: They will tire a Profeſſor of Divinity very intent upon them, in order to explain 'em and anſwer the Objections of the Hereticks. Some other ſtudious Men, who examin them very nicely, may be alſo weary of the reſiſtance of their Reaſon; but all other Men are eaſy in that reſpect: they believe or fancy they believe all that is ſaid of 'em, and quietly reſt in that Perſuaſion. None therefore but a kind of a Viſionary can think that Citizens and Peaſants, Soldiers and Gentlemen wou'd be freed from a Heavy Yoke, if they were diſpenſed from believing the Trinity, and the Hypoſtatical Union. They like much better a Doctrine that is Myſterous, Incomprehenſible and above Reaſon: Men are more apt to admire what they don't comprehend; they form to themſelves a more Sublime and Comforting Idea of it. All the ends of Religion are much better to be found in Incomprehenſible things: They inſpire a greater Admiration, Reſpect, Fear and Conſtancy. If Falſe Religions have had their Myſteries, 'tis becauſe they have been forged by the Ape of the True one. God out of his Infinite Wiſdom has Accommodated himſelf to the State of Man, by mixing Darkneſs with Light in his Revelation. If a Man had a mind to invent an Hypotheſis only for Philoſophers, and ſuch as might be call'd *Religio Medici*, 'tis likely, he wou'd think himſelf obliged to lay aſide the Doctrines that can hardly be comprehended; but then he muſt not expect to be followed by the Multitude. If he had a mind to ſatisfy his Vanity in that reſpect, he ſhou'd do as the Hero of *Lorenzo Gratian* (c). But granting that thoſe *Italians* have been ſo ſilly as to think that People wou'd be freed from an Intolerable Yoke, if they were diſpenſed from believing the Trinity, *&c.* muſt we alſo grant that they thought the Prohibition of Civil and Military Imployments wou'd not be a Yoke a Thouſand times Heavier than that which they intended to Break? Will any one be ſo unreaſonable as to require that we ſhou'd have ſuch a Notion of thoſe Men, who wanted neither Wit nor Addreſs, as every Body owns? What I am going to ſay will doubtleſs reſolve the Queſtion. When Men of Abilities, deſigning to ſet up a New Sect, pitch upon a looſe Method, and ſubſtitute an eaſy Doctrine in the Room of a Difficult one, it may

---

(a) *See the Article* Abelians.

(b) See l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud tom. 1. chap. 6. pag. 211.

(c) *That Author ſays, that* el Heroe platique incomprehenſibilidades de caudal: *And that he diſcovers him-without being comprehended.* Gran treta en el arte de entendidos oſtentarſe al conocimiento, pero no a la comprehenſion. *See Father* Bouhours, Entretines d'Ariſte, p. m. 54.

daily practiced. They alledge ſome other (I) *Reaſons very proper to ſhew that this Sect is not like to encreaſe. Thoſe, who ſay that the Socinians have a full Liberty of Conſcience* (K) *in the United Provinces, are little acquainted with Hiſtory*

be ſaid that they don't pitch upon the moſt proper Method to ſucceed in their deſign; but it ought not to be ſuppoſed that they are contented to ſuppreſs Speculative Myſteries, and that they keep the whole Practical Part, and even aggravate the Yoke of the Moral Precepts. And yet this is ſuppoſed concerning the Founders of the Socinian Hereſy; and therefore what is ſaid of their deſign is a miſtake. They are more rigid than other Chriſtians about the Prohibition of Vengeance, and the Contempt of Worldly Honours; they are not for any mitigated or figurative Explications of ſuch Texts of the Scripture as relate to Morality. They have revived the Severity of the Primitive Chriſtians, who did not approve that the Faithful ſhou'd concern themſelves with Magiſtracies, (a) and ſhou'd have a hand in the Death of their Neighbours, ſo far that they wou'd not have 'em to accuſe a Malefactor. The Prohibition of Civil and Military Offices is a heavier Burthen than the Prohibition of Vengeance; for it excludes the Expedients of deceiving one ſelf and others. Thoſe, who Preach moſt earneſtly againſt Vengeance, find out a Thouſand Diſtinctions to elude that Precept. Some ſay, they don't hate their Neighbour as he is a Man, but as he is an Enemy of God: Others proteſt that they do him no harm to Revenge a private Quarrel, but for God's Glory. This is approving by the help of ſome Diſtinctions what one pretends to Condemn. Some deceive themſelves; Others are meer Hypocrites who deceive the World: But no ſubterfuge can be alledged as to the Doctrine, which forbids going to the War, and exerciſing Civil Offices; thoſe who profeſs ſuch a Doctrine muſt neceſſarily follow it; the Practice cannot be ſeparated from the Theory; there are no Diſtinctions nor Equivocations. 'Tis therefore a true conſtraint; 'tis not a Tranſient Maceration, like that of thoſe who Diſcipline themſelves once a Year; 'tis a perpetual and continual State. We may therefore affirm that thoſe *Italian* Refugees were no Cheats: They were deceived by their Subtilties, and by relying too much upon Reaſon; and if they kept only part of the Chriſtian Doctrines, 'tis becauſe their firſt Principle, whereby they will admit nothing that is directly againſt their Reaſon, led them to it. This is probably the cauſe of their choice; had they been meer Cheats, greedy of Followers, they wou'd have gone another way to Work. Let us therefore Condemn their Principle, as a deceitful one, without pretending to ſearch the Hearts. Their Principle debaſes Religion, and changes it into Philoſophy. The Greatneſs, Authority and Sovereignty of God require that we ſhou'd walk by Faith and not by Sight.

The Heathens ſaid that Myſteries make God appear more Majeſtuous, and are an Image of his Nature, becauſe he cannot be perceived by our Senſes. Ἡ κρύψις ἡ μυστικὴ τῶν ἱερῶν σεμνοποιεῖ τὸ θεῖον, μιμουμένη τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἐκφεύγουσαν ἡμῶν τὴν αἴσθησιν. *Myſtica ſacrorum occultatio majeſtatem numini conciliat imitans ejus naturam effugientem ſenſus noſtros.* They are *Strabo*'s Words pag. 322, of the 10th Book.

But what I am going to ſay may undeceive thoſe, who flatter themſelves that the averſneſs of the Socinians for Military and Civil Offices will always be a great Obſtacle to the Progreſs of that Sect. 'Tis no Article of the Socinian Faith that one ought to renounce Civil and Military Offices. The Socinians are in that reſpect more indulgent than the Mennonites. They don't Scruple to exerciſe publick Imployments in *Tranſilvania*, and 'tis likely they would bear Arms as other Men do, if they had a Sovereign of their Religion.

(I) *They alledge ſome other Reaſons.*] For if it be conſidered that moſt Men are more inclined to acquieſce in their inward Sentiments, than to follow the Thread of many Conſequences Methodically Connected and proceeding from diſtinct Notions, and beſides that may be quickly and eaſily offended they the Paradoxes which Reaſon brings forth, it will appear ſomewhat probable that the Socinian Syſtem is not Adapted to moſt People. It may rather lead ſtudious and ſpeculative Men to Scepticiſm. There will always be ſome thing in that Syſtem, whereby People may be kept from it: The Eternity of Matter, God's Extenſion, the Limitation of his Extenſion, and of the Divine Knowledge, and of Hell Torments, are Socinian Doctrines, which being Eloquently repreſented to Princes and their Subjects, will always inſpire them with great Horror. If it be a convenient thing to each private Perſon not to be afraid of being puniſh'd after this Life, it is ſtill more inconvenient to think that one is daily Converſing with People who are not afraid of it. And therefore 'tis not the Intereſt of Private Perſons, that any Doctrine tending to leſſen the Fear of Hell Torments ſhou'd be admitted in their Country; and 'tis probable that the Preachers of ſuch a looſe Doctrine will always be more offenſive than acceptable to the publick. An Author ſays, that (b) *the ſame Perſons, who reject the Goſpel by Reaſon of the Auſterity of its Moral Precepts, would expreſs a greater Horror for a Religion enjoyning them to plunge themſelves into the moſt infamous Diſorders, if it was offered to them, when they are able to Reaſon, and before they are blinded by the prejudices of Education.* He argues upon it, but he has omitted one of the beſt Reflections; for he ſays nothing of Self-Love and Perſonal Intereſt. 'Tis true, that a wicked Man wou'd like a Doctrine, with reſpect to his Conſcience, that ſhou'd allow him to be a Poiſoner, and to Commit Adultery, Perjury, &c. but he wou'd not like it upon many other Accounts. He has a Mother, a Wife, ſome Siſters and Neeces, who wou'd vex him horribly, if they grew infamous for their Lewdneſs. There are more People, who can Poiſon, Rob, and Cheat him, &c. than there are againſt whom he can Commit the ſame Crimes. Every Body is more capable of being offended than of offending others; for of 20 equal Perſons, 'tis Evident that every one of 'em is leſs ſtrong againſt 19 than 19 (c) againſt one. 'Tis therefore the Intereſt of each Private Perſon, tho' never ſo wicked, that Men ſhou'd be taught that there are Puniſhments after this Life.

(K) *That the Socinians have a full Liberty of Conſcience in the United Provinces, are little acquainted with Hiſtory.*] The Unitarians made ſeveral Attempts to ſettle in *Holland*. The firſt is aſcribed to *Eraſmus Joannes* Rector of a College at *Antwerp*, who Publiſh'd a Book in 1585, without putting his Name to it. That Book is Intitled, *Antitheſis Doctrinæ Chriſti & Antichriſti de uno vero Deo. Zanchius* confuted it the Year following. The Second Attempt was that of *Cornelius Daems*, a Civilian of *Mechlen*, who removed from *Tergow*, where he reſided, to *Utrecht*, in order to diſperſe ſome Manuſcript Tracts of *Socinus*. The Magiſtrates having notice of it reſolved to Arreſt him; but he ran away: His Papers were ſeized, but he recovered them ſome Months after, becauſe the Government of the Town came into other Hands. The Third Attempt was that of *Oſtorode*, and *Vaivode*, who came from *Poland* to *Amſterdam* in 1598, with many Socinian Books Printed and Manuſcript, which they began to get Tranſlated into *Dutch* (d). The Magiſtrates having ſeized all thoſe Books ſent 'em to the Univerſity of *Leyden* and then to the States General, having firſt made a ſevere Reprimand to thoſe two Socinians and Commanded them to leave the Country. The States General, being informed of the Judgment paſt upon thoſe Books by the Divines of *Leyden*, ordered them to be burnt in the Preſence of *Oſtorode* and *Vaivode*, and thoſe two Men to depart from the United Provinces within ten days (e). The Judgment of the *Leyden* Divines imported that thoſe Books were little different from Mahometiſm, and

---

(a) Non enim cum occidere Deus vetat, latrocinari nos tantum prohibet, quod ne per leges quidem publicas licet, ſed ea quoque ne fiant monet, quæ apud homines pro licitis habentur. Ita neque militare juſto licebit, cujus militia eſt in ipſa juſtitia, neque vero accuſare quemquam crimine capitali, quia nihil diſtat, utrumne ferro, an verbo potius occidas, quoniam occiſio ipſa prohibetur. Itaque in hoc Dei præcepto nullam prorſus exceptionem fieri oportere, quin occidere hominem ſit ſemper nefas, quem Deus ſanctum animal eſſe voluit. *Lactant lib. 6. cap. 20. pag. m. 426.*

(b) Penſ diverſes ſ les Comè tes, p. pag. 598.

(c) *Withou ſuppoſing that the* 19. *Att concert a gainſt the* 20th

(d) *Taken from* Giſbertus Vo etius Diſ put. tom. 3. p. 811.

(e) Hoorn beeck, Apparatu ad contro verſias Socinia nas, pag. 98.

Hiſtory, and will plainly ſee the contrary, if they read the * Anſwer that was made to *M. Stoupp's* Letters: They'll find in it the dates † of many Ordinances publiſh'd againſt the Sectaries. I || ſhall ſay ſomething of thoſe which concern the Socinians, and I ſhall dwell ſomewhat longer (*L*) upon that of the Year 1653. The

contain'd ſome Blaſphemies, that cou'd not be Tolerated among Chriſtians without great Impiety. (*a*) *Scripta iſta ad Turciſmum proxime accedere, & veram æternamque Deitatem Chriſti Filii Dei, & Spiritus S. officium Chriſti, beneficia ejus ſalutaria, & Baptiſmi ſancti inſtitutionem, & noſtrum Religioſum erga eum officium evertere, & ſimilia multa adeo blaſphema, ut ſine graviſſima impietate nec in vulgus ſpargi, nec inter Chriſtianos ferri poſſint continere.* *Adolphus Venator*, a Miniſter of *Alcmaer* was confined to an Iſland in 1617. for Writing a Book, that favoured of Socinianiſm, *quod portenta Sarmatica ſaperet* (*b*). The Schiſm of the Arminians made way for the Introduction of Socinianiſm into *Holland*; for they don't refuſe to hold an Eccleſiaſtical Communion with the Socinians; and therefore the latter might ſtay in many Towns of the United Provinces without being known. The (*c*) Prince of *Tranſilvania* intercepted a Letter in 1638. wherein the Socinian *John* (*) *Sartorius*, who lived at *Amſterdam*, acquainted a (*d*) Miniſter of his Sect, that there were many (*e*) Perſons of their perſuaſion in *Holland*. 'Tis certain they had ſome Followers at that time, and that their Books were diſperſed up and down. In order to put a ſtop to it, the Magiſtrates of *Amſterdam* Condemn'd ſome Pieces (*f*) of *Volkelius* to be burnt in the Year 1642. The Synods of *Holland* have appeared very Zealous to prevent the Propagation of that Hereſy. They (*g*) preſented a Petition to the States of the Province in 1628. wherein they alledged ſeveral Reaſons why they ſhou'd not Tolerate it, and repreſented, among other things, (*h*) that ſuch a Toleration would make the Common-Wealth of the United Provinces ſtink all over Chriſtendom. That Remonſtrance was Publiſh'd and Confuted. Thoſe, who confuted it, ſaid in anſwer to that particular Reaſon, that (*i*) *Poland* was therefore very ſtinking, ſince it granted Liberty of Conſcience to the Socinians. Whereupon *Voetius* ſays, they never had ſuch a Liberty in *Poland*; and that the contrary appear'd ſome Years after by the ill uſage they met with. (*k*) *Sed infelices illi hiſtorici perperam præſupponebant Regis & regni conceſſionem; quæ nulla erat* (*l*), *nec unquam fuerat: & paucis annis poſt ſatis oſtendit regnum Polonicum quid iſtic libertatis cuivis ſectæ, & inter eas Socinianæ conceſſum ſit. Quærant modo ex fratribus ſuis* Sartorio, Jona Slichtingio, *aliiſque, quo loco nunc ſit libertas ipſorum.*

(*L*) *I ſhall dwell ſomewhat longer upon* the Ordinance *of the Year* 1653.] I don't know what the States of *Holland* anſwered in 1628, to the Remonſtrances of their Synods; but I have read the Acts of what was done in a like caſe in the Year 1653. The Deputies of the ſame Synods repreſented to them that the Followers of *Socinus*, a ſort of Men who deſtroyed Chriſtianity, the Reſurrection of the Dead, the Hopes of an Eternal Life, &c. were ſo bold as to come into the United Provinces, and particularly into *Holland*, to pervert the Faithful, and tear the Church; that it was well known how Zealous the *Ragotski*'s had been againſt thoſe Hereticks in *Tranſilvania*, and that ſome Decrees had been made againſt 'em in *Poland* in the Years 1638. and 1647. That they had been expell'd from *Poland*; that their Church, their Library and their Printing Houſe had been deſtroyed, becauſe they had in the Preſs a very Scandalous Book againſt the Myſtery of the Trinity. (*m*) *Quemadmodum Rakociana domus in Tranſſylvania adverſus hos errorum ſeminatores zelaverit; quid Anno* 1638. & 1647. *in Polonia contra ipſos actum ſit, quomodo ex Polonia ſint ejecti, & ipſorum bibliotheca diſperſa, ipſorum cœtus disjectus, templum, ſchola, typographeum, ipſis adempta, quòd librum ſub prelo haberent hac inſcriptione,* Tormentum throno Trinitatem deturbans, *in recenti memoria eſt.* That the States General proceeded ſeverely againſt 'em in 1598. That in 1619, by the Suggeſtion of the *Engliſh* Ambaſſador, all the Provinces were informed of the Arrival of ſome Socinians, and deſired to prevent the Evil by their Decrees. That in the Year 1630. the States of *Holland* acquainted the Synod of *Amſterdam* with their Reſolution, importing that in what concern'd the Proſcription of the Socinians and their Books, all neceſſary Orders wou'd be given about it, as ſoon as the State of the thing ſhou'd be more exactly known. (*n*) *Anno* 1640. *Synodo Amſterodamenſi hoc decretum Illuſtrium & Præpotentium Ordinum intimatum eſt: Quod attinet Socinianorum excluſionem & librorum ejus Sectæ, ſcitum eſt, ſi accuratius Illuſtres Ordines doceantur, Socinianos aut libros ipſorum in hac provincia apparere, ipſos tunc promtè adverſus ipſos & ipſorum libros prout res exegerit, ſtatuturos.* That the States General ordered the 17th of *July* 1651, purſuant to the Advice of the States of the Province of *Holland*, given the 12th of *April* foregoing (*o*), that the inſolence of the Sectaries ſhou'd be repreſs'd, and good Edicts Publiſh'd againſt the Socinian Books, &c. Next to this, the Deputies of the Synods repreſent, that 'tis plain thoſe Hereticks go all over the Country, make it their Buſineſs to get Proſelytes, and diſperſe many (*p*) ill Books; that they are the moſt dangerous Enemies the Church can have, ſince beſides their being Cunning, and Apparently Devout, they teach a Doctrine that is not above the reach of Reaſon. They conclude, 1. With moſt Humbly beſeeching their Illuſtrious Lordſhips to prevent the Evil in due time, by proceeding againſt the Perſons, and forbidding Conventicles and prohibiting Books: 2. With intimating that they hope their Lordſhips will Execute the Ordinances already made. (*q*) *Rogant ſubmiſsè Illuſtrium VV. DD. cultores, Deputati Synodorum Auſtralis & Borealis Hollandiæ, ipſorum nomine, ut huic malo in tempore obviam eatur, ut in perſonas ſtatuatur, ut conventicula ipſorum & libri prohibeantur, ut prela & typographiæ iſto ſtercore non contaminentur, & officinæ tam damnoſa merce vacuentur.* The States of *Holland* Communicated this Synodal Petition to the Faculty of Divinity of *Leyden*, deſiring to have their Opinion about it. The Faculty anſwered, that nothing (*r*) cou'd be more Horrid and Abominable than the Socinian Sect; that it differ'd but little from Paganiſm; that it was certain it crept into the Country, and that there was a neceſſity to Pray to God that he wou'd inſpire the Sovereigns with a Steady and Holy Reſolution of removing all thoſe Blaſphemies, and ſuppreſſing ſuch wicked Books. *Conſilium ſapiens, utile avertendis omnibus Blaſphemiis & abolendis tam noxiis libris.* Whereupon the States made an Edict, whereby all Perſons, whatever Condition they might be of, were forbidden to bring any Socinian Hereſy into the Country, or to impart it to others, and hold any Aſſembly with ſuch an intent. They declared that all Offenders ſhou'd be baniſh'd the firſt time from the Province, as Blaſphemers of God's Name, and diſturbers of the Publick Peace, and in caſe of a relapſe they ſhou'd be puniſh'd as ſhou'd be thought fit. They alſo forbad under ſevere Penalties, the impreſſion and ſale of the Socinian Books, and ordered that this Edict ſhou'd be Publiſh'd and Poſted up where ever it ſhou'd be requiſite, that none might pretend to be Ignorant of it. This is what they decreed the 19th of *September* 1653. The Magiſtrates (*ſ*) of *Utrecht* Publiſh'd a like Edict in the Year 1655.

The Socinians were not ſilent: They employed one (*t*) of their beſt Writers to Compoſe an Apology, that came out in the Year 1654, with this Title, *Apologia pro veritate accuſata ad illuſtriſſimos & potentiſſimos Hollandiæ & Weſt-Friſiæ Ordines, conſcripta ab Equite Polono.* That piece is well Written, and with a great deal of Art; the Author ſhews a great Moderation, and boldly denies the Accuſations. He alledges the ſame General (*v*) Reaſons made uſe

---

† Page 171.

|| In the Remark L.

fœteat. id. ibid. (*k*) Id. ib. (*l*) *The Socinians maintain contrary in the Paſſages above quoted Remark* A. *See alſo Remark* L. (*m*) *See* Cocceius's *Anſwer* ad Apologiam E- Poloni, fol. **** 2. verſo.

(*n*) Ibid.

(*o*) Decretum eſt, ut non tantum protervia & inſolentia Sectariorum, ut oportet, corrigatur, ſed & idonea Edicta adverſus omnia gravia peccata, ſcandaloſos libros & ſcripta Sociniana, & ſimilia, publicentur & proponantur. *Ibid.*

(*p*) *Many of 'em are ſpecified in the Remonſtrance.*

(*q*) Cocceius ibid. fol. **** 3 verſo.

(*r*) Nihil exitiabilius & magis horrendum iſta hæreſi excogitari poteſt . . . nihil aut parum differt à Paganiſmo.

(*ſ*) Voetius, Polit. Eccleſ. tom. 1. p. 533.

(*t*) Jonas Slichtingius. *See the* Biblioth. Antitr. pag. 130.

(*v*) *I uſe that Epithet, becauſe the Circumſtances with reſpect to the ſeverity of the Penal Laws,* &c. *are not the ſame as here in* Tertullian*'s and* Calvin*'s Apologies*

The Accuſation Publiſh'd by a Modern Author is altogether improbable, *viz.* that

uſe of by *Tertullian* in his Apology, and by *Calvin* in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Inſtitutions, and by many other Reformers in their Books againſt the *Sorbonne.* 'Tis an unavoidable Inconveniency: A Falſe Church, which pleads for Toleration, and complains of the Penal Laws, alledges the ſame common Topicks with the true Church in a like caſe. The true Church, which deſires that the Sovereigns would extirpate a falſe one, uſes the ſame Motives and Arguments alledged by the falſe one for the Extirpation of the true Church. It were to be wiſh'd that Communions ſo different in their Tenets, ſhou'd not be like one another in uſing the ſame Style and the ſame Topicks; but ſuch a thing is not to be expected in this World. The Evil is paſt curing in that reſpect: Man among other Exerciſes is obliged to ſearch after Truth, in the midſt of a Hundred Pretenders, who expreſs themſelves the ſame way as to general Reaſons. But I proceed to another Obſervation.

When People preſent a Petition againſt a Party, they ought to take ſpecial care not to alledge any Facts whereof they are not well informed, or which are only equivocal Proofs; for ſome time after they are Confuted in an unpleaſant manner. For Inſtance, the *Poliſh* Knight maintains, 1. That the (a) *Rogotski's* never Perſecuted the *Socinians*, and (b) never deprived them of the Liberty of Conſcience which they had granted 'em. 2. That no advantage ſhou'd have been taken of the Vexations the Socinians were expoſed to in *Poland*, nor of the Deſtruction of their Church at *Racovia*, ſince the Evangelicks met with the ſame croſſes in that Country, and received at *Vilna* a treatment like that of *Racovia* two years after, and under the ſame pretence. (c) *Poloniam deinde, infauſto omine commemorant, patriam noſtram; quæ dum non tantum nobis, ſed etiam* (d) *Evangelicis, & aliis, contra juriſjurandi & fœderum fidem, templa adimit, exercendæ religionis libertatem labefactat, & variis preſſuris, ob diverſum in ſacris ſenſum, infeſtam ſeſe præbet; vindicem Dei manum in ſe provocavit*——(e) *Everſum nobis fuerit Racoviæ templum, quanquam de everſione templi decretum nihil habet, eo quo dicunt anno: ſed eodem exemplo everſum eſt & Vilnæ Evangelicis biennio poſt ſuum templum. Pulſi fuerint Miniſtri Racovia, quanquam Miniſtri Racovia decreto pulſi non ſunt, ſed ſoli Profeſſores; pulſi ſunt & Vilna; proſcripti fuerint illi; proſcripti ſunt & iſti & quidem illi ipſi, qui paulo ante Racoviano caſui ex ambone inſultaverant. Sic in nobis cœptum, in Evangelicis, qui permiſerant, ulterius progreſſum eſt exemplum. Exempla enim tramites quærunt, nec ibi conſiſtunt, ubi cœpere. Occaſio & prætextus utriuſque injuriæ & calamitatis innocentibus inferendæ fuit idem, nempe imago juvenili quorundam temeritate violata.* 3. That what happen'd at *Racovia* was not grounded upon the Impreſſion of a Book, whoſe Title was injurious to the Trinity. He proves it demonſtratively by the decree of the Diet, which mention'd no ſuch Book, and wou'd have certainly mention'd it, if it had been the reaſon of inflicting ſuch a Puniſhment upon their Sect. He adds that *John Lætus*, the only Author who mentions the Impreſſion of that Book, does not ſay that it occaſion'd the deſtruction of their School, and of their Printing-Houſe. (f) *Nam cauſa diſturbationis Racovianæ, quam accuſatores noſtros coram vobis pro vera venditare non pudet, ipſo Decreto Comitiali manifeſtæ vanitatis coarguitur. Ajunt enim cauſam fuiſſe, quod librum habuerimus ſub prælo, hoc titulo,* Tormentum throno Trinitatem deturbans. *Nullus liber unquam hoc titulo inter nos extitit, nedum ut ſub prælo fuerit.——Auctor* (1) *iſtius commenti fuit Lætus quidam, Moravus, qui profugum ſeſe ex Moravia, religioniſve an rebellionis cauſa oblitus; ſed odii in nos ex ſuorum diſciplina concepti non immemor, in ipſa patria noſtra, quæ exulem benigne ſuſcepit & fovit, eo proterviæ progreſſus eſt, ut nobis patriæ civibus inſultare auſus fuerit, edito fumorum pleno libello; inter quos & hæc de libro iſto fabula eſt. Et tamen hic ipſe, quamvis vanus Auctor, dicit quidem illo ipſo tempore, quo res Eccleſiæ noſtræ Racoviæ ſunt everſæ,* deſudaſſe noſtros in extrudendo iſto peſtifero, *quem ait,* libello: *ſed hanc fuiſſe cauſam adverſariis illorum evertendorum non dicit:* Juventus, *inquit,* Scholæ cauſam præbuit, quæ effigiem crucis depecerat. *Sed narrationi illius per ſe vanæ, quo ſpecioſior eſſet, aſſumentum aliquid fuit ab accuſatoribus.* *Cocceius* Publiſh'd a very ſolid Anſwer to that Manifeſto of the Socinians, in the Year 1656. I have conſulted it particularly upon thoſe three Heads; for I expected to find the Apologiſt confounded: But I have found nothing in it neither upon the firſt, nor upon the ſecond Head; and as for the third, all that *Cocceius* ſays is, that there was a Report, that the Socinians had ſuch a Book in the Preſs, when they were ſo ill uſed at *Racovia.* (g) *Quam cauſam habuerint Poloni eripiendæ nobis Racoviæ, non diſputo. Certum eſt, eo tempore vulgatum fuiſſe rumorem, tale, quale libellus Deputatorum memorat, ſcriptum ſub prælo ſudaſſe.* Uncertain Reports ſhou'd never be depended upon in Juridical Pieces, ſuch as the Remonſtrances of a Synod to their Sovereign, deſign'd to obtain the ſuppreſſion of a Sect. In Accuſations that concern Doctrines, it is more eaſy to juſtify an unexact Aſſertion: For inſtance, it was poſitively ſaid in the Remonſtrance, that the Socinians denied the Reſurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Life. The Faculty of Divinity at *Leyden* affirm'd likewiſe that they deny, as the Sadducees do, the Life of the Soul ſeparated from the Body, and the Reſurrection of the Wicked. The Poliſh Knight maintain'd that ſuch an Accuſation was a Calumny. (h) *Quis non cupiat animas etiam corporibus carentes vivere, agere, intelligere; Dei conſpectu & gaudiis cæleſtibus perfrui, pro nobis, in corpore adhuc, tanquam in carcere agentibus, Deum orare, noſtrique curam gerere? quis non pedibus in hanc ſententiam eat?*——(i) *Nos animarum, quamdiu ſine corporibus ſunt, ſtatum, Deo relinquimus, certiſſima fide, quæ propria Chriſtianorum eſt, mortuorum reſurrectionem complexi*——Negare nos *ajunt* impiorum reſurrectionem. *Nos vero cum Apoſtolo* (2) ſpem habemus in Deo, reſurrectionem fore mortuorum, juſtorum & injuſtorum; *juſtorum ad vitæ æternæ gaudia; injuſtorum ad ignis æterni ſupplicia. Et* (3) hunc terrorem Domini, (*qui haud quaquam vanus in ullis futurus eſt*) ſcientes, homines ſuademus, Deo autem manifeſti ſumus, ſperamus vero etiam conſcientiis veſtris fore manifeſtos. *Cocceius* was not ſilenced by this denial, grounded upon a Book, in ſome meaſure Liturgical and at leaſt Authentick, ſince it was an Apology for the Confeſſion of Faith: He (k) confeſt he knew nothing of that Book; but he alledged ſeveral Quotations, and had ſomething to ſay.

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that nothing has proved more prejudicial to the Socinians, than a certain Doctrine which they thought very proper to remove the greateſt difficulty a Philoſopher can find in our Theology. A thinking Man, who only conſults Reaſon and the bright Idea of an Infinite Goodneſs, which morally ſpeaking, makes up the Principal Character of the Divine Nature, will be offended at what we read in the Scripture concerning the Eternity of Hell Torments; eſpecially if he adds to it the Paraphraſes, and the many (l) Explications that are to be found in ſeveral Books. *Deus optimus maximus* were the current and uſual Titles of the Divine Nature among the Ancient Heathens: 'Twas their ſet form when they ſpoke of God, and they never ſaid *Deus ſeveriſſimus, implacabiliſſimus.* The two Epithets *Optimus* & *Maximus*, properly ſpeaking, were only the Image and Expreſſion of one ſole quality, I mean a Supreme Goodneſs; for Goodneſs ought to be attended with Greatneſs to appear in all its Luſtre. But what is Greatneſs? Is it any thing elſe beſides Magnanimity, Generoſity, Liberality, Magnificence, and pouring out of Favours? This natural Idea, which made the Heathens ſpeak in that manner, is confirm'd by the Scripture, wherein the Goodneſs of God is all along extoll'd above his other Attributes. Doing good, ſhewing Mercy, is the daily and pleaſant work of God: Chaſtizing, Puniſhing, ſhewing Severity, is his unuſual and unpleaſant Work. And therefore unleſs a Man humbly ſubmits

(a) Apolog. pro veritat. accuſata, pag. 39.

(b) Quibus hæc illuſtriſſima Domus pacem & libertatem conſcientiæ ac religionis juratam, ſacroſancte cuſtodivit ſemper, & etiamnum cuſtodit. *Ibid.*

(c) Ibid. pag. 40.

(d) *See John Lætus* in Compend. Hiſtoriæ p. m. 532. & alibi, *where he ſhews that the Evangelicks of* Poland *loſt their Churches in ſeveral places, ſometimes by Popular Commotions, and ſometimes by unjuſt Pretences.*

(e) Ibid. pag. 41.

(f) Ibid. pag. 42.

(1) Joan. Læti Compend. Hiſtor. Leidæ 1643. pag. 766. *and* pag. 543. *of the Edition* 1661.

(g) Cocceius in examine Apologiæ Equitis Poloni, cap. 116.

(h) Apologia Equitis Poloni, p. 77, 78.

(i) Ibid. pag. 78.

(2) Act. 24. 15.

(3) 2 Cor. v. 11, 12. Vide et Confeſſ. vindic. cap. 20.

(k) Negari a ſuis impiorum reſurrectionem, negat Eques. Citat in margine Confeſſ. vindic. cap. 22. Ipſa Confeſſio Belgica, quæ Apologiæ adjungi ſolet, in capita diſtincta non eſt. Quid libri ſit Confeſſ. vindic. adhuc ignoro. *Cocceius ubi ſupra* pag. 220.

(l) *See the Book, Intitled,* Les merveilles de l'autre monde, *written by a Canon of* Riez *call'd* Arnoux.

that the Socinian Hereſies (*M*) were privately taught at *Port-Royal*; and 'tis certain he has given out a falſe Story about it. It has been * confuted. Moſt People

* See hereafter the Remark M Δ.

mits to the Authority of ſome Paſſages in the Goſpel, he will not believe that moſt Men are Condemn'd to Hell Torments for ever. The Socinians relying too much upon Reaſon, have limited thoſe Torments the more carefully, becauſe they conſidered that no advantage wou'd accrue from thoſe Torments to the Sufferers or the Spectators. They hoped to bring over to Chriſtianity by that means thoſe, who are offended with a Notion, that ſeems little conſiſtent with the Supreme Goodneſs. But thoſe Hereticks were not aware that this very thing wou'd make 'em more odious, and more unworthy of a Toleration than all their other Tenets. After all, few People are offended with the Doctrine concerning the Eternal duration of Hell Torments, and are like (*a*) *Theodorus Camphuſius*. He was a Miniſter, born at *Gorcum* in *Holland*: He turn'd Socinian, and publickly declared he wou'd have had no Religion, had he not met with ſome Books, wherein he found that Hell Torments will not laſt for ever. (*b*) *Memini, meminerunt & alii, fuiſſe quendam Didericum Camphuſium, qui in epiſtola typis expreſſa, & canticis ipſius adjuncta, profiteretur, ſe pronum fuiſſe ad relinquendam omnem religionem, donec incideret in illos libros, qui docerent, perpetuos ignes nihil eſſe & æternos cruciatus.*

(*M*) *That the Socinian Hereſies were privately taught at* Port-Royal.] The Author of the *Politique du Clergé de France* affirms, that there is a third Party, from which the Gallican Church has every thing to fear. "They profeſs, *ſays he* (*c*), "to believe that the Church of *Rome* is the True "Church, to which one ought to be inſeparably "United; and yet they don't follow her Doctrines, "and have no reſpect for her Worſhip. Such Men "were never ſo numerous in that Kingdom as they "are now. Some of 'em carry their Unbelief ſo "far as to call in queſtion the moſt important Doctrines of Chriſtianity. They are Socinians; they "believe neither the Trinity nor the Incarnation. I "know ſome things about it, that are ſo particular "that I cannot doubt of it: I ſhall not impart "them to you for fear of Scandalizing you. And "what is moſt terrible is, that 'tis not only the "Religion of our Young Abbots, but alſo of ſome "Grave and Wiſe Societies, that make a great "ſhew of the Purity of their Morals, and of their "Adherence to the Catholick Faith". Let's ſee what *M. Arnauld* anſwered to that Author. "(*d*) "A Man muſt have neither Honour nor Conſcience, who aſcribes heinous Crimes to many Perſons, when every body may eaſily know that ſuch "horrid Accuſations are only grounded upon a meer "Calumny. Now who does not ſee that no other Thoughts can be entertained of this Writer? "There may be in *France*, and even among Abbots, ſome Perſons that are ſo Impious as to "believe neither the Trinity nor the Incarnation; "but ſomething elſe is requiſite to ſay, without "being guilty of a horrid Calumny, that *'tis now* "*the Religion of our Abbots*. He muſt be ſure that "there are at leaſt many of thoſe Young Abbots, who "have no other Religion. But how cou'd he know "it? If any of 'em were ſo unhappy as to entertain "ſuch Impious Opinions, wou'd they be ſo Imprudent as to declare them up and down, and "thereby expoſe themſelves to the dangerous Conſequences of it? Could ſuch a folly be common "to ſo many Perſons, that one might ſay, without "fearing to be accounted an Impoſtor, that *'tis the* "*Religion of Young Abbots?* And yet he is ſo Impudent as to ſuppoſe it as a thing ſo well known, "that it ſerves him only for a Prelude to authorize a more horrid Calumny; for he affirms it "as a thing, of which he is very ſure, that ſome "grave, wiſe, and orderly Societies, which are accounted Catholick, believe neither the Trinity "nor the Incarnation no more than thoſe Abbots. "*And what is moſt terrible*, ſays he, *is, that 'tis not* "*only the Religion of our Young Abbots, but alſo of* "*ſome grave and wiſe Societies, that make a great* "*ſhew of the Purity of their Morals, and of their* "*Adherence to the Catholick Faith*. 'Tis a moſt Imprudent thing to impute not to ſome Private Perſons, but to Societies, not to one only, but "*to ſome Societies*, whom he very much commends for their Wiſdom and Morals, that they "do not believe the firſt Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion; and to ſuppoſe that thoſe, who "cou'd put a ſtop to ſo great a diſorder, know "nothing of it, or are unwilling to ſuffer "it; and laſtly, to fancy that the World will be "ſo ſilly as to believe ſuch an incredible Thing, "upon the credit of an inconſiderable Writer, "who ſays in an Anonymous Book: *I know ſome* "*things about it that are ſo particular, that I can-* "*not doubt of it*, adding with a ſorry Craftineſs, "*I ſhall not impart them to you for fear of Scan-* "*dalizing you*. One can hardly conceive how a "Man can carry Boldneſs and Calumny to ſuch a "degree. However, the thing is not ſo ſurprizing "in a Calviniſt, &c.

The Author of the *Politique du Clergé de France* cou'd not well be ſilent after ſuch a vigorous Anſwer: I ſhall ſet down what he ſaid in his Vindication. *He thought*, ſays he (*e*), ſpeaking of Mr. *Arnauld*, that the Author *meant the Janſeniſts by* thoſe grave and wiſe Societies, that make a great ſhew of the Purity of their Morals, and of their adherence to the Catholick Faith. *Perhaps he is not in the wrong.* (*f*) *I don't know the thoughts of the Author of the* Politique du Clergé; *but I do very well know that there is ground to ſuſpect thoſe Gentlemen of having a Theology little Chriſtian, and bordering upon Socinianiſm. I am ſorry I am obliged to ſay what I think, and what I have reaſon to think of it. I don't love to oppreſs thoſe unhappy Men, who are already loaded with the Publick Hatred. And indeed, were it not that I am forced to it by thoſe Gentlemen, I wou'd not expoſe to the Publick view, what may confirm that ſuſpicion. But they have no regard for us; and if they are diſpleaſed with what I am going to ſay, they muſt blame themſelves for it. I wou'd not be ſo poſitive as* Filleau, *and the Jeſuite* Meynier, *who ſay that* thoſe who go by the name of Janſeniſts are downright Deiſts, Enemies to the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion. *But 'tis certain they have dropt ſome words againſt the Divinity of* JESUS CHRIST, *which give ground to ſuſpect that they harbour dreadful Monſters in their Breaſts.* Pray, mind the Proofs he alledges. *Thoſe Gentlemen*, ſays he (*g*), *don't ſcruple to confeſs that the Divinity of* JESUS CHRIST *is not ſufficiently proved in the Holy Scripture* ——— (*h*) *The Author of the* Perpetuité de la Foy, *asks*, (1) *Why did not* CHRIST *diſcover his Divinity in ſuch clear words that they might not be eluded?* From thoſe words and from theſe, *God was not willing that the Chriſtian Doctrines ſhou'd be propoſed with the utmoſt Evidence*, the Author of the *Politique du Clergé* infers, that the Janſeniſts admit this Principle: (*i*) *The Divinity of* JESUS CHRIST *and the Trinity are not clearly expreſs'd in the Scripture.* Afterwards he tells us, 1. *That this Principle is utterly falſe; for 'tis not true that the Paſſages which prove* CHRIST's *Divinity, may be any ways eluded. There are no Paſſages, tho' never ſo clear, but what the Hereticks may Cavil upon. If this be call'd eluding, there is nothing in the Holy Scripture, nor in any Book or Language but what may be eluded.* This he proves by ſhewing how one might Cavil about ſome Texts in the Goſpel, wherein Chriſt's Humanity is aſſerted, and about the (*k*) Canons of the Council of *Nice*, and a Paſſage contrived on purpoſe (*l*), to be the cleareſt and the moſt diſtinct proof of the Trinity and Incarnation that can be imagin'd. In the 2. place he ſays, that (*m*) *it is the moſt ſhamefull thing, and the greateſt Prevarication an Orthodox Divine can be guilty of againſt the Divinity of the Son of God, thus to give it up to the Hereticks, by acknowledging a thing ſo falſe, ſo dangerous, and ſo proper to Confirm them in their Errors* ——— (*n*) *The Confeſſion, that the Divinity of the Son is not ſufficiently explain'd in the* Revelation, *is that very thing which confirms the Socinians in their*

(*e*) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld tom. 1. ch. 6. pag. 196.

(*f*) *That writer is the Author of the* Politique du Clergé, *tho' he denies it.*

(*g*) Eſprit de Mr. Arnauld ibid. pag. 197.

(*h*) Id. ib. pag 198.

(1) Pag. 103.

(*i*) Eſprit de M. Arnauld ibid. pag. 201.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 203. & ſeq.

(*l*) Ibid. pag 205. & ſeq.

(*m*) Ibid. pag 209.

(*n*) Ibid. pag 211.

People would be extremely concern'd, if they had Publiſh'd a Story as ill Cir-cumſtantiated

their Hereſy, and may induce others to Embrace it. In the Third place he ſays, (a) that M. Arnauld ought to acknowledge, That 'till the Council of Nice, it was lawful to deny the Divinity of Chriſt without running the hazard of one's Salvation, and that if the Divinity of the Son was not an Article of Faith, neceſſary to Salvation, for the ſpace of three Hundred Years, it could not be ſo by the Deciſion of a Council, becauſe according to the Wiſeſt Doctors of the Church of Rome, among whom the Gentlemen of Port-Royal ought to be Reckon'd, the Church, the Pope and the Councils cannot make New Articles of Faith. From whence it follows, that to this very Day the Divinity of the Son is not an Article of Faith, for which thoſe who deny it deſerve to be Anathematiz'd. Thus, by proceeding from one Principle to another, 'tis plain there is good ground to ſuſpect that M. Arnauld does not believe the Myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, or at leaſt, that he does not look upon 'em as eſſential parts of the Chriſtian Religion. In the Fourth place he proves, (b) that thoſe Gentlemen have made it appear that they have no great Regard for the Authority of the Church. Which being ſo, concluded he (c), ſince the Myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation cannot be proved by any Paſſages of the Scripture, but what may be eluded, according to thoſe Gentlemen; and beſides, ſince they are only grounded upon Deciſions, to which they don't think themſelves oblig'd blindly to ſubmit; 'tis plain thoſe Myſteries are built upon no ſolid Foundation, and are only meer Problems according to their Theology. In the Fifth place, he tells us a Story, to which he prefixes a pleaſant Preamble. I ſhall add a Story, ſays he (d), which I Publiſh with Reluctancy. If theſe Gentlemen were not ſo hard upon us, I would have been more reſerved; but I am not oblig'd to ſhew any regard to ſuch a Man as M. Arnauld, who openly tranſgreſſes againſt the Laws of Charity and Sincerity.

Here follows an Abridgement of that Story. “(e) About (f) Fifteen or Twenty Years ago, a young Man, the Son of a Treaſurer of France in the Generality of Orleans, whoſe Name was Picaut or Picot, and who was deſign'd for the Church, Studied at Paris, in the Houſe of the Gentlemen of Port-Royal.„ The Converſation of a Miniſter, and the reading of ſome Books, convinced him that the Pope is Antichriſt; whereupon he wrote a Piece for his own uſe, and being informed that it was come into the Director's Hands, and that his Family had notice of it, he made his eſcape. “(g) He came into Perche, where he had a Living, to try whether he could get ſome Money by it. He fell, by chance, into the Hands of a Proteſtant Gentleman, a Perſon diſtinguiſh'd by his Birth, and particularly by his Merit. That Gentleman being very well skill'd in Matters of Religion, ask'd him ſeveral Queſtions about the Motives of his Change; and as he proceeded from one Subject to another, he perceiv'd that this young Man had the Notions of the Socinians about the Trinity and Incarnation, and knew all their ſorry Objections; but abating of that, he was very fond of the Opinions of the Church of Rome, and very little diſpoſed to embrace the Doctrines of the Reformed, excepting this, that the Pope is Antichriſt. The Gentleman was very much ſurprized to find this young Man a Socinian, and ask'd where he had learn'd that Doctrine. The young Man anſwer'd, without any Myſtery, that he had learn'd it at Port-Royal, where he had ſtudied; that ſeveral Perſons had the ſame Opinions in that Houſe; that the Novices and the Students were not allowed to read the Books of Calvin and of the Calviniſts; but the Socinian Books were not ſhut up by themſelves in the Library, and every body might read them. Afterwards the young Man made his eſcape into a remote Province, and at laſt left the Kingdom to avoid being moleſted by his Relations. And it has been known ſince, that thoſe who went about to inſtruct him, could never cure him of his Socinianiſm.„ What follows is the moſt curious part of the Story, and therefore I muſt not forget it. “(h) The Author of the Apology for the Catholicks, who falls into a violent Paſſion when he meets with a word that vexes him never ſo little, will doubtleſs call this Story a piece of Impudence, an Impoſture and a Calumny. He will ſay that all the Fire in Hell will not be ſufficient to puniſh the Author of ſo horrid a Slander. But I muſt tell him, that I only warrant the Truth of theſe two things. 1. That this young Man told that Story, and even to many Perſons very credible, and of known Probity. 2. That this young Man was a true Socinian, when he left the Divines of Port-Royal, and that he learn'd Socinianiſm in their Houſe. As for what he adds, that his Maſters were infected with the ſame Hereſy, I cannot tell whether it be true. But I ſee no reaſon why that Student ſhould invent ſo horrid a Calumny. This, together with their way of ſpeaking of the Trinity and Incarnation, may form, if not a Proof, at leaſt a very ſtrong Suſpicion. This is what I know of the matter, and what I had to ſay about it. The Publick will judge of it, as they think fit. This is what People get by being ſo hard upon others.„

This Author did not think that M. Arnauld's Reply would contain but few Words; he expected abundance of Reflections and Exclamations, for he believ'd his Hiſtory would produce great Effects. But M. Arnauld was contented to Confute it in a few words, and with great Moderation, tho' he knew very well how to be Paſſionate. His Anſwer runs thus (i) He had a mind to make People believe that the Divines of Port-Royal had an Averſion for Calviniſm, but that they were very much inclin'd to the Socinian Hereſy, for which he gives this Proof. Some young Children of Quality were inſtructed at Port-Royal, in Humane Learning, tho' at the ſame time care was taken to give 'em a pious Education. Moſt of 'em were but Ten, Twelve, or Fourteen Years of Age, and the Oldeſt was hardly Sixteen. The Greek and Latin Methods, and the Greek Roots in French Verſe were made for 'em. Now let's ſee what M. Jurieu tells us in his famous Book, Intitl'd, l'Eſprit de M. Arnauld. He ſays the Books of the Calviniſts were carefully kept from them, but that they had a full liberty to read thoſe of the Socinians; and that by the reading of thoſe Books, one of thoſe Children whom he Names, and who was a Native of Orleans, as he ſays, being fond of the Socinian Errors, left the Church, and turn'd Huguenot. But this Story is utterly falſe. There never was a Child at Port-Royal of ſuch a Name and Family; Nay, there never was any of the City of Orleans. The ground on which he builds that Story, viz. That Children of that Age were allowed to read the Socinian Books, ſufficiently ſhews that one may expect any thing from a Man, who does not ſcruple to Publiſh ſuch horrid and incredible Lies.

Many Reflections might be made on the Pains the Author of L'Eſprit de M. Arnauld took to Convict the Gentlemen of Port-Royal of Socinianiſm; but I ſhall only make Three.

The I. is, that if any one accuſed that Writer of the ſame thing, he wou'd find the Proofs of his Accuſation in L'Eſprit de M. Arnauld, for he needs only form this Syllogiſm.

A Man (k) who believes on the one ſide, that the Myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation cannot be proved by any Paſſages of the Scripture, but what may be eluded, and who on the other ſide does not blindly ſubmit to the Deciſions of Councils, is a Socinian.

But the Author of L'Eſprit de M. Arnauld believes it, and has no ſuch Submiſſion.

Therefore he is a Socinian.

The major Propoſition of this Syllogiſm is plainly the Doctrine of that Author; for intending to juſtify what he had ſaid, (l) that Socinianiſm was the Theology of ſome grave Societies, meaning the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, he alledges for a Proof their Teaching that Chriſt's Divinity has not been Revealed with a ſufficient Evidence, and their giving ground to ſuſpect that they don't believe one ought to ſubmit to Councils. He muſt therefore look upon this as an undoubted Sign of the Socinian Hereſy, otherwiſe he could not clear himſelf of Calumny; his Accuſation would be ill Proved, and he would be a Falſe Accuſer. Wherefore I need only

prove

(a) Ibid. pag. 212, 213.

(b) Pag. 213. till 219.

(c) Ibid. pag. 220.

(d) Ibid.

(e) Ibid.

(f) Note that the Author wrote his Book in the Year 1683

(g) Ibid. pag. 222.

(h) Ibid. pag. 224.

cumſtantiated as that which concerns (MΔ) young *Picaut*, the Witneſs alledged by

prove the *Minor Propoſition*. It conſiſts of two Parts: The Second does not want to be proved; for 'tis manifeſt that a Proteſtant Miniſter does not blindly ſubmit to Councils: And the following words afford the Proof of the Firſt. (a) *I am far from deſigning to leſſen the force and clearneſs of thoſe Characters of the Divinity of the Scripture; but I dare ſay that every one of them may be eluded by Prophane Men. None of 'em makes a Proof, and is unanſwerable; and if they be conſidered together, tho' they have a greater force than when they ſtand by themſelves, yet they are not ſtrong enough to form a Moral Demonſtration.* It were needleſs to object to me that this Paſſage does not concern Chriſt's Divinity; for it were in vain to pretend that God has evidently revealed to us the Divinity of his Son in the Scripture, if it was affirm'd that it does not clearly appear, that the Scripture is the Word of God. But, beſides, that Author (b) has a Diſpute with another Miniſter (c) about this Queſtion, Whether the Belief of our Myſteries ſuppoſes the Evidence of the Teſtimony, and does not only deny it, but alſo maintains that the Affirmative is a pernicious Opinion. I am going to ſhew that he may receive another Wound with his own Weapon. You have ſaid (d) that *'tis not true that the Paſſages, which prove Chriſt's Divinity, can be any ways eluded.* You have ſaid that they are as clear as the Paſſages which concern his Humanity, and as clear as the deciſion of the Council of *Nice*, or any Text made on purpoſe. The meaning of which is, that the Cavils raiſed againſt them are as frivolous and vain, as thoſe that ſhould be raiſed againſt a Text made on purpoſe. How come you then to confeſs (e) that the Characters of the Divinity of the Scripture may be eluded? How come you to ſay that the Objections of the Socinians are conſiderable? Theſe are your words: (f) *The Proofs of the Scripture, on which* the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the neceſſity of Grace *are grounded, have not the utmoſt Evidence: Thoſe Myſteries are liable to ſome Difficulties, not only with reſpect to Human Reaſon, but in relation to the Holy Scripture, wherein there are many Paſſages that want to be reconcil'd. Thoſe, who take the Objections of the Socinians againſt Myſteries, and thoſe of the Pelagians againſt Grace, to be vain and inconſiderable, are miſtaken, and do not conſider the thing with a due Attention. They are real Difficulties, and deſerve to be cleared.* Remember that in the Book, Intitl'd, *L'Eſprit de M. Arnauld*, (g) *'tis a baſe thing, and the greateſt Prevarication an Orthodox Divine can be guilty of againſt the Divinity of Chriſt, thus to give it up to the Hereticks, by making a Confeſſion ſo falſe, ſo dangerous, and ſo proper to confirm them in their Errors*, that is, by confeſſing as you do, that (h) *Chriſt has not diſcovered his Divinity in words ſo clear as not to be eluded.*

My II. Reflection is, That if thoſe Proofs alledged to ſhew that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are Socinians, were good, it would follow from thence that all the Roman Catholicks are Socinians; for what has been ſaid by thoſe Gentlemen concerning the Obſcurity of the Scripture, is the general Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. Beſides, few Roman Catholicks believe the Pope's Infallibility in Matters of Fact; Nay, they don't aſcribe that Privilege to Univerſal Councils. The Janſeniſts never denied the Infallibility of thoſe Councils in point of Doctrine, and even have acknowledged that the Five Propoſitions were Heretical, in the Senſe they pretend the Popes have condemn'd them. What they have ſaid in particular to juſtify ſome Nuns, who refuſed to Subſcribe to ſome Formularies, and to ſubmit to ſome Epiſcopal Mandates, is of ſuch a Nature, that all Monks would ſay the ſame, if they were moleſted by ſome Biſhops. How often have they been at Law with their Prelates? How often have they appeal'd againſt 'em to Synods, or to the Pope? Is it not a plain Demonſtration, that they don't believe one ought to Sacrifice one's Knowledge to the Authority of inferior Tribunals? I confeſs ſome ſay that a Monk ought blindly to obey his Superiors; but 'tis only in what concerns the Diſcipline and Obſervances; and they would not think themſelves obliged to obey him, if he commanded them to believe what they know to have been condemn'd by the Councils. And therefore if the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* are Socinians, becauſe they ſay, on the one ſide, that our Myſteries are not evidently contain'd in the Scripture, and on the other, that one ought not to ſign againſt ones Conſcience an Epiſcopal Mandate, or a Bull that decides only a Matter of Fact, there is no Univerſity nor religious Commonalty in the Church of *Rome*, but what is Socinian. Let us therefore admire the diſcerning Faculty of M. *Arnauld's* Adverſary, and let us confeſs that no Man was ever more lucky than he in the choice of his Proofs. 'Tis not to be doubted, that if the Jeſuits found themſelves in the ſame Circumſtances with the (i) Divines of *Port Royal*, they wou'd do what thoſe Divines have done. Wou'd that prove their being Socinians?

My III. Reflection concerns the great care that Writer takes to excuſe himſelf to the Publick, for revealing the Secret of *one Picaut or Picat*. He is afraid of undoing *Port-Royal*; he declares he has been a long time doubtful whether he ſhould ſtrike ſuch a blow; he wou'd never have done it, had thoſe Gentlemen been leſs unjuſt and cruel to his Party; However, he applauds himſelf for his Victory; *this is what People get*, ſays he, *by being ſo hard upon others*. Does it not look like a convincing Proof? Would not one think it is one of thoſe Productions, that put an end to all Cavils, and further proceedings in a Cauſe? But after all, it appears that the only thing he objects againſt the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* is a Story, the truth whereof he dares not warrant: He knows not whether it be true. Who will believe it then, ſince he himſelf doubts of it, being otherwiſe ſo ſilly as to fancy that his Tale wou'd caſt ſuch a Blot upon thoſe Gentlemen, that he is afraid of being guilty of a piece of Cruelty? He needs not be afraid of it: He may be ſure that ſuch Stories will never make any Impreſſion upon Impartial Men, not even upon the Jeſuits. I wou'd not deny that *Picaut* ſaid ſo; but he muſt be compared to thoſe Deſerters, who tell a thouſand Lies to the Beſiegers about the State of the Towns that are Beſieged. I have a Book Printed at *Cologne* for *Peter Marteau* in 1679, and Intitl'd, *Traité des Parlemens ou Eſtats generaux composé par Pierre Picault*. This is doubtleſs, the Man I have been ſpeaking of; for there is a great deal of Socinianiſm in that Book. When a grave Man, who has a great Reputation, leaves his Country and his Church, what he ſays may be depended upon. And therefore I believe the Author of the *Politique du Clergé* knew not what he ſaid when he ſpoke of a third Party, and of a vaſt number of Socinians in *France*; for when I ask'd two (k) or three Years ago a famous (l) Father of the Oratory, whether it was true that there were many Socinians among the Clergy of *France*, he anſwered me that there was hardly any body who knew the Works and Doctrines of that Sect. There are every where ſome Unbelievers and Doubting Men, but they are not Socinians.

Let us conclude, That the Author of the *Politique du Clergé* not being able to prove the heinous Accuſation Publiſh'd by him againſt *Port-Royal*, is duly Convicted of being a downright Calumniator. The Proofs alledged by him, ought to be compared with thoſe of a Man, who having ſaid that the Governor of a Place betrays his Sovereign, ſhould prove it, Firſt, By imputing to him a Conduct like that of all other Governors, and of thoſe whoſe Fidelity he could not deny. Secondly, By Publiſhing a ſilly Story, which a Soldier, who left the Place, told the Enemies.

(MΔ) *What concerns young* Picaut, *the Witneſs alledged by the Modern Author.*] Here follows what *M. le Vaſſor* did me the Honour to write to me, the 2d of *January* 1697. *If you had told me that you deſign'd to ſpeak of* Picaut's *Adventure, which* M. Jurieu *relates very wrong, I could have given you a good account of it. He was my* (m) *Country-man, and I was very well acquainted with him. His eldeſt Brother married a near Relation of mine. He was a Young Man, whom* Aubert de Verſé *ſpoiled with Socinianiſm, not at* Port-Royal, *but in a Houſe of the Oratory,*

(i) *During the Congregation* de Auxiliis, Clement VIII. *being not favourable to them, they publickly* maintain'd *at Rome*, that 'twas no Article of Faith, to believe that *Clement* VIII. was Pope. Others taught that he was not Infallible. *See the Hiſtory of that Congregation Printed in* 1687. *pag.* 49. *Matthieu* Hiſt. de France, *Book* 2. *is quoted in it.*

(k) *I write this in* July 1696.

(l) Viz. M. le Vaſſor, *who is now at* London, *and is very well known by his Works, who profeſt Divinity in the Oratory, and is perfectly acquainted with the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical ſtate of* France.

(m) M. le Vaſſor *is a Native of* Orleans.

by the Modern Author I speak of. I ſhall not give a particular Account of what concerns the Opinions and Books of Socinus: It may be ſeen in general in Moreri's Dictionary. A German Hiſtorian * has reduc'd the Doctrine of the Socinians into 229 Propoſitions. The moſt general Objection raiſed againſt 'em is, That by refuſing to believe what they think to be contrary to Reaſon, and by denying the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion, they open a way to Scepticiſm, Deiſm, and Atheiſm. Perhaps it might be objected to them, that they do it alſo, at leaſt indirectly, by their way of explaining the Paſſages of the Scripture, which concern the Conſubſtantiality of the Word. For it ſeems, that the Reſult of their Explications is, That the Apoſtles being animated with an ardent Zeal for the Glory of CHRIST, made uſe of the moſt ſtrain'd Figures and Expreſſions that Devotion can ſuggeſt, when they ſpoke of his Perfections. Thus the Votaries of the Holy Virgin have carried it as high, and as near a True and Real Deification as ever they could. But if the Expreſſions of the Apoſtles were to be aſcribed to an Enthuſiaſtick Zeal, and not to the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, 'tis plain the Scripture would be of little more Authority than the Panegyricks upon the Saints. But by over-throwing the Inſpiration of the Sacred Writers, the whole Revelation comes to nothing, and then every thing will be a meer Philoſophical Diſpute.

SOMMONA-CODOM. So the *Siameſe* call a certain extraordinary Man, whom they think to have attain'd to the Supreme Felicity †. I mention him *(A)* only to have an Opportunity of Examining a very Subtil Objection of *M. du Rondel* againſt what I have ſaid in the Article of || *Lucretius*, *That the Belief of God's Exiſtence without the Belief of a Providence, cannot be an inducement to Virtue.*

* *Daniel* [illegible] *in his continuation of M. Micraelii Syntagm. Hiſtor. Eccleſ.*

† See *M. de la Loubere, Relation de Siam, tom. 1. chap. 22. n. 4. & 5. pag. m. 400, 401.*

|| At the end of the Remark *I.*

Oratory, where they happen'd to be. The Fathers of the Oratory ſent away de Verſé *as ſoon as they perceived that he dogmatized, and kept* Picaut *for ſome time in order to Cure him, but they could not do it.* This Account does perfectly agree with a Printed Letter of M. *Simon*, who ſays: (a) *I can aſſure you that there are in that (b) Libel, many falſe Stories, which could not be (c) ſpoiled by* M. J. *For Inſtance, can any thing be more Falſe and more Ridiculous than that, which is to be found at large in the* 221 *Page, and the following of the Firſt Volume. He ſuppoſes the Gentlemen of* Port-Royal *had a Houſe in* Paris, *where they taught their Scholars Socinianiſm, and permitted them to read the Books of the Socinians. That Tale is ſo well Circumſtantiated, that any body would think at firſt, 'tis rather true matter of Fact than an idle Story. And yet 'tis certain, the Gentlemen of* Port-Royal *have had no School in* Paris *where they taught Youth. Here is what gave occaſion to that Story. The young Man ſpoken of in that Book, call'd* Picaut, *was in the Inſtitution of the Fathers of the Oratory, which is properly a place for the Novices, who deſire to be admitted into that Congregation. A Man very well known in the World, who had been a Miniſter in* Burgundy, *and was expell'd by his Brethren, being Convicted of Socinianiſm, happen'd to be there at the ſame time. The Fathers of the Oratory, who took him to be a converted Miniſter, admitted him into their Inſtitution. 'Twas he who turn'd the young Man's Brains with what he told him about the* Apocalypſe *and Socinianiſm. Thus that Socinianiſm proceeded from your People, and not from the Gentlemen of* Port-Royal, *nor from the Fathers of the Oratory. That School, wherein the Socinian Books are not lock'd up, is a meer Viſion of your Men, who give out thro' the whole Book manifeſt Lies for true Stories.*

(A) Only to have an Opportunity of examining an Objection.] M. *du Rondel* having read what I have ſaid at the end of the Remark *I.* in the Article of *Lucretius*, was pleaſed to write to me, that he thouht it would be confuted by Examples and Arguments. " (d) For in the Firſt place, at *Siam*, and in other " Countries, where they believe in *Sommona-Codom*, " 'tis an undoubted Doctrine that this God concerns " himſelf with nothing in his *Nireupan*, and ſuffers " every thing upon Earth to take its courſe; and " yet they Pray to him, and endeavour to imitate " him in the Practice of Virtues. See the firſt Tome " of *M. de la Loubere*'s Relation. But in the Second " place, ſuppoſing there was no *Sommona-Codom*, " nor any other God in this World, the bare ſpeaking of the Gods, and annexing to thoſe Ideas all " the Beauty of Morals, would induce many People to aſpire to that degree of Glory. „ Being under a neceſſity of laying aſide a great many things till another time, I am forced, to my great grief, to ſuppreſs the ſequel of *M. du Rondel*'s fine Letter; but I ſhall give the Subſtance of it in theſe few words: He ſets forth the power of Admiration, and ſhews by great Examples, that the bare deſire of imitating an excellent Model, has induced Men to very difficult Actions.

I. I ſhall Anſwer firſt the Objection he grounds upon the Conduct of the *Siameſe*; and the better to clear the matter, I ſhall firſt of all ſet down the Words of the Hiſtorian. " (e) *Sommona-Codom* order'd, before he died, that Statues and Temples " ſhould be Conſecrated to him, and ſince he died " he is in that ſtate of Reſt, which they expreſs by the " word *Nireupan*. 'Tis not a Place, but a manner of Being; for, ſay they, to ſpeak properly, " *Sommona Codom* is no where, and enjoys no Felicity: He has no Power, and can do neither good " nor harm: The *Portugueſe* call it an Annihilation. Nevertheleſs, the *Siameſe* believe on the other ſide, that *Sommona-Codom* is Happy, they put " up Prayers to him, and ask him whatever they " want: Whether it be that their Doctrine is Inconſiſtent, or that they carry their Worſhip beyond their Doctrine. But in whatever ſenſe they " aſcribe a Power to *Sommona-Codom*, they are agreed in this, that he has no Power, but over the " *Siameſe*, and does not concern himſelf with Nations, that Worſhip other Men than him. „ It plainly appears, that the *Siameſe* ſpeak inconſiſtently of their *Sommona-Codom*. They ſay, *he enjoys no Felicity, and on the other hand, they think he is Happy.* One may therefore believe, that tho' they ſay *he has no Power*, they take him to be very Powerful: And therefore, 'tis no wonder if they Pray to him; their Notions are ſo confuſed, that they affirm Contradictory things of one and the ſame Object. When they conſider it in a certain Senſe, they ſay one thing of it, and when they conſider it in another Senſe, they deny it. Their Notions are different from their inward Sentiments, which is the reaſon why their Theory does not agree with their Practice: However it be, we ought to believe that they don't invoke *Sommona Codom*, as a Being to which they aſcribe no Power, and which minds nothing, but as a Being in which they acknowledge ſome Power in ſome reſpects, by virtue of an inward Sentiment, which commonly has a greater influence upon People, than the clear Doctrines of ſpeculative Men. The Hiſtorian does clearly inſinuate, that they aſcribe ſome Power to him; *in whatever Senſe*, ſays he, *they aſcribe it to him, they are agreed in this, that he has no Power but over the* Siameſe. This is my Firſt Remark, to which I add this Obſervation. They are fully perſuaded that ſome things lead the Soul to an Eternal Happineſs or Miſery, and that whatever they can do in the Honour of *Sommona-Codom* is Fine, Praiſe-worthy, Juſt, and proper to make one attain to the Supreme Good. And therefore, tho' they ſhould teach conſtantly, and without any contradiction, that he concerns himſelf with

(a) Lettres choiſies de M. Simon, pag. 145.

(b) *That is,* l'Eſprit de M. Arnauld.

(c) *This refers to theſe words of the ſame Page,* The Man being vexed at that overſight, Anſwered me very ingenuouſly, and without much conſideration on what he ſaid, ſpeaking of M. J... *That Man ſpoils every thing that is ſent to him.*

(d) *A Letter of* M. du Rondel *of the* 28. *of* January 1696.

(e) La Loubere, Relation de Siam, tom. 1. ch. 14. p. m. [illegible] 534.

I add in this Second Edition what follows. Father *Tachard* relates many things of this *Sommona Codom*, whom he calls *Sommonakhodom*. 'Tis, *ſays he* ‖, the God whom the *Siameſe Worſhip at this time.* They ſuppoſe he "was Born a God by his "own Virtue, and that immediately after his Birth, without any Maſter to inſtruct "him, he acquired by a bare Intuition of his Mind, a perfect Knowledge of what-"ever concerns Heaven and Earth, Paradiſe and Hell, and of the moſt Impene-"trable Secrets of Nature; that he remembred at the ſame time, whatever he had "done in all the ſeveral Lives he had lived; and that after he had Taught "thoſe great things, he left 'em in Writing, that the Poſterity might be bene-"fitted by them. He ſays in thoſe Books, that being a God, he deſired to mani-"feſt his Divinity to Men by ſome extraordinary Prodigy—— † That immedi-"ately he found himſelf carried thro' the Air on a Throne Shining with Gold "and Jewels, that came out of the Earth in the very ſame place where he was, "and that the Angels coming down from Heaven paid him the Honour and Wor-"ſhip due to him—— * That ever ſince he aſpired to be a God, he return'd "into the World five Hundred and Fifty times under different Shapes; that in each

‖ *Tachard voiage to Siam B. 6. p. 2??, Dutch Edit.*

† *Id. ib. pag.* 206.

* *Id. ib. pag.* 207.

with nothing, that he has no Power, and does not hear the Prayers put up to him, yet they ſhould apply themſelves to him in their Neceſſity, and practice ſuch Virtues as he was pleaſed with; for in their Opinion, 'tis the way to the Supreme Felicity. And therefore, I ſay, that their Devotion and their Practical Morality are not contrary to what I advance; for they believe both an Exiſtence and a Providence. 'Tis true, they aſcribe no Providence to *Sommona-Codom*; but it is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that they attribute it to ſomething elſe, from which they expect to be Rewarded for their Good Works. (*a*) *They have loſt the Idea of God, as well as the Chineſe.* But they have *preſerved an Ancient Maxim according to which Virtue is to be rewarded, and Vice to be puniſh'd.* They aſcribe *that diſtributive Juſtice to a blind Fatality*, from which they expect their Happineſs, if they live virtuouſly; and they are perſuaded it will reward them for the Honours paid to *Sommona-Codom*. To have a right Notion of their Impious Doctrine, one needs only conſider the Opinions of the Men of Letters among the *Chineſe*: They are (*b*) *thoſe, who have degrees of Literature, and the only Men who have a ſhare in the Government.* They are *grown altogether Impious, and having made no Alteration in the Language of their Predeceſſors, they have changed the Soul of the World, and all other Souls into I know not what Aerian Subſtances, deſtitute of Intelligence: And they have eſtabliſh'd a blind Fatality, as the only judge of Mens Actions, that does what an Omnipotent and moſt wiſe Juſtice could do.* They pretend that '*tis a thing Conſonant to the Principles of Nature, that Virtue ſhou'd be always attended with Happineſs, and Vice with Miſery, by a certain tho' unknown Sympathy between Virtue and Happineſs, and between Vice and Miſery.* Thus the *Chineſe* and *Siameſe* very much differ from *Epicurus*: They deny the Exiſtence of God, and acknowledge a (†) Providence, whereas *Epicurus* rejected Providence, and acknowledged the Exiſtence of a Deity. 'Tis not therefore ſtrange that the *Siameſe* ſhou'd invoke *Sommona-Codom*, and endeavour to imitate his Virtuous Life; but one might wonder at *Epicurus*, if he had prayed to *Jupiter*, and laid a great conſtraint upon himſelf to Honour the Gods; for he was perſuaded that his Prayers and Endeavours wou'd be of no uſe to him. On the contrary, the *Siameſe* believe that the Worſhip of their Hero will bring a Noble Reward upon them: The Blind Fatality, the Natural Laws and Sympathies they acknowledge between Virtue and Happineſs, and between Vice and Miſery, are as Powerful a Motive and as great a Curb as the belief of a knowing Providence.

(*a*) *Id. la Loubere* ... *chap.* ... *pag.* 515.

(*b*) *Id. ib.* ... *pag.* 514.

(†) That ... a Law ... whereby ... Vice is ... puniſh'd, ... Virtue ... rewarded.

I go farther ſtill, and I ſay that according to the courſe (*c*) of Nature, that belief has not ſo great an Influence as the Opinion of the *Siameſe*. A Natural Connexion between Virtue and Happineſs, and between Vice and Miſery, wou'd be more proper to Act upon a Mercenary Mind than the perſuaſion of the Orthodox without the Divine Grace. That Connexion wou'd never fail to produce its Effect, ſince it wou'd not be ſubmitted to a Cauſe, which thinks fit ſometimes to derogate from it Laws, to extend or confine them, and to haſten or retard the Execution of 'em, in a Word, to diſpoſe of 'em according to its Deſigns and Various Circumſtances. That Connexion, for that very Reaſon that it were only a Blind Fatality, wou'd afford Good Men a perfect certainty of a quick Reward, and fill the Wicked with a neceſſary Fear of a quick Puniſhment. But by ſuppoſing a Providence, which diſpoſes of all things according to its will, and with a Wiſdom whereof all the deſigns are unknown to us, one cannot be certain that a good Action will be Profitable, or a bad one Detrimental; for one may think in each particular juncture that 'tis one of the Caſes, wherein God is not pleaſed to follow the General Laws of rewarding Good Actions, and puniſhing Evil ones. Chriſtians acknowledge that God ſuſpends the Execution of thoſe Laws as long as he thinks fit. Nay, they ſay that an old Sinner, who has enjoyed all the Pleaſures of Life, will be Eternally Happy, provided he truly Repent on his Death-Bed; and that whoever in his old Age departs from the way to Virtue, tho' he walk'd in it for a long time with many Adverſities, will be Eternally Damn'd (*d*). Doubtleſs this may be the Reaſon why the Fear of God's Judgments, or the Hope of his Rewards, make no great Impreſſion upon Worldly People. If there was an indiſſoluble Connexion between Devoutly asking a good thing of God, and obtaining it, none cou'd doubt of the Efficacy of a Devout Prayer; but according to the Doctrine of Divines about that part of Divine Worſhip, none can be ſure that the moſt Earneſt and Devout Prayers of a Mother for the Recovery or Converſion of her Son, or for the Deliverance of her Husband unjuſtly Impriſon'd, will be heard. Thoſe, who have heard ſome Divines Preach about the Efficacy of Prayer, or who have read ſome Books upon that Queſtion, know that the Proofs alledged and grounded upon Examples or Arguments, are very ſtrong and cogent: However, the Difficulties muſt be examin'd at laſt. Preachers don't conclude without ſuppoſing that it will be aſk'd, How comes it that ſome things are not obtain'd tho' they be aſk with Faith, and for the greateſt Glory of God? Their Anſwer is, That God refuſes us what we aſk'd of him upon ſeveral occaſions, in order to try us, or Humble us more and more, or becauſe he knows that the Favours we Pray for wou'd be prejudicial to us, and becauſe our Wants and what concerns his Glory are better known to him than to us. In each Caſe every Body may judge that his Prayers will not be heard thro' one of thoſe Motives; hence it is that the hope of being heard is always mixed with great uncertainty, and many People grow remiſs in the Practice of Prayer, or only aſk of God the General Grace of acquieſing in his Will. Men wou'd act otherwiſe, were they perſuaded that there is a neceſſary Connexion between a Devout Prayer, and the obtaining of what is Prayed for; they wou'd apply themſelves to Providence in all their Wants, as they come near a Fire, when they are troubled with Cold. And therefore ſince the *Siameſe* are perſuaded that there is a Fatal, Immutable, and Neceſſary Connexion between Virtue and Happineſs, and between Vice and Miſery, that Doctrine ſhou'd be a more Powerful inducement to Virtue among 'em, than Orthodoxy in other Countries. They ſhou'd apply themſelves to Virtue in order to be Happy, as they have recourſe to Food, when they are Hungry; and they ſhou'd depart from Vice to avoid Miſery, as they keep off from the Fire when they are afraid of being Burnt. But then their Morals wou'd be wholly Mercenary;

(*c*) That ... without ... conſidering ... the opera- ... of the ... Divine ... Grace.

(*d*) *Compare with this the* XVIII. *Chapt. of* Ezekiel.

“ each Birth, he had always been the firſt, and as it were the Prince of thoſe “ Animals under whoſe Shapes he came into the Word; that he often gave his “ Life for his Subjects, and that being an Ape he delivered a Town from a Horrid Monſter which deſolated it; that he had been a moſt Potent King, and that “ ſeven Days before he obtain'd the Empire of the World, he removed in Imitation of a certain Anachoret, with his Wife and his two Children into remote “ Solitudes, where he renounced the World and his Paſſions —— * He went all over “ the World diſcovering Good and Evil to Men, and teaching them true Religion, “ which he writ down to leave it to Poſterity. He had many Diſciples, who being “ Prieſts, were to Imitate him in a moſt particular manner by wearing an Habit like “ his, and obſerving the Rules he preſcribed to them, when at laſt he attain'd to the “ Eighty Second Year of his Age——He was ſeized with a violent Cholick of “ which he died. (*B*) His Soul aſcended into the Eighth Heaven ”. We ſhall ſee (*C*) what is related of his Brother.

* Ibid, pag. 215.

SOPHRONIA, is the Name that is given to a *Roman* Lady, whom *Euſebius* commends for her Courage and Chaſtity. I can't tell where ſome have found her Name; for *Euſebius* does not Name her in the † 14. Chapter of the 8. Book of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, nor in the 34. Chapter of the 1 Book of *Conſtantin*'s Life.

He

† *Moreri* quotes 17. after *Charles Stephens*, and many other Dictionaries

the Pure Notions of Honeſty wou'd not be their Principle. I muſt obſerve by the by, that 'tis very ſtrange they ſhou'd believe what is told of 'em concerning that Fatal Connexion. Is there no Man among 'em that grows Rich by unlawful means, or that is Wounded by endeavouring to ſave another Man's Life? I fancy, if they were preſs'd hard upon this Head, they wou'd come off with ſome Stoical Notions, *viz.* that Diſeaſes, Vexation, and Poverty are no Evils, and that Riches, Pleaſure and Health are not good things. I cou'd eaſily believe that the People do not follow that Opinion of a Natural Sympathy between Virtue and Happineſs, and between Vice and Miſery; and that it is only a Doctrine of their Men of Letters, who deny a Providence, and are ſenſible that 'tis an uſeful thing to preſerve the Common Opinion about Rewards and Puniſhments.

WHETHER the Admiration of an excellent Being, that can do neither good nor harm, may be of any uſe to make us Virtuous.

II. I come now to examin the other Part of the Objection. I grant, that a Man may admire and honour an Object without expecting any Reward for it, beſides, the ſatisfaction of doing Juſtice to Merit; but I cannot grant that any Man will invoke it, croſs his Inclinations, and offer Sacrifices to it in order to pleaſe it, and appeaſe its Anger, if he be well perſuaded, 1. That it concerns it ſelf with nothing; that the ill Lives of Men do not diſpleaſe it, and that their good Lives are not acceptable to it. 2. That there is no Being that can reward the Honours paid to that Object, nor puniſh Men for indulging their Paſſions. This is the ground of the Maxim I have advanced, *the belief of the Exiſtence of God without the belief of a Providence, cannot be an inducement to Virtue, nor a curb againſt Vice.* But, will ſome ſay, is it impoſſible for Men full of Admiration for an Excellent, Holy and Happy Being, that is Honoured all over the World, to propoſe it to themſelves as the Model of their Lives, and to croſs their bad Inclinations and uſe their utmoſt endeavours to Practice Virtue in order to Imitate it? I anſwer, they can do it, if they believe that this Painful Imitation will make 'em like that Being, or procure 'em another Glory of great Value. But then their Belief of the Divine Exiſtence will be attended with the Belief of a Providence: They'll believe, as the *Siameſe* and *Chineſe* do, that Nature has inſeparably United by a blind fatality Happineſs with Virtue, and Miſery with Vice, and that the Imitation of one *Sommona-Codom* will in time put 'em in a State like his; or they'll believe that an Intelligent Legiſlator has deſign'd a Reward for thoſe, who chuſe the Holy and Happy Life of the Immortal Gods for their Pattern. At leaſt, they'll hope that Mankind will be ſo Equitable as to admire their Virtue, and beſtow Glorious Rewards upon it, and that perhaps ſome time or other they ſhall be Deified. The Glory of *Miltiades* had a great influence over *Themiſtocles*, tho' *Themiſtocles* expected nothing from *Miltiades*; I grant it: Will any Body deny that at this Day the Memory of the *Alexanders* and *Cæſars* may have ſuch a Power over the Paſſions of ſome Men, as to make 'em undertake the moſt difficult things? And yet they are perſuaded that thoſe Conquerors know not what paſſes upon Earth, and can do neither good nor harm. I own it; but didn't *Themiſtocles* know that by imitating *Miltiades*, he wou'd attain to the ſame Glory with him? And if any one ſhou'd now tread in the ſteps of *Cæſar* and *Alexander*, cou'd he be Ignorant that Trophies, Panegyricks, and the Immortality of his Name wou'd be the Price and Reward of his Fatigues? And therefore all the Examples of the Power of Admiration and Imitation, that can be alledged, ſuppoſe the Exiſtence of a Cauſe, which Rewards the Admirer and the Imitator; and conſequently they are not contrary to my Aſſertion. Here is another Reflection. The Belief of the Divine Exiſtence, without a Belief of a Providence, ought not to be accounted an Inducement to Virtue, if whatever it can produce, may be produced by the meer Idea of what is Honeſt, and by the meer deſire of being Praiſed: But the meer Idea of what is Honeſt, and the meer deſire of being Praiſed may produce whatever the Admiration and Imitation of the Gods of *Epicurus* cou'd Effect. This is manifeſt if it be attentively conſidered. Therefore, &c. I have not been willing to take Advantage of this, *viz.* That a Follower of *Epicurus* cou'd not flatter himſelf, that by Imitating the Gods, he (*a*) wou'd be in time as Happy as they were: It had been an improper thing, ſince *M. du Rondel* does not ſuppoſe that *Epicurus* is alſo concern'd in the Objection. See the Margin (*b*).

(*B*) *His Soul aſcended into the Eighth Heaven.*] “ (*c*) 'Tis properly the Paradiſe call'd *Nyruppaam*: She is no longer Subject to Pain and “ Miſery, and enjoys a perfect Felicity; and therefore ſhe will never be Born again: this is what “ they call being Annihilated. For they don't underſtand by that word the entire Deſtruction of a “ thing, whereby it is reduced to nothingneſs; but “ they only mean that one appears no longer upon “ Earth tho' he lives in Heaven. As for his Body “ it was Burnt; and his Bones, as they ſay, have “ been preſerved to this preſent time. They are “ partly in the Kingdom of *Pegu*, and partly in “ that of *Siam*. They aſcribe a wonderful Virtue “ to thoſe Bones, and affirm that they Shine with “ a Divine Splendor ”. It may be infer'd from theſe laſt Words, that the Worſhip which the *Siameſe* pay to that God is attended with the hopes of ſome Advantage accruing from it.

(*C*) *What is related of his Brother.*] His (*d*) Name was *Thevathat*. (*e*) *He was always Born with his Brother* Sommonokhodom *of the ſame kind with him, but alwas inferior in Dignity, becauſe* Sommonokhodom *was the Prince of the Animals, whoſe figure he aſſumed. But* Thevathat *aſpiring likewiſe to become a God, and not being able to bear any thing above him, would never ſubmit to his Brother. On the contrary, he endeavoured by continual Revolts to diſturb his Reign, and left nothing unattempted to deprive him of the Empire: At laſt he accompliſh'd his deſign in ſome meaſure, for he kill'd him, when they were both Apes* (†)——(*f*) *Having a great deal of Wit and Addreſs he found a way to Form a new Sect, in which he engaged many Kings and Nations, who followed him to be his Imitators. This occaſion'd a Schiſm, which divided the World into two Parts, and gave Birth to two Religions, whereas before there was but one. Some——* adhered

to

(*a*) *Epicurus and his Followers taught that the Soul dies for ever with the Body.*

(*b*) *I propoſe this only as a Problem, which* M. du Rondel *may examin, and I deſire him to confute it as much as he'll think fit, for the further Inſtruction of my Readers.*

(*c*) Tachard Voiage de Siam B. 6. p. 215. Dutch Edition.

(*d*) Id. ib. pag. 206.

(*e*) Id. ib. pag. 206.

(†) This Tale ſeems to be derived from the Hiſtory of Cain and *Abel.*

(*f*) Id. ib. pag. 209.

He only ſays that the Lady was Married to the *Governor of Rome*, and that knowing that the Archers whom *Maxentius* made uſe of to bring him the Woman he intended to Raviſh, were already got into her Houſe with a Permiſſion extorted from her Husband, ſhe thruſt a Sword into her Breaſt, and made it appear by that Action, that nothing but Chriſtian Virtue is Invincible and Proof againſt Death. This is *Euſebius*'s Account. He does not ſay that ſhe *ask'd her Husband's leave, and God's Pardon for what ſhe was going to do*; nor that *the Church has given a Teſtimony of the Truth of her Martyrdom by the Declaration of her Holineſs*. They are meer Gloſſes, which *Moreri*, being deceived (*A*) by *Charles Stephens*, falſely aſcribes to that Hiſtorian.

SORANUS (QUINTUS VALERIUS) Flouriſh'd * in the VII. Century of *Rome*. He was eſteem'd for his Eloquence, but much more for his Learning, being the moſt Learned Man, that had (*B*) been ſeen among the Latin Authors. Tho' he was Born near † *Rome*, he had a Country Accent, which doubtleſs did ſome prejudice to

to Thevathat, *and others to* Sommonokhodom. *Thevathat, tho' the Younger Brother, finding himſelf ſupported by ſo many Princes, who undertook to defend him, made uſe of Forcible and Treacherous means to deſtroy his Brother, and invented the moſt horrid Calumnies to Blot his Reputation; but he did not ſucceed in his deſigns. Nay, he was overcome more than once, when in order to confirm his Followers in his Doctrine, he durſt contend with his Brother, who ſhou'd work the greateſt Miracles. His Ambition made him wiſh to be a God; but not being truly one, he was ignorant of many things, whereof his Brother had a perfect knowledge; and becauſe his Pride did not permit him to hear* Sommonokhodom, *he did not learn of him what paſt in Paradiſe and in Hell, nor the Doctrine of Tranſmigration, nor the Changes which had happen'd and were to happen in all Ages.* The *Siameſe* (a) *believe that the Doctrine* of Thevathat, *as a cauſe of Schiſm and Diviſion, has produced ſeven other Sects, which have a great affinity one with another* —— " (b) " *Thevathat* having done ſo many injuries to his " Brother, without any reſpect for the Rights of " Nature, and for the Deity it ſelf, it was juſt he " ſhou'd be puniſh'd for it. Accordingly the " Writings of the *Siameſe* mention his Puniſhment; " and *Sommonokhodom* ſays in thoſe Books, that being " made a God, he ſaw his Impious Brother in the " deepeſt part of Hell. I ſaw him, ſays he, over-" whelm'd with Evils, and Groaning under the " weight of Miſery. He was in the Eighth Abode, " in the place where the greateſt Malefactors are " Tormented, where he expiated by a Horrid Pu-" niſhment all the Sins he had Committed, eſpecially " the Injuries he had done me. Afterwards, ex-" plaining the Puniſhment inflicted upon *Thevathat*. " He ſays he was faſtened to a Croſs (c) with large " Nails, which piercing his Hands and his Feet, " gave him a violent Pain; that he had a Crown " of Thorns on his Head, that his Body was full of " Wounds, and to compleat his Miſery, the Infernal " Fire burnt him without conſuming him. He was " moved with Compaſſion at the ſight of ſuch a " dreadful Spectacle; he forgot all the Injuries his " Brother had done him, and cou'd not ſee him in " that Condition without reſolving to come to his " Aſſiſtance. In order to it, he propoſed to him to " adore theſe three Words *Pputhang*, *Thamang*, " *Sangkhang*: Sacred and Myſterious Words, for " which the *Siameſe* have a Profound Veneration; the " firſt whereof ſignifies God, the ſecond Word of " God, and the third Imitator of God. He promiſes " him, that if he wou'd accept ſuch reaſonable and " eaſy Terms, he wou'd deliver him from the Tor-" ments to which he was Condemn'd. *Thevathat* " conſented to adore the two firſt Words, but re-" fuſed to adore the third, becauſe it ſignified Prieſt " or Imitator of God, proteſting that Prieſts were " ſinful Men, who deſerved no reſpect. 'Tis for a Pu-" niſhment of ſuch a Pride that he is under ſufferings " to this Day, and will ſuffer in Hell for the ſpace " of many Years".

Judge by this whether the *Siameſe* can ſay, without Contradicting themſelves, that 'tis a God who has no Power. Do they not acknowledge that he can deliver from the moſt Horrid Torments of Hell thoſe, who accept the Conditions he Propoſes to them? If it be ſaid that this concerns the time when he was not yet in the Eighth Heaven; I'll Anſwer that the Example of *Thevathat* may make 'em afraid of being miſerable, if they don't conform to the Rules preſcribed to them by *Sommonokhodom*; and conſequently, their Worſhip is not free from Self-Intereſt. They fancy that the (d) Chriſtians are *Thevathat's* Diſciples, (e) *and they are ſo afraid of being thrown into Hell with* Thevathat, *if they follow his Doctrine, that they cannot be perſuaded to embrace Chriſtianity.*

(*A*) Moreri *being deceived by* Charles Stephens.] The Article of *Sophronia* being very ſhort in *Charles Stephens*, I ſhall ſet it down at length. *Sophronia matrona Romana, altera Lucretia Chriſtiana, cum vim Decii Principis videret ſe paſſuram, conſentiente viro arrepto gladio ſeipſam tranſfixit, ac inter ſanctas mulieres eſt relata. Euſeb. lib. 8. cap. 17.* *Moreri* had from thence that *Sophronia is call'd the Chriſtian Lucretia*; which is a Fault, for he gives too large a ſenſe to the Words of the Latin Dictionary. The words *conſentiente viro*, which ought to be referr'd to *paſſuram*, and not to *arrepto gladio*, was a Trap for *Moreri*; a Comma ill placed made him believe that this Lady did not kill her ſelf without asking her Husband's Permiſſion to do it, which is falſe. Perhaps, the Comma ſignifies nothing to the Matter; for if you put one next to *paſſuram*, and one next to *viro*, the Ambiguity will be the ſame. An exact Writer wou'd have placed *paſſuram* next to *viro*, and then the Reader wou'd not have been uncertain. I need not take notice of the other miſtakes. I ſhall only ſay that *Moreri* has not Tranſcribed all the miſtakes of *Charles Stephens*; he has left out *Decii Principis*, and put the Tyrant *Maxentius* in the Room of *Decius*. *Lloyd* and *Hofman* have not mended one Syllable. I wonder *Rivet* ſays, (*f*) that *Euſebius* tells us that *Sophronia* having pray'd to God upon her Knees, as it were to Sacrifice her Chaſtity to JESUS CHRIST, kill'd her ſelf in the preſence of the Tyrant *Maxentius*. From whence I learn that he is alſo one of thoſe, who quote from the Modern Writers, without conſulting the Originals: I had a better Opinion of him. I was not ſurpriſed that *Raviſius Textor* in his *Officina*, and *Decimator* in his *Sylva vocabulorum* had Committed the ſame Faults with *Charles Stephens*. Thoſe Authors did not think of verifying their Quotations. *Decimator* ſeems to me more exact than all the reſt as to the Alluſion to *Lucretia*; he does not ſay, as *Moreri* does, that *Sophronia* was call'd the Chriſtian *Lucretia*, but that ſhe might juſtly be call'd ſo: *Caſtitatis nomine celebris, ita ut altera Lucretia Chriſtiana non immerito dici poſſit.*

(*B*) *The moſt Learned Man* —— *he had a Country Accent.*] The Proof of this is to be found in the 3. Book *de Oratore*; where *Cicero* ſays that the moſt agreeable Pronunciation of the Greek Tongue was that of the *Athenians* (*g*). They ſpoke better without any Learning than the moſt Learned *Aſiaticks*: Which ought not to be underſtood as if their words had been better placed; it concerns only the tone of their Voice and their Accent. *Cicero* ſays the ſame of the *Romans*: He obſerves that the moſt Ignorant *Roman* ſurpaſs'd in that reſpect the Learned *Soranus*; I ſhou'd rather call him the moſt Learned Man of that time. (*b*) *Hanc dico ſuavitatem, quæ exit ex ore, quæ quidem ut apud Græcos Atticorum, ſic in latino ſermone hujus eſt urbis maxime propria* —— *Noſtri minus ſtudent literis quam latini, tamen ex iſtis quos noſtis, urbanis, in quibus minimum eſt literarum, nemo eſt quin literatiſſimum togatorum omnium Q. Valerium Soranum* to his Eloquence: He obſerved in his Works a (B) Method, which *Pliny* followed; he added ſeveral Summaries to his Books, whereby the Reader cou'd chuſe what he had a mind to, without giving himſelf the trouble of Reading every thing. 'Tis ſaid he was ſo bold as to divulge a Myſtery (C) which the *Romans* kept very ſecret; 'twas the Name of the Tutelar God of their City. 'Tis further ſaid that he was puniſh'd with Death upon that account. Perhaps he ought not to be diſtinguiſh'd from *Quintus* (D) *Valerius*, whom *Pompey* cauſed to be put

---

* See the Remark [A]

† See the Remark

(a) Id. ib. pag. 211.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 211,

This es 'em ve JE- S RIST not r from vathat, what firms m moſt that inion y are er chard's ds ib. 214) that we orſhip Image the cified iour, ch does fectly reſent Pu- ment icted n Thevathat.

(d) Id. ib. pag. 209.

(e) Id. ib. pag. 213.

(f) Euſeb. lib. 8. Hiſtoriæ refert de Sophronia præfecti Romanæ urbis uxore quod cum animadverteret maritum metu mortis perterritum, prodidiſſe pudicitiam ſuam Maxentio Tyranno, cum prius defixis genibus Deum oraſſet, tanquam pudicitiam ſuam Chriſto immolaturam, pectus coram eo ferro transfixiſſe. *Andr. Rivetus in Geneſ. Exercit. 73. oper tom. 1.* p. 281. *I have refer'd* coram eo *to* Maxentius; *perhaps it ſhould be referr'd to* Husband. Rivet *has committed a Solecism in this place.*

(g) Eruditiſſimos homines Aſiaticos quivis Athenienſis indoctus, non verbis, ſed ſono vocis, nec tam bene quam ſuaviter loquendo facile ſuperabit. *Cicero lib. 3. de Oratore fol. 90. D.*

(b) Id. ib.

Soranum lenitate vocis, atque ipſo oris preſſu & ſono facile vincat. Theſe words plainly inſinuate that *Soranus* was then Living; and therefore I had reaſon to ſay, that he Flouriſh'd in the VII. Century of *Rome*; for *Cicero* ſuppoſes that the Diſcourſes, which make up his work *de oratore*, were made in the *Year 662*. Many believe that this *Soranus* was a friend of *Cicero*, and underſtand the following Paſſage of him: (a) *Q. & D. Valerii Sorani, vicini & familiares mei non tam in dicendo admirabiles, quam docti & græcis literis & latinis.* What goes before, ſhews that thoſe two *Soranus's* were not born at *Rome*, but in the *Latium*. I believe they were Natives of *Sora*, a Town of that Country, according to *Pliny* and *Ptolemy* (b).

(B) *A Method which* Pliny *followed.*] Theſe are his words in his Preface to *Titus* Son of *Veſpaſian*: (c) *Quia occupationibus tuis publico bono parcendum erat, quid ſingulis contineatur libris huic epiſtolæ ſubjunxi: ſummaque cura, ne perlegendos eos haberes, operam dedi. Tu per hoc & aliis præſtabis ne perlegant: ſed ut quiſque deſideraverit aliquid, id tantum quærat & ſciat quo loco inveniat. Hoc ante me fecit in litteris noſtris Valerius Soranus, in libris quos* ἐποπτίδων *inſcripſit.* I muſt not forget the Note of Father *Hardouin*: (d) *Epoptides ſcripſerat, hoc eſt, ut Turnebus quidem intepretatur, de Grammatica libros: tanquam de myſteriis literarum & doctrina. Erant enim* ἐπόπται *qui ad inſpicienda ſacra occulta admittebantur.* 'Tis certain our *Soranus* wrote ſome Grammatical Books. See (e) *Varro*, (f) and *Aulus Gellius*.

(C) *To divulge a Myſtery———that he was puniſh'd with Death upon that account.*] *Pliny* does not ſay in expreſs Terms that *Soranus* divulged the Name of the Tutelar God of *Rome*; but it may be inferr'd from his words: (g) *Cujus* (Romæ) *nomen alterum dicere arcanis cærimoniarum nefas habetur: optimaque & ſalutari fide abolitum enunciavit Valerius Soranus luitque mox pœnas.* He ſays the City of *Rome* had two Names: One that was known to every Body; and the other ſo Myſterious that Religion did not permit it ſhou'd be Revealed, and that *Soranus* having divulged it, was immediately Puniſh'd for it. 'Tis not to be doubted that the Myſterious Name was the ſame with that of the Tutelar God of the Town, or (h) at leaſt, that it was look'd upon as a thing that protected it. *Solinus*, who Tranſcribes *Pliny*, took the liberty to ſpecify the Puniſhment inflicted upon *Soranus* for his Profanation: He ſays (i) that he was Condemn'd to Death; but confines himſelf to the unknown and myſterious Name of the City, and does not ſay it was the Name of the Tutelar God of *Rome*. I am going to quote two Authors, who are more formal upon this Point. (k) *Verum nomen ejus numinis quod urbi Romæ præeſſet, ſciri ſacrorum lege prohibetur, quod auſus quidam tribunus plebis enuntiare, in crucem levatus eſt.* This is the ground on which ſome (l) ſay that our *Soranus* was Tribune of the People, and Crucified. They are obliged to add ſomething of their own, for *Servius* names no Body. The other Paſſage, which I am to quote, is out of *Plutarch*. (m) Διὰ τί τὸν θεὸν ἐκεῖνον ᾧ μάλιστα τὴν Ῥώμην σῴζειν προσήκει ϗ φυλάττειν, εἴτε ἐστὶν ἄρρην εἴτε θήλεια, ϗ λέγειν ἀπείρηται ϗ ζητεῖν ϗ ὀνομάζειν; ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἀπόρρησιν ἐξάπτουσι δεισιδαιμονίας, ἱστοροῦντες Οὐαλέριον Σωρανὸν ἀπολέσθαι κακῶς διὰ τὸ ἐξειπεῖν. *Cur tutelarem Romæ Deum, maſne ſit an femina, dicere aut quærere, ejuſque nomen efferre nefas eſt? quod quidam interdictum a ſuperſtitione repetunt, narrantes Valerium Soranum male periiſſe, quod nomen illud edidiſſet.* Note, That according to *Plutarch*, none was allowed to inquire into the Sex or the Name of the Tutelar God of *Rome*. Note alſo, that ſome Authors find ſomething more Myſterious in *Soranus's* Puniſhment; for they ſay, that as ſoon as he uttered that Name, he fell Dead upon the place. They (n) affirm that this is to be found in *Pliny*, and ſeveral other Writers. *Pliny* ſays nothing of it. We ſhall ſee in the Remark *D* that perhaps *Soranus's* Indiſcretion was not the occaſion of his Death. Take notice of a great Miſtake in *Gyraldus*. Having ſaid, 1. That (o) *Pliny* and *Solinus* relate that *Valerius Soranus* (p) was Condemn'd to Death for being ſo bold as to pronounce the occult Name of *Rome*, 2. That (q) *Sempronius* wrote the ſame thing; he adds, that others affirm that this *Soranus* was Crucified, which occaſion'd the Worſhip of the Goddeſs *Angerona*, the Patroneſs of Silence. (r) *Alii in crucem ſublatum tradunt, &* PROPTEREA *cultam Deam Angeronam ſilentii præſidem.* It plainly appears from *Pliny* that it was a very Ancient Worſhip, grounded upon the Myſtery of the occult Name of *Rome*. (s) *Exemplum religionis* ANTIQUÆ *ob hoc maxime ſilentium inſtitutæ. Namque Diva Angerona, &c.* *Solinus* expreſſes himſelf more clearly ſtill: (t) *Inter* ANTIQUISSIMAS *ſane religiones Sacellum colitur Angeronæ.* There is hardly any Illuſion more dangerous than that of the Particles term'd *Cauſales* by the Grammarians. They have occaſion'd horrid Blunders in the moſt Learned Compilers; and when a Man goes about to give a different turn to what he Tranſcribes, and to ſhorten it as much as he can, he'll be apt to miſtake the Senſe of thoſe Particles, unleſs he be very attentive. The Learned *Gyraldus* was miſtaken for want of duly conſidering *Pliny's* words.

(D) *From* Quintus Valerius, *whom* Pompey *cauſed to be put to Death.*] If I am not miſtaken, *Plutarch* is the only Author who informs us of this particular. He ſays that *Pompey* being well informed of that Man's Learning, took him a ſide and walk'd with him. Note, that *Pompey* was then in *Sicily*, and actually judging the Criminals, that is, thoſe of *Marius's* Party who were to be put to Death. When he ſaw *Quintus Valerius* brought to the Tribunal, he roſe up to diſcourſe with him in Private; but as ſoon as he knew of him what he deſired to know, he ordered him to be kill'd. *Plutarch* relates this only upon the credit of an Author, whom he (u) miſtruſts as to thoſe things which concern'd the Friends or Enemies of *Cæſar*. (x) Γάϊος δὲ Ὄππιος, ὁ Καίσαρος ἑταῖρος, ἀπανθρώπως φησὶ ϗ Κοΐντῳ Οὐαλερίῳ χρήσασθαι τὸν Πομπήϊον. ἐπιστάμενον γὰρ ὡς ἔστι φιλολόγος ἀνὴρ ϗ φιλομαθὴς ἐν ὀλίγοις ὁ Οὐαλέριος, ὡς ἤχθη πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐπισπασάμενον ϗ συμπεριπατήσαντα, ϗ πυθόμενον ὧν ἔχρῃζε ϗ μαθόντα, προστάξαι τοῖς ὑπηρέταις εὐθὺς ἀνελεῖν ἀπαγαγόντας. *Addit C. Oppius Cæſaris familiaris ſævum Pompeium etiam in Q. Valerium extitiſſe: quum enim ſciret humanitatis & literarum inter paucos ſtudioſum Valerium, ut actus ad ipſum eſt, ſeduxiſſe illum & deambulaſſe una, ubi accepit & didicit ab eo quæ cupiebat, imperaſſe lictoribus ut ilicò auferrent eum & interficerent.* May not one ſuppoſe, 1. That it was upon this occaſion that our *Soranus* divulged the unknown Name of the City of *Rome*? 2. That *Oppius* omitted this particular, not to afford a pretence to excuſe *Pompey*? For if it might have been alledged that *Soranus* revealed to him ſuch a Secret, he who cauſed him to be put to Death might have been cleared, and his ſeverity might have been look'd upon as an act of Devotion, and a Holy Zeal againſt Profane Men. I affirm nothing, and leave it to the Judgment of the Criticks. I ſhall only ſay, that 'tis not to be imagin'd that *Pompey* had a mind to learn of him ſome Political Secrets, and ſome Intrigues of *Marius*; for his deſire of having a private Diſcourſe with him, was only grounded upon his knowing that he was a Man of great Learning. *Plutarch* obſerves it in expreſs words. Now 'tis certain that the knowledge of Philoſophy and the ſtudy of Antiquity enabled *Soranus* to diſcover to *Pompey* a Religious Secret, an unknown Law, an old Ceremony, but not the

(a) Idem in Bruto p. m. 283.

(b) *See* Corradus in Brutum Ciceronis pag. 284.

(c) Plinius in præfat. in fine.

(d) Harduin. in hunc locum Plinii.

(e) Varro de lingua Latina l. 6. p. m. 71.

(f) Aulus Gellius lib. 2. c. 10.

(g) Plinius lib 3. cap. 5. pag. m. 330, 331.

(h) *See the Paſſage of* Macrobius *in the Remark* E.

(i) Valerium denique Soranum, quod contra interdictum id eloqui auſus foret ob meritum profanæ vocis neci datum. Solin. c. 1, p. 1.

(k) Servius in 1. lib. Georg. v. 499.

(l) Vives in Auguſt. de civit. Dei l. 7. c. 9.

(m) Plut. in quæſt. Roman. p. 278. E.

put to Death. I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the reaſon why the *Romans* (E) conceal'd the Name of their Tutelar God, has little Solidity in it. It appears from two Verſes of *Soranus*, which are ſtill Extant, that he believed that God is the Immanent Cauſe of all things. That Opinion does not differ (F) from *Spinoziſm*. I ſhall alſo obſerve why * ſome think that he was Tribune of the People. I make no doubt that he was related to *D. Valerius* SORANUS, who, as well as he, made himſelf more conſiderable for † his Learning, than for the beauty of his Diſcourſes.

(*) *In the Remark C.*

(†) *See in the Remark A.*

SOUBISE,

the moſt Private Intrigues of *Marius*'s Factions. Beſides, 'tis not improbable that, as things ſtood then, *Pompey* was willing to know the occult Name of *Rome*. His Party, which was that of *Sylla*, had lately taken that Town. Was *Pompey* ſure that the other Party wou'd never Conquer it again? Did not *Pompey* ſee that the Republick wou'd be expoſed to Civil Wars? Was he not ſenſible of his Ambition? Cou'd he think that the diſcovery of the Name of the Tutelar God wou'd be of no uſe to him? However it be, if *Quintus Valerius* in *Plutarch*, and *Soranus* in *Pliny* are one and the ſame Man, which is very likely, there is little reaſon to ſay that the Profane Indiſcretion of the Man, who divulged the unknown Name of *Rome*, was immediately Puniſh'd; for according to *Plutarch* he was Puniſh'd as one of *Marius*'s Accomplices. 'Tis not true that *Plutarch* calls him a (a) Philoſopher. (b) *Ludovicus Vives*, *Charles Stephens*, *Lloyd* and *Hofman* are in the wrong to ſay ſo. Note, that *Florus* reckons the Death of the Prætor *Soranus* among the Cruel Actions of *Sylla*'s Party. *Piget poſt hæc referre*, ſays he (c), *ludibrio habita fata Carbonis, fata Sorani prætoris*, &c. This might be of ſome uſe to thoſe, who wou'd prove that our *Soranus* was Prætor, and the ſame *Valerius* whom *Pompey* cauſed to be put to Death.

(E) *The Reaſon why the* Romans *conceal'd the Name of their Tutelar God, has little Solidity in it.*] They had Conjured upon ſome occaſions the Tutelar Gods of other Towns, and were afraid the like wou'd be done to them. This was the reaſon why they were not willing that the Name of their Patron ſhou'd be known. They hoped the Ignorance of that Name wou'd ſecure his Protection to them, as the *Tyrians* believed they might keep their Gods from removing by loading 'em with Chains. This is one of *Plutarch*'s Anſwers to the Queſtion above mention'd. (d) Πότερον, ὡς τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν τινὲς ἱστορήκασιν, ἐκκλήσεις εἰσὶ καὶ γοητεῖαι θεῶν· αἷς νομίζοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεούς τινας ἐκκεκλῆσθαι παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων καὶ μετῳκηκέναι πρὸς αὑτούς, ἐφοβοῦντο τὸ αὐτὸ παθεῖν ὑφ' ἑτέρων; ὥσπερ οὖν Τύριοι δεσμοὺς ἀγάλμασι λέγονται περιβαλεῖν, ἕτεροι δὲ αἰτεῖν ἐγγυητὰς ἐπὶ λουτρὸν ἢ καθαρμόν τινα προπέμποντες, οὕτως ᾤοντο Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ τὸ ἄγνωστον ἀσφαλέστατον εἶναι θεῷ καὶ βεβαιότατον φρουράν. *An quia, ut nonnulli rerum Romanarum ſcriptores tradunt, carmina quædam ſunt & præſtigiæ quibus dii eliciuntur: quibus uſi Romani cùm putarent ſe quoſdam hoſtium deos ad ſe traduxiſſe, cavere voluerunt ne idem ſibi ab aliis eveniret? Itaque ſicut Tyrii* (†) *vincula injicere ſimulacris dicuntur, alii autem cùm ea ad lavacrum aut luſtrationem aliquam deducunt, fidejuſſores pro reditu exigunt: ita Romani tutiſſimè ac conſtantiſſimè adſervari deum crediderunt, qui neque de nomine notus aliis eſſet.* I have found in *Pliny* a Paſſage ſo full of Particulars, that the Reader will be well pleaſed to find it here: (e) *Verrius Flaccus auctores ponit, quibus credat, in oppugnationibus ante omnia ſolitum a Romanis ſacerdotibus evocari Deum, cujus in tutela id oppidum eſſet: promittique illi eundem, aut ampliorem apud Romanos cultum. Et durat in Pontificum diſciplina id ſacrum: conſtatque ideo occultatum, in cujus Dei tutela Roma eſſet, ne qui hoſtium ſimili modo agerent.* *Macrobius* informs us of two things: One is, (f) that every Town is under the Protection of a God, and that the *Romans* perceiving that it was likely the Towns they Beſieged, wou'd be obliged to Surrender, Conjured their Tutelar Gods, whether they believed they cou'd not take a Town without it, or becauſe they thought it an Impious thing to make the Gods Priſoners. The other is, that for theſe Reaſons they conceal'd the Name of the Tutelar God of *Rome*, and the Latin Name of that Town. He adds, that the Name of that Deity was nevertheleſs ſeen in the Books of ſome Ancients. 'Tis true they mention'd it differently; but as for the Occult Name of *Rome*, it was never known, no not to the moſt Learned Men, for the *Romans* took an effectual care to prevent their being treated as they had treated others, by conjuring the Gods who protected them. (g) *Propterea ipſi Romani & deum in cujus tutela urbs Roma eſt ut ipſius urbis Latinum nomen ignotum eſſe voluerunt, ſed dei quidem nomen nonnullis antiquorum licet inter ſe diſſidentium libris inſitum: & ideo vetuſta perſequentibus quidquid de hoc putatur innotuit---Ipſius vero urbis nomen etiam doctiſſimis ignotum eſt, caventibus Romanis ne quod ſæpe adverſus urbes hoſtium feciſſe ſe noverant idem ipſi quoque hoſtili evocatione paterentur, ſi tutelæ ſuæ nomen divulgaretur.* I wonder *Macrobius* did not know what *Pliny* and *Plutarch* relate of *Soranus*. He knew it not, ſince he ſays the Myſterious Name of *Rome* was always unknown even to the moſt Learned Men. I wonder alſo at his diſtinction between the Tutelar God of *Rome*, and the unknown Name of that City, to which he aſcribes likewiſe the ſame Protection. But I wonder more ſtill, that having ſaid what I have juſt now mention'd, he ſhou'd give us the Formulary of conjuring Tutelar Gods; for it appears by that Formulary that there was no neceſſity to know the Name or the Sex of the Deities who protected a Town. They conjured them without naming them, and with this Clauſe, *Whether you be a God or a Goddeſs.* (h) *Eſt autem carmen hujuſmodi, quo di evocantur cum oppugnatione civitas cingitur:* SI. DEUS. SI. DEA. EST. CUI. POPOLUS. CIVITAS. QUE. KARTHAGINIENSIS. EST. IN. TUTELA. TE. QUE. MAXIME. ILLE. QUI. URBIS. HUIUS. POPOLI. QUE. TUTELAM. RECEPISTI. PRECOR. VENEROR. QUE. VENIAM. QUE. A. VOBIS. PETO. UT. VOS. POPOLUM. CIVITATEM. QUE. KARTHAGINIENSEM. DESERATIS. LOCA. TEMPLA. SACRA. URBEM. QUE. EORUM. RELINQUATIS. ABSQUE. HIS. ABEATIS, &c. Was not I in the right to ſay that the reaſon why the *Romans* kept the Name of the Tutelar God ſecret, was not a ſolid one? They knew not the Names nor even the Sex of the Tutelar Gods they Conjured, and yet they Conjured them; and therefore, what did it avail them that their Enemies ſhou'd not know the Name of the God who was the Protector of *Rome*, or the True Name of that City? Cou'd this prevent practiſing againſt the *Romans* what they had practiced againſt other Towns? *Macrobius* is leſs excuſable than the other Writers, ſince in the very ſame Page where he ſpeaks as they do, he mentions a Formulary of Conjuring which confutes what he ſays. 'Tis certain that the Conditional Particle *ſi Deus*, *ſi Dea*, undeniably proves that they knew not the Name of the God whom they Conjured; for *Varro* affirms that they uſed thoſe words, when they were afraid of miſtaking the Name of a Deity for that of another. They made uſe of 'em when they offered Sacrifices upon occaſion of an Earthquake; becauſe they knew not the Name of the God, who was the cauſe of ſuch a Calamity. *Aulus Gellius* is my Author for it. (i) *Propterea*, that is, becauſe the Name of that God was unknown, *veteres Romani* —— *ubi terram moviſſe ſenſerant, nunciatumve erat, ferias ejus rei cauſa edicto imperabant; ſed dei nomen, ita uti ſolet, cui ſervari ferias oporteret, ſtatuere & edicere quieſcebant; ne, alium pro alio nominando, falſa religione populum alligarent. eas ferias ſi quis polluiſſet, piaculoque ob hanc rem opus eſſet, hoſtiam,* SI. DEO. SI. DEAE. *immolabat. idque ita ex decreto pontificum obſervatum eſſe M. Varro dicit: quoniam & qua vi & per quem deorum dearumve terra tremeret incertum eſſet.*

(F) *That Opinion does not differ from* Spinoziſm.]

(a) He … calls him a Philoſo… pher and … a Phi… loſopher.

(b) Lud. Vives in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei lib. 7. c. 9.

(c) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 21.

(d) Plut. in quaſt. Roman. pag. 278, 279.

(†) See … Quintus Curtius lib. 4. cap. … n. 22. & … Freinſ… mius.

(e) Plin. … 28 c. 2. … 119, … 20.

(f) Con… omnes … es in … cujus … i eſſe … tela, … morem… e Ro… norum … anum … multis … otum … iſſe, ut, … m ob… derent … bem … ſtium … m que … m capi … ſſe con… derent, … rto car… ine evo… rent tu… lares … os: quod … aliter … bem … pi poſſe … n cre… rent, aut … poſſet … fas æſti… arent … os ha… re cap… vos. … acrob. … turnal. … 3. cap. … pag. m. … 3.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) Macrobius ubi ſupra. *He ſays he takes it from the fifth Book* rerum reconditarum *of* Sammonicus Serenus, *who had found it in an old Book of* Furius.

(i) Aulius Gellius lib. 2. cap. 28.

SOUBISE, a Town in *Saintonge*. Many Perſons of Quality had their Name from it. In 1575, it fell to the Houſe of *Rohan* by the Marriage of *Catherine de Parthenai*, Daughter and Heireſs of *John de Parthenai L'Archeveſque*, with *Renatus de Rohan* II. of that Name. This *John de Parthenai*, known by the Name of *Soubiſe*, will make the Subject of the following Article.

SOUBISE (*John de Parthenai* Lord of) is one of the Heroes of the XVI. Century among the Proteſtants of *France*. He began to know their Doctrine at the Court * of the Duke of *Ferrara*; when *Renata* of *France*, Daughter of *Lewis* XII. and Wife of that Duke, received there ſome Preachers of the Reform'd Religion, and embraced their Opinions. Being return'd into *France*, he zealouſly (*A*) endeavoured to propagate his Doctrine; and *Catherine* (*B*) *de Medicis* was like to become his Proſelyte. In the very beginning of the *Criſis*, which made the War unavoidable between both Religions in 1562. he was one of the moſt conſiderable Aſſociates of the Prince of *Condé*, who choſe him to Command at *Lyons*, when that great Town, which had declar'd for the Cauſe, did not ſeem to be in good Hands under Baron *des Adrets*. *Soubiſe* wonderfully juſtify'd the Choice that was made of him to keep ſuch a Place; for notwithſtanding all the Difficulties he went through, he preſerved it, and gave a good Account of it. He perform'd many † Noble Actions. The Duke of *Nemours* Beſieged that Town to no purpoſe, and the Queen Mother endeavoured in vain || to ſurpriſe him by Negotiations. He was very much ſuſpected of having a Hand in the Murder of the Duke of *Guiſe*; and it appears that *Poltrot* laid many things to his charge in his Depoſitions: Nevertheleſs, 'tis the Opinion of the moſt Equitable (*C*) Writers of the Church of *Rome*, that he was not concern'd in that abominable Action. He had been β Gentleman of the King's Chamber, and was made Knight γ of the Order the 7th of *December* 1561. He had Commanded the Army of *Henry* II. in (*D*) *Tuſcany*, and to uſe *Le Laboureur*'s δ Words, he was a Leading and very Serviceable Man. He died in ε 1566, being ζ about 54 Years of Age. He had Married *Antoinette Bouchard*, Eldeſt Daughter of the Houſe of *Aubeterre*. She was a Lady (*E*) very Zealous for her Religion. They left but one Daughter, *viz.* *Catherine de Parthenai*, whom I have mention'd in Her Article.

I need only quote a Paſſage of St. *Auguſtin* to prove this. (*a*) *Jovem ut Deus ſit, & maxime ut rex deorum, non alium poſſunt exiſtimare, quam mundum: ut in diis cæteris ſecundum iſtos ſuis partibus regnet. In hanc ſententiam etiam quoſdam verſus Valerii Sorani exponit idem Varro, in eo libro, quem ſeorſum ab iſtis de cultu deorum ſcripſit, qui verſus hi ſunt.*

Jupiter omnipotens regum rex ipſe (*b*), deuſque
Progenitor, genitrixque deûm, deus unus, & omnis.

Exponuntur autem in eodem libro, ita ut eum marem exiſtimarent, qui ſemen emitteret, fœminam quæ acciperet: Jovemque eſſe mundum, & eum omnia ſemina ex ſe emittere, & in ſe recipere, qua cauſa, inquit, ſcripſit Soranus: Jupiter progenitor genitrixque: nec minus cum cauſa unum & eundem omnia eſſe. Mundus enim unus, & in eo uno omnia ſunt.

(*A*) *He zealouſly endeavoured to Propagate.*] The Author of the Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches in *France*, makes the following Obſervation concerning the Reformation of the Town of *Soubiſe*. (*c*) " As " for the Town of *Soubiſe*, the Lord of that place, " who was a Man of an extraordinary Piety, had ſo " ordered it, that many People were already very " well inſtructed. Which the (*d*) Old Man perceiving, " ſo earneſtly laboured in the Work of the " Lord, that every body look'd upon his Labours " as a wonderful thing. He never ſlept in the " Night, becauſe they durſt not meet in the Day " time, and he went through all the adjacent places, " being often obliged to make his Eſcape into the " Woods, where he ſpent whole Nights. In ſhort, " the Lord did ſo effectually employ him in his " Work, that in a little time a great part of the " People forſook the Maſs in the Neighbouring " Country.

(*B*) Catherine de Medicis *was like to become his Proſelyte.*] I ſhall quote an Author (*e*), who read a Manuſcript Life of *Soubiſe*, wherein doubtleſs he found many particulars. The Admiral, *ſays he*, was only miſtaken " in believing that *Catherine de Medicis* " was a Calviniſt in her Heart; but any body " elſe would have been deceived in it. *Soubiſe* ac- " quainted him with the long Conferences he daily " had with that Princeſs about Calviniſm. He aſ- " ſured him that ſhe was as well inſtructed in it " as the Queen of *Navarre*. He ſuppoſed at leaſt, " that ſhe was no leſs inclin'd to it——— The " Dutcheſs of *Montpenſier* was always preſent at " thoſe Converſations, and ſeem'd to be ſo well per- " ſuaded of *Soubiſe*'s Diſcourſes, that ſhe oppoſed, " as much as ſhe could, the Deſign of her Hus- " band, who intended to put into a Nunnery their " three laſt Daughters——— And indeed the " Dutcheſs being at the Point of death, when Diſſi- " mulation can be of no uſe, ſent for *John Malot*, " a Miniſter of *Paris*, and deſired to receive the Sa- " crament in the Calviniſtical way, which was de- " nied her." *Varillas* informs us in another (*f*) place, that *Soubiſe*, *who left the Queen at laſt, being weary of her Delays, affirm'd, that tho' ſhe wanted Courage to declare her ſelf a Calviniſt, ſhe wou'd not be unwilling to be forced to it.* He had ſome reaſon to think ſo, witneſs what ſhe ſaid (*g*), when ſhe heard the falſe News that the Proteſtants had won the Battle of *Dreux*, *Well, we muſt pray to God in French*; to which I add, the great Fondneſs ſhe ſhewed *to the Friends of the New Opinions.* She wou'd have quickly reſolved to abjure Popery, if it had been worſted, and to procure to *Soubiſe* the glory of a great Converter. *Varillas* owns (*h*) that ſhe *ſided with the Catholick Party more out of Neceſſity than out of Choice.*

(*C*) *'Tis the Opinion of the moſt equitable Writers.*] *Le Laboureur* made no Scruple to Publiſh theſe Remarkable Words. (*i*) " Admiral *de Chatillon*, " Count *de la Rouchefoucaut*, and the Sieurs *de* " *Soubiſe* and *Feuquieres* had no hand in *Poltrot*'s " Conſpiracy——— One cannot believe ſuch a " thing of Men of their Quality, and it is ſo ill " proved by the Interrogatories of the Murderer, " that 'tis plain, his only Deſign in accuſing them " was to make the World believe, that ſome Lead- " ers of a Faction that was actually in Arms, had " a hand in that Plot.

(*D*) *The Army of* Henry II. *in* Tuſcany.] If we believe *Brantome*, he was brought into Trouble when he had that Employment. That Hiſtorian ſays (*k*) that *M. de Soubiſe being accuſed by the* Sieneſe *of many things he had done in* Tuſcany, *when he was employed there in King* Henry's *Reign, the Duke of* Guiſe *interceded for him.* I cannot tell why *Varillas* (*l*) clears and paraphraſes thoſe Words in the following manner. *After the War of* Siena, *in which 'twas ſaid that* Soubiſe *had been guilty of a Miſdemeanor, both as to the War, and the Diſtribution of Money, ſome Accuſations were brought againſt him, tending to deprive him of his Honour and Life; but the Duke of* Guiſe *openly Protected him.*

(*E*) *A Lady very Zealous for her Religion.*] A Report being ſpread that the Catholicks deſign'd to take her, to carry her to the Gates of *Lyons*, and to threaten to ſtab her and her Daughter in the ſight of her Huſband, if he refuſed to Surrender that Place; *Soubiſe* ſent to her *Poltrot*, who came back with

---

* *Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſ.* l. [illegible] towards the End.

† See *Varillas Hiſt. de Charl. IX.* tom. 1. pag. 212, 215. Dutch Edition. But ſee particularly *Beza hiſt.* Eccleſ. l. 11.

|| *Varil. ib.* pag. 225.

β *Beza l.* 3. p. 257.

γ *Le Laboureur Add.* t. to *Caſtelin.* tom. 1. pag. 378.

δ *Labour. ib.* p. 804.

(*a*) Auguſtin. de civitate Dei lib. 7. c. 9. pag. m. 637.

(*b*) *There is in the Old Manuſcripts as* Ludovicus Vives *obſerves*, rerumque deumque, *and I find the ſame reading in the* 11. *Chapt. of the ſame Book of* St. Auguſtin *in my Edition.*

(*c*) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 2. ad. ann. 1559. pag. 199.

(*d*) *He means a Miniſter, call'd* Michael Mulot *who was above* 60 *Years old.*

(*e*) Varillas Hiſt. de Charl. IX. tom. 1. pag. 60.

Article. The First Husband ſhe had, *viz.* the Baron *du Pont* in *Bretagne*, took the Name of SOUBISE: 'Tis he who makes a glorious Figure in the moſt remarkable Operations of the Second and Third Civil Wars. He was made Priſoner * at the Battle of *Jarnac* in 1569; but he made his Eſcape. *La Noue* being Wounded at the Siege of *Fontenai-le-Comte* the Year following †, *Soubiſe* Commanded in Chief, and made himſelf Maſter of the Place. In the ſame Year he receiv'd two Wounds at the Siege of *Saintes* ‖. He was kill'd during (*F*) the *Paris* Maſſacre, after he had Defended himſelf like a Lion. The Ladies β were curious to ſee what ground there was for the γ Action that was brought againſt him. I ſpeak of it in another place δ.

SOUBISE (BENJAMIN DE ROHAN, DUKE (*A*) OF) Grand-Son of the fore-going, and Son of *Renatus de Rohan* II. of that Name, and of *Catherine de Parthenai*, ſeconded ſtoutly the Enterpriſes of the Duke of *Rohan* his Brother, either to relieve *Rochelle*, or to maintain the Proteſtant Party in *France*. He had learn'd the Art of War in *Holland*, under Prince *Maurice*, and he was one of the *French* Gentlemen ε who threw themſelves into *Bergue*, when the *Spaniards* Beſieged that Place in the Year 1606. He ſuſtain'd the Siege of *St. Jean d'Angely* in 1621, againſt an Army commanded by *Lewis XIII*, and when he Surrendred the Place, obtain'd an Amneſty for what was paſt, upon Promiſe (*B*) of Obedience for the time to come. Nevertheleſs he made himſelf Maſter of *Royan* towards the latter end of the ſame Year. In *February* 1622, he ſeized *Olonne*, and was ſo fully Maſter of the Country in the Lower *Poitou*, that his Parties went and made ſome Priſoners five Leagues from *Nantes*. He was not long uppermoſt, for he was ſo vigorouſly attack'd in the Iſle (*C*) of *Rié*, ſoon after he had ſubdued it, that all his Forces were ſcattered. He retir'd to *Rochelle*, where the Inhabitants expreſſed ſome Contempt and Diſſatisfaction againſt him; which moved him to go the ſooner into *England* to ask for Succours. The Court of *France* being inform'd of it, he was declared Guilty of High Treaſon the 15th of *July* 1622. He found a way to fit out ſome Ships, notwithſtanding the Refuſal of his Britannick Majeſty; but they were caſt away at *Plimouth*. In the beginning of ζ the Year 1625, he took Poſſeſſion of the Iſle of *Ré*, and made an Attempt upon *Blavet* or *Port-Louis* in *Bretagne*, in which he had but an imperfect Succeſs; for 'twas commonly his Fate (*D*) not to be very Fortunate in the vaſt Projects he formed. He took the Port and ſix Men of War he found in it; the Landing Forces took the Town, but meeting with ſome Reſiſtance in the Fort,

* *D'Aubigné* tom. I. p. 291.
† [illegible] *hist.* [illegible] l. 5.
‖ *D'Aubigné ib.* pag. 475.
β *Ib. ib.* pag. 540.
γ 'Twas a Proceſs about Impotency.
δ In the Article *Quellenec*, and in the Remark C. of the Article *Parthenai.*
ε *Grotius Ann. l.* 15.
ζ This Event is placed in the Year 1624, in the *Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu.*

with ſome Letters of that Lady, "wherein ſhe entreated him to ſuffer 'em both to be kill'd, and "to remain faithful to his Party (*a*). "She was a "worthy Wife of a Man, who (*b*) expreſs'd an unſurmountable Averſion for all ſeperate Treaties, "and proteſted he would never ſign none but ſuch "as ſhould be Sign'd with the Prince of *Condé's* "Hand." She was likewiſe a worthy Siſter of the Viſcount *d'Aubeterre*, who forſook all for the Proteſtant Religion, and ſubmitted to a very hard Life. *Brantome* ſpeaks of him in the following manner. "(*c*) He was a Refugée at *Geneva*, and "a Button-maker by his Trade; for there was a "Law in that Town, that every Body ſhould have "a Trade and live by it, tho' he were a Gentleman "or a Lord. The ſaid *Aubeterre*, tho' a Man of "a Noble Family, was a Button-maker: I ſaw him "once, as I went through *Geneva*, very poor and "miſerable. Afterwards he was taken, during the "Conſpiracy of *Amboiſe*, and Condemn'd like the "reſt; but the Duke of *Guiſe*, at the Requeſt of "*Marechal de St. André*, procured him his Pardon." Some have ſaid, (*d*) that by the recommendation of the Lady *de Soubiſe*, Counſellor *Fumée* was ſet at Liberty, when he run the ſame Danger as Counſellor *du Bourg*; but others (*e*) aſcribe it to the Expedients ſuggeſted by *Soubiſe* to the Queen Mother, who *had been kind to him long before. Catharina,* they are (*f*) *Thuanus*'s words, *in gratiam Joannis Parthenai Subiſæ reguli ſibi percari, & Fumeo amiciſſimi ſua commendatione apud judices illius cauſam non parum ſublevaſſe creditur.* 'Tis very likely, *d'Aubigné* took the Wife for the Husband.

(*F*) *Was kill'd during the* Paris *Maſſacre.*] *Varillas* ſays, that after *Poltrot*'s Attempt, Soubiſe *went but once to Court, which he left before he had been obſerved, being afraid that the* Guiſes *were not perſuaded of the Truth of what was Publiſh'd, to invalidate the Depoſition of an Aſſaſſin, who had been his Domeſtick.* If this be true, he would not have gone to the King of *Navarre*'s Wedding, if he had been living; and it wou'd be a new Proof that *Soubiſe* mention'd by *d'Aubigné*, was the Baron *du Pont* (*g*).

(*A*) *Duke of.*] I give him that Title in imitation of the Author, who Publiſh'd the Life of the Duke of *Rohan* in 1666. That Writer follows the common Road. Nevertheleſs, 'tis certain, that the Lordſhip of *Soubiſe* was never erected into a Dutchy, and that the Geographer *du Val* (*h*), who affirms it, does it without Reaſon. 'Tis an Abuſe that prevails in the Noble Families of *France*, to annex ſometimes one Title, and ſometimes another to a Seat, without expecting Letters of Erection. Don't we ſee that the Sons of Dukes bear, under the Title of Marquiſate, the Name of the Seats of which their Fathers ſtyle themſelves Dukes? Nay, there are ſome Seats that belong no longer to a Family, and yet the Perſons belonging to that Family take the Name of thoſe Seats; one calls himſelf *Marquiſs*, another *Count*, another *Viſcount* or *Baron*, &c. of thoſe Seats. *Le Laboureur* (*i*) does mightily exclaim againſt it.

(*B*) *Upon promiſe of Obedience for the time to come.*] The Author who anſwered this Duke of *Soubiſe*'s Manifeſto in 1625, pretends, (*k*) that the Duke asked the King's Pardon when he came out of *St. Jean d'Angely*, and *ſwore to be for ever his moſt faithful Subject and Servant; to bear Arms no longer againſt his Service, upon any Pretence whatſoever, and to adhere no more to the Aſſociations and Aſſemblies that ſhould be made without his Majeſty's Authority.* He pretends alſo that the *Proteſtant Hiſtorians took care not to inſert in their Hiſtories the Oath taken by* M. de Soubiſe, *and thoſe that came out of* St. Jean d'Angely, *with him, but that 'tis to be found in the Records of the Provoſtſhip of the* Hôtel, *and in the Memoirs of the Sieur* de Modene, *Great Provoſt of* France, *Printed at* Toulouſe *in the Year* 1621.

(*C*) *In the Iſle of* Rié] *M. de Puyſegur* has confounded that Defeat with the Loſs which the Duke of *Soubiſe* ſuſtain'd in the Iſle of *Ré* in the Year 1625. *After the Siege of* Montpellier, ſays he (*l*), *there was no War againſt the Proteſtants for the ſpace of Four Years. The King cauſed a Fort to be built near* Rochelle——— *and then he went into the Iſle of* Ré *with his Army commanded by the Prince of* Condé. *The Duke of* Soubiſe, *who had Four Thouſand Men in that Iſland, was beaten.* Thus you ſee how the reſemblance of Names occaſions Anachroniſms. The Victory of the Iſle of *Rié*, wherein *Lewis* XIII was in Perſon, was obtain'd before the Siege of *Montpellier*; but neither he nor the Prince of *Condé* were preſent at that of *Ré*, which happen'd after that Siege.

(*D*) *Not to be very Fortunate.*] If this was the only thing charged upon him in the Relations of the Catholick

(*a*) *The Manuſcript life of* Soubiſe ... Va- ... Charl. ... tom. 11 ... pag. 331. (*b*) Va- ... ibid. ... pag. 277. ... occa- ... of the ... des ... Lettres ... the ... Dauphi- ... and to ... to have ... Soubiſe's ... (*d*) Me- ... 3. ... du ... de ... (*e*) D'Au- ... tom. ... p. 123. ... La ... de ... II. ... 147. ... hiſt. ... l. 3. ... 257. ... Thu- ... l. 23.

(*h*) *In his Book, Intitl'd* la France, *in the Chapt. of* Xaintonge.

(*i*) *Addit. to* Caſtelnau's *Memoirs* tom. 2. p. 793.

(*k*) Mercure Fr. tom. 11. pag. 262.

(*l*) Memoir. pag. 37. *Dutch* Edit.

Fort, he Re-imbarkt his Troops, and went away, not (E) without leaving ſome Ships that run a-ground. One of thoſe he took, call'd the *Virgin Mary*, carried Eighty Guns, and coſt above Two Hundred Thouſand Crowns. He had the Vexation of being diſown'd by the Proteſtants, tho' it was not doubted that he had Concerted every thing with the Duke of *Rohan* his Brother, in the Conferences he had with him at *Caſtres*, in the Autumn of the Year 1624. He Publiſh'd a Manifeſto, which was aſcribed to *La Milletiere*, who ſtyled himſelf *Intendant of the Churches Admiralty*: And 'till he ſhould find a proper time to make a Deſcent near *Bourdeaux*, he made himſelf Formidable by taking many Merchant-men, and kept all the Coaſt in Awe from the Mouth of the *Garonne* to the Mouth of the *Loire*. He came into the *Garonne* the 11th of *June* 1625 with a Fleet of Seventy Four Sail, and making a Deſcent into *Medoc*, poſſeſt himſelf of *Caſtillon*. After all, this Undertaking ſignified but little; he was quickly obliged to return into the Iſle of *Ré*, from whence advancing ſome Days after towards the Fleet of the Enemies, he Burnt (F) the *Dutch* Admiral, which made the Court haſten the Preparations that were making to clear that Coaſt. The Duke of *Montmorency* Admiral of *France*, ſupported by the *Dutch* Ships, beat *Soubiſe*'s Fleet. He was expell'd from the Iſle of *Ré*, and then from that of *Oleron*, and forced to retire into *England* *. He was there very Inſtrumental to procure to the *Rochelois* the Succour that was ſent to them; and when that Town was taken, notwithſtanding that Succour, he did not care to enjoy the Benefit of the Amneſty in *France*, but rather choſe to ſtay in *England*, where he died without Iſſue, and from whence he endeavour'd to prejudice the Court of (G) *France* as much as he cou'd. The Name of SOUBISE continues ſtill in the Houſe of *Rohan*, in the Perſon of *Francis de Rohan*, (Son of *Hercules de Rohan* Duke of *Mombazon*) who ſtyles himſelf Prince of SOUBISE. He Married the 16th of *April* 1663 *Anne de Rohan*, Daughter of *Henry Chabot* and of *Margaret de Rohan*, Heireſs of the Duke of *Rohan*. He is Captain of the *Gendarmes*, and has ſignaliz'd himſelf on ſeveral Occaſions, for inſtance, at the Battle of *Senef*, where he had a Leg broke. The Princeſs of *Soubiſe*, his Conſort, was Lady of Honour to the late Queen of *France*, and has been accounted one of the † greateſt Beauties of the Court. She has been very much Praiſed by the Modern Authors, and no leſs admir'd for her Virtue and Wiſdom than for her Beauty. The News-Writers in *Holland* gave out that the Prince of *Soubiſe* was one of thoſe, who laid down their Commiſſions of Lieutenants General, becauſe they were not comprehended in the Promotion of the Mareſchals of *France*, that was made in *March* 1693.

The Abbot *de* SOUBISE, his Son, has been much taken notice of during the courſe of his Studies. He is Coadjutor of the Biſhop of *Strasburg* || ſome Months ſince. His Elogy may be ſeen in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Poſthumous Works of the Chevalier *de Meré*.

SOU-

Catholick Writers, they could not be ſuſpected of being too Paſſionate; but they go ſo far as to accuſe him of Want of Courage. 'Tis too great an Inſult. (a) 'Tis ſaid that a great Lord told the King, *Sir*, M. de Soubiſe *having ſhunn'd your Preſence at* Rié, *and now that of your Admiral in the Iſle of* Ré, *there's Reaſon to believe that if he goes on, he will be, one day, the Oldeſt Captain in your Kingdom*. 'Tis ſaid (b) in the ſame Relations, that he did not engage in the Fight of the Iſle of *Ré*, and that as ſoon as he ſaw the Ill Succeſs of it, he haſtily made his Eſcape in a Shallop, without his Hat and his Sword. Nay, we are told, that his Captain of the Guards having ſeen that Sword, *ſaid it had certainly dropt from his Belt, becauſe he was ſure he had not drawn it*. The Satyrs (c) upon the Defeat in the Iſle of *Ré* are ſtill more Injurious. He has been reproach'd with another thing very different from that, (d) *viz*. That at his Return from *England*, *he made a Gentleman belonging to him ſwear, that if he ſaw his Ship ready to be taken, and if they cou'd not make their eſcape, he wou'd ſet the Powder on fire to burn 'em all, chuſing to die in ſuch a manner, rather than make their Enemies triumph by their being made Priſoners*. But that the Reader may have a better Reaſon to miſtruſt the Hiſtories Publiſh'd by the Catholick Party, I ſhall mention a Slander that looks like one of thoſe Calumnies, that are ſpread among the People to keep up their Zeal by ſtirring their Paſſions. It was given out (e), that when the Inhabitants of *Olonne* deſired to Capitulate, *M. de Soubiſe* anſwer'd *them haughtily and impudently, that he would have 'em chuſe the moſt handſome Maids they had, for himſelf, and then for his Favourites, or give him a Hundred Thouſand Crowns*; that both Conditions being rejected, he promiſed to exempt them from being Plunder'd for Twenty Thouſand Crowns, Eighty Pieces of Canon, and Three Ships, and that he Plundered them, tho' they had granted him all his Demands.

(E) *Not without leaving behind him ſome Ships that run a-ground.*] To ſhew the Partiality of thoſe Relations, I ſhall ſet down here what a Catholick (f) Author tells us about that Attempt upon *Blavet*. He ſays that the Duke of *Soubiſe with only Three Hundred Soldiers and a Hundred Sea-men, ſo vigorouſly attacked the large Ship call'd the* Virgin, *that after ſome reſiſtance, he got into it with Sword in Hand, and took it, and then all the reſt.* ——— And that the Port having been ſtopt with Men. *And with an Iron Chain and a large Cable*, he was ſhut up in it Three Weeks; *but the Wind turning about he made uſe of it, and cauſed the Chain and the Cable to be cut with Hatchets, notwithſtanding the Fire that was made upon him, and went and poſſeſt himſelf of the Iſle of* Oleron. How come theſe Paſſages that are glorious to him, to be omitted in the *Mercure François*?

(F) *He Burnt the* Dutch *Admiral.*] I have ſeen no Author yet, that makes a ſolid Anſwer to thoſe, who ſay that the Duke of *Soubiſe* broke his Word to the *Dutch* Admiral. We are told (g) they had agreed to undertake nothing one againſt another, during the Negotiations for a Peace that were carrying on at the Court; but that *Soubiſe* taking advantage of the Promiſe the Admiral had made him, came upon him in half an Hour's time by the help of the Wind and Tide, took his Ship, when he expected no ſuch thing, and burnt it by means of two Pinaces full of Fire-works. 'Tis futher ſaid in the *Mercure* (h) that Hoſtages had been given on both ſides. 'Tis likely the Agreſſor replied ſomething, when he was charged with Unfaithfulneſs in that reſpect. The Catholick Writer of the Duke of *Rohan*'s Life makes no mention of that Reproach: He ſays that *Soubiſe* being inform'd *that* Manty, *and* Hautin, *Admiral of* Zealand, *came to charge him with Forty Ships, he went to meet 'em, ſunk five of their Ships, and kill'd above Fifteen Hundred Men.* I have juſt now read what the Proteſtant Author, who took the Fictitious Name of *Theophilus Miſathée*, Publiſh'd (i) in *Soubiſe*'s Vindication. 'Tis ſomething, but I could deſire a better Diſcuſſion, and a more exact Verification.

(G) *To prejudice the Court of* France *as much.*] For it appears by a Declaration (k) of *Lewis* XIII. Dated

---

* Taken from ſeveral Volumes of the *Mercure François*.

† See *Cotin's Oeuvres galantes*. M. Menage made ſome Greek Verſes upon that Lady's being adviſed to Bath her ſelf in the Sea, after ſhe had been bitten by a Dog. They are very fine Verſes, and may be ſeen at pag. 178 of his Poems, *edit. Amſtel.* 1687.

|| I write this in *May* 1701.

(a) Merc. Franc. tom. 11. p. 891.

(b) Ibid. pag. 882. *See alſo the* Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu ad ann. 1625. pag. 179. *Dutch Edit.*

(c) *See the* Mercure Franc. tom. 8. pag. 559.

(d) Merc. Fr. tom. 11. pag. 281.

(e) Claudius Malingre Hiſt. de la rebellion tom. 2. pag. 225.

(f) *The Author of the History of the Duke of Rohan, Printed at Paris 166. I have* [illegible] *in another place that this History is aſcribed to* M. Fauvelet-du-Toc.

(g) Miniſt. du Card. de Richelieu pag. m. 177.

(h) Tom. 11. pag. 874.

(i) Apologie pour les Egliſ Reformées de France, *Printed* 1625. chap.

(k) *See* Montreſor's Memoirs pag. 366.

SOUCHES (LEWIS RATTUIT, COUNT DE) Son of a (*A*) Gentleman of *Rochelle* call'd *John Rattuit* Sieur *de Barres*, left *France* after the War of the Proteſtants, and went thro' *Holland* and *Germany* in his way to *Sweden*. He was no ſooner arrived there but he had a proſpect of being raiſed by the good Offices of Count *de la Gardie*, who quickly procured him a Regiment of Dragoons, and then a Regiment of Foot. After he had ſerved ſome Years, he had a quarrel with his * General, laid down his Commiſſion, and fought him; and intending to return into *France* by the way of *Auſtria* and *Italy*, he ſtaid ſome days at *Vienna*; and becauſe the Arch-Duke *William*, Brother of the Emperor *Ferdinand* III. Propoſed to him to ſerve in the Emperor's Armies, he reſolved to do it, and accepted a Regiment of Dragoons, that was Vacant. He made a great Fortune in the Service of his Imperial Majeſty, for he was ſucceſſively raiſed to the Dignities of Gentleman of his Chamber, Counſellor of War and State, Marſhal de Camp General, and Commander General of the Frontiers of *Sclavonia*. He died in *Moravia* in the Year 1682. being 74 Years of Age, and left Children (*B*) as we ſhall ſee. Theſe are the Contents of

* Call'd S[illegible].

ted the Eighth of *June*, 1641. That *within the ſpace of one Year, ſome of thoſe who had been ſent by* Soubiſe *and* la Valette, *to corrupt many* French *Men, came into his* Majeſty's *Hands*, and had Confeſt, *that the ſaid* Soubiſe *and* la Valette——— *were treating with the King of* Spain *to make a Deſcent into* Bretagne *and* Aunis, *or into the* Gaionne.

(*A*) *Son of a Gentleman of* Rochelle.] The Author of the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary was baſely deceived by what he had heard in common Diſcourſe; when he affirm'd that Count *de Souches was the Son of a Grocer of* Rochelle. A Hear-ſay is hardly to be depended upon, when the Queſtion is about the Birth of a Perſon raiſed to great Poſts, tho' his Anceſtors are not mention'd in Hiſtory. This ſilence proves only that they did not appear at Court, and had no conſiderable Imployments in their Provinces; but 'tis no Proof that they were not Gentlemen. And yet thro' a Baſe or Malicious Inclination to tell Lies, People take delight in Vilifying, as much as they can, the Birth of a Favourite, a Miniſter of State, or a General of an Army, who is the firſt of his Family, that was raiſed to great Preferments (*a*). Some ſay, his Father was a Peaſant, a Fiſher-man, or a Servant; others will have it, that he was the Son of a Shoe-maker, a Mercer, or at moſt, of a Scrivener, or an Attorney's Clerk. They are ſometimes in the right, and very often miſtaken; and therefore Prudence requires one ſhould miſtruſt thoſe common Reports; for when the thing is narrowly examin'd, it commonly appears that this pretended Son of a Mercer, or Fiſher-man, is of a very noble Family, but little known out of its Diſtrict. However it be, here are the Proofs of Count *de Souches's* Nobility, as they have been imparted (*b*) to me.

) *See*
Re-
A
the Ar-
le Tou-
n.
) *They*
e been
from
nna to
Book-
er by
**

The 6th of *Auguſt* 1686. Before *Gabriel Beraudin* Eſquire, Seigneur *de Grandjai*, Counſellor to the King, and his Lieutenant-General in the *Senechauſſée*, and Preſidial of the City and Government of *Rochelle*; at the requeſt of *Meſſire Amabee Huet*, Chevalier Seigneur *du Rivau*, Captain of the Marine, appeared Fourteen of the moſt Eminent Perſons in the Country, whoſe Names and Offices are ſpecify'd in the Act whereof I have a Copy, Collated with the Original at *Vienna* in *Auſtria* the 18th of *September* 1692. by *Henry Caſtillan d'Aviſter*, ſworn Apoſtolical Protonotary. The Lieutenant General in the *Senechauſſée* of *Rochelle* above Named declares, that thoſe Fourteen Perſons *living and ſettled in* Aulnis *have certified to all thoſe, whom it may concern, that* Meſſire Lewis Ratuit Count de Souches, *was Born a Gentleman, being the Son of* John Ratuit *Eſquire, Sieur* de Barres, *and of the Lady* Margaret de Bourdigale, *and that they do certainly know, that the ſaid* John Ratuit, *Father of the ſaid Count* de Souches *deceaſed, was deſcended from a Noble Family, and one of the moſt conſiderable in the City of* Rochelle, *where he and his Predeceſſors made their Abode, and kept their Rank among other Gentlemen, according to their noble Extraction. In witneſs whereof they have ſign'd this preſent Declaration, and put to it the Seal of their Arms; which Declaration we have received, and given a Copy of it to the ſaid Lord at his requeſt, which we have alſo ſign'd, and for a greater Approbation we have cauſed his Majeſty's Seal to be put to it: in this Preſidial Chancery of the City of* Rochelle. I need not Name all thoſe, who ſign'd that Act; it being ſufficient to ſay that M. Miller Marſhal de Camp, Governor of the Principality of *Chateau-Renaud*, and Lieutenant General in the Government of *Aunix*, *M. Arnou*, Intendant of the Province, *M. Gabarret* firſt Commodore, *M. de Chaſtellaillon* Commander at *Rochelle* were ſome of thoſe, who Certified it.

Here follows another Atteſtation: I have a Copy of it Collated with the Original at *Vienna* the 18 of *September* 1692. by the ſame *Henry Caſtellani d'Aviſter* above mention'd. "We whoſe Names are "under Written, atteſt and certify that we certainly "know, that *M. Lewis Ratuit de Souches* is of a "Noble Extraction both by the Father's and Mother's ſide, and of one of the moſt Ancient Families of this Country, and that they have enjoyed "the Honours, Privileges and Exemptions granted "by our Kings to the Nobles and Gentlemen of this "Kingdom, and that they always kept their Rank "among other Gentlemen. In Witneſs whereof we "have ſign'd the Preſent Atteſtation. Done at *Rochelle* the 12 of *March* 1687". This Atteſtation was ſign'd by Eighteen Perſons: The firſt is the Biſhop (*c*) of *Rochelle*, the Second *M. de Chaſtellaillon*, Commander in *Aunix* and at *Rochelle*, the Third *M. Beraudin* Lieutenant General of *Rochelle*. The others are *M. Villette* Commodore, the Chevalier *de Blenac*, the Chevalier *d'Arbouville* Captain of a Ship of War, *M. d'Oſmons* Knight of *Malta*, &c. I add that I have ſeen a Copy of a Letter written by *M. le Baili de la Vieuville* from *Paris* the 29, of *March* 1699. to Count *de la Tour* Son-in-Law to Count *de Souches*. He writes to him, *that he has been very well pleaſed to find an opportunity to write to* Malta *what he had heard, being at* Rochelle, *of the Family of Count* de Souches, *whoſe Anceſtors*, ſays he, *without much raiſing themſelves in the War, have always enjoyed the Privileges of Nobility, and never done any thing derogatory to it.*

(*c*) Henry de Laval.

Menage obſerves that the Name *Souches* is the Name of a Lordſhip belonging to the Count I ſpeak of. He ſays the Ancient Name was *Des-Ouſches*. I ſhall ſet down his Words, which I take out of a Chapter, wherein he proves by ſeveral Examples, that Proper Names are not always Pronounced according to the Ancient and true Orthography. "(*d*) Like-"wiſe they always ſay *De Souches* inſtead of *Des-*"*Ouſches*, ſpeaking of the Governor of *Moravia*, "who Commands now the Emperor's Troops in "*Flanders*. *Souches* is the Name of that General's "Lordſhip, for his Name is *Rattuit*. *Rattuit* is a "Family of *Rochelle*, where that Lord was Born; "and *Ouſche* is an old *French* Word, which ſignifies "a Garden Encloſed with a Hedge, and full of Trees, "under which they ſow Pulſe or Hemp. That *French* "Word is derived from the Latin *Olca*, which is to "be found in *Gregorius Turonenſis*, much in the ſame "ſenſe.

(*d*) Menage, Obſervations ſur la langue Françoiſe tom. 1. pag. 307. Paris 1675.

(*B*) *He left Children.*] He was Married twice, firſt to *Anne Elizabeth* Counteſs *de Hoffkirk*, and then to *Anne Solome* Counteſs *d'Aſpermont* and *Reckheim*. He had two Sons and one Daughter by his firſt Wife. *John Lewis* his Eldeſt Son is ſtill living, and is Married to *Eve Eleonora de Nottbaſſt* and *Werenberg* Counteſs of the Empire, by whom he has had three Daughters, *viz.* 1. *Louiſe* Lady of Honour at the Empreſs's Court, and now the Wife of Count *de Horn*. 2. *Claudia* Lady of Honour at the Empreſs's Court in her Siſter's Room. 3. *Thereſa* a *Carmelite* Nun in *Stiria*. The Second Son of Count *de Souches* was call'd *Charles*. He was General of the Emperor's Infantry, and died of a Wound he receiv'd at the Battle of *Salankemen* in *Hungary* in the Year of a Memorial imparted to me, which comes from * very good Hands. I ſhall add to it a thing, which very much heightens the Glory of Count *de Souches*, viz. that he was the Principal cauſe of the long Reſiſtance of the Town of *Brin* (C) againſt the *Swedes*, who were forced to raiſe the Siege upon that account, which proved a great Piece of Service to the Emperor. I ſhall take Notice of ſome miſtakes (D) in *Moreri's* Dictionary, and I'll make ſome Obſervations on what concens the Count *de*

Souches,

1691. He had loſt his *Wife Marianne* Counteſs *de Buchem*, by whom he left behind him two Sons, *Lewis* and *Charles Joſeph*. The latter has been admitted Knight of *Malta* in the Priory of *Bohemia*. The Daughter of Count *de Souches* is Married to Count *Charles de la Tour*, and has many Children (†).

(C) *The Principal cauſe of the long Reſiſtance of the Town of* Brin *againſt the* Swedes——— *which proved a great piece of Service to the Emperor.*] *Torſtenſon* having beaten the Imperialiſts in *February* 1645. made himſelf Maſter of ſeveral places in *Moravia*, and was ſo dreaded, that upon the News of his March the Enemies raiſed the Siege of *Olmutz*; and then he Beſieged *Brin*, the only ſtrong place that was ſtill for the Emperor in that Province (a). The Beſieged made ſuch a Vigorous Defenſe, that his Imperial Majeſty had the time to ſettle his Affaies that were in an ill Poſture. He made a Treaty with *Ragotzki* Prince of *Tranſilvania*, (b) and yielded to *him ſeven Lordſhips in* Hungary: *Ninety Churches were open'd in his Conſideration, wherein the Proteſtants were to teach their Doctrine publickly, and the Privileges of the Hungarians were reſtored to them. This Treaty ſeem'd diſadvantageous to the Catholicks; but it proved more prejudicial to the* Swedes: *For the Emperor having removed this rub out of his way, relieved* Brin, *and Forced* Torſtenſon *to raiſe the Siege. Then* Lewis *Count* de Souches, *a* French *Gentleman, who had been the Principal cauſe of its Preſervation, was made Governour of it as a Reward for ſo great a Service.* An Hiſtorian obſerves that *Torſtenſon* loſt more Soldiers before that place, than he wou'd have loſt in a Pitch'd Battle: He adds that in the mean time the Emperor repaired his Forces. (c) *Longa illic difficiliſque obſidio, atque ad extremum irrita fuit. Ac ſatis conſtat plus ibi militum, quam ſi juſta acie depugnatum foret, Dorſtenſohnio periiſſe. Interea Cæſari ſpacium datum reparandi vires, colligendique & conſcribendi novum exercitum, quem hoſti opponeret.* No Service was ever more ſeaſonable than that, and Count *de Souches* did certainly deſerve to be Rewarded for it. Note, that the Town of *Brin* was alſo Rewarded according to its Deſerts; for the Emperor gave it the firſt Rank among the Towns of *Moravia*: This Superiority belong'd to the Town of *Olmutz*, which was deprived of it by Reaſon of their weak Reſiſtance againſt the *Swedes*. This Obſervation is to be found in the Voyage of Count *de Brienne*. (d) *Cracovia relicta Vindobonam verſus pergimus, per Sileſiam, & Moraviam: ubi præter Olomutium & Brinnum nihil notatu dignum: illud, ſede Epiſcopali; hoc, obſidione quam adverſus Suecos tam fortiter ſuſtinuit, ut inde ob memoriam facti extiterit caput regionis, virtutis præmium; dignitate illa Olomutio ſublata, nota vecordiæ.*

(D) *Some miſtakes* (e) *in* Moreri's *Dictionary.*] I. The firſt Concerns the Extraction of Count *de Souches*, and has been ſufficiently confuted in the Remark *A*. II. He ſhou'd not have been call'd *General of the Empire*; he was only the Emperor's General. III. 'Tis certain from the Memorial imparted to me, out of which I have Compoſed the Text of this Article, that *his Father* did not give him *to a German Gentleman*, and that he entred not into the Emperor's Service before he had Fought that Gentleman. IV. An Exact Hiſtorian will not ſay that this Count *was defeated at the Battle of* Senef *by the Prince of* Conde, in the Year 1674. For, properly ſpeaking, that Battle was neither won nor loſt by either of the Parties. The Allies as well as the *French* aſcribed the Victory to themſelves, and cauſed *Te Deum* to be ſung, and Bone-fires to be made: Both did it out of Policy, being fully convinced that there was no ground to boaſt of any Advantage (f). The beginning of that Bloody Battle was Advantageous to the *French*, and the end proved Advantageous to the Enemies. Many are of Opinion that the Prince of *Conde* behaved himſelf like a great Captain for ſome Hours, and then like *Orlando Furioſo*, and *Hercules in a Fury*, *Hercules furens* in *Seneca*. Was it not a kind of *Enthuſiaſm*, and *Delirium*, ſay they, to leave the beſt Troops ſo long expoſed to the fire of the Enemy well covered with Hedges and Hop-Fields; I ſay, to leave them expoſed to a Perfect Slaughter, which they cou'd not avoid, and to a dreadful ſhower of Musket Shots? At laſt (g) he was forced to Retire, and he left behind him a vaſt Number of dead Bodies. *They add*, that the Prince of *Conde* was not well pleaſed with himſelf on occaſion of that Battle, and did not care to hear any thing of it: The Remembrance of it made him uneaſy. This is the Opinion of many People; I don't pretend to give my Judgment upon ſuch things. However it be, whether he was well pleaſed with that Journey or not, whether he obtain'd or loſt the Victory, this at leaſt is no Problematical thing, that Count *de Souches* had no hand in the Misfortune of the Allies, and very much contributed to their Advantages. The *Dutch* and *Spaniſh* Troops ſuſtain'd the whole Loſs; the Imperial Troops Commanded by him did not begin to fight till the reſt were diſordered; and after they had joyn'd their Allies the Enemy loſt his Advantage and was very much worſted in his turn. V. What has been added (h) to *Moreri's* Dictionary in the *Dutch* Editions is not right. Theſe words have been inſerted in it; *By refuſing to expoſe his Troops he occaſion'd the Victory obtain'd by the Prince of* Conde. They can only be underſtood of the Battle of *Senef*; but the Enemies of *France* don't uſe to own that ſhe got the Victory on that day. However it be, 'tis not true that ſhe got it, becauſe our Count refuſed to expoſe his Troops; for 'twas by expoſing them that he put a ſtop to the Progreſs of the Enemy. The *Dutch* Relations agree in this, that (i) Count *de Souches*, *who was gone before with the Imperialiſts, and was at ſome Hours diſtance from the Army, being inform'd of what paſt, went back with great diligence, and came at one a Clock in the Afternoon near the main Body of the Allies; ſo that his Highneſs* (k) *placed the Imperialiſts and Spaniards in an Advantageous Poſt on the left Hand, and his own Troops in the right Wing, and then it was that the Battle was renewed with greater Fury than before*——— (l) *The Prince of* Conde *endeavoured firſt to make his Men turn to the left Hand, but* M. de Fariaux, *a Man of a known Valour, and Major General of the* Dutch *Army, was ſent thither with ſome Battallions, and being ſupported by Count* Chavagnac, *who commanded a Squadron of Horſe near that place, he made ſuch a reſiſtance that the French were forced to retire, ſo that the ſaid Count cauſed four Pieces of Canon to be placed there, and by that means did very much annoy the* French. *The left Wing, the greateſt part whereof was made up of Imperialiſts and Swiſs* (m), *gave ſo many Proofs of their Valour, that above one half of the Swiſs were kill'd upon the ſpot, according to the Report of the Priſoners. Count* de Souches *their General threw himſelf wherever the Enemies were thickeſt, and gave Proofs of an extraordinary Valour, as he had done before on many other occaſions. The Prince of* Lorrain *did the ſame, and was ſeen ſeveral times fighting in the firſt Ranks, where he was ſo much Wounded in the Head that he was forced to retire. Prince* Pio, *who was near the Village of* Senef *with his Squadron, being attended by the Marquis* de Grana, *and Count* Starnberg, *ſhewed a wonderful Bravery, and was alſo Wounded in the Thigh with a Musket-ſhot. The Marquis* de Grana, *and the Son of Count* de Souches *Fought ſo Valiantly at the Head of their Squadrons, that the Swiſs cou'd not get an Inch of Ground from them, ſo that they contributed to the Happy Iſſue of that Battle.* This Account is confirm'd by the Prince of *Orange's* (n) Letter to the Deputies for the Secret Affairs of the States General; for having deſcribed what paſt before the *Germans* came back again, he adds: " (o) " The Enemies endeavoured at firſt to turn to the " left

* [illegible]

(†) *Taken from the Memorial* de quo infra *in the Margin of the Text of this Article.*

(a) *See* John Cluverius's *Universal Hiſtory in the Appendix* pag. 759. Edit. 1668.

(b) Lewis du Mai, Diſcours hiſtorique & politique ſur les cauſes de la guerre de Hongrie p. m. 284.

(c) Appendix Joh. Cluveri ubi ſupra.

(d) Lud. Hen. Lomenii Briennæ Comitis itinerar. pag. 58. edit 1662.

(e) *See alſo the Article* Leuwentz.

(f) *We went near* Mons, *where* Te Deum *was ſung as it was at* Paris; *both Parties pretending to have got the Victory. For my Part I have always been of Opinion that neither Party had reaſon to boaſt of it.* Memoires de Chavagnac pag. 388, 389. Dutch *Edit. This is perhaps the beſt thing that is in thoſe Memoirs.*

(g) *The Battle of Senef was with reſpect to the French as the Figure mention'd by Horace de arte Poet.* v. 3. *ut turpiter atrum deſinat in piſcem mulier formoſa ſuperne.*

(h) *This Addition is alſo to be found in* Moreri's *Dictionary Printed at* Paris 1699.

(i) Mercure Hollandois *for the Year* 1674. pag. 451.

(k) *That is, the Prince of Orange.*

(l) Ibid. pag. 452, 453.

(m) *It ſhou'd not be, and* Swiſs, *but oppoſed to the* Swiſs, *or ſomething like it; for it appears by the whole Thread of the diſcourſe, that the Author means the* Swiſs *in the* French *Army.*

(n) Ibid. pag. 47[illegible]

(o) Ibid. pag. 47[illegible] 481.

Souches in Chavagnac's (E) Memoirs. That Book was Printed in Holland in the Year 1700, when the Style had been mended in ſeveral places.

SPANHEIM (FREDERICK) Profeſſor of Divinity at *Leyden*, was a Man of great Merit. He was Born at *Amberg* in the *Upper Palatinate* the firſt day of * *January* 1600,

“ left Hand, but ſome Battalions were detached to “ go to them; and *M. de Chavagnac*, who was there “ with a Body of Imperial Horſe, repuls'd them “ with all imaginable Vigour, and kept that Poſt, “ and ſent for 4 Pieces of Canon, which did very “ much Annoy the Enemy——— (a) Among the “ Imperial Troops Count *de Souches* has given Proofs “ of the Courage and Bravery he has diſcovered on “ ſo many other occaſions. The Prince of *Lorrain* has “ alſo ſignalized himſelf, but at laſt he has been “ Wounded in the Head, and the Prince *Pio* in the “ Thigh. The Vigorous Reſiſtance of the Marquis “ *de Grana*, who was near the Village with his Battalion, has not contributed a little to the Happy “ Succeſs of the Battle; and I may ſay the ſame of “ the Bravery of the Battallions of the Regiment of “ *Souches* Commanded by the Son of the ſaid Count”. How then can it be ſaid that Count *de Souches*, by refuſing to expoſe the Imperialiſts occaſion'd the Victory obtain'd by the *French*?

There are ſtill three Faults in the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary, which I intend to mend. VI. Count *de Souches* did not live Fourſcore Years, but only ſeventy Four. VII. His Son did not *Command the Armies of the Empire*; he has been only imployed in the Emperor's Troops. VIII. He *was not kill'd at* Rhinfeld *in* 1678. but in *Hungary* in the Year 1691.

(E) *Upon what concerns Count* de Souches *in* Chavagnac's *Memoirs.*] *Chavagnac* (b) deſcribes him as the moſt Fooliſh and the baſeſt Man in the World; and having mention'd whatever may induce one to think that he was a Traytor, he adds: (c) *I don't think he was; but he was a Malicious and Ignorant Man, and the greateſt Robber that ever lived.* Many Reaſons convince me that theſe Slanders ought to be minded. 1. The Author of thoſe Memoirs Commends himſelf all along: He pretends to have given all the Counſels that have prov'd ſucceſsful; if a thing does not ſucceed, 'tis becauſe they wou'd not believe him; he has frequently prevented great Inconveniencies; he takes upon him the Boldeſt and the moſt Laborious Executions with a good Succeſs; in a word every thing goes Well when he meddles with it, and every thing goes Ill without him. His Commending himſelf ſo much, ſhews he had a great Opinion of his Merit, and was willing others ſhou'd have the ſame Notion of it. It appears from his own Hiſtory that he was a Haughty, Ambitious, Fantaſtical and Conceited Man. From whence it ought to be infer'd that whoever was his Enemy cou'd not miſs being ſlandered by him. I obſerve in the 2. place, that he fell out (d) with Count *de Souches* in the beginning of the Campaign of 1647, and that probably his blunt way moved ſometimes that General to put him in mind of his Inferiority. Thus Subaltern Officers expoſe themſelves to ſeveral Mortifications, when they have not a due regard for their General. This vexed Count *de Chavagnac* more and more, and diſpoſed him to ſpeak ill of Count de *Souches*. Note, in the 3. place, that he loved to ſpeak ill of Generals. He (e) gives us a very mean Character of Count *Monsecuculi*, with reſpect to the moſt Glorious and Brighteſt Campaign that can be found in the long life of that General: I mean, the Campaign, of 1673, in which he diſappointed all the Deſigns of *M. de Turenne*, and deſtroyed by the taking of one (f) Town all the Harveſt the *French* had made in *Holland* in the Year 1672. Can any Body give Credit to ſuch Slanders? Are they not contrary to the Rules of Probality? And therefore muſt we not conclude that what ſuch a Writer ſays of his Enemies ought to be ſuſpected? I omit many Sharp and Satyrical Stories, to be found in his Memoirs againſt the Chief Officers of the Imperial Troops, which ſeem to proceed from a Reſentment, that made him unwilling to do them Juſtice. For every Body owns that the Imperial Armies have been above theſe Hundred Years one of the beſt Schools of War, and that there are very few that Form ſo many good Officers. Note, in the 4. place, that he is often miſtaken in his Accounts, even when he does not deſign to ſpeak Ill of thoſe with whom he was diſpleaſed. Conſult the Notes inſerted in the *Dutch* Edition, which concern what paſt in *Germany* in the Year 1675. The Marquis de * * * who is the Author of thoſe Notes, and who Commanded one of the beſt *French* Regiments at that time, contradicts him in ſeveral Important Points: If other Officers wou'd give themſelves the Trouble of Criticizing him, doubtleſs they wou'd find matter enough for it. In the 5. place, there are ſo many incredible things in what he ſays againſt Count *de Souches*, that this alone is ſufficient to confute him: “ (g) *Souches*, who had received orders from the Emperor not to paſs the *Maeſe* upon any pretence “ whatſoever, to act only between the *Maeſe* and the “ *Moſelle*, and to give Four Thouſand Horſe with a “ General, if the Allies wanted them, ordered me “ to ſtay in the Camp, whilſt he went and dined “ with all the Generals in the Camp of the *Spaniſh* “ Troops———(h) *Souches* decamped to go and beſiege *Mont-Olimpe*; but becauſe the Prince of *Orange* demanded the Four Thouſand Horſe which “ the Emperor had promiſed him, I was detach'd to “ Command 'em; ſo that I went back and Encamp'd “ in the Suburb of *Namur*: I can't tell what Jealouſy he had upon my Account, he himſelf came “ thither with his whole Army. Every Body knowing that the Orders were formal, knew not what “ he meant; but he was not long unreſolved, for he “ brought the Army thro' *Namur*. *Monterey* and “ the Prince of *Orange* joyned him, and aſk'd what “ good Angel had moved him to paſs the *Maeſe*: He “ anſwered that he paſt the *Moſelle* and not the *Maeſe*. I could not forbear Laughing, and telling him “ that I pitied him, and that the *Moſelle* was above “ 15 Leagues from thence. He told me that I was “ not a Man of a ſufficient Capacity to teach him “ the Country, and fell into a great Paſſion againſt “ me. *Caplieres* our Commiſſary General, and the “ Emperor's Agent came upon this, and aſk'd him “ what was the matter. This Gentleman, ſaid he, “ uſes me like a Child, but I'll complain of it to “ his Imperial Majeſty. I told *Caplieres* what was “ the Subject of his Diſcontent, and *Caplieres* told “ him that I was in the Right: Whereupon he “ grew Angry again, and aſk'd his Guides what “ River we had paſs'd: They told him 'twas the “ *Maeſe*; and then he changed his Countenance, and “ cried out, I am undone”. The Falſity contain'd in thoſe Words is ſo Plain and Obvious that one may perceive it without any Examination; but whoever conſiders the circumſtances of the Narrative, that this General (i) *brought* his *Army into the Country of Liege*, that he went and dined (k) in the Camp of Count *Monterey*, which he cou'd not do without paſſing the *Maeſe*, that he went up again (l) towards *Charleville* to make the Siege of *Mons-Olympe*, a place ſituate on the *Maeſe*, that he (m) came again near *Namur*, another place ſtanding on the *Maeſe*, will think it impoſſible that he ſhould have been ignorant of the Situation of that River. The moſt ſtupid Soldiers cou'd not be Ignorant of it, after ſo many Marches and Countermarches of that Nature; how then can one believe that a General above 60 Years Old knew it not, having received an expreſs (n) order to act only between the *Moſelle* and the *Maeſe*? Whoever can believe ſuch a thing muſt be more credulous than a Child of four Years of Age. The abſurdity of *Chavagnac's* Narrative will be more ſenſible, if it be conſidered that Count *de Souches* had raiſed himſelf to a great Poſt in the Emperor's Court. He was a *French* Man, and 'twas a Fault not eaſily forgiven in that Court. He was a Gentleman Born, but his Gentility not being attended with a Title, and ſupported by the Credit and Wealth of his Family, wou'd hardly have been of greater uſe to him to become a General in the *French* Armies, than if he had been a Citizen's Son: Much more was it inſignificant to him in *Germany*. He had therefore no other way to Raiſe himſelf but his Valour and the Art of War; and he muſt needs have excell'd in it to overcome all the Obſtacles a meer *French* Gentleman cou'd meet with at the Emperor's Court.

---

* *Ut his annos cum ſeculo computaveris, qui lucem cum incipiente anno & ſeculo primam vidit.* He is miſtaken in taken the Year 1600, to be the firſt of the XVII. Century. 'Tis the laſt of the XVI. Many commit the ſame Fault.

Ibid. . 464.

See vag- 's Me- from 390.

Ibid. 401.

Ibid. 371.

Ibid. page to 358.

Bonn. took ntly the ch ps mand. by the ce of nge King Eng. d.

(g) Ibid. pag. 372, 373.

(h) Ibid. pag. 374, 375.

(i) Ibid. pag. 372.

(k) Ibid. pag. 373.

(l) Ibid. pag. 374.

(m) Ibid.

(n) Ibid. pag. 373. 374.

1600, and very carefully bred up by his Father, (*A*) who was not only a Learned Man, but also very much eſteem'd at the Electoral Court. After he had ſtudied in the College of *Amberg* till the Year 1613, he was ſent the next Year to the Univerſity of *Heidelberg*, which was then in a very flouriſhing Condition, where he made ſo great a Progreſs both in the Languages and Philoſophy, that it appeared he wou'd prove a great Man. He return'd to his Father's in 1619, and went ſoon after to *Geneva* to ſtudy Divinity. The Miſeries of the *Palatinate* made him reſolve to ſave his Father the Charges of his Board; and therefore he went into *Dauphiné* in the Year 1621, and was three Years in the Houſe of the † Governor of *Ambrun* in the Quality of Tutor. He had twice || a ſet Conference about matters of Controverſy, which was an uſual thing at that time, and came off Gloriouſly. He return'd to *Geneva*, and then went to *Paris*, where he found a good (*B*) Kinſman, who was Miniſter of *Charenton*, and adviſed him not to accept the Profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy at *Lauſanne*, which the Magiſtrates of *Berne* offered him. He took a Journey into *England* for four Months in 1625. and after he had made a further ſtay at *Paris*, he return'd to *Geneva*, where he diſputed for a Chair of Philoſophy in 1626, and carried it. The Year following he (*C*) Married a Gentlewoman Originally come from *Poitou*. Sometime after he was admitted Miniſter, and in the Year 1631. he ſucceeded *Benedict Turretin* in his Profeſſorſhip of Divinity. He diſcharged the Duties of thoſe places both like an able and an indefatigable Man; ſo that his great Reputation made ſeveral Univerſities deſirous to have him. That of *Leyden* was the moſt Happy, for he accepted their offers: But the utmoſt endeavours were uſed to keep him at *Geneva*, and the Marks of Eſteem and Affection he received at his departure cannot be expreſs'd. He took his Degree of Doctor of Divinity at *Baſil*, to comply with the uſe of the Country

† John de *Bonne, Baron de Vitrolle.*

|| Firſt with Father *Hugh*, a Jeſuit of *Avignon*, who Preach'd the Lent Sermons at *Ambrun*, and then with a Cordelier of *Naples*.

Court. None therefore but a ſilly Reader can believe that a General Beſieges and takes a (*a*) Town upon a River, and goes along that River for ſeveral Months, without knowing its Name, and thoſe of the Fortreſſes that are waſh'd by it, without knowing that *Namur* is ſituate upon the *Maeſe*, and not upon the *Moſelle*. Had he behaved himſelf in that manner, tho' he had a particular Reaſon to be well informed of the Situation of the *Maeſe*, ſince he had been ordered not to ſerve beyond that River, he wou'd be the moſt ridiculous Man in the World; but we ſhou'd be very near as Ridiculous as he, ſhou'd we believe that he thought he went over the *Moſelle* (*b*) when his Troops croſs'd the *Maeſe* at *Namur*. We may therefore look upon this as one of thoſe Falſities, which never appear too extravagant, when a Man intends to give out a ſingular thing, or to ridicule an Enemy. I omit ſaying that 'tis not likely the Emperor gave expreſs orders to Count *de Souches* not to paſs the *Maeſe*. Did not the Emperor deſign to do as much miſchief to the Enemy as ever he cou'd? Why then ſhou'd he have forbidden his General to joyn with the *Dutch* and the *Spaniards*, if ſuch a Conjunction was neceſſary to ſtrike a greater blow? To which I add, that if Count *de Souches* had perceived that he had been Surpriſed, he wou'd have ordered his Army to repaſs immediately. He had been more willing to mend his Fault in ſuch a manner, than to expoſe himſelf to loſe his Head for having acted againſt the Expreſs Orders of his Imperial Majeſty. How comes it that Count *de Chavagnac*, having ſaid that this General cried out, *I am undone*, forgets to tell us whether his Fault was approved or excuſed? It was neceſſary to acquaint the Reader with it; but the Writer of thoſe Memoirs did not much care for it. What has been ſaid confirms the Suſpicions of thoſe, who read this part of Count *de Chavagnac*'s Memoirs.

After all the Obſervations I have made, the Reader will be apt to give no credit to the Satyrical Deſcription he gives (*c*) of Count *de Souches*'s Conduct before *Oudenarde*. I am willing to believe according to the moſt Common Opinion that this General wou'd not follow the advice of the reſt, nor take with them the neceſſary Meaſures for the good Succeſs of that Enterpriſe; but none can believe the extravagance and cowardly Stupidity that he is Taxed with in *Chavagnac*'s Memoirs. 'Tis plain that Author was Angry when he writ that Paſſage. The Reader perceives that his Pen was directed by the reſentment of ſome Offence, and is confirm'd in that Opinion by conſidering the Conduct of the Imperial Court. The Puniſhment inflicted upon Count *de Souches* was ſo ſlight and ſo diſproportion'd to what he deſerved, were *Chavagnac*'s Memoirs true, that this very thing is ſufficient to convince us that this Author is not to be credited. I don't think the Relations of Count *de Souches* ought to juſtify him againſt ſuch an Enemy, who knew not how to obſerve any Probability or Equity; for 'tis not to be thought that he was Ignorant of the Reaſons on which the Count *de Souches* grounded his Opinions and his Conduct. Why didn't he ſay ſomething of the matter at leaſt to confute him? Equity required it of him.

(*A*) *By his Father, who was not only a Learned Man.*] His Name was *Wigand* SPANHEIM; he was Doctor of Divinity, and Eccleſiaſtical Counſellor to the Elector *Palatin*. He Married *Renata Toſſan*, Daughter of *Daniel Toſſan* Miniſter of *Orleans*, and then Profeſſor of Divinity at *Heidelberg*. *Daniel Toſſan* had Married *Mary Couet* a *Pariſian*, Daughter of *Philibert Couet* Advocate in the Parliament of *Paris*, who had fled to *Orleans* for her Religion with her Mother and two Siſters in the Year 1562. *Toſſan*, in order to avoid the Perſecution, retired thro' ſeveral by-ways to *Montargis*, where his Wife was brought to Bed of a Daughter, and *Renata* of *France* Dutcheſs of *Ferrara* was her God-Mother. That Dutcheſs, Daughter of *Lewis* XII. being extremely Zealous for the Reformed Religion, received at *Montargis* as many Refugees as ſhe cou'd; but 'tis not true, as *Heidanus* will have it, that ſhe kept there *Daniel Toſſan* till the Year 1575. We ſhall ſee in the Article of *Toſſan* in what Year he retired to *Montargis*, and went away from thence. His Daughter *Renata* (God-Daughter of the Dutcheſs of *Ferrara*) was Married to *Wigand Spanheim*, and was the Mother of our *Frederick* and of two Daughters (*d*). *Wigand* was a very Pious Man, a Learned Divine, and a good Philologer, as it appears from his Letters to *Chriſtian Becman* (*e*). He died in the Year 1620. having in his hands a Letter of his Son, which made him Cry with Joy. *Freberus* (*f*) mentions this particular as being in the Funeral Oration of *Frederick Spanheim*; but he is miſtaken in that reſpect. *Lecto affixus poſtquam literas à filio* Geneva *accepiſſet eas præ gaudio totas lachrymis conſperſit, & tenaciter ambabus manibus retinuit, donec in Chriſto exſpiravit A.* 1620.

(*B*) *A good Kinſman, who was Miniſter of* Charenton.] His Name was *Samuel Durant*: I cannot tell in what degree he was related to him, for the Latin Words of my Author are Ambiguous. (*g*) *Humaniſſimè à Samuele Durantio —— cognato ſuo (erat enim Durantii mater ſoror aviæ parentis ejus) exceptus eſt*. The Ambiguity lies in the Parentheſis. For 'tis uncertain whether the Word *Parens* ſignifies a Father or Mother. Beſides, a every Man having two Grand-mothers, many Families ſhou'd be run over to find the Grand Mother of our *Spanheim*, Siſter to *Durant*'s Mother. *Durant* left (*h*) his whole Library to our *Frederick Spanheim*.

(*C*) *He Married a Gentlewoman Originally come from*

(*a*) Dinant *which he took before his Army paſs'd the* Maeſe *at* Mamur. *See the* Mercure Hollandois ubi ſupra. pag. 436.

(*b*) *To confirm this, I add that if he had thought to paſs the* Moſelle *when he went thro'* Namur, *he muſt have believed that he had not yet followed the order of acting between the* Maeſe *and the* Moſelle, *or he muſt have thought that he paſt the* Moſelle *to go towards* Philisburg *or* Nancy, *which are monſtrous ſuppoſitions.*

(*c*) Chavagnac ubi ſupra pag. 390. & ſeq.

(*d*) Ex Heidano, in Orat. funebr. Frid. Spanhem. pag. 6. & 7.

(*e*) De Wigando Spanhemio nihil aliud mihi compertum eſt niſi ſingularis pietate & eruditione præſtantem hominem fuiſſe, nec Theologica ſolum ſed & Philologica eruditione inſtructiſſimum, & linguarum Latinæ imprimis & Græcæ callentiſſimum. Id quod ex literis quæ... quæ in operibus Philologicis Chriſtiani Becmani... leguntur conſtat. Heidanus Orat. funeb. pag. 7.

(*f*) Theatr. pag. 406.

(*g*) Heidanus ibid. pag. 17.

(*h*) Id. ib. pag. 18.

Country he was going to; for neither at *Geneva* nor in the Proteſtant Academies of *France*, the Profeſſors of Divinity were not admitted Doctors; it had been of no uſe to them. He ſet out from *Geneva* in 1642. after he had been Profeſſor of Divinity Eleven Years. He happen'd to be Rector, when they Celebrated the Jubile or the Secular Year of the Reformation, and he made a very fine Speech upon that Subject. He arrived at *Leyden* the 3d of *October* 1642, where he kept up and even encreaſed the Reputation he had got; but he died in *May* 1649. His great Labours ſhorten'd his Days. Notwithſtanding his Lectures and Diſputations, his * Sermons and the Books he wrote, and many Viſits, and Domeſtick Concerns, he kept a great Correſpondence by way of Letters. Beſides, he was obliged to wait upon the Queen of *Bohemia* and the Prince of *Orange*; he was very much eſteem'd in thoſe two Courts. Queen *Chriſtina* did him the Honour to write to him, to acquaint him with her great Eſteem for him, and that ſhe was very well pleaſed with the reading of his Works. He *(D)* Publiſh'd many Books. He left behind him Seven Children †, whereof the two Eldeſt *(D*Δ*)* are become very Famous. He was rigid in *(E)* point of Innovation, and in that reſpect, ſpared neither Friends nor Foes. He could not forbear writing againſt *M. Amyraut*, and did not live long enough to reply

* *He was* Miniſter of the *Wallon* Church *at* *Leyden*.

† Taken from his Funeral Oration, made the 21ſt of *May* 1649. 'Tis a good Piece.

from Poitou.] *Heidanus*, *(a)* calls her in Latin *Carlottam à Portu*, which I take to ſignify *Charlotte du Port*. She was the Daughter of *Peter du Port*, *Seigneur de Mouillepied & de Boiſmaſſin*, Counſellor to the King, and Commiſſary for Proviſions in his Majeſty's Armies, only Son of *Joachim du Port*, a Gentleman of *Poitou*, *Seigneur de Mouillepied*. The Mother of *Peter du Port*, call'd *Joan du Cheſne*, was the only Daughter of *Joſeph du Cheſne* (*Sieur de la Violette*, Counſellor and Phyſician to the King) and of *Anne de Tile*, Daughter of *Margaret Budé*, whoſe Father was the Learned *William Budé (Budæus)* *(b)*.

(D) He Publiſh'd many Books.] At the Requeſt of *Guſtavus*'s Envoy to *Geneva*, he wrote a Book Intitl'd, *Le Soldat Suedois* *(c)*, which ſold very well. That Book was quickly follow'd by the *(d)* *Mercure Suiſſe*. He Publiſh'd in 1639, a *Commentaire Hiſtorique de la vie & de la mort de Meſſire Chriſtofle Vicomte de D'hona*, at the Widow's Requeſt: I ſhall ſpeak of it hereafter. He Publiſh'd Six Years after, ſome Memoirs upon the Life and Death of the moſt Serene Princeſs *Louiſe Juliana*, Electreſs *Palatin*, Born Princeſs of *Orange*. He undertook that Work, at the Requeſt of the Queen of *Bohemia*. All theſe *(e)* Books are Anonymous. *le Throne de Grace, de Jugement, & de Gloire*, are Three Sermons prodigiouſly long, and written in a pretty Old *French*, but they contain excellent things. The Firſt was Preach'd at *Charenton*. His *Dubia Evangelica*, in Three Parts, written at *Geneva*, and occaſion'd by the Objections diſperſed among the Students of Divinity by one *Antoine*, who being a Chriſtian, had turn'd Jew, are good Books. He Compos'd his *Chamierus Contractus*, for the Benefit of the Students of Divinity, who cou'd not conveniently make uſe of *Chamierus*'s vaſt *Panſtratia*. Whilſt he liv'd at *Leiden*, he wrote againſt *Amiraut*'s Hypotheſis *Exercitationes de gratia univerſali*, in Three Volumes in 8. *Item Epiſtolam ad Cottierium de conciliatione gratiæ univerſalis*. He alſo writ a Letter *ad Buchananum de Controverſiis Anglicanis*, & *Vindiciæ de gratia univerſali* *(f)*. 'Tis a Reply to *M. Amyraut*, which he could not finiſh, and it ſavours of a Poſthumous Piece. The Author I quote has omitted a Letter, which M. *Spanheim* writ to Prince *Edward*, when he Changed his Religion. Since he mentions a *(g)* Conſolatory Letter upon the Death of an only Son, he might alſo have mention'd the other Letter. I muſt not forget M. *Spanheim*'s Speeches, which are very good, eſpecially his Funeral Oration of *Frederick Henry* Prince of *Orange*. See *Balzac*'s *(h)* Thanks to him, after he had read it.

I have ſaid that this Profeſſor of Divinity, is the Author of the *Commentaire hiſtorique de la vie & de la mort de Meſſire Chriſtofle Vicomte de Dhona*. But I muſt add that the word *Viſcount* he made uſe of, is very improper, and does not anſwer the Title of *Burgrave*, which has been in the Illuſtrious Family of DHONA for many Ages. 'Tis a Nobler Title than that of Viſcount. See the *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans*, Publiſh'd at *Berlin* by M. *(i)* *Chauvin* in 1696. and look for the Extract of the Firſt and Second Volumes of M. *(k)* *Manget*'s *Bibliotheca Practica*, Dedicated to Count *Alexander de Dhona* Governour to the Electoral Prince of *Brandenburg*, where you'll find ſome things very inſtructive concerning the *Burgraves*. This is not a proper place to enlarge upon the great Merit of that Count, and the glory of the Houſe of *Dhona*. I ſhall only refer the Reader to *Moreri*'s Dictionary, and occaſionally obſerve that a Fault has crept into it; for inſtead of ſaying that Count *Alexander*'s Mother was Counteſs *de Terraſſieres Montbrun*, it ſhou'd be *de Feraſſieres Montbrun*. She was the only Daughter of Count *de Feraſſieres*, Lieutenant General in the *French* Armies, and Brother to M. *de* St. *André Montbrun*, who was General of the *Venetians* in *Candia*, and whoſe Hiſtory *(l)* was Printed at *Paris* in 1696.

*(D*Δ*) Seven Children, whereof the two Eldeſt are become very Famous.*] The firſt *(m)* has a perfect Knowledge of Medals, and all ſorts of Literature: Beſides, his Embaſſies give him a glorious Rank among States-men. He is a Perſon of an extraordinary Merit. *(n)* The Second died within theſe *(o)* few days, being Profeſſor of Divinity at *Leyden*. He had been a long time in that Imployment, and was juſtly accounted one of the moſt conſiderable Men in the Reformed Church. He has writ many Books, which procured him a great Reputation: The Journaliſts have often made an honourable mention of him. Tho' the Journaliſt of *Paris* does ſeldom ſpeak of Books written by the Miniſters, he has given large Extracts of this Learned Man's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: You'll find 'em in the Twenty Eighth Volume of the *Journal des Sçavans*. Whoever deſires to be informed of the great Learning of M. *Spanheim* the Eldeſt, needs only read his Book *de præſtantia & uſu numiſmatum*; the Five Letters he writ to M. *Morel*, a famous Antiquarian, and a great Medalliſt, which have been Printed with the *Specimen univerſæ rei numarariæ antiquæ*, Publiſh'd by the ſame M. *Morel*, at *Leipſick* in 1695; his Notes upon *Callimachus*, and *Julian*'s *Cæſars*, and ſome other Tracts, the Titles whereof may be ſeen in *Moreri*'s Dictionary of the *Paris* Edition 1699. together with a Liſt *(p)* of all his Imployments in the Courts of Princes, 'till he was ſent the fouth time to the Court of *France* after the Peace of *Ryſwick*. He was at *Paris* from that time till the beginning of the Year 1701, that is, 'till his Electoral Highneſs of *Brandenburg* became King of *Pruſſia*. He took then his Audience of leave, becauſe the change of the Ceremonial was not yet regulated at the Court of *France*. He is *(q)* lately gone into *England* by order of the New King his Maſter. I ſhall obſerve by the by, that this New Epoch of the Royalty of *Pruſſia* will ſignalize the beginning of the XVIII Century, and that there was in it a remarkable Concourſe of Circumſtances; for about the ſame time that the Electoreſs of *Brandenburg* was Crowned Queen of *Pruſſia*, the Electoreſs of *Brunſwick*, her Mother, Daughter to the King of *Bohemia*, has been named to ſucceed to the Crown of *England*. Thoſe two Princeſſes are extraordinarily qualify'd to fill up a Throne, and to renew the Glory of Queen *Elizabeth*.

(E) He was rigid in point of Innovation.] It was a Maxim with him, That one ought to fight ones own Brethren, whenever they act againſt Orthodoxy: *The neglect of little Evils*, ſaid he, *will ſometimes occaſion the greateſt Diſorders.* *(r)* *Sæpe profitentem audivimus ſe licet mallet cum Eccleſiæ hoſtibus congredi, tamen*

(l) *See an Extract of it in the* Journal des Sçavans *of the Fourth of* Auguſt 1698. p. 551. & ſeq. *Dutch Edit.*

(m) Ezechiel Spanhemius.

(n) Fridericus Spanhemius.

(o) *I write this the 26th of* May 1701.

(p) *It was before in the* Dutch *Edition of* Moreri's *Dictionary till* 1693.

(q) *I write this in* May 1701.

(r) Heidan. p. 32.

reply to him as he had a Mind to. His Adverſaries (*F*) gloried *of it*. I ſhall (*G*) mention the Praiſes beſtowed upon him, by a Man who cannot be ſuſpected of Flattery.

SPIFAME (*James Paul*) Biſhop of *Nevers* in the XVI Century, left his Biſhoprick, and retir'd to *Geneva*, in order to profeſs the Reformed Religion. He * went by the Name of *M. de Paſſi*, and at laſt he † *turn'd Miniſter, to have, as 'tis ſaid, a more eaſie Acceſs into the Councils, and a greater Share in Affairs.* The Parliament of *Paris* iſſued out ‖ a Warrant againſt him in the Year 1550. That Proſelyte was very ſerviceable to the Cauſe in *Germany*, whither the Prince of *Conde* ſent him to juſtify his taking up Arms. He Publiſh'd there γ the Four Letters which *Catherine de Medicis* had writ to that Prince, to recommend to him the Welfare of the Kingdom, and the Intereſt of the King her Son: He diſcovered δ many Secrets, obtain'd great Succours *of the Princes of* Germany, and ε harangued the Emperor at the Diet of *Francfort* in 1562 with ſuch a Strength, that it proved one of the beſt Manifeſto's of the Proteſtants. He cauſed ζ the *Reiſters and Lanſquenets to be recall'd, and Count* de Rocquendolfe, *and other Chiefs, who Commanded them, to be put to the Ban of the Empire.* He made Three Speeches in that Country. His End was not η anſwerable to ſuch a Noble Beginning; for he found himſelf involved in ſome Crimes, for which he was (*A*) Beheaded at *Geneva* the 23d of *March* 1566. His Birth, his (*B*) Parts, and his Learning might have raiſed him to the higheſt Dignities in *France*, where he had quickly gone through ſeveral Employments. Nothing can

* *Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau tom. 2. pag. 29.*

† *Id. ib. pag. 53.*

‖ *Spondan. Annal. Eccleſ. ad ann.* 1550. *n.* 18. See alſo *Thuanus l.* 12. *pag.* 453.

β *Le Laboureur ib. tom* 1. *pag.* 798.

γ *Id. ib.*

δ *Id. ib. tom.* 2. *pag.* 29.

men & bellum illis etiam fratribus indicendum judicare, qui vel data opera, vel ex ignorantia & infirmitate per cuniculos illam ſubruerent. Quod enim initio parvum videtur, id ſæpe, neglectum magna incendia dare in progreſſu. Cum cui quis ſemel patrocinium commodavit et mordicus inhæret, & ſæpe error non detectus cum occulte ſerpat, placere incipit, & tandem pudor eſt retractare quæ ſemel defenderis. Many Reaſons may be alledged to maintain this common Topick and this Maxim; but in order to perſuade, they ought to be attended with Choler. With ſuch an Ingredient, they commonly produce a Conviction; but without it, they appear weak, and are Confuted by many other fine Maxims. *Heidanus* obſerves, that the Perſon he praiſes, was a Man of a (*a*) fiery temper. That Fire is a wonderful Light to ſhew that the Reaſons alledged for Toleration, are bad ones, and that thoſe who cry out, *to Arms, to Arms, bella, horrida bella*, have well dived into the bottom of things. (*b*) *Tros Rutulusve fuat nullo diſcrimine habebo*; no matter, tho' they be Friends, Allies, or Relations; let's fall upon 'em, *per calcatum perge patrem* (*c*); 'tis for Truth.

(*F*) *His Adverſaries gloried of it.*] See the Paſſage quoted by *Colomeſius* (*d*) out of a Book of M. *Amyraut*.

(*G*) *I ſhall mention the Praiſes beſtowed upon him*, &c.] *Sorbiere* is the Perſon I ſpeak of: What he ſays of *M. Spanheim* deſerves to be tranſcribed; it contains ſome Particulars that will be acceptable to the Curious, and beſides, they belong to the Deſign of this Dictionary. *Barlæus*, ſays he (*e*), *having made a Funeral Oration in Verſe, upon the Death of the Prince of* Orange, *and Dr*, Spanheim *having deliver'd one in Proſe, was very much diſpleaſed with the unequality of their Reward; for, as* Salmaſius *wittily ſaid, it was a great Overſight to give the Pay of a Trooper to a Foot-Soldier, and that of a Foot-Soldier to a Trooper.* Barlæus *received but Five Hundred Livres, and the other Five Hundred Crowns. All that I can tell you of the latter, is what was ſaid of him after his Deceaſe*, viz. *That* Salmaſius *had kill'd him, and that* Morus *had been the Dagger. 'Tis a long Story, and to be ſhort, I ſhall only tell you that* Salmaſius *did not love* M. Spanheim, *out of Jealouſie about Merit and Learning in the School; that in order to mortify him, he cauſed* M. Morus *to be ſent for into* Holland, *whom he only knew by his Name, but he was the Scourge and the Averſion of his Collegue; that the Doctor left no Stone unturn'd to prevent his coming, and that he died when he heard that his Adverſary was ſet out on his Journey. However, I muſt do this juſtice to that Learned German, even by* Salmaſius's *Confeſſion, who was not Prodigal of his Praiſes*, that he had a ſtrong Head, and full of Learning, that he was fit for Buſineſs, Steady and Dexterous, Quick and Laborious. *He read publick Lectures of Divinity four times in a Week, and private ones upon different Subjects to his Scholars; he heard the Students of Divinity; he preach'd in two Languages,* German *and* French; *he viſited the Sick; he wrote a vaſt number of Letters; he compoſed at the ſame time, two or three Books upon quite different Subjects; he aſſiſted every* Wedneſday *at his Highneſs's Council, who ſent for him to the* Hague; *he was Rector of the Univerſity, and notwithſtanding ſo many Occupations, he kept an Account of all the Expences of his Houſe, that was full of Boarders.*

(a) Ὀξύχολος etiam, ut ipſe fatebatur, fuit, & ſubtilis choleræ nonnihil habuit, quæ inſtar flammulæ ſalpetræ momento incendebatur, ſat ſine fumo & nidore momento diſpergebatur. Ibid. p. 33.

(b) Virgil. Æn. l. 10. v. 108.

(c) Ita apud illum præponderabat amor veritatis, ut nulla amicitiæ jura, nullæ neceſſitudines, nullus metus illum a defendenda illa avertere potuiſſent. Heidan. ib. pag. 32.

(d) Colomeſ. in Gallia Orientali. pag. 206.

(e) Sorbiere *Letter* 64. p. 442, 445.

(*A*) *In Crimes for which he was Beheaded.*] M. Spon gives the following account of it. (*f*) "*James Paul Spiſame* Biſhop of *Nevers*, having left his Biſhoprick, and a yearly Income of Forty Thouſand Livres, retir'd to *Geneva*, to profeſs the Doctrine of the Proteſtants. He preſented a Petition to be made a Citizen, which was granted him, and even was admitted into the Councils of Two Hundred and of Sixty. The Magiſtrates and the Men of Letters had an eſteem for him on account of his Learning. Sometime after he was ſent into *France* to ſerve there as a Miniſter; but the Magiſtrates of *Geneva* were inform'd that he privately endeavour'd to get another Biſhoprick. Wherefore at his Return, his Conduct was more narrowly obſerved, and his former Life examin'd. It was found out that before his Marriage he had a Child by the Woman he Married, and leſt it ſhould be accounted a Baſtard, he cauſed his Contract of Marriage to be Antidated, and a falſe Seal to be put to it, that his Son might inherit his Eſtate, which was pretty conſiderable. For theſe Cauſes he was Impriſon'd, and having confeſt the whole matter, he was Beheaded in the Place *du Molard*, with a great Repentance of his Faults, which he ſhew'd by a fine Diſcourſe he made to the People upon the Scaffold. Some will have it that thoſe Accuſations were only a Pretence to Condemn him, and that he was Executed to comply with *Catherine de Medicis*, who had prevail'd upon the *Syndics*, being ſollicited to it by the *Pope*." See the Paſſage of M. *de Rocolles* in the Remark *E*.

(*B*) *His Birth, his Parts, and his Learning might have raiſed him——— he had——— gone thro' ſeveral Employments.*] " (*g*) He was of a Noble Family, originally come from *Lucca*, and ſettled at *Paris* in the Year 1350, when *Bartholomew* SPIFAME was living, from whom are deſcended all thoſe of that Name, Seigneurs *de Biſſeaux, des Granges*, and *de Paſſy*. His Father was *John* SPIFAME, Sieur *de Paſſy*, Secretary to the King, and Treaſurer of the Wars; and his Mother *Jaquette Ruzé*: He was the youngeſt of Five Brothers——— The progreſs he made in Learning procured him an Office of Counſellor in the Parliament of *Paris*; afterwards he became Preſident of the Inqueſts, Maſter of the Requeſts, and Counſellor of State; and he ſhewed ſo great a Capacity and Learning in all his Employments, that having devoted himſelf to the Church, there was no Dignity above the great Reputation he was in. After he had been a Canon of *Paris*, Chancellor of the Univerſity, and Abbot of *St. Paul* at

" *Sens*,

can be more abſurd than what *Moreri* (*C*) ſays, that *Calvin* cauſed him to be put to Death. Others aſcribe (*D*) his Tragical End to *Beza*'s Jealouſie, but cou'd not prove it. I have Confuted in another † Book *Maimbourg*'s Reflections, and therefore I need not do it again. One of thoſe, who wrote againſt his Hiſtory of Calviniſm, wants (*E*) to be rectify'd. He has given us ſeveral curious Particulars about the true Cauſe of that Biſhop's Execution. 'Tis not true that *Spiſame* wrote a Book under (*F*) the Name of *Peter Richer*. Some ſay * he aſſiſted at the Council of *Trent*, and was afterwards Miniſter of *Bourges* and *Iſſoudun*. 'Tis certain, that when the Reformed received the Communion in the Town-Houſe of *Bourges*, towards the Beginning of the Year 1562, 'twas he who Officiated. He went thither from *Iſſoudun* with a Guard of 150 Troopers ††. The Author, who informs me of this, ſays in a Letter dated from *Paris* the 11th of *December* 1561, that *Spiſame* had been call'd by the Reform'd Church of *Lyons*, to be their Miniſter, and that four Years before he had been Accuſed of Lutheraniſm, for which he had been put to Death, had he not quickly fled to *Geneva* ‖.

SPINA, β (*John de*) in Latin *Spinæus*, Miniſter of a Reformed Church in the XVI. Century

“ſent, he became Great Vicar of *Charles* Cardinal *de Lorraine*, Archbiſhop of *Rheims*, and in that Quality, he was named by *Henry* III. to the Biſhoprick of *Nevers*, of which he took Poſſeſſion in the Year 1548 ——— (*a*) Being infatuated with his Learning and Reputation, he reſolved to follow the New Opinions as ſome other Learned Prelates had done, and left his Church to take a Wife.

(*C*) *Than what* Moreri *ſays, That* Calvin *cauſed him to be put to Death.*] See with what Rhetorical Flouriſhes he adorn'd his Dictionary. (*b*) Calvin, *who was then the great Califf of* Geneva, *the Infamous Receptacle of Hereſy and Hereticks, being acted by an Intolerable Vanity, thought that every body was to ſubmit to him, and was not ſatisfy'd with the Civility* Spiſame *ſhewed him. Perhaps, having obſerved that* Spiſame *repented of his Apoſtacy, he falſly accuſed him of ſome Crimes, eſpecially of being a meer Spy at* Geneva, *and had him Beheaded to be revenged of him. It was the 25th of* March 1565. That Paſſionate Author might be Confuted ſeveral ways; but I ſhall only uſe this Chronological Reaſon. *Calvin* died the 27th of *May* 1564, and *Spiſame* was Beheaded the 23d of *March* 1566, according to *M. Spon*, who, in that reſpect, is a more Credible Author than thoſe (*c*) who place that Execution on the 25th of *March* 1565. Tho' we ſhou'd prefer this Date to that of *M. Spon*, and ſuppoſe it agrees with the Cuſtom of beginning the Year in *January*, it were ſtill moſt certain, that *Calvin* died above Nine Months before *Spiſame* was Executed.

(*D*) *Others aſcribe it to* Beza's *Jealouſy.*] *Le Laboureur* ſpeaks of it as confidently as if he had ſome Proofs for it. *Beza*, ſays he (*d*), *who envied him mortally, did ſo narrowly obſerve him, when that Man was vexed to be reduc'd to a Private and Miſerable Life, that he made him ſuſpected of keeping Intelligence with Queen* Catherine *and the Catholicks, and of intending to leave* Geneva. *He was Impriſon'd, Try'd, and Beheaded the Twenty Fifth of* March 1565, *and was the Firſt Victim of the Liberty he had* (*e*) *procured to that City.* Beza, *who was his Enemy, not contented with his Execution, made the following Latin Verſes againſt his Memory, wherein he could not forbear Reflecting upon him, contrary to the Maxims of his Religion, for preferring a Wife to a Biſhoprick; and beſides, he owns, that ſhe was rather a Concubine than a lawful Wife.* That Author quotes Ten Latin Verſes, which he aſcribes to *Beza*, upon the Death of *James Spiſame*, with a bloody Anſwer that was made to them likewiſe in Latin Verſe. I queſtion whether it can be proved that the Epigram of Ten Verſes has been juſtly aſcribed to *Beza*. It will not be improper to ſee what he anſwered to *Claudius de Sainctes*, who had reproach'd him with ſome things relating to *James Spiſame*. (*f*) *Spiſamius mihi nunquam collega fuit, & cur ego illum odiſſem, à quo nunquam injuriam acceperam? num, ſicut in alterius nomine ineptus ille tuus monitor mihi exprobrat, quod vererer ne meis luminibus officeret? Atqui, neque hoc ille unquam cogitavit, opinor, neque (abſit verbo invidia) cauſa ulla fuit cur id timerem. An tamen illi à me intentata vana crimina fuiſſe proditionis, illiciti matrimonii, & ſtupri, quum longè gravius ipſo in iſtis deliquiſſem. Quòd ſi vana illa fuerunt, quomodo ille minùs quàm ego graviter deliquerit? an quòd apud vos iſta pro nihilo ducantur? At tu hominum vaniſſime, vide quam teipſum fallas. Num enim ego accuſator, num ſubſcriptor in eo fui quæ nunquam in illius cauſa in diſceptationem venerant? Nam de proditione vel ſtupro nulla quod ſciam fuit mentio. Sciunt autem omnes ex hujus civitatis more qua quiſque de cauſa damnetur. Nec de adulterio quæſitum eſt. De quo igitur dices? hoc vero tu ex me non audies, qui ne hoc quidem niſi à te coactus commemoro. Jure tamen damnatum fuiſſe ſi mihi non credis, ipſemet ſaltem credere te oportuit.* There are Three things in this Latin Paſſage. 1. That *Spiſame* was not a Man who pretended to eclipſe *Beza*'s Glory, and that *Beza* had no ground to be afraid of ſuch a thing. 2. That *Beza* did not ſet up for an Accuſer of *Spiſame*. 3. That *Spiſame* was not accuſed of Adultery, nor of Fornication, nor of Treaſon. *Mezeray* is therefore to blame for ſaying that (*g*) *upon I know not what Umbrage that was taken at him, at* Geneva, *he was accuſed of Adultery, and Beheaded for that pretended Crime.*

(*E*) *Wants to be rectify'd. He has given us ſome curious Particulars.*] “(*h*) *Spiſame* ——— having retired to *Geneva* cou'd not be quiet. Having formed an Intrigue with the Counſellors of the Queen-Mother, *Catherine de Medicis*, to get the Catholicks reſtored into that Town, and to enable the Biſhop to get into it with main Force, in hopes of being provided with a New Biſhoprick, his Treacherous Practices were diſcovered by *Grillon*, Collonel of the Regiment of Guards, who gave notice of it to the Agent of *Geneva* who attended the Court. The Agent took care to acquaint the Magiſtrates of *Geneva* with it: Whereupon *Spiſame* was Arreſted; and the Pretence on which he was brought to his Trial, was that he kept a Married Woman, and not, as *Maimbourg* brutiſhly ſays, that he had made a falſe Contract, or falſe Seals. An Adulterer may be puniſh'd with Death according to the Law *Julia de Adulteriis*. 'Twas upon this juſt Pretence that he was Beheaded, without mentioning his Conſpiracy, for fear of diſpleaſing the Court of *France*. And to prevent that Court from concerning themſelves for him, and ſending an Expreſs to ſave his Life, the Council made a quick diſpatch of his Tryal, which ended the Third day after he had been Arreſted.” This Author gives a hard word to *Maimbourg* without a cauſe; for that Jeſuit goes upon the Credit of a Proteſtant (*i*) Writer. The ſame Author tells us that *Spiſame* was Condemn'd under pretence of Adultery, which is not true. He takes no notice of a Falſity in *Maimbourg*. *The Prince of* Conde, ſays he (*k*), *imploy'd* Spiſame *in other things beſides making Sermons; for he ſent him* into *Germany* to demand *the Succours, which he cou'd not obtain.* 'Tis certain he obtain'd them. *Beza* (*l*), *d'Aubigné* (*m*), *Le Laboureur* (*n*) and ſeveral others ſay ſo. And *Maimbourg* himſelf mentions (*o*) *above Three Hundred* Reiſters, *and Four Thouſand* Lanſquenets, whom the Prince of *Condé* receiv'd from *Germany*.

(*F*) *'Tis not true that* Spiſame *wrote a Book under the Name of* Peter Richer.] *Du Verdier Vau-Privas* ſays, (*p*) that *James Spiſame*, *who left his Biſhoprick*, wrote, *under the* Name *of* Peter Riaher, *a Confutation of the Idle Fancies and Lies of* Nicolas Durand, *call'd the* Chevalier de Villegaignon, in the Year 1562, in 8. *Moreri* affirms the ſame thing. But

---

† See the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm pag. 480. & ſeq.

* Catherinot, Calviniſme de Berri pag. 1.

†† Hub. Languetus Ep. 57. lib. 1.

‖ Id. Ep. 63. ejuſd. lib. p. 184.

β He is alſo call'd de L'Epine.

(a) Id. ib. pag. 53.

(b) Moreupon the ...d Spiſame. This Paſſage ... been ...ft out in ... Dutch ...itions.

...) M. le ...aboureur ...m. 2. ... 51. ...one of ...n.

...) Le Laboureur ...bid.

...) 'Tis not ...e that ...piſame ...ocured ... Liber... of Ge...va.

...) Theod. ...za apo...gia alte... ad F. Claudium ... Xain... ... p. m. ...81.

(g) Mezerai Abregé Chronol. tom. 6. circa fin. pag. m. 450.

(h) Rocolles Hiſtoire veritable du Calviniſme pag. 444, 445.

(i) Mr. Spon. See the Remark A.

(k) Maimbourg ubi infra.

(l) Beza, Hiſt. des Egliſes. B. 6. p. 88.

(m) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. univ. tom. 1. B. 3. ch. 12. p. 226.

(n) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau's *Memoirs* tom. 2. pag. 42. *See the Text of this Article.*

(o) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſm B. 4. pag. 285.

(p) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franc. pag. 620.

Century, had been a Monk. I ſhall obſerve upon what occaſion he forſook (*A*) his Order, and ſided with the Proteſtants. He did many Services to the Cauſe. He was one of the Deputies of the Conference of *Poiſſy*: I have ſaid in another * Place, that he was diſtinguiſh'd from the Miniſters that were call'd Factious, and † that he and *Du Roſier* Diſputed with two Catholick Doctors in the Year 1566. The Church of *Rochelle* deſir'd he ſhou'd be their Miniſter in the Year 1561, ‖ and ſent to him ſome Deputies at *Fontenai-le-Comte*; but the Conſequences of that Deputation are not known. He wrote (*B*) very edifying Books, full of Piety and good Morality. He Died § at *Saumur* in 1594. *Anjou* was his Native Country, as *La Croix du Maine* obſerves. He eſcaped the *Paris* Maſſacre, becauſe the Murderers were too eager in running after a Lady whom he accompanied, and killing her in the River ¶. I don't think he was then 76 Years Old, as 'tis affirm'd in a Marginal Note of *Varillas*'s Hiſtory of *Charles* IX, of the *Paris* Edition in 12. 1684.

* In the Article Charpentier.

† In the Article Roſier Remark B.

‖ Vincent, Recherches ſur les commencemens de la reformation de la Rochelle pag. 61.

§ Id. ib. pag. 68.

¶ Varillas Hiſt. de Charles IX. tom. 2. p. m. 458. See alſo Thuanus lib. 52. pag. m. 1078.

SPINOSA (*John de*) lived in the XVI. Century. He was Born at *Belovado* in the Province of *Rioja* in the Kingdom of *Caſtile*, and at Fourteen Years of Age was taken into the Houſe of the Marquis *d'Alarcon*. He became an Able Man, and ſhewed ſo great a faithfulneſs, that the Marquis conceived a particular Affection and Eſteem for him, ſo far as to entruſt him with the greateſt Secrets, and Conſult him about the moſt important Affairs. After the Deceaſe of that Lord, *Don Pero Gonçalez de Mendoça* his Son-in-Law ſucceeded him in his Offices, and was afterwards made Captain-General in *Sicily* by the Emperor *Charles* V. He made *John de Spinoſa* Secretary of the Cyphers, and of State Affairs, and was very well ſatisfy'd with his Conduct; for when *Barberouſſe*'s Fleet fill'd the *Streights* of *Meſſina*, *John de Spinoſa* was ſo fortunate and dexterous as to croſs the *Streights*, and bring into *Sicily* the Emperor's Orders, and the Money due to the Soldiers. Some time after he quelled the Mutiny of the Troops in the Kingdom of *Naples*. He follow'd the ſame *Mendoça* in the Wars of *Piedmont*, and was his Secretary; and after the Death of that Lord, he was ſent twice to *Venice* for the Affairs of the *Milaneſe*. That Imployment made him ſtay Twelve Years at *Venice*, and gave him occaſion to diſcover ſome Qualities, which procured him the Approbation and the Praiſes of the *Venetians*. He alſo received many Marks of a particular Eſteem from the Emperors *Charles* V. and *Ferdinand*, and from *Philip* II. He commanded in ſome Provinces of *Lombardy* under the Duke *de la Cueva*, Governor of the *Milaneſe*, and General of the *Spaniards* in *Italy*. He had before commanded in part of *Abruzzo* with great Probity, where he cauſed two (*A*) Famous Robbers to be Puniſh'd

---

But I have ſhewed in another (*a*) place that *Peter Richer* is a real Man, and not a Fictitious Name.

(*A*) *Upon what occaſion he forſook his Order.*] M. *Vincent*'s Grandmother by his Mother's ſide, ſaid that *John Rabec* was taken at *Chateau-Gontier*, in *Anjou*, in her Father's Houſe. " *M. de l'Eſpine*, who was " then a Carmelite, and was going to Preach at " *Angers*, happen'd to be *in that Houſe*, where he " was known and well beloved, as one who had a " great Reputation, tho' he was but a young Man. " He had been there ſome days with *Rabec*, with- " out knowing him; but being well pleaſed with " his Converſation, he was very much concern'd " for his Impriſonment: which moved him to give " him many Viſits in his Priſon, in order to diſſuade " him from the Reform'd Religion, and bring him " back to the Catholick. His Viſits had an effect " quite contrary to his Intention; for *Rabec*'s Ar- " guments convinced him, and prevail'd upon him " by degrees. Beſides, he was extremely moved with " the admirable Conſtancy *Rabec* expreſs'd when " he was Burnt, and with the Wonder God wrought " in him; for tho' his Tongue had been cut off, " he ſung at the place of Execution with an au- " dible Voice, the LXXIX Pſalm.

O God, the Gentiles do invade
Thine Heritage, to ſpoil, &c.

" As he was continually reflecting upon thoſe " things, he made no doubt that the Doctrine, a- " gainſt which he had ſo much diſputed with *Rabec*, " was the true one. He himſelf Preach'd it at *Angers* " above a Year, tho' without openly profeſſing it, " and quitting his Habit. He Cenſured ſeveral A- " buſes; and inſtead of inſiſting, as other Monks " did, upon Indulgences, Pilgrimages, and the In- " terceſſion of the Saints, he exhorted his Hearers " to Repent, and to implore the Divine Grace " through Jeſus Chriſt. He was very much fol- " lowed at firſt, but at laſt he was ſuſpected, which " made him think of removing. He went to *Re-* " *nata* of *France*, Dutcheſs of *Ferrara*, who was a " Proteſtant and reſided at *Montargis*." This is what *M. Vincent* (*b*), a Miniſter of *Rochelle*, heard his Grand-Mother ſay ſeveral times. He obſerves, that ſhe (*c*) " was Twelve or Thirteen Years of " Age, when M. *de l'Eſpine* and *Rabec* happen'd to " meet at *Chateau-Gontier*, and that ſhe died in the " Year 1624, being about Eighty Years Old." This Chronology is not very Exact; and indeed a great accuracy is ſeldom minded in ſuch Narratives. We read in *Beza*, (*d*) that *Rabec* was arreſted at *Chateau-Gontier* the 1ſt of *Auguſt* 1555, where he ſuffer'd Martydom the 24th of *April* 1556. *M. Vincent*'s Grand-Mother muſt therefore have been then younger than ſhe ſaid, or muſt have lived more Years than her Grand-Son gives her. Note, as he obſerves (*e*), that *L'Eſpine had been an Auguſtin Monk*, if we rely upon the Preface of his Tracts. Others ſay, (*f*) he had been a Dominican. *D'Aubigné* (*g*) ſays he did not make an open Profeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion, 'till the Conference of *Poiſſy*.

(*B*) *He wrote very Edifying Books*] Here follow the Titles of 'em. *Traicté des tentations, & moien d'y reſiſter*. Lyons 1566. in 8. *Traicté conſolatoire contre toutes afflictions, qui adviennent ordinairement aux fideles Chrêtiens*. Lyons 1565. in 8. *Traicté pour ôter la crainte de mort, & la faire deſirer à l'homme fidele*. Lyons 1558. in 8. He Publiſh'd alſo ſome Controverſial Pieces, among others, *Diſcours du vrai ſacrificateur*. Lyons 1564. *Defenſe & Confirmation du Traicté du vrai ſacrifice & ſacrificateur à l'encontre des frivoles reſponſes & argumens de René Benoiſt Docteur en Theologie*. Geneva 1567. in 8. (*h*). Some of his Works were Tranſlated into Latin; for we have the following Books in that Tongue. *De tranquillitate animi libri* 7. *De juſtitia Chriſtiana, de confeſſione peccatorum, de ægrotis conſolandis & de Providentia Dei.* He made an (*i*) *Excellent Sermon at* Rochelle *in* 1587, *upon the Lord's Supper, which* M. Vincent intended to Publiſh. *Simon Goulart* of *Senlis* Publiſh'd in 1591. a Collection of Excellent Diſcourſes made by *John de l'Eſpine*, to which, as he uſed to do, he added Notes and Summaries. They are the ſame Seven Books concerning the Tranquility of the Mind, which, as has been ſaid above, were Tranſlated into Latin.

(*A*) *Where he cauſed two famous Robbers to be Puniſh'd.*] One of 'em was ſo Cruel, that he drank the

(*a*) In the Article of this Richer.

(*b*) Vincent Recherches ſur les commencement de la reformation en la ville de la Rochelle p. 65. & ſeq.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 68.

(*d*) Bez. Hiſt. eccleſiaſt. l. 2. pag. 10[illegible]

(*e*) Vincent ib. p. 61.

(*f*) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie l. 24. p. m. 214.

(*g*) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. univerſ. tom. 1. B. 2. chap. 15. pag. 14[illegible]

(*h*) Taken from Du Verdier's Bibliotheque Françoiſe. pag. 68[illegible]

(*i*) Vincent ubi ſupra pag. 6[illegible] niſh'd. He loved Study, and applied himſelf to it as much as his Employments and Journeys cou'd permit him, and even writ (*B*) ſome Pieces †.

SPINOZA (BENEDICT DE) a *Jew* by Birth, who forſook Judaiſm, and at laſt became an *Atheiſt*, was a Native of *Amſterdam*. He was a Syſtematical Atheiſt

† Taken from the preface which ſerves me for an Introduction prefixed to the *Gynecepenos* of *John de Spinoza*, Printed at *Milan* in 1580.

the Blood of thoſe, whom he kill'd; the other added a Horrid Lewdneſs to his Robberies and Murders, for he raviſh'd as many Women as he cou'd get. Here are the *Spaniſh* words of my Author. (*) *Governo en Abruzzo el eſtado de la valle Siciliana, dando de ſu integridad muy grandes ſennales, con ſu pobreza: De ſu prudencia con diverſos juizios, y ſentencias notables: y de ſu juſticia con la muerte de Proſpero Camiſola cruceliſſimo homicida, è, inſolentiſſimo violador de mugeres, y de Ruttino de haman, atroce ſalteador de caminos, (y tan in humano, que como fiera ſalvaje acoſtumbrava bever la ſangre de aquellos a quien por los boſques heria, ò, matava:) y con la cabeça de ſcachia diabolo pueſta por terror de los mal hechores, en una pica à las almenas; y ſu cuerpo en quatro partes, en los paſſos, mas peligroſos del eſtado.*

(*B*) *And even writ ſome Pieces.*] I have only ſeen his *Gynecepænos*, or his *dialogo en laude de las mugeres*. It was Printed at *Milan* in 4. in the Year 1580, and Dedicated by the Author to *Mary* of *Auſtria*, Daughter of the Emperor *Charles* V, and Wife of the Emperor *Maximilian* II. Women are highly praiſed in that Book, which is ſtuff'd with Examples and Quotations, the choice whereof is none of the beſt. The Author promiſed a ſecond Part, wherein he was to beſtow Encomiums upon many illuſtrious Ladies of that Age. I wiſh he had perform'd his Promiſe, and that I might ſee his Book. He wrote another Book, Intitled, *Micracanthos*, wherein he inſerted the Actions and memorable Sayings of great Men, and obſerved the Tragical end of the wicked, that his Book might teach his Readers how to attain to Glory and how to avoid Infamy. He inſerted in it a Digreſſion concerning thoſe, who take delight in ſpeaking ill of a Book. It will appear a good one, if we judge of it by the following words. They are very judicious, and teach us how to make a difference between Cenſures and Flatteries, and then between Cenſures that may be uſeful, and thoſe that can be of no uſe. (*a*) *Pero contra aquellos que——— quiſieſſen por ventura en otras coſas tacharme: dexare por agora de hazer excuſationes, ò, reſpueſta defenſiua; refiriendome ala apologia que enel micracanthos tengo ſcrita. Donde ſuficientemente ſe trata delas ſpecies de maldicientes, y detractores; y dela reprehenſion que deue (excluſas todas las de mas) aceptarſe, y como obra ſaludable, y virtuoſa, agradeſcerſe. Alo qual remi tiendome, ſolamente dire agora que ſin deſear contra los mal dicientes, y arrogantes burladores; mas venganza de aquella con que la ſcriptura los amenaza diziendo,* (1) *parata ſunt deriſoribus judicia. Y ſin admitir por otra parte, las alabanzas engannoſas delos aduladores: ſperare gratamente con deſeo, y humildad la correction delos buenos, y ſabios varones. Teniendo para ello ſiempre enla memoria, aquellas divinas palabras del Eccleſiaſte, que dizen.* (2) *Melius eſt à ſapiente corripi, quàm ſtultorum adulatione decipi.* *Nicolas Antonio* never ſaw (*b*) that *Micracanthos*. I add that our *Spinoza* made a large Collection of Proverbs, and fill'd it with Moral Reflections. He did not Publiſh it, and gave his Reaſons for it in the 2d Part of the *Micracanthos*. (*c*) *Ha ſcrito algunas otras obras. Entre las quales (allende de los Dialogos dichos:) no es de poca importancia, la que yo he viſto de mas de ſeiſmil proverbios vulgares que ha recogido, y parte dellos compueſto; (aunque no acabada de comentar, ni impreſſa; por las cauſas que in los poſtreros razonamientos de la ſegunda parte del Micracanthos, ſe dize:) obra cierto de maravilloſa Doctrina, y provecho, y muy agradable: (anſi como las otras:) por la copia, y diverſidad de las materias, Todas ellas puramente applicadas ala virtud.*

This Author may be therefore added to thoſe, who were mention'd in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* for the Year 1686. I ſhall ſet down the Paſſage, without minding the moroſe Humour of thoſe, who will not like it: I rather chuſe to have a regard for thoſe, who will be very well pleaſed with it. (*d*) "*M. Menage* Promiſes to Publiſh an Etymological Treatiſe upon the *French* Proverbs. There are few Subjects that are ſo curious as that is, and that require a greater ſkill in the knowledge of Hiſtory. There has been a vaſt Number of Proverbs in all Languages. *Didymus* made a Collection of 'em in 10 Books, which he Dedicated to thoſe, who had writ upon that Subject. *Aldus Manutius* Publiſh'd ſomething of *Didymus*'s work with *Tharræus*'s Proverbs in the Year 1505. But 'tis to be obſerved, that Greek and Latin Proverbs are not ſo Numerous as *Eraſmus*, and thoſe who have collected what was omitted by him, wou'd make us believe; for 'tis certain, and they have been ſufficiently upbraided with it, that they took for a Proverbial Expreſſion what was not ſo. *Oudin* made a pretty large Collection of *French* Proverbs, Intitled, *Curioſitez Françoiſes*, but he does not give their Etymologies. The Dialogues between a Clown and a Philoſopher have been often Re-Printed at *Paris*; they contain the Origine of a conſiderable Number of Proverbs, ſometimes well and ſometimes wrong. The Edition of 1655. is Intitled, *Les illuſtres proverbes nouveaux & Hiſtoriques expliquez par diverſes queſtions curieuſes & morales 2. Vol. in 12.* M. *Furetiere*, who has Publiſh'd a ſecond Caſe very Satyrical againſt many Members of the *French* Academy, pretends that the Proverbs of his Univerſal Dictionary are not taken from that of the Academy, *and that in order to remove their meanneſs, he has enrich'd moſt of 'em by enquiring into their Origine, or applying to them curious Hiſtories, and comparing them with the Proverbs of other Nations, which* Paquier, Belinghen, *and ſome other grave Authors have not thought unworthy of their Pen*". A good Supplement might be made to this long Paſſage. It might be ſaid that *Belinghen* mention'd by *Furetiere* ſhou'd have been call'd *Fleury de Bellingen*, which was his true Name. I think he taught *French* in *Holland*. He Publiſh'd at the *Hague* in 1656. *L'etymologie ou explication des proverbes François*, divided into three Books by way of a Dialogue. 'Tis a Book in 8. of 363 Pages. The *Premiers eſſais des proverbes*, Publiſh'd by that Author in 1653, having met with a good Reception, he reſolved to put out a 2d Edition much larger, *viz.* that whoſe Title I have juſt now mention'd. *M. de Brieux* Publiſh'd at *Caen* the Origines of ſome Proverbs in the Year 1672. in 12. If we go higher we ſhall find at the end of *Nicod*'s (*e*) Dictionary the *Explications morales d'aucuns proverbes communs en la langue Françoiſe*, with a Tranſlation of ſome *French* Proverbs into Latin Verſe by *Joannes Ægidius Nucerienſis*. You'll find in *Morhofius*'s *Polyhiſtor* many things upon this Subject; you'll find there that *Angelus Monoſinius* has Treated at large of the *Italian* Proverb in a Book Printed at *Venice* in 1604, and (*f*) that *Julius Varini* wrote a Book (*g*), Intitled, *Scuola del Volgo*, wherein the *Italian* Proverbs are placed according to the order of Humane Actions, and attended with ſome Prudential Precepts. You'll ſee there that the Alphabetical Collection of *Italian* Proverbs made by *Orland Perſquet* is to be found in *Gruterus*'s *Theſaurus*; and that ſome mention one *Thomaſo Buoni*, who Publiſh'd a Collection of *Italian* Proverbs in (*h*) Two Volumes. But you will not find there the *origini de volgari Proverbii* (*i*) Publiſh'd by *Aloyſio Cinthio* at *Venice* in 1526. *Morhofius* (*k*) forgot the Name of a Modern Author, who has Collected the *Italian* Proverbs, and is mention'd in the Journals: I mean *Menage*. It does not appear that *Morhofius* was well acquainted with the Writers of our *French* Proverbs. He only mentions the Collection of an Anonymous Author, and that of *Joh. Ægidius Nucerienſis*, and the firſt Edition of *Belingen*'s Proverbs, and laſtly *le Duc*, who put out a Book, (*l*) Intitled, *Proverbes en rimes, ou rimes en Proverbes*. *Morhofius* knew the Collection of *Spaniſh* Proverbs made by *Ferdinand Nunnez*, Profeſſor of Eloquence and of the Greek Tongue at *Salamanca*, and the *Filoſofia vulgar* of *Juan de* (*m*) *Mal Lara*, and the *Medicina Eſpannola contenida en proverbios vulgares de nueſtra lengua*, Compoſed by *Juan Soropan de Rieros*. That *Filoſophia vulgar* is a Collection of a Thouſand Proverbs, with their Explication. I don't wonder he does not mention

(*) Hiero- ... nymo ... Geronim, ... he praiſes ... things ... of thoſe ... in his mu- ... ders.

(*a*) John ... Spino- ... Adver- ... ment to ... Reader ... fixed to ... Gyng- ... nos

(1) Prov. 19. ...

(2) Eccl. 7.

(*b*) See his ... liot. ... Script. ... Hiſpaniæ ... on the ... word ... Joannes de ... Spinoza ... tom. 1. ... p. 521.

(*c*) Hiero- ... ni. Set- ... ubi ... 2.

(*d*) Nou- ... velles de ... Repub- ... que des ... tres for ... bruary ... 1686. art. ... In the ... Extract of ... Etymo- ... gies of ... Italian ... Tongue ... written by ... M. Me- ... nage, at ... end of ... which ... there is an ... Explica- ... tion of ... many Ita- ... lian Pro- ... verbs. ... AUTHORS, who have writ upon Proverbs.

(*e*) *The Edition I make uſe of is that of Paris 1606. in fol.*

(*f*) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. lib. 1. c. 21. pag. 256.

(*g*) *Printed at* Verona 1642. in 12.

(*h*) *Printed at* Venice in 8. *in* 1604. & 1606.

(*i*) *See* Nicolas Antonio Bibl. Hiſp. tom. 1. pag. 559.

(*k*) Mentio etiam fit, ſi recte memini, in poſtremis Ephemeridibus Gallicis novi cujuſdam autoris qui proverbia Italica congeſſerit, cujus mihi nunc nomen excidit. *Morhof. ibid.* The Journal des Savans 1686. pag. 164. Dutch *Edit. and the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres *for the ſame Year* pag. 164. *mention that Collection of* Mr. Menage.

(*l*) *Printed* at Paris 1665. *in* 12.

(*m*) *It ſhou'd be* Mallara.

theist, and brought his Atheism into a (A) new method, tho' the substance of his Doctrine was the same with that of many Ancient and Modern Philosophers, both in *Europe* and the Eastern Countries. As for the latter, one needs only read what

I

mention the Book of our *Spinoza*; for 'tis lost. He does not forget the Compilers of *German*, *English*, and *Dutch* Proverbs. I know no Author that mentions *Polydore Virgil*, who pretends to have broke the Ice, both with respect to Proverbs and the Inventors of things. His Treatise of Proverbs came out in 1498, and was Dedicated to *Guido Ubaldo* Duke of *Urbino* (a). I have an Edition of it revised and enlarged the fourth time, and Printed at *Basil* 1541. it contains 456 Pages in 8.

(A) *A systematical Atheist, and brought his Atheism into a new method, tho' the substance of his Doctrine was the same with &c.*] I think he is the first who brought Atheism into a System according to the method of the Geometricians; but his Doctrine is not new. It has been believed long ago that the whole Universe is but one Substance, and that God and the World are but one Being. *Pietro della Valle* mentions some Mahometans (b), who call themselves *Ehl Eltahkik*, or *Men of Truth*, *Men of certainty*, who believe *that there is nothing but the Four Elements, which are God, Man, and every thing else.* He also mentions the *Zindikites*, another Mahometan Sect. (c) *They come near the* Sadducees, *and have their Name from them. They don't believe a Providence, nor the Resurrection of the Dead, as* Giggeius *shews upon the Word* Zindik ——— (d) *One of their Opinions is, that whatever is in the World is God.* There have been such Hereticks among Christians; for we find in the beginning of the XIII. Century, one *David* of *Dinant*, who made no Distinction between God and the first Matter. 'Tis a mistake to say (e) that he is the first who vented such a foolish Doctrine. *Albertus Magnus* mentions a Philosopher, who had done the like. (f) *Alexander Epicureus dixit Deum esse materiam vel non esse extra ipsam, & omnia essentialiter esse Deum, & formas esse accidentia imaginata, & non habere veram entitatem, & ideo dixit omnia idem esse substantialiter, & hunc Deum appellavit aliquando Jovem, aliquando Apollinem, & aliquando Palladem; & formas esse peplum Palladis, & vestem Jovis; & neminem sapientum ajebat ad plenum revelare posse ea quæ latebant sub peplo Palladis & sub veste Jovis.* Some (g) believe that this *Alexander* lived in *Plutarch*'s time; others say in express words, that he lived before *David* of *Dinant*. *Secutus fuit Alexandrum qui fecit librum de materia, ubi probare conatur omnia esse unum in materia.* This we find in the (h) Margin of the Treatise, in which *Thomas Aquinas* confutes that Monstrous and Extravagant Opinion. Perhaps, *David* of *Dinant* knew not that there was such a Philosopher of the Epicurean Sect; but it must be granted me, that he knew very well he had not invented that Doctrine. Had he not Learned it of his Master? Was he not the Disciple of *Amalricus*, whose dead Body (i) was dug up and burnt in 1208, and who taught that all things were God, and but one Being? *Omnia sunt Deus: Deus est omnia. Creator & creatura idem. Idea creans & creantur. Deus ideò dicitur finis omnium, quòd omnia reversura sunt in ipsum, ut in Deo immutabiliter conquiescant, & unum individuum atque incommutabile permanebunt. Et sicut alterius naturæ non est Abraham, alterius Isaac, sed unius atque ejusdem: sic dixit omnia esse unum, & omnia esse Deum. Dixit enim, Deum esse essentiam omnium creaturarum* (k). I dare not affirm that *Strato*, a Peripatetick Philosopher, was of the same Opinion; for I don't know whether he taught that the Universe or Nature was a simple and sole Being: I only know, that he believed it to be Inanimate, and that he acknowledged no other God than Nature. *Nec audiendus ejus* (Theophrasti) *auditor Strato, is qui Physicus appellatur, qui omnem vim divinam in natura sitam esse censet, quæ causas gignendi, augendi, minuendi habeat, sed careat omni sensu ac figura* (l). Because he laugh'd at *Epicurus*'s Atoms and *Vacuum*, one might think that he made no distinction between the several Parts of the World; but this is no necessary Consequence. All that can be concluded is, that his Opinion comes a great deal nearer *Spinozism*, than the System of Atoms. Here follows a Passage, wherein it is more largely set forth. (m) *Negat sine Deo posse quicquam, ecce tibi è transversò Lampsacenus Strato, qui det isti Deo immunitatem magni quidem muneris. Sed quum Sacerdotes Deorum vacationem habeant, quanto est æquius habere ipsos Deos? Negat opera Deorum se uti ad fabricandum mundum. Quæcunque sint docet omnia effecta esse natura, nec ut ille qui asperis, & levibus, & hamatis, uncinatisque corpusculis concreta hæc esse dicat interjecto inani, somnia censet hæc esse Democriti non docentis, sed optantis. Ipse autem singulas mundi partes persequens, quicquid aut sit, aut fiat, naturalibus fieri, aut factum esse docet ponderibus & motibus: sic ille & Deum opere magno liberat, & me timore.* Nay, there is ground to believe that he did not teach, as the Atomists did, that the World was a new Work produced by Chance; but that he taught, as the *Spinozists* do, that Nature has produced it necessarily and from all Eternity. I think the following words of *Plutarch*, if rightly understood, signify, that Nature made all things of it self and without knowledge, and not that its Works begun by Chance. (n) Τελευτῶν τὸν κόσμον αὐτὸν οὐ ζῶον εἶναι, τὸ δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἕπεσθαι τῷ κατὰ τύχην. ἀρχὴν γὰρ ἐνδιδόναι τὸ αὐτόματον, εἶτα οὕτω περαίνεσθαι τῶν φυσικῶν παθῶν ἕκαστον. *Denique mundum ipsum animal esse negat* (Strato) *vultque naturam sequi temerarios fortunæ impetus, initium enim rebus dare spontaneam quandam naturæ vim, & sic deinceps ab eadem natura physicis motibus imponi finem.* This Translation, which I have found in Page 58. of *Lescaloperius*'s Commentary upon *Cicero de natura Deorum*, and to which I have added *enim* after *initium*, is better than those of *Amyot* and *Xylander*: Nevertheless, there is something in it that does not suit the Notion one ought to have of the Opinion of that Famous Philosopher, the greatest (o) of all the Peripateticks: The words *temerarii fortunæ impetus* spoil the Symmetry of his System; and we see that *Lactantius* distinguishes it from that of the *Epicureans*, and ascribes no chance to it. *Qui nolunt*, says he (p), *divina providentia factum esse mundum, aut principiis inter se temerè coeuntibus dicunt esse concretum, aut repente natura extitisse. Natura verò (ut ait Straton) habere in se vim gignendi & vivendi, sed eam nec sensum habere ullum, nec figuram: ut intelligamus, omnia quasi sua sponte esse generata, nullo artifice, nec authore. Utrumque vanum, & impossibile.* Note, that *Seneca* (q) represents *Plato*'s Doctrine, and that of *Strato* as being Diametrically opposite: one of 'em deprived God of a Body, and the other deprived him of a Soul. I think I have read in Father *Salier*'s Book upon the Eucharist, that many Ancient Philosophers or Hereticks Taught the Unity of all things; but because I have not that Book now, I only mention this by the by. Father *Salier* is a *French Minime*. His Book Printed at *Paris* in 1689, is Intitled, *Historia Scholastica de speciebus Eucharisticis, sive de formarum materialium natura singularis observatio ex profanis sacrisque Autoribus.* It has been mention'd in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans* for *September* 1690, Page 13.

The Doctrine of the Soul of the World, which was so common among the Ancients, and the Principal Part of the System of the *Stoicks*, is in the main the same with that of *Spinoza*. Which wou'd more clearly appear, if it had been explain'd by Methodical Authors; but because the Books wherein it is mention'd, are Written rather in a Rhetorical than in a Dogmatical Method; whereas *Spinoza* is a Precise Writer, and avoids the Figurative Style, which often hinders us from having a just Notion of a Body of Doctrine; hence it is that we find many Material differences between his System and that of the Soul of the World. If any one shou'd maintain that *Spinozism* is more Coherent, he shou'd also maintain that it is not so Orthodox; for the Stoicks did not deprive God of his Providence; they re-united in him the knowledge of all things; whereas *Spinoza* ascribes to him only a separate and very limited Knowledge. Read these Words of *Seneca*. *Eun-*

dem

(a) *See the Epistle-Dedicatory of the Book de Inventoribus rerum, written by Polydorus Virgil.*

(b) *See the Article Abumuslimus.*

A LIST of some Persons, who had the same Opinion with *Spinoza*.

(c) Bespier, Remarques curieuses sur Ricaut, Etat present de l'Empire Ottoman. pag. 648.

(d) Pietro della Valle, p. 394. *of the* 3. tome, apud Bespier ibid.

(e) Asseruit Deum esse materiam primam, quod nemo ante eum deliraverat. Theoph. Raynaud. Theol. naturali, distinct. 6. n. 6. p. 563.

(f) Albertus in 1. Phys. tract. 3. cap. 13. apud Pererium de communibus principiis, lib. 5. c. 12. p. m. 309, 310.

(g) Is est, opinor, quem inter sodales suos memorat Plutarchus II. sumpos. 3. Thomasius Dissertat. 14. ad Phil. Stoic. pag. 199.

(h) Ad. lib. 1. Thomæ contra Gentil. c. 17. f. 23. ed. Lugd. A. 1586. *Thomas.* ib. p. 200.

(i) *See* Prateolus in Elencho hæresum, voce Almaricus, pag. m. 23. *He says that according to some Authors, that Heretick and his Adherents were burnt alive.*

(k) Hæc de Amalrico Gerson tract. de Concord. Metaph. cum Log. Part. IV. Oper alphab. 20. lit. N. ex Hostiensi & Odone Tusculano. *Thomasius ubi supra pag.* 200.

(l) Cicero de nat. Deorum, lib. 1 pag. m. 56.

(m) Idem Academ. Quæst. l. 4. fol. C.

(n) Plutarchus adversus Colotem, p. 1115. B.

(o) Τῶν ἄλλων περιπατητικῶν ὁ κορυφαιότατος Στράτων. Peripateticorum reliquorum summus Strato, Plut. ubi supra.

(p) Lactant. de ira Dei cap. 10. p. m. 539.

(q) Ego feram aut Platonem aut Peripateticum Stratonem, alter fecit Deum sine corpore, alter sine animo? Seneca in libro contra superstitiones, apud Augustin. de Civit. Dei lib. 6. cap. 10.

I have related in the Remark *D* of the Article *Japan*, and what I ſhall ſay (*AΔ*) concerning

dem quem nos Jovem intelligunt, cuſtodem RECTOREMQUE *univerſi, animum ac ſpiritum, mundani hujus operis dominum & artificem, cui nomen omne convenit. Vis illum fatum vocare? non errabis. Hic eſt, ex quo ſuſpenſa ſunt omnia, cauſa cauſarum. Vis illum providentiam dicere? recte dices. Eſt enim, cujus conſilio huic mundo providetur, ut inconcuſſus eat, & actus ſuos explicet. Vis illum naturam vocare? non peccabis. Eſt enim, ex quo nata ſunt omnia, cujus ſpiritu vivimus. Vis illum vocare mundum? non falleris. Ipſe enim eſt, totum quod vides, totus, ſuis partibus inditus, & ſe ſuſtinens vi ſua* (a). *Quid eſt autem, cur non exiſtimes in eo divini aliquid exiſtere, qui Dei pars eſt? Totum hoc quo continemur, & unum eſt, & Deus: & ſocii ejus ſumus & membra* (b). Read alſo *Cato*'s diſcourſe in the 9. Book of *Lucan*'s *Pharſalia*, eſpecially theſe three Verſes,

Eſtne (c) *Dei ſedes niſi terra, & pontus, & aer,*
Et cælum & virtus? Superos quid quærimus ultra?
Juppiter eſt quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris.

I ſhall obſerve by the by an abſurdity of thoſe, who maintain the Syſtem of the Soul of the World. They ſay, that all Souls both of Men and Brutes, are Particles of the Soul of the World, which are re-united to their Whole, by the Death of the Body: And to make us apprehend it, they compare Animals to Bottles full of Water, floating upon the Sea. If thoſe Bottles were broke, their Water wou'd be re-united to its Whole; thus it is with particular Souls, ſay they, when Death deſtroys the Organs in which they were ſhut up. Nay, ſome ſay that Extaſies, Dreams, and ſtrong Meditations re-unite a Man's Soul to the Soul of the World, and that this is the Reaſon why People foretell things to come by compoſing figures of Geomancy (d). 'Tis no difficult thing to perceive the Falſity of this Parallel. The matter of the Bottles floating in the Sea is an incloſure, which keep the Sea Water from touching the Water they are full of; but if there was a Soul of the World, it wou'd be diſperſed in all the Parts of the Univerſe, and therefore nothing cou'd prevent the Union of the Soul to its Whole, and Death cou'd not produce that Re-union. I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage of *Bernier*, whereby it will appear, that *Spinoziſm* is only a particular method of explaining a Doctrine, which very much prevails in the *Eaſt-Indies*.

"(e) You are not Ignorant of the Doctrine of many Ancient Philoſophers concerning the great Soul of the World, whereof they ſay our Souls and thoſe of Brutes are Portions. Shou'd we dive into *Plato*'s and *Ariſtotle*'s Doctrine, perhaps we ſhou'd find that it was their Opinion. This is in a manner the Univerſal Doctrine of the *Pendets* in the *Eaſt Indies*; and that very ſame Doctrine conſtitutes to this day the Cabal of the *Souſys*, and of the greateſt Part of the Men of Letters in *Perſia*, and is explain'd in *Perſian* Verſes very Sublime and Emphatical in their *Goul-tchen-raz* or *parterre of Myſteries*; as it has been the Doctrine of *Flud*, which our Great *Gaſſendus* has ſo Learnedly confuted, and that of moſt of our Chymiſts. Now thoſe Cabaliſtical *Indians* carry the Extravagance farther than all thoſe Philoſophers, and pretend that God or that Supreme Being, which they call *Achar*, Immutable, Immoveable, has not only produced the Souls out of its own Subſtance, but alſo whatever is Material and Corporal in the Univerſe, and that their Production was not made in the way of efficient Cauſes, but as a Spider produces a Cob-Web out of it ſelf, and re-aſſumes it whenever it pleaſes. Creation therefore, ſay they, is only an Extenſion of God's own Subſtance, and Deſtruction only his re-aſſuming that Divine Subſtance into himſelf; ſo that the laſt Day of the World, which they call *Maperlé* or *Praley*, in which they believe there will be a general Deſtruction of all things, will only be a general re-aſſuming of what God had Emitted out of himſelf. And therefore, ſay they, there is no reality in any thing which we Believe we See, Hear, Smell, Taſte or Touch: this World is but a kind of a Dream and a meer Illuſion, becauſe that multitude and great Variety of things, that appear to us, are but one and the ſame thing, *viz.* God himſelf, as all our different Numbers, ten, twenty, one Hundred, a Thouſand, *&c.* are but one and the ſame Unity repeated many times. But if you ask 'em a Reaſon of ſuch a Fancy, and if you deſire 'em to explain that Emanation and Return of Subſtance, that Extenſion, and Apparent Diverſity, or how it comes to paſs that God, who is not Corporal, but *Biapek*, as they own, and Incorruptible, ſhou'd nevertheleſs be divided into ſo many Portions of Bodies and Souls, their Anſwer conſiſts in Compariſons. They tell you that God is like an immenſe Ocean, in which many Vials full of Water ſhou'd move; that thoſe Vials, where ever they ſhou'd go, wou'd be always in the ſame Ocean, in the ſame Water; and that if they ſhou'd break, the Waters contain'd in them wou'd be united to their Whole, to that Ocean of which they are Portions. Or they'l tell you, that 'tis with God as 'tis with light, which is the ſame all over the World, and yet appears a Thouſand ways different, according to the Variety of the Objects on which it falls, or according to the different Colours and Figures of the Glaſſes thro' which it is conveyed. They are contented with theſe Compariſons, which have no Affinity with God, and are only fit to caſt a miſt before the Eyes of Ignorant People; and no ſolid Anſwer can be expected from them, if they be told that thoſe Vials wou'd be in the like Water, (f) but not in the ſame, and that there is indeed a like light all over the World, but not the ſame; and ſo with many other ſtrong Objections that are raiſed againſt 'em: They repeat ſtill the ſame Compariſons, and the ſame fine Words, or, as the *Soufs* do, the fine Poems of their *Goult-chen-raz*".

It appears from the following Paſſage that *Peter Abelard* is accuſed of aſſerting that all things are God, and that God is all things. (g) *Primam elementorum concordiam eſſe Deum & materiam ex quâ reliqua fierent, docuit Empedocles——Hæc erat illius ætatis Theoſophia, hæc notitia quæ de Cauſa principe habebatur. Jam tandem obſoleverat, & inter veterum ſomnia & phantaſmata recenſebatur. Eam inter veteris Philoſophiæ parietinas & rudera revocavit Petrus Abailardus, ingenio audax, & famâ celeber: Sepultam cineribus invenit, & quaſi Euridiceen Orpheus ab inferis tandem revocavit. Teſtor Vazquezium* i. part. quæſt. 3. art. 8. Num. 28. & *Smiſingum* de Deo uno tract. 1. diſp. 2. quæſt. 2. Numb. 54. *Deum eſſe omnia, & omnia eſſe Deum, eum in omnia converti, omnia in eum tranſmutari aſſeruit, quia Empedocleâ, aut fortè Anaxagoricâ præventus Theoſophiâ, diſtinguebat ſpecies ſecundum ſolam apparentiam, nempe quia aliquot Atomi in uno ſubjecto erant educta quæ latebant in alio.*

(*A Δ*) *Concerning the Theology of a Sect of* Chineſe.] The Name of that Sect is *Foe Kiao*. It was eſtabliſh'd by the Royal Authority among the *Chineſe* in the Year 65. of the *Chriſtian Æra*. Its firſt Founder was a Son of the King *In fan vam*, and was at firſt call'd *Xe*, or (h) *Xe Kia*; and then when he was thirty Years of Age, *Foe*, that is, *no man* (i). The *Prolegomena* of the Jeſuits prefixed to *Confucius* Publiſh'd by them at *Paris*, treat of that Founder at large. It is ſaid there, that "(k) having retired into a Deſart, as ſoon as he came to be 19. Years of Age, and having put himſelf under the Diſcipline of four *Gymnoſophiſts* to learn Philoſophy of 'em, he remain'd under their Direction till the Age of 30 Years, when

rising

(a) Seneca, Quæſt. Natur lib. 2. c. 45.

(b) Idem Epiſt. 92. pag. 351.

(c) Lucan. Pharſal. lib. 9. v. 578.

(d) Nihil
…s attin-
…de arte
… pro-
…tica
…que
…omman-
…, quibus
…e Flud-
… quam
…rinum
…uit.
…ſi enim
…ns co-
…ndo
… in ſeip-
… colli
…, ac ve-
…i ab-
…phi
…ſit, ut
…manas
… con-
…mpletur
…ut e
…dam
…cula:
…tamen
…d illa
…ſic,
…ndia
…x mor-
… cir-
…veſti-
…corpo-
…ita uni-
…animæ
…ndanæ,
…ſicut il-
omnia
…gnoſcit, ita ipſa particeps fiat cognitionis hujuſmodi: quòd
… item in hac extaſi digitos regat ad exprimenda varia pun-
…la, ex quibus effectus ſive arbitrarios, ſive fortuitos colligere
…at; hoc aut longe fallor, aut fabulam ſapit. Gaſſendus in
…mine Philoſoph. Flnddanæ, n. 29. Operum tom. 3. pag. 247.

…) Bernier, Suite des Memoires ſur l'Empire du grand Mo-
…, p. 202. & ſeq. *Dutch Edit.*

(f) *Note, that the* Spinoziſts *make no better anſwer to the puzzling diſtinction between* ſame *and* like.

(g) Caramuel, Philoſoph. realis lib. 3. ſect. 3. pag. 175.

(h) *The* Japaneſe *call him* Xaca.

(i) *See the* Acta Eruditor. 1688. pag. 257, *in the Extract of the Book of* Confucius *Printed at* Paris *in the Year* 1687.

(k) Biblioth. Univers. tom. 7. pag. 403, 404. *in the Extract of the ſame Book of* Confucius.

cerning the Theology of a Sect of *Chineſe*. I have not been able to learn any particulars relating to *Spinoza*'s Family; but there is ground to believe it was none

"riſing in the Morning before break of Day, and contemplating the Planet of *Venus*, that bare ſight gave him immediately a perfect knowledge of the firſt Principle; ſo that being full of a Divine Inſpiration, or rather of Pride and Folly, he betook himſelf to inſtruct Men, gave out himſelf as a God, and drew after him Fourſcore Thouſand Diſciples——At 79 Years of Age being upon the Point of Death he declared to his Diſciples, that for the ſpace of Forty Years that he had Preach'd to the World, he had not told 'em the Truth, but had concealed it under the vail of Metaphors and Figures; and that it was time to declare it to them. *There is nothing*, ſaid he, *to be inquired after, and on which one may place ones hopes, but Nothingneſs and a* Vacuum (1), *which is the firſt Principle of all things*". Here's a Man very different from our Unbelievers: They don't leave off ſpeaking againſt Religion but towards the latter end of their life; they don't renonce their Libertiniſm, but when they think the time of departing this life draws near. But it was then that *Foe* began to declare his Atheiſm. (a) *Teterrimum virus Atheiſmi jam moriturus evomuiſſe perhibetur, diſerte profeſſus, ſe per annos quadraginta eoque amplius non declaraſſe mundo veritatem, ſed umbratili & metaphorica Doctrina contentum, figuris, ſimilibus, & parabolis nudam veritatem occultaſſe; at nunc tandem, quando eſſet morti proximus, arcanum ſenſum animi ſui ſignificare velle: extra vacuum igitur & inane, primum ſcilicet rerum omnium Principium, nihil eſſe quod quæratur, nihil in quo collocenter ſpes noſtræ.* His Method was the Reaſon why (b) *his Diſciples divided his Doctrine into two parts: One is outward, and publickly Preach'd and taught; the other is* inward, *and carefully concealed from the Vulgar, and diſcovered only to thoſe that are initiated. The outward Doctrine, which, as the* Bonzes *expreſs it, is only like the Centers, on which a Vault is built, which are afterwards removed, when the Building is finiſh'd, conſiſts* 1. *In teaching that there is a real difference between Good and Evil, Juſtice and Unjuſtice:* 2. *That there is another life wherein Men ſhall be Puniſh'd or Rewarded for what they have done in this World:* 3. *That Happineſs may be attain'd to by thirty two figures and Fourſcore qualities:* 4. *That* Foe *or* Xaca *is a Deity and the Saviour of Men, that he was Born for their ſake, out of Compaſſion for their Errors, that he has Expiated their Sins, and that by Virtue of his Expiation they ſhall obtain Salvation after Death, and ſhall have a new and more Happy Birth in another World.* They add to this five moral Precepts, and ſix works of Mercy, and threaten with Damnation thoſe who neglect thoſe Duties.

"(c) The inward Doctrine, that is never imparted to the Vulgar, becauſe they ought to be kept to their Duty by the Fear of Hell and ſuch like Stories, as thoſe Philoſophers ſay, is however in their Opinion, the ſolid and true one. It conſiſts in laying down, as the Principle and end of all things, a certain *Vacuum* and *real Nothingneſs*. They ſay, our firſt Parents proceeded from that *Vacuum*, and return'd into it when they died, and that it is ſo with all Men, who are reſolved into that Principle by Death; that Men, all the Elements, and all Creatures make part of that *Vacuum*; and that therefore there is but one and the ſame Subſtance, which is different in all particular Beings only by Figures and Qualities, or an Internal Configuration, much like Water, which is always Eſſentially Water, whether it be turn'd into Snow, Hail, Rain or Ice". If it be a Monſtrous thing to aſſert that Plants, Brutes and Men are really the ſame thing, (d) and to ground ſuch an Opinion upon this pretenſion that particular Beings are not diſtinct from their Principle, 'tis ſtill more monſtrous to ſay, that this Principle has no Thought, no Power and Virtue. And yet, this is the Doctrine of thoſe Philoſophers: They place the ſupreme Perfection of that Principle in its Inaction and abſolute Repoſe. (e) *Hoc autem Principium cum doceant eſſe prorſus admirandum quid, purum, ſimplicium, ſubtile, infinitum, quod nec generari poſſit nec corrumpi, quod perfectio ſit rerum omnium ipſumque ſumme perfectum & quietum; negant tamen, corde, virtute, mente, potentia ulla inſtructum eſſe, imo hoc eſſe maxime proprium eſſentiæ ipſius, ut nihil agitet, nihil intelligat, appetat nihil.* Spinoza was not ſo Abſurd: The only ſubſtance he admits, is always acting and thinking; and his moſt general Abſtractions cannot inable him to diveſt it of Action and Thought. The Foundations of his Doctrine don't allow it.

Obſerve by the by, that the Followers of *Foe* teach *Quietiſm*; for they ſay that all thoſe, who ſeek true Happineſs ought to be ſo far abſorbed by profound Meditations as to make no uſe of their Intellect, and that they ought, thro' a perfect Inſenſibility, ſink into the Repoſe and Inaction of the firſt Principle; which is the true way of being perfectly like it and partaking of Happineſs. They further ſay, that thoſe, who have attain'd to that State of Quietude, may follow the uſual courſe of life as to the outſide, and teach others the Doctrine commonly received. 'Tis only in private and inwardly, that one ought to practice the Contemplative Inſtitute of the beatifical Inaction. (f) *Quocirca quiſquis bene beateque vivendi ſit cupidus, hunc aſſidua meditatione, ſuique victoria eniti oportere, ut principio ſuo quam ſimillimus, affectus omnes humanos domet ac prorſus extinguat, neque jam turbetur, vel angatur re ulla, ſed ecſtatici prorſus inſtar abſorptus altiſſima contemplatione, ſine ullo prorſus uſu vel ratiocinio intellectus, divina illa quiete, qua nihil ſit beatius, perfruatur: quam ubi nactus fuerit, communem vivendi modum & doctrinam tradit aliis, & ipſemet ſpecie tenus ſequatur, clam vero ſibi vacet & veritati, & arcana illa quiete vitaque cœleſtis inſtituto gaudeat.* Thoſe who were moſt intent upon this Contemplation of the firſt Principle, formed a new Sect, call'd *Vu guei Kiao*, that is, the Sect of Idle People, *nihil agentium*. Thus among Monks thoſe, who pretend to the moſt ſtrict Obſervance, form new Commonalties or a new Sect. The greateſt Lords and the moſt illuſtrious Perſons ſuffered themſelves to be ſo infatuated with this Quietiſm, that they took the inſenſibility to be the way to Perfection and Happineſs, believing that the nearer a Man came to the Nature of a Block or a Stone, the greater Progreſs he made, and the more he was like the firſt Principle, into which he was to return ſometime or other. 'Twas not enough that the Body ſhou'd be without motion for ſeveral Hours; the Soul was alſo to be unmoveable, and deſtitute of all manner of ſenſe. (g) *Optimates Imperii & ſummos quoſque viros hac inſania adeo occupatos, ut quo quiſque propius ad naturam ſaxi truncive acceſſiſſet, horas complures ſine ullo corporis animique motu perſiſtens, ſine ullo vel ſenſuum uſu vel potentiarum, eo profeciſſe felicius, propiorque & ſimilior evaſiſſe principio ſuo aërio, in quod aliquando reverſurus eſſet, putaretur.* A Follower of *Confucius* refuted the Impertinences of that Sect, and fully proved this Maxim of *Ariſtotle*, that (h) Nothing can be made out of Nothing; nevertheleſs they maintain'd and ſpread themſelves, and there are many People to this day, who apply themſelves to thoſe vain Contemplations (i). Were it not for the Extravagances of our Quietiſts (k), we ſhou'd be apt to think that the Writers, who mention thoſe ſpeculative *Chineſe*, did neither underſtand nor relate well what they ſay of 'em; but if we conſider what paſſes among Chriſtians, we need not deny what we are told of the Follies of the Sect *Foe Kiao*, or *Vu guei Kiao*.

I am apt to believe either that the Senſe, which thoſe Men put upon *Cum hiu*, is not exactly expreſs'd, or that their Notions are contradictory. We are told that thoſe Words ſignify *Emptineſs and Nothingneſs, vacuum & inane*; and in order to confute that Sect, this Axiom, Nothing can be made out of Nothing, has been alledged againſt them; and therefore thoſe who alledged it, muſt have believed that, according to that Sect, Nothingneſs is the Principle of all Beings. I cannot believe that thoſe *Chineſe* take the Word Nothingneſs

(1) Pag. 29. Vacuum & inane, Cum hiu *in the* Chineſe *Language*.

(a) Acta erudit. Lipſiens. p. 257.

(b) Biblioth. Univerſ. ubi ſupra pag. 404. & ſeq. *See alſo the* Nouveaux Memoires ſur l'état preſent de la Chine *by Father* le Comte, tom. 2. pag. 103. Amſt. 1698.

(c) Biblioth. Univers. ibid. pag. 406.

(d) Omnia, quæcunque exiſtunt, vita, ſenſu, mente] prædita, quamvis inter ſe uſu & figura differant, intrinſece tamen unum quid idemque eſſe, quippe a principio ſuo indiſtincta. *Acta erudit. Lipſ. ib. pag.* 258.

(e) Ibid.

Quietiſm taught and practis'd by ſome Chineſe.

(f) Ibid.

(g) Ibid.

(h) Copioſe probans Ariſtotelicum illud ex nihilo nihil fieri. Ibid.

(i) Ibid.

(k) See the Remark in the Article Brachmanes.

none (B) of the most considerable. He learned the Latin Tongue of a Physician * who taught it at *Amsterdam*, and applied himself † early to the study of Divinity, and bestowed many Years upon it: And then he wholly devoted himself to the study of Philosophy. Having a Geometrical Genius, and being desirous to have a good Reason for every thing, he quickly disliked the Doctrine of the Rabbins: so that the Jews easily perceived, he did not approve many Articles of their Religion; for he was a free Thinker, and hated Dissimulation, and therefore he freely declared his Doubts and his Belief. 'Tis said that the Jews offered to tolerate him, provided he would comply outwardly with their Ceremonies, and even that they promised him a Yearly Pension; but he could not resolve upon such an Hypocrisy. However, 'twas only by degrees that he left their *Synagogue*; and perhaps he wou'd not have broke with them so soon, had he not been treacherously attack'd by a Jew, who gave him a Thrust with a Knife, that went no deeper than his Cloaths. From that time he left them altogether, which was the Reason of his Excommunication. I have enquired into the Circumstances of it, but have not been able to find 'em out ‖. He wrote, in the Spanish Tongue, an Apology for his leaving the Synagogue, which has not been Printed: However β 'tis known that he inserted several things in it, that have appeared since in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, Printed at *Amsterdam* γ in 1670, a Pernicious and Execrable Book, which contains all the Seeds of the Atheism he plainly discovered in his *Opera Posthuma*. M. *Stoupp* has no reason to insult (C) the Ministers of *Holland* for not answering the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. What he says of him is not

ness in its proper signification, and I fancy they understand it, as People do, when they say that there is nothing in an empty Trunk. We have seen that they ascribe some (a) Attributes to the first Principle, which suppose that they conceive it as a Liquor. And therefore 'tis likely they only divest it of the gross and sensible parts of Matter. If it be so, the Disciple of *Confucius* would be guilty of the Sophism call'd *ignoratio elenchi*; for he understood by the Word *nihil*, what has no Existence; whereas his Adversaries understood by it what has not the Properties of sensible Matter. I fancy they meant by that Word, what the Moderns mean by the Word *Space*; I say, the Moderns, who being neither *Cartesians* not *Aristotelicians*, maintain that Space is distinct from Matter, and that its indivisible, unpalpable, penetrable, unmoveable, and Infinite Extension is something real. The Disciple of *Confucius* wou'd have easily proved that such a thing cannot be the first Principle, being besides destitute of Activity, as the speculative *Chinese* will have it. An Extension, tho' never so real, can produce no particular Being, unless it be moved; and if it be supposed that there is no Mover, the production of the World will be equally impossible, whether there be an Infinite Extension, or nothing at all. *Spinoza* wou'd not deny it; he does not admit of a First Principle without Action. The abstracted Extension he gives it in general is only, properly speaking, the Idea of Space; but he adds Motion to it, which may produce the Varieties of Matter.

(B) *Poor and very inconsiderable.*] 'Tis well known that *Spinoza* would not have had wherewithal to live, if one of his Friends had not left him by his Will, wherewithal to maintain himself. The Pension that the Synagogue offered him, shews that he was not rich.

(C) M. Stoupp *has no reason to insult the Ministers of* Holland *for not answering.*] He is the Author of some Letters, Intitl'd, *La Religion des Hollandois*. That Book was written at *Utrecht* in the Year 1673, whilst the *French* were Masters of it. *M. Stoupp* was then Lieutenant Collonel of a *Swiss* Regiment. He raised himself afterwards so far as to be made a Brigadier, and wou'd have been promoted to higher Offices, had he not been kill'd at the Battle of (b) *Steinkerken*. He had been formerly a Minister, and had served the *French* Church of the *Savoy* in *London* in *Cromwel's* time. He affected in the Letters I speak of to make an odious Description of the many Sects that are in *Holland*. What he says of *Spinozism* is contain'd in these words. "(c) I should think that I have not mention'd all the Religions of this Country, if I shou'd say nothing of a Famous and Learned Man, who, as I have been assured, has many Followers wholly devoted to his Opinions. His Name is *Spinoza*; he was born a Jew, and has not abjured the Jewish Religion, nor embraced the Christian: And indeed he is a bad Jew, and no better Christian. He has Publish'd within these few Years a Latin Book Intitl'd, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, wherein the chief thing he seems to aim at is, to destroy all Religions, particularly the Jewish and the Christian, and to introduce Atheism, Libertinism, and a full liberty for all Religions. He maintains that all of 'em have been Invented for the Publick Good, that all Citizens may live Honestly and obey the Magistrates, and practice Virtue, not in hopes of any Reward after Death, but for the Excellency of Virtue it self, and the Advantages that accrue in this very Life to those who follow it. He does not openly say in that Book what he thinks of the Deity; he only gives some hints of it, whereas in Conversation he plainly declares that God is not an Intelligent, and a most Perfect and Happy Being, as we fancy, but only the Power of Nature, diffused all over the World. *Spinoza* lives in this Country; he has been sometime at the *Hague*, where he was visited by all the Curious, and even by some Women of Quality, who pretend to more Wit than is allotted to their Sex. His Followers dare not discover themselves, because his Book wholly overthrows the Foundations of all Religions, and has been Condemn'd by a Decree of the States, and the Sale of it is forbidden, tho' they Sell it still Publickly. Among all the Divines that are in this Country, none has ventur'd to Confute the Opinions contain'd in that Treatise. I am the more surpris'd at it, because the Author discovers a great Knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue, of all the Ceremonies and Customs of the *Jews*, and of Philosophy; and therefore those Divines cannot say that 'tis a Book that deserves no Answer. If they continue to be silent, it will be said that they have no Charity, since they leave such a pernicious Book Unanswer'd, or that they approve the Opinions of that Author, or are not able to Confute 'em." This Passage has been imparted to me by *M. Des-Maizeaux*.

An Answer to those Letters of *M. Stoupp* was Printed in 1675. It is Intitl'd, *La Veritable Religion des Hollandois, avec une Apologie pour la Religion des Estats Generaux des Provinces Unies*— *by* John (d) Brun. The Substance of what concerns *Spinoza* in that Answer is as follows. "(e) I think *Stoupp* is Mistaken, when he says, *that* Spinoza *has not abjured the Jewish Religion*, since he has not only renounced the Opinions of the Jews, having forsaken all their Practices and Ceremonies, but also Eats and Drinks every thing that is brought to him, "and

* Call'd *Francis Van den Ende*. See the Remarks.

‖ Taken from a Memorial imparted to the Bookseller.

β See the Book of *M. Van Til*, Minister and Professor of Divinity at *Dort*, Intitl'd, *Het Voor-hof der Heidenen voor de Ongeloovigen geopent*. That Book is mention'd in the *Acta Erudit.* 1695. p. 393.

γ And not at *Hamburg*, as 'tis in the Title Page.

(d) *He was then Minister and Professor of Divinity at* Nimeguen. *He is now Professor at* Groningen. *His Latin Name is* Braunius; *it has appeared in the front of several Books.*

(e) Pag. 158.

not (D) always right. When * *Spinoza* betook himſelf to the Study of Philoſophy, he quickly grew out of Conceit with the common Syſtems, and was wonderfully pleaſed with that of *Deſcartes*. He found himſelf ſo much (E) inclined to inquire after Truth, that he renounced the World in a manner, the better to ſucceed in that Enquiry. Not contented to free himſelf from all manner of Buſineſs, he alſo left *Amſterdam*, becauſe the Viſits of his Friends interrupted his Speculations, and went into the Country, where he Meditated without any hindrance, and made Microſcopes and Teleſcopes. He continued in the ſame courſe of Life after he had ſettled at the *Hague*; and was ſo well pleaſed with Meditating, and putting his Meditations into order, and communicating them to his Friends, that he ſpent very little time in Recreating himſelf, and was ſometimes

times

* Præfat. Oper. Poſthum.

" and even Bacon and Wine, tho' it ſhou'd come " from the Pope's Cellar, without inquiring whether it be *Caſcher* or *Neſech*. 'Tis true, he profeſſes no other Religion, and ſeems to be very " indifferent for all Religions, unleſs God moves " his Heart. I ſhall not inquire whether he maintains all the Opinions *Stoupp* aſcribes to him; " and it had been more edifying if *Stoupp* had " ſaid nothing of it: Let him juſtify himſelf, if " he will. Neither ſhall I enquire whether he " is the Author of the Book, Intitl'd, *Tractatus* " *Theologico-Politicus*. I am aſſured that he does " not own it; and if we may believe the Title " Page, it has been Printed at *Hamburg*, and " not in theſe Provinces. But ſuppoſe this wicked " Book had been Printed in *Holland*; the States " endeavoured to ſtifle it in its Birth, they Condemn'd it and Prohibited the Sale of it by a Publick Decree, as ſoon as it came out in their Country, as *Stoupp* himſelf confeſſes *pag. 67*. I know " it has been ſold in *England*, *Germany* and *France*, " and even in *Swiſſerland* as well as in *Holland*; but " I don't know whether it has been Prohibited " in thoſe Countries. The States, whilſt I am " writing this, expreſs their Piety by forbidding " that Book again, with many others of the ſame " ſtamp.„ As for what concerns *Stoupp*'s Complaints, that this Book had not been confuted, the Author Anſwers 1. That ſince (a) it *has been Printed at* Hamburg, *at leaſt*, *according to the Title*, Stoupp ſhou'd rather Complain of *the Divines of that City*, than of the *Dutch*. 2. That (b) ſince that pernicious Book tends *to the ſubverſion of Chriſtianity, the Roman Catholicks and the Lutherans were no leſs obliged to Confute it than the Reformed; and among the Reformed, the Divines of* Germany, France, England, *and* Swiſſerland, *ſhould have done their Duty in that reſpect as well as the* Dutch *Divines*. 3. *That* M. Stoupp *may be blamed for the ſame thing. Why did he not Anſwer it himſelf?* 4. (c) *That* Spinoza's *Book is not more Pernicious than his; for, if the firſt teaches Atheiſm openly, the other does it covertly: Both of 'em ſhew the ſame indifference for Religion. An Enemy, who attacks us privately, and under the appearance of Friendſhip, is much more dangerous than an open Enemy. 'Tis neceſſary to cry out againſt a Private Enemy, that every Body may know of it, whereas every body ſtands upon his Guard againſt a profeſt Enemy. Perhaps, this is the Reaſon why the Divines of* Holland *and* Swiſſerland *have been of Opinion that there was no neceſſity to make a ſpeedy Anſwer to* Spinoza, *believing that the Horror of his Doctrine is a ſufficient Confutation of it; the more, becauſe there is nothing New in that Treatiſe, what is contain'd in it having been a thouſand times repeated by Profane Men, and yet, thanks be to God, the Church has received no great harm by it*. That he (*John Brun*) (d) has writ *ſeveral Remarks upon that execrable Book*, which perhaps he would have Publiſh'd, had not the War prevented it: *Tho'*, ſays he, *I think I have ſpent my time much better upon ſome other Works: Nay, I never took* Spinoza's *Book to be ſo pernicious as the Defamatory Libel of* Stoupp. 6. That (e) Spinoza's *Tract has been at laſt Confuted in* Holland *by an Excellent Man, who was a very good Divine, and a great Philoſopher, viz. by the late* M. Mansfeldt *Profeſſor at* Utrecht. *Doubtleſs that Confutation had been ſooner Publiſh'd, had not Death prevented the Author. And I don't queſtion that others would have confuted it long ago, had not* Stoupp *and his Accomplices hindred it by this Bloody War*. I ſhall ſet down in the Remark *H*, the Titles of ſome other Anſwers to that Book of *Spinoza*.

(D) *What he ſays of him, is not always right.*] Does he not ſay, that according to *Spinoza*, Religions have been Invented to induce Men to the Practice of Virtue, not in hopes of being rewarded in another World, but becauſe Virtue is an Excellent thing in it ſelf, and advantageous in this Life? Is it not certain that this Atheiſt had no ſuch Thoughts, and that he wou'd not have argued thus without making himſelf ridiculous? All the Religions in the World, both the True and the Falſe ones, run upon this great Hinge, That there is an inviſible Judge, who Rewards and Puniſhes Men after this Life. The greateſt Uſe of Religion is ſuppoſed to derive from that; and if Religion had been Invented, this had been the chief Motive of the Contrivers of it. 'Tis plain enough that Good Actions don't generally procure Temporal Advantages ot Men, and that Bad ones are the moſt uſual and the moſt effectual way of raiſing ones ſelf; and therefore in order to inſpire Men with the love of Virtue, and prevent their running into Vice, it had been neceſſary to propoſe to them Rewards and Puniſhments after this Life. This is the Craft which the Libertines aſcribe to thoſe, whom they Pretend to have been the firſt Contrivers of Religion. This is what *Spinoza* ſhould have believed, and doubtleſs he believed it; and therefore *M. Stoupp* did not underſtand this part of his Doctrine. I wonder this Fault was not left out in the Supplement to *Moreri*'s Dictionary, in an Article that bears *M. Simon*'s Name. Note, that thoſe who deny the Immortality of the Soul, and Providence, as the Epicureans did, are thoſe who maintain that Virtue ought to be follow'd by reaſon of its Excellency, and becauſe the practice of Morality is attended in this Life with ſufficient Advantages, to have no reaſon to Complain. Doubtleſs, this is the Doctrine *Spinoza* would have taught, if he had been ſo bold as to dogmatize Publickly.

(E) *So ſtrongly inclined to inquire after Truth.*] The Proof of theſe words, and of many more in the Text of this Article, is to be found in the Poſthumous Works of that Author. (f) *Fuit ab ineunte ætate literis innutritus, & in adoleſcentiâ per multos annos in Theologiâ ſe exercuit; poſtquam verò eo ætatis pervenerat, in quâ ingenium matureſcit, & ad rerum naturas indagandas aptum redditur, ſe totum Philoſophiæ dedit: quum autem nec præceptores, nec harum Scientiarum Auctores pro voto ei ſatisfacerent, & illo tamen ſummo ſciendi amore arderet, quid in hiſce ingenii vires valerent, experiri decrevit. Ad hoc propoſitum urgendum Scripta Philoſophica Nobiliſſimi & ſummi Philoſophi* Renati des Cartes *magno ei fuerunt adjumento. Poſtquam igitur ſeſe ab omnigenis occupationibus, & negotiorum curis, veritatis inquiſitioni magnâ ex parte officientibus liberaſſet, quò minus à familiaribus in ſuis turbaretur meditationibus, urbem Amſtelædamum, in quâ natus, & educatus fuit, deſeruit, atque primò Renoburgum, deinde Voorburgum, & tandem Hagam Comitis habitatum conceſſit, ubi etiam IX. Kalend. Martii anno ſupra milleſimum & ſexcenteſimum ſeptuageſimo ſeptimo ex Phthiſi hanc vitam reliquit, poſtquam annum ætatis quadrageſimum quartum exceſſiſſet. Nec tantum in veritate perquirendâ intentus fuit, ſed etiam ſe ſpeciatim in Opticis & vitris, quæ Teleſcopiis & Microſcopiis inſervire poſſent, tornandis, poliendiſque exercuit;*

exercuit;

(a) Pag. 160.

(b) Ibid. pag. 161.

(c) Ibid. pag. 162.

(d) Ibid. pag. 163.

(e) Ibid. pag. 164.

(f) Præfat. oper. Poſthum. B. D. S.

times a Quarter of a Year without ſtepping out of doors. Tho' he lived a very retired Life, his Name and his Reputation flew every where. Men of little Belief (F) reſorted to him from all parts. The *Palatin* Court offered him a (FΔ) a Profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy at *Heidelberg*, but he refuſed it, being an Employment little conſiſtent with his great Deſire of inquiring into Truth, without any Interruption. He fell ſick of a lingring Diſeaſe, of which he died at the *Hague*, the 21ſt of *February* 1677, being ſomewhat above 44 Years of Age §. I have heard ſay that the Prince of *Condé* * being at *Utrecht* in the Year 1673, ſent him word that he would be glad to ſee him. Thoſe who have been acquainted with *Spinoza*, and the Peaſants of the Villages where he liv'd a Retir'd Life for ſome time, do all ſay that he was a Sociable, Affable, Honeſt, Officious,

§ Taken from the Preface of his Poſthumous Works. See the Remark [?]

* See the Remark F.

exercuit; & niſi mors eum intempeſtiva rapuiſſet, (quid enim in his efficere potuerit, ſatis oſtendit) præſtantiora ab eo fuiſſent ſperanda. Licet verò ſe totum mundo ſubduxerit, & latuerit, plurimis tamen doctrinâ, & honore conſpicuis Viris ob eruditionem ſolidam, magnumque ingenii acumen innotuit: uti videre eſt ex Epiſtolis ad ipſum ſcriptis, & ipſius ad eas Reſponſionibus. Plurimum temporis in naturâ rerum perſcrutandâ, inventis in ordinem redigendis, & amicis communicandis, minimum in animo recreando inſumpſit: Quin tantus veritatis expiſcandæ in eo ardor exarſit, ut teſtantibus iis apud quos habitaverit per tres continuos menſes in Publicum non prodierit. Quinimò, ne in veritatis indagine turbaretur, ſed ex voto in eâ procederet, Profeſſoratum in Academiâ Heidelbergenſi, ei à Sereniſſimo Electore Palatino oblatum, modeſtè excuſavit, uti ex (a) *Epiſtola quinquageſimâ tertiâ & quartâ perſpicitur.* The Theology he ſtudied ſo long was that of the Jews. (b) 'Tis ſaid that he was not well verſed in their Learning, and in the Knowledge of the Scripture. 'Tis certain he underſtood (c) Hebrew better than (d) Greek.

(F) *Men of little Belief reſorted to him from all Parts*] I have named one in another (e) place. I omit the reſt, and I ſhall only ſay that the Prince of *Condé*, whoſe Learning was almoſt as great as his Courage, and who loved the Converſation of Free Thinkers, deſired to ſee *Spinoza*, and procured him a Paſſport to come to *Utrecht*. He commanded then the Troops of *France*. I have been told, by ſome Perſons, who were certainly informed of the thing, that he was obliged to go and viſit a Poſt the Day *Spinoza* was to come, and that the term of the Paſſport expired before that Prince return'd to *Utrecht*: So that he did not ſee the Author of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*; but he had given orders, that in his Abſence, *Spinoza* ſhould meet with a good Reception, and ſhould not go without a Preſent. The Author of the Anſwer to the Book, Intitl'd, *La Religion des Hollandois*, mentions this in the following Manner. "(f) Before I leave this Subject, I muſt needs "ſay that I wonder *Stoupp* ſhould ſo much inveigh "againſt *Spinoza*, and ſay that he is Viſited by ma-"ny People in this Country, ſince he contracted "ſuch a ſtrict Friendſhip with him when he was "at *Utrecht*. For I have been aſſured that the "Prince of *Condé*, at his Sollicitation, ſent for him "from the *Hague* to *Utrecht* on purpoſe to Diſ-"courſe with him, and that *Stoupp* praiſed him "very much, and was very familiar with him.

(FΔ) *A Profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy at* Heidelberg.] M. *Chevreau* ſays thereupon a thing that wants to be rectifyed. Being at the Court of the Elector *Palatin*, ſays he (g), "I gave a good Cha-"racter of *Spinoza*, tho' (h) I knew not then that "Proteſtant Jew but by the Firſt and Second parts "of *Deſcartes*'s Philoſophy, Printed at *Amſterdam* "for *John Rieuwertz* in 1663. The Elector had "that Book; and after I had read ſome Chapters "of it to him, he reſolved to call him to his U-"niverſity of *Heidelberg* to teach Philoſophy, *on* "*Condition that he ſhould not Dogmatize.* M. *Fabricius*, who was then Profeſſor of Philoſophy, "was order'd to Write to him; and tho' *Spinoza* "was not in very good Circumſtances, he refu-"ſed that Honourable Employment. The Rea-"ſons of his Refuſal were enquired into; and I "Conjectured from ſome Letters I received from "the *Hague* and *Amſterdam*, that theſe Words, *on* "*Condition that he ſhou'd not Dogmatize*, had fright-"ed him." M. *Chevreau* is miſtaken as to the Condition he mentions, and M. *Bernard* rightly obſerves that it had been a Contradiction. Theſe are his words. "(i) One may very well wonder, that "ſince *Spinoza* was already ſo well known, the "Elector ſhould have been willing to intruſt him "with the care of teaching young People Philoſo-"phy, and much more to require from him that "he ſhould not Dogmatize; for ſince his impious "Doctrine was built upon the very Principles of "his Philoſophy, how could he have taught that "Science without teaching his Impious Errors? "Such a Propoſal, together with the Law impo-"ſed on him, implied a kind of Contradiction." 'Tis certain, that ſuch a thing was not required from him, and that M. *Chevreau* is miſtaken in that particular: Which may be eaſily proved by the Letter that was written to him. M. *Fabricius*, who was ordered to write it, promiſed *Spinoza* a full Liberty of Philoſophizing; of which, adds he, the Elector thinks you will not make an ill uſe to the Prejudice of the Religion Eſtabliſh'd by the Laws. If you come hither, you'll live a pleaſant Life, and ſuch as becomes a Philoſopher. (k) *Philoſophandi LIBERTATEM habebis AMPLISSIMAM, quâ te ad Publice ſtabilitam Religionem conturbandam non abuſurum credit* ——— *Hoc unum addo, te, ſi huc veneris, vitam Philoſopho dignam cum voluptate tranſacturum, niſi præter ſpem & Opinionem noſtram alia omnia accidant.* *Spinoza* anſwered, that if he had deſired to be a Profeſſor, he wou'd have deſired no other Profeſſorſhip than that which was offered him in the *Palatinate*, eſpecially, becauſe his Electoral Highneſs granted him the liberty of Philoſophizing. (l) *Si unquam mihi deſiderium fuiſſet alicujus facultatis profeſſionem ſuſcipiendi, hanc ſolam optare potuiſſem quæ mihi à Sereniſſimo Electore Palatino, per te offertur, PRÆSERTIM OB LIBERTATEM PHILOSOPHANDI quam Princeps Clementiſſimus concedere dignatur.* I confeſs, that among other Reaſons for which he declares he does not find himſelf diſpoſed to accept that Profeſſorſhip, he ſays he does not know within what Bounds he muſt confine himſelf, to avoid doing any Prejudice to the Religion Eſtabliſh'd by Law. (m) *Cogito deinde, me neſcire, quibus limitibus libertas iſta Philoſophandi intercludi debeat, ne videar publice ſtabilitam Religionem perturbare velle.* But this does not prove that the Condition mention'd by M. *Chevreau* was required from him. This ſhews that even good Authors are very apt to give a wrong account of a Fact. M. *Chevreau* ſhould have been contented to ſay that *Spinoza* was given to underſtand, that if he ſhould impugn the Principles of the Reformed Church, it would be taken amiſs. Inſtead of which he uſes a general Propoſition, importing a formal Prohibition of Dogmatizing: This is a perfect Contradiction in the Terms. However 'tis certain that the Clauſe inſerted in the Letter written to *Spinoza*, ſeem'd very inconvenient to him: this I have expreſſed in a general way,

(a) M. Fa- ...icius ...feſſor ...*Divini-* ...at Hei- ...berg, ...Coun- ...r to ...Ele- ...Pa- ...ne, ...it that ...ter to ...inoza, ...his ...ſter's ...ler, ...16th. ...Febru- ...1673. ...fol- ...ing ...ter is ...inoza's ...ſwer to ...Fa- ...icius, ...e, that ...was ...nknown ...be the ...ther ...the ...ractatus ...heolo- ...co-Po- ...icus.

...) See ...Sup- ...ments to ...reri's ...ctiona- ...upon ...word ...za.

(i) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres *for* September, 1700. pag. 301.

(k) Epiſt. 53. Spinozæ p. 562. Oper. Poſth.

(l) Ibid. Epiſt. 54.

(m) Ibid. pag. 563.

...) *See at the end of his* Opera Poſthuma *his Abridgment of* ... Hebrew *Grammar.* (d) Tam exactam linguæ Græcæ cog...ionem non habeo, ut hanc Provinciam ſuſcipere audeam. ...za *Tractatu Theologico-Politico*, cap. 10. ſub. fin. p. 136. ...) *See the Article* Henault. (f) Brun, veritable Religion des ...ollandois, p. 164. (g) Chevræana tom. 2. pag. 99, 100. ...ch *Edition.* (h) *To ſpeak like an Orthodox*, M. Chevreau ...uld have *ſaid, becauſe I only knew that* Proteſtant *Jew by the* ...ſt, &c.

cious, and a (F△△) good Moral Man. This is ſtrange; but after all, 'tis not a more ſurpriſing thing, than to ſee Men live an ill Life, tho' they be fully perſuaded of the Truth of the Goſpel *. Some will have it that he follow'd the Maxim, *nemo repente turpiſſimus*, and that he became an Atheiſt only by Degrees, and that he was very far from being ſo in the Year 1663, when he Publiſhed the † Geometrical Demonſtration of *Deſcartes*'s Principles. He appears as Orthodox in that Book upon the Nature of God, as *Deſcartes* himſelf; but we muſt know that he did not ſpeak according to (F△△△) his Perſuaſion. There is ground to believe that the Ill Uſe he made of ſome Maxims of that Philoſopher, occaſion'd his Atheiſm. Some ſay that the Pſeudonymus Piece *de Jure Eccleſiaſticorum*, Printed in 1665, (G) was the Fore-runner of the *Tractatus* Theolo-

gico

by ſaying, That he refuſed that Profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy, *being an Employment little conſiſtent with his great Deſire of inquiring after Truth without any interruption*; for he had good Reaſon to believe he would be continually interrupted, and that the Divines of the *Palatinate* would make him loſe a great deal of time in juſtifying to the Prince what he ſhould teach his Scholars. They wou'd have found in his Lectures ſometimes one thing directly contrary to the Religion of the Country, and ſometimes another indirectly contrary to it. Which would have afforded many Complaints and Accuſations: He knew not how far the thing would go, and therefore he could not be ſure of living a quiet life; and tho' he had not fore-ſeen that it would make him loſe a great deal of time, he was ſenſible that his Meditations would be very much interrupted by his ſet Lectures, and many other Functions belonging to a Profeſſor. I deſire my Reader to add this to the Explanation, which has been Publiſh'd in the (a) *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*.

(F△△) *And a good* **Moral Man.**] If you except what he told his Intimate Friends, who deſired to be his Diſciples, he ſaid nothing in Converſation but what was edifying. He never ſwore; he never ſpoke diſreſpectfully of God; he went ſometimes (b) to hear Sermons, and exhorted others to go conſtantly to Church. He did not care for Wine, good Chear or Money. What he gave to his Landlord, a Painter at the *Hague*, was very inconſiderable. He minded nothing but Study, in which he ſpent the greateſt part of the Night. He liv'd a perfect ſolitary Life. 'Tis true, he did not refuſe the Viſits occaſion'd by his Reputation; and that ſometimes he viſited ſome conſiderable Perſons, not to talk of trifling things, or for his Diverſion, but to diſcourſe of State-Affairs. He had ſome Skill in them, tho' not by Experience, and gueſs'd pretty right what courſe General Affairs would take. I find all theſe Particulars in the Preface of (c) *M. Kortholt*, who in a Journey he made to *Holland*, inform'd himſelf of *Spinoza*'s Life as well as he could. *Vacavit interdum doctis & principibus viris*, ſays he (d), *quos non tam convenit, quam admiſit, iiſque cum de rebus civilibus ſermones inſtituit. Politici enim nomen affectabat, & futura mente ac cogitatione ſagaciter proſpiciebat, qualia hoſpitibus ſuis haud rara prædixit* ——— *Se profeſſus eſt Chriſtianum, & vel Reformatorum vel Lutheranorum cœtibus non modo ipſe adfuit, ſed aliis auctor ſæpenumero & hortator extitit, ut templa frequentarent, domeſticiſque verbi quoſdam divini præcones maximopere commendavit. Nec unquam jusjurandum aut petulans de Déo dictum ex ore Spinoſæ exiit; nec largiore uſus eſt vino, & ſatis duriter vixit. Ideoque hoſpiti quavis anni parte LXXX, aureos Belgicos tantummodo perſolvit, & ſummum CCCC. quotannis impendit. Auro plane non inhiabat.*

(F△△△) *He did not ſpeak according to his Perſuaſion.*] On the contrary, he believed then the ſame things which are to be found in his Poſthumous Works, *viz.* That our Souls are but Modifications of the Subſtance of God. This may be certainly inferr'd from the Preface of the Book, by any one that knows *Spinoza*'s Syſtem. I ſhall ſet down the Paſſage of that Preface, wherein 'tis ſaid, that having a Scholar to whom he had promiſed to explain *Deſcartes*'s Philoſophy, he ſcrupl'd to depart never ſo little from the Opinions of that Philoſopher, tho' he did not approve of 'em in ſeveral things, eſpecially in what concerns Mens Will and Liberty. (e) *Cum Diſcipulum ſuum Carteſii Philoſophiam docere promiſiſſet, religio ipſi fuit, ab ejus ſententia latum unguem diſcedere, aut quid, quod ejus dogmatibus aut non reſponderet, aut contrarium eſſet, dictare. Quamobrem judicet nemo, illum hic, aut ſua, aut tantum ea, quæ probat, docere. Quamvis enim quædam vera judicet, quædam de ſuis addita fateatur; multa tamen occurrunt, quæ tanquam falſa rejicit, & à quibus longè diverſam fovet ſententiam. Cujus notæ inter alia, ut ex multis unum tantùm in medium afferam, ſunt, quæ de voluntate habentur.* Schol. Prop. 15. part. 1. Principior. & Cap. 12. Part. 2. Appendic. *quamvis ſatis magno molimine atque apparatu probata videantur: Neque enim eam diſtinctam ab intellectu, multò minus tali præditam eſſe libertate exiſtimat. Etenim in his aſſerendis, ut ex* Diſſertat. de Method. Part. 4. & Meditat 2. *aliiſque locis liquet, tantùm ſupponit, non probat Carteſius, mentem Humanam eſſe ſubſtantiam abſolute cogitantem. Cum contrà Author noſter admittat quidem, in Rerum natura eſſe ſubſtantiam cogitantem: Attamen neget illam conſtituere eſſentiam Mentis humanæ; ſed ſtatuat, eodem modo quo Extenſio nullis limitibus determinata eſt, Cogitationem etiam nullis limitibus determinari: adeoque quemadmodum corpus humanum non eſt abſolute, ſed tantum certo modo ſecundum leges naturæ extenſæ per motum & quietem determinata extenſio; ſic etiam mentem ſive Animam humanam non eſſe abſolutè, ſed tantum certo modo determinatam cogitationem: quæ neceſſario dari concluditur, ubi corpus humanum exiſtere incipit. Ex quâ definitione, non difficile demonſtratu eſſe putat, Voluntatem ab intellectu non diſtingui, multò minus eâ, quàm illi Carteſius adſcribit, pollere libertate; quin imò ipſam affirmandi & negandi facultatem prorſus fictitiam.* It appears from a (f) Letter of *Spinoza*, that he deſired the Author of the Preface ſhou'd uſe the Advertiſement we have juſt now read. From which you may conclude, that a Divine might have taken many Thoughts and Phraſes from that Book of *Spinoza*, without being Heterodox. See the Book, Intitl'd, (g) *Burmanorum pietas*, Printed at *Utrecht* in 1700.

(G) *The Pſeudonymous Piece* de Jure Eccleſiaſticorum ——— *was the Fore-runner.*] M. *Davis* inſerting ſome Objections in his Journal againſt a Book (h) of *M. de la Placette*, ſays that ſincere Men (i), "who depreſs the Eccleſiaſtical Authority, and at "the ſame time raiſe the Temporal one —— don't "obſerve that they Fall into the Firſt Snare laid by "*Spinoza*, to open the way to his Impious Do-"ctrine. This Conjecture is grounded upon the "Date of two Books Publiſh'd by that perni-"cious Man, One in 1665, and the Other in "1670. The Firſt is Intitl'd, *Lucii Antiſtii Con-"ſtantis de jure Eccleſiaſticorum liber ſingularis quo do-"cetur: Quodcumque Divini humanique juris Eccle-"ſiaſticis tribuitur, vel ipſi ſibi tribuunt, hoc aut falſo "impieque illis tribui, aut non aliunde quàm a ſuis, "hoc eſt ejus Reipublicæ ſivè Civitatis Prodiis, in qua "ſunt conſtitui, accepiſſe.* The Second is his *Tracta-"tus Theologico-Politicus*, which made a much great-"er Noiſe than the firſt. The Style and the Prin-"ciples of thoſe two Books are ſo like, that one "needs only compare 'em together, to be fully "convinc'd that they were written by the ſame "Author. And the bare reading of 'em is ſuffi-"cient to ſee that he has depreis'd the Authori-"ty of the Clergy, and at the ſame time "rais'd that of Kings and Magiſtrates, in the "Firſt, only to make way for the Impious Do-"ctrines which he aſſerts in the Second.

I

---

* Taken from the Memorial imparted to the Bookſeller.

† Here is the Title of that Work: *Renati DesCartes Principiorum Philoſophiæ Pars I. & II. more Geometrico demonſtrata per Benedictum de Spinoza Amſtelodamenſem. Acceſſerunt ejuſdem Cogitata metaphyſica, in quibus difficiliores, quæ tam in parte Metaphyſices generali, quam ſpeciali occurrunt, quæſtiones breviter explicantur.*

(a) In *December* 1700, p. 689, 690.

(b) *See the Remark* S.

(c) Sebaſtian. *He is Profeſſor of Poetry at* Kiel, *ſince the Month of* Februaary, 1701.

(d) Sebaſtianus Kortholtus præfat. edit. 2. Tractatus Chriſtiani Kortholti patris ſui de tribus impoſtoribus.

gico-Politicus. All those, who have (H) confuted the Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, have discovered in it the Seeds of Atheism; but none has done it so nearly as M. *John Bredenbourg*. It is not so easy to Answer all the Difficulties contain'd

I don't think that Mr. *Dartis* is in the right: There is more Reason to believe that the Author *Lucii Antistii*, &c. was the same *Socinian*, viz. *Lewis Meier*, who Publish'd the Year following the Dissertation, Intitled, *Philosophia sacræ Scripturæ interpres.*

(H) *All those, who have confuted the* Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, *have discovered in it*——*but none has done it so nearly as* M. John Bredenbourg.] I have already mention'd the Posthumous Answer of a (a) Professor of Philosophy in the University of *Utrecht*. To which I add, that a *Socinian* call'd *Francis Cuperus*, who died at *Rotterdam* in 1691. Intitled his Answer to that Book of *Spinoza*, *Arcana Atheismi revelata, philosophice & paradoxe refutata.* 'Tis a Book in Quarto Printed at *Rotterdam*, in 1676. M. *Yvon* a Disciple of *Labadie*, and Minister of the *Labadists*, at *Wiewert* in *Friesland*, confuted the same Book of *Spinoza*, in a Work, Intitled, *L'impieté convaincue*, and Publish'd at *Amsterdam* in 1681, in 8. 'Tis said in the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary, 1. That M. *Huet*, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, and M. *Simon*, in his Book concerning the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings, have confuted the Impious System contain'd in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. 2. That this *Tractatus* has also been Translated into *French*, and Printed with this Title, *Reflections curieuses d'un Esprit desinteressé sur les matieres les plus importantes au salut tant public que particulier*. I add that this Translation, Printed in the Year 1678, in 12. came out with (b) two other Titles, as it has been rightly observ'd in the Catalogue of the Library of the Arch-Bishop of *Reims*, and that the Latin Original has been Re-Printed in 8. with several Odd and Chimerical Titles, as the Booksellers thought fit to deceive the Publick, and elude the Prohibitions of the Magistrates. I further add, that Father (c) *le Vassor* has very well confuted *Spinoza*, in his Treatise concerning the true Religion, Printed at *Paris* in 1688. See the *Journal des Sçavans* of the 31st of *January* 1689. the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, and the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans* in the same Year. M. *Van Til* (d) a Minister of *Dort*, wrote very good Books in *Dutch*, to maintain the Divinity and Authority of the Scripture against that Impious Man. The Passage I am going to quote out of M. *Saldenus*, a Minister at the *Hague*, will inform us of the Names of some other writers against *Spinoza*. That Minister does not approve that *Spinoza* should be confuted in the Vulgar Tongue; he's afraid that Curious Men, fond of Paradoxes, will learn by that means, what it were better for them to be Ignorant of. (e) *Neque defuere, qui se (f) abominandis ipsius Hypothesibus voce calamoque opposuerunt. Hos inter fuere,* Batelerius, Mansveldius, Cuperus, Musæus, &c. *qui omnes an æque feliciter contra eum decertarint non sine ratione à quibusdam dubitatur. Hos secutus postmodum est* Guilielmus Blyenbergius (g), *civis Dordracenus, qui idiomate etiam vernaculo confodere ipsum laboravit; licet nesciam, an consilio satis tuto; tum quod, quem oppugnat, Adversarius Sermone ille non scripserit, tum quod periculo vix careat, ne pestilentissimum impudentissimi* Novatoris *venenum, quod sub linguâ ignotâ latere hactenus plurimos poterat, Sermone vulgato in ipsum etiam vulgus plus justo fere curiosum, & in paradoxa proclive, proserpat tandem & transeat.*

An Anonymous Writer, who denoted his Name by these Initial Letters, *I. M. V. D. M.* Publish'd a Latin Letter at *Utrecht* in 1671. against the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. As for those, who have inserted in some Books, which they did not write designedly against that Tract of *Spinoza*, many things whereby they confute his Principles, I cannot Name 'em all, they are so many: I shall only Name two Famous Professors of Divinity, M. *Witzius*, and M. *Majus*, one in *Holland*, and the other in *Germany*, and M. *de la Motte* a *French* Minister at *London*.

I shall now speak of M. *John Bredenbourg*. He was a Citizen of *Rotterdam*, who Publish'd a Book (h) in 1675. Intitled, *Johannis Bredenburgii enervatio tractatus Theologico-politici, una cum demonstratione, geometrico ordine disposita,* NATURAM NON ESSE DEUM, *cujus effati contrario prædictus tractatus unice innititur.* He set in a full light what *Spinoza* had endeavoured to wrap up and Disguise, and made a solid Confutation of it. The Readers were surpris'd that a Man, who was no Profest Scholar, and who had very little (i) Learning, shou'd have been able to dive into all the Principles of *Spinoza*, and to Confute them so successfully, after he had represented them in their full strength, by a fair Analysis. I have heard of a Remarkable thing, viz. That this Author having made many Reflections upon his Answer, and the Principle of his Adversary, found at last that this Principle might be demonstrated. Whereupon he undertook to prove that there is no other Cause of all things, but a Being which necessarily Exists, and Act, by an immutable, and unavoidable Necessity. He observed the Method of the Geometricians, and after he had built his Demonstration, he examin'd it all manner of ways; he endeavour'd to find out the weak side of it; and could never think of any way to Confute it. Which made him very uneasy; he groan'd and sigh'd, he was angry with Reason, and desired his most Learned Friends to help him to find out the Fault of that Demonstration. Nevertheless, he suffered no Body to take a Copy of it: *Francis Cuperus* Transcribed it (k) by stealth, tho' he had promised not to do it. That Man, perhaps out of Jealousy, for he had writ against *Spinoza*, and had not been so successful as *John Bredenbourg*, made use of that Copy some time after to accuse him of Atheism. He Publish'd it in *Dutch* with some Reflections; *Bredenbourg* defended himself in the same Language: Many Pieces were Publish'd on both sides, which I have not read, for I don't understand *Dutch*. *Orobio* (l) an able Jewish Physician, and *Aubert de Verse* (m) engag'd in that Quarrel, and sided with *Cuperus*. They maintain'd that the Author of the Demonstration was a *Spinozist*, and consequently an Atheist. As far as I have been able to understand by what I have heard, the latter defended himself, by alledging the Common Distinction between Faith and Reason. He pretended that as the Protestants and the Catholicks believe the Mystery of the Trinity, tho' inconsistent with the Light of Nature, he believed Free-Will, tho' Reason afforded him strong Proofs that every thing happens by an unavoidable Necessity. It is no easy thing to drive a Man out of such an Intrenchment. It may be said that he is not sincere, and that 'tis impossible to believe as a Truth what is contrary to a Geometrical Demonstration: But can this be said without setting up for a Judge in a Case, wherein Incompetency may be Objected against you? Have we a right to decide what passes in other Mens Hearts? Have we a sufficient knowledge of a Man's Soul, to be positive that such and such Combinations cannot be found in it? Have we not many instances of Absurd Combinations, and such as come nearer Contradiction than that which *John Bredenbourg* alledg'd? For it ought to be observed that there is no Contradiction between these two Things: 1. Reason teaches me that this is false; 2. And yet I believe it, because I am persuaded that Reason is not Infallible, and because I had rather follow an inward sense, and the Impressions of Conscience, in short, the word of God, than a Metaphysical Demonstration. This is not believing, and disbelieving at the same time one and the same thing. Such a Combination is impossible, and none ought to be admitted to alledge it for his Vindication. However it be, the Man I speak of made it appear that the Sense of Religion, and the Hopes of another life prevail'd in his Soul against

(a) Call'd Regnier de Mansvelt. His Book was Printed at Amsterdam 16[illegible] in 4to.

(b) One of 'em is, Traité des Ceremonies superstitieuses des Juifs, and the other La clef du Sanctuaire.

(c) He as then ather of tory. is rn'd otestant ce.

(d) See he Hi oire des Ouvrages s Sçavans r March 696. t. 3.

(e) Saldenus, in tiis Theologicis, pag. 25.

(f) See m b: is of the Tractatus Theologico-Politicus pag. 23.

(g) I think writ against the Posthumous orks, and ot against he Tractatus Theologico-Politicus.

(h) 'Tis a Book in 4. of 100 Pages.

(i) He owns in his Preface, that not being able to express himself in Latin, he had writ his Book in Dutch, and then had it Translated into Latin.

(k) I have been inform'd just now, that Cuperus did always deny it, and that he always protested that he found the demonstration among the Papers of the Sieur Hartighvelt, whose Heir he was.

(l) I have seen the Tract he publish'd at Amsterdam in 1684. Intituled, Certamen philosophicum propugnatæ veritatis divinæ ac naturalis, adversus I. B. principia, &c. It is in Latin and Dutch.

(m) I have seen something of what he publish'd in the same Year under the Name of Latinus Serbaltus Sartensis. 'Tis a Book in Latin and Dutch.

tain'd in that Book, as utterly to deſtroy the Syſtem of his *Opera Poſthuma*; for it is the moſt Abſurd and Monſtrous Hypotheſis that can be imagin'd, and the moſt (l) contrary to the cleareſt Notions of our Mind. One would think that

against his Demonſtration; and I have been told that the Signs he gave of it, during his laſt ſickneſs, put his ſincerity out of all doubt. The Abbot *de Dangeau* (a) ſpeaks of ſome Men, whoſe Religion is in their Mind and not in their Heart; they are perſuaded of the Truth of it, but they are not affected with the Love of God. I think it may be ſaid that there are ſome Men, whoſe Religion is in their Heart, and not in their Mind. They loſe the ſight of it, when they make uſe of Reaſon to come to the knowledge of it; it eſcapes the Subtilties and Sophiſms of their Logick; they know not which way to turn whilſt they compare the Arguments *pro* and *con*: But when they leave off diſputing, and mind only their inward ſenſe, the Inſtinct of Conſcience, &c. they are perſuaded that there is a Religion, and Conform their Lives to it as much as Humane Infirmities can permit it. This was the caſe of *Cicero*: One can hardly doubt of it who compares his other Books with thoſe *de natura Deorum*, wherein he makes *Cotta* Triumph over all the Interlocutors, who maintain'd the Exiſtence of the Gods.

Whoever deſires to know the Shifts and Equivocations made uſe of by *Spinoza* to conceal his Atheiſm, needs only read *Chriſtian Kortholt's* Book *de tribus* (b) *impoſtoribus magnis*, Printed at *Kiel* in 1680, in 12. The Author has Collected many Paſſages of *Spinoza*, and ſhown all the Venom and Artifice that lye in 'em. This is one of the moſt Curious Parts of the Hiſtory and Character of that Atheiſt. He quotes (c) among other things his 19. (d) Letter, wherein *Spinoza* complains that there was a Report (e) that he had a Book in the Preſs to prove that there is no God.

(l) The moſt Abſurd and Monſtrous Hypotheſis—— the moſt contrary to the cleareſt Notions of our Mind.] He ſuppoſes (f) that there is but one Subſtance in Nature, and that this only Subſtance is endow'd with Infinite Attributes, and among others, with Extenſion and Thought. Afterwards he affirms that all Bodies in the Univerſe are Modifications of that Subſtance, as it is Extended; and that for Inſtance, all the Souls of Men are Modifications of that Subſtance, as it thinks: So that God, the neceſſary and moſt perfect Being, is the Cauſe of all things that Exiſt, but does not differ from them. There is but one Being, and one Nature, and that Being produces in it ſelf, and by an Immanent Action, whatever goes by the Name of Creatures. He is both Agent and Patient, an Efficient Cauſe and a Subject; it produces Nothing but what is its own Modification. This is the moſt extravagant Hypotheſis that can be thought of. The moſt Infamous things ſung by the Heathen Poets, do not come near the Horrid Notion *Spinoza* gives us of God For the Poets did not aſcribe to the Gods all the Crimes that are Committed, all the Infirmities of Mankind; but according to *Spinoza*, there is no other Agent and Patient but God, with reſpect to Phyſical and Moral Evil. Let us obſerve ſome Abſurdities of his Syſtem.

THAT according to *Spinoza* God and Extenſion are the ſame thing.

I. It is impoſſible that the Univerſe ſhou'd be one only Subſtance; for whatever is Extended muſt neceſſarily conſiſt of Parts, and whatever conſiſts of Parts muſt be compounded: And becauſe the Parts of Extenſion do not Subſiſt one in another, it neceſſarily follows that Extenſion in General is not a Subſtance, or that each part of Extenſion is a particular Subſtance, and diſtinct from all others. But according to *Spinoza*, Extenſion in General is the Attribute of a Subſtance. He owns, as all other Philoſophers do, that the Attribute of a Subſtance does not really differ from that Subſtance; and therefore he muſt acknowledge that Extenſion in General is a Subſtance: From whence it ought to be concluded, that each part of Extenſion is a particular Subſtance; which overthrows the Foundation of the whole Syſtem of that Author. He cannot ſay that Extenſion in General is diſtinct from the Subſtance of God; for ſhou'd he ſay ſo, it wou'd follow that this Subſtance is in it ſelf unextended: And therefore it cou'd never have acquired the three Dimenſions but by Creating them, ſince 'tis manifeſt that Extenſion cannot proceed from an unextended Subject, but by way of Creation. But *Spinoza* did not believe that any thing cou'd be made out of nothing. Again, 'tis manifeſt, that a Subſtance unextended by its Nature, can never become the Subject of the three Dimenſions; for how could they be plac'd upon a Mathematical Point? They wou'd therefore Subſiſt without a Subject; and therefore they wou'd be a Subſtance: So that if this Author admitted a real Diſtinction between the Subſtance of God and Extenſion in General, he wou'd be obliged to ſay, that God is compos'd of two Subſtances diſtinct one from another, *viz.* of his unextended Being, and of Extenſion. Thus he is obliged to acknowledge that Extenſion and God are but one and the ſame thing; and becauſe he maintains that there is but one Subſtance in the Univerſe, he muſt needs teach that Extenſion is a ſimple Being, and as much uncompounded as Mathematical Points. But is it not a Ridiculous Aſſertion, and contrary to our moſt Diſtinct Ideas? Is it more evident that the Number One Thouſand is made up of a Thouſand Unites, than 'tis evident that a Body of a Hundred Inches is made up of a Hundred Parts really Diſtinct one from another, each of which has the Extenſion of an Inch?

THAT Extenſion is compoſ'd of Parts, each of which is a particular Subſtance.

It were in vain to raiſe any Objections againſt our Imagininination and our Senſes; for the moſt Intellectual and the moſt Immaterial Notions diſcover to us, with the utmoſt Evidence, that there is a moſt real Diſtinction between things, one of which has a Quality, which the other has not. The School-Men have been very ſucceſsful in ſhowing the Characters and Infallible Signs of Diſtinction. When, ſay they, one may affirm of one thing, what cannot be affirm'd of the other, they are diſtinct: Things that may be ſeparated one from another, either with reſpect to time, or with reſpect to Place, are Diſtinct. If we apply thoſe Characters to the 12 Inches of a Foot of Extenſion, we ſhall find a true Diſtinction between them. I can affirm of the five, that it is Contiguous to the ſix, and I can deny it of the Firſt and Second, &c. I can remove the Sixth into the place of the Twelfth; and therefore it may be Separated from the fifth. Note, that *Spinoza* cannot deny that the Characters of Diſtinction made uſe of by the School-Men are very juſt; for 'tis by that he acknowledges that Stones and Animals are not the ſame Modification of the Infinite Being. He acknowledges therefore, will ſome ſay, that there is ſome difference between things. He muſt needs own it, for he was not ſo Fooliſh as to Believe that there was no difference between him and the *Jew*, who offered to run him thro with a Knife; or to ſay, that his Bed and his Chamber were in all reſpects the ſame Being with the Emperor of *China*. What did he ſay then? He taught, not that two Trees are two Parts of Extenſion, but only two Modifications. You'll be ſurpris'd that he ſpent ſo many Years in forging a New Syſtem, ſince one of the main Pillars of it was to be the pretended difference between the word *Part*, and the word *Modification*. Could he expect any Advantage from this change of a word? What ſignifies it, whether he declines to uſe the word *Part*, and ſubſtitutes the word *Modification* in the room of it? Will the Notions annexed to the word *Part* vaniſh away? Will they not be apply'd to the word *Modification*? Are the Signs and Characters of difference leſs real or evident, when Matter is divided into Modifications, than when it is divided into Parts? Not at all. The Idea of Matter is always that of a compounded Being, of a Syſtem of many Subſtances. This will be fully prov'd by what I am going to ſay.

Modi-

(a) *See his 3. Dialogue at the end, or the Extract of it in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres *for* August 1685. art 6. pag. m. 805.

(b) Viz. Edward Herbert de Cherbury; Thomas Hobbes; & Benedict de Spinoza.

(c) Chriſt. Korth. de tribus Impoſt. pag. 171.

(d) *Written to* M. Oldenbourg *in* 1675.

(e) Qui quidem rumor, *ait*, a plurimis accipiebatur. Unde quidam Theologi (hujus forte rumoris authore occaſionem cepere de me coram principe & magiſtratibus conquerendi.

(f) *See among his Poſthumous works what he has intitled* Ethica.

that Providence puniſh'd in a particular manner the Boldneſs of that Author, by Blinding him to ſuch a degree, that in order to avoid ſome Difficulties, which may perplex a Philoſopher, he run himſelf into others Infinitely more Inexplicable,

INCONSISTENT Modifications require Diſtinct Subjects.

Modifications are Beings, which cannot Exiſt without the Subſtance they Modify; and therefore there ought to be a Subſtance where ever there are Modifications; Nay, it muſt needs be multiplyed in Proportion as Modifications inconſiſtent one with another are multiplyed: So that where ever there are five or ſix ſuch Modifications, there are alſo five or ſix Subſtances. It is evident, and no Spinoziſt can deny it, that the Square and the Circular Figures cannot be in the ſame Piece of Wax. And therefore the Subſtance Modified by a Square Figure is not the ſame Subſtance with that which is Modified by the Circular Figure. When therefore I ſee a Round Table, and a Square Table in a Room, I may affirm that the Extenſion, which is the Subject of the Round Table, is a Subſtance diſtinct from the Extenſion, which is the Subject of the other Table; for otherwiſe the Square Figure and the Round Figure wou'd be at the ſame time in one and the ſame Subject; which is impoſſible. Iron and Water, Wine and Wood are Incompatible; and therefore they require diſtinct Subjects. The lower end of a Stake driven into a River is not the ſame Modification with the other end: It is ſurrounded with Earth, whilſt the other is ſurrounded with Water; and therefore they have two Contradictory Attributes, *viz.* being ſurrounded with Water, not being ſurrounded with Water: And therefore the Subject they Modify muſt be at leaſt two Subſtances; for an only Subſtance cannot be at the ſame time Modified by an Accident ſurrounded with Water, and by an Accident not ſurrounded with Water. This ſhows that Extenſion is made up of as many Diſtinct Subſtances as there are Modifications.

THE IMMUTABILITY of God is Inconſiſtent with the Nature of Extenſion. That Matter is actually divided into Parts.

II. If it be an abſurd thing to ſay that God is extended, becauſe, 'tis depriving him of his Simplicity, and aſcribing to him an Infinite Number of Parts; what ſhall we ſay when we conſider that this Opinion reduces him to the Condition of Matter, the vileſt of all Beings, and ſuch as moſt Ancient Phiſophers have plac'd immediately next to Nothing. Matter is the Stage of all ſorts of Changes, the Field of Battle of contrary Cauſes, the Subject of all Corruptions and of all Generations, in a word, there is no Being, whoſe Nature is more Inconſiſtent with the Immutability of God. And yet the *Spinoziſts* maintain that it ſuffers no Diviſion; and the Reaſon they alledge for it is the moſt frivolous in the World. They pretend that if Matter was divided, one of its Portions ſhould be ſeparated from others by empty Spaces; which never happens. This is certainly a very wrong Definition of the Diviſion of Matter. We are as really ſeparated from our Friends, when the Space that divides us is taken up by other Men plac'd a Breaſt, as if it was full of Earth. And therefore when the *Spinoziſts* maintain, that Matter reduc'd into Aſhes and Smoak is not actually divided, they advance a thing quite contrary to our Notions. But what will they get, if we ſhould lay aſide the Advantage we may draw from their wrong Defining Diviſion? There will remain ſtill many Proofs of the Mutability and Corruptability of the God of *Spinoza*. All Men have a very clear Idea of an Immutable Being: They underſtand by that word a Being, which never acquires any new Thing, which never loſes what it is once poſſeſt of, which is always the ſame with reſpect to its Subſtance and the manner of its Being. The clearneſs of this Idea enables us to apprehend moſt Diſtinctly what a moveable Being is: 'Tis not only a Being, whoſe Exiſtence may begin and have an End; but a Being, which always ſubſiſting as to its Subſtance, may ſucceſſively acquire many Modifications, and loſe the Accidents or Forms which it has ſometimes. All the Ancient Philoſophers have acknowledged, that the continual Series of Generations and Corruptions, which is obſerv'd in the World, neither produces nor deſtroys any Portion of Matter: hence it is, that they ſaid that Matter is *Ingenerable* and *Incorruptible* as to its Subſtance, tho' it be the Subject of all Generations and Corruptions. The ſame Matter which is Fire now was Wood before; all its Eſſential Attributes remain the ſame under the Form of Wood, and the Form of Fire: and therefore it loſes and acquires nothing but Accidents, when Wood is chang'd into Fire, Bread into Fleſh, Fleſh into Earth, &c. And yet it is the moſt ſenſible and the moſt proper Example that can be given of a Being mutable, and actually liable to all ſorts of Internal Alterations and Changes. I call 'em Internal; for the different Forms under which it Exiſts are not like the different Cloaths under which Actors appear upon the Stage. The Bodies of thoſe Actors may ſubſiſt without any manner of Change or Alteration under a Thouſand ſorts of Cloaths: Cloth and Linnen, Silk and Gold, are not united with the Man that wears 'em: they are always Foreign Bodies, and outward Ornaments; but the Forms produc'd in Matter are inwardly and penetratively united to it; it is their Subject of Inherence, and according to right Philoſophy, there is no other Diſtinction between them and Matter, then what is to be found between Modes and a thing Modified. From whence it reſults, that the God of the *Spinoziſts* is a Being actually Changing, that goes continually thro' ſeveral States internally and really different one from another. *It is not therefore the moſt perfect Being,* (a) *with whom there is no variableneſs, neither ſhadow of turning.*

Note, that *Proteus* mention'd by the Poets, their *Thetis*, and their *Vertumnus*, who were Images and Examples of Inconſtancy, and (b) which occaſion'd the Proverbs whereby the oddeſt fickleneſs of Men was denoted, would have been Immutable Gods, if the God of the *Spinoziſts* was Immutable; for it was never pretended that there happen'd any Alteration in their Subſtances, but only New Modifications. See the Remark Y. If any Reader wants here ſomething to entertain him, let him Read theſe Verſes of *Virgil* concerning *Proteus.*

Verum, (c) *ubi correptum manibus vincliſque tenebis,*
Tum variæ illudent ſpecies, atque ora ferarum:
Fiet enim ſubitò ſus horridus, atraque tigris,
Squamoſuſque draco, & fulvâ cervice leæna:
Aut acrem flammæ ſonitum dabit, atque ita vinclis
Excidet: aut in aquas tenues delapſus abibit.
Sed, quantò ille magis formas ſe vertet in omnes,
Tantò, nate, magis contende tenacia vincla:
Donec talis erit mutato corpore, qualem
Videris, incepto tegeret cùm lumina ſomno.

As for what concerns *Thetis* ſee (d) *Ovid*: See alſo the ſame Poet concerning (e) *Vertumnus*, and beſides conſult the fourth Book of *Propertius* in the Second Elegy.

THAT GOD cannot be the Subject of Inherence of Men's Thoughts, ſince thoſe Thoughts are contrary to one another.

III. We ſhall ſee ſtill more monſtrous Abſurdities, if we conſider the God of *Spinoza* as being the Subject of all the Modifications of Thought. The Combination] of Extenſion and Thought, in one and the ſame Subſtance, is a great Difficulty; for the Queſtion is not about a Mixture like that of Metals, or of Wine and Water, which requires only a *juxta-poſition*: But the Combination of Thought and Extenſion ought to be an *Identity*; Thought and Extenſion are two Attributes *Identify'd* with a Subſtance. They are therefore *Identify'd* between themſelves, by the Fundamental and Eſſential Rule of (f) Humane Logick. I am ſure that if *Spinoza* had found the ſame Intricacy in another Sect, he would have thought it unworthy of his Attention; but he did not much Trouble himſelf with it in his own Cauſe: So true it is that the moſt diſdainful Cenſurers of other Men's Thoughts, are very indulgent to themſelves. Doubtleſs, he derided the Myſtery of the Trinity, and wondred that ſo many People ſhou'd ſpeak of a Nature terminated by three Hypoſtaſes; and yet properly ſpeaking

(a) Jam. 1. 17.

(b) Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo? *Horat. Epiſt. 1. lib. 1.* Sæpe notatus Cum tribus annellis, modo læva Priſcus inani, Vixit inæqualis, clavum ut mutaret in horas: Ædibus ex magnis ſubito ſe conderet, unde Mundior exiret vix libertinus honeſte. Jam mœchus Romæ, jam mallet doctus Athenis Vivere: Vertumnis, quotquot ſunt, natus iniquis. *Idem. Sat. 7. lib. 2. v. 8.*

(c) Virgil. Georg. lib. 4. v. 405. *See alſo* Horace Sat. 3. lib. 2. *They had it from* Homer Odyſs. lib. 4.

(d) Ovid. Metam. lib. 11. fab. 8. pag. m. 262, 263.

(e) Id. ib. lib. 14. fab. 16. v. 647. & ſeq.

(f) Quæ ſunt idem uni tertio, ſunt idem inter ſe.

cable, and ſo ſenſible that any Man of a right Judgment muſt needs perceive them. Thoſe who complain that the Authors who have undertaken to Confute him,

ſpeaking he aſcribes as many Perſons to the Divine Nature as there are Men upon Earth. He looks upon thoſe who believed Tranſubſtantiation, and who ſay that a *Man* may be in many places at one and the ſame time, as ſo many Fools; and yet he maintains, that the Extended Subſtance, tho' but one and Indiviſible, is all at once every where, Cold in one place, Hot in another, Melancholly in one place, Merry in another, *&c.* This by the by: But mind what I am going to ſay. If there is any thing certain and undeniable, 'tis this Propoſition: (a) *Oppoſita ſunt quæ neque de ſe invicem, neque de eodem tertio ſecundum idem, ad idem eodem modo atque tempore vera affirmari poſſunt.* That is, two oppoſite Terms cannot be truly affirm'd of the ſame Subject in the ſame reſpects and at the ſame time. For Inſtance, one cannot ſay without lying, *Peter is well, Peter is ſick: He denies that, and he affirms it*: Suppoſing, that the Terms have always the ſame Relation, and are taken in the ſame ſenſe. The *Spinoziſts* deſtroy that Idea, and falſify it in ſuch a manner, that I don't know where they can find the Character of Truth; for if ſuch Propoſitions were falſe, there is none that can be accounted true. And therefore 'tis in vain to diſpute with 'em; for if they deny this, they may as well deny any other Reaſon alledg'd againſt 'em. I ſhall make it appear that this (b) Axiom is very falſe in their Syſtem; and in order to it, I lay down firſt of all this undeniable Maxim, that all the Titles that are given to a Subject to ſignify what it does, or what it ſuffers, do properly and Phyſically belong to its Subſtance, and not to its Accidents. When we ſay Iron is hard, Iron is heavy, it ſinks into Water, it cleaves Wood, we don't pretend to ſay that its hardneſs is hard, that its heavineſs is heavy, *&c.* This wou'd be an Impertinent way of ſpeaking: We mean that the extended Subſtance it is made of Reſiſts, is heavy, goes down into Water, and cleaves Wood. In like manner when we ſay that a Man denies, affirms, is angry, is kind, Praiſes, *&c.* we aſcribe all thoſe Attributes to the ſubſtance of his Soul, and not to his Thoughts, as they are Accidents or Modifications. And therefore were it true, as *Spinoza* will have it, that Men are Modifications of God, we ſhould ſpeak falſly ſhou'd we ſay, *Peter* denies this, he wills that, he affirms ſuch a thing; for according to that Syſtem 'tis properly God who denies, who wills, who affirms, and conſequently all the Denominations, reſulting from the Thoughts of all Men, do properly and Phyſically belong to the Subſtance of God. From whence it follows that God hates and loves, denies and affirms the ſame things, at the ſame time, and according to all the Conditions requiſite to make the Rule I have mention'd concerning oppoſite Terms falſe: For it cannot be deny'd, that according to thoſe Conditions ſtrictly taken, ſome Men love and affirm what other Men hate and deny. I go further ſtill: The Contradictory Terms, to Will and not to Will, belong at the ſame time to different Men according to all thoſe Conditions; and therefore according to *Spinoza*'s Syſtem they belong to that ſole and indiviſible Subſtance he calls God. 'Tis therefore God who at the ſame time forms an Act of Will, and does not form it with reſpect to the ſame Object. And therefore two Contradictory Terms are true of him; which overthrows the (c) firſt Principles in Metaphyſicks. I am not Ignorant that in diſputes concerning Tranſubſtantiation, a Cavil is made uſe of which might help the *Spinoziſts*. 'Tis ſaid that if *Peter* Wills a thing at *Rome*, which he does not Will at *Paris*, the Contradictory Terms to Will and not to Will, are not true with reſpect to him; for ſince 'tis ſuppoſed he Wills at *Rome*, it were a Lie to ſay he Wills not. I leave 'em this vain Subtilty, and I ſhall only ſay that as a Square Circle is a Contradiction, a Subſtance is ſo too, when it Loves and Hates the ſame Object at the ſame time. A Square Circle wou'd be and wou'd not be a Circle; which is a plain Contradiction: It wou'd be a Circle according to the Suppoſition, and it wou'd be no Circle, ſince the Circular Figure is wholly inconſiſtent with the Square Figure. I ſay the ſame of a Subſtance, that Loves and Hates the ſame thing; it Loves and does not Love it; there is nothing wanting to make this a Contradiction: It Loves it, according to the ſuppoſition; it does not Love it, ſince Hatred does eſſentially exclude Love. Thus you ſee what it is to have a wrong Niceneſs. *Spinoza* cou'd not bear the leaſt obſcurity of Peripatetiſm, Judaiſm, or Chriſtianity; and yet he heartily imbraced an Hypotheſis, which reconciles two things ſo contrary to one another, as the Square and the Circular Figures, and whereby an Infinite Number of Inconſiſtent Attributes, and all the Variety and Antipathy of the Thoughts of Mankind are true at the ſame time of one and the ſame moſt ſimple and indiviſible Subſtance. We commonly ſay, *quot capita tot ſenſus*, as many Men ſo many Minds; but according to *Spinoza* all the Thoughts of all Men are in one head. The bare relating of ſuch things is a ſufficient Confutation of 'em, and clearly ſhews they are Contradictory; for 'tis manifeſt either that nothing is impoſſible, no not that two and two ſhou'd make 12, or that there are as many Subſtances as Subjects in the Univerſe, which cannot receive at the ſame time the ſame Denominations.

ANOTHER PROOF of what has been ſaid, taken from the wickedneſs of Man's thoughts.

IV. But if it be, Phyſically ſpeaking, a prodigious Abſurdity, that a ſimple and only Being ſhou'd be Modified at the ſame time by the Thoughts of all Men, 'tis an execrable Abomination, if it be morally conſidered. According to this Hypotheſis the Infinite, Neceſſary, and moſt Perfect Being will not be ſteady, conſtant and immutable. Nay, it will not be one Moment the ſame; its thoughts will continually ſucceed one another; the ſame Mixture of Paſſions and Sentiments will never be twice. This is what cannot be admitted; but here is ſomething worſe. This continual Mobility will be very uniform in this ſenſe, that for one good Thought the Infinite Being will have a Thouſand Fooliſh, Extravagant, Filthy, and Abominable ones. It will produce in it ſelf all the Fooleries, idle Fancies, lewd and unjuſt Practices of Mankind: It will be not only the Efficient Cauſe of 'em, but alſo the Paſſive Subject, *ſubjectum inhaſionis*: It will be united to them with the moſt intimate Union that can be conceived; for 'tis a Penetrative Union, or rather a Perfect *Identity*, ſince a Modification is not really Diſtinct from the Modified Subſtance. Many Philoſophers not being able to apprehend how the moſt Perfect Being can permit that Man ſhou'd be ſo wicked and ſo unhappy, have ſuppoſed two Principles, the one good, and the other bad; but here's a Philoſopher, who does not think it improper to make God the Cauſe and the Subject of all the Crimes and Miſeries of Men. If Men hate and Aſſaſſinate one another, if they Form themſelves into Armies to kill one another, if the Conquerors eat ſometimes the Conquered, 'tis a thing that may be apprehended, becauſe 'tis ſuppoſed they are diſtinct one from another, and that Property produces contrary Paſſions in them. But if Men are only a Modification of one and the ſame Being, to ſuppoſe that there will be Wars and Battles, is to advance a thing more Monſtrous and Chimerical than all the broken Thoughts and Fooliſh Fancies of Men ſhut up in Mad-Houſes. Obſerve, as I have ſaid before, that Modes do nothing, and that Subſtances only act and ſuffer. This Phraſe, *the ſweetneſs of Honey tickles the Tongue*, is only true, as it ſignifies that the Extended Subſtance of which Honey is made up tickles the Tongue. Thus according to *Spinoza*'s Syſtem, whoever ſays, *the Germans have kill'd ten Thouſand Turks*, ſpeaks improperly and falſely, unleſs he means God

Modified

(a) *See* Logica Conimb. in capit. 10. Ariſtotelis de Prædicamentis pag. m. 579. *and the Logick of* Burgerſdicius lib. 1. cap. 22. pag. m. 127.

(b) *That is, the above mention'd Definition of Oppoſite Terms.*

(c) Duo contradictoria non poſſunt eſſe ſimul vera: de qualibet re vera eſt affirmatio vel negatio. *See* Ariſtotle's Metaphyſicks chap. 3. & 4. *of the 4th Book.*

him, have not been ſucceſsful, confound things: they would have the Difficulties, under which he ſunk, (K) wholly removed; but they ſhould be contented to

modified into Germans has kill'd God modified into Ten Thouſand Turks; And therefore all the Phraſes made uſe of to expreſs what Men do one againſt another, have no other true ſenſe but this, *God hates himſelf; he asks Favours of himſelf, and refuſes them to himſelf; he Perſecutes, Kills, Calumniates, and Eats* (a) *himſelf*, &c. This would be leſs Unintelligible, if *Spinoza* had repreſented God as a Syſtem of many diſtinct Parts; but he reduces him to the moſt Perfect Simplicity, to an Unity of Subſtance, and Indiviſibility. And therefore he aſſerts the moſt Infamous and the greateſt Extravagancies that can be conceived, infinitely more Ridiculous than thoſe of the Poets concerning the Gods of the Heathens. I wonder he did not perceive 'em, or if he did, how he came to perſiſt in his Opinion. A Man of ſenſe would rather chuſe to grub up a piece of Ground with his Teeth and Nails, than to Cultivate ſuch an Offenſive and Abſurd Hypotheſis.

V. Here follow two other Objections. Some Philoſophers have been ſo impious as to Deny the Being of a God; but they did not carry their Extravagance ſo far, as to ſay that if he did Exiſt, he wou'd not be Perfectly Happy. The greateſt Scepticks among the Ancients ſaid, that all Men have an Idea of God, according to which he is a Living, Happy, and Incorruptible Being, of a Perfect Felicity, and ſuſceptible of no Evil. (b) *Κοινὴν πρόληψιν ἔχουσι πάντες ἄνθρωποι περὶ θεοῦ, καθ' ἣν μακάριόν τι ἐστι ζῶον, καὶ ἄφθαρτον, καὶ τέλειον ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ, καὶ παντὸς κακοῦ ἀνεπίδεκτον. Communem anticipatam homines omnes habent de Deo notionem, ex qua eſt beatum quoddam animal, ab interitu alienum, in fœlicitate perfectum, in quod nullum poſſit malum cadere.* Happineſs was the moſt inſeparable Property contain'd in his Idea: Thoſe who deprived him of the direction of the World, acknowledged his Felicity and Immortal Beatitude (c). Thoſe who made him ſubject to Death, ſaid at leaſt, that he was Happy all his Life time. It was doubtleſs a horrid Extravagance not to aſcribe Immortality as well as Happineſs to the Divine Nature. *Plutarch* does very well Confute this Abſurdity of the Stoicks: I ſhall ſet down his Words ſomewhat at large, becauſe they prove a Thought, which I have advanced above, and becauſe they Confute the *Spinoziſts*; for his Argument is inconſiſtent with the Hypotheſis, according to which God is ſubject to Death, as to his Parts, or Modalities, and is, as it were, the Matter of Generations and Corruptions, and deſtroys his Modalities, &c. (d) *Καὶ ἴσως ἐντύχοι τις ἂν ἔθνεσι βαρβάροις καὶ ἀγρίοις θεὸν μὴ νοοῦσι. θεὸν δὲ νοῶν, μὴ νοῶν δὲ ἄφθαρτον μηδὲ ἀΐδιον, ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲ εἷς γέγονεν. οἱ γοῦν ἄθεοι προσαγορευθέντες οὗτοι, Θεόδωροι, καὶ Διαγόραι καὶ Ἵππωνες, οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν εἰπεῖν τὸ θεῖον ὅτι φθαρτόν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ὡς ἔστι τι ἄφθαρτον. τοῦ μὲν ἀφθάρτου τὴν ὕπαρξιν μὴ ἀπολείποντες, τοῦ θεοῦ δὲ τὴν πρόληψιν φυλάττοντες. ἀλλὰ Χρύσιππος καὶ Κλεάνθης ἐμπεπληκότες (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν) τῷ λόγῳ θεῶν τὸν οὐρανὸν, τὴν γῆν, τὸν ἀέρα, τὴν θάλατταν, οὐδένα τῶν τοσούτων ἄφθαρτον οὐδὲ ἀΐδιον ἀπολελοίπασι, πλὴν μόνου τοῦ Διὸς, εἰς ὃν πάντας καταναλίσκουσι τοὺς ἄλλους. ὥστε καὶ τούτῳ τὸ φθείρειν προσεῖναι τοῦ φθείρεσθαι μὴ ἐπιεικέστερον. ἀσθενείᾳ γάρ τινι καὶ τὸ μεταβάλλον εἰς ἕτερον φθείρεται, καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰς ἑαυτὸ φθειρομένοις τρεφόμενον σώζεται. Ac fieri ſane poteſt, ut incidas aliquis in homines barbaros & feros, qui deum eſſe nullum putent: deum eſſe qui exiſtimet; ſed eundem non ſecurum interitus, non æternum, inventus eſt ne unus quidem homo. Certè qui athei appellantur quod negarent eſſe deos, Theodorus, Diagoras, Hippo, non auſi ſunt dicere deum eſſe interitui obnoxium, ſed non crediderunt aliquid eſſe ab interitu immune, ac talem naturam aliquam eſſe poſſe negantes, notitiam de deo reliquerunt in medio. Chryſippus verò & Cleanthes, cùm implevisſent (ut ſic dicam) ſuis dictis cœlum, terras, aërem, mare diis; nullum horum ab interitu liberum aut ſempiternum ſtatuerunt: ſolo Jove excepto; in quem reliquos omnes conſumi putant; ut jam is perdat, quod nihilo eſt quam perire melius. Eſt enim imbecilitas ut pereundo in alium tranſire, ita interitu aliorum in ſe tranſeuntium nutriri atque ſervari.* But tho' this Doctrine of the Stoicks was never ſo Extravagant, it did not deprive the Gods of Happineſs during their Life. Perhaps the *Spinoziſts* are the only (e) Men, who have reduced the Deity to a miſerable Condition. His Miſery is ſo great, that he falls into Deſpair, and would Annihilate himſelf if he could; he endeavours to do it; he deprives himſelf of as many things as he can; he throws himſelf headlong into a Precipice, being no longer able to bear the Melancholy that conſumes him. What I ſay, does not ſavour of a Declamation; 'tis an Exact and Philoſophical Language: For if Man is only a Modification, he does nothing: it were an Impertinent and Burleſque Expreſſion to ſay, *Joy is Merry, Saltneſs is Salt*: 'Tis a Phraſe no leſs Impertinent in *Spinoza*'s Syſtem, to affirm, *Man thinks, Man afflicts himſelf, Man hangs himſelf*, &c. All thoſe Propoſitions ought to be affirm'd of the Subſtance, whereof Man is only a Mode. How cou'd *Spinoza* think that an Independent and Self-Exiſtent Nature, endowed with infinite Perfections, is ſubject to all the Miſeries incident to Mankind? If ſome other Nature forced it to vex it ſelf, and to feel Pain, its Unhappineſs would be leſs ſurprizing; one might ſay, it muſt needs obey a ſtronger Power; 'tis likely it torments it ſelf with the Gravel, the Cholick, a Fever and Madneſs to avoid a greater Evil. But it is the only Being in the Univerſe, there is nothing that Commands, Exhorts, or Entreats it. 'Tis its own Nature, will *Spinoza* ſay, that moves it under ſome Circumſtances, to have a great deal of Vexation, and to feel a violent Pain. But I'll ask him whether he does not find ſomething monſtrous and unconceivable in ſuch a Fatality.

(e) *Their Predeceſſors, whom I have mention'd in the firſt Remark, have not clear'd and dived into the Conſequences of their Principle, as* Spinoza *does.*

The ſtrong Reaſons alledged againſt thoſe, who maintain'd that our Souls are a Portion of God, are ſtill more ſolid againſt *Spinoza*. 'Tis objected againſt *Pythagoras* in a Piece of *Cicero*, that Three palpable Falſities reſult from that Doctrine. 1. That the Divine Nature wou'd be torn in pieces: 2. That it wou'd be as unhappy as Men: 3. That Man's Mind wou'd be ignorant of Nothing, ſince it wou'd be God. *Nam Pythagoras qui cenſuit*, &c. (f).

(f) *You'll find the ſequel of theſe words of* Cicero *in the Article* Pythagoras *Remark* N.

THE SYSTEM of *Spinoza* makes his whole Conduct, and all his Diſcourſes Ridiculous.

VI. Were it not that I remember I don't write a Book againſt that Man, but only ſome Obſervations by the by, I cou'd find many other Abſurdities in his Syſtem. I ſhall conclude with this. He engaged in an Hypotheſis, which makes all his Labours ridiculous; and I am ſure that every page of his Ethicks affords a wretched Nonſenſe. Firſt, I wou'd fain know whom he has in view, when he rejects ſome Doctrines, and propoſes others. Does he deſign to Teach ſome Truths, and to Confute ſome Errors? But how can he ſay that there are any Errors among Men? Are not the Thoughts of the common Philoſophers, and of the Jews and Chriſtians, Modes of the Infinite Being, as well as thoſe of his Ethicks? Are they not Realities as neceſſary to the Perfection of the Univerſe, as all his Speculations? Do they not ariſe from the neceſſary Cauſe? How then can he pretend that they ought to be rectify'd? In the Second place, does he not ſay that the Nature, whereof they are Modalities, acts neceſſarily, and always follows its Courſe; that it can neither turn aſide nor ſtop; and that being the only Nature in the Univerſe, no outward Cauſe will ever ſtop or rectify it. And therefore nothing can be more needleſs than the Inſtructions of this Philoſopher. Is it fit for him, who is but the Modification of a Subſtance, to preſcribe to the Infinite Being what it ought to do? Will that Being hear him? And if it ſhou'd heard him, could it be the better for what he ſays? Does it not always act according to the whole extent of its Power, without knowing whither it goes, or what it does? Such a Man as *Spinoza* ſhould not pretend to Write, if he argued well. If it be poſſible, ſhou'd he ſay, for ſuch a Doctrine to take Root, the Neceſſity of Nature will Eſtabliſh it without my Book: If it be not poſſible, all my Writings will be inſignificant.

(K) *They would have the Difficulties, under which* Spinoza *ſunk, wholly removed.*] I think it may be ſuppoſed that he run into theſe Abſurdities, becauſe he to ſee his Hypotheſis overthrown, as it has been done even by his (L) weakeſt Adverſaries. I muſt not forget that this Impious Man was not ſenſible of the unavoidable

he cou'd not apprehend that Matter is Eternal, and different from God, or that it has been produced out of Nothing, or that an Infinite Mind, perfectly Free, and the Creator of all things, cou'd produce ſuch a Work as the World. A Matter, that neceſſarily Exiſts, and yet is deſtitute of Activity, and ſubject to the Power of another Principle, is a thing that does not ſuit with Reaſon. We ſee no Affinity between thoſe three Qualities; ſuch a Combination is repugnant to the Notions of Order. A Matter Created out of Nothing cannot be conceived, tho' we ſtrive never ſo much to form an Idea of an Act of Will, which changes into a real Subſtance what was nothing before. This Principle of the Ancients, *ex nihilo nihil fit*, offers it ſelf continually to our Imagination. Laſtly, That an Infinitely Good, Holy and Free God, who cou'd make Creatures always Holy and Happy, ſhou'd rather chuſe the contrary, is a thing that ſtartles Reaſon; the more, becauſe it cannot reconcile Man's (a) Free-will with the quality of a Being created out of Nothing. But unleſs thoſe two things be reconciled, it cannot conceive how Man deſerves any Puniſhment under a Free, Good, Holy and Juſt Providence. Theſe three Inconveniences put *Spinoza* upon looking for another Syſtem, wherein God ſhou'd not be diſtinct from Matter, and ſhou'd act neceſſarily and according to the whole extent of his Power, not out of himſelf but in himſelf. It reſults from this Suppoſition, that this neceſſary Cauſe, whoſe Power is not limited, and whoſe Actions are not directed by Goodneſs, Juſtice and Knowledge, but only by the Infinite Power of its Nature, muſt needs have Modified it ſelf all manner of ways that are poſſible; ſo that Errors and Vices, Pain and Grief being as real Modifications as Truth, Virtue, and Pleaſure, all thoſe things muſt have been in the Univerſe. *Spinoza* hoped to reſolve by that means the Objections of the *Manichees*, againſt the Unity of a Principle. Thoſe Objections have no force but in the Suppoſition that a ſole Principle of all things acts out of choice, and can act or forbear acting, and confines its Power according to the Rules of Goodneſs and Equity, or according to an inſtinct of Malice. This (b) being ſuppoſed, the Queſtion is, if that only Principle be Good, whence comes Evil? If it be Bad, whence comes Good? *Spinoza* wou'd Anſwer, my only Principle being able to do Good and Evil, and doing whatever it can do, Good and Evil muſt neceſſarily be in the World. But if you conſider the three Inconveniences he intended to avoid, and the extravagant and abominable Conſequences of his Hypotheſis, you'll find that his choice is neither that of a good Man, nor that of a Man of parts. He rejects ſome things, of which, the worſe that can be ſaid is, that the weakneſs of our Reaſon does not allow us clearly to perceive the Poſſibility of 'em; and he admits others, which are evidently impoſſible. There is a great difference between not comprehending the Poſſibility of a thing, and comprehending the Impoſſibility of it. Now ſee the Unjuſtice of the Readers. They require from all thoſe, who write againſt *Spinoza*, that they ſhou'd remove the Difficulties which perplexed him, and ſet in a clear Light the Truth he could not comprehend; and becauſe they find no ſuch thing in the Writings of the Anti Spinoziſts, they declare they have not ſucceeded. Is it not ſufficient to overthrow the Syſtem of that Atheiſt? Reaſon teaches us that Cuſtom ought to be maintain'd againſt Innovators, unleſs they bring in better Laws; and if their Opinions were not better than thoſe that are commonly receiv'd, they ſhou'd deſerve to be rejected, tho' they were not worſe than the Abuſes they intend to ſuppreſs. It ought to be ſaid to thoſe Men, ſubmit (c) to Cuſtom, or give us ſomething better. Much more ought we to reject the Syſtem of *Spinoza*, ſince he runs himſelf into greater Difficulties. If they were equal on both ſides, the common Syſtem ſhould be prefer'd to the other, becauſe, beſides the privilege of Preſcription, it promiſes us a great Happineſs for the time to come, and affords us many Comforts in the Miſeries of this Life. How great a ſatisfaction is it in our Adverſity to hope that God will hear our Prayers, and that, if he does not hear 'em, he will however reward our Patience, and indemnify us in a Glorious manner? 'Tis a great Comfort to flatter ones ſelf that other Men will ſome times follow the Dictates of their Conſcience, and be reſtrain'd by the Fear of God. And therefore ſince the Syſtem of *Spinoza* is not liable to leſſer Objections than the Chriſtian Hypotheſis, it were a ſufficient Reaſon to reject it. So that any Author, who ſhews that Spinoziſm is obſcure, and falſe in its Firſt Propoſitions, and perplexed with impenetrable and contradictory Abſurdities in its Conſequences, does very well confute it, tho' he does not clearly reſolve all the Objections of *Spinoza*. The whole Matter may be reduced to theſe few words. The common Hypotheſis, if compared with that of the Spinoſiſts in thoſe things that are clear, has a greater Evidence: And if it be compared with the other in thoſe things that are Obſcure; it appears leſs oppoſite to the Light of Reaſon. And beſides, it promiſes us an Infinite Happineſs after this Life, and procures us a Thouſand Comforts in this; whereas the other gives us no proſpect of a future Happineſs, and deprives us of Confidence in our Prayers, and of the Advantage we may expect from the remorſes of our Neighbours: And therefore the common Hypotheſis is to be preferr'd to the other.

(L) *As it has been done even by his weakeſt Adverſaries.*] I ſhall not ſet up for a Maſter of Ceremonies, to place thoſe Gentlemen in the higheſt or loweſt Ranks, and ſhall only name thoſe (d) who are come to my Knowledge. M. *Velthuyſe* (e) Publiſh'd a Book againſt *Spinoza* in 1680. It is Intitl'd, *Tractatus de cultu naturali, & origine moralitatis.* Four Years after the Sieur *Aubert de Verſé* put out a Book with this Title, *L'Impie convaincu ou diſſertation contre Spinoza, dans laquelle l'on refute les fondemens de ſon Atheiſme* (f). M. *Poiret* inſerted in the Second Edition (g) of his Thoughts *de Deo, anima, & malo*, a Treatiſe Intitl'd, *Fundamenta Atheiſmi everſa, ſive ſpecimen abſurditatis Atheiſmi Spinoziani.* In the Year 1690, a Poſthumous Book of M. *Wittichius* came out, Intitl'd, *Anti-Spinoza ſive examen Ethices Benedicti de Spinoza, & commentarius de Deo & ejus attributis.* To which I add a Dutch Piece quoted (h) by M *Saldenus*.

I add in this Second Edition, 1. A Dutch Book Publiſh'd by the ſame *Francis Cuperus*, whom I have mention'd at the Beginning of the Remark *H.* This Dutch Book is only a Tranſlation of what *Henry Morus* ſaid in Latin againſt *Spinoza* in ſome Paſſages of his Works. It appear'd very ſolid to *Cuperus*, tho' his *Arcana Atheiſmi revelata* had been uſed with the utmoſt Contempt by (i) *Henry Morus*. 2. The Book Publiſh'd at *Paris* in 1696, by *Dom Francis Lami* a Benedictin. It is Intitl'd, *Le Nouvel Atheiſme renverſé, ou Refutation du ſiſteme de Spinoſa, tirée pour la plupart de la connoiſſance de la nature de l'homme.* You'll find an Extract of it in the (k) *Journal des Sçavans* of the 28th of *January* 1697. And you may ſee a juſt Encomium upon it in the 101 Page of the Second Part of the *Chevræana*, Dutch Edition. 3. The Work which (l) M. *Jaquelot* cauſed to be Printed at the *Hague* in 1697. It is Intitl'd, *Diſſertations ſur l'exiſtence de Dieu, où l'on demontre cette verité par l'hiſtoire Univerſelle de la premiere antiquité du monde; par la refutation du ſyſteme d'Epicure & de Spinoza, &c.* You'll find a good Extract of it in the (m) *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*. 4. The Book Publiſh'd by M. *Jens* at *Dort* in 1698. The Title of it runs thus: *Examen philoſophicum ſextæ definitionis partis 1. Eth. Benedicti de Spinoza, ſive prodromus animadverſionum ſuper unico Veterum & recentiorum atheorum argumento, nempe* avoidable Consequences of his System; for he Laugh'd at the Apparition * of Spirits,

---

(a) *That is, the liberty of Indifference.*

(b) Deteriora velle, noſtri fuerit fortaſſe defectus: poſſe vero contra innocentiam, quæ ſceleratus quiſque conceperit, inſpectante Deo, monſtri ſimile eſt: unde haud injuria tuorum quidam familiarum quæſivit: Si quidem Deus, inquit, eſt, unde mala? bona vero unde, ſi non eſt? Boëthius, de conſol. Philoſoph. lib. 1. proſa 4. pag. m. 11.

(c) Sin melius quid habes, accerſe, aut imperium fer. Horat. epiſt. 5. lib. 1.

(d) *Note, that I ſpeak only of thoſe who have confuted the Poſthumous Works of* Spinoza.

(e) *Being* [illegible] *it, and help'd by* M. PAETS *to whom he Dedicated it.*

(f) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *for* October 1684, *pag.* 162.

(g) *At* Amſterdam 1685. *See the ſame* Nouvelles, *for* April 1685. pag. 452.

(h) *In his* Otia Theologica. *The Author's* Name *was* Blyenberg: *He was a* Merchant *at* Dort, *who died in 1696.* (i) Oper. Philoſoph. tom. 1. pag. 60 (k) Page 72. *of the Dutch Edition.* (l) *He was* Miniſter *of the Church of* Vaſſy *in* Champagne, *and is now* Miniſter *at the* Hague. (m) *For* September 1696. Art. 3.

tiva substantia; *ubi infirmitas & vanitas argumentorum pro ea evincetur. Accedunt quædam necdum proposita argumenta pro vera existentia Dei.* 'Tis a Book of 68 pages in 4to. The Author is a Physician at *Dort*, and the Father of M. *Jens*, Rector of the College of the same Town, and a Learned Humanist, and a good Critick, as appears from his *Lectiones Lucianeæ*, Printed at the *Hague* in 8. in the Year 1699. I must not forget the *Dutch* Book Publish'd by M. *Van Til* in 1696, an Abstract of which may be seen in the (a) *Acta eruditorum Lipsiensium.* I shall speak (b) hereafter of a *Dutch* piece, that is just come out.

You'll find that the Principles of *Spinoza* are overthrown in all those Books; you'll find that at the very beginning of his Work, he advances false Propositions; and therefore, what he concludes from them afterwards can be of no Force. Let him run as much as he pleases: What can he do by running much, if he loses his way the first step he makes? 'Tis to be observed that his greatest Admirers acknowledge that if he had taught the Doctrines laid to his charge, he wou'd be an execrable Man; but they pretend he has not been understood. (c) *Si igitur prædicti philosophi intentio vel opinio fuit naturam cum Deo hoc modo tam fœdè confundere, judico illum ab adversariis justè impetitum atque condemnatum, imo & memoriam ejus in omne ævum execrandam esse: attamen quia de alicujus intentione solus potest judicare intimus cordium perscrutator Deus, nobis nihil aliud restat nisi ut judicemus de opinione quæ continetur in scriptis quæ memoratus vir in lucem emisit; & licet inter illius adversarios habeantur etiam perspicacissimi, puto tamen eos horum scriptorum verum sensum minimè assecutos fuisse, quoniam in iis nihil reperio nisi id quod abunde satis indicat hunc virum minimè confundere velle Deum & naturam: saltem ego ita judico ex ejus scriptis, quæ si alii melius intelligant, quæ dixi indicia sunto, patrocinium illius hominis in me suscipere nolo, peto duntaxat ut quod aliis licuit, id & mihi liceat, nempe ut exprimam quem puto horum scriptorum genuinum sensum esse.* These words taken from a Book of one of his Followers, Printed at (d) *Utrecht* in 1684, clearly shew that *Spinoza* has been so much confounded by his Adversaries, that the only way of replying to them, is like that of the Jansenists against the Jesuits, *viz.* That his Opinion is not such as it is supposed to be. This is the result of what his Apologist says. And therefore in order to shew that his Adversaries have attain'd a compleat Victory over him, we need only consider that he has actually taught what is imputed to him, or that he contradicted himself wretchedly, and knew not what he said. He is accused of teaching that all particular Beings are Modifications of God This is plainly his Doctrine, since his Fourteenth Proposition runs thus: *Præter Deum nulla dari neque concipi potest substantia:* And he affirms on the 15th, *quicquid est, in Deo est, & nihil sine Deo esse neque concipi potest:* Which he proves by this Reason, that every thing is a Mode or a Substance, and that Modes can neither Exist nor be Conceived without a Substance. When therefore an Apologist speaks in this manner: Were it true that *Spinoza* teaches that all particular Beings are Modes of the Divine Substance, I wou'd not deny that his Adversaries have obtain'd a compleat Victory over him; I only deny the Fact, I don't believe that the Doctrine they have well Confuted, is contain'd in his Book: I say when an Apologist speaks in such a manner, he had as good own that his Hero has been Defeated; for certainly the Doctrine in Question, is in *Spinoza*'s Ethicks (e).

Here I must give an Instance of the Falsity of his First Propositions; it will be of some use to shew how easie it was to overthrow his System. His Fifth Proposition contains these Words, *In rerum natura non possunt dari duæ aut plures substantiæ ejusdem naturæ seu attributi:* This is his *Argumentum Achilleum*, and the most steady Foundation he builds upon; but at the same time, 'tis such a wretched Sophism, that no Scholar, who has read what is call'd *parva logicalia*, cou'd be perplexed with it. All those who teach School-Philosophy, begin with telling their Scholars what *Genus*, *Species*, and *Individuum* are. This Lecture is sufficient to put *Spinoza* to a stand. The following Distinction will do the business: *Non possunt dari plures substantiæ ejusdem numero naturæ sive attributi, concedo; non possunt dari plures substantiæ ejusdem specie naturæ sive attributi, nego.* What cou'd *Spinoza* say against this Distinction? Must he not admit of it with respect to Modifications? Is not Man, according to his Notion, a Species of Modification, and is not *Socrates* an Individuum of that Species? Wou'd he have us say that *Benedict Spinoza*, and the Jew, who attempted to thrust a Knife into his Body, were not two Modifications, but one only? It might be proved Invincibly, if his Proof for the Unity of a Substance was a good one; but since it proves too much, for it proves that there is but one Modification in the World, he ought to be one of the first who reject it. He ought therefore to know that the word *Idem* signifies two things, *Identity* and Similitude. We say that such a one was Born the same Day as his Father, and died the same Day with his Mother. With respect to a Man Born the first of *March* 1630, and who Died the 10th of *February* 1655, whose Father was Born the 1st of *March* 1610, and whose Mother Died the 10th of *February* 1655. the Proposition would be true in the two Senses of the Word *same*. It would signify *like* in the first Part of this Proposition, but not in the second. *Pythagoras* and *Aristotle*, according to *Spinoza*'s System (f), were two like Modifications: Each of 'em had the whole Nature of a Modification, and yet the one differ'd from the other. The same may be said of two Substances: Each of 'em has the whole Nature, and all the Attributes of a Substance, and yet they are not one only Substance, but two. I shall set down what a Spaniard says against those, who, thro' a Sophism like that of *Spinoza*, thought that the *Materia prima* did not differ from God. (g) *Quis non obstupescat fuisse ullo tempore aliquos adeò despientes, & in clarissima luce cæcutientes, qui Deum esse materiam primam & constanter assevérarent, & pugnaciter defenderent? At qua ratione tam stultam & impiam opinionem confirmabant? Si materia prima & Deus (inquiunt) non sunt idem, ergò differunt inter se: quæcunque autem differunt, ea necesse est aliquo differre, quare composita esse oportet ex eo in quo conveniunt, & ex eo in quo differunt; cùm igitur nec in Deo nec in materia prima ulla sit compositio, nulla quoque differentia inter ea esse poterit; quare necesse est esse unum & idem. Vide quam levi argumento in tam gravem errorem seu potiùs amentiam inducti sunt, non intelligentes discrimen quod est inter differens & diversum, quod etiam traditur ab Aristotele 10. lib. Metaphys. text. 12. Differunt enim inter se, quæcunque in aliquo conveniunt & in aliquo distinguuntur; ut homo & leo conveniunt in genere, quia uterque est animal, & distinguuntur per proprias differentias, alter enim est rationis particeps, alter verò expers: Diversa autem sunt quæcunque seipsis distinguuntur, quoniam sunt simplicissima.* There are few Notions in our Mind clearer than that of *Identity*. I grant that it is Confounded, and very ill applied in the common Language: Nations, Rivers, *&c.* are accounted the same Nations, and the same Rivers during many Ages; the Body of a Man is accounted the same Body for the space of sixty Years or more: but those Popular and abusive Expressions don't deprive us of the certain Rule of *Identity*; they don't blot out of our Minds this Idea: *A thing of which one may deny or affirm what cannot be denied, or affirm'd of another thing, is distinct from that other thing. When all the Attributes of Time, Place, &c. which belong to a thing, belong also to another thing, they are but one Being.* But notwithstanding the clearness of these Ideas, 'tis hard to say how many great Philosophers have erred in that Point, and reduced all (h) Souls and Intelligences to the Unity, tho' they acknowledged that some were United to Bodies, to which others were not United, This Opinion was

so

* See his 56 and 58 Letters.

(a) Page 331. & seqq. of the year 1696.

(b) In the Remark X.

(c) Autor anonymus Speciminis artis ratiocinandi naturalis & artificialis, pag. 111.

NOTE, That since the 1. edition of the Dictionary I have seen that Specimen artis ratiocinandi, &c. with the Author's Name and Picture. 'Tis M. Kuffelaer. That Book is ascribed to Spinoza himself, in Micrælius's Historia Ecclesiastica, pag. 1160. edit. 1699. Micrælius thought he was still living in the Year 1684. which is not true.

(d) There is in the Title Hamburgi, as in the Tractatus Theologico-Politicus.

SPINOZA knew not that the word *Idem* is sometimes used for *simile*.

(e) *The Apologist I have quoted* (viz. M. Kuffelaer) *maintains with might and main, in the* 14 Page, *that there can be but one Substance in the Universe.*

(f) *Note, by the by, that by virtue of this Principle,* Quæ sunt idem uni tertio, sunt idem inter se, Spinoza *cannot deny that* Pythagoras *and* Aristotle *were but one Man:* Erant enim idem uni tertio, nempe substantiæ Dei.

(g) Benedictus Pererius de communibus principiis, lib. 5. cap. 12. p. m. 309.

(h) *See the Article* Cesalpinus, *Remark* B, *and what is said of the Scotists in the Article* Abelard, *Rema*

Spirits, and there is no Philoſopher, who has (M) leſs Reaſon to deny it. *Spinoza* ought to acknowledge that every part of Nature Thinks, and that Man is not the moſt Knowing and moſt Intelligent Modification of the Univerſe; and therefore he muſt admit the Exiſtence of Demons. The Diſpute of his Followers about Miracles (N) is a meer Quibble, and a further Proof of the Unexactneſs of his Notions. 'Tis ſaid, he died fully perſuaded of his Atheiſm, and

ſo common in *Italy* in the XVI. Century, that Pope *Leo X.* thought himſelf obliged to Condemn it, and to threaten with ſevere (a) Penalties all thoſe that ſhould Teach it. Here are the words of the Bull, dated the 19th of *December* 1513. *Cum diebus noſtris Zizaniæ ſeminator nonnullos perniciosiſſimos errores in agro Domini ſeminare ſit auſus, de natura præſertim animæ rationalis, quod videlicet mortalis ſit aut unica in cunctis hominibus; & nonnulli temere Philoſophantes ſecundum ſaltem Philoſophiam verum eſſe aſſeverent: Contra hoc, ſacro approbante concilio, damnamus & reprobamus omnes aſſerentes, Animam intellectivam mortalem eſſe aut unicam in cunctis hominibus; aut hoc in dubium vertentes: cum illa——— immortalis, & pro corporum quibus infunditur multitudine ſingulariter multiplicabilis & multiplicata & multiplicanda ſit.* This was lopping off a conſiderable Branch of *Spinoziſm*. I muſt obſerve, that ſome Philoſophers do ſtrangely confound the Idea of *Identity*; for they maintain,(b) that the parts of Matter are not diſtinct before they be actually ſeparated. Nothing can be more abſurd.

(M) *Who has leſs reaſon to deny the Apparition of Spirits.*] I have ſaid in another (c) place, that when 'tis ſuppos'd that a moſt perfect Mind has Created all things out of Nothing, without being determin'd to it by its Nature, but by a free Choice, the Exiſtence of Angels may be deny'd (d). If it be ask'd, Why ſuch a Creator has not produced other Spirits beſides Humane Souls? The Anſwer will be, That ſuch was his Will, *ſtat pro ratione voluntas*: No reaſonable Reply can be made to this Anſwer, unleſs the Fact be prov'd, I mean, that there are Angels. But when 'tis ſuppoſed, that the Creator did not act Freely, and exhauſted all his Power without any Rule or Choice, and that Thinking is one of his Attributes, 'tis a ridiculous thing to aſſert, that there are no Demons. According to this Syſtem, it ought to be believed, that the Thoughts of the Creator have been Modified, not only in the Bodies of Men, but alſo throughout the whole Univerſe; and that beſides the Animals, that are known to us, there is an Infinite number of 'em that are unknown to us, and exceed us in Knowledge and Malice, as much as we exceed in that reſpect Dogs and Oxen: For it were the moſt unreaſonable thing in the World, to fancy that a Man's Mind is the moſt perfect Modification that an Infinite Being, acting according to the whole extent of its Power, cou'd produce. We can conceive no Natural connexion between the Underſtanding and the Brain; and therefore we ought to believe, that a Creature without Brain may as well Think, as a Creature organized as we are. What is it then that cou'd move *Spinoza* to deny (e) what is ſaid of Spirits? Why did he believe that there is Nothing in the World, that can excite in our Machines the Sight of a Spectre, make a noiſe in a Room, and occaſion all the Magical *Phænomena* mention'd in Books? Was it becauſe he believed that no Being can Produce ſuch Effects unleſs it has as thick a Body as that of Man; and that therefore the Demons cou'd not ſubſiſt in the Air, nor come into our Houſes, nor ſteal away from our ſight? But ſuch a Thought would be Ridiculous: The bulk of Fleſh of which we are made up, is rather an Obſtacle than a help to Wit and Power. I mean a mediate Power, or the faculty of applying the moſt proper Inſtruments for the production of great Effects. The moſt ſurpriſing Actions of Men ariſe from that Faculty; as it appears from a thouſand Examples. An Engineer as little as a Dwarf, Lean and Pale, performs more things than Two Thouſand Savages, ſtronger than *Milo*, are able to perform. An animate Machine a thouſand times ſmaller than an Ant, might produce greater Effects than an Elephant; it might diſcover the inſenſible parts of Plants and Animals, and place it ſelf upon the Seat of the firſt Springs of our Brain, and open ſome Valves, by which means we might (f) ſee ſome Phantoms, hear ſome Noiſe, *&c.* If Phyſicians knew the firſt Fibres, and the firſt Combinations of the parts in Vegetables, Minerals, and Animals, they might alſo know the Inſtruments that are proper to put 'em out of Order, and might apply thoſe Inſtruments in ſuch a manner as to place thoſe parts in a new Order, whereby good Meat would be turn'd into Poiſon, and Poiſon into good Meat. Such Phyſicians would be incomparably more knowing than *Hyppocrates*; and were they little enough to get into the Brain and the Entrails, they might Cure any body, and alſo produce the moſt ſtrange Diſeaſes that can be ſeen. The whole may be brought to this Queſtion, *Is it poſſible that an Inviſible Modification ſhould be more Knowing and Malicious than Man?* If *Spinoza* denies it, he knows not the Conſequences of his Hypotheſis, and acts Raſhly and without Principles. One might make a long Diſſertation upon this Subject, wherein one might prevent all his Subterfuges and Objections. Compare with this what I have obſerved in the Articles of *Lucretius* and *Hobbs*.

(N) *The Diſputes of the Spinoziſts about Miracles is a meer Quibble.*] The common Opinion of Orthodox Divines is, That God produces Miracles immediately, whether he makes uſe of Creatures or not. Thoſe two Means undeniably ſhew that he is above Nature; for if he produces ſomething without the concourſe of other Cauſes, he does not want the help of Nature; and he never uſes them in a Miracle, but after he has diverted them from their uſual Courſe: And therefore he ſhews that they depend on his Will, that he ſuſpends their Power when he pleaſes, or applies it in a different manner from their ordinary Determination. The Carteſians, who make him the immediate Cauſe of all the effects of Nature, ſuppoſe, that when he works Miracles, he does not obſerve the general Laws he has Eſtabliſh'd, and that he applies Bodies quite otherwiſe than he would do, if he follow'd the general Laws. Whereupon they ſay, that if there were any general Laws, whereby God had engaged to move Bodies according to the Deſires of Angels, and if an Angel had deſired that the Waters of the Red Sea ſhou'd be divided, the paſſage of the *Iſraelites* would not be a Miracle properly ſo call'd. This Conſequence, which neceſſarily ariſes from their Principles, makes their Definition of a Miracle leſs convenient than it ſhould be; and therefore it were better for them to ſay, that all the Effects, contrary to the general Laws we know, are Miracles; and by this means the Plagues of *Egypt*, and ſuch other extraordinary Actions will be Miracles, properly ſpeaking. Now, in order to ſhew the Unſincerity, and the Illuſions of the Spinoſiſts upon this Head, I need only ſay, that when they deny the poſſibility of Miracles, they alledge this Reaſon, that God and Nature are the ſame Being; ſo that if God did ſomething againſt the Laws of Nature, he wou'd act againſt himſelf; which is impoſſible. Speak plainly, and without any ambiguity: Say, that the Laws of Nature being not made by a free Legiſlator, who knew what he did, but being the action of a blind and neceſſary Cauſe, nothing can happen that is contrary to thoſe Laws. You'll alledge then your own Poſition againſt Miracles: it will be a *petitio principii*; but however, you'll ſpeak roundly. Let us bring 'em off from this general Aſſertion, and ask 'em what they think of the Miracles mention'd in the Scripture. They will abſolutely deny all thoſe, which they cannot aſcribe to a Cunning Trick.

(a) Omnes hujuſmodi Erroris aſſertionibus inhærentes, veluti damnatiſſimas hæreſes ſeminantes per omnia ut deteſtabiles & abominabiles hæreticos & infideles, Catholicam fidem labefactantes, vitandos & puniendos fore decrevimus.

(b) *Sir* Kenelm Digby *does alſo maintain it, if I am not miſtaken.*

(c) *In the Article* Ruggeri.

(d) *I ſuppoſe that the Authority of the Holy Scripture is laid aſide, and that a man declares he only argues like a Philoſopher.*

(e) *See his* 56. 58. 60. *Letters.*

(f) *Hence it is, that nothing can be more improper than to require that the Angels, when they appear, aſſume a Humane Body, or a Corps. They have no need of it. They need only move the Optick and Acouſtick Nerves, as they are moved by the Light, reflected from a Humane Body, and by the Air that comes out of the Mouth of a Man who ſpeaks.*

and that he took ſome Precautions to conceal (O) his Inconſtancy, if there ſhou'd be occaſion for it. Had he argued conſequently, he wou'd not have call'd the Fear of Hell a Chimerical Thing. His Friends ſay that out of Modeſty,

Teich. Not to inſiſt upon their Impudence in denying ſuch Facts, I ſhall only Argue againſt 'em by their own Principles. Don't you ſay that the Power of Nature is Infinite? But wou'd it be Infinite, if there was Nothing in the whole Univerſe that cou'd reſtore a dead Man to life? Wou'd it be Infinite, if there was but one way of forming Man, viz. that of Generation? Don't you ſay that the Knowledge of Nature is Infinite? You deny that Divine Underſtanding, in which we believe the Knowlede of all poſſible Beings to be re-united; but by diſperſing Knowledge you don't deny its Infinity. And therefore you ought to ſay that Nature knows all things, much in the ſame manner as we ſay that Man underſtands all Languages: One Man does not underſtand them all; but ſome underſtand one, and ſome another. Can you affirm that the Univerſe contains nothing, that knows the Conſtruction of our Bodies? If you affirm it, you Contradict your ſelves; you can ſay no longer that the Knowledge of God is Infinitely divided; the Contrivance of our Organs will be unknown to him. You muſt therefore acknowledge, if you argue conſequently, that ſome Modification knows it; you muſt acknowledge that Nature can revive a dead Body, and that your Maſter confounded his Ideas, and knew not the Conſequences of his Principles, when he ſaid (a), that if he cou'd believe the Reſurrection of *Lazarus*, he wou'd break his Syſtem to Pieces, and willingly imbrace the Chriſtian Faith.

This is ſufficient to ſhew that the *Spinoziſts* contradict their own Hypotheſis, when they deny the poſſibility of Miracles; I mean, (to avoid all Ambiquity) the Poſſibility of the Facts mention'd in the Holy Scripture.

(O) *To conceal his Inconſtancy, if there ſhou'd be occaſion for it.*] I mean that he took care, that in caſe the approach of Death, or his Illneſs ſhou'd make him ſpeak againſt his Syſtem, no ſuſpected Perſon ſhou'd be Witneſs of it. The thing is this; or at leaſt we find the following Account of it in a Printed Book (b). Perhaps it will be ſaid that Atheiſts "are not greedy of Praiſes. But "what can any Man do more than what was "done by *Spinoza*, a little before he died? The "thing is of a (c) freſh date, and I have it from "a great Man, who had it from good Hands. He "was the greateſt Atheiſt that ever lived, and "he grew ſo fond of certain Philoſophical Principles, that the better to Meditate upon 'em, he "confined himſelf to a cloſe Retirement, renouncing all the Pleaſures and Vanities of the World, "and minding nothing but thoſe abtruſe Meditations. Being upon the Point of Death, he "ſent for his Land-Lady, and deſired her not to "ſuffer that any Miniſter ſhou'd ſee him in that "Condition. His Reaſon for it was, as his Friends "ſaid, that he had a mind to die without diſputing, "and was afraid that the weakneſs of his Senſes "might make him ſay ſomething Inconſiſtent with "his Principles. That is, he was afraid it wou'd "be ſaid in the World that his Conſcience, awakening at the ſight of Death, had made him "renounce his Opinions. Can there be a more "Ridiculous and Extravagant Vanity, and a more "Fooliſh Paſſion for a wrong Notion of Conſtancy?

A Preface, which I have quoted (d) above, and which contains ſome Circumſtances of the Death of that Atheiſt, ſays nothing of this. I find in it that he told his Landlord (e) who was going to Church, come and ſpeak to me when the Sermon is over. But he died quietly before his Landlord return'd, and no Body ſaw him die but a Phyſician of *Amſterdam* (f). We are told in that Preface, that he was extremely deſirous to Immortalize his Name, and wou'd have willingly Sacrificed his Life to that Glory, tho' in order to obtain it, he had been torn in Pieces by the Mob. (g) *Auro plane non inhiabat, aliquot delata ſibi Profeſſoris munera aliquoties non reſpuiſſet homo gloriæ avidior & nimis ambitioſus, qui vel cum Wittiis amicis ſuis crudeliter dilacerari ſubitus optavit, modo vita brevi gloria cujus fieret ſempiternam.*

(P) *He wou'd not have call'd the Fear of Hell a Chimerical Thing.*] Thoſe, who believe that the World is not the work of God, and is not directed by a Being Simple, Spiritual, and Diſtinct from all Bodies, muſt at leaſt confeſs that there are ſome things endowed with Intelligence and Will, and jealous of their Power, which exerciſe ſome Authority over others, and Command and Puniſh them, and ſeverely Revenge themſelves. Is not the Earth full of ſuch things? Does not every Man know it by Experience? It wou'd be an unreaſonable thing to fancy that all Beings of ſuch a Nature are only upon Earth, which is but one Point if compared to the World. Muſt Reaſon, Wit, Ambition, Hatred, and Cruelty be upon Earth rather than any where elſe? Why ſo? Can any Reaſon be given for it? I don't think ſo. Our Eyes move us to believe that thoſe vaſt Spaces we call Heaven, which have ſuch rapid Motions, may as well Form Men as our Earth, and deſerve no leſs than the Globe we Inhabit to be divided into many Dominions. We don't know what paſſes there; but if we conſult only Reaſon, it will appear very probable, or at leaſt poſſible, that there are Thinking Beings in thoſe vaſt Spaces, which extend their Empire as well as their Light to our Globe. Our not ſeeing them is not a Proof that we are unknown or indifferent to them: Perhaps we are part of their Dominions: They make Laws, which they reveal to us by the Dictates of our Conſcience, and are very Angry with thoſe that tranſgreſs 'em. The Poſſibility of it is ſufficient to make Atheiſts uneaſy; and nothing but denying the Immortality of the Soul can make 'em Fearleſs. Otherwiſe thoſe Spirits might appear more dreadful than God himſelf. I explain my ſelf. There are ſome Men, who believe a God, a Paradiſe and a Hell; but they flatter themſelves, that the Infinite Goodneſs of the moſt Perfect Being does not permit him to Torment his own work for ever. He is the Father of all Men, ſay they; and therefore he Chaſtizes like a Father thoſe who diſobey him, and after he has made 'em ſenſible of their Faults, he reſtores them to his Favour. *Origen* argued in that manner. Others ſuppoſe that God will Annihilate the Rebellious Creatures, and be appeaſed with a (h) *quem das finem Rex Magne laborum.* They carry their Illuſion ſo far, as to think that the Everlaſting Torments mention'd in the Scripture, are only Comminatory. If ſuch Men were Ignorant of the Being of a God, and by conſidering what paſſes in our World, ſhou'd believe that there are Beings in the Univerſe that concern themſelves with Mankind, they cou'd not be eaſy when they come to die, unleſs they believed that the Soul is Mortal; for if they believed it to be Immortal, they might be afraid of falling under the Power of a Cruel Maſter, angry with them by Reaſon of their Actions; they cou'd not hope to come off after having been Tormented for ſome Years. A limited Being may be deſtitute of all manner of Moral Perfection; it may be like our *Phalaris's* and *Nero's*, a ſort of Men who cou'd have left an Enemy in a Dungeon for ever, had they been able to get an Eternal Authority. Will they hope that miſchievous Beings will not laſt for ever? But how many Atheiſts pretend that the Sun had no beginning, and will have no end? This is what I meant, when I ſaid that ſome Beings might appear more dreadful than God himſelf? A Man may flatter himſelf, when he conſiders that God is Infinitely Good, and

---

(a) *I have been aſſured that he ſaid ſo to his Friends.*

(b) Pre... di... ſes for Come... n. 181, 555, See Hi... re Ou... ges des ...ans, for ...b ...9 pag.

(c) *The* ...ſens ...les ...meres ...e ...ted in ...3.

(e) In the ...ark ... Ad an... dum ...orem ſacrum horis pomeridianis tendentem, finita, in ... concione, DEO volente, ad ſermones redibis. *Sebaſt,* ...*holtus ubi ſupra pag.* 6. (f) *Id. ib.*

(g) *Id. ib.*

(h) Virgil. Æneid, lib. 1. v. 241.

Modesty, he desired that no Sect (Q) shou'd go by his Name. 'Tis not true that his Followers are very Numerous. Few People are suspected of adhering to his Doctrine, and among those, who are suspected of it, few have studied it; and among the latter, few apprehend it, and most of 'em are discouraged by the Difficulties and impenetrable Abstractions * that attend it. But the thing is this: All those, who have little Religion, and don't much scruple to own it, are call'd *Spinozists*. Thus in *France* all those, who are thought not to believe the Mysteries of the Gospel, are call'd *Socinians*, tho' most of 'em never read *Socinus* nor his Followers. I must observe, that *Spinoza* has not avoided what is unavoidable to all those, who frame Impious Systems; they secure themselves from some Objections, but they lie open to others that are more perplexing. If they can't be Orthodox, if they are so fond of disputing, it were better for them not to Dogmatize. But of all Atheistical Systems, none is less capable of deceiving than that of *Spinoza*; for as I have said before, it is contrary to the most Distinct Notions of our Minds. Objections throng in upon him; and he can make no Answers || but what are more obscure than his Assertions: And therefore, his Poison brings a Remedy along with it. He wou'd have been more dreadful, had he used all his skill to clear (R) an Hypothesis, that

* Which is the Reason why some are of Opinion that he ought not to be refuted. See the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres, for June* 1684. *art.* 6. *pag. m.* 388, 389.

|| Confer Mr. Lo[illegible] You'll [illegible] the [illegible] Answers [illegible] from my Relating to the [illegible] Question.

Infinitely Perfect; and he may fear any thing from an Imperfect Being: He does not know whether its Anger will not last for ever. Every Body knows the choice (a) of the Prophet *David*.

To apply what has been said to a *Spinozist*, let us Remember that he is obliged by his Principle to acknowledge the Immortality of the Soul; for he looks upon himself as the Modification of a Being essentially Thinking. Let us Remember, that he cannot deny that some Modifications are Angry with others, put 'em to the Torture, make their Torments last as long as ever they can, send 'em to the Gallies for life, and wou'd make that Punishment last for ever, if Death did not prevent it. *Tiberius*, *Caligula*, and many others are Examples of such Modifications. Let us Remember that a *Spinozist* makes himself Ridiculous, if he does not acknowledge that the Universe is full of Ambitious, Morose, Jealous and Cruel Modifications; for since the Earth is full of 'em, there is no Reason to believe that the Air and the Heavens are not likewise full of 'em. Lastly, let us Remember, that the Essence of Humane Modifications does not consist in being Cloathed with a bulk of Flesh. *Socrates* was *Socrates* the day of his Conception, or soon after (b); whatever he had at that time may remain intire, when a Mortal Disease has put an end to the Circulation of the Blood, and the Motion of the Heart, in the Matter wherewith he was inlarged: And therefore he is after his Death the same Modification as he was during his Life, if we consider only what is essential to his Person: Death cannot therefore free him from the Justice or Caprice of his invisible Persecutors. They may follow him wherever he goes, and Torment him whatever visible Form he may assume.

These Considerations might be made use of to induce to the Practice of Virtue, even those who adhere to the Impious Doctrine of such Sects; for it stands to Reason that they shou'd be particularly afraid for having transgress'd the Laws revealed to their Conscience. 'Tis more likely that those Invisible Beings wou'd concern themselves with the Punishment of such Faults.

(Q) *That no Sect shou'd go by his Name.*] I shall set down the Words of the Preface of his *Opera Posthuma*, without curtailing them. *Nomen Auctoris in libri fronte, & alibi literis duntaxat initialibus indicatum, non aliâ de causâ, quam quia paulò ante obitum expressè petiit, ne Nomen suum Ethicæ, cujus impressionem mandabat, præfigeretur; cur autem prohibuerit, nulla alia, ut quidem videtur, ratio est, quàm quia noluit*, ut Disciplina ex ipso haberet vocabulum. *Dicit etenim in Appendice quartæ partis Ethices capite vigesimo quinto, quòd*, qui alios consilio; aut re juvare cupiunt, ut simul summo fruantur bono, minimè studebunt, ut Disciplina ex ipsis habeat vocabulum; *sed insuper in tertiâ Ethices parte Affectuum Definit. XLIV. ubi quid sit ambitio explicat, eos, qui tale quid patrant, non obscurè, ut Gloriæ cupidos, accusat.*

(a) *Being to chuse either to be overcome by his Enemies or to be afflicted with a Plague sent from God, he answered the Prophet* Gad. I am in in a great strait: Let us fall now into the hand of the LORD, (for his Mercies are great) and let me not fall into the hand of Man. II. Sam. XXIV. 14.

(b) Spinoza, *who made Microscopes, shou'd have believed that Man is organized and animated in the Seed, and that therefore* Socrates was Socrates *before his Mother conceived him*.

(R) *To clear an Hypothesis, that is very much in vogue among the* Chinese.] A Father of the Church advanced a thing, which perhaps wou'd not be excused at this day in a Philosopher, *viz.* that those, who deny the Deity or a Providence, alledge probable Reasons both for their Cause, and against their Adversaries. (c) *Deos nonnulli esse abnegant: prorsus dubitare se alii an sint uspiam dicunt: alii vero existere, neque humana curare: immo alii perhibent, & rebus interesse mortalium, & terrenas administrare rationes. Cum ergo hæc ita sint, neque aliter fiat, quin sit unum ex omnibus verum, pugnant tamen argumentis omnes, neque singulis deest id, quod probabiliter dicant, sive cum suas res asserunt, sive cum alienis opinionibus contradicunt.* If he was in the right, perhaps it were chiefly with respect to those, who suppose a great Number of Souls in the Universe Distinct one from another, each of which Exists by it self, and Acts by an inward and essential Principle. They are more Powerful one than another, &c. The Atheism so generally spread among the *Chinese* consists in that Doctrine. The Author of the following Passage tells us how he fancies they have by Degrees obscured true Notions. "(d) God, that "pure and perfect Being, is become at most the "Material Soul of the whole World, or of its fi"nest Part, which is Heaven. His Providence "and his Power became limited, tho' of a much "greater extent than the Power and Prudence "of Men——— The *Chinese* have in all times "ascribed Spirits to the four Parts of the World, "to the Stars, Mountains, Rivers, Plants, Towns, "and their Ditches, Houses, and their Hearths, in "a word to every thing. They don't say that "all Spirits are good; they acknowledge wicked "ones, which they take to be the immediate Cause "of the Evils and Miseries incident to Humane "Life——— (e) And therefore as the Soul of "Man was, in their Opinion, the cause of all the "Vital Actions of Man; in like manner they as"cribed a Soul to the Sun, to be the spring of "its Qualities and Motion. And because, accord"ing to this Principle, the Souls, that are dis"persed every where, produced in all Bodies the "Actions which appear'd Natural to those Bo"dies, this was sufficient in their Opinion to ex"plain the whole œconomy of Nature, and to sup"ply the Infinite Providence and Power, which "they admitted in no Spirit, no not in that of "Heaven. 'Tis true, that because it seems that "Man, using Natural Things for his Nourishment "and Conveniency, has some Power over Natu"ral Things; the Ancient *Chinese*, who ascribed in "Proportion a like Power to all Souls, supposed "that the Soul of Heaven acted with a Prudence, "and a Power incomparably greater than the "Prudence and Power of Men. But at the same "time, they acknowledged in the Soul of every "thing an inward Power, independent by its own "Nature of the Power of Heaven, and acting "sometimes against the designs of Heaven. Hea"ven govern'd Nature as a potent King, whom
" the

(c) Arnobius adversus Gentes lib. 1. pag. m. 12.

(d) La Loubere Relation de Siam, tom. 1. chap. 23. n. 2. pag. 503, 504. *See the Article* Sommona-Codom.

(e) Id. La Loubere ibid. n. 5. pag. 505, 506.

that is very much in vogue among the *Chineſe*, and very different from that which I have mention'd in the ſecond Remark of this Article. I have been juſt now informed of a curious Particular, *viz.* that after he had forſaken Judaiſm, he publickly profeſt Chriſtianity, and frequented the Aſſemblies of the Mennonites, or thoſe of the Arminians of *Amſterdam* *. Nay, he approved a (*S*) Confeſſion of Faith Communicated to him by a Friend.

What is ſaid of him in the Continuation of the (*T*) *Menagiana* is ſo falſe, that I wonder *Menage*'s Friends did not perceive it. *M. de Vigneul Marville* wou'd have adviſed them to leave it out, had he been concern'd in the Edition of that work; for he has acquainted the Publick, † *That there is reaſon to doubt of the Truth of that Fact.* The Reaſons he alledges for his Doubt are very reaſonable: He had not been too forward, had he poſitively denied the thing. I ſhall take notice of a miſtake he has Committed in (*V*) the ſame Page. I muſt ſay ſomething concerning the Objections I have propoſed againſt the Syſtem of *Spinoza* I might add a very large Supplement to thoſe Objections, were it not that I conſider they are already but too long, conſidering the Nature of my work: This is not a proper place to engage in a formal diſpute; It was ſufficient for my deſign to make ſome general Obſervations in order to undermine the Foundations of *Spinoziſm*, and to ſhew that 'tis a Syſtem grounded upon ſuch a ſtrange Suppoſition, that it overthrows the Common Notions, which are the rule of Philoſophical Diſcuſſions. Whoever ſhews that this Syſtem is contrary to the moſt Evident, and the moſt Univerſal Axioms we have had hitherto, does certainly go the right way to confute it, tho' perhaps it is not ſo proper to reclaim the Old *Spinoziſts*, as if they

" the other Souls were to obey, and they were " generally forced to it; but ſome of 'em did " ſometimes diſpenſe themſelves from it ". I confeſs, 'tis an abſurd thing to ſuppoſe many Eternal Beings, independent one of another, and of an unequal Power; nevertheleſs, this Suppoſition appeared true to *Democritus*, *Epicurus*, and many other great Philoſophers. They ſuppoſed an Infinite quantity of ſmall Bodies of different figures, uncreated, ſelf-moving, *&c.* This Opinion (*a*) is ſtill very common in the *Levant*. Thoſe, who ſuppoſe the Eternity of Matter, ſay nothing that is more reaſonable than if they ſuppoſed the Eternity of an Infinite Number of Atoms; for if there can be two Beings Co-Eternal and Independent as to their Exiſtence, there may be a Hundred Thouſand Millions, and ſo *in infinitum*. Nay, they ought to ſay that the Number of 'em is Infinite; for matter tho' never ſo ſmall, contains Diſtinct Parts. And 'tis to be obſerved that all the Ancients denied the Creation of Matter; for they never departed from the Axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit.* And therefore they were not ſenſible that 'tis an abſurd thing, to acknowledge an Infinity of Subſtances Co-Eternal, and independent one of another as to Exiſtence. However abſurd that Hypotheſis may be, it is not liable to the great Inconveniencies of *Spinoziſm*. It wou'd Account for many *Pænomena*, by aſſigning to every thing an active Principle, a more Powerful one to ſome, and a leſs Powerful to others; or if their Power was equal, it might be ſaid that thoſe, which prevail, make a greater Combination. I don't know whether any Socinian did ever ſay or believe, that the Souls of Men, not Being made out of nothing, Exiſt, and Act of themſelves. Their Liberty of Indifference wou'd manifeſtly flow from thence.

(*S*) *Nay, he approved a Confeſſion of Faith.*] One *Jarig Jelis* his Intimate Friend, being ſuſpected of Heterodoxy, thought himſelf obliged to publiſh a Confeſſion of his Faith for his Vindication. He ſent it to *Spinoza*, and deſired him to write to him his Opinion of it. *Spinoza* made anſwer, that he had read it with Pleaſure, and found nothing in it that wanted to be altered by him, *Domine ac amice Clariſſime: ſcripta tua ad me miſſa cum voluptate perlegi, ac talia inveni ut nihil in illis mutare poſſim.* That Confeſſion of Faith is in *Dutch*, and was Printed (*b*) in the Year 1684.

(*T*) *What is ſaid of him in the Continuation of the* Menagiana *is ſo falſe.*] The Story runs thus. " (*c*) " I have heard ſay that *Spinoza* died for fear of " being ſent to the *Baſtille*. He came into *France* " at the Sollicitation of two Perſons of Quality " who had a mind to ſee him. *M. de Pomponne* " was informed of it; and being a Miniſter very " Zealous for Religion, he did not think it proper to ſuffer *Spinoza* in *France*, where he might " have done a great deal of Miſchief; and to prevent it, he reſolved to have him ſent to the *Baſtille*. " *Spinoza* having notice of it, made his eſcape " in the diſguiſe of a Cordelier; but I don't " Warrant the Truth of this laſt Circumſtance. " What is certain is, that many Perſons, who " ſaw him, have told me that he was a little Man, of a Yellowiſh Complexion, that he " had an Ill look, and a Character of Reprobation in his Face ". The laſt part of this Paſſage may be true; for, beſides that *Spinoza* was originally come from *Portugal* or *Spain*, as his Name ſufficiently ſhews, I have heard ſome Perſons, who had ſeen him, ſay the ſame thing of his Complexion. But the firſt Part of this Story is a wretched Falſity: From whence one may judge how many Lies are told in ſuch Aaſſemblies of *M. Menage*'s *Mercuriales* *, whereof there are many at *Paris* and in other Cities.

(*V*) *A fault* M. de Vigneul Marville *has committed in the ſame Page.*] " (*d*) The Jew or rather the " Atheiſt mention'd by *M. Huet* in the Preface of " his *Demonſtratio Evangelica*, without naming him, " who occaſion'd his Writing that Learned Book, " is the Famous *Benenict Spinoza*, with whom he had " ſome Converſations about Religion at *Amſterdam* ". The Jew, with whom *M. Huet* had ſome Conferences at *Amſterdam*, is *Manaſſes Ben Iſrael*, whom he Names in the Latin Poem of his journey into *Sweden*.

> *Altera* (*e*) *lux ſpectare dedit myſteria gentis*
> *Judææ, ductor Judæum & ipſe Manaſſes.*
> *Aſt adducta ſecans dirus præputia culter*
> *Dum tenet attentum, & ſublati inſania ritus,*
> *Ecce abaci, quo inferre pii cæleſtia Moſis*
> *Scripta ſolent, ſummo extremum limbum pede tango*
> *Inſcius; inſueto cuncti fremuere tumultu:*
> *Diffugio veritus damnoſi vulnera cultri.*

The Character *M. Huet* gives of that *Jew* in the Preface of his *Demonſtratio Evangelica*, does not agree with *Benedict Spinoza*, who never made a figure among the *Jews*; for he left 'em being very Young, and after many Conteſtations, which made him Odious. *Unicum ſelegi de multis argumentum*, ſays M. *Huet* (*f*), *ex Propbetiarum eventu conflatum, quod propoſui hoc Opere, & quo olim ad retundendam Judæi cujuſdam, viri acuti ſane & ſubtilis, contumaciam uſus ſum. Cum enim eſſem Amſtelodami,* they were convinced that the Propoſitions of *Spinoza* are contrary to one another. They wou'd be leſs ſenſible of their Prejudices, were the forced to confeſs that he does not always agree with himſelf, that his Proofs are wrong, that he does not prove what wants to be proved, that his Concluſions are not exact, *&c.* This Method of confuting him by ſhewing the † abſolute Defects of his Work, and the relative Defects of its Parts compared one with another, has been well managed * by ſome of thoſe, who writ againſt him. I have been juſt now informed that the Author of a ſmall (*X*) *Dutch* Book, Printed within theſe few days, makes uſe of it with great Strength and Ability. But to ſpeak of the Supplement I deſign to give: It conſiſts in an Explanation of the Objection (*Y*) I have grounded on the Immutability of God,

---

* See in Remark ΔΔ.

† Vigneul Marville Mélang. tom. 2. p. 320. Dutch Edit.

(*a*) See the Anonymous Book Printed in the Year 1690. at Amſterdam, and intitled, Philoſophia vulgaris refutata.

(*b*) At Amſterdam. The title is A Catholick Chriſtian Confeſſion of Faith in a Letter to N. by

(*c*) Suite du Menagiana pag. Dutch

* Conferences held in M. Menage's houſe every Wedneſday; which is the Reaſon why they were ſo call'd.

(*d*) Vigneul Marville Mêlang. tom. 2. p. 320. Dutch Edit.

(*e*) Petrus Daniel Huetius poem. pag. 53. 54. edit. Ultraj. 1700.

(*f*) Id. In præfat. demonſtr. Evangelica pag. m. 3.

† I underſtand by this word the Defects, which do not proceed from *Spinoza*'s aſſerting things contrary to the Maxims, which other Philoſophers generally acknowledge to be true.

* See *Wittichius*'s *Anti-Spinoza*, or the Extracts of 'em in the *Acta Eruditor.* 1690. pag. 346. & *ſeq.* and in the 19. Vol. of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, pag. 123. &c.

dami, & Judæorum, quorum magna eſt hic in locis frequentia, ritus ac myſteria penitius introſpicere vellem, ad eum deductus ſum, qui tum inter illos peritiſſimus, ac totius Judaicæ diſciplinæ conſultiſſimus habebatur. You ſee he ſpeaks of a remote time, and of the moſt famous *Rabbies* of *Amſterdam*: And 'tis to be obſerved, that this Paſſage is to be found at the beginning of a large Book in Folio, which came out in the Year (*a*) 1678, and whoſe Compoſition and Impreſſion took up ſome Years. I think that the time *M. Huet* denotes by the word *olim* is the Year 1652. in which he Travell'd into *Sweden*; but if I was miſtaken in this particular, it were ſtill true that he means *Manaſſes Ben Iſrael*, who died in the Year 1659, and not *Spinoza*, who, as I ſaid before, never kept a conſiderable rank in the Synagogue.

(*X*) *The Author of a ſmall* Dutch *Book, Printed* (*b*) *within theſe few days.*] He only calls himſelf N. N. *Philalethes*: The Title of his Book comes to this, *A Demonſtration of the weakneſs of* Spinoza's *Argument, concerning the only abſolutely Infinite Subſtance.* He lays down as matter of Fact: 1. That this Propoſition is the Foundation, on which *Spinoziſm* is built, *viz.* *That there is but one Subſtance, and that it is abſolutely Infinite.* 2. That from ſuch a Principle *Spinoza* drew this conſequence, *That particular Beings are only Modifications of that abſolutely Infinite Subſtance.* The Author maintains that this Principle being conteſted by every Body, ſhou'd have been proved with all imaginable care, and yet that *Spinoza* gave no Proof of it. I cou'd give ſome Extracts of that Piece, for I have ſeen a *French* Tranſlation of it in Manuſcript; but becauſe 'tis but a ſmall Book, and in all Probability it will be Printed in *French* or *Latin*, before my Dictionary comes out, it were a needleſs thing to enlarge upon it.

(*a*) The 1. Edition of the Demonſtratio Evangelica was publiſh'd in 1678. tho' the Year 1679. is in the Title Page.

(*b*) At Amſterdam for Bernard Viſcher 1701.

(*Y*) *An Explanation relating to the Objection which I have grounded upon God's Immutability.*] You'll find that Objection above in the Remark I. Number II. I muſt confirm it, ſince ſome Perſons maintain that the Weakneſs of it ſufficiently appears, if it be conſidered that no Alteration happens to the God of *Spinoza*, as it is a Subſtance Infinite, Neceſſary, *&c.* Tho' the face of the whole World ſhou'd change at every Moment, tho' the Earth ſhou'd be reduced to duſt, the Sun darken'd, and the Sea become a luminous Body, there will only be a Change of Modifications: The only Subſtance will always remain a Subſtance Infinite, Extended, Thinking, and ſo with all Subſtantial or Eſſential Attributes. When they ſay this, they ſay nothing but I have (*c*) already confuted before hand: But the better to ſhew their Illuſion, I muſt obſerve here that they diſpute againſt me, as if I had maintain'd that, according to *Spinoza*, the Deity is ſucceſſively Annihilated and Produced again. This is not what I Object, when I ſay that he makes God Subject to Change, and diveſts him of his Immutability. I don't confound, as they do, the Notion of Things, and the ſignification of Words: What I underſtand by the word *Change* is what every Body underſtands by it; not the Annihilation and total Deſtruction of a thing, but its going thro' ſeveral States, the Subject of the Accidents it ceaſes to have, and of thoſe it begins to acquire, remaining the ſame. The Learned, and the Illiterate, the Mythologiſts and the Philoſophers, the Poets and thoſe who ſtudied Phyſicks, never differ'd about this Notion, and the ſignification of this Word. The fabulous Metamorphoſes, ſo much ſung by *Ovid*, and the true Generations explain'd by Philoſophers, equally ſuppoſed the Preſervation of the Subſtance, and kept it immutably as the ſucceſſive Subject of the old and new Form. Theſe Notions have been only confounded by the unhappy diſputes of Chriſtian Divines: And yet it muſt be confeſt that the moſt Ignorant Miſſionaries come into the right way again, when the Queſtion is no longer about the Euchariſt. If you aſk 'em, upon any other occaſion, what's meant by the Change, Converſion, Tranſelementation, and Tranſubſtantiation of a thing into another; they'll anſwer you, the meaning of it is, for inſtance, that Wood becomes Fire, that Bread becomes Blood, and Blood Fleſh, and ſo on. They don't think then of the improper Expreſſions conſecrated to the Controverſy of the Euchariſt, that the Bread is Converted and Tranſubſtantiated into the Body of our Saviour. This way of ſpeaking does by no means agree with the Doctrine deſign'd to be explain'd by it: 'Tis as if one ſhou'd ſay that the Air of a Cask is Transformed, Changed, Converted, and Tranſubſtantiated into the Wine poured into the Cask. The Air goes ſome where elſe, and the Wine ſucceeds it in the ſame place: One of 'em is not in the leaſt Metamorphoſed into the other. The Myſtery of the Euchariſt, as it is explain'd by the *Roman* Catholicks, is not a Metamorphoſis neither: The Subſtance of the Bread is Annihilated; the Body of CHRIST takes its place, and is not the Subject of Inherence of the Accidents of that Bread preſerved without their Subſtance. But I repeat it again, this is the only caſe wherein the Miſſionaries make a wrong uſe of the words *Change*, *Converſion*, or *Tranſelementation* of a Body into another: In all other things, they ſuppoſe with the reſt of Mankind, 1. That it is eſſential to a Transformation, that the Subject of the Forms, that are deſtroyed, ſhou'd remain under the New Forms: 2. That tho' the Subject be preſerved, it undergoes an Internal Change, properly ſo call'd, and inconſiſtent with an immutable Being. The *Spinoziſts* ſhou'd therefore leave off putting a new ſenſe upon words, contrary to the Notions of all Men. If they have any Sincerity left, they muſt confeſs, that according to their Syſtem, God is Subject to all the Viciſſitudes, and Revolutions, the *materia prima* of *Ariſtole* is liable to, in the Syſtem of the *Peripateticks*. But cou'd any thing be more abſurd than to maintain, that ſuppoſing *Ariſtotle*'s Doctrine, Matter is a Subſtance, that never undergoes any Change?

(*c*) See the 2. Paragraph of the Remark I.

But in order to puzzle the *Spinoziſts*, 'tis but deſiring them to give a Definition of Change. They muſt define it in ſuch a manner, that it will not differ from the total Deſtruction of a Subject, or will agree with that only Subſtance, which they call God. If they define it in the firſt manner, they'll make themſelves more Ridiculous ſtill than the Tranſubſtantiators; and if they define it in the the ſecond manner, they'll give up the Cauſe.

I add, that the Reaſon they alledge to elude my Objections, proves too much; for if it was a good one, they muſt needs teach that there never was, nor will be any Change in the Word, and that all manner of Change is impoſſible. Let us prove this Conſequence. The Reaſon, ſay they, why God is Immutable, is becauſe, as he is a Subſtance, and an Extenſion, he neither is not

God, and in the Examination of this Queſtion, Whether it be true, that I have not (Z) at all apprehended *Spinoza's* Doctrine; for I have been told that many Perſons think ſo. It were a very ſtrange thing, ſince I have only undertaken

can be ſubject to any Change. He is an extended Subſtance under the Form of Fire, as well as under the Form of Wood, which is converted into Fire, and ſo with other things. I'll prove to them by this very Reaſon, that the Modifications themſelves are Immutable. Man is, according to their Syſtem, a Modification of God; they own that Man is ſubject to Change, ſince he is ſometimes Merry and ſometimes Melancholy; ſometimes he wills one thing, and ſometimes he wills it not. This is no Change, will I ſay; for he is as much a Man when Merry as when Melancholy: The Eſſential Attributes of Man remain immutably in him, whether he be willing to ſell his Houſe, or to keep it. Let us ſuppoſe the moſt inconſtant Man in the World, and ſuch as might fitly apply to himſelf theſe Verſes of *Horace*:

(a) Mea--- pugnat ſententia ſecum.
Quod petiit, ſpernit: repetit, quod nuper omiſit,
Æſtuat, & vitæ diſconvenit ordine toto.
Diruit, ædificat, mutat quadrata rotundis.

(a) Horat. epiſtol. 1. lib. 1.

Or who might, more than any body elſe, be the true Original of theſe Verſes of *M. Deſpreaux*:

Mais (b) l'homme ſans arreſt, dans ſa courſe inſenſée,
Voltige inceſſamment de penſée en penſée,
Son cœur toujours flottant entre mille embarras,
Ne ſçait ni ce qu'il veut, ni ce qu'il ne veut pas.
Ce qu'un jour il abhorre, en l'autre il le ſouhaitte.
. . . .
. . . .
Voila l'Homme en effet. Il va du blanc au noir.
Il condamne au matin ſes ſentimens du ſoir.
Importun à tout autre, à ſoi-même incommode,
Il change à tous momens d'eſprit comme de mode;
Il tourne au moindre vent, il tombe au moindre choc.
Aujourd'hui dans un caſque, & demain dans un froc.

(b) Deſpreaux Sat. 8. pag. m. 48.

Let us ſuppoſe a Man, who has ſincerely profeſt all Religions in leſs than two Years: Let us ſuppoſe that he is gone through all the Conditions of Life; that he has been a Merchant, a Soldier, and a Monk, and then a Married Man; that he Divorced his Wife, and then turn'd Regiſter, Financier, and Clergy man, &c. If the Spinoziſts tell him, you have been very Inconſtant: I? Will he ſay; you are miſtaken, I have never changed, I have been as conſtantly a Man ever ſince I was born, as a Mountain has been a Mountain. What could they reply to that Argument *ad hominem*? Is it not moſt evident that the whole Eſſence of Humane Species remains in Man, whether he wills the ſame things, whether he hates to day, what he loved Yeſterday, and daily changes his Inclinations?

But to make uſe of an Example very proper for a Country, the Inhabitants whereof are uſed to the Sea, let us ſuppoſe that a Spinoziſt, at his return from *Batavia*, ſhould ſay that his Voyage has been longer than uſually, becauſe the Winds changed almoſt every day. He might be anſwered, you are miſtaken, the Winds never Change. Indeed one may ſay that they blow ſometimes North, ſometimes South, &c. but they always retain the Eſſence of Wind; and therefore they do not Change, as they are Winds, and remain as Immutable as your only Subſtance of the World: For you ſay it is Immutable, becauſe it never changes its State as to its Eſſential Properties. No more does the Wind change its State, as it is Wind, it always retains the whole Nature and Eſſence of it; and therefore it is as Immutable as your Deity.

I go farther, and I ſay, that even when a Man is Burnt alive, no alteration happens to him. He was a Modification of the Divine Nature when alive, and is he not ſo in the Flames, or under the form of Aſhes? Could he loſe the Attributes that conſtitute a Modification? Could he go thro' any Change as he is a Modification? If he changed in that reſpect, may not one affirm that Flame is not a Mode of Extenſion? Could *Spinoza* affirm it without contradicting it himſelf, and deſtroying his Syſtem? This is ſufficient to ſhew that thoſe are miſtaken, who pretend I have not proved that this Syſtem makes God ſubject to Change. My Argument cannot be denied, without aſſerting that Modifications themſelves are Immutable, and that no Alteration happens in Man's Thoughts, nor in the diſpoſition of Matter; which is a moſt abſurd thing, and contrary to the Doctrines acknowledged by the Spinoziſts; for they dare not deny that the Modifications of the Infinite Subſtance are ſubject to Corruption and Generation.

Let us deſire of 'em to grant us, for a while, by a *dato non conceſſo*, as the Logicians ſpeak, that *Socrates* is a Subſtance. They muſt then acknowledge that each particular Thought of *Socrates* is a Modality of his Subſtance. But is it not true that *Socrates* proceeding from affirming to denying Changes its Thought, and that it is a real and internal Change? And yet *Socrates* remains ſtill a Subſtance, and an Individuum of Humane Species, whether he Affirms or Denies, whether he Wills or Rejects a thing. And therefore, tho' he does not Change, as he is a Man, he cannot be ſaid to be Immutable; and one may very well ſay that he is Mutable, and actually Changes, ſince his Modifications are not always the ſame. But let us grant to the Spinoziſts in our turn, by a *dato non conceſſo*, that *Socrates* is but a Modification of the Divine Subſtance; let us grant that his relation to that Subſtance is, as in the common Opinion, the Relation of *Socrates*'s Thoughts to the Subſtance of *Socrates*. Since the Change of thoſe Thoughts is a good Reaſon to maintain that *Socrates* is not an Immutable Being, but rather an inconſtant and variable Subſtance, it ought to be concluded that the Divine (||) Subſtance does actually undergo a Change and a Variation, properly ſo call'd, whenever *Socrates*, one of its Modifications, changes his State. 'Tis therefore a moſt evident Truth that the Change of a Being, as to its Modifications, is ſufficient to ſay, that it does actually and really undergo ſeveral Changes; and if it was further required that it ſhould loſe its Eſſential Attributes, Annihilation or a total Deſtruction would be groſly confounded with Change or Alteration. See the Margin (†).

(||) *Note, that Ariſtotle de prædicam. cap. 5. reckons among the Properties of a Subſtance, to remain the ſame in number under contrary qualities.* Μάλιστα δὲ ἴδιον τῆς οὐσίας δοκεῖ εἶναι τὸ, ταὐτὸν καὶ ἓν ἀριθμῷ ὂν, τῶν ἐναντίων εἶναι δεκτικόν. Maxime vero ſubſtantiæ proprium hoc eſſe videtur, IDEM UNUMQUE NUMERO permanens contrariorum eſſe ſuſceptivum.

(†) *One may ſee in the* Janua cœlorum reſerata pag. 127. & ſeq. *ſeveral Remarks upon what wou'd be ſufficient to infer the generability and corruptability of the Divine Nature, if the Fathers had taught what is imputed to them.*

(Z) *Whether it be true, that I have not at all apprehended* Spinoza's *Doctrine; for I have been told, that many Perſons think ſo.*] I have it from ſeveral Hands; but no body could tell me the Reaſons of thoſe who make ſuch a Judgment of my Diſpute: And therefore I can neither formally Confute 'em, nor Examin whether they are in the right. All that I can do, is to juſtify my ſelf in a general manner; and I think I may ſay, that if I have not underſtood the Propoſition I undertook to Confute, 'tis not my fault. I wou'd not be ſo poſitive, if I had writ a Book againſt the whole Syſtem of *Spinoza*. Doubtleſs, I ſhould not have always underſtood him; and 'tis not likely he himſelf underſtood every part of his Doctrine, and could make all the Conſequences of his Hypotheſis Intelligible. But ſince I have confin'd my ſelf to (c) a ſingle Propoſition, expreſs'd in few words, which appear clear and preciſe, and are the Foundation of the whole Structure, I muſt have underſtood it, or it contains ſome Ambiguities altogether unbecoming the Founder of a Syſtem. However it be, I need not be uneaſie upon this Account, becauſe the ſenſe I put upon that Propoſition of *Spinoza* is the ſame his other Adverſaries have put upon it, and becauſe the beſt Anſwer his (d) Followers can make, is that he has not been underſtood. Notwithſtanding this Objection, the laſt Author (e), who writ againſt him, underſtands the Propoſition in Queſtion as I do; which ſhews that their Accuſation appears very ill grounded.

But to be more particular, what I ſuppoſe in my Objections amounts to this. I ſay, that *Spinoza* taught, 1. That there is but one Subſtance in the Univerſe.

(c) *See the Remark* L.

(d) *See the ſame Remark.*

(e) *See the Remark* X.

dertaken to Confute the Propoſition, which is the Baſis of his Syſtem, and very clearly expreſs'd. I have confin'd my ſelf to the Confutation of what he clearly lays down as his Firſt Peinciple, *viz.* That God is the only Subſtance that

Univerſe. 2. That this Subſtance is God. 3. That all particular Beings, Material Extenſion, the Sun, the Moon, Plants, Beaſts and Men, their Motions, Ideas, Imaginations, and Deſires are Modifications of God. Now I ask the Spinoziſts whether their Maſter taught thoſe things or not? If he taught 'em, it cannot be ſaid that I did not underſtand the State of the Queſtion; for 'tis this very Doctrine I have confuted. I am therefore ſafe, and whoever ſays that I have undertaken to Confute what I did not apprehend, is miſtaken. If it be ſaid that *Spinoza* does not teach the three things above mention'd, I ask why he expreſſed himſelf exactly as thoſe wou'd do, who ſhou'd be extremely deſirous to make the Reader believe that they teach thoſe three things? Is it a fair and laudable thing to uſe the common Style, without annexing to the words the ſame Idea's other Men annext to them, and without informing the Reader of the New Senſe put upon 'em? But in order to diſcuſs the matter, let us enquire wherein the Miſtake may lie. I cannot have been Miſtaken as to the word *Subſtance*; for I have not Confuted *Spinoza* upon that Head; I have admitted what he ſuppoſes, that a Thing cannot be a Subſtance, unleſs it be independent of all other Cauſes, or have an Eternal and Neceſſary Exiſtence: I don't think I was miſtaken in ſaying, that according to *Spinoza*, God only has the Nature of a Subſtance; and therefore I believe that if there was any Miſtake in my Objections, it would be only in putting a different ſenſe upon the words, *Modalities*, *Modifications*, *Modes*, from that of *Spinoza*. But I repeat it again, If I was miſtaken in it, it would be his Fault: I underſtand thoſe words as they have been always underſtood, or at (*a*) leaſt, as they are underſtood by all the New Philoſophers; and I had all the reaſon in the World to believe he took 'em in that Senſe, ſince he gave no notice of the contrary. 'Tis the General Doctrine of Philoſophers, that the Idea of Being contains two Species under it, *viz.* Subſtance and Accident, and that a Subſtance ſubſiſts by it ſelf, *ens per ſe ſudſiſtens*, and that an Accident ſubſiſts in another Being, *ens in alio.* They add, that ſubſiſting by one ſelf, ſignifies only not depending upon a Subject of Inheſion; and becauſe, according to their Notions, this agrees with Matter, Angels, and Humane Souls; they admit two ſorts of Subſtance, one of which is Uncreated, and the other Created; and they ſubdivide the Created Subſtance into two Species. One of thoſe two Species is Matter; the other our Souls. As for Accidents, they all believed before the Unhappy Diſputes, which have divided Chriſtianity, that they do ſo eſſentially depend upon their Subject, that they cannot ſubſiſt without it. The Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation confounded that Notion, and made the Philoſophers ſay, that an Accident may ſubſiſt without a Subject. They cou'd not avoid ſaying ſo, ſince they believed on the one hand, that after the Conſecration, the Bread of the Euchariſt ſubſiſted no longer, and they ſaw on the other hand, that all the Accidents of Bread ſubſiſted as before. Wherefore, they admitted a real diſtinction between a Subſtance and its Accidents, and a mutual ſeparability between thoſe two ſorts of Beings, by virtue of which, each of 'em could ſubſiſt without the other. But ſome of 'em acknowledged ſtill that there are ſome Accidents, whoſe Diſtinction from their Subject is not real, and which cannot ſubſiſt without it. They call'd thoſe Accidents Modes (*b*). *Carteſius*, *Gaſſendus*, and in general, all thoſe who have forſaken the Scholaſtick Philoſophy, deny that an Accident can be ſeparated from its Subject, ſo as to ſubſiſt after its Separation, and they give to all Accidents the Nature of thoſe that were call'd Modes, and uſe the Words *Mode*, *Modality*, or *Modification*, rather than that of Accident. Now ſince *Spinoza* was a great *Carteſian*, 'tis reaſonable to think that he put the ſame Senſe upon thoſe Words as *Carteſius* did. If it be ſo, he underſtands by the Modification of a Subſtance only a Manner of Being, which has the ſame relation to a Subſtance as Figure, Motion, Reſt and Situation have to Matter, and Pain, Affirmation, Love, &c. to the Soul of Man. For this is what the Carteſians call Modes. They acknowledge no other Modes; from whence it appears that they have kept the old Notion of *Ariſtotle*, (*c*) according to which, an Accident is of ſuch a Nature, that it makes no part of its Subject, and cannot Exiſt without it, and the Subject can loſe it without loſing its Exiſtence. All this agrees with Roundneſs, Motion, and Reſt, with reſpect to a Stone, and likewiſe with Pain, and Affirmation with reſpect to the Soul. If *Spinoza* annexed the ſame Idea to what he calls Modification of Subſtance, my Objections are certainly juſt; I have confuted him according to the true ſignification of his Words, I have underſtood his Doctrine, and Confuted it according to its true ſenſe. In a word, there is no ground for the Accuſation I inquire into. But if he had the ſame Notion of Matter or Extenſion, and of Humane Souls, as *Carteſius* had, and yet would not give the quality of Subſtance to Extenſion or to our Souls, becauſe he believed that a Subſtance is a Being that depends upon no Cauſe; I confeſs I have aſcribed to him an Opinion which was none of his. This is what remains to be examin'd.

Having once laid down, that a Subſtance is what Exiſts by it ſelf, as independently upon an efficient Cauſe, as upon a material one, or a Subject of Inheſion, he could not ſay that Matter and Humane Souls are Subſtances: and becauſe, according to the common Doctrine, he divided Being only into two Species, *viz.* into Subſtance and Modification of Subſtance; he ſhou'd have ſaid that Matter and Humane Souls are only Modifications of Subſtance. No Orthodox Man will deny that, according to this Definition of Subſtance, there is but one Subſtance in the World, and that this Subſtance is God. Then the only thing that will remain to be known, is, whether he ſubdivides the Modification of Subſtance into two Species. If he uſes ſuch a Subdiviſion, and if he means by one of thoſe two Species, what the Carteſians and other Chriſtian Philoſophers call created Subſtance, and by the other Species what they call Accident or Mode; there will only be a Diſpute about words between him and them, and it will be a very eaſie thing to make his whole Syſtem appear Orthodox, and to put an end to his Sect: for a Man is a Spinoziſt only becauſe he believes that *Spinoza* has utterly deſtroyed the Syſtem of the Chriſtian Philoſophers, and the Exiſtence of an immaterial God, who governs all things with a Perfect Liberty. From whence we may conclude by the by, that the Spinoziſts and their Adverſaries do perfectly agree about the ſenſe of the word *Modification of Subſtance.* All of 'em believe that *Spinoza* meant by it, a Being of the ſame nature with what the Carteſians call Modes, and that he never underſtood by that word a Being, which has the Properties, or the Nature of what we call Created Subſtance.

Thoſe, who wou'd maintain, by all means, that I am miſtaken, might ſuppoſe that *Spinoza* rejected only the name of Subſtance given to Beings that depend upon another Cauſe, as to their Production, Preſervation, and Operation, *in fieri, in eſſe, & in operari*, as they ſpeak in the Schools. They might ſay that tho' he retain'd all the reality of the thing, he avoided the uſe of the word, becauſe he believed that a Being ſo dependent upon its Cauſe, could not be call'd *ens per ſe ſubſiſtens*, *ſubſiſting by it ſelf*, which is the Definition of Subſtance. I Anſwer, as I have done above, that if it be ſo, there is only a Diſpute about Words between him and other Philoſophers, and that I ſhall willingly confeſs my Miſtake, if it appears that

Spinoza

(*a*) *I uſe this Reſtriction becauſe of the difference there is between the Doctrine of the Modern Peripateticks, and that of the Carteſians, Gaſſendiſts*, &c. *about the nature of Accidents. 'Tis a notable difference; but all comes to the ſame with reſpect to the Objections againſt* Spinoza.

(*b*) *Such as Union, Action, Duration. and Ubication.*

that is in the Univerſe, and that all other Beings are only Modifications of that Subſtance. If we don't underſtand what he meant by it, 'tis doubtleſs, becauſe he put a new Senſe upon his Words, without giving notice of

Spinoza was a Carteſian; but that he has been more nice than *Carteſius* in the application of the Word *Subſtance*, and that all the Impiety laid to his charge, lies only in a miſunderſtanding. He only meant what is to be found in the Books of (a) Divines, *viz.* That the Immenſity of God fills up Heaven and Earth, and all imaginary Spaces *in Infinitum*, and conſequently that his Eſſence locally ſurrounds all other Beings, ſo that 'tis in (b) him we have Life and Motion, and that he has produced nothing out of himſelf; for ſince he fills up all Spaces, he could not place any thing but in himſelf, there being nothing out of him. Beſides, 'tis well known, that no Being can Exiſt without him; and therefore 'tis true, that the Properties of the Carteſian Modes agree with what is call'd Created Subſtances. Thoſe Subſtances are in God, and cannot Exiſt out of him and without him. 'Tis therefore no wonder if *Spinoza* call'd them Modifications; but on the other hand, he did not deny that there was a real Diſtinction between them, and that each of 'em Conſtituted a particular Principle of Actions or Paſſions, in ſuch a manner, that one of 'em does what the other does not; and that when one denies of one of 'em what is affirm'd of the other, 'tis according to the Rules of Logick, and no body can object to *Spinoza*, that it follows from his Principles, that two contradictory Propoſitions are True of one and the ſame Subject at the ſame time.

(a) Note, that the Carteſian Divines explain God's Immenſity in another manner.

(b) Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν, καὶ κινούμεθα, καὶ ἐσμέν. In ipſo enim vivimus, & movemur, & ſumus. Act. Apoſtol. cap. 17. v. 28.

This Diſcourſe ſignifies nothing; and in order to reſolve the Difficulty, one ought to Anſwer this Queſtion: Does the true and proper Character of Modification ſuit with Matter with reſpect to God; or does it not ſuit with it? Before you Anſwer it, let me explain by ſome Examples, what the proper Character of Modification is. 'Tis to be in a Subject in the ſame manner as Motion is in Matter, and Thought in the Soul, and the Form of a Porrenger in the Veſſel call'd a Porrenger. A thing cannot be a Modification of the Divine Subſtance, only becauſe it ſubſiſts in the Immenſity of God, becauſe it is penetrated by, and ſurrounded with it on all ſides, becauſe it Exiſts by the Power of God, and cannot Exiſt without him, nor out of him; 'tis further requiſite, that the Divine Subſtance ſhou'd be its ſubject of Inherence, juſt as, according to the common Opinion, the Humane Soul is the Subject of Inherence of Senſe and Deſire; Pewter is the Subject of Inherence of the form of a Porrenger, and Matter is the Subject of Inherence of Motion, Reſt and Figure. Anſwer now: and if you ſay that, according to *Spinoza*, the Subſtance of God is not in ſuch a manner the ſubject of Inherence of Extenſion, Motion and Humane Thoughts; I'll confeſs that you make an Orthodox Philoſopher of him, that there was no ground to raiſe ſo many Objections againſt him, and that he is only to blame for taking great pains to perplex a Doctrine which every body knew, and to forge a new Syſtem built only upon the ambiguity of a Word. If you ſay that he believ'd that God is the ſubject of Inherency of Matter, and of all the Varieties of Extenſion and Thought, in the ſame Senſe as *Carteſius* ſays that Extenſion is the Subject of Inherency of Motion, and the Soul of Man the ſubject of Inherency of Senſations and Paſſions, you grant all that I deſire: 'Tis in this Senſe I underſtood *Spinoza*, and all my Objections are grounded upon it.

The reſult of what has been ſaid, is a Queſtion of Fact concerning the true ſenſe of the Word *Modification* in the Syſtem of *Spinoza*. Muſt it be taken for the ſame thing, that is commonly call'd Created Subſtance, or muſt it be taken in the ſenſe *Carteſius* puts upon it? I believe the laſt ſenſe is the right; for in the other ſenſe, *Spinoza* would have acknowledged ſome Creatures diſtinct from the Divine Subſtance, and made out of Nothing, or out of a Matter diſtinct from God. But it were an eaſie thing to prove by a great many Paſſages of his Books, that he admits neither of thoſe two things. Extenſion, according to his Doctrine, is an Attribute of God; from whence it follows, that God is Eſſentially, Eternally, and Neceſſarily an extended Subſtance, and that Extenſion is as Eſſential to him as Exiſtence. The reſult of which is, that the varieties of Extenſion, which make the Sun, the Earth, Trees, the Bodies of Brutes, the Bodies of Men, *&c.* are in God, as the School-Philoſophers ſuppoſe they are in the Firſt Matter. But if thoſe Philoſophers ſuppoſed that the Firſt Matter is a ſimple and ſole Subſtance, they wou'd conclude that the Sun and the Earth are really the ſame Subſtance. And therefore *Spinoza* muſt needs draw the ſame Concluſion. If he does not ſay that the Sun is compoſed of God's Extenſion, he muſt acknowledge that the Extenſion of the Sun was made out of Nothing; but he denies Creation; and therefore he muſt ſay that the Subſtance of God is the Material Cauſe of the Sun, what compoſes the Sun, *Subjectum ex quo*, and conſequently that the Sun is not (c) diſtinct from God, but God himſelf, God intirely, ſince, according to his Notion, God is not a Being compoſed of Parts.

(c) Matter, as Ariſtotle *ſays*, Phyſic. lib. 1. cap. 9. *remains in the effect it produces*. Λέγω γὰρ ὕλην τὸ πρῶτον ὑποκείμενον ἑκάστῳ, ἐξ οὗ γίνεταί τι ἐνυπάρχοντος. Dico enim materiam quod rei cujuſque ſubjectum eſt primum ex quo inexiſtente fit aliquid.

Let us ſuppoſe for a while, that a Lump of Gold has the power to Convert it ſelf into Plates, Diſhes, Candleſticks, Porrengers, *&c.* it will not be diſtinct from thoſe Plates and Diſhes; and if it be further ſaid, that it is an uncompounded Lump, it muſt be all in each Plate, and in each Candleſtick; for if it was not all in each of 'em, it would have divided it ſelf into ſeveral Pieces, and therefore it would be compoſed of Parts, which is contrary to the Suppoſition. Theſe reciprocal and concertible Propoſitions would be true, *the Candleſtick is the Lump of Gold, the Lump of Gold is the Candleſtick. The Candleſtick is the whole Lump of Gold, the whole Lump of Gold is the Candleſtick.* This is an Image of the God of *Spinoza*: He has the Power to Convert or to Modify himſelf into an Earth, a Moon, a Sea, a Tree, *&c.* and he is abſolutely one, and without any compoſition of Parts; and therefore it may be affirm'd that the Earth is God, that the Moon is God; that the Earth is wholly God, that the Moon is ſo too; that God is the Earth, that God is the Moon; that God is wholly the Earth, that God is wholly the Moon.

There can be but three ways, according to which, the Modifications of *Spinoza* are in God: But none of thoſe ways is what the other Philoſophers ſay of the Created Subſtance. It is in God, ſay they, as in its efficient and tranſitive Cauſe; and conſequently it is really and wholly diſtinct from God. But according to *Spinoza*, the Creatures are in God, either as an Effect in its material Cauſe, or as an Accident in its Subject of Inheſion, or as the form of a Candleſtick in the Pewter it is made of. The Sun, the Moon and Trees, as they are things that have Three Dimenſions, are in God as in the Material Cauſe of which their Extenſion is compoſed; and therefore there is an *Identity* between God and the Sun, *&c.* The ſame Trees, as they have a Form, whereby they are diſtinguiſh'd from a Stone, are in God, as the form of a Candleſtick is in Pewter. To be a Candleſtick is only a manner of being of Pewter. The motion of Bodies, and the Thoughts of Men are in God, as the Accidents of the Peripateticks are in the created Subſtance; they are Entities inherent in their of it: Which is an effectual way to become Unintelligible by ones own Fault. If there is any Term that he took in a new Sense, and unknown to Philosophers, 'tis probably the word *Modification*. But whatever Signification he takes it in, he cannot avoid being confounded, as may be ſeen in a * Remark of this Article. Thoſe who will carefully examin the Objections I have propoſed, will eaſily perceive that I have taken the word *Modification* in the Senſe it ought to have, and that the Conſequences I have drawn, and the Principles I have laid down to Confute thoſe Conſequences, do perfectly agree with the Rules of Reaſoning. I don't know whether it be neceſſary to obſerve, that that part of *Spinoza*'s Syſtem which I attack, and which always appeared to me very weak, is that which the (*AA*) Spinoziſts are leſs willing to defend. I ſhall conclude with this Obſervation, that ſeveral Perſons have aſſured

* The Remark P.

Subject, of which they make no part. See the Margin (||).

I am not ignorant, that an Apologiſt (*a*) of *Spinoza* maintains that this Philoſopher does not aſcribe a Material Extenſion to God, but only an Intelligible one. But if the Extenſion of the Bodies we ſee and imagine, is not the Extenſion of God, whence comes it? How has it been made? If it has been produced out of Nothing, *Spinoza* is an Orthodox Man, his new Syſtem ſignifies nothing. If it has been produced out of the Intelligible Extenſion of God, 'tis ſtill a true Creation; for the Intelligible Extenſion being but an Idea, and not having really the Three Dimenſions, cannot form the Matter of the Extenſion, which formally exiſts out of the Underſtanding. Beſides, if we diſtinguiſh two ſorts of Extenſion, one Intelligible belonging to God, the other Imaginable belonging to Matter, we muſt alſo admit two Subjects of thoſe Extenſions diſtinct one from another; and then the Unity of Subſtance will be deſtroyed, and the whole Structure of *Spinoza* falls to the ground. We may therefore ſay, that his Apologiſt does not reſolve the Difficulty, and raiſes greater ones.

The Spinoziſts may take advantage of the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; for if they conſult the Writings of the Spaniſh School men, they'll find many Subtilties to anſwer ſomething to the Arguments of thoſe, who ſay, that one and the ſame Man cannot be a Mahometan in *Turky*, and a Chriſtian in *France*, ſick at *Rome*, and well at *Vienna*; but perhaps they will at laſt find themſelves obliged to compare their Syſtem with the Myſtery of the Trinity, to clear themſelves from the Contradictions that are objected to them. If they don't ſay that the Modifications of the Divine Subſtance, *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, a Horſe, an Ape, a Tree, a Stone, are as many perſonalities, which tho' *Identified* with the ſame Subſtance, may be, each of 'em a particular, determin'd, and diſtinct Principle of the other Modifications, they'll never be able to anſwer the Objection grounded upon their overthrowing this Principle, *Two contradictory Terms cannot belong to the ſame Subject at the ſame time.* Perhaps they'll ſay ſome time or other, that as the Three Perſons of the Trinity, without being diſtinct from the Divine Subſtance, as Divines teach, and without having any abſolute Attribute that is not the ſame in number in each of 'em, have nevertheleſs each of 'em ſome Properties that may be denied of others; ſo *Spinoza* may have admitted in the Divine Subſtance an Infinite Number of Modalities or Perſonalites, one of which does a thing, which others do not. This will not be a true Contradiction, ſince Divines acknowledge a Virtual diſtinction, *in ordine ad ſuſcipienda duo prædicata contradictoria*, with reſpect to the ſuſceptibility of two Terms that contradict one another. But, as the ſubtil *Arriaga* judiciouſly obſerves upon Metaphyſical (*b*) Degrees, which ſome will have to be ſuſceptible of two contradictory Propoſitions, ſhould we tranſfer to natural things what Revelation teaches us concerning the Nature of God, it would intirely deſtroy Philoſophy; for it would make way to prove that there is no real diſtinction between the Creatures. (*c*) *Dices quartò, dari diſtinctionem virtualem inter animalitatem, & rationalitatem, æquivalentem reali, quatenus, etiamſi à parte rei ſint idem, una tamen poteſt terminare cognitionem, altera verò non, quod eſt æquivalere ſubſtantiis* [illegible] *rebus diſtinctis; ſicut, licet eſſentia divina ſit idem realiter cum Paternitate, tamen eſſentiæ convenit communicari tribus perſonis, Paternitati verò non convenit ea communicatio. Reſpondeo——— explicare res creatas per hoc adeò difficile exemplum, eſt res faciles per difficillimas intelligere, præterquam quòd, ſi ex divinis liceret argumentari ad creata, etiam poſſet inferri, animalitatem poſſe produci, quin producatur rationalitas——— (d) Imo etiam poſſet inferri res omnes creatas eſſe idem realiter inter ſe, & virtualiter ſolùm diſtinctas, & quando una illarum perit, altera producitur, una movetur, altera quieſcit, id fieri ſecundùm diverſas formalitates ejuſdem entitatis——— Cùm ergo Deus ex una parte propter ſuam infinitatem neceſſariò careat compoſitione phyſica, & ex alia parte non poſſit natura divina eſſe multiplex, ſed unica tantum in tribus perſonis, quæ omnia non poſſunt intelligi ſine virtuali diſtinctione in ordine ad ea duo prædicata contradictoria, non licet ponere in creaturis ſimilem diſtinctionem, cùm neque creaturarum perfectio, neque ulla ratio efficax poſſit eſſe ad illam ponendam: imo potiùs (ut jam dixi) ſi ſemel poneretur, non eſſet ullum fundamentum ad diſtinguendas inter ſe realiter creaturas; & conſequenter deſtrueretur tota Philoſophia.* How little are we beholden to *Spinoza*! He deprives us of the moſt neceſſary Principle; for were it true that one and the ſame thing may be at the ſame time what it is, and what it is not, all our Meditations and Reaſonings would be inſignificant. See what *Averroes* ſaid (*e*).

(*AA*) *That part of* Spinoza'*s Syſtem, which I attack——— is that which the Spinoziſts are leſs willing to defend.*] I have Confuted *Spinoza*'s Suppoſition, that Extenſion is not a Compounded Being, but one Numerical Subſtance, and I have pitch'd upon that part of his Syſtem, becauſe I knew the *Spinoziſts* ſay the Difficulties don't lie in that. They think they are much more perplexed, when they are ask'd how Thought and Extenſion can be United in one and the ſame Subſtance. There is ſomething odd in it; for if it be certain that Thought and Extenſion have no Affinity one with another, 'tis ſtill more Evident that Extenſion conſiſts of Parts really Diſtinct one from another. And yet they are more ſenſible of the firſt Difficulty than of the Second, and call the latter a trifle if compared with the other. I thought therefore it was neceſſary to give 'em occaſion to Argue thus: If that part of our Syſtem can hardly be defended, which we took to be Proof againſt all Attacks, how ſhall we defend the weak parts of it?

(*A*) *He*

(||) *Obſerve this difference, that the Accidents of the Peripateticks are really diſtinct from their Subject of Inheſion, and that* Spinoza *cannot ſay ſo of the Modifications of the Divine Subſtance; for if they were diſtinct from it, without being compoſed of it, they would be made out of nothing.* Spinoza *would own it: He wou'd not cavil about it, as the Peripateticks do, when they are told that Accidents would be created, if they were diſtinct from the Subſtance.*

(*a*) Kuffelaer ſpecim. artis ratiocinandi pag. 222. *Note, That he very much inveighs againſt* Blyenberg, *who ſaid that* Spinoza *aſcribed a Material Extenſion to God. Note alſo, that* pag. 230. & ſeq. *He Confutes one* Adrian Verwer, *who had ſaid ſomething againſt the Syſtem of* Spinoza.

(*b*) *By* [illegible] *they call the* [illegible] *Corporeity, Vitality, Animality, Rationality, which conſtitute the nature of a Man. 'Tis agreed that they are not diſtinct one from another, but that they really are one and the ſame Entity.*

(*c*) Arriaga diſput. 5. logica ſect. 2. n. 29. pag. m. 83.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 84.

(*e*) Quo fit ut merito dicat Averroes hoc loco ſine hoc pronunciato non modo poſſibile non eſſe Philoſophari ſed ne diſputare quidem aut ratiocinari. Fonſeca in Metaphyſ. Ariſtot. lib. 4. cap. 3. pag. m. 655.

aſſured me that his Doctrine, even conſider'd without a Relation to Religion, appears very Contemptible to the greateſt † Mathematicians of our days. Which may be eaſily believed, if theſe two things be conſider'd: Firſt, That no Man ought to be more fully perſuaded of the Multiplicity of Subſtances, than thoſe, who apply themſelves to the Conſideration of Extenſion; Secondly, That moſt of thoſe Gentlemen admit a *Vacuum*. But there is nothing more contrary to *Spinoza*'s Hypotheſis, than to aſſert that all Bodies don't touch one another; and there never were two Syſtems more oppoſite than his and that of the Atomiſts. He agrees with *Epicurus* in rejecting Providence, but in all other things their Syſtems are like Fire and Water.

SPON (*Charles*) a Phyſician of *Lyons*. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* β.

SPON (*Jacob*) a Phyſician of *Lyons*, and an Antiquarian, Son of the Foregoing. See the ſame *Nouvelles*, γ.

STANCARUS (*Francis*) a Native of *Mantua*, lived in the XVI Century. He was one of thoſe, whoſe Endeavours to Eſtabliſh the Reformed Religi- in *Poland* proved moſt ſucceſsful. He δ had been call'd to (*A*) *Cracow* to teach the *Hebrew* Tongue; but when it was obſerved that he inſinuated the Doctrines of the Proteſtants in his Lectures, he was accuſed to the Biſhop ζ of *Cracow*, who had procured him that place; the Biſhop being informed that he was a Heretick, had him Impriſon'd η. He was releaſed by the Addreſs or Intereſt of ſome Lords, and θ found a good place of Refuge in the Houſe of *Nicolas Oleſnicki*, a Gentleman, whoſe Quality, Merit, and || Courage conſpired to make him a conſiderable Man. He propoſed to him to put an end to the Romiſh Worſhip, and to throw down Images; but *Oleſnicki* having conſulted his Friends, did not think it proper to be (*B*) ſo haſty, and was contented to have the Sacrament Adminiſtred in his Caſtle with ſuch Ceremonies as *Stancarus* ſhou'd think fit to appoint. Some time after, the firſt deſign of that Reformer was put in Execution; the Monks ‡, who officiated in the Church of that place, were expell'd, and the Images were Broke, and Burnt to Aſhes. *Oleſnicki* ʒ Founded a reformed Church at *Pinezovia* in the Year 1550. whither he call'd many Perſons Illuſtrious for their Piety and Learning. *Stancarus* ω ſet up there a Noble School, and drew up Fifty Rules of Reformation (*C*) for the Churches

(*A*) *He had been call'd to* Cracow.] *John Laetus* ſays that the Biſhop of *Cracow* himſelf call'd him thither to be Profeſſor of the *Hebrew* Tongue. (*a*) *A Maciejovio Epiſcopo Cracovienſi evocatus erat ut linguam S. Cracoviæ doceret.* But others (*b*) ſay, that being expell'd from *Italy* as an Heretick, and not being able to ſettle in *Germany*, he went into *Poland*, where he was permitted to teach *Hebrew* in the College of *Cracow*, becauſe they knew not what he was, but only that he underſtood that Language. Thoſe, who ſay this, being both his Enemies, and the Biſhop of *Cracow*'s Friends, might have omitted ſome Circumſtances. However, I believe that Biſhop did not ſend for him out of *Italy*, and that he knew nothing of his being qualified to Teach *Hebrew*, till he ſaw him in *Poland*.

(*B*) Oleſnicki——— *did not think it proper to be ſo haſty.*] A *Roman* Catholick gives the following Account of it. (*c*) *Capit errorem* (Stancarus) *inſtaurare Zwinglii, in idque operam dare, ut abduceret Oleſnicium à religione paterna & perſuaderet illi religionem externam. Cujus ad præſcriptum imagines è fano tolli, cœnam pro uſitata peregrinam inſtitui, Sacra quæ Monachi in ejus oppidi fano religionibus vetuſtis adminiſtrabant, explodi jubet. Erat hoc fanum cum adjuncta Monachorum domo, munificentiâ Sbignei Oleſnicii operosè extructum ac liberaliter ditatum, quod profanare Stancarus properabat, cujus conſilium cum Oleſnicio videretur periculoſum eſſe, ne quid inconſideratè faceret, vocat amicos ac in conſilium adhibet, in quo, variatis ſententiis, illa poſtremo vicit, ut imagines cum reliqua ſupellectili ſalvæ in fano manerent: Monachi etiam veteri inſtituto ſacra facerent: quod nihil earum rerum mutari tùm poſſet impunè: adeſſe Regem in proximo, Epiſcopum etiam Cracovii nondum diſceſſiſſe, fore biſce rebus mutandis aliud tempus magis idoneum. In præſentia placere cœnam inſtitui, idque fieret in Arce privatim non in fano publicè, quod in oppido ſubjectum eſt arci. Secundùm hanc ſententiam permittunt Stancaro novæ cœnæ modum præſcribere, ac illius uſum docere.* *Stancarus*'s Temper may be known from theſe words. If he had not the gift of Perſeverance, it ought not to be aſcribed to any lukewarmneſs: He was a very fiery Man; his Patron, who was a Sword Man, threw Water upon that great Fire by the Advice of ſome Lay Perſons, who examin'd that Affair. Take Notice of a Negligence of the *Socinian* Writer, whom I have quoted. He relates the whole Latin Paſſage to prove by the Teſtimony of a Poliſh Annaliſt, that *Stancarus* cauſed the Monks to be turn'd out, and Images to be thrown down; and yet it appears from the words of that Annaliſt, that no ſuch thing was done: *Lubienteiski* betrays therefore his want of Judgment. He might have found in *Spondanus* what he ſhou'd have quoted. (*d*) *Adverſus* Stancarum *prodiit Orichovii Roxolani elegans libellus titulo Chimæra——— ubi ait ——— (e) eum Pinczoviam Cracovienſis municipii oppidum ſe contuliſſe, ibique punico incitatum furore in templa irruiſſe, imagines ſanctorum ſuſtuliſſe, memorias Martyrum deleviſſe, altaria everiiſſe, ſacra profanaſſe, gazam eccleſiaſticam diripuiſſe, denique ſacerdotes ex oppido exterminaſſe.*

(*C*) *Drew up* 50 *Rules of Reformation for the Churches of* Poland.] We ſhou'd wrong him ſhou'd we ſuppoſe that he was a ſedentary Reformer, who keeping in his School at *Pinezovia*, ſent his Orders and his Counſels every where. 'Tis certain

---

† They have named to me among others, Mr. Iſaac Newton, M. Huygens, M. Leibnitz, M. Bernoulli, and M. Fatio.

β For July 1685. art. 5.

γ For February 1686. art. 9.

δ Laetus, compend. Hiſtor. univerſ. pag. m. 359.

ζ His Name was Samuel Maciejowski.

η Id. ib.

θ Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, Hiſt. reform. Polonicæ lib. 1. c. 5. pag. 31.

|| Id. ib. pag. 31.

‡ De hinc Monachos cambio & imagines templo ejicit, quin & has frangi & comburi facit (Oleſnicius.) Id. ib. p. 31.

ʒ Id. ib. pag. 31.

ω Laetus ubi ſupra.

(a) Jo. Laetus compend. hiſtor. univ. pag. m. 359.

(b) Staniſlaus Orichovius in Chimæra fol. 4. 23.

(c) Orichovius annal. 3. apud Staniſlaum Lubienieccium hiſtor. reformat. Polonicæ l. 1. c. 5. p. 31, 32.

(d) Spondanus ad ann. 1551. n. 22. pag. 538.

(e) Orichovius in Chimæra fol. m. 24. verſo.

Churches of *Poland*. He was ſent into *Pruſſia* ſometime after, and was *Hebrew* Profeſſor γ for a Year at *Koningsberg*. There aroſe violent Quarrels between him and *Oſiander*, the conſequences whereof proved fatal to Orthodoxy. *Oſiander* taught that Man is juſtified by the Eſſential Righteouſneſs of God, and that JESUS CHRIST is our Righteouſneſs according to his Divine Nature. *Stancarus* being too Zealous in Contradicting him, and departing from that Error with two great a Vehemence, run into the oppoſite extreme; for he maintain'd that JESUS CHRIST is our Mediator only according to his Humane Nature *. 'Tis ſaid that he had this Doctrine from *Peter* (*D*) *Lombard*, whom he admired. He undertook to Eſtabliſh it in *Poland*, but he met with ſome Obſtacles he cou'd not overcome. It was Condemn'd || in (*E*) ſome Synods, and that Condemnation was confirm'd in that of *Xian*, at which fifty Miniſters aſſiſted, with moſt of the great Lords of the Proteſtant Party, and many Gentlemen, in the Year 1560. Nevertheleſs, the Churches of *Poland* (*F*) were Troubled with that diſpute during *Stancarus*'s Life. He died † at *Stobnitz* in the Houſe of

γ *Micræl. Syntag. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. p. m.* 865, 870.

* *Id. ib. pag.* 865.

|| *Lætus ubi ſupra, pag.* 411.

† *Id. ib.*

tain that he travell'd into ſeveral Parts to perform the work of the Reformation. (*a*) *Stancarus Eccleſias a papatu reformavit. L. Canones inſtaurandarum Eccleſiarum conſcripſit.* This Proof being too weak, don't mind it, but depend upon this. (*b*) *Stancarus* ——— *ad reformandas Eccleſias ab Anno* 1553. *magno ſtudio incubuerat: in quam rem hortatu Jacobi Comitis Oſtrorogii libros conſcripſerat. Cum enim ei, tum Felici Crucigero & aliis piis viris, motâ in ditione Cracovienſi perſecutione* ——— *aliæ ſedes quietæ quærendæ eſſent, in majorem Poloniam conceſſerat & Oſtrorogii protectu tutus permanſerat. A quo Anno* 1553. *dimiſſus in Minorem Poloniam cum eodem illo Crucigero reverterat, & reformandis ab idololatria eccleſiis pro tempore operam dederat, favore Staniſlai Stadnicii, Hieronymi Philipovii, Nicolai Oleſnicii & aliorum Patronorum Virorum Nobiliſſimorum & Generoſiſſimorum fretus.*

(*a*) Lætus compend. hiſtor. univerſ. pag. m. 589.

(*b*) Staniſl. Lubieniecius ubi ſupra lib. 2. c. 6. pag. 116, 117.

(*D*) *That he had this Doctrine from* Peter Lombard, *whom he admired.*] I have read the following Paſſage long ago in *Micrælius*. (*c*) *Hic homo tanti fecit* Magiſtrum ſententiarum, *ex cujus lacunis hauſerat errorem, ut dicere non ſit veritus*, unum Petrum Lombardum plus valere, quam C. Lutheros, CC. Melanchthones, CCC. Bullingeros, CCCC. Martyres & D. Calvinos: ex quibus omnibus, ſi in mortario contunderentur, non exprimeretur una uncia veræ theologiæ. *Florimond de Remond* (*d*), who mentions part of thoſe things, and ſome others, quotes *Stancarus*'s Apology againſt the Divines of *Zurich*. I have conſulted it, and (*e*) found in it *Micrælius*'s Words. Note, That the Author pretends to have taken his Doctrine from the Holy Fathers, and not from *Peter Lombard*, who has only Collected, ſays he, the Authorities of the Fathers, and the Doctrines of the Church.

(*c*) Micrælius ubi ſupra pag. 890.

(*d*) Flor. de Remond, Hiſt. de la naiſſ. & progrés de l'hereſie B. 2. ch. 15. pag. m. 222.

(*e*) *Folio* k 5. edit. Cracovienſ. 1562. in 8.

(*E*) *It was Condemn'd in ſome Synods.*] *John Lætus* (*f*) Names three, that of *Sendomir*, that of *Vladiſlavia*, and that of *Pinczovia*. But *Lubienietski* affirms, that *Stancarus*'s Opinion was (*g*) ſo carefully diſcuſs'd in the Synod of *Pinczovia* in *November* 1558, and ſo well defended and Attack'd, that both Parties broke up without coming to any Concluſion. (*h*) *Æquo tunc Marte ab utrinque diſceſſum eſt, quoque cum ſua Sententia ad ſua, Stancaro Dubietzcum ad Patronum Staniſlaum Stadnicium revertente.*

(*f*) Lætus ubi ſupra pag. 411.

(*g*) Acrites diſcuſſa fuit. *Staniſl. Lubieniecius ubi ſupra pag.* 117.

(*h*) Id. ib.

(*F*) *Were troubled with that diſpute during* Stancarus's *Life.*] We have juſt now ſeen that he had ſome Friends in the Synods. We need not wonder at it: He underſtood the Languages and the Fathers, he was a Man of Parts, he cou'd ſpeak and write well, he grew fond of his Opinion, and diſputed about a very Difficult Subject, which afforded too much Matter to the boldneſs of the Logicians; and therefore had he had no Followers, one might well wonder at it. (*i*) *Stancarus ut multa erat non tantum linguarum ſcientia ſed & eruditione, ex ſcripturis & antiquitate ſententiam ſuam ratione profecto ſuffragante probabat. John Laſcus, Liſmaninus, Gonezius, Crovicius, Blandrata*, and many others cou'd never bring him off from his Opinion (*k*). The Churches of *Poland* being Alarm'd at thoſe Diviſions, and perplexed with the Subtilties of that Man, conſulted the Conſiſtory of *Geneva*, who ſent 'em (*l*) a ſhort and good Inſtruction, drawn up by *Calvin* in the Year 1560. It wanted to be ſupported by another very accurate Piece, that is to be found among (*m*) *Calvin*'s Letters. The Author of that Piece ſpeaks very cautiouſly of *Stancarus*, tho' he complains of his Anger againſt *Melancthon*. The latter, and *Peter Martyr* publiſh'd ſomething againſt his Doctrine. The former did it with great (*n*) Moderation, knowing that he had to do with a paſſionate Man. *Stancarus* refuſed to ſubmit to the Synods, that Condemn'd him. It appears from the (*o*) Letter, which the Miniſters of *Poland* writ to the Church of *Strasburg* in 1562, that he charged them with Arianiſm, and introduced a kind of Sabellianiſm. He inſtantly demanded a new Conference; but it was denied him, and his Books were Condemn'd and Burnt. (*p*) *Pincovienſes, rejectâ cum Stancaro, quam multum expetebat, diſputatione, in dubium vel in diſputationem trahi communem Eccleſiæ ſententiam, in gratiam unius inquieti, & arrogantis hominis indignum exiſtimantes, libros ejus condemnaſſe, & tradidiſſe rogo, lego apud Staniſlaum Hoſium, in Judicio de Cenſura Heidelbergenſium, ac Tigurinorum de dogmate contra Trinitatem in Poloniâ tum ſparſo.* The Schiſm laſted ſtill in the Year 1568, as it appears from a letter of *Beza*, wherein he exhorts the Schiſmaticks, and *Stancarus* by Name, to ſubmit to a Confeſſion, not doubting that if they do it, they will be reſtored to the Communion of the Church. I ſhall ſet down his words the more willingly, becauſe they contain a curious Circumſtance, *viz*. That *Stancarus* offered ſome formularies of Faith full of Ambiguous Expreſſions. (*q*) *Omnes illos qui à vobis diſceſſionem fecerunt, totque conſequutis malis aditum patefecerunt, ipſumque adeò Stancarum, precor & obteſtor per viſcera miſericordiæ Dei noſtri, ut & ſui & pacis Eccleſiarum majorem habeant rationem, iſtaque abjectâ in defendendo ſemel arrepto dogmate pertinaciâ, in animum inducant cum Eccleſiis in verè fraternam gratiam, abolitis prioribus omnibus, redire, & ſynceris omnium Eccleſiarum orthodoxarum confeſſionibus apertè potiùs acquieſcere, quam novas*

(*i*) Id. ib.

(*k*) Id. ib. pag. 111.

(*l*) *It is among* Calvin's *Tracts pag.* m. 682.

(*m*) *'Tis the* 152. *Letter.*

(*n*) Reſponſionem de Stancari controverſia perſcripſi, quæ multo eſt & brevior & ſummiſſior quam poſtulat magnitudo cauſæ. Sed hominem iracundum & bilioſum non volui accendere. Melancth. *epiſt.* 309. *l.* 4. p. m. 925. *It is dated in the Year* 1553.

(*o*) *'Tis the firſt among thoſe of* Zanchius. *See* Hornbeeck in apparatu ad controv. Socinianas pag. 29. (*p*) Hornbeeck ibid. (*q*) Theod. Beza, epiſt. 28. pag. 241. tom. 3. operum. *It is dated the* 1. *of* September 1568.

of *Peter Zborow*, and then that diſpute was over; but it appeared that (G) *Arianiſm* had accidently got a new ſtrength by it. 'Tis a Subject, that might afford (H) many Reflections. *Stancarus* loſt all the Glory of his firſt Actions by

pacis & ambiguas conciliationum formulas ſcribendo, ſuſpicionem præbere, quaſi fucare potius manifeſte defenſas errores, quam ſemel abjectis illis veram cum fratribus concordiam inire velint. Id verò ſi fecerint, non dubito quin dextram illis ultro præbeatis, exultent in cælis Angeli, applaudant omnes Eccleſiæ. We ſhall ſee (a) hereafter what he ſaid of the Perſecutions he had ſuffered.

(G) *It appeared that Arianiſm had accidentally got a new ſtrength by it.*] The chief Argument of *Stancarus* was this: If CHRIST is our Mediator as he is God, he is Inferior to his Father as to the Divine Nature; and therefore he is not Coeſſential with God the Father; and conſequently thoſe who ſay he is a Mediator as he is God, revive the Hereſy of the *Arians*. He urged this Conſequence with all the ſubtilties his Wit and the Nature of the ſubject cou'd afford him: Which occaſion'd a third Party; ſome being moved on the one hand with his Reaſons, and on the other with the Arguments of his Adverſaries, laid down that JESUS CHRIST was a Mediator with reſpect to his Humane Nature, and with reſpect to a Divine Nature inferior to that of his Father. *Blandrata*, and ſome others, who had fled from *Geneva* for ſome Errors concerning the Trinity, took Advantage of *Stancarus*'s Objections, and pretended that ſince his Adverſaries cou'd not reſolve them, 'twas neceſſary to think of another Syſtem. This gave Birth to Tritheiſm and Arianiſm in *Poland*, and at laſt to Socinianiſm. *Lubienietski* ſays, that the Synod of *Pinczovia*, wherein *Stancarus*'s Cauſe was thoroughly diſcuſs'd, and both Parties had an equal Advantage, made way for the Deſtruction of the Doctrine of the Trinity. (b) *Hæc mox, ut illa Serveti de præeminentia Patris, Viros pios & doctos ad hoc argumentum diſcutiendum haud leviter incitavit. Itaque meritò illam Synodum Pinczoviæ Anno* 1558. *celebratam Andreas Lubieniecius Senior in M. S. de Synodis magnum ingreſſum ad demoliendum dogma Trinitatis feciſſe dixit*——— *Et certè ex his, quæ ſecuta ſunt in illa Pinczoviana Synodo portam ad diſcutienda vulgò recepta dogmata apertam eſſe, nemo non videbit. Hoc enim ipſo anno cum veniſſet Pinczoviam Blandrata, quem invidia Calvini Geneva expulerat, habitis Pinczoviæ cum Liſmanino multis de hoc argumento ſermonibus, & videns Stancari adverſarios ei non ſatisfeciſſe, tantùm effecit, ut & ille de dogmate Trinitatis dubitare inceperit. Hinc Liſmaninus in ſuſpicionem Arianiſmi apud Miniſtros inolitis erroribus tenacius adhærentes incidit.* *Calvin* had been all along afraid that *Stancarus*'s Adverſaries wou'd run into another Extreme, and ſaw to his great grief that his fear was not groundleſs. Here follows what he writ to the Brethren of that Country. (c) *Tabulam nuper in Polonia editam, quæ Chriſtum & Spiritum ſanctum alios à Patre deos facit, non ſine acerbiſſimo mærore inſpexi. Pridem me hæc cura, non abs re anxium tenuit, ne fratres minus in Scriptura exercitatos abriperet Stancari importunitas, ut vitandæ unius abſurditatis cauſa, in aliam fœdiorem laberentur. Accidit ergo quod timui, ac triſti exemplo patefactum eſt quàm noxia ſit peſtis contentio, ubi magis propoſitum eſt, adverſarium vincere, quàm bonam cauſam ſimpliciter tueri. Craſſum Stancari delirium meritò à fratribus Polonicis repudiatum eſt. Sed dum ſibi ab una diaboli aſtutia cavent, obrepſit alter impoſtor Blandrata Stancaro deterior: & hac occaſione abuſus eſt ad errorem non minus deteſtabilem ſpargendum.* I ſhall ſet down a very fine Paſſage of a Letter he writ to them in 1563, which ſhews the pernicious effects of Diſputes, and that God ſends a Curſe upon the work of thoſe, who diſpute rather to Triumph over their Enemies, than for the ſake of Truth. (d) *Porrò teterrimus hic error, qui apud vos graſſatur, favorem obtinuit ex immodico contentionis fervore. Nam cùm Stancarus inſulſus Sophiſta, & rabula improbiſſimus commenta ſua ingereret, Chriſtum Mediatorem duntaxat eſſe, quatenus homo eſt, ideoque apud totam Trinitatem intercedere, optimum compendium quidam eſſe duxerunt, ſi reſponderent ſolum Patrem verè & propriè eſſe Deum. Ita effugium illud nimis cupidè multi arripuerunt, quod ita putarent nullo negocio refutari Stancari ineptias. Sic ut veteri proverbio dicitur, nimium altercando veritas amiſſa fuit. Equidem non dubito quoſdam inſcitia vel inconſiderata facilitate lapſos eſſe: verùm conjicere ſimul licet, nonnullos aſtutè (e) captaſſe occaſionem, ut execrabile delirium, quod plauſibile fore ſperabant, ſimplicibus impunè obtruderent.* That is, "This pernicious Error, "that is ſpread among you, proceeds from "too great a Contention. For when *Stancarus*, "that ſilly Sophiſt, and wicked Babbler, main"tain'd that Chriſt is our Mediator only as he "is a Man, and that therefore he intercedes "to the whole Trinity; ſome were of Opi"nion that the beſt way was to ſay that the Fa"ther only is truly and properly God. Many "were too fond of this Subterfuge, becauſe "they fancied *Stancarus* wou'd be eaſily con"futed by that means. Thus, as the Proverb "has it, Truth has been loſt by too much contend"ing. I don't doubt that ſome have been miſled "thro' Ignorance and Inconſiderateneſs; but 'tis "very likely others have cunningly waited "for an occaſion to ſet forth ſuch an execra"ble Doctrine without any danger, hoping it "wou'd be acceptable to the Ignorant". *Beza* (f) does alſo acknowledge that Tritheiſm and Arianiſm, revived in *Poland*, were occaſion'd by *Stancarus*'s diſputes.

EXAMINATION of the complaints againſt the multitude of Univerſities and Profeſſors.

(H) *Might afford many Reflections.*] I ſhall only make a few, and I'll begin with the complaints ſome make againſt Learning. Were it not better to ſuppreſs the Univerſities than to maintain ſo many Profeſſors in all Faculties? They are the Men, who give Birth to Hereſies, or bring up thoſe, who ſpread and Multiply erroneous Doctrines. The People, that is, all thoſe who are not call'd to explain Matters of Religion, preſerve the Faith imparted to them, ſound and undefiled. Teach 'em that they muſt believe the Trinity, the Unity of the Divine Nature, the Incarnation, CHRIST's Mediation, &c. they'll believe all thoſe Myſteries, without altering the Purity of 'em, and raiſing any diſturbance about 'em. But the Doctors take a contrary Courſe: Some are willing to diſtinguiſh themſelves by ſubtil Interpretations, and others will not ſuffer it. Which occaſions diſputes, that Trouble the Spring, and divide it into ſeveral muddy Streams. The firſt Diviſion is quickly followed by a Second, and ſo on: that Fecundity, or rather Contagion, is very ſurpriſing. In a little time you'll hear of many Sectaries, (g) *Apollinariſts*, *Arians*, *Eutychians*, *Macedonians*, *Monothelites*, *Neſtorians*, *Sabellians*, &c. If any one drew the Genealogy of Hereſies, it wou'd appear that their Filiation is chiefly grounded upon theſe two Cauſes. 1. The diſputants are willing to keep at two great a diſtance from their Adverſaries; and therefore they run into another extreme. 2. The deſire of getting the Victory, makes 'em carry their Objections ſo far, that they may be retorted againſt 'em, or favour a third Party. What do they do to Remedy that Inconveniency? They yield the ground they are not able to defend, and have recourſe to a new Invention. This produces a quite different Syſtem, which another

(a) In the Remark L.

(b) Staniſl. Lubieniecius ubi ſupra.

(c) Calvin. in admonitione ad fratres Polonos ne triplicem in Deo eſſentiam pro tribus perſonis imaginando tres ſibi Deos fabricent, int. pag. 683. tractatuum Theolog.

(d) Idem, pag. [illegible]

(e) He means Blandrata, Gentilis, John Paul Alciatus, whom he Names ſoon after.

(f) Beza, in Apologia altera ad Claudium de Xainctes pag. 345. tom. 2. operum. *See alſo what he ſays in* Calvin's *Life*, ad ann. 1560. pag. 381. tom 3. operum.

(g) *I follow an Alphabetical order and not a Chronological one.*

by the Troubles he raised afterwards, indulging to much † his Vanity and Subtilty. He publish'd (*l*) several Pieces. Some are strangely mistaken about

another Doctor will reform a-new, not finding it so exact as it shou'd be, and so on. Another, who fancies that both Parties have the Advantage and are worsted by turns, as they Act offensively, or stand upon the defensive, thinks himself obliged to pitch upon another Hypothesis. All these disorders appear'd in the case of *Stancarus*. He fell out with his Collegue *Osiander* in the University of *Koningsberg*; and the better to oppose him, he ascribed to CHRIST's Humanity what the other ascribed to the Divine Nature. When he removed from *Koningsberg* (*a*) to *Francfort* upon the *Oder*, he found there an (*b*) Antagonist, who run into a new extreme, that he might the better Contradict him; for 'tis (*c*) said, that he Taught that JESUS CHRIST, our Justification and our Mediator as he is God and Man, died according to his Divine Nature. *Stancarus* returning into *Poland* maintain'd his Opinion so warmly, and accused his Adversaries so violently of favouring Arianism, that he gave many Persons occasion to revive the Sect of the Arians, and then that of the Samosatenians. I believe they went upon this: 1. That the Objections of the other Ministers proved, that the sole Humanity of CHRIST was not our Mediation: 2. That his Objections proved that a Coessential Son of God cou'd not be a Mediator. They took a Medium between those extremes: They said that JESUS CHRIST, the Son of God, not Coessential, and Cloathed with our Nature, was our Mediator as to his Humane Nature, and as to the Spiritual Nature he had before he was Born. These are the unhappy effects of Theological Disputes, and Professors Chairs.

There is another thing to be considered. If a Professor advances a new thought, and gives ground to believe that he does it to get some Reputation, an Antagonist does immediately start up, who maintains that it is an ill thought. They grow hot by degrees, and at last hate one another in earnest. To Colour their proceedings, which are so like Humane Passions, the Aggressor must say that the Question is about a thing of great Moment for the good of the Church. He that is Attack'd must say the same, and shew that the Opinion he has altered gives a great Advantage to the Enemies. When things are come to this Pass, there is no going back; the Superiors must intervene. But what is the usual effect of their Decisions? An actual or a Virtual Schism. No such thing wou'd happen, if Men were not over fond of their own Thoughts. Had *Stancarus* confest, as he shou'd have done, that his Opinion was of little Importance for the good of the Church, he wou'd not have thought himself obliged in Honour to maintain it; he wou'd have been silent, as soon as he perceived that his assertion occasion'd some Troubles. How many disorders might have been avoided in the World, if Men had been contented to dispute about things necessary to Salvation? At this rate *Osiander* and *Stancarus* had never writ two Pages one against another. Is there any Body among the People that follows either of those Doctrines, when they put their trust in the Death of CHRIST? Nay, don't those very Divines, who have most disputed about those Questions, Worship him without thinking of those Distinctions between the Humane and Divine Nature?

Here's another Consideration. In all Countries where many Persons are paid to explain a Body of Divinity, some will doubtless be so rash as to start up Questions, which it were better (*d*) to let alone, as Landmarks that divide Inheritances. The Example of such Men is much to be feared; for every Body thinks he may do what is done by others, that have not more Authority than himself: Hence it is, that new disputes never arise more easily, than when they have been lately preceded by many others. This is what some say against the great Number of Universities.

“I shall answer all those Complaints in a few Words. 'Tis a most certain Maxim, that good things ought not to be suppress'd, because some make an ill use of 'em: And therefore since the improving of ones Mind is very Worthy of Man, and the Appointing of Masters for that end is a good thing, it ought not to be Abolish'd under pretence, that some Learned Men make an ill use of their Knowledge to raise Theological Disputes. To which I add, that the ill consequences of Ignorance are still more to be feared. Ignorance wou'd not prevent Divisions: Some Men less Ignorant than others, tho' they had never been in an University, wou'd be so presumptuous and so vain as to sow new Doctrines, and might Establish 'em the more easily, because their Hearers wou'd be Silly and Ignorant.

I shall conclude with deploring the miserable Condition of Mankind. They can't avoid an Evil but by running into another: If you cure 'em of their Ignorance, you expose 'em to scandalous Disputes, and such as frequently shake and even overthrow the Government.

(*l*) *He publish'd several Pieces.*] An *Hebrew* Grammar at *Basil* 1546. An Exposition of St. *James*'s Epistle, with the Conciliation of some Passages of the Scripture, at *Basil* 1547. This Conciliation (*e*) was taken almost Word for Word from *Bullinger*'s Commentaries; and therefore *Stancarus* may be placed in the Catalogue of Plagiaries. *De decem captavitatibus Judaeorum: De sanguine Zacharia*, and many other Tracts, the Titles whereof may be seen in the Epitome of *Gesner's Bibliotheque*. I shall only transcribe what follows: *De Trinitate & mediatore Domino nostro Jesu Christo adversus Henricum Bullingerum, Petrum Martyrem & Joannem Calvinum & reliquos Tigurina ac Genevensis Ecclesia Ministros, Ecclesia Dei perturbatores. De trinitate & unitate Dei, deque incarnatione & mediatione Domini nostri Jesu Christi adversus Tritheitas, Arrianos, Eutychianos, Macharianos, Cerinthianos, Ebionitas & Photinianos. Opus novum de reformatione tum Doctrina Christiana, tum vera intelligentia Sacramentorum, cum matura consideratione & fundamento Scriptura sancta & consilio SS. Patrum*, at *Basil* 1547 in 8. (*f*). 'Tis observed in the Epitome of *Gesner's Bibliotheque*, that *Stancarus*'s Book against the Ministers of *Zurich* and *Geneva* is full of injurious Words, and that it was confuted by *Josias Simler*. Here's an Apostrophe of *Stancarus*: (*g*) *Conclusum est, o Calvine, doctrinam suam de filio Dei esse plane Arrianam, à qua resilias quam primum te oro atque obsecro, & has hareses quam citius fieri potest retractes, & liberes Ecclesiam Dei ab istis blasphemiis quibus eam contaminasti.* He says in another place, that he has demonstrated that the Churches, call'd Reformed, were *Arian* and *Eutychian*. (*b*) *Omnes Ecclesia quas vos appellatis reformatas per Euangelium filii Dei, Arriana & Eutychiana sunt, nec hoc negari potest, ut supra* demon-bout the nature of his Opinions, as I ſhall make it appear, taking notice of (K) *Moreri's* Faults. The Books he writ againſt his Antagoniſts are full of injurious Words: He alledged for his Juſtification the Law of Retaliation, the importance of the Hereſies he oppoſed, and even the Example of the

---

† See the Remark *l*.

(*a*) Melch. Adam in vit. Theol. German. pag. 234.

(*b*) Call'd Andreas Musculus.

(*c*) Staphylus apud Prateolum voce Stancarini pag. m. 458.

(*d*) [illegible]

(*e*) Epit. biblioth. Gesneri pag. 14

(*f*) Taken from the Epitome of Gesner's Bibliotheque ibid.

(*g*) Stancarus contra Ministres Genevenses ac Tigurinos fol. 118, apud Ju ubi infra.

(*h*) Id. fol. 94.

demonſtrative probavit. *Andrew Jurglewski* (a), a Canon of *Vilna*, alledges thoſe two Paſſages in his *Bellum quinti Evangelii.* From whence it appears that *Calvin* and *Stancarus* gave one another the ſame hard Words; each of them accuſed the other of being a Blaſphemer and a Diſturber of the Church; and if *Calvin* blamed *Stancarus's* Vanity, I make no doubt that the latter charged him with the ſame Fault. (b) *Eſt illud non abſurdum modò, ſed exitiale commentum, quo vir ille faſtu turgidus & novitatis nimium cupidus orthodoxæ fidei principia labefactare conatus eſt. Dolendum ſanè eſt, quòd hominem qui prodeſſe alioqui poterat, mater hæreſeôn ambitio ad nocendum impulit. Adeò enim frivolæ ſunt quas obtendit rationes, ut ſatis appareat, nihil aliud quàm acuti ingenii famam ab aliis diſſentiendo captaſſe* ——— (c) *Utinam his moveatur Stancarus: quod tunc demum fore ſperandum eſt, ubi ingenium, quod ſua vanitate nimis in ſublime elatum eſt, ad manſuetudinem & modeſtiam ſe flexerit.*

(K) *Taking notice of* Moreri's *Faults.*] He ſays, "That *Stancarus* being willing to oppoſe "the Errors of *Oſiander*, who taught that the "Humane Nature of Chriſt is the cauſe of our "Juſtification, ran into the contrary Extreme, "and wrote againſt the Divinity of Chriſt "like an *Arian*". He quotes *Florimond de Remond*, *Bellarmin*, *Onuphrius*, and *Gualterius*. The I. Miſtake of *Moreri*, is his ſaying that *Oſiander* taught that the Humanity of Chriſt is the cauſe of our Juſtification; on the contrary, he ſhould have ſaid that *Oſiander* believed that the Eſſential Juſtice of God, and that CHRIST, as he is God, are our Juſtification. The II. Miſtake, which unavoidably follows from the Firſt, is his ſaying, that *Stancarus* taught that the Divinity of CHRIST is the cauſe of our Juſtification; whereas his Doctrine was Diametrically oppoſite to that. III. *Stancarus* was ſo far from oppoſing the Divinity of CHRIST, like an Arian, that on the contrary, the only Reaſon why he grew ſo fond of his Doctrine, was, becauſe he pretended that the oppoſite Opinion was a neceſſary In-let into Arianiſm. *Sandius*, who put into his Catalogue of Antitrinitarians, as many Men as ever he could, and ſometimes under equivocal Pretences, has omitted *Stancarus*; which plainly ſhews, that he did not in the leaſt oppoſe the Coeſſential Divinity of CHRIST. *Moreri* is therefore groſly miſtaken in point of Fact. His wrong conſequence is his IV. Miſtake. He falſly believed that *Oſiander* aſcribed our Juſtification to the Humanity of CHRIST. How then could he ſay, that *Stancarus* oppoſing *Oſiander*, ſo far as to run into another Extreme, oppoſed the Divinity of the *Meſſias*? For 'tis a natural Conſequence of the direct Oppoſition, which *Moreri* ſuppoſes between thoſe two Men, that *Stancarus* rigidly maintain'd the Divine Nature of the Mediator, as he did. V. The Authors quoted by *Moreri* ſay the contrary to what he aſcribes to them concerning *Oſiander's* Error. I ſhall only prove it as to Father *Gaultier*, who has miſled *Moreri*. *Franciſcus Stancarus Mantuanus*, ſays he (d), *tueri cupiens, ut Oſiandro* (e) *obſiſteret, Jeſu Chriſti humanitatem eſſe noſtræ juſtificationis cauſam, in oppoſitum extremum eodem circiter tempore ſe præcipitem egit, Jeſu Chriſti nimirùm divinitatem Arianorum more impugnando: ejus enim erat opinio, Chriſtum dominum eſſe juſtificatorem noſtrum ſecundum ſolam humanitatem excluſa divina natura.* You may plainly ſee in thoſe words the Third Miſtake of *Moreri*, and another as near as bad as the Fourth. For tho' a Man aſſerts, that JESUS CHRIST is our Mediator, and our Juſtification, as he is a Man, and not as he is God, it does not follow that he favours Arianiſm: And therefore Father *Gaultier* made uſe of an *enim*, unworthy of an Author, who ſhould pretend to Argue right. The greateſt overſight lies in the matter of Fact, that is, in his being ignorant that *Stancarus* aſcribed the Mediation of Chriſt to the Humane Nature, becauſe he believed that the contrary Opinion favoured Arianiſm. If Father *Gaultier* had ſaid that *Stancarus* revived the Doctrine of *Neſtorius*, there had been ſome appearance of Truth in it, and he would have been a little more faithful in his Quotation; For *Florimond de Remond*, quoted by that Jeſuit, touches upon Neſtorianiſm. Thus this Author wrongly ſtates the matter of Fact, draws wrong Conſequences, and is not right in his Quotation. He is more faithful in what he quotes out of *Prateolus*, for what he advances, is to be found in that Author; but becauſe the Words of *Prateolus* are taken from *Lindanus*, it had been better to quote *Lindanus*, tho' an Author of no Authority, who had read nothing of *Stancarus*, and only goes (f) upon the Teſtimony of one *Palladius*. I dare ſay that there are few Books that caſt a greater Blot upon the Church of *Rome*, than thoſe which contain a Catalogue of the Hereſies of the XVI. Century. There are two great Faults in thoſe Catalogues: The Firſt is, That they are ſtuffed with a vaſt number of (g) imaginary Sects; the Second is, That the Authors of thoſe Libels Tranſcribe one another, and it does not appear that any of them read the Books of the Hereſiarchs they ſpeak of. But tho' they be never ſo abſurd in what they ſay of other pretended Party Leaders, I think their Account of *Stancarus* ſhews their Ignorance as much as any other, ſince on the one hand they aſcribe to him an Hereſy which he oppoſed, and wherewith he continually charged his Adverſaries; and on the other hand, the Opinion, whereby he got many Enemies among the Proteſtants, is a Doctrine which the Roman Catholicks maintain againſt the Proteſtant Divines. Read theſe words of the famous *Turretin*. (h) *An Chriſtus ſit mediator ſecundum utramque naturam?* affir. cont. Pontificios & Stancarum. *Quæſtio hæc nobis intercedit cum Pontificiis qui ut facilius obtineant plures dari poſſe Mediatores, pertendunt Chriſtum Mediatorem fuiſſe ſecundum naturam humanam tantùm, ut poſt Lombar. lib. 3 diſt. q. 19. l. 9. Thom. p. 3. q. 26. art. 2. Bell. contro. 1. de Chriſto lib. 5. c. 3. Becanus in Manu. lib. 3. cap. 2. & alii aſſerunt. Quos hîc* Stancarus *ſequitur.* I have juſt now conſulted the *Summa Theologica* of the Jeſuit *Becanus*, and I find theſe words in it. (i) *Secunda concluſio. Chriſtus ſecundum humanitatem eſt Mediator non ſecundum divinitatem. Eſt contra Lutheranos & Calviniſtas qui docent Mediatorem eſſe ſecundum utramque naturam.* He confutes their Arguments; he quotes the Fathers for his Opinion, and refers the Reader to *Vaſques* and *Bellarmin*.

WHETHER *Stancarus* was an Heretick.

Perhaps it will be ask'd whether the particular Opinions of *Stancarus* ought to be accounted Heretical. 'Tis none of my Buſineſs to decide the caſe. I ſhall only ſay, that in order the Apoſtles †. He gloried that he had been Perſecuted (L) and Condemn'd, as Saint *Athanaſius* was. I know that he taught *, with great Zeal, in *Tranſylvania*, but I don't know certainly, at what time.

(a) Andreas Jurgievicius, Bell. quinti Evangelii pag. 111, 152. edit. Colon. 1595.

(b) Calvinus in reſponſo ad fratres Polonos pag. 682. Tractat. Theolog.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 683.

(d) Gual-ter. in Tab. Chronogr. c. 16. 21. pag. m. 797. *He quotes* Prateol. v. Stancariani. orim. lib. 2. de orig. hæreſ. c. 15. n. 1.

(e) *He had* fore *faithfully related the Doctrine of* Oſiander.

(f) Lindanus in Dubitantio dial. 2. pag. m. 127.

(g) *See the Article* Bezanites.

(h) Franciſcus Turrettinus, inſtitut. Theol. Elencticæ, parte 2. loco 14. pag. 411. edit. Genev. 1682.

(i) Martinus Becanus, ſumma Theolog. parte 3, cap. 21, pag. 716. Edit. Pariſ. 1634.

Staniſlaus

der to judge of the nature of a Doctrine, one ought to know the Principles and Deſign of an Author: For inſtance, *Stancarus* ought to be aſk'd whether he denies the Mediation of CHRIST according to the Divine Nature, becauſe he does not believe that he is both God and Man; or whether he denies it, becauſe he will acknowledge no Inferiority in the Divine Nature of CHRIST, and is afraid it will make way for Arianiſm? If he alledges the firſt Reaſon, he is a Samoſatenian and a Socinian; but if he alledges only the Second, 'tis quite another thing; he is an Orthodox Man as to the Coeſſential and Conſubſtantial Divinity of CHRIST; and his Error, at the worſt, conſiſts only in his ſuppoſing that the Mediation implies an Inferiority inconſiſtent with the Divinity of the Eternal Word. Perhaps, the Circumſtances of the time, and that Man's Haughtineſs, were the true Reaſon why the Miniſters of *Swiſſerland* and *Geneva* exclaim'd ſo much againſt him. The Churches of *Poland* were then in ſuch a Condition, that nothing could be more prejudicial to them than ſuch a Diſpute; and 'twas thought that *Stancarus* acted more out of Vanity than out of Zeal. Perhaps, his Doctrine would not appear ſo Pernicious at this preſent time; for ſince the Objections of the *Socinians* (a) have obliged ſome Proteſtant Divines to ſay, that CHRIST is not Adorable, as he is a Mediator; one would think they believe he is not a Mediator, as he is God. He is certanly adorable, as he is God; and therefore if he ought not to be Worſhipp'd, as he is a Mediator, 'tis becauſe he is not a Mediator, as he is GOD. As for the Letter (b) of the Miniſters of *Poland* to the Divines of *Straſburg*, I think it ought to be obſerved that it was written by Men, who had Excommunicated *Stancarus*, and diſputed with him upon ſeveral occaſions. 'Tis an uſual thing to aſcribe to a Man the Conſequences which are thought to ariſe from his Doctrine, whether he owns them or not; for 'tis ſuppoſed he does not fairly diſown them. And therefore Prudence requires we ſhould judge of the Doctrine of that Writer not by that Letter, but by his own Writings: I don't think he was a *Sabellian*. However, read the following Paſſage: (c) *Neque in eo ſolo ſubſtitit Stancari intemperies, quod doceret, Chriſtum Mediatorem eſſe juxta humanam tantum naturam; ſed ultra progreſſus, quoque veram Perſonarum Trinitatem ſuſtulit, unum Deum confuſâ Trinitate, apud quem Chriſtus homo mediatorem ageret, Trinomium, cum Sabellio imaginans, cæteras Eccleſias ut Arianas traduxit: quod patet ex litteris Miniſtrorum Polonorum, è Synodo* Pincovienſi *ſcriptis A.* MDLXII. *ad Theologos Argentinenſes,* (*quæ extat prima inter epiſtolas Zanchii*) —— (d) *Præterquam de Deo & Chriſto, etiam alia in cæteros fidei articulos movit Stancarus non ſana, de juſtificatione, &c. quod video ex* Reſponſione *Melanthonis, de controverſiis Stancari ſcriptâ, A.* MDLIII. *atque extat inter Melanthonis Declamationes, Tom.* iv. Mind theſe Words of *Melchior Adam:* (e) *ita diſſeruit* (Stancarus) *de duabus naturis ut non diſtinguere, verum ſeparare pleriſque ſit viſus.* They plainly intimate that *Stancarus*'s Enemies took the liberty to impute to him a Doctrine which he did not teach. Many thought that he divided the Two Natures of CHRIST. Which ſhews that he did not actually divide 'em, and even that ſuch a Diviſion did not neceſſarily reſult from his Principles; for in both caſes all his Adverſaries would have accuſed him of *Neſtorius*'s Hereſy. We may therefore ſay, that *Melchior Adam* means the Senſe which many put upon *Stancarus*'s Doctrine. But there is nothing more fallacious than to judge of a Man's Doctrine by the Interpretations of his Adverſaries. For a Confirmation of what I ſay, I ſhall quote *Stancarus* himſelf. The Divines of *Zurich* made uſe of theſe Words: *Videat Stancarus qui noſtram eccleſiam vult gravare ſuſpicione hæreſeos, ne ipſe interea jure convincatur Neſtorianus a quo tam parum abeſt ut difficillimum ſit eum ab illo internoſcere.* His Anſwer was, (f) *Cum Tigurini non affirment me eſſe Neſtorianum, non opus eſt ut me defendam; quod ſi etiam affirmarent, cum non probent, ſed ſimpliciter accuſent, illis docti viri non crederent, quia ipſimet Tigurini ignorant prorſus quod fuerit dogma Neſtorii, ut jam probabo. Hoc tamen profiteor & coram Deo & hominibus fateor me nihil negotii habere cum Neſtorio, & Neſtorii doctrina.* This Proteſtation ought to make us wary in the preſent caſe.

We ought chiefly to miſtruſt *Orichovius* (g), who ſays that *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Neſtorius*, and *Aerius* were revived in *Stancarus*. What he imputes to him with reſpect to the Euchariſt (h) is ſo extravagant, and even contradictory, that it ought to be look'd upon as a Calumny. It does not appear that the Divines of *Zurich* and *Geneva* exclaim'd againſt *Stancarus* upon this Head. The Writers (i) of the Catalogues of Hereticks, accuſe him of teaching that the Lord's Supper is an Earneſt of the Body of our Saviour. Is it an Opinion contrary to that of *Zuinglius*'s or *Calvin*'s Doctrine? They add, that he was Infected with Rabbiniſm. This Accuſation was only grounded upon his Skill in Rabbinical Learning, and his mentioning ſometimes (k) the Opinions of the Rabbins.

(L) *He gloried that he had been Perſecuted and Condemn'd, as St.* Athanaſius *was.*] I have Adviſed, ſays he (l), ſeven times at leaſt, *Philip Melancthon*, *Oſiander*, and *Felix*, the Superintendant of the Poliſh Churches, and the Miniſters of *Zurich* and *Geneva*: I have done it Civilly, I diſſembled their Errors, the way I took was to aſk them whether they were ſtill Orthodox as to the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. They all joined againſt me. The following words contain a particular Account of his Complaints. (m) *Omnes inſurrexerunt contra me. Alii enim vitam meam quæſiverunt ut* (n) *Melancthon per Joachimum Marchionem Brandenburgenſem & Electorem Imperii. Alii carceres præparaverunt perpetuos mihi, niſi admonitus aufugiſſem, ut Oſiander. Alii expulerunt me* (o) *è domo mea & literas ſcripſerunt ad omnes nobiles majoris & minoris Poloniæ & Ruſſiæ, ut nemo me reciperet, ſed expelleret ut Fælix ille impius & hypocrita cum ſuis Pinczovianis. Alii tam in Germania quam in Hungaria, Tranſylvania & Polonia minori multas Synodos celebraverunt contra me & fidem Catholicam de Trinitate & mediatore, & multos libellos plenos blaſphemiis Arrianis & Eutychianis, conviciis & horendis calumniis ediderunt, ut me tandem cum pura doctrina catholicæ fidei perderent, at nihil facere potuerunt, ſicut, nec poterunt. Durum enim eſt contra ſtimulum, unum Deum Trinitatem calcitrare. Hoc enim modo Conſtantius Imperator Arrianus cum Arrianis noveus Concilia celebravit contra D. Athanaſium, quem miris modis afflixerunt, proſcriptionibus, exiliis & perſecutionibus, ſed veritas tandem vicit.*

He

---

† See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Anſwer to the Divines of *Zurich* and *Geneva*.

* *Stancarus de Trinitate & mediatore adverſus Tigurin.* folio 7. of the Sheet F.

(a) Hinc nata quæſtio de adoratione Chriſti qua mediatoris, circa quam in partes itum eſt aliis affirmantibus aliis negantibus --- licet fatendum ſit——— quæſtionem hanc prout inter orthodoxos agitatur problematicam eſſe, & minus principalem, de qua utrinque diſputari poteſt ſalva fidei compage, imo & multum logomachiæ involvat. Turrettin. ubi ſupra quæſt. 18. pag. 539. *See alſo* M. Saurin, Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu pag: 749. & ſeq. (b) *See the Remark* F. (c) Hoornbeeck in appar. ad diſput. Socinian. pag. 29. (d) Id. ib. pag. 30. (e) Melch. Adam. in vita Bullingeri pag. 494.

(f) Stancarus de Trinitate & Mediatore adverſus Tigurinos & Genevenſes folio 6. verſo of the Sheet F. (g) Orichovius in Chimæra apud Spondanum ubi ſupra. *See the* Folio 5 *of that Book of* Orichovius. (h) Ibid. *See alſo* Florim. de Remond. l. 2. ch. 15. (i) Lindanus, Prateolus, Gaultier. (k) One of his Books is Intitul'd, de Rabinorum & Anabaptiſtarum falſa opinione. Another is Intitul'd, de locuſtis juxta ſcripturam & Rabinos. *See the* Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, pag. 245 (l) Stancarus de trinitate & mediatore adverſus Tigurinos *in the laſt Leaf but one of the Sheet* K. (m) Id. ib. (n) *This is ſo contrary to* Melancthon's *Genius, that it ought not to be credited.* (o) *In the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſame Book, he ſpeaks thus.* Expuliſtis me paralyticum cum familia ex domo mea (non omnes damno) & ex toto regno quantum in vobis fuit.

Stanislaus Orichovius's Book, intit'led *Chimæra* †, which he wrote against him, contains many Reasons and hard Words: as for his Reasons, the only Design of them is to prove, that his *Polish* Majesty ought to destroy that Man, and all those who sow new Opinions in the Kingdom. Thus he thinks the Arguments of Sectaries ought to be refuted. He confesses that he had (*M*) married a Wife being a Priest, but he dissembles the Apostacy which *Stancarus* reproaches him with.

STEPHANUS *Byzantinus* was an expert Grammarian, who' liv'd in the Fifth or Sixth Century. He composed a Dictionary, wherein he inserted the (*A*) Nouns Adjectives derived from the Nouns Substantives of Places, which served to denote the Inhabitants of those Places. This was attended with many Observations borrowed from Mythology and History, which discover'd the Origine of Cities and Colonies, and their Changes and Differences, whereby the Author equally shew'd his Exactness and Learning. We have but a sorry Abridgment of that Work, which the Grammarian *Hermolaus* thought fit to make ‡, and which he dedicated to the Emperor *Justinian*. Notwithstanding the Injury this curious Book has suffer'd by the Ignorance of the Abbreviator and Transcribers, it has prov'd very useful to the Learned, who thought that no ancient Book did better deserve to be Corrected and Explain'd in a critical way. *Sigonius*, *Casaubon*, *Scaliger*, *Salmasius* *, &c. took upon them to Illustrate it; but it did not appear (*B*) in *Latin* till 1678. That Edition publish'd at

He adds, That the Ministers of *Zurich* writ to those of *Poland* in 1560, to expel him from their Churches. Take notice that he composed this Work at *Dubeltz* in *Russia*, in the Year 1561, and had it printed at *Cracow* the Year following. *Stanislaus Matthew Stadnicki* (*a*) had shelter'd him at *Dubeltz*.

(*M*) *That he had married a Wife being a Priest.*] So far he confesses that his Fault was as great as *Stancarus*'s, who had also married being a Priest; but in other respects he clears himself of the Sin whereof he accuses his Adversary. He alledges for his Vindication, that he had kept within the Pale of the Church, and that he abstain'd from the Sacerdotal Functions after his Marriage. Thus he submitted to the Holy Canons, and underwent the Penance impos'd on married Priests; but *Stancarus* married and forsook the Church of *Rome*. (*b*) *Do hoc tibi, atque concedo, me inter sacerdotes publicos, tantisper sacrificasse, quoad licuit, & quoad fas fuit: cùm autem sacerdos duxissem uxorem, à sacrificio me funditùs removi, & quod Canon jubet, in ordinem redegi, ita unus de multis factus, offero nunc Deo cor contritum & humiliatum, quod ne despiciat Deus, supplex plebe in media posco. An ego te imitarer arrogantem, atque contumacem? cui parùm erat visum mulieroso sacerdoti uxorem ducere, cum qua tibi connubii jus aliter non erat, nisi si à sacrificio, & à sacris administrandis abstineres: ni etiam sacrilegio status solennesque ceremonias sacerdotii pollueres, atque impiis in Ecclesiam introductis sacris, omnia sacra vetera, unà cum sacerdotio, ex Ecclesia exterminares.* . . . . (*c*) *Uxorem ego sacerdos, contra legem duxi: sed idem tamen ejus legis pœnam sustinui: abrogationem nempe sacerdotii. Hac enim mulcta sola sequitur meum factum, legis atque Canonis præscripto.* . . . . *Cùm factum, Stancare, in ducenda uxore, par sit nostrum, audi, quàm ipsius facti conditio sit inter nos dispar: tibi enim, in dissensione, ac dissidio, per summum Ecclesiæ contemptum, uxor ducta est: mihi verò, summa voluntate, ac judicio ipsius Ecclesiæ, hæc eadem est adjudicata. quid ita? quia pœnam legis sustinui: & quod obedientem decuit, Canonis jussu, à sacris me removi: tu contrà, & pœnam legis contemnis, & sacris te immisces.* But we must not depend upon all that he says; he dissembles and suppresses what he thinks disadvantageous in the Accusation. He does not confess that he had intirely broke with the Church of *Rome*, and that he had disputed against it a long time. Nevertheless this is very true (*d*): He return'd afterwards into the Pale of that Church; which was the reason why *Stancarus* call'd him an Apostate.

(*A*) *The Nouns Adjectives . . . to denote the Inhabitants.*] The Title, περὶ πόλεων, *de urbibus*, which is commonly given to that Work, is neither that which the Author, nor that which the Abbreviator put to it. The true Title of the Book was ἐθνικά: hence *Hermolaus* intit'led the Abridgment he made of it ἐθνικῶν ἐπιτομή. " (*e*) But because " several Persons have undertaken at several times " to abridge this Abridgment, and to leave out " even the Name and the Epistle Dedicatory of " the first Abbreviator, 'tis no wonder if the anci" ent Titles of the Book are lost. In the room of " which some Smatterers in Learning have substi" tuted this περὶ πόλεων, because they thought the " main Design of the Author was to write a Geo" graphical Book. But they were mistaken, his " real Design was to write a Grammatical Work, " to explain the Names derived from Nations, " Cities, and Provinces, just as if one should ex" plain Grammatically the Words *Parisian*, *French*" *man*, *Dutchman*, &c. and shew the great Variety " that may be observed in the Formation of these " *derivative* Terms." This is the Opinion of those who have publish'd *Stephanus*, as it is related in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*. This Opinion might have been criticized; for there is no appearance that the principal Design of this Grammarian was the Explication of these derivative Terms. It was probably the least Part of his Project, and only an Accessory to his Work. I own he is very careful to observe that sort of Nouns, but that takes up little room, compar'd with the Facts that he relates, and the Testimonies he quotes; which would be more apparent if we had the whole Work. There we should find a Line or two in an Article for the explanation of the Noun Adjective, deriv'd from the Name of a City, and sometimes whole Pages in one Article only. I believe, till I be better inform'd, that the Title ἐθνικά implies all the Observations that can be made upon a Nation, a City, and a Place, in as much as an Author confines himself to the Origin of Places and Geographical History. See in the Remark G the Passage of Father *Lubin*. " (*f*) What is very pleasant is, that when they " cite the Author of this Book they call him *Ste*" *phanus de Urbibus*, whence it came to pass that " many Persons took *de Urbibus* to be the Name " of the Author's Family. Father *Lubin* had a " mind to call him *Stephen of the Cities* in his " Geographical Tables on *Plutarch*; but having " consulted the Gentlemen of the *French* Academy, " he could never make 'em approve his Design. " He seems to complain of their hardness in his " Geographical Mercury (*g*)." He was much in the wrong to complain of it.

(*B*) *It did not appear in* Latin *till* 1678.] There were three *Greek* Editions, that of *Aldus Manutius*, that of *Junta*, and that of *Xylander*; but though the latter engaged to publish his *Latin* Version forthwith, and though the Continuator of *Gesner*'s *Bibliotheca* affirm'd, that the Book of our *Stephanus* was publish'd by *Xylander* in *Greek* and *Latin* in 1568, 'tis certain it did not thus appear till the Year I have mention'd. A *Portugueze* Jew nam'd *Pinedo* publish'd it at *Amsterdam* in 1678, with a *Latin* Translation of his own making, and a Commentary (*h*). Six Years after M. *Rijk* Professor at at *Amsterdam* was follow'd by that of *Leyden* ten Years after. The *Dutch* publish'd before-hand some Sheets of those Editions, which hindred Father (C) *Lubin* from publishing this Author, on whom he had bestow'd much Pains. The Fragment of *Stephanus* (D) concerning *Dodona*, plainly shews, that *Hermolaus* left out a thousand good Things; and because he adds sometimes something of his own, one cannot certainly tell (E) whether *Stephanus Byzantinus* made Profession of Christianity or not: for who knows whether the Passages wherein he seems to speak like a Christian are his? M. *Moreri* deserves (F) to be censured. Father *Lubin* had reason (G) to believe that a great Service would be done to the Readers, if the Nouns Adjectives of Inhabitants were inserted in Geographical Dictionaries. If I might advise, I would have them inserted in the Second Edition of *Furetiere*'s Dictionary. M. *Colomies* ‡ quotes some Words of *Scaliger*, (H) which appear very obscure to me.

---

† *It was printed at* Cologne *in* 1563, *in* 8.

‡ *Suidas in* Ἑρμόλαος.

* *See* Colomies's Bibliotheque choisie *p.* 45. & *seq. where you'll find the Names of many Authors, who have writ upon* Stephanus.

) *See the* ...*ille De*... *atory of* ... *Work.*

) *Stanisl.* ...*hovius* *Chimæra* ...5.

) *Id. ib.* ...6.

) *See* ...*n Sta*... *fcius* ...*leg.* ...*um* ...*rum* ...78, 79.

) *Nou*... *s de* ...*epubl.* *lettres* *July* ...4. *art.* ...485.

(*f*) *Nouv. de la Rep. des lettres ibid. pag.* 486.

(*g*) *Pag.* 62.

(*h*) *See the Judgment that* Colomies *passes on it in his* Bibliotheque, choisie *p.* 46.

STILPO

at *Leyden*, publish'd the Notes of *Lucas Holstenius* on that same Book of *Stephanus*, which he had from Cardinal *Francis Barberini*. There was a new Edition of *Stephanus* printed at *Leyden* in 1688, in *Greek* and *Latin*, as that of *Pinedo*: the *Latin* Translation was made by *Berkelius* (i). This Translator added to it a large and learned Commentary. His Remarks on the last Letters are shorter and not so Learned, because he died before the Work was printed off. M. *Gronovius* has much contributed to the amendment of this Edition.

(C) *Which hindred Father* Lubin *from publishing that Author.*] This Disappointment vex'd him, and made him inveigh against the *Dutch*. Here I shall transcribe the Words of a Journalist. "(a) Having mention'd Father *Lubin*, I will not "forget the Indignation he has conceiv'd against "the *Dutch*, since he has been inform'd that "they were printing *Stephanus de Urbibus* with "a *Latin* Translation, and a Commentary. If "you consult the 63 Page of his Geographical "Mercury, you may see with what Anger he "speaks. The occasion of his Grief is, that they "have maliciously supplanted him, as he says, "and deprived him of the Fruit of his long "Studies. *He had been ten Years translating that "Book, and had corrected the Faults of three Editions, by the help of two* Greek *Manuscripts of the "King's Library, which had been very civilly lent "him by M.* Carcavi; *he had made some Geographical Notes upon it, filled up the empty Spaces, "and compared all the Authorities of the Authors "cited with the Originals that are extant. Those "who saw his Manuscripts were amazed at his "great Labour*; and yet the *Dutch*, all of a sudden "dispersed the first Sheets of their Edition over "all *Europe*, that no Bookseller might undertake "the printing of that Book. This is certainly a "severe Blow for an Author, and especially for "a Monk of the Order of St. *Augustin*, who was "going to shew the World his great Skill in the "*Greek* Tongue and critical Learning, which "People will not easily believe without plain "Proofs for it. It is so true, that People can "hardly believe such a thing, that the Abbot "*Baudrand* having inform'd the Publick in his "Dictionary that *Stephanus de Urbibus* had been "translated and adorned with very Learned Notes "by the R. F. *Lubin*; *Pinedo* writ on purpose to "*Paris* to know the truth of it, and was answer'd, that M. *Baudrand* had given it out *in "fide parentum.*"

(D) *The Fragment of* Stephanus *concerning* Dodona.] It was taken from a very ancient Manuscript, which was in the Library of M. *Seguier*, Chancellor of *France*. *Tennulius*, Professor in the College of *Nimeguen*, was the first that publish'd it. He added to it a *Latin* Translation with Notes. *Berkelius* made a Second Edition of it (b) which contain'd a new Translation of his own, and some Remarks. *Pinedo* made a third Version of it, and publish'd it at the End of his *Stephanus* with Notes. M *Gronovius* made a fourth Edition of it (c) in 1681, wherein the three preceding Versions are to be seen: he added to it some Learned Dissertations.

(E) *One cannot certainly tell whether* Stephanus .... *made Profession of Christianity.*] The Reflection of a Journalist seems to me very proper to shew what a little Command the Writers of these last Ages have over their Prejudices; for there is hardly any Book wherein their unhandsome way of speaking of other Religions does not discover what Religion they profess. The Reflection is as follows. "(d) Although *Lucas Holstenius* believed that *Stephanus Byzantinus* was a "Christian, the thing is still disputable. There "are the same Difficulties concerning *Ammianus "Marcellinus*: some say he was a Pagan, others "maintain that he was not. I conclude from "thence, that the Writers of this Age are infinitely more passionate or conceited than the "ancient. Are there any Geographical or Historical Dictionaries, or even Histories, that do not "discover the Partiality of the Author for or "against the Church of *Rome*? It will never "be disputed in future Ages, whether *Moreri*, "the Abbot *Baudrand*, &c. were *Roman Catholicks* "or *Protestants*. One may know the *Sect* of a "Grammarian by the very Rudiments of a Grammar." If I was to give my Opinion, I had rather say, that our *Stephanus* was a Christian (e), than that he was a Pagan, as a very Learned Man (f) will have it; and had he always related the ridiculous Opinions of the Heathens, without criticizing on them it would be no Crime.

(F) Moreri *deserves to be censured.*] For he refers his Reader to a Book that was never publish'd, and says nothing at all of *Pinedo*'s Edition. *Father* Lubin, *an* Augustin, says he, *has translated it into* Latin, *and hath added to it very Learned Remarks. See his Translation.* Would any Man doubt, after the reading of these Words, that Father *Lubin*'s *Stephanus* has been actually publish'd? I believe *Moreri* thought so, but he deceiv'd his Reader. He had read in M. *Baudrand*, (g) *Quod* (opus Stephani) *nunc Latinum reddidit, restituit, & notis illustravit doctissimis P. Augustinus Lubin Augustinianus.* He did not doubt, after such a Testimony, that he might speak as positively as he did. M. *Baudrand* made a good use of *Pinedo*'s Reflection; (h) he declar'd in his new Edition, that Father *Lubin*'s Work was not yet (i) printed. Such a Clause should never be forgotten, by those who mention a Work that is still in the Author's Study.

(G) *Father* Lubin *had reason to believe.*] Here follows the Passage which I promised above. You'll find in it, among other things, the Author's Thoughts about the Design of *Stephanus*. *The Design of* Stephanus de Urbibus *was*, says he (k), *to teach his Scholars the Greek History; and lest in reading they should take the People of one City for that of another, he made it his Business, speaking of Cities, to observe* τὰ ἐθνικὰ *of them, which we may translate the* Familiar Names (l) *that are given to those People, derived from the Name of the City where they dwell; for instance,* ἀντιόχεια, τὸ ἐθνικὸν ἀντιοχεύς, ἀθῆναι, ὁ πολίτης ἀθηναῖος. *We have good Reason to wish, that some Learned Man would undertake the same thing about* Latin *Names of Towns, adding to them the derivative Name by which the Inhabitants are called; as from* Roma, Romanus, *from* Carthago, Carthaginensis. *The same might be done in our own Language, and it wou'd not be unbecoming a Man of Parts to observe how the Inhabitants of our Cities and Provinces are called, how an Inhabitant of* Bretagne *is called a* Breton, *of* Anjou *an* Angevin, *of* Paris *a* Parisian, *and the like of others: the reading of our Histories would be more pleasant, and there would not be so many Faults in our Tongue; those derivative Words should not be wanting in our Geographical Dictionaries.*

(H) *Of* Scaliger, *which appear to me very obscure.*] "*Pinedo* does not observe in his Preface that

"*Nico-*

---

‡ *Ubi supra.*

(i) *He was Rector of the College of* Delft.

(a) *Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres, ubi supra, pag.* 487.

(b) *At* Leyden, 1674. *in* 8.

(c) *That Edition is in* 4.

STILPO, a Native of *Megara*, was one of the most famous ancient Philoſophers. He was either Diſciple of *Euclid* himſelf, or of ſome of *Euclid*'s Diſciples; and acquir'd ſuch a Reputation by his Eloquence, and the Acuteneſs of his Wit, that People left the other Schools in Crowds to go to *Megara*, in order to improve by his Lectures †. In a Journey he made to *Athens*, Trades-People left their Shops to ſee him *. Being jeſted (*A*) upon by reaſon of that Curioſity he had an Anſwer ready. Some ſay he kept a (*B*) Miſtreſs beſides his lawful Wife; but this is not certain. He was naturally very much given to Wine and Women; and yet it did not appear that he made himſelf drunk, or that he lived a lewd Life: He corrected the bad Inclinations of his Temper by (*C*) the Study of Philoſophy. The Fear of the Gods did not work that Effect in him; for he is reckon'd among (*D*) Atheiſts, or among thoſe Philoſophers, who had little

† *Diogen. Laertius, lib.* 2. *n.* 113.

* *Id. ib. n.* 119.

" *Nicolas Sophianus* had in his Poſſeſſion an entire " *Stephanus*: *Præter alios codices Græcos*, ſays " *Scaliger* in a Letter to *Gruterus*, *quos Nic. Sophianus habebat, erat & integer Stephanus cum toto* K *&* Λ, *quæ hodie imperfecta circumferri non ignoras* (*m*). „ I can't apprehend what he means by an entire Dictionary, with the whole Letters *K* and *L*; 'tis a Riddle to me. Juſt as if one ſhould ſay, that a Man has read the whole New-Teſtament, with the Goſpel of St. *John* and the *Acts of the Apoſtles*.

(*A*) *Being jeſted upon by reaſon of that Curioſity.*] Every Body is eager to ſee you, ſaid one to him, they admire you as a wild Beaſt; ſuch an eagerneſs is like that which People expreſs to ſee a Bear or an Elephant. You are miſtaken, anſwer'd he (*a*), they admire me as a true Man. This Thought was not unlike that of *Diogenes* the Cynick, who, with a Lanthorn in his Hand, look'd for a Man in ſuch Places where he ſaw moſt People. The Men he ſaw having not a humane Reality and Perfection, ſeem'd to him Counterfeit Men; they had nothing of the Man but the Name. In this ſenſe *Stilpo*, a true and real Man, ſhou'd have been accounted by the *Athenians* a more ſcarce and admirable Animal, for which Trades-People ſhould leave their Work, than the moſt extraordinary Beaſts of the *Indies*.

(*B*) *That he kept a Miſtreſs . . . but this is not certain.*] *Diogenes Laertius* ſays ſo only upon the Credit of an inconſiderable Author. (*b*) Καὶ γυναῖκα ἠγάγετο, καὶ ἑταίρᾳ συνῆν Νικαρέτῃ, ὥς φησί που καὶ Ὀνήτωρ: *Ac præter uxorem quam duxerat, Nicarete etiam pellice utebatur, ut Onetor ait.* Had there been any ground for this Slander, *Athenæus* wou'd not have forgot to mention it, ſince he makes it his buſineſs to cry down every body upon that Account, eſpecially the Poets, the Wits and the Philoſophers. But he only ſays that *Nicarete*, a Curtezan, illuſtrious for her Birth and Learning, heard *Stilpo*'s Lectures. Wou'd he not have added, that ſhe was his Concubine, if he had believed what *Onetor* ſays of it? (*c*) Νικαρέτη δὲ ἡ Μεγαρεὺς (*d*) οὐκ ἀγεννὴς ἦν ἑταίρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ γονέων καὶ κατὰ παιδείαν ἐπέραστος ἦν· ἠκροᾶτο δὲ Στίλπωνος τοῦ φιλοσόφου. *Megarenſis quoque Nicarete non obſcura & ignobilis meretrix fuit, ſed & natalium ſplendore, & doctrinâ perquàm amabilis. Philoſopho namque Stilponi operam dederat.* See in the following Remark the glorious Teſtimony that was given to our Philoſopher's Chaſtity.

(*C*) *Corrected the bad Inclinations of his Temper by the Study of Philoſophy.*] This we find in a Paſſage of *Cicero*. (*e*) *Stilponem Megaricum philoſophum, acutum ſanè hominem, & probatum temporibus illis accepimus. Hunc ſcribunt ipſius familiares & ebrioſum, & mulieroſum fuiſſe: neque hoc ſcribunt vituperantes, ſed potiùs ad laudem: vitioſam enim naturam ab eo ſic edomitam, & compreſſam eſſe doctrina, ut nemo unquam vinolentum illum, nemo in eo libidinis veſtigium viderit.* We ſhall ſee hereafter the noble Encomiums beſtow'd upon his Virtue by *Plutarch* (*f*) and *Athenæus* (*g*).

(*D*) *He is reckon'd among Atheiſts, or among thoſe Philoſophers*, &c.] He ſpoke his Thoughts too freely; ſo that he was baniſh'd, notwithſtanding the Subterfuges wherewith he endeavour'd to rectify his Expreſſions in the *Areopagus*. I ſhall uſe *La Mothe le Vayer*'s Words, and at the ſame time correct 'em when there is occaſion for it. " (*h*) *Stilpo* was more cautious; for being ask'd " by *Crates*, whether our Prayers and Worſhip " are acceptable to God, he anſwer'd, that ſuch " a Queſtion ſhou'd not be ask'd in the Street, " but in Private, and in a Cloſet: which is the " ſame Anſwer that (*l*) *Dion* made to another, " who ask'd him, whether or no there were any " Gods. The great Pontiff *Cotta* gave alſo the " ſame Anſwer to *Velleius*, who ſuppoſed that it " was a very difficult thing to deny the Exiſtence " of the Gods. *Credo*, ſays he, *ſi in concione quæratur, ſed in ejuſmodi ſermone & conſeſſu faciliimum.* But *Stilpo* found himſelf much more " perplex'd upon another occaſion, being ſummon'd to appear before the *Areopagites* for ſaying that the *Minerva* of *Phidias* was not a God: " nevertheleſs he came off cunningly enough, by " ſaying that ſhe was a Goddeſs, and not a God, " making a diſtinction between a Male and a Female. Which made *Theodorus* ask him, as he " was going from the Court, whether he had ſeen " *Pallas* under her Petticoats, ſince he ſpoke ſo " pertinently of her Sex. Nevertheleſs he was " baniſh'd for his Freedom of Speech. „ To ſatisfy every Body I ſhall relate the thing in the words of the Original. (*l*) Κράτητος αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσαντος, εἰ οἱ θεοὶ χαίρουσι ταῖς προσκυνήσεσι καὶ εὐχαῖς, φασὶν εἰπεῖν, Περὶ τούτων μὴ ἐρώτα, ἀνόητε, ἐν ὁδῷ, ἀλλὰ μόνον. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ Βίωνα ἐρωτηθέντα εἰ θεοί εἰσιν, εἰπεῖν,

Οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ σκεδάσεις ὄχλον ταλαπείριε πρέσβυ.

Quum rogaſſet illum Crates an Dii precationibus ac divinis honoribus gaudeant, Noli me inquit, fatue, in via de hiſce rogare, ſed ſolum ac ſeorſum. Hoc ipſum & Bionem interrogatum, an ſint Dii, dixiſſe tradunt,

Tune ſenex turbam à nobis propellere curas?

Diogenes Laertius means, without doubt, *Bion Boryſthenita*, one of the boldeſt Atheiſts mention'd by the Ancients. The Conformity of his Thought with that of *Stilpo* is very diſadvantageous to the latter. *Cotta* in *Cicero* was little more Orthodox, ſince he found it no difficult thing to deny the Exiſtence of the Gods, but when there was ground to be afraid of Informers, and of the Fury of the People (*m*). Thoſe Men would have made a great Alteration in the Maxim mention'd by *Balzac* (*n*), *De divinis etiam vera dicere periculoſum eſt*; they would have put in *præcipue* inſtead of *etiam*. They had been right in a certain Senſe; for the Pagans wou'd not allow that the Ideas of the Unity and perfect Simplicity of God ſhou'd take place of their pernicious and ridiculous Opinions concerning the Divine Nature.

A STRANGE Opinion of the Heathens concerning the Statues of their Gods

Here follows an Inſtance of the Blindneſs of the Heathens. Can any thing be more ſtrange than the Opinion of the *Athenians*, otherwiſe an Ingenious and Learned Nation, concerning the Statues of their Gods? Did they not fancy that the Work of a Sculptor became a God, aſſoon as it was conſecrated to a Deity? Did they not believe that *Phidias*'s *Minerva* was the very Goddeſs that ſprang out of *Jupiter*'s Head? Doubtleſs they had ſuch a fooliſh Conceit, otherwiſe there had been no neceſſity for *Stilpo* to uſe ſuch a Diſtinction as he made to vindicate himſelf. He ask'd one Day, whether *Minerva*, the Daughter of *Jupiter*, was a God: he was anſwer'd that ſhe was. But, replied he, that *Minerva* is *Phidias*'s Work, and not *Jupiter*'s Daughter; and therefore ſhe is not a God.

(*m*) *Colomies ubi ſupra, pag.* 49.

(*a*) Θαυμάζουσί σε ὥσπερ θηρίον, οὐ μὲν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἀληθινόν. Admirantur te veluti belluam. Minime, inquit ille, ſed velut hominem verum. *Diogenes Laertius, lib.* 2. n. 119.

(*b*) *Id. ib.* n. 114.

(*c*) *Athen. lib.* 13. *pag.* 596.

(*d*) *He had been ſpeaking of another* Nicarete, *a Curtezan, page* 593.

(*e*) *Cicero de fato, circa init. pag. m.* 324.

(*f*) *See the Remark H. at the end.*

(*g*) *See the Remark E.*

(*h*) *La Mothe le Vayer, Dialogue de la diverſité des Religions, p. m.* 358, 359. *'Tis the laſt of the five Dialogues of* Oraſius Tubero.

(*l*) *It ſhould be* Bion.

(*l*) *Diog. Laert. lib.* 2. *n.* 117. *pag.* 142.

(*m*) Quæritur primum in ea quæſtione quæ eſt de natura Deorum, ſintne Dii, necne ſint? Difficile eſt negare credo, ſi in concione quæratur, ſed in hujuſcemodi ſermone & conſeſſu facillimum. *Cicero de natura Deorum, lib.* 1. *pag. m.* 85.

(*n*) *Balzac Letter* 3. *to Chapelain, B.* 1. *pag. m.* 21.

little Religion. Some alledge, as a Proof of his Impiety, a thing which (E) happen'd to him in a Temple, and perhaps they have done him no wrong. He had an extreme Indifference for the good Things of Fortune, and look'd upon the Qualities of his Soul as his only Good. Which appears from the (F) Anſwer he made after the Deſtruction of his Country. Nay, he look'd upon the Infamy of his Daughter as (G) an inſignificant thing; for he cou'd never be brought to own that it was a Diſhonour or a Misfortune. Many Learned Men want ſuch a Turn of the Mind. The Innovations of his Logick cannot be ap-

a God. Whereupon he (p) was cited before the *Areopagites*, and did not deny what he had ſaid: he pretended that he had expreſs'd himſelf exactly; *Minerva*, ſaid he, is not a God, but a Goddeſs, for the Gods are Males. 'Tis plain, that if the Pagans had made a real Diſtinction between the Statues and the Gods to whom they were Conſecrated, there had been no neceſſity for *Stilpo* to alledge the difference between a God Male and a God Female, in order to juſtify himſelf. This way of clearing himſelf was Inſignificant, ſince the Word Θεὸς among the *Greeks*, and the Word *Deus* among the *Latins*, (q) did very properly belong to the Goddeſſes. The beſt Apology had been to ſay, that *Minerva*, as *Jupiter's* Daughter, was a God; but that the Piece of Metal out of which *Phidias* had made a Statue conſecrated to *Minerva*, was not a God. This Apology wou'd have been a very good one, if *Stilpo* had been arraign'd before other Judges; but it ſignified nothing in the Court of the *Areopagites*, and therefore *Stilpo* did not make uſe of it. He was not ignorant that the Gods were thought to incorporate themſelves in their Statues, and that the Statues were metamorphoſed into Gods by virtue of the Conſecration.

(E) *A thing which happen'd to him in a Temple.*] All thoſe who eat Garlick were forbidden to enter into the Temple of the Mother of the Gods. *Stilpo* had ſo little regard for that Prohibition, that he went into the Temple of that Goddeſs after he had eat Garlick, and even lay in it. He dream'd that the Goddeſs appear'd to him, and told him, *Stilpo, you are a Philoſopher, and yet you offend againſt the Holy Laws.* He thought he had anſwer'd her, *Give me ſomething better to eat, and I'll engage to leave off Garlick.* *Menage* alledges this Particular as a Proof (r) that this Philoſopher had no Religion. And indeed this ſavours of a prophane Man, who derided the Law and the Goddeſs. I confeſs that *Athenæus*, who relates this Adventure, makes a quite contrary Judgment of it; for he alledges it as a Sign of *Stilpo's* Temperance. (a) Στίλπων δ' οὐ κατεπλάγη τὴν ἐγκράτειαν κατεφαγὼν σκόροδα καὶ κατακοιμηθεὶς ἐν τῷ τῆς μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν ἱερῷ· ἀπείρητο δὲ τῷ τούτων τι φαγόντι μηδὲ εἰσιέναι. ἐπιστάσης δ' αὐτῷ τῆς θεοῦ κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους, καὶ εἰπούσης ὅτι φιλόσοφος ὢν ὦ Στίλπων παραβαίνεις τὰ νόμιμα, καὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἀποκρίνασθαι κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους· σὺ δέ μοι πάρεχε ἐσθίειν, καὶ σκορόδοις οὐ χρήσομαι. *Enimverò Stilpo ſua confiſus temperantia, non ideò perterritus eſt, quod cum allium comediſſet in templo matris Deûm obdormierit. Arcebatur enim delubro qui horum quidquam guſtaſſet. Ei porrò ſomnum capienti, adſtans Dea cùm diceret, Philoſophus es, ô Stilpon, & ſacras tamen leges violas, viſum ſibi fuiſſe hæc reſpondere in ſomnis, Præbe mihi quod edam, & allio non veſcar.*

(F) *The Anſwer he made after the Deſtruction of his Country.*] *Demetrius Poliorcetes* having ſubdued *Megara*, gave Orders that *Stilpo's* Houſe ſhould be ſpared, and that whatever was taken from it ſhou'd be reſtor'd. I relate the thing as I find it in *Diogenes Laertius* (b). Were I to deſcribe it of my own Head, I wou'd add ſomething to it; I wou'd ſay that the Soldiers plunder'd *Stilpo's* Houſe without any regard to his Orders; but this is not the thing in queſtion: The Queſtion is, that *Demetrius* writ to *Stilpo* to know of him what he had loſt in the plundering of the Town. *Stilpo* anſwer'd him that he had loſt nothing, ſince no Body had depriv'd him of his Reaſon and Learning. He added ſeveral other things to inſpire him with Humanity and a noble Deſire of being Beneficial to Men; and the Prince was ſo mov'd with his Advice, that he conformed to it. I believe ſeveral devout People wou'd do the ſame; but I believe ſome wou'd go by this Maxim, *Charity well order'd begins at home.* Shou'd a Prince, after the plundering of a Town, promiſe them the Reſtitution of all their Effects, they wou'd certainly take hold of ſuch an opportunity to inſpire him with Clemency, and recommend to him the Welfare of the People; but they wou'd not forget themſelves; they wou'd ſend him an exact Liſt of all their Loſſes, and endeavour to make them up with Uſury. But here's a Philoſopher who was far from being a devout Man, who uſes his Intereſt with a Victorious Prince, to no other end than to perſuade him to put a ſtop to the Diſorders of War, and to beſtow his Favours upon the People; he does not ſend a Liſt of what he has loſt. His Houſe has been plunder'd, they offer him a full Indemnity; but he anſwers that he has loſt nothing, and that his Goods did not conſiſt in ſuch things as the Soldiers might take from him. This is doubtleſs very Generous. I wiſh *Seneca* had not ſuppoſed that *Stilpo* had loſt his Wife and Children; for a Man who boaſts in ſuch a caſe that he has loſt nothing, carries his Philoſophy too far. 'Tis probably a falſe Gloſs of *Seneca*; he is the only Author that (c) mentions ſuch a Loſs. (d) *Omne intra ſe bonum terminabit, & dicet quod Stilpon ille dixit, Stilpon quem Epicuri epiſtola inſequitur. Hic enim capta patria, amiſſis liberis, amiſſa uxore, cum ex incendio publico ſolus, & tamen beatus exiret, interroganti Demetrio, cui cognomen ab exitio urbium Poliorcetes fuit, Num quid perdidiſſet? Omnia, inquit, bona mea mecum ſunt. Ecce vir fortis ac ſtrenuus, ipſam hoſtis ſui victoriam vicit. Nihil, inquit, perdidi. Dubitare illum coëgit, an viciſſet. Omnia mea mecum ſunt. Juſtitia, virtus, temperantia, prudentia, hoc ipſum, nihil bonum putare quod eripi poſſit.* 'Tis ſaid that (e) *Ptolemy*, ſurnamed *Soter*, having taken *Megara*, offer'd ſome Money to *Stilpo*, and deſir'd him to take Shipping with him. That Philoſopher accepted of a little Money, and refuſed the Honour of following that Prince into *Egypt*. He retir'd into the Iſle of *Ægina* till *Ptolemy* return'd into his Kingdom. This ſhews a great Diſintereſtedneſs, tho' it falls very ſhort of the preceding Inſtance.

(G) *Nay, he look'd upon the Infamy of his Daughter as an inſignificant thing . . . . Many Learned Men want ſuch a turn of Mind.*] He married her to *Simmias*: 'tis not ſaid whether the Husband of that Lewd Woman did patiently bear his Diſgrace; but we are told that the Father expreſs'd an extraordinary Indifference. Your Daughter's Behaviour is a Diſgrace to you, ſaid one to him. Not at all, anſwer'd he, ſhe can no more caſt a Blot upon my Reputation, than I can adorn hers. (f) Ταύτης οὐ κατὰ τρόπον βιούσης, εἶπέ τις πρὸς τὸν Στίλπωνα, ὡς καταισχύνοι αὐτόν· ὁ δέ, ΟΥ μᾶλλον (εἶπεν) ἢ ἐγὼ ταύτην κοσμῶ. *Hæc dum laſciviùs viveret, Stilponique à quodam renuntiatum eſſet eam ſibi probro eſſe, Non, inquit, iſta majori mihi probro eſt, quam ego illi ornamento.* See in *Plutarch* (g) how he maintain'd that the Sins of his Daughter were only a Misfortune to herſelf. Happy are thoſe who can give ſuch a turn to their Minds.

A LIST of ſome Learned Men diſgraced by the Lewdneſs of their Families.

Such an Indifference wou'd have been very neceſſary to many Learned Men, in order to make their Lives eaſy; for their Wives or Daughters have been very Unchaſte: and I think there are ſtill ſome Inſtances of ſuch a Diſorder. *Fernel* (h) and *Druſius* (i) have been in that Category; and *Cujas* likewiſe: (k) *The Daughter of that Great Man was of ſuch an Amorous Temper, that tho' Preſident de* Thou *procured her a Husband when ſhe*

(p) Ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ εἰς Ἄρειον πάγον προσκληθέντα μὴ ἀρνήσασθαι, φάσκειν δ' ὀρθῶς διειλέχθαι. μὴ γὰρ εἶναι αὐτὴν θεὸν, ἀλλὰ θεάν· θεοὺς δὲ εἶναι τοὺς ἄρρενας. Qua ex re quum in Arium pagum pertractus fuiſſet, nihil inficiatum ferunt, imo recte ſe loquutum aſſeruiſſe: non enim deum eſſe, ſed deam: deos quippe mares eſſe. *Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, num.* 116. *p.* 148.

(q) *See* Menage's *Notes in hunc locum Laertii, pag.* 128.

(r) Fuit Stilpon parcus Deorum cultor & infrequens, imo ἄθεος. Narrat Athenæus X. 5. in Templo matris Deûm allium &c. *Menagius in Laert. lib.* 2. *n.*117. *pag.* 128.

(a) *Athenæus lib.* 10. *cap.* 5. *pag.* 422.

(b) *Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, n.* 115.

(c) *Diog. Laertius ſays nothing of it, nor Plutarch in the two Places wherein he mentions* Stilpo's *Anſwer, viz. in his Tract de* educatione puerorum, *p.* 5. *and in the Tract de* animi tranquillitate, *pag.* 475.

(d) *Seneca, epiſt.* 9. *pag. m.* 178, 179. *See alſo the ſame* Seneca de conſtantia ſapientis, *cap.* 5.

(e) *Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, n.* 115.

(f) *Id. ib. n.* 114.

(g) *Plut. de tranquillitate animi, p.* 468.

(h) *See the Art.* Fernel. (i) *See the Art.* Druſius, *Remark* O.
(k) *Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres for* June 1686. *p. m.* 722.

approved; he rejected the (H) Universals: And though it were supposed that he did it only to ridicule the Sophists, he shou'd be blamed for his ill Taste and his wrong Subtilties. Instead of improving one's Judgment, they spoiled it.

A

she was but Fifteen Years of Age, having doubtless observed that she was in haste, yet he could not prevent her Anticipating her Marriage, and after she was Married, she carried on her Love Intrigues so openly, that her Husband, who was an Honest Gentleman, died of Grief for it. The Author from whom I have these Words, had been saying, *That the Scholars, who did what they pleased with her, called it* Commenting *upon Cujas's* Works, *and that some of them,* out of Respect to her Father's Memory, abstain'd from such an Infamous Commerce. 'Tis said, That a Collegue of *Cujas* was not so Discreet, and that he Caress'd his Daughter, even during her Father's Life. *Paul Manutius* was in the same Case. He put his Daughter into a Convent, hoping by that means to free himself from the Care of looking after her; but even after she had made her Vows, she writ several Letters to him one after another to let him know, that if he did not take her out of that Confinement, she wou'd steal away. That poor Man made several Journeys, and used so many Sollicitations, that he obtained from the Court of *Rome* the Dispensation his Daughter desired. She quickly got a Husband, and tho' he was a very honest Man, she gave up her self to all manner of Dissoluteness. Her Father did not sink under his Grief, nor under the Indisposition occasion'd from time to time by the Remains of a Venereal Disease; but it made him very uneasy. (l) *Sacris in claustris jampridem conjecta filia, eo dementiæ, ac furoris abrepta est impetu, ut inde se clàm egressuram minaretur misero patri, nisi omni studio ipsam extrahere niteretur. Quo factum, ut is plurium itinerum vexatione, morisque apud Romanos judices prehensatione, æger animo, adflictusque corpore, tandem hujusmodi poculum, licet peramarum, tamen justa necessitate quæsitum exorbere sit coactus, insitato exemplo virginem pluribus annis Deo dicatam, mundanis iterum angustiis devovendi, quæ cum postea honesto conjugi nupta, prava se libidinis fœdarit indole, infeliciterque peregerit, intestino is mœrore correptus, reliquum vitæ sollicita cogitatione traduxit. Quùm vero etiam ei accesserint vetusta luis gallicæ inquinamenta, quibus alternatim vel temporum, vel locorum, vel victuum lædebatur mutatione, deterrimam prorsus vitæ conditionem sortitus videri potuit, nisi commoderato semper, infractoque animo, eam se perferre singulis ostendisset.* Some Learned Men have had a Lewd Wife and a Lewd Daughter all at once. *Barnabas Brissonius* was one of 'em, if we believe *Scaliger* (m). Some others have been so deeply engag'd in one half of that Misfortune, that no mention is made of their Daughters. Such was *Paulus Perusinus*, that Learned Man, so highly praised by *Boccacio*, and so well belov'd by *Robert*, King of *Naples*. His Wife made him a Cuckold; and when he died, his (n) finest Writings were treacherously destroy'd by his Wife. I cou'd give a List, wherein one might see great Names, besides the Learned of a low Rank, *quos fama obscura recondit*; but I leave it to those who will undertake to carry on the Subject which *Pierius Valerianus* (o) began. It will not be amiss to put in one Class, by themselves, all the Learned, who have been Unhappy by their Marriage. All those Men wanted our *Stilpo*'s Indifference.

(H) *He rejected the Universals.*] Being a sharp (a) Disputant, he rejected the very *Species*. Who says *Man*, says nothing of this or that Man; he does not speak of the one more than of the other, and therefore he says nothing of any Body. The Grass that is shown me, is not Grass; for Grass existed a thousand Years ago; and therefore it is not the Grass you shew me. Such was *Stilpo*'s way of Arguing (b). Perhaps 'twill be thought that he proposed those Objections only to play upon an Equivocation, which the *Greek* construction of the Words afforded him, and to which the Modern Languages are not liable. There is a great difference between these two Propositions, Peter *is Man*, Peter *is a Man*. The first is false and not used; the second is true, and generally used: The *Greeks* and *Latins* wou'd have made use of the same Terms, to say, That Peter *is Man, and that* Peter *is a Man*. Hence it is that *Stilpo* might suppose that if he ask'd, shewing a Cabbage, *What's that?* he would be answered, *'Tis Cabbage.* But he might have answered, *You are mistaken; Cabbage existed a Thousand Years ago; and therefore it is not what I shew you.* Such a Cavil wou'd be groundless now-a-days; for the Answer to *Stilpo*'s Question wou'd be, *'Tis a Cabbage*, and not *'Tis Cabbage.* Is it not then likely that this Philosopher had no other Design than to divert himself with Cavils, grounded upon the turn of the Expression? I believe he had another thought, and that he was altogether against universal Terms, and what they call *Predicables* in the *Aristotelian* Schools. There was something real in his Objection; it was more than playing upon Words. I think he meant that the *Species* is not affirm'd of *Individuums*, and that therefore the *Species* are a meer Chimera. Man is not more this Man than that Man, and it does not signify *John* rather than *Peter*; and therefore it signifies no body. His Meaning appears more clearly in *Plutarch* than in *Diogenes Laertius*. We read in *Plutarch* that *Colotes* violently exclaimed against *Stilpo*, and accused him of overturning humane Life; for how could we live, said *Colotes*, if we were not allow'd to call a Man Good, and a Captain; and if we shou'd say *Man is Man*, and then by it self *Good is Good*. (c) Τραγῳδίαν ἐπάγει τῷ Στίλπωνι, καὶ τὸν βίον ἀναιρεῖσθαι φησὶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, λέγοντος ἕτερον ἑτέρου μὴ κατηγορεῖσθαι. πῶς γὰρ βιωσόμεθα, μὴ λέγοντες ἄνθρωπον ἀγαθὸν, μηδὲ ἄνθρωπον στρατηγὸν ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπον ἄνθρωπον, καὶ χωρὶς, ἀγαθὸν ἀγαθὸν, καὶ στρατηγὸν στρατηγόν. *Tragœdiam adversus Stilponem excitat, atque ab eo vitam tolli, quod dixisset, Alterum de altero non prædicari. Quomodo enim, inquit, vivemus, si non dicamus hominem bonum, hominem imperatorem, sed hominem hominem seorsum, bonum bonum, ducem ducem.* It appears from this Objection of *Colotes*, that *Stilpo* wou'd not allow that a thing shou'd be affirm'd of another, but that every thing shou'd be affirm'd of it self, and that the Attribute of a Proposition shou'd not reach farther then the Subject. Here's the Ground he went upon. That two things may be affirm'd one of another, they ought to have the same Nature; for in every Affirmative and true Proposition, the Attribute and the Subject are really the same. But *Man* and *Good* are not of the same Nature; the Definition of the one differs from the Definition of the other; and therefore *Good* and *Man* cannot be joyn'd together, one of 'em cannot be affirm'd of the other. In like manner *running* cannot be attributed to *a Horse*; 'tis an Action, the Definition whereof is not the same with that of a Horse. Besides, shou'd you affirm of a Man that he is Good, and of a Horse that he Runs, that is, shou'd you affirm that Good and Man are the same thing, and that a Horse and Running are the same thing, (d) how cou'd you affirm that Aliments and Medicaments are good, and that Lyons and Dogs run? These are Logical Subtilties, whereby all Languages wou'd be confounded, and all Men would be oblig'd to be silent or to speak ridiculously; and yet a Sophist train'd up in the Art of Disputing, and used to Cavils about Abstractions, wou'd give a great deal of trouble to his Adversaries, if he undertook to maintain *Stilpo*'s Opinion to the utmost. He wou'd not be immediately silenced by the Distinction of the Attributes *in Concreto* and *in Abstracto*, and by the *secundum id quod important in obliquo*, or *in recto*; it wou'd be requisite to dispute a long time about this Question, *utrum universale maneat in actuali prædicatione.* These Trifles, tho' contemptible in themselves, and such as cannot perplex a Man of a solid Judgment, might nevertheless carry a Man into Spinozism: *Hæ nugæ seria ducunt in mala*: For those who deny Universal Attributes, cannot admit any Individuum's that resemble one another. They must say, that two Beings, of

which

(l) Jan-
us Impe-
rialis, in
M[illegible] hi-
storici,
pag. 108.

(m) In
Scaligera-
nis, voce
Biron.

(n) Quem
librum
maximo
hujus ope-
ris incom-
modo
[illegible]ella im-
pudica
conjugis
crimine,
eo de-
functo,
cum plu-
ribus aliis
ex libris
ejusdem,
perditum
comperi.
Boccacius
de Genea-
logia Deor.
lib. 15. c.
[illegible]. apud
Vossium de
Hist. Lat.
pag. 526.

(o) He
wrote a
Book inti-
tuled, De
Infelici-
tate lite-
ratorum.

(a) Δεινὸς
δ' ἄγαν
ὢν ἐν τοῖς
ἐριστικοῖς,
ἀνῄρει καὶ
τὰ εἴδη.
Quum
[illegible]et dis-
putator
acerri-
mus, spe-
cies quo-
que tolle-
bat. Dio-
gen. La-
ert. ubi
supra, n.
115.

(b) Apud
Diogen.
Laert. ib.

(c) Plutarch. adversus Colotem, pag. 1119. C.

(d) Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ταὐτόν ἐστι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, καὶ τῷ ἵππῳ τὸ τρέχειν, πῶς καὶ σιτίῳ καὶ φαρμάκῳ τι ἀγαθὸν, καὶ νὴ Δία πάλιν λέοντος καὶ κυνὸς τὸ τρέχειν, κατηγοροῦμεν· εἰ δ' ἕτερον, οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἄνθρωπον ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἵππον τρέχειν λέγομεν. Nam si idem sunt homo & bonum, & equus ac currere, quo pacto bonum etiam de cibo & medicamento dicetur? rursusque currere de leone & cane? Ergo non recte dicemus de homine prædicari bonum, de equo currere, cum diversa sint. Plutarch. ibid. pag. 1120. A.

A Curtezan rallied him about it (I) in Anſwer to a Cenſure of Raillery he uſed againſt her. I muſt not forget a Dream of his, which ſeems to ſignify (K) that he was a Prieſt, and which ſhews, that even in his Sleep, he knew how to Philoſophize.

STOF.

which the Attribute of Subſtance ſhou'd be truly affirm'd, wou'd be one and the ſame Subſtance; which is to ſay in equivalent Terms, that there is but one Subſtance in the whole Univerſe. Common Senſe agrees, in this Point, with the moſt evident Notions of Philoſophy. A Peaſant does clearly conceive, without being miſtaken, that the whole Eſſence of Man belongs to each Man, and ought to be affirm'd of each Man, and yet that each Man is diſtinct from all others. And therefore he clearly conceives that the ſame Eſſence, which is affirm'd of *Peter* is not affirm'd of *Paul*; but that the Eſſence, which is affirm'd of the one, is like the Eſſence which is affirm'd of the other. The Scotiſts are pitifully miſtaken in this Point, with their *Univerſale formale à parte rei.* The moſt perplexing Subtilties will never prevail over theſe Notions in a Man of Solid Parts; and whoever cannot reſolve 'em, may juſtly laugh at 'em. I remember that in a publick Diſputation, one of the Opponents endeavoured to prove that there are no Univerſals; he went about it thus. If there were Univerſals, *Genus*'s wou'd have two *Species* under them; but it is impoſſible: for a Species cannot differ from another: I prove it. The Difference of a Species is altogether like the Difference of another; therefore there are not two Species. The Conſequence is right, and I am going to ſhew the truth of the Antecedent by an Example. Rationability, the ſpecificial Difference of a Man, does not at all differ from Irrationability, the ſpecificial Difference of Beaſts. Rationability does not differ from a humane Soul; therefore it is a Subſtance: Irrationability (e) does not really differ from a Beaſt; therefore it is a Subſtance. Thus Rationability, as it is a Subſtance, does not differ from Irrationability. How then does it differ from it? Are there ſome Entities or Realities in it that are not in Irrationability? But are thoſe Entities Accidents or Subſtances? If they are Subſtances, they make no Difference between Rationability and Irrationability. If they are Accidents, they have the Eſſence of Being; but Irrationability has it likewiſe, and therefore it perfectly reſembles them; they cannot therefore make it differ from Rationability. If it be ſaid, that they differ from Being, ſince they have the Attribute of Inherence, which Being has not; I reply that Inherence is a Being, and therefore cannot make an Accident differ from Being. And if you Anſwer that Inherence implies ſomething elſe beſides Being, I repeat my Inſtance: That other thing does neceſſarily contain the Eſſence of Being; it is therefore like Being; and you'll always have that Objection in your way, tho' you ſhou'd ſuppoſe *in infinitum* that the Conſtitutive Character of Inherence contains ſomething that has ſomething beſides Being. This Objection proves that Being has not under it Subſtance and Accident, and that Subſtance has not under it Body and Spirit, and conſequently that there are no Univerſals, *Quod erat probandum.* The Reſpondent did not apprehend the Difficulty; nor did the Preſident apprehend it much better. The Aſſembly did not apprehend it neither, and the Opponent was like to be hiſs'd. Doubtleſs it was the beſt way to Silence him: His Argument was altogether wrong; for it wou'd prove that there is no difference between White and Black, a Pain and a Pleaſure.

If you conſult *Ariſtotle*'s Metaphyſicks, in that part of his Work wherein he Examines what concerns the Unity of Being, you'll ſee that the Queſtion about Univerſals was ſurrounded with a thouſand perplexing Difficulties. He does not forget this Objection: If Being and Unity are ſomething, how can there be many Beings beſides that thing? How can there be more than one Being? For what differs from Being is nothing; and therefore we muſt conclude, as *Parmenides* did, that all Beings are but one; becauſe, if there were many, they wou'd be different from Being, that is, they wou'd be nothing at all. (†) *εἰ δ᾽ ἔστι τι αὐτὸ ἓν καὶ αὐτὸ ὄν, ἀναγκαῖον οὐσίαν αὐτῶν εἶναι τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ ὄν. οὐ γὰρ ἕτερόν τι καθόλου κατηγορεῖται, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα αὐτά. ἀλλὰ μὴν εἴ γ᾽ ἔσται τι αὐτὸ ὂν καὶ αὐτὸ ἕν, πολλὴ ἀπορία πῶς ἔσται τι παρὰ ταῦτα ἕτερον. λέγω δὲ πῶς ἔσται πλείω ἑνὸς τὰ ὄντα. τὸ γὰρ ἕτερον τοῦ ὄντος οὐκ ἔστιν. ὥστε κατὰ τὸν Παρμενίδου συμβαίνειν ἀνάγκη λόγον ἓν ἅπαντα εἶναι τὰ ὄντα, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ ὄν. Quòd ſi quid eſt ipſum unum, & ipſum ens, neceſſe eſt, eorum ſubſtantiam eſſe unum, & ens: non enim aliquid aliud univerſaliter prædicatur, ſed eadem ipſa. At vero ſi quid erit ipſum ens, & ipſum unum, magna dubitatio eſt, quonam modo aliquid aliud præter hæc erit. Dico autem quomodo entia erunt plura uno. Quod enim aliud ab ente eſt, non eſt. Quare ſecundum Parmenidis rationem, neceſſe eſt accidere omnia entia eſſe unum, & hoc eſſe ens.* It does not appear that *Ariſtotle* was able to Reſolve that Difficulty.

But to return to *Stilpo*. *Colotes* is blamed for two Things: one is, that he Exclaimed againſt the Subtilties of that Philoſopher, without reſolving them categorically; the other is, that he pitch'd on a Doctrine, in order to criticize it, which *Stilpo* advanced meerly out of a witty (f) Conceit, and to ridicule the Sophiſts of that time, by giving them a Bone to pick. *Plutarch* was the more exaſperated at this Choice of *Colotes*, becauſe a great many fine things might have been ſaid of *Stilpo*, of which *Colotes* did not ſpeak one word. It will appear from the following Paſſage of *Plutarch*, that *Stilpo* was a very honeſt Man. (a) Μετὰ δὲ Σωκράτην καὶ Πλάτωνα προσμάχεται Στίλπωνι, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀληθινὰ δόγματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους τοῦ ἀνδρός, οἷς ἑαυτόν τε κατεκόσμει καὶ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους, καὶ τῶν βασιλέων τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν σπουδάσαντας, οὐκ εἴρηκεν, οὐδ᾽ ὅσον ἦν φρόνημα τῇ ψυχῇ μετὰ πραότητος καὶ μετριοπαθείας. ὧν δὲ παίζων καὶ χρώμενος πρὸς τοὺς σοφιστὰς λογαρίων προὔβαλλε γέλωτι αὐτοῖς, ἑνὸς μνησθείς, καὶ μηδὲν εἰπὼν πρὸς τοῦτο, μηδὲ λύσας τὴν πιθανότητα, τραγῳδίαν ἐπάγει τῷ Στίλπωνι. *Poſt Socratem & Platonem Stilpo oppugnatur. Hujus quidem vera decreta, & ſermones, quibus ſeipſum, patriam, amicos regeſque ipſi operam navantes exornavit, tum animi elationem manſuetudini & affectuum mediocritati conjunctam, Colotes non retulit. Quas vero jocans ille ſophiſtis ridenſque objecit ſententiolas, harum unam allegans, cum neque refelliſſet neque ſolviſſet ipſe probabilitatem, tragœdiam adverſus Stilponem excitat.*

(I) *A Curtezan rallied him about it.*] *Athenæus* ſays, That *Stilpo* ſitting at Table with *Glycera*, upbraided her with Corrupting young Men. To which ſhe anſwered, You are charged with the ſame Fault, for People complain that you ſpoil their Judgment with your needleſs and Sophiſtical Subtilties; and they add, that it ſignifies but little which way they are ſpoiled, whether it be by a Philoſopher or a Curtezan. (b) Μηδὲν οὖν διαφέρειν ἐπιτριβομένοις καὶ κακῶς πάσχουσιν ἢ μετὰ φιλοσόφου ζῆν ἢ ἑταίρας. *Nihilque referre iis qui ſic in miſerias incidunt ac pereunt, an apud philoſophum degant, an apud ſcortum.* *Athenæus* had been ſaying that Curtezans took great pride in their Learning, whereby they got the Art of quick Reparteės and witty Sayings; but *Glycera*'s Anſwer alledged by him, is no proper Inſtance to ſhew the juſtneſs of their Railleries. That Curtezan defended her ſelf by advancing a Falſity; for there never was ſo great a Corruption in Ancient *Greece*, that People ſhou'd have been as unwilling to ſee young Men learn nothing but vain Subtilties of a Philoſopher, as to ſee 'em ingag'd in lewd Practices with Women.

(K) *A Dream of his . . . which ſhews that even in his ſleep he knew how to Philoſophize.*] *Plutarch* will afford me the Commentary I want upon theſe words. "It is reported of one *Stilpo* a Philo-
"ſopher,

(e) By Irrationability the Opponent underſtood the poſitive Attributes which conſtitute the Beaſt, conſidered as not having the Faculty of Reaſoning.

(†) Ariſtot. Metaph. lib. 3. c. 4. p. m. 655.

(f) Plutarch is perhaps miſtaken in ſuppoſing this.

(a) Plut. ubi ſupra, pag. 1119. C.

(b) Athen. lib. 13. pag. 584.

STOFLERUS (*John*) a Famous Mathematician and Aſtrologer, was born at *Juſtingen*, in *Suabia*, the 10th of *December* 1452. Notwithſtanding the Meanneſs of his Birth, he made ſo great a Progreſs in his Studies, that he was admired for it. He particularly minded thoſe things, for which he was naturally beſt Qualified; for being ſenſible that he had a Genius for Mathematicks, he applied himſelf to that Science much more than to any other. He Taught it at *Tubingen* with ſo good Succeſs, that he got a wonderful Reputation. The Books (*A*) he publiſhed, kept up and encreaſed the Glory he had acquired by his Lectures †; but he did not ſucceed in the Prognoſtications he had the boldneſs to publiſh. He foretold that there would be a great (*B*) Deluge in the Year 1524, and ſtruck a great Terror all over *Europe*: but he was confounded by the Event. I ſhall mention ſeveral Particulars relating to this,

† *Taken from Melchior Adam in Vitis Philoſophorum*, pp. 73, 74.

" ſopher, that he thought he ſaw *Neptune* in his " ſleep, and that he ſeemed very much diſpleaſed with him, becauſe he had not (as was uſual with his Prieſts) ſacrificed an Ox in Honour of him; not in the leaſt daunted at the " Apparition, he thus boldly accoſted it. Neptune! *What's this Buſineſs you here complain of? You come hither like a Child, and are angry with me, becauſe I did not borrow Money and run in Debt to pleaſe you, and fill the City with coſtly Odours, but privately ſacrificed to you in my own Houſe, ſuch ordinary Victims as I could get.* At " this confident reply, *Neptune* ſmiled, and " (as the Story goes) reached him his Hand, as " an Aſſurance of his good Will to him, and " told him, *That for his ſake he would ſend the* " Megarenſians *abundance of Fiſh that Seaſon.*"

(*A*) *The Books he publiſh'd.*] His *Kalendarium Romanum*, dedicated to the Emperor *Maximilian*, was printed (*d*) in 1518. He publiſhed his Aſtronomical Tables at *Tubingen*, the Year before. He alſo publiſhed *Rationem compoſitionis Aſtrolabiorum*; *Coſmographicas* aliquot *deſcriptiones*, *de Sphæra Coſmographica, hoc eſt, de globi terreſtris artificioſa ſtructura; de duplici terræ projectione in planum, hoc eſt, qua ratione commodius chartæ Coſmographicæ, quas Mappas mundi vocant, deſignari queant.* A *Latin* Commentary upon *Proclus*'s Sphere, and a *German* Tract about the Dimenſion by the Aſtrolabe and the Quadrant, and the Calculation of Conjunctions and Oppoſitions, with a Cenſure upon the Ancient Cycles, and the Prediction of Eclipſes (*e*). *Voſſius* (*f*) ſays his Ephemerides begin with the Year 1432, and end with the Year 1525; but according to *Melchior Adam*, they begin with the Year 1532, and reach to the 20 Years following. *Voſſius* is more credible than *Melchior Adam*. Doubtleſs the latter took for the whole Work what was only a Continuation of it.

(*d*) At Oppenheim.

(*e*) Taken from Melchior Adam in Vitis Philoſophorum, pag. 74.

(*f*) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 186.

(*B*) *Foretold that there woud be a great Deluge in the Year 1524, and ſtruck a great Terror.*] *Auguſtin Niphus* perceiving the great Amazement of the People after that Prediction, publiſhed a Book to ſhew that there was no Reaſon to fear ſuch a Deluge. (*g*) *Cum ſtatim à publicata* Joan. Stoefleri *Ephemeride diluvii iſtius prænuncia, Auguſtinus* Niphus *ut homines à gravi timore liberaret, quem ipſa omnibus incutiebat, libellum ſuum de falſa diluvii prognoſticatione Carolo V. obtuliſſet, non defuit, &c.* Princes, and even learned Men were afraid of that Calamity as well as the People; which was doubtleſs occaſion'd in ſome Meaſure by the Agreement of many Aſtrologers in publiſhing ſuch a Prediction, among whom there were ſome of the beſt Aſtronomers. *Cirvellus*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Alcala*, put out a Book in the vulgar Tongue, wherein, without blaming in general the Precautions that were us'd againſt the Deluge, he was contented to blame thoſe, who made great Expences upon that Account: He Propoſed ſome Expedients to preſerve one's ſelf from the Inundation, at a cheap rate. Thoſe, who had their Houſes near the Sea, or near ſome Rivers, left 'em, and ſold their Land and Houſehold Goods at a great Loſs. (*h*) *Simile falſis hujuſmodi, & extremæ dementiæ prognoſticis, fuiſſe illud mihi perſuadeo, quo non vulgarium Ephemeridum conſarcinatores dumtaxat, ſed ex Aſtronomiæ peritiores multi, ſupremam ex imaginaria quadam eluvione, cunctis mortalibus perniciem impendere contendebant; adeoque rumoribus iſtis, vulgarium hominum animos perterruerant, ut metus etiam ad ſapientiores pervenerit. Nam Petrus* Cirvellus *Hiſpanorum omnium ſui temporis doctiſſimus, cum Theologiæ, in almo Complutenſi Gymnaſio, Lectoris munere fungeretur, & verò multos, ut ipſemet inquit, fluviis,* vel mari finitimos populos, jam ſtupido metu perculſos, domicilia ac ſedes mutare vidiſſet, ac prædia, ſupellectilem, bonaque omnia, contra juſtum valorem ſub actione diſtrahere, ac alia loca vel altitudine, vel ſiccitate magis ſecura requirere, ſui officii eſſe putavit, *in publica illa conſternatione, quam de nihilo excitari perſuaſum non habebat, Conſilium vernaculo ac materno idiomate conſcribere, ut paſſim ab omnibus legeretur, quo ſingulis modum præſcriberet, impendentis ejuſmodi calamitatis præcavendæ: atque adeò ita rebus ſuis conſulendi, ut minimum ab illa damnum reciperent.* The Great Chancellor of the Emperor *Charles* V. conſulted *Peter Martyr* about that Conſternation, who told him that the Calamity wou'd not be ſo dreadful as People fancied; but that thoſe Conjunctions of the Planets wou'd certainly occaſion a great Diſorder. The Duke of *Urbino* ſtood in need of a good Philoſopher, who proved to him in a printed Book, that the fear of ſuch a Flood was ill-grounded. (*i*) *Quod rumor ille non per Hiſpanias modo, ſed longè lateque per Europam diſſeminatus fuerit, teſtem ſiſtere poſſum Petrum* Martyrem, *qui de illo à Caroli V. magno Cancellario percunctatus, ipſi hunc in modum ex Valleoleto reſpondet Epiſtola 20. libri* 34. Quid ego ſentiam de pluviis, in initio anni quarti & vigeſimi prædictis ab Aſtronomis interrogas, veras fore conjunctiones illas omnium Planetarum, & iiſdem locis ſcio, in materiis præcipuè diſpoſitis, & particularibus regionibus aliquid magni parituras arbitror; ſed neque auſim eorum ſententias approbare, qui ore aperto abſolutè fore alluviem ita generalem vociferantur, ut neque mari, aut ulli terrarum parti ſit ignoſcendum, quin horrenda ſint incommoda perpeſſuræ, &c. *Neque verò tantùm Cancellarius ille ſe ex eorum numero eſſe oſtendit, quos vaniſſimus diluvii metus percellebat, ſed Urbini Dux non priùs ab eodem liberari potuit, quàm* Paulus de Middeburgo *Foroſempronienſis Epiſcopus, variis rationibus Mathematicis, & Philoſophicis, quas poſtea typis commiſit, ei liquido demonſtraſſet, inanem eſſe prorſus metum omnem, quem de futuro diluvio conceperat. Guido Rangone* General of an Army at *Florence*, being afraid that the Reaſons alledged by *Auguſtin Niphus*, wou'd remove the Fear of *Charles* V. and make him neglect the neceſſary Precautions, ingag'd a Famous Phyſician to write againſt that Book of *Niphus*, in order to oblige his Imperial Majeſty to provide for his Safety, and to appoint Inſpectors who ſhou'd view the Ground in the Provinces, and mark out the Places where Men and Beaſts wou'd be leſs expos'd to the Waters of the Flood. (*a*) *Non defuit Thomas quidam Philologus patria Ravennas, & celeberrima fama Medicus, qui è veſtigio libellum alium de vera diluvii prognoſticatione, ad eundem Imperatorem miſit, cum Præfatione, quam iſthuc maxima parte referre, non alienum à propoſito duxerim.* Ne ex illo conventu tot ſyderum in piſcibus, diſfortunium quodquam patereris, Guido Rangonus Rei Florentinæ armorum generalis gubernator, me monuit, & excitavit, ut de futuro diluvio anni MDXXIIII, exactam ad te compoſitionem dirigeremus; Quatenus amoto Sueſſani Philoſophi, jam impreſſo errore, locis huic maximo diluvio ſubditis, & ab hoc ipſo alienis, dili-

(*g*) Naudæus, in Judicio de Auguſtino Nipho, pag. 48.

(*h*) Id. ib. pag. 46. 47.

(*i*) Id. ib. pag. 47. 48.

(*a*) Naudæus ibid. pag. 48.

this, whereby it will appear that 'tis *no eaſy thing to* (BΔ) diſcredit Aſtrologers; for notwithſtanding this Falſe Prediction, they found afterwards a vaſt num-

diligentiùs circumſpectis, & annotatis, humanum genus & cætera viventia, vel tu ipſe ad minus (nam ubi imperatoris periculum, hic pro viribus & manu, & corpore, & ingenio utendum) ab eo diſfortunato & horribili aſpectu liberareris. Some (b) other Writers imitated that Phyſician. There was ſo great a Terror in *France*, that many People were like to grow diſtracted upon that Account. *In Gallia parum abſuit quin ad inſaniam homines non paucos, periculi metu* (diluvium) *adegerit, quemadmodum apud Joannem* Bochellum *ſcriptorem Annalium Aquitaniæ; Claudium* Duretum *cap. 27. libri de fluxu & refluxu maris; Spiritum* Roterium *ordinis ſancti Dominici, & ſacræ apud Toloſates fidei quæſitorem, in refutatione doctrinæ cujuſdam Aſtrologi; Augerium* Ferrerium *in libro quem ſcripſit adverſus Rempublicam Bodini; Albertum* Pighium *in Aſtrologiæ defenſione ad Auguſtinum Niphum;* Euſtorgium a Bello loco *Poëtam vernaculum in Rythmis ſuis, multoſque alios videre eſt* (c). Read theſe Words of *Bodin*. "(d) God has promiſed that there will be no Deluge for the time to come, and has perform'd his Promiſe. For tho' the great Conjunction of *Saturn*, *Mars*, and *Jupiter* happen'd in the Sign *Piſces*, in the Year 1524, when all the Aſtrologers of *Europe*, *Aſia*, and *Africa*, foretold an univerſal Deluge, and many Unbelievers built up Arches to ſave themſelves, and even Preſident *Auriol* at *Toulouſe*, tho' they were told of God's Promiſe and Oath, that he wou'd no more deſtroy Men by a Flood, that Year was indeed attended with Storms and great Floods in many Countries, but there happen'd no Deluge." A Writer who animadverted upon *Bodin* denied the Fact as to *Auriol*; but the following Reply was made to him. "I think I have omitted nothing but what is frivolous and inconſiderable, and deſerves no Anſwer. You ſay, *pag.* 47. that *Auriol* did not make a Boat to avoid being deſtroyed by the Deluge, which the Aſtrologers foretold, but to go a Fiſhing; and yet you tell us, that the Boat ſtands upon Four Pillars: 'tis not uſual to put Boats upon Pillars. But I have read a Book written againſt Aſtrologers, by a Dominican, call'd *Spiritus Roterus*, an Inquiſitor of the Faith, when he was at *Toulouſe*, which was lent me by *Raymund l'Eſtonat* of *Pamiers*, who has ſettled in theſe Parts, and told me how that Monk undertook to write that Book againſt an Aſtrologer who was then at *Toulouſe*, and pretended to tell one's Fortune by the Stars. That Author ſays in that Book, that *Auriol* cauſed an Arch to be built up, in order to avoid the Deluge; which he cou'd know better than you, ſince you liv'd neither in the ſame Place, nor at the ſame Time with *Auriol*. As for what you ſay in the ſame Page, that *Bodin* is very much to blame for ſaying, that *Auriol* was a Preſident, ſince he was only a Doctor of the Canon Law, whom you call a bold, rich, and learned Man; I confeſs that *Bodin* was miſtaken in that Point (e)." The Northern Nations were not free from thoſe Alarms, as it appears from this Paſſage. (f) *Mali iſtius impendentis metum ad extremum uſque Septentrionem pervaſiſſe, teſtatur manifeſtè Cornelius* Scepperus *Neoportuenſis, cùm inter cauſas quibus fuit compulſus, ut librum adverſus Aſtrologos de ſignificationibus conjunctionum ſuperiorum Planetarum anni* MDXXIV. *conſcriberet, eas potiſſimum enumerat.* Adde me neque in Aſtrologiam ſcribere, ſed in eos tantùm, qui falſa prædictione totum in ſe orbem converterant. Neque enim ſolùm vulgo eam rem perſuaſerunt, ſed ſummis etiam Regibus, & Principibus. Occurrunt quæ hac de re me percunctatus eſt ſereniſſimus Princeps D. Chriſtiernus Daniæ, Sueviæ, Norvegiæque Rex, occurrunt & crebra vulgi ſuſpiria, tamdiu mala ſibi ominantis: quem autem hominum non impellerent hæ lacrymæ? quem non permoveret impoſtura, incitaret iniquitas?

We have ſeen what *Bodin* ſays, that Rains and Floods made a great Devaſtation in ſeveral Places, in the Year of that pretended Deluge; but ſome Authors, who are more to be credited than he, affirm, that the Month of *February* 1524, was very dry and clear. Now this was the time of the Conjunction pointed out by the Aſtrologers for a Deluge; ſo that one would think the extraordinary Dryneſs of that Month happen'd on purpoſe to confound thoſe Men. *Cardan* and *Origan* were vexed that *Stofferus* had brought ſuch a Diſgrace upon their Trade by a Prognoſtication ſo contrary to the Event. Read theſe Words of the Learned *Gaſſendus*. (g) *Memorabile certè eſt, quod in hiſtoriis,* (1) *ac omnibus penè ſuperioris ſeculi libris legitur; cum Aſtrologi ob plureis Conjunctiones magnas, & nonnullas medioereis in Aqueis Signis celebrandas, prædixiſſent menſe Februario anni* MDXXIV. *fore Diluvium generale, ac ſtragem tantam, quanta fuiſſet ante id tempus inaudita; adeò ut non paucis conſternatis per Galliam, Hiſpaniam, Italiam, Germaniamque animis, apparaſſent navigia, aut comportatis farinis, aliiſque rebus neceſſariis, petiiſſent loca editiora; contigiſſe tamen, ut totus Februarius ſereniſſimus pulcerrimuſque extiterit; planè, ut ſi opera data comparatus fuiſſet vaticiniis Aſtrologorum refellendis (cùm ſit alioquin inſolitum, abire Februarium impluvium) quod ne ipſis quidem Cardano* (2), *& Origano* (3) *diſſimulare licuit; dolentibus illud de futuro Diluvio judicium fuiſſe non ſine Aſtrologiæ infamia à Stœflero prolatum.* Take notice that *Bodin*, a credulous Man, and infatuated with Aſtrology, vindicates *Stofferus* as well as he can; for, on the one hand, he gives us to underſtand, that if there was not a ſecond Deluge in the Year 1524, 'twas becauſe God prevented it to perform his Promiſe; and, on the other hand, he enlarges upon the Calamities wherewith Chriſtendom was afflicted after that conjunction of the Planets: and the better to mend the buſineſs he has recourſe to ſome Falſities; for he ſpeaks (h) of the War of the Boors in *Germany*, and of the League againſt *the King of* France, *who was taken*, and of the Conqueſt of *Rhodes* by the *Turks*. That Iſland had been ſubdued in the Year 1522. I ſha'l have occaſion by and by to mention another Fraud of that Writer.

(BΔ) *Several Particulars, whereby it will appear that 'tis no eaſy thing to diſcredit Aſtrologers.*] I have mention'd, in the foregoing Remark, ſeveral Facts concerning the Chimerical Prediction of that pretended Deluge; to which I add what follows, "(i) In the ſaid Year 1523, reckoning as they do in *Aquitain*, where the Year begins in *March* upon *Lady-Day*, and ends on the ſame Day, all the Provinces of *France* were extremely afraid of an univerſal Deluge, becauſe the Aſtronomers had foretold, that in the Month of *February* of the ſaid Year, and in the beginning of the Year 1524, according to their Computation, (for they begin with the firſt Day of *January*) there wou'd be Twenty Conjunctions, Sixteen of which wou'd poſſeſs watery Signs, portending to the greateſt part of the World, to Climates, Kingdoms, Provinces, States, and Dignities, and to all Land and Sea Creatures, a certain Change and Alteration, ſuch as our Foreſathers never ſaw, nor read in Hiſtories. Whereupon Men and Women were in great Fear. Many removed from their Low Habitations, went into High Places, provided themſelves with Meal and other Neceſſaries, and made publick Proceſſions and Prayers, that God wou'd take pity on his People; and yet there happen'd no ſuch thing: on the contrary, the ſaid Month of *February* proved as fine as ever it was, and the Months following finer than they had been Ten Years before. Whereby God made it appear that Aſtronomy is not a certain Science; and whatever the Planets may foretel, God is above it." The Author from whom I have this Paſſage, does not forget the Chicanries which the Aſtrologers alledged to ſave their Honour. However, ſays he, "(a) ſome Aſtrologers alledged in their Vindication, that thoſe Conjunctions had produced their effect the Year before, becauſe there had been many great Floods in ſeveral Places, which had drown'd Houſes and Lands. Others ſaid, "that number of Cullies. Some ſay he foretold that the End of the World would be in the Year 1586. (C) I believe they are miſtaken; and I can't tell whether thoſe are to be credited, who give out, that he made ſome *Predictions* upon (*D*) the Year 1588. Authors are not agreed about the Circumſtances

---

(b) Quemadmodum contingit aliquando ut cæcus cæcum ducat, ſic nonnulli alii Philologum hunc licet aberrantem ſequuti ſunt; ex quibus *Nicolaus Peranzonus* vaticinium de vera diluvii prognoſticatione, cum xx. inundationum hiſtoria, Anconæ edidit. Mihique præterea videre contigit, cujuſdam *Michaëlis de Petra ſancta, Ordinis Prædicatorum de Obſervantia, ſacræ Theologiæ Doctoris, Regentis ſtudii in Conventu Minervæ, & Metaphyſicam in Romano Gymnaſio profitentis libellum, in defenſionem Aſtrologorum, judicantium ex conjunctionibus Planetarum in Piſcibus* MDXXIV *diluvium futurum.* Hunc enim veluti conceptis verbis, operi ſuo titulum fecit. *Id. ib.* pag. 49.

(c) *Id. ib.*

(d) *Bodin, de la Republique, B.* 4. *pag. m.* 550.

(e) *Renatus Herpin, Apologie pour la Republique de Jean Bodin, in the laſt pa.*

(f) *Naudæus ubi ſupra p.* 50.

(g) *Gaſſendus, Phyſic. ſect.* 2. *lib.* 6. *Oper. tom.* 1. *pag.* 729. *col.* 1.

(1) *Bochel. in Annal. Aquit. Bodin.* 4. *de Rep.* 2. *Duret. de flu. & refl. mar. c.* 27. *&c.*

(2) *Lib.* 5. *aphor.* 34.

(3) 2 *Par. introd.* 3.

(h) *Bodin, de la Republique, B.* 4. *p.* 552.

(i) *John Buchet, Annales d'Aquitain fol. m.* 113. *Naudæus & Gaſſendus call him wrong* Bochellus *in the Paſſages abovequoted.*

(a) *Id. ib.*

of

“ that ſuch *Conjunctions* wou'd not have their “ Effect till ten Years after, during which many “ great, dreadful, and detrimental things wou'd “ happen; which prov'd true, as will appear “ hereafter. For, that very ſame Year 1523, in “ *November*, there was a little Froſt, which froze “ up the greateſt part of the Wheat, and moſt Cabbages, and ſhort-ſhank Apple-Trees: and a vaſt “ number of ſmall Treaſurers, who conſumed the “ publick Finances of *France*, were put out of their “ Places; whereupon this Diſtich was made in a “ bantering way.

“ *L'an mil cinq cent vingt & quatre moins ung*
“ *Le Choux d'yver & Treſoriers tout ung.*„

How comes this Author to reckon among the Publick Calamities the turning out of the Treaſurers, who waſted the Finances and devour'd the People? He ſhou'd rather have accounted it a happineſs. As for what concerns the Froſt in the Month of *November*, which he calls a ſmall one, tho' he aſcribes great Effects to it, the ſame Doubts ariſe in my Mind, which I have propos'd in the Article *Berquin*. 'Tis a remarkable thing that *Beza* ſhou'd mention ſuch a Froſt upon the Year 1528, as a Curſe, which the Execution of an Innocent Man brought upon the whole Kingdom. *Cunæus*, Profeſſor at *Leyden*, made an Oration about Climacterical Years in 1638, when he left the Rectorſhip, wherein he mention'd the Prediction of a new Deluge in the Year (*c*) 1524, and laugh'd at it. He added, (*d*) that according to the Teſtimony of *Ludovicus Vives*, that Year proved as clear, happy, and plentiful as ever was ſeen. *Vives* does not ſay all this preciſely; nevertheleſs his Words are ſtill more proper than *Cunæus's* to ſhew the Falſity of the Prediction. (*e*) *Illud quoque Noë diluvium non ſiderum commiſtionibus aſſignatur, ſed ultioni numinis. Verum iſti* (aſtrologi) *ſolita temeritate ſub certum horoſcopum reducunt eluviem illam orbis, & ſimilem horoſcopum contigiſſe ferunt anno vigeſimo quarto, qui annus orbem ferè totum inſanis iſtorum prædictionibus terruit, quum nullus annus memoria eorum qui viverent aut mitior aut ſerenior fuerit, aut ſuis omnibus partibus tempeſtivior? Primùm in tanta varietate, tamque incertis iis qui annales ſcribunt, quem annum poſſunt ipſi annotare quo diluvium contigerit? Ita non dicunt hoc eveniſſe, quia hic erat aſtrorum coitus: ſed quia id contigerit, talem affirmant fuiſſe. Hoc verò non eſt ab experimentis ſcientiam colligere, ſed ad tuendam temeritatem aſſertionis confingere ſibi experimenta. Verum irriſit iſtos natura, qui quo tempore natatura in aquis omnia erant minati, ſereniſſimi ut ſi quando antea fulſerunt ſoles, & ver fuit omnium amœniſſimum.* A Learned *German*, who publiſh'd ſome Notes upon *Cunæus*'s Orations, quotes this Paſſage of *Ludovicus Vives*, and ſays, that *Cardan* maintain'd that *Stoflerus* was out for want of a ſufficient Skill in Phyſicks. *Cardan* endeavours to ſhew, that the ſame Poſition of the Planets which was to produce an Inundation, according to *Stoflerus*, was really to produce fair Weather (*f*); but this pretended Juſtification of Aſtrology, by cenſuring thoſe who do not well underſtand it, does not deſerve to be minded upon this occaſion.

(*C*) *The End of the World . . . in the Year* 1586. *I believe they are miſtaken.*] This concerns M. *Petit*, Intendant of the Fortifications, who uſes theſe Words. “ (*g*) Did not *Stoflerus* foretel, “ that in the Year 1524, there wou'd be ſo great “ Inundations, that if the World was not to be “ deſtroyed by Fire, there wou'd be then an univerſal Deluge, by reaſon of the great Conjunctions of the Planets in watery Signs? Which “ frighted all *Europe* to that degree, that many “ People repair'd to the Mountains with all manner of Proviſions. Others provided Barks and “ Ships to avoid being drowned; and yet the “ Month of *February* in which all theſe things “ were to happen, proved extremely dry, to the “ ſhame of Aſtrologers. Did not he ſay likewiſe “ that in the Year 1586, after an Eclipſe of the “ Sun in *May*, and the Conjunction of all the “ Planets, the World wou'd be at an end by the “ Fury of Winds and Storms, which proved ridiculous?„ I believe one might boldly deny what he ſays in his ſecond Queſtion, and affirm, that *Stoflerus* foretold no ſuch thing for the Year 1586. In the firſt place, his Ephemerides don't reach ſo far. In the ſecond place, that Year is not characterized by an Eclipſe of the Sun in *May*, nor by *the Conjunction of all the Planets*. I think I have found out what led that Author into this Miſtake: he had read in *Gaſſendus*, next to what concerns the Prediction of a Deluge, an Account of a Prediction concerning the Year 1186. Some time after, truſting too much to his Memory, he thought that *Gaſſendus* upbraids *Stoflerus* with a ſecond Overſight; and on this Suppoſition he ſet down 1586, inſtead of 1186. What will confirm my Conjecture is, that the Year 1186 has the two Characters abovemention'd, *viz.* an Eclipſe of the Sun (*h*), and a Conjunction of all the Planets, as it appears from theſe Words of *Gaſſendus*. (*i*) *Simile vaticinium fuit, quod ex Rigordo Scaliger* (1) *refert, ſcribente Aſtrologos tantum portendiſſe exitium, à ventorum, tempeſtatumque vehementia, ob Planetas tam inferiores, quàm ſuperiores coituros menſe Septembri anni* MCLXXXVI *præeunte Solis defectione* XI *Kal. Maij, ut rerum finem imminere à nemine dubitaretur, cùm eventus tamen poſtea coarguerit ejuſce Oraculi vanitatem.* *Naudæus* obſerves that the Weather proved very fine, inſtead of the dreadful Storms foretold by the Aſtrologers. (*k*) *Vide ſodes apud* Rigordum, *quid anno Chriſti* MCLXXIX *acciderit. Orientales Aſtrologi omnes, literis per totum orbem miſſis, tam ſecurè quàm ſi Regio diplomate res ipſa ſancita fuiſſet, edixerant, anno ſeptimo poſt, qui fuit* MCLXXXVI, *Planetas omnes tam inferiores, quàm ſuperiores, in unum coituros ineunte Septembri, ſcilicet poſt Eclipſim factam* XI *Kalend. Mai. Indeque tantùm ex ventorum, & tempeſtatum violentia periculi ſecuturum, ut fermè rebus humanis, extremum finem imminere aſſererent. Quid igitur poſtea factum eſt, niſi ut mortales innumeros, qui per totum illud ſeptennium, vitam ſibi præ metu, & periculorum expectatione acerbam putaverant, ineunte termino ab Aſtrologis illis præſtituto, molles potiùs Favonii, quàm Aquilones, & blanda ſedataque Autumni temperies, quàm nubila vel perturbata exciperet?* *Bodin* has been a Prevaricator upon this occaſion: He ſuppoſes the Aſtrologers did not foretel great Winds, but great Revolutions of State. He had a mind to ſave their Honour by ſuch a Subterfuge; for take the Hiſtory of the World where you will, you'll find ſome Revolutions within the Space of fifteen or twenty Years. We read alſo, ſays he (*l*), “ that “ in the Year MCLXXXVI. in *September*, the “ lower and upper Planets were in Conjunction, “ when the Eaſtern Aſtrologers by Letters ſent “ into all Parts, as the Chronicle of *Saint Denys* “ has it, threaten'd all Nations with a Change of “ Government, which proved true. But it muſt “ be confeſs'd that the Hiſtorian is miſtaken in “ ſaying that there was an Eclipſe of the Sun the “ eleventh of *April* (*m*), and the fifth of that “ Month an Eclipſe of the Moon: which is naturally impoſſible.”

(*D*) *Some Predictions upon the Year* 1588.] A Year “ (*n*) which all Judicial Aſtrologers call'd “ a wonderful one, becauſe they foretold ſo many “ ſtrange Accidents, and ſo much Confuſion in “ Natural Cauſes, that they affirm'd, that if the “ World was not then at an End, there wou'd “ happen at leaſt an univerſal Change.„ The Author of the *Mercurius Gallo-Belgicus* ſays, that *Stoflerus* found as many Calamities in the Prognoſtications for the Year 1588, as *Regiomontanus*: which is as much as can be ſaid. *Joannes Regio-*

montanus,

(*c*) *The* rinters ut 1504. *That Fault* has been nded in the Leipſick *Edit.* 1693.

(*d*) Prodi- tum me- oria Lu- ovicus Vives, Doctor cer- tiſſimus, reliquit, llum num que ſe- num, llum que fau- n, & ertate otabilem iſſe. naeus at. 4. g. 78. t. Lipſ. 53.

) *Lud.* ves de itate i Chri- na lib. cap. 10. . 120. t. Baſil. 44.

) *Car-* n. *aphor.* rol. mento 7. hor. 34. d Aug. chnerum ras. nai m. 375.

) *Petit,* ſerta- n ſur la ure des metes, . 337.

(*h*) *Not in* May, *as* M. *Petit ſays, but the* 21. *of* April. *M. Petit, for want of Attention did not mind the word* Kal. *in* Gaſſendus.

(*i*) *Gaſſendus ubi ſupra.*

(1) *Præfat. in Manil.*

(*k*) *Naudæus ubi ſupra pag.* 45. *Conſult Calviſius ad ann.* 1186. *who obſerves that the* Arabians *in* Spain *gave notice of that conjunction.* Hinc prædixerunt: *Tantus,* inquiunt, *erit ventus, ut pulvere repleturus ſit arbores & turres.* Inde ſequentur hæc miracula: *Veniet vir ſapiens, Doctor veritatis. Deinde orietur quidam ex Elam, qui magnas ſtrages faciet.* Sed nihil annotatum eſt, quod evenerit. *He quotes* Richardus: *'tis likely he meant* Rigordus

(*l*) *Bodin. ubi ſupra pag.* 557. (*m*) *Probably 'tis an Error of the Tranſcriber; for all Authors place that Eclipſe on the* 21 *of* April. (*n*) *Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, p. m.* 92.

of his Death: Some ſay † he died of the Plague at *Blaubeurs*, the ſixteenth of *February* 1531. Others will have it that he died of a Wound (*E*) in his Head, which he receiv'd by the Fall of a Board: they add, that he foreſaw that Danger. He had a great Affection for *Munſter*, his Scholar; which proved very beneficial to the Commonwealth of Learning: for had he not ſuffer'd him to tranſcribe his Writings, they had been loſt for ever, when the Originals were burnt ‡. 'Tis to be obſerv'd, that he was one of thoſe who went about the Reformation of the Calendar; (*EΔ*) but this Undertaking was not finiſh'd 'till a long time after his Death.

STRIGELIUS (*Victorinus*) was born at * *Kaufbeir* the 26th of *December* 1524. He loſt his Father † in 1527, and was ſent to *Friburg* in *Briſgaw*, in the Year 1538, to continue his Studies. There he went through a Courſe of Philoſophy under *John Zinckius*, and left that Place in 1542, to go to the Univerſity of *Wittemberg*, where he made it his Buſineſs to inform himſelf of the Opinions of the *Proteſtants*. He went to *Luther*'s Lectures, but more frequently to thoſe of *Philip Melancthon*. After he had taken his Degree of Maſter of Philoſophy in 1544, he betook himſelf to read private Lectures, which procured him a great Reputation, and proved very uſeful to his Scholars. He went on with this Exerciſe till the War forced him to leave *Wittemberg*, and to go to *Magdeburg*, and then to *Erford*. The War being ended he went to *Jena* in 1548, where he married the Year following; and being a Widower two Years after, he married again in 1553. He aſſiſted at the (*A*) Conference of *Eiſenac* in 1556, and had a friendly Diſpute with *Menius*, upon a Queſtion concerning the Neceſſity of Good Works, about which the Divines were divided. He reduced that Controverſy to ſeven Propoſitions, on which the whole Diſpute run. The Concluſion was, that *Menius* engaged before the Elector of *Saxony*, and the whole Aſſembly, not to depart from the Doctrine contain'd in the Seven Propoſitions, which he acknowledged to be very conſonant to the Word of God. Afterwards *Strigelius*, purſuant to the Prince's Order, drew up a Form of Confeſſion, to which all the Divines ſubſcribed. The Year following he was attack'd

montanus, Mathematicus ſummus, aliquantò antequàm Roma anno à partu Virginis 1475, ætatis ſuæ 42 in vivis eſſe deſiit, prognoſticum ſeu vaticinium in hanc ferè ſententiam edidit:

Poſt mille expletos à partu virginis annos,
  Et poſt quingentos rurſus ab axe datos,
Octuageſimus octavus mirabilis annus
  Ingruet, & ſecum triſtia fata trahet.
Si non hoc anno totus malè concidet orbis,
  Si non in nihilum terra fretumque ruet;
Cuncta tamen mundi ſurſum ibunt atque deorſum
  Imperia, & luctus undique grandis erit.

Eadem Joannes Stœflerus, inſignis Aſtrologus, & noſtro ſeculo generoſiſſimus Heros Henricus Rantzovius, in ſuo de annis climactericis & imperiorum periodis libello, vaticinatus eſt (*a*). That Author imitates *Bodin*, for he falſifies Hiſtory to ſave the Honour of thoſe Aſtrologers: He places the Execution of the Queen of *Scotland* (*b*) in the Year 1588 (*c*). For the Diverſion of the Reader I ſhall ſet down a Flight of M. *Petit*, Intendant of the Fortifications. *Don't you think*, ſays he (*d*), after having quoted the four laſt Verſes of *Regiomontanus*'s Prophecy, *that it was Word for Word the ſame Prognoſtick with that of the Sieur* Andreas (*e*), *only* Regiomontanus *is not ſo poſitive as to the Year, and does not ſo much contradict himſelf. That Coxcomb* (Andreas) *ſays poſitively, that the World will be at an end in two Years time at fartheſt: and immediately after he affirms*, that all the Powers will be deſtroyed, and fall into the Hands of the *Turks*; *that is, after the End of the World, and when there will be neither Men nor Beaſts. Wou'd to God he might be the laſt Beaſt, and the laſt Aſtrological Fool.*

(*E*) *Of a Wound in his Head, which he received by the Fall . . . They add, that he foreſaw.*] This I find in *Sethus Calviſius. Johan. Stofflerus*, ſays he (*f*), *Juſtingenſis, Mathematicus inſignis, certo die ſibi periculum ruinâ imminere præviderat, & quia ædes ſuas ſatis firmas noverat, convocat in Muſæum ſuum viros eruditos, quorum conſuetudine & ſermonibus recrearetur: orta inter ſobria pocula diſputatio: ad controverſiam explicandam è ſuperiori loco librum depromit: ſed laxato clavo aſſer, in quo ſtabant libri, in caput ejus decidit, & inſigne vulnus infelici ſeni inſligit, ex quo mortuus eſt die 16 Febr. Tubingæ. Voſſius* did not know that this Particular is to be found in *Calviſius*; for he mentions it only upon the Credit of a (*g*) *quidam*.

(*EΔ*) *He was one of thoſe, who went about the Reformation of the Calendar.*] After the Neceſſity of that Reformation had been propoſed in the Council of *Conſtance*, ſome Aſtronomers conſider'd how it might be effected. I need not name here thoſe who began: I ſhall only ſay, that under the Pontificate of *Leo* X. two Writers publiſh'd their Thoughts about it: one of 'em was *Paul* (*h*) of *Middleburg*, and the other our *John Stoflerus*, who inſcribed (*i*) his Propoſitions to the Council of *Lateran*. I ſay nothing of *Joannes Maria de Tholoſanis*, whoſe Book *De emendatione Calendarii Romani* was dedicated to the Council of *Trent*. That Monk ſays, that *Stoflerus* propoſed three Expedients, one whereof was to leave out Ten Days, which was pitch'd upon to put an end to that Affair. (*k*) *Frater Joan. Maria de Tholoſanis ordinis prædicatorum de emendatione Calendarii Romani cap. 3. ad Concilium Tridentinum ſic ſcribit:* Circa hujus æquinoctii reformationem reperiuntur variæ formulæ: quarum tres ponit Joan. Stoefflerus in ſuo Calendario propoſitione 39. Prima earum inter alias potiſſima eſt & facillima, ſecunda difficilis eſt, & gignens perturbationem magnam, & diſſidium in eccleſia Dei per orbem diffuſa. Ultima abſque difficultate ſervari poſſet. *Hæc ille. Secundam autem formulam vocat, qua noſtri temporis correctores uſi ſunt*, 10 *dies eximentes ex uno menſe.*

(*A*) *He aſſiſted at the Conference of* Eiſenac in 1556.] *George Major*, a Divine of *Wittemberg*, openly declar'd for the *Interim* (*l*), and for the Phraſe inſerted in it concerning the Neceſſity of Good Works (*m*). *Amſdorf* ran into another extreme, for he maintain'd, that Good Works were pernicious to Salvation (*n*). This was the fourth Schiſm of the *Lutherans* (*o*). Such was the ſubject of the Conference of *Eiſenac*, in which our *Strigilius* acted the moſt conſiderable Part. *Thuanus* (*p*) confounds the time and the place when he ſays that Strigetack'd (*B*) by *Illyricus*, and had a verbal Diſpute with him at *Weimar*. The Acts of the Conference were publiſhed, but not faithfully, ſo that he complain'd ‡ that ſomething had been left out. He was Impriſon'd (*C*) with two others in 1559, becauſe they had diſapproved ſome Theological Doctrines, and the Writing which thoſe of *Weimar* had publiſh'd againſt thoſe of *Wittemberg*. He was ſet at Liberty three Years after, and betook himſelf again to read Lectures; but becauſe he quickly perceived that (*D*) the Poſt he was in was not a ſafe one, he left *Jena*, and did not mind the Remonſtrances which the Univerſity of that Name writ to him to perſuade him to return. He went to *Leipſick*, where he publiſhed Notes upon the Pſalter. He obtained from the Elector the Liberty of Teaching in the Univerſity of *Wittemberg*, or in that of *Leipſick*, and choſe to live in this laſt City. He began his Lectures there the 1ſt of *March*, 1563, and explain'd not only Divinity, but alſo Logick and Morals. He had carried his Common-Places as far as the Article of the Euchariſt, which he was to begin in *February* 1567; but the School Door was ſhut up againſt him, and they ſent him word to leave off reading Lectures. He applied himſelf to the Elector of *Saxony* for Redreſs, and not obtaining the Juſtice he expected, he yielded * to the *Odium Theologicum*, and retired into the Palatinate. He hoped the Elector wou'd take care of him, and he was not miſtaken, for he was called to *Heidelberg* to be Profeſſor of Morality, and for ſome other Employments. He worthily diſcharged the Duties of thoſe Places till he died, which happen'd the 26th of *June* 1569, after a very ſhort Sickneſs, † according to his Wiſhes. He was a good Philoſopher and a good Divine, and he had an admirable Talent to teach Youth. His Life was attended (*E*) with a thouſand Vexations; he was accuſed of Hereſy; he was Defamed to the higheſt Degree, Anathematized and expoſed to Penal Laws: which was the Reaſon why, like

---

† *Melch. Adam ib. pag.* 14.

‡ *Omnibus libris inſtrumentiſque Stoffleri incendio fortuito Tubingæ conſumtis, nihil illarum lucubrationum evaſiſſet, niſi multa Munſterus deſcripta adſervaſſet. Melch. Adam ubi ſupra.*

* *'Tis an Imperial City in* Suabia *near the* Alpes. Melch. Adam. ubi infra.

† *He was a Native of* Memminguen, *and Phyſician to the Lords* de Fronsberg *Id. ibid.*

(*a*) *Janſonius Doccomenſis Friſius, in Mercurio Gallo Belgico, ad init. anni* 1589. *apud Wolfium, Lect. memorabil. to.* 2. *p.* 1028.

(*b*) *Ibid. apud eumdem Wolfium ibid.*

(*c*) *She was Beheaded the* 8 *of* Feb. 1587. *Old-Stile.*

(*d*) *Diſcours ſur l'eclipſe de ſoleil du* 12. *d'Août* 1654. *printed at the end of his* Diſſertation *upon Comets*, *pag.* 338.

(*e*) *Upon occaſion of the Eclipſe of the Year* 1654. *a Diſcourſe in* German *and* French *was handed about under the Name of the* Sieur Andreas, *ſometimes ſtiled a Mathematician of* Padua, *and ſometimes of* Prague, *with an Atteſtation of the Chancery of* Meninguen. *Id. ib. pag.* 326.

(*f*) *Sethus Calviſius, ad ann.* 1531. *pag. m.* 1165.

(*g*) De morte e ſic conte no, pen quem fides eſt, *Voſſius in addit. libr. de ſcien. Mathem. pag.* 450.

(*h*) *He was Biſhop of* Foſſombrone *in* Italy.

(*i*) *Henricus Wolphius ubi infra pag.* 121.

(*k*) *Henricus Wolphius in tractatu de tempo & ejus mutationibus p.* 12

(*l*) *Micræ lius, Synt. hiſtor. Eccleſ. pag. m.* 755.

(*m*) *Id. ib. pag.* 865.

(*n*) *Id.*

(*o*) *Id.*

(*p*) *Thuan. l.* 45. *pag.* 941.

‡ *See the Remark B*

* Ceſſit impotentiæ Theologorum. *Melch. Adam ib. pag.* 423.

† Conſecutus eſt quod ſæpe in votis habuit, videlicet ne difficili & producto morbi genere ſpiritum edere cogeretur. *Id. ibid. pag.* 425.

Strigelius aſſiſted at the Conference (*q*) of *Altemburg* in the Years MDLXVIII, and MDLXIX. *Bochſtadius* (*r*) ſhowed long ago that 'tis a Miſtake.

(*B*) *He was attack'd by* Illyricus, *and had a verbal Diſpute.*] They were both Profeſſors (*ſ*) in the Univerſity newly founded at *Jena*. Their Diſpute run upon two Points (*t*): 1ſt. Whether God creates a new Subſtance, when he Regenerates a Sinner: 2d. Whether the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt leaves any Liberty to Man. *Strigelius* denied the firſt Point, and affirm'd the Second. (*v*) Note, that *Flacius Illyricus* was a rigid aſſertor of *Luther*'s Doctrine *de ſervo arbitrio*. On the contrary, *Strigelius* approved the moderate Expreſſions of *Melanchthon*: And therefore he was look'd upon as one of the Leaders of the *Synergiſts*, that is, of thoſe who acknowledge that Man's Will co-operates with Grace. This was (*w*) the 5th Schiſm of the *Lutherans*. According to *Quenſtedt*, *Strigelius* was the Incendiary and Trumpeter of that War, (*x*) *belli ſynergiſtici* κορυφαῖ&#8203;ος, *fax & tuba*. I have mentioned in another ((*y*) Place the Conference of *Weimar*: many Authers place it not in the Year 1557, as *Melchior Adam* does, nor in the Year 1551, as (*z*) *Spondanus*, but in the Year 1560; and I think they are in the right.

(*C*) *He was impriſoned.*] Falling ſick during his Impriſonment he had leave to get himſelf carried to his Wife, but upon Condition that he ſhould be at home as a Priſoner. Many Princes, and even the Emperor *Maximilian* interceded for him, and obtained that he might be viſited by his Friends (*a*).

(D) *That the Poſt he was in was not a ſafe one.*] He thought he could not continue in it without endangering his Conſcience, his Reputation, and his Life. He perceived that the Peace, ſuch as it was, which the Divines of *Jena* had concluded between him and his Enemies, was ill obſerved: beſides, he was informed by many credible Perſons, that he ſhou'd uſe all poſſible Diligence to avoid the Snares, or rather the open Violence deſigned againſt him. His Fear was not groundleſs, for he knew that *Solomon* adviſes us *not to truſt to an Enemy*, and to keep off from him; and he remembred *Menander*'s Saying, That *Reconciliations produce a Wolf's Friendſhip* (*b*). When he Anſwered the Letter of the Univerſity of *Jena*, he declared, That if his going away was not free from blame, it was rather to be aſcribed to the Inconveniencies of the Time and Place, and the Snares of falſe Brethren, than to himſelf (*c*), and in a word, that he had rather retire into the moſt dreadful Solitude, than return to *Jena*. (*d*) " *Paucis ut dicamus: ſumma propoſiti ipſius hac fuit*: " nolle ſe redire Ienam: ſed potiùs iturum quocunque Deus vocarit: etiamſi in ea loca migrandum eſſet:

- - - (†) Pigris ubi nulla campis
Arbor æſtiva recreatur aura:
Quod latus mundi nebula, maluſque
Jupiter urget.

If we conſider all thoſe things, we ſhall be leſs ſurprized to ſee that the Diſputes of Divines are now a-days ſo ſcandalous. They were more ſcandalous ſtill at that time. Take notice that *Strigelius* was diſmiſſed by the Elector (*e*) for not keeping his Word, and raiſing unneceſſary Conteſtations. He anſwered that he had promiſed to be modeſt only upon condition of doing nothing contrary to Truth and his Conſcience. *Strigelio contra affirmante ſe modeſtiam quidem promiſiſſe, ſed duabus adjectis conditionibus ſalva veritate, & ſalva conſcientia.* Thoſe two Conditions do certainly deſerve to be underſtood, or expreſly mentioned in all Treaties: but they open a way for reviving old Quarrels; and with thoſe two Pretences, one may break the Bonds of any Engagement.

(*E*) *His Life was attended with a thouſand Vexations; he was accuſed of Hereſy*, &c.] *Melanchthon* having conſidered *Strigelius*'s Horoſcope, ſaid, That the Stars threatned him with all manner of Aſſaults. (*f*) *De ſchemate ejus genethliaco*, Melanchthon, *ubi id conſideraſſet, ita ex ſiderum poſitu ratiocinatus fait; fore, ut artibus innumeris oppugnaretur; non aliter,*

Quàm lapis æquoreis undique pulſus aquis.

Perhaps the Man born under ſuch Malignant Conſtellations, explain'd that Prediction by theſe Verſes of *Horace*, when he found himſelf expos'd to Slanders, and School Diſputes:

(*g*) *Inſtat fatum mihi triſte, Sabella*
Quod puero cecinit, divinâ motâ anus urnâ:
Hunc neque dira venena, nec hoſticus auferet enſis,
Nec laterum dolor, aut tuſſis, nec tarda podagra,
Garrulus hunc quando conſumet cunque: loquaces,
Si ſapiat, vitet, ſimulatque adoleverit ætas.

However it be, let's ſee how he deſcribes his Anguiſh: (*b*) *De meis rebus quid multa attinet ſcribere, cùm non ſolum in veteri luto adhuc hæream; ſed etiam ad reliquas moleſtias accedat truncata & mutilata editio diſputationis inter me & hominem*

barbarum

(q) It was ld towards the latter end of 1568, nd in the eginning 1569.

) See he Letters ritten to oldaſtus, nd publiſh'd in 688.

(ſ) Hen. Alting. eol. hiſt. g. 298.

) Melch. dam in itis Theolog. pag. 20.

)Alting. id.

) Mia'l. ubi pra.

) Quend de paiis viror. luſtr.pag. 58.

) In the emarkC. f the rticle yricus.

) Sponn. ad n. 1560. 32. pag. 02.

a) Taken om Melior Am, ib. g. 421.

) Id. ib. g. 421, 22.

) Id. ib. g. 422.

(*d*) *Id. ib.*

(†) *Theſe Verſes are to be found in* Horace od. 22. lib. 1.

(*e*) Quod violaſſet promiſſa, ac certamina moviſſet non neceſſaria. *Id. ibid. pag.* 424.

(*f*) *Id. ib. pag.* 417.

(*g*) *Horatius ſat.* 9. *lib* 1. *v.* 29.

(*b*) *Strigelius epiſt. ad Wolfangum à Koteritz apud Melch. Adamum ubi ſupra pag.* 420. *That Letter was written in* 1562.

like (F) *Melanchthon* in a like Caſe, he often beg'd of God that he wou'd take him out of this World *. I ſhall not give a Catalogue of his Works; it may be ſeen in M. ‡ *Teiſſier.* I muſt obſerve as a remarkable thing, that he made no ſcruple to uſe the Thoughts and Expreſſions (G) of other Writers. It has been ſaid, That he (H) retracted at his Death; but I take it to be a meer Story.

STROZZI (*Philip*) of an Ancient and Rich † Family of *Florence*, was one of thoſe, who, after the Death of *Clement* VII, moſt earneſtly endeavoured to recover the Liberty of their Country, by expelling *Alexander de Medicis.* When he

barbarum (i) *agitata, & aliorum ſcriptorum: quibus fama mea atrociſſimè, apud eos, qui vitam & mores meos non penitus perſpexerunt, læditur ac deformatur. Nam inter reliquas criminationes ipſa morte acerbiores tribuitur mihi impia & extrema levitas, vanitas, inconſtantia, perfidia in negocio religionis, & pertinax odium veritatis. Ad hæc convicia, quorum molem vix una navis vehat, accedit fulmen injuſtæ condemnationis, quam Paulus vocat Anathema Maranatha.* He adds, that tho' the Teſtimony of a good Conſcience ſerves him for a Shield againſt the Darts of Calumny, yet he could not but reſent the Falſities publiſh'd againſt him. His greateſt Grief was to have his Hands tied, that is, to be forced by the Circumſtances of Time and Place to ſay nothing, tho' his Silence made him ſuſpected by ſeveral Perſons. Such is the Fate of thoſe, who are perſecuted by Enemies whoſe Faction is uppermoſt, and ſupported by the Secular Power. Thoſe Enemies publiſh whatever they pleaſe, and lye impudently to conceal their ſhameful Artifices, and their Iniquity from the Publick. Thoſe, who are calumniated by them, cou'd not make a good Defence without ſaying ſome things that wou'd exaſperate their common Maſter, and expoſe them to new Miſeries. They are therefore ſilent; but ſuch a Conduct produces an ill Effect: The Enemy triumphs at it, and many People, haſty in their Judgments, put a ſiniſter Interpretation upon it. There is nothing more advantageous, according to the Notions of the World, than to be always for the ſtrongeſt Side; and on the contrary, nothing can be more diſadvantageous, with reſpect to one's Temporal Intereſt, than to be for the Party that is in the Right, if it be inferior in Credit and Power. (k) *Multis etiam,* they are *Strigelius*'s Words, *meum ſilentium, quo has calumnias diſſimulare cogor, ſuſpectum eſt, perinde quaſi mihi honeſta oratio deſit ad has labes & maculas detergendas. Sed boni viri, quibus conditio mea, triſtis ſane & luctuoſa, notior eſt, non ignorant, quibus vinculis conſtrictus impediar, quo minus vel cauſam ipſam explicare, vel innocentiam meam à morſibus venenatiſſimis hominum vindicare poſſim.* All that I can do, ſays he, is to implore God's Juſtice, and to cry out, as the Prophet *David* did, (l) *O Lord God the avenger, O God the avenger, ſhew thy ſelf clearly. Exalt thy ſelf, O Judge of the World, and render a Reward to the Proud.* When he gave the Reaſons why he had left *Leipſick*, the chief he alledged was the (m) Injury done, not ſo much to himſelf, as to Truth, by forbidding him to mention a Doctrine that was dearer to him than his Life. His Second Reaſon was, That no body offered to aſſiſt him, when his Innocence was oppreſt. The Third, That he had received a threatning Anſwer from the Court; and laſtly (n) That he was oppreſt by the Threatnings of the Divines, and the Anathema's of the Preachers. But the better to know the Unhappineſs of his Fate, and how unfortunate he was in being expoſed to the Injuſtice of a Violent Faction, and more ſtill, in being too ſenſible of the Injuries he received from them; 'tis ſufficient to obſerve that he grew old before his time. He was worn out, and decrepit in Body and Mind at 44 Years of Age. He complain'd of it ſome few Months before he died, as it appears from theſe Words. (a) *Cum ante annos decem & corpore & animo vigerem: nunc tot calamitatibus tum victus tum fractus, vix ægra membra traho, & animi alacritatem ſeneſcere comperio. Quare me omni cura & cogitatione præparo ad iter, quod ducit ex hujus vitæ miſeriis ad æternam tranquillitatem.* (b) A Verſe of *Virgil* with a ſmall Alteration in it might have been applied to him.

(F) *Like Melanchthon in a like caſe, he often beg'd of God.*] I deſire to die, ſaid *Melanchthon*, firſt that I may enjoy the beatifical Viſion; Secondly that I may be no longer expoſed to the implacable Hatred of Divines. *Strigelius* ſaid the ſame thing: read theſe Words of *Melchior Adam.* (d) *A Flacio Illyrico, & ejus manipularibus, objectum ei eſt crimen hæreſeos: quod graviſſimè tulit: nominatim accuſatus eſt; quod non recte ſentiret & doceret de ea parte doctrinæ, quæ appellatur, de libero arbitrio.* Ab aliis verò aliorum inſimulatus eſt errorum: ut vita ejus perpetua fuerit pugna & dimicatio. Itaque ut *Melanchthon* ante mortem dixit: *cupio ex hac vita migrare propter duas cauſas: primum ut fruar deſiderato conſpectu Filii* DEI *& cæleſtis eccleſiæ: deinde ut liberer ab immanibus & implacabilibus odiis Theologorum:* ita ipſe eaſdem cauſas ſæpè inter precandum uſurpare ſolitus fuit: cum videret ſe hoc fato natum: ut omnibus eorum telis, qui eſſent arguti cives ſine virtute, vita & fama ſua propoſita eſſet. If his Father and Mother had been Witneſſes of his great Trouble, their Grief for it wou'd have proceeded from a Cauſe very different from that which made *Iſaac* and *Rebecca* uneaſy. The latter were troubled to ſee how well their Son agreed with Strangers; but the former wou'd have been Afflicted at the War kindled between their Son and his Brethren, a War which grieved him no leſs than the Alliance of Strangers grieved *Eſau*'s Mother. 'Tis to be obſerved that the Church, who is a good Mother, bears her Grief a little better than *Rebecca*; ſhe is troubled to ſee her Children at War, and is ſo uſed to it, that one wou'd think it is become familiar to her. But what is moſt admirable is the Patience of the People; it may be ſaid that as in ſome Countries they patiently bear all manner of Taxes, they are every where no leſs tame with reſpect to Controverſies.

(G) *To uſe the Thoughts and Expreſſions of other Writers.*] In this reſpect he ſeem'd to be for a Community of Goods; he did not think that in doing ſo he was a Plagiary, and he was very willing that other Authors ſhou'd deal with him as he dealt with them. If you find any thing in my Books, ſaid he, that fits you, you may freely uſe it; every thing is at your Service. (f) *Cùm Victorinus noſter diu multumque verſatus eſſet in lectione eorum Autorum, qui libros Ariſtotelis quaſi in ſuum ſuccum convertiſſent, illorum potiùs veſtigia voluit, ubi & quantum poſſet, conſectari, quàm novam per omnia cudere verſionem. Ac quidem ille vir & factus erat, & natus, ut ſi qua ei de re dicendum eſſet aut ſcribendum, & ipſi, qui de eadem illa ipſa re alii etiam recentiores, & qui viverent adhuc, rectè tradidiſſent, in mentem venirent, non puderet hinc illum verba ab iis & ſententias mutuari. Non enim hoc dicebat plagium eſſe literarium, ſed ingenuam atque candidam doctis atque bonis viris dignam κοινωνίαν. Et faciat, inquit, aliquis idem, ſi ſe cum fructu hoc poſſe ſperat, de meis quoque.*

(H) *That he retracted at his Death.*] We are told that a Gentleman, who ſtudied at *Heidelberg*, met one day *Strigelius* in the Street, and told him, Sir, ſome Years ago you did not believe or teach the Calviniſtical Doctrines you teach now. I have been your Scholar at *Jena*, where you gave other Inſtructions to your Diſciples. *Strigelius* made no Anſwer, and went home, and finding himſelf very ill moſt humbly entreated the (g) Elector to be ſo kind as to come to him, giving him to underſtand that he wou'd impart to him ſome things relating to Salvation. The Prince went to him, being accompanied by Count he ſaw that their Sollicitations at the Court of the Emperor (*A*) Charles V. were inſignificant, he took a ſhorter and more Criminal Method, which was (*B*) to cauſe the pretended Uſurper to be aſſaſſinated. He engaged a Man in this Plot who put it in Execution; but the Succeſs of that Enterprize was more fatal to the Liberty of the Florentines, than the Diſcovery of the whole Conſpiracy wou'd have been. The Death of *Alexander de Medicis* made room for a Succeſſor better qualify'd than he was, to ſettle a new Sovereignty. He beat the Malecontents: *Strozzi* was made a Priſoner, and found no better Expedient than (C) to kill himſelf. He had married *Clarice de Medicis*, nearly

---

* *Taken from Melchior Adam, in vitis Theolog. German. pag. 417. & ſeq.*

‡ *Teiſſier Addit. aux eloges tom. 1. p. 225.*

† *See the Remark A towards the end.*

(i) *That is* Flacius Illyricus.

(k) *Id. ib. apud eundem pag.* 421.

(l) *Pſalm* 94. v. 1.

(m) *Melch. Adam. ib. pag.* 424.

(n) Ad hæc omnia acceſſerunt *minæ Theologorum & fulmina anathematum* adverſus ipſum in concionibus edita. *Id. ibid.*

(a) *Id. ib. pag.* 425.

(b) *The* 114 *of the* 6. B. *of the Æneid,* Invalidus vires ultra ſortemque ſenectæ. *Let us ſay of Strigelius,* Invalidus vires infra ſortemque juventæ.

(d) *Melch. Adam. ib. pag.* 421.

(f) *Jacobus Mazonius præf. Nicomacheorum Ariſtotelis cum verſione, argumentis & ſcholiis Strigelii apud Thomaſium de Plagio literario n.* 194. *pag.* 82.

(g) *That is* Frederick *III.*

Count *George de Hundſruſſen*. What I have taught hitherto at *Heidelberg* in favour of the Calviniſts, ſaid *Strigelius* to him, does not well agree with the Word of God; but the Doctrines, which the Lutherans have profeſſed till now, are very true. The Elector having heard thoſe Words, went away in Anger. (*h*) *Strigelius* quickly expired with a Groan. This Story is taken from the Relation of a Journey to *Conſtantinople*, made by *Gerlach*, to whom *Andreas Carolus* (*i*) Abbot of *St. George*, refers the Reader, after having mentioned what you have juſt now read. He doubts whether one ſhou'd ſay that *Strigelius* had an unconſtant Soul, rather than call it an (*k*) unhappy one. He had call'd him before (*l*) a Weather Cock in point of Religion, and a Favourer of the Synergiſts and Zuinglians.

(*A*) *Their Sollicitations at the Court of the Emperor* Charles *V.*] There is ſomething about this in *Rabelais*'s Epiſtles. The Cardinals *Salviati* and *Rodolphus* went to *Naples* with our *Strozzi* in the Year 1536, to engage the Emperor to ſet up again a Republican Government in *Florence*: they did not ſucceed in it. "(*m*) I hear their Affairs "have not had the Succeſs they hoped for, and "that the Emperor told 'em peremptorily that "he had, at theirs, and the late Pope *Clement*'s "Requeſt, appointed *Alexander de Medicis*, "Duke of the Territories of *Florence* and *Piſa*, "which he never thought of, and had never "done, had it not been for them; that if he "ſhou'd depoſe him, it were acting the Part of "a Juggler, doing and undoing; and that there-"therefore they ſhou'd reſolve to Acknowledge "him for their Duke and Lord, and to obey him "as Vaſſals and Subjects ought to do. As for the "Complaints they made againſt the Duke; he "told 'em he would take Cognizance of 'em up-"on the Place". I ſhall add the following Words out of the firſt Letter. "(*n*) I hear that "'tis (*o*) about the Affair of *Florence*, and the "Difference between Duke *Alexander de Medicis* "and *Philip Strozzi*, whoſe Eſtate the Duke de-"ſign'd to confiſcate. It is no ſmall Eſtate, for "next to the *Fourques* of *Ausburg*, he is accounted "the richeſt Merchant in *Chriſtendom*. The "Duke had appointed ſome Men in that Town "to poyſon or kill him. Being inform'd of it "he obtain'd the Pope's Leave to bear Arms, "and he was commonly attended by thirty Sol-"diers well armed. The Duke of *Florence* be-"ing informed that *Strozzi* and thoſe Cardinals "were gone to the Emperor, and that he offered "him four hundred Thouſand Ducats, if he "wou'd appoint ſome Perſons to inquire into the "Duke's Tyranny and Wickedneſs, ſet out from "*Florence*, appointed Cardinal *Cibo* Governor in "his Abſence, and arrived in that Town (*p*) the "Day after *Chriſtmas*". In the third Letter *Rabelais* ſays (*q*) that thoſe Cardinals, and *Strozzi*, "with his Money, could not prevail with the "Emperor, tho' they offered in the Name of all "thoſe that were baniſh'd from *Florence*, to give "him a Million of Gold ready Money, to finiſh "*La Rocqua*, that was begun in *Florence*, and to "keep a good Garriſon in it in the Emperor's "Name, and to pay him a Hundred thouſand "Ducats every year, provided he wou'd get their "Eſtates and former Liberty reſtored to 'em". Afterwards the Author mentions the Honours that were done to the Duke of *Florence* by *Charles* V. and then he adds: "(*r*) From that time the ſaid "Cardinals, the Biſhop of *Xaintes*, and *Strozzi* "have continued their Sollicitations; the Em-"peror has at laſt refer'd the thing till he comes "to *Florence* . . . . And the Duke has proceeded "ſo cunningly in his Tyranny, that the Floren-"tines have proteſted to the Emperor *No-"mine Communitatis*, that they deſire to have "no other Lord but him. 'Tis certain he has "ſeverely puniſhed the Exiles".

Take notice that the Author of the Notes upon *Rabelais*'s Epiſtles, will not believe (*a*) that *Philip Strozzi* was a Merchant. But it is hardly conceivable how at that time a Family of *Florence* could have got ſo much Wealth without Trading. However, if he was not a famous Banker, he deſerved to be accounted one. The Baron *de Forquevauls* gives him that Title. "*Philip Strozzi*, "*ſays he* (*b*), and *Bartholomew Valori*, better Ban-"kers than Captains, were forced at *Montemurlo*. He adds (*c*), That "he was prodigiouſly rich "for a Citizen. (*d*) *Peter Strozzi*, notwith-"ſtanding his Loſſes and Expences, had ſtill "four hundred thouſand Crowns in the Banks "of *Venice* and *Lyons*, that remain'd out of his "Father *Philip*'s Inheritance". (*e*) He went to *Francis* I. at the Camp of *Marolles*, with a Troop of two hundred Arquebuziers, which coſt him above fifty thouſand Crowns. This I find in *Brantome*, who adds: "(*f*) He was "vaſtly rich, and ſaved a great deal of Money "at *Venice*, where he kept for ſome time with "M. (*g*) *Strozzi*, his Son. That brave Lord "ſpent that vaſt Eſtate in the Service of our "Kings; for, as I have it from his Son, and "his Ancient Servants, whereas he was worth "above five hundred thouſand Crowns, when he "came into the Service of our Kings, he did "not leave twenty thouſand Crowns to his Son "when he died". Here is another Paſſage of *Brantome*, which fully confirms what I have quoted out of him. "(*h*) The King gave to M. "*Strozzi*, Son of the Mareſchal of *France*, fifty "thouſand Crowns as a Reward for the Office of "Colonel General of the Infantry, of which he "bought *Breſſuire* in *Poitou*; and this is all that "he and his Father left of ſo great an Eſtate he "brought into *France*: for I have heard many "People ſay, That when he came thither, he "had a Million of Gold in Bank, or in Goods "and Jewels, or in Money".

(*B*) *Which was to cauſe the pretended Uſurper to be Aſſaſſinated.*] I ſhou'd be very much to blame, ſhou'd I think that I can Comment upon this Text more elegantly, by uſing my own Words than by uſing *Balzac*'s Expreſſions; and therefore I ſhall make no Alteration in the Proof he affords me. "(*i*) *Philip Strozzi*, the Husband of *Clarice de* "*Medicis*, Siſter (*k*) to Pope *Leo*, not being "able to bear the Reign of Duke *Alexander de* "*Medicis*, exhorted *Laurence de Medicis*, his Couſin, "to Conſpire againſt the Life of Duke *Alexan-"der*, and to reſtore the Liberty of his Coun-"try. *Laurence* appeared willing to undertake "ſuch a dangerous Enterprize; but he was afraid "that his two Daughters wou'd run the hazard "of loſing their Honour, becauſe his Eſtate "wou'd be confiſcated. *Philip* told him that "ſuch a Fear ſhou'd not hinder him, and aſſured "him that whatever the Succeſs of his Enter-"prize might be, he wou'd Marry two of his "Sons to his two Daughters. Which he did, "for *Laurence* having made his eſcape after "Duke *Alexander*'s Murther, without reaping "any Advantage from it, *Philip* religiouſly per-"formed his Promiſe, and gave *Laodamia de Me-"dicis* to *Peter Strozzi*, who was ſince Mareſchal "of *France*, and *Magdalen* to *Robert Strozzi*, "who lately (*l*) died at *Rome*."

(*C*) *No other Expedient than to kill himſelf.*] I ſhall uſe ſtill *Balzac*'s Words. "(*m*) The ſame "*Philip*

(*h*) *Mox autem ægrotans Victorinus animam (inconſtantem dicam, an infelicem?) gemebundus exhalavit. Andr. Carolus, memorab. eccleſiaſt. ſeculi xvii. pag.* 49.

(*i*) *Andr. Carolus ib.*

(*k*) *It ſeems in this place that he means a damned Soul.*

(*l*) Homo varius & verſipellis cum Synergiſtis, cum Zuinglianis addictus. *Id. ibid. pag.* 34.

(*m*) *Rabelais, Letter* 8. *pag.* 29.

(*n*) *Idem pag.* 8. *& ſeq.*

(*o*) *That is, that the Cardinals* Salviati *and* Rodolphus *were gone to the Court of* Charles *V. at* Naples.

(*p*) *That is, at* Rome.

(*q*) *Rabelais ibid. pag.* 55.

(*r*) *Id. ib. pag.* 56.

(*a*) *Obſervat. ſur les epitres de Rabelais, pag.* 61.

(*b*) *Francis de Pavie, Baron de Forquevauls, Vies de pluſieurs grands Capitaines pag.* 379.

(*c*) *Id. ib. pag.* 382.

(*d*) *Ibid. pag.* 383.

(*e*) *Brantome, Capitaines etrangers, tom.* 2. *pag.* 287.

(*f*) *Brantome ibid, pag.* 289.

(*g*) Philip Strozzi, *Colonel General of the French Infantry. See* Moreri, *and* Father Anſelm, *whom he tranſcribes. See alſo the following Article.*

(*h*) *Idem Brantome Memoir. des Capit. Francois tom.* 4. *p. m.* 311, 312.

(*i*) *Balzac Entretien* 34. *ch.* 6. *p. m.* 330.

(*k*) Balzac *ſhou'd have ſaid Niece.*

(*l*) *When* Balzac *writ this,* Robert *cou'd not but have been dead a long time.*

(*m*) *Balzac ibid. pag.* 331, 332.

like (F) *Melanchthon* in a like Case, he often beg'd of God that he wou'd take him out of this World *. I shall not give a Catalogue of his Works; it may be seen in M. ‡ *Teiſſier*. I muſt obſerve as a remarkable thing, that he made no ſcruple to uſe the Thoughts and Expreſſions (G) of other Writers. It has been ſaid, That he (H) retracted at his Death; but I take it to be a meer Story.

* *Taken from Melchior Adam, in vitis Theolog. German. pag. 417. & ſeq.*

‡ *Teiſſier Addit. aux eloges tom. 1. p. 325.*

STROZZI (*Philip*) of an Ancient and Rich † Family of *Florence*, was one of thoſe, who, after the Death of *Clement* VII, moſt earneſtly endeavoured to recover the Liberty of their Country, by expelling *Alexander de Medicis*. When he

† *See the Remark A towards the end.*

---

barbarum (i) *agitata, & aliorum ſcriptorum: quibus fama mea atrociſſimè, apud eos, qui vitam & mores meos non penitus perſpexerunt, læditur ac deformatur. Nam inter reliquas criminationes ipſa morte acerbiores tribuitur mihi impia & extrema levitas, vanitas, inconſtantia, perfidia in negotio religionis, & pertinax odium veritatis. Ad hæc convicia, quorum molem vix una navis vehat, accedit fulmen injuſtæ condemnationis, quam Paulus vocat Anathema Maranatha.* He adds, that tho' the Teſtimony of a good Conſcience ſerves him for a Shield againſt the Darts of Calumny, yet he could not but reſent the Falſities publiſh'd againſt him. His greateſt Grief was to have his Hands tied, that is, to be forced by the Circumſtances of Time and Place to ſay nothing, tho' his Silence made him ſuſpected by ſeveral Perſons. Such is the Fate of thoſe, who are perſecuted by Enemies whoſe Faction is uppermoſt, and ſupported by the Secular Power. Thoſe Enemies publiſh whatever they pleaſe, and lye impudently to conceal their ſhameful Artifices, and their Iniquity from the Publick. Thoſe, who are calumniated by them, cou'd not make a good Defence without ſaying ſome things that wou'd exaſperate their common Maſter, and expoſe them to new Miſeries. They are therefore ſilent; but ſuch a Conduct produces an ill Effect: The Enemy triumphs at it, and many People, haſty in their Judgments, put a ſiniſter Interpretation upon it. There is nothing more advantageous, according to the Notions of the World, than to be always for the ſtrongeſt Side; and on the contrary, nothing can be more diſadvantageous, with reſpect to one's Temporal Intereſt, than to be for the Party that is in the Right, if it be inferior in Credit and Power. (k) *Multis etiam*, they are *Strigelius*'s Words, *meum ſilentium, quo has calumnias diſſimulare cogor, ſuſpectum eſt, perinde quaſi mihi honeſta oratio deſit ad has labes & maculas detergendas. Sed boni viri, quibus conditio mea, triſtis ſane & luctuoſa, notior eſt, non ignorant, quibus vinculis conſtrictus impediar, quo minus vel cauſam ipſam explicare, vel innocentiam meam à morſibus venenatiſſimis hominum vindicare poſſim.* All that I can do, ſays he, is to implore God's Juſtice, and to cry out, as the Prophet *David* did, (l) *O Lord God the avenger, O God the avenger, ſhew thy ſelf clearly. Exalt thy ſelf, O Judge of the World, and render a Reward to the Proud.* When he gave the Reaſons why he had left *Leipſick*, the chief he alledged was the (m) Injury done, not ſo much to himſelf, as to Truth, by forbidding him to mention a Doctrine that was dearer to him than his Life. His Second Reaſon was, That no body offered to aſſiſt him, when his Innocence was oppreſt. The Third, That he had received a threatning Anſwer from the Court; and laſtly (n) That he was oppreſt by the Threatnings of the Divines, and the Anathema's of the Preachers. But the better to know the Unhappineſs of his Fate, and how unfortunate he was in being expoſed to the Injuſtice of a Violent Faction, and more ſtill, in being too ſenſible of the Injuries he received from them; 'tis ſufficient to obſerve that he grew old before his time. He was worn out, and decrepit in Body and Mind at 44 Years of Age. He complain'd of it ſome few Months before he died, as it appears from theſe Words. (a) *Cum ante annos decem & corpore & animo vigerem: nunc tot calamitatibus tum victus tum fractus, vix ægra membra traho, & animi alacritatem ſeneſcere comperio. Quare me omni cura & cogitatione præparo ad iter, quod ducit ex hujus vitæ miſeriis ad æternam tranquillitatem.* (b) A Verſe of *Virgil* with a ſmall Alteration in it might have been applied to him.

(F) *Like Melanchthon in a like caſe, he often beg'd of God.*] I deſire to die, ſaid *Melanchthon*, firſt that I may enjoy the beatifical Viſion; Secondly that I may be no longer expoſed to the implacable Hatred of Divines. *Strigelius* ſaid the ſame thing: read theſe Words of *Melchior Adam*. (d) *A Flacio Illyrico, & ejus manipularibus, objectum ei eſt crimen hæreſeos: quod graviſſimè tulit: nominatim accuſatus eſt, quod non rectè ſentiret & doceret de ea parte doctrinæ, quæ appellatur, de libero arbitrio.* Ab aliis verò aliorum inſimulatus eſt errorum: ut vita ejus perpetua fuerit pugna & dimicatio. Itaque ut *Melanchthon* ante mortem dixit: *cupio ex hac vita migrare propter duas cauſas: primum ut fruar deſiderato conſpectu Filii DEI & cœleſtis eccleſiæ: deinde ut liberer ab immanibus & implacabilibus odiis Theologorum:* ita ipſe eaſdem cauſas ſæpè inter precandum uſurpare ſolitus fuit: cum videret ſe hoc fato natum: ut omnibus eorum telis, qui eſſent arguti cives ſine virtute, vita & fama ſua propoſita eſſet. If his Father and Mother had been Witneſſes of his great Trouble, their Grief for it wou'd have proceeded from a Cauſe very different from that which made *Iſaac* and *Rebecca* uneaſy. The latter were troubled to ſee how well their Son agreed with Strangers; but the former wou'd have been Afflicted at the War kindled between their Son and his Brethren, a War which grieved him no leſs than the Alliance of Strangers grieved *Eſau*'s Mother. 'Tis to be obſerved that the Church, who is a good Mother, bears her Grief a little better than *Rebecca*; ſhe is troubled to ſee her Children at War, and is ſo uſed to it, that one wou'd think it is become familiar to her. But what is moſt admirable is the Patience of the People; it may be ſaid that as in ſome Countries they patiently bear all manner of Taxes, they are every where no leſs tame with reſpect to Controverſies.

(G) *To uſe the Thoughts and Expreſſions of other Writers.*] In this reſpect he ſeem'd to be for a Community of Goods; he did not think that in doing ſo he was a Plagiary, and he was very willing that other Authors ſhou'd deal with him as he dealt with them. If you find any thing in my Books, ſaid he, that fits you, you may freely uſe it; every thing is at your Service. (f) *Cum Victorinus noſter diu multumque verſatus eſſet in lectione eorum Autorum, qui libros Ariſtotelis quaſi in ſuum ſuccum convertiſſent, illorum potiùs veſtigia voluit, ubi & quantum poſſet, conſectari, quàm novam per omnia cudere verſionem. Ac quidem ille vir & factus erat, & natus, ut ſi qua ei de re dicendum eſſet aut ſcribendum, & ipſi, quæ de eadem illa ipſa re alii etiam recentiores, & qui viverent adhuc, rectè tradidiſſent, in mentem venirent, non puderet hinc illum verba ab iis & ſententias mutuari. Non enim hoc dicebat plagium eſſe literarium, ſed ingenuam atque candidam doctis atque bonis viris dignam κοινωνίαν. Et faciat, inquit, aliquis idem, ſi ſe cum fructu hoc poſſe ſperat, de meis quoque.*

(H) *That he retracted at his Death.*] We are told that a Gentleman, who ſtudied at *Heidelberg*, met one day *Strigelius* in the Street, and told him, Sir, ſome Years ago you did not believe or teach the Calviniſtical Doctrines you teach now. I have been your Scholar at *Jena*, where you gave other Inſtructions to your Diſciples. *Strigelius* made no Anſwer, and went home, and finding himſelf very ill moſt humbly entreated the (g) Elector to be ſo kind as to come to him, giving him to underſtand that he wou'd impart to him ſome things relating to Salvation. The Prince went to him, being accompanied by Count he ſaw that their Sollicitations at the Court of the Emperor (*A*) Charles V. were inſignificant, he took a ſhorter and more Criminal Method, which was (*B*) to cauſe the pretended Uſurper to be aſſaſſinated. He engaged a Man in this Plot who put it in Execution; but the Succeſs of that Enterprize was more fatal to the Liberty of the Florentines, than the Diſcovery of the whole Conſpiracy wou'd have been. The Death of *Alexander de Medicis* made room for a Succeſſor better qualify'd than he was, to ſettle a new Sovereignty. He beat the Malecontents: *Strozzi* was made a Priſoner, and found no better Expedient than (*C*) to kill himſelf. He had married *Clarice de Medicis*, nearly

---

(i) *That is* Flacius Illyricus.

(k) *Id. ib. apud eundem pag.* 421.

(l) *Pſalm* 94. *v.* 1.

(m) *Melch. Adam. ib. pag.* 424.

(n) Ad hæc omnia acceſſerunt *minæ Theologorum & fulmina anathematum* adverſus ipſum in concionibus edita. *Id. ibid.*

(a) *Id. ib. pag.* 425.

(b) *The* 114 *of the* 6. *B. of the Æneid*, Invalidus vires ultra ſortemque ſenectæ. *Let us ſay of Strigelius*, Invalidus vires infra ſortemque juventæ.

(d) *Melch. Adam. ib. pag.* 427.

(f) *Jac. Mosanus præf. Nicomacheorum Ariſtotelis cum verſione, argumentis & ſcholiis Strigelii apud Thomaſium de Plagio literario n.* 194. *pag.* 82.

(g) *That is Frederick III.*

Count George de Hundſruſſen. What I have taught hitherto at *Heidelberg* in favour of the Calviniſts, ſaid *Strigelius* to him, does not well agree with the Word of God; but the Doctrines, which the Lutherans have profeſſed till now, are very true. The Elector having heard thoſe Words, went away in Anger. (*h*) *Strigelius* quickly expired with a Groan. This Story is taken from the Relation of a Journey to *Conſtantinople*, made by *Gerlach*, to whom *Andreas Carolus* (*i*) Abbot of *St. George*, refers the Reader, after having mentioned what you have juſt now read. He doubts whether one ſhou'd ſay that *Strigelius* had an unconſtant Soul, rather than call it an (*k*) unhappy one. He had call'd him before (*l*) a Weather Cock in point of Religion, and a Favourer of the Synergiſts and Zuinglians.

(*A*) *Their Sollicitations at the Court of the Emperor* Charles *V.*] There is ſomething about this in *Rabelais*'s Epiſtles. The Cardinals *Salviati* and *Rodolphus* went to *Naples* with our *Strozzi* in the Year 1536, to engage the Emperor to ſet up again a Republican Government in *Florence*: they did not ſucceed in it. "(*m*) I hear their Affairs "have not had the Succeſs they hoped for, and "that the Emperor told 'em peremptorily that "he had, at theirs, and the late Pope *Clement*'s "Requeſt, appointed *Alexander de Medicis*, "Duke of the Territories of *Florence* and *Piſa*, "which he never thought of, and had never "done, had it not been for them; that if he "ſhou'd depoſe him, it were acting the Part of "a Juggler, doing and undoing; and that there-"therefore they ſhou'd reſolve to Acknowledge "him for their Duke and Lord, and to obey him "as Vaſſals and Subjects ought to do. As for the "Complaints they made againſt the Duke; he "told 'em he would take Cognizance of 'em up-"on the Place". I ſhall add the following Words out of the firſt Letter. "(*n*) I hear that "'tis (*o*) about the Affair of *Florence*, and the "Difference between Duke *Alexander de Medicis* "and *Philip Strozzi*, whoſe Eſtate the Duke de-"ſign'd to confiſcate. It is no ſmall Eſtate, for "next to the *Fourques* of *Ausburg*, he is accounted "the richeſt Merchant in *Chriſtendom*. The "Duke had appointed ſome Men in that Town "to poyſon or kill him. Being inform'd of it "he obtain'd the Pope's Leave to bear Arms, "and he was commonly attended by thirty Sol-"diers well armed. The Duke of *Florence* be-"ing informed that *Strozzi* and thoſe Cardinals "were gone to the Emperor, and that he offered "him four hundred Thouſand Ducats, if he "wou'd appoint ſome Perſons to inquire into the "Duke's Tyranny and Wickedneſs, ſet out from "*Florence*, appointed Cardinal *Cibo* Governor in "his Abſence, and arrived in that Town (*p*) the "Day after *Chriſtmas*". In the third Letter *Rabelais* ſays (*q*) that thoſe Cardinals, and *Strozzi*, "with his Money, could not prevail with the "Emperor, tho' they offered in the Name of all "thoſe that were baniſh'd from *Florence*, to give "him a Million of Gold ready Money, to finiſh "*La Rocqua*, that was begun in *Florence*, and to "keep a good Garriſon in it in the Emperor's "Name, and to pay him a Hundred thouſand "Ducats every year, provided he wou'd get their "Eſtates and former Liberty reſtored to 'em". Afterwards the Author mentions the Honours that were done to the Duke of *Florence* by *Charles* V. and then he adds: "(*r*) From that time the ſaid "Cardinals, the Biſhop of *Xaintes*, and *Strozzi* "have continued their Sollicitations; the Em-"peror has at laſt refer'd the thing till he comes "to *Florence* . . . . And the Duke has proceeded "ſo cunningly in his Tyranny, that the Floren-"tines have proteſted to the Emperor *Nomine Communitatis*, that they deſire to have "no other Lord but him. 'Tis certain he has "ſeverely puniſhed the Exiles".

Take notice that the Author of the Notes upon *Rabelais*'s Epiſtles, will not believe (*a*) that *Philip Strozzi* was a Merchant. But it is hardly conceivable how at that time a Family of *Florence* could have got ſo much Wealth without Trading. However, if he was not a famous Banker, he deſerved to be accounted one. The Baron *de Forquevauls* gives him that Title. "*Philip Strozzi*, "*ſays he* (*b*), and *Bartholomew Valori*, better Ban-"kers than Captains, were forced at *Montemurlo*. He adds (*c*), That "he was prodigiouſly rich "for a Citizen. (*d*) *Peter Strozzi*, notwith-"ſtanding his Loſſes and Expences, had ſtill "four hundred thouſand Crowns in the Banks "of *Venice* and *Lyons*, that remain'd out of his "Father *Philip*'s Inheritance". (*e*) He went to *Francis* I. at the Camp of *Marolles*, with a Troop of two hundred Arquebuziers, which coſt him above fifty thouſand Crowns. This I find in *Brantome*, who adds: "(*f*) He was "vaſtly rich, and ſaved a great deal of Money "at *Venice*, where he kept for ſome time with "M. (*g*) *Strozzi*, his Son. That brave Lord "ſpent that vaſt Eſtate in the Service of our "Kings; for, as I have it from his Son, and "his Ancient Servants, whereas he was worth "above five hundred thouſand Crowns, when he "came into the Service of our Kings, he did "not leave twenty thouſand Crowns to his Son "when he died". Here is another Paſſage of *Brantome*, which fully confirms what I have quoted out of him. "(*h*) The King gave to M. "*Strozzi*, Son of the Mareſchal of *France*, fifty "thouſand Crowns as a Reward for the Office of "Colonel General of the Infantry, of which he "bought *Breſſuire* in *Poitou*; and this is all that "he and his Father left of ſo great an Eſtate he "brought into *France*: for I have heard many "People ſay, That when he came thither, he "had a Million of Gold in Bank, or in Goods "and Jewels, or in Money".

(*B*) *Which was to cauſe the pretended Uſurper to be Aſſaſſinated.*] I ſhou'd be very much to blame, ſhou'd I think that I can Comment upon this Text more elegantly, by uſing my own Words than by uſing *Balzac*'s Expreſſions; and therefore I ſhall make no Alteration in the Proof he affords me. "(*i*) *Philip Strozzi*, the Husband of *Clarice de* "*Medicis*, Siſter (*k*) to Pope *Leo*, not being "able to bear the Reign of Duke *Alexander de* "*Medicis*, exhorted *Laurence de Medicis*, his Couſin, "to Conſpire againſt the Life of Duke *Alexan-*"*der*, and to reſtore the Liberty of his Coun-"try. *Laurence* appeared willing to undertake "ſuch a dangerous Enterprize; but he was afraid "that his two Daughters wou'd run the hazard "of loſing their Honour, becauſe his Eſtate "wou'd be confiſcated. *Philip* told him that "ſuch a Fear ſhou'd not hinder him, and aſſured "him that whatever the Succeſs of his Enter-"prize might be, he wou'd Marry two of his "Sons to his two Daughters. Which he did, "for *Laurence* having made his eſcape after "Duke *Alexander*'s Murther, without reaping "any Advantage from it, *Philip* religiouſly per-"formed his Promiſe, and gave *Laodamia de Medicis* to *Peter Strozzi*, who was ſince Mareſchal "of *France*, and *Magdalen* to *Robert Strozzi*, "who lately (*l*) died at *Rome*."

(*C*) *No other Expedient than to kill himſelf.*] I ſhall uſe ſtill *Balzac*'s Words. "(*m*) The ſame "*Philip*

(*h*) Mox autem ægrotans Victorinus animam (inconſtantem dicam, an infelicem?) gemebundus exhalavit. *Andr. Carolus, memorab. eccleſiaſt. ſeculi* xvii. *pag.* 49.

(*i*) *Andr. Carolus ib.*

(*k*) *It ſeems in this place that he means a damned Soul.*

(*l*) Homo varius & verſipellis cum Synergiſtis, cum Zuinglianis addictus. *Id. ibid. pag.* 34.

(*m*) *Rabelais, Letter* 3. *pag.* 29.

(*n*) *Idem pag.* 8. & 9.

(*o*) *That* , *that the Cardinals* Salviati *and* Rodolph *were ne to the Court of* Charles *V.* Naples.

(*p*) *That* , *at* ome.

(*q*) *Rabelais ibid. pag.* 55.

(*r*) *Id. ib. pag.* 56.

(*a*) *Obſervat. ſur les epitres de Rabelais, pag.* 61.

(*b*) *Francis de Pavie, Baron de Forquevauls, Vies de pluſieurs grands Capitaines pag.* 379.

(*c*) *Id. ib. pag.* 382.

(*d*) *Ibid. pag.* 383.

(*e*) *Brantome, Capitaines etrangers, tom.* 2. *pag.* 287.

(*f*) *Brantome ibid, pag.* 289.

(*g*) Philip Strozzi, *Colonel General of the French Infantry. See* Moreri, *and Father* Anſelm, *whom he tranſcribes See alſo the following Article.*

(*h*) *Idem Brantome Memoir. des Capit. Francois tom.* 4. *p. m.* 311, 312.

(*i*) *Balzac Entretien* 34. *ch.* 6. *p. m.* 330.

(*k*) Balzac *ſhou'd have ſaid Niece.*

(*l*) *When* Balzac *writ this,* Robert *cou'd not but have been dead a long time.*

(*m*) *Balzac ibid. pag.* 331, 332.

ly related to *Leo* X. by whom he had many Children, and among others *Peter Strozzi*, Mareſchal of *France*, mentioned in *Moreri's* Dictionary. 'Tis not true that the Nun, who made ſome *Latin* Hymns, was that Mareſchal's (*D*) Siſter.

STROZZI (*Philip*) Grandſon † of the foregoing. You'll find in *Moreri* that he was born at *Venice* in 1541; *and that he was brought into* France *at Seven Years of Age. He was* bred up with King* Francis *II. who was then Dauphin*, and *began to bear Arms in* Piedmont, *under Mareſchal* de Briſſac. A Sally of Youth moved him to go into *Piedmont*, without telling his Father of it. We ſhall ſee (*A*) the Par-

"*Philip* after the Death of Duke *Alexander* oppoſed *Coſmo*, his Succeſſor, firſt Great Duke of "*Florence*. But having loſt the Battle of *Marone*, near *Florence*, he was made Priſoner; and "believing that his Enemy wou'd poiſon him or "put him to an ignominious Death, reſolved to "kill himſelf. Before he executed that ſtrange "Reſolution, he made his Will, the Original "whereof I have ſeen at *Rome*, among the Papers of the late Signior *Pompey Frangipane*, in "which among other things, that Man, "whom the Ancients wou'd have adored, orders and entreats his Children to dig up his "Bones out of the Place where they ſhall lie in "*Florence*, and to get 'em tranſported to *Venice*, "that ſince he cou'd not be ſo happy as to die in "a Free City, he may enjoy that Bleſſing after "his Death, and his Aſhes may reſt in Peace "out of the Conqueror's Domination. Afterwards he engrav'd upon the Mantle-Piece of "the Chimney with the very ſame Point of the "Dagger wherewith he killed himſelf, this "Verſe of *Virgil*,

"*Exoriare aliquis noſtris ex oſſibus ultor.*

"Which was faithfully executed by his Children, "who came into *France* to ſerve the King againſt "the Emperor *Charles* V. who had Founded the "Domination of the *Medicis* at *Florence*. I muſt "not forget that the ſame *Philip Strozzi*, at the "Beginning of his Will, expreſſes a great Confidence in God's Mercy, hoping he will forgive "him for killing himſelf, ſince he did it like a "Man of Honour to maintain his Liberty; being "of Opinion that when a Free Man has loſt it "he may lawfully die. But the Goſpel is contrary to ſuch an Opinion, and New *Rome* calls "Deſpair what Old *Rome* call'd Greatneſs of "Soul. She Excommunicates now thoſe whom "ſhe formerly Deified."

Note, (*n*) That one of the Reaſons that mov'd *Strozzi* to kill himſelf was the Fear of expoſing his Friends to great Dangers by what he ſhou'd confeſs againſt his Will upon the Rack; which appears from a Paper that was found in his Chamber, wherein he "(*o*) upbraided Cardinal (*p*) "*Cibo*, a Friend and a Truſty Counſellor to the "Duke, with his great Cruelty, *and exhorted him* "to fill himſelf with the Blood he had ſo much "thirſted after. As for me, *added he*, ſince I "have not been able to help my Friends in my "Life-time, I will do 'em no Prejudice after my "Death . . . . A remarkable Inſtance of Humin Miſery, *ſays the Baron de Forquevauls*, and "of the Uncertainty of the things of this World! "*Philip Strozzi*, who few Months before was as "much eſteem'd and honour'd as any Man in "*Italy*, not only for his Riches, that were prodigious for a Citizen, and for the Antiquity of "his Family, which had continued in Honour "for ſeveral Hundred Years, but alſo for his "agreeable Converſation, Magnificence and Liberality, for his (*q*) Learning and his great "Knowledge and Experience of the World, "finds himſelf a Captive in that very Town "whoſe Liberty he deſign'd to preſerve, and is "obliged to kill himſelf with his own Hands to "avoid the Cruelty of his ungrateful Citizens."

(*D*) *That the Nun, who made ſome* Latin *Hymns, was that Mareſchal's Siſter.*] *Brantome*, who ſays ſo, is miſtaken. "He had a Siſter, *ſays he* (*r*), "who was a Nun, and an Abbeſs in *Italy*, a "very honeſt Lady, and very well skill'd in Divine and Human Learning, eſpecially in *Latin* "Poetry. She made many fine Hymns and ſpiritual Canticles in *Latin* Verſe, which have been "ſung in the Churches of *Italy* with great "Admiration and Devotion: Nay, I have heard "ſay that they are ſung ſtill in ſome Churches." *Colomies* knew not this Miſtake of *Brantome*: He quotes him (*ſ*) to confirm what he had quoted out of *Thuanus* in praiſe of *Laurentia Strozzi*, a Dominican Nun, who died in 1591, aged 77 Years, and whoſe Hymns were printed at *Paris* ten Years after (*t*). That Nun was not Siſter to *Peter Strozzi*, Mareſchal of *France*, as *Colomies* thought upon *Brantome's* Credit: She was Siſter to *Cyriacus Strozzi*, (*v*) Profeſſor of Philoſophy and of the *Greek* Tongue at *Florence*, and then Profeſſor at *Bologna*, and at laſt at *Piſa*, Son of *Zachary Strozzi*, deſcended from the ſame Anceſtors with our *Philip*. There is more Reaſon to ſay that Signior *Flaminio's* Wife (*w*) was Siſter to *Peter Strozzi*, Mareſchal of *France*. *Brantome* ſpeaks of her thus. "She had alſo another "Siſter, *Signora Magdalena Strozzi*, an able, ingenious and very beautiful Woman, whom I "ſaw at *Rome* in my younger Years. She had "Married Signor *Flaminio*, Count *d'Anguilare*, who "commanded ſome Gallies with the Prior of "*Capua*, his Brother-in-Law. That Count was "the Son of that brave Count *d'Anguilare*, who "was killed in the Service of King *Francis* "the Firſt." This *Magdalen* might very well be the ſame that is mentioned in the *Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme*, on occaſion of a Steel-Box, containing among other Relicks our Saviour's Prepuce. "(*a*) A Devout Lady, call'd *Magdalen* "(*b*) *Strotia*, was commiſſioned to unfold that precious Treaſure, and put it in order. When "ſhe came to the little Bag, wherein the Prepuce was, ſhe went about to unty the String of "the Bag; but her Fingers grew ſtiff and without motion at three ſeveral times: This was "look'd upon us a Miracle; and another Perſon "was appointed to open the Bag, *viz.* *Clarice*, "Daughter of Madam *Strotia*, who was a Virgin "and young enough to be ſure of her Virginity. "For none but a Virgin cou'd touch that Prepuce". Read the Sequel of this Paſſage in the Original; it is a ſharp Satyr and a pleaſant Ridicule upon many other Things, beſides the Imprudence of thoſe who write ſo many Chimerical things about Relicks.

(*A*) *The Particulars of that mad Prank*,] "(*c*) "Being but a Boy, and bred up with the young King "*Francis* II. who was then Dauphin, and hearing of the noble War that was made in *Piedmont*, he ſtole away only with two Horſes, and "a *Milan* Arquebuſe at his Saddle-Bow, and "went thither, having for his Guide that eſpecial Rogue *John d'eſt*, a German, who was lately "hang'd at *Blois*. . . . . That Fellow adviſed "him to ſteal ſome Silver Baſons, Cups and "Ewers from his Mother, in order to make his "Journey. When the Mareſchal his Father came "to know this, and what Reaſon had mov'd him "to it, he ſaid, That if it had been for ſomething "elſe, and not for ſuch a glorious Deſign as that "of going to the War, he wou'd have hang'd "him, but that he forgave him, and wou'd do ſo "for the time to come, if he took more from "him, provided it were upon ſuch a noble Account. M. *Strozzi* told me ſo himſelf. Afterwards when he ſaw him, tho' he was naturally very ſevere, he laughed at it before his Mother, who deſired he ſhou'd be puniſhed for "it: however he gave him a ſevere Reprimand".

(*B*) The

---

† *He was the Son of* Peter Strozzi *Mareſchal of* France.

* Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grans Officiers pag.* 386.

(*n*) *See the Baron de* Forquevauls, *p.* 281.

(*o*) *Id. p.* 282.

(*p*) *It ſhou'd be* Cibo.

(*q*) *'Tis ſaid that he was a Man of Learning.* Fortes non ſunt, qui alicujus deſiderii potiundi ſpe privati, aut calamitate oppreſſi, manus ſibi intulerunt, qualis paucis annis ante Philippus Stroſſius, opibus florens, literis non ineruditus cætera felix, ſi ſua ſorte contentus, partibus adverſis non faviſſet. *Rorarius, quod animalia bruta ratione utantur melius homine, pag.* 15.

(*r*) *Brantome Capit. etrangers. tom.* 2. *p.* 294.

(*ſ*) *Colomiés, Bibliotheque choiſie, pag.* 207.

(*t*) *See an Encomium upon that Nun in* Hilarion de Coſte, *tom.* 2. *pag.* 57. *& ſeq.*

(*v*) *See her Encomium among thoſe of Papyrius* Maſſo. *tom.* 2. *p.* 222. *& ſeq. See alſo Mr.* Teiſſier *Addit. aux eloges tirez de Mr.* de Thou, *tom.* 1. *p.* 275. *& t.* 2. *p.* 188. *edit.* 1696

(*w*) *Father* Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grans Officiers pag.* 387. *calls him* Flaminio d'Affaita.

(*a*) *Jurieu, Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme, tom.* 2. *p.* 227. *He quotes* Tolet. in ſecundum Luc. poſt. annotat. 31.

(*b*) *It ſhou'd be* Strozzi.

(*c*) *Brantome Memoir. des Capitaines* François *tom.* 4. *p. m.* 353.

Particulars of that mad Prank, and the Care that was taken of (*B*) his Studies. He was a very Brave Man, and expreſt upon many occaſions * the utmoſt Intrepidity. He was made ‡ Colonel General of the Infantry, after the Deceaſe of M. *Dandelot*, in the year 1569. 'Twas he who † *did ſo well arm* the Infantry, and *brought in the uſe of large bor'd Arquebuſes*. He reſign'd that Office when they (*C*) gave him the Command of the Army that was ſent to the *Tercera* Iſles, to attempt the Re-eſtabliſhment of *Dom Antonio*, King of *Portugal*. That Expedition proved very unfortunate; he (*D*) loſt his Life in it the 26th of *July* 1582, and was uſed by the Enemies as an infamous (*E*) Pirate: many Gentlemen

(*B*) *The Care that was taken of his Studies.*] “(*d*) His Father took great care of his Education, “and particularly that he ſhould be inſtructed in “good Learning; he himſelf had made a great “Proficiency in it; his Son cou'd not come near “it; however he had Learning enough. I have “heard him ſay that one day his Father asked “him what he had done that Morning. He told “him that he had rid, plaid at Tennis, and then “breakfaſted. Ah! unhappy young Man, ſaid “his Father, muſt you feed the Body before you “feed the Soul! Do ſo no more; firſt of all fill “your Mind with good Reading and Study, and “then deal with your Body as you think fit. “Such were the wiſe Precepts which that Father “gave to his Son, who made a good uſe of 'em; “for he had as much Knowledge as Valour, tho' “I believe that ever ſince he left his Books to “betake himſelf to the War, he did not beſtow “half an Hour upon Reading”.

(*C*) *He reſign'd that Office, when they gave him the Command of the Army.*] *Varillas* is miſtaken as to the Circumſtances of this Fact. I ſhall make it appear when I have ſet down *Brantome*'s words. “(*e*) Not long before he undertook that Voyage “by the Queen's Order, he was deſired to lay “down his Office of Colonel, being to'd that he “cou'd not be General of that Army, and Colonel “in *France*. Such a Propoſal was unacceptable “to him, and he was unwilling to comply “with it. However, becauſe the King had a “mind to raiſe M. *d'Epernon*, and to gratify him “with that Poſt, of which he was more Ambitious “than of any other, M. *Strozzi* was forced “to reſign it, to his great Grief; For I know “what he told me then: He added, that if he “did not die in the Enterprize, he wou'd be preferr'd “to a greater Poſt than that was, and “that none ſhou'd ever dare to deprive him of “it. The King gave him fifty thouſand Crowns “as a Reward, wherewith he purchaſed *Breſſuire* “in *Poitou*”. It appears from the laſt Words of this Paſſage, that *Varillas* ſhou'd not have ſaid that (*f*) *Philip Strozzi*, going to the *Tercera* Iſles, “had nothing to loſe in *France*, ſince he was ſo “far from having made any Purchaſe in it, “that he had ſpent the three Millions his Grandfather “had left”. That Hiſtorian is the more inexcuſable, becauſe he quotes *Brantome*'s Encomium upon *Philip Strozzi*. Let's ſee his other Miſtakes. “(*g*) The Court had lately done *Strozzi* “the greateſt Injury he cou'd receive, for King “*Henry* III. had depriv'd him without a Cauſe, “and even without a Pretence, of his Office of “Colonel of the French Infantry, to beſtow it “upon the Duke *d'Epernon*; and becauſe all thoſe “that are out of Favour grow contemptible, tho' “their Merit be never ſo great, 'twas not to “be thought that the French on board the “Queen Mother's Fleet, wou'd have a ſufficient “Eſteem for the General ſhe had given 'em, ſince “they knew that the Court made ſo little Account “of him, that they had taken from him “the moſt important Poſt in the Army, without “making him any amends; which had never “been practiſed in the foregoing Reigns, nor in “that of *Henry* III. before the prodigious Fortune “of the Duke *d'Epernon*”. There are two things in this Paſſage, the Falſity whereof appears from the Words of *Brantome*, above quoted. 'Tis not true that *Strozzi* was deprived of his Office of Colonel *without* any *Pretence, and without making him any Amends*. I am contented with this Criticiſm, though I might proceed farther in my Obſervations againſt *Varillas*; for the Hiſtory of the French Monarchy may doubtleſs afford ſome Examples of what he affirms to have never been practiſed.

(*D*) *That Expedition proved unfortunate; he loſt his Life in it.*] The Marqueſs *de Sainte Croix*, who commanded the Spaniſh Fleet, obtain'd a compleat Victory over the French; but he caſt a blot upon his Victory, by his cruel Uſage of the vanquiſh'd. A particular Account of his Cruelty may be ſeen in a (*h*) Book of *Varillas*, out of which I ſhall only take what concerns our *Strozzi*. He was forced (*i*) to ſurrender, after he had made a brave Defence: “(*k*) *Binvile*, a Gentleman “of *Picardy*, who wrote fifty years after “three Volumes *des Veritez Francoiſes* (*l*) in Cardinal “*de Richelieu*'s Vindication, with more “Eloquence and Neatneſs than any other Apologiſt “of that firſt Miniſter, relates from the Depoſition “of the French, who made their eſcape “from the Expedition of the *Tercera* Iſles, that “*Strozzi* was wounded above his Knee with the “Shot of an Arquebuſs, ſo that he cou'd not “ſtand; and that he was carried in that condition “to the Marqueſs *de Sainte Croix*, who turn'd “his Head another way with Diſdain, that he “might not ſee him; that being told he was the “General of the French Fleet he ordered him to “be removed, becauſe he did but foul and poyſon “his Ship; that a Spaniſh Soldier, in Obedience “to the Marqueſs, made an end of *Strozzi*, “by giving him two Stabs, and then they “threw him into the Sea. Other Relations don't “agree about theſe Particulars; and tho' they own “that *Strozzi* had been wounded in the Fight, “ſo that he cou'd not have recover'd, and yet “that the Marqueſs *de Sainte Croix* order'd they “ſhou'd make an end of him; they add, that he “kept his Corps to have it hanged with the other “Priſoners, on whom he deſign'd to inflict that “Puniſhment, under pretence that they were “Men whom no body wou'd own, who came to “make War with *Spain* in the *Tercera* Iſles, tho' “that Monarchy was at Peace with that of *France*.” *Varillas* ſhou'd not have quoted *Binvile*, for that Author ſays nothing in particular about *Strozzi*: he only ſays (*a*) that the Marqueſs *de Sainte Croix* us'd him barbarouſly; and of all the Facts he relates thereupon, there's none he grounds upon the Teſtimony of the French, who return'd from the *Tercera* Iſlands. *Varillas* ſhould have quoted *Brantome*, who expreſſes himſelf thus: (*b*) When M. *Strozzi* “ſaw the Army Commanded “by the Marquis *de Sainte Croix* making towards “him, he was ſo deſirous of preventing “him, that his Ship being heavy, and a bad “Sailer, he removed into a lighter Ship, on “which was M. *de Beaumont*, Lieutenant to M. “*de Briſſac*, whoſe Governor he had been, and “without any further delay came up to the Admiral, “and they fought a long while hand to “hand; but being wounded in the Thigh, near “the Knee, with a Musket-ſhot, his Men being “diſcouraged, left off Fighting: Whereupon “the Spaniards eaſily got in, and carried him to “the Marqueſs *de Sainte Croix*, who ſeeing what a “miſerable Condition he was in, ſaid, he wou'd “but hinder the Ship, and order'd they ſhou'd “make an end of him; which was done by giving “him two Stabs, and then they threw him into “the Sea”. See the Margin (†).

(*E*) *He was uſed as an infamous Pirate: many Gentlemen, who had followed him, were delivered up to the Executioner as Robbers on the Sea.*] “(*c*) “As ſoon as the Marqueſs *de Sainte Croix* landed “in the Iſland of St. *Michael*, he cauſed about “three

* See Brantome in the *Encomium upon Strozzi, in the 4th Volume of his Memoirs.*

‡ Anſelme *ibid. See alſo* Brantome *ibid. pag.* 270.

† Brant. *ib. p.* 285.

(*d*) *Id. ib. pag.* 304.

(*e*) *Id. ib. pag.* 311.

(*f*) *Varillas, Hiſt. de Henry III. Book* 6. *pag. m.* 134.

(*g*) *Id. ib. pag.* 135.

(*h*) *The Hiſtory of* Henry III

(*i*) *Varill. ibid. pag.* 145.

(*k*) *Id ib. pag.* 146.

(*l*) Moreri *upon the word* Barthelemi (Charles) *mentions the Author of that Book; he Styles him* Sieur de Bienville.

(*a*) *Veritez Francoiſes* 2. *part. pag.* 403.

(*b*) *Brant. ubi ſupra* 307.

(†) *You'll find in* d'Aubigné *Hiſt. univ. tom.* 2. *Book* 5. *ch.* 21. *pag* 1160. *an Account very different from this.*

(*c*) *Varillas ibid. pag.* 147.

men, who had followed him, were delivered up to the Executioner, like so many Robbers on the Sea. He was † *extremely severe*; which appeared when he ordered *eight hundred Women of Pleasure, who followed the Camp, to be thrown into the River* Loire. His Free Discourse about Religion occasioned a Belief that he was little persuaded of the Truth of (F) Christianity; but *Brantome* affirms he was wrong'd in that respect, and that he was otherwise * *a very honest Man*. This Testimony proceeding from a Man, who acknowledges on the other hand ‡ that *Strozzi* plaid him *a Trick of a most ungrateful Friend*, and that he had the *Reputation of being neither a bad Enemy nor a good Friend*, is of great Weight: for Men offended upon such a nice Account, don't use to conceal the other Faults that are known to them, and don't say that this was the ‖ only one. 'Tis affirm'd that he gave great Credit to Judicial Astrology, (G) and that it proved very prejudicial to him in his Expedition.

STURMIUS (*James*) was born at *Strasburg* (*A*) in the Year 1489, of one

" three Hundred French Prisoners, among whom " there were fifty two Gentlemen, to be brought " into the publick Place call'd (*d*) *Villa Franca*. " They were exposed by his Order upon Scaffolds " to the publick View, or rather to be laugh'd " at by the People; and then they were Sentenced to be Hang'd; as being Enemies of the " publick Peace, and Favourers of Rebels and Pirates, who made bold to come from *France* in a " body, to serve Dom *Antonio* against *Philip* II. " King of *Spain*, lawful Heir of *Portugal*, notwithstanding the Peace between the Spaniards " and the French." *Thuanus*'s Words are more energetical. (*e*) *Tum per tubicinem captivis sisti jussis, ex numero procerum* XXVIII *numerati sunt, ex nobilitate circiter L.; ex omni numero* CCC, *quos omneis ad mortem damnavit*, (Santacrucius) *publicato elogio, quod pacem inter Christianissimum & Catholicum reges juratam violassent; Antonio Crati Priori ad classem Indicam intercipiendam insidias struenti operam navassent; insulas R. Catholici, uti jam ad S. Michaelis insulam fecerant, prædaturi venissent; conserta pugna Catholici classem oppugnassent. Proinde tanquam publicæ tranquillitatis ac commercii perturbatores erga majestatem Catholicam perduelles ac piratæ infames utriusque Regis bono, sic Santacrucii sententia ferebat, criminalium causarum judici capite plectendi traduntur.* 'Tis affirm'd in some Relations that the Marquess having caused *Strozzi* to be put to Death, (*f*) *kept his Corps, to have it hang'd with the other Prisoners, on whom he intended to inflict such a Punishment. Henry* III. had no satisfaction given him for that bloody Affront, which ought to be reckon'd one of the most shameful Passages of his Reign. The Historian (*g*) *Contestagio . . . tho' he was a Pensionary of* Spain . . . . *owns that* Strozzi *acted in* Henry *the Third's Name, and had a Patent for the Generalship of that Army.* The Author, from whom I have these Words, adds, that the Nobility and the Soldiers who followed *Strozzi*, *had engaged in that Journey by the most Christian King's special Command*; and that *his Majesty had declared to Pope* Gregory *XIII. by his Ambassador, and to* Philip *II. by M* de Saint Goart, *afterwards Marquess* de Pisany, *that he owned that Sea Army, as being obliged by Ancient Treaties to Protect the Kingdom of* Portugal. It was therefore an inexcusable Baseness to express no Resentment for such a Breach of the Laws of War, and such an ignominious Punishment inflicted upon the French Prisoners, as if they had been Pirates and Men whom no body wou'd own. Those who blame that Prince for giving too great a Power to his Favourites, do him no Injustice; but they shou'd blame him much more for being so weak as to approve all the Fancies of his Mother, an Ambitious Woman, who pretended to the Crown of *Portugal* out of an intolerable Vanity. She was one of those, who laid a Claim to that Kingdom, (*h*) and made no scruple to produce ridiculous and chimerical Pretensions, that the World might think her Ancestors had been more Illustrious than 'twas reported. Having made such a Step out of meer Vanity, she proceeded to warlike Preparations in order to conquer *Portugal*; she sent a Fleet into the *Tercera* Islands, which had the ill Success I have mentioned; she had the confusion to see that those who acted in her Name, and her Son's Authority, were used like Pirates; and *France* left such an ignominious Affront unpunished. That Queen, who pretended to be so great a Politician, had wrong Notions of Things. Cou'd any thing be more imprudent and impertinent than to engage in such a War, when the Kingdom was full of Factions, and laboured under great Distempers, the curing of which shou'd have been the principal Care of the Court.

REFLECTION upon the Conduct of *Catherine de Medicis*

(*F*) *His free Discourse about Religion occasioned a Belief that he was little persuaded . . . . but* Brantome *affirms, he was wrong'd in that Respect, and that he was otherwise a very honest Man.*] These last Words are *Brantome*'s: here follows what he adds. " (*i*) Most People look'd upon him as a Man " who had little Religion; they might think so " if they pleased, but they never sounded the " Bottom of his Soul. 'Tis true he was no Bigot, no Hypocrite, and no Devourer of Crucifixes, and that he little minded Masses and " Sermons; but then he believed what ought to " be believed; and besides he wou'd not have " wronged any body for any thing in the World. " Indeed when he was in a merry Mood, he " wou'd sometimes laugh at Purgatory and Hell; " but no stress shou'd have been laid upon it; for " he did certainly believe Hell Torments, tho' " he laugh'd at the great Dragon represented by " Painters. To conclude, he said many things, " which he might as well have let alone; but " that was more out of Mirth than out of any " ill Design. I have been familiarly conversant " with him about thirty Years, and I may say, " he was no impious Man". 'Tis in vain for *Brantome* to palliate the thing; what he says is sufficient to shew that *Strozzi* had infinitely more Virtue than Religion.

(*G*) *Great Credit to judicial Astrology, and that it proved very prejudicial to him.*] Read these words of *Varillas*. " (*k*) The French plundered and " burnt the Town of *Aguna*, and caused such a " consternation through the whole Isle of Saint " *Michael*, that they wou'd have made themselves Masters of it on the same day, if they " had pursued their Victory; but it was *Strozzi*'s " Fault as well as the Queen Mother's, his near " Relation, to be too much addicted to Judicial " Astrology. He was persuaded that there were " fortunate and unfortunate Days for him, and " he had made a kind of a Calendar, which " he observed with all possible exactness. The " Day on which he had been fighting was mark'd " in it with a black Spot; which made a greater Impression upon his Mind than the Victory " he had obtain'd. He fancied that if he pursued " it, he shou'd fall into the Precipice his ill Fate " had prepared for him; and that his ill Fortune " began to favour him, the better to bring him to " it. This was sufficient to stop him, tho' the Circumstances were so favourable, that the Citizens of the two chief Towns of the Isle of " St. *Michael*, had deserted them, and fled to the " Mountains, where they hoped to be more " safe." There's no body, whom it more concerns to be free from such Superstitions, than the General of an Army.

(*A*) *Was born at* Strasburg *in the Year* 1489.] *Melchior Adam* (*b*) places his Birth in the Year 1490; but he mentions his Epitaph (*c*) wherein it one of the moſt Noble Families of that Town, and made himſelf Illuſtrious by the Services he did to his Country. He exerciſed the moſt conſiderable Offices with great Capacity and Probity, and gloriouſly performed ſeveral Deputations both in the Diets of the Empire, and at the Courts of *Vienna* and *England*. He very much (*B*) contributed to the Alteration that was made in Religion at *Straſburg* in the year 1528, and to the Erection of the College that was open'd † ten years after, and to *Sleidan*'s Hiſtory. He died at *Straſburg* the 30th of *October* 1553 ‡. He had been ſome years without receiving the Sacrament, being offended at the Diſputes of Divines about the Senſe of theſe Words, *This is my Body*. See the Remark *F* in the following Article.

---

† *Varillas, Hist. de Henry III l. 6. pag. m.* 149.

* *Brant. ubi supra pag.* 305.

‡ *Id. ib. pag.* 310.

‖ *As honest a Man as ever came from* Florence: *He had but one Fault; he was the coldest Friend that ever was seen.* Id. ibid. pag. 311.

(*d*) Varillas *shou'd have said* to the publick Place of *VillaFranca*: Villa Franca *is a Town, and not the name of the publick Place of a Town.*

(*e*) *Thuanus lib.* 75. *p. m.* 422, 423.

(*f*) *Varillas ibid. pag* 146. *See also* Thuanus, *ibid. pag.* 423.

(*g*) *Veritez Françoises* 2. *part. p.* 405.

(*h*) *See* Mezerai *in the 5th. Vol. of his* Abregé chronologique p.m. 238.

(*i*) *Id. ib. pag.*

(*k*) *Varillas ibid. pag.* 137.

(*b*) *Melch. Adam. ubi infra pag.* 91.

(*c*) *Ibid. pag.*

STURMIUS (*John*) was born at *Sleida* in *Eifel* ß near *Cologne* * the firſt of *October* 1507. He Studied firſt in his Native Country, with the Sons of Count *de Manderſcheid*, whoſe Receiver his Father was. Afterwards he ſtudied at *Liege* in St. *Jerom*'s College, and then he went to *Louvain* in 1524, where he ſpent five years, three in being Inſtructed and two in Inſtructing others; and his School-Fellows were *John Sleidan*, *Gonthier Andernac*, *Chriſtopher Montius*, *Bartholomew Latomus*, *Andrew Veſalius*, *James Omphalius*, and ſome others, who became very Famous, and had a great Affection for him. He ſet up a Printing-Houſe with *Rudger Reſcius*, Greek-Profeſſor, and printed ſome Greek Authors, beginning with *Homer*, and ſoon after he carried thoſe Editions to *Paris* in 1529 †. What *Melchior Adam* ſays, is not true, that he was familiarly (*C*) acquainted with *Conrad Goclenius* at *Louvain*. He was very much eſteem'd at *Paris*, where he read publick Lectures upon *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, and upon Logick. He alſo married there, and kept many Boarders; but becauſe he liked the new Opinions, as they were call'd, he found himſelf in Danger more than once, which doubtleſs was the Reaſon why he removed and went to *Straſburg* in 1537, to fill up the Place the Magiſtrates offer'd him. The year

† *See the Remark D in the following Article.*

‡ *Taken from* Melchior Adam *in vita Juriſc. pag.* 91. & *ſeq.*

ß *See his Epiſtle Dedicatory in the 2d. Volum of Cicero's Orations.*

* *Melch. Adam. in vit. Philoſoph. pag.* 342.

† *Id. ib.*

---

it is placed in the Year 1489. I rather chuſe to follow the Epitaph, then the Narrative of that Writer. 'Tis ſaid in the Supplement to *Moreri*'s Dictionary, that our *James Sturmius was born at* Sleida, *near* Cologne, *according to* Verheiden. This is taken from M. *Teiſſier* (*d*); but 'tis certain *Verheiden* does not ſay ſo, for he ſpeaks of *John Sturmius*, and not of *James*. What M. *Teiſſier* adds, That *Sturmius, after he had begun his Studies at* Liege, *went on with them at* Paris, and that he *had the Direction* of the Univerſity of *Straſburg, in the Quality of Rector*, is a Conſequence of his firſt Miſtake, *viz.* of his ſuppoſing that *Verheiden* ſpeaks of *James Sturmius*. What follows is not better. (*e*) *He died, not* 80 *years Old, as* Verheiden *ſays, but in his Climacterical year. Verheiden* does not deſerve ſuch a Cenſure; he (*f*) only ſays that *John Sturmius* died being above 80 years old, which is true. *Thuanus* is miſtaken when he ſays that *James Sturmius* died (*g*) *in his Climacterical year.* His Epitaph (*h*) imports, that he died in his 64th year. Note, that *Pantaleon* (*i*), who quotes *Sleidan*, tells us, that *James Sturmius* departed this Life in his Climacterical year 63. *Sleidan* does not ſay ſo; on the contrary he obſerves that *Sturmius* lived above 63 years. I ſhall ſet down the whole Paſſage, becauſe it contains a juſt Encomium upon the Perſon, who makes the Subject of this Article. (*k*) *Octobris die penultimo, Jacobus Sturmius, vir longè & prudentiſſimus & integerrimus, ac planè decus nobilitatis Germanicæ, propter eximias animi dotes & doctrinam inſignem, è vita decedit Argentorati, cùm ex febri quartana per tempus bimeſtre decubuiſſet. Ætatis annum exceſſerat tertium & ſexageſimum.* See how dangerous it is to truſt to Quotations, that have not been compared with the Original.

(*B*) *He very much contributed .... to* Sleidan'*s Hiſtory.*] That Hiſtorian acknowledges it. (*l*) *Hiſtoriam nihil magis decet quàm veritas atque candor. Ego certè, ne quid in ea parte poſſet in me deſiderari, diligenter incubui: nec enim ex vano quicquam hauſi, vel auditione levi, ſed ſcribendi materiam mihi ſuppeditarunt acta, quæ ſtudioſè collegi, de quorum fide nemo dubitare poſſit: Intervenit etiam verè nobilis & præclari viri, Jacobi Sturmii, ſubſidium & opera, qui per annos amplius triginta verſatus in publicis & arduis negociis, maxima cum laude, quum ſua me non dedignaretur amicitia, quæ fuit ipſius humanitas, dubitantem & hærentem aliquando in vadis atque ſcopulis, peritus ipſe gubernator, ſubinde reduxit in viam æquabilem minimeque ſalebroſam, & majorem operis partem, ante morbum, quo ſublatus interiit, meo rogatu perlegit, & quorum oportuit, diligenter admonuit.*

(*C*) *Not true that he was familiarly acquainted with* Conrad Goclenius.] *Melchior Adam* expreſſes himſelf thus: (*m*) *Ibidem* (Lovanii) *cum familiariter verſaretur cum* Rudgero Reſcio, & Conrado Goclenio, *hominibus literatiſſimis, utriuſque linguæ Græcæ & Latinæ Lovanii tum Profeſſoribus*, &c. Theſe Words are not clear enough: the plain Meaning of 'em ſeems to be that *Conrad Goclenius* was Profeſſor of the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues, as well as *Rudgerus Reſcius*; but it was not ſo. *Goclenius* was only Profeſſor of the *Latin* Tongue, and *Reſcius* of the *Greek*. The Words I am going to quote out of *John Sturmius* will inform us of this Diſtinction, and, beſides, that he applied himſelf to *Reſcius*, who had fallen out with *Goclenius*, and was little acquainted with the latter. *Memini ego, Hermanne princeps Illuſtriſſime*, So *Sturmius* ſpeaks to the Archbiſhop of *Cologne* in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the 2d Volume of *Cicero*'s Orations, *cum Lovanii ante annos quindecim eſſem, præclaram de Comite Schauemburgio, quem tu tibi adjutorem atque ſucceſſorem cooptaſti, ſpem nobis omnibus datam eſſe. Audivit ille tum quotidie in Latina lingua doctorem, diſertum hominem Conradum Goclenium: cum ego Rutgeri Reſcii propter græcas literas, quas ille omnium optime tradebat, eſſem ſtudioſus: ob eamque cauſſam minus ego Conrado familiaris qui a Rutgero diſſentiebat. Sed de Schauemburgio conſentientes noſtri ſenſus erant, maximum aliquando ornamentum atque lumen in ſua Repub. futurum, ſi eum curſum ſtudiorum, in quo tum erat, poſſet conficere.* I have ſaid more than once that 'tis a Fault not to date Epiſtles Dedicatory and Prefaces, and I have been confirm'd in this Opinion as I was tranſcribing this Paſſage of *Sturmius*; for becauſe 'tis not ſaid in my Edition, which is that of *Straſburg, apud Joſiam Ribelium* 1558, whether it be the ſecond or the third, &c. I ſhou'd have thought that it is the firſt, and conſequently that *Sturmius* dedicated it in the year 1558: but had I drawn ſuch a Conſequence, I had been miſtaken in ſeveral things; I had falſely believed that he ſtudied at *Louvain* in 1543, and that *Conrad Goclenius* was then living. In order to avoid thoſe Miſtakes I have been oblig'd to inquire into the true Date of the firſt Edition of *Cicero*'s Orations, publiſhed by *Sturmius*, and I have found that it came out in 1540. Is it not a ſad thing to loſe ones time by the negligence of others? Is it reaſonable that the Omiſſion of a (*a*) thing, which

(*d*) *Teiſſier* … *dit. to* … *huanus's* … *gies,* … *m.* 1. … 72.

… *Id. ib.*

… *Ver-* … *den in* … *ib. pag.*

… *Thuan.* … *d Teiſ-* … *ibid.*

… *Apud* … *lch.* … *m. in* … *Ju-* … *pag.*

… *Pan-* … *on in* … *ie hi-* … *ie ad* … 30. … *br.* … 327.

… *Slei-* … *Hiſt.* … 25. … *m.* 725 … *ann.*

… *Jo.* … *lanus* … *De-* … *Hiſt.* … 2. v.

(*m*) *Melch. Adam. in vit. Philoſoph. pag.* 342.

(*a*) *That is, the Date of a Letter*

Year following he open'd a School (D) there, which became famous, and by his means obtained of the Emperor *Maximilian* II, the Title of an Univerſity in the year 1566. He was a good Philologer, and writ *Latin* with great Purity, and his way of Teaching was very methodical. Upon this Account the College of *Straſburg*, of which he was Rector, became the moſt flouriſhing in *Germany*. His Talents were not confin'd within the Bounds of his School; for he was intruſted with many Deputations in *Germany*, and into foreign Countries, and acquitted himſelf in thoſe Employments with great Honour and Vigilance. He ſhew'd an extraordinary Charity to the Proteſtant Refugees: He was not contented to beſtir himſelf in order to help 'em in their Miſery; but (E) ran into Debt and grew poor for them. He publiſhed ‡ many Books, and lived till the 3d of *March* 1589, that is, 81 Years, five Months and two Days. Tho' he had loſt his Sight, he minded the publick Good §. He was married three * times, and left no Children behind him. He had many Troubles in his Life-time, the greateſt whereof was his being expoſed to the Perſecutions of the Lutheran Miniſters. When he came to *Straſburg* he found a moderate Lutheraniſm, which he liked well enough, tho' he was of *Zuinglius*'s Opinion. The Lutheran Miniſters grew angry by Degrees with thoſe, who did not believe the Real Preſence: He was diſpleaſed with their violent Sermons, and 'tis ſaid (F) he abſtained many years from the publick Exerciſes of Religion. He

required no more then a Daſh of a Pen, ſhou'd expoſe many Readers to a very great Trouble?

(D) *He opened a School in 1538, which became famous.*] This ought not to be ſo underſtood as if no publick Lectures had been read in the City of *Straſburg*, before that year. The contrary is true; for *Sturmius* ſays, that when he arrived there *Capito* expounded the Bible, *Hedio* explained the Goſpels, *James Bedrot* taught *Greek*, *Michael Delius* (b) *Hebrew*, *Chriſtopher Herlin* explain'd *Euclid*, *Bucer*, who was writing his Retractation without any conſtraint put upon him, and Correcting his Commentaries upon the Goſpels, explain'd in his Houſe *Themiſtius*'s Paraphraſes, and *James Sturmius*, *Nicolas Cniepſius*, and *James Meyer* were Curators of the School (c). The ſame *Sturmius* ſays, that when he made a Journey from *Louvain* to *Straſburg* in the year 1528, he found there a School (d) where *Bucer* read Lectures upon the *Pſalms*. What was done in the year 1538 is as follows. The College received an Authentick Form under the Statutes drawn up ſince *Sturmius*'s arrival, and began to be ſolemnly regulated according to the Diviſion of its ſeveral Claſſes, and the Functions aſſign'd to each Teacher and Profeſſor. Read this Inſcription, which is to be ſeen at *Straſburg*. (e) *Anno poſt milleſimum 538, depoſitis armis, & pacata gravi inter Carolum V. Imperatorem Rom. & Franciſcum I. Galliarum Regem, diſcordiâ, S. P. Q. Argentin. juventuti* CHRISTIANÆ *religione & liberalibus diſciplinis inſtituendæ ludum literarium aperuit.*

Præfecto primario Jacobo Sturmio,
Rectore Joan. Sturmio.

Thoſe, who ſay (f) that *James Sturmius* was Rector (g) of the College of *Straſburg*, wou'd not have confounded that illuſtrious Magiſtrate with our *John Sturmius*, if they had read that Inſcription. This Confuſion is to be found in a contrary Senſe in the *Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica* of *Andreas Carolus*. That Author ſtyles *John Sturmius* firſt Senator and Syndic of the City of *Straſburg*. 'Tis in that Part of his Work where he obſerves that the Academy of that Place was not made an Univerſity till the year 1621. (h) *Anno ſuperioris Centuriæ ſexageſimo* (i) *octavo*, Gymnaſium literarium Argentinenſe, *à Johanne Sturmio fundatum, qui primarium Senatorem & Syndicum loci agebat, gratiâ Maximiliani ſecundi privilegia Academica accepit, & Sturmius, qui commodam rationem inſtituendæ juventutis monſtraverat, perpetuus Rector creatus eſt; Sed hoc demum anno* jus Univerſitatis *ei Ferdinandus II impertiit, ac poteſtatem conferendi omnium Facultatum gradus honorarios, dedit. Micræl. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* 172. That Writer quotes *Micrælius*, tho' the latter has not committed that Fault; for he has very well diſtinguiſh'd the two *Sturmius*'s: he ſays that *James*, a Senator and a Syndic, founded the College, and that *John*, who taught the Scholars, was made Rector of it for Life. (k) *Anno 1568, Argentinenſis ſchola, quam jam ante XXX, annos Jacobus Sturmius, ſenator primarius & ſyndicus, adornari curaverat, privilegia à Maximiliano II. accepit, & Johannes Sturmius, qui rationem inſtituendæ juventutis monſtraverat, perpetuus Rector eſt creatus. Noſtra demum ætate, A. 1621, jus univerſitatis à Ferdinando II. accepit.*

(E) *He ran into Debt, and grew poor for them.*] Read theſe Words of *Melchior Adam.* (l) *Cum domus illius optimo cuique dies ac noctes pateret, eſſetque velut commune quoddam exulum aſylum, peregrinorum ac pauperum hoſpitium, quos omnes fovendo, alendo, foris domique juvando, facultates haud exiguas abſumſit: maxime Gallorum Evangelicorum ſalutem tuendo, in quam omnes ſuas divitias impendit, ipſeque cum ſuis egere maluit, quam communem cauſam deſerere: animo laudabili & perpetua gratitudine digno.* *Sturmius* being call'd *Veſpertilio*, a Bat, by *Oſiander*, anſwered (m) that perhaps it was an Alluſion to the *Veſpertilio* in the Proverb, to ſignify that he was very much in Debt. He does not deny that he was, but he maintains that he never abſconded to cheat his Creditors, and that his Debts, contracted upon a (n) glorious Account, were prejudicial to no Body; that he was the only ſufferer, and that for above Sixteen years (o) that he groaned under that Yoke, and exhauſted himſelf, by paying large Intereſts, and contracting new Debts to pay the old ones, not one Creditor cou'd be produc'd who had loſt a Farthing in his Service. (p) *Heus bone vir: quando ego unquam, fraudationis cauſa latitavi? vel potiùs, quandò ego unquam latitavi? vel creditorem nomina, vel indicem produc, qui me fraudationis cauſa latitaſſe dicat, aut qui dicat, me latitaſſe, & quando latitarim: & quo tempore: & propter quem creditorem. Creditorem unum nomina: qui annis jam ſedecim uno nummo in hoc ære alieno fraudatum ſe à me verè poſſit dicere. Sedecim enim annos & eo amplius in hac miſeria verſor; unum creditorem produc, qui unius teruncii, mea cauſa, & meo nomine jacturam feciſſe jure conqueratur, tametſi graviſſimis uſuris & verſuris, tot jam annos exhauriar.* Afterwards he declares that he has run into Debt to maintain his Proteſtant Brethren. (q) *Cur non iſtud potiùs cogitavit innocentia & caritas, & ſimplicitas tua? Hic homo horum hominum Eccleſias defendit, propter quas eſt ære alieno oppreſſus, & propter quas omne æs ſuum, jam alienum eſt: & propter æs alienum, in extremam egeſtatem dejectus eſt.* I don't think *Oſiander* alluded to that Proverb. I believe he uſed the Word *Veſpertilio* only to reflect upon *Sturmius* for being neither a profeſt Lutheran nor a profeſt Calviniſt. *Sturmius* was ſenſible that it might be *Oſiander*'s Meaning, and (r) vindicated himſelf in that reſpect.

(F) *'Tis ſaid he abſtained many years from the publick Exerciſes of Religion.*] *Oſiander* laid to his Charge that he had never been at Church for the 20 laſt Years. *Sturmius* made him this Anſwer. (s) Had you been a Preacher 30 years at *Straſburg*, I had

---

‡ See the Catalogue of 'em in Teiſſier, addit. to Thuanus's Elogies. Tom. 2. pag. 117, 118. Edit. 1696.

§ Taken from Melchior Adam in vitis Philoſoph. pag. 342, & ſeq.

* See the Remark F.

(b) Note that he was married to Anne Mychſnera, who ſpoke eaſily Latin. Abſque hæſitatione latine cum domeſticis loquens. Jo. Sturmius in parte 1. Antipappi quarti pag. m. 17.

(c) Ex Sturmio Ibid. pag. 17, & 18.

(d) Tum ſchola etiam conſtituta erat. Id. Ib. pag. 10.

(e) See Nathan Chytræus in itinerum deliciis p. m. 430.

(f) See the Remark A. in the foregoing Article, and the laſt Remark of this.

(g) See Melchior Adam. ubi ſupra pag. 343.

(h) And. Carolus Memor. ſæculi XVII, ad ann 1621. pag. 526.

(i) According to Melchior Adam ubi ſupra pag. 344 it was in 1566.

(k) Micræl. Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 570. Edit. 1699.

(l) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra pag. 345.

(m) Sturmius in 4. Antipappi part. 3. pag. 148.

(n) Propter æs alienum nemini noxium verſor .... ob æs alienum honeſtiſſima de cauſa conflatum. Id. Ibid.

(o) He ſpoke ſo in the year 1582.

(p) Id. ib.

(q) Id. ib. pag. 149.

(r) Id. ib. and pag. 150.

(s) Id. ib. pag. 15

He was preſſed hard, and forced to declare, and was not the Strongeſt; (G) for they turn'd him out of his Place. I have mentioned in another Place

I had never gone to your Sermons. During the laſt 20 years I wou'd have conſtantly avoided to hear you preach, if I had been oblig'd to be ſilent, and to approve your Invectives by my Silence. (z) After I had been ſilent and kept off a long time from the Sermons and Diſputes of your Miniſters, I was preſent at the laſt publick Diſputation of *Pappus*, and becauſe I ſaid ſomething, which might have remov'd the Perplexity the Opponent had reduc'd him to, I raiſed a Storm againſt me, by which I have been almoſt overwhelm'd: how then can you object to me that I have been twenty years without going to your Sermons? *Et mihi objicis viginti annorum neglectas conciones; cum una diſputatiuncula, cui vix interfui, me prope perdiderit!* He mentions to him thoſe, who in the primitive Church, put off receiving Baptiſm till the laſt Moment of their Lives; which ſhews that they were a long time without communicating. He alledges *James Sturmius*, who had been many years without receiving the Communion, and abſtain'd from it, by reaſon of the Diſpute the Miniſters had raiſed about the Euchariſt. (a) *Quis Jacobo Sturmio fuit diligentior, in noſtra urbis religione, & Senatus autoritate defendenda? Quàm multos annos ille vir ad menſam Domini non acceſſit? Quam quaſo ob cauſam aliam, quàm propter hoc Theologorum diſſidium? Idcircone aut Eccleſiam, aut Senatus autoritatem contemſit?* His other Anſwers give ground to believe that *Oſiander* accuſed him of hindering his Wife, his Servants, and his Boarders from going to Church. He calls it a Falſity, and defies his Adverſary to produce a Witneſs of his Accuſation. I married, ſays he, my third Wife Seven years ago; I have lived 20 years with the (b) firſt, and as many with the (c) Second. No body can ſay that they have not conſtantly heard Sermons and received the Communion, and been very careful to give Alms. I ſhall ſet down in *Latin* what concerns his Servants. (d) *Tot jam annos, tot ſcribas & famulos, tot ancillas, tantam familiam habui: ex his unum aliquem bonum compares, qui dicat, ſe meo juſſu, aut me autore à concionibus, & à ſacra menſa abſuiſſe.* He names ſome of his Boarders, and among others two Grandſons of a Siſter of *Martin Luther*, who, ſays he, will Witneſs that I never reproved them for hearing Sermons. Hitherto he has ſaid nothing that contains a formal Denial of what was objected to him, that he had been 20 years without hearing any Sermon; but afterwards he calls it a lye, as you may ſee in theſe Words. (e) *At viginti jam annos nullas conciones audiviſti: at ſi tu iſtud viginti annos affirmes, totos viginti annos mentieris, quod pace tua dictum velim. Quamobrem, inquis, non venis? tot jam annis. An non reſpondi? ſi tu tot annos conciones tales haberes, cujuſmodi tu & Pappus ſape habetis: tot ego te etiam deinceps, audire nequeam, & cauſam quaris, quam tibi jam expoſui?* To find this Part of his Anſwer coherent, we muſt ſuppoſe that he did not avoid all ſorts of Sermons in general; but only thoſe of ſuch rigid Lutherans as *Pappus* was.

Nevertheleſs 'tis certain that a Divine of the Confeſſion of *Augsburg*, has given out that *John Sturmius* was above 20 Years without going to Church and receiving the Sacrament, and that he uſed to play at Cheſs in Sermon time. (f) *Venerabile Miniſterium Argentoratenſe non ignorat, Sturmium ultra 20 annos nec templum frequentâſſe, nec ſacra cœna uſum. Retulit mihi M. Frideric. Rhodius, olim Superintendens Arnſtadienſis in Thuringia, gravis Theologus, quique multos per annos Sturmii fuerat domeſticus convictor, ſe illum vidiſſe nunquam in templo, ſed plerumque ludo ſcachorum diebus Dominicis ſub concionis tempus triviſſe.* Mr. *Crenius*, who affords me this curious Paſſage, mentions another, which ſhews what *John Pappus* anſwered, being accuſed of never Praying for the Reformed Churches of *France*. How cou'd *John Sturmius*, ſays he, hear me pray for them? I have ſerved theſe Ten years the Church and Univerſity of *Strasburg*, and he has never heard my Lectures nor my Sermons. *Tu vero audiveris? Ecquam (h) igitur ſcholam meam, aut concionem totis hic decenniis, qui in ſchola & Eccleſia jam miniſtro audiviſti?* Afterwards *Pappus* tells him what he begs of God not only for the Reformed of *France*, but alſo for all perſecuted Churches. 1ſt. That the Errors which their Miniſters teach them, be not imputed to them. 2d. That God wou'd be pleaſed to diſcover to them the Truths they are Ignorant of. 3d. To ſtrengthen them in their Afflictions, and enable them to ſuffer 'em patiently, and not to relapſe into the Popiſh Idolatry. 4th. To convert or reſtrain their Perſecutors. *Atqui ego quotidie, & in Eccleſia, & domi Deum precor, non modo pro Gallicanis, ſed pro omnibus afflictis & perſecutionem patientibus Eccleſiis: & ne neſcias, hæc ipſis precor. 1. Ne Dominus ipſis errores, quibus inſcientes imbuuntur à ſuis Doctoribus, imputet*, (i) &c.

I muſt not forget that *Sturmius* was accuſed of flattering the Roman Catholicks. If this Accuſation was grounded on his Writing againſt 'em in a civil, and not in a paſſionate and injurious Manner, it was very unjuſt. His Moderation was very acceptable to his Popiſh Adverſaries, and (k) Cardinal *Sadolet*, and *John Cochlæus* writ very civilly againſt him. He ask'd (l) whether they wou'd alledge as a Proof, a Piece of Poetry, wherein he had lately congratulated the Biſhop of *Strasburg* upon his coming to Town, and his Agreement with the Magiſtrates; and he maintain'd that it wou'd be a very wrong Reaſon, ſeeing the Friendſhip eſtabliſhed between that Prelate and the Magiſtrates, was a very proper Subject for a Congratulation; and he adds a particular Reaſon, grounded upon the Family of that Prelate. He was a Count of *Manderſcheidt*, related to thoſe with whom our *Sturmius* had learn'd the *Latin* Tongue. He confeſt that many illuſtrious Perſons of the Church of *Rome* had been his Friends or his Patrons, and he declared that tho' we are diſpleaſed with the Conduct of great Men and Princes in ſome reſpects, yet we ought to eſteem their Virtues and fine Qualities. (m) *In magnis autem viris & in Principibus, etiamſi aliqua diſpliceant, tamen virtutes magna ſunt conſideranda, ut in Sadoleto, Bembo, Julio Phlugio, aliiſque doctiſſimis viris. In Carolo V* (n) *pater tuus, ſi meminiſti, quid improbarit, noſti: tamen qua nobis non placebant in hoc Imperatore, ita non placebant, ut illi in ratione militari gloriam, & in victoriis æquitatem, & fortunam non adimeremus.* To this example of *Charles* V. he adds that of the *Guiſes*, pretending that the French Proteſtants did not ſcruple to acknowledge their Valour, their Parts, *&c.* It muſt be confeſt that thoſe Maxims are very reaſonable; but they are little practiſed by Men tranſported with Zeal, or of a fiery Temper.

(G) *He was preſſed hard .... and was not the ſtrongeſt; for they turn'd him out of his Place.*] He was ſuſpected of Calviniſm in the year 1561, as it appears from the Letter (o) he writ to *Melchior Speccer*, the 26th of *October*, of the ſame year; for he informs him of the Reaſons that moved him to expound St. *Chriſoſtom*, and Anſwers what was ſaid of him, that he was like a Snail, which began to ſhew its Horns after they had been hid for a long time (p). He clearly diſcovered his Thoughts about the Euchariſt, (q) which occaſioned the firſt Perſecution he was expoſed to. He defended *Zanchius* in the Quarrel, of which I ſhall ſpeak in another (r) Place; which made him more odious ſtill to the Lutherans; and he was ſo much diſpleaſed with their Proceedings, that he had a mind to leave *Strasburg* and to go to *Zurich*. I find this Particular in a Letter of *Zanchius* to *Henry Bullinger*. (ſ) *Sed quid ſi Sturmius quoque me ſequatur, vel potiùs ego ipſum? Is enim conſtituit, ſe ad vos conferre, &, ſi fieri poſſit, prædium aliquod ſibi apud vos comparare, & ibi tanquam in quodam Tuſculano, totum ſe S. literarum ſtudio conſecrare, & contra adverſarios ſuum ſtylum in hac ſenecta pro Chriſto exercere. Sed hoc*

cupit

(h) *Jo. Pappus defenſ. 4. contra Sturmium pag. 118. apud Crenium ubi ſupra pag. 140.*

(i) *Id. ib. apud Crenium ibid. pag. 141.*

(k) *Sturmius in parte 3. Antipappi 4. p. 150.*

(l) *Id ib. pag. 169.*

(m) *Id. ib.*

(n) *He ſpeaks to* Andreas Oſiander *a Divine of* Tubingen.

(o) *It is among thoſe of* Zanchius *in the 2d. Book, pag. 223. & ſeq.*

(p) Innuis me limacem eſſe qui annos jam multos latuerim, nunc demum cornua exeram. *Epiſt. Zanchii lib. 2. pag. 225.*

(q) *Ibid. pag. 28.*

(r) *In the Article* Zanchius (Jerôme)

(ſ) *Ibid. pag. 17.*

Place the Encomium he beſtowed upon (*H*) *Calvin's* Inſtitution. I ſhall take notice of ſome Faults (*I*) in *Moreri*.

SUETONIUS PAULINUS (*Caius*) Governor of *Numidia*, in the year of *Rome* 794, overcame the *Mauri* † as far as Mount *Atlas*; and was * the firſt Roman Captain, who went beyond that famous Mountain. He made a ‖ Relation of that War. He was one of the beſt Warriours in his time, and People did not ſcruple to ſay, that he ‡ contended with *Corbulo* for Military Glory.

cupit interim celari, donec videat, quem exitum habitura ſit cauſſa. Si igitur, ut antè dixi, aliter cadat cauſſa noſtra quam ipſa meretur: non ſolùm ego ſed etiam Sturmius, libentiſſimè vobiſcum vivemus. Si verò ita controverſia noſtra componatur, ut mihi quoque liceat veritatem tueri: Sturmius quidem manebit, ego verò faciam, quod tu ipſe conſultius gloriæ Dei futurum judicaveris. The Quarrel wherein *Zanchius* was concern'd, had ſuch an iſſue, that *Sturmius* did not find himſelf obliged to retire. But he happen'd to have much leſs Credit and good Fortune, when there aroſe ſome Differences between him and *Pappus*, Doctor of Divinity, and Miniſter of *Strasburg*. He publiſh'd (*t*) ſeveral *Anti-Pappus's*, and many Books were publiſh'd againſt him. You'll find many things relating to this in the 1ſt Volume of M. *Baillet's Anti*. At laſt *Pappus* being ſupported by Authority, obtain'd the Victory, and had *Sturmius* depriv'd of the Rectorſhip of the Univerſity, and the Calviniſts turn'd out of their Places (*v*). *Idem . . . adverſus Pappum Argentinenſem Theologum, turbonem verius, à quo quod loco illo moti ſint Noſtri, initio facto à venerando ſene Johanne Sturmio, cœpit, probavit Michael Beutherus, in* Declaratione Agendæ Eccleſiæ Argentinenſis (*w*). They are the Words of a reform'd Divine, who calls *Pappus* a ſhuffling and factious Man; but the Lutherans maintain that he was an excellent Servant of God, (*x*) a very ſtout Champion, and an invincible Combatant in the Spiritual War for the pure Goſpel; and that *Sturmius* was deprived of his Place for no other Reaſon but becauſe he had raiſed ſome Troubles. (*a*) *Joh. Pappus . . . . inſignis Argentinenſium athleta* adverſus Joh. Sturmium, *Rectorem Academiæ, Rhetorem Calvinianorum, & ob turbas datas tandem ab officio remotum.* Perhaps, not to overwhelm the good old Man, and to make the thing more tolerable to him, the odious Words of Deſtitution and Expulſion were omitted, and they gave him to underſtand that they diſpenſed him from the Rectorſhip of the Univerſity by reaſon of his old Age. I have read a reformed Author, who makes uſe of this Turn, that Heaven declared him *emeritus* in the year 1583. (*b*) *Uſque ad annum Chriſti 1583 quo Deo placuit eundem rude donare . . .* (*c*) *Exiſtimo autem D. Sturmium noſtrum, rude, quo divinitus donatus eſt, contentum*, &c. I take this from a Letter, which contains a handſome Parallel between *Theophraſtus* and *Sturmius*. Here follows a Paſſage that wants to be rectified. (*d*) " *John Sturmius* . . . having continued in his Office till he was 80 years old and above, found himſelf no longer able to diſcharge the Duties of it, and obtained from the Magiſtrates of *Strasburg* that his Place ſhou'd be fill'd up by *Melchior Junius*, his Scholar." 'Tis not true that he exerciſed his Office till he was 80 years of Age and above; he loſt it in 1583, which was the 76th year of his Age. He deſired no Succeſſor, becauſe he was no longer able to continue in it; it was taken from him.

(*H*) *I have mention'd in another* (*e*) *Place the Encomium he beſtowed upon* Calvin's *Inſtitutions.*] And I ſaid that this Encomium concerns the Edition of the year 1543, which is the third. I went upon two Reaſons: one is, that 'tis certain (*f*) the ſecond Edition is that of the year 1539; the other is that theſe Words of *Sturmius*, *Inſtitutio Chriſtiana religionis quam primo inchoatam, deinde locupletatam, hoc vero anno abſolutam edidit*, ſuit only with the third Edition. But to conceal nothing, I ought to mention here what I have read in the ſecond *Anti-Pappus*, *viz*. That *Calvin* being Miniſter at *Strasburg*, enlarg'd his Inſtitution, and publiſh'd it in the ſame City, *apud Wendelinum Ribelium*, and that *Sturmius* prefixed to that Book the Judgment he made of it. (*g*) *Ego meam ſententiam in fronte ejus libri de Calvini aſſixi.* Which does not agree with the third Edition, *viz*. that of the year 1543, for *Calvin* was not at *Strasburg* that year; he returned to *Geneva* in *September* 1541. I have a Conjecture upon it: *Sturmius* knowing that the Book was Reprinting at *Strasburg* in 1543, inſerted ſome Words in his Judgment, which ſhewed that it was a third Edition. And therefore 'tis true that the Words of *Sturmius*, which I have quoted in the Article of *Calvin*, concern the third Edition, and conſequently I have ſaid nothing but what is true; but I think I ſhou'd have obſerved that *Sturmius* had prefixed the ſame (*h*) Encomium to the ſecond Edition, 1539. Let thoſe who have this ſecond Edition, judge whether my Conjecture be right or not.

(*I*) *Some Faults in* Moreri.] I. 'Tis not true that *Verheiden* ſays that *James Sturmius was born at* Sleida *near* Cologne. See the Remark *A* in the foregoing Article. II. 'Tis not true that this *Sturmius began his Studies at* Liege, and went on with them at *Paris*. III. And that he perſwaded *John Sleidan to write the Hiſtory that made him ſo Famous*. See in the Remark *B* of the foregoing Article, how far he contributed to that Hiſtory. IV. 'Tis not true that *John Sturmius* perſwaded him to undertake the Eſtabliſhment of an Univerſity at *Strasburg*: The only thing they had in view then was a College, or what thay call in *Holland* (*i*) and *Germany* an illuſtrious School, which is different from an Univerſity: however it be, *John Sturmius* did not adviſe ſuch an Eſtabliſhment; for he was ſent for from *Paris* for no other Reaſon but becauſe they had already form'd the Project of that School, that is, they had reſolv'd to introduce into the School that was already at *Straſburg*, and of which *James Sturmius* was one of the Curators, the beſt Regulations, and the moſt proper Method to promote Study; and they thought, with great Reaſon, that *Sturmius* was a Man well qualified both to teach and to have the Direction of the School. V. *Moreri* ſhou'd not have ſaid that the Deſign of Founding an Univerſity was happily executed; for, I repeat it again, nothing but a School was deſign'd at that time. VI. He ſhou'd therefore have ſaid not that *John Sturmius* had the Foundation of that Univerſity confirm'd by the Emperor, but that he obtain'd from that Prince that the School ſhou'd be erected into an Univerſity. VII. when *Moreri* ſays, that *from* the year 1566, *John Sturmius performed . . , ſeveral Embaſſies . . . . and aſſiſted at ſeveral Conferences*; he intimates that *Sturmius* had no ſuch Imployment before that time, which is a Miſtake; for not to mention the other Deputations that preceded the year 1566, 'tis certain (*k*) that in 1540, he was ſent to the Conferences of *Worms* with *Calvin*, *Capito* and *Bucer*. VIII. He did not loſe his Sight after he had *taught at* Strasburg *for the ſpace of* 51 *years*. He began to teach there in 1538, and was deprived of his Place in 1583, and therefore he taught but 45 years. IX. If he had taught *for the ſpace of* 51 *years*, and then if he had loſt his Sight, *Moreri* ſhou'd not have diſtinguiſh'd between the time when he died, and the time when he loſt his Eyes; for the year 1589, in which he died, according to *Moreri*, and according to the Truth, falls in with the 51ſt year ſince he began to teach in that City. X. *Moreri* ſhou'd not have ſaid that he died at 80 years of Age; for he had ſaid that *Sturmius* was

---

† *Dio lib.* 60.

* *Plin. lib.* 5. *cap.* 1.

‖ *Pliny lib. ſays ſome thing of it.*

‡ *See the Remark A at the Begining.*

(*t*) At Neuſtad, *in the Palatinate in the year* 1579, *and in the year* 1580. *in* 4to.

(*v*) *Which ſhews that the Formulary of Concord had been often altered by the Lutherans.*

(*w*) *Hoornbeeck ſumma controverſ. pag. m.* 505.

(*x*) Strenuum ſe præſtitit in bello ſpirituali pro Eccleſia puriore militem atque Athletam invictum. *Andreas Carolus ubi ſupra ad ann.* 1610, *pag.* 226.

(*a*) *Micræl. ubi ſupra pag.* 785.

(*b*) *Jo. Jacobus Grynæus Epiſt.* 9. *lib.* 1. *p.* 151.

(*c*) *Ibid. pag.* 153.

(*d*) *Thuanus apud Teiſſier addit. to the Elog. tom.* 2. *pag.* 116.

(*e*) *In the Article of* Calvin.

(*f*) *This appears by a ſhort Epiſtle of* Calvin *to the Reader, dated at* Strasburg, Aug. 1. 1539.

(*g*) *Sturmius in Antipappo ſecundo pag.* 111.

(*h*) *Except the Words, which ſignify that 'tis the* 3 *Edition.*

(*i*) *Note, that in the Illuſtrious Schools there are no Forms that learn Grammar and Rhetorick, but the School of Strasburg had alſo theſe Forms.*

(*k*) *See the ſecond Antipappus of Sturmius pag.* 112.

Glory. He perform'd very noble Exploits in *Great Britain*, where he (A) commanded in the year 814, and 815; but having overcome the Rebels, he puniſhed them too ſeverely for the Devaſtations and Slaughter they had made, and therefore he was ſucceeded * by a more indulgent Man. 'Tis thought he was Conſul (B) in the year of *Rome* 819. He was one of the chief Commanders † of the Troops of the Emperor *Otho*, and did not keep up in that War the Reputation he had got. The Soldiers openly murmured ‡ at his Conduct; and 'tis certain that his Maxims, which conſiſted in venturing nothing, and

was born in 1507, and departed this Life in 1589. Judge whether *Moreri* had got the Art of Writing, how careleſly does he make uſe of *Melchior Adam*! I omit his calling *James* and *John Sturmius*'s Deputations, by the Name of Embaſſies. He ſhou'd have known that an Imperial City has indeed Agents, Reſidents, Envoys and Deputies, but not Ambaſſadors. He knew not that the *Latin* Word *Legatio* has a larger Senſe than the Words *Embaſſy* and *Deputation*.

(A) *He perform'd noble Exploits in* Great Britain.] Emulation was no ſmall Help to him; for he endeavour'd to equal the Glory *Corbulo* had got by recovering *Armenia*. (l) *Sed tum Paullinus Suetonius obtinebat Britannos, ſcientia militiæ, & rumore populi, qui neminem ſine æmulo ſinit, Corbulonis concertator, receptæque Armeniæ decus æquare domitis perduellibus cupiens.* Having obſerved that the Iſle of (m) *Mona* ſerved the Rebels for a Shelter, he reſolved to take it, and ſucceeded in his Deſign with no great difficulty, tho' the Multitude of the Iſlanders, who expected him on the ſhore, and their Wives dreſs'd like Furies, and their Druids lifting up their Hands to Heaven, and uttering Imprecations, ſurpriſed the Roman Soldiers by the Novelty of the Spectacle. He cauſed their (n) ſacred Groves to be cut down, in which the Inhabitants ſacrificed humane Victims, and ſettled Garriſons; but whilſt he was taken up with thoſe things, he was inform'd that the Britains, under the Conduct of the Widow of *Praſutagus*, King of the *Icenians*, had roſe up in Arms, and committed great Diſorders. Whereupon he went over, and took ſuch effectual Meaſures to prevent the Progreſs of thoſe Rebels, that he obtained over them a Victory (o) as remarkable as thoſe of former times. 'Tis ſaid that about 80 thouſand Britains were kill'd in that Battle, and that the Romans did not loſe four hundred Men, and had not ſo many Wounded. *Suetonius*'s Courage and Firmneſs, and his Prudence and Experience appeared glorioſly on that Occaſion. You'll find a curious Account of this in (p) *Tacitus*'s Annals, and in (q) *Xiphilinus*. The vanquiſh'd were ſeverely treated, which was the Reaſon why many Rebels remained in Arms, fearing the Conſequences of their Submiſſion. (r) *Tenentibus arma pleriſque, quos conſcientia defectionis, & proprius ex Legato timor agitabat. Hic cum egregius cetera, arroganter in deditos, & ut ſua quoque injuriæ ultor, durius conſuleret; miſſus Petronius Turpilianus tanquam exorabilior, & delictis hoſtium novus, eoque pœnitentiæ mitior.* Theſe Words of *Tacitus* want a Supplement; we muſt add to them the Account he gives in the 14th Book of his Annals. There we find what happen'd before *Turpilian* ſucceeded *Suetonius*, *viz.* that *Julius Claſſicianus*, who was Intendant in *Britain* after *Suetonius*'s Victory, fell out with that General, and cried him down as much as ever he could. He aſcribed to him ill Succeſſes, and imputed the good ones to the Fortune of the Romans. He gave out that a General wou'd quickly come, who wou'd uſe Clemency towards the Vanquiſh'd, and he writ to the Court, that the War wou'd never be ended, unleſs *Suetonius* was recall'd. (a) *Julius Claſſicianus ſucceſſor Cato miſſus, & Suetonio diſcors, bonum publicum privatis ſimultatibus impediebat: diſperſeratque* novum Legatum opperiendum eſſe, ſine hoſtili ira & ſuperbia victoris clementer deditis conſulturum. *Simul in Urbem mandabat*, nullum prœlio finem exſpectarent, niſi ſuccederetur Suetonio: *cujus adverſa pravitati ipſius, proſpera ad fortunam Reipub. referebat.* *Nero* hearing of this, ſent *Polycletus*, one of his Freedmen, into *Britain*, looking upon him as a fit Man to reconcile the Governor and Intendant of the Province, and to make the Rebels accept of a Peace. This Freedman appeared with great Pomp, and *Suetonius* (b) was obliged to make his Court to him; however he kept his Poſt, till it was thought proper to beſtow it upon *Turpilian*.

If any one, in order to excuſe *Suetonius*'s Severity, ſhou'd alledge the horrid Barbarities the Britains exerciſed upon the Romans, it might be anſwered that the Britains did not do it till after they had ſuffered prodigious Violences and Extorſions, and that therefore the Roman General ſhou'd not have been ſo implacable towards the vanquiſhed; for there is a vaſt difference between thoſe, who riſe up againſt a new Maſter, whoſe Yoke is pretty eaſy, and thoſe who ſhake off a new Domination the moſt tyrannical in the World. In the firſt Caſe an Inſurrection attended with Cruelty deſerves a ſevere Puniſhment; but in the ſecond Caſe, Clemency ought quickly to ſucceed Severity. *Tacitus* (c) ſays, that after the Death of a Britiſh King, who had made the Roman Emperor joint Heir with his two Daughters, his Houſe and his States were plundered, his Widow was whip'd, his two Daughters were raviſh'd, the chief Perſons of the Country were turn'd out of their Eſtates, and the King's Relations reduc'd to the Condition of Slaves. The Roman Colony of *Camalodunum*, made up of Veteran Soldiers, ſeized every body's Goods, and turned People out of Doors, being countenanced by the Roman Soldiers, who hoped to have ſome time or other the ſame Liberty of Plundering the Iſlanders. (d) *In coloniam Camalodunum recens deducti, pellebant domibus, exturbabant agris*, captivos, ſervos *apellando: foventibus impotentiam veteranorum militibus, ſimilitudine vitæ, & ſpe ejuſdem licentiæ.* Theſe Proceedings inſpired the Britains with ſuch a Hatred againſt the Romans, and with ſuch a violent Deſire of recovering or preſerving their Liberty, that there happen'd quickly a general Inſurrection, the Effects whereof were bloody and barbarous. The King's Widow (e) put her ſelf at the Head of the Britains, and made 'em a very pathetical (f) Speech. She did not forget the Laſhes ſhe had received, nor the Rape of her Daughters; but alledged them, the better to encourage 'em to ſhake off ſuch a hard Slavery. (g) *Solitum quidem Britannis feminarum ductu bellare* teſtabatur; *ſed tunc non ut tantis majoribus ortam regnum & opes; verum ut unam è vulgo, libertatem amiſſam, confectum verberibus corpus, contrectatam filiarum pudicitiam ulciſci: eo provectas Romanorum cupidines ut non corpora, nec ſenectam quidem aut virginitatem impollutam relinquant.* *Suetonius*'s Abſence favoured the Enterprize of the Britains; they (h) deſtroyed 70 thouſand Romans or Allies of the Romans; they gave no Quarter, they killed, hanged burnt or crucified every Man they took. (i) *Neque enim capere aut venundare, aliudve quod belli commercium, ſed cædes, patibula, ignes, cruces, tanquam reddituri ſupplicium, ac prærepta interim ultione, feſtinabant.* They were no leſs cruel to the Women (k) of the beſt Quality and the greateſt Vertue; they hanged them ſtark Naked, and cut off their Breaſts and ſowed them in their Mouths, that they might ſeem to eat them, and then they laid them at full length on ſmall and ſharp Stakes, that ran into their Bodies. This is what happens when new Subjects are delivered up to the Soldiery; but on the other ſide the Britains paid dear for their Barbarity; for *Suetonius* puniſhed them cruelly. Note that the Queen, who put herſelf at the Head of 'em, (l) poyſoned herſelf after the Loſs of the Battle.

(B) *'Tis thought he was Conſul in the year of* Rome 819.] It plainly appears from a Paſſage of and taking his Meaſures with the utmoſt (C) Circumſpection, prevented h improving favourable Opportunities, and afforded the Enemies a ſufficient Time to take care of their Affairs. The worſt was that he ran away on the Day of a general and deciſive Battle, and that he boaſted to *Vitellius* that he had (D) betray'd *Otho*, which probably was not true; but he was believed upon his Word, and that ſaved his Life. It has been ſaid that the Hopes he had of being made Emperor, moved him to adviſe that the War ſhou'd be kept up between *Otho* and *Vitellius*; but *Tacitus* thinks he was too wiſe a Man to have (E) ſuch Thoughts.

---

* *See the Remark A.*

† *Tacit. Hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 87.*

‡ *Id. ib. lib. 2. cap. 23, & alibi.*

(l) *Tacit. Annal. lib. 14. cap. 29. ad. ann. 814.*

(m) *'Tis thought to be that now called* Angleſey.

(n) Exciſi luci, ſævis ſuperſtitionibus ſacri; nam cruore captivo adolere aras, & hominum fibris conſulere deos fas habebant. *Id. ib. cap. 30.*

(o) Clara & antiquis victoriis par ea die laus parta. *Id. Ib. cap. 37.*

(p) *Lib. 14. cap. 29. & ſeq.*

(q) *In epitome Dionis in Nerone p. m. 173, & ſeq.*

(r) *Tacitus in vita Agricolæ cap. 16.*

(a) *Idem Annal. lib. 14. cap. 38.*

(b) Mirabantur (*hoſtes*) quod dux & exercitus tanti belli confector ſervitiis obedirent. *Id. ib. cap. 39.*

(c) *Id. ib. cap. 31.*

(d) *Id. ib.*

(e) *Xiphilinus calls her* Bunduica: *Tacitus in his Annals* ibid. *calls her* Boudicea, *& in the Life of Agricola cap. 16,* Voadica. *'Tis very likely he always call'd her by the ſame Name, and that the Tranſcribers have ſpoil'd the Original in both Places. I believe the true Name is that we find in* Xiphilinus.

(f) *See her Speech in* Xiphilinus *ubi ſupra pag.* 169. *& ſeq. See alſo* Tacitus *ib. cap.* 35.

(g) *Tacit. Ann. lib.* 14. *c.* 35.

(h) *Id. Ib. cap.* 33.

(i) *Id. Ib.*

(k) Xiphilin. *ubi ſupra. pag.* 173.

(l) *Tacit. ubi ſupra cap.* 37. *but according to* Xiphilinus *Ib. p.* 175, *ſhe died of Sickneſs.*

We

of (m) *Pliny* that he was Conſul; which is no leſs evident from theſe Words of *Tacitus*. (n) *Atque eo duces Othonianos ſpatium ad moras ſuaſiſſe; præcipuè Paullinum, quod vetuſtiſſimus* CONSULARIUM, *& militia clarus, gloriam nomenque Britannicis expeditionibus meruiſſet.* If it be ſaid that there is no need of this Paſſage of *Tacitus*, and that it is ſufficient to alledge theſe Words out of the 14th Chapter of the 16th Book of his Annals: *C. Suetonio L. Teleſino Conſulibus Antiſtius Soſianus . . . . ſibi conciliat.* I anſwer that this Paſſage of the Annals, which is commonly alledged to prove *Suetonius*'s Conſulſhip, does not appear deciſive, if we take notice of a Note of M. *de Tillemont* (o). We have ſeen that *Suetonius* was, in the year of *Rome* 822, the moſt Ancient of thoſe who had been Conſuls. But *Lucius Piſo* was ſtill (p) living, and had been Conſul in the year 809; and therefore *Suetonius* muſt have been Conſul before the year 809, and conſequently the Words of *Tacitus*'s Annals do not concern his Conſulſhip, ſince they belong to the year 819, or 818. M. *de Tillemont* (q) conjectures that *Caius Suetonius*, who was Conſul with *Lucius Teleſinus* in the 66th year of the Chriſtian *Æra*, that is, in the year 818, or 819, of *Rome*, was the Son of *Suetonius*, who makes the Subject of this Article. Father *Hardouin* (r), and all the other Authors I have conſulted, ſay, that our *Suetonius Paulinus* was *Teleſinus*'s Collegue. You'll find the ſame Opinion in *Voſſius*, and a Fault in Chronology; for *Voſſius* ſuppoſes that this Conſulſhip belongs to the year of *Rome* 811 (ſ). Father *Hardouin* (t) places it in the laſt year of *Nero*'s Life, and quotes the 6th Book of *Tacitus*'s Annals. He ſhou'd have quoted the 16th, and remembred that *Nero* died the 2d year after the Conſulſhip of *Suetonius* and *Teleſinus*. M. *de Tillemont* (v) ſuppoſes as a thing undeniable, that *Suetonius* had been Conſul before he was ſent into *Britain*; and the Reaſon he goes upon, is, that all thoſe who were ſent thither had been Conſuls. I can't tell whether he is in the right as to this laſt Point, and the Proof he takes from theſe Words, *vetuſtiſſimus conſularium*, does not appear to me a convincing one; for perhaps the Meaning of 'em is, that *Suetonius* was older than all thoſe who had been Conſuls, tho' ſome of 'em had exerciſed the Conſulſhip before him; and therefore I don't abſolutely condemn the common Opinion, nor his neither. There may be ſome Reaſons on both ſides: It were ſomewhat ſtrange that *Tacitus* ſhould never mention the Conſular Quality of *Suetonius*, if it had belonged to him, when he commanded in *Britain*.

(C) *His Maxims, which conſiſted in venturing nothing . . . . prevented his improving favourable Opportunities.*] *Cæcina*, General of *Vitellius*'s Troops, made uſe of a Stratagem, which did not ſucceed, and was like to be fatal to him, becauſe the Generals of *Otho* having diſcovered it, avoided the Snare, and laid another which the Enemy did not perceive. By this means they obtained a conſiderable Advantage, but not ſuch as it might have been, if *Suetonius* had been bolder and leſs cautious. *Tacitus* gives the following Character of him. (w) *Signum pugnæ non ſtatim à Suetonio Paullino pediti datum. Cunctator natura, & cui cauta potius conſilia cum ratione, quam proſpera ex caſu placerent*; compleri foſſas, aperiri campum, pandi aciem *jubebat, ſatis cito incipi victoriam ratus, ubi proviſum foret ne vincerentur. Ea cunctatione, ſpatium Vitellianis datum, in vineas nexu traducum impeditas refugiendi: & modica ſilva adhærebat; unde rurſus auſi promptiſſimos prætorianorum equitum interficere.* He rather choſe to give his Opinion according to the Rules of Prudence, than to obtain an Advantage, by meer Chance. Had he not ſounded the Retreat on that day, the whole Army of *Vitellius* had been cut in pieces; at leaſt 'twas the Opinion of both Parties: the Reaſons he gave of his Conduct were not approved, and I think Warriors wou'd readily change the Proverb, *Too much precaution is cunning*, into this, *Too much precaution is an overſight*. Let us ſtill hear *Tacitus*. (a) *Ceterum ea ubique formido fuit, apud fugientes, occurſantes, in acie, pro vallo, ut* deleri cum univerſo exercitu Cæcinam potuiſſe, ni Suetonius Paullinus receptui cecinîſſet, *utriſque in partibus percrebuerit.* Timuiſſe ſe *Paullinus ferebat*, tantum inſuper laboris atque itineris; ne Vitellianus miles recens e caſtris feſſos aggrederetur, & perculſis nullum retro ſubſidium foret. *Apud paucos ea ducis ratio probata, in vulgus adverſo rumore fuit.* But if on the one ſide *Suetonius*'s Circumſpection proved ſometimes prejudicial to *Otho*, it might on the other have prevented his Ruin occaſion'd by the Raſhneſs of the other Generals. *Suetonius* was for protracting the War, and his Opinion grounded (b) upon very ſolid Maxims, was alſo that of (c) *Marius Celſus*, and *Annius Gallus*, his Collegues. But *Titian*, *Otho*'s Brother, and *Proculus*, Prefect of the Prætorium, who had the greateſt Intereſt (d) with that Emperor, adviſed the quite contrary, and brought things into the greateſt danger. The following Paſſage is to *Suetonius*'s Honour. (e) *Otho conſultavit, trahi bellum, an fortunam experiri placeret. Tum Suetonius Paullinus, dignum fama ſua ratus, qua nemo illa tempeſtate militaris rei callidior habebatur, de toto genere belli cenſere*; feſtinationem hoſtibus, moram ipſis utilem *diſſeruit . . . .* (f) *Otho pronus ad decertandum; frater ejus Titianus, & præfectus prætorii Proculus, imperitia properantes*, fortunam & deos & numen Othonis adeſſe conſiliis, affore conatibus *teſtabantur, neu quis obviam ire ſententiæ auderet, in adulationem conceſſerant.* A Battle being reſolved upon, it was debated whether *Otho* ſhould be there or not, and it paſſed in the Negative; *Suetonius* and *Celſus* not daring to oppoſe it, leſt they ſhou'd be accuſed of expoſing the Prince to Danger (g). They ſent him therefore with very good Troops into a ſafe Place: Which weaken'd the Army, and diſcouraged the Soldiers (h), and after that Retreat (i) *Suetonius* and *Celſus* had only the Name of Generals; their Counſels were not followed, every thing depended upon *Proculus*'s Fancy. 'Tis therefore no great wonder if the Battle was loſt, and if *Suetonius* ran away and durſt not return into the Camp. But he cannot be excuſed for what I am going to relate; 'tis a true Infamy.

(D) *He boaſted to* Vitellius *that he had betray'd* Otho.] The Commanders of the victorious Army, and thoſe who had been vanquiſh'd, went to *Vitellius* at *Lyons*. He cauſed many Captains of *Otho*'s Party to be put to Death, and left *Suetonius* and *Proculus* in the Uncertainty of the Event. At laſt they were heard, and obtained their Pardon, becauſe they made him believe they had betray'd *Otho*, and gave an Account of the Meaſures they had taken to deſtroy him. (k) *Suetonium Paullinum, ac Licinium Proculum, triſti mora ſqualidos tenuit: donec auditi, neceſſariis magis defenſionibus, quam honeſtis uterentur. Proditionem ultro imputabant:* ſpatium longi ante prœlium itineris, fatigationem Othonianorum, permixtum vehiculis agmen, ac pleraque fortuita, fraudi ſuæ *adſignantes, & Vitellius credidit de perfidia, & fidem abſolvit.* Can any thing be more unworthy of the Roman Name?

(E) Tacitus *thinks he was too wiſe a Man to have ſuch Thoughts.*] He had read in ſome Authors that the Armies of *Otho* and *Vitellius*, whether it be that they were afraid of the War, or

our

(m) *Plin. lib. 5. cap. 1.*

(n) *Tacit. Hiſt. lib. 2, cap. 37, ad ann. 822.*

(o) *Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. tom. 1. pag. m. 464.*

(p) *This plainly appears from a Paſſage in* Pliny *the younger Epiſt. 7, lib. 3.*

(q) *Tillem. Ib.*

(r) *Harduin. in Plin. lib. 5. cap. 1. pag. 526.*

(ſ) *Hard. Ib.*

(t) *Voſſius de Hiſt. Latin. lib. 1. cap. 26. p. m. 133.*

(v) *Tillem. ubi ſupra.*

(w) *Tacit. Hiſt. lib. 2. cap. 25, ad ann. 822.*

(a) *Id. Ib. cap. 26.*

(b) *They may be ſeen in Tacitus, Ib. cap. 32.*

(c *Ib. cap. 33.*

(d) *Id. Ib. lib. 1. cap. 87.*

(e) *Id. Ib. lib. 2. cap. 32.*

(f *Id. Ib. cap. 33.*

(g) *Id. Ib.*

(h) *Id. Ib.*

(i) Profecto Brixellum Othone, honor imperii penes Titianum fratrem, vis ac poteſtas penes Proculum Præfectum. Celſus & Paullinus, cum prudentia eorum nemo uteretur, inani nomine ducum, alienæ culpæ prætendebantur. *Id. Ib. cap. 39.*

(k *Id. Ib. cap. 60.*

We ſhall ſee hereafter * that it was wrong to take him for the Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian, and to ſay that he wrote the Life of *Otho*.

SUETONIUS (*Caius Suetonius Tranquillus*), a Roman Hiſtorian, Son of *Suetonius* (*A*) *Lenis*, flouriſh'd under the Empire of *Trajan* and *Hadrian*. He applied himſelf very much to Study, and I think it may be ſaid that he taught † Grammar and Rhetorick. 'Tis certain he pleaded ſome imaginary Cauſes; and I think he alſo pleaded ſome real Ones before the Judges. *Pliny*, who places him among thoſe β who were call'd *Scholaſtici*, γ a ſort of Men who never pleaded or made Orations but in a Hall, or by way of Exerciſe, affirms in another δ Place that *Suetonius* deſired him to procure him a Delay, becauſe a Dream made him afraid of miſcarrying in a Cauſe at the Bar. There was a long and * very ſtrict Friendſhip between thoſe two Writers; and it proved advantageous to *Suetonius*, for *Pliny* did him great Services. He procured him an Office of Tribune ‡, and then he had it beſtowed upon another, at *Suetonius*'s Requeſt. He obtained for the latter, whoſe Wife was barren, the *jus trium liberorum*, that is, the Privileges of thoſe who have three Children. That Favour was ſeldom granted, and *Pliny* had not obtain'd it for his Friend, had it not been for the great Intereſt he had at the Imperial Court, and for the earneſt Deſire he expreſt to obtain it ζ. He was then ↓ Governor of *Bithynia*, under the Empire of *Trajan*. *Suetonius* raiſed himſelf conſiderably, for he was Secretary to the Emperor *Hadrian*; but he loſt that Office about the Year 121, when many Perſons were put

out of Conceit with both Emperors, whoſe Infamy diſcover'd it ſelf daily, thought of coming to an Agreement, and electing a new Maſter, or intruſting the Senate with that Election, and that this was the Reaſon why the Commanders of *Otho*'s Troops, eſpecially *Paulinus*, were for prolonging the War (*l*). *Tacitus* is willing to believe that ſome few Men wiſh'd in their Hearts the publick Peace and a good Prince; but he cannot perſuade himſelf that *Suetonius*, who was ſo prudent a Man, cou'd hope that in ſo Corrupt an Age, the Soldiers, who had broke the Peace to have a War, wou'd give over the War out of a Deſire of Peace. Nor can he believe that Armies, whoſe Manners and Languages were ſo different, cou'd agree in ſuch a Deſign, nor that moſt of the chief Officers, being conſcious of their Luxury, Indigence and Crimes, wou'd have been contented with an honeſt Emperor, not beholden to them for his Dignity. (*m*) *Neque Paullinum, qua prudentia fuit, ſperaſſe, corruptiſſimo ſeculo, tantam vulgi moderationem reor, ut qui pacem belli amore turbaverant, bellum pacis caritate deponerent: neque aut exercitus linguis moribuſque diſſonos, in hunc conſenſum potuiſſe coaleſcere: aut Legatos ac duces, magna ex parte luxus, egeſtatis, ſcelerum ſibi conſcios, niſi pollutum obſtrictumque meritis ſuis Principem paſſuros.*

(*A*) *Son of* Suetonius Lenis.] The Proof of this is contained in the following Paſſage. (*p*) *Interfuit huic bello pater meus Suetonius Lenis, tertiæ decimæ legionis Tribunus anguſticlavius.* It appears alſo from theſe Words that *Suetonius*'s Father was Tribune of the 13th Legion, and that he was at the Battle of *Bedriacum*, in which *Vitellius*'s Troops defeated thoſe of *Otho*. Had *Muretus* exactly remembred the Paſſages of *Tacitus*, alledged by him, he wou'd have made a better uſe of his Critical Learning. He found *linus* with a little hole before it in a Manuſcript, whereupon he fancied that three Letters were loſt, and that inſtead of *Linus*, the true reading was *Paulinus*; from whence he inferr'd that *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian was the Son of *Suetonius Paulinus*, who makes the Subject of the foregoing Article. (*q*) *Vidi ego librum, qui cariem & tineas ſenſerat, in quo poſt nomen* Suetonius *foramen erat exiguum: deinde ſequebatur* linus: & *ſupra alia manu emendatum* lenis: *Omnino autem legendum eſt* Paulinus; *id enim ei verum cognomen fuit. Teſtem in eam rem laudabo Tacitum, qui fortis viri neque nomen, neque virtutem tacitam eſſe ſivit. Ejus enim & ſæpe in annalibus, & in Agricolæ vita perhonorificam mentionem facit.* He was ſo fond of his Conjecture, that he did not mind the Teſtimonies of *Tacitus*, which he made uſe of; for if he had conſidered them with Attention, he might eaſily have perceived that they were wholly inconſiſtent with his Critical Obſervation; and he would have concluded that *Suetonius*, whoſe Exploits are mentioned by *Tacitus*, cou'd not be he who was only a Tribune in the War of *Vitellius*. To which I add, that according to the ſame *Tacitus* in (*r*) a Work not quoted by *Muretus*, *Suetonius Paulinus* was one of *Otho*'s Generals during the ſame War, which utterly deſtroys *Muretus*'s Correction. Theſe are very ſtrange Faults, and yet a Critick ought never to take notice of 'em in an inſulting Manner, being always mindful that he may want the ſame Indulgence when he commits the like Miſtakes, which is unavoidable. Were I allowed to compare my ſelf with great Men, I would apply to my ſelf the Inference drawn by *Lipſius* from this Miſtake of *Muretus*. (*ſ*) *Quid dicam? Non inſector te vir elegantiſſime. ſed bona fide hæc ſcribis? Erras nimis. Suetonius ille Lenis, Tribunus fuit: noſter belli dux. Ille anguſticlavius, id eſt, nondum Senator, ſed inter equites: Ille Conſularis, nec tenue uſquam veſtigium confuſionis ejus quam facis. Hoc mihi in tranſcurſu monitum, non ut carpam (Fidem teſtor:) ſed ut claro ſub exemplo doceam quam fallax hæc Critica, & ignoſcendum etiam nobis eſſe, ſi labimur interdum in proclivi iſtâ viâ.*

Perhaps ſome will think that *Suetonius Lenis*, Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian, was the Son of *Suetonius*, who makes the Subject of the foregoing Article; but there is no ground for ſuch an Opinion; for if *Suetonius* had been the Grandſon of that great Warrior, and of that Roman Conſul, he wou'd not have ſpoken of his Grandfather ſo plainly as he does: (*a*) *Avum meum narrantem puer audiebam, cauſſam operis ab interioribus aulicis proditam, &c.* An Hiſtorian may be ſo modeſt as not to inſert in his Work occaſionally the glorious Titles of his Anceſtors; but 'tis hardly poſſible, that when he mentions his Father or Grandfather, he ſhou'd be contented to name 'em without mentioning the important Offices conferred upon 'em. Our *Suetonius* did not forget his Father's Tribuneſhip; much more wou'd he have mention'd his Father's Generalſhip: the Occaſion neceſſarily required it; for 'tis on Account of the Battle of *Bedriacum* that he obſerves that his Father commanded a Legion, during the War of *Otho* and *Vitellius*: but 'twas in that War that *Suetonius Paulinus* commanded *Otho*'s Troops.

One *Sicco Polentonus* ſaid before *Muretus* that *Suetonius Paulinus* is the Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian. Beſides, he aſcribes to him ſome Books that were written by the latter, *viz.* *de Inſtitutione officiorum*, *de Illuſtribus ſcriptoribus*, *deque hiſtoria ludicra*. 'Tis in a Life of *Suetonius*, which *Pibius* inſerted in his Annals (*b*), and which is of no value. This *Polentonus* was Secretary of the City of *Padua* in the Beginning of the XV. Century (*c*). *Voſſius* (*d*) affirms two things: 1ſt. That *Geſner* ſays that *Suetonius Lenis* is the ſame with *Suetonius Paulinus*, and that he was the Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian, and Author of a Life of the Emperor *Otho*: 2d. That *La Popeliniere* ſays the ſame. There is no ſuch thing in *Geſner*'s *Bibliotheca* quoted by *Voſſius*; but the following Words are to be found in the Abridgment of it;

---

* *In the Remark A of the following Article.*

† *Suidas in* Τραγκυλλος *calls him only a Grammarian, and mentions the Titles of many Grammatical Books written by* Suetonius.

β *Plin. Ep. 24. l. 1.*

γ *Id. Ep. 3. l. 2.*

δ *Id. Ep. 18. l. 1.*

* *Id. l. 1. Ep. 24. l. 10. Ep. 95.*

‡ *Id. Ep. 8. l. 3.*

ζ *See the 95th, and 96th Letters of the 10th Book of* Pliny.

↓ *About the year 104.*

(*l*) *Ex e-* *, Ib.* *37.*

(*m*) *Id. Ib.*

(*p*) *Sueton. in Othone* *10.*

(*q*) *Muret.* *iar.* *l. 15.* *11. p.* *1144.*

(*r*) *The 1ſt and the 2d Book of* Tacitus's *Hiſtory.*

(*ſ*) Lipſius *in Tacit. Hiſt. l. 2. pag. m. 484.*

(*a*) *Sueton. in Caligula, cap. 19.*

(*b*) *Ad annum 818. See Voſſius de Hiſt. Latinis. p. 134, & 167.*

(*c*) *See Voſſius Ib. pag. 864.*

(*d*) *Voſſius Ib. pag. 135.*

and taking his Meaſures with the utmoſt (C) Circumſpection, prevented his improving favourable Opportunities, and afforded the Enemies a ſufficient Time to take care of their Affairs. The worſt was that he ran away on the Day of a general and deciſive Battle, and that he boaſted to *Vitellius* that he had (D) betray'd *Otho*, which probably was not true; but he was believed upon his Word, and that ſaved his Life. It has been ſaid that the Hopes he had of being made Emperor, moved him to adviſe that the War ſhou'd be kept up between *Otho* and *Vitellius*; but *Tacitus* thinks he was too wiſe a Man to have (E) ſuch Thoughts.

We

of (m) *Pliny* that he was Conſul, which is no leſs evident from theſe Words of *Tacitus*. (n) *Atque eo duces Othonianos ſpatium ad moras ſuaſiſſe; præcipuè Paullinum, quod vetuſtiſſimus* CONSULARIUM, *& militia clarus, gloriam nomenque Britannicis expeditionibus meruiſſet.* If it be ſaid that there is no need of this Paſſage of *Tacitus*, and that it is ſufficient to alledge theſe Words out of the 14th Chapter of the 16th Book of his Annals: *C. Suetonio L. Teleſino Conſulibus Antiſtius Soſianus . . . . ſibi conciliat.* I anſwer that this Paſſage of the Annals, which is commonly alledged to prove *Suetonius*'s Conſulſhip, does not appear deciſive, if we take notice of a Note of M. *de Tillemont* (o). We have ſeen that *Suetonius* was, in the year of *Rome* 822, the moſt Ancient of thoſe who had been Conſuls. But *Lucius Piſo* was ſtill (p) living, and had been Conſul in the year 809, and therefore *Suetonius* muſt have been Conſul before the year 809, and conſequently the Words of *Tacitus*'s Annals do not concern his Conſulſhip, ſince they belong to the year 819, or 818. M. *de Tillemont* (q) conjectures that *Caius Suetonius*, who was Conſul with *Lucius Teleſinus* in the 66th year of the Chriſtian *Æra*, that is, in the year 818, or 819, of *Rome*, was the Son of *Suetonius*, who makes the Subject of this Article. Father *Hardouin* (r), and all the other Authors I have conſulted, ſay, that our *Suetonius Paulinus* was *Teleſinus*'s Collegue. You'll find the ſame Opinion in *Voſſius*, and a Fault in Chronology; for *Voſſius* ſuppoſes that this Conſulſhip belongs to the year of *Rome* 811 (ſ). Father *Hardouin* (t) places it in the laſt year of *Nero*'s Life, and quotes the 6th Book of *Tacitus*'s Annals. He ſhou'd have quoted the 16th, and remembred that *Nero* died the 2d year after the Conſulſhip of *Suetonius* and *Teleſinus*. M. *de Tillemont* (v) ſuppoſes as a thing undeniable, that *Suetonius* had been Conſul before he was ſent into *Britain*; and the Reaſon he goes upon, is, that all thoſe who were ſent thither had been Conſuls. I can't tell whether he is in the right as to this laſt Point, and the Proof he takes from theſe Words, *vetuſtiſſimus conſularium*, does not appear to me a convincing one; for perhaps the Meaning of 'em is, that *Suetonius* was older than all thoſe who had been Conſuls, tho' ſome of 'em had exerciſed the Conſulſhip before him; and therefore I don't abſolutely condemn the common Opinion, nor his neither. There may be ſome Reaſons on both ſides: It were ſomewhat ſtrange that *Tacitus* ſhould never mention the Conſular Quality of *Suetonius*, if it had belonged to him, when he commanded in *Britain*.

(C) *His Maxims, which conſiſted in venturing nothing . . . . prevented his improving favourable Opportunities.*] *Cæcina*, General of *Vitellius*'s Troops, made uſe of a Stratagem, which did not ſucceed, and was like to be fatal to him, becauſe the Generals of *Otho* having diſcovered it, avoided the Snare, and laid another which the Enemy did not perceive. By this means they obtained a conſiderable Advantage, but not ſuch as it might have been, if *Suetonius* had been bolder and leſs cautious. *Tacitus* gives the following Character of him. (w) *Signum pugnæ non ſtatim à Suetonio Paullino pediti datum. Cunctator natura, & cui cauta potius conſilia cum ratione, quam proſpera ex caſu placerent;* compleri foſſas, aperiri campum, pandi aciem *jubebat, ſatis cito incipi victoriam ratus, ubi proviſum foret ne vincerentur. Ea cunctatione, ſpatium Vitellianis datum, in vineas nexu traducum impeditas refugiendi: & modica ſilva adhærebat; unde rurſus auſi promptiſſimos prætorianorum equitum interficere.* He rather choſe to give his Opinion according to the Rules of Prudence, than to obtain an Advantage by meer Chance. Had he not ſounded the Retreat on that day, the whole Army of *Vitellius* had been cut in pieces, at leaſt 'twas the Opinion of both Parties: the Reaſons he gave of his Conduct were not approved, and I think Warriors wou'd readily change the Proverb, *Too much precaution is cunning*, into this, *Too much precaution is an overſight*. Let us ſtill hear *Tacitus*. (a) *Ceterum ea ubique formido fuit, apud fugientes, occurſantes, in acie, pro vallo, ut deleri cum univerſo exercitu* Cæcinam potuiſſe, ni Suetonius Paullinus receptui cecinisſet, *utriſque in partibus percrebuerit.* Timuiſſe ſe *Paullinus ferebat*, tantum inſuper laboris atque itineris, ne Vitellianus miles recens e caſtris feſſos aggrederetur, & perculſis nullum retro ſubſidium foret. *Apud paucos ea ducis ratio probata, in vulgus adverſo rumore fuit.* But if on the one ſide *Suetonius*'s Circumſpection proved ſometimes prejudicial to *Otho*, it might on the other have prevented his Ruin occaſion'd by the Raſhneſs of the other Generals. *Suetonius* was for protracting the War, and his Opinion grounded (b) upon very ſolid Maxims, was alſo that of (c) *Marius Celſus*, and *Annius Gallus*, his Collegues. But *Titian*, *Otho*'s Brother, and *Proculus*, Prefect of the Prætorium, who had the greateſt Intereſt (d) with that Emperor, adviſed the quite contrary, and brought things into the greateſt danger. The following Paſſage is to *Suetonius*'s Honour. (e) *Otho conſultavit, trahi bellum, an fortunam experiri placeret. Tum Suetonius Paullinus, dignum fama ſua ratus, qua nemo illa tempeſtate militaris rei callidior habebatur, de toto genere belli cenſere;* feſtinationem hoſtibus, moram ipſis utilem *diſſeruit . . . .* (f) *Otho pronus ad decertandum; frater ejus Titianus, & præfectus prætorii Proculus, imperitia properantes,* fortunam & deos & numen Othonis adeſſe conſiliis, affore conatibus *teſtabantur, neu quis obviam ire ſententiæ auderet, in adulationem conceſſerant.* A Battle being reſolved upon, it was debated whether *Otho* ſhould be there or not, and it paſſed in the Negative; *Suetonius* and *Celſus* not daring to oppoſe it, leſt they ſhou'd be accuſed of expoſing the Prince to Danger (g). They ſent him therefore with very good Troops into a ſafe Place: Which weaken'd the Army, and diſcouraged the Soldiers (h), and after that Retreat (i) *Suetonius* and *Celſus* had only the Name of Generals; their Counſels were not followed, every thing depended upon *Proculus*'s Fancy. 'Tis therefore no great wonder if the Battle was loſt, and if *Suetonius* ran away and durſt not return into the Camp. But he cannot be excuſed for what I am going to relate; 'tis a true Infamy.

(D) *He boaſted to* Vitellius *that he had betray'd* Otho.] The Commanders of the victorious Army, and thoſe who had been vanquiſh'd, went to *Vitellius* at *Lyons*. He cauſed many Captains of *Otho*'s Party to be put to Death, and left *Suetonius* and *Proculus* in the Uncertainty of the Event. At laſt they were heard, and obtained their Pardon, becauſe they made him believe they had betray'd *Otho*, and gave an Account of the Meaſures they had taken to deſtroy him. (k) *Suetonium Paullinum, ac Licinium Proculum, triſti mora ſqualidos tenuit: donec auditi, neceſſariis magis defenſionibus, quam honeſtis uterentur. Proditionem ultro imputabant:* ſpatium longi ante prœlium itineris, fatigationem Othonianorum, permixtum vehiculis agmen, ac pleraque fortuita, fraudi ſuæ *adſignantes, & Vitellius credidit de perfidia, & fidem abſolvit.* Can any thing be more unworthy of the Roman Name?

(E) Tacitus *thinks he was too wiſe a Man to have ſuch Thoughts.*] He had read in ſome Authors that the Armies of *Otho* and *Vitellius*, whether it be that they were afraid of the War, or

our

(m) *Plin. lib. 5. cap. 1.*

(n) *Tacit. Hiſt. lib. 2, cap. 37, ad ann. 822.*

(o) *Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. tom. 1. pag. m. 464.*

(p) *This plainly appears from a Paſſage in* Pliny *the younger Epiſt. 7, lib. 3.*

(q) *Tillem. Ib.*

(r) *Harduin. in Plin. lib. 5. cap. 1. pag. 526.*

(ſ) *Hard. Ib.*

(t) *Voſſius de Hiſt. Latin. lib. 1. cap. 26. p. m. 133.*

(v) *Tillem. ubi ſupra.*

(w) *Tacit. Hiſt. lib. 2. cap. 25, ad ann. 822.*

(a) *Id. Ib. cap. 26.*

(b) *They may be ſeen in Tacitus, Ib. cap. 32.*

(c) *Ib. cap. 33.*

(d) *Id. Ib. lib. 1. cap. 87.*

(e) *Id. Ib. lib. 2. cap. 32.*

(f) *Id. Ib. cap. 33.*

(g) *Id. Ib.*

(h) *Id. Ib.*

(i) Profecto Brixellum Othone, honor imperii penes Titianum fratrem, vis ac poteſtas penes Proculum Præfectum. Celſus & Paullinus, cum prudentia eorum nemo uteretur, inani nomine ducum, alienæ culpæ prætendebantur. *Id. Ib. cap. 39.*

(k) *Id. Ib. cap. 60.*

We ſhall ſee hereafter * that it was wrong to take him for the Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian, and to ſay that he wrote the Life of *Otho*.

SUETONIUS (*Caius Suetonius Tranquillus*), a Roman Hiſtorian, Son of *Suetonius* (*A*) *Lenis*, flouriſh'd under the Empire of *Trajan* and *Hadrian*. He applied himſelf very much to Study, and I think it may be ſaid that he taught † Grammar and Rhetorick. 'Tis certain he pleaded ſome imaginary Cauſes; and I think he alſo pleaded ſome real Ones before the Judges. *Pliny*, who places him among thoſe β who were call'd *Scholaſtici*, γ a ſort of Men who never pleaded or made Orations but in a Hall, or by way of Exerciſe, affirms in another δ Place that *Suetonius* deſired him to procure him a Delay, becauſe a Dream made him afraid of miſcarrying in a Cauſe at the Bar. There was a long and * very ſtrict Friendſhip between thoſe two Writers; and it proved advantageous to *Suetonius*, for *Pliny* did him great Services. He procured him an Office of Tribune ‡, and then he had it beſtowed upon another, at *Suetonius*'s Requeſt. He obtained for the latter, whoſe Wife was barren, the *jus trium liberorum*, that is, the Privileges of thoſe who have three Children. That Favour was ſeldom granted, and *Pliny* had not obtain'd it for his Friend, had it not been for the great Intereſt he had at the Imperial Court, and for the earneſt Deſire he expreſt to obtain it ζ. He was then ‡ Governor of *Bithynia*, under the Empire of *Trajan*. *Suetonius* raiſed himſelf conſiderably, for he was Secretary to the Emperor *Hadrian*; but he loſt that Office about the Year 121, when many Perſons were put

out of Conceit with both Emperors, whoſe Infamy diſcover'd it ſelf daily, thought of coming to an Agreement, and electing a new Maſter, or intruſting the Senate with that Election, and that this was the Reaſon why the Commanders of *Otho*'s Troops, eſpecially *Paulinus*, were for prolonging the War (*l*). *Tacitus* is willing to believe that ſome few Men wiſh'd in their Hearts the publick Peace and a good Prince; but he cannot perſwade himſelf that *Suetonius*, who was ſo prudent a Man, cou'd hope that in ſo Corrupt an Age, the Soldiers, who had broke the Peace to have a War, wou'd give over the War out of a Deſire of Peace. Nor can he believe that Armies, whoſe Manners and Languages were ſo different, cou'd agree in ſuch a Deſign, nor that moſt of the chief Officers, being conſcious of their Luxury, Indigence and Crimes, wou'd have been contented with an honeſt Emperor, not beholden to them for his Dignity. (*m*) *Neque Paullinum, qua prudentia fuit, ſperaſſe, corruptiſſimo ſeculo, tantam vulgi moderationem reor, ut qui pacem belli amore turbaverant, bellum pacis caritate deponerent: neque aut exercitus linguis moribuſque diſſonos, in hunc conſenſum potuiſſe coaleſcere: aut Legatos ac duces, magna ex parte luxus, egeſtatis, ſcelerum ſibi conſcios, niſi pollutum obſtrictumque meritis ſuis Principem paſſuros.*

(*A*) *Son of* Suetonius Lenis.] The Proof of this is contained in the following Paſſage. (*p*) *Interfuit huic bello pater meus Svetonius Lenis, tertiæ decimæ legionis Tribunus anguſticlavius.* It appears alſo from theſe Words that *Suetonius*'s Father was Tribune of the 13th Legion, and that he was at the Battle of *Bedriacum*, in which *Vitellius*'s Troops defeated thoſe of *Otho*. Had *Muretus* exactly remembred the Paſſages of *Tacitus*, alledged by him, he wou'd have made a better uſe of his Critical Learning. He found *linus* with a little hole before it in a Manuſcript, whereupon he fancied that three Letters were loſt, and that inſtead of *Linus*, the true reading was *Paulinus*; from whence he inferr'd that *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian was the Son of *Suetonius Paulinus*, who makes the Subject of the foregoing Article. (*q*) *Vidi ego librum, qui cariem & tineas ſenſerat, in quo poſt nomen* Suetonius *foramen erat exiguum: deinde ſequebatur* linus: *& ſupra alia manu emendatum* lenis: *Omnino autem legendum eſt* Paulinus; *id enim ei verum cognomen fuit. Teſtem in eam rem laudabo Tacitum, qui fortis viri neque nomen, neque virtutem tacitam eſſe ſivit. Ejus enim & ſæpe in annalibus, & in Agricolæ vita perhonorificam mentionem facit.* He was ſo fond of his Conjecture, that he did not mind the Teſtimonies of *Tacitus*, which he made uſe of; for if he had conſidered them with Attention, he might eaſily have perceived that they were wholly inconſiſtent with his Critical Obſervation; and he would have concluded that *Suetonius*, whoſe Exploits are mentioned by *Tacitus*, cou'd not be he who was only a Tribune in the War of *Vitellius*. To which I add, that according to the ſame *Tacitus* in (*r*) a Work not quoted by *Muretus*, *Suetonius Paulinus* was one of *Otho*'s Generals during the ſame War, which utterly deſtroys *Muretus*'s Correction. Theſe are very ſtrange Faults, and yet a Critick ought never to take notice of 'em in an inſulting Manner, being always mindful that he may want the ſame Indulgence when he commits the like Miſtakes, which is unavoidable. Were I allowed to compare my ſelf with great Men, I would apply to my ſelf the Inference drawn by *Lipſius* from this Miſtake of *Muretus*. (*ſ*) *Quid dicam? Non inſector te vir elegantiſſime. ſed bona fide hæc ſcribis? Erras nimis. Suetonius ille Lenis, Tribunus fuit: noſter belli dux. Ille anguſticlavius, id eſt, nondum Senator, ſed inter equites: Iſte Conſularis, nec tenue uſquam veſtigium confuſionis ejus quam facis. Hoc mihi in tranſcurſu monitum, non ut carpam (Fidem teſtor:) ſed ut claro ſub exemplo doceam quàm fallax hæc Critica, & ignoſcendum etiam nobis eſſe, ſi labimur interdum in proclivi iſtâ viâ.*

Perhaps ſome will think that *Suetonius Lenis*, Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian, was the Son of *Suetonius*, who makes the Subject of the foregoing Article; but there is no ground for ſuch an Opinion; for if *Suetonius* had been the Grandſon of that great Warrior, and of that Roman Conſul, he wou'd not have ſpoken of his Grandfather ſo plainly as he does: (*a*) *Avum meum narrantem puer audiebam, cauſſam operis ab interioribus aulicis proditam, &c.* An Hiſtorian may be ſo modeſt as not to inſert in his Work occaſionally the glorious Titles of his Anceſtors; but 'tis hardly poſſible, that when he mentions his Father or Grandfather, he ſhou'd be contented to name 'em without mentioning the important Offices conferred upon 'em. Our *Suetonius* did not forget his Father's Tribuneſhip; much more wou'd he have mention'd his Father's Generalſhip: the Occaſion neceſſarily required it; for 'tis on Account of the Battle of *Bedriacum* that he obſerves that his Father commanded a Legion, during the War of *Otho* and *Vitellius*: but 'twas in that War that *Suetonius Paulinus* commanded *Otho*'s Troops.

One *Sicco Polentonus* ſaid before *Muretus* that *Suetonius Paulinus* is the Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian. Beſides, he aſcribes to him ſome Books that were written by the latter, *viz.* *de Inſtitutione officiorum, de Illuſtribus ſcriptoribus, deque hiſtoria ludicra.* 'Tis in a Life of *Suetonius*, which *Pibius* inſerted in his Annals (*b*), and which is of no value. This *Polentonus* was Secretary of the City of *Padua* in the Beginning of the XV. Century (*c*). *Voſſius* (*d*) affirms two things: 1ſt. That *Geſner* ſays that *Suetonius Lenis* is the ſame with *Suetonius Paulinus*, and that he was the Father of *Suetonius* the Hiſtorian, and Author of a Life of the Emperor *Otho*: 2d. That *La Popeliniere* ſays the ſame. There is no ſuch thing in *Geſner*'s *Bibliotheca* quoted by *Voſſius*; but the following Words are to be found in the Abridgment of it;

---

* *In the Remark A of the following Article.*

† Suidas *in* Τραγκυλλος *calls him only a Grammarian, and mentions the Titles of many Grammatical Books written by* Suetonius.

β *Plin. Ep.* 24. *l.* 1.

γ *Id. Ep.* 3. *l.* 2.

δ *Id. Ep.* 18. *l.* 1.

* *Id. l.* 1. *Ep.* 24. *l.* 10. *Ep.* 94.

‡ *Id. Ep.* 8. *l.* 3.

ζ *See the* 95*th, and* 96*th Letters of the* 10*th Book of* Pliny.

‡ *About the year* 104.

(*l*) *Ex eodem, Ib. cap.* 37.

(*m*) *Id. Ib.*

(*p*) *Sueton. in Othone cap.* 10.

(*q*) *Muret. Variar. Lect. l.* 15. *cap.* 11. *p.* 1144.

(*r*) *The* 1ſt *and the* 2d *Book of* Tacitus's *Hiſtory.*

(*ſ*) Lipſius *in Tacit. Hiſt. l.* 2. *pag. m.* 424.

(*a*) *Sueton. in Caligula, cap.* 19.

(*b*) *Ad annum* 818. *See Voſſius de Hiſt. Latinis. p.* 134, & 167.

(*c*) *See Voſſius Ib. pag.* 864.

(*d*) *Voſſius Ib. pag.* 135.

put out of Favour (B) for not paying a due Reſpect to the Empreſs. He wrote many (C) Books, moſt of which are loſt. We have only his Hiſtory of the firſt twelve Emperors, and part of his Treatiſe concerning the illuſtrious Grammarians and Rhetoricians. That Hiſtory is very much (D) commended by our moſt learned Humaniſts: He ſpeaks much more of the Emperors than of the Affairs of the Empire; and the Diligence wherewith he has collected ſo many Particulars concerning their Actions and Inclinations, cannot be ſufficiently admired. He does not obſerve the Order of Time; and no Hiſtory was ever more different from Annals than this is. He reduces every thing to ſome general Heads, and places together what relates to each Head. He is very conciſe, and frequently touches upon Cuſtoms and Ordinances, ſo that thoſe who read his Hiſtory with a good Commentary, or hear it explain'd by a learned Critick, may learn a vaſt Number of things relating to Antiquity. Some blame him

it, made by others: (e) *Suetonius Lenis, Suetonii Tranquilli pater, Lucii Othonis imperatoris vitam deſcripſit. Item librum de inſtitutione obſervata, & librum Prætorum.* There is nothing in theſe Words, whereby it may appear that the Author of 'em believed that *Suetonius Lenis*, and *Suetonius Paulinus* are the ſame Perſon. *La Popeliniere* expreſſes himſelf thus: "(f) *Suetonius Lenis* "the Father of *Tranquillus*, wrote the Life of "the Emperor *L. Otho*, and a Book concerning "the *Prætors*." This is all falſe.

Note that *Suetonius* taking the Sirname of *Tranquillus*, retain'd the whole Senſe of the Sirname *Lenis*, which his Father had. But we don't know the Reaſon which made him prefer the one to the other: Perhaps he only conſulted his Ear, and *Tranquillus* ſounded better to him.

(B) *He loſt that Office . . . . when many Perſons were put out of Favour for not paying a due reſpect to the Empreſs.*] This is to be found only in a Paſſage of *Spartianus*. (g) *Septicio Claro præfecto prætorii, & Suetonio Tranquillo Epiſtolarum magiſtro, multiſque aliis qui apud Sabinam uxorem, injuſſu ejus, familiarius ſe tunc egerant quàm reverentia domus aulicæ poſtulabat, ſucceſſores dedit.* The Senſe of thoſe Words is thus repreſented by M. *de Tillemont*: (h) "*Adrian* put out of Favour many Perſons "in *England*, for having behaved themſelves too "freely, without his Order, towards the Empreſs "*Sabina*, [which is not farther explain'd in Hiſtory.] *Suetonius Tranquillus* [who doubtleſs "is the Hiſtorian] loſt his Office of Secretary, "*&c.*" This is very Judicious: We ſhall ſee in the Remark, wherein I take notice of *Moreri*'s Miſtakes, that every Body has not been ſo cautious as M. *de Tillemont*.

(C) *He wrote many Books.*] I ſhall uſe ſtill the Expreſſions of the ſame Writer. "(i) *Suidas* ". . . . aſcribes to him ſeveral Works, which "concern that (k) Profeſſion. Beſides, he obſerves "that he had writ a Book about the Grecian "Games, two upon the Spectacles of the Romans, two upon the Laws and Cuſtoms of *Rome*, "one upon the Life of *Cicero* or upon his Books "*de Republica*, a Catalogue of the Illuſtrious "Men of *Rome*, and the eight Books [ſtill extant] of the Hiſtory of the Emperors. (1) "He had alſo writ three Books of Kings, of "which St. *Paulinus* made an Abridgment in "Verſe. (2) The Book of the Inſtitution of "Offices, quoted by *Priſcian* [perhaps the Book "concerning the Laws and Cuſtoms of *Rome*.] "The ſame *Priſcian* quotes eight Books of his "concerning the *Prætors*. A Book intit'led *de* "*rebus variis*, is aſcrib'd to him, wherein he "treated of things that concern Grammar. (3) "It appears by many Authors, who quote his "Works, that they have been very much eſteem'd "even among the Greeks. (4) *Tertullian* quotes "his Book concerning Spectacles, (5) and St. *Jerome* that of the Illuſtrious Men, in whoſe Imitation he wrote his. ['Tis likely that what is now "extant of *Suetonius* about the Illuſtrious Grammarians, Poets and Orators, made part of that "Work. He ſpeaks of ſome Grecians, but they "taught at *Rome*".]

(D) ***That Hiſtory of the firſt Twelve Emperors, is very much commended by our moſt Learned Humaniſts.***] 'Tis a continued Series of choice and curious Facts, related ſuccinctly without Digreſſions, Reflections and Reaſonings. There is in it a Character of Sincerity, which plainly ſhews that the Author feared and hoped for nothing, and that his Pen was not directed by Hatred or Flattery. He repreſents abundance of Vices, with all their Deformity, without diſcovering any Inclination to Slander, and without omitting (l) the good Qualities of thoſe whoſe Crimes he deſcribes. Which muſt needs pleaſe the Judicious Readers, who are extreamly offended, when they obſerve that an Author loves Slandering, and relates wicked Actions, not ſo much to perform the Part of an Hiſtorian, as to ſatisfy his Satyrical Humour. Many Readers don't much care whether an Hiſtorian diſcovers ſuch a Humour, or appears free from it; 'tis enough for them if he be Satyrical: thoſe Men have doubtleſs wrong Notions of things, and little Honeſty; but all things being otherwiſe alike, I think they wou'd rather chuſe a Hiſtory, wherein wicked Princes are ingenuouſly deſcrib'd, than one that may be ſuſpected by reaſon of the Author's Malignity; and therefore they may agree with Men of a good Taſte in approving *Suetonius*. He found the Art of perſwading the Reader of his Sincerity; which plainly ſhews that he is no paſſionate Writer. Let us ſee what Judgment has been made of him by ſome Learned Men: I begin with the Eloquent *Politian*. (a) *Hæc ſingula ita Suetonius hic noſter perfectus in ſua Hiſtoria eſt, ut præter explicandi ſcientiam, qua mirifice eſt uſus, etiam diligentiam nobis, fidemque, & libertatem ſuam plane probaverit. Nulla in his libris ſuſpicio eſt gratiæ, nulla ſimultatis, nihil ſtudio dictum, nihil ſuppreſſum metu, rebus ipſis data omnia, veritati in primis ſervitum eſt, ut plane appareat ad perpetuam magis poſſeſſionem (ut Thucydides ait) quam ad intuitum hoc opus, pugnamque præſentem comparatum eſt. Nam qui aut fœdis aſſentationibus, aut malignis obtrectatiunculis, ſupra quam res ipſa poſtulet, quaſi ſervire hiſtoriam cogunt, ii mihi haud minus eam dehoneſtare videntur, atque ii qui Herculem ipſum depingant, Lydiæ Omphalæ in muliebri & crocina tunicula famulantem.* . . . . (b) *Hanc in primis captare Hiſtoricus laudem debet, ut libertate uſus maxima in ſcribendo, ut neque aſſentationi quaſi obnoxius, neque obtrectationi quaſi offenſus, ſed fidei ſerviſſe atque incorruptæ veritati exiſtimetur, ne quid in eo ſervile, neve quid malignius deprehendatur, ſic ut nec ullis conditionibus ſolicitatus, neque mercedula cuiquam auctoratus, ſed ſui homo juris, rectus, atque intrepidus neutram in partem præponderet.* . . . . (c) *Tantum abeſt, ut hic noſter quicquam vel metu, vel ſtudio adductus, rebus ipſis detraxerit, ut Nervæ etiam, Trajani, Adrianique ſuæ ætatis Imperatorum vitas tacere præoptaverit, quam aut periculoſe de viventibus male ſentire, aut extollendo potentiores, parum videri liber.* I ſhall add the following Words of *Lipſius* to this noble Encomium. (d) *Suetonium Tranquillum non injuria commendo ſæpe juventuti. Verba vides? Pura, terſa, propria. Filum totum orationis? Breve, nervoſum. Rem ipſam? Utilis pariter & jucunda hiſtoria eſt: &, quod mihi caput, plena moris & doctrinæ antiquæ. Quis obſecro, ritus publicus olim privatuſque fuit, quem velut de induſtria non tangat? Quod munus, quis magiſtratus, quem non libet? Tangat & libet, dico. Non enim explicet: quod inſtitutum ejus vetuit & ratio ſcribendi. At viam tamen latam ſternit ad indagandum: & aures atque animum imbuit auditione aliqua, imo cognitione.* One Witneſs more: (e) *Suetonius vitas aliquot deſcripſit Auguſtorum. Fidem ſi ſpectes, nihil certius. Acumen ſcribentis ſi conſideres, & prudentiam, nihil acutius, nihil prudentius. Verborum,* quantam

---

(e) *Epitome bibl. Geſner. pag.* 769. *Edit.* 1583

(f) La Popeliniere Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires *Book*, 6. (*and not* 5 *as* Voſſius *quotes it*) *pag.* 344.

(g) *Ælius Spartian. in vita Adriani cap.* 11. *p. m.* 102. *tom.* 1. *Hiſt. Auguſtæ ſcriptor.*

(h) *Tillemont Hiſt. des Emper. tom.* 2. *p. m.* 418. *ad ann.* 121.

(i) *Id. ib. pag.* 486.

(k) *That is, that of a Grammarian.*

(1) *Auſon. Ep.* 19. *p.* 466.

(2) *Suet. prol.*

(3) *Prol.*

(4) *Tert. ſpec. c.* 5. *p.* 92. *c.*

(5) *Hier. v. ill. præf. p.* 261. *a.*

(l) *See Bodin, Method. Hiſt. cap.* 4. *pag. m.* 55.

(a) *Politian. præfat. in Suetonium fol. m. b* 3.

(b) *Id. ib. fol. b* 4.

(c) *Id. ib. fol. b* 5.

(d) *Juſtus Lipſius Elector. lib.* 2. *cap.* 17. *p. m.* 911. *tom.* 1. *oper.*

(e) *Petr. Criſc. Robortellus in litteris ad Jo. Bapt. Campegium tom.* 1. *de Populi Romani vita & [illegible] promiſſi.*

him for being ſo particular (E) in deſcribing the lewd Actions and horrid Debaucheries of *Tiberius*, *Caligula*, *Nero*, &c. It cannot be denied that the Inquiries he made into thoſe things are very ſingular, and that he allowed a great deal of Liberty to his Pen; and therefore it has been ſaid that he writ the Lives of the Emperors with the ſame Freedom as they lived. Nevertheleſs he was a Man of very good † Morals, and great Virtue. He made no haſte to publiſh his Works, and wanted to be entreated ß not to keep 'em ſo long in his Cloſet. The beſt Commentaries upon that Writer are thoſe of *Torrentius* and *Caſaubon*. They have been inſerted at large, with the Notes of ſome Learned Criticks, in γ the Edition of *Utrecht* 1672. I have not ſeen the French Tranſlation of *Suetonius*, printed at *Lyons* * in the year 1556, in 4to; and therefore I cannot ſay whether

quantum ſatis eſt, adhibet; copiam autem rejicit. Formulas fori & curiæ omnes ſervat in loquendo. Mirificus planè vir, & dignus qui ab omnibus ametur & legatur. If any one deſires a greater number of Teſtimonies, he needs only read *Hanckius* in the 1ſt Volume *de Romanarum rerum ſcriptoribus*, pag. 112, and 113; and in the 2d Volume, pag. 287, and 288. See alſo Sir *Thomas Pope Blount*, pag. 104, of the *Cenſura celebriorum autorum*. But the Reader muſt alſo find here what the Ancients have ſaid of *Suetonius*'s Candor and Sincerity. See the Margin (f).

I muſt not conceal that thoſe, who are willing to know the Date of each Event, are very much diſpleaſed with *Suetonius*. That Hiſtorian has wholly neglected it; he does not obſerve any Chronological Order: and indeed it was no Part of his Deſign; and 'tis to be obſerv'd that he is excuſable for pitching upon a Method, which diſpenſed him from following that Order. There were Hiſtories enough, which contained an exact Account of the Reign of the Emperors, according to the time in which every thing had been done; and therefore he did not think it proper to compoſe a Work of the ſame Nature, but rather choſe to diſcover the private Actions of the Emperors, and to put together in one Chapter what concern'd their Marriages, and in other Chapters what concern'd their Education, their Friendſhips, their Buildings, &c. He pitch'd upon the moſt difficult Part of Hiſtory; for 'tis much eaſier to collect the Materials of Wars or other publick Affairs, than to give a particular Account of what paſſes in a Palace, I mean of the Inclinations and private Actions of the Monarch; what he was as a Husband, as a Maſter, as a Friend, as a Lover; what Caprices he was ſubject to, what Clothes he wore, what Meals he made, &c. I am ſure that if a Man ſhou'd undertake at this day to write the Hiſtory of the Popes, Emperors, or Kings of *France*, &c. in Imitation of *Suetonius*, running back to the laſt 150 Years, more or leſs, as he did, he wou'd meet with great Difficulties; and if he ſucceeded as well as *Suetonius*, he would be admired, and look'd upon as an excellent Author of a Secret Hiſtory. Oh, how fit wou'd ſuch a Book be to Inrich a Bookſeller!

(E) *Some blame him for being ſo particular in deſcribing the lewd Actions.*] *Muretus* exclaim'd with great Eloquence againſt *Suetonius* upon that Account, ſo far as to ſay that the Reading of that Hiſtorian is as dangerous for young People as that of *Catullus* and *Martial*. I ſhall ſet down the whole Paſſage of the Speech he delivered in the College of *Rome*, the 4th of *November* 1580. (g) *At Suetonium S. Hieronymus laudat. Magnum teſtimonium, ſi laudat. Non enim ſanctitate tantùm Hieronymus, ſed & eruditione & judicio præſtitit. Quomodo igitur laudat? Eâdem libertate ſcripſiſſe eum ait Cæſarum vitas, quâ ipſi vixerunt. Non magna laus, ſi laus eſt: ſed ego laudem eſſe non puto. Quid enim laudis habet, cùm Cæſares in ſumma licentia atque impudentia vixerint, orationis turpitudine, ipſorum flagitia æquaſſe, quæque illi perpetuis tenebris operienda patrarant, ea nudis & prætextatis verbis in lucem & in aſpectum hominum protuliſſe? Itaque nihil apud Suetonium frequentius legas, quàm exoletos, & ſpintrias & cellarios, & nubentem Neroni Sporum, Doryphoro Neronem; voces etiam, quas in illis flagitiis miſerint, quaſi hæc ſcire, poſterorum intereſſet: quorum commemoratione non ſcriptorem modo, ſed ipſas chartas erubeſcere oportebat: cùm hæc interim ita ſubtiliter ac particulatim perſequitur, ut docere voluiſſe videatur. In Tacito nihil ſimile reperias. Talia aut præterit, aut ita ſignificat, ut odiſſe & abhorrere videas, non, ut illum alterum, cupidè in eis immorari. Inter Vopiſcos igitur & Spartianos, & Lampridios & ejuſmodi vitarum ſcriptores Suetonius emineat, illâ ſe jactet in aulâ; hic ceteris melior, quod ætatis beneficio, melius quàm illi latinè loquitur: ad Taciti quidem gloriam aſpirare, aut ſe cum eo conferre ſi voluerit, omnium eruditorum convicio vapulabit. Equidem quod ad me attinet, Suetonii lectionem non minus quàm Catulli aut Martialis adoleſcentibus perniciosam, etiam confirmatæ ætatis viris periculoſam puto.* Take notice that he oppoſes *Tacitus* to *Suetonius*, in order to ſhew that *Tacitus* is not to blame, conſidering how cautious he is to ſay nothing of thoſe filthy things, or to mention them only in general, and with Indignation. *Bodin* made the ſame Obſervation before *Muretus*, to make it appear that *Tacitus* is more to be commended than *Suetonius*, whom he otherwiſe acknowledges to be leſs blameable than *Lampridius*. (h) *Hic fortaſſis improbari poteſt* (Suetonius) *quòd fœdiſſimas quaſque principum libidines nimis ſtudioſè conſectatur quas Corn. Tacitus omiſit. Sed in eo genere longè à Lampridio ſuperatur, is enim tot portenta novarum voluptatum ab Heliogabalo invecta deſcribit, ut non magis ea narrare, quàm unicuique ad imitandum proponere videatur.* But *Bodin* and *Muretus* did not conſider what difference there is between the Author of an Hiſtory of the Empire, and the Author of an Hiſtory of the Emperors. The former ought to touch but lightly upon the private Actions of a Prince; he ought to ſay but little of Kings, except when they have an Influence upon the general Affairs of the State. But thoſe, who write the Hiſtory of the Perſon of a Monarch, ought chiefly to dwell on his private Actions. Which is the Reaſon why *Suetonius* thought himſelf obliged principally to inſiſt upon the perſonal Actions of the Emperors. Beſides, it may be affirm'd that *Tacitus* did not take ſuch a Method as the Cenſurers of *Suetonius* aſcribe to him. He expreſſes the Lewdneſs of that time in very plain Words, and perhaps he ſpeaks as much of it in (i) proportion as the other does. We might Judge better of it, if we had all his Hiſtory of *Caligula*. What *Muretus* ſays, that the publick is not concern'd to know the Particulars of the Emperors Debauchery, proves too much; for he may be anſwered that the publick is not concern'd to know the Particulars mentioned by *Tacitus* concerning *Agrippina*, who inticed her own Son to commit Inceſt with her. What have we to do, may one ſay to *Muretus*, with the (a) *laſciva oſcula & prænuntias flagitii blanditias*, which we read in *Tacitus*? You muſt either condemn that Hiſtorian, or acquit *Suetonius*, and acknowledge that they are only more or leſs Faulty. Note that *Eraſmus*, whoſe Authority is as good as that of *Muretus*, does not think that the Deſcription of the Lewdneſs of the Emperors, whoſe Hiſtory has been written by *Suetonius*, is unprofitable to the publick. On the contrary he believes it may be a curb to wicked Princes, and that no Tyrant cou'd be at reſt, ſhou'd he conſider that his Memory wou'd be one day as execrable as that of *Caligula* and *Nero* is at this Day. It was for the publick Good that he put out an Edition of *Suetonius* and other Hiſtorians, who give us a particular Account of the abominable Actions of the Roman Emperors. I ſhall ſet down his own Words, which repreſent his Thoughts more fully and more Emphatically than I can do.

† *See the Paſſage of Pliny in the Remark E.*

ß *See the Remark F.*

γ *Publiſh'd by M. Grævius. It was printed in 1691.*

* *Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bib. Franc. pag. 415. La Croix du Maine pag. 118. mentions only the Edition of* Lyons, 1569.

(f) Sueto-nius Tran-quillus, emenda-tiſſimus & candidiſ-ſimus ſcriptor, Antonium Vindi-tacu-, con-tentus eo quod eis ſim per-eat . . . . de Sue-tonio non ramur familii- fuit a-re bre-vitatem. *Vopiſcus in pag.* 691. 1. *aug.* *ipt. See the wri-in obo,* 639. *ere he ces him ng the rians,* non diſer-quam e me-rie *s ge-*) tra-derunt.

(g) *Mure-orat.* Vol. 2. 347, Edit. 1672. vo.

(h) *Bodin. Method. Hiſt. cap.* 4. *pag. m.* 65.

(i) *That is conſidering that he wrote the Hiſtory of the Roman Empire, and that* Suetonius *wrote the Lives of the Emperors.*

(a) *Tacit. Annal. l.* 14. *cap.* 2.

whether *George de la Bouliere*, who is the Author of it, has been as cautious as M. *du* § *Teil*. The latter has left out whole Chapters, and in many Places enervated *Suetonius*'s Phraſes; for he was ſenſible that the French Language cou'd not bear the

§ *The 4th Edit. of his Tranſlation of Suetonius, is that of Amſterdam, 1699*

(b) *Ex bonæ fidei ſcriptoribus ſuper alios ſummoperè, hic præcipue capitur utilitas, quod non alia res æque, vel bonorum regum animos ad res cum laude gerendas accendit, vel Tyrannorum cupiditates cohibet ac refrenat, dum utrique cernunt horum literis ſuam vitam omnem, non in totius orbis, imo ſeculorum omnium Theatrum producendam, & quidquid nunc vel in abditis patrant, vel aliis fucis prætexunt, vel metu diſſimulari cogunt verius quàm ignorari, paulo poſt clariſſima in luce ſub oculis omnium traducendum, cum jam metu pariter ac ſpe libera poſteritas, nec ullis corrupta ſtudiis, magno conſenſu rectè factis applaudet, parique libertate his diverſa explodet exſibilabitque. Nec enim arbitror quenquam tyrannum, ſic penitus omnem hominis ſenſum exuiſſe, ut vitam ſibi jucundam ducat, ſi norit ſuum nomen apud poſteros omnium ætatum ac nationum, tam inviſum & execrabile fore, quam eſt Neronis, Caligula, Heliogabali, Commodi, ad quorum mentionem, ceu portentorum verius quàm principum, nemo jam non deſpuit, non abominatur, non deteſtatur.* What *Eraſmus* ſays may be confirm'd by the following Example. The Emperor *Commodus* (c) cauſed a Man, who had read the Life of *Caligula*, written by *Suetonius*, to be devoured by Beaſts; and he uſed him thus, becauſe he was born the ſame Day with *Caligula*. From whence it may be infer'd that he was more concern'd for the Memory of *Caligula*, than for that of the other Emperors defamed by that Hiſtorian. But ſince he exerciſed ſo great a Cruelty upon a Reader, by virtue of his Concern grounded on ſuch Frivolous Reaſons, 'tis an eaſy Matter to apprehend that he wou'd not, for any thing in the World, have been uſed as *Suetonius* uſed *Caligula*; and therefore 'tis certain that Tyrants are not willing their Infamous Actions ſhou'd be known. Such an Hiſtorian as *Suetonius* may therefore make 'em uneaſy, and afraid that ſometime or other their Memory will be as Execrable as that of the Emperors, whoſe Debaucheries he lays open.

Politian maintain'd, many Years before *Eraſmus*, that the lewd and cruel Actions deſcrib'd by *Suetonius*, might inſpire the Reader with Love for the contrary Virtues; and he alledged the Conduct of the Lacedemonians, who in order to make their Children hate Drunkenneſs, took care to ſhew them Drunken Slaves. Read his Words, wherein you'll find alſo that a Muſician, the better to inſtruct his Scholars, wou'd have 'em hear very bad Singers. (d) *Sed neque aut obſcœnitatis apud hunc quiſquam, aut crudelitatis exempla reformidet. Siquidem & Lacedæmonii (ut eſt apud Plutarchum) ſoliti etiam ſunt per feſtos dies bene potos ſervos, atque ex eo parum ſui compotes, quos illi* Εἵλωτας *vocabant, oſtendere inter convivia, atque illo pacto docere adoleſcenteis, quantum in ſe mali ebrietas contineret. Et Thebanus (e) Giſmenias bonos juxta maloſque tibicines diſcipulis oſtendens, Hoc modo, aiebat, canere oportet, illo non oportet. Videlicet collatæ vitiis virtutes, magis aliquanto, quam ſi ſeorſum inſpexeris, diluceſcunt.*

M. *de Tillemont* is of *Maretus*'s Opinion. "(1) "*Voſſius* quotes out of St. *Jerome*, *ſays he* (f), "that *Suetonius* is as looſe [and infamous] in his "Narration, as the Princes, whoſe Hiſtory he "writes, were in their Lives: [wherein he contradicts the Praiſes beſtowed upon him by *Pliny*:] (2) and it may be ſaid of him and *Lampridius*, that they teach the greateſt Crimes by "relating them". I cannot grant him all the Parts of this Sentence of Condemnation; for I am perſwaded that *Suetonius* might write after ſuch a manner, without *contradicting the Praiſes beſtowed upon him by* Pliny. *Pliny* "ſays, "(g) that the more he knew him, the more he "loved him, by Reaſon of his Probity, Honeſty, "good Conduct, Application to Study, and "Learning." The particular Account *Suetonius* gives of the Emperors Debauchery is no Proof that he was a Lewd Man, or that he took delight in Deſcribing Lewd Actions, and that there was any thing wanting to his Probity and Honeſty. It ſhews only that he was a very Ingenuous and Sincere Man, and that he believed an Hiſtorian ought faithfully to relate all the Truths he can find out: and thoſe who are never ſo little Qualified to judge of the Character of an Author by his way of Writing, will be of Opinion that *Suetonius* was only directed by his Sincerity and natural Ingenuity, and not by a Deſire of Indulging his Satyrical Humour. Nay, it ought to be preſum'd that he deſign'd to puniſh Vice as much as an Hiſtorian can puniſh it, and to caſt a Blot upon the Memory of thoſe monſtrous Men, by tranſmitting it to future Ages, attended with all the Execration it deſerves, and that he thought ſuch a Method might in time prevent the like Brutiſhneſs. 'Tis certain that he and *Lampridius* Inſpire a greater Averſion and Horror for the Princes, whoſe abominable Actions they have written, than the wiſeſt and moſt grave Writers can do. Laſtly, I muſt obſerve that M. *de Tillemont* did not make a right uſe of his Judgment, when he undertook to invalidate the formal Teſtimony of *Pliny* the younger, by looſe and uncertain Conſequences. Let us ſtick to the Teſtimony of one of the moſt honeſt Men of that time. It were in vain to ſay that he beſtowed this Encomium upon *Suetonius* in a Letter wherein he beg'd a Favour of him. I know that in ſuch Caſes 'tis a common thing to uſe Flattery; but *Pliny* affirms in the ſame Letter, that he and *Suetonius* had contracted a ſtrict Friendſhip long before: It was not a Lie; for the Truth of it appears from ſome other Letters of *Pliny*. This great Friendſhip and Familiarity between *Suetonius* and *Pliny* had not laſted long, if *Suetonius* had not been ſuch a Man as *Pliny* repreſents him to be. I add that there is no Author extant that reflects in the leaſt upon *Suetonius*'s Virtue; for we muſt not mind what *Domitius Calderinus* a great Romanceer, ſays. Read this Paſſage: (i) *Siniſteriora quædam de Suetonii moribus conſectatur, Marii, neſcio cujus, teſtimonium citans. Nos enim adoleſcenteis ipſum meminimus audire Domitium, cum diceret habere ſe peculiarem Marii Ruſtici librum, quem cæteris incognitum ſecum de Gallia attuliſſet, qui tamen codex, ne extincto quidem illo, nunquam comparuit. Atque ego quidem ſtudio incogniti mihi ſcriptoris incenſus, etiam ad ipſius Domitii parentis Benaci lacus accolas acceſſi, omnemque ejus librorum ſupellectilem ſcrutatus, Marium certe hunc ruſticum inveni nuſquam.*

I ſhall inſert in this place *La Mothe le Vayer*'s Reflection upon *Muretus*'s Invective. "(k) It "were to be wiſh'd, ſays *Muretus*, we had not "been informed of ſo many Debaucheries and "horrid Vices of *Tiberius*, *Nero* and *Caligula*; "and, if what an ancient Author ſays be true, "(3) that there is but little difference between "thoſe who carefully deſcribe ſuch things, and "thoſe who teach 'em; we can hardly excuſe "*Suetonius* for taking ſuch a Method .... (l) "But becauſe I have anſwered ſuch like Objections in ſome other Sections, I ſhall only ſay, "that there will hardly be any Hiſtorian free "from guilt, if it be a Crime to mention wicked "Actions, which make up the greateſt, and often the moſt conſiderable Part of his Narration. Nay, don't we read of Parricides, Inceſts, Idolatries, and a thouſand Profanations "in the Sacred Hiſtory, among good Examples "and holy Inſtructions?" It is a difficult thing to make a good Anſwer to that Remark; and I wou'd fain know what the ſcrupulous *Tillemont* wou'd have ſaid againſt it. Doubtleſs he wou'd have alledg'd ſpecious things; but it might have been infer'd from them, that the moſt ancient Hiſtorian, and the moſt knowing, ſince he wrote by Inſpiration, ſhou'd not have mention'd the Daughters of *Loth*. It might alſo be infer'd from the Reaſons alledged by that Author, that Hiſtory in general the Vivacity and Strength of the Deſcription that *Latin* Hiſtorian gives us of the Emperors Debauchery. I muſt not (F) forget *Moreri's* Miſtakes.

(b) *Eraſm. Ep. Dedic. Suetonii, Dionis Caſſii, Spartiani, Capitolini, Lampridii, &c. He dedicated that Work to Frederick Elect. of Saxony, and to Prince George, Couſin to that Elect. The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from* Antwerp *the 5th of* June 1517

(c) Eum etiam qui Tranquilli librum vitam Caligulæ continentem legerat, feris objici juſſit, quia eundem diem natalis habuerat quem & Caligula. *Lamprid. in Commodo, cap.* 10.

(d) *Politian. ubi ſupra fol. 5. B.*

(e) *It ſhou'd be* Iſmenias.

(1) *Voſſ. h. lat. l.* 1. *c.* 31. *p.* 156.

(f) *Tillemont ubi ſupra pag.* 488.

(2) *Ruald. v. Plut. c.* 28. *p.* 51. 2.

(g) *Tillem. Ib. p.* 486. *Theſe are* Pliny's *Words*, Ep. 95. lib. 10 Suetonium Tranquillum, probiſſimum, honeſtiſſimum, erudítiſſimum virum, & mores ejus ſequutus & ſtudia, jampridem, domine, in contubernium adſumſi: tantoque magis diligere cœpi, quanto hunc propius inſpexi.

(i) Politian. ubi ſupra.

(k) *La Mothe le Vayer, Jugemens ſur les principaux Hiſtoriens pag.* 230. *of the 3d Volume of his Works in* 12s.

(3) Parum abeſt a docente qui talia narrat.

(l) *Id. Ib. pag.* 230.

SULACHA ‖ *(Simon)* a Neſtorian Monk, of the Order of St. *Pacomus*, withdrew his Obedience to his Patriarch, and united himſelf to the Church of *Rome*. Thoſe, who ſhook off the Yoke, as he did, made him their Patriarch, and ſent him to *Rome*, where Pope *Julius* III. confirm'd his Patriarchate † in 1552. *Sulacha* made his Confeſſion of Faith at *Rome*, which was Tranſlated into *Latin* by *Maſius*, with the Letter thoſe Neſtorians writ to *Julius* III, to deſire him to confirm the Election of *Sulacha*, and to ask his Protection againſt a Family, which had kept the Patriarchate a long time *. This was the Subject of their Diviſion: Many of 'em cou'd not endure that this Dignity ſhou'd always remain in one Family; and that Family, which had enjoy'd it above two hundred years, wou'd not reſign it. *Simon Sulacha* being return'd into the Eaſt, eſtabliſhed his Patriarchal See at *Caramit*, a Town of *Meſopotamia*, took the Title of Patriarch of the *Aſſyrians*, and ordained many Biſhops and Archbiſhops. The Turks put him to Death at the Solicitation of the Schiſmaticks. They Elected for his Succeſſor a Monk of St. *Pacomus*, whoſe Name was ‡ *Hebed-Jeſu*. I have mentioned him under that Name, and that of *Abdiſſi*: See thoſe Articles. *Fra-Paolo* † intimates that the Court of *Rome* out of Policy, made a great Noiſe of that Embaſſy of the Neſtorians, to keep up their Reputation

ral ought to be condemn'd, and that the Tryal of the Lady *de Brinvilliers* ſhou'd not have been publiſh'd at *Paris*; and that the Relations of Conſpiracies ſhou'd not be made publick, becauſe one may learn from them the Art of Plotting, and avoiding the wrong Meaſures, which made that of the *Pazzi*, and many others Miſcarry.

(F) Moreri's *Miſtakes.*] I. *Suetonius's* Father was not *Tribune of the third Legion*, but of the thirteenth. II. The Title of *Secretary of State* is too great for *Suetonius*; 'tis not at all likely he ever had ſuch an Imployment: doubtleſs his Office was like that of thoſe, who are now call'd Secretaries of the Cloſet. *Spartianus* calls him (b) *Magiſtrum Epiſtolarum*, according to the Style of his Time, if we believe the Learned *Gutherius*, who maintains (c) that the *Magiſterium Epiſtolarum* was not appointed till after *Hadrian's* Empire. III. *Moreri* ſhou'd not have ſaid that *Suetonius* loſt his Place *by reaſon of ſome Privacies he had with the Empreſs* Sabina. That Expreſſion does too clearly imply a Notion of Gallantry, which does not appear in the Words of *Spartianus*, the only Author who informs us of *Suetonius's* being put out of Favour. We have ſeen (d) above how he expreſſes himſelf. *Moreri* (e) quotes him, after having ſaid, that the Emperor Hadrian *diſcovered ſome Love Intrigues of* Sabina, *and cauſed her to be poiſoned.* 'Tis not true that *Spartianus* ſays all this; and he is ſo far from giving to underſtand that thoſe, who loſt their Places, had been in Love with the Empreſs, that he clearly ſhews they had treated her with Contempt. *Salmaſius* juſtly wonders (f) that theſe Words *Injuſſu ejus* have not been minded, whereby it appears that thoſe Men were turn'd out of their Offices, becauſe they had behaved themſelves too Haughtily and too Familiarly with the Empreſs without *Hadrian's* Order. If they had been guilty of ſome Love Intrigues, the Hiſtorian wou'd not have ſaid *Injuſſu ejus*; for it were a very impertinent thing to ſay, that the Emperor deprived the Prefect of the Prætorium, *Suetonius* and many others, of their Offices, becauſe they had ſome Love Intrigues with *Sabina* without his Order. Were it not a Piece of Extravagance to ſuppoſe that he gave ſuch Orders upon ſome Occaſions? Don't tell me that on the other Hand it were an extravagant thing to ſuppoſe that he ordered ſometimes his Miniſters to uſe *Sabina* uncivilly; this Suppoſition is very well grounded. We know that he uſed his (g) Wife as if ſhe had been a Servant Maid; from whence it may be eaſily infer'd that he allowed his Officers to uſe her hardly and very uncivilly. But this Permiſſion was not unlimited; he did not always permit ſuch an Uſage, ſome Perſons were only allowed to treat the Empreſs in that manner, and he told them how far that Permiſſion might go. Thoſe who loſt their Places did not keep within thoſe Bounds; which is the Reaſon why the Hiſtorian made uſe of the Words *Injuſſu ejus*, which ſhew the true Cauſe of their Diſgrace, and at the ſame time remove all Suſpicion of Gallantry. *Salmaſius* (h) perfectly unfolds this little Myſtery. What he ſays againſt thoſe, who find ſome Love Intrigues in the matter, might have been confirm'd by a Reaſon, which he did not think of. *Spartianus* adds immediately after, that *Sabina* wou'd have been divorced for her ill Humour, if her Husband had been a private Perſon. (i) *Uxorem etiam ut moroſam & aſperam dimiſſurus (ut ipſe dicebat) ſi privatus fuiſſet.* He does not ſay one Word of her Unfaithfulneſs, and (k) Gallantry. From whence I conclude that the deprived Officers were only guilty of a blunt Proceeding towards *Sabina* in her ill Humour. Her Vexation made her peeviſh and intolerable; but becauſe the Officers of the Court knew that the Emperor diſpiſed her, and did not much care ſhe ſhou'd be reſpected, they ſcolded at her in their turn, and went ſo far in it without the Prince's Approbation, that they loſt his Favour. The other Particular, mentioned by *Moreri*, for which he quotes *Spartianus*, is really to be found in ſome manner in that Author. (l) *Sabina uxor non ſine fabula veneni dati ab Adriano defuncta eſt*: That is, *Sabina* died, not without a Report that ſhe had been poiſoned by *Hadrian*. Nevertheleſs *Moreri* is miſtaken; for he will have it that the diſcovery of *Sabina's* Gallantry was the Cauſe of her being Poiſon'd; which wou'd be very falſe, tho' we ſhou'd grant him that ſome Love Intrigues were diſcover'd when *Suetonius* was put out of Favour. There were 16 Years (m) between the depriving of that Secretary, and the Death of the Empreſs.

I ſhall further Examine *Moreri's* Narrative. "That Diſgrace, *ſays he*, put *Suetonius* upon "Writing for the Publick; he compos'd the "Lives of the twelve *Cæſars* . . . . Pliny the "younger deſired him to put off no longer the "Publication of that Work, and told him he "found it ſo perfect that the further poliſhing of "it did but ſpoil it." There are many Faults in thoſe Words. IV. It cannot be proved that *Suetonius's* Diſgrace inſpired him with the Deſire of Writing for the Publick. V. And therefore 'tis a great Piece of Raſhneſs to ſay in expreſs Words, that it moved him to write the Hiſtory of the twelve Emperors; for ſince he compoſed many Books, he might have writ when he was out of Favour, and it cannot be concluded that he wrote preciſely a certain Book. VI. No body knows what Books *Pliny* the younger deſired him to publiſh. Why then does *Moreri* affirm that he deſired him to publiſh the Twelve *Cæſars*? VII. It cannot be ſaid, without helping the Matter, that *he found 'em perfect.* Which ſuppoſes that he declared he had read 'em; but this Suppoſition does not well agree with theſe Words: (o) *Patere, me videre titulum tuum; patere audire, deſcribi, legi, venire volumina Tranquilli mei.* 'Tis

---

‖ See the Remark A in the Article Hebed-Jeſu.

† *Petrus Strozza de dogmate Caldeor. apud Aubert. Miræum. Pol. Eccl. l. 2. cap. 5.*

* See the Hiſt. critique du Levant, by the Sieur de Mony, chap. 7.

‡ *Strozza apud Miræum Ib.*

† Hiſt. du Concile de Trente, *B. 5. at the Beginning.*

(b) *Spartian. in Adriano cap. 11. p. m.* 102.

(c) *Gutherius de officiis domus Auguſtæ l. 3. cap. 4. p. m.* 438.

(d) In the Remark B.

(e) Upon the Word Sabina.

(f) Qui impudicam familiaritatem intelligunt, nae illi multum falluntur. Ne tale quicquam cogitarent, poterat per illas duas voces fieri, *Injuſſu ejus*, ſi diligentius paulo attendiſſent. *Salmaſ. in Spart. Adr. cap.* 11. *p. m.* 102.

(g) Hujus uxor Sabina dum prope ſervilibus injuriis afficitur ad mortem voluntariam compulſa eſt. *Aur. Victor in Adriano.*

(h) *Salmaſ. ubi ſupra.*

(i) *Spart. ubi ſupra.*

(k) *This may ſerve to confute the fabulous Stories publiſh'd by* Brantome *againſt* Sabina *in the 1ſt. Volume of his* Dames Galantes, *pag.* 118.

(l) *Id. Spart. Ib. cap.* 24. *pag.* 204.

(m) *See Tillemont ubi ſupra pag.* 418, & 450.

(o) *Plin. Ep.* 11. *l.* 5.

Reputation in *Europe* with Chimera's. I ſhall ſet down in a Remark what (*Z*) that Hiſtorian ſays.

SULPICIA, or **SULPITIA**, a Roman Lady, Daughter of *Sulpicius Paterculus*, and Wife of *Fulvius Flaccus*, obtain'd a very great Honour, when it was thought fit to ſeek out a Remedy againſt the Lewdneſs that was obſerved among the Women of *Rome*. The Evil appeared ſo great that Recourſe was had to the Aſſiſtance of Heaven, and to thoſe Religious Helps, which ſupply the want of human Means. The Books of the *Sibyls* were conſulted, and upon the Report of the Conſultors it was Decreed by the Senate that a Statue ſhou'd be conſecrated (*A*) to *Venus Verticordia*, that is, *Converter of Hearts*, that Women and Maids might be more eaſily reclaim'd from their lewd Practices. It was ordered that a moſt Virtuous Woman ſhou'd Conſecrate that Statue of *Venus*; and at firſt a hundred Women were choſen among all others, and then ten out of that hundred, and all of 'em unanimouſly nominated *Sulpicia* to perform that Function: So that this Lady was acknowledged to be the moſt Chaſt of all †. I ſhall

true he had been ſaying what *Moreri* quotes, *Perfectum opus abſolutumque eſt; nec jam ſplendeſcit lima, ſed atteritur.* But how do we know but he ſaid ſo like a Friend? VIII. However it be, were it true that *Suetonius* did not write the Lives of the twelve *Cæſars* till he was turn'd out of Favour, *Pliny* the younger cou'd not have complain'd (*p*) of his Slowneſs in publiſhing them; for doubtleſs he writ that Letter to him under the Empire of *Trajan*. But *Suetonius* did not loſe his Place till the 4th or 5th Year of *Hadrian's* Reign. IX. Inſtead of *Sicco Polemon*, *Moreri* ſhou'd have ſaid *Sicco Polenton*.

Some (*q*) of theſe Miſtakes of *Moreri* have been committed by *La Mothe le Vayer*, in his Judgment upon the chief Hiſtorians. I wonder at it; for he was a much more Learned Man than *Moreri*, and had been directed in that Work by Meſſieurs *du Puy*, and had the Aſſiſtance (*r*) of *four great Libraries, the King's, Thuanus's, their own*, and that of Cardinal *Mazarin*. With ſuch Helps he might have writ an excellent Book, and even avoided thoſe four Miſtakes without 'em.

(*Z*) ***What that Hiſtorian ſays.***] We find in his (*a*) Work that the Pope received with great Magnificence the Patriarch ſent to him by all the Churches between *Euphrates* and the *Indies*; that he cauſed him to be conſecrated Biſhop; that he gave him the Pallium with his own Hands in a private Conſiſtory; that he ſent him back into his Country, and had him accompanied by ſome Monks who underſtood Syriack; that at *Rome*, and all over *Italy*, the only Talk was about the vaſt Number of Chriſtians that were in that Country, and the great Acquiſitions the Holy See had made in it; that People diſcourſed particularly of the great Number of Churches (*b*) at *Muzal*, a Town which was ſaid to be the Ancient *Aſſur*, ſituate upon the *Tigris*, not far from *Nineve*; that they reckon'd the moſt famous Towns under the Juriſdiction of that Patriarch, ſuch as *Babylon*, *Tauris*, *Arbela* where *Darius* was overcome by *Alexander*, *Ecbatana*, call'd by others *Seleucia* and *Niſibis*, and many Provinces of *Aſſyria* and *Perſia* . . . . that all thoſe things were printed and read with great Curioſity. There was doubtleſs more Oſtentation than Truth in the Matter; and it was a good Piece of Policy to make the Names of thoſe famous Cities ſound ſo high.

(*A*) *That a Statue ſhou'd be conſecrated to* Venus Verticordia.] This Particular is to be found in many Authors, but in none with ſo many Circumſtances as in *Valerius Maximus*, *Merito*, ſays he (*c*), *virorum commemorationi Sulpitia, Ser. Paterculi filia, Q. Fulvii Flacci uxor, adjicitur. Quæ, cum ſenatus libris Sibyllinis per decemviros inſpectis cenſuiſſet, ut Veneris Verticordiæ ſimulachrum conſecraretur, quo facilius virginum mulierumque mentes à libidine ad pudicitiam converterentur; & ex omnibus matronis centum, ex centum autem decem ſorte ducta, de ſanctiſſima fœmina judicium facerent, cunctis caſtitate prælata eſt.* *Pliny* ſays the ſame in fewer Words, only he does not mention the Cauſe of that Conſecration, nor the Epithet of *Venus*. (*d*) *Pudiciſſima femina ſemel, matronarum ſententia, judicata eſt Sulpicia Paterculi filia, uxor Fulvii Flacci: electa ex centum* (*e*) *præceptis, quæ ſimulacrum Veneris ex Sibyllinis libris dedicaret.* *Solinus* (*f*) tranſcribes *Pliny*, as he uſes to do. *Ovid* ſays nothing of our *Sulpicia*, and inſtead of a Statue, he pretends that a Temple was built to *Venus Verticordia*. He does not forget the Cauſe of that new Devotion; he ſays in expreſs Words that it was occaſion'd by the Loſs of Chaſtity.

Roma (*g*) *pudicitia proavorum tempore lapſa eſt:*
Cumæam, veteres, conſuluiſtis anum.
Templa jubet Veneri fieri: quibus ordine factis,
Inde Venus verſo nomina corde tenet.

He is to blame for not doing to *Sulpicia* the Honour ſhe deſerved. The Glory ſhe acquired then, is ſo great, that he ſhou'd not have been ſilent about it. The other Ladies acknowledged that ſhe ſurpaſt them in Chaſtity. Such an Acknowledgement is as glorious to her, as it wou'd be for a brave Man, if a hundred brave Men ſhou'd confeſs that he has more Courage than they. It is a rare thing, ſays *Martial* (*h*), to ſee any body that is willing to yield to others in point of Wit. But 'tis ſtill more rare among Soldiers to find any that will yield to another in Point of Bravery: Nay, Compliments are very ſcarce upon that Head; and in general an honeſt Man will ſeldom acknowledge that he has leſs Honeſty than another, and a Virtuous Woman that ſhe is leſs Chaſte than others. Such a Civility is as rare among virtuous Women, as 'tis among gallant Women to acknowledge that their Rivals exceed them in Beauty. However, civil Words and Compliments are far from being look'd upon as judicial and ſolemn Acknowledgments; for if the Queſtion was to chuſe for an honourable Function, appointed by the Magiſtrates, the moſt honeſt Woman or the moſt honeſt Man in a Town, none wou'd be willing that others ſhou'd take Advantage of the Compliments they might have made 'em. Every body wou'd revoke them, and enjoy the Freedom of his Judgment, and would think it a very hard thing publickly to acknowledge, that he is leſs Worthy of being choſen for the appointed Function; and therefore *Sulpicia*'s Virtue muſt needs have been very Shining, ſince a hundred Roman Ladies voted for her upon ſuch an Occaſion. But perhaps it ought to be ſuppoſed that the Senate ordered that no Lady ſhou'd Vote for her ſelf. The Circumſtances of this Fact are not clearly deſcribed by Authors. Their Meaning ſeems to be that a hundred Roman Ladies were firſt of all choſen by Lots, and then that ten of 'em were likewiſe choſen in the ſame Manner, and that all of 'em Acknowledged that *Sulpicia* deſerved to conſecrate the Statue. The Management of that Affair ſeems to me intricate; for why did they caſt Lots twice, if they had a Mind that the hundred Ladies ſhou'd Vote? I had rather ſay that a hundred Women of the beſt Reputation were firſt of all ſet apart, and then they drew Lots, that ten of 'em ſhou'd Name the Woman, who was to conſecrate the Statue, and it was ordered that none ſhou'd Name her ſelf. Thus *Sulpicia* by the Votes of ten Ladies was preferr'd to a hundred Women of the beſt Reputation

---

† *Taken from Valerius Maximus l. 8. c. 15. You'll find his Words in the Remark A.*

(*p*) Sum & ipſe in edendo hæſitator, tu mora tamen meam quoque cunctationem tarditatemque viciſti. *Id. Ib.*

(*q*) *The 2d the 3d, the 4th, & the 5th.* Moreri *had 'em from him.*

(*r*) La Mothe le Vayer's *Preface to his* Jugement ſur les principaux Hiſtoriens.

(*a*) *Fra-Paolo*, Hiſtoire du Concile de Trente, *B. 5. at the Beginning.*

(*b*) *The Confeſſion of Faith of that Patriarch mentions* 18, *whereof* 15 *were poſſeſt by the Neſtorians, and* 3 *by the Jacobites. Amelot de la Houſſaye, in his Tranſlation of Fra-Paolo, Ib.*

(*c*) *Valer. Maximus l.* 8. *c.* 15. *n.* 12. *p. m.* 738.

(*d*) *Plin. l.* 7. *c.* 35. *p. m.* 56.

(*e*) *That is, who had been already choſen. Read* præceptis, *and not* præcipuis *as there is in moſt Edit.* See Salmaſius in Solinum p. 54, *and Father* Hardouin *in Plin. tom.* 2. *pag.* 56, *and* 124.

(*f*) *Solin. c.* 1. *p. m.* 12.

(*g*) *Ovid. Faſtor. l.* 4. *p. m.* 74.

(*h*) Aurum & opes & rura frequens donabit amicus: Qui velit ingenio cedere rarus erit. *Mart. Epig.* 18. *l.* 8.

I ſhall Inquire into the Date of this (B) Fact; it has been too much neglected by Authors.

SULPITIUS (*John*) Surnamed *Verulanus*, becauſe, if I am not miſtaken, he was a Native of * *Verulam*, a Town in the *Campania di Roma*, applied himſelf to the Study of Philology with a good Succeſs. He flouriſh'd towards the End of the XVth Century. His Commentary upon *Lucan's Pharſalia* was pretty good for that time. He publiſhed *Vegetius* with two ‡ other Tracts *de re militari*: He alſo publiſhed ſome *Latin* Verſes *de moribus*, and *Præludia Grammatica*. I think he ought not to be diſtinguiſh'd from *Sulpitius*, who Taught in the College of *Rome*, under the Pontificate of *Innocent* VIII, and who began to reſtore the Uſe of (*A*) Muſick upon the Stage; ſo that he may be look'd upon as the firſt Author of *Opera's*. He is alſo the firſt who publiſhed *Vitruvius*.

* *Veroli in Italian.*

‡ *Ælian & Frontini. See Geſner's Biblioth. fol.* 457.

SURENA, General of the *Parthians* in the War againſt the *Romans*, commanded by *Craſſus* in the year of *Rome* 701, * *was for Wealth, Family and Authority, the Second Man in the Kingdom, but for Courage and Prowefs he was the firſt; neither was any one ſo large ſized, or ſo well ſhaped. Whenever he travelled alone he had a thouſand Camels to carry his Baggage, two hundred Chariots full of* Concubines, *a thouſand completly arm'd Men for his Life-Guards, and a great many more light-arm'd, and at leaſt ten thouſand of his Servants and Retinue. And the Honour had long belonged to his Family, that at the King's Coronation he put the Crown upon his Head; and when this very King* Orodes *had been exiled, he brought him in: 'twas he that took the great City of* Seleucia, *was the firſt Man that ſealed the Walls, and with his own Hand beat off the Defendants; and tho' at that time he was not above thirty Years old, he was counted Wiſe and Diſcreet: wherein he had much the advantage of* Craſſus, *who was eaſy to be impoſed upon, firſt through his overweening Confidence, and afterwards becauſe he was daſtarded and cow'd by his Calamities.* Many Stratagems were uſed againſt the *Romans*, and beſides, the *Parthians* fought with great Vigour. † Surena *was the the talleſt and comelieſt Man himſelf. And the Sweetneſs of his Looks, and*

* *Plutarch in Craſſo.*

† *Id. Ib.*

tion in the City; and yet none did formally declare that ſhe was leſs Chaſte than *Sulpicia*. It had been a hard thing to require ſuch an Acknowledgement in ſuch a Conjuncture.

Perhaps it will be ſaid that the Senate did not make a right Application; for, according to the Doctrine of the Heathens, *Venus* equally preſided over unlawful and lawful Love, and ſhe had occaſion'd the prodigious Lewdneſs they intended to put a ſtop to. This Objection is of no weight: The Senate knew very well what they did, and for this very Reaſon that *Venus* had occaſioned ſuch a Diſorder, 'twas neceſſary to have Recourſe to her; for, according to *Cato's* Maxim (*i*), thoſe who are the Cauſe of great Evils, ought to put an end to them. The Senate might expect that *Venus* being appeaſed by the Conſecration of that new Statue, and acknowledged to be the Miſtreſs of Hearts, wou'd reclaim the fair Sex, either by ceaſing to Inſpire them with Love, or by fixing it on lawful Objects. The firſt Method is not amiſs; for how many People may uſe the Complaint we read in an Opera?

My Heart had been all along Innocent,
Had it not been for Love.

The ſecond Method is a very good one: the Senate might have told *Venus*; Inſpire them with Love, we are not againſt it; but let their Love be Lawful. Reclaim them from their ill Courſes; bring 'em back into the right Way. They are like Rivers that run out of their Channels, and overflow the Country; let thoſe Waters return into their Channel; this we beg of you, as you are the Goddeſs *Verticordia*, *Converter of Hearts*.

I have read in *Pauſanias*, that *Harmonia*, *Cadmus's* Wife, conſecrated three Statues to *Venus* at *Thebes*; the firſt to *Venus Urania*; the ſecond to *Venus Pandemos*, and the third to *Venus Apoſtrophia*. The firſt was for Spiritual Love, the ſecond for Bodily Love, and the third was deſign'd to prevent extravagant Conjunctions, ſuch as Inceſt, *&c.* (*a*) Ἔθετο δὲ τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τὰς ἐπωνυμίας ἡ Ἁρμονία. τὴν μὲν Οὐρανίαν ἐπὶ ἔρωτι καθαρῷ, καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένῳ πόθου σωμάτων· Πάνδημον δὲ, ἐπὶ ταῖς μίξεσι· τρίτην δὲ Ἀποστροφίαν, ἵνα ἐπιθυμίας τε ἀνόμου καὶ ἔργων ἀνοσίων ἀποστρέφῃ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Cognomina impoſuit Harmonia Urania, purum ſignificans, & corporum cupiditate vacantem amorem: Popularis, ob* Venerios *congreſſus: jam vero Apoſtrophia* numen coli inſtituit (id eſt Averſatricis) *quo ab exlege cupiditate & inceſtis ſtupris hominum genus averteret*. The Romans might have learn'd of other Nations to Honour *Venus* under the Title of *Verticordia*; for there is no great difference between this Title and that of *Apoſtrophia*: one implies the Notion of a *Converter*, and the other that of a *Diſſuader*, if I may be allow'd to uſe ſuch a Word.

(*B*) *I ſhall Inquire into the Date of this Fact.*] The ancient Authors do continually afford new occaſions of complaining of their negligence in Chronology. Tho' you examine the Words of *Ovid*, *Valerius Maximus*, *Pliny* and *Solinus*, never ſo narrowly, you'll find nothing in them, whereby you may know at what time the Conſecration of that Statue was performed. It may be known from *Julius Obſequens* (*b*), who mentions a certain Prodigy, which happen'd under the Conſulſhip of *Marcus Acilius* and *Caius Portius*, that is, according to *Sigonius's Faſti*, in the Year of *Rome* 639. The Daughter of a Roman Knight was thunder-ſtruck, and it was found that her Tongue was gone through that part of her Body not proper to be nam'd. The Soothſayers were conſulted; their Anſwer was, that the Maids and the (*c*) Knights were threatened with Infamy: which proved true; for three Veſtals, who had Love Intrigues with ſome Roman Knights, were puniſh'd at the ſame time. It was then that a Temple was built to *Venus Verticordia* (*d*). Note, that from the Year of *Rome* 539, till *Julius Cæſar* made himſelf Maſter of the Commonwealth, the Corruption of Manners, and particularly Luxury, increaſed more and more; and therefore the Statue Conſecrated by Chaſt *Sulpicia*, did no good. See the Margin (‡).

(*A*) *Who began to reſtore the uſe of Muſick upon the Stage.*] I ingenuouſly confeſs that I ſhould be Ignorant of this Particular, had I not read it in a Book of the Jeſuit *Menetrier*. I ſhall ſet down the whole Paſſage. " (*e*) Thoſe Remains of Dra-" matick Muſick, which had been preſerv'd " in the Church, ſerved to reſtore it two hun-" dred Years ago; and *Rome*, which had in a " manner loſt it, to beſtow upon the Recitation " and Declamation of Actors, whilſt the *Grecians* " beſtowed

WHETHER it was a proper Thing to make one's Application to *Venus* in order to put a ſtop to Lewdneſs.

(*i*) Τῶν ... αὐτῶν εἶναι καὶ παύειν τὰ μεγάλα κακὰ καὶ ποιεῖν. Illum eorundem eſſe & facere magna mala & comprimere. *Plutarch. in Catone Minore p.* 784. *D.*

(*a*) *Pauſan. l.* 9. *c.* 16. *p.* 742.

(*b*) *Julius Obſequens in libro de prodigiis. n.* 97. *p. m.* 51.

(*c*) *'Tis to be obſerved that this Maid was on Horſeback when ſhe was thunder ſtruck.*

(*d*) Tres uno tempore virgines Veſtales nobiliſſimæ, cum aliquot equitibus Romanis, inceſti pœnas ſubierunt. Ædes Veneri Verticordiæ facta. *Id. Ib.*

(‡) *The Evil grew worſe and worſe ſince* Cæſar, *inſtead of growing leſs. See what I quote out of* Seneca *in the Remark H. of the Article* Vayer.

(*e*) *Menetrier, des repreſentations en Muſique, pag.* 155, 156. *That Book was printed at* Paris *in* 1681.

and Effeminacy of his Habit, could not promiſe ſo much Manhood, as he really was Maſter of; for his (A) *Face was painted, and his Hair parted, after the Faſhion of the* Medes, *whereas the other* Parthians *look'd more terrible, with their Hair ſhaggy, after the* Scythian *Mode.* The Succeſs of the Battle was glorious to him; but he caſt a Blot upon

" beſtowed upon Singing and Harmony, brought " it upon the *Stage* towards the Year 1480, as I " find it in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Sulpitius*, " prefixed to his Notes upon *Vitruvius*, which " preſented to Cardinal *Riari*, Great Chamberlain " of the Church, and Nephew of Pope *Sixtus* IV. " . . . . *Sulpitius* praiſing the Magnificence of that " Cardinal, who had built ſtately Palaces in and " about *Rome*, begs of him that he wou'd ſet up " publick Theaters for Muſical Repreſentations, " of which he calls himſelf the Reſtorer, having " ſhown at *Rome* a few Years ſince, what had " not been in uſe there for many Ages. He tells " the Cardinal in that Epiſtle, that *Rome* expects " from him a Theater for ſuch Performances, " becauſe he has already given ſuch an Enter" tainment to the People upon a moveable Thea" ter, ſet up in a publick Place, and at other " times in the Caſtle of St. *Angelo* for the Pope's " Diverſion, and in his Palace for ſome Cardi" nals. *Tu enim primus Tragœdiæ quam nos juven" tutem excitandi gratiâ & AGERE & CANTARE " primi hoc ævo docuimus, (nam ejuſmodi actionem " jam multis ſeculis Roma non viderat) in medio " foro pulpitum ad quinque pedum altitudinem erectum " pulcherrimè exornaſti. Eamdemque poſtquàm in " Hadriani mole Divo Innocentio ſpectante eſt acta, " rurſus intrà tuos penates tamquam in media Circi " caveâ toto conſeſſu, umbraculis tecto admiſſo popu" lo, & pluribus tui ordinis ſpectatoribus honorificè " excepiſti. Tu etiam primus picturatæ ſcenæ faciem, " quùm Pomponiani* (f) *comœdiam agerent noſtro " ſæculo oſtendiſti: quare à te Theatrum novum tota " urbs magnis votis expectat."* Father *Menetrier* is miſtaken, when he ſays that this *Latin* Paſſage is taken from the Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Sulpitius*'s Notes upon *Vitruvius.* M. *du Francaſtel*, Keeper of the *Mazarin* Library, has been pleaſed to inform me of ſome things relating to the Book, wherein that Epiſtle Dedicatory is to be found: 'tis a *Vitruvius* (g) without any Notes upon the Text, and without any various Readings. It is not Paged and has no Signatures. Neither the Time nor the Place of the Impreſſion, nor the Printer's Name, are to be found in it. There is no Date in the Advertiſment to the Reader, nor in the Epiſtle Dedicatory. That Advertiſment contains theſe Words, among other things: *Jo. Sulpitius Lectori ſalutem . . . . Collatis multis id genus libris & imprimis uno noſtri Delii manu ſatis accurate perſcripto, eum mihi laborem aſſumpſi ut quantum per plurimas occupationes meas fieri poſſet, redderem unum imprimendorum archetypum adeo emendatum, ut parvus labor cuivis alteri ejuſdem rei ſtudioſo relinqueretur. Quod ſi fidelis ut ſpero librarius fuerit & cum his impreſſis ſcripti calamis conferentur, facile fides noſtra & diligentia apparebit . . . . Primus hoc in ſtadio curro & ad certamen via jam liberaliter ſtrata reliquos inter ſe excito.* The Epiſtle Dedicatory begins thus. *Raphaeli Riario Cardinali Sanctæque Ro. Eccleſiæ Camerario, Jo. Sulpitius fœlicitatem. Quidquid curæ, ſtudii, vigiliarum & operæ in emendando & vulgando Vitruvio poſui . . . . tuæ dedico amplitudini.* Then follows the Paſſage quoted by Father *Menetrier.* This Edition of *Vitruvius* did not come out in the Year 1480; for it was publiſh'd under the Pontificate of *Innocent* VIII, who reign'd from the Year 1484, till 1492. Here follow ſome Words of the Epiſtle Dedicatory, whereby it appears that it was written towards the laſt Years of that Pontificate. *Innocentius impoſito bellis fine, Prætorio ſuburbano peracto, agilitatis certaminibus & equitum concurſionibus, dotalibuſque & ſumptuariis legibus revocatis. . . . Tum floræ campus, tum Circus Flaminius lateribus aptiſſime ſternitur . . . . de Gymnaſio noſtro evertendo & magnifice conſtruendo (quod utinam præoccupaſſes: ibi enim cotidiana omnium diſciplinarum eduntur ſpectacula) prudentiſſimi Reformatores jam iniere conſilium* (h).

From what has been ſaid, I conclude that Father *Menetrier* does not well deſcribe this Work of *Sulpitius*; for he ſays they are Notes upon *Vitruvius* publiſh'd about the Year 148[illegible].

Note that this Edition of *Vitruvius* is little known. The Reader will be convinced of it by this Extract of a Letter, which M. *du Francaſtel* has done me the Honour to write to me. I inſert it here the more willingly, becauſe I am ſure that thoſe, who love the Hiſtory of Books, will find it very Curious. " (a) To be better in" form'd of the matter, I have read all the Pre" faces, the Epiſtles Dedicatory, and other *Pro" legomena*, prefix'd to the *Vitruvius*'s of the " *Mazarin* Library, that have been printed " with and without Commentaries, in *Latin*, " *Italian* and *French*. 'Tis a ſurprizing thing " that none of 'em mentions this *Jo. Sulpitius* " nor his Edition, which muſt needs be the " firſt. Nay moſt Commentators and Editors " pretend to be the firſt who have gone about it. " M. *Perrault*, who in the Preface to his French " Tranſlation of *Vitruvius*, mentions the Names " of thoſe who have publiſh'd, tranſlated, or " commented upon that Author, ſays nothing of " *Sulpitius*. I have ſeen the Editions of *Jocundus*, " *Philander*, *Daniel Barbarus*, *Ceſariano* and *Caparoli*, beſides that of M. *Perrault*, which are " in our Library. I have found out another " thing concerning one *Hiero. Advocatus Am" broſii JCti. F.* 'Tis in a Letter of *Joannes Bri" tannicus Brixianus*, to that *Advocatus*, wherein " he ſpeaks to him thus. *Fuiſti tuâ induſtria, " ſtudio & labore ut Vitruvius de architectura, qui " jam tot ſæculis in lucem caput ſuum proferre non " audebat, qui ex omni parte mancus, lacerus, mu" tilatum ſe ſentiebat, nunc politus, purus, integer " huc & illuc geſtiat meare, omnibus carus occurrat, " omnibus gratus excipiatur.* . . . . That Letter is " printed at *Venice* in 1493. Having read the " *Vitruvius*'s, without finding any thing in them, " whereby one may know who was this *Jo. Sulpi" tius*, I thought that if I ſhould read all the " Prefaces, &c. of *Verulanus*'s Works, that are " in our Library, I might diſcover ſomething in " them, ſuppoſing he had made the Notes in " Queſtion; but it was to no purpoſe, for that " Author makes no mention of 'em in Seven or " Eight Books which I have ſeen."

(A) *The Sweetneſs of his Looks, and Effeminacy of his Habit, cou'd not promiſe ſo much Manhood, as he really was Maſter of; for his Face was Painted.*] Generally ſpeaking, thoſe Men, who pretend to be handſome, and who have recourſe to Art to ſet off the Luſtre of their Complexion, and who often conſult their Glaſs, that the Symmetry of their Hair and Curles may charm Women, are not fit for the War. They are meer Beaux and Sparks; the Aſſemblies of Ladies, Feaſts and Balls are the Places where they ſignalize themſelves: The Fatigue of the War does not agree with them; it requires Men who are not afraid of being Sun-burnt: Bravery does rather inſpire a Deſire of frightning the Enemy with a Martial Look, than of pleaſing Women with a foppiſh Way. But here's an Exception to that general Rule: *Surena* ſhews himſelf a Valiant Man in Battle, he performs all the Duties of a General, with all imaginable Vigour and Application; and yet he paints, and is very careful of his Hair. Which puts me in mind of a common Topick very contrary to *Cæſar*'s Practice. 'Tis a common Maxim in War, that Soldiers ought not to be permitted to enjoy the Sweets of a delicious Life, that 'tis the way to enervate them and make 'em lazy; and among other Inſtances the Fault of *Annibal* after the Battle of *Cannæ* is frequently alledged. He quartered his Army in ſeveral Places, where the Soldiers uſed themſelves

to

(f) *That is the Scholars of the Academy or College of* Pomponius Lætus.

(g) *A very ſmall folio Book.*

(h) *I am beholden for all theſe Paſſages to* Mr. du Francaſtel *keeper of the* Mazarin *Library*

(a) *This Letter of* M. du Francaſtel *written from Paris the* [illegible] *of December* 1699.

upon his Glory by his Perfidiouſneſs † in demanding an Interview with *Craſſus* to conclude a Treaty of Peace. He was very civil to that Roman General, he gave him his Word, and aſſured him there was an Agreement concluded between the Parthians and the Romans, and that the only thing that remained to be done was to advance as far as the River to write it down. *Craſſus* had a mind to ſend for a Horſe, but *Surena* told him that it was needleſs, ſince King *Orodes* gave him one. *Craſſus* got on Horſeback, and ſoon after they

to a Voluptuous Life, and Wine, Baths, good Cheer and Women deſtroyed that martial Vigour, which had made 'em ſo Formidable. The Delights of *Capua* were to him (*b*) what the Battle of *Cannæ* had been to the Romans. (*c*) *In hyberna Capuam conceſſit. ibi partem majorem hyemis exercitum in tectis habuit, adverſus omnia humana mala ſæpe ac diu durantem, bonis inexpertum atque inſuetum. itaque quos nulla mali vicerat vis, perdidere nimia bona ac voluptates immodicæ: & eo impenſius, quo avidius ex inſolentia in eas ſe immerſerant. ſomnus enim & vinum, & epulæ, & ſcorta balneaque, & otium conſuetudine indies blandius, ita enervaverunt corpora animoſque, ut magis deinde præterita eos victoria quàm præſentes tutarentur vires: majuſque id peccatum ducis apud peritos artium militarium haberetur, quàm quod non ex Cannenſi acie protinus ad urbem Romam duxiſſet. illa enim cunctatio diſtuliſſe modo victoriam videri potuit: hic error vires ademiſſe ad vincendum. Itaque hercule, velut ſi cum alio exercitu à Capua exiret, nihil uſquam priſtinæ diſciplinæ tenuit, nam & redierunt plerique ſcortis implicitii: & ubi primum ſub pellibus haberi cœpti ſunt, viaque & alius militaris labor excepit, tyronum modo corporibus animiſque deficiebant: & deinde per omne æſtivorum tempus magna pars ſine commeatibus ab ſignis dilabebantur: neque aliæ latebræ quam Capua deſertoribus erant.* The Maxim grounded upon ſuch Examples was neglected by *Julius Cæſar*; and he had no occaſion to repent that he had not followed it. He ſuffered his Soldiers to plunge themſelves into all manner of Debauchery after a great Victory, and uſed to ſay that they cou'd fight ſtoutly, even when they were perfumed. (*d*) *Nonnunquam poſt magnam pugnam atque victoriam, remiſſo officiorum munere, licentiam omnem paſſim laſciviendi permittebat: jactare ſolitus,* milites ſuos etiam unguentatos bene pugnare poſſe.

I think our *Surena* was one of thoſe Men, of whom I have given two Examples in the Life of *Henry* IV. They give up themſelves to Pleaſures, and intirely abſtain from them according to the ſeveral Junctures: they are Voluptuous and Lazy to the higheſt Degree, when there is nothing to do; and extreamly Vigilant and Laborious, when there is a Neceſſity for it. If we believe *Velleius Paterculus*, *Mæcenas* laboured very hard, when 'twas neceſſary; but when there was no preſſing Buſineſs, he gave up himſelf to idleneſs, and lived as deliciouſly as the moſt effeminate Man can do. (*f*) *C. Mæcenas, vir ubi res vigiliam exigeret, ſane exſomnis, providens atque agendi ſciens; ſimul vero aliquid ex negotio remitti poſſet, otio ac mollitiis pæne ultra feminam fluens.* What the ſame Hiſtorian ſays of *Lucius Piſo*, though it falls ſhort of that, may yet ſerve for an Example of the Character I here deſcribe. (*g*) *De quo viro hoc omnibus ſentiendum ac prædicandum eſt, eſſe mores ejus vigore ac lenitate mixtiſſimos, & vix quemquam reperiri poſſe, qui aut otium validius diligat, aut facilius ſufficiat negotio, & magis, quæ agenda ſunt, curet ſine ulla oſtentatione agendi.* He ſays much the ſame thing of *Sentius Saturninus*. (*a*) *Virum multiplicem in virtutibus, navum, agilem, providum, militariumque officiorum patientem ac peritum pariter, ſed eundem, ubi negotia feciſſent locum otio, liberaliter lauteque eo abutentem; ita tamen, ut eum ſplendidum ac hilarem potius, quam luxurioſum aut deſidem diceres.*

Tacitus mentions a General (*b*) of the ſame Stamp. 'Twas he who contributed moſt to raiſe *Veſpaſian* to the Throne. He was (*c*) too Voluptuous when he had nothing to do, and very Active in time of Buſineſs. See alſo what *Tacitus* ſays of one *Criſpus Salluſtius* in the 30th Chapter of the 3d Book of his Annals. Every Body knows that *Demetrius* was a diſſolute Man to the higheſt Degree; and yet in time of War that Prince gave over his Pleaſures, and applied himſelf entirely to his great Enterpriſes. Let's ſee how *Plutarch* relates the Matter. He ſays (*d*) that *Antigonus* being uncapable of the Fatigues of the War, by reaſon of his great Age and the Bulk of his Body, "committed the Management of his greateſt Affairs unto the Prince, "whoſe Conduct was very admirably dextrous "in Military Matters; and the old King was "induced to bear with thoſe exceſſive Liberties, wherein he drowned himſelf in the time "of Peace, becauſe he obſerved him to be the "moſt temperate and abſtemious Perſon in the "World, in the time of War and Action. . . . "As for *Demetrius*, if he devoted himſelf to "his Pleaſures and Luxury, he abandoned himſelf entirely to them; and if the Trumpet "ſounded to Horſe, he was no leſs aſſiduous "in the Fatigues of War; he was, beyond all "doubt, a very great Captain, and moſt notably "dextrous, not only in his Conduct, but in "forming his Levies, and raiſing an Army, "and in making all the neceſſary Preparations "of Stores and Magazines, the very Muſcles "and Nerves of War, which he ever took care "to provide in great abundance."

I ſhall add an Obſervation of the ſame Author, attended with a Fact relating to the Matter I treat of. "(*e*) *Artaxerxes* plainly proved that "Cowardice and Effeminacy are the Effects of "a baſe degenerous Nature, guided by erroneous Notions, and not of Niceneſs and ſuperfluous Exceſſes, as moſt Men ſuppoſe. For "notwithſtanding his Jewels of Gold, his Robe "of State, and the reſt of his coſtly Attire, "worth no leſs than twelve thouſand Talents, "with which he was conſtantly clad, his Labours and Toils were no leſs than thoſe of "the meaneſt Perſons in his Army. Nay, turning up his Horſe, with his Quiver by his "ſide, and his Shield on his Arm, he led them "through craggy and ſteep ways, inſomuch that "the other Soldiers obſerving his Chearfulneſs "and unwearied Strength, took Wing, and went "the more ſwiftly along with him, whoſe daily March was above two hundred Furlongs."

I ſhall here apply a Reflection that was made upon the Athenians. An Author who had deſcribed their Luxury and Softneſs, adds, (*f*) *and yet they won the Battle of* Marathon. One wou'd think that when the Ancients ſuppoſe that *Bacchus* did Wonders on the Day of the Battle with the Giants, their Deſign is to give us to underſtand that thoſe who ſeem only fit for Dancing and Amorous Sports, will nevertheleſs ſhew their Bravery in a Battle.

Tu, (g) cùm parentis regna per arduum
Cohors Gigantum ſcanderet impia,
Rhœtum retorſiſti leonis
Unguibus, horribilique malâ:
Quanquam choreis aptior, & jocis,
Ludoque dictus, non ſat idoneus
Pugnæ ferebaris: ſed idem
Pacis eras, mediuſque belli.

I will not reckon great *Scipio* among the Voluptuous Men, who minded important Affairs. I ſhall only ſay, that his great Cares were attended with innocent Recreations. The Rigid and Auſtere *Cato* did not approve of it; but he was too ſevere in his Judgment about the Difference that is between an effeminate Life and Gaiety. However it be, he openly complain'd of *Scipio*'s Behaviour, who during the Preparations for the Expedition of *Carthage*, made merry in *Sicily*. *Cato* was to be his Queſtor; but he left him

† *Id. ib.*

...Titus ...ar all ...s pag. ...p. Fir... ...l. 2. c. 6.

...Titus ...ius l. ...p. m. ...See ...p. 77. ...where ...cellus ...urages ...Soldi... ...rs, re... ...ſenting ...them ...the ...elights ...Capua ...d ener... ...ated the ...ldiers of ...nnibal.

...Sue... ...in Ca... ...re c. 67.

...OME ...xamples ...Volup... ...ous ...en, and ...et very ...aborious.

...) *Vell. Patercu...* ...*l. 2. c.* ...

...) *Id. Ib.* ...p. 98.

...) *Id. Ib.* ... 105.

...) Lici... ...us Mu... ...anus.

...) Luxu... ...ia, in... ...ſtria, ...mitate, ...rogan... ...a, malis ...niſque ...tibus ...ixtus: ...imiæ vo... ...ptates ...m vaca... ...t: quo... ...ens ex... ...edierat ...agnæ ...rtutes. ...*acit. Hiſt.* ...l. c. 10.

(*d*) *Plut. in Demetrio.*

(*e*) *Id. in Artaxerxe.*

(*f*) Τοιοῦτοι δ' ὄντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἐνίκησαν. Et ejuſmodi quum eſſent, tamen à prælio Marathonio victores diſceſſerunt. *Ælian. var. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 22.*

(*g*) *Horat. Od. 19. lib. 2.*

they cut off his Head. This Perfidiouſneſs was attended (B) with Inſults and Deriſion: but *Surena* did not long enjoy the Pleaſure of the Victory; for the King of the Parthians grew Jealous of him †, and cauſed him to be put to Death.

SUS.

as ſoon as he perceived that his Remonſtrances were not acceptable to him. (h) He " return'd " from *Sicily*, and together with *Fabius*, made " a huge noiſe in the open Senate againſt *Scipio*'s " laviſhing of unſpeakable Summs, and his childiſh loitering away his time in Wreſtling-Matches and Comedies, as if he were not to make " War, but Holiday; ſo that he cauſ'd ſome of " the Tribunes of the People to be ſent to call " him back to *Rome*, in caſe the Accuſations " ſhould prove true: But *Scipio* demonſtrating as " it were to them, an enſuing Victory, and appearing only to live pleaſantly with his Friends, " when there was nothing elſe to do, ſhewing " alſo he was not by his Liberality the more negligent in things of Conſequence and Moment, " he forthwith ſet ſail towards the War". *Valerius Maximus* mentions this pretended Remiſſneſs of *Scipio*, and ſays, among other things, that great Souls run in with greater Impetuoſity when they have been at reſt. (i) *P. Scipio, cum in Sicilia augendo, trajiciendoque in Africam exercitu opportunum quærendo gradum, Carthaginis ruinam animo volveret; inter conſilia ac molitiones hujus tantæ rei operam gymnaſio dedit, palliòque & crepidis uſus eſt. Nec hac re ſegniores Punicis exercitibus manus intulit: ſed neſcio an ideo alacriores, quia vegeta & ſtrenua ingenia, quo plus receſſus ſumunt, hoc vehementiores impetus edunt. Crediderim etiam favorem eum ſociorum uberiorem ſe adepturum exiſtimaſſe, ſi victum eorum & ſolennes exercitationes comprobaſſet: Ad quas tum veniebat, cum multum ac diu fatigaſſet humeros, & cetera membra militari agitatione firmitatem ſuam probare coegiſſet, conſiſtebatque in his labor ejus, in illis remiſſio laboris.* It appears from the End of this Paſſage that there was no Effeminacy in *Scipio*'s Conduct, and that he only mixed ſome Recreation with his moſt important Cares and Labours. All great Men are not capable of ſuch a Variety; ſome deſpiſe Pleaſures, and love an uninterrupted Gravity; others, who are qualified for great Deſigns, can never be fond of Dancing and Drinking. *Flaminius*, one of the moſt illuſtrious Perſons of Ancient *Rome*, cou'd not apprehend how a Man can be capable of ſuch a Variety. Here follows what *Plutarch* ſays of him. " (k) At another time *Dinocrates* the *Meſſenian*, " having been Fuddled at a merry Meeting in " *Rome*, danc'd there in a Woman's Habit, and " the next Day addreſſed to *Titus* for Aſſiſtance in his Deſign to get *Meſſena* out of the " *Achæan* Hands. I ſhall (*ſays he*) conſider of it, " but can't but wonder that you who are enterprizing Deſigns of that Moment, can find leiſure to Revel and Sing in your Cups." *Montagne* makes very fine Obſervations upon the Capacity of the Soul, whereby a Man may turn his Mind ſometimes one way and ſometimes another, and is able to do things that ſeem inconſiſtent. " (a) I am well pleaſed to ſee a General of an " Army at the Foot of a Breach he deſigns to attack, talking freely at Dinner time and with " his Friends; and *Brutus*, againſt whom Heaven and Earth were combined, and againſt " the Roman Liberty, ſtealing ſome Hours in the " Night, as he goes the Rounds, to read *Polybius*. Little Souls buried under the Weight of " Affairs, know not how to extricate themſelves; " they know not how to lay them aſide, and " reaſſume them.

" - - - - *ô fortes pejoraque paſſi,*
" *Mecum ſæpe viri, nunc vino pellite curas,*
" *Cras ingens iterabimus æquor.*"

He alledges many Examples upon that Subject.

It were to be wiſh'd that the general Rule in Queſtion were not liable to ſo many Exceptions; for a young Man well qualified for the War, who is given to Drinking, Gaming and Women, has ſomething to anſwer to thoſe who endeavour to reclaim him by Repreſenting to him the ill Conſequences of ſuch a Courſe. You'll never be able to command an Army, ſay they to him; Such an Employment is Inconſiſtent with an unſurmountable Inclination for a Voluptuous Life. Why ſo? will he ſay: Why ſhou'd not I be in time like ſo many others, who have been debauched and laborious by turns, according to the Poſture of Affairs? *Surena* painted, and was attended by many Concubines. Was he a worſe General for it? How many ſuch Examples does Ancient and Modern Hiſtory afford? *Montgomery*, who performed ſo many noble Exploits in the XVI Century, " (b) was extremely careleſs in his Office, for he " loved an eaſy Life and Gaming; but when he " was once got into the Saddle, he was the moſt " valiant and careful Captain that ever was ſeen." Many Generals avoid being ſurprized, and perform Actions that require an extreme diligence, though they love Drinking, and make long Meals; and their Enemies are often miſtaken in the Conſequences they draw from it. *Granville*, Biſhop of *Arras*, made a very imprudent Anſwer, as it appeared by the Event. It (c) was repreſented to the Emperor *Charles* V that Duke *Maurice* was not to be truſted; " (d) but *Granville* anſwered that there was no occaſion to " ſuſpect thoſe great Drinkers, becauſe their " Heads being always clouded with thick Vapours, were not clear enough to carry on " a nice Intrigue." *Maurice* made it appear that he was more cunning than the *Italians* and *Spaniards*.

A Voluptuous young Man, who conſiders the Examples I have mentioned, grows more incorrigible, and expoſes himſelf to great Inconveniencies. The beſt Way is to follow the Rule, without truſting to Exceptions.

(B) *This Perfidiouſneſs was attended with Inſults and Deriſion.*] *Surena* ſent the Head and the Hand of *Craſſus* to the King his Maſter; " (e) " but himſelf by his Meſſengers ſcattered a " Report, That he was bringing *Craſſus* alive " to *Seleucia*, and made a ridiculous Proceſſion, " which, by way of ſcorn, he call'd a Triumph. " For one *Caius Pacianus*, who of all the Priſoners was moſt like to *Craſſus*, being put into " the Habit of the Barbarians, and inſtructed " to take the Title of *Craſſus*, and Emperor, from " thoſe who ſpoke to him, was brought ſitting " upon his Horſe, but before him went a parcel of Trumpeters and Lictors upon their Camels; the Girdles and Purſes of the Romans " were hung at the end of the Bundles of Rods, " and the Heads of the Slain, freſh bleeding, " at the end of their Axes; after them followed the Seleucian Minſtrels, making abundance of ſcurrilous and abuſive Reflections " upon the Effeminacy and Cowardlineſs of " *Craſſus*, with a Muſical Cadence: and this " Show was ſeen by every Body. But *Surena* " calling together the Senate of *Seleucia*, ſhewed " to them a wanton Book of *Ariſtides*, called " his *Mileſiæ*; neither was this a Forgery, for " it was found amongſt the Spoils of *Roſcius*, " and was a good Subject for *Surena* to droll upon the Romans, who were not able even in " time of War to forbear ſuch wanton Writings " and Practices. But the People of *Seleucia* had " reaſon to commend the Wiſdom of *Æſop*'s " Fable of the Sack, ſeeing their General *Surena* " carrying a Bag full of looſe *Mileſian* Sonnets " before him, but drawing after him a whole " Parthian Brothel-houſe, if I may ſo call it, " with ſo many Coaches full of his Wenches " which might well be compared to Vipers and " Aſps: for he reſembled that Fable, where " the Front looks Great and Terrible, with " Spears and Arrows, and Darts, and Horſemen; but the Rear conſiſted of looſe Women,

" and

---

† Id. ib. pag. 585.

(h) Plut. in Catone majore. See alſo Livy l. 29. p. m. 532.

(i) Valer. Maximus l. 3. c. 6. n. 1. pag. m. 298, 299.

(k) Plut. in Q. Flaminio.

(a) Montagne, Eſſays, B. 3. in the laſt Chapter, p. m. 595.

(b) Brantome in his Diſcourſe upon the Prince of Condé, tom. 3. of his Memoirs, p. m. [illegible]

(c) The Duke of Alva repreſented it. See Melvil infra.

(d) Melvil's Memoirs, p. 40.

(e) Plut. in Craſſ.

SUSSANNEAU (*Hubert*) was born at *Soiſſons* (*A*) in the Year 1514. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his *Latin* Verſes, and publiſhed ſome ‡ Grammatical Tracts, that met with a good Reception. He taught Philological Learning at *Turin*, before he had ß a Beard: He taught it alſo at *Paris*. He Styles himſelf Doctor of Law and Phyſick.

SUTCLIFFE † (*Matthew*) an Engliſhman, and a Proteſtant Divine, flouriſh'd towards the latter end of the XVI Century, and the beginning of the XVII. He publiſh'd many Controverſial Books, ſome in *Latin*, and others in *Engliſh*, and made it his chief Buſineſs to confute Cardinal *Bellarmin*. He writ alſo ſomething againſt the Presbyterians. He did not (*A*) put his

" and Minſtrels, and Players on Caſtanets, and " all Inſtruments of Luxury."

This Conduct of *Surena* plainly ſhews that the Parthians deſerved to be call'd Barbarians, as they were by the Greeks and Romans; for none but bruitiſh People, who are uncapable of Civility, will treat an Enemy in ſuch a manner, much leſs an Enemy overcome by a ſhameful Treachery. Take notice that *Plutarch* blames that *Roſcius*, who brought the lewd Books of *Ariſtides* to the Army. People are not now ſo rigid; and if *Boccace*'s Novels, or *La Fontaine*'s Tales were found in the Baggage of an Officer, no notice wou'd be taken of it. I don't think the moſt Biting and the moſt Burleſque News Writers wou'd Reflect upon him for it. Much leſs wou'd they Cenſure thoſe, who ſhou'd have a Looking-Glaſs among their things. But in *Juvenal*'s time they were more ſevere in that Reſpect: an Emperor was laugh'd at for having a Looking-Glaſs in the Camp. 'Tis true that Glaſs did belong to a Man who painted, and by reaſon of that Circumſtance, it afforded a better occaſion for Railleries and Inſults. I am ſure the Reader will excuſe me for mentioning this Particular, ſince it concerns a Roman like *Surena* in that part of Effeminate Softneſs, who nevertheleſs ſhow'd (*g*) a great Courage; ſo that this is a new Example to be added to thoſe, which I have (*h*) mentioned. *Juvenal* does very much exclaim againſt *Otho*'s Inequality.

Nimirum (i) *ſummi ducis eſt occidere Galbam,*
Et curare cutem ſummi conſtantia civis:
Bebriaci campo ſpolium affectare Palati,
Et preſſum in faciem digitis extendere panem.
Quod nec in Aſſyrio pharetrata Semiramis orbe,
Mœſta nec Actiaca fecit Cleopatra carina.

The Courage *Otho* expreſſed, when he killed himſelf, appeared the more admirable, becauſe he took care to paint and trick up himſelf like a Woman. Read theſe Words of *Suetonius*. (*k*) *Munditiarum vero pene muliebrium: vulſo corpore: galericulo capiti propter raritatem capillorum adaptato & annexo, ut nemo dignoſceret. Quin & faciem quotidie raſitare, ac pane madido linere conſuetum: idque inſtituiſſe a prima lanugine, ne barbatus unquam eſſet. Sacra etiam Iſidis ſæpe in lintea religioſaque veſte propalam celebraſſe. Per quæ factum putem ut mors ejus minime congruens vitæ, majori miraculo fuerit.*

(*A*) *Was born at* Soiſſons *in the Year* 1514.] *La Croix du Maine* (*l*), who ſays he was born there, was better informed of the Place than of the Time of his Birth. He will have him to have flouriſh'd in the Year 1520; which is not true; for *Suſſaneau* ſays he was only twenty four Years of Age, in a Book publiſhed by him in 1538. He ſpeaks thus in his Poem upon the Siege of *Perone*.

Taurinum (m) *nuper ſtudiis ignobilis oci*
Juriſque & legum florebat: ubi impiger artes
Ingenuas docui, Muſarum gratus alumnis,
Tum cùm nulla genas veſtiret barba decora:
Quæ nunc in flavo pulchrè ſedet hiſpida mento,
Ad quintum quanquàm luſtrum, mihi deficit
annus (1).

It appears from thoſe Verſes that he taught Philological Learning at *Turin*. He was ſent thither when the French had made themſelves Maſters of *Piedmont* in the Year 1536. He made no long ſtay in that Country: It appears from the Collection of the *Latin* Poems, which he publiſhed in 1538, that he had already begun again his publick Lectures upon the *Æneid* at *Paris*. This Advertiſement is to be found in the 22d Leaf.

Fixit ab Italia Luteciam reverſus.

Venit ab Italia Gallorum redditus oris
Hubertus, ſacri maxima cura chori.
Qui etas doctiloqui repetet compendia vatis,
Unde tibi Ænean Æneadaſque canit.

He obſerves, that in order to make himſelf more capable of explaining *Virgil*, he had been at *Rome* to examine the Ancient Monuments of that Place, and had ſuck'd in (ȥ) the Air of *Mantua*.

(*A*) *He did not put his Name to a Book, which treats of the Conformity of Popery and the Turkiſh Religion.*] He publiſhed it at *London* in 1604. 'Tis the Confutation of a Book printed at *Antwerp* (*a*) in 1595, and at *Cologne* in 1603, with this Title, *Calvino-Turciſmus, id eſt, Calviniſtica perfidiæ cum Mahumetana collatio, & dilucida utriuſque ſectæ confutatio.* There is hardly any Book more violent than this *Calvino-Turciſmus*: It was the Work of two Engliſh Catholicks, who left their Country: One of them was *William Raynolds* or *Reginaldus*, and the other *William Gifford*. The firſt died as he was about it; the ſecond put the laſt hand to it, and publiſhed it (*b*). The latter was a Prieſt, who (*c*) had ſeveral times encouraged ſome Aſſaſſins to kill Queen *Elizabeth*, and who (*d*) was well beloved by the Flemiſh Women. He had fled to *Liſle*. *William Raynolds* had been formerly a Miniſter (*e*) and expreſſed a great Zeal for the Proteſtant Religion; afterwards he turned Papiſt. He was Brother (*f*) of *John Raynolds*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Oxford*, who writ excellent Books againſt the Roman Catholicks. I have mentioned in another (*g*) Place what is reported of theſe two Brothers, *viz.* that they were brought up out of their Country, *John* in the Church of *Rome*, *William* in the Proteſtant Religion, and that meeting together one Day, they diſputed with ſo great force, that both of 'em changed their Religion. I very much doubt (†) of it. *William* was Profeſſor of Divinity in the Engliſh College of *Rheims*. He is ſaid to be the Author of a very Seditious Book, dedicated to the Duke of *Mayenne*, and written according to the moſt furious Maxims of the League, and in a moſt violent Rage againſt *Henry* III, and the King of *Navarre*. My Edition is that of *Antwerp, apud Joannem Keerbergium* 1592, in 8vo. Here's the Title of that Book. *De juſta Reipub. Chriſtianæ in Reges impios & Hæreticos Authoritate, juſtiſſimaque Catholicorum ad Henricum Navarræum, & quemcunque hæreticum à regno Galliæ repellendum confœderatione. G. Guilelmo Roſſæo Authore.* *Sutcliffe* (*h*) affirms that *William Raynolds* writ that Book. *Moreri* (*i*) ſays ſo too, and quotes *Pitſeus*. But others aſcribe it to *William Gifford*, or to *John Boucher*, or to a Jeſuite, or to *Genebrard*

‡ *See the Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, pag.* 361.

ß *See the Remark K.*

* *In Latin* Sutclivius.

(ȥ) Mox diverſatum laute ſacra Mantua cepit, Plenaque Vergilii mens nova mente fuit. *Suſſan. ludor. l.* 2. *fol.* 22.

(*a*) *Sutclivius knew not that Edition.*

(*b*) *See the Preface to the* Calvino-Turciſmus.

(*c*) *Sutcliffe ubi infra.*

(*d*) Stericus, ut aiunt, comptus & calamiſtratus, & apud mulieres Belgicas gratioſus. *Sutcliffe præfat.* Turco-Papiſmi.

(*e*) *Id. Ib.*

(*f*) *Rivetus in Jeſuita vapulante c.* 11. *n.* 14. *p.* 531. *tom.* 3. *oper.*

(*g*) *In the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres *for* July 1685, *art.* 6. *p.* 769.

(†) *This ſeems to me Inconſiſtent with a Letter of* John Raynolds *to his Brother, which is to be found in* Whitaker's *Anſwer to a Book of* William Raynolds.

(*h*) *Sutcliffe ubi ſupra.*

(*i*) *Upon the Word* Reginaldus.

put his Name to a Book which treats of the Conformity of Popery and the Turkiſh Religion.

TABOR.

heard (I). 'Tis more likely that it was written by the Author of the *Calvino-Turciſmus*. Boucher's Book has another Title, as you may ſee in his Article.

The Title of *Sutcliffe's* Anſwer runs thus. *De Turco-Papiſmo, hoc eſt, de Turcarum & Papiſtarum adverſus Chriſti Eccleſiam & fidem conjuratione, eorumque in Religione & moribus conſenſione & ſimilitudine, liber unus. Eidem præterea adjuncti ſunt, de Turco-papiſtarum maledictis & calumniis, adverſus Gulielmi Giffordi famoſi Pontificum Rom. & Jeſuitarum aſſeclæ paraſitaſtri volumen illud contumelioſiſſimum, quod ille Calvino-Turciſmum inſcripſit, libri quatuor. In quibus non tantum hujus hominis levitas, ſed etiam aliorum importuniſſimorum ſcurrarum adverſus Orthodoxam Chriſti Eccleſiam continenter latrantium, malitia & petulantia reprimitur, hominumque piorum fama ab eorum calumniis vindicatur.*

(I) See *Placcius de Pſeudonym. pag.* 249, 250. and the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres* June 1684 *art.* 2. & *Deckherr. de ſcript. Adeſpotis pag.* 337, 380. *Edit.* 1686.

T.

T.

TABOR (JOHN OTTO) a famous *German* Civilian, born at *Bautzen* *, the Capital of the *Upper Luſatia*, the third of *December* 1603. He began to ſtudy Philoſophy and the Civil-Law at *Leipſick*; and before he was twenty Years of Age rendred himſelf capable to explain to his Comrades the Paratitles of *Weſenbecius*. He went from the Univerſity of *Leipſick* to that of *Straſburg*, and afterwards he took a Voyage to *France* at the time of the Taking of *Rochelle*. He had ſcarce return'd Home, but he undertook to travel into *Italy*, with two young Gentlemen, to whom he was Governour; but there aroſe ſome Obſtacles to this Voyage. He was admitted Doctor of Law at *Straſburg November* the 10th 1631. The Wars of *Germany* deprived him of part of his Patrimony, and reduced his Birth-place to Aſhes, *Anno* 1634. where he then diſcharged the Office of Advocate and Syndic of the City. He was invited a few Days after this Diſaſter to ſucceed *Joachim Clutenius*, who had left a Profeſſor of Law's Chair at *Straſburg* vacant. He accepted of that Profeſſorſhip, and was ſoon after honour'd with the chief Poſt in the Faculty of the Law. He lived in that City till the Year 1656, although many very honourable Employments were offer'd him from divers Places; but about the End of this Year he found himſelf more diſpos'd to remove. The Reſtoration of the ‡ Peace, the Regret of having loſt a Wife, with whom he had lived 22 Years, the Diſtaſte he took at the Place where ſhe died, and ſome other Diſcontents, to which Men of great Merit are commonly expoſed, brought our *Tabor* to the Country of *Mecklemburg*, to be Chancellor to the Duke. He ſoon quitted this Poſt, to devote himſelf entirely to his Studies; but before he could re-enjoy the Repoſe of his Cloſet, he was obliged to go to the Court of *Saxony*, and to that of the Emperor, about the Duke's Buſineſs. He retired to *Gieſſen* in 1659, and there was Chancellor of the + Univerſity, and Councellor to the Landgrave of *Heſſe Darmſtad*. Several Reaſons obliged him to remove again, which he did in 1667, to retire to *Francfort*, where his Son was Advocate. He was not free from Trouble there no more than in other Places. He died the 12th of *December* 1674. He publiſhed at divers times ſeveral Books on Matters of Law, that ſold very well: Which was the Reaſon they were grown very ſcarce; and therefore a Profeſſor of *Leipſick*, named *Mylius*, made a Collection of them as exactly as he could, which he publiſhed in two Volumes in *Folio* †, *Anno* 1688. Mr. *Praſchius*, an ancient Burgomaſter at *Ratiſbon*, and Son-in-Law to *Tabor*, printed in 1675, a little Tract β containing a Narrative of the (Z) Life of his Father-in-Law.

TACFARINAS, General of the Army in *Africa* againſt the *Romans* in the time of *Tiberius*, was a *Numidian* γ. He ſerved firſt amongſt the Auxiliary Troops of the *Romans*; and having deſerted, got together a Band of Vagabonds and Robbers, and betook himſelf to make Incurſions, and to Plundering. Afterwards he diſciplin'd thoſe Men, and divided them into Companies, according to the Art of War. At length he became General of the *Muzulans*, a potent Nation near the Deſarts of *Africa*, and confederated with the Moors of the Neighbourhood. Theſe were commanded by *Mazippa*, and formed a Flying-Camp, carrying Sword, Fire and Terror on all ſides; whilſt *Tacfarinas*, with the Choice of the Troops, encamped after the manner of the *Romans*, and accuſtomed them to Military Diſcipline. The *Cinithians*, another conſiderable Nation, entered into the ſame Intereſts. *Furius Camillus*, being then Pro-Conſul of *Africa*, and inform'd of theſe Motions, march'd againſt the Enemy, and put them to flight: Which procured him the triumphal Ornaments δ. This happened in the Year of *Rome* ϑ 770. *Tacfarinas* renewed his Robberies ſome time after, and laid Siege to a Caſtle where *Decrius* was Commander, and overcame the Garriſon that went out to fight in the open Field. *Decrius* performed the part of a brave and experienced Warriour: The Wounds he received, one of which put out one of his Eyes, did not hinder him from making Head againſt the Enemies till he was ſlain: His Soldiers had ran away. The Pro-Conſul *Apronius* puniſh'd them for their Cowardice very ſeverely, for he put every tenth Man to Death. This had ſuch an Effect, that five Hundred Soldiers, having charged the ſame Troops of *Tacfarinas*, (who beſieged a Place) put them to the Rout. After this *Tacfarinas* reſolv'd not to ſtay for the *Romans*; he divided his Men into different Places; and when he was purſued he betook himſelf to flight, and when the *Romans* retired he charged them in the Rear: But, having ſtopt in a Camp, he was beaten, and forced to fly into the Deſarts *. It was not long before he betook himſelf again to the open Field; and this News being brought to *Rome*, they ſent *Junius Blæſus*, Uncle (A) to *Sejanus* ‡ againſt him into *Africa*. This new Pro-Conſul acquitted himſelf very well

* *In Latin, Budiſſina.*

‡ Reſtituta pax, erepta conjux, & hinc innatum loci tædium, tum cauſæ aliæ quæ infeſtari ſolent magnas virtutes. *Mauſol. Jo. Otton. Taboris.*

+ *They give him theſe Qualities in the Title of the new Edition of his Works.*

† *Lipſiæ apud Joh. Frider. Gleditſchium.*

β *It is entituled,* Mauſoleum Jo. Ottonis Taboris J. C.

γ *Tacit. Annal. lib.* 2. *cap.* 52.

δ *Taken from Tacitus ib.*

ϑ *It was the 17th of the Christian Æra.*

* *Ex eod. ibid. lib.* 3. *cap.* 20, 21.

‡ *Id. ib. cap.* 32, 35.

(Z) *A Narrative of the Life.*] In ſome reſpects the Account is particular enough; but in thoſe things, concerning which the Publick might have moſt Curioſity, the Author gives but general Notions, and contents himſelf with telling us, *Si tantas virtutes aliquo vitiorum confinio læſit, ſi in vita nonnunquam vel doctrina offendit, aut juſtam cauſam paulo acrius defendit, exemplo docuit illuſtri nihil in humanis rebus perfectum, aut ſuperbia conceſſum eſſe, quo maneat* SOLI DEO GLORIA. This is the Concluſion of Mr. *Praſchius*'s Account, from which I have taken this Article.

(A) Junius Blæſus, *Uncle to* Sejanus.... *This new Proconſul acquitted himſelf very well in his Office.*] The Emperor acquainting the Senate with *Tacfarinas*'s new well § in his Office, and yet *Tacfarinas* repair'd his Loſſes ſo well, that he had the Boldneſs to ſend Deputies to *Tiberius* to demand of him to aſſign him a Country; otherwiſe he threatned a War which ſhould be perpetual. The Emperor took this Inſolence ſo ill, that he gave order to *Junius Blaſus* to take *Tacfarinas* whatever it coſt. This War was not ended till the Year of *Rome* 777, and *Dolabella*, who was then Pro-Conſul, finiſh'd it. The Army of *Tacfarinas* was beat; they endeavour'd to take the General, but he choſe rather to loſe his Life in fighting courageouſly than to fall alive into the Hands of the Pro-Conſul †. The Faults (*B*) of *Moreri's* Supplement ſhall be obſerved.

§ Id. ib. cap. 73.

† Id. ib. lib. 4. cap. 23. & ſeq.

TACHUS, King of *Egypt*, in the time of * *Artaxerxes Ochus*. The Dominion of the *Perſians* was ſo odious to the *Egyptians*, that it was no hard Matter for *Tachus* to cauſe an Inſurrection; but he ſtood in need of the Succours of *Greece*, to maintain him in the Dignity to which he was arrived. He was not ignorant of the Valour and Experience of *Ageſilaus*, King of the *Lacedæmonians*; and therefore he took him into his Service. *Ageſilaus*, although eighty Years of Age, did not refuſe it. He raiſed Troops with the Money which he received from *Tachus*, and led them into *Egypt*, without conſidering that he might be blam'd for accepting an Employ ſo inferiour to his Rank and Reputation. He was ſoon diſguſted at *Tachus*, who, inſtead of giving him the Command of his whole Army, left him only the Command of the Foreigners, and gave the Dignity of Admiral to *Chabrias* the *Athenian*, and retain'd the Character of General in all things for himſelf. *Ageſilaus* waited an Opportunity to ſhow his Reſentment, which was ſoon offer'd to him, and he readily embrac'd it. *Nectanabus*, the Kinſman of *Tachus*, commanded Part of the Army; he drew them off from their Obedience to *Tachus*, and procured himſelf to be choſen King by the *Egyptians*. This made him ſend Ambaſſadors to King *Ageſilaus*, to deſire him to joyn with him, and he failed not to make him magnificent Promiſes. *Tachus*, on the other hand, did not forget any thing to retain him. Each of thoſe Competitors ſent their Deputies to *Lacedæmon*. *Ageſilaus* ſent ſome too, but much more to recommend the Intereſt of *Nectanabus*, than that of *Tachus*. He received full Power to act as he ſhould think moſt expedient for the good of his Country, and he thought it much more advantageous for

the

* About the 104 Olympiad.

Irruptions, exhorted them (*a*) to the Choice of a new Pro-conſul, very well skill'd in War, and capable to undergo the Fatigues of it. The Senators declining this Choice (*b*) referred it to the Emperor's Care. This Prince (*c*) reproved them for throwing all the difficult Affairs upon him, and named to them two Perſons, *Manius Lepidus* and *Junius Blaſus*, that they might chooſe one of them to ſend him into *Africa*. *Lepidus* deſired that he might be excuſed from undertaking that Employ; *Junius* demanded the ſame thing: But they eaſily perceived the difference of their Speeches, and that *Lepidus* ſpoke his Mind, but *Blaſus* did not. They underſtood very well the Reaſons which *Lepidus* alledged, and alſo that which he did not alledge, and which was the chief, *viz.* the Superiority of *Junius Blaſus*, who was Uncle to the Favorite. Prudence required him not to be his Competitor in this Affair; and it was better for him not to commit himſelf to the Deciſion of the Suffrages: The Pro-conſulſhip could not fail *Blaſus*, as if he had been the only Perſon the Emperor had named. I ſay nothing but what reſults from the Words of *Tacitus*. (*d*) *Tum audita amborum verba, intentius excuſante ſe Lepido, cum* valetudinem corporis, ætatem liberum, nubilem filiam *obtenderet: intelligereturque etiam quod ſilebat, avunculum eſſe Sejani Blaſum, atque eo prævalidum. Reſpondit Blaſus ſpecie recuſantis, ſed neque eadem adſeveratione; & conſenſu adulantium auditus eſt.* This Uncle is an Example which proves, that the Relations of a Prime Miniſter are oftentimes very worthy of the Offices, that are only conferr'd upon them on account of their Conſanguinity. He took the beſt Way that could be (*e*) taken to ſubdue *Tacfarinas*; and we read in *Tacitus*, that the Honours of the Triumph, which were granted him, were his due; although *Tiberius* declared, that he granted them in Conſideration of *Sejanus*. (*f*) *Neque multo poſt Cæſar cum Junium Blaſum Proconſulem Africæ triumphi inſignibus attolleret*, dare id ſe *dixit* honori Sejani, *cujus ille avunculus erat. Ac tamen res Blaſi digna decore tali fuere.* Note, That this Emperor required that the Legions ſhould honour *Junius Blaſus* with the Title of *Imperator*. This Title, given by the Acclamations of the Soldiers, was very glorious. This had been a Cuſtom in the Wars of the People of *Rome*, in the time of the Republick; but it grew almoſt out of uſe under *Auguſtus*, and was entirely aboliſhed under *Tiberius*; for *Junius Blaſus* was the laſt that was honour'd with this Salutation. This whole Matter deſerves to be related in *Tacitus*'s own Words. (*g*) *Tiberius pro confecto* (Bello) *interpretatus, id quoque Blaſo tribuit, ut* Imperator *à legionibus ſalutaretur: priſco erga duces honore, qui bene geſta Republica gaudio & impetu victoris exercitus conclamabatur: erantque plures ſimul Imperatores, nec ſuper ceterorum æqualitatem. Conceſſit quibuſdam & Auguſtus id vocabulum; ac tunc Tiberius Blaſo poſtremum.* The firſt Words of this Paſſage inform us, That *Tiberius* thought the War with *Tacfarinas* to be ended, although *Blæsus* return'd into *Italy* before he had rooted out (*h*) the Seeds that might raiſe it again. *Tiberius*, thinking the Buſineſs was over, recalled the ninth Legion out of *Africa*. *Tacfarinas* gave out, that they were drawn off to another Place, becauſe other Nations laid the *Roman* Empire waſte; and that therefore, it would be an eaſy matter to hem in thoſe *Roman* Troops that were left, provided that all thoſe, who preferred their Liberty before Servitude, would readily unite their Forces. He was joined and aſſiſted by many People, and created a great deal of Trouble to the new Pro-conſul, *Dolabella*, who at length totally vanquiſhed this Enemy (*i*). He demanded the Honour of a Triumph, but could not obtain it; for *Tiberius*, out of Complaiſance to *Sejanus*, refuſed to conſent to what might diminiſh the Glory of *Junius Blaſus*. This Refuſal added more to the Glory of *Dolabella*, than to that of the Uncle of the Favourite. *Tacitus* took care not to ſuppreſs this Obſervation. (*k*) *Dolabella petenti abnuit triumphalia Tiberius Sejano tribuens, ne Blaſi avunculi ejus laus obſoleſceret. Sed neque Blaſus ideo inluſtrior, & huic negatus honor gloriam intendit. Quippe minore exercitu, inſignis captivos, cædem ducis, bellique confecti famam deportarat.* It was a great deal of Injuſtice, to refuſe to *Dolabella*, who had concluded this War, what had been allow'd to the Half-Conquerors (*l*) of *Tacfarinas*.

(*B*) *The Faults of* Moreri's *Supplement.*] 'Tis wrong to ſay, I. That *Tacfarinas* was a Slave. II. That *he retired into* Africa. III. That out of the Robbers that he aſſembled *he formed a powerful Army of* Saracens. IV. That he cauſed himſelf *to be proclaimed King*. V. That *he beat the* Roman *Army, commanded by* Decius, *Pro-conſul of* Africa. VI. *That he wounded him in the Eye.* VII. That *he was afterwards vanquiſhed by* Camillus. VIII. And that *Tacitus* relates all this in his ſecond Book. Here are eight Capital Faults, too many for an Article of ten Lines. *Tacitus* ſays nothing to make us believe, that *Tacfarinas* was a Slave, or that he had ſerved out of *Africa* in the *Roman* Army. It was in *Africa* that he bore Arms for them, in all appearance, and by conſequence he did not retire into *Africa* after he had deſerted. As for this Army of *Saracens*, I believe I am not miſtaken

in

(*a*) Judicio patrum deligendum Proconſulem, gnarum militiæ, corpore validum, & bello ſuffecturum. *Tacit. Ann. lib.* 3. *cap.* 32.

(*b*) *Id. ib.*

(*c*) *Id. ib. cap.* 35.

(*d*) *Id. ib.*

(*e*) *See* Tacitus, *ib. cap.* 74.

(*f*) *Tacit. ibid. cap.* 72, 73.

(*g*) *Id. ib. cap.* 74.

(*h*) Fratre ejus (Tacfarinatis) capto regreſſus eſt, properantius tamen quam ex utilitate ſociorum, relictis per quos reſurgeret bellum. *Id. ibid.*

(*i*) Ex eod. *ibid. lib.* 4. *cap.* 23. & *ſeq.*

(*k*) *Id. ib. cap.* 26.

(*l*) Priores duces, ubi impetrando triumphalium inſigni ſufficere res ſuas crediderant, hoſtem omittebant. Jamque tres laureatæ in Urbe ſtatuæ, & adhuc raptabat Africam Tacfarinas. *Id. ibid. cap.* 23.

the *Lacedemonians* to abandon *Tachus*, than to maintain him; and ſo he went into the Service of *Nectanabus* with the Troops that he commanded; which, as his Hiſtorian obſerves, deſerves to be called nothing but Treaſon, though the Publick Good be alledged for it. *Tachus*, being thus abandoned, fled where he could ‡. I do not believe that Hiſtory ever found him. Some ſay, he retired into *Perſia*. He muſt needs have been at a loſs where to find a Place of Refuge, ſince he fled to a Prince, who could not but look upon him as a Leader of Rebels. *Athenæus* aſſigns a very different Cauſe of *Ageſilaus*'s Reſentment from that which has been given ∥: But I had much rather (*Z*) believe *Plutarch* than *Athenæus* concerning it.

TACITUS (* **CAIUS CORNELIUS**) a *Roman* Hiſtorian, who flouriſh'd in the firſt Century. There is nothing known concerning his Anceſtors, and the Dignity of his Family did probably begin with his Perſon. His firſt Employ, as it is ſaid, was that of Procurator (*A*) to *Veſpaſian* in *Gallia Belgica*. Being return'd to *Rome*, he receiv'd from the Emperor *Titus* a more honourable Degree †. He was Prætor (*B*) under the Empire of *Domitian*, and Conſul (*C*) under *Nerva*. But all theſe Dignities gave him but ſmall Glory, if we compare it with that which he procur'd to himſelf by the Performances of his Pen. His Annals, and (*D*) his Hiſtory are admirable, and one of the greateſt Efforts of Humane Mind; whether

‡ Taken from Plutarch, in vita Ageſilai.

∥ Theopompus & Lyceas Naucratites, apud Athenæum, lib. 14. pag. 616.

* Others give him the Sirname of Publius, and are blamed for it.

† See the Remark A.

in my Conjectures, if I ſay, that the Word *Muzulani*, which *Tacitus* makes uſe of, made the Continuator of *Moreri* think that *Tacitus* meant the *Muſulmans*; and becauſe the Followers of *Mahomet* go by that Name, and have alſo been known by that of *Saracens*, he fancied it was indifferent to ſay an Army of *Saracens*, or an Army of *Muſulmans*. *Tacitus* does not ſpeak of a Pro-conſul named *Decius*, but of one *Decrius*, who commanded in a Caſtle; the Garriſon of which conſiſted of a (*b*) Cohort, which is here converted into an Army of *Romans*, commanded by the Proconſul *Decius*. Now, ſince *Decrius* was killed, *Moreri*'s Continuator ſhould not have been contented to ſay, that *Tacfarinas* wounded him in the Eye. *Camillus*'s Victory was before the Defeat of *Decrius*. He ſhould have cited the ſecond, third and fourth Books of *Tacitus*'s Annals; for theſe Words, *Tacitus lib.* 2. refer you as well to the ſecond Book of his Hiſtory, as to the ſecond Book of his Annals: And after all, whatever ſecond Book you take, you will not find there all the things which you are told of *Tacfarinas*.

(*Z*) *Believe* Plutarch *than* Athenæus *concerning it.*] The latter attributes all to a Jeſt: He would (*c*) have it, that *Tachus*, deriding *Ageſilaus*, ſeeing his ſmall Stature, ſaid to him, *A Mountain has been in travail*, Jupiter *has been afraid of it, it has brought forth a Mouſe*: ὤδινεν ὄρος, Ζεὺς δ' ἐφοβεῖτο, τὸ δ' ἔτεκεν μῦν. He adds, that *Ageſilaus* fell into a Paſſion, and anſwered, *You ſhall one Day find that I am a Lion.* He was as good as his Word; for an Inſurrection happening againſt *Tachus*, he ſaw himſelf abandon'd by *Ageſilaus*, and forced to flye into *Perſia*. I ſee no likelyhood of this. Firſt, *Plutarch*, who gives a large Account of the Contempt of the *Egyptians* for *Ageſilaus*, upon the Score of his mean Equipage and Mien, and for his indifferent Taſte, which they knew by the Choice he made of the Preſents that were ſent him, doth not ſay, that *Tachus* uſed any ſuch Jeſt. He doth indeed ſay, that that great Concourſe of People that went to the Sea-ſide to ſee this great Captain, ſo much celebrated by Fame, applied to him the Fable of the Mountain that brought forth a Mouſe; but he doth not ſay, that *Ageſilaus* made any Anſwer to it, and *Tachus* was not there. The ſharp Saying, which *Athenæus* aſcribes to this King of *Lacedæmon*, had no doubt been among thoſe, which *Plutarch* relates of this Prince, had it been grounded on a good Tradition. Beſides, is it probable, that a Man who wanted ſo much the Aſſiſtance of *Ageſilaus*, wou'd be ſo impudent as to exaſperate him by ſo biting a Jeſt? I do not deny, but that *Plutarch* (*d*) has obſerved, that *Tachus*'s Vanity made *Ageſilaus* uneaſy: But once more, this Hiſtorian would not have forgot in this Place the Story of the Mountain, and the quick Anſwer of *Ageſilaus*. I verily believe, that *Athenæus*'s Narrative ought to be reduced to this. It was told this King of the *Lacedæmonians*, that the *Egyptians*, after they had ſeen him ſo little, of whom they had form'd ſo great an Idea, ſpoke of the Mountain that brought forth a Rat: he replied, probably, *That they ſhould ſoon ſee, that that Mouſe they had ſeen by the Sea-ſide, would fight like a Lion.* He did not pretend to threaten *Tachus*, but to fill him with Hopes. I have heard ſay, that ſome *French* Generals, being in *Germany*, and obſerving, that the *Germans* had no good Opinion of ſome of their Regiments, becauſe the Soldiers were not tall, fat, bulky, and well-cloathed, encouraged them with theſe Words, *You ſhall ſee theſe little, lean and meager Soldiers, fight like Lions, and fetch down the great Giants.* However that be, one may learn by this account of *Athenæus*, true or falſe, a very important Leſſon; which is, that Princes ſhould never offend any Body with Railleries (*e*): They may one time or another pay dear for it.

(*A*) *Of Procurator to* Veſpaſian.] You will find theſe Words in the Life of *Tacitus*, compoſed by *Juſtus Lipſius*. *Initium Dignitatis illi ſub Veſpaſiano fuit, à quo Plinio auctore, procurator datus Galliæ Belgicæ rationes Principis adminiſtravit.* I will cite (*a*) hereafter what *Pliny* ſays, and there it may be ſeen, that he makes no mention of *Veſpaſian*; why then is he cited as an Author that informs us, that this Emperor gave *Tacitus* this Employ? Is it becauſe it is found that *Tacitus* exerciſed this Office under *Veſpaſian*? But does this give an Allowance to attribute to Authors what they never ſaid? However it be, there's little doubt but that *Tacitus* poſſeſs'd this Office under *Veſpaſian*; which is grounded upon this: (*b*) *Dignitatem noſtram à Veſpaſiano inchoatam, à Tito auctam, à Domitiano longius provectam non abnuerim.* They are *Tacitus*'s Words. We ſhall ſee ‡ whether this Opinion be well grounded or not.

(*B*) *He was Prætor under the Emperor* Domitian.] *Vertranius* places (*c*) this Prætorſhip under the ninth Conſulſhip, of this Emperor; but he ſhould have placed it under the 14th; for it falls in with the Time in which *Domitian* celebrated the Secular Games: Now it is certain, that he celebrated them, being Conſul (*d*) for the 14th time. I ſhall cite *Tacitus*: (*e*) *Is* (Domitianus) *quoque edidit ludos ſæculares; iiſque intentius adfui ſacerdotio Quindecimvirali præditus, ac tum prætor. Quod non jactantia refero, ſed quia collegio Quindecimvirum antiquitus ea cura, & magiſtratus potiſſimum exſequebantur officia cærimoniarum.*

(*C*) *And Conſul under* Nerva.] He was ſubrogated in the place of *Virginius Rufus*, who died in his third Conſulſhip, in the Year of *Rome* (*f*) 850, and he honour'd him with a Funeral Oration. (*g*) *Laudatus eſt à Conſule Cornelio Tacito, nam hic ſupremus fœlicitati ejus cumulus acceſſit, laudator eloquentiſſimus.*

(*D*) *His Annals and his Hiſtory.*] He wrote the Hiſtory before the Annals; for he refers us to his Hiſtory (*h*) in the 11th Book of the Annals: He refers us thither, I ſay, about ſome things that concern *Domitian*. Now it is certain that his Hiſtory (*i*) extended from the Reign of *Galba* incluſively to the Reign of *Nerva* excluſively. He deſign'd a particular Work for the Reigns of *Nerva* and *Trajan*, and that was the Buſineſs he reſerved for his old Age: But I believe he never was able to put his Deſign in Execution. (*k*) *Quod ſi vita ſuppeditet, principatum Divi Nervæ, & Imperium Trajani, uberiorem ſecurioremque materiam ſenectuti ſepoſui: rara temporum felicitate, ubi ſentire quæ velis, & quæ ſentias dicere licet.* Theſe Words ſhew, that he began his Hiſtory, after the Death of the Emperor *Nerva*, and during the Life of *Trajan*: And therefore he gives the Title of *Divus* to the firſt, which he does not give to the ſecond. We have now but five Books of his Hiſtory left, which is but a very ſmall Part of it; for they do not contain above a Year and an half, when the whole

) Which … about … Men.

) Athen. … 14. … 616.

Ἐγγυᾶ … ἔνεν … ὤδινεν … Ζεὺς … ἐφοβεῖτο … ende … qua … ypcii … pentia … vanita- … tiga- … Plu- … in … Age- … pag. … 7.

(*e*) See the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres *for the Month of* March 1684, *pag.* 47.

(*a*) *In the Remark K.*

(*b*) *Tacitus hiſtor. lib.* 1. *c.* 1.

‡ *In the Remark K.*

(*c*) *Lipſius*, in vita Taciti, *cenſures him for it.*

(*d*) *It was in the Year* 848 *of* Rome, *according to* Lipſius, *or* 840, *according* Calviſius.

(*e*) *Tacitus Annal. lib.* 11. *c.* 11.

(*f*) 849, *according to* Calviſius.

(*g*) *Plin: epiſt.* 1. *lib.* 2.

(*h*) Utriuſque Principis rationes prætermitto, ſatis narratas libris quibus res Imperatoris Domitiani compoſui. *Tacitus Annal. lib.* 11. *c.* 11.

(*i*) *See* Tacitus *at the beginning of his Hiſtory.*

(*k*) *Idem hiſt. lib.* 1. *cap.* 1.

whether you conſider the Singularity of the Style, or the Beauty of the Thoughts, and that happy Pencil, with which he knew how to paint out the Diſguiſes and Cheats of Politicks, and the Weakneſs of Paſſions. However, he may be cenſured (E) for the Affectation of his Language, and inquiring into the ſecret Motives of Actions, and rendring them Criminal; but it is a great Elogy for his Wit to ſee the Eſteem which many Princes (F) have had for his Works. A Modern Author has

whole Work was to contain about twenty-nine Years. Thoſe who number theſe five Books, as the Continuation of the Annals divided into 16 Books, are to blame; for the Annals ought to be conſidered (l) as a ſeparate Work. The Author compoſed them after he had finiſhed his Hiſtory, beginning them at the Death of *Auguſtus*, and continuing them to that of *Nero*. We have but one Part of 'em left, *viz.* the four firſt Books, ſome Pages of the fifth, and all the ſixth, and from the ninth to the fifteenth, and Part of the ſixteenth: The two laſt Years of *Nero*, and Part of the foregoing Year are wanting. Theſe were the laſt Books of the Work. The five firſt Books were found in *Germany*, by a Receiver of *Leo X.* He carried them to that Pope, and received a Gratification of 500 Crowns. (m) *Corbeiæ, quod ad Viſurgim Monaſterium eſt, à quæſtore Pontificis fuere inventi, qui eos ad Leonem X. detulit, ac præmii loco quingentos accepit aureos.* Philip *Beroaldus* had Orders to publiſh them. (n) I remember I heard the late Mr. *Faure*, Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of *Paris*, ſay, that *Leo X.* having publiſhed a Brief, by which he promis'd not only Indulgences to thoſe that ſhould diſcover *Tacitus*'s Manuſcripts, but alſo Money, and Honour (o), there was a *German*, who ſearch'd all the Libraries and found at laſt ſome Books of the Annals in the Monaſtery of *Corwey*. He went and preſented them to the Pope, who received them with great Pleaſure, and ask'd of him what Recompenſe he deſired. The *German* contented himſelf with being re-imburſed the Charges he had been at in going to ſee thoſe Libraries, and in his Journey to *Rome*. *Leo* thought that was too little, and gave him more; and to procure him Honour and Profit, he would leave him the care of publiſhing this *Tacitus*. But the *German* excuſed himſelf, by reaſon of his Want of Learning neceſſary thereunto (p).

(E) *However, he may be cenſured for the Affectation of his Language, and enquiring into the ſecret Motives of Actions.*] *Muret* has made three Orations (q), in Anſwer to thoſe who have criticiſed *Tacitus*. Their Criticiſms were too ſharp, and unjuſt in ſome reſpects: Therefore it was no hard matter for the Apologiſt, who was a good Orator, and a ſubtle Rhetorician, to elude them. You may ſee in thoſe Orations what *Tacitus* is reproached with. You may alſo find it in (r) *Strada*'s *Proluſiones*. He is one of the moſt profeſſed Enemies of *Tacitus*: He thereby diſpleaſed (s) *Paganinus Gaudentius*, who not only criticized (t) many Places of his Hiſtory of the *Low-Countries*; but alſo went about to juſtify *Tacitus*. *Gaudentius* was no very ſtout Champion; he underſtood a little of many Things, but learned nothing perfectly. *Magis literis tinctus quam imbutus .... nihil in ingenio ſolidum, cum per artes & diſciplinas peregrinaretur nulli penitus inſiſtens* (v). It ſeems to me, that Cardinal *du Perron* (w) has too much deſpiſed *Tacitus*.

The Book entituled, *Anonymiana, or Miſcellanies of Poetry, Oratory and Learning*, which was printed at *Paris*, *anno* 1700, contains a Diſcourſe which is not very favourable to our Hiſtorian. See what Judgement the Author paſſes upon his Language. “(x) *Tacitus* ſpoke *Latin* very well, but too obſcurely to expreſs what he would write. His hard and contracted Style might be eſteem'd in other things, than in a Hiſtory, the whole of which ought to be clear and well eſtabliſh'd; the Diſtance of the Facts, their Variety, their Epoch's, and their Changes, continually controverted, render it obobſcure enough in it ſelf, without the Style being ſo too .... (y). It is a Miſtake to pretend, that *Tacitus*'s way of Writing is commendable: if ſome Wines are eſteem'd for a little Bitterneſs, it is becauſe of a good Quality; but a harſh and rough way of Writing will never gain Reputation in a Hiſtory. It is ſo far from raiſing the Mind to greater Knowledge, as this Learned Man (z) pretends, that it perplexes and diſcourages it. As for Example; may it be ſaid, that *Cæſar* had excited more Attention, if he had been more obſcure, and leſs natural? Does not he raiſe the Mind to his own Thoughts, which ought to be always the Rule of ours? Whereas in an obſcure manner of Writing, the Mind of the Reader roves where it pleaſes, and forms Imaginations which oftentimes have no exactneſs or proportion to the things. *Cæſar*, by his Neatneſs, never gives occaſion to deſire more Light in the Actions he deſcribes.” I could readily ſubſcribe to this Judgment, and it ſeems to me, that what the Author adds concerning the other Affectation of *Tacitus*, is no leſs (aa) judicious. (bb) “*Tacitus* was a good Politician, and yet a more judicious Writer. He has drawn very juſt Conſequences about the Tranſactions of the Reigns, of which he wrote the Hiſtory, which he turned into Maxims for the well governing of a State. But if at any time he has given to the Actions or Motions of the Republick their true Principles, if he hath well unravell'd their Cauſes, it ought to be own'd, that he has often ſupplied with too much Nicety and Penetration, thoſe which had none: So true it is, that Men characterize themſelves in whatever they do, and that Hiſtory never is in the Hands in which it ſhould be, when thoſe who undertake to write it, give for the true Cauſe of that which they know nothing of, what they imagine to be leſs ſenſible, and moſt hidden from the Eyes of the People. It falls out oftentimes, that they make a particular Secret of a Prince, an Affair known to all the World: And this is a Fault ſo familiar (z) to *Tacitus*, that I dare venture to ſay, ſupported otherwiſe by many good Reaſons, that to take him for a very exact Hiſtorian, who has written according to Rules, is to pay him too much Deference .... (a) He has choſen the niceſt Actions, and the moſt ſuſceptible of the Delicacies of Art. Thoſe Reigns that he has principally medled with in his Hiſtory, are no ſmall Proof of it. In that of *Tiberius*, which is without Diſpute his Maſter-piece, and his beſt Performance, he found a kind of Government more adapted to the Character of his Genius. He lov'd, as I have ſaid, to unfold the Intrigues of the Cabinet, to aſſign their Cauſes, to turn Pretences into Deſigns, and deceitful Appearances into real Things. A Genius too ſubtle, that ſaw ſome Myſtery in all the Actions of this Prince. A ſincere Deference of his Deſigns to the Judgment of the Senate, was ſometimes a Snare laid to their Integrity; ſometimes a nice way of becoming their Maſter; and always the Art of making 'em the Accomplices of his Deſigns, and of executing them without any Reproach. When he puniſhed the Seditious; it was an Effect of his natural Diffidence of the Citizens, or ſome ſlight Marks of Anger ſpread among the People, to diſpoſe their Minds for greater Cruelties. Here the Contrariety of Humours of two Generals, is a ſecret Method of croſſing the Fortune of a Competitor, and the means to leſſen him in the Affection of the People. The Honours conferr'd on thoſe that deſerved them, were general ways of removing a Rival, or of deſtroying an Enemy, and always fatal Recompenſes: In a word, Policy has a hand in every thing, Vice and Virtue are there equally dangerous, and Favours as pernicious as Diſgraces. *Tiberius* is never natural, he does not do the moſt ordinary Actions of other Men without Deſigns. His Repoſe is never without Conſequence, and his Motions do always contain many ſecret Practices.” The other Things which I have read in this Diſſertation of the Author of the *Anonymiana*, are more liable, in my Opinion, to a juſt Diſpute.

(F) *Which many Princes have had for his Works.*] Pope *Paul* III. wore out his *Tacitus* by much reading of him. *Coſmo de Medicis*, the firſt great Duke of *Florence*, accounted the reading of him a great Pleaſure. *Muret* tells us this in finer Words, (b) *Paulus III. P. M. quo nullum ſapientiorem ſenem noſtra vidit ætas, Tacitum ſæpè relegendo contriverat, neque ullum profanum ſcriptorem æquè libenter legebat. Coſmus Medices, qui primus Magnus Etruriæ Dux fuit,* bone has made this Judgment of 'em: "*Tertullian accuses him of having put a great many Falshoods upon us. He was not only an Enemy to the true Religion, but it may be seen in several places that he had none at all. His Style is certainly very obscure, it is also sometimes harsh, and has not all the Purity of good Authors in the Latin Tongue. Nevertheless, his Art of comprising a great deal of Sense in a few Words, his Vivacity in painting out Events, the Perspicuity with which he penetrates into the Darkness of the corrupt Heart of Men, the Energy and Eminency of Mind, which appear throughout the Whole, makes him be look'd upon at this Day almost generally as the chief of Historians.*" There are so many (G) Versions of him, and so many Comments upon him, that this alone is enough to make a pretty large Library. I shall take notice of some (H) Faults

---

(l) *See the Proofs which Lipſius gives of it in the Preface to his Commentaries on* Tacitus.

(m) *Voſſius de hiſt. Lat. lib.* 1. *cap.* 30. *pag.* 150.

(n) *They were printed at* Rome, *an.* 1515.

(o) *That is, that their Names ſhould be prefixed with an Elogy to what they ſhould find out.*

(p) Note, *That Mr.* Faure *ſaid, that he had read this Narrative in the Preface to the firſt Edition of theſe Books of* Tacitus. *See an Elogy on Mr.* Faure *in the* Journal des Savans, Nov. 16. 1693. *pag.* 673. Dutch *Edition.*

(q) *The* 16. 17, & 18. *of the* 2*d Volume*, in *the* Leipſick *Edition* 1672.

(r) *Lib.* 1. *proluſ.* 2.

(s) *Profeſſor at* Piſa. *He was of the Country of the* Griſons, *if I am not miſtaken.*

(t) *See his Book,* de Candore Politico, *printed at* Piſa, *an.* 1646.

(v) *Octav. Ferrarius in proluſione cui titulus,* Literatorum tumus.

(w) *See the* Perroniana *at the Word* Stiles.

(x) *Anonymiana, p.* 7.

(y) *Ibid, pag.* 9.

(z) *That is to ſay,* La Mothe le Vayer.

(aa) De- *deviſed this ge- rally* ing.

(bb) *Ibid pag.* 10.

(z) *The Author ſhould not therefore have ſaid, that he was a more judicious Writer, than an able Politician.*

(a) *Ibid pag.* 15. & 16.

(b) *Mu Orat.* 16 *vol.* 2. *p* 342. *edi Lipſ.* 16

(a) Tillemont History of the Emperors, Tom. I. part 1. pag. 55 of the Brussels Edition.
(b) In the Remark A.

homo factus ad imperandum, qui eam, quæ vulgo fortuna dicitur, in consiliis & prudentiâ consistere docuit, Taciti libros in deliciis habebat; eorumque lectione avidissimè fruebatur. Neque non hodie multi aut Principum, aut eorum, qui de summis rebus à Principibus in consilium adhibentur, eundem studiosissimè legunt, & quasi pro magistro quodam prudentiæ habent. I shall set down a Passage of *Balzac* after this *Latin* one. It is taken from a Letter that he wrote to the Sieur *d'Ablancourt*, the 4th of *June* 1643. "(c) *Tacitus* being become yours, my ill Opinion of him can last no longer: I cannot hate a Man that you love; and, to tell you the Truth, I do believe that he is become more sweet, and less thorny, by passing through your Hands. The best of all is, that you have not defiled your self by meddling with dirty Matters, and that among those Excrements of Policy, your Morality is preserved in its Purity. A Stoick Philosopher of the last Age, as you may call *Justus Lipsius*, has had the same Inclination that you have. A great Captain, as you may call the Marquiss of *Spinola*, has made a Translation of it into his Language, although it hath not been published; and I inform you of this Secret which I learn'd from one of his most intimate Confidents." Add to this a Passage of *Guy Patin*: (d) Cornelius Tacitus, *who is a State-Breviary, or the first or chief Master of the Secrets of the Cabinet, and whom Mr.* de Balzac *calls somewhere*, the ancient Original of Modern Policy, *says, speaking of* Tiberius, *&c.* Remember the forwardness of *Leo X.* I have spoke of it above (e).

I add Queen *Christina* to the Examples which I have given. Mr. *Chanut* says (f), that she used the *Greek* Tongue only *as her Diversion in spare Hours; and that the reading of this Language and others did not keep her from her serious Studies. So she call'd among others the reading of* Tacitus's *History, some Pages of which she read constantly every Day. This Author, who exercises the most Learned, was very familiar to her.*

(G) *There are so many Versions, and so many Comments.*] Mr. *Amelot de la Houssaie*, who has translated the six first Books of the Annals into *French*, has prefixed to his Translation a Critical Discourse, where you may find the Names of many Persons, who have labour'd on this Writer. There you may see the Judgment that is made of their Endeavours, and of *Tacitus*'s Style and Morals. All this is very curious: But this *French* Translator speaks in general of all those who have written on *Tacitus*, or who have translated him into other Languages; he only speaks of the principal ones. I wish *Peter Andrew Canonheri* had named the 11 Commentators that he points at in these Words. (g) *Præter hos sunt undecim qui Tacitum notis & commentariis illustrarunt.* He gives just before a long List of those, *qui ex professo de jure status conscripserunt.* That List contains eight Pages in 4°. I know some Persons of good Judgment, who make a great account of the Critical Commentaries on *Tacitus*, such as is that of *Justus Lipsius*, and slight very much the Political Commentaries, with which *Italy* has infatuated *Germany*: For since the *Germans* have seen the Dissertations of *Scipione Ammirato* translated into *Latin* by *Christopher Pflugius*, a Gentleman of *Misnia*, they loved a little too much to comment on *Tacitus*'s Works in that manner. Not but that one may profit by their Writings, chiefly by those of (h) *Boeclerus*. That which *Berneggerus* composed on the same Historian, is intermixed with Literature and Politicks; and therefore it is entituled, *Quæstiones Miscellaneæ*. The *French* did not bite at the Hook, when *John Baudoin* added to his Translation of *Tacitus* (i), printed with Notes, a Translation of *Scipione Ammirato*.

(H) *Some Faults* in Justus Lipsius.] I. I have already observ'd (k), that he makes *Pliny* say more than he should have done. II. He had rather believe, that *Tacitus* was the first of his Family who enjoy'd any Honours, and that this Family was not very illustrious, than to believe, that his Father had any Office: And nevertheless in another Place he understands of his Father what *Pliny* says of *Cornelius Tacitus*, a *Roman* Knight and Procurator of the Demesns in *Gallia Belgica*. Let us compare these two Passages of *Lipsius* together. Here is the first. (l) *Pater avusque honores gesserint, & ad remp. accesserint, necne, ut re vetustâ & incertâ nihil adfirmem: propius à vero abest, ipsum primum jus imaginis & honores in familiam non nimis illustrem intulisse. Initium dignitatis illi sub Vespasiano fuit, à quo, Plinio auctore, procurator datus Galliæ Belgicæ, rationes Principis administravit, quæ dignitas equestri ordini diu peculiaris fuit.* Here is the other, which serves for a Commentary on these Words of *Tacitus*, *dignitatem nostram à Vespasiano inchoatam.* How can this be says *Lipsius*? (a) *Quomodo, quiane Procurator sub illo Belgicæ? E Plinio id suspicâre, sed suspicâre tantum, imo verius id ceperis de hujus patre. Intellige ergo dignitatem ejus inchoatam à Vespasiano, quòd ab eo laticlavius factus, & relatus in ordinem primum.* *Lipsius* will have it in the first of these two Passages, that *Pliny* says, that *Tacitus* was honoured with a Commission by *Vespasian*; and in the other he will have it, that this is meant of *Tacitus*'s Father. According to this last Case, this Historian had for his Father a Knight promoted by the Emperor to honourable Employments; and that which to *Lipsius* did not appear likely, would nevertheless be very true. No Body can deny, but that this Office of Procurator was very honourable; they attributed to it, under the Emperor *Claudius*, the Authority of (b) Jurisdiction without Appeal. Consult the Learned (c) *Gutherius*; and though *Augustus* had conferr'd this Office on some (d) Freed-Men, *Tacitus* did nevertheless look upon it as a Dependency of Knighthood; *utrumque avum procuratorem Cæsarum habuit* (Agricola) *quæ equestris nobilitas est* (e). III. *Lipsius* asserts, that *Tacitus* being grown grey-headed at the Bar, devoted his old Years to the Writing of History. *Historiæ scribendæ senex demum vacavit, cum reliquum ætatis in foro & causis orandis egisset.* But if it be so, how comes it, that *Tacitus* declares, that he undertakes to write an History that will extend from the Death of *Nero* to that of *Domitian*; and that he reserves for his old Age the Empire of *Nerva* and *Trajan*? (f) *Quod si vita suppeditet, principatum divi Nervæ, & imperium Trajani, uberiorem securioremque materiam senectuti seposui.* One may here apply to *Lipsius* the Proverb, *Sorex suo indicio periit.* He tells us (g), that he has, within a very small matter, found out the Year of *Tacitus*'s Nativity, thus. *Pliny* the younger, much of (h) the same Age with *Tacitus*, was in his 18th Year when his Uncle died; that is to say, according to *Lipsius*, the second Year of the Reign of *Titus*. He was then born in the Year of *Rome* 816: So that *Tacitus* being a little older than he, must have been born the last Year of the Emperor *Claudius*, or rather, the first Year of *Nero*. Whereupon, I say, that he was therefore but 44 Years of Age when *Trajan* mounted the Throne; and since nothing obliges us to put back the Beginning of his Work beyond the second, or the third Year of this Prince, it manifestly follows, that he was not old when he began to apply himself to it. It is certain, supposing that he undertook this Work in his 45th Year, that it may be much better conceived that he had time to finish it, and afterwards to go about his Annals, which he carried on from the Beginning of *Tiberius*'s Reign, to the Death of *Nero*. And observe, that in writing his Annals, he proposed to himself a new (i) Enterprise for the time when he had finished them. Observe also, that his manner of Writing required much time, every thing in it favours of Pains, Meditation, Study, and *festina lente.* And lastly, observe, that the Letters *Pliny* the younger wrote to him, either to entreat him to make mention of him, or to communicate to him some

(l) *Just. Lipsius in vita Taciti in limine comment. ad Tacitum.*

(a) *Lipsius in Tacit. histor. lib. 1. init. p. m. 451.*

(b) Eodem anno sæpius audita vox Principis, parem vim rerum habendam à Procuratoribus suis judicatarum, ac si ipse statuisset. Ac ne fortuito prolapsus videretur, Senatus quoque consulto cautum, plenius quam antea & uberius. *Tacitus Annal. lib. 12. c. 60.*

(c) *Gutherius de Officiis domus Augustæ, lib. 3. cap. 33.*

(d) *Dio lib. 53. pag. 506.*

(e) *Tacit. in vita Agricolæ, c. 4.*

(f) *Tacit. histor. lib. 1. cap. 1.*

(g) *Lipsius in vita Taciti.*

(h) *See the Epistle 20. of the 7th Book of* Pliny.

(i) Sed aliorum exitus, simul cetera illius ætatis memorabo, si effectis in quæ tendi, plures ad curas vitam produxero. *Tacitus Annal. lib. 3. cap. 24.*

Faults in *Justus Lipsius*, *la Mothe* (*l*) *le Vayer*, and *Moreri*; and you may, in my

some Memoirs concerning the Death of his Uncle (*k*) *seem to be of the* 102, *or* 103 *Year*; that is, of the 5th or 6th Year of *Trajan*. Now it is certain, that *Tacitus* was then writing his History; and since there is great likelyhood that he was not far from the time when the Fire of Mount *Vesuvius* destroyed *Pliny* the Naturalist, in the first or second Year of *Titus*, we may very well judge, that he did not long defer the beginning of his Work after the Installation of *Trajan*. IV. *Lipsius* conjectures (*l*), that *Tacitus*'s History contained 20 Books. The ground he goes upon is this, that it contained an Interval of 21 Years, and that the five first Books mention only the Actions of a Year and some Months. This is a Falsity in Fact, and a prodigious Forgetfulness of what the Rule of Proportion requires. There are more than twenty eight Years between the Death of *Nero*, and that of *Domitian*, which are the two Bounds of *Tacitus's* History: and no Man that understands the Rule of Three would reason after this manner; If fifteen Months take up five Books, twenty-one Years take up twenty Books. *Note*, That the Years that are lost of the History of *Tacitus*, are scarce, in the main, less fruitful in Events, than the time that is left. St. *Jerom* (*m*) says, that *Tacitus* composed the History of the Emperors, in thirty Books, from *Tiberius* to the Death of *Domitian*. This Testimony can be of no use, because the History of *Tacitus* does not begin at the Death of *Augustus*; and there is no appearance that this Work and his Annals contain'd but thirty Books; and so St. *Jerom* has not well express'd himself. See the Margin (*n*).

The greatest part of these Mistakes of *Justus Lipsius* are to be found in the Writings of the most Learned Men, who have spoken of *Tacitus* historically. I will excuse them: For who could believe, that so great a Writer had committed them in a very short Work, and framed, so as to persuade, that the Author of it had weighed attentively all his Words! I do not think, that his Conjecture concerning the Year of *Tacitus*'s Nativity is amiss; which shews a gross Error of *Francis Garasse*, who believed, that *Lucan*'s *Pharsalia* (*o*) is later than *Tacitus*'s History. His Words are these. (*p*) The first Objection "may be of those
" who imagine, that God takes Pleasure in disordering us, and is delighted to see us exposed to
" Tempests, Rebellions and Wars, as though we had
" a barbarous and revengeful God, who bathes himself in the Blood of Men. Such are in some
" manner the pompous Objections, and Atheistical
" Sentences of *Tacitus* and *Lucan*, who was, in his
" time, accounted the Father of Atheists: For they
" say in express Terms: *Tot Romanæ Reipublicæ cladibus*
" *manifestum est fuisse curæ Diis* VINDICTAM, *non*
" *fuisse* SALUTEM: *That is to say, by so many*
" *Calamities, and by the divers Disorders which have shaken the Republick of* Rome, *it plainly appears, that*
" *the Gods take care to be revenged on us, and not to*
" *succour us. These are the Words of* Tacitus, *in the*
" *first Book of his History*; *and* Lucan, *who perhaps had it from him, as an Asp, who borrows Venom from the Viper, says in lofty Terms,*

" *Felix Roma quidem, civesque habitura superbos,*
" *Si* LIBERTATIS *Superis tam cura fuisset,*
" *Quàm* VINDICTA *placet, &c.*

" *Rome*, says he, *would be the most happy City in the*
" *World, if God studied so industriously our* Liberty, *as*
" *he studies particular* Revenge."

(*l*) La Mothe le Vayer, *and* Moreri.] The first of these two Authors says (*q*), that the twelve last Years of *Nero* are wanting in *Tacitus*'s Annals. This is false: There wants but the two last Years, and part of the preceding: This is the Ist. Fault. The IId. is to say, that this Author's History reached *to the happy Government of* Trajan. A new mistake: It ended at the Death of *Domitian*. III. It is not true, that, according to the Conjectures of *Lipsius*, we have lost ten Books of *Tacitus*'s History: For, according to his Conjectures, this Work comprehended twenty Books; therefore, since there remains but five, we have lost fifteen, according to the Opinion of this Critick. IV. This Author should not have said (*r*), that there are *at least* 21 *Years* from *Galba* to *Nerva*. This is a Fault of *Lipsius* which I have refuted, and which *Vossius* has committed likewise (*s*). V. (*t*) *It is not to be wondred at, if* Tacitus *having imitated* Thucydides, *and both of 'em* Demosthenes.... *the first has retained I know not what Harshness or Austerity, which have always been observed in the Style of those two Grecians.* These Words of *la Mothe le Vayer* contain an extravagant Anachronism; for *Demosthenes* was much later than *Thucydides*. VI. (*v*) *The Emperor* Tacitus, *in the Supreme Dignity of the World, wherein he was placed, did not omit, almost two hundred Years after the Death of this Historian of whom we speak, to pride himself in the Name that was common to them both, esteeming himself honour'd to have him for his Ancestor, and to be taken for one of his Posterity. He caused his Statue to be set up in all Libraries, and his Works to be written out ten times every Year; to the end that they might pass from hand to hand, and from Age to Age, as they have done even to ours.* This Story is not very exact: it supposes, that this Emperor reigned a certain number of Years; or else it would be absurd to say, that he caused such or such a thing to be done every Year: Nevertheless, it is certain, that his Reign lasted only about six Months. Besides, this Account supposes the Event answered this Emperor's Intentions; that is, that the Books of *Tacitus did pass from Age to Age down to ours*, according to the Design of the Prince who caused them to be transcribed: and yet there remains but a very small part of 'em. I do not much wonder, that the Care of this Emperor has not procured to us the Preservation of the Works of his Ancestor: For, considering the short Duration of his Empire, I believe the Execution of his Orders amounted to a very small Matter. However it be, here is what he ordered: (*w*) *Cornelium Tacitum, scriptorem historiæ Augustæ, quod parentem suum eundem diceret, in omnibus bibliothecis collocari jussit: & ne lectorum incuria deperiret, librum per annos singulos decies scribi publicitus in* (*a*) *evicis archiis jussit, & in bibliothecis poni.* VII. *La Mothe le Vayer* concludes this Chapter with these Words: " (*b*) It is
" also well known, that *Tacitus* did not go about Writing, till he was far advanced in Years, after the
" Empire of *Nerva*, and under that of *Trajan*, as we
" learn from himself." This is to commit two Faults; for in the first place the Historian speaks not of his Age; and in the 2d place it is very wrong to conclude that he was an old Man, because he composed his Work under the Empire of *Trajan*. See the (*c*) preceding Remark. VIII. The Clamours of *La Mothe le Vayer* against two Civilians, who spoke ill of *Tacitus's Latin*, appear to me to be a great Fault. He accounts those two Persons (*d*) *more worthy of Pity than of an Answer.* He adds, (*e*) *If ever a ridiculous Judgment was past, it is without doubt this: And I dare be bold to say, as full of Indignation as I am against such unreasonable Opinions, that in all appearance the meanest Cook or Groom of* Tacitus *spoke better* Latin *than* Ferret *or* Alciatus, *very learned Men in the Law, but very bad Judges of the thing we speak of....* (*f*) *Who can forbear wondering that some Barbarians at this present time, such as* Alciatus *and* Ferret, *with respect to the ancient* Romans, *should be so rash as to say, that an Author of so great Account, did not know how to speak his own Mother-Tongue! In Truth, one must have a Brazen Fore-head and a great Assurance to advance such Propositions.* What a Noise and bustle here is about nothing? For at last all the Fault of those two Civilians consists in having found out in *Tacitus*'s Style many Thorns, and little Brightness and Purity. Here are *Alciatus*'s Words; I take them from a Letter that he wrote to (*g*) *Paul Jovius*: *Illi porrò qui rerum & locorum notitia gaudent, nec affectatas exornationes admittunt, non reposcent à te rationem, cur lacteam Livii ubertatem non sis assecutus, postquam & te omnino piguerit Salustii sobrietatem imitari, & satis tibi fuerit pauculos tantum flores ex Q. Curtii pratis, sæpius quam ex Cor. Taciti senticetis, arguta manu decerpsisse.* Note, by the by, that *Vossius* had never read this Letter; for had he seen it, he had better represented the Author's Thought: He would not have attributed to him an excessive prepossession, which engag'd him to pretend, that in comparison of the History of *Paul Jovius*, that of *Tacitus* was like a Field covered with Brambles. (*h*) *Imo & Alciatus vir sane egregius non dubitat affirmare dictionem ejus præ illa Paulli Jovii esse senticeta. Condonemus tale judicium tanto viro, & cogitemus ex amore Jovii proficisci.* This is to speak at the third hand. *Alciatus*'s Letter is not very flattering, if it be well examin'd. Let us proceed to *Ferret*'s Words. (*i*) *Tanto acumine, tantoque judicio res Romanas mandavit litteris* Tacitus,

of

(*k*) *Tillemont Hist. of the Emperors, Tom.* 2. *part.* 1. *pag.* 550.

(*l*) *Lipsius in præfat. Comment. ad Histor. Taciti.*

(*m*) *Hieronym. in Zachariam, l.* 3. *c.* 14. *apud Vossium de hist. Lat. pag.* 159.

(*n*) Note, *That the Book which we reckon the fifth in the History of* Tacitus, *is cited as the fifth by* Tertullian, in libello de Spectaculis.

(*o*) Lucan *died under* Nero.

(*p*) *Garasse, Somme Theologique pag.* 440, 441.

(*q*) La Mothe la Vayer, *Judgment on the principal Historians, pag.* 207. *Tom.* 3. *edit. in* 12°.

(*r*) *Ibid. pag.* 208.

(*s*) *Vossius de histor. Lat. pag.* 159.

(*t*) *La Mothe le Vayer ibid. pag.* 209.

(*v*) Ib. pag. 21

(*w*) Vopis- cus in Taci- to Imp. cap. 10. p. m. 612. vol. 2. Scripto- rum Hist. Augusta.

(*a*) The Words without doubt cor- rupted, the Manu- scripts vary much; Ca- saubon and Salma- sius here not conten- ted to de- cide any thing.

(*b*) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi supra, pag. 219.

(*c*) Remark III.

(*d*) Id. ib. pag. 219.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 212.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 212, 213.

(*g*) It is prefixed to the first Vol. of the History of Paul Jovius.

(*h*) Vossius de histor. Latin. pag. 160.

(*i*) Aemil. Ferretus, in Castigat. ad Taci- tum, apud Petr. An- dream Ca- nonherium, Discurs. polit. in C. Tacitum, pag. 2.

my Remarks, find ſeveral Things, which relate to the Life of *Tacitus*. He married the Daughter of *Agricola*, whoſe Life he wrote. Many believe he had a Son, of whom (K) *Pliny* relates

ut nemo certè legatur in ſuo genere illi comparandus; nam quamvis caruerit nitore, & puritate linguæ, abeunte jam Romano ſermone in peregrinam formam, atque figuram, ſuccum tamen, & ſanguinem rerum incorruptum retinuit, idemque tam multa pauciſſimis complexus eſt, ut attenti lectoris in animo aculeos relinquat, indiligentem, ac aliud cogitantem fallat, ac prætereat. The Author, who affords me this Elogy, cites (k) a Paſſage of *Alciatus*, wherein he beſtows great Encomiums upon *Tacitus*. If we obſerve it narrowly, I am perſuaded we ſhall find, that theſe two Civilians went not beyond *La Mothe le Vayer*, (l) who did not deny, that *Tacitus* had retain'd ſomething of the Harſhneſs or Auſterity of *Thucydides*, and that his way of Writing is a little rugged. Would he have us find in *Tacitus* the Model of a pure and elegant *Latin* Style? Then we muſt burn *Cicero* and *Livy*; for as long as we can compare them with *Tacitus*, this will neceſſarily appear to us very much decayed. He had therefore no Reaſon to fall into ſo great a Paſſion againſt *Alciatus* and *Ferret*. He ſhould have not amplified the Murmurs and Invectives *(m)* of *Muret*. He neither ſpoke the Truth, nor his own Thoughts, when he ſaid, that the Muleteers of the antient Authors ſpoke, and underſtood the *Latin* Tongue better, than the moſt learned among the Moderns, either ſpeak or underſtand it. *Quorum coqui & muliones multo melius quam omnes nos Latine & intelligebant & loquebantur (n).* He would have been offended at this Hyperbole, if another Man had included him in it; and who doubts, but that he believ'd himſelf more learned in the *Latin* than the ordinary Citizens of antient *Rome*? He might have Reaſon for it; for it is certain, that there are ſome Foreigners, who without having ſeen *France*, ſpeak and underſtand our Tongue better than many *Frenchmen*: And I am ſure, that *Caſaubon* and *Salmaſius* wrote better in *Latin*, than in their own Tongue. If Mr. *de Tillemont (o)* had been treated at this time, as *Alciatus* was, there would be found a great deal of Pedantry in ſuch a Cenſure. *Balthaſar Bonifacius*, a great Admirer of *Tacitus*, does nevertheleſs own, that his Style is harſh. *(p) Stylus magis gravis quam elegans, aſper enim parumque duriuſculus eſt, atque à Latina lingua candore diſcedens.*

As for what concerns Mr. *Moreri*, he may be blamed, I. for having exalted *Tacitus*'s Birth a little too much. II. For having aſſerted, that *Tacitus* was very old when he began his Hiſtory in the Empire of *Trajan*. III. And that the Author himſelf obſerves it. He has avoided the Over-ſights of *Charles Stephens*; for he has not made this Hiſtorian flouriſh *(q)* from the Empire of *Tiberius*, the Year of *Rome* 767, till the time of *Veſpaſian*, *An.* 822. He does not ſay that *Tacitus (r)*, an illuſtrious Orator under *Hadrian*, liv'd to the time of the *Veſpaſians*, and that they promoted him to Dignities, and that his Hiſtory extends from *Auguſtus* to *Hadrian*. *Lloyd* and *Hoffman* have adopted all theſe laſt Faults. I believe *Charles Stephens* copied them from *Geſner (ſ)*, who had copied them from *Volaterranus (t)*.

(K) *A Son, of whom* Pliny *relates a thing very extraordinary.*] Here it is, according to *Du Pinet*'s Verſion. “We find in the Chronicles, that at *Salamis* one named *Euthymenes* had a Son, who in three Years grew three Cubits: he was very unwieldy and dull in Motion and Underſtanding, and yet he had got a downy Beard, and a ſtrong Voice; but as ſoon as he was three Years of Age, he died ſuddenly with a Contraction of the Nerves. I have ſeen ſomething like this, ſetting aſide that he had no Hair on the Privities, in a Son of *Cornelius Tacitus*, a *Roman* Knight, and Receiver and Treaſurer of *Gallia Belgica*.” I ſet down theſe Words on purpoſe to have room to ſay, That there are ſome People who pretend, that the Tranſlator did not well underſtand his Original. Here are the Words of *Pliny*, in the Edition of Father *Hardouin*. (v) *Invenimus in monumentis Salamine Euthymenis filium, in tria cubita triennio adoleviſſe, inceſſu tardum, ſenſu hebetem, & jam puberem factum voce robuſta, abſumptum contractione membrorum ſubita, triennio circumacto. Ipſi non pridem vidimus eadem ferme omnia, præter pubertatem, in filio Cornelii Taciti Equitis Romani, Belgica Gallia rationes procurantis.* This ſignifies, as ſome would have it, that the Son of *Euthymenes*, having grown three Cubits in 3 Years, began immediately to decreaſe and was conſumed at the end of three Years. He lived therefore ſix Years. I ſhall not decide on theſe two Verſions; but that of *du Pinet* does not ſeem to me the worſt (w). It cannot be proved from this Paſſage, that our *Tacitus* had an Employ in *Gaul*; for it is not true that *Pliny* ſpeaks of him. Let us remember, that *Tacitus* did not marry till after *Agricola* his Father-in-Law had been Conſul. Here is the Proof of it. (x) *Conſul egregiæ tum ſpei filiam juveni mihi deſpondit, ac poſt conſulatum collocavit, & ſtatim Britanniæ præpoſitus eſt.* The Conſulſhip of *Agricola*, according to the moſt probable Opinion (y), falls in the 77th Year of JESUS CHRIST; we muſt therefore ſay, that *Tacitus* married in the 78th. Now *Pliny* died (z) in the 79th or 80th Year; therefore he could not have ſeen a Son of *Tacitus* who had ſuch an extraordinary Growth at three Years. I do not advertiſe you to obſerve, that he makes mention of this prodigious Growth in the ſeventh Book of his Natural Hiſtory, a Work divided into 37 Books: I have no deſign to infer from thence, that there is a great likelyhood, that he had ſeen this ſome Years before he finiſhed this Work; for it may be anſwered me, that he read it over after he had finiſhed it, and that he put throughout the Date of the time when he reviſed his Writing. We find the ſame Date in Chap. 4. of Book 14. and in Chap. 2. of Book 28. The Author in theſe two Places points at the 830 Year of *Rome*, which is the 77th of the Chriſtian *Æra*. This is enough to make my Objection good. Beſides he ſays that he had ſeen, a long time before, this extraordinary Growth, *nos pridem vidimus*. I know very well, that Father *Hardouin* has corrected theſe Words, and has put *non pridem vidimus*. I ſhall let this Correction paſs; it can do me no harm, for though it ſhould it be ſuppoſed, that *Pliny* wrote this Chapter of his Hiſtory a few Days after he had ſeen this tall Child, it is not poſſible, that this *Roman* Knight, of whom he ſpeaks, ſhould be our *Tacitus*. And therefore I do confidently aſſert, that the Reaſon for which this Commentator reads *non pridem* inſtead of *nos pridem*, is void; he goes upon (a) the falſe Suppoſition that *Pliny* means the Hiſtorian, whom I ſpeak of. He applies to him *(b)* the Inſcription inſerted by *Reineſius*; but he ſhould have taken notice, that it was made by *(c) Cornelius Verus Tacitus*. Now no Body ever put *Verus* among the Names of *Tacitus*. *He may have had for his Father*, (they are Mr. *de Tillemont*'s (d) Words) Cornelius Tacitus, *a Roman Knight, Intendant of* Gallia Belgica [*that is probably*] Cornelius Verus Tacitus, *of whom there is an Inſcription found in the Country of* Juliers, *made when he was going to* (1) *exerciſe a ſecond Intendance.* [*Thus he had been Intendant of* Gallia Belgica, *and the* Lower Germany *where* Juliers *is.*] *This Intendant had a Son, of whom* Pliny *the Naturaliſt* (2) *relates ſomething extraordinary, in taking notice, that he was dead at that time:* [*So that this is not the Hiſtorian.*] Thoſe who from henceforward will attribute to *Tacitus* an Employ in *Gaul* under *Veſpaſian*, will do well to look for better Proofs than this Paſſage of *Pliny*. How many Learned Men have been miſtaken in it? *Lipſius (e)* and *Voſſius* are not the only Perſons. Nay, there are ſome, who might be cenſured, though they might reaſonably pretend, that *Pliny* ſpoke of our *Tacitus*; for they ſuppoſe he had great Military Offices, and that he govern'd the *Lower Germany* in the Quality of Pro-conſul. Alſo they will have it, that Learning then the Manners and Laws of the *Germans*, he wrote concerning them, during his Pro-conſulſhip the Work we now have. *Floruit diutiſſime in militari urbanaque diſciplina & Proconſul Germaniam inferiorem obtinuit, quo tempore Germanorum mores, inſtituta, ritus tanta diligentia perſcripſit, ut uni Tacito ſuam antiquitatem Germani acceptam ferant.* This is what *Bodin* ſays, in his Treatiſe concerning the Method of Hiſtory. *Balthaſar Bonifacius (f)* has tranſcribed him without any alteration. Mr. *Pichon* meant without doubt that *Tacitus* was Governor of *Gallia Belgica*. This Title is too great. However here is what he ſays, in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to his *Tacitus* IN USUM DELPHINI. *Hoc autem oportet eſſe Tibi* TACITUM *acceptiorem, quod olim in Gallia tua, & quidem Belgica, quæ maximè rectoris impatiens, obtinuit*

Imperelates a very extraordinary thing. 'Tis an idle Fancy (*L*) to pretend, that *Domitian* banish'd him; and perhaps 'tis another to say that he (*M*) lived eighty Years.

(w) *See* Salmaſius *in Solinum, Tom.* 1. *pag.* 54.

(x) *Tacit. in vita Agricolæ, cap.* 9.

(y) *See* Tillemont, *note* 4. *on the Hiſtory of* Titus, *p. m.* 853, 854.

(z) *See the ſame, ib. note* 4. *pag.* 855.

(a) *See the* Notæ & Emendationes *of Father* Hardouin *on the 7th, Book of* Pliny, *n.* 65. *pag.* 119.

(b) *In his Commentary on thoſe Words of* Pliny, *pag.* 37.

(c) *This would make me doubt, whether he was the Father of the Hiſtorian.*

(d) *Tillemont, Tom.* 2. *part.* 1. *pag.* 348.

(1) Rationatoris honore uſurus ſecundùm.

(2) *It appears, that this Child died aged 3 Years, without Strength or Senſe.* Pliny *had ſeen him a long time before*, pridem. *And ſo* Tacitus *his Father, who had ſome Children, before the Year 77, in which* Pliny *wrote, is not the Hiſtorian, as* Voſſius *thinks*, de Hiſtor. Lat. l. 1. c. 30. pag. 158.

(e) *In the Life of* Tacitus. *But he judged better of the thing in his Commentary*, in Lib. 1. Hiſt. init. *See the Remark H. Letter a.* (f) *Balth. Bonifacius de Scriptoribus hiſtoriæ Romanæ.*

TAISNERIUS (JOHN) was of *Ath* in *Hainault* §. He was Preceptor to the Pages of *Charles* V. and follow'd this Emperor in his Expedition to *Tunis*. He read some Mathematical Lectures at *Rome* and *Ferrara*, and after he had travell'd a long time, he devoted himself entirely to the Writing of Books; But chusing a Subject very unworthy of a Man of Judgment, he lost * all his Reputation. He betook himself to Chiromancy; and though he had gain'd the Reputation of being very successful therein, he nevertheless tired, (*A*) by the great bulk of his Book, those that were desirous to benefit themselves by it. Many Persons were so simple as to send him ‖ the Picture of their Hands, on purpose to learn from him, what their Fortunes should be. Consult *Moreri*'s Dictionary and *Bullart*'s *Academie*. They speak at large of our *Taisnerius*; but whether with that Order and Exactness that is necessary, is what I shall examine another time. There is nothing there to be found, concerning his being (*B*) of a Plagiary, which he was accused of.

TAKIDDIN, a *Mahometan* Author. I shall mention but one thing relating to him; *viz.* that he said †, that the *Calif Almamon* would be infallibly punish'd by God, for having disturbed the Devotion of the *Musulmans*, by the Introduction of Philosophical Studies. This Thought has nothing singular in it: It has appeared in all the Countries

Imperium, & quid hic forsitan ea ipsa meditatus est, & usu didicit, quæ scriptis mandaret ac posteris relinqueret.

(*L*) *To pretend, that* Domitian *banish'd him.*] There are some who do not content themselves with asserting this, but compute also the Duration of this Exile; they make it amount to ten Years, and then they terminate it by the Efficacy of an Intercession that wrought upon *Domitian*. This Exile in general is not founded on any Proof; and as to the Duration of it, it is invincibly refuted by some Words of *Tacitus*, related above in the Remark *B*. They are those wherein he tells us, that he exercis'd the Prætorship at *Rome*, when *Domitian* celebrated the Secular Games. They were celebrated in the 7th Year of *Domitian*'s Reign, and after (*g*) that time this Prince lived not quite eight Years. I praise *Lipsius* for having observed, that this Mistake owes its Rise to a popular Custom, which makes People fond of representing illustrious Men lying under great Misfortunes. This Error might also proceed from a wrong way of arguing. It was thought, that since *Domitian* turn'd Persecutor of honest Men, he did not spare *Tacitus*, who was a Man of Honour, and in great Repute. These Consequences are too popular, and Authors ought not to draw them. (*h*) *Exsulasse sub Domitiano quidam tradiderunt, magis tamen ut opinor, pro more vulgi, qui magnis viris insignes casus adfingere amat, quàm quod ejus rei certus auctor sit. Ego legendo non aliud comperio, quàm abfuisse eum aliquot annis ab urbe, idque eo ipso tempore quo Julius Agricola socer ejus mortem obierit* COSS. *Pompejo Conlega, & Cor. Prisco, non tam exsilii necessitate, ut arbitror, quàm tædio temporum & cupidine otii. Nam quod iidem, ut omni ex parte tam anxia diligentia constet, decennium in exsilio egisse scribunt, ac demum exorato Domitiano restitutum, Latinè ut loquar, inanis fabula est.* I observe, that, though this Historian (*i*) has very boldly described the Tyranny of *Domitian*, yet he has not in the least insinuated, that this Storm fell upon him personally: On the contrary, he acknowledges, that he was under some Obligations to that Prince; and (*k*) he fears least he should be suspected of suppressing the Truth by way of Gratitude. A Man who had been banish'd, would hardly have spoken after this manner.

(*M*) *That he lived eighty Years.*] The Testimony that I am going to cite is of no great weight. (*l*) *Vixit annos* 80. *ut legitur in lib.* 3. *Thes. Histor.*

(*A*) *He tired by the great bulk of his Book.*] Consult *Jacobus Philippus Tomasinus*; there you will find these Words: (*m*) *Uno volumine quæcunque Chiromantiam attingerent complexus est. At crescente illo in vastam molem factum est ut studentium animos defatigarit quos sibi proposuerat erudiendos.* If you would know the Credit that this Man acquired by his Chiromantick Boastings, read this Passage of the same Author. (*n*) *Divinandi munere ex manuum lineis temperamenti signa, & animi characteres varios colligebat, &, spretis genituraram laboriosis supputationibus, ignaras curiosorum mentes, rerum suarum sciscitantes eventus, vaticiniis circumducebat. Jamque Viri quoque gravissimi fide prædictionibus illius haberi captâ, ei typos manuum suarum lineis effigiatarum undiquè demandabant, & ab ejusdem ore, ut de privatis rebus statuerent, pendebant.*

(*B*) *Concerning his being a Plagiary, which he was accused of.*] It is pretended that he did not content himself to steal some Thoughts, but that he appropriated to himself some entire Books, which others had published. *Gabriel Naudæus* reproaches him with this, with respect to a Book of *Bartholomew Cocles*, concerning Physiognomy; and with respect to a Book of *Peter le Pelerin*, concerning the Load-stone. He defames him, as he deserves, for those Thieveries committed with such Audacity. This was not to commit Petty-Larceny, or to be a Cut-Purse in the Republick of Learning, but to act as a notorious Robber, as a Corsair of *Barbary*: This Case was punishable on *Parnassus*. See after what manner *Gabriel Naudæus* exercises Justice. (*o*) *Inter recentiores qui artem ejusmodi* (crisim Physiognomicam) *scriptis explicarunt, potiores semper habe Augustinum Niphum, & Camillum Baldum, eruditissimos Aristotelis commentatores: Bartholomæumque Coclitem Bononiensem cujus integrum librum convasavit, ac in suum opus mathematicum transtulit, Joannes Taisnerus, plagiarius insignis, & imprudentior longe Horatii Corniculâ, cum præterea tractatum etiam de Magnete, à Petro Peregrino Gallo quondam editum, furto vendicarit. Quod equidem velut per transennam observandum esse duxi, ut suus bene de Republica literaria meritis honos asseratur, & ipse Taisnerus.*

Regali conspectus in auro nuper & ostro,
Migret in obscuras furaci mente tabernas.

Thomasius was not ignorant of this publick Accusation, against *Taisnerius*; he makes mention of it (*p*) in his Account of Plagiaries: But he did not know, and it may be *Naudæus* did not know it neither, that in the Year 1574, an *Italian* Mathematician, published bitter Complaints, and a sharp Invective against the same Plagiary. All that he said about it deserves to be transferred into this Page. There you will see both some universal Instructions, relating to these Thieveries, and some particular Facts concerning the Person we speak of. Moreover, the Book from which I have taken all this is very scarce. (*q*) *Si hos non laudamus qui aliquid ab aliis sunt mutuati, quid de manifestis furibus dicemus, qui vel ipsa integra aliorum volumina sibi imprudentes adscribunt, & quasi steriles ac scelesti plagiarii, viventium filiorum (est enim haud dubiè legitima proles quicquid fecundum ingenium longo studio concepit, & peperit) miserandas infligunt piis parentibus orbitates, & se, summa cum jactantia, eorum operum authores mentiuntur, quæ magna cum infamia rapuerunt, ut fecit impurissimus omnium Joannes Taisnerius Hannonius. Qui opusculum nostrum, demonstrationis proportionum motuum localium contra Aristotelem, & alios philosophos, jamdiu antea à nobis editum, & iterum impressum Venetiis anno salutis* 1554. *ita integrum sibi desumpsit, ut nihil præter authoris nomen immutaverit, quid enim mutavisset, qui nec percipere poterat, quæ in ea disputatione continerentur? Homo vanus ab omni mathematica facultate alienus, qui merito propter crassissimam ignorantiam verebatur, ne vel aliqua Syllaba sublata, aut addita totius tractationis inficeretur substantia. Credidit (ut opinor) me jam vita functum qui furti nunquam argui posse confidit, & non intellexit suam temeritatem, qui seipsum mille argumentis qualis esset prodidit; dum utre inflato inanior sese juris doctorem, & simul etiam musici sacelli rectorem asseruit, quasi jura docere sit musici, aut jurisperiti sacellum regere, & dum de magnete, & motibus, tractatus emisit, nusquam in titulis se mathematicum nominavit, sed poetam, eo quod crediderit poeta. aut*

musici,

---

§ *Valer. Andreas Desselius, Bibl. Belg. pag.* 570.

‡ *Jacobus Philippus Tomasinus, elog. virorum illustrium, pag.* 161, 162. *edit. Patav.* 1630.

* *Bullart. Acad. des Sciences, Tom.* 2. *p.* 288, 289.

‖ *See the Remark A.*

† Fieri non posse quin Deus certas de Almamone pœnas sumeret, quod scientiis philosophicis introductis Mohammedanorum pietatem interpellaverit. *Sephadius in commentariis ad Tograi poema, apud Pocockium notis in specimen histor. Arabum, pag.* 166.

(*g*) *See* Lipsius in vita Taciti.

(*h*) *Lipsius ibid.*

(*i*) *In vita Agricolæ, cap.* 2. 44, 45.

(*k*) *See the beginning of Book I. of his History.*

(*l*) *Canonherius in vita Corn. Taciti in limine discursuum politicorum.*

(*m*) *Jacob. Philippus Tomasinus, elog. pag.* 162.

(*n*) *Id. ib. pag.* 161.

(*o*) Gabri… Naudæ… Bibliogra… phia politi… ca, p. m. 62, 63.

(*p*) Thoma… sius, de plagio lite… rario, p. m. 246.

(*q*) Jo. Baptista Benedictus, Patricius Venetus, Philosophus, in præfatione libri de Gnomonum umbrarumque solarium usu. *This Book was printed at Turin, ann.* 1574, *in folio.* Vossius says nothing of this Author in his Book de Scientiis Mathematicis. *He has been divided into two in the* Oxford Catalogue; *There he is spoken of first under the* Name of Joh. Baptista de Benedictis, *and afterwards* under that of Joh. Baptista Benedictus.

Countries of the World and in all Ages; and at this very Day a great many People complain of *Carteſius*, and other modern Philoſophers of the firſt Rank, as having occaſion'd the Contempt which ſo many Perſons expreſs for Devotion, and the Myſteries of Chriſtianity. Which might afford Matter for a (*A*) large Commentary.

TALAUS, King of *Argos*, Son of *Abas* or *Bias*, and Grand-ſon † of *Lynceus*, one of the fifty Sons-in-Law of *Danaus*, loſt the Crown and his Life by *Amphiaraus*'s Contrivances. His Son *Adraſtus* was forced to fly to *Sicyon*, where ſome ſay he married the Daughter of King *Polybius*, and ſucceeded him. But others will have it, that he ſucceeded him, becauſe his Mother was the only Daughter of *Polybius*. See the Article of *Adraſtus*. Some tell us, that he, whom *Amphiaraus* dethroned and put to Death, was *Pronax* the Son of *Talaus*. See the Scholiaſt upon the ninth Nemean Ode of *Pindar*, wherein we are told what the Pretenſions of *Amphiaraus* were grounded upon: *Melampus* having cured the Daughters of *Proetus* King of *Argos*, who were grown mad, received, as a Reward, one half of the Kingdom of *Argos*, which he divided between him and his Brother *Bias*. But *Melampus* left behind him a Son call'd *Antiphates*, who was *Oicles*'s Father, and *Amphiaraus*'s Grand-father.

† Schol. Pindari in Od. 8. Pyth. & 9. Nem.

TAMIRAS, was ſent for from *Cilicia* into the Iſle of *Cyprus*, to teach the Art of the *Haruſpices*. The Temple of *Venus* at *Paphos* was conſecrated by *Cinyras*; and 'twas ſaid, that this Goddeſs, conceived and born in the Sea, had landed in that Place; but that Man of *Cilicia* was made uſe of for the thing I have mentioned. Things had been ſo ordered, that the Deſcendants of *Cinyras* and *Tamiras* were to preſide

muſici, aut juriſperiti, eſſe de naturalibus motibus corporum diſſerere. Debebat ſaltem & in hoc mentiri infamis impoſtor, ut ſe mathematicum in titulis prædicaret, ut in præfatione ad lectorem ejuſdem uſurpati opuſculi fecit, dum ſe matheſeos publice legiſſe Ferrariæ, & alibi, trecentis, & pluribus auditoribus prædicat, cujus numeri auditorum ne ſextam quidem partem, quiſpiam vidit in Italia, in auditoriis cujuſvis (etiam primi nominis) mathematici: quis inquam hos infames laudaverit in Flaviam legem committentes? ac non potius juxta Conſtantini Cæſaris ſententiam, ad Celſum Aphricæ Vicarium reſcribentis, beſtiis ſubjiciendos cenſeat!

(A) *Afford Matter for a large Commentary.*] A thouſand Things might be ſaid upon this Subject; however I ſhall be ſhort, for I have already more Copy than I want to make an end of this Volume. As to the Matter of Fact, I ſhall only ſay, that Philoſophers have been at all times charged with Irreligion. The ancient Rhetoricians having ſaid, that among probable Propoſitions, ſome were grounded upon what generally happens, and others upon the common Opinion, alledged immediately theſe two Examples: Mothers love their Children: Philoſophers don't believe the Exiſtence of the Gods. (*b*) *Probabile eſt id quod ferè fieri ſolet, aut quod in opinione poſitum eſt...... In eo genere, quod ferè ſolet fieri, probabile hujuſmodi eſt: SI MATER eſt, diligit filium: SI AVARUS eſt, negligit jusjurandum. In eo autem, quod in opinione poſitum eſt, hujuſmodi ſunt probabilia: Impiis apud inferos pœnas eſſe præparatas: Eos, qui philoſophiæ dent operam, non arbitrari deos eſſe. Apuleius* obſerves, that moſt of the ancient Philoſophers were accuſed of denying the Exiſtence of the Gods, or of applying themſelves to Magick. (*c*) *Hæc fermè communi quodam errore imperitorum philoſophis objectantur: ut partim eorum, qui corporum cauſas meras & ſimplices rimantur, irreligioſos putent, eoſque aiant Deos abnuere; ut Anaxagoram, & Leucippum, & Democritum, & Epicurum, cæteroſque rerum naturæ patronos: partim autem, qui providentiam mundi curioſius veſtigant, & impenſius Deos celebrant, eos vero vulgo Magos nominent: quaſi facere etiam ſciant, quæ, ſciant fieri: ut olim fuere Epimenides, & Orpheus, & Pythagoras, & Oſthanes.* Our *Takiddin* would not have condemned the great *Almamon*, that Protector of Learning, who introduced the Study of Philoſophy, had he not obſerved the ill Effect of that Study. It raiſed many Doubts in the Minds of Men; it diſcovered to many People the Fooleries of the *Mahometan* Sect: and by that means the Publick Worſhip, Piety, and Devotion, grew weak and languid. Some Doctors (*d*) maintain, that the *Arabian* Philoſophers profeſt only Mahometiſm outwardly, and laugh'd at the *Alcoran*, becauſe they found in it ſome things contrary to Reaſon. Many People are fully perſuaded, that *Carteſius* and *Gaſſendus* believed the Real Preſence as little as the Fabulous Stories of old *Greece*. 'Tis alſo their Opinion, that the Followers of thoſe two Philoſophers are not good Catholicks; and that if they were allowed to teach publickly their Principles, they would quickly undermine all the Foundations of the Romiſh Religion. The Proteſtants have not a better Opinion of *Carteſius*'s Doctrine. Generally ſpeaking, the *Carteſians* are ſuſpected of Irreligion, and their Philoſophy is thought to be very dangerous to Chriſtianity: So that many People believe, that the ſame Perſons, who have removed in our Age the Darkneſs which the Schoolmen had ſpread all over *Europe*, have increaſed the number of the Libertines, and made way for Atheiſm, or Scepticiſm, or the Unbelief of the greateſt Myſteries of Chriſtianity. But Irreligion is not only aſcribed to the Study of Philoſophy, but alſo to Philology; for 'tis ſaid, that Atheiſm never appear'd in *France* before the Reign of *Francis* I. and that it began to ſhew it ſelf in *Italy*, when Philological Learning was revived there. (*e*) *The less Foreign Learning we have,* ſays a Catholick Writer, *the greater Submiſſion we expreſs for the Chriſtian Faith; and the most Learned Ages, ſays* Baronius, *have often produced moſt Unbelievers. The* Aladiniſts *appeared only under the Reign of* Almanſor, *who was the moſt Learned Monarch of his Age; and I find no Atheiſts in* France *before the Reign of* Francis I. *nor in* Italy *till after the taking of* Conſtantinople, *when* Argyropulus, Theodorus Gaza, Georgius Trapezuntius, *with the moſt celebrated Men of* Greece, *retired to the Dukes of* Florence. What is certain, is, that moſt of the Wits and Learned Philoſophers, who ſhined in *Italy*, when the *Belles Lettres* began to revive there, had but little Religion. But on the other ſide, the Reſtoration of the Learned Languages, and good Literature, made way for the Reformation; as the Monks, and their Adherents foreſaw, who continually inveighed againſt *Reuchlin*, *Eraſmus*, and the other Scourges of Ignorance. Thus whilſt the Roman Catholicks deplore the Fatal Conſequences of the Study of good Literature, the Proteſtants (*f*) have all the Reaſon in the World to praiſe God for it. It is not ſo with the new Philoſophy, which demonſtratively overthrows Tranſubſtantiation, and all its Dependencies; for the ſame Weapons are made uſe of againſt the moſt eſſential Doctrines. In a word, ſuch is the Fate of Man, that the Knowledge which frees him from one Evil, throws him into another. Drive away Ignorance and Barbarity, and you'll put an end to Superſtition, and the Fooliſh Credulity of the People, ſo profitable to their Leaders, who afterwards make uſe of their Gain to plunge themſelves into Idleneſs and Debauchery: But by putting Men in a Capacity of diſcovering ſuch Diſorders, you make 'em deſirous of examining every thing; and at laſt they are ſo much for enquiring and ſcaning, that they find nothing that will ſatisfy their miſerable Reaſon.

However it be, I have heard ſome wiſe Men ſay, that the common Affectation of crying down the Philoſophers, as being guilty of Impiety, is a very imprudent Thing: For how great a Scandal would it be for ignorant People, if they came to know that 'tis the Opinion of many Doctors, that there is but little

) Cicero
Inventi-
lib. 1.
m. 29.
) Apu-
s in
logia,
m. 291.
) Toſta-
in c.
Ex.
l. 20.
er.
d Phi-
phi
er Sa-
enos
a reci-
nt
per
Alco-
um.
em pro-
Calix-
in diſp.
verit.
ligion.
rit. ex
erroe,
ſputante
ura de-
uſtiones
gazelis,
Avicen-
Metaph.
9. c. 7.
noxata
Religi-
em
dici,
1. ſect.
p. m.
6. in
verba.
Philo-
his pa-
ntibus.

(*e*) *Clavigny de Sainte Honorine, Diſcernement & uſage des livres ſuſpects*, p. 82. Note, *that I don't alledge what he ſays as true Matter of Fact.*

(*f*) *See M.* Jurieu's *Reflections*, Apolog. pour les Reformat. pag. 66. & ſeq. of the 1ſt Vol. in 4. *upon* Maimbourg's *ſaying*, hiſt. du Calvin. pag. 4. *that the Courſe* Francis I. *took* to revive Learning in his Kingdom.... proved, by a Misfortune he did not foreſee, an occaſion of bringing in Hereſy into his Kingdom ſide over the Ceremonies, but, that the Royal Family might have ſome Pre-eminence, the Family of *Tamiras* (Z) did quickly reſign their Share to them; ſo that from that time no other Prieſt was conſulted, but that of the Family of *Cinyras* §.

TANAQUIL, the Wife of *Tarquinius Priſcus* King of *Rome*, was born at *Tarquinii* in *Tuſcany*, where ſhe married *Lucumon*, the Son of a Man who fled thither, being expell'd from *Corinth* his Birth-place. *Lucumon* having inherited his Father's whole Eſtate, happen'd to be a very rich Man; and the Family of *Tanaquil* being one of the nobleſt in the Town, he hoped to raiſe himſelf to ſome Dignities; but being a Son of a Foreigner, he met with great Obſtacles *. *Tanaquil*, being vexed at the little Account that was made of her Huſband, and being unwilling to loſe the Glory ſhe was born in, reſolved to leave *Tarquinii*, in hopes of raiſing her ſelf in ſome other Place ‡. She therefore repreſented to her Huſband that their beſt way was to repair to *Rome*, where Men of Merit might hope for the nobleſt Preferments, whatever Country they might be of. *Lucumon* follow'd her Advice, and had an Omen of his great Fortune before he got to *Rome*. That Omen was explain'd (*A*) to him by his Wife; for ſhe had a great Skill in it. He took the Name of *Tarquinius*, and got the Eſteem and Affection of the *Romans*; and inſinuated himſelf into the King's Favour in ſuch a manner, that the Offices he obtain'd from him enabled him to aſpire to the Crown, and to ſucceed in his ambitious Deſign. He was kill'd in his Palace in the 38th Year of his Reign. *Tanaquil* appeared unconcerned, notwithſtanding this ſevere Blow, and managed things ſo dexterouſly, that ſhe ſettled the Crown upon *Servius Tullius* her Son-in-Law, whoſe good Fortune (*B*) ſhe had foretold long before *. Her Memory

Religion among great Philoſophers; that Devotion is particularly to be found among the common People; and (*a*) *that thoſe who have moſt carefully examin'd the Characters of Divinity of the Holy Scripture, are commonly leſs pious and devout than others.* It were much more edifying to teach, as *Plutarch* (*b*) did, that Philoſophy is a Remedy for Impiety and Superſtition; and to ſay, with *Origen*, that no Man can be truly pious without Philoſophy. *Omnino nec pium erga communem omnium Dominum eſſe abſque Philoſophia quemquam cenſebat* (*c*). The Mixture of Good and Evil, that is to be found in all humane Things, appears on this occaſion in a particular manner. The *Arabian* Philoſophers came to know, by their Philoſophy, that the *Alcoran* was a falſe Revelation; but on the contrary many Jews forſook their Religion, and embraced the Pagan Philoſophy, which diſcovered to them, as they pretended, that *Moſes* had preſcribed them needleſs Laws. (*d*) *Multis è Judæorum gente adeo perſuaſa eſt olim hæc opinio, quòd, ſub initia regni Saracenici ad Philoſophiam Ethnicam defectionem fecerint, quod iis leges haud pauca inutiles & ſupervacanea viderentur.* Thus the ſame Principle, which ſometimes diſcovers a Falſity, is ſometimes prejudicial to Truth.

(*Z*) *The Family of* Tamiras *did quickly reſign their Share.*] Neverthleſs, *Heſychius* mentions certain Prieſts of the Iſle of *Cyprus*, call'd Ταμιράδαι, *Tamirada*. This Orthography in *Heſychius*'s Manuſcripts gave *Meurſius* (*e*) a juſt occaſion to obſerve, that the Word *Thamyras* in *Tacitus*, ought to be read, *Tamiras*.

(*A*) *That Omen was explain'd to him by his Wife.*] When they came to the *Janiculum*, an Eagle lighted gently upon their Chariot, and took off *Lucumon*'s Hat, and having for ſome time hovered over their Chariot, with a great Noiſe, put down the Hat very orderly in its proper Place. *Tanaquil*, ſitting by her Huſband, embraced him, and foretold him a great Fortune, explaining to him the Circumſtances of that Preſage. Thus they got into *Rome*, full of mighty Hopes. (*f*) *Ad Janiculum forte ventum erat: ibi ei carpento ſedenti cum uxore, aquila ſuſpenſis demiſſa leniter alis pileum aufert: ſuperque carpentum cum magno clangore volitans, rurſus velut miniſterio divinitus miſſa, capiti apte reponit: inde ſublimis abiit. Accepiſſe id augurium læta dicitur Tanaquil; perita, ut vulgo Etruſci, cæleſtium prodigiorum mulier. Excelſa & alta ſperare complexa virum jubet: eam alitem ea regione cæli & ejus Dei nunciam veniſſe: circa ſummum culmen hominis auſpicium feciſſe: levaſſe humano ſuperpoſitum capiti decus, ut divinitus eidem redderet. Has ſpes cogitationeſque ſecum portantes, urbem ingreſſi ſunt.*

(*B*) *She had foretold the good Fortune* of Servius Tullius.] He was born and bred up in the Palace of King *Tarquin*. One Day a Fire was ſeen about his Head whilſt he ſlept: The great Noiſe that was made at the ſight of this Prodigy, obliged that Prince to go and ſee what was the Matter: Some Body had a Mind to throw Water upon the Fire, but *Tanaquil* prevented it, and ordered that the Child ſhould not be diſturbed, till he awaked. He quickly awaked, and the Fire vaniſhed away. Then the Queen took her Spouſe aſide, and told him that this Child would one Day ſupport the Royal Family in their Adverſity, and that he ſhould be bred up as a very hopeful Subject. The King approved of it: great Care was taken of the Education of that Child, who became ſo accompliſhed that none was thought more worthy of being the King's Son-in-Law, and he ſucceeded *Tarquin* accordingly (*g*). Some believe, that his Mother was the Wife of *Servius Tullius*, who was kill'd in defending his Principality of *Corniculum* (*h*). They add, that this Woman was with Child, and that being known among the other Women-Slaves, ſome regard was had to her Quality. *Tanaquil* ſet her at Liberty, and had her in her Palace, where ſhe was delivered of a Boy. This is likely enough, but not wonderful enough for all ſorts of Hiſtorians: And therefore ſome would have it that the Birth of a King of *Rome*, of ſuch a mean Extraction, had ſomething more myſterious in it. Wherefore they ſuppoſed, that *Ocriſia*, Widow of the Prince of *Corniculum*, was for ſome time a Slave in *Tanaquil*'s Palace before ſhe was made free; and that ſhe perceived in a Chimney the Figure of a Man's Privy-Parts. She acquainted the King and Queen with it. When the King ſaw that Prodigy he was amazed it: The Queen, who (*i*) was as well skilled in Preſages as the beſt Augur in *Hetruria*, told her Huſband, that it was decreed by Fate, that a Perſon of a Merit more than Humane, ſhould be born in the Palace; and that the Figure, which appeared in the Chimney, was to be his Father, and that the Woman, coupled with that Figure, would be his Mother. *Tarquin* being inform'd by ſome Men well-skill'd in ſuch Things, that *Tanaquil* gave a right Explication of that Prodigy, reſolved to get the Woman, who had ſeen that Member firſt, to lye with it: She was therefore dreſs'd up like a Bride, and brought into the Chamber where that Figure was. They left her alone, and ſhe was known by ſome Genius, whether it was *Vulcan*, or the Houſhold God. That Figure was never ſeen afterwards. *Ocriſia* was got with Child, and brought to Bed at the uſual time (*a*). The ſame thing has been ſaid almoſt of *Romulus*'s Mother (*b*). If there had been no Annaliſts at *Rome* a long time before Rhetorick was taught there, I ſhould be apt to think, that the Declamations which the Sophiſts put their Scholars upon, had been converted into Hiſtorical Relations; for 'tis likely enough that the young Rhetoricians had a full Liberty to feign whatever they had a Mind to, in their Panegyrical Eſſays. The Deſign of thoſe Fictions

---

§ Ex Tacit. hiſt. l. 2. c. 3.

* Taken from Livy, lib. 1. pag. m. 23.

‡ Cum divitiæ jam animos facerent, auxit ducta in matrimonium Tanaquil, ſummo loco nata, & quæ haud facile iis, in quibus nata erat, humiliora ſineret ea, quæ innupſiſſet. Spernentibus Etruſcis Lucumonem exule advena ortum, ferre indignitatem non potuit, oblitaque ingenitæ erga patriam caritatis, dummodo virum honoratum videret, conſilium migrandi ab Tarquiniis cepit. *Livius ib.*

* Excid… ibid.

(*a*) *Jurieu apud Saurin, Examen de la Theolog. pag.* 98. *See M.* Saurin's *Reflections upon this,* ibid.

(*b*) *See* Plutarch *de Iſide & Oſiride, pag.* 378.

(*c*) St. Cyran *quotes that Paſſage of* St. Gregory *of* Neocæſarea in panegyr. *in his Work againſt Father* Garaſſe's Somme Theologique, *Tom.* 2. *pag.* 33, & 70.

(*d*) *Joan. Spencerus, de Legibus Hebræorum, lib.* 2. *cap.* 3. *ſect.* 1. *ſub. fin. p.* 225. *edit. Hag.* 1686. *He confirms this by the Teſtimony of* Gulielmus Pariſienſis, lib. de legibus, *pag.* 3, 4.

(*e*) *Meurſius, in Cypro, pag.* 50.

(*f*) *Titus Livius, l.* 1. *c.* 34. *p. m.* 23. *See alſo* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, *l.* 3. *c.* 70. *where the thing is more particularly related than by* Livy.

(*g*) Tak… from Liv… ibid.

(*h*) A … of Italy, … beſieged, taken, … ſack'd … burnt by Tarquini… us Priſc… Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. 3. cap. 7…

(*i*) … quilem, uxorem, & aliom… ſapientem & divina… di ſcienti… nulli Etru… corum … cundam, dixiſſe. *Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib.* 4. … *init. pag.* 207.

(*a*) See Plutarch in vita R… muli, pag. 18.

(*b*) Taken from Dio… nyſius … carnaſſ… lib. 4. …

Memory was in Veneration at *Rome* for several Ages. They preserved the (C) Works of her Hands, and great Virtues were ascribed to (D) her Girdle. St. *Jerome* * observes, that *Tarquin* was not so well known as his Wife: He adds, that the admirable Virtue of that Queen has taken such deep Roots in the Memory of all Ages, that it can never be forgotten. Yet it seems one might infer from some Passages of the ancient Authors, that she was look'd upon as a Woman, who had been too (E) imperious. It is not true that she was alive when *Tarquinius Superbus* put his Brother to

ons was to know whether they had any Invention, and could turn and handle well a common Topick; and therefore they were not blamed for supposing a Divine, Miraculous, and very Surprizing Origine. This would have occasion'd great Abuses, if the most ingenious Pieces of those young Men had been preserved in the Archives, and look'd upon, some Ages after, as Historical Relations. How do we know but that most of the ancient Fables owe their Original to a Custom of making Panegyricks upon the ancient Heroes, on their Festival Days, and preserving the Pieces that seem'd to be the best. See what I shall say about Martyrologies, in the Article *Valerius*.

(C) *They preserved the Works of her Hands.*] *Varro*, Contemporary with *Cicero*, affirms, that he had seen in *Sangus*'s Temple, *Tanaquil*'s Distaff and Spindle, full of the Wool she spinn'd; and that they kept in the Temple of *Fortune*, a Royal Robe of her making, which *Servius Tullius* wore. *Pliny*, who mentions this, adds, that this was the Reason why the Maids, who married, were followed by a Person, who carried a Distaff and a Spindle, set off with Thread. He also says that Queen was the first who made that sort of Tunicks, which were given to young Boys to wear, when they put on the *Toga Virilis*, and to Maids when they married. *Moreri* has committed a gross Mistake; He takes the *Tirones* in *Pliny* to be *new Soldiers*, instead of understanding by that Word the Boys, who had lately left off the Gown of Childhood, the *Prætexta*. Here follows the whole Passage of *Pliny*. (c) *Lanam in colo & fuso Tanaquilis, quæ eadem Caia* (d) *Cæcilia vocata est, in templo Sangi durasse, prodente se, auctor est M. Varro: factamque ab ea togam regiam undulatam in æde Fortunæ, qua Ser. Tullius fuerat usus. Inde factum, ut nubentes virgines comitaretur colus compta, & fusus cum stamine. Ea prima texuit rectam tunicam, quales cum toga pura tirones induuntur, novæque nuptæ.* I don't know why Father *Hardouin* prefers *Plutarch*'s Opinion to that of *Varro*, and *Verrius*. (e) *Verius Plutarchus in quæst. Rom. pag.* 271. *uxorem ait fuisse* (Caiam Cæciliam) *unius è Tarquinii liberis: eidemque in templo Sanci statuam priscis temporibus positam cum sandaliis & fuso, quæ domi acta vita industriæque argumento essent.* 'Tis more reasonable to think, that this *Caia Cæcilia*, whose Brazen Statue, Sandals and Spindles, were to be seen in *Sancus*'s Temple, was the Wife of the first *Tarquin*, than to think she was the Wife of one of *Tarquin*'s Sons. I know *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* (f) supposes, that the first *Tarquin* had a Son, who was married, and was the Father of the two Sons-in-Law of *Servius Tullius*; but neither he, nor any other Historian, mentions the Merit of the Woman, who married that Son of *Tarquin*; and yet she must have been very illustrious, if the *Romans* paid her the Honour, mention'd by *Plutarch*. Was she the Wife of one of the last *Tarquin*'s Sons? But would the *Romans* have had such a Veneration for the Daughter-in-Law of a Tyrant, whom they had expell'd with his whole Family, and whose Memory was always execrable to them? Was she the first Wife of *Tarquinius Superbus*? I know she was (g) an honest Woman, but her Merit is not to be compared with that of *Tanaquil*. She never reigned, and she died young; and therefore she had not the Opportunities of shewing what she could do, as *Tanaquil*, who reigned a long time. We may therefore say, that the Monuments preserved in *Sancus*'s Temple, belonged to that Queen, and not to the Wife of one of *Tarquin*'s Sons: *Festus* and *Pliny*, or rather *Verrius* and *Varro*, have been more exact than *Plutarch* in this particular; it is one of the Mistakes of the last Historian, which are many. Perhaps it will be objected to me, that those Sandals, and that Spindle, don't suit with such an intriguing Queen as *Tanaquil* was; and that it appears from those Monuments that the *Romans* intended to honour the Memory of a Woman, who seldom went abroad, but kept much at Home, minding her Distaff: But was it *Tanaquil*'s Character? I answer, that she was indeed an able Queen, and a States-Woman, and that she shewed a great Courage and Resolution upon Occasions; notwithstanding which she might mind her Distaff, and her Needle, as being her usual Employments.

(D) *Great Virtues are ascribed to her Girdle.*] Had I said that it was kept as a perpetual Cause of Miracles, I had express'd my self wrong; for the *Romans* had not recourse to it, as to a Moral Cause, but as to a Physical one: They supposed, that *Tanaquil* had found out excellent Remedies for Distempers, and enclosed them in her Girdle: And therefore those who got some Scrapings of it, believed they would be cured by them; not because the Soul of that Queen would reward their Faith, but because they had some Particles of the Remedies contain'd in that Girdle. Which being so, no exact Comparison can be made between those who had recourse to *Tanaquil*'s Statue, in order to rub her Girdle, and those who endeavour to get a piece of St. *Hubert*'s Stole, or to have their Beads touched by some Relick. There is a great deal of Credulity on both sides. I leave it to those, who are at leisure, to examine whether old *Rome* equall'd the new in this Respect; and to help 'em a little in their Enquiry, I shall set down the Words of my Author. (h) *Prædia Verrius vocari ait ea remedia quæ Caja Cæcilia uxor Tarquinii Prisci invenisse existimatur, & immiscuisse zonæ suæ qua præcincta statua ejus est in æde Sancti qui Deus Dius Fidius vocatur, ex qua zona periclitantes ramenta sumunt: ea vocari ait prædia quod mala prohibeant.* What *Pliny* relates of *Pelops*'s Rib, is much more miraculous. It was shewed as a Remedy, (i) *Elide solebat ostendi Pelopis costa quam eburneam affirmabant.* Here's a Relick that wrought Miracles among the Heathens: For *Pliny* had been saying, that the Members (k) of some Persons have the Virtue of curing Diseases; and therefore he means that this Part of *Pelops*'s Body had that Faculty. So that the only thing that *Charles Stephens* is to be blamed for, is his making no distinction between what he infers from *Pliny*'s Words, and what *Pliny* himself says. Such a Distinction ought never to be neglected: Those, who take no care to observe it, occasion many Authors to quote, as the Words of an ancient Writer, what is but a Paraphrase, or a Consequence of a Modern. Here are *Charles Stephens* Words: (l) *Ad quem quidem humerum* (m) *post ejusdem Pelopis mortem varia morborum sanabantur genera, & multiplicia edebantur miracula. Plin. libro decimo nono, capite tertio.* *Lloyd* and *Hoffman* have not rectified this Passage in the least, nor even the false Citation contain'd in it.

A *French* Author, who lived in the XVIth Century, tells a Story which he had never been able to prove. *The* Tarquins, says he (n), *caused a Statue to be erected in the middle of their Palace, with Slippers on, a Distaff and a Spindle, that those who followed their Family, might imitate their assiduous* Diligence, *in minding Domestick Concerns, without stirring abroad.* Thus you see how the Passage of *Pliny*, concerning *Tanaquil*'s Statue, has been strangely misrepresented. Every Body takes upon him to alter some Circumstances in what he quotes: By this means Matters of Fact are quickly spoiled and perverted by those who mention them.

(E) *Who had been too imperious.*] This is what many Authors infer from these Words of *Juvenal*: (a) *Consulit ictericæ lento de funere matris, Ante tamen de te* TANAQUIL *tua*; and from these Words of *Ausonius*, (b) *Tanaquil tua nesciat istud. Tu contemne alios.* This seems to signify, that the Wives, who govern'd their Husbands, were call'd *Tanaquil's*. 'Tis *Scaliger*'s Opinion. (c) *Uxorem sanctissimam Paulini, cujus meminit Ambrosius Epist.* XXXXVI *vocat* Tanaquilem *Ausonius, videns scilicet: quia ei erat addictus Paulinus. Et, ut ex eodem loco Ambrosii cognoscimus, videtur secutus uxoris consilium Paulinus in secessu Nolano. Quare vocat eam fœminam* Tanaquilem *poeta noster: quia illis temporibus ita solerent uxores*

---

* *Notior est marito suo Tanaquil, illum inter multa regum nomina jam abscondit antiquitas, hanc rara inter fœminas virtus altius sæculorum omnium memoriæ, quàm ut excidere possit, infixit. Hieronym. advers. Jovinian.*

(h) *Sextus Pompeius Festus, de verborum significatione, voce* prædia.

(i) *Plinius lib.* 28. *cap.* 4. *pag. m.* 568.

(k) Quorundam partes medicæ sunt sicuti diximus de Pyrrhi regis pollice.

(l) *In Dictionario, voce* Pelops.

(m) Pliny *says* costa, *and not* humerus. *But he is the only Author, who mentions the Ivory Rib of* Pelops. *Another Writer says 'twas a Shoulder.* Humeroque Pelops insignis eburno. *Virgil. Georg. lib.* 3. *v.* 7.

(n) *Franc. Tillier, in his Philogame, pag.* 120. *Paris* 1578.

(a) *Juvenal. Sat.* 6. *v.* 563.

(b) *Auson. epist.* 23. *v.* 31.

(c) *Scalig. in Auson. epist.* 23. *p. m* 678.

to Death, nor that she was (F) the Mother of that Tarquin. The Historian, who shews the Falsity of it, has been more successful in confuting his Predecessors (G) than in avoiding Mistakes.

TANDE

vocare, quæ imperabant maritis. He confirms it by a Passage of *Sidonius Apollinaris*, wherein *Chilperic*'s Wife, who had a great Ascendant over her Husband, is call'd *Tanaquil*; she is also compared with *Agrippina*. (d) *Quod principaliter medetur afflictis, temperat Lucumonem nostrum Tanaquil sua, & aures mariti virosa susurronum face completas, opportunitate salsi sermonis eruderat, cujus studio factum scire vos par est, nihil interim quieti fratrum communium apud animum communis patroni junioris Cybiratarum venena nocuisse, neque quicquam (Deo propitiante) nocitura; si modo, quamdiu præsens potestas Lugdunensem Germaniam regit, nostrum suumque Germanicum præsens Agrippina moderetur.* Here is a Prince under his Wife's Direction; but because such a Direction proved advantageous to his Subjects, it is to *Tanaquil*'s Honour. It ought to be inferr'd from it, that if the first *Tarquin* was govern'd by his Wife, it was no Misfortune. Another Commentator upon *Ausonius* observes, that *Paulinus* (e) was not well pleased to see his Wife compared with a Queen, ambitious, and addicted to Magick: He could have wish'd she had rather been compared with *Lucretia* (f).

(F) *'Tis not true that she was living, when .... nor that she was the Mother.*] The two Daughters of *Servius Tullius* and *Tarquinia*, the Daughter of *Tarquinius Priscus* and of *Tanaquil*, were married to *Lucius Tarquinius* and *Aruns Tarquinius*. Those two Brothers were not like one another in any thing, no more than their two Wives: One of them was an honest Man, and the other a profligate one: One of the *Tullia*'s was an honest Woman, and the other a wicked one. The latter was married to the honest Man; and the other to the profligate one. The wicked *Tullia* proposed to the wicked *Tarquin* to marry him: She promised him to make away with her Husband, and made him promise to kill his Wife: and before they parted, they committed (g) Incest. *Aruns Tarquinius* was soon after poison'd by his Wife, and the eldest *Tullia* by her Husband; and then the two Murtherers were not long without marrying together; rather without the King's Opposition, than with his Consent, *magis non prohibente Servio quam approbante* (h). *Fabius Pictor* said, in his *Roman* History, that *Tanaquil* buried *Aruns Tarquinius*; for which he is censured by (i) *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*, who shews, that *Tanaquil* would have been then 115 Years old. Here is the Proof of it: *Tarquinius Priscus* (k) was at least twenty-five Years of Age, when he settled at *Rome*; 'tis very probable his Wife was twenty. But they came to *Rome* the first Year of *Ancus Martius*'s Reign, according to some Historians, or the eighth, according to others. I keep to this last Opinion; for if they did not come sooner to *Rome*, they did not come later; since all the Historians are agreed, that *Ancus Martius*, in the ninth Year of his Reign, gave *Tarquin* the Command of the Cavalry against the *Latins*: And therefore, seeing that Prince reigned twenty-four Years, it follows, that when he died *Tarquin* had attained to his forty-second Year, more or less, and *Tanaquil* to the thirty-seventh Year of her Age. To which, if you add the thirty-three Years of that *Tarquin*'s Reign, you'll find that he died at eighty Years of Age, and that he left behind him *Tanaquil*, who was seventy five Years old. But *Aruns* died the fortieth Year (l) of the Reign of *Servius Tullius*, who succeeded that *Tarquin*: If therefore *Tanaquil* had been then alive, she would have been 115 Years old. Nothing can be more exact than this Computation of *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*, nor more reasonable than the liberty he takes of censuring *Fabius Pictor* for his Carelessness. (m) Οὕτως ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ αὐτοῦ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀταλαίπωρον. *Adeo parum laboris hic scriptor impendit perquirenda veritati historicæ.* He takes notice of a like Carelessness in the same *Fabius Pictor*, and in many other Historians, who affirm, that the two *Tarquins*, the Sons-in-Law of *Servius Tullius*, were the Sons of King *Tarquin*. Those Historians wrote without minding the Absurdities that resulted from their Accounts. (n) [illegible] *Omnino enim inconsiderate ac negligenter historiam hanc prodiderunt scriptores Latini, non caventes absurditates impossibilitatibus quibus fides ipsarum elevetur.* Let us see *Dionysius*'s Proofs. Since *Tanaquil* was seventy-five Years old, when she lost her Husband, the youngest of her Sons must have then been twenty-five Years of Age: For Women leave off bearing of Children when they are above fifty Years. The other Son had been twenty-seven Years old. Would they have been so silly as to suffer *Tanaquil* to deprive 'em of the Crown, in favour of *Servius Tullius*? Would she have been so foolish and unnatural as to exclude them from it? These Absurdities are fully represented by the Author, who adds, that if *Tarquinius Superbus* had been twenty-seven Years of Age, when *Tarquinius Priscus* was kill'd, he would have been above seventy when he dethroned his Father-in-Law, and above ninety-five when he was expell'd from *Rome*, and about 110 when he left off making War in Person with the *Romans*: And yet he is represented as a Man, who was in the Flower of his Age, when he usurp'd the Throne. He commanded at the Siege of *Ardea*, when the *Romans* dethroned him. He endeavoured for the space of fourteen Years to recover the Throne, being at several (o) Battles, and performing all the Functions of a General. Some Historians, being sensible of these Absurdities, supposed, that he was not the Son of *Tanaquil*, but of one *Gegania*, the second Wife of *Tarquinius Priscus*; but, besides that they have no Proof for it, there being no Monuments extant, wherein *Gegania* is mention'd, they involve themselves in many Difficulties: They must say, that *Tarquinius Priscus* being about eighty Years of Age, and having two Daughters married, did nevertheless marry again, and had Children by his second Wife. These last Objections of *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* are not very strong; for it might be answered, that *Gegania* was married before *Tarquin* was so old, and that she would not be the only Woman, that bore Children, being married to a Man about eighty Years old: And that a King, who has only Daughters, is willing, though he be never so old, to try whether he can get a Son. That Historian has forgot one of the strongest Objections; he does not say, that according to the general Tradition, *Tanaquil* did so cunningly manage the Intrigue, after *Tarquin*'s Death, that she raised *Servius Tullius* to the Throne: Which shows that what is said of *Gegania*, is a fabulous Story. This being so, is it not a surprizing thing that *Dionysius* (p) should have found but one (q) Author, who said that the two Sons-in-Law of *Tullius* were not the Sons of the first *Tarquin*, but his Grand-sons. The Opinion of this single Author has been adopted by that great Historian. *Livy* was not so judicious; he rather chose to follow the Crowd (r), and thereby involved himself in many Difficulties, prejudicial to his Memory. See *Laurentius Valla*'s Dissertation upon that Subject. One can hardly apprehend how so great a Man as *Livy* could commit so many Faults, in his Account of the *Tarquins*. The greatest Objection that can be raised against *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* is this, that *Tanaquil* would not have endeavoured to place her Son-in-Law, *Servius Tullius*, on the Throne, had she had two Grand-Sons: But it may be answered, that they were in their Infancy, and that the Posture of Affairs required a Successor, who might reign by himself; and that therefore she was obliged to prefer her Son-in-Law to her Grand Sons.

(G) *The Historian .... has been more successful in confuting .... than in avoiding Mistakes.*] He fell into his own Snare; for he ascribes to *Tanaquil* a Daughter, of whom it is no less absurd, that she should be the Mother, than 'tis absurd, that *Lucius Tarquinius*, and *Aruns*, should be her Sons. He will have it (s), that *Brutus* was the Son of *Tarquinia*, Daughter of *Tarquinius Priscus* and of *Tanaquil*; and says, that *Brutus* was very young, when his Father, and

---

(d) *Sidon. Apollinar. epist. 7. lib. 5. pag. m. 138.*

(e) Moleste tulisse videtur Paulinus in epistola ad Ausonium prima & secunda: & Lucretiæ illi pudicissimæ matronæ comparari maluit, quam isti *Tanaquili*, ambitiosæ mulieri, & sagæ. *Vinetus in Ausonium, epist. 23. pag. 678.*

(f) Nec Tanaquil mihi, sed Lucretia conjux, *says he in another place.*

(g) Ἀσμένως δέξασθαι τὴν αἵρεσιν ὁ Ταρκύνιος, καὶ αὐτίκα δοὺς αὐτῇ πίστεις, καὶ λαβὼν τὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀνοσίων γάμων, καὶ διαπραξάμενος, ἀπήρχετο. Libenter conditionem accepit Tarquinius, moxque data & accepta fide, ac delibato incestarum nuptiarum fructu, abiit. *Dionys. Halicarn. lib. 4. pag. 234. edit. Lips. 1691.*

(h) *Livius, lib. 1. p. 29.*

(i) *Diony). Halicarn. ubi supra.*

(k) *Idem. lib. 3. pag. 218.*

(l) Ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυσίαις ἀναγραφαῖς εὗρον τῷ τεσσαρακοστῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς Τυλλίου ἀρχῆς τὸν Ἄρροντα τετελευτηκότα παρειλήφαμεν. In annalibus invenimus anno regis Tullii quadragesimo defunctum Aruntem. *Id. lib. 4. pag. 234.* (m) *Id. ib.*

(n) Id. pag.

(o) *According to* Livy, l. 2. p. 48. *he drove his Horse against the* Roman *Dictator at the Head of his Army, and was wounded.*

(p) *Ubi supra. pag. 213.*

(q) *Lucius Piso Frugi.*

(r) Hic L. Tarquinius, Prisci Tarquinii regis filius neposne fuerit, parum liquet: pluribus tamen auctoribus filium crediderim. *Titus Livius, lib. 1. pag. m. 29. A.*

(s) *Dionys. Halicarn. lib. 4. pag. 264.*

TANDEMUS †, an Heretick, who rose in *Germany*, under the Emperor *Henry* V. about the Year 1124, and spread his Errors particularly among the Citizens of *Antwerp*. He was a Lay-Man, who had his Tongue well hung, and exceeded the greatest Scholars of his Time in Subtilty, Eloquence, and many other Things. He was richly (Z) clothed; he kept a good Table, and was attended by three Thousand armed Men; by whose means he brought about what the Charms of his Language could not effect. He had infatuated his Followers to such a Degree, that they drank the Water in which he bathed himself, and kept it as a Relick. One may very well wonder, (though perhaps 'tis no wonder at all) how he could seduce many People with such odious Doctrines and Actions, as his were. He maintain'd, that it was no Sensual Action, but rather a Spiritual One, to lye with a Maid in her Mother's Presence, and with a Wife in the sight of her Husband, and practised that abominable Doctrine. He kill'd those whom he could not persuade. He ascribed no Virtue to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and acknowledged no Distinction between Lay-men, and those in Orders. A Priest, with whom he happen'd to be in a Boat, gave him a blow on the Head, which kill'd him. His Errors were not quickly extirpated; but at length those erring People were brought back into the Pale of the Church. *Norbert* * was the chief Instrument of their Conversion, and so moved both Men and Women that they brought back the Hosts they had kept for the space of ten Years in some Holes or Trunks ‡.

T A-

and eldest Brother were put to Death, by order of *Tarquinius Superbus*. I shall make use of his Reasons against himself. If the Mother of that *Brutus* was *Tanaquil*'s Daughter, she was twenty-five Years of Age, when her Father was assassinated, and sixty-nine when *Tarquinius Superbus* usurp'd the Crown; and therefore *Brutus* would have been then nineteen Years of Age. 'Tis not likely that *Tarquin* put to Death his Brother-in-Law, and his Nephew, the same Year he took away *Servius Tullius*'s Life. 'Tis probable he had the Policy to leave some Intervals between his great Crimes. We may therefore say, that *Brutus* was at least twenty Years of Age, when his Father was put to Death; but if he had been of that Age, would he not have had time enough to shew his Wit? Whoever undertakes to conceal a great Courage, a noble Soul, and a great Design under the out-side of a Fool, must needs be a Man of a great Genius not to contradict himself. *Brutus* did admirably succeed in hiding those things, under the false Appearance of Stupidity; and therefore he had a great Address, and several noble Qualities which he would have discovered before his Father's Death; and therefore he would have had the same Fate with his eldest Brother: The Tyrant would have destroyed both of 'em, lest they should revenge the Death of their Father. It must be said then, that *Brutus* had not yet shewn his natural Endowments; and therefore he was not nineteen Years of Age, when *Tullius* was dethroned. I allow him to be fifteen, as I have done in his Article; according to which Supposition he was born in the 54th Year of his Mother's Life, whereby some Objections of *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* come to nothing.

Laurentius Valla alledges against *Livy*, the Argument taken from the Age of *Tarquin*'s Son; as if that Historian had said, that *Brutus* and they were of the same Age: But I don't find that *Livy* says so, nor that it can be inferr'd from *Brutus*'s going with them to *Delphi*. This would prove a very strong Argument against *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*, (b) who tells us, that the Marriage of *Tarquin* and *Tullia* falls in the fortieth Year of *Servius Tullius*'s Reign; from whence it follows, that *Tarquin*'s Children were but two or three Years of Age, when their Father invaded the Throne: And therefore, if there was a Necessity that *Brutus* should be of the same Age or thereabouts, he must have been born in the 65 or 66 Year of his Mother's Life. I would not much insist upon that Proof: For, though that Historian informs us, that *Tarquin* would have *Brutus* (c) to be bred up with his Children, one cannot affirm, that he believed they were not much younger than *Brutus*. A Lad of eighteen or twenty Years may be placed with Princes of seven or eight Years of Age, to be their Companion; especially when such a Familiarity (a vain Shew of Honour) is only design'd for their Sport. When all is done, it must be acknowledg'd, that they were younger than he; for he had some Children old enough to engage in a Conspiracy, when (d) the eldest of *Tarquin*'s Sons was not yet thirty Years of Age. I must take notice of a Mistake in these four Propositions of *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*: 1. That if *Tarquinius Superbus* had been the Son of the first *Tarquin*, he would have been 27 Years old, when the first *Tarquin* was kill'd: 2. That *Servius Tullius* had been (e) only three Years older than he: 3. That *Servius Tullius* was forty Years in possession of the Crown, that was set upon his Head, after the Death of the first *Tarquin*: 4. And that therefore, *Tarquinius Superbus* would have been above seventy Years old, when *Servius Tullius* was dethroned. This is a very wrong Consequence; and rather than ascribe it to the Historian, I had rather say, that the Transcribers skipp'd the Word τέτταρα, *quatuor*; for he could not be ignorant that *Servius Tullius* reign'd forty-four Years.

Have you observed, said one to me the other Day, that *Henry Glareanus* (f), having read *Valla*'s Dissertation, and *Dionysius*'s Arguments against *Fabius Pictor*'s Opinion, does nevertheless adopt that Opinion; and draws up the Pedigree of the *Tarquins* according to it? He says, that the two Sons-in-Law of *Servius Tullius* were the Sons of the first *Tarquin*: He also says, that *Brutus*'s Mother was his Daughter. I don't much wonder, that *Stephen* (g) *Pasquier* has committed the same (h) Fault; for perhaps he never heard of *Valla*'s Book, and did not observe the Dispute of *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* against *Fabius Pictor*, and the other *Roman* Historians. I know *Glareanus* acknowledges, that the Opinion of *Dionysius* is grounded on good Reasons, *multis id ac dignissimis astruens argumentis*. Generally speaking, they are the same with those of *Laurentius Valla*. However, I believe, as *Glareanus* does, he did not steal them from that ancient Historian: he had read the ancient Authors: But after all, more learned Men than he know not, when they write Books, that such or such things are to be found in *Plutarch*, or *Diodorus Siculus*, &c. He protests, he knew not that *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* had alledged those Arguments, and he is more free than *Perottus* and *Politian* in acknowledging from what Authors he takes what is not his own. (i) *Nisi quis Dionysium ab eo non lectum, atque eum suopte hoc ingenio expiscatum contendat, quod ipse fatetur in priore defensione adversus Benedictum Morandum quendam. Nam ut de Valla aliud suspicer ejus candor obstat. Liberè enim ac ingenuè ubique fateri solet, per quos profecerit, & unde habuerit quod scripserit: secus certè atque Perottus in suo cornu aut in suis operibus Politianus, gloriola ac popularis aura captatores, ut mihi quidem visum est, etsi bonæ literæ eis multum debent.* I heard that Man patiently, and then I shewed him, that *Glareanus* declares plainly enough against *Livy*, and acquaints his Readers, that he gives the Genealogy of the *Tarquins* only according to the Plan of that Author. I further alledged a probable Reason against those, who charge *Valla* with Plagiarism in this particular; *viz.* that he did not make use of an Observation (k), which might have strengthen'd his Arguments, and which he might have found in *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*.

(Z) *Richly cloathed.*] This is a killing Blow for *Moreri*, who says (l), that *Tandemus* revived the Heresy of the *Adamites*. The latter were particularly distinguish'd by their Doctrine about Naked-

ness

† He is also call'd Tanchelin

* The Founder of the Order of the Premonstratenses.

‡ Pratealus voce. Tandemus ex Sigeberto.

(b) Dionys. Halicarn. lib. 4. pag. 2[illegible]

(c) [illegible]

...Verique in... liberos ...os patie... ...ur, non ...onoris ...usa, ut ...deri vo... ...ir, quasi ...gnarum; ...d ut ridi... ...lis dictis ...stisque ...lecta... ...ento es... ...t adole... ...entibus, ...emad... ...odum ...lent veri ...ui. *Id.* ...d. *pag.*

(d) *The* ...*r in* ...*ich* Tar... ...*n was* ...*ll'd.* ...*t he was* ...*ll'd the* ...*th Year* ...*his* ...*ign an* ...*began* ...*four* ...*ars af-* ...*he mar-* ...*d* Tul... ...; *for* ...rvius ...llius ...*n de-* ...*ned the* ...*th Year* ...*his* ...*ign.*

(e) Τρισὶ μόνον ἔτεσιν [illegible] προγενέστερος ἦν. Triennio tantum eorum alterum antecederet. *Ibid. pag.* 212.

(f) *Glareanus in annotationibus ad lib. 1. T. Livii, pag. m.* 40.

(g) *In the 7th Letter of the 9th Book, pag. m.* 546.

(h) *Except that he says*, pag. 548. *that* Brutus *was* Tarquin'*s Cousin-German; wherein he is mistaken.*

(i) *Glareanus, ubi supra.*

(k) Dionysius Halicarnassæus *shews, that* Lucumon *went to* Rome *the 8th Year of* Ancus'*s Reign at the farthest; from whence it follows, that he lived 16 Years at* Rome *before he was a King. But* Valla *says he lived there only ten Years.*

(l) *At the Word* Adamites.

TAPHIANS, a *People situate towards Acarnania*, the same with the *Teleboes*. See the Remarks in the Article **TELEBOES**.

TAPPERUS (RUARDUS) a Native of *Enchuysen* in *Holland*, lived in the XVIth Century. He studied Philosophy and Divinity at *Louvain*, where he was Professor of Divinity thirty-nine Years, and Dean of St. *Peter's* Church about twenty-four Years. He was also Chancellor of that University. He followed sometimes the Court of *Charles* V. and was consulted by that Prince upon several important Occasions *. Some say, that those Avocations hindred him (*A*) from throughly studying the Doctrine of Grace; and that for want of reading St. *Augustin* carefully, and out of a desire of keeping at too great a distance from the Protestants, he came too near (*B*) Pelagianism. He was deputed to the Council of *Trent* †, as the Emperor's Divine, in the Year 1551; where he discovered a great ß Capacity: And at his Return he set up for a Party-Leader γ against *Michael Baius*, who strictly adhered to St. *Augustin's* Doctrine about Predestination and Free-will. He ‡ died at *Brussels* the second of (*C*) *March* 1559, at seventy-one Years of Age, and was buried at *Louvain*. He left his Estate to the Poor, and his Books to the Faculty of Divinity ↓. I'll give a (*D*) Catalogue of his Works, and (*E*) some Extracts of that Doctor's

ness: But no Body observes, that *Tandemus* would have every one to shew his whole Body, as *Adam* and *Eve* shewed it before their Fall. On the contrary, he lov'd to be finely dress'd. (*m*) *In pretioso habitu, & vestibus deauratis incedens.*

(*A*) *Those Avocations hindred him from throughly studying the Doctrine of Grace.*] "He would not "have departed from the common Doctrine of the "(*a*) University, were it not that his Attendance at "Court, and his extraordinary Occupations, took "away from him the time he should have spent in "reading St. *Augustin*, before he fill'd his Head with "the Notions of a new Divinity." This is what I find in Page 48 of a Book, printed in 1688, with this Title, *Apologie Historique des deux censures de Louvain & de Douay sur la matiere de la Grace.*

(*B*) *Out of a desire of keeping at too great a distance from the Protestants, he came too near Pelagianism.*] "(*b*) The Desire of being always, and in every "thing, of a contrary Opinion to the new Hereticks, "was a common Temptation at that time, which "made some great Men depart from Tradition. "*Tapperus* was one of 'em.... *Peter Soto*, that "Learned *Dominican*, Confessor to *Charles* V.... "wrote a long and learned Letter to *Tapperus*, "wherein he shewed him, that he could not follow "those new Opinions, without running into Pelagianism." *Soto* was in the right; for *Tapperus* taught in express Words, that Man can do many good Actions by the meer Strength of Nature, and without the Assistance of Grace, (*c*) *Sine gratia ex viribus natura multa bona ab hominibus fieri posse*, and that impious Men and the Infidels might have glorified and worship'd God, and avoided Sin, only by the help of Nature. (*d*) Quòd *Impii & Infideles per solam natura legem, sicut Deum cognoscere, ita eum solum adorare & glorificare potuerunt*: & quòd *Impius & Infidelis solis natura talentis naturalibusque viribus relictus possit vitare peccata: quia*, inquit, *discernit inter multa licita atque illicita, ita pro tempore & loco potest non peccare, nolle fornicari, ex eo quod judicat illa esse illicita.* OMNE ENIM QUOD MALUM ESSE NOVIT, ODISSE ATQUE ABOMINARI POTEST. He asserted, that a Man would not be guilty for not converting himself, if he wanted a Grace necessary for his Conversion. (*e*) *Si igitur deest gratia, quâ opus est, ut ad Deum cor converti possit,* NEC PECCATUM EST *quòd quis non convertitur; quia non potest pro tunc ad Deum converti, & necessariò non convertitur, & per consequens non liberè.* Some other Propositions of this Nature, extracted out of *Tapperus's* Book, may be seen in the new Edition of *Michael Baius's* Works, at Page 218 of the 2d Part.

(*C*) *He died the 2d of* March 1559, *at* 71 (*f*) *Years of Age.*] Perhaps some will say, that *Moreri* has committed two Faults: I. in putting 1559 instead of 1558. II. In affirming, notwithstanding this, that *Tapperus* died *at his Return from the Council*. Would he have said so, if he had known, that *Tapperus* return'd from *Trent* to *Louvain* in the Year 1552? He found the first Mistake in *Valerius Andreas*; but why did not he take notice of a thing in that Author, whereby that Mistake is rectified? The two *Latin* Verses, wherein the Numeral Letters point out the Day and the Year of that Doctor's Decease, give us the Year 1558. *Moreri* quotes them after *Valerius Andream*, and therefore he should have concluded from them that 1559 was a Fault of the Press. Besides, *Valerius Andreas* observes (*g*), that *Tapperus's Apotheosis* was printed in the Year 1558. This is what may be objected to *Moreri*: But I have something to say in his Vindication, as to the first Head; for he was in the right to place *Tapperus's* Death in the Year 1559: And because the Nature of his Work did not oblige him to make any Criticisms, he may be excused for keeping to the *Bibliotheca Belgica*, without entering upon the Discussion of the Faults. The Author of that *Bibliotheque* is not exact enough, he puzzles and confounds his Reader. He acquaints us, that the two Verses mention'd by him, point out the Year in which *Tapperus* died; but they point out the Year 1558. I add, that the *Apotheosis* of that Doctor was printed in the Year 1558, how can those things be reconciled with the Year 1559, in which he says *Tapperus* died? Why does he not remove such a Difficulty? Should he not have acquainted us, that the Author of those two Verses began the Year at *Easter*? At this rate the second of *March* 1558, mention'd by him, is truly the second of *March* 1559. I think *Valerius Andreas* knew nothing of this Solution. Note, That the Author of *Tapperus's Apotheosis* supposes (*h*), that *Tapperus* died after *Charles* V. 'Tis certain that Emperor departed this Life in *September* 1558: Which proves, that the second of *March*, on which *Tapperus* died, belongs to the following Year, and that the *Apotheosis* was not printed (*i*) till the Year 1559.

(*D*) *A Catalogue of his Works.*] He publish'd in two Volumes in *Folio*, at *Louvain* 1555. *Explicationes in articulos* circa Ecclesiastica dogmata hoc sæculo controversa, *à Facultate Theologica Academia Lovaniensis* Caroli V. Imp. jussu *collectos*. His *Orationes Theologica una cum corollario de veris calamitatum Belgii causis atque remediis*, were published by *Lindanus* at *Cologne* in the Year 1577, in 8vo. An Edition of his Works in *Folio* came out in the same Town, in the Year 1582. The Original of his Treatise, *de Providentia Dei & Predestinatione* is kept at *Louvain*; but 'tis such an ugly hand that no Body can read it (*k*).

(*E*) *Some Extracts of his* Apotheosis.] My Edition is that of *Basil* 1567, in 8vo. The (*l*) Title of it runs thus. *D. Ruardi Tappart Enchusani, hereticæ pravitatis primi & postremi per Belgicum inquisitoris, Cancellarii Academia Lovaniensis, Apotheosis: Gratiano Vero Autore. Lege lector funestissimam Ecclesiasticorum tyrannidem, qua quid profecerint demonstrabit, nisi Deus avertat, totius tandem inferioris Germania excidium: liber ante octo Annos primum editus fuit, sed ita ut omnia ista, qua nunc præsentibus motibus gliscunt, tanquam in speculo ostenderit. Tuum igitur est collatis omnibus inter se, judicium facere quàm nihil autorem præsagientem fefellerit.* 'Tis a Dialogue between *Tapperus*, a *Genius*, and St. *Peter*. I find in it, that *Tapperus* had a Mind to be made Bishop of (*m*) *Louvain*; that when he delivered, in the same Town, a Panegyrick upon *Maximilian* King of *Bohemia*, that Prince silenc'd him with these Words; *I have heard what he will say, as well as what he has already said*; that he could not endure those, who said, that the Clergy should be allow'd to marry, and exhorted the latter to beg of

---

* Valer. Andreas Bibl. Belg. pag. 802.

† Opera Baii part. 2. p. 191. edit. 1696.

ß Valer. Andr. ib. pag. 803.

γ Opera Baii ibid. pag. 207, 217.

‡ Valer. Andr. ib.

↓ Id. ib.

(*m*) Prateol. in elencho heres. voce Tandemus.

(*a*) The University of Louvain.

(*b*) Gery, Apologie histor. des censures, pag 49.

(*c*) Ruard. Tapper. in art. 7. contra Protestantes apud opera Mich. Baii part. 2. pag. 218. edit. 1696.

(*d*) Oper. Baii ibid.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) This does not agree with his Apotheosis, where 'tis affirm'd, that he was born the fifteenth of February 1485.

Doctor's *Apotheoſis*. Notwithſtanding his violent Zeal againſt the Proteſtants, he gave out * that what is ſaid in the ſixth Chapter of St. *John*'s Goſpel does not concern the Lord's Supper, though the Fathers adapted it to that Myſtery in their Sermons. This Opinion of his † was confuted. He thought, that *Penſion Regenſis*

of God, that he would be pleaſed to deliver them from the Temptation of the Fleſh by ſome Dreams; or, if ſuch a Remedy was not ſufficient, to be prudent, when they could not be Chaſte. *Ad cœlibatum ſervandum, vitandumque conjugium ſoles noſtris orgiis initiatos hortari ut quoties ſentirent deſiderio humanitatis intumuiſſe venas, orarent Deum, ut ab ea imbecillitate liberaret ipſos per ſomnia, & nocturnas pollutiunculas. Si ne hoc quidem prodeſſet, quod non poſſent caſtè, facerent cautè, nec admitterent ullo pacto in animos ſuos flagitioſam cogitationem de conjugio ſacerdotum*: That the firſt thing he did againſt the Sectaries, was to cauſe *John Vordenat* to be burnt at the *Hague*, who maintain'd, that he had done well to marry, though he was a Prieſt: That the City of *Antwerp*, being afraid of loſing their Trade, did not approve that the Hereticks ſhould be perſecuted; and that he adviſed the King of *Spain* to get it burnt, that the other Towns might be frighted by ſuch a ſevere Puniſhment: That he was deputed to *Trent*, where he ſpoke, as being the eldeſt of his Collegues: That the *Spaniards* themſelves laugh'd at his Speech: That he loſt many Books in his Return to *Louvain*: That, after his Return, He and his Collegues cauſed all the Tranſlations of the Scripture to be condemn'd, except the Vulgar: That they endeavoured to deſtroy all the Works of *Eraſmus*, but could not ſucceed in it, being thwarted by the Preſident of *Brabant*, and the Biſhop of *Arras*: That *Sleidan*'s Hiſtory proved a moſt pernicious Poyſon, which every Body greedily ſwallowed: That it was tranſlated into all ſorts of Languages: That the Emperor (a) commended that Hiſtorian for his Faithfulneſs, and was ſurprized to find in it ſo many unknown Truths: That it could not be put into the Catalogue of prohibited Books, before it had been read over and over by every Body: (b) *Tunc demum (ſi diis placet) Sleydani nomen ridiculè adjectum eſt catalogo noſtro, cum omnes (inquam) ut ungues ſuos tenerent, aut potius ſatietate nauſearent. Antè nihil impetrari potuit*: That, notwithſtanding the great Care that was taken to get the Books of the Proteſtants condemn'd, the Bookſellers continu'd to ſell 'em: That by altering or leaving out the Names of the Authors, many dangerous Books were put off, and the Inquiſitors impoſed upon; and that it fell out ſometimes, that they condemn'd a Book, which they had before approved of. (c) *Quanquam ne ſic quidem cavere potuimus quin typographi, homines verſutiſſimi impoſuerint nobis: mutatis autorum nominibus vel omiſſis, vel inverſis, vel etiam Græcè redditis quæ erant Latina, & è contrà: ut ſæpe coacti ſimus quæ antè approbaveramus, ea damnare poſt, vix auſi profiteri apud Regem noſtram ſimplicitatem. Nam ex titulis librorum æſtimanda nobis omnia erant, cùm non vacarit perlegere quæ intus erant, quorum quædam ita etiam erant obſcura & ingenioſa (qua fraude ſemper hæretici abundarunt) ut quid ſcriberetur, non aſſequeremur. Ad quem modum turpiter nos decepit Philippi Melanchthonis libellus de Theologia Chriſtiana, qui titulo Hippophili Melangæi paſſim ſenatorum, præſidum & noſtrorum etiam Baccalaureorum manibus tritus eſt: donec amici, qui in Germania adhuc ſynceri erant, admonuerunt, ut habita ſynodo conſuleremus lexica noſtra, fore enim ut idem eſſe Philippum & Hippophilum deprehenderemus......* (d) *Idem accidit in Cœlii Secundi de providentia libello quidem non magno, ſed peſtilentiſſimo: quem ille nebulo tum primum innoteſcens Araneum inſcripſerat. Nos enim vati eſſe poeticum, aut grammaticum figmentum, non ante olfaciebamus fucum quàm omnia exemplaria eſſent Lovanii diſtracta. Taceo de Hutteno, Calvino, Urbano Rhegio & aliis (prò dolor) multis, quos nobis oſcitantibus neſcio quibus titulis, ex metamorphoſi opinor Ovidiana petitis, inſinuaverunt.* Afterwards *Tapperus* tells us, that he forced many Students in *Louvain* to recant, and pay a Fine: That he cauſed ſome of 'em to be burnt and be-headed: That he cauſed ſome (e) Women of good Families to be buried alive: That he proſecuted *Perſevald*, a Rhetorician, who abuſed the Inquiſitors: That, fearing the accuſed Perſon would prove his Innocence, being proteſted by ſeveral People, he brought againſt him (f) an Action for Pederaſty, whereby he loſt moſt of his Protectors: That he privately condemn'd him to perpetual Impriſonment; but, to avoid the Charges of maintaining that Priſoner, and leſt it ſhould be thought he had ſtarved him to Death, he delivered him to a Gentleman, who interceeded for him: That afterwards he forced that Gentleman to clear himſelf on account of that Interceſſion, and condemn'd him to forfeit his whole Eſtate. I omit a long Account of the Proceedings againſt *Angelus Emphlitius*, a *Paris* Divine, wherein Fraud and Violence had an equal ſhare. 'Tis obſerved, in the Preamble to that Narrative, that *Bartholomew Latomus* compared the Chriſtian Church to a young Bear, which could not have its due Shape, till it had been lick'd up for many Ages. (g) *Perinde ac ſi religionem Chriſtianam urſa aliqua peperiſſet, quam non una mater tamen lambendo detergeret atque efformaret, ſed mille quingentorum annorum ſomnia.* Here follows a Reflection of the Author of the *Apotheoſis*. *O cæci! Chriſti lex æterna eſt, nec eget maturatione temporum, ut ſtabilitatem conſequatur. Alioqui primis Eccleſiæ membris magna fuiſſet injuria facta, ſi quid ad illorum inſtitutionem defuiſſet cujus percipiendi edentula iſta mundi ſenecta demum capax fuiſſet.*

I muſt here take notice of the Fate of Controverſies. At that time the Objections of the Proteſtants forced *Latomus* to maintain, that the beginning of Chriſtianity (h) was a Chaos, which had been cleared by degrees. The Proteſtants were continually ſaying, that things ſhould be brought to the firſt Inſtitution; and that whatever was not preſcribed in the Scripture ſhould be aboliſhed. What Courſe did he take to anſwer 'em? He bethought himſelf of this Hypotheſis, that the Church had attain'd to Perfection only by degrees. The above-mention'd Reflection, which was the Proteſtants Reply, is the Foundation of a Book (i), which the Biſhop of *Meaux* wrote againſt 'em, an hundred and forty Years after. What Courſe did *M. Jurieu* take to anſwer him? He revived (k) *Latomus*'s Hypotheſis. What a Change is this! *Sors omnia verſat.*

'Tis to be obſerved, that the Author of the *Apotheoſis* ſuppoſes, that *Tapperus* confeſſes he had perform'd the part of a Mid-wife in a Boat, without knowing what he did, and that Children came into the World in ſuch a manner; believing ſtill what his Mother had told him, that they came from Places thick-ſet with Reeds. (l) *Ecce auditus vagitus eſt (ut ſit verbo venia) neſcio quo loco...... Dii talem terris avertite peſtem: ego inde prodire infantulos putaſſem?...... Mater mihi perſuaſerat apud nos è proximis arundinetis dari mulieribus.* I further obſerve, that, though the Author of the *Apotheoſis* brings him in, confeſſing, that he felt (m), ſince that time, the Motions of Luſt, and look'd upon his Servant-Maids, with a kind of Temptation; Yet he does not contradict him, when he proteſts (n), that he never knew, or ſo much as kiſs'd, a Woman. He did not come off with being inſtrumental in the Delivery of one: For at his coming out of the Boat, he was ſurrounded with many Country-Women, who hurried him into a Tavern, and forced him to be God-Father to the Child, and to pay for the Wine. He had not one Penny left, when he had paid the Entertainment that was made at his Coſt. (o) *Emunctus ſum omni pecunia: nec potui redimere ubi navem appuliſſemus quin fierem compater hominis quem nunquam vidi. Pertrahebant me in diverſorium paluſtres mulierculæ bibaciſſimæ, vocatus ſacrificus æque ſobrius.... omnes certatim paſcebantur tanti compatris largitate.... nunquam nudior, nec ſordidior redii domum.* His Exploits againſt the Anabaptiſts are not forgotten in the *Apotheoſis*, nor his pernicious Maxims, or Methods of Inquiſition. Take notice, that *Valerius Andreas* confeſſes, that this Piece does plainly diſcover *Tapperus*'s Conduct. *Cæterum*, ſays he (p), *Apotheoſin* R. Tappero *ſcripſit* Henr-Geldorpius, *editam an.* 1558. *in* 4°. *Verum*

ſannis

---

* [illegible] *Tom.* 2. *p. m.* 138.

† *Id. ib.*

(f) Hominem cæco & deformi maſculi amoris infamiam affinxi, ſtatimque ocius Euro à favore cauſæ pleroſque deterrui. *Ib.*

(g) *Ibid. fol.* E 4.

(h) Ne vacillent argumenta Latomi quum rudem indigeſtamque molem vocat primitivam Eccleſiam, *Ibid.*

(i) *See the Preface to his* Hiſtoire des Variations.

(k) *See his Paſtoral Letters, wherein he deſcribes the Doctrine of the antient Fathers.*

(l) *Apotheoſ. fol.* G. 2.

(m) Ab eo die nunquam carui neſcio quo pruritu, nec æquis oculis aſpexi famulas meas. *Ibid.*

(n) *Ibid. fol.* G *verſo. See hereafter the Paſſage of* Lindanus.

(o) *Ibid. fol.* G 2 *verſo.*

(p) *Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra, pag.* 803.

Regienſis (F) was an Orthodox Man. The Praiſes beſtowed upon him by *Lindanus* are very ſingular: That Author believed, that *Tapperus* was endowed (G) with a Prophetical Gift.

TARPA (SPURIUS METIUS, or MÆCIUS) was a Cenſer, or a Critick of the Poems, that were to be recited on the Stage. He had four Collegues, and one of 'em (T) was to approve thoſe Pieces before they were produced in publick. In order to it, the Poets were appointed to meet in the Temple of *Apollo Palatinus*, where they read their Works, and then the Criticks paſs'd their Judgment upon 'em. Good Judges were not always pleaſed with *Tarpa*'s Approbation, as it appears from a Paſſage of *Cicero*; which may be ſeen at the End of the laſt Remark of this Article. However, *Horace*, who was no Flatterer, ſays (Z) nothing of that Critick but what is more to his Honour than to his Diſpraiſe.

TARRUNTIUS* **(LUCIUS)** ſir-named *Firmanus*, becauſe he was a Native of *Firmum*, a Town of *Italy*, in the Country of the *Picentini*, flouriſhed at the ſame time with *Cicero*, and was one of his † Friends. He was a ‡ Mathematical Philoſopher; I mean, that he pretended to a great Skill in judicial Aſtrology. He would be little known, had he not drawn up two Horoſcopes, mention'd by the Ancients, *viz.* that of (A) *Romulus*, and that of *Rome*. Thoſe Horoſcopes

ſanis & ſcommatibus plena gentum auctoris ſui prodit: ex qua alioqui ſummi illius viri ACTA DILUCIDE PATENT.

This Article being ready for the Preſs, I found a Copy of the firſt Edition of the *Apotheoſis*. I ſhall ſet down the Title of it, that it may be compared with the Title of the ſecond. *Clariſſ. Theologi D. Ruardi Tappart Enchuſani, hereticæ pravitatis primarii & generalis inquiſitoris, Cancellarii celeberrimæ Academiæ Lovanienſis, pridem inconſolabili ſuorum luctu vita functi, Apotheoſis: Gratiano Vero Theologiæ Baccalaureo autore. Reperies in hoc ſcripto, Lector, non parum multa ſcitu digniſſima, & paucis hactenus cognita, Inquiſitorum hæreticæ pravitatis Conſilia atque Secreta: quæ omnibus tandem cognoſcenda ſproponi, in primis intereſſe Reipublicæ duximus.*

(F) *He thought that* Fauſtus Regienſis *was an Orthodox Man.*] (q) He quoted him, "calling him a "venerable Man: Whereupon, being inform'd by "one of his Brethren, that *Fauſtus* had been con"demn'd, as being full of Errors; he was very "much ſurprized at it, and could not believe it, as "*Eſtius* relates in a Theological Diſcourſe, pro"nounced at *Douay*, in 1609. He had it from the "Doctor himſelf, who gave that Information to "*Tapperus.*" Here is another Authority for it: (r) *Ut quantùm Pelagianis faverit, neminem lateret, Fauſtum Regienſem Epiſcopum, qui Semipelagianorum fuit anteſiganus, & cujus libri à Sancto Gelaſio Papa in Concilio Romano è Catholicorum albo deleti ſunt, paſſim commendat & inter Patres adducit.*

(G) *The Praiſes* (ſ) *beſtowed upon him by* Lindanus ... *believed, that* Tapperus *was endowed with a Prophetical Gift.*] Theſe are his Words: (a) *Hoc ipſum certè tam vita, quam voce, cum apud nos mortalis ageret, magis præ ſe ferebat, diſerte tantum non prophetans, quæ modo peccatorum noſtrorum cauſa Belgici patimur, ſicuti & his ipſis Orationibus perſpicuè prædixiſſe cernitur.* It was an eaſy thing to gueſs, that the Conduct of the Romaniſts, againſt the new Religion, would occaſion great Diſorders; and that a Civil War would be the Conſequence of their tiring out the Patience of the Reformed.

(T) *One of 'em was to approve.*] This Particular is to be found in one of the Scholiaſts upon *Horace*, on theſe Words of the tenth Satyr of the firſt Book.

——— Hæc ego ludo
Quæ nec in æde ſonent certantia judice Tarpa,
Nec redeant iterum atque iterum ſpectata theatris.

Metius Tarpa, ſays he, *fuit judex criticus, auditor aſſiduus poematum & poetarum in æde Appollinis ſeu Muſarum, quo convenire poetæ ſolebant ſuaque ſcripta recitare, quæ niſi à Tarpa aut alio critico, qui numero erant quinque, probarentur, in ſcenam non deferebantur.* This Office might be compared with that of the Cenſurers of Books, in the Countries where there is an Inquiſition. It was very troubleſome, both becauſe ſo many Readers were to be heard, and becauſe the Cenſurers were expoſed to a double danger: For the Pieces, which they rejected, made the Authors, (b) *genus irritabile vatum*, very angry with them; and thoſe, that were approved, might have been ſlighted by the People, or Men of Judgment.

(Z) *Says nothing of that Critick.*] *Horace* mentions that Critick again in his *De Arte Poetica*.

Si quid tamen olim
Scripſeris, in Meti deſcendat judicis aures,
Et patris, & noſtras.

Voſſius (c) having obſerved, that *Achilles Statius* (d) confeſſes he does not remember to have read any thing concerning that *Metius Tarpa* any where, except in the tenth Satyr of the firſt Book of *Horace*, ſays, that he is alſo mention'd in the tenth Satyr of the firſt Book, and repeats what *Horace* ſays there about *Tarpa*. This is plainly an Effect of a great Diſtraction. *Voſſius* remember'd, that *Horace* mentions that Critick twice; *viz.* in the tenth Satyr of the firſt Book, and in his *de Arte Poëtica*: But he forgot, that the Paſſage known to *Statius* is that of the tenth Satyr; which is the Reaſon why he refers him to it. I don't know whether he perceived that Miſtake when the Book was printed off; for, though there are many things in his *Addenda* to be inſerted in the Page, where *Achilles Statius* is mention'd by him, and though the Paſſage concerning *Metius*, in *Horace de Arte Poetica*, is one of thoſe things; yet the Reader is not told, that there is any Correction to be made in that Page. Here is the Paſſage of *Cicero*, which I have promiſed to ſet down. (e) *Reliquas partes diei tu conſumebas his delectationibus quas tibi ipſe ad arbitrium tuum compararas: nobis autem erant ea perpetienda quæ ſcilicet Sp. Mecius .... probaviſſet.*

(A) *The* Horoſcope *of* Romulus, *and that of* Rome.] *Plutarch* gives the following Account of it. "(f) In the times of *Varro* the Philoſopher, a "Man very well read in *Roman* Hiſtory, liv'd one "*Tarrutius*, his familiar Friend and Acquaintance, "both a good Philoſopher and ſkillful Mathematician, "and one too that out of Curioſity of Speculation, had "ſtudied the way of drawing Schemes and Tables, and "ſeem'd to be excellent in the Art. To him "*Varro* propounded to caſt *Romulus's* Nativity, even "to the firſt Day and Hour, and to make his "Deductions from the ſeveral Events of the Man's "Life, which he ſhould be inform'd of, as the "Solutions of Geometrical Problems do re"quire; for it belongs to the ſame Science both "to foretell a Man's Life, by knowing the time "of his Birth, and alſo to find out his Birth by "the knowledge of his Life. This Task *Tarru"tius* undertook, and firſt looking into the Acti"ons and Caſualties of the Man, together with the "time of his Life, and manner of his Death, and "then comparing all theſe Remarks together, he "very confidently and poſitively pronounc'd, that "*Romulus* was conceiv'd in his Mother's Womb, "the firſt Year of the ſecond *Oympiad*, the twen"ty-third Day of the Month, the *Ægyptians* call *Chaac* "(which may be ſaid to anſwer our *December*) and "the third Hour after Sun-ſet; that he was born the "twenty-firſt Day of the Month *Thoth*, (which is "*September*) about Sun-riſing; and that the firſt "Stone of *Rome* was laid by him the ninth day of the ſcopes were retrograde, and there are few Examples of 'em; for there are very few (B) Aſtrologers, who pretend to find out the Moment of one's Birth, by knowing the Hiſtory of his Life. *Tarruntius*, at *Varro's* Requeſt, took that Courſe, and boldly mark'd out the Hour of the Birth. There is good Reaſon to believe that (C) he was quoted by *Pliny*.

---

* Some call him *Tarrutius*, being deceived by the Greek Word Ταρρούτιος. See Salmaſius in Solin, pag. 15.

† See the Remark A. Letter g.

‡ See the Remark C. Letter m. and the Remark A, Letter f.

(q) Gery, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 50.

(r) *Opera Mich. Baii ubi ſupra*, pag. 218, 219.

(ſ) Ornamentum hujus ſæculi noſtri ſingulare ... ſobrietatis perpetuæ exemplum, inviolatum caſtitatis & ejus virginalis ſpeculum, prudentiæ norma, eximiæ pietatis in pauperes ſpecimen, ... jejuniis frequentioribus aſſiduiſque deditus... modeſtiæ regula, temperantiæ amuſſis, tolerantiæ, patientiæ, charitatis Chriſtianæ, omnis denique virtutis magiſter abſolutiſſimus. *Lindanus, ubi infra*, pag. 27.

(a) *Lindanus in præfat. Orationum Theolog. Ruardi Tapperi*, pag. 26. *He has alſo theſe Words:* A Prophetarum gratia minime vacuus pleriſque piis viris crederetur .... alienum à vero dixiſſe non videatur qui cum ſpiritu prophetiæ divinitus præditum fuiſſe pronunciet.

(b) *Horat. epiſt.* 2. *lib.* 2.

(c) *Voſſius, de imitat. & initat. veterum*, pag. 55.

(d) *Not. ad Hor. lib.* i. *ſat.* i. 8.

(e) *Cicero, ep.* 1. *l.* 7. *ad famil.*

(f) *Plutarch, in the Life of Romulus.*

TASSO

" the Month *Pharmuthi*, (*April*,) between the ſecond " and third Hour; for as to the Fortune of Cities, as " well as Men, they think they have their certain Pe- " riods of time prefixt, which may be collected and " fore-known from the Poſitions of the Stars at their " Foundation." *Cicero* relates more particularly what concerns the Horoſcope of the City of *Rome*, and is in the right to laugh at it. (g) *L. quidem Taruntius Firmanus familiaris noſter, in primis Chaldaicis rationibus eruditus, urbis etiam noſtræ natalem diem repetebat ab iis Parilibus, quibus eam à Romulo conditam accepimus: Romamque in jugo quum eſſet Luna, natam eſſe dicebat, nec ejus fata canere dubitabat. O vim maximam erroris, etiam ne urbis natalis dies, ad vim ſtellarum & lunæ pertinebat! Fac in puero referre ex qua affectione cæli primum ſpiritum duxerit, num hoc in latere, aut in cæmento, ex quibus urbs effecta eſt, potuit valere?* I obſerve a notable Difference between *Cicero's* and *Plutarch's* Narratives. According to *Cicero*, *Rome* was founded on the Day of the *Palilia*, that is the 21ſt of *April*, and (h) therefore *Tarruntius* followed the common Opinion: But according to *Plutarch*, he did not follow it; for he placed the Foundation of that Town on the ninth (i) Day of an *Egyptian* Month, which Day, according to (k) ſome Learned Chronologers, anſwered the fourth of *October*. Some Chronologers (l) conjecture, that the Year which *Romulus, and the Inhabitants of* Alba, *made uſe of*, was out of order; that *the Month of* April *correſponded with the Autumn*; and that King *Numa* having given a new form to the *Roman* Year, the Feſtival of *Pales*, which was celebrated the twenty-firſt of *April*, correſponded with the Spring. According to this Conjecture, it might be true at the ſame time that *Rome* was founded the twenty-firſt of *April*, of the Year of the *Albans*, and the ninth of an *Egyptian* Month, which correſponded with the Month of *October*. However, *Varro* would not have exactly followed *Tarruntius*, if he had ſaid poſitively that *Romulus* began to build *Rome* the twenty-firſt of *April*, that is, in the Spring. I further obſerve, that *Plutarch* does not ſay in what Year the City of *Rome* was founded, according to *Tarruntius*. However, 'tis ſaid that this Aſtrologer mark'd out the third Year of the ſixth Olympiad. I think this Opinion is grounded upon *Tarruntius's* placing the Conception of *Romulus* in the firſt Year of the ſecond Olympiad; and upon a Suppoſition, that, according to the common Opinion, he ſaid, that *Romulus* built the City of *Rome* at eighteen Years of Age. Beſides, 'tis ſuppoſed that *Varro* followed *Tarruntius's* Opinion; which is a further Reaſon why 'tis commonly believed, that he placed the Foundation of that Town in the third Year of the ſixth Olympiad.

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*, after many Chronological Computations, (m) aſſigned the firſt Year of the ſeventh Olympiad for the Epoch of the Foundation of *Rome*: And therefore Father *Labbe* expreſſes himſelf very ill, when he ſays, (n), that *ſome aſcribe* that Epoch *to Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*. An eminent Divine (o) tells us, that *he was followed* therein *by* Tarruntius *and* Velleius Paterculus; but *Varro*, adds he, pitched upon an Epoch later than that by two Years, *viz.* the fourth Year of the ſeventh Olympiad. He'll give me leave to obſerve three or four things. I. *Tarruntius* wrote before *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*; for *Cicero* ſpeaks of the Horoſcope of *Rome* in ſuch a manner as ſhews that *Tarruntius* was already dead; and we know that *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* (a) went about his Hiſtory after he had been twenty Years at *Rome*: but he came thither ſoon after the entire Defeat of *Mark Antony*. II. *Tarruntius's* Opinion does not agree with that of *Dionyſius*; for, as we have already ſeen, he placed the Foundation of *Rome* in the third Year of the ſixth Olympiad. III. *Velleius Paterculus* (b) places it in the ſame Year; and therefore is of a different Opinion from *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*. IV. The moſt Learned Chronologers ſay, that *Varro's* and *Tarruntius's* Hypotheſes are the ſame, and therefore *Varro's* Epoch is not later by two (c) Years than that of *Dionyſius*.

(B) *There are very few Aſtrologers, who pretend . . . by knowing, &c.*] I don't underſtand how M. *Dacier* could ſay, (d) that *the ſureſt way is to draw up Retrograde Horoſcopes; for an Aſtrologer may boldly infer from known Actions the time of one's Conception and Birth. Who will contradict him?* I anſwer, that there is nothing more eaſy than to contradict him. In moſt Families the Birth-Day of each Perſon is well known; and as for Men of Note, one may eaſily come to the Knowledge of it, by conſulting the publick Monuments. So that a miſtaken Aſtrologer would be quickly convicted of his Over-ſight; which is the Reaſon why thoſe Cheats will not venture upon it. They may ſafely determine at what Hour a modern King was born, for they know it and may read it in Hiſtory; and therefore they are not conſulted about ſuch Things. I ſhall occaſionally take notice of a Miſtake of *Amyot*, which M. *Dacier* has not avoided. *Plutarch* ſays there was an Eclipſe of the Sun on the Day that *Rome* began to be built. (e) Σύνοδον ἐκλειπτικὴν ἐν αὐτῇ γενέσθαι σελήνης πρὸς ἥλιον. *Xylander* is wrong in tranſlating thoſe Greek Words thus: *quo ſubiens ſolis orbem luna defecit*. *Amyot* has not been more ſucceſsful, *on which* Day, ſays he, *there was an Eclipſe of the Moon*. M. *Dacier* renders it, *and that there was an Eclipſe of the Moon*. There is no Obſcurity in the Original, which is to be underſtood of a Conjunction of the Sun and Moon; at which time the Moon cannot be Eclipſed. An Obſervation ſhould have been made upon the Parentheſis, immediately following the Greek Words, juſt now quoted out of *Plutarch*. That Parentheſis runs thus: (ἣν ἔτει τρίτῳ τῆς ἕκτης ὀλυμπιάδος συμπεσοῦσαν εἰδέναι καὶ Ἀντίμαχον οἴονται τὸν Τήϊον ἐποποιὸν,) that is, 'tis thought, that the Poet *Antimachus*, a Native of the Iſle of *Peos*, ſaw that Eclipſe of the Sun, which happen'd in the third Year of the ſixth Olympiad. The whole Note of M. *Dacier* (f) amounts to this, that the Poet *Antimachus*, mention'd by *Plutarch*, is the *ſame, whom others will have to be a* Clarian *or a* Colophonian, *and who lived in* Plato's *time*. If this Note was right, *Plutarch* would have been groſly miſtaken; for how could *Antimachus*, contemporary with *Plato*, obſerve an Eclipſe ſo long before he was born? That Hiſtorian could not be juſtified but by ſuppoſing that he mentions an *Antimachus* different from him, who was Contemporary with *Plato*; or that the only meaning of his Parentheſis is, that *Antimachus*, Contemporary with *Plato*, ſpeaks of an Eclipſe, which is the ſame with that of the third Year of the ſixth Olympiad. 'Tis certain this is not the ſenſe of his Greek Words. Perhaps it had been better for Father *Labbe* to cenſure *Plutarch* upon this account, than upon ſome other things. He (g) obſerves, after *Petavius*, that *not only in the Month* Pharumthi, *but alſo in the whole* Julian *Year* 3961 *of the* Julian *Period there was no Eclipſe of the Sun, that might have been obſerv'd in* Aſia, *and leſs ſtill in* Italy, *by that Poet*, Antimachus *of* Teos. And then he adds: " *Plutarch* is miſtaken in this; for having ſaid that " *Tarruntius* affirm'd that *Rome* was built when the " Sun and Moon were in conjunction, he adds, of " his own Head, that that New Moon was truly E- " cliptick." This Cenſure is falſe in ſome reſpects; for *Plutarch* does not ſay, that *Tarruntius* affirm'd that the Sun was eclipſed on the Day of the Foundation of *Rome*. *Tarruntius* ſays this only of the Day of *Romulus's* Conception. And therefore (h) *Petavius* ſhould not have affirm'd, that *Tarruntius* ſaid ſo both with reſpect to that Day, and that of the Foundation of *Rome*.

(C) *There is good reaſon to believe that he was quoted by* Pliny.] There is in moſt Editions, (i) *L. Arruntio qui Græce de aſtris ſcripſit, Cæſare dictatore qui item.* Which might make one think that *Pliny* ſpeaks of *Arruntius*, a celebrated Hiſtorian; but becauſe there is in the beſt Manuſcripts, *L. Taruntio*, 'tis eaſie to gueſs at the true reading; which is,

Dacier
Month
mou-
an ye-
the
th of
. But
vius is
diffe-
rent.
See
next
tion.
) Peta-
in ra-
ario
porum
2. lib.
p. 2.
m. 157.
See Fa-
Lab-
French
nology
1. in
Intro-
ion. ch.
5.
) Dionyſ.
lic. lib.
m. 60.
) Labbe,
ſupra
) Jaque
de
iſtence
Dieu
11.
) Dionyſ.
licarn.
1. pag.
6.
) Sexta
mpia-
poſt
s & vi.
an-
quam
ma
ſtituta
at Ro-
lus . . .
mam
em
ilibus
Palatio
didit.
. Pa-
cul. lib.
c. 8.

(c) *M. Jaquelot ſhould have ſaid three Years.*

(d) Dacier *Remarks upon the Life of Romulus pag. m.* 178.

(e) *Plutarch. in Romulo pag.* 24.

(f) Dacier *ubi ſupra pag.* 178.

(g) *Labbe, ubi ſupra n.* 6.

(h) *See his Rationarium temporum parte* 2. *lib.* 3. *c.* 2. *p. m.* 159. *where he refers to the* 48*th Chapter of the* 9*th Book of his Work* de doctrina temporum.

(i) *Plin. lib.* 1. *in indice autorum lib.* 18.

TASSO (TORQUATO) an Italian Poet, and one of the greateſt Wits of the XVIth Century. *See his Life written by the Abbot Decharnes.* 'Tis a very curious * Piece, and it may be eaſily had. I have obſerved many Faults committed by ſeveral Authors who ſpeak of that Poet. You will find an Abridgment of his Life prefixed to his Moral Treatiſes, tranſlated into † *French* by *Francis Baudoin.*

TAVERNIER (JOHN BAPTIST) Baron (A) d'Aubonne, one of the greateſt Travellers of the XVIIth Century, was born at *Paris* β in the Year 1605. His natural Inclination to travel did very much increaſe, by what he daily ſaw (B) and heard in his Father's Houſe. He began ſo early to ſatisfie his Curioſity in that reſpect, γ that *at twenty-two Years of Age he had ſeen the fineſt Countries in Europe, France, England, the Netherlands, Swiſſerland, Poland, Hungary, and Italy. He travell'd ſix times* δ *in Turkey, Perſia, and the Eaſt-Indies, during the ſpace of forty Years, and ſteered his Courſe all manner of ways.* He was making a ſeventh Voyage when he ‡ died at *Moſcow* in *July* 1689. He got a great Eſtate by dealing in Jewels; and yet he found himſelf in low Circumſtances towards the latter end of his Life, by reaſon of the Miſdemeanour of one of his Nephews +, who had in the *Levant* the direction of a Cargo made in *France*, amounting to two hundred twenty-two thouſand Livres; which ſhould have brought in above a Million of Livres. 'Tis thought he undertook his laſt Voyage in hopes of making up that loſs. He had collected a great many ‡ Obſervations; but he could neither ſpeak nor write good *French*, and his (C) Relations were drawn up by another Hand. In one of 'em he ſpeaks very

is, *Lucio Tarruntio.* (k) There is a quite contrary Miſtake in *Solinus*'s Manuſcripts, where we find *L. Aruntius* inſtead of *L. Tarruntius* (l); for 'tis plain *Solinus* meant the Mathematician, who drew up the Horoſcope of *Rome* at *Varro*'s requeſt. (m) *Ibi Romulus manſitavit qui auſpicato fundamenta murorum jecit duodeviginti natus annos undecimo Kalendas Majas hora poſt ſecundam ante tertiam plenam: ſicut Lucius Tarruntius prodidit Mathematicorum nobiliſſimus.* Note, that *Pliny* places our *Tarruntius* before *Cæſar*; which confirms what I have ſaid, that this Aſtrologer lived before *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus.*

(A) *Baron* d'Aubonne.] Being made Noble by the King of *France*, he bought that Barony, ſituated in that part of the Canton of *Bern* call'd *le pais de Vaud*, near the Lake of *Geneva*. He was obliged to part with it, either to pay his Debts, or to make the neceſſary Preparations for his laſt Voyage into the *Eaſt Indies.* M. du (n) *Queſne* bought it, and retired thither after the Revocation of the Edict of *Nantes.* He is ſtill in poſſeſſion of it, preferring that Retirement to the great Employments he might have pretended to by changing his Religion.

(B) *By what he daily ſaw and heard in his Father's Houſe.*] His Father, a Native of *Antwerp*, ſettled at *Paris*, where he dealt in Geographical Maps. The Curious, who bought 'em of him every day, uſed to diſcourſe very much of Foreign Countries. Thoſe frequent Diſcourſes, and the ſight of ſo many Maps, raiſed in young *Tavernier* a greater Deſire of travelling.

(C) *His Relations were drawn up by another Hand.*] They came out (a) in two Volumes in the Year 1679, and contain his ſix Voyages. He publiſh'd (b) afterwards a Relation of the Inſide of the *Seraglio*, and ſome particular Tracts, *viz.* A Relation of *Japan* and the Kingdom of *Tunquin*; the Hiſtory of the Conduct of the *Dutch* in *Aſia, &c.* 'Tis in this laſt Tract that he violently inveighs againſt the Directors of the *Eaſt-India* Company: And 'tis reaſonable to obſerve, that he declares at the very beginning, that he (c) *does not blame the Conduct of the* Dutch *in general*; on the contrary he commends them very much. *What I ſay,* adds he, *does not concern the* States-General, *for whom I have a due reſpect: I ſpeak only of private Men, for whom I am not obliged to have any regard, ſince they have been ſo unjuſt to me upon ſeveral occaſions.* If the Reader deſires to know who put his Memoirs into order, he needs only read the following Words of M. *Chappuzeau.* " (d) At his Return in the Year 1668, having a great Eſtate, he (e) thought fit to buy the " Barony *d'Aubonne* in the Canton of *Bern*: To that " end he came to *Geneva*, and lodged for ſome time " in my Houſe. Our Friendſhip was then renewed, " but upon a very heavy condition; which was, to " give a Form to his Chaos, as you rightly call the " confuſed Memoirs of his Voyage; part of which " he had from one Father *Raphael* a Capuchin, " who had been a long time at *Iſpahan.* I put him " off above two Years, and he hoped all the time " that I would write for him; but at laſt his Patience was tired out. I happened to be at *Paris*, " whither I went upon private occaſions: and tho' " I was never ſo unwilling to grant him his requeſt, " having many reaſons for not doing it, as ſeveral of " my Friends knew, he at laſt found out the way of " engaging me in that Work by a Superior Power. To that end he applied himſelf to the firſt " Preſident *de Lamoignon*, who having ſpoke to the " King about it, as he gave me to underſtand, " told me, that His Majeſty deſired to ſee *Tavernier*'s Voyages; and that, ſince that Traveller " could not find any Body but me that he liked " for ſuch a Work, I ſhould not put it off any " longer. M. *de Lamoignon*, and M. *de Baville* his " Son, loved to hear him tell Stories of his Voyages; " and the firſt being beſides curious of Medals, had " received many from *Tavernier*, as the latter often " told me, which obliged him in Gratitude to eſpouſe his Intereſt. Thus, Sir, if you knew how " much I was mortified and vexed above a Year " that this wretched Work laſted, by the Bluntneſs " of the Husband, and the ridiculous Humour of " the Wife, doubtleſs you would not have been ſo " cruel as to inſult me about a thing which I did " againſt my Will, and without any Profit. This " is what many honeſt Men may ſtill witneſs. Beſides, I muſt acquaint you, Sir, that when I came " to that part of his Voyages, relating to the Conduct of the *Dutch* in *Aſia*, the Friends to whom " M. *Tavernier* communicated his Memoirs, (which " he had moſt of 'em in his Head, and dictated to " me in bad *French*, having nothing in Writing but " what he had from the Capuchin,) did whatever " they could to diſſuade him from harping upon " that String. I did the ſame, and when I ſaw that " neither they nor I could prevail upon that Man, " whom you have well deſcribed, I told him plainly, that he might look for ſome Body elſe to " write down ſuch a Diſcourſe. Having twenty " Years ago beſtowed great Encomiums upon the " *Dutch* Nation, no leſs out of a Senſe of Gratitude, " than out of Juſtice, in the firſt Volume of my " *Europe vivante*, which has been printed twice " in *French*, and tranſlated into the *German* " Language: I ſay, after ſuch Encomiums, ſo ſincere and ſo well-grounded, ſhould I have been " ſo baſe as to contradict my ſelf, and be guilty of " ſuch a ſhameful Complaiſance? Upon my Refuſal, " which occaſion'd our falling out for ſome Days, and " was

---

* *Printed at Paris in the Year 1690, and reprinted in Holland. See the Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans for December 1690, pag. 160.*

† *They were printed at Paris in the Year 1632, in 8vo.*

β *It appears from his Cutt, prefixed to the firſt Vol. of his Travels, that he was 74 Years old in 1679.*

γ Tavernier's *Preface to the firſt Vol. of his Travels.*

δ *See the Title of the ſame Volume.*

‡ Mercure Galant *for* February 1690. *The Author is miſtaken, when he ſays that* Tavernier *was* 89 *years old in* July 1689.

+ *Ibid.*

‡ *Some of which are meer Stories, which they made him believe to laugh at his Simplicity. See Doctor* Gio. Franceſco Gemelli Careri, *pag.* 138, 139, *of the* 2d *Tom. of his* Giro del Mondo, *printed at* Naples *in the Year* 1699. *in* 12°.

(k) *See Voſſius de ſcient. Mathem. pag.* 447.

(l) *See ib. See alſo Salmaſ. in Solin. pag.* 15.

(m) *Solin. cap.* 1. *pag.* 2. *edit. Salmaſ.*

(n) *Eldeſt Son to M.* du Queſne, *the greateſt Seaman that ever was in* France.

(a) *At* Paris *in* 4°. *they have been reprinted in* Holland *in* 12°.

(b) *At* Paris *in* 4°. *in the Year* 1681. *reprinted* in Holland, *in* 12°.

(c) *Tavernier, Hiſtoire de la conduite des Hollandois en Aſie, chap.* 1. *pag.* 241. *of the* 3d. *Volume of his Relations,* Dutch *Edition.*

(d) *Defenſe du Sr. Samuel Chappuzeau contre une ſatire intitulée l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud, pag.* 7.

(e) Tha

very ill of the Dutch †. *In some others he shews himself a (C Δ) down-right Plagiary. He was strangely abused in a Book entitled L' Esprit de Mr. Arnauld: And 'tis thought he would have made his Application to the Civil or Ecclesiastical Courts of Holland, in order to have satisfaction for that Affront, had he not considered that his Adversary would alledge in his Vindication that he had revenged the Country and Religion. Those, who approved this Reason of his Patience, wondred that he did (D) not pay some Author to revenge him. M. Chappuzeau, who was abused in the same Book upon his Account, has not (E) been altogether silent.*

TAULERUS

" was like to set us at Variance for ever, M. *Tavernier* made his Application to M. *de la Chapelle*, Secretary to M. *de Lamoignon*. That Secretary " undertook to write for him; and 'tis he, who, " after my Return to *Geneva*, wrote the third Volume of *Tavernier's* Relations, which contains the " History of *Japan*, and wherein, out of Imprudence or Malice he brings in a Protestant " speaking like a Roman Catholick. I can easily " prove that I was at *Geneva* with my Family, and " not at *Paris*, when that Volume was written and " printed."

It will not be improper to acquaint the Reader, that the Jesuits complain'd *(f)* of *Tavernier's* Relations. See what Mr. *Arnauld* answered to them *(g)*.

(C Δ) *He shews himself a down-right Plagiary.*] Dr. *Hyde* having quoted a long Passage of the Relation of that Author informs us, (†) that *Tavernier* took it, like a down-right Plagiary, out of a Book printed at *Lyons*, in the Year 1671, in 8vo. and written by a Man, who had been thirty Years in *Persia*. (‡) *Sciendum est Tavernierum ad instar Plagiarii hocce de Gavris paragraphum (& forte multa alia) desumpsisse ex alio Itinerario Gallico ed.* Lyons 1671, *in* 8vo. *cujus autor est P. G. D. C. i. e.* Father Gabriel de Chinon, qui 30 annos in Persia transegit.

(D) *Wondred that he did not pay some Author to revenge him.*] Though *Tavernier* had not writ the Books that came out under his Name, yet he was obliged to look upon himself as an Author, and to act accordingly against those who should criticize him. I mean, that, according to the Laws of the Commonwealth of Learning, he was only to write against those who should write against him. The Censure of a Book, is, properly speaking, an Action brought against an Author before his Judges. He is summon'd to appear before the Publick to be told that he argues wrong, or that he puts a wrong Sense upon certain Things. He is therefore cited before a Lawful Tribunal; for it belongs to the Publick to give a final Judgment about such Accusations without further Appeal. He ought not therefore to have recourse to other Judges; for if he does he plainly betrays his Weakness; he alters the usual Course of Things, and is willing to supply his want of Knowledge by the Favour he hopes to find with the Magistrates, by his many Intrigues *(b)*. But I except out of this Rule the Authors, who are wounded in their Reputation: For if a Critick is not contented to censure a Writer for a wrong Version, a false Principle, a wrong Consequence, an unfaithful Quotation, *&c.* if, besides, he reproaches him with a Blot in his Family, a Robbery, an Adultery, a State-Crime, *&c.* he may be sued before Secular Judges. The accused Person, though never so learned, and without mistrusting his Ability, may very well remove the Cause from one Tribunal to another, decline the Jurisdiction of the Publick, and have recourse to the Magistrates and the Laws establish'd by Sovereigns against Defamatory Libels. I don't say that he is obliged to have recourse to them; for he may be contented with the short way of giving the Lye, in imitation of Father *Valerian (l)*: He may with a *mentiris impudentissime*, confound his Accusers, and fully justify himself, unless they make out their Accusations. So that any Author in such a case will be accounted a publick Calumniator by all equitable Judges, if he does not clearly prove what he advances against the Honour of his Neighbour. His Silence is a full Vindication of those whom he accuses, *actore non probante absolvitur reus*. And therefore, as the Insult offered to *Tavernier* in the Book entitled, *L' Esprit de Mr.* Arnauld, went beyond a Criticism, and did very much savour of a Defamatory Libel, that Author might have made his Application for Redress to the Magistrates or Consistories. *He was not necessarily obliged to it, but he might have done it without breaking the Rules which a criticized Author ought to observe.* He made a Noise *(k)* in the Taverns and Streets, he threatned, and even named the Day and Hour when he would go to the *Wallon* Consistory of *Rotterdam*, to demand that the Canonical Laws shou'd be executed against the Minister who had dishonoured him: But his Threatnings came to nothing; he retired peaceably, and did not prosecute his Adversary. And indeed, it had been a difficult thing for him to obtain the Satisfaction he desired, whether we consider M. *Jurieu's* great Interest, or the Pretence he might have alledged in his Vindication. He would, undoubtedly, have exaggerated the injurious Reflections contain'd in the Tract concerning the Conduct of the *Dutch*. This Circumstance would have made his Cause less odious, though judicious Men know what difference there is between an Author who reflects upon the *Dutch* in general, or the Supreme Power of the Seven United Provinces, and an Author who blames the Conduct of some few *Dutch*-Men, trading in another World, Two Thousand Leagues from their Masters. *Tavernier* did only *(a)* the last of these two Things; and therefore the Fits and Spurts of the Author of *L' Esprit de Mr.* Arnauld, against that famous Traveller, were scarce approved by any Body. How comes the Writer of that *Satyr* to meddle with such a thing? said most People; who required it at his Hands? Had he a Special Commission to answer? If he undertook to do it of his own Motion, why didn't he confute *Tavernier*, instead of heaping up personal Injuries? What is most strange, is, that what he says of the *Dutch* in a few Words, is scarce less scandalous than *Tavernier's* Account, as M. *Chappuzeau (b)* has made it appear. 'Tis to be observed, that *Tavernier* being in *Holland* since the Publication of his third Volume, met with a very civil Usage. See what M. *Leti (c)* says upon it; the thing is curious enough. See also the *(d) Entretiens sur la Cabale chimerique*, concerning this Question, whether *Tavernier* was a patient Man

But if he may be excused for not prosecuting the Author of *L' Esprit de Mr.* Arnauld, before Civil or Ecclesiastical Judges, one cannot but wonder that he did not make use of another Hand to vindicate himself, since he was not able to write three Lines without frightful Barbarisms. For ten Pistoles he might have found a Man, who would have revenged him to the full. No Book was ever more liable to Censure than *L' Esprit de Mr.* Arnauld, and the Author of it might have been easily confounded: And yet that Work has not been answered; which is an Instance of Impunity that never was, and perhaps will never be seen. Many curious Things might be said upon this Subject: I had a Mind to dwell upon it; but the remaining Sheets of this Volume are too few in proportion to the Materials more important still, which I would make use of; and part of which I am obliged to lay by till another time for want of room. I therefore suppress whatever I had collected concerning this Article.

(E) *M.* Chappuzeau .... *has not been altogether silent.*] He was defamed in a most bloody and cruel manner in the Book entitled, *L' Esprit de Mr.* Arnauld, and yet he made no answer for the space of seven Years, though he might have said very good things in his Vindication, as he made it appear at last in 1693 by two Letters *(e)* publish'd at the *Hague*, and written *to the Sieur* Peter Jurieu *the Author of the Libel*: He proves him guilty of many Falsities; and though he is pretty sharp upon him, he keeps within the Bounds of Moderation: Nay, he represents to him the Gospel-Duties in a charitable and Christian-like manner. In a word, one would think that he is an honest Minister, not in

---

† *See the Remark C.*

(f) *In the*
d Volume
the De-
nse des
uveaux
rétiens.

) At the
d of the
d Vo-
e of the
rale
tique.

) Hyde
Religi-
vete-
m Per-
um in
pendi-
pag.
5. &

) Id. ib.
545.

) See the
marks
the Ar-
le Tho-
s.

) See the
ticle
gni.

(k) *See the* Entretiens sur la Cabale Chimerique, *pag.* 202. *& seq.*

(a) *See above, Remark C. Letter c.*

(b) *Chappuzeau, ubi supra, pag.* 8.

(c) *In his Differtation prefixed to* la Monarchia Universale del Re Luigi XIV *printed at* Amsterdam 1689.

(d) *Pag.* 201, *& seq.*

(e) *These two Letters contain but ten Pages in* 4°. *with two Columns. I have set down above the Title of those Letters.*

TAULERUS (JOHN) a famous Author among the mystical Votaries, flourished in the XIVth Century. The Year and the Place of his Birth are not known: For those who say that he was born at *Cologne* could not prove it; but we know that he was a Native of *Germany*. He turn'd *Dominican*, and made a great Progress in School-Philosophy and School-Divinity; but he applied himself particularly to Mystical-Divinity: And because he was thought to be gratified with Divine Revelations, he was firnamed the *Inlightened Divine*. He was endowed with great Talents for Preaching, and no Preacher in his Time was more resorted to than he. He reproved with great Zeal and Freedom every Body's Faults, whereby he became odious to some Monks, whose Persecutions he bore patiently and courageously. He submitted with the same Patience and Constancy to the Trials which God brought him under for the Space of two Years, though they were so great that his very Friends look'd upon him as a ridiculous Object. 'Tis thought he was thus visited by God, lest he should be puffed up with the extraordinary Gifts Heaven had bestowed upon him. *Cologne* and *Strasburg* are the chief Towns where he preached. He died in the last after a long Sickness, where he had a decent Burial in the Academical College, near the Winter-Auditory. His Tomb is still to be seen there. If his Epitaph had been carefully read, there would not be so many different Opinions (*A*) about the Year in which he died: All Authors would be unanimous in placing it on the 17th of *May* 1361 †. He wrote (*B*) many Books about which there are different Opinions: They are blamed (*C*) by some Catholicks,

the least offended, who speaks to a Lay-Man; and not a Lay-Man offended who speaks to a Minister, by whom he has been offended.

(*A*) *So many different Opinions about the Year in which he died.*] Some (*f*) say he died in the Year 1355. Others (*g*) will have it that it was the 15th of *July* 1379. Others (*h*) think that he departed this Life in the Year 1380.

(*B*) *He wrote many Books.*] He wrote them in his Mother-Tongue: The most considerable were translated into *Latin* by *Surius*, and publish'd at *Cologne*, in the Year 1548, in the following Order. *Historia vitæ & conversionis Joannis Tauler. Conciones de Tempore. Conciones de Sanctis. De veris virtutibus, institutionibusque divinis. Epistola devotionem, divinumque amorem spirantes. Prophetia de plagis nostri temporis. Cantica quædam spiritualia animæ Deum impendio amantis. De novem rupibus sive gradibus Christianæ perfectionis. Speculum lucidissimum & exemplar Domini nostri J. Christi. Convivium M. Eckardi jucundum & pium. Colloquium Theologi & Mendici. Oratio fidelis præparatoria ad mortem. Præparationes quatuor notabiles ad mortem felicem. Notabilis alia ad mortem felicem præparatio. De decem cæcitatibus, & quatuordecim divini amoris radicibus libellus.* 'Tis to be observed, that all the Works, whose Titles I have set down, except the Sermons, are Collections out of *Taulerus*, and intermixed with the Writings of some other Authors (*i*). 'Tis also to be observed, that the Work entitled, *Sermones quibus explanatio Evangeliorum quæ diebus Dominicis ac festis Sanctorum enarrari solent, comprehenditur*, was printed at *Augsburg*, in the Year 1508 in *Folio*, at *Basil* in 1521 and 1522 in *Folio*, at *Francfort* in 1681 in 4o. and that the *Augsburg* Edition does not contain all the Sermons that are to be found in the other Editions (*k*). Some will have it, that *Taulerus* is the Author of a Book entitled, *Theologia Germanica*, printed in 1518, 1519, 1528, 1681, &c. No Body doubts that *Sebastian Castalio*, translated it into *Latin*, under the Disguise of *Johannes Theophilus*. Many are of Opinion, that *Taulerus* is not the Author of that Book: For, say they, he is quoted in it, and the Author styles himself Priest and Warden of the Order of the Knights of the Teutonick Order, in their House of *Francfort* (*l*). *James Thomasius* (*m*) has made a Collection of many Encomiums bestowed upon that Book. But see particularly the Preface to the *French* Edition (*n*) of *Theologia Germanica*, and the Letter concerning Mystical Authors at the end of that Edition. You'll find in the Preface many Particulars concerning the Book translated into *Latin* by *Castalio*, and the following Passage may be seen in the Letter. " (*o*) *Taulerus* wrote in old *German*, which is rarely to be met with. *Surius* made a *Latin* Translation of it, printed several times at *Paris*, and " at *Cologne*, till the Year 1615, which now serves " instead of the Original. There are many *German* " Editions of it, publish'd both by the Roman Catholicks and the Protestants. The *Dutch* have also " printed it several times; but the old *Dutch* Edition of *Francfort* in 1565, is altered, as well " as that which M. *Serrarius* publish'd at *Hoorn*, " about forty Years ago, though the latter contains more Pieces of the Author than any other. " The best is that of *Antwerp* 1685: However, his " *Institutions*, his *Letters*, and his *Exercises upon the Passion*, are wanting in it; but they are to " be found by themselves, the two first with this " Title *Medulla Animæ*, of which there is an old " *French* Edition, but inferior to a new and very " fine Translation, both of his Institutions, printed " at *Paris* in 1668, and of his Exercises upon " the Passion, printed in the same Place the next " Year, with the *Exercises* of the pious *Eschius*, " upon the Purgative, Illuminative and Unitive " Life, added to it. Father *Mabillon*, in the Catalogue inserted at the end of his *Traité des Etudes Monastiques*, places *Taulerus*'s *Works* among the Spiritual Books, translated into *French*. " I never saw his *Sermons* among his Works, tho' " they are the most considerable part of 'em: And " I am sure that his Treatise *concerning the poor Life of Jesus Christ* is still less to be found there, " since it is wanting in *Surius*'s *Latin* Translation, " and is only to be had in *German* and *Dutch*."

(*C*) *They are blamed by some Catholicks, and commended by some Protestants.*] *Eccius* said that *Taulerus* was a doating Man, suspected of Heresy, and that he should not have appeared in Publick. (*a*) *Vocavit* Eccius *Taulerum* somniatorem, hæreseos arguit, & ut prorsus lateret, & nunquam in monasteria involaret *optavit*. *Blosius* did by no means approve this Censure. (*b*) Eccio *strenue se opposuit* Ludovicus Blosius *Abbas Latiensis qui Taulerum* Catholicæ fidei integerrimum cultorem *appellavit*, *dixit* ea quæ scripsit sana & plane divina esse, *optavitque in nomine domini*, *ut* Taulerus ubique gentium cognitus esset, & à pluribus diligentissime legeretur: *addit* minus circumspectum *Eccium*, *Taulerum* nondum satis à se lectum damnasse. This Judgment of *Blosius* is mention'd and approved by (*c*) *Possevin*. *Spondanus* takes *Taulerus*'s part, and says he foretold *Wickliff's* Heresies, and praises *Blosius* his Apologist. (*d*) *Cujus* (Tauleri) *extant sermones, & alii tractatus unctionem divini spiritus referentes: prædixitque hæreses contra Sacramenta & Dogmata Ecclesiæ Catholicæ brevi ab Wickliffo orituras. Contra cujus obtrectatores apologiam scripsit Ludovicus Blosius, recentior ejusdem Spiritus Sancti devotissimus discipulus.* (*e*) *Sixtus Senensis* highly commends the Devotion of our *Dominican*. I have read in *Hottinger* (*f*), that some Catholicks call *Taulerus* an Heresiarch, and say that several People doubted of his Salvation; but an Apparition removed their Doubts. *Luther* was one of those, who bestowed great Encomiums upon *Taulerus*. *Hunc doctorem*, says he (*g*), *scio quidem ignotum esse Scholis Theologorum, ideoque forte contemptibilem, sed ego plus in eo (licet totus Germanorum vernacula sit conscriptus) reperi Theologiæ solidæ & synceræ quam in universis omnium universitatum* Schola-

† *Taken from a publick Thesis maintain'd at Wittemberg the 31st of March, 1688, intitled.* Memoria Joh. Tauleri instaurata, *&c. composed by* Georgius Fridericus Heupelius, Argentoratensis.

(*f*) *Teste Spondano ad ann.* 1355. *n.* 17. *pag. m.* 534.

(*g*) *Hottinger. hist. Eccles. part.* 3. *pag.* 707.

(*h*) *Stratemannus theatr. hist. Eccles. pag.* 847. *apud Georg. Frider. Heupelium in memoria Joh. Tauleri restaurata, pag. ult.*

(*i*) *Taken from* Peter Labe differt. de scriptor. Eccles. *Tom.* 1. *pag.* 608, 609.

(*k*) *Georg. Frider. Heupelius. ubi supra, fol. B.*

(*l*) *Ex eod. ibid.*

(*m*) Thomas. Schediasm. histor. de Philosophia gentili, Gnosticorum hæresi & Theologia mystica, *pag.* 75, *apud eund. ibid.*

(*n*) Amsterdam 1700, *for* Henry Wetstein.

(*o*) *Lettre touchant les Auteurs mystiques, pag.* 12, 13.

(*a*) *Georg. Frid. Heupelius fol. B. verso. He cites* Possevin. apparat. sacr. *Tom.* 1.

(*b*) *Id. ib.*

(*c*) *Id. ib.*

(*d*) *Spond. ubi supra.*

(*e*) *Sixtus Senensis, lib.* 4. *biblioth. sanctæ, pag.* 335, *edit. Colon.* 1626. *apud Heupelium ubi supra, fol. B.* 2.

(*f*) *Hottinger, ubi supra: He cites* Baronius ann. Christ. 1355. *§.* 21, 22.

(*g*) *Luther Tom.* 1. *Latin Jenens. pag.* 85. 6. *apud Heupelium fol. B. verso.*

licks, and commended by ſome Proteſtants. It cannot be denied that he ſpoils many Readers by (*D*) leading them to Fanaticiſm. *We ſhall ſee the Character* (*E*) *which a Man well-skill'd in thoſe things gives of him.* We ſhould do him wrong, did we not diſtinguiſh him from thoſe myſtical Men, who have taught ſomething like the Errors (*F*) of the Eaſtern Philoſophers, mention'd in the Article of *Spinoza*.

TAURELLUS (NICOLAS) a Phyſician, and a Philoſopher, was born at *Montbelliard*, the 26th of *November* 1547. He was admitted Maſter of Philoſophy at *Tubingen* in the Year 1565, and when the Magiſtrates of *Nuremberg* founded an Univerſity at *Altdorf*, in the Year 1581, they made him Profeſſor of Phyſick †. He diſcharged the Duties of that place with great Ability: But becauſe he departed from the Opinions commonly received, he had ſome Enemies, and fell out with the Divines.

† *Taken from Melchior Adam, in vitis medicorum, pag.* 403.

ſticis Doctoribus repertum eſt, aut reperiri poſſit in ſuis ſententiis. He wrote the following Words to *Spalatinus*. (*h*) *Si te delectat puram ſolidam antiquæ ſimillimam Theologiam legere in Germanica lingua effuſam, Sermones Joh. Tauleri prædicatoriæ profeſſionis comparare tibi potes. Neque enim ego vel in Latina vel in noſtra lingua Theologiam vidi ſalubriorem, & cum Evangelio conſonantiorem.* *Luther's* Encomiums upon *Taulerus* have been prefixed more than once to (*i*) the Work of that Myſtical Divine. Some affect to ſay, that *Luther* commended him either before he ſet up againſt Popery, or during the firſt Years of his Reformation, and afterwards grew more reſerved in praiſing that Writer. (*k*) *Poſt illa tempora ubi B. viro datum fuit tenebras papales magis magiſque ſuperare, & negotium cum novis prophetis interceſſit in* Taulero *ejuſque Theologia commendandis cœpit eſſe parcior.* Nay, they quote a Sermon, wherein he cenſures him for a pernicious Doctrine, *viz.* that God ought not to be prayed to. (*l*) *Taulerus exemplo neſcio quo docere vult eſſe à precibus deſiſtendum: ſed hac doctrina nihil eſt pernicioſius: nimis enim ad intermittendas preces jam antea propenſi ſumus.* However it be, *Michael Neander*, *Nicolas Hunnius*, *Dorſcheus*, *Quenſtedt*, *Spener*, *Arndius* (*m*), and ſome other *Lutherans*, have beſtowed fine Encomiums upon *Taulerus*; and (*n*) *Flaccus Illyricus* places him among the Witneſſes of Truth. I ſhall conclude this Remark with the Words of a Myſtical Man. “(*o*) Every good Man that knows him muſt needs “like and approve him. Hence it is, that the “wiſeſt Proteſtants, Dr. *Arndius*, Dr. *Mullerus*, “and many others, without excepting *Luther* and “*Melanchthon*, have no leſs commended him than “the Roman Catholicks. Their Commendations “have been prefixed to the *German* Edition of his “Sermons, procured by the pious *Arndius*, and to “the Edition of all his Works, publiſh'd by the “famous Dr. *Spener*, and re-printed (1) ſeveral “times at *Francfort*.”

(*D*) *That he ſpoils many Readers, by leading them to Fanaticiſm.*] *Beza* deſpiſed him very much: *Sainte Aldegonde* look'd upon him as an Enthuſiaſt: *Voetius* took him only for a Man, who, without being a down-right Enthuſiaſt, ſaid many things that made way for the Enthuſiaſm of ſome Sectaries (*p*). Here follows a Paſſage of *Hoornbeeck*. (*q*) *Fuerunt ſub Papatu, qui vel inſcii, vel imprudentes viam multùm ſtraverunt Enthuſiaſticis illis, ſuâ Theologiâ* myſticâ, *quemadmodum loquuntur, & libellis pietatis, quibus terminis & phraſibus duris, myſticis & allegoricis, tum inſpirationis, tum deificationis, &c. utebantur, & ab aliis pro enthuſiaſmis ſuis habiti vel accepti poſtea fuerunt. Quales,* Johannes de Schoonhovia, Joh. Taulerus, *quem inter Pontificios, Eckius; inter noſtros Marnixius carpunt: defendit autem Lud. Bloſius, ſingulari pro eo apologia.* *Nicolas Hunnius*, and ſome other *Lutherans*, had the ſame Opinion of *Taulerus*. (*r*) *Ex quibus & permultis ſimilibus …. proclive eſt judicium ferre, annon* Taulerus *per ſe, minimum per accidens,* Schwenckfeldianorum, Anabaptiſtarum, & Weigelianorum figmenſis *anſam dederit.* *Heupelius*, ſo often quoted by me, brings his whole Diſputation to theſe two Propoſitions: 1. That *Taulerus* deſerves to be recommended to the Students in Divinity: 2. That he ought to be read with Caution; For, ſays he, there are ſome falſe Doctrines in his Works, and ſome Phraſes that ſeem to favour the Enthuſiaſts and Quietiſts. (*ſ*) *Quod non ſolum haud pauci in eo reperiantur errores approbati, qui in ſermonibus edit. Francof.* 1621, *&* 1681. *diligenter ſunt annotati, ſed etiam non raro dictionibus & formulis loquendi utatur, quæ videntur Enthuſiaſtis nominatim Weigelianis, & quos non ita pridem D. Michael de Molinos in Italia excluſit, Quietiſtis favere.*

(*E*) *The Character, which a Man, well-skill'd in thoſe things, gives of him.*] “(*t*) In my Opinion, “this is the Character of that Inlighten'd (*v*) Author. “That the Soul, by the Mortification of her Paſ-“ſions, and Vices, by the Practice of Virtues, and “the Abnegation of her ſelf, her Deſires, her Will, “Self-love, and her whole Activity, and that of all “Creatures, ought to return into her internal Re-“ceſs, looking for God there, and finding him at “laſt, who manifeſts himſelf there, by the Birth “of his Divine Word and the Spiration of his Holy “Spirit: And that afterwards, by a laſting and “continual Introverſion, ſhe ought to continue in “that State of Interiority, in which God may “work in her his Will, his Wonders, and his “Special Conduct; of which nevertheleſs that Au-“thor ſpeaks but generally.” Theſe are the Words of the Author of the new Edition of the *Theologia Germanica*.

(*t*) *Lettre ſur les Auteurs myſtiques, pag.* 11, 12.

(*v*) *That is,* Taulerus.

(*F*) *Something like the Errors of the Eaſtern Philoſophers.*] It is a ſurprizing thing that thoſe Myſtical Chriſtians, and thoſe Heathen Philoſophers, ſhould have had ſo exactly the ſame Notions, that one would think they had agreed among themſelves to vent the ſame Follies, ſome in the Eaſt and ſome in the Weſt. What a wonderful Agreement between People who never ſaw, and never heard of one another! I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage, whereby it will appear that ſome Myſtical Men have taught the Transformation of all Things into God, and an *Identification*, which would reduce the Creator and the Creatures to a kind of Nothingneſs, that is, to an eternal Inaction. This is very like the *Nireupan* of the *Siameſe*. Thoſe Myſtical Men ſuppoſed the Doctrine of the Trinity, and aſcribed the whole Action to the three Perſons, and ſo they believed that the Divine Eſſence did nothing; and that when the Soul is transformed into God's Eſſence, and raiſes her ſelf above the three Perſons, ſhe enjoys as great a reſt as if ſhe were annihilated. *Itaque*, ſays he (*x*), *ne quis aliquo implicetur ac ſeducatur errore, diligenter falſos hoſce Prophetas, me eos depingente, animadvertat. Qui primi generis ſunt, Dei eſſentiam ſe eſſe ajunt ſupra divinitatis perſonas, adeoque ſe eſſe ocioſos, ac ſi non eſſent: quandoquidem Dei eſſentia non agit, ſed Spiritus Sanctus operatur. Putant ergo ſe ipſo Sancto Spiritu eſſe ſuperiores, & ſe neque ipſo, neque ejus gratia habere opus: dicunt enim non modo nullam creaturam, ſed nec ipſum quidem Deum quicquam eis vel conferre vel auferre poſſe. Quidam etiam ejus ſunt ſententia, ut animas ſuas ex Dei ſubſtantia creatas affirment, cumque mortui fuerint, rurſum ſe futuros eſſe id quod antea fuerant: perindè ut ſcyphus aqua hauſtus ex fonte, ſi in ipſum fontem refundatur, idem eſt quod fuit prius. Ajunt præterea, ſi quis per cœlum omne pervagetur, nullum eum neque angelorum neque animarum, neque ordinum, neque gloriæ, neque præmiorum diſcrimen diſtinctionemque reperturum; ſi quidem nihil illic, niſi ſimplicem quandam beatamque eſſentiam, omni actione vacantem, eſſe arbitrantur: Addunt his, poſt extremum judicii diem omnes omnino homines, malos æque ac bonos, & ſimul Deum ipſum, non niſi unam eandemque Dei eſſentiam, quæ in omnem æternitatem abſque ulla actione ſemper ocio vacatura ſit, eſſe futuros. Atque eam ob rem nihil neque ſcire, neque cognoſcere, neque velle, nec amare, nec cogitare, non gratias agere, non laudare, ſed nec deſiderare, nec habere volunt. Nam ſupra Deum & ſine Deo eſſe, nec in ulla re Deum quærere nec invenire, atque demum ab omnibus prorſus immunes*

(*x*) *Ruyſbrochius in libro de vera contemplatione, cap.* 19. *pag.* 445. *apud Giſb. Voetium in exercitiis pietatis cap.* 3. *pag.* 86.

Divines. Those of *Heidelberg* cried him down as (*A*) an Atheiſt. He β died at *Altdorf* in *September* 1606. It was a time of Peſtilence; and as ſoon as γ he ſaw that one of his Servant-Maids had got the Plague, he left his Houſe in the Night time, but came Home again ſoon after, and died the ſame Day. He publiſh'd ſome Books which made (*B*) a Noiſe.

He was a little Man; hence it was that a Poet, alluding to the Word *Taurellus*, a Diminutive of *Taurus*, beſtowed this Encomium upon him; *Corpore Taurellus, Taurus et ingenio.* 'Tis one of the Verſes of an Elegy, that was made in his Praiſe when he was admitted Doctor of Phyſick in the Univerſity of *Basil* δ.

TECMESSA, the Daughter of a *Phrygian* (*A*) Prince, was made a Priſoner when the *Grecians* laid waſte all the Countries adjacent to *Troy*. *Ajax* liked her ſo well that he made a Concubine of her. She forgot, by Degrees, the Fall of her Family, and conceived ſuch an Affection for *Ajax*, who promiſed to * make her a Queen, that ſhe was extremely (*B*) afflicted at his Death. He had by her a Son call'd *Euryſaces*, who reigned in *Salamis*, after the Deceaſe of *Telamon*, *Ajax's* Father. *Teucer*, the ſecond Son of *Telamon*, had a Mind to return into *Salamis*, after he had ſettled in the Iſle of *Cyprus*; but † *Euryſaces* hinder'd him. The *Athenians* had a particular Veneration for *Ajax* and his Son. *Pauſanias* ſays ‡, that the Honours, which had been decreed to them, continued in his time, and that the Altar of *Euryſaces* was ſtill to be ſeen at *Athens*. I find nothing concerning the other Son of *Ajax*, mention'd by β *Dictys Cretenſis*, whom he calls *Aiantides*. His Mother's Name was *Glauca*. He was put into *Teucer's* Hands, as well as *Euryſaces*, when

β Id. ib.

γ Paulus Freherus in Theatro virorum illuſtrium, pag. 1320.

δ Taken from Scioppius in Scaligero hypobol. fol. 198, verſo.

* Quintus Calaber, l. 5. v. 548.

† Juſtin. l. 44. c. 3.

‡ Lib. 1. pag. 33.

β Dictys. Cret. lib. 5. See hereafter the Remark C.

immunes eſſe volunt. Et hoc ipſi perfectam appellant ſpiritûs paupertatem. Verum ejuſcemodi paupertas in cælo minimè invenitur neque in Deo, neque in angelis, neque in ſanctis, ſed nec in hominibus bonis toto orbe terrarum. Itaque non niſi diabolica & tartarea paupertas eſt. Our *Taulerus* was never like thoſe doating Men, and very ſolidly confutes thoſe who fancy they are only a meer Paſſive Inſtrument in God's Hands (*a*).

(*A*) *Cried him down as an Atheiſt.*] *Voetius* tells us what was the Occaſion of it. This Queſtion being put to him: (*b*) *Cur* Theologi Heidelbergenſes *ante annos aliquot* Nicol. Taurellum *philoſophum non ignobilem dixerint Atheum Medicum, in* (*c*) literis ad Deputatos Synodi Holland. ſuper libro & cauſâ Conr. Vorſtii perſcriptis? *Et an non falcem miſerint in alienam meſſem, & indignè traduxerint iſtius aliorumque ſimilium magnorum virorum inventa ad illuſtrandam & perficiendam philoſophiam?* He anſwers it thus: *Arbitror eos reſpexiſſe paradoxa non pauca quæ imprimis* compendio Metaphyſico, *&* Triumpho Philoſophiæ *inſpargit; & ad divina ac Thelogica paſſim applicat: quibus limites communes hodierno Chriſtianiſmo Theologiæ tranſiliri, & dogmata nonnulla conquaſſari, atque adeo Scepticis, Libertinis, aliiſque fanaticis & ſecundi generis Atheis cauſam nimis tradi non immeritò metuendum eſt. De intentione illius viri nolumus judicare, nec cætera ejus inquirimus. Aliter etiam judicamus de ingenioſis ipſius* diſputationibus, in naturalibus *contra Piccolomineum, Cæſalpinum, aliosque phyſicos: ubi omnem libertatem Socraticam tollere nolimus: nec Theologici hoc fori eſt, ſed medici, phyſici, mathematici: quomodo vice verſa, metaphyſica, pneumatologica, & theologica naturalia non tam, nedum ſolius, phyſico-medici & mathematici fori ſunt, quam theologici. Videant ergo juniores, ut cum judicio legant philoſophemata ejus, quæ naturalia tranſcendunt.* Though that famous Author does not plainly condemn the *Heidelberg* Divines, he gives us ground to believe that they were too haſty. Such Accuſations ought not to be ſo common. It appears, on the other hand, that he does juſtice to that Profeſſor, who was certainly a Man of great Parts, and a ſubtil Diſputant. I have quoted in (*d*) another place a Paſſage, wherein 'tis ſaid, that the ſame Divine charged him with Atheiſm: But I muſt obſerve here, that he call'd him only an Aſſertor of Paradoxes, (*e*) *Aſſertio παραδοξολογίας Taurelli.*

(*B*) *He publiſh'd ſome Books.*] A Method of Prognoſtications, relating to Phyſick; Notes upon the Works of *Arnaldus à Villanova*: *Diſcuſſiones Phyſicæ de mundo contra Piccolomineum*: *Diſcuſſiones Phyſicæ & Metaphyſicæ de cælo adverſus eundem*: *Alpes cæſæ*, 'tis a Book againſt *Cæſalpinus*: *de infiniti continui ſectione*: *de rerum æternitate.* I have quoted (*f*) in another place a Book, wherein he has a particular Opinion, concerning the Souls of Beaſts. See the Titles inſerted in a Paſſage out of *Voetius*, in the foregoing Remark.

He had begun a Book *de Uſiis per ſe ſubſiſtentibus*, ſome Pieces whereof were Printed after his Death, with a new Edition of the Tract *de Cælo & Mundo*. *Picart* his Collegue, took care of that Edition at *Amberg*, in 1611, in 8vo. It appears from theſe Fragments that *Taurellus* underſtood very well the Nature of Subſtance, and wherein it is diſtinguiſh'd from Accidents. 'Tis ſomewhat ſtrange that the Liberty he took to confute *Ariſtotle* ſhould have made him ſo odious to the Divines: For he chiefly confuted the Doctrines of *Ariſtotle* that are contrary to Religion. This one may ſee particularly in a Book of his, printed at *Marpurg*, in 1604, in 8vo. and intitled, *De Rerum æternitate: Nicolai Taurelli Mutbelgardenſis, Med. & Phyſices in Altdorffenſi Noricorum Academia Profeſſoris, Metaphyſices Univerſalis partes quatuor. In quibus placita Ariſtotelis, Valleſii, Piccolominei, Cæſalpini, Societatis Conimbricenſis, aliorumque diſcutiuntur, examinantur atque refutantur.* He therein clearly and ſolidly confutes *Ariſtotle's* Opinion, concerning the Eternity of the World. He was certainly one of the beſt Metaphyſicians of that time.

(*A*) *Daughter of a* Phrygian *Prince.*] *Dictys Cretenſis* (*g*) calls him *Teuthrantes*, and ſays, that *Ajax* kill'd him *ſolitario certamine.* Every Body will tranſlate theſe Words as he thinks fit, and perhaps ſome Readers will underſtand 'em of a Duel. Afterwards *Ajax* took, plunder'd and burnt the Town of that *Phrygian*, whoſe Daughter *Tecmeſſa* was carried away, with the reſt of the Booty, and adjudged to *Ajax*, when the Booty was divided. *Poſt paucos dies expugnata atque incenſa civitate magnam vim prædæ abſtrahit, abducens Tecmeſſam filiam regis ….. At deinde Ajaci ob egregia laborum facinora Teuthrantis filiam Tecmeſſam concedunt.* If we believe (*h*) *Horace*, the Priſoner moved *Ajax's* Heart by her Beauty. *Sophocles* (*i*) does not agree with *Dictys* in every particular: For he ſays, that *Tecmeſſa's* Father (*k*) was already dead, when his States were laid waſte by *Ajax*: and that 'twas his Widow, who was kill'd when the Town was taken. *Tecmeſſa* ſpeaks to *Ajax* in theſe Words:

> Σὺ γάρ μοι πατρίδ' ᾔστωσας δορὶ
> Καὶ μητέρ' ἀλλ' ἡ μοῖρα (*l*) τὸν φύσαντά μοι
> Καθεῖλεν ᾅδου θανασίμους οἰκήτορας.
> *Tu enim mihi patriam vaſtaſti bello,*
> *Matrem ſuſtuliſti, mors verò patrem*
> *Abripuit ad manes qui apud inferos ſunt.*

(*B*) *Extremely afflicted at his Death.*] *Sophocles* and *Quintus Calaber* bring her in, uſing very moving Expreſſions. The firſt ſuppoſes that ſhe uſed many Intreaties to prevent his killing himſelf; and that ſhe begg'd of him not to leave her expoſed to a Thouſand Misfortunes by his Death, putting him (*m*) in mind of the Pleaſures he had enjoy'd by her.

> Ἀνδρί τοι χρεὼν
> Μνήμην προσεῖναι, τερπνὸν εἴ τί που πάθοι.
> *Decet enim virum*
> *Memorem eſſe, ſi quid illi ſuave accidit.*

The

(*a*) *See the Paſſage of* Taulerus, *quoted by* Voetius, *ubi ſupra. p.* 78, 79.

(*b*) *Giſb. Voetius, diſput. ſelect. Tom.* 1. *pag.* 200.

(*c*) *That Letter is dated from* Heidelberg, *the* 26th *of* Auguſt 1610. *'Tis the* 149 *among thoſe publiſh'd by the Remonſtrants in the Edition of the Year* 1684.

(*d*) *In the Article of* Gorlæus.

(*e*) Voetius in Theologico philoſophicis Corollariis.

(*f*) *In the Article* Sennertus.

(*g*) Lib.

(*h*)

4. l. 2.

(*i*) In *Ajax.*

(*k*)

(*l*)

(*m*)

Ajax. l. 4. v. 517.

when the *Grecians* took Shipping in order to go Home γ. Some said δ, that *Teucer* grew angry with *Telamon*, because he did not bring back with him *Tecmessa* and *Eurysaces*. He went on Board a Ship which made more haste than the rest. *Pausanias* observes ζ, that *Ajax*'s Posterity was not very illustrious, and the private Life of *Ajax* is the Reason he gives for it; which, I think, is a (C) wrong one. In my Opinion, *Lescaloperius* should not have said, that *Julius Cæsar* writ a Tragedy (D) intitled, *Tecmessa*.

TELAMON, the Son of *Æacus* (A) and *Endeis*, is one of the principal Heroes of the fabulous History. He had two Brothers, *viz.* *Peleus* and *Phocus*; but the latter η was his Brother only by the Father's side. There arose such a Jealousy between *Phocus* and the two others, that the latter plotted to kill him. They took their Time as they were playing together at Quoits. Some θ say, that *Peleus* kill'd *Phocus*, by throwing his Quoit at his Head; others say ι *Telamon* did it: and 'tis generally agreed that he who did not kill him, was nevertheless κ an Acomplice in that Action. *Æacus* (B) thought so, for he turn'd out μ *Peleus*, as well as *Telamon*. The latter retired into the Isle of *Salamis*, where *Cychreus* reigned, who * married him to his Daughter *Glauca*, and made him his Successor. Others say, that † having no Children he appointed *Telamon* for his Heir. What is certain, is, that *Telamon* reigned in the Isle of *Salamis*. *Glauca* being dead, he married (C) *Periboea*, the

γ *Dictys, ubi.*

δ *Read Servium in Æn. l. 1. v. 619. where instead of* Theomissam *read* Tecmessam, *and instead of* Turisacen *read* Eurysacen.

ζ *Lib. 1. pag. 71.*

η *Apollodor. l. 3. p. m. 240.*

θ *Pausanias, lib. 2. pag. 72.* Note, *That according to* Diodorus Siculus, Peleus *did it out of Inadvertency.*

ι *Apollod. ib. Plutarch. in Parall. c. 25.*

κ *Appollodor. ibid.*

μ *He reign'd in the Isle of* Ægina.

* *Diodor. Sical. l. 6. c. 10.*

† *Apollod. ibid.*

The Scholiast observes upon this, that *Tecmessa* (a) puts *Ajax* in Mind of what had pass'd in their Bed; and that she does it modestly, and like a chaste Woman, and not so plainly as *Hecuba* in *Euripides*. Ὁ δέ γε Εὐριπίδης [illegible] εἰπὼν τὴν Ἑκάβην λέγουσαν ποιεῖ· Ποῦ τὰς φίλας δῆτ' εὐφρόνας δείξεις ἄναξ; Ἢ τῶν ἐν εὐνῇ φιλτάτων ἀσπασμάτων χάριν τίν' ἕξει παῖς ἐμή, κείνης δ' ἐγώ; *What will my Daughter get by the amorous Embraces she will afford you in her Bed?* The *French* Stage is more nice than that of *Athens*. The best Pieces of *Racine* would be hiss'd at for such a plainness.

(C) *Which, I think, is a wrong* Reason.] I will not object to *Pausanias*, that he says (b) *Ajax* succeeded his Grand Father (c) by the Mother's side, who was King of *Megara*: I am willing to grant him, that *Ajax* lived always a private Life, because he died before his Father *Telamon*: But I deny that this is the Reason why his Descendants were less illustrious than those of *Teucer*, the second Son of *Telamon*: The Posterity of *Teucer* reigned in the Isle of *Cyprus* till *Evagoras*; and therefore some Descendants of *Telamon* made a great Figure for many Ages. Why? Because *Teucer* reigned; but because *Ajax* did not reign, his Descendants were not very illustrious. This is *Pausanias*'s way of arguing. I repeat it again, this is a wrong way of reasoning; for *Eurysaces*, *Ajax*'s Son, succeeded to the Kingdom of *Salamis* after the Death of *Telamon*, as if (d) he had been a King's Son. But here is the Reason why his Descendants made no great Appearance in the World. He had a Son call'd *Philaus*, who parted with the Kingdom of *Salamis* to be made Citizen of *Athens*: This we find in *Pausanias* (e). And therefore the Posterity of *Ajax*, being divested of the Supreme Authority, could not make so great a Figure as that of the other Son of *Telamon*. They had in the Person of *Miltiades*, descended from that Son of *Eurysaces*, all the Glory that a Family, not possess'd of a Kingdom, can have; but after all, they did not sway the Scepter as *Teucer*'s Posterity did. I must observe, that *Philaus*, who, according to *Pausanias*, was *Eurysaces*'s Son, and *Ajax*'s Grand-Son, was *Ajax*'s Son, according to (f) *Herodotus*. He was, according to the same Historian, the Stock of the *Athenian Æacides*, from whom *Miltiades* descended. *Plutarch* (g) will have it, that *Phileus* and *Eurysaces*, both *Ajax*'s Sons, resign'd the Property of the Isle of *Salamis* to the *Athenians*, in order to be made Citizens of *Athens*. He adds, that *Eurysaces* made his Abode at *Brauron* in *Attica*, and *Philaus* at *Mileta* (h); and that *Philaus* gave his Name to the *Philaides*, a People of *Attica*, from whom *Pisistratus* derived his Original. *Stephanus Byzantinus* ranks the *Philaides* under the Tribe call'd *Ægeis* (i), and says, that *Philaus*, from whom that People had their Name, was the Son of *Ajax* and *Lyside*, the Daughter of *Coronus*, the Son of *Lapithus*.

(D) *A Tragedy entitled*, Tecmessa.] This Jesuit observes, that the *Romans* inserted the Vowel *u* in many *Greek* Words; which was practised to the time of *Julius Cæsar*, who was the first Author of a Tragedy intitled, *Tecmessa*. These are his Words (k). *In* Alcumena, Alcumaon, Tecumessa, Hercules, Æsculapius, *& aliis ejusmodi Græcis nominibus, vocalis u à priscis Latinis interjecta est, non tantum ubi carmen exigeret, ut ait ille; sed ubique passim, quod ita mos ferret, etiam in salutatione. Atque ille mos tenuit usque ad Julium Cæsarem, qui Tragædiam de* Tecmessa *primus scripsisse fertur, & ita pronunciari jussisse. Itaque post* Tecmessam *cæptum est dici, uti hodieque dicimus,* Alcmena, & Alcmæon*: verùm* Hercules & Æsculapius *prævaluere, & adhuc intercalariam retinent vocalem.* The Grammarian *Victorinus* was contented to say, that *Julius Cæsar* began to contract those Words. If *Lescaloperius* had read the Book of one of his Brethren, he would have found the following Passage in it. (l) *Scribit Victorinus, lib. 1. veteres nunquam c, & m conjunxisse, usque ad Julium Cæsarem, qui primus Alcmaon Alcmena, Tecmessa, quos prius Alcumenam, Tecumessam Alcumaonem scribebant.* I don't think *Suetonius* would have forgot this Dramatick Piece of *Julius Cæsar*, if it had been composed by him.

(A) *The Son of* Æacus *and* Endeis.] The Children of *Telamon* had a Divine Original upon several Accounts. *Æacus* was *Jupiter*'s Son. *Endeis* was the Daughter of the *Centaur Chiron*, Son of *Saturn*. *Periboea*, the Wife of *Telamon* and the Mother of *Ajax*, was the Daughter of *Alcathous*. The latter was the Son of *Pelops*, whose Father was *Tantalus* the Son of *Jupiter*.

(B) Æacus *thought so.*] It will not be improper to mention what *Pausanias* (m) says of it. Some time after the Flight of those two Brothers, *Telamon* sent a Deputy to *Æacus*, to assure him that the Murther had been committed out of Inadvertency. *Æacus* made Answer, that he should take care not to come into the Island; but that, if he had a Mind to justify himself, he might speak on Board a Ship, or upon a Causey made for that end. *Telamon* pitch'd upon the last Expedient, and made a Causey near the Port, where he pleaded his Cause; but not being found innocent, he retired a second time.

(C) *He married* Periboea *the Daughter of* Alcathous.] Though the Story, which *Plutarch* (n) had from *Aretades*, concerning *Telamon*, is miserably disfigured; yet one may perceive he meant that *Telamon*, having too much sported with *Periboea*, thought fit to make his escape. The Father of that young Woman, thinking that one of his Subjects had debauched her, ordered one of his Guards to throw her into the Sea. The Guard, moved with Compassion, chose rather to sell her: The Ship, on Board which she was, landed at *Salamis*, where *Telamon* bought *Periboea*, who was brought to Bed of *Ajax*. A Learned (o) Man is of Opinion, that instead of Εὔβοιαν, we ought to read Μέγαραν in that Passage of *Plutarch*, since most Authors are agreed, that *Ajax*'s Mother was the Daughter of *Alcathous*, King of *Megara*. They are not so unanimous as to the Name of that Lady: Some call (a) her *Periboea*, and others (b) *Eriboea*. 'Tis plain this Difference proceeds only from the Fault of a Transcri-

(k) *Lescaloperius, commentar. in Ciceron. de nat. Deor. l. 3. p. 624.*

(l) *Martin. del Rio Syntagmat. tragici parte ultima.* Mr. du Rondel *has acquainted me with this Passage.*

(m) *Lib. 2. pag. 72.*

(n) *In Parallelis, pag. 312. n. 27.*

(o) Meziriac *upon* Ovid's *Epistles, pag. 275.*

(a) *Apollodor. l. 3. Pausanias, l. 1. p. 15. & 40.*

(b) *Sophoc. in Ajace, Pindarus Isthm. od. 6. Diodor. Siculus, l. 4. Hyginus c. 97.*

the Daughter of *Alcathous*, Son of *Pelops*, and King of *Megara*, by whom he had (D) *Ajax* that great Warriour; of whom I speak in its proper place. We are told of a third Wife of *Telamon*, who brought him a Son call'd *Teucer*. That Wife is *Hesione* ¶, the Daughter of *Laomedon* King of *Troy*, and *Priamus*'s Sister: That Marriage happen'd in this manner. *Telamon* follow'd *Hercules*, when *Laomedon* was to be puniſh'd for refuſing to pay to *Hercules* what he had promis'd him. He was forced in his chief Town; and becauſe *Telamon* was the firſt who ſcaled the Walls of *Troy*, *Hercules* preſented him with *Heſione*. *Telamon* ſignaliz'd himſelf upon ſeveral other Occaſions in his Attendance upon that General, as in the War * with the *Amazons* and *Meropes*, and β in the Fight with the Giant *Alcyoneus*. He was one of the γ *Argonauta*, and probably 'twas only old Age that prevented his going to the Siege of *Troy*. He ſent thither his two Sons. In *Pauſanias*'s time they ſhewed ſtill near the Port of *Salamis*, the Rock on which δ he ſat, to ſee, as far as his Sight could reach, the Ship on which they went to the ζ General Meeting of the *Grecian* Fleet. He was ſtill alive when the *Grecians* return'd from *Troy*, and doubtleſs very ſorry for the Death of his Son *Ajax*; but he appear'd more diſpleaſed with *Teucer* η his other Son, for not having prevented or revenged it. He would not receive him, and ſhamefully expell'd him. It has been obſerv'd θ of him, as well as of his Brother *Peleus*, that he had a Son that ſurpaſs'd him. See what was the Fate of *Ajax*'s Deſcendants in the Article *Tecmeſſa*, and of *Teucer*'s Poſterity in the Article of that Name.

TELEBOES, a People who inhabited an Iſland near *Acarnania*, of whom perhaps no mention had been made long ago, had they not indirectly a great Relation with the Birth of *Hercules*; but by Reaſon of that Relation they are known in the loweſt Forms of the Schools. Is there any School-Boy who does not know that *Alcmena* conceived *Hercules*, whilſt *Amphytrion*, her Huſband, was making War with the *Teleboes*, &c? The Reaſon why he made War with 'em, is, that *Alcmena* had promis'd to marry the Man, who ſhould fight 'em. But in order to know why ſhe hated that People, the thing muſt be fetch'd a little higher. *Meſtor*, the Son of *Perſeus*, had by his Wife ‡ *Lyſidice*, a Daughter named *Hippothoe*, whom *Neptune* carried away into the Iſlands called *Echinades* ¼, where ſhe brought him a Son, (A) whoſe

Tranſcriber, who left out, or added a Letter to the Name of *Ajax*'s Mother. Thoſe who tranſcrib'd his Copy, took in that Fault, which occaſion'd a different reading; and then the Authors followed the Copy they had bought. The Name *Meliboea*, which we find in *Athenaus*, proceeds from the ſame Cauſe. That Author ſays ſhe was married to *Theſeus* in (c) due Form. He names ſome other Women, whom *Theſeus* took by Force; he names two other Wives of that Prince that are mention'd by *Heſiod*; and at laſt he ſays, that, according to *Pherecydes*, he had alſo another Wife call'd *Phereboea*. Thoſe four Women ought to be reduced to one; *Periboea*, *Eriboea*, *Meliboea* and *Phereboea*, are four Names of one and the ſame Woman, who hath been multiplied by the Fault of the Tranſcribers. If *Theſeus*'s Polygamy was not more certain, with reſpect to the other Women, than as to *Meliboea*, mention'd by *Athenaus*, and *Phereboea*, mention'd by *Pherecydes*, I ſhould poſitively aſſert, that he was a *Monogamiſt* in *Tertullian*'s Senſe. There is more Difficulty in what follows. *Ajax*'s Mother was the lawful Wife of *Theſeus*; but when? Was it after *Telamon*'s Death, or before ſhe married *Telamon*? If the firſt, it muſt be ſaid, that *Theſeus* ſurvived the Deſtruction of *Troy*, which is falſe; and that he had a very extravagant Deſire of marrying, ſince he pitch'd upon ſo old a Woman, which is very improbable. Wherefore I had rather ſay, that he married *Periboea* before ſhe was *Telamon*'s Wife. But then what ſhall we do with the Story, mention'd by *Plutarch*? Inſtead of a young Woman, whom *Telamon* thought he had debauched, he would have had only another Man's Leavings, a Widow or a divorced Woman: Which does not agree with *Plutarch*'s Narrative, and cannot be proved by other Authors. It appears by a Paſſage of *Pindar* (d), that *Telamon* was married to *Periboea*, when *Hercules* deſir'd him to follow him in his Expedition againſt *Laomedon*. At this rate *Theſeus* muſt needs have divorced his Wife ſomewhat early. However it be, we ought to remember, that (e) *Periboea* was one of the Virgins, whom the *Athenians* were obliged to deliver to *Minos*. *Theſeus* was delivered to him at the ſame time, and boldly oppoſed *Minos*'s Attempt upon *Periboea*'s Honour. Which may make one believe, that *Theſeus* fell in Love with that Maid during his Journey, for ſhe was very handſome; and that he married her ſoon after. I cannot tell whether he contain'd himſelf till after his Return; for the Heroes of antient *Greece* were very dangerous Fellow-Travellers for a Maid, they got Children a-pace. They were very well qualified to preſerve the Fair Sex from the Violence of a fierce Tyrant: But Women ran no leſs Danger in the Hands of ſuch Deliverers; and one might have ask'd this Queſtion, (f) *ſed quis cuſtodiet ipſos cuſtodes?* Let us ſee how *Theſeus* ſpoke to *Minos*. (g) *Dicitur cum Theſeus Cretam ad Minoa cum ſeptem virginibus & ſex pueris veniſſet, Minoa de virginibus Periboeam quandam nomine, candore corporis inductum comprimere voluiſſe, quod cum Theſeus ſe paſſurum negaret, ut qui Neptuni filius eſſet, & valeret contra tyrannum pro virginis incolumitate decertare*, &c. *Hyginus* tells us afterwards how *Theſeus* proved his Divine Original. 'Tis a curious thing: There never was ſo difficult a Proof of one's Nobility.

(D) *By whom he had* Ajax.] I think *Dares Phrygius* is the only Author, who ſays, that *Heſione*, *Laomedon*'s Daughter, was *Ajax*'s Mother, and that *Ajax* and *Hector*, by reaſon of their Kindred, were very civil, and made Preſents to one another, after they had fought ſtoutly together. Authors are generally of a quite different Opinion, *viz*. that *Periboea* or *Eriboea*, was *Ajax*'s Mother, and *Heſione*, *Teucer*'s Mother. I don't mind what *Sophocles* (h) ſays, that *Ajax*'s Mother was alive, when that unfortunate Prince kill'd himſelf; for a Poet does not pretend to much exactneſs in writing a Tragedy: Beſides, *Telamon* might have been married at the ſame time to *Periboea* and *Heſione*. 'Tis certain *Sophocles* (i) ſays, that *Teucer* was a Baſtard, born of a Woman who had been taken in the War. 'Twas *Heſione*, as *Servius* informs us. *Ejus* (Laomedontis) *filia Heſione*, ſays he (k), *belli jure ſublata, comiti Telamoni tradita eſt qui primus aſcenderat murum, unde Teucer natus eſt, nam Ajacem ex alia conſtat eſſe procreatum*. The Scholiaſt upon theſe Words of *Homer*'s (l) *Iliad*, καί σε νόθον περ ἐόντα. *& te ſpurium licet exiſtentem*, ſays, that *Heſione*, a Priſoner of War, was given to *Telamon*, who had *Teucer* by her; and that this *Trojan* Original was the Reaſon why the Child had that Name.

(A) *A Son, whoſe Name was* Taphius.] We read in the Scholiaſt (m) upon *Apollonius*, that the Son of *Neptune* and *Hippothoe*, was call'd *Pterelaus*, and had two Sons, *viz*. *Teleboas* and *Taphus*, who went to *Electryon* and demanded of him the Eſtate of their whoſe Name was *Taphius*. This *Taphius* ſettled a Colony in *Taphos*, and call'd the Inhabitants (*B*) *Teleboes*, becauſe he thought he had gone a † great way. He had a Son named *Pterelaus*, who was the Father of ſix Sons, and one Daughter. Thoſe ſix Sons going to *Mycena* to demand *Meſtor*'s Kingdom, obtain'd nothing from *Electryon* the Son of *Perſeus*, and Brother of *Meſtor*; wherefore they plunder'd his Country. The Sons of *Electryon*, endeavouring to oppoſe them, were all kill'd. Their Father was making the neceſſary Preparations to revenge their Death, when he was kill'd by a ſtrange * Accident. His Daughter *Alcmena* was forced to retire to *Thebes*, and being not willing to let the Death of her Brothers (*C*) go unpuniſhed, ſhe promis'd to marry him, who ſhould revenge it. *Amphitryon* offered to do it, and got together as many Troops as ever he cou'd, and made a Deſcent in the Country of the *Teleboes*. He laid waſte ſome of their Iſlands, but could not take *Taphos* before *Comatho*, who fell in Love with him, had pluck'd out (*D*) the Golden Hair of her Father *Pterelaus*, which made

---

¶ *Apollod. ubi ſupra.*

* *Pindar. Nem. od.* 4.

β *Id. ib. od.* 4. & *Iſthm. od.* 6.

γ *Apollon. & Valer. Flaccus Argon. paſſim.*

δ *Pauſan. l.* 1. *p.* 34.

ζ *'Twas at* Aulis *in the Iſle of* Euboea.

η *See the Article* Teucer.

θ Vinceris ut Ajax Praeterit Telamonem, ut Pelea vicit Achilles. *Juven. Sat.* 14. *v.* 213.

‡ *The Daughter of* Pelops (*and of* Hippodamia.) *Apoll. l.* 2. *p.* 97.

¼ *They are at the Entrance of the Gulph of* Lepanto.

(c) Νομίμως δ' αὐτὸ γῆμαι Μελίβοιαν τὴν Αἴαντος μητέρα γυναῖκα. Juſtam vero illius conjugem fuiſſe Meliboeam Ajacis matrem. *Iſter. lib.* 14. *rerum Atticarum apud Athen. lib.* 13. *p.* 557.

(d) *Iſthmior. od.* 6.

(e) Pauſanias, l. 1. pag. 15. *See alſo pag.* 40. *where he concludes from* Periboea*'s being ſent to* Minos, *that* Megara *made in former times part of the State of* Athens. Diodorus Siculus *ſays,* Alcathous *was an* Athenian.

(f) *Juven. Sat.* 6. *v.* 345.

(g) *Hygin. Poet. Aſtron. lib.* 2. *c.* 5.

(h) *In Ajac.*

(i) *Ibid.*

(k) *In Æn. l.* 1. *v.* 61

(l) *Lib.* 8. *v.* 284.

(m) *In Argonaut. l.* 1. *v.* 74

† [illegible] *Teleboas vocavit, ideò quod procul à patria iverit. Apollod. ib.*

* *See the Article of* Amphitryon.

their Grand-Mother *Hippothoe*; and not being able to prevail upon him, they had recourſe to forcible means, and kill'd many People. By this Account we get a whole Generation, and therefore this Narrative is fitter to be admitted. 'Tis an abſurd Thing to find in *Apollodorus*, that *Electryon* was attack'd by the great Grand-Sons of the Daughter of his Brother *Meſtor*. There is another thing in *Apollodorus*, concerning *Taphius*, which is not well cleared. This Author ſays (*a*), that *Taphius* reigned at *Mycenæ* with *Electryon*, when the ſix Sons of *Pterelaus* went to *Electryon* and demanded of him *Meſtor*'s Kingdom for their Grand-father by their Mother's ſide. That Grand-father was *Taphius* himſelf, who reigned at *Mycena* with *Electryon*: *Electryon* had no other Kingdom; and therefore what Kingdom could they demand of him for *Taphius*? Obſerve, that, according to the (*b*) Scholiaſt upon *Apollonius*, the whole Kingdom of *Perſeus* was poſſeſt in common, after his Death, by his four Sons, *Alcæus*, *Sthenelus*, *Meſtor* and *Electryon*. According to this Account, no juſt claim could be made to *Meſtor*'s Kingdom, in favour of *Taphius*, ſince *Taphius* was already in poſſeſſion of it. However it be, we read in that Scholiaſt that *Taphius*, the Son of *Pterelaus*, call'd the Iſle of *Taphos* by his Name; and that his Brother *Teleboas* call'd by his the People I ſpeak of in this Article, whoſe chief Habitation was in the Iſle of *Taphos*. This is one of the Etymologies: I have already mention'd another; the reſt may be ſeen hereafter. 'Tis certain, that the ſame People were indifferently call'd (*c*) *Taphii* and *Teleboes*.

(*B*) *And called the Inhabitants* Teleboes.] *Stephanus Byzantinus* informs us, that the Country of the *Teleboes*, or *Telebois*, was part of *Acarnania*, and had its Name from *Teleboas*, being formerly called *Taphion*. *Ariſtotle* (*d*) ſays partly the ſame; for he tells us, that the *Teleboes* were poſſeſt of part of *Acarnania*. He further ſays (*e*), that one *Lelex*, a Native of *Leucadia*, had a Daughter, whoſe Son, call'd *Teleboas*, had 22 Sons of that ſame Name. What I have juſt now mentioned out of *Stephanus Byzantinus*, is directly contrary to *Strabo* (*f*), who affirms, that the Iſles of the *Taphians*, one of which was call'd *Taphos*, were at firſt called the Iſles of the *Teleboes*. He adds, that *Amphytrion* ſubdued them, and gave 'em to *Cephalus* an *Athenian* Fugitive, who help'd him to conquer them. It has been ſaid (*g*), that the Iſle of *Cephalonia* was then given to *Cephalus*, who call'd it by that Name, and (*h*) became afterwards Maſter of *Acarnania*. We read, that the *Teleboes* (*i*) were great Robbers. See the Proofs of it in *Bochart*'s *Geographia Sacra* (*k*), and the Remark *F* of this Article. I ſhall ſet down the Words of the Scholiaſt of *Apollonius* upon a Paſſage wherein that Poet calls the ſame People *Teleboes* and *Taphii*. 'Tis in the 747th Verſe of the firſt Book. *The Iſle of* Taphos *is one of the* Echinades: *It was inhabited by the* Teleboes, *who before lived in* Acarnania; *they were great Robbers* (*l*). *They went into the Kingdom of* Argos *to carry away the Oxen of* Electryon, *Father of* Alcmena. *There happen'd a Fight, in which* Electryon, *and his Sons were kill'd. Wherefore* Alcmena *declared ſhe would be the Reward of him, who ſhould revenge* Electryon; *and becauſe* Amphitryon *undertook it, ſhe married him.* 'Tis commonly ſaid in our Dictionaries, that *Amphitryon* revenged the Death of *Alcmena*'s Brother: Which is a Fault, for ſhe loſt ſeveral Brothers; and in *Apollodorus* ſhe declares, that whoever has a Mind to be her Husband, muſt undertake to revenge her Brothers. In the Scholiaſt upon *Apollonius* ſhe deſires her Father ſhould be revenged. Through a Fault of the Preſs the Authors, conſulted by *Charles Stephens*, ſaid *Patris* inſtead of *Fratris*; and that Fault remains ſtill. Here follow two Etymologies. (*m*) Τηλεβόαι [illegible] οἱ Τάφιοι, ἤτοι τῆλε [illegible] ἢ ἀπὸ Τηλεβόου τοῦ [illegible] βασιλέως υἱοῦ. *Lloyd* aſcribes many things to the Scholiaſt upon *Apollonius* which I don't find. 1. That *Herodotus* ſays, that *Perſeus* left four Sons behind him. *He ſhould have ſaid* Herodorus. 2. That one of 'em was call'd *Aſarus*: *He ſhou'd have ſaid* Alcæus. 3. That another was call'd *Neſtor*: *He ſhould have ſaid* Meſtor. 4. That *Electryon* was bound for a Sum of Money for *Hippothoe*: *The Scholiaſt ſays no ſuch thing.* 5. That *Alcmena* married *Amphitryon*, a very powerful *Theban* Lord: *The Scholiaſt could not call him a* Theban; Amphitryon *was not a* Theban. 6. That the Kingdom of the *Teleboes*, that was given to *Cephalus*, devolved to *Ulyſſes* by Inheritance: *I find no ſuch thing in the Scholiaſt.* See *Lloyd* at the Word *Taphia*. His Article is the ſame with that of *Charles Stephens*. I muſt not forget, that the *Teleboes* ſettled in one part of *Great Greece*, in that Iſland which *Tiberius*'s Retreat made ſo famous. This we find in *Tacitus*: (*n*) *Græcos ea tenuiſſe, Capreaſque* Teleboïs *habitatas fama tradit.* *Virgil* (*o*), *Auſonius*, and *Statius* ſay the ſame.

Quem generaſſe Telon Sebethide Nympha
Fertur, Teleboum Capreas cum regna teneret.

They are *Virgil*'s Words. As for *Auſonius*, he expreſſes himſelf thus: (*p*) *Virideſque reſultant Teleboæ.* He ſpeaks of the Iſle of *Caprea*. *Statius* (*q*) ſays

Seu tibi Bacchei vineta madentia Gauri,
Teleboumque domos, trepidis ubi dulcia nautis
Lumina noctivaga tollit Pharus æmula lunæ.

(*C*) *To let the Death of her Brothers go unpuniſhed.*] I have ſhewn in the foregoing Remark that the ſingular Number ought not to be uſed here, and that ſome Authors, contrary to *Apollodorus*'s Account, ſay, that *Electryon* was kill'd with his Sons; ſo that *Alcmena* mention'd her Father and not her Brothers, when ſhe deſired to be revenged by him, who was to be her Husband.

(*D*) *Of her Father* Pterelaus.] *Plautus* ſuppoſes, that *Amphitryon* (*r*) kill'd *Pterelaus* with his own Hand; and that he had for his ſhare of the Booty the Golden (*s*) Cup of that Prince. Poets are allowed to ſuppoſe ſuch things, though they be never ſo falſe. But I don't think, that the Learned Mrs. *le Fevre* is well grounded in charging *Plautus* with *a ſmall Anachroniſm. It is certain*, ſays ſhe (*t*), *that* Pterelaus *was not contemporary with* Amphitryon, *ſince he was the Son of* Taphius, *who was the Son of a Niece of* Alcæus, *Father of* Amphitryon; *and conſequently the Couſin-German of* Amphitryon *was* Pterelaus*'s Grand-Mother*. This Genealogy is taken out of *Apollodorus*: I have already ſaid, that this Author is not ſo clear as the Scholiaſt upon *Apollonius*. Nevertheleſs *Plautus* ought not to be cenſured upon this Head; for ſince *Apollodorus* ſays, that *Pterelaus* was alive when *Amphitryon* went to attack him, *Plautus* does not advance of his own Head that thoſe two Men lived at the ſame time; he might have found it in ſome Hiſtorical Monuments: And therefore he is not guilty of that Anachroniſm. 'Tis much more ſurprizing, that the Sons of *Pterelaus* ſhould make War with *Electryon*, *Amphitryon*'s Uncle by the Mother's ſide, as we read in *Apollodorus*.

I muſt ſay ſomething of *Pterelaus*'s Cup: *Jupiter* made a preſent of it to *Alcmena*; and then when the true *Amphitryon* look'd for it among his Things, to know whether it had been given to his Wife, as ſhe affirm'd, it occaſion'd a very ſurprizing and divert-

Xxxx

(*m*) *Schol. Apollon. in lib.* 1. *v.* 747. *See alſo Euſtath. in l.* 1. *Odyſſ.*

(*n*) *Tacit. annal. l.* 4. *c.* 67.

(*o*) *Virgil. Æn. l.* 7. *verſu* 734.

(*p*) *Apud Lipſium in Tacit. Ann. l.* 4. *c.* 67.

(*q*) *Silv.* 5. *l.* 3. *v.* 100.

(*r*) Ipſuſque Amphitruo Regem Pterelam ſua obtruncat manu. *Plaut. Amphitr. Act.* 1. *ſc.* 1. *v.* 95.

(*s*) Poſt ob virtutem hero Amphitruoni eſt patera donata aurea. Quî Pterelea potitare Rex ſolitu'ſt. *Ib. v.* 104.

(*t*) *Remarks upon the* Amphitryon, *pag.* 251.

made him immortal. *Amphitryon* did not keep thoſe Conqueſts for himſelf, but left 'em to *Cephalus* and *Eleus*, who aſſiſted him in that War. This is what we find in *Apollodorus* *. What I have found in other Authors, that may ſerve to rectify or clear him, or to give a more diſtinct Account of the Matter, may be ſeen in the Remarks, where you'll find ſome Obſervations (*E*) upon ſome Paſſages of *Plautus*'s *Amphitryon*, and upon Mrs. (*F*) *le Fevre*'s Notes.

TELLIER

vering Incident in *Plautus*'s Comedy. It was not a meer Invention of the Poet, for (*v*) "*Charon* of *Lampſacus* an Hiſtorian, who lived in the 75th Olympiad, that is, 478 Years before Chriſt, ſaid, that the Cup beſtowed upon *Alcmena*, was ſtill to be ſeen in his time in the *Academy*; that it was long, ſomewhat hollow'd in the middle, with the Edges a little turn'd down." *Charon*'s Works are not extant, and therefore I have conſulted *Athenæus* (*w*), who quotes him. He ſays *Charon* of *Lampſacus* affirm'd, in one of his Books, that the Cup, which *Jupiter* preſented to *Alcmena*, when he put on the ſhape of *Amphitryon*, was ſtill to be ſeen in his time at *Lacedæmon*. I don't find that *Charon* made a Deſcription of that Cup: 'Tis *Macrobius* (*a*) who deſcribes it, building upon what was ſaid by (*b*) *Pherecydes*, that the Veſſel which *Jupiter* preſented to *Alcmena*, was a *Carcheſium*. *Athenæus* tells us, that *Pherecydes*, and *Herodorus* of *Heraclea* ſaid ſo; and mentions *Callixenus*'s Deſcription of the *Carcheſium*. Doubtleſs *Macrobius* had from *Athenæus* what he ſays of it, and his Words ought to be mended by thoſe of that Greek Author, as *Caſaubon* obſerves. (*c*) *Plautus inſuetum nomen reliquit, atque in fabula Amphitryone pateram datam: cum longe utriuſque poculi figura diverſa ſit: patera enim ut & ipſum nomen indicio eſt, planum ac patens eſt: carcheſium vero procerum & circa mediam partem compreſſum, anſatum mediocriter, anſis à ſummo ad infimum pertinentibus.* Now ſee the Text of *Athenæus*. Καλλίξενος ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας φησὶν, ὅτι ποτήριόν ἐστιν ἐπίμηκες συνηγμένον εἰς μέσον ἱκανῶς, ὦτα ἔχον μέχρι τοῦ πυθμένος καθήκοντα. *Callixenus Rhodius tradit in ſuis libris de Alexandria, carcheſium eſſe poculum oblongum, in medio leniter compreſſum, auribus utrinque ad fundum uſque deſcendentibus.* 'Tis plain the Adverb *Mediocriter* in *Macrobius*, refers to *compreſſum*, and not to *anſatum*. A Copiſt, who thinks that an Adverb belongs to a certain Adjective, does hardly ſcruple to put it before, or after that Adjective. No Body thinks that there is any harm in writing *anſatum mediocriter*, rather than *mediocriter anſatum*. But ſometimes 'tis a thing of great Moment, not to take ſuch a Liberty; for Inſtance, when the Adverb does not belong to *anſatum*.

(*E*) *Some Obſervations upon ſome Paſſages of* Plautus's (*d*) Amphitryon.] I. This Poet ſuppoſes, that 'twas *Creon* King of *Thebes*, who made War with the *Teleboes*, to revenge the *Thebans*, who had been very ill uſed by them.

(e) Victis hoſtibus legiones reveniunt domum,
Duello extincto maximo, atque internecatis hoſtibus,
Qui multa Thebano populo objecerunt acerba funera.
Id vi & virtute militum victum atque expugnatum opidum 'ſt,
Imperio atque auſpicio heri mei Amphitruonis maxime.
Præda atque agro adoreaque affecit populares ſuos,
Regique Thebano Creonti regnum ſtabilivit ſuum.

Plautus overturns this Hiſtory; for Authors are agreed, that *Amphitryon* undertook this Expedition only to puniſh the *Teleboes*, who had kill'd *Alcmena*'s Father, or at leaſt her Brothers. He could not marry *Alcmena* without revenging her of the *Teleboes*. This was the occaſion of the War, in which *Creon* engaged merely out of Complaiſance to *Amphitryon*, or in Acknowledgment of a Service he had received from him (*f*). This Hiſtorical Argument would have afforded many Ornaments, if the Poet had been willing to improve it. He makes his Hero a leſſer Man than he was: He repreſents him as commanding only the Troops of another Prince, in a War undertaken for the Intereſt of that Prince; whereas, according to Hiſtory, *Amphitryon* acted in chief for his own Intereſts, and had with him none but Auxiliary Troops, whoſe Commanders he gratified with the Countries conquered by him. II. *Plautus* ſays, the Troops took ſhipping in the Port of *Euboea*, which he calls *Perſicus* by a Licentious Anticipation. But this is not the worſt: 'Tis a great deal more ſtrange that he does not find a Port more convenient for People, who were to ſail towards the *Echinades*. What a great Compaſs muſt one fetch to go thither from the Iſle of *Euboea*! III. The Lying in of *Alcmena* is an ill-contrived Incident, whereby the Poet is obliged to contradict Tradition. All thoſe, who mention *Hercules*'s Birth, ſuppoſe, that *Jupiter*, having put on the Shape of *Amphitryon*, lay with *Alcmena*, in a Night which he took care to make longer than others are. *Plautus* ſhould have built upon this Ground, and adorn'd it; but he ſhould not have ſuppoſed a ſecond Viſit, *Jupiter* ſhould not have appeared again under the ſame Shape the Night before the Lying-in. This is contrary to Tradition, and beſides the Hearers and Readers are offended at it. 'Tis no longer a tender Love but a Piece of Brutiſhneſs. A Woman, ready to be deliver'd of two Boys, is not an Object fit to be produced upon the Stage; much leſs ought the greateſt of the Gods be repreſented ſo greedy of ſuch an Object, that the uſual length of the Night is not ſufficient for him to ſatisfy his Paſſion. If the Charms he found in the Embraces of that Lady made him wiſh for a ſecond Interview, he ſhould not have put it off till the Day before her Lying-in. So great a Patience is highly improbable. This Objection cannot be anſwered; for none can ſay, that *Plautus* makes his Play laſt nine Months, without running himſelf into greater Difficulties, and being ignorant of theſe Words of *Mercury* (*h*).

HODIE *illa pariet filios geminos duos.*

This *Hodie* refers to the ſame Day that he turn'd out *Soſia* in the firſt Scene. IV. I don't approve what ſome ſay, that *Alcmena*'s Delivery, without any pain, is too plainly contrary to what we are told by the *Greeks* of *Juno*'s Artifices: And 'tis a thing, ſay they, which ought not to be ſuppoſed, without an extreme Neceſſity. A Poet, who pitches upon the Death of *Polyxena* for the Subject of his Tragedy, may be allowed to alter many Things in the Tradition: But if he ſuppoſed, that *Achilles* did not deſire ſhe ſhould be ſacrificed to him, if he neglected the moſt material Paſſages of that Hiſtory, he would act againſt the Rules. What ſignifies it to *Plautus* if *Alcmena* feels no pain?

Dum (i) hæc aguntur, interea uxorem tuam
Neque gementem, neque plorantem noſtrum quiſquam audivimus.
Ita profecto ſine dolore peperit.

This ſeems to me a wrong Objection; for it was neceſſary, in order to unravel the Plot, that there ſhould be ſomething miraculous in *Alcmena*'s Delivery. Her Chaſtity was to be juſtified, and a jealous Husband was to be pacified; and therefore there was a neceſſity for the Poet to bring in *Jupiter* in the Caſe. He might therefore, nay, he was obliged to lay aſide what was ſaid of *Lucina* (*k*).

(*F*) *And upon Mrs.* le Fevre's (*l*) *Notes.*] She (*m*) thinks, that *Plautus* made uſe of the Word *Nepos* to ſignify *a Nephew* in theſe Words of the 4th Scene of the 4th Act. *Ego idem ille ſum Amphitruo, Gorgophones nepos, Imperator Thebanorum.* I can hardly believe it. 'Tis true, that, according to the Genealogy mention'd by *Apollodorus*, this was the only degree of Kindred between (*n*) *Gorgophone* and *Amphitryon*; but, ſince *Plautus* did not follow *Apollodorus* in ſome things, 'tis reaſonable to think that he had ſeen ſome other Genealogies, wherein he found that *Gorgophone* was *Amphitryon*'s Grand-Mother. There is more Senſe in boaſting of being the Grand-Son of an illuſtrious Lady, than in boaſting of being her Nephew: 'Tis therefore probable, that the Poet took the thing in the moſt advantageous Senſe. I proceed to another Fact. He ſuppoſes, that the *Teleboes* deſtroyed *Electryon*. I ſhall quote the whole Paſſage, which contains a Proof of what has been ſaid above concerning the Robberies of that People.

Ego (p) idem latrones hoſtes bello & virtute contudi.
Electryonem perdiderant, noſtræ & germanos conjugis,
Achaiam, Ætoliam, Phocidem, per freta Ionium &
Ægeum, & Creticum
Vagati, vi vortebant piratica.

Mrs. *le Fevre* (*q*) will have it, that he has *altered Hiſtory in this Point*; "for *Electryon* was not kill'd by his Enemies. 'Twas *Amphitryon* himſelf who

kill'd

---

* Biblioth. l. 2. p. 97. & 98.

(*v*) *They are Mrs.* le *Fevre's Words, ubi ſupra. pag.* 275. *If you compare 'em with the Words of* Macrobius, *you'll ſee whether ſhe hath render'd them well.*

(*w*) *Lib.* 11. *p.* 475.

(*a*) Meminit *carcheſii* Pherecydes in libris hiſtoriarum, atque Jovem Alcmenæ precium concubitus carcheſium aureum dono dediſſe. *Macrob. Saturn. l.* 5. *c.* 21.

(*b*) *Apud Athen. pag.* 474.

(*c*) *Macrob. ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) *Confer quæ ſupra, Remark D.*

(*e*) *Act.* 1. *ſc.* 1. *v.* 33. Mercury *had been ſaying in the Prologue.* Is nunc Amphitruo præfectu'ſt legionibus Nam cum Telebois bellum 'ſt Thebano poplo.

(*f*) *See* Apollodorus, *l.* 2. *pag. m.* 97. *& ſeq.*

TELLIER (MICHAEL LE) Chancellor of *France*, who died the 30th of *October* 1685. See an Encomium upon him in *Moreri's* Dictionary. He left behind him two Sons, one of which was very much ſpoken of in *Europe*, under the Name of (*A*) Marquis *De* LOUVOIS: The other is one of the moſt illuſtrious Prelates of the *Gallican* Church for his Learning, and the Vigour wherewith he always maintain'd † the Pre-eminencies and Rights of his Dignity, and rectified the falſe Steps of the (*A*Δ) Monks in his Dioceſe. He is Arch-biſhop of *Rheims*. He has collected one of the fineſt Libraries in *France*. See the Catalogue of it, which he publiſh'd ‡ in the Year 1693. He β increaſes it every Day with all ſorts of Books, and all the Curious have a free Acceſs to that noble Repertory of Learning.

TELMESSUS, γ a Sea-Town in the utmoſt part δ of *Lycia*, at the Foot of a Mountain of the ſame Name, which makes part of Mount *Cragus*. That Town was beſtowed upon *Eumenes* * by the *Romans*, when they defeated *Antiochus*; but the *Lycians* recovered it ǂ when the Kingdom of *Eumenes* was deſtroyed. The Inhabitants of that Town had naturally a Prophetical Spirit, which is the Reaſon why it has been much talk'd of. Every Body (*A*) was born there with a Gift of Prophecy; Women and Children received that Favour from Nature. *Gordius* (*B*) went thither to know the Meaning of a Prodigy that made him uneaſy: He had it explained to him without being obliged to get into the Town; for meeting a handſome Maid at the Gate, he ask'd her who was the beſt Diviner he could apply himſelf to. The Maid immediately deſired to know what he had to propoſe, and being told of it, gave him the Interpretation he wanted: It was a very good Piece of News, ſhe anſwered, that the Prodigy meant that *Gordius* would be made King. At the ſame time the Propheteſs offered to marry him: He accepted of her Offers, as a beginning of the good Fortune that

“ kill'd him by Accident, throwing his Club at an “ Ox.” I confeſs, that *Plautus* departs from *Apollodorus* in this; but ſome Authors (*r*) ſay, that *Electryon* was kill'd by the *Teleboes*. I ſhall conclude with this Remark: “ (*ſ*) I have pitch'd upon *Am-* “ *phitryon*, becauſe 'tis one of the fineſt Pieces of “ *Plautus*; and it was ſo highly eſteem'd by the “ Ancients, that under *Diocletian's* Reign it was ſtill “ acted in a time of a publick Calamity to appeaſe “ *Jupiter's* Anger. *Arnobius* ſays in his 7th Book; *po-* “ *nit animos Jupiter, ſi Amphitryo fuerit actus, pronun-* “ *tiatuſque Plautinus? What, will* Jupiter *be appeaſed,* “ *if* Plautus's Amphitryon *be acted?*” I don't think *Arnobius* meant that the Heathens pitch'd upon a time of a publick Calamity, ſuch as an Irruption of Barbarians, a Plague, or a Famine, to act *Amphitryon*: But this ſeems to be his Meaning. He thinks it ſtrange that the Pagans ſhould make the Solemnity of their publick Games, one of their religious Performances; and that they ſhould conſecrate them to a Deity. He asks what may be the Reaſon of it, and ſuppoſes that he is anſwered, that the Celebration of thoſe Games was a means to be reconciled with the Gods, and to make 'em forget the Injuries they might have received. Whereupon he asks, by way of Reply, *Whether* Jupiter *ceaſes to be in an ill-humour when* Plautus's Amphitryon *is acted?* 'Tis certain, that the Inſtitution of the Publick Games was occaſion'd by ſome publick Calamity, and a Deſign of worſhipping, for the time to come, in a ſolemn manner, the Deity whoſe Anger they dreaded: But afterwards the Anniverſary Celebration was not perform'd during a publick Calamity: Thoſe Games were exhibited in time of Plenty, as well as in time of Scarcity; nay, they were more ſumptuous and magnificent during the Proſperity of the State, than during its Adverſity.

(*A*) *Under the Name of Marquis* de LOUVOIS.] He died at *Verſailles* the 16th of *July* 1691 in his 51ſt Year. He was Miniſter and Secretary of State, and had many Employments. The greateſt Encomium that can be beſtowed upon him, is to ſay, that all *Europe* was perſuaded, that his Death would be more advantageous to the Allies, than a complete Victory, or the Conqueſt of two or three Places. M. *de Barbeſieux*, one of his Sons, ſucceeded him in the Office of Secretary of State, and died the fifth of *January* 1701. The Abbot *de Louvois*, his other Son, is a great Lover of Learning. He was admired in his younger Years by the Anſwers he made to the Difficulties propoſed to him about *Homer*, in the preſence of many People, as it appears from this Paſſage of the Continuation of the *Menagiana*. (*a*) *The Abbot* de L.... *who, though ſo young, ſhews ſo great a Skill in the* Greek *Tongue, has been pleaſed to quote me upon that Subject, and to praiſe me for the Application of thoſe two Verſes in an illuſtrious Aſſembly, that was held at his Houſe not long ago, in the Preſence of the moſt learned Men in the Kingdom, who propoſed to him ſome Difficulties upon* Homer, *which he anſwered with a wonderful Preſence of Mind. One of the moſt conſiderable was propoſed by the Abbot* Faydit, *viz. whether* Homer *had mentioned the* Jews *in his* Iliad *or his* Odyſſey. *He anſwered, that he had made no mention of 'em, and that the Word* Ἰουδαῖοι *was not to be found in* Homer, &c. You may ſee in the Original what was further urged by the Abbot *Faydit*, and the Reply made to him. I need not acquaint the Reader, that the Book publiſh'd in *Holland* with this Title, *Teſtament politique du Marquis de Louvois*, is a ſuppoſititious Piece: But every Body does not know that the Author of that Piece lives at *Paris*, and is a Roman Catholick.

(*A*Δ) *And rectified the falſe Steps of the Monks in his Dioceſe.*] I could give many Inſtances of it; but I ſhall only refer the Reader to what I have ſaid in the Remark *M* of the Article *Francis* of *Aſſiſi*, and in the Remark *I*Δ of the Article *Mariana*. See alſo the *Lettres hiſtoriques* for *July* 1697.

(*A*) *Every Body was born there with the Gift of Prophecy.*] I ſhall quote a conſiderable Hiſtorian for it. (*b*) Τὸν δὲ (γόρδιον) ἐκπλαγέντα τῇ ὄψει, ἰέναι κοινώσοντα ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου παρὰ τοὺς Τελμισσέας τοὺς μάντεις. εἶναι γὰρ τοὺς Τελμισσέας σοφοὺς τὰ θεῖα ἐξηγεῖσθαι, καί σφισιν ἀπὸ γένους δεδόσθαι αὐτοῖς καὶ γυναιξὶ καὶ παισὶ τὴν μαντείαν. *Gordium ſpectaculo attonitum, Telmiſſenſes vates communicandæ rei cauſa adiiſſe, (eſſe enim Telmiſſenſes peritiſſimos prodigiorum interpretes, & vaticinandi ſcientiam ipſis pariter atque uxoribus & liberis ab ortu inſitam eſſe.)* (*c*) *Pliny* ſeems to ſay, that the Town of *Telmeſſus*, which he calls moſt religious, had been one of the principal Seats of Magick, and does not ſcruple to joyn it with *Theſſaly* in that reſpect. But there never was a Country more cried down for Witchcraft than *Theſſaly*.

Somnia, terrores magicos, miracula, ſagas,
Nocturnos lemures, portentaque THESSALA *rides?*

Horace, who ſays this in the 2d Epiſtle of the 2d Book, does often uſe the like Expreſſion; and it appears by *Lucan*, that (*d*) *Theſſala* or *Theſſalis*, without any Addition, denoted a Witch. If the thing be rightly conſidered the Paſſage of *Pliny* expreſſes the Character of the *Telmeſſians*, as fully as that of *Arrianus*. See what I ſhall quote out of *Cicero* hereafter.

(*B*) Gordius *went thither to know the meaning of a Prodigy.*] This Story is to be found in *Juſtin* (*e*), if we change the uſual reading, and put *Telmiſſi urbis*, or *Telmiſina urbis*, inſtead of *vicinæ urbis*, according to the (*f*) Correction of the beſt Criticks. The Paſſage runs thus: *Gordius cùm in his regionibus bubus conductis araret, aves eum omnes generis circumvolare cœperunt. Profectus ad conſulendos augures vicinæ urbis, obviam in porta habuit virginem eximiæ pulchritudinis; percontatus eam quem potiſſimum augurem conſuleret, illa audita cauſa conſulendi, gnara artis ex diſciplina parentum, regnum ei portendi, reſpondit, polliceturque ſe & matrimonii & ſpei ſociam. Tam pulchra conditio,* prima

---

† See the Memoirs publiſhed by him, about the Cardinals ſitting in Parliament, and againſt the erection of Cambray into a Metropolis.

‡ With the Title of Bibliotheca Telleriana, in fol.

β I write this in June 1701.

γ Ptolemy l. 5. c. 3. calls it Τελμησσός, Strabo, l. 14. p. m. 457. & Stephanus Byzantinus Τελμισσός.

δ Quæ Lyciam finit urbs Telmeſſus, Plin. l. 5. c. 27. Mela l. 1. c. 15. Vide ibi If. Voſſium.

* Livius l. 37.

ǂ Strabo, pag. 458.

(*r*) Schol. ollon. Argon. l. 1. 97.

(*ſ*) Mrs Fevre her Preface.

(*a*) Suite de Menagiana pag. 94. Dutch Edition.

(*b*) Arrian. de expedit. Alex. l. 2. pag. m. 85, 86.

(*c*) Nec poſtea quiſquam dixit quonam modo veniſſet Telmeſſum religioſiſſimam urbem, quando tranſiſſet ad Theſſalas urbes. Plin. lib. 30. c. 1. Father *Hardouin*, going upon the Authority of good Manuſcripts, reads *Matres* inſtead of *Urbes*.

(*d*) Lib. 6. verſ. 451. vide Harduin. in Plinium, tom. 4. pag. 771.

(*e*) Lib. 11. c. 7.

(*f*) See Grævius's Juſtin, pag. 230.

that was foretold him. *Cicero* (C) thought that the Inhabitants of *Telmessus* and the adjacent Country applied themselves mightily to the Observation of Prodigies, because they inhabited a fruitful Country, that produced many Singularities. Others fetch the thing higher, and speak of one *Telmessus* [†] a great Diviner, who founded that Town, and whose Relicks were in great Veneration among the Inhabitants. They lay under the Altar of *Apollo*, who [ε] was his Father. The Prophetical Spirit, so eminent in that Place, was to proceed from thence, according to the prejudicated Opinions of the Heathens. *Telmessus* taught the Art of Prophesying in his Life-time, and was to inspire his Votaries with it after his Death. To which I add, that his Mother, *Antenor's* Daughter, was possest with the same Spirit: She had it from *Apollo* [γ], when he lay with her, under the Shape of a little Dog. If the Work of *Stephanus Byzantinus* was not curtail'd, we might find some Particulars in it about *Telmessus*. It appears [δ] from the broken Remains of that Author, that *Telmessus* founded the Town I speak of, being come from the Country of the *Hyperboreans*, to the Oracle of *Dodone*, with a Fellow-Traveller, who founded a Town, whose Inhabitants were all Diviners. Which is a great Presumption, that the like Virtue was bestowed upon *Telmessus*, both for him and those, who should build about the Altar he erected, as he had been directed by the Oracle. 'Tis likely that Altar was in the Temple of *Apollo* [*] *Telmessium*. The Inhabitants of *Telmessus* gave great (D) Credit to Dreams. *Aristander*, a Native of that Town, and one of the most expert Diviners of his Time [χ], wrote a Book upon that Subject. Probably 'twas he who negociated a Treaty between his Country and *Alexander*: *Arrianus* speaks of it in his first Book. I don't think the Town of *Termessus* (E) ought to be confounded with that of *Telmessus*: They seem to me to be two distinct Towns; and in my Mind, that, which was situated on the Frontiers of *Lycia*, ought to be (F) call'd *Telmessus*.

TENEDOS

prima regni felicitas videbatur. That Correction may be mightily confirm'd by *Arrianus* (g), who positively says, that *Gordius* applied himself to the Diviners of the Town of *Telmessus*. What follows in *Arrianus* does not agree in all the Circumstances with *Justin's* Narrative; but this is of no great Moment. However, I shall observe, that the Translator of *Arrianus* has put *Telmissensium* in a wrong place. It was not to the Assembly of the Inhabitants of *Telmessus* that the Chariot carried *Midas*, attended by his Father and Mother, but to that of the *Phrygians*.

(C) Cicero *thought*.] I shall set down two Passages of *Cicero* to prove this. The first runs thus: (h) *Licet videre & genera quædam & nationes huic scientiæ deditas. Telmessus in Caria est, qua in urbe excellit Aruspicum disciplina.* Here follows the other: *Tum Caria tota præcipueque Telmessenses quos ante dixi, quod agros uberrimos maximeque fertiles incolunt, in quibus multa propter fœcunditatem fingi gignique possunt, in ostentis animadvertendis diligentes fuerunt. Telmessus* being in the utmost part of *Lycia*, it was very near *Caria*; which is the Reason why *Cicero* places it in this last Province. *Stephanus Byzantinus* places it there also; but he adds, that *Philo* and *Strabo* place it in *Lycia*, and that it is on the Frontiers of those two Countries.

(D) *Great Credit to Dreams*.] This we find in *Tertullian*. *Telmessenses*, says he (a), *nulla somnia evacuant, imbecillitatem conjectationis incusant*. The Meaning of which seems to be, that the Inhabitants of *Telmessus* believe that all Dreams signifie something; that none of 'em is vain; and that the Imperfection of our Knowledge does not allow us to understand the Signification of each Dream.

(E) *I don't think the Town of* Termessus *ought to be confounded with that of* Telmessus.] *Strabo* does so plainly distinguish 'em, that he leaves no room for any doubt about it. His way of describing the Situation (b) of *Termessus*, shews that it was a Town of *Pisidia*, near the Streight where one went over Mount *Taurus* in the way to *Mylias*; and therefore *Alexander* being willing to clear that Passage, which was commanded by the Town of *Termessus*, caused it to be demolished. As for (c) *Telmessus*, that Geographer places it in the entrance into *Lycia* on this side of the River *Xanthus*, and even of *Phaselis*, a Sea-Town, which he places near Mount *Solymus*, and *Termessus* (d) *a Town of* Pisidia, says he. I shall confirm this by the Authority of *Arrianus*. Having mention'd *Alexander's* Entry into *Lycia*, he says (e), that Conqueror got the Town of *Telmessus* by a Treaty; and then, that he went over the *Xanthus*; that he took the Town of that name, and several others which surrender'd to him; that he advanced towards the Province of *Mylias*; that he secured the Place, from whence he sent part of his Troops to *Perga* through the Mountains, and marched with the rest along the Sea; that he advanced as far as *Side*; that he went back to *Aspendus*, because the Inhabitants of that Place had not perform'd their Promise; that he forced them to surrender; that he went to *Perga*, and from thence into *Phrygia*; but the Town of *Telmessus*, inhabited by *Barbarians*, who were *Pisidians*, being in his way, he was obliged to take it; that it proved no easie thing, because that Town stood upon a steep Hill, and the Inhabitants had posted themselves upon a Neighbouring Hill, so that they were Masters of the Streight or Defile between those two Hills. This is exactly the Town, which *Strabo* calls *Termessus*; and 'tis manifest *Arrianus* speaks of two different Towns, when he says (f), that his Hero made a Treaty with *Telmessus* when he entred into *Lycia*; and that he besieged (g) *Telmessus* as he was marching from *Perga* towards *Phrygia*. What remains to be inquired into, is, whether those two Towns ought to be call'd *Telmessus*, as they are in *Arrianus*, or whether that of *Lycia* ought to go by the Name of *Telmessus*, and that of *Pisidia* by the Name of *Termessus*, as in *Strabo*, *Stephanus Byzantinus*, and *Suidas*: For the Opinion of some Learned Men, who call 'em both *Termessus* or *Telmessus*, cannot be maintain'd. *Bochart*, who (h) read *Telmessus* in *Strabo* for *Termessus*, may be confuted by a (i) Medal, in which there is on the one side ΤΕΡΜΕΣΣΕΩΝ, and on the other ΣΟΛΥΜΟΣ: Which plainly shews, that the Town of *Pisidia*, call'd Τερμισσὸς by *Strabo*, is rightly named; for since the Hill (k) on the Promontory of *Termessus*, was call'd *Solymus*, and the *Termessians* were also call'd *Solymi*, 'tis plain, that the People who have this great Affinity with the *Solymi*, ought to have the Name express'd in the Medal: But 'tis the Name of the *Termessians*; and therefore *Bochart* is in the wrong to read *Telmissus* and *Telmissenses* in that Passage of *Strabo*; and thus one of his Etymologies comes to nothing. He says, that *Casaubon* found in the Manuscripts Τελμισσέως instead of Τερμισσέως; but they ought to be mended by the Medal. He adds, that *Eustathius*, who quotes *Strabo*, says Τελμισσὸς; but he might have found in *Salmasius*, that *Eustathius* should not (l) have made use of that Name; and besides, that he did not (m) understand the Passage quoted by him.

(F) *Ought to be call'd* Telmessus.] There being many Medals (n) with the Inscription ΤΕΡΜΗΣΣΕΩΝ, what remains to be known is, whether the Town of *Lycia*, which makes the Subject of this Article, ought to be call'd *Termessus*. I beg leave to say, that I think it ought to be call'd *Telmessus*; otherwise we must suspect not only the Passages (o) of *Polybius*, *Arrianus*, *Aristides*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Cicero* and *Livy*, but also many others of *Plutarch*, *Ælian*, *Lucian*, *Ptolemy*, *Stephanus Byzantinus*, *Pliny*, *Pomponius Mela*, *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, &c. At this rate it must be said, that a Fault crept into all the Places, where *Aristander* is sir-named of *Telmessus*; which

---

[†] Sub Apollinis arula quæ Telmessi apud oppidum visitur, Telmessum esse conditum vatem, non scriptis constantibus indicatur? *Arnob. l. 6. p. 193.* See Suidas ubi infra.

[ε] *Dionysius in Originibus apud Suidam v.* Τελμισσεῖς.

[γ] *Idem Dionys. ib.*

[δ] *In voce* γαλεῶται. *It is called there* Τελμισσός.

[*] Τελμισσὸς ἐς Καρίαν ἦλθεν, ἔνθα Ἀπόλλωνος Τελμισσέως ἱερόν. Telmissus in Cariam venit, ubi Apollinis Telmissii templum. *Steph. Byzant. in* Τελμισσός.

[χ] *See his Article*

(g) *Ubi supra.*

(h) *Cicero, libro 1. de divinat.*

(a) *Tertull. de anima*

(b) *Strabo, l. 13. sub fin. p. 434. & l. 14. pag. 458.*

(c) *Idem l. 14. pag. 457, 458.*

(d) Τέρμισσος Πισιδικὴ πόλις. *pag. 458.* Τερμισσὸς ἐστὶ Πισιδικὴ πόλις. *pag. 434.*

(e) *De expedit. Alex. l. 1. pag. 69. & seq.*

(f) *Pag. 57.*

(g) *Pag. 75, 76.*

(h) *Bochart Geograph. Sacr. l. 1 c. 6.*

(i) *Apud Erizzo, Sponium, de usu & præst. numism. pag. 477, 478.*

(k) [illegible] cumulus qui supra Termessum jacet promontorium, Solymus appellatur: ipsi Termessii vocantur Solymi. *Strab. l. 13. pag. 433.*

(l) *Male* Τελμισσὸς *vocat Eustathius. Salmas. Exercit. Plinian. pag.* [illegible]

(m) Mira heic supinitas Eustathii in Strabonis verbis referendis. *Ibid.*

(n) *Spanhem. ubi supra.*

(o) *Id. ib. pag. 478.*

TENEDOS, an Iſle of the *Ægean Sea*, near the Continent of *Aſia*, over againſt *Troy*. Some ſay, † it was uninhabited, and call'd *Leucophrys* before *Tenes*, the Son of *Cygnus*, landed in it; and therefore 'twas he who firſt brought Inhabitants into that Iſland. He reigned over them with ſo much Equity, that great Honours were paid to him in his Life time, and after his Death he was placed among the Gods, as I ſhall ſay when I come to ſpeak of him. He built a Town, and the Iſland was call'd *Tenedos* from him ‖. In proceſs of time People rather choſe to ſay, that he had not brought the firſt Colony thither; but that he landed there as (*A*) by a Miracle, and that the Inhabitants expreſſed immediately ſo great a reſpect for a Man, who was ſo manifeſtly protected by the Gods, and afterwards ſo great an Admiration for his noble Qualities, that they † made him King. Thus all Nations have aſcribed ſomething marvellous to their old Traditions. However it be, what is related of *Tenes*, did not happen before the Time of *Priamus*, ſince *Tenes* loſt his Life β when *Achilles* ranſack'd *Tenedos*, during the *Trojan* War. That Iſland was then particularly (*B*) conſecrated to *Apollo Smintheus*. The *Grecians* hid their Fleet behind that Iſland, when they made a Shew of giving over their Enterprize; for which reaſon *Tenedos* has been more talk'd of (*C*) than for any thing elſe. Nevertheleſs that Iſland was remarkable upon a better account: For the Adminiſtration of Juſtice was very ζ ſevere in it; it produced the beſt Origan in the n World; the Inhabitants made Earthen Veſſels π that were very much eſteem'd; the Grapes and Ears of Corn and *Ceres*, that are to be ſeen on its Medals *, ſhew that it abounded with Wine and Corn, as it does (*D*) to this Day; and the Women of that Iſland were (*E*) the moſt beautiful in the World. Their Crevices (*F*) were very remarkable. Some ſay ‡ that *Paris* landed at *Tenedos*, after the Rape

which is highly improbable. 'Tis therefore better to admit of two Names; that of *Termeſſus* for the Town of *Piſidia*, and that of *Telmeſſus* for the Town of *Lycia*, where People were all inſpired. The Paſſage of *Arrianus*, wherein the Town of *Piſidia* is call'd Τελμισσὸς, ought to be mended, as it has been by *Salmaſius*. *Male*, ſays he (*p*), *apud Arrianum* Τελμισσὸς *vocatur quæ eſt* Τερμισσός.

(*A*) *As by a Miracle.*] His Father being impoſed upon by his Wife's Calumnies, put him into a Cheſt, and threw him into the Sea. I ſhall ſpeak of it hereafter (*q*). I don't find in the Authors I have conſulted the Circumſtances of his Preſervation; but I find in *Muretus* (*a*) that *Neptune*, *Tenes*'s Grand-father, came to the Aſſiſtance of his Grand-ſon; and that the Cheſt, being carried to the Iſle of *Leucophrys*, was open'd by the Inhabitants, who no ſooner knew what it was, but they made *Tenes* King, &c.

(*B*) *Particularly conſecrated to* Apollo Smintheus.] *Homer* does plainly intimate it, when he brings in the Prieſt *Chryſes* uſing this Prayer;

> Κλῦθί (*b*) μευ ἀργυρότοξ' ὃς χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας
> Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην, Τενέδοιό τε ἶφι ἀνάσσεις
> Σμινθεῦ.
> *Audi me argenteum arcum gerens, qui Chryſam tueris*
> *Cillamque valde divinam, Tenedoque fortiter imperas*
> *Smintheu.*

Strabo (*c*) confirms by this Paſſage what he had been ſaying, that there was a Temple of *Apollo Smintheus* in the Iſle of *Tenedos*. There were ſome ſuch Temples in ſome other Neighbouring Towns (*d*); and 'tis a common Opinion, that *Apollo* was worſhipp'd by that Name, becauſe he kill'd the Rats, that deſtroyed the Fruits of the Earth. There was a Rat under the Feet of his Statue at *Chryſa*. Σμίνθος ſignified a Rat in the Dialect of that Country. Some other Reaſons were alledged, beſides that which I have mention'd: See the Learned Collections of *Cuperus* upon this Subject in his ancient Monuments (*e*).

(*C*) *More talk'd of than for any thing elſe.*] All School Boys learn by Heart the ſecond Book of the *Æneids*; and therefore every Man, that is a Scholar, knows theſe Verſes:

> *Eſt* (*f*) *in conſpectu Tenedos notiſſima fama*
> *Inſula, dives opum, Priami dum regna manebant,*
> *Nunc tantum ſinus & ſtatio maleſida carinis.*
> *Huc ſe provecti deſerto in litore condunt.*
>
> . . . .
>
> *Et* (*g*) *jam Argiva Phalanx inſtructis navibus ibat*
> *A Tenedo, tacitæ per amica ſilentia lunæ.*

The Beginning and the End of the Story of the Wooden Horſe are more minded by School-Boys than any other part of that Romance, and conſequently make more laſting Impreſſions.

(*D*) *As it does to this day.*] *M. Spon*, who has been there, ſays (*h*) that the Iſle of *Tenedos is fruitful in good Wines, wherewith it ſupplies* Conſtantinople, *and that its* Muſcadine *Grapes are excellent*; that there is *a great deal of Game, eſpecially Hares and Partridges*. Sir *George Wheeler*, his Fellow Traveller, ſays, (*i*) *it abounds with Corn and Wine, and eſpecially* Muſcadine *Wine, the greateſt part whereof is exported to* Conſtantinople. See the Supplement to *Moreri's* Dictionary.

(*E*) *The Women of that Iſland were the moſt beautiful in the World.*] One may very well wonder that a thing of this Nature ſhould not be mention'd by many Authors: *Athenæus*, who had read ſo much, and who quotes ſo many Writers, would have quoted ſome other Author beſides *Nymphodorus*, had he known of any other, who had made the ſame Obſervation. However it be, theſe are his Words: (*k*) Καὶ Νυμφόδωρος δ' ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀσίας περίπλῳ, καλλίονας φησὶ γίνεσθαι γυναῖκας τῶν πανταχοῦ γυναικῶν ἐν Τενέδῳ τῇ πρὸς Τροίᾳ νήσῳ. *Nymphodorus autem in Aſia circumnavigatione Tenedias fœminas (ea Trojæ vicina inſula eſt) omnes alias ubivis terrarum mulieres pulcritudine ſuperare tradit.* A Writer who went round *Aſia*, or made a Deſcription of it, is more credible than a hundred, who never Travelled or Studied Geographical Hiſtory. Though *Theophraſtus* does not affirm what *Nymphodorus* advances, yet his Teſtimony may be alledged, becauſe he ſays (*l*), that as the Barbarians had appointed ſome Judges to inquire into the Virtue and Husbandry of Women, in order to declare which of 'em exceeded the Reſt in that reſpect; there were likewiſe ſome Judges in the Iſles of *Tenedos* and *Lesbos*, who did the ſame in relation to the Beauty of Women: For it was thought that the very Gifts of Fortune and Nature ought to be honoured and reſpected. Thoſe Judges of *Tenedos* had a very niceOffice The Gods themſelves refuſed it; and it had been well for *Paris* if he had to imitated them: He paid dear for the Device (*m*) of which he bethought himſelf, and for the Poſſeſſion of *Helena*, whom he obtained as a Reward for his Sentence. But that Fabulous Story made no great impreſſion; for there were ſome Perſons, who deſired to Judge of Beauty, not only in *Lesbos* and *Tenedos*, but alſo in a Town of *Peloponneſus*, where there was every Year a Diſpute about Beauty, (*n*) and ſhe who overcame her Competitors, carried the Prize. This Cuſtom was ſtill practiſed in *Athenæus*'s time. Such an Emulation was excuſable in Women; but 'tis very ſtrange that Men (*o*) ſhould have alſo contended for the Prize of Beauty.

(*F*) *Their Crevices were very remarkable.*] Their Shells repreſented a Hatchet; for which reaſon, according to *Plutarch* (*p*), the Inhabitants of *Tenedos* conſecrated a Hatchet in the Temple of *Delphi*. I ſhould rather think that they conſecrated it, becauſe the Forms obſerved in their Tribunals, which occaſion'd the Proverb (*q*) about the Hatchet of *Tenedos*, moved them to pitch upon a Hatchet for the Arms of their Country. It appears by their Medals, that it was their conſtant (*r*) Symbol. *Suidas* (*ſ*) mentions thoſe

---

† Diodor. Siculus, l. 5. c. 83. Servius in Æn. l. 2. v. 21.

‖ Quaſi Τενέδος, that is, Tenni ſedes. Stephan. in Τένεδος.

† See Diodorus Siculus ib.

β Plut. quæſt. Gr. pag. 297. Pauſan. l. 10. p. 340.

ζ See the Article Tenes.

n Antiphanes apud Athen. l. 1. c. 22. See alſo Julius Pollux l. 6. c. 10. & Euſtathius in Il. λ.

π Plutarchus, init. tractat. de vitando ære alieno p. 828 & Scholiaſt. Ariſtoph. in nubib. act. 4. ſcen. 3.

* Vide Spanhem. epiſt. ad Laurent. Beger.

‡ In portum Tenedon pervenit, ubi Helenam mœſtam alloquio mitigavit. Dares Phryg. de excid. Trojæ.

Sal-
, ubi

In the
ticle
es.

Variar.
l. 1.
12.

Homer.
Il. lib.
v. 37.

Lib. 13.
415.

Id. ib.

Ad
em
pperæ-
edit.
7. pag.

Æn.
2.
21.

Ibid.
254.

Spon.
g. tom.
153.

(i) Wheeler voiag. pag. 103.

(k) Athen. l. 13. pag. 609.

(l) Apud Athen. pag. 610.

(m) He made the three Goddeſſes pull off their Shifts.

(n) Nicias in Arcadicis apud Athen. pag. 609.

(o) Theophraſtus, apud Athen. ib. ſays it was practiſed at Elea. (p) De Pythiæ oraculis pag. 399. (q) See hereafter the Remark H & the Article Tenes. (r) Vide Ez. Spanheim. epiſt. ad Laur. Beger. (ſ) In Τενέδιος ξυνήγορος.

Rape of *Helena*, and cajolled her in that Island to ease her (G) Grief. The Inhabitants of *Tenedos* not being able to preserve their Independency, submitted ς to the City of *Alexandria* situated in *Troas*. They were rich in *Cicero's* time, as it appears from his Orations †. Their Cause concerning their Immunities was determined at *Rome* with too great (H) a Rigour; *Cicero* protected them, but he was not seconded. That Island is about ten Leagues round β, and lies only two Leagues and a half from the Continent of *Asia*. The *Turks* have a Fortress in it, *which is only a Tower, with a Bulwark having about 12 Pieces of Cannon. The* Venetians *made themselves Masters of it, during the War of* Candia, *but the* Turks *retook it by means of a Tun of Zechins, with which they gained the Commander* γ. *Aristotle* δ wrote a Book concerning the Republick of the *Tenedians*. *Zoilus* ζ composed an Encomium upon them, wherein he vented a great Fallity, *viz.* that the Spring of the River *Alpheus* was in the Isle of *Tenedos*. That Island was often mentioned in the *Gazettes*, whilst the *Venetians* were possest of *Chio*, which they took in the Year 1694.

TENES or TENNES, the Son of *Cygnus*, gave his Name to the Isle of *Tenedos*, where he landed, when his Father exposed him to the Mercy of the Sea in a Chest. *Cygnus* used him so severely, having too rashly believed his Wife, Step-mother (A) of *Tenes*. That Woman complained that *Tenes* had (B) ravished her, and she made use of θ a Piper, who brought in a false Evidence. Which occasion'd the Law, that was observed in the Isle of *Tenedos*, that no Man of that Profession should be admitted into the Temple. *Tenes*, who κ probably was the Author of that Law, very proper to preserve the Memory of the Hatred he had conceived against that false Witness, shewed himself worthy of the Command by some other Laws, which he Enacted, and caused to be Executed without any distinction of Persons. He condemn'd Adulterers to be beheaded; and being asked, what should be done with his Son, who was Guilty of that Crime, he answered, *Let the Law be put in Execution*. Which occasion'd the stamping of (C) Medals, having on one side the Figure of an Ax, and on the other the Faces of a Man

those Crevices of *Tenedos*, and says they were to be found in a Brook in that Part of the Country call'd *Asserina*. *Bochart* (t) rightly observes it should be 'Αστέριον, and not 'Ασσερίνα, because *Plutarch* says in express Words, that the Crevices of *Tenedos*, whose Shell was like a Hatchet, were to be found in a Place call'd 'Αστέριον. Besides, according to *Hesychius*, the first Inhabitants of that Island were call'd 'Αστέριοι, a Name that might very well proceed from the place, which afforded those Crevices. This Conjecture of *Bochart*, and the Corrections he makes in that Passage of *Suidas*, are a great deal better than all his Etymological Fancies, stuffed with *Hebrew*, to derive the *Tenedians* from *Phœnicia*.

(G) *Cajoll'd her .... to ease her Grief.*] Nothing can be more modest than the Words of the pretended *Dares Phrygius, alloquio mitigavit*. The Author, who (v) made a Paraphrase upon him in Verses, did not confine himself within such narrow bounds: He carries the thing as far as it can go, leaving nothing to be supplied by the Reader. 'Tis true he leaves two Stumbling-Blocks in their way. 1. He supposes that *Paris* did not lye with *Helena* before they landed in the Isle of *Tenedos*; which is neither likely, nor consistent with the Iliads wherein the Isle of *Cranae*, less distant than *Tenedos* from the place, where the Rape was committed, is the Scene of the last (w) Favour. 2. The second Difficulty is taken from the Rich Presents *Paris* is obliged to make, in order to obtain his Wishes. Which is contrary to *Decorum*, in the opinion of those, who know the Character of *Helena*: The Author was sensible of it, and therefore he breaks out into an Exclamation immediately after the Verses, wherein he describes the Presents (a) and the Enjoyment.

Proh scelus! an tantis potuisti pessima votis
Indulsisse moras? expectabatque voluptas
Emptorem? O teneri miranda potentia sexus!
Præcipitem in lucrum suspendit femina luxum,
Nec nisi conducto dignatur gaudia risu.

(H) *Was determin'd at* Rome, *with too great a rigour.*] *Cicero* (b) wrote the following Words to his Brother about it. *Tenediorum igitur libertas securi Tenedia præcisa est, cum eos præter me & Bibulum & Calidium & Favonium nemo defenderet.* The Proverbial Expression of *Cicero* may be explain'd by *Pausanias* or *Stephanus Byzantinus*. *Tenedia Securis*, says the latter (c), *de iis qui vel asperè vel etiam magis concise abscidunt quæstiones & alias res.* *Pausanias* having said that *Tenes* broke with a Hatchet the Rope, wherewith the Ship of his Father *Cygnus* was fastened, adds (d) *Ex eo in Proverbii consuetudinem venit ut quidquid quis præfracte negaret, id Tenedia bipenni præcidisse diceretur.*

(A) *Step-Mother of* Tenes.] We read in *Pausanias* (e) that *Cygnus*, the Son of *Neptune*, reign'd at *Colonæ* in *Troas*, and had two Sons by *Proclea*, the Daughter of *Clytius*, and Sister to *Caletor*, who was kill'd at the Siege of *Troy* by *Ajax*, as it appears from the Iliad. Those two Children of *Cygnus* were, a Son call'd *Tenes*, and a Daughter call'd *Hemithea*. After the Death of their Mother, *Cygnus* married *Philonome*, *Crangasus's* Daughter. This *Philonome* accused *Tenes* of having attempted to ravish her, whereas she on the contrary fell in Love with *Tenes*, who refused to comply with her Desires. Thus, here is an Example, which may be added to those of *Theseus* and *Constantin*. *Muretus* has Collected some others in the 12th. Chapter of the first Book of his *Variæ Lectiones*. See the Article *Fausta*.

(B) *That* Tenes *had ravish'd her.*] I follow my Author, who says, καταψευσαμένης αὐτοῦ τὸ βιάζεσθαι ταύτην. But because we have only some Fragments of that Work of *Heraclides*, which savour of the Carelesness and Precipitation of a Man, who is in haste to make an end of an Abridgment, I make no doubt that some Words are wanting in this place. A Wife will not complain to her Husband that she has been ravish'd; she will only tell him that there was such a Design. Though *Stephanus Byzantinus* has been strangely used by his Abbreviator, yet he (f) informs us, that *Philonome*, *Cygnus's* Wife, complain'd only of *Tenes's* ill Design, and that the Evidence of the Piper went no farther. *Pausanias* makes no mention of that Evidence: He will have it that *Cygnus* was persuaded by the bare Complaints of *Philonome*; but he observes that she complained only of the ill Design of her Son-in-Law. (g) Ψευδομένη πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ὡς αὐτὴ μὲν ἐκ ἐθέλουσα, τὸν δὲ αὐτῇ Τέννην συγγένεσθαι θελήσοντα; that is, *she falsely complain'd to her Husband, that* Tenes *attempted to lye with her against her Will.* The Latin Translation of *Romulus Amasæus* seems to me to go beyond the Original, *quod ille invitam & repugnantem constuprare conatus esset*. The Latin Words signifie great Endeavours; but the Greek may be understood of a bare Sollicitation.

(C) *Which occasion'd the stamping of Medals.*] Mr. *Beger* (h) has publish'd one stamped at *Tenedos* having on one Side two Faces upon one and the same Neck, and on the other an Ax between a Lyre and a Bunch of Grapes. Those two Faces represent a Man and a Woman: That Author says, that the Design of this Medal was to denote the Union, which ought to be between married People. The Medal of *Tenes*, mention'd by the Ancients (i), was not stamp'd with such an intent; but rather to denote the Capital Punish-

---

ς *Pausanias l. 10. pag. 330.*

† *In Verrem l. 3.*

β *Wheeler voiage pag. 103. Strabo l. 13. p. 415. says it is 80 Stadia in compass, and the Canal that divides it from Asia,* 40.

γ *Spon, voiage tom. 1. p.* 153. Dutch *Edit.*

δ *Stephan. in* Τένεδος.

ζ *Strabo l. 8. p. 187.*

θ *Plutarch* Quæst. Græc. n. 28. p. 297. *calls him* Molpus.

κ *See the Remark G.*

(t) *Geograph. sacr. parte 2. l. 1. c. 9.*

(v) *Josephus Iscanus, Anglus, who lived in the XIII. Century. See his* Dares Phrygius de bello Trojano lib. 3. pag. m. 52, 53.

(w) *See the Remark I in the Article* Helena.

(a) Hæc faciles emere toros, domuere rebelles Amplexus, pepigere fidem, non jam oscula reddit Non reddenda negat Helene, sed pectore toto Incumbens, gremium solvit, premit ore, latentem Furatur Venerem, jamque expirante Dione Conscia secretos testatur purpura rores. Proh scelus, &c. (b) *Cicero ad Q. fratrem lib.* 2. (c) Τενέδιος πέλεκυς ἐπὶ τῶν ἤτοι πικρῶς ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον συντόμως ἀποκοπτόντων τὰ ζητήματα, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πράγματα. *Steph. Byzant. voce* Τένεδος.

a Man and a Woman upon the same Neck. This likewise, and what shall be said hereafter, was the reason why the Ax of *Tenedos* became a Proverb †, to denote a great Severity *. *Tenes* ordered another thing, that was very remarkable, viz. that a Man holding an Ax in his Hands should ‡ always stand behind the Judge, to cut off the Head of any one, who should be convicted of Falsity. Others say he ordered that the Executioner should stand behind the Accusers holding up an Ax, (C Δ) to put to Death immediately those, who should be Guilty of a false Accusation. *Aristotle*, says in general * that the King of *Tenedos* Administring Justice with an Ax, made a quick dispatch of those, who had wronged some Body. And therefore 'tis no wonder if the Proverb §, *He is a Man of* Tenedos, denoted a Man, who had a terrible Look. *Tenes* shewed himself inflexible even to his Father. *Cygnus* having discovered his Wife's Calumny, went into the Isle of *Tenedos*, to give his Son satisfaction for the injury he had done him ω. He fasten'd his Ship to a Tree or a Rock, but *Tenes* in a fit of Passion cut the Ropes with his Ax: We are not told how he (D) used *Cygnus* after this blunt Action; but we read that the Father and the Son were kill'd by *Achilles*, during the *Trojan* War: The first, when the *Grecians* § landed, and the second, when *Achilles* ‡ laid waste the Isle of *Tenedos*. *Tenes* came to the Assistance of his dear (E) Sister *Hemithea*, who was pursued by *Achilles*; but he got his Death by it. This Action was attended with many (F) Consequences.

† See the Remark [illegible] in the Article Tenedos.
* Ex Heraclide in Politia.
‡ Suidas in Τενέδιος ἄνθρωπος.
* Apud Suidam in voce [illegible].
§ See Erasmus in the Proverbs Tenedia bipennis. Tenedius homo. Tenedius patronus. Tenedius Tibicen.
ω Pausanias l. 10. pag. 340.
§ Ovidius Metam. l. 12.
‡ Plutarch. quæst. Gr. pag. 297.

Punishment of a Man and a Woman, who had committed Adultery, and to be a perpetual Monument of the Execution of the Law upon *Tenes*'s own Son. You may see what a (k) learned Man answered to M. *Beger*. There are some Medals of *Tenedos*, in which one of the Faces represents an Old Man, and the other a young Woman; in others, the two Faces represent young People, *&c.* 'Tis inferred from those Variations, that those Medals were not stamp'd according to the first intent; but some for one Design, and some for another: Unless it be said that whenever the Law was put in Execution, a new Medal was stamp'd, and that the two Heads upon one Neck differ'd as to the Age, or some other Ornaments, according to the Personal Qualities of those, who had been punish'd. It would be no wonder if an Old Beard had been found in the Fact with a young Woman.

(C Δ) *That the Executioner should stand behind the Accusers holding up an Ax, to put to Death immediately.*] *Suidas* says so: Ἐνομοθέτησε, says he (l), τῶν τὰ ψευδῆ κατηγορούντων ὄπισθεν παρεστάναι τὸ δήμιον πέλεκυν ἐπηρμένον ὡς ἐλεγχθέντας παραχρῆμα ἀναιρεῖσθαι. *Legem tulit ut carnifex securim sublatam tenens à tergo astaret illis qui falsa crimina objicerent, ut convicti ex tempore occiderentur.* Which puts me in mind of a Maxim commented upon by a *French* Civilian of the XVIth Century. It imports that a Man, who goes about to oppose the prevailing Religion, ought not to be heard, but upon this Condition, that he shall be punish'd with Death, if he does not convince others, that his private Opinion is more certain than the Doctrine commonly received. (m) *Qui antiqua, legitima atque ordinaria sacra audet in controversiam adducere, eum non audiendum esse, nisi periculo sui capitis, si non persuadeat veriorem esse suam sententiam.* Whereupon he alledges a very remarkable Example taken from *Josephus*, in the 6th Chapter of the 13th Book of his *Jewish Antiquities*. The *Jews*, and the *Samaritans* having a quarrel in the City of *Alexandria* about this Question, Whether the Temple of *Jerusalem* was to be preferred to that of *Garizim*; the Cause was brought before the Council of the (a) King of *Egypt*, and before the Case was argued, it was determined, that the Advocates of the Party cast should be condemn'd to Death. The Advocate of the *Jews* spoke first (†), and so clearly made out the Justice of his Cause, that he obtained such a Sentence as he desired; so that *Sabbeus* and *Theodosius*, the two Advocates of the *Samaritans*, were condemn'd to lose their Lives. The same Civilian (b) alledges *Zaleucus*'s Law, by Virtue of which, whoever proposed any Innovation, was to do it with a Rope about his Neck, that he might be strangled immediately, if he could not make it appear, that there was a Necessity to abrogate the old Customs; and the Result of his Discourse is, that he wishes the same were practised in *France*. He fancies that the Factions and Troubles, occasion'd by Innovations in the Kingdom of *France*, would have been prevented by that means. (c) *Quibus omnino rationibus atque conditionibus si nos, præsertim hoc tempore uteremur, quo is demum nihil scire & illiberalis esse dicitur, cui non placent absurdissima quæque, modo recentissima: non ita planè res incerta essent ac turbulenta, neque tam multi multarum partium, factionum, opinionum auctores evaderent: cùm suo saltem periculo ex discerent amare, colere, pacem patriamque, leges ac magistratus, quæ illis sanè prosequuntur.* 'Tis plain he could have wish'd that the Disputes between the *Romish* Priests and the Protestants had been determin'd like that of *Alexandria*: But was there in *France* a Tribunal like that of the King of *Egypt*? The latter was composed of Men, who were neither *Jews* nor *Samaritans*; and therefore the contending Parties might expected to be tried without any Partiality. *Luther*, and *Calvin*, and their Followers, could not expect the same, since the same Persons would have been both Judges and Parties: And therefore, neither *Zaleucus*'s Law, nor that of the King of *Egypt*, can reach Matters of Religion.

(D) *We are not told how he us'd* Cygnus.] I have kept to *Pausanias*'s Narrative, which is the Reason why I have left the Account of that Voyage very imperfect. 'Tis plain, the main Design of that Author was to describe Statues and Pictures, and that he did not much consider whether the Stories he mention'd, by the by, were lame or not. He says, that *Cygnus* landed in the Isle of *Tenedos*, that he fasten'd his Ship to a Tree or a great Stone; and that *Tenes* cut the Cable. He should at least have told us whether the Son permitted his Father to live in *Tenedos*, or to go Home. This Adventure is better related by *Conon* (d), tho' we have but an Abstract of his Book. *Cygnus*, says he, fasten'd his Ship, but did not land; he desired his Son to forget what was past, but he did it on board his Ship. *Tenes* cut the Cables with his Hatchet to prevent his Landing. Any Body may see what became of *Cygnus*; he went Home.

(E) *His dear Sister.*] 'Tis not without reason that I use this Epithet, since *Hemithea* was (e) so afflicted at her Brother's Misfortune, that *Cygnus* shut her up in the same Chest, in which he committed his Son to the Mercy of the Sea. What *Suidas* says of her is still more glorious, for he tells us (f) that she resolved to run the same Hazard with her Brother. 'Twas very reasonable, that *Tenes* should expose his Life to prevent her being ravish'd; and yet he died in so just a Cause: 'Tis said (g), that *Hemithea* was swallowed up by the Earth; and that it was the only thing that put a Stop to *Achilles*'s Attempt. The Remedy was somewhat Violent, and few People would think it more tolerable than the Evil it self. (h) *Hemithea* was a very handsome Woman.

(F) *Attended with many Consequences.*] When *Achilles* came to know that he had kill'd *Tenes*, he was sorry for't, and took care to get him buried. He kill'd a Servant he had from *Thetis*, because he did not well perform *Thetis*'s Orders. She had not only strictly charged her Son not to kill *Tenes*, but besides she had enjoyned that Servant to put him in Mind of her Orders, when there should be occasion for it, lest he should disobey her through Inadvertency. (i) *Plutarch* gives no other Reason for this Care of *Thetis*, but that *Tenes* was beloved by *Apollo*: Others (k) say, that he was his Son, and that *Cygnus* was only his reputed Father. Now, according to the Destinies, *Achilles* was to dye assoon as he should kill one of *Apollo*'s Sons. The Inhabitants of *Tenedos* conceived so great an Indignation against *Achilles*, that they order'd that no Body should

(d) *Apud Photium* pag. 437.

(e) *Conon ubi supra.*

(f) Ἑλομένης δὲ τῆς ἀδελφῆς συγκινδυνεῦσαι τῷ ἀδελφῷ, ἐμβληθῆναι τοὺς δύο. Cum autem Hemithea cum fratre periculum idem subire voluisset utrumque conjecit in mare.

(g) *Tzetzes in Lycophr.*

(h) *Plut. quæst. Gr. ubi infra.*

(i) *Id. ib. pag.* 297.

(k) *Tzetzes ibid.*

quences. He was honoured like a God *(G)* in the Isle of *Tenedos*. See the Article of that Island.

TEOS, one of the twelve Cities of *Ionia*. *Athamas* *(A)* was the first Founder of it §. This *Athamas*, Grand-Son to another *Athamas*, the Son of *Æolus*, conducted a Colony of *Orchomenians* to *Teos*: That Colony was, in Process of Time, increased by some other Colonies of *Athenians* and *Bœotians*. *Herodotus* says *, that *Teos* was in the middle of *Ionia*; and that it was the Reason why *Thales* advised the *Ionians* to make it the Seat of their General Assemblies. *Strabo*, who places it in a Peninsula, is not so faulty as *Pliny*, who makes an Island of it; for 'tis certain that *Teos* stood ß on the Southern Side of the Isthmus *(B)* over against *Clazomenæ*, which was on the Northern Side. The Inhabitants of *Teos* being no longer able to hold out against the Troops of *Cyrus*, commanded by *Harpalus*, put γ to Sea in the 59th. Olympiad, and settled a Colony at *Abdera* in *Thrace*. *Suidas* ε speaking of *Anacreon*, *(C)* who was a Native of *Teos*, seems to say that it was in the Reign of *Darius* the Son of *Hystaspes* that the *Teians* went to *Abdera*; for he says, that *Anacreon* retired thither, being expell'd from *Teos*, on Account of *Histiæus*'s Revolt. Some *Teians* ξ return'd into their Country in Process of Time. That Town produced not only *Anacreon*, but also the ‡ Poet *Scythinus*, the Historian † *Hecatæus*, and *Apellicon*, who collected so many Books. *Stephanus Byzantinus* mentions another Town call'd *Teos*, which he places in the Country of the *Dirbæ* in *Scythia*; but because 'tis a Nation altogether unknown, and it must be different from those, whom he calls *Dyrbai*, that Passage is thought to be faulty.

TERMESSUS, a Town of *Pisidia*. See the Remark *E* in the Article TELMESSUS.

TETTI

should mention his Name in the Temple of *Tenes*. *(l)* The Pipers were also forbidden to enter into it. *Diodorus Siculus* *(m)* does not say, that those two Prohibitions concern'd the Temple of *Tenes*, though he observes, that the Inhabitants of *Tenedos* built a Temple to him, and worship'd him as a God. He tells us, that *Tenes* himself ordered that the Pipers should not enter into the Temple. He adds, that the Temple, which was re-built, when *Achilles* had destroyed the Town, was that, in which it was not lawful to mention *Achilles*. He, and *Plutarch* are therefore of a quite contrary Opinion as to the Place, which those two Prohibitions concern'd. 'Tis certain, that no Temple was built to *Tenes* during his Life.

(G) Was honoured like a God.] I have quoted two Authors who say so. *Cicero* may be added to them: *Jam vero*, says he, *(n)*, *in Græcia multos habent ex hominibus Deos Alabandum Alabandi, Tenedi Tenem.* It was one of the Deities which *Verres* Stole. *(o) Tenedo, præterea pecuniam quam eripuit, Tenem ipsum qui apud Tenedios sanctissimus deus habetur, qui urbem illam dicitur condidisse, cujus ex nomine Tenedus nominatur, hunc, inquam, ipsum Tenem pulcherrimè factum, quem quondam in comitio vidistis, abstulit magno cum gemitu civitatis.* It may be inferr'd from thence, that the ancient Deity of *Tenedos*, *viz. Apollo Smintheus*, was in a manner forgotten, since *Tenes* was placed among the Gods: For it was not objected to *Verres*, that he had made an Attempt upon the Statue of *Apollo*; which plainly shews, that it was not to be compared with that of *Tenes*. Men seem to act in Point of Religion, as they do in Point of Friendship: None but wise and reasonable Men prefer old Friends to new ones. 'Tis an usual thing to imitate wanton Women; the last Comers are the most acceptable. In like manner the new Saints make People forget the old ones. Some grave Writers have complain'd of it.

(A) Athamas *was the first Founder of it.*] *Ortelius* *(p)* is mistaken when he says, that, according to *Strabo* and *Stephanus Byzantinus*, *Anacreon* call'd it *Athamas*, before it went by the Name of *Teos*. Those two Authors do only say, that *Anacreon* call'd it Ἀθαμαντίδα, because it was founded by *Athamas*. One ought to make a great difference between the proper Names of a Town, and the Epithets bestowed upon it in Poetry; which shews, that *Ortelius* would have committed a Mistake, though he had said that *Teos* went by the Name of *Athamantis*. It will appear, by a right Computation, that he is guilty of three Faults. 1. He confounds *Athamas* with *Athamantis*. 2. He takes an Epithet for a proper Name. 3. He thought the Native Country of *Anacreon* was not call'd *Teos*, when that Poet call'd it *Athamantis*. *Charles Stephens* has committed the same Mistakes.

(B) Of the Isthmus over against Clazomenæ.] Here follows a Passage of *Pomponius* *(a)* *Mela*, which I must examin. *Super angustias, hinc Teos, illinc Clazomenæ, & quia terga jungunt confinio adnexa maris, diversis frontibus diversa maria prospectant.* *Pintianus* makes the following Correction, *quæ terga agunt, confinibus adnexa muris diversis frontibus diversa maria prospectant.* *Salmasius* not liking it, reads thus *(b)*, *Quæ terga agunt confinio adnexa maris, adversis frontibus diversa maria prospectant.* *Isaac Vossius* always ready to find fault with that Critick, will have *(c)* the Words to be read in this manner, *quæ terga agunt confinio adnexa muri diversis*, &c. He calls the reading *adversis*, instead of *diversis*, a very great Mistake; for, says he, if those two Towns had *frontes adversas*, they would not look towards the Sea, but would Face one another: *Manifeste*, *Vossius* goes on, *hic tergum pro fronte, & frontem pro tergo accepit vir doctissimus.* *Vossius* must needs have read the Passage of *Salmasius* very carelesly, since he raises such an Objection against him. How could *Salmasius* take the Front for the Back-side, since he expresly observes, that the *Teians* had the Sea of *Clazomenæ* before them, as the *Clazomenians* had the Sea of *Teos* before them? He will have it, that each of those two Towns had the Sea before and behind; that each had behind it the Sea near which it was built, and before it the Sea on which the other Town was built. And therefore, the Objection of *Vossius* is altogether wrong in that respect. The Reason on which it is grounded is not better, *viz.* that those two Towns would have faced one another, if *Salmasius*'s Correction was right; for *Salmasius* did not pretend to deny that they faced one another; on the contrary, he supposes it *(d)*, or rather manifestly declares it: But for that very Reason he pretended, that each of those two Towns look'd towards the Sea on which the other was built. Besides, it seems to me, that *Vossius* should not have asserted, that *Teos* and *Clazomenæ* had the Sea only on the fore-side; and that there was a Wall between them, which took up the breadth of the *Isthmus*. This Particular wanted to be proved, and would not have been forgotten by all the ancient Authors, if it had been true. And therefore, notwithstanding *Pincianus*'s reading *Muris*, instead of *Maris*, a Correction partly adopted by *Vossius*, we ought to keep to *Salmasius*'s Correction till we have a better.

(C) Anacreon, *who was a Native of* Teos.] *(e)* *Moreri* tells us, that some say *Anacreon* was a Native *of* Teios, *a Town of* Paphlagonia. One would think that *Strabo* and *Ovid*, quoted by him at the end of his Artick, should be the Authors who say so; but 'tis not to be expected he should be so exact. Yet *Moreri* did not invent that Particular; he found it in these Words of *Charles Stephens*: *(f)* *Teium, urbs in Paphlagonia (ut Sallustius scribit) in qua ortus fuit Anacreon.* Properly speaking, there is no Quotation in those Words for what concerns the Native Country of *Anacreon*; for *Sallust* seems to be alledged only to prove, that there was a Town call'd *Teium* *(g)* in *Paphlagonia*. And therfore we are never the better for what *Charles Stephens* says than for what we read in *Moreri*. *Lloyd* and *Hofman* don't help us in the Matter: They have left out the Quotation of *Sallust* in the Article of *Teium*, thinking, doubtless, that it was false; and yet 'tis certain, that *Charles Stephens* is right in that respect: They affirm, without quoting any

---

§ *Pausanias l. 7. pag. 208. Strabo l. 14 circa init.*

* *Lib. 1. c. 170.*

‡ *Lib. 5. c. 31.*

ß *Strab. ib. Pompon. Mela l. 1. c. 17. & ibid. Il. Vossius.*

γ *Herod. l. 1. c. 168. Strabo. l. 14. pag. m. 443.*

ε *See the Remark I in the Article Anacreon.*

ξ *Strabo ibid.*

‡ *Stephanus in* Τέως.

† *Strab. ib. & l. 13. pag. 419.*

(l) *Plutarch. ib.*

(m) *Lib. 6. c. 17.*

(n) *Cicero, lib. 3. de natura Deor. pag. m. 619.*

(o) *Id. in Verr. l. 3.*

(p) *In Thesauro Geograph.* v. Teos.

(a) *Lib. 1. c. 17.*

(b) Exercit. Plin. pag.

(c) In Melam, pag.

(d) Ita a tergo mare [illegible] circum cui adjacent sunt, & frons diversa maria prospectant. Teos enim adversa fronte prospectat mare in quo sita Clazomena (as says Salmasius instead of saying Clazomenæ) & Clazomenæ mare Teium. Illa contra Teon respiciunt & frons cui adjacet est Teos.

(e) Upon the Word Teos.

(f) Upon the Word Teium.

(g) Strabo lib. 12. pag. m. 374, 375 mentions it, but does not say it was in Paphlagonia.

TETTI (SCIPIO) in Latin *Tettius*, a Learned Man of the XVIth Century, was born at *Naples*. He came to an unfortunate End; for he was prosecuted, as having some ill Opinions concerning the Deity, and sent (*A*) to the Galleys. He wrote a Tract *de Apollodoris*, publish'd at *Rome* (*B*) by *Benedictus Ægius* in the Year 1555. He was very much (*C*) esteem'd by the Learned.

TETTIX, was a Native of the Isle of *Crete*, and went with a Fleet to *Peloponnesus*. He landed at the Promontory call'd *Tænarium*, where he built a Town. He made his Residence near a Place call'd Ψυχοπομπεῖον, by Reason of the Ceremonies performed there to appease the *Manes*. He, who kill'd the Poet *Archilochus* (*Z*), was sent thither by the Priestess of *Delphi*.

TEUCER, the Son of *Telamon* and of *Hesione* †, Sister to *Priamus*, went with twelve Ships to the Siege of *Troy* ‡, where he gave noble Proofs of his Courage; but he did not revenge § the Affront put upon his Brother *Ajax*; nor prevent * his killing himself. Which made him (*A*) so odious to *Telamon*, that he received an Order from him not to set Foot in *Salamis*. Whereupon he went to seek his Fortune; and having landed in the Isle of *Cyprus*, he built a Town which he call'd (*B*) *Salamis*, the Name of his Father's Kingdom. When

any Author for it, that *Teium* a Town in *Paphlagonia*, on the *Euxine Sea*, was the Native Country of *Anacreon*; and they say, upon the Word *Teos*, that some make him a Native of *Teium*. So that they quote no Author that may be consulted. I have enquired into the thing, and find that one of the (*b*) Scholiasts upon *Horace* has these Words: *Teia dicta est à Teio Anacreontis poetæ lyrici oppido, quod in Paphlagonia esse Sallustius indicat, cum de situ pontico loquitur.* I would not affirm, upon the Authority of that Passage, that *Sallust* said, that *Teium*, upon the *Euxine Sea*, was *Anacreon*'s Native Country. It might be a Gloss of the Scholiast, grounded upon what he had read in *Sallust*, concerning the Town of *Paphlagonia*. But, though *Sallust*, and other Writers should say, that *Anacreon* was born in that Town of the *Euxine Sea*, we should not doubt that he was a Native of *Teos* in *Ionia*.

(*A*) *He was sent to the Galleys.*] If *Thuanus* had not mention'd this Particular, I fancy we had never known it: For the curious *Nicodemo*, who made so many Inquiries concerning the *Neapolitan* Writers, acknowledges that he knew nothing of it, but what he had read in *Thuanus*. *Questo luogo del Tuano*, says he (*i*), *qui si e trascritto volentieri perche oltre alla lode che si da al Tetti in esso, si ha una notizia anche curiosa intorno al medesimo Tetti.* These are *Thuanus*'s Words: (*k*) *Ab eo* (Mureto) *de Scipionis Tettii Neapolitani casu cognovit, hominis undecunque, ut ille ajebat, doctissimi, qui delatus quod male de numine sentiret, remo mancipatus fuerat, & tunc an adhuc in vivis esset, incertum erat.* *Thuanus* speaks of the time (*l*) when he was at *Rome*, and of the frequent Conversations he had with *Muretus*. What we read in the *Thuana* has a Relation to this: "The Inquisition was very severe "under the Pontificate of *Sixtus* V. *Muretus* told me, "we don't know what becomes of People here. I "am amazed, being told when I rise in the Morning, "that such a one is not to be found, and yet none "dares speak of it. The Inquisition made a quick "Dispatch of 'em." I find a Slip of Memory in this Passage *Muretus* died soon after the Election of *Sixtus* V. in 1585. *Thuanus* was in *France* all that Year; and therefore *Muretus* told him nothing in that Pope's Reign. I think I may say, without being mistaken, that *Thuanus*, remembring on one hand what *Muretus* had told him concerning the Executions of the Inquisition; and knowing on the other hand, that *Sixtus* V. was very severe, confounded the time in which *Muretus* spoke to him, with the time when *Sixtus* V. was Pope. People don't use to be so exact in Conversation, and Memory is not then quick enough to make one avoid Anachronisms.

(*B*) *Publish'd at* Rome *by* Benedictus Ægius.] He added it to his Edition of *Apollodorus*, translated by him into *Latin*, and printed with his Notes, wherein he often mentions *Tetti*, and speaks of him as of a very honest and learned Man. (*b*) *Sic habet exemplar Scipionis Tetti Neapolitani, viri nobilissimi & summa doctrina & modestia & humanitatis incredibilis.* M. *Baillet* makes mention of him in the 403. page of the 1st. Volume of the *Jugemens des Savans.* "*Scipio Tetti*, says he, a *Neapolitan*, bestowed many "Years upon his small Tract *de Appollodoris*, before "he was sent to the Gallies. 'Tis a Work of two "Sheets; but notwithstanding its Smallness, and the "Author's Misfortune, it is still esteem'd by the pub"lick." *Colomies* (*c*) thought that *Tetti* had only writ that Tract, and a Catalogue of Manuscripts publish'd (*d*) by Father *Labbe*; but he should have known that the same Father ascribes to him (*e*) *Bibliotheca scholastica instructissima Latinè, Gallicè, Italicè, Hispanicè, Anglicè, & Græcè*, Printed at *London* in the Year 1618, in 8vo. *Nicodemo* knew nothing of it, but what he found in Father *Labbe*.

(*C*) *Very much esteem'd by the Learned.*] He himself informs us, that he had contracted Friendship with many illustrious Men. *Testes*, says he (*f*), *conscii que nostrum utriusque laborum celeberrimi rerum antiquarum conservatores, nedum rei literariæ acerrimi patroni ac defensores, Achilles Maffeus, Gentilisque Delphinius. Testes amici alii literis & ingenio præstantissimi Carus Hannibal, Baptista Sigicellus, Antonius Augustinus, Alexandri duo, Picolominus & Corvinus, Marcus Casalius. Testes item alii quos longum esset enumerare. Denique & Fulvius Ursinus juvenis imprimis honestus & ornatus, & supra quam par sit ejus ætati Latinè & Græcè eruditus.*

(*Z*) *Was sent thither.*] *Plutarch*, who supplies me with the Matter of this Article, expresses himself thus: (*g*) Ε'κελεύσθη πορευθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Τέττιγ☉ οἴκησιν ἱλάσασθαι τὴν τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ψυχήν. *He was ordered to go to* Tettix's *House, in order to appease the Soul of* Archilochus. According to *Suidas*, he was ordered to go to *Tænarium*, where *Tettix* was buried, and to offer a Propitiatory Sacrifice to the Soul of *Telesicles*'s Son (*h*). *Goropius Becanus* (*i*), who consulted no other Author but *Suidas*, thought, that *Tettix* was *Archilochus* himself; which is a great Falsity. Had he consulted *Plutarch*, he would have avoided that Mistake, and the Misapplication of (*k*) *Archilochus*'s Words against a Man, who had abused him. Τέττιγα τοῦ πτεροῦ συνείληφας, *cicadam ala apprehendisti.* See the Remark C in the Article *Archilochus*.

(*A*) *Which made him so* (*l*) *odious to* Telamon.] *Sophocles* brings in *Teucer* foretelling that Misfortune, and foreseeing that his Father would call him (*m*) Bastard and a Coward, and even accuse him of having deceitfully contributed to the Death of his Brother, in hopes of being the only Heir; and that he would turn him out of his House. He observes, that *Telamon* never laugh'd, no, not in a time of Mirth; and that he would be much more angry and peevish, hearing, in his old Age, of the unhappy Death of his Son. It appears from the following Words of *Cicero*, that he admired the Verses, wherein *Pacuvius* represents how *Teucer* was received by his Father. (*n*) *Quid potest esse tam fictum quàm Versus, quàm scena, quàm fabula? Tamen in hoc genere sæpe ipse vidi quum ex persona mihi ardere oculi hominis histrionis viderentur spondalia illa, dicentis,*

> Segregare abs te ausus, aut sine illo Salamina ingredi,
> Neque paternum aspectum es veritus.

Nunquam illum aspectum dicebat, quin mihi Telamon iratus furere luctu filii videretur. Ut ille inflexa ad miserabilem sonum voce,

> ——— Quem ætate exacta indigem
> Liberum lacerasti, orbasti, extinxisti, neque fratris
> necis,
> Neque gnati eius parvi qui tibi in tutelam est traditus.

Flens ac lugens dicere videbatur? Quæ si ille Histrio quotidie cum ageret, tamen recte agere sine dolore non poterat, quid Pacuvium putabis in scribendo leni animo ac remisso fuisse?

(*B*) *Which he call'd* Salamis.] An (*o*) Oracle of *Apollo* had promised him that the new *Salamis*, built by

---

(*m*) *Agamemnon in the* 8*th Book of the Iliads v.* 284. *tells him, that* Telamon *had carefully bred him up, though he was a Bastard.* (*n*) *De Oratore l.* 2. *fol.* 80. (*o*) *Euripides in* Helena *mentions that Oracle.*

† *See the Remark D, in the Article Telamon.*

‡ *Hygin. c.* 97.

§ *Teucer non receptus à patre Telamone ob segnitiam non vindicatæ fratris injuriæ, Cyprum appulsus cognomine patriæ suæ Salamina constituit. Vell. Paterculus init.*

* Ἐδιώχθη [illegible] ὑφ' αὐτοῦ. Ejectum Salamine eo quod Ajacem fratrem manus sibi illaturum minime prohibuisset. *Scholiast. Æschil. in Persic.*

(*e*) *In biblioth. bibliothecarum.*

(*f*) *In tractatu de Apollodoris.*

(*g*) *De iis qui sero à numine puniuntur, pag.* 560.

(*h*) *He was Archilochus's Father*

(*i*) *Orig. Antwerp. l.* 4. *apud Schottum biblioth. Hispan. pag.* 378.

(*k*) *Apud Lucianum in Pseudolog.*

(*l*) *See in Servius in Æn. lib.* 1. *v.* 619. *all the reasons that are given for* Telamon's *Anger.*

When he heard of *Telamon's* Death, he went to take Possession of his Kingdom; but *Eurysaces*, *Ajax's* Son, opposed him. This Resistance raised in him a desire of turning Adventurer; he Sailed towards *Spain*, and having landed in the Place where new *Carthage* was built, he went as far as *Gallicia*, where he settled. *Justin* ‖ says so, but 'tis more likely (C) that *Teucer* settled in the Isle of *Cyprus*. He built a Temple to *Jupiter* in *Salamis*, and ordered (D) that a Man should be Sacrificed to that God. That cruel Sacrifice lasted till the time of the Emperor *Hadrian*. *Teucer's* Posterity reigned there for many Ages. *Pausanias* † says they reigned there till the time of *Evagoras*; but he is not exact, for they reign'd (E) longer. They reign'd also in *Cilicia*, as I have shewn speaking of *Ajax*, the Son of *Teucer*. It might be inferr'd from a Passage of *Pausanias* *, that *Teucer* married a Daughter of *Cinyras*. He was assisted by the King of the *Tyrians*, to secure his new Domination: *Virgil* § says so, and *Servius* does not deny that it was the Opinion of many Writers. Others said that *Teucer* made himself Master of the Country without such an Assistance. According to *Homer* ‡, he was the best Archer in the *Grecian* Army.

THAIS, a Greek Curtezan, followed *Alexander's* Army, and occasion'd the (A) Destruction of *Persepolis*. She was so well beloved by *Ptolemy* King of *Egypt*, that he ¶ married her. Those who say that *Menander* was one of her Gallants, can give no good

by him, would be as famous as the other:

Certus (p) enim promisit Apollo
Ambiguam tellure nova Salamina futuram.

The Passage, wherein *Horace* says this, is very well known, because 'tis a piece of a drinking Song.

Teucer Salamina patremque
Cum fugeret, tamen uda Lyæo
Tempora populea fertur vinxisse corona,
Sic tristes affatus amicos;
Quo nos cunque feret melior fortuna parente,
Ibimus ô socii, comitesque:
Nil desperandum Teucro duce & auspice Teucro.

. . . .

O fortes pejoraque passi
Mecum sæpe viri, nunc vino pellite curas,
Cras ingens iterabimus æquor.

Teucer does not say in *Horace*, where he would build the new *Salamis*; but he says in *Euripides* that he would build it in the Isle of *Cyprus*: All the Historians observe that he built it there, except *Messala Corvinus*, who is reproved for it by *Meursius*. (q) *Itaque manifestus est error Messalla Corvini, qui in Sidonia conditam à Teucro dicit lib. de Augusti progenie.* Teucer qui patria profugus in Sidonia alteram Salaminam condidit.

(C) *'Tis more likely that* Teucer *settled in the Isle of* Cyprus.] If he had settled in *Spain*, *Asclepiades* of *Myrlea*, who taught Grammar in that Country, would not have forgot to say so in his Description of the Nations, who inhabited it; since he (r) observed that some of those who bore Arms under *Teucer*, settled in *Gallicia*: His Silence is a very good Proof.

(D) *That a Man should be Sacrificed.*] *Tacitus*, who (s) mentions the Construction of that Temple, says nothing of that Sacrifice, *& Jovi Salaminio Teucer, Telamonis patris ira profugus.* *Lactantius* (t) informs us of it. *Apud Cypri*, says he, *Salaminem humanam hostiam Jovi Teucrus immolavit, idque sacrificium posteris tradidit, quod est nuper Hadriano imperante sublatum.* What puzzles me is, that *Porphyrius* (a), who owns that Men were Sacrificed in *Salamis* for a long time, does not say that any of 'em were Sacrificed to *Jupiter*; and he tells us, that this Custom was suppressed under the Reign of *Diphilus*, Contemporary with *Seleucus* the *Theologian*. That Prince ordered that for the time to come, an Ox should be Sacrificed instead of a Man. That Sacrifice was offered to *Agraule*, the Daughter of *Cecrops* and of the *Nymph Agraulis*.

(E) *For they reigned longer.*] It appears from one of *Isocrates*'s Orations that it was not without interruption; for he introduces *Nicocles*, who having said that *Teucer* the Founder of their Family had built *Salamis*, he adds, that his Father *Evagoras* had recovered the Kingdom which had been lost by others; and that he had so ordered things that *Salamis* was no longer Tyrannized by the *Phœnicians*, and had no other Kings but those, to whom the Kingdom did belong at first. Thus *Teucer's* Posterity sway'd the Scepter after the Death of *Evagoras*. 'Tis certain that his Son *Nicocles* reigned at *Salamis*: Some (b) say that *Demonicus* reign'd also in that Town, and that he was his Son. *Isocrates* inscribes some Orations to them. I find also one *Nicocreon* King of *Salamis*, (c) descended from *Teucer*. The learned *Meursius* takes him to be the same Man, whom *Ptolemy* (d) made Governour of *Cyprus*, in the first Year of the 117 *Olympiad*, 62 Years after the Death of *Evagoras* (e): For which he gives no other reason but a Passage of *Antoninus Liberalis*. It is a wrong Proof, since the Greeks did not apply their Metamorphoses to an Age so far distant from the fabulous times as that of *Alexander's* Successors was: And therefore *Nicocreon* mention'd by *Antoninus Liberalis* is not the same with that of *Ptolemy*. I omit that *Nicocreon* reigned (f) before the Olympiad mention'd by *Meursius*; notwithstanding which the King of *Egypt* might have given him the Government I speak of.

(A) *And occasioned the Destruction of* Persepolis.] *M. Guillet* rightly observes that *Thais* form'd that design out of a Principle of Ambition. "(g) She "proposed to *Alexander* to burn the Royal Palace of "*Persepolis*, and plainly told him that she long'd to "set it on Fire first; that it might be said in time to "come all over the World, that the *Athenian* Ladies, "who followed *Alexander* into *Persia*, had revenged "the *Athenians*, whose City had been formerly burnt "by *Xerxes*. Her Beauty and Eloquence occasion'd "the Success of her Ambition, and the Royal Palace "was burnt that very Night." The thing is related more at large in the following Words. "(h) From "hence designing to march against *Darius*, before "he set out, he diverted himself with his Officers "at an Entertainment of Drinking, and other Pastimes, and indulg'd so far as to have every one "his Mistress sit by and drink with them. The "most celebrated of them was *Thais* an *Athenian*, "*Ptolemy*'s Mistress, who was afterwards King of "*Ægypt*. She sometimes cunningly prais'd *Alexander*, "sometimes play'd upon him and rally'd him, and "all the while drank so freely, that at last she fell "to talk extravagantly, as those of her Country us'd "to do, much above her Character or Condition. "She said it was indeed some Recompence for the "Pains she had taken in following the Camp all "over *Asia*, that she was that day treated in, and "could insult over the Stately Palace of the *Persian* "Monarchs: But she added, it would please her "much better, if while the King look'd on, she "might in sport, with her own Hands, set Fire to "*Xerxes* his Court, who reduc'd the City of *Athens* to Ashes; that it might be recorded to Posterity, that the Women who followed *Alexander*, "had taken a sharper Revenge on the *Persians* for "the Sufferings and Affronts of *Greece*, than all his "Commanders could do by Sea or Land. What she "said was receiv'd with such Universal liking, and "murmurs of Applause, and so seconded by the Incouragement and Eagerness of the Company, that "the King himself, persuaded to be of the Party, started from his Seat, and with a Chaplet of Flowers on "his Head, and a lighted Torch in his Hand, led "them the way, who went after him in a Riotous "manner, Dancing, and making loud Noises about "the Place." *Diodorus Siculus* * observes that *Thais* set Fire to the Royal Palace, next to the King, and that all the Houses round it were burnt down. He calls her ἑταίραν, a Word that may be rendred *Curtezan*. According to *Plutarch* nothing was burnt but the good Reaſon for it, as I ſhall make it appear in (B) taking notice of *Moreri's* Miſtakes. Whores were commonly call'd by the Name of that Curtezan in † Comedies, and other Pieces of Poetry. 'Tis ſaid, that *Paphnutius* (C) who flouriſh'd in the IVth Century, converted in *Alexandria* a famous Woman of Pleaſure, call'd *THAIS*.

‖ *Justin.* l. 44. c. 5.

† *Lib.* 2. *pag.* 71.

* *Lib.* 1. *pag.* 9.

§ *Æn. l.* 1. *v.* 620.

‡ Τεῦκρος θ', ὃς ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν τοξοσύνῃ, ἀγαθὸς δὲ καὶ ἐν σταδίῃ ὑσμίνῃ. Teucerque qui præstantissimus Achivorum arte sagittandi, strenuus autem & in stataria pugna. *Homer. Iliad. l.* 13. *v.* 313. *See also l.* 8. *v.* 266. *& seq. &* Horace *od.* 9. *l.* 4.

¶ *See the Remark A, towards the end.*

(p) *Horat. od.* 7. *l.* 1.

(q) *Meursius in Cypro p.* 58. *In the foregoing pag. he corrects* Acron, *who says upon the* 7 *ode of the* 1. *Book of* Horace, *that one of the two* Salamis's *was in* Thraciæ regione (*he should have said* in Atticæ regione) *and the other in the Isle of* Cyprus.

(r) *Apud Strabonem l.* 3. *pag. m.* 108.

(s) *Tacit. Ann. l.* 3.

(t) *Lact. divin. inst. lib.* 1. *c.* 21.

(a) *De abstinentia l.* 2. *Eusebius* de præpar. Evang. l. 4. c. 16. *S. Cyril* in Julianum l. 4. *quote the whole Passage of* Porphyrius, teste Meursio in Cypro, *pag.* 61.

(b) *See* Meursius *in* Cypro, *pag.* 113.

(c) *Anton. Liberalis, Metam. c.* 39.

(d) *Diodor. Sicul. l.* 19.

(e) *See Meursius in Cypro l.* 2. *c.* 12 & 15.

(f) *He assisted a Tragedy before Alexander, Plut. in Alex. pag.* 681. *Isocrates died at his House, Idem in Isocr.*

(g) *Guillet, Athenes ancienne & nouvelle p. m.* 238.

(h) *Plutarch in the Life of Alexander, pag.* 687. *of the Francfort Edition* 1620.

* *Lib.* 17. *c.* 72.

THALES, One of the ſeven Wiſe Men of *Greece*. *Moreri* ſpeaks of him at large. I add to what he ſays, that this Philoſopher believed (AΔ), that the World was the

the Royal Palace: But according to *Quintus Curtius*, the whole Town was conſumed to Aſhes, and was never rebuilt. I wonder he does not mention the fineſt Paſſage of *Thais*'s Diſcourſe: It does not appear, from his Account of it, that ſhe earneſtly deſired it ſhould be ſaid in future Ages, that ſhe and her She-friends, had more contributed to revenge the *Grecians* than the greateſt Captains. (i) *De die inibat convivia* (Alexander) *quibus feminæ interant: non quidem quas violari nefas eſſet; quippe pellices licentius quam decebat cum armato vivere adſueta. Ex his una Thais & ipſa temulenta, maximam apud* omnes Græcorum initurum gratiam *adfirmat*, ſi regiam Perſarum juſſiſſet incendi, expectare hoc eos, quorum urbes barbari deleſſent. *Ebrio ſcorto de tanta re ferente ſententiam, unus & alter, & ipſi mero onerati, adſentiunt, rex quoque fuit avidior, quam patientior:* quin igitur ulciſcimur Græciam, & urbi faces ſubdimus. *Omnes incaluerant mero: itaque ſurgunt temulenti ad incendendam urbem, cui armati pepercerant. Primus rex ignem regiæ injecit, tum convivæ & miniſtri pellicesque. Multa cedro ædificata erat regia: quæ celeriter igne concepto, late fudit incendium. Quod ubi exercitus, qui haud procul ab urbe tendebat, conſpexit, fortuitum ratus, ad opem ferendam concurrit. Sed ut ad veſtibulum regiæ ventum eſt; vident regem ipſum adhuc adgerentem faces. Omiſſa igitur, quam portaverant aqua, aridam materiam in incendium jacere cœperunt. Hunc exitum habuit regia totius Orientis .... ac ne longa quidem ætate, qua excidium ejus ſequuta eſt, reſurrexit.* It does not appear from thoſe two Accounts that *Thais* was at that Entertainment in the Quality of *Alexander*'s Miſtreſs; nay, it appears, that ſhe had not that Character. *Quintus Curtius* ſays only (k), that ſhe was one of the Concubines, who followed the Army: *Plutarch* affirms in expreſs Words, that ſhe was the Concubine of *Ptolemy*, one of *Alexander*'s Captains. Yet 'tis a common Opinion, that ſhe was one of *Alexander's* Miſtreſſes; but it may be falſe, though it be ſupported by a Paſſage of *Athenæus*. That Author ſays, that *Alexander* had that Curtezan with him; and that after his Death ſhe married *Ptolemy*, King of *Egypt*, by whom ſhe had two Sons and one Daughter, who was the Wife of *Eunoſtus*, King of (l) *Soli*, in the Iſle of *Cyprus*. (m) Ὁ δὲ μέγας Ἀλέξανδρος Θαΐδα εἶχε μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἑταίραν· περὶ ἧς φησὶ Κλείταρχος ὡς αἰτίας γενομένης τοῦ ἐμπρησθῆναι τὰ ἐν Περσεπόλει βασίλεια. αὕτη δὲ ἡ Θαῒς καὶ μετὰ τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου θάνατον, καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ ἐγαμήθη τῷ πρώτῳ βασιλεύσαντι Αἰγύπτου. καὶ ἐγέννησεν αὐτῷ τέκνα Λεοντίσκον καὶ Λάγον, θυγατέρα δὲ Εἰρήνην, ἣν ἔγημεν Εὔνοστος ὁ Σόλων τῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ βασιλεύς. *Thais Athenienſis meretrix cum Alexandro magno fuit, eumque precipuè impulit, ut Cleitarchus autor eſt, ad comburendam regiam Perſepolidis. Poſt obitum Alexandri, Ptolemæo, qui primus Ægypti regnum adeptus eſt, illa nupſit, ex eoque liberos concepit, Leontiſcum, & Lagum mares: Eirenen fœminam, quæ Solonis Eunoſti regis Cypriorum uxor fuit.*

(B) *In taking notice of* Moreri*'s Miſtakes.*] I. He ſays ſhe was a Native of *Alexandria*, and that *being gone to* Athens *all the Youth of that Country flock'd to her*. This Falſity is confuted in the following Paſſage. (a) "Don't believe what is ſaid in five or ſix ſorry "Hiſtorical Dictionaries, that *Thais* was a Native of "*Alexandria*. There was ſo ſhort an Interval between "the Time when *Alexander* laid the Foundation of "that City, and the Time when he burnt *Perſepolis*, "that *Thais* could not have ſeen the burning of that "Town, unleſs ſhe had been quickly ſnatch'd away "among the Firſt-Born of *Alexandria*, and tranſported in her Cradle: For you know that after the "Battle of *Arbela*, fought in the ſame Year that "*Alexandria* was built, *In Oriente victoriis magis quàm* "*paſſibus omnia peragrabat Alexander.* But laying "aſide Chronology, *Plutarch* and *Athenæus* ſay ſhe "was born at *Athens* (b)." II. *Moreri* adds, that *the Poet* Menander *made her famous by his Verſes, which was the reaſon why ſhe was call'd* Menandrea. This is taken from *Charles Stephens*'s Dictionary, and cannot be ſo well confuted as *Guillet*'s Paraphraſe upon it. *It was there*, ſays he (c), ſpeaking of *Athens*, *that Thais had an Intrigue with* Menander, *that famous Poet, who was ſo tender-hearted, and ſo much given to Love, that he committed extraordinary Follies for his Miſtreſſes.* In order to confute this Account, I alledge what *Plutarch* (d) ſays, that *Thais* was *Ptolemy*'s Concubine during *Alexander*'s Expedition, and what *Athenæus* obſerves, that ſhe married the ſame *Ptolemy* after the Death of that Conqueror. Which ſhews that, if ſhe had an Intrigue with *Menander*, it was before that Expedition. Nay, 'tis probable, that ſhe was *Ptolemy*'s Miſtreſs ſometime before the War of *Aſia*: 'Tis probable, that this great Lord of *Macedonia* got her out of *Athens*, and kept her in his Houſe for ſome time, before *Darius* was attack'd. But this Expedition of *Alexander* began when *Menander* (e) was not above eight Years of Age; and therefore he could not be in Love with *Thais* before the *Perſian* War. In what Time then ſhall we place his Love for that Curtezan, ſince after the Death of *Alexander*, ſhe married the King of *Egypt*, I mean the ſame *Ptolemy* whom ſhe had followed every where, whilſt that Conqueror was ſubduing *Aſia*? I think the beſt Proof that can be alledged for that Love of *Menander* is grounded upon theſe Verſes of *Propertius*,

Turba (f) *Menandreæ fuerat nec Thaidos olim*
Tanta, in qua populus luſit Erichthonius;

or upon theſe,

Non (g) *te Medeæ delectent probra ſequacis,*
Nempe tulit faſtus auſa rogare prior:
Sed potius mundi Thais pretioſa Menandri,
Cum ferit aſtutos Comica mœcha Getas;

or upon this Inſcription of *Martial*, under *Menander's Thais*,

Hac (h) *primum juvenum laſcivos luſit amores,*
Nec Glycere, vere Thais amica fuit.

But 'tis certain, that *Menander*'s *Thais*, mention'd by thoſe two Latin Poets, ſignifies a Comedy of *Menander*, intituled *Thais*, and not the Curtezan, who occaſion'd the burning of *Perſepolis*. See the Obſervations (i) of *Gronovius* the Father. I would not deny, that our *Thais* was, in the Poet's Mind, the Original of the Comedy that went by her Name; but this does not prove, that there was an Intrigue between *Menander* and the Curtezan who makes the Subject of this Article.

(C) *That* Paphnutius .... *converted in* Alexandria.] *Charles Stephens*, and many Lexicographers after him, have mention'd this Converſion: They all quote *Volaterranus*, who relates it in this manner. *Paphnutius*, ſays he (k), going *incognito* to (l) *Thais* of *Alexandria*, thought that the Place ſhe carried him to was never private enough; and at laſt being told by her, that none but God could know what paſſed between 'em in the Place they were in, he took from thence occaſion to exhort her to fear God, who ſees and puniſhes the moſt private Actions. She was ſo ſenſibly moved with his Exhortation, that ſhe gave over her Trade, and became a holy Woman.

(AΔ) *That* Thales *believed that the World was the Work of God, and that God knew the moſt ſecret Thoughts of Men.*] I mention this as I find it in *Diogenes Laertius*, without affirming, that it was really the Opinion of that Philoſopher. The following Apophthegms are aſcribed to him among others. 1. (m) *God is the moſt ancient thing of all, for he is uncreated.* 2. *The World is the fineſt thing of all, for it is God's Work.* 3. *Thoſe who commit a ſin, are ſo far from being able to conceal it from God, that they cannot ſo much as prevent his knowing their Thoughts.* You may ſee in the Margin the Greek Words of *Laertius*: *Valerius Maximus* mentions alſo the third Sentence. (o) *Mirifice etiam Thales. Nam interrogatus an facta hominum Deos fallerent: Nec cogitata, inquit. Ut non ſolùm manus, ſed etiam mentes puras habere vellemus; cùm ſecretis cogitationibus noſtris cæleſte numen adeſſe credidiſſemus.* What *Valerius Maximus* ſays, that *Thales* taught this Doctrine, that Men being perſuaded the Work of God, and that God knew the moſt Secret Thoughts of Men. Some ſay that he married; but others deny it, and relate, that he diſappointed his Mother, who earneſtly deſired he ſhould get a Wife, by telling her when he was Young, *there is time enough for that*, and when he was in a declining Age, *'tis too late* *. 'Tis ſaid he believed, that Life and Death are the ſame thing; and that being ask'd why he did not dye, he made an Anſwer, which others aſcribe to *Pyrrho* †. An old Woman bantered him, becauſe going abroad with her to look upon the Stars, he (*A*) fell into a Ditch. 'Tis thought he lived above (*B*) ninety Years.

---

† See *Juvenal ſat. 3. v. 93. where he ſays an melior cum Thaida ſuſtinet; & Martial in ſeveral places.*

(d) *See the foregoing Remark.*

(e) *He was born about the 3d Year of the 109 Olympiad. See Voſſius* de poetis Græcis *p. 57. and* Alexander *began his March the 3d Year of the 111. Olympiad.*

(f) *Propert. eleg. 6. lib. 2.*

(g) *Id. lib. 4. eleg. 5.*

(h) *Martial. epigr. 187. lib. 14.*

(i) *Upon the Eccleſiaſtical Writers in the 2d Chapter pag. 25. & ſeq.*

(k) *Volaterr. lib. 20. circa init. pag. m. 718.*

(l) Thaidis nomen nobilitatum in primis à Thaide Alexandrina. *Id. ib.*

(m) Πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων, θεός· ἀγέννητον γάρ. κάλλιστον, κόσμος· ποίημα γὰρ θεοῦ. Antiquiſſimum eorum omnium quæ ſunt, deus; ingenitus enim. Pulcherrimum, mundus; à deo enim factus eſt. *Diogen. Laert. lib. 1. n. 35.*

(n) Ἠρώτησέ τις αὐτὸν εἰ λάθοι θεοὺς ἄνθρωπος ἀδικῶν. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ διανοούμενος, ἔφη. Interrogatus, lateretne deos homo male agens: Ne cogitans quidem, inquit. *Id. ibid. n. 36.*

(o) *Valer. Maxim. lib. 7. cap. 2. n. 8. ext. pag. m. 602.*

Thoſe, who are not unacquainted with the Doctrine of the moſt ancient Philoſophers of *Greece*, know, that he aſſerted, that Water was the Principle of all (*C*) the Bodies, which

that God knew their moſt ſecret Thoughts, ſhould preſerve their Hearts pure as well as their Hands, does very well agree with a Paſſage of *Cicero*, concerning the ſame Philoſopher. If you carefully examine the Sequel of *Cicero*'s Argument, you'll find, that the Ground of *Thales*'s Maxim, was the moral Advantage that might accrue to Man by it. (*p*) *Melius græci atque noſtri, qui ut augerent pietatem in deos, eaſdem illos urbes quas nos incolere voluerunt. Affert enim hæc opinio religionem utilem civitatibus. Siquidem & illud bene dictum eſt à Pythagora doctiſſimo viro, tum maxime pietatem & religionem verſari in animis, cum rebus divinis operam daremus: & quod Thales qui ſapientiſſimus inter ſeptem fuit, homines exiſtimare oportere deos omnia cernere, deorum omnia eſſe plena: fore enim omnes caſtiores, veluti quo infans eſſet maxime religioſus.* Take notice of a Difference between *Cicero* and *Diogenes Laertius*. The latter ſays abſolutely, that, according to *Thales*, the World was animated and full of *Genii*: (*q*) Τὸν κόσμον ἔμψυχον καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη, *animatum mundum ac demonibus plenum*: but *Cicero* ſeems to reſtrain *Thales*'s Words; for he ſays, that, according to that Philoſopher, it was proper or requiſite, that Men ſhould believe every thing to be full of Gods. *Ariſtotle* thought, that perhaps *Thales* meant only what was ſaid by others, that all Beings have a Soul: Καὶ ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ δέ τινες αὐτὴν (ψυχὴν) μεμῖχθαί φασιν· ὅθεν ἴσως καὶ Θαλῆς ᾠήθη πάντα πλήρη θεῶν εἶναι (*r*). *Sunt & qui in toto univerſo permiſtam ipſam* (Animam) *inquiunt eſſe. Quocirca forſitan & Thales omnia plena deorum eſſe putavit.* Here follow ſome other Variations. *Plutarch* does not ſuppoſe that *Thales* alledged the Reaſon above mention'd, why the World is the fineſt Thing of all: He ſays, that *Thales* being to reſolve this Queſtion, *Which is the fineſt Being of all?* Anſwered, *the World; for every thing that is according to order, is part of the World.* (*ſ*) Τί κάλλιστον; κόσμος· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κατὰ τάξιν, τούτου μέρος ἐστί. *Quid pulcherrimum? Mundus. omnes enim ejus partes ordine aptæ ſunt.* As for the Anſwer to the Queſtion, whether God knows the wicked Actions of Men, ſome aſcribe it to *Pittacus*, and not to *Thales*. See *Theon* in the 5th Chapter of his *Progymnaſmata* pag. 66 and 77 of the *Leyden* Edition 1626.

I obſerve all theſe Variations to ſhew, that the Reaſons, which might be alledged againſt what I have ſaid in another (*t*) place, that *Thales* did not bring in the Power of God into his Syſtem concerning the Production of things, are not very convincing. But I ſhall touch upon this hereafter. See the Remark C.

(*A*) *To look upon the Stars, he fell into a Ditch.*] *How can you know what paſſes in Heaven*, ſaid that good old Woman to him, *ſince you do not ſee what is before your Feet?* (*a*) Λέγεται δ᾽ ἀγόμενος ὑπὸ γραὸς ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας, ἵνα τὰ ἄστρα κατανοήσῃ, εἰς βόθρον ἐμπεσεῖν, καὶ αὐτῷ ἀνοιμώξαντι φάναι τὴν γραῦν, Σὺ γὰρ, ὦ Θαλῆ, τὰ ἐν ποσὶν οὐ δυνάμενος ἰδεῖν, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴει γνώσεσθαι; *Fertur, quum domo exiret contemplandorum ſiderum cauſa, in ſubjectam foſſam incidiſſe, petulantique probro dictum ab anu domeſtica, Qua ratione, ô Thales, quæ in cœlis ſunt comprehenſurum te arbitraris, qui ea quæ ſunt ante pedes, videre non vales?* This Thought has been turn'd ſeveral ways. See the Commentaries upon the 105. Emblem of *Alciatus*, wherein you'll find the Verſes which Sir *Thomas Moor* made upon an Aſtrologer, who was a Cuckold. Sometimes he excuſes him for not ſeeing in the Stars his Wife's Gallantry, and ſometimes he banters him for it.

Saturnus procul eſt, jamque olim cæcus, ut ajunt,
Nec propè diſcernens à puero lapidem.
Luna verecundis formoſa incedit ocellis,
Nec niſi virgineum virgo videre poteſt.
Jupiter Europam, Martem Venus, & Venerem Mars,
Daphnen Sol, Herſen Mercurius recolit.
Hinc factum, Aſtrologe, eſt, tua cum capit uxor amantes,
Sidera ſignificent ut nihil inde tibi.

You ſee he alledges ſome Reaſons why the Planets cannot diſcover to that Aſtrologer his domeſtick Misfortune: But here are ſome other Verſes, wherein he pretends that ſince the Stars ſee every thing, they ſhould have acquainted him with his Wife's unfaithfulneſs.

Aſtra tibi ætherea pandunt ſeſe omnia vati,
Omnes & quæ ſint fata futura monent.
Omnibus aſt uxor quod ſe tua publicat, id te
Aſtra, licet videant omnia, nulla monent.

There being ſome Aſtrologers every where, who are not free from that Misfortune, no more than Men of other Profeſſions, a *French* Author, who knew ſome of 'em, preſented them with a *French* Tranſlation of the firſt Verſes of Sir *Thomas Moor*. Theſe are his Words. (*b*) *Now, ſince this Man* (*c*), *intent upon a high Contemplation, and pretending to great Knowledge, did not ſee what was before him, you may be ſure he is not the only Perſon of that Character. Many Aſtrologers are like him; for, though they pretend to foretell the Fate of other Men, they cannot foretell their own; as I do certainly know of ſome of that Profeſſion, who are extremely Jealous, and .... you know what I mean, with due Reſpect to the Ladies. I made formerly the following Epigram upon them, in imitation of Sir* Thomas Moor.

Tu cognois aſtrologue eſtoilles etherees,
Dont à chacun predis futures deſtinees:
Mais de ce que ta femme eſt à pluſieurs commune,
Par les aſtres n'en peux cognoiſtre choſe aucune.
Saturne eſt trop loingtain, aveugle eſt en apres,
Le blanc d'entre le noir ne diſcernant de pres.
Ayant les yeux honteux la Lune fait ſon cours,
Puis la vierge ne veut voir laſcives amours.
Les autres affaire ont, Mars ſa Venus regarde,
Venus Mars, Jupiter à Europe prent garde.
Ainſi donc tu ne peux ta femme apercevoir,
Quand ſon amant l'embraſſe, & moins tes cornes voir.

See what I quote (*d*) out of the *Menagiana*.

(*B*) *'Tis thought he lived above ninety Years.*] (*e*) He was born in the 1. Year of the 35th Olympiad, and died in the 58th Olympiad: Which makes at leaſt ninety two Years. And therefore *Diogenes Laertius* argues wrong when he ſays (*f*) Τελευτῆσαι γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ὀγδόης Ὀλυμπιάδος: *quinquageſima* QUIPPE & *octava Olympiade eſſe defunctum*; and yet *Aldobrandinus* (*g*) does not find fault, with the Computation of that Author. *Moreri* is wrong in his Calculation; for he ſays, that *Thales*, who was *born in the* 36th *Olympiad*, died *in the* 58th *about the Year of* Rome 209 *in the* 95th *Year of his Age*. The Year of *Rome* 209 is the laſt of the 58th Olympiad; but which way ſoever you reckon, you'll never find ninety five Years in the Hypotheſis of that Writer.

(*C*) *That Water was the Principle of all Bodies.... Many Reflections might be made.*] There is very good reaſon to believe, that he was not the firſt, who advanced that Doctrine; and that he had it from the *Egyptians*, or the moſt Ancient Poets of *Greece*. See the Diſſertation *de dogmate Thaletis, quod aqua ſit principium omnium rerum*, Printed with ſome (*h*) others at *Hall* in *Saxony* in the Year 1700. Some Authors ſay, that the *Chaos* of *Heſiod* is, in the main, the ſame Principle, which *Thales* call'd Water: Which I can hardly believe; for the Water of *Thales* muſt needs have been an Homogeneous thing, whereas the *Chaos* was an odd Mixture of all ſorts of Principles. *Ovid* gives us that Notion of it, at the Beginning of his *Metamorphoſes*; and when the other Poets ſpeak of a certain Infernal Chaos, they mean a dark and frightful Place, wholly deſtitute of the Beauty that is to be ſeen in things well ordered, or deprived of the Simplicity of a firſt Principle.

Di

---

* Diog. Laert. l. 1. n. 26.

† See the Article Pyrrho.

(*p*) *Cicero de legib. lib. 2. fol.* 334. *B.*

(*q*) *Diog. Laert. ib. n.* 27.

(*r*) *Ariſt. de anima lib.* 1. *cap.* 5.

(*ſ*) *Plut. in convivio ſeptem ſapient. p.* 153. *C.*

(*t*) *In the Remark D of the Article* Anaxagoras.

(*a*) *Diog. Laert. lib.* 1. *n.* 34.

which make up the Universe. Many Reflections might be made upon that Supposition: I shall set down a Passage, whereby it appears, that he made very fine Discoveries in Astronomy,

Di (k), quibus imperium est animarum, umbræque
silentes,
Et Chaos, & Phlegethon, loca nocte tacentia late.

Servius understands by the word *Chaos*, in these two Verses, the first Principles as they were in the confusion of the Elements. But perhaps he is too subtil; for 'tis likely *Virgil* intended to speak only of Hell in general, or of part of it. These words of *Ovid* ought to be understood in the same Sense:

(l) Per ego hæc plena timoris,
Per chaos hoc ingens, vastique silentia regni
Eurydices oro, properata retexite fata.

'Tis a Prayer of *Orpheus* to *Pluto* and *Proserpina*. See (m) *Grævius's* Notes upon *Hesiod*, wherein he proves, that the Word *Chaos* does frequently signifie Hell. I know that another Sense has been put upon the Chaos, which was, according to *Hesiod*, the first of all Beings: It has been said, that this Chaos signifies the Space wherein all Bodies have been placed. *Simplicius* (n) tells us, that it had been a very common Opinion: It is mention'd by *Sextus Empiricus*: (o) Εἶναι γὰρ φασι Χάος τὸν τόπον ἀπὸ τοῦ χωρητικὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένων. *Dicunt enim Chaos esse locum, eo quod comprehendat illa quæ in ipso sunt.* But, if we admit of this Sense, 'tis impossible that *Thales* should have taught the same Doctrine with *Hesiod*; for Water wants a Place as well as other Bodies; and therefore Space must have existed before Water, and consequently Water would not be the first Principle. I don't think, that *Hesiod* meant what is ascrib'd to him: Certainly, by the Word *Chaos*, he did not understand the Space or the Place which contains Bodies. Doubtless, he meant by it the State of Confusion, that things were in before the Earth, the Sea, the Air, the Heaven, *&c.* had their proper Situation. He did not intend to speak of the Space, which, if it be distinguish'd from Matter, is necessarily an Homogeneous Body, and uncapable of being the Subject of the Composition of any Element or mix'd Body. This shews, that the Water of *Thales* was not the Space, though he must have look'd upon it as a Whole perfectly Homogeneous *in actu*, but Heterogeneous *in potentia*. I make use of a Distinction very famous in the Schools of the Peripateticks; by which I mean, that, according to *Thales*, Water considered in it self, and before the particular Formation of all Bodies, ought to be actually Water in each of its Parts, and yet capable of becoming Air, Fire, Earth; and then a Tree, a Metal, Blood, Wine, a Bone, *&c.* according to the several Degrees of Rarefaction and Condensation that it goes through. Those are in the wrong who object that there would be no Difference in Bodies, if there was but one sole Material Principle. This Objection can be of no force but against those, who should suppose, that this sole Principle is immutable: But if they suppose, that it is susceptible of several Qualities one after another, like the *Materia prima* of *Aristotle*, any sort of Body might arise from it. The Objection proposed by *Lactantius*, either against *Thales*, or against *Heraclitus*, who admitted nothing but Fire for the Principle of all Things, is not a good one. Fire, says he (a), cannot be produced from Water, nor can Water proceed from Fire. He is mistaken: Any particular Body may proceed from Fire, Earth or Water, provided there be some Causes that know how to modify Matter according to its *alterability*, or mutability. But I must observe, by the by, that neither *Thales*, nor *Heraclitus*, nor any of the ancient Philosophers, who took only one of the four vulgar Elements for the general Principle of all Bodies, equall'd *Aristotle* in Penetration of Wit: They were not sensible that none of the four Elements is Matter in general, and that they are a kind of determin'd Matter. Which is the Reason why *Aristotle*, who was more judicious than all of 'em, pitch'd upon Matter, in general, for the first Principle of all Things.

The great Difficulty of *Thales*'s Hypothesis lies in this, that he did not say how Water began to alter, and to put on the particular Forms of Air, Fire, Earth, *&c.* Was it rarefied, was it condensed by its own Virtue? Did that Virtue arise all of a sudden in the beginning of the World, or did it always exist in Water? One cannot apprehend how Water could exert that Virtue, if it had not been always in it; and how it could have been from all Eternity without Condensation and Rarefaction, if that Virtue had been always in it. Some are of Opinion, that *Thales* supposed that God was the efficient Cause, which produced all particular Bodies out of Water. They alledge two Passages of *Cicero*, and one (c) of *Lactantius*: But *Lactantius* had from *Cicero* what he says upon this Point, and therefore his Testimony is insignificant. As for *Cicero*, the Reasons (d) that may be alledged against him, are so strong, that his Testimony cannot be depended upon. If any should alledge the Words of *Diogenes Laertius*, above quoted (e), I answer, that *Plutarch* does not make use of 'em, when he mentions the same Answer made by *Thales*. If it be replied, that *Plutarch* and *Diogenes Laertius* agree in another Point, viz. that *Thales* giving a Reason why God is the most ancient of all things, alledged, that God was not made, or had no beginning; I'll answer, that it is not a positive Proof that he ascribed to God the Generation of the World. Were there not some Philosophers, who, acknowledging on the one hand the Existence of the Gods, denied, on the other, that the Gods had made the World? If it be further replied, that *Thales* attributed to the Gods a Knowledge of the most secret Thoughts of Men; I'll answer, 1. That 'tis not certain he said so, since some Writers (f) ascribe that Saying to *Pittacus*: 2. That he might have believed, that the Gods concern themselves with our Affairs, and know our secret Thoughts; but it does not follow from thence, that he ascribed to them the Production of the World; and that he did not believe, that they themselves proceeded from Water, as from their Cause and Principle: 3. That the true Philosophical Opinions of *Thales*, the Naturalist, ought not to be look'd for in the Conversation of *Thales*, one of the seven Wise-Men of *Greece*. He might have said many Things under this last Notion, which he did not say in his School of Philosophy. He mention'd nothing but Water, when he explain'd the Formation of the World, like a Philosopher; he did not add the Power of God to that of Water. But when he look'd upon himself as a *Sage*, whose sententious Discourses should tend to promote Virtue, and would be spread among the People, he thought himself obliged to conform to Theological Notions. Take notice, that the Opinions of the Heathen Philosophers were so incoherent, that, from their Hypothesis concerning the Existence of God, it did not follow, that he had a share in the Production and Government of the World; and that, from their Hypothesis concerning his Providence, it did not follow, that he had cleared the Chaos, or formed the Universe. Their Hypothesis allowed them to say, that the Gods govern'd the World, though they had been produced and form'd out of the Chaos, as well as Bodies. When a Man believes, that Humane Souls are formed of the most subtil Parts of Blood, he may say, that *Jupiter*, *Venus* and *Mercury*, have been produced out of the most subtil Parts of the Chaos. Now, as the Soul governs the Body, which it has not made, and whereof it (h) is but a kind of distilled Water; and as we govern Beasts, and even some Men who were not produced by us; so the Gods govern the World which they have not made, and which made 'em of its refined Parts.

I wish the Learned Men of *Hall* (i), who have said such fine Things of the Ionick Sect, had saved me the Trouble of reconciling St. *Augustin* with *Cicero*. One of 'em says, that *Thales* acknowledged no Divine Influence in the Production of the World; the other says the quite contrary. Those Gentlemen say nothing of the Arguments (†) above-mentioned; whereby it seems, that one may prove, that this Founder of the Ionick Sect, was Orthodox in his Notion of the Deity. I wish they had examin'd that Objection, for I would have made use of their Answers. They positively affirm, that from *Thales* inclusively, to *Anaxagoras* exclusively, the Ionick Sect has been guilty of Atheism in the second Degree. To understand this, I must observe, that they admit of three (k) Degrees of Atheism. The first is to maintain, that there is no God: The second is to deny, that the World was made by God, whose Existence is acknowledged: The third is to say, that God has created the World necessarily, and not with a Free-will. *Thales*, *Anaximander*, and *Anaximenes*, are guilty of the second Degree of Atheism, as well as *Epicurus*. (l) *Hi tres universi convenerunt in eo, quod principium omnium rerum sit aliquid similare, quod orta res fuerint nulla Dei opera, solius naturæ sponte, qui est gradus Atheismi Epicureus (sic enim vocare liceat) quod orta sint condensando & rarescendo. Quod Atheismi illos tres postulavi, de singulis probatu non difficile est ex Augustino, qui ubi,* &c. *Anaxagras, Aristotle*

(c) *Lactant. lib. 1. cap. 5. pag. m. 15.*

(d) *You'll find them in the Article Anaxagoras, Remark D and E.*

(e) *In the Remark A.*

(f) *See above the Remark A.*

(h) *That is according to the hypothesis of the Heathens.*

(i) *See the first Volume* Observationum selectarum ad rem litterariam spectantium, *Printed at* Hall *in the Year* 1700. *pag.* 445. *& seq.*

(†) *In the Remark A.*

(k) *Ibid. pag.* 448.

(l) *Ibid. pag.* 450.

Astronomy, and that he was so well pleased, because he had found the Proportion (D) *of the Sun's Diameter to the Circle it describes round the Earth, that having imparted it to a Man, who was willing to give him any Reward for it, he* † *only desired, that he would be so ingenuous as to declare, that the Glory of that Invention was due to him.*

THAMYRAS, *who invented the Science of the Haruspices.* See **TAMIRAS**

THAMYRIS, *a Poet, and one of the most excellent Musicians of his time*, was born at *Odrysa* in *Thrace*, whither his Mother † retired to hide her shame. She had the Imprudence to lye with a Man ‡, who would not marry her. Doubtless she often desired it of him, as her big Belly encreased; but he gave no Ear to it, which made her leave her Country, which was (A) Mount *Parnassus*. The Son, of whom she was delivered at *Odrysa*, was call'd *Thamyris*, and was endowed with many Perfections, whereby he might have got a great Glory, had it not been for his Vanity, which made him run into a thousand Extravagancies. He trod in his Father's Steps, for he learn'd Musick so perfectly, that the *Scythians* β made him their King, though he was a Foreigner. He had the finest γ Voice of any Man in his time, if we believe *Plutarch*, who adds, that he composed a Poem concerning the War of the *Titans* with the Gods. He is said to have made some other Poems, five thousand Verses δ about the Creation of the World, and a System of *Theology* consisting of three thousand Verses, which was still extant when *Suidas* was writing his Dictionary. 'Tis likely those two Poems are not wholly different. He was more ancient than *Homer* ζ by eight degrees according to some, or five according to others; and he was the first τ, who gained the Prize of Singing at the *Pythick* Games. He is said to have been the first Man guilty of the (B) unnatural Sin. He gave a vain and insolent Challenge to the Muses: Proud of his Beauty and Skill in playing upon Instruments, he Challenged them to a Trial of Skill, in Musick, upon this Condition that if he got the Victory, he should deprive them of their Virginity; and that if he was overcome, they might use him as they should think fit. The Muses, who probably did not doubt of a good Success, accepted the Condition, and after their Victory deprived him of his Sight and of his Skill in Musick. *Homer*, who (C) mentions this Challenge of *Thamyris*, and the Punishment inflicted upon him on that account, says nothing of his Pretension, in case he had not been worsted; a Pretension like that of Male * Partridges, when they fight in the presence of their Females: But *Apollodorus* and the *Scholiast* upon *Homer* affirm it positively ┼. *Natalis Comes*

stotle, (m) and the Stoicks, are guilty of the third Degree: (n) *Anaxagoram & duos ejus socios* (Diogenem Appolloniatem & Archelaum) *tametsi à Thaletico atheismo, qui Deo plane nihil vult esse cum fabricatione rerum negotii, adeo excuso, ut ejus comparatione religiosus ipse, qualem & vulgo habent quidam, videri queat, atheorum tamen catalogo minime expungendum statuo. Fuit autem atheismus ejus in eo gradu quem minimum vocavi.*

(D) *A Passage, whereby it appears, that he made very fine Discoveries in Astronomy, and .... the proportion of the Sun's Diameter.*] I find that Passage in *Apuleius. Thales Milesius*, says he (o), *ex septem illis sapientia memoratis viris facile præcipuus: fuit enim geometricæ penes Grajos primus repertor, & naturæ rerum certissimus explorator, & astrorum peritissimus contemplator, maximas res parvis lineis reperit: temporum ambitus, ventorum flatus, stellarum meatus, tonitruum sonora miracula, siderum obliqua curricula, Solis annua reverticula: idem Lunæ vel nascentis incrementa, vel senescentis dispendia, vel delinquentis obstacula. Idem sane jam proclivi senectute divinam rationem de Sole commentus est: quam equidem non didicit modo, verum etiam experiundo comprobavit: quotiens Sol magnitudine sua circulum quem permeat metiatur. Id à se recens inventum Thales memoratur edocuisse Mandraytum Prienensem, qui nova & inopinata cognitione impendio delectatus, optare jussit quantam vellet mercedem sibi pro tanto documento rependi. Satis, inquit, mihi fuerit mercedis Thales sapiens, si id quod à me didicisti, cum proferre ad quospiam cœperis, tibi non adsciveris; sed ejus inventi me potius quam alium repertorem prædicaveris.* It seems to me that the true Sense of these Words, *quotiens sol magnitudine sua circulum quem permeat metiatur*, is this, that *Thales* found out the Sun's Diameter, and the Circle it seems to describe round the Earth. We are told, that he computed how many times the whole Body of the Sun was to change its Situation to make an end of that Circle; but we are not told how many times it was. The modern Astronomers suppose, that the Sun's Diameter is about thirty Minutes: From whence it follows, that, by changing its place 720 times, according to the whole extent of its Globe, it describes the whole Circumference of its Circle. Some infer from thence, that its daily Swiftness would not be very considerable, if it were true that it moves, as 'tis supposed in *Tycho Brache*'s System; that is, as an Arrow in the Air, and not as the Nails of a Wheel. Cannot Oxen, with a slow Pace, go in a few Hours through a Space seven or eight hundred Times greater than they are? Observe how the Inventers of Things are sensible to the Glory of a first Discovery. *Thales*, that wise Man of *Greece*, was old, and enjoyed a glorious Reputation: He did not care for any Reward in Money, or any Gain; but he could not have endured the Injustice of those, who should have appropriated his Discovery to themselves, or deprived him of the Glory of it, by an unkind Silence. See what *Tacitus* says, speaking (a) of *Helvidius Priscus*, that the Desire of Glory is the last thing the wisest Man can part with.

(A) *Which was Mount* Parnassus.] (b) Others say, she retired from *Peloponnesus*, and that *Philammon*, a handsome young Man, on whom she had bestowed too many Favours, was born at *Thoricum* in *Attica*.

(B) *The first Man guilty of the Unnatural Sin.*] (c) Πρῶτος ἀρξάμενος ἐρᾶν ἀῤῥένων. *Mascula Venere primus usus dicitur*. The Boy, he loved, was the same *Hyacinthus*, who was afterwards beloved by *Apollo*, and kill'd by him with a Quoit, against his Will. He was the Son of the Muse *Clio*, and of *Pierus* (d) the Son of *Magnes*. This we find in *Apollodorus*; but *Suidas* calls the Boy *Himneus*, and says he was the Son of *Calliope* and *Magnes*. I have not read in any Author what *Lloyd* and *Hofman* have taken from *Charles Stephens*, *viz.* that *Thamyris*, the most beautiful of all Men, fell in Love with Boys at first, and then took another course, and loved the Muses. This is to pervert and confound what the Ancients have said.

(C) Homer, *who mentions this Challenge.*] 'Tis in the second Book of the Iliads, in the List of the *Grecian* Fleet, on occasion of the Town *Dorion*, near which he says, *Thamyris* was met by the Muses. It is evident, by what follows and goes before, that this Town was not in *Thrace*, as *Lloyd* will have it, but in *Peloponnesus*. (e) *Lucan*, who places it in *Thessaly*, was little better acquainted with its Situation. (f) *Beroaldus*, who quotes *Lucan* to prove, that it was in *Bœotia*, has committed two Faults instead of one. *Diodorus Siculus*, in the third Book, and *Dion Chrysostome*, in his third Oration *de Fuga*, mention that Challenge of *Thamyris*,

---

† *See the Remark D.*

† *Her Name was Arsinoe, according to Suidas; and Argiope, according to* Pausanias *and Apollodorus.*

‡ *His Name was* Philammon, *and he was a good Musician; See* Pausanias *l. 4. p. 143. & l. 10. pag. 322. Plut. de musica pag. 1132.*

β *Conon apud Photium n. 186. pag. 428*

γ *De musica pag. 1132. Natalis Comes* Mythol. l. 6. c. 14. *says that* Plutarch *values that Poem more than all the others; but 'tis certain he neither praises nor dispraises it.*

δ *Tzetzes Chil. 7. histor. 108.*

ζ *Suidas.*

τ *Pausan. l. 10. pag. 322.*

* Tunc inter se dimicant mares desiderio feminarum, victum ajunt Venerem pati. *Plin. l. 10. c. 33.*

┼ *See the Remark D.*

(m) Infimum (*atheorum gradum faciunt*) quia produxerit quidem Deus, (*mundum*) sed necessitate naturæ coactus, non voluntate sua libere motus, quæ fuit Aristotelis & Stoicorum sententia.. Interim qualicunque providentiæ Divinæ confessione factum est, ut Aristoteles & Stoici pro nonatheis vulgo haberenter. Esse tamen ipsorum eandem sortem debere cum physicis Ionicæ Sectæ, quos pro atheis habitos monstrabimus, sectarum convenientia edocebit. *Ibid. pag.* 448, 449. (n) *Ibid. pag.* 453. (o) *Apuleius Floridor. pag. m.* 361.

(a) Opus contemp- tur, reli pervers, conflans adversa menta; Etiam bus sap- ientior ma vide- retur, quando etiam sa- pientibus cupido gloriæ no- vissima exuitur. *Tacit. hist. lib. 4. cap. 5 & 6.*

(b) *Conon apud Photium n. 186. pag. 428.*

(c) *Apollodor. lib. 1. pag. m.* See also Suidas and the Scholiast upon Homer in Il. lib. 2. v. 102.

(d) *Apollodor. lib. 1. pag. m.*

(e) Quæ terræ Phylace Peleos & Dorion ira Flebit Pieridum. *Lucan. Pharsal. l. v. 352.*

(f) *Beroald. in Propert. eleg. 22. v. 2.*

Comes (D) should have quoted them. I wonder *Lucian* (E) did not show his bantering Wit upon it, and was contented to represent *Thamyris* as an ungrateful Man, who turn'd against the Muses the Talent he had received from them. Some Authors have * said, that the Punishment of his Presumption was put off till the time when he should be in Hell. *Pausanias* † says, he believes that *Thamyris* lost his Sight, not as *Homer* says, for having contended with the Muses, but thro' Sickness. 'Tis ‖ observed, that this Poet left off making Verses when he was blind, and that he threw his Lyre into a (F) River: Hence it is, that when he was painted Blind, he was represented ‖ with a broken Lyre. He invented (FΔ) the Musick called *Dorick*. *Plato* ‡ feign'd, according to the Principles of the *Metempsychosis*, that the Soul of *Thamyris* removed into the Body of a Nightingale.

THEON, a *Greek* Sophist, of whom we have still a † Rhetorical Book, written with great Politeness and Judgment. His Rules are neat and short, and he makes a good choice of the common Topicks, from which Arguments are to be fetch'd. There is no Subject, wherein he has been more successful, than in that which concerns (A) God's Providence. He passes a right Judgment upon the fine Passages, and the Faults of the most illustrious Historians and Orators. I shall give an Instance of (B) his Niceness about the

Thamyris, and how he was punish'd for it. (g) *Barthius* finds in that Oration, that *Thamyris* lost his Sight and his Skill in Musick, by reason of his Wealth: But this is not the Author's Meaning.

(D) Natalis Comes *should have quoted them.*] He (h) gives a right Account of that Adventure; but he quotes only *Asclepiades* of (i) *Myrlea*; which is a wrong way of quoting, and a Remainder of the vain Affectation of some Learned Men of *Italy*, when good Literature was revived. Some quoted a Greek Author only in general; others call'd him by his Name, but they took care not to say, that what they cited out of him, was only to be found quoted in some known Authors. The Scholastick Divines and Philosophers are not so unfair in their Quotations: They don't scruple to refer the Reader for a Passage of an Author, whose Works are in every Body's Hands, to a modern Writer who quotes it. Thus Father *Terillus* in his Book upon the *Prima Regula Morum*, does seldom quote the Fathers, or *Thomas Aquinias*, but upon the Credit of *Sanches*, *Vasques*, and other Jesuits, as it is observed by the Author of the IVth *Denonciation du peché Philosophique*. I give here an Example of such Quotations. However it be, *Natalis Comes* should have told us, that there are some Authors extant, who may be quoted about the Conditions of the Challenge. Συνθέμενος, says *Apollodorus*, ἂν μὲν κρείττων εὑρεθῇ πλησιάσειν πάσαις. The Scholiast upon *Homer* has the same Expression upon the Passage of the second Book of the Iliads: Συνέθετο, ἂν μὲν κρείττων εὑρεθῇ πλησιάσαι πάσαις.

(E) *That* Lucian *did not shew his bantering Wit upon it, and was contented to represent* Thamyris, *as an ungrateful Man.*] (k) Ἐκ τῆς οἱ μὲν ᾐτιῶ τὸν Θάμυριν, ἢ τὸν Εὔρυτον οἷα τὴν φύσιν, ὡς ταῖς μούσαις ἀντᾴδειν, παρ᾽ ὧν εἴληφε τὴν ᾠδὴν, ἢ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐριδαίνειν, ἐναντία τοξεύειν, καὶ ταῦτα, δοτῆρι ὄντι τῆς τοξικῆς. *Nisi ejusdem naturæ, cujus Thamyris, vel Eurytus, ut musis occinat, à quibus canendi normam acceperit, vel Apollinem, idque jaculationis præceptorem, jaculando provocet.* Perhaps *Lucian* forgot that Circumstance, or never observed it in his reading. 'Tis well he didn't; for this seems to be the true Reason why he did not jest upon it in any of his Books, by falsly and maliciously supposing, that the Muses did not sing well that Day, either because they pretended to have got a Cold, or happen'd to be troubled with one, which they were not sorry for, or by some other Trick, like those of Courtiers and ambitious Men (a) when they play; and that therefore *Thamyris*, &c. But I must not forget, that, according to some Authors (b), the Prize annexed to the Victory was not a transient Favour, but an actual Marriage to be contracted between him and the nine Muses: 'Twas a lasting Business.

Connubio (c) jungam stabili propriamque dicabo.

(F) *That he threw his Lyre into a River.*] *Caseneuve*, in his *French* Commentary upon some Epistles of *Philostratus*, says, that *Thamyris*, after he had been punished, *threw his Lyre against Mount* Parnassus, *and that the Blow produced a Brook, which was called* Balyra *for that very Reason.* This is a strange Alteration of *Pausanias*'s Words, wherein (d) we find, that at the distance of thirty *Stadia* from the Gate of *Messena* in *Peloponnesus*, there was a River call'd *Balyra*, because *Thamyris* had thrown his Lyre into it.

(FΔ) *Invented the Musick call'd* Dorick.] He was so great a Master in that Art, that he could not rest satisfied to leave it as he found it, without adding some new Ornaments to it. (e) *Lydios modulos Amphion* (invenit) *Doros Thamiras Thrax: Phrygios Marsyas Phrix.*

(A) *Wherein he has been more successful than in that which concerns God's Providence.*] Read the 12th Chapter of his Book, where you'll find many and the best Proofs that a Pagan could think of; which shews, that *Theon* was a Man of great Parts. You'll find there among other Things, that those, who believe that God does continually see what they do, live in great Safety, and practise their Duty; and that those, who are persuaded that the Gods take care of 'em, spend their Lives with a wonderful Pleasure. (f) Εἶθ᾽ ὅτι ἀσφαλέστατα ἂν ὅτι, καὶ προσηκόντως τὸν βίον διάγοιεν, νομίζοντες ἔχειν ἐπισκόπους ἀεὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον πραξέων. καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα ἡδέως ζῶσιν, οἱ ἡγούμενοι ἐπιμελητὰς ἔχειν τοὺς θεούς. *Quemadmodum & omnium tutissime ac diligentissime eos vivere contiet, qui omnium suarum in vita actionum inspectores se habere existimant Deos. Sed & jucundissime ætatem agere, qui à Diis respici se credunt.* 'Tis certain, that if Men lived according to their Principles, the Doctrine of God's Presence would be the most effectual Means to keep them from Evil, and to excite 'em to good Actions. The most Profligate can hold their Hands and refrain their Tongues, when they think they are seen or heard by some Persons whom they fear or respect. Much more should the Persuasion, that God sees every thing, keep Men to their Duty (g). Which is the Reason why the Authors of pious Books do so much inculcate the Necessity of meditating upon God's Presence. 'Tis likewise for the same Reason that these Words, **GOD SEES THEE, SINNER**, use to be posted up, even in the Corners of the Streets. 'Tis also true, that those who believe, that God takes care of them, have a plentiful Stock of Comfort and Pleasure. The profane Poets were not ignorant of it; but 'tis a just Cause of Scandal to see, that they made use of that Maxim (h) to gain a Mistress.

I shall set down here a Thing, that is to be found in a Book, intitled, *Pratiques de Pieté pour honorer le S. Sacrement.* The Author of it mentions (i) " this Saying of " *Marshal de Gassion. If I believed the Real Presence I* " *would be all the time of my Life in a Church prostrated to* " *the Ground; and I cannot believe that many Catholicks* " *are persuaded of what they say concerning that Mystery,* " *when I consider how little respect they express at* " *Church.*" If that *Marshal* had believed the Real Presence, he would have done as others do: He would have been used to that Doctrine, and a long Habit would have made him insensible to it, as he was to the Doctrine of God's Presence in every part of the World. A visible Presence of CHRIST's Humanity would doubtless be more efficacious than God's Presence; but a Presence of CHRIST's Humane Nature, as invisible as that of the Divine Nature, will soon come to the same thing. Those who believe it are not more powerfully affected with it, than the Protestants with the Doctrine of God's Presence.

(B) *His Niceness about the placing of Words.*] When he shews, that the Expression ought to be clear (k), he mentions several Causes of Obscurity, that are to be avoided. He says, among other things, that the Readers or Hearers ought not to be uncertain what a certain part of a Period relates to; and therefore he blames this Expression: (l) Δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὅν ποτ᾽ Ἀθήνη θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα. *Populum præstantis Erechthei, Pallas quem Jove nata aluit, terra edidit alma.* One cannot tell, says he, whether it be the People, or *Erechtheus*, whom *Pallas* bred, and the Earth produced. He adds, that *Heraclitus*'s Books were grown very obscure, by reason of such a frequent placing of the Words, whether the placing of *Words*. Here is another Proof of his good Taste: He would, not have Maxims or Sentences to appear like Flourishes in a Narrative, but to (C) be incorporated with it, in an imperceptible manner. His Book was printed at *Basil*, with the Latin Translation of *Joachim Camerarius* in the Year 1541: But the best Edition is that of *Leyden* 1626, in 8vo. *Daniel Heinsius*, who procured it, carefully revised the *Latin* Translation, and mended it in a great many Places.

---

* *Prodicus Phocaensis apud Pausaniam l. 4. p. 159.*

† *Pausan. ibid.*

‖ *Ibid.*

‖ *Id. l. 9. pag. 304. & l. 10. pag. 347.*

‡ *Plato, de repub. lib. 10. pag. 755.*

† *Intitled* προγυμνάσματα, Progymnasmata.

(f) *Theon in progym. cap. 12. p. m. 135.*

(g) Confer quæ supra *in the Remark AΔ. of the Article* Thales.

(h) *See the* 17 *Ode of the* 1. *Book of* Horace, *and mind these words*, Di me tuentur: Dis pietas mea, Et Musa cordi est.

(i) *See the* Bibliotheque Universelle *tom* 1. *pag.* 313.

(k) *Theo cap.* 4. *pag.* 46. *& seq.*

(l) *Id. ib. pag.* 47.

THEOPOMPUS, an Orator and an Historian, born in the Isle * of *Chios*, flourish'd in the time of *Philip* (A) King of *Macedonia*, Father of *Alexander* the Great. He was the most famous † of *Isocrates's* Scholars, and carried the ξ Prize above all the Panegyrists sent for by *Mausolus*. There was no considerable Town in *Greece*; but he harangued in it with a general Applause. It was one of the Reasons he alledged, to justify the good Opinion he had of his Merit, when, having represented the Orators of the foregoing Age as very much inferior to the Modern, he gave himself for one of the best of his Time ‡. After he had signalized himself as an (B) Orator, he began to write Histories; and made it appear, that the Study of Eloquence is a (C) good Preparative for it;

for-

ther it be that the Author was not sensible of it, or was willing it should be so. (m) Περὶ ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν, τὰ Ἡρακλείτου τοῦ φιλοσόφου βιβλία σκοτεινὰ γέγονε, κατακόρως αὐτῇ χρησαμένου, ἤτοι ἐξεπίτηδες, ἢ καὶ δι' ἄγνοιαν. *Ex hujusmodi ambiguis locutionibus Heracliti philosophi libri obscuritatem contraxere: qui ad fastidium illis, sive gnarus sive ignarus, usus est.* When I consider *Theon's* Niceness about ambiguous Expressions, I don't know how he could find any Authors, who writ as he desired; for the greatest Masters of the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongue are full of such Ambiguities. 'Tis true, they are not so perplexing in a Piece of History or Eloquence, as in a Tract of Physicks; and that therefore the Philosopher, censured by *Theon*, was particularly obliged to avoid them. I have said, in another place, that the *French* Language is not so faulty in that respect as the *Greek* and *Latin*: But it must be confest, that even some excellent Writers do very much neglect, in that respect, the strict Rules of our Grammar. A new *Theon* would find many wrong Periods in their Writings.

(C) *But to be incorporated with it in an imperceptible manner.*] This is, without doubt, the true Sense of these Words: (o) Ὅταν μέν τι συνεχῶς ἐγκαταπλέκηται, καὶ λανθάνῃ ταῦτα γνωμικὰ, ἐπιχαρίτως πως ἡ διήγησις γίνεται. *Quæ sententiosa quidem quamvis sæpe inferantur modo ne emineant, mirifice amœnam ac venustam efficiunt orationem.* *Petronius* was of the same Mind. Read these following Words, which I take out of the Preface of a Book of M. *Corbinelli*. *Those, who have read* Livy, *will be surprized to find so many Maxims in an Historian, who has but few, or scarce any, but such as those mention'd by an* (1) *Ancient Author, which are incorporated with the Discourse, without having a turn or appearance of Maxims.* That Historian is praised in those Words for a very noble thing. Moral and Political Sentences or Reflections, not interwoven with the Thread of the Discourse, do not much deserve to be commended. 'Tis no very difficult thing to scatter 'em in that manner; but the inserting them, in the very Body of the Narrative, requires a great Art. They ought to be there like a flat Picture, and not like an Imbossed Piece of Work.

(A) *Flourish'd in the time of* Philip .... *Father of* Alexander *the Great.*] The Anonymous Writer, who described the Olympiads, says he flourish'd in the 93d. 'Tis a Mistake, to be found likewise in *Suidas*, and adopted by (a) *Meursius*, and (b) *Vossius*. It has been solidly confuted by (c) *Jonsius*. He quotes *Diodorus Siculus* (d), who observes, that the 41, 42 and 43d. Books of *Theopompus's* History, contain'd what pass'd in *Sicily* from the 3d Year of the 93d Olympiad, to the 2d Year of the 109. Is it likely, that an Author, who flourish'd in the 93d Olympiad, should have been alive (e) in the 110 Olympiad? Here is a more solid Proof. *Theopompus* publish'd a Letter, and some Counsels he wrote to *Alexander*, who did not begin to Reign till the 111 Olympiad. I pass by several other Proofs alledged by *Jonsius*: They might be eluded, and after all they are not more cogent than those which I have mention'd. He might have found in *Photius* a better Argument than any thing he alledges; for, as I have said in the Text of this Article, we read in *Photius*, 1. that *Theopompus* was but 45 Years when *Alexander* caused him to be re-establish'd at *Chios*; 2. That *Ptolemy* King of *Egypt*, was like to put him to Death. Which shews, that, far from flourishing in the 93d Olympiad, he was not born till towards the hundredth at the soonest.

(B) *After he had signalized himself, as an Orator, he began to write Histories.*] *Quintilian* makes that Observation. (f) *Theopompus .... ut in historia prædictis* (Herodoto & Thucydide) *minor, ita Oratori magis similis, ut qui antequam est ad hoc opus sollicitatus, diu fuerit Orator.* *Cicero* does not clash with *Quintilian*, when he says, that *Theopompus* did never plead any Cause; for many Orators of *Greece* never pleaded any. 'Twas *Isocrates* (g), who advised *Theopompus* to apply himself to History. The Passage quoted by me out of *Cicero*, might make one believe, that *Theopompus* and *Ephorus* were two Men of a like Genius, since their Master advised them to apply themselves to the same Study; but be not deceived by it: They were Men of a different Character; one wanted a Curb, and the other a Spur: *Theopompus* was too vehement, *Ephorus* wanted Activity; and therefore *Isocrates* used different Methods with them. (h) *Hoc doctoris intelligentis est, videre quo ferat natura sua quemque, & eo duce utentem sic instituere, ut Isocratem in acerrimo ingenio Theopompi, & lenissimo Ephori dixisse traditum est, alteri se calcaria adhibere, alteri frænos.* *Cicero* expresses this in another place better still for my Purpose; for he says, that these two Scholars were never alike. (i) *Dicebat Isocrates .... se calcaribus in Ephoro, contrà autem in Theopompo frenis uti solere: alterum enim exultantem verborum audacia reprimebat, alterum cunctantem, & quasi verecundantem incitabat. Neque eos similes effecit inter se, sed tantum alteri affinxit, de altero limavit, ut id confirmaret in utroque, quod utriusque natura pateretur.* *Quintilian* (k) relates the same thing. Others (l) make a like Observation concerning *Plato*, with respect to *Aristotle* and *Xenocrates*, and concerning *Aristotle*, with respect to *Theophrastus* and *Callisthenes*.

(C) *That the Study of Eloquence is a good Preparative* to write History.] 'Twas *Cicero's* Opinion, as it appears from these Words of *Pomponius Atticus* to him: (m) *Potes tu profecto satisfacere in* historia *quippe cum sit opus, ut tibi quidem videri solet, unum hoc oratorium maxime.* Nevertheless, it seems, that a Man, who has been used to compose Orations, is not well qualified to observe, in his Expressions, that grave Simplicity, which becomes the Character of an Historian. 'Tis to be feared, that his Style will be too lofty, and too full of Metaphors. But this is a much stronger Objection against those, who say, That none can be a good Historian, unless he has been a good Poet (n); which is the Opinion of some great Men. However it be, *Theopompus's* Style was thought to favour more of an Orator, than of an Historian, and to be like that of *Isocrates*, whom he had imitated. (o) *Veterum hoc commune judicium est dictionem ejus oratoriæ ac imprimis Isocrateæ similiorem esse, quam historiæ.* Those, who, in order to justify him, say, in a general manner, that he came nearer the Strength of *Demosthenes*, do not wholly remove the Difficulty; for that very thing shews, that an Oratorial Eloquence prevailed in his Historical Writings. The best thing that can be said for him is what we find in *Dionysius Halicarnasseus*. I shall set it down in *Latin*: It will appear from it, that *Theopompus* added to the Character of *Isocrates* the Strength which his Subject required, and that his Censures were as sharp as those of *Demosthenes*. (p) *Ea forma quæ in elocutione cernitur, maxime ad similitudinem Isocrateæ accedit. Pura enim dictio, vulgaris, simplex, perspicua, sublimis, magnifica, & summam pompam præ se fert, & quadam harmonia temperata est, jucunde & suaviter fluens. Differt autem ab elocutione Isocratis in austeritate & vehementia in aliquibus; nimirum cum se in affectus concitandis dederit, & vel maxime cum urbibus & ducibus improba consilia & res gestas exprobrat atque vitio dat. Multus enim est in iis, & à Demosthenis acrimonia ne paululum quidem abest.* *Cicero* observes, that *Theopompus* eclipsed the Glory of *Philistus*, and *Thucydides*, by the loftiness of his Style. (q) *Ut horum concisis sententiis, interdum etiam non satis apertis*

cum

---

* Strabo lib. 14. pag. 444.

† [illegible] Clarissimus omnium Isocratis discipulorum. Dionys. Halicarn. epist. ad Pompeium sub fin. pag. m. 262.

ξ Aulus Gellius, lib. 10. c. 18.

‡ Photius, Biblioth. cod. 176. pag. 392.

‡ Id. ib. See the end of the last Remark.

(m) Ibid.

(o) Id. ib. pag. 63, 64.

(1) Curandum est, ne sententiæ emineant extra corpus orationis expressæ, sed intexto vestibus colore niteant. Petr. Satyric.

(a) Meursius de Archont. Athen. apud Jonsium ubi infra.

(b) Vossius de hist. Græc. lib. 4. cap. 8. pag. 459.

(c) Jonsius de script. hist. philos. pag. 45.

(d) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 16. c. 72.

(e) Theopompus's History consisted of 58 Books.

(f) Quintil. lib. 10. cap. 1. pag. m. 469.

(g) Ecl... rissim... Rhetor... efficit... duo pr... stante... genio T... pompu... Ephoru... ab Isoc... magist... impulsi... ad hist... riam co... tulerat... endo... ... Cicero de Orat. lib. 2. fol. ... D.

(h) Cicero in Brut... pag. ...

(i) Cicero de Orat. lib. 3. ... 9. C.

(k) Quintil. lib. ... cap. ... pag. ...

(l) Diog. Laertius ... Xenocr... & Theo... phrastus...

(m) Cicero de legib. lib. 1. ... init. ... 328. C. See also Cicero ... 1. de Oratore.

(n) See ... Pensées ... verses ... les Com... tes ...

(o) Vossius de hist. ... cis, p. ...

(p) Dionys. Halicarn. epist. ad Pompeium in fine, p. m. 264.

(q) Cicero in Orat... p. m. 11...

for he acquired the Reputation of a good Hiſtorian. He was beſides, very well qualified to write Hiſtory; for he boldly ſpoke (D) the Truth, and was not ſparing of his Money, when an exact Enquiry into Matters of Fact required great Expences. He is blamed for (E) his Digreſſions: And 'tis very likely, the Cenſure paſt upon him on that Account is very reaſonable, though perhaps it is not in all Reſpects ſo exact and equitable, as it ſhould be, and the Plan he laid down has not been duly conſidered. If we had his Preface, perhaps we ſhould find ſomething in it, whereby he might be juſtified in ſome meaſure; but I don't think he can be fully excuſed; no, not by ſuch Readers as have the greateſt Indulgence for the *Epiſodes* of Hiſtorians. Much leſs could he expect to have the Approbation

cum brevitate, tum ſimilis acumine, efficit Theopompus elatione atque altitudine orationis ſuæ, quod idem Lyſiæ Demoſthenes: ſic Catonis luminibus obſtruxit hæc poſteriorum quaſi exaggerata altius oratio. But there is one thing, in which he ſhewed himſelf too much an Orator: He carefully avoided the meeting of Vowels, and was extremely fond of the Turn and Cadence of his Periods, and of the Correſpondence of Grammatical Figures. 'Tis a Fault, for which *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* blames (r) him; and there is ſomething mean in ſuch an Affectation, when the Sublimity and Majeſty of the Subject ought to take up the whole Attention of the Writer. However, it may be ſaid, as to what concerns the meeting of Vowels, that he did not amiſs in avoiding it, and that he was only to blame for diſcovering to the Reader that he avoided it too ſcrupulouſly. I obſerve, that when *Cicero* ſays, *Theopompus* was blamed upon that Account, he does not ſay he was juſtly blamed: Nay, he ſeems to ſay, that there was no occaſion for it. *Ut in legendo*, ſays he (ſ), *ſic animus in dicendo proſpiciet quid ſequatur, ne extremorum verborum cum inſequentibus primis concurſus, aut hiulcas voces efficiat, aut aſperas. Quamvis enim ſuaves, graveſve ſententiæ, tamen ſi inconditis verbis efferuntur, offendent aures, quarum eſt judicium ſuperbiſſimum. Quod quidem latina lingua ſic obſervat, nemo ut tam ruſticus ſit, qui vocales nolit conjungere. In quo quidem etiam Theopompum reprehendunt, quod eas literas tantopere fugeret, & ſi id magiſter ejus Iſocrates, at non Thucydides...... In ea eſt crebra iſta vocum concurſio, quam magna ex parte, ut vitioſam, fugit Demoſthenes.* *Duris Samius* ſpoke of *Theopompus*'s Style with great contempt; but, as *Photius* (t) obſerves, he was far from equalling him. Conſult *Longinus* in two Places of his Tract *de ſublimi dicendi genere*: He commends and juſtifies him in the one, and cenſures him in the other. Which may be further ſeen, ſays he (v), "in a Paſſage of *Theopompus*, which *Cæcilius* blames I "know not why. I think on the contrary that it ought "to be praiſed for its juſtneſs, and becauſe it is very ex"preſſive. *Philip*, ſays that Hiſtorian, *eaſily puts up all* "*the Affronts, which the Neceſſity of his affairs obliges him* "*to ſuffer.*" There is in the Greek δεινὸς ὢν ὁ Φίλιππος ἀναγκοφαγῆσαι πράγματα. *Tanaquillus Faber* renders theſe Words: *Philippus rerum neceſſitatem devorare callidus.* The other Paſſage of *Longinus* begins thus: "(a) In "like manner, the Hiſtorian *Theopompus* made a Deſcrip"tion of the King of *Perſia*'s Deſcent into *Ægypt*, which "is otherwiſe wonderful; but he ſpoils all by the mean "Words he intermixes with it. *Is there any Town, and* "*Nation in Aſia*, ſays that Hiſtorian, *but what ſent Am*"*baſſadors to the King? &c.*" *Longinus*, having mention'd the remaining part of the Deſcription, adds: "From "the higheſt Elevation he falls into the loweſt Meanneſs, "in the very Place where he ſhould have been moſt lofty: "For the Buſhels, Ragoo's, and Sacks, which he impro"perly mentions in the pompous Deſcription of thoſe "Preparations, would make one think that he deſcribes "a Kitchin." The Jeſuit *Cauſſin*, who was a good Judge of Rhetorick, does not approve that Cenſure. Theſe are his Words. (b) *Dionyſ. Longinus, mordax Criticus, eum irridet, quod ubi dona Regi Perſarum ab Aſiaticis oblata commemorat, poſt ſtragulam veſtem, purpuram, tabernacula aurea, periſtromata, emblemata, carnes etiam victimarum ſalſas, regi oblatas ad alendum exercitum, commemoret. Debebat, inquit, iſta minuta, aut omittere, aut initio collocare, ut à minoribus ad majora aſcenderet: ſed in eo frigidus eſt, & fruſtra mordax Longinus. Erat enim fidelis hiſtorici, & prudentis, poſt opulenta principum dona, tenuiorum quoque in colendo rege ſtudia commemorare, & rem, ut geſta eſt, deſcribere. Quod ſi tantopere petaſonem averſatur, quin Homerum, ſuum numen, reprehendit, qui tam ſimpliciter rem coquinariam à principibus obitam deſcribit: & quid hoc eſt, niſi* μαγειρεία, *quod inſectatur in Theopompo,* φαντασία *eſt?* This ſeems to me to be the moſt plauſible thing that can be ſaid in *Theopompus*'s Vindication; but if I was to chuſe, I ſhould rather ſide with *Longinus* than with Father *Cauſſin*: For the Faithfulneſs of an Hiſtorian does not oblige him to give a particular Account of all the Preſents that were made to a King. But what is ſaid againſt *Longinus* in the laſt part of Father *Cauſſin*'s Words, ſeems to me a Home-Argument. You cannot, ſays he, find Fault with *Theopompus*, without blaming *Homer* your great Deity. 'Tis certain, that *Homer* has given a particular Account of Things relating to a Kitchin, &c. more frequently than *Theopompus*.

(D) *He boldly ſpoke the Truth, and was not ſparing of his Money.*] See hereafter the Remark *H*. I ſhall only ſet down here theſe Words of *Athenæus*. (c) Εἰ δὲ τις τοῦτο ἀπιστεῖ, μαθέτω καὶ παρὰ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ Χίου, ἀνδρὸς φιλαλήθους καὶ πολλὰ χρήματα καταναλώσαντος εἰς τὴν περὶ ἱστορίας ἐξέτασιν ἀκριβῆ. *His fidem ſi quis non adhibeat, diſcat Theopompum Chium veritatis ſtudioſum hominem, & qui hiſtoriæ exactâ inquiſitione, magno pecuniarum impendio, perſcrutatus eſt.*

(E) *He is blamed for his Digreſſions.*] The Sophiſt *Theon* (d) ſays they were ſo long, that any one who read them, did quite forget what went before. It muſt be confeſt, that it is an unpleaſant thing to thoſe who read a Work of that Nature. *Photius*, intending to ſhew how *Theopompus* launch'd into Matters foreign to his Subject, tells us the following Particulars. His Hiſtory of *Philip*, King of *Macedonia*, contain'd 58 Books, which were reduced to 16; when every thing, that had no relation to the Hiſtory of that Prince, was left out. (e) Πλείσταις μὲν παρεκβάσεσι παντοδαπῆς ἱστορίας, τοὺς ἱστορικοὺς αὐτοῦ λόγους Θεόπομπος παρατείνει. διὸ καὶ Φίλιππος ὁ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πολεμήσας, ἐξελὼν ταύτας, καὶ τὰς Φιλίππου συνταξάμενος πράξεις, αἳ σκοπὸς εἰσὶ Θεοπόμπῳ, εἰς ἑκκαίδεκα βίβλους μόνας, μηδὲν παρ' ἑαυτοῦ προσθεὶς ἢ ἀφελών, πλὴν (ὡς εἴρηται) τῶν παρεκτροπῶν, τὰς πάσας ἀπήρτισε. *Digreſſionibus itaque variæ hiſtoriæ quamplurimis, hiſtoricos ſuos implet libros Theopompus. Quamobrem & Philippus, ille qui cum Romanis bellum geſſit, digreſſionibus hiſce ſublatis, & Philippi rebus geſtis, quas Theopompus ſcribendas potiſſimum ſuſceperat, collectis, in ſedecim eas dumtaxat libros (nihil de ſuo addens, aut præter digreſſiones, ut diximus, detrahens) redegit.* If you mind the Extracts, which the ſame Author gives us (f) of the 12th Book of *Theopompus*'s Hiſtory, you'll be fully convinced that he loved to depart from his main Subject. I muſt obſerve, that if any thing can make us believe, that the *Roman* Name was ſcarce known to the *Greeks* in *Alexander*'s Time, 'tis this, that *Theopompus* (g) ſays nothing of *Rome*, except, that it had been taken by the *Gauls*. *Rome* would have afforded him Matter for a long Digreſſion, had it been known never ſo little at that time.

Perhaps we may juſtly ſuſpect, that *Photius*'s Account is ſomewhat fallacious. *Theopompus* began his Hiſtory with the Reign of King *Philip*, and his main Deſign was to relate the Actions of that Prince; but perhaps he intended at the ſame time to give an Account of the moſt remarkable Tranſactions in the other Parts of the World during that Reign. If it be ſo, that Work would have been an Univerſal Hiſtory of that Time, and not that of *Philip* in particular; and conſequently what was left out, when it was reduced to ſixteen Books, ſhould not be look'd upon as Digreſſions, properly ſo called. The Wars of *Cyprus* and *Sicily*, and many others were left out, which perhaps he did not mention occaſionally, and by way of Digreſſion, but as an eſſential part of his Deſign. 'Tis impoſſible to decide the Matter, ſince we have neither his Preface, nor any other Part of his Work. However, I believe, that *Photius* ſtretch'd the thing too far; and if I was to complain of *Theopompus*'s Digreſſions, I would not inſiſt, as *Theon* (h) does, upon his relating many things, wherein neither the King of *Macedonia*, nor any of his Subjects, had a hand. Can it be denied, that the main Deſign of *Thuanus* was to write the Hiſtory of *France*? And yet how many Things does he relate, that have no relation to the *French*? I would therefore blame *Theopompus* for putting a wrong Title (i) to his Work; but if he had acquainted his Readers that he intended likewiſe to write the Hiſtory of other Countries, I would not call his Account of the Wars of *Evagoras*, and of the Tyrants of *Syracuſa*, a Digreſſion. In order to paſs a right Judgment upon his *Epiſodes*, I would not compare them with *Philip* or *Macedonia*, I would go no further than this: His twelfth Book, for Inſtance (k), was deſign'd for the Wars of *Cyprus*; He goes back as far as the Siege of *Troy*; he ſpeaks of *Agamemnon*, and *Mopſus* the Soothſayer, &c. Does what he ſays of 'em carry me too far from

(c) *Athen. lib.* 3. *c.* 8. *pag.* 85. Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 264. *praiſes that Author for the Pains and Charges he was at in collecting Materials.*

(d) Theo. in progymnaſmatis: *I have quoted his Words in the Remark E of the Article* Philiſtus.

(e) Photius *ubi ſupra, pag.* 393.

(f) *Id. ib. pag.* 390, 391.

(g) Theopompus ante quem nemo mentionem habuit (*de Romanis*) urbem duntaxat à Gallis captam dixit. *Plinius lib.* 3. *c.* 5. *pag. m.* 324.

(h) *Theo. in progymn. cap.* 4. *pag.* 44, 45.

(i) *It was intitled,* τὰ Φιλιππικά. Res Philippi.

(k) *Photius ubi ſupra.*

bation of (F) those Criticks, who cannot bear any thing in History that is Foreign to the Subject. He is also blamed for his many Fabulous Stories, and long (G) Speeches, and (H) for being too Satyrical. They put a base Trick upon him by publishing in his Name, and in a Style altogether like his, a History wherein the most considerable Republicks of Greece

from *Evagoras King of Cyprus*? If it be so, I blame him, but I would not approve those who should complain, that *Mopsus* and *Agamemnon* carry them too far from the Court of *Macedonia*. I am of Opinion, that this Restriction would not be sufficient to justify that Historian. Doubtless, he ran too frequently into *Episodes*, wherein he forgot himself. That Fault is a new Reason for us to lament the Loss of his History; for since the only Design of his Digressions was to explain Antiquities, to relate the Origine of Things, and different Traditions, how many Curiosities should we find in it, that are now unknown to us, and which we could not have found in a close History?

(F) *Of those Criticks, who cannot bear any thing in a History that is Foreign to the Subject.*] How could *Theopompus* appear before their Tribunal, and expect any Favour from them, since they have past a Sentence of Condemnation upon *Tacitus*? The first thing they do, is to lay down these Rules, That *an Historian ought to make it his only Business to tell the Truth, and to distinguish Matters of Fact; that he ought to renounce his own Taste, and to neglect Foreign Ornaments, which neither contribute to make things clearer, nor occasion a greater Knowledge of Matters concealed.... that his Narratives ought to be coherent, his Computations exact, and his Reflections short and few; that History ought to contain the Prince's Actions, and the Alterations that happen'd in his Dominions, during his Reign; that Foreign Digressions and study'd Discourses are not proper for it, and ought to be laid aside.* Afterwards they pretend, "(b) That if *Tacitus* were examined "according to these Rules, it will not appear that "he intended to write an History: Any one may easily "observe, as well as the Learned, that he frequently "leaves the Thread of his Narration without resuming it, to describe a Battle, or to introduce his Heroes making long Speeches. Being affected with the "Excellency of this sort of Performances, he sometimes "leaves his own Country to make Excursions into a Foreign one, on purpose to describe the Beauties of it. "Wherein I think he shows himself an Orator more "than any thing else, and that he did not so much design to write a faithful History, as to exercise his Eloquence..... (d) I am therefore of Opinion, that *Tacitus* touch'd upon History occasionally; and that "his only Design was to exercise his Eloquence several "ways.... (e) Indeed every thing in *Tacitus* speaks "his Character, and not that of History. He seldom "relates Events; he makes long and frequent Digressions, and his Carelesness and Affectation are too apparent. He acts the Part of an Orator who is resolved "to applaud himself, and who turns and handles different Facts to his Advantage.... (f) Dying Men make "Speeches in their very Tents with the Niceness, and "all the Presence of Mind of a Man in Health, who "writes in his Closet: Nay, he has such an Itch of "Speaking that he does not stay till a General of an "Army is at the Head of his Troops to harangue them, "but makes him write Orders like a School-Master, full "of Antitheses and Rhetorical Figures."

I believe this Judgment upon *Tacitus* will appear unjust and extravagant to good Judges; and it had been well for *Theopompus*, if all those, who criticized him, had been like the Author of these Passages. He would have been condemn'd without Mercy, and in a very insulting Manner; but he might have answered, that his Judges went upon strain'd Maxims, and he might have come off by saying, that all Historians were involved in the same Censure, as well as he, and that consequently it is false and over-nice.

(G) *He is also blamed for his many Fabulous Stories, and long Speeches.*] As to the Fabulous Stories, which *Theopompus* inserted in his Work, I shall quote *Cicero*'s Testimony. (h) *Intelligo te alias in historia leges servandas putare, alias in poemate: quippe quum in illa ad veritatem quæque referantur, in hac ad delectationem pleraque: quamquam & apud Herodotum patrem historiæ & apud Theopompum sint innumerabiles fabulæ.* *Dionysius Halicarnasseus* mentions two absurd Tales of that Historian. (i) *Multas ineptias præ se fert ex quo genere illa sunt quæ de Sileno commemorat qui in Macedonia apparuit, & quæ de dracone ad triremem pugna navali contendente & alia nonnulla iis similia.* I cannot tell whether what is said of *Silenus*'s Apparition, is the same thing with the Dialogue of *Silenus* and *Midas*. It is to be found in *Ælian* (k), as taken from *Theopompus*. 'Tis an Adventure, which appears so fabulous to *Ælian*, that he concludes the Recital of it with these Words. (l) Καὶ ταῦτα εἴ τῳ πιςὸς ὁ Χῖος λέγων, πεπιςεύσθω. ἐμοὶ δὲ δεινὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ μυθολόγος, καὶ ἐν τούτοις, καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δέ. *Hæc si cui fide dignus videtur Chius*, (that is, *Theopompus*) *credat. Mihi egregius fabulator tum in his, tum in aliis videtur.* It may be question'd whether *Dionysius* meant that Dialogue, for he speaks only of the Fables inserted in *Theopompus*'s History, and *Servius* (m) informs us, that *Theopompus* had related that Story in a Book intitled, *Thaumasia, Wonderful things.* But this doubt is not built upon a solid Foundation; for that Historian might have repeated in his History what he had said in another Book, or might have adorned his *Thaumasia* with some Pieces of his History.

We must not reckon among *Theopompus*'s Fables his (n) Geographical Mistakes, or the Falsities grounded upon some Relations, which it was a hard Matter for him to rectify. The Falsities vented by him concerning the *Ægyptians* (o), ought to be placed in this last Class.

Here is a Touch upon the Length of his Harangues. "(p) But as for those Rhetorical Flourishes and Harangues of *Ephorus*, *Theopompus*, and *Anaximenes*, "which they made after they had arm'd, and set in "order the Battalions, it may be said of 'em,

None talks thus foolishly so near the Sword.

(H) *He is also blamed.... for being too Satyrical.*] *Vossius* (q) quotes three Authors for it, *viz.* (r) *Cornelius Nepos*, *Lucian* and *Josephus*. The latter (s) observes, that *Theopompus* defamed the *Athenians*. The Words of the second deserve to be set down. He says, that the Historians, who insert Speeches in their Histories, ought to be sparing of their Praises and Censures, and remember they are not at the Bar; otherwise they will be guilty of *Theopompus*'s Fault. (t) Τὴν αὐτὴν Θεοπόμπῳ αἰτίαν ἕξεις, φιλαπεχθημόνως κατηγοροῦντι τῶν πλείςων, καὶ διατριβὴν ποιουμένῳ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὡς κατηγορεῖν μᾶλλον, ἢ ἱςορεῖν τὰ πεπραγμένα. *Alioqui in eadem eris culpa qua Theopompus, qui plurimos odiosè nimis accusat, & eam rem in studium quoddam vertit, ut accuset magis, quam res gestas historia tradat.* *Vossius* might have also quoted *Plutarch*, who (v) says, that *Theopompus* is more to be credited when he praises than when he censures. *Dionysius Halicarnasseus* takes *Theopompus*'s part on this Head: He compares him with Physicians, who launce and cauterize the infected part to the Quick, but without hurting the Parts that are sound. (w) *Proinde etiam obtrectator videtur esse, dum nonnullos debitis convitiis afficit, & facta virorum illustrium non necessaria perstringit: simile quiddam faciens ac medici, qui corruptas corporis partes secant & urunt, quam profundissime cauteria & sectiones immittentes, non tamen sanas corporis partes & bene affectas attingunt.* Take notice, that *Theopompus* did not spare the Divine *Plato* (x): Which can be no wonder, since he gave a very ill Character of *Philip* of *Macedonia*. The Description he made of the Court of that Prince (y) contains more Abominations than were ascribed to that of *Henry* III. King of *France* by the anonymous Writers of Libels. 'Tis further said, that after he had very much praised *Alexander* the Great, he contradicted it by some injurious Writings. (z) *Pulsus è patria quum supplex in Dianæ Ephesiæ templum confugisset multa contra Chios scripsit ad Alexandrum in quibus illum laudavit: sed postea παλινῳδίαν cecinit. Nam dicitur in eundem postea scripsisse quamvis quod scripsit in manus hominum non videatur venisse.* The sharp Style of *Theopompus* is hinted at in the following Words of *Cicero*: (aa) ἀνέκδοτα *quæ tibi uni legantur, Theopompino genere aut etiam asperiore multo pangentur.* That Writer began to set up for a Critick in the very Preface (bb) of his History, for he censured in it the other Historians.

If what I have read in an Epistle Dedicatory be true, *viz.* that King *Philip* was very liberal to *Theopompus*, it must be acknowledged that he made an ill use of his Money. (cc) *Celebratur multorum literis ac libris principum quorundam benignitas in viros literatos, ut Dionysii in Platonem, Philippi in Theopompum, Alexandri in Aristotelem, Severi in Oppianum.* I could easily believe, that *Philip* made some Presents to *Theopompus*; for 'tis certain, *Theopompus* composed a Panegyrick upon that King; and that, among other Praises, he bestowed this upon him, *That King needs only go on as he has begun,*

to

(l) *Anonymiana*, *pag.* 13.

(b) *Ibid.* *pag.* 14, 15.

(d) *Ibid.* *pag.* 22.

(e) *Ibid.* *pag.* 23.

(f) *Ibid.* *pag.* 24.

(h) *Cicero, de legibus lib.* 1. *circa init. fol. m.* 328. *C.*

(i) *Dionys. Halicarn. ubi supra in fine pag. m.* 264.

(k) *Ælian var. histor. lib.* 3. *cap.* 18. *pag. m.* 200. See *Casaubon upon* Strabo, *lib.* 7. *pag. m.* 112.

(aa) *Cicero, epist.* 6. *lib.* 2. *ad Atticum, pag. m.* 209. (bb) D *Halicarn. in Præfat. Histor.* (cc) *Francisc. Duarenus epist. ad* *garitam Valesiam Henrici II. sororem præfixa commentariis in Tit.* *matrimonio.*

Greece (I) were reflected upon. 'Tis (K) pity none of his Books should be extant; for the Notion a great † Critick gives of 'em, shews, that the Loss of 'em is to be lamented. He says, that *Theopompus* enquired into the secret Causes of Things, and into the Motives of those who perform'd them; that he β was very lucky in his Guesses, and γ unmask'd those who concealed real Vices under the appearance of Virtue: So that his History was a Tribunal where every Man's Conduct was examin'd with all the Exactness ascrib'd by the Poets to the Infernal Judges. I omit the other Praises bestowed upon him by the same Critick. You'll see in the Remark C what Judgment has been made of *Theopompus*'s Style. What is quoted out of his Works by *Athenæus* is sufficient to make us lament the Loss of 'em. It has been ♁ observed, that there were some Things in that Author not to be found in any other Writer. All that I can say concerning his Life is only this. He ξ fled from *Chio* with his Father, who was convicted of favouring the *Lacedemonians*. He was recall'd into his Country after the Death of his Father, by Virtue of a Letter, which *Alexander* writ in his behalf: He was then 46 Years of Age. He found himself obliged, after the Death of *Alexander*, to wander up and down like a Fugitive; and being gone into *Egypt*, he found no Refuge there, and even would have lost his Life had not his Friends interceeded for him with King *Ptolemy*, who design'd to put him to Death, because he * concern'd himself with too many Things. He was ‡ an Eye-Witness of several Events related by him, and he insinuated himself into the Favour of many Persons, who commanded Armies, or managed State-Affairs: Which he did, looking upon it as a thing that would very much contribute to the Perfection of his Work. He had some Contestations ↓ with his Countryman *Theocritus* about the Government of the Town. I don't find that he deserv'd the Encomium of being a Peripatetick (L) Philosopher, bestowed upon him by

† *Dionys. Halicarn. ubi supra, pag.* 263, 264. *See also pag.* 101.
β *Idem, pag.* 101.
γ *Idem, pag.* 264.
♁ *Plutarch in Agesilao, p.* 614. *C.*
ξ *Photius, ubi supra.*
* Ὡς τὰ πολυπράγμονα ἀνελεῖν θέλοντα. *Velut nimis curiosum de medio tollere voluisse. Id. ibid.*
‡ *Dionys. Halicarn. ubi supra, pag.* 263.
↓ *Strabo, lib.* 14. *pag.* 444. *See also* Athenæus, *B.* 6. *pag.* 230.

to make himself Master of all Europe. (dd) Καὶ ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῷ Φιλίππου ἐγκωμίῳ. ὅτι εἰ βουληθείη Φίλιππος τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐμμένειν, καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης πάσης βασιλεύσει. *Et quemadmodum in Philippi Laudatione Theopompus, Philippum, si pergere, ut instituisset, suique esse similis vellet, totius Europæ imperio mox potiturum. Theon*, from whom I have those Words, says in another Place (a), that *Theopompus*'s Panegyricks upon *Philip* and *Alexander* were still extant. Those two Pieces made no part of his History: Doubtless he writ 'em as an Orator; and though he had been rewarded for 'em, he altered his Note in his History; he spoke ill of the same Prince, whom he had so much praised. The Orator had acted his Part; the Historian succeeded him and kept up his Character. The Discourses of a Panegyrist have no Influence upon his Conversation, or upon the Moral and Historical Books he writes. Such a Difference may be observed even at this Day. A Man, who, on a Solemn Day, as, for Instance, when Prizes are distributed, bestows noble and magnificent Encomiums, will not spare his Censures sitting by the Fire-side; and, though he enjoys still his Pension, he will say many unacceptable Things, if he is an Historian. I don't say that every Body does the same. There are but too many, who prove as great Flatterers in their Histories as in their Panegyricks. But *Theopompus* took another Course, and some others are like him in that respect.

(I) *By publishing in his Name, and in a Style .... a History, wherein the .... Republicks .... were reflected upon.*] *Anaximenes*, his Enemy, put that Trick upon him, as we read in *Pausanias*, who, if I am not mistaken, is the only Author that mentions it. These are his Words: (b) Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἄνδρα ὁ Ἀναξιμένης ἐχθρὸν ἐκ ἀμαθέστατα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιφθονώτατα ἀμυνάμενος. Ἐπεφύκει μὲν αὐτὸς σοφιστὴς, καὶ σοφιστῶν λόγους μιμεῖσθαι. ὡς δὲ οἱ διάφορα ἐς Θεόπομπον ἐγεγόνει τὸν Δαμασιστράτου, γράφει βιβλίον ἐς Ἀθηναίους, καὶ ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους ὁμοῦ καὶ Θηβαίους συγγραφὴν λοίδορον. ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον αὐτῷ μεμιμημένα, ἐπιγράψας τοῦ Θεοπόμπου τὸ ὄνομα τῷ βιβλίῳ, διέπεμπεν ἐς τὰς πόλεις. καὶ αὐτός τε συγγεγραφὼς ἦν, καὶ τὸ ἔχθος τὸ ἐς Θεόπομπον ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐπηύξητο. *Idem etiam Anaximenes inimicum suum non minus vafre quam invidiose ultus dicitur. Nam qui ingenio sophista esset, quum sophistarum orationem aptissime imitaretur, suscepta cum Theopompo Damasistrati filio simultate, historiam conscripsit maledictorum in Athenienses, Lacedamonios, & Thebanos plenissimam. Ad unguem vero quum Theopompi stylum expressisset, supposito ejus nomine, per Græcia civitates librum divulgandum curavit: quæ res Theopompo magnam apud omnes plane Græcos invidiam concitavit.*

(K) *That none of his Books should be extant.* He publish'd many (c) Orations, and (d) Letters. He writ one to *Alexander* (e), and another to the Inhabitants of *Chio* (f), which are quoted by *Athenæus*. He also wrote (g) some Counsels to that Prince. His Treatise (h), περὶ τῶν συληθέντων ἐκ Δελφῶν χρημάτων: *de rebus quæ sacrilegio ex Delphis surrepta sunt*; and that (i) κατὰ τῆς Πλάτωνος διατριβῆς: *de exercitationibus Platonis*, are quoted by the same Author. His Dissertation περὶ εὐσεβείας, *de Pietate*, is quoted by the Scholiast (k) upon *Aristophanes*. Others (l) quote his Θαυμάσια, *admiranda*; but his chief Works were two Histories: One was that of *Greece* (m) in twelve Books, containing the Transactions of seventeen Years, beginning where *Thucydides* left off. It ended with the Sea-fight at *Cnidus*. The other was intitled Φιλιππικά, because it was design'd to represent the Reign of *Philip* King of *Macedonia*. It (n) contain'd fifty-eight Books, whereof the sixth, seventh, ninth, twentieth and thirtieth, had been lost for a long time, when *Photius* read the rest. He gives us some Extracts of the twelfth, though *Menophanes*, an ancient Author, thought it was lost. (o) *Diodorus Siculus*, and the anonymous Author, who described the Olympiads, mention the Loss of five Books of *Theopompus*. It were in vain to alledge against 'em, that the fifty-fifth and fifty-seventh Books are quoted by *Stephanus Byzantinus*, and the fifty-sixth by *Athenæus*. Those (p), who raise this Objection, would not urge it, if they knew what *Photius* observes, that most of the five Books, not extant, were nearer the Beginning than the End of the Work.

Vossius (q) says, that *Harpocration* quotes a Letter of *Theopompus* to *Tisamenes*. 'Tis a Mistake: *Harpocration* quotes a Dramatick Piece written by *Theopompus*, the Comick Poet, and intitled *Tisamenes* (r).

(L) *The Encomium of being a Peripatetick Philosopher, bestowed upon him by* Grotius.] The Resurrection of a dead Body, says he, ought not to be accounted an impossible thing, since some Learned Men, *Zoroaster* among the *Chaldeans*, and the greatest part of the Stoicks, and *Theopompus* among the Peripateticks, believed the Possibility of it, and that it would effectually happen. This is what he says in the Text of the second Book (s) of his Treatise *de veritate religionis Christianæ*. His Note concerning *Theopompus* runs thus: (t) *De quo Diogenes Laertius initio* (v) *libri.* Καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ὃς καὶ ἀναβιώσεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς μάγους φησὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἔσεσθαι ἀθανάτους, καὶ τὰ ὄντα ταῖς αὐταῖς διακλήσεσι διαμενεῖν. *Theopompus vero etiam octavo Philippicorum, qui revicturos homines ex magorum sententia tradit, immortalésque futuros, & omnia in suis iisdem semper mansura nominibus. Grotius* means *Theopompus* the Historian, who makes the Subject of this Article. But I don't remember I ever read, that he was placed among the Philosophers; and I think he was too proud to learn of *Aristotle* in an Age so far advanced. But if this Fault of *Grotius* could be excused, he would be liable to Censure upon another Account; for what he quotes out of *Diogenes Laertius* signifies only that *Theopompus* mention'd in his History the Opinion of the *Magi*, concerning the Resurrection. Let us suppose *Theopompus* to have been a very illustrious Peripatetick, will it follow from his Passage, alledged by *Diogenes Laertius*, that a famous Disciple of the great *Aristotle* believed, that Men would rise again. Do Historians believe what-

---

Christ. pag. m. 381. (v) *Pag.* 7. *of the* Amsterdam *Edition*, 1692.

d) *Theon.*
supra,
. 8.
. 103.

) *Theon.*
supra,
. 2.
. 19.

) *Pausan.*
. 6. *pag.*
6. *edit.*
96.

) *Photius*
supra.
. 392
) *Dionys.*
licarn.
st. ad
mpeium,
fine.
) *Athen.*
. 13.
. 595.
) *Id ib.*
. 586.
) *Id. lib.*
p. 230.
) *Id. lib.*
p. 604.
) *Id. lib.*
p. 508.

(k) *Schol. Arist. in aves.*
(l) *Apollonius histor. commentit. cap.* 10. *Laertius in Epimenide & Pherecyde. Servius, ubi supra.*
(m) *Anonym. in descript. Olymp. apud Vossium, ubi supra, pag.* 32.
(n) *Photius ubi supra, pag.* 389.
(o) *Diodor. Siculus, l.* 16. *c.* 3.
(p) *Jonsius* de script. hist. philos. p. 46. *raises it.*
(q) *Vossius ubi supra, pag.* 31.
(r) *See* Maussac's *Notes upon Harpocration, voce* καταπλήξ.
(s) *Pag. m.* 64, 65.
(t) *Hugo Grotius in annotatis ad librum* 2. *de veritate relig.*

by *Grotius*. I ſhall ſay nothing of the Puniſhment mention'd by *Ariſteas*; *Moreri* ſpeaks ſufficiently of it. To conclude, *Theopompus* was accuſed of (*M*) being a Plagiary.

THERON (VITAL) a *French* Jeſuit, was born at *Limoux* in *Languedoc* in the Year 1572. He turn'd Jeſuit in 1587. He taught Rhetorick, Philoſophy, and Moral Divinity, and profeſs'd the fourth Vow. He preach'd in the moſt conſiderable Towns of *France* for the ſpace of fifty Years. He was Rector of the Colledge of *Montauban*, and Provincial of the Province of *Toulouſe* *. He publiſh'd at ſeveral times many *Latin* Verſes, that were very much eſteem'd; and thoſe he made in his old *Age* were ſo good, that his (*A*) Poetical Vein did not ſeem to be weaken'd. *Balzac* commended him mightily for it: He was miſtaken as to the Age (*B*) he aſcribed to him. That † Jeſuit died at *Toulouſe* the 25th of *February* 1657.

THES.

whatever they relate? If M. *de Cordemoi*, who was a *Carteſian*, had inſerted in his Hiſtory a Doctrine of the ancient *Druids*, might it be concluded from thence, that this Doctrine was believed among the *Carteſians*? This is certainly a very weak Paſſage in the Learned Commentary, which *Grotius* added to his excellent Book concerning the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

(*M*) Theopompus *was accuſed of being a Plagiary.*] 'Tis ſaid (*a*), that he inſerted Word for Word in the Eleventh Book of his Φιλιππικῶν, a long Paſſage of an Oration of *Iſocrates*; that upon other occaſions, in order to hide his Robberies, he changed the Scene and the Names of the Perſons; that, for Inſtance, he related, that *Pherecydes* having drunk of the Water of a Well in a Town of *Syria*, foretold an Earthquake which happen'd three Days after; and that he took that courſe becauſe he was ſenſible, that if he had mention'd that Earthquake, as a thing foretold by *Pythagoras*, in the Town of *Metapontum*, the Readers would have known that he had it from a Book (*b*) of *Andron*. 'Tis further ſaid, that he ſtole many things from *Xenophon*, and ſpoiled them: For intending to inſert in the Eleventh Book of his Hiſtory of *Greece* the Conference of *Pharnabazus* and *Ageſilaus*, ſo well deſcribed by *Xenophon*, he deprived it of its Energy. He would not uſe the Words of *Xenophon*, becauſe he was willing to conceal his Pilfering, and beſides to adorn the Matter in his own way; but he miſcarried in it: His Narration was languiſhing, dull and heavy, whereas that of *Xenophon* was bright and lively. (*c*) Τὰ γοῦν περὶ τὴν Φαρναβάζου πρὸς Ἀγησίλαον σύνοδον ..... εἰς τὴν ἑνδεκάτην τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν μεταθεὶς ὁ Θεόπομπος, ἀργά τε καὶ ἀκίνητα πεποίηκε καὶ ἄπρακτα. λόγου γὰρ δύναμιν, καὶ διὰ τὴν κλοπὴν, ἐξεργασίαν ἐμβάλλειν, καὶ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι σπουδάζων, βραδὺς καὶ μέλλων, καὶ ἀναβαλλομένῳ ἐοικὼς φαίνεται, καὶ τὸ ἔμψυχον καὶ ἐνεργὸν τὸ Ξενοφῶντος διαφθείρων. *Nam illum ſane Pharnabazi cum Ageſilao congreſſum .... in Græcarum hiſtoriarum undecimum tranſtulit Theopompus: verum ita quidem, ut omnia ſine vi, ſine motu, habere prorſus ac jacere videantur. Dum enim is, ut plagium diſſimulet, dicendi facultatem oſtentare geſtit, & elaboratæ dictionis cultum aſſuere, tardus, cunctabundus, ac procraſtinanti ſimilis videtur, adeoque vivam illam ac ſpirantem Xenophontis efficacitatem elidit.* Laſtly, we are told of a Book (*d*) intitled ἰχνευταὶ, *indagatores*, which contain'd many ſuch things concerning *Theopompus*.

I muſt obſerve, by the by, that if *Theopompus* falſified what he ſtole from *Andron*, it affords us an Example of what is ſaid, that Falſhood makes a greater Progreſs than Truth. Many grave (*e*) Writers aſcribe the Prediction to *Pherecydes*.

I muſt not forget, that *Porphyrius* accuſes him alſo of preferring himſelf to *Iſocrates*, and of boaſting that he had the better of him in a Trial of Eloquence upon *Mauſolus*'s Tomb. (*f*) Καίτοι ὑπερφρονεῖ τὸν Ἰσοκράτην καὶ νενικῆσθαι ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ λέγει, καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ Μαυσώλῳ ἀγῶνα, τὸν διδάσκαλον. *Iſocratem interea deſpicit, eoque certamine, quod in Mauſoli honorem inſtitutum eſt, victum abs ſeſe Magiſtrum.* *Photius* ſhould have mention'd this Particular among thoſe of the ſame Nature related by him. I can't tell why he has omitted it. He ſays, *Theopompus* relates, that *Iſocrates*, *Theodectes*, *Naucrates*, and himſelf, were (*g*) at that time four of the greateſt Orators in *Greece*; that *Iſocrates* and *Theodectes*, being Poor, made Orations for Money, and kept School to get a Lively-hood; but that He and *Naucrates*, having wherewithal to live handſomely, ſpent all their leiſure Time in Study. The Tranſlator does not well expreſs the Senſe of theſe Words: (*h*) καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἂν εἴη αὐτῷ παράλογον, ἀντιποιουμένῳ τῶν πρωτείων. He pretends the Meaning of it is, (*i*) *It ought not be thought ſtrange that I ſhould place my ſelf in the firſt Rank.* *Theopompus* was not ſo proud; he only ſays, that he may reckon himſelf among the firſt without being guilty of Raſhneſs. This is a great Piece of Vanity, and it needs not be encreaſed by an unfaithful Tranſlation.

(*A*) *That his Poetical Vein did not ſeem to be weaken'd.* Balzac *commended him mightily for it.*] Here follow ſome Thoughts of *Balzac*, taken from a Letter written by him to Father *Theron*, the fourth of *March* 1643. (*k*) *The Winters of Naples, full of Light, and crown'd with Roſes, are a lively Image of your old Age. That of Maſſiniſſa was not ſo briſk and vigorous; and the Child he got at Fourſcore Years of Age was not a Production comparable to the Poem you have made at Seventy-five. Which ſhews, that the Fire that comes down from Heaven, by way of Inſpiration, is not extinguiſh'd by the Abatement of Natural Heat, and if Art has found out the Invention of inextinguiſhable Lamps, the Maſter of Art may no doubt preſerve the igneous Part of our Minds, and the Quickneſs of their Motion .... I muſt contradict a wrong Propoſition, which I advanced formerly as a certain Truth,* That there is no fine old Age. *I deſire you would excuſe this raſh Saying. I did not know then your Muſe, which ſhews the Falſity of my Propoſition, and runs down a Proverb I expected to put in Vogue. The old Age of your Muſe is not the Decay, but the Confirmation of her Beauty .... Had I the Courage of the Authors of your Country, I would ſay a great deal more upon it: I would ſay, at leaſt, of that admirable old Woman, that, though ſhe is as old as* Hecuba, *ſhe has as many Lovers as* Helena *had in the Flower of her Youth. I could name a great many, who burn in* Paris, *and ſigh on this ſide of the* Loire. In order to give ſome Weight to thoſe Encomiums, I muſt obſerve, that *Balzac* praiſed Father *Theron* very much in the Letters which that Jeſuit did not read. He writ the following Paſſage to his Friend *Chapelain*. " (*l*) Since you deſire to know the Chara-
" cter of Father *Theron*, whom I thought you knew
" better than I do, I muſt tell you that he is a Poet
" above Seventy-five Years old. Soon after the
" King's Birth he made two Poems in ſhort Verſes,
" which I take to be Glyconick; and the late King,
" to whom they were praiſed, ordered *Motin* to
" tranſlate them. They are intitled, *les Couronnes &*
" *les Dauphins*, and have been printed in *Latin* and
" *French*. They are two valuable Pieces, and I am
" ſure you'll be pleas'd with them I have ſeen ſome o-
" ther things of his, wherein I have obſerved an ex-
" cellent Genius; but I know he is lazy, and
" one that loves his Trade the leaſt of any Man in the
" World." M. *Baillet* does not ſpeak of that Poet.

(*B*) Balzac *was miſtaken as to the Age he aſcribed to him.*] We have juſt now ſeen, that he ſaid on the 15th of *February* 1641, that Father *Theron* was then above Seventy-five Years old. At this rate that Jeſuit muſt have been born in 1566. But 'tis not true; for *Alegambe* and *Sotuel* ſay he was but Fifteen Years of Age when he was admitted among the Jeſuits in the Year 1587. Such Miſtakes are commonly diſobliging; for few People deſire to be accounted older than they are. I don't except thoſe who will not marry. I know that ſome old Men, who, as it was ſaid of the firſt Duke *d'Eperon*, have paſs'd the Age of dying, are as willing to make themſelves five or ſix Years older than they are, as they were formerly deſirous to make themſelves younger by ſo many Years. Vanity finds its account in it, it being a more admirable thing that a Man of Ninety or a Hundred Years ſhould ſtill have ſome Vigour, than if he enjoyed his Health pretty well at Eighty or Eighty-five Years of Age. Other old Men are well pleaſed with a right Computation; they are afraid that a wrong reckoning, which brings 'em nearer the end of their Race, will make 'em leſs reſpected. However it be, *Balzac*'s Miſtake was of another Nature: It was not diſobliging, but rather advantageous to Father *Theron*: The older he was thought to be, the more he was admired for the Livelyneſs of his Poems.

---

* *Taken from Sotuel in Biblioth. ſcriptor. Societatis Jeſu pag. 794.*

† *Id. ib.*

(*a*) *Porphyrius lib.* 1. τῆς φιλολόγου ἀκροάσεως de erudito auditu *apud Euſebium præpar. Evangel. lib.* 10. *c.* 3. *pag. m.* 464.

(*b*) *Who collected* Pythagoras's *predictions in a Book intitled* Tripos. Id. ib.

(*c*) *Id. ib. pag.* 465.

(*d*) *Id. ib. pag.* 467.

(*e*) *Cicero lib.* 1. & 2. *de divinat. Plinius lib.* 2. *c.* 79. *Apollonius hiſtor. memor. l.* 5. Diogen. *Laert. lib.* 1. *n.* 116.

(*f*) *Porphyrius ubi ſupra pag.* 464.

(*g*) Τούτους ἅμα αὐτῷ τὰ πρωτεῖα τῆς ἐν λόγοις παιδείας ἔχειν ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Hos ſecum in dicendi facultate principatum in Græcia tenuiſſe. *Photius bibl. n.* 176. *pag.* 392.

(*h*) *Id. ib.*

(*i*) Neque vero temere ſe aut præter rationem primas ſibi vindicare.

(*k*) *Balzac, lettres choiſies* 2. *Part. B.* ... *Letter* ... *pag. m.* 313.

(*l*) *Idem, lettres a Chapelain B.* 6. *Letter* 5. *p. m.* 283, 284. *It is dated the* 15th *of February* 1641.

THESMOPHORIA, were the Feſtivals celebrated in Honour of *Ceres*, conſider'd as (*A*) a Law-giver; for there were other Feſtivals conſecrated to her, as Inventreſs of the Products of the Earth. The Men were utterly excluded from the *Theſmophoria*, and only Women of the better rank were admitted *. They ſolemniz'd a Proceſſion at *Eleuſis*, in which they cauſed the † ſacred Volumes to be publickly carried by Virgins of unſpotted Reputation. This Feaſt laſted three or four days, tho' 'tis affirm'd by others that it continu'd nine, during which, the Women were not permitted to lie with their Husbands. To render this Abſtinence more ſupportable, we are told they uſually lay upon certain (*B*) Anti-venereal Leaves: It is indeed ſtrange, generally ſpeaking, they ſhould want ſuch a Remedy;

(*A*) *Conſider'd as a Law-giver.*] It was the common opinion of the Antients, that Mankind were oblig'd to this Goddeſs for the two great Benefactions, of teaching them Agriculture, and giving them Laws.

Prima (a) Ceres unco glebam dimovit aratro;
Prima dedit fruges, alimentaque mitia terris:
Prima dedit leges. Cereris ſumus omnia munus.

Conſult the Commentators on the words of *Virgil*; (*b*) *Mactant lectas de more bidentes Legiferæ Cereri.* It is therefore very probable (*c*) that two ſorts of Feaſts were dedicated to her, and that the *Theſmophoria* were chiefly inſtituted with regard to her Character of Law-giver. The word it ſelf leads us to this Opinion; for according to *Heſychius*, θεσμὸς ſignifies a Divine Law, νόμ☉ θεῖ☉. *Sacra ipſius* Theſmophoria, *id eſt*, *legum latio vocatur*, are the words of *Servius* on the mention'd paſſage of *Virgil*; but this did not hinder the practice of ſome Ceremonies in alluſion to her Character of Inventreſs of Husbandry. (*d*) *Pauſanias* and (*e*) one of *Gruterus*'s Inſcriptions teſtify, that one of her Epithets was θεσμοφόρ☉. The following Citation may ſerve as a proof of what is advanced in the Article; that the ſacred Volumes were carried by Virgins of untainted Reputation. (*f*) Παρθένοι γυναῖκες, καὶ τὸν βίον σεμναί, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τελετῆς, τὰς νομίμους βίβλους καὶ ἱερὰς ἐπὶ τῶν κορυφῶν αὐτῶν ἀνατιθεῖσαι καὶ ὡσανεὶ λιτανεύουσαι ἀπήρχοντο εἰς Ἐλευσῖνα. *Virgines mulieres, vitaque honeſtæ; quæ per ſolemnitatis diem legales libros & ſacros vertice geſtantes, tanquam ſupplicantes Eleuſinem contendebant.*

(*B*) *To render this Abſtinence more ſupportable*—*they lay upon certain Anti-venereal Leaves.*] *Ovid* doth not mention this, but only their ſeparation from their Husbands.

Feſta (g) piæ Cereris celebrabant annua matres
Illa, quibus nivea velata corpora veſte
Primitias frugum dant ſpicea ſerta ſuarum:
Perque novem noctes Venerem tactuſque viriles
In vetitis numerant.

I am not at all ſurprized at his Omiſſion of this circumſtance, becauſe it was impertinent to his Deſign. Tho' I cou'd here alledge ſeveral Authors, I ſhall only make uſe of *Pliny* and the Scholiaſt on *Theocritus*. (*h*) *Græci lygon vocant, alii agnon, quoniam matronæ Theſmophoriis Athenienſium caſtitatem cuſtodientes, his foliis cubitus ſibi ſternunt*, are the Words of *Pliny*, ſpeaking of the *vitex*, which our Botaniſts call *agnus caſtus*. Whence by the Way, 'tis obſervable, that they have changed an Epithete into a proper Name. The *Greeks* pretended that thoſe who eat or drank this Plant, or laid it under them in their Beds, would thereby be preſerved from Impurity; and therefore gave it the Sirname of ἄγν☉, from the word ἁγνὸς, which ſignifies *Chaſte*: and it became the proper word to expreſs *vitex*, tho' not alone, but with the Latin word of the ſame import. The Scholiaſt on *Theocritus* his words are, (*i*) τὴν κονύζαν, κνύζαν εἶπεν. ἔστι φυτὸν ψυκτικώτατον. ἔνθεν καὶ ἐν τοῖς θεσμοφορίοις ὑποστρωννύουσι τὸ φυτὸν τὴν θερμότητα τὴν κατὰ τὰ Ἀφροδίσια ἐκκόπτοντες. *Conyzam dixit Cnyzam. Planta refrigerandi ſumma vi pollens, quam propterea in Theſmophoriis lecto ſubſternunt, calorem ad res venereas extirpantes.* 'Tis here to be obſerv'd that he ſpeaks of *Conyza* or *Cunilago*, a Plant of a different Species from that mention'd by *Pliny*; as alſo on what occaſion this Remark was made, which was to explain a place in *Theocritus*, where a Shepherd is brought in telling what he would do, if his dear Friend made a proſperous Voyage to *Mitylene*. "I will, ſays he, place a Crown "of Flowers on my Head, I'll drink of the beſt "Wine, and ſtrew Herbs on my Bed up to my El-"bows.

Χ' ἁ στιβὰς ἐσσεῖται πεπυκασμένα ἔς τ' ἐπὶ πᾶχυν
Κνύζᾳ τ' ἀσφοδέλῳ τε πολυγνάμπτῳ τε σελίνῳ (*k*).
Et torus denſatus erit ad cubitum uſque
Cnyza, aſphodelo & flexibili apio.

This recited by the Scholiaſt, was one of the Herbs ſtrewed on the Womens Beds during the Theſmophorian Rites, to preſerve their Chaſtity. It will be granted me that thoſe who by ſplendid feaſting, and ſuch other emphatical Signs expreſs their great joy that their Vows are accompliſh'd, have no recourſe to thoſe Remedies which ſtifle all Amorous Thoughts. 'Tis not then likely that the *Cunilago* had any ſuch effect; and the Scholiaſt's Aſſertion contradicts the very Text on which he comments: and perhaps we ſhould not be at all in the wrong to affirm, that the ſtrewing of Leaves on the Womens Beds during this Feſtival, was only a bare dependency on it. 'Tis no uncommon thing, in great Solemnities, to ſtrew the Streets with Flowers and Leaves, and to affix Feſtoons on the Gates; and frequently the Chambers participate of theſe Ornaments: Nor is it unlikely that the *Greeks* might extend this Cuſtom to the Beds of thoſe who celebrated the Feſtival of *Ceres*; and ſome inquiſitive Perſons, fond of diſcovering Myſteries, at laſt imagin'd that the Experience of ſage Antiquity had pronounced this a Remedy againſt Incontinency. Nor can I tell whether the Wits and Satyriſts were not the Authors of this Suppoſition, which might in a long tract of time come to be ſeriouſly aſſerted as a reality. 'Tis certain, a more diſobliging Reaſon for this Cuſtom could not be produced; nor can I imagine the *Grecian* Women ſo ſervile as tamely to ſubmit to a Remedy which ſo publickly proclaimed their Laſciviouſneſs. Their conſent was not ſtay'd for, will ſome ſay: But did *Greece* ever ſo enſlave the Sex, as to ſubject them to ſhameful Cuſtoms? 'Tis not very eaſie to find a ſlip of Land in the whole Map of the World, where things are eſtabliſh'd on this miſerable foot; and if we would find ſuch a place, we ought not to look for it in *Attica*, *Peloponneſus*, or the Iſles of the *Ægean* Sea. In order to come the neareſt to truth, it ought to be laid down that the Honour of the Women was not in the leaſt concern'd in theſe Strewings of *Agnus Caſtus*. But who would believe it? muſt not one have a very mean Opinion of their Virtue, who can imagine that Married Women could not lie five or ſix Nights, (or nine (*l*) if you pleaſe) in a ſeparate Bed without being expoſed to thoſe Temptations, and impure advances, which render'd them unworthy of participating in a Chaſte Feſtival? But I expect in anſwer, that all Countries are not alike, and that in Climates leſs hot than *Greece*, Wine or Brandy, tho' plentifully drank, would not produce the ſame venereal Irritations that the meaneſt Food would elſewhere occaſion; and that conſequently we ought not to judge of the Ceremonies of the Feaſts of *Ceres* by the Deſires of the Northern Nations. But admit we do not ſtir out of *Greece*, I perſiſt in my Opinion, that theſe Motives for the uſe of *Agnus Caſtus* are not very probable: For if the Women, of their own accord, had recourſe to this Remedy, they acknowledged a very great fault, and confeſſed a ſcandalous Infirmity, which Modeſty and Prudence would by no means permit them to reveal. Prudence, I ſay, becauſe ſuch a Confeſſion might fatally diſturb and alarm their Husbands. The commerce of one of which might occaſionally oblige him to ſeveral Weeks abſence; as a Law-ſuit might detain another as long: Some went to the Wars, others engaged in Foreign Voyages; thoſe at home were not always in good health, and thoſe who were well could not tell how ſoon they might be ſick. What ground was there to rely on their Wives Chaſtity, at the *Theſmophorian* Feaſt, if they had profeſſed their Incontinence? This was a very Auguſt Feſtival, a great act of Religion; the Women participated in the principal Functions of this Holy Ceremony, in the performance of which, the Ritual obliged them to an untainted Chaſtity: they had therefore the moſt

* [illegible]

† [illegible] Remark B at the End.

(*a*) *Ovid. Metam.* lib. 5. v. 341.

(*b*) *Virgil. Æneid.* lib. 4. v. 58.

(*c*) See Caſaubonus de Satirica Græcor. pag. 168.

(*d*) *Pauſan.* lib. 1. pag. 212.

(*e*) *Gruteri* Inſcript. p. 309.

(*f*) Scholiaſt. in Theocrit.

(*g*) *Ovid. Metam.* lib. 10. v. 431.

(*h*) *Plinius* lib. 24. c. 9. pag. m. 327. Father Harduin ſays on this paſſage, Hæc totidem verbis Dioſcor. lib. 1. cap. 135. & Galenus lib. 6. de fac. ſimp. med. pag. 145. Ælianus item lib. 9. Hiſt. animal. cap. 26.

(*i*) Scholiaſt. Theocriti in Idyll. 7. He alſo ſaith the ſame on the 4th. Idyll. Κνύζα φυτὸν χαμαίζηλον ᾧ αἱ Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι διὰ τὴν ἁγνείαν ἐστιβάζοντο. Cnyza, planta graminis forma, qua Cereris ſacra celebrantes fœminæ lectos ad ſervandam caſtitatem inſternunt.

(*k*) *Theocrit. Idyll.* 7. pag. m. 53, 54.

(*l*) *Ovid in the former citation, Letter g, makes this Feſtival laſt nine days.*

remedy, and yet more ſurprizing, they ſhould acknowledge the neceſſity of it. The principal Object of their Adoration in this Feſtival, was that part (C) which diſtinguiſhes them from Men. You may very well imagine the Antient Fathers did

moſt engaging Motives to Continence. The Divine Worſhip, Conſcience, the publick Proſperity, the honour of *Ceres*, and the Sanctity of her Myſteries abſolutely requir'd it: and nevertheleſs we are told, they owned themſelves unable to contain during the ſhort duration of this Feſtival. What was then to be expected from their Virtue, when on other occaſions 'twas put to longer tryals? 'Tis then undeniable, that by having recourſe to *Agnus Caſtus* on this occaſion, they had betray'd a great Imprudence, becauſe this muſt neceſſarily fill their poor Husbands with uneaſie Fears and Jealouſies. But what will you ſay, if their Husbands Eſtabliſhed this Cuſtom? Says an Objector? I anſwer, that if by Advice or Order they were the Authors of it, the Women would not have ſubmitted to it as a neceſſary, or at leaſt uſeful Remedy; for in accepting of it they had confeſſed a natural Infirmity, which would have ſcandalouſly tainted their Honours, and rendred them ſuſpected of Infidelity in the Abſence or Sickneſs of their Spouſes. All the Husbands who had been ſo raſh as to propoſe or approve of this Counſel, would have expoſed the Reputation of their Wives. The Wits would not have failed to cry out, Alas poor Wretches! a dire experience has obliged them to hunt after Expedients; they never have a Nights quiet except that which Religion provides for them: But when the *Theſmophorian* Rites are ſolemniz'd, the remembrance of what is paſt, makes them rely on the Virtue of *Agnus Caſtus*. Would what they made uſe of to inſure their Wives Virtue during this Feſtival, appeaſe the Alarms of him who was gone a long Voyage? Could this ſatisfie the uneaſie Mind of the Sick man? 'Tis undeniable that whoever ſhould have introduced this Cuſtom, deſerv'd to paſs for a Diſturber of the publick repoſe.

A hundred other Reaſons convince me that the uſe of *Agnus Caſtus* in the Womens Beds in the *Theſmophorian* Rites, was not founded on the alledged Motive. The ſame Reaſon which preſcribed this Remedy, during the Feſtival, would oblige the uſe of it in caſe of the abſence or indiſpoſition of the Husband; and young Virgins as well as young Widows would be expoſed to a perpetual Neceſſity of this preſervative; and ſince the latter was not done, it ſtrongly concludes againſt the former. If there had been as much occaſion for *Agnus Caſtus*, as I have remarked, we ſhould find in ſome Author or other, that no Plant was more common than this in all *Greece*; every perſon would have had a dozen of them in his Garden; whole Foreſts had been fill'd with it, and expert Planters purpoſely employ'd to cultivate it, becauſe the Virtue of its Leaves laid them under a perpetual neceſſity of keeping it alive. It would have been the firſt care of all thoſe, who in their declining Years married young Women, to plant ſeveral of them, that they might continually have a Remedy at hand, in order handſomely to aſſwage thoſe Deſires they could not ſatisfie. The Leaves of this Shrub would have been celebrated as the tutelar God of married Men, and a *Deus averruncus*, or *alexicacus*, the protecting Deity againſt Cuckoldom. A *Juvenal* (a) would have felicitated *Greece* about it; he had probably ſaid of theſe Leaves what another doth of Frogs (b). But we find no Tract of any thing like it in antient Monuments.

Perhaps it may be objected, that the *Theſmophorian* Rites exacted an extraordinary Purity, an Imagination exempt from what the Caſuiſts call *unruly Thoughts*, an uninterrupted Application to the excellency and ſublimities of Chaſtity; which was utterly unneceſſary at other times. All the Anſwer I ſhall make to this is, to ask what Proofs there are of this extraordinary Property of the *Theſmophoria*: I am ſure this Character of them is only imaginary (c). I would alſo add, that neither *Agnus caſtus, nor cunilago*, nor Willow-leaves, &c. (d) are capable of inſpiring ſuch a Purity. The *Athenians* were too ſenſible a People, to believe that a few Leaves between the Sheets were ſufficient to mortifie Incontinence. I will readily own that there are ſome Herbs which at length may refrigerate thoſe who eat them; but as to the external Application of them, I cannot tell whether it may not fitly be ſaid of Luſt as of Death, *Contra vim mortis non eſt medicamen in hortis.* I don't forget the Anſwer of *Theano*, *Pythagoras's* Daughter, who, when asked, *How many days reſpite, after having to do with a Man, were requiſite to qualifie a Woman to aſſiſt at the* Theſmophoria? reply'd, She was qualify'd the minute ſhe came from her Husband's embraces, but never if from thoſe of another Man. (e) *Apud Theodoretum lib. 12. Græcarum affectionum, Pythagorica Theano, rogata quoto ſummum die mulieri liceret a complexu viri Theſmophoriis intereſſe:* Α'πὸ μὲν τῦ ἰδίε παραχρῆμα, ἔφη, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίε οὐδέποτε. *Et quæ a proprio viro ſurrexerit, ſtatim licere reſpondit; quæ ab alieno nunquam.* This moral Deciſion of *Theano* doth not in the leaſt ſavour of *Rigour*. Such a Lady as ſhe would not if now alive, condemn a frequent communion under pretence of too ſhort an Interval after the Conjugal Duty. What may further be inferred from her Anſwer is, that in order to a due performance of the Theſmophorian Functions, a preparation of ſome days Continence was neceſſary. But as this prolonged the time of Abſtinence, it may be objected that I ought not to be ſurpriz'd, that they ſhould have had recourſe to *Agnus Caſtus*. But this is indeed too weak an Objection to alter my Opinion; I refer the Reader to my laſt Remark but one.

It would be unjuſt to condemn my Criticiſms on this head, for Equity will not permit us to ſacrifice the Reputation of an infinite number of Grecian Women, to Evidences brought from *Pliny* and others, if they have not deſerved ſuch an Affront.

(C) *That part which diſtinguiſhes them from Men.*] *Faſoldus*, who wrote a ſmall Tract of the Grecian Feſtivals, cites *Theodoret* concerning this Circumſtance. (f) *In hoc quoque feſto pudenda muliebria mulieres illæ initiatæ honore divino afficiebant.* Theodoretus lib. 3. Græcan. Affection. He doth not cite the words of *Theodoret*, tho' he found them in *Caſtellanus* in the manner following (g) Καὶ τὸν κτένα τὸν γυναικεῖον (οὕτως δὲ τὸ γυναικεῖον ὀνομάζουσι μόριον) ἐν τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις, παρὰ τῶν τετελεσμένων γυναικῶν θείας τιμῆς ἀξιούμενον. *Nec minus muliebrem pectinem (ſic enim pudenda mulieris vocant) in Cereris feſto, mulieres initiatæ divino honore dignum habent.* *Faſoldus* alſo informs us, that at *Syracuſa* they carried a repreſentation of this part, formed with a ſort of Meal and Honey, in a proceſſion on the laſt Day of the Feaſt, in Honour of *Ceres* and *Proſerpina*. This he grounds on the Authority of *Athenæus*, lib. 14. *Athenæus*, ſaith he, (h) *refert muliebria pudenda*, μυλλοὶ *appellata, quæ ex ſeſamo & melle facta erant, ultimo die hujus feſti apud Syracuſanos, qui hæc ſacra etiam obſervarunt, Cereri & Proſerpinæ circumlata fuiſſe.* Perhaps he hath not rendred the Senſe of *Athenæus* exactly, and inſtead of the *Laſt Day of the Feſtival*, he ought to have tranſlated it *at the great Theſmophoria.* The Greek runs thus: (i) Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Συρακούσιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ θεσμῶν, ἐν Συρακούσαις φησὶ τοῖς παντελείοις τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἐκ σησάμου ϗ μέλιτος κατασκευάζεσθαι ἐφήβαια γυναικεῖα, ἃ καλεῖσθαι κατὰ πᾶσαν Σικελίαν μυλλοὺς, ϗ περιφέρεσθαι ταῖς θεαῖς. *Dalechampius* renders it thus: *Heraclides Syracuſius libro de vetuſtis & ſancitis moribus, ſcribit, apud Syracuſios in perfectis Theſmophoriis (k), ex ſeſamo & melle fingi pudenda muliebria, quæ per ludos & ſpectacula (l) circumferebantur, & in tota Sicilia vocabantur Mylli.* *Montagne* abounds with paſſages on a like Subject. I have not ſeen this in the place where he obſerves, (m) *that in the greateſt part of the World this part of our Bodies was deify'd*; that in certain places, *the chief Magiſtrates were reverenc'd and diſtinguiſh'd by this part; and in ſeveral Ceremonies inſtituted in Honour of divers Deities, the repreſentation of it was carried about in Pomp. The Egyptian Dames in their Bacchanalian Feaſts, wore a well carved Wooden Image of it about their Necks, proportioned in ſize and weight to their ſtrength; beſides the Statue of their God was furniſh'd with one of a ſize far ſurpaſſing the other parts of his Body* (n). *The married Women, not far from hence, adjuſt the upper part of their Head-dreſs to that ſhape; thereby boaſting of the Pleaſure receiv'd from it; and when they become Widows they turn'd it behind, and hide it under their Head-dreſſes.* It is probable that the reaſon why the part proper to the did not ſpare the Heathens on account of ſuch Ceremonies as theſe. Thoſe who Celebrated this Feſtival were alſo obliged to (*D*) watch the whole Night.

(a) O ſanctas gentes quibus hæc naſcuntur in hortis numina. Juv. Sat. 15. v. 10.

(b) *See the Paſſage of Pliny cited in the Article* Democritus.

(c) *See the following Remark.*

(d) Salicem habere vim perimendi ſeminis, & libidinis extinguendæ, author eſt Theophraſtus. Ælianus Α'φροδισίας κώλυμα nuncupat. Alii ἄγνον caſtam appellant. Homerus Odyſſ. κ. ὠλεσίκαρπον, id eſt ut exponit Plinius lib. 16. cap. 26 frugiperda. Ad quem locum Euſtathius: Διότι οἱ πίνοντες τῦ καρπ' αὐτῆς ἄνδρες ἐκλύουσι τὸν καρπὸν, ἢ τῦι ἄγονοι γίνονται. *Caſtellanus* de feſtis Græcorum pag. 171.

On this occaſion *Brantome's* miſtake is obſervable, who Erroneouſly Aſſerts, that according to *Pliny* the (*E*) Veſtal Virgins made uſe of *Beds of Leaves* to preſerve their Chaſtity.

THIBAUT,

---

the other Sex had ſuch Honours paid to it in the *Theſmophoria*, was in Remembrance of the Good Service it had done *Ceres*. This Goddeſs after a vain ſearch of *Proſerpina*, arrived very Diſconſolate at *Eleuſis*: Where *Baubo* an old Country Woman uſed all endeavours to perſuade her to Refreſh her ſelf, and drive away Melancholy; but all to no purpoſe. *Ceres* utterly refuſed to eat and drink any thing, and would not admit of any Conſolation. *Baubo* changed the Scene and indeavoured to Divert the Goddeſs with a new invented Spectacle. She retired into another Chamber, where ſhe tricked up a certain thing which had been long neglected as a piece of waſte Ground; after which ſhe return'd to the Goddeſs, to whom ſhe ſhewed her nudity, putting her Body in the moſt extravagant Poſtures ſhe poſſibly could (*a*). *Ceres* fixing her Eyes on this Object could not help Laughing, and ſoon after accepted of the proffered Refreſhments. I cannot deſcribe this in our Language ſo naturally as an Ancient Father of the Church, whoſe words are theſe. (*b*) *Rogat illa (Baubo) atque hortatur contra, ſicut mos eſt in hujuſmodi caſibus, ne ſollicitum ſuæ humanitatis aſpernetur: obſtinatiſſime durat Ceres, & rigoris indomiti pertinaciam retinet. Quod cum ſæpius fieret, neque ullis quiret obſequiis ineluctabile propoſitum fatigari, vertit Baubo artes, & quam ſeriis non quibat allicere, ludibriorum ſtatuit exhilarare miraculis: partem illam corporis, per quam ſecus femineum & ſubolem prodere, & nomen ſolet acquirere generi, tum longiore ab incuria liberat: facit ſumere habitum puriorem, & in ſpeciem levigari nondum duri atque ſtriculi puſionis: redit ad Deam triſtem, & inter illa communia, quibus moris eſt frangere ac temperare mœrores, retegit ſe ipſam, atque omnia illa pudoris loca revelatis monſtrat inguinibus: atque pubi affigit oculos diva, & inauditi ſpecie ſolaminis paſcitur. Tum diffuſior facta per riſum, aſpernatam ſumit atque ebibit potionem: & quod diu nequivit verecundia Baubonis exprimere, propudioſi facinoris extorſit obſcœnitas.* Hence with very good Reaſon he vigorouſly Attacks the Pagans on the Ridiculous Abſurdity of their Feſtivals; what, could this Object afford ſo extremely diverting to *Ceres*, who could at all times ſee the ſame in her ſelf? (*c*) *Ut animum commodare alimoniis poſſint, victuique ſumendo, non ratio, non tempus, non ſermo aliquis adhibetur gravis, aut affabilitas ſeria, ſed propudioſa corporum monſtratur obſcœnitas, objectanturque partes illæ, quas pudor communis abſcondere atque naturalis verecundiæ lex jubet: quas inter aures caſtas ſine venia nefas eſt, ac ſine honoribus appellare præfatis. Quidnam, quæſo, in ſpectu tali, quid in pudendis fuit verendiſque Baubonis, quod feminei ſexus Deam, & conſimili formatam membro, in admirationem converteret atque riſum? quod objectum lumini conſpectuique divino, & oblivionem miſeriarum daret, & habitum in lætiorem repentina hilaritate traduceret?* Is it not very probable that in Commemoration of this Adventure, divine Honours were paid to that Object which had ſo opportunely diverted the Goddeſs *Ceres*? Hence ariſes an Objection againſt the Aſſertion laid down in the precedent Article: For, will ſome ſay, the Grecian Women ought to be more than ordinarily Fortified, when they not only lay alone, but were employed in the Contemplation of a Subject ſufficiently apt to taint their Imagination, and excite immodeſt Thoughts. I confeſs this may ſomewhat weaken my Arguments; but all things well weighed, they remain ſtill ſtrong enough to keep me in the ſame Opinion.

(*D*) *To watch the whole Night.*] This might furniſh my Adverſaries with another Objection. The Huſbands, will they ſay, conſidering, 1. That their Wives were ſeparated from them, whilſt they were employed in Celebrating the Memory of a tickling Adventure, and in worſhiping a tempting Object, of which (*d*) they were alſo obliged to make Images in Paſte: 2. That they watched all Night, might well have ſome diſagreeable Suſpicions; for Watchings have always afforded lucky Opportunities. 'Tis then not unlikely, that they had recourſe to effectual Preſervatives, which were the Leaves of *agnus caſtus*. Theſe difficulties are very inconſiderable: For beſides that all Men were abſolutely Excluded from the *Theſmophoria*, which might afford a plenary Satisfaction to the Jealous Huſbands, is it poſſible to believe the Grecians Fooliſh enough to rely on the feeble Aſſiſtance of Leaves, when they diſtruſted their Wives Virtue, notwithſtanding the engaging Obligations laid on them by the neceſſary Circumſtances of the Feſtival? Such were the utter Excluſion of Men, the Chaſtity enjoyned, the Watchings in the Temple, &c. If it be asked on what Authority I found the Text of this Remark, I alledge the Words of *Arnobius*: (*e*) *Velitis enim conſideremus myſteria & illa divina, quæ Theſmophoria nominantur a Græcis: quibus genus ab Attica ſimilis illa protolis conferens ſunt & (f) pannychiſmi graves.* I don't deny but ſeveral Diſorders were occaſioned by theſe Watchings. *Plautus's Aulularia* runs upon the Marriage of a young Woman got with Child on a like occaſion (*g*). The Romans never attempted the Abolition of ſeveral Nocturnal Feaſts, till they diſcovered their Irregularities. Several Grecian Cities alſo Aboliſhed the ſame Ceremonies: And the following words inform us how *Ariſtophanes* rail'd at thoſe Devotional Watchings: (*h*) *Diligentiſſime ſanciendum eſt, ut mulierum famam multorum oculis lux clara cuſtodiat, initienturque eo ritu Cereri, quo Romæ initiantur. Quo in genere ſeveritatem majorum ſenatus vetus auctoritas de Bacchanalibus; & conſulum exercitu adhibito quæſtio animadverſioque declarant. Atque omnia nocturna, ne nos duriores forte videamur, in media Græcia Diagondas Thebanus lege perpetua ſuſtulit. Novos vero Deos, & in his colendis nocturnas pervigilationes ſic Ariſtophanes facetiſſimus poeta veteris comœdiæ vexat, ut apud eum Sabeius, & quidam alii dii de peregrinis judicati è civitate ejiciantur.* A certain Journaliſt informs us alſo in his Extract of a Diſſertation of Mr. *Rainſſant*, (*i*) *That the ſecular Games were not only Celebrated for three Days, but alſo three Nights together; for they Aſſembled in the Temples*, where they Watched, Prayed, and performed their Sacrifices: This was what they called *Pervigilium*; and to prevent all Immodeſties in theſe publick Aſſemblies, the Youth of both Sexes aſſiſted at them under the Conduct of their Parents or elder Relations, who could anſwer for their Deportment, as *Auguſtus* had decreed. *The Precaution was neceſſary and the Law very wiſe; the tender Paſſion is too diligent in queſt of favourable Opportunities, to forget its Intereſts in theſe Nocturnal Aſſemblies. But it was ſomewhat late when the Emperour* Auguſtus *apply'd this Remedy.* Præſtat ſerò quàm nunquam. Better late than never. *'Tis not to be doubted but before this the three Nights of the ſecular Games were a very happy time for the Amorous Youth, and that they made the beſt uſe of it, ſince they knew 'twas impoſſible to Enjoy it twice.* The Devotional Watchings of the Primitive Church were not intirely free from Abuſes of this kind; for which reaſon St. *Jerome* adviſes the Young Virgins (*k*) when they aſſiſted at theſe Rites, not to ſtir ſo much as a finger's breadth from their Mothers. This Father had much better have acquieſced in the juſt complaints of *Vigilantius*, who Condemned theſe Nocturnal Meetings (*l*) on account of the Impurities there committed. The truth of which at laſt the Church was obliged to own and ſuppreſs them, as Cardinal *Bellarmin* acknowledges. (*m*) *Quoniam occaſione nocturnarum vigiliarum abuſus quidem irrepere cœperant, vel potius flagitia non raro committi, placuit Eccleſiæ nocturnos conventus, & vigilias proprie dictas intermittere, ac ſolum in iiſdem diebus celebrare jejunia.*

Doubtleſs the Mandate of the Arch-Biſhop of *Paris* in the Year 1697. againſt the Cuſtom of viſiting *Mons St. Valerien* in the Holy Week, was Founded on like Reaſons.

(*E*) Brantome's *miſtake —— according to* Pliny *the Veſtal Virgins made uſe of Beds of Leaves.*] This Author's words at large are: " (*n*) I have read a " ſmall fooliſh *Italian* Pamphlet, which pretends to " give Receipts againſt Concupiſcence, of which ſort " it

Aaaaa 2

(*a*) Sic effata, ſinu veſtem contexit ab imo, Obſcœnaque oculis formatas inguinibus res: Quas cava ſuccutiens Baubo manu, nam puerilis Ollis vultus erat, plauſit, contrectat amice. Orpheus apud Arnobium lib. 5. p. 175. See Clemens Alexandrin. in Protrept. pag. 13.

(*b*) Arnob. ibid. pag. 174. 175.

(*c*) Id. ib. pag. 176.

) *This is* *ſidered* *n a* *ſſage of* *theneæ-* *; but the* *ng is not* *rtain,* *r we* *n't find* *whom* *eſe Ima-* *s were* *ade.*

(*e*) Arnobius ubi ſupra pag. 175.

(*f*) *This word ſignifies to Watch the whole Night, as appears by the Gloſſaries*, pervigilium, παννυχισμὸς ἡ διὰ νυκτὸς ἀγρυπνία.

(*g*) Is adoleſcentis illius eſt avunculus Qui illam ſtupravit noctu, Cereris vigiliis. *Plaut. in prologo Aululariæ.*

(*h*) Cicero de legibus l. 2. fol. 335. *A.*

(*i*) Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres, March 1685. art. 2. pag. 259. 260.

(*k*) Vigiliarum dies & ſolemnes pernoctationes ſic virguncula noſtra celebret, ut ne tranſverſum quidem unguem à matre diſcedat. *Hieronymus ad Lætam de inſtitut. filiæ.*

(*l*) Vide Hieronym. adverſus Vigilantium c. 4. *Conſult Mr.* Van Dale, de oraculis pag. 232. *of the 1ſt Edition, and* p. 60 *of the 2d. See alſo one of the Remarks in the Article* Vigilantius. (*m*) Bellarminus, de Eccleſia triumph. l. 3. c. ult. (*n*) Brantome Dames galantes tom. 2. p. m. 163. 164.

THIBAUT, Earl of *Champagne*, the Vth of that Name, rendred himſelf Famous by his Paſſion (*A*) for Queen *Blanche*, St. *Lewis*'s Mother: In which if he was unhappy, as moſt Hiſtorians believe; yet that did not protect this great (*B*) Queen

" it [illegible] ſo Ridiculous that I will " not adviſe the Women to the uſe of them, leſt " they ſhould bring themſelves too low; and this " is the reaſon why I would not Tranſcribe them " here. *Pliny* alledges a Remedy which the Veſtals " and Athenian Ladies uſed during the Feaſts of " *Ceres* called *Theſmophoria*, to refrigerate and extin- " guiſh all the ardent Deſires of Love, that they " might Celebrate this Feſtival with the utmoſt " Chaſtity; in order to which they made uſe of " Beds of Leaves of *agnus caſtus*. 'Tis natural to " imagine that they thus Mortified themſelves du- " ring the Rites; but at the Expiration of them " they ſcattered their Beds in the Air. I have ſeen " one of theſe Trees at the Houſe of a very fine and " honourable Lady in *Guienne*, which was fre- " quently ſhewed to Strangers for its Rarity, and " every Body was told its Virtue; but I could ne- " ver obſerve or hear that any of the Sex had ſtuffed " the leaſt corner of their Bed with its Leaves, or " plucked ſo much as one Branch, nor even the Lady " her ſelf, who owned it, and conſequently could " diſpoſe of it at Pleaſure. See the Margin (†).

(*A*) *By his Paſſion for Queen* Blanche.] *Claudius Fauchet* mentions our Earl of *Champagne* and his Amours, when he treats of the ancient *French* Poets. *Blanche*, ſays he, (*a*) " who was a Young, Beauti- " ful, and beſides a *Spaniſh* Lady, managed *Thibaut* " ſo artfully, that he abandoned the other Barons: " And what was yet more, he diſcovered the deſign " to ſeize the King in his return from *Orleans* to *Paris*. " But *Thibaut*'s Amours diſpleaſing ſeveral Lords, " (ſays a certain good Manuſcript Chronicle which I " have,) He happening one Day to enter the Hall " where Queen *Blanche* was, *Robert* Earl of *Artois*, " the King's Brother threw a ſoft Cheeſe in his " Face. The Earl of *Champagne* being aſhamed of " it, took occaſion to retire from Court, to avoid " a greater Diſgrace. The Great Chronicle of *France* " tells us, that the Earl again took up Arms a- " gainſt the King; but being informed of the great " Preparations made againſt him, he ſent ſome of the " Wiſeſt of his Council to deſire a Peace, which was " agreed to. But the King had been at a great Ex- " pence on this account, and therefore the Earl was o- " bliged to quit *Montereau-faults-yonne*, and *Bray* on the " *Seine* to him. On this occaſion (ſays the Great " Chronicle) Queen *Blanche* told the Earl that he ought " never to have taken up Arms againſt the King her " Son; but ſhould remember that he came even to his " own Country to aſſiſt him againſt the Barons " when they Attacked him. The Earl earneſtly " looking at the Wiſe and Charming Queen, re- " plyed, On my Faith, Madam, my Soul, my Body, " and all my Lands are at your Command: No- " thing can pleaſe you which I would not freely Un- " dertake: Nor will I ever engage againſt you " or yours. He departed very Penſive, often Recol- " lecting the Queen's languiſhing Eyes and charm- " ing Air. Sometimes the tender Paſſion ſeized his " Heart, but was ſoon checked by the remembrance " of her high Character, and ſtrict Virtue, which " utterly deprived him of all Hopes of Enjoying " her, and ſerved only to perplex him. Deep " Thoughts begot Melancholy; to divert which he " was adviſed by ſome Wiſe Men, to apply him- " ſelf to Poetry and Muſick, in which he ſucceeded " ſo well, that he Compoſed the moſt Melodious " Songs that ever were either ſung or plaid on In- " ſtruments, and cauſed them to be Ingraved in the " Halls of *Provins* and *Troyes*, and they are called " the King of *Navarre*'s Songs.

(*B*) *Did not protect this great Queen from ill* (*b*) *Tongues.*] Several things gave occaſion to it. *Thibaut* had rendred himſelf Odious by his Precipitate Retreat from the Camp at *Avignon*, and became more ſo on account of the Suſpicions he lay under of having Poyſoned *Lewis* the VIIIth; which were increaſed, when ſo good an Underſtanding was obſerved betwixt him and the Queen Dowager, that he diſcloſed to her all the Deſigns of the Confederate Princes, tho' ſeveral Injuries had ſo enraged him, that he engaged himſelf as one of the Chiefs of the League. This looked very like a hearty Engagement betwixt them (*c*), without which it was not probable that a Widow ſhould ſuffer the Approaches of a Man, ſuppoſed to be her Husband's Murtherer. Beſides, the Confederate Princes marching into *Champagne*, met Queen *Blanche* on the way; and ſhe would not abandon the Earl, tho' they purſued him as the Poiſoner of her Husband. This Conduct appeared ſo Suſpicious that they laugh'd at the Offers ſhe made of Puniſhing *Thibaut* if he was Guilty: To which purpoſe is the following Paſſage in a Modern Author, who has conſulted very good Manuſcripts. (*d*) *The Queen ſent a ſecond Order to the Princes of the League to quit* Champagne; *aſſuring them, that if they had any Complaint againſt* Thibaut, *ſhe was ready to do them Juſtice. But all ſhe could obtain from them, we are told, was an Inſolent as well as Barbarous Anſwer:* " *That they had taken up Arms to do them-* " *ſelves Juſtice, and not to wait for it from a Woman,* " *who declared herſelf the Protectreſs of her Hus-* " *band's Murtherer.* As for the Songs Compoſed by the Earl, moſt Hiſtorians tell us they proved the ill ſucceſs of his Amours. The paſſage of *Claudius Fauchet* already cited, ſhews that this Unfortunate Galant was adviſed to drive away by Songs the Melancholy which Preyed upon him. Common Senſe obliges us to believe, that if *Blanche* had favoured the Earl's Paſſion, he had much better concealed his Flame; and that the deſpair of any tender returns from the Queen, occaſioned the Exhalation of ſuch crowds of Sighs and languiſhing Verſes Ingraved on the Walls of his Palace. We are told 'twas a ſort of Folly and Extravagance, which a Compaſſion in the Queen would have entirely prevented. To this purpoſe a Modern Author informs us that " (*e*) whether his Preſumption e- " qualled his Love; or his Paſſion degenerated into " Folly; or he was prepoſſeſſed that concealing " would rather encreaſe than cure his Diſeaſe; " or the Queen's Virtue had at laſt thrown him in- " to Deſpair: 'Tis certain he was ſo little ſollicitous " to conceal the conſuming Fire; that he affected to " diſcover it by all means which the moſt wretched " Extravagance could ſuggeſt to a Man of his Qua- " lity. He wrote ſeveral Amorous Songs, in which " he diſcovered more Wit than Elegance: He found " Opportunities to hand them to the Queen; they " were ſet to Tunes; they were fitted to all " ſorts of Inſtruments, and to keep up the Idea of " them when they ſhould loſe the grace of Novel- " ty, or to preſerve the Memory of them when the " Author and the Princeſs ſhould be no more, he " cauſed them to be Engraved in Braſs, and expo- " ſed to the view of all the World in the Galleries " of his Palaces at *Troyes* and *Provins*: As if he " was afraid that future Ages would not be ſuffici- " ently informed of his Folly, or that the Age he " lived in was very Barren of Satyriſts". *Varillas* is here miſtaken in his Chronology; he ſuppoſes *Thibaut* guilty of all theſe Extravagancies before the Death of *Lewis* the VIIIth. But I rather ſubſcribe to the Hiſtory cited by *Fauchet*, (*f*) which places all theſe Songs after the loſs of *Montereau* and *Bray*. This agrees with the Chronology of one of our beſt Hiſtorians (*g*): This loſs, ſays he, did not make him Wiſer; *he ſtill perſiſted in the fooliſh paſſion for the Queen which had ruined him, and retired to his Caſtle of* Provins *to indulge his amorous Madneſs, by making Verſes and Songs.* He was obliged to ſurrender theſe Towns in the Year 1235, according to *Mezerai* (*b*).

I ſhall conclude this Remark with the words of the Modern Hiſtorian of St. *Lewis*, which are an exact Recapitulation of what hath been ſaid. (*i*) " The " Author who hath collected moſt of theſe Detra- " ctions, perpetually Praiſes *Blanche* to a degree of " exceſs, and tho' an Engliſh Man, ſpeaks of theſe " Detractions as meer Rumors, to give credit " to which would be the higheſt Injuſtice. He alſo " aſſures us, as well as another Author born at *Liege*, " when theſe reports were yet freſh, that they only " proceeded from the Animoſity of the Nobles a- " gainſt the Regency and the firm Reſolution of this " Princeſs; and indeed every Age furniſhes Exam- " ples of this kind. Beſides, of the four Authors " who have related this Story, no one has ſo much as " inſinuated that the Queen encouraged in the leaſt the

---

(†) *'Tis no wonder, becauſe if a Woman had gathered thoſe Leaves, ſhe would have conſeſt her Infirmity.*

(*a*) Des anciens poetes François Book 2. pag. 117.

(*b*) *See other Scandalous reports concerning this Queen in the remark* E.

(*c*) *The Modern Hiſtorian of St.* Lewis *l.* 2. *n.* 6. *pag.* 51. *tells us that the Eaſineſs which* Blanche *diſcovered to be reconciled to* Thibaut, *tho' ſhe knew he paſſionately loved her, occaſion'd ſeveral ill reports.*

(*d*) Hiſtoire de S. Louis l. [illegible] n. 11. pag. [illegible]

(*e*) Varillas, Minorité de S. Louis pag. 12.

(*f*) *See the remark A.*

(*g*) Mezerai ubi infra.

(*h*) Mezerai abregé Chronol. tom. 2. pag. 71[illegible]

(*i*) Hiſtoire de S. Louis, [illegible] pag. [illegible]

Queen from ill Tongues. Some Authors † pretend that he diſcovered his Paſſion, (C) whilſt her Husband *Lewis* the VIIIth was alive, who, they add, was obliged to diſſemble the Affront, by reaſon of the Wars in which he was engaged. That the Earl furniſhed him with conſiderable Auxiliaries, and behaved himſelf very bravely; but freely declared, that if he was obliged to Winter out of his Territories, he would withdraw his Aſſiſtance. Which the King imagining to proceed only from an impatient deſire of ſeeing the Queen, tho' he was not ignorant of the ill conſequences of this Lord's Retreat, yet he not only treated him ill, but threatned him. That *Thibaut* enraged at the Affront, reſolved to Revenge himſelf, and cauſed the King to be Poyſoned. That finding the Queen full as inſenſible in her Widow State as before, he engaged with the Princes who deſigned to remove her from the Regency; to which they eaſily perſuaded him, by alledging that the Queen's indifference proceeded from the Paſſion ſhe had entertain'd (D) for the Cardinal Legate, who had reſided for ſome time at the Court of *France*. That it was equally eaſy for the Queen to oblige him to abandon the Confederates, which he did when the Queen acquainted him that ſhe ſhou'd not be Diſpleaſed to ſee him. That his greateſt hopes of ſucceeding in his Amours were Founded on this bare Compliment. That he Deſerted the Princes of the League, and diſcovered their Deſigns to the Queen, at a juncture which was very favourable to her Intereſts. That they turning all their Rage againſt him, Entred into and Ravaged *Champagne*. That the Queen Regent aſſiſted him, and ſo Compoſed the difference, that they were deprived of all pretences for an Invaſion. That they endeavoured to Ruin him another way by accuſing him of the King's Death. That the Queen brought him off, obliging them to lay down their Arms on condition that he ſhould immediately ſerve in the Wars againſt the Infidels, accompanied with one hundred Knights, which he was to Maintain at his own Expence *a*. This whole Relation mentions nothing of the Crown of *Navarre*: Which obliges me to ſay in this place, that *Thibaut* Aſcended that Throne in the Year 1234. immediately ſucceeding *Sanche* *. who died Childleſs. Two Years after, he undertook a *Cruſade* againſt the Infidels, of which he was alſo the Chief: But for the common Reaſon, I mean the Miſunderſtanding of the Princes engaged in that Enterpriſe, the Expedition came to nothing. He died in the Year ‖ 1253. leaving his Territories to *Thibaut* his Son. In his latter Days he was ingaged in ſeveral Broils with his Clergy, and drew an Interdict on the Kingdom of *Navarre* for the ſpace of three Years, for having Baniſhed the Biſhop of *Pampelona* ‡. The Remarks (E) will inform you that he was a great Poet. He was a Man ſuſpected on eaſy grounds of the greateſt Crimes. 'Twas thought he Poiſoned (F) *Philip* Earl of *Boulogne*, Uncle to St. *Lewis*.

† Varillas, Minorité de S. Louis Printed at the *Hague* 1685.

a Id. Ib.

* Father, or according to others, Uncle to *Blanche* of *Navarre*, *Thibaut*'s Mother.

‖ And not 1277, as *la Croix du Maine* ſays pag. 465.

‡ See the Hiſtory of St. *Lewis* by Monſ. *de la Chaiſe* l. 21. n. 4. p. m. 172.

THO-

" the Earl of *Champagne*'s Paſſion, if it be true that " he had any ſuch Tenderneſs for her: But one of " the four poſitively avers, that *Thibaut* only ſcribbled " his Ditties on the Walls of the Palaces of *Troyes* and " *Provins*, to charm the Deſpair into which *Blanche*'s " Virtue had caſt him. That if amongſt the reſt " of thoſe excellent Works, ſome Verſes appear which " ſeem liable to be wreſted to this purpoſe; 'tis a " ſtrange thing to alledge the Evidence of ſuch a " Man as *Thibaut*, a Poet tranſported by a warm " Imagination, who may as probably entertain the " Publick with ſuch Adventures as never happened, " to him, as others of his Character tire the Reader " with the Paſſions which they never felt.

(C) *Whilſt her Husband was alive.*] It is very likely that his Paſſion did not ſtay for the King's Death: Nor is it much leſs probable that ſuch a vain, inconſtant, daring Prince, ſhou'd have had a ſufficient command over his Paſſions, to Love the Queen a long time, without betraying any Marks of his Tenderneſs. Note, that the Queen was at leaſt forty, and perhaps older, when ſhe loſt her Husband: For ſhe was Married to him in the Year 1200, and he died in 1226. It is very rare for a Man to ſee a fine Woman of thirty Years of Age without any concern, and to fall in Love with her all at once when ſhe is forty, after ſhe has had above ten Children. This was the caſe of Queen *Blanche* in the Year 1226. One of our Hiſtorians imagins that there was a greater ſhare of Vanity than Love in this action of *Thibaut*. *The Earl of* Champagne *ſays he* (a) *was the perſon who gave this advice to the Queen. This young Prince was touched with a ſort of Gallantry for her, rather owing to the vanity of a Courtier, than to the charms of a Woman above forty.* He is thus far in the right, that Vanity is capable of obliging a Man to act the part of a Lover: But he doth not in the leaſt conſider, that the Earl's Paſſion might have began long before the Queen's Age was ſo far advanced. And at that Age it was much eaſier for her to keep alive a great Fire long ſince lighted than to begin to kindle one.

(D) *She had entertained for the Cardinal Legate.*] An (b) Author whom I have often Cited, obſerves that the Cardinal's Perſon was very agreeable; that his charming Mien was equalled by none; *that he had a Delicacy of Wit which was extremely ſurpriſing*, and that *Europe* never produced ſuch a compleat Courtier. He adds that *Blanche* had a very particular value for him; that ſhe conſulted him on important Emergencies: that ſhe frequently preferred his Advice to that of others, and that ſhe never denied any of the ſmall Favours he asked for his Friends. There needed no more, to kindle a Jealouſy in *Thibaut*, or to furniſh Detractors with a fair Pretext, to ſpread injurious reports againſt the Honour of the Regent: Which accordingly they did not fail to do; and what was yet worſe, the Men of Letters were the chief promoters of thoſe Slanders; for the Scholars of the Univerſity of *Paris*, (c) *all of them of an Age at that time ſo far advanced, that it would at preſent appear ſcandalous for a Man to be leſs than Doctor*, being diſguſted at the Proceedings on occaſion of their Quarrel (d) with the Citizens, left the City, *after having publiſhed Licentious Songs and Verſes to blacken the Reputation of the Queen Regent, and the Cardinal Legate.* (e)

(E) *He was a great Poet.*] Preſident *Fauchet* aſſures us that (f) *the Italians formerly ſo well eſteemed the Odes of* Thibaut *King of* Navarre, *and other French Poets, his Contemporaries, that they imitated them, as* Dante *has ſhewn us, who in his Book* de Vulgari Eloquentia, *cites this King as an excellent Maſter of the Art of Poetry.* Several of this King's Poetical Fragments are extant in *Fauchet*'s Book (g)

(F) *He Poiſoned* Philip *Earl of* Boulogne.] This Earl was the Son of *Philip Auguſtus*. He was the Chief of the League formed againſt the Regent *Blanche*, ſoon after the Death of *Lewis* the VIIIth. As " (h) " his Death was very ſuddain, the People always " prone to Calumny, were very willing to aſcribe it " to a violent Cauſe, and by dark hints charged it " on the Queen her ſelf. But to attempt to defend her

(a) Mezerai abregé Chronol. tom. 2. pag. 710. ad ann. 1227.

(b) Varillas, Minorité de St. Louis pag. 22.

(c) Hiſt. de S. Louis, l. 2. n. 16. pag. 71.

(d) *These Quarrels began in the Year* 1229. *See a ſhort Deduction of 'em in the* Hiſt. de S. Louis ubi ſupra.

(e) Mezerai, abregé Chronol. tome 2. pag. 715.

(f) Fauchet, des anciens poetes François, Book. 2. pag. 118.

(g) Du Verdier Vau-Privas *has inſerted in his* Bibliotheque Françoiſe *what* Fauchet *ſays of* Thibaut *Earl of* Champagne.

(h) Hiſt. de S. Louis, l. 3. n. 20. pag. 140.

THOMÆUS (*Nicolas Leonicus*) a famous Professor at *Padua* in the XVIth Century. He was a Venetian †, Originally of *Albanian* Extract. He studied the Greek literature at *Florence* under *Demetrius Chalcondylas*, and was the first of the Latins who Explained *Aristotle* in Greek at *Padua*. He recurred to the Source in order to Re-establish Philosophy, which he found miserably Disfigured (*A*) by the vain Subtilties of the Schoolmen, and the Speculations of the Arabian Commentators. As he was a great Humanist, we have no reason to be surprised at his dislike of the manner of Philosophizing customary at that time, nor that he adventured to Explain the Greek Text of *Aristotle*. His manner of living was truly Philosophical: He was fond of a studious Repose *, without suffering himself to be disturbed by the Commotions which Emulation and Ambition usually inspire. He was content (*B*) with a moderate Fortune, lived Frugally and never Married. He took the Death of a Crane which he had kept Forty Years (*C*) for a Presage of his own approaching End, and considering the Age he lived to, any thing might have furnished him with such a thought. He succeeded very well in Poetry ||. He died at *Padua*, ‡ in the Year 1533, aged 75 Years. I shall speak of his (*D*) Writings in one of my Remarks. He had a (*E*) Brother whom *Pierius Valerianus* ranks amongst the Unfortunate Learned.

THOMAS

“ her would be to injure her: They let loose in quite “ another manner against *Thibaut*, either because he “ had been the greatest Gainer by it, or because being “ persuaded that he had already made a Bloody Essay “ on *Lewis* the VIIIth, they did not think that he “ would make any scruple of this second Murther. “ But no proof was ever given of his being guilty “ of either, tho' his unconcernedness at the Death of “ the latter was sufficiently liable to a Suspicion that “ it was procured by him. Thus we see how Queen *Blanche* was represented by the discontented Parties; so hard it is to have a great Reputation, and not be exposed to the Malice of Calumniating Tongues.

(*A*) *Which he found miserably Disfigured.*] *Paul Jovius* happily expresses the sad Condition to which the Schoolmen had reduced Philosophy. They never enquired after Truth; but studied the art of raising and answering Objections, with the help of a hundred new-fangled Terms which they did not themselves understand. (*a*) *Philosophiam ex purissimis fontibus, non ex lutulentis rivulis salubriter hauriendam esse perdocebat, explosa penitus sophistarum disciplina, quæ tum inter imperitos, & barbaros principatum in scholis obtinebat, quum doctores excogitatis barbara subtilitate Dialecticorum figmentis, Physicas quæstiones non ad veritatis lucem, sed ad inanem disputandi garrulitatem revocarent; & juventus in gymnasio Arabum, & Barbarorum commentationes secuta, a recto, munitoque itinere in confragosas ignorantiæ crepidines duceretur.*

(*B*) *He was content with a moderate Fortune.*] His Chast and Innocent Life, is very well expressed in the following Citation. (*b*) *Pervenit veneranda barbæ canitie ad septuagesimum* (*c*) *tertium ætatis annum, mediocri substantia, ipsaque civili frugalitate, & cælebs & felix, quòd nemo vel innocentiæ, & doctrinæ conscientia, vel munditia corporis, vel animi nitore, beatior ætate nostra fuerit.*

(*C*) *Death of his Crane for a presage of his own.*] For which *Paul Jovius* is also my Authority. *Aluerat domi gruem, de manus ipsius senili oblectamento cibaria capientem, per quadraginta annos. Is senio tabefactus quum periisset, & ejus desiderio triste omen concepit, prædixitque nullo lacessitus morbo, se non multò post adamati gruis fatum, maturo vitæ exitu secuturum.*

(*D*) *I shall speak of his Writings.*] He Composed ten Dialogues in Imitation of the Academicks on curious or Important Subjects, as *de divinatione, de nominum inventione, de ludo talario, de precibus, de animorum immortalitate*, &c. He Translated or Paraphrased several (*d*) tracts of *Aristotle* and *Galen*, and Published a Miscellany of very Fine Collections entituled *Varia Historia*, in which he followed the fashion of the Age he lived in, which was never to cite those Ancient Authors who furnished him with Materials. Mr. *Huet* gives him the following good Character, (*e*) *Emendatus interpres, ad auctoris normam totum se fingens.* It is observable of his Work called *de Varia Historia libri tres*, that he wrote it when Young, but did not Publish it till he was very Old in the Year 1531, as he himself informs us in his Epistle Dedicatory to *Cuthbert Tonstal* Bishop of *Durham*. *Commentariolos de Varia Historia quos alias juvenis admodum multiplici cum Græcorum tum Latinorum lectione confeceram sepsueramque nunc edendos excudendosve curavi: ut quando maturioris ætatis pleraque jam à me de omnimoda philosophia exierunt opera ex Academicarum peripateticorumque fontibus hausta, hæc quoque juvenilia studia nostra sua aliquando mercede non defraudarentur.* Here is an Author who had the prudence not to Publish his Juvenile productions before he had acquired a great Reputation by his Works Composed in his Riper Years. A very wise Conduct; for there are scarce any Authors, but Repent the Precipitation with which they Hurry their first Essays into the World, even before the soft Down begins to grow on their Chin. *Grotius* who perhaps had less Reason to Repent of it than all others, was in Extreme Confusion on this Account; as he complains in a Letter, wherein he praises *Scriverius* for the contrary Conduct. (*f*) *Quo rependam non habeo, ex quo tandem resipiscere cœpi ab ea insania, quæ mihi cum aliis nonnullis communis fuit, ut cæca quadam innotescendi libidine nihil nisi infamiam meam publicarem, daremque ea mundo spectanda, quæ nunc ne solus quidem apud me sine magno pudore & acri doloris sensu conspicio. Tu vero* (*dicam non ut blandiar, sed ut raram animi fortitudinem, quam, si possim, imitari velim, sane, quod possum, probem atque commendem*) *in annos non doctrina tantum, sed & sapientiæ capaces, tibi te & publico servasti; & quo nullum maturæ mentis certius esse signum potest, ausus es ita utilitati aliorum studere, ut appareret priorem tibi hujus esse quam gloriæ tuæ rationem.* Those Authors who are not quite so hasty run a greater risque; because the World is more naturally enclined to excuse the faults of Writers of 15 than those of 20. or 25 Years of Age. These are then obliged to take special Care of their First Book; for if it be worth nothing they will find a Thousand Difficulties to retrieve their Reputation, and Cure the Publick of their prejudices. If they with *Thomæus* keep their juvenile Composures by them till they have established a good Reputation, they may then easily pass an indifferent Piece upon the World. They must not follow the Italian fashion, where the Lacqueys go before their Masters; but clap the finest of their Equipage in the Van, to prepossess the Spectators in Favour of them, and the remainder will come in time. They would not lose their Labours, they may expect with *Thomæus* that they also shall meet with a Reward. 'Tis unquestionable that at a certain pitch of Reputation, Authors may put off indifferent Performances that meet with a good Reception; and wou'd undoubtedly be laugh'd at, if Published by an unknown Writer. But those who make an ill use of this Prepossession of the Publick are very often deceived. They gather their Papers; even their most trifling Manuscripts, Written by way of Diversion from more serious studies, or their Juvenile Exercises for their degrees; all these they send to the Printer; they disgust all their Readers, and are often more Blamed for their last Books, than they were Praised for their first.

(*E*) *He had a Brother which* Pierius Valerianus.] He would not have been at all inferior to our *Thomæus*, if he had lived as long; but he died Young, and yet he lived long enough to suffer too great a Load of Miseries: Short and Evil were his days as *Valerianus* says. (*g*) *Bartolomæum Leonicum cognominato Fuscum agnovistis, cujus ingenium, & absolutissimam*

† Epirotâ patre Venetiis genitus. Paulus Jovius Elog. cap. 91.

|| Petrus Bembus in.

‡ Spondan. ad ann. 1533. n. 20.

* [illegible]

(*a*) Paulus Jovius in Elogiis, cap. 91. p. m. 213.

(*b*) Id. ib.

(*c*) Spondan. ad ann. 1533. n. 20. *makes him live till* 75.

(*d*) De animalium motione ac ingressu: quæstiones mechanicæ: Liber primus de partibus animalium: Argumenta in aliquos libros Aristotelis parvorum naturalium ex Michaele Ephesio fere translata. *Gesner. in biblioth.* fol. 521. Paul Jovius *says Scripsit erudite & luculenter commentarios in parva naturalia Aristotelis.*

(*e*) Huet. de claris Interpret. p. m. 222. See Vossius de hist. Lat. pag. 677.

(*f*) Grotius's Epistle in which he thanks Scriverius for a Copy of the Authors de re Militari, dated June 8. 1607. In my Remarks at the beginning. *To the example of Grotius add those alledged by* Monf. Baillet, in the first Tome of the Jugemens des Sçavans pag. 384.

(*g*) Pierius Valerianus de Litteratorum Infelicitate, lib. 2. pag. m. [illegible]

THOMAS (*Paul*) Sieur *de Girac*, Son of *Paul Thomas*, Sieur (A) *de Maiſonnette*, was a very Learned Man, a good Neighbour, and hearty Friend to *Balzac*. The ſame of his Wit and Learning had perhaps never extended beyond the Walls of *Engoulême* his Native place, if he had not Criticiſed *Voiture's* Works: But this Cenſure, tho' but a ſmall Diſſertation, made way for a long Controverſy which made a great Noiſe in the World. *Voiture's* Friend *Coſtar* had no ſooner ſeen this Diſſertation, but he attempted to Refute it. This deſign which he Executed very (B) ſlowly, and with abundance of Artifice, as 'tis ſaid, ſucceeded him. He publiſh'd a Defence of *Voiture*, which (C) was very much Eſteem'd. *Girac* who thought himſelf obliged to reply, did it not in Latin, as in his firſt Diſſertation; he defended his Tract in French, the Language in which *Coſtar* had Publiſhed the Apology for his Friend. † *Girac's* Anſwer not only defended his Cenſures on *Voiture*; but alſo Criticis'd ſome Faults of *Coſtar*. For which reaſon the latter replied in two Tracts, one of which was an Apology for himſelf, and the other a continuation of his defence of *Voiture*. His Adverſary return'd to the Charge, and Publiſhed a large Volume againſt the continuation of the Defence. Here the Controverſy ſtopt; being carried to the laſt Extremities, which our Language can poſſibly bear on ſerious Subjects. *Coſtar* was a railing Satyriſt, who when he began to ſtrike gave heavy Blows: Of the weight of which *Balzac* and *Girac* were ſenſible in his firſt Defence. An Author ſenſibly touched, commonly imagines that he does not Revenge himſelf to ſome purpoſe, if the ſhocks he returns are not ruder than thoſe he received. *Girac* form'd himſelf on this Principle in his Anſwer, as did *Coſtar* alſo in his laſt Defences; which *Girac* Anſwering with the ſame Spirit, carried the Invective to the utmoſt height. In order to find more Injurious Books than this Reply, we ought to have recourſe to ſome Authors who write in Latin, or to ſome who have ſometime paſt Written in French in ſome Cities in *Holland* which I will not name. *Girac* had the advantage of ſtriking the firſt and the laſt Blow. Another thing which

† He Publiſhed it in 1655, adding to it his Latin Diſſertation already Printed in the 3d Edition of his Defence of *Voiture*. I have an Edition of this Defence Printed at *Paris* in the Year 1654, in which we are aſſured that the World was preſented the firſt time with Mr. *Girac's* Latin Diſſertation. How Ridiculous it is to affirm this in 1655.

---

abſolutiſſimam eruditionem omnes admirabamur. Is cùm Pictavinum bellum, & totius ejus regionis deſolationem, incendiaque devitaſſet, Romæ aliquamdiu fuit, ſed, cùm neque hic otium, quod ſibi propoſuerat, reperiſſet, in Caſſinatem receſſit ſolitudinem, facta illi a loci illius monachis, quieſcendi copia; ſed, dum hic ſperat ſcripta ſua incuientiſſima maturare, & immortalem ſibi gloriam comparare, paucis poſtquam illuc ſeceſſerat diebus, rapidiſſima correptus febri, cùm ægrotaſſet graviſſime, valetudinis ejus violentia ſublatus eſt: futurus dubio procul Leonico Thomeo germano fratri non inferior, ſi fata eum diutius in vita eſſe voluiſſent.

(A) *The Son of* Paul Thomas *Sieur* de Maiſonnette.] Monſ. *de Girac's* Father was born at *Jarnac* (b), but Lived at *Engouleme*. He underſtood Hebrew very well as appears by the Words of *Jarrige*; (1) *Father* Beautes *having laſt Year received a Hebrew Letter, travelled all Night from Ruffec to* Angouleme, *to obtain an interpretation and anſwer of Mr.* Thomas de Maiſonnete *a learned Man perfectly acquainted with that Language. This Honeſt Gentleman cannot deny the truth of what I ſay.* Mr. *Colomies* (a) cites this paſſage of *Jarrige*, and ſays (b) that he has read Mr. *de Maiſonnette's* Poetry with a great deal of pleaſure, and that *Balzac* praiſed him in his Latin Letters, (c) as did alſo *Nicolas Bourbon*.

(B) *Very ſlowly and with abundance of artifice, as is ſaid.*] A little after the Impreſſion of *Voiture's* Works, *Balzac* (who perhaps could not obſerve the good Reception they met with without Chagrin) deſired Mr. *Girac* to Write him his Opinion concerning that Book. In complaiſance to his Friend's requeſt he Wrote a Latin Diſſertation on that Subject; which *Balzac* communicated to *Coſtar* to have his Opinion of it. *Coſtar* took this as a favourable Opportunity of Signalizing himſelf, and as he believed that *Balzac* was not diſpleaſed that ſome faults were found in *Voiture*, he reſolved to apologize for the latter by counter-blows at the former. But in order to take the ſurer meaſures, (d) *He immediately excuſed himſelf as not capable of giving his Opinion on* Girac's *remarks, urging a thouſand affairs which depriv'd him of all leiſure. At laſt after ſome Years he ſent his defence in Manuſcript to Monſ.* Balzac, *conjuring him*, that if he found any lines which diſpleaſed him, to blot them out, to commit them to the Flames or throw them into the Water, for he abſolutely abandon'd them to him. *In the mean time this Book, which indeed is nothing but a Satyr againſt the Reputation of the Perſon to whom it was addreſſed, notwithſtanding all the profeſſion of Loving and Honouring him, was Printed, and in every Body's Hands, before the Manuſcript reach'd him.* A paſſage in the *Menagiana* makes me doubt whether the laſt part of *Girac's* Relation is true. I don't believe that the defence of *Voiture* was Printed before the Author ſent the Manuſcript Copy to Mr. *de Balzac*. I find in the *Menagiana* "(e) that M. *de* "*Balzac* —— after having obliged M. *de Girac* "to Write againſt *Voiture's* Letters in Latin, engaged alſo Mr. *Coſtar* to undertake the defence "of them, and to Write againſt *Girac*; this was "deſigned to make ſure of the praiſes of both Parties. I went through *Mans* in my return to "*Paris*, when the *Defenſe* was finiſhed. Mr. *Coſtar* "gave me two Copies, one of which to be ſent to "Mr. *Pinchêſne*, Mr. *de Voiture's* Nephew, and the "other to Mr. *Conrart*. He told me he freely ſubmitted it to all manner of Alterations that his "Friends would pleaſe to make, whether it were "to add or retrench. One of the Copies was communicated to Mr. *de Balzac* who ſent his corrections while the work was under the Preſs; but "they not arriving till the Sheets were wrought "off, he was adviſed that they came too late, and "the Book appeared as it was, at which he was "ſomewhat Angry. Compare this with Mr. *Coſtar's* account (f) and a Letter (g) of *Balzac* to *Conrart*, and you will plainly ſee that *Balzac* received the Manuſcript, before the Book was Printed. This will not hinder ſeveral People from believing that *Balzac* was impoſed upon, and that all the excuſes grounded on *Voiture's* Nephew cauſing this Book to be Printed unknown to *Coſtar*, are but ſo many affronts. The Wars of Authors have their Stratagems as well as thoſe of Princes; and that this was a Subtilty of the Pen combatants, which was on this Occaſion practiſed againſt *Balzac*, is very apparent. The impreſſion went on and was finiſhed maugre the ſtrong Oppoſitions of Mr. *Conrart* (h).

(e) Pag. 15 of the Dutch Edition.

(f) Suite de la Defenſe, pag. 20. and the following.

(g) The 15th of the 4th Book, dated the 15 of June, 1653.

(C) Coſtar —— *Publiſhed a Defence of Voiture which was very much eſteemed.*] It may indeed be ſaid that this Book Proclaim'd him to the World; after this his Name flew every where, and what is much more conſiderable, by Virtue of this Book he obtain'd a Penſion of 500 Crowns. *He cou'd not help*, ſays Mr. *Girac* (i) *evincing on all Occaſions his mighty Satisfaction and Joy that he had been acquainted with me. And indeed in what Corner of* France *has he neglected to publiſh*, that he is infinitely obliged to me for an Opportunity to introduce him to the World; that by my means the Eyes of all the Learned and polite are fixed on him, and that he is indebted to me for the Glory and applauſe which flows on him from all Parts; *and what he ſets a greater Value on*, That I have been the cauſe that he has gained 500 Crowns? *I have ſeen a great many of his Letters which ſing no other Tune, and I have not met one of his Friends who has not thankt me on his behalf*, for adminiſtring an occaſion to this happy Book, which his Eminence has thought worthy of his Liberality. (1) *Theſe are his own Words in his Epiſtle Dedicatory.*

(h) Ubi ſupra.

(i) Replique a Coſtar pag. 3. and the 4th Edit. in Holland. See alſo the Menagiana pag 368. 369

(1) Epiſt. ded. to the *ſuite de la Deff.*

(D) *Uſed*

which plainly decides the Victory on his ſide was, that *Coſtar* uſed his utmoſt Intereſt (D) to obtain of the Magiſtrates, that his Antagoniſt's Reply might be ſuppreſſed. The Pretext he alledged (E) that his Morals were attackt, tho' ſomething ſpecious, generally ſpeaking, was nevertheleſs invalid; for he was not accuſed

(D) *Uſed his utmoſt intereſt to obtain of the Magiſtrates.*] It is leſs Scandalous for a Logician to be Guilty of the Fault which they they call *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*, *to ſhift, to abandon the Queſtion, to ramble about in order to catch at another difficulty*, than for a polite Genius after it has been ſomewhat worſted by the Pen, to quit that weapon in order to have recourſe to the Arms of the Magiſtrate. This is viſibly to loſe ground, to quit the Field, to lay down one's Sword and Buckler, that one may the eaſier get into a Place of Refuge, and make all poſſible haſte to hide one ſelf behind an Altar. I am ſurpriz'd that a Perſon of the penetration of Mr. *Coſtar*, did not fore-ſee that this Conduct would meet with this Interpretation, and be compar'd to that of a Gentleman who in a Quarrel where his Honour is concern'd, ſhould apply himſelf to a Judge inſtead of his Sword. He anſwer'd and reply'd to the Criticiſms on *Voiture*, he treated his Adverſary as he pleaſed, and after having enjoyed the utmoſt liberty the Republick of Letters could give, he applied himſelf to the Lieutenant Civil, to hinder his Adverſary from defending himſelf, and to prevent his making uſe of the ſame liberty. This was a loud Injuſtice, tho' the fear which this ſort of proceeding betrayed, was yet plainer than the Wrong. *Girac* does not ſpare him on this account, he plentifully inſults him. "What's become, ſaith he (z) of the generous Sentiments of this Bravo, who, not long ſince, call'd himſelf a Gentleman of *Pomerania*, and the younger *Orondates* (1); who was hectoring, and who boaſted of *having the ſacred Laws of Antient Chivalry always deeply engraved in his Mind, ſo that it was not poſſible for him to Violate or Infringe them!* If thoſe ridiculous and frivolous Imaginations are evaporated, and Mr. *Coſtar*'s Brain is no longer troubled with ſuch Extravagancies, does he not ſee, (to expreſs my ſelf plainer) to what Confuſion and Scandal a man of Letters, as he is, renders himſelf liable; who when accuſed of a thouſand Errors, a thouſand Inſtances of Ignorance, and as many Abſurdities, applieth to the Magiſtrate to ſuppreſs the Book which convicts him, inſtead of defending his Opinions, or acknowledging his Errors?" He makes another advantageous uſe of the great Confuſion and diſorder which he diſcover'd in the conduct of his Adverſary. "This Diſorder, ſays he, (a) appear'd very plainly in all his Proceedings; but nothing publiſh'd it more effectually, than the Proteſtation he made ſo publickly, that (2) *as long as he liv'd he would never read any thing which went under my Name.* For if his Hatred or Contempt of me were ſo great, that he would never look on any of my Writings, why doth he give himſelf ſo much Trouble to hinder their publication? Why does he ſo loudly proteſt, (3) that being in the purſuit of a vaſt Deſign, he will not be diverted from the way; that the Stones which I ſhall throw will never reach him; and that tho' I ſhould continue perpetually flinging at him, he would not ſo much as turn his Head towards me? When at the ſame time the ſacred Obligation of an Oath, nor ſuch a ſolemn Proteſtation could not hinder him from Reading my Book, and that by the baſe means of corrupting my Printer, and getting all the Sheets of my Book as faſt as work'd off. But, to continue his fine Allegory, I had ſcarce taken this fatal Sling into my Hand, but this intrepid, terrible, and haughty *Goliah* was ſo ſcandalouſly ſtruck with fear, that he cried out for help, and implor'd the aſſiſtance of Juſtice, which I hope will always be in vain; and I deſire no other Proofs of his flight and of my Victory, if I may ſo call the Defeat of ſo inconſiderable an Enemy, who runs away at the ſight of a blow.

(E) *The pretext he alledged——was nevertheleſs invalid.*] Let us hear *Girac* a little further. (b) "By what Law then doth he aſſume the liberty of proſcribing Authors, and act the Tyrant in an Empire which has always maintain'd the Poſſeſſion of an intire and perfect liberty? It is indeed an unprendented Attempt, and worthy of the Arrogancy of my Adverſary: for tho' he dreſs'd his Deſign with a more ſpecious pretext, and took other meaſures to obtain that Sentence, in which he at preſent triumphs; it was to impoſe on the Judge and the World, to perſuade them that he was conſtrain'd to take theſe meaſures, by reaſon of the pretended Calumnies, levell'd at his Religion and Morals. Indeed he would be a very nice Man to complain of two or three Letters, which I have made uſe of, ſince he cannot deny the writing of them; and indeed he ought to own that what he has himſelf Printed, is much more ſcandalous: Beſides, they were in the hands of all the Curious, and publickly read in all the Provinces where Mr. *Coſtar* is known." After having alledged ſeveral other Reaſons to juſtifie the uſe he made of thoſe Letters, he goes on. "(c) Is it then becauſe he bluſhes to have his fraud, breach of Truſt, falſe Parts, and miſunderſtanding of Authors detected? He is concern'd that any ſhock ſhould be offer'd to that *fine, long eſtabliſh'd, and general Reputation, which he fancies he enjoys without any interruption; and that the Inchantments and Illuſions with which he made an ill cauſe appear good, will no longer be efficacious.* He knows very well that his *fucus* of fine words, the only inviting thing in his Writings, will no longer impoſe on the Ignorant. He is apprehenſive that inſtead of *the lofty Epithets of Illuſtrious, the Ornament of* France, *and the glory of our Age*, he ſhould be taken for an ignorant and inconſiderate Man, and for a Plagiary. Theſe are the true Motives which oblige him to have recourſe to Law-quirks, as the laſt Refuge of a deſperate Cauſe amidſt all the trouble, confuſion and diſorder to which he is reduced." Some may perhaps urge, that *Coſtar* was not ſo unjuſt as ſome others (d), to deſire that he might have leave to write againſt his Adverſary, and that the latter might be depriv'd of the Liberty of anſwering: No, he was very willing that the Judge ſhould include him in the Prohibition, and make an Order that Mr. *Coſtar* and Mr. *Girac* ſhou'd not for the future, write againſt one another: but this is to ſay very little in favour of *Coſtar*, for he having Publiſh'd all he had to ſay, could be very little injur'd by the prohibition of a future Publication. His advantage was to have his Adverſary's Hands ty'd up. "To ſpeak truly, ſays Mr. *de Girac* (e), It is not eaſie to conceive what could oblige the Lieutenant Civil to order that Mr. *Coſtar* and I ſhould not for the future write againſt one another; when I had not yet (f) begun to defend my ſelf, and my Adverſary had Publiſh'd three large Volumes, in which he had treated me in an opprobrious manner, and ſo loaded me with Calumny, that of neceſſity I muſt either refute him, or ſuffer my Reputation to be ſcandalouſly wronged. I muſt allow a School-maſter, who ſcarce knows the common Principles of Sciences, to raiſe himſelf on my Ruins, and put a value on himſelf at my expence. Notwithſtanding the Reſolution which I have taken to ſtifle my juſt Complaints againſt this Injuſtice; I cannot help ſaying of that Sentence, what an excellent Perſon (4) long ſince ſaid of a certain Emperor. *This Sentence deſtroys it ſelf, it confounds and overturns all things, and under the pretext of a fallacious Humanity, covers an unparallel'd and extreme rigour.* It binds the Hands of the Accuſed, in order to deliver him up as a Prey to his Enemies; it is a violation of oppreſſed Innocence, and a Cruelty which the ſevereſt Laws never exerciſed againſt the moſt profligate Criminals, to deprive them by a forced ſilence, of the privilege of juſtifying themſelves. It forbids Mr. *Coſtar*'s writing any more, after he hath ſo long abus'd my patience, and tired his Cruelty and rage with mangling my Reputation. Was ever a more captious, more unjuſt, or more illuſory Trick heard of?" I ought to advertiſe my Reader, that *Girac* doth not forget the Paſſage of *Tacitus* concerning *Cremutius Cordus*. For he is not contented to convince his Adverſary's Conduct of a great deal of Injuſtice; but with *Tacitus*, he obſerves the Imprudence of it, ſince the Prohibition of a Book advances its Reputation.

It is evident that an Author who employs the Magiſtrates Authority, for the ſuppreſſion of Books written againſt him, loudly proclaims his Defeat, and inability to anſwer, and increaſes the curioſity

---

(z) *In his 1ſt. Letter to Mr.* de Montauſier *at the beginning of his Reply*, fol. * 4. verſo.

(1) *Continuation of the Defence*, p. 12. l. 336.

(a) Girac. Ibid.

(2.) *Continuation*. pag. 424.

(3.) L. 334.

(b) Ibid. fol. * 5.

accuſed without Proof (F), and that ſhould rather have engaged (G) the Judges to

rioſity of the Publick for the very Books which he would ſtiſle. Whence then can it proceed that ſo many Authors, when their credit is come to that paſs, have recourſe to this Method? Is it very agreeable to declare to the whole World, that they are not able to reſiſt an oppoſing Author? Can Self-love find its account in raiſing a deſire to read thoſe Books in thoſe People, who would never buy them, upon any other account, than a Curioſity to be informed what it is the Magiſtrates have forbidden? Can Self-love, I ſay, which is ſo angry at the Contents of theſe Books, and ſo greedy of ſuppreſſing their Memory, be gratify'd by taking ſuch meaſures as directly tend to a clearer Information of the Publick in their moſt particular Contents? What Charm is there in inſerting the Sentence of prohibition of ſome Books in the *Gazettes*? Is it not the direct way to convince all *Europe* of the Scandalous neceſſity a man lies under of imploring the aſſiſtance of the Civil Magiſtrate for what he ought only to be obliged to his Pens (a)? I am apt to think that the Authors who take theſe Meaſures, don't at the bottom find them very ſatisfactory: 'Tis only a laſt ſhift to which they give the moſt conſolatory turn they poſſibly can. They endeavour to regain by virtue of their Credit, what they have loſt by their Adverſaries Pen: They would retain the Populace on their ſide; the Populace are always prone to judge the ſtrongeſt Party in the right: They would alſo prevent the Attacks of others; for how many are there who are ſilent at a Man's Injuſtice, only in proportion to the Good or Injury he is able to do by his Credit? Not to ſay that they hope a great many ignorant Readers will conclude a Book ſtuffed with Falſities, whoſe publication is forbid. It is true indeed, that ſeveral People are capable of this wretched Reaſoning; for want of conſidering that the Magiſtrates themſelves, even when they ſuppreſs a Book for Political Reaſons, do not pretend to prejudice the Publick againſt the Contents of it; they take no cognizance of them, nor do they ſet up for Judges. This ſeems one of the principal Motives which influences certain Authors to follow the ſame Conduct with *Coſtar*; a Conduct very diſhonourable, to ſay no worſe of it, and intirely Sophiſtical. Is it not a Sophiſm to change the ſtate of the queſtion? Was the Diſpute more or leſs betwixt *Coſtar* and *Girac*, concerning their reſpective Power with the Judges of the *Chatelet*? Did Mr. *Girac*, confined within his Province, pretend to have more Friends, or greater Intereſt in the Capital City, in order to ſolicite a Proceſs? The Queſtion was, whether *Voiture*'s Thoughts were juſt or no, and whether he had been juſtly cenſur'd and ill defended. What does it avail to this Queſtion, to have intereſt enough with the Lieutenant Civil to ſuppreſs a Book?

(F) *He was not accuſed without Proof.*] It is very indecent for a Paſtor, a Prieſt, a Miniſter to exerciſe his Pen on Subjects of Gallantry and Raillery. Wherefore Mr. *Coſtar* who was a (b) Prieſt preferred to a Benefice, and alſo Arch-Deacon, forgot his Character, and all the Laws of Decency, when he employ'd his Wit in too licentious Gaieties with the other Sex, and in ſeveral places interſperſed his Letters with amorous Stories. His Adverſary has indeed cruelly perſecuted him on this Head, if a War ſo juſt deſerves that Name. On this Paſſage in a Letter of *Coſtar* to a Maid, *Your nimble Feet dance to that degree of Perfection, that they mount above your Head, and help to ſhew the forked Tree, and repreſent a thouſand other diverting Sights*; *Girac* ſays, (c) that when *the Arch-deacon ſaw this young Gentlewoman in this pleaſant poſture, he was not ſo hard hearted as that Anachoret* (d), who turned the Hair of ſome young Girls perfectly grey, becauſe they told him in raillery, that he durſt not ſee them naked. *Mr.* Coſtar, *ſays he, is too gallant a Man to impoſe ſuch ſevere Penances on the Ladies; and if ſuch an Adventure ſhould happen to him, I dare ſwear for him that he had rather never have a gray hair himſelf than cover the Heads of thoſe unhappy Wretches with any ſuch* (e). He will not pardon this Prieſt for ſaying in a Letter to a Lady, where he repreſents himſelf at the point of Death: (f) *I cannot tell where I ſhall ſuffer my Purgatory: 'twou'd be a moſt agreeable conſolation, if I might be permitted to ſuffer it in your Chamber; I ſhould be ſtruck with ſuch an inexpreſſible joy to ſee you ſo charming,* &c. Nor will he pardon the Pity he beſtows on one of the *Graces* on account of the impotence of her Husband. (g) *He rails againſt the Poets for their Cruelty and Impertinence in marrying one of the Graces to Vulcan, and another to Sleep. Nevertheleſs* (he goes on) *the firſt was not wholly diſconſolate, if what a Queen of the Amazons ſaid be true, that lame Men liſe the beſt, ἄριστα χωλὸς οἰφεῖ. But* " he deplores the miſerable condition of the ſecond, " *ſince Virgil has told us that Sleep is ſoft,* Et ſomno " mollior herba. *An excellent quality in the Husband* " *of a Goddeſs perpetually young. 'Twas a mighty hap-* " *pineſs for him that Paſithea (ſo ſhe is called) was ſoluta* " Zona, *as were all the Graces,* & ſoluti Gratiæ Zonis, " *or elſe*

" *Quærendum aliunde foret* (nervoſius illud)
" *Quod poſſet zonam ſolvere virgineam.* "

His Explication of theſe words in *Horace*, (h) *Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus vidi docentem*, was not forgotten. I have cited it in the Article *Sicyone*. He is charged with groſſer Impurities (i) extracted from his Works in print: He is alſo cenſured for a Letter he wrote to his Phyſician, which indeed was not printed; but as he (k) diſtributed Copies of it in all parts, he was without ſcruple publickly blamed for it. He had ſtill ſome remains of a Fever on him, and finding two Nights ſucceſſively that Nature was very briſk, he wrote this agreeable News (l) to his Phyſician, deſiring to be inform'd whether he might rely on an old Proverb, which repreſents this Symptom as a good ſign of convaleſcence. This Letter being but ſhort and in Latin, I ſhall make no difficulty to Print it at large. (m) *Febris mea longe remiſſior fuit quam fuerat hactenus, hac nocte placidiſſime quievi, haud ſcio an uſquam melius. Sub ortum Solis* (*neque enim tibi & medico & amiciſſimo viro quicquam reticere æquum eſt*) *valida tentigine, & ſatis diuturna & non inſuavi, quod & heri acciderat, correptus ſum. Luſit animus aliquantulum in umbra voluptatis, ſed ne de Teologo male ſentias, dormiebam. Vides mi colendiſſime, ſeu potius mi jucundiſſime ſenex, nondum in m funeratam eſſe eam partem corporis, cui apodixim defunctoriam ſcribere paratus eram. Vetus verbum eſt, id jam jam redituræ ſanitatis argumentum indubitatum eſſe. Verum uni tibi plus credo quam univerſis adagiis. Si commodum eſt ad me reſcribas velim hac de re quid ſentias, hoc eſt quid ſentire debeam. Ride, vale, & me ama, alioquin nec ridebo, nec valebo.* *Balzac* having read this Letter, wrote to *Coſtar* amongſt other things (n): " Now that I ſee by your Billet to Mr. *le Gouſt*, " that you are not contented with Health alone, " but pretend to ſtrength, and look rather like a " vigorous Wreſtler than a Man that is barely well, " I don't know, &c. " We ought indeed to confeſs, that theſe Reproaches regarded Mr. *Coſtar*'s Morals; but this was no reaſon why the *Chatelet* ſhould ſuppreſs Mr. *Girac*'s Reply; ſince it could by no means be taken for a Libel, becauſe the Author put his Name to it, and proved his Accuſations.

(G) *Rather engage the Judges to licenſe.*] A Critical Book which pathetically repreſents to a Prieſt, the ill uſe he makes of his Time and Wit, is no unprofitable work. On the contrary, the publick good ſeems neceſſarily to require that ſome Men ſhould be bold enough to cenſure thoſe Eccleſiaſticks, whoſe life is not conformable to their Profeſſion. But this is to lead a life very incompatible with the Character of a Beneficed Prieſt and Arch-Deacon as Mr. *Coſtar* was, to ſet up for a Wit, and to ſpend the beſt part of ones time in reading Books of Gallantry, and writing to Ladies and Gentlemen on gay Subjects. One ought to leave this to the *Voitures* and *Sarazins*, and in general to thoſe whoſe Profeſſion does not reſtrain them from thoſe Trifles. Or if the Inclination be ſtrongly bent, and the Perſon have a happy Talent that way, he ought to keep in a lay-Capacity, and then he is free to Write Verſes and Letters of Gallantry at pleaſure. He may jeſt and trifle in his Books at diſcretion, and laugh at the ſour Cenſurer who is diſpleas'd at it. But if he enters on an Eccleſiaſtical ſtate, and takes on him the charge of Souls, or is only a Prieſt without Benefice, he ought to reſtrain his Tongue and his Pen from all thoſe freedoms. Nay, I think it were to be wiſhed, that the Rewards which the *Voiture*'s, the *Sarrazin*'s and other fine Wits have a juſt Title to, were not aſſign'd on the Revenues of the

Bbbbb Church

(b) Girac's Reply, Section 7. pag. 15.

(c) Ibid. pag. 19.

(e) Ibid. pag. 20.

(g) Girac, pag. 21.

(h) Od. 19. Lib. 2.

(i) *See the* Entretiens de Coſtar de Voiture pag. 200. Girac's *Reply*, pag. 23, 24. *and the news Letters againſt* Maimbourg's *Hiſt. of Calviniſm*; pag. 748.

(k) Girac, pag. 21.

(l) *His Name was* Mr. le Gouſt; *a Phyſician of* Niort.

(m) Girac, ibid.

(n) Balzac's *choice Letters* part. 2. l. 3. pag. 562. apud Girac, ibid.

to licence that to prohibit *Girac*'s Book; *Patin* misrepresents this Controversie (*H*). One cannot sufficiently wonder at the niceness of *Voiture*'s Friends, who pretended that *Girac*, for criticizing on him, deserv'd (*I*) Military Execution. The Passage which proves this, informs us that this Author was rich: As doth also a place (*K*) of *Balzac*. What I have said concerning Mr. *de Girac* in the Project of this Dictionary, shall be (*L*) one of the Remarks of this Article. You'll find in it the time of his Death, and with what Restriction one ought to understand an Elogy on him, concerning his Knowledge of the Oriental Tongues. The Judgment

Church, (*a*) as they are but too often. It certainly never was the design of those who enriched the Church, that the Estates which they bestowed on it, should serve as a Recompence for amorous Poetry, Romances or Plays. Is it credible that those who pinch'd their Families, to bestow an estate upon such as serve at the Altar, ever design'd the maintenance of those who turn their studies the same way as *Costar*, and employ their Pen as he did? Is it possible to believe that they intended to give these sorts of Authors wherewithal to (*b*) *keep a publick Table garnished with all sorts of Dainties*? All things well consider'd, it cannot be deny'd, that such a Book as *Girac*'s Reply was very proper to correct the Abuses, and for the future, to prevent a Clergy-man's distributing Copies of a Letter in which he acquaints his Physician with the resurrection of a thing, the mortification of which should have been one of his principal cares. It appears by *Balzac*'s Reflection, that the Author of the Letter desired to be congratulated on the return of his Amorous Dreams. What an exorbitant indecency! Had he only desir'd to be praised for his imitation of *Petronius* in that Letter, he had justly deserved a Censure.

(*H*) Patin *misrepresents this Controversy.*] His Words, are—— "(*c*) A Second Tome of Mr. *Costar*'s Letter is under the Press. Mr. *Paul Thomas*, "Sieur *de Girac*, Counsellor (*d*) of the Presidial of "*Angoulême*, and an intimate Friend of Mr. *Balzac*, "had a Dispute with Mr. *Costar*, in defence of *Balzac* against *Voiture*. There is something of it "Printed. Mr. *de Girac* has answer'd him, and sent "his Copy hither. Mr. *Costar* was advised of it "and has presented a Petition to hinder the Impression of the Book, and obtained an Order against the Printing of it: And what was already "begun was seiz'd; and yet *Balzac* is better than "*Voiture*." Who would not infer from these words, that *Voiture* was engaged in a Controversy with *Balzac*, and that *Girac* appear'd as Protector of the latter against the former? which is utterly false. *Voiture* never had any Dispute with *Balzac*: *Balzac*, after *Voiture*'s Death, criticis'd his famous Sonnet of *Uranie*; but this was not the subject of the Quarrel betwixt *Costar* and *Girac*. If *Guy Patin* was not better informed in his other News from the Common-wealth of Learning than in this, unhappy are they who rely on him. *Sorel* had much better Intelligence, he (*e*) relates the Affair exactly as it was, and doth not forget to tell us, (*f*) *That* Girac*'s last Reply, tho' the Impression was stopp'd, was not long since Publish'd. Some are of Opiontion, adds he, that Mr.* Girac *does very well to defend himself; others say, he ought not to have extended this quarrel beyond the death of* Costar, *who consequently cannot reply.* These last words are liable to censure. *Sorel* speaks of *Girac* as of a Man who was alive in the Year 1667, when he had been dead four Years. He speaks of his Reply as of a Work just Published; and yet it was Printed (g) in the Year 1660. He ought to have blamed those who censured *Girac* for continuing this War after *Costar*'s Death. Such Censures were very unreasonable, since *Girac*'s reply was Printed in *Costar*'s life time; and if it was not Sold, 'twas because *Costar* had Interest enough to hinder it. Was it then just under pretence that he was dead, that is to say, that he could no longer oppress his Adversary by his Interest with the *Chatelet*, to deprive the Author of his right of Publishing his Vindication, and the Bookseller of the means to recover the Mony spent for the Impression?

(*I*) *Deserved military Execution.*] It is *Costar* who informs us of it. "(*h*) To speak truth, a Man of "this Humour is very liable to be beaten, (I "mean with the Tongue and Pen) for we "don't live in an Age so licentious as that, when "the young Roman Gentlemen walked in the "Streets the whole day, with long Rods conceal'd "under their Robes, (*i*) to chastize the insolence "of those who dislik'd the Poet *Lucilius*, if they "were so unhappy as to fall in their way. Nevertheless Mr. *Girac* is in danger of quartering some "*Gens d'Armes*, if they pass through *Angoulême*; "and I wonder that he who is not used to neg"lect his Interest, but has always been very care"ful of his Affairs, should forget what a certain "Captain told him two or three years ago: *out of* "*respect to the Marquis* de Montausier, *I will pre*"*vent my Company quartering upon you; he is a Lord* "*to whom I owe every thing: But 'tis on this condi*"*tion, that for the future you write no more against* "Voiture (*k*). I can scarce imagin what could so effectually put Mr. *de Girac* in heart, notwithstanding "those menaces, unless he fancied that being a cele"brated Author, he had no occasion for the "recommendation of any body, and that his Book "alone would prove an inviolable safeguard against "the Soldiers." He afterwards alledges the consideration *Alexander* shew'd for *Pindar*'s House, and that of *Alfonsus* King of *Arragon* for a Seat of *Cicero*; and concludes with these words: *I know all this and something more; notwithstanding all which, if Mr.* de *Girac was my Friend, I would not advise him to depend on those great Examples; but to take care of better Security against the Captain Protector and Avenger of the Wits.* Can any thing be more extravagant than this Captain's Pretension? He would have every body like *Voiture*; none must find any fault in that Author; and he who presumes to criticise on this Wit, is threatned of having his Company quarter'd in his Village. Is not this to prepare a fine Vengeance on account of a Friend? Is not this to introduce a Military Government in the Republick of Letters, the most free state in the World? These are the effects of prepossession: *Voiture*'s Relations and Friends had a mind to make him the Pope of Wit, and to constitute him an Infallible and Orthodox Rule on that Subject. They should at least have been contented with the Excommunications of *Parnassus* against those who should dispute the infallibility of such a Pontif. But they threatened the quartering of Soldiers. A strange way of converting Hereticks in Wit? Does not this resemble the *French* Dragooning?

(*K*) *As doth a place in* Balzac.] *Girac* answering his Adversary on the Threats of this Captain Revenger of the Wits, declares; (*m*) *That he had hitherto been so happy as to have no Soldiers quarter'd in his Village.* He was then Lord of a Village (); and by what follows, it appears that his Lands were very well Wooded: (*n*) *The Place in the* Dissertation, *which you desire should be clear'd, is a piece of his History.* Those *Silvæ* which now employ (*o*) Mr. *de Girac*, are not *Metaphorical ones, of the same nature with those of* Statius *or* Politian. *But in the common Language, it is a Wood which he has caused to be felled, and which he has sold for* 1500 *Pistoles. But if* Diana *and the Nymphs, the Dryades, and Hamadryads*, Pan *and the* Sylvans; *if this whole* Train of petty Gods *could but find a Poet at their Devotion, what Elegiacal Complaints, what Iambick Imprecations should we see levelled against another Poet, who has so cruelly chased them from their ancient Abode, who has wounded and murder'd the Nymphs with the hard blows of the Ax, which has given them the last fatal stroke, by felling the sacreed Trees in which they inhabited?*

Non sine Hamadriadis fato, prostrata bipenni
Alta cadit quercus: clausam sub cortice Nympham
Mors eadem plantamque manet.

(*L*) *Shall be one of the Remarks.*] I freely declar'd that I thought Mr. *Girac* was in the wrong to blame *Costar* on account of the Lions Marrow, wherewith several Authors say that *Achilles* was fed: And thereupon I made the following Remark. By this we do not pretend to derogate from his Merit, or adjudge the Victory to his Adversary. It

---

(z) See the Article of [illegible] Remark. (a) See the Art. of [illegible] Remark M.

(b) The Menagiana of the 1st Dutch Ed. See this of Costar.

(c) In a Letter, dated [illegible] being the [illegible] of the last Edit. and the [illegible] of the [illegible].

(d) This doth not at all agree with Girac's Letter to Mr. de Montausier of the 6th of Mar. 1660 Printed at the beginning of his Reply, where he saith: Having all my Life profess'd my Hatred of Law-suits, and that I would as much as possible endeavour after that tranquility and ease of Mind, which are incompatible with the Fatigues, the Tricks and Quirks of the Bar; I heartily renounce the prosecution of Injuries which I have receiv'd. See also his Reply. Sect. 12. pag. 93.

(e) Bibl. Françoise, chap. 7. last Section

(f) Ibid. pag. 142. Edition of 1667.

(g) At Leiden, in 8.

(h) Suite de la Defense. p. 40, 41.

(i) [illegible] Lucilius, [illegible]

(k) [illegible]

(l) [illegible] Dissertation [illegible]

(m) In his Dissertation against Voiture, he says, Qui enim [illegible] in illis occupatus [illegible] plenus & infinitis [illegible] mine.

(n) Balzac, [illegible] p. [illegible] Says: My Friend, tho' as great a Poet, and of a Genius as highly elevated as the best Poets, is at present employ'd in greater Thoughts. For a small triple of five thousand Crowns, he has made a Complaisance of clearing the Shades, &c.

(o) Chevreau, Oeuvres meslées p. 350.

The Judgment of Mr. *Chevreau* concerning theſe two Celebrated Combatants, *Girac* and *Coſtar*, decides intirely for the former (*M*). I doubt not but the moſt Intelligent would agree with *Chevreau*, if they would take the pains to examine all the pieces of this Controverſy: Thoſe who ſhould ſearch to the bottom of this Diſpute, would find a new Reaſon to paſs Sentence againſt *Coſtar*, for uſing Mr. *Balzac* very Ill. On which account he is ſeverely Cenſured in the Preface to the Diſcourſes of the latter. Monſ. *du Rondel*, who when Young was a great admirer of *Balzac*, and is ſo ſtill as much as ever (*N*), was ſo incenſed at this Conduct of *Coſtar*, that he hardly forbore Writing againſt him.

THORIUS (*Raphael*) a Phyſician and Latin Poet, who Flouriſhed in *England* in the Reign of King *James* the Iſt. * A Letter of his is Printed *de cauſa morbi & mortis Iſaaci Caſaubon*. His complaint in Verſe on occaſion of *Caſaubon's* Death was alſo Publiſhed. His Poem on Tobacco (*A* △) is very much eſteem'd. I am of Opinion that he did not in the leaſt doubt the Truth of the Maxim, † that Water drinkers never make good Verſes. The Circumſtance of his Life, which gave him the greateſt Trouble, was perhaps Monſ. *de Peireſc's* Obliging (*A*) him to drink a large Glaſs of Water. King *James* deſired to hear the Story, which is very diverting.

TIBARENIANS,

If on the one ſide *Coſtar's* thoughts ſeem more ſhining and higher Coloured by the Sun of the Capital City, as Mr. *de Balzac* would ſay, it appears on the other ſide that Monſ. *de Girac* had more depth, and it was a great loſs that he died ſo Young. In a Word *I readily ſubſcribe* (*m*) with Monſ. *Colomies*, but with the reſtriction hereafter mentioned, *to the fine Elogy which Monſ.* de Balzac *beſtows on Mr.* de Girac *in one of his Latin Letters*, and which Mr. *Colomies* (*n*) cites, as well as to the praiſes which *Balzac* gives him in *French* (*o*); and to thoſe of Father *Gaudin* in the Preface to his Dictionary (*p*). According to that Preface Monſ. *de Girac* died the 2d. of *January*, 1663. Mr. *Colomies* makes him dye in *April* following. However his Death ſhould not have been wholly unknown, as it was to *Sorel*, when he Publiſhed his *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*, in 1664. and when he renewed and inlarged it in 1667, where he treats of the Controverſy betwixt *Coſtar* and *Girac* ſomewhat at large. On which Head alſo ſee *Guy Patin's* 74th Letter. The difference amongſt Authors concerning the Death of Illuſtrious Men is incredible: And yet that Subject doth not ſeem liable to many Variations.

The Reſtriction I promiſed is as follows. Mr. *de Balzac* writing to *Scipio le Gaillard* (ſo Mr. *Coſtar* (*r*) explains this Author's *Scipioni jucundi*) averts that Mr. *Girac* underſtood Latin, Greek and Hebrew to an incredible degree. (*s*) *Habeo jam certe quicum non ſolum ſuaviſſimo ſermone horas conſumo, ſed etiam a quo recedo ſemper & melior & doctior. Paulum Thomam à Giraco, paternâ virtute, ſua virtute clariſſimum; rerum divinarum & humanarum cognitione inſtructum, à prima adoleſcentia: litteris Latinis, Græcis, Hebraicis ſupra quam credibile eſt, ornatum; omnibus denique & naturæ & artis præſidiis ad dicendum, ad ſcribendum paratum.* From which Character Mr. *Coſtar* takes occaſion to Rally his Adverſary. He repreſents (*t*) him ſo deeply engaged with the Bulky Volumes of the *Latins*, *Greeks*, *Hebrews*, *Arabians*, &c. that he was leſs ſenſible of the Beauties of Modern Authors, than of thoſe that appear in ſome *dead or oriental Language*, and ſpending the beſt of his time on a *Scholiaſt on* Lycophron, or *perhaps on* Rabbi Nepthalim. On which account Monſ. *Girac* tells him: *Perhaps you think* (*b*) *that you have odiouſly Reproached me, with what, if it were true, I ſhould take for a great Honour; but as I always act with ſincerity and truth, you may if you pleaſe be informed, that my Studies are not yet much advanced beyond the Greek and Latin Tongues; that I ſcarce underſtand the Principles of the Holy Languge, and am intirely Ignorant of the Arabick and Oriental Languages, which you mention to cry me down.* This was acting like a Man of Honour who would not take advantage a of the flatteries of his Friend, to impoſe on the publick; he doth not deſerve that theſe words of *Horace* ſhould be applied to him, (*c*) *Sed vereor ne cui de te plus quam tibi credas.* This is properly to make a good uſe of this Diſtich of *Cato*:

Cum te aliquis laudat, judex tuus eſſe memento:
Plus aliis de te quam tu tibi credere noli.

If Mr. *Colomies* had obſerved *Girac's* Anſwer, he had not mentioned him in his *Gallia Orientalis*.

(*M*) *The Judgment of Mr.* Chevreau---*decides intirely for* Girac.] The particulars of this deciſion are theſe. "(*d*) I dare aver——that there is a very conſiderable difference betwixt Mr. *de Girac*, and Mr. *Coſtar*: "The firſt puſhes with all his Force; and the other "Shuffles and does not Pary at all; Or to ſpeak "plainer, Mr. *Coſtar* does his utmoſt to reſiſt truth "and reaſon by dint of common Places; and Contents himſelf with denying what the other proves. "To re-aſſume the former Figure. The one charges home and puts by every Paſs in his way: The "other Rallies as well as he can, and diſputes what "he is aſſured never to obtain. The Victor is aſtoniſhed at the Weakneſs of his Enemy; and the "Vanquiſhed rails at him with a good Grace.

(*N*) *And is ſo ſtill as much as ever.*] On his reading the firſt Tome of the *Melanges* of *Vigneul Marville* he wrote to me: "(*e*) Several other things "(*f*) pleaſe me in this Miſcellany: but there are two "or three which I do not like; particularly amongſt the reſt what he ſays of *Balzac*. Such a "Man ſhould not be mentioned without Reſpect and "Veneration. Without him our Language at this "time had been Wavering and Uncertain; and we "are obliged to him for being able to Speak and "Write. It is true that in the Examples he has left "us he ſeems to brave rather than Inſtruct us His "Elevation is ſo Lofty, ſo Nervous, ſo Majeſtical, "and he maintains himſelf ſo well in his extent and "height, that he is perfectly Inacceſſible. But it is not "his fault if no body has followed him: This cannot detract from his extraordinary Merit, the vigour of his courſe, and the beauty of his carrier; "he is rather the more Conſpicuous for it. Let the "*Voitures* be allowed to write handſomly, naturally "and in the common Style; herein they ſucceed very "well, and they cannot do better. But let us not be "angry with *Balzac*, for being exalted above "Mankind, by the moſt Charming, moſt Noble, "and moſt Glorious Attempt that was ever made. "Before him the ſublime Style was unknown in "*France*, and our Language was thought uncapable "of it. But he has plainly evinced the contrary; "and becauſe in opening our Eyes he has diſplayed "his Addreſs and Courage, we cannot pardon him "the diſcovering our Stupidity and Sloth. This is "the conſequence of Converſing with inſenſible "Wretches; we awake them to our prejudice, and "becauſe they cannot deſpiſe us, they will not fail to "hate us.

If you find here ſome lively Marks of the Admiration of *Balzac*, you may alſo obſerve the fertile effect of an Admiration ſo juſt. Mr. *du Rondel* clearly diſcovers that he is able to imitate what he ſo much values in this great Model of Majeſtick Eloquence.

(*A* △) *His Poem on Tobacco is very much eſteemed.*] The *Oxford* Catalogue, mentions an Engliſh and Latin Edition of it at *London* 1651. in 8. *Hymnus Tabaci, or a Poem in Honour of Tobacco.* Mr. *Paſch*, Philoſophy Profeſſor at *Kiel*, cites an Edition of *Utrecht* 1644. in 12. in the 6th Chap. (*g*) of his Treatiſe *de inventis nov-antiquis*. Mr. *Konig* (*h*) ſpeaks of an Edition of 1628. in quarto at *Leyden*. But this is not the firſt; for Mr. *de Zuylichem*, in the Year 1625 wrote ſome Verſes *in Patologiam Raphaelis Thorii*, which are at the end of *momenta deſultoria*. Where you will alſo find ſome *Latin* Verſes compoſed by the ſame Author and *Thorius*, one againſt the other by way of an Amicable Combat.

(*A*) Monſ. *de Peireſc's obliging him to drink a large Glaſs of Water.*] Mr. *Peireſc* dining at *London* with

ſeveral

† Nulla placere diu nec vivere carmina poſſunt, Quæ ſcribuntur aquæ potoribus. *Horat. epiſt.* 19. *lib.* 1.

(*e*) *Monſ.* du Rondel's *Letter from* Maeſtricht, *dated* July 10. 1700.

(*f*) He Remarked to me ſeveral places which he liked in that Book.

(*g*) *Pag.* 475. of the 2d. Edit. at *Leipſick*, 1700.

(*h*) Konig Biblioth. pag. 805.

TIBARENIANS, † an Aſiatick People bordering on the *Euxin* Sea. They were Famous for two very remarkable Cuſtoms, the latter of which ſeems conſequential of the former. They * were extremely addicted to Sporting, and Laughing, in which they placed their chief Good; and when their Wives were Delivered, they kept their Beds, played the Sick Perſons, and received from their Spouſes all the Nurſing attendance which in other places is rendred to Child-Bed Women. It is plain this Cuſtom was only owing to their prevalent buffooning Humour, which extracted matter of Diverſion from every thing. Several Authors (*Y*) mention this laſt Cuſtom, which was alſo in uſe α in the Iſle of *Corſica*. *Lancelotti* of *Perugia* (*Z*) unjuſtly inſults *Diodorus Siculus* on this Subject. *Theodoret* β obſerves that after the *Tibarenians* had received the Goſpel, they abrogated a Cruel Law obſerved amongſt them, which obliged them to throw their Old People head-long from a Precipice.

TIBUR, a City of *Italy* near to, and older than *Rome*, called at preſent *Tivoli*. It was Built on the River γ *Anio*, either by the *Aborigines*, according to ‖ *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*, or by a parcel of ‡ *Peloponneſian Greeks*, as ſeveral Authors believe. It was in a very Flouriſhing Condition (*A*) when *Æneas* Landed in *Italy*, if we may believe *Virgil*, and we find that it made a long and vigorous Reſiſtance

† [illegible] *Aſperia*.

* [illegible] Ephorus lib. 4. inquit Tibarenos ſtudio ludendi & ridendi teneri & maximam felicitatem hoc judicare. Id ib. *See alſo* Pomponius Mela lib. 1. c. 19. *who ſays* Tibareni Chalybas attingunt quibus in riſu luſuque ſummum bonum eſt.

α Diodor. Sicul. lib. 5. c. 14.

β Theodoret. de Græc. affect. ſerm. 9. p. 615.

γ *Now called* Teverone.

‖ Dionyſ. Halicarn. antiq. Roman. l. 1. c. 16. p. m. 14.

‡ *See the remark* A.

ſeveral Learned Men, could by no means obtain a Diſpenſation from a Health which Dr. *Thorius* impoſed. The Glaſs was extraordinary large, for which reaſon Mr. *Peireſc* excuſed himſelf a long while, and alledged a thouſand reaſons; but all in vain, he was obliged to drink it: But before-hand he contracted with the Doctor that he ſhou'd drink a Health in his turn. After which he filled the ſame Glaſs with Water, drank it, and named the Health to *Thorius*. At which thunder-ſtruck, and finding no way to avoid it, after ſeveral profound ſighs he put his Mouth a thouſand times to the brim of the Glaſs and as often withdrew it: He call'd to his Aſſiſtance all the Sentences of the Greek and Latin Poets, and was almoſt all day at ſeveral times in emptying this accurſed Cup. You will find it more agreeably related by *Gaſſendus*, in the following words. (*k*) *Contigit ut in quodam virorum doctorum convivio, Doctor Thorius ipſi Peireskio ingenti Scypho præbiberit: Ac ille quidem ſe excuſare, ob vaſtitatem pateræ; ob merum inſolitum; ob imbecillem ſtomachum; ob compotandi infrequentiam: verum cùm nihil admitteretur, petiit, ut ſaltem ſibi liceret, poſtquam Thorio feciſſet ſatis, ſuo arbitrio præbibere. Annuerunt omnes, ac tum aſſumptis, quaſi adigente neceſſitate animis, fœcundum hauſit calicem, eodemque mox aquâ oppleto, Thorio intentans præbibit, totumque rurſus (tanquam inſolitum temperaturus merum) abſorpſit. Ille quaſi fulmine ictus, delapſuſve è nubibus, vix tandem ad ſe rediit, & quia ex condicto agebatur, neque reſilire fas erat, tam longa ſuſpiria è pectore duxit, toties admovit, removitque ora, tot interea carmina ex omnibus Græcis, Latiniſque Poetis profudit, ut diem penè contriverit inſtillandæ aquæ in inſuetum guttur. Atque id ipſum eſt, quod Rex cùm audiiſſet ex aliis, ex Peireskii ore accipere voluit.*

(*Y*) *Several Authors mention this* —— *Cuſtom.*] I ſhall content my ſelf with citing theſe Verſes of *Appollonius*.

(*a*) Σώοντο πάρεξ Τιβαρηνίδα γαῖαν:
Ἔνθ᾽ ἐπεὶ ἄρ κε τέκωνται ὑπ᾽ ἀνδράσι τέκνα γυναῖκες,
Αὐτοὶ μὲν στενάχουσιν ἐνὶ λεχέεσσι πεσόντες.
Κράατα δησάμενοι· ταὶ δ᾽ εὖ κομέουσιν ἐδωδῇ
Ἀνέρας, ἠδὲ λοετρὰ λεχώϊα τοῖσι πένονται.

Eruperunt ad Tibarenorum terram.
Ibi, cum è viris gravidæ mulieres reddiderunt fœtum,
Ipſi verſantur in gemitu, & puerperio cubant,
Capitibus circumvinctis: illæ rurſus molliter curant eſcis
Præbitis viros, & puerperæ ipſis lavacra calfaciunt.

Valerius Flaccus ſays (*b*) the ſame of them; and if the Teſtimony of two Poets be inſufficient, the Reader may beſides find that of an Hiſtorian in the Remark *A* of the Article *Nymphodorus*.

(*Z*) Lancelotti *of* Perugia *unjuſtly Inſults.*] He Publiſhed a Treatiſe entitled, *Farfalloni de gli antichi Hiſtorici*, where he treats (*c*) *Diodorus Siculus* very ill "becauſe in the 14th Chap. of his 5th Book, "he affirms that the Corſican Women as ſoon as delivered, quitted their Beds to their Husbands who "lay in in their ſtead. Nothing is more common in "the greateſt part of *America*; or what is reported "of *Canada*, and ſeveral other places, ought to paſs "for Impoſture: Which is very unlikely, conſidering "the Character of the People who inform us of it, and "that they cannot all agree to deceive us. I wonder that *la Mothe le Vayer* doth not mention the *Tibarenians* and the Antient *Spaniards*. (*d*) Γεωργοῦσί τε γὰρ αὗται, τεκοῦσαί τε διακονοῦσι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐκείνους ἀνθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν κατακλίνασαι. *Mulieres enim agros colunt, & cum pepererunt, ſuo loco viros decumbere jubent, iiſque miniſtrant.* Mr. *Colomies* (*e*) believed that this pleaſant Cuſtom which formerly obtained in *Bearn*, *that when a Woman was Delivered ſhe did riſe, and put her Husband to Bed*, was derived from the Spaniards. He adds, *that it was practiſed by the Tartars, according to the Teſtimony of* Paulus Venetus, *chap.* 41. *of the 2d Book of his Voyages.* Note, that various cauſes might engage theſe Nations to this Cuſtom; for it is not probable that the Humour of turning Humane Life into Ridicule, in order to attain the Felicity which they placed in Laughter, engaged the Antient Corſicans and the American Nations to agree with the Tibarenians in this practice. I wou'd willingly be informed on what reaſons the Nations of *Canada* &c. found this uſage. Would they by the hopes of a delicious Food excite a Man to get more Children; or do they believe that playing the Nurſe would make him leſs willing to get his Wife with Child? But perhaps we ſhou'd find our ſelves very much puzzled to diſcover a reaſon for ſuch a ridiculous Uſage.

(*A*) *In a very flouriſhing Condition when Æneas Landed in* Italy.] *Virgil* reckons it amongſt the great Cities which Armed againſt the *Trojans*.

Quinque (f) adeò magnæ, poſitis incudibus, urbes
Tela novant, Atina potens, Tiburque ſuperbum,
Ardea, Cruſtumerique & turrigeræ Antemnæ.

Leandro Alberti ſo wretchedly miſunderſtood this place, that he aſſures us that *Tibur* was one of the Cities which forged Arms for *Æneas*. *N'e fatto anche memoria*, ſays he (*g*), *d'eſſa città da Vergilio nel ſettimo libro annoverandola fra quelle cinque città che fabricarono l'armi ad Enea coſi,*

Quinque adeo, &c.

Virgil in the ſame Book mentions their two Chiefs who went to the War againſt *Æneas*:

Tum (h) gemini fratres Tiburtia mœnia linquunt,
Fratris Tiburti dictam cognomine gentem,
Catillusque, acerque Coras, Argiva juventus.

Lloyd makes uſe of this paſſage to prove that *Catillus* and *Coras* built *Tibur*; but he Falſifies the Text, by reading *mœnia condunt* inſtead of *mœnia linquunt*. This is a way to make Citations prove whatever we pleaſe, and to deceive the poor Reader. But we ought not to look for an Authority for the building of this City in theſe words of *Virgil*, but in thoſe of his Commentator *Servius*. *De Græcia*, ſays he (*i*), *tres fratres venerunt ad Italiam: Catillus, Coras, Tybur vel Tyburnus. Hi ſimul omnes unam fecere civitatem & eam de fratris majoris nomine Tybur appellaverunt: licet & alias fecerint ſinguli.* *Pliny* aſcribes the Foundation of this City to one of theſe three only, who he tells us was *Tiburtus* the Son of *Amphiraus*. I have elſe where (*k*) cited his words, which affording ſomething very particular, I would adviſe the Reader to turn to them. Others pretend that the three

---

(*k*) Gaſſendus in vita Peireskii, lib. 2. ad ann. 1606. Operum tom. 5. pag. 263. col. 2.

(*a*) Apollonius, Argonaut. lib. 2. v. 1012. p. m. 242.

(*b*) Valer. Flaccus, Argonaut. lib. 5. v. 148.

(*c*) La Mothe le Vayer, Obſervations ſur la compoſition des Livres tom. 15. *of his Works* p. 50. *edit. of* Paris, 1681. *in* 12. *he cites the 9th* Fartalloni.

(*d*) Strabo lib. 3. pag. m. 114.

(*e*) Colomies, mélanges hiſtoriques pag. 11.

(*f*) Virgil. Æneid. l. 7. v. 629.

(*g*) Leandro Alberti, deſcritt. di tutta l'Italia fol. 147. verſo, edit. Venet. 1561.

(*h*) Virgil. ib. v. 670.

(*i*) Servius in Virgil. Æn. 7. v. 670.

(*k*) *In the Remark* M *of the Article* Amphiaraus.

ſtance againſt the Roman Arms †, before it ſubmitted to that Victorious Republick. To which it was at laſt Conſtrained in the Year of *Rome* * 403. It is reported of this City, that they ſo haughtily Upbraided the Romans with their Services to that Republick, that their Deputies could obtain no other Anſwer than, *a you are Proud*. This City diſcovered a particular Devotion (B) for *Hercules*, in Honour of which God, they built a moſt Magnificent Temple. She alſo Zealouſly Worſhipped the God (C) *Tiburnus*. The Romans built ſeveral Country Houſes in the Territories of this City, which hath alſo been cuſtomary in the latter Ages. The Inhabitants of *Tibur* were put to the ſword by *Totila*'s Soldiers in 545. as *Procopius* informs us. The German Wars ruined this City: *Frederick Barbaroſſa* ‡ cauſed the Walls to be re-built, and enlarged it. Pope *Pius* the IId, ordered a Fortreſs to be built there, at the Entrance of which is the following Inſcription of *Giovanni Antonio Campani*.

Grata ‖ bonis, inviſa malis, inimica ſuperbis
Sum tibi Tibur enim ſic Pius inſtituit.

Lloyd

three Brothers mentioned by *Servius* were *Amphiraus*'s Grandſons, and the Sons of *Catillus*. (l) *Tibur, ſicut Cato facit teſtimonium, a Catillo Arcade præfecto claſſis Evandri: ſicut Sextius, ab Argiva juventute. Catillus enim Amphiarai filius poſt prodigialem patris apud Thebas interitum Oeclei (m) avi juſſu, cum omni fœtu ver ſacrum miſſus tres liberos in Italia procreavit, Tiburtum, Coram, Catillum, qui depulſis ex oppido Siciliæ veteribus Sicanis, a nomine Tiburti fratris natu maximi urbem vocaverunt.* Salmaſius's Cenſure on this paſſage of *Solinus* is very unjuſt. He ſtrangely exclaims againſt this Author. (n) *Sanum putamus fuiſſe Solinum cum hæc ſcriberet? Quis Siciliam pro Italia ſanus dixit? ——Scio Sicanos Italiam olim tenuiſſe —— Sed Italiam dictam fuiſſe Siciliam, nemo, quod ſciam, prodidit; falſiſſimum igitur, & abſurdiſſimum eſt, quod heic narrat Solinus.* But preſently he grows ſomewhat cooler, he ſuppoſes the Fault is owing to ſome wretched Pedant who foiſtered a Gloſs into the Text of this Author. (o) *Sed fortaſſe ita ſcripſerat:* qui depulſis veteribus Sicanis, a nomine Tiburti fratris natu maximi urbem vocaverunt, *cum ſciolus aliquis heic Sicanos legeret, ad oram videtur addidiſſe,* ex oppido Siciliæ *quia ſcilicet putaret Sicanos non alibi quam in Sicilia fuiſſe.* He did not obſerve that what he cites nine or ten Lines after confounds all his Criticiſms. (p) *Quinimo Siculos illos veteres Tibur oppidum tenuiſſe ſcribit Dionyſius lib. 1. περὶ οἷς, inquit, καὶ ἐς τόδε χρόνου, μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως ὀνομάζεται Σικελιών.* That is, part of the City *Tibur* is yet called *Sicilia* or *Sicilium*. Is not this a manifeſt Evidence that this place was ſo called before *Tiburtus* and his Brothers drove out the Sicanians? Why then doth *Salmaſius* declame againſt either *Solinus* or the preſent Text of his Book? Obſerve that *Catillus* paſſed for the Principal Founder of *Tibur*. (q) *Hinc Tibur Catille tuum*, as *Silius Italicus* hath it: To which we may add theſe two lines of *Horace:*

Nullam (r), Vare, ſacrâ vite priùs ſeveris arborem
Circa mite ſolum Tiburis, & mœnia Catili.

That this City was was of Greek Original, is unanimouſly confirmed by a vaſt crowd of Authors.

Tibur (ſ) Argeo poſitum colono
Sit meæ ſedes utinam ſenectæ!

And *Ovid* as clearly:

(t) Jam mœnia Tiburis udi
Stabant, Argolicæ quæ poſuere manus.

See alſo (a) *Strabo*, (b) *Martial* and *Artemidorus* cited by *Stephanus Byzantinus* (c).

Nor ought we to forget *Servius*'s Commentary on theſe Words, *Tiburque ſuperbum* in the 7. Æneid. *Aut nobile*, ſays he (d), *aut per tranſitum tetigit illud, quod cum aliquando a Senatu auxilia poſcerent Tyburtes ſub commemoratione beneficiorum, hoc tantum a Senatu reſponſum acceperunt*, ſuperbi eſtis.

(B) *A particular Devotion for* Hercules, *in Honour of which God they Built a moſt Magnificent Temple.*] *Statius* ranks *Tibur* amongſt the Four Places where this Deity was principally Worſhipped.

Nec (e) mihi plus Nemee, priſcumque habitabitur Argos,
Nec Tiburna domus, Soliſque cubilia Gades.

This Temple was one of thoſe Repoſitories where the Richeſt Treaſures were laid up. *Auguſtus* on occaſion drew large Sums from thence as well as from the Capitol, the Temple of *Antium*, and that of *Lanuvium*, for which he obliged himſelf to pay Intereſt: And *Appian* (f) who relates this, adds, that in his time a great quantity of holy Treaſures were kept there. The following Lines evince that the Oracles were frequently conſulted in the Temple of *Tibur*:

Quod (g) ni templa darent alias Tirynthia ſortes,
Et Prœneſtinæ poterant migrare ſorores.

This verſe is part of a *Silva* written by *Statius* in Praiſe of *Manlius Vopiſcus*'s Country Seat near *Tibur*. The Oracle of *Prœneſte* ſaith *Statius*, would be induced to leave its reſidence, and remove to this charming Place, if the Temples of *Hercules* were not already occupied by other Oracles. The Commentators on this Place are very much puzled. *Sabellicus* owns (h) that he hath never met with any thing relating to the Herculean Oracle of *Tibur*, and is inclined to believe that this paſſage rather hints at the Oracle of *Albunea*, a Deity, Worſhipped in conjunction with *Hercules*. And to this purpoſe are applyed the following Words, (i) *quodque Albuna ſacras Tiberis per flumina ſortes, portarit:* tho' with very little Reaſon, for this place hath no Relation to a *Tiburtine* Oracle, but to the Books which a *Sybil* brought to *Rome*. Another Commentator imagines that the following Lines of *Propertius* afford an Authentick Teſtimony.

Nam (l) quid Prœneſtis dubias, ô Cynthia, ſortes,
Quid petis Ææi mœnia Telegoni?
Curve te in Herculeum deportant eſſeda Tibur?
Appia cur toties te via ducit anum?

From hence it clearly appears, ſays *Barthius* (l), that *Cynthia* went to *Tibur* to conſult the Oracle, and was it not the Oracle of *Hercules*? I anſwer that *Propertius* doth not found this Voyage to *Tibur* on this motive. What he hints concerning the Oracle is only in the firſt Verſe, and *Tibur* is no more concerned in it, than the Walls of *Telegonus*, that is *Tuſculum*, and the only inference that can be made with regard to *Tibur* is that here it hath the Epithet of *Herculeum*: Which we may alſo be informed of by *Silius Italicus*.

Quoſque (m) ſub Herculeis taciturno flumine muris
Pomifera arva creant Anienicolæque Catilli;

and by ſeveral Epigrams of another (n) Author. *Leandro Alberti* has converted this Epithet into a proper Name, and to compleat his miſtake, he cites *Strabo* as well to prove this, as that the City of *Tibur* was alſo called *Cataracta*. (o) *Fu altreſi nominata queſta citta (ſecondo Strabone) Herculeum —— era anche nominata Caterratta.* When in truth *Strabo* only ſaith that there was a Temple of *Hercules* and a Cataract there; that is, that the River *Anio* fell there with a rapid Force from the Precipice of a Hill into a Valley. (p) Τίβυρα μὲν, ἐν ᾧ τὸ Ἡράκλειον καὶ ὁ καταῤῥάκτης, ὃν ποιεῖ -- ὁ Ἀνίων ἀφ᾽ ὕψους μεγάλου καταπίπτων εἰς φάραγγα βαθεῖαν. *Tibure fanum eſt Herculis & preceps aquæ dejectus (cataractam vocant) quem facit Anio——ab excelſo loco in convallem dejiciens ſeſe profundam.*

Aulus Gellius informs us of a very fine Library in this Temple. (q) *Promit è bibliotheca Tiburti, quæ tunc in Herculis templo ſatis commode inſtructa libris erat, Ariſtotelis librum.*

(C) *They alſo zealouſly Worſhipped the God* Tiburnus.] Conſult *Cluverius* in the 4th Chap. of the 3d. Book of his *Italia antiqua*, and the Commentators on theſe Words of Horace: (r) *Et præceps Anio, & Tiburni lucus.*

(D) *Several Country-Houſes.*] The Air all about this place was Healthful, good and very Temperate: The Land being watered by an infinite Number of

Rivulets

† See [illegible] Trellius [illegible]
* According to Calviſius, p. m. [illegible] According to Sigonius in Faſt. in the Year 399.
a See the Remark A at the end.
‖ Leandro Alberti deſcritt. di tutta l'Ital. f. l. m. 249.
‡ Id. eod. ind.

(l) Solin. cap. 8. p. m. 13.
(m) Leandro Alberti [illegible] ſupra [illegible]
(n) Salmaſ. exercit. Plin. in Solin. p. 61.
(o) Id. ib.
(p) Id. ib.
(q) Sil. Italic. l. 8. p. m. 345.
(r) Horat. ode 18. l. 1.
(ſ) Id. od. 6. lib. 2.
(t) Ovidius l. 4. Faſtor.
(a) Strabo lib. 5. pag. 165.
(b) Mart. epig. 57. lib. 4.
(c) Steph. Byzant. voce Τίβυ-ρις.
(d) Servius in Virgil. Æneid. 7. v. 630.
(e) Statius Silva 1. lib. 3. ſub fin. pag. m. 55.
(f) Appian. lib. 5. de bell. civili. pag. m. 339.
(g) Statius Silv. 3. lib. 1. v. 79. p. m. 55.
(h) See Barthius in Statium Silv. 3. lib. 1. p. 107.
(i) Tibullus eleg. 5. lib. 2.
(l) Propert. lib. 2. eleg. 32. pag. m. 476.
(l) Vides clare & Tibur petiiſſe Cynthiam, ad capiendas ſortes: quæ autem illæ niſi Herculeæ cum hujus præcipue numen hic jungatur. Barth. ib. pag. 108.
(m) Silius Italicus lib. 4. pag. m. 172.
(n) Martial. epig. 13. lib. 1. & epig. 62. l. 4. &c.
(o) Leandro Alberti ubi ſupra.
(p) Strab. lib. 5. pag. 164.
(q) Aul. Gellius lib. 19. c. 5.
(r) Horat. ode 7. lib. 1.

Lloyd is extremely miſtaken when he talks of the Mountain of *Tibur*, as of a place Famous (*E*) for the Ivory found there. He had better have been ſilent on this Head, and have mentioned the (*F*) Quarries with which thoſe parts abounded. We muſt not forget the Fountain and (*G*) Goddeſs *Albunea*, one of the moſt Memorable things in the Neighbourhood of *Tibur*.

TILLI

Rivulets was very fertile. 'Tis then no wonder if the *Romans* Built there ſo many Country Seats, planted ſo many Orchards, and made this place ſo much the Seat of their rural Diverſions. The Emperor *Auguſtus* from time to time retired thither. (*s*) *Ex ſeceſſibus præcipue frequentavit maritima, inſulaſque Campaniæ, aut proxima urbi oppida, Lanuvium, Præneſte, Tibur, ubi etiam in porticibus Herculis templi perſæpe jus dixit.* The Emperour *Hadrian* (*t*) Built a Magnificent Palace there; in the Neighbourhood of which *Zenobia* had a Solitary retirement. (*v*) *Manlius Vopiſcus* had a very fine Houſe in this Territory, which *Statius* (*w*) hath pompouſly deſcribed. *Cetronius* who was Guilty of ſuch enormous Extravagancies in Building, had a Palace here which diſgraced the Temple of *Hercules*.

Ædificator (*x*) *erat Cetronius, & modo curvo*
Littore Cajetæ, ſumma nunc Tiburis arce,
Nunc Præneſtinis in montibus, alta parabat
Culmina villarum, Græcis longeque petitis
Marmoribus vincens Fortunæ, atque Herculis ædem.

Shall we forget *Horace*, who had a Houſe there which he frequently reſided at, and ſo earneſtly deſired might be (*y*) the fixed retreat of his Old Age? (*z*) *Vixit plurimum in ſeceſſu ruris ſui Sabini aut Tiburtini: domuſque ejus oſtenditur circa Tiburtini lucum.* He informs us that *Munatius Plancus* had a very Beautiful Houſe (*aa*) there. What I Advanced in the beginning of this Remark might be proved by a Crowd of Witneſſes, but I ſhall content my ſelf with a few only.

Cum (*bb*) *Tiburtinas damnet Curiatius auras*
Inter laudatas ad Styga miſſus aquas.
Nullo fata loco poſſis excludere: cum mors
Venerit, in medio Tibure Sardinia eſt.

Theſe Verſes are made on the Death of a Man, whoſe Life the reſtorative Air of *Tibur* could not ſave: And the following were by the ſame Author addreſſed to *Fauſtinus*, who enjoyed the refreſhing Breezes of this Country in the Dog Days.

Herculeos (*cc*) *colles gelida vos vincite bruma,*
Nunc Tiburtinis cedite frigoribus.

I have already cited *Silius Italicus*, who calls the adjacent Lands *pomifera arva*; to which may be added theſe Verſes of *Horace*.

Et (*dd*) *præceps Anio, & Tiburni lucus, & uda*
Mobilibus pomaria rivis.

Chriſtian *Rome* hath not been leſs Charmed with the Pleaſures of *Tivoli*; for *Leandro Alberti* (*ee*) relates that the Prelates of the Court of *Rome*, anciently paſſed the Summer in this refreſhing Air. Cardinal *Hippolyto d'Eſte*, as *Moreri* obſerves, Built a very fine Palace there adorned with the moſt Magnificent Gardens in the World. *Uberto Folietta* hath Publiſhed a deſcription of it which well deſerves Reading. See alſo the *Itineraries* of *Italy*, particularly thoſe of *Andreas Schottus*, and *Geronimo Capugnani*.

(*E*) *Lloyd is extremely miſtaken when he talks —— as of a Place Famous for the Ivory found there.*] He may juſtly be accuſed of two groſs Faults. *Tiburtinus mons*, ſaith he, *locus ebore notiſſimus*; and immediately after he cites two Verſes of *Martial*, one (*a*) out of the 12 Epigram of the 7th Book, and the other (*b*) out of the 28th of the 8th Book. He plainly means that the Mountain of *Tibur* produced Ivory: whereby it appears that he was Ignorant that Elephants Teeth are the only Ivory in the World. For what *Theophraſtus* (*c*) ſaith on this Head amounts to nothing, and can by no means concern our *Tiburtine* Mountain. This is Mr. *Lloyd's* firſt error. His Second is that the firſt Verſe of *Martial* does not mention Ivory; and that the ſenſe of the Second is not what he ſuppoſes. He could make no manner of uſe of the firſt Verſe without citing the Poet's whole thought; which if he had done, all his Readers would have diſcovered that he had produced a very ill proof. Let us by the way from hence infer, that 'tis good to diſtruſt all paſſages cited by halves under the ſpecious pretext of avoiding prolixity. Is it not better to be prolix than to deceive the Readers? It is my Maxim, for which Reaſon I have generally taken care that my Citations ſhould take in the Authors whole thought. An example of the ill-effects of imperfect quotations is Mr. *Lloyd*, who only cites the firſt Verſe, and that falſly, of the whole Epigram, which runs thus,

Dum (*d*) *Tiburtinis albeſcere collibus audit*
Antiqui dentis fuſca Lycoris ebur,
Venit in Herculeos colles: quid Tiburis alti
Aura valet? parvo tempore nigra redit.

Martial's thought is that *Lycoris* having heard that old Ivory whitened on the Mountain of *Tibur*, went thither; but inſtead of bleaching her Tawny Complexion, ſhe turned Black in a ſmall ſpace of time. He had made uſe of the ſame raillery before.

Tibur (*e*) *in Herculeum migravit nigra Lycoris*
Omnia dum fieri candida credit ibi.

Ramirez de Prado (*f*) from *Pliny* aſſures us, that the Cool Air of *Tibur* improved Ivory to a purer White. He cites alſo *Propertius* and *Silius Italicus*, one of which ſaith.

Ramoſis (*g*) *Anio qua pomifer incubat arvis,*
Et nunquam Herculeo numine pallet ebur;

And the other.

Quale micat (*h*) *ſemperque novum eſt, quod Tiburis aura*
Paſcit (*i*) *ebur.*

It plainly appears that Mr. *Lloyd* hath impertinently cited the Second place of *Martial*, ſince it doth not ſignify that the *Tiburtin* Mountain furniſhed Ivory; but only that the Air there had the Virtue to blanch and brighten it as well as to repair it.

(*F*) *The excellent quarries with which thoſe parts abounded.*] Strabo (*k*) obſerves that they Furniſhed Stone for the greateſt part of the Edifices of *Rome*. The *Tiburtin* Stones were in great eſteem; they were proof againſt all Injuries of the Weather; but the Fire ſoon deſtroyed them. (*l*) *Tiburtini* (lapides) *ad reliqua fortes, vapore diſſiliunt.* Theſe Words of *Pliny* will become more intelligible by a Compariſon with theſe: (*m*) *Tiburtina vero & quæ eodem genere ſunt omnia, ſufferunt & ab oneribus & a tempeſtatibus injurias: ſed ab igni non poſſunt eſſe tuta: Simulque ut ſunt ab eo tacta, diſſiliunt & diſſipantur, ideo quod temperatura naturali parvo ſunt humore.* *Pliny* relates as a witty repartee what *Cicero* ſaid to the People of *Chios*, who out of oſtentation ſhewed him their Walls of party coloured Marble. I ſhould much more admire them, ſaid *Cicero*, if they had been Built with *Tiburtine* Stone. (*n*) *Primum, ut arbitror, verſicolores iſtas maculas Chiorum lapicidinæ oſtenderunt, cum exſtruerent muros, faceto in id M. Ciceronis ſale: omnibus enim oſtentabant ut magnificum. Multo, inquit, magis mirarer, ſi Tiburtino lapide feciſſetis.* A very Learned Man tells us that if (*o*) theſe Stones had been tranſported to the Iſle of *Chios*, they would perhaps have been more eſteemed becauſe far fetched; which is not unlikely: But I do not believe that *Cicero's* raillery turned on this; he ſeems rather to have meant this: You buy your Marble very Cheap, your Iſle produces it, don't brag therefore of the ſumptuouſneſs of your Buildings. Your Riches and Expences would appear more magnificent, if your Materials were brought from *Tibur*.

(*G*) *We muſt not forget the Fountain and Goddeſs Albunea.*] Let us begin this Note with a paſſage of Virgil.

At (*p*) *rex ſollicitus monſtris, oracula Fauni*
Fatidici genitoris adit, lucoſque ſub altâ
Conſulit Albuneâ: nemorum quæ maxima ſacro
Fonte ſonat, ſævumque exhalat opaca mephitin.
Hinc Italæ gentes, omniſque Oenotria tellus,
In dubiis reſponſa petunt.

I omit the remainder of this Paſſage, and ſhall only hint that it informs us, that thoſe who conſulted this Oracle ſlept on the Skins of their Victims, and ſleeping received their Anſwer. It doth not clearly appear from theſe words of *Virgil*, whither the God *Faunus* reſided in the *Albunean* Grove; for the Laws of Grammar will very well allow us to believe that King *Latinus* conſulted the Oracle of *Faunus*, and the ſacred Albunean Groves, that is to ſay, that he Informed himſelf of the Pleaſure of the Gods in two different places: But yet the moſt reaſonable meaning

(*s*) Sueton. in Aug. c. 72.

(*t*) See the Remark I. on the Article Hadrian.

(*v*) See the Remark C. of the Article Zenobia.

(*w*) Stat. Silva. 3. lib. 1.

(*x*) Juven. ſat. 14. v. 86.

(*y*) See the Remark A. Letter. f.

(*z*) Sueton, in vita Horatii.

(*aa*) Seu te fulgentia ſignis Caſtra tenent, ſeu denſa tenebit Tiburis umbra tui. Horat od. 7. lib. 1.

(*bb*) Martial. epig. 60. lib. 4.

(*cc*) Idem epig. 57. lib. 4.

(*dd*) Horat. ubi ſupra.

(*ee*) Leandro Alberti ubi ſupra fol. 148.

(*a*) De Tiburtinis albeſcere collibus audit. *Mart.epig.* 12. *l.* 7.

(*b*) Et Tiburtino monte quod albet ebur. *Id. epigr.* 28. *lib.* 8.

(*c*) Theophraſtus auctor eſt & ebur foſſile candido & nigro colore inveniri. *Plin. lib.* 36. *c.* 18.

(*d*) Martial. epigr. 12. lib. 7.

(*e*) Idem epigr. 62. lib. 4.

(*f*) Evenire itaque cum ſciret ebur credidiſſe fieri [illegible] gidiſſima Tiburis aura ut Plin. refertur. *Lau. Ramirez de Prado in Mart. epig.* 62. *lib.* 4.

(*g*) Propert. eleg. 7. lib. 4. ſub fin.

(*h*) Silius Italicus lib. 12. p. m. 490.

(*i*) Paſcit, dixit pro ſuſtentat & conſervat. *Ramir. de Prado ubi ſupra.*

(*k*) Strab. lib. 5. pag. 164.

(*l*) Plin. lib. 36. c. 22. pag. m. 314.

(*m*) Vitruvius lib. 2. cap. 7.

(*n*) Plinius ubi ſupra cap. 6. pag. 2[illegible].

(*o*) Rem vulgaris in eam advectus inſulam accepiſſet fortaſſis ab loci unde peteretur intercapedine pretium. *Harduin. in Plin. ib.*

(*p*) Virgil. Æn. lib. 7. v. 81.

TILLI or **THILLI**, a Lordſhip (D △) in *Brabant*, which afforded a Title to *John* Count *de Tilli*, who was Born there, and has been one of the greateſt Captains of the XVIIth Century. He is mentioned in *Moreri*'s Dictionary, under the word *Tferclas* the name of the Family of this Famous General. His Eldeſt Brother's Grand-Sons * at preſent make a very conſiderable Figure. There are three Brothers of them, all called Counts *de Tilli*. One is Canon of *Liege*; and the two other bear Arms. One of which is General of the Troops of *Liege*, and has been raiſed to the Dignity of a Prince (Z △ △) by the King of *Spain*. The other by his long Services hath been advanced to the firſt Employments in the Dutch Army. He Married a Siſter of the Count of *Reckheim*, Biſhop of *Chur*, and Canon of *Cologne* and *Saltzburg*, a Lord who by his vaſt Merit and Exalted Genius ſupports the Illuſtrious Nobility of his Houſe.

* The Letters of 1696. Mention him continually.

TIMÆUS,

ing of theſe words ſeems to be, that the King conſulted the Oracle of *Faunus* in the Sacred Albunean Grove. Againſt which a ſmall difficulty ariſes, which is, that no Perſon (that I know) has hitherto informed us that there was any Oracle of *Faunus* at *Tibur*. This City adored *Hercules* as their Chief Divinity. Their other Deities were *Tiburnus* and *Albunea*: *Faunus* was not talked of here. If we ſhould urge that *Virgil* was not here concerned to Accommodate his Fictions to Tradition, it would perhaps be more true than probable. However we may obſerve that *Albunea* was at the ſame time the Name of (q) a Grove, a Fountain and a Deity of the (r) Mountain of *Tibur*. She only appears under the Notion of a Fountain in theſe Words of *Horace*, (ſ) *& domus Albuneæ reſonantis*: In the above quoted Words of *Virgil* ſhe appears under the Notion of a Wood as well as of a Fountain; and the following place of *Lactantius* elevates Her to a Goddeſs: (t) *Decimam Tiburtinam, nomine Albuneam, quæ Tiburi colitur, ut dea, juxta ripas amnis Anienis: Cujus in gurgite Simulachrum ejus inventum eſſe dicitur, tenens in manu librum, cujus ſacra Senatus in Capitolium tranſtulerit.* That is, *Albunea* was the tenth of the *Sibyls* and Worſhipped at *Tibur* as a Goddeſs; and her Image was reported to have been found with a Book in her Hand in the Gulf of *Anio*. 'Tis alſo to be Noted that ſome are of Opinion that the Fountain *Albunea* was only another Name for thoſe Mineral Waters called *Albula* or *Albulæ*. *Strabo* (u) ſays they were Cold, that they ſprung from ſeveral Sources, and either drank or bathed in, Cured ſeveral Diſeaſes. *Pliny* (w) aſcribes to them the Virtue of Healing Wounds: But *Suetonius* (x) does not mentions them with this reſtriction. *Cluverius* (y), who believes them to be the Fountain *Albunea*, may alledge this reaſon for it: This Fountain according to *Virgil* ſtinks, (z) *Sævamque exhalat opaca Mephitim.* But according to *Martial* and ſeveral others this Quality agreed very well with the Mineral Waters called *Albula* or *Albulæ*. (aa) *Canaque ſulfureis Albula fumat Aquis.* Therefore, &c. Note, that *Albula* was a ſmall River which diſcharg'd it ſelf into the *Anio*, whoſe principal Source according to *Cluverius* was the Fountain *Albunea*. This Author believes that the Image of the *Tiburtine* Sibyl was reported to be found in this Fountain. He adds that the Ancients erected this Spring into a Divinity, and conſecrated to it a Grove, a Temple and an (bb) Oracle, and that it appears (cc) by an Epigram of *Martial* that there was a Grove conſecrated to the Muſes in this Place. But the laſt is utterly falſe, and *Cluverius* read too haſtily the following Words of *Martial*.

Itur (dd) ad Herculei gelidas quà Tiburis arces,
Canaque ſulfureis Albula fumat aquis.
Rura, nemuſque ſacrum, dilectaque jugera Muſis
Signat vicina quartus ab urbe lapis:
Hic rudis æſtivas præſtabat porticus umbras,
Heu quam, &c.

If he had conſidered them with the leaſt Attention, he would have found that they did not in the leaſt concern *Tibur* but another place in the Road thither, about four Miles from *Rome*. Nay, it is not certain that there was in this place a Grove Conſecrated to the Muſes: Perhaps *Martial* deſign'd only to repreſent *Regulus*'s Lands (a) beloved by theſe Goddeſſes. By the way we ought not to forget that the ſame Author has put a diſtance of 20 Miles betwixt *Rome* and *Tibur*.

(D △) *A Lordſhip in* Brabant.] Which *Gramaye* informs us belonged to the Houſe of *Warfuzè*, and that *Robert de Warfuzè* transferred it to *Gerard Marbais* in the Year 1389. In proceſs of time it fell into the Hands of *John le* [illegible], and was afterwards poſſeſſed by *Sanſon de Lalain*, who on the 11th of *June* 1458. Conferred the *Dominium altum & baſſum*, on *John Serclaes*, deſcended from one of the moſt Noble Patrician Families of (c) *Bruſſels*. The Lordſhip of *Tilli* was then intirely Independant, but afterwards became a Fief to the Dukes of *Brabant*, by virtue of the following Inſtrument: "(d) *John* Lord of *Thilly* transfers into the Hands of my Lord Duke, his Houſe and Lordſhip of *Tilly*, with all its Rights and Appurtenances as by him Enjoyed, and our ſaid Lord the Duke hath again Transferred the ſaid Houſe and Lordſhip, and all the Lands thereto Appertaining to the ſaid *John*, his Heirs and Succeſſors, to hold it in perpetual Fief of our ſaid Lord and his Heirs and his Succeſſors the Dukes and Dutcheſſes of *Brabant*. And the ſaid *John* held his ſaid Houſe and Lordſhip of *Thilly* of our ſaid Lord, and therefore pledges his Fealty, Homage, and Oath of Allegiance, as cuſtomary in the Court of the Fiefs of *Brabant*. And our ſaid Lord received his Homage with a Salvo to the Rights of each. Done *May* 16. in the Year 1449." This *John Serclaes* was the Father of *James t'Serclaes*, who was the Father of *Martin t'Serclaes*, Father of *John T'Serclaes* Member of the Council of War to the Emperour, who Married a Daughter of the Count of *Friſeland* (e). From which Marriage proceeded *John t'Serclaes* (f) created Count by the Emperour *Ferdinand* the II. and one of the greateſt Generals of the XVIIth Century.

(Z △ △) *Raiſed to the dignity of a Prince by the King of* Spain.] The Abridgement of the Letters Patents to this purpoſe as publiſhed by the Baron *le Roy* and dated at *Madrid* the 22. of *December*, 1697. runs thus. "(g) *Charles* by the Grace of God King of *Caſtile*, &c. Being informed that ſeveral Anceſtors of our moſt Dear and Loyal Lord *Albert T'Serclaes de Thilly*, Count of the Holy *Roman* Empire, Gentleman of our Chamber, Sergeant General in our Armies in the Low Countries, and at preſent by our permiſſion and conſent, General of the Troops of the Prince and Biſhop of *Liege*, our Ally, and others of his Family have with the utmoſt Bravery *and Reſolution done ſeveral important Services to the Emperours, Kings and Princes our *Auguſt* Predeceſſors. As alſo that the ſaid *Albert T'Serclaes de Thilly*, hath ſerved in our Armies from the Year one Thouſand Six Hundred and Sixty Six, as Captain, Lieutenant Colonel, Colonel of Horſe, and Serjeant General, and that on all occaſions which have offered in our Service he hath neither ſpared his Life or Eſtate, of which we have received the utmoſt Satisfaction which we can deſire. As well as of the Services he continues at preſent to perform in the quality of General of the Forces of the Prince and Biſhop of *Liege*, for the common cauſe, with a Zeal, Bravery and experience ſo well known to the whole World. Very well knowing beſides that the ſaid *Albert T'Serclaes de Thilly* is deſcended from a very Illuſtrious and Ancient Family, which hath always maintained its Honour, by ſeveral high and very conſiderable Alliances, and that beſides he poſſeſſes ſeveral Lands, Lordſhips, and Eſtates ſufficient to ſupport his Honour, as *Montigny*, *Farciennes*, *Prelle*, and others; and being willing for this Reaſon to raiſe and advance him to the greateſt Honours, Rights, Prerogatives, and Pre-eminences; We have of our certain Knowledge, &c. Made and Created, as we do by theſe Preſents Make and Create *Albert* Count *de T'Serclaes de Thilly*, Prince of *T'Serclaes*, conſenting and granting

(c) Patricia imprimiſque nobili apud Bruxellam ſtirpe ortu. *Le Roy* in topograph. Gallo Brabantiæ pag. 99.

(d) Id. ibi

(e) Ex eod. ibid.

(f) Id. ib

(g) Idem. Erection de toutes les terres Seigneuries & familles titrées du Brabant pag. 106.

T I M Æ U S.

TIMÆUS, a Greek Historian, the Son of an (*A*) Illustrious Father, was of † *Tauromenium* in *Sicily*, and Flourished in *Agathocles*'s time, who Died in the Fourth Year of the 129 *Olympiad*. He wrote several (*B*) Books, and amongst others, the History of his own Country. All his Works are intirely lost. He was very much addicted to Detraction (*C*), and his (*D*) Veracity was very much doubted of. His violent Resentment against *Agathocles*, and his (*E*) Affectation to do him so little Justice displeas'd some Persons. He was too strongly biassed

† Athen. lib. 6. p. 27[illegible] & alibi.

“ granting that he may bestow the said Title of
“ Prince upon the Seat and Lordship, which he
“ shall name, under our Obedience and Ju-
“ risdiction in our said Low Countries: Which
“ Seat and Lordship we have to that end erect-
“ ed, and do by these Presents erect into the Dig-
“ nity, Name, and Pre-eminence of *Principality of*
“ *T'Serclaes*, &c.

(*A*) *The Son of an Illustrious Father.*] He was the Son of *Andromachus*, who was very Famous for his Riches and excellent qualities, and in a manner the Founder of one of the most considerable Towns in *Sicily*; for he assembled all the Fugitives of *Naxus*, a City which *Dionysius* the Tyrant had ruined, and Setled them on a Hill call'd *Taurus*. This was the Original of *Tauromenium* (*a*) in the Second Year of the 106 *Olympiad* (*b*). Long before which *Dionysius* had destroyed *Naxus* (*c*). *Andromachus* reigned very mildly in his New City, and on all occasions shewed himself an Enemy to all Tyrants. He received *Timoleon*'s Troops, and animated his Subjects to his assistance in order to deliver all *Sicily* From the Yoke of Tyranny. (*d*)

(*a*) Diodorus Siculus, lib. 16. c. 7.
(*b*) Id. ib.
(*c*) Id. lib. 14. c. 16.
(*d*) *Taken from Plutarch in the Life of* Timoleon. p. 240.

(*B*) *He wrote several Books.*] Three of *Syria*, Sixty Eight *de Argumentis Rhetorica*: Ὀλυμπιονῖκαι ἢ Χρονικὰ πραξίδια, *Olympionicas seu alia Chronica*. Ἰταλικὰ καὶ Σικελικὰ *libris* 8. Ἑλληνικὰ καὶ Σικελικά. In the first of these two last Works, he writ the History of *Sicily*, as far as it was coincident with the Roman History, and in the other he describ'd the Sicilian Gests, which fell in with the Grecian History (*e*). He wrote the History of *Pyrrhus*, by it self, as we are inform'd by *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* (*f*), and these words of *Cicero*: (*g*) *Deesse mihi nolui quin te admonerem ut cogitares conjunctène malles cum reliquis rebus nostra contexere, an, ut multi Græci fecerunt, Callisthenes Troicum bellum, Timæus Pyrrhi, Polybius Numantinum: qui omnes a perpetuis suis historiis ea quæ dixi bella separaverunt.* We have already seen *Timæus*'s History represented in two Parts, the first whereof we are told was in Eight Books, but the number of the Books of the Second is not handed to us. 'Tis necessary to add, that several cite this work without observing this division; expressing in general such or such a Book of his Histories. The highest number, quoted by *Athenæus* (*h*), is the 28th Book. *Diogenes Laertius* (*i*) cites none beyond the Eighteenth.

(*e*) Vossius de Hist. Græcis, p. 82. *See* Suidas.
(*f*) Dionys. Hal. lib. 1. cap. 6.
(*g*) Cicero Epist. 12. lib. 5. ad Familiar. p. m. 255.

(*C*) *He was very much addicted to detraction.*] For which reason his strong Inclination to Censure was signify'd by some additional Letters to his Name. (*k*) Τίμαιος μὲν ὖν μεγίστην πρόνοιαν πεποιημένος, τῆς τῶν χρόνων ἀκριβείας, καὶ τῆς πολυπειρίας πεφροντικὼς, διὰ τὰς ἀκαίρους καὶ μακρὰς ἐπιτιμήσεις εὐλόγως διαβάλλεται, καὶ διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἐπιτιμήσεως Ἐπιτίμαιος ὑπό τινων ὠνόμασται. *Timæus sane, & in temporum notatione exquisitam adhibuit diligentiam, & ut varia rerum cognitione abundet, sollicite laborat. At propter intempestivas, & verbosas reprehensiones, jure etiam ipse reprehenditur. Quare ob nimiam taxandi libidinem, & acerbitatem, Epitimæus* (*id est, taxator*) *a quibusdam nominatus fuit.* The Historian who hath given him this Blow, still praises the exactness of his Chronology, and his great Learning. All those who have criticised on him have not been so just; one of them has only drawn his worst side, to which purpose he hath employed a Parenthesis. (*l*) Τούτων δὲ μαρτυρία ἐςὶ τὰ γραφέντα τότε ψηφίσματα ἅπερ ἀγνοῆσαί φησιν ὁ Ἀρτεμίδωρος τὸν Ταυρομενίτην Τίμαιον, καὶ ἄλλως βάσκανον ὄντα, καὶ συκοφάντην (διὸ καὶ Ἐπιτίμαιον κληθῆναι) λέγειν ὡς ἐκ τῶν Περσικῶν παρακαταθηκῶν ἐποιήσαντο τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν ἐπισκευήν. *Testantur hoc quæ tum facta sunt decreta: quæ ignorantem ait Artemidorus Timæum Tauromenitam, hominem alioqui invidum & calumniatorem, ac cui propterea nomen Epitimæi, id est reprehensoris factum sit scripsisse, id templum eos è depositis Persarum condidisse.* To elucidate this Passage, I add, That it relates to the Refutation of a Falsity, which our *Timæus* had divulged concerning the *Ephesians*. He had, said that they made use of the Persian Treasure deposited in their Hands, to Build the Temple of *Diana*. Here is a third Censure who touches to the quick. (*m*) Διὸ δὴ καὶ τῶν ἡμεῖς εἰκότως ἂν ἐπιτιμήσαιμεν Τιμαίῳ κατὰ Δημοχάρους εἰρηκότι. ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἂν ἐκ ἄξιος συγγνώμης, ἀλλὰ πίστεως ὑπ' ἐδενὸς [illegible] φανερῶς ἐν ταῖς λοιδορίαις ἐκπίπτων τὸ καθήκοντος διὰ τὴν ἔμφυτον πικρίαν. *Quocirca nos quoque ea, quæ a Timæo dicta sunt in Democharem, merito improbare videmur. Ille autem indignus, cui à quoquam ignoscatur, & fides habenda, videri debet: quia aperte in maledictis ab officio historici se deflectit propter insitam acerbitatem.* Clemens *Alexandrinus* (*n*) represents *Timæus* and *Theopompus* as a Brace of Satyrical and Fabulous Historians. *Cornelius Nepos* (*o*) sets them both in the same light. *Athenæus* (*p*) observes, that *Ister* writing against *Timæus*, called him *Epitimæus*. He was perhaps the first Inventer of this *Pun*. *Aristotle* was one of those abused by *Timæus* (*q*). We must not omit that he also vented all his Spleen against others, tho' they were not blame-worthy. It is in this manner he exclaim'd against those who mention'd *Phalaris*'s Bull. He loudly call'd them Fabulous Writers; (*r*) and with the utmost heat maintain'd that there was never any such thing; when indeed he was mistaken, for this Bull was still in being in the time of (*s*) *Diodorus Siculus*. It had been transported to *Carthage*, when *Imilcar* sacked *Agrigentum*, and restor'd to the *Agrigentines* 260 Years after, when *Scipio Africanus* destroyed *Carthage*. *Diodorus Siculus* (*t*) relates these particulars as a favourable opportunity to censure our *Timæus*, and to shew the conjunctures wherein one ought to excuse the Errors of Historians or not. One ought to excuse them, when the Facts lie so obscure that even with a great diligence they cannot be discover'd: But one ought never to excuse them, when either Negligence or an Inclination to flatter or calumniate any Person, hath turned them out of the right way. This Author's words in the Original will much better please those who are capable of understanding them; on whose account I have transcribed them: at which the other Readers ought not to be displeased, they may pass them by, and yet know the general import of the Author's Thought. (*u*) Περὶ δὲ τούτου φιλοτιμότερον εἰπεῖν προήχθην, διότι Τίμαιος ὁ τῶν πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφέων πικρότατα κατηγορήσας, καὶ συγγνώμην οὐδεμίαν τοῖς ἱστοριογράφοις ἀπολιπὼν, αὐτὸς εὑρίσκεται σχεδιάζων, ἐν οἷς μάλιστα ἑαυτὸν ἀποπίφασκεν ἀκριβολογούμενον. Δεῖ γὰρ, οἶμαι, τοὺς συγγραφεῖς ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀγνοήμασι τυγχάνειν συγγνώμης, ὡς ἂν ἀνθρώπους ὄντας, καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς παρῳχημένοις χρόνοις ἀληθείας οὔσης δυσευρέτου. τοὺς μέντοι γε κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἐ τυγχάνοντας τῆς ἀκριβείας προσηκόντως κατηγορίας τυγχάνειν, ὅταν κολακεύοντες τινὰς ἢ δι' ἔχθραν πικρότερον προσβάλλοντες, ἀποσφάλλωνται τῆς ἀληθείας. *Qua de re studiosius disserere mihi libuit; quia Timæus, cum magnâ acerbitate scriptores ætatem suam antecedentes reprehendat, nullumque historicis veniæ locum relinquat; ipse tamen, ubi diligentissimum veritatis studium profitetur, nugari & allucinari deprehenditur. Scriptoribus enim in iis, quæ non assequuntur, veniam (meo quidem judicio) tribui æquum est, quippe, cùm homines sint, & temporum prætèrlapsorum veritas difficulter è caligine eruatur. Contra verò, qui datâ operâ exactiam inquisitionem negligunt, hos meritò accusandos arbitror, & quando nimirum nonnullis adulando, vel per odium virulentiùs alios impugnando, à regiâ veritatis viâ exorbitant & aberrant.*

(*h*) Athen. lib. 11. c. 6. p. 471.
(*i*) Diogen. Laert. in Empedocle. lib. 8. n. 60.
(*k*) Diodorus Siculus lib. 5. circa init.
(*l*) Strabo lib. 14. pag. 440.

(*D*) *His veracity was very much doubted of.*] See the passage of *Polybius* cited in the precedent Remark, and that hereafter (*x*) quoted. Read, in one word, the remainder of the 12th Book of *Polybius*.

(*E*) *To do* Agathocles *so little justice——Spirit of revenge.*] *Agathocles* had forced him to fly out of *Sicily*: this indeed cost him nothing during his life, but after his death he severely paid for it. *Agathocles*, when living, was out of the reach of *Timæus*'s Resentment, which he was then obliged to conceal, and defer his Vengeance 'till *Agathocles* was in his Grave. Then he discharged all the impetuous Torrents biassed by a Spirit of Revenge on this occasion. Several other Faults were also discover'd in his (F) History; but very able Judges allow him to have been very learned, (G) and very eloquent. He was not less exorbitant in his Praises than in his Invectives, which appears by the Elogies he bestowed on (H) *Timoleon*. He lived † 96 Years. His Fortune seems to have been but moderate. He * lived very quietly in the place of his || Exile. He utterly renounced all active ways of Living, Travelling, War, and the Offices of the Robe. On which account some were surprized

rents of his rage against him. The Tyrant was not only defamed by a Description of his Crimes and ill Qualities, but also by fabulous Calumnies. He robb'd him of all the glory of his good Success, and laid to his charge all the Misfortunes which befel him, not excepting the most fortuitous: He represented him as a Poltroon, tho' by a thousand clear Proofs, he had convinc'd the World, that he was a brave Commander. Unless he had been so, was it possible for him, but a Potter's Son (as he was) to have subdu'd all *Sicily*, and a great part of *Italy* and *Libya*? Doth not *Timæus* contradict himself? In (a) all the rest of his Book he exalts the Valour of the *Syracusians* to the Clouds, and yet he pretends that *Agathocles*, who subdued them, was the most worthless Wretch alive. He too evidently betrays his Passion and Hatred. The five last Books of this History, which treat of the Actions of *Agathocles*, don't indeed deserve any praise. *Suidas* (b) to whom I am oblig'd for all this, allows that in all the other parts of his History, he took extraordinary care of the truth of his Relations. (c) Οὗτος ὁ Τίμαιος τῆς ἀκριβείας τῶν περὶ ἑαυτῷ συγγραφέων πικρότατα ἐξελέγξας, κατὰ μὲν ἄλλα μέρη τῆς γραφῆς πλείστην πεποίηται πρόνοιαν τῆς ἀληθείας. ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀγαθοκλέους πράξεσι τὰ πολλὰ κατέψευσται τοῦ δυνάστου, διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχθραν. *Timæus iste qui veterum historicorum peccata gravissime redarguit, in aliis quidem scripti partibus maximam veritatis curam provide gessit. In Agathoclis vero rebus pleraque ementitus est in principem illum propter odium quo prosequebatur eum.*

We find in *Polybius* some of the odious Calumnies which *Timæus* disgorged against *Agathocles*. He represented him in his younger days, as the most abandon'd Prostitute to the Lust of every Comer, and that in whatever way his extravagant Bestiality could prompt him to desire: Γεγονέναι τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν κοινὸν πόρνον, ἕτοιμον τοῖς ἀκρατεστάτοις, κολοιὸν, τριόρχην, πάντων τῶν βουλομένων τοῖς ὄπισθεν ἔμπροσθεν γεγονότα: *Agathoclem in prima ætate publicum fuisse prostibulum, passim omnium incontinentissimorum libidini expositum, graculum, triorchem sive buteonem qui aversus & adversus impudicus omnibus quibusque pateret* (d). And he related that the Wife of this Prince breathed out the following Exclamation on the sight of his Corps; *Which way have I not enjoy'd thee, and which way hast thou not enjoy'd me!* Words which *Polybius* charges with the utmost Infamy. Ὅτ᾽ ἀπέθανε τὴν γυναῖκά φησι κατακλαιομένην αὐτὸν, οὕτω θρηνεῖν· τί δ᾽ οὐκ ἐγὼ σέ; τί δ᾽ οὐκ ἐμὲ σύ; *Ubi fato functus esset, ejus uxorem mortuum maritum lamentantem hujusmodi plangorem edidisse, quid non ego tibi? quid non tu mihi* (e)? *Polybius* doth not deny that *Agathocles* was (f) the most impious of all Men; but he is of Opinion that this cannot excuse the scurrilous malignity of *Timæus*, and that it refutes it self: For it is evident, by the relation of that Author, that this Tyrant, without the Advantages of Birth or Estate, arrived to such an accumulated pitch of Authority, that he subdued all *Sicily*, endangered *Carthage*, maintain'd his Tyrannick Acquisitions in his Old age, and died a King. This shews the great Endowments Nature had liberally bestow'd on him. The Historians ought therefore not only to have represented him by his ill actions, but also by those which deserved to be praised; and consequently *Timæus* is inexcusable, since he has with the utmost Malice and Ill nature been hyperbolical in the relation of whatever was to be blamed in him, and intirely suppressed whatever would admit of Praise. (g) Ὁ δὲ παρεσκοτισμένος ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας πικρίας τὰ μὲν ἐλαττώματα δυσμενικῶς καὶ μετ᾽ αὐξήσεως ἡμῖν ἐξήγγελκε, τὰ δὲ κατορθώματα συλλήβδην παραλέλοιπε. *Egregius hic Scriptor maledicendi studio occæcatus minus recte facta cum quadam animi malignitate solitus narrare, & simul omnia in majus extollere, præclara simul cuncta prætermisit.* Nothing can be more judicious than this whole Discourse of *Polybius*.

(F) *Other Faults in his History.*] *Suidas* (h) informs us that *Timæus* was called a *doating Rhapsodist*, γραοσυλλέκτρια, because whatever occurred, he indistinguishably inserted in his History. This is much the same thing as if they had called him *a Compiler of Tales*. (i) *Polybius* accuses him of speaking very ignorantly of *Italy*; and that in his Description of *Africa*, besides being guilty of the same fault, he betray'd a trifling Genius, a want of Judgment, and a great deal of Credulity with regard to obsolete Traditions. Τὸν δὲ Τίμαιόν φησι πρὸς τῷ μὴ μόνον ἀπείρως γεγονέναι περὶ τὴν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην, ἀλλὰ καὶ παιδαριώδη καὶ τελέως ἀσυλλόγιστον, καὶ ταῖς ἀρχαίαις φήμαις ἀκμὴν ἐνδεδεμένον: *Timæum præterea arguit aliquis non solum imperitum rerum Africæ, sed etiam puerili ingenio virum, ac prorsus infirmo judicio & qui antiquitus traditis opinionibus supra modum fuerit deditus* (k). He blames him for writing on the credit of the Reports he had heard, and reproaches his want of discernment (l). Whence doubtless proceeded the Contradictions charged on him (m). To these may be added the passage of *Longinus*, which I shall hereafter cite in the Remark *I.* and those of *Plutarch* also quoted hereafter: and observe by the way that he was not so bigotted a Follower of the Ancient Traditions, as not to refute some of them; but he was not very happy in his choice, Instances of which are his attempts to overthrow the Tradition (n) of *Phalaris*'s Bull, and that of the (o) Colony of the *Locri*; nor did he go upon a better Foundation, when he (p) denyed that *Zaleucus* gave Laws to that People. Nay, he denied that there was (q) such a Person as *Zaleucus*.

(G) *Allow him to be very Learned and very Eloquent.*] The passage of *Diodorus Siculus* above cited, may serve as a Commentary on this Text; but the following words of *Cicero* are much more to my purpose: (r) *Minimus natu horum omnium Timæus, quantum autem judicare possum longe eruditissimus, & rerum copia ac sententiarum varietate abundantissimus, & ipsa compositione verborum non impolitus magnam eloquentiam ad scribendum attulit, sed nullum usum forensem.* He had named *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, *Philistus*, *Theopompus*, *Ephorus*, *Xenophon* and *Callisthenes*. All which I mention only to shew what place *Timæus* possessed in *Cicero*'s esteem. His Opinion was, that all the great Historians were inferior to him in Knowlege as well as fertility of Subject and Thought. He praised him for his Eloquence: Of which the subsequent words will give you a further light: (s) *Genera Asiaticæ dictionis duo sunt, unum sententiosum & argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus & severis quam concinnis & venustis qualis in historia Timæus.* But that the Reader may see that the best Judges of the Works of the Learned did not anciently agree better than in our Days, I shall cite an excellent passage of *Plutarch*. (t) *Timæus the Historian, aiming to exceed* Thucydides *in Vivacity of Eloquence, and to disgrace* Philistus *as ignorant, disagreeable, and impertinent in his History, attempts the Description of Sea and Land Fights, and the eloquent Speeches made by them, where indeed he approaches them no more than a Foot-man doth a* Lydian *Chariot, as* Pindar *hath it, and discovers himself to be an Author of an aukward grace, and very little judgment, or as* Diphil. says,

Fat, and stuffed with Sicilian *Grease.*

Cicero citing one of *Timæus*'s Thoughts as a witty Saying, (u) says, there are several of the same nature in this Historian. But *Plutarch*, who attributes it to another Author, charges it with being flat and childish.

(H) *By the Elogies he bestow'd on* Timoleon.] He placed him above the greatest Gods, (x) if we may believe *Suidas*, who superadds, that this flattery deserv'd a greater punishment than that of *Callisthenes*; For he only design'd the deifying of *Alexander*, a Prince infinitely more illustrious than *Timoleon*; but *Timæus* not contented with that, exalts his Hero to a superiority above the highest Divinities. *Suidas*'s Reasoning turns upon a very just Parallel; there is on the one side more merit in the Person honoured, and less excess in the Honours conferred; and on the other, the Honours are greater, and the Merit less: Wherefore *Suidas* very reasonably concludes that if *Callisthenes* was most justly punish'd with Death for his flattery, *Timæus* deserv'd it more than he.

---

† Lucian. in Macrob. p. 6[illegible] tom. 2.

* Polybius lib. 12. p. 6[illegible]

|| That is at *Athens*, if we believe Corradus in Brutum Ciceronis pag. 115.

Mr. Grævius lib 22. init. & *Suidas* in τριόρχης. (f) Πάντων ἀνοσιώτατος. Fuit ille sane omnium maxime impi-

Id. ibid. (g) Id. ibid. pag. 660. (h) *Suidas* ibid.

(i) Polybius lib. 12. pag. 655.

(k) Id. lib. 12. *init.* pag. 655.

(l) Περὶ τὰς ἀνακρίσεις ῥαθύμως ἀνεστράφη. In dijudicandis iis quæ sibi narrarentur negligens fuit. Id. ibid. pag. 668.

(m) Athenæus l. 6. pag. 272.

(n) *See the Remark* C.

(o) Polyb. lib. 12. pag. 656.

(p) Cicero epist. 1. lib. 6. ad Atticum p. m. 589.

(q) Id. lib. 2. de legib. fol. 333. C.

(r) Cicero de Oratore lib. 2. fol. 73. D.

(s) Id. in Bruto circa fin. pag. m. 451.

(t) Plutarch. in Nicia initio, p. 523.

(u) *You'll find this in the Remark* C *of the Article* Fontarabia.

(x) Μείζω ποιῶν Τιμολέοντα τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Θεῶν. Timoleontem illustrissimis Diis majorem facere. *Suidas* ubi supra pag. 910.

ſurpriz'd, that he ſhould ever acquire the Reputation * of an able Hiſtorian. *Longinus* criticiſes on him for what (*I*) doth not deſerve a Cenſure. But *Plutarch* condemn'd him juſtly on account of his Puerility with relation to a Favourite Common-place, very much encourag'd in Ancient Hiſtory: That is, the compiling

* Id. Polyb. ib.

he. I am ſurpriſed to find this Relation of *Calliſthenes* in *Suidas*; for ſeveral Authors believe that he rendred himſelf odious to *Alexander*, by ſpeaking too freely of him, in a manner contrary to flattering or deifying him. We may obſerve that *Suidas* (*g*) charges *Timæus* with two great Faults; the condemning too ſeverely the Vices he was himſelf addicted to; and ſuffering his judgment to be tainted with thoſe Maxims which he lays down, and with the Opinions which he would inſinuate into his Readers.

(g) Suidas ubi ſupra.

(*I*) **Longinus** *Criticiſes on him for what doeſnot deſerve Cenſure.*] (*h*) "As for the affected and Puerile Style, "*Timæus* abounds with it. This Author, who, on "other accounts, ſhews himſelf a learned Man, ſome-"times does not come ſhort of the lofty and ſub-"lime Style: He hath a great ſhare of Knowledge, "and expreſſes himſelf very judiciouſly; if he were "not naturally addicted to reprehend the Vices of "others, whilſt he is blind to his own Faults; and "beſides, ſo ſollicitous to diſplay new Thoughts, "that he frequently falls to the moſt deſpicable "degree of Puerility. I ſhall content my ſelf with "one or two Examples only; becauſe *Cecilius* has "cited a vaſt number. When he is praiſing *Alex-*"*ander* the *Great*, he tells us that *he Conquer'd all* "*Aſia in leſs time than* Iſocrates *employ'd in the com-*"*poſure of his Panegyrick.* The *comparing Alex-*"*ander the Great* to a Rhetorician, is indeed an "admirable Compariſon. By a parity of Reaſon, it "muſt neceſſarily follow, that the *Lacedemonians* "would be oblig'd to give place to *Iſocrates*, ſince "they were Thirty Years in taking *Meſſenia*, and he "wrote his Panegyrick in Ten. That Reflection is "unworthy of *Longinus*, and I don't know what had "debauched his Taſte when he wrote theſe Lines. One of our Modern learned Wits judges of him in the following manner. (*c*) *Longinus*, ſaith he, *is a Caviller, and a falſe pretender to Subtilty.* Timæus *ſaid*, That *Alexander* ſpent leſs time in the Conqueſt of all *Aſia*, than *Iſocrates* in finiſhing his Panegyrick. Longinus *cenſures him for comparing a great Prince to a Sophiſt; and maintains that by the ſame Reaſon, we might be induc'd to believe, that the* Lacedemonians *were leſs Valiant than* (*d*) Iſocrates, who requir'd but Ten Years to compoſe his Panegyrick, when they ſpent Thirty in the Conqueſt of *Meſſenia. What? did* Timæus *ſpeak of the Valour of* Iſocrates? *Is it properly to compare an Orator with a Conqueror; to compare the time ſpent in the compoſure of the one, with that employ'd in the Conqueſt of the other? Tho' there is no proportion betwixt Actions intirely different, doth it follow that there is none betwixt the long and ſhort ſpace of their duration? May we not ſay, That the great* Guſtavus Adolphus *rendred himſelf Maſter of part of* Germany, *in leſs time than* Mr. Vaugelas *ſpent to tranſlate* Quintus Curtius; *or Father* Strada *to finiſh his Hiſtory, or* (1) Scriverius *to Publiſh his* Martial?

(h) Longinus, de Sublimi dicendi genere cap. 3.

(c) Coſtar Apolog. p. 88, 89.

(d) *So it ought to be tranſlated; for there is in the Greek* κατ' ἀνδρείαν quoad fortitudinem. Mr. Depreaux *has ſkipp'd this in his Tranſlation of* Longinus, *and perhaps he did it the better to hide the falſe thought of the Author.*

(1) Scaliger *calls him ſomewhere in his Epiſtles*, Lentulum Martialis editorem.

Mr. *Coſtar* hath not obſerved all the Faults of this place of *Longinus*: He might have added that there are ſome things which we cannot exceed or equal, without an extraordinary Merit, to which we may yet be Inferior, without being contemptible. If a Prince ſhould ſubdue three Kingdoms in as little time as is requiſite for a Geographer to draw three Maps, he would doubtleſs do a great Action; but if he ſhould Conquer but one Province whilſt a Geographer is drawing Ten Maps of the World, we cannot be allow'd to infer from hence, that in expedition and addreſs, he is inferior to the Geographer. I urge this to make it appear, that *Longinus* had no reaſon to conclude, That *Timæus*'s Compariſon could beſtow more honour on *Iſocrates* than on the *Lacedemonians*; for Ten Years ſpent in the compoſure of a Harangue, may imply a leſs Expedition than Thirty, ſpent by a ſmall Nation in the Conquering of a Neighbouring State.

A REMARK *on the Deſign of Compariſons.*

This Cenſurer of *Timæus* hath not in the leaſt conſider'd the Deſign of Compariſons. They are intended to render the greatneſs or ſmallneſs of Objects the more ſenſible. Nothing is therefore more proper to be compared to certain things, than what moſt apparently inlarges the Idea of them. So to render the rapidity of *Alexander*'s Victories the more conſpicuous, they may be very well oppoſed to the ſlowneſs of a Panegyriſt. Conſider on one hand the Obſtacles of War, the great number of Enemies which *Alexander* engaged, and the vaſt extent of Land which he ſubdu'd; Conſider on the other; the facility of writing a Diſcourſe which may be recited in an Hour: and it is impoſſible but that you muſt be ſtruck with the incredible ſwiftneſs of this Conqueror, if you imagine that he ſpent no more Years in his Conqueſt than the Rhetorician in compoſing an Oration. Another Conqueror who had not ſubdued ſo many Provinces in 30 Years as *Alexander* in Ten, would not have done ſo well in this Compariſon as *Iſocrates*; for we are naturally inclin'd to imagin almoſt an infinite diſproportion betwixt the labour of a Rhetorician, and that of a Conqueror. We think it infinitely more eaſie to range Words, than ſubdue Kingdoms. For which Reaſon let us allow *Timæus* to be very happy in his choice. He took what would moſt pathetically ſtrike the Imagination of his Readers. I find in a Modern Author, (*e*) that the Duke of *Candale*, and Cardinal *de la Valette*, Generals of the *French* Army, in the Year 1637, *took* Landrecies *almoſt in fewer days than* Charles V. *formerly employ'd Months in vain, being conſtrain'd, after ſix Months time, ignominiouſly to raiſe the Siege.* This was certainly a beautiful, lofty, and noble Idea; but I am ſure that we ſhould be more ſenſibly touched with the expedition of a Conqueſt, if it ſhould be ſaid, *A famous Engineer formerly ſpent as much time in drawing a Plan of this place, as they did in taking it.* The Precedents of the greateſt Orators declare as ſtrongly in favour of *Timæus* as the Reaſons already urged. The greateſt Roman Orator ſaid, that *Pompey* had finiſhed more Wars than others had read, and that Travellers never went through ſo many Countries in ſo little time as he ſubdued them by his Victories. (*f*) *Qui ſæpius cum hoſte conflixit quam quiſquam cum inimico concertavit: plura bella geſſit quam cæteri legerunt: plures provincias confecit quam alii concupiverunt*—— (*g*) *Quis unquam aut obeundi negocii aut conſequendi quæſtus ſtudio tam brevi tempore tot loca adire, tantos curſus conficere potuit quam celeriter Cn. Pompeio duce belli impetus navigavit?* Is not this to compare *Pompey* with an ordinary Man that can read, and with a Merchant (*h*) whoſe Avarice tranſports him from place to place? If the Parallel betwixt *Alexander* and a Rhetorician ſo much blamed by *Longinus* is not good; ought we not to condemn this, which notwithſtanding is really admirable, and the moſt proper thing in the World to excite thoſe Idea's in the Mind, which the intereſt of the Orator required? But to come to the Moderns.

Not to alledge what was ſaid of *Charles* VIII. that he run through *Italy* ſwifter than a Quarter Maſter with Chalk in hand, and without ſtopping; I ſhall come directly to Mr. *Deſpreaux*, one of the greateſt Maſters of this Art. He alledges two reaſons in excuſe for not ſinging the Victories of 1672. Firſt, that the Names of the Towns which the King Conquer'd in *Holland*, are ( ) *harſh and Barbarous, affording only odd Syllables in all parts of them:* The ſecond reaſon was that the Conqueror marched too faſt for the Muſes to keep pace with him.

Encor (*k*) *ſi tes exploits moins grands & moins rapides*
Laiſſoient prendre courage a nos Muſes timides;
Peut-être avec le temps, à force d'y rêver,
Par quelque coup de l'art nous pourrions nous ſauver.
Mais dès qu'on veut tenter cette vaſte carriere,
Pegaſe s'effarouche & recule en arriere;
Mon Apollon s'étonne, & Nimegue eſt à toy,
Que ma Muſe eſt encore au camp devant Orſoy.

Mr. *Peliſſon* made uſe of this Thought in his invocation of *Pegaſus*, a piece of Poetry which is extraordinarily admir'd; the whole deſign of which is to expreſs that the King's Conqueſts were ſo incredibly ſwift, that the Poets could not follow the rapid Torrent. Since Mr. *Peliſſon* choſe this Image, ſo many Authors have uſed it that it is become a Common place. I remember it in the *Paris* Gazette, when, if I am not deceiv'd, Mr. *de Guilleragues* had the direction of that Paper. He declares that he is forced to take advantage, that is, to anticipate his Majeſty's Victories, that he may in ſome meaſure keep pace with his rapid Expeditions. Mr. *Pavillon* who is very well acquainted with the clean management of a Subject, hath very agreeably turned this Thought in his Ode on the taking of *Namure* in the Year 1693. Note that this manner of praiſing the King, is very well approv'd by an extraordinary good Judge of the Juſtneſs and Delicacy of Thoughts. *Perhaps you have not heard*, ſays he, (*l*) *of another Madrigal with which I am Infinitely pleaſed.*

LOUIS

compiling (K) of good or ill Preſages. From his Character it is eaſy to conclude him very unfit for an Hiſtorian; and (L) that he ought eſpecially to have avoided exerciſing his Pen on the Actions of *Agathocles*.

Louis plus digne du troſne
Qu'aucun Roy que l'on ait vû,
Enſeigne l'art à Bellone
De faire les impromptu.
C'eſt une choſe facile
Aux diſciples d'Apollon:
Mais ce Conquerant habile
A plutoſt pris une ville
Qu'ils n'ont fait une Chanſon.

All theſe thoughts are ingenious, continues Eudoxus; *but the Envy viſibly appears, and theſe Authors profeſs to praiſe, whereas he who ſaid;* he believes that Verſes are made as faſt as Towns are taken, *ſeems not to think of praiſe: He ſeems to be in an Angry Mood, and to think only of coming off: and ſo the praiſe, that he beſtows by the by, is certainly more Nice.* The exact Conformity betwixt theſe thoughts and *Longinus's* parallel will not allow us to doubt that this paſſage carries in it Father *Bouhour's* approbation of *Timæus*. But to prevent all Scruples on this Head we ought to have recourſe to the expreſs Words of this *Jeſuit*: (h) "I am not of *Longinus's* ſide; his Criticiſm went too far when he Charged *Timæus* "with puerility in his Praiſe of *Alexander*. He that "ſhould ſay of *Lewis* the Great, that he Conquered the firſt time *Franche-Comte* in fewer Days "than t'was poſſible to Write his *Panegyrick*, do you "think he wou'd ſay any thing Ridiculous? And "at his return from a Campaign ſo ſhort and ſo "Glorious, if it had been ſaid that thoſe who on that "account were obliged to Compliment his Majeſty, "had occaſion for more time to prepare their Speeches than he employed in the Conqueſt: Would "you cenſure the Thought? I don't believe I ſhou'd, "replied *Eudoxus*; and yet I take *Timæus's* thought "to be wrong, becauſe the Speeches which you "Mention relate to the King and his Conqueſts; "but *Iſocrates's Panegyrick* did not Concern *Alexander* or his Victories." I believe it had been better for *Eudoxus* to have given his approbation without any reſerve. Indeed the *Greek* Author's thought would have been more perfect, if *Iſocrates's* Oration had been a *Panegyrick* on *Alexander*; its Beauty would by this have been improved by ſome freſh Charms: But I cannot conceive that the want of this circumſtance vitiates the Compariſon. Without this it ſtill retains a lively Image of the rapidity of *Alexander's* Conqueſts.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 81.

I ought not to forget that Mr. *Racine* muſt needs be for *Timæus* againſt *Longinus*. Read this paſſage in Madam de *Sevigni's* Letter to the Count de *Buſſy*, dated the 3d of *November*. 1677. (i) "What "you ſay of *Racine* and *Deſpreaux* is very juſt. The "King four Days ſince expreſſed himſelf thus to "them: I am ſorry that you did not come to the "laſt Campaign, you would have ſeen the War, "and the Journey wou'd not have been long. "*Racine* anſwered: Sir, we had only City Cloaths; "we indeed beſpoke travelling Cloaths but the "places you attack'd were taken before they were "made. This Compliment was very agreeably "received." I can't tell whether any Body has yet made uſe of this thought of *Martial*, concerning the *Copiſts*, who wrote faſter than the Words were Dictated to them.

(i) Lettres Comte Buſſy abutin m. 1 pag. n⁴. Dutch dit.

Currant (k) verba licet, manus eſt velocior illis,
Nondum lingua, ſuum dextra peregit opus.

(k) Mar- al. lib. 4. epigr. 08.

Why could it not be ſaid that a Conquering Arm finiſhes its Work much ſooner than the Tongue of an Orator can reach the end of his Oration?

(K) Plutarch *Condemned him juſtly on account of his Puerilities—— Common Place ——— preſages.*] (l) "He falls into the Follies of *Xenarchus* in ſeveral places, as where he ſays, that he took it "for an ill boding Omen for the *Athenians*, that the "Captain *Nicias*, having his Name derived from "the Word *Nice*, which ſignifies Victory, ſhou'd "contradict the Sicilian Enterpriſe: And that by "the Mutilation of the *Hermes's*, that is, the Images of *Mercury*, the Gods Advertiſed them, that "in this War they ſhould ſuffer abundance of Evils "from the *Syracuſan* General, whoſe Name was "*Hermocrates* the Son of *Hermon*: And that it was "beſides probable that *Hercules* would favour the "*Syracuſans* on account of the Goddeſs *Proſerpina*, "(under whoſe Protection the City of *Syracuſa* was) "in return of the Favour done him, in ſurrendring "to him the Infernal *Cerberus*; and on the contrary, "that he bore a Grudge to the *Athenians*, "becauſe they defended the *Ægeſte*, who were "deſcended from the *Trojans*, his Mortal Enemies, "by Reaſon he deſtroyed their City, in revenge of "the violated Faith, and of the Injury done him "by King *Laomedon*. But perhaps his judgment was "at an equal pitch when he wrote theſe fine Stories, "as when he Cenſured *Philiſtus's* Style, or Railed "at *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*." We may hence obſerve what falſe Notions the Pagans had of God. The Decalogue teaches us that the Iniquity of the Fathers ſhould be viſited on the Children only, to the fourth Generation. And this Ethnick Hiſtorian imagined that the *Trojans* drew on their Protectors the hatred of *Hercules*, 800 Years after this Demy-God's Quarrel with a *Trojan* Prince.

(l) Plu- rch. ubi pra. *Note that* Longinus *ubi Supra* *Laught at* *the Reaſon* *ken* *om* Her- ocrates's Name.

(L) *Very unfit for an Hiſtorian, and that he ought eſpecially to have avoided exerciſing his Pen on the Actions of* Agathocles.] His Favourite Talent was the Imprinting a Satyrical Character on his Diſcourſe. For this reaſon it was impoſſible his Hiſtory ſhould be good, tho' he had been happy in the other neceſſary Talents of an Hiſtorian (a). This Satyrical Genius prompts a Writer to ſuppreſs all laudable Actions, and only to preſent to the Reader the weak or the ill ſide of things. This is the common way of ſpeaking of a Man who hath offended us: Wherefore our *Timæus* was not capable of Writing well the Hiſtory of *Agathocles*. The remembrance of the Injury received, was always before his Eyes, and cryed aloud for Vengeance in the Writer's Ears. I Leave it to you to determine whether an Author naturally Satyrical could in theſe Circumſtances preſerve an exact Neutrality betwixt the good and ill Qualities of the Tyrant who had Baniſhed him. Thoſe who are fond of railing, if they would give themſelves the trouble of a narrow Search, would find that their Satyrical Humour is the product of a Cholerick and Preſumptuous Temper; which as it excites ſtrong deſires of Vengeance, even on account of the leaſt Offence, 'tis reaſonable to conclude that *Timæus* was tranſported by a violent Paſſion to revenge himſelf on *Agathocles*. For which reaſon he ought not to have attempted his Life, as being aſſur'd that if he medled with it he could not avoid violating the Laws of Hiſtory. The Modeſteſt and moſt Moderate may diſtruſt their own Virtue, when deſcribing the Actions of a Perſecutor. They have juſt reaſon to fear that the Injuries of Baniſhment ſhould excite thoſe Clouds, which would obſcure the true ſtate of Affairs, and hinder the diſcharging the part of an Hiſtorian. But ſuch a Man as *Timæus* had yet much ſtronger reaſons to be apprehenſive of the Illuſions of Reſentment. I am of Opinion that there are ſome Men ſo reaſonable, that they would rather chooſe not to write, than to meddle with Hiſtory when their Circumſtances expoſe them to theſe Miſrepreſentations: They would not content themſelves with calming the firſt Commotions of the Mind, and ſtaying till Time had cloſed up the Wound; but they would for ever renounce Writing on a Subject which would infallibly renew it afreſh. But *Timæus* was not of this Temper, and I dare engage that the ſole deſire of Revenging himſelf on *Agathocles*, would have determined him to take Pen in hand to Compoſe a Hiſtory of *Sicily*. Every Age can furniſh us with Examples of Authors, who had never thought of writing Hiſtories, if perſonal Reſentments and modiſh Paſſions had not put them upon it. They have not Patience to ſtay till their Paſſion is over, which is the leaſt they ought to do (b); but they write from the firſt hour of their Reſolution. Their Hiſtories are very Partial, and they add their Gloſſes to every Action which they relate. One would be apt to take them for Qualificators of the Inquiſition: They give Sentence on every Fact; they pronounce it Weak and Baſe, &c. Why do they Impoſe their judgment on the Reader? They ought to confine themſelves to a Narration which only contains the Principles or the Premiſſes of Reaſoning; the Reader ſhould draw

(a) *Compare with this the Remark* D *of the Article* Remond.

(b) *They ſhould Remember this fine Precept,* Ne frena animo permitte calenti, Da ſpatium tenuemque moram: male cuncta miniſtrat Impetus. Stat. Theb. *lib.* 10. *v.* 697. *But perhaps they are afraid they ſhould not be able to write, if they ſhould ſtay till their Minds are compoſed. Perhaps they fancy that Anger gives 'em a Talent which they had not before.* Si natura negat facit indignatio verſum, *ſaid* Juvenal *in his 1ſt Satyr v.* 79.

TIMESIUS, (A) *a very conſiderable Man in Clazomenæ* the Place of his Birth, where he acquired ſo great an Authority, that he did whatever he pleaſed; and as the Publick was obliged to him for ſeveral Services, he did not believe that the Credit which he had gained could render him Odious. But he was ſatisfyed of the contrary, when paſſing by a place where ſome little Children were playing at Cockals, he Liſtned to their Talk. One of them was buſied in making a little Bone fly out of a Hole; which ſeeming difficult, moſt of the Children believed he would not be able to do it: But he who was to Play being of another Opinion, *I wiſh to God*, ſaid he, *that I could make* Timeſius's *Brains fly out, as I will do this Bone.* After this *Timeſius* never doubted but that he was extremely Hated in the City, and when he came home, he related the Story to his Wife, whom he ordered to follow him, and left *Clazomenæ* †. I am willing to believe that it was after this time that he endeavoured to conduct a Colony into *Thrace*, and re-build *Abdera*. We have ſeen elſewhere || that his deſign did not ſucceed, and that he was driven out by the *Thracians* before he had ſet his new Eſtabliſhment in order. The *Teians* who in the 59th Olympiad abandoned their City, ſucceeded much better in the deſign of building *Abdera*. They a retained ſuch a vaſt reſpect for him, that they Honoured him as a Hero. He experienced the truth of the Anſwer, which the Oracle gave, when Conſulted concerning the conduct of a Colony, which was; *Look for ſwarms of Bees, and you will find abundance of Waſps* *. The Misfortune was, that inſtead of ejecting the Drones like the Bees in *Virgil* ‡, the Waſps conſtrained him to quit his Enterprize.

TIMOLEON, General of the *Corinthians*, was one of the greateſt Men of Antient *Greece*. He might have been called the Plague of Tyrants; for his ſtrongeſt Inclination and greateſt Occupation was to Puniſh the Uſurpers of Sovereign Power, and to maintain or re-eſtabliſh Liberty. If he fought againſt Tyrants, it was not to rid himſelf of Competitors, and to ſeize the unlawful Authority of which he would deprive them. We find but too many ſuch Enemies of Uſurpers. All his Actions Centred in the Peoples good. His Zeal for the Intereſt of his Country carried him ſo far, that he cauſed his Eldeſt Brother *Timophanes* (A) to be Killed, after all his Remonſtrances and Requeſts had proved inſufficient to his Converſion. We ought to know that *Timophanes* ſet up for a Tyrant at *Corinth*. His Death was followed by ſeveral Conſequences very diſadvantageous to *Timoleon*. (B) Some were pleaſed to reproach him as an Execrable Parricide, and his Mother loaded him with Curſes on

draw the Concluſion, whether it tends to Cenſure or to Commend. It is therefore ſufficient to repreſent Facts: Such Sentences ought to be as well husbanded as Maxims: They ought not to ſhew themſelves in *Relievo*; but ought to be Incorporated with the Narrative, as hath been already ſaid (c). There are ſeveral Modern Hiſtories, in whoſe Titles the word *Critical* is wanting; for the Authors of them do nothing elſe but Criticiſe, and ſometimes engage in a regular Diſpute. They relate and refute Alternately.

(A) *Timeſius.*] I call him by the name which *Herodotus* has given him, and not *Timeſias*, as *Plutarch* names him. I have elſewhere obſerved, that a very Learned Man (d) calls him *Tiſamenes*, and by an apparent Typographical fault (e) hath made him drive out the *Thracians*. Another ſaith that he was expell'd by the *Teians*; I have alſo (f) Corrected this Miſtake.

(A) *He cauſed his Elder Brother* Timophanes *to be Killed.*] He did not ſtain his own Hands with his Brother's Blood; but he was one of the real Authors of his Murther, which was in the following manner. *Timoleon* ſtrictly engaged himſelf with *Æſchylus*, *Timophanes*'s Wife's Brother, and (a) *Satyrus* a Diviner. They all three went to the Tyrant, and indeavoured to perſuade him the laſt time to reſtore Liberty to the People. He at firſt Laughed at them, and afterwards grew very much enraged: Whereupon *Timoleon* ſtepped aſide, covered his Face and wept whilſt the other two Kill'd his Brother (b). This is *Plutarch*'s Relation, which generally ſpeaking agrees with that of *Cornelius Nepos* (c). But *Diodorus Siculus* (d) makes *Timoleon* himſelf kill his Brother. There is a difference obſervable betwixt *Cornelius Nepos* and *Plutarch*. The firſt ſays that *Timoleon* joyned with his Brother-in-Law; the other tells us that 'twas with *Timophanes*'s Brother-in-Law. To be more plain, this Aſſociate, according to *Plutarch*, was (e) *Timophanes*'s Wife's Brother; but according to *Cornelius Nepos*, he was the Husband of *Timophanes*'s and *Timoleon*'s Siſter. (f) *Per aruſpicem communemque affinem cui ſoror ex iiſdem parentibus nata, nupta erat, fratrem tyrannum interficiendum curavit.* Mr. *Moreri* is here guilty of an Error. *Timoleon* ſays he conſented *that* Satyrus, *who had Eſpouſed their Siſter ſhould kill this Upſtart Tyrant.* He cites *Diodorus Siculus*, and *Plutarch*: the firſt doth not mention this and the other doth not ſay that *Satyrus* was any way Related to *Timoleon*; but only calls him a Diviner, and makes the other Accomplice to be *Æſchylus*, *Timophanes*'s Wife's Brother. It is not impoſſible that this *Æſchylus* might have Married *Timophanes*'s Siſter, and yet be *Timophanes*'s Wife's Brother: And on this foot both Authors would be in the right, tho' each would have Omitted a part of his Relation to that Family.

(B) *Reproach him as an execrable Parricide, and his Mother loaded him with Curſes on this account.*] Let us take this Story in all its Extent as told by *Plutarch* (g). *Thoſe who could not bear a ſtate of Popular Liberty, or who had been long accuſtomed to be near the perſons of Great Men and to make their Court, ſeemed indeed to Rejoyce at the Tyrant's Death; but were continually Reproaching* Timoleon *as having committed a Parricide Execrable and Abominable to the Gods and Men: which they continued ſo long till they touched him with a Regret for having committed the Fact: Being beſides Informed that his Mother bore it very Impatiently, continually uttering the moſt terrible Expreſſions and horrible Maledictions, he went to her, in order to Conſolate her: But ordering the Door to be ſhut on him ſhe would never ſee him. Thus born down by accumulated Grief, he ſuddainly reſolved to Starve himſelf: But his Friends who did not abandon him in this Deſperate Melancholy, continued to urge him by Perſuaſions and earneſt Intreaties, till they forced him to Eat. After this he reſolved to quit all publick Employs and retire to a Country Solitude: Where he at firſt led ſo rigorous a Life, that he not only abſtained from ever coming to the City, but avoided all Company, and ſpent his time only in wandring in the moſt remote and ſolitary Places he could imagine, and conſumed himſelf with Melancholy*——(h) *His Regret for the Death of his Brother, or his being aſhamed to appear before his Mother ſo broke his Spirits and diſheartned him, that for twenty Years after he did not in the leaſt intermeddle in Publick Affairs.* *Cornelius Nepos* (i) ſays much the ſame thing: But *Diodorus Siculus* doth not in the leaſt mention this long Melancholy of *Timoleon*, and on the contrary gives us to underſtand (k) that the ſpace betwixt the Death of *Timophanes*, and the *Syracuſan* Expedition was very ſmall. He ſaith that as ſoon as *Timoleon* had Killed his Brother a great Tumult aroſe; one part of the Inhabitants demanded Juſtice on the Murtherer, and the other requeſted

---

† Plutarch. præc. reip. ger. p. 812.

|| In the Article Abdera.

a Herodot. lib. 1. cap. 168.

* Plut. de amicor. multitud. pag. 95.

‡ Ignavum fucos pecus a præſepibus arcent. Virgil. Georg. lib. 4. v. 168.

(c) In the Remark C of the Article Theon.

(d) In the Article Abdera, Remark K.

(e) Ibid. Remark B.

(f) Ibid. Remark C.

(a) So Theopompus calls him; but Ephorus and Timæus call him Orthagoras. Plut. ubi infra.

(b) Taken from Plutarch in the Life of Timoleon, pag. 237.

(c) Cornel. Nepos in vita Timoleontis.

(d) Diodor. Siculus lib. 16. c. 66.

(e) Ἀδελφὸν ὄντα τῆς Τιμοφάνους γυναικός. Fratrem uxoris Timophanis. Plut. ib.

(f) Cornel. Nepos ib.

(g) Plutarch in the Life of Timoleon pag. 235.

(h) Id. ib.

(i) Hic præclariſſimum ejus factum non pari modo probatum eſt ab omnibus. Nonnulli enim læſam ab eo pietatem putabant, & invidia laudem virtutis obterebant. Mater vero poſt id factum, neque domum ad ſe filium admiſit, neque aſpexit, quin eum fratricidam impiumque deteſtans compellaret. Quibus rebus ille adeo eſt commotus, ut nonnunquam vitæ finem facere voluerit, atque ex ingratorum hominum conſpectu morte decedere. Cornel. Nepos ubi ſupra.

(k) Diodorus Siculus ubi ſupra.

on this account. All which threw him into a profound Melancholy, he deſign'd to end his Life, and when his Friends had engaged him to alter his Reſolution, he renounced all Publick Affairs, and retir'd to an obſcure Solitude, where he paſſed Twenty Years, as in all probability he had done his whole Life, if an opportunity had not offered of ſetting *Syracuſa* at Liberty. This City Oppreſſed by the Tyranny of *Dionyſius*, had recourſe to the *Corinthians.* They reſolved to aſſiſt them, and gave *Timoleon* the Command of the Troops deſign'd for that Service. The beginning of that Voyage was accompanied with very favourable Omens (*C*), but he met with many difficulties in order to Land in *Sicily*; for *Icetes* Tyrant of *Leontium*, who had pretended to joyn with the *Corinthians* in the Recovery of the Liberty of *Syracuſa*, but at the bottom aimed at Dethroning *Dionyſius*, only in order to render himſelf Maſter of that City, had joyned with the *Carthaginians*, and had poſſeſſed all the Paſſes. He kept *Dionyſius* cloſe Beſieged in the Fortreſs of *Syracuſa*, having already taken the reſt of the Town. Notwithſtanding all which *Timoleon* by Stratagem Landed in *Sicily*, defeated *Icetes*'s Army, and in a ſmall time became Maſter of the Citadel of *Syracuſa*, and afterwards of the whole City; * *Dionyſius* the Tyrant having ſurrendred the former, together with his Perſon into his Hands. He cauſed the Fortreſs to be raſed, in order to aſcertain the Inhabitants of the duration of that Liberty which he came to recover, and after having ſucceſsfully Re-eſtabliſhed their Affairs on a good Foot, he applyed himſelf to the Reſtoration of their Priſtine Liberty to all the Cities of *Sicily*, who then groaned under the heavy Oppreſſion of Tyrants. He forced *Icetes* to renounce his Alliance with the *Carthaginians*, and to content himſelf with living in a private Capacity at *Leontium.* He obliged *Leptines* Tyrant of *Apollonia* to Surrender himſelf, and ſent him to *Corinth.* He obtained a ſignal Victory over the *Carthaginians.* He puniſhed (*D*) the Treachery of *Icetes* who made new Alliances with them. He Defeated *Mamercus* Tyrant of *Catana*, and purſued him to *Meſſina*,

* He was ſent to *Corinth*: but it cannot be ſaid, as 'tis in *Moreri*, that he was ſent thither, after he had been Overcome by *Timoleon*; for *Dionyſius* did not oppoſe *Timoleon*.

ſted thoſe Elogies ſhould be beſtowed on him, which were due to the Deſtroyers of Tyrants. This Diſpute was referred to the deciſion of the Senate; the Cauſe was Pleaded on both ſides by the Counſel for and againſt *Timoleon*: The Judges had not pronounced their Sentence, when the *Syracuſan* Ambaſſadors requeſted the Aſſiſtance of the *Corinthians.* The Senate ordered that *Timoleon* ſhould be ſent to *Syracuſa*, and that if he diſcharged that Truſt well, he ſhould be treated as the Killer of a Tyrant; but if the contrary, as a Fratricide. I ſhall once more cite *Plutarch*, to evince by an unqueſtionable Example, how much the beſt Hiſtorians can wreſt the moſt Eſſential Characters of an Action. *Diodorus Siculus* aſſures us that the *Corinthian* Senate did not entruſt *Timoleon* with the Command of their Forces, otherwiſe than under a diſagreeable Condition, *viz.* That his Criminal Proceſs ſhould end in his Abſolution or Condemnation, according as he ſhould behave himſelf Well or Ill in that Poſt. But *Plutarch*'s Relation is quite different: He ſays that *Timoleon* was abſolutely Elected General, without any reſtraining Conditions by the Voice of the People, after which (*l*) Teleclides *then a Perſon of the greateſt Reputation and Authority in the Corinthian Affairs, riſing up made a Speech to* Timoleon, *in which he exhorted him to behave himſelf like a good Man and brave Commander in this Charge: For, ſaid he, if you do this we ſhall pronounce Sentence on your ſide that you have Killed a Tyrant; but if you do not diſcharge this Truſt well, we ſhall Condemn you for Murthering your Brother.* Theſe are no trifling Variations, but eſſential Differences, and according to the Latins *toto cœlo diverſi.* We cannot poſſibly excuſe both theſe Hiſtorians; one of them is certainly very much in Fault.

(*l*) Plutarch ubi ſupra pag. 238, 239.

(*C*) *With very favourable Omens.*] I ſhall not mention the happy Preſage at *Delphi*: *Moreri* hath already done it. But the others were: (*m*) *When the Fleet was ready, and the Forces compleatly Equipped for their departure, the Prieſteſſes of* Proſerpina *declared, that in their Sleep the laſt Night the Goddeſſes* Ceres *and* Proſerpina *appeared to them in a Viſion, in traveling Dreſſes, and told them they would go with* Timoleon *to* Sicily. *On this account the Corinthians fitted out a Gally called the* Ceres *and* Proſerpina.—— (*n*) *When* Timoleon *was on the Main-Sea, having the Wind a-Stearn, in the Night he thought that the Heaven was ſuddainly Cleft, and from that open place, a large quantity of bright and viſible Fire expanded it ſelf over his Ship, appearing like ſuch a burning Torch as is uſual in the Myſterious Ceremonies. This Torch guided and accompanied all his Voyage, and at laſt Diſſolved and Vaniſhed at a place near the Coaſt of* Italy, *where the Pilots had conſulted to Land. The Diviners being asked the Signification of this Preſage, anſwered that this Miraculous Apparition confirmed the Dream of the Prieſteſſes of* Ceres, *and that the Goddeſſes favouring the Enterpriſe had ſent this Light from Heaven to guide them; the Iſland of* Sicily *being Sacred and Dedicated to* Proſerpina, *the Rape on which Goddeſs was alſo ſaid to be there Committed, and the Government of it offered to her as a Nuptial Gift on her Wedding Day.* This relation of *Plutarch* is not very Accurate; but nevertheleſs all Circumſtances duly weighed, it clearly enough appears that this was only a Dream, and that there was no ſuch thing as a real Conducting Fire which went before the Fleet. So that this cannot reaſonably be compared with the Pillar of Fire which went before the *Iſraelites*, or with the Star which Conducted the Wiſe-Men to *Bethlehem.*

(*m*) Id. ib.

(*n*) Id. ib. pag. 239.

(*D*) *He puniſhed the Treachery* of Icetes.] *Timoleon's* bright Glory was by this ſomewhat Eccliplſed; he puſhed his Vengeance too far, and exerted a cruelty againſt thoſe Perſons whom he had much better have exempted from Puniſhment. *Plutarch's* Words are, (*a*) "Shortly after *Timoleon* brought his Army before *Leontium*, took *Icetes*, his Son *Eupolemus* and "the General of his Horſe alive, they being ſurrendred to him by the Souldiers themſelves. *Icetes* "and his Son were puniſhed with Death, and *Euthydemus* tho' a Valiant Man and brave Warriour, "could not obtain a more Merciful Fate, being "only charged with ſome injurious Reflections on the "*Corinthians.* For in a ſpeech he made to the *Leontins* on occaſion of the *Corinthians* firſt Arrival "in *Sicily* to War againſt the Tyrants, amongſt "other things he ſaid that they ought not to be "ſurprized at, or afraid, if

(1) "*A few* Corinthian *Women were* abroad.

"Thus moſt Men are more offended at Words than "Pernicious Actions; they more patiently ſuffer "a real Damage than a Reflection, and pardon "their Enemies, when they Revenge themſelves by "way of Arms, becauſe they can do no leſs: But "provoking expreſſions ſeem to proceed from too "great an Exceſs of Hatred and Malignity. After "this *Timoleon* returning to *Syracuſa*, the *Syracuſans* publickly Tryed, Condemned and Executed "the Wives and Daughters of *Icetes* and his Son. "This ſeems the harſheſt Action of *Timoleon's* Life: "for if he had pleaſed he could eaſily have ſaved "the Lives of theſe unhappy Women: But he "was not ſollicitous about it, he intirely abandoned them to the Fury of the Citizens, who were "reſolved to Revenge on them the Injuries done "to *Dion* after he had expelled the Tyrant *Dionyſius*: For *Icetes* had cauſed *Dion's* Wife, *Arete*, "his Siſter *Ariſtomacha*, and his Son who was but "a Child, to be drowned in the Sea, as we have related in the Life of *Dion.*" *Plutarch's* reflection on Humane Weakneſs in pardoning ill Actions eaſier than injurious Words, is very judicious.

(*a*) Plutarchus ubi ſupra pag. 252.

(1) 'Tis the begining of *Euripides's* Medea.

(*E*) *The*

Meſſina, where the Tyrant *Hippo* Protected him. He Beſieged that place, and had the Satisfaction to get (E) both the Tyrants into his Hands. So many Glorious Actions did not inſpire him with the leaſt Inclination to Rule: But on the contrary he Rejoyced that there were ſome Perſons in *Syracuſa* (F) who dared publickly accuſe him. He ſpent the reſt of his Life in (G) this City, where he received all the Marks of Gratitude which he deſerved, he really enjoyed all the advantages (H) of Ruling, without hazarding the Glorious Character of Acting for no other end than the Freedom of the People, and without expoſing himſelf to the Envy of the Republicans. His Funeral Solemnities were very Magnificent. I muſt not forget his acknowledging all his great Exploits to be the work (I) of the Gods, a favour of Fortune, a Happineſs, and not aſcribing them to his own Conduct

(E) *The Satisfaction to get both the Tyrants into his Hands.*] They both came to an unhappy end. *Hippo* finding *Meſſina* beſieged by Sea and Land, put himſelf on Board a Ship in order to eſcape: (b) *But he was taken in his Flight; and the* Meſſinians *having got him into their poſſeſſion, cauſed the Children to come from the School to the Theatre to ſee one of the fineſt Spectacles in the World, which was the Puniſhment of a Tyrant, who was publickly whipt and afterwards Executed.* Mamercus *ſurrendred himſelf to* Timoleon *to be Tryed by the* Syracuſans, *on condition that he ſhould not be his accuſer. He was brought to* Syracuſa, *where he endeavoured to pronounce a ſtudied Oration which he had compoſed for that end: But finding the People made a great Noiſe and expreſſed themſelves in loud and violent acclamations againſt the hearing of him, and conſequently that it was not very likely that they ſhould pardon him, run croſs the Theatre and ſtruck his Head with all his Force againſt one of the ſteps on which the People ſit, deſigning by daſhing out his Brains at once to diſpatch himſelf the quickeſt Way: But he was not ſo Happy, for he was taken up yet alive and Executed in the ſame manner that Robbers uſually were.* We muſt not forget that *Mamercus* was a Poet and had irritated the *Syracuſans* by his poinant Satyrs. But let us hear *Plutarch* on this Head: (c) “The common People of *Syracuſa* very hardly bore the “railleries of the Tyrants: For *Mamercus* amongſt “others valuing himſelf extremely on his Talent in “Verſe and Tragedy, having in ſome Engagements gotten ſome Advantage over the ſtrangers “which were in the *Syracuſan* Pay, ſo gloried in his “Succeſs that when he dedicated the Bucklers taken “from them to the Temple of the Gods, he added the “following galling Verſes in raillery and contempt “of the Conquered.

“ *Theſe Shields, with Purple, Gold and Ivory wrought,*
“ *Were taken by us that with Poor ones Fought.*

This Poet is not ſo much as mentioned by *Voſſius*. *Hieronymo Raguſa* the *Jeſuit* doth not forget him in his Elogies of the Ancient *Sicilians*; (d) but inſtead of referring us to *Plutarch* he only cites *Giovanni Vintimiglia*.

(F) *He rejoyced that ſome Perſons in* Syracuſa *publickly accuſed him.*] This ſeems to me the moſt ſhining part of his Life: *Plutarch's* Words without any retrenchment run thus: (e) *But ſeeing not only all the Larks of that Tufted ſort which the* Latins *call* Caſſitæ, *muſt, as* Simonides *proverbially ſpeaks, have a Creſt growing on their Heads; ſo in all Cities governed by Democracy, there are detractors. Two of theſe at* Syracuſa, *who were accuſtomed to Harangue the People, engaged againſt* Timoleon, *one of them* Laphyſtius, *and the other* Demænetus. *The former of theſe once ſummoning* Timoleon *to appear before the People to anſwer to a Crime of which he pretended to Convict him, the Citizens mutinyed, and would not have him obey the Citation. But he appeaſed them by remonſtrating to them that he had run through ſo many Fatigues, and expoſed himſelf to ſo many Dangers, to the end that every* Syracuſan *might freely enjoy the utmoſt privilege of the Laws. Another time* Demænetus *in a full Aſſembly of the People having reprehended and cenſured ſeveral of his Actions during the time he was a General,* Timoleon *made no Anſwer to it; but only told the People that he heartily thanked the Gods that they had granted what he had ſo often petitioned for in his Prayers: Which was, that he might once ſee the* Syracuſans *in perfect Freedom and Liberty to ſay whatever they pleaſed.* Thoſe who had rather Read the *Latin* Narrative of *Cornelius Nepos*, will find it in the (a) Margin.

(G) *He Spent the reſt of his Life in* Syracuſa.] Nothing is more extraordinary than a Great Man, who knows how to continue in the quiet Enjoyment of his Glory without aſpiring after new Dignities. Moſt of thoſe who arrive to a great height of Reputation and an extenſive Authority, imprudently aim at Mounting yet higher, and expoſe themſelves through the Oppoſition of ſome mortifying Obſtacles, more eſpecially in popular States. *Timoleon* was wiſer: (b) *He never return'd to* Corinth, *but obliged his Wife and Children to come to him; he never intermedled with thoſe troubles which afterwards aroſe mong the* Greeks, *nor expoſed himſelf to the envy of his Fellow Citizens, which moſt Governours and Generals have raiſed by their inſatiable deſire of Honours and Authority. He ſpent the remainder of his Days in* Sicily, *in the happy enjoyment of the Fruits of his own Labours, the greateſt of which was to ſee ſo many Cities, and ſo many Thouſands of Men owe their Happineſs to him.*

(H) *He really enjoyed all the Advantage of ruling.*] If we may believe *Cornelius Nepos*, *Timoleon's* conduct was that of a very Wiſe Man; he voluntarily quitted all Authority and by this means acquired a power more laſting than that of Kings. (c) *Quum tantis eſſet opibus, ut etiam invitis imperare poſſet, tantum autem haberet amorem omnium Siculorum, ut nullo recuſante regnum obtineret: maluit ſe diligi, quam metui. Itaque, cùm primum potuit, imperium depoſuit, & privatus Syracuſis, quod reliquum vitæ fuit, vixit. Neque vero id imperitè fecit. Nam quod ceteri reges imperio potuerunt, hic benevolentiâ tenuit. Nullus honos huic defuit: neque poſteà Syracuſis res ulla geſta eſt publica, de quâ prius ſit decretum, quàm Timoleontis ſententia cognita. Nullius unquam conſilium non modo antelatum, ſed ne comparatum quidem eſt. Neque id magis benevolentiâ factum eſt, quàm prudentiâ.* This Hiſtorian adds, that tho' *Timoleon* became Blind he did not deſiſt from the Service of the Publick. He cauſed himſelf to be carried in a Litter to the Aſſembly, and gave his Opinion without ſtirring out of it: Which more at large related by *Plutarch* is as follows. (d) “It was very agreeable to obſerve “how highly he was Honoured in their Councils. “For if the Affair in debate was of ſmall conſequence, “they diſpatched it without him: But if it were “of importance and required mature Deliberation, “they called him to their aſſiſtance: He was carried “in his Litter a-croſs the publick place to the “*Theatre* where the Aſſembly of the People was “held, which he alſo entred in his Litter: The “People unanimouſly ſaluted him, and he returned “their Salutations; and after the Praiſes and Benedictions of the whole Aſſembly were beſtowed “on him, the Buſineſs in debate was propoſed to him, “and he gave his Opinion; which being approved by “the Voices and Suffrages of the People, his Servants carried him back a-croſs the *Theatre* in “his Litter, and the Citizens received him with “Clapping of Hands and loud Acclamations of Joy. “After which the Council proceeded to the remainder of their Publick affairs.

(I) *Acknowledging all his great Exploits to be the Work of the Gods.*] (e) “And in his Familiar Letters written to his Friends at *Corinth*, as well as “in ſeveral Speeches made to the People of *Syracuſa*, he often repeated, that he rendred Thanks

“ to

(a) Hic quidem Laphyſtius [illegible] vadimonium [illegible] imponere, [illegible] complures convenissent, qui procacitatem hominis manibus coercere conarentur: Timoleon oravit omnes, ne id facerent, namque id ut Laphyſtio ceteriſque liceret, ſe maximos labores ſummaque adiiſſe pericula. Hanc enim ſpeciem libertatis eſſe, ſi omnibus, quod quiſque vellet, legibus experiri liceret. Idem, cùm quidam Laphyſtii ſimilis, nomine Demænetus in concione populi de rebus geſtis ejus detrahere cœpiſſet, ac nonnulla inveheretur in Timoleonta: dixit, nunc demum ſe voti eſſe damnatum: nam*que hac à diis immortalibus ſemper precatum, ut talem libertatem reſtituerint Syracuſanis, in qua cuivis liceret, de quo vellet, impune dicere.* Cornel. Nepos in vita Timoleontis. (b) Plut. ubi ſupra (c) Cornel. Nepos ubi ſupra p. m. 344. (d) Plutarch. ibid. pag. 254. (e) Ibid. pag. 253.

(b) Id. ib.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 251.

(d) Mamercus quoque poetarum Siculorum gloria effulſit. Ex Joanne Vigintimillio in Tabula Poetarum Siculorum. *Hier. Raguza in elogiis Siculorum* pag. 178.

(e) Plutarchus ubi ſupra pag. 253.

duct *. This gives me an opportunity to make some Extracts concerning what the Ancients

* Taken from Plutarch in the Life of Timoleon.

“ to God for that being willing to save “ and deliver *Sicily* from Slavery, he had been “ graciously pleased to make use of him to that “ end. And having Built an Oratory in his “ House he dedicated it to Fortune and there “ sacrificed to her, and which is more, he con“ secrated and dedicated all his House to Holy For“ tune.” *Cornelius Nepos* relates the same in the following Words. (*f*) *Nihil unquam neque insolens, neque gloriosum, ex ore ejus exiit: qui quidem, cum suas laudes audiret prædicari, numquam aliud dixit, quam se in ea re maxime diis gratias agere atque habere, quod, cum Siciliam recreare constituissent, tum se potissimum ducem esse voluissent. Nihil enim rerum humanarum sine deorum numine geri putabat. Itaque suæ domi sacellum Automatias constituerat, idque sanctissime colebat.*

This Chappel Built to Fortune in his House, and the strict Worship which he paid to this Divinity, give us Reason to believe that he spoke as he thought, when he attributed his Happy success not to his own prudence, but to the favourable influences of Heaven. It is indeed very probable that all those who made these acknowledgments, had not always in View the Duties of Religion, I mean the Gratitude with which we ought to attribute our Happiness to Divine Providence, and not to our own Wisdom. Several talk'd in this manner only for a Political end; they would appease the envious (*g*) or Create a greater confidence in their friends. But let us hear a Man, who knew how to make very judicious reflections. *The great Obstacle*, saith he, (*h*), *which the Founders of Sects and Empires have met with in their designs, is the Natural aversion of Men to be Subject to one another, to acknowledge a Superiority of Merit and knowledge. It hath always been a certain way to exclude a Person from all manner of Pre-eminence, to discover that he pretends to it or believes that he deserves it. And therefore all great Men have with the utmost Care avoided ever mentioning the extraordinary Qualities which they had received from the Liberal Hand of Nature. They have been always so circumspect that tho' every Body else admired them, they only seemed Ignorant of them.*——(*i*) *But the most successful artifice they ever made use of to secure themselves against the Pride and Natural independence of Men was, when these Illustrious impostors have permitted the People to ascribe whatever was excellent in them, to a certain secret communication with the Gods: By means of this Address whatever was great in them ceased to offend any Person, because it was no longer looked on as any part of a Personal Merit, which Men Naturally don't care to acknowledge, but only as an effect of Fortune, Chance or the particular Favour of Heaven which extends to the worthy, and unworthy, and does not debase the one or the other.*—— (*k*) *It is on this ground that* Cicero *when obliged to particularize all his Conduct against* Catiline *in order to Justify one accused of being concerned in his conspiracy; this great Orator very well knowing that a recital so Glorious for him, would in his own Mouth rather alienate than engage the minds of his Auditors; to render this recital less Odious he very artfully in the Entrance of his Oration ascribes all his great Actions on this occasion to a Divine inspiration.* (*l*) O ye Gods, *begins he*, immortal Gods, (for to you I will render what is yours, nor can I indeed presume so much on my Capacity, as to believe that I alone could ever prevent such numerous Accidents, which were so great, so different and so unexpected, and that in a time when the State was in the most turbulent tempestuous Condition) Yes, it is you who inflamed my Soul with an ardent Zeal for the Preservation of my Country; you who have taken me from all other Cares that I might apply my self solely to the Happy prosperity of the Republick: 'Tis you lastly who have darted such a refulgent light into my Mind before obnubilated by Error and Ignorance.

If these Reflections of the Abbot *de St. Real* are judicious, those of *Mr. Costar* are not less so, when he is enquiring into the Reasons which engaged *Sylla* to assume the Sir-name of Happy. He utterly dislikes Mr. *Girac*'s Opinion who saith: (*l*) “ It was indeed “ a Moderation in so illustrious a Commander to “ ascribe to Fortune so many signal Victories, which “ he might have attributed to his own Virtue. Ne“ vertheless this was the Effect of a consummated “ Prudence, and a refined Policy, which would yield “ to the envy which ordinarily attends those who “ raise themselves above others. The Ancient “ Greeks always feared the Goddess *Nemesis*, who “ diverted her self with abating and destroying “ those too highly exalted.” Mons. *Costar's* Reflections on this place of his Adversary are as follows, (*m*) *As for* Sylla *it was not the Defeat of* Mithridates, *which engaged him to assume the Name of* Happy. (*x*) *After having Oppressed all the Enemies of his Greatness and Person, and becoming Dictator by dint of his own Authority, he made an ample recital of all the Felicities which had attended both his Military and Civil Actions: After which he declared that in Acknowledgment of those Favours which Heaven had plentifully showred on him, he had resolved for the Future to add to his other Names the Title of Happy.* (*z*) *That the choice of this Sir-Name proceeded from his Moderation and to appease envy, as Mr.* Girac *believes, is what I cannot persuade my self. I rather conjecture that it was to give a greater Assurance to those of his Party and to strike terrour into his Enemies. In effect, we are more apprehensive of the Fortune of a great Man than of his Virtue, because the latter is but Humane, and we are pretty nearly acquainted with its Measure, and limited Cause; whereas Fortune is a Divine cause whose force is unlimited. And on this account we more readily rely on the protection of the Fortunate, than of the Virtuous; and the Lord Chancellor* Bacon *is of Opinion that* Cæsar *had not so effectually encouraged the affrighted Pilot in the Tempest, if he had said,* be not afraid, thou carriest *Cæsar* and his Virtue, *as he did by saying,* Fear nothing, thou carriest *Cæsar* and his Fortune. It seems more reasonable to me to ascribe this Action of *Sylla* to both Motives, that alledged by *Girac* as well as that Advanced by *Costar*; for it is certain that in the *Pagan* times they very much feared the Goddess *Nemesis*, and firmly believed her an Enemy to the Proud. And pursuant to this some were persuaded that the General *Timotheus*'s reverse of Fortune was owing to his refusing to acknowledge his Obligations to his Stars. Let us hearken to *Plutarch* on this Head. (*a*) *Timotheus an* Athenian *the Son of* Conon, *whose Malicious Enemies attributed all his great Actions to the Favour of Fortune, to express which they represented in Pictures, Fortune bringing Towns to him already taken in her Net, whilst he was asleep; very warmly resented it, and was very much incensed against them on that Account, urging that they robbed him of his just Glory: On which occasion once on his return from a successful War after having given an account to the People, and publickly recited the particulars of his Expedition, he added,* Athenian *Lords, I can assure you that Fortune has no Hand in what I have related. The Gods were so enraged at this ridiculous ambition, that after this he never was successful; they thwarted him in all his Actions to that Degree, that he became so Odious to the people that he was Banished* Athens. To this may be added what *Plutarch* tells us of *Sylla's* affecting the contrary. (*b*) “ *Sylla* not only patiently acqui“ esced to those who cried him up as a particular “ Favourite of Fortune, but backed their Opinion “ by his own Practice, always Glorying in the “ especial Favour of the Gods, and ascribing the “ Glory of all his Actions to Fortune (*c*), either “ out of a sort of vain Glory, or a real Imagina“ tion that the Gods conducted him in all his affairs; “ for he informs us in his Commentaries that of the “ enterprises which were best consulted, those which “ he warmly hazarded according as opportunity “ offered, tho' directly opposite to his former Re“ solutions in Council, were they which succeeded “ best. Besides when he said that he was rather Born “ for Fortune than War, he seems to acknowledge “ his successes rather due to Fortune than to his own “ Valour. In short on all occasions he seems intire“ ly to submit to and own his dependance on For“ tune; he always spoke of it as a singular Favour “ of the Gods that he preserved such an Union and “ Amity with his Father in Law *Metellus*, a person “ in equal Authority with himself.” See in *Plutarch* (*d*) several other actions extracted from the Commentaries of this *Roman* General; and observe that he supposes that his ascribing all his Glorious exploits to Fortune, might proceed from a bragging Humour (*e*). Εἴτε κόμπῳ χρώμενος, εἴθ' οὕτως ἔχων τῇ δόξῃ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, either, *saith he*, Sylla talked thus out of a vain glorious Bravado, or from the profound Veneration he had for Providence. Tho' indeed the Justness of this disjunction doth not clearly appear to me; for if this great Captain had not really believed that God had Favoured him, I own

(*m*) Costar Apologie, pag. 257, 258.

(*x*) Plut. in Sylla.

(*z*) Page 255.

(*a*) Plutarch in the Life of Sylla. pag. 454.

(*b*) Id. ib.

(*c*) *And yet* Sallust *tells us,* Atque illi (*Sullæ*) felicissimo omnium ante civilem victoriam nunquam super industriam fortuna fuit, multique dubitavere fortior an felicior esset. *Sallust. de bello Jugurth. p. m.* 362.

(*d*) Plut. in Sylla pag. 454.

(*e*) Ibid.

Antients (K) have ſaid on the Influence of Fortune, and particularly to refute thoſe who affirm that there is no other cauſe of Proſperity than Prudence, nor of

own he might yet have ſaid ſo on ſome Political Accounts already mentioned. But I cannot believe that Vanity or Vain Glory could induce him to it, ſince he was not one of thoſe worthleſs Wretches, who ground their Bravadoes on Extravagancies, and are ſufficiently ſatisfyed if they do but talk. Such a Man as he could not be Ignorant that whatever Victories he aſcrib'd to Fortune as the cauſe, he in proportion diminiſhed the Merit of his Courage and Conduct. How is it then poſſible that theſe acknowledgments ſhould proceed from a Principle of Vanity, ſuppoſing him Guilty of a Lie? In my Opinion the Hiſtorian ought to have joyned theſe two particulars, which he hath ſeparated. He ought to have ſaid that *Sylla* being perſuaded that Providence had Accumulated theſe ſurprizing Bleſſings on him, vainly affected to Boaſt of it: For as all things are liable to be Abuſed, 'tis certain that if on the one ſide Wiſe Men Humble themſelves, by acknowledging that they are only the Inſtruments of Providence; on the other hand Haughty Men Pride themſelves not a little, that God hath been pleaſed to make uſe of them for the Execution of his Deſigns. They look upon themſelves as the Darling Favourites of Heaven, and thence believe they are above all the reſt of Mankind. Conſider that St. *Paul* himſelf had occaſion for a ſtrong preventive againſt Pride, on account of the ſublime Excellence of thoſe Revelations, which God had by a very particular Privilege Communicated to him. But to attempt ſomething in Defence of *Plutarch*: Thoſe Perſons who believe nothing of what they ſay concerning Fortune, may nevertheleſs out of Vanity and Preſumption aſcribe their greateſt Actions to her. They Govern themſelves by the general Vogue; and imagine that thoſe who believe God to the Sovereign Director of all things, will admire and firmly rely on his Favourites. A Modern Author pretends that a certain Bravade (*f*) of *Tiberius* (*g*) was "rather Political than Vain. For it "is of great Importance for a Prince to be Fortunate "or thought ſo. And this paſſes among his Subjects "for Merit and Virtue; (3) beſides they believe their "Felicity depends on his. So *Tiberius* who perfectly "underſtood all the Maxims of Government, loudly "Proclaims the proſperity of his Houſe, declaring "that ſuch a Fortunate Incident had never hapned to "a *Roman* Prince. By which he deſign'd to render "himſelf more Venerable to the People, engaging "them to value him as the Favourite of the Gods. "(4).

(K) *What the Ancients have ſaid on the influence of Fortune.*] If I would here collect all that hath been ſaid on this Subject, I ſhould be obliged to undertake a Book on that Head alone. I only propoſe to gather a few Ears in this ſpatious Field. I dare averr that no Opinion is better Eſtabliſh'd in the Writings of the Ancients than that Induſtry and Prudence have a much leſs Share in Humane Events, than good or ill Fortune, or in other Words, an unforeſeen concourſe or Diſpoſition of circumſtances not in the leaſt dependant on us. *Sunt in his quidem virtutis opera magna, ſed majora Fortunæ*, ſaith *Pliny* (*h*) after having related ſeveral events: But who doubts that he might have ſaid the ſame of an Infinite Number of other particular occurrences? He lays down the Maxim tho' ſomewhat more obſcurely a little farther. *Plurimum refert in quæ cujuſque virtus tempora inciderit.* Tho' *Quintus Curtius* ſhould not (*i*) formally tell us that *Alexander*'s Conqueſts were leſs owing to Valour than Fortune; yet without that his Hiſtory alone ſays as much. *Cornelius Nepos* affirms that in the Diviſion of Military Glory Fortune has always the greateſt Share: (*k*) *Jure ſuo nonnulla ab Imperatore miles, plurima vero Fortuna vindicat, ſeque his plus valuiſſe quam ducis prudentiam verè poteſt prædicare.* Mr. Spanheim (*l*) conjectures that theſe Words are only an Imitation of the following: (*m*) *Nam bellicas laudes ſolent quidam extenuare verbis, eaſque detrahere ducibus, communicare cum militibus,———maximam verò partem quaſi ſuo jure Fortuna ſibi vindicat, & quidquid eſt proſpere geſtum id pene omne ducit ſuum.* Cicero who ſpoke this to *Cæſar*, had no Reaſon to fear that he ſhould be offended at it; for no Perſon ever aſcribed more to Fortune than he. You may ſee in Mr. *Spanheim* (*n*) what *Livy*, *Diodorus Siculus* and others have acknowledged concerning this Supreme power, either in expreſs Words, or by declaring that we ought not to judge of perſonal Merit by the ſucceſs of Actions, which is intirely ſubject to Fortune, but by the means that are uſed. Scarce any of the Poets has ſpoken ſo nervouſly on this Subject as *Juvenal.*

Si (*a*) *fortuna volet, fies de rhetore conſul;*
Si volet hæc eadem, fies de conſule rhetor.
Ventidius quid enim? quid Tullius? anne aliud quam
Sidus & occulti miranda potentia fati?

The Opinion of Princes being in this place of greater force than that of a Poet; I ſhall cite the Anſwer of *Dionyſius* the younger: (*b*) *Wherefore did not you keep the Kingdom which your Father left you*, was he asked by *Philip*, King of *Macedonia*: *Don't be ſurpriz'd at that*, reply'd he, *for my Father, who bequeathed to me all his other Goods, did not leave me the Fortune by which he acquired them.*

I might here ſubjoin the Opinions of ſeveral Moderns; but ſhall content my ſelf with a paſſage in *Montagne.* (*c*) "It is ordinarily obſervable in humane Actions, that Fortune, in order to convince "us of her powerful influence over all things, takes "pleaſure in abating our preſumption; and not "being able to make Fools wiſe, ſhe makes them "happy in Spite of Virtue: And is moſt inclined to favour thoſe executions, where the Deſign "is more eſpecially her own. Hence we daily ſee "the moſt Ignorant Wretches put an end to the "greateſt both publick and private Enterpriſes. And "as *Sirannez* the *Perſian* anſwered thoſe, who were "very much ſurpriſed at the ill Succeſs of his Affairs, conſidering that his deſigns were ſo well "laid; That he alone was Maſter of his deſigns, "but the ſucceſs was owing to Fortune. So they "may Anſwer in the ſame manner, but in a different ſenſe. The greateſt part of the buſineſs of "the World is generally done by it ſelf.

"*Fata viam inveniunt.*

"The Iſſue frequently Authoriſes a very trifling "Conduct. Our Interpoſition is only a thing of "courſe, and more commonly in conſideration of "Cuſtom and Example than Reaſon. When I "have been aſtoniſhed at the greatneſs of an Action, and by enquiry of thoſe who have accompliſhed it, have been led to the Motives and Management; I have found their Counſels very common, and the moſt vulgar and cuſtomary are perhaps alſo the moſt Secure and beſt Adapted to "Practice, not for ſhew———Good luck and ill "luck are in my Opinion two great Powers. "'Tis ridiculous to think that Humane Prudence "is ſufficient to fill up Fortune's Roll. And his enterprize is very vain, who would preſume to graſp "both the cauſes and conſequences and carry the "Progreſs of Actions in his Hand: And above all "it's vain in Martial Councils."

Nowithſtanding all thoſe Authorities, 'tis certain that ſeveral good Writers have maintained that every one is the Author of his own Fortune, and is either miſerable or happy as he acts imprudently or wiſely. (*d*) *Plautus* has laid down this Maxim.

LY. *Ne opprobra, pater. Multa eveniunt homini quæ*
volt quæ nevolt.
PH. *Mentire edepol, gnate: atque id nunc facis haud*
conſuetudine,
Nam ſapiens quidem pol ipſe fingit fortunam ſibi.
Eo ne multa quæ nevolt eveniunt niſi fictor malu'ſt.

The ſame Maxim is to be found in the following Words cited from an Ancient Poet in a diſcourſe attributed to (*e*) *Salluſt*. *Res docuit id verum eſſe quod in carminibus Appius ait fabrum eſſe ſuæ quemque Fortunæ.* Cornelius Nepos, alledges it twice in his Life of *Pomponius Atticus*. (*f*) *Itaque hic fecit ut vere dictum videatur* SUI CUIQUE MORES FINGUNT FORTUNAM——(*g*) *quantum poterimus rerum exemplis lectores docebimus, ſicut ſupra ſignificavimus,* SUOS CUIQUE MORES PLERUMQUE CONCILIARE FORTUNAM. Thoſe who exclaimed againſt *Theophraſtus* for praiſing the Maxim, that Fortune and not Wiſdom the Directreſs of Life, have come very near to *Plautus*'s Aſſertion. And what ſhall we ſay of *Juvenal*, who after having in his 7th Satyr preached up the Omnipotence of Fate and Stars, tells us in his 10th Satyr that all depends on Prudence?

Nullum (*i*) *numen abeſt, ſi ſit prudentia: nos te*
Nos facimus, fortuna, deam cæloque locamus.

Some

(*f*) *The Wife of Druſus, the Son of Tiberius being delivered of two Boys, Tiberius ſaid in a full Senate that ſince the beginning of the Empire no Man of his rank had been bleſſed with the like good Fortune.* Tacit. ann. lib. 2.

(*g*) Amelot de la Houſſaye *in his* Tiberius ch. 83. p. 106. edit. 1683. in 4.

(3) Quibuſdam fortuna pro virtutibus fuit. *Hiſt.* 2.

(4) Cœleſtis favor, & quædam inclinatio numinum oſtenderetur. *Hiſt.* 4.

(*h*) Plinius lib. 7. cap. 28. pag. m. 49.

(*i*) Fatendum eſt quum plurimum virtuti debuerit plus debuiſſe fortunæ quam ſolus omnium mortalium in poteſtate habuit. *Q. Curtius* lib. 10. c. 5. *n.* 35.

(*k*) Cornel. Nepos in Thraſybulo p. m. 156.

(*l*) Spanheim, *in* Juliani Cæſares pag. 428.

(*m*) Cicero orat. pro Marcello.

(*n*) Spanheim ibid. & p. 255.

(*a*) Juven. Sat. 7. v. 197. *He ſays the 16 Satyr v. 4.* Plus enim fati valet hora benigni Quam ſi nos Veneris commendet epiſtola Marti, Et Samia genitrix quæ delectatur arena.

(*b*) Ælian. div. hiſt. lib. 12. c. 60.

(*c*) Montagne, Eſſais liv. 3. ch. 8. p. m. 267, 268.

(*d*) Plautus in Trinummo act. 2. ſc. 2. v. 80. pag. 43.

(*e*) Salluſtius Oratio 1. ad Cæſarem de ordinanda republica.

(*f*) Cornel. Nepos in vita Pomp. Attici pag. m. 394.

(*g*) Id. ib. pag. 398, 399.

(*h*) Vexatur idem Theophraſtus & libris & ſcholis omnium philoſophorum, quod in Calliſthene ſuo laudaret illam ſententiam, Vitam regit fortuna non ſapientia. *Cicero Tuſcul.* l. 5. fol. 273.

(*i*) Juven. ſat. 10. v. 365. *See alſo* ſat. 14. v. 315.

of Adverſity than Imprudence. But it ought not to be expected that I ſhould attempt

ſome Moderns have approved *Plautus*'s Opinion. *Galeotto de gli Oddi* pronounced an Oration on this Subject (a) in the Academy of the *Inſenſati* at *Perugia*. *Reignier declares* for the ſame Opinion in one of his *Satyrs*:

Nous (b) *ſommes du bonheur de nous même artiſans,*
Et fabriquons nos jours ou faſcheux ou plaiſans.
La fortune eſt à nous, & n'eſt mauvaiſe ou bonne,
Que ſelon qu'on la forme ou bien qu'on ſe la donne.

Mr. de Calliere, in his Book of the Fortune of Perſons of Quality maintains: (c) *That our good or ill Fortune depends on our Conduct.* He declares in his Epiſtle Dedicatory, *That he deſigns to deſtroy the Idols of Fortune, to demoliſh her Temples and Altars, and to force away the ſounder part of her Adorers.* Tho' Mr. de *Silhon* (d) ſays that *Fortune* is a Fantome which *Religion hath aboliſh'd, the invention of which is not uſeleſs ſince the unhappy and imprudent attribute to that, the cauſes of their Miſery, and the effects of their ill Conduct*; Yet I don't reckon him one of the Approvers of *Plautus*'s Maxim; for he did not believe, that in order to ſucceed in our Undertakings, it is ſufficient to comport our ſelves according to the Rules of Prudence, and to have a good cauſe. He owns a Proſperity and Adverſity, diſpenſed by the Providence of God, without any neceſſary regard to our Intentions and Meaſures. (e) A very good Book appeared not long ſince Intituled, *Reflections on what is called Good or Ill Luck in Lotteries*. The Author is undoubtedly of *Plautus*'s Opinion; or to ſpeak plainer, he doth not believe that the fortunate Lots run for, or againſt certain perſons with a ſort of diſtinction. It doth not then amount to a general Opinion, that there is ſome unknown thing which favours or croſſes certain Perſons without any regard to their good or ill Qualities, or the meaſures they take to attain their ends. But we are obliged to own that the greateſt number of Suffrages is for the affirmative; but becauſe that is no manner of Proof of the truth of an Opinion, I wiſh that ſome able Pen would examine this Subject to the bottom, and diſcuſs what could be ſaid on each ſide; in the mean time I will offer a few Reflections.

I. I obſerve firſt of all, that we ought not to believe that the Pagans repreſented *Fortune*, as a Being which blindly diſtributed Good and Evil, without knowing what ſhe did. They called her Blind (f) I own; but that was not in order to deprive her abſolutely of all Knowledge; it was only to ſignifie that ſhe did not act with a juſt diſcernment. So we ſay a Prince is blind in the diſtribution of his Favours, when he beſtows and takes them away by caprice, and without any reſpect to the merit of his Subjects. We don't infer from thence, that he doth Good or Ill to ſuch and ſuch, without knowing that he gives or takes away the reſpective place from the reſpective perſon. We only mean, that he doth not govern himſelf according to the rules of Reaſon and Juſtice, and that he is determined raſhly by the inſtigation of his inconſtant Paſſions. This is the Idea which the Heathens formed of *Fortune*. They all, except a few Philoſophers, were perſuaded that the Divine Nature was a ſort of Being divided into ſeveral individuals. They attributed to every God a large ſhare of Power, but did not exempt them from the Imperfections of our Nature; they believ'd them ſuſceptible of Anger and Jealouſie, litterally ſpeaking. They made no ſcruple (g) to ſay in their moſt ſerious Writings, that a Maligne and ſecret Envy of the Gods oppoſed their Proſperity. They more particularly attributed to the God which they call'd *Fortune*, a Conduct which was inconſtant, raſh and capricious to the laſt degree. It was for this Reaſon that an infinite number of Temples were built to her, and that ſhe was worſhipped in a particular manner, in order to prevent the ill effects of her Caprices. They did not then believe that ſhe wanted either Eyes or Ears, or Thought. Thoſe Philoſophers who acknowledged the Unity of the Deity, called that Divine Being *Fortune*, when they conſider'd it only as a Diſtributer of Good and Evil things, which did not conform it ſelf in the leaſt to what we call Merit, Conſtancy, or Reaſon. But the wiſeſt of them always owned that it never acted contrary to abſolute Juſtice, or without Reaſons which it very well knew to be perfectly good. At the bottom God himſelf ſays, That his Ways are not our Ways and his Thoughts are not our Thoughts.

II. My ſecond Reflection is, that under the Goſpel Diſpenſation we attribute, to earthly Goods, all the defects which the Pagans aſcribed to Fortune. We ſay that the poſſeſſion of them is no ſign of Merit, that they are very fleeting and periſhable, and that they miſerably deceive thoſe who rely on them, &c. 'Tis eaſie to obſerve the reaſon of this diverſity of Language. The Chriſtians acknowlege only one God, and by that word they underſtand a Nature ſovereignly perfect, which governs all things, and diſpenſes all Events; but the Pagans laviſhed the Name of God into an infinity of limited Beings, imperfect, full of Faults and vicious Paſſions. For which reaſon they made no ſcruple to charge on them the Irregularities of Humane Life, when they could not diſcover the cauſe of them amongſt the free actions of Men. The Chriſtians on the contrary, charge on the Creature whateve they find of Infirmity in the World; they caſt on the Benefit what the Pagans blamed in the Benefactor.

III. I ſay in the third place, That it can ſcarce be deny'd, that there are fortunate and unfortunate People, that is, according to the Pagan Language, that there are ſome People to whom *Fortune* plays a hundred Tricks in the whole courſe of their Affairs, whilſt there are others, out of whoſe way ſhe removes all Obſtacles, and takes care to hand to them a hundred favourable diſpoſitions. Merchandiſe, Gaming, and the Court have always furniſhed Examples of both theſe ſorts; but nothing ſo manifeſtly confirms this as the Military Art. There *Fortune* rules more than any where elſe: Our *Timoleon* (h), *Alexander*, *Sylla*, *Cæſar*, and ſeveral other Antient Warriors, have acknowledged it in the moſt authentick Manner: The Moderns ſubſcribe to it as well in their Memoirs as Converſations. I have been told by a Perſon of Quality, that the Conſtable *Vrangel* aſſured him, that nothing was more raſh than to hazard a Battle, which was liable to be loſt by a thouſand unforeſeen Accidents; tho' at the ſame time the moſt exact meaſures have been taken, which the moſt conſummate Military prudence can ſuggeſt. *Girard*, Secretary to the Duke of *Epernon*, in his long life of that famous Favourite, diſplays ſo many happy Events independant on precaution, that it is hardly poſſible to deny the Truth of the popular Opinion concerning the Fortune of ſome People. After this, ſays the Hiſtorian, we ought not to wonder if the Duke never complained of Fortune on account of the Adverſity of his Old age: On the contrary, ſome of his Friends once talking on that Subject, he told them that he ſhould be very ungrateful for the Benefits with which *Fortune* had conſtantly favour'd him for above 60 Years, if he ſhould be diſcontented, that ſhe would leave him for the ſmall time he had yet to live; that he had ſcarce obſerv'd an intire life, tho' much ſhorter than his, that had been always proſperous; and that in the inconſtant ſtate of Humane Affairs, it was no ſmall advantage that his Diſgraces were reſerv'd to a time, when he was hardly capable of reliſhing Proſperity.

IV. My fourth Reflection is, that it ſeems utterly falſe, that what we call good Fortune depends only on Prudence; and that what we name ill Fortune, is only the reſult of Imprudence. I freely own that the Aſſertion of the Author above cited (i) doth not appear to me well grounded. It is falſe that the winning Gameſter always plays better than the Loſer; it is falſe that the enriched Merchant ſurpaſſes thoſe who do not grow rich in the knowledge of Trade, Induſtry, or circumſpection. No perſon is ignorant, that in thoſe Games which depend on Chance, an inviſible Somewhat prevails, which contributes more to Loſs or Gain, than whatever depends on the Skill of the Gameſters. There are days on which he wins large Sums: This is not owing to his playing with greater application, or with a more ignorant Gameſter; but he has a good Game, the very Cards are dealt him which he wants, or the Dice turn according to his Wiſhes. On other days he experiences the clean contrary. Nay, even before he riſes from his Seat, he finds the turn of Fortune; he is lucky in the beginning, and unlucky at the end; he loſes the laſt Hour, more than he won in all the fore-going. There are Men who immediately after they begin to play, find their good or ill luck, and perceiving that the Day does not favour them, they are ſo wiſe as not to puſh any farther, and give out in good time. Not that they diſtruſt tempt to do it by inconteſtable Reaſons. It is not poſſible in a Subject of this nature to lead the Reader to Evidence, or Demonſtration. We find it

---

(a) See Don Secondo Lancelotti in the Book intituled, [illegible] pag. 237.

(b) Reignier, Satyr 13. [illegible] 96 verse.

(c) To the Title of the firſt Chapter.

(d) Silhon Miniſtre d'Etat. Book 1. ch. 9. at the beginning.

(e) Printed at Amſterdam 1695.

(f) Spargitque manu munera cæca pejora fovens. Seneca.

(g) Hinc ve invidia Deum, ve fato rapidiſſimus procurrentis imperii curſus parumper Gallorum Senonum incurſione ſupprimitur. Florus lib. 1. c. 13. Indignantium voces exaudiebantur tam viridem & in flore ætatis fortunæque invidia Deum ereptum eſſe rebus humanis Alexandrum.) Q. Curtius lib. 10. c. 5.

(h) Rex juſſum confidere felicitati ſuæ remiſit, ſibi enim ad alia gloriam concedere Deos. Q. Curtius lib. 7. c. 7. Rex fortuna ſua & conſiliis ſuorum ſe uſurum eſſe reſpondet, nam & fortunam cui confidat & conſilium ſuadentium ne quid temere & audacter faciat ſequuturum. Id. ib. c. 9.

(i) Mr. de Cailliere *in his Book* de la fortune des gens de qualité.

moſt

aſſiſt either their Skill and Capacity, but what doth not depend on them. This inviſible ſomewhat doth not ſo apparently reign in Trade; 'tis nevertheleſs certain, that Perſons of the meaneſt capacity, and of very little judgment, by buying and ſelling thoſe Bargains, which a Man of clear parts and great Experience would by no means venture on, frequently gain immenſe Sums. It may paſs for a general rule, that thoſe who acquire the moſt Riches by Trade, are not either more intelligent, or more laborious than ſeveral others whoſe Gain is very moderate: the latter are not therefore ſuch Favourites of *Fortune* as the former. There is then a good or Ill *Fortune* in Humane life, independent on Prudence or Imprudence; which I do not believe the Author I am at preſent examining, will deny ſo far as relates to Play and Commerce: He only means the Fortune which People of Quality may make in the ſervice of their Prince. If he only intended to Counſel a Gentleman to chuſe the prudent part, I have nothing to ſay againſt his Opinion; but he goes much farther, he would perſuade us, that thoſe who ſucceed, owe their advancement to their wiſe Conduct only, and that thoſe who do not make their Fortune, ought to impute it to their imprudence. This is what I cannot indeed believe: I'll allow him to call wiſe Conduct, whatever a Man does to conform himſelf to the preſent Circumſtances, as to be a Braggadocio, a Debauchee, an Impertinent, a Buffoon, *&c.* whenever it is the certain way to pleaſe; or to pretend to be mad, (a) when without it he cannot eſcape imminent dangers. Let every thing paſs for Imprudence, which is contrary to the Humour of preſent times; as to be a very honeſt Man in a depraved Court, where there is no buſineſs for any but Raſcals. Notwithſtanding all this, I cannot help maintaining my Aſſertion, that the riſe and fall of great Men are not commonly meer effects of Prudence or Imprudence. Chance, fortuitous Accidents and Fortune juſtly claim a large ſhare. Un-foreſeen occurrences in which we have no hand, diſcover the way, and oblige us to redouble our pace. A Caprice, a Jealouſie, which it was impoſſible to fore-ſee ſtops your ſpeedy courſe, and throws you entirely out of the way.

V. The better to refute Mr. *de Cailliere*, I add a fifth Reflection. We ought not to pretend that all Events being connected to a determinate Cauſe, *Fortune* is a Chimerical Being, and ſo that we are fortunate or unfortunate, only becauſe we fore-ſee, or do not fore-ſee the reſult of natural Cauſes and Effects. To evince the nullity of this Objection, I will ſuppoſe a Fact not only very poſſible, but which may be proved by ſome Examples. A Prince cauſes a Town to be beſieged in the middle of Winter: If the Rains, Snow, or the Ice come upon him, he is not likely to take it; but if the Weather be dry, and but moderately cold, he will take it. He meets with ſeveral ſucceſſive Weeks of fine Weather; no Rain, no Snow interrupts his Deſign, the Siege advances daily, and the Town capitulates before the Froſt. Another Prince beſieges a place in the heat of Summer, and is likely to take it if the Seaſon keeps its ordinary courſe; but if it rains hard for ſeveral days, if the Nights are cold, if this occaſion ſeveral Diſtempers in the Camp, he will not be able to take it. The Seaſon turns utterly irregular, the Summer is cold and rainy, the Trenches advance but ſlowly, the Army grows weaker daily by the growing Diſeaſes which the rigorous Weather has produced, he finds himſelf forced to raiſe the Siege. Can you poſſibly aſcribe the happy Succeſs of the firſt Siege to Prudence, and charge the ill ſucceſs of the ſecond on Imprudence? This would be to aſſert two Abſurdities; for in the firſt Siege the fine Weather could not be fore-ſeen any more than the ill Weather could reaſonably be feared in the latter; and conſequently the firſt was not prudently, nor the ſecond imprudently attempted. It is then purely owing to good Fortune that the firſt ſucceeded, as it is to be aſcribed to ill luck that the latter did not. I know wery well that if Men were but ſufficiently clear-ſighted to fore-ſee Rain and fair Weather, 'twould have been an act of Imprudence to have formed the latter Siege. The ill ſucceſs would then be a great fault, and not an unfortunate Blow; but humane Capacity doth not extend ſo far, and if we do not know that the Summer will prove rainy, it is not owing to Imprudence. There are a hundred fortuitous Accidents, which we can no more fore-ſee than theſe, and they are equally capable of diſappointing the beſt concerted military Enterprizes. Now as ſome Generals are much more frequently perplexed with theſe croſs Occurrences than others, we may reaſonably acquieſce in the popular Opinion, that there are fortunate and unfortunate Generals. But we muſt not hence infer, that the fortunate always, or almoſt always equal the unfortunate in Prudence and Valour: No, let us on the contrary believe that the latter ſometimes ſurpaſs the former in both Virtues. (b) *Forſtnerus*, in his Notes on a Paſſage of *Tacitus*, (c) wherein that Hiſtorian aſſures us, that all Humane Affairs are a continual Game, will afford you ſeveral illuſtrious Examples, which prove that the beſt concerted Deſigns in this World are confounded by an inviſible force, which Humane Prudence cannot ward off: This is particularly obſervable in the (‖) Conclaves; and as for thoſe who pretend that every Perſon is the Author of his own Fortune, you may find them ſolidly and amply Confuted in a Book (d) of *Don Lancelotti*.

Obſerve carefully what I am about to ſay. Sovereigns do commonly judge of things by the Succeſs. A General ſtands very well in their favour who ſucceeds in a military Undertaking; but if the contrary happens, he forfeits their Eſteem and Amity. Tho' they are perfectly ſenſible that the Victory was barely a piece of good Fortune, and the Defeat was not in the leaſt owing to the General's fault, yet they are always more diſpoſed to prefer the Victor than the vanquiſh'd; for to be fortunate is a recommendatory Character which ſtrongly ſways them, as on the other ſide, an unfortunate, tho' ſhining merit is but a diſguſting quality. Since then Battels are loſt and won by unfore-ſeen Accidents, it is clear that Misfortunes happen independently on Imprudence, and that ſome make their Fortune independently on Prudence. A lucky Raſhneſs, you'll tell me, doth not deſerve the name of Temerity; for ſince it has ſucceeded, 'tis a ſign that it was proper to produce its wiſh'd effect. Wherein doth Prudence conſiſt? Is it not in making uſe of ſufficient means to accompliſh our Deſigns? My anſwer is, that to act prudently, 'tis requiſite we be ſure that the means we uſe are proportioned to the end. A raſh fortunate Man is unacquainted with this proportion; he is hurried on by an impetuous fury; there appears nothing in his Conduct which is not clearly viſible in that of the raſh unfortunate: wherefore the ſucceſs of the enterprize ought not to be aſcrib'd to Prudence but Fortune. Obſerve alſo further, that 'tis no manner of imprudence not to be precaution'd againſt thoſe things which Humane Capacity cannot diſcover, and of conſequence if a Perſon doth not ſucceed at Court, or if he loſes the Fortune he has already made, 'tis not always to be attributed to Imprudence. Is it poſſible for him to diſcover all the Caprices, Diſguſts and Jealouſies that are produced in the Mind of a Monarch, or of his Miſtreſſes or Favourites? Can he diſcover all the Grimaces of falſe Brethren, diſſipate their Calumnies, and prevent their Lies and falſe Reports which wound without threatning? What follows, was ſaid by a great Miniſter, whoſe Genius was not leſs than his Authority. (e) *In the Poſt which you are in*, ſaid Cardinal *Richelieu* to a (f) Captain of the Guards, *'tis eaſie for you to know your Friends and your Enemies. No diſguiſe can conceal them from your diſcernment; but with reſpect to mine, in the poſt which I ſupply, I cannot penetrate into their Sentiments, they all ſpeak to me in the ſame Language. They all make the ſame earneſt Court to me, and thoſe who would ruin me, give me the ſame Marks of Amity, as thoſe who are ſincerely and firmly in my Intereſts. Reignier*, in the Satyr already cited, tells us:

La (g) faveur eſt bizarre a traitter indocile,
Sans arreſt, inconſtante & d'humeur difficile,
Avecq' diſcretion il la faut careſſer,
L'un la perd bien ſouvent pour la trop embraſſer,
Ou pour s'y fier trop, l'autre par inſolence,
Ou pour avoir trop peu ou trop de violence,
Our pour ſe la promettre ou ſe la dénier,
En fin c'eſt un caprice eſtrange à manier,
Son amour eſt fragile & ſe rompt comme verre,
Et fait aux plus matois donner du nez en terre.

VI. Let

(a) Inſipiens eſto quumtempus poſtulat, aut res: Stultitiam ſimulare loco, prudentia ſumma eſt. *Cato diſt.* 19. lib. 2. David, & Brutus *and many others have been the better for ſuch a conduct. See.* Cornelius à Lapide in lib. 1. *Regum* cap. 21.

(b) *We may ſay of ſeveral Great Captains what* Florus *ſaid of* Sertorius l. 3. c. 22. ſummæ quidem ſed calamitoſæ virtutis.

(c) Mihi quanto plura recentium ſeu veterum volvo, tanto magis ludibria rerum mortalium cunctis in negotiis obſervantur. *Tacit. annal.* lib. 3. c. 18.

‖ *See the* Melanges *of* Vigneul Marville vol. 2. p. 230, 231. of the *Dutch Edition.*

(d) *It is intituled* Chi ſindovina e Savio, overo la prudenza humana fallaciſſima: *The Author refutes it in the 3.* diſinganno *of the 2d. Book, the Oration of* Galeotto de gli Oddi.

(e) Hiſtoire du Marechal de Fabert. pag. 53.

(f) Mr. de Fabert, *who was* Marechal de France.

(g) Regnier ubi ſupra fol. 96.

moſt only ſtrong Probabilities in it; and it is no ſmall Objection againſt the Opinion

VI. *Let us then take it for granted and certain, which is my ſixth Reflection, That the Prudence of a Man is not the ſole nor even the principal cauſe of his Fortune. There are ſome Fortunate People, whoſe Conduct is very Imprudent: And others Unfortunate, tho' their Conduct be prudent. The difficulty is to know what this Fortune is which favours ſome People and perſecutes others, without regard to their Merit or the Meaſures they take. To recur to God is not to remove the difficulty; for acknowledging him the general cauſe of all things, it may be asked whether he manages immediately and by particular acts of his Will, all thoſe unforeſeen Occurrences which cauſe the deſigns of one Man to ſucceed, and confound the Enterpriſes of another. If you anſwer in the Affirmative you will bring all the Philoſophers, eſpecially the* Carteſians *on your back, who will maintain that you Attribute ſuch a Conduct to the Supreme Being as is Inconſiſtent with an Infinite Agent. He ought, they will tell you, to make a ſmall number of general Laws, and by this means produce an Infinity of Events, without recurring every Moment to Exceptions, or particular Acts, muſt needs be Miracles, tho' we ſhould not call them ſo, by reaſon they would be ſo frequent (g). You may indeed reply to them, that the Occurrences favourable to the Fortunate, and thoſe that are contrary to the Unfortunate, are a natural conſequence of thoſe general Laws; but they will not eaſily believe you. Can you perſuade me that Chance can produce what I am about to ſay? Let one Hundred Tickets well Sealed be ranged in order on a Table: Let ten of them be Blanks, and ten of them marked with the Letter A, and write a Sentence on all the reſt; then let ten Men be called in, and one of them directed to take up the 1, the 15, the 21, the 37, the 44, the 68, the 80, the 83, the 90, and the 99. Let another be ordered to take the 3, the 6, the 13, the 25, the 50, the 73, the 88, the 89, the 95, and the 100. Tell me, if the firſt of theſe Men draws the ten Blank Tickets, and the other the ten marked A, can you ever hope to perſuade me that this was the reſult of the general Laws of the Communication of Motion? Should not even you your ſelf believe that by a premeditated Deſign theſe 20 Tickets were placed in ſuch an order that one ten ſhould fall intirely into the Hands of the firſt, and the other into the Hands of the ſecond Perſon? Put the caſe that certain Gameſters had always, (h) or almoſt always the beſt Cards, or in general that certain Perſons are almoſt always favoured with Fortunate Occurrences; this would require ſomething beſides the natural reſult of the Communication of Motion, this muſt proceed from a particular Direction and Determination; and I ſhould rather chooſe with ſeveral Learned Men to deny the diſtinction of good or ill Fortune, than to explain it only by the general Laws of Nature. But we argue here on the Hypotheſis that there are Fortunate and Unfortunate People.

Cannot we recur to Occaſional Cauſes, I mean, to the deſires of ſome Created Spirits? *Platoniſm* would eaſily reliſh ſuch an Explication; but it is beaten off by ſtrong Arguments, according to the Idea which Theology gives us of the Angelical Nature. It teaches us that the Angels are ſome of them perfectly Good, and others extremely Wicked, and both endowed with an almoſt unlimited Knowledge, under the general Direction of God. This Idea cannot eaſily be adjuſted to the particular train of Fortunate or Unfortunate Occurrences. But confining our ſelves to *Hypotheſes* purely Philoſophical, we ſhall be better able to anſwer theſe Objections, if we ſuppoſe for Example, that the Inviſible (i) Spirits are more different from one another, than Men are amongſt themſelves; that there is a great Subordination amongſt theſe Spirits; that there are ſome who are this Moment Good and the next Evil, now in a good Humour, and preſently in an ill Humour; that they are Fantaſtick, Inconſtant, Jealous, Envious, that they thwart one another, that their Power is very much Limited in certain particulars, and that if they can perform a thing which is very difficult, it does not hence follow that they accompliſh a thing which is much eaſier. Don't we ſee Country-women Ignorant of the Alphabet, who know a thouſand excellent Medicinal Secrets? *Archimedes* who made ſuch admirable Engines, Could he Sow? Could he Spin? However it be, there is no Fortune without the direction of an Intelligent Cauſe, and I cannot be ſufficiently ſurprized that a Learned Man ſhould venture to ſay, (k) That Fortune was neither God nor Nature, Underſtanding, or Reaſon, but a certain Natural and Irrational Impulſe. (a) *Licet diſputatum ſit, fortunam à naturâ prorſus eſſe aliam, non defuere tamen, qui aſſererent, etſi à naturæ moribus, inſtitutiſque longe plurimum fortuna abhorreat, ſitque ipſa inconſtans admodum, & lubrica, non continua, non eadem ubique, non eorundem ſemper effectrix, non ſimileis ſibi retinens progreſſiones, non diſcriminata ſervans tempora, denique improvida ſit, repentina, inordinata, temeraria, quæ ſive mores, ſive impulſus, neque naturæ conveniant, neque rationi, quarum utriuſque propria ſit conſtantia, maturitas, ordo, menſura, regula, diſcriminatio item rerum, temporum effectuum, non inquam defuere, fortunam qui aſſerant, irrationalem quandam eſſe naturam, nec aliud illam denique, quam naturæ impetum quendam, hoc eſt ratione carentem agitationem naturæ quandam, in iis ipſis videlicet, quæ nec rationi ſubjiciantur naturæ, neque hominum electionibus, ac conſiliis. Impetum itaque eſſe eam cenſent, quod ſit abſque ratione, ferature que ſuopte tantum agitatu, atque impulſu, quodque ubi impetus dominetur, illic rationi nullus omnino relictus ſit locus, nulla prorſus authoritas, aut penſitatio earum quæ geruntur rerum.* Perhaps you would gladly be informed for what reaſons he deprives God and Nature of the acts of Fortune: Wherefore ſince his Works are ſomewhat ſcarce, I will inſert what he ſaith on this Head. *Fortunam non eſſe Deum*, is the Title of one of his Chapters: Here is Chapter it ſelf: (b) *Quomodo enim Deus erit, ſi hæc tam ſæpe, tam inconſiderate, tam etiam inique, atque ex inopinato extollit ignavos, locupletat immeritos, vexat atque affligit inſontes, bonos in calamitatem adducit, ac ſervitutem, pravos ſtatuit in ſolio, liberat à periculis perverſos, moderatos & honeſtos viros laboribus, periculis, ærumnis, ac miſeriis, conficit? Tyrannorum hæc ſunt non Dei, cujus eſt ſumma bonitas, abſoluta juſtitia, rectiſſimum judicium, æquiſſima rerum omnium diſpenſatio.* The following Chapter entituled *Fortunam non eſſe naturam*, amongſt other things contains the following words: (c) *Naturam quoque non eſſe eam hæc ipſa liquido ſatis docent, quod fortuna ipſa quidem inconſtans eſt, inordinata, varia, repentina, incerta: Contra vero quid natura ipſa ordinatius, conſtantius, certius? cujus is eſt ordo, ea lex, ac regula, ut non niſi certis, conſtitutiſque è principiis ſuo tempore, ſuis progreſſionibus, menſuriſque tum univerſa proveniant, tum etiam ſingula quarumcunque ipſa rerum, effectionum, operum author eſt & cauſa. Pergit natura ordine ſuo, graditur ſuis paſſibus, diſpenſat actiones ſuas cum temporibus, viribus, opibuſque ſuis utitur cum menſura, & penſo, non fluitat, non nutat, ſtabilis eſt in officio ſuo, ſibique ſemper conſtat.* See the Margin (†).

VII. My laſt Reflection is, that Men uſually are exceſſive in their Murmurs againſt Fortune; for very often they impute to her what they ought to charge on their own Imprudence. *Homer* was not Ignorant of this Fault, for he introduces the Gods complaining of this Injuſtice of Men. Read theſe words in *Aulus Gellius*: (d) *Propterea negat* (Chryſippus) *oportere ferri audirique homines aut nequam aut ignavos & nocentes & audaces; qui, cum in culpa & in maleficio revicti ſunt, perfugiunt ad fati neceſſitatem, tamquam in aliquod Fati aſylum; &, quæ peſſime fecerunt, ea non ſuæ temeritati ſed fato eſſe attribuenda dicunt. Primus autem Homerus ſapientiſſimus & antiquiſſimus poetarum dixit in hiſce verſibus:*

Ω πόποι (e), οἷον δή νυ θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται.
Ἐξ ἡμέων γάρ φασὶ κάκ' ἔμμεναι. οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
Σφῇσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουσιν.

Theſe three *Greek* Verſes are taken from the firſt Book of the *Odyſſey*, and ſignify in *Latin*.

Papæ, quomodo jam Deos mortales culpant,
Ex nobis enim inquiunt mala eſſe: at illi ipſi
Ob ſua ſcelera præter fatum dolores patiuntur.

La Fontaine hath ingeniouſly deſcribed the ſame Injuſtice; you'll find his Thoughts and ſeveral others in the Book (f) which I quote. But may not one ſay that on ſeveral occaſions, the Perſon whoſe own Fault has rendred him unhappy, has not a

---

(g) *There are ſome other Objections taken from Morality, which may be ſeen hereafter in Pontanus's words. See alſo the* Reflections ſur le bonheur & malheur des loteries *ch. 8. p. 92. & ſeq.*

(h) *Take notice of the Clauſe; for if there was no Providence, but a Fortuitous Diſtribution of good and evil things, ſome Men would find themſelves in happy Circumſtances, and others not.*

(i) *I call 'em ſo in Oppoſition to Humane Souls, which are Spirits United to ſenſible Bodies.*

(k) Jovianus Pontanus de Fortuna lib. 1. fol. m. 129. & ſeq.

(a) Id. ib. fol. 150. verſo & fol. 151.

(b) Id. ib. fol. 129.

(c) Id. ib.

(†) Jerôme Garimberto *who lived in the* XVI *Century, wrote an Italiana Treatiſe* della Fortuna, *wherein he maintains in the* 10th *Chap. of the* 1 *Book* che la fortuna è un impeto naturale privo di ragione ne gli huomini; *and in the next Chapter, that a Man is Happy, when he is led by a natural Inſtinct to a thing, which he does not foreſee, and without any ſhew of Reaſon.*

(d) Aulus Gellius lib. 6. cap. 2. p. m. 171.

(e) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. 1. v. 32.

(f) Reflexions ſur ce que l'on apelle bonheur & malheur en matiere de loteries chap. 6. pag. 79. & ſeq. *See alſo* Regnier ubi ſupra fol. 96. verſo.

nion I defend, that Cardinal *Richelieu*, that prodigious Politician, would not allow any other cauſe of Unhappineſs than Imprudence (*L*).

TIMOMACHUS, a Celebrated Painter, Born at *Byzantium*, who Flouriſhed in *Julius Cæſar's* time. He Painted an *Ajax* and a *Medea*, which were purchaſed for Eighty Talents by that Emperour, to be placed in the Temple of *Venus* *. A Sum not inconſiderable, amounting, according to Father *Hardouin's* Supputation

leſs right to complain of Fortune, than the unfortunate who has punctually diſcharged his Duty? May we not ſay that this Power, which we call Fortune, occaſions Miſery two ways? She ſometimes permits a Man to uſe all the means which Prudence can ſuggeſt, and yet deprives him of the Succeſs he ought to expect; ſhe pleaſes her ſelf with this diſorder to ſhew her Superiority, and the Inſufficiency of our Reaſon and Humane Wiſdom. Sometimes alſo ſhe plunges Men into Miſery, by obſtructing their uſe of the Means which would have preſerved them from it: She confounds their Judgment, and hurries them on to Irreparable Faults. It was probably ſo that ſhe inevitably ruined *Pompey*. She had declared for *Julius Cæſar*, and procured him the Triumph, by allowing him to act purſuant to the Dictates of the cleareſt Judgment of a Great Commander, and by Eclipſing in *Pompey's* Soul thoſe bright Qualities which he poſſeſſed. They did not appear on the *Pharſalian* Day; *Pompey* there ſeemed but a weak Man, a poor General. Was not this Eclipſe Supernatural? Was it not the influence of ſome Superior Force, which had deſigned to Raiſe *Cæſar* on the Ruins of his Competitor? *Velleius Paterculus* declares that when the Deſtinies are reſolved to deſtroy a Man, they deprive him of Prudence: (*g*) *Sed profecto ineluctabilis fatorum vis cujuſcunque fortunam mutare conſtituit, conſilia corrumpit*: . . (*h*) *ſed prævalebant jam fata conſiliis omnemque animi* (*i*) *ejus aciem præſtrinxerant. Quippe ita ſe res habet, ut plerumque fortunam mutaturus Deus, conſilia corrumpat, efficiatque, quod miſerrimum eſt, ut quod accidit, id etiam merito accidiſſe videatur, & caſus in culpam tranſeat.* This grave Hiſtorian's Opinion was very common amongſt the *Pagans*; and every Day we uſe this Proverb, *quos Jupiter vult perdere dementat*. A certain Writer being to prove that it is poſſible for two Authors to utter the ſame Thought without one Borrowing of the other, (*k*) cites *Philip de Commines*, who without ever hearing of *Paterculus's* Name, yet ſaid with him *that when God begins to Chaſtize Princes, he firſt leſſens their Senſe, and makes them fly Wiſe Men and ſound Counſels.* Here is an excellent Paſſage of *Ammianus Marcellinus*. (*l*) *Ut ſolent manum injectantibus fatis hebetari ſenſus hominum & obtundi, his illecebris ad meliorum exſpectationem erectus, egreſſuſque Antiochiâ numine Levo ductante, prorſus ire tendebat de fumo, ut proverbium loquitur vetus, ad flammam.* A little after ſpeaking of *Nemeſis*, he tells us that ſhe turns Men out of their Way, and perverts the ends of their Deſigns: (*m*) *Hæc ut regina cauſarum & arbitra rerum ac diſceptatrix, urnam ſortium temperat, accidentium vices alternans: voluntatumque noſtrarum exorſa interdum alio, quam quo contendebant, exitu terminans, multiplices actus permutando convolvit.* She doth not always effect this by Error, ſhe ſometimes makes uſe of pure Ignorance. What I call Error is that falſe Judgment which our Mind makes of ſeveral things, in comparing them together, and chooſing the worſt: And I call that Ignorance, when a Man is in ſuch a State, that the neceſſary Ideas do not offer themſelves to his Imagination. Now when he takes the wrong ſide, either by rejecting the proper means actually preſented to his Mind, or by reaſon of the abſence of thoſe Ideas, which ought to have preſented to him thoſe means, he paſſes for Imprudent; but 'tis certain that Imprudence in the firſt caſe is more voluntary than in the ſecond, and conſequently more to be condemned. Several Philoſophers aſſert, that what is called *pure Omiſſion* is never free. Who ſhou'd dare to maintain that we are Maſters of our Memory, and that to forget certain things which our Conduct requires us to remember, in order to deliberate wiſely, is a Fault? Thoſe who acknowledge the Empire of Fortune, would methinks be unreaſonable, if they ſhou'd ſuppoſe that ſhe doth not Influence our Forgetfulneſs and Omiſſions: For on the contrary, 'tis by them that ſhe frequently occaſions our ill Succeſs. She removes thoſe Ideas which would naturally occur to us, and hinder our commiſſion of thoſe fatal Faults. How many times doth it happen that a Man of Judgment, very much leſſens himſelf by the Anſwers he makes to ſeveral Queſtions propoſed to him? All thoſe to whom he relates the Queſtions, ask why he did not make ſuch an Anſwer? He is immediately convinced that he ſhould have done it. He owns it; he is Surprized that he did not think of it; he proteſts that on all other occaſions this Idea muſt neceſſarily have occurred to him, he finds it ſo eaſy, natural, and exactly conform to common Senſe. Nevertheleſs he is convinced that he did not in the leaſt think of it, and that even the moſt confuſed Notion of it never reached his Thoughts. Why will not you allow him to believe that his Ill Fortune preſided over this Oblivion, and purpoſely directed it? Our Divines don't deny that Providence ſometimes blinds Men, with reſpect to Omiſſions, as well as with regard to actual Judgment. *Plutarch* wou'd never approve their Doctrine, for he earneſtly recommends to thoſe who read the Poets, the rectifying of all thoſe Paſſages which repreſent the Gods deceiving us, and inſtigating us to Evil. He particularly warns us of theſe (*a*) Verſes in *Euripides*, thus Tranſlated by *Amyot*:

Les Dieux puiſſans trop plus que nous ne ſommes,
Vont abuſant nous autres povres hommes
Par pluſieurs tours de ruſe tromperoſſe.

He is ſo far from owning that a Divine Power influences us to chooſe the wrong way, even when we are not ignorant of the right way, that he would oblige us to aſcribe it to a Brutal Paſſion.

Αἶ (*b*) αἶ τόδ᾽ ἤδη θεῖον ἀνθρώποις κακὸν,
Ὅταν τις εἰδῇ τἀγαθὸν, χρῆται δὲ μή.

Θηριῶδες μὲν οὖν, καὶ ἄλογον, καὶ οἰκτρὸν, εἰδότα τὸ βέλτιον, ὑπὸ τοῦ χείρονος ἐξ ἀκρασίας καὶ μαλακίας ἄγεσθαι.

Eheu, malum mortalibus divinitus
Venit, ut bonum videant, non utantur tamen:

Immò verò belluinum, non divinum eſt hoc malum, & brutum ac miſerabile, melius videntem intemperantia & mollitie ad deterius rapi. But how ſolid ſoever theſe Reflections of *Plutarch* are, we ought always to remember that our Theology, and the univerſal Language of all Chriſtians, founded on ſeveral Paſſages of Holy Writ, acknowledge as a certain Doctrine, that the blindneſs of Man, his Raſhneſs, Folly, and Cowardice are frequently the effect of a particular Providence, which inflicts them on him as a Puniſhment; and that his Prudence, his wiſe Anſwers to Queſtions, his firm Reſolution, and his Underſtanding are Favours inſpired by Providence, in order to preſerve and proſper him. This Opinion alſo obtained among the Heathens; for we ſee *Manlius* declaring to the *Roman* Citizens, that if the Gods prevented his Ruin, it would not be by deſcending on Earth, but by inſpiring the *Romans* with a wiſe Reſolution, as they had inſpired him with that Valour and Courage which ſaved the Republick: (*c*) *Benè facitis quòd abominamini: dii prohibebunt hæc: ſed nunquam propter me de cœlo deſcendent: vobis dent mentem oportet, ut prohibeatis: ſicut mihi dederunt armato togatoque, ut vos à barbaris hoſtibus, à ſuperbis defenderem civibus.*

I cannot conclude without hinting, that if on the one ſide that is called ill Fortune, which ſometimes is the natural conſequence of Imprudence; on the other ſide we name that good Fortune, which is ſeveral times the reſult of Prudence. We have obſerved ſome Men make uſe of a Conduct ſo raſh, that there appeared no room to doubt but that it would end in a cruel Mortification; they attackt and drove all the World before them, and if the firſt Engagement pronounced them Inconſiderate, the following were only a long train of raſh, irregular and violent Sallies. According to all Rules, theſe Men ſhould have been ſhamefully Cruſhed, and nevertheleſs we have ſeen them Triumph, or at leaſt retire from the Battle without any mark of Diſhonour. This is a great piece of good Fortune, ſay ſome. But it is certain that ſome Stratagem, ſome refined putation to 192000 *French* Livres. *Timomachus* had not put the laſt hand to *Medea*; which procured it a greater Eſteem. *Pliny* admires this capricious Taſte (*A* Δ) of Men. There are ſome Epigrams on this *Medea* in the *Anthology*, which ‡ *Auſonius* has Tranſlated into *Latin*. This was not the Painter's Maſter-Piece; for beſides that his *Iphigenia* and his *Oreſtes* were not leſs Eſteemed, his *Gorgone* was the Picture in which he had diſcovered the greateſt Art (*A*). I have Collected ſome Miſtakes.

---

* *In Veneris Genetricis æde. Plin. l. 35. cap. 11.*

(*g*) Velleius Paterculus lib. 2. c. 57.

(*h*) Id. ib. c. 118.

(*i*) *That is, of* Quintilius Varus.

(*k*) Ogier, Apologie pour *Balzac*. p. 34.

(*l*) Amm. Marcell. l. 14. c. 11. p. m. 55.

(*m*) Id. ib. pag. 59.

(*a*) [illegible] Mortalis formis homines ſophiſmatum quod his potentia præſtant in fraudem agunt. *Euripides apud Plutarchum de audiendis poetis* p. 20. 21.

(*b*) Id. ib. p. 33. F.

(*c*) Titus Livius lib. 6. pag. m. 176.

TIPHERNAS (*Gregory* ‡) a Native || of *Tifernum* in *Italy*, deſerves a very good place amongſt the Learned Humaniſts of the XVth Century. He underſtood *Greek*, and Tranſlated that part of *Strabo* which *Guarinus Veronenſis* had left undone. Some tell us that *Politian* owned the Verſion of *Herodian*, of which *Tiphernas* was the real Author; but this is ſcarce Credible *a*. The manner of his obtaining the (*T*) *Greek* Profeſſor's place in the Univerſity of *Paris* was very particular. His *Latin* Verſes are to be found in *β* the *Deliciæ Poetarum Italorum*. He ſometimes bought his own Proviſions, but he diſputed the Price in ſuch a ſtudied Style, that the Peaſants did not like it (*Z*).

TYPOT

‡ Epigr. 155, 156.

‡ *And not George, as Moreri has it.*

|| Leand. Albertus in deſcript. Ital. pag. m. 132.

a Taken from Paul Jovius elog. c. 117. p. m. 259.

β In the 2. tome pag. 1171.

refined ſtroke of Policy, had a greater ſhare in this good Succeſs than Fortune. Theſe pretended raſh Men, by a vaſt Prudence, had long before Armed themſelves with Precaution. They had rendred themſelves neceſſary to thoſe who were capable of retrieving all their falſe Steps. They had found the ſecret of being Subſervient either to their private Pleaſures or Ambition. The circumſtances of the Times favoured them; a topping Spy or ſome other ſecret Service was of extraordinary uſe. They were ſure to be backed with Succeſs in their unreaſonable Quarrels; they did not therefore act raſhly.

(*L*) *Cardinal* Richelieu——*would not allow any other cauſe of Unhappineſs than Imprudence.*] M. *Auberi* informs us of this particular. He ſaith that Cardinal *Richelieu*, and the Duke of *Olivarez* two prime Miniſters, the one of *France*, the other of *Spain*, were Rivals and Antagoniſts, (*d*) *That their Credit was much of an equal Duration; that they were compared to two Stars of the firſt, or at leaſt of the ſecond Magnitude; that they drew on themſelves the Eyes, the Eſteem and Admiration of all Chriſtendom. That the Cardinal was firſt Eclipſed by a natural Death, the 4th of* December 1642. *And that the other enjoyed the advantage of Shining alone, not above five or ſix Weeks, being Diſgraced the 17th of* January 1643. *The Motive or Pretext of his Diſgrace, was the ill Succeſs which accompanied all his Enterpriſes. This was in effect to accuſe him of Imprudence. In Cardinal* Richelieu's *Opinion, Imprudent and Unfortunate are but two words to expreſs the ſame thing* (*e*). *This great Eccleſiaſtick vigorouſly Practiſed one of his moſt conſtant Maxims which was, to give it you in his own Terms.* "*That in State "Affairs is is impoſſible to be too Cautious, or look "for too great Security. That a Stateſman ought, if "he can, always to have two Strings to his Bow; "That to ſucceed he ought not to take too exact Meaſures, but that in order to do much, he ought to "ſtrive and take a large Aim at doing yet more: "That in a word, in all Important Affairs, if he did "not take thoſe Meaſures which ſeemed too Extenſive, "he would always find them too ſhort.* 'Tis hard to believe that the Cardinal on occaſion of the failure of Succeſs in ſome of his Enterpriſes, never acknowledged that he had notwithſtanding taken all thoſe Meaſures which Prudence cou'd ſuggeſt. If after this he thought himſelf Guilty of ſome Imprudence, he extended the Idea of Prudence beyond its true Bounds; for if he believed that thoſe, who truſt a Man who deceives them, are Imprudent, he ſuppoſed Prudence to comprehend the certainty of Events which depend on Free-Will. But that is a palpable Error. There are Perſons who have given many Proofs of their Fidelity; in ſo ſignal a manner that one may truſt them in an Important Affair, without the leaſt ſhadow of Imprudence. And yet they diſcharge their Duty very ill, they begin their Treachery on this occaſion, and betray or ſpoil the Deſign. It would be to expect a more than Humane Knowledge from a prime Miniſter to pretend that he has raſhly and unadviſedly relyed on this Man, that it is not his Misfortune but his Fault if the Affair miſcarried, ſince he ſhould have known the Thoughts and inward Change of this Perſon. You ſee then that this Diſpute is liable to ſeveral Equivocal Diſputations. The ill Fortune of an Enterpriſe is always attended with want of Knowledge. If indeed you call this Imprudence and will argue on this Definition, you may fully and without the leaſt reſerve maintain Cardinal *Richelieu's Theſis*; but your Definition will be falſe, and at the bottom you will be found to agree with your Adverſary.

(*A* Δ) *Pliny admires this capricious taſte.*] It is no wonder that the Sketches of a great Maſter ſhould be more valued than the finiſhed pieces of a mean Artiſt; but that the finiſhed Pictures of a great Hand ſhould be leſs able to excite our Admiration than his Sketches, ſeems ſomewhat unreaſonable. Is pity concerned in this Affair? Do we think it our Duty to cheriſh theſe Pieces, becauſe they have had the misfortune to loſe their Author before they received his laſt perfecting hand? Perhaps we hunt after Reaſons, and none is able to give any: Let us therefore quit our Search and only cite what *Pliny* ſaith: (*g*) *Illud perquam rarum ac memoria dignum, etiam ſuprema opera artificum imperfectaſque tabulas, ſicut Irin Ariſtidis, Tyndaridas Nicomachi, Medeam Timomachi, & quam diximus venerem Apellis, in majori admiratione eſſe quam perfecta.*

(*A*) *In which he had diſcovered the greateſt art. I have collected ſome faults.*] Read theſe Words of *Pliny Chap.* 11. *lib.* 35 *Præcipue ars ei favisse in Gorgone viſa eſt.* Charles Stephens cites the 5th Book; Mr. *Lloyd* has ſuppreſſed this Quotation inſtead of rectifying it, and has added nothing to this Article, but that *Athenæus lib.* 14. cites one *Timomachus* who had Written the Hiſtory of *Cyprus*. *Moreri* and *Hofman* cite no Authorities. The Article *Timoniachus* is left out in the laſt Editions of *Charles Stephens*, tho' it remained in that of 1620. which was reviſed and Corrected by *Frederick Morel*. It is ſtrange that ſuch a Learned Man ſhould not diſcover that a *Typographical* fault of changing an *m* into *ni*, had produced *Timoniachus* the painter.

(*T*) *The* Greek *Profeſſor's place in the Univerſity of* Paris.] *Peter Matthieu's* words are: (*a*) *Gregory Tiphernas came from* Emanuel Chryſoloras's *School to* Paris *and preſented himſelf to the Rector, freely telling him*, that he came to Teach the *Greek* literature, and demanded the recompence allotted by the Holy Decrees. *The Rector was ſomewhat ſurprized at the Stranger's aſſurance, yet commended his deſign, and with the Advice of the Univerſity retained him, and granted him his deſired Salary.* Hermonymus *of* Sparta *ſucceeded him.* Gabriel Naudé relates the ſame thing, to prove *Lewis* the XI. his inclination to protect Learned Men. *We may judge*, ſays he (*b*), *by* Philelphus's *Epiſtle cited in the preceding Chapter —— how he continually encouraged the Conſtantinopolitan* Greeks, *who came to* Paris *to reſide and continue the courſe of their Studies under the Aſſurance of his Liberality.* Gregory Tiphernas *was the firſt* (*c*) *who made Way for the reſt; he being arrived at* Paris *preſented himſelf to the Rector*, &c. Naudé cites *Melanchton in oratione de Capnione, tom*, 3. Several Authors mention this paſſage of *Tiphernas*, and amongſt the reſt *Sixtinus Amama*, who obſerves that he came to *Paris* about the Year 1470 and informed the Rector of what had been ordered by the Council of *Vienne*: He did not forget to ſay that the Univerſity of *Paris* was expreſly mentioned in the Decrees of that Council (*d*).

(*Z*) *He diſputed the Price in ſuch a ſtudied Style.*] *Jovianus Pontanus*, who was his Diſciple, tells the

Story

(*d*) Auberi, Hiſtoire du Cardinal Mazarin. B. 1. pag. 100.

(*e*) *This is very different from the opinion of* Garimberto, *who* ...mmain'd *ubi ſupra* cap. 18. *that a Man, who Acts according to Prudence, ought not to be call'd a Happy Man; and* cap. 19. *that none is Happy out of Art, or Prudence, or through God's favour, but by a Natural Impetuoſity* ...*ated in the Soul;* and cap. 3. and 4. lib. ... *that Fortune Favours bold Men, and is a friend to the Preſumptuous,* ... *a very* ... *to the* ...

(*g*) Plin. lib. 35. cap. 11.

(*a*) Peter Matthieu. Hiſtoire de Louis XI. B. 11. p. m. 734. 735.

(*b*) Naudé *Additions to the Hiſtory of* Lewis *XI.* pag. 185.

(*c*) *One may infer from theſe Words of* Naudé *that he believed that* Tiphernas *was a Grecian.*

(*d*) *See* Sixtinus Amama in paræneſi de excitandis SS. linguarum ſtudiis, *page* 197. *of his* Antibarbarus biblicus edit. 1628.

TYPOT (*James*) in Latin *Typotius*. You'll find in *Moreri* what Mr. *Teissier* γ has Published concerning this *Dutch* Civilian. To which I shall make some ‡ Corrections, and only add that *Typot* was Guilty of such ill Actions, and wrote a Book in which he Defamed so may Persons of Quality ∫ in *Sweden*, that he narrowly escaped a capital Punishment. He in particular Abused (*A*) the Illustrious *Pontus de la Gardie*, whom he had accompanied in his Embassy to *Rome* *. How much *John* the IIId. King of *Sweden* was Incensed against this Author, clearly appears from his Answer (*B*) to a Letter, requesting *Typot*'s Enlargement. Which he would not consent to; and accordingly the Prisoner did not obtain his Liberty till after the Death of that Prince, † when getting again into Favour for some time, he found the Face of Affairs changed, and Retired to the Imperial Court. He did not Die in the Year 1604, as *Thuanus* relates, but (*C*) some time before. There is also something elso to be Rectifyed in his Article.

TYRANNION,

Story thus: (*e*) *Gregorius Typhernas quo præceptore Græcis in literis usus sum adolescens, ad forum accesserat rerum venalium, dumque rusticano cum homine non potest de mercimonio convenire, sermone enim cum illo nimis composito utebatur, ibi ego qui rem perpendissem, conversus ad rusticum* &c.

(*A*) *He abused* —— Pontus de la Gardie.] He accused him of gaining the Favour of *Eric* King of *Sweden* by delivering to him the Fortress of *Wardberg* which belonged to *Denmark*. He supposes that *Pontus* was in the Service of his *Danish* Majesty at that time, which was in the Year 1565. Mr. *Oernhielm* refutes this Accusation by the Pasport which that King gave to *la Gardie*, *May the* 16. 1571. *La Gardie* being in the *Swedish* Service was taken by the *Danes* in a Battel in which the latter were victorious in the Year 1569. He was detained in Prison till the Peace was concluded the 13. of *December* 1570, and ratifyed the 16 of *March* 1571. The King of *Denmark* gave him a very Honourable Pasport, which he would not have done if he had taken him for a Traytor. (*f*) *Non aliunde melius dilucet Typotiani mendacii vanitas, qui, ut superius indicavimus, nugatur, apud Ericum Sueonum Regem PONTUM captasse locum gratiæ, proditâ ei Wardbergensi arce. Si sic se res habuisset, quomodò potuisset Fridericus Rex, sponte nullaque adactus necessitate, rerum sibi carissimarum proditorem, cari dilectique sibi Equitis nomine compellare? Quis unquam Regum, arcium, terrarum copiarumque suarum proditorem, dignatus est nomine tam honorifico, ac non potius quovis, pro atrocitate facti, proscidit non injusto convitio? Cur non æquam tanto facinori mercedem retulit? Cur alia omnia de se meritum, mancipio jam sibi etiam traditum, non benignè tantum toto captivitatis tempore habuit Rex, sed etiam redintegratâ cum Suecis pace, honoris gratiæque plenissimis literis securum redire fecit in Sueciam?* This Author cites the Words of the Pasport translated out of the Original into Latin. A little before, he had told us that *Typotius* spoke very ill of *Pontus de la Gardie*'s extraction; which continues he, is not to be Wondred at, for this Writer had Assurance enough to calumniate even the Kings of *Sweden* themselves. He observes that this Satyrical piece had been lately reprinted by the Diligence of some Malicious Persons. (*g*) *Quæ paulo liberaliore manu adduci à me oportuit, ut famosum libellum Jacobi Typotii venenati convincerem mendacii, quo ille, suggerente veteri quodam congerrone Ægidio, ut ipse fatetur, homine ignoto ac terræ filio, natalibus, vitæ famæque PONTI adspergere voluit labem, quam fœdissimam conscivit sibi ipsi, typis committens fuco dictionis pictas livorisque plenas calumnias. Sed quid mirum est, allatrasse eum genus & famam PONTI, qui ne Regibus quidem, aut ulli Suecicæ gentis honesto viro satis fuit æquus? Etenim, in monstroso illo ingenii fœtu, recuso nuper à malevolis, nefandi in bonorum famam sceleris consciis, atque ideò nec loci nec editoris nomen proferre ausis, debacchatur in Ericum ipsum & Johannem Reges, adeò non parcit aliis viris illustribus ex ordine Equestri, quorum gloriosa semper fuit, ac deinceps erit apud posteros memoria. Quin imo, in religionem, & nationem ipsam, cujus, ut Pontificius è Belgio sacrificulus, flagrabat odio, stolidè nonnunquam invehitur.* For this Satyrical Boldness, and other Crimes (adds he) *Typotius* was Condemned to Death, which he had certainly suffered if the King of *Denmark* had not interceded for him; but tho' the Intercession of that Prince saved his Life, they did not protect him from an Ignominious Banishment. (*h*) *Ob quæ, aliaque* (1) *facinora, damnatus hic fuit capitis, luissetque factis dignum supplicium, nisi intercessio Regis Daniæ intervenisset, quæ quidem à meritâ morte illum liberavit, sed non ab ignominiosâ ex hoc regno Relegatione.*

(*B*) *His answer to a letter requesting.*] *Frederick* II. King of *Denmark* had Written to him on this Account: Part of the King of *Sweden*'s answer runs thus: (*i*) *Quo minus* (*k*) *petitioni Majestatis Vestræ in hac causâ satisfacere possimus, facit magnitudo scelerum, quibus caput suum obstrinxerat idem Typotius, quæ si æque Majestati Vestræ ac nobis nota fuissent, scimus non tantum tributuram fuisse Majestatem Vestram ejus desideriis ac precibus, ut pro ipso intercedere sustinuerit. Etenim is homo est, qui virus mendacis linguæ, sine ullo discrimine, in summos imosque passim effundit. Inde est, quod non tetro tantum carceri mancipandum, sed ultimo etiam supplicio afficiendum eum censuimus, in quem si quid mitius in posterum decreverimus, id clementiæ nostræ, Majestatisque Vestræ intercessioni, non innocentiæ suæ debebit. Confidimus certò, majestatem Vestram hanc excusationem nostram, ut justam & idoneam approbaturam.* This Letter of the King of *Sweden* is dated the 17. of *February* 1583. Observe that the King of *Denmark* interceded for *Typot* at the Request of a Person for whom he had a particular regard, who was his Physician and the Prisoner's Bother (*l*).

(*C*) *He Dyed* —— *before the Year* 1604. *There is also something else to rectify in his Article.*] *Thuanus*'s fault (*a*) in placing his Death in 1604, is observed by Mr. *Mollerus* in his (*b*) Additions to Scheffer's *Suecia Litterata*. There is a Book Printed (*c*) in 1602 in which we find *Typot*'s Funeral Elogy by *John Jessenius à Jessen*, Physician to the Emperor. If Mr. *Teissier* had observed this, he had corrected *Thuanus*'s Error. Some Authors (*d*) tell us that *Typot* Dyed in 1600. We find in the Preface to the Second Tome *symbolorum Pontificum, Regum & Principum Octavii de Strada*, dated the 15. *March* 1602, that he died after having finished the Explication of the Symbols of this 2d. Tome. These Words (*e*) Jacobus Typotius —— *in aula Suecica diu fuit, Carolo Sudermaniæ duci ac tandem Regi cum Sigismundo Poloniæ Rege nepote tunc dissidenti percarus*, are translated in Mr. *Teissier*: (*f*) "*James* "*Typot* —— long resided at the Court of *Sweden*, "where he was very much regarded by the Duke "of *Sudermania* and the King, who then had some "difference with *Sigismund* King of *Poland* his Nephew." This Translation is faulty; the Duke of *Sudermania*'s Christian Name ought not to have been suppressed, nor a King of *Sweden* been introduced distinct from this Duke; for it is visible that *Thuanus* says that *Charles* was Duke of *Sudermania*, and afterwards King of *Sweden*. In which he was in the right, but he is to blame when he Reports that *Typot* was long this *Charles*'s Favourite. He should have said that this Duke's Brother, King *John* the Third, Favoured *Typot* for a long time, and that *Typot* lost the King's Favour, having been Imprisoned and Condemned to Death, and that his Life was granted him by the intercession of the King of *Denmark*. He might have added, if I am not mistaken, that after the Death of *John* III. he was restored to Favour, which he also enjoyed under *Sigismund* his Son; but that he had nothing to do in *Sweden* when the Duke of *Sudermania* was Created King by the exclusion of *Sigismund* King of *Poland* his Nephew; that he kept his ground during the Contest betwixt the Unkle and Nephew, and at last retired when *Sigismund*'s Party was ruined. These seem to me the Changes in *Typot*'s affairs.

I

γ *Additions to the Elogies of Thuanus Tom. 2. pag. 358. Edit. 1696.*

‡ *See the Remark C.*

∫ *See the Remark A.*

* *See the Life of that* Pontus *published in the Year 1690.* Claudius Arrhenius Oernhielm pag. 165.

† *See the Remark C.*

(*e*) Jovian. Pontanus de Sermone lib. 5. c. 1. p. m. 1704. 1705.

(*f*) Claudius Arrhenius Oernhielm in vita Ponti de la Gardie pag. 19. 20.

(*g*) Id ib. p. 11. 12.

(*h*) Id. ib.

(1) Messenius Scondiæ Illustratæ I. VII. ab Anno 1581. A Ponto Typotius plurimarum convictus imposturarum & calumniarum, carceri perpetuo adjudicatur mancipaturque, inquit. Unde mirum non est, quod in illum in primis debacchetur.

(*i*) Id. ib. p. 17. 18.

(*k*) That is that Typot should be released out of Prison.

(*l*) Vit [illegible] Friderici II. Danorum Regis (cui frater ejus Majestatis gratissimus erat atque a cura valetudinis) intercessione. Jo. Mollerus hypomn. ad Schefferi Sueciam litteratam pag. 443.

(*a*) Thuan. lib. 131. pag. m. 1242.

(*b*) Pag. 443.

(*c*) In the 2. Tome, Symbolorum Octavii Strada. See Mr. Mollerus hypomn. ad Sueciam litteratam pag. 44

(*d*) Witte in diario biogr. Mollerus ubi supra. Valerius Andreas ubi infra *says that he Died about the Year* 160

(*e*) Thuan. ubi supra.

(*f*) Teissier's Elogies taken out of Thuanus Tom. 2. p. 34

TYRANNION, a celebrated Grammarian in *Pompey*'s time, who was of *Amisus* in the Kingdom of *Pontus*. His first Name was *Theophrastus*; but by reason of his teazing and tormenting his School-Fellows (*A*), his Master *Hestiæus* gave him the Name of *Tyrannion*. He was a Disciple of *Dionysius Thracius* at *Rhodes*. He fell into *Lucullus*'s Hands, when that *Roman* General beat *Mithridates*, and seized his Territories. This Captivity of *Tyrannion* was not disadvantageous to him, since it procured him an Opportunity of rendring himself Illustrious at *Rome*, and of acquiring great Riches: Which he employed amongst other uses to Erect a Library of above * thirty thousand Volumes. He Died very Old, Harrass'd and Wasted with the Gout †. *Suidas* is mistaken in the time of his Death (*B*). I must not forget that *Murena* asked *Tyrannion* of *Lucullus*, that he might have the Glory of procuring the Liberty and Freedom of a Celebrated

I ground what I have said on what *Valerius Andreas* says in his *Bibliotheca Belgica* that after the Death of *John* III. he was set at Liberty by *Sigismund*, and pronounced the Inaugural Oration at his Coronation before the States of the Realm. (*g*) *Mortuo deinde Suecorum Rege Joanne, ejus filius atque in Regno successor Sigismundus III. annuente etiam Daniæ Rege Christierno IV.* Typotium *pristinæ mox restituit libertati: eique tum imposita est provincia in ipsis Regni Comitiis Stockolmiæ Orationem illam, quam Inauguralem vocant, habendi, quâ Suecorum erga Regem suum fidei atque benevolentiæ causas diserte exposuit. Rege autem in Regnum Poloniæ, quod ei per electionem accesserat, profecto,* Typotius *à Romanorum Imp. Rodolpho II. inter Aulæ suæ familiares allectus, ac Cæsarei Historiographi titulo ornatus, Pragæ diem clausit extremum circa annum salutis millesimum sexcentesimum*. We find in the same *Bibliotheque*, that his *Orationes genethliacæ ad Annam Sueciæ & Poloniæ Reginam*, were Printed at *Stockholm* in 1594. The above mentioned inaugural Oration was also Printed (*h*) at the same place in the same Year, and he informs us that he published (*i*) the Funeral Oration on the Death of King *John* III. who Dyed in *November* 1592. (*k*) 'Twas Printed at *Stockholm* 1594. Which is a Sign that he was in good Reputation in *Sweden* after the Death of that Monarch. There is a Difficulty which arises against all this, which is that very good Authors (*l*) assure us that at the Intercession of his *Danish* Majesty he was pardoned his designed Punishment, but not excused from an infamous Banishment. *Frederick* II. King of *Denmark* interceded for *Typot*, in the Year 1582 or in the beginning of 1583. If on his Account the Punishment of Death was changing into Banishment, it seems that it should be said that the Prisoner was Banished in 1583. and yet we see that *Sigismund* the successor of a Prince who Dyed in 1592 (*n*) gave *Typot* his Liberty, and that *Christiern* IV. King of *Denmark* interceded for him. I cannot Reconcile these two Relations; perhaps after the Death of King *John*, King *Sigismund* reversed *Typot*'s exile, and recalled him.

Whilst this is Printing I find a Confirmation of my conjectures in a *German* Treatise (*o*), some Pages of which relating to *Typot* I got Translated. I there find a passage which makes me believe that Mr. *Ornhielm* was mistaken in saying that the intercession of *Frederick* II. King of *Denmark* did not excuse this Man from an infamous Banishment. This place is in a Letter from *Zachary Palthenius* to *Typot*, and Printed with a Treatise of *Typot* at *Francfort* in 1595. *Palthenius* informs us 1. that *John* III. King of *Sweden* prevented *Typot's* being intirely ruined by his Enemies: 2. That *Sigismund* III. King of *Poland* and *Sweden* restored this Prisoner to Liberty. (*p*) *Quæ tibi ergastulum, aut, ut tu loqui soles, Dei gratia peperis, de fortuna & legibus, cum fortuna, quam liberatio, uti videre est, concepit, ego fasciis involvi, prodibuntque brevi in lucem. *Felix infelicitas tua, quæ tibi vera laudis, imo solidæ felicitatis principium exstitit. Absuisti a familiarium commercio, doleo, dolet mecum litteratorum chorus, quamquam mœroris tui vehementioris nullum signum in libris tuis repererim, & tu Joannis III. Regis Sueciæ humanitatem ac clementiam prædicare soleas, ut per quem stetit, ne adversariorum malignitate caderes. Sed cum abesses a tuis, versatus es cum, quæ maxime tuæ sunt, Musis. Restitutus in libertatem a Sigismundo III. Poloniæ & Sueciæ Rege, huic enim secundum Dei, cui etiam ille cedit, misericordiam, consuetudinem nostram refers acceptam, profers in lucem luce dignissimos diversi argumenti plurimos Codices.* Mr. *Tentzelius* acquaints us that *Typot* Dedicated his Treatise *de fortuna* Printed at *Francfort* in 1595. to *Sigismund* III. King of *Sweden*, as he did his Book *de fato* Printed in the same Year at the same place to King *Christiern* of *Denmark*, and that he says at the beginning of his Treatise *de fortuna*, that he had received many Favours from King *Sigismund*, and that he had waited the return of that Monarch at *Calmar*, and that his Enemies prevented his meeting his Majesty at *Dantzick*. You may observe that the Preface to this Book was Written at *Wurtsburg* in *December* 1595. It is somewhat surprizing that Mr. *Ornhielm* Historiographer of *Sweden*, should be ignorant that this Man was gloriously delivered out of Prison, and not by an infamous Sentence of Banishment.

Mr. *Moreri* has been Guilty of the following faults. I. He says that *Sigismund King John's successor enlarged Typot, and employed him in several affairs of the utmost importance.* Mr. *Teissier* (*q*) makes use of the same Words, quoting only *Valerius Andreas*, who hath nothing to this purpose, and only informs us that *Typot* being enlarged was appointed to make the inaugural Speech before the States of the Kingdom. II. Mr. *Moreri* like a faithful Copist of Mr. *Teissier* adds; *that Sigismund being elected King of* Poland, Typot *retired to the Court of the Emperour* Rodolph II. This hints that *Sigismund* was elected King of *Poland* some Years after he succeeded *John* III. King of *Sweden*, than which nothing is more false; for *John* III. Dyed in *November* 1592, *Sigismund* his Son was not Crowned King of *Sweden* till 1594. and he had been elected King of *Poland* in 1587. The III. Error is that Mr. *Moreri* has fixed *Typot's* Death in 1604.

(*A*) *Teazing and Tormenting his School Fellows.*] In the version of *Suidas* we find these *Greek* Words, Τυραννίων ὠνομάσθη ὡς καταλαζονεύων τῶν ὁμηλίκων, thus rendred, *Tyrannio dictus est quod condiscipulos excogitaret*, l. ὡς καταλαζονευόμενον. It is hardly necessary to Advertise the Reader that *excogitaret* is a typographical Error crept into the place of *exagitaret*; but we may very well say that Mr. *Moreri* little minded the Title of his Book; he gives his conjecture for the Translations of the Authors whom he cites at the bottom of the Articles. If he had writ a Romance instead of an Historical Dictionary, this Liberty had been excusable. He had read in no Author that *Theophrastus was called* Tyrannion *on Account of his becoming Proud of his Science and despising his Equals.*

(*B*) *Suidas is mistaken in the time of his Death.*] How was it possible that *Tyrannion* should dye the 3d. Year of the 120 *Olympiad* as we find in *Suidas*, seeing he was not brought to *Rome* till after *Lucullus* had put *Mithridates* to Flight in the 177. *Olympiad*? *Patricius* (*a*) conjectures that instead of ὀλυμπιάδι ρκʹ, *Suidas* said ὀλυμπιάδι ρπʹ. According to which *Tyrannion* Died in the 3d. Year of the 180 *Olympiad*. There is some probability in *Patricius*'s Correction, tho' 'tis certain that *Tyrannion* taught (*b*) in *Cicero's* House, in the last Year of the 180 *Olympiad*; and as he took care to digest *Tully's* Library into a Method, 'tis not very likely that he was then in the infirm State in which he Died, according to *Suidas*. What I am going to Advance is incomparably more forcible against *Patricius*'s Correction or *Suidas* himself, if he said what the other would have him. When *Cæsar* was in *Africa* to make War with *Juba*, in the Year of *Rome* 707. which was the 2d of the 184. *Olympiad*, *Cicero*, and *Atticus* promised to meet at an appointed time in order to hear *Tyrannion* (*d*) Read one of his own Books; and *Atticus*

was

* Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Hofman, Moreri, say only three Thousand.

† Ex Suida in Τυραννίων

(q) Teissier ubi supra pag. 354.

(a) Discussiones Peripateticæ. Tom. 1. l. 4. pag. 36.

(b) Cicero epist. 4. lib. 2. ad Q. Fratrem. *It was Written in the Year that* Tullia *was married to* Crassipes: *'twas the* 697. *Year of* Rome. *See* Fabricius *in the* Life of Cicero.

(c) *See the remark* G.

(d) Epist. 2. lib. 12. ad Atticum.

lebrated Grammarian. *Plutarch*'s Reflections (C) on this occaſion are not amiſs. *Tyrannion*'s diligent care to collect a great quantity of Books, very much Contributed to the preſervation of *Ariſtotle*'s Works. (D) The Writings of this Philoſopher met with a deſtiny ſo particular, that it deſerves a Relation, eſpecially conſidering

was reproached by his Friend (y) for having heard it Read without him.

(C) *Plutarch's Reflections on this occaſion, are not amiſs.*] *Murena*, ſays he, did not at all anſwer the generoſity of *Lucullus*; for, in ſeeming to affranchiſe *Tyrannion*, he depriv'd him of his liberty. It had been better to leave him as he was. Here are *Plutarch*'s Words in his Deſcription of the ſacking of *Amiſus*, which *Lucullus* not being able to prevent, repaired as well as he could. *Τότε δὲ καὶ Τυραννίων ὁ γραμματικὸς ἑάλω. Μουρήνας δ' αὐτὸν ἐξῄτησε, καὶ λαβὼν ἀπηλευθέρωσεν, ἀνελευθέρως τῇ δωρεᾷ χρησάμενος. οὐ γὰρ ἠξίου Λεύκολλος ἄνδρα διὰ παιδείαν ἐσπουδασμένον δοῦλον γενέσθαι πρότερον, εἶτα ἀπελεύθερον. ἀφαίρεσις γὰρ ἦν τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἡ τῆς δοκούσης ἐλευθερίας δόσις. ἀλλὰ Μουρήνας μὲν οὐκ ἐνταῦθα μόνον ὤφθη πολὺ τῆς τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καλοκαγαθίας ἀπολειπόμενος* (z). *Eadem tempeſtate captus eſt Tyrannio grammaticus. Hunc Murena petivit à Lucullo, quem ut accepit, manumiſit eum. Verum uſus eſt eo munere illiberaliter, nolebat enim inſignem virum eruditione Lucullus prius ſervum fieri, inde libertinum. Quippe ereptio præſentis erat illa ſimulatæ libertatis donatio. Cæterum non hic tantum oſtendit ſe Imperatore ſuo Murena honeſtate imparem.*

(D) Ariſtotle's *Works met with a Deſtiny ſo particular.*] This great Philoſopher left them with his School and his other Books to *Theophraſtus*. The latter left his Library to *Neleus*, who had been Scholar both to him and *Ariſtotle*. *Neleus* cauſed it to be removed to (a) *Scepſis*, where he left it to his Heirs. (b) They, ignorant and illiterate, took no other care of this Treaſure of Learning than to keep it cloſe ſhut up; and being informed how diligently the Kings of *Pergamum*, to whom they were Subjects, ſought after Books, they buried under ground thoſe of *Neleus*. A long time after, their Poſterity took them out of their Priſon very much damaged by Damps and Vermin, and ſold thoſe of *Ariſtotle* and *Theophraſtus* to one *Apellicon*, who cauſed them to be copied: But his Copiſts very ill ſupplied thoſe places which the Worms had eaten, or the Damps defaced; ſo that thoſe Books came out with innumerable faults. After *Apellicon*'s death, his Library was carried from *Athens* to *Rome*, by *Sylla*. His Library-keeper permitted *Tyrannion*, who was a great admirer of *Ariſtotle*, to take away the Writings of that Philoſopher. The Bookſellers cauſed them to be tranſcribed, but they made uſe of ignorant People, who did not collate their Tranſcripts with the Originals; ſo that the miſchief was more encreaſed at *Rome* than it had been at *Athens*. Thus having ſeen how far *Strabo* hath carried this Relation, let us ſee the ſequel of it in *Plutarch* and others.

Plutarch ſaith (c) that *Sylla* having render'd himſelf Maſter of *Athens*, ſeiz'd for himſelf *Apellicon*'s Library, where were the greateſt part of *Ariſtotle*'s and *Theophraſtus*'s Works, then very little known to the Publick. He adds, that it was reported, that after *Sylla* had tranſported them to *Rome*, *Tyrannion* the Grammarian, ſurreptitiouſly got ſeveral of them into his hands; and that *Andronicus Rhodius* (d) getting of him the Copies, publiſh'd 'em, and made thoſe Tables or Indexes which afterwards appear'd to 'em. *Plutarch* and *Strabo* agree, that for a long time the *Peripateticks* hardly knew the Writings of *Ariſtotle* and *Theophraſtus*, and that the ignorance of *Neleus*'s Heirs was the cauſe of their remaining obſcure: *Strabo* ſaith plainly that the Modern *Peripateticks* ſurpaſſed the Ancients, becauſe the latter having but very few of *Ariſtotle*'s Books, and on the meaneſt Subjects, (e) were not able to Philoſophize with a nice and methodical exactneſs. But after *Ariſtotle*'s Writings were diſcover'd, it was much eaſier for thoſe of that Sect to reaſon according to their Maſter's Notions; yet they were obliged to rely much upon Conjectures, becauſe there was an infinite number of Faults in his Works. This is *Strabo*'s Obſervation (f).

Athenæus (g) hath a Paſſage very proper to be cited here: He ſaith that *Neleus*, the Poſſeſſor of *Ariſtotle*'s Library, ſold it intirely to *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, who removed it to *Alexandria*, together with thoſe Books which he had bought at *Rhodes* and *Athens*. He obſerves at the ſame time, that one *Larentius* a Citizen of *Rome*, under *Marcus Aurelius*, had collected a larger number of Books than *Polycrates* Tyrant of *Samos*, *Piſiſtratus* Tyrant of *Athens*, *Euclid*, *Nicocrates*, the Kings of *Pergamum*, the Poet *Euripides*, and *Ariſtotle* the Philoſopher. *Athenæus* and *Strabo* clash in two things. The latter ſays, that *Ariſtotle* was the firſt who collected a Library, and who taught the Kings of *Egypt* how to erect one. *Athenæus* names ſeveral who collected great quantities of Books before *Ariſtotle*. He ſays further, that *Neleus* ſold all this Philoſopher's Books to *Ptolemy Philadelphus*; but *Strabo* aſſures us, that *Neleus* left them to his Heirs, who hid them. The Learned *Francis Patricius* (h) pretends to remove this laſt Difficulty, by ſuppoſing that *Neleus* got *Ariſtotle*'s Books tranſcrib'd, and ſold a Copy of each Book to the Kings of *Egypt*, and kept the other for himſelf. I allow that it was a very eaſie thing for *Neleus* to get ſo many Volumes copied; but when I conſider *Ptolemy*'s Expences on account of his Library, I cannot ſee any impoſſibility in it. What will not a Man do, to furniſh himſelf with what can gratifie a Prince who pays well? On the other ſide 'tis more than probable, that one of *Ariſtotle*'s Scholars, as he was, might be extremely fond of keeping his Library, and there was no other way to ſatiſfy theſe two Paſſions, than to cauſe them to be copied. (i) *Voſſius* imagins that *Neleus* ſold all his Library, *Ariſtotle*'s Works only excepted; but beſides that this Exception has no Foundation in the Text of *Athenæus*, How is it probable that the King of *Egypt* buying *Ariſtotle*'s Library, ſhould ſuffer the Writings of this great Genius to be taken out? When it was principally ſuch Books that he wanted. I obſerve that (k) *Ammonius* ſaith, That *Ptolemy* very carefully bought up the Works of *Ariſtotle*, and very liberally rewarded thoſe who brought them to him, but he doth not mention *Neleus*. This Prince's Liberality was ſo great, that to obtain his Rewards, ſome ſuppoſititious (l) pieces were aſcribed to *Ariſtotle* in order to ſell them the dearer. What *Patricius* obſerves on the other part of the difference betwixt *Strabo* and *Athenæus* appears to me wrong. (m) He pretends that *Strabo* ſays, That *Neleus* was the firſt who erected a Library, and that he taught the Kings of *Egypt* that art. But it is very evident, that *Strabo* ſays that of *Ariſtotle* and not of *Neleus*. If it be objected that *Ariſtotle* dyed a year after *Alexander*, when *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, the firſt founder of the *Alexandrian* Library, was not yet King, nor a King's Son: I anſwer, That *Ariſtotle* might have taught People who lived long after him, the method of making a Library; for to do this it was only neceſſary for them to have learned how he placed his Books. *Patricius*'s Objection is therefore ruined, and this without doubt is the true ſenſe of *Strabo*'s Words, *διδάξας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλέας βιβλιοθήκης σύνταξιν*, *Ægypti reges bibliothecæ ordinem docuit*. I know very well that (n) *Strabo* is miſtaken in that place, where he ſaith that *Ariſtotle* was the firſt to the beſt of his Knowledge, who collected Books; he doth not remember *Polycrates*, *Piſiſtratus*, *Nicocrates*, nor *Euripides*, who according to *Athenæus*'s Obſervation, had collected great quantities of Books. This is a great fault in his Memory, I own it; but it ſeems eaſier for *Strabo* to fall into this Fault, than to think that *Ariſtotle* was alive when *Ptolemy Philadelphus* formed his Library. *Patricius* aggravates *Strabo*'s Miſtake, when he makes him ſay that *Neleus* was the firſt Collector of Books. This indeed would have been to have forgot how zealous (o) *Ariſtotle* was in buying of them.

Father *Rapin* very pleaſantly relates the Adventures of *Ariſtotle*'s Works; ſome Fragments of which Narration I deſign to cite here, becauſe they deſerve ſome reflections. (p) It is pretended that *Ariſtotle* could not prevail upon himſelf to publiſh his Writings, out of pure reſpect for *Plato*; becauſe he oppoſed his Doctrine in ſeveral places. But this Conduct diſcovered more Policy than Virtue; he was reſolved to govern himſelf with Diſcretion, becauſe Mens Minds were as yet too much prepoſſeſſed in favour of *Plato*'s Opinions. Hence it was that to conceal his Works, he entruſted them to *Theophraſtus*, with a ſtrong injunction againſt their " Publication, which was religiouſly obſerv'd. So that

(y) Epiſt. 4. epiſt. libri.

(z) Plut in Lucullo pag. 504.

(a) *'Twas the place of his birth, and a Town of* Troas.

(b) *Παραδοῦναι ἰδιώταις ἀνθρώποις οἱ κατάκλειστα εἶχον τὰ βιβλία, οὐδ' ἐπιμελῶς κείμενα.* Reliquit ineruditis hominibus, qui incuriè poſitos ſub clavibus repoſuerunt. Strabo lib. 13. pag. 413. Salmaſius in Tertul. de Pallio, p. m. 177. *proves by this paſſage that κατάκλειστον ſignifies a precious thing, which is carefully preſerved.* Strabo *inſinuates no ſuch thing. Beſides* Salmaſius *ſpeaks of* Apellicon's *heirs, whereas he ſhould have mention'd thoſe of* Neleus.

(c) In Sylla, pag. 468.

(d) *Add to this the Paſſage out of* Porphyrius, in vita Plotini, *which I have quoted in the Article of* Andronicus.

(e) *Theſe were call'd* ἐξωτερικοί: *the others which contain'd a more profound Doctrine, were call'd* ἀκροαματικοί.

(f) Strabo ubi ſupra.

conſidering the celebrated Character of their Author. They were in *Apellicon's* Library:

“that *Theophraſtus*, who was the Depoſitory, *Strato*, *Lyco*, *Demetrius Phalereus*, and *Heraclides*, who ſucceeded one another in the *Lyceum*, taught *Ariſtotle's* Doctrine only by Tradition. Which not being ſupported by any Writing, began in time to cool, and ſhare of the warmth of other Sects—— *Theophraſtus*, in order ſtrictly to obſerve his Maſters's Order, dying, intruſted *Ariſtotle's* Writings to the deareſt of his Friends and Diſciples, on the ſame condition that he had receiv'd them. His Friend's Name was *Neleus*. ——He dy'd ſoon after; tho' not without informing his Heirs of the value of the *Depoſitum* which he left them. Which they ſo well apprehended, that being informed that the King of *Pergamum* made very ſtrict ſearches after Books and Writings, in order to erect a Library, the better to ſecure *Ariſtotle's* Works, they buried them in a Vault built on purpoſe. This precious Treaſure remained in this Obſcurity about 160 Years, from whence, half eaten with Vermin, and putrify'd with the moiſture of the place, it was at laſt taken. Which was done only to ſell it at a very dear rate to *Apellicon* a Citizen of *Athens*. The Philoſophers who then taught in the *Lyceum*, being informed of this, made their court to this Citizen, who lent them thoſe Writings for ſome time. But he got them again in order to ſecure them in his Library, which he render'd very famous by this important *Depoſitum*. Some Years after, *Sylla* cauſed them to be ſeiz'd and carried to *Rome*——ſoon after which he died, and theſe Manuſcripts fell into the hands of *Tyrannion*, a certain Grammarian, who learned from *Sylla's* Library-keeper, with whom he was very intimate, that they were there. Tho' this Grammarian was a very Learned Man, and collected a Library of above 30000 Volumes, after *Lucullus* had brought him to *Rome*, yet he did not know the value of *Ariſtotle's* Works. But after his death, *Andronicus Rhodius* being come to *Rome*, and being perfectly acquainted with *Ariſtotle's* Merit, becauſe he had been bred in the *Lyceum*, treated with *Tyrannion's* Heirs for theſe Books, and having them in his Power, he ſo earneſtly apply'd himſelf to examin them —— that he was in a manner their firſt Reſtorer—— It was this *Andronicus* who firſt made *Ariſtotle* known at *Rome*, about the time when *Cicero*, by his great Reputation, roſe to the firſt Poſts in the Republick.

What I will obſerve on this Diſcourſe, may be reduced to the following Heads. I. Father *Rapin* doth not cite one Author who relates that *Ariſtotle* intruſted his Writings to *Theophraſtus*, *with an expreſs Prohibition againſt their Publication*. *Strabo* and *Plutarch*, who obſerve that this Philoſopher's Books remained long unknown, aſcribe the cauſe of it only to the Ignorance of *Neleus's* Deſcendents; and we have already cited an Author (*a*) who aſſures us, that this *Neleus* ſold *Ariſtotle's* Library to *Ptolemy Philadelphus*: So far is he from ſaying that *Neleus* preſerv'd theſe Books according to the Injunction laid on him againſt the Publiſhing of them. II. Father *Rapin* miſrepreſents the Author whom he cites (*b*); for *Strabo* doth not any where ſo much as hint that *Neleus* did not die *without informing his Heirs of the Value of the Depoſitum which he left them*; and he is ſo far from ſaying that they apprehended the worth of them, that he ſays they left them locked up and in Confuſion (*c*). It is true that *Strabo* adds they buried them, when they heard the Kings of *Pergamum* were collecting Books; which ſeems to ſignifie that *Neleus* had forbidden the alienation of his Library: But in ſhort *Strabo* ſaith no ſuch thing, and the Caſuiſts of *Parnaſſus* ought to inform us, whether it is lawful for an Author to aſcribe to thoſe he cites, the Conſequences, Reaſons, and Motives which he fancies engaged them to write ſuch and ſuch things. How do we know but that *Neleus's* Executors were afraid that their Prince ſhould not give them any thing for theſe Books, and therefore thought it more proper to reſerve them for a better opportunity? III. Father *Rapin* applies ſolely to *Ariſtotle's* Writings, what *Strabo* ſaith in general of all the Books which *Neleus* left to his Heirs. IV. *Strabo* doth not ſay one word of thoſe Philoſophers who made their court to *Apellicon* to borrow *Ariſtotle's* Works of him for ſome time. He doth not ſay that *Apellicon* having lent theſe Books to them for ſome time, afterwards called them home; he ſaith on the contrary, that *Apellicon* cauſed them to be Copied, and Publiſh'd them full of Faults. V. No Author ever ſaid that *Tyrannion* did not know the Value of *Ariſtotle's* Works. *Strabo* rather inſinuates the contrary by theſe words, *Φιλαριστοτέλης ὢν, he was a zealous Admirer of* Ariſtotle. VI. Nor hath any one ſaid that *Andronicus Rhodius* came to *Rome* after the Death of *Tyrannion*, and that he bought *Ariſtotle's* Works of his Executors: On the contrary, (*d*) *Plutarch* avers, that *Andronicus Rhodius* received thoſe Books at the hands of *Tyrannion* (*e*). VII. If it was true that *Andronicus* did not come to *Rome* before the time mention'd by Father *Rapin*, he would not have found *Tully* in the beginning of his Fortune, but at the higheſt pitch of his Glory, recalled from his Exile to the great ſatisfaction of the Roman People. The proof of this is drawn from *Tyrannion's* coming to *Rome* in the 177 *Olympiad*, where he became illuſtrious, (*f*) enriched himſelf, collected a Library of 30000 Volumes, and dyed very old, in the third Year of the 180 *Olympiad*, according to *Patricius's* correction of *Suidas*. Twelve Years at leaſt were requiſite to ſtore up ſuch a large ſhare of Riches and Books at *Rome*. Now the third year of the 180 *Olympiad* is the very (*g*) Year of *Cicero's* being recall'd. But beſides, I have proved that *Tyrannion* was alive in the 184 *Olympiad*, when *Cicero* was at leaſt aged 60 Years.

I ſhall conclude this Remark with a Reflection which I find in *Voſſius* (*h*). It is no ſmall glory to *Ariſtotle*, that his Works being ſo long unknown, were no ſooner come out that they cut ſhone the Writings of other Philoſophers, who had enjoy'd a long and uninterrupted Reputation. I add of my own head, that by a turn of Fortune, the Sect which was to prevail moſt in the Schools, is that which for ſeveral Ages found it moſt difficult to lift up its Head, and riſe out of its obſcurity. Laſtly, I ſay that it is much more ſurprizing, that ſo many Books of *Ariſtotle* are preſerved, than that we have loſt ſo great a number. It is true, there is room to doubt whether thoſe which paſs at preſent under his Name, were the genuine Iſſue of his Pen. (*i*) *Voſſius* rejects the Judgment of *Cælius Secundus Curio*, who owns for *Ariſtotle's* works only the Hiſtory of Animals, the Treatiſe of the World, and his Rhetorick to *Alexander*. But I am ſurpriz'd that inſtead of *Curio*, he doth not mention *Francis Patricius*, who hath ſo learnedly diſcuſſed what Works are, and what Works are not *Ariſtotle's*, and hath rejected a very great number on account of being counter-band Goods. *Ramus* attempted the ſame, and was not the firſt as appears by the following paſſage. (*k*) *It is not ſtrange that* Francis Picus (1) *who ſucceeded as well in the Learning as in the Principality of his Uncle, the Phœnix of his Age, the great* Picus, *labours to evince by a long train of Reaſons, that is is utterly uncertain whether* Ariſtotle *compoſed any of all the Books at preſent contained in the Catalogue of his Works: which was afterwards Confirmed by* Nizolius (2), *and ſo well examin'd by* Patricius (3), *that after having given very remarkable Proofs of his diligent ſearch after the truth of this Propoſition, he concludes at laſt, that of all the Books aſcribed to this Genius of Nature, only Four, and thoſe very ſmall and very inconſiderable, with reſpect to the worth of the reſt, are handed to us free from ſuſpicion or Controverſy, namely his Mechanicks, and three others which he wrote againſt* Zeno, Georgias *and* Xenophanes: *When on the contrary,* Ammonius *teſtifies in his Commentary on the Categories, that in the magnificent Library of* Alexandria, *they found forty Books of Analyticks, which all bore* Ariſtotle's *Name, tho' he only compoſed Four, the two firſt of which anſwer the Nine cited by* Diogenes Laertius. *Which is to be imputed, as* Galen *obſerves* (4), *to the emulation between the Kings of* Pergamum *and* Alexandria, *in Rewarding of thoſe who brought them a Book of any good Author, and eſpecially of* Ariſtotle, *the better to adorn their Libraries: Before which time none of the Ancient Books were falſly intituled. This I would ſhew more at large, if* Patricius *had not already done it* (5). *See* Gaſſendus. (*l*)

(*d*) Παρ' αὐτοῦ (Τυραννίωνος) τὸν Ῥόδιον Ἀνδρόνικον εὐπορήσαντα τῶν ἀντιγράφων. A quo (*Tyrannione*) accepiſſe Andronicum Rhodium exemplaria. *Plut.* in *Sylla*. p. 468. *B.*

(*e*) *Add to theſe Remarks concerning Father* Rapin, *what has been ſaid in the Article of* Andronicus Rhodius.

(*f*) Ex Suida.

(*g*) *See* Calviſius ad Ann. Mundi. 3893:

(*h*) Voſſius de Philoſoph. Sectis, pag. 88.

(*i*) Id. ib. p. 87 *where he obſerves that of theſe three Works, the two laſt are not* Ariſtotle's.

(*k*) Naudé, Apologie des grans hommes, chap. 6. pag. 101, 102, 103.

(1) Lib. 4. Examin. vanit. doctrinæ Gentium.

(2) Lib. 4. cap. 6. de recta ratione philoſophandi.

(3) Diſcuſſion. Peripat. tom. 1. lib. 3.

(4) Comment. in lib. Hippoc. de natura humana.

(5) Diſcuſſ. Peripat. tom. 1. lib. 3.

(*l*) Gaſſend. Exercit. adverſ. Ariſtotelæos, lib. 1. cap. 4.

Library (E), of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereunder. *Sylla* rendring himſelf Maſter of *Athens*, ſeized this Library, and ſent it to *Rome*. *Tyrannion*, by inſinuating himſelf into an Intimacy with *Sylla*'s Library-keeper, got into his Poſſeſſion all the Works of *Ariſtotle* and *Theophraſtus* which he could find there. The conſequence of which may be ſeen in the Article of *Andronicus Rhodius*, and more amply hereunder. *Strabo* † was *Tyrannion*'s Diſciple (F); as were *Cicero*'s Son and Nephew at *Rome*. *Cicero* made uſe of him to digeſt his (G) Library. *Tyrannion* wrote a Book which (H) *Pomponius Atticus* admired.

TYRANNION, ſo called, becauſe he was the former's (Y) Diſciple: his firſt Name was *Diocles*. He was of *Phœnicia*, and taken Priſoner in the War betwixt *Octavius* and *Mark Antony*, and bought by one of the Emperor's freed Men *. He was afterwards given to *Terentia*, who infranchiſed him. After which he ſet up a School in *Rome*, and compoſed Sixty eight Books. One of which was to prove, that the Latin Tongue was deſcended from the Greek ‖. This *Terentia* had been (Z) *Cicero*'s Wife.

TIRAQUELLUS (*Andrew*) in French *Tiraqueau*, one of the moſt Learned Men of the XVI Century, was born at *Fontenai-le Comte*, a Town of *Poitou*. I have but very little to add to what Mr. *Teiſſier* and *Moreri* * have already ſaid. Only that 'tis not at all probable that he had ſo many Children as ſome Authors beſtow on him. They reckon Forty five, (A) and tell us that if he had drank Wine, he had been yet much more fruitful, as well in the iſſue of his Brain,

† Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 377.
‖ His Name was Tyrmas.
* Ex Suida.
‖ Ghilini teatro tom. 2. pag. 1??, ſays he was born at Fontainebleau Terra del diſtretto di Poitiers.
† *He has committed two faults, which I have mended in the Remark* B.

(E) *They were in* Apellicon's *Library.*] I have not ſpoken of him in his place, but referred hither: It is then juſt that I ſhould ſay ſomething of him in this Remark. APELLICON was of *Teos*, but ſettled at *Athens*, of which he was made a Citizen. He was very rich and of a ſhuffling Humour. He apply'd himſelf to Philoſophy, and embraced the Peripatetick Sect (a); but he diſcovered that he had a better Talent for buying the Works of the Philoſophers, than for acquiring Knowledge of their Opinions. He bought *Ariſtotle*'s and ſeveral other numerous Libraries. He ſpared no coſt to buy rare Books, and found out an expedient to rob the *Archives* of the Original Decrees which had been antiently publiſh'd at *Athens*. If there were in any other Cities any Original Pieces valuable for their Antiquity, or very little known to the Publick, by reaſon of their being kept up cloſe, he took ſo much care to recover them, that he got all Papers of this nature into his Hands. The *Athenians* having diſcovered his pillage, had probably puniſh'd him with Death, if he had not made his Eſcape. His Friends ſoon occaſion'd his being recall'd. He engaged himſelf in the Cabal of *Athenion*, a Peripatetick Philoſopher, who was become very powerful by a popular Sedition during the War betwixt the *Romans* and *Mithridates*. The Confuſions then predominant in *Athens*, contributed to the Elevation of *Appellicon* on one ſide, and to the Diſcovery that he was utterly unfit for command on the other. *Athenion* ſent him Commander to the Iſle of *Delos*; but he ſo ill obſerved Military Diſcipline, and took ſo little care to prevent being ſurpriz'd by the Enemy, that the *Romans* made a Deſcent into the Iſle, without being perceiv'd by him, and kill'd the Garriſon when aſleep. *Appellicon* had the good fortune to ſave himſelf (c). He died a little before *Sylla* maſtered *Athens* (d). I have already ſaid what he did with regard to the Writings of *Ariſtotle*, and what became of his Library. He was an Author; for he is cited (e) as a Defender of *Ariſtotle* againſt the Calumnious Reports raiſed againſt him on account of his intimacy with *Hermias*.

(F) Strabo *was* Tyrannion's *Diſciple.*] I have cited the place where *Strabo* relates this particular: But it is falſe, that he ſaith that he was his Countryman, and his Diſciple in his own Country. *Popma* (f) who advances theſe two Errors, hath confounded *Amiſus*, *Tyrannion*'s native Country, with *Amaſia* the Country of this famous Geographer.

(G) *Cicero made uſe of him to digeſt his Library.*] Of which he informs his Friend *Pomponius Atticus*: *Perbelle feceris ſi ad nos veneris: offendes deſignationem Tyrannionis mirificam in librorum meorum Bibliotheca, quorum reliquiæ multo meliores ſunt quam putaram. Etiam vellem mihi mittas de tuis librariolis duos aliquos, quibus Tyrannio utatur glutinatoribus, ad cætera adminiſtris* (g). He owns in another Epiſtle, (h) that the two Men which *Atticus* ſent him did Wonders: *Poſtea verò quam Tyrannio mihi libros diſpoſuit, mens addita videtur meis ædibus: qua quidem in re mirifica opera Dionyſii & Menophili tui fuit.*

(H) *A Book which* Pomponius Atticus *admir'd.*] Some believe it was a Treatiſe of Proſody, and ground their Conjecture on theſe words of *Cicero* (i) *Quid ex iſta acuta & gravi refertur ad τὸν* ... Another (k) Paſſage ſeems to hint that *Tyrannion* pretended to Geography.

(Y) *Becauſe he was the former's Diſciple.*] I don't know where Mr. *Lloyd*, *Hoffman* and *Moreri*, have found that he aſſumed his Uncle *Tyrannion*'s Name; for *Suidas* whom they cite, ſays no ſuch thing, and I cannot find it in the Edition of *Charles Stephens*, at *Paris*, 1620, nor in that of *Geneva*, 1662.

(Z) *This* Terentia *had been* Cicero's *Wife.*] Tho' *Suidas* has not diſtinguiſhed the times, Mr. *Moreri* ought not to confound them. He ought not to ſay that *Damas* bought *Tyrannion*, nor that he gave him to *Terence*, *Cicero*'s Wife. It was *Dymas* who bought the ſlave, and no body ſaid that it was he who preſented him to this Woman, whom he ought to have called *Terentia* and not *Terence*; and to prevent Miſtakes, he ought not to have uſed an expreſſion which ſignifies, that *Cicero* was then alive; when indeed he had been long dead, and *Terentia* was neither his Wife nor his Widow; for ſhe had been divorced ſeveral Years before his death.

(A) *Reckon forty five, and tell us.*] Not long ſince, I read in a Theſis *de aqua calida potu*, maintain'd at *Helmſtad*, under *Henry Meibomius*, in the Year 1689. That tho' *Tiraquellus* drank only Water, he was Father of 45 Children, and Author of as many Books; to which purpoſe theſe four Verſes were made:

> *Fœcundus facundus aqua Tiraquellus amator*
> *Terquindecim librorum & liberûm parens,*
> *Qui niſi reſtinxiſſet aquis abſtemius ignes,*
> *Impleſſet orbem prole animi atque corporis.*

I dare averr, that the Fact is ſtretched too far. *Thuanus* had not been ignorant of a thing ſo obſervable as this, and would undoubtedly have mention'd it, if he had believ'd it true: But he contents himſelf with ſaying that *Tiraquellus* (l) beſtowed a Book and a Child on the Publick every Year. Some other Writers have particularized the number, confining themſelves to 30. (m) *Tiraquellus was no leſs fruitful in the production of the Children of his Mind than of thoſe of his Body; for in Thirty Years not one paſſed in which he did not give the World a Book and a Son, and if on the one ſide he extended his Name and Family by a large number of Children, all excellent Perſons, which he had by a virtuous Wife, he alſo acquir'd a large ſhare of Glory by a great number of Books with which he enriched the Publick; but what encreaſes the Wonder is, that he was thus fruitful whilſt he drank only Water.* Mr. Teiſſier (o), who cites *Frey*, *Admir. Galliæ*, does not go beyond thirty. Nor can we reach 45 if we regulate our ſelves by the common obſervation of thoſe Authors who mention this; they averr that *Tiraquellus* had but one Wife, and that all his Children were lawfully begotten. I am not ſurpriz'd that this Fecundity, ſhould appear more wonderful to thoſe who reflect that this Learned Man drank only Water: But this perhaps contributed to his Prolifick Virtue. His natural

(a) Athenæus lib. 5. pag. 214.
(b) Φιλόβιβλος μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόσοφος. Librorum amore tenebatur majore quam Philoſophiæ ſtudio. *Strab.* lib. 13. p. 419.
(c) Athen. Ibid.
(d) Strabo ibid. *The taking of* Athens *falls on the* 173. Olympiad, *about the Year of* Rome, 666.
(e) Ariſtocles Peripateticus, apud Euſebium Præp. l. 15. c. 2. pag. 793.
(f) In Ciceron. epiſt. 6. l. 2. ad Atticum in edit. Græviana.
(g) Epiſt. 4. lib. 4. *He wrote it ſoon after he return'd from his baniſhment.* Confer epiſt. 4 & 5. l. 3. ad Q. fratrem.
(h) Epiſt. 8. l. 4. ad Atticum.
(i) Vide epiſt. 4. lib. 4. ad Atticum.
(k) Ibid. epiſt. 6. l. 2. ad Atticum.
(l) Æque ingenii ac corporis monumentis fœcundus prole, cum ſingulis annis ſingulos libros ac liberos reipublicæ daret. Thuan. lib. 21. p. 432. ad ann. 1558. Sainte Marthe in Elog. p. m. 39. ſays in general cum numeroſam ſobolem ex honeſtiſſima uxore ſuſcepit.
(m) Peter de St. Romuald, Abregé du treſor chronologique, tom. 3. p. m. 324. ad ann. 1558.
(o) Teiſſier, in the Additions to the Eloges, tom. 1. p. 144.

Brain as in that of his Body. He Died very Old (B) in the Year 1558. Some Plagiaries took more from him (C) than he took from others. I have elsewhere cited a Paſſage, where it is obſerved that he inſerted ſeveral Obſcenities in one of his Books.

TIRESIAS, one of the moſt Celebrated Diviners of Antiquity, was the Son of *Everus* * and the Nymph *Chariclo*, and derived his Original from *Udeus*, one of thoſe || who proceeded from the Serpent's Teeth which *Cadmus* ſowed in the Earth. He was Blind, for which ſeveral Reaſons are aſſigned. Some ſay that the Gods unwilling that he ſhould reveal to Mortals what they deſired they ſhould be Ignorant of, ſtruck him Blind. *Pherecydes* aſcribed it to the Anger of (A) *Minerva*. He ſaid that Goddeſs was ſo Incenſed that ſhe had been ſeen Naked by *Tireſias*, that ſhe deprived him of his Sight. She was earneſtly ſollicited by *Chariclo* her Favorite, and *Tireſias*'s Mother, to reſtore Sight to her Miſerable Son, but not being able to do her that Favour, ſhe endeavoured at ſome Reparation; and accordingly ſhe perfected his Hearing to that degree, that he underſtood (B) all the

* *Moreri* call him wrong *Everus*.

|| They were call'd Σπαρτοί

natural Heat would perhaps have been enflamed to an exceſſive degree by the uſe of rich Wines, and in this Exceſs he had been leſs fit for Generation; for we are told of Barren Marriages, by reaſon of the too great Salacity of the Parties. However *Tiraquellus*'s Wife had no reaſon to fear the Attacks of the Wits, as ſhe might if ſhe had been but ſeldom Pregnant. Her Husband was fond of his Studies to an exceſſive degree; his Works loudly Proclaim that he ſpent whole days among his Books. His Writings diſcover a prodigious Reading, Labour and Searches which require a ſtrong Application. When we know a Man ſpends the Day in this manner, we ſuppoſe that he hath Exhauſted himſelf, and hath occaſion for a great deal of reſt in the Night; for (d) *quod caret alterna requie durabile non eſt, Hæc reparat vires feſſaque membra novat.* People naturally imagine that he ſpent his Spirits by Studying, Writing and Reading, and that he prepares himſelf for freſh Fatigues by a ſound Sleep. They on this account rally his Wife in Company, they pity her, and make her ſad Complements of Condolence: But by ſhewing a numerous train of Children ſhe is ſheltered from theſe Jeſts. As all things have two Faces, it is certain that a Married Author buried all day amongſt his Books and Papers, may paſs for a Convenient or Inconvenient Husband, according to the Wife he is Married to. If ſhe is a Coquet and Looſe, he is a very convenient Spouſe; for whilſt he Studies twelve Hours or more each Day, ſhe is at liberty to diſpoſe of her Perſon at pleaſure. But if ſhe is Virtuous, he is not in all reſpects a good Husband, he ſometimes obliges her (e) to wiſh her ſelf a Book, he goes to Bed utterly haraſſed with Study, and his Head is full of a Chapter which he has left Unfiniſhed. The Inconveniencies of this Diſpoſition of Body and Mind are viſible to every Body. Obſerve that every thing has its Exceptions: In reading the Lives of Learned Men, we may obſerve a great many of them who had large Families. For ſome Tempers are ſo ſtrong and well made, that they ſuffice for every thing.

Obſerve that in order to juſtify thoſe who aver that *Tiraquellus* had forty five Children tho' Married but once, we cannot ſuppoſe of him what the *Menagiana* relates of one *Blunet* (f), who (g) *had by his Wife one and twenty Children at ſeven ſucceſſive Births*, three at each time; for if this Learned Civilian's Wife had often brought two or three at a time, it would have been the principal Circumſtance which Authors wou'd have obſerved. But not one of them has mentioned it, and on the contrary they have told us that *Tiraquellus* produced every Year a Book and a Child (h). *Singulis annis ſingulos liberos reipublicæ daret.*

(B) *He Dyed very Old in the Year* 1558.] *Sainte Marthe* obſerves twice or thrice almoſt in the ſame Page, that *Tiraquellus* attained to a very great Age; but he doth not ſpecify the number of Years: Which if he knew he is to be blamed for not informing his Readers of it. I will not affirm that he did not know for 'tis his cuſtom to forget Dates. He certainly knew that *Tiraquellus* Died in 1558. and yet he has not told us ſo, but makes uſe of a long Periphraſis to expreſs the time of *Tiraquellus*'s Death. *Obiit*, ſays he (i), *plane ſenex haud multò ante quàm inter Henricum ſecundum & Philippum Hiſpaniæ Regem poſt varias bellorum offenſiones de pace tandem per utriuſque legatos ageretur.* Mr. *Bullart* makes uſe of and explains theſe Words, with reſpect to the time he believes they point at; but he has not Succeeded in the Attempt (k). "Having attained to a venerable and "decrepit Old Age, he piouſly quitted the Earth "for Heaven at the end of the Year 1559, at that "Juncture when the Charming Hopes of Peace began to appear after a Bloody War, which divided "the moſt Potent Monarchs". But the Treaty of *Cateau* in *Cambreſis* which gave Peace to *Europe* was concluded the 3d of *April* 1559. The World was not then in hopes of this Peace at the end of that Year. Hence doubtleſs Mr. *Moreri* was led into the Miſtake he hath committed in placing this Civilian's Death in 1559. He hath been guilty of another Fault which Mr. *Bullart* might have helped him to avoid. He faith *Michael de l'Hôpital* wrote a Poem *in Honour of the Tiraqueau's*, when he ought with *Bullart* to have ſaid (l) *in Honour of Tiraquellus's Writings*. To ſpeak exactly he ought to have ſaid that *Michael de l'Hôpital* addreſſed one of his Poems to *Tiraquellum*. *Ghilini* is yet more miſtaken than Mr. *Bullart*, with reſpect to the Circumſtances which *Sainte Marthe* made uſe of. *Ghilini*, I ſay (m), believed that the Year 1556 preceded the Peace of *Cateau*, betwixt *Philip* the IId. and *Henry* the IId. but a few days. 'Tis a Blunder, and a falſity to Aſſert as he doth, (n) that *Tiraquellus* Died the 23d of *December* 1556.

(C) *Some Plagiaries took more from him than he took from others.*] He accuſes *Bartholomew Chaſſanæus* of having ſtolen from his Book *de legibus connubialibus* above ſix hundred Pages intire, without making any Alterations. (o) *In hunc furti nomine vehementiſſime invehitur Tiraquellus cum (p) alibi tum in tractatu de utroque retractu (q), ubi dicit eum pluſquam ſexcentas paginas integras ne vocabulo quidem mutato ex legibus ſuis connubialibus in tractatum ſuum de gloria mundi tranſcripſiſſe.* *Chaſſanæus* accuſed *Tiraquellus* of having ſtolen ſeveral things from *Cœlius Rhodiginus*. The accuſed juſtified himſelf and charged him in his turn. His Accuſation is better grounded than his Adverſary's (r).

(A) *To the Anger of* Minerva.] It will be very proper to compare this place of *Apollodorus* with a Hymn of (s) *Callimachus*, which ſays that *Minerva* having been ſeen by *Tireſias*, while ſhe was Bathing her ſelf in Company with *Chariclo* in the Fountain of *Hippocrene*, had no ſooner declared that he ſhould ſee no more, than he loſt his Eyes. *Chariclo* was very much afflicted at this Misfortune of her Son. *Minerva* to comfort her, aſſured her, that it was an Irrecoverable Law of the Deſtinies, that all thoſe who ſaw a Deity without leave, (t) ſhould be ſeverely Chaſtized, and that a time would come when ſhe wou'd be look'd upon as a happy Woman, becauſe her Son came off only with the loſs of his Eyes. *Minerva* farther added out of her great Affection for *Chariclo*, that ſhe would render *Tireſias* the moſt excellent Diviner in the World; that ſhe would perfectly inform him in the Preſages deducible from the flight of Birds; that ſhe would give him a Staff which ſhould ſerve him inſtead of a Guide; that ſhe would give him a long Life; and that he ſhould be the only Knowing Man in Hell, and that *Pluto* ſhould particularly Honour him.

(B) *To underſtand all the Language of Birds.*] Ἅπασαν ὀρνίθων φωνὴν ποιῆσαι συνιέναι: *Omnium avium vocem feciſſe ut intelligeret.* Methinks this favour of *Minerva* will not be underſtood in its full extent, if it be ſaid only that ſhe Communicated to *Tireſias* a perfect knowledge of all the Preſages which depend on the Singing of Birds: We muſt further

(d) Ovid. in epiſt. Herod. epiſt. 4. v. 89.

(e) *See the* ... *Vol. of* ... *the Che-* ... *vræana* ... *pag.* 115. ... *Dutch* ... *Edit.*

(f) *A* ... *Civi-* ... *of* ... *ris.*

(g) *Mena-* ... *giana pag.* ... 27. *of the* ... Dutch ... *Edition.*

... *is fur-* ... *faid* ... *be De-* ... *ed* ... *Maid,* ... *at* ... *onths* ... *was* ... *livered* ... *three* ... *s.*

(h) Thuan. ... ſupra.

(i) Sam- ... martha ... s, Elog. ... 1. ... m. 35.

(k) Bullart, Academie des Sciences tom. 1. pag. 226.

(l) Bullart ibid.

(m) Ghilini, teatro tom. 2. pag. 18.

(n) Id. ib.

(o) Jacobus Thomaſius, de plagio literario n. 385. p.m. 169. *He quotes* Speckh. Cent. I. qu. 88. n. 10. p. 376.

(p) Thomaſius *quotes here ſeveral Paſſages out of Tiraquellus* in leges connubiales.

(q) Thomaſius *quotes here* §. 1. gl. 9. n. 76. circa fin.

(r) *See* Thomaſius ubi ſupra n. 563. 564. pag. 249.

(s) Εἰς λουτρὰ τῆς Παλλάδος. In lavacrum Palladis.

(t) *See an Inſtance of it in th Text of the Article* Adonis.

suppoſe

the Language of Birds. She alſo gave him a Staff, with which he could guide his Steps as ſurely as when he had Eyes. *Heſiod* gives the Story a different turn; he ſays that *Tireſias* having found two Serpents coupled, he ſtruck them with his (C) Staff *, and was immediately turned into a Woman; that at the expiration of a certain time † he again found the ſame Animals coupled, and reaſſumed the Male Sex. Now as he || had taſted the Pleaſures of both Sexes, he was choſen Judge of a Diſpute betwixt *Jupiter* and *Juno*, on the Queſtion, whether Women had a larger ſhare than Men of the Venereal Pleaſure. *Jupiter* affirmed it, *Juno* denied it. *Tireſias* decided (D) againſt the Goddeſs *Juno*, who was on that

ſuppoſe that they meant that Birds interchangeably impart their Thoughts by their Notes as Men do by Words; and that *Tireſias* received of *Minerva* the gift of Interpreting this Language of Birds. *Porphyrius* takes it in this manner (a); for imagining that Brutes have not only the faculty of Reaſoning, but alſo that of Speaking to one another, he ſaith, that *Apollonius Tyanæus*, *Melampus*, *Tireſias*, and *Thales* underſtood Animals. It is related of *Melampus* (b) that ſome Serpents having licked his Ears whilſt he Slept, were the cauſe, that when he awaked he underſtood what the Birds ſaid as they flew over his Head; and that afterwards he declared to Men the future Events he learned of that way. *Qui credit iſta & Melampodi profecto aures lambendo dediſſe intellectum avium ſermonis dracones non abnuet.* Theſe are *Pliny's* Words (c), who immediately after adds that *Democritus* mentions the Names of certain Birds, whoſe Blood mingled together would produce a Serpent, which would impart to him that Eats it the underſtanding of the Dialogues of the Birds. *Vel quæ Democritus tradit nominando aves, quarum confuſo ſanguine ſerpens gignatur, quem quiſquis ederit intellecturus ſit alitum colloquia.* The *Jews* and ſeveral Mahometans aſſert that *Solomon* underſtood this Language (d). To return to *Tireſias*, if we well take *Apollodorus's* Expreſſion, to ſignify only that *Tireſias* perfectly underſtood that ſort of Divination, which was properly called *Augury*, (or Divining by Birds) *Ælian* will inform us (f) that *Tireſias* became principally Famous on this account. *Barthius* (g) fancies this utterly contrary to *Statius*; but this Imagination is only Founded on the falſe Suppoſition that this Poet introduced *Tireſias* deſpiſing Auguries. I aſſert that this Suppoſition is falſe, to prove which againſt *Barthius*, I need only quote page 1069, of the 2d Tome of his own Notes on *Statius*, where he acknowledges that *Tireſias* declares, that the other ways of founding the Intentions of the Gods, had not afforded him ſuch a profound Knowledge of Futurity, as what he had acquired by the Invocation of the *Manes*: Is the not acknowledging of a thing for the very beſt, to deſpiſe it?

(C) *Struck them with his Staff.*] Others ſay that he trode upon them: (h) *In monte Cyllenio Tireſias dracones coeuntes calcaſſe dicitur: ob id in mulieris formam verſus, ut Ovidius refert. Deinde monitus ſortibus in eundem locum rediit, & in figuram priſtinam.* Before *Lutatius*, *Hyginus* had told us, (i) *In monte Cyllenio Tireſias Everis filius paſtor dracones venerantes dicitur baculo percuſſiſſe, alias calcaſſe, ob id in mulieris figuram eſt converſus: Poſtea monitus à ſortibus in eodem loco, dracones cum calcaſſet, redit in priſtinam ſpeciem.* The Commentators are very much puzled about thoſe words, *alias calcaſſe*; but why don't they take *alias* for an Adverb, after which there is no need of imagining that a gloſs hath ſlipt out of the Margin into the Text. *Hyginus* might very well mention both, in order to comprehend both Traditions: But if nothing be wanting in the two mentioned Paſſages, we may juſtly be ſurprized that theſe Authors ſhould omit ſome eſſential Circumſtances. The firſt forgot that *Tireſias* met a ſecond time the Serpents coupled, and renewed his firſt Blow; he forgot, I ſay, that this was neceſſary, in order to reſtore him to his Manhood; he pretends he was only obliged to return to the place. The other forgets the firſt of theſe two things. *Ovid* (k) with all his Prolixity likewiſe forgets it. *Heſiod* in *Apollodorus* hath alſo omitted the laſt of theſe two Circumſtances; he hath not told us that *Tireſias* ſtruck the ſecond time. But *Phlegon* and *Fulgentius* have remembred them both. Tho' on the other ſide *Phlegon* hath his peculiar Variations; he (l) will have it that *Tireſias* ſtruck one of the Serpents the firſt time, and the other the ſecond; but doth not allow him to have ſtruck them both each time. *Euſtathius* and the Scholiaſt on *Homer* (m), as alſo *Tzetzes* on *Lycophron* ſay, that the firſt time *Tireſias* killed the Female and became a Woman, and afterwards killing the Male he was changed to his Priſtine Sex; and that this happened on Mount *Cithæron* (n), and not on Mount *Cyllene* (o).

(D) Tireſias *decided againſt the Goddeſs* Juno.] We are told that to give the more judicial Air to this Deciſion, he took into his Hand the Balance with which Juſtice is Painted. He weighed the whole Pleaſure in diſpute, then he made the Diviſion, and aſſigned to each Sex its Lot or Quota in Weight and Meaſure; and pronounced that the whole being divided into ten parts the Woman had nine, and the Man one.

> Οἴην μὲν μοίρην δέκα μοιρῶν τέρπεται ἀνήρ,
> Τὰς δὲ δέκ' ἐμπίπλησι γυνὴ τέρπουσα νόημα.

> *Parte una è denis mas partibus oblectatur;*
> *At mulier ſolidum coitus capit ipſa decuncem.*

Apollodorus, (p) who cites theſe two Verſes tells us juſt before, if we follow the preſent Miſerable State of his *Greek* Text, (q) that the Pleaſure being divided into nineteen parts the Man enjoys nine, and the Woman the other ten; at which *Juno* was ſo Incenſed, that ſhe deprived him of his Sight. Two convincing Reaſons offer themſelves to ſhew that this place is Corrupted; firſt, nothing can be more flat or inſipid, and more remote from the deſign of the Inventers of this Chimerical Diſpute, than to Condemn *Juno* for ſo inconſiderable a difference. I ſay nothing of the ſevere Puniſhment which ſhe inflicted on her Judge for a Sentence ſo little diſtant from Truth; for I ſhould be anſwered that her Character is (r) Fierce, Cholerick and Vindicative, and that on this occaſion her Reſentment exceeded the bounds of Reaſon.

> (s) *Gravius Saturnia juſto*
> *Nec pro materia fertur doluiſſe, ſuique*
> *Judicis æterna damnavit lumina nocte.*

The other reaſon is, that *Apollodorus* would be utterly void of Judgment, if after having related the ſubſtance of the Deciſion one way, he ſhould ſoon after make appear by citing the words of the Sentence, that he had miſerably Falſified it. If this blow may be warded off by ſaying that we have only a ſmall Abridgment of *Apollodorus*, what ſhall we urge againſt ſo many other Authors, who follow the two Verſes he hath cited, and not his preſent Text? *Phlegon* (t) and *Lutatius* (u) admit exactly the Proportions expreſs'd in theſe Verſes. The Scholiaſt (w) on *Homer* cites theſe two Lines with a very inconſiderable Alteration. *Euſtathius* (x) quotes ſome words of them, and *Lucian* doth not much differ from them at the bottom. (y) *Fulgentius* diſagrees leſs ſtill, and the Scholiaſt on *Juvenal* ſtill leſs (a) explaining a place where this Poet ſaith that thoſe Women who were moſt fond of manly Occupations, and moſt avoided thoſe of their Sex, would not become Men: The Reaſon he aſſigns for it, is the too unequal diviſion of the Venereal Pleaſure.

> *Quæ fugit à ſexu, viros amat, hæc tamen ipſa*
> *Vir nollet fieri; nam quantula noſtra voluptas!*

I ought not to forget that *Barthius* ſeems very happy in his Correction of the Text of *Apollodorus* in pag. 319. and 1066. of the 2d Volume on *Statius*.

Some may aſk whether this pretended Judgment of *Tireſias*, is ſupported by Natural or Moral Reaſons

---

* See in the Remark C. how this Fable is variouſly reported.

† Ovid is the only author, that I know of, who ſpecifies the time: He makes it 7. years.

|| Venus huic erat utraque nota. *Ovid. Metam. l. 3.*

(a) Porphyr. l. 3. de abſtinent. *See the Article* Pereira.

(b) Apollodor. Bibl. l. 1. p. 46.

(c) Plin. lib. 10. cap. 49.

(d) Vide Pfeiffer. Theol. Judaicæ atque Mohamm. pag. 307. 308.

(e) Bonaventure Baron *in the* 1. *tome of the* Scotus defenſus, *mentions a Franciſcan Monk, who underſtood the Language of Beaſts, and by that means foretold things to come.*

(f) Animal. hiſtor. l. 8. c. 5. *See alſo* Euripides in Phœnic. v. 846.

(g) Barthius, in Statium, tom. 2. pag. 1065. 1149.

(h) Lutatius, *in* Stat. Thebaid. l. 2.

(i) Cap. 75.

(k) Metamorph. lib. 3.

(l) Phlegon de rebus mirabil. c. 4.

(m) In Odyſſ. K, v. 492.

(n) In Bœotia.

(o) In Arcadia.

(p) Apoll. Biblioth. pag. 155.

(q) [illegible] De novem ac decem quæ inter concubitum voluptatis partes capiantur, novem mares ac mulierem decem ſentire. *Ib. ibid.* pag. 191.

(r) Et germana Jovis, Saturnique altera proles, Iram tantos volvis ſub pectore fluctus. *Æneid.* 12. v. 830.

(s) Ovid. Metam. 3.

(t) Phleg. ubi ſupra.

(u) In Statium, apud Barthium tom. 2. pag. 318.

(w) In Odyſſ. K, v. 494. Vide Munckerum in Hygin. pag. 128.

(x) In eumd. loc. Odyſſ.

(y) In amoribus, *where he ſays that according* to Tireſias. Ἡ θήλεια τέρψει ὅλῃ μοίρᾳ πλεονεκτεῖ τὴν ἄρρενα, muliebris delectatio tota parte maſculam ſuperat (z). Tireſias dixit tres uncias habere virum amoris, & novem feminam. *Fulgent. Mytol.* l. 2. c. 8. (a) Una uncia libidinis eſt in maſculis, undecim in feminis. *Scholiaſt. Juven. in Sat. 6. v. 253.*

that occaſion ſo enraged that ſhe *(E)* Blinded him: But his loſs of ſight was made up *(F)* by the gift of Prophecy which *Jupiter* beſtowed on him. He acquired a great Reputation

ſons. I refer them to the Phyſicians for thoſe deducible from Nature in all probability, who will hardly give a clear deciſion of this Queſtion. And as for Moral Reaſons I do not believe any much ſtronger can be alledged, than that a wiſe and good Providence, ſuch as that of God, hath ſo ordered things by way of Compenſation, that he hath multiplied the Female Pleaſures in proportion to all the diſguſts, Uneaſineſs and Pain which they endure from their Conception to their Delivery. On this foot the ſhare of Pleaſure ought to be prodigiouſly unequal in favour of that Sex: But beſides that the Law of Compenſations would be attended with Conſequences that ſhou'd lead one too far; it may be ſaid that God hath thouſands of ways of Compenſating beſides this, and ſo that nothing can be determined about any of theſe ways. But the beſt Morality of this Fable is never to talk of this pretended Hiſtory of *Tireſias*, without adding that it is falſe as well in Fact as Reaſon. The neceſſity of which Addition *Brantome* will confirm to you. I knew, ſays he, (b) " a Young Lady, of a very good and " great Family, who was Ruined and became a " Whore, by having heard her School-Maſter relate " the Story or rather Fable of *Tireſias*, who having " experienced both Sexes, was choſen by *Jupiter* " and *Juno* to decide a Diſpute betwixt that " God and that Goddeſs, which Sex enjoyed moſt " Pleaſure in the act of Copulation. The dele- " gated Judge pronounced againſt *Juno*, that the " Woman, was by much the moſt Happy herein: " The Goddeſs enraged at the Sentence againſt her " ſtruck the poor Judge Blind. 'Tis not much to " be wondred at, if this Girl was tempted by ſuch a " Story: For without doubt ſhe had often heard " from her Companions, or amongſt other Women, " that the Men were always in eager purſuit of, " and expreſſed a great Pleaſure in it; and that the " Woman according to *Tireſias*, had yet a greater " Dividend of thoſe Joys, and of conſequence ſhe " muſt take a Taſte of them. Such Leſſons are " indeed very proper for Girls! Are there no other " for them? But their Maſters Anſwer that they " will know every thing, and if in the courſe of " their Reading, Hiſtories or Fables occurr, which " either want Explanation (or Explain themſelves) " they Explain them, and muſt not ſkip them, or " turn to the next Page. How many Studious " Girls have been undone reading this very Story, " that of *Biblis* and *Caunus*, and ſuch like in *Ovid*'s " *Metamorphoſis*?

There having been ſome People, who ſaid that I was in the wrong to ſuppoſe that this Queſtion ſhould be referr'd to Phyſicians. I ſhall ſhew them that it has been diſcuſs'd already in the Works of one of that Profeſſion. I can Juſtify it with ſo much the more Liberty, becauſe my Quotation will be only in *Italian* or *Latin*. (†) *Queſto ſuo donare naſce dalla sfrenata ſua libidine, e dal prendere maggior piacere nel atto venereo, che gli huomini non pigliano, e non ſentono: Come prova Avicenna nel libro nono, e venteſimoprimo de gli animali, & Hali Abbate nel ſeſto libro della ſua Teorica in queſto propoſito diſſe*, Duplicia eſt in fæmina concubitus voluptas, quia præter ſeminis motum, & orificii vulvæ in ſuggendo quoque naſcitur oblectatio, vulva ipſa diverſimode mota; *il che conferma anco Galeno nel quarto libro* de morbis, & ſymptomatis. *E lo dimoſtra il giuditio di Tireſia, ſecondo i Poeti.*——*E lo confermò anco Pietro Aponenſe ſopra il decimo quinto problema d'Ariſtotile; benche Polibio in quel ſuo libro de genitura proui il contrario, facendo due voluttà; voluttà intenſiva, & eſtenſiva: voluttà intenſiva chiamando l'ultima, & eſtrema nel mandare fuora il ſeme genitale, & in queſta uuole, che ſi diletta più l'huomo: Eſtenſiva intende quella, la quale ſi piglia innanzi l'emiſſione nel maneggiarſi: & in queſta uuoles ſi diletta più la donna, onde Gorreo Pariſino medico dottiſſimo nelle annotationi al libro di Polibio ſcriſſe le ſeguenti parole à favor delle Donne.* Tametſi maribus ſemen calidius acrius copioſiuſque ineſt, motuquè ipſi majore quam fæminæ in coitu concutiuntur, pluſque multò caloris, & ſpiritus obtineut, quamobrem ex his major eſſe maris quam fœminæ videri poſſit. Verum in fæmina alia privatim conſiderare oportet, quæ inter præcipuas, & potiſſimas voluptatis venereæ cauſſas eſſe poſſunt. Si quidem ejus uterus magno virilis Seminis deſiderio tenetur, ipſumque mirum in modum appetit, & attrahendo, ſugendo, concipiendoque impenſiſſimè delectatur; eſt enim ea in re uterus ventriculo ſimilis: ſicut enim iſte ſuavibus cibis, potibuſque gaudet, eoſque avidiſſimè amplectitur; ita ille ſemen amat, habetque gratiſſimum. *Mario Equicola nel quarto libro de natura amoris. Dice, che ſe ciò foſſe vero, che le donne haveſſero maggior piacere che gl' huomini non hanno nell' atto venereo, ſempre le femine ricercherebbono i maſchi, del che (dice egli) ſi vede tutto il contrario.*

(E) So enraged that ſhe blinded him.] Apollodorus doth not acquaint us how: But *Hyginus* informs us that it was with her own Hand, (c) *Juno irata manu averſa eum excæcavit. Phlegon's* expreſſion may very well be interpreted that ſhe did it with her Bodkin, κατανύξαι αὐτοῦ τὰς ὀφθαλμάς. The *Scholiaſt* on *Statius* adds that ſhe cut off his Hands beſides; *illa irata manus ejus præcidit & excæcavit*; but he being the only Author who ſays this, 'tis probable this place is corrupted. (d) *Barthius* corrects it thus, *manus ei ſuperjecit & excæcavit*; and confirms his conjecture from *Apollodorus*, who ſpeaking of the Puniſhment inflicted by *Minerva* on *Tireſias*, ſaith ſhe did it with her own Hands. τὴν δὲ ταῖς χερσὶ ὀφθαλμὰς αὐτοῦ καταλαβομένην πηρὸν ποιῆσαι.

(F) Was made up.] He acquieſced in the Exchange; it doth not in the leaſt appear that he regretted the loſs of his Eyes: ſhe is never introduced deploring his deſtiny; this had been indecent, after the reſplendent light which his mind was ſuppoſed to have received. (e) *Augurem Tireſiam quem ſapientem fingunt Poetæ nunquam inducunt deplorantem cæcitatem ſuam. At vero Polyphemum Homerus cum immanem ferumque finxiſſet, cum ariete etiam colloquentem facit, ejuſque laudare fortunas quod quo vellet ingredi poſſet, & quæ vellet attingeret. Rectè hic quidem, nihilo enim erat ipſe cyclops quàm aries ille prudentior:* 'Tis for *Cyclopes*; tis for Ignorant Men to believe that by the loſs of Sight a Man is deprived of the joy of this World. It is true that all the unthinking crew are not agreed on this Principle, Witneſs the two Beggers mentioned in the 19. *Seree* of *Bouchet*. They were at a Church Door *and could not agree what was the joy of this World; for the Blind Man cried out*, beſtow your Alms on a poor Man, who has loſt the joy of this World: *The other Raſcal, who by a Faulcon-Shot had loſt what ſhould have been in his Breeches, told him he lyed, and averred that it was he who had loſt the joy of Life.* We are told of a Princeſs who would have put it out of diſpute by condemning the firſt of theſe Beggars. The Story runs thus: (f) " A Princeſs of great " Virtue who remained a Virgin all her life, " continued the Duke, loſt her ſight in her old " Age, after which, a Poor Blind Man was led " to her Coach ſide where he immediately ſaid, " my Good Lady have pity on a Poor Man who " hath loſt the joy of this World: The Princeſs " hearing this asked one of her Women, *what's the* " *matter with that Man, is he then an Eunuch?* No " my Princeſs, replyed the Waiting Woman, 'tis be- " cauſe he is Blind, *alas Poor Man! He is in the* " *right*, ſaid the Princeſs, *indeed I did not think of that* " *in the leaſt*. The Natural Simplicity of the " Princeſs's Queſtion pleaſantly enough diſcove- " red what Opinion ſhe had of the joys of Life." It is very probable that *Malherbe* would have decided the diſpute conformably to the Opinion of the fellow, who was maimed by a Faulcon-Shot. For deficiency in that part made him inconſolable, he had rather choſen to be in a Condition (g) to Reap the Ladies Favours than to obtain the higheſt Dignities of the King his Maſter. By the pathetick Air (h) of his Complaints one would be apt to judge that he had been more than once in the ſame diſagreable Condition of the falſe Hermit, who in vain had the Charming *Angelica* at his Mercy.

Gia (i) reſupina ne l' arena giace
Atutte voglie del Vecchio rapace.

Egli l'abbraccia, à piacer la tocca.
Et ella dorme; è non può fare iſchermo;
Hor le bacia il bel petto, hora la bocca;
Non è chi'l veggia in quel loco aſpro & ermo.

Ma

(b) Brantome, Memoires des Dames galantes tom. 2. pag. 45.

(†) Io- ph Paſſi the cademy the gnori ccou- ti di dua, & formi di avenna, the 33 d 34 ages of Book lled i onnes chi fetti, inted at enice 618, in o. 'tis 4th dition.

(c) Hygin. c. 75. Vigenere upon Philoſtratus, pag. 50. of the 2 tome in 4. renders it, Junon indignée de cela lui donna une arriere-main dont il demeura aveugle.

(d) Barth. in Stat. tome 2. p. 318. *See alſo* Munckerus in Hygin. pag. 128.

(e) Cicero Tuſculan, 5. circa fin.

(f) *Mr.* de Cailliere, *of the* French *Academy*, Recueil des bons contes & des bons mots pag. 132. *Dutch Edit.* 1693.

(g) *See* Malherbe *Remark* B.

(h) *See his Letter to* Balzac, *in the Collection of new Letters, Printed at* Paris 1642. *pag.* 65.

(i) Arioſto, Orlando furioſo, canto ottavo, ſtanza 48. & ſeq.

Reputation (G) by his Divining Science, notwithſtanding which he was Ignorant that the Water of the Fountain *Tilphuſa* would be Fatal to him; for having fled with his Country-Men (H) in the time of the Second *Theban* War, he drank of this Water and Dyed. This is what *Apollodorus* affords on this Subject *. We are informed by *Strabo* † that the *Thebans* then took refuge on the Mountain *Tilphuſa*, at the foot of which there was a Fountain of the ſame Name, and *Tireſias*'s Tomb. *Pauſanias* agrees β with *Strabo* concerning the place where *Tireſias*'s Tomb was Situated. Which was, I own it, not very far from *Alalcomenium*; nevertheleſs *Moreri* is very much miſtaken, when he ſaith γ *Alalcomenium was remarkable for Tireſias's Tomb.* I have ſpoken in its proper place, (in the Article of *Manto*,) of that Worthy Daughter of this great Diviner to whom ſhe ſerved as a δ Guide, and was the Staff of his old Age: For it muſt not be forgotten that (I) he lived very long. Some Writers beſtow on him another Daughter Named *Hiſtoris* ζ, who by an Ingenious Stratagem deceived the Goddeſs *Lucina*, and occaſioned the Happy delivery of *Alcmena*, whoſe Labour had been prolonged by that Goddeſs. There was a certain Book which went under *Tireſias*'s Name by means of an Impoſture which hath Hundreds of times been practiſed. This Book treated of the preſages of Incenſe, *de thuris Signis*. It is twice cited η by the Scholiaſt on *Statius*. *Tireſias* practiſed all ſorts of predictions; he made uſe of *Pyromancy* θ, *Capnomancy*, *Necromancy*, &c. The laſt of which, conſiſting in the raiſing up of the Dead, he preferred before κ the reſt; and exerciſed it very imperiouſly

Ma ne l'incontro il ſuo deſtrier trabocca;
Ch'al deſio non riſponde il corpo infermo;
Era mal'atto, perche havea tropp' anni,
E potrà peggio, quanto più l'affanni.
Tutte le vie, tutti li modi tenta;
Ma quel pigro rozzon non però ſalta.
Indarno il fren gli ſcote, e tormenta,
E non può far, che tenga la teſta alta.

Racan, *Malherbe's* faithful Scholar, had alſo his Maſter's taſte; he would not have parted with the Remainder of his Vigour for all the Triumphs of the greateſt Conquerors, nor for all the Policy of the Prime Miniſters. *I am not at all ſurprized*, ſays he in (k) a Letter to Balzac, *that N. hath adventured to cenſure your Eloquence, ſince* Mr. de Malherbe *hath had the Impudence to accuſe me of frigidity, when he himſelf is nothing but meer Ice, and his laſt Miſtreſs Died of Age, the laſt hard Winter: In boaſting of the Miracles of his Youth, he plays a ſure Game, for I know none who can give him the Lye; for my Part I would not Exchange my reſt of vigorous Years for the Victories of the Prince of* Orange, *or the Wiſdom of* Cardinal Richelieu, *and ſhould be very uneaſy to be in ſuch a State as would render his reproach juſt.* *Malherbe*'s raillery was in the following Words: (l) "As for Paſtorals his Affair ſucceeds the beſt in the World, but certainly as to what relates to the Shepherdeſſes it could not go worſe. This requires a ſort of Sollicitude of which his lazineſs is incapable. If he attacks a place he doth it ſo faintly, that it would be Burthenſome to him if he had it; and if he takes it, he ſo ſlightly keeps it that he gives reaſon to believe that a Woman has been very much ſurpriſed when ſhe has Broke her Faſt, for ſuch a wretched Morſel." *Malherbe* doth not ſpeak of himſelf in the third Perſon as I once thought: He ſpeaks of his Diſciple *Racan*, and 'tis on this Account that *Racan* juſtifies himſelf, and inſults the other in the paſſage juſt now cited. But let it be how it will, here are a Couple of Souls to which baſe *Minerva* could not have made amends, if inſtead of blinding them, as ſhe did *Tireſias*, ſhe had made them Eunuchs.

I CONCLUDE with the thought of a Philoſopher, who was of a Sect more Heretical in their Notions of Pleaſure, than that of *Epicurus*. He had loſt his Eyes, and hearing the Good Women deplore his Condition, he asked them whether Nocturnal Enjoyments were not to be accounted pleaſures. (a) *Illud Antipatri Cyrenaici eſt quidem paulo obſcœnius, ſed non abſurda ſententia eſt. Cujus cæcitatem quum mulierculæ lamentarentur, quid agitis, inquit? an vobis nulla videtur voluptas eſſe nocturna?*

(G) *He acquired a great Reputation.*] This plainly appears by *Sophocles* and ſeveral other Ancient Authors. He was the only wiſe Perſon in (b) Hell, if we believe *Homer*.

Τῷ (c) ϗ τεθνειῶτι νόον πόρε Περσεφόνεια
Οἴῳ πεπνῦσθαι· τοὶ δὲ, σκιαὶ ἀΐσσουσιν.

Huic etiam mortuo mentem tribuit Proſerpina
Soli ut ſaperet, reliqui verò umbræ circumvolitant.

He was Honoured (d) as a God after his Death. Yet I cannot find in the 9th book of *Strabo*, what *Charles Stephens*, *Lloyd*, *Moreri* and *Hofman* quote, that the *Thebans* paid divine Honours to *Tireſias* interred near *Tilphuſa*. I find only in *Pauſanias* (e) that they had in their City a place called *Tireſias*'s obſervatory, οἰωνοσκοπεῖον Τειρεσίου, (which probably was the place where he contemplated the Auguries) and an Honorary Tomb, or *Cenotaphium*: For the *Thebans* owned that he Dyed near *Haliartus* (f); and that they had not his Tomb amongſt them. This is a very odd Argument; but it doth not much concern us. Thoſe Gentlemen who have cited *Strabo*, would have found their account much better in *Diodorus Siculus*; who informs us (g) that the *Thebans* celebrated a Pompous Funeral to *Tireſias* and paid him Divine Honours.

(H) *Having fled with his Countrey-Men.*] Mr. *Moreri* hath very much miſtaken his original *Charles Stephens*, when he ſaith that *Tireſias being in Exile* near the Fountain *Tilphuſa*, *Died there.* *Charles Stephens*'s Latin runs thus, *juxta fontem ejuſdem nominis, ubi profugus diem ſuum obiit*: Which is taken from *Strabo*, ὑφ' ᾧ Τίλφωσσα κρήνη ϗ τὸ τοῦ Τειρεσίου μνῆμα ἐκεῖ τελευτήσαντος κατὰ τὴν φυγὴν, *ſub quo fons eſt Tilphoſa, & monumentum Tireſiæ qui extorris ibi mortem obiit.* If Mr. *Moreri* had been acquainted with the Hiſtory of *Tireſias*, he had not rendred the Word *Profugus* by that of *Exile*. From hence we may infer that Tranſlators are liable to ſtrange Blunders, when they don't underſtand their Subject; for they may indeed know 3 or 4 Significations of the ſame Word, but this doth not hinder them from chooſing that which doth not properly agree in this or that place. I obſerve a conſiderable difference betwixt *Strabo* and *Pauſanias*. The firſt makes *Tireſias* Die in his flight without falling into his Enemies power: The ſecond on the contrary Building his Relation on the *Grecian* Hiſtories, ſaith (h) that the *Argivi* having take the City of *Thebes*, were carrying *Tireſias* with the reſt of their Booty to the Temple of *Delphi*, but that he having drank of the Water of *Tilphuſa* Dyed by the Way. *Diodorus Siculus* (i) relates the Fact to the ſame purpoſe as *Strabo*. An Author (k) whoſe Memory I Honour, ſaith that *Tireſias* in his latter Days retired to the Mountain call'd *Tilphuſius*, to end his life in Repoſes remote from the tumults of the City. He doth not cite any Authority; but I doubt not that he had met with it in ſome celebrated Writer. This retreat of *Tireſias* was not at all Voluntary.

(I) *He lived very long.*] *Hyginus*, *Phlegon*, and *Lucatius* agree that *Jupiter* repaired *Tireſias*'s loſs of Sight, by granting him the knowledge of Futurity, and a life ſeven times as long as that of others, *Septem ætates* (l). *Agatharcides* mentions but five imperiouſly (K), and would not ſuffer the Ghoſts to delay their Appearance. He being Blind, *Manto* x was obliged to inform him of the Appearances of Fire, and Smoak, &c. *Lucian* in his Treatiſe of Aſtrology obſerves that *Tireſias* taught that the Planets have not all the ſame Virtue, nor the ſame Sex.

---

* Biblioth. lib. 3. pag. 191. edit. Salmur. 1661.

† Lib. 9. pag. 285. See also pag. 281.

β Lib. 9. pag. [illegible]

γ In the Article of Alalcomenium; *for he forgot it in that of* Tireſias: *He places that Monument right, and quotes Strabo.*

δ O noſtræ regimen viresque ſenectæ. Stat. Theb. lib. 4. v. 536.

ζ Pauſan. lib. 9. pag. 290.

η *See* Barthius in Stat. tom. 2. p. 1106. & tom. 3. pag. 673.

θ Ille coronatos jamdudum amplectitur ignes, Fatidicum ſorbens vultu flagrante vaporem. Stat. Theb. lib. 10. v. 598. *See alſo Seneca* in Oedipo, act. 2. ſc. 2.

κ *See the end of the Remark B.*

(k) *Racan, Letter to Balzac, in the* 2. *Tome of the Collection of new Letters, Printed at* Paris *by Touſſaint Quinet in* 1634. p. 295. *and ſeq.*

(l) *Malherbe Letter to* Balzac p. 61. *of the Collection of New Letters, Printed at* Paris *in* 1642. (a) Cicero Tuſcul. lib. 5. fol. 278. B. (b) *See what has been quoted out of* Callimachus *in the Remark A.*

(c) Odyſſ. [illegible]

(d) Cic. [illegible]

(e) Lib. 9. pag. [illegible]

(f) The Tranſlator [illegible] from [illegible] Tilphuſius.

(g) [illegible] in the Tranſlation found at [illegible] Quem in civitatem magna cum pompa ſepeliere, Deorum illi honores tribuentes, there is ſibi inſtead of ipſi.

(h) Pauſan. lib. 9. pag. 307.

(i) Diod. Sicul. lib. 5. cap. 6.

(k) Petrus Muſſardus (de quo vide Decherrum de Script. adeſpot. pag. 337. edit. 1686.) hiſtor. Deor. fatidicorum, pag. 8.

(l) Some render it ſeven Ages.

He was ‖ the inventer of Auſpices: He was Worſhipped as a God at *Orchomenus*, his Oracle was Famous there for ſeveral Ages, but ‡ ſilenced at laſt after a Plague had rendred the City deſolate. Perhaps all the directors of the Oracles periſhed by the contagion: or perhaps they believed that a God who ſuffered the Inhabitants of *Orchomenus* to be deſtroyed by the Plague, was not capable of predicting future Events. I wholly omit ſupernatural Reaſons.

TISSANDIER (*N.*) Author of a Book no otherwiſe known to me than by a Letter of *Balzac*. He Dyed very (*Y*) old in the Year 1628. *La Croix du Maine* doth not mention him, (*Z*) and I think *Du Verdier Vau-Privas.* has wholly omitted him.

TITIUS (CAIUS) A *Roman* Orator and Poet, was a *Roman* Knight. He carried Eloquence as far as poſſible (*A*) without underſtanding *Greek.* His Orations were very polite and abounded with Subtilties and Numerous examples, on which Account they ſeem'd to be in the Attick Stile. This Subtilty of thought did not ſucceed on the Stage, when he attempted it in his Tragedies, as he had uſed it in his pleadings. It did not nobly enough keep up the Gravity of the Tragick

x Stat. & Senec. ib.

‖ Auſpicium Tireſias Thebanus (invenit.) Plinius lib. 7. c. 56. pag. 106.

‡ Plut. de oracul. defectu. pag. 434.

---

five Ages: *Lucian* ſix: But according to *Tzetzes* ſome made *Tireſias* to have lived Eleven Ages (*m*).

(*K*) *Exerciſed it very imperiouſly.*] *Seneca* makes him ſpeak theſe menacing Words.

Carmenque (n) magicum volvit, & rabido MINAX
Decantat ore, quicquid aut placat leves,
Aut cogit umbras.

Statius introduces him Armed with threats and reproaches.

Atque (o) hic Tireſias nondum adventantibus umbris
Feſtor, ait, Divos quibus hunc ſacravimus ignem,
Jam nequeo tolerare moram. Caſſuſne ſacerdos
Audior, an rabido jubeat ſi Theſſala cantu
Ibitis, & Scythicis quoties armata venenis
Colchis aget, trepido pallebunt tartara motu?
Noſtri cura minor! . . .

. . . . . .

Ne tenues annos nubemque hanc frontis opacæ
Spernite ne, moneo, & nobis ſævire facultas,
Scimus enim & quidquid dici noſcique timetis.

See in *Lucian* (*p*) a long train of threats uttered by the *Theſſalian Magician* againſt the infernal Gods. This Style was very common in the Magical Rites. A *Pagan* Philoſopher ridicules them with a great deal of Reaſon. (*q*) Πολλῷ δὲ τούτου ἀλογώτερον, τὸ μὴ δαίμονι, εἰ τύχοι, ἢ ψυχῇ τεθνηκότος, αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἡλίῳ, ἢ Σελήνῃ, ἢ τινι τῶν κατ᾽ οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώπων τῷ τυχόντι ὑποχείριον ἀπειλὰς προσφέροντα ἐκφοβεῖν, ψευδόμενον ἵν᾽ ἐκεῖνοι ἀληθεύσωσι. *Quodque omnium abſurdiſſimum non eſt, jam vulgari cuipiam Dæmoni, aut defuncti animæ, ſed ipſimet Soli ſyderum principi, Lunæ, reliquiſque Diis cæleſtibus, homo cuivis e Populi fæce obnoxius minas intentat, ut eos ad vera dicenda compellat, falſum vanumque terrorem oſtendit.* This puts me in mind of our popular Stories concerning *Magick*. I don't ſpeak of the moſt common, but of thoſe which raiſe themſelves ſomewhat above the crowd. It is pretended that ſome Magicians exerciſe a ſort of conſtraining command over thoſe Spirits which they conjure. As abſurd as this may ſeem, it may be thought poſſible, if we ſhould once allow that certain Covenants or Treaties are made betwixt Men and evil Angels: For there being doubtleſs a ſubordination amongſt theſe Spirits, there may be ſome *Dæmons* who arbitrarily reign over ſeveral others. Cannot one of theſe Superiour *Dæmons* promiſe his Magician that he will Subject to him all the Spirits under his command? Cannot he promiſe him to threaten thoſe with his diſpleaſure who are reſty? *Thuanus*, who was preſent at a Dialogue betwixt the Sieur *de Calignon* and a famous Magician, relates that the Magician did not deny his commerce with thoſe *Dæmons*, but affirmed that Magick tended only to the doing good to Mankind, and that there was a very great difference between Sorcerers and Magicians. A Magician, continued he, hath no correſpondence with any other than the aerial and celeſtial Spirits, who are good and beneficent, and teach him a Thouſand very profitable Secrets, and beſides he commands thoſe Spirits. But a Sorcerer is a vile Slave to Terreſtrial Spirits naturally malignant and Enemies to Mankind. He added that there (*a*) were Schools of Magick in *Spain*, and that there had been alſo very Flouriſhing ones in *Germany*, which were moſtly diſperſed ſince *Luther* divulged his Hereſy. He did not confeſs to his Judges all that he owned to the Sieur *Calignon*; but this did not prevent the Parliament of *Paris* condemning him to Death on the evidence produced againſt him. The thing is remarkable enough to engage me to inſert it for my Readers uſe in *Thuanus*'s own Words. (*b*) *Magiam quam profitebatur Bellomontius, dæmonum, qui numinis divini particulæ ſunt, cum hominibus conciliatricem artem præclaram eſſe ad beneficium inventam non ad maleficium, quo Sortiarii qui vocantur vulgo utuntur, ipſi malorum ſpirituum vilia mancipia in craſſam ignorantiam demerſi, & veneno ac diris faſcinationibus eorum arbitrio perniciem humano generi machinantes, cum contra magi ipſis dæmonibus imperent, & eorum conſortio ac familiaritate arcana naturæ vulgo ignota nec libris prodita cognoſcere, futura rimari, mala declinare, pericula antevertere, amiſſa recuperare, corpora citerius quam humana ratione fieri poſſit, de loco in locum transferre, diſſidenteis componere, patres cum filiis, uxores cum maritis, & amicitiam cum iis quibus debet conciliare diſcant, denique ſibi rem cum aeriis ſpiritibus & cælo participantibus eſſe, qui natura benefici nihil niſi juvare ſciunt, cum terreſtres & ſubterranea incolentes, qui Sortiariis imperant, ſint maligni & nocere tantum noverint: tam præclaræ artis ſcholas* (*c*)&c. See the remainder in the Margin of this Page. Let us conclude with *Cicero's* Words, who informs us that *Tireſias* was none of thoſe Wretched Diviners who get their Bread by their trade of ſelling Impoſtures. (*d*) *Ante hos Amphiaraus & Tireſias non humiles & obſcuri, neque eorum ſimiles, ut apud Ennium eſt,* qui ſui quæſtus cauſa fictas ſuſcitant ſententias, *ſed clari & præſtantes viri qui avibus & ſignis admoniti futura dicebant, quorum de altero etiam apud inferos Homerus ait ſolum ſapere, cæteros umbrarum modo vagari.*

(*Y*) *He Dyed very old in the Year* 1628.] See the Letter (*e*) Written the ſame Year by *Balzac* to one Mr. *Tiſſandier*, where he comforts him on the Death of his Uncle, who was as old as the Hereſy and older than the League; for he publiſhed a Book to forewarn *France* againſt the conception of this Monſter. I need not tell you theſe are *Balzac's* expreſſions.

(*Z*) *And I think* Du Verdier Vau-Privas.] I expreſs my ſelf thus, becauſe I had not leiſure to examine this Writer's *bibliotheque Françoiſe* page by page in ſearch of *Tiſſandier*. The Authors are there ranged according to their Chriſtian Names, and there is no Table of Sirnames added. Theſe are two inexcuſable Faults when they meet together. The firſt is ſupportable when it is alone, as it is in *La Croix du Maine*; but not to repair the firſt by a Table of Sirnames is to banter the World.

(*A*) *He carried Eloquence as far as poſſible.*] *Cicero* the beſt judge in the world gives him this teſtimonial. (*f*) *Ejuſdem fere temporis fuit eques Romanus C. Titius: qui meo judicio eo perveniſſe videtur, quò potuit fere Latinus orator ſine Græcis literis, & ſine multo uſu pervenire. Hujus orationes tantum argutiarum, tantum exemplorum, tantum urbanitatis habent, ut pene Attico ſtylo ſcriptæ eſſe videantur. Eaſdem argutias in tragœdias ſatis ille quidem acute, ſed parum tragicè tranſtulit.*

(*B*) When

(*b*) Thuanus devitæ ſuæ, lib. 6. pag. 1233. 1234.

(*c*) Id. ib.

(*d*) Cicero, lib. 1. de Divinat. fol. m. 310. C.

(*e*) 'Tis the 18. of the 8. Book in the Folio Edition.

(*f*) Cicero in Bruto, p. m. 280.

tragick Character *. When the conſul *Fannius* propoſed his Law, againſt Luxurious Feaſting, *Titius* made an Oration to the People to repreſent the utility of that Law. We ſhall ſee in the Remarks whether this Fact will aſſiſt us in the Diſcovery of the time when the *Lex Fannia* (B) was Eſtabliſh'd. This Oration of *Titius* clearly informs us that Drunkenneſs (C) was then at its higheſt pitch. To confound our *Titius* with a certain TITIUS who lived in *Auguſtus*'s time is an intolerable miſtake in an interpreter of (D) *Horace*.

TORQUATO (*Antony*) a Famous Aſtrologer of the XVth Century, Born at *Ferrara*. He gave *Mathias* King of *Hungary* a Prediction in the Year 1480, which was very Fatal to *Chriſtendom*; for he threatned the intire Ruin of the *Ottoman* Empire after a fixed time, which cauſed the *Hungarians* to engage in a War † that Ruined them ||. Some of his predictions came to paſs, but the

* Cicero in Bruto, p. m. 185.

† See the Remark A.

|| See Leunclavius in Hiſtoriæ Muſulmanæ appendice.

(B) *When the* Lex Fannia *was eſtabliſhed.*] I have in another place (g) examined *Glandorp*'s Opinion and found it ill grounded. This Author believes (h) that he who propoſed this Law was not *Caius Fannius* the Father, Conſul in the Year of *Rome* 592. but *Caius Fannius* the Son, Conſul in the Year of *Rome* 632. For this he offers but one proof taken from a paſſage of *Aulus Gellius*, which is of no Force. He would have offered ſomething more ſpecious if he had quoted *Macrobius*, who acquaints us that *Titius* contemporary of *Lucilius* adviſed the People to Eſtabliſh the *Lex Fannia*. (i). It is certain that *Lucilius* was Born in the beginning of the 7th Century of *Rome*: Which agrees wonderfully with *Glandorp*'s Hypotheſis, for according to it *Lucilius* was Aged about Thirty, when the *Lex Fannia* was Eſtabliſh'd. The Orator who perſuaded the acceptance of this Law ought then to be *Lucilius*'s contemporary. But if you place the Eſtabliſhment of that Law in the Year 593. this Orator and *Lucilius* did not live at the ſame time; and the former had been an Old Man in the time of the other's Youth, and conſequently *Macrobius* furniſhes a very plauſible proof for *Glandorp*. Which may be ſtrengthened by theſe Words of Cicero, *Ejuſdem fere temporis fuit Eques Romanus C. Titius*; for he had juſt ſpoke of three or four Orators who Flouriſhed towards the Year of *Rome* 660. *Titius* would come near to their time, if he recommended the *Lex Fannia* in the Year 632. But the diſtance of time between them and him would be found very great, if this Law was Eſtabliſh'd in 593. Notwithſtanding all theſe Reaſons I perſiſt in my Opinion declared in the Article *Fannius*. That paſſage in *Pliny* (k) which points out the preciſe interval of Eleven Years betwixt the *Lex Fannia* and the 3d. *Punick* War is more valid than ten citations, where it is only ſaid in general, *ejuſdem ætatis, ejuſdem ferme temporis*. Theſe looſe expreſſions, *he lived near another's time, or in the ſame Age with him*, will frequently admit of a great Latitude, and may be Lengthned or Shortned, and favour of a Man not very nice in Chronology, and who ſpeaks according to the confus'd Idea's of his Memory. But when an Author makes uſe of a determinate Number, when he Names exactly Eleven Years, 'tis a ſign that he took more pains, that he ſearched farther into the matter, and conſequently *Pliny's* teſtimony is here of very great Efficacy to fix the *Lex Fannia* in the Year 593, becauſe the Year 604 was the firſt Year of the 3d. *Punic* War. If we don't yield to theſe Reaſons, what ſhall we ſay, when we conſider that according to *Macrobius* the *Lex Fannia* was inacted in the Year 588. and nevertheleſs he Advances that *Titius* and *Lucilius* lived at the ſame time (a) or in the ſame century? I argue thus; either *Macrobius* was perfectly well acquainted with the Age of *Lucilius*, or he was not ſo well acquainted with it: If the firſt be true, we ſhall be obliged to conclude according to him, that an Orator who recommended a Law in 588, and a Poet Born 12 Years after, lived at the ſame time, and ſo his Words don't at all confirm *Glandorp*'s Opinion: In the Second caſe they confirm it yet leſs; for no Chronological proofs can be drawn from a Man who ſpeaks at random without regard to exactneſs. As for Cicero's *ejuſdem fere temporis*, it is a Phraſe which doth not hinder us from believing that *Titius* made his Harangue in the Year 593. Obſerve that *Afranius* (b) imitated *Titius*. I don't offer this as a cogent proof or demonſtration that he was Younger, but only as a ſign that he was ſo. Now *Afranius* (c) was contemporary with *Terence* who died (d) in 594. Thus *Cicero* hath furniſhed us with a ſtrong proof againſt *Glandorp*. Let us then own that our *Titius* Flouriſhed about the Year of *Rome* 590.

(C) *Drunkenneſs was then at its higheſt pitch.*] The Judges drank ſo much Wine before they went to the Bench, that they were neceſſitated to Urine in every Corner. After having heard the State of the caſe, they cauſed the Witneſſes to be called, and in the mean time went to the Chamber-pot: Being returned they gathered the Votes; and could ſcarce refrain from Sleeping. Going to council they uſed to ſay, why ſhould we torment our ſelves with theſe trifles, let us rather take a Charming Bottle and get a Nice bit of ſomething to Eat. Thoſe who underſtand Latin will be much better pleaſed with *Titius*'s own words. (e) *Ludunt alea, ſtudioſe unguentis delibuti, ſcortis ſtipati, ubi horæ decem ſunt; jubent puerum vocari ut comitium eat percunctatum quid in foro geſtum ſit, qui ſuaſerint, qui diſſuaſerint, quot tribus juſſerint, quot vetuerint. Inde ad comitium vadunt, ne litem ſuam faciant: dum eunt, nulla eſt in angiporto amphora, quam non impleant, quippe qui veſicam plenam vini habeant. Veniunt in comitium triſtes, jubent dicere. quorum negotium eſt, dicunt: judex teſtes poſcit: ipſus it minctum: ubi redit, ait ſe omnia audiviſſe, tabulas poſcit, literas inſpicit, vix præ vino ſuſtinet palpebras, eunti in conſilium ibi hæc oratio: Quid mihi negotii eſt cum iſtis nugacibus: quam potius potamus mulſum mixtum vino Græco, edimus turdum pinguem, bonumque piſcem lupum germanum, qui inter duos pontes captus fuit?* *Macrobius* who hath preſerved this curious fragment of this Oration of *Titius*, hath cited another paſſage of the ſame in his 9. Chapter; for we ought not to doubt that *Cincius in ſuaſione legis Fanniæ*, in the 9. Chapter is a miſtake of the Tranſcribers, who by degrees changed *Titius* into *Cincius*. This other (f) paſſage informs us that they uſed to Cook ſeveral Animals in a Hog's-belly, and that they called this a Trojan Hog, in alluſion to the Trojan Horſe filled with Soldiers. Theſe exceſſes wanted to be ſuppreſſed; Luxury was then become ſo enormous, that ſeveral Children of good Families proſtituted and ſold themſelves in order to gratify their Palate with delicious Meats: Drunkenneſs was become ſo common, that the Citizens went drunk to the Councils, where the Publick Affairs were debated; as we are informed by *Sammonicus Serenus* (g). The ſucceeding Ages have ſeen the moſt horrible Vices at *Rome*, but they have ſcarce perceived Drunkenneſs to reign there: At preſent it is not known in that Country; but as for the Ancient *Romans*, they lived like true Northern Drunkards. See the Drunkenneſs of the Deputies of a Synod in the Remark *A* of the Article *Berengarius*. I am ſurpriz'd that *Corradus*, who was ſo conſummate in the Hiſtory of particular perſons, knew our *Titius* only by this Paſſage of *Cicero*: He was ignorant of that of *Macrobius*. *C. Titius*, ſaith he, in Page 282 of his Commentary on *Cicero's Brutus*, *de quo ſcriptum nihil nos præterea vidimus.*

(D) *Miſtake in an Interpreter of* Horace.] *Corradus* takes notice of this Blunder without telling us whoſe it is. *Unde videtur interpres Horatii deceptus, qui putavit eundem Titium fuiſſe pindarici fontis qui non expalluit hauſtus, & eum qui ſcripſit tragædias, quum hic multo ante floruerit, & ille tempore Auguſti vixerit: quamquam ille potuit etiam utrumque præſtare.* *Corradus* ſeems to doubt whether *Horace*'s *Titius* was at the ſame time a Compoſer of Odes and Tragedies, tho' there doth not appear much reaſon of doubt, when we read theſe ſix Verſes of the 3d Epiſtle of the 1ſt Book of *Horace*:

(g) *In the Article* Fannius.

(h) Onomaſtic. pag. 333.

(i) Id oſtendunt tum multi alii, tum etiam C. Titius, vir ætatis Lucilianæ, in oratione qua legem Fanniam ſuaſit. *Macrob. Saturn. l. 2. c. 12.*

(k) Plin. lib. 10. c. 50.

(a) C. Titius, vir ætatis Lucilianæ.

(b) Quem ſtudebat imitari L. Afranius poeta, homo perargutus in fabulis quidem etiam, ut ſcitis, diſertus. *Cicero, ubi ſupra.*

(c) Dulces Latini leporis facetiæ per Cæcilium, Terentiumque, & Afranium, ſub pari ætate nituerunt. *Paterculus* l. 1. c. 27.

(d) Sueton. In vita Terentii.

ſalute conſulerent. *Sammonicus Serenus*, apud Macrobium *cap.* 13. *pag.* 367.

Quid

the principal (*A*) proved Chimerical. This hath not diſguſted People againſt uttering or believing ſuch Prognoſticks. They have been ſo often reiterated, that I forgive an *Italian* Politician for believing that the *Turks* (*B*) ſuborned this ſort of People to Publiſh theſe Predictions, in order to lull the Chriſtians into a ſecure Sleep. I do not think the Infidels guilty of any ſuch Stratagem, which would not be very ſubtil; for nothing more animates Men to Arm againſt a Monarch, than a Belief that 'tis Written in the Deſtinies that he ſhall be very ſoon deſtroyed.

TORTELLIUS (*John*). See **ARETIN** (*John*.)

TOUCHET (*Mary*) Miſtreſs to *Charles* IX. King of *France*, was of *Orleans*. What is averred by ſo many Authors is not true; *viz*. That ſhe was an Apothecary's Daughter (*A*). She bore * Children to *Charles* IX. and afterwards Married a Perſon of Quality. I believe ſhe did not Marry till after the Death of that

Quid Titius Romana brevi venturus in ora?
Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit hauſtus,
Faſtidire lacus, & rivos auſus apertos.
Ut valet? ut meminit noſtri? fidibuſne Latinis
Thebanos aptare modos ſtudet auſpice muſa?
An tragica deſævit & ampullatur in arte?

The Antient Scholiaſt on *Horace* aſſures us that he here means *Titius Septimius*, who had written both Lyrick Verſes and Tragedies, whoſe Tomb was to be ſeen below *Aricia*. Mr. *Dacier*, after ſeveral others, avers that this *Titius* was the ſame *Septimius*, to whom *Horace* addreſſed the 6th Ode of his 2d. Book, and for whom he wrote the 9th Epiſtle of his 1ſt Book. This may be; but ſince he gives no reaſon for it, and two Reaſons ſeem to oppoſe this Opinion, I ſhall remain a Sceptick on this Subject. The 6th Ode of the 2d Book contains 24 Verſes, not one word of which inſinuates, that *Septimius* was a Poet; whereas all that concerns *Titius* in the 3d. Epiſtle of the 1ſt Book relates to him as a Poet only. This is my firſt Reaſon. The Second is, that *Titius*, in *Horace*'s 3d Epiſtle, is one of the Wits who accompanied *Tiberius*, and compoſed a Society of Learned Men in his Court: Whereas in the 9th Epiſtle, *Septimius* is one who deſires *Horace* to introduce him to *Tiberius*. I ſay nothing in particular againſt another notion of Mr. *Dacier*: He would (*a*) have *Horace*'s *Septimius*, and that who ſo ardently loved *Acme* in the 46th Epigram of *Catullus*, to be the ſame Perſon.

(*A*) *The Principal proved Chimerical.*] The Prediction at length was. The Turks ſhall make War with the Chriſtians, and loſe great numbers of their Troops (*b*). They will firſt attack the *Venetians*, and do them a great deal of miſchief: After which they will make peace with that Republick, and take *Belgrade*, and *Rhodes*, and lay *Hungary* waſte. Then uttering ſeveral Threats, ſacking *Hungary*, and attacking the Roman Empire, they'll fall under the power of the *Hungarians*, about the Year 1594. or 1595. But before this they will enter into *Apulia*, they will diſturb and afflict *Sicily*, *Italy*, the Coaſts of *France* and *Spain*. Soon after which their Emperor ſhall be killed in a Battle; their Monarchy ſhall be deſtroy'd under the 13th or 14th of their Chiefs; they ſhall not exceed that number, nor the Year 1596. The Chriſtians ſhall then become Maſters of that vaſt Empire (*c*). Read the Reflection made on this by a Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of *Paris* (*d*). *Non eſt vel hujus loci, vel mei otii Hiſtorias retexere, quibus multa quæ hic exprimuntur, eveniſſe intelligamus, ſatis ſit expendiſſe corollarium hujus prædictionis quàm varium ſit, quam falſum, quàm ridiculum, de Imperio Turcico funditus everſo, ad annum Chriſti* 1596. *cum hoc anno* 1608. *tam florens & potens, magno quidem Chriſtiani nominis malo, cernamus, quam antea extiterit, nec ulla parte, aut hiare, aut nutare, aut inclinare, tanti Imperii moles perſpiciatur: nec in quarto decimo Imperatore Oſmanidæ ſeriem Sultanorum & Principum ſuorum defeciſſe videamus, cùm Sultanus Muhamet Cham, tertius hujus nominis, ſit decimus quintus Oſmanidarum Principum, à primo illo Oſmano Sultano. Magnò certè conſtitit Hungaris hæc prædictio, cui cùm ſtolidè innixi terentur, motumque maximum ſub Sultano Soleimanno in Hungaria excitaſſent, ab eo magna clade affecti, ſuæ credulitatis veſanæ pœnas non minimas dederunt, quemadmodum narrat Leunclavius hiſtor. Muſulmanæ lib.* 18.

(*B*) *That the* Turks *ſuborned ſome People to publiſh theſe Predictions.*] What this *Italian* Politician ſaith on this Head, ſeems to me worth copying. But we ought to remember that when this was written, the *Turks* were more potent than they have been ſince the Siege of *Vienna*, in the Year 1683. (*e*) *Molte preditioni d'Aſtrologi, oltre à molte profetie, ſecondo, che ſi dice, vi ſono, & ſe ne leggono ogni di, con le quali vien minacciata la diſtruttione del Regno, & Imperio Turcheſco, & ogni tanti anni pare, che ſi vadano rinovando cotali credenze, ſenza vederſene l'effetto. Hora io m'auviſo, che non darebbe molto lontano dal ſegno, uno, che diceſſe ciò eſſer'intentione de' medeſimi Turchi, ò di qualche Chriſtiano rinegato, per addormentar gli animi de Prencipi Chriſtiani, con queſto ſonnifero, & renderli negligenti, à penſar d'offendergli, con la ſperanza di dover veder, che il tempo debba eſſer quello, che trionfi di così fatto nemico: & non è dubbio, che Prencipi Cattolici, ricercati à colligarſi contro il Turco, hanno dato per riſpoſta, che egli era meglio ſtar à veder quel che partorirebbe il tempo, parendo impoſſibile, che ſignoria così violenta, debba eſſer di lunga durata. Et per non parere di dire coſe del tutto à vento, certo è che per accelerar la morte di qualche Imperadore Romano, ſi ſerviva alcuno di ſparger voci, che le ſtelle, promettevano il principato à tal'uno, che eſſi conoſcevano atto à dover, con ſi fatto preteſto, inſurgere contro al dominante, & accelerarar' à ſe ſteſſi la ſucceſſione, con l'accelerative della morte di lui. Onde al contrario potrebbe pur eſſere, che tra Turchi per diuturnar'il loro Imperio, ſi diffamaſſero queſte dicerie, della ſua piccola durata, per indurre altri ad aſpettar, che il pronoſtico ſi verifichi, ſenza venir'all'atto d'offenderlo, armata mano: Il che ſarebbe un ſottile, ma non impoſſibile ſtratagemma.* This may ſerve as a Supplement to the Remark *EE* in the Article *Mahomet*. To enlarge which, freſh Matter offers it ſelf daily; but it generally conſiſts of groſs Errors. An Example of which is the following Story. A Father of the Oratory relates, that on certain days of the Year, the *Turks* ſolemnly Curſe the Chriſtians. They read in their Moſques a Propheſy, threatning (*f*) the Deſtruction of the Ottoman Empire by the *Francs*, after it has continued Ten Ages. During which, the Women cry diſmally, and ſweep the Altars with their diſhevelled Hair. They imagine that this Ceremony will avert the impending Fate with which they are threatned. This Father of the Oratory doth not affirm this of his own Knowledge, but on the credit of one of his Friends. *Vias Maſſilienſis Poeta (ſi mihi creditur) valdè bonus*, ſays he (*g*), *mihi olim cùm Maſſiliæ Rhetoricem profiterer multùm familiaris, in ſuis ad Sylvas* (*h*) *notis, morem refert Turcarum cùm illi Chriſtianos, quos perditè oderunt, ultrò ſtatis diebus deteſtantur. Habent, inquit ille, Turcæ inter ſuos faſtos prophetiam, per id tantum tempus, M. ſcilicet annos, Ottomanorum permanſurum, mox ſubvertendum à Francis. Legitur illa quotannis ſuis in Moſquetis, ut illius ominis terrore ultrò Chriſtianis adverſentur. Lugent interim ululantes fœminæ, ſparſiſque comis infanda verrunt altaria: ſicque huic malo fato procurare credunt, dum tam funeſto vaticinio perterrentur.*

(*A*) *That ſhe was an Apothecary's Daughter.*] She is obliged to *Brantome* for this *Origin*, whom I ſhall cite here under. *Papyrius Maſſo* ſeems to make her of a meaner Deſcent, for one would think by what he ſays, that ſhe was a Perfumer's Daughter, (*i*) *Amavit Mariam Tochetiam Aurelianenſis* (*k*) *Unguentarii filiam*. Others ſay, ſhe was a Scrivener's Daughter; but it is certain that ſhe was better deſcended, as Mr. *le Laboureur* ſhews. "*John Touchet*, her Father, ſaith he, (*l*) took the Title of Sieur *de Beauvais* and *Quillart*, Counſellor to the King, and Lieutenant particular

" of

* See the Remark F.

(*e*) Bonifatio Vannozzi, della ſuppellettile de gli avvertimenti politici, volume primo, p. 97. Bologna. 1609.

(*f*) *This Prediction does not concern the Turkiſh Empire, but the Mahometan Religion. If it concern'd the* Turks, *they would be a little too haſty; their Monarchy would be very far from its deſtruction.*

(*g*) Petrus Berthaldus, libro ſingulari de ara, c. 15. pag. 181, 182. edit. Nannetenſis, 1636.

(*h*) *They are* Statius's Silvæ, *upon which* Vias *a Poet of* Provence, *praiſed by* Gaſſendus in vita Peireskii, *made ſome Notes.*

(*i*) Papyr. Maſſo in vita Caroli IX.

(*k*) *Perhaps this word ought to be rendred an Apothecary, as* le Laboureur *renders it.*

(*l*) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau's *Memoirs* tom. 2. pag. 656.

that (B) Monarch. She had two Daughters lawfully begotten, which follow'd her Example; one was Concubine (C) to *Henry* IV. and the other to the Marſhal

" of the Diſtrict and Preſidial Court of *Orleans*. He was the Son of *Peter Touchet*, a Citizen of *Orleans*, and Grandſon of *John Touchet*, Advocate and Counſellor at *Orleans*, in the Year 1492. whoſe Father was *Regnaut Touchet*, a Merchant of the Town of *Parthai en Beauſſe*. And all that could be ſaid againſt this Lady's Birth, was that her Mother was *Mary Mathy*, the natural Daughter of *Orable Mathy*, a Dutch man, and one of the King's Phyſician, who to promote his Daughter's Alliance to this Family, gave two thouſand Crowns with her, which was then a conſiderable Sum."

Men commonly fall into two ſorts of Errors concerning thoſe which Providence hath very much exalted above their Birth. Some by fabulous Genealogies furniſh them with Anceſtors of the Firſt Quality; others debaſe them to a much meaner Condition than their true one; either to indulge Envy and Calumny, or to repreſent the aggrandizing of their Fortune as ſomething ſtupendious and more proper for Exclamations. The Hiſtorian of the *Amours du Palais Roial*, hath degraded the Nobility of Madam *de la Valiere*, in making her a mean Citizen of *Tours*. Yet (a) ſhe was of a Family related to that of *Beauvau le Rivau*, one of the beſt of the Country; and about a hundred Years ago, a certain *Seigneur de la Valiere* married a Lady who had been Maid of Honour to Queen *Louiſe*, Conſort to *Henry* III. Which doubtleſs he had never done, if he had not been a Gentleman. We ſhall ſhew in their places, that Reports of this nature were raiſed againſt *Albert de Gondi*, firſt Duke of *Rets*, againſt Cardinal *de Pelleve*, the Conſtable *de Luynes*, Cardinal *Mazarine*, &c.

(B) *That ſhe did not marry him till after the Death of Charles.* IX.] *Mezeray* knew very well that *Mary Touchet*'s Father was *Lieutenant Particular* of the Preſidial of *Orleans*; but I ſomewhat doubt what he adds, (b) that *Charles* IX. Married this Miſtreſs to *Francis Balzac d'Entragues*, Governor of *Orleans*. I paſs over in ſilence that this *Francis Balzac* was not Governor of *Orleans*, before ſeveral Intrigues had occaſion'd the Chancellor *de Chiverni*'s loſing that Government in the Year 1588, (c) before which he was only Lieutenant of that City: I ſay only that his Marriage with *Mary Touchet*, ſeems to be poſterior to the death of *Charles* IX. And that is all I can ſay at preſent, not being in a place where I can Conſult the Genealogy of this Houſe, nor being yet poſſeſſor of Books capable of affording an intire certainty. But conſidering on one ſide what *Papyrius Maſſon* ſays, that King *Charles*, on his Death-bed, durſt not recommend his Miſtreſs himſelf to the Queen his Mother, but did (d) it by the mediation of *Charles de Gondi*; and on the other ſide, what Mr. *le Laboureur* tells us, (e) *That we ought not to be ſurpriz'd, that* Mary Touchet *found ſo good a Match (f) after ſo great a figure ſhe had made at Court, where ſhe maintain'd her Rank as well as any of the Ladies of the firſt Quality*: Conſidering, I ſay, theſe two things, I cannot think ſhe was married to the Lord *d'Entragues* in *Charles* IX. his life time. For if ſo, it would have been unneceſſary for that Prince to cauſe her to be recommended to *Catherine de Medicis*, (ſuch a Husband being a ſufficient Protector) and one could not apprehend why Mr. *de Laboureur* offers ſo many Reaſons why we ſhould not be ſurprized at the Marriage of *Francis de Balzac* with *Mary Touchet*, without mentioning the chief, which muſt have been the great Favours beſtow'd by a living King upon his Miſtreſs's Husband. This Author obſerves, that ſhe *was equally incomparable for Wit and Beauty*, and that the Anagram made on her Name, *Marie Touchet, Je charme tout*, (*I Charm all*) was very juſt. He ſaith alſo that M. *d'Entragues* became ſo enamour'd on her, that he was call'd in deriſion, *d'Entragues Touchet*, Duke of *Orleans*, in a Libel Intituled, *The King's Edict diſguiſed (g), written in the Year* 1586, *againſt certain Sparks called* Bourbons, *and ſome ſtupid Sots, and* German *Drunkards*.

(C) *One was Concubine to Henry* IV. *and the other to the Marſhal* de Baſſompierre.] If the Fact which I relate in the Remark (*D*) is true, *Henry* IV. might have been deceiv'd; for perhaps the Girl that was raviſhed might be the very Lady *d'Entragues*, who ſo much valued the Preſent of her Virginity to this Prince. A particular relation of her Subtilties and Cajoling is to be ſeen in *Sulli*'s Memoirs, and *Perefixe*'s Hiſtory. The hundred thouſand Crowns with which the King preſented her, were not a ſhower of Gold ſufficient to introduce him into her Lap, and put an end to her Artifices by which ſhe diſputed the Ground. He muſt at laſt be forced to promiſe her Marriage, to remove the Difficulties and Oppoſitions of the Father and Mother, whom the Daughter had purpoſely obliged to interpoſe, and which ſhe declared were not to be ſurmounted, if theſe good People were not brought over to this nice point, by this Promiſe ſatisfying their Conſciences towards God, and ſheltering their Honour from the malicious World. This fair one ſo pathetically repreſented to her Lover, (h) *That he ought not to make any difficulty to ſatisfie their Deſire, ſince it was only that he ſhould give her a ſmall ſcrip of Paper in Exchange for what to her was the moſt valuable thing in the World; that he oblig'd himſelf under his Hand to Marry her within a Year, provided, within the compaſs of that time ſhe brought him a Male-Child.* If the Adventure mention'd by *St. Romuald*, was meant of this Lady, what vaſt Expences and earneſt purſuits was a great Monarch obliged to, in order to enjoy a Page's leavings!

Mr. *de Roſni*, one of the warmeſt Men in the World in the Prince's Intereſt, was not contented with tearing this Promiſe of Marriage when the King ſhewed it him; but he endeavour'd to Cure that Prince, by urging to him ſome Suſpicions concerning the Lady's Vertue. 'Tis true, that Monarch told this Favourite, that he fatigued himſelf in queſt of a Maidenhead, which perhaps he ſhould not find. But the other talked much more ſuſpiciouſly of her Honour. "If you remember "ſays he, what you have formerly ſaid to me "concerning this Lady and her Brother in the Dutcheſs's time, how freely you then talked of them, "and the Commands which you obliged me "to carry to that Baggage, (for ſo you then call'd "the Houſe and Family of Mr. and Madam "*d'Antragues*) to leave *Paris*, you will be apt to "doubt more than at preſent you do, whether you "will ever find what you expect. See *Sulli*'s *Memoirs*, pag. 248, 250. tome 2. of the *Dutch* Edition.

However we find this Lady more nicely ſenſible of her Daughter's Honour than ſhe had been of her own. The Puniſhment of the Page (*i*), if true, is a proof of this; for ſhe would not probably have been guilty of a Murther on that account, if ſhe had been treated in the ſame manner before. We may further obſerve how conſcientious a Mother ſhe was in this particular, and how cautious with reſpect to the World. But her care was ineffectual; for as ſhe came from a right ſtrain with reſpect to her Grandmother, (*k*) ſo did her Daughters with reſpect to her. One of them furniſhed (*l*) a natural Race to *Henry* IV. as the other did to Marſhal *Baſſompierre*, to whoſe words we ought to hearken on this Head. "I returned to *Paris*, ſays he, (*m*) "to ſee my Miſtreſs (*n*) in the *Coutellerie-ſtreet*, "where her Lodging was, in which I had a private paſſage to the third Story which her Mother "did not rent; and ſhe came to me by a private "Stair-caſe of the Wardrobe when her Mother "was aſleep." A little after he hints ſomewhat from whence one might infer that *Henry* IV. would have made no Conſcience of enjoying both Siſters, which is that this Prince was his Rival. He informs us of another thing which confirms my laſt Remark concerning *Mary Touchet*: "By misfortune, ſaith "he, the Mother had notice of it, and kept the "ſtricter Guard. One Morning, going to ſpit, ſhe "drew the Curtain of her Bed, and ſaw that of her "Daughter uncovered, and obſerving that ſhe was "miſſing, ſhe roſe very ſoftly, and went up into the "Wardrobe, where ſhe diſcover'd that the Door of "our private Stair-caſe was open, which ſhe thought "had been nailed up. This made her ſhriek out, and "her Daughter at her Voice immediately ran to her.

In

(a) Mr. de Marolles, Abbot of Villeloin, *in the Catalogue of his Writings* p. 8.

(b) Mezer. Abr. Chronolog. tom. 6. p. 154.

(c) Thuan. hiſt. l. 92.

(d) Brantome *relates the thing ſomewhat differently. Being a dying, ſays he*, he ordered Mr. *de la Tour* to remember him to her (*his Miſtreſs*) and never durſt ſpeak of it to the Queen his Mother.

(e) Le Laboureur ubi ſupra.

(f) *He had ſaid pag.* 70. *That ſhe had no leſs Ambition and dexterity than the Dutcheſs of* Etampes, *and the Dutcheſs of* Valentinois, *and that ſhe maintain'd her Poſt ſo well, that all the glory, and all the Artifices of* Queen Catherine, *could not put her out of Countenance.*

(g) *By way of alluſion to the* Duke *of* Guiſe.

ſhal *de Baſſompierre*. The Reaſon why ſhe ſtabbed a (D) Page, according to ſome Authors, is ſomewhat curious. What ſhe ſaid, conſidering the Picture of the (E) Princeſs, whom *Charles* IX. was to Marry, deſerves to be known. I take this occaſion to obſerve, that thoſe who tell us that this King was no Lover of Women, (F) did not look narrowly into the matter. It ought not to be thought ſtrange

“ I in the mean time ſhut the Door, and marched off in Pain to know the Event, which was that her Mother beat her, and cauſed the Door of the Chamber, in the third Story, to be broke open, which ſhe was ſurprized to find hung with Velvet, and ſplendidly furniſhed with Candleſticks and other Utenſils of Silver, as well as all other Rich Moveables. Then all our Converſation was broke off; but I Accommodated the matter with her Mother, by means of a young Gentlewoman whoſe Name was (i) *d'Aſt*, where I ſaw her and asked her a thouſand Pardons, proteſting that nothing had paſſed beyond Kiſſing, which ſhe feigned to believe (k)”. He was not long deprived of this Lady's Converſation, for after ſome Months Madam *d'Entragues* being gone to Court, he ſays, (l) *he paſſed his time very well with her Daughter and others alſo.* The young Lady proved with Child four Years after, and being turned out of Doors by her Mother, (m) *ſhe begged of her Spark to give her a promiſe of Marriage to appeaſe her Mother, offering at the ſame time all the Counter-Promiſes which he could deſire, urging that ſhe deſired this only, that ſhe might Lye-in quietly, and enjoy the benefit of her Mother's Aſſiſtance.* She obtained her requeſt, and was ſo good natur'd as not to fail in her Counter-Promiſe.

There goes a Story which I ſhall here relate. That Marſhal being in a Coach with the Queen, when there was a great number of Coaches in the (*) *Cours*, it happened that Madam *d'Entragues* Coach was obliged to ſtop for ſome time very near that of the Queen, by reaſon of the Crowd. The Queen looking upon the Marſhal, *there is*, ſaid ſhe, *Madam de Baſſompierre*. That is only her Gallant Name, replyed he, loud enough to be heard by his old Miſtreſs: Upon which ſhe cryed out, *you are a Fool*, Baſſompierre: *Not enough to Marry your Ladyſhip*, replied he, and then the Coaches began to move. As this Marſhal had a vaſt number of Amours, I cannot tell whether this other Story in Mr. *Menage* relates to another, or the ſame Miſtreſs: (n) “ Marſhal *Baſſompierre*'s Coach being ſtopped by that of a Lady whom he had Loved, and on whom he had Spent vaſt Sums, ſhe ſaid aloud, there is the Marſhal, from whom I have plucked ſo many Feathers. 'Tis true Madam, replied he, but they were only the Feathers of my Tail, and my Flight is not thereby hindred.

(D) *The reaſon why ſhe ſtabbed a Page.*] I ſhall here repeat without the leaſt alteration what I have ſaid in the Project of this Dictionary. *Dom Peter de St. Romuald* falls in with the ſame Chronology (o) with Mr. *de Mezerai*, as to the Marriage of *Mary Touchet*; for he fixes it in 1572. His Printer was a perfect Murtherer of proper Names, herein following the Example of ſeveral of his Brethren. The Paſſage contains an Action ſo particular that it deſerves to be ſet down intire. “ (p) It was about that (q) time that *Francis de* (r) *Baſſac* Lord *d'Entragues-Marcouſſe*, Governour of *Orleans*, Married for his ſecond Wife *Mary Touchet*, an Apothecary's Daughter in that City, equally exceeding in Wit and Beauty, by whom King *Charles* IX. had had a Son, afterwards called the Count *d'Auvergne*. An Action as ſtrange as bold is Storied of her, which ſhe did to one of her Husband's Pages, who had Raviſhed one of her Daughters very Young and Beautiful, in a Summer Houſe in the Garden, inſtigated by an extravagant Amorous Madneſs. This Wretch ſhe Stabbed upon the ſpot, depriving him of Life, who had Robbed her Daughter of her Honour.” I wiſh that this Honeſt Monk, who hath heaped up ſo many Events of all ſorts, but not without being liable to ſome Suſpition, had told us where he had this; without which I would not adviſe the Reader to believe him.

(E) *Seeing the Picture of the Princeſs.*] She eagerly aimed at the Poſſeſſion of King *Charles*'s Heart to the Prejudice of his Conſort. She was very curious when the Treaty of Marriage with *Elizabeth* of *Auſtria* was on foot, in the Examination of the Picture of that Princeſs, and *having very well conſidered it, ſhe only ſaid, ſhe gives me no cauſe of fear*; inſinuating by that, as *Brantome* (a) ſaith, *that ſhe preſumed ſo much on her Beauty and Character, that ſhe believed the King could not leave her. Papyrius Maſſo* (b) tells us, that when ſhe examined the Picture, and ſaid, *I am not afraid of that German Lady*, the Queen was then Arrived; but 'tis not at all probable that *Mary Touchet* ſhould have ſtaid ſo long before ſhe ſaw the Queen's Picture; and *Brantome*'s Relation ſeems therefore more like Truth, with regard to the Circumſtance of time. *Gabrielle d'Eſtrée* having ſeen the Pictures of the Infanta of *Spain*, and of *Mary de Medicis*, ſhe is repreſented ſaying (c) that ſhe had no apprehenſion of the brown *Spaniard*, but very much feared the *Florentine*. We have this from an Hiſtorian, (d) who pretends to have heard it himſelf. *I remember*, ſaith he, *that the King having entruſted to my keeping the Pictures of theſe two Princeſſes, permitted me to ſhew them to the Dutcheſs, and obſerve what ſhe would ſay, which was, I am not afraid of that Black Woman, but the other gives me ſome Apprehenſions.*

(F) *That this King was no Lover of Women, did not look narrowly into the matter.*] Thoſe Hiſtorians who have moſt freely ſpoken of his ill Qualities, ſay that he was not very Irregular with regard to Women. They endeavoured to throw him into ſeveral Debaucheries; *but once perceiving that Wine diſturbed his Reaſon, ſo much that it run him into the Commiſſion of ſeveral Violences, he abſtained from it the whole remainder of his Life: And as for Women, being ill received by one of thoſe about his Mother's Perſon, he took an Averſion to the Sex, and ſcarce ever applied to any of them again.* So Mr. *Mezeray* (e) expreſſes himſelf, without obſerving the Rule of the Sophiſtical Grammarian, (f) who cenſured the placing of the Expreſſions in *Voiture*'s Famous Sonnet, where the laſt Imported much leſs than the firſt, *I bleſs my Torment, and content to Dye, dare not complain of her Tyranny. Brantome* teſtifies that this (g) Prince did not at firſt appear very fond of the fair Sex, and that the Ladies Reproaches animated him. I remember, ſaith he, “ that in his greeneſt Years of 17 or 18, being once violently tormented with the Tooth-Ach, and the Phyſicians Remedies proving ineffectual, a great Lady gave him a Receipt, which ſhe had often Experienced her ſelf and found very good; but it did him no good, and next day ſhe asking him how he found himſelf, he anſwering not well at all, ſhe replyed, *I am not at all ſurprized at it*, Sir, *ſince you neither Love nor truſt the Women, but prefer Hunting and Dogs to all of us. Whence*, ſaid he, *have you that Opinion of me, that I love the exerciſe of Hunting better than yours? By G...., if you provoke me once, I ſhall joyn you ſo cloſe, that I ſhall throw you all on your Backs one after another.* He was not as good as his word with regard to ALL, but he attacked ſome of them rather for the advancement of his Reputation, than the gratifying of his Leachery, and that very coolly too, and choſe a young Lady of a very good Family for his Miſtreſs. She was a very Beautiful, Diſcreet, and Virtuous Lady, whom he treated with all poſſible Honour and Reſpect, and more, ſaid he, to form an agreeable Air than for any other end; Nothing, ſaid he, contributing more to the Accompliſhment of a young Man, than a Love fixed on a Noble Subject. He always loved this Virtuous Lady to his Death, even when he had his Queen *Elizabeth*, a very agreeable and charming Princeſs. He alſo was very fond of *Mary Jaceſſie*, otherwiſe called TOUCHET, an Apothecary's Daughter of *Orleans*, and a moſt Beautiful Creature, by whom he had the Grand-Prior, at preſent called the Count *d'Auvergne*”. Here is a fair account of (h) three Miſtreſſes beſides a Wife: For we ought not confound her that Mr. *Mezerai* ſaith diſguſted the King, with her *Brantome* would not Name, and whom this Prince Loved to the laſt. When therefore we conſider that he Dyed before he was 24 Years of Age, and after

(i) Perhaps the ſame, whom he calls d'Achy, pag. 173. proper Names being very much confounded in this Journal.

(k) Journal de Baſſompierre ibid. pag. 167. ad ann. 1606.

(*) *A place of Concourſe like the Ring in Hide-Park.*

(l) Ibid. pag. 165.

(m) Ibid. pag. 161.

(n) Suite du Menagiana, pag. .. *Dutch edit.*

(o) *See the Remark F towards the end.*

(p) Peter de St. Romuald, Abridgment of the 3d. Tome of his Threſor chronol. & hiſtor. pag. m. 43. ad ann. 1572.

(q) *That is, the Paris Maſſacre.*

(r) *It ſhould be* Balzac, *Lord d'* Entragues Marcouſſis.

(a) Brant. diſ. ſur Charles *IX.*

(b) Inſpectâ Iſabellæ Reginæ, quæ recens in Galliam venerat, pictura, riſiſſe dicitur, addito verbo, nihil me terret Germana.

(c) Du Pleix, hiſt. de Henri *IV.* pag. 162.

(d) D'Aubigné, tom. 3. p. 637.

(e) Mezerai, Abregé Chron. tom. 5. p. 183.

(f) *See the pieces at the end of* Balzac's Socrate Chretien.

(g) Brant. ubi ſupra.

(h) Le Laboureur, *Addit. to* Caſtelnau's *Memoirs* tom. 2. *mentions a Letter, where 'tis ſaid that* Charles *IX. was in Love with the Wife of the Sieur* de la Tour.

ſtrange that I ſhould beſtow ſome Articles (G) on ſuch Women as this is.

TOULOUSE, a City of *France* on the River *Garonne*, being one of the Largeſt and moſt Ancient *Weſtern* Cities, and the Seat of the Second Parliament of the Kingdom, deſerves a very long Article; but Mr. *Moreri* and the Author of his Supplement having deſcribed it at large, I ſhall not dwell upon it. I ſhall only ſay that its Conſuls bear the Title of *Capitouls*, and become Noble by virtue of their Office. Mr. *de la Faille* Publiſhed an excellent Diſſertation † on this Subject, * when a ſearch was made after the falſe Pretenders to Nobility. The World impatiently expects the continuation of the Annals ‡ of *Toulouſe*, which that Illuſtrious Writer hath Compoſed. This City which hath always || abounded with Learned

a long Sickneſs, and that Hiſtory (i) lays to him two Natural Sons; I cannot ſee on what that Averſion is Grounded, which Mr. *Mezerai* beſtows on him. What would he have him do more? He wanted, it ſeems, ſomething more to fix the Character of Debauchery on the life of that Prince. It is indeed true that in Proportion to the horrible Corruption of the Court of *France* at that time, *Charles* IX might paſs for a ſort of a moderate Man. That Hiſtorian mentions but one Son of this Prince by *Mary Touchet*, and tells us that he was Born in 1572, and that he was firſt Grand-Prior of *France*, then Count *d'Auvergne* and *Lauraguais*, and afterwards Duke of *Angoulême* and (k) Count de *Pontieu*. Father *Anſelme* diſſents from this Chronology, and makes him Born at the Caſtle of (l) *Fayet* in *Dauphiné*, near *Montmelian*, the 28th of *April* 1573. I cannot clearly account to my Reader why this Lady ſhould be ſent ſo far from the Court, and her own Country to Lye-in. This was not her firſt Child; the high Character of the Father took off the Diſgrace, and nothing could engage her to affect Privacy, as when upon ſuch an occaſion, a Journey may ſeem neceſſary to conceal the thing, and diſcharge the Burthen unknown to the World.

If what *Brantome* relates without believing it was true, we ought not to entertain a great Opinion of *Mezerai*'s Memoirs as to the Averſion which he aſcribes to that Prince. 'Some ſay (they are *Brantome*'s 'words) that during his Illneſs he ran to the Queen, 'and ſo heated himſelf that he ſhortned his Days, 'which gave occaſion to the ſaying that *Venus* killed 'him with *Diana*, which I cannot believe, for it was 'never talked of at Court amongſt thoſe that were 'moſt worthy of Credit, for I was there. What he ſaith of *Venus* and *Diana* is an Alluſion to the two Verſes which he had already cited, and were a kind of Epitaph on *Charles* IX.

> *Pour aimer trop Diane & Cytherée auſſi,*
> *L'une & l'autre m'ont mis en ce tombeau icy.*

Papyrius Maſſo, who wrote an Abridgment of this Prince's Life a Year after his Death, relates an Event perhaps no truer than this, but at leaſt more probable. He ſaith the King once in his long Diſeaſe went to ſee his Miſtreſs *Mary Touchet*, and it was conjectured that by Diverting himſelf with her at an improper time or to exceſs, he increaſed his Diſtemper and haſtned his Death. (||) *Sane Rex ipſe inter moras longiſſimi morbi ſemel ad eam divertit, ſuſpicioque eſt auctum morbum ex importuno aut immodico coitu & acceleratum vitæ finem.* Mr. *le Laboureur* hath ill Tranſlated theſe words (m) to this purpoſe. *Alſo the King once during his tedious Diſtemper going to ſee her, 'tis taken for certain, that on account of not being in a Condition to approach her, or being guilty of ſome Exceſs, his Diſeaſe increaſed, and this Viſit haſtned his Days.* Not to take notice that he delivers that as a certainty which amounts only to a ſuſpition in the *Latin*, I am apt to think that there are ſcarce any Readers who by theſe words *on account of not being in a Condition*, would not imagine ſomething elſe than the Hiſtorian intended to ſay; ſome Accident (n) like that which Mr. *Rabutin* imitates out of *Petronius*. Mr. *Varillas* has not failed to adopt this Paſſage of *Papyrius Maſſo*. "The King was dangerouſly Ill, ſaith "he (o), and thoſe who were very well inform-"ed, Whiſpered two cauſes of it. The firſt was "his haſty Journey from *Paris* to *Orleans* to Viſit "the Beautiful *Mary Touchet* his Miſtreſs; and the ſe-"cond the Poiſon which they affirm was given him "by his Steward (p) *la Tour*, younger Brother "to the Marſhal *de Rets* and the Biſhop of *Paris*. "The extraordinary vigour of this Prince ſeemed to "ſurmount his Sickneſs, and the apprehenſion which "*la Tour* had conceived of the report ſpread con-"cerning him, threw him into a Phrenzy which oc-"caſioned his Death ſoon after". Mr. *Varillas* "only cites *Papyrius Maſſo*.

Which gives me room to make ſome Remarks; for I. the Author to which Mr. *Varillas* refers us, doth not ſay that *Charles* IX. was obliged to take a Journey to *Orleans* to ſee *Mary Touchet*; and there is very little reaſon to believe that ſhe ſhou'd keep ſo far from the King, ſince ſhe was his publick Miſtreſs, and had had Children by him. In the II. place it is falſe that *Maſſon* charges this Poiſoning on *la Tour*; on the contrary he makes him Dye of a Sickneſs occaſioned by his Grief for having loſt with *Charles* IX. the hopes of a vaſt Fortune. I do not deny that *la Tour* was accuſed of this wicked Act by others; but he ought then to have referred us ſomewhere elſe than to *Papyrius Maſſo*'s Elogy. Mr. *le Laboureur* hath inſerted in his Additions to *Caſtelnau*'s Memoirs, page 462 of the 2d Tome, a Satyrical Letter, in which *Catherine de Medicis* is Reproached for having cauſed *Charles* IX. to be Poiſoned by the Sieur *de la Tour*, and afterwards *la Tour* by another. 'Your Majeſty contrived it ſo, *ſays the Author of this Letter*, that the late Sieur *de la Tour* was 'made to underſtand either by you or by your Ap-'pointment, that the King your Son deſigned to Kill 'him, that he might the eaſier Enjoy his Wife; 'which the ſaid *la Tour* was eaſily induced to believe, 'becauſe he very well knew that the King paſſionately 'loved her, and was on that account without much 'difficulty engaged to Poiſon his ſaid Majeſty, &c. This Letter is dated at *Lauſanne*, the 3d Month of the 4th Year after the Treachery, (*that is, the* Paris *Maſſacre*) and is Signed *Grandchamp*, who was a Gentleman of *Nivernois*, who had been Ambaſſadour at *Conſtantinople*, and engaged in the Intrigues of *la Mole* and *Coconnas*. In the III. place it is impoſſible to Gueſs from Mr. *Varillas*'s words, whether *la Tour* Dyed before or after the King; but of the two we ſhould be more apt to conclude it was before than after: Nevertheleſs he Dyed after this Prince, either of Regret, or Poiſon, or any other way.

The following Relation doth not redound to the Diſhonour of *Charles* IX. "(a) That Prince one "day walking in the *Tuilleries*, and ſeeing a charming "fine Woman Swim the River from the *Louvre* to "*Saint Germains*, ſtopped to obſerve her; but whilſt "his Eyes as well as thoſe of the reſt of the Court "were fixed on the Beautiful Object, ſhe Dived "out of ſight, and at laſt riſing to the Surface "of the Water, as ſwift as lightning flew Aſhoar, "began to wring her Hair and do what *Antipater* "ſays of *Venus*:

> " *Voy n'agueres Venus hors de la mer ſortant,*
> " *Ouvrage d'Apelles, entre ſes mains tenant*
> " *Ses moettes cheveux; elle faict de ſa treſſe*
> " *Humide l'eſpraignant, ſortir l'eſcume eſpaiſſe.*

"After which ſhe Retired carrying with her the "Eyes and Hearts of all the Company. Never-"theleſs tho' the thing was diverting enough, it "appeared ſo odd and ſtrange to the King, that "he was not heard to ſay one Word in her Praiſe, "tho' he heard the greateſt part of his Retinue, "and even the moſt Reſerved, loudly expreſs their "Admiration.

(G) *That I ſhou'd beſtow ſome Articles on ſuch Women as this is.*] The beginning of this Article in my Project contains theſe words: "Dictionaries ought "not to Omit Perſons of this Category: The Fi-"gure which they make in the World, is high e-nough

---

† You may ſee the Subſtance of it in a Quarto Book of Mr. *Gilles de la Roque* concerning Nobility.

* That is about the Year 1666.

‡ M. *de Beauval* ſpoke of the 1. Vol. of thoſe Annals, *Sept.* 1688. p.1. and ſeq. See alſo the *Journal des Savans* of the 19. of *April* 1688.

|| See *Balzac* in the laſt page of his *œuvres diverſes*, & *Sorberiana at the word* Toulouſe.

(i) *Father* Anſelme, Hiſt. Genealog. de *France*, pag. 146. *does not ſay whether they had both the ſame Mother: But* Papyrius Maſſo *mentions two, whom he had by* Mary Touchet.

(k) *The laſt Dukes of* Angouleme *are deſcended from him. He died* at Paris *the* 24th *of* Sept. 1650.

(l) Hiſt. Genealog. pag. 173.

(||) Papyr. Maſſo in vita Caroli *IX*.

(m) Addit. to Caſtelnau tom. 2. pag. 879.

(p) *Brantome makes him Maſter of the Wardrobe;* Papyrius Maſſo *calls him* Carolum Gondium, Cubicularium. *The Journal of* Henry III. *makes him Maſter of the Wardrobe, and places his Death on the* 15th *of* June 1574, *and attributes it to another Cauſe.*

(a) Pierre de Lancre Counſellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux, Tableau de l'inconſtance & inſtabilité de toutes choſes, fol. 52. verſo.

(n) *In the* Hiſtoire amoureuſe des Gaules. Ovid. Amor. lib. 3. eleg. 7. *deſcribes ſuch an Accident at large.* (o) Varillas, Hiſt. de *Charles* IX. tom. 2. pag. 365. *Dutch Edit.* 1684.

Learned Men, and is at preſent as happy on that account as ever ‡, did very well deſerve the Eſtabliſhment (*A*) of the Polite Academy Erected there.

‡ The [illegible] and the French Academy may vie[illegible] it.

TRABEA

" nough to place them there, and doubtleſs ſuch a " Work as Mr. *Colomies* promiſed (*b*) and deſigned " to Entitle, Cupid *on the Throne, or the Hiſtory of* " *the Amours of our Kings ſince* Dagobert, would " be very Curious ". Since the Impreſſion of the Project, a Book has appeared which carries the Subject higher than *Colomies* deſigned it, and begins with *Pharamond.* I ſhould rather chooſe *Colomies's* Performance than this. The former Author would have ſaid nothing but what he would have Extracted from ſome written Book, he would have conſulted ſeveral rare Books, and always have cited his Evidence. But this Anonymous Author who hath given us the Hiſtory of the Galantries of the Kings of *France*, from the beginning of the Monarchy to *Lewis* XIV. hath cited no Authors, and has not at all ſecured us from ſuſpecting his Book for a Romance. The 1. Edition is better than the following ones: It is more natural and leſs clogged and looks more like a Hiſtory. I happened one day to praiſe it upon that Account before the Bookſeller that Printed it. But he very freely anſwered that he had found by the Sale of the Book that it was the greateſt fault in the Work, and that it wou'd be ſupplyed in the 2. Edition. The publick did not find (ſaid he) a ſufficient Number of Intrigues and ſurprizing Adventures in that piece. After this I diſtruſted that performance more than before. There are ſeveral things in it concerning *Mary Touchet* which I have refuted, or have not related, not being ſure that they are not the Author's invention; as I judge concerning a dozen (*c*) of Cut-Purſes, which he has introduced that the King might ſee the Letter, which his Miſtreſs had received from another Gallant, the Biſhop of *Valence's* Brother.

(*A*) *The Eſtabliſhment of the Polite Academy erected there.*] M. *de Baſville* (*d*), who in the Provinces over which he has been appointed Intendant has ſhewed himſelf a Son worthy of his Illuſtrious Father the Preſident *de Lamoignon*, whilſt his Brother (*e*) the Advocate General ſhews himſelf worthy of the ſame Honour in the Parliament of *Paris*, was very diligent in this New Eſtabliſhment. He reſolved (*f*) *to change the Floral Games of* Toulouſe *into an Academy of polite Learning.* The Society of the Floral Games alarmed at this deſign, publiſhed a Memorial tending to perſuade the City to let things remain in their preſent poſture. This Memorial was refuted; the uſefulneſs of the (*g*) Games were laid down, *and the neceſſity of Eſtabliſhing a polite Academy in* Toulouſe *was urged, that the Happy Genius's which that City produces might be Furniſhed with an opportunity of perfecting themſelves in Eloquence.* It was aſſerted that *that City could furniſh a great many Subjects* to imitate the Academiſts of the other Cities of the Realm, *and a long liſt of polite Genius's which* Toulouſe *has produced was collected.* To know whether theſe Reaſons were effectual we need only Read the following paſſage extracted out of one of Mr. *Couſin's* Journals. (*h*) " The Floral Games of *Tou-* " *louſe* have been at laſt erected into an Academy, the " Letters patents to which purpoſe were Sealed at " the end of the laſt Year. This Society is compo- " ſed of thirty five Perſons eminently diſtinguiſhed " for their Merit and Learning. They'll diſtribute " their Prizes annually, to which purpoſe will be " applyed the Rents of the Floral Games, which are " conſiderable.

SINCE the firſt Edition of this Dictionary I have been informed by the *Journal des Scavans* of the 11th of *June* 1696. That it was not long after the Eſtabliſhment of the *French* Academy (*i*) that Mr. *Pelliſſon, who was then at Toulouſe, formed a Scheme of a Society deſigned to the ſame end; which yet did not grow into perfect Shape till the Year* 1688. *when ſome Learned Men began to meet at the Houſe of Mr.* Carriere, *Chief Judge and Preſident of the Preſidial Court of that City, which they continued to do till the Year* 1694. *when they removed to Mr.* de Mondran, *a Gentleman whoſe Houſe was more conveniently ſituate. That thoſe* (*k*) *who deſire to know who were the Perſons that compoſed this Society, and what their exerciſes were, may be informed of it by Reading the Anſwer of Mr.* de Martel, *one of the Members and worthy Secretary of this Society, which he cauſed to be Printed at* Montauban *in* 1692. *to take off the diſadvantagious Impreſſions which the Author of a Memorial againſt this Eſtabliſhment endeavoured to make, under the pretence of defending the Floral Games. That the Gentlemen who aſſiſt at theſe Academical Conferences, frequently compoſe in verſe and proſe, ſeveral pieces in Honour of the King and on ſeveral important Subjects; ſeveral of which have been Printed and met with a general Applauſe. Their Zeal went conſiderably farther in the Year one Thouſand Six Hundred and Ninety Four, when they beſtowed a prize amounting to Twelve Piſtols.* All this and ſeveral other particulars much redounding to the Glory of theſe Gentlemen, are mentioned in a Letter from *Toulouſe*, made uſe of by Mr. *Couſin* Author of the *Journal des Scavans.* I have received from that City a long Manuſcript Relation, the Subſtance whereof I ſhould very willingly inſert here, if the Printer could give me time to write for and receive the information which I want. But as I did not examine this Relation till two Days before I ſent this Article to the preſs, I cannot ſtay for the Arrival of this Information: I am therefore obliged to confine my ſelf to a few extracts, by which the Reader may eaſily apprehend that the Academy erected at *Toulouſe*, is diſtinct from the Society in which the Academical conferences mentioned in the *Journal des Scavans* of the 11 of *June* 1696, were held.

Theſe Conferences began in two different places at *Toulouſe* in 1640. at Mr. *de Malepeires'*, (*a*) and at Mr. *de Campunaut's* (*b*): But theſe two Societies united at Mr. *de Garrigis's* Counſellor of the Preſidial Court, and choſe for their Director Mr. *de la Garde, who rendred himſelf equally Famous for his Latin Poetry, and his excellent diſcoveries in Natural Philoſophy; for he wrote againſt* Ariſtotle's *forms and accidents before* Gaſſendus's *Works appeared.* Mr. *Donneville* Preſident *au Mortier*, re-Eſtabliſhed theſe excellent Exerciſes in a much more conſpicious manner in the Year 1667. Mr. *de Nolet* Treaſurer of *France*, ſome time after eſtabliſhed ſome regular Conferences in his own Houſe under the direction of Mr. *Bayle* (*c*) Dr. of Phyſick; and Mr. *Regis* made very Learned Diſcourſes on *Deſcartes's* Syſtem there. Another Society was afterwards formed in the College *de Foix*, and they began the erection of a Polite Academy. The Society of the Floral Games did not reliſh this Project, and an anonymous Author wrote a tract to prove it impracticable. Mr. *Martel* a Member of the *Ricovrati* of *Padua*, refuted him (*d*) in a Book, the extract of which is extant in the *Journal des Scavans* of the 14. of *September* 1693. He in conjunction with Mr. *de* (*e*) *Carriere* and Mr. *de Malepeire* formed regular Conferences which continued to the Year 1698. " Mr. *Pelliſſon*, who with Mr " *de Malepeire* had formerly laid the Foundation of " the like Learned exerciſes at *Toulouſe*, could not " ſee this Happy re-eſtabliſhment, without looking " on it in ſome Meaſure as his own performance, " ſince he had formed the firſt Plan thereof, and ſince " the Illuſtrious Magiſtrate, whom he had formerly " engaged in the firſt Conferences, had ſo large a " Share and was ſo much concern'd in the reviving " of 'em. This Great Man continually bent on the " improvement of polite Learning, ſuggeſted to " the Authors of theſe new exerciſes the Erection " of their Society into an Academy of polite Learn- " ing, to be firmly Eſtabliſhed at *Toulouſe*. He of- " fered his Sollicitation, flattering himſelf with Rea- " ſon that he was able to procure the ſame Advantage " for *Toulouſe*, which he had formerly obtained, even " in a conjuncture leſs opportune, in Favour of *Soiſſons*. " To further this deſign he engaged the Prince of " *Mayne* Governour of *Languedoc* to be their pro- " tector, who had the Goodneſs to preſent a Pe- " tition to the King, ſupplicating his Majeſty to " approve the Project and Execution of that deſign. " It was in acknowledgement of ſo Signal a Favour " that Mr. *Richebourg*, a Member of this Society, " had the Honour to Addreſs an Ingenious Fable " to this Prince——This piece of Poetry alarmed " ſome of the Gentlemen of the Floral Games—— " and then their Society favoured by ſeveral of the " Chief of the Magiſtracy, who were Members of it " fearing the new Academy would be erected on the " ruins of theirs, which had the Management of " a conſiderable Fund, took the moſt proper Mea-

" ſures

(*a*) *Now Dean of the Preſidial.*

(*b*) *Father of Mr. Campunaut Regius Profeſſor of the Civil Law.*

(*c*) *He is Profeſſor of Philoſophy.*

(*d*) *Printed at* Montauban *in* 1692.

(*e*) *Now* Juge Mage.

TRABEA (QUINTUS) a Comic Poet, ſome of whoſe Verſes are cited by † *Cicero*. The piece which he Intituled *Ergaſtulum*, is cited by * *Nonius Marcellus*. *Aulus Gellius* informs us ‖ that *Vulcatius Sedigitus* gave him the 8th Place amongſt the Ten Chief Comic Poets of old *Rome*. *Muret's* Fraudulent Impoſition (*A*) on the great *Scaliger*, which occaſioned his quoting ſome Verſes as *Trabea's* which were of a much later Date, deſerves to be mentioned here. The ſame miſtake is to be found in the *Lexicon*, ‡ of *Buchnerus*.

† Cicero Tuſcul. lib. 4. fol. m. 270. B. *See alſo* lib. 1. de finibus fol. 519 D.

* Nonius Marcell. *voce ra-peiter* pag. m. 515.

‖ Aul. Gellius lib. 15. cap. 23.

‡ Voce *Præfica* f. 1128. *See Muret's Poems* pag. 50. edit. Lipſ. 1672.

TRAPPE

" ſures to get it Eſtabliſhed by Letters Patents under
" the protection of Chancellors of the *France*. They
" preſerved as much as poſſible the Name and
" Cuſtoms it had, in order to follow the Footſteps of its ancient Eſtabliſhment: For beſides that
" by their Statutes theſe Gentlemen are reſtrained
" from Printing any thing in the Name of the Society,
" or returning any Thanks on their reception; of the
" Four Prizes diſtributed, three, and even one of the
" moſt conſiderable, are appointed for Poetry. The
" Gentlemen of the Academical Conferences redoubled their Zeal to perfect their Studies; and as
" they had particularly in view Eloquence, Antiquity, and all that relates to polite Learning,
" they choſe *Terence's* Comedies and *Quintilian*,
" for the Subject of their Conferences. Mr. *de*
" *Mondran* Treaſurer of *France*, who had a Houſe
" very conveniently ſituated in the middle of the
" City, offered it to them for the performance of
" their Exerciſes.

The Author of the Memorial from whence I have extracted all this, concludes with ſaying *that thoſe Conferences, which would not have been interrupted on any other Account than the Death of ſeveral Worthy Members, may, 'tis hoped, be revived in a juncture ſo Favourable to the Sciences as the General Peace* (*f*) *which prevails throughout Europe*.

(*A*) Muret's *Fraudulent impoſition on the great* Scaliger.] I ſhall collect ſeveral paſſages relating to this Fact. " *Scaliger* at the Age of Eighteen
" valued himſelf on diſcerning the different manners of Writing of all Ages. *Muret* deſirous to
" entrap him, made ſome Verſes which he ſhewed
" him, pretending that he had received them from
" *Germany*, and that they were tranſcribed from
" an old Manuſcript. *Scaliger* after having attentively Read them, aſſured him without heſitation
" that *Trabeas* an Ancient Comic Poet was their
" undoubted Author: And continuing in the ſame
" Opinion that his conjecture was infallible, he afterwards cited theſe Verſes as Written by this
" Ancient Poet in his Commentary on *Varro*. *Muret* laughed at it heartily, without the leaſt reſtraint." *Coſtar* having expreſſed himſelf thus, in his Apology, did afterwards more particularly explain in a Letter the Circumſtances of that Fact.
" (*h*) Theſe Verſes of *Muret*, falſly aſcribed to
" the Ancient Comick Poet *Trabeas*, deſerve indeed
" your impatient deſire to ſee them. As I have
" the Honour to know you, I dare ſay that you
" will Learn them by Heart; for they handſomly
" expreſs a Moral and frequently uſeful Reflection.

" *Here, ſi querelis, ejulatu, fletibus*
" *Medicina fieret miſeriis Mortalium,*
" *Auro paranda lacrumæ contra forent.*
" *Nunc hæc ad minuenda mala non magis valent,*
" *Quam nænia Præfica ad excitandos Mortuos.*
" *Res turbidæ conſilium, non fletum expetunt.*

" *Scaliger* cited theſe Verſes in his Commentary on
" *Varro de Re Ruſtica*, page 211. of *Henry Stephens's* Edition. *Producam autem*, ſaith he, *locum*
" *veteris Comici Trabeæ ex Fabula Harpace, ubi hoc*
" *loquendi genus uſurpatur* (*i*) &c. (He is ſpeaking
" of the Phraſe, *auro contra*) *Quis enim tam averſus à Muſis, tamque humanitatis expers, qui horum verſuum publicatione offendatur*, &c. *Muret*
" bragged of having deceived that great Man who
" thought himſelf infallible, and *Scaliger* ſenſibly
" touched by this Cheat, reveng'd himſelf by the
" following Diſtich.

" *Qui rigidæ* flammas *evaſerat ante Toloſæ*
" *Muretus*, fumos *vendidit ille mihi*.

" You underſtand what he means by the *Flames of*
" *the Severe Toulouſe*, and have not forgot that
" *Muret* was accuſed before the Parliament of that
" City of a Crime, which is puniſhed by Fire. *Scaliger* ſuppreſſed theſe Verſes of *Muret* in the Second Edition of his Book.

Mr. *Borreman* (*k*) had no Reaſon to ſay that this ſnare was laid for *Julius Cæſar Scaliger*. What is ſaid of this pretended Paſſage of *Trabea's* being an Epigram, is as groundleſs. (*l*) *Joſeph. Scaliger, cui ille (Muretus) verba dederat, atque epigramma recens à ſe compoſitum pro vetere obtruſerat*, &c. It was a paſſage in a Scene of a Comedy. See Mr. *Menage* in the 83. Chapter of the *Anti-Baillet*, where you will find ſeveral curious things concerning this Fact, but not the whole paſſage of *Scaliger*. I cannot believe that *Menage* purpoſely omitted it. I ſuſpect that he had not by him the Commentary on *Varro*; for if he had known that it contains another ſnare into which this great Critick fell, I am apt to think he had freely cited it. I have not that Edition of *Scaliger's* Commentary, but on the credit of *Scriverius* I ſhall venture to affirm that immediately after the Words cited by *Coſtar* are the following. (*a*) *Quod ſi hi placent, non gravabor, & alios ejuſdem notæ, ſed alius Poetæ, adhibere, qui tanquam ſuperiorum gemini & germani ſunt. Sunt autem Accii, veteris ac graviſſimi Tragici, ex Oenomao:*

Nam ſi lamentis allevaretur dolor,
Longoque fletu minueretur miſeria,
Tum turpe lacrumis indulgere non foret,
Fractaque voce Divûm obteſtare fidem,
Tabifica donec pectore exceſſet lues.
Nunc hæ neque hilum de dolore detrahunt,
Potiuſque cumulum miſeriis adjiciunt mali,
Et indecoram mentis mollitiem arguunt.

Qui verſus hactenus latuerunt, eoſque nunc primum in vulgus publicamus, quorum priores Trabeæ mihi ad verbum è Philemone (vel Menandro, ſecundùm alios,) *mutuati videntur: qui eandem ſententiam extulit:* Εἰ τὰ δάκρυ' ἡμῖν, &c. *Hæc illuſtris heros, qui poſteaquam dolum perſenſit, præ indignatione hoc diſtichon, quod mihi de manu in manum vivus videnſque olim tradidit, ex tempore luſit:*

Qui rigidæ flammas evaſerat ante Toloſæ,
Falſidico fumos vendidit ore mihi.

Virum diſertum deſignans, cujus nomini heic parco. Heroe (æterno, heu, doctorum omnium dolore) defuncto, incidi in Poſthuma quædam ſcripta M. A. M. C. R. (†) *& inter poemata repperi hæc.*

AFFICTA TRABEÆ.

Here, ſi querelis, ejulatu, fletibus, &c.

Prorſus eadem cum iis quæ ſuprà recitavi. Illud alterum ex Actii Oenomao fragmentum nuſquam compares: præterquam in Rittershuſii in Oppianum Commentario: ubi Trabeæ & Actii hos verſus, elegantes & memoria digniſſimos (ut ipſe vocat) producit, tranſcriptos & mutuatos ex Notis Scaligeri. I have not concluded this Citation with *Scaliger's* Words, but choſe to continue it by citing thoſe which *Scriverius* adds to them becauſe they afford matter for two critical remarks. In the firſt place it is viſible that *Scaliger's* Diſtich is otherwiſe expreſſed than Mr. *Baillet* after *Nicius Erythræus* has quoted it (*b*), and otherwiſe than Mr. *Menage* (*c*) cites it from the *Collection of Scaliger's Poems made by Scriverius from Scaliger's Originals*. In the 2d. place we plainly ſee that *Scriverins* was ignorant that the pretended Verſes of *Accius* were any where elſe to be found than in *Scaliger* and *Rittershuſius* his Copiſt. But we ſhall immediately ſee that they were inſerted in an Edition of *Muret's* Poems publiſhed two Years after *Scaliger* had publiſhed his Commentary on
" *Varro*. Here is the proof of it: (*d*) *Muret cauſed*
" *them to be Printed in his Collection of Poems of Aldus's Edition in* 1575, *with this Note: Cum veteris*
" *Comici Græci Philemonis ſententiam à Plutarcho & à*
" *Stobæo acceptam, animi cauſſâ exprimere tentaſſem,*
" *& dicendi genere, & numero, veterum Latinorum*
" *ſimillimo: Placuit etiam experiri, nunquid eandem*
" *comicè explicare poſſem. Viſum eſt utrumque non infeliciter ſucceſſiſſe. Per jocum itaque prioribus verſibus*
" *Accii, poſterioribus Trabeæ nomen aſcripſi, ut experirer aliorum judicia, & viderem num quis in eis ineſſet vetuſtatis ſapor. Nemo repertus eſt qui non ea pro*
" *veteribus acceperit. Unus etiam, & eruditione & judicio acerrimo præditus, repertus eſt, qui ea à me acceptä*

(*f*) *This was Written in the beginning of the Year* 1700.

(*g*) Coſtar, Apolog. pag. 303. 304.

(*h*) Id. ib. pag. 419. *in his* 2d. *Letter to Mr.* de Heurles.

(*i*) *Theſe are the Words that are Wanting here*: tum propter ſententiæ elegantiam, tum etiam quia vulgo nondum noti ſunt. Scaliger *brings in afterwards the ſix pretended verſes of* Trabea.

TRAPPE (THE ABBY OF LA) Situate in a very Solitary place (*A*) on the Frontiers of *Perche* in the Dioceſs of *Seez*, is become very Famous ſince the *Abbot de Rancé* hath reformed it. He held it in Commendam above 25 Years, but in 1662. he made an Agreement, † *by Virtue of which the Monks of the ſtrict Obſervance entred and took Poſſeſſion of the Monaſtery. And the better to Encourage their Eſtabliſhment, he quitted to them the Seat of* Nuiſement *which he enjoy'd as Abbot in Commendam.* The following Year he obtained of the King *a permiſſion* * *to become regular Abbot of this Abby. He took the Regular Habit, and was admitted Novice in the Monaſtery of our Lady of* Perſeigne, *of the ſtrict Obſervance of the* Ciſtercian *Order on the* 13 *of* June 1663. *being then Aged* 37 *Years and five Months* —— † *On the* 26 *of* June *following having received his Diſpatches from* Rome, *impowering him to hold the Abby of* la Trappe, *as a Regular Abbot, he made his profeſſion in the Abby of* Perſeigne —— ‖ *The* 3d *of* July *following he received the Abbatial Benediction* —— *in the Monaſtery of St.* Martin *of* Seez, and went to his Abby the 14th Day of the ſame Month. By his Natural Eloquence and Example he prevailed on his *Monks* to ſubmit to the Primitive Auſterities of their Rule. ‡ *There was not one of them but would follow his Abbot's ſteps, and in imitation of him abſtain from Drinking of Wine, eating of Eggs and Fiſh and apply himſelf to manual Labour for three Hours each Day.* This Abby was fallen into (*B*) a very depraved State. It was Founded in the Year 1140.

TREBATIUS (CAIUS) ſurnamed ζ *Teſta*, was a very great Civilian. He had a α vaſt Memory, and tho' he θ profeſſed himſelf an Epicurean, he was a Man of κ incomparable Probity. During the War with the *Gauls* he

" *cepta pro veteribus publicaret. Ne quis igitur amplius fallatur, & rem totam detegendam, & carmina ipſa hic ſubjicienda duxi.*

" Affi**c**ta Attio.
" *Nam ſi lamentis, &c.*
" Affi**c**ta Trabeæ.
" HERE, *ſi querellis, &c.* "

Theſe Words of *Muret* detect a miſtake contained in the paſſage which is in the beginning of this Remark. Mr. *Colomiés* imagined that *Scaliger* ventured to find a Father for the Latin Verſes communicated to him; Mr. *Colomiés* I ſay fancied that this great Critick not content to receive them as a fragment of an Antient Author, peremptorily decided that it was a part of ſuch a Dramatick piece of *Trabea*. But *Muret* convinces us that the Fact was not ſo, but that he ſuddenly produced theſe Lines as the Verſes of that Ancient Poet. *Scaliger* was only deceived by giving Credit to *Muret*'s Words. As for the reſt he clearly ſaw that they were an imitation of certain *Greek* Verſes in *Plutarch* (*e*), which in *Amyot*'s Verſion run thus:

Si nos mal-heurs les larmes gueriſſoyent,
Et ſi nos maux incontinent ceſſoyent
Que l'on auroit larmoyé tendrement,
Au poids de l'or payees cherement
En un mal-heur les larmes devroyent eſtre:
Mais maintenant les afaires, mon maiſtre,
N'y penſent point, & n'y jettent point l'œil:
Ains ſoit, ou non que tu pleures en dueil,
Pas ne lairront d'aller la meſme voye.
Qu'eſt-il beſoin donc que noſtre œil larmoye?
Qu'y gagnons-nous? Rien: mais douleur produit,
Comme arbres font, des larmes pour ſon fruit.

Scaliger was more excuſable on this Occaſion than when he took the Oration *de duplici concordia*, for a performance (*f*) of *Juſtus Lipſius*; for nothing better reſembles the Verſes of the Ancients than thoſe of the (‖) pretended *Trabea*: But the Oration falſly attributed to (*g*) *Juſtus Lipſius*, is not like any of that Writer's other Works. The Poet *Apollonius Collatius* hath nothing in him which looks like Antiquity, and yet *Scaliger* (*h*) and ſeveral other very good Criticks have taken him for an Ancient Poet. Add to this Mr. *Colomies*'s Words. " (*i*) I have " heard Mr. *Voſſius* ſay, that *Boxhornius* corrected " and commented on a *Satyr de Lite*, which he " believed to be Ancient, which was Written " by Chancellor *de l'Hoſpital*. Which to " my great Satisfaction I afterward found true. " *Pricæus* an Engliſh Critick is Guilty of the " ſame fault " in his Commentary on *Apuleius*'s Apology page 54. A *Madrigal* of *Menage* paſſed for *Taſſo*'s: It is in the 2d. Tome of the *Anti-baillet* page 259. and *the Hiſtory of this Innocent Cheat* is inſerted in the ſame Author's *Meſcolanze*. *Muret* (*k*) complains that he was wrongfully accuſed of being the Author of ſome Letters and Poems Compare with this the Remarks M and Y of the Article *Eraſmus*.

(*A*) *In a very Solitary place.*] (*l*) " This *Abby* " is ſituated in a Valley moderately large. The " Wood and little Hills which ſurround it, are diſpoſed as if deſign'd to hide it from the reſt of " the World. They encloſe arable Lands, Plantations, Fruit Trees, paſture Grounds and Nine Ponds " which encompaſs the *Abby*, and render it ſo " difficult of acceſs that it is very hard to come at it " without a Guide. There was heretofore a Road " from *Mortagne* to *Paris* behind the Walls of the " Garden; but tho' it was in the Wood, and above " five Hundred paces from the Encloſure, and tho' " it was not poſſible to remove it farther without " a vaſt Expence, yet the *Abbot* turned it another " Way, in order to render the place round the " Monaſtery more Solitary. And indeed nothing " is more ſo than this Deſert: For tho' there are " ſeveral Towns and large Villages for three " Leagues round it, yet thoſe who are here ſeem " to be in a Foreign Country. An uninterrupted ſilence Reigns throughout; and if any noiſe, " is heard, 'tis only the ruſtling of Trees agitated by the Wind, or the Brooks running through " the Pebbles. This *Abby* diſcovers it ſelf at going " out of the Foreſt of *Perche*, when one is coming " from the South; and tho' the Traveller thinks himſelf very near, he finds it near a Mile before he " reaches it: But having at laſt deſcended the Hill, " croſſed the Heath, and gone on a little way amongſt Hedges and through Shady Paths he comes " to the firſt Court, where the Receiver's Apartment is. It is ſeparated from thoſe of the " *Monks* by a ſtrong Paliſſado of Pales and Thorns, " which the *Abbot* cauſed to be made after he retired thither.

(*l*) Felibien, deſcription de l'Abbaye de la Trappe, pag. 6. & Seq. Printed at Paris in 1671. *and the ſecond time in* 1682.

(*B*) *Fallen into a depraved State. It was founded.*] I ſhall continue to uſe the ſame Author's Words who furniſhed me with the precedent Remarks (*a*) " The *Abby* of *Our Lady de la Maiſon Dieu de la* " *Trappe*, (for ſo it is called) was founded by *Rotrou* Earl of *Perche*, in the Year 1140. and conſecrated under the Name of the Bleſſed Virgin in " 1214. by *Robert* Arch-Biſhop of *Roüen*, *Ralph* " Biſhop of *Evreux*, and *Sylveſter* Biſhop of *Séez*. It " felt for a long time the decay of the *Ciſtercian* " Order, and fell into the ſame irregularities, in " which every Body knows ſeveral Monaſteries " of that Order continue to this Day ſince the " looſeneſs introduced 200 Years ago, having " not yet embraced the Strict obſervance of " the rule re-Eſtabliſhed in *France*, by the late " Cardinal *de la Rochefoucault*, when M. *Armand* " *John Bouthillier de Rancé*, Doctor of Divinity, chief *Almoner* to the late Duke of *Orleans*, " and *Abbot* in Commendam of this *Abby* above " 25 Years by his great Care, and frequent " exhortations brought the *Monks* of this *Abby* to " conſent and to requeſt that it might be put into " the hands of the Fathers of the ſtrict Obſervance, " to re-Eabliſh the Primitive and exact practice " of the Rule. The *Abbot de Barbarie* of the

(*a*) Felibien ibid. pag. 11. & ſeq.

" ſtrict

he was received into *Julius Cæsar*'s favour by the recommendation of *Cicero* (*A*), and if he would, might have enjoyed the Profit of a *Tribune*'s Post without the performance of that Office. Perhaps he would not have acquitted himself very well in it; for *Cicero* * seems sometimes a little to reproach his want of Bravery, and doubtless it was only his Learned Conversation which indeared him to *Cæsar* and his Friends. Several of the Letters he received from *Cicero* are yet extant. Those who say that he engaged in *Pompey*'s party (*B*), are very much mistaken. He was always firm to *Julius Cæsar*, and persuaded *Cicero* to the same. He maintain'd so great a Reputation after *Julius Cæsar*'s Death, that *Augustus* being in doubt concerning the validity of (*C*) *Codicils*, authoriz'd the use of them by the Advice and persuasive Reasons of *Trebatius*, after having before consulted the most able Civilians. Several are of Opinion, that wherever we find in the *Pandects* * the Sayings of the Ancients brought in, it ought chiefly to be understood of *Trebatius*, and his Scholar *Labeo*. The Character of a Learned Man given to *Trebatius* by *Horace*, seems to signifie a great deal in that ‖ place. This Civilian's Tutor was *Cornelius Maximus*. He Published several Works (*D*). He was sometimes mistaken in affirming (*E*), that certain things had never been taught.

TRISTAN L'HERMITE (*Lewis*) was *Lewis* the XI. his Instrument of Vengeance and † Cruelty. He was Provost Marshal, or, according to others, Great Provost of the King's Houshold. "a He became so terrible to all good Men, "that they were afraid to Name him——— He was not content to obey the barbarous Commands of depriving those of their Lives who had not been Convicted "of any Crime; but executed those Orders with a precipitation not excusable in the "most savage Monsters of Cruelty. This made him take sometimes the Innocent "for the Guilty; and to repair the Fault committed by his Mistake, he was oblig'd to kill two Persons instead of one.

He was Knighted by β *Charles* VII. after the Siege of *Fronsac*. His Son *Peter* L'HERMITE was the Father of *John* L'HERMITE, who shewed *Thevet* the Cosmographer, in the House of *Mortaigne*, γ several *Antient Deeds, importing the Relation betwixt the Lords of that House and the Antient* Romans. I take notice of this only as an Instance of the Folly of those Traditions which are preserved in Antient Families. *Thuanus* δ wonders that *Philip de Comines* hath not mention'd this *Tristan*, who left a great Estate behind him, part of which was the *Principality of* Mortaing *in* Gascogne—— *possibly 'twas he who imprison'd* Philip de Comines.

TRISTAN L'HERMITE (*Francis*) Gentleman to the Duke of *Orleans*, and one of the best Poets of the XIIth Century, η *pretended to descend* from *Lewis* XI's Grand Provost. He was ζ *born at the Castle of* Souliers, in the Province

"strict Observance, and Visitor of the Province, "being come thither at the request of the *Abbot de Rance*, with a Commission from the *Abbot de Prieres* Vicar General, compleated an Agreement "between the *Abbot* and the Old *Monks* of *la Trappe* the 17 of *August* 1662. wich was ratified "in the Parliament of *Paris* the 16 of *February* "1663. By Virtue of which the *Monks* of the strict "Observance entred and took possession of the Monastery."

(*A*) *Was received into Julius Cæsar's Favour by the recommendation of Cicero, and if he would, might have enjoyed.*] *Cicero* recommended him in the following terms: (*a*) *Hunc, mi Cæsar, sic velim omni tua comitate complectare, ut omnia quæ per me possis adduci ut in meos conferre velis, in unum hunc conferas: de quo tibi homine hæc spondeo non illo vetere verbo meo, quod, cum ad te de Milone scripsissem, jure lusisti: sed more Romano, quo modo homines non inepti loquuntur: probiorem hominem, meliorem virum, prudentiorem esse neminem. Accedit etiam, quod familiam ducit, in jure civili singularis memoria, summa scientia. Huic ego neque tribunatum, neque præfecturam, neque ullius beneficii certum nomen peto: benevolentiam tuam & liberalitatem peto: neque impedio, quo minus, si tibi ita placuerit, etiam hisce eum ornes gloriolæ insignibus. Totum denique hominem tibi ita trado de manu (ut ajunt) in manum tuam istam, & victoria & fide præstantem.* This was a very important Recommendation, for *Trebatius* might have been an Honorary Tribune and enjoyed the Profits of that high Office: (*b*) *Ex tuis literis cognovi præproperam quandam festinationem tuam, & simul sum admiratus cur tribunatus commoda, demto præsertim labore militiæ contemseris. Cicero* foresaw that (*c*) he himself would prove the greatest Obstacle to his Fortune. He is not the only Person of that humour: How many Men are there who would have Risen, if they had had but Patience enough, or if they had been Importunate or Immeasurably Impudent?

(*B*) *That he engaged in* Pompey's *Party, are very much mistaken.*] *Zazius* gave out this Falsity, and was refuted by *Rutilius*, as *William Grotius* observes: (*d*) *Cum bellum civile incrudesceret partes Cæsaris semper bona fide secutus est, ipsumque Ciceronem monere non destitit, ut vel ei se conjungeret, vel in Græciam proficisceretur* (1). *Ut mirum videri possit Zasium scribere, Trebatium Pompejanarum fuisse partium, & Ciceronis interventu in gratiam receptum: sed hæc jam Rutilius diluit. Suetonius* relates, 1st. That *Trebatius* advised *Julius Cæsar* to rise when the Senators went to him in the Temple of *Venus*: 2. That *Cæsar* disapproving his Counsel (*e*) shew'd some indifferency for him. This evinces, that our Civilian was a Favourite of *Julius Cæsar*.

(*C*) *Concerning the validity of Codicils, authoriz'd the use of them.*] *Bertrand*'s words are, (*f*) *Cæterum Justinianus in* §. 1. de jure codicil. in Institut. *refert, Augustum, cum de codicillorum viribus dubitaret, qui antea in usu non fuerant, convocasse sapientes viros, inter quos Trebatium, cujus tunc maxima auctoritas erat, & quæsisse, an non absonans a juris ratione codicillorum usus esset, recipique possit: Trebatium id suasisse Augusto, quod diceret, utilissimum ac necessarium civibus esse, propter magnas & longas peregrinationes quæ apud veteres fuissent; ubi si quis testamentum facere non posset, tamen codicillos posset.* Mr. *Menage* (*g*) rejects *Heinsius*'s Opinion, who pretends to prove that *Trebatius*'s Opinions are most times Condemned in the Pandects: *Longe plura sunt*, saith Mr. *Menage*, *in quibus Trebatii sententiam sequuntur cæteri Juris interpretes, & omnino falsa est Heinsiana Sententia.* It is certain that *Trebatius*'s Authority was very great for several Ages. Which *Ammianus Marcellinus*'s Words plainly testify: (*h*) *Hi ut altius videantur jura callere* TREBATIUM *loquuntur & Cascellium, & Alfenum, & Auruncorum Sicanorumque jam diu leges ignotas cum Evandri matre abhinc seculis obrutas multis.*

(*D*) *He Publish'd several Works.*] An Antient (*i*) Scholiast asserts (*k*) That *Aulus Trebatius* a Roman Knight, and Civilian, Composed several Tracts on the Civil-law, and Nine Books concerning Religions. This Account is not very exact, for (*l*) *Macrobius* hath cited the 10th Book of that work of *Trebatius*. And

---

* See Bertrand, de jurisperitis l. 2. p. m. 249. & Cicero ep. 10. l. 7. ad famil.

* Bertrand. ib. p. 249.

‖ Horat. sat. 1. lib. 2. v. 78.

† Pomponius de origine juris l. 3. c. 11. n. 45.

* See the Remark Q. of the Art. *Louis* XI.

a Varillas Hist. de *Louis* XI. Book 10. pag. 341. Dutch Ed.

β *Matthieu*, hist. de *Louis* XI. B. 11. p. m. 751.

γ *Thevet* Cosmographie universelle, B. 14. fol. 517.

δ *Thuana*. p. m. 37, 38

ε *Chevræana* tom. 1. pag. 29. Dutch. Ed.

ζ *Pellison* ubi infra. I think it should be *Soliers*.

(*a*) *Cicero* epist. 5. lib. 7. ad familiar, pag. m. 375, 376. *Note that in the* 1st *Letter of the* 10th *Book to* Atticus, *he uses these words*, Trebatii boni viri & civis verbis te gaudeo esse delectatum.

(*b*) Idem epist. 8. ejusd. libri.

(*c*) Tibi unum timendum sit ne ipse tibi defuisse videare. Id. epist. 7. ejusd. lib.

(*d*) *Guilel. Grotius*, de vitis Jurisconf. pag. 78.

Province of *Marche*. * He was brought up Page of Honour to Scevola de Sainte Marthe. His Tragedy intitled (AΔ) *Mariamne* paſſed for an excellent Piece †. He was admitted into the *French* Academy, in the place of Mr. *Colomby* about the year 1640. After which he lived about ſix or ſeven Years.

"‖ He died very religiouſly at the Palace of *Guiſe*, without ſuffering his Friends "to viſit him, and forgot all things to think of God. What is ſaid of his Poverty, doth not ſeem true (*A*) in all particulars, and would be no Proof of the Injuſtice

* Chevræana, T. I.

† St. Baillet Jugemens ſur les poetes, vol. 4. p. 158.

‡ Mr. Peliſſon, hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe, p. m. 352. where one may ſee the Catalogue of his Works.

‖ Chevræana ibid.

And *Bertrand's* Words are yet wider from Truth; (*a*) *Certum eſt Trebatium ſcripſiſſe de religionibus lib.* [illegible]

(*E*) *In affirming that certain things had never been ſaid before.*] *Cicero* once convicted him of Falſity. I ſhall cite the Paſſage at length, to inform the Reader that *Trebatius* treated his Friends very handſomly. (*b*) *Illuſeras heri inter ſcyphos, quod dixeram, controverſiam eſſe, poſſetne heres, quod furtum antea factum eſſet, furti recte agere. Itaque, etſi domum bene potus ſeroque redieram, tamen id caput, ubi hæc controverſia eſt, notavi, & deſcriptum tibi miſi: ut ſcires, id, quod tu neminem ſenſiſſe dicebas, Sex. Ælium, M. Manilium, M. Brutum ſenſiſſe.* Thoſe who quote this Epiſtle of *Cicero*, to make it appear that *Trebatius* reduced the Precepts of his Sect into practice, and that he lived like an Epicurean Libertin, reaſon very ill. Doth not *Cicero*, tho' of a contrary Opinion, own that he had drank very freely that Evening? And is it Reaſonable thence to form Concluſions againſt his Manners? It is therefore certain, that this Paſſage doth not hinder *Trebatius* from being a Proof that the impious Opinions of the *Epicureans* were compatible with the practice of Moral Virtues; for as I have already ſaid, *Trebatius* was a very honeſt Man. *Bertrand* draws another Conſequence from this Epiſtle of *Cicero*: He would have it to prove that *Trebatius* attempting to paſs for the Inventer of his Anſwers, magiſterially affirmed that no Author had ever ſaid any ſuch thing: (*c*) *Tantam autem Trebatius in reſpondendo vanam oſtentationem, inanemque gloriolam habebat, ut ſæpiſſime quæ plerique ante eum dixerant, neminem præter eum ſenſiſſe audacter profiteretur.*

(*A*Δ) *His Tragedy intitled* Mariamne.] The Abbot *Marolles* obſerves, (*d*) That *this Play was that with which the incomparable* Mondori, *the beſt Actor of his time, ended.* This is a little equivocal. He ſhould have ſaid that this famous Player left his Life by the Efforts he was obliged to make, to repreſent the Paſſions which the Author had deſcribed. In the *Parnaſſe Reformé*, an Actor is introduced, ſaying to *Triſtane*, (*e*) *I believe you would have us act nothing elſe but* Mariamne, *and kill a* Mondory *every Week in your Service.*

(*A*) *What is ſaid of his Poverty doth not ſeem true in all particulars.*] Let us hear Mr. *Menage*. (*f*) M. "Q——— was a Servant to Mr. *Triſtan. M. de Montauſier* ſaid, That when he died he left him his Spirit "of Poetry, and would willingly have left him his "Cloak too if he had had one: On which Mr. *de* "*Montmor* made this Epigram, which is cited by "Mr. *de Furetiere*:

" Elie ainſi qu'il eſt écrit
" De ſon manteau joint à ſon double eſprit
" Récompenſa ſon ſerviteur fidele.
" Triſtan eût ſuivi ce modele;
" Mais Triſtan qu'on mit au Tombeau
" Plus pauvre que n'eſt un Prophete,
" En laiſſant à Q——— ſon eſprit de Poete,
" Ne put lui laiſſer de manteau.

It is certain that Mr. *Furetiere*, whom Mr. *Menage* cites, doth not aſcribe this Rallery to Mr. *de Montauſier*, but to Mr. *Bourdelot*. It is no ſmall happineſs for Mr *Quinaut*, ſays he, (*g*) "to have been Servant to "the illuſtrious Mr. *Triſtan*, under whom he ſerved "his Apprentiſhip in Poetry. Which one day drew "on him the Compliment of a great Prince (1), "who at the end of one of his Plays congratulated "him, by comparing him and his Maſter to *Eliſha*, and "*Elijah*. As *Elijah*, ſaid he, when taken up to "Heaven, by giving *Eliſha* his Mantle, left him the "Spirit of Prophecy; ſo *Triſtan* at his death, tranſmitted to *Quinaut* his Prophetical Genius. Mr. "*Bourdelot*, who was preſent, obſerved that the "Simile was lame of one foot; for *Triſtan* had never a Cloak: which occaſion'd this Epigram, that "was then made to preſerve the Memory of this "Parallel.

" *Elie, ainſi qu'il eſt écrit*, &c.

I doubt not but *Triſtan's* wretched condition was here puſhed too far, and I cannot perſuade my ſelf that his Poverty was like that of the famous Poet with whom Mr. *Deſpreaux* begins his Satyrs:

Damon (*h*) *ce grand Auteur, dont la Muſe fertile*
Amuſa ſi long temps, & la cour & la ville;
Mais qui n'étant vêtu que de ſimple bureau,
Paſſe l'eté ſans linge, & l'hyver ſans manteau,

I dare engage that ſome Perſons, yet alive, have ſeen *Triſtan* with a Cloak, or at leaſt that they know ſome who have ſeen him with one in cold Weather or Rain. I am willing to believe that it was not a new, or a very dear one, but in ſhort it was a Cloak ¶. A Wit diſpoſed to divert himſelf with the Poverty of the Poets, chiefly turns on theſe two Topicks, *viz.* their being ill cloathed, and ill lodged; and this ſort of Rallery moſt times exceeds the Bounds of Truth. *Coſtar* was puzzled when oblig'd to account for theſe words (*i*). "*Arioſto* and *Taſſo* have erected very rich Palaces, not-"to ſpeak of that of Love in *Marino's Adonis*; and "yet they hir'd Chambers to lodge in: this is not "what we call *ædificare caſas*. Theſe, Sir, are the "People who, as you ſay, would delay Building till the "Stones will ſucceſſively come of their own accord, "and place themſelves one upon another. But his Adverſary diſcovered his Fallacies and their Origin; he obſerved that *Coſtar* was not much concerned for Truth, provided he could pleaſe his Fancy. The whole Criticiſm which falls ſeverely on him, runs thus. (*k*) "I own that *Taſſo* was poor, "yet he did not live in Lodgings; he had his Apartments in the Palaces of the Dukes of *Ferrara*, "and other Princes, in whoſe Court he reſided. "And as to what concerns *Arioſto*, he was rich enough, and ſo far from being reduc'd to live in "Lodgings, that he built a very convenient Houſe, "where he generally reſided, as he himſelf aſſures us "in theſe Verſes which he cauſed to be Engraved "on it.

" *Parva, ſed apta mihi, ſed nulli obnoxia, ſed non*
Sordida, parta meo, ſed tamen ære domus.

"*Battiſta Pigna*, who wrote his Life ſaith, That he "was very much addicted to Building, and that his "moſt common Employment, was continually to "alter or improve ſomething or other in his Houſe. "*Ma dilettando ſi molto d'edificare*, &c. *Intorno à "queſta ſua caſa non ſi contentando mai d'una coſa fatta, facea ſpeſſo rifarla dicendo d'eſſere ancora tale "nel far verſi, eſſendo che molto li mutava e rimutava.* If you deſire another Witneſs, *Paulus Jovius* "ſays in his Elogies, *Receptus inde eſt ab Alfonſo "Principe tanquam bonarum omnium amicus & ſodalis, "cujus benigna manu urbanam domum extruxit "peramœnâ hortorum ubertate, frugi menſa quotidianos ſumptus adæquantem.* But you are not "much concerned for the truth of what you ſay; "you are afraid that things *would be ridiculous if "too true.* All is well, if the matter doth not fail "you, and you can fill the Page." *Coſtar* was not ſo inſenſible of this vigorous Blow as not to think of ſome Shifts; but indeed they are meer Cavils. *It is true*, ſaith he (*l*), *that* Taſſo *for a long time had an Apartment in the Ducal Palace of* Ferrara: *But when he wrote his Heroick Poem* Rinaldo *at* Padua, *or when he was imployed in the diſpoſition of the Deſign and matter of his* Gieruſalemme liberata; *did not he live in Lodgings? and doth not he in one of his Letters complain of their inconveniencies? As for* Arioſto, *we ſhall find him in his Satyrs complaining of his extreme Poverty* (*m*). ——— (*n*) *At laſt* Alfonſo's *Liberalities enabled him to build a Houſe. But* Battiſta Pigna *teſtifies, that 'twas at a very ſmall Expence*, poca ſpeſa. *And a certain Perſon telling him that ſuch a ſmall Building did not very well agree with ſo many Towring and Magnificent Palaces, which he had erected in his Writings*; he anſwer'd, *that building with Words and building with Stones were not the ſame thing*: Egli dandogli queſta feſtevole riſpoſta, che porvi le pietre & porvi le parole non è il medeſimo

(*h*) Deſpreaux Sat. 1. at the beginning.

(¶) *Add that it was without doubt rather his own Cloak, tho perhaps bought in a Broker's ſhop, than a borrowed or hired one.*

(*i*) Entretiens de Voiture & de Coſtar. pag. 329.

(*k*) *Girac*, remarques ſur les entretiens de Coſtar. pag. 263, 264.

(*l*) Coſtar, Apologie p. 330.

(*m*) Coſtar *quotes in this place ſeveral Verſes of* Arioſto, *that witneſs his Poverty; but the Complaints of Poets are not always a Proof of their being poor.*

(*n*) *Id. ib.* pag. 331.

justice of the Age, nor any Argument of the (Z) sterility of the Services done to the Muses. He had a Brother † *who applied himself to the writing of Genealogies*, and who Publish'd a *History of Touraine*, and is, if I am not mistaken, the same *John Bap* TRISTAN L'HERMITE *de Soliers*, who * in the Year 1661, Published *the Cabinet of* Lewis XI. *containing several Fragments, Letters, and secret Intrigues concerning the reign of that Monarch; and several other very curious Pieces, never before Published. Collected from several Archives and Repositories.*

TRISTAN DE SAINT AMANT (*John*) an Antiquary and Medallist in the XVII. Century, Author of a Work in Three Volumes in Folio, Entituled a *Commentaires Historiques*, was the Son of *Charles* ‖ *Tristan*, Auditor of Accompts at *Paris*. Father *Sirmond* and he wrote against each other. †

desimo. *I would ask Mr.* Girac *if it is not probable, that* Ariosto *lodged in a hired Room, whilst the Builders were at work; and much more before he was able to employ them?* Costar subjoins several Examples. He saith that *Terence* had *not so much as one hired House; that* (a) Vitellius *when he left* Rome *to go into* Germany, (b) *where soon after the* Roman *Legions created him Emperor, left his Wife and Children in a hired Room; that* Malherbe *never lived otherwise; and that his excellent Verses did not bring him in enough to build even a poor Cottage which he could call his own.* Every one must needs see that this way of answering is but a wretched Apology; for, not to insist on every particular, could not *Ariosto*, while the Workmen were employ'd in building his House, rent another; a Practice very common amongst a vast number of very rich People? Are *Terence*, *Vitellius*, or *Malherbe* concerned in this Dispute, or does the question run upon this, *viz.* Whether (c) it was scandalous for *Tasso* and *Ariosto* to live in Lodgings? The Question is only about the matter of fact it self. *Costar* could not maintain what he advanced; he is therefore conquered. The same Fate would probably fall on those who should be oblig'd to bring Proofs that *Tristan l'Hermite* had not so much as a Cloak.

Men are too much pleased with exaggerations in this sort of Rallery; they imagine that without exceeding the bounds of Truth, they cannot give a sufficient vigour to their Thoughts. We shall next take a view of a *Rondeau*, which supposes some Poets not able so much as to get a Lodging. This is a hint from the Fable of *Amphion*'s Lyre, which was of that strange virtue, that without the help of any other Artifice, it was able to build a City.

Le (d) *beau secret pour Elever le corps*
D'un grand Logis! Tels Ouvriers sont morts;
Il n'en est plus; a leur douce harmonie
Les gross moelons venoient de compagnie,
Et s'arrangeoient comme par des ressorts.
A peu de frais, & sans aucuns efforts,
Pareilles gens édifioient alors,
La seule voix au Luth estant unie;
Le beau secret!
Ah! pour bastir, si les charmans accords,
Si les bons Vers, tenoient lieu de trésors,
Que de Palais de splendeur infinie!
Nos Amphions sont en chambre garnie;
S'ils n'y sont pas, c'est qu'ils couchenti (d) *dehors:*
Le beau secret!

You see Mr. *Berserade* thought it impossible to rally agreeably without taking his Subject a Note higher than those who touched it before him. He believed it too vulgar to lodge the Poets in a hired Room very near the Garret. This is doubtless the Destiny of some, as well as it was the hard fate of the Grammarian *Orbilius*, who, as *Suetonius informs us*, taught at *Rome* with much more Reputation than Profit (e), and he himself complained in one of his Books, that the Poverty which attended his Old-age, obliged him to lodge in a Garret. This Complaint seems better grounded than the Confession which *Martial* makes of being lodged in the third Story.

Et (f) *scalis habito tribus, sed altis.*

Mr. *Gombaud* was rallied for having no better Lodging. "(g) Mr. *Boitard*, President of the Cham-
"ber of Accounts at *Montpelier*, was very much
"pleased with jesting upon Mr. *de Gombaud.*
"Once in raillery he caused a Bill to be clap-
"ped on his Door, importing, *That if any Per-
"son had found a Bruges Satin Bag, in which are
"Mr.* de Gombaud's *Thoughts, if they'l be pleased to
"bring them to the Scutcheon of* Ancezune, *in the
"*Rue des Noyers, *four pair of Stairs*, ubi ponunt ova
"(h) columbæ; *they shall be very well rewarded.*

Some are of Opinion, that *Juvenal* did not mean that the best *Roman* Poets were just ready to turn Keepers of Baths or Bakers; but that the true sense of his words is, that they design'd to lodge at some Bath-keepers or Bakers, that they might warm themselves for nothing. However, it be, the place of *Juvenal* which gives a lively Description of their deplorable condition:

(i) Cum jam Celebres, notique poetæ
Balneolum Gabiis, Romæ conducere furnos
Tentarent; nec fœdum alii, nec turpe putarent
Præcones fieri, cum, desertis Aganippes
Vallibus, esuriens migraret in atria Clio.

But Mr. *Benserade* goes yet much further; he says some Poets pass the whole Night in the Street, and lie under no other Canopy than that of Heaven, being more miserable than Foxes (k) who have their Holes, or the Birds of the Air who do not want their Nests.

It is so true, that the thing aimed at by this sort of rallery, is to shew, that Poets have no Houses of their own, that a certain ingenious Man was pleased to feign, that a Poet having once bought a House, a Poetical Parliament was call'd to consider of this great Novelty, and the greatest Poets urging that they never lived otherwise than in Lodgings, he was immediately oblig'd to sell his House. This Story in Latin runs thus; (l) *Memini me olim legisse elegantem ingenii lusum, superiore ætate excusum, cum inscriptione:* Poeta domum emit. *Argumentum libelli est, nescio quis poeta, qui cum propriam domum emisset, res ea tanquam novi & pessimi Exempli, ad Poetarum Senatum delata, acerbe judicata est.* Præses *Senatûs* Eobanus Hessus *constitutus, cui assederunt,* Celtes, Huttenus, Bebelius, Brassicanus, *alii. Cum Sententias dicerent, nemo ex omnibus fuit, qui vel Mecœnatum gratia, vel ingenii felicitate tantum profecerit, ut ædes proprias vel hæreditate vel emptione possederit; omnes rei familiaris incurii, in conducto se vixisse & fassi sunt & gloriati. Jussus igitur est quam primum ædes revendere,* pecuniam *vero in* sympotium *conferre quo immanem hanc culpam elueret, & ubique habitare ac* sine curis vivere poetice discerent. *Hac illi.*

The Jests made on our *Tristan l'Hermite* were chiefly levelled at the meanness of his cloaths. It was he whom Mr. *Gueret* chose to be an Apologist for ill-drest Poets; for a certain Person having said (m) *That their uncombed Hair, their nasty Linnen, and the ridiculous figure which their ragged cloaths made, would force a smile from the gravest men*, *Tristan* briskly reply'd, (n) "You trouble your Head about a
"Trifle——let the Poets live as they please: don't
"you know they can't abide constraint? And what
"is it to you, that they are ill cloathed, if their
"Verse be lofty and magnificent? Don't deceive
"your self, this great Negligence is the source of
"their finest Poems: they are thus unconcerned at
"worldly things, to make their court to the Muses
"with the greater assiduity; and when their eyes
"appear to you distracted, their Imagination is busi-
"ed in quest of those surprising Wonders which ra-
"vish you. Would to God that our Dramatick Po-
"ets were only guilty of this fault, I could easily Par-
"don them. But contrary to those you speak of, they
"are magnificently dress'd, they look great by reason
"of their rich Apparel, and their Poems are languid
"and without Oeconomy.

(Z) *Would be no Proof of the Injustice of the Age, nor any Argument of the sterility of the Services done to the Muses.*] If any one should ever think of reducing all the Lists of poor Learned Men, which we find in several places (o), into an universal Catalogue, it would swell to a very large Book; and the Poets would here take up more room than all other Authors, if we either regard their Accounts of themselves, or the truth of the Fact. I think I have already cited these Verses of *Reignier*.

Or

† Marolles, dénombrement des auteurs.

* At Paris, 'tis a Book in 12. of 122 pages.

a See what Judgment M. de Spanheim gives of him, De usu & præst. numism. pag. 774. & epist. 3. ad Morellium. pag. 148.

(a) Id. ib. pag. 332.

(b) Uxore & liberis quos Romæ relinquebat, *meritorio cœnaculo* additis, &c. Suet. in Vit. c. 7.

(b) Costar *supposes without any reason for it, that People fancied he* did a great deal of wrong to the Reputation of *Tasso* and *Ariosto*.

(c) Benserade, metamorph. d'Ovide mises en rondeaux.

(d) *This puts me in mind of Father* Garasse's *words in his* Doctrine Curieuse p. 63. *They are of the Opinion of the Parasite mention'd by the Old Comick Poet* Orbilius, *that the greatest Torment a Spunger can be put to, as they generally are, is* affligere cum Domicœnio, *to condemn him to sup at home*, ii tamen Lares habet.

(m) Gueret, Parnasse reformé p. m. 101.

(n) Ib. pag. 103.

(e) Docuit majore fama quam emolumento. Namque jam persenex pauperem se & habitare sub tegulis quodam scripto fatetur. Sueton. de illustr. Grammat. cap. 9. (f) Mart. epigr. 118. lib. 1. *See also the* 109. *Epigram of the same book, where he says,* At mea Vipsanas spectant cœnacula laurus. (g) Suit. du Men. p. 176. Dutch Ed.

TRONCHIN (*Theodorus*) a Miniſter, and Profeſſor of Divinity, Born *April* 17. 1581. at *Geneva*, where his (*A*) Father was a Refugee on Account of Religion. He was deſign'd to be a Scholar by the Advice of his Godfather *Theodorus Beza*, and he made an Extraordinary Progreſs in his Studies. The Teſtimonials given him in the Year 1600. when he went to viſit Foreign Univerſities, ſpoke him a Young Man of very great Hopes. He confirmed this Character among all the Learned Men to whom he was Pupil, or with whom he Contracted any acquaintance in his Travels (*B*). He returned to *Geneva* in 1606, and gave ſuch Signal proofs of

Or (b) avecq' tout cecy le poinct qui me conſole,
C'eſt que la pauvreté comme moi les affole,
Et que la grace à Dieu, Phœbus & ſon troupeau
Nous n'euſmes ſur le dos jamais un bon manteau &c.

A little lower he ſaith:

Pour moy, ſi mon habit, par tout cicatricé
Ne me rendoit du peuple & des grands meſpriſé
Je prendrois patience, &c.

The Epitaph on *Malherbe* written by *Gombauld*, diſcovers the Poverty of both of 'em:

L'Apollon (c) de nos jours, Malherbe, icy repoſe;
Il a vécu long-temps ſans beaucoup de ſupport:
En quel ſiecle? paſſant! je n'en dis autre choſe,
Il eſt mort pauvre, & moy je vis comme il eſt mort.

It would be very eaſy to make a Collection of Poems of the like Nature, which would fill ſeveral Sheets. The General Concluſion is that the Age is very ungrateful and unjuſt to ſuffer ſo many Men to be afflicted with Poverty, who deſerve ſo well to be rewarded, and to enjoy the conveniencies of Life. But it is certain that thoſe who talk thus are very often in the wrong; for there are ſeveral Poets, whoſe Poverty is only to be aſcribed to their too great neglect of their Domeſtick Affairs, and not knowing how to husband the Favours which they receive. Thoſe who apply themſelves wholly to the Muſes, can ſcarce think of any thing elſe, and find ſo many charming Engagements in the Compoſition of a Poem, that they cannot take off their thoughts, even when their private intereſt requires them to be employed in ſomething elſe, than the working up an Ode. " (*d*) Poetical Diverſions are " very great ones, and—— the Hours paſs away " very faſt that are employed that way. But is it " not this elevated pleaſure which Poets take in " their performances, that diverts them from their " Affairs, ruins their Fortune, and eſtranges them " from common Prudence? For rather than not " finiſh a Sonnet well begun, a Poet will ſuffer his " Friend to depart without bidding him Adieu, " abandon the Solicitation of his Law-ſuit, and neg- " lect the Care of his Health: As it happened " to the *Cavalier Marino*, who burnt his Leg " writing ſome *Stanza's* of his *Adonis*. This Poetick " Madneſs is not diſagreeable after the Evils are " happened; for it does in ſome meaſure take off the " ſenſe of them: But it is not to be valued at a " very high Rate, when it throws Men into perni- " cious Accidents, like that of *Marino*. On indiffe- " rent Subjects it is inocent and even divert- " ing.

" *Si lors que tu luy parles,*
" *Il te laiſſe au Roy Jehan, & s'en court au Roy Charles.*

" The Elevated imagination of a Poet is no diſa- " greeable object, when at leiſure Hours we ſee it " take its flight, and ſoar up towards every thing " that can afford it ſome thoughts. And if ſome- " times the Beauty or the Boldneſs of thoſe Pictures " which he draws, divert us; yet the Poet's ill " Fortune is always to be lamented, becauſe his moſt " preſſing Affairs ſcarce ever prevail over his Di- " ſtraction. There are ſeveral other cauſes of the ill poſture of their Affairs, which are indeed ſcandalous ones; ſome are poor notwithſtanding the Liberalities of a *Mæcenas*, becauſe they are prodigal and Voluptuous; others loſe at play all the Money which their poetical productions bring in. Our *Triſtan* ruined himſelf by this. To which purpoſe ſee what Mr. *Chevreau* ſays of it. " (*e*) We may judge of his *Genius* " by his *Mariana*. We were intimate Friends; and " when he deſired me to inform him of the fate " of the laſt Verſes which he made for the Queen " (*f*), I anſwered him that the Perſon who ſhewed " them to her Majeſty, did not chooſe a time when " the Queen was in a gay Humour. But if ſhe " had made him a Preſent, he wou'd have made " but a very indifferent uſe of it: Gaming was his " predominant Paſſion; and he loſt all he could " play for. At ſeveral times he received of the Duke " of S. *Aignan* a Thouſand Piſtoles, out of which " he could not ſpare enough to Buy a good Suit " of Cloaths." Could he then complain of the hardneſs of the *Age*? If he was not rich in proportion to his Condition, 'twas his own fault, and only to be Charged on his ill Conduct. He is reported to have Written his own Epitaph in theſe ſix Verſes.

Ebloui (g) de l'eclat de la ſplendeur mondaine,
Je me flatay toujours de l'eſperance vaine;
Faiſant le chien couchant auprés d'un grand Seigneur,
Je me vis toujours pauvre, & tâchay de paroiſtre;
Je veſcus dans la peine attendant le bonheur,
Et mourus ſur un coffre en attendant mon Maiſtre.

Mr. *Chevreau* mentions another Poet, who ruin'd himſelf by his pleaſures, *viz. Colletet*. " (*h*) In his Poems we find this Verſe.

" *City and Country Houſes I enjoy.*

" But theſe Houſes muſt have been *in partibus infidelium*. He was naturally libidinous, and to tempt " him, it was not neceſſary to be either fair or young. " That he might not get a Scandalous Name a- " mongſt his Neighbours, and not being able to " live without a Female Servant, he Married her, " and ſhe was no ſooner dead than he got ano- " ther, which he alſo did not fail to make his " Wife —— (*i*) Thoſe who deſigned to take an " Inventory of his Goods, aſſured me that he ſaved " them that Trouble, and left his Son the Name " of *Colletet* only for an Inheritance.

It would be almoſt as difficult to enrich certain Authors, as to fill the *Danaides* tub. They are with reſpect to their Expences what others are with reſpect to (*k*) Secrets; Money ſlips from them a Thouſand ſeveral ways.

(*A*) *Where his Father was a Refugee on Account of Religion.*] He was of *Troyes* in *Champagne*, and quitted *France* on the Account of the Maſſacre in 1572. which he eſcaped by the kind Offices of a Prieſt his Friend and Neighbour, who hid him in his Houſe. He deſign'd for *Germany*, and accordingly to have only paſſed through *Geneva*, where he nevertheleſs ſtayed by the Advice of an Acquaintance. He obtained the Freedom of that City, and not long after was admitted into the Council of two Hundred, in acknowledgment of ſeveral Services done to the Republick, during the War it was then engaged in with the Duke of *Savoy* (*l*).

(*B*) *In his Travels.*] Leaving *Geneva* in 1600. he ſtudied at *Baſil* under *John Nicolas Stupanus*, *Amandus Polanus*, and *Antony Walaus*. He returned to *Geneva* in 1602. and departed thence in 1604. to go to *Heidelberg*, where he was inſtructed by the Lectures of *David Pareus* Profeſſor of Divinity, and by thoſe of *Æmilius Portus Greek* Profeſſor. He Spent ſome time at *Francfort* to ſee *Gruterus*, who had rendred himſelf Famous by his Collection of Inſcriptions. In 1605. he went to the Univerſity of *Franeker*, to hear *Sibrand Lubbertus*. He ſtaid a conſiderable time at *Leyden*, under the Profeſſors *Gomarus*, *Trelcatius*, *Bertius* and *Arminius*: Under the laſt of which he ſolemnly maintained a *Theſis* in Divinity. He alſo frequented *Merula* and *Baudius*, and very often viſited *Joſeph Scaliger* and *Heinſius*, who ſhewed a great eſteem and affection for him. *He was loved and praiſed by all for his Virtue and Learning.* At the *Hague* he ſaw *Hugo Grotius*, *who gave him ſixteen Verſes of his own making, and told him that he did it to put him in mind of his Love for him, and of his eſteem for his Learning.* He ſaw at *London Aaron Cappel*; at *Oxford* (*m*) *Druſius*, and *John Raynolds*; at *Cambridge Richard Tompſon* and ſeveral others. He was very much eſteemed at *Paris* by *Montigni* and *Du Moulin* Miniſters, and by *Caſaubon* who of his Learning that he was the ſame Year made *Hebrew* Profeſſor. In 1607, he married *Theodora Rocca*, a Woman of an Extraordinary Merit in all reſpects, ſiſter to the firſt *Syndic* of the Republick, and Grand-Daughter to *Theodorus Beza's* Wife, by whom ſhe was brought up, and whoſe * God-Daughter ſhe was. He was choſen Miniſter in *December* 1608. and Created Rector of the Academy in 1610. He was deſired in 1614. beſides his *Hebrew* Lectures to Read in Divinity, one of the Profeſſors being then ſick; and when a Profeſſorſhip of Divinity became Vacant in 1618. he ſucceeded to it, and was thereby Diſcharged from his *Hebrew* Profeſſorſhip. The ſame Year he received Orders from the Paſtors and Profeſſors to anſwer the *Jeſuit Coton*, who had Writ againſt the *French* Verſion of the Bible a Book entituled *Geneve plagiaire*. He acquitted himſelf of this Commiſſion by a Tract entituled *Coton plagiaire*, a work very much eſteemed by the Publick. At the ſame time he and Mr. *Diodati* were deputed by the Church of *Geneva* † to the Famous *Synod* of *Dort*, where he diſcovered his profound knowledge in *Theology*, and a moderation which was very much praiſed. In this great conjuncture he acquired the Reputation of an extraordinary prudence. He was lent to the Duke of *Rohan* (C) for ſeveral Months in 1632. and perfectly anſwered that Lord's expectation, who teſtified a very great eſteem and particular affection for him. He was very grateful, and Honoured the Memory of that Duke by an Oration which he pronounced a few Days after the Death of that great Man in 1638. He continued to raiſe an eſteem in the exerciſe of all his imployments, and by a very extenſive Correſpondence in the Reformed Countries, where he obtain'd the Friendſhip of the moſt Learned Men, as well as of ſeveral great Lords and Princes. He was very happy in the Compoſition of β Orations and Latin Poems: His Converſation was very inſtructive and agreeable; for he had added to the ſtudy of Divinity, and of ſeveral Languages, the Knowledge of the Civil Law, and of ſeveral other Sciences, and that of ſacred and profane Hiſtory, eſpecially of the two laſt Centuries, of which he knew an infinite Number of Particulars. He was one of thoſe Men, who are more fond of deſerving Reputation, than of hunting after it, and he might if he had pleaſed have publiſhed very excellent Books, as γ *Meſtrezat* aſſures us. He was choſen by the Paſtors in 1655. to confer with and aſſiſt *John Dureus* in the Affair of the Union of the *Lutherans* and the Reformed, on which he wrote ſeveral Tracts. He arrived to a Happy Old Age free from Diſeaſes, and died very eaſily, after a Fever which had continued ſome Days, on the 19 of *November* 1657. the very Moment after he had received the viſit of the Paſtors and Profeſſors in a Body, who in their diſcourſe with him gave him all the Marks of a tender affection. It was obſerved that he ſurvived all the Foreign Divines who aſſiſted at the *Synod* of *Dort*. He was a frank ſincere Man, zealous for Religion and the Service of the Churches, a great Enemy to the Vices of Men, tho' very tender of their Perſons. His Advice was very much valued both for the Government, and in the two Eccleſiaſtical Bodies, and by ſtrangers, a great Number of which conſulted him. Amongſt other Children he left *Lewis* TRONCHIN, who was Miniſter of the Church of *Lyons* δ, and Four Years after was elected to ſucceed his Father in his Divinity Profeſſorſhip μ. This worthy Son enjoy'd that Poſt many Years with the Reputation of one of the ableſt Divines of this Age. All thoſe that were acquainted with the juſtneſs and penetration of his *Genius* paſſionately deſired that he would at laſt become an Author, and were very ſorry that he put ſo ſlight a value on that Title. He died at *Geneva* the 8. of *September* 1705. being 76 Years old. See his Elogy in the inaugural Speech of Mr. *Turretin* his Succeſſor in the Profeſſorſhip of Divinity.

(b) Regnier Sat. 2. fol. m. 5. verſo.

(c) See the Diverſitez curieuſes, part 10. pag. 15. Dutch Edit.

(d) Sorbiere, letter 77. pag. 559. 560.

) Chevræana m. 1. g. 29. tch Edit.

f) That Chriſtina Queen Sweden.

(g) See the Diverſitez curieuſes en pluſieurs lettres, tom. 2. pag. 141. Dutch Edit.

(h) Chevræana ib. pag. 30.

(i) Ibid pag. 31.

(k) Plenus rimarum ſum, hac atque illac perfluo. *Terent. Eunuch. act.* 1. *ſc.* 2.

(l) *From an imparted Memorial.*

(m) *I keep to my Memorial, without inquiring who this* Druſius *was. Apply this throughout whenever there is occaſion.*

* 'Tis therefore a thing ſomewhat ſingular, that both the Husband and the Wife ſhould have had ſuch an Illuſtrious God-Father.

† The Republick of the United Provinces had deſired of that of Geneva two of their Doctors.

β I have mention'd his Funeral Oration upon Simon Goulart in the Diſſertation concerning Junius Brutus.

γ The Paris Miniſter.

δ He was admitted Miniſter in 1651.

μ Taken from a Memorial ſent from Geneva

TULENUS, a Learned Man in the Reign of *Henry* the II. He was Preceptor to the Cardinal and Admiral *de Chatillon* ✝. He was touched with a ſort of Folly which did not prejudice his Reaſon and Judgment in all other things; but his Amorous paſſion for a certain Princeſs miſerably diſtracted him. Of which *Paſquier* an Eye Witneſs (Z) relates ſome circumſtances.

✝ Paſquier's Letters, B. 19. pag. 541. 542. & B. 22. pag. 791.

TULLIA,

who beſtowed great Elogies on his Learning and Piety. He afterwards made his *Tour* of *France, and viſited at* Blois, Nicolas Vignier *the great Hiſtorian*; *at* Saumur Philip Birgan, *a Breton called thither by* Du Pleſſis *and the Academical Senate to be Profeſſor of the Oriental Tongues. He Spent ſome Months in* 1606. *at* Montauban, *where the Divinity Profeſſor* Sonius *ſhewed a particular eſteem for him, and at* Montelimar *where the Famous* Daniel Chamier *diſcovered a tender affection for him* (a).

(C) *He was lent to the Duke of* Rohan *for ſeveral Months in* 1632.] This Duke was then Ambaſſador extraordinary from the King of *France* and General of his Armies in the Country of the *Griſons*. He ſent a Gentleman to *Geneva* with Letters to the Government, and the Paſtors, to deſire a Miniſter to reſide with him, with whom he might adviſe on thoſe things which might tend to the good of the Reformed Churches in that Country, that were ill treated by the *Spaniards*. *Theodorus Tronchin* was ſent to him only for ſome Months. The Neceſſities of the Academy could not allow of his long ſtay. The Term being expired, it was prolonged for two Months at the inſtance of the Duke of *Rohan*. *The Churches of the Griſons preſerved a great Veneration for his Perſon, and very gratefully acknowledged the good Offices he had done 'em* (b).

(Z) *Of which* Paſquier *an Eye Witneſs relates ſome circumſtances.*] Propoſing ſome Objections againſt the Common Opinion of Phyſicians, that the Judgment, Imagination, and Memory are three Faculties which are lodged in three ſeparate ventricles of the Brain, he ſaith that the diſtinction of the three ventricles is inſufficient, and that the ventricle of Judgment, and that of Memory ought to be ſubdivided as often as either of them act ſeparately in us. And to prove theſe different Operations he obſerves that in the Reign of *Francis* I. (c) *One Villemanoche reſided at Court, whoſe Judgment never appeared touched on any other Account*

(a) Taken from the ſame Memorial.

(b) Ibid.

(c) Paſquier's Letters, Book 1 pag. 5

TULLIA.

TULLIA, *Cicero's* Daughter, is ſo often mentioned in that great Man's Epiſtles, that her Hiſtory deſerves to be enquired into. She was Born the 5th of *Auguſt* †; but the Year is unknown to us. Some very Learned Men || believe that ſhe was Married to her firſt Husband in the Year 689. His Name was (*A*) *Caius Piſo*. He was a Man of a ſtrict Honour, he Intereſted (*B*) himſelf with the utmoſt concern in the Affairs of his Father-in-Law, and wanted neither Capacity nor Eloquence. It is thought he Dyed during *Cicero's* Exile, which was in 696. *Tullia* was a ſecond time Married to (*C*) *Furius Craſſipes* the following Year. It is not known how ſhe was Separated from this Husband; whether he Dyed, or whether ſhe was Divorced from him: We are only told that in 703, ſhe was Married to *Publius Cornelius Dolabella*. This third Marriage was Contracted during *Cicero's* Abſence, when he was Governor of *Cilicia*. Thoſe Friends whom he deſired to Inform him (*D*) whether *Dolabella* was in good Circumſtances, acquitted themſelves very Ill of that Commiſſion; and he afterwards Repented that ever he had conſented to the Concluſion of that Match, before he could himſelf more narrowly ſearch into *Dolabella*'s Affairs, which were not in a very good Poſture. He was a Young Man who (*E*) Lived irregularly; but knew ſo well how to

† Cicero Orat. pro Sextio, & Epiſt. 1. l. 3. ad Attic.

|| See the Remark *A*.

---

count than the Marriages of Ladies of Quality which he promiſed to himſelf; and after him, continues he, “*Tulenus* a Learned Man——whoſe Judgment was intire in every thing elſe but a Paſſion, which he had ridiculouſly Vowed to one of the firſt Princeſſes of *France*, who was Dead. With this Perſon I once diverted my ſelf at my own Table, when ſeveral Men of Honour, who were Strangers, and not in the leaſt acquainted with him were preſent. He Entertained us till the middle of our Dinner with an infinite variety of Learned and Judicious Diſcourſe, to the Admiration of all who heard him. At laſt believing I had ſufficiently Impoſed on the Company, and that it was now time to make the good old Man play another part, I took occaſion ſeemingly by Accident to ſpeak of this Princeſs; after which quitting his Amble he immediately began to Trot, relating an Incoherent Crowd of Follies, concerning the good and ill Treatment he had met with from her. The Company amazed whence this ſudden Change proceeded, could not tell what to think of him, he having before talked ſo Wittily and Learnedly. But he being gone, I at large acquainted them with the reaſon of the alteration of his Brain. Beſides what I have related, it was obſerved of him, that the judging part being wounded on this Subject, had alſo affected the Imaginative ſo much that at the firſt ſight of any Young Lady whom he met with, he was perſuaded it was his *Julia*, (as he called his pretended Miſtreſs in *Latin*, and *Jolivette* in *French*) and guided by this fooliſh Imagination he ſometimes walked in his Gown and Square-Cap as far as *Fontaine-Bleau*, perſuading himſelf that ſhe hid her ſelf there. I relate nothing concerning him but what I have ſeen or heard of him (*b*).” This Example confirms what we have ſeen in another place, that ſome Perſons loſe Common Senſe with regard to ſome things, who nevertheleſs by the reſt of their Conduct plainly convince us that their Senſe, Knowledge, and Reaſon are intire and in a Flouriſhing Condition

(*A*) *His Name was* Caius Piſo.] Which is not to be doubted of after theſe words: *Tulliolam C. Piſoni L. F. Frugi deſpondimus.* So *Tully* concludes the 3d Epiſtle of his firſt Book to *Atticus*. It is thought to have been Written (*d*) in the Conſulſhip of *Lucius Julius Caſar*, and *Caius Martius Figulus*, in the Year 689; but no reaſon is urged for that Date, and I find no hint in the Letter it ſelf to Countenance it. *Caſaubon* (*e*) believes it was Written before the Year 686, and that *Tullia* was not above twelve Years Old at moſt when ſhe was Married to *Caius Piſo*.

(*B*) *He intereſted himſelf with the utmoſt concern in the Affairs of his Father-in-Law.* Cicero could never ſufficiently Praiſe him. *Vexabatur*, ſaith he (*f*), *uxor mea: liberi ad necem quærebantur: gener, & Piſo gener à Piſonis Conſulis pedibus ſupplex rejiciebatur.* In one of his Orations he ſpeaks thus: *Alter fuit propugnator mearum fortunarum & defenſor aſſiduus, ſumma virtute & pietate C. Piſo gener, qui minas inimicorum meorum, qui inimicitias affinis mei propinqui ſui Conſulis, qui Pontum & Bithyniam Quæſtor pro mea ſalute neglexit.* The like Paſſages are to be found in his Epiſtles. See the Elogy which he beſtows on him with reſpect to his Eloquence and Virtue in his Treatiſe *de Claris Oratoribus* (*g*).

(*C*) *Was a ſecond time Married to* Furius Craſſipes *the following Year.*] See *Cicero's* Epiſtles to his Brother, Book the ſecond, Epiſt. 4. and 7. *Ludovicus Vives* (*h*) hath reduced theſe two Sons-in-Law of *Cicero* to one: He ſuppoſes that *Tullia* was but twice Married, the firſt time to *Piſo Frugi Craſſipes*, and the ſecond to *Cornelius Dolabella*, and that ſhe Died in Child-Bed in the Houſe of the latter. We ſhall refute this below (*i*).

(*D*) *To inform him whether* Dolabella *was in good Circumſtances.*] I only advance this as a Conjecture which I borrow from the Learned *Manutius*: It is very probable and Founded on ſome Expreſſions of *Cicero*. He tells *Atticus*: (*k*) *Tullia mea venit ad me pridie Idus Jun. deque tua erga ſe obſervantia benevolentiaque mihi plurima expoſuit, literaſque reddidit trinas: ego autem ex ipſius virtute, humanitate, pietate non modò eam voluptatem non cepi, quam capere ex ſingulari filia debui; ſed etiam incredibili ſum dolore affectus, tale ingenium in tam miſera fortuna verſari, idque accidere nullo ipſius delicto, ſumma culpa mea.* Let us now ſee how the two laſt words are Paraphraſed by *Manutius*. *Mea enim negligentia factum eſt, ut Dolabellæ nuberet: quem ego probare generum non debui, niſi prius omnia perſcrutatus, non ſolum quod ad mores, ſed etiam quod ad facultates attineret: quod ſi feciſſem, ejus ære alieno perſpecto, nunquam paſſus eſſem, ut homini in tanta rei domeſticæ difficultate conſtituto filia mea collocaretur; ſed commiſi, ut me abſente res per amicos ageretur, quibus in Ciliciam proficiſcens ita* (*l*) *mandavi, ut, quoniam ego tam longe abfuturus eram, de Tulliæ meæ matrimonio agerent ipſi quod probaſſent, in quo meam negligentiam agnoſco, tantam enim rem aliis committere non debui, ſed in reditum meum integram reſervare.* This Author confirms his Paraphraſe in the following manner: *Cur autem hoc à Cicerone putem ſignificari, facit epiſtola ad Terentiam his verbis ſcripta:* Tullia noſtra venit ad me pridie idus Jun. cujus ſumma virtute & ſingulari humanitate graviore etiam ſum dolore affectus, noſtra factum eſſe negligentia, ut longe alia in fortuna eſſet, atque ejus pietas ac dignitas poſtulabat. *Dixit autem,* Tale ingenium in tam miſera fortuna verſari, *hoc ſenſu; quod Tullia virum haberet tam perditum, tam flagitioſum, tam multa in tribunatu nefarie molientem: ſiquidem in tribunatu iniquas leges ferre Dolabella conatus eſt, maxime debitorum cauſa, è quibus ipſe unus erat* (*m*).

(*E*) *He was a young Man who lived Irregularly.*] *Cælius* hinted it to *Cicero*, when he Congratulated him on that Marriage: I ſhall cite his own words becauſe they contain the very Compliment we ſhould make at preſent in a like caſe. He excuſes what was paſt on account of his Youth, and tho' he durſt not venture to aſſure him, that all the Imperfections of that Age were Corrected, yet he hoped the Marrying ſuch an accompliſhed Lady, the Daughter of ſuch a Father, would certainly compleat the Cure. (*n*) *Gratulor tibi affinitate viri medius fidius optimi. Nam hoc ego de illo exiſtimo. Cetera porro quibus adhuc ille ſibi parum utilis fuit, & ætate jam ſunt decurſa, & conſuetudine atque autoritate tua & pudore Tulliæ, ſi quæ reſtabunt, confido celeriter ſublatum iri. Non eſt enim pugnax in vitiis, neque hebes ad id quod melius ſit intelligendum.* Obſerve

---

(*b*) Paſquier repeats the ſame thing much in the ſame words in the 2d Book p. 738. But he ſays there that Tulenus was Crazy in two reſpects, in aiming at the Biſhoprick of Cambray, and in his Love for that great Princeſs. See Sorel's Remarks upon the Berger extravagant pag. 176, 177.

(*c*) Corradus in Quæſtura, p. m. 83. and after him Sagittarius in vita Tulliæ, n. 5. & 11.

(*d*) See Cicero of Grævius's Edition Epiſt. ad Attic. Tom. 1. pag. 33. And in Manutius's Commentary pag. 18.

(*e*) Orat. pro Sextio pag. m. 73.

(*f*) Poſt reditum in Senatu. See alſo his Speech Poſt reditum ad Quirites.

(*g*) Pag. m. 198.

(*h*) In Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, l. 19. c. 4.

(*i*) *In the Remark* N.

(*k*) Epiſt. 17. l. 11.

(*l*) *This appears from theſe words of* Cicero: In quo unum vereor ne tu parum perſpicias ea quæ geſta ſunt ab aliis eſſe geſta, quibus ego ita mandarant, ut cum tam longe abfuturus eſſem ad me ne referrent, agerent quod probaſſent. Epiſt. 12. l. 3. ad familiares, wherein he excuſes himſelf for having Married *Tullia* to *Dolabella*, the Accuſer of *Appius* to whom he writes.

(*m*) Manutius quotes Dion *in this place.*

(*n*) *See* Cicero's 13th *Epiſt. of the* 8th *Book* ad familiares.

to (*F*) Cajole the Mother * and the Daughter that they Winked at his Debaucheries, and looked on him as a good Match. He gave his Father-in-Law (*G*) a thousand Uneaſineſſes by the Tumults which he excited in *Rome* when he was Tribune of the People. He endeavoured to Eſtabliſh a Law very prejudicial to Creditors; for he pretended that Debtors ſhould not be forced to the Payment of their Debts, either by perſonal Impriſonment or Seizure of their Effects. *Mark Antony* † was obliged to bring ſome Troops into the City, who charged the Favourers of *Dolabella*, of which they (*H*) killed Eight Hundred. Poor *Tullia* was unhappy in her laſt Husband; and 'tis not to be doubted that her Journey to (*I*) *Brundusium* to ſpeak with her Father, proceeded amongſt other Reaſons from the neceſſity of Conſulting him how to behave her ſelf towards ſo troubleſome a Spouſe. She was Divorced from him (*K*), and yet (*L*) *Cicero* always treated

* I mean *Terentia*, *Cicero's* Wife, and their Daughter.

† He was at that time General of the Cavalry under the ſecond Dictatorſhip of *Julius Cæſar*, the Year after the Battel of *Pharſalia*.

ſerve what *Cælius* ſays, that Age had already cured the vicious Inclinations of *Dolabella*. This incines me to believe that *Appian* was miſtaken when he (*a*) affirmed that *Dolabella* was not Aged above 25 Years when *Cæſar* was killed. He muſt then have been but 18 or 19 when he Married *Tullia*. Was it then reaſonable to ſay that the vicious courſe of his Youth was paſt? But here are yet other difficulties againſt *Appian*. The Commentators on *Cicero* will have the following words to be meant of *Dolabella*: *Illud verò mihi permirum accidit, tantam temeritatem fuiſſe in eo adoleſcente, cujus ego ſalutem duobus capitis judiciis ſumma contentione defendi, ut tuis inimicitiis ſuſcipiendis oblivisceretur patroni omnium fortunarum ac rationum ſuarum: præſertim cum tu omnibus vel ornamentis vel præſidiis redundares, illi (ut leviſſime dicam) multa deeſſent, cujus ſermo ſtultus & puerilis erat jam antea ad me à M. Cælio, familiari noſtro, perſcriptus: de quo item ſermone multa ſcripta ſunt abs te. Ego autem citius cum eo qui tuas inimicitias ſuſcepiſſet, veterem conjunctionem diremiſſem quam novam conciliaſſem.* *Cicero* wrote this in 703, when he was in *Cilicia*, before *Dolabella* was his Son-in-Law. The Epiſtle of which theſe words are part, was written to a Perſon (*b*) whom *Dolabella* had accuſed. It ſeems therefore that they cannot be meant of any Body elſe beſides *Dolabella*. But it would be very ſtrange, that before the Age of 18 a Perſon ſhould be twice Arraigned for capital Crimes. Beſides I find that *Tullia* was not *Dolabella's* firſt Wife. He had one (*c*) who left him when he accuſed *Appius*.

(*F*) *Knew ſo well how to Cajole the Mother and the Daughter.*] This we may infer from *Cicero's* words to *Atticus*: (*d*) *Ego, dum in provincia omnibus rebus Appium orno, ſubito ſum factus accuſatoris ejus ſocer. id quidem, inquis, dii approbent. ita velim: teque ita cupere certo ſcio. ſed crede mihi, nihil minus putaram ego, qui de Ti. Nerone, qui mecum egerat, certos homines ad mulieres miſeram, qui Romam venerunt factis ſponſalibus. ſed hoc ſpero melius. mulieres quidem valde intelligo delectari* OBSEQUIO ET COMITATE *adoleſcentis, cætera non* ἀξαγανάκτειν. *Terentia* and *Tullia* were ſo Charmed with the Complaiſance and Civility of this young Man that they pardoned his Faults, and did not enquire into his Life. The ſame thing frequently happens in our times. A young Debauchee who renders himſelf agreeable by his Deportment, and by acting the well bred-Man, will ſo inſinuate himſelf into the Favour of both Mothers and Daughters, that they will not conſider whether he has waſted his whole Eſtate; he'll exclude his Rivals tho' never ſo meritorious, if not plentifully endowed with this Cringing quality. *Let us have him, he pleaſes our Eyes.* This undoubtedly utterly ruined the Affairs of the other Pretender to *Tullia*, who was not *Titus Nero*, but *Tiberius Nero*: Probably the ſame who Married *Livia*, and was Father to the Emperor *Tiberius*. (*e*) Some Authors believe that *Dolabella* by his artful Proteſtations and obliging Civilities ſo touched *Tullia's* Heart, that ſhe eaſily excuſed his almoſt Dwarfiſh ſhape: For 'tis to him that *Tully's* Jeſt is applied, *Who has faſtned my Son-in-Law to his Sword?* Their Conjecture may be a little helped by *Macrobius* (*f*), who calls *Lentulus* the Son-in-Law, whom *Cicero* rallied in that manner. This Sir-Name agrees better with *Dolabella* than with *Piſo* and *Furius*; for the *Lentuli* were a branch of the *Cornelian* Family, and perhaps the *Dolabella's* were of the Branch of the *Lentuli*. See below a paſſage of *Aſconius Pedianus*.

(*G*) *He gave* Cicero *a thouſand Uneaſineſſes.*] Not to repeat what I have ſaid in the Article of *Dolabella* concerning the new Laws which he propoſed in favour of Debtors, I ſhall content my ſelf with citing one or two Proofs of his Father-in-Law's Uneaſineſs. *O dii*, ſaith he in a Letter (*g*) to *Atticus*, *generum ne noſtrum potiſſimum, ut hoc, vel tabulas novas.* *Quod me audis*, ſaith he in another Letter (*h*), *fractiorem eſſe animo, quid putas, cum videas acceſſiſſe ad ſuperiores ægritudines præclaras generi actiones!*

(*H*) *Of which they killed Eight Hundred.*] We ſhould have had the particulars of this Action, if *Livy* had come to us entire; for in the Summary of his 113th Book we find: *Quum ſeditiones Romæ à P. Dolabella tribuno plebis legem ferente de novis tabulis excitatæ eſſent, & ex ea cauſſa plebs tumultuaretur, inductis à M. Antonio Magiſtro equitum in urbem militibus octingenti è plebe cæſi ſunt.* All Hiſtorians repreſent the City at that time in a diſmal Eſtate. It is true that the Inhabitants of *Rome* were ſo accuſtomed to Bloodſhed in their Streets and in the Aſſemblies of the People by Animoſity and contrary Factions, that they were leſs ſurprized than we at this time ſhould be, to ſee their City filled with Guards continually ready to fall on one another.

(*I*) *Her Journey to* Brunduſium.] Her miſerable Condition accumulated the Father's Grief to ſuch a height, that this Interview which on another occaſion would have afforded this tender Father an infinite Satisfaction, turned into an inſupportable Affliction: As we may be informed from the words above Cited in the Remark *D*, and thoſe in a Letter written to his Wife *Terentia*. (*i*) *Tullia noſtra venit ad me pridie Idus Junii: cujus ſumma virtute, & ſingulari humanitate, graviore etiam ſum dolore affectus, noſtra factum eſſe negligentia, ut longe alia in fortuna eſſet, atque ejus pietas, ac dignitas poſtulabat.* *Cicero* did not retain his Daughter long there, he ſent her Home; her Preſence could not leſſen their Mutual Affliction. *Tulliam autem non videbam eſſe cauſam cur diutius mecum tanto in communi mœrore retinerem: itaque matri eam, cum primum per ipſam liceret, eram remiſſurus.* This he writes to his Friend *Atticus* in the 17th Epiſt. of his 11th Book.

(*K*) *She was Divorced from him.*] This is not to be doubted of after *Sulpicius's* hint in his Conſolatory Letter on her Death. Amongſt other Reaſons he offers this, *viz.* That in the unhappy poſture of Affairs, nothing could engage *Tullia* to deſire to Live, ſeeing her Father could not have found a good Husband for her. This ſuppoſes that ſhe was perfectly diſengaged from the Conjugal Bonds. (*k*) *Quoties in eam cogitationem neceſſe eſt & tu veneris, & nos ſæpe incidimus, hiſce temporibus non peſſime cum iis eſſe actum quibus ſine dolore licitum eſt mortem cum vita commutare? Quid autem fuit quod illam hoc tempore ad vivendum magnopere invitare poſſet? quæ res? quæ ſpes? quod animi ſolatium? Ut cum aliquo adoleſcente primario conjuncta ætatem gereret? Licitum eſt tibi (credo) pro tua dignitate ex hac juventute generum diligere, cujus fidei liberos tuos te tuto committere putares.* If this Proof was inſufficient I would offer thoſe places in *Cicero's* Letters concerning (*l*) the Reſtitution of her Portion. Some think that *Dolabella* deſigning to Divorce *Tullia*, preſſed the Eſtabliſhment of the new Tables, that he might not be obliged to refund her Fortune to *Cicero* (*m*). It is ſurprizing that *Aſconius Pedianus* was ſo ill informed concerning *Tullia's* Deſtiny, as to affirm (*n*) that after *Piſo's* Death ſhe Married *Lentulus*, and Died in Child-Bed at his Houſe: Which are two or three Miſtakes.

(*L*) Cicero

(*a*) Appian. lib. 4. de bello civili.

(*b*) *To Appius Pulcher. That Letter is the 10th of the 3d Book* ad familiares.

(*c*) Inter poſtulationem & nominis delationem uxor à Dolabella diſceſſit. *Epiſt. 6. l. 8. Cicer. ad familiares.*

(*d*) Epiſt. 6. lib. 6.

(*e*) Adeo placuit Tulliæ novi ſponſi comitas, ut minori ejus ſtatura non offenderetur. Notus eſt Ciceronis jocus, *Quis generum meum alligavit gladio?* Caſpar Sagittarius, in vita Tulliæ, n. 30.

(*f*) M. *Cicero* cum Lentulum generum ſuum exiguæ naturæ hominem longo gladio accinctum vidiſſet, *Quis*, inquit, *generum meum ad gladium alligavit?* Macrob. Saturnal. l. 2. c. 3.

(*g*) *The 23d of the 11th Book.*

(*h*) *The 25th of the ſame Book.*

(*i*) Cicero Epiſt. 11. lib. 14. ad Familiar.

(*k*) Epiſt. 5. lib. 4. Ciceron. ad Familiares, p. m. 132.

(*l*) Tenor tamen dum à Dolabella procuratoribus exigam primam penſionem. Epiſt. 18. lib. 6. *ad familiares*, written whilſt *Cæſar* was in Spain againſt *Pompey's* Sons.

(*m*) See Cicero *of Grævius's* Edit. tom. 2. epiſt. ad Attic. pag. 270.

(*n*) Cicero filiam poſt mortem Piſonis generi P. Lentulo collocavit, apud quem illa ex partu deceſſit. *Aſcon. Pedian. in Orat. Ciceron. contra L. Piſonem, pag. m. 157.*

treated *Dolabella* as tenderly as poſſibly he could, till after the Murther of *Trebonius* * he fell on him (*M*) with his whole ſtock of Rhetorical figures. *Tullia* (*N*) died

* *See the Article* Dolabella.

(*L*) *Cicero always treated Dolabella as tenderly &c.*] He doubtleſs had a greater ſhare of Capacity than Reſolution, and he ſaw *Pompey's* party running on Ruin more and more by the continual Victories of *Julius Cæſar*. He apparently feared that the Conqueror would at laſt ceaſe to ſhew his Clemency, and would make away with ſuch Republicans as were Men endowed with parts ſufficient to oppoſe him. He knew that *Dolabella* was in very great Credit with *Cæſar*: After which 'tis needleſs to ask why *Cicero* diſſembled his reſentment againſt his Son in Law. His kind treatment of him kept him within the compaſs of Friendſhip; for *Dolabella* ſtood *Cicero's* Friend at *Julius Cæſar's* Court in Oppoſition to thoſe who endeavoured to render him odious (*a*), and a little after the Death of *Tullia* he deſired to be acquainted with the poſture of his Affairs. For which Reaſon *Cicero* wrote to him a very obliging Letter (*b*) in the midſt of the Affliction with which he was Loaded. We have a convincing proof of their mutual intimacy, even when *Julius Cæſar* was killed, in *Cicero's* firſt *Philippick*. Where he repreſents to *Dolabella* how Glorious his Action was of throwing down the Column which the Mutineers had erected, to animate the People againſt *Cæſar's* Murtherers. All honeſt Men Complimented and thanked *Cicero*, they thinking him *Dolabella's* director in that Affair. (*c*) *Te invenis, Dolabella, qui es mihi cariſſimus, non poſſum de utriuſque veſtrum errore reticere*——— *Dicerem Dolabella, qui recte factorum fructus eſſet, niſi te præter ceteros pauliſper eſſe expertum viderem. Quem potes recordari in vita tibi illuxiſſe diem lætiorem, quam cum expiato foro, diſſipato concurſu impiorum, principibus ſceleris pœna affectis, urbe incendio & cædis metu liberata te domum recepiſti? cujus ordinis, cujus generis, cujus denique fortunæ ſtudia tum laudi, & gratulationi tuæ ſe non obtulerunt? quin mihi etiam, quo auctore te in iis rebus uti arbitrabantur, & gratias boni viri agebant, & tuo nomine gratulabantur. Recordare, quæſo, Dolabella, conſenſum illum theatri, cum omnes, earum rerum obliti, propter quas tibi fuerant offenſi, ſignificarunt ſe novo beneficio memoriam veteris doloris abjeciſſe.* This long paſſage doth not expreſly particularize what was done againſt the Column; but *Cicero* a little before he had given ſuch an exact Account of it (*d*), that what I have ſaid hardly admits of a Scruple. I ſhall take this occaſion to obſerve that this Column is the ſame which *Suetonius* ſpeaks of. *Poſtea*, ſaith he (*e*), *ſolidam columnam prope* 20. *pedum lapidis Numidici in foro ſtatuit* (plebs) *ſcripſitque* PARENTI PATRIÆ. *Apud eandem longo tempore ſacrificare, vota ſuſcipere, controverſias quaſdam interpoſito per Cæſarem jurejurando diſtrahere perſeveravit.* This *longo tempore* is a miſtake, which clearly proves that *Suetonius* had not read the firſt *Philippick*, or at leaſt did not remember it; for that Oration informs us that the Column was deſtroyed before the 1ſt. of *June*. *Cicero's* Letters (*f*) teſtify further that it was pulled down before the 1ſt. of *May*. Now *Cæſar* was killed the 15 of the preceding *March*. But to return to the good correſpondence betwixt *Cicero* and *Dolabella*: Nothing could be more endearing than the Letter which *Cicero* wrote to him on Account of that Column. *Cum te ſemper tantum dilexerim quantum tu intelligere potuiſti, tum his tuis factis ſic incenſus ſum, ut nihil unquam in amore fuerit ardentius* (*g*). He doth not forget to acquaint him that he himſelf paſſed for the Author of this good Advice; and his turn of thought on that occaſion is admirable. (*h*) *Etſi contentus eram, mi Dolabella, tua gloria, ſatiſque ex ea magnam lætitiam voluptatemque capiebam, tamen non poſſum non confiteri, cumulari me maximo gaudio, quod vulgo hominum opinio ſocium me adſcribat tuis laudibus. Neminem conveni, convenio autem quotidie plurimos*——— *quin omnes, cum te ſummis laudibus ad cælum extulerunt, mihi continuo maximas gratias agant. Negant enim ſe dubitare, quin tu meis præceptis & conſiliis obtemperans præſtantiſſimum te civem & ſingularem conſulem præbeas. Quibus ego quamquam veriſſime poſſum reſpondere te quæ facias tuo judicio & tua ſponte facere, nec cujuſquam egere conſilio: tamen neque plane aſſentior, ne imminuam tuam laudem, ſi omnis à meis conſiliis profecta videatur: neque valde nego, ſum enim avidior etiam quam ſatis eſt gloriæ.*——— *A te autem peto, ut me hanc quaſi falſam hereditatem alienæ gloriæ ſinas cernere, meque aliqua ex parte, in ſocietatem tuarum laudum venire patiare; quamquam, mi Dolabella, (hæc enim jocatus ſum) libentius omnes meas, ſi modo ſunt aliquæ meæ laudes, ad te transfuderim, quam aliquam partem exhauſerim ex tuis.* He ſeems to be tranſported when he ſpeaks of this Action to his Friend *Atticus*. See Epiſt. 15. and 16. of the 14th Book, and the 1ſt Letter of the 9th Book *ad familiares*. I have ſomewhere Read that he deſigned to go to *Syria* as *Dolabella's* Lieutenant, if *Hirtius* and *Panſa* who were to be Conſuls the next Year, had not diſſuaded him. He let *Dolabella* go without him, and embarked for *Athens*, after having promiſed to return when *Hirtius* and *Panſa* ſhould enter on the Conſulſhip. Contrary Winds retarded his Voyage, and he received ſome Advices from his Friends, which engaged him to return ſpeedily to *Rome*. The Day after his Arrival the Senate was aſſembled, but he did not appear there, at which Mark *Antony* was incenſed. This is what we find in *Amyot's* Tranſlation of *Plutarch's* Life of *Cicero*. One might convict *Plutarch* of a miſtake, if the phraſe (*i*) which he makes uſe of, and *Amyot* Tranſlates *he let Dolabella go*, was not Equivocal: But as it may barely ſignify *he thought no more of Dolabella, he left him*, this Criticiſm only affects the Tranſlator. He was in the wrong to think that *Dolabella* departed from *Rome* before *Cicero*; for the firſt *Philippick* was pronounced in *Dolabella's* preſence, after *Cicero's* return. This obliges me to Repeat what I have ſeveral times ſaid, that it is extremely difficult to Tranſlate well; for tho' we may take the Expreſſions of the Original in the moſt probable ſenſe, that doth not ſecure us againſt ſome miſtakes; and the Knowledge of a Thouſand particular Events is neceſſary to direct us to expreſs the true ſenſe. For inſtance, if *Amyot* had remembred that *Dolabella* was preſent in the Senate as Conſul, when *Cicero* ſpoke his firſt *Philippick*; if he had remembred that *Cicero* in that Oration urged his Reaſons for departing from *Rome* and the Motives of his return, he would not have Tranſlated thoſe Words of *Plutarch he let Dolabella go*. At the Bottom I don't diſpute the Fact; I ſee nothing to hinder our Believing that *Cicero* deſigned to follow *Dolabella* into *Syria*. This is a freſh proof of the Text of this remark.

(*M*) *Till after the Murther of* Trebonius *he fell on him.*] He had Reaſon to cenſure very ſeverely ſuch a perfidious and enormous Cruelty; but he ſhou'd have taken care not to contradict himſelf, and expoſe his Reputation too much. He had proteſted a great Value for *Dolabella* in ſeveral Letters, and afterwards in his *Philippicks* he declared that he never was a Man of any Merit, and had been always a wicked Wretch. (*k*) *Dolabella quidem tam fuit immemor humanitatis, quamquam ejus* NUNQUAM *particeps fuerit, ut ſuam inſatiabilem crudelitatem exercuerit non ſolum in vivo, ſed etiam in mortuo, ac in ejus corpore lacerando atque vexando, cum animum ſatiare non poſſet oculos paverit ſuos.* He makes him Equal to *Mark Antony* in (*l*) all ſorts of Vice: What could he ſay more? And when he affirms that to compare *Tribonius* with *Dolabella* were to treat the former very unjuſtly, he expreſſes himſelf thus, for the paſſage deſerves to be Tranſcribed: *Nam cæteris quidem vitæ partibus quis eſt qui poſſit ſine Trebonii maxima contumelia conferre vitam Trebonii cum Dolabellæ? alterius conſilium, ingenium, humanitatem, innocentiam, magnitudinem animi in patria liberanda quis ignorat? alteri à puero pro deliciis crudelitas fuit; deinde ea libidinum turpitudo, ut in hoc ſit ſemper ipſe lætatus, quod ea faceret, quæ ſibi objici ne ab inimico quidem poſſent verecundo: & hic dii immortales, aliquando fuit meus, occulta enim erant vitia non inquirenti. Neque nunc fortaſſe alienus ab eo eſſem, niſi ille vobis, niſi mænibus patriæ, niſi huic urbi, niſi diis penatibus, niſi aris, & focis omnium noſtrum, niſi denique naturæ, & humanitati inventus eſſet inimicus,*

(*N*) Tullia *died in the Year* 708.] *Cæſar* was then in *Spain* engaged againſt *Pompey's* Sons. The Conſolatory Letter which he wrote to *Cicero* on this occaſion was Dated from *Hiſpalis* (*m*). Which is

(*i*) Δολοβέλλαν μὲν εἰάσας χαίρειν. Dolabellam miſſum fecit. *Plutarch. in Cicer.* pag. 882. *E.*

(*k*) Philippica 11. pag. 827. edit.. Græv.

(*l*) Duo hæc capita nata ſunt poſt homines natos teterrima & ſpurciſſima Dolabella & Antonius. ... Ecce tibi geminum in ſcelere par, inuſitatum, inauditum, ferum, barbarum. Itaque, quorum ſummum quondam inter ipſos odium, bellumque meminiſtis, eoſdem poſtea ſingulari inter ſe conſenſu, & amore devinxit impuriſſimæ naturæ & turpiſſimæ vitæ ſimilitudo. *Idem in eadem Oratione init.*

(*m*) *Now* call'd Seville. *See the* 20. *letter of of the* 13. *Book to* Atticus died in the Year 708. Her Father (O) remained inconſolable for ſome time: His Friends uſed all their Endeavours to comfort him: He himſelf wrote a Book on (P) that Subject, and deſign'd to build a Chappel to the deceaſed, and

is a ſtrong proof of my Text. That which *Plutarch* furniſhes me with, is not ſatisfactory; it is not clear enough, not free from ſome Errors. This Hiſtorian having ſpoken of the Divorce of *Terentia*, (a) adds, That *Cicero* afterwards married a young Woman, and that *Tullia* died in Child-bed not long after this Match, ſhe died, continues he, at *Lentulus*'s Houſe, to whom ſhe was married after the death of *Piſo*, her firſt Husband. To prove from this, that *Tullia* died in 708, one thing ought (b) to be ſuppoſed, which *Plutarch* doth not mention, which is, that *Cicero* married his 2d Wife in 708. And as for the reſt, it plainly appears, that *Plutarch* did not well conſult *Tully*'s Epiſtles: For he would there have been informed, that *Tullia*'s ſecond Husband's Name was *Furius Craſſipes*, and that ſhe died divorced from her Third Husband who was *Dolabella*. (c) A Modern Author in order to prove that *Tullia* did not die in Child-bed, and that ſhe was with Child when Divorced by *Dolabella*, alledges the following Paſſage of *Cicero*, (d) *Tullia mea peperit* XIV. *Kal. Jun. puerum* ἑπταμηνιαῖον, *quod* εὐτόκησεν *gaudebam; quod quidem eſt natum perimbecillum eſt.* He ought to have known that *Cicero* wrote this before the Battle of *Pharſalia*, and that conſequently theſe Words are of no uſe to prove that *Tullia* did not die in Labour, and that ſhe was divorced when big with Child. What he ſhould have alledged I find in another Letter written during the laſt War which *Cæſar* made in *Spain*. The words are: *Me Romæ tenuit omnino Tulliæ meæ partus; ſed cum ea, quemadmodum ſpero, ſatis firma ſit, teneor tamen dum a Dolabella procuratoribus exigam primam penſionem* (e). Let us favour *Plutarch* and *Aſconius Pedianus* as much as we pleaſe, we ſhall yet be forced to accuſe them of having expreſſed themſelves ill. *Cicero*, whoſe Credit in this caſe, outweighs that of one hundred Hiſtorians, informs us, that *Tullia* was very well after her Delivery: So that the beſt Suppoſition we can make in favour of *Plutarch* and *Aſconius Pedianus*, is that *Tullia* before ſhe was perfectly recovered, was ſurprized by ſome Diſtemper incident to Child-bed-women, of which ſhe died.

(O) *Cicero was inconſolable.*] If we believe *Plutarch* (f) the Philoſophers flocked from all Parts to *Cicero*'s aſſiſtance. They doubtleſs brought him the choiceſt of their Troops, I mean the moſt excellent Moral Reflections which their Topicks, or Common places could furniſh. But Company was inſupportable to *Cicero*, he confin'd himſelf in a Solitude, where he found much more conſolation, than in the Diſcourſes of his Friends, or his Books. (g) *Quod me ab hoc mærore recreari vis, facis ut omnia: ſed me mihi non defuiſſe, tu teſtis es. Nihil enim de mærore minuendo ſcriptum ab ullo eſt, quod ego non domi tuæ legerim. Sed omnem conſolationem vincit dolor* —— (h) *Ne diſceſſiſſem quidem è conſpectu tuo niſi me plane nihil ulla res adjuvaret* —— *mihi adhuc nihil prius fuit hac ſolitudine* —— *me ſcriptio & litteræ non* (i) *leniunt ſed obturbant.* He proteſts in another Epiſtle (k), that Solitude ſeem'd to him the moſt ſupportable thing in the world. *Nunc omnia reſpuo, nec quicquam habeo tolerabilius quam ſolitudinem.* To be perfectly informed of the Diſorder into which his Affliction had plunged him, we need only conſider his frank Confeſſion that he ſunk under his Grief, and at the ſame time reflect on the oſtentation with which he brags of his Courage. He willingly boaſted that he was inconſolable, but would by no means endure the Reproaches of too much weakneſs. Sentiments utterly incompatible. (l) *Quod me ipſe per literas conſolatus ſum non pœnitet me quantum profecerim. Mærorem minui, dolorem nec potui, nec ſi poſſem, vellem.* Here is a Man who neither could, nor would abate his Grief. (m) *In hac ſolitudine careo omnium colloquio; cumque mane me in ſilvam abſtruſi denſam & aſperam, non exeo inde ante veſperum. ſecundum te nil eſt mihi amicius ſolitudine. in ea mihi omnis ſermo eſt cum litteris. eum tamen interpellat fletus: cui repugno quoad poſſum. ſed adhuc pares non ſumus.* He hid himſelf in the obſcureſt place of a Wood from Morning till Night, and could not refrain from Tears. Doth not he almoſt own that he had loſt his Senſes? (n) *In conſolationis libro quem in medio* (NON ENIM SAPIENTES ERAMUS) *mærore & dolore conſcripſimus.* Doth not he confeſs that (o) he had ſcandalouſly ſurrendred his Arms to Fortune? But let us ſee on the other ſide, how he glories in the Efforts of his Courage. (p) *Quod ſcribis te vereri, ne & gratia & auctoritas noſtra hoc meo mærore minuatur; ego, quid homines aut reprehendant, aut poſtulent, neſcio; ne doleam? qui poteſt? ne jaceam? quis unquam minus? dum tua me domus levabat, quis a me excluſus? quis venit, qui offenderetur?* (q) *Alteram ſunt a te profectas, legere iſti læti, qui me reprehendunt, tam multa non poſſunt, quam ego ſcripſi. quam bene, nihil ad rem. ſed genus ſcribendi id fuit, quod nemo abjecto animo facere poſſet.* To thoſe at *Rome* who took it ill that he hid himſelf ſo long, he declared that his Employments were not thoſe of a diſturbed or depreſſed Mind. (r) *Ne me quidem contemno: meoque judicio multo ſtare malo, quam omnium reliquorum. neque tamen progredior longius, quam mihi doctiſſimi homines concedunt: quorum ſcripta omnia, quæcumque ſunt in eam ſententiam, non legi ſolum, quod ipſum erat fortis ægroti, accipere medicinam; ſed in mea etiam ſcripta tranſtuli; quod certe afflicti, & fracti animi non fuit.* See the Marginal Note *i* above, which makes it appear that writing of Books afforded him ſcarce any relief againſt his grief, but only a little ſtupify'd the part affected. Is this an effect of Fortitude?

We are oblig'd to own that his Affliction is the moſt convincing proof which he gave of his tender Affection for *Tullia*; but if he had dy'd before her, we ſhould not have wanted proofs of his extraordinary Affection to her. All his Expreſſions, when he ſpeaks of her, are ſo many Evidences of it, *deliciæ, deliciolæ, mea anima, lux, deſiderium.* It is very probable that *Tullia* was endowed with a Thouſand good Qualities, and was one of the moſt charming Ladies of her time, ſince ſhe ſo deeply engaged the Affection of ſuch a Father. Mr. *Sagittarius* (s) conjectures, that ſhe was inſtructed in polite Learning. He had not advanced this as a bare Conjecture only, if he had met with the paſſage (t) hereafter cited out of *Lactantius*. If *Plutarch* is to be believ'd, (u) one of the cauſes of *Terentia*'s Divorce was, that ſhe would not allow her Daughter a ſufficient Equipage to go to adviſe with her Father at *Brundiſium*. He adds, that *Cicero*'s ſecond Wife was divorced, becauſe ſhe rejoyc'd at *Tullia*'s Death. There is no reaſon to (x) diſpute the Truth of this with *Plutarch*, under pretence that *Cicero*'s Epiſtles to *Atticus* inform us, that this ſecond Wife lived a pretty long time with her Husband after *Tullia*'s Death: This Objection, I ſay, would be ill grounded, becauſe it is certain the Divorce was perfectly finiſhed (y) the Summer after *Tullia*'s Death.

Cicero's extraordinary Affection for his Daughter, inſpired his Enemies with ſuch a boldneſs as to report that he loved her inceſtuouſly: So true it is, that there is nothing ſo pure from which a Satyrical Genius cannot extract a filthy Poiſon. Thoſe Careſſes which proximity of Blood authorizes amongſt Relations of different Sexes, are expoſed to ſiniſter Interpretations when they are more than ordinary. How doth Calumny envenom things! See in the Margin (z) what the Declaimer, who aſſumed the Name of *Salluſt*, ſaith, and remember that *Donatus*, an Antient Interpreter of *Virgil*, believed that this Verſe of the *Æneids*, (a) *Hic thalamos invaſit natæ vetitoſque hymenæos*, ought to be underſtood of *Cicero*. But *Servius* rejects this Opinion (b).

(P) *He himſelf wrote a Book on that Subject.*] I have cited ſome Paſſages in the preceding Remark that hint at this Tract. It is great Pity that it is loſt. But it is not *Sigonius*'s fault that the Publick doth not at preſent believe it is yet extant: He wrote a Tract *de Conſolatione*, and endeavour'd to make it paſs for *Cicero*'s. The judicious Criticks (c) prevented the Deceit immediately. *Sigonius*, tho' he Publiſhed ſome Diſſertations againſt them, did not gain his point. *Cicero*, on this occaſion, ſeem'd like

thoſe

(a) Plut. in Cicerone pag. 881, 882.

(b) Fabricius *ſuppoſes it in* vita Ciceronis, p. m. 193.

(c) Caſpar Sagittarius in vita Tull. n. 44.

(d) Epiſt. 18. lib. 11. ad Attic.

(e) Epiſt. 18. lib. 6. ad famil.

(f) In Cicer. pag. 882. A.

(g) Cicero epiſt. 14. ad Attic. lib. 12.

(h) Ibid. epiſt. 16.

(i) *He ſays much the ſame thing in the* 14. ibid. Totos dies ſcribo non quo proficiam quid, ſed tantiſper impedior, non equidem ſatis (vis enim urget) ſed relaxor tamen. *He endeavoured to ſtupify himſelf by reading and writing.*

(k) *The* 18 *of the ſame Book.*

(l) Epiſt. 28. ejuſd. libri.

(m) Epiſt. 15. ejuſd. libri.

(n) Tuſcul. quæſt.

(a) Æn. lib. 6. v. 623. (b) Servius in hunc locum Æneidos. Schottus in Cicerone vindicato, cap. 12, p. m. 90. Gullielmus, &c.

and even deſign'd to make an (Q) Apotheoſis. His Enemies were ſo baſe as to accuſe him of loving *Tullia* † inceſtuouſly. *Plutarch* is miſtaken in ſome parts of her Story. He did not know that ſhe had three * Husbands. Mr. *Moreri* who had || *Gaſpar Sagittarius*'s Diſſertation on the Hiſtory of *Tullia*, did not know how to make the moſt advantageous uſe of it; he has ſcarce extracted any thing worth his trouble; only a Story related by *Cælius Rhodiginus*, which Mr. *Sagittarius* has juſtly baniſhed to the Fabulous Lands. The Project of a Temple is by Mr. *Moreri* converted into a real one, furniſhed with a magnificent *Mauſoleum*. See the Remark Q. *Cicero*'s Words in the *Exordium* of his Book *de Conſolatione*, where he

thoſe who eat nothing with pleaſure, which they themſelves have not a hand in cooking of. All the conſolatory Arguments which his Friends offered either in converſation or by writing, were ineffectual. It was his Book *de Conſolatione* only which in ſome meaſure abated his Grief: (c) *Quid ego de conſolatione dicam, quæ mihi quidem ipſi ſane aliquantum medetur; ceteris item multum illam profuturam puto.* He ſaith, that in the greateſt of his grief, he began the Preparation of this Antidote, &c. (b) *In conſolationis libro quem in medio (non enim ſapientes eramus) mœrore & dolore conſcripſimus, quodque vetat Chryſippus ad recentes quaſi tumores animi remedium adhibere, id nos fecimus, naturæque vim attulimus, ut magnitudini medicinæ doloris magnitudo concederet.* This Tract abounded with Hiſtorical Paſſages and Inſtances, as St. *Jerome* (c) and St. *Auguſtin* (d) inform us. We ſhall hereafter produce an Obſervation of *Lactantius*.

(Q) *To make at an Apotheoſis.*] He ſeveral times communicated his Deſign to *Atticus*. But we ſhall at preſent content our ſelves with two or three Paſſages. *Habeo nonnullos ex iis, quos nunc lectito, auctores, qui dicant, fieri id oportere, quod ſæpe tecum egi, & quod a te approbari volo. de fano illo dico; de quo tantum, quantum me amas, velim cogites; equidem neque de genere dubito; placet enim mihi Cluatii: neque de re; ſtatutum eſt enim; de loco nonnunquam. velim igitur cogites. ego, quantum his temporibus tam eruditis fieri poterit, profecto illam conſecrabo omni genere monumentorum, ab omnium ingeniis ſcriptorum, & Græcorum & Latinorum: quæ res forſitan ſic refricatura vulnus meum. ſed jam quaſi voto quodam, & promiſſo me teneri puto* (e). The following Paſſage more clearly ſhews, That he was engaged by a Vow to the conſtruction of a Temple, and that he believed it was irreligious not to put that Deſign in Execution. *Lactantius* hereafter will inform us concerning this Engagement. *Si iſta minus confici poſſunt, effice quidvis. Ego me majore religione quam quiſquam fuit ullius voti, obſtrictum puto* (f). A Monument, a *Mauſoleum*, or whatever had the Name or likeneſs of a Sepulcher, could not ſatisfie him. (g) *Fanum fieri volo; neque hoc mihi erui poteſt: ſepulchri ſimilitudinem effugere non tam propter pœnam legis ſtudeo, quam ut maxime aſſequar ἀποθέωσιν: quod poteram, ſi in ipſa villa facerem. ſed, ut ſæpe locuti ſumus, commutationes dominorum reformido. in agro ubicumque fecero, mihi videor aſſequi poſſe, ut poſteritas habeat religionem.* He gave his Imaginations a very proper Name (h). If Mr. *Moreri* had but given himſelf the trouble of conſidering with attention, what he took from the Moderns; had he then told us, "That *Cicero* "cauſed a Temple to be built, in which he en"cloſed *Tullia*'s Aſhes, in a lofty *Mauſoleum*?" Might he not have ſeen in the Author which he cites in the laſt Paſſage quotd by me, which ſays that *Cicero* deſigning an Apotheoſis, avoided all that could be thought to look like a Tomb? This was not an account of the Expence, as he clearly explains himſelf: (i) *Ante quam a te proxime diſceſſi, numquam mihi venit in mentem, quo plus inſumtum in monumentum eſſet, quam neſcio quid, quod lege conceditur, tantundem populo dandum eſſe, quod non magnopere moveret, niſi neſcio quomodo, ἀλόγως fortaſſe, nollem illud ullo nomine, niſi fani, appellari. quod ſi volumus, vereor ne aſſequi non poſſimus, niſi mutato loco.* According to *Cicero*'s Principles, nothing was more abſurd or impious, than to pay Divine Honours to thoſe Perſons on whoſe Tombs Funeral Rites were celebrated; and 'twas for this Reaſon that he ſays he would not have given his ſuffrage to the Decree of the Senate, which ordered Supplications to be made to *Julius Cæſar*: (k) *An me cenſetis, patres conſcripti, quod vos inviti ſecuti eſtis decreturum fuiſſe ut parentalia cum ſupplicationibus miſcerentur? ut inexpiabiles religiones in Rempublicam? ut decernerentur ſupplicationes mortuo?* ——— *Fuerit ille L. Brutus* ——————— *adduci tamen non poſſum ut quemquam mortuum conjungerem cum deorum immortalium religione, ut cujus ſepulchrum uſquam exſtet ubi parentetur, ei publicè ſupplicetur.* If Mr. *Moreri* had writ conſiderately, he had avoided another Miſtake. He aſſures us that *Cicero* actually cauſed a Temple to be built: Of which there appears no Footſteps in his Letters. *Cicero* appears very earneſt and warm on this Deſign, I own; we find him even threatning his good Friend, for not being ſufficiently expeditious, and prefixing a ſet time when the Work ſhould be finiſhed: but it doth not appear by any of his Letters, that it was ever perfected, or even begun. Is not this a ſign that his Project vaniſhed, and that either Time, which aſſwages Grief, had made him apprehend the ridiculous folly of his Deſign, or that unforeſeen Accidents, or other Affairs had diverted the Execution of his *Apotheoſis*.

Lactantius ſeveral times cites the Book *de Conſolatione*: By which it appears that *Tully* did not in the leaſt ſcruple to ſacrifice the Honour and Glory of the Gods to his ridiculous fancy of deifying his Daughter: To juſtify which, he ſhew'd that the Gods publickly adored in *Rome*, were formerly Men. This inſtance affords a natural Image of the Empire of the Paſſions. They ſpare nothing (l) in Heaven or Earth, when bent on their juſtification. *Lactantius* expreſſes himſelf very handſomly, and his words the rather deſerve our Tranſcribing, becauſe they contain a fragment of the loſt Book, and *Cicero*'s publick Promiſe to fix his Daughter amongſt the number of the Gods. (m) *M. Tullius* ——— *in eo libro quo ſeipſum de morte filiæ conſolatus eſt, non dubitavit dicere, Deos, qui publicè colerentur, homines fuiſſe. Quod ipſius teſtimonium eo debet graviſſimum judicari, quòd & augurale habuit Sacerdotium, & eoſdem ſe colere, venerarique teſtatur. Itaque intra paucos verſiculos duas res nobis dedit. Nam dum imaginem filiæ eodem ſe modo conſecraturum eſſe profitetur, quo illi à veteribus ſunt conſecrati, & illos mortuos eſſe docuit, & originem vanæ ſuperſtitionis oſtendit. CUM verò (inquit) & mares, & feminas complures ex hominibus in Deorum numero eſſe videamus, & eorum in urbibus, atque agris auguſtiſſima delubra veneremur, aſſentiamur eorum ſapientiæ, quorum ingeniis, & inventis omnem vitam legibus, & inſtitutis excultam, conſtitutamque habemus. Quod ſi ullum unquam animal conſecrandum fuit, illud perfectò fuit. Si Cadmi, aut Amphitryonis progenies, aut Tyndari in cœlum tollenda fama fuit, huic idem honos certe dicandus eſt, quod quidem faciam, teque omnium optimam, doctiſſimamque approbantibus Diis immortalibus ipſis in eorum cœtu locatam ad opinionem omnium mortalium conſecrabo.* I might ſtop here, but the reſt of this paſſage affording a Reflection, I ſhall ſubjoin it: (n) *Fortaſſe dicat aliquis præ nimio luctu deliraſſe Ciceronem. Atqui omnis illa oratio & doctrina, & exemplis, & ipſo loquendi genere perfecta non ægri, ſed conſtantis animi ac judicii fuit. Et hæc ipſa ſententia nullum præfert indicium doloris. Neque enim puto, illum tam variè, tam copioſè, tam ornatè ſcribere potuiſſe, niſi luctum ejus & ratio ipſa, & conſolatio amicorum, & temporis longitudo mitigaſſet. Lactantius* propoſes as an Objection: That perhaps *Cicero* raved, and the greatneſs of his Affliction had affected his Brain. But I averr, replies *Lactantius*, that his Book *de conſolatione* is ſo fine, that it could not have been compoſed by a Perſon which was not in his perfect Senſes, and whoſe Grief had not been worn off by Reaſon, the Conſolation of his Friends, or Time. He was obliged to turn the Argument upon this, in order to render *Cicero* an unqueſtionable Evidence. But if he had deſigned to prove the inſufficiency of Philoſophy to comfort a Man in Affliction, he would then have alledged this very Book of *Cicero*, (o) as the performance of a Man who confeſſed himſelf ſhamefully born down by Grief for the loſs of his Daughter. To what cauſe is this Conduct to be aſcribed? Is it owing to Inadvertence, or ſome rhetorical Artifice, that things are thus made uſe of to contrary ends?

(R) To

---

† See the latter end of the Remark Q.

* See the four firſt Remarks.

|| He quotes it; but the Printers have put a Comma after *Gaſpar*, which made many Reader believe that he had quoted two Writers, *Gaſpar* and *Sagittarius*.

(c) De Divinat. lib. 2. init.

(b) Cicero in Tuſcul. apud Conradum in Quæſtura, pag. 193.

(c) In Epitaphio Nepotiani.

(d) Quis enim ſufit quanoris eloquentiæ umine itæ huæ miſeriexplica, quam menta- us eſt Ciro in nſolatine de orte fiæ, ſicut uit? Auguſtin. civit. Dei lib. cap. 4.

(e) Cicero piſt. 18. lib. 12. ad ttic.

(f) Ibid. piſt. 43.

(g) Ibid. piſt. 36.

(h) Hæc tibi æ ineptiæ, fateor enim, tenendæ ſunt. Id.

(i) Ibid. piſt. 35.

(k) Cicero hilipp. 1.

(l) *We have ſeen of late a famous Miniſter, who endeavoured to find in the Prophets of the Old Teſtament all the Faults that were objected againſt the falſe Prophets of* Dauphiné, *whom he thought himſelf obliged to defend.*

(m) Lactant. Divin. inſtit. lib. 1. c. 15. p. m. 48.

(n) Ibid.

(o) *See above the Remark O.*

ng advanced, that Men come into the World only (R) to ſuffer the Puniſhment of their Sins, will admit of a good Reflection.

TURLUPINS, A Sect of impudent and ſcandalous Hereticks, who taught that when Man was arrived at a certain degree of Perfection, he was freed from the Yoak of the Divine Law: And contrary to the Doctrine of the *Stoicks*, who made the Liberty of their Wiſe Man conſiſt in being free from paſſions, they placed this liberty in being no longer ſubject to the Precepts of Eternal Wiſdom. They did not believe they ought to pray to God any otherwiſe than mentally; but what was yet more ſhocking in their Sect, was that

(R) *To ſuffer the Puniſhment of their ſins.*] He could not paint his Grief by more ſignal Characters, than by ſaying, that Humane life is a puniſhment, and criticiſing on thoſe of a contrary Opinion. (a) *Quid Ciceroni facimus? qui cum in principio conſolationis ſuæ dixiſſet luendorum ſcelerum cauſa naſci homines, iteravit id ipſum poſtea, quaſi objurgans eum qui vitam pœnam non eſſe putet.* *Lactantius* ought not to be blamed for cenſuring (b) this Aſſertion of *Cicero*; for it is certain that it betrays an Ignorance of the reaſon why God placed us in the World: but as this Reaſon was above the reach of natural light, and is only well known by the Evangelical Revelation, we ought not to be much ſurprized that *Cicero*, hurried on by Grief, and oppreſſed by Affliction, extended the Platonical Hypotheſis. *Plato's* Philoſophy taught, That the Soul of Man did exiſt before it was incloſed in a Human body, and that this anterior Eſtate had been much more glorious and happy than that of Man. Hence ſome Reaſoners advanced, that the Soul had never changed its Condition, if it had not deſerved chaſtiſement; and they concluded, (c) that it was confined to the Body as its Priſon, in order to inflict on it its deſerved Puniſhment. *Cicero* adopted this Hypotheſis, but *Lactantius* looks upon it as the moſt ſenſeleſs of all Extravagancies. And yet it differs from the Doctrine of Original Sin in its circumſtances only; for ſince the Chriſtian Faith inſtructs us, that *Adam* ſinned for himſelf and all his Poſterity, it follows, 1. That all Souls, in the Eye of God, are involved in Guilt even before they exiſt. 2. That they are united to the Body only by an Act of Puniſhment, ſince by their being united to the Body, they incur the Penalty of eternal Damnation, to which they are juſtly ſentenced; and it is by no other means than remiſſion and Grace that ſome are ſaved; wherefore the Scripture ſaith, (d) that all Men are born *Children of wrath*. *Lactantius* ought therefore to have refuted *Tully's* Hypotheſis more dexterouſly, and that by Proofs which only affect thoſe particulars in which it differs from that of Original Sin. If he had well conſider'd *Arnobius's* ſecond Book, he would have believ'd it not very eaſie to refute *Cicero* by Philoſophical Arguments; for I don't ſee what Reply the *Platoniſts* might offer to *Arnobius's* Reaſons, I mean thoſe Objections which he offered againſt the Aſſertion, that immortal Spirits in their own nature Innocent, Happy, abounding in Knowledge, either voluntarily deſcended into Humane Bodies, or were ſent thither by Providence. He makes a long enumeration of the Follies, Crimes and Miſeries of Mankind, and concludes that it was inconſiſtent with the Divine Goodneſs and Juſtice that ſuch Spirits ſhould be united to Humane Bodies. Into which he takes it to be exactly the ſame thing to command or ſuffer them to deſcend. *Atque ita perficitur*, ſays he (e), *ut nihil interſit omnino voluntarie venerint, an illius obtemperaverint juſſioni: cùm non prohibendo quòd oportuerat prohiberi, ceſſatione crimen fecerit proprium, & retentionis diſſimulatione permiſerit prius. Sed procul hæc abeat ſceleratæ opinionis immanitas, ut Deus credatur omnipotens, magnarum & inviſibilium rerum ſator & conditor, procreator, tam mobiles animas genuiſſe gravitatis ac ponderis conſtantiaque nullius, in vitia labiles, in peccatorum genera univerſa declives: cumque eas tales atque hujuſmodi ſciret, in corpora ire juſſiſſe, quorum inductæ carceribus ſub procellis agerent tempeſtatibuſque quotidie fortunæ, & modo turpia facerent, modo paterentur obſcœna: naufragiis, ruinis, incendiorum conflagrationibus ut perirent. Pauperies alias, alias ut mendicitas premeret, ut ferarum paterentur aliæ laniatus, muſcularum aliæ ut interirent veneno, claudæ ne incederent aliæ, ut aliæ lumen amitterent, ut articulis ſederent aliæ colligatis, morbis denique objectarentur ut cunctis, quos infelix & miſeranda mortalitas diverſarum ſuſtinet dilaceratione pœnarum: tum deinde oblitæ unius eſſe ſe fontis, unius genitoris & capitis, germanitatis convellerent atque abrumperent jura: urbes ſuas everterent, popularentur hoſtiliter terras, ſervos de liberis facerent, inſultarent virginibus, & matrimoniis alienis, odiſſent invicem ſeſe, aliorum gaudiis & felicitatibus inviderent: tum deinde ſe omnes maledicerent, carperent, & ſævorum dentium mordacitate laniarent. Sed procul hæc abeat, ut eadem rurſus frequentiuſque dicamus, tam immanis, & ſcelerata perſuaſio, ut ille ſalus rerum Deus, omnium virtutum caput, benignitatis & culmen; atque ut cum laudibus extollamus humanis, ſapientiſſimus, juſtus, perfecta omnia faciens, & integritatis ſuæ conſervantia menſuras, aut aliquid fecerit claudum, & quod minus eſſet a recto, aut ulli rei fuerit miſeriarum aut diſcriminum cauſa, aut ipſos actus quibus vita tranſigitur & celebratur humana, ordinaverit, juſſerit, & a ſua fluere conſtitutione præceperit. Minora hæc illo ſunt, & magnitudinis ejus deſtruentia poteſtatem: tantumque eſt longe ut iſtarum auctor rerum eſſe credatur, ut in ſacrilega crimen impietatis incurrat quiſquis ab eo conceperit hominem eſſe pregnatum, rem infelicem & miſeram, qui eſſe ſe doleat, qui conditionem ſuam deteſtetur & lugeat: qui nulla alia de cauſa ſeſe intelligat procreatum, quam ne materiam non haberent per quam diffunderent ſe mala, & eſſent miſeri ſemper, quorum cruciatibus paſceretur neſcio qua vis latens, & humanitati adverſa crudelitas.* To cenſure this Doctrine of *Arnobius* as an ill one, would be too great a piece of moderation, it ought to be called abominable; for it overthrows the foundations of Chriſtianity, and is not much better than the Doctrine of the *Manichees*. *Cicero* might have found in it as lively a Deſcription of Humane Miſery as he could have made; but he might have anſwered that Objection by his Hypotheſis of the pre-exiſtence of Sin, which however falſe it was, might yet inſpire Patience. For he might very well ſay to himſelf, "My Daughter's Death hath overwhelmed me, and plunged me into deſpair; but about or above two hundred Years ago, I committed ſome Crimes which deſerve this Puniſhment. I hereby expiate them. I ſuffer for them in this organized Priſon, in which my Soul was confined when I was born: It is juſt that I ſhould be unhappy, ſince I ſinned ſo long ago." If *Pſyche's* Father had reaſoned in this manner, he would not have anſwered, as the *French* Stage makes him anſwer to that Common place of Conſolation, That the Gods have the right to take away thoſe Children which they have given.

Ah, (f) cherche un meilleur fondement
Aux conſolations que ton cœur me preſente,
Et de la fauſſeté de ce raiſonnement
Ne fais point un accablement
A cette douleur ſi cuiſante,
Dont je ſouffre ici le tourment.
Crois tu la me donner une raiſon puiſſante
Pour ne me plaindre point de cet arrêt des Cieux!
Et dans le procedé des Dieux
Dont tu veux que je me contente,
Une rigueur aſſaſſinante
Ne paroit-elle pas aux yeux?
Voi l'état où ces Dieux *me forcent à (g) te rendre,*
Et l'autre où te receut mon cœur infortuné;
Tu connoitras par là qu'ils me viennent reprendre
Bien plus que ce qu'ils m'ont donné.
Je receus d'eux en toi, ma Fille,
Un preſent que mon cœur ne leur demandoit pas;
J'y trouvois alors peu d'appas,
Et leur en vis ſans joye accroître ma famille.
Mais mon cœur ainſi que mes yeux
S'eſt fait de ce preſent une douce habitude:
J'ai mis quinze ans de ſoins, de veilles, & d'étude,
A me le rendre precieux:
Je l'ay paré de l'aimable richeſſe
De mille brillantes vertus,
En lui j'ai renfermé per des ſoins aſſidus
Tous les plus beaux treſors que fournit la ſageſſe,
A lui j'ai de mon ame attaché la tendreſſe,
J'en ai fait de ce cœur le charme & l'allegreſſe,
La conſolation de mes ſens abbatus,
Le doux eſpoir de ma veilleſſe.
Ils m'otent tout cela, ces Dieux.

Et

(a) Lactant. Divin. Inſtit. lib. 3. c. 18. p. m. 197.

(b) Recte ergo profatus eſt errore ac miſerabili veritatis ignorantia ſe teneri. Id. Ibid.

(c) Quæ ignorantia effecit ut quoſdam dicere non puderet, idcirco nos eſſe natos ut ſcelerum pœnas lueremus, quo quid delirius dici poſſit non invenio. Ubi enim, vel quæ ſcelera potuimus admittere, qui omnino non fuimus. Id. Ibid. pag. 196.

(d) Eph. 2. 3.

(e) Arnobius, lib. 2. pag. m. 74, 75.

(f) Moliere, Tragedie de Pſiché, act. 2. ſcene 1.

(g) A Father is brought in ſpeaking to his Daughter, whom the Gods deſign'd ſhortly to take away from him.

that (Y) they went Naked, and according to the example of the Cynicks †, or rather of Brutes, they performed the work of the Flesh at Noon-Day in view of all the World. They affirmed we ought not to be aſhamed of any part which Nature has beſtowed on us. Notwithſtanding theſe profane Extravagancies they affected a very ſpiritual and devout Air, the better β to inſinuate themſelves into the Womens Favour, and allure them into the ſnare of their Unchaſte Deſires. For this is the fatal Rock of all thoſe Sects who aim at diſtinguiſhing themſelves by Paradoxes in Morality: Examine to the bottom the Viſions of the Pretenders to new Light, and of the Quietiſts, *&c.* You will find if any thing can Unmask them, 'tis ſomething relating to the Venereal Pleaſure; this is the weak part of the place, where the Enemy makes the Aſſault; it is a Worm which never dies, and a Fire which never goes out. Theſe Hereticks appeared in *France* in the Reign of *Charles* γ V. Their principal Scenes were *Savoy* and *Dauphine*. Great care was taken (Z) to purge the World of them. It is not eaſy to diſcover the true cauſe of their Name. *Vignier* derives it from their living in places expoſed to the Wolves. They affected to call themſelves the FRATERNITY OF THE POOR, as *du* || *Tillet* and *Gaguin* ‡ have obſerved.

TURPIN, a Fabulous Hiſtorian of the actions of *Charlemagne* and *Roland*. No Body at preſent takes him for *Turpin*, promoted to the Arch-Biſhoprick of *Reims* by *Charlemagne*, nor gives any credit to his Relations; but ſome believe

Et tu veux que je n'aye aucun ſujet de plainte
Sur cet affreux arrêt dont je ſouffre l'atteinte?
Ah! leur pouvoir ſe joue avec trop de rigueur
Des tendreſſes de nôtre cœur:
Pour m'ôter leur preſent, leur falloit-il attendre
Que j'en euſſe fait tout mon bien?
Ou plûtôt, s'ils avoient deſſein de le reprendre,
N'eût-il pas été mieux de ne me donner rien?

However I am apt to think that *Cicero* would much better have reliſhed *Arnobius*'s Diſcourſe, which doth not extenuate the Miſeries of Life, than that of *Lactantius* which doth Extenuate them. (a) *Quid ergo dicemus, niſi errare illos, qui aut mortem appetunt tanquam bonum, aut vitam fugiunt tanquam malum? Niſi quod ſunt iniquiſſimi, qui pauciora mala non penſant bonis pluribus? Nam cum omnem vitam per exquiſitas, & varias traducant voluptates, mori cupiunt, ſi quid fortè his amaritudinis ſupervenerit: & ſic habent, tanquam illis nunquam fuerit benè, ſi aliquando fuerit male. Damnant igitur vitam omnem, plenamque nihil aliud, quàm malis opinantur. Hinc nata eſt inepta illa ſententia, hanc eſſe mortem, quam nos vitam putemus, illam vitam, quam nos pro morte timeamus. Ita primum bonum eſſe non naſci, ſecundum, citius mori. Quæ ut majoris ſit authoritatis, Sileno attribuitur. Cicero in conſolatione: NON (inquit) longe optimum, nec in hos ſcopulos incidere vitæ: Proximum autem ſi natus ſis, quam primum mori, & tanquam ex incendio effugere fortunæ. Credidiſſe illum vaniſſimo dicto exinde apparet, quòd adjecit aliquid de ſuo, ut ornaret.* By this we are informed that *Cicero* in his Book *de Conſolatione*, put a great value on this Sentence of *Silenus*: "The "higheſt pitch of Happineſs is never to be Born, "and next to that to eſcape very quickly out of "this Life as out of a Houſe on Fire.

He mentions this Sentence in one of his Books at preſent Extant, and adds ſome Verſes which import that we ought to Mourn at the Birth and Rejoyce at the Death of Men. (b) *Fertur etiam de Sileno fabella quædam: qui cùm à Mida captus eſſet, hoc ei muneris pro ſua miſſione dediſſe ſcribitur: Docuiſſe regem, NON NASCI HOMINI LONGE optimum eſſe: Proximum autem, quam primùm mori: Quâ eſt ſententia in Creſphonte uſus Euripides.*

Nam nos decebat cœtus celebrantis domum,
Lugere, ubi eſſet aliquis in lucem editus,
Humanæ vitæ varia reputantis mala:
At, qui labores morte finiſſet gravis,
Hunc omneis amicos laude & lætitia exequi.

Plutarch hath the Original Greek (c) of theſe Verſes, which run thus in *Amyot*'s Verſion:

Plorer convient celui qui ſort du ventre
Pour tant de maux auſquels naiſſant il entre,
Et convoyer au ſepulchre le mort,
Qui des travaux de ceſte vie ſort,
En faiſant tous ſigne d'aiſe & de joye,
En beniſſant de ſon depart la VOYE.

Lactantius ſuppoſes one thing which *Cicero* would have denyed him: That the good things of this Life ſurpaſs the Evil. I am ſure that the diſmal State to which *Cicero* was reduced by the loſs of *Tullia*, appeared to him ſuch a weighty Preſſure that he would very willingly have quitted all the Luſtre of his Glory, to be delivered from this inſupportable Anxiety. I believe withal that he would not have returned in to the World, on condition of paſſing through the various States that he had gone through (d). We have already ſeen what he made *Cato* ſay (e): He thought as much of himſelf. He had nevertheleſs a large ſhare of Fortune's Favours: His Eloquence was admired; he was raiſed to the firſt dignities of the Republick; he acquired a glorious Character: But if I am not miſtaken, he wou'd have ſwore that all the Pleaſures of his Life weighed againſt the Pain and Uneaſineſs which he had endured, or did then feel, would not have amounted to an Ounce in a Pound. I ſhall elſewhere touch on this Diſpute (f): Whether the Good things of this Life ſurmount the Evil. Authors are divided on this Subject, ſome declare for the Affirmative, others for the Negative.

(Y) *That they went Naked.*] We cannot ſufficiently wonder that ſuch a whimſical Fancy ſhould be ſo often renewed amongſt Chriſtians. Paganiſm affords us only the Sect of the Cynicks who hit on this impudent Practice; and it muſt alſo be obſerved that this Sect was not Numerous, and that the greateſt part of the Cynicks did not diſcover their Nudity, as it was ſaid of *Diogenes*. The Indian Gymnoſophiſts were not Naked in thoſe parts which the *Adamites*, *Turlupins*, *Picards*, and ſeveral *Anabaptiſts* diſcovered. We ought then to grant, that in that reſpect the Chriſtians have been more irregular than the Pagans. At which we ſhall not be ſurprized, when we obſerve that a Goſpel Principle, of which the Pagans were ignorant, is liable to this Abuſe. I mean that the ſecond *Adam* came to repair the Evil which the firſt had introduced into the World. From hence a Fanatick ventures to conclude, that thoſe who are once partakers of the benefits of the Covenant of Grace, are perfectly reſtored to the State of *Adam* and *Eve*. I own that Fanaticiſm muſt be far advanced, and the Doſe muſt be very large, which is able to overcome the Impreſſions of Modeſty which Nature and a Chriſtian Education have ſtamped on us; but what is not the infinite Combination of our Paſſions, Imaginations, animal Spirits, *&c.* capable of doing? I have in another place (g) ſpoken of ſome Antient Anachorets, who ſcrupled to ſee their own Nudity. The Pagans afford us no ſuch Example that I know of; they were only very careful of hiding it from the Eyes of others. This was obſerved not only amongſt the Women, but alſo amongſt ſome very Debauched Men: And therefore *Petronius* did not ſtretch too far when he ſaid, *Quam ne ad cognitionem quidem admittere ſeverioris notæ homines ſolent.*

(Z) *Great care was taken to purge the World of them.*] The following words afford us a Specimen of that Diligence

---

† *Cynicorum Philoſophorum more omnia verenda publicitus nudata geſtabant, & in publico velut jumenta coibant, inſtar canum in multitudine exercitio membrorum pudendorum degentes. Gerſon apud Prateol.*

β Gerſon apud eundem.

γ Mezeray, Abregé, chronolog. tom. 3. p.m. 227. *Dutch Edit.*

* Ad ann. 1159.

|| Chroniq. des Rois de France, *under Charles* V.

‡ *In the Life of Charles* V.

(a) Lactant. ubi ſupra, pag. 198.

(b) Cicero Tuſcul. 1. ſub fin. m. 153. ...ſe. *See the Remark* ... *of the Article* Xenophanes towards the end.

(c) Plut. de Audiend. Poetis ſub ... pag. ...6.

(d) *Compare with this what ſhall be ſaid in the Remark* F *of the Article* Vayer.

(e) *In the Remark* ... *of the Article* Porcius.

(f) *In the Article* Xenophanes.

(g) *In the Remark* F *of the Article* Adamites.

lieve him to be as antient as (*A*) that Arch-Biſhop. Others rather incline to fix him in the XIIth Century (*B*). If it were true that ſome (*C*) Popes or Councils declared his Book Authentick, it wou'd be a clear proof of a groſs Ignorance, or of an egregious Impoſture.

Mr. *Allard* * affirms that the Romance of the Arch-Biſhop *Turpin* of the Year 1092, was compoſed at *Vienne*, by a Monk of St. *Andrew*.

TURRETIN

ſiance: (*a*) "To Brother *James le More*, of the "Preaching Order, Inquiſitor of the Sodomites in "the Province of *France*, as a Gift beſtowed on him "by the King by his Letters Patents the 2d of *February* 1373, for and in Compenſation of ſeveral "Pains, Miſſions and Expences which he had been "at, ſuffered and ſuſtained in purſuit of the Male "and Female *Turlupins* whom he found and took in "the ſaid Province, and who by his diligence have "been Puniſhed for their Errors and Falſities, the "Sum of 50 Francs which are worth 40 *Paris* Livres. *Gagnin* obſerves in his Life of *Charles* V. that "the Books and Veſtments of the *Turlupins* were burnt in the Hogs-Market at *Paris*, "without the Gate of St. *Honoré*; that *Joan Dabentonne*, and a Man, being the Chief Holders-"Forth of that Sect, were alſo burnt; but the latter, "*ſays he*, whom I do not name, dying in Priſon, "before Sentence, his Corps was kept Fifteen Days "in a heap of Lime, after which it was burnt at "the time appointed for Execution. *Du Tillet* faith alſo that under *Charles* V. "the ſuperſtitious Religion of the *Turlupins*, who had called "their Sect the FRATERNITY OF THE "POOR, was Condemned and Aboliſhed, and "their Ceremonies, Books and Cloaths condemned "and burnt." But how do theſe Cloaths which were burnt agree with the report of thoſe, who tell us that they went Naked? We muſt ſuppoſe the Nakedneſs of all theſe ſorts of Fanaticks to have been limited with regard to times, places, and certain Members. We have ſeen that the *Adamites* did not ſtrip themſelves any where but in the Stoves where they met, and that the *Picards* condemned above all, thoſe who did not ſhew their Privy-Parts. The Cold and Rain would not permit them to go always Naked: It is not at all probable that they durſt regularly and continually appear Naked in thoſe Cities in which they were not ſtrong enough; and it ſeems that the *Turlupins* diſcovered only the Parts which diſtinguiſh the Sexes. (*b*) *Turleupini Cynicorum ſectam ſuſcitantes de nuditate* PUDENDORUM *& publico coitu*. My Citation out of *Gerſon* amounts to the ſame thing. They had then Cloaths notwithſtanding their Impudence; and probably before Perſons not yet Initiated, or thoſe they intended to draw into their Nets, they did not immediately ſhew their Privy-Parts.

(*A*) *Believe him to be as Antient as that Arch-Biſhop.*] *Papyrius Maſſo* places him a little after the Reign of *Charles* the Bald; but ſpeaks of him as of a Miſerable Author, who miſpent his leaſure Hours in compoſing a Romance for the uſe of Children. See the following Remark.

WE FIND a very curious Obſervation in Mr. *Catel*. This Author having mentioned ſome Lyes of *Tilpin* or *Turpin* Arch-Biſhop of *Rheims*, adds: (*c*) "Theſe Fables written by *Tilpin* are very Antient; the Book is to be ſeen in Manuſcript in a "very Antique Letter, and in old French, in ſeveral "Libraries: They are followed by many Old Authors, as by *Matthew Paris*, who wrote the Hiſtory of *England*; *Dante* an antient *Italian* Poet; *Chalcondylas* in his Hiſtory of the *Turks*; *Petrus Venetus* in his Catalogue of Saints, who wrote "the Life of *Roland* and others, which he partly "extracted from the ſaid *Tilpin*, and *Godfery* of *Viterbo* in his Hiſtory called *Pantheon*, who improving thoſe Fables, adds that *Charlemagne* was "at *Jeruſalem* to viſit the Holy Places, where the "Myſteries of our Redemption were accompliſhed. "But moſt of what theſe Hiſtorians have written is "Fabulous, for *Tilpin* himſelf in the Preface of his "Hiſtory inſcribed to *Leopard* Dean of *Aix la Chapelle*, ſaith, that *Charlemagne*'s Spaniſh Wars "are not mentioned in the Antient Chronicles of "St. *Denys*, of which he might be very well informed being a Monk of the Order of St. *Denys*. And beſides it is very hard to believe that "Arch-Biſhop *Tilpin* ſhould be the Author of this "Romance, which contains the Hiſtory of *Charlemagne*, in which the Death of that Prince "is mentioned, which happened in 814, and yet "Arch-Biſhop *Tilpin* Dyed in 813, as *Trithemius* with a great deal of probability obſerves; "for *Wulfarius* who ſucceeded him in his Biſhoprick, held a Council in 814, as *Flodoart* in the "third Book of his Hiſtory of *Rheims* informs "us.

(*B*) *Fix him in the XIIth Century.*] *Oihenart* is ſurprized that *Papyrius Maſſo* places him much higher. (*d*) *Hanc* (de rebus Caroli Magni prodigioſam Hiſtoriam) *neſcio quo argumento, Papyrius Maſſonus* (*etſi authorem imperitiæ & mendacii damnet*) *è vetuſtate commendat. Dum, non multò poſt Caroli Calvi imperium, ab homine otioſo in juventutis gratiam ſcriptam fuiſſe videri pronunciat.* Here is the reaſon which induced *Oihenart* to believe that *Turpin* lived in the XIIth Century, and was a Spaniard. Mr. *des Cordes* Canon of *Limoges* had lent him a Manuſcript of this Hiſtory, to which was prefixed a Preface written by a Prior a little before the Year 1200. (*e*) This Preface teſtifies that the Prior had lately recovered that Manuſcript, which was brought him out of *Spain*, and which he took for Arch-Biſhop *Turpin*'s Hiſtory, to whoſe Interceſſion he devoutly recommends himſelf. I believe his own words may not be unacceptable here: (*f*) *Gaufredus Prior Voſienſis, ſacro Martialis conventui & univerſo Clero Lemovicini climatis gaudiis ſempiternis perfrui. Egregios invicti Regis Caroli triumphos ac præcelſi Comitis Rotholandi prædicandos agones in Hiſpania geſtos nuper ad nos ex Eſperiâ delatos gratanter excepi & ingenti ſtudio corrigens ſcribere feci, maximè quod apud nos iſta latuerant hactenus, niſi quæ joculatores in ſuis præferebant cantilenis. Quia verò ſcriptura ipſa Scriptorum vitio depravata ac pene deleta fuerat non ſine magno ſtudio decoranda correxi, non ſuperflua ſubtrahens, ſed quæ neceſſaria aderant, addens, ne quis me putet reprehendere inclita laudis Turpinum qui ſe infraſcripta ſcripſiſſe fatetur. Ego tanti Pontificis orationibus mihi a judice pio dari veniam opto.*

(*C*) *That ſome Popes or Councils declared his Book Authentick.*] (*g*) *Voſſius* having obſerved that this Hiſtory in the Manuſcript of it in *Bennet*-College Library at *Cambridge*, is Intituled, *liber Turpini Archiepiſcopi Rhemenſis quomodo Carolus Rex Francorum adquiſivit Hiſpaniam*, adds, that Pope *Calixtus* declared it Authentick: He doth not ſay this on his own Authority, but on the credit of *Thomas James*, which he ſuppoſes grounded on the Title of the Book, or ſome Manuſcript Note: (*h*) *Hunc librum dicit Papa Calixtus eſſe authenticum, ut adjungit Thomas James: Ut puto ex MSi operis inſcriptione ſive nota ei addita.* *Voſſius* did not know the Foundation of *James*'s Aſſertion; he did not remember a certain place in the *Faſciculus temporum*. The thing is this. Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornai* ſpeaking of ſome Canons of a Council held at *Rheims* in 1119. adds this Reflection, "And obſerve by what "Spirit thoſe Biſhops were Influenced, who in "the ſame Council declared the Hiſtory of *Charlemagne* by Arch-Biſhop *Turpin* Authentick, "which is Fabulous and Ridiculous, and as ſuch "condemned and ſentenced by *Baronius* himſelf "(*i*)". *Coeffeteau* anſwered him thus: (*k*) *He cites in the Margin his trifling Chronicler* Faſciculus temporum, *who doth not ſay one word of this Synod: and the Fraud proceeds from hence, that he ſpeaking of* Calixtus *ſaith,* He wrote a little Book of the Miracles of St. *James*: He alſo made a Statute concerning the Hiſtory of *Charles*, compiled by Bleſſed *Turpin* Arch-Biſhop of *Rheims*. *Well! Reader, is it not a pretty Concluſion?* Calixtus *made a Statute concerning the Hiſtory of* Charles, *written by the Arch-Biſhop of* Rheims: *Ergo the Council of* Rheims, *where he preſided, declared this Book Authentick. Certainly they had ſomething elſe to do than amuſe themſelves with theſe Fables. But after all where did his wretched Chronicler find that* Calixtus *made* this

---

* Allard, Bibliotheque de Dauphiné at the end.

(*a*) Ex computo Nicolai Mauregart, Burgenſis Pariſienſis de auxilio Præpoſituræ Pariſienſ. an. 1374. apud Du Cange Gloſſar. voce *Turlupini*.

(*b*) Genebrard Chronic.

(*c*) Catel, Memoires de l'Hiſtoire du Languedoc pag. 545.

(*d*) Ap. [illegible] Oihenart. Notit. [illegible] pag. [illegible]

(*e*) MS. præfixo hiſtoriæ illi, a Gaufredo Priore Voſienſi, qui [illegible] annum [illegible] habet, in exemplari manuſcripto, cujus copiam fecit Joannes Cordeſius Canonicus Lemovicenſis, plane [illegible] opus, recens tempore Gaufredi [illegible], Hiſpani hominis illo ipſo ſæculo xii. viventis, abortum eſſe. Ibid.

(*f*) Apud Oihenartum ibid.

(*g*) Voſſius, de hiſtor. Latinis, lib. 2. [illegible] p. m. [illegible]

(*h*) Id. ib.

(*i*) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'iniquité, pag. [illegible] He quotes Faſciculus temporum an. 1119.

(*k*) Coeffeteau, Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité, pag. [illegible]

TURRETIN (FRANCIS), a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at *Geneva* (*A*) his Native Country, was born the 17. *October* 1623. Having ſtudied at *Geneva*, *Leyden*, *Paris*, *Saumur*, *Montauban* and *Nimes* with great Succeſs, he was admitted to the Holy Miniſtry in 1648, and officiated at the ſame time in the *French* and *Italian* Churches at *Geneva*. Two Years after he was offered the Philoſophy Profeſſorſhip, which he refuſed, but he complied with a Call to the Church of *Lyons* †. He was recalled to *Geneva* at a Year's end, that City wanting him for their Theological Lectures, on which he entred in the Year 1653. He was deputed to *Holland* in 1661. to requeſt a pecuniary aſſiſtance which the City of *Geneva* then wanted: In which journey he met with all the Succeſs which he could promiſe himſelf, and got ſo great a Reputation, that the Walloon Churches of the *Hague* and *Leyden* earneſtly invited him to their Miniſtry, and the Univerſity at the latter of theſe places paſſionately intreated his ſtay. After his return, he reaſſumed the exerciſe of his Office, in which he continued until his Death with very great Application. He dyed the 28 of *September* 1687. with the moſt edifying Marks of an ardent Love for God ||. He was a Man of a great deal of Merit; he was eloquent, judicious, laborious, learned, and zealous for Orthodoxy. All which appears by the Books he hath (*B*) publiſhed. He left a Son (*C*) endowed with extraordinary parts.

TUSCUS (BALERUS) went (as we are told) for the Author of a Book condemned by the Inquiſition in 1622. and entituled *Tela Catholica contra judicia erronea*, he went I ſay, for the Author of this Treatiſe, becauſe it was thought that the Style diſcovered it to be written by him *. Brother *Angel of the Purification*, Hiſtoriographer of the Order of the Barefooted *Carmelites* made uſe of this inſtance to Authoriſe his ſuſpicion that *Conrad Janningus* the *Jeſuit* was the Author of a Letter diſperſed under the Emperor's Name, and written to his Catholick Majeſty in the Year 1696. and alledged alſo that by this Conformity of Style St. *Jerome* ‡ found that *John* of *Jeruſalem* was the Author of a certain Letter. We ſhall ſee (*Z*) his Illuſions. It is certain that the Letter diſperſed under the Emperor's Name was really written by his Imperial Majeſty.

VAYER

this Statute? What appearance is there that he ſhould trouble himſelf with this Romance? Gretſer the *Jeſuit* anſwering the ſame Book of *du Pleſſis* doth not know whether what is related concerning this Authentickneſs of *Turpin* ought to be reckoned *Fabulous*. Perhaps, ſaith he, we ſhould not be in the wrong to deny all this, (*a*) for the Acts of the Council nor the Commentary of *Heſſo* the Scholaſtick do not Mention it at all. The *Faſciculus temporum* only hints it in an indefinite manner: *Statuit etiam* (Calixtus) *hiſtoriam Caroli deſcriptam a beato Turpino Remenſi Archiepiſcopo*. He doth not tell us the Contents of this Statute, where or when it was made: But let us grant, ſaith *Gretſer*, that *Calixtus* approved this Book; what Advantage accrues thereby to the *Myſtery of iniquity?* This Hiſtory is not ſuch a lying one but the Proteſtants have publiſhed it amongſt the Ancient Hiſtories: (*b*) *At demus Calixtum Hiſtoriam Turpini ſtatuiſſe, hoc eſt, confirmaſſe, quid utilitatis inde ad Myſterium Pleſſæum redit? Quæ tam fabuloſa non eſt, ut abſterreat ipſos etiam Sectarios, quò minus eam cum aliis veterum monumentis publicent. Teſtis Juſtus Reuberus, qui a ſuo Tomo Antiquorum Scriptorum* Turpinum *excludere, turpe duxit*. This laſt part of the *Jeſuit's* Anſwer is very pitiful; for if it be a ſhameful thing, as it is no doubt, for a Council to approve a Book Stuffed with impertinent Fables, *du Pleſſis*'s reflection is very judicious. And then is it to prove ſtrongly that a Hiſtory is good, to ſay that a Huguenot or Lutheran compiler hath publiſhed it amongſt other Books? Is it not ſometimes a ſufficient Reaſon for the inſerting a Book in a Collection that it hath ſome Antiquity? And after all is an Orthodox Neceſſarily Happy in the Choice of Authors, who beſt deſerve to be placed in a Collection of Hiſtorians? *Gretſer* had done very well to have kept to his firſt Anſwer: He ought to have been ſatiſfied with the *Faſciculus*'s being no good Witneſs againſt him. Mr. *Rivet* is of the ſame Opinion; he replies for M. *du Pleſſis* in the following manner: " (*c*) It is of no importance whether *Calixtus* confirmed this Hiſtory of " *Turpin* in a Council, or whether he did it alone by " Virtue of his Authority. It is undeniable that the " *Carthuſian*, who collected the *Faſciculus*, expreſſed " himſelf thus, *ſtatuit hiſtoriam Caroli, deſcriptam* " *a B. Turpino, Rhemenſi Archiepiſcopo*. Here *Coeffeteau* inſults *du Pleſſis*, after his falſe verſion, " *he made a ſtatute concerning the Hiſtory of Charles* " inſtead of *he decreed*, that is, *eſtabliſhed* or *confirmed* " the Hiſtory of *Charles*. He may learn at his leiſure " from any pedantick *Grammarian* the difference betwixt *Statuere Hiſtoriam* and *Statuere de* " *Hiſtoria*. If this ſorry Chronicler is miſtaken, if " he ſaith this without mentioning any Author, " we are not to blame. We return to the Papiſts " what they give us. For my part I am partly " of Opinion that it is a miſtake, and that inſtead " of *Calixtus*'s Statutes *for the Eſtabliſhment of Arch-* " *Biſhop Turpin*, he miſtook and inſerted the Eſtabliſhment of Arch-Biſhop *Turpins*'s Hiſtory.

(*A*) Geneva *his Native Country*.] *Francis* TURRETIN his Grandfather of an Ancient and Noble Family of *Lucca*, having left *Italy* on Account of his Religion, reſided ſome Years at *Antwerp*, and was Familiarly acquainted with the Famous *Saint Aldegonde*. He afterwards went to *Zurich*, and at laſt fixed at *Geneva*, where he had a Son Named *Benedict* TURRETIN, who was an Illuſtrious Profeſſor of Divinity, in that City, very well known by his Writings (*d*): This was the Father of our *Francis Turretin*. All which the Reader may find in the Funeral Oration of the Letter pronounced by Mr. *Pictet* his Nephew, a very Elegant piece and worthy of its Author, who is a Miniſter and Profeſſor at *Geneva*, and Author, beſides other Works, of a Book entituled *Morale Chretienne* in ſeveral Volumes in 12. and of a *Theologia Chriſtiana in* 8.

(*B*) *By the Books he hath publiſhed.*] Beſides his Sermons Dedicated to Madam *de Schomberg*, he wrote an Anſwer to a tract Publiſhed by a Canon of *Aneci*, to expoſe the Proteſtants amongſt other Topics, on that of the Obedience of Subjects to lawful Princes. He alſo anſwered the Biſhop of *Lucca*'s Letter to the Families of *Geneva*, originally deſcended from his Dioceſs, to exhort them to the Profeſſion of the Catholick Faith which their Anceſtors had abandoned. But what will chiefly immortalize him is (*e*) his *Inſtitutio Theologiæ Elenctica* in three Volumes in 4. and his *Theſes de Satisfactione Chriſti* against the Socinians, and *De neceſſaria ſeceſſione ab Eccleſia Romana*.

(*C*) *A Son endowed with extraordinary parts.*] I have cited (*f*) ſomewhere the Learned *Theſes* which he maintained at *Leyden* in 1692. The Carteſian Philoſophy, in which he was ſo perfectly inſtructed by Mr. *Chouet* (*g*), does very much ſet off his great knowledge of Divinity. A Profeſſorſhip of Sacred Hiſtory in the Academy of *Geneva* was erected on his Account, which he very worthily diſcharges, as well as the Office of Miniſter.

(*Z*) *We ſhall ſee his Illuſions.*] Father *Papebroch*, who

|| Taken from his Funeral Oration pronounced at *Geneva* by Mr *Pictet* the 28. of Novemb. 1687.

† To ſucceed *Aaron Morus*, Brother to Mr *Morus*.

* Lancell. [illegible] cap. 9. apud Papebroch. [illegible] Histor. pag. 149.

‡ Hieron. epiſt. 5. apud eund. ibid.

(*d*) *He wrote amongſt other Books, the* Defenſe des verſions de Geneva contre le Pere Coton. *That work contains* 2. *Vol. in* 4. *He publiſh'd alſo ſome French Sermons intituled* Profit des chatimens. *He had been Miniſter of the Church of* Nimes.

(*e*) *See the Encomium beſtowed upon it in the* Dutch *Edition* 1696. *It has been abridged for the uſe of Young Students. The Author of that Abridgment, which was Printed the Second time at* Amſterdam 1695. *calls himſelf* Leonard Rijſſenius.

(*f*) *In the Article* Nicolle.

(*g*) *This Illuſtrious Profeſſor, the Ornament of* Geneva, *has been long ſince removed from his Profeſſorſhip, and admitted into the Government of the Republick.*

(*a*) Neque enim in actis quidquam hujus apparet, ut nec in Commentario Heſſonis Scholaſtici, qui res geſtas hujus Concilii ex profeſſo literis mandavit. Gretſer. in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani, pag. 375.

(*b*) Id. ib.

(*c*) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité, tom. 2. pag. 238.

V

VAYER (FRANCIS DE LA MOTHE LE) a *Parisian*, Counsellor of State in Ordinary, and Preceptor to the Duke of *Anjou*, only Brother of King *Lewis* XIV. was a very Learned Man. He was admitted into the *French* Academy (*A*) the 14th of *February* 1639. He had more Reading and Learning than the greatest part of that Society, but of most of them wrote more Elegantly than he: For his Style was not very polite; and if he had made less use of his Memory and of his Reading of the Latin Authors than he did, he would yet have come far short of Perfection in Language. He was a Man of a regular Conduct, very like that of the Ancient Sages: A true Philosopher in his Manners, who despis'd even lawful Pleasures, and was passionately fond of a studious Life, and of Reading and Composing of Books. This Regularity, Austerity and Wisdom, did not prevent his being suspected of having no (*B*) Religion. It's likely that this Suspicion was grounded on some Dialogues which he wrote, and which appear'd under the Name of * *Orasius Tubero*, and on his discovering in his Works too great a prepossession in favour of Scepticism or the Pyrrhonian Principles. It is certain there is a great deal of Libertinism in the Dialogues of *Orasius Tubero*; but he that should conclude from thence that the Author had no Religion, would render himself guilty a very rash Judgment: For there is a vast difference betwixt writing freely what may be objected against Faith, and believing it to be really true. Several People persuade themselves that these Dialogues hinder'd his Preferment to the Place (*C*) (design'd for him) of Preceptor to his Majesty. This is not very probable, since if the Queen or Cardinal *Mazarin* had been shocked by this Reason, they would

who hath inserted in one of his Books this Carmelite Historiographer's Complaint to the tribunal of the Inquisition, says that the Imperial Embassadour at *Madrid* demanded that the Author of this injurious Complaint against the Emperor should be punished, and that it was reported that this Carmelite escaped the Punishment only by disowning the Accusation. Observe that this Accuser attempting to prove that the Letter, which he pretended to be suppositious, was *Janningus*'s Style, cited as the works of that *Jesuit* two Tracts which were Written by *Sebastian de St. Paul* a Carmelite Monk (*a*). Was not this effectually to prove the Conformity of Style? Father *Papebroch* adds (*b*) that he has not found the Name of *Balerus Tuscus* in any Catalogue of Books Condemned by the Inquisition, and suspects that this *Balerus* having prefixed his Name to a Book, wherein the Private Regulations of the East-India Company, were blamed, the *Dutch* Ministers censured him, and that the Author anonymously opposed that Censure by his *Tela Catholica*, which were also Condemned. He also conjectures that *Lambertus Batavus* was Captain of a Ship in the *Dutch* Service, and consequently a Protestant, and that his Book taught the Art of Sailing in all parts of the World. At last he saith that the most expert in Affairs of this Nature could not hitherto discover any thing concerning this Book at *Amsterdam*. (*c*) *ipso* (libro) *necdum reperto, licet ab ejusdem rerum peritissimis Amstelodami quæsitus sit.* I never met with any Person who had heard of this Book, nor have I found the Title of it in any Catalogue.

(*A*) *He was admitted into the French Academy.*] Mr. *Esprit* and he were admitted unto it on the same day. Mr. *Balzac* Writ on this Subject to his Friend Mr. *Chapelain* thus: (*d*) *I rejoyce at the Academy's new acquest of the Philosopher——who indeed is a fine Gentleman and doth not want Wit, tho' he for the most part makes use of that of others.* I observe here by the way that *Moreri*, when he saith, that *la Mothe le Vayer was one of the first admitted into the Academy*, is mistaken. For that cannot be said of a Man elected (*e*) in the place of a dead Academick.

(*B*) *His being suspected of having no Religion.*] *Patin* shall be my Evidence " (*f*) Mr. *de la Mothe le Vayer* was lately called to Court, and made " Preceptor to the Duke of *Anjou* the King's " Brother. He is about 60 Years old, of a mid- " dle stature, as much a Stoick as any Man in the " World; he is one who wou'd be praised him- " self but never praises any Body, fantastical and " capricious, suspected also of the Spiritual Vice " with which *Diagoras* and *Protagoras* were taint- " ed." *Patin* wrote this Letter the 13. of *July* 1649.

(*C*) *His preferment to the place (designed for him) of Preceptor to his Majesty.*] *Moreri* says that he was Preceptor to the King for a Year: But I dont believe it; for the Learned *Naudé* informs me of some things which contradict that Opinion. He tells us: " (*g*) I have also been " always persuaded, that the Choice of Men was " one of the most difficult things at Court. But I " was throughly convinced of it when the Question " was put who should be Preceptor to the King; for " the intention of the Queen and the Ministers " being to commit that Charge to one of the " ablest, most Famous, and esteemed persons in " *France*, they first cast their Eyes on Mr. *de la Motte le Vayer*, as on him whom Cardinal *Richelieu* had designed for that post, induced thereto " as well by the excellent Book which he had " writ about the Education of the *Dauphin*, as " on Account of the Reputation he had acquired " by his many other Writings of being the *French* " *Plutarch*. But the Queen having resolved never " to bestow that place on a Married Man, they " were necessarily obliged to think of another; " which was Mr. *Aubert*, *Abbot* of *Saint Remy*, " Principal of the College of *Laon*, Canon of that " City, and *Regius* Professor of the *Greek* Tongue " of whose polite Manners, Probity, Learning, and " Facility of expressing himself in the *Latin* and " *French* Language no Man can doubt *modo caput* " *habeat extra cucurbitam.* But neither he, nor Mr. " *Gassendi* the only Oracle in our time of Phi- " losophy, Mathematicks and Astronomy, and of " whatever is excellent in the most Sublime Sci- " ences; nor also Mr. *Rigaud*, tho' the *Coriphæus* " of our Humanists, and of a Capacity universal- " ly known to extend to all other Sciences; af- " ter having been put to the Tryal without " knowing any thing of it, did not stand it so " well as the *Abbot de Beaumont*, Doctor of Divi- " nity and at present worthy Bishop of *Rodez*, " who was also preferred to another of the most " Shining lights of the Clergy, because not being " inferior to any of the preceding, he had some- " other qualities, which turned the balance on his " side." The Reason (*h*) which I have advanced against those who pretend that the Dialogues of *Orasius Tubero* were the occasion of our *Vayer*'s being excluded from this Charge, seems to me demonstrative; for tho' 'tis usual to take a greater care of a Young King's Education, than of his Brother's, yet they would never give a Precepter to a King's Brother, whom they wou'd not have intrusted with the King's Charge, for fear of an impious Education. If there had been no other Reason, *la Mothe le Vayer* had been chosen Preceptor to *Lewis* the XIV. notwithstanding his Dialogues, as well as to the Duke of *Anjou*: For since it was judged that so Wise a Man would carefully avoid instilling the Libertinism of *Orasius Tubero* into would not have entrusted the King's only Brother to his care. The World was surpriz'd that so wise a Man (D) should write so very freely on Obscene Subjects, but they were just enough at the same time not to draw any Conclusion from thence to the prejudice of his Morals: So true it is that the Publick is not always Rash, Blind

---

* *These Names, and those of* Tubertus Ocella, *under which he disguis'd himself upon some occasion relate to the signification of* la Mothe le Vayer, *or* Voyer.

(*a*) Daniel. Papebrochius elucidat. historica actorum in Controversia Carmelitica pag. 150. *See also the* 1. *Part of his answer art.* 11. *n.* 240. 241.

(*b*) Id. ib. pag. 153.

(*c*) Id. ib.

(*d*) Pellisson, Hist. de l'Acad. Françoise, p. m. 228.

(*e*) Balzac's 1st. *letter of the* 4. *Book to Chapelain page* 149. 150. Dutch Edit. 1661. *That letter is dated the* 4. *of January* 1639.

(*e*) *See* Pellisson. ubi supra.

(*f*) Patin, letter 22. pag. 97. & 98. *of the* 1. *Vol.*

(*g*) Naudé Dialogue de Mascurat, pag. 575.

(*h*) *In the Text of this Article.*

into the Young Duke, 'twas more reasonable to conclude that he never durst presume to inspire it into the Young Monarch. *Cardinal Mazarin* knew perfectly well that a Philosopher, who by I know not what thread of ratiocination is led to Pyrrhonism in Religion, is a Man of a clearly different Character from a Man who becomes impious out of Brutality and Debauchery. Such a Philosopher, in all particulars like *la Mothe le Vayer*, would be very uneasy, that Persons liable to make an ill use of his Opinions should ever imbibe them. He would always be so discreet as to keep them from Youth, and much more from a Prince whose solid Piety may extremely contribute to the publick Happiness.

What *Moreri* says that *la Mothe le Vayer* was Preceptor to his Majesty for the space of one Year, is affirmed * by *Mr. Pellisson*: And we find in another Writer † that *la Mothe le Vayer* began to exercise that Function in *May* 1652. and that he was chosen by the Queen Mother her self being already Preceptor to the King's Brother. Tho' Mr. *Pellisson* Mentions only one Year, it cannot be inferred from thence, that this Function lasted no longer. We can only infer from it that it had lasted but one Year, when he spoke of it, that is, when he published his History of the *French* Academy in 1653. However it be, this confirms what I have said against those, who believed that *la Mothe le Vayer* was excluded from that place upon the Account of the Dialogues of *Orasius Tubero*.

(D) *So very freely on obscene Subjects*] There are some very merry thoughts, and very smutty expressions in the Dialogues of *Orasius Tubero*: But perhaps they are nothing if Compared with the (b) 3d and (c) 4th Days of the *Hexameron rustique*. His other Books contain nothing like this, tho' in certain places by way of Quotation or otherwise he expresses himself somewhat Cynically. He seems to have Apologized for himself two ways. 1. By making it appear (d) that *Seneca*, *Dion Chrysostome* and St. *Augustin* have inserted in their Works some things so obscene and so filthy, that there is scarce any Body but is offended at it; and yet (e) *the first is acknowledged the most austere Moralist of the Romans, the Second*——*the wonder of his Age, and the third for one of the principal Doctors of the Church.* 2. By establishing as a Maxim, (f) *That a Man's Books are no evidence of his Inclinations, and that it is impossible to form a good Judgment of the Manners of any Man by his Writings.* Let us see what he offers in confirmation of this *Thesis.* (g) *If we are obliged to Condemn all those Authors who have chosen very obscene Subjects for their Theme, not only* Ausonius's Cento *and the Hendecasyllabick Verses of* Pliny *the Younger would defame them to perpetuity; but* Plato *himself and* Xenophon, *would be put to a great deal of Trouble to excuse the Liberty which they have allowed themselves in their Compositions. We might further add, that generally this would occasion the most extravagant Judgments in the World on all Authors.*

> Accius (1) esset atrox, conviva Terentius esset,
> Essent pugnaces, qui fera bella canunt.

The Falshood of this way of arguing formerly influenced Timæus *to assert* (2) *that* Homer *and* Aristotle *were great Gluttons, the last having frequently treated of the seasoning of Eatables, and the first frequently used the Word* δαιτρεύειν, *which implies to distribute Meats. And if such consequences are just, as* Virgil *must of Necessity pass for a Soldier, and* Dioscorides *for an infamous poisoner; so the pious Meditations of* Aretin *will prove his Sanctity, and the fine* (h) *Sentences of* Seneca *concerning Poverty will oblige us to believe him necessitous, notwithstanding the six Millions of Gold in cash, and the Eight Hundred Thousand Livres Annual estate which he is said to have enjoyed.*

La Mothe la Vayer's Maxim generally considered is very true: The Judgment to be passed on a Man's Morals from his Writings would be false on a Thousand occasions. *Sallust* is an Example which may be added to the former. What he says "(i) against the corruption and disorders of his Age could not be better expressed by any other: but he should have left that to *Cato*, or to some other Persons of a rigid Virtue, who were Zealous for the Ancient Discipline: And in my Opinion a Declamation against Luxury and Irregularity is not less Incongruous in the History of *Sallust*, who was reprimanded for Debauchery by the Censor in a full Senate, and twice accused of Adultery before the Prætor, than an invective against the ambition of Ruling would be in *Cæsar's* Commentaries." See how *Cicero* rallies *Clodius*'s (k) Oration against the Negligence of the *Romans* in their Divine Service. The World hath always been, and is at present full of Persons who declame against Vice, and are themselves very Immoral; who are grave and severe in their Books, and very loose in their Conduct. And we should then be finely deceived, if we should judge of their Morals by their Writings. But may we justly say by the rule of Contraries, that there are some persons whose Morals are stricter than their Writings? Yes, I believe we may: But it more rarely happens that an Author allows himself a large liberty in his Writings and but a little in his Manners, than that he indulges himself with a large scope in his Manners, and takes but a very little freedom in his Books. The reason of this difference is very obvious; for he that can perform the most, can also perform the least, but he who is capable of performing the least cannot perform the most. What is more easy than to declaim in Verse or Prose against the Irregularities of the Age, and what is more difficult than to avoid sharing some part of them? A Wise Man then hath the hardest Task; it is not then very difficult for him to instruct by the productions of his Pen, for this is infinitely easier than that. But it doth not follow that a Man who can write very Edifying and Religious Books, clean and free from all immoral Licence, can live as regular. This is infinitely harder than the other.

To come more directly to the thing in hand. *Catullus* and *Ovid*, whose Verses were so impure, lived as they wrote. Their Debaucheries with Women were excessive. The same may be affirmed of the *French* Poets who Composed the *Parnasse Satyrique*, and of several *Italian* Poets whose Poems are very Filthy. And this Sentence is very true.

> *Raro moribus exprimit Catonem*
> *Quisquis versibus exprimit Catullum.*

But by allowing all this we do not thereby ruin *la Mothe la Vayer*'s Apology; for there is a vast difference betwixt 1. The relating Debaucheries committed by ones self, praising, and applauding them, and exhorting the Readers to an imitation: And 2. the relating gallant Adventures in terms a little too lively and natural, growing very gay in the recital, tho' one condemns or disapproves those Actions; and discussing a point of (l) Doctrine, or a Mythological Reflection by Phrases which represent Impurities. The first of these is utterly Inexcusable and Infamous and ought to be severely Punished. But the second is perhaps only a witty Diversion, and naturally affords no reason to make any Inferences prejudicial to the Author's Morals. It is this that saves *le Vayer*.

I shall take occasion to offer, that we ought not universally to condemn all those Poets as unchaste in their Lives whose Verses are immodest. *Catullus* doth not deserve to be comprehended in the Apology which he made for them: He too much exceeds all bounds in most of his Poems, and even in the very Epigrams in which he pretends to justify himself. There is enough in it to condemn him.

> *Pædicabo (m) ego vos, & irrumabo,*
> *Aureli pathice, & cinæde Furi:*
> *Qui me ex versiculis meis putatis*
> *Quod sint molliculi, parum pudicum,*
> *Nam castum esse decet pium poetam*
> *Ipsum. Versiculos nihil necesse est:*

Qui

ces that may be drawn from a Man's Writings as to his Morals

(i) *Father* le Moine Discours de l'histoire, pag. 185.

(k) Cicero in Orat. de Haruspicum responsis.

(l) *See in the Article of* Lucretius *what has been said in his Vindication.*

(m) Catullus, Epigr. 16.

Blind and Biassed in their Judgments! This Subject affords a favourable opportunity of answering a Question, lately proposed to a learned Journalist, concerning (E) John

Qui tum denique habent salem, ac leporem,
Si sunt molliculi, ac parum pudici,
Et quod pruriat incitare possunt,
Non dico pueris, sed his pilosis,
Qui duros nequeunt movere lumbos.

Ovid, *Martial*, and several others ought to be excluded the benefit of this justification, tho' they protest their (a) Innocence, and the purity of their Lives in the midst of all the impurities of their Muse. *Beroaldus* hath in vain endeavoured to excuse them, and made himself Ridiculous when he said that if those Books ought to be Condemned which contain criminal Galantries; the canonical Scriptures ought to be treated in like manner: (b) *Si scripta omnia quibus amores, vel amatoria continentur sunt cum suis scriptoribus repudianda, repudientur Canonicæ scripturæ, hoc est instrumenti veteris luculenta illa volumina, quibus nihil sacratius, nihil religiosius, nihil mysticum magis æstimatur.* This is wretched stuff, and doth not at all affect the reason for which these Poets are condemned (c). But if those already excepted do not deserve the mentioned Benefit, there are yet several who deserve to be included in it. Their Lascivious Poems were only diverting efforts of Wit: The contagion of these impure Ideas never spread so far as to corrupt their Minds: They made those Verses to display their ingenious Thoughts; they could not resist the Temptation of expressing themselves in such a manner as would make their Genius applauded: They were willing to accommodate themselves to the taste of a vast number of Readers, who find in it an agreeable Tartness, and Charms with which they are ravished. They had indeed done very well to have resisted this Temptation, *tanti non erat esse te disertum:* But they were only words; their Morals preserved their Integrity, and what an Emperour said of (d) *Voconius* is applicable to them, *Lascivus versu, mente pudicus erat:* This he would never have ventured to say (e), adds *Apuleius*, if too Licentious Verses were a proof of Lasciviousness. *Ausonius* having occasion to prevent the Suspicions which might be formed against his Wisdom on account of his *Cento nuptialis*, alledges several Persons irreproachable in their Conduct, who had made very bold in their Verse: (f) *Sed quum legeris, adesto mihi, adversum eos, qui ut Juvenalis ait,* Curios simulant, & Bacchanalia vivunt, *ne forte mores meos spectent, de carmine.*

Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba:

Ut Plinius *dicit. Meminerint autem, quippe eruditi, probatissimo viro* Plinio *in poëmatis lasciviam, in moribus constitisse censuram: prurire opusculum Sulpicii, nec frontem caperare: esse Apulejum in vita Philosophum, in epigrammatis amatorem, in præceptis omnibus extare severitatem, in epistolis ad Caerelliam subesse petulantiam.* He besides mentions *Plato*, *Annianus*, *Lævius*, *Evenus*, *Menander* (g) and *Virgil*. Note that a Reader ought not to judge of Poets by himself; I mean that he ought not to think that that piece which in Reading hath an ill effect upon his Mind, made the like impression on the Poet who wrote it. Several of them accustom themselves to these thoughts, and are touched with nothing but the poetical ideas with which they are Cloathed. Constitution and Habit have created in them the same insensibility, which *Marigni* ascribes to a Governor of the *Spanish Netherlands* with regard to the fine Ladies of the Court of *Brussels*. *The Arch Duke*, saith he, (h) *seconded by his sole Virtue resists the powerful Charms of all the Beauties of which I speak——He looks on them as fires which dart refulgent light, but do not inflame him.*

Comme dans un jardin rempli de fleurs nouvelles,
Dont l'éclat fait des yeux le plus noble plaisir,
Un Sage curieux regarde les plus belles;
Mais sans songer à les cueillir.

This Prince looks on all these Miracles just as he does on the Pictures of his Gallery, and tho' the Queen (i) *of the North lay six Weeks not above 4 paces from his apartment, as if he had drank of* Merlin's *enchanted Fountain, the passion which often disturbs the Repose of the bravest Heroes, does not at all affect him* (k).

Dorme vicino a lui la donna bella,
Fusse altro, fusse l'acqua di Merlino
Non è quel ch'esser suole il Paladino.

You see some Poets make amorous Verses, in which they express themselves broadly, tho' Age hath rendred 'em as Cold as Ice. Ought not what they say to pass for a sportive effort of wit? Read *Pontanus's* Hendecasyllabick Verses, Written to a Lady who shewed her Breast, and selected from several somewhat less modest.

Pradico (l) *tege candidas papillas,*
Nec quæras rabiem ciere amantum,
Me quem frigida congelat senecta,
Irritas male, calfacisque, quare
Pradico tege candidas papillas,
Et pectus strophio tegente vela.
Nam quid lecteolus sinus, & ipsas
Præ te fers sine linteo papillas?
An vis dicere basia papillas?
Et pectus nitidum suaviare?
Vis num dicere, tange, tange, tracta?
Te ne incedere nudulis papillis?
Nudo pectore te ne deambulare?
Hoc est ad Venerem vocare amantes.
Quare contege candidas papillas,
Et pectus strophio decente vesti,
Aut, senex licet, involabo in illas,
Ut possim juvenis tibi videri.

There are some Authors who are more scrupulous in the choice of modest expressions, for fear the contrary shou'd confirm the Report which runs concerning their Manners. Others on the contrary emboldened by their Virtuous Life and the good Opinion which the World hath entertained of their Wisdom, *morum fiducia*, are not so sollicitous in this particular, and allow themselves too large a scope in order to divert their Readers. Probably Mr. *de la Mothe le Vayer* was of this Number: He very well knew that he could alledge for his excuse (m) in case of necessity, (n) *Verba mea arguuntur, adeo factorum innocens sum.* Let us conclude with considering the Stupendious diversity of Tempers and Characters observable amongst Men. There are some who nicely Scruple to say, what they make no difficulty of Acting: Others dare not commit what they freely venture to say. " (o) A certain " Writer declares that those who discover so much " Zeal in leaving out such places in the Classicks " offend Chastity, are not always so sober as those " Ancient Authors.

" *Nimirum Criticus facere id quàm scribere mavult,*
" *Quod mavult vates scribere quàm facere.* (p) "

(E) *Concerning* John della Casa.] I have already said that several *Italian* Poets ought not to be admitted to justify the obscenities of their Poems by this Rule, *Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba.* I shall say nothing in particular against (q) *Calcagnini*; but *Molza*, *Mauro*, *John della Casa*, &c. deserve a sentence of Condemnation. Not but that the Judgment passed on the last by incompetent Judges, who have not Read him, is somewhat too severe; and as we ought to do justice to every Body, I am obliged to declare that they have wrong'd him in imputing to him a Book *de Laudibus Sodomiæ*. This pretended Poem is nothing but the *Capitolo del forno*, where under the Allegory of an oven, *John della Casa* describes the lewd intercourse betwixt Men and Women. These sort of Allegories were then in Fashion; one borrowed the Metaphor of a Fig, another of a Bean. What is most horrible in *John della Casa* is that having observed that certain lewd Youths began to despise the common Oven, he adds that for his part he was not so nice, and that he seldom baked any where else. Which was to own that sometimes at least he committed the unnatural Sin.

Tennero (r) *il Forno gia le donne sole.*
Oggi mi par che certi Garzonacci
L'abbian mandate poco men ch' al Sole.
Spazzinlo a posta lor, nessun non vacci.
Dicon pur ch' egli è umido e mal netto.
E sono ben cagion quelle sue stracci.
Io per me rare volte altrove il metto:
Con tutto che'l mio pan sia piccolino.
E'l forno delle Donne un po grandetto.
Bencbe chi fa questo mestier divino,

Si

(a) Crede mihi mores distant a carmine nostro: Vita verecunda est, Musa jocosa mihi. *Ovidius Tristium* v. 353. Innocuos censura potest permittere lusus: Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba *Martialis epigr.* 5. *lib.* 5.

(b) Philippus Beroaldus, Orat. habita in principio enarrationis Propertii, continente laudes amoris.

(c) Consult Raderus *upon* Martial, epigr, 5. lib. 1.

(d) Hadrianus, apud Apulejum apolog. pag. m. 281.

(e) Quod nunquam ita dixisset, si forent lepidiora carmina argumentum impudicitiæ habenda *Apul. ibid.*

(f) Auson. in Centone nuptiali, sub fin. p. m. 515. 516. See Ausonius *Remark E.*

(g) Quid ipsum Menandrum? Quid Comicos omnes? Quibus severa vita est, & læta materia. *Auson. ibid.* (h) Marigny *in his Letters Printed in the Year* 1658. (i) *That is* Christina *Queen of* Sweden.

(n) Cremutius Cordus apud Tacitum Ann. lib. 4. cap. 34.

(o) Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, October 1686, art. 3. of the Catalogue of New Books pag. 1222.

(p) In the Remark A of the Article Virgil, I shall quote [illegible]

(q) Among his Latin Poems Printed with those of John Baptist Pigna and Lewis Ariosto at Venice 1553, in which there are some very obscene.

(r) John della Casa apud Menage, Anti-Baillet, tom. 2. pag. 15[illegible]

John della Caſa, and his deteſtable *Capitolo del Forno*. *La Mothe le Vayer* is a great Inſtance of the ſmall Portion of Happineſs we taſte in this Life; for whatever Reaſon he might ſeem to have, to be contented with his State, he would not have return'd (*F*) into the World, on condition of being oblig'd to act the ſame part which Providence had impoſed on him. He afflicted himſelf extremely at the loſs of

Sà ben trovar dove l'anno naſcoſto
Colà diritto un certo fornellino.

Mr. *Menage* cites this ſcrap of the *Capitolo del forno* in a French book which he publiſhed at the *Hague* in 1688. This ought to be obſerv'd, to prevent ſome Cavillers ſaying, that I alledge things which no body before knew, and which ought to be kept unknown. Let us now come to the queſtion which occaſions this Remark.

A certain Perſon (*a*) wrote from *Utrecht* to Mr. *Baſnage de Beauval*, that he had read in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, for the Month of* June 1685, That *John della Caſa* finding himſelf galled in a Satyr, anſwered it in Latin Verſes, where he *denyed the Fact*, affirming, "That he never pretended to praiſe any "thing beſides the enjoyment of Women. But I "would fain ſee them, *adds that Anonymous Perſon* "*of Utrecht*, not being able to imagine that the "Archbiſhop of *Benevento* was capable of denying "the Fact with ſo much Impudence; for it is not "long ſince I ſaw and read this infamous Italian "piece, Entitl'd, *Capitolo di M. Giovanni della Caſa ſopra el forno*: And moſt certainly it is not "concerning the uſe of Women as Women, that he "intended to ſpeak." Since *Daniel Franeus*'s Book, where the Latin Verſes of that Archbiſhop are recited, (*b*) is ſo hard to be found, I here advertiſe the Reader, that he may read them in Mr. *Menage*'s. (*c*) *Anti-Baillet*. It is beyond diſpute that *Caſa* denyed that he had ever praiſed the Sin againſt Nature.

——Obſcœni nihil
Scripſiſſe me ſcitote: namque tunc quoque
Feſtiva nos à turpibus ſecrivimus,
A mollibuſque impura. Cumque verſibus
Laudavimus Furnum, haud mores laudavimus:
Quod ille ait per maximam calumniam:
Sed feminas planè: ut videre Carmine
Ex ipſo adhuc poteſtis.

You ſee he appeals for evidence to the Poem it ſelf for which he was accuſed. *Moſt certainly*, are we told in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, *it is not concerning the uſe of Women as Women that he intended to ſpeak.* But we may anſwer that moſt certainly his *Capitolo* was only made for that Uſe. It is true that he inſerted into his Poem the Obſervation which I have cited, that certain great Boys were diſguſted at it, and hunted after other Pleaſures, in which he very ſeldom imitated them. He doth not praiſe thoſe great Boys nor himſelf, for ſometimes imitating them; wherefore he cannot be juſtly accuſed of praiſing that abominable Crime. But the Poem and its Author are nevertheleſs execrable; for tho' the Epithete of *Meſtier divino* falls (*d*) on the venereal Exercise in general, and not on Sodomy in particular, the Libertiniſm and Profanation is ſuch as cannot be ſufficiently deteſted. "Some (*e*) ex"cuſe him by *Laſciva eſt nobis pagina, vita proba eſt*, "and *Laſcivus verſu, mente pudicus erat*. And it is pro"bable that *Caſa* here calumniates himſelf, in imitation "of ſeveral other Poets (*f*) —— But of all the ex"cuſes alledged for *Caſa*, on account of this *Capitolo del Forno*, the beſt in my Opinion is, that "he ſaith he repaired this Fault by a virtuous "Life."

———Moribus,
Induſtria, pudore, continentia,
Laſciviam nos Carminis correximus
Illius: emendavimuſque ſeriis
Jocos.

Theſe Verſes are part of the Latin Poem which that curious Perſon of *Utrecht* deſires to ſee. In which there are alſo others wherein *John della Caſa* confeſſes his Fault, but too faintly, and endeavours to excuſe himſelf on account of his Youth, and by the cuſtom of good Poets, tho' on all other accounts, virtuous Men.

Annis ab hinc triginta, & amplius, ſcio
Nonnulla me, fortaſſe non caſtiſſimis
Luſiſſe verſibus: quod ætas tunc mea
Rerum me elegit inſcia, & ſemper fuit
Licentiæ gravis, conceſſu omnium,
Juventa: quod fecere & alii tum boni.

The only excuſe is that which *Menage* likes beſt. Let us obſerve by the by, that there are few Subjects where the boldneſs of Authors in copying one another, without ever conſulting the Original, is more clearly viſible, than in this. Mr. *Menage* hath cited ſeveral who accuſed *Caſa*, but he hath forgotten a very great number; and I wonder he did not know this place of a Book which *has been read by every body*: (*g*) John de la Caſa, *Archbiſhop of* Benevento, *wrote a Book in praiſe of Sodomy, calling it a Divine Work, and ſaying that he found a great deal of pleaſure in it, and uſed no other ſort of Venery.* Obſerve that the moſt illuſtrious *Magliabechi* having deteſted the Infamous Paſſages of the *Capitolo del Forno*, points out ſeveral other *Italian* Poets whoſe Works are equally horrible, or even more execrable than this; of which the Proteſtants have nevertheleſs taken no notice: whence he concludes, that *Vergerio*'s perſonal hatred againſt *Caſa*, was the ſource of their Complaints ſo often copied. (*h*) *Io non intendo di far qui l'Apologiſta del Caſa: troppo chiare ſono l'infamità che ſi leggono in quel ſuo ſporco Capitolo, &c. Contuttociò, come ò detto, fu ſua gran diſgrazzia l'aver per nemico il Vergerio. Ognun vede le orribili infamità nel medeſimo genere che ſi trovano nel Berni nel Capitolo a M. Antonio da Bibiena, e nell' altro Capitolo ſopra un Garzone, ed in mille altri luoghi: in Curzio da Marignolle: nel Ruſſoli: in Marco Lamberti: nel Perſiani: ed in cento e mille altri noſtri Poeti Fiorentini; per tralaſciare altri quaſi infiniti di altre patrie.* The Poets were not the only Perſons who let looſe at this rate; but Proſe was alſo made uſe of to the ſame beſtial end by ſome Authors of that Country: Witneſs the Oration of *Heliogabalus* compoſed by *Leonard Aretinus* (*i*). All theſe Authors are very much to blame, and ſo much the more inexcuſable, becauſe they knew the weakneſs of their Readers. They were not of a Country where Nature is proof againſt temptations, but where it is eaſily heated; for which reaſon *Poggius* envyed the *Swiſs*, the Honeſty and Sincerity which he obſerved amongſt them. He could not ſufficiently admire the Baths of *Baden*, where the Men and Women, Boys and Girls were bathing promiſcuouſly without raiſing any ill Suſpicions. (*k*) *Poggius Florentinus de Thermis Badenſibus Helveticorum admirabundus* (*l*) *ſcripſit ad Leonb. Aretinum, in iis pueros puellaſque viros & fœminas ſimul conſpici: ſæpe fœminas nudas nudo viro obviam ire, nulla inhoneſti ſuſpicione: maſculos campeſtribus ſeu femoralibus, fœminas linteis indui veſtibus, crurum tenus à latere ſciſſis: neque collum, neque brachia, neque lacertos tegere, &c. Et addit poſtea:* Cernunt viri uxores tractari, cernunt alteri colloqui. Eſt quidem illis ſolatium, nihil his commoventur, nihil admirantur: omnia *BONA MENTE* fieri putant, neque eſt ex iis, qui Zelotypus eſſet: ô mores noſtris (*Italicis*) diſſimiles, qui ſemper res in deteriorem partem excipimus; qui uſque adeo calumniis delectamur & obtrectationibus, ut, ſi quid videmus per ullam conjecturam, ſtatim pro manifeſto crimine atteſtemur. Invideo, imo noſtras execror animi perverſitates, &c.

(*F*) *He would not have return'd into the World.*] His Words are, (*m*) "Life alone ſeems to me "ſo indifferent, to ſay nothing farther to its "diſadvantage, that far from ever deſiring "to renew the Race, if put to my choice, "I would not change the few remaining Calamitous days in an Age ſo far advanced as mine is, "for the numerous Years, expected by an infinite "number of young Perſons, all whoſe Pleaſures "I well know. I could really ſwear to this "as well as *Cardan*, if I did not think it more "to the purpoſe to cite his own Expreſſions, to "which I ſubſcribe, tho' according to his manner "of writing, they are more judicious than elegant: "*Nos, per Deum, fortunam noſtram exiguam, atque in ætate ſeni, cum ditiſſimo juvene, sed imperito,*

(*a*) See the Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, May 1686. pag. 427.

(*b*) Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Sçavans ib.

(*c*) Anti Baillet ubi ſupra, pag. 102.

(*d*) Mr. Menage ubi ſupra, pag. 105. has theſe words: "Benche "chi fa "queſto "meſtier "divino, "*ought to* "*be un*"*derſtood*, "*accord*"*ing to* "*ſound* "*Gram*"*mar*, *of* "*the love* "*of Wo*"*men, and* "*not of* "*Boys.* "*See what* "*goes be*"*fore and* "*what* "*follows.*

(*e*) Menage ibid, pag. 110, 111.

(*f*) Mr. Menage quotes here the Verſes of Catullus, which you have ſeen above in the Remark D.

(*g*) Sainte Aldegonde, Tableau des differens 2. part, tome 2. chap. 6.

(*h*) Magliabechi, *letter to* Mr. Bigot *in the* Anti-Baillet, ubi ſupra, pag. 152, 153.

(*i*) Extat in monumentis Deſiderii Eraſmi Roterodami ex recenſione editis, oratio invitatoria Heliogabali Romanorum Imperatoris, habita in concione ad meretrices, quam à Leonhardo Aretino compoſitam plerique credunt. *Sacra Eleuſinia patefacta*, pag. 21.

(*k*) Matthias Berneggerus, Quæſt. Miſcellan. 90. ex Taciti Germania.

(*l*) *That Letter is the* 425 *among thoſe of* Æneas Silvius.

(*m*) *La Mothe le Vayer*, *Letter* 134. *pag.* 204. *of the* 12 *vol.*

of his only Son *, his (G) Grief diſorder'd him ſo much that he married again, tho he was above 78 Years old, and had no reaſon to deplore the loſs of his Firſt Wife. The Paſſage where he acquaints us with this laſt particular, is (H) very favourable to thoſe who aſſert, that the Conjugal Vow of Fidelity is

“ *non commutaremus.*„ I ſuppoſe with great probability a thing, which he hath not exactly expreſſed; which is, that the *race* of life which he would not begin again, would be the ſame which he had almoſt finiſhed. From whence I conclude that there is ſcarce any part which to a Man of Judgment ſeems worth repeating on the Stage of the World; for that which was allotted to *La Mothe le Vayer*, was the moſt deſirable that could be imagined in his rank. He wanted nothing that was agreeable, if we may judge of it by the outſide. *La Mothe le Vayer* was born in the Metropolis of his Country, an advantage which all Learned Men and ſeveral others would beſtow on themſelves if in their Gift. He was very well educated (a) by a learned Father, whoſe Merit and Employments (b) render'd him conſiderable. He was loved and conſidered by the two Cardinals who governed *France* ſucceſſively: Splendid Titles, and honourable Poſts he did not want; for he was Counſellor of State in ordinary, and Preceptor to the King's only Brother. He diſtinguiſh'd himſelf gloriouſly amongſt the Authors, and deſerved a place in the *French* Academy. The great number of Books which he Publiſhed, met with a very great demand. They were ſeveral times re-printed, and afterwards collected together. He was as rich as his Condition required. He was a little inclin'd to (c) forbidden Pleaſures during the heat of the beginning of his Youth; but he ſoon extricated himſelf, and afterwards conſtantly led a pure life, which made him be looked on as a rigid (d) Follower of the moſt perfect Morality, inſomuch that he acquired a very particular eſteem on that Account. It is a Character of greater perfection to be always wiſe than to become ſo by way of amendment; but the Converſion to Wiſdom is more difficult than the keeping in her Paths without ever turning out of the way. There was then in this particular of *La Mothe le Vayer*'s life ſomething very agreeable. This made him remember the Violence which he made uſe of to renounce the Pleaſures which he was very well acquainted with: A Violence perhaps greater than to abſtain from thoſe Pleaſures which one hath never taſted. Beſides, was it not agreeable to find in one's Lot the ſucceſſive Enjoyment of the Pleaſures of the Body and Soul? This was more likely to tempt him to accept of the repetition of his condition, than if he had been deprived of the pleaſures of Youth. Yet neither this, nor all the other Allurements of this Author's Life, tho' ſo Charming, could engage him to deſire the repetition of his part. This is a Proof that it was intermixed with Croſſes, of which we are ignorant, which turned the Scale on the ſide of Evil. But if Misfortune fell in upon ſo many ſeeming happineſſes; if it poiſoned them with a loathſome bitterneſs, ſo as to make him deſpiſe Life as a Burthenſome Honour, which he would not accept, if he had the power of refuſal; What can we think of the condition of ſo many Perſons, who ſeem to us to be deſtitute of almoſt all the Cauſes of Humane Happineſs, and expoſed to a thouſand Diſgraces? A great many aſſert, that except ſome brutal Wretches, no old Man would return into the World on condition to be obliged to act the ſame part over again. We are indeed unwilling to die, we would always live, we flatter our ſelves that things will mend; but the remembrance of what is paſt, the Good and Evil things of this World being duly weighed, does not permit to deſire to run again in the ſame career. The Antients feigned that the Souls that were to return into the World, paſſed through the River of oblivion, as if without that there were reaſon to fear they ſhould grow reſtive. On this Head, ſee (e) the new Letters againſt *Maimbourg*.

(G) *At the loſs of his only Son, his Grief diſorder'd him ſo much that he married again.*] To this purpoſe, *Guy Patin* furniſhes me with two neceſſary paſſages. “(f) We have here an honeſt Gentleman “ greatly afflicted. It is Mr. *de la Mothe le Vayer*, “ a celebrated Author, and formerly Preceptor to the “ Duke of *Orleans*, aged 78 Years. He had an only “ Son about 35 Years old, who fell ill of a continual “ Fever, to whom Dr. *Eſprit*, Dr. *Brayer*, and Dr. *Bodineau*, have given Emetick Wine three times, and ſent “ him to the place from whence there is no return. This is extracted from a Letter dated the 26th of *September* 1664. Three Months after *Patin* wrote another Letter, in which are the following words: (g) *Mr. de la Mothe le Vayer, to comfort himſelf for the death of his only Son, is this day married, being 78 years old, to the Daughter of M. de la Haye, formerly Ambaſſador at* Conſtantinople, *who is at leaſt Forty. She ſtaid long enough to be a Sibyl.* Non invenit vatem, ſed virum, ſed vetulum. Obſerve, that *Patin* makes him 78 years old in the Year 1664. This doth not at all agree with what he ſaith in another Letter, that in 1649, he was aged about 60 Years. Mr. *de Viſé*'s Noveliſts make it a round Number; they aſſure us that he married when eighty Years of age. The death of Mr *Godeau* (i) *gave occaſion to ſpeak of that of* Mr. de la Mothe le Vayer, *who hath thereby left a ſecond Vacancy in the French Academy. He was a very learned Man, richly ſtored with Polite Learning, and hath left the Publick fifteen or ſixteen Volumes of his Works, by which he acquired a vaſt Reputation. He was Preceptor to the King's only Brother, and at the age of fourſcore, married* Madam de la Haye. *After which he lived ſeveral Years. Thus the Noveliſts diſcourſed about it, and as they ſaid nothing but what is true, I have nothing further to add on this Subject.* The Author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* ſticks at 78. I ſhall cite what he ſays ſomewhat at large, becauſe, beſides other particulars, we are thereby informed, that this Marriage was a weakneſs which the Philoſophers will never forgive him. Mr. (k) Petit *diſcharges his indignation on ſome Learned Men, who imagin that the Deſcription of the* (l) *Nymphs* Cave, *denotes the characteriſtick part of Women. He ſaith, that after the War which they have declared againſt the Sciences, and Humane Reaſon, nothing could ſtop their fury from attempting the Ruin of polite Learning by beſpattering* Homer. *'Tis eaſie to perceive that this is levelled at the fourth day of the* Hexameron ruſtique *of* La Mothe le Vayer, *a famous* Pyrrhoniſt. *Indeed it had been better, if in his old age, he had not Printed ſuch a Book as this, in which, notwithſtanding his prudent care, in ſeveral places, it cannot be deny'd that there are too many impure Thoughts. But this is not the only thing which is cenſured in the laſt Years of this venerable Old Man, whoſe Virtue had ſo ſucceſsfully conducted him in the Paths of the Antient Sages: He married again at* 78 *Years of age; a weakneſs which the Philoſophers will never forgive him.* Becauſe all Learned Readers will deſire to ſee this Indignation of Mr. *Petit*, as it is vented in the Original, and perhaps may not have his Work *de Sibylla*, I ſhall here cite his Words: (m) *Sed & prope pudicoſa quorumdam interpretamenta exploduntur, qui iſta imagine antri Nympharum uterum & pudendum muliebre ænigmatice ab Homero deſignatum cenſent: quibus cum opponitur duarum ejus antri portarum deſcriptio, eo amentiæ & furoris procedunt, ut ad adverſa & averſa ſeu poſtica veneris flagitioſa divortia confugere non erubeſcant. Adeo impudentes ut non vereantur poetarum omnium principem, literarum parentem, ingeniorum fontem, ad hæc transferre nefanda. Nempe hoc illis ad extremam vecordiam reſtabat, ut qui rationi humanæ & ſcientiis bellum indixiſſent, literas quoque omnes, infamato earum principe, quantum in ipſis eſſet, perderent.* *La Mothe le Vayer*'s Son was reckon'd amongſt the Learned Abbots; it is to him that 'tis thought Mr. *Deſpreaux* inſcribed his 4th. Satyr. In the Year 1656 he Publiſh'd a *French* Tranſlation of *Florus*, and dedicated it to the Duke of *Anjou*, the King's only Brother. He ſaith that he Publiſhed this *Florus* from the Tranſlations which the young Prince had made. This Verſion is accompanied with a Learned and curious Commentary, where *Caſſeteau*'s Tranſlation is very much cenſured. See the Elogies which the Abbot of (n) *Villeloin* beſtows on the Father and the Son.

(H) *The Paſſage* —— *where he acquaints us that he had no reaſon to deplore* (o) *the loſs of his firſt Wife, is very favourable to thoſe who aſſert.*] Firſt of all I ought to acquaint the Reader that he never charges his Wife with any Amours: He only owns that he was perhaps as ſenſible of the incommodities of Marriage as any Body. In a letter to a Friend who had informed him that a certain Perſon was ſeparated from his Wife, on account of Adultery, he expreſſes himſelf thus. Do

---

(*) He died in 1664.

(a) See la Croix du Maine pag. 84. *who calls him* Felix de la Mothe le Vayer.

(b) Moreri *ſays he was Counſellor to the King, and Subſtitute to the Attorney General in the Parliament of* Paris.

(c) *See the* Hexameron ruſtique, p. 97, 98.

(d) Virtutis veræ cuſtos rigiduſque ſatelles. *Horat.* Epiſt. 1. lib. 1. *We have ſeen that* Patin *calls him a* Stoick.

(e) *New Letters againſt* Maimbourg's *Hiſtory of Calviniſm*, p. 722. 719. *bis* & 768.

(f) Patin's *Letter* 326. p. 656. *of the* 2. vol.

(g) *Patin, Letter* 3[illegible]. *of the* 3. *Tome. It is dated the* [illegible] *December*, 1664.

(h) *See the Paſſage of* Patin *cited in the Remark.*

(i) Mercure Galant *for the Year* 1672. *Tome* 1. pag. 31. & 32. *Dutch Ed.*

(k) Nouv. de la Republique des Lettres, October 1686, p. 11[illegible], 11[illegible].

(l) *The Author of a Treatiſe of Anonymous*, I think, Sacra Eleuſinia patefacta, *explains in the ſame manner the* Cave *of* Atalanta. *See Ælian* Var. Hiſt. lib. 13. c. 1.

(m) Petrus Petitus, *de Sibylla* lib. 2. cap. [illegible] in fine. p. 23[illegible].

(n) Marolles, Memoires, p. 194.

(o) *You'll ſee in the* Remark B *of the Article* Crito *who ſhe was.*

is not much better obſerved than that of *Celibacy*. The Reflections he made in

“ (*) Do not expect that I ſhou'd offer you a Panegyrick on a condition of Life, whoſe Inconveniencies I am perhaps not leſs acquainted with than thoſe who are moſt weary of them. I have always taken that Sleep into which God caſt our firſt Father before he preſented him with a Wife, not only for a caution to diſtruſt our own ſight, as a very evil Counſellor in this Affair; but for a Moral Hint, that no Man would ever clog himſelf with that Incumbrance, if the Eyes of his Mind were open enough to foreſee the Inconveniencies to which he ſubjects himſelf, who engages in ſo dangerous a Society. And I never read the firſt Verſe of the tenth Book of *Ovid's* Metamorphoſis, where he arrayes the God *Hymen* in a Saffron coloured Robe,

“ ——— *Croceo velatus amictu*,

“ without fancying that the Poet thereby deſigned to expreſs what is ſo Eſſential in Marriage. The cares of a Family with which you charge your ſelf, the ſeveral Blows of Fortune which you render your ſelf liable to, the Inevitable Jealouſy which you will have of your Wife, on account of the Charms you find in her, and the fear of being touched in your Honour, are they not ſufficient cauſes of Jaundice? And is it not a Miraculous thing, if a Conſtitution even the moſt Sanguine or Gay, be not by this means Icterial? But after all we ought to acquieſce to our Deſtiny, and ſubmit to what the wiſeſt Legiſlators have on this occaſion ordered for the beſt. We cannot change their Decrees, and we may render our ſelves yet more Miſerable, by taking a courſe much more dangerous than that already preſcribed to us.” By theſe laſt words he gives us to underſtand that the Inconveniencies of Marriage do not render that State the moſt Miſerable of all conditions of Life; this he had plainly told us in the foregoing Pages. (a) *I am very much miſtaken, if this Man doth not find the Remedy which he deſigns to apply to his Misfortune, worſe than the Evil which he believes to be inſupportable; and if at length he doth not find that in ſeveral reſpects Concubinage is ſomething more intolerable than Marriage it ſelf. For it does not ſeem a ſufficient thing to ſay only with the Antients*,

Tam (1) malum eſt foris amica, qàm malum eſt
uxor domi.

——— *He is ridiculous, if he expects a greater intimacy in Libertiniſm, and imagins that he ſhall be more ardently and ſincerely Loved in a ſtate where the Fires are barely Artificial. You, as well as I, have known ſeveral Men more haraſſed in extricating themſelves from the fatiguing Effects of ſuch a Licentious Life as he deſigns, than they could be by all the diſgraces of an unfortunate Marriage.* All this is worthy of the Wiſdom and Genius of this great Author. But I proceed to what he ſays more eſſentially proper for the Commentary on my Text.

“ (b) I will not penetrate ſo far as you into the Secrets of this Marriage. It is enough that I tell you that without being a very great Prophet, one might long ſince have foretold this Adventure. No Man ever diſcovered a more fooliſh Paſſion for his Wife, he made Love to her with all the Extravagancies of an enamoured Spark. But this is a great defect in a Wiſe Man, who ought to avoid all ſuch Behaviour; *Adulter eſt uxoris amator acrior*, and this is; according to *Laberius*, to make a Cocquet of one's own Wife. And truly it cannot be denied that the Wife I ſpeak of has hitherto behaved herſelf in ſuch a manner, that one may very well believe part of her Husband's Accuſations, without doing her much wrong, or without being too Credulous. And yet what does he charge her with beſides living according to the Mode? Indeed our Manners are at preſent arrived at a very ſtrange Period; and the proſtitution of the Sex, even by thoſe whoſe Honour ſo abſolutely depends on their Conduct, is what is not to be accounted for by Reaſon, nor could any thing but ſeeing it every day make us believe it poſſible. (z) *Eo prolapſi mores jam ſunt, ut nemo ad ſuſpicanda adulteria nimium credulus videri poſſit.* And the *Latin* Grammar by its Rules never rendred (*Cornu*) Horn ſo indeclinable, as our ſenſeleſs Deportment in this reſpect hath at preſent rendred it inevitable by a pleaſant Synonimy.” Do not believe that *la Mothe le Vayer* is the only Author who thunders out ſuch Terrible and Satyrical Sentences: A vaſt number of other Writers pronounce the ſame Sentence. To mention ſome of the neweſt Books, ſee thoſe which terminate in (c) *ana*, and thoſe that go by the name of Stories, Letters, Memoirs, Comedies, Novels, &c. They repreſent Lewdneſs like *Deucalion's* Deluge which overſpread the whole Earth, and like an Evil which Marriage rather heightens than reſtrains.

They induce us to conclude that the time which *Seneca* mentions is returned upon us, the time I ſay when the multitude of Adultereſſes took off the ſhamefulneſs of that Crime, when conjugal Fidelity was a proof of Uglineſs, and a Husband was for no other reaſon than to excite the Love of a Gallant. *Seneca's* Deſcription is ſo nervous, that I chooſe rather to Tranſcribe it than Tranſlate it faintly. (d) *Non expedit notum omnibus fieri, quam multi ingrati ſint, pudorem enim rei tollet multitudo peccantium: & deſinet eſſe probri loco, commune maledictum. Numquid jam ulla repudio erubeſcit, poſtquam illuſtres quædam ac nobiles fœminæ non conſulum numero, ſed maritorum annos ſuos computant? & exeunt matrimonii cauſſa, nubunt repudii? Tam diu iſtud timebatur, quamdiu rarum erat, quia verò nulla ſine divortio acta ſunt; quod ſæpe audiebant, facere didicerunt. Numquid jam ullius adulterii pudor eſt, poſtquam eò ventum eſt, ut nulla virum habeat, niſi ut adulterum irritet? argumentum eſt deformitatis, pudicitia. Quam invenies tam miſeram, tam ſordidam, ut illi ſatis ſit unum adulterorum par? niſi ſingulis diviſit horas, & non ſufficit dies omnibus? niſi ad alium geſtata eſt, apud alium manſit? Infrunita & antiqua eſt, quæ neſciat, matrimonium vocari unius adulterium ——— horum delictorum jam evanuit pudor, poſtquam res latius evagata EST.*

The Champions of Monaſtical Vows boaſt of no ſmall advantage to their cauſe by this, and they pretend that the Vow of Celibacy is as effectual as the Solemn one of conjugal Fidelity. Theſe are two ſorts of Vows, one of which ought to be obſerved as Inviolably as the other; and if one is not better kept than the other, as Practice plainly ſhews, of what advantage would the Abrogation of Monaſtical Rules be? The Monks and Nuns are charged with thouſands and thouſands Incontinencies. Terrible Liſts (e) are made of Baſtards and Abortives, and ſuch other diſorders proceeding from the Celibacy of Eccleſiaſticks. But if thoſe Perſons obliged to Continence by their Vow of a Single Life, ſhould diſengage from any ſuch Tie, would not they fall into worſe Uncleanneſs? Turn your Eyes to what Authors (f) relate of the Abortive Births at *Paris*: Under the covert of Marriage, exempt from the fear of dreadful Conſequences, to what Lewdneſs do not they abandon themſelves? And if thoſe who have Reaſon to fear the Anxiety which the Fox was reduced to, I mean the neceſſity of being confined, till their Bellies grow as flat as they were before, will notwithſtanding jump in; can we expect any better from thoſe who on the like occaſion lye under no neceſſity to hide themſelves, Marriage Vailing their fault from the Eyes of the World? But whatever you may ſay, in vindication of Monaſtical Vows, you will never be able to evince with all the Proofs which you are pleaſed to cite out of *la Mothe le Vayer* and a hundred other Authors, that the conjugal Vow of Fidelity is not better obſerved than that of Celibacy, and that Marriage is not an effectual Remedy againſt the Incontinence of a very great number of Perſons. We ought not to ſtretch too far what was ſaid by a very honeſt Man, equally recommendable for his Father's Glory and his own Virtue. In one of the beſt pieces of Chriſtian Morality that we have, Entituled, *Of the Peace and Contentment of the Mind*, a ſerious, grave, and religious Book, he ſaith, that the Husband whoſe Wife is falſe (g) ought *to practiſe the great Remedy againſt irremedia-*

(*) La Morale de Vayer, Lettre 86. pag. [illegible] & ſeq. of the [illegible] Vol.

(a) Id. ib. pag. 223, 224.

(1) *Laberius.*

(b) Id. ib. pag. 222. 223.

(z) Sen. Cont.

(c) *As Menagiana, Harlequiniana, Furetieriana, Saintevremoniana.*

(d) Seneca, de benefic. lib. 3. cap. 16. pag m. 53. vide etiam ibid lib. 1. cap. 9.

(e) *See the Book Intituled*, Le Cabinet du Roi de France, dans lequel il y a trois perles precieuſes d'ineſtimable valeur. *It was Inſcribed to* Henry *III. the 1ſt of* November 1581. *The Reader is there frequently referred to another Book Intituled*, La polygamie ſacrée. *Theſe two Books are full of horrid things; but there ſeems to be ſome Exaggeration in them.*

(f) *See the Article* Patin, *Remark* C *and* D△△.

(g) Peter du Moulin *the Son*, Traité de la paix de l'ame, *Book* 3. *Ch.* 14. pag. 382. Paris 1673.

another place of his Books give us room to imagine that he was experimentally acquainted with the ill side of Marriage, (*H* Δ) the Broils of the Day, and the manner of composing them at Night, *&c.* He lived several Years after his second Marriage,

his Folly, which is Patience, and that the good Company of so many Honest Men, who are in the same Condition, helps to bear it, and he needs not think it more strange than to wear a fashionable Hat. Once more, this Expression ought not to be extended too far; for the number of those, who follow the Mode in their Dress, surpasses the number of those whom this wise Divine endeavours to Comfort.

What I have said above concerning the Fox will be more intelligible, when I have related to those Gentlemen what I have read concerning the pernicious Effects of those Vows, which they would justify. It is a Relation, the ground of which I could never yet meet with in the Ecclesiastical Annals: I have engaged some People in quest of it. In the mean while all that hath yet reached my Knowledge is, that (*a*) about the Year 1537, the Countess of *Guastalla*, by the advice of *Baptist de Crema*, a Jacobin Monk, founded a Society of *the Victory over one's self against the Flesh* ——. *To gain this Victory a certain Lady named* Julia, *put a Young Fellow into Bed with a Young Girl, and laid a Crucifix as a Barrier betwixt them, to the end that they should not kick one another, as we generally clap Bars or Poles between Horses: And this was the Tryal.* This Society multiplied prodigiously. (*b*) *Frequently such Ladies,* says my Author, *go to several of the Neighbouring Towns, to visit their Priests and Spiritual Fathers, for they have their Nests in many Towns. But it often happens to them as to a certain famished Fox, who entring into a Chamber by a little hole eat so greedily, and stuffed his Belly so full, that he became so swoln that he could not get out again: So it happens frequently to these good Ladies, when they enter the Chambers of their Fathers Confessors, their Belly begins to swell to that degree that they are obliged to stay there, and not stir a foot till the Fruit is ripe, because their Repast proved too large: Which proceeds from their hunger, which is as great as that of the Fox* (*c*). He assures us that at *Venice* and in several other places *these Libertin Guastalians* were expelled (*d*).

Let us return to *la Mothe le Vayer.* He judiciously observes that this Married Woman was ruined by her Husband's Fault; who loved her too Lasciviously. (*e*) *Brantome* for the same reason charges the ill Lives of several Wives to their Husbands account. Generally speaking we may affirm that the Mens part in all these Disorders is infinitely greater than the Womens. They are the Instigators, Sollicitors and Seducers. Which an Author of the XVI. Century hath very handsomly shewed in Justification of the fair Sex. "We very seldom see, *saith he* (*f*), Women guilty of Pride, Cruelty, Murther, Drunkenness, Intemperance, Sacrilege, Robbery, or generally tainted with all sorts of Vices as Men are: But on the contrary they are for the most part Humble, Gracious, Sober, Chaste, Discreet and Charitable; their Hearts are tender and humane; and if there are any, as it may be alledged against me, who are Vicious, I aver and maintain that they are most commonly induced to and initiated into it by Men, without whose Inticements few or none of this sort would be found. And to speak plainer, for a small number of ill Women the greatest part of the Men are stark naught. And if any Person is pleased to contradict me, I ask him what the Men would be, if they were continually enticed, excited and sollicited to Evil, Vice and Sin, by the Women as they are by them, considering that of their own accord without any Instigation they are so Corrupt and Vicious? Who ought to be esteemed most excusable, she who at the Inticement of another loses her Virtue, or he that uses his utmost endeavours to engage her to it, which we see confirmed by daily Experience? And therefore I am not a little surprized at the thoughtless Sparks, who incessantly Censure the Women for the very Vice which is not near so ripe amongst that Sex as amongst their own. And if the Women were subject to Luxury and Incontinence, (which I utterly deny) ought they not to think full as abominable and detestable, or rather more, the infinite Load of other Vices which they may find amongst themselves, the least of which deserves as much to be blamed as that? I cannot imagine whence such an Error should proceed, unless from a desire of Condemning others to Justify themselves; which will not avail with most of 'em; for I know that they are almost all so generally addicted to the same Vice (besides others) that there is not a Wretch tho' never so mean amongst them that doth not desire to gratify his Lust with all or as many Women as please him: So that if their Modesty and Chastity did not stop the torrent of Vice, there would be no more Continence amongst Mankind than amongst Brutes. But we see they are sollicited without Intermission, and with much less trouble than Men they might enjoy their fill of Pleasure, notwithstanding which they very seldom fall into this Fault, which tho' so much blamed in them is become almost a Virtue in the Men. Is it then less displeasing to God in one Sex than in the other? It is indeed very strange that they should be so severely Censured, for what these Fools Glory in, considering also that the Sin is committed on the Female side with some colour of Excuse, whilst the other have really none." What hath been lately said concerning the weakness of Men and the strength of Women, in a Book Entituled (*g*) *Moliere, Comedien aux champs Elisées,* is the best thing in that Book. And doubtless he that wrote the Satyr against Husbands, in answer to Mr. *Despreaux*'s Satyr against Women had the more ample Subject.

(*H* Δ) *To imagine that he was experimentally acquainted with the ill side of Marriage, the Broils of the Day, and manner of Composing them at Night,* &c.] See a Letter which he wrote to a Person who desired his advice concerning Marriage. He first of all makes an enumeration of some Imperfections which the Antients attributed to Women, after which he adds (*h*). "But the want of Capacity, and a sufficient number of other defects, with which those of our Days abound more than ever, would not perhaps be so considerable, if we had the Remedies which the Antients practised against the most Incorrigible. For besides Divorces, which were allowed them if they found their Wives but in a small fault, on four occasions they had a right to take away their Lives, and the Women ran as great a risk by drinking of Wine, or using of false Keys, as by imposing of Children on the Husband, or committing Adultery. —— (*i*) But as our Laws are very far from any such strict severity, we find that their Indulgence favours the Debauchery and Depravation of Women to that degree, that being at present restrained by no sort of fear, I see nothing which we ought reasonably to hope for from the most Prudent of them.

"*Pauca* (1) *adeò Cereris vittas contingere digna.*

"And if we ought to except some few who are touched with a sense of Honour, how can you be free from the rest of their Infirmities, which the greatest Philosophers, nor the most Potent Emperors have not been able to Correct? *Philip* of *Macedonia* freely protested (2), that he did not know a Humour so Martial as that of his Wife *Olympias*, who incessantly made War against him. Their gaming, the excesses of their Mouth and the rest of their Profusions, at present exceed those of the most Debauched of our Sex, and quickly make a Husband sensible of the truth of the *Italian* Proverb, *sposa di spesa, noce che nuoce.* Nor are you yet to expect that the noisy uneasiness of the Day will exempt you from the duties of the Night. There is no Reconciliation or Repose to be hoped for, if it doth not proceed from that side,

"*Sed* (3) *lateri ne parce tuo, pax omnis in illo est.*

"And you will find the greatest part of them like the Fountain of *Hammon* (1) extremely cold by Day, and very hot by Night." When a Married Man talks at this rate, he gives very good reason to believe, 1. That he has often undergon such a Tryal. 2. That this made him so well acquainted with the Seal, which ought to be affixed to

(*a*) Histoire de la Mappe-monde Papistique, pag. 46. Edit. 1567. in 4.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 87.

(*c*) *See what Horace first Epist.* 7. lib. 1. Forte per angustam tenuis vulpecula rimam Repserat in cameram frumenti, pastaque rursus Ire foras pleno tendebat corpore frustra. Cui mustela procul: si vis (ait) effugere isthinc, Macra cavum repetes arctum, quem macra subisti.

(*d*) *I can't tell whether the following passage of a Letter of* Lucretia Gonzaga pag. 134. *may be applied to the Members of that Fraternity.* Havete ridette tutte quelle piacevolezze che io vi narrai occorse tra le Guastalline, & lui. Hortensio Lando *is meant by the word* lui.

(*e*) Brantome, Memoires des Dames galantes, tom. 1. pag. 54, 55.

(*f*) Claudius de Taillemont, *of* Lyons, *in his* Discours des Champs Faëz, à l'honneur & exaltation des Dames, Printed at Lyons 1553, in 8.

(*g*) Printed in 1696. See Scene 6. of the 3. Act, pag. 157 & seq. of the Amsterdam Edition. You'll find the same things in the 4th Part of the Diversitez curieuses pag. 68. & seq. Dutch Edit.

(*h*) La Mothe le Vayer's Letter 45. pag. 357. of the 12th Vol.

(*i*) Id. ib. pag. 358, 359.

(1) Juven. Sat. 6.

(2) Dio. Chrys. or. 2.

(3) Ov. l. 2. de art. am.

(1) Diod. Sic. l. 17.

Marriage x, and died in the Year 1672 ‡. I ſhall ſpeak of the Editions of his Works (*I*).

" || The *French* Academy conſider'd him as one of their beſt Members; but the " World look'd on him as a Capricious Humoriſt, who lived according to his Fancy, " and as a *Sceptick* Philoſopher. His Phyſiognomy and Dreſs made every Body " that ſaw him judge him an extraordinary Man. He walked always with his " Head erect, and his Eyes fixed on the Signs of the Street. *Before I was told who he was*, continues the Writer from whom I have extracted this paſſage, *I took him for an Aſtrologer, or a Searcher after Secrets and the Philoſophers Stone.* This ſerves only to confirm x what we have ſeen above.

VAL (GEFFREY DU) See **VALLEE.**

VAL (JOHN DU) a Phyſician at *Iſſoudun* his Native place, who Tranſlated into *French* the Antidotary or Diſpenſary of *John James Wecker*, Phyſitian at *Baſil*, and added to it ſeveral things of his own. This Book was Printed at *Geneva in quarto* in 1609. The New Edition of *Vander-Linden de Scriptoribus Medicis*, doth not Mention him at all, any more than it doth *James du VAL* a Phyſitian of *Evreux* who publiſhed β a Book in *French* treating *of Hermaphrodites and the delivery of Women* in 1612 γ. He had before Printed δ a Book concerning the *Medicinal Springs about Rouën*, and a * *New Method of curing Catharrs* †.

VALDES (JOHN) in *Latin Valdeſius*, flouriſhed at *Rome* under *Pope Julius* II. He was a Young well proportioned Handſome *Spaniard*. His Learning Induſtry and intereſt with ſeveral Great Perſons procured him very Great Riches. He fell in Love with a *Senator's* Daughter, not leſs Virtuous than Beautiful; and finding that the only way to gratify his paſſion was Honourable Love, he courted her for Marriage, and carried the matter even to the ſigning of the Contract. A little after which it was diſcovered that it was not poſſible to Advance ſo far as the Nuptial Solemnity, by Reaſon of his engagement in the Eccleſiaſtical Life. This very much Angred the Father of the betrothed Lady, and obliged him to Complain to *Cardinal Leonard de la Rovere*, who commanded in *Rome* in the abſence of *Julius* II. He cauſed *Valdes* to be Impriſoned in the Caſtle of *Saint Angelo*. The Priſoner ſeeing himſelf Charged with a Crime, promiſed to renounce his Prieſthood if the *Pope* would permit him, and Marry the betrothed Lady, even tho' ſhe had no Fortune. Upon which he was diſcharged under Bail; but while

---

to thoſe Reconciliations. 3. That he was very well verſed in the diſtinction betwixt the groundleſs quarrels, which are like the ill Humour of a Creditor ill payed, and thoſe which reſult from an angry temper.

(*I*) *Of the Editions of his Works.*] His Son collected them into a Body in 1653. and Dedicated them to *Cardinal Mazarin.* This Edition *in Folio* being followed by a 2d. he publiſhed a (*a*) 3d. *larger and more Correct than the two former*, and Dedicated it to the King in 1662. After this Edition another came out in 15 Volumes in 12. which comprehends more Tracts than the laſt *in Folio* which was in 3 Volumes. Theſe 3 Volumes *in Folio* contain but the twelve firſt Tomes of that in 12. The 13. 14 and 15. being the Tracts which the Author publiſhed in the Year 1667. 1668 and 1669. There is no ſmall Advantage to be made of Reading this Writer, and we have no *French* Author who approaches nearer to *Plutarch* than he. We find Beautiful thoughts, and Solid Arguments Interwoven and diſperſ'd through his Works. Wit and Learning go Hand in Hand. His Wit would doubtleſs appear more conſpicuouſly if it went alone: for the Authorities and Citations very often obſcure it: but in ſome places it ſhines moſt by the happy Application of a Foreign thought. This Author amongſt his other various ſorts of Reading, applyed himſelf to that of Voyages. In which each Perſon hath generally his particular end. Mr. *Daillé* (*b*) Read them only to diſcover the difference betwixt the Apoſtles converting the Ancient Pagans, and the *Popiſh* Miſſionaries converting the New ones. Our *Vayer* had another aim, he only looked for Arguments to confirm *Pyrrhoniſm.* The prodigious diverſity which he met with betwixt the Manners and Cuſtoms of different Nations charmed him: He could not conceal the Satisfaction with which he digeſted theſe Materials, nor did he hide the Conſequences which he would have us draw from thence; which was that we ought not to be ſo deciſive as to Condemn as ill and unreaſonable, whatever we do not find conform to our Opinions and Cuſtoms. I cannot tell whether he believed with *Cardan*, that Opinion is (*c*) the Queen of Mankind; but I believe that he might have made as good an Oration about the Empire of Opinion as that of (*d*) *Scioppius*, and an Excellent commentary on theſe ε Verſes of *Sophocles.*

Παῦσαι· καλὸν γὰρ τῷδε κεκλῆσθαι πατρός,
Εἴπερ πέφυκά γ'· εἰ δὲ μὴ, μεῖον βλάβη.
Τὸ γὰρ νομισθὲν τῆς ἀληθείας κρατεῖ.

Pauſa: ſat eſt me hoc patre natum dicier,
Natus tamen ſi ſum: ſin autem, obeſt parum.
Nam veritate potentior eſt opinio.

His Treatiſe concerning (*e*) *the inſtitution of the Dauphin* and that of the Pagan Philoſophy, are the beſt which he hath written. That of the Hiſtorians is good: But as Mr. *Baillet* very judiciouſly obſerves (*f*), it did not coſt him much Pains. I have obſerved in it ſeveral other Faults beſides thoſe which I have mentioned in the Articles of *Suetonius* and *Tacitus.* (*g*) *No Body is Ignorant that his laſt Works are much inferiour to thoſe compoſed in the Flower and Vigour of his Age.* Theſe are the Words of Mr. *Baillet.*

MR. DE *Vigneul Marville* pretends (*h*) that *la Mothe le Vayer's* Works *are only a collection of what he liked beſt in the courſe of his Reading*; that *formerly ſuch ſort of Rhapſodies were read, but are not reliſh'd at preſent.* There is too much harſhneſs and Severity in this Sentence: All unbyaſſ'd perſons have always made a vaſt difference, betwixt *la Mothe le Vayer's* Writings, and Rhapſodies. He was not an Author who heaped up paſſages like the Compilers of a *Florilegium* or a *Polyanthea.* He contented himſelf to confirm his thoughts by thoſe of the moſt excellent Authors of Antiquity, or to uſe his Learning in order to give new hints by the Applications which he made, or the conſequences which he drew. This is not what is called a Rhapſody. He gave out an infinite Number of things which were purely his own, and which he intermixed with a great deal of Salt and Wit; and tho' he hath interſperſed ſeveral borrowed thoughts, all which are not choſen with ſufficient diſcernment, it is nevertheleſs true that from thence ariſes a Work, the Reading of which is highly advantageous, and which continues to pleaſe ſome very good Judges. Mr. *de Vigneul Marville* believes that he hath done a great Honour to *France* by ſaying that *la Mothe le Vayer's Rhapſodies are not adapted to our preſent taſt*, and

---

‡ Moreri [illegible] 1672. Mr. [illegible] is very much miſtaken in his [illegible] graphicum, where he places the Death of the Author in the Year [illegible]

|| Vigneul Marville, Melanges d'Hiſt. & de Litterat. tom. 2. pag. [illegible] Dutch Edit.

x That is, he was a Philoſopher, who minded only the [illegible] part and deſpiſed the vanities of Humane Life.

β At Rohen in 8.

γ I have this from Mr. Drelincourt.

δ At Poitiers in 1603. in 12.

* Publ. 1611. in 8.

† I have this from Mr. Bourdelot.

(*a*) Epiſtle dedicatory of the 3. Edition.

(*b*) *See his Life Written by his Son.*

(*c*) Æſtimatio & opinio rerum humanarum reginæ ſunt. Cardanus, lib. 3. de utilit. apud Naudæum, Coups d'Etat, p. m. 92.

(*d*) Chriſtopher Pellerus quotes it ſometimes in his Politicus ſceleratus Impugnatus. *See there* pag. 55. 56. & 2.9.

(*e*) *See* Sorberiana pag. 223. *Dutch Edit.*

(*f*) Baillet, Jugemens des Savans, tome 2. pag. 215.

(*g*) Id ib. tome 1. pag. 390.

(*h*) Vigneul Marville, Mêlang. d'hiſt. & de litt. tom. 2. p. 300. *Dutch* Edit.

whilst they were endeavouring to obtain the dispensation, he was so embarassed betwixt the desire of keeping his Benefices, and that of enjoying a Wife, that he could not disengage himself from this (*Z*) Labyrinth, otherwise than by throwing himself from the top to the bottom of his House. By which he broke all his Bones, and Died immediately very much lamented by the whole City. His Mistress being informed of this desperate Act, would have killed her self; wherefore they were obliged to keep a Watchful Eye over her to prevent any attempts of that Nature. You expect to hear that Time and another sighing Lover comforted her, but you are mistaken; for as soon as her Grief admitted of a little Solace, she turn'd Nun †.

VALDES (JOHN) one of the first Founders of *Lutheranism* in the Kingdom of *Naples*, was a β Civilian, and a *Spanish* Gentleman α on whom *Charles* the fifth conferred the Honour of Knighthood. It is believed γ that in his Travels to *Germany* he got a relish of the Opinions there Preached against the Church of *Rome*; and that having carried to *Naples* the Books of *Luther*, *Bucer* and the Anabaptists, he made use of them to get *Proselytes.* It is certain that he communicated his Opinions to several Persons, who Assembled in Secret (*A*) to serve God according to these new instructions. Some Women of Quality frequented these Assemblies, as did also some Monks of Extraordinary Merit, and among others ‖ *Peter Martyr Vermilius*, and * *Bernardinus Ochinus* often resorted thither. The Inquisition perceived it, and by the Application of their usual Violent Remedies Supprest this beginning of Reformation. *Valdes*'s Disciples were not all equally stedfast: Some stuck to the new Doctrines and retired into Protestant Countries; but the greatest part (*B*) yielded and betrayed their Con-

γ See the Bibliotheca Antitrinit. pag. 2. & Spondanus ad. Ann. 1547. n. 21. 22.

β See the Remark A.

* Spondanus ubi supra n. 21.

‖ Cœlius Secundus Curio, Preface to *Valdes*'s considerations

† Taken from [illegible]

§ See [illegible]

‖ [illegible] Melch. Adam. in vita Petri Martyris pag. 31.

and that the Readers no longer lose their time in Reading them; but it is to be feared that he will hereby confirm several Foreigners in the Judgment which they make, that *France* too much disgusted with all that favours of Learning, only employs her self in the refining of her Language and the happy turning of the Pictures and Characters of Men. The best Writings of the first Academists are not less slighted than (*a*) those of *la Mothe le Vayer*; and yet it is agreed on all hands that the *French* Academy was never better filled than in its beginning.

(*Z*) *He could not disengage himself from this labyrinth otherwise than by throwing*, &c.] He received a very Vigorous Charge from two different passions; On the one side he found himself unable to quit the Charms resulting from the large Revenue of his Benefices, and on the other he despaired of resisting the Violence of his Love, if he could find Means to annul his Contract. If I keep my Benefices, said he to himself, I shall never enjoy the Person I Love, and I don't find my self able to endure that privation. If I enjoy this Person, I shall lose my preferments, and I don't believe I can any more bear that than the other. This plunged him into an intollerable Melancholy, which was aggravated by his reflecting on the prejudice he did his Mistress. He knew that by breaking off the promised Marriage, he at once ruin'd the Reputation and Fortune of a very Virtuous Lady. For he doubtless imagined that she would find no more a Sortable match. The Scrupulous niceness of the *Italians* is such that they cannot easily digest the privacies which they suppose to have been in such a case. Nay in the very Countries, where People are not so nice, some Men would never address to a Lady who hath several times hearkened to the Declarations of Love of a Young Spark admitted by the Relations; for they suppose that the more she became sensible of her Parents consent, the fewer bounds she set to her Endearments, and that she abandoned the out-side of the place. What would they not think if the matter broke off betwixt the Contract and the Wedding Day? However it was our *Valdes*'s thought he should ruin the Reputation of this fair one, if he should annul the Contract; he was, touched with a Compassion for her; he was ashamed to use her so ill, and these two Passions joyning with others, so cruelly tormented him, that to free himself from this Slavery he resolved to end his Life. Early in the Morning he went to the prospect Turret on the top of his House, and threw himself into the Street; (*b*) *Valdesius neque libenter sacerdotiis, quæ opulenta erant, abdicare cogitat, neque perferre se amorem, etiam si impune liceat, ulterius sperat. Igitur cum id consilii se cepisse videret, quod non facile poterat explicare, graviore ob id dolore affectus, quòd pudicissimæ feminæ famam, & fortunam omnem everterit, si repudii nuntium remisisset, magnis excruciatus sollicitudinibus, misericordiaque & pudore confectus, ut erat æstivus dies, turriculam quandam ad prospectum super ædium culmen excitatam discinctus adhuc ascendit, quasi matutinalem auram strictiorem animi gratia capturus, servuloque mox negotii certi nomine ablegato nullam aliam rationem nactus, qua se turbulentissimis miseriis explicaret, & dulcissimæ sponsæ famæ nominique prospiceret, ex editissimo eo loco in viam mediam sese præcipitem dedit, quo ita totis ossibus colliso, & statim exanimato, Alterii filia re percepta, ipsa quoque sponsi desiderio sibimet manum inferre tentavit, sed diligenti familiarium observatione prohibita, custoditaque, posteaquam tempore dolor aliquantulum mitigatus est, maritalem perosa vitam perpetuo victura cœlibatu vestalem induit.* This Author does not mention whether this unhappy Man was interred in a Church, or whether the Judges exercised the Rigour of the Law on his Corps. He only tells us that the whole City deplored his Death (*c*).

(*A*) *Who assembled in secret to serve God—— some Women of Quality frequented.*] A passage in *Peter Martyr's* life informs us of this more particularly. We have there a very fine Elogy on our *Valdes* the Founder of this dawning Church. (*d*) *Qui* (Joannes Valdesius) *posteaquam à DEO vera religionis agnitione donatus est, vitam suam in Italia, & præcipue Neapoli egit, quo loco doctrina & sanctissimo vitæ exemplo, quamplurimos, præsertim nobiles, Christo lucrifecit, ac fuit eo tempore non spernenda Ecclesia piorum hominum in urbe Neapolitana. Nam in illo cœtu multi viri erant nobiles & docti; multæ etiam excellenti virtute fœminæ: inter quas ut alias illustres & vere heroinas omittamus, silentio tamen præterire non debemus nobilissimam heroinam* Izabellam Manricham, *quæ postea CHRISTI nomine a patria exulavit. In hoc cœtu piorum fuit ibidem CHRISTI nomine exul* Galeazzius Caracciolus *Marchio Vici, & alii magni viri post exules, & quos omnes nominare non necesse est. Quamvis autem hujus Ecclesiæ prima laus debeatur Valdesio: nihilominus tamen Martyris quoque virtus commemoranda est.* See the Remark F.

(*B*) *The greatest part yielded and betrayed their consciences.*] *Nicolas Balbani* Minister of the *Italian* Chuch at *Geneva* informs us of this: His Words according to Mr. *Minutoli*'s version are. " (*e*) The
" greatest Danger that threatned him (*f*) pro-
" ceeded from the same Person from whom he
" had received the beginning of his knowledge;
" for the Number of the Disciples of this *Valdes*, of
" whom we have already spoken, and who were
" the only Company that *Galeazzo* frequented af-
" ter he became acquainted with them, being ex-
" tremely encreased in *Naples*, most of them not
" advancing farther in point of Religion than to
" Establish the Means of Justification by Jesus Christ
" and to Condemn some of the grossest Popish Su-
" perstitions, without abstaining on that Account
" from frequenting the Churches, and assisting at

" Mass

(*a*) *I made this Observation to shew that if* la Mothe le Vayer *is not read as he was formerly, it proceeds from a general disgust at most things that have lost the Grace of Novelty.*

(*b*) Pierius Valerianus de litterator. infelicit. lib. 1. pag. 45.

(*c*) Valdesius totius Romæ luctu deploratus est. Id. ib.

(*d*) Melch. Adam. in vita Theolog. exter. pag. 31.

(*e*) Vie de Galeace Caracciolo pag. 47. 48.

(*f*) That is Galeazzo Caracciolo Marquis de Vico.

Conſciences. He lived ‡ unmarried and very Chaſtly, and dyed at *Naples*, about 1540. He attacked the Church of *Rome* (*C*) on ſome points only, and it is reported that on the Doctrine of the Trinity, he did not agree with the (*D*) Proteſtants, nor the *Roman* Catholicks. The Unitarians have placed him in the Number of their Authors. He wrote ſeveral (*E*) Books, of which the moſt eſteemed is

‡ Cœlius Secundus Curio, *Preface to Valdes's Conſiderations.*

" *Maſs*, and partaking with the reſt of the " Papiſts in ſeveral Idolatries; it was to be feared " that *Galeazzo* would make no greater progreſs than " thoſe Gentlemen, whoſe good Intentions miſcarried when they came to be perſecuted and imprisoned, and they were conſtrained to abjure " their Principles, after which ſome were put to " Death on pretence of relapſing to their former " Errors, and amongſt them was *Caſerta* himſelf, who had been the Inſtrument of *Galeazzo*'s " Converſion.

(*C*) *He attacked the Church of* Rome *on ſome points only.*] Add to the Paſſage I have juſt now cited the following words of the ſame Book: " (*a*) " There was then at *Naples*——a certain *Spaniſh* " Gentleman whoſe Name was *John Valdes*, who " having ſome knowledge of, and being ſenſibly " touched with the truth of the Goſpel, eſpecially " in the point of Juſtification, had the happineſs to " ſow ſome Seeds thereof amongſt the Nobility he " converſed with, and began in that manner to " draw ſome Gentlemen out of their Ignorance, " undeceiving them concerning the Merit of good " Works and the Righteouſneſs of Men, as well as " concerning ſeveral Superſtitions." Compare this with what I have cited from *Thuanus*, in the Article *Flaminius*, and obſerve that *Flaminius* (*b*) was one of thoſe who with *Valdes* confirmed *Peter Martyr Vermilius* in his new Opinions.

Ibid. 10. 11.

Melch. m. ſupra.

(*D*) *On the Doctrine of the Trinity he did not agree.*——*The* Unitarians *have placed him.*] See the following paſſage of the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*: (*c*) *Ab eo* (Johanne Valdeſio) *Bernardinus Ochinus ſententiam ſuam contra receptam de Trinitate opinionem imbibiſſe perhibetur. Floruit a.* 1542. *De eo Miniſtri eccleſiarum conſentientium in Sarmatia & Tranſylvania lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. *de falſa & vera unius Dei Patris, Filii & Spiritus Sancti cognitione, hæc ſcribunt:* De Joanne etiam Valdeſio, genere & pietate clariſſimo, quid dicendum? Qui ſcriptis publicis ſuæ eruditionis ſpecimina nobis relinquens, ſcribit, ſe de Deo ejuſque Filio nihil aliud ſcire, quam quod unus ſit Deus altiſſimus Chriſti Pater: & unicus Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus ejus filius, qui conceptus eſt de Spiritu Sancto in utero virginis, unus & amborum Spiritus. This may perhaps be confirmed by *Balbani*'s words: (*d*) *The Devil ſtill continued to forge Shackles for* Galeazzo Caracciolo; *for fear he ſhould eſcape, he again endeavoured to pervert his Mind, by the efforts which he obliged certain Perſons to make, to draw him over to a Pernicious Party. Theſe were a band of* Anabaptiſts *and abominable* Arians, *who were unhappily ſpread in* Naples *and other parts of the Kingdom; they promiſed themſelves to find in* Galeazzo (*thinking the ſtarting of a new Opinion enough to gain a Novice*) *the Man whom they wanted to be their powerful Support and Defence, and the Patron of their Cabal: Wherefore they left no means which they thought proper unattempted to engage him on their ſide, and taint him with their Hereſy.* The Author further adds, that this Gentleman vigorouſly repulſed their Efforts. Obſerve that he makes (*e*) a diſtinction betwixt theſe Perſons, and *Valdes*'s Diſciples: But we may venture to ſay, that his acknowledgment that a Party of *Antitrinitarians* appeared in the Kingdom of *Naples*, renders more probable what (*f*) *Sandius* affirms concerning *Valdes*'s Hereſy. I have read a thing in *Beza*'s Letters which deſerves a place here. A Miniſter of the *French* Church at *Embden*, was accuſed amongſt other things of having got Tranſlated and Printed in the *Dutch* Language, without the Knowledge of his Collegues, *Valdes*'s Conſiderations, (*g*) filled with Blaſphemies againſt the word of God, and of having left out the Notes which were added to the *Lyons* Edition. Beſides other reaſons in his Defence he urged the two following; that the Book was not full of Blaſphemies, and that it ought not to be leſs permitted at *Embden*, to praiſe the Piety of *Valdes* than at *Baſil*, *Zurich*, and *Geneva*. He was anſwered, that Book had done a great deal of Miſchief to the Flock of Chriſt at *Naples*, and that *Ochinus* had there found the extravagant Errors which had ruined him; and that if any good Men had beſtowed Elogies on thoſe Conſiderations of *Valdes*, they would change their Opinion as ſoon as they had Examined them. It was added that the Bookſeller at *Lyons*, who Printed them, was very ſorry and asked Pardon for it, after *Calvin* and ſome others had Advertiſed him of his Fault. Read all the particulars in the following *Latin* words of *Beza*: (*h*) *Scimus ex idoneorum hominum teſtimonio, quantum naſcenti Neapolitanæ Eccleſiæ liber ille detrimenti attulerit: Scimus etiam quod fuerit de illo judicium D. Joannis Calvini: Scimus & illud, Ochinum infelicis memoriæ virum ex illis lacunis ſuas illas prophanas ſpeculationes hauſiſſe, & ita tandem ſenſim a verbo Dei abductum in ultimum illud exitium ſeſe præcipitaſſe, in quo miſer interiit: ac proinde librum illum a ſpiritu Anabaptiſtico multis locis non multùm diſſidentem, id eſt, à verbo Dei ad inanes quaſdam ſpeculationes, quas falſo Spiritum appellant, homines abducentem, vel nunquam editum, vel ſtatim ſepultum fuiſſe magnopere cuperemus.*——*Cæterùm quinam illi ſint procati judicii homines qui ſcriptum illud* (*perſonam enim ipſam Valdeſii non attingimus*) *ut pium & religioſum libris etiam editis commendarint, nos quidem ignoramus, neque dubitamus quin ſi boni viri ſunt, re diligentiùs perſpecta ſententiam mutent, quod & Lugdunenſi Typographo viro bono evenit, ut qui, quamvis additis illis notis meritò ſe poſſet excuſare, admonitus tamen à fratribus, & nominatim quidem à D. Calvino, culpam deprecari quàm excuſare maluit.*

Balba- vie de ace accio- pag. 45, 46.

Ibid. 47.

He is Author the liothe- Anti- itario-

Multis oribus e m pie. ad- us fa- m Dei bum entes. u, epiſt. g. 220. 3. ope-

(*h*) Theod. Beza ibid.

(*E*) *He wrote ſeveral Books.*] Of which *Sandius* gives us the following Liſt: (*i*) *Dialogi Charon & Mercurius impreſſi Italicè. Conſiderationes piæ & doctæ. In Pſalmos aliquot. In Evangelium Matthei. In Evangelium Johannis. Commentarius in epiſtolam Pauli ad Romanos. a.* 1556. *Commentario breve, ó declaracion compendioſa, y familiar, ſobre la primera epiſtola de ſan Pablo á los Corinthios, muy util para todos los amadores de la piedad Chriſtiana.* He obſerves that the *Spaniſh* Inquiſition hath inſerted *Valdes*'s Commentary on the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, in their Index of Prohibited Books, both with and without the Author's Name. He was in the right to make this Obſervation, for that it is ſo expreſſed in the Index is very (*k*) true. *Don Nicolas Antonio* (*l*) obſerves the ſame thing; but he doth not diſcover that he knew who *Valdes* was. *Joannes de Valdes quidam*, ſaith he, *ſcripſit commentario breve ò declaracion*, &c. He adds that *du Verdier Vau-Privas* relates that *Claudius de Kequiſinen* a Pariſian, Tranſlated the hundred and ten Divine Conſiderations *Johannis Valdeſii* out of *Spaniſh* into *French*. *Du Verdier* (*m*) calls this Author *Jean de Valdeſſo*, and ſaith, that the *French* Tranſlation of theſe Divine Conſiderations was Printed at *Lyons* in 8. by *Charles Peſnot*, and at *Paris* in 16. by *Mathurin Prevoſt* 1565. So he ſays under the word *Claudius de Kequiſinen*: But under the word *Jean de Valdeſſo*, *Secretary to the King of* Naples (*n*), he only ſpeaks of one hundred Conſiderations, and refers us to *Claudius de Kerquiſine*. By which we may obſerve that he had no regard to Uniformity either in Proper Names or the Titles of Books. He adds that *Charon* and *Mercury*, *Dialogues of the ſame* Valdeſſo, were *rendred into* French *by an uncertain Tranſlator*. This confirms the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* and the Epitome of that of *Geſner*, where our *John Valdes* is call'd *Secretarius Regis Neapolitani*, and declared to be the Author of the Dialogues *Charon* and *Mercurius*. Let us ſay by the by that they deceive us, when they make uſe of the Plural Number with reſpect to the Book wherein *Charon* and *Mercury* are the Interlocutors. It is but one Dialogue; which I own is followed by another, but the Perſons there are *Lactantius* and an Arch-Deacon. The whole Title of the Book runs thus. *Due Dialoghi, l'uno di Mercurio & Caronte: nel quale, oltre molte coſe belle, gratioſe, & di buona dottrina, ſi raconta quel che accade nella guerra dopò l'anno* M D X X I. *L'altro di Lactantio*

(*i*) Bibliot. Antitrinit. pag. 2. *See alſo the* Epitome *of* Geſnerus's Bibliotheca p. m. 506.

(*k*) *See the Index* librorum prohibitorum & expurgandorum pag. 736. *of the Edition of* 1667. *at the word* Juan Valdeſio.

(*l*) Nicol. Antonio, biblioth. ſcript. Hiſpan. tom. 1. p. 606.

(*m*) Du Verdier, biblioth. Françoiſe pag. 182.

(*n*) Ib. ib. pag. 759.

is intituled *one Hundred and ten Considerations.* I shall (F) relate by whose care it was Printed.

VALDES (*James* *) Author of a Book, in which he endeavours to prove (Z) that the Kings of *Spain* have a just right to the Pre-eminence of all Christian Princes. He was born in *Asturia* in the XVI Century, and run through the Course of his Studies at *Valladolid*, where he exercised the Profession of an Advocate, and taught the Canon-Law for Twenty Years. After which he was promoted to the Office of Counsellor in the Council of *Granada*. His *Additiones ad Roderici Suarez lecturas variorum Jurium* were Printed at *Valladolid* in 1590 †.

VALERIA, Sister to the Orator (A) *Hortensius*, by a very odd way came to

tanio & di uno Arcidiacono, nel quale piacevolmente si trattano le cose avenute in Roma nell' anno M. D. XXVII. Di Spagnolo in Italiano con molta accuratezza & tradotti & reviste. In Vinegia con gratia & privilegio per anni Dieci. The Date of the Impression is not specified: It contains 148. Leaves in *Octavo*. Mr. *Konig* misleads us, when (a) he refers us to *Pierius Valerianus* in quest of *John Valdes*, who wrote a Commentary on the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Romans*, Printed in 1556. For *Pierius*'s *Valdes* is another Man. I find nothing concerning our *Valdes* in the *Oxford* Catalogue, but under the Name of *John de* VAL D'ESSO, or *Valdesso*, you find *One hundred and ten Divine Considerations*, Printed at *Lyons* in 8vo, 1563. Also the same Book Printed in *Italian* at *Basil* in 1550, and in *English* at *Oxford*, in 1638. in 4to.

(F) *By whose care it was Printed.*] The *French* Edition which I here make use of, is that of *Paris*, 1565. in 16. Entitled, *Cent & dix Considerations divines de Jan de Val d'Esso. Traduites premierement, d'Espaignol en langue Italienne, & de nouveau mises en François, par C. K. P.* The Preface is *Cœlius Secundus Curio*'s, who was the Editor of the *Italian* Edition at *Basil* in 1550. He represents it as an excellent Work, and after a great many Elogies, goes on in the following Words. "But we are obliged for this great and Heavenly Treasure, to Mr. *Peter Paul Vergerius*, as the Instrument of Divine Providence to occasion the Printing and the Publishing of it, that it may be seen and possessed by every Person. For leaving *Italy*, and quitting a false and pretended Bishoprick to joyn and apply himself to the true Apostleship, to which he was called by Christ, he brought with him several excellent Compositions. He did as every body uses to do, when by some sad Disaster, his House is on fire, or the place where he lives in danger of being plunder'd by Soldiers; for he endeavours to save himself with the most valuable things he has. In like manner our *Vergerius* having nothing dearer to him in this World than the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, he packed up and carried off with him those Compositions which tended to illustrate and spread it. He neglected the Earthly Riches, and carefully preserved the Heavenly and Divine Treasures: Amongst which this little piece was one of the most valuable which could be imagin'd or coveted. After which, very well knowing that all things in their own Nature excellent, raise their value and esteem, by being communicated and distributed to several Persons, he left me these hundred and ten Considerations on condition I should Publish them: which I have done, as you see with the utmost diligence that I have been capable of. These Considerations, as several can testify, were originally written by the Author in *Spanish*, but afterwards translated into *Italian*, by a Person of great Piety and Virtue: And through inadvertence, several *Spanish* Idioms, have slipt into the Version. *John de Val d'Esso* the Author, was a *Spaniard*, of a Noble and Ancient Family, raised to an honourable state, being at first a Gentleman, Knighted by *Charles* V. but after that a more Honourable and Magnificent Knight of *Jesus Christ*. After *Christ* was revealed to him, he did not long follow the Court, but lived in *Italy*, and resided at *Naples*. Where by the engaging Charms of his Doctrine, and the holiness of his Life, he gained many Disciples to Christ, especially a good number of Gentlemen and Knights, and Women of Quality who deserved all sorts of Praise. He was so mild and charitable, that he made himself Debtor to every Person for the great Talents with which he was entrusted, and accommodated himself to Persons of the meanest condition in order to gain them to *Christ*. Not only this, but he served as an Instrument to convey the light of the Gospel to some of the most famous Preachers in *Italy*. This is what I know, by having particularly conversed with them — And besides he left several excellent Compositions behind him, which by means of the mentioned *Vergerius*, we hope in time will be communicated to us."

(Z) *A Book in which he endeavours to prove.*] This piece was Publish'd at *Granada* in 1602, in *Folio*, and Dedicated to *Philip* III. King of *Spain*, and it was re-printed at *Francfort*, in 4to in 1626. The Title is *Prærogativa Hispaniæ, hoc est, de dignitate & præeminentia regum regnorumque Hispaniæ, & honoratiori loco ac titulo eis eorumque legatis a Conciliis, nec non Romana sede jure debito, tractatus eximius, Reges Catholicos Christianissimis aliisque jure, regno, sede ac titulo potiores extitisse & adhuc (b) liquido demonstrans.* The Author had chosen this for the Subject of an Oration, which he pronounced in the University of *Valladolid* in the presence of King *Philip* II. Which was so applauded, and that Monarch was so well pleased with it, that he order'd him to write a Tract on that Subject. This occasioned the Book, (c) wherein the Author pretends to the same Fate with *Ægidius Romanus*, who having argued on the Question *de Regno* in the Schools, in the presence of *Philip* IV. King of *France*, received Orders from that Prince to prepare an intire Treatise *de regimine Principum*. (d) *Mihi evenit id, quod olim Ægidio Romano accidisse Paulus Æmilius in Philippo* IV. *auctor est, quod cum in Scholis publicis de regno coram Philippo Pulchro quæstionem habuisset, tandem ejus regis imperio, opus de regimine principum edidit.* If *Valdes* hath not more sincerely cited other Authors, I look upon his Book to be one of the worst in the World; for it is false that *Ægidius Romanus* disputed on the Thesis *de Regno*, in presence of *Philip* IV. It is false that he received any Order to write a Book on that Subject after the pretended Disputation. But the thing is this. That Prince engaged him to Publish a Tract *de Regimine Principum*, and afterwards commanded him to make a Speech to him in the Name of the whole University, at his return from his Coronation. *Paulus Æmilius*'s words are: (e) *Philippus pulcher jam inde à prima adolescentia Ægidium Romanum theologum observarat, authorque fuerat ut de regimine principum monumenta quæ extant conscriberet, ederetque. Eundem Lutetiam a Rhemensibus sacris regressus, quod Sacræ Scholæ universique Musæi orationi novos excipi Reges solemne sit, dicere jussit.* It is indeed true that the Subject of this Oration was *de Regno*: *Paulus Æmilius* has it, but it is of his own Composure. *Ægidius Romanus* could not express himself otherwise than in the crabbed Scholastick Style; he could not use the selected words and neat Latin which that Historian lends him. To conclude, the *French* Authors have not been silent concerning this *Spaniard*'s Pretensions: They have Publish'd Books to convince him of his Mistake. See the *Memoirs concerning the precedence of the Kings of* France *before the Kings of* Spain, by *F. Godefroy*, Advocate in Parliament, Printed in 1612. but above all, Mr. *Bulteau*'s Tract (f) Printed at *Paris* in 1675. The *Journal des Sçavans* of *Feb.* 11. in the same Year, gave an Extract of it.

(A) *Sister to the Orator Hortensius.*] Doubtless she was only his Sister by the Mother's side, and it ought to be said, that *Hortensius*'s Mother was married to a Man of the Antient Family *Valeria*. But on the other side, we know that *Hortensius* had a Sister, (g) who was the Mother of *Valerius Messala*, Consul in the Year of *Rome* 701. It must therefore

* *Nicolas Antonio* Biblioth. script. Hispan. tom. 1. pag. 547. calls him Didacus.

† Taken from Nicolas Antonio ubi supra.

(a) Konig bibl. vet. & nova pag. 836.

to be *Sylla*'s Wife. She was a Woman of great Beauty and Quality, and had lately been Divorced from her Husband. *Sylla* having juſt loſt his Wife, was preſent at a great Combat of Gladiators: The Women ſat then confuſedly intermixed with the Men. *Valeria* going to ſit next to *Sylla*, ſoftly put her Hand to his Robe when ſhe was behind him, and pinched off a little of the Wool. He looking on her with ſurprize; *'Tis nothing, my Lord*, ſaid ſhe, *I would only enjoy a little of your good Fortune as well as others.* These Expreſſions, very far from diſpleaſing *Sylla*, inſpired him with ſome agreeable emotions. He preſently diſcovered that he was touch'd; he ſent to inform himſelf of the Name, Quality, and Reputation of the Lady. After which nothing but Glances and (*B*) mutual Smiles paſſed between 'em, which at laſt ended in a (*C*) promiſe of Marriage. The Hiſtorian, * from whom we have this Adventure, blames *Sylla* only; others think, that without injuring his Judgment, he might alſo have cenſured (*D*) *Valeria*. Which he doth not in the leaſt; but he obſerves that her Husband was ſo far from being very fond of her, that he kept Actreſſes in his Houſe. He left her pregnant of a Daughter, called *Poſthumia*, from her being born after the Death of her Father.

* Plutarchus in Sylla, pag. 475.

VALERIUS (*Auguſtin*) Biſhop of *Verona*, and a Cardinal, flouriſhed towards the end of the XVI. Century. He was born at *Venice*, and taught Moral Philoſophy there. He perfectly underſtood the Latin Tongue, which he ſpoke freely and elegantly; but could not without difficulty expreſs himſelf in his Native Language. His Morals were very edifying, and he faithfully diſcharged the Duties of a Biſhop and of a good Paſtor. He was created Cardinal by *Gregory* the XIII. His Grief to ſee his Country lie under the Excommunication of *Paul* V. threw him into a Diſtemper, of which he dy'd †. Beſides ſeveral other Books, he Compoſed a holy Rhetorick, where he informs us of a very curious particular relating to the (*Z*) Martyrologies.

† *Taken* from Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. 1. p. 170, 171.

VALLA

fore be ſaid that his Mother and Siſter married into the ſame Family. I have not found any Author, who hath informed me whether *Valerius Meſſala's* Mother had the ſame Father with *Hortenſius*, or whether ſhe was the ſame who married *Sylla*.

(*B*) *Nothing but Glances.*] If any one is ignorant that the Greek Language abounds with very ſignificant terms to expreſs the mute Language of Love, let him only conſider the words which I cite (*a*).

(*C*) *Which at leaſt ended in.*] *Plutarch* hath not exactly ſpecified whether the Propoſals of Marriage, and the acceptation of it, happened the ſame day at their departure from the Spectacle. It is probable that that Affair was not long a doing, and that after they had tired their Eyes with making love by Signs, while the Gladiators were engaged, they broke ſilence as they were leaving the Amphitheatre. *Sylla* quickly took fire, and the Lady did not act a very nice part. It is then very likely that ſhe did not put him to the trouble of asking twice, and that as ſoon as ſhe had a glimpſe of Hopes to participate of *Sylla*'s fortunate Star, not by barely touching of his Robe, or keeping a little of the Wool of it, but by a Conjugal Union, ſhe abandoned her ſelf to her good Fortune. This was to take the opportunity by the Fore-lock. From an Union of Glances, they proceeded to that of Lips and Bodies within the narrow ſpace of one day, tho' *Plutarch* doth not tell us ſo in expreſs terms.

(*D*) *He might alſo have cenſured* Valeria.] *She perhaps*, ſaith he, according to *Amyot*'s Verſion, *does not deſerve any Cenſure for her Carriage on this occaſion; but tho' ſhe was the moſt honeſt and virtuous Woman in the World, the occaſion of* Sylla's *marrying her, was neither honourable nor proper, becauſe he was ſtruck on a ſudden by an affected Look and Expreſſion, as if he had been a young Boy, and thoſe Paſſions which are moved by theſe Trifles, are commonly the groſſeſt and moſt ſcandalous.* Methinks I hear *Brantome* relate the Adventures of his gallant Women, after having given them the Elogies of good and Virtuous Ladies. If a Tranſlator ſhould give himſelf never ſo little liberty, he might make *Plutarch* ſpeak more reaſonably than he doth in *Amyot*'s Tranſlation: He might make him ſay, that tho' *Sylla* ſhould have met with a Virtuous Woman, yet he would be to blame to marry her from ſuch a Principle of Love as this which determined him.

(*Z*) *A very curious particular relating to the Martyrologies.*] In the *Mercure Galant* of *September*, 1695, there's a Letter inſerted (*b*), which to me ſeems very extraordinary. I cannot tell how the Publick judges of it; but I imagin that I am not the only Perſon who reliſhes it. There is in it a judicious and modeſt cenſure on a piece (*c*) of *Loredano*, tranſlated into *French* very lately. The Author ſeems to me to treat him too gently, contenting himſelf with ſaying, *That he hath apparently trifled with his Subject, and without any reſpect to the holy ſource from whence he drew it, but only painted it in the gayeſt Colours of his Eloquence, and adorned it with the moſt agreeable Incidents which his imagination could ſuggeſt.* He adds, that *Lope de Vega* uſed the ſame liberty in his Paſtoral, where he treats of the Shepherds coming to the Manger at *Bethlehem*, and that he has ſeen a Manuſcript in Folio, *Written by a poor young Man on the Dialogue betwixt our Lord and his Diſciples at Emmaus.* After this he relates, *That Cardinal* Valerio, *Biſhop of* Verona, *in his Book, Entituled* de Rhetorica Chriſtiana, *informs us, that one of the cauſes of the falſe Legends of the Martyrs, was the cuſtom formerly obſerved in ſeveral Monaſteries, to exerciſe the young Monks, by Latin Amplifications propoſed to them on the Martyrdom of ſome Saint, which gave them the liberty of introducing the Tyrants and the perſecuted Saints ſpeaking, in ſuch a manner as appeared to them the moſt probable, giving them room at the ſame time to compile out of theſe Subjects a ſort of Hiſtories, rather filled with Ornaments and Inventions than Truth; but tho' they did not deſerve much conſideration, yet thoſe which ſeemed moſt ingenious and beſt compoſed, were laid up. So that after a long ſeries of Years, they, together with other Manuſcripts* (*d*), *were found in the Libraries of the Monaſteries, when it was very difficult to diſtinguiſh theſe Exerciſes of Wit from the true Hiſtories of the Saints there alſo preſerved. It is to be confeſſed that thoſe pious Writers are very excuſable, they having no other Deſign than to exerciſe themſelves on holy Subjects, could not fore-ſee the erroneous conſequences, which in proceſs of time proceeded from thence; ſo that if Poſterity is thereby deceived, it is rather owing to their own want of diſcernment than a proof of the ill Intention of thoſe Writers. It would be hard to have the ſame regard for Si*meon Metaphraſtes, *a Greek Author, of the Ninth Century, who firſt gave us the Lives of the Saints for every day of the Month thro' the whole Year; ſince it is viſible they were not written in that manner, but very ſeriouſly, tho' at the ſame time amplified and ſtuffed with ſeveral imaginary events, as* Bellarmin *himſelf teſtifies, who plainly tells us, that* Metaphraſtes *writ ſeveral of theſe Lives, as they might be, and not as they really were. But 'tis no wonder that ſuch a thing ſhould have been done by ſome Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, thro' a pious Zeal to Honour the Saints, and to render their Lives agreeable to the People, commonly more inclined to admire thoſe they reverence than to imitate them; ſeeing this Liberty creeps into the very Tranſlation of ſome Books of the Bible; as we are informed by St.* Jerome, *in his Preface to that of* Eſther, *that the vulgar Edition of that Book of Holy Writ, commonly read in his time, was ſtuffed with ſeveral Additions, which I cannot better expreſs than in his own words.*

(*d*) *See the Article* Tanaquil, *at the end of the Remark* B.

VALLA (*Lawrence*) One of the most Learned Men of the XIV. Century, Born at *Rome* (*A*) in 1415. He very vigorously attacked the Barbarity under which the Latin Tongue had groaned for several Ages, and compiled some Books in which he Collected the Elegancies of that Language so little in use in the Works of the School-men and Civilians. (*B*) But writing a History, he shewed that he was more capable of pointing out how others ought to write, than of practising his own Rules. He was a great lover of Criticism and Contradiction, in both which he allowed himself a liberty which drew on him a great many Enemies (*C*). He had the courage to Confute a false Tradition, which intirely pleased the Court of *Rome*; it was the pretended Donation of *Constantin*. He left * his Country either by the Pope's Orders, or because he had rendred himself the Object of the Hatred of too many, and retired to the Court of *Alphonsus* King of *Naples*, that great Protector of Learned Men, who attempted to learn Latin of him at 50 Years of Age. If he had confined himself to criticising on the Humanists, he had escaped several Reflections Publish'd against him with a great deal of Animosity, which he returned in the same Style; but he did not stop here, he levelled his Censures yet higher, he fell on the Ecclesiasticks (*D*) and spoke very boldly of certain things which they approved, and he disliked. These Adversaries were much more formidable

Quem librum, saith he, speaking of the Book of *Esther*, *Editio vulgata lacinosis hinc inde verborum finibus trahit, addens ea quæ ex tempore dici potuerant, & audiri, sicut solitum est scholaribus disciplinis sumpto themate, excogitare quibus verbis uti potuit qui injuriam passus, vel qui injuriam fecit.*

Those, who would see a vast number of curious and judicious Observations on this head, need only read Mr. *Baillet's* Discourse of the Lives of the Saints. Of which Mr. *de Beauval* has given us a very good Extract in his Journal for *January* 1701. pag. 37, to 56.

(*A*) *Born*——— in 1415.] The proof of which I draw from his Epitaph, where we find he died the first of *August* 1465, and that he lived 50 Years. The words of this Inscription in the Church of St. *John* of *Lateran* are: *Laurentio Valla harum ædium sacrarum Canonico, Alphonsi Regis & Pontificis maximi Secretario, Apostolicoque scriptori, qui sua ætate omnes eloquentia superavit, Catharina mater filio pientissimo posuit. Vixit annos L. obiit anno Domini* M. CCCC LXV. *Calendis Augusti.* According to *Vossius*, this Distick follows the Epitaph. (*a*)

Laurens valla jacet, Romanæ gloria linguæ,
Primus enim docuit qua decet arte loqui.

But he is undoubtedly mistaken; for these Verses were indeed written as a sort of Epitaph, (*b*) by *Franchinus of Cosenza*, but 'tis no Proof that they were ingraved upon the Tomb of the deceased. *Paul Jovius* does not say they were. Several Persons are mistaken concerning the Age of *Laurentius Valla*, and the Year of his death. Some assure us that he signaliz'd himself in the Council of *Constance*, in 1420. (*c*) *Claruit in Concilio Constantiensi personaliter sub Sigismundo Imperatore Anno Domini* 1420. Here are two Errors, for that Council began in 1414, and ended in 1418. And we have seen that *Laurentius Valla* was 50 Years of Age in 1465. So that he was but three Years old when that Council ended. (*d*) *Gesner* hath committed the same fault; he hath made him flourish in (*e*) 1410. The learned Mr. *Huet* hath also patronized this Opinion; for making *Casaubon* speak towards the latter end of the Reign of *Henry* IV, he makes him say (*f*) that two hundred Years ago *Laurentius Valla* Translated *Herodotus*. His death is placed in 1457, by *Paulus Jovius* (*g*), in 1467 by (*h*) *Spondanus*, and in 1495 by *Moreri*.

(*B*) *He very vigorously attacked the Barbarity*——— *But writing a History.*] *Paul Jovius* furnisheth me with an Evidence of these two things. (*i*) *Indignatus tandiu corrumpi seculum leguleorum & sophistarum immani conspiratione, optimasque artes inculta sermonis barbarie defœdari, Elegantiarum libros edidit, traditis Romanæ elocutionis præceptis ex accurata veterum scriptorum observatione, quibus juventus æmulandi studio ad detergendas corruptarum literarum sordes accenderetur*——— *apud* Alphonsum regem *de avitis bellis in Hispania, atque Sicilia gestis historia perscripta est, sed eo styli charactere, ut ejus minime videri possit, qui cæteris elegantiarum præcepta tradiderit.*

(*C*) *Which drew on him a great many Enemies*] On which head read the following Passage of Paul Jovius: (*k*) *Fuit Valla ingenio maxime libero, ob idque mordaci, contentiosoque, utpote qui aliena satirico dente facile perstringeret, & lites in literis, quasi id opus esset, adversus ignorantes acerrimas sereret. Extant enim Invectivarum, & recriminationum aliquot libri, erudite satisque perscripti; quibus dum læsi nominis famam tueretur, Facium Ligurem, Panhormitam, Pogium, & Raudensem jugulasse videri possit.* I shall specifie the Titles of some of his Works, which will be sufficient to prove him one of the greatest Duellists of the Republick of Learning, and that we may justly compare his life to that of a Gladiator. *Antidoti in Pogium Florentinum libri 4. in quibus promiscue & mores ac vitam hominis & impuram dictionem notat. Apologus & actus Scenicus in eundem. Adversus eundem libellus sive dialogus secundus. In Antonium Raudensem annotationum libellus. In Benedictum Morandum Bononiensem libri duo sive confutatio prior & posterior. In Bartolemæum Facium Ligurem & Anto. Panhormitam recriminationum libri 4.* He never forgave his Adversaries one Word or Phrase that relished of Barbarism; which gave occasion to the Fiction after his death, that he rendred himself so formidable in Hell, that *Pluto* dared not presume to speak Latin. To which it was added that *Jupiter* would have given him a place in Heaven, if he had not been afraid of introducing a Censurer of his Words. *Spondanus* cites the 4 Verses, which contain this ill-natur'd Jest. (*l*) *Acerrimâ mordacitate suâ & aliorum doctorum virorum veterum recentiorumque satyricâ perstrictione infamis. Ut non illepide quidam in illum mortuum, apud Trithemium* (*1*) *sic luserit.*

Nunc postquam manes defunctus Valla petivit,
Non audet Pluto verba Latina loqui.
Jupiter hunc cæli dignatus parte fuisset,
Censorem linguæ, sed timet esse suæ.

Cato the Censor was rallyed almost in the same manner.

Πυῤῥὸν, (*m*) πανδακέτην, γλαυκόμματον, οὐδὲ θανόντα
Πόρκιον εἰς ἀΐδην Φερσεφόνη δέχεται.
Ruffum, mordacem, glaucum, ne quidem exanimatum
Porcium in infernum Persephone recepit.

Another Epitaph on our *Valla* was,

Ohe ut Valla silet solitus qui parcere nulli est!
Si quæris quid agat, nunc quoque mordet humum(*n*).

Several have believed that in writing of Books, his end was not the Instruction of his Readers, but to Censure both the living and the dead. He (*o*) fell upon *Aristotle*, *Cicero*, *Virgil*, and paid no respect to any besides *Epicurus*. The latter was a fit Man to be praised by those, who loved to be singular. All the World cried out against, and abhorred him; which perhaps was the reason that rendred him admirable to *Valla's* Eyes. This Thought is not in *Pontanus* whom I here cite: (*p*) *Qui cum Laurentio familiarius vixerunt, affirmant illum eo nequaquam consilio in Grammaticis scripsisse, ac dialecticis, quo doceret, disciplinasque ab ignoratione vindicaret, atque à sorde, verum ut malediceret, obloquendoque detraheret de fama atque autoritate rerum scriptoribus; tum illis qui exemplo sunt ad scribendum aliis propter antiquitatem majestatemque dicendi, ac præcipiendi, tum illis ipsis, qui tunc viverent, quos dubitaverit ipse quidem dicere, profiterique palam, habere se quoque in Christum spicula.* This Learned Man, notwithstanding, did not want Defenders: read the Writings of *Floridus Sabinus*, and *Erasmus's* Epistle to (*q*) *Christopher Fisher* in 1505, occasioned by *Valla's* Notes on the New Testament, which he found in a Library, and which he Publish'd. See also the 3d Letter of *Erasmus's* 7 Book of Epistles.

(*D*) *He fell on the Ecclesiasticks, and spoke very boldly of certain things.*] It is agreed that his Censure was dable that thoſe who diſputed with him on points of Literature only; they were not leſs able to Rail, and beſides could dart the thunders of the Inquiſition, and deliver him up to the Penal Laws of the Secular Power. They Proſecuted him ſo violently that he had been Burnt alive †, if King *Alfonſo* had not Moderated their Rigour. They were then obliged to content themſelves with Whipping him round the *Jacobins* Cloiſter. He returned to *Rome* *, where he found ſo good Patrons that they obtained for him the Pope's Favour, and leave to Teach, beſides a Penſion. He Died there the 1ſt of *Auguſt* 1465, as appears by ‖ the Epitaph which his Mother cauſed to be Engraven in the Church of St. *John de Lateran* of which he had been Canon. I ſhall give you the ſubſtance of a very long Relation (*E*) which I have met with of his Quarrel with the Inquiſitors. We find beſides that he had drawn on himſelf the violent Enmity of a Civilian,

---

* He [illegible] *Hankius de Romanarum rerum scriptor. lib. 2. parte 1. pag. 116. Orthuinus Gratius in fasciculo rerum expetendarum, says he, was expelled from* Rome.

(*a*) Vossius de hist. Latinis lib. 3. c. 7. p. 580. *Moreri has transcribed this fault*

(*b*) Paulus Jovius in elog. c. 13. p. 37.

(*c*) Trithemius de scriptor. ecclesiast.

(*d*) Gesner. in biblioth. fol. 477.

(*e*) *And not in the Year* 1510. *as* Hankius de scriptor. rerum Romanar. tom. 2. parte 1. c. 11. pag. 118. *says he did.*

(*f*) *I have set down his words in the Remark* K.

(*g*) Jovius in elog. c. 13. p. 37. Boissardus in iconib. 13. apud. Hankium ubi supra pag. 117. Aub. Miræus in auctario scriptor. ecclesiast. p. 275. Zeillerus in Histor. parte 2. pag. 154. *agree with* Paul Jovius.

(*h*) Spondan. in an. ad an. 1467. n. 13. *which he grounds upon* Paul Jovius, *who only mentions the Year* 1457. (*i*) Paul. Jov. ubi supra pag. 36. (*k*) Id. ib.

was not only Perſonal, but alſo Real in ſome reſpects; for he cenſured the Faults and ſeveral of the Opinions of the Eccleſiaſticks: (*a*) *Ipſos etiam ſui ſeculi Theologos ſeu ignorantiâ ſupinâ ſeu inveteratâ perſuaſione variis opinionibus indormientes, ad veri ſenſum a ſtilo excitare nihil veritus eſt——quod in publicis Scriptis quaſdam Eccleſiæ Romanæ traditiones erroris damnaviſſet, aliis ipſe gravis cenſor, hæreticæ pravitatis cenſores ſibi graviſſimos ſentiebat.* He was Advertiſed that unleſs he was weary of his Life, he ought to refrain from cenſuring the Eccleſiaſticks, and writing ſuch Tracts as his refutation of *Conſtantin's* Donation. Two things then raiſed him Enemies, he had galled the Sacred Heads by cenſuring both their Morals and Opinions. (*b*) *Et ſane a Franciſco Philelpho etiam commonitus eſt ſatyrâ luculentâ, ut niſi vitæ ſatur ſit, abſtinere velit a perſtringendis ſacri ordinis viris, ac ſimilibus ſcribendis, uti illa adverſus donationem Conſtantinam. Satyra ea extſtat Hecatoſtichorum lib. 2 ſat. 4.* Several take one of theſe two things for the true cauſe of the Perſecution which he ſuffered, and the other for the pretence. His perſonal Satyrs irritated the Inquiſitors to Revenge, after which they endeavoured to Convict him of Hereſy. To ſatisfy their Reſentment they accuſed *Laurentius Valla* of Hereſy in ſeveral points of great Conſequence, ſuch as the Myſtery of the Trinity, the Doctrine of Free will, and Vows of Celibacy, &c. 'Tis affirmed that he was Condemned to be burnt, the Execution of which Sentence he eſcaped only by the Favour of the King of *Naples*; that he was obliged publickly to Abjure the Aſſertions for which he had been Condemned, and beſides to ſuffer the Chaſtiſement of the Laſh in the *Jacobins* Monaſtery. *Spondanus*'s words in the Year 1447 are: (*c*) *Eodem tempore* Laurentius Valla *Romanus, elegantiæ quidem pro ſeculo, ſed pro quolibet tempore virulentiſſimæ linguæ homo; Neapoli exiſtens, cum quaſdam propoſitiones hæreticas aſſeruiſſet delatus ad Inquiſitores, & in carcerem truſus, damnatuſque pro hæretico, beneficio Alfonſi Regis pœnam ignis evaſit; propoſitionibus tamen publicè ejuratis, virgis, privatim per clauſtra monaſterii Prædicatorum manibus revinctis cæſus.* He adds (*d*) that *Poggius* inſinuates that *Laurentius Valla* had erred on thoſe Articles, which I have mentioned above. It is very obſervable that this Annaliſt doth not relate the Propoſitions which *Laurentius Valla* was obliged to retract; he doth not ſay that they contained Hereſies relating to the Trinity, Free-will, &c. he ſaith only that one of *Laurentius Valla*'s Enemies inſinuated it. This may make us think that this Man's Doctrine was miſrepreſented by captious and malitious Extracts, and that it was charged as Erroneous, tho' it was not really ſo. Obſerve that notwithſtanding all the Miſchievous Efforts of the Neapolitan Inquiſitors, he lived Honourably at *Rome*; he there obtained permiſſion to Teach; he enjoyed a Penſion, and the Pope's Eſteem. This confirms the Aſſertion of thoſe who conjecture he was no Heretick, but that it was reſolved he ſhould be Chaſtiſed for having Cenſured the Clergy. See the following Remark.

(*E*) *Relation which I have met with of his Quarrels with the Inquiſitors.*] The Author whom I cite doth not mention theſe Quarrels before he hath related a diſpute which *Laurentius Valla* maintained on a Juridical Subject. A Civilian cenſured him very ſeverely: (*e*) You are, ſaid he, a Shoemaker, you go beyond your Laſt, you do not content your ſelf with the Study of Philology, you thruſt your Sickle into other Peoples Corn, and pretend to underſtand the *Roman* Law. Explain me then that place of the Code, continued he, ſhewing him the famous puzling Law (*f*), *Quinque pedum Præſcriptione. Valla* replyed that nothing could be more unjuſt than to aſſert that he was abſolutely Ignorant of the *Roman* Law, if he did not explain a Paſſage which ſcarce any Perſon had yet underſtood; that he ought not to propoſe that difficulty to thoſe who only believe they have ſome Knowledge of the Ancient Law, but to ſuch as pretend to be Ignorant of no part of it. (*g*) *Quid improbius quam velle damnare me, ut nihil juris intelligentem, quia locum aut nulli, aut vix ulli intellectum non expoſuerim? Debuiſſe illum proponi non ei qui aliquid juris ſe intelligere diceret, ſed ei qui omnia.* He nevertheleſs by his Elucidation of the Queſtion diſcovered that he very well underſtood the *Roman* Laws; after which in his turn he propoſed a Queſtion to the Civilian which ſilenced him. This Aggreſſor finding himſelf gravelled by the Queſtions put to him concerning the Right of Preſcriptions Eſtabliſhed in the XII. Tables, withdrew in a Rage, and from that time conceived ſuch a Mortal Hatred againſt *Valla* that he attempted his Death. (*h*) *Alia e Jure quæſtione petita adverſarium ad ſilentium adegit. Nam cum de Jure Uſucapionum ex duodecim tabulis nonnihil rogaret, in eas anguſtias eundem illum ſuum adverſarium adduxit, ut hic in conclave, velut furens ſe receperit, atque ex eo tempore homo vindictæ cupidiſſimus, odio pluſquam Vatiniano Vallam fuerit proſequutus, vitæque ejus inſidiatus.* This is the firſt part of *Boxhornius*'s Relation, the ſecond follows.

As the Knowledge of the Divines is more holy and more neceſſary, continues he, and their Authority greater, *Valla* could not attack their Follies without expoſing himſelf to the greateſt dangers. (*i*) *Ut Theologorum & ſanctior magiſque neceſſaria diſciplina eſt, & auctoritas major, ita cum eorum quoque ignorantiâ & putidiſſimis ineptiis commiſſus, vitam ac omnes fortunas ſuas in ultimum pene diſcrimen adduxit.* He was preſent at a *Lent* Sermon, Preached by a *Cordelier* (*k*) at *Naples*, he was one of the Auditory, I ſay, when the Monk took for his Text the Apoſtles Creed. And having obſerved the Preacher to affirm that St. *Peter* ſaid *I Believe in God the Father Almighty*, that St. *Andrew* added, *Creator of Heaven and Earth*, and that the other Apoſtles furniſhed the reſt of the Articles in their turn; after the end of the Sermon he asked (*l*) *Angelillus Campanus*, whether he knew any Authors who related that the Creed was compoſed in this manner. *Campanus* anſwered that he had never met with any ſuch thing in any Book, and that this Monk was the only Perſon whom he ever heard aver that St. *Jerome* was Born at *Rome*. They made him a viſit, and asked him where he had read that this Holy Father was a *Roman*. Several affirm it, replyed he, but who denies it? *Valla* (*m*) Laughed at this Incongruity; for 'tis he that affirms who ought to produce his Evidence, when required; and others are not to name thoſe who deny it. Yet he did not fail to obſerve to the Preacher that St. *Jerome* makes himſelf a Native of a Town in *Dalmatia*: (*n*) *Hieronymus ipſe non ſe Romanum dicit, ſed Pannonium aut Dalmatam ex oppido Stridone.* Some, anſwered the Monk, ſay he was a *Roman*, and others that he was a *Dalmatian*. There were two faults in this Anſwer. Could any Witneſs worth hearing be oppoſed to St. *Jerome* himſelf? And after all, ought he not to have Named his Evidence? *Valla* finding the Ignorance and Obſtinacy of the Man (*o*) left that Subject and proceeded to the Queſtion concerning the Creed. What Foundation have you, ſaid he,

---

† See the Remark D.

‖ See the Remark A.

(*a*) Boxhornius ſupra pag. [illegible]

(*b*) Voſſius de hiſtor. Lat. pag. [illegible]

(*c*) Spondanus ad ann. 1447. n. 10. pag. m. [illegible]

(*d*) Quod probris narrans Poggius ſermonis in eum invectivâ, erraſſe dicit in articulis Perſonæ in Deo, Trinitatis, Liberi Arbitrii, & Virginitatis ſanctimonialium. Id. ibid.

(*e*) Vallam aliquando acerbe increpuit quod, ut ſutor ultra crepidam, humaniorum literarum cultu haud contentus falcem mitteret in meſſem alienam, & juris Romani ſcientiam ſibi arrogaret. *Boxhornius, hiſtor. Univerſ.* pag. 953. edit. 1652.

(*f*) Quem (locum) obſcuriſſimum, & a nemine ejus ætatis Juriſconſultorum intellectum, imo depoſitum eſſe conſtabat. *Id. ib.* p. 954. *See* Abelard *Remark* Y.

(*g*) Id. ib.

(*h*) Id. ib.

(*i*) Id. ib.

(*k*) *His Name was* Antonius Betontinus.

(*l*) *He was Secretary to the King.*

(*m*) Primum hominis ſtultitiam riſu Valla excepit quaſi alius deberet oſtendere qui negaret, & non ipſe qui hoc affirmaverat, & quis traderet rogabatur. *Id. ibid.*

(*n*) Id. ib.

(*o*) Cognita hominis imperitia & improbitate, ultra noluit inſtare. *Id. ibid.* pag. 955.

him, whom he had gravelled in a Diſputation. He was provoked to this Diſpute by an air of Contempt, which doubtleſs increaſed the Rage of the Aggreſſor. He is blamed for being a little too Vain; for he made too great a ſhew of his Wit and Learning, which he diſplayed with more Pomp and (F) Affectation in the converſation of Learned Men, than in his Works. This is the Character of thoſe who aim at being paid on the ſpot, and are willing to be the Witneſſes of the Admiration they aſpire after. He Embraced *Epicurus's* (G) Opinion of the ſovereign Good, but ſo rectifyed as to render it agreeable to the Principles of Chriſtianity. He was an immoderate admirer of *Quintilian* (H), and affected to deſpiſe *Ariſtotle*. It is Storied of him that at Table he once let fall a Hint, that he had Arrows in his Quiver againſt (I) the Meſſiah himſelf. He did not underſtand *Greek* well enough to undertake, as he did, the Tranſlation of *Thucydides*, *Herodotus*, and *Homer*'s Iliad: Theſe Verſi-

ons

to aſſert that it was formed by pieces by the Apoſtles? The Doctors of the Church, anſwered the Monk, have informed me ſo. Name them, replyed he, cite them. I have already anſwered you, ſaid he, and (a) then growing very Angry he ſaid that *Valla* was an impious Man, and an Enemy to the Chriſtian Religion. Some days after he defamed him in a Sermon, and continued to inveigh againſt him ſo outragiouſly, that King *Alphonſus* was obliged to ſtop the Torrent of his Calumnies. *Valla* believing himſelf Challenged to diſpute with him, affixed to the great Church all the Propoſitions which he found Cenſured, and offered to maintain them againſt all Opponents. To this fight he Invited ſeveral Spectators, and even the King's Son. He prepared a very ſpacious Hall; Every Body was very attentive on the Iſſue of this Affair, but *Valla*'s Enemies would Hazard nothing: In order to ſtrengthen themſelves they made Intereſt at Court that *Valla* might be forbidden to proceed any farther. He obeyed, but inſulted his Adverſaries by a *Latin* Diſtich which he affixed to the Door of the Hall.

Rex pacis, miſerans ſternendas Marte phalanges
Victoris cupidum continuit gladium.

After this they became ſo Incenſed that they uſed their utmoſt endeavours either to have him Condemned to Death, or a perpetual Impriſonment. They cited him before the Arch-Biſhop's Vicar. He appeared and was ſurprized to ſee a numerous crowd of Monks; for he never once ſuſpected that this Intrigue was of that Importance. He was asked whether he did not believe that the Creed was compiled by the Apoſtles? No, ſaid he, but by the Council of *Nice*, and I ground my ſelf on very ſtrong Reaſons. The Inquiſitor who interrogated him, declared that the Anſwer was Heretical. Some Letters were produced, in which *Valla* Corrected ſome Errors, which by the negligence of the Copiſts had crept into the Pope's Decrees, and it was urged againſt him that his Inſolence deſerved Burning. He perceived the danger, and proteſted that on all theſe Heads he believed as the Church believed. They preſſed him to Condemn and Retract his Writings; but he deſired that firſt they would pleaſe to ſhew where he was Miſtaken, otherwiſe they would plainly make it appear that they did not aim at the Correction of his Heart, but only at that of his Tongue. (b) *Cur non potius vos docetis eſſe revocanda? an mavultis oris mei quam animi emendationem? quo enim pacto ego emendor, niſi id quod ore fateor, animo etiam ſentiam? Et quomodo ex animo ſentiam niſi ſententiam, quam ut veriſſimam hactenus tueor, vos falſi convincatis?* (c) A Biſhop then laid hold on him and cryed out, Wicked Wretch that thou art, thy Pride muſt be immediately abated. *Valla* repeated as before, *I believe all that the Church believes.* He was afterwards asked what he thought of the ten Categories. What, replyed he, do they belong to matters of Faith as the ten Commandments of the Divine Law? (d) Why, replyed they, ſhou'd they not belong to Religion? Are you Ignorant that the Logical Doctrine, *ſenſus diviſus, ſenſus compoſitus*, ſerves to explain the moſt important Controverſies in Theology? To ſhorten the diſpute, anſwered *Valla*, I declare, that tho' our Holy Mother the Church knows nothing of the matter, yet I believe all that ſhe believes concerning it. *Age, inquit Valla, rem compendii faciamus: etſi iſta mater Eccleſia ignoret, tamen idem de illa credo quod mater Eccleſia.* They would have proceeded; but the King having ſent Meſſengers to protect *Valla*, they ſtopt there.

I find two faults in this long Relation of *Bzovius*: One is that he dates all theſe things in 1401, which is before the Birth of *Valla*; the other that he cites no Author.

(F) *He diſplayed with more Pomp —— in the Converſation —— than in his Works.*] *Jovianus Pontanus* makes this Obſervation after having very much Praiſed the Modeſty of *Pomponius Lætus*. *Contra vero*, continues he (e), *Laurentius Vallenſis, multæ vir doctrinæ, ingeniique in primis acuti, popularibus in congreſſibus, ac literatorum circulis oſtentatione diſciplinæ judicatus eſt fuiſſe ſtudioſior, ne dicam parum modeſtus, ut in iis circulis multo appareret arrogantior, quam in libris ipſis, quos ſcriptos reliquit. Cumque non pauca in Dialecticis admonuiſſet adverſus horum temporum artis ejus magiſtros, eo ſeſe efferebat, palam ut diceret, nullam eſſe Logicam præter Laurentianam.*

(G) *Epicurus's Opinion of the Sovereign Good.*] See his Book *de voluptate & vero bono*, which was put into the *Index* as a Book, the reading of which is prohibited. See alſo the Book, which he calls *Apologia pro ſe & contra calumniatores ad Eugenium quartum Pont. Maximum.* You will there find that he chiefly juſtifies what he had taught, that Pleaſure is the Sovereign Good. (f) *Defendit ſe ſuaque ſcripta, & PRÆCIPUE quod voluptatem ſtatuerit ſummum bonum, Virtutes ancillas eſſe voluptatis, Prudentiam non a malitia, Nihil amari propter aliud, nec etiam propter ſe, Præſcientiam Dei non obſtare arbitrii libertati, Symbolum non factum eſſe ab apoſtolis per particulas.*

(H) *An immoderate admirer of* Quintilian, *and affected to deſpiſe* Ariſtotle.] *Voſſius* furniſhes me with all I want on this Head. Which I borrow from that place where he attempts to prove that *Ariſtotle* is the greateſt Maſter of Rhetorick that we can imitate. *Neque nos*, adds he (g), *aut Auſonii judicium movet, qui Latinorum tantum rationem habuit: aut Vallenſis (quamvis viri non minus de Rep. literaria meriti, quam Camillus olim de Romana) elogium terret: quia ille, nec in Fabio laudando modum invenit, nec in Ariſtotele, Tullio, Priſciano, (& quo non, ſi unum Fabium demas?) inſectando, ſæpe habebat cauſſam.* The following words are obſervable: *Videtur autem vir ille nimis quantum liberaliter Quinctilianum ſuſtuliſſe laudibus, quod videret Georgium Trapezuntium perpetuum eſſe in hoc inceſſendo. Nam Pontanus & lib. iv. Antidoti ſcribit, ea de cauſſa ſibi ſemeſtri integro cum Trapezuntio fuiſſe contentionem; neque in hac gratiam cum eo rediiſſe, niſi cum is publice docendi provinciam deſereret.* I believe with *Voſſius* that the Spirit of Contradiction hurried *Laurentius Valla* to this exceſs of Admiration of *Quintilian*: He had an Adverſary who continually declaimed againſt this Rhetorician, he wanted no other reaſon to eſpouſe the contrary Party. In his Logick he depreſſes as much as in him lies the Authority of *Ariſtotle*.

(I) *Arrows in his Quiver againſt the Meſſiah himſelf.*] We are told that he uttered this Blaſphemy to *Antonius Panormita*. This was doubtleſs whiſpered in his Ear (h) and not ſpoke ſo loud that all at the Table could hear it. *Panormita* trembled with horrour and would not ſpeak to him. *Taceo*, ſaith *Voſſius* (i), *quod neque in Chriſtum (horrendum!) ſpicula ſibi deeſſe dicebat; ut quidem ſcripſit Jovianus Pontanus* (1): *& ante eum Poggius ſecunda in Vallam Invectiva* (2), *ubi exprobrat, quod hoc in convivio dixerit Antonio Panormitæ: qui propterea exhorruerit, & alloquio ulterius dignum negarit.* *Spondanus* (k) has not forgotten this,

after

(a) Vehementer in Vallam velut impium hominem & Chriſtianæ rei Eccleſiæque hoſtem exorſus eſt ſtomachari. Id. ib.

(b) Id. ib.

(c) Tum Aleſanus Epiſcopus ejuſdem Ordinis (*Prædicatorum*) manus ei injecit, & *tibi*, inquit, *homo ſceleſtiſſime ſuperbia hæc deponenda eſt.* Id. ibid.

(d) Quidni, *inquit Aleſanus*, ad fidem iſta pertineant? An ignoras ex illo dogmate Dialecticorum de ſenſu diviſo & compoſito graviſſimas in Theologia controverſias explicari. *Id. ibid.*

(e) Jov. Pontan. de ſermone, [illegible]

(f) Geſner. in Biblioth. fol. 478.

(g) Voſſius de Rhetoricæ natura ac conſtitutione pag. 41.

(h) Ut Pontanus [illegible] habere [illegible] quoque in Chriſtum ſpicula.

(i) Voſſius ubi ſupra.

(1) Lib. de ſermone.

(2) [illegible] edit. 1511.

(k) Spond. [illegible] ann. [illegible] n. [illegible] on (K) are not good, but his Notes on the New Teſtament are not amiſs. See what Mr. *Simon* † ſaith of them. He was much more Learned in *Latin* than in *Greek*, as his Book of Elegancies (L) compared with his verſions of *Thucydides, &c.* proves: He is falſly accuſed of having ſtolen it. (M) *Ludovicus Vives* praiſes him for a thing which deſerves to be known. Mr. *Varillas* hath committed (N) ſeveral Errors.

VALLA (GEORGE) a Native of *Piacenza*. He was a Phyſician and Profeſſor of polite Learning at *Venice*, and Flouriſhed ‡ after the middle of the XV. Century. He was very well acquainted with the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues, and wrote ſeveral Books of (A) Phyſick and Litterature. He ſo * irritated

after having told us that this Critick ſpared neither St. *Auguſtin*, St. *Jerom*, nor *Boethius*. We may add that he had no Mercy on *Thomas Aquinas*. "(*) His ſtyle is too free, cenſuring too "ſeverely the Faults of *Remigius*, St. *Thomas Aquinas* "and ſome other Writers, who preſumed to comment on St. *Paul* (according to him) without any "Knowledge of the *Greek* Tongue. He rejects "as a Story what is commonly ſaid of that Apoſtle "appearing to St. *Thomas Aquinas*, and aſſuring him "that no Man ſo well underſtood his Epiſtles as "himſelf. If this had been true, ſaith he, he had not "failed to give him Notice of his Faults." (3) *Puteam niſi id commentitium: Nam cur eum Paulus non admonuit erratorum ſuorum?* He ſeveral times injudiciouſly reprehended the Popes, as when he accuſed *Cœleſtin* the IV. Father † *Theophilus Raynaud* loads him with Invectives on this account.

(K) *Theſe verſions are not good.*] Let us ſee what Mr. *Huet* ſuppoſes that *Caſaubon* thought of 'em. (a) *Annis ab hinc ducentis Herodotum & Thucydidem Latinis literis exponebat Laurentius Valla, in eâ bene & eleganter dicendi copiâ, quam totis voluminibus explicavit, inelegans tamen, & penè barbarus; Græcis ad hoc literis leviter tinctus, ad auctorum ſententias parum attentus, oſcitans ſæpe, & alias res agens, ſidem apud eruditos decoxit.*

(L) *His Book of elegancies—— proves: He is falſly accuſed of having ſtolen it.*] This Book hath been Printed a vaſt many times. He ſays in the Epiſtle Dedicatory that it was publiſhed, without his order or Conſent. This Epiſtle Dedicatory was inſcribed to *Tortellius* Chamberlain to *Nicolas* the V. It is without any date, notwithſtanding which one may ſee that it was written in that Pope's time. In thoſe days it was very difficult to collect ſo many Obſervations: It required a vaſt ſtudy and a ſtrong *Genius*. The great ſucceſs of this Book angred the Author's Enemies, and moved them to ſay that he appeared in borrowed Feathers, and that the piece was really a production of *Aſconius Pedianus*. This Calumny, which at the bottom very much redounded to *Valla's* Glory, met with no Credit. *Voſſius* was very much in the right to call it impudent: (b) *Admodum perfrictæ frontis fuiſſe neceſſe eſt, qui, cum Laurentii Vallenſis Elegantiarum libros in honore eſſe dolerent, in vulgus ſparſere, eos jam olim in Germania fuiſſe repertos, quodque ſcripti eſſent literis fugientibus ac fatiſcentibus vix certum cognitum indicatis tandem fuiſſe, Aſconii Pediani eſſe opus: cujus calumniæ meminit Mariangelus Accurſius in diatribarum ſuarum defenſione, cui* Teſtudo *nomen fecit.*

(M) *Ludovicus Vives praiſes him for a thing, which deſerves, &c.*] Notwithſtanding *Valla's* great diligence in diſcovering the propriety of Terms, and teaching it his Readers, yet he ſpared his pains when he met with an obſcene Word, and ſeemed rather to deſire that its import ſhould remain unknown. This *Vives* with a great deal of Reaſon approves. (c) *Bene Laurentius Valla de verbo quodam obſcœno, ignorari malo quam me docente ſciri.*

(N) *Mr. Varillas hath committed ſeveral Errors.*] I. He ſaith (d) that *Laurentius Valla, finding no longer any Body to cenſure in the Court of Rome, went to that of Naples.* This is a double miſtake, he hath ill Tranſlated his Original, and advanced a thing, that has but little Truth in it. The Latin which *Varillas* Tranſlates, ſignifies that *Laurentius Valla* (e) finding nothing at the *Pope's* Court which pleaſed him, went to *Alphonſus* King of *Naples*. Is this to ſay, *that he found no longer any Body to cenſure the Court of Rome?* Doth not this rather inſinuate the Contrary, that there remained yet a great many to Cenſure? For when every thing in a Court diſpleaſes, the Subject of Cenſure is not exhauſted. We may take it for granted that a Perſon of *Valla's* Humour could never leave *Rome* for want of objects on which to employ his Cenſure, as having already ſaid all that he could againſt that Court. II. *Valla* did not offer *to write the Hiſtory of the moſt Illuſtrious events of Naples*: But he wrote the Hiſtory of *Ferdinand* King of *Caſtile* and *Arragon*, the Father of *Alphonſus* King of *Naples*. Here are two Faults; *Paul Jovius's* (f) Latin ill Tranſlated, and a falſity in the Fact it ſelf. III. Mr. *Varillas* too much exceeds the bounds of Juſtice in the Sentence which he pronounces againſt that Book of *Valla*. *He laboured therein*—— *with ſo little ſucceſs*, they are his own words, *that his adverſaries had room enough to reproach his falling into the Faults which he had cenſured in others.* He commits a third time the two Errors, which I have mention'd. *Paul Jovius's* Latin (g) ſaith no ſuch thing, and it is utterly falſe that *Laurentius Valla* in Writing this Book was Guilty of all the Barbariſms with which he Charges other Authors. IV. No Body believes, tho' Mr. *Varillas's* aſſures it, that *Laurentius Valla* exiled himſelf from the Court of *Naples* becauſe this Work was ſlighted. He had other and more ſevere (h) diſgraces, which forced him to leave that Court. V. It is very Ridiculous to imagine that this Learned Man's Mother made his Epitaph. It is true we find theſe Words in the Inſcription on his Tomb, *Catharina Mater filio pientiſſimo poſuit*; but according to the ſtyle of Epitaphs, this imports no more, than that his Mother cauſed this Tomb to be erected. And allowing this falſe Principle of *Varillas*, we may eaſily believe that ſeveral Perſons who never underſtood one Latin Word, have written very fine Epitaphs in that Language; for we find a great many under which we read *mæſtiſſima conjux* or *mater*, or *filia poſuit*, or *mæſtiſſimi filii poſuerunt*. VI. As one fault often introduces another, Mr. *Varillas* falls into a freſh miſtake; for believing that *Laurentius Valla's* Mother made her Son's Epitaph, he aſſures us that *no Body* would *ſave her that trouble*. VII. As to what he ſaith of *Valla* that he gave an ill example *in the Common Wealth of Learning, by publiſhing firſt intire Books of Invectives and recriminations*, I refer him to Mr. *de Larroque*, who hath ſhewed him (i) that Saint *Gregory Nazianzen*, and St. *Hilary* publiſhed Invectives, the one againſt the Emperor *Julian* and the other againſt the Emperor *Conſtantius*. We may yet go higher, for tho' there is room to doubt whether *Salluſt's* Invective againſt *Cicero*, and that of *Cicero* againſt *Salluſt* are really the performances of thoſe Authors whoſe Names they bear, yet it is certain that they are Older than *Conſtantin's* time. It is not to be pretended that *Varillas* intended only to ſpeak of Chriſtian Writers; for the Republick of Letters of which he is ſpeaking doth not exclude Paganiſm. But if we ſhould have the complaiſance to confine our ſelves to the limits of Chriſtianity, we ſhould yet find other Examples beſides thoſe mentioned by Mr. *Larroque*. Have we not two (k) works full of Invectives, Written by *Ruffinus* againſt St. *Jerom*? I elſewhere (l) mention an Invective written in the very age of *Laurentius Valla*, but before he thought of writing his. And *Petrarch* who preceded him one Hundred Years did not he write Invectives againſt a Phyſician? VIII. It is not true that *Laurentius Valla* (m) *praiſed no Grammarian of his time beſides* Candidus December. This is to be Guilty of the ſame Fault a fourth time; for the Fact is utterly falſe, and he hath very ill Tranſlated his (n) Original: *Paul Jovius's* Words tend to the praiſe of *December* without excluding any other Grammarian.

(A) *Several Books of Phyſick and Literature.*] The Titles of ſeveral of which are: *De tuenda ſanitate per victum, & quæ ſecundum cujuſque naturam in victu ſequenda aut fugienda ſunt. De humani*

[illegible] * Simon Hiſtoire critique des commentateurs du Nouveau Teſtament chap. [illegible] pag. [illegible]

(a) Huetius de claris interpretibus pag. m. 218.

(3) Laur. Vall. Not. in Epiſt. I. ad Cor. Cap. 9. v. 11

† Theoph. Raynaudus in hoplotheca, ſerie 1. cap. [illegible] pag. m. 16, 17.

(b) Voſſius de hiſtor. Latinis lib. 3. c. 27. pag. 144. He quotes the title of Mariangelus Accurſius.

(c) Lud. Vives de tradendis diſciplinis lib. 3. pag. m. 237.

(d) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence pag. 166.

(e) Quod nihil in aula Pontificis ſibi placeret Neapolim ad Alfonſum regem ſe contulit. Jovius ubi ſupra pag. 36.

† In the [illegible] of his Critical Hiſtory of the Commentators on the New Teſtament.

* Pierius Valerianus de literatorum infelicitate lib. 1. pag. m. 17.

(f) Apud quem (Alfonſum regem) de avitis bellis in Hiſpania atque Sicilia geſtis hiſtoria perſcripta eſt. Id. ib.

(g) Eo ſtyli charactere ut ejus minime videri poſſit qui cæteris elegantiarum præcepta tradiderit. Id. ibid.

(h) See above the Remark D.

(i) Larroque, preface to the Nouvelles accuſations contre Mr. Varillas.

(k) They are commonly Printed in the 9th Volume of St. Jerom's works.

(l) In the Remark B. of the Article Vergerius

(m) Varillas, ubi ſupra pag. 167

(n) Candidus December .. Laurentii Vallæ teſtimonio exactiſſimæ cenſuræ Grammaticus Paulus Jovius in elog. c. 15. pag. 39.

tated the Duke of *Milan* by his too impetuous Zeal for the *Trivultian* Faction that the Duke ſo violently perſecuted him, as to cauſe him to be Impriſoned at *Venice* it ſelf. He endured the moſt grievous hardſhips in this confinement; but being tryed was declared innocent, and his Poſt reſtored to him. Which he did not long enjoy, a ſudden Death hurrying him out of the World ſoon after. He was juſt going out of his Apartment in order to Read his Lecture, nothing ſtopped him but a Natural Neceſſity to go to the Privy, where he expired in the ſame manner as *Arius* the *Hereſiarch*. His *Scholars* waited a tedious while in the Auditory, and were (B) ſeized with a deep Melancholy when acquainted with the Reaſon why he did not come. He was that day to continue his Explication of a paſſage in *Cicero's Tuſculanæ Quæſtiones*, which concerns the Immortality of the Soul ||. *Pierius Valerianus*, who informs me of this particular, makes very judicious reflections (C) on the Nature of this kind of Death.

|| *Taken from Pierius Valerianus ib.*

VALLA

mani corporis partibus. De differentiis pulſuum. De corporis commodis & incommodis. Univerſæ medicinæ ex Græcis potiſſimum contractæ libri ſeptem. It is obſerved in *Lindenius renovatus*, that the laſt Tract (a) is a part of that intituled *expetenda & fugienda*. We may alſo add that our *Valla* Tranſlated out of *Greek Rhazes de peſtilentia*, *Pſellus de victus ratione*, *Alexander Aphrodiſienſis de febrium cauſis & differentiis*, *Nemeſius de Natura hominis* (b) and ſome (c) others. It is to be obſerved that Mr. *Huet* (d) calls him a very ill Tranſlator. The Books of literature compoſed by *Valla* are either ſome Treatiſes of Grammar and Rhetorick, or ſome Commentaries on ſome Books of *Tully*, on *Horace's* art of Poetry, on *Juvenal*, &c. He alſo commented on the Second Book of *Pliny*: That Work was Printed at *Venice* in 1502. in 4. and muſt needs be very ſcarce ſince (e) Father *Hardouin* could not meet with one. But we muſt not forget his Book *de expetendis & fugiendis rebus*: It is a ſort of Body or collection of all Sciences, of which *Paul Jovius* ſpeaks ſomewhat contemptibly; for it is ſcarce to be doubted that the Words which I here cite relate to this compoſure. (f) *Diſciplinas, literaſque omnes, uno ingenti volumine complexus, multa potius didiciſſe, quam in eo celeri tranſcurſu perdiſcenda poſteris reliquiſſe videtur. Quandoquidem coacervandis omnis, indefeſſique ſcribendis, requiſitus ille Romanæ elocutionis ſpiritus omnino defuerit, quo uno voluminum vita præclarè alitur, longiſſiméque producitur.* *John Peter Valla* the Author's Son cauſed it to be Printed, and very humbly acknowledged that the Work was not perfect: He (g) makes ſeveral excuſes to the Reader that Death had prevented his Father's putting his laſt Hand to it. This Work is divided into 49 Books or 7 Weeks. It was very much criticized by * *Sovel*. *Geſner* obſerves that *George Valla* borrowed largely from the *Greeks* without owning it. (h) *Nos ſane obſervavimus Georgium Vallam à Græcis permulta diſſimulanter eſſe mutuatum, & non pauca perperam in Latinum ſermonem tranſtuliſſe.* He then deſerves to be put into the liſt of Plagiaries.

(B) *His Scholars——were ſeized with a deep Melancholy.*] The following Citation is longer than the Text requires, but I ſhall ſtill venture to inſert it to ſhew what eſteem *Valla's* Scholars had for him. (i) *Haud ita multo poſt cùm mane ſummo paratus eſſet conferre ſe ad auditorium, ubi tunc Tuſculanas Ciceronis quæſtiones prælegebat, deque animæ immortalitate vehementiſſimè, doctiſſiméque quotidie diſſerebat, dum interim corpori vacaturus excrementa cibi dejecit, animam etiam morte ſubitaria exhalavit. Nos qui quotidie ad admirandam hominis doctrinam ſub matutinum crepuſculum conveniebamus, non prius tali nos doctore defraudatos intelleximus, quam hora profitendi fruſtra elapſa certos, qui moræ cauſam ſciſcitarentur, domum ejus delegavimus, qui redeuntes gymnaſium noſtrum præter omnium ſpem, quia, nullum malæ valetudinis incommodum præceſſerat voce illa erudita ſpoliatum, atque orbatum renunciaverunt.*

(C) *Pierius Valerianus——makes very judicious reflections on the Nature of this kind of Death.*] He firſt obſerves that ſome may think *George Valla's* dying without any Sickneſs to be a great Happineſs. He afterwards ſaith that according to the Chriſtian Law, ſudden Death ought to be looked on as a misfortune. He then obſerves that according to Philoſophy this accident and all others, which do not depend on us, ought not to paſs for Evils. To be ſhort, he would have us believe that *Valla's* manner of Death was a Happineſs, ſince it was not preceded by pains and uneaſineſs. (k) *Erant qui genus hoc mortis inter mortalium felicitates enumerabunt, quippe nullo dolore prævio, nullaque mortis metu ſtatim exanimari. Nos tamen ex Chriſtianæ pietatis inſtitutis in ærumnis hoc exiſtimamus, ex Philoſophiæ verò præceptis, neque quidem calamitates alias, quæ alterius, non noſtri juris ſunt, mala exiſtimo; ſed erit ſuper hoc alius differendi locus. At fuerit felix Valla, quia cruciatu nullo, nulliuſque rei anxius è vita migravit: nobis certè ejus diſcipulis calamitoſa fuit hominis mors, quibus eruditionis ſuæ tam triſte deſiderium reliquit.* All this is very juſt; for the tormenting Pains of a Diſeaſe of 15 Days, and the Languiſhing weakneſs of a long Diſtemper, reduce a Man to a miſerable State naturally ſpeaking. He is uncapable of enjoying both forbidden and lawful pleaſures; he ſuffers in Body and Mind; his Members render him ſenſible of ſeveral uneaſineſſes; his Reaſon is enfeebled; he is peeviſh, he is afraid of Death, and cannot think of the approach of the King of terrours without horrour. A ſudden Death ſpares all this, and ought therefore to paſs for a great Happineſs, unleſs we reflect on the Goſpel Principles. Wherefore *Pierius Valerianus* very judiciouſly inſerted this exception. Chriſtianity teaches us that a Sinner ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven without Repentance: And Experience convinces us that all Men are Sinners. According to theſe Principles we ought to look upon ſudden Death as a very great infelicity, ſeeing the Dead Perſon hath not had ſufficient time to Humble himſelf before God, and implore his Mercy through the Merits of JESUS CHRIST. Now a Man, who preſents himſelf an impenitent Sinner before the Throne of God, can expect nothing but Eternal Damnation. This is the Chriſtian Doctrine. 'Tis in vain to alledge that a Man predeſtinated to Salvation, cannot dye impenitent, ſuppoſe his Death never ſo ſudden; and that a reprobate cannot dye penitent tho' his Death is preceded by a tedious Sickneſs: it is in vain, I ſay, to alledge this; for this Remark will not ſatisfy the Scruples of thoſe who Reaſon in this manner: A Man predeſtinated to Salvation always reconciles himſelf to God before his Death; thoſe who dye ſuddenly have no time to Reconcile themſelves to God; they are not therefore predeſtinated to Salvation. I own it would be raſh to aſſert the Minor of this Syllogiſm as certain Truth; but it is at leaſt the moſt ſpecious Argument againſt the Advantage which ſeveral pretend to find in a ſudden Death. They don't fail to obſerve that Diſeaſes are very often great Obſtacles to Repentance, either becauſe they deprive us of our Senſes and Judgment, or becauſe they ſo much enfeeble our Reaſon, and Memory, that we are not very well qualified to reflect on the Goſpel Truths, or to make a good uſe of the Exhortations of a Divine, or becauſe when they prove long and lingring they occaſion Complaints and Murmurs. This diſpoſition leads directly to impenitence, and hardning, and ſometimes to impiety it ſelf. Tho' we ſhould agree to all this, yet we may very juſtly aſſert that Diſeaſes moſt commonly produce a better effect. So that to pronounce *George Valla's* Death Happy, it ought not to be conſidered according to the Chriſtian Principles but looked on with the Eyes of *Auguſtus*. In the Judgment of that Emperor, that was the Happy Death which was preceded by no pain; he deſired ſuch a Death for himſelf and his Friends. He found herein what good Men find in the Death of the juſt, that is, the object of his Wiſhes. He obtained al-

moſt

(a) Extant operis ſui expetendorum & fugiendorum libri 24.25.26.27.28.29.30. *Mercklinus in Lindenio renovato* pag. 342.

(b) Id. ib.

(c) *See* Geſnerus's Bibliotheca fol. 273.

(d) Nec felicius Georgio Vallæ labor ille ſucceſſit, nam & à Græcis diſſentit ſæpe & quæ aſſequitur non raro pervertit. *Huetius de claris interpretibus*. See here under *Geſnerus*'s words.

(e) Vide Harduini præfation. in Plinium.

(f) Paulus Jovius in elog. c. 113. pag. 256.

(g) In epiſtola nuncupatoria. *See* Geſner in Bibliotheca fol. 273.

* *Sovel of Man's perfection*, Pag. 289, 290.

(h) Geſn. ibid.

(i) Pierius Valerianus de litterator. infelicit. lib. 1. p. 27,28.

(k) Id. ib. pag. 28.

VALLA (NICOLAS) Doctor of Law, and Canon of St. Peter's Church at Rome, lived in the XV. Century. He undertook to Translate Homer's Iliad into Latin Verse, but Death prevented his compleating that Work †. So far as he proceeded in this (A) version was Printed after his Death in 1474. and Reprinted in 1541. We have also his Latin version β of a Poem of Hesiod, and two Letters in Elegiack Verse. He died (B) very Young γ in 1473. His Father Lelius δ VALLA Doctor of Law was consistorial Advocate ε.

VALLA (NICOLAS) in French du Val, Counsellor * in the Parliament of Paris, and afterwards in the Parliament of Rennes, is the Author of a Civil Law Book which is (C) esteemed. He flourished in the XVI. Century. He mentions ‡ his Son in Law James Capel, who was Counsellor in the Parliament of Bretagne. Konig † confounds him with Nicolas Valla the Subject of the preceding Article. It is not improbable that our du Val was the Counsellor of the Parliament of Paris β who was suspected of Lutheranism in the Famous Mercuriale of 1559. and by Flight avoided the impending Danger. Thuanus γ calls him *Nicolaus Valla*.

VALLEE (GODFREY DE LA) a Native of *Orleans* caused a Book to be Printed at *Paris* Intituled *Erre Geru, le fleau de la Foy bigarré*. It is full of Blasphemies and Impieties against JESUS-CHRIST. This Author was Burnt at *Paris* for his Heresy in 1574. He was commonly called *handsome Vallée* ‖. This is what we find in *la Croix du Maine*'s *Bibliotheque Françoise*. Others say he was Burnt for Atheism at *Paris* in 1571. and that he wrote a Book Intituled, *The art of believing nothing* *. *Maldonat* made a false Reflection (Z) on a passage which he pretends to be in that Book. I wonder that so few Authors have mentioned that *Atheist*, and that most of those who have taken any Notice of him have grounded their Relations on the Evidence of this *Spanish Jesuit*.

VANDER-LINDEN (JOHN ANTONIDES) Professor of Physick at *Leyden*, was not the first Learned Man of his Family. Some of his Ancestors have also enjoyed Posts in the Republick of Letters, as we are informed by

γ Id. ib. pag. 15

‖ Taken from la Croix du Maine pag. 155. Renatus de la Barre at the beginning of his Notes upon Navitimine de Trinitate, says that Man was call'd Bellum Vallensem. That is, handsome Vallée.

* Maldonatus in Matth. cap. 26. p. m 572. in the margin. Others say it was in the year 1572.

most what he desired. (a) *Sortitus exitum facilem & qualem semper optaverat. Nam fere quoties audisset cito ac nullo cruciatu defunctum quempiam sibi & suis εὐθανασίαν similem (hoc enim & verbo uti solebat) precabatur. Cæsar* his Father by adoption was of the same Opinion. He despised the lazy Death of *Cyrus* mentioned by *Xenophon*, and nothing seemed to him preferable to leaving the World unexpectedly. (b) *Illud plane inter omnes fere constitit, talem ei mortem pene ex sententia obtigisse. Nam & quondam cum apud Xenophontem legisset, Cyrum ultima valetudidine mandasse quædam de funere suo, aspernatus tam lentum mortis genus, subitam sibi celeremque optaverat. Et pridie quam occideretur in sermone nato super cœnam, apud, M. Lepidum, quisnam esset finis vitæ commodissimus, repentinum inopinatumque prætulerat. Hesiod* reckons it amongst the Prerogatives of the Golden-Age that Men then died in the Arms of Sleep. One of our Criticks has blamed *Ovid* for omitting this Privilege in his description of the Felicities of that Age. Mr. *Menage* remembred this Censure, when he said that his Father died in that Manner. His words are: (c) *At verò cùm dormiturus caput in cervical inclinasset, ecce tibi confestim exanimatus est. Dictum est senis Ascræi, aurea ætate mortales quasi domitos somno interiisse: quam rem optimam, ut hoc te obiter doceam; neque enim te docendi occasionem ullam prætermittere debere mihi videor; in optimi illius sæculi descriptione omittere Pelignum Vatem non debuisse, rectè à Julio Scaligero animadversum. Eo igitur modo placido & quieto parens meus fato functus est.* You see plainly (d) that his Relish, and that of *Scaliger* the Elder were conform to that of *Augustus*. They would willingly have applied to them who died thus, the Proverb, *le bien leur vient en dormant*. See the Remark *F* of the Article *Regius*.

(A) *So far as he proceeded in this Version was Printed —— and Re-printed.*] The first of these Editions was made at *Rome*, and was neither known to *Gesner* or his Abridgers. It contains the 3. 4. 5. (e) 13. 18. 20. 22. 23. and 24 Books of the *Iliad*, and a small Portion of the 19. To the second Edition were added *Joseph Iscan*'s six Books *de bello Trojano*, and the Translation of (f) four Books of *Homer* in *Latin* Verse by *Opsopæus* (g).

(B) *He died very Young.*] Which *Vossius* doth not mention, but we find it in *Pierius Valerianus*. *Inter Romanos autem*, saith he (h), *paucis antè annis non ignobilis fuit Nicolaus Valla, summæ juvenis eruditionis, Græcis, Latinisque literis apprimè doctus, qui quidem adolescens admodum ad Homeri sublimitatem eleganti Latini carminis facilitate cæperat aspirare. Is tamen nondum alterum a vigesimo egressus annum fati quadam inclementia eruditorum omnium spei surreptus est.* What occasions some difficulty is that *Valerianus*, who wrote (i) in *Clemens* the Seventh's time, saith that few Years before *Valla* died at the Age of 21. If we go to the rigour of exactness, this doth not very well suit a Person, who Dedicated a Poem to *Pius* II. Observe that I here consider the particular ways, by which *Valerianus* commonly expresses himself in the Tract which I cite.

(C) *A Civil Law Book.*] The Title of which is: *De rebus & dubiis quæstionibus in jure controversis Tractatus XX.* I make use of the fifth Edition at *Arnheim* 1638 in 4.

(Z) *A false reflection on a passage.*] This Jesuit's Words are. (k) *Nonnulli progressi sunt longius, ut nihil crederent, quorum unus cum libellum quendam his annis de arte nihil credendi composuisset, nihil in eo nisi hoc unum verum dixit, oportere prius Calvinistam fieri qui atheus esse volet. Fuerat ille antea Calvinista, fuit postea atheus, & unicuique in sua arte credendum est. Verissima sententia: nam quisquis Calvinista est, si ea quam ingressus est incredulitatis via ire pergat, ad nihil credendum perveniat necesse est.* It is incredible how many Jesuits and other Controversial Writers amongst the Romanists, have copied this passage of *Maldonat*. Several of which have at the same time corrupted it; for they suppose that *Godfrey de la Vallée* (l) in his Book endeavoured to prove at large, that whosoever would be an *Atheist* ought first to be a *Calvinist*. *Maldonat* never said that this Assertion was amply handled in the little Book *de arte nihil credendi*. His Copists have not trodden in his Footsteps. They suppose this *Atheist* to have said so because he believed the *Calvinistical* Sect to be so abominable, that all those who took a near view of it would rather chuse to profess no Religion than that. (m) *Cur autem dixit eum, qui atheus esse volet, oportere prius Calvinistam fieri; nisi quod putaret, tam fœdam ac profligatam esse Calvini sectam, ut qui eam prope aspexisset, mallet nullam, quam talem sectam profiteri?*

(f) Viz. the 1. 2. 9. and 10. of the Iliad. Vossius ib.

(g) Taken from Vossius ib.

(h) Pierius Valerianus de litteratorum infel. l. 2. pag. 55.

(i) See his tract de litterat. infelicit: init. & pag. 11.

(k) Maldonat. in Evangel. Matthæi. c. 26. pag. m. 572.

(l) In suo libro de arte nihil credendi, fuse contendit eum qui Atheus futurus est, Calvinistam prius esse debere. Henricus Fitz Simon, Britannom. pag. 107.

(m) Martinus Becanus, Opusculorum Theologicorum tom. 1. p. m. 175.

ficia- / Poet. La- / tin. pag. / 80.

β This which is ... This Translation is in Epick Verses, and was Dedicated to Pius II. See Gesnerus in Biblioth. fol. 514.

γ Konig Bibl. pag. 828. where he observes that his Epitaph is to be found at pag. 1176 of Fabricius's Roma.

δ Or de Valle.

ε Vossius ibid.

* See Pasquier, Recherch. de la France B. 9. ch. 39. pag. m. 920.

‡ Nicolaus Valla, de rebus dubiis tract. 8. circa fin. pag. m. 136.

† Konig Biblioth. pag. 828. where he ascribes to Nicolas Valla the Translator of Hesiod who died at Rome in 1473. the Treatise de rebus dubiis.

β Thuan. lib. 22. p. m. 453.

Sueton. in Augusto c. 100. (b) Sueton. in Cæsare c. 87. Ægidius Menagius in vita Guillelmi Menagii p. 76. 77. In his Remark upon the passage quoted by me, he speaks thus: ese are the Words of *Julius Scaliger*, in the 8 chapt. and 5. Book de Poetica. *Omisit autum illud Hesiodi longè optim in hac ætate.* Θνῆσκον δ' ὡς ὕπνῳ δεδμημένοι. *The age of Hesiod is in his* Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέρας. (e) *Except above two ndred Verses at the end.* See Vossius de poet. Lat. g. 80.

by his funeral Oration, where we are preſented with a very exact Genealogy of his Family (*A*). He was Born at *Enckhuyſen* † the 13th of *January*, 1609. He was ſent to the Univerſity of *Leyden* in 1625. to ſtudy Philoſophy; and afterwards he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Phyſick. From *Leyden* he went to *Francker*, in order to continue his ſtudies there in 1629. where he took his Degree of Doctor of Phyſick ſome Months after. His Father, who had practiſed Phyſick at *Amſterdam* ever ſince the Year 1625, called him home in order to inſtruct him in the method of Practice, and died in 1633. Our *Vander-linden* continued in the Exerciſe of that Function, of which he acquitted himſelf with ſo much Reputation, that in 1639 he was invited to be Profeſſor of Phyſick in the Univerſity of *Francker*. He very worthily filled that place for almoſt twelve Years. He read on the Theorial and Practical part, on Anatomy and Botanicks, and it was to his care that the enlargement of the Academical Garden, and the building of a Houſe there were owing. The Library was not leſs indebted to him; for whilſt he had the direction of it, he ſupplied it with a great many Books, by a perſuaſive Addreſs which engaged the Nobility to that good Work. The Univerſity of *Utrecht* offered him a Profeſſor's Place in 1649, which he refuſed; but two Years after he accepted of that tender'd to him by the Curators of the Univerſity of *Leyden*. He worthily diſcharged all theſe Functions till his Death, which happened on the Fifth

† 'Tis a Town in North-Holland.

profu-rit? Theſe are *Becanus*'s Words. He adds, that the Fruits of *Calviniſm* are more pernicious than thoſe of Atheiſm, and that tho' the Atheiſts do not believe a Providence, yet they in ſeveral particulars obſerve the Rules of Virtue. They are not guilty either of Robbery or Murther; they abhor a Lye, they keep their Word, they abominate unjuſt Wars, and love Peace: But on the contrary, *Calvin*'s Diſciples are inſtructed not to account Lying, Perjury, Adultery and Sacrilege amongſt the number of Sins; for they believe that God hath impoſed on them a neceſſity of committing them, and that the Elect cannot periſh whatever they are guilty of. (*a*) *Si ex fructu doctrina cognoſcenda eſt; pejores fructus Calvini, quàm Atheorum Doctrina parit. Hi tametſi negent Deum aliquem orbi præſidere, honeſtatem tamen, & rectæ rationis ductum ac directionem in multis ſequuntur, & multa rectè agunt, quæ laudari poſſunt. Cavent furta, homicidia, rapinas, à mendacio abhorrent; juramenti religionem colunt; ſervant fidem alteri promiſſam; bellum injuſtum deteſtantur; pacem ac tranquillitatem amant. At contra docentur à Calvino diſcipuli, parvi pendere mendacia, perjuria, adulteria, rapinas, libidines, ſacrilegia. Unde hoc? Quia Deus, inquiunt, æterna ſua prædeſtinatione neceſſitatem, &c.* This Objection of *Becanus* is too ridiculous to ſtand in need of any Caution againſt it. For which reaſon I ſhall content my ſelf with barely ſaying that he had appear'd leſs ridiculous, if he had exactly follow'd his Original. I do not pretend that in arguing as *Maldonat* hath done, he would have reaſoned juſtly; I only ſay his Objection had been leſs abſurd. *Maldonat*'s Reflection runs thus: That *Calviniſm* having once ſhook off the Yoak of Tradition with regard to the Real-preſence, under pretence that it is an Opinion clogged with a thouſand Difficulties contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, hath put all ſorts of Hereticks in the way of rejecting all Myſteries; and that ſome of the (*b*) moſt ſubtil and incredulous *Calviniſts* have made uſe of the ſame Arguments to deny the Trinity, which they had formerly uſed againſt Tranſubſtantiation. Some, adds he, advance farther, even ſo far as to believe nothing, and that is what the Road they are got into naturally leads to. He goes on thus: what I have obſerved is not deſign'd to injure the Calviniſts, but to ſhew them the Precipice that is at their Journy's end, that a view of this imminent danger may divert them from the way of perdition. Two things in this common place of *Maldonat* deſerve to be Cenſured; for in the firſt place to grant that preferring the light of Reaſon to the Authority of thoſe Councils, which have defined the Real-preſence, leads one into the direct Road to Atheiſm, is to give too great ſcope to Libertines and Atheiſts. Is it not to aver that the Doctrine of the exiſtence of God is not leſs contradictory to common ſenſe than that of Tranſubſtantiation? Is it not to aſſert, that to believe this Exiſtence, we ought blindly to ſacrifice the cleareſt light of Philoſophy to the Authority of Tradition; as we ought to ſacrifice it to the ſame Authority, in order to believe the Romiſh Opinion concerning the Euchariſt? But what can he more pernicious to Religion than ſuch an Acknowledgment? It is therefore very neceſſary to limit this Objection. He ought only to have ſaid that ſuch a Breach being made in the deciſions of the Councils by denying the Real preſence, may grow ſo wide, as to extend to other incomprehenſible Opinions of the Church of *Rome*. 2. *Maldonat* was ignorant of the Principles of thoſe whom he calls Calviniſts. They are ſo far from teaching, that we ought to reject a Doctrine becauſe our Reaſon cannot comprehend it, or is capable of offering almoſt invincible Arguments againſt it, that they are the firſt who aſſert, and are always ready to maintain, that nothing can be more pernicious, than to regulate our ſelves by Reaſon in the choice of ſome particular Doctrines. This is what they inceſſantly alledge againſt the *Socinians*, always urging the neceſſity of ſubjecting our Underſtanding to the obedience of Faith. So that if the Opinion which this Spaniſh Jeſuit attacks, was full as dangerous as he repreſents it; yet what he advances againſt the *Calviniſts* by urging *la Vallée*'s Book againſt them, would be abſolutely unjuſt. In ſuch a critical Work as this, it is neceſſary that not only Errors in fact, but alſo the ill uſe of true Facts ſhould be handled in this manner.

(*A*) *With a very exact Genealogy of his Family.*] Which reaches as high as his *Abavus*, or his great Grandfather's Father, who was *Hen. Regnier*, a Burgher of *Harderwick*, whoſe Houſe being burnt in the Conflagration which conſumed that Town, he removed to *Naerden* (*c*). Where his Son *Antony* was preferred to be Maſter of a Claſs, Chanter in the Choir, and Secretary to that City: he was a ſtrict Papiſt, (*d*) but Orthodox in a point which, according to *Coccejus*, is of the higheſt importance to Chriſtianity; I mean the right which the Children of God obtain in JESUS CHRIST by Faith, as being made one Body with him by his Spirit. *Antony* left a Son named *Henry*, born in 1546, who acquainted himſelf throughly with the Learned Languages, and with a Chriſtian Conſtancy ſuffered a great many Afflictions for the Reformed Religion. He was very young when he firſt reliſhed the Reformation, and applied himſelf to the Inſtruction of the perſecuted Faithful, and even of little Children. Being in a Boat where the Paſſengers refuſed to make room for a young Gentlewoman of *Gelderland*, each urging they could not crowd themſelves any cloſer; he notwithſtanding by preſſing made room for her to ſit (*e*). He diſcovered ſuch a ſolid Piety in this Lady, that he fell in love with her, and with the conſent of her Relations married her. She was the faithful Companion of his Afflictions and Dangers. He loſt his Father, his Father-in-law, his Relations and Friends at the *Spaniſh* Maſſacre at *Naerden* in 1572. After this fatal Accident, he exerciſed the miniſterial Function at *Enckhuyſen*, till the Year 1585, when he was invited to be Profeſſor of Divinity at *Francker*. He was the firſt who read Lectures in that Univerſity, and it was he who pronounced the inaugural Oration of the Univerſity, (*f*) *Quam Academiam ipſe initiavit oratione prima & lectione.* Hence by the way, we are informed, when that Univerſity was firſt founded. He continued in this Profeſſorſhip till he died, which was in 1614. He left ſeveral Children. *Antony*, the eldeſt, was a Learned Man; whoſe great

---

(*a*) Becan. ibid.

(*b*) Multos jam Calviniſtas videmus qui ingenioſiores & magis increduli, id eſt magis Calviniſtæ cæteris erant, eò jam perveniſſe, ut qua ratione hoc prius myſterium (*Euchariſtiæ*) non credebant, nunc Trinitatis myſterium non credant cæteroſque Calviniſtas ſicut Calviniſtæ nos tanquam nimis ſimplices & credulos rideant, Maldonatus ibid.

(*c*) 'Tis the chief Town of Gooiland upon the Borders of Gelderland, and the Province of Utrecht.

(*d*) Sed in Papiſticis dis[illegible] inimicus, niſi quod de juſtitia Dei, h. e. jure filiorum Dei, quod in Christo per fidem, per Spiritum ipſi ut unum corpus cum ipſo fideles obtinent (qui religionis Christianæ apex eſt) integram ſemper habuerit ſententiam. Coccejus in Orat. funebri.

(*e*) Eam virginem primam in navi cum eam recepiſſet in multitudine, [illegible] arctius [illegible] ob pietatem amavit & conjugem optavit, ac deinde a parentibus impetravit. Ib.

(*f*) Id. ib.

Fifth of *March* 1664. * He was Author (*B*) of ſeveral Books, and Editor of (*C*) others. His Place remained vacant until *May* 1668. when Mr. *Drelincourt* was called to ſucceed him. See *Guy Patin's* 501 Letter, in the 414th Page of the third Tome; and obſerve that *Guy Patin* who was a Friend (*D*) to *Vander-Linden*, hath frequently mention'd him in his Letters.

VAQUERIE, (*John de la*) Firſt Preſident in the Parliament of *Paris*, in the time of *Lewis* XI, had been † Penſionary of the City of *Arras*. He ſpoke for that City in 1476, they were obliged to anſwer the Deputies of that Prince, who demanded the ſubmiſſion of the Inhabitants to him, as their lawful Sovereign, after the death of the Duke of *Burgundy*. They declared that the King pretended to have *Arras* and *Artois by way of Confiſcation*, and that if the Citizens did not open the Gates, *it would be in danger of being taken by force*. *La Vaquerie* reply'd, that *the County of* Artois *belonged to the Princeſs of* Burgundy, *Daughter of Duke* Charles, *on whom it devolved in a direct Line, from* Margaret, *Counteſs of* Flanders, *the Conſort of* Philip *the firſt Duke of* Burgundy; *and he ſupplicated his Majeſty, that he would be pleaſed to obſerve the Truce betwixt him and the late Duke* Charles ‖. This Anſwer was to no purpoſe, *Arras* was obliged to ſubmit to the Yoak of *France*. There is a ſtrong report of a Remonſtrance (*A*) made by *La Vaquerie* to the ſame King: Nor is the Anſwer much leſs talked of which he offered when the Attempt

* Taken from his Funeral Oration pronounced by John Cocceius Prof. of Divinity.

† That Office is much the ſame with that of Syndic. See the 2d Edition of Furetiere's Dictionary at the word Penſionaire.

‖ Taken from Philip de Comines B. 5. chap. 11. p. m. 298.

great Knowledge of claſſick Learning engaged the Magiſtrates of *Enckhuyſen* to make him Rector of their College. He was beſides, a good Muſician, and a good Organiſt; he was no Novice in Theology; but what he excelled in was Phyſick, of which he commenced Doctor at *Franeker* in 1608. and practiſed it with great Succeſs and Reputation, firſt at *Enckhuyſen*, and afterwards at (*a*) *Amſterdam*. I have already (*b*) ſaid that he dy'd in 1633, and that the *Leyden* Profeſſor *John Antonides Vander-Linden* was his Son. *Cocceius* enlarges very much on the maternal Relations of the deceaſed: He is doubtleſs herein too particular; but in general the funeral Orations in the Northern Univerſities are of this ſort. I believe the Word *Antonides* was formed in imitation of the Patronymical Names of the Antient Poets. Tho' I own that there are ſome Families in *Holland* of the Name of *Antonides*. Yet probably it was at firſt no more than a patronymical Name.

(*a*) He writ ſeveral Books about Phyſick, Muſick, and other Sciences. His Son has given a Catalogue of the Books of Phyſick, in his Tract de ſcriptis Medicis: I do not think that they have been Printed. He left many others imperfect.

(*b*) In the Text of this Article.

(B) *He wrote ſeveral Books.*] The Titles of which are: *Univerſæ Medicinæ Compendium, quinque centuriis ſub Clypeo Clariſſ. viri D. Menelai Winsbemii Med. Doct. & in illuſtri Friſiorum Academia ejuſdem Facultatis & Anatomes Profeſſoris, publico examini decem Diſputationibus propoſitum. Addita eſt centuria inauguralis poſitionum Medico-practicarum de virulentia venerea, ibidem propoſita & defenſa ad diem* 18 *Octobris* 1630. Theſe are properly the Theſes which he maintained when he went out Doctor in 1630. *Medulla Medicinæ partibus quatuor comprehenſa* Printed at *Franeker* 1642 in 8vo. *Medicina Phyſiologica novâ curatâque methodo ex optimis quibuſque Auctoribus contracta, & propriis obſervationibus locupletata.* At Amſterdam 1653. in 4. *Selecta Medica & ad ea exercitationes Batavicæ.* At Leyden 1656 in 4. But this Book more properly falls under the following Remark than under this, it being a Collection of ſeveral Pieces of *Hippocrates* and other Antient Authors. *Diſſertatio de Lacte*, this is amongſt *Deuſingius*'s Diſſertations, Publiſhed at *Groningen* 1655. in 12. *De Hemicrania menſtrua, hiſtoria & conſilium.* Printed at *Leyden* 1660, and 1668. in 4. *Meletemata Medicinæ Hippocraticæ.* At *Leyden* 1660, and at *Francfort* 1672. in 4. *Hippocrates de circuitu ſanguinis.* At *Leyden* 1661. in 4. *De Scriptis Medicis Libri duo, quibus præmittitur Manuductio ad Medicinam.* This Piece was three times Printed at *Amſterdam* by *John Blaeu* in 1637. 1651, and 1662 in 8. It is a Catalogue of Medicinal Writers. The Author inlarged it at every Edition; and after his Death *Merklinus* a *German*, very conſiderably enlarged it, and Publiſhed it in a large Volume in 4. Entitl'd *Lindenius renovatus*. It is Printed at *Nuremberg* 1686. It is from this Edition that I have taken the Catalogue of *Vander-Linden*'s Writings, which I have inſerted in this Remark.

This Book of *Vander Linden de Scriptis Medicis*, hath had the fate of all Works of this nature; tho' they be very much corrected, and enlarged in every new Edition, yet they remain imperfect ſtill. See *Voglerus*'s (*c*) cenſure on this Book of *Vander-Linden*. How large ſoever the Additions of *Merklinus* are, we are yet very far from meeting with all the Medicinal Writers therein. This I'll prove by an Example: There are in it five Authors named *Martin*, and yet *Bernardin* MARTIN Born at *Paris* the 8th of *January* 1629, is omitted. He was the Son of *Samuel Martin* Apothecary to *Mary de Medices*, Queen of *France*, and Publiſhed a Treatiſe of Milk, and another of Dentition, both which were very well received (*d*) and approved by the Faculty of *Paris*. He alſo wrote a Relation of his Travels in *Spain*, *Portugal*, *Holland* and *Germany*, &c. which contains ſome very remarkable things. The late Prince of *Conde* deſired his attendance on his Perſon in 1669. *Martin*, from that time to the Death of that great Prince, diſcharged his Function very well, and received ſeveral marks of his Highneſs's Affection. The preſent Prince of *Conde* (*e*) only Son of that Prince, kept him continually in his Houſe (*f*). Since *Merklinus*'s Edition often contains an Abridgement of the Lives of the Medicinal Writers, this may, on ſeveral Accounts, be ſerviceable to thoſe who ſhall make Additions to the *Lindenius Renovatus*.

(*c*) Voglerus, Introduct. in notitiam bonorum Scriptorum, pag. m. 48.

(*d*) They have been Printed at Paris for Denys Thierry.

(*e*) I write this in the year 1696.

(*f*) Taken from a Memorial imparted to the Bookſeller.

(C) *Editor of others.*] Let us continue our Extracts from the Book (*g*) juſt now cited. *Adriani Spigelii Opera quæ extant omnia, recenſuit & cum addita præfatione edidit*, At Amſterdam 1645, in Folio. *Hier. Cardani, de utilitate ex adverſis capienda libros* iv. *ſerio emendatos edidit*, at Franeker, 1648, in 8vo. *Cornel. Celſi de Medicina libros octo recognovit & edidit*, at Leyden, 1657, & 1665. 12. *Hippocratis Coi Opera omnia Græcè & Latinè duobus voluminibus comprehenſa, & ad omnes alias editiones accommodata, edidit*, at *Leyden* 1665, in 8vo. This Edition of *Hippocrates* was not intirely finiſhed when *Vander-Linden* dyed. He beſtowed a great deal of care on it. The *Journal des Sçavans* ſpoke of it thus: (*h*) "The New Edition —— hath the advantage of anſwering all the former, by the help of the Figures in the Margin, which ſhew in what Page and Place every thing is to be found. So that it is preferable to all other Editions, and remedies the Confuſion introduced by their Diverſity, when a Paſſage was to be looked for. It is alſo the moſt correct of them all, for Mr. *Vander-Linder* having carefully compared all the Old Editions with ſeveral Manuſcripts, hath reſtored a great number of places, not before corrected even in *Fœſius*'s Edition. The Latin Verſion he hath choſen is that of *Cornarius*, becauſe it is the Oldeſt, and that which is commonly uſed. Death ſurprized him a little before this Edition was finiſhed, which prevented his deſigned Notes on *Hippocrates*." *Cocceius* touches on this laſt Particular (*i*).

(D) *Guy Patin* —— *hath frequently mention'd him.*] I ſhall only cite one Paſſage. (*k*) "I know nothing that's new of *Vander-Linden*'s *Hippocrates*. The Editor dyed at *Leyden*, aged 53 (*l*) years, of a Fever and Defluxion on his Breaſt, after having taken Antimony, and without bleeding: What a pity it is, he ſhould write ſo many Books, underſtand ſo much Latin and Greek, and die of a Fever and ſuffocating Catarrh without Phlebotomy!"

(A) *Of a Remonſtrance made by* la Vaquerie *to the ſame King.*] I ſhall here make uſe of *John Bodin*'s Words.

(*g*) Lindenius renovatus.

(*h*) Journal des Sçavans of the 22d of February 1666.

(*i*) Scio τὸν μακαρίτην multa de variis locis Medicorum principis eſſe meditatum, & magnam ſibi ſupellectilem collegiſſe obſervationum ad hunc auctorem illuſtrandum utilium, quas non potuiſſe ab ipſo edi dolendum eſt. *Cocceius* ubi ſupra.

(*k*) Patin. letter 310. p. m. 610. of the 2d vol.

(*l*) It ſhould be 55.

tempt was made to engage the Parliament to (*B*) interpose their Authority in the choice of a Regent of the Realm. Chancellor *de l'Hoſpital* ſaid one day in a Speech, ‖ "That the Poverty of the Preſident *de la Vaquerie* was much more commendable than the Riches of a Chancellor of *Burgundy*, to whom his Maſter ſaid, "*Rolin*, *'tis too much*."

VAUBRUN (*The Marquis of*) See **BAUTRU** (*Nicolas*.)

VEDELIUS (*Nicolas*) a famous Reformed Divine, who lived in the XVII Century. He was Born in the *Palatinate*, and was Profeſſor of Philoſophy for Twelve Years at *Geneva*, and Miniſter of the Church in the ſame City for Ten Years *. He was invited to *Deventer* in 1630. in order to become Divinity and Hebrew Profeſſor, having accepted of which, he commenced Doctor of Divinity at *Baſil*, in his Journey from *Geneva* to *Deventer*, the 24th of *June* the ſame Year §. He acquitted himſelf very well of his Duty, and diſcovered a great Zeal againſt (*A*) the *Arminians*. He excerciſed proviſionally the Function of Profeſſor of Philoſophy in 1634. He removed from *Deventer*, and became Divinity Profeſſor at *Franeker*, about the Year 1638. † This was his laſt Station; for he died in that

Words. "(*a*) *Lewis* XI. had terribly threatned the "Court of Parliament for refuſing to Publiſh, Ratify, and Regiſter ſeveral pernicious Edicts: The "Preſident *Lavacrie*, accompanied with a great "number of Counſellors in Scarlet Robes, went "to preſent their Complaints and Remonſtrances "on account of thoſe menaces. The King obſerving "the Gravity, Countenance, and Dignity of thoſe "Gentlemen, who were reſolved to quit their Poſts "rather than ratify the Edicts ſent to them; was "ſurprized, and dreading the Authority of the Parliament, cauſed the ſaid Edicts to be torn in their "preſence, deſiring them to continue in the adminiſtration of Juſtice, and ſwore to them that he "would never ſend any Edict to them which was "not juſt and reaſonable. This action was of very "great importance in order to keep that King in "ſtrict Obedience to Reaſon, who had always exerciſed an Abſolute Power; and when he was only *Dauphin*, he ſent for the Preſidents of that "Court, and told them that they ſhould raze out "the Clauſe DE EXPRESSO MANDATO, which "the Court had inſerted into the Ratification of the "Privileges granted to the Count *du Maine*, otherwiſe he would not leave *Paris* till it was done, and "that he would ſurrender the Commiſſion which the "King had given him. The Court order'd that thoſe "Words ſhould be blotted out, but that the blotting "out might plainly appear, the Regiſter was order'd to be kept, as it is at preſent, in purſuance of that Order, with the Date of the xxviii "of *July* M CCCCXLII." The Latin Edition of this Book of *Bodin* contains a Circumſtance which I muſt not omit. It is that the King commanded the Parliament to Ratify his Edicts on forfeiture of Life, and that the firſt Preſident at the Head of that Senate declared to the King, that they had rather die than Obey him. (*b*) *Rex ſua juſſa ingeminans minas adjecit, capitis etiam indicta pœna niſi curia paruiſſet.* (*c*) *Lanacrius præſes re intellecta regem adiit corona judicum purpuratorum ſtipatus, non ut culpam deprecaretur, ſed ut mortem precaretur, cum diceret ſe ſuoſque collegas mortem malle quam legis propoſitæ promulgationem pati.*

It was not a needleſs thing to relate in this place what was done by this Prince in 1442. This enhanceth the Merit of *la Vaquerie*; for it is much more glorious to ſhew one's Courage in reſiſting an Imperious Perſon, than to make uſe of it in oppoſition to thoſe who have never diſcovered any obſtinate reſoluteneſs in the maintenance of Arbitrary Power. Tho' *Bodin* forgot to mention the Year when this firſt Preſident made this reſolute and undaunted Declaration, it is certain that we are informed by another Proof how abſolutely this Monarch reſolved to be obey'd. *Paſquier* relates (*e*) *That in the Year Four hundred ſixty five, the ſame* Lewis *being King, cauſed his Grant to the Count* de Charolois, *to be forcibly Publiſh'd in full Court; and notwithſtanding the Proteſtations made againſt it by the greateſt part of the Councellors, he would have endorſed on the Inſtrument*, Regiſtrata Audito Procuratore Regis, & non contradicente. *La Vaquerie* was ſtill Pentionary of the City of *Arras*, in the Year 1476. And therefore he was not firſt Preſident of the Parliament of *Paris*, till long after *Lewis* XI. had exacted this form of Regiſtring. Obſerve carefully *Paſquier*'s words. "(*f*) Such Proteſtations have been "very frequent in this Court; and ſeveral Edicts "have this Clauſe, *De expreſſo & expreſſiſſimo mandato Regis, pluribus vicibus reiterato.* Which clauſe, as it "is added for a good end, ſo ſeveral People could "wiſh (perhaps not without cauſe) that honourable "Society would ſometimes be more flexible, according as the publick neceſſity requires." This confirms what I have ſaid (*g*) concerning the Evils which the Parliaments have frequently occaſioned by their refuſing to regiſter Edicts, or by the Clauſes which they added to the ratification of them. *Paſquier* had not talked in this manner, if he had not known that the ſtiffneſs of thoſe Sovereign Courts had been ſometimes prejudicial to the State. Let us alſo confirm by an Obſervation of *Bodin*, a particular which I have mention'd in another place (*h*). "Now the words DE EXPRESSO MANDATO & "*de expreſſiſſimo mandato*, and ſometimes *multis vicibus* "*iterato*, which are frequently found in the Regiſters of Sovereign Courts, about the publication "of Edicts, occaſion ſuch Edicts to be neglected, or ſoon after forgotten and ſlighted by the "Magiſtrates. There is no greater Encouragement to Diſobedience, than to ſuffer the Tranſgreſſors of an Edict to hope for Impunity: But this is in effect what the Parliaments did, when they diſgraced the Princes Edicts in ſuch a manner.

(*B*) *The Anſwer—— which he offered when the Attempt was made to engage the Parliament—— In the choice.*] After the Death of *Lewis* XI. the Counteſs *de Beaujeu*, his eldeſt Daughter had the Adminiſtration of the Government, during the Minority of *Charles* VIII. The Duke of *Orleans* deſirous to diſpoſſeſs her of the Regency, addreſſed to the Parliament of *Paris*; but (*i*) Mr. *de la Vaquerie, firſt Preſident, declared to him, that Affairs of that nature did not fall under their Cognizance.* The Author of the Book Entitl'd, *The Miniſtry of Cardinal de Richelieu* relates it thus: (*k*) "The Parliaments are not "leſs obliged by the Laws of Juſtice than by thoſe of "Prudence, to ſtand firm to the King in Affairs of "State: I ſay they are obliged to it by Juſtice, "becauſe it is to uſurp a Power which doth not "belong to them, to attempt to judge of ſuch things, "they being only created by the King, to adminiſter Juſtice to the People; as the Preſident *de la* "*Vaquerie* told the Chancellor of the Duke of *Orleans*, who formerly deſired Parliament on the "part of his Maſter, to preſs the King to come to "*Paris* and make uſe of their Counſel in the moſt "important Affairs."

(*A*) *And diſcovered a great Zeal againſt the* Arminians.] He Publiſhed a Book in 1631, Entitled *De Arcanis Arminianiſmi*, in which he maintains that explicitly and by Profeſſion, they introduce a ſubtil ſort of Atheiſm into the Church; and that tho' they do not with premeditation attempt to bring in a groſs Atheiſm, they open a great and wide Gate for its admittance. The beginning of one of his Chapters runs thus: (*l*) *Propoſuimus hactenus doctrinam Remonſtrantium, quæ omnis generis hæreſes & ſectas in Eccleſiam Dei, adeoque Libertiniſmum hoc eſt Atheiſmum ſubtilem* EX PROFESSO *introducere conantur.* A little after he hath theſe words: (*m*) *Scopus meus non eſt gravare Remonſtrantes accuſatione ea, ac ſi Atheiſmum craſſum introducere data opera ſeu ex profeſſo molirentur. Nequaquam vero prout eodem cap. primo monui.*

‖ Le Grain, [illegible] pag. 1[illegible], 1[illegible].

* See the Programme mentioned by Revius in his History of Deventer, pag. 496.

§ Revius, in Historia Daventriensi.

‖ Id. ib. p. 604.

† Id. ib. p. 713.

(*a*) Bodin, de la Republique B. 3. chap. 4. p. m. 417. *See alſo* Matthieu, hiſt. de Louis XI. B. 11. p. m. 668.

(*b*) Bodinus ubi ſupra pag. 454. edit. 1601.

(*c*) *It ſhould be* Lavaquerius.

(*d*) Paſquier, Recherches. B. 2. c. 4. pag. m. 61. *gives a larger account of it than* Bodin.

(*e*) Paſquier ibid.

(*f*) Id. ib. pag. 62.

(*g*) In the Remark K of the Article of Chancelier de l'Hoſpital.

(*h*) Bodin ubi ſupra pag. 318.

(*i*) Le Grain Hiſt. de Louis XIII p. 4.

(*k*) Hiſtoire du Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu part. 2. p. 219. Dutch Edit. ann. 1631.

(*l*) Vedelius, De arcanis Arminianiſmi, lib. 2. cap. 12. p. m. 242.

(*m*) Ibid. p. 243.

that City in 1641. He was concerned that Death (B) did not permit him to Publiſh the Anſwer, which he had prepared to his Adverſaries, concerning the Power of the Magiſtrate in (C) Eccleſiaſtical Affairs. I ſhall give you a Catalogue (D) of his Works. I have in another place § ſpoken of his quarrel with *Barlæus*.

VEGIUS (MAPHEUS) Born at *Lodi* in the *Milaneſe* in 1407. was an illuſtrious Orator, and the ‖ greateſt *Latin* Poet that had been ſeen for ſeveral Ages. He went through his School Learning at *Milan*, from whence he removed to *Pavia* to ſtudy the Civil Law; but the Plague obliged his quick return to *Lodi*, where he applyed himſelf intirely to polite Learning, and particularly to Poetry, and began to write Books very early (A). Going to *Rome* he made himſelf beloved and eſteemed by Pope *Martin* the V. who made him Secretary of the Briefs. Which Office he diſcharged ſo faithfully that he was raiſed to a more conſiderable Poſt by the ſame *Pope*; which was that of *Datary*. He beſtowed on him alſo a Canonicate ‡ in Saint *Peter*'s Church. He was ſo throughly contented with theſe preferments that he refuſed a Rich Biſhoprick. The Value which *Eugenius* the IV. and *Nicolas* the V. had for him, obliged them to continue him in the Poſt of *Datary*. He was very much eſteemed by *Panormitanus*, and *Æneas Silvius*, and ſhewed a great Devotion for (B) Saint *Auguſtin*. His Morals were very exemplary. He died at *Rome* in 1459 †. Amongſt thoſe Authors who mention him, I find ſcarce any, who do not paſs over in ſilence the fineſt Paſſage of his Life; for they don't tell us any thing of the Alteration of his Taſt. The Poetical Fictions were at firſt his greateſt delight *; he thought of nothing but making of Verſes, and placing the *Pagan* Divinities in them. *Virgil* was

§ In the Remark D of the Article *Barlæus*.

‖ Jovius elog. c. 117. p. m. 240.

‡ *Moreri ſays he was Canon of* Lateran.

† *Taken from* Ghilini teatro d'Huomini letterati, parte 2. pag. 188.

* *See the Remark* C.

mari. Sed tantum oſtenſurus ſum, præter alia effecta peſtilentiſſima quæ nova ipſorum Theologia & Religio producit; etiam feneſtram & portam aperiri ea Atheiſmo craſſo patentiſſimam atque ampliſſimam. He adds that he has no other deſign than to Convert the Remonſtrants by ſhewing them the Danger which attends their Doctrine. (a) *Quo nimirum unuſquiſque eo magis ab ea ſibi caveat: & ipſi Theologi Remonſt. Lucri fiant, qui etiam noſter in hoc labore ſcopus eſt.* We have ſeen (b) ſomething like this in *Maldonat*'s Commentaries. The *Arminians* vigorouſly returned the Blow in a Book intituled *Vedelius Rhapſodus*.

(B) *He was concerned that Death did not permit him.*] This circumſtance you will find in one of *Voſſius*'s Letters. You will there ſee alſo that in caſe this reply of *Vedelius* had been Printed, they would have left out all the violent and injurious expreſſions diſperſed in that Book by way of return to his Antagoniſt. (c) *Vedelius Theologiæ apud Franekeranos Profeſſor, dum in Friſia ſum, fatis conceſſit. Moribundum cruciabat, quod terris eriperetur, priuſquam potuiſſet Revio & Triglandio reſpondere. Horum uterque acerbe ſatis ſcripſit adverſus ſcriptum ejus de Conſtantini Epiſcopatu; quo Magiſtratus jura circa res Eccleſiæ defendit. Collegæ defuncti mihi Franekeræ aiebant, fortaſſe reſponſum ſic etiam edendum; ſed deletis, quæ ut par pari redderet hoſtimentum, virulentius chartis illeviſſet adverſus Revium.*

(C) *The Power of the Magiſtrate in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs.*] Several diſputes aroſe concerning this queſtion in *Holland* after the Synod of *Dort*; ſome Divines endeavoured to withdraw the Eccleſiaſtical Authority from the Sovereign, and others would confer on the Magiſtrate all Eccleſiaſtical Authority. At leaſt thus each party interpreted the other's intention. *Vedelius* engaged in this diſpute, and in the beginning of 1638. publiſhed a *Diſputatio Theologica de Magiſtratu adverſus Bellarmini librum de Laicis*, where he extended the Magiſtrates power much farther than others would have it. Some time after knowing that ſome were preparing to refute him, he publiſhed a (d) 2d Edition of his Diſputation, to which he added ſeveral Explanations. The whole Title of this piece is, *De Epiſcopatu Conſtantini magni, ſeu poteſtate Magiſtratuum Reformatorum circa res Eccleſiaſticas, diſſertatio repetita cum reſponſione ad interrogata quædam.* He foreſaw that he ſhould irritate (e) his Adverſaries, and draw on himſelf a heap of Calumnies; but for all this he had Courage enough to enter the liſts. His foreſight was juſt, and 'twas not neceſſary to be a great Prophet in order to predict an Event of that Nature. He was attacked in his Life time and after his Death. Several *Zealand* Miniſters cauſed him to be refuted, when he was Dead, making uſe of the Pen of a Miniſter of (f) *Middleburg*. His Friends in *Frieſland* defended him, and Treated the *Zealand* Miniſters with the utmoſt contempt. See the Book intituled (g) *Grallæ ſeu vere puerilis cothurnus ſapientiæ, quo ſe jactat apud imperitos Guillelmus Apollonii*, &c. *Apollonius* anſwered: They replyed by a Book whoſe Title (h) is Comical enough.

(D) *A Catalogue of his Works.*] I have already Mentioned three: The reſt are *Notæ in Epiſtolas Ignatii. Commentarius de tempore utriuſque Epiſcopatus, S. Petri, Antiocheni & Romani*, at Geneva 1624. *Rationale Theologicum, ſeu de neceſſitate & vero uſu principiorum rationis ac Philoſophiæ in Controverſiis Theologicis*; at the ſame place 1628. *A Remedy againſt Apoſtacy* in French, Printed alſo there in the ſame Year. *Panacea Apoſtaſiæ*, at the ſame place 1628. This is a Tranſlation of the former. *S. Hilary or an Antidote againſt ſorrow*, in French, at *Geneva*, 1630. *S. Hilarius ſeu Antidotum contra triſtitiam pro ſancta hilaritate*, at *Leyden*, 1632. 'tis a Tranſlation of the former. *De prudentia veteris Eccleſiæ*, at *Amſterdam* 1633. *De Deo Synagogæ contra Caſp. Barlæum* at *Harderwick* 1632. *Opuſcula Theologica* at *Franeker*.

(A) *He began to write Books very early.*] At the Age of ſixteen, if we believe *Ghilini*, whoſe Authority in this caſe ought to be of little weight; for it is certain that he is tainted with the Enthuſiaſm of a Panegyriſt, and that he has not well adjuſted the Parts of his Narrative. Doth he write judiciouſly when he relates 1. That *Vegius* (i) being arrived at a ſupreme perfection in all ſorts of Humane Literature, went to *Pavia* in order to ſtudy the Civil and Canon Law? 2. That having ſcarce began to ſtudy there, he was obliged to leave the Town on Account of the peſt? 3. That he returned into his own Country, where he applyed himſelf again to the Study of polite Learning, and to Writing, being (k) ſcarce yet ſixteen Years old? Doth not this Relation naturally mean that *Vegius* underſtood perfectly all the Parts of Literature before he was ſixteen? This Hyperbole is abſurd. He dyed before he nearly approached that perfection; how then was he arrived at it in his Younger Years?

(B) *A great Devotion for Saint Auguſtin.*] He Built a Chappel in the Church dedicated to that Saint at *Rome* on the Right Hand of the great Altar, and having cauſed the Bones of Saint *Auguſtin* to be put into a very fine Shrine with thoſe of his Mother *Monica*, he Tranſported them from *Oſtia* to this Chappel. He wrote Poems in Honour of thoſe two Saints, which he alſo very much praiſed in the Preface of his Book, *de educatione puerorum & claris eorum moribus*. In which work he confirms his Precepts concerning the Education of Children by as many proper inſtances as he could poſſibly find in the Life of Saint *Auguſtin* and his Mother *Monica*. (l) *In præfatione poſtquam D. Auguſtini & matris ipſius Monicæ laudes pluribus prædicavit, ſubjungit: Enitemur oſtendere omnem bene educandorum filiorum rationem, & convenientiſſimis ſubinde etiam ſanctiſſimiſque*

(a) Ibid.

(b) See the Article Vallée.

(c) Voſſius epiſt. 483. p. m. 429. col. 2. It is dated the 25. of October 1641. It is among thoſe of the Arminians pag. 811. of the Edition in Folio.

(d) In the Year 1641.

(e) Jam præclara temeritatis & ſuperbiæ ingenia nihil magis in votis fuit, quam ut ſpretis ſalutaribus pacis & concordiæ conſiliis ac monitis in me inſolescant, & virus ſuum contra me evomant. *Nicol. Præf. de Epiſcopatu Conſtantini.*

(f) Called Gulielmus Apollonius.

(g) *It was Printed at* Franeker *in the Year* 1646.

(h) Grallator ſaventis de novo in ſcenam productus, cum pantomimo ſuo bombomachide Vliſſingano. *At* Franeker 1647.

(i) Dopò eſſer egli a ſomma perfezione arrivato in ogni genere di lettere humane andò a Pavia. *Ghilini, teatro part.* 2. p. 188.

(k) Diedeſi nell' età di ſedici anni appena a ſcrivere *Ibid.*

(l) Geſner, in biblioth. fol. 491. *ſpeaking of* Vegius's *Treatiſe* de educatione puerorum *Printed at* Baſil *with other ſuch ſmall Books in the Year* 1541.

was one of his great Gods. *David's* Pſalms ſeemed to him but old Womens Songs, and he equally abhorred the Prieſthood and Death: But at laſt he (C) was diſguſted at the Profane Beauties of Poetry; the Pſalms of *David* appeared to him admirable, and he was touched with an extreme Pleaſure in the ſacerdotal Functions, and employing himſelf in the inſtruction of the Nuns. I ſhall ſpeak of his Works (D).

VELSERUS (MARK) (A) Conſul of *Augsburg*, his Native City, was a Learned Civilian and a Famous Author. He was Born the 20 of *June* 1558 (B) of

ſanctiſſimiſque tum precum Monicæ quam filii Auguſtini exemplis, ſingula quidem tamen ea applicari poterunt confirmare ſtudebimus.

(C) *But at laſt he was diſguſted at the profane Beauties of Poetry; the Pſalms of David.*] Such an excellent converſion, ſuch an holy Metamorphoſis are ſo rare that they ſhould not have been forgotten by thoſe who mention this Writer. Moſt Poets retain till Death their paſſion for the Beauties of Poetry. *Vegius* is an Exception to this general Rule, his Confeſſion runs thus. (a) *Prima recolens tempora*, ſaith he, *quibus inhiabam quotidie condendis carminibus, nihil præter Muſis & Poetarum luſit pulchrum ducens, mirari non ſatis poſſum, adeo IMMUTARI affectus meos, adeo vim animo meo [ut ita dixerim] fieri potuiſſe, ut a dulcibus prurientibuſque fabulis, ad ſtudia ſeriora converſus ſim, & qui decantandis ingentibus rerum geſtis, confiſiſque tot incertorum Deorum numinibus, ardentius inſtabam, nunc ad exhortandas ſorores, ad docendas virgunculas deſcenderim, ut pro Ovidiis & Flaccis, nunc Auguſtinos & Hieronymos, pro Virgilio, quem alterum in terris Deum eſſe arbitrabar, nunc David fideliorem Vatem colam, ſuſcipiam ampleƈtarque, & ejus mihi carmina, quæ tanquam anilia deliramenta ſordebant, nunc mira aſpergant animum ſuavitate, atque [unde magis etiam obſtupeſcam] quod tantopere deteſtabar exhorrebamque inſtar mortis, nunc ſacerdotis dulcius nihil putem.*

(D) *I ſhall ſpeak of his Works.*] Some of which are in proſe, others in Verſe, ſome are Printed, others not. The Poem for which he is moſt Famous is his ſupplement to the *Æneid*; he imagined that *Virgil* had not concluded that work. He reſolved then to add a 13th Book which is cuſtomarily Printed with the 12. of that *Roman* Poet. His enterprize hath been Cenſured (b). His Dialogue *de felicitate & miſeria* for ſome time paſſed for (c) a piece of *Lucian*. It was printed with the Book *de Educatione puerorum*, the *Philalethes*, and the *diſceptatio inter terram, ſolem & aurum*. All theſe tracts are in Proſe. *Ghilini* falſly believes that the 7 Books *de perſeverantia religionis ad Sorores*, were never Printed. But they were really Printed at *Paris* (d) in 1511. with ſome of thoſe pieces whoſe Titles I have mentioned. They were inſerted in the great *Bibliotheca Patrum*. His Poem on the Frauds of the Peaſants muſt needs be very curious. You will find in *Ghilini* the Titles of a great many pieces of this Author, which were never Printed. *Paulus Jovius* hath not forgot to praiſe him on Account of ſome Monuments of the Application of his Pen to ſacred Subjects, which he left behind him. (e) *Ne quid ad cumulatam eruditionem vero Chriſtiano acceſſet, quædam etiam in ſacris literis ſynceræ interpretationis gloſſemata reliquit, aureumque præſertim libellum de rebus antiquis memorabilibus Baſilicæ ſancti Petri, in quo donaria, ſepulcraque Pontificum recenſentur.*

(A) *Conſul of* Augsburg.] I cannot tell whether theſe Words *Duumvir Reipublicæ Auguſtanæ*, about the Print of our *Velſerus*, can be better rendred. It were to be wiſhed that ſome Body would publiſh a Dictionary of Modern Offices, a Task very worthy of a Learned Man. Such a work would be very ſerviceable to Tranſlators, and Readers; for inſtance, it would inform us what we ought to underſtand by *Duumvir Auguſtanus*, the continual Title of *Marcus Velſerus*. *Conſul of Augsburg* is not a right Tranſlation; for the conſular Dignity of the *Romans* did not reſemble that of thoſe, who are call'd *Duumvirs* of *Augsburg*. On this Occaſion I obſerve that one of the moſt conſiderable poſts of *Holland*, I mean that of *Penſionary*, is very improperly Named. Its name is derived from an accident (f) intirely external, which gives no manner of idea either of the Rights or (g) Functions of him, who is poſſeſt with it. What I have ſaid of the Conſulſhip of *Velſerus*, I ſay it alſo of his Prætorſhip. I am perſuaded that a Prætor of *Augsburg* doth not at all reſemble the old *Roman* Prætors; and yet we can ſcarce avoid giving the *Roman* Names to Modern Offices, when we either Write in *Latin* or Tranſlate any of the Moderns out of that Language. I don't know whether *Duumvir* and *Prætor* are not the ſame thing at *Augsburg*. However there are Offices in that City inferior to that of *Duumvir*, which Modern Writers expreſs by the Word Conſulſhip (h).

(B) *Of a very ancient Family.*] Some will have it to be deſcended from *Beliſarius*, the Famous General of the Emperor *Juſtinian*. It is ſtoried that *Francis Beliſarius* about the *Year* 564. Married *Antonia*, *Pompey's* Daughter, and Couſin to the Siſter of the Emperour *Anaſtaſius* the I. He left two Sons, *Peter*, and *Charles*, the firſt of which Married *Mary Colonna*, and died without Iſſue at *Milan*; the other in order to live ſecure from the incurſions of the *Barbarians*, retired into the Country of *Vallais*, and poſſeſſed a Caſtle (i) in the Territory of *Sion*, which he left to his deſcendants (k). What a Genealogy is here of a Citizen of *Augsburg*! But what is very ſurprizing is, that we are told that Authentick Proofs to make good all this, are ready to be produced. For, ſay they, *John Bartholomew* VELSERUS, Counſellor to the Emperor *Lewis* of *Bavaria*, and Canon of *Straſburg*, wrote a Letter to that Emperor in 1336. when the Diet was aſſembled at *Spire*, to ſupplicate him earneſtly, to affix his Signet by way of approbation to the *German* Tranſlation of a Book, which Cardinal *Stephen Colonna* had written concerning the Genealogy of the *Velſeri*. This Emperour himſelf had commanded the Compoſure of this Book; and the Author therein produced an exact ſeries of Proofs founded on publick Acts and Deeds, from 545. to *John* VELSERUS the Brother of *John Bartholomew*. (l) *Pro venuſtiſſima familiæ ſuæ gloria ac dignitate non rogans ſolum, verum etiam obſecrans, ut Germanicam libelli verſionem ſigillo annuli ſui confirmaret, quem auctoritate ac juſſu ipſius Imperatoris Stephanus Colonna, ſummi Pontificis tunc Vicarius & Cardinalis, ex omnibus inſtrumentis, tabulis, literiſque publicis ab A. C.* 545. *uſque ad* Johannem Velſerum, *Joh. Bartholomæi fratrem germanum, omni cura & diligentia complexus eſt.* This work was put into *Latin* at *Rome* in 1337. by the ſame *John Bartholomew*. We are told that *Emanuel* VELSERUS Canon of *Baſil* in 1071. Writing to his Brother *Octavian* mentioned *Charles Beliſarius*, who with his Wife *Paula degli Urſini* retired from *Rome* into *Vallais* in 620. *Agitur inibi mentione de* Carolo Beliſario, *qui una cum conjuge* Paula Urſina *Valleſiam verſus ad Rheni fontes A. C.* 620. *ex urbe Roma ob ſæviſſimos & violentiſſimos in omnem nobilitatem Longobardos, exemplo aliorum egreſſus eſt.* (m) This *Octavian* VELSERUS already mentioned was the firſt of the Family, that has been Senator of *Augsburg*. He was alſo Captain in that City, Director of the Military Affairs, and beſides Counſellor to *Conrad* Duke of *Franconia*. He died in 1074 (n). *James* VELSERUS was the firſt of the Family who ſetled at *Nuremberg*, whither he came in 1493. He Married and died there in 1544. being the Father of Six Sons and Eleven Daughters. The Alliances of the *Velſeri* have been very illuſtrious, in *Switzerland*, and ſeveral Provinces of the Empire: But the greateſt Honour which they received on this Account was doubtleſs the Marriage of *Philippina Velſerus* to *Ferdinand* Arch-Duke of *Auſtria*, Son of the Emperor *Ferdinand* the I. and Brother to the Emperor *Maximilian* the II. That Prince fell deſperately in Love with *Philippina* in the time of the Diet at *Augsburg* in 1548. and (o) Married her privately. She lived with him as his lawful Wife till his Death, (p) above 24 Years. She was a very fine Woman, and endowed beſides with a rich ſtore of good Qualities. She was Daughter to (q) *Francis* VELSE-

RUS

(a) Vegius de perſeverantia religionis in tomo 26. bibl. Max. f. 698. apud Spizelium in literato feliciſſimo pag. 162.

(b) *See* Mr. Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poetes n. 1222. tom. 3. p. 43. & ſeq.

(c) Ghilini, ubi ſupra.

(d) *See the Catalogue of the* Bodleian *Library* pag. 224.

(e) Jovius elog. c. 107. p. m. 250.

(f) *From his receiving a yearly Penſion from the Publick.*

(g) *They are very well explained in* Furetiere's *Dictionary Corrected by Mr.* de Beauval.

(h) [illegible]

(i) Supplementum [illegible]

(k) [illegible] MARCO [illegible] MATTHAEO [illegible] PAULO [illegible]

(l) Ibid.

(m) Ibid. pag. 6.

(n) Ibid.

(o) Marinus Cruſius, part. 3. Annal. Suevic. l. 12. fol. 713. apud Arnold. ib. pag. 12.

(p) Jacob. Menius, apud Arnold. ibid.

(q) Arnold. ibid.

of a very Ancient Family, which (C) had poſſeſſed vaſt Riches. He was carefully Educated; and being touched with a paſſion for polite Literature, he was when very Young ſent to *Rome* as a Pupil to *Antony Muret* *, where he was in 1574. With the Study of the Antiquities he Intermixed that of the *Italian* Tongue, in which he became ſo great a Proficient, that he wrote that Language like a (D) *Florentin*. Returning Home he applyed himſelf to the Bar in the Year 1589. He obtained the Senatorial Dignity in the Year 1592. He was preferred to the little Council in the Year 1594, and Elected Prætor in the Year 1600. He diſcharged all theſe Offices with a great deal of Honour, and was an Ornament to his Country. He was both a lover and a protector of Learning and Learned Men. He Publiſhed ſeveral good (E) Books, and afforded

* [illegible] pag. 17.

---

rus Baron of *Zinnenberg*, and Siſter to *Charles* VELSERUS, Governour of the Marquiſate of *Burgaw*. She died at *Inſpruck* the 24th of *April* 1580, and left two Sons, which their Father *Ferdinand* could never qualify to ſucceed him. He was obliged to content himſelf with the Marquiſate of *Burgaw* for the Elder; and the Younger being an Eccleſiaſtick became a Cardinal (a). *Arnoldus* cites an Author who affirms (b) that *Andrew*, the Eldeſt Son of *Ferdinand* and of *Philippina Velſerus*, was a Cardinal, and that *Charles* his Younger Brother Marquis of *Burgaw*, Married *Sybilla* Siſter to *John William* Duke of *Cleves*. Theſe two Brothers died without Iſſue. It is ſaid that *Charlemagne* gave three Flowers-de-luce for Arms to *Philip* VALISERUS, who behaved himſelf very Bravely in the War of *Lombardy*. It is added that he was Honoured with ſeveral other Prerogatives, (c) and that *Otho* the Great confirmed all thoſe Privileges in Favour of *Julius* VELSERUS Grandſon of *Philip Valiſerus*, whom he made his Counſellor in the Council of War in 950, and a Knight in 971. (d) *Charles* the fifth ranked this Family amongſt the *immediate Noble Men*, whoſe cauſes are cognizable before the Emperour only (e). The Arch-Duke *Ferdinand* made *Charles* VELSERUS, *Philippina's* Brother, a free Baron (f).

Obſerve that *Julius Velſerus* ſaved the Emperor *Otho*'s life in a Battle againſt the *Huns*, and that he died of a continual Fever in the Camp at the Age of 96. in the Emperor *Henry* the II's. time, (g). The Author whom I cite ſpeaks of ſeveral *Velſerus's*, who ſignalized either their Valour in the Armies, or their Prudence in the Magiſtracy.

(C) *Which had poſſeſſed vaſt Riches.*] *Melchior Adam* relates that *Francis* the I. being by a Treaty of Peace obliged to pay 12 tuns of Gold to *Charles* the V. the *Fuggers* and the *Velſers* promiſed to Advance that great Sum of Money (h). *Martin Cruſius* ſaith that in the Year 1528. *Bartholomew* VELSER and his Partners Armed ſeveral Ships in *Spain*, and ſent them into *America*, where they diſcovered a very Rich Country, on the Frontiers of *Peru*, called *Venezuela*, of which they made themſelves Maſters, and kept it 28 Years, according to the Treaty which they concluded with *Charles* the V. But a difference aroſe betwixt the Farmers of *Elizabeth* King *Philip*'s Queen, and *George* of *Spire*, who govern'd that Country in the Name of the *Velſers*. At firſt they diſputed only about Tolls, and then about the Limits, and at laſt it was pretended that thoſe *Germans* ought not to poſſeſs any part of *Venezuela*. The Cauſe was pleaded in *Spain*, and they were ejected out of all they poſſeſſed in *Venezuela*, by Virtue of the Sentence pronounced in the *Spaniſh* Court in 1555. The firſt Governour whom the *Velſers* Eſtabliſhed there was *Ambroſe Dalſinger* Born at *Ulm*, whom the *Spaniards* killed; but *Charles* V. cauſed the Authors of this Murther to be Puniſhed (i). Mr. *Arnoldus* is very angry becauſe *Jerom Benzo* calls the *Velſers* (to whom the Emperour engaged the Country of (k) *Valentiola*) Merchants. *Vano iſtius judicio & Reges & Principes magnarii negotiatores erunt, & delicatarum mercium inſtitores. Hercules tuam fidem!* Thus *Arnoldus* exclaims againſt the word *Merchant*. He Abridges what *Herrera* hath ſaid concerning the Exploits of thoſe Governors, whom the *Velſers* ſent to that Country.

(D) *He wrote that Language like a* Florentin.] The Teſtimony of an *Italian* to this purpoſe is cited by Mr. *Arnoldus* (l): *Mirari poſſibus deſinant qui linguæ Italica civem in Marco attoniti ſtupent; Orlandus enim Peſcetti* (m) *in reſponſione ſua ad Anticruſcam Benii Florentinam, illius puritatem* [illegible] *exſultatur, dum ait:* Se'l Cavalier (n) Guariti, Uomo pur Ferrareſe, prepi come nelle ſue lettere ſi vede, il Cavalier Salviati che purgaſſi il ſuo Paſtor Fido da Lombardiſmi, e dell' Illuſtriſſimo Sig. Marco Velſero Duumviro della Rep. Auguſtina, e chiariſſimo lume della Germania ſcrive all' Eccellentiſſimo Sig. Chiocco, che le ſue lettere gli paiono dettate da Uomo nato ed allevato in Firenze. *Immo judicium Velſeri de lingua Italica mille aliis præfert cenſoribus:* quando (o) ogn' altra vi mancaſſe, quella del Sig. Marco Velſero addietro mentovato, mi varebbe per mille, il quale in una lettera ſcritta all' Eccellentiſſimo Sig. Chiocco, dice che nel legger le coſe del Caſa ſente tanto diletto, che non vorebbe che aveſſer mai fine. You will find in *Arnoldus* the Elogy which *Nicolas Manaſſes* beſtowed upon *Velſerus*, in his Dedication to him of (p) a Book of *Lewis le Roy*, which *Hercules Catus* had Tranſlated from the *French* into *Italian*. I ſhall not Tranſcribe this, but another Elogy which ſeems of more weight. *Galileo* declaring his Reaſon why he made uſe of the *Italian* Language, in his three Letters to *Velſerus de Maculis Solaribus*, expreſſes himſelf thus: (q) *Ma in oltre ci hò avuto un altro mio particolar intereſſe, ed è il non privarmi delle riſpoſte di V. S. in tal lingua vedute da me e dagl' Amici miei con molto maggior diletto, è meraviglia, che ſe foſſero ſcritte del più purgato ſtile Latine, e parci nel legger lettere di locuzzione tanto propria che Firenze eſtenda i ſuoi confini, anzi il recinto delle ſue mura, ſino in Auguſta.*

(m) Nelle riſpoſte all' Anticr. del Beni, cart. 16.

(n) *It ſhould be Guarini, and 'tis likely a fault of Impreſſion.*

(o) Riſpoſt. cart. 112, 113.

(p) *Concerning the Viciſſitude of the things of this World.*

(q) Lettera terza, cart. 103. & 104. apud Arnoldum pag. 44.

(E) *He Publiſhed ſeveral good Books.*] His firſt Work, according to *Melchior Adam*, was that which he Publiſhed at *Venice* in the Year 1594. The bare Title diſcovers the uncommon Learning of the Author; it runs thus. *Rerum Auguſtanarum Vindelicarum libri octo, quibus à prima Rhætorum ac Vindelicorum origine ad annum uſque 552. à nato Chriſto nobiliſſimæ gentis hiſtoria & antiquitates traduntur, ac antiqua monumenta tam quæ Auguſtæ, quam quæ in agro Auguſtano, quin & quæ alibi extant ad res Auguſtanas ſpectantia, ære inciſa & notis illuſtrata exhibentur.* *Melchior Adam* had reaſon to (r) call this a happy Prelude. *Velſerus* Conſecrated the firſt Fruits of his Labours to the Glory of his Country. (s) *In Italiam progreſſus edidit* antiquitates Auguſtanas, *felix famæ ſurgentis auſpicium & pium.* In the Year 1602. He Publiſhed at *Auſbourg*, *Rerum Boicarum libri quinque, hiſtoriam à gentis origine ad Carolum Magnum complexi.* He afterwards Publiſhed at ſeveral times the Lives of ſome Martyrs of *Augsburg*, St. *Ulric* Biſhop of that City, St. *Severinus* and *Apollonius* of *Tyre*. As for the Ancient *Itinerary*, which *Peutinger* poſſeſſed, whence it was called *tabula Peutingeriana*, he Publiſhed it at *Venice* (t) in the Year 1591. Moſt of thoſe Pieces are Illuſtrated with *Velſerus*'s Commentaries. All the Works of this Author have been Collected into a Body, and Re-printed in Folio at *Nuremberg* in 1682. *Christopher Arnoldus* Profeſſor at *Nuremberg* had the care of this Edition, and adorned it with Prefaces, in which he informs us of a great many Particulars, concerning the Family of the *Velſers* in general, and the Life of *Mark Velſerus* in particular; together with the judgment which the Learned have paſſed on his Works, and the Funeral Elogies with which they Honoured him. And as he kept a great Correſpondence with the Learned of *Italy*, and of ſeveral other Countries,

(r) *It ought to be remembred that* Velſerus *had Publiſh'd a little Book in* 1591.

(s) In vitis Juriſconſult. pag. 480.

(t) *He ſays ſo himſelf in his 96th Letter* ad Italos, pag. 879.

afforded helps to (F) several Authors; and no Man ever had more Friends than he in the Republick of Learning. He would never suffer himself (G) to be Drawn; but his Picture was taken unknown to him. He Died the 13th of *June* in the Year 1614, and left no Children. He had several Brothers † distinguished as well by their great Merit as considerable Posts. See his Life prefixed to the new Edition of his Works, for which we are beholden to the diligent Care of *Christopher Arnoldus* Professor at *Nuremberg*. An Author observes || that *Velserus* left his Domestick Affairs in an ill Posture; at which I am not at all surprized. When a Man Consecrates himself as he did to the Service of the Learned, and the Correspondence with Authors, it is extreamly difficult for him to avoid Expences, and neglecting his Patrimony. One *Roserius* Censured him, to whom he did not vouchsafe the Honour of an Answer. *Scaliger* and others advised him to this contempt of his Adversary.

Cluverius

ries, the Editor hath Collected several of his *Latin* and *Italian* Letters which he hath added to this Edition.

OPINIONS concerning the Author of the *Squittinio della liberta Veneta.*

Velserus passed for the Author of the *Squittinio della liberta Veneta*, which was Printed about the Year 1612. *Gassendus* acquainting us that several ascribed that Book to Mr. *de Peiresc*, adds that they were mistaken, and that it is very probable that *Velserus* composed it. He grounds this Conjecture on *Velserus*'s great Learning and singular Propensity to the House of *Austria*: (a) *Non disquiro quidem an auctor hujusce libri fuerit Antonius Albizius, nobilis ille Florentinus, qui Christianorum Principum Stemmata ediderat ante duos annos, ut nonnullis persuasum est; an, ut videtur verosimilius, insignis ille Marcus Velserus, cujus sæpius meminimus, ob consummatam eruditionem, propensionemque singularem erga domum Austriacam.* Mr. *Arnoldus* (b) declares that he knows nothing of this affair, and blames their Temerity who pronounce so decisively concerning a Fact so uncertain as this is. He cites *Ernstius* (c), *Rhodius* (d), *Scavenius* (e), *Placcius* (f), who affirm that *Velserus* was the Author of this Book. He owns that *Octavius Ferrarius* wrote to him that *Scioppius* had frequently assured him, that *Velserus* was the Author of the *Squittinio*. (g) *M. Velseri scripta eo plausu a studiosis excipientur, quem ingens viri fama & celebre nomen meretur. Nollem tamen illis inseri Venetæ Reip. Scrutinium, cujus illum auctorem fuisse sæpe mihi Scioppius firmavit.* The Authority of *Scioppius* in this case seems to me to carry a great force; for besides that he was generally very well acquainted with all things of this Nature, he enjoyed a large share of *Velserus*'s Friendship, and kept a very strict (h) Epistolary Correspondence with him. Mr. *Arnoldus* was not ignorant that the Author of the Book Entituled, *The Conspiracy of the Spaniards against the Republick of Venice*, attributes the *Squittinio* to the Marquis of *Bedemar*; but he hath not chosen the passage of that Piece, which most clearly ascribes the *Squittinio* to the Marquis. His Proof is grounded upon these words: *The other point was that in all Affairs which he was to Negotiate concerning the Prerogatives of the Republick, he should make use of the Memoirs of the* Squittinio della liberta veneta, *to which the Marquis of* Bedemar *refers in several places of this Instruction, and that in Terms which tho' somewhat modest, yet discover plainly enough* HIS PATERNAL LOVE FOR THIS LIBEL. The Abbot *de St. Real* Author of the Relation of this Conspiracy, saith this in the last Page but one; and in the 35. 36. and 37th he relates the History of the *Squittinio*, and how the Marquis of *Bedemar* had conceived and executed the design of this Work. From whence, and not from the last Page save one, Mr. *Arnoldus* ought to have drawn his necessary Proofs. But this is a very little fault compared with that which I am about to observe. He pretends that the Relator of that Conspiracy is very much mistaken, when he supposes that the Marquis of *Bedemar* in his Instruction to the Ambassadour, who was to succeed him, very much recommended the reading of the *Squittinio*. This is false, saith Mr. *Arnoldus*, for the Marquis decried this Piece, as a work abounding with Errors. The intire passage in the Professor of *Nuremberg* runs thus: "*Verum quam falsus etiam hic auctor fuerit ex instructione secreta ab Alfonso della Cueva Hispanico apud Venetos legato successori suo Lud. Bravo data, cuivis uni ad oculum statim apparet, prout Laur. Bank eamdem cum Scrutinio evulgavit.* (i) E perche in tempo mio fu divulgato un libretto intitulato *Squittinio della liberta de Venetiani*, opretta veramente degna d'esser letta. *Deinde omnem illi derogat fidem, ob multas fallacias veritati inimicas quæ inibi occurrunt, ac vivos magistros mortuis longe præferendos censet.* Questo ancora vorrei che si trovasse appresso di lei, scoprendosi per la lettura di quello molte fallacie introdotte da gli historici moderni, che trascurando la pura verita contenuta nelle Chroniche antiche, hanno dato ad intendere a posteri tutto quello che gli e parso a proposito per stabilire la loro liberta. Ne meno profitto sara che Vostra Excellenza potra trarne da libri vivi, che s'hara cavati da Volumi morti: Vuoglio dire che l'informatione a bocca di persone prattiche solite a frequentar la casa nostra, &c. *Sed quid pluribus verbis opus est? Mentis acies se ipsam intuens nonnunquam hebescit.*"

The Reflection couched in these last words, seems to be made only to be turned against its Author; for it is plain that Mr. *Arnoldus* is dazled with too bright a Light. The passage, which he cites out of the Instruction, clearly shews that the *Squittinio* ought to consulted by the Ambassadour, because by reading it he might be informed of the Impostures of several Modern Historians. So far is *Bedemar* from saying that it is filled with Lies, that he recommends it as a Corrective of the Falsities of others. What is most blameable in the Abbot *de St. Real* is perhaps that he too warmly engages in the Affirmative, in ascribing the *Squittinio* to *Alphonso de la Cueva*. Which hath occasioned others (k) to declare too decisively on this Head. He had indeed better have suspended his Judgment: And we have here an instance which proves that some Books which make a great noise, are falsely attributed to various Persons, without our ever discovering (l) the true Author. A *French* Historian, who wrote when the *Squittinio* appeared publickly, makes no scruple to Attribute it to our *Velserus*, whose name he spells very ill. *The second*, saith he (m), *is a Treatise composed by one* Vulser, *concerning the Liberty of Venice.*

(F) *And afforded Helps to several Authors.*] No one Person contributed more than he to the large Collection of Inscriptions, which *Gruterus* Published. See the Elogy of *Velserus* in *Gruterus*'s Preface. *Melchior Adam* gives us a long List (n) of several Antient Books, the Publication of which were procured by *Velserus*. Mr. *Arnoldus* enlarges on the (o) detail of the Services, which this Learned Man did to several Authors, and doth not forget the two Manuscripts of *Anastasius*, which he sent to the Jesuits of *Mentz*, after having borrowed them out of the *Palatine* Library, by the Interest of *Marquard Freherus*. The Story of Pope *Joan* was in those Manuscripts. Nor doth he forget that *Velserus* was security for one thousand Florins, in order to procure for *Conrad Rittershusius* a Manuscript of the Epistles of *Isidorus Pelusiota* out of the Duke of *Bavaria*'s Library (p). But the Generosity of this Action wou'd not sufficiently appear, if we did not know that *Velserus* paid the mentioned sum without pretending any Obligation from *Rittershusius*, or so much as giving him notice of it.

(G) *He would never suffer himself to be Drawn.*] As we are informed in *Peireskius*'s Life. There was a great and amicable Epistolary Commerce betwixt these two Learned Men; but *Peireskius* could never obtain this Friend's Picture. He was obliged to have recourse to a Stratagem, which he practised more than once: He payed a Painter

to

† See Schottus, in the [illegible] and the Remark A in the Margin.

|| [illegible] pag. [illegible]

(a) Gassendus in vita Peireskii, lib. 3. ad ann. 1612. p. m. 279.

(b) In præfat.

(c) Lib. 2. Observat. variar. c. 36.

(d) In Auctor. supposit. p. 20, 21.

(e) In Catalogo, n. 60. in calce libri Placcii.

(f) De anonymis, cap. 15. pag. 116.

(g) Ferrarius, epist. ad Arnold. in præfat. operum Velseri.

(h) See the Remark F of the Article Bongars.

(i) Bizzar. Polit. num. 14, 15. pag. 85 & seq.

(k) See the Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres for May, in the Year 168[illegible] p. [illegible] of the 1 Edit.

(l) See the Cabinet chimerique, pag. 21[illegible] of the 2. Edition.

(m) Le Grain, Decade de Louis XIII. Book 10. p. 440. The Author of the Veritez Françoises Printed in the Year 164[illegible] says pag. 31[illegible] that Vulser Publish'd his Treatise of the Liberty of Venice.

(n) In vitis Jurisconsult. pag. 412.

(o) De vita … Marci Velseri, p. 55. & seq.

(p) Georg. Rittershusius, in vita Conradi patris [illegible] præmissa, apud Arnold. pag. 59.

Cuverini, who Cenſured him in ſome particulars, deſerved an Anſwer; but *Velſerus* had been Dead one Year when *Cuverini's* Book came out §. *Pignorius* wrote a very good Epitaph on him, which is to be ſeen in the *Jacobins* Church at *Augsburg*, and in *John Tonjola's* * Appendix to the † *Baſilea ſepulta retecta continuata*.

VERDIER (N. DU) Hiſtoriographer of *France*, Author of (*A*) ſeveral Books, which as they are not Excellent, are not inferior to ſeveral which have ſupplied their Authors with Bread. Notwithſtanding which he had the Misfortune not to be able to ſubſiſt on the Fruits of his Pen, tho' very fertile: As I am informed by a very long (*B*) Parentheſis of Mr. *John Baptiſt de Rocoles*, Hiſtoriographer of *France*, and *Brandenburg*, which I have Inſerted in a Remark. We may learn from it at what time *Du Verdier* lived.

VERGERIUS (PETER PAUL) One of the Learned Men of the XVth Century, was Born at *Capo* † *d'Iſtria* on the Gulph of *Venice*. He was a good Philoſopher, and ſo happily intermixed Polite Learning with the Law, that he was eſteemed the moſt Eloquent Civilian of his time. He ‖ Learned *Greek* under *Emanuel Chryſoloras* at *Venice*, and the Canon Law χ under *Francis Zabarella* at *Florence*. He was ζ very much reſpected by Prince *Carrari* Lord of *Padua*, who choſe him Preceptor to his Children. He was not leſs conſidered by the Emperor *Sigiſmund*, ∧ at whoſe Court in *Hungary* he died, and whom he accompanied to the Council of *Conſtance*, if I am (*C*) not miſtaken. He wrote ſeveral (*D*) Books.

VERGERIUS (PETER PAUL) of the ſame * City and Family with the precedent, Flouriſhed in the XVIth Century. He ſtudied the Civil Law, and took his degree of Doctor Law; but he made himſelf more famous by his Embaſſies, and eccleſiaſtical Affairs than for his Learning in the Civil Law. He was ſent Nuncio into *Germany* to the King of the *Romans* † by *Clement* VII. and had Orders to uſe all poſſible means to hinder the Aſſembling of a National Council. He ſupported the Intereſt of Popery with a great deal of Vigour and Addreſs, and oppoſed the Progreſs of the *Lutherans* as much as in him lay. He was recalled by *Paul* III. who was reſolved to be thoroughly informed of the Diſpoſitions of *Germany*, and was ſent thither again in the Year 1535, with Orders to promiſe the holding of a Council, and with ſome other Inſtructions. On this Head he conferred

to watch an opportunity of placing himſelf in a convenient place, where unſeen he could eaſily have a full view of *Velſerus*. (*a*) *Hoc uno ipſi durus fuit* (Velſerus) *quod ſui effigiem conſtantiſſime denegavit, pro eo quo omnibus aliis ardentiſſime flagitantibus denegaverat inſtituto. Et Peireskius tamen ut alios nonnullos, ſic illum neſcientem pingi procuravit, conducto artifice qui ipſius vultum è clandeſtino loco ſpectaret. Sic obtinuit quod illi Occo ſperare nefas prædixerat, cum id abs Velſero tuliſſet reſponſum, Cato major poſteros volebat quærere cur ſibi ſtatua nulla poſita: Mihi contra, quantum video cavendum ne quis aliquando miretur, ſi non & indignetur, qua ambitione conſortio magnorum virorum, quorum imagines ſe colligere Fabricius oſtendit, irrepſerim.* This ſhews that *Velſerus* was not more Complaiſant to others than to Mr. *de Peireſc*, and that he very modeſtly Excuſed himſelf to him. I cannot tell whether the Effigies of *Velſerus* in the Library of *Milan*, was copied from that drawn for Mr. *de Peireſc*: But I know that the Picture of this Illuſtrious *German* was placed in that Library. Of which *Boſca* informs us when he mentions the Interview of *Olgiati* and *Velſerus*. *Et quidem nos cùm pictam tabulam quæ expreſſam ipſius imaginem refert, in Ambroſiano Muſeo ſpectamus, gravitatem eam ex oculis conjicimus, & ex oris ipſius majeſtate vim literaturæ ac conſilii in adminiſtranda Vindelicorum provincia deprebendimus* (*b*).

(*A*) *Author of ſeveral Books.*] Beſides others, he hath Publiſhed the Abridgments of the Hiſtory of *England*, *France*, *Spain*, and of the *Turks*, &c.

(*B*) *As I am informed by a very long Parentheſis.*] The Author whom I cite having related the Death of *Baſſa Geduc Acomat*, according to the Narrative of the *Turkiſh* Pandects, extracted from the *Italian* of the Secretary of *Sigiſmund Malateſta* Prince of *Rimini*, adds immediately after: " (*c*) But Poor " *du Verdier*, who wrote in a Conciſe but Elegant " Style, an Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the *Turks*, " relates it after ſeveral others. (I call this Celebra- " ted Writer Poor, becauſe whilſt I write this, he " and his Poor Wife are in the Hoſpital of the " Salt-Peter-Houſe at *Paris*, where they have been " for ſeven or eight Years paſt, where I have viſited " him, and found true what Fame had long ſince " divulged concerning his great Probity: This " made me deplore the Fate of ſeveral Learned " Men in this Flouriſhing Age, in which Virtue and " Merit ought to be more valued.") This Author ſaith &c.

(*C*) *Accompanied to the Council of* Conſtance, *if I am not miſtaken.*] I make uſe of this Reſerve, becauſe the Expreſſions of thoſe, who inform us that he appeared with a great deal of Luſtre in that Council, (*d*) *claruit in Concilio Conſtantienſi*, do not prove him a Domeſtick to the Emperour. Perhaps the Proof he gave of his Merit during the holding of that Council, determined *Sigiſmund* to take him into his Service.

(*D*) *He wrote ſeveral Books.*] The Hiſtory of the Princes of *Carrari*, and that of the Princes of *Mantua*. An Elogy of St. *Jerom*. A Treatiſe *de republica Veneta*, Printed at *Rome* in 1526 (*e*). An Invective againſt *Malateſta*, who cauſed *Virgil's* Statue at *Mantua* to be thrown down (*f*). A Letter *de vita & obitu Franciſci Zabarellæ Cardinalis Florentini* (*g*). The Life of *Petrarch*. A Treatiſe *de ingenuis moribus ac liberalibus ſtudiis*, which was Printed at *Venice* in 1502, with ſeveral other ſmall Tracts of like nature, *cum commentariis Joannis Bonardi Veronenſis & aliis aliorum de puerorum educatione opuſculis* (*h*), and Re-printed at *Baſil* in the Year 1541. *cum L. Vitruvii Roſcii de docendi ſtudendique modo, & claris puerorum moribus libello* (*i*). This was read in Colleges, when *Paul Jovius* (*k*) was a young Scholar. Beſides which he was the (*l*) firſt who Tranſlated *Arrianus de rebus geſtis Alexandri Magni*. But this Verſion being deſigned for the uſe of the Emperor *Sigiſmund*, who was not very Learned, he therefore made uſe of very Barbarous *Latin*, as *Bartholomew Faccius* (*m*) obſerves. We may here by the way obſerve a Miſtake of *Leander Albertus*; he clearly inſinuates that *Marius Æquicola* is the firſt, who mentioned that *Charles Malateſta* cauſed *Virgil's* Statue to be thrown into the River. *Quamquam*, ſaith he (*n*), *a Mario Æquicola in commentariis lingua vernacula de Mantuanis principibus conſcriptis injuria hercle carpatur, ac ſi ſtatuam Virgilii poetæ in flumen abjici juſſerit: Etenim* (*o*) *ipſo auctori hu e rei Æquicolæ fides tribuitur exigua, modicæ*

§ [illegible]

* Miniſter of the *Italian* Church of *Baſil*.

‖ See what *Anſelm Dromcellis* him in Dedicating to him his *Latin* Tranſlation of the *Iliad*. You'll find his words in *Geſner's* Bibliotheque fol. 552. and in *Voſſius* de hiſt. Lat. pag. 553.

† *Ferdinand* Brother to the Emperor *Charles* V.

(*d*) Andreas Divus, præfat. in Iliada Homeri à ſe verſam.

(*e*) Geſner: in biblioth. fol. 551. verſo.

(*f*) Voſſius de hiſtor. Lat. pag. 553.

(*g*) Panzirol. de claris legum interpret. l. 3. c. 28. pag. m. 444.

(*h*) Voſſius ibid. pag. 552.

(*i*) Geſn. ib. fol. 552.

(*k*) Jovius in elog. c. 111. pag. 254.

(*l*) Voſſius ibib.

(*m*) In præfat. ſuper ſua tranſlat. eorundem librorum apud Geſn. ubi ſupra.

(*n*) Leand. Albert. in deſcripa. Ital. p. 455.

(*o*) *I ſet down thoſe words with the faults of the Preſs that are in them.*

conferred with ſeveral Proteſtant Princes, (C) and with *Luther* himſelf at *Wittemberg*. He gave an account to the Pope of his Nunciature the following Year, and was immediately ordered to *Naples* to Treat with *Charles* V. He was raiſed to the Epiſcopal Dignity † in the ſame Year 1536, and in Conjunction with twelve other Commiſſioners he drew up the Papal Indiction or Promulgation of a Council. He returned into *Germany* in the Year 1541, to aſſiſt at the Aſſembly of *Worms*: He appeared there as a Perſon employed by the King of *France*, but this

dicta nimirum opinione ſcriptori. It is certain that our *Vergerio* lived before this *Æquicola*.

I deſire it may be obſerved that *Voſſius* when he wrote his Book concerning the *Latin* Hiſtorians, remembred very well, that our *Vergerius* was Author of the Invective againſt *Charles Malateſta*; but he perfectly forgot it when he Compoſed his Treatiſe of the *Latin* Poets: For he there declares that he did not know whether this Invective was Written by *Guarini* of *Verona*, or one of his Diſciples. (a) *Statuam Mantuæ conſtitutam Maroni ante bos annos ducentos Carolus de Malateſta, tanquam quæ nihil ad religionem Chriſtianam pertineret, dejici curavit. Habeoque orationem Manuſcriptam adverſus Carolum in temporibus ſuper hoc exaratam, ſatis ſanè acerbam: Et tamen auctor ait, acerbiùs ſe ſcripturum fuiſſe, ſi tutum fuiſſet in eos ſcribere, qui poſſent proſcribere. Nomen auctoris non apponitur: Sed permiſta legitur orationibus, libelliſque Guarini, ac diſcipulorum, qui auctore magiſtro hujuſmodi oneris aliquid ſuſcipere ſolerent. Ut videri poſſit ſcripta ab ipſo Guarino Veronenſi, clariſſimo ſui temporis viro, vel ſaltem diſcipulorum aliquo.*

(C) *And with* Luther *himſelf at* Wittemberg.] Father *Paul* and *Pallavicini* relate this very differently. The firſt (b) aſſures us that the Pope ordered *Vergerius to treat with* Luther, *and the Chief of his Fraternity, and to endeavour to regain them by Promiſes and Careſſes,* and that this (c) Nuncio *went to* Luther *at* Wittemberg, *and treated him very obligingly, according to his Orders.* He recites the diſcourſe the *Nuncio* made, and *Luther*'s Anſwer. He ſhews the Magnificent Promiſes and moſt engaging Behaviour of the former in his Diſcourſe. But *Luther*'s Anſwer is full of a Holy contempt of all thoſe advantageous Offers: He diſcovers an admirable firmneſs and reſolution. *Pallavicini* relates this Story in a quite other manner, and accuſes Father *Paul* of having ſtuffed his Hiſtory with more Lies than *Homer* had invented concerning the *Trojan* War. He complains that Father *Paul* diſgraces the Pope by repreſenting him making ſuch ſhameful Advances, and that he beſtows ſo much Piety, Wiſdom and Greatneſs of Soul on a Heretick. He maintains that *Vergerio* unexpectedly ſaw *Luther*. This *Nuncio*, ſaith he, being obliged to paſs through *Wittemberg*, was there very honourably Received. The Commander of that Town waited at his Table during his Supper, and came to him next Morning to do him the ſame Service at his Breakfaſt, bringing with him two Doctors, *Martin Luther* and *John Bugenhage*, and telling him that the Court and Univerſity were both abſent, (d) and that he could find no other Perſons but theſe two, who were able to converſe with him in an intelligible Language, and keep him Company; and he begged of him to accept of them whilſt he breakfaſted. The *Nuncio* could not deny it, he found that *Luther* expreſt himſelf barbarouſly in Latin; he ſuffer'd him to ſay ſeveral things without anſwering ſcarce one word, and took him for a very haughty, malitious, and impudent Man, whoſe Manners were very courſe. (e) *Have you heard any thing in* Italy, *concerning the Character I have there of a drunken German?* was one of the Queſtions which *Luther* asked *Vergerius*. He ſaid ſeveral things of the ſame nature, which the *Nuncio* mentioned in his Letter to the Pope's Secretary, in which he did not forget to deſcribe *Luther*'s Habit and Manners. This is the ſubſtance of *Pallavicini*'s Relation (f), which he took from *Vergerius*'s Letter written to the *Pope*'s Secretary on the 12th of *November* 1535, and he concludes from hence, that Father *Paul* is miſtaken when he affirms that the Pope gave *Vergerio* Order to make large Promiſes to *Martin Luther*. This Inference is inconteſtable, and there is no other way left to bring off Father *Paul* than to plead the Falſity of the *Nuncio*'s Letter; for if it be owned to be Authentick, it plainly appears that the Pope did not order *Vergerio* to gain *Luther* by endearing Perſuaſions and the hopes of Honours; for if it be ſo, *Vergerio* by this relation of his diſcourſe with *Luther*, which he ſent in his Letter to the Pope's Secretary, had render'd himſelf as ridiculous as any of the moſt ſenſeleſs Wretches that are ſhut up in a Mad-houſe.

Perhaps it may be ſaid, that it is at leaſt true that *Vergerius* held of his own head, this Diſcourſe with *Luther*, which Father *Paul* relates, from whence it will naturally follow, that *Luther*'s Anſwer is not a pure Invention. I wiſh at leaſt that Father *Paul*'s fidelity on this laſt head could be juſtified; but I cannot ſee how: for in the firſt place according to Father *Maimbourg*'s Remark, (g) *Theſe fine Diſcourſes of Father* Paul *are not found in the Writers of thoſe times; not even in* Sleidan, *who ſaith only in one word, that Vergerio ſaw* Luther *at* Wittemberg. In the ſecond place, the curious and indefatigable *Seckendorf* (h), who met with a relation of the interview betwixt the *Nuncio* and *Luther*, ſaith nothing concerning the *Nuncio*'s Promiſes; and this relation being made by a very good Friend to *Luther*, it is not credible that he ſhould forget the moſt conſiderable paſſage in his Narration, I mean, the *Nuncio*'s advantageous Offers, and the Heroick, and intirely Apoſtolical contempt of them which *Luther* ſhewed. And therefore the ſilence of this Relater in this particular, is a demonſtrative Proof againſt Father *Paul*. It ought not to be objected that the Author of this Relation informs us, that he has omitted ſeveral particulars; for ſince what he relates is leſs important and honourable than Father *Paul*'s fine Diſcourſes, he would doubtleſs have inſerted them into his Narrative, rather than any of the reſt, if they had really been ſpoken. He hath not omitted *Luther*'s jeſting Anſwer to his Barber, and would he then have forgot an Anſwer more worthy of St. *Paul* than of a Doctor of the XVIth Century? *Luther* before he made a Viſit to *Vergerio*, cauſed himſelf to be ſhaved very early in the Morning. At which the Barber was very much ſurprized. Don't wonder at this, replies the (i) Reformer, I have been ſent for to talk with the *Nuncio* of the Holy Father, and I would not appear in a ſlovenly manner; and ſhaving will make me appear younger, and I ſhall the more terrify my Adverſaries with a fear of my living the longer. This Author does not forget this Particular. Obſerve that this Account very plainly inſinuates, that this Interview was not unexpected on the *Nuncio*'s ſide, and that it expreſly ſays, that they talked much concerning the holding of a Council. From whence we may infer that *Vergerio* did not write an exact Account of all the Particulars of this Converſation to the Pope's Secretary: So that one of *Pallavicini*'s Reaſons is very weak; (k) he ſaith the *Nuncio* dared not diſguiſe the Truth, ſince the Contents of his Dialogue with *Luther* before a whole table full of Auditors, might be related to the Pope by other hands. Obſerve alſo that *Spondanus* (l) relates, that *Paul* the Third charged his *Nuncio*, *Peter Paul Vergerius*, to treat *Martin Luther* in a very engaging manner, and to make him a great many Promiſes. Once more, this is inconſiſtent with the *Nuncio*'s Letter, and perhaps we ſhould not be in the wrong to ſubſcribe to the Judgment of a Jeſuit in this particular. *I believe*, ſaith he (m), *that the moſt certain thing that can be ſaid upon this is, That Father* Paul *diverted himſelf at the Expence of Truth, by making theſe two Perſons ſpeak as he pleaſed, to whom, as it appears, he was no Enemy.*

Will it be objected that the Order to tempt *Luther* by magnificent Promiſes, was a Secret whiſpered in the Ear, that only *Vergerio* and the Pope were acquainted with, and therefore it was not mentioned in the long Letter written to the Pope's Secretary by *Vergerio*, which Father *Pallavicini* cites? This is the laſt Intrenchment of a Cavilling Man, which may be eaſily forced; for if this particular inſtruction of the *Nuncio* was only whiſpered in his Ear this is said to have been only a feint (*D*), and that he took that Character in order to render himself the more serviceable to the Court of *Rome*. He Published an Oration on the Unity of the Church, chiefly to prove that a particular Council ought not to be attempted. Being returned to *Rome*, he found that some Persons had so far rendred him suspected of Lutheranism, that the Pope hearkning to their Calumnies, had given over his Design * of making him a Cardinal. This News threw him into a Consternation, and he resolved to justify himself. To which end he retired into his own Country, and there began a Controversial Book against the *German* Apostates. He examined their Books, he weighed the force of their Objections, he attentively sought after ways of refuting them; but this diligent study only served to convince him, that they were in the right. From that time he renounced all hopes of a Cardinal's Hat, and went to his † Brother, who was Bishop of *Pola*, to whom he declared the Condition he was in; he asked his Advice, and without any regard to the compassion he had excited in him, he exhorted him to consult the Scripture, and above all on the Doctrine of Justification. The Bishop of *Pola* having followed his Counsel, was convinced of the truth of the Protestant Doctrine, and agreed with his Brother to teach the truth for the future. They executed their Design; but the Monks perceiving it, alarmed the Inquisition, and made a great stir about it. One of the Inquisitors (*E*) prodigiously vexed the Citizens of *Pola* and *Capo d'Istria*; insomuch that our *Vergerius*, not believing himself safe, retired to *Mantua*, to Cardinal *Hercules de Gonzaga*: which he did not long find a secure retreat; for *John della Casa*, the Pope's Legate at *Venice*, made so many Instances to the Cardinal, to oblige him to rid himself of such a Guest, that

---

† *Tunc primum factus Epiſcopus Modruſſienſis, ac non multo poſt Juſtinopolitanus. Melch. Adam ubi infra pag. 118.*

(a) Voſſius de poetis Latin. p. 27.

(b) Fra. Paolo, *hiſt. du* Concile de Trente l. 1. p. 69. *of* Amelot's *Tranſlation Printed at* Amſterdam 1686.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 70.

(d) *The Profeſſors had removed elſewhere by reaſon of the Plague.*

(e) La prima coſa che diſſe vedendomi taciturno fù, ſe in Italia io haveva inteſo alcuna coſa, della ſua fama d'eſſer Tedeſco imbriaco. *Vergerius Epiſt. ad ſecretarium Papæ apud Pallavic. iſtor. del Concilio l. 3. c.* 18. n. 9.

(f) Pallavicin. ibid. n. 6. & ſequent.

* See the Remark D.

† John Baptist Vergerius

ter by the Pope: If the *Nuncio* durst not write any thing to the Pope's Secretary, which should hint that his Holiness had given him such an Instruction, how came Father *Paul* by this large account of the *Nuncio's* Offers? Had he seen *Vergerio's* Letters, which were to be read by the Pope only? This is what he should inform us of, and till we know it, we have occasion to believe *Vergerio's* Dispatches, that are still in the Archives, and to affirm that the *Pope* burnt all those Letters which were written for his perusal only; which is a new Reason to ask how they then reached the Hands of this *Servite* at *Venice*. And after all, may we not object to Father *Paul*, silence of the Relation the which Mr. *Seckendorf* found amongst the *Wittemberg* Manuscripts.

(*D*) *This is said to have been only a feint.*] *Sleidan* and after him *Melchior Adam* affirm it. (*a*) *Erat etiam hoc in conventu* (Wormatiensi) *Petrus Paulus Vergerius, episcopus Justinopolitanus, verbo quidem, tanquam Galliæ regis causa, sed revera missus à pontifice, qui suis rebus illum inservire magis posse putabat, si quidem alieno nomine ibi versaretur.* Father *Paul* affirms the same thing, *The Bishop of* Capo d'Istria, saith he (*b*), *was present at this Conference, not as the Pope's Minister, tho' really sent by* Paul *as a Man very well verst in the Knowledge of that Country, but in the name of* France, *that he might be less suspected by the* Germans, *and more capable of serving the Pope under a foreign Name.* He adds, "that several Persons there made it their Business to prolong "that Affair, to which they were engaged by the Nun"cio *Campegio*, and the secret Practices of *Vergerio*. Cardinal *Pallavicini*, according to his Custom, here complains of the malignity of Father *Paul*; he accuses him of falsly charging the Pope with a Spirit of Fraud; and to convince him of Falsity, he tells us that *Vergerio* had been long suspected at the Court of *Rome*. Cardinal *Alexander's* Letters had produced this effect; he had advertised the Pope that *Vergerio* spoke disadvantageously of the Holy See, and held correspondence with *Luther's* Disciples. It was believed at *Rome*, that this Bishop's continuance in *Germany* was a sign of the Venom of Heresy which he had swallowed, wherefore they endeavour'd to oblige him to residence, and made it a Request to the Emperor, that a Prelate so much suspected as he, should be obliged to live far from the Empire, and not assist at all at the Conferences concerning Religion. If this be true, we may suppose that he assumed the Character of Envoy of *France*, without any Collusion of the Pope. *Pallavicini's* words and proofs run thus. (*c*) *Il qual racconto è si falso, che molto prima il Cardinal Aleandro haveva ammonito* (1) *segretissimamente il Pontefice, come il Vergerio parlava con poco onore della Sede Apostolica, minacciava contra di essa, e teneva amicizia con Luterani; del che allegò per testimonii il Nunzio Morone, e quel di Vinezia. E conforme à tale opinione formata di lui, nel quale trasparivano i semi di quelle serpi ch'egli covava nell' animo, e che poi uscirono nelle scritture e nell' azioni: era il senso che havevasi à questo tempo in Roma della sua dimora in Germania: Tantoche gli s'era anch'esibito lo sgravamento della pensione per indurlo alla residenza nel Vescovado. E tuttociò fe significare il Pontefice* (1) *all' Imperadore dal Nunzio Poggi, affinche l'autorità Cesarea (quando ciò fosse possibile) il tenesse lungi da quelle Provincie, e da que trattati.* Observe that the Cardinal doth not deny what *Fra. Paolo* says concerning *Vergerio's* Conduct: He doth not deny the Artifices of this Minister of the King of *France*, which were so conform to the Court of *Rome*. He saith nothing on that Head, but tells us that *Vergerio* was a Man of a lively and bold Genius, and of the humour of certain Persons who cannot live without being in the management of publick business, and who fancy that it cannot be carried on without them. (*d*) *Huomo quanto vivace, tanto audace, e frà la condizion di coloro che nè possono vivere senza maneggiar negozii, nè pensano che i negozii possano maneggiarsi senza di loro.* As for the rest (*e*), what *Sleidan* saith, that *Vergerio* at his return from the Dyet of *Worms*, had been created Cardinal, if some Persons had not alter'd the Pope's Mind, he calls it a Falsity, and maintains that in 1539 the Pope was displeased with that Bishop.

(*E*) *Prodigiously vexed the Citizens of* Pola, *and.*] We can never too often represent the Villany and Injustice annexed to the Trade of an Inquisitor. Wherefore I shall here give a short account of that Man's Conduct, who exercised that Office in the Dioceses of the two *Vergerio's*. His Name was *Annibal Grison*. He entred the Houses of the Inhabitants to search for suspicious Books; he Excommunicated those who did not detect the Persons that appeared to them suspected of *Lutheranism*; he promised to mitigate the Punishment of those who should renounce their Heresie, and apply to him to ask Pardon; but he threatned those with Fire, who did not prevent their Accusers by an humble confession of their Crime. He denounced his Threats from Door to Door, and scattered Terror in every place. Some accused themselves: He very terribly censured those, who had read the Bible in the vulgar Language, and forbad their continuance in that crime. In a very small time nothing was seen but Accusations, every one ingaged in them without regard to the Laws of Consanguinity or Gratitude. The Wife did not spare her Husband, the Son his Father, nor the Client his Patron; several Persons were brought into trouble for Trifles, such for Example who had only adventured to speak against the Bigottry of others. (*f*) *Deinde promiscua Multitudo, timore perculsis animis, deferebant quosque certatim, nulla neque propinquitatis neque necessitudinis aut beneficiorum habita ratione:* non parenti filius, non uxor marito, non cliens patrono parcebat. *Delationes autem erant plerunque de rebus frivolis; ut quisque forte aliquid ob superstitionem in aliquo reprehenderat.* On a solemn day this Inquisitor celebrated Mass in

(a) Sleida- lib. 13. m. 318 rio.

(b) Fra. olo, ift. du Concile Trente k 1. p. 7. of A- lot's rsion.

(c) Palla- in. ubi pra lib. . c. 12. . 11. p. m. 33, 434. e also hap. 13. 3. of the th Book. g. 635.

(1) Lette- a del Card. A- ndro l Cervi- no a, 12. di Marzo 1539. del- la quale il Cervino accusa la ricevuta in una all' Aleandri otto i 28. dell' i- stesso.

(1) Lettere del Card. Farnese al Poggi dell' ultimo di Febraio, 1541.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Id. lib. 6. c. 13. n. 1.

(f) Melc. Adam. in vitis Theol. exter. pag. 119.

that *Vergerius* found it very proper to leave *Mantua*. He went to *Trent* (F) in order to purge himself before the Council. The Pope would very willingly have received him, but being loath to give occasion to any Complaints that the Assembly was not free, he wrote to his Legates to forbid this Bishop taking his place there, and that they should order him to depart. Some Circumstances are related on this head, which (G) are pitiful. *Vergerius* retired to *Venice*, where he took care not to conform to the Desires of *John della Casa*, who advised him to go to *Rome*. A few days after he was forbid returning to his Bishoprick, in the Pope's name. He went to *Padua*, and there became a Witness of the deplorable death of *Francis Spira*. This Example of Despair, to which those expose themselves, who wickedly and knowingly deny the Truth, made him resolve to undergo a voluntary Exile, that he might be thereby enabled to make an open profession of the pure Religion. He went to the *Grisons*, and was a Minister amongst them for several Years, as well as in the *Valteline*: After which, he was invited to *Tubingen* by the Duke of *Wirtemberg*, where he died the 4th of *October* 1565. He Publish'd

in the Cathedral of *Capo d'Istria*, and told the People: Of late years you are loaded with numerous Calamities; your Olive-Plantations as well as your Corn-fields and Vineyards are barren; your Cattle are sorely afflicted. Your Bishop and other Hereticks have exposed you to these Evils. Don't expect any mitigation of these Judgments, unless you suppress those Hereticks, and what have you now to do but to stone them immediately? (a) *Hoc tempore, & hisce aliquot annis multæ vos premunt calamitates: quæ nunc oleas, nunc segetes, modò vineas, modò pecudes, aliasque facultates graviter affligunt: his verò malis causam præbet Episcopus vester & hæreticorum turba reliqua: nec est quod levationem ullam speretis, nisi coerceantur: proximum autem est, ut impetu facto lapidentur.* You will find all this in *Sleidan's* (b) History. Observe, that *Vergerius* had so much prudence as not to trust himself to the mercy of a Populace thus animated by a furious Persecutor. *He made his escape*, as Father *Paul* (c) observes, *from the fury of the People of his Diocese, which the Inquisitor* Hannibal Grison *had irritated against him by charging him with being a* Lutheran, *and the cause of the sterility of the Earth.* I cannot tell whether this *Hannibal* had ever read the (d) Writings of the Fathers, wherein we find the ridiculous Reproaches of the Pagans, that the Followers of JESUS CHRIST were the cause of all the Calamities which befell the People. I do not know whether he had read this excellent passage of *Tertullian*: (e) *At è contrario illis nomen factionis accommodandum est, qui in odium bonorum & proborum conspirant, qui adversum sanguinem innocentium conclamant, prætexentes sanè ad odii defensionem, illam quoque vanitatem, quòd existiment omnis publicæ cladis, omnis popularis incommodi Christianos esse causam. Si Tyberis ascendit in mœnia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si cœlum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim Christianos ad leonem.* But I am persuaded that tho' he had perfectly known all this, it would not have hindred him from saying, when Provisions were dear, or there was a mortality amongst the Cattel, that the Hereticks were the cause of it. Such a Man consults his false Zeal more than Reason, and consequently may very well be so blind as not to see the absurdity of casting the same Reproaches on Lutheranism which the Pagans did upon the Primitive Christians, and which all Protestants may return on Papists in the Countries where they are strongest. But which is more, tho' such a Man had been sensible of this Absurdity, he was yet capable of practising it, because no means seemed more proper to him, to enrage the People against the Lutherans, and make 'em stone them than this. Is it astonishing that a Monk should use this contrivance? Don't we see that as soon as the Christians were able to persecute, they reproached Error with the same effects which Paganism had ascribed to them, that is to say, with being the cause that they had not good Crops, and that the Seasons changed their natural course. I do not cite a private inconsiderable Author to prove this, but a very Authentick Piece and Imperial Authority. Read what follows, (f) *An diutiùs perferimus mutari temporum vices, iratâ cœli temperie? quæ, Paganorum exacerbata perfidiâ, nescit naturæ libramenta servare. Unde enim ver solitam gratiam abjuravit? unde æstas messe jejunâ laboriosum Agricolam in spe destituit aristarum? unde hyemis intemperata ferocitas, ubertatem terrarum penetrabili frigore sterilitatis læsione damnavit? nisi quod ad impietatis vindictam transit lege suâ naturæ decretum.* Mr. *Van Dale* (g) hath made some very good Reflections on this Head. When we consider these disparities, it is not easie to refrain from saying that there are certain Faults which cling fast to Sects, not as they are Sects, but as they are predominant. And hence it is that the same Communions change their Spirit and Maxims, proportionably as they acquire or lose superiority. That Maxim, that Honours alter the Manners, is very true here, and we may very well invert the sense of that of (h) *Cornelius Nepos*, without falsifying it.

(F) *He went to Trent in order to purge himself.*] *Melchior Adam* ought to be blamed for not expressing the Year in which *Vergerio* went to *Trent*. He hath extracted all that he hath said concerning the Conversion of this Bishop from *Sleidan*; but tho' that Author successively relates these things under the Year 1548. we ought not to believe that *Vergerio* was at *Trent* in that year. He was there according to Father *Paul* in 1546. (i) "He believed that the most honourable and commodious way of justifying himself was at the Council. But the Legates would not admit him into the Congregation, because he had not cleared himself to the Pope, to whom they earnestly pressed him to go; and if they had not been afraid of raising a report against the liberty of the Council, they had not contented themselves with Exhortations. So that *Vergerio*, after some days stay, departed from *Trent*, intending to return to his Bishoprick, where he hoped the troubles were appeased. But when he was at *Venice*, the *Nuncio* (1) forbad his return thither, having receiv'd orders from *Rome* to prosecute him. Which obliged him to quit *Italy* within a few Months, either induced to it by resentment, or fear, or some other Motive.,, I cite this passage, as well because it relates some facts not touched on by *Sleidan*, as because Father *Paul's* Chronology wants a little Correction. What he tells us of *Vergerio's* leaving *Italy* in 1546 is not true. He did not quit that Country till after having seen the miserable end of *Spira* at *Padua*, who died in (k) 1548. If we will add to this *Pallavicini's* Censures, we must say that (l) *Vergerio* finding himself cited at *Rome*, where he had been accused as suspected of Heresy, went to *Trent*, where he expected a safe refuge, and hoped to enjoy his right of Session amongst the Bishops as Judge of that Faith which he was charged with having deserted. But being excluded from this Right, he obtained, by the intercession of the Legates, a Dispensation from appearing at *Rome*; and his case was committed to the *Nuncio* and Patriarch of *Venice*, according to his request: but being sensible that he could not justify himself, he retir'd to the Protestants.

(G) *Circumstances —— which are pitiful.*] (m) "*Vergerius* intending to retire from the Council, went to *Cervin* (n), and asked him for what Articles he was rejected out of the company of the other Bishops of the Council. *Cervin* then answer'd: Because I have heard that you deny'd the Truth of the Legends of St. *George* and St. *Christopher*. It is true, reply'd *Vergerio*, I did, and do yet deny them: But I ground that denyal on the Authority of *Pope Paul* III, who commanded them both to be left out of the Breviary. And in the Preface at the beginning of that Book, he saith that he had commanded that all those Legends should be left out which are not true. *Cervin* being surpriz'd, could think of no other Answer than this:

Those

(a) Id. ib. ex Sleidano ubi infra.

(b) Sleidan, *Book* 21. fol. m. 589. ad ann. 1548.

(c) Fra-Paolo ubi supra, lib. 2. p. 141.

(d) *See* Origen contra Celsum lib. 3. & in Matthæum c. 24. Arnobius l. 1. St. Cyprian lib. ad Demetrianum, *and among his Letters the* 75. Orosius, lib. 7. c. 37. *St.* Augustin de civit. Dei passim, &c.

(e) Tertul. Apologet. c. 40.

(f) Novella 3. Theodosii de Judæis, Samaritanis & Hæreticis.

(g) Van Dale de Oarculis pag. 21, & 22.

(h) [illegible]

(i) Fra-Paolo ubi supra pag. 141.

(1) John della Casa, Archbishop of Benevento, who was Secretary of State under Paul IV.

(k) Sleidan. lib. 21. fol. m. 558.

(l) Pallavicini ubi supra lib. 6. c. 13. n. 3. He quotes the Letters written by the Legats to Cardinal Ardinghelli the 20th of February, 1546, and to Cardinal Farnese, the 2d and the 6th of March in the same year.

(m) Crespin, Estat de l'Eglise, p. m. 570.

(n) He was one of the Legates, and afterwards Pope Marcellus II.

liſhed ſeveral Books (H) which proved very prejudicial to the Roman Communion. Before he left Italy he loſt his Brother, who died by Poiſon, as was ſuſpected *. The Relation which I have extracted from *Melchior Adam*, is defective in many particulars.

“ thoſe Perſons ought not to paſs for good Men, “ who ſeem to agree with the *Lutherans* in any “ particular whatever, and therefore leave our “ Council.” Thoſe who hold it utterly improbable, that *Vergerio*'s deſpiſing thoſe Legends could be the only reaſon which the Legate urged, will be at leaſt ſatisfy'd with the Hiſtorian, when he owns that it left the Legate quoted that reaſon and alledged another. But they will never pardon *Chemnitius* for ſaying, That *Vergerius* ran the riſque of his Life by adventuring to declare, that he did not approve all that was contained in the Legend of St. *George*. (a) *Narrat de Vergerio, hiſtoria quæ cum in Tridentina ſynodo Georgii legendam, quam Gelaſius diſtinct. 15.* [illegible] *hæreticis tribuit, ſibi non per omnia probari dixiſſet, in diſcrimen dignitatis, imo vitæ & capitis adductus fuit.* It muſt be allowed that this Recital is not very exact, and that at leaſt there plainly appears in it the Sophiſm *a non ſufficienti enumeratione partium*. He reduces ſeveral Reaſons to that, which in all likelyhood was look'd upon as the moſt inconſiderable.

What I am going to ſay is not one of the Circumſtances which concern the Text of this Remark. (b) *Creſpin* avers, that ſeveral Biſhops being inform'd that *Cervin*, contrary to the Opinion of his two Collegues and of ſome Cardinals, perſiſted in his refuſal to admit *Vergerius* into the Council, reſolved to write to the Pope: (c) Hierom Vida *of* Cremona, *Biſhop of* Alba, *an excellent Poet, had already drawn up the Letters as well in the name of himſelf as of others*, but this Legate's ſevere Advertiſement hinder'd his ſending them to the Pope.

(H) Several Books which proved very prejudicial to the Roman Communion.] As he was well acquainted with the Intrigues and moſt hidden abuſes of *Italy*, he was better able than another to render Popery odious. Beſides he ſcarce wrote any but ſmall Tracts, which could eaſily be diſperſed throughout *Europe*, and choſe ſuch Subjects as were ſuſceptible of a particular turn which very ſenſibly touched the Readers. You will find in the Catalogue of his Writings (d): *Relatio de perſecutione facta contra Evangelium in urbe Juſtinopolitana. Contra librum cui nomen* Floſculi ſancti Franciſci. *Contra librum cui titulus* Rotarium. *Contra librum cui titulus* Miracula Virginis. *De libro cui titulus* Lux fidei. *De libro cui titulus* Floſculi Bibliæ. *De ſtatuis ac imaginibus. De coronatione Julii Papæ III. quid ſperandum ex papatu Julii III. de literis Othonis Cardinalis Auguſtani ſcriptis de creatione Julii III. Quatuor literæ ſub nomine (e) Bonini de Boninis de ſtatu Romanæ Curiæ. De nugis & fabulis papæ Gregorii I. (f) De idolo Lauretano. Scholia in orationem Cardinalis Poli ad Cæſarem qua illum ad arma contra eos qui Evangelio nomen dederunt, inſtigat. Nova editio libri Ceremoniarum Romanæ Eccleſiæ cum præfatione & ſcholiis. Quot modis vir pius qui in Italia degat ſæpe Deum & Chriſtum negare compellitur.* I omit ſeveral others, whoſe Titles are extant in the Epitome of *Geſner*, and (g) in *Verheiden*; but I ſhall take notice of that piece of his Entitl'd, *Epitome libri cui titulus*, Anatomia Miſſæ *ab Antonio de Adamo*. I never ſaw this Abridgement of the Anatomy of the Maſs, and cannot tell whether thoſe who mention it, write well the name of the Author of this Anatomy; for I find in the Latin Edition of this Work, that the Author's Name was *Antonius ab Ælia*. A paſſage in the Preface runs thus: *Quoniam igitur Anatomiæ cognitio non ſolum medicis chyrurgiſque, verum etiam aliis ſummopere commendatur: eam ob cauſam, Anthonium ab Ædam Italum imitatus, hanc miſſæ ac miſſalis Anatomiam Gallicè, ut ab omnibus percipi poſſet facilius, in lucem edere ſtatui.* Theſe words inform us that this piece was firſt Publiſh'd in *Italian* and then in *French* (h). It was Tranſlated into Latin in 1561. The Title of the Latin Verſion is: *Miſſæ ac Miſſalis Anatomia. Hoc eſt dilucida ac familiaris ad minutiſſimas uſque particulas Miſſæ ac Miſſalis enucleatio. Nunc primum (ut ea res purioris fidei cultoribus ſcitu neceſſaria, ad alias quoque nationes deveniret) è Gallica lingua Latine verſa anno Domini M. D. LXI.* This Book contains 172 Pages in *Octavo*, beſides an *Errata* of 15 Pages. The place where it was Printed is not expreſſed. The Perſon who wrote the *Errata* advertiſes us that a very urgent occaſion obliged him to it. It was, ſaith he, to prevent the Artifices of the Devil; for he ſuppoſes that Satan, to ruin the effects of this Book, had made uſe of two very malicious Frauds; the firſt of which was before, the ſecond during the Time of the Impreſſion. The firſt was, that the Manuſcript was thrown into a Mire, and reduced to a miſerable ſtate. The ſecond was, that the Printers committed a great many Faults. So that to oppoſe this double machination of Satan, he was obliged to reviſe the work very carefully, and to make a long liſt of Typographical Faults. I know very well that ſome may ſuſpect me of impoſing on my Readers; wherefore I cannot help citing part of the Prologue to the *Errata*. *Maledictus Sathan, ut totam* MISSÆ *(execrandæ filiæ ſuæ) Tragœdiam in hoc inſtituit, & gubernavit hactenus, quo Chriſti meritum prorſus in hominum pectoribus extingueret, & mendaciorum tenebras pro veritatis luce obtruderet: Ita jam quoque, dum hic ipſe libellus excuderetur, rurſum artes ſuas egregie adhibuiſſe videtur, dum tot eum mendis conſpurcari (ut multis in locis non modò nullam ſententiam, ſed inverſam planè colligere liceat) curavit, quò ejus lectionem vel prorſus è manibus piorum excuteret: vel mendarum tedio ita lectores afficeret, ut ad finem uſque lectionem deducere non niſi ſumma cum nauſea poſſent. Idem verò etiam antea quam ad Typographum libellus perveniret, alia via aggreſſus, eum in lacunam alicubi projectum ita deturparat, ut non paucis foliis in itinere, antequam afferretur, ex cœno ac humore illo jam corruptis ac putridis, ſcriptura etiam paſſim ita oblitterata fuerit, ita multis in locis lacerata omnia, ut non modo non legi rectè, ſed ne aperiri quidem alicubi abſque detrimento, ac folia a ſe mutuo ſeparari potuerint. Huic itaque Sathanæ fraudulentiæ occurrere ſtudens, libellum jam typis abſolutum denuo percurrere, atque errata, quamlibet multa, tamen ea (nam in nullo unquam libro, vel centuplo hoc quidem majore, tot eſſe unquam commiſſa puto) hic ſubnotare, quo cuivis lectionem ſuam emendare in promptu eſſet, operæ pretium duxi.* Obſerve that the Corrector hath ſtumbled at the very Threſhhold, for he reckons the firſt fault to be the word *Gallicè* in the paſſage of the Preface cited above. He would have it read *Latinè*; his Correction is ill grounded: Is it not indiſputable that a Perſon who tranſlates a Preface into Latin, in which it is ſaid, *for good reaſon a French Tranſlation was made*, ought to make uſe of the word *Gallicè*, and not *Latinè*? It is alſo obſervable that *du Moulin*, who called one of his Books the *Anatomy of the Maſs*, is not the Inventor of that Title. Not by the way did he invent that of *the Buckler of Faith*; for I have a Book Printed at *Avignon* by *Francis Tachet* (i) 1549. and Intituled *the Buckler of Faith, by way of Dialogue, extracted from Sacred Writ, the Holy Fathers, and moſt antient Doctors of the Church*. Of which, Brother *Nicolas Grenier*, Canon of St. *Victor*, is the Author.

Thuanus hath ſpoken amply enough of *Vergerius*'s Book, which he Publiſhed againſt the Proclaiming of the Council in the time of *Pius* IV. in the Year 1561. *Vergerius* was then at *Augsburg*. We ſhall find how ſeverely ſharp this Tract was, if we examin theſe words of *Thuanus*. (k) *Contra diploma illud Paulus Vergerius Juſtinopolitanus quondam Epiſcopus, & magnis legationibus ſub Pontificibus defunctus, qui (l) paulo ante ab iis defecerat, cum Auguſtæ Vindelicorum eſſet, ſcripto edito acriter invectus eſt, & Curiæ R. faſtum, pompas, luxum, ambitionem, ſordeis, corruptos mores, quos perſpectos ſe habere dicebat, multis & acerbis verbis deteſtatus, poſtremo addit Concilium a Pontifice indictum non ut oportuit ad ſtabiliendam Chriſti doctrinam, ſed ad firmanda infirmæ carnis divinis mandatis adverſantis commenta, non ad purgandum ovile dominicum, ſed ad diſſeminandos hominum inveteratos errores; denique non ad Chriſtianam libertatem, ſed ad miſerarum animarum ſervitutem & oppreſſionem inſtitutum eſſe: quippe in quo juxta ceremonialis, &c.* *Spondanus* (m) ſays, that Father *Paul* made very great uſe of the Libels compoſed by *Vergerius*, who, ſaith he, made all the Acts of the Council of *Trent*, the ſubjects of his Sermons: He diligently collected all the Diſputatiparticulars. We do not find there the Service (I) which *Vergerius* did to *Henry* II. nor his *Conferences* in *Alsace* with the Apostolical (K) *Nuncio*. We are not

---

* Taken from Melchior Adam in vitis Theologorum exterorum pag. 116, & ſeq.

(a) [illegible]

(b) Creſpin [illegible]

(c) Ibid.

(d) Note that many of them are only Italian Pamphlets.

(e) Here is a Pſeudonymous work not mention'd by Placcius. Mr. Baillet in his Liſt of Pſeudonymous Writers, pulls off this Mask as well as that of Athanaſius, under which Vergerio appear'd ſometimes.

(f) This Book was Tranſlated out of Italian into French in the year 1556. by Paul VERGERIUS, the Author's Nephew.

(g) Verheid. in effigiebus præſtant. aliquot virorum pag. 154, 155.

(h) The French Tranſlation was Printed at Geneva, the firſt time, in 1555.

(i) This is not the firſt Edition, for the Title imports that it was reviſed and inlarged by the Author. La Croix du Maine mentions only the Edition in 2 volumes, which came out at Paris in 1566. and 1567. 'Tis true, that a little after he ſays that the 2d volume was Printed in 1565. This is not very exact.

(k) Thuanus lib. 28. p. m. 570. col. 2. ad ann. 1561.

(l) Thuanus is miſtaken in that: Vergerius had profeſſed himſelf a Proteſtant above 12 years.

(m) Spondan. ad ann. 1545. n. 13.

ons of that Assembly; he communicated them to other Ministers; he wrote Books concerning them, and dispersed his Calumnies on the whole Conduct of the Council (a). I am surpriz'd not to find in the *Epitome of Gesner*, what *Vergerius* wrote against his Country man and violent Persecutor *Mutius*. I find only, *ad Papam Julium III, qui librum Mutii approbavit*. This *Mutius* was joined to *Annibal Grison* in the Function of Inquisitor at *Capo d'Istria*, and Published an Invective against our Prelate. (b) *Huic (Annibali Grisonio) adjunctus Hieronymus Mutius qui & Vergerianam scripsit invectivam postea, nec id modo, sed evulgato quoque libello Germaniam, odio religionis, maledicentissime traducit.* But the following words seem to hint that *Vergerius* and *Mutius* wrote Letters against each other; (c) *Finalmente accorgendosi il Vergerio che'l suo delitto non haveva difesa, si ricoverò fra' Grigioni eretici, e di là mandò fuori contra la Religione, contra il Concilio, e contra'l Papa libri tanto indotti quanto audaci; e che non piaceranno se non à que' palati si pravi che con essi il fele, come già la manna, fa ufficio di tutti i più dilicati sapori. Ed intorno à quest' huomo ed alle sue azioni basti di leggere oltre agli altri le Vergeriane e le lettere cattoliche del Muzio suo compatriota.* I have fetch'd a little higher the Testimony of *Pallavicini*, to shew that it was not without Reason that I advanced that *Vergerius*'s Works cruelly galled the Court of *Rome* and its Devotees. They affected to speak of them with contempt and to represent Boldness, Rashness and Ignorance as the parts which made up their Character. This Affectation is not disadvantageous to his Works. See *Stanislaus Hosius*'s (d) Epistle Dedicatory of the *Propugnatio veræ, Christianæ, Catholicaque doctrinæ*. Our *Vergerius* is there treated very violently; *Hosius*, besides other things, complains that he had the assurance to dedicate a Book of *Brentius* to his Polish Majesty, and to urge (e) *Lipomannus* to a Disputation on all the Doctrines contained in that Book, of which he offer'd this Monarch should be judge. This is not all, he complains of several Tracts which he carefully dispersed amongst the People, during the last Diet at *Warsaw*, Books, saith he, full of Impudence and Falsities: (f) *Ego verò, quòd illius tam eminet, tamque projecta est audacia, minùs miror, quem & frontem pridem omnem perdidisse, & ab omni Dei metu prorsus remotum esse, vel ea sola scripta satis indicant, quæ in proximis hisce Varschaviensibus Comitiis in vulgus spargi curavit. Illud non possum non mirari, quòd inveniuntur nihilominùs, qui non sine quadam animorum assensione commenta legant ejus hominis: qui sic ad omnem levitatem incubuisse videtur, nihil ut caverit diligentiùs, quàm ne quid usquam veri scriberet.* Add to this the passage I shall hereafter cite (g) from Cardinal *Pallavicini*.

I shall conclude with a Reflection which seems to me to deserve a place here. I am certain that in *Vergerio*'s time few Books were read more than his. They were very Satyrical, they contained a vast many personal particularities which easily passed for true, because it was very well known what opportunity he had to be throughly informed of them, having been so long engaged in publick Employments by the Court of *Rome*. Yet these pieces so much esteemed when new, could not maintain their Reputation. They were Favourites with whom Fortune did not long continue, they quickly lost their Credit, and became so neglected, that scarce any Books are at present harder to find. We scarce meet with one piece of *Vergerius* in the most numerous Libraries. It was in vain that an Edition of his Works (h) was Published at *Tubingen* in 1563. So many small Tracts reduced into one Volume, are not less lost than if they had continued in their former dispersed Condition: scarce any of them more sensibly affect my Curiosity than his (i) Censure of *Leander Alberti*, and of the Letters of (k) *Claudius Ptolemæus*.

(I) *The service which* Vergerius *did to* Henry II.] Before I come to the Proof, I shall cite a passage of Father *Paul*: " (l) The Pope by his Letter invited " the Catholick Swiss to come to the Council——— sent " from *France*, his *Nuncio*, incessantly solicited " them on his part, and made pressing Instances, " which were supported by the good Offices of the " Emperor. But the most Christian King dissuaded " them by his Ambassador *Marlot*; and *Paul* " *Vergerio* (*) perfectly versed in the secrets and Artifices " of the Court of *Rome*, gave that Minister " so good Instructions, besides the Book he wrote on " that Subject (†), that at the Diet then held at *Baden*, " the Catholick and Evangelick Cantons resolved " in concert, not to send any Person to " *Trent*. And the *Grisons* suffering themselves to " be persuaded by *Vergerio*, that the Pope was contriving " something against them, recalled *Thomas* " *Planta*, Bishop of *Coire*." These words do not prove that the King of *France* employed *Vergerius*. Embassadors frequently conceal from their Masters the Name and Character of those Persons whose assistance or advice they make use of; so that it may be pretended, that *Marlot* made use of *Vergerio* without ever mentioning any thing of it to *Henry* II. But an Annalist, a French Bishop, owns that that Prince was throughly informed of *Vergerius*'s intrigues, and made use of his assistance to obtain his ends, which were to vex the Pope and the Emperor. (m) *Rex——ut Pontifici & Cæsari ægre faceret, cum Helvetiis, quos Pontifex hortatus fuerat ad Synodum suos dirigere legatos, egit ne tam Catholici quam Sacramentarii, nec item Rheti mitterent, & qui jam missi fuissent revocarentur: in his, quod turpius fuit, industriâ usus Petri-Pauli Vergerii Episcopi olim Justinopolitani, qui ad hæreticos delapsus inter Rhetos agebat.* *Spondanus* had reason to say that it was very scandalous for *Henry* II. to employ a Protestant Minister, who had formerly been a Bishop. If *Vergerius* had been in *France*, he had caused him to be burned, and yet the same Prince Caresses him in a foreign Country, employs him against the Pope, to forge Machines to overthrow the Council, and apparently recompences all his good Services. Doth not this plainly discover the Genius of Sovereign Princes? Their Conduct towards Hereticks is not of a piece, they persecute them in one place and encourage them in another. Their Conduct is void of all Principles, or rather they universally form themselves on the Maxim, that all things ought to be sacrificed to the temporal glory of the State, which requires that a jealous Neighbour should be crossed by all possible means, on all occasions.

(K) *His Conferences in* Alsace *with the Apostolical* *Nuncio*.] Which happened in the Year 1561. He was then in the Dutchy of *Wirtemberg*: He first spoke with the *Nuncio Delfino* at (||) *Zabara*, and afterwards at *Strasburg*, and the Neighbouring places, sometimes alone, and at other times in company with *John Sturmius*: When he was with the *Nuncio* alone he talked more freely (n), but when in company with *Sturmius*, he was very reserved both in words and deportment. On the one side he discovered an ardent desire to return into *Italy*, and on the other he broke out into Calumnies against those who had persecuted him, and even against the Pope himself. He chiefly accused *John della Casa* of having forced him to turn Protestant. The *Nuncio* exhorted him to reunite himself to the Church, and to recommend himself to the (o) Legates his old Patrons. *Vergerius* acknowledged his infinite Obligations to them, but utterly rejected the Proposition of making a recantation. He wrote two Letters to the Cardinal of *Mantua*, one of the Legates, and gave them to the Nuncio *Delfino*, who sent them to *Rome* before they were transmitted to the Cardinal. In these *Vergerius* testified a great Zeal for his Country, and the peace of the Church; he offered his Endeavours towards this great work, and promised him that he could give some advantageous Overtures if he could speak with the Legate. He did not shew any design of repenting of his Errors, he only requested a safe Conduct both from the Council, and his Imperial Majesty. The *Nuncio* passionately desired the recovery of this lost Sheep. He believed that in all *Germany*, there not informed by it that he bought a Collection of Reliques (L) for an Elector of *Saxony*, &c. He was the cauſe that the *Capitolo del Forno* (K) expoſed its Author to a Hundred ſorts of Invectives, which obliged *John della Caſa* to write a ſmall Tract, which was Publiſh'd in 1688, (M) wherein *Vergerius* is very roughly treated. Prudence will not allow us to believe what an Enemy Publiſhes of another without Proof, and therefore we ought at leaſt to ſuſpend our Judgment concerning the infamous Crimes charged on our *Vergerius*; but I muſt own that there are

---

(a) Actis Concilii omnibus detrahens. Id. ibid.

(b) Sleidanus lib. 21. fol. 589.

(c) Pallavic. ubi supra lib. 6. cap. 13. n. 3. pag. m. 636.

(d) *It is dated the* 15th *of* October 1557.

(e) *He was then Nuncio in* Poland.

(f) Hosius in epist. dedicatoria ad Sigismundum Augustum Poloniæ Regem.

(g) *In the Remark* K.

(h) *It is in quarto. See* Seckendorf hist. Lutheran. lib. 3. p. 601. col. 2.

(i) *In* Gesner's *Epitome there is in the Title*, contra Leandrum Albertum monachum Dominicanum, ejusque mendacia quæ ille scripsit in libro cui titulus *descriptio Italiæ*.

(k) *The Title* ibid. *is* de epistolis Italice scriptis a Claudio Ptolemæo.

(l) Fra. Paolo ubi supra lib. 4. p. 327. ad ann. 1551.

(*) [illegible] *the* [illegible] *of the Grisons*, [illegible] *Apostate* [illegible] *Cardinal's Hat.*

(†) Thuanus speaks of it in the 28th Book of his History, An. 1561. Mr. Amelot is mistaken; for the Book mentioned by Thuanus, was written against the [illegible] the Council in the time of Pius IV. *I have quoted his words above.* Father Paul *mentions that Book of* Vergerio *in the* 5th *Book pag.* 419.

(m) Spondanus ad an. 1561. n. 18. pag. 537.

(||) *So 'tis in* Pallavicini: *perhaps it should be* Zabern, Saverne.

(n) *Likewise this is extracted out of* Pallavicini.

(o) *The Cardinal of* Trent, *and the Cardinal of* Mantua.

(K) See the Remark M.

there were not two perſons whoſe Converſion was equivalent to that of *Vergerius*. This was not becauſe he did not believe that he was ignorant, but by reaſon he found his Pen very pernicious to the Holy See. (a) *Il Delfino era cupidiſſimo di ricuperarlo: imperò che quantunque, ſecondo ch'egli ſcriveva, il Vergerio niente affatto ſapeſſe; onde mentr'era ſoggiornato in Elvezia haveva ſolo ſpeſa l'induſtria nel traſportare i libri eretici in italiano; ciò non oſtante riputava, in tutta Alemagna non eſſer due Teſte il cui acquiſto foſſe ſtato di pregio uguale à quel di coſtui: tanto riuſciva la ſua penna a diſſervigio della Sede Apoſtolica per una certa ſua eloquenza popolare, e sfacciatamente maledica de' più invidiati Perſonaggi.* The Cardinal of *Mantua*, whom the Pope abſolutely intruſted with this Intrigue, did not think it proper to Anſwer *Vergerius*. He thought that a Letter from a Legate would render a Perſon in his Circumſtances too vain, and would tend to perſuade the Proteſtants, that he was eſteemed in the Church of *Rome* as a Perſon of a great deal of Merit, whoſe Converſion they were willing to purchaſe with a large Reward. This Cardinal caution'd the *Nuncio* to have a particular care of this: This advice was neceſſary, for the *Nuncio* had made uſe of *Vergerio*'s Ambition in order to gain him by the offer of a glorious Recompence. The Pope was extraordinary well pleaſed with this Conduct of the Legate. The *Nuncio* at laſt declared that *Vergerio*'s Impudence and Arrogance increaſed daily, and he received orders to ſee him no more. The Legate would have had *Vergerius* come to the Council of *Trent*, not alone, but accompanied by *John Sturmius*, and *Hierom Zanchius*, and that new Methods ſhould by their aſſiſtance be attempted to confer with the Sectaries; but the Pope diſapproved all thoſe Propoſals. This is what I find in the Hiſtorian here (b) cited.

(a) Pallavic. ubi ſupra lib. 15. cap. 15. n. 13. p. m. 644, 645.

(b) Cardinal Pallavicini.

(L) *He bought a Collection of Reliques for an Elector of* Saxony.] This was the Elector *Frederick* firnamed *the Wiſe*. (c) He amaſſed as many Reliques as he poſſibly could. He collected himſelf to *Francis* I. and *Margaret* of *Auſtria*, Governeſs of the *Low-Countries*, to that end, and obtained his Requeſt. He had ſeveral ſent him from *Mantua*, *Colmar*, *Baſil*, and the Monaſtery of (d) *Ilmene*. A *German* (e) Monk was in diligent ſearch of Reliques in *Italy*, and employed our *Vergerius*, who had delivered this Collection into the Elector's Hands if he had not been ſeized by a Diſeaſe on his Journey. *James Vergerius* his Brother, who accompanied him, and who as well as he had ſerved the German Monk was alſo ſtopped by a like occaſion: He alſo fell ſick by the way (f). I believe that *Peter Paul* hoped, as a Reward, to be made a Profeſſor in the Univerſity of *Wittemberg*; for he had been recommended as a learned young Man, who deſired a maintenance that would enable him to finiſh his ſtudies under the Profeſſors of that Univerſity. Here are the words of this Monk's Letter from *Venice* to *Spalatin* the 29th of *Octob.* 1521. (g) *Intendit ipſe Petrus Paulus, frater Jacobi, permanere & complere in Wittenberga ſtudium ſuum, ſi potuerit & ſit beneplacitum Principis noſtri. Rogavit quoque me, ut tibi ſupplex fierem pro eo, & certe credo, magni honoris & utilitatis eſſet illi Univerſitati; habet enim nobiliſſimum ingenium & memoriam, ut experientia videre licet, reputaturque præcipuus de humanitate & jure, inter juvenes ſtudii Patavini. Rogo propterea T. Dom. ſuſcipe eum, & commenda eum Principi Ser. ut filium, & primo in Univerſitate, ut invenias locum legendi, vivendi, & proficiendi.* *Spalatin* anſwered that he could promiſe nothing to the two *Vergerio*'s: and as for the Reliques which he had already receiv'd, the payment for which the Monk ſollicited, he anſwer'd that he would ſend them back again, the price of them being fallen ſince *Luther*'s Reformation, and that doubtleſs they would be more eſteemed and ſell better in *Italy* than in *Germany*: (h) *Reliquias a nobis miſſas, una cum cruce, recipies omnes, a te, quanticunque poteris, vendendas; credibile enim eſt, illic quam hic majoris eſſe tum pretii tum honoris. Hic enim vel vulgus ita reſipuit, ut verba Dei edoctum ſatis ſibi eſſe putet, ut & revera eſt, fide & fiducia erga Deum & charitate erga proximum.* The Perſon who wrote this Letter had told the Elector his Maſter, that it had been very well if the Diſpute concerning Indulgences had began ſooner, for it had ſaved him a great deal of Care and Money (i).

(c) Seckendorf, hiſtor. Lutheran. lib. 1. pag. 223.

(d) It was in Thuringia.

(e) Call'd Burcardi, He was of the Family of the Barons of Schenck.

(f) Taken from Seckendorf, ibid.

(g) Seckendorf ubi ſupra litera i.

(h) Id. ib. quoting a Letter of Spalatin to the Monk Burcard, dated the 13th of July 1522.

(i) Id. ib.

(M) *Wherein* Vergerius *is very roughly treated.*] When I mention'd his Books, I did not ſpeak of that Entitled, *contra Catalogum Joannis della Caſa Sodomiæ Patronum*. He beſtowed the Epithete of Apologiſt for Sodomy on *John della Caſa* on account of his *Capitolo del Forno*. He ſo defamed him throughout *Germany*, that this Author thought himſelf obliged to addreſs a Poem to the *Germans*, to remove thoſe finiſter Impreſſions which our Author had made on them againſt him. I have (k) elſewhere obſerved the miſtake of a Modern, who was of opinion that *Caſa* wrote this Poem by way of anſwer to the Invectives of *Naogeorgus*. It is certain that it was only aimed at *Vergerius*. I have (l) alſo ſaid ſomewhere that the Reaſon why *John della Caſa* was ſo defamed, when ſeveral *Italian* Poets remained undiſturbed, whoſe Poems were more deteſtable than his, was, that he perſecuted *Vergerius* at *Venice*, which other Poets did not. But let us here ſpeak of the ſmall Tract, which Mr. *Menage* Printed in 1688, at the end of his *Anti-Baillet*. This is a Piece written in very good Latin, which Mr. *Menage* received from the celebrated *Magliabechi*, in which *Caſa* throws Reviles at *Peter Paul Vergerius* at a ſtrange rate. He accuſes him of long and violent quarrels with his Brother *John Baptiſt*, Biſhop of *Pola*; of Perjury to avoid the payment of his Debts, and of having cauſed his Wife to be killed, in order to advance himſelf to Benefices: he charges him with having ſupplicated Cardinal *de Tournon* to carry him into *France*, and with offering him to write concerning *Germany* and the *Swiſs*, and concerning Religion, whatever ſhould be preſcribed him. Obſerve that *Vergerius* was then in the *Griſons* Country. This Cardinal who (m) at firſt took him for a Butcher, at laſt knowing who he was, very ſeverely reproved him, and took no notice of his Offers to repent. This ſmall Tract informs us that (n) *Vergerius* in his younger days profeſſed Poetry; that he was afterwards admitted Advocate; that he practiſed as ſuch; but in pleading, he render'd himſelf inſupportable to the Judges, to the Litigants, and in general to the whole Court, by his Falſities, Calumnies and Prevarications: (o) *Linguâ atque audaciâ fretus, cauſſas agere te velle dixiſti: ſed cùm, quoties diceres, toties maledicceres, mentireris, pejerares, calumniareris, prævaricarere, neque litigatores tibi jam, neque corona, neque Judices, fidem habebant; nemoque ferre te, ac ne aſpicere quidem poterat.* That getting no Money, and being a Widower, (thanks to the Poiſon which he had given his Wife,) he caſt his Eye on Spiritual Benefices, and went to *Rome* where his Brother *Antony* recommended him to *Clement* VII. and obtained for him the Nunciature of *Germany*. He adds, that (p) *Francis Spiera*, whom he paſſed on the World, as a Man inſpired, one day put him into an extreme confuſion (q) by calling him Bankrupt, Poyſoner and Heretick. To conclude; he accuſes him of flying to the *Griſons*, in order to ſhelter himſelf from the purſuit of his Creditors (r). The *Leipſick* Journaliſts, in their extract of the *Anti-Baillet* exactly quote moſt of the Accuſations againſt *Vergerio*; but they ſuppoſe that *Mutius* had praiſed him, and that *Caſa* refuted that Elogy: (s) *Mutii laudes Vergerio tributas*, p. 377 *evertit* Caſa. Which they ground on theſe words of *Caſa*, *de Mutio vero affirmare*

(k) *In the Article* Oricellarius.

(l) *In the Article* Molza *and in the Article* Vayer.

(m) Qui cùm te ſqualidum, ſordidum, pannis obſitum, conſpicatus, viſuſque tibi videre lanionem aliquem eſſet; quæſivit de te qui tu eſſes: atque ubi Vergerium eſſe dixiſti, multis, homo graviſſimus, te verbis malè accepit. Antibaillet tom. 2. p. 370.

(n) Ibid. pag. 381.

(o) Ibid. p. 383, & 384.

(p) *He does not name him; but doubtleſs he means him.*

(q) Ibid. pag. 386.

(r) Ibid. pag. 387.

(s) Acta eruditor. *Lipſ* 1689 pag. 497.

are ſome Proteſtants who own that he was (N) Inconſtant, Fraudulent, and Ignorant in Theology. In the Authors which I have conſulted concerning him, I don't find any mention of his Journey to *France* after he was made a Biſhop: I am informed

affirmare tibi hic poſſum non eſſe illum hominem cum de te ſcripſit, bibiſſe, ſed potius eſſe. Which import that *Marius* had not done *Vergerius* the Honour to refute him, if he had not had a particular regard to the Country which produced them both. And he was ſo far from Praiſing *Vergerius*, that he Publiſhed moſt injurious Invectives againſt him.

Two things are yet obſervable concerning this Tract of *John della Caſa*. He objects two Faults with reſpect to the infamous Crimes with which *Vergerio* charges *Paul* III. The firſt is, that thoſe Crimes which he imputed to that Pope were of ſuch a nature, that they could never reach his Cognizance: The ſecond is taken from the Enmity betwixt *Paul* III. and him: (a) *Obſecro te quid tu tibi voluiſti, aut quicumque ille fuit, qui de* PAULI III. *vita ſcripſit? Putaſtine quemquam fore qui tibi de tot tantiſque criminibus ac ſceleribus crederet? Qui tu iſthæc ſcire potuiſti? Præſertim cum tam multa ſint inteſtina ac domeſtica, de quibus vix unus aut alter ex intimis familiaribus etiamſi maxime velit ſuit, ſuſpicari aliquid ſignis quibuſdam poſſit, qui igitur tu homo alienus, ac prope alienigena, tam pro certo affirmas, præſertim ſolus? Quis ad te detulit? Qui teſtes aſſuerunt? Quæ proferantur literæ? Ubi tu interfuiſti?* A few Pages farther he expreſſes himſelf thus concerning his Invectives againſt *Peter Lewis Farneſe*, and *Julius* III. (b) *A te requirunt Itali homines ſuperiora illa ſcilicet quibus teſtibus, atque adeo quibus indiciis ea compereris? Cur id, quod tibi non magis quam cæteris omnibus compertum ſit, ſolus affirmes?* ——(c) *Eadem tibi de Julio III. reſpondeant, deque iis literis quas tu de Conclavi miſſas, ad te delatas ais. Negant tibi quicquam credi oportere à quoquam: vanitatis, levitatis, mendacii, te convictum defendunt. Profer igitur eas literas: Manum, ſignum, proba.* Theſe are preſſing and really very juſt Interrogatories: For the Rules of writing oblige an Author, who Publiſhes the moſt occult Tranſactions of a Monarch's Palace, and relates a thouſand infamous Crimes committed in its moſt dark Receſſes with an uncommon Aſſurance; theſe Rules I ſay, oblige ſuch a Writer to inform us how he came to the knowledge of theſe Events; he ought to produce and name his Authorities; he muſt have either Original Letters or Authentick Copies; in a word he ſhould very ſubſtantially prove what he ſaith. If it be objected that it is not poſſible to produce ſuch proofs of Facts of that Nature; I anſwer that a Man ought not then to ſet up for a publick Accuſer: He ought to back what he ſays at leaſt with the Authority of his Name, I mean the Title of the Book ought to declare its Author. But if it be found that the Author, who names himſelf, may juſtly be charged with too much Credulity, or with Crimes, or is an utter Enemy to the Perſon defamed, it is then certain that his Teſtimony will not be much Credited. I believe that I have more than once Remarked that the Authors of Libels do not at all conſider what I have offers: Nor, which is worſe, are their Readers more careful herein than they. I am not fond of Patronizing *Caſa*'s Applications, I content my ſelf with Remarking that he pretends *Vergerius* was too Ill a Man, and too much an Enemy to *Paul* III. to deſerve that an ear ſhould be given to his Teſtimony againſt this Pope. Don't you know, ſaith he, that Perſons (d) of the moſt exact Probity are not allowed to be Witneſſes in a Cauſe againſt their Enemies? On this occaſion he relates the Enmity betwixt *Paul* III. and *Vergerius*, and ſaith that he offers an Affront to the *Germans*, in thinking them capable of giving any Credit to his Libels: (e) *Magnam tu Germanis hominibus contumeliam facis quòd idoneos arbitreris eſſe, apud quos tam impudenter mentiare, quoſque uſque adeo contemnas, imperitoſque rerum putes, ut tibi de tuo inimico tam inepte, tamque aperte mentienti fidem habeant. Si literas, ſi teſtes, ſi tormenta atque equuleum, ſi omnia probationum genera proferres, nemo tibi tamen veneſico atque uxoricidæ crederet; de tot tantiſque præſertim rebus. Tu innuenti modò tibi fidem haberi exiſtimas.*

This is the firſt of my two Obſervations: The other will ſerve to prove that a Satyriſt can put a Criminal Interpretation upon the moſt Pious Actions. We have already ſeen that (f) *Vergerius* deſigning to refute Lutheraniſm, applyed himſelf to the Study of that Controverſy, which convinced him that the Romiſh was a Falſe Church; we have ſeen that his Brother was of the ſame Opinion, and that they both reſolved to apply themſelves to the Inſtruction of their Dioceſe. The Malicious *John della Caſa* gives a quite different turn to this Conduct. He ſaith that *Vergerius* having drained thoſe Springs which ſupplyed the extravagant Expence of his Luxurious Table, applyed himſelf to Dogmatizing in private, and chiefly to ſeveral Rich Women, and under the ſpecious pretext of Inſtructing them in the pure Religion, he emptyed the Purſes of a great many People: (g) *Gula licet creverit, & luxus atque ſuperbia: Quæ quorundam hominum, qui male te noverant, benignitate ſuſtentata aliquamdiu ſunt: Sed ubi exhauſta eſt, nec enim tu parvo contentus eſſe poteras; convertiſti te ad aliam quæſtum: Homines quoſdam non nimium ſapientes, ſuperſtitioſos, ruſticanos, ſtultaſque aliquot mulieres locupletes aggreſſus es: Seduxiſti; Docere eos te poſſe arcana quædam de Religione dixiſti: Nam quæ adhuc tradita illis eſſent ab aliis, perperam eſſe tradita: Mutari ea oportere atque corrigi perſuaſiſti imprudentibus ac fatuis quibuſdam. Interea; merces magiſterii ſcilicet magna; perſuadati multi à te ſunt, atque ad ſummam inopiam redierunt.* How many Catholicks are there who believe this on the ſingle Teſtimony of *Caſa*, *Vergerio*'s declared Enemy? Which is a very great Injuſtice. Perhaps ſome indifferent Perſons may credit part of what he ſays: They know that a Private deſign to reform a Dioceſe might probably draw the Purſe-ſtrings of ſome well-meaning Perſons; for it is eaſy to make it appear, that for the advancement of ſo good a Work ſuch and ſuch Expences are neceſſary. By which means a Man becomes (without being accountable) the Truſtee, with whom ſeveral Alms and Subſidies, which the Zeal of the firſt Brethren furniſhes, are depoſited.

(N) *That he was Inconſtant, Fraudulent, and Ignorant in Theology.*] Mr. *Seckendorf* will Evidence this. *Verſatile ingenium* Vergerio *tribuitur*, ſaith he (h), *nec ſuſpicione caruit quod conciliationem religionis quovis modo moliretur, & tandem ad vetera ſacra redire cogitaret.* Which is to ſay, that he was ſuſpected of a deſign to Unite the Religions even at the expence of Truth, and at laſt of being deſirous to return to Popery. It is pretended that he made uſe of fraudulent (i) means in the Letters which he ſent to *Paris*, when he deſired to be one of the Deputies which the Duke of *Wirtemberg* ſent into *France* in 1561. He did not obtain this Honour, either becauſe that Prince had not a ſufficient Confidence in him, or becauſe he was not thought to be ſufficiently verſed in Theological Subjects. (k) *James Andreas* forgetting the Injury he had received of him pronounced his Funeral Oration, and praiſed him for profeſſing the Truth, and diſcovering ſeveral wicked Intrigues of the Court of *Rome*; but he charged him with not having perfectly underſtood Religious Controverſies. *Surius* relates that *Gablerus* Profeſſor of Phyſick was preſent at the Death of *Vergerio*, and made ſome Obſervations (l) which determined him to become a Catholick: (m) *Adfuerat is Petro Paulo Vergerio e corpore migranti apud quem mira quædam viderat quæ illi animum videbantur perfregiſſe, ut non modo Catholicus ſed pientiſſimus quoque Catholicus fieret.* Obſerve that *Surius* is no Claſſical Author in point of Hiſtory. Much more ought we to diſtruſt thoſe who Magnify this Story. They aſſure us that the horrible Death of *Vergerius* cauſed ſeveral Proteſtants to return into the Boſom of the Church (n). See in the Margin the moderate Expreſſions of thoſe Authors.

By

(a) Anti-Baillet ib. pag. 405.

(b) Ibid. pag. 37.

(c) Ibid. pag. 38.

(d) Vel caſtiſſimi atque integerrimi viri —— à teſtimonio dicendo removeri ſolent (inimicitia.) *Ibid.* pag. 365.

(e) *Ibid.* pag. 366, 367.

civitatum hominibus ſalutare præbuit documentum, ut ſeſe collegerint, & ad pacem ac unitatem Eccleſiæ reve fruſtra frementibus lupis infernalibus. *Jo. Paulus Windeck* *Prognoſtic. futuri ſtatus* p. 113. *He quotes* Ederus.

formed of this part of his Life only by a Collection of Letters Printed at *Venice* in 1558. in which are some of his Writing, which acquaint us (*O*) that he admired the Piety and excellent Qualities of the Queen of *Navarre*, Siſter to *Francis* I. and began to diſreliſh his courſe of Life, and to think of reſiding in his Biſhoprick. There is alſo one † Written by his Brother *Aurelius* * VERGERIUS to *Julia Gonzaga*. I have not much to object againſt (*P*) *Moreri* on this Article.

VERGERIUS (ANGELUS) Born in the Iſle of ‖ *Candia*, Tranſlated out of *Greek* into *Latin* the Tract *de fluviorum & montium nominibus*, attributed to *Plutarch*. He wrote the *Greek* Character ſo exquiſitely, (*Q*) that his Writing was made uſe of as an Original by thoſe who Engraved the Letters of that Language for the Royal Impreſſions ‡ in the Reign of *Francis* I. He was alive ſtill in (*R*) *Charles* the IX's time. He is too violently Cenſured (*S*) by a *Dutch* Critick. *Nicolas*

By a Letter of *Hubert Languet* written from *Paris* the ninth of *October* 1561. we underſtand that the Duke of *Wirtemberg* had ſent our *Vergerius* into *France*, who was the moſt proper Man in the World to Imbroil things. *Languet* thought it ſtrange that this Prince ſhould be deſirous to put Ubiquity and other Fancies of *Brentius* among the Doctrines of the French Reformation (*a*). *Miror etiam Virtembergenſem nobis velle obtrudere ubiquitatem & alias nugas Brentii, nec religionis apud nos infantiam conſiderare, quæ non ſit obruenda iſtis ſpineſis & futilibus diſputationibus, quas ne quidem intelligunt qui eas proponunt, ſed omni indulgentia fovenda, & tanquam lactis potu alenda donec magis in Chriſto adoleſcat. Præterea huc miſit Vergerium, hominem quo nullus eſt magis Idoneus ad res turbandas.* *Languet* writ another Letter eight days after, and ſays that *Vergerius* was not yet come to the French Court, but that (*b*) 'twas reported he would be ſent quickly, or at leaſt that he endeavoured it. I wiſh, ſays he, he would ſtay at Home.

(*O*) *That he admired the Piety ——— of the Queen of* Navarre*———and that he began to Diſreliſh.*] See what he writ to *Lewis Alamanni* the day after he had Converſed with that Princeſs: (*c*) *Ne la Signora Marcheſa di Peſcara, ne la Signoria voſtra, che ſapete tanto ben tutti due in vive voci, e tanto bene ne i ſcritti voſtri dir cio, che volete, ne il Cardinal noſtro Illuſtriſſ. ne tutta Roma, predicandomi l'altezza & la bellezza dell' animo, & dell'ingegno, & il fervor dello ſpirito acceſo in Chriſto, & la carita ardente della sereniſſima Regina di Navara, me ne havete ſaputo dire tanto, quanto io nel vero ho trovato hieri, che ſua maeſta degno di fare, che io udiſſi un pezzo quelle ſue rari voci, il qual giorno mi ha portato una letitia inenarrabile, & ſenza dubbio la maggiore, che io habbi havuto gia molto tempo.* All the reſt of the Letter turns on the Pious Sentiments, which the great Knowledge of that Queen excited in the Heart of that Prelate. He was in *France* when he wrote a Letter to *Ottonello Vida*, in which he deplores the Progreſs of Lutheraniſm, and the little care that was taken of the Lord's Vineyard. He declares that having weighed theſe words of the Goſpel, *What doth it profit a Man to gain the whole World and loſe his own Soul*, againſt all thoſe reaſons which encouraged him with hopes of making his Fortune, he found the Scale turn on the ſide of the words of JESUS CHRIST. Wherefore, ſaith he, it will be beſt for me, for the future to apply my ſelf to the culture of that Portion which is allotted me. (*d*) *Perciò dico, che ſarà meglio, ch'io venga a coltivare quelle poche viti, ch'io ſu quel confine Tedeſco, & veder di circondarle con un buon ſiepe, & tenerle difeſe, per poterne cogliere qualche frutto da offerire a Dio; che ſtare fuori, & otioſo ad aſpettare, che altri ſi riſolvino a voler mettere in lavoro tutta la vigna inſieme.* *Vida*'s Anſwer (*e*) to confirm him in this Reſolution is very Pertinent and Excellent.

(*P*) *I have not much to Object againſt* Moreri *on this Article.*] I. The two Articles of *Verger* (*Peter Paul*) are Tranſpoſed; for he places the Biſhop of *Capo d'Iſtria* before *Emanuel Chryſoloras*'s Diſciple. As for the laſt he referrs us to the *Authors of the following Article*, that is, to thoſe which he cites after having amply ſpoken of *John Verger de Haurane Abbot of St.* Cyran. This Abſurdity is redreſſed in the *Dutch* Edition of that Dictionary. II. What *Moreri* (*f*) affirms that *Paul* III. intended to make *Vergerio* a Cardinal, is contradicted by (*g*) *Pallavicini*. III. What he adds *that he brought away with him one of his Brothers, who was alſo a Biſhop*, is diſproved by *Sleidan*, who averrs (*h*) that before the Biſhop of *Capo d'Iſtria* left *Italy*, the Biſhop of *Pola* was Dead. IV. To what end doth he cite *Paul Jovius*, *Volaterranus*, *Jacobus de Bergamo*, *Voſſius*, &c. to confirm what he had ſaid concerning the Biſhop of *Capo d'Iſtria*, of which they make no manner of mention, and which could not be known to ſome of them. V. What is the meaning of theſe words, *for the ſecond conſult Spondanus?* They ſeem to direct us to ſome places wherein mention is made of *John Baptiſt Vergerius* Biſhop of *Pola*: But that would be a falſe Direction, and is not *Moreri*'s Senſe. It muſt be a Typographical Blunder.

(*Q*) *He wrote the* Greek *Character ſo exquiſitely, that his Writing was made uſe of as an Original by thoſe who Engraved the Letters*, &c.] This I find in the *variæ lectiones* of *Rutgerſius*. (*i*) *Duos*, ſaith he, (interpretes) *mihi videre contigit, Italum unum, Natalem de Comitibus, alterum Cretenſem, Angelum Vergerium eum qui tam eleganter Græcè pinxit, ut ejus manus pro archetypo iis fuerit, quorum opera in ſculpendis regiis characteribus Rex Franciſcus uſus eſt.* The two Tranſlations mention'd here are thoſe of the little Book *de fluviorum & montium nominibus*.

(*R*) *He was Alive ſtill in* Charles *the IX's time.*] Of which I have no other Proof than the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Poems of *Jan Antoine de Baïf*, Which is directed to that Monarch, and beſides other things affords the following Lines,

Charle Etiene premier, diſciple de Lazare
Le docte Bonamy, de mode non barbare
M'aprint à prononcer le langage Romain:
Ange Vergece Grec, à la gentile main
Pour l'écriture Grèque, Ecrivain ordinère
De vos Granpere & Pere & le VOSTRE, *ut ſalère*
Pour a l'accent des Grecs ma parole dreſſer,
Et ma main ſur le trac de ſa lettre adreſſer.

You will alſo find another place (*k*) below, where this *Candiot*'s Name is written *Vergece* as well as here. Which makes me apt to ſuſpect that inſtead of calling him *Vergerius* in *Latin*, he ought to be called *Vergecius*.

(*S*) *He is too violently Cenſured by a* Dutch *Critick.*] We have ſeen in the Remark Q. that *Natalis Comes*, and our *Vergerius* Tranſlated into *Latin* the Tract περὶ ποταμῶν ϰ̀ ὀρῶν ἐπωνυμίας. Theſe words are to be found in it. (*l*) Κάδμος τὸν κρηνοφύλακα δράκοντα τοξεύσας, ϰ̀ εὑρὼν ὥσπερ πεφαρμακευμένον φόβῳ τὸ ὕδωρ, περιήρχετο τὴν χώραν ζητῶν πηγήν. They are thus expreſſed in *Latin* by *Natalis Comes*: *Ubi Cadmus ſerpentem fontis cuſtodem jaculis confodiſſet, inveniſſetque aquam quaſi ob timorem veneno infectam, regionem luſtravit fontem inquirens.* *Vergerius*'s Verſion runs thus: *Cum Cadmus fontis cuſtodem draconem jaculis confeciſſet, & aquam ejus veneno infectam cerneret, eam abhorrens circuivit regionem ad inveſtigandum fontem.* *Rutgerſius*'s Judgment of theſe two Verſions is: (*m*) I believe, ſaith he, that *Vergerius* was Drunk when he talked in this manner; and it is not to be wondred that *Natalis Comes* hath ill Tranſlated a Corrupted place, for he did moſt times ſpoil even ſuch places as were Correct. This Cenſure is ſo extravagant with regard to *Vergerius* that his Memory would ſuffer leſs by it than that of *Rutgerſius*. For his Tranſlation is not only better than that of *Natalis Comes*, tho' this Critick mentions the latter much more tenderly than the former, but is the beſt which could poſſibly be made ſuppoſing the *Greek* Text not Corrupted. The Learned *Mauſſac* underſtood this place juſt as *Vergerius* did, and thus Tranſlates it: *Cum Cadmus ſagittis confixiſſet draconem qui fontem cuſtodiebat*, VERITUS *ne aqua veneno infecta eſſet, circuivit regionem*

(*a*) Lan- …Epiſt. …lib. 2. pag. 143.

(*b*) Dici- …r mit- …dus …vi aut …tem hoc …re in …ntatur. …perem …m ma- …re domi. …l. Epiſt. …o. pag. 151.

(*c*) Lettere …lgari di …verſi no- …liſſimi …omini …. 1. fol. …h. *See* …ſo fol. …1. *what* …wrote to …*Mar-* …*neſa of* …ſcara.

(*d*) *Ibid.* …l. 82. …rſo & …l. 83.

(*e*) You'll …d it …bid. fol. …3. & ſeq.

(*f*) *He* …*s ſo* …erſpon- …nus …l ann. …542. n. …3.

(*g*) *See* …*e end of* …*e Remark* …).

† … of … Book.

* He was a Learned Man. *See* Scholiis, *ubi ſupra in ſupplem. indicis n.* …

‖ See the Remark …

‡ Mr. Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprimerie p. 159. ſpeaks of thoſe fine Letters, that were caſt in the Matrices which *Francis* I. cauſed to be made with a Royal Magnificence.

(*h*) Ante quam ex Italia diſcederet, jam erat mortuus ejus frater Epiſcopus *Polæ* ſuſpitioque fuit veneno ſublatum eſſe. *Sleid. lib.* 21. *fol.* 590.

(*i*) Jo. Rutgerſius var. lect. lib. 3. c. 12. p. 235, 236.

(*k*) *In the Remark* T.

(*l*) *In the* 2. *Chapter, where the* River Iſmenus *is mention'd.*

(*m*) Equidem Vergerium cum hæc ſcriberet, ſobrium fuiſſe non puto. Nam in Natali mirandum non eſt ſi corrupta non recte tranſtulit, cum illi pene fatale fuerit, *male vertendo*, ut ille ait, etiam ex *Græcis bonis Latina facere non bona.* Rutgerſius ubi ſupra pag. 236.

colas Vergerius (T) his Son was a Learned Man, and made ſome Verſes on the Death of *Hadrian Turnebus*.

VERONA, A City of *Italy*, which ſome Writers ſay, was built, and others that it was only rebuilt by the *Gauls*. *Pompey's* Father led a *Roman* Colony thither †. It was ſacked by *Attila*, and ſucceſſively poſſeſſed by *Odoacer* King of the *Heruli*, *Theodorick* King of the *Goths*, and his Succeſſors to *Totila*, by the *Lombards*, *Charlemagne*, and his Poſterity; but when his Deſcendants loſt the Empire, ſeveral Lords made themſelves Sovereigns of ſeveral Cities of *Italy*. Which ſort of Government continued till *Otho* I. re-united ſeveral States to the Empire, which had been alienated from it. Amongſt which *Verona* was one, but it obtained the power of electing its own Magiſtrates: So that it was properly a Republick, under the name of an Imperial City. In which ſtate it continued till *Ecelin* ſeized the Sovereign Power, to come at which, he waded through a great effuſion of Blood. He enjoy'd his Tyranny 33 Years, and died in 1269. After him the *Veroneſe* elected *Martin della Scala* their General, whoſe Conduct they ſo well approved, that five Years after they created him perpetual Dictator. His Deſcendants govern'd *Verona* with great Reputation, and were created Princes by the Emperor in 1310. They render'd themſelves formidable by their Conqueſts, and were driven out of *Verona* in 1387, by *John Galeazzo* Duke of *Milan*. They re-enter'd in 1404, but did not keep poſſeſſion long, for the *Venetians* ſeized the City in 1409 *, and have ſo carefully kept it, that they enjoy it to this day. It is not known whether any of the Illuſtrious Family *della Scala* remained, who left any Children. *Julius Cæſar Scaliger*, one of the moſt Learned Men of the XVI Century, pretended to be deſcended from this Houſe. But the truth of it is diſputed; and few at preſent believe his Pretence to be well grounded. Several are of opinion, that the Letters of Naturalization which he obtain'd in *France*, contradict his Claim, ſince he there bears only the Character of a Phyſician born at *Verona* ‖. I am certain the Publick will be very glad to ſee thoſe Letters of Naturalization (*A*) here, wherefore I inſert them.

VESPA-

regionem alium fontem quo ſitim levaret, quærens. So that all *Vergerius's* Fault is not having conjectured as *Rutgerſius* (a) hath, that inſtead of φόβῳ the reading ought to be ἐκ φόνου, *hoc eſt, è ſanguine ſive tabo*. *Mauſſac* did not think of it neither: Wherefore I wonder that *Rutgerſius* did not cenſure his Verſion, which makes me believe he knew nothing of it. Tho' according to the time of its Publication (*b*), he might have ſeen it; but how many Books are there which remain unknown, even to the moſt Learned? Mr. *Mauſſac* had never heard of any Verſion of this Tract (*c*) when he undertook its Tranſlation, and afterwards he ſaw indeed the Verſion of *Natalis Comes* and *Turnebius*, but not that of *Vergerius*. A hundred Examples of this nature might be quoted.

(*T*) *Nicolas* VERGERIUS —— *made ſome Verſes.*] This you find in theſe Words of *Thuanus* (*d*) *Ei* (Hadriano Turnebo) *Joan. Auratus* —— *Nicolaus denique Vergerius, Angeli illius Cretenſis elegantiorum Græcæ linguæ characterum ad omnem admirationem & oculorum jucunditatem formatoris F. —— & alii epitaphiis carminibus parentarunt.* He was born in *Candia*, from whence he went into *France* about the year 1540. This I infer from two paſſages of *John Antony de Baif*, one of which (*e*) informs me, that the ſame *John Antony* was committed to the Tutorſhip of *Tuſanus*, and the other that he there contracted a Friendſhip with *Nicolas Vergece*, then lately come from *Candia*,

Amy (*f*) *qu'en la prime jeuneſſe*
J'acointay chez le bon Tuſan,
Voicy cinq fois le cinquieme an
Tout nouveau venu de la Grece.

—————————

—————————

Bien jeune tu vis eſcumer
Deſſous toy la ronflante mer
Tiré de l'iſle ta naiſſance
Qui vit de Jupiter l'enfance.

Theſe Lines are taken from the *Contretrene a Nicolas Vergece Candiot*, in which you will find the following Elogy on his Muſe,

FEE, (*g*) *ces mignardiſes laiſſe,*
Je ne puis entendre à tes jeux;
Laſchons un peu couver nos feux,
A fin que m'acquite à Vergece,
Qui m'a mis en ſoucy plaiſant,
M'étrenant d'un mignard preſant
Que la Muſe avec la Charite
Ont ourdi de fleurons d'eſlite.
Ces beaux vers en langue Latine
Confits au miel Catullien,
Vers de bon heur, meritent bien
Que beuſſe de l'eau Cabaline.

John Antony de Baif, before he finiſhes this Poem, takes notice of his own Poverty and of that of his Friend.

Pauvreté (*h*) *mes eſpaulles preſſe,*
Me foule & jamais ne me laiſſe.
Je ſuis pauvre, & tu n'es pas riche:
Vien-t'en me voir, Amy treſdoux:
Embraſſons-nous, conſolons-nous:
Le ciel ne ſera touſiours chiche
Envers nous du bien qui des mains
De fortune vient aux humains:
Or vivons une vie eſtroitte
En pauvreté, mais ſans ſouffrette.

(*A*) *The Publick will be very glad to ſee thoſe Letters of Naturalization.*] Mr *Baluze*, one of thoſe extraordinary Men, who are born for the good of the Republick of Letters, and who beſides the Productions with which they enrich it, are pleaſed to furniſh other Authors with all ſorts of aſſiſtances, did me the favour to ſend me what follows.

An Extract of an Original Regiſter of Francis I. *which is in the Repoſitory of Records at* Paris.

"*Francis*, &c. We give to underſtand, &c. that we "have received the humble ſupplication of our dear "and well beloved *Julius Cæſar de l'Eſcalle de Bordons*, "Doctor of Phyſick, Native of the City of *Verona* in "*Italy*, containing that about four Years paſt, or thereabouts, He came into this our Kingdom to the City "of *Agen* in *Agenois*, with intention and full reſolution to end the remainder of his days there; in "which City, and the Country about it, the ſaid Supplicant is poſſeſſed of a Houſe, and ſeveral other Eſtates. But becauſe he is a Stranger and not a Native of our Realm, he is dubious that the Eſtate "which he may have gotten, or hopes to become "poſſeſſed of, likewiſe the Inheritances which may devolve on him from his Relations or others, may be "pretended to, as belonging to us by right of *Aubaine* or otherwiſe, and that our Officers may accordingly give him ſome trouble or hindrance, "if he be not qualified and diſpenſed with on that "account, and humbly requeſting us to impart to "him our Favour and Liberality. Wherefore we, "theſe things conſidered, freely inclined to grant "the Supplication and Requeſt of the ſaid Suppliant,

---

† Taken from *Cluverius in Italia antiqua*, lib. 1. cap. 16.

* Taken from *Leander Alberti's Deſcript. Italiæ*, pag. 516. & ſeq. He made uſe of the Antiquities of *Verona*, Publiſhed by *Torello Sarayna*.

‖ *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des lettres, *February* 1686 pag. m. 164. & Menagiana, p. 25. of the *Dutch E-*

(*a*) Ibid. pag. 235.

(*b*) *The Book de* fluviorum ac montium nominibus *tranſlated into Latin by* Philip James de Mauſſac *was Printed at* Toulouſe *in* 1615. *and that of* Rutgerſius at Leyden 1618.

(*c*) *See his Preface.*

(*d*) *Thuan. lib.* 38. *pag.* 769. *ad ann.* 1565.

(*e*) *John Antony* de Baif *Epiſtle to the King prefixed to his Poems, Printed at* Paris, *in the Year* 1573. in 8vo.

(*f*) John Antony de Baif, œuvres en rime fol. m. 119.

(*g*) Id. ib.

(*h*) Id. ib.

VERSORIS, (*Peter de*) Lord of *Fontenai le Viconte*, and *Marilli*, and in Part of *Moninger*, and President of the Council of the Dukes of *Guise* in the XVI Century, was an Advocate in the Parliament of *Paris*, and one of the most famous and illustrious of his Profession. He was born at *Paris* the 16th of *February* 1528, of (A) a Noble and considerable Family. *He was design'd by his Father to be an Officer in a Sovereign Court; but having extravagantly spent, whilst he was young, the Money that was laid by for that use, he set himself to repair that Loss by hard Labour, whereby —— he became one of the chief Advocates of his time: He was so much Master of all the things which were necessary to him, that he hardly used any Books.* He pleaded for the Jesuits in 1564, in the famous Tryal which they had with the University of *Paris*, and to speak properly, he gained the Cause. He was deputed to the States of *Blois* in the Year 1576, and spoke in the Name of the Third State. He was as good a Chamber Counsellor as a Pleader. *He was very zealous for his Clients, particularly for the House of* Guise —— *He died of Grief in less than four or five Hours*, the 25th of *December* 1588, *after he heard that the* (B) *Duke of* Guise *had been killed at* Blois. 'Tis said that that Duke used him as Counsel for his private Affairs only *, but not for the Cabals

"pliant, given and granted, give and grant leave and licence; willing by our especial Grace, full Power and Royal Authority, by these presents, that he be freely permitted to inhabit, and dwell in our said Realm, and in it hold and possess all such Estates moveables or immoveables, which he hath already acquired, or shall for the future lawfully acquire; and likewise that he may succeed to all those Goods and Inheritances which in our said Realm, Territories, Lands and Lordships, shall devolve on or belong to him by good and just Title, and that he may dispose of 'em by his last Will, as his proper Goods and Inheritance; and that his Heirs or others to whom he may dispose of them, may be enabled to succeed and take possession of and enjoy the said Goods, and in general that he shall enjoy intirely all and every the Honours, Privileges, Prerogatives, Franchises, Liberties and Rights which are customarily enjoyed by the Originary Natives of this our Kingdom, and that he shall be held and accounted our Subject, in all Cases as a Native of our Realm; and therefore we have qualify'd and dispensed, and do qualify and dispense him out of our said Grace by these presents; he paying us a moderate Sum for once only. We give in command by these same presents to our Trusty and Beloved Officers of our Accounts and Treasurers at *Paris*, Baillies, Seneschals, and to all our other Justiciaries and Officers, and to their Lieutenants for the present and for the future, and to every one of them whom it may concern, and we will that the Grace, Licence, Habitation, and all the Effects by these presents granted, be by them suffered and permitted to the Suppliant to enjoy and use, fully and peaceably without giving or suffering to fall on him any arrest, disturbance or hindrance in what manner soever on any occasion, &c. For such is, &c. But without prejudice, &c. Given at *Paris* in the Month of *March* in the Year of Grace, One Thousand five Hundred and Twenty eight, and the 15th of our Reign. Thus signed. By the King, *Gedoyn. Visa. Consentor. des Landes.*"

I expected from Mr. *Baluze* a Memorial which I have not receiv'd concerning (a) *Du Pin*, Bishop of *Rieux*. The Bishop of *Rieux* (b) one of the most Learned and Illustrious Prelates of *France* was to send it to him.

(A) *Of a Noble and considerable Family.*] The Proof of this is given by Mr. *Joly* in his Notes on the Alphabetical Index of the Advocates, Printed with divers pieces of *Antony Loisel*, in the Year 1652. Mr. *Peter Versoris*, says he (c), "Advocate in Parliament was the Issue of a Noble Family, which came originally from some Gentlemen in *Normandy* about *Falaize*, as he himself remarked in his Genealogy which he writ with his own hand, during the leisure which the contagious Distemper that raged in 1582 afforded him in his Retirement in his House *de Clichy la Garenne* near *Paris*. Their Name was *le Tourneur*, which they have changed since into *Versoris*. *John le Tourneur alias Versoris* coming to *Paris* about the Reign of *Charles* VII. was one of the first Doctors of the University, and writ several Books in Latin, some of which, as this Genealogy observes, are to be seen in the Library of the *Minimies*, at *Nigeon*. He changed his French Name *le Tourneur* into the Latin one *Versoris*, as Men of Letters were wont then to do. He took his Nephew with him, made him a Lawyer, and married him to *Jan Fourier*, of a good Family, and nearly related to the Lieutenant Civil *Charmolue*. All the *Versoris*'s are descended from this Marriage, who have for the most part exercised the Function of Advocate with great Reputation both in the *Palace* and the *Chatelet*." There is something wanting in this relation of Mr. *Joly*, we don't find by it that the Nephew whom *John le Tourneur* had with him, was call'd *Frederick le Tourneur*, and that in imitation of his Uncle, he call'd himself *Versoris*. He left one Son, *William Versoris*, who was Lord of *Garge*, and a famous Advocate, and Father of our *Peter Versoris* (d). 'Tis without doubt the same *William Versoris*, who is in the List (e) *of the Advocates pleading in the Court of Parliament in* 1524, *and who* (f) *dyed at five and twenty, after he had been Married five times, as* Mr. Peter Versoris *observes in the Genealogy which he made of that Family in the Year* 1582. Mr. *Blanchard* mentions this Family in the Catalogue of the Counsellors of the Parliament of *Paris*.

(B) *He dy'd —— for grief after he had heard that the Duke of* Guise *had been killed at* Blois.] Mr. *Joly* relates it thus. "*Peter Versoris* (g) was President of M. *de Guise*'s Council, kept his Seals, and was very affectionate to the Family, tho' he had no Communication, or any thing to do but with his domestick Affairs; so that on the very day of the *Barricadoes* in 1588, he came in his Coach in the Morning to the *Hotel de Guise*, to speak with him as he used to do, not knowing any thing of what passed, and returned again to his own House without seeing him, Mr. *de Guise* having then more urgent Business on his hands. He dy'd the same year on *Christmass* day in the Morning, having heard at his Collation the Night before, the News of what was transacted at *Blois*, for which he was very much concern'd, deploring the Misfortunes into which he saw they were going to fall, and spoke these words with grief, *That those Princes* (meaning *Messieurs de Guise*) *were very well beloved, and that if the King had not prevented it, he would have a great deal of trouble.* However he was very easie, and went to Bed, designing to communicate at the Midnight Mass, having already been confessed; but finding himself ill, he could not go: Mr. *de Verthamon* Counsellor in Parliament, his Son-in-law, and his Daughters, coming to see him, at their return about five a Clock in the Morning, found him dead in his Bed. The eldest of his Sons, *Frederick Versoris* was then young, and was admitted into the Court as a Counsellor a long time after. His two Sons in law M. *Rauncher*, Master of the Requests, and M. *de Verthamon* also Counsellor in Parliament, follow'd the King's Person and Interest during all those Commotions, as well in the States of *Blois*, as in the Parliament sitting at *Tours*.

(d) *Out of some manuscript Memoirs.*

(e) *'Tis in the* 574, & 575. *pages of* Loisel's *Opuscul.*

(f) Opusc. cul. *of Loisel*, pag. 750.

(g) Opusc. cul. *of* Loisel. p. 751, 752.

Cabals of State. We ſhall ſee (C) below in what his Talents lay. § *Mornac* made an *Encomium* upon him in his *Feriæ forenſes*. I ſhall ſpeak (D) of thoſe who Deſcended from him.

VESPASIAN (TITUS FLAVIUS) Son of an Honeſt Publican (A), and Grandſon of a Collector, ‡ who had been Captain of a Company of one hundred Men in *Pompey's* Party, and who eſcaped from the Battel of *Pharſalia*, roſe to the Higheſt Dignity on Earth, being Created Emperor of *Rome*, in the Year of *Grace* 69. He was Born ♯ in a Village of the Country of the *Sabins*, near *Reate* the 17th of *November*, in the Year of *Rome* * 761. He was brought up in the Country by *Tertulla* his Grandmother by his Father's ſide, and preſerved ‖ ſo great a Reſpect for her Memory, that at great Solemnities he always Drank in her Goblet. He paſſed gradually through all the Dignities of the Empire. He was made Tribune of the Soldiers in *Thrace*, as a Reward of his ſervices. *Crete* and the Province of *Cyrene* fell to his Lot when he was Quæſtor. He was refuſed the Office of *Ædile* the firſt time he ſtood for it. He obtained it afterwards, but was the laſt of the ſix *Ædiles*, to which he could not Arrive without ſome difficulty. He was a more ſucceſsful Canditate for the Prætorſhip; he got into the firſt Rank the very firſt time he ſtood for it. He made uſe of a great many Arts to gain *Caligula's* Favour, and ſtood very well with *Narciſſus* under the Emperor *Claudius*. By the Intereſt of which Favourite he was ſent into *Germany* at the Head of a Legion. He was afterwards ſent into *Britain*, at

§ *Ibid. p.* 357.

‡ *Sueton. in Veſpaſ. c.* 1. See the Remark A.

♯ *Id. ibid. cap.* 2.

* That is the 9 Year of CHRIST.

‖ *Aviæ memoriam tam tenere dilexit, ut ſollemnibus & feſtis diebus pocillo quoque ejus argenteo potare perſeveraverit. Id. ibid.*

(C) *We ſhall ſee——in what his Talents lay.*] *Antony Loiſel* made a ſort of Parallel between *John le Maitre* and *Peter Verſoris*. The firſt, ſays he (a), *was really a very ſtrenuous and powerful Advocate, Reſolute in points of Law, Cuſtoms and Practice, very Prudent and Deliberate in his Cauſes, as he made appear as well at the Bar as in the Adminiſtration of his places. After he had reſigned that of Preſident to M. de Sillery, he deſired to Live and Die privately in his own Houſe, in which he was Conſulted without going to the Palace, and often employ'd in Arbitrations.* After this he adds, "that 'twas not exactly ſo with Mr. *Peter Verſoris*; for altho' they went to him, 'twas chiefly to mend ſome Faults which happen ſometimes in preparing a Caſe for a hearing; for he was really full of fine and ſubtile Inventions, and underſtood the Affairs of the Palace ſo well, that tho' he had in a manner quitted it, yet the Palace never quitted him, for his Houſe was another Palace; inſomuch that he kept not only his Days, his Mornings and Afternoons, but his Hours alſo, which he ſo managed that there were always Attendants in the Great-Hall, whilſt he gave his Advice in the Little one. And as he was much Sollicited in his latter Years for Advice, ſo was he Employed in his Younger Days more than any Body elſe for Pleading, as one who ſpoke with a ſprightly ready and natural Eloquence: (1) And with a great Facility and Perſuaſion which made him to be concerned in the greateſt and fineſt Cauſes of his time, as that of the Jeſuits (2) which we Pleaded together, he for them (3) and I for the Univerſity of *Paris*, of which I ſhall ſay nothing, becauſe ſince both Pleas are Printed, every Body may paſs a Judgment on them. Only this I ſhall ſay, that having read his ſome Years ſince, I did not think it near ſo good as when we Pleaded, which proceeds from the Grace, the Force, and the Weight that is given to a Diſcourſe by the Voice, and way of delivery, eſpecially by his, which was Fine and Agreeable to what a meer, Dull, Mute, and Inanimate Reading is. 'Tis true he had one Fault, which was generally pronouncing A for E and E for A, and thoſe who knew what he quoted out of Claſſick Authors, might perceive that he was not well Verſed in them; but take him altogether he was a great Advocate."

(a) *Ibid. p.* 526.

(1) Mr. du Vair compares him with Mr. Mangot, at the beginning of his *Treatiſe of the French Eloquence. We have heard,* ſays he, *Mr.* Mangot *and Mr.* Verſoris *at the ſame time: But one of them was rather a Subtil Civilian, who eaſily explained himſelf with a cloſe and a ſharp Voice, than a great Orator. The other did not want a full and free Expreſſion, or a great and nice Judgment; but having employed all his Thoughts about Cauſes, he did not go ſo far as his Natural Parts, if they had been Cultivated by Care and Art, would have carried him.* (2) *Paſquier* in the firſt Letter of the XXI. Book to Mr. *de Sainte Marthe* relates at large how he was engaged in that Cauſe, and all that paſſed in it. (3) Mr. *Peter Verſoris*, ſays he, at the end of that Letter. pag. 675. *a great Advocate Pleaded againſt me for the Jeſuits, being aſſiſted by the Memoirs which* Caigord *the Jeſuit furniſhed him, who was a Native of* Auvergne, *one of the fineſt Sollicitors the Palace ever ſaw, and as ſuch I have heard him Commended by the late Cardinal of* Lorrain.

(D) *We ſhall ſpeak of thoſe who Deſcended from him.*] He Married *Margaret Caignet*, by whom he had two Sons and two Daughters, *Frederick*, *James*, *Catherine*, and *Mary*. The latter was the Wife of *Francis de Vertamont* Counſellor in the Parliament of *Paris*, and Died in *Auguſt* 1625. *Catherine* was Married the 5th of *September* 1580. to *Antony Rancher Seigneur de la Foucaudiere*, Counſellor in the Parliament, Maſter of the Requeſts, and afterwards Preſident in the Parliament of *Paris*.

Frederick de VERSORIS, Counſellor in the Parliament *February* 19. 1601. left among other Children *Francis Frederick* Lord of *Fontenai le Vicomte*, (who left only one Daughter) and *Lewis* Lord of *Marſilli*, Lieutenant of the Guards, who left only two Daughters. They Died without Iſſue, The youngeſt was Married the 10th of *September* 1689. to her ſecond Couſin, and Died the 6th of *November* 1691.

James de VERSORIS, the other Son of our Advocate, was Lord of *Coulommiers*, Counſellor and Secretary to the King, and Father of *Peter de* VERSORIS, Lord of *Coulommiers*, *Beauvoir* and *Malmuſſe*, the King's Steward in Ordinary. This *Peter de Verſoris* left five Children, three Daughters who are Nuns, and two Sons, *Charles* and *Peter*. *Charles de* VERSORIS, Lord and Patron of *Agi* and *Beauvoir*, was Married firſt to his ſecond Couſin, Daughter of *Lewis de Verſoris*, Lieutenant of the Guards; and afterwards on the 3d of *March* 1695. to *Genevieve Bourgoin*, by whom he has no Children. *Peter de* VERSORIS Lord of *Beauvoir*, Married Mademoiſelle *Tonnelier* at *Orleans* the 22d of *February* 1700 (b).

(A) *Son of an Honeſt Publican.*] He behaved himſelf generouſly in his Employ, and ſo juſtly withal, that the Cities gave a publick and laſting Teſtimony of his Probity. (c) *Hujus filius cognomine Sabinus——publicum quadrageſima in Aſia egit. Manebantque imagines à civitatibus ei poſita ſub hoc titulo*, ΚΑΛΩ͂Σ ΤΕΛΩΝΗ΄ΣΑΝΤΙ. *Poſtea fœnus apud Helvetios exercuit, ibique diem obiit, ſuperſtitibus uxore Veſpaſia Polla, & duobus ex ea liberis: quorum major Sabinus ad præfecturam urbis, minor Veſpaſianus ad principatum uſque proceſſit.* Satyrical Men cannot here come in with their Gloſs on this Text, they cannot object that *Veſpaſian's* Father was an Honeſt Man in the ſame ſenſe that one of thoſe, who was Crucified with JESUS CHRIST, is called the good Thief. The latter did not deſerve that Character *in ſenſu compoſito*, as the Logicians ſpeak, but only *in ſenſu diviſo*. He was not Good and a Thief at the ſame time, but from a Thief he became a Good Man. The ſame may be ſaid of *Zacheus*: He was not an Honeſt Man when he gathered the publick Impoſts: He became ſo by acts of Reſtitution and Repentance (g). This cannot be ſaid of our Emperor's Father; for he United the Character of an Honeſt Man at the head of a Legion. He was afterwards ſent into *Britain* †, where he fought the Enemy thirty times, ſubdued two Potent Nations, above twenty two Towns, and the Iſle of *Wight*. In recompence of which he obtained the Triumphal Ornaments, two Prieſthoods, and the Conſulſhip. He lived in a ſort of Retirement whilſt *Agrippina* continued in Favour, who hated all *Narciſſus*'s Friends. Returning to publick Employments, he became Proconſul of *Africa*, which Poſt he very (*B*) Honourably diſcharged, without enriching himſelf. He accompanied *Nero* in his Voyage to *Greece*, but not having the complaiſance to Applaud that Emperor's Singing (*C*), he was utterly Diſgraced, and concealed himſelf in an obſcure Town. He did not believe himſelf ſafe there, he feared the fatal effects of *Nero*'s Rage, when he received the News that the Government of a Province, and the Command of an Army were beſtowed on him. No perſon was found ſo proper as he to reduce the Jewiſh Nation to Obedience, which had preſumed to Revolt. This Expedition in which *Titus* his Son ſerved him as Lieutenant General, was perfectly Glorious, and opened a way to the Throne. Which great Riſe he began to hope for during the Civil War betwixt *Otho* and *Vitellius* *. Several Preſages which promiſed him a very ſublime Fortune, were very powerful Engagements to his reſolution of Seizing the Imperial Authority; for beſides the Impreſſion which they made upon his Mind, they Supplied his Friends with

† Now call'd [illegible]

* Taken from *Suetonius* ubi ſupra cap. 2. & ſeq.

Man with that of a Publican, ſo much decryed in the Goſpel, and profane Authors. Nay, the Satyriſt, who cannot deny this, would ſtretch things too far, if they ſhou'd make uſe of the Application of this thought, *theſe two words are very much ſurprized to find themſelves together, for in all likelyhood they never met before*. I have formerly touched (*a*) on this in obſerving that a great extent of Learning is very rarely accompanied with a great Modeſty. Nevertheleſs we meet with ſome Examples in which they are United: Some Partiſans are alſo Honeſt Men, tho' it ought to be owned that from all Antiquity theſe two Qualities have been pleaſed to ſeparate themſelves. The eaſineſs of Gaining cauſes them to amaſs Riches, which without Regret are expended (*b*) on whatever Luxury inſpires; but to defray theſe extravagant Expences, new and more exorbitant Extortions are neceſſary. This is the Venom which Poiſons the Minds of thoſe concerned in the management of the Treaſury. See ſeveral Remarks againſt them in the firſt part of *la Mothe le Vayer's* (*c*) *proſe chagrine.*

We may obſerve that *Veſpaſian*'s Maternal Anceſtors were more Illuſtrious than the Paternal; for *Veſpaſia Polla* his Mother was a Senator's Siſter, and Daughter of *Veſpaſius Pollio*, who went through conſiderable Offices in the Army. (*d*) *Polla Nurſiæ honeſto genere orta, patrem habuit Veſpaſianum Pollionem, ter Tribunum militum, præfectumque caſtrorum, fratremque Senatorem prætoriæ dignitatis.* Several Monuments of this Family were obſerved at a place called *Veſpaſiæ*, on the top of a Mountain ſix Miles from *Nurſia*, in the Road to *Spoleto*, which diſcovered its Ancient Luſtre. (*e*) *Ubi* (Veſpaſiis) *Veſpaſiorum complura monumenta exſtant, magnum indicium ſplendoris familiæ & vetuſtatis.* *Veſpaſian*'s Elder Brother aſſuming the Sir-Name of *Sabinus*, affords us reaſon to conclude that in that Age, the Younger Brothers ſometimes took a Sir-Name borrowed from their Mothers Family, and terminated like thoſe which indicated Adoption.

(*B*) *He very Honourably diſcharged the Proconſulſhip of* Africa.] We have here a proof of what I ſaid (*f*) above, that *Suetonius* was not hurried by a Satyrical Genius to ſpeak ill of People. He here beſtows Elogies on *Veſpaſian* very contrary to the Teſtimony of *Tacitus*; this ſhews that he had throughly examined what had been ſaid concerning *Veſpaſian*'s Conduct, and having found the ill Reports concerning him falſe, he rejected them, in order to do that Proconſul the juſtice which was due to him. A Hiſtorian naturally ill Natured and Satyrical is not ſo juſt. (*g*) *Exin ſortitus Africam, integerrime, nec ſine magna dignatione adminiſtravit: Niſi quod Adrumeti ſeditione quadam, rapa in eum jacta ſunt. Rediit certe nihilo opulentior, ut prope labefactata jam fide, omnia prædia fratri obligaret.* You ſee that *Suetonius* doth not conceal the Inſurrection of the Inhabitants of *Adrumetum*, nor that they threw Turneps at *Veſpaſian*. He is then ſo much the more credible in the Elogies he beſtows upon him, and we may reaſonably believe that *Tacitus* was neither juſt nor exact enough, when he tells us only that *Veſpaſian* (*i*) was Decried, and drew on himſelf the publick Hatred during his Proconſulſhip.

(*C*) *Not having the Complaiſance to Applaud Nero's Singing.*] This Prince's paſſion for Muſick was a Ridiculous Extravagance. The principal cauſe of (*k*) his Voyage to *Greece* was his ardent deſire of ſignalizing himſelf in the Muſical diſputes in ſeveral Cities of that Country, and to bear away the Prize. *Suetonius* (*l*) relates a great many Circumſtances to this purpoſe which are very ſurprizing. He ſaith amongſt other things that no Perſon was admitted to retire from the Theatre whilſt *Nero* was a Singing, and that ſome Women were forced to be Delivered there, and that the Gates of the Cities being ſhut, ſome Perſons were ſo fatigued and tired with Hearing and Praiſing this Prince, that they ſecretly eſcaped over the Walls, or feigned themſelves Dead, that they might be carried out of the Town under pretence of being Buried. (*m*) *Cantante eo, ne neceſſaria quidem cauſſa excedere theatro licitum erat. Itaque & enixæ quædam in ſpectaculis dicuntur, & multi tædio audiendi laudandique, clauſis oppidorum portis, aut furtim deſiluiſſe de muro, aut morte ſimulata funere elati.* It is eaſy to conceive that *Nero* was extremely Incenſed againſt *Veſpaſian*, who very often went out of the Theatre, or grew Sleepy whilſt his Maſter was Singing. (*n*) *Peregrinatione Achaica inter comites Neronis, cum cantante eo, aut diſcederet ſæpius, aut præſens obdormiſceret, graviſſimam contraxit offenſam: prohibituſque non contubernio modo, ſed etiam publica ſalutatione, ſeceſſit in parvam ac deviam civitatem, quoad latenti, etiamque extrema metuenti, provincia cum exercitu oblata eſt.* Some will aſk why *Suetonius* ſaith here, that *Veſpaſian* frequently retired from the Theatre? Hath he not elſewhere affirmed that no Perſon was admitted to go out of the Theatre on any pretext whatſoever? I anſwer, that indeed he did not very well remember to render all the parts of his Relations exactly conſiſtent; but to juſtify him in ſome ſort, we may ſuppoſe that the Prohibition of leaving the Theatre was a conſequence of the Liberty of not ſtaying till the Spectacle was ended, which ſeveral had taken. *Veſpaſian*, before the Prohibition, was one of thoſe who laid the leaſt Conſtraint upon himſelf. By which he began to diſpleaſe that Prince, and his Diſgrace was compleated after the forbidding Order. He indeed obeyed, but fell aſleep on the Theatre. I cannot think of a better way of Reconciling theſe two places of *Suetonius*. It may perhaps be imagined that he Confounded the times, I would ſay that inſtead of applying this to the Year of the Muſical Victories which *Nero* obtained at *Rome*, he placed it in the Year of his Victories amongſt the *Greeks*. We are informed by *Tacitus* that it was at *Rome* that *Veſpaſian* fell into Diſgrace for Sleeping at the Muſical Diſputes of the Emperor. (*o*) *Ferebantque Veſpaſianum, tanquam ſomno conniveret, a Phœbo liberto increpitum, ægreque meliorum precibus obtectum: mox imminentem perniciem majore fato effugiſſe.* Mr. *de Tillemont* (*p*) conceives that *Veſpaſian* twice

---

(*a*) See [illegible] Book [illegible] Chap. XIX.

(*c*) See the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres for June [illegible] Article 2. at the end.

(*b*) Julian the Apoſtate knew very well that the Financiers love Luxury. [illegible]nerat bilem dictum, they are Ammianus Marcellinus's words lib. 22. c. 4. p. m. 300. ut ad detondendum Imperatoris capillum tonſor venire præceptus, introiret quidam amplo [illegible] veſtitus. Quo viſo Julianus obſtupuit: Ego, inquit, non Rationalem juſſi, ſed tonſorem acciri.

(*d*) Pag. 327. of the 9th tome edit. in 12. See alſo the 1. tome, pag. 70. & ſeq.

(*e*) Sueton. ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Id. ib.

(*g*) In the Remark D of the Article Suetonius.

(*h*) Sueton. ubi ſupra cap. 4.

(*i*) Integrum illic ac favorabilem Proconſulatum Vitellius; famoſum inviſumque Veſpaſianus egerat. *Tacit. hiſt. lib.* 2. *cap.* 97.

(*k*) Sueton. in Nerone cap. 22. *See alſo* Tacitus ann. lib. 16. cap. 4. & 5.

(*l*) Suet. ibid. cap. 23. & ſeq.

(*m*) Id. ib. cap. 23.

(*n*) Id. in Veſpaſiano cap. 4.

(*o*) Tacit. annal. lib. 16. cap. 5. ad ann. Romæ 818. Chriſti 65.

(*p*) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. tom. 2. pag. m. 6

with a good opportunity of Animating him to this Enterpriſe. † *Tacitus* and *Suetonius* || who have related the Preſages, have not omitted the Anſwer made him on (*D*) Mount *Carmel*. It was given by the true God, if we may believe the *Carmelites*, who Build on the Authority of theſe two Hiſtorians, the Chimerical Antiquity of their Order, and the pretended Succeſſion of the Diſciples of the Prophet *Elias* continued to the beginning of their Inſtitution. *Veſpaſian* tho' animated by Preſages, and the Inſtances of his Friends, did yet Heſitate for ſome time, and wanted the Concourſe of ſeveral Fortuitous ‡ Events, and the moſt preſſing § Reaſons of *Atheiſm* to puſh him from uncertain Thoughts to the fixed Reſolution of declaring himſelf Emperor. It is very probable that the Lies, which with a great Addreſs were ſpread, (*E*) contributed very conſiderably to the ſucceſs of his Enterpriſe. He was γ the firſt who mended on the Throne; and not to own that he Remedied ſeveral Evils, and did ſome very good Actions, were to be Unjuſt. The deſire of amaſſing Treaſures was his great Vice, which he took no care to hide; yet there is reaſon to believe that he con-

trived

† Tacit. Hiſtor. lib. 2. cap. 78.

|| Sueton. in Veſpaſ. cap. 5.

‡ Id. ib. cap. 6.

§ You'll find 'em in Tacitus Hiſt. cap. 76, 77.

γ Ambiguæ de Veſpaſiano fama: Soluſque omnium ante ſe principum in melius mutatus eſt. *Tacit. ib. lib. 1. cap. 50.*

twice committed this Crime of Sleeping at *Nero's* Muſick; firſt at *Rome*, and afterwards in *Greece*. This is not very probable: A Courtier who hath once run the Riſque of his Life, would take more care to avoid a Relapſe, eſpecially, when it may be eaſily done.

(*D*) *The Anſwer made him on Mount* Carmel. —— *The* Carmelites *who Build——the Chimerical Antiquity.*] *Tacitus's* words are: (*a*) *Eſt Judæam inter Syriamque Carmelus, ita vocant montem, deumque: nec ſimulacrum deo, aut templum, (ſic tradidere majores) ara tantum & reverentia. Illic ſacrificanti Veſpaſiano, cum ſpes occultas verſaret animo, Baſilides ſacerdos, inſpectis identidem extis.* Quidquid eſt, *inquit*, Veſpaſiane quod paras, ſeu domum extruere, ſeu prolatare agros, ſive ampliare ſervitia, datur tibi magna ſedes, ingentes termini, multum hominum. *Has ambages & ſtatim exceperat fama, & tunc aperiebat, nec quidquam magis in ore vulgi; crebriores apud ipſum ſermones: quanto ſperantibus plura dicuntur.* The laſt words of this Citation ought not to be ſuppreſſed by me, for they contain an excellent Morality, or rather a lively Image of the Deceits and Illuſions of Ambition. The People diſcourſed of thoſe Preſages, but thoſe who approach'd *Veſpaſian* talk'd more of them ſtill; for the more ſuch Diſcourſes create a ſort of hope, the more they are increaſed. I proceed now to *Suetonius*: (*b*) *Apud Judæam Carmeli Dei oraculum conſulentem, ita confirmavere ſortes, ut quidquid cogitaret volveretque animo, quantum libet magnum, id eſſe proventurum pollicerentur.* Thoſe who weigh the Circumſtances of theſe two Hiſtorians words, and underſtand the Religion which God deliver'd to the *Jews*, will without any difficulty be convinced that the Oracle conſulted by *Veſpaſian* was a Deity full as falſe as that at *Delphi*. Nevertheleſs the *Carmelites* maintain, that this was the Oracle of the ſame God who was Worſhipped at *Jeruſalem*. *Hermenigildus, a Sancto Paulo*, a *Spaniſh* Monk, refuted this Opinion, and ſhew'd the Paganiſm of the God *Carmelus* mention'd by *Tacitus* and *Suetonius*: But *Laurence Angelus Eſpin*, a Carmelite, could not bear this Truth; he Publiſhed a Tract at *Saragoza* in Anſwer to it, with the Pompous and Inſulting Title of *ruina Idoli Carmelitici quod ſomniavit Reverendiſſ. P. Fr. Hermenigildus a S. Paulo.* This bold Writer did not maintain his preſuming Character; he was ſilenced by the Marquis of *Agropoli*, who Printed a piece at *Seville*, in 1678. in which he with a great deal of Solidity and Learning proves that Father *Hermenigildus a S. Paulo* had a very juſt Cauſe: The Carmelites reſolved him a Miſchief, and to gratify their Paſſion (*c*) with the more Addreſs, they Proſecuted the Marquis for denying the pretended *Haubert* of *Seville*. They brought him into the Inquiſition, as an Accomplice of *Papebroch* a *French* Writer, and hired ſaid they, to Write againſt *Spain*. They pretended that he had Betrayed *Spain*, and that his Crime was really High Treaſon. (*d*) *Neque ſcimus*, inquiunt, *utrum major ſit audacia quod homo Francus* (qualem me fingunt) *eo ſtylo utatur contra ſcriptores Hiſpanos, quam quod Agropolitanus Marchio homo mere laicus, ſcriptis ſuis ignorantia plenis, patriæ honorem prodat, favens auctori Franco, quem novit conductum ut ſcribat contra Hiſpaniam* —— *quod grave Marchionis illius delictum eſt, perduellionis etiam crimine exaggeratum, adeoque facit cum ſacro Tribunali delatabilem, ſicut eum delatamus in præſentiarum, una cum Papebrochio, ut eorundem peccatorum complicem.* This is what they did in the Year 1691. By which we ſee that the moſt Eminent Characters are no ſecurity againſt Monkiſh Perſecutions; for a Man can ſcarce have more Titles of Honour than this Marquis: Part of which follow, for I am ſtopt by an *Et cætera* from citing the whole. *Gaſpar de Mendoza, Ibañes de Segovia & Peralta, Eques Ordinis de Alcantara, Marchio de Mondexar, Comes Tendillæ, & utroque titulo ex Primatibus Hiſpaniæ; nec non Marchio de Valhermoſa & Agropoli, Dominus Provinciæ de Almoguera, Toparcha Oppidorum Corpa, Meci, Fuentonobiliæ, Loranciæ, Aunionis, Viana, &c.* Obſerve that his Book was Printed in *Spaniſh* at *Seville*, and Tranſlated into *Latin* by Father *Papebroch* a Jeſuit of *Antwerp*, and not a *French*-Man as theſe Accuſers moſt ignorantly pretend. This *Latin* Tranſlation was Printed at *Antwerp* in 1698. See the *Utrecht* Journaliſts (*e*).

(*a*) Tacitus Hiſtor. lib. 2. cap. 78.

(*b*) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. c. 5.

(*c*) Eodem aſtu contra Marchionem mihi conſentientem procedunt; eamdem quidem pretendentes cauſam, reapſe vero ſtomachantes quod ſuum Laurentium Eſpin conatum Carmelo vindicare pro ætate Veſpaſiani decorem indebitum, fecerit obmuteſcere. *Dan. Papebrochius præf. ad examen divinitatis quam in Carmelo Veſpaſianus conſuluit.*

(*d*) Id. ib.

(*e*) *In September and October* 1698. pag. 770. & ſeq.

Beſides other Reaſons which this Marquis uſes, he refutes the *Carmelites* by an Argument drawn from the Perſon of *Veſpaſian*; for he cites (*f*) ſeveral Authors who are of Opinion that this Emperor was the Boar of the Foreſt, of which *David* ſpoke (*g*) by a Prophetick Spirit. He ſaith that he is called *Ceſor piorum* in the Sibyl's Verſes, and that he and his Son *Titus* are the Types of Antichriſt according to *Malvenda*. What probability then, concludes he, is there that the true God ſhould Honour ſuch a Man as he with his Anſwers? He ſolidly refutes *Marcellus Donatus*, who was of that Opinion (*h*).

(*f*) Exam. divinit. art. 25.

(*g*) Pſalm 79. v. 14.

(*h*) Marc. Donatus ſchol. in Hiſtor. Roman.

(*E*) *That the Lies* —— *contributed very conſiderably to the Succeſs of his Enterpriſe.*] Copies of a Letter from the Emperor *Otho* to *Veſpaſian* were diſperſed, by which the latter was Conſtituted that Emperor's Avenger, not to ſay that *Otho* therein expreſſed an ardent deſire that *Veſpaſian* would relieve the Republick. A report was alſo induſtriouſly ſpread that *Vitellius* had reſolved to remove the *German* Legions to *Syria*, and thoſe of *Syria* to *Germany*. (*i*) *Plurimum cœptis contulerunt, jactatum exemplar epiſtolæ, veræ ſive falſæ, defuncti Othonis ad Veſpaſianum, extrema obteſtatione ultionem mandantis, & ut Reip. ſubveniret, optantis, ſimul rumor diſſipatus, deſtinaſſe Vitellium victorem permutare hiberna legionum, & Germanicas transferre in Orientem ad ſecuriorem molliorem que militiam.* Theſe two particulars which doubtleſs were forged by the Enemies of *Vitellius*, very much conduced to *Veſpaſian*'s Intereſt. The pretended Letter of *Otho* paſſed for a ſort of Laſt-Will, which afforded *Veſpaſian* a Lawful Pretence. The *Syrian* Legions charmed with their Pleaſant Quarters in ſo agreeable a Climate, and forming to themſelves a terrible Idea of the *German* Ice and Snow, were eaſily gained to the Emperor's Party, who would prevent the change of their Winter Quarters. The *Syrians* alſo uſed to theſe Legions, were very uneaſy to part with them for others ordered thither from a Barbarous Country (*k*). This encouraged them to favour *Veſpaſian*. This is the fate of Revolutions: They require the aſſiſtance of a thouſand Forgeries and falſe Alarms to affect the Minds of the People. Without which two in a thouſand will never ſucceed.

(*i*) Sueton. ib. cap. 6.

(*k*) See Tacitus ubi ſupra cap. 7.

(*F*) Part

ward it ſo, that part of his Extortions were imputed to his Concubine (F) Cænis. This was a poor way of clearing himſelf; for even thoſe who had believed that he knew not that ſhe ſold all Places, wou'd have accounted this Ignorance as a moſt ſcandalous Fault. He was the firſt § who laid a Tax on *Urine.* I have ſaid ſomething ‖ elſewhere concerning ſome Miraculous Cures of which he paſſed for the Author. He Died the 24th of *June*, in the Year 79. after a Reign of Ten Years wanting Six Days, aged a little above Sixty Nine Years. It ought not to be forgotten that he Deported himſelf with great Moderation * towards thoſe who had Offended him, and ſhowered numerous Preſents and Favours † on Ingenious Men, and thoſe who Cultivated the liberal Arts. He never was aſhamed of the Meanneſs of his firſt Condition, but ridiculed the vain Efforts of ſeveral (G) Genealogiſts who would make him to be Deſcended from one of *Hercules*'s Companions. He was too fond of Rallery, which he carried to a great degree

§ Sueton. ib. cap. 23.
‖ In the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, June in the Year 1686. Art. 1. pag. 630.
* Sueton. ib. cap. 15. & ſeq.
† Id. ib. cap. 18.

(F) *Part of his Extortions were Imputed to his Concubine* Cænis.] *Xiphilin* in Abridging *Dion Caſſius* left out ſeveral things that were doubtleſs of great Importance: but if I miſtake not, he hath not done ſo in thoſe Facts which concern this Concubine: I am apt to think he hath retained the whole. His Abridgment (a) acquaints us when ſhe Died. We there find that *Veſpaſian* loved her tenderly, and was accountable to her for the Great Power which he acquired, and the vaſt Treaſures which he Amaſſed. She ſold all the Offices depending on the Law, the Sword, and Religion, beſides the very Anſwers of *Veſpaſian* himſelf. No Body loſt his Life under that Emperor upon the account of his Money; but many ſaved it with the help of their Purſes. *Cænis* received all thoſe Sums, and he was ſuſpected not without reaſon to be Privy to it. The Hiſtorian offers two Reaſons (b) which obliged him to mention this Woman: Firſt ſhe had a great ſhare of Fidelity, and in the ſecond place a very extraordinary Memory; for Proof of which, ſee the Anſwer which ſhe returned to *Antonia* her Miſtreſs (c), who had obliged her to write ſome ſecret Paſſage relating to *Sejanus*, to be communicated to *Tiberius*, and who ordered it to be immediately blotted out, to prevent all Inconveniencies from the diſcovery, (d) *'Tis in vain*, replyed ſhe, *that you give me that Order, for this and all other things which you ſpeak of to me are ſo firmly fixed in my Memory, that they cannot be blotted out.* I admire this in her, (e) ſaith the Hiſtorian. I allow this Anſwer worthy a place in this Author, but it muſt at the ſame time be acknowledged that it was not pertinent. It could only have been juſt, if *Antonia* had deſired that all Ideas of this Letter might be Aboliſhed. But this was not what ſhe deſired, her Intention was only to prevent all external Evidences of her ſecret, and that no diſcovery ſhould be confirmed by Proofs: She did not diſtruſt *Cænis*, nor was ſhe apprehenſive of Accuſations purely Verbal, and deſtitute of the ſtrong ſupports of written Teſtimonies. To what purpoſe then was it to ſay that blotting out the Letter, was no effectual way to prevent the Inconvenience, againſt which *Antonia*'s Precaution was levelled? *Cænis*'s Memory did not give *Antonia* any Uneaſineſs, when ſhe knew the Writing was not in being. Obſerve that *Cænis* was made free by this Lady, and was her Secretary. *Veſpaſian* kept her in his Houſe before he Married, ſent her away when he Married, and took her again after the Death of his Wife, and treated her almoſt like a Wife. (f) *Poſt uxoris exceſſum, Cænidem Antoniæ libertam, & a manu dilectam quondam ſibi, revocavit in contubernium: Habuitque etiam Imperator pene juſtæ uxoris loco.* After her Death he took ſeveral (g) Concubines, which ſhewed that he thought none ſufficient to ſupply her place, and that he had recourſe to ſeveral to compenſate the Loſs which he ſuffered in this one Miſtreſs. It is obſerved as an Evidence of *Domitian*'s Pride or Incivility, that *Cænis* (h) at her return from a Journey offering to Kiſs him according to cuſtom, he preſented her his Hand to Kiſs.

(a) Xiphilin in Veſpaſiano p. m. 271.
(b) [illegible] propterea mentionem feci quod maxime fide & excellenti memoria fuit. Idib.
(c) Mother of the Emperor Claudius. See the Remark C of the Article Antonia the Elder.
(d) Id. ib.
(e) [illegible] θαυμάσαι. Id igitur in ea admiratus ſum. Id. ib.
(f) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. cap. 3.
(g) Id. ib. cap. 21.
(h) Cænidi patris concubinæ ex Iſtria revertenti oſculumque ut aſſuerat offerenti manum præbuit. Id. in Domit. c. 12.

(G) *He Ridiculed the vain Efforts of ſeveral Genealogiſts.*] Moſt of whom are prodigiouſly Impudent, and when encouraged by the leaſt beck of a Favourite or Miniſter, they preſent him with whatever Pedigree he pleaſes. A Superintendant of the Finances needs only chooſe, and if he is diſpoſed liberally to Reward thoſe Genealogy Makers, he ſhall deſcend, if he will, from the Ancient *Trojans.*

Tunc (i) licet a Pico numeres genus, altaque ſi te
Nomina delectant, omnem Titanida pugnam
Inter majores ipſumque Promethea pones:
De quocunque voles proavum tibi ſumito libro.

(i) Juven. ſat. 8. v. 131.

"(k) *Pegnafiel Contreras* of *Granada*, —— not "content to particularize —— one hundred and "eighteen Succeſſions from *Adam* to *Philip* the "Third, hath deduced one hundred and twenty "one from the ſame Original to the Duke of "*Lerma*, on whoſe account this Excellent Piece "was written. To accompliſh this, the Author, as "others have done, takes up the Ruins of Old "*Troy*, where he finds (even before its Deſtruction) two Brothers *Ilus* and *Aſsaracus*, from the "firſt of which he makes the King of *Spain* to "be deſcended, and from the other his Excellency; who by this means being a very diſtant "Relation to his Catholick Majeſty, he hath obliged him with a much nearer Affinity by his "Maternal Line, which he hath alſo drawn. And "becauſe it would not be proper to leave a Duke "ſo highly Deſcended without ſome Sovereignties "in his Family, he makes *Æneas* one of his Anceſtors. —— A little after *Æneas* he crowds in "*Brutus*, who is ſaid to have given his Name to *Great-Britain.*" The number of Cheats and Bubbles was not Anciently leſs than at preſent. If *Veſpaſian* had pleaſed, the Genealogical Stem of the Houſe of *Flavia* had been ſo drawn, that the greateſt Names in Old *Rome* had infallibly been Inſerted in the Male or Female Line. He would have ſeen in it,

(k) La Mothe le Vayer, Diſcours de l'Hiſtoire tom. 2. pag. 160, 161.

(l) Stantes in curribus Æmilianos,
Et Curios jam dimidios, humeroſque minorem
Corvinum, & Galbam auriculis naſoque carentem,
. . . .
Fumoſos equitum cum dictatore magiſtros.

(l) Id. ſat. 8. v. 3.

He would therein have found *Murranus* who was killed in *Æneas*'s time, from whom the moſt Ancient *Latin* Kings were deſcended.

Murranum (m) hic, atavos & avorum antiqua ſonantem
Nomina, per regeſque actum genus omne Latinos,
Præcipitem ſcopulo, atque ingentis turbine ſaxi
Excutit.

(m) Virgil. Æneid. lib. 12. v. 529.

Some undertook to prove that the Founders of the City of *Reate*, and a certain Hero whoſe Monument was in a Street of *Rome*, and who had accompanyed *Hercules*, were alſo the Founders of the Family of *Veſpaſian*; but this Emperor was the firſt who Laughed at their Endeavours, he never concealed the Meanneſs of his Extract, but frequently ſpoke of it himſelf. (n) *Mediocritatem priſtinam neque diſſimulavit umquam, ac frequenter etiam præ ſe tulit. Quin & conantes quoſdam originem Flavii generis ad conditores Reatinos, comitemque Herculis, cujus monumentum exſtat via Salaria, referre, irriſit ultro.* It is not ſtrange that ſuch a Genealogical Labour ſhould be undertaken to Flatter an Emperor, ſince more than this was done for a Perſon who was no more than Quæſtor to *Auguſtus.* I ſpeak of one *Quintus Vitellius*, to whom it was proved (o) by a Book written expreſly to that end, that his Anceſtors had Reigned over all *Latium*, and that they owed their Original to *Faunus* King of the *Aborigines*, and to *Vitellia*, who had been Worſhipped in ſeveral places as a Goddeſs. Notwithſtanding which, according to ſeveral other Authors (p), the *Vitellii* ſprung from a Freed-Man, or even from a Cobler. It is incredible how many Families

(n) Sueton. ubi ſupa cap. 12.
(o) Sueton. in Vitellio cap. 1.
(p) Id. ibi cap. 2.

degree of Buffoonry, and made no ſcruple of (*H*) the moſt obſcene Expreſſions. He very frequently made uſe of this turn of Thought to elude the juſt Reproaches to which his Avarice and the rigour of his Exactions expoſed him.

VIGERIUS (*Mark*) Cardinal of the Title of St. *Mary* beyond the *Tiber*, was of *Savona*. He was taken from a *Franciſcan* Monaſtery, and created Cardinal by *Julius* the II. He was afterwards made Biſhop of *Præneſte*, and Archprieſt of the *Vatican* Church. He had taught Theology at *Padua* and *Rome*. He died the 18th of *June* 1516, aged 70 Years, and was buried without an Epitaph at Saint *Mary*'s beyond the *Tiber* *. He wrote ſeveral Books, one of which was (*A*) to prove that JESUS CHRIST's Tunick was inferior to *Longinus*'s Spear.

VIGILANTIUS, a Pariſh Prieſt in the Dioceſe of *Barcelona* in *Spain*, was by Nation (*A*) a *Gaul*, and lived about the beginning of the Vth Century. He compoſed ſome Books, in which he diſcover'd ſome Zeal for Religion, but ſuffering himſelf to be ſeduced by the love of Praiſes, and preſuming too much on his

milies boaſted of an elder Date than the famous Siege of *Troy*. The *Glabrio*'s (*a*) pretended to be deſcended from *Æneas*. The pious *Paula* ſo celebrated in St. *Jerom*'s Works, gave out that ſhe was iſſued from *Agamemnon*; and that Genealogy was mentiond in her Epitaph written by St. *Jerom*:

Scipio (*b*) *quam genuit, Pauli fudere Parentes*
Gracchorum Soboles, Agamemnonis inclyta proles
Hoc jacet in tumulo.

Syneſius Biſhop of *Cyrene* (*c*) in the beginning of the V. Century, ſaid he was deſcended from *Hercules*, and maintain'd that the Archives of *Cyrene* contain'd ſufficient proofs of this Extraction. The obſervation of theſe things is not uſeleſs; for it plainly ſhews, that our Age (†) doth not go beyond the moſt venerable Antiquity in this ſort of Chimera's. Our Age affords us Example which runs parallel with that of *Veſpaſian*. Read *Naudé*'s Words; "Cardinal *Mazarin*, ſaith he, (*d*) above five years ago in the preſence of ſeveral Perſons of Honour and Probity, from whom I have it, ridiculed a certain Flatterer, who would trace the Original of the Family and Arms of *Mazarin*, from the old *Roman* Conſuls *T. Geganius Macerinus*, *M. Geganius Muerinus II. Proculus Geganius Macerinus*, *M. Geganius Macerinus III.* which the Ancient Chronicle of *Haloander*, *Panvinius* in his *Faſti*, and the *Roman* Hiſtorians mention, in the Years *à Regifugio* xviii. & *ab urbe condita* cccvii. cccxiv. & cccxvii. He much at the ſame time threatned a certain Prieſt of *Avignon* named *Thomas Bonnet*, to cauſe him to be ſent to the *Baſtille*, if contrary to his frequent forbidding Orders, he Publiſhed a Genealogy or Hiſtory *di Caſa Mazarini*, becauſe he ſaid wonderful things of it without any Proof, and without ſhewing by ſome Authentick Deeds the Affinity of many illuſtrious Families he ſpoke of.,,

(*H*) *He was too fond of rallery—— made no ſcruple of the moſt obſcene Expreſſions—— to elude the Reproaches.*] Being accuſtomed to this in his private condition, it would have been very difficult for him to have abſtained from it on the Throne, for the Itch of jeſting is one of the moſt incurable ones that can poſſibly infect a Perſon. However it is infinitely below the Character of a great Monarch to debaſe himſelf by ſcurrillous jeſting as *Veſpaſian* did. (*e*) *Super cœnam autem, & ſemper alias comiſſimus, multa joco tranſigebat. Erat enim dicacitatis plurimæ, & ſic ſcurrilis ac ſordidæ, ut ne prætextatis quidem verbis abſtineret. Et tamen nonnulla ejus facetiſſima extant, in quibus & hoc: Menſtrium Florum, conſularem, admonitus ab eo* plauſtra *potius quam* ploſtra *dicenda, die poſtero* Flaurum *ſalutavit. Expugnatus autem à quadam, quaſi amore ſui deperiret, cum productæ pro concubitu ſeſtertia quadraginta donaſſet: admonente diſpenſatore quemadmodum ſummam rationibus vellet referri*, Veſpaſiano, *inquit*, adamato—— (*f*) *Maxime tamen dicacitatem in deformibus lucris affectabat, ut invidiam aliqua cavillatione dilueret, transferretque ad ſales.* Did he believe theſe ralleries would make People inſenſible of the Oppreſſion of his exorbitant Exactions?

(*A*) *He wrote ſeveral Books, one of which was to prove that* JESUS CHRIST's *Tunick.*] The occaſion of this Work was ſomewhat ſingular. (*g*) *Bajazet*, Emperor of the *Turks*, having two very precious Reliques, the ſeamleſs Coat of our Saviour, and the Spear which pierced his Heart, preſented the latter to the Pope, and kept the former for himſelf. On this occaſion a great Diſpute aroſe in *Italy*, whether the Preſent made to the Pope was better than that which the Grand Signor reſerved for himſelf. They diligently examined whether a Turkiſh Prince had a good taſte in point of Reliques. Our *Vigerius* was order'd to make it appear, that the Sultan was no nice Judge in things of this kind, ſince the ſeamleſs Tunick ought not to pretend to come near the Lance. The Spear penetrated to the Heart, and was tinctur'd with the very vital Blood; but the Tunick only touched the external parts. *Bartholinus* mentions this Diſpute, *Inſedit hæc opinio*, ſaith he, (*h*) Marco Virgerio *Epiſcopo Præneſtino & Cardinali Senogallienſi in Controverſia quam juſſu æqualium ſuorum de præſtantia & dignitate lanceæ Longini Pontifici Romano à Turcarum Imperatore miſſæ, præ tunica inconſutili, quam ipſe* Bajazetes *ſibi reſervarat, olim ipſe conſcripſit, poſt à* Simone Begnio *Modruſienſi Epiſcopo per prælum Aſcenſianum typis divulgatum.* Tractatu quarto fol. 10. *primas lanceæ defert, quia* non extrema ſolum, ut tunica, ſed ſanctiſſimi corporis medium attigit & nobiliſſima; vel forte loca cordis; & ipſum attigit cor; ad quæ in morte Chriſti omnis vigor vitalis humoris, in exhauſto corpore reliqui, ut ad arcem muniendum, & ad proprium domicilium ſe contulerat: qua forte de cauſa ſangnis defluxit & aqua per lanceam. *Poſtea paucis interjectis*: Ferrum autem aqua perfuſum eſt; quam de fonte intimi cordis eduxit, & de micanti mucrone rubens & ſanguinolentum ſpiculum regio ſacerdotalique ſanguine cruentatum extitit.

Calvin had not heard of this Preſent of *Bajazet*, for he takes no notice of it (*i*) in that place where he obſerves that the Iron point of that Lance was actually in four different places, if we believe the Papiſts. He did not forget that the *Turks* boaſt of having the Tunick. His words are, "(*k*) Concerning the ſeamleſs Garment for which Lots were caſt, becauſe it was thought very proper to excite the Devotion of the ignorant, there are ſeveral of them. For at *Argenteuil* near *Paris*, there is one; and another at *Trier*. And if the Bull of St. *Salvador* in *Spain* ſpeaks truth, the Chriſtians, by their inconſiderate Zeal, have done worſe than the Infidel Soldiers. For they not daring to tear it in pieces, they caſt Lots for it: But the Chriſtians have divided it in order to adore it. Beſides, what Anſwer will they make to the *Turk*, who laughs at their folly, and pretends it is in his poſſeſſion? But we need not make 'em quarrel with the *Turk*; let them end the debate amongſt themſelves. In the mean while we ſhall be excuſed from believing what is ſaid by the one as well as the other ſide, that we may not favour one party more than the other, without any knowledge of the cauſe. For that would be contrary to all reaſon.,,

Oldoini mentions the following Books of our *Vigerius*: (*l*) *Apologiam contra Piſanum Conciliabulum ſcripſit, & libellum unum decachordum Chriſtianum prænotatum, & alterum de ferro lanceæ, & Chriſti indumentis, eorumque dignitate.* I omit the Liſt (*m*) of Books not Printed.

(*A*) *Was by Nation a Gaul.*] *Gennadius* (*n*) aſſerts his ſtrength, and having acquired more Politeneſs (B) of Style, than Knowledge in the Scripture, he very ill explain'd * one of the Viſions of the Prophet Daniel, and vented ſome other trifles, which placed him in the Catalogue of Hereticks. St. Hierome refuted him †. This is what Gennadius ſaith of him; from whence we may conjecture that he did not altogether approve the Vehemence with which St. Hierome wrote againſt Vigilantius; for one would think, by what St. Hierom (C) ſays of that Prieſt, that he was the moſt accurſed Heretick that ever was. The Proteſtants judge otherwiſe of it, they are perſuaded that Vigilantius very juſtly condemned Vows of Celibacy, the uſe of Torches at the Sepulchers of the Martyrs, the Honour paid to Saints, Prayers for the Dead, and nocturnal devotional

---

* *Taken from the* Athenæum Romanum *of the Jeſuite Auguſtin* Oldoini pag. 481.

(*a*) Herodian. lib. 2. cap. 3. pag. m. 70.

(*b*) Hieronym. epiſt. ad Euſtochium Virginem pag. m. 514.

(*c*) *See* Balzac's *Diſſertations at the end of the* Socrate Chretien p. 63, 64.

(†) *See* la Bruyere's *Characters in the Chapter intitled* de quelques uſages. p. m 599.

(*d*) Naudé, Dialogue de Maſcurat pag. 26, 27. *That Book was written in* 1649.

(*e*) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. cap. 22.

(*f*) Id ib. cap. 23.

(*g*) *See the Article of* Innocent VIII.

(*h*) Thomas Bartholinus, diſſertat. de latere Chriſti pag. [illegible]

(*i*) Calvin, Inventaire des reliques p. m. 29.

(*k*) Idib. pag. [illegible]

(*l*) Auguſt. Oldoinus in Athenæo Romano pag. 481.

(*m*) [illegible] Oldoini ibid.

(*n*) Vigilantius preſbyter natione Gallus. Gennadius de ſcript. Eccleſ. [illegible]

ſerts it in expreſs terms; but he is thought to be miſtaken by ſome who ground their Opinion on St. *Hierome*, who gives *Vigilantius* the Epithete of *Calaguritanus*. (a) *Fuit ipſe natione Hiſpanus, patriâ Calaguritanus, ut idem S. Hieronymus tradit, ex quo Gennadius redarguitur.* But I ſhould rather chuſe to juſtifie *Gennadius* from St. *Hierom's* words; for an Author who mentions ſeveral Monſters, and ſaith particularly that *Gerion* was born in *Spain*, (b) *triformem Geryonem Hiſpaniæ prodiderunt*, and adds, that *Gaul* alone never had any Monſters, and that it always abounded with great and eloquent Men, but that all on a ſudden *Vigilantius* aroſe, and fought againſt the Spirit of our Lord; a Writer, I ſay, who places his Periods in this manner, would he have us believe that this Heretick was born in *Spain*, and not in *Gaul*? It is certain that if a Perſon deſign'd to ſignifie that *Vigilantius* was a *Gaul* and not a *Spaniard*, he would expreſs himſelf like St. *Hierome*. (c) *Cacum deſcribit Virgilius, triformem Geryonem Hiſpaniæ prodiderunt. Sola Gallia monſtra non habuit, ſed viris ſemper fortiſſimis, & eloquentiſſimis abundavit. Exortus eſt ſubito Vigilantius, ſeu verius Dormitantius, qui immundo ſpiritu pugnet contra Chriſti ſpiritum.* Another paſſage of St. *Hierome* more expreſly points out *Vigilantius's* Country, and that ſo exactly, that no room is left to doubt that he makes him a Native of the Country which is at preſent called *Cominge*. (d) *Nimirum reſpondet generi ſuo* (Vigilantius) *ut qui de latronum & convenarum natus eſt ſemine: quos Cn. Pompeius, edomitâ Hiſpaniâ, & ad triumphum redire feſtinans de Pyrenai jugis depoſuit, & in unum oppidum congregavit; unde & Convenarum urbs nomen accepit. Huc uſque latrocinetur contra Eccleſiam Dei, & de Vectonibus, Arrebacis, Celtiberiſque deſcendens incurſet Galliarum Eccleſias, portetque nequaquam vexillum Chriſti, ſed inſigne Diaboli. Fecit hoc idem Pompeius, etiam in orientis partibus; ut Cilicibus & Iſauris piratis, latronibuſque ſuperatis, ſui nominis inter Ciliciam & Iſauriam conderet civitatem. Sed hæc urbs hodie ſervat ſcita majorum, & nullus* IN EA ORTUS *eſt Dormitantius. Galliæ* VERNACULUM HOSTEM *ſuſtinent, & hominem moti capitis, atque Hippocratis vinculis alligandum, ſedentem cernunt in Eccleſia.* But it is then asked why he uſed the Epithete *Calaguritanus*, in ſuch a manner as (e) diſcovers that he took that word in the ſame ſenſe as if he would have expreſs'd *Quintilian's* Country? For an Anſwer to this, I refer you to the Learned Mr. *de Marca*, who, I doubt not has abſolutely removed this Objection in a Diſſertation which I have not read, nor do any otherwiſe know than by the words of the Abbot *de la Roque*: " (f) As it is no diſhonour for a Man to be of a Country which hath produced ill Men, and an Hiſtorian is always obliged to ſpeak truth, Mr. *de Marca*, in a Diſcourſe which he wrote concerning the Country of *Vigilantius*, which this Monſter hath ſcandalized by his Errors, corrects the Blunder which almoſt all Hiſtorians have committed concerning this Heretick, by proving that his Birth-place was not *Calaguris*, a City in *Spain*, but *Calaguri* a Village near the City of St. *Bertrand* in the Dioceſe of *Cominge*. This is what *Baronius* was ignorant of, and which they may certainly correct in *Moreri's* new Dictionary.,, I ſhall paſs over *Hadrian Valeſius's* Obſervations againſt St. *Hierome*. That learned Critick (g) ſhews that this Father utters a Contradiction, ſince the ſituation of the places will not allow that the ſame Perſon ſhould be deſcended from the *Vectones* (h), the *Arebaces*, the *Celtiberi*, and thoſe Robbers whom *Pompey* gathered into a body. Father *Pagi* (i) promiſes to anſwer *Valeſius's* Objections in favour of St. *Hierome*, and ſaith beforehand that inſtead of *Vectonibus*, it ought not to be read (k) *Veronibus*, but *Vettonibus*. This Correction will not remove the difficulties as to the *Arebacis Celtiberiſque*. This is only by the way.

Obſerve that *James Valdes* the Civilian conjectures that the Epithete *Calaguritanus* might be taken from ſome Town in *Gaul*; for he will not allow *Vigilantius* to be a *Spaniard*. *Gallus*, ſaith he (l), *a Gennadio de ſcript. Eccleſ. dicitur, & quamvis Calaguritanus a B. Hieronymo nuncietur in princ. adverſus Vigilantium, & a Baronio t. 5. anno 406. & Pampilonenſem dicat Mariana de reb. Hiſp. libr. 4. c. 20. tamen non Hiſpanum appellant, ſed potius videntur Gallum nunciare, cum tunc monſtra Galliæ naſci hæreticorum dixerint, & potuit eſſe Calaguritanum aliud oppidum Galliæ, vel ibi presbyterum fuiſſe, ut Barcinone, non tamen natum.* In another place he alledges (m) Saint *Hierome* declaring that *Spain* never produced any Heretick beſides *Priſcillian*.

(B) *More politeneſs of Style.*] For ſo with Mr. *du* (n) *Pin*, we may tranſlate the *lingua politus* of *Gennadius*. I obſerve this to the end that we may more clearly ſee the difference betwixt St. *Hierom* and *Gennadius*. The former ſaith that *Vigilantius* wrote very ill: (o) *Miſeruntque libros per fratrem Siſinium quos inter crapulam ſtertens evomuit.* —— *Eſt quidem imperitus & verbis & ſcientia, & ſermone inconditus, ne vera quidem poteſt defendere.* *Gennadius* who knew what Character St. *Hierome* had given him, yet doth not ſcruple to acknowledge the Polite Language of *Vigilantius*. He meant doubtleſs, not that this Heretick ſpoke elegantly, and wrote barbarouſly, but that there appeared a Politeneſs in his Writings. He then judges quite otherwiſe of him than St. *Hierome*, and ought more to be credited; for when an Adverſary refutes a Man with that acrimony which clearly appears in St. *Hierome*, it is hardly poſſible for him to own that he writes well; he chiefly aims to expoſe him to the Readers Contempt.

(C) *One would think by what St.* Hierome *ſays of this Prieſt, that he was the moſt accurſed Heretick*] St. *Hierome* calls him *Samaritan* and *Jew*, a filthy Wretch, whoſe Tongue ought to be cut out, and a furious Monſter that ought to be bound. (p) *Aio, Vigilantium, qui* κατ' ἀντίφρασιν *hoc vocatur nomine, nam Dormitantius rectius diceretur: os fœtidum rurſum aperire, & putorem ſpurciſſimum contra ſanctorum martyrum proferre reliquias; & nos, qui eas ſuſcipimus, appellare cinerarios & idolatras, qui mortuorum hominum oſſa veneremur. O infelicem hominem, & omni lacrymarum fonte plangendum, qui hæc dicens, non ſe intelligat eſſe Samaritanum, & Judæum.* —— (q) *O præcidendam linguam a medicis, immò inſanum curandum caput, ut qui loqui neſcit, diſcat aliquando reticere. Ego vidi hoc aliquando portentum, & teſtimoniis ſcripturarum, quaſi vinculis Hippocratis, volui ligare furioſum: ſed abiit, exceſſit, evaſit, erupit, & inter Hadriæ fluctus, Cottiique regis alpes in nos declamando clamavit. Quidquid enim amens loquitur, vociferatio & clamor eſt appellandus.* He calls *Vigilantius's* words (r) a moſt filthy drunken Vomit: He ſaith in another place, that the Conduct of his Followers is not ſo much their own action, as that of the Devils which dwell in them. (s) *Quales nuper ſub Magiſtro cerebroſi in Gallia pullularunt, qui baſilicas martyrum declinantes, nos qui ibi orationes ex more celebramus, quaſi immundos fugiant. Hæc autem non tam illi faciunt quam habitantes in eis dæmones, fortitudinem & flagella ſancti cineris fugientes.* He ſaith ſo particularly of *Vigilantius*, (t) *Sentio, ſentio, infeliciſſime mortalium, quid doleas, quid timeas. Spi-*

ritus

---

* [illegible] Gennadii de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt. c. 35.

† Taken from Gennadius ibid.

(k) Tis Valeſius's Conjecture is

(l) Jacobus Valdeſius de dignitate Hiſpaniæ c. 9. n. 17. p. m. 204.

(m) Regio enim Hiſpania ut B. Hieronymus c. 17. in Eſaiam inquit, monſtra hæreticorum non generavit & unum partum Priſcilliani ut abortivum & impium pia mater procul à ſe abdicavit, pariterque ablegavit. Id ib. c. 19. n. 72. p. 398.

(n) Du Pin, Biblioth. des auteurs Eccleſ. Tom. 3. p. 158. *Dutch* Edit.

(o) Hieron. adverſ. Vigilant. p. m. 550.

(p) Hieron. epiſt. ad Riparium p. m. 543.

(q) Ibid. pag. 545.

(r) Eructaret immundiſſimam crapulam. *Ib.*

(s) Id. in Iſaiam c. 75. apud Baron. ad ann. 406. n. 43.

(t) Idem. epiſt. adv. Vigilant. p. 558, 559.

devotional Assemblies, &c. Several Sins were committed in those (D) Assemblies, and at last it was thought necessary to do as *Vigilantius* advised, to suppress those Assemblies, and to give another form to that sort of Devotion. The ardour which St. *Hierome* shewed, was perhaps intermixed with some Personal resentment; for *Vigilantius* had traduced him as a favourer of (E) *Origen*, and this was at the instigation of *Ruffinus*. He had discovered several Marks of Esteem ‡ for *Vigilantius*, whom *Paulinus* had recommended to him. This was when *Vigilantius* travelled to *Jerusalem*. An Earthquake which happen'd whilst he was in the Holy Land, so

much

ritus iste immundus, qui hæc te cogit scribere, sæpè hoc vilissimo tortus est pulvere, immo hodieque torquetur: & qui in te plagas dissimulat, in ceteris confitetur. Observe that *Vigilantius*'s Diocesan acquiesced in his Doctrine. Which St. *Hierome* (a) disliked, and would have had this earthen Vessel broken with an Iron rod. If these Invectives are very exorbitant, I don't think that St. *Hierome*'s Description of *Vigilantius*'s Opinions is less so. I believe he was treated with the same injustice as the Protestants are treated. He disapproved the religious Honour paid to Relicks, and therefore he was accused of abhorring the Memory and the dead Bones of the Martyrs, and avoiding their Sepulchers, as places filled with Carrion. But who is ignorant of the difference betwixt hating an Object, and refusing to pay religious Worship to it? I cannot believe that *Vigilantius*'s Opinions concerning Celibacy, were what they are represented. Undoubtedly he contented himself with asserting that Marriage ought not to be forbidden to Ecclesiasticks, and that they ought not to ingage in Vows of Continence. To render this Doctrine odious, it was Publish'd that he condemn'd and detested Celibacy, and look'd on those as incapable of the Priesthood who had no Wife. This false Gloss was yet further improved; it was affirmed that according to *Vigilantius*, incontestable proofs of a consummated and fruitful Marriage, ought to be given to qualify a Person for Ordination, and that no Man ought to present himself to be ordain'd without being attended by a Wife big with Child, or who carried one in her arms. There is no appearance that he either taught or caused to be practised such fooleries as these. What judgment then would you have us form of the sincerity of St. *Hierom*, or of those Accusers who informed him concerning this Heretick? Consider very well the words of that Holy Doctor. (b) *Proh nefas, Episcopos sui sceleris dicitur habere consortes* (Vigilantius); *si tamen Episcopi nominandi sunt, qui non ordinant diaconos, nisi prius uxores duxerint, nulli cælibi credentes pudicitiam, imò ostendentes quàm sanctè vivant, qui male se de omnibus suspicantur. Et nisi prægnantes uxores viderint Clericorum, infantesque de ulnis matrum vagientes. Christi sacramenta non tribuunt.* He reports the same thing (c) at the end of his Book. If these extravagancies had been stretched a little farther, *Vigilantius* would have been accused of a Discipline which revived the *jus trium liberorum* in favour of the Ecclesiasticks, I mean which allowed exemptions and Privileges to the Clergy whose Wives were fruitful. They would have asserted, that the Laws of his Discipline assigned the best Bishopricks and Benefices not to the most Virtuous and Learned, but to those who had most Children. They would have said that it subjected those Clergymen to Canonical Penalties, who could not shew any Heirs of their Body. They had maintain'd at last that even with regard to the Laity, all the antient Rules of Paganism were revived, which annexed a sort of real Damage and Scandal to Celibacy. They had uttered a hundred more extravagancies of this Nature.

(D) *Several Sins were committed in those Assemblies, and at last,* &c.] In those times it was customary to pass whole Nights in the Churches on occasion of the celebration of certain Festivals. The Youth applied these opportunities to amorous ends, and several Women were hereby debauched, which had not been possible if they had staid at home. It is then certain that *Vigilantius* justly condemned those Assemblies, which afforded so many tempting opportunities to sin. See what I have said in the Remark *D*, at the Article *Thesmophoria*. St. *Hierome* doth not deny that these Watchings were attended with several disorders, but he asserts that this ought not to interrupt the frequency of their celebration. He alledges that those who pervert these opportunities to sinful purposes, would, without them find means to defile themselves; that People are more careful to take hold of occasions which very seldom offer themselves; and that the Easter Watchings were not exempt from this Lewdness, and consequently ought to be abolished if his Adversary's Reasons were just. But after all, tho' wicked men abuse good things, it does not follow that the use of them ought to be abolished. His words are. (d) *Error autem & culpa juvenum, vilissimarumque mulierum, qui per noctem sæpè deprehenditur, non est religiosis hominibus imputandus; quia & in vigiliis Paschæ tale quid fieri plerumque convincitur: & tamen paucorum culpa non præjudicat religioni; qui & absque vigiliis possunt errare vel in suis, vel in alienis domibus. Apostolorum fidem Judæ proditio non destruxit. Et nostras ergo vigilias malæ aliorum vigiliæ non destruent: quin potius pudicitiæ vigilare cogantur, qui libidini dormiunt. Quod enim fecisse bonum est, non potest malum esse, si frequenter fiat: aut, si aliqua culpa vitanda est, non ex eo, quod sæpè, sed ex eo, quod fit aliquando, culpabile est. Non vigilemus itaque diebus Paschæ; ne expectata diu adulterorum desideria compleantur; ne occasionem peccandi uxor inveniat, ne maritali non possit recludi clave. Ardentius appetitur, quidquid est rarius.* It would be very easie to evince the Sophisms in every one of St. *Hierom*'s Arguments, but it is sufficient for me that the event refuted him, and justify'd *Vigilantius*; for these nocturnal Assemblies were at last abolished, to put a stop to the Impurities there committed. Remember here the Mandate which the Archbishop of *Fara* Publish'd in 1697, to remedy a like abuse. Let us occasionally observe that the Assemblies of the faithful in the Churches of the Martyrs were exposed to another inconvenience; the Christians brought with them wherewithal to make good cheer, and made themselves drunk. This abuse prevail'd still in *Africa* in St. *Augustin*'s time; but that Custom had been then abolish'd in several places: Men are so corrupt that even the exercise of Devotion it self is perverted to an occasion of Evil.

(E) Vigilantius *had traduced him as a favourer of* Origen, *and that was at the instigation of* Ruffinus.] The Proofs of all this are to be found in Baronius: You will there see (e) that *Ruffinus* being at *Jerusalem*, instigated *Vigilantius* against St. *Hierome*. You will there find that after *Vigilantius*'s departure from *Palestine*, he traduced St. *Hierome* in all places. (f) *Dimisisti Ægyptum & cunctas provincias reliquisti in quibus sectam tuam libera plerique fronte defendunt, & elegisti me ad insectandum qui omnia contra Ecclesiam dogmata reprehendo, & publica voce condemno.* You will there find that this Sect of *Vigilantius* has no relation to the particular Opinions, which he did afterwards Publish in *Gaul*, but to the Calumnies which he dispersed against St. *Hierome*, whom he accused of Origenism, to impute to him an unequal conduct (g), and a way of proceeding very common among Zealots, who condemn in their Neighbour what they are themselves guilty of. You will there besides find that this Holy Father denies that he accused *Vigilantius* of Heresy. (h) *Unde adversus Ruffinum, illum in se concitantem, ipsemet Hieronymus hæc ait:* (1) In Vigilantii nomine quid somnies, nescio. Ubi enim eum scripsi hæretica apud Alexandriam communione maculatum: Da librum, profer epistolam; nusquam omnino reperies; & *inferius*; Ego in Vigilantio tibi respondi. Eadem enim accusabat, quæ tu postea & amicus laudas, & inimicus accusas, *nimirum quod ille diceret Sanctum Hieronymum Origenis errores sectari; nam subdit:* Scio a quo illius contra me rabies concitata sit, novi cuniculos tuos. *Hæc Sanctus Hieronymus. Agebat enim id astutè Ruffinus, ut esset qui Origenis heresis accusaret Hieronymum, qui ipsum Ruffinum & alios omnes Origenistas*

‡ See the last Remark.

(a) Miror sanctum Episcopum, in cujus parochia esse presbyter dicitur, acquiescere furori ejus, & non virgâ Apostolicâ, virgaque ferreâ confringere vas inutile, & tradere in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus fiat. Id. epist. ad *Riparium pag.* 545.

(b) Hieron. advers. Viglant. p. m. 549.

(c) Tota nocte vigilabo, & sociis illius, immò discipulis, vel magistris, qui nisi tumentes uteros viderint feminarum, maritos earum Christi ministerio arbitrantur indignos id ib. pag. 564.

much affrighted him, that he immediately run ſtark naked to a Church (F) for ſhelter. Leaving this Country he took a view of † Egypt, and when he return'd into the Weſt, he ſowed his Opinions amongſt the Gauls. His Sect was of no very long duration; the irruption of the barbarous Nations quaſhed it; the Irruption, I mean which the Barbarians made not long after into that Country, and of which the Errors of this Heretick were the cauſe (G) if we believe the Eccleſiaſtical Annaliſt. I have only two Faults to charge (H) Mr. *Moreri* with.

† Hieron. epiſt. 75.

VILLAMARINI, (*Iſabella*) Wife of the Prince of *Salerno*. See the Remark *B* in the Article *Capucins*.

VILLAREAL (*Emanuel Fernandes*) the Plagiary Author (*A*) of a Book, which procured him a Penſion from Cardinal *Richelieu*, was burnt at *Lisbon* for Judaiſm. He had been Conſul for the *Portugueſe* Nation at *Rouen*; and wrote a Book againſt *Caramuel* whilſt he was in that poſt.

rigeniſtas ejuſdem Origenis errorum inſimularet; ipſumque talionis pœnam ſubire cogeret: ut quem in Origeniſtas ipſe gladium exacuerat, in ſua ſe præcordia convertiſſe non ignoraret. I have cited a Paſſage (*a*) in which St. *Hierome* complains, that *Vigilantius* had traduced him between the Adriatick Sea and the *Alps*. From all which let us conclude that it was poſſible a Perſonal Reſentment might enflame the Zeal which he ſhewed for the Truth.

(*a*) *In the Rem.* C.

(*F*) *He immediately run ſtark naked into a Church for ſhelter.*] St. *Hierome* reproaches him with this Fear, and the diſcovery of his ſhameful parts to the Eyes of the faithful. (*b*) *In hac provincia cum ſubitus terræ motus, noctis medio omnes de ſomno excitaſſet, tu prudentiſſimus & ſapientiſſimus mortalium, nudus orabas, & referebas nobis Adam & Evam de paradiſo. Et illi quidem apertis oculis erubuerunt, nudos ſe eſſe cernentes, & verenda texerunt arborum foliis: tu & tunicâ, & fide nudus, ſubitoque timore perterritus, & aliquid habens nocturnæ crapulæ, ſanctorum oculis obſcœnam partem corporis ingerebas, ut tuam indicares prudentiam.* Obſerve that he continually, as well as here, accuſes him of being a Drunkard.

(*b*) Hieron. adverſ. Vigilant. p.m. 559.

(*G*) *The Errors of this Heretick were the cauſe, if we believe the Eccleſiaſtical Annaliſt.*] I mean *Baronius*. He and an hundred other celebrated Writers have made it a Common place to aſſign Hereſies as the cauſe of the heavy ſtroaks of Divine Juſtice; I mean thoſe ſtroaks which indifferently fall upon the followers of Error, and thoſe who engage againſt it: for Example, the Evils with which the *Gauls* were loaded, gave no more quarter to the Orthodox than to the Diſciples of *Vigilantius*. All Parties pleaſe themſelves with this Common place, without (*c*) remembring that the Pagans made uſe of it againſt the primitive Chriſtians. However we ſhall cite *Baronius*'s words: They inform us that St. *Hierome*'s Books did not ſilence the Followers of *Vigilantius*: It was requiſite that God ſhould make uſe of other means to repreſs this Hereſie. (*d*) *Porrò quod poſthac ſiluerit infamis hæreſis, nec amplius ad multa ſæcula audita fuerit: haud ſcias brevem illam Hieronymi ſcriptionem eſſe veritam, ut caput tollere amplius auſa non fuerit. Non enim ea eſt natura hæreticorum, ut victi cedere ſciant, & dent manus ratione convicti: ſed proſtrati licet, pertinaciori audaciâ ſurgant, reſtituantque acriora certamina. Sed unde accidit ut ſileret? audi:* ( ) Terribilis Deus in conſiliis ſuper filios hominum, *vocavit gentes ab extremis terræ: immiſitque in Gallias, in eamque potiſſimum partem graſſari juſſit, in qua hæreſis nefanda plantata eſt; adeo ut ſub barbarico gladio magis de vita tuenda contendere, quàm de dogmatibus licuerit diſputare. Creduntur autem è barbaris illi eſſe ſublati, quorum nulla umquam fuit poſteà vox audita. Ecce tibi quod ſoleant vehere ſecum, vel poſt ſe ducere hæreſes, clades nimirùm provinciarum; quod multis exemplis ſæpe omnibus ſæculis, & hoc ipſo infelicius contigit demonſtrari.* Could not *Vigilantius*'s Friends aſſert, that the *Gauls* were thus afflicted, becauſe they did not embrace the Truths which he declared to them? What Anſwer could they make to them? They would be oblig'd to come to this Theſis, *I am in the right, and you are miſtaken*. But doth not every one make uſe of this Language? Has not one as much right as another to beg the Queſtion, if ſuch a thing be once allowed? Nothing is then more frivolous than *Baronius*'s Reflections.

(*c*) *See the Article* Vergerius *Remark* I.

(*d*) Baronius ubi ſupra n. 52. p. m. 310.

(1) *Pſalm.* 65.

(*H*) *Only two Faults to charge Mr.* Moreri *with.*] The 1ſt is, that he ſaith that St. *Paulinus entertained* Vigilantius *when Sick at* Barcelona. He here miſtakes the place, for St. *Paulinus*'s words as cited by *Baronius* are: (*e*) *Vigilantius quoque noſter in Campania, & antequam ad nos veniret, & poſtquam pervenit vi febrium laboravit, & ægritudini noſtræ qui & ipſe ſociale membrum erat, (f) ſalutivo dolore compaſſus eſt.* We don't find there, that St. *Paulinus* entertained *Vigilantius*; We are only informed that they were both ſick at the ſame time. I am nevertheleſs willing to believe that St. *Paulinus* offered the other the civility of his Houſe. His goodneſs, civility and piety perſuade me to it, beſides which he had a great eſteem for *Vigilantius*, and had (*g*) been very intimate with him at *Barcelona*. He recommended him to St. *Jerom*; and his Letter proved effectual, as appears by theſe words of the Anſwer, (*h*) *S. Vigilantium Presbyterum quâ aviditate ſuſceperim, melius eſt ut ipſius verbis quam meis diſcas literis.* St. *Jerom* credited the Teſtimonial in favour of *Vigilantius*, contained in the Letter of recommendation. But ſome time after writing againſt him, he ſaid that he repented the credit he had given to *Paulinus*'s Teſtimonial. We ſhall cite this Paſſage ſomewhat at length: (*i*) *Credidi ſancti presbyteri Paulini Epiſtolis, & illius ſuper nomine tuo non putavi errare judicium. Et licet ſtatim accepta epiſtola, ἀσυνάρτητον ſermonem tuum intelligerem: tamen ruſticitatem & ſimplicitatem magis in te arbitrabar, quam vecordiam. Nec reprehendi ſanctum virum: maluit enim apud me diſſimulare quod noverat, quam portitorem clientulum ſuis litteris accuſare. Sed memetipſum arguo, qui alterius potiùs acquievi quam meo judicio; & oculis aliud cernentibus, aliud ſchedulæ credidi, quam videbam.* *Moreri*'s 2d Fault is ſaying that *Vigilantius called the Miracles wrought at the Tombs of the holy Martyrs, Illuſions.* This is to calumniate *Vigilantius*, and I admire that *Baronius* hath advanced ſuch a Calumny, ſince he needed only to conſider the words of St. *Jerom*, which he cites, to be informed that it was falſe. (*k*) *Idem nebulo reſpuens ſanctorum reliquias addebat illud horrendum dictu ſigna apud eas fieri ſolita, dæmonum eſſe præſtigias.* This is *Baronius*'s enormous Accuſation levelled at this Heretick, and ſee how he proves it, (*l*) *niſi forte in morem Gentilium, impiorumque Porphyrii & Eunomii has præſtigias dæmonum eſſe confingas.* It is clear that theſe words of St. *Jerom* teſtifie that *Vigilantius* did not call the Miracles wrought at the Tombs of the Martyrs, Diabolical Deluſions. St. *Jerom* had not talked as he did, if he had found either in the Book of his Adverſary, or in the declaratory Letters of his Opinions, what *Baronius* imputes to this pretended Hereſiarch. He had then refuted it as a poſitive Opinion of *Vigilantius*, and not as a ſubterfuge to which he ſuppoſed he might have recourſe. When one anticipates an Objection, when one ſpeaks thus to one's Adverſary, *perhaps you will alledge ſuch a thing, how do I know that you will not affirm as the Heathens did, &c.* it is certain that the Adverſary hath ſaid no ſuch thing. Obſerve, that *Baronius*'s Calumny is to be found in many Authors. *Lindanus* had already advanced it. I cite him to ſhew his want of judgment. (*m*) *Porphyrius, Eunomius, Euſtathius, Vigilantius aliique Hagiomaſtiges ſanctorum miracula ajebant eſſe dæmonum præſtigias.* *Prateolus* adopts (*n*) this whole Paſſage, as doth the Jeſuite *Gaultier* (*o*) under the Shelter of *Prateolus*. But what more ſurprizes me is, to ſee that Mr. *Godeau* (*p*) has aſſerted this Calumny. Mr. *Moreri* took it from him.

(*e*) Paulinus epiſt. 1. ad Severum apud Baron. ubi ſupra n. 42. pag. 324.

(*f*) *In ſome Manuſcripts 'tis* fetido.

(*g*) Baronius ibid.

(*h*) *Hieronym.* epiſt. 13. apud Baron. ib.

(*i*) Idem. epiſt. 75. apud eumd. Baroniumib. n. 41. pag. 324, 325.

(*k*) Baronius ibid. 50. pag. 329.

(*l*) Hieron. adverſ. Vigilant. apud Baron. ibid.

(*m*) Lindanus in Dubitantii dialogo 2. p.m. 207.

(*n*) Prateolus in elencho hæreſ. pag. m. 512.

(*o*) In tabula Chronograph. p. m. 372.

(*p*) Godeau Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe ad ann 406.

(*A*) *The Plagiary Author—— was burnt.*] All which particulars I learn from Mr. *le Laboureur*: He relates them immediately after an Obſervation which he had made againſt the Genealogiſts, who Publiſhed, that Cardinal *Richelieu* was deſcended from the Marriage of *Guyonne de Laval* with *Francis du Pleſſis*. He proves it a Falſity, and *conſequently*, adds he, (*q*) *the whole Book ought to be ſuppreſſed, which was written in* Spaniſh *by a Portugueſe named* Ville-Real, *afterwards burnt for Judaiſm at* Lisbon; *a famous*

(*q*) Le Laboureur, Addit. *to* Caſtelnau's *Memoirs*, tom. 2. p. 303.

VILLAVICENTIUS (*Lawrence*) a Religious of the Order of Saint *Auguſtin*, and Preacher to *Philip* the II. King of *Spain*, was born at *Xerez* in *Andaluſia*. He continued a long time in the Low Countries, and took his Degree of Doctor of Divinity at *Louvain*, before he was call'd to the Court, in order to be Preacher to the King of *Spain* †. In 1561 he made his laſt Viſit in the Province of the Lower *Germany*, of which he was Vicar General *. We have already || ſpoken of ſome of his Writings, which coſt him only the trouble of cutting off from the Works of other Authors, what did not favour enough of Catholiciſm. We are not certain that he had a Share even in that manner, in all the other Works attributed to him. He flouriſhed β 'till 1581.

VILLEGAIGNON (*Nicolas Durand de*) a Knight of *Malta*, a γ Native of *Provins* in *Brie*, ſerved a long ſpace of time in the Gallies, and was in ſeveral Naval Expeditions, ſo that having beſides (*A*) ſome Learning, he render'd himſelf conſiderable as a Perſon of Merit, and was δ promoted to the Vice-Admiralty of *Bretagne*, in the Reign of *Henry* II. He quarrelled with the Governour of the Caſtle of *Breſt*, and fearing the conſequences † of this difference, he thought of an Enterprize, which frequently ſerves for an Epiſode in Controverſial Books, and which is mention'd by (*B*) Mr. *Maimbourg*. He reſolved to eſtabliſh a Colony in *Braſil*, and knowing

† Andr. Schottus, Biblioth. Hiſpan. pag. 265.
* Elſſius Encomiaſtic. Auguſtin. pag. 428.
|| In the Remark C. of the Article Hyperius.
β Id. ib.
γ Theod. Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. Book 2. pag. 158.
δ Id. ib.
† Id. ib.

Plagiary, who copied from du Cheſne, *in order to make Cardinal* Richelieu *deſcend by the Alliance of* Laval, *from the Kings of* Caſtile *and* Portugal, *for which ſervice he enjoyed a good Penſion.* I wonder that *Don Nicolas Antonius* ſaith nothing concerning the Tragical death of this Author; he (*b*) contents himſelf with giving the Titles of the two Pieces mentioned in the Text of this Article, and obſerves that they were written whilſt the Author was Conſul for the *Portugueſe* Merchants at *Rouen*. The firſt of theſe Books is entitl'd, (*c*) *El Politico Chriſtiano, ò diſcurſo Politico de la Vida y acciones del Cardinal de Richelieu*: And the other, (*d*) *Anticaramuel, ò defenſa del manifeſto del Reino de* Portugal. See the *Anti* (*e*) of Mr. *Baillet*.

(*A*) *Having beſides ſome Learning.* "(*f*) Which is "very rare in Perſons of his Condition, he was very "well verſed in Polite Literature, as appears by his "beautiful Latin Deſcription of the unfortunate "*Algerine* Expedition, in which he was wounded, "in the Service of *Charles* V. who was then in Peace "with *France*." Mr. *Maimbourg* adds in the Margin, that this Deſcription is inſerted in the 2d. *Tome* of the Hiſtorical Pieces which *Schardius* hath collected. He might have told us that it was Printed alone (*g*) at *Straſburg* in 1542, in 8vo. His Treatiſe *de Bello Melitenſi & ejus eventu Francis impoſito*, was Printed at *Paris* by *Robert Stephens* in 1553, in Quarto. *La Croix du Maine* (*h*) ſaith that the ſame Piece was Printed in *French*, in the ſame Place and Year, by *Charles Stephens*. I ſhall ſay ſomething below concerning *Villegaignon*'s Controverſial Works. *John de Leri* tells us: (*i*) That he never heard a Man talk better concerning Religion, and a Chriſtian Reformation than he.

(*B*) *Which is mention'd by Mr.* Maimbourg.] What he ſays of it in the ſecond Book of his Hiſtory of *Calviniſm*, hath ſerved as an Original to the Continuator of *Moreri*. I ſhould then have a very particular right to examin it, but the Continuator hath taken nothing which I deſire to contradict. I ſhall only obſerve, 1. That the *Dutch* Editions have falſly Changed the Date of 1557. into 1558. concerning the arrival of the *Geneveſe* at the Iſle of *Coligni*. 2. That Mr. *Moreri* had no reaſon to ſay that *Villegaignon* did not return into the Romiſh Communion till after he came back into *France*. But to come to Mr. *Maimbourg*: His firſt Lie is ſaying (*k*) *That there was alſo a Diviſion betwixt the Proteſtants, and even amongſt the Miniſters themſelves; for,* adds he, *ſome would have the Lord's Supper adminiſtred according to the* Roman *manner, as Jeſus Chriſt had inſtituted it, with unleavened Bread; and others affirmed that it ought to be celebrated in the* Greek *manner with leavened Bread. The former would retain the Ceremonies of the Catholick Church, and the other rejected them as Superſtitious.* He cites the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches, and that alone confounds him; for we find there that it was *Villegaignon* and a Student of *Sorbonne* only who raiſed the Diſpute. "(*l*) A Perſon named *John Cointat*, a Student of *Sorbonne*, ſecretly aſpiring after I know not what Epiſcopal Dignity as fantaſtical as *Villegaignon*'s Kingdom, "came on the day appointed for the celebration of "the Lord's Supper, asked where the ſacerdotal Habits were, and began to diſpute concerning unleavened Bread, which he ſaid was neceſſary, as well "as to mix Water with the Wine, and other ſuch "like Objections he raiſed. Nevertheleſs the "Sacrament was adminiſtred according to the plain "Ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt, and as it is in the Reformed Churches of *France*: But the difference ſtill "grew, and came to ſuch a pitch that *Richer* celebrating the Sacrament of Baptiſm and Condemning "the additional Superſtitions, *Villegaignon* aloud "gave the lye to the Miniſter, proteſting that he "would come no more to his Sermons, nor adhere "to the Calviniſtical Sect, as he call'd it." The ſecond Falſity is ſaying that (*m*) the Miniſter *Richer* aſſerted *againſt the Calviniſts, that* JESUS CHRIST *ought not to be either adored or invoked, and that the Lord's Supper or Euchariſt, in what manner ſoever we there receive the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, doth not at all conduce to the good of the Communicants.* I have elſewhere mention'd (*n*) the particular Opinions imputed to this Miniſter. It is eaſie to perceive that he only taught that JESUS CHRIST's Humanity, being a Creature, ought neither to be adored nor invoked; but this doth not ſignifie that JESUS CHRIST (*o*) both God and Man, ought not to be adored, and invoked. If *Peter Richer* had embraced the Opinions which Mr. *Maimbourg* charges on him, *Calvin* had cauſed him to be ignominiouſly depoſed: Nor am I ſure that he would not have been forced to undergo a more rigorous puniſhment; for he would have been looked on as a wretched *Anti-Trinitarian*; but we know he was reſpected as a worthy Miniſter of the Goſpel after (*p*) his return from *Braſil*. Obſerve that *Gaultier* the Jeſuit doth not charge him with this monſtrous Opinion concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which *Maimbourg* ſpeaks of. The 3d. Falſity is his ſaying (*q*) *that continuing to preach his Blaſphemies Villegaignon* gave him the Lye. The Author whom he (*r*) cites, ſaith expreſly that the Lye which was given, only regarded the Miniſters condemnation of thoſe Superſtitions which the Papiſts have (*s*) added to Baptiſm.

The Miniſter who anſwered *Maimbourg*, ſhould have cenſured this part of his Hiſtory of *Calviniſm* thus; but inſtead of handling him in this manner, he hath amuſed himſelf with obſerving, 1. That (*t*) Admiral *de Coligni* caſt his Eyes on *Villegaignon* in order to ſend him to prepare a retreat in *America* for the Proteſtants. 2. That *Villegaignon* promiſed to grant them liberty of Conſcience. 3. That after having kept his Word for ſome time, *he hanged, drowned, and threw into the Sea all thoſe who would not follow his Apoſtacy.* 4. *That he confined others to a moving Priſon, which was an old rotten Ship, without Proviſions and Arms, to which he ſent as many of the Reformed as he could ſtow there.* The firſt of theſe four things is contradicted by *Beza*, and *John de Leri*, who aſſure us that *Villegaignon* was the firſt that made this Overture to the Admiral. They alſo affirm that he promiſed to endeavour, to the utmoſt of his power, the advancement of the Kingdom of God in that Country, and that he would publickly declare himſelf a good Proteſtant. This confutes the ſecond particular, according to which *Villegaignon* is a Catholick who promiſes to tolerate the Proteſtants. The Third is a Lye, which as juſtly at leaſt deſerves to be condemned as thoſe of *Maimbourg*; for it appears by *John de Leri*'s Relation, 1. That *Villegaignon* puniſhed with Death only (*u*) three Proteſtants, who return'd into his Iſland after the departure of the *Genevois*. 2. That he (*x*) neither durſt nor could hinder the Miniſters from preaching nor uſe any Authority (*y*) with reſpect to the *Genevois*. 3. That if he was cruel or barbarous, it was either

(*b*) Nicol. Antonius, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſp. tom. 1. pag. 267.
(*c*) *It was tranſlated into French and Printed at Paris in* 1643. in 4. Id. ib.
(*d*) *It was Printed at* Paris in 1643. Id. ibid.
(*e*) *In the* 2d tome pag. 105.
(*f*) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſme B. 2. p. 100. *Dutch Edit.*
(*g*) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franc. pag. 909.
(*h*) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franc. pag. 342.
(*i*) Jean de Leri, Hiſt. d'un voiage fait au Breſil ch. 6. pag. m. 58.
(*k*) Maim. ubi ſupra pag. 103.
(*l*) Beza, Hiſt. eccleſ. B. 2. pag. 160.
(*m*) Maim. ibid.
(*n*) *In the* Remark C. *of the Article* Richer.
(*o*) *See the Paſſage which I have produced out of* Mr. Saurin *in the* Remark C. *of the Article* Richer.
(*p*) *See the* Remark A *of that Article.*
(*q*) Maim. ubi ſupra pag. 104.
(*r*) Beza ubi ſupra.
(*s*) *That is, their mixing Salt and Oil with Water.* See John de Leri ubi ſupra pag. 73.
(*t*) Jurieu, Apolog. pour la Reformat. tom. 1. p. 552.
(*u*) See the Remark E.
(*x*) Leri, ubi ſupra pag. 82.
(*y*) See the Remark

knowing that Admiral *de Colligni* favoured the Reformed Religion, he gave him to underſtand that his Deſign was to advance the Kingdom of God in that Country, and procure a Refuge for the Faithful who were perſecuted in *France*. The Admiral with his accuſtomed Prudence concealed this excellent Motive from *Henry* II. and only repreſenting this Enterprize on the ſide of the Advantages it might bring to this Realm, obtained two large Ships well equipped for *Villegaignon*, beſides the Sum of ten Thouſand Livres †. This Knight embarked α the 15th of *July* 1555, and in *November* following arrived β at the Mouth of the River *Ganabara*, in the 23d Degree of *South* Latitude. He endeavoured to Plant his Colony in the firm Land, γ but ſeveral Reaſons engaged him to retire into an Iſle which he called *A Colligni* in honour of the Admiral. He appear'd extraordinary Zealous δ for the Reformed Religion, for moſt of thoſe who followed him were Proteſtants, who made this Voyage on no other account than the hopes which he had given them of carrying on the Work of God, and procuring for themſelves that Liberty of Conſcience which *Henry* II. deprived them of. He wrote to ζ the Church of *Geneva* by the returning Ships, to deſire ſome Miniſters and other Perſons, who might ſucceſsfully labour in the Inſtruction of the Savages. His Letter being read, η they firſt of all *gave thanks to God for the amplification of Chriſt's Kingdom in ſuch a diſtant Country*, and afterwards choſe two Miniſters, *Peter Richier*, and *William Chartier*, who with ſome other Perſons Proper for his Intentions were ſent to him. They θ departed from *Geneva* the 10th of *September* 1556, and embarked at *Honfleur* ι the 19th of *November* of the ſame Year, and κ Landed in the Iſland of *Colligni* the 10th of *March* 1657. *Richier* preached the ſame Day, and *Villegaignon* heard him λ ſhewing ſome Marks of an extraordinary Zeal. Some days after, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated, and he was obſerved to Communicate very devoutly, after he had recited two long μ Prayers, ſo fervent that no Miniſter could have dictated better. It was however perceiv'd that all this was but appearance, and that he only deſir'd to act the Controverſiſt; for he and one *Conta* who had ſtudied in the *Sorbonne*, fell a diſputing concerning the Real Preſence. They maintain'd ν that though Tranſubſtantiation and Conſubſtantiation were abſurd Doctrines, it was nevertheleſs true, that the Body of JESUS CHRIST was included in the Signs of the Euchariſt. It was agreed ξ that this Diſpute ſhould be referred to the Deciſion of the *German* and *French* Churches, and that *Chartier* the Miniſter ſhould be ſent into *Europe* to conſult them. *Villegaignon* engaged to ſubmit to this Deciſion, and (C) particularly to the Opinion of ο *John Calvin*, for whom he pretended a great reſpect. He contrived * new Cavils, when the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament came on the ſecond time, and at the Expiration of ſome Days, publickly declared that he had changed his Opinion, and without expecting the Anſwer *which he had ſent* Chartier *the Miniſter to* France *in queſt of, he declared that* Calvin *was a wicked Heretick* ‖. From that time † they gave the Sacrament by Night unknown to him, and ſome told him that they would no longer depend on him. They were thoſe who followed the two Miniſters of *Geneva*. He was not ſtrong enough to force them to obey his Orders, and therefore contented himſelf

‡ Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

α Id. ib. [illegible]

β [illegible]

γ Id. ib. [illegible]

δ Id. ib. [illegible]

ζ Id. ib. [illegible]

η [illegible]

δ Leri, ubi ſupra, chap. 7. p. 83.

ε Leri ib. ch. 6. & ſeq.

ζ Id. ib. pag. 4.

η Ibid. pag. 5.

θ Ibid. pag. 7.

ι Ibid. pag. 8.

κ Ibid. chap. 6. p. 55.

λ See the Article Richer.

μ You'll find 'em at length in

ξ Leri, pag 69. & ſeq.

ο Id. ib. pag. 69.

§ Beza ubi ſupra pag. 160.

ο Leri ubi ſupra pag. 68.

* Id. ib. pag. 71.

‖ Id. ib. p. 76.

† Ibid. pag. 82.

(a) either towards the Savages or his Domeſticks, or thoſe who violated his Laws; Religion had no hand in this. The 4th is no leſs falſe than the precedent, ſince *John de Leri* averrs, (b) that he and the others who returned into *France* in this old Ship, treated with the (c) Maſter thereof for the expences of their Paſſage, without *Villegaignon*'s interpoſing in the leaſt, and that when they were out of his Iſland and Juriſdiction. Compare with this the Remark *D* towards the end. Beſides, this Adverſary of *Maimbourg* hath ill gloſſed this Paſſage: *He eaſily rid himſelf of all the Proteſtants, who would not follow his Example.* This is plainly enough to confeſs, ſaith he, that he was their cruel Executioner. But we ſhall ſee hereafter that (d) *John de Leri* acknowledges, that during the time the *Genevois* ſtaid in the Iſle of *Coligny*, no *French* Man was put to death, and that after their departure, *Villegaignon* cauſed only three (e) Proteſtants to be put to death. Theſe were part of thoſe five, who after they had Embarked with *Richer*, *John de Leri*, &c. choſe rather to return to *Braſil* than continue their Voyage. But ſince *Villegaignon* ſpared the Lives of the two others, it ſeems probable either that theſe three did not ſuffer Death barely for their Religion, or that the remaining two apoſtatized, which no Author that I know of has mention'd. No Body can ſay that I ſet up for a Defender of *Villegaignon*; have not I related whatever *John de Leri* hath ſaid againſt him? But the Laws of Hiſtory will by no means ſuffer me to be ſilent concerning Falſities Publiſhed againſt any perſon whatſoever.

Farther, if the Subject were not too ſerious and Melancholy, could one read without Laughing, that a Man cauſed ALL thoſe to be put to death who would not follow the Example of his Apoſtacy, and put the reſt on board of a Veſſel? Who ſays all, excepts no body. To make ſenſe of theſe words, the reſt ſhould have apoſtatized as well as he, than which nothing is more falſe; as the ſequel of this Author's Diſcourſe ſufficiently proves. We need ſay no more of this Author than that he wrote with a great deal of precipitancy, and without knowing what he ſaid the greateſt part of the time.

(C) *Particularly to the Opinion of* John Calvin, *for whom he pretended a great reſpect.*] *Calvin* wrote a Letter to him by the two Miniſters who were ſent to him. *Villegaignon* anſwered him in Latin, (f) *and not only informed him at large of his condition in general, but particularly wrote to him with his own hand of what follows.* "I add the advice which you "have given me by your Letters, uſing my utmoſt en"deavours not to depart from it in the leaſt. For "indeed I am fully perſuaded, that no way can be "more holy, juſt and perfect. Wherefore we have cau"ſed your Letters to be read in the Aſſembly of our "Council, and after that Regiſtred, in order that "if we ſhould ever turn out of the right way, we may "be recalled by the reading of them, and redreſs that "Error." *John de Leri* adds: (g) *Nicolas Carmeau who was the Bearer of theſe Letters* ——— *taking leave of us told me, that* Villegagnon *had commanded him to ſay by word of Mouth to* Calvin, *that he begged of him to believe that to perpetuate the Memory of the Counſel he had given him, he would cauſe it to be engraven on Copper.* I have frequently heard him, ſays *John de Leri*, "(h) reiterate the following Expreſſion: Mr. *Calvin* is "one of the moſt Learned Men ſince the time of the "Apoſtles; nor have I read any Doctor, who in my Opi"nion, hath more purely explain'd the Holy Scrip"ture." *Theodorus Beza* (i) *tells us that* Villegaignon *cauſed thoſe Letters which came from* Geneva *to be Regiſter'd in the Rolls of his Imaginary Realm.* He is miſtaken in the Date of *Villegaignon*'s Anſwer, which he

(a) Leri ib. p. 77. & ſeq. item p. 85.

(b) Id. ib. chap. 6. pag. 84. & ch. 21. pag. 339.

(c) He was not a Native of Bretagne, as Beza ſays ubi ſupra pag. 160. he was born at Havre de Grace.

(d) In the Remark H. at the end.

(e) See the Remark E.

(f) Leri ubi ſupra chap. 6. pag. 68.

(g) Id. ib. pag. 69.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 68.

(i) Beza ubi ſupra pag. 159.

himſelf with Commanding them to leave his Iſland. They could with Impunity have diſobeyed (D) him, but they thought it more proper to return. And † accordingly they imbarked the 4th of January 1558, and arrived at Port de Blavet the 26 of May * following. The Horrible Miſery and ſcarcity of Proviſions which they endured during this Voyage is deſcribed by *John de Leri*, who, being one of them, publiſhed a Relation of it. *Villegaignon*, who as ſome Writers ſay, (E) was the cauſe of this Famine, was Guilty of a much more Villanous deſign againſt them, which they happily eſcaped. He alſo afterwards returned into *France*, without taking any care ‖ of his Fort *de Colligni*, which the *Portugueze* ſeized, and tranſported the Artillery to *Lisbon*. At his return he engaged in a vehement Paper War againſt the (F) Proteſtants. They alſo on the other ſide wrote againſt him in ſuch a manner as did not much turn to his Advantage. He dyed ‡ *in a Malteſe Commandery near St. John de Nemours, and managed his Affairs ſo ill, as well during his ſickneſs as before, and was ſo ſet againſt his Relations*, that they reaped no Advantage from his Eſtate, neither in his life nor after his Death. Some of his Adverſaries

he fixes on the 14th of *February* 1557, inſtead of the (c) laſt of *March*; and ſince he had juſt told us, that the *Genevois* arrived the 7th of *March* 1557, it was eaſy for him to ſee that the Anſwer to the Letters which they brought with them could not be dated the laſt of *February* 1557. I only obſerve this in order to diſcover the Errors and Confuſions into which the greateſt Authors and the beſt Correctors ſometimes fall. Thoſe of the lower Rank are not ſo ſubject to them; nevertheleſs I am very much afraid that ſome of them will be found in this Dictionary.

(D) They could with Impunity have diſobeyed him but they thought it more proper to return.] The *Genevois* having ſignifyed to him that (*) ſince he rejected the Goſpel, *they were not willing to continue any longer in his Service, he cauſed the two Goblets of Meal of Roots*, which was dayly diſtributed to them, to be withheld. *They were very glad of this refuſal, becauſe it intirely rid them of any Subjection to him. If he had been ſtrongeſt, and if part of his People, and even ſome of the chief, had not taken their part*, He had endeavoured without Doubt to ſubdue them by force. He deſigned one day to put *John de Leri* and another in Irons, under pretence that, notwithſtanding his order, they went out of the Iſland without his leave. He pretended to be Ignorant that his Lieutenant had permitted this Voyage. (a) *They plainly declared that they would not ſuffer it, after which he grew milder.* The chief of their Reaſons was *that they had made known to him, that ſince he had broken his promiſe of maintaining the Exerciſe of the Evangelical Religion, they could no longer depend on him* ——— *The chief of his People being of our Religion*, ſaith John de Leri (b), *and conſequently diſſatisfied with him on account of his Apoſtacy; if we had not been apprehenſive that the Admiral, who under the King's Authority (as I ſaid in the beginning) had ſent him, and was as yet ignorant of his Carriage, might have taken it ill, ſome of us would very fain have thrown him into the Sea, that his Fleſh and brawny Shoulders might have ſerved as Food for the Fiſh.* (c) About the end of *October*, he told them that he would no longer bear with them, and commanded them to depart his Iſland. *It is indeed true*, adds John de Leri (d), *That if we had pleaſed we were able to have driven him out our ſelves: But as well to deprive him of any juſt reaſon of Complaint againſt us, as becauſe* France *and other Nations, knowing that we came hither only to enjoy the free uſe of the Goſpel, we would not caſt any Scandal upon it, we choſe rather to Obey* Villegaignon, *and without any farther Conteſt quit the Place to him.*

From all which we may conclude, that a certain Author whom I have already Cenſured, was not very well informed, when he tells us that *Villegaignon* (e) *ſhut them up in a floating Priſon, and that they preferred Embarking in a Leaky Veſſel on the moſt Treacherous of the four Elements, to ſtaying any longer expoſed to the Fury of this Mercileſs Tyger, who was more faithleſs than the Sea.*

(E) Villegaignon, *who as ſome Writers ſay, was the cauſe of this Famine, was guilty of a much more Villanous deſign againſt them.*] *Theodorus Beza* (f) aſſures us that he ſo managed it, that the Maſter of the Veſſel *had not one fourth part of the Proviſions neceſſary for his Voyage, hoping by this means that they would Die of Hunger and other Miſeries, before they arrived at their intended Port.* Mr. *Jurieu* avers (g) the ſame thing, but *John de Leri* ſaith nothing of it: And he certainly was as well acquainted with this Affair as any Perſon, and much better than any other not concerned in it, and he was not likely to ſpare *Villegaignon*. As for the other Perfidiouſneſs, let us ſee how he relates it: "(h) *Villegaignon* not only ſent us our Licenſe to depart, Signed by himſelf; but alſo wrote to the Maſter of the Ship, to Advertiſe him that he ſhould make no difficulty of carrying us on his Account: For, ſaid he, (fraudently) as I was very glad of their Arrival, hoping to have met with what I aimed at; ſo ſince we cannot agree together, I am content that they return. So that under this fair pretext he had contrived a moſt Villanous Piece of Treachery; for having given the Maſter of the Veſſel a little Cheſt, covered with oiled Cloth in the Sea faſhion, and filled with Letters to ſeveral Perſons, he had amongſt them put in a formal Proceſs or Accuſation againſt us, recommended to the firſt Judge to whoſe Hands it ſhould come in *France*, with direction to ſtop and burn us as Hereticks, which he ſaid we were." The Divine Providence turned this infamous Treachery to the advantage of thoſe good Men: For their Leader (i) *being acquainted with ſeveral of the Juſtitiary Officers of* Bretagne, *who were favourably enclined to the* Religion *which we profeſſed, gave them the Cheſt which contained the Letters and Accuſation, who after they ſaw the Contents of it were ſo far from treating us according to* Villegaignon's *deſire, that on the contrary they entertained us as well as they poſſibly could, and kindly offered to ſupply the wants of thoſe of our Company who were Neceſſitous, and lent Money to our Conductor, and ſeveral others.* Here I ought to take notice of the three Proteſtant Martyrs whom *Villegaignon* put to Death. Five of the *Genevois* after the firſt danger of Shipwrack (k) choſe rather to return to *Braſil* in a Bark which was given them, than to ſtay in the Veſſel. With a great deal of difficulty they regained the Coaſt of *America*, and *Villegaignon* cauſed three of them to be Drowned on account of their Religion. Some very creditable Eye-witneſſes of this Fact, (l) put the Confeſſion of theſe Martyrs, and the whole Proceedings of *Villegaignon* in Writing, which *John de Leri* (m) having received the ſame Year 1558, ſent to *John Creſpin* a Printer, who inſerted it in his fifth Book of Martyrs.

(F) Paper War ——— *againſt the Proteſtants. They alſo wrote againſt him.*] Of which *Du Verdier Vau-Privas* gives me the following Catalogue: (n) *An Anſwer to the Remonſtrances made to the Queen Mother, Printed at* Paris *in the Year* 1561, *in* 4°. *The controverted Propoſitions betwixt the Chevalier* de Villegaignon, *and* John Calvin, *concerning the Truth of the Holy Euchariſt*, Paris 1562. *in* 4°. *The Chevalier* de Villegaignon's *Anſwer to* John Calvin's *Reſolution concerning the Sacraments.* Paris 1562. *An Anſwer to the Libels and publick Calumnies againſt him, firſt Printed*: At Paris, and afterwards at *Lyons* in the Year 1561. *De Cœna controverſia Phil. Melancbth. judicio*: at Paris 1561. *in* 4°. *Liber ad articulos Calvinianos*: at Venice 1565. *De conſecratione myſtici ſacramenti, & duplici Chriſti oblatione adverſus Vannium Lutherologiæ profeſſorem: De Judaici paſchatis implemento adverſus Calvinologos: De poculo ſanguinis Chriſti, & introitu in ſancta* *ſanctorum*

† Leri, [illegible]

* Idem, chap. 22. pag. 377.

‖ [illegible]

‡ Leri ubi ſupra pag. [illegible]

(c) Leri ubi ſupra pag. 57.

* Ibid. pag. 80.

(a) Ibid. pag. 81.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 82.

(c) Ibid. pag. 83.

(d) Ibid. pag. 84.

(e) Jurieu ubi ſupra pa. 553.

(f) Beza ubi ſupra pag. 160.

(g) Jurieu ibid.

(h) Leri chap. [illegible] pag. [illegible]

(i) Idem chap. 22. pag. 377.

(k) Idem chap. 21. pag. 346.

(l) Idem chap. 22. pag. 379.

(m) Ibid. pag. 380. See alſo Beza ubi ſupra pag. 161.

(n) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franc. pag. [illegible]

Adverſaries have owned (*G*) that he did not debauch with any of the Female Savages of *America*: An Elogy which ſeveral Governors in that Country have no pretence to. I ſhall obſerve ſome faults in (*H*) *Thevet*.

VILLENA

fuſilorum adverſus Regem; at Paris 1563. *His Adverſaries of the Reformed Religion*, continues *du Verdier*, *wrote Defamatory Libels againſt him*, *of which were La ſuffiſance de Maiſtre Colas Durant, Alias Eſpouſette de ſes Armoiries*, *and ſeveral others*. See the Article *Richer*.

I have ſeen only three of his Books, viz. *Ad articulos Calvinianæ, de ſacramento Euchariſtiæ, traditionis ab ejus Miniſtris in Francia Antarctica evulgata Reſponſiones, per Nicolaum Villegagnonem Equitem Rhodium, ad Eccleſiam Chriſtianam*: Printed at *Paris* by *Andrew Wechel*, 1560. in 4°. *De Cœna controverſiæ Philippi Melanchthonis judicia*: Printed at *Paris* by the ſame *Wechel*, 1561 in 4°. *The Chevalier de* Villegaignon's *Paraphraſe on Mr.* Calvin's *Reſolution concerning the Sacraments*: Printed at *Paris* by *Wechel*, in 1561. in 4°. All theſe three Books are extraordinary well Printed.

(*G*) *That he did not Debauch with any of the Female Savages.*] "(*a*) Not to conceal any more what redounds to his Praiſe than what tends to his Diſcredit, I ſhall by the way inform you that certain *Normans* who eſcaped Shipwrack, long before he came into that Country, living very Impiouſly, and committing all manner of Lewdneſs with the Female Savages, (by whom I knew ſome had Children four or five Years old,) in order to ſuppreſs this Abuſe and prevent it for the Future, *Villegaignon*, with advice of his Council, prohibited any profeſſed Chriſtians Habitation with the Female Savages on pain of Death. But if any of them were Converted and Baptized, the Marrying of them was hereby freely permitted.——— (*b*) As this Law was doubly founded on the word of God, it was alſo ſo well obſerved, that *Villegaignon*'s People and ours religiouſly and ſtrictly abſtained from any ſuch Pollution; and tho' ſince my return I heard that he was guilty of a Lewdneſs of that nature, I bear him Witneſs that he was not ſuſpected to be ſo whilſt I was there. And further, he ſo ſtrictly obſerved this Ordinance, that it was not without the moſt preſſing Inſtances of ſeveral of his chiefeſt Favourites, that he ſo far mitigated the Puniſhment of an Interpreter, who had committed this Crime with a Female Savage whom he had formerly Debauched, as to get him tied by the Leg and condemn him to Slavery; for *Villegaignon* would have had him Hanged. And as far as I know of him, he was very ſtrict in this particular, as well with regard to himſelf as others, and was really to be commended for it." I have cited this long Paſſage to make way for two Remarks: Firſt, that we ought to be very cautious how we give credit to ill Reports of Men. How many are there who believe what hath been ſaid of *Villegaignon*'s Impurities, and nevertheleſs he is acquitted of them by the Evidence of a Perſon, who very far from ſparing him, would have been fond of uttering all the diſadvantageous Truths againſt him. My ſecond Obſervation is that there is no Paſſion either more Incorrigible or Brutal than that of Uncleanneſs. All Chriſtians know that the Law of God forbids their impure Commerce with Infidel Women: And they are Educated in Principles which inſpire Horrour at the thoughts of ſuch an Intercourſe. Humane Laws, which puniſh this Crime, fortify the Impreſſions of Education. And yet to what degrees of Impurity hath not the Laſciviouſneſs of the diſcoverers of the new World tranſported them? Could the ſhocking Deformity and Barbarity of the Savages, ever reſtrain Men from this Crime, tho' prohibited by Divine and Humane Laws? Let's go no farther than *John de Leri*'s Relation. Are we not there informed that ſome *Normans* eſcaping a Shipwrack, gave themſelves over to this Vice, and obliged *Villegaignon* to make a Law in order to puniſh this Crime with Death, which could not yet prevent the Commiſſion of it by this Interpreter. If we conſult other Relations we ſhall find the ſame Puniſhment was requiſite to prevent Men from defiling themſelves with certain Amphibious Animals, which in ſome ſort reſemble Women. A horrible Depravation, an incorrigible Paſſion, which hurries Men on to the Commiſſion of the Sin againſt Nature, and Beſtiality (*c*); and prompts to a Laſcivious Commerce with dead Bodies. *Herodotus* (*d*) informs us, that after it was diſcovered that one of the Embalmers of dead Bodies, had Defiled himſelf with a Woman a little while after her Death, they kept the (*e*) Corps of Beautiful Women three or four Days before they truſted them in the hands of thoſe Men.

(*H*) *Some faults in* Thevet.] Let us firſt of all lay down this Foundation. In the Year 1558 a Book was Printed Entituled, *les Singularitez de l'Amerique* digeſted into order by Mr. *de la Porte*, according to the Memoirs of Brother *Andrew Thevet*. By which it plainly appears that (*f*) *Thevet* arrived at *Cape de Frie* on the 10th of *November* 1555. and four Days after at the River of *Ganabara*, from whence he departed the 31ſt of *January* following in order to go for *France*. From which it follows that he is in the wrong when he avers in the 21. Book of his Coſmography, Printed in 1575. that the Factiouſneſs of four Miniſters of the new Religion, *the Chief of which was Richier*, raiſed a Sedition, which expoſed ſome of the Mutineers to capital Puniſhment, that the reſt, and namely *Richier* eſcaped, and that *the Savages irritated by this Tragedy*, deſigned to put the remainder to Death. He reckons himſelf amongſt thoſe who were in this danger: *We narrowly eſcaped their Revenging it on us*, ſaith he. He tells us in another place (*h*) that he quitted the Enterpriſe of Converting the Natives, as well becauſe *he was not well verſed in their Language*, as on account *that the Calviniſt Miniſters undertook this Charge, envying my deſign*, ſays he. Theſe two Paſſages ſhew that he pretends to have been there whilſt the *Geneva* Miniſters were there. But it is a notorious Falſity. For they did not Arrive there till *March* 1557. and he left that place the 31 of *January* 1556. and he himſelf refutes thoſe who would have us believe that he made a Second Voyage; to which purpoſe liſten to his own Words: *I very much wonder what excited* Calvin *to tax me in his Apology Printed at* Geneva, *with being one of the Principal abetters of the Death of theſe ſaid Miniſters whom the Sieur de Villegaignon cauſed to be thrown into the Sea, ſince that was done three Years or thereabouts after my return into* France, *as appears by my Book of the Rarities*, &c. *which is a ſufficient Evidence in point of time, beſides ſeveral other of my Writings*. He confeſſes therefore that from the 31. of *January* to the time that *Villegaignon* cauſed ſome Hereticks to be drowned he was abſent from that Country. Conſequently he was not there, during the Sojournment of the *Genevois* there, which was from *March* 1557. till towards the end of the Year. His own words diſcover therefore that he was, and was not there. Not to take notice of his other Falſities, it is not true that thoſe whom *Villegaignon* cauſed to be drowned were Miniſters, nor that there were above two Miniſters ſent from *Geneva* or any other place. I ſhall only obſerve, the better to convict his Impoſtures, that the Sedition he ſpeaks of preceded the Arrival of *Peter Richier*, and that *Richier* was the firſt Miniſter who ever ſaw *Villegaignon* in his Iſle of *Colligni*. The proof of all which is drawn from the Letter which the ſaid *Villegaignon* wrote to *Calvin* on the 31 of *March* 1557. In which he declares (*i*) that *Richier* and his Brethren *found him reduced to that extremity that he was obliged alternatively to perform the Offices of Magiſtrate and Miniſter*, *which*, adds he, *put me in great anguiſh; for the Example of King Uzziah was ſufficient to deterr me from this Practice*. He there relates the conſpiracy formed againſt him, and how the Authors of it were diſcovered and puniſhed.

John de Leri (*k*) made a good uſe of thoſe Arguments againſt *Thevet*, and proved that during the

ſtay

(*a*) *John* de Leri chap. 6. pag. 71.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 72.

(*e*) Τὄτο δὲ ποιεῦσι ἕνεκα τοῦδε, ἵνα μή σφι οἱ ταριχευταὶ μίσγωνται τῇσι γυναιξὶ· ἁλῶναι γάρ τινα φασὶ μισγόμενον νεκρῷ προσφάτῳ γυναικός. κατειπεῖν δὲ τὸν ὁμότεχνον. Ea de caussa facientes, ne cum feminis iſti ſalitores concumbant. Deprehenſum enim quendam aiunt coeuntem cum recenti cadavere muliebri, delatumque ab ejuſdem artificii ſocio. *Id. Ibid.*

(*f*) *See John de Leri's preface: He quotes the* 1. 24. 25. *and* 60. *Chapters of thoſe Singularities*.

(*g*) Thevet, Coſmographie univerſelle B. 21. fol. 909.

(*h*) Id. ib. chap. 8. fol. 925.

(*i*) Villegaignon's *letter to* Calvin apud. *John* de Leri in præfat.

(*k*) Leri *in his Preface*.

VILLENA, a Marquiſate (*A*) on the Confines of new *Caſtile* and of the Kingdoms of *Murcia* and *Valencia*, did belong to *Don John Emanuel* § *the moſt potent* Lord *in Spain* next to the King in the XIV. Century. He had a Daughter, who in the Year 1350. ‖ Married *Don Henry* Count *de Tranſtamare*, natural ſon of *Don Alfonſo* the XI. King of *Caſtile*. The Count becoming King of *Caſtile* by the depoſition of *Don Pedro* the Cruel β in the Year 1336. gave the Marquiſate of *Villena* to *Don Alfonſo* of *Arragon* γ Count of *Denia*, and Nephew to the King of *Arragon*. This New Marquis of *Villena* grew very great. King *John* the firſt being deſirous to make a Conſtable in his Kingdom of *Caſtile*, as there was one in *France*, and another in *Arragon*, Created that Dignity in the Year 1382. and conferred it on this Marquis δ. And by his laſt Will, in caſe he ſhould die during the Minority of his Son, the Government of the Young King was intruſted to this Conſtable in Conjunction with ſome other Lords ζ. He dyed in the Year 1390. and his Son *Don Henry* the III being ſcarce θ eleven Years of Age, Tutors were to be choſen for him, and a Council was requiſite to be appointed in order to govern the Realm. Several difficulties were diſcovered in the King's Will, wherefore it was not obſerved; but our Marquis of *Villena* was one of thoſe to whom the Regency was intruſted *. He was then ‡ in *Arragon*, and becauſe he Adhered to the Malecontents, and demanded the Execution of the deceaſed King's Teſtament, he was deprived of the Charge of Conſtable of *Caſtile* †. The reſtauration of which he demanded of King *Henry* the III. at *Illeſca*, *Anno* 1393. the firſt time he had the Honour ♦ to congratulate him; and was promiſed it, provided he would accompany the King to *Caſtile*; but excuſing himſelf from that, he never recovered that Dignity β, but receiv'd alſo other ill treatments (*B*). He was Created Duke of *Gandia* by the King of *Arragon* in 1399 γ. and had two Sons δ who Married two Aunts ζ of *Don Henry* III. King of *Caſtile*. One of which was the Father of a Marquis of VILLENA, who was a lover of Sciences, and (*C*) paſſed for an Egregious Magician. This Marquiſate *Anno* 1445. was

ſtay of the Miniſters and their Companions of *Geneva*, there was neither any Sedition, nor Conſpiracy at *Colligni*, nor any *French* Man killed there. To confound times is a great Fault, but to make uſe of theſe confuſions to calumniate the Innocent is yet a much greater. Both which *Thevet* is Guilty of.

(*A*) *Villena a Marquiſate on the confines of new* Caſtile.] Mr. *Baudrand* (*a*) ſaith that *Villena*, the chief place of the Territory of that Name, *caput agri cognominis*, is in the Kingdom of *Murcia*: But having juſt now conſulted a Map of *Sanſon* Printed in 1663. I there find *Villena* placed in *New Caſtile*. Mr. *du Puy* in his Hiſtory of the Favourites relates, that in the reign of *John* the II. King of *Caſtile*, and during the continuance of his great Favour to *Alvaro de Luna*, the Prince *Don Henry* of *Arragon* in the Year 1420. Married (*b*) *the Infanta Catherine Siſter* to that *King*, *on whom was beſtowed the* Marquiſate of Villena, *which was erected into a Dutchy*. I believe this erection became null, becauſe I find by the ſame Mr. *du Puy* (*c*) that *Pacheco* the Favourite of *Don Henry* Son of *John* the Second, was made *Marquis of Villena* about the Year 1445. *Mariana* and other Hiſtorians don't give this *Pacheco* or his Son any other Title than that of Marquis of *Villena*.

(*B*) Receiv'd *alſo other ill Treatments*.] I ſhall ſet down the Words of *Mayerne Turquet*: (*d*) "The "Marquis having cleared himſelf to the King "of whatſoever was alledged againſt him, and Ad"vanced ſeveral excuſes why he did not come to "Court, requeſted the reſtauration of his Office "of Conſtable of *Caſtile*, of which he had been "deprived by his Majeſty's Tutors, in order to "make room for D. *Pedro* Count of *Tranſtamara* "in Prejudice of his Honour and Dignity: To "which the King made a tender and Gracious "Anſwer, aſſuring him that he would take all "juſt and equitable Care of his Affairs: After "which he deſired him to go with him into old "*Caſtile*, from which the Marquis excuſed him"ſelf, alledging that he was not come thither "with a proper Equipage to ſerve his Ma"jeſty as he deſired, but if he pleaſed to Enable "him he would very willingly return to his Ser"vice. He then returned to his Seat ſomewhat "diſguſted at King *Henry*, who took no care of "the reſtauration of his Office of Conſtable of "*Caſtile*, but ſometime afterwards, by Advice of "the Arch-Biſhop of *Toledo*, deprived him of the "Title of Marquis of *Villena*, by reaſon it ſeemed "unſafe and diſadvantageous to the State of *Caſtile* "that a Marquiſate bordering on a Foreign Realm, "ſhould remain in the hands of a Gentleman "who was ſo engag'd, and nearly allied to the "King and Kingdom of *Arragon* as the Marquis "*Alfonſo*.

He had two Sons —— *one of which was* —— *Father of the Marquis of* VILLENA —— *an Egregious Magician.*] One of the two Sons of the firſt Marquis of *Villena* was *Alfonſo*, and the other *Peter*. Their Wives Dowries were paid to the *Engliſh* in Ranſom for their Father, and in order to releaſe *Alfonſo* who was hoſtage on that Account. This *Alfonſo* (*e*) cauſed himſelf to be divorced, not being able to ſuffer the Publick Lewdneſs of his Wife. His Brother *Peter* was killed in a Battle. The King *Don Henry* taking the Wives of theſe Brothers under his Protection, and reſenting their refuſal of reſtoring their Dowry, ſeized all their Lands except the Caſtles of *Villena* and *Almanſa*, which enabled by their ſituation and an *Arragoneſe* Garriſon, held out againſt him (*f*). *Peter* of *Aragon* the Marquis of *Villena*'s Son, left a Son known by the Name of *Henry de* VILLENA, who ſtudied very hard, and wrote ſome very learned Books tho' in a very Barbarous ſtyle: (*g*) *Petrus ad Aliubarrotam ceciderat, ejus Henrici pater, cui à Villena cognomentum fuit, eruditionis tantum ſtudium, ut magica etiam ſacra, carminaque caluiſſe fama ſit. Extant ingenii monimenta: In quibus multa reconditaque eruditio eſt, elegantia parum quippe affectata, ſed horrida, & cum Hiſpana lingua Latinam miſcentis.* He died at *Madrid* in 1434. having conſtantly ſtruggled with the injuries of Fortune even to his old Age, (*) ſuch as were the loſs of his State and Dignity. It was believed of him that his too great Zeal after knowledge, engaged him in Magick: His Books by the King's order were ſubmitted to the Examination of Brother *Lopez de Barrientos*, a Dominican, who was Preceptor to the Prince of *Aſturia*; and the greateſt part of them were Burned: Which diſguſted ſeveral Perſons who urged, that a Library which had been collected at ſuch a great expence as his, might without any danger have been preſerved for the uſe of the Learned. The Dominican publiſhed a

§ [illegible]

‖ Id. ib. [illegible]

β Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

γ Mariana de rebus Hiſpaniæ lib. [illegible] cap. 7. pag. m. [illegible]

δ Id. ib. 18. cap 5. pag. 143.

ζ Mayerne Turquet liv. 17. pag. [illegible]

θ Id. ib. pag. 564.

* Id. ib. pag. 766.

‡ Mariana ib. cap. 15. pag. 165.

[illegible] ſtood of the Son, and not of the Father

δ Idem cap. 8. pag. 158.

ζ They were two Natural Daughters of Don Henry II.

(*a*) Baudr. geograph. Tom. 2. pag. 383.

(*b*) Peter du Puy, Hiſtoire des Favoris p. m. 146. Du Chaintreau *ſays the ſame thing in his Hiſtory of D. John II. King of Caſtile*, pag. 19. *of the* Paris *Edition* 1640.

(*c*) Id. ib: pag. 229.

(*d*) Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne *B.* 17. pag. 786.

(*e*) Alfonſi conjugium diremptum ob male tectas uxoris libidines. Mariana ubi infra.

(*f*) Taken from Mariana lib. 19. cap. 8. p. 158.

(*g*) Id. ib.

(*) Mariana lib. 20. cap 6. pag. 221. *ſays that in order to be made great Maſter of the order of Calatrava he divorced his Wife* Mary Albornos, *who was very rich, and yielded to King Don Henry the Marquiſate of Villena and other Lands, and that the Knights of the Order Created another great Maſter, who was Confirmed by the Pope about the Year* 1413. *after a conteſtation that laſted Six Years.* Henricus, *adds* Mariana, in tantis litteris tantaque eruditione parum ſibi ſapuiſſe viſus eſt, repetitoque conjugio egenus vitæ reliquum exegit.

was given to ζ *John Pacheco* the Favourite of Prince *Henry*, Son of *John* the II. King of *Caſtile*. The Son of this *Pacheco* having endeavoured to make the Kingdom of *Caſtile* devolve on the *Portugueze* by the Marriage of the King of *Portugal* with the pretended Daughter of King *Henry* the IV. thereby expoſed himſelf to great troubles. His own Vaſſals of the Marquiſate of *Villena* favoured the King of *Arragon's* Forces: The Caſtle of *Villena* was taken, * *and by that means the Marquiſate was re-united to the Crown in 1475, with a reſolution never to alienate it.*

VINAY (ALEXANDER DE) Miniſter of the Reformed Church of *Annonai* publiſhed a Book (Z) in 1626. and in the Epiſtle Dedicatory he obſerved that a Famous ‖ Prelate about 30 Years before had Printed that the City *of Annonai was older in Hereſy than Geneva.*

VIRET (PETER) a Proteſtant Miniſter, Born at *Orbe* a ſmall Town ‡ in the Canton of *Bern* in the Year 1511. He ſtudied at *Paris* where he became acquainted with *Farel*, whoſe Fellow Labourer he was afterwards in the Eſtabliſhment of the Reformation in ſeveral Towns of *Switzerland* *. He went with him to *Geneva* in † 1534, and ſtrenuouſly ſeconded him in whatever was requiſite for the Abolition of Popery. The City of *Lauſanne* having Embraced the Reformation in 1536. *Peter Viret* was called to exerciſe the Miniſterial Function there. In which he acquitted himſelf ſo well, that he acquired the Love and Eſteem of the Inhabitants. Which appeared by the difficulty which they made of lending him to the Church of *Geneva* β for ſix Months, when the Abſence of *Calvin* made that Church ardently deſire the Preſence of *Viret*. To make this the more Intelligible, I ought to mention that *Calvin* being reſolved to return to *Geneva*, from whence he had been γ Baniſhed, could not come back at the deſired time, being engaged to go δ to the Conferences at *Ratisbonne*. During this time ζ *Viret* very profitably ſerved the Church of *Geneva*. *Calvin* being Re-united to his Flock, η paſſionately deſired *Viret* for his Collegue, but had not that Satisfaction. *Viret* was recalled to *Lauſanne*, where he to Admiration diſcharged all the Duties of his Office, until the θ Proteſtants of *France* by their Entreaties obtained him for the Church of (A) *Lions*. Which he ſerved very Faithfully in the midſt of a thouſand difficulties, it being in the time of Civil Wars, and the Plague κ. He was obliged to quit *Lions* when *Charles* IX. by an Edict Interpretative of the Peace concluded in *March* 1563. prohibited his Proteſtant Subjects the having any Miniſters Born out of the Realm λ. *Viret* then Retired to *Orange*, from whence the Queen of *Navarre*

‡ *In the* Country of Vaud.

* Melch. Adam. in vitis Theol. exter. pag. 120, 121.

† Spanhemius in Geneva reſtituta pag. 59.

β Leti, Hiſtoria Genevrina tom. 3. pag. 70.

γ *In the Year* 1538.

δ *In the Year* 1541.

ζ Leti, ib. *See alſo* Beza in vita Calvini ad ann. 1541.

η *See the Remark E.*

θ Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra pag. 121.

κ Id. ib.

λ *The true and entire Hiſtory of the Troubles*, B. 1. fol. 6. verſo ad ann. 1564.

a Defenſe of his Conduct alledging the King's pleaſure for his Apology. *Mariana* relates this Fact in beautiful Expreſſions: (a) *Henricus Villena Madriti, ubi Rex erat, extinctus eſt, amiſſas opes, atque ampliſſimos honores ablatos, injuriamque fortunæ honeſtis ſolatiis ad extremam ſenectutem toleravit, tanto eruditionis ſtudio, ut ne a magicis quidem ſacris abſtinuiſſe feratur. Libri juſſu Regis Lupo Barriento Dominicano, Henricique Principis magiſtro examinandi ſunt traditi, quorum parte combuſta, multorum vituperationem incurrit, libros exiſtimantium magno comparatos, eruditorum uſibus ſine periculo noxaque ſervari debuiſſe. Regiam ille de ſcripto conceptâ defenſione, voluntatem excuſavit, cui repugnare fas non eſſet.* *Mayerne Turquet* ſuppoſes that only the Magical Manuſcripts of the Marquis's own Compoſure were Burned, and farther he ſays, that even all of them were not committed to the Flames (b). But if he had been at the pains of Examining *Mariana*, he had been more exact, and would have informed us that the greateſt part of this Lord's Library was Burned. How abſurd is it to pretend that part of his Magical Books were ſpared? It is ſcarce poſſible to commit a ſingle Fault alone. This Hiſtorian having miſtaken the Queſtion, hath made an improper uſe of a Reſtrictive Clauſe: And being not able to Err conſequently, has committed a double Error. There goes a Pleaſant Story in *Spain* relating to this Marquis, of which I am informed by Reading the Relation of the differences betwixt *Don John* of *Auſtria*, and the Jeſuit *Nitard*. This Jeſuite Publiſhed a Manifeſto, to which an Anſwer was made in which the Author feigns, (c) "That the Marquis of *Villena* accompanied with *Don Pedro* the Cruel, and the Ghoſt of *Pedro Hernandes*, three Perſons very well known, were come from the other World on purpoſe to refute him with the greater Liberty." I need not ſay any thing of the Speech aſcribed to *Don Pedro*: I ſhall only ſet down the beginning of what the Second Actor ſays. (d) "The other Old Man beginning told him, for my part, my Lord, I am the Marquis of *Villena*, who rendred my ſelf Famous in the World by Aſtrology, and the Invention of the Bottle, into which it is reported I cauſed my ſelf to be put peace-meal, in order to diſcover the Events of Future Ages through the Glaſs, and what ſhould happen at this preſent time; and indeed it is ſo, for it was impoſſible that a Man of my Quality and Humour ſhould forbear being broke in pieces to ſee the preſent Events, the Subverſion of this Monarchy by a Private Man. ——— It is true I cauſed my ſelf to be cut to pieces, I cannot conceal it, to ſee a Man Born in *Germany*, where the Laws are ſo different from ours, become the Arbitrator of our Faith. I cauſed my ſelf to be cut to pieces, out of Curioſity to ſee a Queen, who ſhou'd have Governed *Spain* according to our Laws, chooſe for her Director, &c.

(Z) *Publiſhed a Book in* 1626.] It was Printed at *Geneva*, and contains 634 Pages in 8. and is Entituled, *The particulars of the Conference held* at Annonay, *from the* 10*th of* December 1625. *to the* 25*th of* February 1626. *betwixt* Alexander de Vinay *Miniſter of God's Word, and* John Francis Martinecourt *Jeſuit, concerning the Opinion of the Fathers, on the ſufficiency of the Scripture, and on the Eucbariſt. To which is added, a Continuation of both Articles, and a Treatiſe of Purgatory by the ſaid* Vinay. I could not find this Jeſuit in *Alegambe's Bibliotheque*, which makes me think that he gave no Relation of this Diſpute. Yet it was cuſtomary for each Party to Publiſh a Relation of a Diſputation, and to attribute the Victory to his own ſide.

(A) *By their Entreaties obtained him for the Church of* Lions.] *Melchior Adam* hath here left a Gap, which ought to be ſupplied. He did not know that *Viret* ſerved the Church of *Niſmes*, and afterwards that of *Mompellier*, before he went to be Miniſter of *Lions*. Of all which we are informed by *Viret* himſelf in an Epiſtle Dedicatory, dated from *Lions* the 7th of *December* 1563. He there acquaints us, (e) *That two Years before that, he fell into a Diſeaſe, which brought him ſo Low, that he thought*

(e) Viret, *Epiſtle Dedicatory of the* 1. *Volume of his* Inſtruction Chreſtienne;

varre ſent for him to *Bearn* †. He there (*B*) render'd his Talents very valuable, and died there in 1571. He was a * little Man, and of a weak Conſtitution, which was yet impaired by the Blows (*C*) he received from a Prieſt, and the Poiſon which was put into his Victuals: But he had a great ſhare of Learning, accompanied with a charming Eloquence. He Publiſhed a vaſt number

thought he had nothing to expell but the Grave——— *that God had, as it were, plucked him by the Hair of the Head from amongſt the People, with whom he had paſſed the greateſt part of his life.* "I know very well, adds he, that my Lords, and alſo my Brothers and Companions, and all the Church of which God had appointed me Miniſter, would not eaſily have conſented to my departure, and ſent me away, if they had not ſeen and known the neceſſity to which the Lord had expoſed me, and choſen rather that I ſhould ſerve in another place for the edification of the Church as weak as I was, than make an unprofitable ſtay amongſt them, without being able to ſerve either one Church or the other, as I deſired to do——— This is the Method by which the Lord drew me from that Church which I had reaſon to love, as if he had taken me by the Hand, in order to lead me faint, and trembling with weakneſs and half dead, and bring me to you (*a*) who are the firſt in *Languedoc*, with whom I reſided after my departure from *Geneva*." He very much praiſes his good reception at *Nimes*, *tho' I looked*, continues he, *like a dry Skeleton covered with Skin, who had brought my Bones to be buried there: inſomuch that even thoſe who were not of our Religion, but very contrary to it, pitied me, crying out, wherefore doth this poor Man come into this Country? Doth he come for any thing elſe than to die? Beſides which, I have heard that the firſt time I aſcended the Pulpit, ſeveral ſeeing me in that condition, feared that I ſhould faint before I had finiſhed the Sermon.*

Here are ſome things which I cannot comprehend nor explain; and perhaps *Viret* did not deſire they ſhould be manifeſt. He ſaith that he could no longer ſerve his old Church, which was the only Reaſon why his Superiors gave him leave to depart. That Reaſon could not be the ſtate to which his Diſtemper had reduced him; for notwithſtanding that, he was able to ſerve the Church of *Nimes*. We might conjecture that this Church was ſmaller than that of *Lauſanne* or *Geneva*, and that the ſame Perſon who was not ſtrong enough to preach in a large Church, might yet be able to perform that Function to a ſmall Auditory. But this Conjecture is ſcarce ſatisfactory.

His Epiſtle Dedicatory to the 2d Tome of his *Chriſtian Inſtruction*, is a Proof that he was afterwards Miniſter of the Church of *Montpellier*. This Epiſtle is dated at *Lions* the 12 of *December* 1563, and addreſſed to that Church as a grateful Acknowledgment of the Favours he had receiv'd from them during the exerciſe of his Miniſterial Function there; and he takes notice of it as a Happineſs that ſeveral of the Phyſicians and Surgeons of *Montpellier* were Proteſtants. Of which amongſt others, he mentions the Phyſick Profeſſors, *Rondellet*, *Saporta*, and their Aſſociates, *Joubert*, *Feynes*, *Trial*; and *Michael Herouart*, a *famous Chirurgeon*. I inſert this particular, becauſe it is unknown to ſeveral who are very well acquainted with the Merit of thoſe Illuſtrious Profeſſors.

In the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the (*b*) Reformed Churches of *France*, we find a very excellent Letter of *Viret* written from *Nimes* the 15th of *January* (*c*) 1562, to the Miniſters of *Languedoc aſſembled in the* Colloquy of *Montpellier*, in which he exhorts them to comply with the deſire of the Court. By both the Epiſtles Dedicatory which I have cited, it appears that he was no Trumpet of Sedition; but rather of a peaceable and moderate temper, who always diſcouraged Violence and popular Commotions, to the utmoſt of his power. The ſame Hiſtory informs us, (*d*) that he went to *Montpellier to recover his Health, and began the exerciſe of his Miniſtry there, the Edict of* January *having been Publiſh'd the 7th of* February 1562. So that *Paſquier* is certainly miſtaken when he ſaith that (*e*) *Viret* preached at *Paris* towards the end of the Year 1561.

(*B*) *To Bearn. He there render'd his Talents very valuable, and dyed there.*] He taught at *Orthez*, as (*f*) Melchior *Adam* obſerves. Some ſay (*g*) he died there, but *Moreri* and ſeveral others avert that he died at *Pau*: And very few Authors there are who tell us, that he was for ſome time impriſon'd in that Country. *D'Aubigne* is the only one who informs me of it. He ſaith (*h*) *that the Governor of a Town which the Proteſtants took by Aſſault in* 1569, *was diſcharged from his impriſonment on promiſe that he ſhould ranſom* Peter Viret *a Miniſter, who was Priſoner in* Bearn. What is certainly to be depended on, is that this Miniſter ended his days in the Territories of the Queen of *Navarre*, and conſequently there is a Falſity in the following words of Mr. *Ancillon*. (*i*) *Viret*——— *taught for ſome time at* Ortez, *from whence he returned to* Lauſanne, *where he Publiſh'd Books enough to make a ſmall Library.* Moſt of his Works were Publiſhed before he went into *Bearn*, and therefore Mr. *Ancillon* would be miſtaken, tho' he were in the right as to *Viret's* return to *Lauſanne*.

(C) *By the Blows which he received from a Prieſt, and the Poiſon which was put into his Victuals.*] He was ſo violently beaten by a Prieſt, who treacherouſly attacked him, that he was left for dead on the ſpot (*k*). In the punning Ages, one would have been apt to ſay, that this Prieſt did not know how to form any other Argument than thoſe in *Ferio*, and in *Barbara*. If he was unjuſt in having recourſe to ſuch means to prevent Innovations, he was not leſs imprudent in giving over beating before he was ſure that the Miniſter could never eſcape with life. On ſuch occaſions the Maxim, *nunquam tentabis ut non perficias, nothing ought to be attempted which cannot be accompliſh'd*, ought to be well remember'd. The ſame Conſequences were drawn from an unfiniſhed Aſſaſſination, againſt the Church of *Rome*, which would have been inferred from a compleated one. All thoſe who were capable of going by this Rule, *a Cauſe muſt be very bad, whoſe Defenders murder thoſe who attack it*, drew the ſame Concluſions from their Miniſters being confuted by the Blows of a Cudgel or the Fiſt. Wherefore the Prieſt who beat *Viret*, did as much miſchief to his Cauſe by raiſing prejudices againſt it as if he had killed him; and by not killing him he left his Cauſe expoſed to great dangers. For *Viret* armed with reſentment more vigorouſly endeavour'd the deſtruction of Popery, and took very effectual meaſures to that purpoſe. He enquired into the Abſurdities of their Errors, and compiled in *French*, ſeveral diverting Books filled with railleries on that head. Theſe ſort of Writings are of all others the moſt dangerous that can be Publiſhed; ſo that if we conſider only the Intereſt of that Prieſt, he had done very well not to believe the Death of *Viret*, without unqueſtionable Proofs. The Certificate of two Chirurgeons perhaps would not have been too much.

But to come to the Poiſon. Some ſay, (*l*) it was given to *Viret* by a Servant of a Canon of *Geneva*; others charge this Crime on a Woman ſuborned for that end by the Canons. However it be, the Life of this good Miniſter was endangered by it, and it is ſaid that this ill action compleated the ruin of the Roman Catholick Cauſe at *Geneva*. And indeed at a critical time when both Parties were almoſt equally ſtrong, nothing could more contribute to turn the Balance in favour of the Reformed. A wavering People full of ſuſpicions, will ſcarce ever find fault with this Argument: If theſe People maintain'd the Cauſe of God, they would never make uſe of infamous ways in order to deſtroy their Adverſaries. The Author whom I'm going to quote, adds, that there was a current report, that the Prieſts had reſolved to cauſe all the Reformed to be kill'd at once by Poyſoning the Bread which they uſed at the Lord's Supper. I am fully perſuaded that a Report of this nature, whether true or falſe, might have a more forcible effect on the Minds of a great many People, than a hundred demonſtrative Reaſons.

Cum

---

† Melch. Adam. ib.

* Id. ib.

(*a*) *He directs his Speech to the Reformed Church of* Nimes.

(*b*) *In the* 5th *Book*, pag. 886. & ſeq.

(*c*) *There is* 1557. *in* Beza's *Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of* France, *which is a fault of the Preſs.*

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 888.

(*e*) Paſquier's *Letters*, B. 4. pag. 201.

ber of (D) Books. He was pretty well verſed in the Knowledge of the Pagan Authors. Which appears by a Work † he publiſhed at *Geneva* in 1560, Entituled: *Of true and falſe Religion, concerning lawful and unlawful Vows and Oaths, and eſpecially the Vows of perpetual Continence, Anathema and Execration, the Sacrifices of Human Victims, and Excommunication in all Religions.* Item, *of the Jewiſh, Pagan, Turkiſh and Popiſh Monkery, and the Corporal as well as Spiritual Sacrifices to* Moloch.

† [illegible]

(a) [illegible] Genevæ [illegible]

(a) *Cum præterea venefica quædam, è Breſſa contermina vicinia oriunda, quæ nigros ſuccos verbi divini Miniſtris tollendis miſcuerat, P. Vireti lethali morbo in ſcelere deprehenſa, ſed ad id flagitii à Canonico immiſſam fateretur, mirum quantum omnium animi à Papiſtarum artium inſtitoribus fuerint averſi, præſertim cum in vulgus innoteſceret, à ſacrificulo deliberatum de inficiendis ſymbolis ſacro, Cœnæ Dominicæ celebrandæ deſtinatis, quo Evangelici omnes facili opera in ſacratiſſimo ſuæ Religionis actu, ad generum Cereris non ſicca morte vel deſcenderent, vel deducerentur. Cujus flagitii, quod ne Thetis quidem ipſa univerſis ſuis undis abluerit, ſola cogitatio ingenti horrore & indignatione omnium animos confudit. Experimentis ad genus aliud compluribus compertum, omnes Clericorum machinas ad ſubruendam Evangelii inſtaurati ſtructuram comparatas, occulta Dei directione in ſummum ejus incrementum ceſſiſſe.* The concluſion of this paſſage is very judicious; the ill conduct of the Romiſh Clergy hath been a very ſucceſsful Inſtrument for the increaſe of the Proteſtants. The Church of *Rome* could not have been attacked at a more favourable opportunity: Her Clergy were very ignorant and very vicious, and on the contrary thoſe who preached up a Reformation, were moſt of them Eloquent and Learned, and more or leſs acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek Tongues; by virtue of which they got the better of the Prieſts in almoſt all Diſputes. The Prieſts were not able to hold up againſt Diſputants, who frighted them with the Original Languages of Holy Writ, and who eaſily made it appear that the Religious Practices, to which the People were ſubjected, were not preſcribed by the Scripture. Two or three Sermons of theſe Miniſters in ſome Pariſhes, ſerved to convert half the Inhabitants. And what ſhould hinder it? Would the Romaniſts have offer'd Reaſon againſt Reaſon? But was it poſſible for an ignorant Prieſt or Monk to ſucceed againſt *Viret*, or *Farel?* Not in the leaſt. They were then obliged to have recourſe to violent meaſures, to Poiſoning, Aſſaſſination, and other deteſtable means, which fully confirmed that a Cauſe which defended it ſelf in this manner, was not of God.

Mr. *Leti* informs us, that the Name of her that poiſon'd *Viret* was *Mary Navau*; that ſhe was born at *Bourg* in *Breſſe*; that at the ſolicitation of ſome Eccleſiaſticks, who promiſed her a good Reward, ſhe fled to *Geneva* on pretence of being perſecuted for her Religion, and acting the devout part, ſhe very effectually inſinuated her ſelf into the good Opinion of *Farel*, *Viret* and *Saunier*, the three *Geneva* Miniſters; by which means ſhe found an opportunity of poiſoning the Diſh of Soop when *Farel's* two Collegues dined with him; that *Farel* and *Saunier* diſliking this Soop did not eat of it, as *Viret* did, who was very well pleaſed with it, and immediately found the effects of the Poyſon; that this Woman was impriſon'd on ſuſpicion, and that without being put to the Torture, ſhe accuſed a Canon, and having confeſſed the whole Crime, was hanged on the 22d of *April* 1535. As alſo that the Canon, out of reſpect to his Family, was only baniſhed (b).

(D) *He Publiſhed (c) a vaſt number of Books.*] I have already ſaid, that he ridicul'd the adverſe Party, and putting out an air of Rallery and Humour, he examined their Ritual and Ceremonial; in a word, he engaged the Church of *Rome* rather on the Practices ſhe permits in her Prieſts and Monks, than on her Deciſions in her Oecumenical Councils. This was to attack her weakeſt ſide, for in our days thoſe (d) who laboured with the greateſt addreſs to defend her, have requeſted us to diſtinguiſh betwixt what the Councils preſcribe as an Article of Faith, and what is not obligatory, or is perhaps an abuſe. I ſhall here cite a long paſſage of *Verheiden*. (e) *Sic ut Eccleſia Lugdunenſis frequentiſſima, aliæque vicinarum [illegible]rum, ob egregiam operam quam præſtitit in promovendo Dei Verbo, hunc virum [illegible], ſcriptaque tempori tum ingenio eſſe Papiſmum exercentibus ſumma voluptate perlegerint. Is autem Viretus erat, qui Myſticam illam Papiſtarum Theologiam cognitam habebat: quam variis libris explicans lectori riſum ſæpe movet, propter mira illa miracula & ridicula quæ continet. Ethnicam præterea Theologiam cum ex prophanis Scriptoribus hauſiſſet, eamdem cum Papiſtarum Sacris ita contulit, tamquam hæc Romana Sacra Parallela eſſent Veterumque Romanorum horrendæ Idololatriæ plene reſponderent. Forte inter ſinceriores Theologos nullus fuit, qui myſticum illud Romani Jovis Regnum ita aperuit & perluſtravit atque hic Viretus, quod vel uno illo Centone (ut alia multa mittam de Theatrica Miſſæ Saltatione,) ex veteribus Poetis conſarcinato, probari poteſt: qui lectorem, præcipue in Poetis verſatum, novo genere voluptatis (ut apud Belgas decantatum illud Apiarium Romanum) perfundit & recreat.*

We ought not to fancy that all this Author's Works are of the Character I have mention'd, nor that amongſt thoſe which are, any of them are tainted with Buffoonry. He always obſerved a wiſe Moderation. Obſerve, that he did not confine himſelf to the Superſtitions only, a very fit Subject for rallery, but very ſeriouſly, and with all due gravity engaged the impious and the Unbelivers. To this purpoſe I ſhall cite a long paſſage in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the 2d Tome of his *Chriſtian Inſtruction*, where we are informed that the multitude of Unbelievers determined him to turn his Arms againſt Deiſm. "(f) There are ſeveral who "profeſs to believe that there is a certain Deity or "God, as the *Turks* and *Jews* do: But as for JESUS CHRIST, and all the Doctrine teſtified by "the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, they take them for "Fables and Dreams——— It is much more, or at "leaſt as difficult to deal with theſe People as with the "*Turks*. For they have entertain'd ſome Opinions "concerning Religion, which are more extravagant "than thoſe of the *Turks*, or any other Infidels. I hear "that ſome of this Band call themſelves *Deiſts*, a new "word in oppoſition to that of Atheiſts. For as the "word Atheiſt ſignifies one that is without or denies "God, ſo they would hereby ſignifie, that they are "not without God, becauſe they believe a Deity, "which they alſo acknowledge for Creator of "Heaven and Earth, as well as the *Turks*: But as for "JESUS CHRIST they do not know who he is, "nor do they believe in him or his Doctrine." *Theſe Deiſts of which we ſpeak*, adds *Viret*, *ridicule all Religion*, "Tho' they accommodate themſelves "to the Religion of thoſe with whom they are oblig'd to live, out of complaiſance or fear. "Some amongſt them have a ſort of Notion "of the Immortality of the Soul; others agree "with the *Epicureans* on that as well as on the Divine "Providence, with regard to Mankind: They think "he doth not intermeddle with Human Affairs, and "that they are either govern'd by *Fortune*, or by the "Prudence and Folly of Men, according as things "happen. I am ſtruck with horror, when I think "that there are ſuch Monſters amongſt thoſe "who bear the Name of Chriſtians. But my "Horror is redoubled, when I conſider that ſeveral of thoſe who make profeſſion of good Learning and Human Philoſophy, and are alſo at the "ſame time frequently eſteemed the moſt Learned, "moſt acute and ſubtil Genius's, are not only "infected with this execrable Atheiſm, but alſo "profeſs it, teach it, and poiſon ſeveral Perſons "with this Venom. Wherefore we live in a time "when we are in danger of having more difficulty in the Engagement of theſe Monſters, than of the "ſuperſtitious and Idolaters, if God doth not, which "I hope he will, prevent it. For amongſt the "preſent differences in Religion, ſeveral very much "abuſe the liberty given them of chuſing which "of the two different Religions they will adhere

AT WHAT *time the* DEISTS began to be talked of.

(b) Taken from Leti's hiſtoria Genevrina tom. 1. pag. 541, 542.

(c) You'll find the Catalogue of 'em in Geſner's Epitome, in Melchior Adam ubi ſupra pag. 122. & in Verheiden ubi infra pag. 120, 121.

(d) *The Biſhop of* Condom, *in his* Expoſition de la doctrine Catholique.

(e) Verheiden, in præſt. theolog. effigiebus pag. 119, 120.

(f) Viret, *Epiſt. dedicat. of the 2d Volume of his* Chriſtian Inſtruction. *It was Printed in* 1563.

Moloch. His Article in Mr. *Moreri* (E) is Confused, and false in several Places.

VIRGIL, in Latin *Publius Virgilius Maro*, the most excellent of all the Antient *Roman* Poets, flourished in *Augustus*'s time. He was Born on the 15th of *October*, in the Year of *Rome* 683, in a Village † not far from *Mantua*. He spent * his first Years at *Cremona*, after which he made some stay at *Milan*, and then went to *Naples*, where he very strenuously applied himself to the study of the Latin and Greek Literature, as he did afterwards to the Mathematicks and Physick. Some Authors say, that he was far from being chast in his Youth; others on the contrary, assure us that he was so modest, so reserved and regular in his Words and Deportment, that the Inhabitants of *Naples* gave him a Sir-name, (A) derived from Virginity. Which affords me Matter for a very long Remark, and

"to. For several are of neither, and indeed live "without any Religion. And if those who have "no good Opinion of any Religion, would con"tent themselves to perish alone in their Error "and Atheism, without infecting or corrupting o"thers by their ill Discourses and Examples, and "leading them into the same perdition with them"selves, this Evil would not be so deplorable as it "is. For this Reason in revising my *Christian* "*Instruction* formerly Printed, I have very much in"larged it, especially on the head of the Creation of "the World, and the Divine Providence towards all "Creatures, and particularly Man, for two Rea"sons. First, because the Holy Ghost frequently "in Holy Writ, proposes this Visible World, as "the great Book of Nature, and of true natural The"ology, and all the Creatures as Preachers, and uni"versal Witnesses of God their Creator, and of his "Works and Glory——The other Reason, which "moved me to treat of these Subjects so amply, is "the present Atheism and its Professors: Of "which I have already spoken.

(E) *In Mr.* Moreri *is confused and false in several places.*] 1. It is false that *Viret* and *Farel* joyned with *Calvin* in order to preach up their Novelties at *Geneva*, and drive out the Catholicks in 1535. *Calvin* did not go to *Geneva* till 1536. 2. *Moreri* relates, *that when* Calvin *departed for the conference at* Worms, Viret *was called to preach at* Geneva, whereby he gives us clearly to understand, that *Calvin* departed from *Geneva*. But that is false. He had been at *Strasburg* two or three Years, when he went to those Conferences. 3. It is ridiculous to bestow the Title of *Preference* on *Viret*'s Vocation, for the People of *Geneva* had recourse to *Viret* only, because they could not oblige *Calvin* to return home before the holding of the Conferences. This shews us that *Moreri* was persuaded that *Calvin* went from *Geneva* at that time; for his Sense runs thus; that this Minister was very sorry that he was deputed to the Conferences, and that during his absence, *Viret* should perform the Ministerial Function. 4. It is very false that *Calvin testified a displeasure at* the calling of *Viret*. 5. It is very false *that he managed it so well that they sent back his Competitor*. 6. It is very false (a) *that the People of* Lausanne *had much ado to receive* Viret. *Calvin* was so far from being desirous that his pretended Competitor should be sent back to *Lausanne*, that on the contrary he made pressing efforts to retain him at *Geneva*. *Melchior Adam*, one of the Authors whom *Moreri* cites, clearly testifies (b) it. The same is attested by (c) *Theodorus Beza*, and we have a literal proof of this under *Calvin*'s own Hand, to which purpose see what he writ to *Farel*: (d) *Quod bene vertat Deus, hic retentus sum ut volebam: superest ut Viretum quoque mecum retineam, quem a me avelli nullo modo patiar. Tua quoque omniumque fratrum partes me hic adjuvare, nisi vultis me frustra excruciari, ac sine commodo esse miserrimum.* I shall by the way observe a Mistake of Mr. *Hofman*. He saith that *Viret* being Minister at *Lausanne* in 1535, was call'd to *Geneva*: Than which nothing is more false. He was Minister at *Geneva* in 1534, and before he was at *Lausanne*.

(A) *A Sirname derived from Virginity.*] The Life of *Virgil* ascribed to *Donatus*, informs us that he was very sober (e), but that he was reported to be inclin'd to the unnatural Sin; that unbiassed Persons gave no credit to this Rumor; that they believed he had no other Affection for Youth, than what resulted from his intention of instructing them; that his lying with *Plotia Hieria* was also talked of; but that he frequently related that he always refused a share in that Mistress which *Varius* offer'd him. (f) *Vulgatum est consuevisse eum cum Plotia Hieria. Sed Asconius Pedianus affirmat ipsum postea minoribus natu narrare solitum, & invitatum quidem se a Vario ad communionem mulieris, verum se pertinacissime recusasse.* The following words are very remarkable, for they affirm, not as a Report, but as a certain Truth, that the Inhabitants of *Naples* gave him the Siraame of *Virginal*, by reason of the purity of his Words and Manners. *Cetera sane vita & ore & animo tam probum fuisse* CONSTAT, *ut Neapoli Parthenias vulgo appellaretur.* Here is an express indication of his Modesty. He preferred living retir'd in the Country, to residing at *Rome* where he was admired. He seldom went thither, and so little affected appearing there, that observing himself to be follow'd and shewed, he ran into the first House he found open. (g) *Si quando Romæ, quo rarissime commeabat, viseretur in publico, sectantes demonstrantesque se subterfugere solitum in proximum tectum.* What is certain, is that in his Youth he wrote several lascivious Verses. Which is not to be doubted, since (h) *Pliny* who had likewise done so, justifies himself by many great Examples, and namely by that of *Virgil*. (i) *Nec vero moleste fero hanc esse de moribus meis existimationem, ut qui nesciunt talia doctissimos, gravissimos, sanctissimos homines scriptitasse, me scribere mirentur. Ab illis autem quibus notum est quos quantosque auctores sequar facile impetrari posse confido ut——An ego verear—— ne me non satis deceat quod decuit M. Tullium, Caium Calvum.—— Neronem transeo, quamvis sciam, non corrumpi in deterius, quæ aliquando etiam a malis; sed honesta manere, quæ sæpius a bonis fiunt. Inter quos vel præcipue numerandus est P. Virgilius, Corn. Nepos, & prius Ennius, Acciusque, non quidem hi Senatores, sed sanctitas morum non distat ordinibus.* The Writer of this Poet's Life makes him the Author of the *Priapeia*, and some Learned Men (k) will have this piece, which is still extant under this Name, to be really *Virgil*'s: But it is more reasonable to believe it a Collection of Poems by several Authors. We have seen above (l) that *Ausonius* alledges *Virgil*'s Example in his Justification; but it is a little surprizing that he only mentions some Passages of his *Georgicks*, and *Æneids*; for those places are scarce proper for his purpose: (m) *Quid etiam Partheniam dictum causæ pudoris? qui octavo Æneidos, quum describeret coitum Veneris atque Vulcani,* αἰσχροσεμνίαν *decenter immiscuit. Quid in tertio Georgicorum de summissis in gregem maritis, nonne obscœnam significationem honesta verborum translatione velavit? Et si quid in nostro joco aliquorum hominum severitas vestita condemnat, de Virgilio accersitum sciat.* He had better have imitated *Pliny* the younger, who without Contradiction aimed at some particular small Poems, in which *Virgil* expressed himself too licentiously on wanton Subjects. The passage of the *Æneids* which *Ausonius* points at, contains nothing too bold for those times: Those who censured it deserve rather the Title of Captious than Critical Writers: And 'tis very observable, that part of those who did not intirely approve it, bestow'd great Elogies on the Poet, as *Aulus Gellius* informs us. (n) *Annianus poëta & plerique cum eo ejusdem Musæ viri summis assiduisque laudibus hos Virgilii versus ferebant; quibus Vulcanum & Venerem junctos mixtosque jure conjugii, rem lege naturæ operiendam, verecunda quadam tralatione verborum quum ostenderet:*

(e) Cibi vinique minimi: fama est eum libidinis pronioris in pueros fuisse. Sed boni ita eum pueros amasse putaverunt, ut Socrates Alcibiadem. Donatus in vita Virgilii.

† Called *Andes See Eusebius in vita Virgilii.* * [illegible] *Donatus ibid.* Du Verdier Vau-Privas.

(a) *They could hardly be prevailed upon to send him to* Geneva *for half a Year.*

(b) Revera Calvinus omnem quidem movit lapidem ut ne Vireto spoliaretur, quo sublato ecclesiam salvam retinere se posse negabat: sed Viretus apud suos *Lausanenses* agere maluit. Melch. Adam. ubi supra. pag. 121. *See also* pag. 73.

(c) Beza in vita Calvini ad ann. 1541.

(d) Calvin. Ep. 50. *That Letter is dated the* 16*th of* September 1543. *but this Date seems to be false; it should be* 1541. *for it were an absurd thing that* Calvin *writing to a Minister of* Neufchatel, *should tell him as a piece of News that he was return'd to* Geneva, *two Years after his arrival.*

(f) Id. ib.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) Plin. Pliny the younger.

(i) Plinius epist. 3. lib. 5.

(k) Joannes Maria Catanæus *is one of 'em. See his Commentary upon Pliny the younger*, pag. 290.

(l) *In the Article* Vayer.

(m) Ausonius in Centone nuptiali, sub finem p.m. 119.

(n) Aulus Gellius. Lib. 9. cap. 10.

and a very Natural Opportunity of refuting an Obſervation, which we find in

[illegible] tenuiſſima atque, [illegible] & [illegible]

——— Ea verba locutus
Optatos dedit amplexus; placidumque petivit
Conjugis infuſus gremio per membra ſoporem.

Mirae autem difficile eſſe arbitrabantur in illuſimili re dicenda verbo uti ita atque altero brevi tenui, que cum ſigno [illegible] ——— *Ea verba & tam cohortibus ac tamen non praetermiſit, ſed pura honeſtaque verba venerandum* [illegible] *puto ſ. certum neminem quemquam alium dixiſſe.* Let us ſee how he hath cenſured a much angrier Critick. (a) *Annæus Cornutus, homo ſane pleraque alia non indoctus neque imprudens, in ſecundo tamen librorum, quos de figuris ſententiarum compoſuit, egregiam totius iſtius verecundiæ laudem inſulſa nimis & odioſa ſcrutatione violavit. Nam quum genus hoc figuræ probaſſet, & ſatis circumſpecte factas eſſe verſus dixiſſet: membra tamen, inquit, paulo incautius nominavit.* The Gravity and Modeſty which reign throughout the *Æneids* are indeed admirable. Was it poſſible for any to have been Shorter than *Virgil*, on the Cave where *Æneas* and *Dido* Conſummated their Marriage? His *Bucolicks* are not ſo modeſt; he there relates very Criminal paſſions, but that is no proof that he was tainted with them. The paſſion for Boys was not leſs common in the Pagan times than that for Girls, ſo that a Writer of Eclogues might make his Shepherds talk according to this curſed Faſhion, as we at preſent make the *Heroes* and *Heroines* of Romances ſpeak; that is to ſay, without its being a ſign that he related his own adventures, or appoved the paſſions he mention'd. Our beſt *French* Romances have been compoſed for a long time by Maids or Married Women. Would it be reaſonable to ſay that they write the Hiſtory of their own Amours, or that they approve their *Heroines* ſuffering themſelves to be ſo ſenſibly affected with the motions of Love (b)? Is it not certain that they may write theſe Books only to diſcover their Wit, and their Art of Painting the Paſſions, and repreſenting Characters? We may ſuppoſe the ſame thing in favour of *Virgil*, ſince on other accounts we have reaſon to believe him endowed with a great ſhare of Virtue. I own that ſeveral Stories run which are not very much to his reputation; but thoſe who relate them repreſent them only as reports, whilſt they aſſure us as a certain truth that his modeſty and probity were very extraordinary. Beſides the ſtories already related, we are told (c) that *Varus* the Tragick Poet Married a very Learned Woman, who lay with *Virgil*, to whom he gave a Tragedy of his compoſure, which ſhe impoſed on her Huſband as her own, and that *Varus* recited it as his performance. It is farther added that *Virgil* obſcurely hints this Adventure in three Verſes of his third Eclogue.

An mihi cantando victus non redderet ille,
Quem mea carminibus meruiſſet fiſtula, caprum?
Si neſcis, meus ille caper fuit.

But *Servius* rejects this as a thing which no body had ſpoken of, and which was repugnant to the Nature of the Eclogue. *Superfluam volunt eſſe allegoriam, dicentes rem nuſquam lectam de Virgilio* ——— *Melius ſimpliciter accipimus: refutandæ enim ſunt allegoriæ in bucolico certamine: niſi, ut ſupra diximus, ex aliqua agrorum perditorum neceſſitate deſcendunt* (d). And it plainly enough appears to be a vain Imagination of ſome perverſe *Genius's*, who hunt after Allegories and Myſteries every where, and are never pleaſed with any thing which is Natural. The moſt forcible Objection againſt *Virgil* would be to repreſent him as the Author of ſome *Priapeia*. But that Reaſon alone is of no great weight againſt his Manners; for as there are Men of Honour and Virtue, who read obſcene Books without any ill deſign, ſo there are ſuch who may compoſe laſcivious Verſes without corrupting their mind. It is reported that St. *Chryſoſtome* frequently read *Ariſtophanes*, and it is certain that St. *Hierome* often read *Plautus*. See the Remark B in the Article *Longus*, and the Epiſtle Dedicatory to *Scioppius*'s Notes in *Priapeia*. Should we dare preſume to rank *Joſeph Scaliger*, *Janus Douza*, *Daniel Heinſius*, and the Preſident *Mainard* amongſt the Debauchees, [illegible] as Reaſons that the firſt wrote Notes on the *Priapeia* and *Catullus*; that the Second very accurately commented on (e) *Petronius*; that the third publiſhed ſome laſcivious Verſes; and that the fourth wrote ſome (f) *Priapeia*? When we believe it impoſſible for another to touch ſuch things without being infected, we too plainly diſcover the weak efforts which we find our ſelves capable of making againſt ſuch objects. *In iis, quæ turpicula & laſcivicula ſunt, ille qui, ut ait Ariſtoteles, bona inſtitutione præmunitus eſt, offendere nequit; Adeo ut, mallicula iſta, qui vel una tali & altera lectione verberantur, & ad nequitiam abducuntur, ſua ſibi culpa & in Venerem prurœdine, perire videantur. Haud ſecus, ac ſi terribili objecta re timidus expaveſcat, fortis non afficiatur* (g). This makes me Remember a thought of *Moliere*. His *Tartuffe*, being juſt ready to hearken to a young Woman, pulls out a Handkerchief and ſays;

(h) *Ah! mon Dieu, je vous prie,*
Avant que de parler, prenez-moy ce mouchoir.
. . . .
Couvrez ce ſein, que je ne ſçaurois voir.
Par de pareils objets les ames ſont bleſſées,
Et cela fait venir de coupables penſées.

But obſerve the young Woman's anſwer:

Vous eſtes donc bien tendre à la tentation:
Et la chair, ſur vos ſens, fait grande impreſſion?
Certes, je ne ſçai pas quelle chaleur vous monte:
Mais a convoiter, moy, je ne ſuis point ſi prompte,
Et je vous verrois nu du haut juſques en bas,
Que toute voſtre peau ne me tenteroit pas.

There may be ſome Poets, Caſuiſts, and Criticks, hardened in the ſame manner againſt thoſe Dangerous Objects, which others cannot read with impunity. *Lipſius* proteſts that the reading of *Petronius* affected only his mind, and left no more traces in his Heart, than a Boat does on a River. (i) *Vidiſtin, quidquam venuſtius, argutius* (Petronio) *poſt natas Muſas? Non ego: abeſſet tantum nuda illa nequitia; qua tamen nihil offendor. Joci me delectant, urbanitas capit: cetera nec in animo nec in moribus meis magis labem relinquunt; quam olim in flumine veſtigium, cymba. Ut vina appoſita vinoſum movent; invinium, ut antiqui loquebantur, non movent: ſic iſta animum jam ante improbum fortaſſe incitent; caſto & caſtigato non adhærent.* If this be true, I dare averr that he might have made Verſes or compoſed Narratives according to the Model of this Romance, and preſerved his mind pure and untainted. Be pleaſed to apply this, *poſitis ponendis*, to the Poetical Amuſements of *Virgil*, which ſerved as an Apology for *Pliny* the Younger.

I ought not to forget the Biſhop of *Avranches*'s Ingenious conjecture concerning the Name of *Parthenias* given to *Virgil*. Having obſerved that this appellation was perhaps beſtowed on him, becauſe it was believed of him as well as of *Homer*, that he was Born of a Virgin, he adds, that it is more probable that the name of *Virgilius* was confounded with that of *Virginius*; that is, in effect to ſay that the Inhabitants of *Naples* being neither acquainted with the Etymology, nor ſenſe of *Virgilius*, and very well knowing the import of *Virginius*, imagined that this Poet's Name was *Virginius*, a word which Anſwers to the *Greek* Word *Parthenias*. (k) *Cur Virgilius Neapolitanis dictus ſit Parthenias, cauſam hanc eſſe ſuſpicari quis poſſit; non quod virginali eſſet modeſtia, ut vulgo fertur, ſed quod virgine natum, perinde ut Homerum, credi voluerint. Probabile ſane hoc eſt; ſed ne quid diſſimulem, longe eſt probabilius ac ſimillimum veri, ſic dictum eſſe a Græcis, pro eo quod Romana lingua appellatum eum putabant Virginium, non Virgilium, cum ignorarent nominis hujus ſignificationem & Originem, a Virgulis, hoc eſt, ramis ſeu ſurculis, petitam; unde & virgeta Ciceroni dicuntur arborum ſeminaria; prioris vero nominis vim notionemque probe callerent.*

(a) [illegible] Annæus Cornutus [illegible] Vir[illegible] Vene[illegible]

(b) Nor [illegible] I don't pretend to deny that ſome of thoſe Women who write Romances have had amorous intrigues.

(c) Ajunt hoc, Varum tragicorum ſcriptorem habuiſſe uxorem litteratiſſimam, cum qua Virgilius adulterium fecit: cui etiam dedit ſcriptam tragœdiam, quam illa marito dedit tanquam a ſe ſcriptam. Hanc recitavit pro ſuo Varus: quam rem Virgilius dicit per allegoriam. Nam tragœdiæ præmium caper fuerat. Servius in Virgil, Ecl. 3. v. 20.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Daniel præter quod Petronium in omni ſua parte [illegible] more cultiſſimum, ſi rebus turpiſſimum illuſtravit, tum etiam verborum laſcivia ſuperare eumdem ſtatuit, & non infeliciter, ut opinor, aſſecutus eſt. *Scioppius epiſt. dedicat. Priapeior. See alſo what he ſays in his Notes upon the Prologue.*

(f) Menagiana, pag. 32. *of the* 1. *Dutch Edition.*

(g) Scioppius, epiſt dedicat. Priapeior. pag. 3.

(h) Moliere, *in his* Impoſteur, act. 3. ſcene 2. p. m. 52. tome 4. *of the* Amſterdam Edition 1679.

(i) Lipſius. epiſtolic. quæſtion. lib. 3. epiſt. 2. ad Petr. Pithœum.

(k) Petrus Daniel Huetius. Alnetan. quæſt. lib. 2. cap. 15. pag. 239. edit Lipſ. 1692.

Mr.

in the (A △) *Anti-Baillet*. Thoſe who tell us that his Eclogues were Admired by (B) *Cicero*, are miſtaken. He did not envy his Neighbours Glory, and diſcovered ſuch a large Share of good Nature and Civility, that the other Poets, who (C) continually envied one another, almoſt unanimouſly agreed in their great Value and tenderneſs for him. Thoſe who ſaid that a ſecret jealouſy prevented his ever mentioning *Homer*, and occaſioned his preferring a leſs known

---

Mr. des Maizeaux hath been pleaſed to communicate to me ſome Obſervations on the Article of Virgil, amongſt which there are ſome wherein he oppoſes this whole paſſage of Mr. Huet, and gives a contrary Account of the ſir Name Parthenias. I had willingly made uſe of his communications, if I had not thought that I ought to ſtay for the New Obſervations, which I know he hath ſent me, and I have not yet received.

(A △) *Of refuting an Obſervation which we find in the Anti-Baillet.*] M. *Menage* pretends that there are Numerous Obſcenities in *Virgil*. His Eclogues, ſaith he (a), "are full of lewdneſs. *Novimus & qui te, tranſverſa tuentibus hirco, &c. Formoſum Paſtor Corydon ardebat Alexin.* He viciouſly lov'd this *Alexis*, as *Apuleius* informs us in the following paſſage of his Apology: *Quanto modeſtius tandem Mantuanus Poeta, qui itidem ut ego, puerum amici Pollionis Bucolico ludicro laudans, & abſtinens nominum, ſeſe quidem Corydonem, puerum verò Alexin vocat.* But *Apuleius* miſtook when he ſaid that *Alexis* was *Pollio's Minion*: He was indeed *Mecænas's* Darling, as we are informed from the 56 Epigram of the VIII. Book of *Martial*." Mr. *Menage* had no Reaſon to infer from this paſſage of *Apuleius* that *Virgil* was enamoured on *Alexis*; for on the contrary, from thence I ſhall prove that he was not, and that ſo much of his Eclogue as relates to this particular was a meer piece of wit. *Apuleius's* accuſers beſides other Crimes objected againſt him ſeveral amorous Verſes on Boys, which he diſguiſed under feigned Names. He replies (b) that it was cuſtomary to alter the Name of the Beloved object. Which he proves by ſeveral Examples, and diſlikes the Conduct of (c) *Lucilius*, who did not make uſe of that diſguiſe. To which he oppoſes *Virgil's* modeſty, who, ſays he, praiſing, as I have done, his Friend's Minion, made uſe of Fictitious Names, &c. If he had pretended that this Eclogue of *Virgil* expreſſed the real amorous Sentiments of its Author, he had directly owned that he was guilty of the ſame Crime, and inſtead of refuting his Accuſers, had acknowledged the juſtice of their Accuſation. But nothing can be more abſurd than to ſuppoſe him Guilty of this Blunder. Let us then ſay that he declares that this Eclogue of *Virgil* was only a witty Amuſement, in which his Affections were not in the leaſt engaged. And it is what he ſays with reſpect to the Poems for which he was proſecuted. He is ſurprized that any Perſon ſhould preſume to Summon him before the Judges on this occaſion. Making Verſes, ſays he, by way of diverſion, is no indication of Manners. The guilty do not uſually boaſt of their Crimes: but thoſe who publiſh Amours, are not engaged in them, and ſuch efforts are only Poetical Fictions. (d) *Sed ſumne ego ineptus, qui hæc etiam in judicio? an vos potius calumnioſi, qui etiam hæc in accuſatione? quaſi ullum ſpecimen morum ſit, verſibus ludere. Catullum ita reſpondentem malevolis non legiſtis?*

> Nam caſtum eſſe decet pium poetam
> Ipſum, verſiculos nihil neceſſe eſt.

Divus Hadrianus, cum Voconii amici ſui poetæ tumulum verſibus muneraretur, ita ſcripſit:

> Laſcivus verſu, mente pudicus eras.

Quod nunquam ita dixiſſet, ſi forent lepidiora carmina argumentum impudicitiæ habenda——— *Cujus* (Platonis) *verſus, quos nunc percenſui, tanto ſanctiores ſunt quanto apertiores: tanto pudicius compoſiti, quanto ſimplicius profeſſi. Namque hæc & id genus omnia diſſimulare & occultare, peccantis: profiteri & promulgare, ludentis eſt. Quippe natura, vox innocentiæ, ſilentium maleficio diſtributa.* Theſe Maxims of *Apuleius* are diſputable, and it may reaſonably be ſaid, that he ought to have reſtrained them, and that they are very liable to exception; but what I aſſert againſt the Author of the *Anti-Baillet*, that *Apuleius's* Words clearly ſignify that *Virgil* did not ſing his own Amours, is beyond contradiction.

(B) *That his Eclogues were admired by Cicero, are miſtaken.*] *Donatus's* Words are (e): *Bucolica eo ſucceſſu edidit, ut in ſcena quoque per cantores crebra pronuntiatione recitarentur. At cum Cicero quoſdam verſus audiſſet, & ſtatim acri judicio intellexiſſet non communi vena editos, juſſit ab initio totam eclogam recitari: quam cum accurate pernotaſſet, in fine ait: Magnæ ſpes altera Romæ, quaſi ipſe linguæ Latinæ ſpes prima fuiſſet, & Maro futurus eſſet ſecunda. Quæ verba poſtea Æneidi ipſe inſeruit.* Here is an Error in Chronology; for it is certain that *Virgil* did not write his Eclogues, till after the Triumvirate of *Octavius*, *Marc Antony* and *Lepidus*, during which, as the World is ſufficiently informed, *Cicero* was cruelly Maſſacred. I dont claim this diſcovery as mine; Father *Vavaſſeur* long ſince refuted (f) the compilers of *Virgil's* Life on this head. He alſo refuted *Servius*, (g) who tells us that the 6th Eclogue being recited by the Author himſelf was received with great Applauſe, and afterwards ſung on the Stage by the Curteſan *Cytheris* or *Lycoris*, and that *Cicero* one of the Audience was ſurprized to a very great degree, and asked who was the Author of it.

CLAUDIUS *du Verdier* took notice of this Fault of *Servius* in a Book which he publiſhed (h), in 1586. *Peter Ramus* had before confuted the ſame miſtake, which Father *Vavaſſor* confutes. *Hinc Donatus affirmat, ſed chronologia repugnat: quatuor enim aut quinque annis antea jam Cicero triumvirali proſcriptione perierat*, are *Peter Ramus's* Words in his Life of *Virgil*, before his *Lectiones* on the *Bucolicks*. To which Words he very properly adds a paſſage in a Dialogue aſcribed to *Tacitus*; Which teſtifies, that all the People roſe up, at the recital of ſome Verſes of our *Virgil* on the Theatre, and that he being accidentally there was ſaluted and Honoured like the Emperor himſelf: (i) *Malo ſecurum & ſecretum VIRGILII ſeceſſum, in quo tamen neque apud divum Auguſtum gratia caruit, neque apud populum Romanum notitia. Teſtes Auguſti epiſtolæ, teſtis ipſe populus, qui auditis in theatro verſibus Virgilii, ſurrexit univerſus, & forte præſentem ſpectantemque Virgilium veneratus eſt, ſic quaſi Auguſtum.*

(C) *The other Poets* ——— *almoſt unanimouſly agreed in their great value and tenderneſs for him.*] This is a great Elogy, which commands my Admiration more than the Beauty of his Works, or the Excellency of his Muſe. His exceeded all the Poets, and yet they loved him. Certainly nothing can be more extraordinary than this; and if the Author who relates it had not prepared the way by deſcribing *Virgil's* Character, he never could have prevailed on us to believe it. He repreſents him endowed with a great deal of goodneſs, he ſays that he was extreamly careful to cultivate honeſt and learned Men, and to acknowledge their Merit, without either envying or blaming any Perſon. He was poſſeſſed of nothing which he did not Communicate to his Friends: A fine Thought in another's Writings pleaſed him as well as if he had been the Author of it; and he was never concerned at being robbed of the Glory of his performances, or that another owned and reaped the Advantage of them. This is his Picture drawn by *Aſconius Pedianus*. (k) *Refert etiam Pedianus* (l) *benignum, cultoremque omnium bonorum atque eruditorum fuiſſe, & uſque adeo invidiæ expertem, ut ſi quid erudite dictum inſpiceret alterius, non minus gauderet, ac ſi ſuum fuiſſet: neminem vituperare, laudare bonos: ea humanitate eſſe, ut, niſi perverſus maxime, quiſque illum non diligeret modo, ſed amaret. Nihil proprii habere videbatur. Ejus bibliotheca non minus*

(a) Menage, Anti-Baillet, tome [illegible] pag. 219.

(b) Apuleius in apologia, p. m. 279.

(c) C. Lucilium, quamquam ſit Iambicus, tamen improbarim, quod Gentium & Macedonem pueros directis nominibus carmine ſuo proſtituerit. Id. ibid.

(d) Id. ib. pag. 280.

(e) [illegible] Donatus [illegible] Author of Virgil's life [illegible] Name.

(f) Vavaſſor de ludicra dictione, pag. 172. & ſeq.

(g) Servius in Eclogam 6. v. 11.

(h) [illegible] in [illegible] antiquos [illegible] centio.

(i) Tacit. de orator. cap. 13.

(k) Donat. ubi ſupra.

(l) In libro quem contra obtrectatores Virgilii ſcripſit. Id. ibid.

known Poet before him, are Guilty of a (C △) great Absurdity. He was none of those Authors who are easily pleased with their own productions; he Corrected and revised his Verses with (D) an extreme Severity; and we are told that his *Æneid*, which we look upon as a finished Piece, was very short of perfection in his Opinion, and that he earnestly desired (D△) it might be burnt, because he had not been able to put his last Hand to it. He

[illegible] poterat, [illegible] antiquum sæpe usurpabat, τὰ τῶν φίλων κοινὰ, hoc est, communia amicorum esse omnia ——— *Gloriæ vero adeo contemptor fuit, cum quidam versus ejus sibi adscriberent, eaque ut docti haberentur, non modo ægre non ferebat, immo voluptati id illi erat.* After which are we not prepared to allow the probability of the following Words of the Author: *Quare novus omnes Poetas ita æquales habuit, ut cum inter se plurimum invidia arderent, illum una omnes colerent?* Perhaps it may be asked why the Text of this Remark is not conform to the Latin; I having inserted the exception *almost*, which is not in the Latin Words. To which I answer that I had just Reason to make use of that Limitation, since immediately after I find in my Author, that the Poets *Anser* and *Cornificius* were *Virgil's* Enemies. 'Tis he then who is to be Blamed for having twice successively said *omnes*, instead of *fere omnes*. And he is the more blameable, since he could not but know that *Virgil* had above two Enemies. *Bavius* and *Mævius* (a) hated him, so that here are four Poets against him. An Anonymous Author is said to have censured (b) his Eclogues, and *Carbilius* **Pictor** his *Æneids*; besides we are told that one *Herennius* collected his Faults, and *Perilius Faustinus* detected his *Plagiarisms* (c). And it ought indeed to be owned that this great Poet was exposed to the Criticisms of his Contemporaries, since *Asconius Pedianus* (d) wrote a Book in his Defence. And if he had not been thus exposed, it ought to be registred amongst the greatest Miracles that ever were; (e) *Urit enim fulgore suo qui*, &c.

(C △) *That a secret jealousy prevented his ever mentioning* Homer—— *are Guilty of a great absurdity.*] *Virgil* supposes in his description of *Æneas's* descent into Hell, that the *Sibyl* desirous to know where *Anchises* was inquired of *Musæus*, the most illustrious of all the Poets, and of all the choice Men, who had an Apartment in the retreat of the Blessed.

Hic (f) manus, ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi;
Quique sacerdotes casti, dùm vita manebat,
Quique pii vates, & Phœbo digna locuti,
Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes,
Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo:
Omnibus his niveâ cinguntur tempora vittâ.
Quos circumfusos sic est, effata Sibylla:
(Musæum ante omnes: medium nam plurima turba
Hunc habet, atque humeris exstantem suspicit altis.)
Dicite felices animæ, tuque optime vates,
Quæ regio Anchisen, quis habet locus?

Which Mr. de *Segrais* renders thus:

Le front ceint de bandeaux en ce lieu de delices,
Sont les Prêtres exempts des souilleures des vices,
Ceux qui pour leur païs sont morts aux champs de Mars,
Ceux que rendit fameux l'invention des arts,
Les Poëtes divins, dont la celeste flâme
A montré qu'Apollon illuminoit leur ame;
Tous ces nobles esprits, dont les faits genereux
Affranchirent leur nom de l'oubli tenebreux.
A ces esprits épars la Sibylle s'adresse,
A Musée entre tous; car dans la foule épaisse,
Par son port éminent il domine sur eux.
Dites heureux esprits, & toi Chantre fameux,
Quels lieux sont habitez par le celebre Anchise?

This *French* Translator of *Virgil* makes the following excellent Remark: (g) “ Some Commentators ask why *Virgil* does *Musæus* the Honour to place him in the *Elysian* Fields, and to address the *Sibyl's* Words to him, rather than to *Homer*. I once observed a Company of very Learned Men, almost unanimously agree, that *Virgil* ought indeed to have bestowed this Honour on *Homer*, but that his jealousy of him prevented it. I did not at that time reflect on it, and yet nothing is more Ridiculous than this, and the answer to this Objection is obvious, which is, that *Virgil* had been Guilty of a horrible Fault in giving this Commission to *Homer* in *Æneas's* life time, since he was not born till a long time after. Wherefore to Answer the *Sibyl*, this wise Poet has chosen *Musæus* who being *Orpheus's* Disciple was much Antienter than *Homer*, for he lived about the time of the *Trojan* War it self. 'Tis scarce credible that the Elder *Scaliger* should be so much mistaken as he is, when he takes *Musæus*, the Author of the small Poem of *Leander* and *Hero*, who as many Learned Men believe was later than *Virgil* himself, for this Antient *Musæus*; and that he should affirm, to shew how much this Poet was Superior to *Homer*, that it was for that Reason that *Virgil* preferred him to *Homer* in the Honour which he did him in the *Elysian* Fields, without ever thinking how impertinent it would have been to place *Homer* in Hell before the Death of *Æneas*, *Ulysses*, and so many Heroes whose Adventures and exploits he sung. If *Homer* had lived during the *Trojan* War he had never chosen it for the Subject of his Poem; and he must have dispatched his *Iliads* and *Odysses* very hastily in Seven Years, in order to be ready to hold this Dialogue with the *Sibyl*. But it is plainly proved that he did not live till long after; and as no Reason obliged *Virgil* to be Guilty of this Error in Chronology, and it being impossible for him to be Ignorant of it, he therefore avoided such a gross Fault: Which would in a Word make *Homer* dye before he was Born. On the Contrary if he could handsomely have mentioned him, he would very willingly have done him that Honour, nothing appearing in his Character as I have observed in my Preface, unworthy of a generous Mind.”

The Learned *Turnebus* (h) who mentions this Objection against *Virgil*, hath not Answered it; whence it ought to be concluded that the most Learned Men do not always think of what should most naturally and necessarily occur to their Minds, when they are writing on a Subject.

(D) *He revised his Verses with an extreme severity.*] He Spent three Years on his *Eclogues*; seven on his *Georgicks* and eleven or twelve on his *Æneids* (i). In compiling the Second of these three Works, he Dictated several Verses in the Morning, and spent the rest of the day in Correcting them, that is to say reducing them to a small Number. He compared himself to a she Bear, which licks her Cubs into Shape. (k) *Cum Georgica scriberet, traditur quotidie meditatos mane plurimos versus dictare solitum, ac per totum diem retractando ad paucissimos redigere, non absurde carmen se ursæ more parere dicentem, & lambendo demum effingere.* Aulus Gellius informs us of the same. (l) *Amici familiaresque P. Vergilii in his, quæ de ingenio moribusque ejus memoriæ tradiderunt, dicere eum solitum ferunt, parere se versus more atque ritu ursino: namque, ut illa bestia fœtum ederet ineffigiatum informemque, lambendoque id postea, quod ita edidisset, conformaret & fingeret; proinde ingenii quoque sui partus recentes rudi esse facie & imperfecta: sed deinceps tractando colendoque reddere iis se oris & vultus lineamenta. Hoc virum judicii subtilissimi ingenue atque vere dixisse res, inquit, judicium facit: nam, quæ reliquit perfecta expolitaque, quibusque imposuit census atque delectus sui supremam manum, omni poeticæ venustatis laude florent: sed quæ procrastinata sunt ab eo ut post recenserentur, & absolvi, quoniam mors præverterat, nequiverunt, nequaquam poetarum elegantissimi nomine atque judicio digna sunt.*

(D △) *That he earnestly desired his Æneid might be burnt, because he had not been able to put his last hand to it.*] This is affirmed in his life ascribed

(a) See Servius upon the 3. Verse of the 3. Eclogue, Qui Bavium non odit amet tua carmina Mævi.

(b) Prolatis Bucolicis Numitorius quidam rescripsit Antibucolica, duas modo eclogas, sed insulsissime παρῳδήσας. Donatus ubi supra.

(c) Id. ib.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Horat. epist. 1. lib. 2. v. 13.

(f) Virgil. Æneid. lib. 6. v. 660.

(g) Segrais, Remarks upon the 6. Book of the Æneid, pag. 164. & seq. Amsterd. 1700.

(h) Turneb Adversar. lib. 28. cap. 36. pag. m. 631. col. 1.

(i) Donat. ubi supra.

(k) Id. ib.

(l) A. Gellius, lib. 17. cap. 10. p. m. 459.

He deſigned a three Years retirement * in order to poliſh it; after which he intended to apply the remainder of his Life ſolely to Philoſophical Studies; but he died in the interim at *Brunduſium* (D △△) the 22 of *September*, 734. His Corps purſuant to his order † was tranſported to *Naples*. The ‡ Emperor was infinitely pleaſed with his Poems. Nothing is more Ridiculous than the Stories of his Magick (*E*), and the pretended Wonders which he ſhewed the *Neapolitans*,

* Donatus ubi ſupra.

† Id. ibid.

‡ See the Remark (3), Number IV.

cribed to *Donatus*. See the Remark *G* hereafter (*a*). This Life is a piece which contains a great many Falſities, wherefore it would be very excuſable (*b*) to call this a lye, if other Authors had not mention'd it alſo; but ſince *Pliny*, *Aulus Gellius*, and *Macrobius* have ſaid it, we may ſafely allow the Fact, without any danger of paſſing for too credulous. *Pliny's* Words are: (*c*) *Divus Auguſtus carmina Virgilii cremari contra teſtamenti ejus verecundiam vetuit; majuſque ita vati teſtimonium contigit quam ſi ipſe ſua probaviſſet.* Aulus Gellius immediately after the Words, cited in the preceding Remark goes on thus: (*d*) *Itaque cum morbo oppreſſus adventare mortem videret; petivit oravitque à ſuis amiciſſimis impenſe, ut Æneida, quam nondum ſatis elimaſſet, adolerent.* See *Macrobius* in the 24. Chap. of the 1 Book of his *Saturnalia*.

(*D* △△) *He died—— at* Brunduſium *the* 22. *of September* 734.] Father *la Rue* ſaith in 735, and that he was Born in 684. I have followed their Chronology, who have placed his Birth in 683, and his Death in 734. They agree with Father *la Rue* in the Conſulſhips of *Virgil's* Birth and Death, but not in the Years of thoſe Conſulſhips. The like variations run through almoſt all Parts of the Antient *Conſular faſti*. This diverſity is of no great Conſequence. They all make *Virgil* live the ſame Number of Years. The following is a difference of another Nature. *Pliny* ſeems to have placed his Death in the Year 740. (*e*) *Hac*, ſaith he, *Virgilii vatis ætate incognita à cujus obitu XC. aguntur anni*. When *Pliny* wrote the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Work, *Titus* had been but ſix times Conſul; he therefore wrote it before the Year 832. which (*f*) was that of the 7. Conſulate of *Titus*, and it is probable that he wrote it in 830. under the Sixth Conſulate of this Son of *Veſpaſian*, and that having reviſed his Work, he inſerted that date throughout. Now he reckons but 90 Years from the Death of *Virgil*, which therefore ſhould be plac'd in the Year 740. Obſerve that on ſuch occaſions he generally aims at an exact Supputation not contenting himſelf with an even Number. Notwithſtanding which I believe that in this place he made uſe of an even Number, or rather that he Compiled the 14. Book of his Natural Hiſtory (*g*) in the Year 825. when in a literal ſenſe it was Ninety Years ſince *Virgil's* Death. In reviſing his Work he propoſed to reduce all the particular dates which he had uſed to that of his reviſal, but probably forgot to alter the date of the 14. Book, and left the Number XC. Thoſe who have Corrected their own Writings will bear Witneſs, that notwithſtanding all their Attention ſeveral things have eſcap'd them, which obſtruct the perfect uniformity of a large Book.

But tho we ſhould ſuppoſe that there were really but 90 intervening Years betwixt the Death of *Virgil* and *Titus's* 6. Conſulate; and that thoſe who fix his Death in the Year of *Rome* 735, ought to ſtand Corrected by this paſſage of *Pliny*, where it is determin'd to the Year 740. we could not help diſcovering a groſs Error in *Triſtan's* Commentaries. This *Antiquarian* (*h*) imagines that at the time of *Caius Cæſar's* Expedition againſt the *Parthians*, *Virgil teſtifies that he finiſhed his Georgicks; for 'tis our* Caius Cæſar *whom he certainly mentions in theſe Verſes towards the end of the laſt Book of that Work*,

Hæc ſuper arvorum cultu, pecorumque canebam,
Et ſuper arboribus: Cæſar dum magnus ad altum
Fulminat Euphratem bello, victorque volentes
Per populos dat jura, viamque affectat Olympo.

And not Auguſtus, as it hath been hitherto thought: For it ought to be Conſider'd, that Auguſtus was not in this War, but Caius (*i*) *his Nephew and adopted Son, who forced Phraates King of the Parthians to reſign Armenia to the Romans.* If this Author had been at the Trouble of Chronological Tables, he would have found that the Conſulate under which *Virgil's* Death is placed, is too widely diſtant from the time of *Caius Cæſar's* Expedition, to Countenance any ſuppoſition that this great Poet was compoſing his *Georgicks* during the ſaid *Caius Cæſar's* War with the *Parthians*. His Expedition happened in, or about the Year of *Rome* 752. If after that *Virgil* had wrote his *Æneids*, he muſt then have lived at leaſt till the Year 765. which doth not want a refutation. I ſhall only ſay that Cardinal *Noris* (*k*) alledges the Common Opinion concerning *Virgil's* dying in 734. againſt *Triſtan*.

(*E*) *Of his magick and the pretended prodigies which he ſhewed the Neapolitans.*] I think it was in the Year 1625. that a Book was publiſhed under the Title of, *A new deciſion concerning what hath been ſaid and written for and againſt the Book of the curious knowledge of the Wits of this Age.* Virgil is there accuſed (*l*) *of having been a Celebrated Enchanter, and Necromancer as well as having performed innumerable Wonders by the aſſiſtance of Magick.* This was tranſcribed *verbatim* from the Book, which the *Sieur de l'Ancre* publiſhed againſt the *unbelief of Sorcery*. Which induced Mr. *Naudé* to write *an Apology for all thoſe great perſonages, which were falſly ſuſpected of Magick.* He upbraids *Boden* and *de Lancre*, who put *Virgil* into the Number of Magicians, with *the* (*m*) *unreaſonableneſs of their Copying the Falſity from the moſt Scandalous Writings of certain Authors, who were the very Sink and Sediment of the moſt Barbarous Writers —— This Phœnix of Latin Poeſy*, continues he, *is not accuſed of that Magick and Poetical Fury, which by the Perfection of his Works Charmed all the politeſt Wits —— but of the Superſtitious and Criminal Magick, of which this Ornament of Parnaſſus had never been ſuſpected, by a leſs degree of impudence than that unbounded one of theſe Muſhrooms and Fabuliſts, for which I cannot tell whether they or the two Modern Authors and ſome others*, quos fama obſcura recondit, *are more blameable, who are ſo riaicuouſly credulous as to admit ſuch Cheats as legal Evidence of a Calumny, which turns much more to their prejudice than to that of Virgil* —— (*n*) *There is indeed Reaſon to Wonder at thoſe, who at preſent make uſe of the lyes and Fabulous Inventions of Seven or Eight Slaves to Barbarouſneſs, and the Opinions of the Populace, in order to draw this Poet's Name into their Catalogue of Magicians, and relate a Thouſand Stories, which if true, would only cauſe him to be eſteemed one of the moſt expert that ever was in that Art.* After which he retracts what had ſaid (*o*), *that we were beholden for all thoſe Fables to Helinandus the Monk.* He took it on *Geſner's* Authority *that this good Monk Flouriſhed in the Year* 1069. *but being convinced* (*p*) *that he lived about* 1209, *I am*, adds he, *obliged* (*q*) *to confeſs ingenuouſly that I was miſtaken, and that the firſt Author of all theſe idle fancies, was in my Opinion that Gervaſius, who Theodorick à Niem* (1) *ſaith was Chancellour to the Emperor Otho the III. to whom he preſented his Book Entituled* Ocia Imperatois, *which is really ſo ſtuffed with abſurdities and Fables, as I Remember to have already obſerved, that I can hardly perſuade my ſelf that he was in his ſenſes when he wrote it.* This Author relates: (*r*) "That *Virgil* "made a Copper Fly, which for the Space of Eight "Years remained on one of the Gates of *Naples*, "to which he had fixed it, and prevented any "Fly entring the City; where he alſo Built a Market Houſe in which Fleſh never Stank or putrified; "that on one of the Gates of the ſaid City he "placed two large Stone Statues, one of which he "called Merry and Beautiful, and the other Melancholy and Hideous; that theſe Statues were "of that Vertue, that any Perſon entring the "Town by the Side where the firſt was, was "Bleſſed with a Happy Succeſs in all his Affairs, "whilſt he who came in on the ſide of the Gate "where the other was fixed, found himſelf "Unfortunate in all his Endeavours, and that every "thing

(*a*) Number IV.

(*b*) Corrected for it. See Virgil's life written by Father la Rue and prefixed to the Commentary in uſum Delphini.

(*c*) Plinius lib. 7. cap. 30. pag. m. 51.

(*d*) Aulus Gellius ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Plinius lib. 14. cap. 1. pag. m. 114.

(*f*) *Others ſay it was the* 831. *Thoſe, for example who place the Death of* Virgil *in the Year* 734.

(*g*) *I ſuppoſe here that the Year in which* Virgil *died, is not the* 734. *as I have put it in the text of this Article, but the Year* 735.

(*h*) Triſtan comment. hiſtor. tom. 1. pag. 137.

(*i*) Triſtan *ſhould have ſaid his Grand Son. He did not conſider that the Word* nepos *ſpoken of Caius with reſpect to Auguſtus, does not ſignify nephew.*

(*k*) Noris Cenotaph. Piſan. pag. 110.

(*l*) In the preface to the Apologie des grands hommes ſoupçonnez de Magie.

(*m*) Naudé Apologie des grans hommes, chap. 21. pag. 615. Paris 1625, in 8.

(*n*) Id. ibid. pag. 619.

(*o*) In the 1. Chapter pag. 17.

(*p*) He ſays pag. 611. that he found in the Lives of the Famous Monks of Citeaux, that Vincentius Bellovacenſis in his Speculum makes him live in 1029.

(1) Lib. de Schiſmate, cap. 19. & 20.

(*q*) Naudé ibid.

(*r*) Naudé ibid. pag.

Neapolitans. The Versions of, and the Commentaries on his Works are † innumerable, Those who have disguised him in Burlesque Verse, have moved the Choler of some

" thing cross'd his Intention; that he caused a " Brass Statue with a Trumpet in its Mouth to be " erected on a high Mountain near the City of Naples, which sounded so loud when the North Wind " blew, that the Fire and Smoak of Vulcan's Forges, " which are at present to be seen near Pozzuoli, were " driven towards the Sea, without any damage to " the inhabitants; that it was he who caused the Baths " of Calanura di petra lapina & anuso di Pierna, to " be made, with the beautiful inscriptions in Gold " Letters, which were after broken and defaced by " the Physicians of Salerno, who were displeased " that by them the People were instructed what " Disease each Bath would cure; that he prevented " any Person being injured in the wonderful Grotto " cut out in Mount Pausilippo in the way to " Naples; and lastly that he made a publick Fire, at " which every person was free to warm himself, near " which he placed a Brass Archer with his Arrow " fixed, and his Bow bent, and this inscription, whoever " strikes me, I let fly my Arrow; that it afterwards " happened that a Mad-man struck the Archer, " who did not fail to shoot his Arrow directly into " the Fire, which immediately went out. Let us now take a view of the Transcribers and Improvers of these ridiculous Fables. (a) " All these Absurdities were first transcribed from this Author by Helinandus Monk of Fresmont, in his " Universal (1)Chronicle, and afterwards by Alexander " Neckam an English Benedictin Monk, who relates " some of the fore-mention'd Stories in his " Book of the Nature and Property of Things; " besides which, he adds, that Naples being afflicted " with a Contagious, and infinite number of Horse-" Leeches, was deliver'd from that Plague instantly, " upon Virgil's throwing a Golden Horse-Leech into " a Well; and that he had encompassed his " House and Garden, in which it never rained, " with an immovable Air, that served instead of a " Wall, and that he there made a Bridge of Brass, " by means of which he transported himself whither " he pleased; that he also built a miraculous " Belfrey, which, tho' of Stone, moved in just proportion " to the Vibrations of the enclosed Bell; " that he made the Statues, called the Salvation of " Rome, which were watched Night and Day by " the Priests, because as soon as any Nation " design'd a Revolt, and to arm against the Roman " Empire, the Statue which by its mark represented " that Nation, and was adored by it, immediately " moved it self, and thereby rung a small Bell " which hung about its Neck, and pointed with its " Finger to the Rebellious Nation, so that its Name " might be seen Written, which the Priest carried " to the Emperor, who immediately prepared an " Army in order to subdue and reduce it to Reason: " which is also carefully observed by an anonymous " Author, who above one hundred and " Twenty years ago, collected the Lives of the " Philosophers and Poets; for when he comes to " Virgil, he with a great assurance tells us, (1) *Hic* " *Philosophia naturali praeditus etiam Necromanticus* " *fuit, & mira quadam arte hac fecisse narratur:* After " which, he recites the above mention'd Stories, " which were afterwards copyed verbatim " from the Latin of this Anonymous Writer, by " Symphorian Champier (2), and Albert of Eib, who " was so weak as to insert them in the second part " of his Margarita Poetica, under the Title of Sentences " and Authorities excerpted from Diogenes " Laertius, and yet not content with them, hath " enlarged them with the Story of a Roman Curtezan, " who having hung up Virgil in a Basket in the middle " of a Tower; he in revenge so extinguish'd all the Fires " in Rome, that it was impossible to light any of " them, any otherwise than by kindling them at " the Privy parts of this Strumpet; and besides the " Fire being so incommunicable, that no one could " light at another's Fire, every person was obliged " to see and visit her: And this fine Story was scarce " Publish'd but one Gratian du Pont thought it " worthy of being inserted in his Controversies " betwixt the Female and Male Sexes, Printed " at Toulouse in 1534, as a very manifest " Proof of the Malice and Malignity of Women: " His Verses shall conclude this long deduction " of Follies.

" *Que dirons nous du bon homme Virgil,*
" *Que on pendit si vers par l'Evangil,*
" *Dans sa corbeille* [illegible]
" *Dont tant moqué fut* [illegible]
" *A luy qui estoit homme de grand honneur,*
" *Ne fu ce pas un* [illegible]
" *Helas si fut, car c'estoit dedans Rome,*
" *Que la pendu demeura le pauvre homme,*
" *Par sa cautelle & sa deception,*
" *Un jour qu'on fit grande procession*
" *Parmy la ville, dont dudit personnage,*
" *Qui ne s'en rit ne fut estimé sage.*

Naudé doth not trouble himself with refuting these Absurdities, but takes some Notice (b) that the Life of Virgil, ascribed to Tiberius Donatus, St. Hierom's Master, says that this great Poet's Father was first Servant, and then Son-in-law to a certain Magus. He answers, that according to Delrio and La Cerda, this Life as handed to us at present, was not written by that Antient Donatus. What we find there concerning Virgil's Father, adds he, (c) sufficeth to determine *the piece to be suppositious.* It is a very strange Blunder to take the Word Magus, which the best Criticks correct by Magius or Majus, for a Magician. The Authority of Johannes Sarisberiensis, who *mentions the brazen Fly which drove all the Flies out of* Naples, does not seem of any great force. Tessatus (3) who places Virgil amongst the Practicers of Necromancy, is not a Witness of any credit, since he grounds what he saith on Helinandus's Chronicle. *But since the Authors,* Naudé goes on, " (d) who have spoke of Virgil's Magick, are so " numerous, that it is impossible to treat of them " particularly one after another, without losing a " great deal of time, and admitting abundance of " Tautologies, I ought to imitate the Civilians, " who take their Authorities *per saturam*, and " making but one Article of all the rest, to shew, " that tho' Le Loyer (4) mentions his Eccho, (5) Paracelsus " his magical Images and Figures, (6) Helmoldus " his representation of the City of Naples " in a Glass Bottle, (7) Sibylla, and the Author of " the Book intitul'd, *the Image of the World*, the " Head which he made in order to be informed of " future Events, (8) Petrarch and Theodorick a Niem " (9) the Grotto at Naples which he caused to be " cut out at the request of Augustus, (10) Vigenere " his Alphabet, (11) Trithemius his Book of " Tables and Calculations, to discover the Genius " of all Persons, and Lastly, those who have visited " the Duke of Florence's Cabinet, a Mirrour " said to be that which this great Poet made use " of in Catoptromancy: Yet all these Authorities " are too Modern absurd, and ill grounded to " turn the Scale against the Silence of all the Authors " who lived during the space of a Thousand " Years, who would be inexpressibly to blame, " not to have mention'd or observ'd any of all " those Wonders, if there had really been any such, " since they have taken notice of a great many particulars " of less moment.,, I pass by some Reasons which he alledges, and what he observes as a Fable, *That all the Sodomites in the World* (e) *dyed on the Night of Jesus Christ's Nativity, and that as the famous Civilian* (12) Salicet *assures us,* Virgil *was one of 'em.* But I ought not to omit what follows. " (f) As for the preceding " Authorities, it ought not to be imagin'd that Petrarch, " Theodorick a Niem, Vigenere and Trithemius " were so imprudent, as scandalously to prostitute " their Credit and Reputation to the Censure " of those that are not easily imposed on by such " Fables; for it is certain that whatever they have " said, was in order to refute them, and give us to " understand that they were not so easy and credulous " as the other Authorss, whom I have cited, " who can never attone for the Fault " which they have committed, of suffering themselves " to be milled by the scandalous and " weak Influences of Hear-says, Street-Ballads, and " the vulgar Opinion of the Inhabitants of Naples, " and ſome (F) Learned Men; and it muſt be confeſt that it is not altogether without Reaſon. Father *de la Rue* Commentary *in uſum Delphini* is a very good one, it is preceded by a Life of this Poet, digeſted according to the Order of the Conſulſhips, and adorned with very judicious Remarks. I ſhall find ſome faults in Mr. *Moreri* (G). I have avoided mentioning a certain Poplar, called *Virgil*'s Tree, which, according to the cuſtom of the Country, was planted when his Mother was deliver'd of him, and was obſerved to grow ſo faſt, that in few Years it equalled much older Poplars. The pregnant and Child-bed Women made it an Object of Religion †. Amongſt *Caligula*'s Follies, are undeniably to be reckoned his Contempt and Hatred of *Virgil*; he endeavour'd to remove his Writings and Effigies out of all Libraries §, and ventured to ſay that *Virgil* had neither Wit nor Learning *. The Emperor *Alexander Severus* judged quite otherwiſe; he called him the *Plato* of the Poets, and placed his Picture with that of *Cicero* in the Temple, in which he had placed *Achilles* and other great Men ‖. *Cecilius* the Grammarian was the firſt † who made Prælections on the Poems of *Virgil*, whoſe Contemporary he was.

---

(1) Cap. 103.

(2) Lib. de claris Medicinæ Scriptorib. tract. 2.

(b) Ibid. pag. 622.

(c) Ibid. pag. 622.

(3) Comment. in epist. D. Hieron. ad Paulinum.

(d) Naudé ubi supra, pag. 626.

(4) Book 1. of Spectres chap. 6.

(5) 1 tom. oper. tract. de imaginibus cap. 11.

(6) Lib. 4. Histor. Slavor. cap. 19.

(7) Peregrin. quæst. decade 3. c. 2. quæstiunc. 3.

(8) In itinerario.

(9) Lib. 2. de schismat. cap. 19.

(10) Pag. 330. of his Chiffres.

(11) Antipal. l. 1. cap. 3.

(e) Naudé ibid. pag. 628. 629.

(82) Apud Emanuel. de Moura, lib. de Ensalm. sect. 3. c. 4. numb. 12.

(f) Naudé ibid. pag. 629.

† *Acceſſit aliud præſagium: ſiquidem virga populea, more regionis in puerperiis eodem ſtatim loco depacta, ita brevi* coaluit, *ut multo ante ſatas populos adæquarit.* Quæ arbor Virgilii ex eo dicta atque conſecrata eſt, ſumma gravidarum & fetarum religione, ſuſcipientium ibi & ſolventium vota. Donatus ib. initio.

VIRGIL.

"and the circumjacent places, who always aſcribed "every thing to *Virgil*'s Magick, which ſeemed "ſomewhat extraordinary or ſurprizing, and for "which they could not find a better cauſe; as it is "very eaſie to judge from the wonderful Grotto "hewn out of the Mountain *Pauſilippo* near the City "of *Naples*, which *Strabo* (who according to *Athenæus*, lived in the time of *Scipio*, and the taking "of *Carthage*, or, according to *Patricius*, in *Auguſtus*'s "and *Tiberius*'s time) mentions as very Ancient; "notwithſtanding which, the Peaſants thereabouts "affirm, that it was dug by *Virgil* at the preſſing "Inſtances of *Auguſtus*, becauſe the top of the "Mountain under which it is cut, was ſo peſter'd "with Serpents and Dragons, that he muſt be a "very bold Man who ventur'd to croſs it. (a) To conclude, He inquires into the firſt cauſe of this ſuſpicion, and believes he hath found it in the "Mathematical Learning which *Virgil* acquir'd. "(b) This is what confirmed all the weak and credulous in this erroneous Opinion, which they had "already entertain'd of him by reaſon of his *Pharmaceutria*, or Eighth *Eclogue*, where, ſays *Apuleius*, "he hath Learnedly repreſented, *Vittas molles &* "*verbenas pingues, & thura maſcula, & licia diſcolora*, and whatever belongs to Magick; ſo that "he could not avoid being ſuſpected of the practice of it, by thoſe who were hindred by their "Ignorance and the barbarity of their Age, from "knowing that it was Tranſlated *verbatim* from "*Theocritus*.

GAFFAREL (c) endeavours to defend the Authority of *Gervaſius Tilberienſis*, and to anſwer *Naudæus*; but his efforts are very ridiculous.

(F) *Who have diſguized him in Burleſque Verſe, &c.*] *Scarron* hath ſucceeded herein much better than all the reſt; but the Majeſty of this Poem deſerves more reſpect than to be ſo daringly prophaned. *Vavaſſeur* the Jeſuit complained of it, and obſerved that *Italy* firſt made way for this liberty: (d) *Vide, Balzaci, de iſtorum hominum conſiliis, & inſtituta ratione quid ſentiam, quidve primum venerit in mentem, cum perſonatos aliquot ejuſmodi, & ementitos Virgilios, neque enim hanc ab uno duntaxat contumeliam paſſus eſt, in manus ſumpſi. Mihi viſi ſunt, qui nobiliſſimum & clariſſimum poëtam fœditate interpretationis ſuæ turpârunt, eodem illum modo tractare voluiſſe, quo Didonem tractavit prius, adeoque vices innocentis & calamitoſæ reginæ ulciſci. Ut is enim Didonem Æneæ turpiter indigneque proſtituit, neque ullam rationem habuit vel temporis, cum ab Ænea Dido diſtaret ipſis trecentis annis; vel famæ & exiſtimationis publicæ, quod eadem omnes ætatis ſuæ feminas pudicitiæ laude anteiret: ita iſti nulla ingenuæ artis præſtantia, nulla principis poetæ dignitate deterriti ſunt, quo minus puram & caſtam poëſim, corruptam & adulteratam extruderent in publicum, diffamarent malis dictis ſuis, eique quantum poſſent, petulanter illuderent.*——— (e) *Quamquam hic ego noſtris hominibus non habeo quid præcipue ſuccenſeam, cum nihil in iſto genere per ſe ac primi, ſed exemplo & imitatione peccarint. Sicut nec ipſi præter ceteros ſuccenſere mihi debent, ſi commune factum, & aliorum potius quam Gallorum, reprehendo. Fecerunt videlicet flagitium antea & Joannes Baptiſta Lallius, cujus Æneis traveſtita mihi caſu nuper occurrit, & alii, ut audio, recentes Itali ſcriptores.*

(G) *Some Faults in Mr.* Moreri.] I. His manner of placing his words in this Sentence, *the two firſt Works were written in favour of* Mæcenas *and* Pollio, would make one believe, that his *Bucolicks* were compoſed in favour of *Mæcenas*, and his *Georgicks* in favour of *Pollio*. But he either deſign'd, or ought to have ſaid the contrary. And if he had poſtponed *Mæcenas* to *Pollio*, he had yet been guilty of expreſſing himſelf wrong; for a Perſon who ſhou'd ſay that *Virgil*'s *Eclogues* and *Georgicks were written in favour of* Pollio *and* Mæcenas, would ſpeak (f) illogically, and contrary to the Laws of our Grammar. This Sentence ſignifies that each of thoſe Pieces was written for *Pollio* and *Mæcenas*. But that is falſe. In the *Dutch* Editions this paſſage is alter'd thus: *The two firſt Works are full of the praiſes of* Mæcenas *and* Pollio. But this doth not mend the two Faults which I have noted, and introduces a third, ſince it is certain that *Mæcenas* is not praiſed in the *Eclogues*, and that he is mention'd in very few places of the *Georgicks*, and always very ſuccinctly, and ſometimes without any manner of praiſe. Nevertheleſs it ſhould be allowable to ſay, that this Poem was Compos'd in his favour, becauſe it is dedicated to him; and it is to him that the Author addreſſes himſelf in the Firſt and Laſt Book, and in ſeveral other places. I do not deny but that *Pollio* is praiſed in the *Eclogues*; but as ſeveral others have a good ſhare in the flattery, what *Donatus* diſtributes (g) amongſt Four Perſons, ſhould not have been beſtow'd upon one; and I ſhould rather have ſaid, as he doth, that they were compoſed at the inſtigation of *Pollio* (h). I have ſaid in my firſt Edition of this Book, that *Donatus* making *Virgil* to be Twelve Years in compiling the *Æneid*, Mr. *Moreri* ſhould not have ſaid *Eleven Years*: But at this time I renounce my former Cenſure, for ſeveral Editions have it *annis undecim*, and not *annis duodecim* (i) as mine hath, which is the *Virgil variorum* Printed at *Leyden* in 1680. II. *Virgil* did not die going to *meet* Auguſtus *as he returned from his Eaſtern Journey*. He went into *Greece* and *Aſia* in ſearch of a Retirement, in order to be at leiſure to correct his *Æneids*; and in this Journey, he met *Auguſtus* at *Athens*; *Auguſtus*, I ſay, who return'd from the *Eaſt*. This determined him to return into *Italy* with the Emperor: But the Diſeaſe which ſeized him in his Journey (out of curioſity) to *Megara*, increaſing upon him in his paſſage, he arrived at *Brunduſium* in ſuch an ill ſtate of health that he died in few days. Thus the Story is told in his Life. III. Since according to *Moreri*, he was born in the Year of *Rome* 684, and died in 735, he could not poſſibly live 52 Years. This fault of *Moreri* is alſo in the Life of *Virgil*. The Day, and the Conſulſhips of his Birth and Death are noted in it. Thoſe two intervals do not quite make up 51 Years, and *Donatus* nevertheleſs ſuppoſe that *Virgil* went into *Greece* at the age of 52 years. IV. Theſe words: *As he was Dying, he ordered that his Æneids ſhould be burned, but* Auguſtus *preſerved that admirable Poem, and commanded* Tucca *and* Varius *to correct it*, are very fallacious, and it is very neceſſary they ſhould be rectified. The Fact

---

(a) Ibid. pag. 631.

(b) Ibid.

(c) Gaffarel, Curioſitez inouïes chap. 7. n. 13. pag. m. 169 & ſeq.

(d) Franc. Vavaſſor, De ludicra dictione, pag. 180.

(e) Id. ib. pag 182,

(f) [illegible] all the Articles ought to agree with the Subject. See the Art of Thinking, 2. part, ch. 9.

(g) Cum res Romanas inchoaſſet, offenſus materia & nominum aſperitate, ad Bucolica tranſiit, maxime ut Aſinium Pollionem, Alphenum Varum, & Cornelium Gallum celebraret: quia in diſtributione agrorum, qui poſt Philippenſem victoriam veteranis, triumvirorum juſſu, trans Padum dividebantur, indemnem ſe præſtitiſſent. *Donatus ubi ſupra.* (h) Bucolica triennio Aſinii Pollionis ſuaſu perfecit. Id. ib. (i) Duodecim *is to be found in many other Editions.*

is

VIRGIL, Biſhop of *Saltzburg* in the VIII Century. Mr. *Moreri* mentions him, but omits a Particular which deſerves to be related. He hath ſaid nothing of the Perſecutions which this Prelate ſuffered for (*A*) believing the *Antipodes*. The Court of *Rome* engaged againſt him, which the Flatterers of the Pope endeavour to elude as much as poſſible; but they cannot help our concluding from thence, the groſs Ignorance of that Age.

VIR-

is thus. *Virgil* finding the increaſe of his Diſtemper, earneſtly aſked for his Manuſcripts in order to commit his *Æneids* to the Flames; and becauſe no Body was ſo obliging as to bring them, he order'd by his Teſtament, that they ſhould be burned as an imperfect Work. *Tucca* and *Varius* repreſented to him, that *Auguſtus* would not permit it. Whereupon *Virgil* bequeathed his Writings to them on condition that they ſhould add nothing to them, and ſhould, if they found any imperfect Verſes, leave them in the ſame Condition. (*a*) *Cum gravari morbo ſe ſentiret, ſcrinia ſæpe & magna inſtantia petivit, crematurus Æneida: quibus negatis, teſtamento comburi juſſit, ut rem inemendatam imperfectamque. Verum Tucca & Varius monuerunt, id Auguſtum non permiſſurum. Tum eidem Vario, ac ſimul Tuccæ, ſcripta ſua ea conditione legavit, ne quid adderent quod a ſe editum non eſſet, & verſus etiam imperfectos, ſi qui erant, relinquerent.* So that *Auguſtus* was no farther the cauſe of the conſervation of this Poem, than that the Author deſiſted from his Reſolution, being told, that this Prince would not ſuffer the execution of it. It redounds to the glory of this great Monarch, that he diſcovered himſelf ſeriouſly intereſted in it, and that he obliged *Varius* to the punctual performance of the Condition (*b*) under which the Manuſcript was left to him. What ſhall I ſay concerning thoſe Verſes, which this Emperor wrote on *Virgil*'s intention to burn this excellent Piece? We have but a ſmall Fragment (*c*) of them. What ſhall I ſay farther of the ardour with which, during the moſt difficult Expeditions, he deſired that this Author would ſend him even the firſt lineaments of his Poem? (*d*) *Auguſtus cum tum forte expeditione Cantabrica abeſſet, & ſupplicibus atque minacibus per jocum literis efflagitaret, ut ſibi de Æneide, ut ipſius verba ſunt, vel prima carminis hypographa, vel quodlibet colon mitteret, negavit ſe facturum Virgilius: cui tamen multo poſt, perfecta demum materia, tres omnino libros recitavit: Secundum videlicet, quartum, & ſextum.* I have elſewhere (*e*) ſpoken of the effect which the recital of his 6th book produced. Which was very great by reaſon of the beauty of the Verſes and of the art of reading which the Author was perfect Maſter of. See the words which inform us that he read his *Georgicks* to *Auguſtus*: (*f*) *Georgica, reverſo ab Actiaca victoria Auguſto, atque reficiendarum virium cauſa Atellæ commoranti, per continuum quatriduum legit, ſuſcipiente Mæcenate legendi vicem, quoties interpellaretur ipſe vocis offenſione. Pronunciabat autem maxima cum ſuavitate, & lenociniis miris. Seneca tradidit, Julium Montanum poetam ſolitum dicere, involaturum ſe quædam Virgilio, ſi vocem poſſet, & os, & hypocriſim: eoſdem enim verſus eo pronunciante, bene ſonare: ſine illo, inareſcere, quaſi mutos.* It is impoſſible to do a greater ſervice to a piece of Poetry, than to read it well: it removes ſeveral Faults (*g*), and no Poem is ſo good but an ill Reader may ſpoil it (*h*). When an Author reads his Play to the Actors, with whom he is about to treat, he is in a wretched Condition, if he doth not read it well. This is what Mr. *Chappuzeau* obſerves in his *French Theatre*. *Virgil* was therefore very happy, having the Talent of making charming Verſes, and of reading them well. Mr. *Corneille* reſembled him but in one of theſe Excellencies (*i*). I return to *Moreri*. His V. Fault is his ſaying that *Auguſtus* order'd, *that whatever was ſuperfluous in the* Æneids, *ſhould be ſtruck out without adding any thing to it*. Is this rightly to underſtand *Donatus*'s *ſummatim emendavit*? To correct a Book in ſome places, and with reſpect to ſome things, doth it ſignify only to ſtrike out of it what is ſuperfluous? May it not ſignifie that ſome words are inſerted in the place of others? VI. His *Virgil, a Roman, and a Comick Poet*, is a ſign that he's a blind Tranſcriber. He had read in *Voſſius* (*k*) *Trajani temporibus fuit Virgilius Romanus, Poeta Comicus*, and miſtruſting nothing he imagined this to be the real name of this Poet; but if he had conſulted the Originals, he would have found that *Pliny*, the Younger, cited by *Voſſius*, ſpeaks of one *Verginius* or *Virginius*, and not of one *Virgilius*. Beſides, *Romanus* ought not to be tranſlated as an Epithet denoting his Country, but as the Name of his Family. Mr. *Huet* hath obſerved this miſtake of *Voſſius* in *Gyraldus*, and *Glandorpius*: (*l*) *Hæc autem nomina duo ſæpe confundi indicat Virginii Romani Poetæ Comici Plinio in Epiſtolis memorati nomen, qui a Lilio Giraldo, Glandorpio, & Voſſio Virgilius appellatur.* Mr. *Couſin* a little miſtakes this Paſſage of the Biſhop of *Avranches*. *We ought not to be ſurprized*, ſaith he (*m*), *that theſe two Names have been confounded, ſince ſeveral Learned Men of theſe laſt Ages have called a certain Comick Poet*, Virginius Romanus, *whom* Pliny *calls* Virgilius Romanus *in his Epiſtles*. I cannot conclude without obſerving, that when *Pliny* the Younger beſtows this Elogy on *Virginius Romanus*, he informs us that the ſame Diſeaſe was obſervable at *Rome*, which reigns amongſt our modern Wits; for he declares that he was none of thoſe who deſpiſed the preſent time, and admired only the Ancients. (*n*) *Sum ex iis, qui miror antiquos: non tamen, ut quidam, temporum noſtrorum ingenia deſpicio. Neque enim quaſi laſſa & effœta natura, ut nihil jam laudabile pariat. Atque adeo nuper audii Verginium Romanum paucis legentem comœdiam, ad exemplar veteris comœdiæ ſcriptam, tam bene, ut eſſe quandoque poſſit exemplar.*

The Paſſage above quoted concerning the reading of the *Georgicks* to *Auguſtus*, wants ſome correction. That Prince after the Battle of *Actium*, in the Year of *Rome*, 724. return'd into *Italy*, and met the Senate at *Brunduſium*, where he ſtay'd 27 Days according to *Suetonius*, or 30 according to *Dion Caſſius*, and then went into *Aſia*, where he ſpent all the Winter in making Preparations for his Expedition to *Ægypt*. It is not then true, that at his return from the War of *Actium*, our Poet's *Georgicks* were read to him at (*o*) *Atella*. If he heard them read at this place, it was after the *Ægyptian* War, and not when he returned to *Italy*, after the Battle of *Actium* (*p*). I borrow this Remark from Father *la Rue*. I could alledge another Reaſon, which is, that *Virgil* obſerves at the end of his *Georgicks*, that he compoſed this Work during *Auguſtus*'s Oriental War; but it may be objected againſt me, that this Poem having coſt *Virgil* Seven Years labour, (*q*) nothing hinders but part of it might be read to *Auguſtus* before he went to attack his Enemy on the Banks of the *Nile*.

(*A*) *For believing the Antipodes.*] He had hardly divulged this Doctrine, but he was accuſed of maintaining that there was another World, and other Men under us, another Sun, and another Moon. *Boniface*, Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, immediately took fire at it, and charged his Opinions with impiety. He cenſured *Virgil* Publickly, and as the Pope's Legate caus'd him to be admoniſh'd, that he ſhould no more corrupt the Purity of the Chriſtian Doctrine. (*r*) *Hoc ita acceptum eſt, quaſi Virgilius alium mundum, alios ſub terrâ homines, alium denique ſolem, atque aliam lunam eſſe aſſereret. Bonifacius hæc velut impia, & Philoſophiæ divinæ repugnantia refutat, Virgilium publice, privatim arguit, ad recantandum has nænias provocat, efflagitatque jure ſuo ut Legatus Germaniæ, ne ille hujuſmodi deliramentis ſinceram & ſimplicem Chriſti ſapientiam polluat atque contaminet.* *Virgil* incenſed at this Affront, complain'd to *Utilo* Duke of *Bavaria*, whoſe Favourite he was, and irritated him againſt *Boniface*, who ſent his Complaints to the Court of *Rome*, and he wrote to the Pope in ſuch terms as render'd *Virgil*'s Faith ſuſpected. The Pope ſent ſome Deputies to the Duke of *Bavaria*, and wrote to him,

---

…) Donatus … Sed … …tur in … … Au… …ius Vir… …tare… …quod … …m … …prope… …ius, ad …nnim …ud… …ui, ut …ſit … …ſeret ſi… …tus, ſi… …tum ſuis …tionibus, …qua e… …ur, te… …pere… …ibid.

…) It is in …Life of Virgil. … lib. ib.

…) In the Article Octavia

…) Idem Donatus ibid.

…) See Pliny … Epiſt. 15. … 3.

…) To this may be referred this Epigram of Martial: …is the 38th of the …ſt. Book: Quem recitas meus eſt ô Fidentine, libellus; Sed male cum recitas, incipit eſſe tuus.

…) See the Menagiana, pag. …3. 304. of the …ſt. Dutch Edition.

…) Voſſius de poetis Latinis, pag. …1.

(*l*) Petrus Daniel Huetius, Alnet. quæſt. ubi ſupra.

(*m*) Journal des Savans 11. *Sept.* 1690. pag. 642. *Dutch Edit.*

(*n*) Plinius Epiſt. 21. lib. 6. pag. 319. edit. Cellarii Lipſiæ 1693.

(*o*) *A Town of* Campania.

(*p*) *Taken from* Virgil's *Life written by Father* la Rue, *and prefixed to* Virgil in uſum Delphini. *M.* Des-Maizeaux *gave me notice that the Jeſuit had made that Obſervation.*

(*q*) Georgica ſeptennio Neapoli confecit. Donat. ubi ſupra.

(*r*) Aventinus, Annal. Boiorum lib. 3.

VIRGIL, or VERGIL (*Polydore*) was born at *Urbino* in *Italy* in the XVth Century. He did not want either Capacity or Learning. I take his firſt Book to be a Collection of Proverbs which he Printed in 1498. Before which time none of the Moderns Publiſhed any thing of that nature; wherefore he Boaſted of having (A) preceded *Eraſmus*, whom he very roughly reproached. His ſecond work

that if *Virgil* was a Prieſt, he ſhould be degraded from his Sacerdotal Function, and ſent to *Rome* to give an Account of his Conduct. (a) *Ipſe (Zacharias Pontifex Maximus) Legatos cum mandatis & litteris ad Utilonem ire jubet, partes ſuas Bonifacio commendat. Virgilium Philoſophum (ſi Sacerdos ſit, inquit, neſcio) à templo Dei & Eccleſia depulſo, Sacerdotio in Concilio abdicato, ſi illam perverſam doctrinam fuerit confeſſus*——— *Inſuper regulo Boiorum denunciatum eſt, ut Virgilium Romam mittat, ubi Virgilius rationem reddat, ac à Pontifice Rom. examine comprobetur.* This is the whole Proceſs in this Affair; we do not find that it went any farther by the Annals: wherefore the raſh careleſneſs of thoſe, who tell us that Pope *Zachary* Excommunicated and Depoſed a (b) Biſhop for preſuming to aſſert that the Earth is round, and inhabited in all parts of its circumference, is inexcuſable. *Kepler*, a Roman Catholick Author, is one of theſe: (c) *Fuit quidem Virgilius Epiſcopus Saliſburgenſis ab officio depoſitus, quod antipodas eſſe, eſſet auſus aſſerere.* *Origanus*, a Proteſtant, ſaith the ſame thing: (d) *Qui ſane Virgilium noſtrum communi calculo damnarunt, à ſacerdotio, templo & Eccleſia depulerunt.* But tho' we don't find that the Pope's Menaces were executed, that cannot hinder us from concluding that they are ſcandalous to his Memory, and moſt of all to that of *Boniface*. It is certain, that *Zachary* order'd that *Virgil* ſhould be ſent to him as a Perſon accuſed of dangerous Errors: *Nos ſcribentes prædicto Duci* (Utiloni) *evocatorias de prænominato Virgilio mittimus litteras, ut nobis præſentatus & ſubtili indagatione requiſitus, ſi erroneus fuerit inventus, canonicis decretis condemnetur: qui enim ſeminant dolores, metunt eos.* Theſe words are taken out of his Letter to (e) *Boniface*. In which are alſo theſe following. *De perverſa doctrina, quam contra Dominum & animam ſuam locutus eſt (quod ſcilicet alius mundus, & alii homines ſub terra ſint, aliuſque ſol & luna) ſi convictus fuerit ita confiteri, hunc, accito Concilio, Eccleſia pelle, Sacerdotii honore privatum.* By which it appears, that he order'd him to be Excommunicated and Degraded from his Prieſthood, if by his Confeſſion he was convicted of having taught that there was another World, and other Men under the Earth, another Sun and another Moon. I am not ignorant that the Doctrine for which he would have this Biſhop to be condemned, was not the bare Hypotheſis of the *Antipodes*; for it doth not ſuppoſe any different Stars from thoſe which appear in our Horizon: But yet this Doctrine of the *Antipodes* plainly appears to be one of thoſe, which he judged worthy of the moſt rigorous Puniſhments of the Canon-law. Was not this a Proof of a prodigious Ignorance? was it not an enormous abuſe of the power of the Keys? I am willing to believe that *Boniface* ſurprized him, and that he falſly repreſented *Virgil*'s Opinions. They had for ſome time been embroiled in a Quarrel in which the jealouſy of Learning and Authority had engaged them; which made *Boniface* take a wrong view of *Virgil*'s Opinions. And who knows whether he did not give a malicious turn to the Story, by annexing ſeveral (f) Conſequences, which he thought proper to excite Fears? Some will have it that he ſuffer'd himſelf to be deceiv'd by falſe Reports, and that he judged of *Virgil*'s Sentiments, from whatever was ſaid of them by ignorant Relaters, who could not comprehend them. This is the Learned *Velſerus*'s charitable Conjecture. *Quod quidam conjecere*, ſays he (g), *non abnuerim: Virgilium de terræ ſpecie acutius, quam pro vulgi captu, diſputaſſe, globoſam eſſe, & vivere e contraria parte, qui adverſis veſtigiis contra noſtra veſtigia, quos antipodas vocemus. Hos perinde ac nos ſole & luna luſtrari. Ea ignoratione audientium perperam accepta detortaque, longe alio ſenſu ad Bonifacium perlata, offenſionum præbuiſſe ſementem.* But this doth not at all excuſe this Archbiſhop: His Ignorance, his precipitation, his temerity in accuſing the Innocent at the Court of *Rome*, are undeniable recorded Facts againſt him. *Velſerus* having found no Traces of the conſequence of this Affair, believes that *Virgil* ſo explained his Opinions, that they ſeemed reaſonable, and that he was reconciled to his accuſer. (h) *Diſceptationis exitum non comperio. Fit veriſimile, aut purgaſſe ſe Virgilium Pontifici, ſive coram, ſive per litteras: aut cognitis invidorum utrimque fraudibus*——— *ultro, quod inter bonos ſolet, in gratiam eſſe reditum. Sane Bonifacius toto deinde* (i) *ſeptennio ſuperfuit, neque iſtius tamen diſſenſionis præterea veſtigium apparet.* I deſire it may be obſerved, that *Velſerus* doth his utmoſt to ſalve the Honour of the Pope and of thoſe two (k) Saints; and yet he dares not venture ſo far as to affirm that their reconciliation was compleated. He declares that he did not know the iſſue of this Quarrel, but that he thought it probable that *Virgil* made his peace with *Zachary* and his Accuſer. It is not unlikely, ſaith he, that the malignity of thoſe who fomented the diſcord by falſe Reports, was detected. Conjectures are allowable in dubious caſes; therefore we have nothing to object againſt *Velſerus*: but it is unreaſonable to ſet up for a deciding Man in ſuch things, and therefore we have reaſon to complain of an Hiſtory who averrs that (l) *by the prudence of the Pope, and the wiſdom of* Utilo, *the Authors of the Calumny were diſcovered, and that thoſe holy Men incapable of Hatred, contracted a more ſtrict Friendſhip than before.* This Hiſtorian is not the only one who hath acted in this manner: A great many of Authors have done the ſame thing; they have converted the Conjectures which they read, into Affirmations; they are like thoſe prating News-mongers, who an Hour after they have read in the *Gazette*, that preparations are making for ſome Siege, or for the paſſage of a River, report that the Place is inveſted, and the Army is already encamped on the other ſide of the River. The Hiſtorians of the ignorant Ages were perhaps bolder in this particular than thoſe of our times, and if that be true, how many Lies are we obliged to believe? and how ſtrongly do they fortify Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm, which daily (m) encreaſes?

(A) *Of having preceded* Eraſmus, *whom he very roughly reproached.* I find in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Treatiſe *de inventoribus rerum*, that he declares, that both with reſpect to that Subject, as well as to the Proverbs, he had beaten the Path for all other Authors. (n) *Non inficior*——— *quin poſſit quiſpiam de hac re, velut de proverbiis, quorum libellum proximo anno* Guidoni *Principi, Urbini Duci inſcripſimus, copioſius tradere. Verum quicunque hoc vel illud poſthac ingredietur iter, quia nos primi ſtadium cucurrimus, is fortaſſe noſtra veſtigia ſequi non gravabitur.* If you read *Eraſmus*'s Epiſtles, you will there be informed that *Polydore Virgil* had ſaid ſeveral harſh things of him in the Preface to the new Edition of his Proverbs: He accuſed him of (o) Vanity and Envy; he call'd him (p) a Plagiary, and took it very ill that he was not mention'd in the Preface to *Eraſmus*'s firſt Edition. He charged him with attempting to rob him of his due Honour. *Ubinam eſt iſta veritas quam in præfatione ſcribis procul eminere? quaque fretus boni conſulis quod ego callidus diſſimulator conatus ſum in gloriæ tuæ poſſeſſionem irrepere* (q)? *Eraſmus* juſtified himſelf very clearly in a Letter (r) which he wrote to him in *December* 1521. See alſo his 12th Letter of the 1ſt Book, pag. 50. He did an action too glorious to be omitted, and ſo exemplary, that it ought to be propoſed to the imitation of all Authors. The Bookſeller at *Baſil* being about re-printing *Polydore Virgil*'s Book, reſolved to ſuppreſs the Preface becauſe it reflected on *Eraſmus*. But this great Man would not conſent to it, but order'd him not to leave out any part of it, whatever the import of it was: (s) *Vel hinc colligas licet, quam non fuerimus iniqui tuo libro.* Frobenium, *ut dictum eſt, abhorrentem ab editione perpuli. Præfationem tuam, qua me ſuggillas, ad me miſerant, velut execrandam. Remiſi juſſique, ut bona fide, ſicut abs te fuerat deſcripta, excuderetur: deleverunt mentionem* Lei, *quam tu de illo ſane quam honorificam facis. Juſſi ut reponerent.*

(a) Id. ib.

(b) *It appears from* Aventinus's *Narrative that he was not a Biſhop yet.*

(c) Keplerus, epiſt. ante lib. 4. epitom.

(d) Origanus, epiſt. ad Elect. Brandenb.

(e) *See* Baronius Tom. 9. ad ann. 748.

(f) *As his teaching that all Men are not deſcended from* Adam, *that* CHRIST *did not die for all Men*, &c.

(g) Marcus Velſerus, lib. 5. rerum Boicarum.

epiſt. 3. l. 17. p. 748. (p) Priuſquam hac præfatione res--livoris ſimul & plagii. Id. ib. p. 749. (q) Id. ib. *which I have juſt now quoted.* (s) Eraſm. ubi ſupra.

Utrum

Work, which Treats of the Inventers of things, was published in (B) 1499. He was sent to *England* * in the beginning of the XVI. Century, to collect the *Papal* Tribute, called the *Peterpence*, in that Kingdom. Where he so well recommended himself, and was so well pleased, that having obtained the dignity of Arch-Deacon of the Cathedral Church of *Wells* †, he resolved to pass the remainder of his life in *England*, and quitted his Office of Collector of the *Peterpence*. He undertook a great Task, in the performance of which he laboured several Years. Which was the History of *England*. He Dedicated it to *Henry* the VIII. in 1533. This Book is not (C) much valued by the *English*. He put his last hand to his (D) Treatise of Prodigies in the Year 1526. He was no very rigid *Papist* in all (E) particulars; he was not at all disgusted at *England* on Account of the change of

* ... the ... B.

† ... the ... mark B.

tiorum hæc sunt faventia an non? Two Years after he advised the Author himself to correct it, that there might be no appearance of any jealousy betwixt them. (a) *Mihi videris consulte facturus, si primam illam præfationem totam retexas. Primum faciet hoc ad operis commendationem ob novitatem. Deinde faciet ad opinionem utriusque nostrum, quod insunt in illa priore quædam, quibus ego quidem non offendor, sed tamen suspicionem præbent eruditis alicujus inter nos æmulationis.* In my Edition of this Treatise of Proverbs (b) there is nothing against *Erasmus*. This trifling quarrel did not break the thred of their Friendship. See *Erasmus*'s Letter to him (c) in 1526. Observe that *Polydore Virgil* had formerly made him a Present (d) to buy a Horse. As also that he Dedicated to him (e) his Translation of a piece of Saint *Chrysostome* in the Year 1528.

(B) *Was published in* 1499.] We shall here make use of a distinction which *Vossius* omits: He saith (f) that this Tract of *Polydore Virgil* contains 8 Books, which were first Printed in 1499. But this Account is not exact. For the Author published but three Books at first, whereof the Epistle Dedicatory was dated in that Year. To which he added five in 1517, and Dedicated them to (g) *John Matthew Virgil*, his Brother, Professor of Philosophy at *Padua*. So that Sr. *Thomas Pope-Blount* mistakes when he saith (h) that these 8 Books were Printed at *Strasburg* in 4° in 1509. Mr. *Moreri* hath committed the same error as *Vossius*.

(C) *This Book is not much esteemed by the English.*] Sr. *Henry Savil* says of it: (i) *Polydorus, ut homo Italus, & in rebus nostris Hospes, & (quod caput est) neque in Republicâ versatus, nec magni alioqui, vel judicii, vel ingenii; pauca ex multis delibans, & falsa plerumque pro veris amplexus, Historiam nobis reliquit, cùm cætera mendosam, tum exiliter sane, & jejune conscriptam.* Another *English* Writer calls him a Malicious Detracter: (k) *nominis Britannici gloriam non solum obfuscare, sed etiam Britannos ipsos mendacissimis suis calumniis infamare totis viribus conatur.* But there is a complaint against him of a different Nature: *Paulus Jovius* observes that the *French* and *Scotch* charged *Polydore Virgil* with flattering the *English* to an excessive degree, (l) *Conscripsit Historias rerum Britannicarum, ea fide ut Scotis, & Gallis sæpe reclamantibus, alieno potius arbitrio, quam suo intexuisse multa in gratiam gentis existimetur, quòd in recensendis minorum Ducum nominibus, tanquam gloriæ avidis plurimum indulserit.* John Leland hath censured several Faults of *Polydore Virgil*, as *Vossius* (m) observes.

(D) *To his Treatise of Prodigies.*] Which is composed of several Dialogues, wherein he vigorously opposes Divinations. A small part of the Preface dated at *London* 1526. runs thus: (n) *Cujus* (Christi) *ipse quoque doctrina instructus confidenter veni in certamen cum ariolis, auguribus, haruspicibus, vatibus, sortilegis, quos partim divinis, partim naturalibus debilitatos imo atque adeo devictos rationibus, jacere cum suis pestiferis artibus, videre jam licebit.* This is then a Work of a very different Nature from that of *Julius Obsequens*, which was Enlarged by *Lycosthenes*. (o) We are told of an Edition at *London* in 1526. but *Gesner* knew nothing of it; for he mentions only that of *Basil*, Printed by *Bebelius*, in 1531. I have the *Basil* Edition in 1545 8° *per Mich. Isingrinum*. To which are prefixed (p) three other Tracts of *Polydore Virgil*; the Epistle Dedicatory Written by him is dated at *London* in 1543.

(E) *He was no very rigid Papist in all particulars.*] He approved the Marriage of the Clergy, and Condemn'd Image Worship. To which purpose I shall here Cite at large what *John Bale* saith of him, which affords me a proof of what I have already (q) promised. (r) *Ob insignem in omni bonarum literarum genere eruditionem, Wellensis* (s) *Ecclesiæ Archidiaconus postmodum factus, priori Officio Pontifici resignato, constituit Romam non repetere, sed deinceps in nostrâ permanere Insulâ. Et licet in plerisque scriptis suis veræ Religioni superstitionem prætulerit, pie nihilominus Christianorum Ministrorum conjugia defendebat, pieque statuarum cultum damnabat, cum quibusdam aliis Romanensium Rabbinorum imposturis. Quòd antiquitati Britannicæ in Anglorum Historiâ, quam par est, iniquior sit, ex veterum illius Gentis Chronicorum & Historicorum ignoratione provenit. Quòd præterea Reges aliquot ab impietate pios, & alios è diverso ab ipsâ æquitate iniquos etiam promulgaverit, communi ante agnitam veritatem per Dei verbum, errori ac cæcitati imputandum esse judico*—— *Erat certè Polydorus ob erudita illa de Rerum Inventoribus, Sacrorum Ritibus & Prodigiis Opuscula, ab ipsis etiam piis suspiciendus.* The Tract *de inventoribus rerum* contains several things which the Inquisition disliked, wherefore they approved of no Edition but that which *Gregory* the XIII caused to be Printed at *Rome* in 1576. which was purged of all those passages which displeased the Inquisitors. And as for the other Editions they order'd the blotting out of several passages (t). The *Spanish* Index expresly Commands the expunging of *Polydore Virgil*'s reflection on Saint *Peter*'s not permitting the Centurion to kiss his Feet. And indeed it contains a very sharp Censure on the Pride of the Ecclesiasticks; the Words are: (v) *Pater mansuetudinis plenus id fieri non est passus, qui elevans eum sibi ad pedes jacentem, dixit: Surge, & ego ipse homo sum. O vocem memorabilem, atque salutarem, si bene multi hodie sese quoque homines tantum esse perpenderent, qui propterea quòd sacerdotio præditi sint, planè se reliquorum mortalium, longè post hominum memoriam imperiosissimos dominos præbent, non communes patres, uti fieri deberet.* But this Author did not take the same Liberty with respect to the *Popes*; for on the contrary he justifies and commends the Custom of kissing their Feet. And yet some Writers cite him as disapproving it. (w) "Non "possum, quin addam, quæ hac de re occurrunt apud "*Polydorum Virgilium*, hominem Papistam, *de rerum* "*invent: lib.* IV. *cap.* 13. *Romani Pontifices*, in"quit, *deosculandos pedes exhibendi morem a Christo* "*se accepisse contendunt. At Christus non Magda*"*lenæ osculandos pedes obtulit; sed sponte peccata* "*fatentem, & suam misericordiam non solo amplexu* "*genuum, ut ethnici, sed etiam osculo pedum implo*"*rantem, ejus consolandæ causâ admisit: hoc ipsum ho*"*noris genus alioquin non minus repudiaturus, etsi sibi* "*re verâ debitum, quam appellationem Magistri boni.* "*Sic quoque Petrus Cornelium centurionem ad genua* "*procidentem manu sua sublevavit,* SURGE, *in*"*quit,* HOMO SUM TIBI SIMILIS: *tantum* "*absfuit ut osculandos pedes exhibuerit. Decipimur specie* "*recti, & sæpe cum Caligula pedes protendimus, dum* "*Christi humilitatem vel spernimus, vel fucato conser*"*vandæ Apostolicæ autoritatis titulo extenuare labora*"*mus.*" This is a Remonstrant Minister who cites of Religion under the Kings *Henry* the VIII and *Edward* the VI. He did not desire to leave that Kingdom in the Year 1550. (F) on any other Account than that his Age required a warmer and more Southern Climate. He obtained leave to depart, and was permitted to receive the Revenue of his Benefices during his absence. It is reported that he dyed * at *Urbino* in 1555. He is accused of having burnt several (G) Manuscripts in order to prevent the discovery of the Faults of his History of *England*. It was Printed (H) several times, which shews that the World was more imposed on in that Age than they are at present, or else more addicted to study; since an impression of the best Historians in Folio will hardly go off at this time.

(a) Idem epist. 45. lib. 20. pag. 1007.

(b) ... is of ... Treat. ... from the prefa... of the Author.

(c) To the 25. of the 21. Book.

(d) Id. ep... l. ... pag. 1093.

(e) Idem opusculum (Chrysostomi Monachum) in Anglia vertit Virgilius Polydorus satis felicior, mihi dicatum. Exemplum est autem Lutetiæ. Id. epist. ... 25. pag. 1355.

(f) Vossius de hist. Latinis pag. 673.

(g) That Epistle Dedicatory is dated from London the 5. of December 1517.

(h) Pope Blount, cens. au... pag.

(i) Henri- Savi- præ- ad re- An- glic. scriptores apud Pope Blount censf. Author. pag. 451. (k) Humfred. Lhuyd in descript. Angl. apud Pope Blount ib. pag. 451. (l) Paulus Jovius elog. c. 135. pag. 279. (m) Vossius supra pag. 679. (n) Polyd. Virgilius præf. ad Franciscum Mariam Urbini Ducem. (o) Vossius ubi supra pag. 678.

(p) De patientia & ejus fructu libri II. de vita perfecta liber I. de veritate & mendacio lib. I.

(q) *In the Margin of the Text of the Article.*

(r) Joan. Balæus, de scriptor. Britann. centur. 13. apud Pope Blount ubi supra pag. 451.

(s) *These Words of Paul Jovius ubi supra*, Is ab Henrico Rege fortunis adauctus flamenque Londini creatus, *are fallacious; they seem to imply that he was of Canon London.*

(t) *See the* Index librorum prohibit. & expurg. pag. 85c. & seq. edit. 1667. in fol.

(v) Polyd. Virgilius de inventor. rerum lib. 4. cap. 13. pag. m. 290.

(w) Anton. Borremans. variar. lect. pag. 167.

VITELLIO,

Polydore Virgil's Words in this manner, having assured us in his Preface, that excepting only twice or thrice, hath always examin'd the passages which he cites. This passage of *Polydore Virgil* must then be one of the two or three, for there is an enormous difference betwixt what he really says and what this Minister ascribes to him. Consult Mr. *Crenius* (a) who hath very exactly Corrected this mistake, and compared the two places together, that just now cited, and the other as it really is in *Polydore Virgil* in the *Strasburg* Edition Printed 1606. in 8°. I have Consulted my Edition which is that of *Lyons apud hæredes Seb. Gryphii* 1558 in 8°. and I find that the Words exactly agree with those alledged by Mr. *Crenius*. I have also Consulted the *French* version of *Polydore Virgil* published by *Francis de Belleforest* at *Paris* in 1582. and I find that he made use of an Original which was exactly the same with my *Latin* one. I cannot therefore be sufficiently surprized at the prodigious Depravations which are crept into the Quotations of this place.

A certain Author assures us that *Polydore Virgil* died in the Year 1562. and that in *Lippomanus's* judgment the Tract *de inventoribus rerum* is a wretched Book (b). *Mors etiam Polidori Virgilii contigit Stasse* (1), *ubi natus erat. Multa scripsit, sed non omnes docti ea existimant. Imperitissimum vocat eum & vanitatis redarguit doctissimus Lindanus* (2), *atque hominis hujus scripto, quod de rerum inventoribus finxit, nihil extare nostrâ ætate in lucem editum, pluribus, quod scateat magis, aut futilibus perfuat compilatis.* It is certain that it did not please the Bigots.

(F) *He did not desire to leave that Kingdom in the Year* 1550. *on any other Account than that his Age ——— He obtained.*] This I take from the History of the Reformation of *England*: (c) *Polydore Virgil* after having lived almost Forty Years in *England*, asked leave to go and end his days, a little nearer the Sun, He being very old. Which was granted him, on the 2. of *June*, and in consideration of the Services, which it was thought he had done to the Publick, by his History, he was allowed during his absence to hold the Arch-Deaconry of Wells and the Prebend of *Nenninton*. Mr *de Larrey* (d) relates the same thing, but adds a marginal Note, by which we are informed that (e) *Harmer saith, it was in* 1551. *that* Polydore Virgil retired, and then he adds: (f) " Perhaps some " regard was had to his moderate Behaviour, in the " Reformation which *Henry* the VIII began, and *Edward* had carried on. For as much an *Italian* " as he was, he did not engage with any of the " Defenders of the See of *Rome*, but subscribed " the Resolutions which were taken in the Assemblies, in Favour of the King's Supremacy. "

The Author, who criticized Dr. *Burnet* about the time of *Polydore Virgil's* retreat, might have criticized him upon another point: For if that *Italian* Author did not leave *England* before the Year 1550. he had been near 50. Years in that Country. He was sent thither by Pope *Alexander* VI. after he had published his Book *de Inventoribus rerum*. But that Book came out in 1499. and that *Pope* departed this life in the Year 1503. and we know that in 1505. *Polydore* began to Write his History of *England* at the request of King *Henry* VII. The result of all * these Facts is, that he was sent into *England* about the beginning of the XVI. Century.

(G) *Of having burnt several Manuscripts in order to prevent.*] To this purpose read the following small particulars. (g) *Quem* (Polydorum) *ne aliquando intelligerentur errores, fama pervebuit, atque etiam cognitum & compertum certò est, tot historias nostras veteres & Manuscripta immani scelere igni commendasse, quot ne plaustrum quidem posset capere atque sustinere, arbitratus, ut credo, se ejus generis omnes solum habuisse, aut veritum sibi vitio dari, quod secutus legem jampridem librorum veterum castigatoribus datam (ut ipse de se ait in præfatione in Gildam) nonnulla resecuerit, quæ Scriptores prodiderunt. Supersunt tamen Deo volente quamplurimi omnis generis, & illis Polydori multò pleniores & perfectiores.* *La Popeliniere* tells the same Story; which I shall give you in his own Words without leaving out any of them, for if I should leave out any, they would be such as ought to be known. (h) " *Polydore Virgil* a Native of *Urbino* in *Italy*, (i) " was sent for appointed by *Henry* the VIII. to " set the *English* History in a true light, which he " digested into twenty six Books. They are more " valuable because the *English* have scarce any Ancient Authors left to have recourse to in case of " doubts or Ignorance with respect to any considerable Event (he after he had finished having caused all those to be Burned which by the King's " Authority and the assistance of his Friends he could " possibly come at,) than for the truth, care or judiciousness of his performances. Our *French* " tell us the same thing of P. *Æmilius* his Neighbour and Contemporary, and of several others " who greedy of equal Fame with *Plato* and *Aristotle*, Burned, as they did, several Books after " having extracted the *Quintessence* of them, in " order to make up Books which they afterwards " published under their own Names.

(H) *It was Printed several times*] I have already said that the date of the Epistle Dedicatory is (k) 1533. And I doubt not but that mentioned by *Gesner* to be Printed at *Basil* by *Bebelius* in 1534. in Folio, was the first Edition. The Author revised his Work and Corrected several places in the 2. Edition which was in 1536. I make use of that of *Basil apud Mich. Isingrinium* in 1556 in Folio, which contains but 26 Books. But I find in the Epitome of *Gesner* (l), that this History in 27 Books *ab auctore recogniti ad amussim expoliti*, was Printed by *Isingrinius*, and afterward by *Thomas Guerin* in Folio in 1570. I wish the Year of *Isingrinius's* Edition had been observed, and I cannot believe that it contains 27 Books, since that which *Thysius* (m) published at *Leyden* in 1649 contains no more than 26 and doubtless *Thysius* followed the best and most compleat of all the foregoing Editions. However it be, the 26 Book of this History end with the Death of *Henry* the VII. Wherefore I can scarce apprehend the Author who accuses our *Virgil* of having falsified the Relation of Affairs concerning the Reign of *Henry* the VIII. in order to insinuate himself into the favour of *Queen Mary*, when it is certain that he left *England* before there was any probability that *Mary* would come to the Crown. It is also certain that his History Printed (n) at *Basil* one Year after his Death, contains but 26 Books, which reach no farther than the Death of *Henry* the VII. And therefore the following passage is somewhat obscure to me. (o) *Maxime erravit Polydorus in describendis temporibus Henrici VIII. Nam præter quod linguæ nostratis prorsus ignarus, plurima eorum temporum nescire habuit necesse: plurima etiam, ut Mariæ Reginæ gratiam promptius demereri posset, scripsisse, non sine causa perhibetur. Priorum verò temporum, eadem non est suspicio.* Besides it is propable that *Polydore Virgil* did not stay so long at *London*, being during that time employed in preparing his History, without Learning *English*. At the worst it was less difficult for him to be acquainted with the Reign of *Henry* the VIII. than with those of the preceding Kings. Wherefore then would he

have

* Thevet, Elog. of the illustr. men tom. [illegible] pag. [illegible]

(a) Crenius animadv. philol. & hist. part. 1. pag. 8 & 9.

(b) [illegible] Romualdo in [illegible] Chronici Alemani pag. 356.

(1) In the Town of Urbino in the [illegible] d'Ancona.

(2) [illegible]

(c) Burnet, Hist. of the reformation of England 2. part. Book 1. ad ann. 1550.

(d) De Larrey, Hist. d'Anglet. tom. 1. pag. 682. ad ann. 1550.

(e) *In an English Book against Dr. Burnet's History of the Reformation.*

(f) De Larrey ibid. pag. 683.

* *They are to be found in the Epistle Dedicatory of the Book* de inventoribus rerum *of the Basil Edition* 1521. apud Joan. Frobenium *in fol. See the* Trevoux *Journal, January and February.* 1702. *art.* 30. *of the Amsterdam Edition.*

(g) Joh. Caius de antiquit. Cantab. lib. 1. p. 52. apud Pope Blount ubi supra pag. 451, 452.

(h) La Popeliniere, Hist. des histoires Book [illegible] pag. [illegible]

(i) *He was not sent for out of Italy by Henry VIII. But the Pope sent him into England to raise what went by the Name of St. Peter's pence.*

(k) *In the Month of August.*

(l) pag. 703.

(m) In 8.

(n) [illegible]

(o) Wheare, de Meth. leg. histor. sect. 32. apud Pope Blount ubi supra pag. [illegible]

VITELLIO, or **VITELLO**, Author of a Treatiſe of Opticks, which is eſteem'd, lived, *(A)* after the middle of the XIII. Century. Some Authors ſay that he was Born in *Germany*, but *(B)* others make him a *Polander*. It is very probable that he compiled his Book in *(C) Italy*. The Edition which *Frederick Riſnerus* procured in 1572. is incomparably better than that of *Noremberg* in 1535. I have below cited the Praiſes *(D)* which he beſtowed on the labours of *Vitellio*. Mr. *Konig* knew of no other Edition than that of *Noremberg*, which he believed to be publiſhed by the Author † himſelf.

VIVIANI (VINCENTIO) a noble Florentine, Diſciple to *Galileo*, and a great Mathematician, who in 1659. publiſhed a Book Entituled, *De maximis & minimis geometrica divinatio in quintum Conicorum Apollonii Pergæi*. His Opinions in point of Religion were very bad; for he believed § *the neceſſity of all things, the Nullity of Evil, and the participation of the univerſal Soul*, as he owned to Mr. *Monconys*. Conſult the *Italia regnante* of Mr. *Leti*, pag. 411. of the third part.

ULEFELD, or **ULFELD** (JAMES) a *Daniſh* Gentleman, and a Senator of that Kingdom, was ſent Ambaſſador to the Court of *Muſcovy* in 1578. by *Frederick* II. King of *Denmark*. He wrote a Relation of his Voyage, and gave it to a Bookſeller at *Leyden* to Print, who ſo neglected it, that it fell into the Hands of a Grocer, and had been uſed to wrap up Sugar, *&c.* if *Goldaſt* had not bought it. He cauſed it to be Printed at *Francfort* in 1608. with the Title of *Hodœporicum Ruthenicum Jacobi, Nobilis Dani*, and in 1627. with the ſame Title *(A)* and the Addition of *Ulfeldii*, after *Jacobi*. This *James Ulfeld* publiſhed * a *Daniſh* Tranſlation of *David Chytræus*'s Treatiſe of the four laſt things, Death, Judgment, Heaven and Hell. He alſo wrote the Hiſtory of ſome of the Kings of *Denmark*, but it was never Printed ||. *Goldaſt* ‡ acknowledges that he was not very elegant, but he ſaith that he judged of things with great prudence.

ULEFELD,

† Vitellis opticam edi curavit, Norimb. An. 1535. Konig. pag. 845.

§ Monconys, Voiages, 1. part, p. 130. of ann. 1646. *Lyons* 1665.

* At Copenhagen in the Year 1592.

|| Taken from Mollerus hypomnem. ad Albertum Bartholinum de ſcriptis Danorum pag. 255, 256.

‡ In epiſt. dedicat. apud Mollerum ib. pag. 255.

---

have been leſs acquainted with this Reign than with the others?

(A) Lived after the middle of the XIII Century.] Which appears by his Dedicating his Book to Brother *William de Morbeta*, who wrote a Treatiſe of Geomancy in 1269. This date was expreſſed by the Author himſelf, as *Frederick Riſnerus* (a) who had a Manuſcript of that Tract, informs us. Whence we ought to conclude that *Tranſletter* (b) miſtook in placing *Vitellio* in the tenth Century. *Eraſmus Reinhold, Gauric, Peucer, Blancanus, Voſſius* &c. agree in placing him after the middle of the XIII. Century.

(B) That he was Born in Germany ——— others make him a Polander.] The laſt is the true Opinion, for in the 74th Theoreme of the 10th Book of *Vitellio* we find theſe Words: (c) *In noſtra terra, ſcilicet Poloniæ habitabili*, &c. In the Title of his Book, the Sir-Name of *filius Polonorum & Thuringorum*, is given to him; which according to *Riſnerus* ſignifies, that (d) his Father was a *Polander*, or a *Thuringian*, or that his Mother was a *Polander* or a *Thuringian*. *Regiomontanus* in his Preface to *Alfragan* expreſſes himſelf thus, (e) *Vitellio autem noſter Thuringus*, which is to pretend that *Thuringia* was *Vitellio*'s Country.

(C) Very probable that he compiled his Book in Italy] See the proofs of this Fact which *Riſnerus* hath Collected. (f) *Quædam ſunt in Opticis nota Vitellonem in Italiam veniſſe. Italiaque bibliothecis adjutum fuiſſe. Etenim Vitello ipſe de ſe teſtis eſt lib. 10. theor. 42. ſe primum omnium in Italia ad Cubalum (qui locus eſt inter Paduam & Vincentiam) contemplatione aquæ tenuiſſimæ ac limpidiſſimæ ad Opticas artes incenſum atque inflammatum eſſe: harum enim formarum intuitu (ait) & mirabili tranſmutatione primum nos amor hujus ſtudii allexit: & lib 10. theor. 67. ubi ſcribit ex iride, quam in aqua è ſcopulo Viterbio proximo vehementius præcipitata ſæpenumero vidiſſet, pleraſque iridis affectiones & proprietates ſibi animadverſas & obſervatas eſſe: illud (inquit) nobis principium cogitationis fuit, ut præſenti negotio ſtudium applicaremus. At quòd Vitello in Italia, quòd Romæ cum cæteris liberalibus honeſtiſque ſtudiis, tum verò Opticis operam navarit, majus fortaſſe argumentum videatur, quod Guilielmo de Morbeta (qui tum Romani Pontificis pœnitentiarium, ut appellant, Romæ agebat) ſuaſore & hortatore, ut ipſe in proœmio teſtatur, optica primum conſcribenda ſuſceperit, eidemque abſoluta poſtea nuncuparit.*

(D) The praiſes which Riſnerus beſtowed on Vitellio.] The paſſage which I am about to Tranſcribe informs us that *Vitellio* wrote other Books beſides his Opticks: (g) *Quid & quantum viribus ingenii perfecerit, præclara ejus monimenta ſempiterno teſtimonio erunt: non ſolum in Phyſiologicis, quæ citat lib. 5. theor. 18. and lib. 10. theor. 80. in libris de ordine entium: de elementatis concluſionibus, qui nominantur in præfatione, & lib. 1. theor. 28. in libris de ſcientia motuum cœleſtium, quæ allegat lib. 10. theor. 53. ſed multò maximè in decem libris Opticis: quos ut ex Alhazeno imprimis, deinde è Græcorum authorum fontibus hauſerit, certè mirandis acceſſionibus amplificavit. Alhazeni, Euclidis, Ptolemæi axiomata, hypotheſes, theoremata omnia collegit; id laboris infiniti fuit. Sed ex Apollonio, Theodoſio, Menelao, Theone, Pappo, Proclo, & aliis firmamenta permultarum demonſtrationum ſingulari judicio reperivit: ſingulari ordine maximè naturali per ſua genera, ſpecieſque Opticam, Catoptricam, Meſopticam diſpoſuit, artemque totam mirabiliter abſolvit. Quid plura? Si artis opifex atque author habendus ſit, qui arti formam, animamque dedit: Vitello jure optimo Opticæ artis autor habeatur.* It appears by this that *Vitellio*'s Glory was not that of invention, but that of digeſting borrowed matters.

(A) With the ſame Title and the Addition of Ulfeldii *after* Jacobi.] He did not know the Author's Name, till after the firſt Edition, when *Claudius Chriſtopher Lyſchander* a Daniſh Divine acquainted him that the Author of this Voyage to *Muſcovy* was of the Noble Family of *Ulfeld*; that he was very Learned, Rich, and a Senator of the Kingdom; but that he fell into diſgrace for Treating concerning ſome Affair without the King's conſent; that his two Sons *Magnus* and *James* were in a Flouriſhing Condition, and that *James* who was a Senator, was Ambaſſadour at the *Hague* in the Year 1608 (h). I believe this is the ſame who was promoted to the Dignity of Chancellor of *Denmark* (i) in 1610. and died the 25th of *June* 1630. I alſo believe that the Count *Ulfeld* of whom I ſpeak in the following Article, was the Son of this Chancellor. Obſerve that the ſame *Lyſchander* in another Letter (k) informs *Goldaſt*, that the two Sons of the Author of the *Hodœporicum Ruthenicum* had ſeen the Book. Whence I conclude that the Author was not then alive.

Obſerve

(a) Federicus Riſnerus præfat. in Vitellonis opticam p. m. 162. præmiſſ. epiſt. & orationum Petri Rami.

(b) In epiſtola Optic. Vitellonis præpoſita.

(c) See Riſnerus ubi ſupra pag. 162.

(d) Ibid.

(e) See Riſnerus ib. p. 163.

(f) Id. ib.

(g) Riſnerus ubi ſupra pag. 164.

(h) Taken from the 219. Letter of the collection of Letters written to Goldaſt, Printed in 1688.]

(i) See Mollerus hypomn. ad Alb. Barthol. de ſcriptis Danorum pag. 255.

(k) 'Tis the 260. of the above mention'd collection;

ULEFELD, or ULFELD (CORNIFIDS, or CORFITS) Grand-Son † to the foregoing, was one of the greateſt *Genius's* of the XVII. Century; and if he had not tarniſhed his Reputation for want of Fidelity to his Sovereign, he might juſtly have been reckoned amongſt the greateſt Men. *Chriſtian* IV. King of *Denmark* made him || *Viceroy of Norway, high Steward of his Realms, and heaped on him all the Graces that a* (A) *Favourite could hope for.* He choſe him for his Son in Law, by Marrying him to *Elenor* his Natural (B) Daughter. This Son in Law of the King was his Embaſſador in *France* in 1647. *Frederick* III. the Son and Succeſſor of *Chriſtian* IV. could not bear the Spirit and Conduct of Count *Ulefeld*; he obſerved too much Ambition in him, and it was ſcarce poſſible for the King to avoid reſenting the vigorous Zeal of the Count for maintaining the Privileges of (C) the Nobility at his acceſſion to the Throne. However, the high Steward was ſent Embaſſadour to *Holland* in 1649. in order * to make a Treaty there concerning the paſſage of the *Sound*; and his Negotiation not happening to pleaſe at home, he grew diſguſted, and kept his Chamber above ſix (D) Months on pretence of Sickneſs. He was accuſed in 1651. of having attempted to poiſon (E) the King †, but the

† I don't affirm it; I only believe it.

|| Sorbiere's Relation of England, p. 147.

* Sorbiere ibid. pag. 149.

† Parival's Hiſt. du Siecle de fer, Tom. 1. pag. 490.

Obſerve that Mr. *Konig* is utterly in the wrong concerning our *James Ulfeld*. (a) He makes him the Author of an Embaſſy to *Poland* written in the Year 1627. By which he is Guilty of two Faults: for *James* was dead at the time of the Publication of the firſt Edition in 1608. and his Book is not a Relation of an Embaſſy to *Poland*. But as he on one hand aſcribes a Relation to him which he did not write, on the other he robs him of the *Hodœporicum Ruthenicum*, to beſtow it on an imaginary Perſon called (b) *James Danus*; that is, Mr. *Konig* miſtakes *Danus*, which here is a National epithet given to the Writer of this *Hodœporicum* by *Goldaſt*, for the Sir-Name of an Author. Mr. *Mollerus* (c) hath noted almoſt all theſe miſtakes of *Mr. Konig*.

(A) *That a Favourite could hope for.*] The Hiſtorical *Novel* which I ſhall hereafter cite informs me that he became the Favourite of *Chriſtian* the IV. not only on Account of his Merit, but by the Intereſt of his Father, who was great Chancellor and governed the Kingdom. This high Chancellor was *deſcended from one of the firſt and moſt Ancient Houſes of the Realm, which was ſolely Honoured with the Dignity of Count by a grant from the Emperor. Cornifix Ulfeld* was the tenth Son: The manner how he came to be known by his Father, who thought for a long time that he was loſt, is romantick. See the Hiſtorical Novel. I can't tell whether it is poſſible to reconcile what has been juſt now related concerning the Dignity of Count, with a little *Latin* (d) Book which ſays that *Cornifix Ulfeld* flying for Refuge to *Chriſtina* Queen of *Sweden*, and having lent her great Sums of Money, acquired her Protection and Favour, and the Title of Count.

(B) *His natural Daughter.*] (e) " The King
" after the Death of the Queen became enamour-
" ed on a Beautiful Lady whoſe Name was *Chriſti-*
" *na*, of the Ancient Family of *Monck*, and not be-
" ing able to obtain any Favour from her, Married
" her with all the Formalities requiſite to a lawful
" Marriage, in the preſence of the Court and Se-
" nate; but one Clauſe of the Contract was, that
" the Children which ſhould proceed from this
" Marriage ſhould not be Princes, but obliged to
" content themſelves with the Quality of Counts of
" *Sleſwick* and *Holſtein*, of which dignity they
" ſhould bear the Name and Arms. " This Prince attempted to divorce her for certain things ſhe had done out of Jealouſy: The cauſe lay before the Senate. *Annibal Seeſted* pleaded the King's cauſe; and the Count of *Ulfeld* pleaded for the Queen, and carried the cauſe (f). The Latin Book which I have cited ſays that ſhe was actually divorced, and that the King afterwards grew in Love (g) with the Bed-Chamber Lady (h) to his divorced Queen, and had a Son and a Daughter by her. The Son called *Ulricus Chriſtian Guldenleeuw* bore Arms under the King of *Spain*, and did wonders at *Copenhagen* when it was beſieged by the *Swedes*. The Daughter was Married to *Claudius Alfeld* a Gentleman of *Holſtein*. The ſame Book informs us that the Reaſon why the King hated his Wife, and loved her Bed-Chamber Lady, was becauſe ſhe diſcovered to him that the Queen deſigned to Poiſon him: Which was revenged on this accuſer after her Death; for Count *Ulefeld* would not permit the celebration of her Funeral, but ſent her out of Town at Night to be Buried in the Burying place of the Poor. She ſurvived the King but few days, dying with Melancholy, as is (i) reported.

(C) *For maintaining the Privileges of the Nobility.*] An Author whom I have cited (k) ſaith that the mildneſs of *Chriſtian* IV. —— " and the
" Charms of Peace, made the Nobility and People
" neglect many Privileges which they propoſed to
" re-eſtabliſh in full force, when " they elected *Frederick* III. and that the high Steward *was obliged by his poſt* —— *to hold out ſtoutly*; for he repreſented all the Nobility of the Realm, and had a Negative Voice in Council: *So that as nothing could paſs without his Conſent, the ſtyle of the Placarts ran, and the Ordinances were notified as made by the King and the high Steward.* He adds (l) as a conjecture, that beſides the intereſt, which Count *Ulefeld* ". had
" in ſupporting the Privileges of that Body, he
" alſo conſidered thoſe of his own Family, and
" the Enmity betwixt the Children of the Royal
" Family, by Reaſon of the inequality of their
" Rank, and of the Jealouſy which the late King's
" paſſion for the *Counteſs Eleonor* had ſown. " The Author of the Hiſtorical Novel, notwithſtanding the part of a Panegyriſt and Apologiſt which he all along acts, ſtill owns, that the Count at his Wife's perſuaſion had ſome thoughts of cauſing himſelf to be elected King after the Death of *Chriſtian* IV. and that he made ſome attempts that way: But finding his meaſures broken, *he dexterouſly turned the courſe of Affairs, and promoted the Election of Prince Frederick on ſuch Conditions as would allow him to Share the Authority with him, under pretext of preſerving the privileges of the Nobility, of which as high Steward he was chief.*

(D) *Kept his Chamber above ſix Months.*] *Sorbiere* calls this a Fault, *for at Court*, ſaith he (m), *no Man ought ever to quit an advantageous poſt, nor retire on any pretext whatſoever; he ought not to loſe the track of Buſineſs, nor uſe People to go on without him, much leſs give them the Advantage of his abſence.* But his blaming this Conduct, did not hinder him from taking his part ſo zealouſly, that his *Daniſh* Majeſty's Embaſſador complained of it at the Court of *France*. The Conſequence of which was that *Sorbiere* was baniſhed to *Nantes*. This Author had formerly Dedicated a Book to (n) Count *Ulefeld*, for which he had doubtleſs received a good reward; which engaged him to inſert in his Voyage an Epiſode in Juſtification of this Lord. He was not well informed of all the particulars of this cauſe; the detention of the Count in the Iſland of *Bornholm*, and the Liberty granted him to go and live in the Iſle of *Funen*, were unknown to *Sorbiere*.

(E) *Of having attempted to Poiſon the King.*] The Author

(a) Konig. bibl. pag. 811.

(b) Konig ib. p. 235.

(c) Mollerus ubi ſupra pag. 255.

(d) *It is intitled* Machinationum Cornificii Ulefeldii ſuccincta narratio.

(e) *An Hiſtorical Novel, intituled* Le Comte d'Ulfeld, *Printed at* Paris *in* 1677.

(f) Ibid.

(g) Fuit hæc Chriſtinæ cujus ſupra meminimus à cubiculis; quumque Regi revelaſſet ipſi à Domina ſua venenum parari, Rex illam, REPUDIATA Chriſtina, ejus loco amavit.

(h) *Her Name was* Wibicha.

(i) Et Mulier, [illegible]

(k) Sorbiere Relat. d'Angleterre pag. m. 14[illegible]

(l) Id. ib. pag. 15[illegible]

(m) Id. ib. pag. 15[illegible]

(n) The French Tranſlation of Hobbes's Treatiſe de Cive, 164[illegible] the Woman who accuſed him (F) not being able to make good her Accuſation, was beheaded. Which yet did not hinder his ſecretly retiring with his Wife and Children out of the Kingdom, and going to *Sweden*, where he was extraordinary well receiv'd by Queen (G) *Chriſtina*. He diſcover'd a great deal of Ardour for the Service of *Sweden*, which would not have been criminal, if he had not endeavour'd it to the prejudice of his Country. His Counſels were wonderfully advantageous to *Charles* (H) *Guſtavus*; and it is inexpreſſible how effectually the politick Machinations which he practiſed, advanced that Prince's Conqueſts in *Denmark*. He was one of the Commiſſioners at the Treaty of *Roſchild*, as he would have been afterwards at *Copenhagen*, if the *French* (I) Ambaſſador had not entreated the King

Author of the Hiſtorical Novel, pretends that a Woman, named *Dina*, was ſuborned to declare that the Count and Counteſs of *Ulefelt* had ſollicited her to poiſon the King, the Queen, and all the Royal Family; and that the Count ſo judiciouſly defended himſelf in full Council, that *Dina*, and Captain *Weller* who had introduced her, were fully convicted of bearing falſe Witneſs, and condemned, ſhe to be beheaded, and he to perpetual baniſhment; which Sentences were executed. If this Relation be compared with that of a (a) Modern Hiſtorian, who tells us, *That one Colonel* Valter *was alſo ſuſpected, who having defended his Innocence, cauſed the ſaid Count* Ulefelt *to be ſummoned; but inſtead of appearing before his Majeſty, he privily retired with his Wife, and went into* Holland, *and from thence afterwards into* Sweden: If I ſay, ſuch a Compariſon were made, one would be apt to think that this Hiſtorian had confounded the Story. He ſeems to hint that the Count and the Colonel were both ſuſpected of the ſame Crime; but that is not true. The Hiſtorical Novel doth not ſay that the Count firſt retired into *Holland*; it ſays that he would have gone into *Poland*, but that being informed at *Dantzick* that the King of *Poland* refuſed him his leave, he went into *Sweden*. The Latin Book makes him firſt retire to *Amſterdam*, and afterwards to *Sweden*, and adds, that at *Stralſund*, he publiſhed an Apology for his Conduct; and that after the Abdication of *Chriſtina*, he went to live in *Pomerania*.

(F) *The Woman who accuſed him.*] Her Name was *Dina*; ſhe was a beautiful Woman, and by Profeſſion a Lady of pleaſure, for ſhe declared before the Judges, that ſhe had had a Child by Count *Ulefelt*. The little Latin Tract relates theſe particulars differently from *Parival*, in the following manner. *Dina* waited on the Count by means of a private Stair-caſe, and lay with him unknown to the Counteſs. Early one Morning the Counteſs entred her Husband's Chamber, and ſhewed him a Poyſon which *Sperlingius* a Phyſician had prepared (b). They mutually concerted the means to give it to the King. *Dina* heard all this Diſcourſe, being hid in the Bed, in order to avoid being ſurpriz'd by the Counteſs. She imparted this Story to a (c) Colonel, on whom ſhe frequently beſtow'd her Favours; wherefore he muſt needs make his Court with it to the King his Maſter, who cauſed *Dina* to be brought before him, from whom he heard all the particulars. The Judges examined her, before whom ſhe owned the ſame thing, and particularly confeſſed that ſhe had a Child by the Count; but when the thing came before the Council of State, where the Count himſelf defended his own Cauſe, *Dina* retracted all ſhe had ſaid, was declared guilty of Calumny, and condemned to loſe her Head; which was afterwards placed upon a Pole without the City (d). It is highly probable that ſhe was ſuborned; for would he not have been more ſtupid than a brute Beaſt, to have talked of ſuch a dangerous Affair when he knew it was within the hearing of a Whore? It is indeed the Prerogative of Sovereigns, which allows them to give ſerious attention to the Depoſitions of a Whore, when their Lives are concern'd; and it is true, that theſe ſort of Creatures have ſometimes revealed Conſpiracies (e). It is juſt that Monarchs ſhould enjoy this Prerogative, for the Publick good is preferable to the obſervations of Formalities; and conſequently we ought not to be ſhocked at the ſight of 20 or 30 Conſpirators cut into Quarters on the Evidence of their Accomplices, tho' the Accuſers loaded with Riches and Rewards, are ſometimes greater Criminals than the Accuſed, and have by numerous Artifices engaged the latter in the Conſpiracy. The Whore, ſay ſome, ought to be chaſtiſed, but the Bawd who accuſed her ought to ſhare in her Puniſhment. I anſwer that this Maxim ſhould not be extended to privileged Caſes, ſuch as the puniſhing of State Crimes. *Salus Populi ſuprema lex eſto.*

(G) *Extraordinary well received by Queen* Chriſtina.] To this purpoſe Mr. *de Wicquefort* relates two remarkable Stories. I ſhall content my ſelf with hinting at one of them. It is an Artifice (f) by which that Queen ſo far impoſed on the *Daniſh* Ambaſſador, as to gain an opportunity for *Ulefeld* to ſay all he could for his juſtification in his preſence: but the other Story I ſhall relate without curtailing it. (g) *The* Daniſh *Ambaſſador, to prove that* Ulefeld *was unworthy of* Chriſtina's *protection, one day told that Queen that the High Steward had converted to his own uſe the ſum of five and twenty thouſand Crowns, which the King his Maſter had order'd him to remit for the King of* England *in his neceſſity. The Queen reply'd, that if the High Steward aſſured her, that he had cauſed that ſum to be paid to the King of* England, *ſhe would believe it; and that if the latter denyed it ſhe would ſay he lyed; and that if a dozen of ſuch Kings as he ſhould affirm it, ſhe would ſay that they all twelve lyed. And ſince the King of* Denmark *would not re-eſtabliſh the High-Steward in the poſſeſſion of his Eſtate, ſhe would give him ſo much that he ſhould not repent his loſs in* Denmark. *The* Daniſh *Ambaſſador boldly reply'd, that her Majeſty might, if ſhe pleaſed, give him the half of her Realm without his Maſter's ſaying any thing againſt it; but that would not prevent his taking* Ulefeld *for the* moſt Infamous and Perfidious of all men. *This happened in* 1654. Mr. *de Wicquefort* doth not cite his Author; but I find he took this from Mr. *Chanut's* Memoirs, where theſe two Stories are told with more circumſtances neceſſary to be known, than thoſe in Mr. *de Wicquefort's* Book. We are informed of ſeveral other particulars relating to Count *Ulefeld* in thoſe Memoirs. (h)

(H) *Wonderfully advantageous to* Charles Guſtavus.] See pag. 98, 99. of the Chevalier *de Terlon's Memoirs*; and in pag. 151. are theſe remarkable words. "Count *Ulefeld*, who knew the Humour "of the Nation, adviſed the King of *Sweden* re"ligiouſly to preſerve the People of *Schonen* in the "Privileges which they enjoyed under the King "of *Denmark*. This was good advice, and per"haps if it had been followed this Second War "had been more ſucceſsful. This Gentleman "had before told us, That the King of *Swe*"*den* was very angry when he heard that theſe "Privileges were violated: But that the diſplea"ſure which he ſhewed did him no ſervice at *Co*"*penhagen*, where it was only taken for a Bait to "induce them to ſurrender that City."

(I) *If the* French *Ambaſſador had not entreated the King to Name another.*] The relation of this Story with a few more Circumſtances will not be diſagreeable. "(i) The Marſhal and Duke of "*Grammont*, and Mr. *de Lyonne*, who were "then at *Francfort* your Majeſty's Ambaſſadors ex"traordinary, and Plenipotentiaries for the Ele"ction of the Emperor, wrote to me to diſſuade "the King of *Sweden* from nominating Count "*Ulefeld* for the Negotiations of *Copenhagen*, as "he had been for thoſe of *Roſchild*. To which this "Prince was willing to conſent, when I urged "that he would be pleaſed not to give the King of "*Denmark* the uneaſineſs of ſeeing one of his diſ"affected Subjects treat for his Enemies in the "very

---

(a) Parival, Tom. [illegible] pag. [illegible]

(b) In [illegible] Otto[illegible] Sperlingii, M. D. [illegible] Regis Daniæ Friderici III. tentati veneficii ſuſpicione [illegible] Corfitz Ulefelt, [illegible] Patriæ Regnique [illegible] vent, quo de Relatione [illegible] Anno 1661. publicata videri poteſt, nec non [illegible] dem (Ulefeldi) Apologia Relationi oppoſita, Annoque ſequenti 1662. Stralſundiæ edita, cui cauſas ſubjunxit, quæ neceſſitatem [illegible] impoſuerunt & allegarunt, ut ad tempus Daniæ excederet. Yuchim de [illegible] pag. 4[illegible]

(c) George Walter.

(d) Ex Machinat. ſuccincta relat.

(e) Fulvia, *for inſtance, who diſcovered that of* Catilina, apud Salluſtium.

(f) De l'Ambaſſadeur & de ſes fonctions, tom. 2. pag. 141. See Chanut's Memoirs, tom. 3. from pag. 342. to pag. 349 Dutch Edition. *The Author of the Hiſtorical Novel relates this quite otherwiſe, and to the Ambaſſador's confuſion.*

(g) Wicquefort ibid. pag. 171. *See* Chanut's Memoirs tom. 3. *from* pag. 292. *to* pag. 295.

(h) *See the* 3d Tome, pag. 74, 97, 98, 100, 420, 240, 364.

(i) Memoirs de Terlon, pag. 1[illegible]

King to name another. At laſt he fell into diſgrace (K) with the *Swedes*, who cauſed him to be put in Priſon. Whence he * *had come out in a glorious manner, if he had not been ſo impatient, and given credit to ſome Reports that the* Swedes *deſigned to bring him to his Tryal.* Theſe were falſe Reports; for they had given their word to the *French* Ambaſſador that he ſhould be ſet at liberty. The Ambaſſador had written about it becauſe the King of *Denmark* demanded that Count, † *as being included in the Treaty.* The impreſſions which this falſe Rumour wrought on the Mind of the Priſoner, were the cauſe why he try'd ſeveral Expedients to deceive his Guards, in which (L) he ſucceeded; he eſcaped out of the Priſon of *Malmoe*, and went to *Copenhagen*, without having obtained the remiſſion of all that he had done againſt his Prince. His Counteſs came thither ſome time after, when *Frederick* III. who had very cunningly diſſembled his deſign of ſecuring their Perſons, cauſed them both to be Arreſted, and ſent them to the Iſle of *Bornholm*; but out of his Clemency, he permitted them to live in the Iſland of *Funen*, after the receipt of a Letter * which the Count wrote to him. In which he acknowledged his Crimes, and only implored the Mercy of his Sovereign, to whom for the future he promiſed abſolute Submiſſion. Some time after he was permitted to travel out of the Kingdom; he went to the *Spaw*-waters ‖, from thence to *Paris incognito*, and afterwards to *Bruges*, where he reſolved to winter with his Family; but he was oblig'd

" very City of his Reſidence, and brave his Sovereign in his Misfortune; what I ſaid to the " King of *Sweden* engaged him to ſubſtitute the " Sieur *Cyet* inſtead of the Count. „

(K) *Into Diſgrace with the* Swedes.] Some Authors report, (a) *That the* Swedes *to rid themſelves of Count* Ulefeld, *whoſe great Abilities they feared, and withal not being able to recompence his good Services, accuſed him of Treaſon, in order to ſeize his great Riches.* The Author who ſpeaks thus, had been ſaying that the *Swedes* had condemned this Count to a perpetual Impriſonment; and therefore he muſt needs have been ignorant of his incluſion in the Treaty of Peace; ſee the Text of this Article. Now amongſt the things of which he was deprived by the King of *Sweden*, we muſt not forget the Library which (b) formerly belonged to *Sepheldt*, a *Daniſh* Senator. The King of *Sweden* found it in the Caſtle of *Reinſtedt*, of which this Senator, who was Count *Ulefeld*'s mortal Enemy, was Governor, and preſented it to the Count, who at the entreaty of the Chevalier *de Terlon*, was willing to reſtore it to the Senator for ſix thouſand Crowns. The Senator *would not give that Sum, tho' his Library was valued at fifty thouſand Crowns, on account of the great number of very rare Manuſcripts and Curioſities which it contained. On his refuſal,* Count Ulefeld *cauſed it to be removed to* Schonen, *and after his confinement it was ſeized by the King and tranſported* to Stockholm.

(L) *He ſucceeded.*] The Circumſtances of this Fact being very ſingular, I ſhall be particular in the relation of it. (c) " Count *Ulefeld* was a " Man of great Abilities, and very much conſidered in *Denmark*, and he was very ſenſible of it, " ſince he ventur'd to go to *Copenhagen*, without " knowing before-hand whether his Sovereign " would be pleaſed with it. The Priſoner, from " the day of his Confinement, ſo naturally acted " the Mute, and ſeemed ſo inſenſible of all the " Injuries done him, that it was impoſſible to draw " one word from him, when examined to draw " up his Indictment; and the methods he took " to deceive his Guards, who were always near " the Bed in which he pretended to be ſick, are almoſt incredible. And yet he himſelf made the " Cloaths in which he eſcaped to *Copenhagen*, which " was his Ruin; for if purſuant to what I cauſed to be ſaid to him, he had relyed on the " goodneſs of the King of *Sweden* for his Liberty, " he had avoided the diſgrace which fell on him; " and his Eſtate in *Sweden* had not been confiſcated, as well as that which belonged to him in " *Denmark* was afterwards. „ The *Hiſtorical Novel* aſſures us, 1. That by the Treaty of *Rotſchild*, the Count obtained a general Amneſty, and was to be re-inſtated in his Places and Eſtate. 2 That the King of *Sweden* having granted him leave to defend himſelf publickly before the Senate at *Malmoe*, and his indiſpoſition not permitting him to appear, his Counteſs *Eleonora* pleaded for him ſo ſtrenuouſly, (d) and with ſo much Eloquence, that the Judges pronounced Sentence of Abſolution. 3. That the King of *Sweden* confirmed this Sentence, and that *Annibal Seſted* his ſecret Enemy, made him afraid of a more cloſe confinement, and adviſed him to endeavour by all means to eſcape. I ought not to omit that according to the ſmall Latin Book, the Count's diſgrace happened after the death of *Charles Guſtavus*. It was after that King's death that the Count with ſome Senators of *Malmoe*, endeavoured to reſtore *Schonen* to the *Danes*. The ſame Book alſo ſaith, that he feigned himſelf affected with a Palſie on the Tongue during his Confinement. *In cuſtodiam traditus eſt in qua quamdiu fuit, hemiplexiae morbum & vitiatam loquelam raro patientiae exemplo ſimulaſſe dicitur* (e). This confirms what the Chevalier *de Terlon* relates, and what follows confirms another particular of which he informs us. *Jam in eo fuit* (Ulefeldius) *intercedente apud Regem Sueciae Chriſtianiſſimi Regis legato, ſi unicum tantum octiduum diutius in cuſtodia ſe continuiſſet, ut libertati reſtitueretur. Quin literae quarum beneficio dimittendus eſſet à Regina matre Hedwiga Eleonora filii tutrice ac proceribus regni ſubſcripta eodem quo evaſerat momento, & hinc paulo ſerius allata circumferebantur* (f).

I ſhall clear this as much as poſſible by Mr. *Puffendorf*'s account of this Affair. He informs us that the Stratagem which *Annibal Seſted* made uſe of to prevent the Count's Re-eſtabliſhment in *Sweden*, and enjoyment of his Eſtate, was to perſuade the King of *Denmark*, his Maſter, who was ſending him into *Sweden*, to give him Orders to recommend the Count's Caſe to the Senators. Which he imagined would render him the more ſuſpected, becauſe he was accuſed of a Traiterous Plot in favour of the King of *Denmark*; ſo that no better means could have been imagined to make him appear Guilty, than the interceſſion of that King. This Stratagem of *Seſted* fell to the Ground. The *Swedes* took no notice of it, and were not willing to examine things rigorouſly after the War was ended, and after the King's death they declared *Ulefeld* acquitted. Then his Enemy had recourſe to another Stratagem; he went to Count *Brahe* and deſir'd that the Senate's Sentence of Abſolution might not be publiſhed, but put into his Hands in order to endear himſelf to (g) his Brother-in-law. But as ſoon as he had the Sentence in his poſſeſſion, impoſing on the Chevalier *de Terlon* (h) and Mr. *Sidney* (i), he made them believe, that the Senate of *Sweden* had condemned *Ulefeld*, and entreated them to give him immediately notice of it, that he might think of ſome ways of eſcaping the execution of the Sentence. The Letters which they wrote to him produced the effect that *Seſted* expected. The Priſoner eſcaped and went to *Copenhagen*, where he loſt that Liberty which he had juſt recovered (k). Mr *Seſted* ſeems to me to have run a bold riſque; for if theſe two Ambaſſadors whom he deceived, had diſcovered what he told 'em, vices, the *Swediſh Senators* would have known his malicious obliged to quit that place. His Son killed (M) *Colonel Wolf*. His Wife who retired to *London*, and quitted that City privately, was ſeized at *Dover*, and carried to *Copenhagen*, where we are told a horrid Conſpiracy was pretended to be diſcovered, (N) which he had formed againſt his Prince. And accordingly Sentence paſſed againſt him at *Copenhagen*, on the 24th of *July* 1663, by which, as Convicted of High Treaſon, he was condemned to Death. Which Sentence was executed in Effigie. They made a waxen Figure repreſenting him, which was carried on a Sledge to the publick place, where the Executioner cut off his Hand and his Head, and divided the Body into four Quarters, which were carried to the four Corners of the City ‖. Of which News the Count was informed at *Bruges*, and † departed the next day for (O) *Baſil*, *where he lived Four or Five Months unknown, and almoſt always ſick.* He left that Place, being informed that ſearch was made after him in order to take him; and tho' very ill, at Night he went into a ſmall Bark on the *Rhine*, in order to go to *Briſac*; but had ſcarce advanc'd two Leagues before the piercing Cold kill'd him. He was 60 years of age or thereabouts, and left three Sons, the eldeſt of which turned Roman Catholick, and lived with the Queen of *Sweden*. The ſecond became Knight of *Malta*; and the third, who was one of the handſomeſt and moſt Learned Gentlemen in *Europe*, lived in *England*. I have extracted the Account of theſe laſt Facts from an Hiſtorical Novel, Entituled, *Le Comte d'Ulfeld*, Printed at *Paris* in 1677, and Dedicated to the Duke of *Montauſier*, by an Author who calls himſelf *Bourſeau de la Valette*; from which I might have extracted a thouſand curious things; but I was afraid of confounding (P) Hiſtory with Romance. I have nevertheleſs made uſe of that Book in my Remarks. The Count is alſo frequently mention'd in (Q) *Charles Ogier*'s Travels. The Counteſs his Widow died the 16th of *March* 1698. She could make Verſes, and ſhe has left a piece, which perhaps will be Printed *.

---

* Memoires du Chevalier de Terlon, pag. 301. Dutch Edition, see the Remark K.

† Memoires de Terlon ib.

* That Letter is dated the 8th of October, 1661. and is to be found in [illegible] tom. 1. p. 510.

‖ [illegible]

(a) See Varival. tom. 4. pag. 206. but it should be pag. 210.

(b) Memoires du Chev. de Terlon, pag. 105, 106.

(c) Memoires du Chevalier de Terlon. pag. 303. *He had said pag. 99. that the Count had a vaſt Eſtate, a great Intereſt with the Nobility, and beſides, a great deal of Wit, and that he was one of the greateſt Men in the Kingdom.*

(d) *Her Speech may be ſeen in the* Hiſtorical Novel.

(e) Machinat. ſuccinct. narrat. p. 28.

(f) Ibid. pag. [illegible]

(g) *Count* Ulefeld.

(h) *The* French *Ambaſſador.*

(i) *The* English *Ambaſſador.*

(k) *Taken from Puffendorf in the life of Charles* Guſtavus, lib. 6. n. 52. *See the* [illegible] Eruditorum, [illegible] pag. [illegible]

ULYS-

as ſick in France, and made a noiſe about it: and conſequently he would have loſt his Reputation. Obſerve that it is impoſſible to reconcile the Relations of the Chevalier *de Terlon* and Mr. *Puffendorf*: One of them is certainly falſe.

(M) *Colonel Wolf.*] A modern Hiſtorian (*a*) whom I have already cited, ſaith, that Colonel *Wolf* being in a Coach with his Wife, Count *Ulefeld*'s Son came cloſe to him, and ſaluted him very courteouſly, *and at the ſame time ſtabbed him to the Heart with a Dagger at the inſtant that he was telling his Wife*, who it was that ſo cloſely approached him. The Aſſaſſin was ſo fortunate as to eſcape. *The Colonel being Governor of the Iſle of* Bornholm, had not ſo ſtrictly guarded Count *Ulefeld*, but he found an opportunity to eſcape; but he was ſeized juſt as he was embarking, and cloſely confined to a Priſon, very much below a Man of his Quality (*b*): And no compaſſionate regard was had to him, for fear he ſhould once more eſcape. This was the cauſe of the hatred which the Count and his Family had conceived againſt the Colonel.

(N) *A horrid Conſpiracy.*] It is related (*c*) that the Elector of *Brandenburg* acquainted King *Frederick* III. that Count *Ulefeld* had writ to him, *That if he would lend him a vigorous aſſiſting hand, he would dethrone the King and his Heirs, and cauſe the Crown to devolve on his head. For, ſaid he, I have ſo many of the Clergy and Laity, who will declare on my ſide, that it will render this Enterprize eaſie.* The Sentence of Death pronounced againſt him, mentions their having Proofs of this; but this Elector is not therein named.

(O) *For* Baſil.] According to the ſmall Latin Tract, he there pretended to be Governor to three *Dutch* Gentlemen, and was not known till one of his Sons had a Quarrel with a *Zurich* Captain. He had his Three Sons and a Daughter with him, his Lady was in Priſon at *Copenhagen*. When he found himſelf diſcovered he embarked on the *Rhine* alone, and died on board in *February* 1664. not far from *Newburg*. The Boat-men carried him to a Convent near that place, whither his Sons came with the utmoſt expedition, in order to ſave the Jewels he had about him, and cauſed him to be buried under a tree in the middle of a Field.

(P) *Of confounding Hiſtory with Romance.*] Tho' the Author of the Hiſtorical Novel aſſures us, *That all there is very true, and that he hath written nothing but what he had from the information of the moſt able and unintereſted Perſons*, I cannot yet help believing that there are ſome Romantick embelliſhments in that Work. The Counteſs *Eleonora* owned (*d*) that *her Story ſavoured very much of a Romance:* He who heard her ſay this, having related ſomething of that Hiſtory, adds, *that* (†) *with ſome Epiſodes, might be a very fit Subject for a Romance.* And doubtleſs, the Author of the *Hiſtorical Novel* formed himſelf on that Idea. I will not throughly examin the Facts, which this Author always turns to the Advantage of his Hero, and ſometimes (*e*) ſo roughly aginſt the Perſon of King *Frederick*, that he a thouſand times more than *Sorbiere*, deſerved the Complaints of the *Daniſh* Ambaſſador at the Court of *France*: But I may probably be allowed to take for a Romantick Thought, *that ſeverity ſufficient to make the boldeſt Man tremble*, with which the Count was looked on when he made his firſt Declaration of love to the Counteſs *Eleonora*, to whom, ſaith the Author, *the name of Love appeared ſo ſtrange, that ſhe formed a diſmal Idea of it.* I do not make the ſame judgment of the Count's exclamation, when born down with Misfortune, he cry'd out, *O God! when wilt thou ceaſe to afflict me?* Nature is too viſible here, this looks like a true Hiſtory, whilſt the other looks like invention only. The Propoſal of an under Match or of a diſhonourable Love, might have occaſioned this terrible menacing Severity; but the Count, a perſon richly endowed with all the Perfections of Body and Mind, and one of the beſt Matches the Counteſs could ever hope for, courted her in order to marriage. Whence then could proceed this thundring ſeverity which our Author mentions but from the imaginary Territories of Romances? where (*f*) *a Declaration of Love is followed by an immediate reſentiment, which appears by our Bluſhes* (as Moliere put into the Mouth of an affected Lady) *and which, for a time, baniſhes the Lover from our preſence. But at laſt he pacifies us, and inſenſibly inures us to the Diſcourſe of his tender Paſſion, and extorts from us the conſent which we have much ado to give.*

(Q) *In* Charles Ogier's *Travels.*] *Charles Ogier* the worthy Brother of that great Preacher *Francis Ogier*, travelled to *Denmark* and *Sweden* with the Count *d'Avaux*, Ambaſſador from *Lewis* XIII. They left *Paris* on the 11th of *July* in 1634. The Relation of this Voyage is very curious, and well written. In which amongſt other

(*d*) Relat. de Sorbiere pag. 146.

(†) Ibid. pag. 153.

(*e*) *In the Memoirs of the Chevalier* de Terlon *ſome Encomiums are beſtowed upon that Prince, which are directly contrary to the Slanders of the* Hiſtorical Novel.

(*f*) Moliere *in his* Precieuſes ridicules, act 1. ſc. 4. p. m 14. *of the* 1ſt. Tome.

ULYSSES, One of the moſt celebrated Generals of the *Grecian* Army at the Siege of *Troy*. Mr. *Delincourt* ‡ hath imparted to me ſo many (*A*) excellent Memoirs concerning this Hero of the *Odyſſes*, that I am extremely ſorry that I cannot ſpare the Place which they deſerve. And it being better to ſay nothing on great Subjects, than to ſpeak of them by halves, I have deferred this Article to another time, and am very much concerned that this Learned Man himſelf could not enrich the Publick with this excellent Portraicture of *Ulyſſes*, as he hath already obliged the World with that of *Achilles*, of which we have ſeen three Editions.

VOLKELLIUS (*John*) a *Socinian* ‡ Miniſter born at *Grimma* in *Miſnia*, was one of the moſt Learned of that Sect. Some Letters which *Socinus* wrote to him are Publiſhed, the firſt of which is dated the 3d of *April* 1593 *. He wrote one to him ‖ in 1596, upon *Volkelius*'s declaring, that he did not think that *Socinus* had intirely refuted *Francis David*'s Arguments. He publiſhed in 1613 an Anſwer ‖, and a Reply † to *Smiglecius*; but his principal Work is that *de vera Religione*, of which (*B*) a great many Copies were burnt at *Amſterdam* by order of the Magiſtrates, the 20th of *January* 1642. I have ſomething

things we find that Count *Ulefeld* being contracted to the Daughter of the King his Maſter, and being afflicted with an Ulcer in his Thigh, made a very great Scruple of approaching a Lady of the Blood Royal before he was cured. Wherefore he took a Journey into *France* in order to put himſelf into the Hands of an able Chirurgeon, to whom Mr. *d'Avaux* recommended him. (*a*) *Ulfeldius crure laborabat inſanabiliter, ex ſententia ſcilicet omnium ſuæ nationis Medicorum, qui tamen anno poſtea, cum ſe ex conſilio Legati noſtri Lutetiam contuliſſet, ab eximio Chirurgo P. Judæo ſanatum eſt. Alter mihi videbatur ille Philoctetes, adeo acutis interdum doloribus cruciabatur: alioquin, cum per benigniorum temporum intervalla, vis mali paululum reſederat, innitebatur baculo. Ceterum tanta hominis virtus ac dignitas fuit, ut dilectiſſimam illi Rex Daniæ Filiam Leonoram deſponderit: at ille tam eximiæ puellæ thalamis cruo putridum inferre reveritus, antequam nuptiæ celebrarentur, operæ pretium duxit, ſi ſe laborioſæ curationis carnificinæ, ac periculis devoveret.*

(*A*) *So many excellent Memoirs concerning this Hero of the Odyſſes.*] He hath collected whatever hath been ſaid for or againſt the Prince of *Ithaca*, and hath very methodically digeſted it. It is a Collection of Erudition and Criticiſms, which would ſurprize even thoſe who are beſt verſed in the Antient Greek and Latin Authors. Copiouſneſs and Exactneſs, Sagacity and Method, Memory and Judgment ſhine ſo brightly in this Work, that it is impoſſible to determin which of theſe Excellencies appear in the greateſt Luſtre.

(*B*) *That* de vera Religione, *of which a great number of Copies were burnt.*] It was Printed at *Racovia* in 1630, after the Author's Death. And the Sect judging it proper that this Work ſhould contain a complete Syſtem of the *Socinian* Doctrine, and finding it defective in ſome particulars, appointed *Crellius* to add as a Supplement, his Treatiſe of God and the Divine Attributes. He having executed this Commiſſion; what he wrote made the firſt part of the Work, and is the firſt of the ſix Books which compoſe it. Several are of Opinion that Socinianiſm hath not produced any thing more dangerous than this Volume, and for that reaſon doubtleſs, when Printed at *Amſterdam*, it was thought very neceſſary to expoſe it to the moſt ſevere Juſtice. (*b*) The Scout of *Amſterdam* ſeized 450 Copies which he found in the Bookſeller's hands; and prevailed with the Judges to confiſcate them, and fine the Bookſeller (*c*); Eight days after which they were publickly burnt. *Curcellæus* having writ this News to *Ruarus* the 8th of *February* 1642, adviſed him on the 12th of *April* following, that the (*d*) new *Schepens* had cancelled the Sentence of their Predeceſſors, and order'd it to be taken out of the Regiſters; inſomuch that the Bookſeller who had not yet paid his Fine, came off with the loſs of his Books only. Notwithſtanding which, he was ſo terrified thereby, that it was thought he would not eaſily be induced to Publiſh any Book of that nature again. *Curcellæus* paſſionately deſired that ſome able Perſon would write againſt the Proceedings of the *Schepens* of *Amſterdam*. (*f*) *Utinam veſtrum aliquis præceps Scabinorum noſtrorum judicium vellet expendere, & iſtos librorum incendiarios peccati ſui coarguere. Si quem noveris ei rei idoneum, urgeat aggrediatur.*

The two letters of this Remonſtrant Miniſter, ſincerely written in Confidence to *Ruarus*, ſhew the Falſity of Mr. *Stoupp*'s conjecture. Read what follows, which I cite from the Copy which Mr. *Des Maizeaux* has been pleaſed to ſend me, and not as in the 1. Edition, where I inſerted this paſſage exactly as Mr. *Arnauld* publiſhed it in the 46 page of the 2. part of his Apology for the Catholicks. He hath curtailed and altered ſeveral places, and yet makes uſe of the Italick Character, without taking Notice of any deficiency. Which is not like an exact Author. " (*g*) The
" *Socinian* Books were very ſcarce till a very few
" Years paſt. Thoſe which were publiſhed, were
" Printed in very diſtant places, and in ſmall
" Numbers, ſo that they could not be got but
" at a very dear rate, and moſt of them were
" not to be come at on any Terms. The States
" General by their goodneſs and ſpecial Favour,
" and a very particular tenderneſs of Conſcience,
" remedied this inconveniency. And to ſatisfy
" the *Socinians*, and thoſe who were willing to
" embrace their Opinions, freely permitted the
" Printing at *Amſterdam* of four of their principal Authors, *Viz. Socinus*, *Crellius*, *Slichtingius*, and *Wolzogenius*. This Collection of
" *Socinian* Writers in Eight Volumes in Folio
" is at preſent publickly Sold at *Amſterdam* for one
" Hundred Gilders. And but very few Years
" ſince an inconſiderable parcel of theſe Books
" would have coſt two Hundred Piſtoles, whereas
" all of 'em may be had at preſent for leſs than
" ten. It is indeed true that ſometime ſince a
" *Socinian* Book was burned at *Amſterdam*, doubtleſs at the interceſſion of *Bleau* himſelf who
" Printed it (*b*). A few days after this Execution he publickly expoſed the ſame Book
" to Sale; and to recommend it to the Buyer,
" and enhance the Price, inſerted in the Title
" Page, that it was the ſame Book which by order
" of the States, had been burnt by the Hands of the
" common Executioner."

Several particulars of this paſſage are juſtly to be objected againſt. In the I. place Mr. *Stoupp* ough to have known that the States General don't meddle with the Government of *Amſterdam*; they are not empowered to permit or prohibit the Bookſellers in the Province of *Holland* in any particular. II. It is not true that the States General, nor the States of *Holland*, permitted the Printing of *Socinian* Books. The Works of the 4 principal Doctors, whereof Mr. *Stoupp* ſpeaks, were privately Printed; of which ſee the particulars in the Apology (*i*) for the Religion of the *Dutch*. III. It is utterly falſe that (*l*) *William Bleau* made intereſt for the burning of this *Socinian* Book:

‡ [illegible] Leyden, Alii Eccleſias [illegible] de bello Jugurthino.

‡ Eccleſiæ Philippovienſis, poſt Smalcium Paſtor, [illegible] Amſterdami. Pag. 95.

(*a*) Carol. Ogerius in Itinere Danico, p. 67. edit. Pariſ. 1656, in 8vo.

(*b*) Steph. Curcellæus epiſtola ad Ruarum. *In the 86th of the Firſt Century of* Ruarus's *Letters*, p. 407.

(*c*) Of 1200 Gilders.

(*d*) *See the 87 Letter of the 1ſt. Century of* Ruarus's *Letters*, pag. 408, 409.

(*e*) Ita illo conſternati eſſe (Cæſii, *that is the* Sieurs Blaew) ut non facile poſthac ejuſmodi ſint libros excuſuri. Id. p. 409.

ſomething to offer concerning this Fact, which is not exactly repreſented in the Book Intitled *La Religion des Hollandois*.

VORSTIUS (CONRAD) was born at *Cologne* the 19. of *July* 1569. His Father who was a Dyer, had not yet broke off from the Church of *Rome*; wherefore he cauſed him to be Baptized at his Pariſh Church. Soon after he privately joyned with the Proteſtant Church, to which he brought over his Wife. He had ten Children, and deſigned this Son a Learned Education. He Learned Grammar, and a little Rhetorick at the Village of *Bedberdyk*, where he ſtaid five Years, after which he went to *Duſſeldorp* in 1583. where he continued his School Studies, till 1586. He ſpent the following Year at *Cologne* in

Stiat

Curcellæus's two Letters clearly prove that the *Sieurs Bleaw* were very Sorry for the burning of *Volkelius's* Book; and I ſhall borrow ſome freſh evidences of this truth, from the Author who refuted Mr. *Stoupp*. "(a) It was not *William*, but *John Bleau* who Printed it. But how impertinent is it to conjecture that this *Bleau* entreated the Magiſtrates to burn this Book? If only a Dozen Copies had been burned, it might be ſaid, that your narrow ſuſpicious Soul, might have found ſome excuſable pretext for this Malicious conjecture: But you ought to know that the Officer who had orders to burn this Book, ſeized Mr. *Bleau* at one of his Friends Houſes, where he then was, and cauſed him to be guarded by ſome Sergeants, whilſt he went directly to the Ware-houſe where he found all the Copies, and cauſed them to be (b) immediately burnt. And half a day was entirely ſpent only in throwing the Books into the Fire, till the Flames had conſumed the whole Number, which redounded to the great damage of Mr. *Bleau*, beſides he was fined two (c) Thouſand Gilders." IV. It is falſe that *a few days* or any time *after this Publick Execution*, the ſame Bookſeller *publickly Sold this Book* of *Volkelius*, and that he *inſerted in the Title, that it was the ſame Book which had been Condemned publickly to be burnt by the Hands of the common Executioner.* The Perſon that furniſhed Mr. *Stoupp* with Memoirs confounded the Fact, and the whole foundation of this Fable was: That *Volkelius's* Book was Printed in Dutch at (d) *Rotterdam* in 1649. and it was in the Title that the *Schepens* had ordered it to be burned in *Holland* in 1642. The Apologiſt for the Religion of the *Dutch* obſerves that (e) one *Colom*, and not the Sieurs *Bleau*, put this in the Title; but that this Tranſlation was notwithſtanding prohibited by the States. *Mareſius* obſerves, that this Additional clauſe in the Title was a bait which the *Socinians* laid, to promote the Sale of the Book: (f) *Quantum præſidii in eo reponant clancularii teterrimæ Hæreſeos emiſſarii & promotores, palam fecerunt ante biennium, illo in Belgicum idioma tranſlato, & quò ad ejus lectionem magis invitarentur homines præpoſterè curioſi, quibus ſolemne niti in vetitum ſemper cupereque negata, præfixo hoc Elogio, quod opus illud eſſet*, in Hollant by Schepen vonniſſe gedoemt, openbaerlijck geexecuteert, en met vyer verbrant anno 1642. in Januario. The *Synods* of *Holland* did not forget this Addition to the Title in the Remonſtrance which I have mentioned in another place (g): In which they complain'd that ſeveral *Socinian* Books were Tranſlated into Dutch; and in the laſt place they quoted *Volkelius*. *Denique Crellius de Deo & ejus attributis & Volkelii quinque libri de vera religione: & ad irridendum zelum piorum judicum pro Deo, perverſoſque homines eò magis alliciendum, in frontiſpicio poſuerunt in Hollandia ſententia Scabinorum eum librum damnatum & publice combuſtum eſſe anno 1642. menſe Januario.*

It is certain that this Book of *Volkelius* was never Printed by its ſelf in *Latin* after the burning of it in the Year 1642. But it was Printed intire in the *Hydra Socinianiſmi expugnata*, publiſhed at (h) *Groningen* by *Samuel Mareſius*. This Orthodoxy Profeſſor attempting the Refutation of the *Socinian* Syſtem, was reſolved to leave no Room to ſuſpect that he had weakened his Adverſary's Arguments. Therefore he Publiſhed them at large without any omiſſion, and ſubjoyned his refutation to the ſame Pages. By which means his Readers had a fair Opportunity of comparing Hereſy and Orthodoxy without any pretence that the Hereſy was not there expreſſed in full force and Vigour. It muſt be owned this is the moſt frank and ingenuous way of anſwering an Adverſary. It ſhews that the Author relies on the goodneſs of his Cauſe, and the ſtrength of his Pen. It prevents all ſuſpicions of partiality; and we have really Reaſon to be jealous on this head in Thouſands and Thouſands of caſes; for it happens but too often that an Author unfairly repreſents the Arguments which he deſigns to confute. He ſeems not to have ſeen what he thinks he is not able to refute; and when he cannot avoid mentioning ſome particulars, he yet omits ſome eſſential terms. In a Word, ſuppoſe as long as you pleaſe that a Controverſiſt acts fairly, you will never be able to perſuade the World, that looſe paſſages which he cites out of the piece he refutes, are an impartial Repreſentation of the ſtrength of that Work, which commonly conſiſts in the connexion of its parts. Wherefore *Mareſius* took the moſt proper Meaſures in the World by inſerting the whole Book, which was burned, in his Anſwer. He ſilenced the Heretical boaſters, and deprived them of the pretext of Reproaching the true Church with mean ſhifts, or inſulting the Orthodox, as Men who not daring to look their Enemies in the Face, and knowing themſelves unable to make head againſt 'em, implored the aſſiſtance of the Secular Power to reduce to Aſhes a Book whoſe Objections they could not overthrow. Some ill Tongues have ventured to ſay, that this Profeſſor took this Method only in compliance to the Bookſeller, who was abſolute in that caſe, from an Opinion that the text of *Volkelius* would ſerve to carry off any refutation whatſoever. This is a Malicious Falſity. And it is infinitely more reaſonable to acquieſce in the Reaſons which the Author himſelf alledges. *Mihi autem*, ſaith he (i), *vitio verti non debet quod textum integrum libri neſarii curarim recudendum. Cum enim ſupprimi per hominum curioſitatem & malitiam nequeat, nec in eo voti ſui compos extiterit Ampliſſ. Magiſtratus Amſtellodamenſis, malui illum integrum ſiſtere Lectori, ne crederer ſuffurari velle victoriam, quod nolebat Alexander, & datâ operâ detruncare atque extenuare Adverſarii mei argumenta; Ubi Lector* ipſam Beſtiam ſua verba reſonantem *audierit, (ut hic adhibeam dictum Æſchinis de oratione Demoſthenis in ſe habita, relatum Hieronymo* epiſt. ad Paul. de lib. Divino cap. 2.) *& ſimul noſtras ad illam Cenſuras & Annotationes ἀλεξικάκως expenderit, facilius de totius Cauſæ natura & merito judicabit. Oppoſita ſibi mutuò appoſita magis eluceſcunt. Et ſicut vinum dulcius eſt quod prope mandragoras creſcit, & ſuavius olent lilia & roſa quæ juxta capas & allia carpuntur, ſic ex hac antitheſi plus accedet ſuaveolentiæ illi veritati Cauſæ quam ſuſcepi propugnandam. Ita vident Lectores nihil nos metuere nobis ab iſtorum hominum ſtrophis & cavillationibus, quandoquidem eas integras, omnibuſque ſuis veſtitas coloribus, proponimus & expendimus, confiſi bonitati noſtræ cauſæ, & quod eorum* Sententias prodidiſſe ſuperaſſe eſt, *ut loquitur Hyeronymus* ad Cteſiph. He adds that he herein imitated (k) *Francis Junius*, *Sibrandus* (l) *Lubbertus*, *Paul* (m) *Tarnovius*, *John* (n) *Junius*, (o) *Alſtedius*, and (p) *Biſterfeldius* Son in Law to *Alſtedius*. He repreſents in his Preface to the 2. Tome that he would not be diſpleaſed that the Magiſtrate ſhould make uſe of another ſort of Anſwer, that is, burn the *Socinian* Syſtem. And as he praiſes the Pious Zeal of the *Engliſh*, who (q) Condemned the Catechiſm of this Sect to the Flames; ſo he complains of the Toleration which *Cromwell* allowed theſe Hereticks. He bewails with

(a) Id. ibid. pag. 218.

(b) Curcellæus mentions an interval of 8 days.

(c) Curcellæus ſays only 1200.

(d) Bibl. Antitrinit. pag. 98.

(e) John Ibid. pag. 219.

(f) Samuel Mareſius, præfat. Hydræ Socinianiſmi expugnatæ, tom. 1. Printed at Groningen in 1651.

(g) In the Article Socinus.

(h) The 1. Tome was publiſh'd in 1651. the 2 in 1654. and the 3. which is the laſt, in 1662.

(i) Mareſius, præfat. vol. I. Hydræ Socinianiſmi expugnatæ, fol. (*) [illegible]

(k) In his Defenſio Catholica.

(l) In the refutation of Fauſtus Socinus's Book De Chriſto Servatore.

(m) In the refutation of the ſame Socinus's Book contra Bellarminum & Wickum.

(n) In the refutation of the ſame Socinus's Prælectiones.

(o) In the refutation of the Catechiſm of Racovia.

(p) In the refutation of Crellius's Book de uno Deo & patre.

(q) Quem (Catechiſmum Rakovienſem) olim Anglia ex ſancto & pio zelo publice cremavit, Mareſ. præf. 2. Tome. The word olim makes me think, that he does not mean the Act of Parliament, which condemn'd that Book to be burnt in 1653. See Micrælius's continuation pag. 929.

Saint *Laurence's* College, where he Learned several things. Two Reasons prevented (*A*) his taking the degree of Batchelor of Philosophy, and interrupted his Studies. The Poverty of the Family was the cause which engaged them to breed him a Merchant. Pursuant to which he spent two Years in Learning what might be useful to him in Trade, as Arithmetick, the *French* and *Italian* Languages. And afterwards he returned to his Studies, and was sent to *Herborn* in 1589. where *Piscator* had read Divinity three Years. *Vorstius* studied under him with great Success, and applied himself to the instruction of some Children of Quality. With some of which he went to *Heidelberg* in *March* 1593. where he was created Doctor of Divinity in *July* 1594. A Year after he went to visit the (*B*) Academies of *Switzerland*, and that of *Geneva*. He read Theological Lectures in the latter, at the instigation of *Theodorus Beza*, and acquitted himself so well that he was offered a Professor's Chair there; which he would not accept, some Reasons inducing him to return home, for he was offered to be Divinity Professor at * *Steinfurt*. The Letter of invitation was delivered to him at *Geneva* in *February* 1596. He accepted that Preferment, and discharged his Functions in a manner which made him very Famous, and courted by other (*C*) Academies. In the Year 1605. besides his Professorship, he was made Minister of *Steinfurt*: And as if those two places had not been sufficient to employ him, he had other Preferments † bestowed on him, whereby,

* Arnold then the Count of Bentheim founded an Academy in that Town.

Tears of Blood the Confusion of *England* which was become their (*a*) *Metropolis*, and that a Catechism containing all their Blasphemies was suffered to be Printed at *London*. (*b*) *Modo enim ex Anglia allatus est Anglica lingua conscriptus Catechismus duplex, major & minor, Londini publice excusus hoc anno* 1654. *apud* Ja. Cottrel *pro* Rich. Moone, ad insigne septem stellarum, in Cœmeterio Paulino, *authore* Johanne Beddle, *sive* Biddello, *Magistro Artium Oxoniensi, editus, uti præ se fert, in eorum gratiam qui mere Christiani nullique sectæ addicti esse volunt, (quamvis nequeant se tales profiteri, quin eo ipso sectam specialem ab aliis omnibus discretam constituant,) & omnes Socinianismi impietates ac blasphemias continet, eructat, propugnat.* Having gradually answered *Volkelius*'s Book, he might have laughed at those Sectaries, if they had alledged against him the Reflections which *Arnobius* made on the request of the Idolaters, that the Senate would prohibit some Books of (*c*) *Cicero*, in which the vanity of their false Gods was demonstrated. Refute them, saith *Arnobius*, if they contain any Impieties, for to forbid the Reading of them, is not to maintain the cause of the Gods, but to be afraid of the Evidence of truth. (*d*) *Cum sciam esse non paucos qui aversentur & fugiant libros de hoc ejus*, (Ciceronis) *nec in aurem velint admittere lectionem opinionum suarum præsumpta vincentem? cumque alios audiam mussitare indignanter, & dicere: oportere statui per Senatum, aboleantur ut hæc scripta, quibus Christiana religio comprobetur, & vetustatis opprimatur auctoritas? Quinimo si fidituus exploratum vos dicere quicquam de Diis vestris, erroris convincite Ciceronem, temeraria & impia dictitare refellitote, redarguite, comprobate. Nam intercipere scripta, & publicatam velle submergere lectionem, non est Deos defendere, sed veritatis testificationem timere.* It is certain that *Socinus* (*e*) took Advantage of his Adversaries forbidding the Reading of his Writings.

It must not be forgotten that the *English* complained of *Maresius*'s accusing their Nation, of Favouring *Socinianism*, and of their Country's becoming its Metropolis. Read the following passage of *John Owen*, Doctor of Divinity and then Vice-Chancellor of *Oxford*: (*f*) *Ille* (Maresius) *universam gentem nostram, ejusque Gubernatores Socinianismi accusat, & qui viri mos est, horrendos clamores excitat, affirmans hæresin ibi sedem Metropoliticam fixisse &c. De temeritate hujus censuræ & de stupenda ejus ignorantia in statu rerum apud nos gestarum, quas tamen referre, judicare, & condemnare præsumit, scripsi ad ipsum epistolam.* Mr. *Daillé* made use of this complaint of Dr. *Owen*, when he writ against *Maresius*. To which *Maresius* answered that he never received (*g*) this Doctor's Letter, and that he was very well pleased to hear that things were not in that State in *England* that they had been. This he tells us in a Preface written in *April* 1658. But it is to be observed that the Preface to the Second Tome of the *Anti Volkelius* is dated the 12th of *August* 1654.

(a) Sacerdotium cessit —— videtur nunc in vicina Anglia sedem sibi metropolitanam fixisse. *Maresius præf.* 2. *Tom. Hydra Socinianismi.*

(b) Id. ib.

(c) *Doubtless Cicero's* Books de natura Deorum.

(d) Arnobius lib. 3. p. m. 103.

(e) *See the* Nouv. de la Rep. des lettres, *for July* 1685. art. 9.

(f) Joan. Owenus in vindic. Evangel. contra Socin Anglice, præfat. pag. 4. apud Dallæum in vindiciis Apologiæ pag. 434.

(g) Maresius in prolegom. epicrisis theologiæ.

(*A*) *Two Reasons prevented.*] One was that he would not betray his Conscience, by swearing that he would submit to the decisions of the last Council; the other was that it was designed to withdraw him from his studies in order to breed him a Merchant, by Reason of the ill posture of the Affairs of his Family. (*h*) *Instabat tempus promotionis ejusdem ad Baccalaureatum, & magisterium philosophiæ, sed quæ fieri non poterat nisi pro more solenniter juraret in decreta Concilii Tridentini; itaque honorem illum licet ejus potiri posset & forte vellet, tamen cum & conscientiæ propter illud juramentum obstaret, & jam parentum res magis ac magis inclinarent, repudiavit, & deliberatum est de studiis ipsius abrumpendis, ipsoque mercaturæ addicendo.*

(*B*) *He went to visit the Academies of Switzerland.*] (*i*) He twice maintained publick Theses at *Basil*; 1. *de Sacramentis*; 2. *de causis salutis*. He was preparing a 3. disputation against *Socinus*, *de Christo Servatore*; but hastening his Journey he did not finish it, but left the Original with *Grynæus*, and receiv'd it back again when he returned by *Basil*. The first Work ascribed to him is a Collection of these sort of Theses containing above 20, defended at several times, beginning with the Year 1594. He placed first in this Collection, his Theses *de Sancta Trinitate, hoc est, de Deo Patre, Filio & Spiritu sancto*, and the Theses *de persona & officio Christi*; which he some time after made use of as an Apology against those who accused him of *Socinianising* in these two Points; and to stop the Mouth of Calumniators, he Reprinted these two disputations apart (*k*) in 1612. We shall find by the following Remarks that he was soon suspected of that Heresy.

(*C*) *And Courted by other Academies.*] Mr. *du Plessis Mornai* and the Church of *Saumur* wrote to him in *July* 1602. to intreat his acceptance of the Theological Professor's Chair in the Academy, which they had newly erected in that place. *Vorstius* gave no Positive Answer: But the Count of *Bentheim* resolved to retain him, answered Mr. *du Plessis*, and the Affair stopt there. (*l*) In 1606. *Maurice Landgrave* of *Hesse* offered *Vorstius* the place of Divinity professor at *Marpurg*, and after having several times writ to him he sent a Coach and a Trumpet (*m*) for him, that the Professor might make a commodious and Honourable Journey. The Count of *Bentheim* would not give leave for his departure; *Vorstius*'s Relations desired him not to remove; so that this

(i) *Marcus Gualther. ubi infra.*

(h) Marcus Gualtherus, in oratione de vita & obitu Conradi Vorstii.

(l) *See* Marcus Gualtherus in oratione de vita & obitu Conradi Vorstii. *I cannot Note the Pages; for the Printer has not Numbered them.*

(*k*) Quas postmodum Apologiæ vicem esse voluit, cum maligne quidam Tribunitii stentores ipsum traducere inciperent, quasi hæretice de duobus illis capitibus sentientem aut docentem. Ideoque anno 1612 denuo & seorsim excudi curavit, ad os calumniæ obturandum. *Id. ibid.* pag. *I* 3. (*l*) Ibid. pag. I 3. (*m*) Misso præter diversas literas singularis honoris causa tubicine & rheda qua illuc veheretur. *Ib. verso.*

as it was but reaſonable, his Salary was increaſed. He was invited to Leyden to ſucceed *Arminius* in the Year 1610, and after one Years irreſolute conſideration (*D*) he accepted that, and with his Family removed to *Leyden*, Imployment having the moſt Authentick Teſtimonials of (*E*) Orthodoxy, and of a good as well as prudent Conduct; but he met with inſurmountable Difficulties. The Miniſters who maintained the old Doctrine of *Calvin* in oppoſition to the *Arminians*, were perſuaded that if *Vorſtius*, who was not of their Opinion, ſhould be Profeſſor at *Leyden*, he would do an irreparable injury to their Cauſe. Wherefore they warmly repreſented the danger; they accuſed him of an infinite Number of Hereſies which they back'd by the concurrence of Foreign Univerſities, from which they obtained

this invitation proved as ineffectual as that of *Saumur*. If the Call to *Leyden* had ſucceeded no better, it is very probable that *Vorſtius* had died with an Orthodox Character; for it ought to be obſerved that the Suſpicions raiſed againſt him before 1599 were ſufficiently quaſhed by his Conduct in the *Palatinate*. And doubtleſs Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornai* would not have had him at *Saumur*, if he had not been throughly convinced of his Innocence. Nor could he be ignorant of what was done at *Heidelberg*. The Count of *Bentheim* being informed that his Divine was ſuſpected, deſired to have that Affair cleared; and therefore he gave *Vorſtius* order to go immediately and purge himſelf of that Accuſation at the Univerſity which had Created him Doctor, and convince them of his Orthodoxy. *Vorſtius* accordingly went to *Heidelberg* (*a*) where he gave an Account of his Faith and returned home perfectly juſtified. The Faculty of Divinity admitted him *ad oſculum pacis*, and gave him *teſſeram hoſpitalitatis*, having told him that he was to blame for Advancing certain aſſertions which favoured the *Socinians*, and having made him promiſe, that for the future he would abſtain from the uſe of any ſuſpicious Expreſſions. He was alſo obliged to proteſt that he abhorred *Socinus*'s Opinions, and that he was heartily ſorry (*b*) that the heat of Youth had drawn him into Expreſſions which ſeemed to Favour that Heretick, and ſhock the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches. This happened the 26th of *September* 1599. This Inſtrument is in the life of *David Pareus*: Where alſo appears the following Relation, which will not be diſagreeable to thoſe who are fond of being acquainted with a great many particulars concerning the lives of Learned Men. (*c*) *Non ita pridem ſupremos in S. Theologia honores, ſive Doctoratum Facultas Theologica contulerat Viro Clariſſimo Domino* CONRADO VORSTIO *Colonienſi, qui poſtea à* D. PAREO *ob ſingularem eruditionem, diſputandi acumen, & docendi* εὐμεθοδίαν, *commendatus fuit ad Profeſſionem Theologicam in nova Schola Steinfurtenſi, Illuſtri & Generoſo Comiti* D. ARNOLDO, *Comiti in Bentheim, &c. In qua cum aliquandiu Orthodoxam doctrinam cum magna laude propoſuiſſet, abreptus tandem ingenii* ἀγχινοίᾳ *aut* καινοτομίᾳ *docendi, animum applicuit ad lectionem nefarii libri* FAUSTI SOCINI *de Servatore: immo & authoris amicitiam aſſectavit ac coluit. Hinc cothurnos corrumpendi receptam doctrinam, de lytro & ſatisfactione* JESU-CHRISTI, *ſubdole excogitavit, quos & Diſputationibus tam publicis quam privatis in Scholis habitis* λάθρᾳ *tanquam* ὕπουλον *venenum turbavit. Sed fraus diu latere non potuit ſagaciores Theologos, qui fermentum illud odorati, magno conatu & zelo hominem monuerunt, ut reſipiſceret: juxta illud:* Retundat me juſtus: benignitas erit: & corripiat me: unguentum erit præſtantiſſimum. *Quin & ipſe Generoſus Dn. Comes, admonitus à viris gravibus, Doctorem ſuum ſerio hortatus fuit, ut in gratiam rediret cum Eccleſiis & fratribus, quos ſua* καινοδοξίᾳ *magno totius Eccleſiæ ſcandalo non ceſſaret offendere: nec ante ad munus docendi in ſua ſchola rediret, quam Teſtimonium* Ὀρθοδοξίας *auferret, ab iis præſertim, qui publicam docendi facultatem in Academia ei juſſent largiti.*

(*D*) *After one Years irreſolute Conſideration he accepted that Imployment.*] Nothing was wanting in this Invitation: It had been approved by the States of *Holland*, and by Prince *Maurice*, who alſo ordered the Deputies, one of which was his own Miniſter, to preſs *Vorſtius* to the utmoſt, to come and ſerve the Univerſity of *Leyden* (*d*). But I believe without the earneſt and violent Sollicitations of the Arminians, *Vorſtius* had never embarked in that boiſterous Sea. He was beloved and Honoured at *Steinfurt*, he there enjoyed a perfect eaſe, and had a very great Reputation, and at the State of the Controverſies betwixt *Arminius* and *Gomarus* then was, he doubtleſs foreſaw the many Oppoſitions which he was like to meet with in *Holland*. They tempted him, if I am not miſtaken, with the Glory of ſupporting a Party, which the Death of *Arminius* had weaken'd. To which were added the *Motives drawn from Conſcience*: It was repreſented to him that he would one day be obliged to Account for the ill uſe of his Talents, if the Love of eaſe made him loſe ſuch a favourable Opportunity of Eſtabliſhing the Truth where it had already taken root. However, it was his ill Stars made him leave the County of *Bentheim*, and tranſported him to *Holland*, where being toſſed betwixt a Thouſand Shoals and Rocks, he at laſt was miſerably Shipwrack'd, and loſt both his Reputation and Fortune, being ſubjected to the laſh of both Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Tribunals. This was an Argument againſt *Arminianiſm*; this was what would oblige one to acknowledge the fatality of Events. His Panegyriſt affords me this thought. *Vir optimus*, ſaith he (*e*), *jam litium Theologicarum quæ in Belgio inter Eccleſiaſticos exortæ erant, gnarus & ob eas non temere tam duram provinciam capiendam ratus, non quidem prorſus quod offerebatur repudiavit, ſed toto nihilominus pene anno aſſenſum ſuſpendit. Itaque eo magis quod tenſo ac tenaci quodam germaniſſimæ benevolentiæ vinculo alligatus à ſuis ægerrime avelli poſſet, certatim contra admonentibus omnibus ut decus illud Scholæ novellæ retineretur: ſed currebant jam propinqua viri* FATA, *quæ ipſum quoque communi & immeritæ cladi involvendum* DESTINAVERANT. If *Vorſtius* had continued quiet at *Steinfurt*, the Errors of his Treatiſe *de Deo* had not ſignified much, and he had eaſily recovered that falſe ſtep: But the queſtion being whether he ſhould teach Theology at *Leyden* or not, that is, whether the growing Party ſhould top the other, nothing was to be pardoned in him; his Treatiſe *de Deo* grew worſe than the *Alcoran*. This parallel is not of my Invention; I found it in the Author juſt now cited. *Reipſa comperimus*, ſaith he (*f*), *vehementius & acerbius librum iſtum oppugnaſſe quam unquam quiſquam Chriſtianorum Mahumedis Alcoranum, aut recutitorum Talmudica deliria invaſit. Neque unquam Lucianus, Porphyrius, Julianus, Libanius aut quiſquis ſimili in Chriſtianos maledicentia fuit, tam crude & barbare exceptus a veteribus ſcriptoribus, qui tamen etiam habebant acetum in pectore, atque hic Noſter ab infrunitis adverſariis ſuis male mulctatus ob ſerium & ſolidum illud ſcriptum.* We ſhall obſerve in the Remark O the prejudice which the *Arminians* did their Cauſe by calling in *Vorſtius*.

(*E*) *The moſt Authentick teſtimonials of Orthodoxy.*] His Hiſtory expreſſes the Teſtimonials which the Counts of *Bentheim* gave him, and that with which the Academy of *Steinfurt* preſented him. I ſhall only cite a very ſmall part of the Elogies which thoſe teſtimonials beſtow upon him. (*g*) *Poſt exceſſum nominati pientiſſimi Domini parentis noſtri hactenus fidelem ipſius operam, vitam irreprehenſibilem, Chriſtianam & puram doctrinam atque inſtitutionem, & inde conſecutam propagationem & ædificationem Eccleſiæ & Scholæ reipſa experti ſumus.* This is taken out of the teſtimonials of the Counts; as the following is from that of the Academy. *Publice & ſancte teſtamur* ——— *Conradum Vorſtium* ——— *ita ſe probaſſe ut* ——— *in hac Republica inculpatum*

(*e*) Idem, pag. ſequenti.

(*f*) Ibid. fol. M 2.

(*g*) Ibid. fol. F.

obtained Evidences againſt his Doctrine; they (F) alarmed the Religious Zeal of King *James* and engaged him to recommend the excluſion of ſuch a Heretick, to the Republick of *Holland*. Upon which (G) there were ſeveral proceedings againſt him, which grew to ſuch a warmth, that *Vorſtius* was obliged proviſionally to renounce the Exerciſe of his Employment, and leave *Leyden*, in order to expect elſewhere a definitive Sentence concerning this diſpute. He retired to

Tergou

ipſum [illegible] curſum ſexdecim circiter annorum continuorum tum in Eccleſia docendo, tum in ſchola [illegible] interpretando, publice privatimque diſputando, juventutem in orthodoxa religione erudiendo ita peregiſſe, ut pietate erga Deum, probitate & dilectione erga proximum nihil prius, nihilque antiquius habuerit. Et ut paucis multa comprehendamus, virum Deo piiſque omnibus placentem, orthodoxo Theologo & Profeſſore dignum egerit. He obtained the like teſtimonial Letters from the Council of the City, and the Conſiſtory, which the Hiſtorian doth not produce; but contents himſelf for Brevity ſake with ſaying that they contain the ſame thing in Subſtance. *Adderem hic totidem præterea alia, unum Senatus oppidani, alterum Conſiſtorii (uti nunc vocant) Steinfurtenſis, niſi & plane idem prioribus iſta dicerent, & mihi brevitatis ſtudium aurem velleret.* It ought to be Remarked that *Vorſtius* obtained all theſe Teſtimonials after the Printing of his Terrible Tract *de Deo*, which raiſed ſuch a cry in *Holland* againſt his Impieties, Blaſphemies and Atheiſm. (a) *Ab his Theonibus prope nihil aliud audire cogeretur quam innumeras & uno libro non dicendas calumnias, dicteria, convicia, ſcommata, punctiones, nempe de ejus impietate, blaſphemiis, mendaciis, perjurio, de ſtupore, inſcitia, & præcipue de hæreſibus (ſi* DEO *placet) Pelagianis, Arianis, Socinianis, Serveti, Enjedini, Oſtorodi, Papiſticis, & —— Turcicis, Judaicis, Paganis, Atheis.* I ſay once again that if he had contented himſelf with the College of *Steinfurt* for his whole life, it is highly probable that he had died with the Reputation of an Orthodox Divine.

(F) *Alarmed the Religious Zeal of King James.*] This was a War agreeable to his Genius, in which he intereſted himſelf more vigorouſly, than in that of the King of *Bohemia* his Son in Law, and bravely cauſed *Vorſtius*'s Book to be burned. I mean that *de Deo*. Of which ſeveral Copies were ſacrificed to the Flames in *London*, *Oxford* and *Cambridge*. The King was hunting when the Book was brought to him: And he run through it ſo diligently, that in the ſpace of an Hour he diſpatched away a Catalogue of Hereſies, which he had found in that piece, to his Reſident at the *Hague*; and ordered him to notify to the States, how much he deteſted thoſe Hereſies, and thoſe who would tolerate them. The States Anſwered that if *Vorſtius* was Guilty of the Errors Charged on him they would not defend him. This anſwer was not at all Satisfactory to the King of *England*. But he wrote a Letter dated the 6 of *October* 1611. to the States, earneſtly exhorting them to baniſh him, tho' at the ſame time he ſhould deny the Errors laid to his Charge; for if he owned, and was convicted of them, his Majeſty did not (b) doubt in the leaſt, but that he ought to be burned. He declared that if vigorous attempts are not made in order *to extirpate of this growing Atheiſm, he will publickly proteſt againſt thoſe Abominations, and ſeparate from the Union of ſuch falſe and Heretical Churches*, and as Defender of the Faith, he will *exhort all other reformed Churches to enter into general conſults, in order to extinguiſh, and baniſh to Hell thoſe Abominable Hereſies lately ſprung up*, and particularly he will interdict any of his Subjects *the frequenting ſuch an infectious place as the Univerſity of Leyden*. *Vorſtius* was inſtalled at *Leyden* before the Letter of King *James* was delivered to the States. Wherefore the *Engliſh* Envoy, at the preſentation of it, made a very vehement Speech againſt his Inſtallation, and threatned the United Provinces with the Enmity of the King his Maſter, if they tolerated *Vorſtius*. He was anſwered that this Profeſſor had receiv'd Orders to deſiſt from the exerciſe of his Function, till he had anſwered the Accuſations againſt him; and that this affair wou'd be examin'd before the States of *Holland* in *February* next. The Ambaſſador very little ſatisfied with this Anſwer, made another Speech to proteſt againſt thoſe proceedings, and threatned the States not only with the enmity, but alſo with the Pen of King (c) *James*. He was anſwered as before, and told that the States were certain that his Majeſty would be content with the proceedings of the States of *Holland*. Notwithſtanding this Anſwer this Prince publiſhed a Book, in which he gave the World an Account of his Conduct, and the Reaſons of it, and very zealouſly argued againſt *Vorſtius*. Who publiſhed a ſmall Anſwer to the Extracts which this Monarch had communicated to the States out of the Book *de Deo*. This he Dedicated to the States the 15. of *December* 1611. This anſwer is written with all due deference and reſpect to King *James*.

All theſe Dates ſerve to convict *Spondanus* of Error, who relates in 1610. (d) that King *James* incenſed at the Protection which the States General granted *Vorſtius*, whoſe Books he had cauſed to be burned, threatned that if they did not baniſh him, he would expoſe them all the World over as ſupporters of Apoſtates, and convert his Alliance with them into immortal hatred; and that the States ſurprized at theſe menaces, tho' with great regret, permitted *Vorſtius* to depart. *Spondanus* adds that *Vorſtius* was Honoured like an Apoſtle in the ſeveral places where he lived, after the States had ſent him away. This Author is not guilty of meer Anachroniſms, for after the States of *Holland* had diſmiſt *Vorſtius*, he concealed himſelf and was expoſed to a Thouſand Dangers and Ignominies. (e)

(G) *Upon which there were ſeveral proceedings againſt him.*] *Mark Gualtherus* has omitted ſome Facts, which ought to have been an eſſential part in the Hiſtory of his Heroe. He ought to have told us that the *Gomariſts* having oppoſed the invitation of *Vorſtius*, the States of *Holland* ordered them to produce their Reaſons for it. There were then ſix Contra-Remonſtrant Miniſters, who in the Famous (f) conference of the *Hague* propoſed their grievances againſt *Vorſtius* the 29 of *April* 1611. They accuſed him of ſeveral *Socinian* Doctrines and affirmed that his Book *de Deo*, favour'd more of an Atheiſt than of a Divine. The States deſired that they would make good their Accuſations againſt *Vorſtius* to his Face in their preſence. This was done in preſence of ſix Miniſters which each party had deputed, and of the Curators of the Univerſity of *Leyden*. And when *Vorſtius* had been heard, the States determined that nothing ſhould hinder his being Profeſſor, as it was intended (g). So that tho' the Contra-Remonſtrant Miniſters rejected his anſwers, *Vorſtius* had Triumphed, if an unhappy Accident had not thwarted him. Which is the Second thing the Hiſtorian ought to have related. Some of *Vorſtius*'s Diſciples publiſhed in *Frieſland* a ſmall Tract *de officio Chriſtiani hominis*, containing ſeveral Antitrinitarian Doctrines, which was publickly burnt: Some of thoſe who cauſed it to be Printed were diſcovered, and ſeveral Letters which were publiſhed were found upon them, containing a great many Elogies on *Vorſtius*, and ſeveral ſuſpicious things relating to ſeveral other Divines. Thoſe who publiſhed theſe Letters added a Warning to all Reformed Churches to give them an Alarm. A ſtrict Scrutiny was made into all *Vorſtius*'s Books, into what he had Dictated in the Chair, and into his Manuſcripts, in order to find matter to charge him with. The States of *Frieſland* adviſed thoſe of *Holland* and the Curators of the Univerſity of *Leyden* of all this. It was therefore neceſſary that *Vorſtius* ſhould ſolemnly clear himſelf, and declare that tho' he had writ ſometimes to the Poliſh *Socinians*, he was very far from being of their Opinion; and that whatever he

did

(a) Ibid. fol. M 3.

(b) *But if this wretched Vorſtius ſhould deny or uſe any Equivocation about the Blaſphemous points of hereſy and Atheiſm which he has already publiſh'd, it might perhaps move you to ſpare his Perſon, and not to burn him, tho' no heretick did ever deſerve it more than he, which we leave to your Chriſtian prudence. But on Account of any Vindication or denial of his to ſuffer him to live and dogmatize among you, is ſo abominable a thing that we are ſure it will never enter into the thoughts of any of you.* King James's Letter in the Mercure François tom. 2. pag. 460. édit. of Cologne.

(c) [illegible]

(d) Num. 12.

(e) See the Remark K.

(f) Compoſed of ſix Calviniſt, and as many Arminian Miniſters.

(g) See the Book intitled Pacificatorium diſſidii Belgii, per Salomonem Theodotum, pag. 61. & ſeq.

Tergou about May 1611, where he lived quiet (H) till 1619, when he was forced to leave Holland; For the Synod of Dort having (I) declared him unworthy of the Profeſſor's Chair, the States of the Province deprived him of that Employment, and condemned him to a perpetual Baniſhment. I do not certainly know whither he went; but he continu'd conceal'd for the ſpace of two Years, and his Life was

did was only to inform himſelf better of their Opinions, and that he did the ſame to the Jeſuits, to whom he never ſcrupled to write. He delivered the Profeſſion of his Faith ſigned by himſelf, concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity, and the Divinity of CHRIST; and on the 22d of May 1612, he pronounced an Apologetical Oration before the States of Holland (a). We ſhall ſee that all this engaged him in the publication of ſeveral Books.

(H) *He lived quiet at Tergou.*] Which appears by the Teſtimonial of the Magiſtrates of that City, dated the 20th of *July* 1619, which certifies, that for the ſpace of 7 Years and three Months that he lived there, (b) he behaved himſelf like an honeſt and good Man. His Hiſtorian producing this Certificate, obſerves, that the Magiſtrates who gave it, were of the Modern Eſtabliſhment, that is, vigorous Opponents of the *Arminians*. Let us here obſerve two Faults of which *Paul Freherus* is guilty. He ſaith (c) that *Vorſtius* removed to *Holland*, and finding the Troubles there increaſe every Day, actually reſigned his Profeſſorſhip, and retir'd to *Steinfurt*, till the Magiſtrates decided the difference. This is his firſt Error; for *Tergou*, and not *Steinfurt*, was the firſt place of retreat which he choſe. *Freherus* adds, that becauſe *Vorſtius* ſucceeded *Arminius*, he had ſeveral conſiderable Diſputes to maintain againſt *Gomarus*. This is another Miſtake; for this hints, that beſides, and after the differences which obliged *Vorſtius* to retire, he had ſome particular Quarrels with *Gomarus*. But this is doubly falſe: For he had no difference with *Gomarus* (d) who retired into *Zealand*, becauſe he would not have him for his Collegue; and if there had been any Diſputes betwixt them, they muſt doubtleſs have been the ſame which forced him to retire to *Tergou*:

(I) *For the Synod of* Dort *having declared him unworthy of the Profeſſor's Chair.*] His Hiſtorian odiouſly exaggerates this Circumſtance; he tells us, that they condemned *Vorſtius* without any regard to his Petition to be heard, before he was ſentenced. And there is ſo much rancour and ill Language in this part of his Hiſtory, that I am not willing to ſoil my Paper with it; and I ſhall cite only what is a meer Narrative, or what is ſo cloſely annexed to it, that to omit it would be to obſcure the reſt. And if I cite any diſagreeable expreſſions, they ſhall be thoſe which have the leaſt harſhneſs. *Procurante-- Bogermanno effectum eſt ut Vorſtius abſens inauditusque condemnatus & Profeſſoris titulo ac honore indignus declaratus ſit——— ut cujus doctrina in Eccleſiis & Scholis reformatis nequaquam toleranda, ſed cum deteſtatione penitus eliminanda atque extirpanda eſſet. Non obſtante quod tam ſerio rogatu per literas ambierit ut Synodus ipſum audire, errorum ac hæreſum (quas clamabant) legitime ac liquidè ex verbo Dei convincere, & Chriſtiana lenitate rectiora docere vellet. Cujus equidem judicii ac ſententiæ damnatoriæ, quam nihil aliud quam caſſa invidia conflavit, & Vorſtii ad cœtum iſtum epiſtolæ ſatis ſeriæ & prolixæ, ſi vel minimam adhuc honeſti ſanguinis guttam habent, ſacroſancti ſcilicet Concilii illius togatos patres æternum pudere debet. Maxime cum tam probas colloquii conditiones, itemque alia pro veritate adverſus hæreticos præſtanda afferret. Sed viri hujus linguam ac legitimam cum eo diſputationem pejus iſti lucifugæ formidabant, quam fullo ululam.* Thus *Vorſtius*'s Friends accounted it a Glorious thing for him that the *Synod* would not hear his defence: They pretended that the *Synod* was terribly afraid of his Wit, of the force of his Eloquence, and of the weight of his Reaſons; in ſhort, that they feared to be overcome in a Diſpute. But now let us ſee what this Hiſtorian ſaith concerning the Sentence of the States of the Province. “ *Poſt hunc ſacri fulminis fragorem, alia Vorſtium &* “ *immitior tempeſtas, quod neceſſum erat, excepit.* “ *Mox enim à promulgata Flaminum ſententia in juſ-* “ *[illegible]* “ *immiſit Vorſtii flammam in hoc [illegible]* “ *tantum vertente Synodi Dordracenæ Vorſtius* “ *functionibus ſuis in Academia Leydenſi movetur,* “ *ſalariumque ſuum deinceps ducere et percipere* “ *vetatur. Præterea Hollandia & Weſtfriſia ei* “ *interdicitur, illique intra ſex ſeptimanas excedere* “ *jubetur, & in eam non redire ſub pœna arbitra-* “ *rii illi, ut perturbatori publicæ pacis, irrogandæ.* “ *Scilicet quia judicatum eſſet ejus in iſto tractu* “ *commorationem Reip. damnoſam eſſe.*„

Several Perſons having given it as their Opinion, that I ought to cite the expreſs terms of the Synodical condemnation of *Vorſtius*, I ſhall here inſert part of them. “ (e) The moſt Illuſtrious and “ Mighty States General, having by their Noble and Honourable Deputies, enjoyned this “ Synod to declare ſummarily their Opinion concerning the Theology, or Doctrine contained “ in the Writings of *Conrad Vorſtius*, Doctor of “ Divinity; and likewiſe whether it may be ſafely “ taught, to the edification and advantage of the Re- “ formed Churches, or whether the toleration of it “ can conſiſt with true Piety: This venerable “ Synod, after having in the fear of God, well and “ duly conſider'd and examined all things, hath, “ and doth unanimouſly by theſe preſents declare, “ that the ſaid *Conrad Vorſtius*, in his laſt Tracts, “ namely in that concerning God and his At- “ tributes, beſides defending the Errors of the five “ Articles, which are rejected by this Synod, hath “ partly called in queſtion not only one or two “ Articles of the Chriſtian and Reformed Religion, “ but alſo doubts of ſeveral of the Principal of them, “ for example, the following; That of the Tri- “ nity——— (f) and that he partly affirms and “ lays down ſeveral Aſſertions, which are wholly and “ diametrically oppoſite to the Truth which God “ hath revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures, and “ to the Confeſſions of all the Reformed Churches. “ ———Beſides which, in ſeveral places he has “ dangerouſly enervated and weakened the chief “ and ſtrongeſt Arguments, which the venerable Antiquity and the Modern Doctors of the “ Reformed Church, have juſtly drawn from the “ Word of God, and made uſe of to eſtabliſh and “ maintain the Orthodox Doctrine, eſpecially “ the Eternal Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, “ without either producing or ſubſtituting any others “ in their room to prove more powerfully, and ſupport the Doctrine which he oppoſes. That he “ induſtriouſly advances, and to the utmoſt “ of his power urges ſeveral Sophiſms, and “ vain Arguments, which intangle and obſcure “ Truth, without ever endeavouring to reſolve “ them, but leaves them as they are, that they may “ the more eaſily be fixed in the Minds of his “ Readers; whence clearly appears his ſubtil De- “ ſign of preparing the way, and clandeſtinely o- “ pening a Gate, in order to inſtill the Wicked and “ Impious Hereſies of *Socinus* and others; and “ conſequently to ſeduce and deceive the World, “ under the ſpecious pretext of a ſearch after Truth. “ That in vain and to no effect, he has hitherto “ diſguiſed and varniſhed his Opinions, with ſeveral impertinent Diſtinctions, frivolous Excuſes, mi- “ ſerable ſubterfuges, deceitful and fraudulent “ Diſſimulations and Gloſſes. Wherefore the pre- “ poſterous and inordinate liberty which he makes “ uſe of to diſpute and queſtion the moſt impor- “ tant Articles of the Chriſtian Religion; and the “ wavering, dubious and uncertain way of inſtruction “ which he practiſes, are very dangerous and pernici- “ ous to the Church, and by no means decorous “ and agreeable to ſuch ſacred and ſublime Sub- “ jects, and conſequently unworthy of an Or- “ thodox Profeſſor——— (g) And declares “ the ſaid *Conrad Vorſtius* ——— utterly un- “ worthy and wholly deprived of the Employment “ and Title of Profeſſor or Doctor of the Reformed

“ Churches

(a) Ex eodem Præfatione [illegible] &c. & ſeq.

(b) Vide in eo [illegible] [illegible] honeſte, probe, modeſte, & ad exemplum, [illegible] quam [illegible] quod ad mores & vitam ejus [illegible], obſervavimus vel audivimus. *Apud Marcum Gualtherum.*

(c) Theatr. virorum illuſtrium pag. 354.

(d) See the *Life of* Gomarus *among thoſe of the Profeſſors of* Groningen, pag. [illegible].

(e) *Acts of the Synod of* Dort, *Seſſion* [illegible], pag. [illegible], *tranſlated by* Richard John de Nerée, Printed at Leyden 1624, in 4to.

(f) Ibid. pag. 587.

(g) Ibid. pag 590.

was more than once in danger (K), there being ſeveral Perſons who tranſported by a furious Zeal, thought that a Man of his Character ought not to be ſuffered to live. At laſt a Duke of *Holſtein* having gathered together the ſcatter'd Remnants of the *Arminians*, and aſſigned them a Place in his Dominions, in order to build a Town, *Vorſtius* found ſome ſecurity and repoſe: For he retired into that Country in *June* 1622. But he fell ſick ſhortly after, and died at *Tonningen* on the 29th of *September* following. He diſcovered very ſignal Marks of a pious reſignation to the Divine Will in his laſt Minutes; and we are told that he was always very devout, and (L) very fervent in Prayer †. His Corps was carried to *Friderickſtadt*, the new *Arminian* City, where he was decently buried. He publiſhed (M) ſeveral Books as well againſt the *Roman* Catholicks as againſt his Proteſtant Adverſaries. The Diſputes raiſed againſt him, were doubtleſs intermixed with a great deal of Paſſion; but after all, thoſe who ſuſpected him to be very ſtrongly

† *Taken from the Oration de Vita & obitu Conradi Vorſtii, pronounced at Frederickſtadt by Mark Gualtherus, and Printed in* 1624. *in* 4to.

" Churches. Finally, this Synodical Aſſembly ſe-
" riouſly and earneſtly petition the Illuſtrious and
" Mighty States-General, by virtue of their
" Sovereign Authority, that they would be pleaſ-
" ed to remove from the Reformed Churches,
" that ſcandalous and common Stumblingblock,
" and to take care for the future, that the
" Churches of the Low-Countries may not be pol-
" luted and defiled with ſuch pernicious Principles,
" Hereſies and Blaſphemies, and to that end uſe all
" neceſſary prudence and caution intirely to ſuppreſs
" all the Writings of the ſaid *Vorſtius*, and of thoſe
" who are tainted with the ſame Leaven." *Vorſtius* wrote a very well turned Anſwer to this Synodical Sentence: It is Printed at large in the Book which I (*a*) cite.

(K) *And his Life was more than once in danger.*] Several Perſons made it their buſineſs to find out his Lodgings, in order to diſcover them to his Enemies. Wherefore he was frequently forced to change his Habitation, and to be continually provided with a Ladder at his Window, in caſe his Door was broke open; and ſometimes that precaution proved inſufficient to ſecure him, by reaſon that the Houſe was wholly ſurrounded with armed Men; which affrighted ſeveral from harbouring him. I will not warrant the Truth of all this: But I relate it from *Gualtherus's* Words which are: (*b*) *Ut ut quietem & ſecuritatem aliquam in iſto ſuo latibulo ſperaret, tamen fieri non potuit quin ſingulis pene diebus & noctibus centenis mortibus enecaretur, cum turpiſſimi proditores* (genus (1) hominum publico exitio repertum) *jugem operam darent uti virum latitantem inveſtigare, extrahere, in manus perſecutorum tradere, & nefario indicii præmio exhilarari poſſent. Quoties iſtic domum mutaſſe, quoties noctes inſomnes ex metu jamjam irruentium duxiſſe, quoties ſcalas feneſtris foris applicatas ad ſubitum effugium habuiſſe putatis? Quoties in extrema conſternatione arbitramini conſtitum fuiſſe, cum non raro omnes cum domibus ſuis recipere negarent periculi timore? Cum Thraſones mariti & anticam & poſticam cum ſclopetis onerati obſervarent ædium quibus tegi putaretur? In tantis anguſtiis biennium circiter aſſumpſit.* It was then that he had much reaſon to wiſh for the Epitaph, which a Poet that was one of his Friends, ſuppoſed that he deſired ſeveral Years before.

At (*c*) *vos poſteritas tumulo hæc inſcribite verba,*
Poſthuma fortunæ ſigna futura meæ.
Nulla Reformata mihi pars dilectior unquam,
Nulla Reformata pars minus æqua mihi.

Here is room for a conſiderable Obſervation on the ill effects of a Religious Zeal: It removes all remorſe for Crimes committed, and diſables a Man from making uſe of the ſole way of obtaining pardon of God for his Sins, which is only to be expected by Repentance. Thoſe who deſign'd to beat, rob, or aſſaſſinate *Vorſtius*, to throw him into a Dungeon, or load him with invectives, thought they did a very good action, and an acceptable ſervice to God: They were not therefore touch'd with any remorſe, and thereby induc'd to apply to the Divine Mercy; but died in their impenitence. This is a Precipice which ought to be carefully conſider'd whenever the Minds of the Populace are inflamed againſt erroneous Doctors.

(L) *And very fervent in Prayer.*] His Panegyriſt ſays very ſurprizing things concerning his Patience, in the midſt of the Invectives, which were ſhower'd on his head. (*d*) *Poſſem, auditores, ad ſingulas iſtius patientiæ ſeu ſpecies ſeu proprietates vivæ exempla proferre, maxime ad devoratas cum patientia nulli lingua dicenda opprobria, zelotarum, hoſtium inſolentias, dicteria, ſcommata, convicia, calumnias quas a primo vigore atque fieri furoris Corybantum in Belgio ab aliquot annis libenter & bono ex aſſuetudine ſtomacho concoxit, propter conſcientiam & cæleſtem veritatem, tam a devotis illis religioſi ordinis capitibus, quam a promiſcua populi fece, & quibuſdam thraſonibus qui ſe Martis pullos & Bellonæ filios, feſtivo Herculis elogio ornare ſolent, poſſem, inquam, hujus rei vivas & vera & admiranda exempla vobis referre, niſi me tempus, &c.* He adds that he was often found on his Knees in the exerciſe of Prayer. *Quam multos eſſe eos putatis qui illum inter precandum humi in genua abjectum, & in conclavi alicubi ſolum de improviſo non ſemel oppreſſerunt?* There is no Chriſtian Virtue, in which he is not repreſented to excell; but above all we are told he made a pious end. To which purpoſe conſult not only our *Gualtherus*, but alſo a Letter which the Author of *Vorſtius's* Funeral Oration (*e*) wrote to one of his Friends, which is amongſt thoſe of the *Arminians*, pag. 684, in *Folio*.

(M) *He Publiſhed ſeveral Books.*] Of which I have already mention'd two, one of which is a Collection of ſeveral Theological Theſes, and the other the famous and pernicious Tract (*f*) *de Deo, ſeu diſputationes decem de natura & attributis Dei, diverſo tempore Steinfurti publicè habitæ.* Before this Book appeared, he Publiſhed his *Idea ſeu brevis ſynopſis totius ſacræ Theologiæ*: A Book of Prayers in the *German* Language: His Diſputations *de cauſis deſerendi Romani Papatus*: His *Index errorum Eccleſiæ Romanæ, ſubjecto cuique capiti Antidoto*: His *German* Treatiſe of Indulgences: His *Teſſaradecas Anti-Piſtoriana, ſeu reſponſio ad librum Johannis Piſtorii de quatuordecim articulis in religione controverſis*: His Apology *pro Eccleſiis Orthodoxis contra Jeſuitas*, and his *antapodixes de tribus primis fidei articulis, ſive contrariæ demonſtrationes tres quibus totidem Jeſuiticæ apodixes a B. D. adverſus apologiam emiſſæ confutantur.* In the Year 1610. came out his *Anti Bellarminus contractus, ſeu brevis refutatio quatuor tomorum Bellarmini.* His other Works were written after his removal to *Holland*, and relate to the *Arminian* Diſputes, or rather, his Book *de Deo*. Many Writers appeared againſt him, whom he oppoſed, as well as he could for ſome time: But he was at laſt forced to give way to the number, and he grew weary of continually repeating the ſame things. The *Frieſlanders* were his moſt violent Enemies, as *Bogerman* Miniſter of *Leeuwarden*, and *Sibrandus Lubbertus*, Divinity Profeſſor at *Franeker*. Againſt the latter he wrote *Catalogus errorum Sibrandi: paræneſis ad Sibrandum*: & *ſcholia apodictica ad Commentarios Sibrandi.* Not to mention his *Exegeſis Apologetica pro tractatu de eodem*, which he Publiſhed in 1611. Nor his *Prodromus adverſus criminationes quorundam fratrum*, nor the *Plenius reſponſum ad eaſdem illas criminationes*: But I ſhall ſay ſomething of his Diſpute with *Piſcator*. It contains 1. *Paraſceve*

(*a*) Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ præſtantium ac eruditorum virorum pag. 588. & ſeq. edit. 1684. *'Tis the ſame Book which I call ſometimes barely* the Letters of the Arminians.

(*b*) Ubi ſupra pag. N.

(1) Tacit.

(*c*) *Theſe four Verſes are the concluſion of an Epigram containing* 8 *Diſticks at the end of an Elogy upon* Vorſtius *in the Book intitl'd,* Illuſtrium Hollandiæ & Weſt-Friſiæ Ordinum alma Academia Leidenſis, *Printed at* Leyden *in the Year* 1614. *The ſix fore-going Verſes are:*

Nunc fratrum in me verſa cohors, & prodiga zeli
Æmula civili prelia Marte gerit.
Nec calamo ſtant bella virum: depoſcitur ipſis
Victima, & inſontis ſupplicium fidei.
Sed mediis erecta malis mens conſcia recti,
Freta Deo, nulli ſuccubat invidiæ.

(*d*) Gualtherus ubi ſupra.

(*e*) *The Oration was made in* Dutch *by* John Grevius. *See the Letters of the Arminians,* pag. 684.

(*f*) *Printed at* Steinfurt *in* 1610.

ſtrongly inclined to *Socinianiſm* (N), were not much in the wrong; and perhaps he had made publick profeſſion of that Doctrine, if he had not followed the Maxim * which the Roman Catholicks alledge againſt the Reformers: That when we are convinced the Church wants reforming, we ought to continue in the Communion of it, the more ſucceſsfully to eradicate its Errors. He very much prejudiced the *Arminian* (O) Party. The *Engliſh* Deputies at the Synod of *Dort*

reſponſio ad amicam collationem cum Joanne Piſcatore, ſuper notis hujus ad loca quaedam ex illius tractatu de Deo & exegeſi apologetica pridem excerpta. 2. *Amica collatio cum eodem Piſcatore.* 3. *Amica duplicatio una cum appendice ſive paralipomenis ad tripartitam reſponſionem apologeticam Piſcatoris.* 4. *Examen tractatus Piſcatoris de divina praedeſtinatione.* He did not make any Anſwer to *Sopingius* a *Frieſland* Miniſter, nor to *Bokerus* a Miniſter in *North-Holland*; but he took other meaſures with *Matthew Slade*, an *Engliſh* Man, who let looſe at him with a terrible fury. He Printed an Anſwer to him at *Tergow* in 1611. This *Slade* was Rector of the publick School at *Amſterdam*, and took Pen in hand in defence of his Sovereign the King of *England*, who deſired the States to Baniſh *Vorſtius*. It was impoſſible for any Book to be written more angrily, one only excepted, which indeed was more outragious, and publiſhed by another of that Prince's Subjects; I mean *George Egliſem*, a *Scotch* Phyſician who lived at the *Hague*, and wrote *Criſis & hypocriſis Vorſtiani reſponſi*, where in a juridical manner he accuſed him to the States of Atheiſm, Paganiſm, Judaiſm, Turciſm, Hereſy, Schiſm and Ignorance (a). He ſent him ſeveral Challenges to appear and defend himſelf; and addreſſing himſelf to the States, (b) he tells them that he requeſts and expects a ſtrict Examination to be made, and that either *Vorſtius* or his Accuſers ſhould be puniſhed. This was to come cloſe to the point, and nothing can be more juſt, than ſuch an Alternative: And nevertheleſs nothing is more rare than to ſee Calumniators on the head of Hereſy and Impiety, brought to condign Puniſhment. It being thought ſufficient to abſolve the Innocent, and inſtead of puniſhing the Accuſer according to *Lex Talionis*, he is ſometimes thanked for his great great Zeal, or at moſt advertiſed that he ought not to have gone ſo far. However this Phyſician made very fair Propoſals, but he was ſure that he ran no riſk, how abſurd and contradictory ſoever his Accuſation might be found: For King *James*'s Menaces to the Republick of the United Provinces, if they protected *Vorſtius*, entirely rid his Accuſers of all manner of fear. It is not therefore ſurprizing that *Vorſtius* ſuffered the Challenges of this *Scotch* man to fall to the Ground; he might eaſily have confounded him in three words. It had been ſufficient for him to have barely ſaid, *You accuſe me of Atheiſm; but according to your own words my Doctrine is Judaical, Mahometan, and Heretical; and the Light it ſelf is not more clear, than it is that the* Jews, Mahometans, *and Hereticks are not Atheiſts; whence it plainly appears by the expreſs terms of your Accuſation, that I am innocent of Atheiſm; and if you make good your Charge of Hereſy, I ought to be depriv'd of the Profeſſor's Chair, but* Lex Talionis *directs that you ſhould be put to death.* But the *Scotch* Man would have ridiculed an Anſwer of this nature, and without being aſhamed of his Calumnies, have relied on his impunity, and conſequently would have ſufficiently triumphed if he had only convicted his Adverſary of Hereſy. There are ſeveral poſthumous works of *Vorſtius*, ſome Commentaries on the Scripture, &c. See the Antitrinitarian Bibliotheque (c).

(N) *To be very ſtrongly inclined to Socinianiſm.*] The *Socinians* offered him a Theological Profeſſor's Chair in the Year 1601, and deputed *Jerome Moſcorovius* to treat with him on that Affair (d). This I own is no convincing proof of his *Socinianiſm*, and his Apology on this Account appears in a Letter to *Uyttenbogard* (e). But what can be offered againſt *Sandius*, who aſſures (f) us, that having for ſome time been dubious whether he ſhould rank *Vorſtius* among the *Unitarians*, he was no longer in ſuſpence after he had ſeen the Confeſſion ſigned by *Vorſtius* on his Death-bed: *In qua*, ſaith he, *haud obſcure prodit quae ejus de Deo ac Chriſto Domino fuerit ſententia.* He adds, that *Vorſtius* cauſing *Fauſtus Socinus*'s Tract *de Authoritate Sacrae Scripturae* to be Printed, prefixed a Preface of his own, and he aſcribes to him the Book intitl'd *Compendiolum Doctrinae Socinianorum*, which *Cloppenburg* refuted, and aſcribed to *Oſtorodus* and *Voidovius*. But none of theſe Evidences are of any force beſides his own Confeſſion of Faith, written and ſigned by himſelf on his Death-bed.

It muſt indeed be owned that a Writing of this nature very ſtrongly confirms the ſuſpicion which had ſo long prevailed concerning him: But yet this doth not deprive us of the liberty of Conjecturing, that the Oppoſitions and Diſgraces which he ſuffered, might compleat what a too inquiſitive and innovating Genius had began. I mean that perhaps the accuſing him of this Hereſy, and treating him ill on that ſcore, perverted him to Socinianiſm; and that he would have been cured of theſe particular Whimſies, if he had found an honourable repoſe in the Reformed Church. For nothing in the World ſo naturally diſguſts a Man againſt Orthodoxy, as Perſecution on that account. And I am of Opinion that what but too commonly happens in caſes of Friendſhip and Fidelity, is alſo very frequent in that of Hereſy. Which is, that we (g) teach People to be falſe when we ſuſpect them to be ſo. A jealous Huſband often draws on himſelf the Diſgrace which he might have prevented by a conduct free from all umbrage of ſuſpicion. And this is all the advantage which ſeveral clamorous People get, who when any difficulties are propoſed to them, or a Perſon ſomewhat differs from their Opinion, cannot ſee it without raiſing virulent Suſpicions of their Neighbours, and endeavouring to render them ſuſpected by the whole World; and are the cauſe of their becoming what indeed they never were. Several cauſes produce this Change: It would be more advantageous and leſs ſcandalous not to proceed to a rupture. But there are ſome junctures wherein Clamours againſt ſuſpected Perſons prove very ſerviceable to a cauſe. It is when under the ſpecious diſguiſe of Friendſhip, and aſſiſted by a great Reputation, they endeavour to pervert every body. How difficult is it to lay down good Rules, when the very ſame Conduct proves ſometimes pernicious, and ſometimes advantageous!

(O) *He very much prejudiced the* Arminian *Party.*] The obtaining of *Vorſtius* to ſucceed *Arminius* in the Profeſſor's Chair, at *Leyden*, was believed to be a Maſter-ſtroke of that Party, and yet on the contrary nothing redounded more to the Advantage of the Enemies of the Remonſtrants. *Vorſtius* gave them ſuch a handle by his new way of dogmatizing on the Divine Attributes, and made it ſo eaſie to raiſe publick Suſpicions about him, that his Adverſaries were not at much trouble to render him odious. After this it was not in the leaſt difficult to Perſons who wanted neither Zeal, Tongues, nor Pens, to caſt on the whole *Arminian* Party, all the Odium raiſed againſt this Profeſſor; in order to which, not much more was neceſſary than to urge the preſſing Inſtances made by *Arminius*'s Friends to get this Man to *Leyden*. Thus Divine Providence is continually pleaſed to confound Humane Prudence: What we toil at the moſt indefatigably, as the moſt ſubſtantial of all our Hopes, moſt frequently proves our Ruin. We ought to obſerve that when *Arminius*'s Friends caſt their Eyes on the Profeſſor of *Steinfurt*, they believed him (b) intirely clear of the *Socinian* Hereſy: But was it eaſie to convince prepoſſeſſed Perſons, or to prevent the very ſame People, urging the contrary? I am of Opinion that what I have ſeveral times heard repeated is probable

---

* See his Letter to *Parrot* among thoſe of the *Arminians*, pag. 305. edit. in fol.

nodo Lublinenſi, *vocare Vorſtium* ad gymnaſium Luclavi- m regendum. (e) *'Tis the* 623d, *in the Folio Edition of the Letters of the* Arminians, p. 927. (f) Ibid.

(g) Fidelem ſi putaveris facies. Nam multi fallere docuerunt dum timent falli, & aliis jus peccandi ſuſpicando fecerunt. Seneca epiſt. 3.

(b) *As appears from the Letter which* Uytenbogard *writ to him the* 24th *of* June 1611. *See the* 164. *Letter of the* Arminians *in the Edition of* 1684.

Dort were the (OΔ) principal Promoters of the Proſcription of this Profeſſor. Their Maſter's Glory and the Reputation of his Learning were concerned in it.

VORSTIUS (*William Henry*) Son to the former, was Miniſter of the *Arminian* Congre-

bable enough; that *Arminius* and the Doctors of his Opinion had done a great ſervice to their Cauſe, if they had kept a profound ſilence. Their five Articles are of an inſinuating nature; and the *Calviniſts* as well as the *Lutherans* would inſenſibly have grown *Arminians*, if Nature only had been left to work. The Ancient Church was not of St. *Auguſtin's* Opinion. That Father was the occaſion of its embracing that Doctrine, which is at preſent called *Calviniſm*; but it is inſenſibly return'd to its priſtine ſtate. And if the Doctrine of Predeſtination and its Conſequences are vigorouſly maintain'd by thoſe of the Reformed Party, it is becauſe Diſputes have occaſion'd two Factions, and a Schiſm which is yet in being. The Church of *England* which lookt upon her ſelf as a ſeparate Body, and diſingaged from that in which this Schiſm was formed, was not prepoſſeſſed with the flaming Zeal which this Diſpute raiſed in the Minds of the *Contra-Remonſtrants*; whence it is that by ſlow degrees they have inclined to moderate Hypotheſes, which are very different from *Calviniſm*: The ſame would have happened in *Holland*, if *Arminius* had not formed a Party. This is what I have frequently heard from very judicious Men; I do not pretend to examin whether they are in the right.

I ſhall only obſerve, that to aſſert that the *Arminian* Diſputes have not raiſed numerous Diſorders amongſt the *Engliſh* Divines, would be to aver a Miſtake; for the time hath been, when the Favourers of that ſide ſuffered Perſecution in that Kingdom. Mr. *Des Maizeaux* has communicated to me ſeveral curious Particulars on this Head, which he has extracted from ſeveral *Engliſh* Books, and perhaps I ſhall publiſh 'em in the Supplement to this Dictionary. We ought not then to imagin that the Church of *England* hath been exempt from Conteſts on the ſubject of Grace; no, ſhe hath had her ſhare of that Controverſy, and even before the Synod of *Dort*. But two things muſt indeed be owned, one of which is, that before that time the *Engliſh* Divines enjoyed a greater liberty of rejecting *Calvin's* Hypotheſis concerning Predeſtination, and the extinction of Free-will, than thoſe of other Countries: The other is, that after the re-eſtabliſhment of Epiſcopacy, under *Charles* II. the Controverſies on theſe Points made no great noiſe in *Great Britain*; nor were there any great Quarrels concerning them, and 'tis to this favourable opportunity which this Calm afforded, that the growing and ſpreading of *Arminius's* Hypotheſis is to be aſcribed. Thoſe who reliſhed his Opinions, forbore diſturbing others with it, and this ſort of Moderation leſſened their Zeal for the Synod of *Dort*. The following Citation will confirm the former of theſe Obſervations, and inform us what was ſaid at *Oxford* at a ſolemn time, by a Profeſſor of Divinity in the preſence of a numerous Aſſembly: (a) *Quæ ſit in Anglia Calvini authoritas, dicam. Anno* 1608. *Menſe Julio, in publicis comitiis, ut vocant, quæ quotannis ſemel in florentiſſimis iſtius regni Academiis, quibus neſcio an in toto terrarum orbe poſſint eſſe antiquiores, & Collegiorum numero, amplitudine, & ſtructuræ magnificentiâ præſtantiores, habentur, ac tum ſollennis in omnibus facultatibus promotio celebratur, quæ res ibi maxime viſu digna eſt: Oxoniæ, Doctor Olandus, Theologus, & Promotor tum deſignatus, hoc de Calvino judicium teſtimoniumque ex altâ cathedrâ, in mille hominum præſentia, proferebat:* Calvinus vir fuit doctus, ſed non ſcripſit in omnibus Catholicè: *item paulo poſt:* Calvini ſententia de Deo peccati authore neque defendi, neque excuſari poteſt: quia ille aperte Catholicorum nudam permiſſionem deridet, & efficacis Dei voluntatis cum peccato concurſum introducit.

(a) Petrus Cudſemius de deſperata Calvini cauſa pag. 125. 126.

AN ENCOMIUM on the Univerſities of *England*.

(OΔ) *The Engliſh Deputies at the Synod of* Dort, *were the principal Promoters of the proſcription of* Vorſtius.] Here are ſome particulars on this Subject. A Report being ſpread that this Profeſſor would be ſummon'd to appear before the Synod, one of the *Engliſh* Deputies wrote to King *James's* Ambaſſador at the *Hague*, and earneſtly preſſed him to make uſe of his Intereſt with the Prince of *Orange*, and Count *William*, that this proceeding might not retard the proſcription of *Vorſtius*. He ſuggeſted to him the Expedient that was to be made uſe of to that purpoſe, which was to adviſe thoſe two Princes not to ſuffer the Synod to engage in the diſcuſſion of any Points with that Divine, or receive any Explications of his Opinions from him. This would have occaſion'd the loſs of too much time. The *Engliſh* Deputy deſir'd that the Aſſembly ſhould declare that all who compoſed it, had read and condemned *Vorſtius's* Book, and that nothing remained for him but to retract his Opinions, and aſk pardon of God and his Church there aſſembled. He alſo farther adviſed, that in caſe *Vorſtius* retracted, and asked ſuch a Pardon, he ſhould be acknowledged for a Brother; but otherwiſe the Synodical Aſſembly ſhould puniſh him at pleaſure. This Deputy alſo deſired that the Synod would publickly Excommunicate *Vorſtius*; and all theſe particulars he recommended to King *James's* Ambaſſador. Having but imperfectly repreſented the Contents of the Letter, I ſhall ſubjoin the expreſs words of it. (b) *Spargitur hic rumor de Vorſtio citando, & Feſtus Hommius heſterna veſpera mihi dixit, ſe ea de re tecum fuiſſe loquutum. Si itaque, tua apud Principem Arauſionenſem & Comitem Gulielmum gratia nobis in ejus cauſa opus erit, alioqui non minus diu, quam Remonſtrantes, Synodum detinebit. Spero te, Vir Illuſtris, illis hoc conſilium daturum; ſi Vorſtius tempus petit tradendi apologiam ac elucidationem de duriis loquendi modis in ipſius libro de Deo, ac velit rationibus convinci, ſuorumque argumentorum confutatione, quod brevi fieri non poterit, ne Synodus de iis rebus cum illo loquatur: ſed ut plane dicat, omnes, qui ſunt in Synodo, legiſſe ipſius librum, ac multa in eo inveniſſe, quæ proxime ad blaſphemiam accedunt, & ſine dubio Eccleſiam Reformatam valde offendunt: explicationem rerum, quas nemo in quæſtionem vocat, non eſſe ſatisfactionem: itaque ſe omnino cupere, ut illas retractet & palinodiam canat, Deumque veniam roget, & Eccleſiam Dei ibi congregatam, cui eo libro ſcandalum dederat. Si hoc facit, cum noſtrum fecimus; ſin minus, Synodus hominem pro libitu caſtiget. Velim eum aliis in exemplum palam a Synodo excommunicari. Harum ſimiliumque rerum curam tibi potiſſimum committimus, ut rite dirigantur.* The Preſident of the Synod having ask'd the *Engliſh* Deputies whether they approved that *Vorſtius* ſhould be cited to appear in the Aſſembly, and what the King of *England's* Pleaſure was in that caſe; they anſwered that they ought to conſult his Ambaſſador on that head, and that it looked very ill to condemn a Man without hearing him: they added that to avoid Delays, (c) *Vorſtius* ought not to be permitted to defend himſelf, or Explain his Blaſphemous Propoſitions; and that he ought not to be anſwer'd any otherwiſe than by Yes or No, nor aſk'd any queſtion but whether he was ready to abjure. Afterwards when the Suffrages were Collected for the Condemning of *Vorſtius*, They declared him unworthy the Name and Office of an Orthodox Profeſſor, and deſired that his Book *de Deo* ſhould be burnt, and read the Decree which condemned that Work to the Flames in *England*. (d) *Se itaque non modo ipſum Vorſtium Orthodoxi Profeſſoris munere ac nomine indignum judicare, ſed etiam perſuadere, ne hujuſmodi ejus libri in bibliopoliis proſtare permittantur: Denique rogare, ut in exemplum, & in ſancti, Dei cauſa, zeli teſtimonium, Vorſtii de Deo tractatus ſummi Magiſtratus juſſu, aut Synodi decreto eadem munito, palam ſolenniterque flammis abſumatur: ſimulque hujuſmodi infamis holocauſti ſpecimen, a Britannis coram Synodo legitur authenticum, Procancellarii Cantabrigienſis ſigillo munitum, decretum* xxi. *Septembris* 1611. *Cujus vi, etiam Sereniſſimi Regis noſtri judicio præeunte, publice flammis ultricibus expurgatus eſt liber prædictus: ejuſdemque decreti Cantabrigienſis exemplar inter* SYNODI *acta relatum.*

From

Congregation at *Warmond* in *Holland*. He wrote ſome Books (*P*) which have been Printed †. Mr. *Chevreau* || cites him on a very curious particular.

VOSSIUS. The Learned Men of this Name, afford with ſuch an Ample Field of matter, that the few ſheets which I have left, will not allow me Room to digeſt it. Wherefore I refer it to another time, together with the Memorial Communicated to me, which contains a Confutation of what is ſaid againſt *Iſaac Voſſius* in *Moreri's* Dictionary.

URCEUS (ANTONY CODRUS) One of the moſt Learned, and moſt Unfortunate Men of the XV. Century, was an (*A*) *Italian*. He was ſo nearly touched with the loſs of his Manuſcripts, that he not only (*B*) uttered execrable Blaſphemies, but alſo like a Savage retired to the Woods, and all Humane Society became inſupportable to him. It is reported that in his laſt Moments he acknowledged his Sin, and devoutly implored (*C*) the Mercy of God. Some ſay that he was killed (*D*) by Aſſaſſins. His Works Printed at *Baſil* in 1540. conſiſt of Orations, Letters and Poems. His life was Written by *Bartholomæus Bononienſis*, He doubted the Immortality of the (*D* Δ) Soul.

URGULANIA,

from this and ſeveral other places the continual Correſpondence betwixt the *Synod* and the Court plainly appears. The *Arminians* loudly complained of this Sympathy betwixt the two Empires, the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Power, and of this concord betwixt the Royalty and the Prieſthood, on which they frequently ſay that as large a Book might be made as that of (*a*) M. *de Marca*. But how can it be helped? Such is the condition of Humane things, that without the concurrence of the two Powers (*b*), it is ſcarce poſſible to ſucceed in affairs of this kind. This redounds to the Advantage of a good cauſe in certain Countries, and prejudices it in others. Patience!

(*P*) *He wrote ſome Books which have been Printed.*] The following Catalogue of them appears in the *Bibliotheque* of the *Antitrinitarians*: (*c*) *Diſceptatio de Verbo vel Sermone Dei, cujus creberrima fit mentio apud Paraphraſtas Chaldæos, Jonathan, Onkelos, & Thargum Hieroſolymitanum. Irenepoli apud hæredes Jacobi Laringhii*, 1643, 8. *Idem Belgice*, *ib.* 1649. 4. *Tranſtulit & notis illuſtravit Maimonidis conſtitutiones de Fundamentis Legis. Editæ ea ſunt Amſtel. apud Blavios, a* 1638. 4. *Item Chronologiam ſacram profanam Rab. David Ganz. & Pirke ſeu capitula R. Elieſer. Edita hæc ſunt Lugd. Bat.* 1634. 4. I take the Book Intituled *Biblia Parvula*, which was Printed in 1700. to be written by our *William Henry Vorſtius*. In the *Leipſick* Journal (*d*) it is aſcribed to him, and 'tis obſerved that it was refuted by the Biſhop of *Bath* and *Wells*, and more fully ſtill by Mr. *Edward*, Profeſſor at *Hamburg*. See the Remark A in the Article *Rittangelius*, and Mr. *Bernard's* (*e*) *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*.

(*A*) *Was* **an** *Italian.*] Of *Revenna*, if we may believe *Pierius Valerianus* (*f*); but *Geſner* (*g*) citing *Bartholomæus Bononienſis* ſays he was Born in the Year 1446. at *Herberia* a little Town in the Territory of *Reggio*, 7 Miles diſtant from *Modena*. *Leander Alberti* ſays likewiſe that he was Born in that place, which is commonly call'd *Verberia*.

(*B*) *Uttered execrable Blaſphemies, but alſo like a Savage retired.*] He loſt what he had prepared for the Preſs in the following manner. He lived at *Forli*, in an Apartment of the Palace. His Chamber was ſo dark as to require a Candle at Noon-day. And happening to go out and leave it burning, his Papers took Fire, and his Library was immediately reduced to Aſhes. As ſoon as he heard this ill News he run in a diſtracted manner to the Palace, and ſtopping at his Chamber Door cried out, JESUS CHRIST what great Crime have I been Guilty of? Which of your followers have I ever offended, that you Treat me ſo Cruelly? Obſerve what I ſay, I ſpeak deliberately and with a Compoſed mind. If by Chance I addreſs my ſelf to you when at the point of Death, do not hear me, for I have reſolved to paſs my Eternity in Hell. (*h*) *Quodnam ego tantum ſcelus concepi Chriſte, quem ego tuorum unquam læſi, ut ita inexpiabili in me odio debaccheris? Audi ea* (pergebat ad quoddam converſus ſimulachrum) *quæ tibi mentis compos & ex animo dicam. Si forte cum ad ultimum vitæ finem pervenero ſupplex accedam ad Te opem oratum, neve audias neve inter tuos accipias oro; cum infernis diis in æternum vitam agere decrevi.* Thoſe who heard theſe Blaſphemies endeavoured to comfort him, but utterly in vain: He left the Town and run to a Foreſt. (*i*) *Alio inſuper ira & indignatio hominem oppreſſerat, ut extra portam urbis egreſſus, amentia ſecuta non ante impoſuerit, quam in vaſtum ſeſe nemus proripuiſſet, ingemuitque cum moleſtia ibi totos dies tranſegiſſet.*

(*C*) *That he devoutly implored the Mercy of God.*] The Author whom I cite mentions our *Urceus's* Prayer. (*k*) *Ultima tandem aliquando appropinquante hora miſer ille oculis ac manibus ad cœlum ſublatis*; Qui cœlum incolis, (*exclamavit*) fer quæſo opem peccatori, noli me, qui tuum in ſinum confugio ſupplicem rejicere. Si unquam peccantem hominem voti reum feciſti, ſic mihi extrema oranti dextram ab alto porrigas oro. After having uttered theſe Words, he ſaw a tall Man with a Torch in each Hand and Trembling all over his Body. Aſtoniſhed at this viſion he ſprung out of his Bed, and asked the Apparition what he did there at ſuch an unſeaſonable Hour and conjured him not to do him any Miſchief. (*l*) *Ad hunc modum ſe animamque ſuam* DEO *commendans, quendam conſpexit ingentis ſtaturæ virum, capite raſo, barba ad terram uſque promiſſa, ardentibus oculis, faces utraque geſtantem manu, ac toto corpore tremebundum, quo viſo in hæc a pavore dictata verba erupit*: Quiſnam tu es, qui ſolus furiali habitu ea noctis parte, qua mortales ſomno premuntur, deambulas, noli ad me qui DEI amicus ſum infeſtus accedere, effare quid quæras, quo ire pergis? *Hæc cum dixiſſet, e ſtrato proſiluit, quaſi illum in ſe irruentem vitaturus.* My Author breaks off here; he did not know whether *Urceus* periſhed (*m*) upon this occaſion or not: Which makes me ſuſpect that he as well as my ſelf wanted the Tract of *Bartholomæus Bononienſis* and only picked up ſeveral Scraps which others had cited before him; for it is not at all probable that our *Codrus's* Hiſtorian ſhould leave his Reader in ſuſpence concerning the Conſequences of this Accident. But be it as it will, *Spizelius* ſwayed by a charitable Principle judges very favourably of the State of this Learned Man's Soul, in conſideration of his laſt exhortation to his Diſciples. He recites it, and it ſpeaks a Man who had a true ſenſe of the fear of God, and of the Vanity of the World.

(*D*) *That he was killed by Aſſaſſins.*] *Pierius Valerianus* who hath not forgot him in his Catalogue of unfortunate Learned Men, expreſſes himſelf thus concerning him: (*n*) *Codrus autem Urceus Ravennas multæ, variæque doctrinæ vir, eruditiſſimis pleriſque ſcriptis, quæ nunc edita ſunt, omnibus innotuit. Is quoque ſanguinaria peremptus eſt morte, ab adverſæ factionis latronibus fœdiſſime trucidatus.*

(*D* Δ) *He doubted the Immortality of the Soul.*] His Friends asked him what he thought of it, he replyed that he did not know what would become of him after Death, or whether the Soul exiſts

after

---

† Ex Biblioth. Antitrinit. Pag. 141.

|| In the Tome of the Chevræana pa. ... of the Dutch Edition.

(c) Biblioth. Antitrin. pag. 141.

(d) Mens. Decemb. 1700. Pag. 143.

(e) For the month of August 1699. pag. 214. and for September 1699. Pag. 359.

(f) In his work in the Remark D.

(g) Geſner in Epitom. Biblioth. fol.

(h) Spizelius in Felice Litterato pag. 12. He cites Barthol. Bononienſis in vita Codri.

(i) Id. Spizelius ib. pag. 13.

(k) Id. ib.

(l) Id. ib.

(m) Utrum extremum hoc evaſerit periculum, & poſt tantam tempeſtatem in perpetuæ felicitatis portum ſit delatus, dicere non habemus. Id. ibid. pag. 14.

(n) Pierius Valerianus de Literatorum infelicitate, lib. 1. pag. 21, 22.

URGULANIA, a *Roman* Lady, Favourite of the Empreſs *Livia*. Her intereſt with that Empreſs rendred her extremely inſolent, in ſo much † that ſhe refuſed to appear before the Senate in order to give Evidence: The *Prætor* waited on her to interrogate her, and a greater deference was paid to her than to the *Veſtal* (*A*) *Virgins*, who were obliged to come to the Bar, when they gave Teſtimony. But *Urgulania*'s great Intereſt and haughty Demeanor did not prevent *Lucius Piſo*'s ſuing her for Debt in the Year of *Rome* 769. She refuſed to appear, and applied for Refuge to the Emperor. But the Plaintiff could not be perſuaded to ſtop his proceedings by the Remonſtrances of his Relations, nor by all the Complaints of *Livia*, that it was a Violation of the reſpect due to her; and *Tiberius* would no farther interpoſe in this proceſs, than by promiſing his Mother to Sollicite the Judges in Favour of the Defendant: So that the Suit was no otherwiſe ended than by *Livia's* cauſing *Piſo* to be paid his demanded Sum. *Urgulania* was ſtill alive in the Year 777. when her Grand-Son *Plautius Silvanus* the *Prætor* was accuſed of the Murther of his Wife; for we find in *Tacitus* * that there being no hopes that the Criminal ſhould eſcape Condemnation, ſhe ſent him a Dagger, which he being unable to uſe, cauſed his Veins to be opened.

† Tacitus, Annal. lib. 2. cap. 34.

* Id. lib. 4. cap. 22.

URGULANILLA, Grand Daughter of the (*B*) preceding Lady was Married to the Emperor *Claudius* β before he became Emperor. He had two (*C*) Children by her, and divorced her γ on Account of her reputed Incontinence, and on ſuſpicion of Murther.

β Sueton. in Claudio cap. 26.

γ Ob libidinum probra & homicidii ſuſpicionem. *Id. ibid.*

URRACA, Daughter and Heireſs of *Alfonſo* VI. King of *Leon* and *Caſtile* was firſt Married to *Raymond* of *Burgundy* ‖, whoſe Widow ſhe became in the Year 1108. She afterwards Married *Don Alfonſo* King of *Arragon* and *Navarre* ╪ in 1106. This

‖ Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne B. 8. pag. m. 311.

╪ Mariana de rebus Hiſp. lib. 10. cap. [illegible], pag. m. [illegible].

after this Life or not. But he was not in doubt concerning the Doctrines commonly aſſerted about Hell, but poſitively affirmed that they were meer Tales invented to terrify Mankind. *Spizelius* mentions alſo this particular. *Cum ejuſdem*, ſaith he (*a*), *de animæ mortalitate opinione peſtilens ſidus olim infelicem illum* Codrum Urceum [*cujus tragœdiam ſupra memoravimus*] *afflaſſet, parum abfuit, quin & ipſe in atheiſmi voraginem fuerit præcipitatus. Rogantibus enim amicis, quid de* immortalitate *animæ ſentiret? neſcire ſe reſpondebat, quid poſt mortem de ſe futurum eſſet, viveretne animus, ſive anima, an interiret una cum corpore, quæque de inferis homines prædicarent, anilia quædam terriculamenta eſſe dicebat: hinc ipſi amariſſimo epigrammate poſt fata etiam fuit exprobatum, quod non velle de Chriſto, inferis, animarumque immortalitate ſentiendo, latentis atheiſmi ſui haud obſcura documenta dediſſet.*

(*A*) *A greater deference was paid to her than to the Veſtal Virgins.*] To which purpoſe *Tacitus* ſaith, (*b*) *Urgulaniæ potentia adeo nimia civitati erat, ut teſtis in cauſſa quadam quæ apud Senatum qui do- tractabatur, venire dedignaretur: miſſus eſt prætor mi interrogaret, cum Virgines Veſtales in foro & judicio audiri, quotiens teſtimonium dicerent, vetus mos fuerit.* M. *du Boulai* had no Reaſon to take *Urgulania* for a *Veſtal*. *The Veſtal Urgulania's deſpiſing the Summons, of the Senate* (ſaith he,) *to give Evidence in a cauſe depending before them was unpreſidented; and that Court was obliged to ſend the Prætor to her Houſe to examine her. As Cornelius Tacitus (whoſe Words are worth reciting) informs us lib.* 2. (*c*). After which he cites the paſſage which I have quoted above: Which if he had read with due attention, he would have been ſatisfied that *Urgulania* was no Veſtal; he would I ſay have been convinced of it without having any occaſion to conſult the other paſſage of *Tacitus*, which ſhews that ſhe was the Grandmother of a *Roman Prætor*, who was accuſed of killing his ſecond Wife. This ſuppoſes an Old Age worthy that Hiſtorian's Obſervation, (for the very earlieſt time that a Veſtal Virgin was permitted to Marry was at the Age of 37.) and doth not very well agree with Mr. *du Boulai's* Obſervation (*d*) *that few Veſtals Married* after thirty Years Obſervance of their Vow, *and thoſe that did proved very unhappy*. A Favourite, who had as potent an Intereſt as *Urgulania*, who ſhould have been Married after having been a Veſtal, would have been an illuſtrious Inſtance of good Fortune. I can eaſily believe that this Author never ſaw the paſſage of *Tacitus* any where elſe than in *Tiraquellus*'s (*e*) Commentaries on *Alexander ab Alexandro*, where being ſeparated from the thred of the Narration it may make one believe *Urgulania* was a Veſtal Virgin.

(*B*) *Grand Daughter of the preceding Lady.*] According to the of Opinion *Reineſius*, a Perſon who ſtudied the *Roman* Families as much as any other in the World. He ſaith (*f*) that *Urgulania*, *Livia's* Favourite, was the Wife of *Marcus Plautius* the Son of *Aulus Plautius*, who was Tribune of the People in the Year of *Rome* 698. That *Marcus Plautius Silvanus* the Son of *Marcus Plautius* and *Urgulania* was Conſul in the Year 752. and honoured with the Triumphal Ornaments in 762. That *Plautius Silvanus* the Son of that Conſul was Prætor of *Rome* in the Year 777. and that he had a Siſter who was our *Urgulanilla*, and two Brothers viz. *Publius Plautius Pulcher*, and *Titus Plautius Silvanus Ælianus*, who was Conſul in 799. and afterwards again in *Veſpaſian*'s time. There is yet extant a very long (*g*) inſcription expreſſing the Offices and Actions of this *Titus Plautius*, and particularly his Conſulſhip in *Veſpaſian*'s Reign. Notwithſtanding which *Lipſius* (*h*) has been ſo inadvertent as to apply this inſcription to that *Plautius Silvanus* who killed himſelf in the Year of *Rome* 777. and was *Urgulania's* Grandſon. It is obſervable that in my Edition of *Lipſius*'s (*i*) *Tacitus*, the Text hath it *Urgulania*, and it is *Virgulania* in the Commentary, aud the Commentator obſerves that the Sir-Name *Virgulanius* was appropriated to the *Plautian* Family, which he proves by an inſcription, and *Suetonius*'s Authority, who, ſaith he, calls one of the Emperor *Claudius*'s Wives *Plautia Virgulanilla*. But all the Authors who produce this inſcription, expreſs the Name to be *Urgulanius*: Whence then can it proceed that *Lipſius* alledges it to prove his *Virgulanius*? I believe I may venture to ſay that the Printers are intirely Innocent of this Blunder, and that *Lipſius* not perfectly remembring the Word *Urgulania* thought that *Tacitus* ſaid *Virgulania*, and Continued this firſt Error throughout. He had done much better, not to have written proper Names without-book, but to have kept the Original before his Eyes. And if we that are Authors would always be ſo prudent as to diſtruſt our Memory, and only rely on an exact view, our Writings would be more accurate.

Our *Urgulanilla* perhaps owed her Name to its being a Diminutive of that of *Urgulania* her Grand-Mother.

(*C*) *He had two Children by her.*] A Son and a Daugh-

(*a*) Spizelius ubi ſupra pag. 174. 175. He cites Barth. Bottonient. in Codri Urcei vita.

(*b*) Tacit. Annal. lib. 2. cap. 34.

(*c*) Du Boulay, Threſor des Antiquitez Romaines, pag. 306.

(*d*) Du Boulai ib. pag. 318.

(*e*) In lib. 5. Genial. dier. cap. 12. p. 109. edit. Lugd. Batavor. 1673. *where* inſtead *of* Cornelius Tacitus, *there is* Conelius Celſus.

(*f*) Reineſius epiſt. 57. ad Rupertum pag. 106.

(*g*) It is to be ſeen in Glandorp. Onom. pag. 683. & in Rickius in Tacitum pag. [illegible].

(*h*) Lipſ. in Tacit. Annal. lib. 4. pag. m. 200.

(*i*) That of Geneva 1619. in 8.

This Marriage proved the cauſe of the re-union of almoſt all the Chriſtian Kingdoms of *Spain* under one Sovereign; for after the Death of † *Don Alfonſo* VI. King of *Leon*, *Caſtile* and *Toledo*, &c. theſe Realms fell into the Hands of *Don Alfonſo* King of *Arragon* and *Navarre*; they devolved on him I ſay by Virtue of his Marrying *Urraca*. The Lords of *Caſtile* were againſt that Marriage || wherefore the King did not go to Claim his Queen's ſucceſſion, without a good Number of Troops in order to reduce the *Caſtilians* to Reaſon in caſe of neceſſity. The Preparatives for his journey and other things retarded his taking poſſeſſion: but in the interim he increaſed the Splendor and Magnificence of his Court, (*A*) and connived at the Scandalous Conduct of *Urraca*. He β went along with her to *Caſtile*, and met with no manner of reſiſtance; nevertheleſs he Acted like a Man who very well knew how to provide (*B*) againſt all Events, and was ſoon obliged to Remedy the ill effects of his Queen's Ambition, who would have deſtroyed a great Lord as a Puniſhment γ for having given the Title of King of *Caſtile* to the King her Husband. She grew ſo diſſolute that he was forced to Confine her to the *Fortreſs of Caſtellar*; from whence ſhe finding ways to eſcape, retired into *Caſtile*, and endeavoured to annul her Marriage. The Arch-Biſhop of *Toledo*, and ſeveral other Prelates aſſiſted her in that Attempt, for which they were ſeverely puniſhed by the King. The great Lords and States of *Caſtile* oppoſed this Divorce, and by ſubmiſſive means brought *Urraca* to the King her Husband in *Arragon*, and he accordingly *Graciouſly received her; but as ſhe continued her Vicious courſe of Life, and daily more and more forgot her own and the Honour of her Houſe*, he at laſt cauſed her to be *conveyed to Soria*, and *baniſhed her for ever from him* δ. After which her party applyed themſelves more vigorouſly than ever to diſſolve the Marriage. She alledged not only the common excuſe on like Occaſions, that ſhe was Married againſt her Conſent, but that her near Relation to *Don Alfonſo* rendred her Marriage with him unlawful *. Application was made to the *Pope*, who committed this Affair to *Don* ‡ *Diego Gelmirio*, *Biſhop of Compoſtella*. And it Terminated in a rupture of the Marriage. Some Hiſtorians praiſe *Alfonſo* for that having put away (*C*) *Urraca*, he at the ſame time renounced all Authority

Daughter. The former was Named *Druſus*, and dyed before Fourteen, by a very odd Accident: For throwing up a Pear into the Air in order to catch it in his Mouth, it accordingly fell in and choaked him. He was Contracted to one of *Sejanus*'s Daughters, notwithſtanding which the ſame *Sejanus* was reported to have cauſed him to be killed (*a*). So true it is that a hundred times more Crimes than they are Guilty of are commonly imputed to Favourites. (*b*) But *Suetonius* rejects this impertinent Accuſation. *Claudia* the Daughter of *Claudius* and *Urgulanilla* was Born before the expiration of five Months after her Mother's Divorce: And the late Husband acknowledged her at firſt, but not long after his mind altered, and he cauſed her to be expoſed Naked at her Mother's door; on pretence that *Boter* his enfranchiſed Slave was the true Father of this Child. Mr. *Chevreau* miſtook *Suetonius*'s Words *quamvis ante quintum menſem divortii natam*, in believing they ſignified (*c*) *tho' ſhe was Born five Months before their Divorce*. He ſeems to intend a Criticiſm on *Reineſius*, (*d*) for ſaying that *Plautia Urgulanilla*, was *Claudius*'s firſt Wife; but indeed here is no room for Cenſure, for *Lepida* and *Medullina* were only Contracted, but not Married to *Claudius*. Wherefore Mr. *Chevreau* deſerves to be blamed for not obſerving *Suetonius*'s diſtinction. He beſtows ſix Wives on that Emperor, when *Suetonius* allows him but (*e*) four, and two Contracted Ladies, *quatuor uxores & duas ſponſas*.

(*A*) *He increaſed the ſplendor and magnificence of his Court, and connived at the Scandalous Conduct of Urraca.*] Both theſe things were Natural Conſequences of the Inheritance which this Princeſs brought with her. Two or three Kingdoms left her by her Father were very well worth the concealing a reſentment at her ill deportment. *Mariana*'s Words plainly ſignify that the tide of *Urraca*'s lewdneſs run very high. (*f*) *Præterea varia Aragonii regni negotia diſtinebant* (Alfonſum) *ne novam & ampliſſimam cerneret hæreditatem. Cuncta tamen ad novi imperii decorem compoſita, dilatæ voluptates, diſſimulatæ Reginæ libidines: quæ non ſine ſugillatione majeſtatis nimium in levitatem atque turpitudinem incubuerat.*

(*B*) *He acted like a Man who very well knew how to provide againſt all Events.*] " (*g*) As ſoon " as ever he had ſet Foot in *Caſtile* he began to " Conſider what might happen, if his Queen " ſhould dye without Iſſue by him; wherefore he " put the Principal Places and ſtrongeſt Forts into " the hands of *Navarreſe* and *Arragonian* Governors and Captains, to the end that if he " ſhould be obliged to quit the Realms of *Caſtile*, " *Leon*, *Toledo*, and their dependances, he might " in ſome meaſure keep thoſe People, in awe and evacuate them on Honourable and Advantageous " Terms: This Practice ſomewhat diſguſted the " *Caſtilian* Lords. He alſo knew his Wife *Urraca* " to be Proud, ungrateful, inconſtant and libidinous; wherefore like a conſiderate Man he fortified himſelf againſt whatever Events Time might " produce. This Woman on a trivial Occaſion, " conceived a moſt inveterate hatred againſt the " Count D. *Pedro Anſures*, Lord of *Valladolid*, " who had Educated her, as well as preſerved " and protected her Realm after the Death of her " Father; it was only becauſe in the Letters which " he wrote to the King her Husband, and to her, " in order to advertiſe them to come and take " poſſeſſion of their heritage, he gave her Husband the Title of King of *Caſtile*. For this " Reaſon ſhe undertook to deprive him of his " Eſtate at *Valladolid* and other places; but the " King immediately re-eſtabliſhed him, and the " better to ſecure him from the rage of this Woman, he ſent him to *Arragon*, with *Donna Elo* his " Lady, intruſting to them the Government of the " Young Count of *Urgel* his Nephew. "

(*C*) *Some Hiſtorians praiſe Alfonſo for that having put away Urraca, he at the ſame time renounced—— but they contradict themſelves.*] *Don Alfonſo*, ſaith *Mayerne* (*h*), " baniſhed *Urraca* for ever from his " Converſation. Notwithſtanding which he retained ſeveral ſtrong places in *Caſtile*, without " being very deſirous of the Government or Adminiſtration of that Kingdom. It is certain " that this King's Courage was very great, and " plainly ſhewed that he put a higher Value on " Virtue and Honour, than on Terreſtrial Goods, " he giving up ſuch ample Territories as thoſe of " *Caſtile*, *Leon*, *Toledo*, and others which *Urraca* " brought him. „ This Hiſtorian in the ſame Page begins to relate *Don Alfonſo*'s reſentment againſt thoſe who had reſtored to *Urraca* the Towns and Fortreſſes which he had in *Caſtile*. This reſentment we find in the ſame Hiſtory to be one of the Motives, which engaged him to make War againſt the

---

† In the Year 1109.

|| Id. Ib. [illegible] pag. [illegible]

β Mayerne [illegible]

γ [illegible]

δ [illegible]

* Id. Ib.

‡ Id. Ib. [illegible]

(a) Sueton. in Claudio cap. 27.

(b) Quo magis miror fuiſſe qui traderent fraude a Sejano necatum. Id. ib.

(c) Chevreau, Hiſt. du monde Tom. 2. pag. 1[illegible]. Dutch Edit. 1687. & pag. 202. 203. Dutch Edit. 1698.

(d) Reineſ. ubi ſupra pag. 109.

(e) Sueton. ib. cap. 26.

(f) Mariana de rebus Hiſpaniæ lib. 1[illegible]. cap. [illegible] 4. pag. m. 419.

(g) Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne l. 9. p. 336.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 3[illegible].

Authority over the Kingdom of *Castile*, but they sensibly contradict themselves by relating several Facts, which make it appear that he did his utmost to keep that Authority. He Fought Battles to maintain it, and gave his Enemies the Trouble of Forcing him to a Restitution of the places which he detained, † even after the *Castilians* had elected *Alphonsus Raymond of Burgundy*, *Urraca's* Son by her first Husband, for their King * in the Year 1122. They made this Choice when they found that § the Queen continued to give up her self to the most Scandalous Amours, and also Countenanced the Tyrannical Government of her Favourite. Her own Son was necessitated to proclaim War against her, and to besiege her in the *Castle* of *Leon*; out of which difficulties she no otherwise extricated her self than by a promise to Renounce her Dominions, and reduce her self to a private life with a pension suitable to her Dignity γ. The Year of her Death is not certainly known; ‖ some say that she died about 1124 in Child-Bed lying in of a (*D*) Bastard; others tell us that her Death was a Punishment of a Sacrilegious Crime. She had a Sister who might very well have disputed with her the pre-eminence (*E*) in boundless lewdness, and

† In the Memoirs c.

* Id. ib. pag. 335.

§ Id. ib.

γ Id. ib. pag. 344.

‖ Septimo decimo circiter anno a morte patris. *Mariana* ubi supra cap. 8. pag. 335. See chap. 14. p. 337. *Remarks that she died in the Year* 1126.

the *Castilians*. It appears from *Mayerne's* Words, that *Urraca's* lewdness is assigned as another cause of the War; (*a*) "From that time *Donna* "*Urraca* continued her Immoralities; for re-assu-"ming her former design of a divorce, she ob-"tained it by the Authority of *Pope Paschal* "——— So that finding her self without any "check, and no restraint laid upon her lust, she "loosely indulged it to an exorbitant degree. "She gave up her self to a Familiar and un-"chast Conversation with Count *Gomez de Candes-*"*pina*, who formerly pretended to be her Hus-"band, and had by her a Son, of whom she was "delivered clandestinely or by stealth, whence he "was Named *Don Fernando Hurtado*, or *stolen*; "from whom the House of the *Hurtado's*, an illustri-"ous Family in *Spain* is said to be descended. "Tho' some doubt the truth of this, yet it is cer-"tain that the Count *Don Gomez*, in a short time "had the Sole Government of the Kingdom, and "intirely disposed of the Affairs of War and Peace "at his Arbitrary Will and Pleasure, and enjoy-"ed the same Privacies with the Queen, as if he "had really been her Husband. Notwithstanding "which *Don Pedro de Lara* another Gallant——— "so far insinuated himself into the Queen's favour, "that he soon became one of her darling Minions, "of whom Count *Gomez* proved very Jealous. "The dissolute and lascivious deportment of *Donna* "*Urraca*, was so universally and publickly known "that King *Alfonso* excited by a just indignation as "well on that Account as by reason the of mentioned "Divorce, resolved to enter *Castile* with a great Army "putting all to Fire and Sword that he met in his "way, being irritated as well by the Impurities of "the Queen as the base pusillanimity of the *Castili-*"*ans*, who tamely obeyed her: He bore them a "grudge, because they had restored to her the "places which he had entrusted to their keeping. "The Queen's two Amorous Darlings *Don Gomez* "and *Don Pedro* took the Field against him with the "Forces of *Castile* and *Leon*, and meeting the "Royal Army, composed of *Navarrese* and *Ara-*"*gonians*, they came to a close Engagement near "*Candespina*, not far from *Sepulveda*. *Don Pedro* "who led the *Van* was first charged," and immediately Fled (*b*) *and retired to the Queen at Burgos, carrying the News of the defeat which he was not at leisure to see.* *Don Gomez* her other Paramour was killed in the Field of Battle. The Victorious *Alfonso* Penetrated as far as *Galicia*, (*c*) *making a merciless slaughter and devastations wherever his Army passed.* He obtained a Second Victory betwixt *Leon* and *Astorga*, and Forced *Alfonso Raimundo*, *Urraca's* Son, to save himself by Flight into *Portugal*. The Queen being deposed, the King her Son (*d*) *thought of the Recovery of the Castilian fortresses, which his Father in Law Don Alfonso King of Navarre kept from him.* Accordingly he raised a great Army: *Alfonso* did the like, (*e*) *and entred the Kingdom of Castile, when the Prelates of both Kingdoms foreseeing the Impendent Miseries which were inevitable, if these two potent Princes should once make War, earnestly endeavoured to negotiate a peace betwixt them; and their Attempts were so successful as to engage the new King of Castile, to address himself by way of request to the King of Navarre and Arragon, in order to obtain his Cities and Castles.* By which means he gained part of his demands; but *Alfonso* would not restore the Countries situated betwixt *Villorado* & *Calahorra*, nor the Provinces of *Guipuscoa* & *Alava*, &c. Pretending that they ought to be reunited to *Navarre*, and that they were usurped by *Don Alfonso* the VI. King of *Castile*.

Hath not the Historian who relates all these particulars a very good Assurance, when he avers that *Urraca's* Husband scorned to detain the Patrimony of the Wife he had divorced? What follows is another Error of the like Nature. An Author whom I here cite, blames *Don Alfonso* for divorcing *Urraca*, (*f*) "and by that means depriving "himself of the possession of three Kingdoms. For "tho' the History of *Spain* praises him for hav-"ing preferred his Honour to those three great "Realms, I cannot help thinking that if on one "side it be taken for a generous Action, on the "other it must pass for very weak and impolitical, "as was that of *Lewis* the VII King of *France*, "who lived at the same time, and who by divorcing "his Wife *Eleonora*, sowed the Seeds of a perpe-"tual War in his Kingdom." This Comparison betwixt *Don Alfonso* and *Lewis* the VII. is not just; for the *French* King intirely dispossessed himself of the Territories of his repudiated Queen, and very exactly acted according to *Marcus Aurelius's* Maxime: But *Don Alfonso* did not at all follow that Rule, and is on that Account censured by one of the best *Spanish* Historians. (*g*) *Alfonsus Aragonius eo* (*h*) *nuncio perculsus repudio facto, Reginam Soria dimittit, in cujus urbis arce custodia rursus mancipata erat: imperandi tamen dulcedine illectus dotalem ditionem non deponit. Id iniquum esse omnibus videbatur.*

(*D*) *Some say that she died——— in Child-Bed lying in of a Bastard; others tell us that it was a Punishment of a Sacrilegious Crime.*] She (*i*), "took up her residence in Saint *Vincent's* Church, "being very strictly guarded: Notwithstanding "which it is reported that she one day went to the "Church, Dedicated to St. *Isidore* of *Leon*, in order "to seize the Treasures, which her Father and "Grand-Father had given to that place, and that "as she was carrying off her Prey, being just going "out, and having Advanced one Foot out of the "Church, her Intrails burst out: A just Punish-"ment for the Adulteries of which she had been "Guilty, and the Murthers which they occasioned, "to the Injury and Dishonour of the Royal Fa-"milies, and all the Christian part of *Spain*, as "well as for her Sacrilege. Others say that she "died in the Castle of *Saldania* in the delivery of "a Bastard Child." *Mariana* mentions both these Opinions, and agrees to this Queen's being the Eternal ignominy of *Spain*: (*k*) *Pudicitiam sane dum vixit haud satis honeste habuit, in Saldania arce ex partu extinctam ferunt. æternum Hispaniæ dedecus. alii Legione affirmant, cum thesauros D. Isidori compilasset, quos auferre nefas erat, in ipso templi limine ruptis visceribus, manifesta numinis vindicta expirasse.*

(*E*) *A Sister who might have disputed with her the pre-eminence in boundless lewdness.*] This was *Theresa* the Bastard Daughter of *Don Alfonso* the VI. who bestowed her in Marriage on a *French* Lord in acknowledgment of the Services he had done him

(*a*) Id. ib. pag. 331.

(*b*) Id. ib.

(*c*) Id. ib.

(*d*) Id. ib. pag. 344.

(*e*) Id. ib. pag. 345.

and brought a Load of Evils on *Portugal*. After this, I am surprized that the Name of *Urraca* should ever be given to the Infanta's of *Castile*, but I do not wonder that the *French* Ambassadors who were sent ‡ *for one of the Daughters of* Don Alfonso IX. *whom he had promised their Master, chose the less beautiful, whose Name was* Blanche, *and could not bear the very mention of her Sister, because named* Urraca. They undoubtedly looked on her Name as a scandalous one, after the vicious Life of the Queen, the subject of this Article.

URSINUS * (*Zachary*) one of the most celebrated Reformed Divines of the Sixteenth Century, was Born at *Breslaw*, the Capital City of *Silesia*, on the 18th ‖ of *July* 1534. After he had made a considerable Progress in Learning for his Age

him in his Wars against the *Moors*. This Lord according to some Writers was *Henry* of *Lorrain*, but others call him *Henry* of *Burgundy*. And the latter are divided whether he was descended from the Dukes, or the Earls of *Burgundy*. One party avers that (*a*) he was Son to *Henry* Duke of *Burgundy*, and Grand-Son to *Robert* of *France*, the I. of that Name Duke of *Burgundy*, and that he was consequently a Prince of the Royal Blood of *France*; and the other side will have him to be (*b*) the Earl of *Burgundy*'s Son, and Brother to Pope *Calixtus* II. However it was, this valiant Lord render'd himself so considerable, that *Don Alfonso* VI. King of *Castile* Marrying him to his Daughter *Theresa*, (*c*) *gave him those parts of* Portugal *which he had conquer'd from the* Moors, *with the Title of Hereditary Earl, for him and his legitimate Successors, proceeding from the Marriage, and also promised to add to these Lordships the Conquests which he should for the future make on the* Moors, *with the same successive and hereditary Right.*——— *on condition that he and his Heirs should acknowledge the Kings of* Leon *for their Sovereign Lords, and hold the said Lands of them in Fealty and Homage. Theresa* was a Widow (*d*) in the Year 1112, and Mother of three Children, one Son and two Daughters. (*e*) *Soon after which, she married a second time to* ——— *Bermund Paez de Transtamara*, and after she had lived some time with him, she eloped from him, *excited thereto by a prevailing* (*f*) *Lust, or some other damnable occasion*, and married *Don Fernando Paez de Transtamara*, Brother to the Husband she left. On the other side, *Don* (*g*) *Bermund* being thus left, *as if he design'd to emulate his Countess's Incest, married her eldest Daughter* Donna Teresa Henriquez, *Sister to* Don Alfonso Henriquez. *These scandalous inter-marriages were contracted amongst Christians, in the infancy of the House of* Portugal——— *But the young Earl* Alfonso Henriquez *being extremely afflicted at these exorbitances, and besides finding himself despised, rejected and disgraced, and that the Adulterous and incestuous* Don Fernand *assumed the Title of Earl of* Portugal, *on account of his Wife, he raised an Army against him*——— (*h*) *Pursuing him as a Tyrant and incestuous Adulterer, and their Forces engaged near* Guymaranes, *where* Alfonso *was beaten, by his falling too rashly on the Enemy.*——— *Having afterwards recruited, and rallied their Forces, they fought a second Battle, which proved more successful to* Don Alfonso: *For* Don Fernando's *Army was utterly routed and scatter'd, he and the Countess* Don Alfonso's *Mother were taken and confined to a strong Prison*:——— *And this was the Fruit which these two lewd Sisters, Daughters of King* Alfonso VI. *reaped in reward of their Lust, and almost at the same time. Theresa* was treated very roughly by Earl *Alfonso Henriquez* her Son. (*i*) "She found a way "to discover her sufferings to *Don Alfonso Raimondo* "King of *Castile*, her Nephew, and petitioned him "to espouse her cause, and deliver her from her "present confinement, in reward of which she offered to settle the Earldom of *Portugal* on him. "King *Alfonso* desirous to re-unite that Country "to his Territories, came in Person with an Army, in order to deliver this Lady, perfectly forgetting that the Earl had assisted him in his Wars, "against his Mother *Donna Urraca*, Queen of *Castile* and *Leon*; but he was beaten and wounded "in the foot. *After he was cured*, he re-enter'd *Portugal*, and besieged the City of *Guimaranes*, in which the Earl himself was shut up. "This "Siege proved very tedious, and if the Attacks "were brisk on one side, the Defence was brave "on the other; insomuch that they both grew "weary of it. *Egas Nunnez* went from the "*Town*, under the shelter of a safe Conduct, and "made Proposals of Peace, which was concluded on "condition that the Earl of *Portugal* should be "obliged to come into the other's Kingdom and take "an Oath of Allegiance to him as his Sovereign. "Upon which he drew off his Army, and marched to *Toledo*, without remembring his Aunt's Interest, on whose account he undertook the Expedition, being struck with horror at her detestable "course of Life, or perhaps engaged to this Enterprise by Ambition only.

Tho' this Story supplies sufficient matter for numerous Reflections, I shall yet offer only a few. The First of which is,

I. That most Authors who write Lives, chuse for their Subjects Illustrious Personages; and if some of them intermix ill Men with the good, it is because they are resolved to give a perfect History of an intire Order or Class of Men. I don't know any Author which hath attempted to write the Lives of great Criminals only. There is no want of Elogies on Illustrious Women; all Libraries swarm with them; but I question whether there ever yet appeared a particular Collection of those Women who were a scandal to their Sex and Country. It is a copious Subject which deserves an Author's pains, and it might be handled in *Plutarch*'s manner: I mean, that as this famous Writer chose the most Illustrious *Romans* and *Grecians* in order to parallel them; in like manner the Queens and Princesses of different Nations might be compared together. I have mention'd in another place, the comparison which the *English* made betwixt *Mary Steward*, Queen of *Scots*, and *Joan* Queen of *Naples*. And abundance of this kind might easily be made. Our *Urraca* might be compared to the Heiress of *Guienne*, or *Margaret de Valois*, Wife of *Henry* IV. But the most exact Parallel that could be found for her, would be that of her Sister *Theresa*. They were both very lewd; the Tyranny which both their Paramours exercised, was owing to them, as well as a thousand Civil and Foreign Hostilities thereby occasioned, and they were both degraded and poisoned by their own Sons.

II. This confirms what I have already said of the Disorders which those Countries are exposed to, where the Salique Law doth not obtain, and concerning the pernicious consequences of the lewd Inclinations of a Female Sovereign. *Urraca* impatiently resented her Subjects acknowledging her Husband's Authority: That she had her Paramours was obvious to the whole World: the Husband was obliged to put a stop to this inordinate Licentiousness; this he could not do without making room for Factions, which occasioned a War. The *Castilians* disgusted at him and their *Urraca*'s Paramour, turned to the Rising-Sun, and set up the Son in order to turn his own Mother out of the Throne; and he fully complied with their Design. Which is a plain indication of what Importance it is for a Queen to avoid all publick Impurities; for if she once grows shameless, no bounds can restrain her. She will place her Affection on despicable Objects; she will not have any regard to Merit in her Choice, nor value any thing besides the Beauty and Vigour of a young Coxcomb, who will scandalize her Reputation, and occasion a hundred Pretexts for a Civil War; and besides, become so insolent as to affront his Mistress, (*k*) and render his Assassination necessary. She will not consider the regular Example which she owes to her Children,

---

‡ [illegible]

* This Name is a Translation of the German word *Beer*, which was the name of his Family, and signifies a *Bear*.

‖ *Freherus* says the 29th of *June*, tho' he follows the same Author as I do. *Bucholcer* says also the 29th of June.

(*a*) See [illegible] Histoire de la maison royale pag. [illegible]

(*c*) See Louis Gollut, Memoires Historiques de la Franche Comté pag. 305, 306.

(*d*) Mayerne ubi supra lib. 8. pag. 112.

(*e*) Idem lib. 9. pag. 319.

(*e*) Id. ib.

(*f*) Campion ubi supra pag. 134. expresses it thus: Which (Bermund Paes) not pleasing her according to her Mind, that mad and lewd Woman left him to marry his Brother Ferdinando Paes de Transtamara.

(*g*) Mayerne ib.

(*h*) Id. ib. pag. 343.

(*i*) Id. ib. pag. 347.

(*k*) Campion ubi supra pag. 135, 136.

Age, he was ſent to *Wittemberg* in (*A*) 1550. Where he ſtudied ſeven Years; and his Father not being rich, he was aſſiſted by publick and private Contributions, and he had alſo recourſe to Tutorage. He ſo cloſely followed his Studies, that at *Wittemberg* he acquired an extenſive Knowledge, as well in Poeſy (*B*) and the Languages, as in Philoſophy and Divinity. *Melanchthon*, the Ornament of that Univerſity, conceived a very particular eſteem and affection for him. *Urſinus* accompanied him in the year 1557, to the Conference of *Worms*, from whence he went to *Geneva*, and afterwards to *Paris*, where he ſtayed ſome time in order to learn *French*, and perfect himſelf in the Hebrew under the Learned *John Mercerus*. He had ſcarce returned to *Melanchthon* at *Wittemberg*, when he received ſome Letters from the Magiſtrates of *Breſlaw* in *September* 1558. containing their Offer of the Maſterſhip of their School. Which he accepted, and ſo worthily acquitted himſelf in that Poſt, that he had continued in it as long as he pleaſed, if he had not been made uneaſie by the Perſecution which the Miniſters raiſed againſt him, they having diſcovered that he was no very good *Lutheran*. In effect, when he explained *Melanchthon*'s Book *de examine Ordinandorum ad Miniſterium*; he ſo treated the Subject *de Cœna Domini*, that he gave occaſion to the Demagogues (ſo the Author of his † Life calls them) to term him *Sacramentarian*. He juſtified himſelf, writing down his Sentiments concerning Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper: But this attempt for the Reſtoration of Peace proving ineffectual, *Urſinus* who hated theſe ſorts of quarrels, choſe rather to go away than to endure them; purſuant to which, he obtained an honourable diſmiſſion of the Magiſtrates, and it being impoſſible for him to retire to his dear Tutor *Melanchthon*, who had been lately dead in *April* 1560. He went to *Zurich*, where *Martyr*, *Bullinger*, *Simler*, *Geſner*, and ſeveral other great Men treated him with the utmoſt Friendſhip. He was ſoon removed from thence by the Univerſity of *Heidelberg*, which then wanted a Learned Man. He reached that City in *September* 1561, and was eſtabliſhed in the College of the *Sapience* in order to the Inſtruction of the Students. He

† Ibi ſtatim Urſinus Sacramentarius a Demagogis preſſimatus, et adverſarios expertus eſt quos prius amicos & fautores habuerat. Melch. in vitis Theol. pag. 531.

Children, nor that an untimely Succeſſion may dethrone Her and crown the Heir. In one word, it is a Chain of Ignominy and Confuſion.

III. It is an aggravation of *Urraca*'s Crimes, that ſhe not only careleſly expoſed them publickly, but alſo that ſhe was Married to an Illuſtrious Monarch. He was ſir-nam'd (*a*) *El Batallador*, the *Battle-Fighter*, by reaſon that he had fought 29 Battles, and been victorious in all of them, two only excepted. He was King of *Arragon* and *Navarre*, wholly independent of *Urraca*, which render'd his Condition equal to that of this Queen. Notwithſtanding all which, he did not eſcape the Matrimonial Diſgrace. So true it is that the perſonal Bravery of a Husband is not ſufficient to avert this Storm.

IV. Laſtly, I obſerve that *Don Alfonſo Raimundo* King of *Caſtile*, who had dethroned his Mother *Urraca*, and kept her in Priſon, yet engaged in a War in favour of his Aunt the Counteſs of *Portugal*, who was treated in the ſame manner by *Don Alfonſo Henriquez* her Son. This Aunt promiſed the King of *Caſtile* to declare him her Heir to the prejudice of her Son. (*b*) *Doloris illa impatientia Alfonſum Caſtellæ Regem eo nomine ſeptimum, ut propinquæ, miſeræ & captivæ matri opem ferat, per literas obteſtatur adverſus impios filii conatus. Navatæ operæ mercedem, Portugaliæ principatum pollicetur Alfonſo filio, pro eo ac par erat, abdicato. Annuit ille ſive ambitione dominandi corruptus, ſive materteræ calamitatem miſeratus: validoque exercitu conflato in Portugaliæ fines irruit.* There needed no more to invite him into *Portugal* with Sword in hand, and it is very probable, that amongſt other Pretexts, he urged that of his Aunt being diſpoſſeſſed and oppreſſed by an unnatural Son: For where are the Men who are aſhamed to condemn in another what they do themſelves? *Don Alfonſo Henriquez* might very juſtly have defended himſelf by an Argument *ad hominem*, and returned an Anſwer like that, which it is ſuppoſed that *Lameck*'s Wives return'd to *Adam*.

Obſerve, that Mr. *Lequien de la Neufville* doth not ſay any thing poſitive of this *Tereſa*'s Amours. His words do not in the leaſt hinder her being thought a chaſt Lady; for this looſe and general expreſſion (*c*) *She thought of nothing but dying more boldly than ſhe had lived*, does not denote any Galantry. The conduct of a Woman may be very oppoſite to holineſs, without being ſtained with any laſcivious Crimes. He poſitively aſſures us, that *Alfonſo*, King of *Caſtile*, *took the Field*——(*d*) *on pretence of delivering the Princeſs*. He places himſelf among thoſe who did not believe her a Baſtard, and ſaith that (*e*) *Theodorus Godefroy* evidently proves, that *Don Henry* her Husband, was great Grandſon to *Robert the devout*, *King of France*. Father *Anſelme*, who eſpouſes the ſame Opinion, refers us to *Godefroy*'s Tract concerning the Original of the Kings of *Portugal*, Printed in 1624. I have not this Edition, but if it affords no ſtronger Proofs than that Printed in 1612, which I have juſt now examined, I dare venture to ſay, that Learned Hiſtoriographer doth not *evidently* prove this genealogical Aſſertion.

(*A*) *He was ſent to* Wittemberg *in* 1550.] *Melchior Adam* is guilty of two Contradictions in one Page (*f*). The Firſt, That *Urſinus* was ſent to the Univerſity of *Wittemberg* at the age of 16; the ſecond, That he entred *Wittemberg* on the firſt of *May*, 1552. One of which particulars muſt neceſſarily be falſe, ſince the ſame Author informs us, that *Urſinus* was born on the 18th of *July* in 1534. I reject the Second, tho' the Author hath not expreſſed the Year 1552 in numbers, but in Words at length. *Ingreſſus eſt* Wittembergam *anno quinquageſimo ſecundo, Kalendis* Maii. The Reaſon why I reject it, is becauſe he tells us alſo in the ſame page, that *Urſinus* having ſtudied above two Years at *Wittemberg*, left it on account of the Plague, and went firſt to *Torgaw*, whither *Melanchthon* was then retired, and afterwards to *Breſlaw*, carrying with him an advantageous Teſtimonial from *Melanchthon*, which *Melchior Adam* cites at large, and this Inſtrument is dated on St. *James*'s Day in 1552. He alſo mentions another, wherein the ſame *Melanchthon* on the firſt of *October* 1557, poſitively ſaith that *Urſinus* had been about ſeven years at *Wittemberg*. I have therefore reaſon to place his going thither in the year 1550, and to have more regard to the Evidences that *Melchior Adam* hath furniſhed me with againſt himſelf than to his Text itſelf. We may very well infer from hence, that he did not much examine what he compiled. He hath confounded *Urſinus*'s ſecond Journey with the firſt; and *Freberus*, without either examining or rectifying any thing, barely ſaith that *Urſinus* went to *Wittemberg* in 1552. He cites the Epitaph wrong, the year lxxxii is inſerted inſtead of lxxxiii, and the 11th of *March* inſtead of the 6th. At this rate how can one rely upon the Printed Copies of Inſcriptions?

(*B*) *As well in Poeſy.*] *Urſinus* in his younger Years muſt needs have diſtinguiſhed himſelf in that particular; for I obſerve that *Melanchthon* in his two

(*a*) *See the Remark* P△ *of the Article* Elizabeth.

(*b*) Goſſut. ubi ſupra pag. 341.

(*c*) Mariana ubi ſupra pag. 433.

(*d*) Lequien de la Neufville, Hiſt. generale de Portugal Tom. 1. pag. 84. Paris 1700.

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) Ibid.

He alſo attempted to preach, but finding himſelf (*C*) ſcarce fit for the exerciſe of that Function, he quitted all thoughts of it. If he was deficient in that Talent, what was therein wanting, was made up to the laſt degree by his Qualifications for a Profeſſor; for he had a lively Genius, a rich ſtock of Knowledge, and a happy dexterity in the expoſition of his Subject. Wherefore keeping in the Preferment he already enjoyed, he was, beſides, made Profeſſor of the Common Places of Divinity. In order to which, the Statutes of the Univerſity rendred it neceſſary for him to commence Doctor of Divinity, which he did ſolemnly on the 25th of *Auguſt* in 1562, and continued in the diſcharge of this Poſt till 1568. He compoſed the *Palatinate* Chatechiſm, and by order of the Elector *Palatin Frederick* III. wrote an Apology for it againſt the Clamours which *Flacius Illyricus*, *Heſhuſius*, and ſeveral other rigid *Lutherans* publiſhed in 1563, on account of that Work. The Elector finding himſelf not only expoſed to the Complaints of ſome *Lutheran* Divines, but alſo to thoſe of ſome Princes, as if he had eſtabliſhed a Doctrine concerning the *Eucharist*, condemned by the *Augsburg* Confeſſion, was for that Reaſon obliged to cauſe to be Printed an Expoſition of the true Doctrine concerning the Sacraments; which was written by our *Urſinus*, who, the following Year, appeared at the † Conference at *Maulbrun*, where he boldly oppoſed the Doctrine of Ubiquity. He afterwards wrote on that Subject, and againſt ſeveral other of the *Lutheran* Opinions. The Project and Statutes which he drew up in order to the eſtabliſhment of ſeveral Schools, and other ſervices he did that Elector, raiſed him ſo high in that Prince's eſteem, that obſerving that he was reſolved to accept of the Divinity Profeſſor's Chair at *Lauſanne* in 1571. He wrote a long Letter to him with his own Hand, urging ſeveral Reaſons to diſſuade him from it. The death of that Prince happening in 1577, occaſioned a great Revolution in the *Palatinate*; for his Son *Lewis* would not ſuffer any Miniſter there that was not a *Lutheran*. *Urſinus*, and the Students whom he Educated in the College of the *Sapience*, were obliged to depart *. He retired to *Neuſtadt*, to be Profeſſor of Divinity in the Illuſtrious School or Academy which Prince *Caſimir* the Son of *Frederick* III. erected there at that time. he began to read there on the 26th of *May* 1578. And he there taught Logick in his Chamber, and alſo publiſhed ſeveral Books; and was preparing for the compoſition of ſeveral others, when his Health which had been impaired by ſeveral violent and great Indiſpoſitions ariſing from his incredible application to ſtudy, at laſt entirely ſunk under the weight of a tedious Diſtemper, of which he died at *Neuſtadt* on the 6th of *March* 1583, in the 49th Year of his Age. His Works were collected after his death, by the care of his only Son, who was a Miniſter, and of *David Pareus*, and *Quirinus Reuterus* his Pupils. To the laſt of which we owe their Publication in three Volumes. *Urſinus* was laborious (*D*), modeſt, and apt to be || angry. And as for readineſs in anſwering Objections, he did not think he ought to aim at it; but ſo contrived the matter, that if an Explanation of any thing was ever demanded of him, it was done in Writing at the end of his Lecture, and he anſwered the next day β. We have elſewhere ſeen how fatiguing he found the direction of a College.

† That is in the year 1564.

* See above in the Text.

|| Fuit tamen [illegible], ut ſit in ejuſmodi ingeniis. Melchior Adam ibid.

β Taken from Melchior Adam, who wrote *Urſinus*'s life from the Funeral Oration, which *Francis Junius*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Neuſtadt*, ſpoke there, and from another Speech of *Quirinus Reuterus*.

URSI-

---

two Teſtimonials ſeems chiefly to value him on that Head; to back which, in the firſt of them he gives in Evidence his publiſhed Greek and Latin Verſes. (*a*) *Cum extent Latina & Græca Carmina Zachariæ Urſini Uratiſlavienſis eruditè ſcripta, prudentes & docti viri lectis illis ſuo judicio probabunt ingenium, ſtudia, & voluntatem ejus*, &c. *Urſinus* was then but 18 Years of age. He Publiſhed in 1560 a Collection of Epigrams which he dedicated to *John Friſius*, in whoſe Houſe he lodged at *Zurich*.

(a) Melch. Adam in vitis Theol. German. pag. 540.

(C) *He alſo attempted to Preach.*] *Thuanus* was miſled by falſe Relations, when he declared (*b*) that the Proteſtants of the Dioceſe of *Cologne*, aſſembled in 1582, to hear *Zachary Urſinus*, a Preacher whom Prince *John Caſimir* had ſent them. *Urſinus* gave over preaching after a few eſſays, with which he himſelf was not pleaſed. Nor did he ſtir from *Neuſtadt* after he was eſtabliſh'd there. Beſides which, he was ſo broken and infirm in 1582, that he was by no means capable of that *Collen* Miſſion. It was *John Stibelius* who went to that Country with Prince *John Caſimir*, as his Miniſter. *Philip Pareus* his Nephew (*c*) has obſerved this Miſtake of *Thuanus*, and informs us at the ſame time, that this *John Stibelius* was afterwards Chaplain to the Court of *Heidelberg*, and Counſellor to the Prince, and that he died in the year 1595, being the firſt Miniſter at *Creutznac*. It is apparent that it was the Authority of *Thuanus*, which moved *John* (*d*) *Latus*, to repreſent *Urſinus* as one of the Reformers of the Electorate of *Cologne Hofman* following *Latus*, makes him labour in this part of the Lord's Vineyard. I ſay, *following Latus*; for beſides, that he refers to him, he could not herein have been miſled by *Moreri*, who hath not ſaid any thing of *Urſinus*, (miſplaced under the Name of *Zachary*,) unleſs that he was a *Sileſian*, and a Profeſſor at *Heidelberg*, who left behind him a great many Works. He cites *Geſner's Bibliotheque*, which ſaith nothing of this Author. He ought to have quoted the Epitome of that *Bibliotheque*. Several Authors have committed the ſame Miſtake.

(b) Thuan. hiſtor. lib. 76.

(c) In vita David. Parei, p. m. 29. He calls Thuanus, Auguſtinus, inſtead of Auguſtus.

(d) Compend. hiſtor. pag. m. 488.

(D) *Urſinus was laborious.*] To be informed of which, we need only take a view of the Inſcription which he cauſed to be affixed to his Cloſet Door: it runs thus:

Amice, (e) quiſquis huc venis
Aut agito paucis, aut abi,
Aut me laborantem adjuva.

Which made him paſs for an ill-natur'd (*f*) Man.

It is obſervable, that *Aldus Manutius*, before him made uſe of a like Inſcription. "(*g*) Nothing was "more uneaſie to him than unprofitable Viſits, "which obliged him to loſe his time—— to ſecure himſelf from which, in a civil manner, he "cauſed to be writ over his Cloſet door the following words: *Quiſquis es, rogat te Aldus etiam* "*atque etiam, ut ſi quid eſt quod a ſe velis, perpaucis agas, deinde actutum abeas, niſi tanquam Hercules veteris ſuppoſiturus humeros: ſemper enim erit* "*quod & tu agas, & quotquot huc attulerint pedes.* "Which words that Learned Greek Profeſſor,

and

(e) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(f) *See what* Junius *ſays about this in* Urſinus's *Funeral Oration.*

(g) Chevillier, Origine de l'imprimerie de Paris pag 234. *He quotes* James Zwinger *in the* Theatrum vitæ humanæ at Baſil 1604. pag. 3713.

URSINUS (*John*) a *French* Phyſician, who flouriſhed in the XVI. Century, wrote ſome Medicinal (*Y*) Tracts in Latin Verſe, and a Commentary [a] on *Cato's* Diſtichs. He is highly extolled by *Stephen* (*Z*) *Roybaſius Tulinus.*

URSUS (*Nicolas Raimarus*) Author of ſeveral Aſtronomical Tracts, was born at *Henſtede* in * *Dithmarſen.* He was a Swineherd in his youth, and did not begin to learn to read before the age of Eighteen, when he diligently ſpent all his ſpare Hours from keeping the Hogs, in learning to Write and Read. After which, he apply'd himſelf to the Study of the Learned Languages; and being endowed with a ſtrong Genius, ſoon made a conſiderable progreſs in the Latin and Greek Tongues. He alſo learned *French*, the † Mathematicks, Aſtronomy, and the other parts of Philoſophy, for the moſt part (*A*) without the aſſiſtance of any Maſter. Afterwards, leaving his own Country, he maintained himſelf by the Inſtruction of Youth; which he practiſed in *Denmark*, in the Year 1584, and on the Frontiers of *Pomerania* and *Poland* in 1585. In which laſt place, he invented a new Aſtronomical Syſtem, not very different from that of *Tycho Brahe.* He communicated it the next Year to the *Landgrave* of *Heſſe*, whence aroſe a violent Conteſt betwixt him (*B*) and *Tycho Brahe.* In which our *Raimarus* diſcovered that he ſtill retained the Manners of his Primitive Occupation; for he let looſe in ſuch a brutiſh manner againſt *Tycho*, that he expoſed himſelf to a (*C*) Criminal Proceſs. He read private Mathematical Lectures at *Strasburg* in 1588, and in 1589, and alſo Publiſhed a Book. After which, he was called by his Imperial Majeſty, to teach the Mathematicks at *Prague.* From whence he ſilenty retired

a See the Remark Z.

* Part of the Dutchy of *Holſtein.*

† Juſtus Byrgius, *Engineer to* Philip *and* Maurice Landgraves *of* Heſſe, *taught him Mathematicks and Aſtronomy.*

---

and afterwards Printer at *Baſil*, *John Oporin*, had them from him and put 'em on the Door of his Study.

(*Y*) *Several Medicinal Tracts in Latin Verſe.*] He then deſerved what he hath not, a Place in the Catalogue of Poetical Phyſicians, Publiſhed by *Bartholinus.* His *Proſopopæia animalium aliquot*, is a Poem in Hexameter and Pentamer Verſe, in which he mentions ſeveral particulars, concerning the Nature and Quality of Animals, more eſpecially as they belong to Phyſick. This Book was Printed at *Vienne* in *Dauphiné* in 1541 in 4to, with the *Scholia* of *James Olveir* a Phyſician. And in the ſame City and Year (*a*) was Printed his *Elegia de peſte eaque medicina parte quæ in victus ratione conſiſtit.*

(*Z*) *Highly extolled by* Stephen Roybeſius Tulinus.] His words (cited by *Reineſius*, run thus. (*b*) *Is eſt etenim, quo cum ſi congreſſus fueris, nihil ignotum homini eſſe putes. Mirus Poeta, eximius & bene fortunatus Medicus, Philoſophus ſummus, Orator facundus. Quorum documentum locupletiſſimum præſtant quæ de re medica carmine ſcripſit, eruditiſſima Comm. in Catonis libellum, Eclogus elegans de moribus, & alia plura quæ ſub ejus nomine circumferuntur.*

(*A*) *Without the Aſſiſtance of any Maſter.*] By a peculiar felicity, he made but one leap from the Plow to the Republick of Learning: and was not like others, oblig'd to ſerve an Apprentiſhip in the Schools. (*c*) *Aliaſque ſcientias Philoſophicas, brevi, & pleraſque quidem αὐτοδίδακτος, ſibi reddidit familiares. Scholas enim, uti ipſe in Libro* (*d*) *paulo ante laudato*, Ruſticum *ſe vocans* Dithmarſum, *teſtatur, uti ſus hortum percurrit, & vix a limine ſalutavit, ſed a Stiva illico, ſingulari quodam fato ac genio, in Remp. literariam irrupit.* This is an undeniable proof of a great Wit. His Works afford ſeveral Marks of his haſty Studies; and his Learning was as ill digeſted as his Style was uncorrect: (*e*) *Homo certe fuit admodum ingenioſus, & in Antiquorum etiam lectione verſatus, ſed doctrina indigeſta, Styli haud ſatis caſtigati, & vere, quod Naſonis de Ennio eſt Judicium*, Ingenio maximus, Arte rudis.

(*B*) *A violent Conteſt betwixt him and* Tycho Brahe.] *Tycho Brahe* accuſed him of Plagiariſm. *Urſus*, ſaid he, coming with his Maſter into my Cloſet, ſaw the Scheme of my Syſtem on a piece of Paper, and not long after arrogated the Invention to himſelf: (*f*) *Cum menſe Septembri verſaretur apud ipſum nobilis vir Ericus Langius, quidam illius famulus nomine Nicolaus Raymarus, Dithmarſus, delineatam hypotheſin quampiam in charta obiter vidit, ac ſibi quaſi a ſe in angulo Poloniæ quodam excogitatam arrogans, illam ut ſuam biennio poſt apud Landgravium venditavit; ubi & impudenter in Tychonem deblaterans repreſſus a Rothmanno fuit.* Upon this charge, the Accuſed in a Book which he publiſhed at *Prague*, *de Aſtronomicis Hypotheſibus*, outragiouſly abuſed *Tycho Brahe*, who was ſtruck to the quick with this ill uſage. *Gaſſendus* gives us the particulars of this Story. "*Quia ſuperiore anno Raimarus Urſus, ille* "*Dithmarſus, Librum Pragæ ediderat de Aſtronomicis Hypotheſibus, in quo Rothmannum quidem, & Reſlinum variis probris onerat, ſed Tychonem innumeris, occaſione eorum, quæ de ſe in Epiſtolis ejus legerat: ideo, cum ejuſmodi Liber ad Tychonis manus recens perveniſſet, iſthac occaſione ipſius literis inſeruit*, Vidiſti procul dubio Plagiarii mei, impuri illius Urſi, maledicentiſſimum ſcriptum in quo præter alia innumera convitia, meo, & meorum honori non parcit. Ego quidem refutatione illum indignum cenſeo, cum omneis modeſtiæ limites, imo honeſtatis longe tranſcenderit: efficiam tamen, ut non impune ferat (*g*)." These are *Tycho's* words in a Letter to *Longiomontanus.* But more on this head in the following Remark.

(*C*) *He expoſed himſelf to a Criminal proceſs.*] In *Tycho Brahe's* Funeral Oration, we are told that a Man of Senſe and Learning, but utterly void of either Religion or Virtue, was not content to arrogate the Aſtronomical Inventions of this great Man to himſelf, but alſo barbarouſly injured his Reputation with black Calumnies: The Orator adds, that if his Death had not put a ſtop to the Proſecution commenced againſt him upon that account, he had been ſeverely puniſh'd. This is ſaid of our *Raimarus.* (*k*) *Ante annos pauculos, quidam ingenioſus, & doctus, ſed abſque religione, & virtute homo, ſatyricum, & famoſum contra præſtantiſſimum hunc virum divulgavit ſcriptum, quale in hoc genere non vidit antiquitas, nec fortaſſis ſpectatura eſt unquam poſteritas. Non ſat fuerat infamatori illi plagium committere litterarum, &* TYCHONIS *Hypotheſin, Uraniburgi repertam, falſarie pro proprio invento venditare; niſi etiam Virum avitis generis, ſummæ eruditionis, inculpatiſſimæ vitæ, cum tota ipſius honeſtiſſima familia, ſexcentis contumeliis, & totidem mendaciis, apud alios, ſi non deformatum, ſuſpectum ſaltem reddidiſſet. Et profecto jure actum cum hoc fuiſſet, velut etiam jam agi cœptum fuerat, niſi mors feram illam ſingulari beneficio affeciſſet, & pœnæ ſubduxiſſet commeritiſſimæ.* *Gaſſendus* quotes a fragment of a Letter, by which it appears that *Tycho Brahe* deſigned to proſecute his Adverſary. His own words, which inform us that Raimarus *Urſus* eſcaped from *Prague*, run thus: (*i*) *Cæterum ne fera iſta Dithmarſica, nimis efferа, & bruta, ut aliqua ſubjungam, licet indigna ſit, cujus recordetur, ſcias iſtam ante aliquot ſeptimanas, prout nuper reſcivi,*

(*a*) Epit. biblioth. Geſneri. pag. 509.

(*b*) Reineſius epiſt. 41 ad. Daumium pag. 118.

(*c*) Mollerus, Iſagogue ad hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, pag. 629.

(*d*) *The* Syſtemate mundi.

(*e*) Mollerus ibid.

(*f*) Gaſſendus in vita Tychon. lib. 2. pag. m. 411. ad ann. 1584. *See alſo* lib. 3. pag 428.

(*g*) [illegible]

(*k*) Joan Jeſſenius, in Orat. funebri Tychon. Brahei, apud Gaſſendum appendice vitæ Tychonis, pag. 4

(*i*) Tycho Brahe, epiſt. ad Longomontanum, apud Gaſſendum vita Tychonis, lib. 6. pag retired to avoid the preſence of *Tycho Brahe*, in 1598. and dyed ſometime after †. *Voſſius* doth not ſo much as mention him: I have inſerted (*D*) the Titles of his Works.

USHER (HENRY) Arch-Biſhop of *Armagh*, and Primate of *Ireland* in the beginning of the XVII. Century, ſpent a great deal of time in the Compoſition of a Book againſt *Cardinal Bellarmin*; but we are told that his Wife Forced the Sheets from him, and threw them into the Fire, on pretence of the great inequality of the Match betwixt a Man charged with Children, and domeſtick affairs, and a Perſon utterly void of all Cares. The Author who relates this, (*A*) and who is indeed very much ſuſpected, adds that *Todd* Biſhop of *Down* being diſguſted at his Wife, and deſirous to Divorce her, petitioned this Primate's Repudiatory Letters, but could not obtain them. He conjectures that the ſole Reaſon of this Arch-Biſhop's refuſal was the fear of diſpleaſing his Lady, who would have been very uneaſy at any thing which tended to introduce the diſannulling of Marriages, by Reaſon ſhe might her ſelf at ſome time or other be in danger of falling under the like inconvenience. All are free to believe this but I will not undertake for the Truth of this, which indeed I relate for no other Reaſon than to make way for the Examination of a falſe Suggeſtion of (*B*) Father *Garaſſe*. Obſerve that whilſt this *Henry Usher* was only ArchDeacon of *Dublin*, he was twice deputed to Queen *Elizabeth*, firſt on an Affair relating to St. *Patrick's* ‡ Church, and afterwards for the Foundation of the Univerſity of *Dublin*. In both which Negotiations he was ſucceſsful *.

† Taken from *John Mollerus's* Book intituled *Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ* Printed at Hamburg in the Year 1691. pag. 618, 619. parte 2. He quotes for moſt of thoſe things Ant. Heimreichius in Catalogo Autorum Chronico Dithmarſico præfixo.

‡ The Cathedral of Dublin.

* Taken from the life of James Usher in collectione [illegible] pag. 7[illegible].

USSERIUS

reſpect Pragâ ſe ſubduxiſſe, ſive male ſibi conſcia, & quod juſtas pœnas per leges formidaret; ſive quid aliud ſinu ſuo latenter more ſuo ruminans. Sed inveſtiganda tamen ſuo tempore per otium, atque in jus pertrahenda, & punienda, quod etiam optimi quique Pragæ ſuadent. For the better Information concerning the Character of this *quondam Swineherd*, I add that he had raiſed a report (*a*) that *Rothmannus* was dead of a Scandalous diſtemper. *Rothmannus* appeared very zealous on *Tycho Brahe's* ſide, when he ſaw that *Urſus* Calumniated him at the Court of *Heſſe*. After which time they became utter Enemies, and interchangeably treated each other with the utmoſt Violence (*b*). *Fuerat ille quoque Rothmanno ea propter infenſus, quod Caſſelis tranſiens & Tychonem conviciis proſcindens repreſſus ab eo vehementer fuiſſet* (*c*).

(*D*) *The Titles of his Works.*] He publiſhed his *fundamentum Aſtronomicum* (*d*) in 1589. at *Stanburg* at the expence of his Pupils. His Book *de Aſtronomicis hypotheſibus ſeu de ſyſtemate mundi* was Printed at *Prague* in 1597 as was alſo *Aſtronomicarum hypotheſium a ſe inventarum Vindicatio & defenſio: Item problemata totius proceſſus aſtronomicæ obſervationis ſeu rationis obſervandi τὰ φαινόμενα*. The *Oxford* Catalogue mentions our *Raimarus's Tetragoniſmus Circuli expeditiori ſtructura productus per Pet. Crugerum*, Printed at *Leipſick* 1607. in 4°. Mr. *Konig* (*e*) aſcribes to him a Book *de doctrina ſinuum & triangulorum*, Printed in 1588. Mr. *Mollerus* (*f*) ſays that he never ſaw the Book *de civitatibus in Dithmarſia Hanſeaticis*, Printed at *Leipſick* in 1563. and Fathered on *Raimarus Urſus* by *Albert Bartholin* and *Lipenius*, and doubts whether any ſuch Work was ever publiſhed, by Reaſon that there is not one Town in the whole Province of *Dithmarſen* which ever engaged in the *Hanſeatick* Confederacy: *Impoſitum illis eſſe à catalogis, quos frequenter exſcribunt, proletariis, conjecto* (*g*). I don't know whether he carefully obſerved *Bartholin's* Words, which run thus: (*h*) *Nicolaus Reimers. De civitatibus Henſaticis in Dithmarſia, Geodeſia Rantzoviana. Lipſ.* 1583. in 4°. Who can certainly conclude from hence that he ſpeaks of our *Raimarus Urſus*? Is it not more probable that he did not mean him? He was no *Dane*, nor Author in *Denmark*; and therefore it is not probable that *Bartholin* ſhould put him into his Catalogue. Nor is it true that *Bartholin* ſays that this Book was Printed at *Leipſick* in 1563.

(*A*) *The Author who relates this, and who is indeed very much ſuſpected, adds.*] The Narrative which *Henry Fitz Simon* an Iriſh Jeſuit gives us, runs thus: (*i*) *Toddus pſeudo Epiſcopus Dunenſis in Ibernia, ſuam conjugem ſeu verius ſcortipeti ſui —— eam voluit repudiare. Acceſſit primo ſymmiſtam ſuum (ut loquuntur) totius Iberniæ Primatem, Henricum Uſherum; libellum ab eo repudii acriter efflagitans. Nimirum fruſtra, apud virum integerrimum ſcilicet, & apprime uxoris (quæ illi viribus ſuis quam tenuiſſimis impar onus exantlanti, nempe multorum annorum elucubrationes contra Bellarminum, extorſit, tradiditque Vulcano, quod iniqua futura eſſet, ut ajebat, concertatio, inter hominem prolibus & domeſticis curis gravatum, & hominem omnis ſecularis ſolicitudinis expertem) imperio, ac voluntati, obnoxium. Diſplicuiſſet autem matronæ gravi (abdominis centum pondio) divortii Miniſtralis cauſaria præterſio, per quam ipſa forte brevi, technis id genus Miniſtralibus, conjugali toro diſcluderetur.*

(*B*) *For the Examination of a falſe Suggeſtion of Father Garaſſe.*] That Author's ſtyle is ſo well known that the *Burleſque* paſſages in the following quotation will not appear very ſurpriſing (*k*). "The "Miniſters (ſaith he) as *Humphredus* tells us in the "Second part of his *Jeſuitiſm*, accuſe the *Jeſuits* "of Magick by reaſon of their Learning. No "wonder (ſay they) that the *Jeſuits* are Learned "ſince they are all Magicians, and Learn all they "know by Diabolical aſſiſtance —— (*l*) Let them "Remember the Story of an Eminent *Roman* Citizen, who was accuſed that by his Sorcery he "attracted the Marrow and Subſtance of the adjoyning Lands, by Reaſon that he had always a "much richer Crop than any of his Neighbours: "In his juſtification he produced his Oxen in good "caſe, his Ploughs in good repair, and his Children "well fed, and offered no other defence to the "Judges than, *Gentlemen, theſe are the Charms I make uſe of, Hæc ſunt veneficia mea, Quirites*, nor can I "further produce my ſweats, my waking nights "and toilſome days. I ſay the ſame to the *Calviniſt* and *Lutheran* Miniſters; the *Jeſuits* are "not embarraſſed with the Family Cares of the "Miniſters, they are not clogged with the long "train of a Wife and a whole neſt of Miniſterial "Brats; their Nocturnal reſt is not broken with "the Cries of ten or a Dozen Chits, nor are they "interrupted in the day time with the Cares of "maintaining fifteen or ſixteen craving famiſhed "Children; any more than they are diverted by "Uſury, Luxury and Pleaſures. *Hæc ſunt eorum veneficia.* Theſe are their Magical Charms, of "which I would willingly prepare an Amulet to "hang about the Miniſters Necks. I Remember "to have read in *Conſtantin Baſſus's* Geoponicks in "the 14. Book pag. 380, that an Honeſt Coun-

---

(*a*) Rumorem ſparſerat fuiſſe ipſum pudendis morbo quibus [illegible] pridem infectum, & tandem confectum, *Gaſſend. ibid.*

(*b*) The following Words were Written by Rothmannus in 1586. Plura ſcribere tam præſertim de impuro nebulone Nicolao Raymaro Urſo Dithmarſo, qui ſuperiori anno ſpurcitiam Excellentiam typographicam literarum collectionem & ordinationem, ut opinor, exercuit. *Gaſſend. ibid.* (*c*) Id. ib. (*d*) Mollerus ubi ſupra. (*e*) Bibliotheca vet. & nova *at the Word Urſus. He ſpeaks of him as of another Writer under the Word* Reimarus, *and he mentions one* Nicolas Reimarus, *who Writ* Theatrum temporis in fol. (*f*) Ibid. pag. 517. (*g*) Ibid. pag. 628. (*h*) Alb. Bartholinus, de Scriptis Danorum, pag. 109.

(*i*) Henric. Fitz Simon Britannomach. Miniſtrorum lib. 3. cap. 6. p. 348.

(*k*) Garaſſe, Recherche des recherches d'Eſtienne Paſquier pag. 973. 974.

(*l*) Id. ib. pag. 976. & ſeq.

USHER (JAMES) Nephew to the former, and Arch-Bishop of *Armagh*, was one of the most illustrious Prelates of the XVII. Century, as well with regard to his great Piety and other Virtues, as his profound Learning. He was Born at *Dublin* on the 4th of *January* 1580. and was taught to Read by two Aunts, tho' they were Born Blind: Which is very particular. He made

"ry Man wished to be informed of a Charm to prevent the Cats, Rats, and Snakes ever infesting his Pigeon-House, and was answered by an anonymous Author, that he knew a very efficacious one to keep out the Cats and Rats. I, said he, carefully shut your Pigeon-house door. II. Open the Windows as little as you can. III. Keep your Walls tight and whole. IV. Stop up the chinks of the Door, and I will engage neither Cat nor Rat shall enter your Pigeon house. Accordingly I can oblige the *Calvinist* Ministers with a good Charm, that they may be as Learned as the Jesuits. 1. Let 'em discharge themselves of their Wives, and the brawls of a Family. 2. Let 'em spend less time in combing their Hair, tricking themselves up, and setting their Starched Bands and Ruffs. 3. Let 'em more seriously apply themselves to the Study of the Gospel than of *Rabelais*, which concerns namely the Ministers *Du Moulin*. 4. Let *Chamier*, *Potter*, *Bonnet*, *Baronius*, and other Ministers not fill themselves with such Loads of Wine and Meat, in order to keep their Minds more free and unclogged ——— If they take and make use of this Amulet, and are endowed with as good Capacities, I promise that they will become as Learned as the *Jesuits*."

Before I reflect on this passage I shall look back to the Original of the cited Story of the *Roman* Citizen, who was accused of Fertilizing his Land by Sorcery. It is related by *Pliny C. Furius Cresinus*, saith he (a), *e servitute liberatus, cum in parvo admodum agello largiores multo fructus perciperet, quam ex amplissimis vicinitas, in invidia magna erat, ceu fruges alienas pelliceret veneficiis. Quamobrem a Sp. Albino curuli die dicta, metuens damnationem, cum in suffragium tribus oporteret ire, instrumentum rusticum omne in forum attulit, & adduxit filiam validam, atque (ut ait Piso) bene curatam ac vestitam, ferramenta egregie facta, graves ligones, vomeres ponderosos, boves saturos. Postea dixit: Veneficia mea, Quirites, hæc sunt: nec possum vobis ostendere, aut in forum adducere lucubrationes meas, vigiliasque, & sudores. Omnium sententiis absolutus itaque est.* He doth not mention the time when this happened; but we guess at it at large, by reason that it is very well known that *Spurius Albinus* here expressed was Consul in the Year of *Rome* 568.

You must take Notice by the by that the Ancient *Romans* were so fully persuaded that there were Magick Charms which could remove the Fruits of the Earth from one place to another; that the Laws of the 12 Tables Established a great Punishment against those pretended inchanters. Mr. *Gravina*, who to his polite literature has added the knowledge of the Law, very justly laughs at this Childish Error. *Sequitur*, says he (b), *frugum incantatio; cum enim veteres illi omnium bonarum artium & disciplinarum rudes putarent fruges, Carminibus magicis vel averti posse vel traduci (ut enim Tibullus ait,*

Carmen vicinis fruges traducit ab agris.)

ideo decemviri pro sua puerili ac ridicula superstitione sanxerunt, ut qui fruges excantassit, *sive Carminibus magicis crescere prohibuerit, aut segetem alienam pellexerit, Cereri sacer esset.*

WHETHER single Men Study better and Publish more good Books than Married Men.

The Reflections which I design on *Garasse*'s Words will not at all concern his Calumnies or Ridiculous Hyperbole's; I leave them to himself, and fix only on that which may in general confirm the Maxim or Principle of *Henry Usher* the Primate of *Ireland*'s Wife. That Woman supposed that an Author who had Children was not able to hold up against a *Monk:* This Maxim indeed appears somewhat probable in the *Theory*, but is numerous false in the Practice; for it is easy to prove by rous Examples, that several Persons who have been clogged with the Cares of a Family have been very great Authors, whether we consider the Quality or the quantity of their productions. And if *Garasse* had writ judiciously, he would not have brought into play, *Peter du Moulin* and *Daniel Chamier*, two Ministers who were very well able to overthrow what he designed to establish. They were both Married and had Children, and yet wrote very good Books, and Gloriously disputed *viva voce*, and in their Writings with the best Controversists of the *Romish* party. And the examples of several other Ministers may be added to these two. So that the Primate's Lady's Maxim is so often Contradicted and refuted by experience, that it ought not ever to pass into a Rule. For whatever is liable to so many exceptions doth not in the least deserve that Name, and whoever would hence draw up a *Rule* or *Aphorism*, is necessarily obliged to make use of this Limitation, *all other particulars being exactly equal, an Author disengaged from all domestick Affairs will exceed one clogg'd with a Wife and Children.* But who can suppose this Equality, or where is it to be found? Compare an unmarried and a married Writer together as long as you please, and if you find that the one hath not less Wit, Judgment or Memory than the other, you will yet perceive that they are not perfectly alike in other particulars. The Married Man may prove more studious and robust, and thereby make good the distractions occasioned by a Thousand petty domestick Cares. He applies himself to study with more ardor after he hath expedited the Affairs of his Family; the strength of his Constitution and Head allow him to study till midnight, and by that means to retrieve the lost Hours of the Day. He is obliged to go abroad twice or thrice in the Morning, and as often in the afternoon, but he returns to his Closet as soon as he can and studies with the greater ardency, because he knows that he hath been and shall be interrupted. And four or five Hours of such a close study are very well worth seven or eight of the common languid and listless Labours of those People, who have abundance of leisure. They study at their ease, without pressing or fatiguing themselves, and rest from time to time; nor are they so sollicitous to avoid the Idle spending of several Hours: Besides If they did not rest themselves, their March may aptly be Compared to that of a Messenger, who without ever halting continually moves on his dull pace, but doth not reach the Goal sooner than he, who after frequently stopping, mends his pace and sets up a run. The latter is a lively Image of the Studies of an Active Author, whose domestick cares frequently divert him from them.

Tho' some Authors, who are free from avocations of this Nature, study very hard, you will find on the other side that they want the Natural endowments which others have, their frail constitution forcing them to rest. They find themselves exhausted, and are necessitated to keep from their Studies till a long repose hath recruited their lost Spirits. If they do not lie under by this inconveniency, there are others which fall in their way, perhaps the want of Books. A Thousand real obstacles may be supposed which break in upon the equality, and compensate the disadvantage of the interruptions: Wherefore *Garasse* and *Henry Usher*'s Wife Advanced a very uncertain Maxim. Tho' it is still true, that it may be said of some Authors, that *they had shone brighter if they had lived single*, or that *they would not have published so many excellent Books, if they had been embarrassed with a Family*. And we may also averr, that several Persons Buried in obscurity had become very Learned, if they had lived without a Wife, Mistress, Children or Law suits.

It is observable that the Monks have not so much leisure as is imagined; the Quire and the Breviary rob the studious of a great deal of time; and if any made ſuch an Expeditious Progreſs in the Sciences, that at the Age of Eighteen he was (C) able to diſpute with a Famous Jeſuit, who like a Modern *Goliath* defyed the Proteſtants. He was ordained Prieſt in the Year 1601, tho', under the Age preſcribed by the Canons. He was choſen Divinity Profeſſor at *Dublin* about the Year 1607, and exerciſed that Imployment for the ſpace of thirteen Years. He choſe *Bellarmin's* Controverſies for the Subject of his Prelections. He was conſecrated Biſhop of *Meath* in 1620, and Arch-Biſhop of *Armagh* in 1624 *. He very vigorouſly oppoſed the deſign of the Lord *Falkland* Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland* (D) to permit the Papiſts the Publick Exerciſe of their Religion, provided they would pay the neceſſary Sums for the ſubſiſtence of the Forces. He went to *England* in 1640. and never returned to *Ireland*, being hindred from it by the Civil Wars, which reduced him to a Melancholy Condition. He dyed at *Rygate* in *Surrey* on the 21. of *March* 1655. His Wife the Daughter of *Luke Challoner* Doctor of Divinity died 18 Months before him, having been Married to him the ſpace of 40 Years; he had one Daughter who Married *Timothy Tyrrel* Eſquire Governour of *Cardiff* in *Wales*. This Article would have been much longer, and contained more particulars concerning the Merit and the Works of this great Man, if I had not known that there is in *Moreri* and yet more at large in the ſecond Volume of † the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, a good Abridgment of his Life.

(a) Plinius lib. 18. cap. 6. pag. m. 448. Note that chapter 4. of the 14. Book p. m. 155. he says that the Grammarian Palæmon, whose Vineyards were very fruitful, was suspected of witchcraft. litteris ejus altioribus contra id pigra vicinitate sibi patrocinante. *His Neighbours excused their laziness upon that account.*

(b) I Vincentius gravina in specimine prisci Juris pag. 53. opusculorum Rome 1696. 12°.

USSON.

---

any of them diſtinguiſhes himſelf by Learning or Piety, he is loaded with Confeſſions. He cannot exempt himſelf from the Direction of Conſciences, which frequently draws him from his Cloſet; he is obliged to give audience to a Thouſand Devotees, whoſe ſcruples often are very ridiculous and very odd. *Bellarmin* had not ſo much time as the Arch-Biſhop of *Armagh's* Lady imagined. I find in a Tract publiſhed in 1625. that (a), " *Cardinal Bellarmin* of " Pious Memory frequently ſaid to the moſt illuſ- " trious *Cardinal de la Roche-foucault*, *Monſignore* " *veramente ci ſono troppo Chriſtiani al mondo.* I " aſſure you that I am crowded with People, and " viſits; and muſt own that there ſeems to me to " be too many Chriſtians in the World. "

(C) *At the Age of eighteen he was able to diſpute with a Famous Jeſuit.*] This Jeſuit was the ſame *Henry Fitz Simon*, whom I have cited in the preceding Article. He was kept Priſoner in the Caſtle of *Dublin*, but his Confinement did not hinder his Challenging all the Proteſtant Clergy to diſpute with him, and fiercely engaging to maintain what they took for the weakeſt part of the *Romiſh* Religion, and to attack what they thought the ſtrongeſt part of the Proteſtant Doctrine. *Donec ego*, ſaith he (b), *cauſæ bonitate ſuffultus, defendere quicquid inter nos infirmiſſimum, vel impugnare quicquid inter ipſos tutiſſimum reputant, in me reciperem.* James *Uſher* whilſt yet beardleſs adventured to enter the liſts with this *Veteran* Champion, and we are aſſured that he vanquiſhed him. (c) *Cum Henrico Simondio Jeſuita, poſcente ſibi dari adverſarios in caſtro* Dublinenſi *de arce cauſæ ſuæ (ſcil. Antichriſto) ſæpius ita conflixit, imberbis juvenis cum veterano milite, ut & provocationis eum ſuæ pœniteret, & ſatis antagoniſtarum in uno hoc octodenario tyrone experiretur. Ipſum audite Jeſuitam in præfatione libri ſui quem de Britannomachia miniſtrorum placuit inſcribere.* Prodiit quidem ſemel, (inquit) octodenarius præcocis ſapientiæ juvenis, de abſtruſiſſimis rebus Theologicis, cum adhuc Philoſophica ſtudia non eſſet emenſus, nec ephebis egreſſus, diſputandi avidus, &c. *Quem poſtea cum adoleverat* Acatholicorum doctiſſimum *idem ille pronunciabat, amplum ſane & inſolitum ex id genus adverſarii ore teſtimonium.* Pray obſerve the *et cetera* at the end of the Citation out of the Jeſuit's Preface, and do not imagin that his remaining Words were omitted only becauſe they were Foreign to the Subject; for they were only ſuppreſſed becauſe they are incompatible with what was ſaid juſt before. The whole paſſage of *Fitz Simon* runs thus (d): *Sed neque in ſpeculis eminentem videre, neque in caſtris, clauſtriſque Stentoria ut agnoſcunt voce provocantem, exaudire voluerunt. Prodiit quidem ſemel in ſumma vocis vultuſque trepidatione, octodenarius precocis ſapientia (non tamen malæ, ut videbatur indolis) juvenis, neſcio an auræ popularis cupidior, ſaltem de abſtruſiſſimis rebus Theologicis cum adhuc philoſophica ſtudia non eſſet emenſus, nec Ephebis egreſſus, diſputandi avidus. Hunc autem juſſi ſuorum calculos adferre, quibus pugil ſeu agoniſta idoneus renuntiaretur, & vel cum ipſo diſputationem ita initurum. Sed ſicut ipſi eum minime tanto honore dignati ſunt, ita me viciſſim ſua deinceps præſentia dignatus ipſe non fuit.* The Jeſuit aſſures us that he asked this Scholar, who trembling came to diſpute with him, *Are you Authorized by your Superiors?* and that he offered, if he was, to enter the liſts with him; but that the young Man not being Honoured with any ſuch Commiſſion could produce no Credentials, and never came again. And yet it is averred in the life of *Uſher* which I have already cited, that he frequently and triumphantly diſputed with this Jeſuit. And we read in another life of this Arch-Biſhop, that he engaged in this diſputation with the conſent of the whole Univerſity, and that at the Second conference he overthrew and ſo ſilenced his Antagoniſt, that after that time, he never was bold enough to engage again, tho' provoked to it: (e) *Communi Academiæ conſenſu placuit Uſſerium, qui tum non niſi Artium Baccalaureus 18 aut 19 ætatis annum agebat, cum ipſo committere: qui utut ab initio ab antagoniſta ſuo fere pro puero ac deſpectui haberetur, poſt unum tamen alterumque colloquium adeo præſidentiam ejus perdomuit, ut ad incitas ſe, certe ad ſilentium redactum mox agnoſceret, nec ulterius confligere, ne provocatus quidem auderet.* Either the Jeſuit's Relation or that of the Authors of *Uſher's* life muſt of neceſſity contain ſome Falſities.

(D) *He very vigorouſly oppoſed the deſign of the Lord* Falkland —— *to permit the Papiſts the publick exerciſe of their Religion.*] The Lord *Falkland* propoſed this to the Parliament of *Ireland* in the Year 1626. Arch-Biſhop *Uſher* who knew how fatal this would be to *Ireland*, aſſembled all the Biſhops of his Province, and drew up a Remonſtrance which they all ſigned. It contained a particular Declaration that conſidering the Falſity of the Principles and Worſhip of the Papiſts, it would be a great Sin to permit the Exerciſe of ſuch a Religion. The Writing which they ſigned was Read in the Pulpit, and put a ſtop to the toleration which the Lord Lieutenant deſigned to procure. All this is particularly related in this *Latin* paſſage: *Reverendiſſimus Primas facile perſpiciens ea res quam fatalis Hiberniæ futura eſſet, omnes ditionis ſuæ Epiſcopos convocavit, qui ejuſmodi indulgentiæ impietatem, ſubſcriptis nominibus, unanimi conſenſu in hanc fere ſententiam teſtati ſunt. Quod quum Papiſtarum religio ſuperſtitioſa eſſet ac idololatrica, fides erronea ac hæretica, Eccleſia utriuſque reſpectu Apoſtatica, liberum iis religionis ſuæ exercitium liberamque fidei ſuæ ac doctrinæ profeſſionem indulgere grave peccatum foret: tum quod hac ratione omnium Papiſmi ſuperſtitionum, idololatriarum, hæreſium, ac uno verbo abominationum ejus omnium, quin & perditionis omnium, quotquot in illius apoſtaſiæ culpa & reatu nos (aiunt) involveret, tum vero etiam quoniam hoc facere pecuniæ gratia nil aliud foret quam religionem venum exponere, imo & animas pretio prodere quas ſalvator noſter Jeſus Chriſtus precioſo ſuo ſanguine redimere non dubitavit. Deum propterea veritatis comprecantes, ut vellet omnes, qui cum imperio erant, zelo Dei*

---

* Taken from his Life in the Collins Batchelors.

† From pag. 179 to page 314 in the Extract of Uſher's Letters, to which his Life written by Mr. *Parr* has been prefixed. Another life of Uſher came out ſince, as you may ſee in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des lettres* for January 1721. pag.

(b) Hen. Fitz Simon epiſt. dedicat. Britanno. mach. Miniſtrorum.

(d) Fitz Simon in præfat. Britannom. pag. 4.

(e) *Acta erudit. Lipſ.* 1687. pag. 115. *in the Extract of Uſher's life written by Mr.* Parr. *Note that* Saldenus de libris pag. 368. *going, as I think, upon this paſſage of the* Acta Eruditorum, *does ſo far exaggerate the thing as to ſay that the Jeſuit himſelf owned he had no more to ſay.* Faſtidioſam viri præſidentiam ita perdomuit, ut ad novum provocatus conflictum, declinavit, cum non tantum, ſed & ad ἀχαμυθίαν redactum ſe eſſe ipſe confeſſus ſit.

USSON, in Latin β UCIO, or UXO, a ſmall Town in *Auvergne* a Leagu diſtant from the River γ *Allier*, and ſix from *Clermont*, formerly dependent on the || County of *Brive*. The Caſtle of *Uſſon is very ſtrong by Reaſon* ‡ *of its Situation on a high Rock naturally cut into round Pillars*. Nothing hath cauſed this Place to be ſo much talked of as the long reſidence of *Margaret de Valois* Wife of *Henry* the IV. She lived there ſeveral Years, not in order to do penance for her paſt lewdneſs (*A*), but to plunge her ſelf the deeper into her (*B*) Impurities; Notwithſtanding

β Hadr. Valeſius notit. Galliar. pag. 588.

γ Baudrand, Geograph. tom. 2. pag. 365.

|| Valeſ. ibid.

‡ Coulon, Rivieres de France 1. part. pag. 265.

Dei gloria & veræ religionis propagandæ ſtudio imbuere & contra Papiſmum, Superſtitionem, ac Idololatriam omnem fortes eos reddere, zelo affectos, & animis quam maxime obfirmatos. Epiſcopi duodecim omnino erant qui huic proteſtationi ſubſcripſerant; quam Downhamus Derrienſis Epiſcopus, cum poſtea coram Falklandio & concilio prædicaret, media concione publice recitavit; quin & Reverendiſſimus Primas eandem proximo die Dominico coram eiſdem inter concionandum comprobavit; una innuens quam gravis ira Dei ob talem animorum propenſionem et genti impenderet. Unde tandem effectum eſt ut alia conſilia deflecterent (a). It is obſervable that Arch-Biſhop *Uſher* and his Dioceſans acted on the higheſt Principles of the Enemies to toleration; for they did not, like moderate Adverſaries, ground their Declaration on political Reaſons, but only on the Nature of Worſhip in the *Roman* Communion, without ſo much as ever mentioning its perſecuting Spirit, the ſole Reaſon urged by the very Favourers of toleration for not tolerating the Papiſts.

(a) Bateſ. vita Uſſerii ubi ſupra pag. 242.

(*A*) *For her paſt lewdneſs.*] Part of which I have elſewhere mention'd from a Book which introduces *Henry* IV. relating the ill Conduct of his Wife. The reſt of the Narrative runs thus (b): "Time ——— provided her with ſeveral Servants; *la Molle* one of which to her great grief, on an accuſation of being concerned in a conſpiracy with which the Marſhals *de Montmorency* and *de Coſſe* were charged, left his Head Accompanied with that of *Coconas* at *Saint Jean en Greve*, where they did not continue time enough to putrify, nor were long expoſed to publick view; for the night following, my good Wife, and Madam *de Nevers* her Companion, *Coconas*'s faithful Lover, cauſed them to be ſtole away, and carrying them off in their Coaches, buried them with their own Hands in St. *Martin's* Chappel under *Montmartre*; and this Death of *la Molle* drew ſhowers of Tears from his Miſtreſs, who ſighed and ſung her paſſionate reſentment in Favour of him under the Name of *Hyacinthus*, notwithſtanding the frequent and Nocturnal Conſolations of *Saint Luc*, who afterwards came often *incognito* and diſguiſed to *Nerac*, till *Buſſy* made her forget the loſs, tho' he was reported to be more Valiant and Stout amongſt the Men than amongſt the Women, by Reaſon of a ſort of Cholick which generally ſeized him at midnight. She being diſguſted excited her appetite with variety of Sauces, and took up with M. *de Mayenne* a jolly bulky Fellow, as voluptuous as her ſelf; after which they remained very good Friends on all Occaſions, tho' not without a reſentment for ſome time on Account of a Letter written to Mrs. *Vitry*, in which he promiſed to prefer the Sun to the Moon—— To her former Lovers ſucceeded at ſeveral times, (for their great Number will excuſe my miſplacing them) that good Fellow the Viſcount *de Turenne*, who like the reſt ſhe ſoon diſmiſt, finding him diſproportionate in ſome part or other: She compared him to empty Clouds which have nothing but a bare ſuperficial Appearance. The Melancholy Lover at the brink of deſpair, after his farewell melting in Tears, had deſtroyed himſelf in a diſtant region, if I who knew the ſecret, and for the good of the Churches pretended ignorance of it, had not expreſly enjoyned my Chaſt Wife to recall him: Which ſhe did very much againſt her Stomach, proudly wiſhing that ſome Blockhead might break his Neck on her Account. But theſe Fools are grown ſcarce ſince they are laught at; for to eat ones Hat-feather in a rage like *la Lole*, and to throw an Ink Bottle at the Ladies Eyes, as *Clermont d'Amboiſe* did in Anger, are ſilly Frenzies and jealouſies which were but too common amongſt us, and which I knew and clearly ſaw conſenting to my own diſhonour, and giving them by my patience the courage and opportunity of offending. She knows it very well, as do ſeveral of you who have aſſiſted her in her diverſions; nor was I ſo Blind in an Affair ſo apparent as not to perceive as well as others, that *Clermont* frequently kiſſed her in her Petticoat only, at her Chamber Door, when in the Evening I either playing or walking in the Hall with my Nobility gave him opportunity to get into her Bed—— (c) Her Beauty drew to me crowds of Gentlemen, and her good Nature retained them: Nor was there any well-born Spark or handſome Fellow, who once in his life had not been an Humble Servant to the Queen of *Navarre*, who never denyed any, but like the Poors Box received the Offerings of all comers." Add to this the paſſage cited from the ſame Book in the Article of this Queen.

(b) Divorce ſatyrique p.m. 191.

(*B*) *But to plunge her ſelf the deeper in her Impurities.*] The paſſages laſt cited carry out *Margaret* no farther than *Auvergne*. Let us then farther hearken to the Author who introduces *Henry* IV. ſpeaking. (d) "The King her Brother hearing of her flight, ſaid aloud in preſence of all thoſe who then ſaw him at Dinner, the Gaſcoon Sparks being inſufficient to Satiate the Queen of *Navarre*, ſhe is gone in queſt of the Muleteers and Tinkers of *Auvergne* ——— This proſtitute being arrived at *Carlat*, where ſhe long continued, not only without Canopy or Bed of State, but even without a ſufficient Number of Shifts for every day, began to caſt her Eyes about and to conſider to which of her Domeſticks ſhe ſhould proſtitute her Honour; and not to be idle, ſhe pitched upon her Cook, being tired with the impatient expectation of *Duras* whom ſhe had ſent to the King of *Spain* for Money, tho' her Confident fearing ſhe might deprive her of her own Lover, continually inculcated the Conſtancy and Merit of the abſent Gentleman. But her inſatiate deſire like the ravenous appetite of a Blood-hound, which enfeebles one that is not continually ſatisfied, could not bear this delay, nor that of *Saint Vincent*, who was gon home to avoid expences. She took up with the wretched *Aubiac*, whom ſhe raiſed from her Stables to her Chamber, and cauſed him to ride her, till her Belly became plump and ſwelled like a Bladder, and in due time diſgorged a Boy, by the help of a Midwife, whom this Spark's Mother out of pure Love to her Son brought thither, and by the aſſiſtance of Dr. *du May* a Phyſitian, who beſides the exerciſe of his profeſſion in curing her of an Impoſtume in her back ſide, ſerved her alſo in conveying this Young Prince *Lyſander* wretchedly ſwadled, to his Nurſe in the Neighbouring Village of *Eſcoubiac*; which was done ſo ſoon after his Birth, that the Cold he endured by the way utterly prevented his ever hearing or ſpeaking: Which Imperfections deprived him of the Love and care of his own Mother, who forgetting the pleaſure of Impregnation, for a long time ſuffered him to tend Geeſe in *Gaſcogne*, where Mrs. *d'Aubiac* his Grandmother (as long as ſhe lived) kept him from ſtarving, and after her *Gaſilax de Firmaçon* her Son in Law, who at preſent ſhews this pledge of the Crown, as a great rarity to all thoſe who come to ſee him at *Birac*, where he keeps him for a penſion of two Hundred Crowns, which *Goute Raquette* ſome time ſince goes to *Uſſon* and *Paris* in queſt of ——— (e) *Aubiac*, a wretched Copper noſed Fellow red haired and more ſpeckled than a Trout, when he conſulted his Glaſs, could never have promiſed himſelf to be one ſtanding which ſhe hath met with ſome Panegyriſts, who compared this Caſtle, as it was the place of her Reſidence, to the Mountain where JESUS CHRIST was Transfigured. *To the end that her Conſolation might be Perfect*, ſaith * one of them, *ſhe deſired to ſee the Court of* Henry *the Great* —— *and to leave her dear* Uſſon, *which had Defended her for the ſpace of Twenty Years, during which time ſhe rendred that ſtrong Caſtle of* Auvergne *a* Tabor *by her Devotion, a* Libanus *by her Solitude, an* Olympus *by her Muſes, and a* Caucaſus *on account of her Afflictions.* It would have favoured much leſs of Calumny to have compared that place with the Iſland of *Caprea*, *Tiberius*'s Retreat, than it favours of Flattery to compare it to a place of

" one day found in Bed with a Daughter of *France*, " as he was at *Carlat*, by Madam *de* (*a*) *Marie*, who " hit on this Noble Adventure by a too early good " Morrow to the Queen according to her Cuſtom, " which officious Compliment ſhe yet paid for with " the Death of her Huſband, whom this Virtuous " Princeſs, perfectly acquainted with her own Coun" try Potions, cauſed to be Poiſoned in hopes that " being delivered from this obſtacle, and aſſiſted by " the Soldiers which *Romes*, *d'Aubiac*'s Couſin, was " gone to raiſe in *Gaſcogne*, ſhe ſhould make her ſelf " abſolute Miſtreſs of the place, and ungratefully " wreſt it out of their Hands who had generouſly " received and protected her . . . . (*b*) The Guard " being reinforced and her *Gaſcon* Auxiliaries diſ" covered, ſhe was familiarly adviſed to leave that " place, and take another lodging. Which through" ly terrified ſhe did at that inſtant, departing with " the ſame precipitancy and confuſion, with which " ſhe came thither, and after Travelling ſome days " ſhe reached *Ivoi* the Palace of the Queen her Mo" ther; where ſhe was ſcarce arrived but by the " King's Command ſhe was by the Marquis *de Canil*" *lac* beſieged and taken with her Paramour, who " was found naſtily hid under ſeveral Ordures " without either Beard or Hair, his Miſtreſs having " ſo Diſguiſed him with her own Ciſars in order " to ſave him. ——— *Canillac* ——— (*c*) pre" ferring a Brutiſh Pleaſure to the Faith which " he owed to his Maſter, Danced after the Pipe, " and ſuffered himſelf to be carried away by the " Artifices of his Priſoner, and forgetting his Du" ty, as well as quitting all Pretentions to the " making of his Fortune, he became Enamoured of " the Queen, and ſo very Jealous that he Sacri" ficed poor *Aubiac* to his Suſpicions, cauſing his " Indictment to be drawn up by *Lugoly*, and after" wards had him Hanged at *Aigueperſe*, at which time " inſtead of conſidering his Salvation and the ſtate " of his Soul, he kiſſed a blue Velvet Muff which " he had yet remaining of the Benefactions of " his Lady. ——— *Canillac* having rather Exe" cuted his Jealouſy than my Vengeance on this " Criminal, did not fail to caſt Glances at her, " and the little Gentleman began to grow ex" traordinary careful of his Dreſs, inſomuch, that " in a little time, from as great a Sloven as " my ſelf, he was as nicely ſet out as an Amorous " Country Eſquire: But at length what did his " Dreſs avail him? His inconſtant Fair one, whoſe " Levity he propoſed to keep under Lock and " Key, encloſed within the inexpugnable Fortreſs " of *Uſſon*, would become Miſtreſs and indulge her " Appetite to the higheſt with its uſual Variety: " To compaſs which, knowing by Experience the " Power of Voluptuous Deſires, ſhe feigns to re" turn Love for Love; and yields to the impor" tunity of ſeveral Addreſſes, after which ſhe ſo " wrought on and influenced her Guardian, that " at laſt by her Artificial Careſſes ſhe obtained " her Liberty, by endearing Promiſes that the " Favours which hitherto ſhe ſeemed to grant " but ſparingly and by force, ſhould be prodigally " beſtowed out of choice, when ſhe came to be " free and abſolute Miſtreſs of *Uſſon*. She delu" ded her Spark in that manner; for the Gar" riſon had ſcarce voided the place, before ſhe " filled it with her own Creatures, whilſt the eaſy " Marquis retired to *Saint Cirque* to gather his " Apples; and ſhe proved ſo Ungrateful to this " Servant of hers, that ſhe could not endure even " the bare Naming of him: Being aſſured of a " large Troop of Luſty-Fellows, ſhe then reſol" ved to follow her own Will, and eſtabliſh " an Empire of Pleaſure within this Rock, " where ſecurely Encloſed by three Walls, and " all the great Gates being Walled, God, and " all *France* know what Delicious Games were " played and practiſed there for the ſpace of twen" ty Years. *Aretin*'s Name and his Holy Wo" man are nothing to it. It is indeed true that " inſtead of the Gallants, who formerly uſed to " Sweeten her Life, ſhe was obliged for want of " better to make uſe of her Domeſticks, Se" cretaries, Chanters, and others, whom " ſhe endeared to her by the force of Pre" ſents, whoſe Families and Names equally un" known to their very Neighbours, are conſe" quently unworthy of my Remembrance, except " only the Famous *Pominy*, the Son of a Tinker " in *Auvergne*, who being taken from the " Cathedral Church, where he was one of " the Singing Boys, being diſtinguiſhed from " his Equals by a fine Voice, was preferred " to this Queen's Muſick, and at laſt from the " Chappel to the Chamber, and from the Cham" ber to the Cloſet, becoming her Secretary —— " (*d*) It was upon his account that the Bedſteads " of her Ladies at *Uſſon*, were raiſed ſo high, " that ſhe might ſee under them without ſtoop" ing, and not be obliged to crawl on all four " in ſearch of him: It was he whom ſhe often " look'd for behind the Hangings, expecting to find " him there, and it was in too eager queſt of " him that ſhe frequently hurt her Face, by run" ning it againſt the Walls and Doors.

I omit whatever concerns the Amours which the Author (*e*) pretends ſhe was engaged in at *Paris*, after ſhe left *Uſſon*. But it will not be improper to caſt our Eyes on a paſſage of *Hilarion de Coſte*, which as to ſeveral Facts, may ſerve for a Confirmation of the Narrative we find in the *Divorce Satirique*. (*f*) " She left *Agen* in the " Habit of a plain Citizen's Wife, riding on " Horſe-Back behind *Lignerac*, on whom ſhe be" ſtowed the Name of *Knight of the Fine-Flower*, " and fled the whole Night, enduring a Fatigue " which tried her Courage at the Peril of her " Health. *De Marſes* came to meet her on the " Frontiers, accompanied with One Hundred Gen" tlemen, and Lodging her at his Manſion-Houſe " of *Carlat*, returned to *Agen* in order to ſecure " her Jewels, and the ſcattered remains of her " Retinue: And after the expiration of eighteen " Months, his Death occaſioned her leaving that " place, and taking up her Station at *Ybois*, a Pa" lace belonging to the Queen her Mother, where " ſhe was Arreſted. The Thunder of the King's " Rage, threatning her every where ſpared " the Sacred Lillies, which ſurrounded her Head, " but put one of her Servants to an Ignominious " Death at *Aigueperſe*. The Marquis *de Canillac* " conveyed her to, and Impriſoned her at *Uſſon*; " but ſoon after this Nobly Deſcended Lord, be" came the Captive of his Priſoner: He thought " he had Triumphed over her, and the ſole view " of her Hands, whiter than Ivory, vanquiſhed " him; after which he lived on nothing elſe but " the favour of the Victorious Eyes of his Charm" ing Captive. But the King's Threats, the fear " of Death, the apprehenſion of deſtroying his " Fortune, and of the ruin of his Houſe, made " deeper Impreſſions in his Mind than any other " Conſideration, and forced him to uſe ri" gorous and ſevere Commands againſt her. The " Protection of God, her own Prudence and " Addreſs, together with the ſeaſonable aſſiſtance of " the Duke of *Guiſe*, ſo happily ſnatched her from " the ſhadows of Death, that at the very inſtant " when ſhe expected to Die a Captive, ſhe found " her ſelf ſecure to Reign free in that ſtrong " Place,

* Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames illuſtres tom. 2. pag. 306.

(*a*) The Author [illegible]

(*b*) Ibid. pag. [illegible]

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 203.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 205.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 210. & ſeq.

(*f*) Hilar. de Coſte, Elog. des Dames illuſtr. tom. 2. p. 301, 302.

of Devotion, and a *Holy Temple of God*, as (C) another Panegyriſt does. If this Lady's Lewdneſs were only mentioned in the *Divorce Satyrique*, or in ſome other Libel, we might juſtly ſuſpect the Truth of it; but ſince Celebrated Hiſtorians (D) are not ſilent on this Head, we ought to believe the truth of the Fact.

"Place, from whence ſhe diſlodged them, who "had fixed her there, and convinced them that "Virtue and Valour make no diſtinction of Sexes. You may ſee that this Monk owns every particular which he poſſibly can, without blaming her.

(C) *Compare the Caſtle of Uſſon——to a Holy Temple of God, as another Panegyriſt does.*] This Author was *John Darnalt* the King's Attorney in the Preſidial of *Agen*. A ſcrap of his Elogy on this Queen runs thus. It is very true, ſaith he, (a) "That her Majeſty, ſince ſhe is in "that (b) Place, moſt ſtrictly obſerves a very "Laudable Cuſtom. After having moderately Re"created her ſelf with the Exerciſe of the Muſes, "ſhe ſpends the greateſt part of her time retired in "her Chappel, offering up Zealous and Fervent "Prayers to God, and Communicating once or "twice each Week. Is not this, *ſtella inſedere & conſiſtere ſunt!* Oh *Phœnix!* who by extending "your Wings, elevate the Eyes of your Under"ſtanding to the great bright Caeleſtial Star, by "the Light of which you See, Live, and Re"vive in it. Oh *Phœnix!* who are daily Born a"gain out of your own Aſhes, Flaming and "Conſuming your ſelf in the Divine Love. Great "Princeſs and Queen, who have neither Motion, "Life nor Light, beſides that which you receive "from this Primitive Light. You live a Life "different from that of Mankind. We read that "the bright and noble Souls of the Elyſian Fields, "before they made their laſt Flight

"*Illuc, unde negant redire quemquam,*

"to the Seat of perfect Bliſs, and uninterrupted "Eternal Joy and Delight,

"*Fortunatorum nemorum, ſedeſque beatas,*

"were for a time purifyed in a clear Air, and freed "from all manner of Corruption. So this moſt "noble Royal Soul retired to the Elyſian Caſtle "of *Huſſon*, and before her entrance into the "Glory of the Heavens, was willing to make "neighbouring approaches to them, and began "to take her Flight that way. Having learned "the exerciſe of the Contemplative Life, and "how to ſeparate her Bleſſed Soul, from her "moſt Perfect Body, in order to Die well. For "according to *Plato* τὸ μελέτημα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐστὶ "τῶν φιλοσόφων, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ "τοῦ σώματος (1). It is the Study of a Wiſe "Man to diſentangle and ſeparate the Soul from "the Body. She is *Jupiter*'s Divine Eagle, which "Contemplates and looks with a fixed Eye, "from an Exalted Place near the Heavens, the "ſolary Rays of the Divine Goodneſs and Provi"dence.——(c) Thou Rock of *Huſſon*, the "Honour and Wonder of *Auvergne*, whoſe Snow "melts by the Eyes, or more properly by the "Rays of this almoſt adorable Terreſtrial Deity! "Thou Rock on which the Light perpetually "Shines, where the Day never fails, but the Rays "of the Royal Preſence are perpetually Reſplen"dant, and illuminate that Place and the Circum"jacent Region!——(d) Fair Star of *Eu"rope*, which is fixed at, and never ſtirs from "*Huſſon! Huſſon* the Royal Reſidence of the laſt "Race——of *Valois*——(e) Pious and Re"ligious Habitation, thou Holy Temple of God, "which ſerveſt not as an inviolable Sanctuary, or "Altar of Refuge, but like Righteous *Noah*'s Ark, "as Her Majeſty's retreat from the Inundations "and Ravages of *France*.——(f) I cannot "yet leave *Huſſon*, that Mountain Crowned with "this Royal Caſtle, that Holy Hermitage, and "devout Monaſtery where Her Majeſty ſequeſtred "her ſelf to Study and Meditation. Thou Rock "art an evidence of the Voluntary, moſt Lau"dable and Religious Solitude of this Princeſs; "a Place which for the Tranſcendent Harmony "of its Muſick, and the Melodious Songs of the "fineſt Voices in *France*, ſeems the only Terre"ſtrial Paradiſe, and here her Majeſty taſtes that "Contentment and Eaſe of Mind, which the "Bleſſed Enjoy in the other World."

(a) John d'Arnalt, Antiquitez d'Agen chap. 25. fol. 125. verſo.

(b) That is, In Uſſon Caſtle.

(1) In Phædone.

(c) Id. ib. fol. 125. verſo.

(d) Id. ib. fol. 126.

(e) Id. ib. verſo.

(f) Id. ib. fol. 127.

Obſerve that Mr. *de Perefixe* (g) ſtrongly tells us, that *Margaret voluntarily ſhut up her ſelf in the Caſtle of Uſſon.*

(D) *Celebrated Hiſtorians are not ſilent on this Head.*] I have mention'd in another place of this Dictionary what *D'Aubigné* ſays of it, not in a Satyr, but in his Univerſal Hiſtory. I have alſo quoted a Paſſage out of *Mezeray*, and the Reader has been told that *Varillas* relates the ſame things. But I ſhall further quote a more credible Hiſtorian in this particular, by reaſon he was devoted to *Catherine de Medicis*, and conſequently not at all inclined to excuſe the Conduct of the King of *Navarre*. I mean *Davila*, who acknowledges that this Prince did in a manner Divorce his Conſort, by reaſon of her ſcandalous Reputation of Unchaſtity. And he alſo owns that in her Retreat ſhe led a looſe Life: (h) *Moveva lo grandemente il riſpetto della Reina Margherita ſua moglie, perche havendola per la fama delle ſue impudicitie, come repudiata, & eſſendoſi lei ritirata in Overnia a certi ſuoi caſtelli a vivere con liberta molto licentioſa, vedeva neceſſariamente, ò convenire riceverla di nuovo all' unione del ſuo matrimonio, ò non poter mai ſtare in ſincera amicitia, & in intera confidenza con la ſuocera, e col cognato.* He repeats almoſt the ſame thing in another place of his Book: (i) *La quale* (Reina Margherita) *havendo abbandonata ſe ſteſſa a vita licentioſa per riſpetto de' riſentimenti del marito, ſi era fuggita da lui, ma per comando per ordine ſuo, e per commiſſione del Rè ſuo fratello, ella fu poſta nel caſtello di Carlat in Overnia come prigione, e di la dopò qualche tempo trasferita al Uſſone nella medeſima Provincia ſotto alla cuſtodia del Marcheſe di Canigliac; il quale come ſi diceva, fatto prigione della ſua prigioniera l'haveva riposta in liberta, onde ella trattenendoſi in alcune ſue caſtella pur in Overnia, e continuando l'isteſſo modo di vita, era di grandiſſimo oſtacolo alle convenientie, che tra il marito, & il fratello poteſſero contrattarſi.*

There are ſome Faults in this Relation of *Davila*. I. It is not true that Queen *Margaret* retired to *Auvergne* in order to live Licentiouſly. She lived every where in the ſame manner, and ſhe would have found her account better at *Agen* whither ſhe fled, than in *Auvergne* whither ſhe retired. It is indeed true that the fear of (k) being Seized at *Agen* was the cauſe of her departure thence, and if ſhe ſheltered her ſelf rather in *Auvergne* than in any other place, it was not owing to her pure Choice, but pure Neceſſity. *Lignerac*, her Guide, had no other place proper for Refuge. II. It is not true that ſhe retired into ſome Caſtles belonging to her. III. Nor is it true that ſhe was Impriſoned at *Carlat* by order of her Husband, and by a Commiſſion of *Henry* III. Her Conductor's Brother purſuant to her own deſire received her. I am apt to think that afterwards the Governor of the Place received Order (l) to be anſwerable for his Gueſt, and Secure her; but this doth not excuſe *Davila*. IV. It is falſe, that being ſet at Liberty by the Marquis *de Canillac*, ſhe retired to her own Seat. V. One of theſe Paſſages of *Davila* is refuted by the other; for if ſhe retired to her Seat when ſhe Broke with her Husband, as we are told in the firſt Paſſage, what is averred in the ſecond, that ſhe did not retreat thither till after ſhe was ſet at Liberty by the Marquis *de Canillac*, is not true. Mr. *de Beauvais Nangis* (m) hath Cenſured no other but this laſt of *Davila*'s Errors, and hath given his Approbation to all the reſt. But theſe ſmall Miſtakes are no juſt Reaſons againſt our believing this Famous Hiſtorian, when he tells us that *Henry* III. and *Catherine de Medicis* conſulted to annul the King of *Navarre*'s Marriage, and

abandon

Fact. *Scipio Du Pleix* hath been (*E*) moſt particular in it: For which he was blamed, and juſtified himſelf: (*F*) I ſhall examine whether the Marſhal *de Baſſompierre*'s Reſentment is juſt. However, we may ſay that the makers of Elogies are much leſs to be excuſed, ſince they have intirely ſuppreſſed the

abandon *Margaret* as unworthy of being acknowledged of their Blood. (*a*) *Deliberarono finalmente, che non era da tener più conto della perſona di Margherita, reſaſi da ſe ſteſſa poco degna d'eſſer da loro riconoſciuta, nè per ſorella, nè per figliuola, e che, poiche la diſpenſa difettoſa ottenuta dal Pontefice al tempo del ſuo matrimonio, porgeva cauſa, e preteſto a poterlo diſciogliere, ſi doveſſe fare queſto divortio, e dar per moglie al Re di Navarra Chriſtiana figliuola del Duca di Lorena.* The Ambaſſador *Busbequius*, whoſe Authority is as good as that of an Hiſtorian, in a Letter written from *Paris* to his Imperial Majeſty, dated the 25th of *Auguſt*, in the Year 1583. expreſſes himſelf thus: (*b*) *Rex ſororem ſuam, Reginam Navarræ, palam multis audientibus graviter increpuit, quòd vitam degeret turpem, & flagitiis contaminatam. Commemorat memoriter mœchorum introductiones, quibus illa conſuevisſet. Etiam puerum ſine mariti opera natum objectavit, eaque omnia ſuis temporibus, & reliquis rebus ita notata, ut ipſe interfuiſſe videretur, & Reginam ea magis confiteri puderet, quàm confutare poſſet. Finis orationis fuit, ut eam ſtatim Lutetiâ migrare juberet, urbemque ſuâ contagione liberaret. Sic, illa, collectis raptim ſarcinis, die ſequenti, non modò ſine ullo proſequentium officio, ſed ſine juſto etiam famulitio, Lutetiâ exceſſit.* You ſee here that *Henry* III. not only particularized the Circumſtances of his Siſter's Adulteries, but alſo charged her with being delivered of a Baſtard. The Author adds, that after this Reprimand, *Chanvalon*, a very handſome young Gentleman (*c*), who paſſed for one of *Margaret*'s Favourite Gallants, retired into *Germany*. (*d*) He had loſt the favour of the Duke of *Alençon*, on account of ſome Letters which he wrote from *Antwerp*, but according to others for bragging of the Favours of a great Lady. Read *Varillas*'s Words: (*e*) "The Lord above all thoſe in the Kingdom, "who made the moſt regular Court to Queen "*Margaret*, was *James de Harlay-Chanvalon*, who "had formerly followed the Duke of *Anjou* into "*Flanders*, where he gave ſeveral Marks of his Valour on ſeveral occaſions. This Duke frequently "received him at his Table: But he not being ſo diſcreet as he ſhould have been, one Day dropping "ſome boaſting Expreſſions concerning the good Fortune, which his Beauty and good Mien (ſaid he) had "obtained from one of the greateſt Ladies of the "Court of *France*; the Duke of *Anjou* hearing him, "Baniſhed him from his Table and the Low-Countries, and it was but one Year ſince *Chanvalon* "was returned from thence. Being not very welcome to the King, becauſe the Favourites did "not look kindly upon thoſe who had declared "for the Duke of *Anjou*; he applied himſelf to "the Service of the Queen of *Navarre*, from which "the Favourites took occaſion to publiſh that "Love was the ſole cauſe of it. And as nothing "could be ſaid of the King's Siſter ſo ſcandalous but he believed it; he gave ſo much Credit "to this Report that he Baniſhed *Chanvalon* from "her, without taking care to cover this with ſome "Pretence that it might not reflect upon her. It "alſo appears that the King publickly complained "to his Siſter of her living with *Chanvalon*. But now let us turn our Eyes to the Relation of *Du Pleix* the Hiſtorian: And we ſhall find amongſt other particulars that *Chanvalon* had a Child by Queen *Margaret*.

(*E*) Scipio Du Pleix *hath been moſt particular in it*] I ſhall collect together what this Author hath diſperſed in ſeveral places: (*f*) "The King "of *Navarre*———made Love to the Maids *of Queen* Margaret *his Wife*, which ſhe ſuffered the "more patiently, by reaſon her Huſband did not "Comptrol her Actions: Tho' ſhe complains in "her Memoirs, that her Maids had done her "ill Offices with reſpect to him. But this ſhe "ſays in order to cover the Sins which ſhe had "been Guilty of againſt the Laws of Marriage. "Written words cannot Bluſh; but I ſhould Bluſh "whilſt Writing, if I ſhould ſet down "what I have heard her ſay ſeriouſly about it. "She was certainly a Princeſs enriched with excellent and perfectly Royal Endowments; but "ſhe had alſo great Weakneſſes, as well as ſome "ill Habits. Perhaps I may ſpeak of it more "largely in the Reign of *Henry* the Great, when "my ſubject will oblige me more particularly to "it, tho' with Regret, having had the Honour to "belong to her Houſhold for ſix Years, and to "be always favourably Treated by that Illuſtrious "Princeſs." What follows ſtrikes with Horrour. (*g*) "*Henry* III. treated his Siſters with fraternal "Tenderneſs, but at laſt hated *Margaret* Queen of "*Navarre*, as well becauſe ſhe did not live honeſtly "with her Huſband, as by reaſon ſhe was a continual "Accomplice in all the Conſpiracies of the Duke of "*Alençon*. Notwithſtanding which he always ſhewed himſelf more indulgent to Pardon than ſevere to Puniſh them, till *Margaret* (either in "Jeſt or Earneſt) let fall an Inceſtuous Expreſſion "to Queen *Louiſe* his Majeſty's Wife. Upon which "this good King finding himſelf touched in a "particular, which moſt ſenſibly affects generous "Souls, never after looked favourably on that "Brother, or that Incorrigible Siſter. The perfectly Chaſt and Virtuous Princeſs *Louiſe* hearing "this infamous diſcourſe of her Siſter-in-Law, "ſuddainly ſtopped her Mouth, by very Modeſtly ſaying as tho' ſhe did not take it ſeriouſly, "*Pray Siſter rally more agreeably.* But yet dreading the Artifices of her Malice, ſhe related the "Immodeſty of her Siſter to the King, which "very ſenſibly Incenſed him againſt her and his "Brother, and he Loved *Louiſe* the more tenderly for it." When *Du-Pleix* ſums up the Reaſons which *Henry* IV. had to ſue for a diſſolution of his Marriage, he expreſſes himſelf thus: (*h*) "The VI. Nullity was Founded on the Manners of Queen *Margaret*, which were equally inſupportable and manifeſt to the whole World; "yet he did not urge this in order to obtain her "conſent to the Diſſolution and Annulling of "their Marriage. But the Pope and the Sacred "Conſiſtory being ſufficiently informed of it, did "highly commend the Goodneſs of the King, who "being able to Convict, and cauſe her juſtly to "be Puniſhed, (as ſome of his Council adviſed) "choſe rather to endeavour the liberty of a ſecond Marriage another way." What follows is a very good Supplement to the ſixth Nullity: (*i*) "*Henry* the Great was twice Married: "Firſt to *Margaret* of *France*, a Match which "ſeemed very advantageous to the poſture of "his Affairs, if it had been as Agreeable to him "as Honourable. For he knew ſhe had elſewhere fixed her Amorous Affection, and had "no Paſſion for him.——— Notwithſtanding "which he Loved her, and bore with thoſe Actions in her, which when known, are inſupportable to all Huſbands. He had no Iſſue by "her; but during her Elopement ſhe had two "Sons: One by the Sieur *de Chanvalon*, who is "yet alive, and is a Capucin that goes by the "Name of Father *Ange*: The other, who is Dead, "ſhe had by the Sieur *d'Aubiac*, and I knew them "both. The notoriouſneſs of the thing obliges "me againſt my Will to mention this: It is, "beſides, a ſhining Proof of the goodneſs of this "moſt Illuſtrious Monarch; who from hence "could have drawn an invincible Reaſon to have "rid himſelf of her by the Hands of Juſtice, according to the Advice of ſeveral of his Council: But he choſe rather to break the Marriage without any Effuſion of Blood by the evident Nullities above mentioned.

I omit what he ſaith, (*k*) that ſhe maintained *a more than fraternal Correſpondence with the Duke of* Alençon *her Brother*.

(*F*) *For which he was Blamed, and Juſtified himſelf: We ſhall examine whether the Marſhal* de Baſſompierre's *Reſentment is Juſt*] *Du Pleix* being to ſpeak of Queen *Margaret*'s return to the Court, doth not

V v v v v

(*a*) [illegible]

(*b*) [illegible] Imperat. [illegible]

(*c*) Chanvalonius [illegible]

(*d*) Id. ib.

(*e*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Henri III. Book 7. pag. m. 231, 232.

(*f*) Du-pleix, Hiſt. de Henri III. ad ann. 157[illegible]. pag. 70.

(*g*) Id. ib. ſub fin. pag. [illegible], [illegible].

(*h*) Id. Hiſt. de Henri IV. ad ann. 1599. pag. 264.

(*i*) Id. ib. ſub fin. pag. 411, 412.

(*k*) Id. Hiſt. de Henri III. pag. 23.

the curious paſſages of the Life of this Queen, in order to crown her with the moſt magnificent Praiſes, that can poſſibly be beſtowed on a moſt illuſtrious Princeſs.

not Treat her in an obliging Manner, and yet owns, (a) *That ſhe was pleaſed that he ſhould have the honour to be one of her ſervants in ordinary in quality of Maſter of the Requeſts, with a handſom Salary; and notwithſtanding, adds he, that ſhe was very much addicted to Change, I always was very well with her: which being very well known to ſeveral Perſons, ſome have been the more ſurprized that I have ſpoken boldly of her Irregularities in the Reign of* Henry III., *as I ſhall alſo in this I am now writing. But for my part, I wonder more that any Man of Judgment could not diſcern that what I have done was grounded upon juſt and neceſſary Conſiderations, without its being neceſſary for me to expreſs them. I ſhall place her Elogy after her death, and I ſhall with truth ſay ſome ſtrange and ſurpriſing things.* He accordingly diſcharged his promiſe, when he came to mention the death of *Margaret*, under the year 1615. Some paſſages of his Diſcourſe run thus: (b) "All the World repreſenting her as a Goddeſs, ſhe in a manner fancied her ſelf to be ſo; and during her whole life was very much pleaſed with the Name of *Venus Urania*, or the *Celeſtial Venus*, as well to hint that ſhe partaked of the Divinity as to diſtinguiſh her Love from that of the Vulgar. For in order to keep it up, ſhe formed her ſelf upon different Rules from thoſe common to other Women. Affecting above all the exerciſe of her Mind rather than of her Body, and her common expreſſion was: *Would you ceaſe to love, poſſeſs the beloved Object.* I could on this account compile a more excellent and ſurprizing Romance than any written in former Ages: But I am engaged in more ſerious Affairs——— The Perſecution and Menaces of her Brother (c); the terrible apprehenſions ſhe conceived, that her Crimes would oblige her Husband to attempt upon her life, and the ſolitude in which ſhe lived for twenty Years, ſo diſcompoſed her Mind, that ſhe grew extremely miſtruſtful of every body: So that her continual Fear made her (d) Hypocondriack. This weakneſs at firſt appeared only by certain Objects which fell under the cognizance of her Domeſticks; but after her laſt Journey to the Court it was but too much divulged, ſhe her ſelf diſcovering it to every Body——— * She having as many amorous Addreſſes made to her as he (†) made to other Women, they agreed very ill. She hath thrown all the Ordure that ſhe could at that great King in her Memoirs, and which are Publiſhed, therefore I have been obliged to repreſent her ſuch as ſhe was in this Hiſtory. For I am not here writing Panegyricks of Princes and Princeſſes, but a true Hiſtory, which ought to expreſs their Virtues, and not conceal their Vices, that their Succeſſors, by a fear of the like Stain in their Memory, may be excited to imitate their glorious Actions, and avoid their Faults. Beſides, on political Reaſons it was requiſite to obſerve that her Baſtards were born during her Divorce and ſeparation from the King: By reaſon that they might otherwiſe paſs for legitimate: Since his Majeſty never would puniſh the Monk as an Impoſtor, who for ſo long a time hath been, and is produced as Queen *Margaret*'s Son. I am neceſſitated to declare this for the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who have charged this important Story with detraction.„ After this he adds ſeveral Elogies of this Queen.

The Marſhal *de Baſſompierre* hath made the following Obſervation on that Paſſage, which charges her with having had two Baſtards: „ Infamous Viper, who by thy Calumnies haſt torn the Entrails of her that gave thee life! Thou Worm, which gnaweſt the ſame fleſh that begot thee! Thou mad Dog, who biteſt thy own Maſter, what moved thee to injure a poor Princeſs after her Death, who cheriſhed thee during her Life? Is it the Intereſt of the late King, who, to his own prejudice, choſe rather to retard the diſannulling his Marriage with her, than utter one ſingle word to her diſadvantage, and tho' he could not keep her any longer his Wife with the Intereſt of his State, yet always honoured her as Queen, loved her as his Siſter, beſtowed large Penſions on her, and made her immenſe Preſents? Is it Truth which obliges thee to it, thou who haſt given the Title of a Hiſtory to this Book filled with Fables, and ſtuffed with Calumnies and Scurrilities? What a Scandal haſt thou caſt upon *France*, by publiſhing to the whole World, and leaving recorded to Poſterity, ſuch infamous Stories of one of the moſt noble Princeſſes of the Royal Blood, which perhaps are falſe, or at moſt, were only known to very few? Is a private man allowed, under the name of an Hiſtorian, to publiſh the Faults of another, to ſpot and defame the Royal Race, and defile the Memory of the dead? If any attempt had been made to force thee, tho' but lightly to ſcandalize that poor Princeſs, (who kept thee from ſtarving) tho' thou ſhouldeſt rather have ſuffered Martyrdom than yield to it; whereas on the contrary, without any conſtraint or the leaſt invitation, thou haſt hunted after, and deviſed even improper and unreaſonable opportunities to ſay ſuch execrable things of her, that no Chriſtian can utter, or hear without horrour. No, no, there are Wheels and Executioners to puniſh thee ſeverely in this World, and a Divine Juſtice in the other, to inflict eternal torments upon thee for thy infinite Crimes (e).„ Laying aſide abuſive Reflections, we find ſcarce any thing elſe in this Sentence of Condemnation, but that *Du Pleix* ought not to have defamed a Princeſs, whoſe Domeſtick he had been, nor publiſh'd ſuch private Events as diſhonoured the Royal Family. It is perfectly unneceſſary for me to examin the laſt of theſe Objections. *Du Pleix* himſelf hath ſatisfactorily anſwered it in one of the Paſſages which I have already cited; and it doth not appear that *Baſſompierre* ever refuted that part of his Defence. Wherefore let us only ſtop at the firſt Objection.

All acquainted with the Laws of Hiſtory are agreed that every Hiſtorian, who deſigns the faithful diſcharge of his Function, ought intirely to diſpoſſeſs himſelf of the Spirit of Flattery, and Calumny, and put on as much as poſſible, ſuch a Stoical Temper, as is out of the reach of any diſturbance from Paſſion, and inſenſible to all other Intereſts. He ought only to be concerned for the intereſt of Truth, to which his Duty obliges him to ſacrifice the Reſentment of an Injury, the remembrance of a Benefit, and even the love of his Country. He ought to forget that he was born in a certain Country, that he was bred up in the Communion of any Church, that he is indebted for the making his Fortune to ſuch and ſuch, and that ſuch or ſuch are his Relations or Friends. An Hiſtorian as ſuch, like *Melchiſedeck*, is without Father, without Mother, and without Pedigree. If he be asked *of what Country are you?* He ought to anſwer, *I am neither a French Man, nor a German, nor an Engliſh man, nor a Spaniard*, &c. *I am an Inhabitant of the World, neither engaged in the ſervice of the Emperor, or of the King of* France, *but only in that of Truth: She is my ſole Queen,* (f) *and I have taken no Oath of Allegiance to any beſides her: I am her ſworn Knight, and the Collar of the Order which I wear, is the ſame Ornament worn by the* (g) *chief Juſtice, and the high Prieſt of the* Egyptians. All that he gives to the Love of his Country, is taken from the Attributes of Hiſtory, and by how much he ſheweth himſelf a good Subject, by ſo much he proportionally declines toward an ill Hiſtorian.

> *Dum* (h) *patriam laudat, damnat dum Poggius hoſtem;*
> *Nec malus eſt civis, nec bonus hiſtoricus.*

So that the cruel Reproaches, which Mr. *de Baſſompierre* grounds on the Sallaries and Poſts which *Du Pleix*

CONSIDERATIONS upon the Duties of an Hiſtorian.

(a) Id. hiſt. de Henry IV. ad. an. 1605. pag. 91.

(b) Id. hiſt. de Louis XIII. pag. 57.

(c) *That is*, Henry III.

(*) Id. ib. pag. 54.

(†) *That is, the King of* Navarre.

(d) *In the* Divorce Satyrique, *pag.* 208. Henry IV. *is brought in ſpeaking thus.* Tho' I pity her, I cannot ſometimes forbear laughing at the extravagant jealouſies, and mad tranſports which frequently prompt her to ſlight what ſhe ſees, and to believe what is falſe; looking ſometimes for her Ruffians in every part of the Houſe, tho' ſhe knows they are ſomewhere elſe; and ſometimes when ſhe ſees and hears 'em, ſhe Fancies they are other Men in their ſhape, who deſign to deceive and do her Miſchief. *And pag.* 210. She has brought her ſelf to that paſs, that ſhe cannot abide that any body ſhould cough, laugh, or ſpeak with a low Voice in her preſence: She is grown ſo ſuſpicious and miſtruſtful, that ſhe thinks every body ſpeaks of her doings.

(e) Baſſompierre Obſervat. ſur Du-Pleix pag. 171. & ſeq. See ſor alſo pag. 181, & ſeq.

(f) Tuus ô regina quid optes Explorare labor, mihi juſſa capeſſere fas eſt. Virg. Æn. lib. 1. v. 76.

(g) [illegible] Circa collum imaginem ex ſapphiro gemma confectam geſtabat: quæ vocabatur Veritas. Ælian. var. hiſtor. lib. 14. cap. 34.

(h) Sannazar. apud Jovium, Elog. cap. 10. pag. m. 31.

Princeſſes. She was thus praiſed (G) by reaſon of her Liberalities to the Monaſteries, the moſt ſure and infallible means to cover a multitude of Sins. If ſhe diverted her ſelf very agreeably at the Caſtle of Uſſon, ſhe alſo ſuffered ſeveral Troubles there. ‖ " From the Terraſs of that Caſtle, ſhe ſaw her Friends cut in
" pieces, and the Count *de Randan*, their Chief, a Lord of the Houſe of *Rochefou-*
" *cand* killed on the ſame day that the King her Huſband triumphed over her
" Enemies at *Yvry*: And tho' this Place fears nothing but Heaven, it being
" impoſſible for any thing but the Sun to enter it by force, and its triple En-
" cloſure ſlighting the efforts of the Aſſailants, like a Rock bearing off the Billows

‖ Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

Pleix enjoyed under Queen *Margaret*, are unjuſt; for *Du Pleix* the Hiſtoriographer was not obliged to diſcharge the Obligations of *Du Pleix* this Queens Domeſtick. It was neither proper for him as an Hiſtorian, to acknowledge a good office, or revenge an Injury: His ſole Obligation was to repreſent things as they really were, without any favourable regard to his Friends, or prejudice to his Enemies. He had the ſame ſtrict engagements to Truth, as the Judges have to Juſtice; and therefore ſince it would be highly unreaſonable to reproach a Counſellor of Parliament, to have occaſion'd his Benefactor's loſs of an ill Cauſe, we ſhould be equally in the wrong to complain of *Du Pleix*, on pretence that he hath Publiſhed defamatory Truths of a Princeſs under whom he was employed. It is to betray an ignorance of the true bounds of things, to maintain, that Gratitude extends even to the diſpoſal of thoſe things which are none of our own; I mean, that to acquit our ſelves of our Obligations, we ſhould make uſe of what belongs to others. If you will acknowledge the good Offices done you, do it at your own Expence, and not at that of your Neighbour. Such an one is the cauſe of your growing rich, that you enjoy the Poſt of Maſter of the Requeſts, or Preſident, &c. Aſſiſt him with your Purſe in his Indigence, but be not an Inſtrument to carry an unjuſt Cauſe for him; for if you carry it for him, your Gratitude is a downright Robbery, and an infraction of the moſt eſſential Duties. You are the Miniſter of Juſtice, and nothing can permit your violation of it; you ought not, as a Judge, to acknowledge the Benefits, which you formerly received when Steward or Tutor. The application of all this to a Publick Miniſter of Truth, an Hiſtoriographer, is not very difficult.

If during the proſecution of a Criminal Indictment againſt *Magaret de Valor*, *Du Pleix* had refuſed to give Evidence againſt her, or endured the Torture rather than reveal the Adulteries of this Lady, whoſe Domeſtick he was, he had deſerved Elogies; and his Silence in this caſe had been an hundred times more commendable than an ingenuous Confeſſion: But whilſt compiling the Hiſtory of *France*, he was diſengaged from all Domeſtick Obligations, and might publickly declare what he ought not to have done to the Commiſſioers appointed to draw up her Indictment. I own that he defamed a Princeſs of the Blood; that if out of fear of caſting ſome ſcandal on the Royal Family, he had been oblig'd to ſilence, it muſt thence be concluded alſo, that an Hiſtorian ought never to mention any of the Rebellions and Conſpiracies of the Princes of the Blood; and for inſtance, the Spaniſh Hiſtorians ought never to have ſpoken of the Combinations of *Don Carlos*, nor of the Puniſhment which was the conſequence of them. But as this is abſurd, it follows that Mr. *de Baſſompierre* hath unjuſtly cenſured the Conduct of *Du Pleix*. His other Obſervations are much better; for it cannot be denied that he hath detected an almoſt infinite number of Faults. If I am anſwer'd that the Rebellions of Princes are publick Facts, and conſequently ought not to be ſilently paſſed over by an Hiſtorian; I reply, that Queen *Margaret*'s Amours were, in their kind, as publickly known as the frequent relapſes of the (a) Duke of *Orleans*. All the Court was perfectly informed of the Reprimand which ſhe received from the King her Brother, who amongſt other things charged her with having a Baſtard. All the Ambaſſadors knew it, and undoubtedly wrote the News to their reſpective Maſters. All *France* was acquainted with the Affront which the ſame King cauſed to be offered to *Margaret* in a publick Road; and the Conſequences of this Affront were blazed abroad by the Complaints of the King of *Navarre*. In a word, to ſay in an Hiſtory what *Du Pleix* hath publiſhed concerning the intrigues of the Queen of *Navarre*, was not to reveal any Private Memoirs. And you may if you pleaſe obſerve, that certain Reaſons of State, which he mentions, obliged him to ſpeak of them. Which is a good juſtification. I deſire you would alſo obſerve that ſeveral have cenſured his inſerting theſe events in his Work, but have not affirmed, that they were meer Lyes. See the Margin (b). On the contrary, they never ventured farther than to ſay that the Veil of Diſcretion ought to have been drawn over them. Wherefore ſince he had no occaſion to juſtifie himſelf on any other account than taking the liberty of publiſhing Truths of this nature, and ſince after that juſtification, he left all theſe paſſages in his Works, ſo that they were not only printed but reprinted with Licenſe; we may conclude, that theſe Facts ought to paſs as undoubted Truths; for if they were Calumnies, the Author would have been obliged to retract and leave them out in the ſecond Edition.

We may ſay that he hath contributed more than any body elſe to fix the certainty of theſe Facts. The Sieur *d'Aubigne*'s Satyrs did not amount to a ſufficient and authentick Evidence; but when they appear confirmed by the publick Atteſtation of an Hiſtorian, who was a domeſtick Servant to this Queen, there is no longer room for doubt. The Hiſtorian lived at the time of the Events, and was Servant to this Princeſs: He hath not deprived her of the glory which ſhe deſerved on other accounts; he was not blamed for calumniating, but for not ſparing her; and never retracted or ſuppreſt in a new Edition what he had ſaid in the firſt. So that the ſilence of a thouſand and a thouſand Authors, and the Elogies beſtowed on her Memory may at pleaſure be alledged, but can never ſhake the truth of the Fact; for we ought to take notice that even her Flatterers never preſumed to averr that ſhe was an Example of Chaſtity, but contented themſelves with ſilence on this Head. If they had affirmed that ſhe was always very chaſte, they would have formed a ſort of Faction and Schiſm in the Hiſtorical World, and fomented in it that Pyrrhoniſm which is already but too epidemical on other accounts: A diſorder whoſe propagation is principally owing to the different accounts of things (c) at the very time of the Events. A Lye is commonly ſuppoſed poſterior to the Truth; but this is not certain with reſpect to Relations; for it but too frequently happens that the falſe precede the true; and that the true and falſe ſtart at the very ſame inſtant, and ſo run through future Ages under the auſpicious Authority of Traditions of equal age. Obſerve what *Tacitus* ſaith (d) on occaſion of a very remarkable event, which at firſt was variouſly repreſented.

It was foretold, that Truth would not be ſtifled by the artifices of mercenary Pens and Tongues. (e) " Thoſe, who in hopes of her liberality, praiſe
" her in their Sermons, dedicate Books to, or write
" Elogies on her, do in vain beſtow on her
" Qualities to which ſhe hath no pretence; for true
" Tradition, which in ſpite of them will be imme-
" morially preſerved from Father to Son, will
" plainly prove them Lyars, and as full of Avarice
" and Flattery, as ſhe is an Enemy to Vir-
" tue." This Prediction is verify'd by the event, for which we are not a little indebted to *Du-Pleix*.

(G) *She was thus praiſed by reaſon of her Liberalities to the Monaſteries.*] **Hilarion de Coſte**, a

(a) Brother to Lewis XIII.

(b) *Baſſompierre pag.* [illegible] *of his Journal of his Life, ſays, that in 1606. Queen Margaret* loſt the Sieur *Sollendat* her Lover, who had been killed by a Gentleman called *Charmond*.

(c) *See my Diſſertation concerning defamatory Libels.*

(d) Is finis fuit ulciſcendi Germanici morte, non modo apud illos homines qui tum agebant, etiam ſecutis temporibus vario rumore jactata, adeo maxima quæque ambigua ſunt, dum alii quoquo modo audita pro compertis habent, alii vera in contrarium vertunt. & gliſcit utrumque poſteritate. Tacit. Annal. lib. 3. cap. 19.

(e) Divorce ſatyrique pag. 212.

“ lows and Surges, yet Neceſſity got into it and obliged her, in order to avoid its Affronts, to pawn her Jewels at *Venice*, to melt down her Plate, and to have nothing free but the Air, hoping but very little, and fearing every thing: For all round about her was in flame and Confuſion. ” I ſhall conclude with this paſſage of *Brantome* †: *The Caſtle of* Uſſon *is a very ſtrong place, that ſeems impregnable, which that cunning and crafty King Lewis the XI. partly made ſo on purpoſe to lodge his Priſoners, and keep them much ſecurer there then at* Loches, Bois de Vincennes, *or* Luſignan.

UTINO

Minime ſpeaks thus of the Charities of this Princeſs: (a) “ At the four moſt ſolemn Feſtivals, and on her Birth-day, ſhe gave with her own hand one hundred Gold Crowns, and as many Loaves to an hundred poor People. She annually maintained one hundred and eleven perſons, and forty *Engliſh*, *Scotch* and *Iriſh* Prieſts, beſides the Alms ſhe daily diſtributed at her Palace, and going from Maſs, as well to Strangers, as to the modeſt uncraving poor. She alſo contributed ſeveral Sums to the building of ſeveral Churches and Monaſteries. She built and founded the Jeſuits College at *Agen*, and the Convent of the Reformed *Auguſtins* near her Palace, near the Suburbs of *St. Germain des Prez* at *Paris*. None of the Mendicant Orders ever eſcaped her Annual Bounty; amongſt others the Carmelites, Auguſtins, Cordeliers, Jacobins, the Jeſuits of St. *Lewis*, the *Ave-Mary* Nuns, the Bernardins the Capuchins, Recollects, and Minimes of *Nigeon*. In the latter years of her life, building all her hopes on God, ſhe daily heard three Maſſes, one high and two low; ſhe communicated three times every Week, on *Tueſday*, *Friday*, and *Saturday*; every *Saturday* ſhe viſited the low Chappel of our Lady in St. *Victor*'s Church, and the Hoſpitals in the Holy Week, and never gave leſs than three or four Thouſand Blankets, beſides frequently a conſiderable Sum for the Marriage of poor Girls. ” *Scipio Du Pleix* (b) relates the ſame, but he adds a Reflection which makes a vaſt difference betwixt this Narrative and that of the Minime. If ſhe, ſaith he (c), “ ſuffered her ſelf to to be drawn away by ſenſuality in her Youth, amongſt ſo many pernicious opportunities as happen in the lives of Princes, and the Allurements of the Court, yet having renounced them in order to return to God, and having redeemed her Sins, by large Charities, who can doubt but that the Prayers of ſo many Religious Perſons, and the Bleſſings of the People have opened the Heavens for her Soul, and made way for her reception amongſt the Bleſſed Angels, conſidering withal that more eſpecially towards the end of her days ſhe prepared and diſpoſed her ſelf for it with a truly Chriſtian Contrition and Reſolution. ” The Minime took great care not to intermix his Relations with ſomething of this Nature: We find nothing there which tends to inſinuate that *Margaret* had any occaſion to buy off the Sins of her Youth by ſo many Alms; and Omiſſions like this are indeed unſufferable. Generally ſpeaking we cannot complain of his placing her amongſt the Illuſtrious Ladies; but his ranking her equally and without any diſtinction, with thoſe whoſe Virtue always remained untainted, is what cannot be excuſed. He ought at leaſt to have divided his Work into three Claſſes, one for the Ladies of perpetual and unſpotted Virtue, one for thoſe unjuſtly ſlandered, and another for thoſe whoſe good qualities compenſated their Vices, and who in their wiſe Old Age expiated the Sins of their Youth. No Body would have been offended to have found *Margaret* in this laſt Claſs, nor taken it amiſs that the Monks out of gratitude for her Alms, ſhould made her ſhine amongſt the Illuſtrious Penitents, and celebrate her Wiſdom, Learning, and the remainder of her good Qualities. We ought to do juſtice to every Body, and even to beſtow thoſe praiſes upon Curtezans, which they deſerve when they have diſtinguiſhed themſelves by ſeveral Virtues, of which there are (d) ſome Examples. We are not Ignorant of the Nullity of her Alms, by reaſon they were given at the Expence of others and the ruin of her Creditors. (e) *Have you ever obſerved any of her Lovers*, (Henry IV. is introduced ſpeaking) *a few excepted, grow rich by her Liberality? But you ſee the Priſons full of thoſe whom ſhe hath impoveriſhed —— I know very well that at my expence ſhe gives the tenth of all her Rents and Penſions quarterly to Monaſteries and Convents: But ſhe withholds the Salary of her domeſticks, (which I very much commiſerate) and of thoſe who for the whole Year have obliged her with their commodities as well as their labour.* If any ſhould ſcruple to give credit to this paſſage on pretext that it is taken out of a defamatory Libel, he needs only conſult the Hiſtory of *Henry* the Great, written by Mr. *de Perefixe*, who died Arch-Biſhop of *Paris*. Where he will find (f) that the Palace which Queen *Margaret* built near the *Pre-aux-Clercs was ſold to pay her debts —— that ſhe was liberal to prodigality, very pompous and magnificent; but* [illegible] *it was to pay debts.* “ *Which is undoubtedly one of the greateſt Faults in a Prince, by reaſon that nothing is ſo diametrically oppoſite to Juſtice, of which he ought to be the Protector and Pattern.* ” This Teſtimony agrees with that of *Mezerai*, and yet one would be apt to excuſe the Panegyriſts who have ſo extolled this Queen's Alms, if like *Du Pleix* they had related the whole matter of Fact; and one would not require from them a profound ſearch into the circumſtances of her Liberalities to the Poor and the Monaſteries.

I ſay again that the Minime *Hilarion de Coſte* ought to have obſerved in his Book, what *Robert d'Arbriſſel* did in his Monaſteries, one of which was appointed for Women of good Reputation, and the other for thoſe who had quitted their ill courſes. That mixture is very Scandalous which in the ſame Book preſents us with the Elogies of *Anne* of *Bretagne*, and *Iſabella Clara Eugenia*, together with thoſe of *Bona Sforza* and our *Margaret de Valois*. To which I add that it is a medley which naturally Encourages thoſe to give up themſelves to Vice, whom an Ambition of being one day placed amongſt the Illuſtrious Ladies, might perhaps keep in the Right way. Nothing is more pernicious than equally to extoll and Honour looſe and Virtuous Women. This Minime had been leſs to blame, if his praiſes had been reduced to the particular deſcription of any ſingle Action; but he hath couched them ſo as to take in the Hiſtorical ſeries of the Queen's whole life. He mention'd whatever he found excellent, and forgot nothing but what was ill. I make this reflection only to make it appear that I never pretended that all theſe, who have mentioned either the Learning or Charities of Queen *Margaret*, ought alſo to have taken notice of her Faults. This never entred into my thoughts, nor do I in the leaſt diſlike *Stephen Paſquier's* contenting himſelf with hinting what he Condemned in general (g), and particularly enlarging on what he admired in her: for he did not attempt a Hiſtory or an Hiſtorical Elogy. See what he ſaith of the meals of this Princeſs. “ Tho' Dinners and Suppers are chiefly Deſigned for the nouriſhment of the Body, yet ſhe more highly valuing the Aliment of the mind, has commonly four Men near her, to whom ſhe firſt propoſes what propoſition ſhe pleaſes for their examination, frequently overthrowing their Arguments and never reſenting their Criticiſms provided they be grounded on good and ſolid Reaſons. Thus ſhe nouriſhes her mind and feeds her Body with all Sobriety, and after theſe Learned Men have ended their diſcourſe, not to abate any part of her Royalty, then follows a band of Violins, after that a Conſort of Vocal Muſick, and laſtly of Lutes, which play ſucceſſively in Emulation of each other (h). ”

Give me leave to obſerve by the by that this Queen and all other Ladies who imitate her, per-

haps

---

† Brantome, Memoires des Dames illuſtres pag. m. 251.

(a) Hilarion de Coſte ubi ſupra pag. 308, 309. *See alſo* Paſquier p. m. 761. *of the 2d* Tome *of his Letters.*

(b) Du Pleix, Hiſt. de Louis XIII. pag. 54. 55.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 55.

(d) *See Chap.* 25. *of the* 3. *Book* Miſcellanearum obſervationum *written by* Peter Petit *a Pariſh Phyſician and Printed at* Utrecht *in* 1682.

(e) Divorce ſatyrique pag. 213.

UTINO (LEONARD DE) a *Jacobin* Monk, who Flouriſhed in the XV Century, and was a great Preacher. His Sermons on the *Saints* were one of the earlieſt productions of the Preſs, being Printed in 1446 †. And his remaining Works were alſo Printed before the end (*A*) of the ſame Century. It was probably he, who complained that the Confeſſions which the Women made at the (*B*) Confeſſion Chair, were defective in ſome things.

VULCANIUS * (BONAVENTURA) was Born at *Bruges* on the 30. of *June* 1538. He made ſuch Expeditious Advances in polite literature, that at the Age of 21. Cardinal *Francis de Mendoza* § fixed on him by Reaſon of his Learning, to be his Secretary and Library-Keeper, and gave him ſome of the *Greek* Fathers to Tranſlate into *Latin*. He returned from *Spain* to the Low Countries, after an abſence of Eleven Years, and finding his Country embroiled in Confuſions, went to *Cologne*, and from thence to *Baſil* and *Geneva*, publiſhing in each of theſe Cities a Book of his Compoſure. Being returned home he was Nominated Profeſſor of the *Greek* Tongue in the Univerſity of *Leyden* in 1578. and three Years after began the Exerciſe of that Imployment. Which he ſupplyed for the ſpace of 32 Years γ, and died at *Leyden* (*A*) on the 9th of *October* 1614.

haps more perniciouſly injure the World, by their extreme aſſiduity in Convents and Churches, than if they Scandalouſly purſued a Courſe of impenitence. They are immortalized by an Hundred forced artificial Eloges, which never mention any of their former Sins. Is not this to cauſe thoſe who live in Impurity to hope for an unſpotted Fame and expect to be loaded with Honour, if in their decayed and deformed Age they turn devout? Wherefore ſhould they not hope for this Glory after ſo many examples before their Eyes? For it is the common courſe of looſe Women to turn devout when no longer able to Charm. They are then very conſtant Auditors of the Sermon and Maſs, and very liberal to Convents; whence 'tis believed they ſhall find the way to Paradiſe, and conſequently Young Ladies may flatter themſelves that their Debaucheries will not deprive them either of Humane Glory, which the applauſes of Monks procure for the dead, or Eternal Happineſs. What is more pernicious than this Security? What can poſſibly let looſe the Reins of corrupt Nature to a greater degree? The Ladies would be terrified at the Apprehenſions of an infamous Character in future Ages, and the Torments of Hell, if they ſaw that all or almoſt all the Wanton continue hardned in their Crimes till Death. This fear would prove a Bridle and a coercive wiſe Leſſon, and by this means the Damnation of ſome few would prove a Remedy againſt the Incontinence and a means of the Salvation of a great Number. If in every Age there were but one lewd Woman, that turned devout in her Old Age, ſhe alone would no more inſpire a Spirit of Security, than the good Thief, (*a*) ſhe could only drive away Deſpair. But when the Number of theſe *Magdalens* (*b*) Mounts High, they univerſally occaſion Confidence and Obduration, ſo that one may ſay, that indirectly and contrary to their Intention they are the firmeſt Pillars of the Empire of *Venus*, even when they themſelves are retired out of it. What Glorious Arms would they afford the Prieſts and Confeſſors if being become the laughing ſtock and execration of the whole Town, when grown grey under *Venus*'s Yoak, and following their Old Trade with all the ridiculous impertinences which attend the Conjunction of Wrinkles and Coquettery, they ſhould at laſt dye blaſpheming or in deſpair; ſo that their rejection of the Sacraments ſhould cauſe their Corps to be dragged on a hurdle to lie unburied! Such a diſmal Spactacle would ſerve for a Bug-Bear. Little Father *Andrew* would have frequently taken occaſion from thence to cry out in his Sermons, the ſame Fate attends you.

A Famous Author (*c*) in a Letter dated the 23d. of *June* 1678. ſaith, that the diſeaſe of which Madam M*** dyed made him do penance, and that ſhe was *one of thoſe mention'd in the Goſpel, who were as well payed for the laſt hour, as thoſe who engaged in the Morning.* Father *Bourdalouë* (*d*) affirmed that this Lady diſcovered a great ſhare of Chriſtian Reſolution at her Death. This is what edifies the publick, but yet lays a ſnare for Sinners. It is obſervable that we are taught by ſome that thoſe have a greater Intereſt in the Favour of God, who extricate themſelves out of great Sins, than if they had never fallen into them. This is another ſnare. The Biſhop of *Meaux* clears this, after having advanced (*e*) that *when we ſee in the Goſpel* (1) *the loſt Sheep preferred by the Good Shepherd to all the reſt of the Flock, when we read of the Happy return of the Prodigal Son and the tranſports of a tender Father which rejoyce the whole Family; We are tempted to believe that Repentance is preferred to Innocence it ſelf, and that the returning Prodigal receives greater Favours than the Eldeſt Son who never ſtrayed from his Father's houſe.* See the remainder in the Author himſelf.

(*A*) *Before the end of the ſame Century.*] His Treatiſe of Common Places was Printed at *Ulm* in 1478. His Lent and Dominical Sermons were Printed at *Lyons* in 1495. See the Epitome of *Geſner's Bibliotheque* pag. 543.

(*B*) *That the Confeſſions, which the Women made at the Confeſſion Chair, were defective.*] *James Olivier* Licentiate of the Civil and Canon Law, ſays (*f*) that *the Learned de Utino obſerves* that Womens Confeſſions "are commonly deficient in three particulars, which they very ſeldom or never confeſs; "Luxurioufneſs and the Vanity of Cloaths, believing it to be due to their Sex; Lewdneſs in thought "or deed, according to the eſſence of the Sin or its "circumſtances, either by ſhame or cuſtom; and immoderate Loquacity, which is not free from Mortal "or Venial Sin, for which an Account muſt be "given before God, even of idle Words." I do not aſſert this for a Truth, but only ſay that it is very probable that the Author here cited is the Monk I am ſpeaking of.

(*A*) *He died at Leyden on the 9. of October in 1614.*] I am obliged to the *Athenæ* (*g*) *Belgicæ* for the particular day of this date, which I believe right (*), tho' the date of the Year is falſe, for it is not true that *Vulcanius* died in 1610. as it is ſaid there. Mr. *Konig* follows this Error. *Meurſius*, *Valerius Andreas*, and Mr. *Moreri* after them are miſtaken in placing the Death of *Vulcanius* in 1615. *Ghilini* who hath only Paraphraſed, and wrongly Tranſlated *Swertius*, hath exceeded the Fault of his Original, by making it 1600. inſtead of 1610. (*h*), and yet he tells us that *Vulcanius* Born according to him and the Truth on the 30 of *June* in 1538. lived above 70 Years. This is not the ſole Blunder he is guilty of: He tells us beſides that (*i*) Cardinal *Francis de Mendoza* was Biſhop of *Bruges*, and that *Vulcanius* having been Profeſſor of the *Greek* Tongue in *Flanders* for three Years went to *Lyons*, and obtained the ſame Imployment in that Univerſity, which he exerciſed for 32 Years (*k*) to the great ſatisfaction of the *French*. It is not neceſſary to tell the Reader that inſtead of *Burgos* a City of *Spain*, he hath put *Bruges* in *Flanders*, and that inſtead of *Leyden*, he hath clapt in *Lyons*, where there never was an Univerſity. He did not underſtand at all theſe Words of *Swertius*:

---

† [illegible] in his A[illegible] pud Konig Biblioth. vet. & nova, pag. 4[illegible].

* He [illegible] of [illegible] Family [illegible]

§ He was Biſhop of Burgos.

γ Taken [illegible]

(1) [illegible] on the effect of many old devout Women, who have been lewd in their Youth.

(*a*) Unus eſt ne deſperes, ſolus eſt ne confidas, ſays a Father of the Church ſpeaking of the good thief.

(*b*) I mean ſuch Women as are falſe or true Converts.

(*c*) Buſſi Rabutin, letter 106. of the 1. tome pag. 257. Dutch Edit.

(*d*) Ibid. Letter 107. pag. 258.

(*e*) *Biſhop of Meaux*, Oraiſon funebre de la Reine Marie Thereſe pag. 66. *Dutch Edit.*

(1) *Luke* 15. 4. 10.

(*f*) *James Olivier*, Alphabet de l'imperfection & malice des femmes, *letter G.* p. 97. edit. of Rouen 1658.

(*g*) Swert. Ath. Belg. pag. 162.

* Mr. Drelincourt *a Phyſician* at Leyden *and a worthy Son of the Profeſſor, has been pleaſant at my requeſt to make ſeveral inquiries concerning the time of* Vulcanius's *death, and has found in the Records of the Town-Houſe that he was buried in St.* Peter's *Church the* 13. *of October* 1614.

(*h*) Ghilini teatro parte 2. pag. 49.

(*i*) Id. ib. pag. 48.

(*k*) Con intera ſodisfazione de Franceſi. Ibid.

1614. after having published || ſeveral Works which diſcovered his erudition. He promiſed (*B*) an Edition of Saint *Cyril's* Works. His Funeral Oration (*C*) raiſed the Murmurs of ſome Criticks. *Ghilini* hath committed a great many † Faults.

|| You'll find the Titles of ſome of 'em in *Moreri*, and all of 'em in *Meurſius*, Ibid. pag. 407, 408, & in *Valerius Andreas* Bibl. Belg. pag. 116, 117.

† There are only two Faults in the [illegible]

W.

WECHEL (CHRISTIAN) a Famous Printer at *Paris* before the middle of the XVI. Century. He was ſo correct in his Editions, that the *Errata* ‡ of a Book in Folio did not ſometimes contain above two Faults. Thoſe who tell us that he firſt began to Print in *Greek* (*A* Δ) in 1538. are miſtaken. There are ſome *Hebrew* Books which he Printed || in 1533. By the Catalogue of the Books which came from his Preſs before 1548. It appears that he was a diligent Man, and that he Printed a great many Books. This Catalogue is at the beginning of the thirteenth Book of *Geſner's* Pandects, with a very obliging Epiſtle Dedicatory. I mean by this that *Geſner* Dedicated his thirteenth Book to him. He was proſecuted * in 1534. for ſelling a Book of *Eraſmus De eſu interdicto carnium*, which was cenſured by the Faculty of Divines. Some Authors ſay that he became Poor, by a particular curſe of God, which fell on him, for Printing (*A*) an impious Book. *Andrew* WECHEL his

‡ See the Remark A.

|| [illegible] Printed [illegible]

* Id. ib. pag. 355.

tius: (*a*) *Lugdunum Batavorum iter faceret, à Curatoribus Academiæ Profeſſor linguæ Græcæ deſignatus eſt anno Domini M. D. LXXVIII. Triennio demum poſt Lugdunum venit, & Profeſſionem ſuſcepit.* Since he is miſtaken in ſuch particulars as theſe, we ought to be believe that on an Hundred more dangerous occaſions he hath corrupted the Authors which he Paraphraſed.

(*a*) Swert. ubi ſupra pag. 161.

(*B*) *He promiſed an Edition of Saint Cyril's Works.*] Of which *Scultetus* gives a curious Account, ſpeaking of the Learned Men he viſited at *Leyden* in 1612. (*b*) *Quem* (Bonaventuram Vulcanium) *ſenem admodum ſellæ affixum, & manibus pedibuſque captum inveni. Promiſerat ille triginta quatuor annis antè, editionem omnium operum Græcorum Cyrilli hactenus a multis deſideratam: hanc cum fruſtra hactenus ſingulis propemodum nundinis expectaſſem, & jam coram hominis ætatem valetudinemque perditam conſiderarem, petii ab eo, ut Cyrillum Græcum fidei meæ concrederet: me non ſolùm operam daturum, ut ex ipſius voto ille in vulgus exiret, ſed etiam de Codicis precio ipſi ſatisfacturum: At ille gratiis pro officio actis, tantum adhuc virium ſibi ſupereſſe ajebat, ut ipſemet promiſſo ſe exſolvere poſſit; uſque adeò verum eſt, Neminem eſſe tam ſenem, qui, non dico diem, ſed annos ſupervivere ſe poſſe, ſperet. Quanquam erat non nemo in Angliâ, qui Bonaventuram de tanti theſauri poſſeſſione magnificè potiùs ſe jactaſſe, quam verè gloriatum fuiſſe, affirmaret.* Obſerve that *Vulcanius* began to Tranſlate *St. Cyril*, to aſſiſt (*c*) Cardinal *de Mendoza*, who was writing a Tract *de naturali noſtra per dignam Euchariſtiæ ſumptionem cum Chriſto unione.*

(*b*) Abrah. Scultetus narrat. hiſtor. pag. 55.

(*c*) Meurſ. Athenæ Bat. pag. 103.

(*C*) *His Funeral Oration raiſed the Murmurs of ſome Criticks.*] They found Fault with *Cunæus* who made it, for not mentioning that the deceaſed when dying recommended himſelf to the Merits of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſuch like things. *Cunæus* juſtified himſelf by declaring that he could not have ſaid ſo without incurring the Guilt of an Officious lye. It is very well known, added he, that the good old Man fell into a paſſion againſt thoſe who exhorted him to prepare for Death, and that he never was obſerved to comfort himſelf by the Maxims of Piety. I ſhall inſert *Cunæus's* whole Letter; it was never Printed, and it will not be unacceptable to the Reader. A Friend of mine Tranſcribed it exactly from the Original, and did me the Favour to communicate to me his tranſcript. I know who hath the Orignal.

Ampliſſimo Viro Rumoldo Hogerbetio Petrus
Cunæus S. D.

Vir Ampliſſime. Ante dies aliquot rogatu Mag. Rectoris, & Senatus Academici laudavi Bonaventuram Vulcanium funebri oratione, in qua reprehendi quædam audio ab ineptis. Et jam perlatus Hagam rumor eſt. Ego non decrevi orationem publicare, neque enim tanti eſt. Sed tamen animi cauſa ſcripſi brevem diſſertatiunculam quam legi a vobis cupio, uti intelligatis quam frigida & febriculoſa ſint, quæ illi culpavere. Præcipue illud exagitatum eſt de Lipſio & Eraſmo. De Lipſio crimen diluit ſatis ſolidè: Eraſmum autem ita defendi ut ſub illius perſona cauſam ipſe meam egerim. Etiam illud culpavere quod de Chriſti merito locutus non ſum. Sed multæ cauſſæ fuere cur hæc & alia multa omiſerim. Novimus nos, novere cæteri Vulcanium qui familiariter cum illo vixerunt. Sane quoties aliquis hominem extrema ſenectute ad mortis meditationem hortaretur, vehementer iraſcebatur ille. Sermones vero de Chriſto aut de pietate, adeo nunquam ex ſene audivimus, ut ſæpe mirati ſimus quibus ille cogitationibus feſſam ætatem ſolari ſoleret. Itaque laudo in funere ea quæ cunctis eruditis litteratiſque communia. Cætera omiſi, ne viderer ſcenæ inſervire. Sermones de Chriſto non ſunt gladii Delphici qui omnibus aptari poſſint. Et profecto qui hæc indignantur relegandi ſunt ad D. Heinſii orationes quibus nobiliſſ. Douzam & Scaligerum laudavit. Eadem enim illi objici poſſunt atque etiam objecta fuerunt. Vale Ampliſſime Senator Lugdun. Batav. Kal. Nov. CIↃ IↃC XIV

If any one objects that I ought not to have reveal'd this great imperfection of *Vulcanius* he muſt be ignorant that the publick hath long ſince been informed of it; to which purpoſe ſee what we find in the *Scaligerana*: (*d*) *Vulcanius's Religion is that of Dice and Cards; he knows not what Religion he is of, nor is he acquainted with the difference of Religions* ——— *Vulcanius pretends to be one of our Communion, but he doth not know what Religion is.*

(*d*) [illegible] voce Vulcanius p. 255.

(*A* Δ) *Thoſe who tell us that he firſt began to Print in Greek in* 1538. *are miſtaken.*] I had mention'd this Epoch and confirmed it by citing the 256 Page of Mr. *Chevillier's* Tract of the Original of Printing at *Paris*; but I have been informed by Mr. *Van Dale* that he has ſome *Greek* Books Printed at *Paris* by *Chriſtian Wechel* in the Year 1530 and 1531. Of which Number are *Hermogenes* περὶ εὑρέσεων τόμοι τέσσαρες in 4. and *Lucian's* Dialogues of the Gods. Theſe two Books are in *Greek* only, and came out in 1530. Of this Number are alſo the ſame *Hermogenes* περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος, & περὶ ἰδεῶν τόμοι δύο, Printed in *Greek* alone in 1531. I here return Thanks to Mr. *Van Dale* for diſcovering to me Mr. *Chevillier's* miſtake.

(*A*) *For Printing an impious Book.*] Here is my Evidence. (*e*) "In the Year 1530 after the diſmal "and prodigious lewdneſſes related by our Hiſtorians and Doctor *Cochleus* in ſeveral places, a"roſe this abortive of Hell, who wrote a Book "againſt the Divine Juſtice in Favour of unbap"tized deceaſed Infants, of which God be thanked, "there is no more at preſent remaining than the "bare Title in *Geſner's Bibliotheque*; and ſeveral "have wiſely obſerved that the ruin of *Chriſtian* "*Wechel* and his labours was inflicted on him as a "Puniſhment for his Preſſes and Characters be"ing employed in ſuch an infamous Work. It "was this unhappy anonymous Author, who un"der the borrowed Name of *Antony Cornelius*, traced

(*e*) Garaſſe, Somme theologique p. [illegible]

" traced out the first Lineaments of this Atheistical Monster, which by little and little, like a venomous Serpent, is grown up, and by intricate Meanders crawled in amongst us ". That the Reader may know more exactly what this Book was, I am obliged to recite what Father Garasse saith of it in another place of the same piece. (a) " *The second Objection is not couched in such elegant terms as the first, but is incomparably worse and more impious than that of Symmachus, and is taken out of that cursed anonymous Author, who took the Name of Antonius* Cornelius, *and composed a Latin Discourse against the distributive Justice of the Creator, espousing the Cause of Infants deceased before Baptism, and pleading pro and con, with Texts and formal Allegations of the Law, by which he condemned the Divine Justice, and called its proceeding, Unjust, Wicked, and Inhuman*——— Time, the last and most incorruptible Judge of our performances, hath discovered the impiety of this wretched Book; for *Christian Wechel* who Printed it, saw his Riches moulder away before his Eyes, without being able to stop the course of his Ruin; and God be thanked, the Book is so vanished, that there is not a single Copy to be found in Libraries, and at present, nothing but the Title is left of that infamous and abominable Work.

Several things make me doubt of the principal parts of this Story. 1. Father *Garasse* cites no Authority, and avers a Fact which is false, *viz.* that the Title of this impious Book is preserved in *Gesner's Bibliotheque*. It is certain that there is no such Person mentioned there as *Antony Cornelius*, and that he whom we find in the Epitome of that Work of *Gesner*, is not mentioned as the Author of the Tract, of which I am speaking. 2. If *Christian Wechel* had Printed a Book of this nature in 1530. had he been left undisturbed? Would he not have been more prosecuted for this attempt, than for selling a Book of *Erasmus*, whose only blemish was that of being censured as a (b) suspicious piece? Would this Printer have been suffered to flourish in *Paris* from 1530, to 1548. at least? I express my self with this restriction, because I have not been able to carry him farther than that Year, in which I find that *Conrad Gesner* dedicated a Book to him (c), and represents him in full prosperity in the City of *Paris*. 3. *Andrew Wechel* his Son so distinguished himself amongst the Printers and Booksellers of *Paris*, that it is not at all probable that his Father's Estate was so miserably impaired. 4. Lastly, it is not perfectly agreed what that accursed Book which ruin'd him was; for some aver it to be that *de tribus impostoribus*, a meer non-existent Chimerical Book, (d) if we may believe those who are best able to give an Account of things of this kind. (e), *Christus Dominus*——— *impostor atque adeo mendax & planus audivit non modo a Celso*——— *sed etiam ab impio & immemorando homine, imo Dæmone corporato, cujus* opus de tribus Magnis Impostoribus, Mose Christo, Mahumete, *exitiale fuisse Wechelo, insigni alias Typographo, sed ejus libri pestifero attactu funditus everso, referunt qui legerunt, digni fide testes. Mihi incestare oculos tam infandæ scriptionis lectione, ad ingens scelus videtur pertinere.* By these four Remarks I do not pretend to deny all Father *Garasse's* Relation; I only call in question, *Wechel's* suffering such terrible effects of the Divine wrath, for having printed a Book in 1530, and don't believe that the Dissertation concerning the Punishment of Infants, was so impious as he represents it. As for the rest I agree with him, that there was a Book entituled, *Querela infantium in limbo clausorum adversus divinum judicium, ab Ant. (f) Cornelio J. V. Lic.* If we rely upon the Title, it was printed at *Paris* by *Christian Wechel*, in 1531. in 4to. There are two Copies (g) of it in the Archbishop of *Rheims's* Library. Without having read this Tract, I conjecture that it is not impious, and that it is like that of *Bartolus de Saxoferrato*, and that of *Jacobus de Ancharana*. The first of these Civilians is Author of a piece intitl'd, *Processus Sathanæ contra D. Virginem coram Judice Jesu*: And the other of a Treatise call'd *Processus Luciferi contra Jesum coram Judice Salomone*. They introduce the Devil engaging in a Law-suit, observing the Formalities of the Bar, and consequently urging all his Reasons. Is it possible to represent him speaking without making him utter impieties? And yet these two Books are not impious. Every thing ends in the confusion of the Plaintiff.

Since the first Edition of this Dictionary, I have read the Book in question (h). The entire Title of which runs thus: *Exactissima infantium in limbo clausorum querela adversus divinum judicium apud æquum judicem proposita. Apologia divini judicii contra querelam infantium. Infantium ad apologiam divini judicii responsio. Æqui judicis super hac re sententia. Autore Antonio Cornelio juris utriusque Licentiato Doctiss. Lutetiæ apud Christianum Wechelum in vico Jacobæo sub scuto Basiliensi, anno M. D. XXXI. mense Januario.* This Tract about 70 pages in 4to, was dedicated by the Author to *Antony du Bourg* (i) Lieutenant Civil at *Paris*, and (k) President of the Council of *Louise* of *Savoy*, Mother of *Francis* the I. The Epistle Dedicatory is very short, and precedes a Preface which is a little longer, and dated at *Paris* the 2d of *January* 1531. *Antony Cornelius* acknowledges his great Obligations to the Person to whom he dedicates his Book, and that he undertook that performance at the request of one of his Friends, who knew that he had dreamed that the Infants detained in *limbo*, complain of being disinherited contrary to the Law *Plautius*, which lays down that *neminem ex facto alterius exhæredari posse*. He declares that their Complaints (l) are ill grounded. Where is then the Impiety? Doth it consist in his citing some Passages of the Scripture, and of the Civil and Canon-Laws which favour the Infants Cause? Does he not alledge some that are contrary to them? and at last, after their reply, doth not he bring in the following definitive Sentence? *Pensitatis diligentissime in utramque partem legibus, censeo infantes injuste de divino judicio queri per lex. in c. regenerante de consec. dist. iiii. fallit dicit lex. & fallitur qui parvulos non baptisatos prædicat in condemnatione non futuros, cum dicat Apostolus ob unius delictum omnes homines damnari.*

A REFLECTION upon the Complaints of some Persons against those, who represent the Objections of the Libertins with all their force.

Thus we see with what temerity Father *Garasse* mentions *Antony Cornelius's* Book. Who can be sufficiently surprized at his Blunder? Perhaps some may reply to me that the Infants Objections are carried too far, and that it makes the Faith of their Advocate suspected. I should not vouchsafe an Answer to this Scruple, if I was not sensible, that it is in the Mouths of an infinite number of People, and objected against those who, without any disguise, fairly represent the Arguments of Hereticks or Libertins. Give me leave to answer those Gentlemen with this Question: If you were obliged to examin some of the Controversies in agitation betwixt the Faithful and the Infidels, would you to the utmost of your knowledge, represent whatever the last could urge with the greatest force in favour of their Opinions? Or would you designedly weaken their Arguments, that your Readers might meet with nothing to render the Victory dubious? You will undoubtedly answer me, that you would do the first of these two things, and that the second is a Fraud utterly unworthy of a Man of Honour, and much less excusable in a Servant of God. Wherefore then are you surprized to see the Objections of the Impious represented with all the force which natural Reason gives them? You say you would do it your self, if you were to refute them, and you agree that swerving from this Rule, is to incur the Guilt of an ignominious Fraud. Learn then not to take all those for Prevaricators, who fairly shew the beautiful side of their Adversaries Cause; and if they are obliged to confess that nothing but the Scripture can furnish Arms against certain Objections of the Impious, and that they recur to it as to the immovable Foundation of their Faith, be very well contented with their Conduct; for otherwise, the World will be apt to distrust you, and to suppose that you endeavour to triumph by the assistance of a train his Son (B) was alſo a very extraordinary Printer. He retired from † *Paris* to *Francfort*; ſome Writers ſay, that it was * after the *Paris* Maſſacre. See the Remark *B*.

(a) Ib. pag. [illegible]

(b) Cum libellum Erasmi de esu carnium, ab Academia Parisiensi tanquam suspectum reprobatum, Christianus Wechelus vendendum exposuisset. Chevillier, Orig. de l'Imprimerie, pag. 353.

(c) *The 13th Book of his Pandects.*

(d) *See the Article* Aretin (Peter) *Remark* F.

(e) Theophilus Raynaud, Hoplotheca, sect. 2. serie 2. cap. 14. pag. 259, 260.

(f) *See* Bibliotheca Telleriana, p. 160. *He is there called* Cornelius, pag. 422. *and in the Index.*

(g) *What* Garasse *affirms is not therefore true, that it is wholly lost.*

(h) *Mr. Bourdelot has been pleased to lend it me from Paris.*

(i) Antonio Burgo judici civili apud Parisienses.

(k) Præsidi sacri Consistorii illustriss. D. Lodovicæ Galliarum gubernatricis.

(l) Non quod dubitem pueros illos justa pœna condemnatos. Anton. Cornelius in præfat.

WEIDNERUS (*Paul*) a Jewiſh Phyſician in the XVI. Century, who was invited from *Udine* a City in *Italy*, to practiſe Phyſick in *Carinthia*, where he ſtayed ſix Years, receiving a very handſom Penſion from the Publick. During this time he conceived ſome Doubts concerning his Religion, which obliged him to compare the Old and the New Teſtament together, and diligently to examin the Expoſitions of the Rabbins; and being convinced by this courſe of reading that JESUS CHRIST is the Meſſias, he reſolved to embrace the Chriſtian Faith. Notwithſtanding which, he wavered for about the ſpace of one Year after this full ‖ Coviction, and

carefully

---

train of Military Stratagems, which are inconſiſtent with the Goſpel.

Not long ſince, I diſcovered one of the Cauſes, which prompt a great many People to ſuſpect thoſe of Libertiniſm, who propoſe the Libertines Objections with their full force. A very honeſt and truly religious Man, a few days ago, mentioning ſome Writers, whoſe Zeal for the good Cauſe is known to the whole World, told me; you don't find the Enemies of Truth offering any thing conſiderable in their Books, the Objections of the Infidels are offered in few words in their Works, and they are amply and victoriouſly refuted: but in ſuch and ſuch Writers who do not paſs for great Zealots, they appear very prolix and more formidable than the Anſwer. In anſwer to this, I made uſe of the ſame Queſtion as above. Did thoſe zealous Writers know all that appears in the leſs zealous Authors, or were they ignorant of it? If the latter, they are not to be praiſed for their Silence, nor for their Victory. But if the firſt, they deſerve a ſevere Cenſure, as being guilty of a pious Fraud, which Truth ought never to ſtand in need of; and I am very ſure that they dare not own that they have ſtifled the leaſt particular, which might be aſſiſtant to the beautiful appearance of their Enemies Objections. Wherein then doth their Zeal ſurpaſs the leſs devout Writer, whom you was ſpeaking of? They ſaid all they could in favour of their Adverſary before they anſwer'd him; hath the leſs zealous Author done more?

(B) Andrew **WECHEL**, *his Son, was alſo a very extraordinary Printer*] I have read in the Hiſtory of (a) Printing. Firſt, *That he was obliged to retire to* Francfort, *under the protection of the Count of* Hanaw, *on account of his Religion about the Year* 1573. In the ſecond place, *that his Son* John *who was married to one of the Daughters of* (b) Jerome Drouart, *Bookſeller at* Paris, *going to* Francfort *with his Father, carried with him half the Impreſſion of* Polybii opera Gr. Lat. cum notis Casauboni *in folio in* 1609. *Which is the reaſon why ſome Copies of* Polybius *are to be ſeen with his Name to 'em, tho' it be the ſame Edition with that of* Paris. Thidly, That *Andrew Wechel* dyed at *Francfort* towards the end of the Year 1600. In the Fourth place, That *his Son* John *printed alſo in the ſaid City of* Francfort *in* 1583. *and afterwards* Diodori Siculi Biblioth. Hiſtoriæ Gr. Lat. *in* 1604. *and other Books which procured him the Reputation of one of the moſt able Printers and Bookſellers of his time.* On the firſt of theſe four things I obſerve, that *Francfort* being a Republick, not in the leaſt depending on the Counts of *Hanaw*, it is not at all likely that *Andrew Wechel* ſhould, in that City, have put himſelf under the Protection of thoſe Counts. Perhaps the time is here confounded, at leaſt it is very certain that *Wechel*'s Heirs kept Printing-Houſes at *Hanaw* towards the beginning of the XVII. Century, and it was then that they put themſelves under the protection of the Count of *Hanau*. On the 2d Head I obſerve that *Caſaubon* was not yet 15 years old, when *John Wechel* retired with his Father to *Francfort towards the year* 1573. Wherefore it is impoſſible that this Printer ſhould have carried with him half the Impreſſion of *Caſaubon*'s *Polybius*. On the 3d. I obſerve that *Andrew Weckel* died the firſt of *November* in 1581, as may be inferred from the Preface which *John Opſopæus* his Corrector prefixed to *Peter Ramus* his Commentaries on ſome of *Cicero*'s Orations Printed at *Francfort apud hæredes Andreæ Wecheli in* 1582. To conclude, I ſay on the 4th Head, that his Heirs who continued the Printing Trade, were *Claudius Marni*, and *John Aubri*: which plainly ſhews, that *John Wechel* was not what the Author of the *Hiſtory of Printing* repreſents him. The Edition of *Diodorus Siculus* in 1604, was Printed by *Claudius Marni*, and the Sons of *John Aubri*.

Obſerve that *Opſopæus* (c) ſpeaking of the Heirs of *Andrew Wechel*, mentions only *Claudius Marni*, and *John Aubri*, the Sons in Law of that Printer; which obliges me to renounce the Opinion I once was of, that *John Wechel* was the Son of *Andrew*. An Epiſtle of *Frederick Sylburgius*, dated the 20th of *June* (d) in 1587, informs me, that he did not lodge in the Houſe of *John Wechel*, but with *John Aubri*. After whoſe death, the Names of his Sons appeared in the Title Pages of Books, joined with that of *Claudius Marni*, with whom they had ſeveral Diſputes. (e) *Aubriani rationes reddi ſibi a Marnio volunt, & hæreditatem prorſus dividi; adeo ut aliquoties officina claudi debuerit, quam alias inter has occupationes ad calculos ſedere quiete nequeant.* It is certain, that what was called *typos Wechelianos, or typographiam Wechelianam*, was under the direction of the *Marni*'s and *the Aubri*'s. During which time *John Wechel* Printed apart. I have, amongſt other Books Printed by him, the *Paraphraſe* and *Scholia* of *Monlorius in Ariſtotelis analyticorum priorum, ſeu de ratiocinatione libros duos*, together with the ſame *Monlorius*'s Tract *De Entelechia, & de Univerſis, Francofurti in officina typographica Joannis Wecheli* 1593.

There is a groſs error in the *French* Tranſlation of *Bongars*'s Letters; there we find the following Words: *I have writ to* Wechel's *Man to take great care of them* which anſwer to this *Latin*, (f) *commendavi eas Aubrio Wecheliano.* And theſe: *I have ordered one of* Wechel's *Men to ſend you the Tract which you deſire*, for (g) *libellum de Morbinis juſſu meo mittet ad te Marnius Wechelianus.* *Bongars* wrote this in 1597, and his Tranſlator hath made him ſpeak as if *Wechel* had been alive then, not knowing that the Original expreſſed the Names of his Sons-in-Law.

To Conlcude, I have very good reaſons to believe, that *Andrew Wechel* left *France* before the Maſſacre. I find in *Melchior Adam*, that *Lawrence Zincgref* was very uneaſie at *Paris* in 1569. on account of Money remitted to him, which was intercepted in *Wechel*'s Hands. He adds that *Wechel* was baniſhed the Kingdom, that all his Effects were confiſcated, and that the greateſt part of his Books being Proteſtant, were ſeized and carried away from his Shop, in order to be publickly burnt. (h) *Multa hoc in itinere perpeſſus eſt indigna* (Zincgrefius) *tum propter alia incommoda, tum propter rei pecuniariæ penuriam: cum inter peregrinos agens a patre nihil acciperet: & illa, quæ ex principum liberalitate, nec non ſecretò a matre tranſmiſſa fuerant, interciperentur apud* Wechelium, *Bibliopolam notiſſimum; quippe cujus bona omnia confiſcata fuerant, ipſo regni limitibus proſcripto, reliquiſque ut plurimum Proteſtantium libris ab officinâ illius, Lutetiæ publicè combuſtis.* *Zincgref* agreed with the *Wechels* to take in payment ſeveral of the Books (i),

which

(a) *Written by* John de la Caille, *and Printed at* Paris *in* 1689.

(b) *The Author ſays* pag. 208. *that it is an Error, and that this* Jerom *was never married.*

(f) Bongarſ. epiſt. 163. pag. m. 580. (g) Idem epiſt. 575. (h) Melch. Adam. in vit. Juriſ. conſ. pag. 431. (i) Wechelianis tranſigere, proque pecuniâ ſibi debita libros nullos, quos clam adhuc illi ſervarant, ac confiſcatoribus Regiis ſubduxerant, ſumere coactus fuit. Id. ibid.

carefully concealed his Thoughts, not (Z) being ignorant of the Dangers to which he ſhould expoſe himſelf, if he let the *Jews* know the ſtate of his ſoul; but at laſt the Intereſt of his Salvation, prevailed on the conſideration of the Fleſh. And leaving *Carinthia*, he removed to *Vienna*, where together with his Wife and four Children he was Baptiſed in St. *Stephen's* Church, on the 15th of *Auguſt* 155*. He was made Hebrew Profeſſor in the Univerſity of *Vienna*, and Publiſhed ſomething concerning the Motives of his Converſion, and to Refute Judaiſm ||.

WESALIA, (*John de*) a Doctor of Divinity in the XVth Century, who was very ill treated by the Inquiſition in *Germany*, for having taught ſome Doctrines which diſguſted the Catholicks. It is pretended that his (*A*) Converſation with ſome Jews diſordered his Head, and occaſioned his falling into ſeveral Extravagancies. He was a famous Preacher, which the Monks, eſpecially the *Thomiſts*, did not love, and accordingly they were the principal Authors of the Perſecutions which he ſuffered. They accuſed him for certain Propoſitions which they had heard him deliver in the Pulpit; and * conſtrained the Archbiſhop of *Mentz*

which they had ſaved from the Inquiſition. He afterwards received ſome other Money, and went to *Orleans*, where he was admitted Doctor of the Civil Law in 1570. (*a*) All theſe things happened before the *Paris* Maſſacre.

Notwithſtanding all this, it is moſt certain that *Andrew Wechel* was at *Paris* on this Cruel Day. He fled into *Germany* in the year 1569, when thoſe Troubles were brought on him which *Melchior Adam* relates, in which he had periſhed (*b*) if the Preſident *de Harlai* had not done him good ſervice. He returned to *Paris*, and re-eſtabliſhed his Printing-houſe there, in the (*c*) beginning of *June* 1571. He himſelf (*d*) relates the danger in which he was the Night of the Maſſacre, and how he was ſaved by *Hubert Languet*, who lodged in his Houſe. He teſtifies his gratitude to him in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Albert Krantzius's Vandalia*.

(Z) *Not being ignorant of the dangers to which he ſhould expoſe himſelf.*] To be firmly perſuaded that a Religion is true, to reſolve to profeſs it, and ſuffer a great many Conflicts of Mind before the execution of ſuch a Reſolution, are not incompatible things. Wherefore we ought not to charge *Weidnerus* with inſincerity. There are very few Deſigns, the execution of which is more perplexed than that of the change of Religion; for not to mention other Obſtacles, don't we know that we ſhall thereby anger the Perſons whom we love and reſpect moſt? Don't we know that we ſhall become odious and Infamous to our Relations? I ſay infamous, by reaſon that all Nations are uſed to fix an infamous Idea on any Man's quitting his Religion. They are not contented with calling him a Revolted, an Apoſtate, but he muſt alſo be called a Renegade (*e*). They aver, that his revolt is an ignominious Blemiſh to his Family, and I have ſeen a devout Woman who ſaid very ſeriouſly, that ſhe had rather ſee her Siſters common Whores, than go to Maſs. Theſe hideous Notions are neceſſary to the temporal good of a Communion, whence it proceeds that they are fomented. A Caſuiſt will not think it ill for a Father to turn his Sons out of doors if they apoſtatize, or that in the like caſe, one Brother ſhould never ſee the other, and a Man ſhould abhor his Wife, or a Woman abhor her Husband. The Proteſtants charge this ſort of Perſecution on the Catholicks, who alſo (*f*) on their ſide, reproach the Proteſtants for it. However, it is certain that this Cuſtom very frequently ſerves as a Scare-crow to thoſe who are perſuaded, that they ought to quit the Church in which they have been educated. Here follows a paſſage of Mr. *Arnauld* on this Head. *The deſign of changing ones Religion carries with it ſomething ſtupendous*, ſaith he (*g*), *and even thoſe who are fully reſolved to execute it, can hardly bring themſelves to it*——— *I know that a young Lady, the Daughter of a very zealous Huguenot concealed her being a Catholick for ſeven years from her Father; and during that whole ſpace of time, ſhe accompanied him to the Sermon and Service, only abſtaining from the Sacrament, out of fear that he ſhould die for grief at the news of it. She cauſed me to be conſulted in this caſe, and being informed that I did not approve of the diſſimulation, ſhe reſolved, tho' with a great deal of difficulty, to diſcover her ſelf*———*There may be alſo ſome, as it was in Saint* Auguſtin's *time, who are throughly convinced of the truth of the Catholick Religion, but cannot break the Bonds of cuſtom which drags them to the Proteſtant Aſſemblies, nor expoſe themſelves to the reproach which they fear from their Relations and Friends, on account of their change, unleſs ſome other Reaſon of Human Conſideration, contrary to thoſe which I have mention'd, counterballances them, and hindering the impreſſion which they make on their Minds, enables them to follow the more eaſily the Truth of which they are convinced.* There are ſome Communities, which believe themſelves ſo much diſgraced by the Apoſtacy of a Monk of Merit, and are ſo afraid that it ſhould prove a fatal Scandal to the Faith of the weak, as well as too great a ſubject of Triumph to the contrary Party, that they would leave no means unattempted againſt any Perſon who diſcovers the leaſt deſign to deſert them. The *Jews* are of the ſame nature. Would they not have murthered *Spinoza*? And did they not attempt to deſtroy our *Weidnerus* after his Converſion? *Porro*, ſaith he (*h*), *ſimulatque res celari amplius non potuit, protinus a meis ſecundum carnem non mediocria propter fidei Chriſtianæ ſuſpicionem exſpectare pericula cogebar, quæ proh dolor! in hunc uſque diem mihi intentari video & experior.* Let us not forget a very terrible ſort of Perſecution againſt thoſe, who change their Religion. They are loaded with defamatory Libels; their whole lives are ſtrictly examined; and if any blemiſhes can be found, they are repreſented to the Publick with all manner of Artifice in the moſt hyperbolical manner. The leaſt ſlips of Youth are never forgiven them. If they have written any private Letters in confidence to their Friends, which may injure their Reputation, they are publiſhed. In a word, for the intereſt of the Cauſe, and to diſcredit the Authority of the Change, no ſcruple is made to enhaunce to a gigantick bulk thoſe very things, which would never have deprived them of the Eſteem and Affection of any one Perſon in the World, provided they had not changed their Religion.

(*A*) *His Converſation with ſome Jews.*] The Plague having obliged him to leave *Mentz*, he retired to *Worms*, where he frequented the Jews company, as a Rabbi converted to Chriſtianity, informed *Orthuinus Gratius*. This Rabbi (*i*) was *Victor de Carben*, who embraced the Chriſtian Faith in the Year 1515. being 42 years of age, and became a Prieſt, and died at the age of 92. He wrote ſome Tracts in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin and the Church, which *Orthuinus Gratius* turned into Latin. *Is Victor quum Achillice adhuc valeret, mibi ſæpius retulit prætactum Johannem Weſalienſem è Moguntia ob peſtis metum Wormaciam ſe contuliſſe, atque ibidem cum Judæis Chriſti inimicis frequentem habuiſſe converſationem, cumque ab illis deceptum in putidam errorum ſentinam corruiſſe* (*k*). There is no manner of appearance of Truth in this Story; for the Doctrines, for which *John de Weſalia* was condemned by the Inquiſition, did not at all favour of Judaiſm.

|| Taken from the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Emperor Ferdinand, prefixed to [illegible] Printed at *Vienna*, in the Year 1559. See *John Henichius* Profeſſor of Divinity at Rinteln, [illegible] Religionis Chriſtianæ pag. 365, & ſeq.

* See the Remark B.

(*a*) Id. ib. pag. 422.

(*b*) Languet. epiſt. ad Camerarium patrem, p. 10.

(*c*) Id. epiſt. 55. ad eundem, pag. 164.

(*d*) In the *Epiſtle dedicatory* of Albert Krantzius's Vandalia *Printed at* Francfort 1575.

(*e*) *That name was used among the Proteſtants in ſome Places* of France, *to denote thoſe who turn'd Papiſts.*

(*f*) *See M.* Bruey's *Book intituled*, Reponſe aux plaintes des Proteſtans. *It is mention'd in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres *for the Year* 1686. *See the* 879th pag. *of thoſe* Nouvelles.

(*g*) Arnauld, Apologie pour les Catholiques 2. part, chap. 12. pag. 240. 241.

(*h*) Weidnerus, epiſt. dedicat. ad Ferdinandum.

(*i*) Orthuinus Gratius, in Faſciculo rerum expetend. & fugiendar. p. 325. edit. Londin. 1690.

(*k*) Id. ib.

Mentz to proceed against him. That Prelate unwilling (*B*) to expose himself once more to the indignation of the Court of *Rome*, convoked an Assembly of Doctors in 1479. *John de Wesalia*, who was then a Prisoner in the Convent of the *Cordeliers* at *Mentz*, was interrogated by *John Elten* the Inquisitor, who was President of this Assembly. He answer'd in the Negative, to most of the Questions put to him, and seemed a little to evade some others. Wherefore on the next day, the Inquisitor declared (*C*) with a great deal of Eloquence, that he ought to be interrogated once more. His Answers were much the same with those of the fore-going day; but he suffered the confusion of being convicted out of his (*D*) own Writings, of having taught Principles which he had denied in answering the Inquisitor. He submitted to the Punishment imposed on him, which was to retract before all the People. His Books were burnt, but some Doctors thought that this (*E*) Venerable Old Man was used too severely, and that Monkish Passion had a great share in this Affair †. He was confined to perpetual Penance in a Monastery of *Augustins*, where he died soon after *. The Protestants have placed him in their List of the Witnesses of Truth; which I am not surprized at, for he was condemned for several Doctrines which they have since taught. What (*F*) *Coeffeteau* offers in Answer to this, hath no manner of Solidity. *Wesalia* taught at ‖ *Erford*. Consult the Article WESTPHALUS (*John*).

WESSE-

(*B*) *To expose himself once more to the indignation of the Court of Rome.*] The liberty which he had taken of condemning the Avarice of that Court had been fatal to him, and was the cause that not only he was deprived of his Archbishoprick, but *Mentz* was destroyed. The following Passage expresses his Name and Family; (*a*) *Reverendissimus præsul Moguntinus Dietherus Isenburgius misit literas ad Universitatem Heidelbergensem & Coloniensem instigantibus, imo cogentibus Thomistis quibusdam: veritus ne denuo ab episcopatu ejiceretur jussu Romani Pontificis, quod commeruerat ante levibus verbis Romanorum in vendendo palliis notata avaritia. Et minabantur ei Romani præsulis iram, quam pridem non tam ipse fuerat expertus, quam tota Moguntia & capta & direpta, ac à victoribus nullum non contumeliarum genus passa. Unde ferunt Pium Pontificem ad Moguntiæ mentionem semper ingemuisse, quod jus suum tam insigni damno vindicasset.* We ought not to be surprized that the Agents of the Inquisition, are so greedy of rendring People suspicious, and amplifying things by malicious interpretations; for those who find themselves suspected, are afraid of losing their Posts if they have any, and break out into a thousand Violences, in order to take off the ill impressions concerning them already made. The Inquisitors do very well know that their odious Slanders will produce this effect; wherefore they never make any scruple of Calumny. To how many People may justly be applied this saying of *Horace*, (*b*) *You design to silence Envy by forsaking Virtue?*

(*C*) *On the next day, the Inquisitor declared with a great deal of Eloquence.*] Those who shall read his Speech on that occasion, need not be advertised that I here speak ironically. (*c*) *Adducto Johanne de Wesalia, dixit Inquisitor: Tria jam futura in hoc actu. Primum quia M. Johannes hesterna die non satis resolutus ad certos responderit articulos, iterum sibi illis proponendos esse, ut luculenter & clare, plus masticando, responderet: deinde ad quosdam alios articulos heri non auditos quid sentiat, respondere deberet: tertio relegi debere omnes articulos principaliores cum responsionibus, ut audiatur si adhuc in illis velit persistere aut ab illis resilire.*

(*D*) *Of being convicted out of his own Writings.*] This poor Man broken by Age and Diseases, was not able to express his Thoughts before such a dreadful Tribunal, and perhaps did not remember all that he had written. The Inquisitors clearly foresaw his negative Plea; and for that reason were not content with binding him by the most solemn Oaths, (*d*) but first of all were resolved to be possessed of all his Papers. (*e*) *Conclusum quod M. N. Wesalia jusjurandum facere deberet, quod præsentare & tradere vellet omnes tractatus, opera, scripta sua qualiacunque quæ condidisset, ut per proprios sermones vinceretur*——— *Adjungebatur quod doctores Heidelbergenses cum tribus aliis, scilicet Naeno, decano Sancti Victoris, & quodam alio perspicerent tractatus ejus, errores excerperent, dearticularent.* Whence it was very easie to convict him of those points which he improperly denied. (*f*) *Dum certas propositiones negasset se scripsisse, tractatus sui propria manu inscripti ei præsentabantur, quam revera literam esse suam non valuit negare.*

(*E*) *Was used too severely, and that Monkish Passion, &c.*] 'Tis testified by the Anonymous Author of the Verbal Process; who was present during the whole proceedings. *Dempto solo articulo*, saith he (*g*), *de processione Spiritus Sancti in aliis videtur non ita gravi censura fuisse castigandus, si induciæ datæ fuissent, si consultores ei fuissent adhibiti, si non omnes uno solo dempto, fuissent de via realium. Et nisi forsitan impetus quidam irrepsisset in religiosos triumphandi de seculari, & præsertim de eo qui illorum Thomam peculiariter non coluerat, forsitan poterat cum eo mitius, humanius, & clementius benigniusque actum & processum fuisse. Deum testor qui omnia novit hunc processum qui cum eo servatus fuit usque ad revocationem & librorum suorum exustionem, vehementissime displicuisse Magistro Engelino de Brunsuico, maximo Theologo, & Magistro Joanni Keisersbergio, duobus utique viris cum doctis, tum integris. Præcipue Magistro Engelino visum fuit nimis præcipitanter cum tanto viro actum esse. Immo non verebatur asserere multos articulos ejus, & majorem partem posse sustineri. Nec obticuit de simultate Thomistarum contra Modernos, & de gaudio triumphandi religiosorum contra seculares.* He adds, That the Devil sowed the Tares of division betwixt the Divines and Philosophers, and so alienated their Minds, that if any person denied the reality of Universals, he was immediately thought to have sinned against the Holy Ghost, and to be guilty of a mortal Sin against God, Christianity, Justice, and the State. Can this Blindness proceed from any other cause but the Devil, who, in order to pervert us from all that is good, indears us to vain speculations, which neither inspire Devotion towards God, nor Charity towards ones Neighbour? *Unde* (*h*) *hæc cæcitas mentis ni a diabolo? Qui ne utiliora, ne honestiora, ne moribus, virtutibus & saluti animarum conducentia discamus, phantasias nostras illudit, & trahit ad res minus salutares, & ad gelidas harum intentionum speculationes, quibus neque ad Deum devoti reddimur, neque ad proximi dilectionem inflammamur.* This Reflection is very just, and sufficient to mortify not only the Realists and Nominalists, but also other Factions.

(*F*) *What* Coeffeteau *offers in answer.*] *Du Plessis Mornai did not forget to say that* (*i*) John de Vesalia, *Doctor and Preacher at* Worms, *was accused before the Inquisitors of having maintained, That the Prelates had no Authority to institute new Laws in the Church, but to persuade the Faithful to observe the Gospel Precepts* (*k*), &c.

Coeffeteau

---

† Taken from [illegible] m & fugiendarum, pag. 325 & seq. edit. Lovaniensi. [illegible]

* Trithemius in Chronico

(*a*) Auctor [illegible] Magistralis ac Thomistici [illegible] Joh. de Wesalia, apud Orthuinum Gratium ibid. pag. 327.

(*b*) Invidiam placare paras virtute relicta. Horat. Sat. 3. lib. 2. vers. 13.

(*c*) Auctor Exam. Magistral. apud Orth. Gratium, pag. 330.

(*d*) Mandavit eidem Johanni (Inquisitor) sub poena obedientiæ, in virtute Sancti Spiritus, sub poena excommunicationis latæ sententiæ (à quo nemo habeat ipsum absolvere nisi solus Papa, vel ipse Inquisitor, nisi in articulo mortis) ut diceret plane verba veritatis super interrogandis de sua fide, sine ambagibus, sine verborum sophisticatione. Ib. pag. 328. *They made him declare that by virtue of that Oath, he thought himself bound to speak the Truth even against himself; and that if he failed in it, he would incur the Punishment of Excommunication, and commit a mortal Sin.*

(*e*) Idem Auctor Examinis apud eumdem pag. 327.

WESSELUS (JOHN) one of the moſt Learned Men of the XV. *Century*, was Born at *Groningen* about the Year (*A*) 1419. and loſing his Father and Mother in his infancy, was Educated by the care of a good Lady, who having an only Son cauſed him to ſtudy with him. She ſent them both to *Zwol*, where there was a College, which was more eſteemed than that of *Groningen*. It was a Society of Regular Prieſts of St. *Jerome*, where Youth were inſtructed. All theſe that were Educated there were ſhaven like Prieſts and wore the Religious Habit; but when they quitted the College they were free to wear what Habit they pleaſed. So that tho' *Weſſelus* wore the Cowl whilſt he ſtudied at *Zwol*, yet there is no Reaſon to infer from thence that he was a Monk, ſince it is certain that (*B*) he never engaged in a Monaſtical life. It is indeed true that in his Youngeſt Years he had ſome thoughts which tended that way, but he refrained them as ſoon as he perceived that ſort of life charged with ſome ſhocking Superſtitions, and at laſt the Inclination wore off. As his great natural Parts were attended with an incredible Application to ſtudy, he made a conſiderable Progreſs in Learning at *Zwol*, and publickly inſtructed others there. He left that City in order to continue his ſtudies at *Cologne*, where he improved to ſuch a degree of Learning as not only rendred him highly admired, but ſuſpected of Heterodoxy. He conſulted the

Coeffeteau having in a different manner repreſented the Opinions of this Man, ſuch, ſaith he (*a*), *as the Proteſtants themſelves relate them*, exclaims thus, “(*b*) Theſe are the extravagancies of the Preacher of *Worms*, amongſt which *du Pleſſis* hath left out thoſe, which he found contrary as well to his own as the Catholick Doctrine; Namely the Article of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit from the perſon of the Son as well as the Father, which the Latin Church always aſſerted againſt the *Greek*. And it is certain that thoſe whom *du Pleſſis* alledges, who ſupported him againſt the *Thomiſts*, own'd that he erred in this Article; and as to moſt of the other Points, he denied the aſſertion of ſome, and endeavoured to explain others. But afterwards he publickly recanted in the Church Yard at *Mentz* in preſence of the Arch-Biſhop and ſeveral eminent Doctors of the Univerſities of *Mentz*, *Cologne*, and *Heidelberg*; beſides which according to *Trithemius*, his Books and Writings were committed to the Flames, and he in perpetual penance confined in an *Auguſtin* Monaſtery, where he dyed ſoon after. Thus it appears what the *Saumur* Witneſſes are. The Reader will remember that the Proteſtant Author, from whom we have cited the heads of his Doctrine, hath couched them according to his particular fancy, in order to make them look leſs odious and more plauſible. *Trithemius* adds that he aſſerted *that there was not, nor never had been any ſuch thing as Original Sin, and that Children were not conceived in Original Sin.* He alſo relates the other Articles quite differently from the Proteſtant, who hath perverted the *Abbot* of *Urſperg*'s Chronicle, from whence thoſe who furniſhed *du Pleſſis* with them, made their extracts.” *Rivet* replyed in favour of *du Pleſſis*, that it is true that *John de Weſalia* (*c*) *agreed with the* Greek *Church on the Article of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, but that in his other Propoſitions to the Number of 23. *he taxed the ſame Errors which the Proteſtants have charged, and this according to the enumeration, and relation not of a Proteſtant, as* Coeffeteau *falſely avers, but of a bigotted* (*d*) *Papiſt who uſes the following expreſſions,* impios Waldenſes, impiorem Weſalienſem, impiiſſimum Wiclefum, *to ſhew that he did not at all favour of Proteſtantiſm, and ſpeaking of this Poor Old Man he reproaches him with Childiſh dotage.* In general, *Rivet* was in the right, for *John de Weſalia*'s Propoſitions cited by *du Pleſſis* are in a Book of *Orthuinus Gratius* a very good Papiſt; but he was in the wrong to charge *Coeffeteau* with pretending here that *Orthuinus* was a Proteſtant. *Coeffeteau* did not cite the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum*, but only the Continuator of the *Abbot* of *Urſperg*. It is at page 1188. and 1189. that he ſays that the Author of the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum* was a Proteſtant and a *Lutheran*. *Rivet* (*e*) had a great deal of Reaſon to correct him here.

Obſerve by the by that the Author of the *Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme* hath been cenſured for alledging the *Abbot* of *Urſperg*'s Continuator in evidence. He hath been told (*f*) that *it is very well known that the Publiſher of this Work was* Cratomelius *of* Schleſtad, *one of Melancthon's Pupils*. I believe the Cenſurer meant *Crato Mylius*, for that is the Name of the Bookſeller who publiſhed in 1573. the Abbot of *Urſperg*'s Chronicle Corrected and continued by *Gaſpar Hedion* Miniſter of *Strasburg*. See the Epitome (*g*) of *Geſner*'s Bibliotheque, and the firſt Tome of the (*h*) *Obſervationes ſelectæ* Printed at *Hall* in 1700.

(*A*) *Was Born at Groningen about the Year 1419.*] Others (*i*) place his Birth about the Year 1400. But it is probable that they are miſtaken, ſince two Authors of *Frieſland* ſay that he died in 1489. at 70 Years of Age (*k*). If we believe *Geldenhaur*, he lived above 90 Years, and his ſight remained ſo good to the laſt that he never made uſe of Spectacles either to write or Read: (*l*) *Geldenhaurius nonageſimum eum annum ſuperaſſe narrat, integro viſu & auditu, ita ut nunquam perſpicillis uſus ſit, minutiſſimaſque literas & commode legeret, & pulchre ipſe pingeret.* *Hardenbergius* doth not confirm this, but on the contrary ſaith that *Weſſelus*, having never had good Eyes, they grew ſo weak in his old Age, that the continual blunders occaſioned by his bad ſight, in Reading the Scripture before the Monks, rendred him the jeſt of his Auditors. (*m*) *At quod ad viſum, Hardenbergius hebetiuſculum eum fuiſſe, & ſenio quoque caligare oculis cœpiſſe tradit, ut cum ſemper die Cœnæ Dominicæ in Cœtu Fratrum veſperi pro collatione, ut illi vocant, legeret ſermonem Domini in Cœna habitum a cap. Joh. 13. uſque ad 18. frequenter a textu aberrans a Monachis ridéretur.* As for the Age beſtowed on him by *Geldenhaur*, it is thus refuted (*n*): *Quod vero ad ætatem, Suffridus Petri & Regnerus Prædinius, quibus ut Friſiis & in Urbe hac verſatis rectius conſtare potuit, undeſeptuaginta annos vixiſſe affirmant, natum 1419. mortuum 1489.* The Regiſters of the Church where *Weſſelus* was Buried expreſs the Year of his Death, but not that of his Age: Which if they had preſerved we ſhould have been more certain of *Goldenhaur*'s or *Suffridus*'s Error (*o*). *Sepultus Groningæ, in Monaſterio, quod Spiritualium Virginum dicitur, in ipſo templi choro, non longe a ſummo altari. In libro memoriali templi illius hæc leguntur.* Anno Domini 1489 obiit Venerabilis Magiſter Weſſelus Hermanni, egregius Doctor Sacræ Theologiæ, & in Latinâ, & Græcâ, & Hebræâ linguis multùm eruditus, & in tota Philoſophia quaſi univerſalis.

(*B*) *That he never engaged in a Monaſtical life.*] This is averred and frequently (*p*) repeated in the Tract from whence I have extracted this Article: Beſides which we are there aſſured that he conſtantly reſiſted the importunities of the General of the *Cordeliers*, who preſſed him to aſſume the Habit of that order (*q*): *Is cùm eſſet eruditus & eruditorum fautor, ad ſe attraxit Weſſelum, tùm ut in diſputationibus, quarum avidiſſimus erat, & quotidiano exercitio ejus opera uteretur; tum verò ut ſuo ordinis monachum eum poſtea faceret, a quo tamen Weſſelus abhorrebat. Sed uſus præſenti fortunâ in familiam ſe ipſius dedit.* Notwithſtanding which a Learned

---

(a) Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité pag. 1214.

(b) Ibid. pag. 1215.

(c) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité, 2. part. p. 631.

(d) That is to ſay Orthuinus Gratius. See what he ſaith of John de Weſalia above Remark A. [illegible] pag. 631.

(f) Critiques des Prejugez pag. 256.

(g) At the Word [illegible] des.

(h) At page 575.

(i) As Hardenbergius, Seckendorf, Altingius &c. See Seckendorf's *Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm lib.* 1. p. 226.

(k) Vita Weſſeli in libro cui titulus effigies & vitæ profeſſorum Academiæ Groningæ & Omlandiæ pag. 12. 13. & 24.

(l) Ibid. pag. 24.

(m) Ibid.

(n) Ibid.

(o) Ibid.

(p) Cucullum monaſticum ſive Franciſcanorum ſive alius ordinis nunquam induit. *Ibid. pag.* 13. Rogatus quare non ſaltem primam tonſuram aſſumeret? dixit ſe non metuere patibulum quanto quidem tempore mentis maneret compos. Ib pag. 14.

(q) Ibid. Pag. 17.

the Originals, and there found many difficulties and Arguments by ſtarting of which he puzzled and ſuprized his Maſters. Beſides he was by no means ſatisfied with their Anſwers, * that *Ariſtotle*, Saint *Thomas*, and the Seraphical Doctor, *&c.* had ſaid this or that; and becauſe he applyed himſelf much to the ſtudy of the Platonick Philoſophy, he thereby fell into a Contempt of that of *Ariſtotle*, which rendred him very diſagreable to the Scholaſtick Profeſſors. He frequently croſſed the *Rhine*, to go to the Monaſtery of || *Duyts* in order to Read the Works of the Abbot *Rupert*, of whom he was a great admirer. He was urged to go to *Heidelberg*, to Read Divinity Lectures there, and followed that Advice; but the Directors of the Univerſity alledged that he was incapable of the Divinity Profeſſor's Chair, by Reaſon that he was not yet promoted to the (*C*) Degree of Doctor; and when he requeſted that Degree, he was anſwered that the Canons did not allow the Admiſſion of Lay-Men to that Academical degree. So that being reſolved againſt the taking of Orders, he contented himſelf with Reading Philoſophical Lectures: After which he returned to *Cologne*, from whence he went to *Louvain*, and having ſpent ſome time in hearing the Lectures of the Theological Profeſſors there, he went to *Paris*. And the Philoſophical Controverſies being then very hot betwixt the Realiſts, Formaliſts, and Nominaliſts; he endeavoured to convert the Principal Heads of the Formaliſts, by bringing them over to the Sect of the Realiſts; and afterwards, he himſelf went over to the Formaliſts, and not finding that Sect more in the right than the other, he embraced the Opinions of the Nominaliſts. Some Authors ſay, that he travelled to *Greece* and the (*D*) *Levant*, in order to ſucceed the better in Learning the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Languages. However it be, the Reputation which he acquired, procured him the particular eſteem of *Francis della Rovere*, General of the Minor Fryers, in whoſe intereſt he engaged. And if he was thereby a Witneſs of ſeveral blamable Actions, amongſt other Motives he

was

* See the Remark (B).

|| Situated over againſt Cologne, Rupert, who is called Abbas Tuitienſis, was Abbot of that Monaſtery.

---

ed Man hath given out that *Weſſelus* was a Cordelier, in the following Words. (*a*) *Wherefore Lewis* XI. *commanded* John Boucart *Biſhop of* Avranches *to take care of this reform, who being aſſiſted by a Cordelier whoſe Name was* Weſelus Gransfortius *of* Groningen, *who by his Voyages in the Levant had acquired a perfect acquaintance with* Ariſtotle *and all the good Greek Authors in each Science, aſſembled all the Principal Heads, and Members of the Univerſity, and with their concurrence and good Advice, drew up and publiſhed an Edict againſt the Nominaliſts, which we ſhall inſert intire at the end of this Chapter, as a Monument not yet Printed, very Advantageous to our* Lewis *the XI.*

(a) Naudé in his *Additions to the Hiſtory of* Lewis XI p. 193.

(*C*) *That he was not yet promoted to the degree of Doctor.*] This Objection furniſhes us with an invincible Refutation of the report of ſome Writers, that our *Weſſelus* acquired ſuch a vaſt ſtock of erudition in the Univerſity of *Cologne*, that he was made Doctor of Divinity, Law and Phyſick there. (*b*) *Geldenhaurius refert magno & aſſiduo & vix credibili labore hoc eum adſecutum eſſe, ut non ſolum Theologicæ Majeſtatis lauream mereretur, ſed etiam Juriconſultis & Medicis Doctoribus annumeraretur: adeoque ſummis in omnibus Facultatibus titulis fuit ornatus; ut vulgò quidem perhibetur. Mihi tamen vix veriſimile videtur. Si enim jam tum triplici laureâ inſignitus fuiſſet Weſſelus, quæ ratio fuerit, quod poſtea admiſſus non fuerit ab Heidelbergenſibus, nullam aliam ob cauſſam, quam quod titulo Doctoris diſtitueretur. Pro exaggeranda ergo Weſſeli viri incomparabilis eruditione hanc de tribus titulis fabulam, & plura alia, jactatam jam olim fuiſſe credo.*

(b) Vita Weſſeli pag. 14.

(*D*) *That he Travelled into* Greece *and the* Levant.] We have ſeen *Naudæus* affirming it above. Others pretend that the Name of *Baſilius* given him by ſeveral Authors, was beſtowed upon him by *Beſſarion*. They tell us that *Beſſarion* coming acquainted with our *Weſſelus* in *Greece*, at firſt by changing the U into B called him *Baſſelus*, and afterwards *Baſilius*. The Author already cited rejects theſe Traditions, and doubts whether *Weſſelus* ever was in *Greece*. His Words are: (*c*) *Hardenbergius pro Weſſelo Baſilium dictum ait, quod elegantiorum hominum auribus Weſſeli nomen nimis durum & veluti barbarum videretur: vel quod alterum quodammodo Baſilium magnum judicarent; vel quod Beſſarion Cardinalis Græcus, quo ibi amiciſſimo uſus, ſuum B per noſtrum B quam V exprimere maluerit, atque pro Weſſelo Baſſelum, ac mox Baſilium cœperit vocare. Quamvis vix videatur veriſimile aut in Græcia unquam fuiſſe Weſſelum, aut in ea familiariter uſum fuiſſe Beſſarione: cum enim hic teſte Jovio jam anno 1434. in Italia vixerit, atque anno 1439. ab Eugenio Papa creatus ſit Cardinalis, debuerit Weſſelus ante annum XV. ætatis in Græciam ad Beſſarionem abiiſſe: quod a vero abhorret.* A little farther he brings in *Weſſelus* boaſting of his Travels in *Greece*: (*d*) *In diſputationibus Theologicis magnos titulos Doctorum contemnebat, ſolis Divinis literis firmiter adhærens. Quare ſiquis forte inter diſputandum, ut fieri ſolet, ei objiceret, hoc dicit Doctor Sanctus; hoc Seraphicus &c. ipſe reſpondere ſolebat; Thomas fuit Doctor, quid tum poſtea? Et ego Doctor ſum. Thomas vix latine intellexit, & unilinguis fuit. Ego trium principalium linguarum mediocrem peritiam aſſecutus ſum. Thomas vix umbram Ariſtotelicam vidit: Ego Ariſtotelem Græcum* IN IPSA GRÆCIA DIDICI. But in the ſame Page he looks upon this Voyage as a Fiction: (*e*) *Poſtea in Græciam abiiſſe creditur; at ſi quis cogitet eo tempore non ſolum literas in Græcia jacuiſſe, ſed totam quoque regionem bello arſiſſe, & hoc confictum fuiſſe cognoſcet. Id de Petro de Aliaco quoque relatum eſt, quod Græce exacte ſciret, per decennium in Græcia vixiſſe; quamvis certum ſit nunquam Italiâ exceſſiſſe.* Let us alſo take a view of his reflection on *Weſſelus*'s Anſwer to a Scholar, who put a queſtion to him: *Stay till I return from* Egypt *a ſecond time, when your difficulty ſhall be ſolved.* My Author imagines that by *Egypt* he myſtically meant *Rome* (*f*). *In Ægyptum quoque profectus creditur Weſſelus noſter, perſuaſus omnes libros Solomonis, & totam illam glorioſam Bibliothecam Judæorum ibi adhuc ſervari: ſed reverſus ſolebat dicere;* fruſtra profectionem abſolvi. Judæi enim totam bibliothecam ſuam perdere maluerunt, quam legere quod confiteri noluerunt. *Quamvis ego ratione habitâ belli, quo eo tempore totus Oriens flagrabat, exiſtimarim Weſſelum nunquam profectionem in Ægyptum inſtituiſſe, ſed intellexiſſe Ægyptum myſticam, ſive Romanam, juxta ſtylum Sp. Sancti, atque Cantero ſignificare voluiſſe, ſe nunquam Romam rediturum eſſe. Joannes Canterus, quem ipſe inſtituerat, & præter alia artem Raimundi Lullii eum docuerat, aliquando curioſiorem quæſtionem ei propoſuit: ad quem Weſſelus:* Expecta donec ſecundò ex Ægypto rediero: tunc reſpondebo tibi; *deridens curioſitatem Canteri.* All this ſerves to ſhew us that the life of *Weſſelus* is little known, and that ſeveral falſities are reported concerning this Illuſtrious Man. A Modern Author aſſures us that he went to the River *Euphrates* on purpoſe to ſee *Ezekiel*'s Tomb, and the Ancient Library

of

(c) Ibid. pag. 12.

(d) Ibid. pag. 14.

(e) Ibid. pag. 12.

(f) Ibid. pag. 21.

was induced to it in expectation of going to Basil (E) at the time of the Council, where he did not doubt but his Master would be present. And his hopes were not vain. For he saw that Council, and made himself known to the Learned Men; he was also consulted, and admired by several publick disputes. He returned to Paris with Francis della Rovere, his Patron, and some Authors say he was persecuted even to (F) Banishment. His Master being created Pope under the Name of Sixtus IV. continued his favour to him, and offered him all sorts of Preferments; but he only asked a Copy of the Bible (G) in Hebrew and Greek, which he obtained. He left Rome and returned into his Native Country, where he got the affection and esteem of all Men. He died at Groningen on the 4th of October in 1489. He was perplexed with some doubts concerning the Christian Religion (H) during his last sickness, but they at last entirely vanished

---

of the *Jews* an evident sign of the contagious Evil which perpetuates Falsities. Let us hear this Modern (a) "The *Rabbi Benjamin* maintains that "the Prophet *Ezekiel's* Tomb on the River *Euphrates*, and the Library of the first and second "Temple were to be seen in his time, nevertheless the Sieur *Wessel* of *Groningen* and many "other great Men, who went to that Country on "purpose to see that Tomb and that Library, have "unanimously reported that neither of them were to "be found. I went thither in vain, says the "Sieur *Wessel*, since the *Jews* have rather chosen to "lose all their Books, than to read what they will "not confess.

(*E*) *In expectation of going to* Basil *at the time of the Council.*] The Author, whom I have abridged in the Text of this Article, ought to be censured here. He saith that *Wesselus* having intrigued for the Formalists in their disputes with the Realists and Nominalists, at last sided with the Nominalists. These things happened, continues he, at the time of the Council of *Basil*, when *Wesselus* was already become a Domestick to Pope *Nicolas* V. by the Recommendation of *Francis della Rovere* General of the Cordeliers, who was afterwards, *Sixtus* IV. and who founded the Vatican Library. (b) *Erant hæc sub id tempus, quo Concilium Basileense celebrabatur. Ipse autem jam pervenerat propter celeberrimam famam & incredibilem eruditionem in omni genere disciplinarum & artium in familiam Nicolai V. Pontificis Maximi, operâ Francisci a Ruvere, Generalis ministri Fratrum Minorum, qui postea Papa creatus Sixtus IV. vocatus est, primusque fundamenta jecit celebratissimæ illius Bibliothecæ, quæ a loco vulgo Vaticana vocatur* ——— (c) ——— *in qua* (familia Fr. a Ruvere) *multa digna & indigna, quædam etiam pia, sed pleraque impia vidit & expertus est. Obduruit tamen, ut per illum in notitiam omnium doctorum virorum magis magisque perveniret, & liberius sine periculo disputare posset, simulque nancisci liberam occasionem admonendi hominis de vitandis idololatricis superstitionibus & apertis obscœnitatibus monasticis: maximè verò, ut via aperiretur, quâ pervenire posset in Synodum Basileensem, in quam sciebat Franciscum, utpote totius Ordinis Supremum, vocatum iri, quod & contigit. Nam paulò post eò profectus est, & operâ Domini sui in Doctissimi cujusque notitiam pervenit, & ad multa consilia adhibitus est, & publicè aliquoties auditus disputare cum summa omnium admiratione.* There are several mistakes contained in these Words. I. The Council of *Basil* began in the Year 1431. and ended properly speaking in 1443. and therefore since the Author whom I am censuring supposes 1419 to be the Year of *Wesselus* his Birth, he cannot with any Colour of Reason say that this Doctor was very much admired at *Basil* during the Session of that Council. Observe that according to him, *Wesselus's* Journey to *Basil* was posterior to his long residence at *Cologne*, to his Journey to *Heidelberg*, to his return to *Cologne*, to his Journey to *Louvain*, as well as to *Paris*, to all his Intrigues in Favour of the Formalists against the Realists, and lastly to his turning Nominalist. If you should suppose that our *Wesselus* was not at *Basil* before the concluding Year of the Council, it were still true mention'd that he had done what I have just now before the Age of 24 Years; which cannot be said without a great absurdity, and nothing can be more false. II. *Nicolas* the fifth was not elected *Pope* before 1447. and consequently was not in the Pontifical Chair, during the Session of the Council of *Basil*. That *Pope* (d) is said to be the Founder of the *Vatican* Library. It is true that others ascribe the Glory of that Foundation to *Sixtus* IV. But it not being impossible that both may be in the right in several respects, I do not charge what our Author says on that head as a Fault. III. It is false that *Francis della Rovere* sate in the Council of *Basil* as General of the Cordeliers. He was Born in 1414. He run through his course of study by the Age of 22. and taught afterwards publickly for several Years before he was made Assistant to the General of his Order, who was succeeded by three Generals before *Francis della Rovere* attained to that dignity (e). Whence it plainly appears that it is impossible he should have been possessed of that Post during the Session of the Council of *Basil*, the conclusion of which happened in 1441. or as others will have it in 1443.

(*F*) *That he was persecuted even to Banishment.*] This particular is very uncertain: *Hardenbergius* declares that he never heard any thing of it from any of *Wesselus's* acquaintance. (f) *Cum Domino suo Francisco, Generali ministro, reversus est Lutetiam ubi mala expertus est, multa etiam passus, ita ut quidam scribant, illum Scholâ aut Urbe pulsum esse propter reprehensas superstitiones: quod tamen Hardenbergius a nemine unquam sibi auditum eorum ait, qui cum illo domesticè versati sunt. Et certum est, illum plus minus sedecim annos Parisiis versatum esse, & cum Domino suo, jam in Papam electo, unà Romam profectum. Unde non videtur verisimile, Papam & eundem Monachum & quidem Minoritanum monachum, passurum eum fuisse, si a Scholâ Theologica Parisiensi proscriptus fuisset antea. Fieri potuit, quod postea illuc reversus pulsus sit.* Observe that the Edict of *Lewis* XI. against the Nominalists is dated (g) the 1. of *March* 1473. Wherefore if it was true that *Wesselus* had been Assistant to *John Bouchart* (h) Bishop of *Avranches* in the Preliminaries of that Edict, he would have been a very considerable Man in *France*, even during the Papacy of *Sixtus* IV.

(*G*) *He only asked a Copy of the Bible.*] The *Pope* thinking this a very Ridiculous request, replyed, why don't you rather ask a Miter or something like it? Because I have no need of any such thing answered *Wesselus*. He chose the good part, but he exposed himself to the railleries of the Worldlings. (i) *Respondit Sixtus; Hæc nobis curæ erunt, tu pro te aliquid pete. Rogo ergo, inquit Wesselus, ut mihi detis ex Bibliotheca Vaticana Græca & Hebræa Biblia. Ea, inquit Sixtus, tibi dabuntur: Sed tu stulte, quare non petis Episcopatum aliquem aut simile quidpiam? Respondit Wesselus, quia iis non indigeo. Hæc ipsa Ebræa Biblia diu hæserunt Groningæ, apud virgines Spirituales, eorumque adhuc hodie quædam fragmina supersunt.* Others say that it was *Nicolas* V. of whom he asked this Present. (k) *Tantò eum promovendarum litterarum Hebraicarum studio flagrasse accepimus, ut, cùm Romam profectus Nicolao Pontifici gratissimus esset, isque amplissima* Wesselo *munera offerret, his omnibus repudiatis unicum modò petierit & obtinuerit, Biblia Hebræa MSS. sibi ut liceret e Bibliotheca Vaticana in Belgium asportare.*

(*H*) *With some doubts concerning the Christian Religion.*] These sorts of doubts more rarely occur in a Death-Bed than in the Vigour of Youth. Wherefore

(a) [illegible]

(b) Vita Wesseli pag. 17.

(c) That is wanting here is to be found above in the Remark B.

(d) See Father Jacob, Traité des bibliothèques pag. 24. Lomeier, de bibliothecis pag. 291. & seq.

(e) Taken from a Manuscript Memorial imparted by a Person whom I caused to be consulted.

(f) Vita Wesseli inter vitas Profess. Groning. pag. 17.

(g) See Naudé ubi supra pag. 223.

(h) See Naudé's Words in the Remark B.

(i) Vita Wesseli ubi supra pag. 18. This is mention'd as a thing which Wesselus had frequently related.

(k) Valer. Andreas bibl. Belg. pag. 349.

the Originals, and there found many difficulties and Arguments by ſtarting of which he puzzled and ſurprized his Maſters. Beſides he was by no means ſatisfied with their Anſwers, * that *Ariſtotle*, Saint *Thomas*, and the Seraphick Doctor, &c. had ſaid this or that; and becauſe he applyed himſelf much to the ſtudy of the Platoniſk Philoſophy, he thereby fell into a Contempt of that of *Ariſtotle*, which rendred him very diſagreeable to the Scholaſtick Profeſſors. He frequently croſſed the *Rhine*, to go to the Monaſtery of || *Duytz*, in order to Read the Works of the Abbot *Rupert*, of whom he was a great admirer. He was urged to go to *Heidelberg*, to Read Divinity Lectures there, and followed that Advice; but the Directors of the Univerſity alledged that he was uncapable of the Divinity Profeſſor's Chair, by Reaſon that he was not yet promoted to the (*C*) Degree of Doctor; and when he requeſted that Degree, he was anſwered that the Canons did not allow the Admiſſion of Lay-Men to that Academical degree. So that being reſolved againſt the taking of Orders, he contented himſelf with Reading Philoſophical Lectures: After which he returned to *Cologne*, from whence he went to *Louvain*, and having ſpent ſome time in hearing the Lectures of the Theological Profeſſors there, he went to *Paris*. And the Philoſophical Controverſies being then very hot betwixt the Realiſts, Formaliſts, and Nominaliſts; he endeavoured to convert the Principal Heads of the Formaliſts, by bringing them over to the Sect of the Realiſts; and afterwards, he himſelf went over to the Formaliſts, and not finding that Sect more in the right than the other, he embraced the Opinions of the Nominaliſts. Some Authors ſay, that he travelled to *Greece* and the (*D*) *Levant*, in order to ſucceed the better in Learning the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Languages. However it be, the Reputation which he acquired, procured him the particular eſteem of *Francis della Rovere*, General of the Minor Fryers, in whoſe intereſt he engaged. And if he was thereby a Witneſs of ſeveral blamable Actions, amongſt other Motives he

was

* See the Remark (B).

|| Situated over againſt Cologne. Rupert, who is call'd Abbas Tuitienſis, was Abbot of that Monaſtery.

---

ed Man hath given out that *Weſſelus* was a Cordelier, in the following Words. (a) *Wherefore Lewis* XI. *commanded* John Boucart *Biſhop of* Avranches *to take care of this reform, who being aſſiſted by a Cordelier whoſe Name was* Weſelus Gransfortius *of* Groningen, *who by his Voyages in the Levant had acquired a perfect acquaintance with* Ariſtotle *and all the good Greek Authors in each Science, aſſembled all the Principal Heads, and Members of the Univerſity, and with their concurrence and good Advice, drew up and publiſhed an Edict againſt the Nominaliſts, which we ſhall inſert intire at the end of this Chapter, as a Monument not yet Printed, very Advantageous to our* Lewis *the XI.*

(a) Naudé in his *Additions to the Hiſtory of* Lewis XI p. 193.

(C) *That he was not yet promoted to the degree of Doctor.*] This Objection furniſhes us with an invincible Refutation of the report of ſome Writers, that our *Weſſelus* acquired ſuch a vaſt ſtock of erudition in the Univerſity of *Cologne*, that he was made Doctor of Divinity, Law and Phyſick there. (b) *Geldenhaurius refert magno & aſſiduo & vix credibili labore hoc eum adſecutum eſſe, ut non ſolum Theologicæ Majeſtatis lauream mereretur, ſed etiam Juriſconſultis & Medicis Doctoribus annumeraretur: adeoque ſummis in omnibus Facultatibus titulis fuit ornatus; ut vulgò quidem perhibetur. Mihi tamen vix veriſimile videtur. Si enim jam tum triplici laureâ inſignitus fuiſſet Weſſelus, quæ ratio fuerit, quod poſtea admiſſus non fuerit ab Heidelbergenſibus, nullam aliam ob cauſſam, quam quod titulo Doctoris diſtitueretur. Pro exaggeranda ergo Weſſeli viri incomparabilis eruditione hanc de tribus titulis fabulam, & plura alia, jactatam jam olim fuiſſe credo.*

(b) Vita Weſſeli pag. 14.

(D) *That he Travelled into* Greece *and the* Levant.] We have ſeen *Naudæus* affirming it above. Others pretend that the Name of *Baſilius* given him by ſeveral Authors, was beſtowed upon him by *Beſſarion*. They tell us that *Beſſarion* coming acquainted with our *Weſſelus* in *Greece*, at firſt by changing the U into B called him *Beſſelus*, and afterwards *Baſilius*. The Author already cited rejects theſe Traditions, and doubts whether *Weſſelus* ever was in *Greece*. His Words are: (c) *Hardenbergius pro Weſſelo Baſilium dictum ait, quod elegantiorum hominum auribus Weſſeli nomen nimis durum & veluti barbarum videretur: vel quod alterum quodammodo Baſilium magnum judicarent; vel quod Beſſarion Cardinalis Græcus, quo ibi amiciſſimo uſus, ſuum B per noſtrum B quam V exprimere maluerit, atque pro Weſſelo Beſſelum, ac mox Baſilium cœperit vocare. Quamvis vix videatur veriſimile aut in Græcia unquam fuiſſe Weſſelum, aut in ea familiariter uſum fuiſſe Beſſarione: cùm enim hic teſte Jovio jam anno 1434. in Italia vixerit, atque anno 1439. ab Eugenio Papa creatus ſit Cardinalis, debuerit Weſſelus ante annum* XV. *ætatis in Græciam ad Beſſarionem abiiſſe: quod a vero abhorret.* A little farther he brings in *Weſſelus* boaſting of his Travels in *Greece*: (d) *In diſputationibus Theologicis magnos titulos Doctorum contemnebat, ſolis Divinis literis firmiter adhærens. Quare ſiquis forte inter diſputandum, ut fieri ſolet, ei objiceret, hoc dicit Doctor Sanctus; hoc Seraphicus &c. ipſe reſpondere ſolebat: Thomas fuit Doctor, quid tum poſtea? Et ego Doctor ſum. Thomas vix latinè intellexit, & unilinguis fuit. Ego trium principalium linguarum mediocrem peritiam aſſecutus ſum. Thomas vix umbram Ariſtotelicam vidit: Ego Ariſtotelem Græcum* IN IPSA GRÆCIA DIDICI. But in the ſame Page he looks upon this Voyage as a Fiction: (e) *Poſtea in Græciam abiiſſe creditur; at ſi quis cogitet eo tempore non ſolum literas in Græcia jacuiſſe, ſed totam quoque regionem bello arſiſſe, & hoc confictum fuiſſe cognoſcet. Ita de Petro de Aliaco quoque relatum eſt, quod Græcè exactè ſciret, per decennium in Græcia vixiſſe; quamvis certum ſit nunquam Italiâ exceſſiſſe.* Let us alſo take a view of his reflection on *Weſſelus*'s Anſwer to a Scholar, who put a queſtion to him: *Stay till I return from* Egypt *a ſecond time, when your difficulty ſhall be ſolved.* My Author imagines that by *Egypt* he myſtically meant *Rome* (f). *In Ægyptum quoque profectus creditur Weſſelus noſter, perſuaſus omnes libros Solomonis, & totam illam glorioſam Bibliothecam Judæorum ibi adhuc ſervari: ſed reverſus ſolebat dicere;* fruſtra profectionem abſolvi. Judæi enim totam bibliothecam ſuam perdere maluerunt, quam legere quod confiteri noluerunt. *Quamvis ego ratione habitâ belli, quo eo tempore totus Oriens flagrabat, exiſtimarim Weſſelum nunquam profectionem in Ægyptum inſtituiſſe, ſed intellexiſſe Egyptum myſticam, ſive Romanam, juxta ſtylum Sp. Sancti, atque Cantero ſignificare voluiſſe, ſe nunquam Romam rediturum eſſe. Joannes Canterus, quem ipſe inſtituerat, & præter alia artem Raimundi Lullii eum docuerat, aliquando curioſiorem quæſtionem ei propoſuit: ad quem Weſſelus:* Expecta donec ſecundò ex Ægypto rediero: tunc reſpondebo tibi; *deridens curioſitatem Canteri.* All this ſerves to ſhew us that the life of *Weſſelus* is little known, and that ſeveral falſities are reported concerning this Illuſtrious Man. A Modern Author aſſures us that he went to the River *Euphrates* on purpoſe to ſee *Ezekiel*'s Tomb, and the Ancient Library

of

(c) Ibid. pag. 12.

(d) Ibid. pag. 14, 15.

(e) Ibid. pag. 15.

(f) Ibid. pag. 22, 23.

was induced to it in expectation of going to Basil (E) at the time of the Council, where he did not doubt but his Master would be present. And his hopes were not vain. For he saw that Council, and made himself known to the Learned Men; he was also consulted, and admired in several publick Disputes. He returned to Rome with Francis della Rovere, his Patron, and some Authors say he was persecuted even to (F) Banishment. His Mecænas being elected Pope under the Name of Sixtus IV. continued his favour to him, and offered him all sorts of Preferments; but he only asked a Copy of the Bible (G) in Hebrew and Greek, which he obtained. He left Rome and returned into his Native Country, where he got the affection and esteem of all Men. He died at Groningen on the 4th of October in 1489. He was perplexed with some doubts concerning the Christian Religion (H) during his last sickness, but they at last entirely vanished

of the *Jews* an evident sign of the contagious Evil which perpetuates Falsities. Let us hear this Modern (a) "The Rabbi *Benjamin* maintains that "the Prophet *Ezekiel's* Tomb on the River *Euphrates*, and the Library of the first and second "Temple were to be seen in his time, nevertheless the Sieur *Wessel* of *Groningen* and many "other great Men, who went to that Country on "purpose to see that Tomb and that Library, have "unanimously reported that neither of them were to "be found. I went thither in vain, says the "Sieur *Wessel*, since the *Jews* have rather chosen to "lose all their Books, than to read what they will "not confess.

(E) *In expectation of going to* Basil *at the time of the Council.*] The Author, whom I have abridged in the Text of this Article, ought to be censured here. He saith that *Wesselus* having intrigued for the Formalists in their disputes with the Realists and Nominalists, at last sided with the Nominalists. These things happened, continues he, at the time of the Council of *Basil*, when *Wesselus* was already become a Domestick to *Pope Nicolas* V. by the Recommendation of *Francis della Rovere* General of the Cordeliers, who was afterwards, *Sixtus* IV. and who founded the Vatican Library. (b) *Erant hæc sub id tempus, quo Concilium Basileense celebrabatur. Ipse autem jam pervenerat propter celeberrimam famam & incredibilem eruditionem in omni genere disciplinarum & artium in familiam Nicolai* V. *Pontificis Maximi, operâ Francisci a Ruvere, Generalis ministri Fratrum Minorum, qui postea Papa creatus Sixtus IV. vocatus est, primusque fundamenta jecit celebratissimæ illius Bibliothecæ, quæ a loco vulgo Vaticana vocatur* ——— (c) ——— *in qua* (familia Fr. a Ruvere) *multa digna & indigna, quædam etiam pia, sed pleraque impia vidit & expertus est. Obduravit tamen, ut per illum in notitiam omnium doctorum virorum magis magisque perveniret, & liberius sine periculo disputare posset, simulque nancisci liberam occasionem admonendi hominis de vitandis idololatricis superstitionibus & apertis obscœnitatibus monasticis; maxime vero, ut via aperiretur, qua pervenire posset in Synodum Basileensem, in quam sciebat Franciscum, utpote totius Ordinis Supremum, vocatum iri, quod & contigit. Nam paulò post eò profectus est, & operâ Domini sui in Doctissimi cujusque notitiam pervenit, & ad multa consilia adhibitus est, & publice aliquoties auditus disputare cum summa omnium admiratione.* There are several mistakes contained in these Words. I. The Council of *Basil* began in the Year 1431. and ended properly speaking in 1443. and therefore since the Author whom I am censuring supposes 1419 to be the Year of *Wesselus* his Birth, he cannot with any Colour of Reason say that this Doctor was very much admired at *Basil* during the Session of that Council. Observe that according to him, *Wesselus*'s Journey to *Basil* was posterior to his long residence at *Cologne*, to his Journey to *Heidelberg*, to his return to *Cologne*, to his Journey to *Louvain*, as well as to *Paris*, to all his Intrigues in Favour of the Formalists against the Realists, and lastly to his turning Nominalist. If you should suppose that our *Wesselus* was not at *Basil* before the concluding Year of the Council, it were still true mention'd that he had done what I have just now before the Age of 24 Years; which cannot be said without a great absurdity, and nothing can be more false. II. *Nicolas* the fifth was not elected *Pope* before 1447. and consequently was not in the Pontifical Chair, during the Session of the Council of *Basil*. That *Pope* (d) is said to be the Founder of the *Vatican* Library. It is true that others ascribe the Glory of that Foundation to *Sixtus* IV. But it not being impossible that both may be in the right in several respects, I do not charge what our Author says on that head as a Fault. III. It is false that *Francis della Rovere* sate in the Council of *Basil* as General of the Cordeliers. He was Born in 1414. He run through his course of study by the Age of 22. and taught afterwards publickly for several Years before he was made Assistant to the General of his Order, who was succeeded by three Generals before *Francis della Rovere* attained to that dignity (e). Whence it plainly appears that it is impossible he should have been possessed of that Post during the Session of the Council of *Basil*, the conclusion of which happened in 1441. or as others will have it in 1443.

(F) *That he was persecuted even to Banishment.*] This particular is very uncertain: *Hardenbergius* declares that he never heard any thing of it from any of *Wesselus*'s acquaintance. (f) *Cum Domino suo Francisco, Generali ministro, reversus est Lutetiam ubi mala expertus est, multa etiam passus, ita ut quidam scribant, illum Scholâ aut Urbe pulsum esse propter reprehensas superstitiones: quod tamen Hardenbergius a nemine unquam sibi auditum eorum ait, qui cum illo domestice versati sunt. Et certum est, illum plus minus sedecim annos Parisiis versatum esse, & cum Domino suo, jam in Papam electo, una Romam profectum. Unde non videtur verisimile, Papam & eundem Monachum & quidem Minoritanum monachum, passurum eum fuisse, si a Scholâ Theologica Parisiensi proscriptus fuisset antea. Fieri potuit, quod postea illuc reversus pulsus sit.* Observe that the Edict of *Lewis* XI. against the Nominalists is dated (g) the 1. of *March* 1473. Wherefore if it was true that *Wesselus* had been Assistant to *John Bouchart* (h) Bishop of *Avranches* in the Preliminaries of that Edict, he wou'd have been a very considerable Man in *France*, even during the Papacy of *Sixtus* IV.

(G) *He only asked a Copy of the Bible.*] The *Pope* thinking this a very Ridiculous request, replyed, why don't you rather ask a Miter or something like it? Because I have no need of any such thing answered *Wesselus*. He chose the good part, but he exposed himself to the railleries of the Worldlings. (i) *Respondit Sixtus; Hæc nobis curæ erunt, tu pro te aliquid pete. Rogo ergo, inquit Wesselus, ut mihi detis ex Bibliotheca Vaticana Græca & Hebræa Biblia. Ea, inquit Sixtus, tibi dabuntur: Sed tu stulte, quare non petis Episcopatum aliquem aut simile quidpiam? Respondit Wesselus, quia tis non indigeo. Hæc ipsa Ebræa Biblia diu servarunt Groningæ, apud virgines Spirituales, eorumque adhuc hodie quædam fragmina supersunt.* Others say that it was *Nicolas* V. of whom he asked this Present. (k) *Tantò eum promovendarum litterarum Hebraicarum studio flagrasse accepimus, ut, cùm Romam profectus Nicolao Pontifici gratissimus esset, isque amplissima* Wesselo *munera offerret, his omnibus repudiatis unicum modò petierit & obtinuerit, Biblia Hebræa MSS. sibi ut liceret è Bibliotheca Vaticana in Belgium asportare.*

(H) *With some doubts concerning the Christian Religion.*] These sorts of doubts more rarely occur in a Death-Bed than in the Vigour of Youth. Wherefore

(a) Ga[illegible] [illegible]

(b) Vita Wesseli pag. 19.

(c) This anonymus here is to be found shown in the Remark B.

(d) See Father Jacob, Traité des bibliotheques pag. 4. Lomeier, de bibliothecis pag. 96. & seq.

(e) Taken from a Manuscript Memorial imparted by a Person whom I caused to be consulted.

(f) Vita Wesseli inter viros Profess. Groning. pag. 17.

(g) See Naudé ubi supra pag. 223.

(h) See Naudé's Words in the Remark B.

(i) Vita Wesseli ubi supra pag. 18. This is mention'd as a thing which Wesselus had frequently related.

(k) Valer. Andreas bibl. Belg. pag. 349.

vaniſhed away §. It is beyond queſtion that his Opinions (I) were in ſeveral particulars oppoſite to thoſe of *Rome*, and he was not unjuſtly called *Luther's* Fore-runner. I muſt not omit in this place that he is cited under different Names (K). Part of his Writings are (L) loſt.

WESTPHALUS (JOHN) an imaginary perſon, who *Moreri* tells us *was ſo Named becauſe Born in* Weſtphalia. He adds, that he was a *Lutheran* Heretick, "Who about the Year 1533. began to Preach Abominable Erroneous Doctrines; particularly that the Holy Scripture doth not ſay that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Son; that the Church hath erred, and ſeveral other Impoſtures worthy of Hell, from whence they proceeded." He cites *Prateolus* V. Weſt. *Gautier* in Chron. But we ſhall prove (A) all this to be meerly Chimerical. Not

Wherefore for the rarity of the thing, I ſhall ſet down the whole Narration. (a) *Rogatus in morbum, qui etiam vitæ ipſi finem attulit, cum amicus quidam inviſeret, atque valeret interrogaret: Reſpondit, ſe pro ſua* ætate & morbi moleſtia utcunque valere; ſed unum admodum moleſtum ſibi eſſe, quod variis cogitationibus et argumentationibus circumactus de veritate Chriſtianæ religionis ſubdubitare inciperet. *Miſertus ejus ille, ac hortari ægrum cœpit, ut omnes cogitationes ſuas in Chriſtum Servatorem unicum rejiceret. Sed cum hujuſmodi admonitionem et moleſtiam eſſe ſenſiſſet, triſtis tum abiit. Atque poſt unam vel alteram horam reverſum ad ſe cum Weſſelus vidiſſet, alacri animo, & quantum valetudo ſinebat exſultans dixit;* Gratias ago Deo, omnes illæ vanæ diſputationes abierunt: & nihil ſcio, niſi Jeſum & hunc crucifixum. *Et in hac confeſſione animam DEO reddidit.*

(I) *His Opinions were oppoſite to thoſe of Rome.*] See the *Catalogus teſtium veritatis*, and conſult alſo *le Myſtere d'Iniquité* where you will find theſe Words: "(b) At the ſame time tho' ſomewhat younger lived Doctor *Weſelus* of *Groningen*, called *the light of this World*, who by one of his Epiſtles diſcovers that after the Inquiſitors had Condemned *John de Weſalia*, he expected that they would fall upon him, and ſaith that he defended his Opinions at *Paris* and *Rome*, which were oppoſite to ſeveral Articles of the Church of *Rome*; and that ſome even of the Court had approved of them: And it is plainly to be collected from his Writings that they were very little different from the Confeſſion of the *Vaudois*. Likewiſe in his Book concerning Subjects and Superiors, he aſſerts that the *Pope* may err, and that when he doth ſo he ought to be reſiſted; that by his Simony and ill Adminiſtration, he clearly enough diſcovers that he neither regards God, nor the Salvation of his Church; that his Commands are no farther Obligatory than they are conſiſtent with the Word of God; that his Excommunications are leſs to be feared than thoſe of any good and Learned Man: whence the Council of *Conſtance* regarded *John Gerſon* more than *John* XXIII. and good Men *St. Bernard* more than *Pope Eugenius*. His works are ſeverally Printed at *Leipſick*, *Antwerp* and *Baſil*." It is obſerved in his life that he had been overwhelmed by the Tempeſt which bore down *John de Weſalia* in 1479. if *David* of *Burgundy* Biſhop of *Utrecht*, his good Patron had not ſupported him. (c) *Quibus* (fratribus prædicatorii ordinis hæreticæ pravitatis inquiſitoribus) *non minus quam coævus & amicus Joannes Weſalienſis jam anno 1479. ſuccubuiſſet, niſi Epiſcopi Ultrajectini Davidis de Burgundia* (*cui non quidem Medicus erat Weſſelus, ut multi perperam tradiderunt, ſed dilectus Civis*) *autoritas eum protexiſſet*. To all theſe may be added the Words of *Luther*, which I have cited in the Article of *Sixtus* IV. and Mr. *Seckendorf's* Extracts (d) of *Weſſel's* Works.

(K) *He is cited under different Names.*] In the Collection of the *Groningen* Profeſſors, his life begins thus: *Weſſelus Groningenſis*——— *diverſis alias & nominibus inſignitus, & elogiis celebratus. In Chronici Urſpergenſis Paralipomenis* Magiſter Joannes Weſſelus Groningenſis *nominatur. In libro memoriali templi Groningani quo ſepultus* Weſſelus Hermanni, *Phlantiko* (*qui ad annos plures fuit Archiater Davidis Burgundi Epiſcopi Ultrajectini*) Weſſelus Goſvoerti, *Alberto Hardenbergio* Goeſvort, *Gelenbauſio* Granſfortius *vocatur. Rodolphus Agricola in epiſtolis ad Reuchlinum, aliique, Baſilium vel Baſilium Phriſium eum inſigniunt. Quarum appellationum diverſitas, Friſiorum nominum non ignaro, facile cognoſcetur, quo fonte promanarit. Nempe Joannis nomen ei proprium ex ſacro baptiſmate videtur, Hermanni a patre, Weſſeli ab avi nominibus adſcitum, quod poſtremum in Græcia, (ut vulgo creditum) aut potius ſupra ſentium Græcorum lingua imbutus, ad ipſius ſonum vel ipſe inflexit, vel deinceps ab aliis admiſit, ut Baſilius diceretur* (e)——— Goſvoetti *autem ſeu* Goeſfortii, *aut* Granſfortii *cognomen, dialecto illius Weſtphalicæ hoc Germanicæ inferiorum videtur ſignans* (*Weſtphalis enim Goos vel Goes eſt, quæ Germanis olim teſte Plinio* 10. 22. *hodieque Ganſa*) *ſuſpicari liceat inde ei obveniſſe, quod majores forte ex vicina Weſtphalia* (*ut multæ aliæ honeſtæ hujus Urbis familiæ*) *huc commigraſſent, quum illud nomen villæ non procul Hamona, hodieque maneat. Cætera appellationes Patriam teſtentur.*

(L) *Part of the Writings are loſt.*] (f) He made ſeveral Collections out of the Works of the *Abbot Rupert*, and ſeveral others, to which he added his own Reflections. And theſe Rhapſodies ſwelled to ſuch an unweildy Bulk under his Pen that he called them *mare magnum*. Several of them were preſerved in the Monaſtery of *Mount Saint Agnes*, but the ſending of the Manuſcript to ſeveral Learned Men of *Holland* and *Zealand*, occaſion'd the intire loſs of it. After the Death of *Weſſelus* (g) the Monks and ſome other Perſons burnt all the Manuſcripts which they found in his Cloſet. (h) And whatever eſcaped the Flames was Printed at *Groningen* in 1614. and at *Amſterdam* in 1617. *Valerius Andreas* (i) quotes theſe two Editions, but inſtead of telling us that the firſt was at *Groningen*, he ſaith it was at *Arnheim*. But poſſibly he might find *Arnhemii* in the Title of his Copy without the Book being ever Printed there, by Reaſon that it is Cuſtomary amongſt Bookſellers to allow a correſpondent, who buys of them a certain Number of Copies, to inſert his Name in the Title Page as well as he who Printed them. And it is probable that the *Groningen* Bookſeller allowed that of *Arnheim* this Liberty. This Cuſtom very frequently impoſes on the Bibliographers, and occaſions their unneceſſary multiplication of Editions.

I ought not to forget that ſeveral Tracts of our *Weſſelus* appeared in Print before the Compleat Edition of His Works in 1614. Some were publiſhed at *Leipſick* in 1522. with the Title of *farrago rerum theologicarum*, and a Preface by *Martin Luther*, and Reprinted at *Baſil* in 1523. by *Adam Petri*, &c.

(A) *All this to be meerly Chimerical.*] I cannot accuſe Mr. *Moreri* of having cited *Prateolus* falſely; for that Writer doth indeed (k) aver that *John Weſtphalus ſeu de Weſtphalia ſuperiore*, a *German* Doctor of Divinity, was very much infected with the Hereſy of *Martin Luther*, and that his Books were Burnt at *Mentz* in the time of *Charles* Vth, and of *Pope Clement* VII. about the Year 1533. He mentions 17 erroneous Tenets of the ſame Man, and then concludes with theſe Words: *Hi ergo ſunt articuli, qui* (*authore Bernardo de Luxemburgo ſacrarum literarum profeſſore, Ordinis Prædicatorii, in ſuo Catalogo hæreticorum*) *per fratrem Gevardum de Elben inquiſitorem fidei, & patrem Jacobum Sprenger, doctores itidem ſacræ paginæ, ejuſdem Ordinis Prædicatorii, conventus Colonienſis, ex Joannis de Weſtphalia libris excerpti ſunt.* He directs us

---

§ Taken from his life among thoſe of the Profeſſors of Groningen pag. 18. & ſeq.

(a) Vita Weſſeli ubi ſupra pag. 14.

(b) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'iniquité p. 569. See alſo pag. 572, 573.

(c) Vita Weſſeli ubi ſupra pag. 21, 22.

(d) Seckend. hiſt. Lutheran. lib. 1. p. 226. & ſeq.

(e) [illegible] the ſame [illegible] of the Remark D.

(f) Vita Weſſeli pag. [illegible]

(g) Ibid. pag. 17.

(h) Ibid. Conſult alſo Geſner's Bibliotheque.

(i) Val. Andr. bibl. Belg. pag. 849.

(k) In Catalogo hæret. voce Joannes Weſtphalus, pag. m. 239.

Not but that there was one *John de* WESTPHALIA; but he was a Printer, (*Z*) who ſettled at *Louvain* in the Year 1475.

WESTPHALUS (*Joachim*) a Lutheran Miniſter in the XVI Century, Born at (*A*) *Hamburg* in the year 1510. He was Teacher of the ſecond Claſs of St. *John's* College in that City; after which he was Miniſter of St. *Catherine's* Church there alſo from the year 1541. (*B*) to 1571; from which time to the 16th of *January* 1574, which was the Day of his death, he was Superintendant of the Churches. There being a very great Diſcord between the Miniſters of *Hamburg*, ſome of them being moderate, and the other rigid Lutherans; *Weſtphalus* was the moſt zealous of the latter Party †. He was violent (*C*) even to Brutality. The Lutherans themſelves own that he ſhewed (*D*) too great an Animoſity. *CALVIN*, when he wrote againſt him, ſufficiently adapted his Style * to that of his Adverſary; but it is ſaid that he did not reproch

as to the Book whence he had this; which is the Catalogue of Hereticks compiled by Brother *Bernard of Luxemburg*, a Dominican Monk. But upon conſulting this Catalogue I found that *Prateolus* hath changed *Joannes de Weſalia* into *Joannes de Weſphalia*; for it is *Joannes de Weſalia* (*a*) *ſuperiore*, to whom *Bernard* of *Luxemburg* aſcribes the 17 Hereſies which *Prateolus* charges on *Joannes Weſtphalus, ſeu de Weſtphalia ſuperiore*. I cannot apprehend what ground *Prateolus*, or thoſe who have copied him, had for ſo many Alterations as they have made in Names and Times. The Dominican Monk obſerves that *John de Weſalia's* Books (*b*) were Burnt at *Mentz* during the Reign of the Emperor *Frederick* III. and mentions this Fact ſix Years at leaſt (*c*) before the Year 1521.

Mr. *Moreri* hath not been leſs faithful in his Citation of Father *Gaultier*; for it is certain that this Jeſuit (*d*) placed *Johannes Weſtphalus* amongſt the Hereticks of the XVI. Century, and made him a Lutheran, juridically convicted of ſeveral Errors, by his own Confeſſion, about the Year 1533. He cites *Prateolus ex Bernardo Lutzemburgo*. Thus we ſee how theſe Authors copy one another without taking the pains to look back ſo much as two ſteps. This Jeſuit ſtops at *Prateolus*, without ſo much as conſulting the Author whom he cites.

Mr. *Moreri* hath of his own head ventured to ſay, that his pretended *John Weſtphalus* was ſo named from his being of *Weſtphalia*. The two Authors whom he cites have not made this Obſervation, and I am ſure that he found it no where. *Prateolus* groundleſly believed that *Weſtphalia* was divided into higher and lower. But indeed we ought not to be ſurprized that *Moreri* fell into this Snare, ſince *Theophilus Raynaud*, tho' a Man of ſo much reading, alſo fell into it before him. He tells us on *Prateolus* his Authority, that *John Weſtphalus* the Lutheran was the only Perſon that ever doubted that JESUS CHRIST was nailed to the Croſs. (*e*) *De hac* (clavifixione) *nemo dubitavit, præter unum quendam haud dubie cum ea effutiret, hilariorem, è Lutheri caula, Joannem Weſtphalum, ut ex eo refert Prateolus eo verbo artic. damnato* 17. In which words are two Faults: 1. *John Weſtphalus* is an imaginary Perſon. 2. Suppoſe that he really had exiſted, and been a Lutheran, he would not have been either the only or the firſt Man who raiſed this doubt; for it was one of the Errors objected againſt *John de Weſtphalia*, in his proſecution for Hereſy in 1479. *Item prædicavit publice in Ser. de paſſione Chriſti, crucifixerunt eum, quis ſcit an funiculo ipſum alligaverunt, aut clavis crucifixerunt.* They are *Bernard* of *Luxemburg*'s Words (*f*): And in the *Examen Magiſtrale Doctoris Joannis de Weſalia*, inſerted in the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum* of *Orthuinus Gratius*, we find the following words: (*g*) *Viceſimo quinto* (interrogatus) *an prædicaverit publice populo dubium eſſe an Chriſtus fuiſſet funibus Cruci alligatus, aut clavo affixus. Fatetur ſe dixiſſe, quod non habeatur in Evangelio paſſionis an clavis ſit affixus, an funibus: Credit tamen quod clavis.*

(*Z*) *A Printer who ſettled at* Louvain *in the year* 1475.] To which purpoſe let us examin theſe words of *Gabriel Naudé*: (*h*) *The firſt that I know of, who Printed in the Low-Countries was* Joannes de Weſtphalia, *who ſettled at* Louvain, *and began the exerciſe of this Art on* Ariſtotle's *Ethicks*. *Revius*' Hiſtory of *Deventer* affords nothing which really amounts to a Refutation of this; for tho' we find there (*i*) that *Richard Paſroed*, or *Paſraet*, a Native of *Cologne*, and Printer at *Deventer*, Publiſhed there the *Doctrinale altum, ſeu liber parabolarum Alani metrice deſcriptus* in 1449. one cannot believe it, conſidering that this Book is the 12th in *Revius*'s Catalogue of the Books Printed by *Paſroed*. The two firſt are without any date: The third is dated in 1477. The Fourth, which is the *Golden Legend*, in 1479. and the following to the 11th are dated from 1480 to 1494. How then is it probable that the Twelfth ſhould be of 1449? it is doubtleſs a Typographical Error.

(*A*) *Born at* Hamburg.] Thoſe who ſay that he was called *Weſtphalus* becauſe a Native of *Weſtphalia*, are miſtaken. Mr. *Moreri* is guilty of this Error; which he copied from Mr. *Teiſſier*, (*k*) who had it from a German Lutheran, I mean *Quenſtedt*, as appears by his Citation (*l*). Mr. *Mollerus* (*m*) when he cenſures Mr. *Teiſſier* for this Fault, ſpares *Quenſtedt*.

(*B*) *From the Year* 1541.] Mr. *Seckendorf* (*n*) tells us that *Weſtphalus* was invited from *Wittemberg* to *Hamburg* in 1542. in order to ſucceed *Kempius* in the Paſtoral office of St. *Catherine's* Church, and that afterwards he ſucceeded *Æpinus* in the office of Superintendant. Mr. *Mollerus* (*o*) who places the beginning of his Miniſtry in 1541. and of his Superintendency in 1571, ſeems the more credible Author. How could he then ſucceed *Æpinus*, who died (*p*) in 1553?

(*C*) *Violent even to Brutality.*] The Divines of the Confeſſion of *Geneva* beſtowed that Encomium upon him. One of them ſaith that he was fitter to dreſs Beaſts of Burthen, than to adminiſter the Sacraments. " (*q*) *H. Bullingerus hominem illum vocat* vere Weſtphalum, id eſt, craſſum. *Theod. autem Bibliander*, hominem ineptum & importunum, qui rectius in agris farragines jumentis colligeret ac miſceret, quam ſacroſancta myſteria unionis ac fidei Chriſtianæ, & ſalutis humanæ ſacramenta tractaret. "] *Bibliander* alludes to a Book which *Weſtphalus* publiſhed in 1552, entitled, *Farrago Confuſanearum & inter ſe diſſidentium de S. Cœna opinionum, ex Sacramentariorum libris congeſta.* It is thought that this Book kindled again the Sacramentary War, which ſeemed extinct, ſince the death of *Luther*. (*r*) *Belli Euchariſtici Lutheri obitu ſopiti acrius denuo inſtaurandi claſſicum A.* 1552. *ipſum ceciniſſe, edita adverſus Calvinum* Farragine confuſanearum &c. *è Pontificiis* (1) *Laur. Surius, ex Calvinianis* (2) *J. Sleidanus*, (3) *J. Sturmius*, (4) *Caſp. Peucerus*, (5) *Lud. Lavaterus*, & (6) *Rud. Hoſpinianus uno ore clamitant.* The Author whom I quote, (*s*) relates what *Altingius* and *Hoornbeeck* have ſaid of *Weſtphalus*. " *Ab Henr. Altingo* Lutheranis, *accenſetur* immoderatis, furioſis & blaſphemis, *ab Hoornbeckio autem animi inflati & αὐτογνώμονος inſimulatur.* "

(*D*) *The Lutherans themſelves own that he ſhewed*

too

Lutzemburgus in Catal. hæreticorum. (*c*) *I expreſs my ſelf thus, becauſe I have only ſeen the Third Edition of his Book, which is that of the Year* 1527. *I believe he ſpeaks of* John de Weſalia *in the fore-going Editions; but I am not ſure* (*d*) In Tabula Chronographica, pag. m. 757. (*e*) Th. Raynaud. de Stigmat. ſect. 1. cap. 5. pag. m. 108. (*f*) Ubi ſupra. (*g*) Faſcic. rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum pag. 330.

(*h*) [illegible] ent. pag. 114.

(*i*) *Addit. to the Hiſt. extracted out of Thuanus*, Part. 1. p. 54.

(*l*) *Ex quinct.* Quenſt. de patr. illuſtr. viror.

(*m*) Moller. Iſagog. ad hiſtor. Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ, parte 3. pag. 579.

(*n*) Hiſtor. Lutheran. lib. 1. pag. 245. litera i.

(*o*) Ubi ſupra p. 579.

(*p*) Id. ib.

(*q*) Id. ib. pag. 581. *He quotes the* 54. *and* 23. *Letters of* Gabema's *Collection. Upon examination, I find his Quotation to be right.*

(*r*) Mollerus ibid. pag. 580.

(*s*) In Comm. hiſtorico ad an. 1552. pag. 604.

(2) Lib. 26. Com. de ſtatu relig. & reip. p. m. 780.

(3) In Anti-Pappo ſecundo, pag. 128, 129, 180. & in Anti-Pappo tertio, pag. 241. 242. (4) In Narrat. hiſtorica Controv. Sacramentariæ, apud Schluſſelb. l. 2. Theol. Calv. p. m. 192, 193. (5) In Hiſt. Sacram. pag. 119. (6) In Dedic. Concordiæ diſcordis. (*t*) Moller. ib. p. 581.

proach him with the Character of a (E) Drunkard. Beza was ſurprized, and not without reaſon, that Weſtphalus publiſhed in Print, that Calvin's Mother was a (F) Prieſt's Concubine. He ſtrenuouſly refuted this Calumny. What is ſaid by ſome that this Lutheran Doctor was the Inventer of the Ubiquitarian (G) Opinion, is not true. In order to judge of his Character, it is ſufficient to remember,

ſo great an Animoſity.] I ſhall quote Mr. *Mollerus*. (3) *Theologus celebris quidem, ſed famam* (a) *Joach. Weſtphali, permagni nominis Adverſarios, quos ſcriptis provocabat, adeptus. Zelus illius, & ſummus, in impugnandis Calvinianis, Crypto-Calvinianis, Synergiſtis, Adiaphoriſtis, Majoriſtis, atque Heterodoxis aliis, vehementia, Theologis etiam aliquot genuinè Lutheranis, & in his Sim. Sulcero, Prof. Baſilienſi* (5), *in exceſſu viſa peccare, plurimis in Germania controverſiis ſacris vel anſam præbuit, vel fomitem ſuppeditavit.*

(E) *That he did not reproach him with the Character of a Drunkard.*] The proof of which, that I am about to alledge, informs us that *Weſtphalus* accuſed *Calvin* of Gluttony. (b) *Uſus eſt aliquoties Calvinus, circa eum edendi modum oppugnans ab abſurdo, vocabulo voracitatis & ingurgitationis. Quid tu ad hæc, Weſtphale?* Admodum, *inquit*, religioſe & reverenter loquitur Calvinus, ex crudo ſuo ſtomacho eructans voracitatem & ingurgitationem. *Nempe Calvinum bene noſti, ut video: quem tota hæc civitas teſtari poteſt tam parvam ſui rationem habere in cibo & potu, ut in eo interdum amicis non leviter peccare videatur. Quum te de temulentia reprehenſum a Calvino ægre patereris, reſpondit Calvinus id quod res eſt, ſeſe de ſpiritus temulentia loquutum: & cur ad iſtam verborum aſperitatem adductus eſſet copioſe declaravit.* But we ſhall ſee what *Calvin* himſelf offered in anſwer to this, and I'll give the Hiſtory of this diſpute.

There was, for ſome time, a miſunderſtanding betwixt the Church of *Zurich* and *Calvin*, about the Doctrine of the Euchariſt; but it ceaſed in the year 1549. and both ſides agreed on a treaty of Peace, which contained 26 Articles, and was called *conſenſio mutua in re ſacramentaria* (c). The rigid Lutherans were offended at this Agreement, and publiſh'd ſeveral Libels againſt it: And it was on this occaſion that *Weſtphalus* wrote the Book, whoſe Title I have mention'd in the Remark C. *Calvin* thought himſelf obliged to ſilence all theſe Clamours, by publiſhing an Expoſition of his *Concordate*. Which he did in the Year 1554, by a little Tract in which he fell very ſeverely upon *Weſtphalus*, without naming him. But he did not keep within that compaſs two years after, when he refuted that Adverſary's (d) Anſwer, nor in 1557, when he inſcribed another Treatiſe to him; for he named him in both theſe Books. Afterwards he gave him up to his reprobate ſenſe, and threatned him with it in the Title of the laſt Book (e). But now let us examin the grounds of the Complaint concerning Drunkenneſs. *Indocti & temulenti homines dum Sacramentarium bellum inſtaurant, primis librorum paginis audacter jactant pro tota Saxonia & vicinis regionibus ſe pugnare.* This period of (f) *Calvin* induced *Weſtphalus* to complain, that he in particular and the *Germans*, were charged with Drunkenneſs. To which *Calvin* anſwer'd, that he did not in the leaſt ſpeak of a vinous ebriety, but of another metaphorical Drunkenneſs mention'd by the Prophet *Iſaiah*. (g) *Quia fortè verius eſt, ne ſi ſolus ipſe læſus foret, paucos inveniret privati doloris ſocios, totam gentem ſuam ad commune prælium incitat, ac ſi Germanis omnibus vulgatum temulentiæ probrum a me objectum foret. Si ita eſſet, ne ipſe quidem mihi vellem ignoſci. Sed notanda eſt quam mox addit probatio. Crimine hoc, inquit, ſemel atque iterum me perſtringit. Quaſi vero ſi bibulus eſt, ſine compotoribus inebriari nequeat. Quamquam ne hic de nihilo anxius ſit, ſciat non indictum fuiſſe prælium ſuis poculis, ſciat de alia temulentia me loquutum eſſe, quam Propheta Iſaias dicit non eſſe a vino.* He renew'd the ſame Apology at the end of his laſt Admonition. (h) *Weſtphalum dixiſſe hominem temulentum vocare contigerat, non ut bibacitatem illi objicerem, ſicuti interpretatur* [illegible] *ſed potius Prophetice ebrium eſſe dixi, & non a vino, qui ſtupore aut vertigine correpti,* [illegible] *Quod privatim de uno homine dictum eſt, ad totam Gentem trahit* [illegible] I am apt to think that this Explanation did not ſatisfy *Weſtphalus*; and indeed it leaves behind it ſeveral great Suſpicions. Beſides it is very viſible that *Calvin* expreſſes himſelf in ſuch Words as ſhew that he was not ſorry it ſhould be believed that he juſtly charged this Vice on his *Adverſary*, tho' he proteſts that he meant another Vice. He doth not deny the having treated him roughly, but affirms that his vehemency is reaſonable, and juſtifies himſelf by the Example of God. (i) *Sicubi vehementius in eum invectus, pro veſtra prudentia & æquitate, quibus me ſtimulis adegerit expendite* ——— *Quid mihi hic reſiduum fuit, niſi ut malo nodo aptarem durum cuneum, ne ſibi in ſua vecordia nimis placeret? Equidem ſi homines illos mollire poſſe ſpes eſſet, non recuſarem demiſſus ac ſupplex Eccleſiæ pacem redimere. Sed quo feratur ipſorum violentia, omnibus ſatis notum eſt. Itaque meam in iſta duritie tractanda auſteritatem* (1) *Dei quoque exemplum excuſat, qui ſe pronuntiat non modo inclementius acturum cum præfractis, ſed contra eos præfractum fore.* That is according to the *French* Edition of that Tract of *Calvin*. “(i) If in ſome places I have dealt too roughly with him and expreſſed my ſelf in too ſharp Terms, be pleaſed according to your prudence and equitable Diſcretion to conſider what ſharp Weapons he hath pointed againſt me, to conſtrain me to it ——— What cou'd I do, in this caſe, but act according to the Proverb, which preſcribes a ſevere Driver for a Headſtrong Aſs, that he might not grow too fond of his Fury? Indeed if there were any hopes of mollifying theſe Men, I would not refuſe to make humble Supplications to them, in order to Redeem the Peace of the Church. But it appears to all Men whither their extravagant Impetuoſity tends. So that if I have been very ſevere in the handling of ſuch a ſtrange obſtinate People, I am excuſed by the Example of God himſelf, who declares not only that he will treat the froward without tenderneſs, but ſhew himſelf froward to them.”

(F) *Was a Prieſt's Concubine.*] A little after the Words of *Theodorus Beza*, which I have already cited, we find theſe. *Quid amplius?* Ingerit, *inquit*, Calvinus voces auribus & oculis, meretricibus convenientes: quas fortaſſe didicit a matre ſua Pontificii ſacrificuli concubina. *Itane verò nugator? honeſtiſſimam matronam jam olim defunctam, & ejus viri matrem, cui quantum debeat Chriſtiana Eccleſia tot ſuſcepti labores teſtantur, & gratioribus futuris poſteris (ut confido) teſtabuntur, tuis vere meretriciis probris aſſicere maluiſti quam animo tuo morem non gerere? Sed continebo ipſe me, & quid nos potius quam quid te deceat, ſpectabo. Calvinum & honeſto loco & integerrima famæ parentibus natum, & in nobiliſſima familia a pueritia educatum ſi teſtibus probare oporteret, nos non unum aliquem teſtem, ſed integram civitatem Noviodunenſem citare poſſumus. Itaque de hoc refutando convitio minime laboramus.*

(G) *Was the inventor of the Ubiquitarian Opinion.*] *George Hornius* affirms it, but Mr. *Mollerus* refutes it by the Teſtimony of *Hoſpinian*, who acknowledges that *Weſtphalus* and *Heſhuſius*, otherwiſe good *Lutherans*, oppoſed the new Opinion concerning the Ubiquity which *Brentius* and *Smidelin* Advanced (k). The Biſhop of *Meaux* is therefore miſtaken when in his *Hiſtoire des Variations* (l) under the Year 1558 he ſaith that *the great diſpute at that time*

(4) Ibid. pag. 179.
(5) In præfationibus de orbe habitabili pag. 16.

(a) In Epiſt. ad Joh. Marbachium A. 1558. ſcripta v. Joh. Fechtii ſupplem. H. E. Sec. XVI. P. II. n. 63. p. 82.

(b) Beza, de Cœna Domini, contra Weſtphalum, Oper. t. 1. p. 257.

(c) *See the Volume of Calvin's Tracts*, p. m. 752.

(d) *That Refutation is intitl'd*, Secunda defenſio piæ & orthodoxæ de Sacramentis fidei, adverſus Joachimi Weſtphali calumnias.

(e) Ultima admonitio Joannis Calvini ad Joachimum Weſtphalum, cui niſi obtemperet, eo modo poſthac habendus erit, quo pertinaces hæreticos haberi jubet Paulus.

(f) *It is at* pag. 756. *of the Vol. of his Tracts.*

(g) Calvin 2. Defenſ. de Sacramentis, pag. 768. Tractat. Theolog.

her, that he ridiculed *(H)* all the Proteſtant Martyrs who did not with the Lutherans believe Impanation. The Arguments, which he once uſed againſt the Miniſters of the *Geneva* Confeſſion, were very *(I)* ridiculous.

WICELIUS (*George*) a pretty good Divine of the XVI Century, was born at *Fuld* in 1501. He entred young into a Monaſtery †, but was not there long, before he not only renounced the Monaſtical life, but the Roman Catholick Religion, and turned Lutheran. He had not the gift of perſeverance, for he returned to the Romiſh Communion. He was not able to digeſt the Diviſions which he ſaw ſpring up amongſt the Reformers, and the perſonal Perſecutions raiſed againſt him: But what ſide ſoever he was of, he never believed that Marriage ought to be forbidden to * Prieſts. We may then eaſily imagin that he married whilſt he was a Proteſtant; but it is falſe that he had ſucceſſively *(A)* ſeveral Wives. He contented himſelf with his firſt Marriage, tho' he was perſuaded ‖ that it was impoſſible to live or die well in Celibacy; and it ſeems, that even when a Lutheran, he diſliked Bigamy. He embraced the Proteſtant Religion at the age of Thirty, *(B)* or Thirty one Years, and became Miniſter of a Church, from which he ſays that he was ſeparated by a cruel Perſecution. *Juſtus Jonas* was one of his moſt violent Antagoniſts; but *Luther* on the contrary wrote in his favour, and removed the Storms raiſed againſt him by ſeveral a Accuſations of State

time amongſt the Lutherans was concerning the Ubiquity, which Weſtphalus, James Andrew *Smidelin,* David Chytræus *and others eſtabliſhed with all their might.*

(H) He ridiculed all the Proteſtant Martyrs who.] *Beza* laſhes him on this Account with the utmoſt Severity. (a) *Ut tuam pietatem orbi teſtere, in martyres jocare qui apud Gallos & alias gentes quotidie crudeliſſimam & ignominioſiſſimam mortem perpetiuntur. Extant enim eorum aliquot confeſſiones, quæ tibi non ſatisfaciunt. Atqui ut tibi non ſatisfaciant, an ideo digni erant quibus etiam mortuis inſultares? Nam certe pro Chriſti nomine ingreſſi ſunt flammas, quas haud ſatis ſcio an tu vel uno digito velles attingere. Quod ſi negotium Cœnæ Domini nonniſi ex parte cognoverunt (demus enim id Weſtphalo, ac ne nobis quidem ſingula eorum dicta ac facta ſatisfaciunt) an idcirco non fuerunt victimæ Deo gratæ, quum ad extremum uſque halitum omnes idolomanias ſint execrati, & Chriſtum ut verum Filium Dei & unicum noſtrum per fidem σωτῆρα ſint amplexi?* Compare the Article (b) *Hutterus* with this.

(I) The Arguments which he once uſed —— were very ridiculous.] *Laſcus* and *Micronius*, Miniſters of the *Flemiſh* Church at *London*, being forced to leave that Country, endeavoured to eſtabliſh themſelves and their Flock in the Territories of the King of *Denmark*; (c) but the Lutherans oppoſed it, and even for ſome time refuſed an amicable Conference with them, urging that it was wholly unneceſſary, ſince neither the King nor they had any ſcruples concerning the truth of the Doctrine eſtabliſhed in *Denmark*. But at laſt they condeſcended to a Conference, and urged that the Calviniſts rejected plain Texts of Scripture; for, ſaid they, what can be clearer than theſe words, *this is my body*? Beſides this they told them, you follow neither *Luther* nor the Saxon Churches, and are condemned by the Confeſſion of *Augsburg*; and in a word, you teach a Doctrine which is not conform to the prevailing Opinion of *Denmark*. They were anſwered, that the Word of God, and not what *Luther* taught, or the Kingdom of *Denmark* approved of, was the Rule of Faith. This and ſeveral other ſuch like Anſwers proved uſeleſs to the *Flemiſh* Refugees, and they were conſtrained to retire out of the Kingdom in the midſt of Winter (d). *Micronius* ſome time after conferred, at *Hambourg*, with *Joachim Weſtphalus*, who immediately urged the conſent of the *Saxon* Churches as an invincible Argument. They, ſaid he, have condemned *Zwinglius*'s Opinion; it is therefore falſe, and ought to be rejected. *Micronius* replyed, that if the truth of an Opinion ought to be determined by the conſent of the Churches, the Papal Cauſe would be triumphant. *Weſtphalus* anſwered, that the *Saxon* Churches were the Church of God; and when the other urged that the true Church was not confined to any certain place, and that there was no Church but what might poſſibly err, as was allowed by *Luther*, he affirmed that the import of *Luther*'s words was not that the Church of JESUS CHRIST might be miſtaken, but that the Popiſh Church might. *Micronius* continually inſiſted upon this Maxim, *That the Holy Scripture is the ſole rule of Faith*; which did not prevent *Weſtphalus*'s anſwering him: It follows from your Arguments, that his *Daniſh* Majeſty, and the Senate of our City who have decreed againſt you, ſhould be guilty of a great fault: Conſider that you are condemned by a Diet of *Augsburg* (e). *Si dubia adhuc eſſet noſtra doctrina, graviter peccaſſet ſenatus noſter, & sereniſſimus Daniæ Rex, qui adverſum vos decreta tulerunt.--Contra veſtram doctrinam Comitiis Auguſtanis pronunciatum eſt* (f). *Micronius* (g) did not fail to reply, that by ſuch Arguments as theſe Popery would perfectly carry the Cauſe. We have here a proof of the natural Inclination of all Parties, to make uſe of the ſhort way of Power, and convert their Adverſaries Errors into State Crimes. Dare you charge the Magiſtracy of *Hamburg*, and the King of *Denmark* who have condemned you, with Injuſtice? If *Weſtphalus* had remembred that there are great numbers of Papiſts in the World, and had he but uſed his Reaſon a little, would he have talked at this rate?

(A) That he had ſucceſſively ſeveral Wives.] His Life inſerted in the 2d. Tome of the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum*, confutes *Cornelius Loos*, who ſaid that *Wicelius* having loſt his firſt Wife, married a ſecond, then a third, and after that others. *Adoleſcens Monaſticen amplectitur, a quo vitæ inſtituto mox reſiluit, uxorem duxit, qua defuncta, alteram, & hac, tertiam, & (ut ferunt) plures.* *Serarius* accuſes him of having left the *Lutherans* on account of their Diviſions, and of having retained ſome of their Opinions, but more eſpecially thoſe relating to Marriage; that in order to remain a married Prieſt, he endeavoured to obtain Orders from a Biſhop of the Greek Church; that being willing to ſerve two Maſters, he was true to neither of them; that he was diſobedient to the Canons of the Latin Church, by uniting Marriage to the Prieſthood, and to thoſe of the Greek Communion, by marrying more than once. (h) *Georgium Wicelium lego primis adoleſcentiæ annis ad monaſticum ſeſe ſtatum applicuiſſe: Sed poſtea carnis Lutherique philtris dementatum uxorem quæſiſſe; magnoque apud Lutheranos, propter aliquam eruditionis, linguarumque peritiæ opinionem, loco fuiſſe: Ab illis tamen cùm nova, neque cum Eccleſiaſtica antiquitatis norma ſatis conſentanea fingi ac refingi quotidie cerneret, variiſque illos & acerbis inter ſe opinionibus diſſidere, pedem retulit: ſed ita ut proprii neſcio quâ cerebri pertinacia ei quam par eſſet diutius glutinatiuſque adhæſerit, in uxoria præſertim re: cui ſervire ſimulque ſacerdos eſſe cùm vellet, dicitur Græcum neſcio ubi Epiſcopum, ut ab eo conſecraretur, quæſiſſe. Sicque eum quodam veluti probro & riſu Græcum audiebat Sacerdos. Ac ſellis ſedere duabus dum voluit, utraque decidit. Neque enim Latinus ſacerdos bonus fuit, qui ad nuptias tranſiit: Neque ſacerdos Græcus bonus, qui ad ſecundas & tertias, imò, ut quidam ferunt, etiam ad plures: Sed prole parum felici, ut Moguntiæ eſt notum.*

(B) At the age of 30 or 31 Years.] *Paul Freherus*, in his *Theatrum* contradicts *Thomas James* in this particular; for we find there, that *Wicelius* went to ſtudy at *Wittemberg*, about the Year 1521. that afterwards he became the Leader of the Rebels in

---

que pie vivere, neque bene mori, citra uxorem. Wicel. Conf. reſponſ. Joniæ, pag. [illegible]

a Juſtus Jonas excitavit Principes adverſus eum, ſeditionario facto conjectus eſt in laqueum, neque longe fuit a laqueo præfocatore: ſed Lutherus pro eo ſcripſit.

(e) *Taken from the ſame Letter of* Voſſius, *p.* 50.

(f) Voſſius ib. col. 2.

(g) Similibus argumentis facile omnes vicerit Papa. *Ib.*

(h) Nic. Serarius in Moguntia, lib. 1. cap. 40. apud Miræum de Scriptor. ſæculi xvi. pag. 23

State Crimes. It is said that his return into the Pale of the Roman Church procured him, but very slowly the post he deserved. He was exposed to several Disgraces before he was so much as barely Beneficed; but at last he became Counsellor to the Emperor *Ferdinand* and *Maximilian*. His Principal Character was that of being earnestly desirous of a Re-union in the state of Christianity; to accomplish which, he would willingly have abolished several things (C) practised in the Church of *Rome*, tho', after his return to that Church, he continued in her Bosom till his Death. *Cassander* the Conciliator took his reconciling Spirit from our *Wicelius*. *Masius*, *Ferus* the Cordelier, and Bishop *John Pflug* who was for the *Interim*, were also his particular Friends. By which we may judge of his Inclinations, but much better by his Writings, his *Via Regia*, his *Methodus Concordiæ*, &c. He wrote a prodigious number of Books, most of which were in the *German* Language, and afterwards translated into *Latin*, and several times Printed. He died at *Mentz* in 1573, and was interred in St. *Ignatius*'s Church. He left one Son, named (as well as himself) *George*, who published several Books: Wherefore to avoid confusion, the Father is distinguished by the addition *Major*, or *Senior*. This is what I thought my self obliged to extract out of the Life of † *Wicelius*, which is inserted in the Appendix to the ‖ *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*. From whence I have taken the body of this Article and the Citations, without any correction, referring Criticisms to the Remarks. The Author of this Life was a very Learned Man; but give me leave to say that he might, and ought to have been much more exact in the writing of it.

WICKAM (*William*) Bishop of *Winchester*, born at *Wickam* in the County of *Southampton* in the year 1324. He laid the Grammatical foundation of his Studies at *Winchester*, learning besides, the Elements of Geometry, Arithmetick and Logick, as well as the *French* Tongue. After which he was sent to *Oxford*, where he became a sedulous Auditor of the Mathematical Lectures of *Lewis Carletan*, and of the Prælections of *William Dorach*, Professor of the Civil Law. He stayed six Years in that University, and had continued much longer, (being highly valued by the most Learned Men there) if his Patron *Nicolas Wedal* *, by King *Edward* III. then made Lord Lieutenant of the County of *Southampton*, had not obliged him to reside with him, in order to advise with, and make him his Secretary. For which Employ he could not have chosen a fitter Person, he being both in speaking and writing one of the most Polite Genius's of that Age. From this Post, within the compass of three Years, he was by *William Edington*, Bishop of *Winchester*, and Lord Treasurer of *England*, chosen to be his Secretary. King *Edward* observing him in that Prelate's Palace, could not help owning that he discover'd a Majestick Air in him, upon which, receiving a great Character of him from *Nicolas Wedal*, and Bishop *Edington*, he engaged him in his Service. Encouraged by this *Wickam* made his Court to this great Monarch with the utmost assiduity, and with equal address, acquitted himself of the Commissions entrusted to him: Besides, he answer'd so pertinently to several a Political Questions which the King put to him, that the Idea of his Merit which that Prince had conceived, daily increased. And understanding Geometry and Architecture, he was made Surveyor of the King's Buildings, to which Post was joined that of Grand Forester. It was he who had the direction of the Building of *Windsor* Castle, which King *Edward* order'd to be built in that Town, the Place of his Birth, where he had, at once, the Kings of *France* and *Scotland* his Prisoners. And being resolved to erect a magnificent Monument of his Victories, he preferred this to all other places: He caused all the Ancient Buildings to be demolished, and ordered a new and most magnificent Structure to be Erected. The intire care of this being reposed in *Wickam*, he acquitted himself of it with the utmost Honour, and took up but three Years to finish the whole. His Enemies gave so malicious a turn to an Inscription (A) which he placed in that Palace, that they exposed him to the King's Displeasure; but he soon remove that Storm, and made it contribute to the increase of his Interest with that Prince.

After

† There is an Edition of it (‖) Printed at London in 1690.

* He was Lord of the Village of Wickam.

a *Quas ejus ingenium altius exploraret multas illi illustres quæstiones quæ statum ac summam rerum concernerent de bello suscipiendo vel deponendo, de conditionibus pacis ineundæ, de ærariis rationibus amplificandis, ac industria proponere solebat, quibus* Wicamus *extempore ita ornate & prudenter tum verbis tum sententiis respondisse fertur, ut Rex præsenti ejus ingenio & peracutis responsis mirifice oblectaretur. Histor. descript. vitæ Wicami. p. 22.*

Thuringia; that he was taken and condemned to die, but that he obtained Mercy by the intercession of *Pontanus*, Chancellor of *Saxony*; that *Luther* setled him in the Ministry in a Village called *Nimeck*, near *Wittemberg*; that in 1531 he was imprisoned by Order of the Elector *John Frederick*, and by the advice of *Melancthon*, by reason that he opposed the Divinity of JESUS CHRIST; that not long after, he was Banished the Elector's Territories; that he (a) retired to *Leipsick*, where Duke *George* protected him; that not long after he turned Papist, and in 1534 wrote against *Luther*'s Book *de bonis Operibus*; that after the death of that Duke, he was driven from *Leipsick*, spent the remainder of his Life at *Mentz* and *Cologne*, turning a bitter Enemy to the *Lutherans*, and that he died in 1563. As to the last particulars, *Freherus*'s *Theatrum* wants correction; for the Appendix to the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, affords incontestable Proofs, that *Wicelius* would have sacrificed several things to an accommodation with the *Lutherans*, and that he was still alive in 1564. And what is yet more, one of his Tracts inserted in this Appendix pag. 750, is dated on the 10th of *August* 1575. And yet pag. 787. *Cornelius Loos* is allowed to be in the right, in placing the death of *Wicelius* in 1573. (b) *Molanus* and (c) *Serarius* place his death in the same year 1573.

(a) Molanus ubi infra, *saith, that he returned to the Romish Communion* in 1532.

(C) *Several things practised in the Church of* Rome.] A Specimen of it extracted out of his Books, may be seen in the Appendix to *Faciculus rerum expetendarum*.

See also the 2d. Vol. (d) of *John Wolfius's lectiones memorabiles*. *Wicelius*'s Letters Printed at *Leipsick* in 1537. contain as many Invectives against the Canonists and Scholastick Divines as the Lutherans. There is just reason to wonder (e) that the Inquisition did not fulminate against these works: This confirms what hath been said of him (f) that his Conduct was not uniform.

(A) *So malicious a turn to an Inscription which he placed in that Palace.*] The Words were, *This*

After his entring into Holy Orders, he was immediately preſented with ſeveral Rich Benefices by the Liberality of that Monarch, who not thinking theſe Donatives ſufficient, made him Principal Secretary of State, and Keeper of the Privy Seal. Whilſt he continued in theſe Poſts, and with the greateſt Conduct diſcharged all his Offices, he was promoted to the See of *Wincheſter* in the Room of Biſhop *Edington* in the Year 1367. Not long after which he was made Lord High Chancellor, and afterwards Preſident of the Privy Council. In a Word,

made Wickam, which admitting of the double Interpretation of *Wickam made this* or *this made Wickam*, his Enemies interpreted it in the firſt ſenſe, and poſſeſſed the King that the Surveyor of that Edifice inſolently arrogated the Glory of it to himſelf. (a) *Non deerant quidam invidi & malevoli qui Regi in aures inſuſurrarent* Wicamum *tam magnificæ ſtructuræ honorem ſibi arroganter vendicaſſe, adeoque in nomen ſuum in interiori quodam pariete arcis* Windeſoriæ *inſculptum regalis ædificii titulum nominatim trajeciſſe.* Upon which the King being very much incenſed, charged *Wickam* with that Crime, but was ſoon appeaſed and laughed at it when he heard his Defence. *Wickam* anſwered with a ſmiling Air, that his Accuſers muſt either be very Malicious or very Ignorant of Grammar, ſince the true ſenſe of the Inſcription was this: *I am the Creature of this Palace, it is that which hath procured me the Favour of my Prince, and raiſed me from a low to a high ſtate.* It is proper to inſert the Hiſtorian's own Expreſſions here: (b) *Cum autem Rex ſtomacharetur & iracunde* Wicamo *crimen objiceret, quod delatum erat, ille vultu non triſti aut conſternato, ſed hilari ac jucundo reſpondit, aut ſtultum hominem inſcitia Grammaticæ, aut calumniatorem malitioſa caſuum inverſione illam criminationem inſtituiſſe. Neque enim Rex ſereniſſime* (inquit) *ego hanc Arcem, ſed hæc Arx me quantus quantus ſum effecit, hoc eſt, me in laude ac gratia apud tuam majeſtatem poſuit, atque ab humili conditione ad tantas fortunas & dignitates evexit. Quod reſponſum tam factum ac* Wicamo *dignum (erat enim verum ſpecimen humanitatis, venuſtatis ac leporis) non ſolum omnem iracundiæ acerbitatem Regi abſterſit, verum etiam lætitiam in ejus animo tum commotionem ſuavem jucunditatis in corpore excitavit.* I ſhould be loth to ſwear that *Wickam* had no Eye on the Equivocal ſenſe of this Inſcription. But that King *Edward's* Anger expreſſed on this occaſion may not paſs for an uncommon weakneſs, I ſhall mention ſome particulars concerning the Nicety and Jealouſy which Sovereign Princes have diſcovered in parallel caſes.

Pericles his Magnificence in the Conſtruction of publick Edifices at *Athens* is very well known. " (c) " Now when the Orators who ſided with *Thucydides* and were of his Party, were at one time " bawling (as their Cuſtom was) againſt *Pericles*, as one who ſquander'd away the publick " Stock in idle Expences, and made havock of the " State-revenues, he ſtarting up in the open Aſ" ſembly put the queſtion to the People, whe" ther they thought that what he he had laid out " was too much; and they ſaying, *Too much* " *of all Conſcience. Well then!* ſaid he, *ſince 'tis ſo,* " *let not the Coſt and Charge go upon your Account* " *but upon mine: And accordingly I will make the* " *Inſcription upon the Temples and other publick* " *Buildings in mine own Name.* When therefore " they heard him ſay this, whether it were out " of a ſurpriſe to ſee the greatneſs of his Spirit, " or out of emulation that they envy'd him the " Glory of the Works and reſolv'd to go ſhares " with him, they cried aloud, bidding him to ſpend " on and lay out o'God's Name, what he thought " fit out of the publick Purſe, and to ſpare no " Coſt, 'till all were finiſhed."

When *Pauſanias* King of the *Lacedemonians* Conſecrated a Golden Tripod to the Temple of *Delphi*, he cauſed to be inſcribed on it that under his Conduct the *Perſians* were beaten at the Battle of *Platæa*. The *Lacedemonians* not being able to ſuffer this vanity, cauſed the inſcription to be raſed, and the Name of the Towns which had furniſht the Victorious Troops to be inſerted inſtead of it, as we are informed by *Cornelius Nepos*. (d) *Qua victoria elatus plurima miſcere cœpit, & majora concupiſcere. Sed primum in eo eſt reprehenſus, quod ex præda tripodem aureum Delphis poſuiſſet, epigrammate ſcripto, in quo erat hæc ſententia:* SUO DUCTU BARBAROS, APUD PLATÆAS ESSE DELETOS, EJUSQUE VICTORIÆ ERGO APOLLINI DONUM DEDISSE. *Hos verſus Lacedæmonii exſculpſerunt, neque aliud ſcripſerunt, quam nomina earum civitatum, quarum auxilio Perſæ erant victi.* As haughty as *Alexander* was, and however jealous of the diviſion of his Glory, he yet made uſe of an Inſcription (e) which admitted the *Greeks* to a part of the Honour of Triumphing. This was after the Battel of *Granicus*; when he had occaſion for their further Aſſiſtance, and conſequently was afraid to irritate them by omitting their Names in the Monuments of his Victories, and hoped to indear them to him by mentioning them (f). He deſired to appropriate the whole Inſcription of the Temple of *Diana* to himſelf, and offered to defray the Expence of the whole Edifice; but the Inhabitants of *Epheſus* would not conſent to it, and not daring directly to refuſe him this Honour, they had recourſe to a Flattering Shift, which extricated them out of this Affair. They told him that it was not proper for one God to raiſe Monuments to another. (g) *Scripſit Epheſiis*, ſe omnes ſumptus qui in id ædificium facti eſſent, reſtituturum; quique porro requirerentur, præbiturum de ſuo, ita tamen ut ipſius nomen inſtaurato operi inſcriberetur. *Idque deprecati ſunt Epheſii. quo tempore, quia Alexandro petenti aliquid denegare arduum erat, legatus eorum ad adulationem confugit, qua maxime expugnabilem noverat, dixitque* dedecere culmen ipſius, ſi diis aliquid conſecraret, quum ipſe deus eſſet. nam cum honorem ab hominibus haberi potiori naturæ. *Ea gloriæ contentio inter maximum regem, & unam civitatem fuit. obtinuerunt Epheſii; & maluerunt ingenti pecunia carere, quam inſtaurati templi titulo regi cedere.* The *Thebans* doubtleſs were not put to ſuch a great Trouble, when a Curtezan offered to rebuild their Walls on the ſame Condition. If what *Athenæus* ſays be true, it is certain that they boldly rejected the offer. (h) Ἐπλούτει δὲ σφόδρα ἡ φρύνη ϗ ὑπισχνεῖτο τειχιεῖν τὰς Θήβας, ἐὰν ἐπιγράψωσι Θηβαῖοι, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΜΕΝ ΚΑΤΕΣΚΑΨΕΝ, ΑΝΕΣΤΗΣΕ ΔΕ ΦΡΥΝΗ Η ΕΤΑΙΡΑ, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Καλλίστρατος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἑταιρῶν. *Phryne uſque adeò dives, erat ut Thebarum mœnia extructuram ſe polliceretur, ſi adſcriberetur,* ALEXANDRUM DIRUISSE, PHRYNEN VERO SCORTUM REFECISSE, *ut ait Calliſtratus libro De ſcortis.* But before I conclude, I ſhall relate a Stratagem full as good as that of *Wickam*. The Architect who built *Pharus*, engraved his own Name on a ſtone, and that of the King on the Lime which covered it. The Trick was not diſcovered during his life, nor was he conſequently expoſed to any manner of danger on that Account, no Perſon being able to accuſe him to the King as a Robber of his Glory; but he expected after the Expiration of ſeveral Years that the Name written in the Lime would crumble away, and none would remain viſible beſides his own, which he had fixed in a much more durable ſubſtance than Lime. The following Citation acquaints us with the Name of this Architect (i) Οἰκοδομήσας γὰρ τὸ ἔργον, ἔνδοθεν μὲν κατὰ τῶν λίθων τὸ αὑτοῦ ὄνομα ἐπέγραψεν. ἐπιχρίσας δὲ τιτάνῳ, ϗ ἐπικαλύψας, ἐπέγραψε τοὔνομα τοῦ τότε βασιλεύοντος, εἰδὼς ὅπερ ϗ ἐγένετο, πάνυ ὀλίγου χρόνου συνεκπεσούμενα μετὰ

(a) [illegible]

(b) Id. ib. pag. 18.

(c) Plutarch, in the life of Pericles.

Pericles his brave Reply when accuſed for waſting publick Monies.

(d) Cornelius Nepos in Pauſania pag. m. [illegible]

(e) Καὶ μέρος δὲ τῆς νίκης τοῖς Ἕλλησι κοιν — κοινῇ τοῖς ἄλλοις λαφύροις ἐκέλευσεν ἐπιγράψαι φιλοτιμοτάτην ἐπιγραφήν, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ Ο ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ, ΠΛΗΝ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ, ΑΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΒΑΡΒΑΡΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΤΗΝ ΑΣΙΑΝ ΚΑΤΟΙΚΟΥΝΤΩΝ. Participem autem Græcis victoriam — cæteris manubiis in communi glorioſiſſimum titulum inſcribi juſſit, ALEXANDER PHILIPPI ET GRÆCI, PRÆTER LACEDÆMONIOS, DE BARBARIS ASIATICIS, Plutarchus in Alexandro pag. 673. C.

(f) *See* Freithemius ſupplem. in Q. Curtium lib. 2. c. 5.

(g) Freinſhemius ſupplem. in Q. Curtium lib. 2. c. 6. n. 33. *He quotes* Pauſanias lib. 7. & Strabo lib. 14. *I have found no ſuch thing in* Pauſanias, *but only in* Strabo lib. 14. p. m. 441.

(h) Athenæus lib. 13. pag. 591. D.

(i) Lucianus de conſcribenda hiſtoria ſub fin. pag. m. 706. tom. 1.

Word, he had ſuch a large ſhare of the King's Favour, that nothing was done (B) without him. In order to diſcharge the Duties impoſed on him by his Spiritual and Temporal Dignities and Poſts, he applyed himſelf on one ſide to regulate his Manners conform to the ſtricteſt Diſcipline, and to eſtabliſh in his Dioceſe (C) a Clergy which led an Exemplary Life, and were able to inſtruct their Pariſhioners: And on the other ſide he omitted nothing that might contribute to the exact and impartial Adminiſtration of Juſtice. Being informed in the Year 1371. that the Great Seal would be taken from him, he prevented the Diſhonour, and ſurrendred it to the King. That Prince returning to *England* after a very ſucceſsful War with *France*, found his Treaſury very much Exhauſted. Upon which the Duke of *Lancaſter*, one of his Sons, at the Head of ſeveral of the Nobility complained of the Eccleſiaſticks at that time having the greateſt part of the high Offices in the Kingdom; they repreſented to the King that it was not the Clergy's Buſineſs to intermeddle with Temporal Affairs, and that it was more proper thoſe places ſhould be filled by the Laity, who would diſcharge them with great fidelity. The King being perſuaded that if he ſlighted theſe Complaints he ſhould diſoblige a potent Faction, and that if he turned out the Eccleſiaſticks, he ſhould draw vaſt Sums from thoſe whom he ſhould call to Account, reſolved on the Alteration. Wherefore our *Wickam* very ſeaſonably ſurrendred the Seal, and deſired leave to retire to his Dioceſe, which he did not obtain before 1374. The Lay-men being promoted to the important Charges, ſupplyed them ſo ill that the Court was forced to re-inſtate the Eccleſiaſticks. The Duke of *Lancaſter* was removed from the Helm, but returned to the Adminiſtration, when the Death of the Prince of *Wales* had thrown the King into a Mortal as well as Languiſhing Diſeaſe. Being now in Power he vehemently declared againſt the Clergy, and left no means unattempted to Ruin our *Wickam*. He cauſed him to be accuſed of Infidelity to his Prince, and Criminally extorting Money from the Subjects, and forced him to appear at the King's Bench as the Court impowered by Law to take Cognizance of this Affair. He provided Judges to Condemn him, without allowing him the neceſſary time to digeſt his Papers in order to his Defence. Beſides which not being content with depriving him of his Temporalities, he adviſed King *Edward* to Baniſh him; but that Prince tho' enfeebled in Body and Mind, refuſed it. He Remembred that *Wickam* was found Innocent of all manner of Extortion five Years before, when all the Eccleſiaſticks were obliged to give an Account of their Adminiſtration of the Treaſury. Wherefore he ſuſpected the Juſtice of the Sentence which Condemned him, and gave Encouraging hopes to thoſe deputed by the Biſhops to him in order to requeſt the Annulling of this Sentence; and at the ſame time ſuſpecting the Duke of *Lancaſter* to be Guilty of ſome ſiniſter deſign (D), he declared Prince * *Richard* his Grand-Son his Succeſſor, and reſtored to *Wickam* whatever the Duke of *Lancaſter* had deprived him of; and dyed not long after †. King *Richard* who ſucceeded him was but eleven Years old. Which rendred it very eaſy for the Duke of *Lancaſter*, Preſident of the Council, to revive the Accuſations againſt our Biſhop of *Winchester*. They were accordingly reduced to ſeven Heads, and affirmed with very great Aſſurance before the Council by the Accuſers, but the Accuſed ſo ſtrenuouſly refuted them that he was declared Innocent. After which, his noble deſire of applying the Riches which Providence had beſtowed on him, to very good uſes, increaſed more than ever; and not being able to think of any more uſeful Appointment, than that which furniſhed Youth with the means of Learning the Sciences, he founded two Magnificent Colleges

* He was the Son of the Prince of Wales.

† In 1377.

μινὸς τῷ χρίσματι τὰ γράμματα, ἐκφαινόμενον δὲ, Σώστρατος Δεξιφάνης κνίδιος, θεοῖς σωτῆρσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν πλωϊζομένων. *Poſtquam igitur hoc opus exædificaſſet, intus in ſaxis ſuum nomen inſcripſit: quo calce illita occultato, nomen ejus qui tum regnavit, ſuperinſcripſit, ratus, id quod etiam evenit, fore ut brevi admodum, literæ illa cum illita calce caderent: hoc verò appareret: Soſtratus Cnidius, Dexiphanis filius, Diis ſervatoribus pro ſalute navigantium.*

(B) *Nothing was done without him.*] The Author I here cite (a) quotes a paſſage of *Froiſſard* which runs thus, *At that time reigned a certain Prieſt called* William *of* Wickam, *and this* William *of* Wickam *was ſo much in Favour with the King of* England, *that all things were done by him, and without him nothing was done.*

(a) The Author of the hiſtorica deſcriptio p. 32.

(C) *A Clergy which* —— *and were able to inſtruct.*] It is not ſufficient for 'em to be either Learned or good Men. Both theſe qualities ought to be united. But in the Age we are ſpeaking of, it was much eaſier to find Prieſts who were neither Learned nor Pious, than to light upon any that were either the one or the other: And tho' the Ignorance of thoſe times was prodigious, yet there were more that were able to inſtruct than that led a good life: And therefore this care of our *Wickam* proved no ſmall fatigue, ſince he ordered that all Deacons and Prieſts ſhould be obliged to be free from the ſtains of Drunkenneſs and Uncleanneſs. (b) *Ante omnia tam Diaconos quam qui ſupra eos collocati ſunt presbyteros ac ſacerdotes ab infami illa ebrietatis & libidinis macula omnino immunes eſſe voluit. Nam quum ipſi ſal terræ, lux mundi ac diſpenſatores myſteriorum Dei crebro in ſcripturis uſurpentur, nimis indignum eſſe dicebat eos vinolentia deformari vel cubilibus & immunditie inquinari, à qua turpitudinis labe & ignominia omnes etiam ex populo (quos Laicos vocant) melioris notæ abhorrerent.* This is not the leaſt glorious of his Adminiſtration.

(b) Hiſtor. deſcriptio pag. 34.

(D) *Suſpecting the Duke of* Lancaſter *to be guilty of ſome ſiniſter deſign.*] It was thought that the Duke intended (c) to uſurp the Crown, and this ſuſpicion was grounded on the ſecret meaſures which he took with ſome Members of Parliament in order to Engage the *Engliſh* in Imatation of the *French* to Enact a Salique Law for the Excluſion of Women from ſucceeding to the Crown of the Realm. But this rendred him odious and very much diſturbed

(c) Vehementiſſima regni appetendi ſuſpicione & invidia laborabat. *Ib.* p. 5

Colleges (E), the one at *Oxford*, and the other at *Winchester*. And whilst he was diligently taking care of whatever could contribute to the compleating these two Noble Establishments, he was recalled to the Court, and by a sort of force obliged to accept of the Dignity of Lord High Chancellor in 1380. He discharged this important Office for three Years, so well that he rendred the Nation Happy; which was the Reason why without the most pressing instances, he could not obtain the King's leave to retire, when he saw the fatal Troubles that were ready to break out, which induced him to desire a retreat in order to shelter himself from the Storm. Being then returned to his Church, he finished the Building of his College at *Winchester*, and there Built that Sumptuous Cathedral, which equalled or wanted but little of equalling that of St. *Paul* in *London*. Besides which he very Liberally disbursed several Sums to the great Advantage of the Publick, and the Poor; all which could not yet prevent his being exposed to imminent Dangers in the Year 1397. when he || and some others were accused of several State Crimes in full Parliament, but he was very Honourably acquitted. And from that time to his Death he continued in a quiet repose in his Diocese, in the exercise of all the Duties of a good Prelate. Nay he was there secure from all those Commotions which violently shook *England*. He died in the 81 Year of his Age in 1404. Several Scandalous reports were spread against him; amongst others it was said that he revealed a secret delivered in Confession concerning (F) a suppositious Son, and that he made Presents and Promises to King *Edward*

|| *Omnes illos simul ac conspirationis proditionisque læsæ majestatis reos fecit, perinde ac si illi Regem regio imperio ac omnium rerum dominatu despoliare statuissent.* Ibid. pag. 109.

sturbed King *Edward* (a) now grown more suspicious than ever, and obliged him to declare his Grandson his Successor. Thus runs my Author's Relation. But perhaps it may be asked what the Duke of *Lancaster* aimed at, since the Establishment of the Salique Law could not prevent the Representation taking place, and consequently he could not get any thing by its Establishment; but he wanted a Law which preferred the Uncles to the Nephews. It may be replyed that not daring to endeavour directly the Exclusion of his Eldest Brother's Son, he began by attempting the introduction of an innovation in the Constitution, which could not easily be suspected to proceed to a farther design: But if he could have gained his end, the Establishment of the Salique Law, he would have found room for other Innovations, and would have requested a Law in preference of the Rights of Uncles to those of Nephews. Mr. *Varillas* (b) imagines that he designed to Abrogate the Representation, and that on that Account he was an Encourager of *Wicliff*; but Mr. *de Larroque* (c) agreeably and solidly refutes this thought.

(E) *He founded two magnificent Colleges.*] He had long given very signal Proofs of a Zealous Inclination to relieve the Necessitous. Hospitality, one of the Virtues, which according to Saint *Paul* (d) ought to shine in an Episcopal Life, was remarkably exemplified in him. He lodged in his House, and all his Life kept 24 Poor People. He received all Strangers with great Humanity; and seven Years before the Foundation of the mentioned Colleges, he began to settle an annual Pension on 50 hopeful Youths, which he caused to study at *Oxford* (e). These were his Preludes. After which having obtained Patents of leave to Build a College in that City, he laid the first stone of it very early in the Morning on the 5. of *March* in 1379. and designed it for one Hundred Persons besides Servants. 50 Scholars were to be entertained there, in order to be instructed in the Sciences, and a grave and Learned Man to Govern the College with the Title of Warden. He added ten Chaplains, three Clerks, and sixteen Choristers. This Edifice being finished in seven Years, he himself placed those Hundred Persons (f) in it at three of the Clock in the Morning on the 14 of *April* 1386. The first thing they did after their Entrance was by a Solemn Publick Prayer to implore the Blessing of God (g). The following Year he founded another College in the Suburbs of *Winchester*, near the Episcopal Palace. He laid the first stone of this on the 26 of *March* in 1387. He designed it for 105 Persons besides Servants. These Persons were a Head or Warden, ten Priests, seventy Scholars, an upper and under School-Master, three Chaplains, three Clerks, and sixteen Choristers (h). All these entred the first time at three in the Morning on the 28. of *March* 1393. (i) The Statutes of these two Colleges are so excellent that they served as a Model for all those, who for the space of two Hundred Years made the like Foundations in *Oxford* or *Cambridge*, (k). I must not omit that *Wickam* provided that this College at *Winchester* should be a Nursery for that which he founded at *Oxford*; for he ordered that all the places vacant in the last should be supplyed by a draught from the former. Which is religiously observed to this very day. My Author expresses this part of the Statutes in very significant Words: (l) *Quod Collegio suo* Oxoniensi *quasi fons & seminarium inserviret, ex cujus (ut ita dicam) utero junior alia soboles quotannis nasceretur, & in alterum Collegium decrescentium loco veluti ad Patres literarum ac Senatores immigraret. Est enim hoc illius Collegii* Oxoniensis *proprium & peculiare, ejusque statutis sancitum ut cum cæterea Collegia* Oxoniensia *in demortuorum aut discedentium locum ex scholis quibuscunque ascititios cooptare soleant, solum hoc non nisi naturales ex seminario suo* Vintoniensi *velut ex sua & propria stirpe succrescentes eligat, & electos ad se tanquam ad novam Coloniam suo tempore & loco deducat.* Observe that his last Testament and Codicil (m) were very Memorable proofs of his Charity and Liberality.

(F) *That he revealed a secret delivered in Confession concerning a suppositious Son.*] This is the third of the five Calumnies which my Author undertakes to refute. The two first are that *Wickam*'s Learning was even below a moderate degree, and that he had been a Servant. Our Author refutes this by several Remarks which it is not necessary to Transcribe here; those who are curious to see them may consult the Original (n). But as for the third Scandal I shall give the Substance of the Apology. In order to which let us begin with the Accusation. It is pretended that the Duke of *Lancaster's* hatred of *Wickam* was grounded on his divulging that that Duke was not the Son of *Edward* III. To which they add, that *Philippa* King *Edward's* Queen, revealed in Confession to our Bishop of *Winchester*, that *John* of *Gaunt* Duke of *Lancaster* was the Son of a *German*, and that she had fraudulently imposed him on the King her Husband instead of a Female Infant she had by him. Farther, that she intreated this Prelate to reveal it to the Nobility of the Realm, in case the Duke, this supposed Son of King *Edward*, should aspire to the Crown, or prepare to succeed to the true Princes of the Blood according to the Laws. Hence some have taken occasion to charge this Bishop with a Notorious Sacrilege, I mean the non Observation of the Canon Law which forbids the divulging any Secrets delivered in Confession. His Apologist justifies him. 1. By the shining Virtue of the Queen. 2. By the good understanding always preserved betwixt the King and Queen. 3. By the impunity of *Wickam*. 4. By his Reconciliation to the Duke of *Lancaster*. 5. By the silence of Historians, and publick Records on this Head. It is impossible, saith our Author, that such a Virtuous Princess

should

(a) *Qui in senili ætate* [illegible] *suspicionibus paulo indulgentior esse cœpit* ... [illegible] *Lancastriæ pater nonnullis videbatur.* Ib. p. 54.

(b) Varillas, Histoire du Wicleffianisme pag. 11. & seq.

(c) Larroque, Nouvelles accusations contre Varillas pag. [illegible] & seq.

(d) I Tim. [illegible]

(e) Taken from his Latin description pag. 35.

(f) He had chosen them himself.

(g) Taken from the same Book pag. 101.

(h) Ibid. pag. 102. 103.

(i) Ibid. pag. 104.

(k) Ibid.

(l) Ibid. pag. 102.

(m) Ibid. pag. 112. 113.

(n) Ibid. pag. 116. & seq.

ward's Miſtreſs (G), in order to obtain the Reſtitution of his Epiſcopal Temporalities *. We ought not to forget that he was employed (H) in the Expulſion of Wicliff.

* Taken from a Book intituled, hiſtoriæ deſcriptio complectens vitam ac res geſtas beatiſſimi viri Gulielmi Wicami quondam Vintonienſis Epiſcopi &c. Printed at Oxford in the Year 1690. in 4.

WIDA † (**HERMAN DE**) Son to *William de Wida* Count of the Empire, was made Arch-Biſhop of *Cologne* in 1515, ‖ and long after Elected Biſhop of *Paderborn*, where he perſecuted the (*A*) Proteſtants. In the Year 1536. he held a

(a) ſhould have kill'd her own Daughter, in order the better to cover an Abominable Fraud. A King of ſuch a great Spirit would not have left ſuch a Villanous Action of his Wife unpuniſhed: Nor could he be Ignorant of it, ſince it is pretended that it was revealed to the Nobility of the Realm. And if he had not believed it, he would have treated *Wickam* as the moſt infamous Detractors deſerve; for certainly the whole Royal Family being Diſhonoured by a Report ſo injurious to the Queen, the Calumniator would have been puniſhed. But the Duke of *Lancaſter* hereby diſgraced more than all the reſt would have brought him to juſtice, and never have been Reconciled to him: and yet it is certain that after King *Richard* had reconciled them, they continued very well together till the Duke's Death (*b*), that is about 21 Years. Obſerve alſo that this Story is no where to be found except in the Compilation of a Monk: *Recte Harpsfeldus in hiſtoria illud de ſuppoſito Reginæ partu tanquam fictum & commentum rejecit, ac nulibi niſi in Monacho Albanenſi reperiri ſcribit.*

(*G*) *Preſents and Promiſes to King* Edward's *Miſtreſs*] This is the fourth Calumny: Our Author indeed refutes it, but by Arguments very far ſhort of the ſtrength of thoſe which he alledges againſt the third. The expreſs Terms of the Accuſation run thus: (*d*) *Regi jam ægroto, ipſaque ſenectute confecto ſemper aderat atque miniſtrabat quædam fœmina* Alicia Peers, *quæ Regi languido & infirmo obſecuta majorem quam ipſe* (*e*) *dux cum Rege iniit gratiam: hanc præſenti mercede & uberiori promiſſa ſpe* Wicamus *adduxit ut a Rege reſtitui ſibi ablata Epiſcopatus jura tam quæ ante percepta & in fiſco reſervata eſſent, quam omnia prædia procuraret, quod illa invito duce, continuo impetravit.* He refutes this. 1. By the hatred which this immodeſt Woman bore to the Biſhops. 2. By the very ſmall confidence which the Corruption of her Manners could allow any Perſon to have in her. 3. By her ſtrict Friendſhip with *Wickam's* Enemies. 4. By the expreſs Terms of the Letters Patents granted to this Prelate for his re-eſtabliſhment, which contain the Reaſons of it, and declare the conſent of the Duke of *Lancaſter*, of all the Nobility and all the King's Council: They being ſubſcribed at the bottom, *per ipſum Regem & conſilium, by the King and his Council.* The Apologiſt's exclamation ought not to be forgotten. (*f*) *O inſignes calumniatores, & chartarum publicarum malicioſos interpretes, qui quod inſtrumenta Regalia per ſanctum Senatum peri aſſerunt, id per impurum ſcortum factitatum prædicant. Nam ſcortum & conſilium iſtis idem ſonat?* He thinks it very ſtrange that notwithſtanding this Declaration of King *Edward*, *ſe liberalitate Epiſcopi ex promiſſione in difficultatibus ſuis atque Regni adductum fuiſſe ut ea bona reſtitueret*, any ſhould preſume to aſſign the purchaſed good Offices of a Curtezan as the cauſe of this Reſtitution. 5. To conclude, he urges that King *Richard* after the Flight of *Alice Peers* (*g*) confirmed this Reſtitution by the Advice of his Council, in which were preſent the Duke of *Lancaſter*, the Prelates, Earls, and Barons. I am inclined to believe that this Calumny of which we have juſt now ſeen the Refutation is falſe; but I don't find that it is Attacked by very ſtrong Reaſons. Thouſands of inſtances prove theſe two things: Firſt that thoſe who are proſecuted by a King's Miſtreſs, will apply to her to be re-eſtabliſhed, and endeavour to gain her by dint of Money and promiſes, without ever diſtruſting her on a ſuppoſition that a profeſſed Whore muſt be capable of all ſorts of perfidy; Secondly that the Inſtruments of Reſtauration obtained by the intereſt of a Miſtreſs, run in the ſame ſtyle, with thoſe obtained by very equitable means. A King, who Grants any thing at the Solicitation of his Miſtreſs, may eaſily engage his Council to approve of it; and if he doth not do it, his Miſtreſs her ſelf can gain the chief Councellors: And then the moſt favourable and glorious clauſes are inſerted in the Letters Patents and no part of the uſual Form is omited. To which may be added that there have been ſome Perſons unjuſtly oppreſſed, who have ſolely reſtored themſelves by buying the good Offices of a Miſtreſs. Nor ought we to be ſurprized that after the diſgrace of ſuch a Woman a Confirmation of the Patent was obtained: For that is not at all extraordinary. So that the Arguments of our Author do not ſeem to me to be very ſtrong. But it would indeed have been enough to have laid it upon the Authors of this Calumny to prove it. What is very certain, is that King *Edward's* Miſtreſs could do every thing with him at that time, and that her power ended only with the life of that Prince. (*h*) *This King was unexpectedly ſurprized by the Loſs of his Speech all at once, ſo that he had only time to expreſs ſome Pious Sentiments, (to which he was exhorted by a Prieſt) by his geſture and Eyes: Which did not happen by Reaſon that he was not long and dangerouſly ill; but the Famous* Alice Peers, *too really his Miſtreſs, had ſo poſſeſſed him, that no Perſon could have acceſs to ſpeak to him before he himſelf was Speechleſs. Then the diſſolute Harpy having in haſte tore off the Diamond Rings which he wore on his Finger, withdrew, and left him in the Hands of a Chaplain, who could only draw ſome ſigns of penitence from him; which indeed tho' late when ſincere are good; but are rarely ſincere when ſo late.*

I ſhall by the by ſay that the 5. Calumny refuted (*i*) in the above cited Book is that *Wickam* was Baniſhed, and continued three Years in Exile according to ſome, and ſeven intire Years according to others. But this is utterly falſe, for he never lay under any Sentence of Baniſhment: To which I add farther, that he was never deprived of his Biſhoprick, ſo that the See of *Wincheſter* was never vacant from 1367 to 1404. Whence it neceſſarily follows that *Wicliff* was refuſed this Biſhoprick in 1367. if what is pretended by *Varillas* (*k*) be true, that his not being able to obtain that Biſhoprick ſo diſguſted him, that it inſpired him with a deſign of ſetting up for a Hereſiarch; but if he was not able to obtain it that Year, one of the Reaſons by which (*l*) Mr. *de Larroque* refutes *Varillas* concerning the conſequences of this pretended refuſal, will become yet more ſpecious.

(*H*) *That he was employed in the expulſion of* Wicliff.] My Author touches only accidentally on this particular, when he is proving that our Biſhop of *Wincheſter* was more Learned than his Detractors imagined. (*m*) *Quid animi fuiſſe putas* Richardo *Regi quum* Wicamum *anno Regni ſui ſeptimo una cum* Courtneo Cantuarienſi *Archiepiſcopo* Oxonium *contra virum acerrimum* Johannem Wickleſum *mitteret? An mediocris eruditionis & ingenii eſſe oportebat, qui (quod ille ibi præſtitit) diſſenſientes in religione opiniones conciliaret, & tam celebrem & acutum virum ſuſpectæ fidei redargueret & ex Academiæ finibus exterminaret?* Obſerve here a Remarkable particular of which the Jeſuit (*n*) *Maimbourg*, Mr. *Varillas*, nay even Mr. *de Larroque* as well as ſeveral others have made no manner of mention; *viz.* that the Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury* was in Perſon at *Oxford* with the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* (*o*) in 1383. or 1384. in order expell *Wicliff* from that Univerſity.

(*A*) *He perſecuted the Proteſtants of* Paderborn.] I ſhall begin this Article with Father *Maimbourg's* Words. " (*p*) After (1) the Death of *Eric* of " *Brunſwick* Biſhop of *Paderborn*, being elected by " the Canons of that Church to ſucceed him, with " a deſign that he ſhould oppoſe the *Lutherans* " who began to eſtabliſh themſelves there, he performed

(*a*) Si primo injuſtæ calumniæ auctori credimus, ea quem non peperit, aluit, quam peperit, occidit. *Ibid.* pag. 123.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 121.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 124.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 125. ex Acwortho in vita Sadburei.

(*e*) *That is, the Duke of Lancaſter.*

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 126.

(*g*) Quum jam *Alicia Peers* ſe in fugam cum ſua peſte ac pernicie convertiſſet. *Ibid.*

a Council, the Regulations of which were highly extolled (B); for being a very good Man, whoſe life was exemplary, he paſſionately deſired the Eſtabliſhment of good order in his Dioceſe. Purſuant to which he was not contented barely to ſettle a good Diſcipline, but alſo intended a Reformation of the Doctrine, and having conſulted *Melanchthon*, (C) and had ſeveral ſecret Conferences with *Bucer*, he cauſed the latter to Preach at *Bonn*, and engaged the former to come thither ſome time after. The Majority of the Canons of *Cologne* oppoſed this Enterpriſe, and not being able to prevail by the Books which they publiſhed, they had recourſe to the Pope and Emperor. The former

---

“ performed it ſo well that being aſſiſted by his Friends, who together with ſeveral good Troops accompany'd him, he made himſelf Maſter of the City, drove out all the Preachers he found in it, utterly aboliſhed *Lutheraniſm* there, and prohibited any Perſons profeſſing it on pain of Death.” Mr. *Seckendorf* obſerves that our *Herman* (a) was hurried on to this Rigour by the Canons, and his Reſentment againſt the inſolence of the populace, and that notwithſtanding this he gave ſome Proofs of Moderation. For he did not moleſt two Miniſters who had eſcaped out of Priſon, and pardoned ſixteen Citizens who were Condemned to Death. To which Mercy the interceſſion of their Relations and the Executioner's refuſing to behead them contributed very much. (b) *Civibus Paderbornenſibus XVI. ad mortem condemnatis gratiam fecit, precibus ſupplicum & adſtantium, immo & carnificis facto ſingulari, motus: Hic enim gladium, quo productos in forum decollare juſſus erat, judicibus publice tradidit, negans, ſe innocentium cruore manus polluturum eſſe.*

(B) *A Council, the Regulations of which were highly extolled.*] Let us again cite *Maimbourg*. “ (c) Being apprehenſive that the *Lutherans* already ſpread in the (1) neighbouring Provinces, would inſenſibly introduce the Venome of their Hereſy into his Electorate, he in conjunction with his Suffragans held a Council at *Cologne*, where he made the moſt excellent Canons that could be deſired for the maintainance of Religion in its purity, the re-eſtabliſhment of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline to its Vigour, and the Regulation of the Duties and lives of all true Chriſtians in every Station.” *Cardinal Sadolet* very much commend to this Council of *Cologne*, but thought it ſomewhat ſtrange that Purgatory was not mention'd in it. See (d) his Letter to *Herman*. This Arch-Biſhop was not much afraid that the *Lutherans* ſhould introduce the Venom of their Hereſy into the Electorate of *Cologne*: F. *Maimbourg* was Ignorant of his real Sentiments: Read Mr. *Seckendorf*, and you will find that this Prelate was already at that juncture more than half a *Lutheran*. (e) Hermannum *jam tum meliora intendiſſe, ex epiſtola MS.* Joh. Lumpii, *Doct. Colon. quæ inter* Heckelianas *extat, & d. 6. Oct. hoc anno data eſt, apparet. Scribit enim:* Archiepiſcopus nondum audet, quæ ſentit, prodere, ob Monachorum & Theologorum ſuperſtitioſa ſupercilia, quibus adhuc, inſipidum eſt, quod ex eorum non prodit culina, ſperatur tamen finis. *Addit:* Minoritanum, qui Præſuli a confeſſione & ſacra concione eſt, cucullum ferre adhuc, ſed aliud ſentire: in templo majori concionari aliquem puram Evangelii doctrinam, advolantibus ex vicinis opidulis, etiam ex Haſſiaca ditione procul diſſita, tot millibus ut eos vix capiat Templum.

(C) *Having Conſulted* Melanchthon, *and had ſeveral ſecret Conferences with* Bucer, *he cauſed.*] He deputed *Peter Medman* to *Melanchthon* in 1539. and was deſirous that he ſhould come to him immediately, but his Journey was deferred to the Year 1543. *Bucer* being ſent for by this Arch-Biſhop came to him towards the end of 1541. and after ſeveral Conferences which were very well reliſhed by that Prelate, he went back to *Straſburg*, from whence he returned to *Herman* the following Year, and preached publickly at *Bonn*. He alſo informed the Elector of *Saxony* and the *Landgrave* of *Heſſe*, that this Prelate had very good deſigns which wanted Encouragement, by Reaſon of his Age which made him act timorouſly and ſlowly. Upon which thoſe Princes did not fail to write to him in order to confirm him in his Chriſtian Intentions. He thanked them, and informed them that he had no other aim than the Glory of *God*, and the Happineſs of his Neighbour. He had before entreated the Elector of *Saxony* to ſend *Melanchthon* to him; who accordingly ſet forwards on his Journey about the end of *April* 1543. and in Conjunction with *Bucer* drew up a Project of Reformation, which the Arch-Biſhop cauſed to be Read to him, and himſelf carefully examined it (f). Some particulars which did not favour much of Proteſtantiſm were overlooked in this Project to pleaſe him; which obliged *Luther* to complain of *Melanchthon's* and *Bucer's* connivance. The Elector of *Saxony* was not better pleaſed with this conduct, tho' the Landgrave hinted to him, that he ought not to promiſe himſelf that the work could be perfected all at once (g). We ought to know that the Archbiſhop was deſirous to retain all the Ceremonies which were not impious, and that each Order ſhould preſerve its Privileges: He did not pretend to aboliſh Epiſcopacy. (h) *Propoſitum ſcilicet erat* Hermanno *ut ex* Melanchthonis *literis colligi poteſt,* Chytræus *etiam* Lib. *16. fol. 460. apertius tradit, ceremonias veteres omnes, quotquot ſine impietate ſervari poſſent, una cum collegiorum dignitate, libertate, prærogativis & juribus omnibus, retinere, ut moderatæ & piæ ordinationis Eccleſiæ Cathedralis exemplum eſſe poſſet: ſed eventus oſtendit, in rebus tantopere corruptis modum difficillime inveniri; quapropter omnis illa cautio inutilis fuit, &, retenta illa pompa, doctrinæ puritati incrementa omnia ſubtracta fuerunt.* The Project of Reformation which he Publiſhed, did not at all mention either *Luther*, or (i) the Pope, and he took care to expreſs himſelf ſo cautiouſly concerning the Lord's Supper, (k) that the *Zuinglians* could agree to it. *Luther* (l) was very well pleaſed that his Name was not mentioned, becauſe he very well knew that the bare naming of it would give Offence; but he condemned the other parts of this cautious conduct, and became ſo violently enraged againſt *Melanchthon*, that perhaps he had never been reconciled to him, if the latter had not laid the Fault on *Bucer*, and if the Elector of *Saxony* had not laboured to prevent an open rupture betwixt them. (m) *Non latuit* Melanchthonem *indignatio Lutheri, immo tantopere eum afflixit, ut de deſerenda Wittenberga cogitaret, ſi Luthero inviſus eſſet, aut quod futurum eſſe dicebatur, publice ab illo refutaretur. Sed pia Electoris Saxoniæ providentia & induſtria* Pontani *placatus eſt Lutherus, & Melanchthonis excuſationem accepit, dicentis, ſe neque caput illud reformationis Colonienſis de ſacra Cœna compoſuiſſe, neque* Bucerum *celaſſe, quæ in eo deſideraret, hunc tamen admonitionis ſuæ nullam habuiſſe rationem. Sic ira Lutheri vehementius in* Bucerum *verſa eſt.*

This Project of Reformation was Printed at *Buſſhoven*, if we believe the Preface, and that is all we can know of it; the time of the Impreſſion not being expreſſed. A ſecond Edition appeared at *Bonn* in 1543, Printed by *Laurence Mylius*, or *Vander Mullen*. And a third was Printed the following Year. Theſe three Impreſſions were in the German Language. But the Latin Edition Printed at *Bonn*, in 1545, by the ſame *Mylius*, is intitl'd, *Noſtra Hermanni, ex gratia Dei Archiepiſcopi Colonienſis & Principis Electoris ſimplex ac pia deliberatio, qua ratione chriſtiana, & in verbo Dei fundata, reformatio doctrinæ, adminiſtrationis divinorum Sacramentorum, ceremoniarum, totiuſque curæ animarum, & aliorum miniſteriorum Eccleſiaſticorum, apud eos, qui noſtræ paſtorali curæ commendati ſunt, tantiſper inſtituenda ſit, donec Dominus dederit conſtitui meliorem, vel per liberam & Chriſtianam Synodum, ſive generalem ſive nationalem, vel per Ordines Imperii Nationis Germanicæ*

(a) Ista ... plebs Paderbor- ... pe- ... & ... commi- ... Seckendorf. lib. Luther. lib. 3. pag. 135.

(b) Id. ib. ... Chytræus lib. 9. fol. ... & lib. 15. fol. 391. & seqq.

(c) Maimbourg ubi ſupra.

(1) Concil. Colon. 1. c. 14. Concil. edit. Pariſ.

(d) It is in the 14. Book of Sadolet's Letters pag. 559. edit. Lugd. 1554. in 8.

(e) Seckendorf. ubi ſupra pag. 138, 139.

(f) *Taken from* Seckendorf ubi ſupra pag. 436.

(g) Non ſatis placebat illa diſſimulatio Electori monito licet a Landgravio quod non omnia ſub initium exacte conſtitui poſſent. *Id. ib.* pag. 437. *n.* 8.

(h) Id. ib.

(i) Hermanno ea placuit lenitas qua etiam cavit ne in toto ſcripto aliquid contra Pontificem nominatim ſpargeretur. *Id. ib.* p. 448. 4.

(k) Id. ib.

(l) Id. ib.

(m) Id. ib.

mer excommunicated and depoſed the Archbiſhop, and was ſo effectually ſeconded by Charles V. that our Prelate was conſtrained (D) to renounce his Dignity in the Year 1547. After which he retired || to his paternal Eſtate, where he died the 13th of Auguſt 1552, being eighty Years old. His Scheme of Reformation was more like * that of England, than that of Germany. Tho' it cannot be denied, that this Archbiſhop was rather a Good than (E) a Learned Man, it may yet be ſaid, that he was not Ignorant. The Error committed in the Supplement to

|| See the Rem. D.

* See the Remark

ſiæ in Spiritu ſancto congregatos. The Copies of the firſt Edition were kept, as it were, locked up (a) for ſome time, and perhaps the publication had been longer deferred, if all thoſe that were concerned in it had been as Phlegmatick as Herman. The Chapter of Cologne no ſooner diſcover'd that the Copies were ſpread on all ſides, but they cauſed to be Publiſhed in German and Latin, a Book entitled (b) Antididagma, ſeu Chriſtianæ & Catholicæ religionis per Rever. & Illuſt. Dominos Canonicos Metropolitanæ Eccleſiæ Colonienſis propugnatio, adverſus librum quendam univerſis Ordinibus ſeu Statibus Diœceſis ejuſdem nuper Bonnæ titulo Reformationis exhibitum, ac poſtea mutatis quibuſdam, Conſultoriæ deliberationis nomine impreſſum. At the end of the Antididagma is a grave and moderate Diſcourſe of twelve Pages only, intitl'd, Sententia delectorum per venerabile capitulum Eccleſiæ Colonienſis de vocatione Martini Buceri. These were not the only Books that were Publiſhed on each ſide: Mr. Seckendorf (c) informs us, that a Book appeared in Publick, intitl'd, Judicium deputatorum Univerſitatis & ſecundarii Cleri Colonienſis de doctrina & vocatione Martini Buceri, which was aſcribed to Everard Billieus, a Carmelite, and ſo ſtuffed with ſcurrilous Buffooneries, that the Canons of Cologne would not licenſe it; wherefore the firſt Title, Judicium Cleri & Academiæ, was ſtruck out, and the other made uſe of, as we find in one of Melancthon's Epiſtles. (d) Coloniæ liber editus eſt, non tam contra Bucerum, quam contra univerſam doctrinam Eccleſiarum noſtrarum, & contra noſtros Principes. Poeta operis eſt Carmelita ille bene ſaginatus, & Bacchi ac Veneris ſacerdos. Titulum operi fecerunt: Judicium Cleri & Academiæ. Cum autem ſeniores in Collegio quidam Comites vidiſſent, ſcriptum dignius eſſe ſcurris, quam Clero, juſſerunt mutari titulum, ac teſtati ſunt, id opus non probari ſuo Collegio. Addita eſt ergo tituli correctio, pro Clero jubent legi Clerum ſecundarium, nothos videlicet Cleros intelligunt. Petulantiſſime convitiatur doctrinæ & Luthero, & in loco de conjugio ſpurcitie & obſcœnitate verborum utitur, quam vix in lenone ferrent aures mediocrium hominum. Convitia ex Plauti fabulis lecta ſunt, quibus fortaſſe Carmelita ille magis delectatur, quam Pſalmis. (e) Caſpar Gennep tranſlated this Tract into German; and Melancthon publiſhed a Refutation of it. The Appeal which the Chapter of Cologne brought in before the Pope, may paſs for a controverſial Tract (f): The Archbiſhop cauſed it to be refuted. The Chapter cauſed a Programma to be publiſh'd in German, on the 18th of November 1544; and the Archbiſhop oppoſed it by an Anſwer the 13th of December, the ſame year (g). In all probality, the prodigious Superſtition of the City of Cologne, was one of the Obſtacles which ſtifled Herman's deſign. That City ſo vaſtly abounds with Monaſteries, Relicks, and Images, that it may be call'd the Teutonick Rome. (h) Manſit aut reſtituta eſt, de qua Melanchthon quæſtus fuit, populi ſuperſtitio, Coloniæ potiſſimum Agrippinæ Clero, templis, ſacellis, ſtatuis, reliquiis, plus, quam ulla in Germania civitas, repleta, ita ut Romam Teutonicam eſſe dicant.

(a) Taken from Seckendorf. ib. p. [illegible]

(b) The Latin Edition I make uſe of is that of Louvain Printed for Servatius Zaſſenus 1544. in 8vo.

(c) Seckend. ubi ſupra pag. 438.

(d) Melanchthon epiſt. ad Crucigerum. 'Tis the 25 of the 3d. Book. It was written from Bonn in 1543.

(e) Seckend. ubi ſupra.

(f) See Seckendorf. ib. p. 442.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 448.

(D) To renounce his Dignity.] He was promiſed aſſiſtance in order to oppoſe Force againſt Force, but he choſe rather to comply, in order to ſave his faithful Subjects from the devaſtations of War. Read what follows, and you will find there the Character of a good man: (i) Conſtantiam preſtitebant Ordines, & res ad vim ſpectabat: Sed bonus ſenex Comitibus Manderſcheidio & Nuenario, nobilitatis in Archiepiſcopatu facile primis, ita ſuadentibus obtemperans, tum miſericordia Populi ſui motus, & ne bello vaſtaretur provincia, ultro ceſſit, fidemque & jusjurandum omnibus remiſit. Obiit poſt annos ſex Idibus Auguſti anno 1552, in patria ſua, &, ut Sleidanus loquitur, quietem expetivit, finem habuit. Nam, aut Evangelii propagare doctrinam, & recte conſtituere ſua ditionis Eccleſias, aut privato ſibi vivere licere, non ſemel optaverat: Et ab amicis aliquando monitus, quantum invidiæ ſibi conflaret ex iſta religionis mutatione, reſpondere ſolebat: nihil eſſe, quod inopinanti poſſet accedere, ſeque jam pridem in omnem caſum obfirmaſſe mentem. Eraſmus would have admired this Conduct, he being ſo charmed with a ſaying of Otho, that he thought it very well deſerved the Roman Empire. Otho finding that he could not diſpute the Empire without prolonging the War, choſe rather to die than occaſion its continuation. (k) Cum inter ethnicos etiam hoc animo repertus ſit Otho, ut potius ducerit ſpontanea morte vitam abrumpere, quam imperium tot hominum vita mercari, vir vel ob hoc ipſum dignus imperio, ſi fortuna virtuti faveret. This Thought hath ſomething in it ſo Heroick, that it is Pity ſuch an effeminate Perſon as Otho ſhould diſcover ſo much greatneſs of mind. But his Body and Mind were not of the ſame temper (l): The former was drowned in Effeminacy, but the latter retained a large ſhare of Vigour; I ſpeak of that ſort of force which forms it ſelf on the Ideas of Equity. He always abhorred Civil Wars, and never would have attempted to ſet up againſt Galba, if he had not believed that Affair would terminate without any effuſion of blood. (m) Othonem etiam privatum uſque adeo deteſtatum civilia arma, ut memorante quodam inter epulas de Caſſii Brutique exitu cohorruerit: nec concurſurum cum Galba fuiſſe, niſi confideret ſine bello rem tranſigi poſſe. When he reſolved to kill himſelf, he had a ſufficient number of Forces to have continued the War with juſt hopes of ſucceſs; but becauſe it would have coſt the lives of great numbers of Men, he concluded that it would be to buy the preſervation of a Crown at too dear a rate. This was what Eraſmus thought ſo excellent, having read it in Tacitus and Suetonius. (n) Hunc, inquit, (Otho) animum, hanc virtutem veſtram ultra periculis objicere, nimis grande vitæ meæ pretium puto—— Civile bellum à Vitellio cœpit; & ut de principatu certaremus armis, initium illic fuit: ne pluſquam ſemel certemus, penes me exemplum erit, hinc Othonem poſteritas æſtimet—— An ego tantum Romanæ pubis, tot egregios exercitus, ſterni rurſus, & Reip. eripi patiar? Eraſmus would not have failed to approve the pacifick modeſty of our Herman, had he lived to that time; but I don't think he would have ſaid, that it was leſs ſurprizing in a Biſhop than in a Pagan.

(i) Id. ib. See alſo Beza in iconibus. Non modo, ſays he, conſcientiam tuam liberaſti, ſed teipſum quoque memorabili vi majori ſeculis omnibus exemplo ſuperaſti, quum ultro cedens, paternis bonis contentus, placide Chriſtianeque vivere, quam licet immerito ereptam dignitatem tuorum ſubditorum ſanguine tutari maluiſti.

(k) Eraſm. epiſt. de- dic. Sue- tonii, Dio- nis, Caſ- ſii &c.

(l) Non ... ra Otho- nis mollis & corpo- ri ſimilis animus. Tacit. hiſt. lib. 1. c.

(m) Sue- ton. in O- thone cap. 10.

(n) Tacit. hiſtor. lib. 2. cap. 47. Theſe are Suetoni- us's words, ubi ſupra cap. 9. Moriendi imperium cepit: ut multi nec fruſtra opinantur, magis pu- dore, ne tanto re- rum ho- minum- que peri- culo do- minatio- nem ſibi aſſerere perſeve- raret, quam de- ſperatio- ne ulla, aut diffidentia copiarum.

(E) Rather a good than Learned Man—— he was not ignorant.] Here's another Paſſage of Father Maimbourg: "(o) He was (p) very ignorant, "and utterly unacquainted with what a Prelate "ought to know, even to that degree, that he had "not Latin enough to enable him to ſay Maſs "and read his Breviary. In effect, when the Land-"grave of Heſſe (2), who took him into his Pro-"tection after his perverſion, one day told the Em-"peror, that the only Crime of that Archbiſhop "was his attempting to reform his Church: Alas, "anſwered that Prince, What can that poor ignorant "Man reform, who very hardly underſtands a little "Latin? He never could ſay above three Maſſes in his "life, two of which I have heard, and am witneſs "that he could not even read the Introit. All thoſe "excellent Canons of his Council which are ſo well "expreſſed, were not made by him who knew no-"thing of the matter, but by the celebrated Do-"ctor Gropperus, Archdeacon of the Church of "Cologne,

(o) Maim- bourg, ſupra p 265.

(1) Rou Pont. Comm. Sleid. l.

(2) Sleid. l. 17.

in *Moreri's* Dictionary (F) is one of the moſt enormous that can be detected. In the *Paris Moreri* of 1699, our *Herman's* Article † runs according to *Maimbourg's* words.

WILHEM (*David* LE-LEU DE) Counſellor in the Council of the Prince of *Orange*, and in that of *Brabant*, deſerves to be placed amongſt the Illuſtrious Men of the XVII Century. He was deſcended from a very Noble (A) and Antient Family, and born at *Hamburg* on the 15th of *May*, 1588. His Mother who (B) joined to the Nobility of the Blood a large portion of Piety, and Zeal for the Proteſtant Religion, educated him very well; ſhe ſent him to ſtudy at *Stade*, at ten years of Age, under the direction of very good Tutors: And after he had improved, at *Hanau*, by the Lectures of *John George Crabius*, and *John Rodolphus Lavaterus*, ſhe carried him to the Univerſity of *Franeker*, where he continued three Years, and in 1611 went from thence to *Leyden*, where he made great advances in Philoſophy, the Civil Law, and the Oriental Languages, *&c.* After which, he went to *France*, and made ſome ſtay in the Academy of *Saumur*, and afterwards in 1613, went to lodge at *Thouars*, in the Houſe of the Learned *Andrew Rivet*, who ſhewed him (C) all the marks of a very particular eſteem, on account amongſt other excellencies of the Theological Learning he had acquired. He improved himſelf very much by his *Levantin* Voyages to *Grand Cairo*, *Jeruſalem*, *Alexandria*, *&c.* in the Years, 1617, 1618, 1619. He was very intimate with *Cyril Lucaris*, and frequently conferred with him concerning the differences betwixt the Greek and Latin Churches. He received ſeveral Letters from * that famous Patriarch, which very well deſerve Printing; and his Heirs promiſe accordingly to publiſh them for the ſatisfaction of the curioſity of the Learned. After his return from

† [illegible]

* See the Remark E.

“ Gropper, who drew them up, and put them in the “ condition we now ſee them in.” It is certain, that *Sleidan* (a) relates this Diſcourſe betwixt the Emperor and the Landgrave; but he adds, that the Landgrave replied, that this Archbiſhop had very carefully read the *German* Books, and underſtood Religion. *Sed diligenter evolvit libros Germanicos, ait ille, & quod certo novi religionem intelligit. Melanchthon* informs us, that this Prelate diſcovered a clear Underſtanding, when the Model of the Reformation was examined in his preſence: (b) *Legi ſibi totum librum juſſit, attentiſſime audivit, multis de pleriſque locis graviter diſſeruit, quædam ſuo judicio recte mutavit, interdum noſtras ſententias, re expenſa, ſuæ opinioni prætulit. Huic labori dies ſex tribuit, ac quotidie matutinas horas quatuor continuas. Miratus ſum Senis aſſiduitatem & diligentiam, ac animadverti ſerio hanc rem tantam ab eo agi; quod, quantum referat, intelligis. Et has controverſias, peritus artifex, dijudicat.*

(F) *The Error committed in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary is one of the moſt enormous.*]. “ It was “ by expreſs order of *Herman*, that Cardinal *John* “ *Gropper* was ſtrangled with his Hatband for endea- “ vouring to oppoſe this new Religion,” are the words of the Supplement (c). It would be very difficult to form probable Conjectures concerning this horrible Falſity, if the Author had not cited *Beza*; but when we repair to the place which he points at, we find what was the occaſion of his miſtake, and then our ſurprize continues, and what is more, encreaſes. *Beza* compares our *Herman* to JESUS CHRIST, and *John Gropper* to *Judas*. He pretends that *Gropper* betrayed his Maſter, and obtained for a Recompence, a ſtring which ſtrangled him, that is to ſay, a Cardinal's Hat. (d) *Iu vero haud ſecus quam olim a Juda* CHRISTUS *a tuo Joanne Groppero proditus quum eſſes, retulit quidem hic quoque proditor ſtipendium peccati mortem Cardinalitii Galeri vinculis ſtrangulatus.* It would be infinitely more excuſable to ſay with Father *Maimbourg*, that *Beza* (e) *childiſhly aiming at Wit, made a wretched dull Jeſt*, than to find in of those words an execrable crime of the Archbiſhop of *Cologne*.

(A) *Deſcended from a very Noble and antient family.*] Which took place amongſt the Nobility of *Artois*, and *Cambreſis* in the year 1096, being, beſides other Eſtates, then poſſeſſed of the Lordſhips and Seats of *Banteux*, *Bantouſel*, *Wilhem*, *Contemerle*, *Froidebize* and *Aveſne lez Gobert*, *&c.* as appears by a deciſion of the Council of *Brabant* at *Bruſſels*, on the 5th of *July* 1676. *George* LE-LEU DE WILHEM, the Father of him who makes the Subject of this Article, left *Tournay* at the beginning of the Troubles about Religion, being himſelf, together with his five Brothers, Out-law'd for having buried their Mother without obſerving the Ceremonies required by the *Romiſh* Communion. It appears by an Authentick Act of the 22d of *December* 1565, that their Eſtates were confiſcated; but they endeavour'd to releaſe themſelves from this Act, after the Year 1576, by virtue of the Pacification of *Ghent*. *James* LE-LEU DE WILHEM, one of the ſix Brothers, took refuge in *England*, and firſt married *Margaret de Zegre*, and his ſecond Wife was *Mary de Duyts*. By the firſt Lady, beſides other Children, he had *Timothy* LE-LEU DE WILHEM, born at *London* the 26th of *November* 1568, and Lord of *Borgeria Finges lez Courtrai*. By the Second, he had beſides, others, *Michael* LE-LEU DE WILHEM, born the 27th of *September* 1587, who died Counſellor and Schepen of the *Hague*, and was married at *Delft* the 25th of *May* 1614, to *Anne de Rechtere* Niece to the Secretary *Adrian Duyck*: (f) His Siſter married M. *Dudley Carlton* (g), King *James* his Ambaſſador in *Holland* (h).

(B) *His Mother who joined to the Nobility of the Blood.*] Her Name was *Gilliette Van Opalſens*: ſhe was the Daughter of *John Van Opalſens*, Eſquire, and of *Joan l'Empereur d'Oppyck*, Siſter to *John l'Empereur d'Oppyck*; (i) Lord of *Malerit*, &c. who was deputed to the Dutcheſs of *Parma*, Governeſs of the Low Countries, by the *City of Tournay*, in conjunction with the Confederated Nobility. His Son *Antony l'Empereur d'Oppyck* was the Father of *Conſtantin* L'EMPEREUR, born at *Bremen* in 1591. Profeſſor of Divinity at *Leyden*, and Counſellor to Prince *Maurice*, a Perſon very well verſed in the Oriental Tongues, as he hath evinced by ſeveral Books. He was twice married, firſt to *Levina de Witt*, Daughter of the Lord of *Roſenburgh*, Counſellor of *Amſterdam*. Secondly, To *Catherine Thyſius* of *Kynogen*. He died in 1648, leaving only one Daughter, *Sarah l'Empereur d'Oppyck*, who married *Mark du Tour*, Gentleman to the Prince of *Orange*, Father to the King of *England*. He died Counſellor in the court of *Brabant*. But after this digreſſion juſtly due to the merit of *Conſtantin l'Empereur*, I return to the Mother of our *David Wilhem*. She was at *Paris* on the fatal St. *Bartholomew*'s day, and was ſaved, as it were, by Miracle; her Huſband was then at *Rouen*, and was alſo preſerved. Her Father, *John Van Opalſens*, had the ſame good fortune ſome years before. He was condemned to death for his Religion, the Sentence was pronounced; but he eſcaped out of the Priſon of *Tournay* by the connivance of the Goaler, and fled into *England*.

(C) Andrew Rivet, *who ſhewed him all the marks of a particular eſteem.*] To know the mutual Friendſhip

(f) *I keep cloſely to the Memorial imparted to the Bookſeller.*

(g) *Who had by her a Daughter, that is ſtill living (in 1696.) She is the Widow of my Lord* Ferers, *and Mother of the Counteſs of* Aran, *Widow of a Son of the Duke of* Hamilton, *Mother of an only Daughter, who is a very rich heireſs.*

(h) *Taken from a Memorial imparted to the Bookſeller.* Idem dic de pleriſque infra memorandis.

(i) *He married the Heireſs of the Houſe of* Aigremont, *Lady* de Malerit, &c.

from this long Voyage, he reſided ſeveral Years with his Brother at *Amſterdam* (*D*); but his earneſt deſire of a more perfect Knowledge of the Oriental Tongues, and an Inclination to the *Levant*, engaged him to make a ſecond Voyage thither in 1625. It is certain, that he travelled like a Learned Man, that is to ſay, he made excellent and curious Obſervations, acquiring beſides an accurate Knowledge of the * *Arabick*, *Perſian*, and *Chaldaick* Tongues. He was met in thoſe Countries by the Learned *Golius*, (*E*) who was recommended to him; and they contracted ſuch a cordial and intimate mutual Friendſhip as laſted as long as their Lives. Being returned to *Holland* about the Year 1631, he raiſed ſuch an eſteem in *Frederick Henry*, Prince of *Orange*, as procured him the place of Counſellor in his Highneſs's Council at the *Hague*. He married a Siſter of the celebrated Mr. *de* || *Zuylichem*, a Lady of great (*F*) parts. He had ſome Children by her, as we ſhall ſee below. The States General having made very conſiderable Conqueſts in the Province of *Brabant*, by the victorious Arms of Prince *Fredrick Henry*, augmented the Council of that Province in 1634, beſtowed a place of Counſellor on our Mr. *de* WILHEM, and made him Superintendant of that Country in 1640. As he loved and underſtood the Sciences and the Liberal Arts, the great Buſineſs, which ſo many Poſts threw on him, never hindred his ſtudying hard, and maintaining (*G*) an extenſive epiſtolatory Correſpondence with the Learned. He took pleaſure in protecting and ſerving them on all occaſions at the Court and elſewhere. He had a very fine Library, furniſhed with the moſt excellent Books in all Faculties, beſides

* Beſides the former European Languages, which he underſtood in perfection, he could eaſily ſpeak moſt Languages that are now ſpoken in *Europe*, and *Aſia*.

|| See his Article.

ſhip which they contracted, and the peculiar value which Mr. *Rivet* had for him, no more is neceſſary than to caſt our Eyes on the (*a*) Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Commentary on the Decalogue. He alſo gives a very great character of the Virtue, Learning, Piety, and other excellent Qualities of *David Wilhem*.

(*D*) *With his Brother at* Amſterdam.] That is, with *Paul* LE LEU DE WILHELM, the Father of *David* LE LEU DE WILHEM, yet (*b*) alive, and Preſident of the Schepens, and Receiver of the City of *Amſterdam*. His Lady is *Hildegonda Van Beuningen*, Siſter to the late Mr. *Conrad Van Beuningen*, ſo well known by his Embaſſies.

(*E*) *By the Learned* Golius, *who was recommended to him.*] I have ſeen the Original of the Letter which Mr. *Rivet* wrote to Mr. *de Wilhem*, (*c*) the 29th of *October* 1625, and from thence extracted theſe words, *Servo adhuc tibi literas itineris tui Hieroſolymitani, & eas quas a Patriarcha Alexandrino acceptas mihi communicaſti quas vel tibi, vel ei qui tuo nomine eas petet, reſtituam cùm volueris. Commendatione mea apud te non opus habet Clariſſ. Golius, vir in rara eruditione, rara pietate & modeſtia præditus, noſtro defuncto Erpenio intimus, & mihi tam proprio nomine quam tali neceſſitudine chariſſimus* &c. This informs us that Mr. *Rivet* was, at that time, the Depoſitory of the Patriarch *Cyril*'s Letters to Mr. *de Wilhem*. He has acquainted the Publick with the correſpondence which his Friend kept up with *Cyril*; as appears by theſe words which we find in the Epiſtle Dedicatory which I have already alledged. (*d*) *Ex iis* (regionibus) *etiam ex ipſa Ægypto, quæ tabernaculo Dei inſervirent abſtuliſti non pauca, aliis liberaliter communicaturus, ad communem utilitatem. Inter quæ non minima ſunt, quæ ex intimâ illâ admiſſione cum Reverendiſſ. Cyrillo tum Patriarcha Alexandrino, hauſiſti; cujus communicationis fructus, & ſedulitatis tuæ in eo de rebus noſtris plenius informando utilitatem, ringentibus adverſariis, etiamnum colligimus & percipimus, poſtquam evectus eſt ad ſummam inter Orientales Chriſtianos dignitatem. Quæ argumento ſunt, quanta fuerit in te propagandæ veræ Religionis cura, etiam inter remotiſſimos a nobis.*

(*F*) *A Lady of great parts. He had ſome Children by her.*] Her Name was *Conſtantia Huygens*, and ſhe was very well read. M. *Deſcartes* highly eſteemed her, and voluntarily, as well as with great deference, deſired to know her Opinion on the new Philoſophical Idea's which he had invented. She ſurvived her Huſband about ten Years, and died the firſt of *December* 1667. very much regretted by all the judicious People of the *Hague*. *M. de Wilhem* left behind him three Daughters and one Son, *Maurice* LE LEU DE WILHEM, at preſent Dean of the Council and Feodal Court of *Brabant*, at the *Hague*, who is a very fine Gentleman, enriched with a very great ſtock of Learning and Merit; and his Converſation is attended with a thouſand Charms. I can indeed ſpeak by experience, he being one of the firſt Acquaintance which I had the honour to make at my arrival in *Holland*. After he had compleated his Studies, he travelled in *Italy*, *France*, *Germany*, *Hungary*, *Sweden*, and ſeveral other places, where he render'd himſelf conſiderable to all eminent Perſons. He accompanied Mr. *de Zuylichem* his Uncle to *Orange* in 1665, when that Principality was reſtored with all the neceſſary Formalities to its Lawful Sovereign. He then went out Doctor of Law with great applauſe (*e*). He hath been always very curious, not only in the Antiquities of his own Country, but the *Roman* alſo. And accordingly, his ſtrong Inclination for that ſtudy interrupted that of the practical part of the Law in 1670. in order to travel a ſecond time in a more advanced age; and having ſtaid ſome Months at *Paris*, he ſet forward for Italy with *Don Franciſco* (*f*) *Brancaccio*, Nephew to the Cardinal of that name, and in company with *Meſſieurs de Grancei*, the Sons of the Marſhal of that name. He ſtayed a whole Year at *Rome*, in order to ſearch into whatever was remarkable in that famous City. Being returned into *Holland*, he ſtrenuouſly applied himſelf to inquire into the Law of Nations, and the intereſts of the Princes and States of *Europe*. His Genius prompted him to it, and his Acquaintance with ſeveral Languages furniſhed him with great helps for that ſtudy. In *November* 1671, he went into *Sweden* with his Ecellency Mr. *de Haren*, Ambaſſador from the United Provinces, and was choſen by the States General to take care of their Affairs at that Court (*g*), when that Ambaſſador was upon his return. Beſides which, the ſame States beſtowed on him the place of Counſellor in the Court of *Brabant*, in the place of Mr. *Fagel*, promoted to be their Regiſter. Having acquired a very conſiderable Acquaintance at the Court of *Sweden*, and ſtanding very well with the Chancelor *de la Gardie*, and the other Senators of that Kingdom, the States of *Holland* reſolved in *June* 1673, to ſend him to that Court, with the Character of Deputy extraordinary of the United Provinces. And the following Year he was twice nominated to the Office of Counſellor of *Holland*, firſt on the part of the Cities, and afterwards on the part of the Nobility. In 1683, he married the Eldeſt Daughter of Mr. *Timmers*, Burgomaſter of *Rotterdam*, who has been Director of the *India* Company, and ſeveral times Deputy to the Admiralty of the *Maes* (*b*).

(*G*) *An extenſive epiſtolary Correſpondence with the Learned.*] And above all, with *Salmaſius*, *Heurnius*, *Rivet*, *Deſcartes*, *Heinſius*, *Voſſius*, *Junius*, *Manaſſeh Ben Iſrael*, who dedicated his Treatiſe *de Creatione*

(*a*) Ad ampliſſimum præſtantiſſimum pietate & multiplici eruditione virum D. Davidem de Wilhem.

(*b*) *I write this in the year 1696.*

(*c*) *Who was then at* Aleppo.

(*d*) Andreas Rivetus epiſt. dedicator. commentar. in Decalog. oper. tom. 1. pag. 1223.

(*e*) *See* M. Cha bron's Re *lation* *Printed* Orange in 1666. p. 161.

(*f*) *He had been* *Captain* *Horſe in* *the ſervi* *of the* *King of* *Spain in* *the Low* Countri

(*g*) *By a* *Reſolu* *taken* *26th.* August 1672.

(*b*) *Ta* *(as to* *ters of* *from a* *Memo* *impart* *to the* *Bookſell* sides a large number of ‡ very curious Manuscripts in *Arabick*, *Persian*, *Chaldaick*, &c. The Present of (H) Mummies, Manuscripts, and such other Rarities, which he made to the University of *Leyden*, is still preserved there as an Ornament. He died of the Stone on the [illegible] of *January* 1658, having faithfully, and with great application, served three Princes of *Orange*, namely *Frederick Henry*, *William II.* and *William Henry*, at present, King of *England* §.

WIMPINA (*Conrad*) Theological Professor at *Francfort on the Oder*, in the XVIth Century, was born at *Buchen* †. He acquired a great repute by his publick as well as private Lectures at *Leipsick*, in Philosophy, Divinity and Poetry, &c. He had great crowds of Auditors, and at the same time raised the Envy of no small number, who in vain endeavour'd to obscure his Glory; in order to which, not being able to succeed by the sophistical Subtilties which they propos'd to him, and he Learnedly answered, they had recourse to Calumnies and Libels. Upon which he was obliged to appear at the Tribunal of the Archbishop of *Magdeburg*, where he triumphed over his Enemies. He was in a splendid manner promoted to the degree of Doctor of Divinity: A Cardinal Legate, to whom he harangued in St. *Paul*'s Church at *Leipsick*, and who admired his Eloquence, caused that Degree to be conferred on him. *Wimpina* was presented by the whole Faculty of Divinity. The Reputation of this Doctor advanced so high, that the Marquisses of *Brandenburg* designing to found an University at *Francfort* on the *Oder*, made him Offers of a very considerable Salary to be Professor there. He accordingly accepted that Chair, and went thither ‡ to lay the Foundation of that University, where he became Rector of two Colleges, and first Professor of Divinity. He Published (A) several Books ‡. He was one of *Luther*'s (B) Antagonists; and passed for the real Author of * the Theses which appeared under the Name of the *Dominican John Tezelius* against this Reformer.

WOUWER (*John de*) One of the Learned Men of the XVI Century, and Author (A) of several Books, was of *Hamburg*, and the Son of a || Refugee in *Germany* on account of Religion. He was born on the 10th of *March* 1574, and having run through the School Studies in his Native Country, was sent to *Leyden* in 1592, where he spent five Years in an intimate familiarity with the most Learned Men, and even with the great *Scaliger*. From thence he went to *France*, where

Gestione (a) to him. The Letters which he received from them and several other illustrious Men, lie in heaps amongst the Papers of his Son Mr. *de Wilhem*, who if he had but leisure to select them, would find great numbers of which he might make a considerable Present to the Commonwealth of Learning.

(H) *The Present* ——— *which he made to the University of* Leyden.] Of which here is a publick Testimony: (c) *Il mihi silentio non est prætereundum, quod erga hanc nostram Academiam, studiorum tuorum olim promotricem, matrem proinde tuam, liberalem admodum te præbueris: factum est enim id curâ tuâ & ære tuo, ut Theatrum in eâ Anatomicum, tot raris & pretiosis κειμηλίοις, exterorum omnium qui illud invisunt animos in admirationem rapiat; inter quæ eminent duo condita cadavera (Mumias vocant) antiquissima, quæ in Ægypto eruta, & a te redempta, integerrima, te mittente, ad nos pervenerunt.*

(A) *He Published several Books.*] The anonymous Author of the Catalogue of illustrious Men, Published by *Joachim John Maderus* (d), mentions several Books written by *Wimpina*, before the Year 1514, but makes no distinction between those already Printed, and those which were not. However the Catalogue of them runs as follows: *Editio proprietatum logicalium in commentatione non vulgari libri iv. De erroribus Philosophorum in fide Christiana. De nobilitate cælestium corporum. De eo an animati cæli possint dici. De nobilitate animarum cæli. De fato opus insigne & præclarum. Palillogia de Theologico fastidio. Panegyrici de Christi mirabilitate ac sublimitate. Apologeticus in sacræ Theologiæ defensionem. Apologia secunda contra obtrectationem Theologiæ. Apologia tertia ad Mollerstatinas offensiones & denigrationes S. Theologiæ. Apologia quarta contra Laconismum Mellerstat. pro defensione Theologiæ. Apologia quinta pro repressione errorum Mellerstat. Cribratio in tergiversationes Martini Mollerstat. De ortu, progressu, & fructu S. Theologiæ. Super sententias libri IV. Præcepta coagmentandi rhetoricè orationes. Opus quodlibeticæ disputationis mirum & varium. Orationes & carmina.* I don't in the least doubt but this *Martin Mellerstat*, against whom *Wimpina* so often drew his Pen, was the same *Martin Melrstat* of whom our Anonymous Author speaks particularly under number 31, and of whose Works he inserts a Catalogue, amongst which we find no track of his Controversy with *Wimpina*. This *Martin Melrstat* bore the Name of his Country which is situated, in *Franconia*, and taught the *Thomists* Philosophy at *Leipsick*, for the space of Twenty Years, with great Reputation; after which, he applied himself to the study of Physick, and being admitted Doctor in that Science, became so famous, that *Frederick*, Elector of *Saxony*, chose him for his Physician (e).

What I have further to say of *Wimpina* is, that his Book *de Divinatione* is one of his principal Works; but he is charged (f) with stealing it from *Picus Mirandula*. Which therefore affords us another Author to add to *Thomasius* his Catalogue of *Plagiaries*. This Tract *de Divinatione* was printed with several others of *Wimpina*, at *Cologne* in 1531, in Folio. And Three Tomes of the said Author were Published at *Francfort* on the *Oder*, in 1528, *de Sectis, Erroribus, ac Schismatis*, together with the Treatises *de Prædestinatione & de Fortuna* in Folio.

(B) *He was one of* Luther's *Antagonists.*] He was one of the Four (g) *Brandenburg* Divines who in 1530 refuted the Articles of Faith which *Luther* had Published, and which served for a Foundation to the *Augsburg* Confession. He was one of those Divines whom the Catholick Princes brought to the Dyet that year. They chose the most able Disputants (h); and finding that the first Conferences betwixt the Deputies on both sides, did not make way for an Accomodation, and suspecting the Multitude of Disputants, on each side, kept them at a distance from the ways of peace, they reduced the whole number of Divines to three of each side only. Those of the Roman Catholick Party were *Eccius*, *Wimpina*, and *Cochlæus* (i). Whence we may conclude that Mr. *Konig* is mistaken in placing *Conrad Wampina*'s death in 1529.

(A) *Author of several Books.*] He Published, with

[illegible] *David de Wilhem* [illegible] *e tenebris* [illegible] *compositum a Lupo Servato Abbate* [illegible] [illegible] *discipulo, qui vixit* [illegible] & *mihi communicavit.*

|| See the Remark C.

(c) [illegible]

(d) At Helmstad in the year 1660, in 4to.

(e) Ex centuria Scriptor. insignium in lucem edita a Joach. Joh. Madero.

(f) Tot[illegible] clam operæ ex Pico plurima. Mart. del. Rio disq. Magic. l. 4. c. 2. quæst. 7. sect. 2 p. m. 247.

(g) Seckend. hist. *Lutheran*, lib. 2. pag. 152.

(h) Adducti erant a variis principibus in Comitia pugnacissimi ex adversariis Lutheri *Seckendorf* ibid. pag. 171. n. 1.

(i) Id. ib. pag. 177. n. 16.

where he acquired the Friendſhip of *Claudius du Puy*, *Francis Pithou*, and ſeveral other great Men. He afterwards ſpent two Years in *Italy*, and was received there in a very engaging manner by ſeveral Prelates and Cardinals. He had alſo acceſs to the Pope, who diſcovered ſeveral Marks of his Affection for him, and offer'd him a very honourable Penſion. Being return'd to *Germany*, he accepted the Poſt of Counſellor to the Count of *Eaſt Frieſland*, and was his Envoy at the *Hague* in the Treaty for the Pacification, of *Embden* as he was afterwards at the Court of *John Adolphus*, Duke of *Holſtein*. Which Prince was ſo charmed with him at the firſt Converſation, that he obliged him to bind himſelf by an Oath, to engage in his Service. And he was accordingly honoured with the dignity of being his Counſellor, and advanced to the Government of *Gottorp*. But after three Years diſcharging that Office, he fell into a Diſeaſe which waſted him by ſlow degrees, and died on the 30th of *March* 1612, to the extreme regret of his Maſter, who cauſed him to be pompouſly interr'd in the great Church at *Sleſwick* ||. He held an Epiſtolary *(B)* correſpondence with the moſt Learned Men of *Holland*, and of ſeveral other Countries. He neither wanted Learning, nor other good qualifications; but we are told that his Faults were not leſs than his Virtues *. Being Born a Proteſtant *(C)* he embraced the *Romiſh* Religion in *Italy*; or at leaſt it was reported ſo. He is alſo ranked amongſt the *(D)* Plagiaries.

He

|| *Taken from Henningus Witte in memoria Woweriana page 79. & ſeq. of the memoriæ philoſophorum.*

* See the Remark E.

Notes the Works of *Sidonius Apollinaris*, *Petronius*, *Firmicus de errore profanarum religionum*, *Minutius Felix*, and *Apuleius*, beſides ſeveral Notes on *Tertullian*, a Tract *de polymathia*, a diſſertation *de cognitione veterum novi orbis*. *Dies æſtiva ſeu de Umbra*. A Panegyrick on *Chriſtian* the IV. King of *Denmark*. We have alſo two Centuries of his Latin Letters, and a *Syntagma de Græca & Latina Bibliorum interpretatione* (a).

(B) He held an Epiſtolary correſpondence with the moſt Learned.] Which appears by the Collection of his Letters Printed with his *Syntagma de Græca & Latina Bibliorum interpretatione*. See Mr. *Morhof's* Opinion of them. (b) *Variæ hic inſtitutæ ſunt de multis rebus literariis conſultationes & judicia: nam multa, quæ agitabantur illo tempore inter viros literatos, his in epiſtolis recenſentur. Scriptæ illæ ſunt ad illuſtres ejus temporis viros, Scaligerum, Meurſium, Heinſium, Gruterum, Scriverium & plures alios, cum quibus non niſi erudita tractari poterant. Epiſtolas ejus multas ineditas ſervat illuſtris Gudius, latitant & aliquæ inter MSta Bibliothecæ Hamburgenſis.*

(C) Being Born a Proteſtant he embraced the Romiſh Religion in Italy.] *Nicolas de Wouwer* his Father, (c) a Perſon deſcended from an Ancient Noble Family, left the Low Countries on Account of the perſecution of the Proteſtants there, and ſetled at *Hamburg*; a manifeſt proof that the Subject of this Article was Born a Proteſtant. *Baudius's* Letters inform us that he changed his Religion. (d) *Illud pro certo habetur, eum Romæ publicitus religionem abjuraſſe, nullo metu qui in virum conſtantem cadere poſſit, ſed contemptu & inſcitia pietatis, vel (quod his potentius eſt apud mentes præcipiti ambitione afflatas) ſpe conſequendæ alicujus opimæ largitionis. Sed, ut audio, eſca elapſa eſt, ſolum hamum retinuit.* In the 2. Tome (e) of the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum*, there is a Letter from one (f) *Francis Broccard*, in which our (g) *John de Wouwer* is ranked amongſt the Learned Men who having apoſtatized, Favoured the deſigns of the Inquiſition at *Rome*. But read the Letter which he wrote to *Baudius*, and you will there find him denying this Abjuration of his Religion; and only owning that he diſliked ſeveral things in the Reformation of *Luther* and *Calvin*. (h) *Non nego profecto eos, qui religionem reformandam ſuſceperunt, multa, quæ fortaſſe diſſuenda erant, pio ſed improvido zelo tota reſcidiſſe, hoc me ſerio improbare aperte fateor: neque illa ſententia heri aut hodie mihi nata, ſed ex illo tempore quo aliquem veri guſtum ſenſus communis mihi ſuggeſſit, hoc ſi omnes in me improbant, ne iraſcor quidem. Mihi vero ita ſentire liberum erit, & oſtendere ſuam cuique ſponſam eſſe pulchram.*

(D) He is ranked amongſt the Plagiaries.] The Learned *Mauſſac* after telling us that ſince *Caſaubon* could not put his laſt Hand to his Book of the Studies of the Ancients, he would one day treat of that Subject himſelf if he had leaſure, adds that *Wouwer* interfered with *Caſaubon*, without publiſhing any thing but what he had taken from that Critick. It is ſuppoſed that *Wouwer* appropriated this Rich Treaſure to himſelf when he was at *Montpellier* with *Caſaubon*. (i) *De Iſaaco Caſaubono loquor, in cujus meſſem falcem injecit Joannes Wouer vir certe ingenii non vulgaris, ſed qui opus imperfectum reliquit, quamvis omne quod edidit à Caſaubono habuerit, dum una cum eo agebat Monſpelii.* The Book out of which I cite theſe Words was Printed at *Toulouſe* in 1615. and that of *Wouwer* which *Mauſſac* means is Intituled *de polymathia tractatio*, and was Printed in (k) 1603. Several reports to the diſadvantage of *Wouwer* had run abroad before *Mauſſac* Publiſhed this Accuſation. *Wouwer* proteſted his Innocence in a Letter (l) which he wrote in 1605. And *Baudius* to whom it was addreſſed, writ to him in Anſwer that thoſe Rumors were vaniſhed, and that he ought not to aſcribe their riſe to *Caſaubon*. (m) *Refrixit jam ſermo leviſſimorum hominum, qui Polymathian ſuam Plagii ſuſpicione infamabant. Caſaubonus vir melior & candidior eſt, quam ut hujus culpæ inſimulandus eſſe videatur.* He ſent him beſides a fragment of a Letter of *Caſaubon*, by which it appears, that without ever complaining of any Plagiariſm that Learned Critick very much commended *Wouwer's* Book. See alſo what *Baudius* wrote (n) to *Meſſieurs du Puy* the ſame Year; but above all ſee *Thomaſius's* Preface to the new Edition of the Treatiſe *de Polymathia*, which ſtrenuouſly refutes Mr. *Mauſſac*. Mr. *Morhof* mentions this particular, and cites *Schoockius*, who ſays that this Reproach of *Mauſſac* proceeded from envy, and that *Voſſius* was Guilty of ſtealing from *Wouwer*. (o) *Ex invidiâ profectum hoc Mauſſaci judicium Martinus Schockius* Confutatione Fab. Hamel. p. 2. c. 4. *exiſtimat. Ex ipſo autem Wouwerio multa cepiſſe, ſuppreſſo ejus nomine, Voſſium etiam Schockius loco laudato, & Joannes Jonſſius* lib. 1. deſcrip. Hiſt. Phil. c. 10. p. 49. *teſtatur*. Scaliger (p) reported the ſame in Converſation which *Mauſſac* did in Print; and generally called *Wouwer* a great Plagiary, and retailer of Traſh. Notwithſtanding which he highly Compliments him (q) in his Letters.

Lindenbrock was violently enraged againſt him. He accuſes him of a Thouſand Plagiariſms, particularly in his little Book *de umbra*. (r) He tells us that *Wouwer* finding that Tract amongſt *Gulielmius's* Papers, only alter'd the form of it, and interwove

(a) *Taken from* Henningus Witte, memor. philoſoph. p. 81, 82.

(b) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. lib. 1. c. 24. pag. 304. *He ſays that Edition was publiſh'd at* Hamburg *in* 1608. *But how can this be reconciled with what M.* Witte *ſays* ubi ſupra *pag.* 82. *that* Elmenhorſt *put out that* Syntagma *in the Year* 1618.

(c) Illuſtri Baronum ſtirpe oriundus Id. ib. cap. 1. pag. 7.

(d) Baudius, epiſt. 69. centuriæ 1. p. m. 101. *It is dated the* 18 *of February* 1603.

(e) *page* 875. (f) *See concerning this Man the Hiſtory of the Edict of* Nantes, tom. 1. p. 374. & *ſeq*. (g) *He is there call'd wrong* Johannes Wourenius Amburgenſis. (h) Joh. à Wouwer epiſtola ad Baudium pag. 110. *'Tis the* 73 *of the* 1. *Century of* Baudius's *Letters*.

(i) Philippus Jacobus Mauſſacus, notis in Plutarchum de fluviis pag. 149.

(k) *The Edition I make uſe of is of that Year*, ex bibliopolio Frobeniano. Thomaſius de plagio literario pag. 261. *mentions only that of* Hamburg 1604.

(l) *'Tis the 7th of the* 2. *Century of* Baudius's *Letters in the Leyden Edition* 1650.

(m) Baudius, epiſt. 9. centur. 2. p. 16

(n) Monui vos jampridem diſſipatum fuiſſe rumorem de Wouwerio noſtro quaſi plagio domeſtico ſublegerit potiſſimam partem ſuæ polymathiæ. *Baudius epiſt.* 3. *cent.* 2. *pag.* 155. (o) Morhofius, Polyh. lib. 1. c. 1. p. 7. (p) *See the Scaligerana at the Word* Wouwerius. (q) *See Scaliger's Letters.* (r) *It is intituled* dies æſtiva, ſive de umbra Paegnion. *It was Printed in* 1610. *My Edition is that of* Oxford 1636 *in* 12.

He was too vainly fond of (E) Flattery, as appears by his Testamentary Legacy to those who should write a Panegyrick on him, after his Death. Baudius his Epistles to him, are an instance of the little sincerity (F) to be met with in the Compliments usually made to Authors. Some Writers confound our John de Wouwer with another (G) of the same Name, who studied under Lipsius, of whom I shall speak in a Remark.

XENOCRATES

were some Latin Verses which were made by another hand (a) *Lindenbrogium Wolfs quondam is semper infensum habuit: superfunt etiam Lindenbrogii tum in Bibliotheca Hamburgensi, tum in Gudiana, Epistolæ, quibus ille acerbe insultat. Vocat illum homo m con latr[illegible] nomine (à barbando.) Multa in illo plagia notat, ac in aliqua epistola hæc de illo habet, ejus de Umbra Tractatum inter plagia recensens:* Quem novissime edidit librum tenebricosum umbratilis ille, inter doctissimi optimique viri Jani Gulielmi Chelsas repertum ajunt: in quo id tamen præstitit, quod aliam illi vestem induit, & suo more exoravit. Nam & carmina, quæ passim intermixta, non adulteri hujus fuerunt, sed Scholæ Schlefwicensis Rectoris, viri eruditi & probi, qui etiam nunc vivit, & id aperte fatetur. *Epistola hæc scripta est Hamburgi an. 1613. Gravis hæc in illum virum injuria est, & nescio quid acerbitatis sapit. In alia epistola passim in eum invehitur, ac plura ejus plagia notat.*

(E) *He was too vainly fond of Flattery.*] This Testamentary promise took effect; for in hopes of the engaged Sum a parcel of Panegyrists started up, who extolled *Wouwer* beyond the Sky. But if we had his Life written by *Lindenbrock*, we should find a great many particulars different from their Relations. (b) *Felicior & aliis Eruditis, & ipso Principe suo, Johan. Adolpho, nullos, uti supra* (1) *monuimus, Encomiastas Posthumos nacto, fuit* Joh. Wowerius, *Minister Aulæ Gottorp. Primarius. Biographias enim, & Sermones Panegyricos, memoriæ illius sacros, publicarunt Gev. Elmenhorstius, Ad. Olearius, Nic. Johann. Crusius, aliique complures,* spe *potius* Nummi dolosi (*Præmii sc. LX. Joachimicorum, quod cuilibet, Laudationem sibi posthumam scripturo, in Tabulis ultimæ Voluntatis Wowerius destinavit,*) *ipsis* affulgente *invitati, quam sincero in virum Virtutibus pariter atque Vitiis magnum ducti affectu. Alio haud dubie fine, ut Animo sc. suo, in Wouwerium ob studiorum Æmulationem iniquiori, morem gereret, Vitæ illius Historiam* (2) *scribere in Animo habuit Frid. Lindebrogius, Civis ipsius, quo rigidiorem Vitiorum ejus Censorem hactenus observavi neminem.* The Author of whom I have borrowed these Words, elsewhere observes that *Wouwer* (c) was a little vain, and frequently talked of himself. *Baudius* also observed a great presumption in him. Read the following lines: (d) *De Wouwerio eadem ad nos fama pervenit, eum id ætatis hominem admiratione doctrinæ (vide & ride ludibria judiciorum) cooptatum in collegium Senatorum sacræ Cæsareæ Majestatis, sed certissimo argumento persuadeor rem ita se* (e) *non habere, quod cum à reditu suo bis terve scripserit ad Scaligerum, ad Scriverium, ad Franciscum Dousam etiam, cum perhonorifico nostri mentione, tamen ubique miserabiliter insectatur fortunæ suæ malignitatem, nec homo sui ostentator magnificus, quidquam de superbo illo titulo adjicit, quem proculdubio non fuit omissurus, nisi prorsus ab ingenio desciscere vellet. Detepuit jam mucro iracundiæ nostræ adversus eum, quod ex pluribus indiciis apparet eum non tam nocendi animo, quam sui extollendi vanitate solitum detrahere famæ & meritis laudibus amicorum. Dempto certe hoc vitio, multa habet ingenii naturæque dona, quibus supra vulgus sapit, & illustrium virorum amicitiam meretur.*

(F) *Of the little sincerity to be met with in the compliments usually made to Authors.*] *Wouwer* published a Panegyrick on *Christian* the IV. King of *Denmark* in 1603. Upon occasion of which *Baudius* writing to the Author loads him with praises, but in a Letter to another he speaks of this performance as of a piece full of Faults. What follows will prove the truth of these two particulars: (f) *In Dominici Baudii* ἀλλοπροσάλλου Epistola ad Wowerium (3) *haud parem observet* [illegible]. *Illic enim non tantum* Generosos *Wowerii* impetus, & ardua felicis Ingenii tentamenta, laudem apud Doctos, Amorem apud Honestos, admirationem apud peritos Rerum Æstimatores, *censet Mereri, sed ironice etiam eundem laudat, quod,* vividarum & erectarum mentium *exemplo*, Eloquentiam *suam in Panegyrico* Præceptiunculis Magistellorum non circumscribat, sed, Artium repagula silenter perrumpens, libero cursu feratur. In Epistola *contra ad* Corn. Mylium (4). *Scaligero* [illegible], *majori, quam ille,* παῤῥησίᾳ, *quid in Oratione hac desideret, significat:* Affectavit Wowerius, *inquit*, in Panegyrico sublime & floridum simul genus dicendi. Laudandus ob generosum conatum, etsi interdum languescit, & pellucet nimis Æmulatio Antiquorum. Multa sunt, quæ non Ignavo Lectori placere possunt. Si currum interdum non bene moderatur, magnis tamen excidit ausis. Generosiores Animi, dum vitant humum, sæpe nubes & inania captant. Ætas & posteræ curæ, limabunt, & depascent luxuriem agnatam melioribus Ingeniis. *Wouwer* himself knew the imperfections of his performance, and made a great many excuses on Account of the hurry he wrote it in, and desired that the World would not judge of his Genius by this Essay. Observe that this Panegyrick was composed on occasion of the Homage which the City of *Hamburg* paid to his *Danish* Majesty; but something escaping the Author's Pen which might redound to the prejudice of the Liberties of that City, the Senate prohibited the Sale of it, till the first Pages were corrected (g).

(G) *Confound our* John de Wouwer *with another of the same Name* ——— *of whom I shall speak.*] This other *John de* (h) *WOUWER* was Born in 1576. at *Antwerp*, where he began his studies under the Jesuits, and afterwards went to *Louvain*, and lived with *Lipsius*, who had such an affection and high esteem for him, that he Appointed him one of the Executors of his last Will, and recommended the care of his Manuscripts to him alone. This *Wouwer* having spent three Years in Travelling into *France*, *Spain* and *Italy*, was no sooner returned but he was promoted to the dignity of a Counsellor in his own Country, and afterwards became a Member of both the Councils of the Treasury and War. The *Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia* deputed him to *Philip* IV. King of *Spain* who dignified him with the Honour of Knighthood. He published some Books, and died on the 23. of *September* 1635. The World expected from him the publication of two Hundred Epistles written to *Lipsius*. (i) Father *Schottus* confounds this *Wouwer* with that of *Hamburg*, as Mr. *Morhof* observes. *Duo monenda nobis sunt,* saith he (k), *in quibus erratum à viris doctis est. Primum est, quod duo confundantur ejus nominis, Antwerpianus & Hamburgensis Polymathiæ Autor. Andreas Schottus hunc Belgam facit in* notis ad Proverbia Græca p. 68. *sed falso. Lipsius in Epistolâ* 8. *Kal. Novembr.* 1599. *ad Antwerpianum illum* (l) *scripta, utrumque probè distinguit:* Janus Wouwerius, *inquit*, cognominis tuus, si non Gentilis, quam bona tecum fœderatio! Optimum par, nec vel Dii dederint magis ex usu aut Voto. Modestiam & probitatem in eo adolescente semper amavi, & ut vidi primùm (Hamburgi id fuit, ante annos novem) una laudatum illam indolem ivi. Vivat, crescat, & lampada à nobis in hoc cursu jam fessis accipiat: me libeater & judicia tradente. *Konig* (m) is Guilty of the same mistake, for when he is speaking of our *Wouwer*, he cites *Swertius* (n) who mentions only the other. Mr. *Mollerus* (o) hath collected several mistakes on this head.

(A) He

Morhofii Polyhist. l. 1. c. 21. p. 214.

(d) Baudius epistola 3. centur. 1. p. m 102. 101. This Letter is dated the 11 of February 1603.

(c) Wouwer in a Letter of a later date written to Baudius affirms the truth of it: Me consiliarium Cæsaris electum vera fama fuit. See Baudius's Letters n. 33. cent. 1.

(f) Joh. Mollerus ubi supra parte. 1. p. 187, 188. *His Edition of Baudius's Letters does not agree with mine.*

(3) Cent. III Ep. 1. p. 490, 491.

(4) Cent. I. n. 66. pag. 157.

(g) *See* Mollerus ubi supra.

(h) *Or rather* Vanden Wouwere, *according* to Valerius Andreas Bibl. Belg. pag. 587.

(i) *Taken from* Valerius Andreas, ubi supra

(k) Morhof. ubi supra pag. 7. *See also* Colomies. cap. 2. [illegible]liter.

(l) *'Tis the* 41. *of the* 1. *Century* ad Belgas.

(m) Konig, bibl. vet. & nova pag. 875.

(n) Page. 487. *and the Book he means is* Athenæ Belgicæ.

(o) Joh. Mollerus de scriptoribus homonymis pag. 731. & seq.

X.

XENOCRATES, one of the moſt illuſtrious Philoſophers of Antient Greece, was Born at * Chalcedon, and very early placed himſelf under the Direction of Plato, for whom he always retained (A) a profound reſpect, and diſcovered a ſtrict Fidelity to him. He ſtudied under this great Maſter, at the ſame time with *Ariſtotle*, but was not endowed with the ſame parts; he wanted a ſpur, and the other a Bridle, according to the Judgment of *Plato*, who farther added, that to place them together would be to Match a Horſe with an Aſs. But if his ‖ ſlow Capacity rendred him far inferior to *Ariſtotle*, he very much ſurpaſſed him in practical Philoſophy: The Purity of his Manners was ſomewhat extraordinary; his Gravity, Severity, or rather Auſterity were of ſuch a Nature, that a Divine who at preſent ſhould reſemble him would infallibly paſs for a Janſeniſt or a very rigid Man. He had acquired ſuch an abſolute Command of his Paſſions, that a moſt Beautiful Curtezan, who laid (B) that ſhe would ſubdue his Virtue, loſt her Wager, tho' ſhe had the Liberty to Lye by him, which afforded her an opportunity of uſing all her Artifices to Allure him to enjoy her. This is a Triumph as Remarkable as that of *Aldhelme*, and ſome other canoniſed Saints who have eſcaped untainted from the like Temptations, as we are told. Chaſtity was not the ſole Virtue of this Philoſopher; all the other parts of (C) Temperance ſhone in his Conduct: He Loved neither Pleaſures,

(A) *He always retained a profound reſpect for* Plato, *and diſcovered a ſtrict Fidelity to him.*] (a) He Accompanied him in his Voyage to *Sicily*, and was with him at the Court of *Syracuſe*. *Dionyſius* the Tyrant one day in diſcourſe with *Plato* telling him that *ſome body would cut off his Head*; no Man ſhall do it, replied *Xenocrates* (b), before he hath cut off mine. The Tyrant's expreſſion imported the ſame thing (c) as if he had ſaid *I will cut off your Head*: which gives a great Idea of the Generoſity of *Xenocrates*. We have already ſeen (d) above what is ſuffered of his Zeal for *Plato's* Honour when Injuriouſly treated by *Ariſtotle*. To which I add, that he very patiently bore *Plato's* Reprimands, and even when by others excited to excuſe himſelf, he made no other Anſwer than this, *he treats me ſo for my Advantage*. (e) Ξενοκράτης ὁ Χαλκηδόνιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος εἰς τὸ ἄχαρι (f) σκωπτόμενος, οὐδέποτε ἠγανάκτει ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸν παροξύνοντα αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τούτου, ἵνα τι ἀντείπῃ τῷ Πλάτωνι, οὐδ᾽ ἂν πάνυ ἠρέμα καταπαύσας, τὸν ἄνδρα, ἔφασκεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἐμοὶ συμφέρει. *Xenocrates Chalcedonius, quum a Platone propter mores inurbanos reprehenderetur, nunquam indignatione iraue commotus eſt: ſed & illi, qui ipſum ad reſpondendum Platoni inſtigaret, Hoc, inquit, mihi bonum atque commodum eſt: & prudentiſſime hominis ſententiam impoſuit.* But inſtead of this we are told the quite contrary by a Latin Writer: where we find (g) 1. that *Plato* was told that *Xenocrates* had ſpoken ill of him. 2. That he would not believe it. 3. That the Accuſer with an Audacious Air asked the Reaſon of his incredulity. 4. That *Plato* anſwered, it is not to be believed that a Perſon, whom I love ſo well, ſhould not love me alſo. 5. That the Accuſer offered to ſwear it. 6. That *Plato* would not ſuffer it to go ſo far, but ended the diſpute by the following Words, *Xenocrates would not have ſaid that, had he not believed that it was for my Advantage.* (h) *Poſtremò cùm ad juſjurandum inimicitias ſerentis malignitas confugiſſet; ne de perjurio ejus diſputaret, affirmavit nunquam Xenocratem illa dicturum fuiſſe, niſi ea dici expedire ſibi judicaſſet.* This Story in *Valerius Maximus* ſeems to me to a corruption, or a Tranſpoſition of that which we find in *Ælian*, and which confirms the Text of this Remark.

(B) *A moſt Beautiful Curtezan, who laid that ſhe would ſubdue his Virtue, loſt her Wager.*] I mention this elſewhere; but I add here what *Valerius Maximus* ſaith: (i) *Phryne nobile Athenis ſcortum juxta eum* (Xenocratem) *vino gravem in pervigilio accubuit, pignore cum quibuſdam juvenibus poſito, an temperantiam ejus corrumpere poſſet: Quam nec tactu, nec ſermone aſpernatus, quoad voluerat in ſinu ſuo morari, irritam propoſiti dimiſit. Factum ſapientia imbuti animi abſtinens: ſed meretriculæ quoque dictum perquam facetum, Deridentibus enim ſe adoleſcentibus, quod tam formoſa, tamque elegans non ſenis animum illecebris pellicere non potuiſſet, pactumque victoriæ pretium flagitantibus: de homine ſe cum iis, non de ſtatua pignus poſuiſſe, reſpondit. Poteſtne hæc Xenocratis continentia a quoquam magis vere, magiſque proprie demonſtrari, quam ab ipſa meretricula expreſſa eſt? Phryne pulchritudine ſua, nulla ex parte conſtantiſſimam ejus abſtinentiam labefecit.* It appears that this Author ſuppoſes ſeveral particulars which raiſe the Glory of the Victory: It was intire tho' all the circumſtances favoured the Enemy. He will have it that the Curteſan took hold of an opportunity when *Xenocrates* had drunk to a pitch; and adds that the Philoſopher did not refuſe the careſſes of her hands and Voice, and that *Phryne* had leave to ſtay with him as long as ſhe pleaſed.

(C) *All the other parts of Temperance ſhone in his Conduct.*] His being fuddled when *Phryne* tempted him may be objected againſt this, as well as *Athenæus's* ſtory. That Author (k) relates that *Xenocrates* won the Crown of Gold, which the *Syracuſan* Tyrant promiſed to the Perſon that ſhould firſt drink off a certain Meaſure of Wine. It will be ſaid that a Man, who gets the Prize appointed for the greateſt drinker in the Court of a drunken Prince, is not ſober. But *Xenocrates* carried off this Prize; therefore he was not Sober. Conſider this expreſſion of *Diogenes Laertius*: (l) Χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ τιμηθέντα ἐπ᾽ ἄθλῳ πολυποσίας, *Corona aurea donatum in* PREMIUM LARGIORIS COMPOTATIONIS. Remember alſo that *Ælian* inſerts *Xenocrates* in that Chapter, where he gives us a Catalogue of thoſe (m) who loved drinking, and could drink a great deal. The firſt in this Liſt the *Syracuſan* Tyrant, who promiſed a Golden Crown to him who could drink moſt: (n) Προὔκειτο ἆθλον τῷ πιόντι πλεῖον στέφανος χρυσοῦς, καὶ ἐνίκησε Ξενοκράτης ὁ Χαλκηδόνιος: *Præmium ordinatum eſt ei, qui* PLUS BIBISSET, *aurea corona, quam meritus eſt Xenocrates Chalcedonius.* Thus you have the Objection fortify'd with all neceſſary proofs. It would be in vain to Anſwer that *Xenocrates* was admired on this occaſion (o); for the Hiſtorian who ſaith ſo adds another particular which is really laudable, I mean that the Victor did not keep this Golden Crown, but placed it on a Statue of *Mercury* as he was going home. He uſed on other days to Crown that Statue with Flowers, but that Evening he fixed on it a Golden Crown. This was a ſign of an uninteresſted mind; this was to ſhew that for the Honour of the Gods he could as eaſily part with what was moſt precious as with

a

---

* Diog. Laert. lib. 4. n. 6.

‖ [illegible]

(a) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. n. 6.

(b) Id. ib. n. 11.

(c) See Kuhnius's *Notes* in Diog. Laert. ad lib. 4. n. 11.

(d) In the Remark E. *of the Article* Ariſtotle.

(e) Ælian. var. hiſtor. lib. 14. cap. 9.

(f) See Plutarch in vita Marii init. pag. 407.

(g) Valer. Maximus lib. 4. cap. 1. n. 12. in ext. pag. m. 351.

(h) Id. ib.

(i) Val. Max. lib. 4. cap. 3. in ext. n. 3. pag. 370.

Pleaſures, Riches, nor Praiſes ‡. He never could be corrupted by (D) Bribes, and acquired ſuch a great Reputation with Regard to ſincerity and probity, that he was the ſole Perſon whoſe Oath by way of confirmation of matters Teſtimonial was diſpenſed with (E) by the Magiſtrates of *Athens*. A diſcourſe, which he made about Temperance, ſo moved the moſt diſſolute Debauchee of that Age, that it

a Noſegay. If the *Objector* ſhould be ſo Opinionative as to affirm that *Athenæus*'s meaning is that *Xenocrates* was admired on this Account, and becauſe he drank more than the reſt, they would be but ſmall gainers: For every thing that is admired is not a good Moral Quality: Several things are admired by Reaſon of their Singularity, and upon this Foot a Philoſopher might be admired for carrying off the Prize from all the Drinkers of *Syracuſe*. He ſhould have been vanquiſhed; he ought to have avoided ſuch an Engagement; and if he had been Temperate he had never entred theſe Liſts. Let us then ſee whether we can think of any other way of juſtification.

It muſt be owned that ſome very Sober People may be of ſuch a Conſtitution as to drink a great deal without loſing their Reaſon. *Socrates*, whoſe Sobriety and Auſterity of life are unconteſtable, did not love (a) *drinking, and yet when forced by Company, no Body could hold out againſt him; and what was admirable in him was, that he never was indiſpoſed on theſe occaſions, and that there was no difference betwixt* Socrates *faſting, and at his departure from a Feaſt or the moſt jolly Converſation.* If ſuch a Man on ſuch an extraordinary occaſion as that Feſtival, which was celebrated at *Syracuſa* when *Dionyſius* the Tyrant promiſed the Golden Crown to the greateſt drinker, made a Tryal of his ſtrength and won the Prize, it ought not to be concluded from thence that he was an intemperate Man. He does not thereby loſe the Character of a ſober Man: This Virtue ought to be conſidered in the ſame manner with other habitual Qualities, which found a Character which is not loſt by any ſingle Act of the oppoſite Quality. Mr. *Daille* made this Remark when accuſed of calling Mr. *Cottiby an extravagant viſionary*. Sometimes the want of Attention, replied he, "(b) and frequently an exceſs of paſſion, fixes a fooliſh or extravagant Notion in the mind of a Wiſe Man. But you don't therefore call him a Fool. If you believe *Horace*, the excellent *Homer* dreams ſometimes. Will you from thence accuſe *Horace* of railing at that incomparable Author, whom he elſewhere ſo highly eſteems and admires? Will you ſay that he calls him *a ſluggiſh, dull, and ſtupid Poet?* No. For theſe Names as well as thoſe of *detractor* and *viſionary* are only beſtowed on ſuch as are habituated to thoſe Vices, and not on thoſe from whom ſuch Actions barely eſcape, and that very ſeldom, either through Humane weakneſs, or by the Force of ſome extraordinary cauſe: *One ſwallow makes no ſpring*, as the Philoſopher (1) hath it on a like occaſion." This is ſufficient to juſtify what I have affirmed concerning *Xenocrates*.

(a) Charpentier, vie de Socrate p. m. [illegible]

(b) Daillé, Replique a Adam & a Cottiby, part. ch. 3 pag. m. 15.

(1) Ariſt. in his Mor. to Nicom. l. 1. c. 7. towards the end.

I ſhall ſay by the by that (c) two very Learned Criticks are perſuaded, that he was not at *Syracuſa* when he carried the Prize, and that it was at *Athens* that he won it. I own indeed that their Opinion is probable, tho' to me it ſeems leſs ſo, than that which I have followed. It is undeniable that *Xenocrates* was at the Court of *Dionyſius*, and that he was then very Young. Is it not then more likely that he ſhould indulge himſelf to drink on that occaſion, than in the City where he ſtood upon the Foot of a thorough auſtere Philoſopher?

(c) Kuhnius in Diog. Laert. lib. 4. n. 8. Perizonius in Ælian. var. hiſt. lib. 2. cap. 41. *but obſerve that M. Perizonius is not ſo poſitively for this Opinion as the other.*

What more Authentick proof can we have of his great Sobriety than the Proverb of the Ancients, *Xenocrates's Cheeſe*, which they made uſe of to expreſs that a thing laſted a long time? (d) The relator of this particular adds. 1. That when he had pierced a Caſk, it was ſo long before it was empty that the Wine quite loſt its Virtue. 2. That *Xenocrates* ſeveral times threw away his Proviſions by Reaſon they grew ruſty or muſty; which would not have happened to a leſs frugal Perſon.

(d) Stobæus de continen. & ſobr. ſerm. 15. fol. m. 69.

(D) *He never could be corrupted by bribes.*] The *Macedonian* Court by Bribes corrupted a great many Perſons in the Neighbouring Republicks, and when their Preſents were refuſed, they gave to underſtand that they never intended to take any Meaſures prejudicial to the intereſt of their Country. *Xenocrates* took the ſame courſe. He refuſed King *Philip's* Preſents; whence that Prince deſpairing to gain him, treated him uncivilly, and did not admit him to the Conferences with the other Ambaſſadors of the Republick of *Athens*, whom he had ſoftened by Bribes, Feaſting and cajolling. But *Xenocrates* continued equally inflexible, and preſerving his Integrity inviolable, never appeared at the Audience and Feaſts as his Collegues did. They complained that he did no Service in his Embaſſy, for which he was very near being fined: But he diſcovered the whole ſecret, and advertiſed the *Athenians* that it was very neceſſary to have a watchful Eye upon the Publick good, ſince the other Ambaſſadors were corrupted by Bribery. This loaded him with double (e) Honour. He would not receive the Money which *Antipater* ſent (f) him, and when he accepted a ſmall part of the Sum which *Alexander's* Miniſters brought him, it was only to avoid the diſcovering any contempt for that great Monarch. (g) *Xenocrates quum legati ab Alexandro quinquaginta ei talenta attuliſſent, quæ erat pecunia temporibus illis Athenis præſertim maxima, adduxit legatos ad cœnam in Academiam. Iis appoſuit tantum, quod ſatis eſſet, nullo apparatu. Quum poſtridie rogarent eum, cui numerari juberet, quin vos heſterna inquit cœnula non intellexiſtis me pecunia non egere? Quos quum triſtiores vidiſſet, xxx minas accepit, ne aſpernari regis liberalitatem videretur.* Obſerve in this *Latin* paſſage, the conſequence which he drew from the mean Supper with which he Treated *Alexander's* Envoys. Doth not this, ſaith he, give you to underſtand that I have no need of Money? Another Hiſtorian tells us that (h) having accepted part of the Preſent, he ſent back the reſt to *Alexander*, Adding, he hath more need of it than I, by Reaſon he ſubſiſts a greater Number of Men than I. Theſe are all excellent Moral Maxims, which point out the true ſource of Avarice, and Contempt of Riches. Let us obſerve that *Valerius Maximus*, who could not be unacquainted with *Cicero's* Relation, hath left out a circumſtance, which was not convenient for his purpoſe. He Aimed at a Jingle of Antitheſes and Parallels: He reſolved to connect the Triumph over *Phryne* to that over *Alexander's* Money. Having told us that *Xenocrates* in *Phryne's* judgment was a Statue; he takes it to be very witty to ſay that this Philoſopher was no leſs a (i) Statue with regard to the Charms of Gold, than thoſe of a Curteſan, and to add (k), that a great Prince would have bought the Affection of a Philoſopher, but the Philoſopher would not ſell it to that great Monarch. All theſe witty turns would have been ſpoiled, if it had been ſaid that *Xenocrates* took part of the Preſent. Wherefore he ſuppreſſed this circumſtance. This is the Exact Fidelity of this, and ſeveral other Writers; they enlarge or curtail Facts as they find it convenient, in order to adjuſt them to their own Conceptions.

(e) Ex Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra n. 8. & 9.

(f) Id. ib. n. 8.

(g) Cicero Tuſcul. quæſt. lib. 5. fol. m. 277. B.

(h) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra.

(i) Quid rex Alexander? an divitiis eum quatere potuit? ab illo quoque ſtatuam & quidem æque fruſtra tentatam putes. *Valer. Maxim.* lib. 4. cap. 3. n. 3. in ext.

(k) Ita rex philoſophi amicitiam emere voluit: Philoſophus regi ſuam vendere noluit. Id. ib.

Father *Abram* cites a paſſage of *Themiſtius*, where this Action of *Xenocrates* is aſcribed to *Xenophanes*. (l) He ſhould have Corrected that miſtake.

(l) *See Abram's commentary* in orat. Ciceron. pro Sextio pag. 181.

(E) *Whoſe Oath was diſpenſed with —— by the Magiſtrates.*] He could not have a greater Honour done him than this. *Valerius Maximus* is very judicious on this Head: (m) *Quantum porro honoris Athenis Xenocrati ſapientia pariter ac ſanctitate claro tributum eſt? Qui cum teſtimonium dicere coactus ad aram acceſſiſſet, ut more civitatis juraret, omnia ſe vere retuliſſe; univerſi judices conſurrexerunt, proclamaruntque ne juſjurandum diceret: Quodque ſibimetipſis poſtmodum dicenda ſententia*

(m) Id. lib. 2. cap. ult. in fine pag. m. 234.

It occaſioned his immediate reſolution (F) to renounce his Pleaſures, and apply himſelf to Wiſdom. And this Converſion was ſteady; for the Convert, afterwards, became a very grave Philoſopher. This great Alteration ought not to be attributed to the Charms of Eloquence, but rather to the auſtere gravity of *Xenocrates*. There was nothing charming, or graceful in his behaviour; but ſolid Gravity and Severity were inſeparable from his Manners; whence it was that *Plato* frequently adviſed him to ſacrifice to the Graces. This want of Politeneſs ſet off ‡ the glory which he had acquired by his Auſterity. It is not to be wondred that with this dry Genius, he ſhould have been ſo ſtrongly inclined to the Mathematicks, that he would not admit any Scholars ‖ who were ignorant of that Science. We ought more to admire that with this great Character of rigid Severity, he had yet a Heart very ſuſceptible of Compaſſion, not only towards his Neighbour, but alſo towards Beaſts. Of which it is affirmed β he gave numerous Proofs, and particularly this: He hid a Sparrow which flung herſelf upon him in her flight from a Sparrow-Hawk, and releaſed her when the danger was over γ. He recommended δ *Polyſperchon*, a Man whom he ſcarce knew, and who proved unworthy of his recommendation; which was the cauſe of his being cautioned to examin the Character of People better another time. This Miſtake however ſerves to ſhew his indulgent nature. He compiled ſeveral * Works which are loſt. He did not want leiſure to write, for he loſt ſcarce any time in Viſits, and was very fond of cloſe retirement; he thought (G) much, and was ſeldom ſeen in the Streets, and when he appeared there, the Debauched Youth durſt not ſtay, but turned out of the way to avoid meeting him. He was ζ the

* Ep. Dio. [illegible]

‡ Auctor [illegible] (Reip. [illegible]) qui T. Gracchi conciones perſpicue [illegible] civit, [illegible] Xenocratem quidem, ſeveriſſimum philoſophorum, ob eamque rem ipſam & magnum & clarum fuiſſe. Cicero de Officiis lib. 1. cap. 30. p. m. 110, 111.

tiæ hoc remiſſiori non erant, ſinceritati ejus concedendum exiſtimaverunt. *Cicero* mentions this in one of his (a) Epiſtles to *Atticus*.

(F) *A Diſcourſe which he made about Temperance occaſioned his immediate reſolution to renounce the Pleaſures.*] If a *Capucin's* Sermon ſhould at this time cauſe ſuch an alteration, the World would acknowledge it to be a particular operation of the Holy Ghoſt, and admire the Influence of a Grace which according to the *Janſeniſts*, would be efficacious to the higheſt degree; for the Perſon who was prevailed upon by this Diſcourſe, to change his courſe of life, was not an ordinary voluptuous Man, but a Ring-leader in that kind, who gloried in his Debaucheries: His Wife alſo accuſed him before a Court of Juſtice for neglecting her, and brutally debauching with Boys; ſhe brought the Indictment againſt him called (b) *malæ tractationis*. He was not aſhamed to ſhew his exceſſive ebriety (c) in the great or moſt publick places of *Athens*, being accompanied with a ſinging Woman and ſeveral players on Inſtruments. He was most frequently drunk when he appeared in the Streets, and his Unchaſtity was not leſs than his Drunkenneſs. He (d) went always well provided with Money, and lodged part of it in ſeveral parts of the City, that he might be ſupplied at all times, and in all places of the City with ſufficient Sums for his Expences, in order to gratify his vicious Appetite. In ſhort, he was the moſt famous Debauchee in *Athens*. One day when he had drank to a pitch, and, as he was uſed, run through the Streets with his cuſtomary Equipage, and lewd Companions (e), he entred the Auditory of *Xenocrates*, with deſign to ridicule him, and to play ſome inſolent tricks. At which all the Auditors being enraged; *Xenocrates* was not at all concerned (f), but more vigorouſly purſued the Diſcourſe which he had begun concerning Temperance. Some Authors ſay, (g) that he was not treating that Subject, but leaving that which he was engaged upon, he turned the Diſcourſe to the Doctrine of this Virtue; on which head he expatiated ſo excellently and gravely, that all of a ſudden he created an affection for Modeſty and Wiſdom in the Mind of this hardened Sinner. *Polemo*, (for that was the Name of this Drunkard) from that very moment, became a Diſciple of Virtue, and an exact Imitator of (h) the Gravity of *Xenocrates*, whom he ſucceeded in his Profeſſor's Chair. He ſo utterly gave over Wine, that he drank (i) nothing but Water. The Latin Deſcription of his Converſion which I here copy, is very fine: (k) *Perdita luxuriæ Athenis adoleſcens Polemo, neque illecebris tantummodo, ſed etiam ipſa infamia gaudens; cum e convivio non poſt occaſum ſolis, ſed poſt ortum ſurrexiſſet, domumque repeteret, Xenocratis Philoſophi patentem januam vidiſſet: vino gravis, unguentis delibutus, ſerto capite redimito, pellucida veſte amictus, refertam turba doctorum hominum ſcholam ejus intravit. Nec contentus tam deformi introitu, conſedit etiam, ut clariſſimum eloquium, & prudentiſſima præcepta temulentiæ laſciviis eluderet. Orta deinde, ut par erat, omnium indignatione; Xenocrates vultum in eodem habitu continuit, omiſſiſque de quibus diſſerebat, de modeſtia ac temperantia loqui cœpit. Cujus gravitate ſermonis reſipiſcere coactus Polemo, primum coronam capite detractam projecit, paulo poſt brachium intra pallium reduxit, procedente tempore oris convivalis hilaritatem depoſuit; ad ultimum, totam luxuriam exuit, uniuſque orationis ſaluberrima medicina ſanatus, ex infami ganeone maximus philoſophus evaſit. Peregrinatus eſt hujus animus in nequitia, non habitavit.* To which may be added theſe lines of *Horace*.

> (l) *Faciaſne, quod olim*
> *Mutatus Polemon? ponas inſignia morbi,*
> *Faſciolas, cubital, focalia: potus ut ille*
> *Dicitur ex collo furtim carpſiſſe coronas,*
> *Poſtquam eſt impranſi correptus voce magiſtri.*

Obſerve that *Plutarch* (m) aſſures us, that one Book of *Xenocrates* was ſufficient to convert *Polemo*.

(G) *He thought much, and was ſeldom ſeen in the Streets; and when he appeared there, the debauched Youth durſt not ſtay, but turned out of the way.*] To this purpoſe let us cite *Diogenes Laertius*: (n) Πολλάκις ἑαυτῷ τῆς ἡμέρας διαμελετᾶν, καὶ ὥραν μίαν φασὶν ἀπονέμειν σιωπῇ. *Sæpe interdiu meditationi inſerviebat, atque unam ſilentio diſtribuebat horam.* The *French* Tranſlator hath rendred theſe Greek words thus (o): *He was ſo well pleaſed with a Solitary Life, that he ſpent the whole day in meditation; but commonly he allowed himſelf one Hour for relaxation.* This Verſion ſeems to me to be good, tho' it doth not literally follow the Original. The Latin Tranſlation, tho' more literal, is leſs reaſonable; for it diſtinguiſhes betwixt the time that a Philoſopher meditates, and that in which he doth not ſpeak. But what ſort of diſtinction is that? Are thoſe who meditate obliged to ſpeak? Are they not commonly in a profound ſilence? But we ſhall ſee another place wherein the French Tranſlator (†) is greatly miſtaken: (p) Διῆγέ τε ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ τὰ πλεῖστα· καὶ εἴποτε μέλλοι εἰς ἄστυ ἀνιέναι, φασὶ τοὺς θορυβώδεις πάντας καὶ προυνίκους ὑποστέλλειν αὐτοῦ τῇ παρόδῳ. *Vixit autem ut plurimum in Academia. Si quando verò ad urbem profecturus eſſet turbas omnes tumultuoſorum ac impudicorum ipſi tranſituro de via decedere ſolitas, ſunt qui tradant.* That is, according to Mr. *de Fougerolles*, *he ſpent the greateſt part of his Life in the Academy, without ſcarce ever going out; but if by chance he was willing to go thence*

(a) *The 15th of the 1ſt. Book. See alſo the ſame Author in orat. pro* Balbo pag. m. 637. *where he mentions the thing without naming* Xenocrates.

(b) Φυγεῖν δίκην Πολέμωνα καὶ δίκην κακώσεως, ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς, ὡς μειρακίοις συνόντα. Et in judicium vocatum Polemonem ab uxore nequitiæ inſimulatum, quod adoleſcentibus congrederetur. Diog. Laert. Ibid. n. 16.

(c) Lucian in bis accuſato pag. m. 321, 323. Tom. 2.

(d) Diog. Laert. ibid.

(e) Origenes ubi infra. (f) Id. ibid. (g) Valer. Maxim. ubi infra. (h) Diog. Laert. ibid. n. 17. & ſeq. Origen. contra Celſum lib. 3, pag. 152. (i) Athen. lib. 2. cap. 6. pag. 44. (k) Valer. Maximus lib. 6. cap. 9. n. 1. in ext. pag. 581, 582.

the Head of the Academy for Twenty five Years; in the ſecond Year of the Olympiad; he ſucceeded, in the Second Year of the 110th Olympiad, Speuſippus, whom Plato had choſen for his Succeſſor. It is ſurprizing that a Philoſopher of ſo much merit ſhould receive ſuch an ill treatment from the *Athenians* as to be ſold by them (*H*) becauſe he could not pay the Capitation impoſed upon Strangers. *Demetrius Phalereus* did a very generous Act in buying *Xenocrates*, whom he immediately ſet at liberty, and payed the Debt to the *Athenians* †. This Philoſopher's Theology was wretchedly (*I*) contemptible, as we ſhall ſee. He lived to the Age of Eighty Four, if we believe || *Lucian*. * Others tell us that he died in his Eighty ſecond Year, having, through inadvertency, hit his Forehead againſt a Kettle in the Night time.

† Id. Laert. [illegible]

|| Lucian. in Macrobiis pag. m. [illegible]

* Diog. Laert. in fine n. 14. [illegible]

hence into the City, it is reported that ſeveral of the Rabble attended him in the way, in order to diſturb him with their impudent Clamours. This is to pervert the Greek Author's Thought, and rob *Xenocrates* of one of the brighteſt parts of his Glory. The Debauchees dreaded the ſight of ſuch a venerable Man, and durſt not appear before a Perſon of ſuch ſtrict Morals. Is not this a great Encomium on *Xenocrates*? Doth it not ſurpaſs what was ſaid of *Cato*, with reſpect to the Floral Games? Add to this, that Paſſage of *Plutarch* concerning the efficacy of (*g*) a bare Look of this Philoſopher, and what engaged the *Athenians* (*h*) to depute him into *Macedonia*.

I muſt not forget what *Plutarch* (*c*) ſaith, that *Xenocrates* did not ſtir out of the Academy above once in a year, which he did to honour the Feaſt, that is, to be preſent at the new Tragedies which were acted during the Feaſt of *Bacchus*.

(*H*) *To be ſold by them*——— Demetrius Phalereus *bought him*——— *immediately ſet him at liberty, and paid the debt to the* Athenians.] We find all theſe particulars in *Diogenes Laertius* (*o*), and I am ſurprized that *Plutarch* doth not mention them, ſince he ſpeaks of an Adventure ſomewhat like this. " (*n*) But we are told that *Lycurgus* the Orator " one day ſeeing the Farmers and Receivers of " Taxes carrying *Xenocrates* the Philoſopher to Pri- " ſon, for not paying a certain Impoſt laid on " Strangers inhabiting the City of *Athens*, forcibly " wreſted him out of their hands; and beſides, ſo " vigorouſly proſecuted them, that he obliged them " to pay a Fine for the Injury done to a Perſon " of his Character; and that afterwards, the Phi- " loſopher meeting *Lycurgus*'s Children in the City " told them: I have rewarded your Father for the " ſervice which he did me, by reaſon that on my " account he is extolled every where for what he " hath done to me.,, From theſe words of *Plutarch* Ancient *Athens* cannot be blamed, for the cruelties of the Collectors of Impoſts cannot be charged on a whole Nation. They are a ſort of People who act upon particular Maxims which are not approved of, but rather deteſted: they are inexorable People, who have no regard to Wit, Virtue or Learning; and there is no other way to get out of their Hands, than paying down the Money. And ſince the action of *Lycurgus* was applauded, it is a general indication that the *Athenians* ought to be cleared upon this occaſion. But as the Story is told by *Diogenes Laertius*, that Nation cannot be acquitted. What! to permit that a *Xenocrates*, the Honour and Ornament of the Academy, ſhould be ſo poor as not to be able to pay the Tax levied on Strangers, is a juſt reaſon of reproach, but to ſuffer him to loſe his Liberty, and become a Slave, to be ſold by Auction like a *Cappadocian*, is an infamous ſcandal to the *Athenians*. None was ſo generous as to lend or give him the ſmall Sum, which this wretched Tax-gatherer demanded; but they ſuffered him to run the utmoſt risk of ſlavery, and to be actually ſold. How could they be ſure that he ſhould not be bought by ſome Slave-Merchant, who might ſell him again to a Miller? Chance diſpoſed it ſo, that a Gentleman, and a lover of Sciences bought him, and reſtored him his liberty. But he had indeed done much better, if he had prevented his being ſold, by preſenting him with what would have ſatisfi'd the Collectors.

Let us now take notice of another paſſage related by *Plutarch*. " (*d*) *Phocion*——— perceiving " that *Xenocrates* payed a certain Tribute to the " Republick, which was payed by all Forreign In- " habitants of *Athens*, would have given him his " Freedom of that City, and enrolled him amongſt " the number of the Citizens; but *Xenocrates* re- " fuſed it, replying that he would not have any " ſhare in that Freedom of Citizens, to prevent " which, he had been ſent Ambaſſador.,, In order to the perfect underſtanding of this, recourſe ought to be had to the paſſage which I ſhall cite (*e*) hereafter, relating to the Conditions which *Antipater* impoſed on the *Athenians*, when *Phocion*, *Xenocrates*, and ſome others were ſent to him as Ambaſſadors from *Athens*.

(*I*) *This Philoſopher's Theology was wretchedly contemptible.*] He acknowledged no other Gods than the ſeven Planets, and the Heaven of the fixed Stars. Which made eight Deities; each Planet being a God, and all the Stars together making but one. See how *Cicero* rejects this Doctrine: (*a*) *Nec verò ejus* (Ariſtotelis) *condiſcipulus Xenocrates in hoc genere prudentior eſt, cujus in libris, qui ſunt de natura Deorum, nulla ſpecies divina deſcribitur. Deos enim octo eſſe dicit: quinque eos, qui in ſtellis vagis nominantur: unum, qui ex omnibus ſideribus, quæ infixa cœlo ſunt, ex diſperſis quaſi membris ſimplex ſit putandus Deus: ſeptimum ſolem adjungit, octavumque lunam, qui quo ſenſu beati eſſe poſſint, intelligi non poteſt.* This Opinion of *Xenocrates* will be found abſurd, not only, if examined by the light of Revelation, but if compared with that of Nature alſo; for without the aſſiſtance of the Bible, we conceive diſtinctly, that the Idea of God is neither that of a *Species* nor of a *Genus*, and conſequently cannot comprehend any thing under it but an individual Being. It is therefore acting againſt Reaſon, to admit more than one Deity. It is alſo another fault againſt Reaſon, to acknowledge any Gods compoſed of Matter; which is neceſſarily to ſubject them to Imperfection, to limit them with regard to Place and Power, and in a word, to diſtinguiſh them from the moſt infirm Creatures, barely by the difference of more or leſs. How great was the diſparity of our Philoſopher? How unconſequentially he argues? He would have the Moon a diſtinct Deity from all the reſt; he ſaid the ſame of every Planet, but not of each of the fixed Stars, to which he allowed no other Advantage than that of being parts of a Deity. The Objection urged againſt him in the Latin paſſage which I have cited, is juſt, tho' perhaps he might have eluded it, by aſſerting that a Planet is a God, as *Socrates* is a reaſonable Animal. He is not reaſonable as he is compoſed of Fleſh and Bones, &c. but as poſſeſſed of a Soul which knows and reaſons. The Sun, for example, is not a Deity, conſidered as compoſed of that luminous Matter which imparts its Rays and Heat to the Earth; but as the Seat of an intelligent Power, which occaſions the motion of that vaſt Body. What hinders this Virtue from the enjoyment of Pleaſure and Felicity? This is what may be anſwered to the Objection; but it is a very ill reſolution of the Point: for this intelligent Power not being numerically the ſame with that of the other Planets, will be fixed and concentred in the Sun by a natural neceſſity; and conſequently, will depend on the Matter of the Sun, and follow its State and Alterations, like thoſe Slaves called *ſervi glebæ*, or *glebæ aſcriptitii*. We cannot conceive any real happineſs in ſuch a dependance. The Doctrine of the Soul of the World doth not give ſo great a check to right Reaſon as this; it doth not divide the Deity into ſeveral *Individuums* really ſeparated from one another.

A CONFUTATION of thoſe, who ſaid that each Planet was a God.

Here is, I think, a contradiction in *Xenocrates*'s Doctrine. He took the Planets for Gods, he therefore ſup-

Aaaaa poſed

(e) See the end of the foregoing Remark.

(f) See the Remark L.

(n) [illegible] Diogen. Laert. lib. 4. num. 14.

(o) Plut. in vita Flaminii pag. 375. He relates the ſame thing in the Lives of the ten Orators, pag. 842.

(g) In the Remark L.

(a) Cicero de natura Deorum lib. 1. pag. m. 56.

(d) Plut. in vita Phocion. Pag. 755.

It occaſioned his immediate reſolution (F) to renounce his Pleaſures, and apply himſelf to Wiſdom. And this Converſion was ſteady; for the Convert, afterwards, became a very grave Philoſopher. This great Alteration ought not to be attributed to the Charms of Eloquence, but rather to the auſtere gravity of *Xenocrates*. There was nothing charming, or graceful in his behaviour, but ſolid Severity and Severity were inſeparable from his Manners; whence it was that *Plato* frequently adviſed him to ſacrifice to the Graces. This want of Politeneſs ſet off † the glory which he had acquired by his Auſterity. It is not to be wondred that with this dry Genius, he ſhould have been ſo ſtrongly inclined to the Mathematicks, that he would not admit any Scholars ‖ who were ignorant of that Science. We ought more to admire that with this great Character of rigid Severity, he had yet a Heart very ſuſceptible of Compaſſion, not only towards his Neighbour, but alſo towards Beaſts. Of which it is affirmed § he gave numerous Proofs, and particularly this: He hid a Sparrow which flung herſelf upon him in her flight from a Sparrow-Hawk, and releaſed her when the danger was over γ. He recommended δ *Polyſperchon*, a Man whom he ſcarce knew, and who proved unworthy of his recommendation; which was the cauſe of his being cautioned to examin the Character of People better another time. This Miſtake however ſerves to ſhew his indulgent nature. He compiled ſeveral ε Works which are loſt. He did not want leiſure to write, for he loſt ſcarce any time in Viſits, and was very fond of cloſe retirement; he thought (G) much, and was ſeldom ſeen in the Streets, and when he appeared there, the Debauched Youth durſt not ſtay, but turned out of the way to avoid meeting him. He was ζ the

* Id. ibid. n. 6.

† [illegible] monis; ne Xenocratem quidem, ſeveriſſimum philoſophorum, ob eamque rem ipſam magnum & clarum fuiſſe, Cicero de officiis lib. 1. cap. 30. p. m. 120, 121.

‖ [illegible]

§ [illegible]

γ [illegible]

δ [illegible]

ε [illegible]

ζ [illegible]

---

ne ſuo remiſſiori non erant, ſinceritati ejus concedendum exiſtimarunt. Cicero mentions this in one of his (a) Epiſtles to *Atticus*.

(F) *A Diſcourſe which he made about Temperance.... occaſioned his immediate reſolution to renounce his Pleaſures.*] If a Capucin's Sermon ſhould at this time cauſe ſuch an alteration, the World would acknowledge it to be a particular operation of the Holy Ghoſt, and admire the influence of a Grace which according to the *Janſeniſts*, would be ſo efficacious to the higheſt degree; for the perſon who was prevailed upon by this Diſcourſe, to change his courſe of life, was not an ordinary voluptuous Man, but a Ring-leader in that kind, who gloried in his Debaucheries: His Wife accuſed him before a Court of Juſtice for neglecting her, and brutally debauching with Boys; ſhe brought the Indictment againſt him called (b) *malæ tractationis*. He was not aſhamed to ſhew his exceſſive ebriety (c) in the great or moſt publick places of *Athens*, being accompanied with a ſinging Woman and ſeveral players on Inſtruments. He was more frequently drunk when he appeared in the Streets, and his Unchaſtity was not leſs than his Drunkenneſs. He (d) went always well provided with Money, and lodged part of it in ſeveral parts of the City, that he might be ſupplied at all times, and in all places of the City with ſufficient Sums for his Expences, in order to gratify his vicious Appetite. In ſhort, he was the moſt famous Debauchee in *Athens*. One day when he had drank to a pitch, and, as he was uſed, run through the Streets with his cuſtomary Equipage, and lewd Companions (e), he entred the Auditory of *Xenocrates*, with deſign to ridicule him, and to play ſome inſolent tricks. At which all the Auditors being enraged; *Xenocrates* was not at all concerned (f), but more vigorouſly purſued the Diſcourſe which he had begun concerning Temperance. Some Authors ſay, (g) that he was not treating that Subject, but leaving that which he was engaged upon, he turned the Diſcourſe to the Doctrine of this Virtue; on which head he expatiated ſo excellently and gravely, that all of a ſudden he created an affection for Modeſty and Wiſdom in the Mind of this hardened Sinner. *Polemo*, (for that was the Name of this Drunkard) from that very moment, became a Diſciple of Virtue, and an exact Imitator of (h) the Gravity of *Xenocrates*, whom he ſucceeded in his Profeſſor's Chair. He ſo utterly gave over Wine, that he drank (i) nothing but Water. The Latin Deſcription of his Converſion which I here copy, is very fine: (k) *Perditæ luxuriæ Athenis adoleſcens Polemo, neque illecebris tantummodo, ſed etiam ipſa infamia gaudens; cum e convivio non poſt occaſum ſolis, ſed poſt ortum ſurrexiſſet, domumque repetens, Xenocratis Philoſophi patentem januam vidiſſet: vino gravis, unguentis delibutus, ſertis capite redimito, pellucida veſte amictus, refertam turba doctorum hominum ſcholam ejus intravit. Nec contentus tam deformi introitu, conſedit etiam, ut clariſſimum eloquium, & prudentiſſima præcepta temulentiæ laſciviis eluderet. Orta deinde, ut par erat, omnium indignatione; Xenocrates vultum in eodem habitu continuit, omiſſaque de quibus diſſerebat, de modeſtia ac temperantia loqui cœpit. Cujus gravitate ſermonis reſipiſcere coactus Polemo, primum coronam capite detractam projecit, paulo poſt brachium intra pallium reduxit, procedente tempore oris convivalis hilaritatem depoſuit; ad ultimum, totam luxuriam exuit, uniuſque orationis ſaluberrima medicina ſanatus, ex infami ganeone maximus philoſophus evaſit. Peregrinatus eſt hujus animus in nequitia, non habitavit.* To which may be added theſe lines of *Horace*.

(l) *Faciaſne, quod olim*
Mutatus Polemon? ponas inſignia morbi,
Faſciolas, cubital, focalia: potus ut ille
Dicitur ex collo furtim carpſiſſe coronas,
Poſtquam eſt impranſi correptus voce magiſtri.

Obſerve that *Plutarch* (m) aſſures us, that one Book of *Xenocrates* was ſufficient to convert *Polemo*.

(G) *He thought much, and was ſeldom ſeen in the Streets; and when he appeared there, the debauched Youth durſt not ſtay, but turned out of the way.*] To this purpoſe let us cite *Diogenes Laertius*: (n) Πολλάκις ἑαυτῷ τῆς ἡμέρας διεμελέτα, καὶ ὥραν μίαν φασὶν ἀπένεμε σιωπῇ. *Sæpe interdiu meditationi inſerviebat, atque unam ſilentio diſtribuebat horam.* The French Tranſlator hath rendred theſe Greek words thus (o): *He was ſo well pleaſed with a Solitary Life, that he ſpent the whole day in meditation; but commonly he allowed himſelf one Hour for relaxation.* This Verſion ſeems to me to be good, tho' it doth not literally follow the Original. The Latin Tranſlation, tho' more literal, is leſs reaſonable; for it diſtinguiſhes betwixt the time that a Philoſopher meditates, and that in which he doth not ſpeak. But what ſort of diſtinction is that? Are thoſe who meditate obliged to ſpeak? Are they not commonly in a profound ſilence? But we ſhall ſee another place wherein the French Tranſlator (†) is greatly miſtaken: (p) Διῆγέ τε ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ εἴποτε μέλλοι εἰς ἄστυ ἀνιέναι, φασὶ τοὺς θορυβώδεις πάντας καὶ προυνίκους ὑποστέλλειν αὐτοῦ τῇ παρόδῳ. *Vixit autem ut plurimum in Academia. Si quando verò ad urbem profecturus eſſet turbas omnes tumultuoſorum ac impudicorum ipſi tranſituro de via decedere ſolitas, ſunt qui tradant.* That is, according to Mr. *de Fougerolles*, *he ſpent the greateſt part of his Life in the Academy, without ſcarce ever going out; but if by chance he was willing to go thence*

(a) The end of the 1ſt Book. See alſo the ſame Author in orat. pro Balbo pag. m. 637. where he mentions the thing without naming Xenocrates.

(b) Φυγεῖν δίκην Πολέμωνα καὶ δίκην κακώσεως, ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς, ὡς μειρακίοις συνόντα. Et in judicium vocatum Polemonem ab uxore nequitiæ inſimulatum, quod adoleſcentibus congrederetur. Diog. Laert. Ibid. n. 16.

(c) Lucian in his accuſ. to pag. m. 321, 323. Tom. 2.

(d) Diog. Laert. ibid.

(e) Origenes ubi infra. (f) Id. ibid. (g) Valer. Maxim. ubi infra. (h) Diog. Laert. ibid. n. 17. & ſeq. Origen. contra Celſum lib. 3, pag. 152. (i) Athen. lib. 2. cap. 6. pag. 44. (k) Valer. Maximus lib. 6. cap. 9. n. 1. in ext. pag. 581, 582.

(l) Horat. Sat. 3. lib. 2. v. 253.

(m) Plut. de diſcrim. adul. & amici pag. 71.

(n) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra n. 11.

(o) Francis de Fougerolles, Doctor of Phyſick.

(†) His fault is the ſame with that of Oliverius in Valer. Maximum ubi ſupra where he ſays, ſi quando ad urbem proficiſcebatur (Xenocrates) turba omnis impudicorum ejus tranſitum obſervabat, ejus inquietandi gratia.

(p) Id. ib. n. 6.

the Head of the Academy for Twenty five Years; in the ſecond Year of the Olympiad, he ſucceeded, in the ſecond Year of the 110th Olympiad, Speuſippus, whom Plato had choſen for his Succeſſor. It is ſurprizing that a Philoſopher of ſo much merit ſhould receive ſuch an ill treatment from the Athenians as to be ſold by them (H) becauſe he could not pay the Capitation impoſed upon Strangers. Demetrius Phalereus did a very generous Act in buying Xenocrates, whom he immediately ſet at liberty, and payed the Debt to the Athenians †. This Philoſopher's Theology was wretchedly (I) contemptible, as we ſhall ſee. He lived to the Age of Eighty Four, if we believe || Lucian. * Others tell us that he died in his Eighty ſecond Year, having, through inadvertency, hit his Forehead againſt a Kettle in the Night time.

† Id. Laert. ib.

|| Lucian. in Macrobiis pag. m. [illegible] tom. [illegible]

* Diog. Laert. [illegible]

thence into the City, it is reported that ſeveral of the Rabble attended him in the way, in order to diſturb him with their impudent Clamours. This is to pervert the Greek Author's Thought, and rob Xenocrates of one of the brighteſt parts of his Glory. The Debauchees dreaded the ſight of ſuch a venerable Man, and durſt not appear before a Perſon of ſuch ſtrict Morals. Is not this a great Encomium on Xenocrates? Doth it not ſurpaſs what was ſaid of Cato, with reſpect to the Floral Games? Add to this, that Paſſage of Plutarch concerning the efficacy of (g) a bare Look of this Philoſopher, and what engaged the Athenians (h) to depute him into Macedonia.

I muſt not forget what Plutarch (c) ſaith, that Xenocrates did not ſtir out of the Academy above once in a year, which he did to honour the Feaſt, that is, to be preſent at the new Tragedies which were acted during the Feaſt of Bacchus.

(g) See the end of the forego- ing Remark.

(h) See Remark L.

(H) *To be ſold by them———Demetrius Phalereus bought him———immediately ſet him at liberty, and paid the debt to the* Athenians.] We find all theſe particulars in Diogenes Laertius (o), and I am ſurprized that Plutarch doth not mention them, ſince he ſpeaks of an Adventure ſomewhat like this. "(n) But we are told that Lycurgus the Orator "one day ſeeing the Farmers and Receivers of "Taxes carrying Xenocrates the Philoſopher to Pri- "ſon, for not paying a certain Impoſt laid on "Strangers inhabiting the City of Athens, forcibly "wreſted him out of their hands; and beſides, ſo "vigorouſly proſecuted them, that he obliged them "to pay a Fine for the Injury done to a Perſon "of his Character; and that afterwards, the Phi- "loſopher meeting Lycurgus's Children in the City "told them: I have rewarded your Father for the "ſervice which he did me, by reaſon that on my "account he is extolled every where for what he "hath done to me.„ From theſe words of Plutarch Ancient Athens cannot be blamed, for the cruelties of the Collectors of Impoſts cannot be charged on a whole Nation. They are a ſort of People who act upon particular Maxims which are not approved of, but rather deteſted: they are inexorable People, who have no regard to Wit, Virtue or Learning; and there is no other way to get out of their Hands, than paying down the Money. And ſince the action of Lycurgus was applauded, it is a general indication that the Athenians ought to be cleared upon this occaſion. But as the Story is told by Diogenes Laertius, that Nation cannot be acquitted. What! to permit that a Xenocrates, the Honour and Ornament of the Academy, ſhould be ſo poor as not to be able to pay the Tax levied on Strangers, is a juſt reaſon of reproach, but to ſuffer him to loſe his Liberty, and become a Slave, to be ſold by Auction like a Cappadocian, is an infamous ſcandal to the Athenians. None was ſo generous as to lend or give him the ſmall Sum, which this wretched Tax-gatherer demanded; but they ſuffered him to run the utmoſt risk of ſlavery, and to be actually ſold. How could they be ſure that he ſhould not be bought by ſome Slave-Merchant, who might ſell him again to a Miller? Chance diſpoſed it ſo, that a Gentleman, and a lover of Sciences bought him, and reſtored him his liberty. But he had indeed done much better, if he had prevented his being ſold, by preſenting him with what would have ſatisfi'd the Collectors.

(o) [illegible]

(n) Plut. in vita Flaminii pag. 375. [illegible] thing in the Lives of the ten Orators, pag. 842.

Let us now take notice of another paſſage related by Plutarch. "(d) Phocion———perceiving "that Xenocrates payed a certain Tribute to the "Republick, which was payed by all Forreign Inhabitants of Athens, would have given him his "Freedom of that City, and enrolled him amongſt "the number of the Citizens; but Xenocrates re- "fuſed it, replying that he would not have any "ſhare in that Freedom of Citizens, to prevent "which, he had been ſent Ambaſſador.„ In order to the perfect underſtanding of this, recourſe ought to be had to the paſſage which I ſhall cite (e) hereafter, relating to the Conditions which Antipater impoſed on the Athenians, when Phocion, Xenocrates, and ſome others were ſent to him as Ambaſſadors from Athens.

(d) Plut. in vita Phocion. pag. 755.

(e) In the Remark L.

(I) *This Philoſopher's Theology was wretchedly contemptible.*] He acknowledged no other Gods than the ſeven Planets, and the Heaven of the fixed Stars. Which made eight Deities; each Planet being a God, and all the Stars together making but one. See how Cicero rejects this Doctrine: *(a) Nec verò ejus* (Ariſtotelis) *condiſcipulus Xenocrates in hoc genere prudentior eſt, cujus in libris, qui ſunt de naturâ Deorum, nulla ſpecies divina deſcribitur. Deos enim octo eſſe dicit: quinque eos, qui in ſtellis vagis nominantur: unum, qui ex omnibus ſideribus, quæ infixa cœlo ſunt, ex diſperſis quaſi membris ſimplex ſit putandus Deus: ſeptimum ſolem adjungit, octavumque lunam, qui quo ſenſu beati eſſe poſſint, intelligi non poteſt.* This Opinion of Xenocrates will be found abſurd, not only, if examined by the light of Revelation, but if compared with that of Nature alſo; for without the aſſiſtance of the Bible, we conceive diſtinctly, that the Idea of God is neither that of a *Species* nor of a *Genus*, and conſequently cannot comprehend any thing under it but an individual Being. It is therefore acting againſt Reaſon, to admit more than one Deity. It is alſo another fault againſt Reaſon, to acknowledge any Gods compoſed of Matter; which is neceſſarily to ſubject them to Imperfection, to limit them with regard to Place and Power, and in a word, to diſtinguiſh them from the moſt infirm Creatures, barely by the difference of more or leſs. How great was the diſparity of our Philoſopher? How unconſequentially he argues? He would have the Moon a diſtinct Deity from all the reſt; he ſaid the ſame of every Planet, but not of each of the fixed Stars, to which he allowed no other Advantage than that of being parts of a Deity. The Objection urged againſt him in the Latin paſſage which I have cited, is juſt, tho' perhaps he might have eluded it, by aſſerting that a Planet is a God, as Socrates is a reaſonable Animal. He is not reaſonable as he is compoſed of Fleſh and Bones, &c. but as poſſeſſed of a Soul which knows and reaſons. The Sun, for example, is not a Deity, conſidered as compoſed of that luminous Matter which imparts its Rays and Heat to the Earth; but as the Seat of an intelligent Power, which occaſions the motion of that vaſt Body. What hinders this Virtue from the enjoyment of Pleaſure and Felicity? This is what may be anſwered to the Objection; but it is a very ill reſolution of the Point: for this intelligent Power not being numerically the ſame with that of the other Planets, will be fixed and concentred in the Sun by a natural neceſſity; and conſequently, will depend on the Matter of the Sun, and follow its State and Alterations, like thoſe Slaves called *ſerviglebæ*, or *glebæ aſcriptitii*. We cannot conceive any real happineſs in ſuch a dependance. The Doctrine of the Soul of the World doth not give ſo great a check to right Reaſon as this; it doth not divide the Deity into ſeveral *Individuums* really ſeparated from one another.

(b) Cicero de natura Deorum lib. 1. pag. m. 56.

A CONFUTATION of thoſe, who ſaid that each Planet was a God.

Here is, I think, a contradiction in Xenocrates's Doctrine. He took the Planets for Gods, he therefore ſup-time *. Some Authors pretend that he lived one Hundred and three (K) Years. He had a share in the Friendship and Esteem || of Alexander the Great, and at his Request wrote a Tract ‡ of the Art of Reigning. He was sent Ambassador more than once (L). It must not be forgotten, that according to his Opinion, the true Philosophers β are the only Persons who voluntarily, and of their own accord, do what others are brought to by the fear of the Laws; and that γ as casting an Eye on one's Neighbour's House, is as great a Sin as setting foot into it. This last Thought condemns the coveting of another's Goods, and

posed the Matter of them to be an essential part of the Gods; for it would be absurd to affirm, that *Socrates* is a Man, and that the Body of *Socrates* is not essential to that Man. But on the other side, he admitted a distinction betwixt the Gods and certain *Genii*, which supposes that he did not believe Matter to be a part of the Substance of the Gods. Was this to argue coherently? Let us cite *Plutarch*, who observes that (a) *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, *Xenocrates*, and *Chrysippus*, *according to the Opinions of the Antient Divines*, *acknowledged several great Demons*, who were neither Gods nor Men, and who "were stronger and more robust than Men, and highly surmounted our Nature in power; but had not the pure and unmixt Divinity, but were Agents compounded of the Corporeal and Spiritual Nature, capable of Pleasure and Pain, and other Passions and Affections which accompany those mutations, discomposing, some more, others less; for there is a diversity and difference in Vice and Virtue amongst Demons, as well as amongst Men——— (b) *Plato* attributed to the Olympick and Celestial Gods whatever is *Right* and *Odd*; and whatever is *Left* and *Even*, to the Demons: And *Xenocrates* held, that the unfortunate Days, and Feasts, where beating, blows, striking of the Stomach, fasting, or any scandalous or filthy Custom obtains, does not appertain to the good Gods, or good Demons; but that there are in the Air some great and mighty Beings, but malicious and ill-natur'd, who find such things done on their account pleasant to them, and when they have obtained them, they cease to do any more Evil to the Persons." A Commentator on *Cicero*, hath made a Note on this Opinion of *Xenocrates*. He saith that the Evil Angels, may be very well pleased with the obscene Discourses of Men, and that if any thing was capable of softning them, it were that; but that Fasts, Macerations and Flagellations with which the Penitents endeavour to expiate their Faults, infinitely displease those unfortunate *Genii*: (c) *Longè fallitur Xenocrates, cùm miseros illos Genios mortalium planctu, verberibs, jejuniis, aliisque id genus corporis afflictationibus delectari putat: nihil enim perinde aversantur, atque oderunt, ut voluntaria, & sancta ejusmodi supplicia, quibus debita flagitiis exolvitur pœna, ac Divina Nemesis placatur. At si quo modo leniri possent hostes crudelissimi, non dubium quin malè ominosis obscœnisque vocibus, quæ impurissimorum Geniorum pollutas ad aures jucundissima semper accidunt, sinerent se mulceri.* I do not know where the *French* Translator of *Diogenes Laertius* took the following words: "(d) *Xenocrates*——— compared the nature of Triangles with that of Intelligences: For, said he, the Divine Nature is like an equilateral Triangle, the nature of Man like a Triangle unequal on all sides, and that of Demons, like a Triangle with one side unequal, and the other two equal."

I omit *Xenocrates*'s Assertion (e), that the Soul is a self-moving Number; a Definition which was relished by several illustrious Persons (f); but I cannot tell whether we can comprehend it at this time: For, I believe, that the *Greeks* annexed an Idea to the word *ἀριθμὸς*, which we do not fix to the word *number* at present; from whence may proceed the obscurity which we now find in this Definition of the Soul.

Let us observe that the Dominican Doctor who wrote a Letter to Father *le Comte* concerning the *Chinese* Ceremonies, was not well informed of the Doctrine of *Xenocrates*; for after having spoken of the Philosophers who admitted no more (g) *than one God, whom they acknowledged to be the Principle and Author of all Beings, a Spirit diffused throughout, who governed all things*——— A pure Spirit, the Love and Enjoyment of which rendred Man happy; he adds, that "*Xenocrates*, *Heraclides*, and "*Theophrastus*, *Aristotle*'s Disciples, had the same "Sentiments of the Deity." And yet these are the three Philosophers whom *Cicero* (h) puts together, when he refutes the erroneous Opinions concerning the Nature of God. I would therefore know why they are all three put together as Orthodox in this Doctor's Letter. Remember that the two former were not *Aristotle*'s Scholars.

(K) *Pretend that he lived one Hundred and three Years.*] *Meursius* defends this Opinion. His Reasons are these: (i) *Xenocrates* was born the first Year of the 91 *Olympiad*. He began to teach in the second Year of the 110 *Olympiad*, and taught 25 Years; from whence it must be inferred that he died in the second Year of the 116th *Olympiad*, at the Age of 102. This is *Meursius*'s Conclusion in the 9th Chapter of the 3. Book of the *Athenian Archontes*. But in the 12th Chaper of the 4th Book, he computes his Life at 103 Years, and founds his Calculation on the same Facts. He is in the right to conclude, that *Xenocrates* died the 3d Year of the 116th *Olympiad*, and reckons better than he did before; but betwixt that and the 1st of the 91st *Olympiad*, he ought to have found no more than 102 years. Let us come to the main point. I think he ought not to have relyed, as he hath, on the Authority of the Anonymous Author, who described the *Olympiads*, and placed the birth of *Xenocrates* in the 1st year of the 91st *Olympiad*. Two Reasons induce me to believe him deceived. The First is, That *Xenocrates* was very young when (k) he became *Plato*'s Scholar. But *Plato* being advanced in years when he began to teach, it could not be possible for *Xenocrates* to enter his School very young, if he was born the 1st year of the 91st *Olympiad*, for he would not have been above Twelve years younger than *Plato*. In the Second place, I observe that he was deputed (l) to *Antipater*, in the 2d year of the 114th *Olympiad*: When he would have been 93 years of Age, according to the Computation of the Anonymous Author. But it is not easie to imagin that the Authors who mention'd this Ambassy, should have taken no notice of the extraordinary Age of the Ambassador.

(L) *Sent Ambassador more than once.*] I have already said that he was one of the Ambassadors whom the Republick of *Athens* sent to King *Philip*, the Father of *Alexander* the *Great*. "(m) Being also sent on an Embassy to *Antipater*, for the deliverance of the Prisoners of War taken at the Battle of *Lamia*, he was by that Prince invited to Supper, to whom he answered in the following words:

O Circe (n), *thy Allurements tempt in vain*
The Man whose Vertue prudent Thoughts sustain;
For who can come with pleasure to a Feast,
Before he see his Captive Friends releas'd.

"Hinting by these words, that he would never eat, unless he first obtained his Request, meaning the liberty of his Captive Citizens and Friends. The King perceiving the dexterity of the Man, freely condescended to his suit, and immediately set the Prisoners free." *Antipater* was not so just in the following Juncture. He exacted from the (o) *Athenians*, that they *should send him full power to act as he should think fit, and refer the Conditions of the Treaty* of Peace to his Pleasure. "They sent to him *Phocion* with other Ambassadors, and amongst the rest *Xenocrates* the Philosopher, the Reputation of whose Prudence and Wisdom was so great and celebrated among the *Athenians*, that they conceived there could not be any thing of Mankind so brutal and barbarous, or devoid of

---

* Diog. Laert. ubi supra n. 14, & 15.

|| See the Remark D.

‡ Plut. Adv. Colot. circa fin. pag. 1126.

(a) Plut. de Iside & Osiride pag. 360.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 361.

(c) Lescaloperius in Ciceron. de nat. Deor. lib. 1. pag. 57. col. 1.

(d) Fougerolles *Additions to the life of* Xenocrates, *in* Diogenes Laertius pag. 260. *Note that he adds,* "*He calculated the number of Syllables, which the Greek Letters can make by their combinations and transpositions, which amounts to* 100200000. *I don't know where the Translator had read this.*

(e) Plut. de procreat. animæ pag. 1012.

(f) Id. ib.

(g) Lettre d'un Docteur de l'Ordre de S. Dominique sur les ceremonies Chinoises pag. 17. Cologne 1700.

(h) Cicero ubi supra.

(i) Meursius de Archont. Athen. lib. 3. cap. 9. pag. 113, 114.

(k) [illegible] A primis ferme annis Platonis auditor fuit. *Diogen. Laert. ubi supra n. 6.*

(l) *See the following Remark.*

(m) Diog. Laert. ubi supra. n. 9. 10.

(n) *Some Verses of* Homer *in the 10th. Book of the* Odyssee.

(o) Plut. in vita Phocion. pag. 753.

and a prying Humour. He had a very good Maxim for the Education of (M) Children. He is praiſed by Reaſon that the dulneſs of his Capacity did not (N) diſpirit him in the courſe of his ſtudies.

XENOPHANES, a Greek Philoſopher born at *Colophon*, was a Diſciple of *Archelaus*, as ſome tell us ‡. According to which Account, he ſhould have been *Socrates's* Contemporary ζ. Others will have it that he Learned of himſelf all that he a knew, and that he lived at the ſame time with *Anaximander*. Purſuant to which he muſt have Flouriſhed before *Socrates*, and about the ſixtieth *Olympiad*, as *Diogenes Laertius* avers ‡. He lived (*A* Δ) very long; for ſome Verſes are cited † in which he declares 1. that his Studies had been applauded in *Greece* 67 Years. 2. That he began to be Famous at the Age of 25. He wrote ſeveral Poems on Philoſophical Subjects: Beſides ‖ two Thouſand on the Foundation of *Colophon*, and that of the *Colony* of * Elea. He had an Opinion concerning

[illegible] ‡ Laert. ibid. n. 19.

"of Common Humanity, that even his Mien and Aſpect would not gain upon and create a Reſpect for him: but the contrary happen'd by the Inſolence and Ferity of *Antipater's* Diſpoſition, who embracing all the reſt of his Companions, paſs'd *Xenocrates* by, not vouchſafing ſo much as to ſalute him, or take the leaſt Notice of him: Upon which Occaſion *Xenocrates* ſaid, *He was well ſatisfied he uſed him ſo ſurlily, ſince he had the ſame Intentions to the whole City.* As ſoon as ever he began to ſpeak, *Antipater* thwarted and interrupted him, not ſuffering him to proceed, but enjoyned him Silence: But when *Phocion* had declared the Purport of their Embaſſy, he replied ſhort and peremptorily, he would make a League with the *Athenians* on theſe Conditions, and no others: *That* Demoſthenes *and* Hyperides *be delivered up to him: That the ancient way of Raiſing Taxes in the City be obſerved: That they ſhould receive a Gariſon from him into* Mynichia: *Defray the Charges of the War, and Damages ſuſtain'd, and put themſelves under Contribution for it.* As Things ſtood, theſe Terms were judg'd tolerable by the reſt of the Embaſſadors: *Xenocrates* ſaid, *Truly if* Antipater *reputed them as already Slaves, they were indifferent; but if he conſidered them ſtill as Free, they were inſufferable.*

Some will think perhaps that *Antipater* Treated this Philoſopher thus roughly to Revenge the incivility with which he had received him. For we are told (a) that going to *Athens*, he made a viſit to *Xenocrates*, who would not vouchſafe to interrupt his Lecture, nor made him any Anſwer before he had finiſhed it. But as it was very well known to all the World, that this Philoſopher did not affect to appear a Courtier, and that the eſteem which the World had for him was founded on his Philoſophical Gravity, it is not at all probable that *Antipater* ſhould have reſented his receiving him in manner.

(*M*) *A very good Maxim for the Education of Children.*] (b) "For this Reaſon *Xenocrates* was of Opinion, That Children rather ought to have a Defenſe fitted to their Ears, than Fencers, or Prize-players; becauſe the Ears only of the latter ſuffered by the Blows, but the *Morals* of the former were hurt and maimed by Words. Not that he thereby recommended Deafneſs, or forbad that they ſhould be ſuffered to hear at all; but adviſing only that Debauchery might be kept out, till better Principles (like ſo many Guardians appointed by Philoſophy) had taken charge of that Part, which is ſo liable to be drawn aſide and corrupted by Diſcourſe.

(*N*) *That the dulneſs of his Capacity did not diſpirit him in the courſe of his ſtudies.*] *Plutarch* made uſe of this Example to Encourage thoſe of ſlow parts. "(c) Therefore all ſuch Sheepiſhneſs and Self-conceit ſet aſide, let us learn to lay up in our minds whatever is uſefully ſaid, enduring to be laugh'd at by ſuch as ſet up for Wits and *Railleurs*. This Courſe took *Cleanthes* and *Xenocrates*, who being ſomewhat ſlower than their Fellows, did not however give over *Hearing* or Deſpond; but prevented the Jeſts of others, by comparing themſelves to narrow-mouth'd Veſſels and Copper Plates; becauſe, though they received Learning with ſome Difficulty, yet they retained it ſurely." One of theſe two Compariſons hath appeared in one of *Moliere's Comedies.*

(*A* Δ) *He lived very long; for ſome Verſes are cited.*] It appears by thoſe Verſes that he was 92. Years Old when he made them; and becauſe no Reaſon obliges us to believe that he died in a ſhort time after, we may hence the more certainly know the Error of *Lucian* (d) who allows him to have lived no longer than 91. Years in all. (e) *Cenſorinus* beſtows on him above one Hundred Years. (f) And *Scaliger* is inclined to believe that he lived at leaſt one Hundred and four Years. This long life affords means to reconcile thoſe who make him flouriſh (g) in the 56 Olympiad, or the (h) 60. and thoſe who place him under the (i) 40. Olympiad; for we may ſuppoſe that the latter don't point out the time when he flouriſhed, but that of his Birth. Obſerve that even on the Foot of this ſuppoſition, it is not poſſible to reconcile them with thoſe, who tell us that he lived to the time when the *Perſians* were driven out of *Greece*. We have ſtill ſome Verſes where it is pretended that he mentions their Flight. (k) *Athenæus* quotes them. If you underſtand by this, the time when they loſt the Battle of *Marathon*, it was in the 72. Olympiad. If you underſtand the Battle of *Salamis*, or that of *Platæa*, it was in the 75th *Olympiad*. Suppoſe in the next place not with *Caſaubon* (l) that he made theſe Verſes 15 or 20. Years after the defeat of the *Perſians*, but the very Year of that great Event, and you will find it impoſſible for him to have come into the World in the 40. *Olympiad*, ſince it muſt then be owned that he lived at leaſt 126 Years. What ſhall we then think of a paſſage of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, which informs us that he was Born in the 40. *Olympiad* and lived to the time of *Darius*? (m) Τῆς δ' Ἐλεατικῆς ἀγωγῆς Ξενοφάνης ὁ Κολοφώνιος κατάρχει, ὅν φησι Τίμαιος κατὰ Ἱέρωνα τὸν Σικελίας δυνάστην, καὶ Ἐπίχαρμον τὸν ποιητὴν γεγονέναι. Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ, κατὰ τὴν τεσσαρακοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα γενόμενον, παρατετακέναι ἄχρι τῶν Δαρείου τε καὶ Κύρου χρόνων: *Eleaticæ diſciplinæ princeps fuit Xenophanes Colophonius, quem dicit Timæus fuiſſe tempore Hieronis, qui in Sicilia obtinuit dominatum, & Epicharmi Poetæ. Apollodorus autem eum, cùm natus eſſet quadrageſimâ Olympiade, perveniſſe uſque ad tempora Darii & Cyri.* Muſt we believe that a miſtake crept into the *Greek* Text, and that inſtead of Δαρείου we ought to Read Κροίσου? My Anſwer is, there is no neceſſity to be of that Opinion. For a life of one Hundred Years which is allowed to *Xenophanes* is ſufficient to fill up the ſpace betwixt the 40th *Olympiad* and the 65th which was the beginning of *Darius*'s Reign. I do not deny that it is a little ſtrange to ſee, that ſuch an excellent Author as *Apollodorus* ſhould ſay that *Xenophanes* lived to the time of *Darius* and *Cyrus*. It would have been much more regular to have ſaid *to the time of* Cyrus *and* Darius, as Mr. *Menage* (n) obſerves. It is certain beſides that in pointing out the time, the Ancients uſually joyned *Cræſus* and *Cyrus* together, which ſerves to ſupport the Correction I have hinted; but at the bottom there is neither any abſurdity or Falſity in *Apollodorus's* Opinion, that *Xenophanes* lived from the 40. *Olympiad* to *Darius*'s time. And yet I ſhould rather chooſe to place his Birth much lower, ſince, according to (o) *Timæus*, he Flouriſhed in *Hiero's* time, who did not begin to Reign before the 76. *Olympiad*. I ſhall take Notice by the

(a) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, n. 3.

(b) Plut. de auditione init. pag. 38.

(c) Plut. de auditione pag. 47.

(d) Lucian. in Macrobiis pag. m. 640. tom. 2. oper.

(e) See Scaliger in Euſeb. p. m. 96.

(f) Scalig. ibid.

(g) Euſeb. in Chron. p. m. 127.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 128. Diogen. Laert. lib. 9. n. 20.

(i) Sext. Empir. adverſ. Mathem. pag. 51.

(k) Athen. lib. 2. cap. 13. pag. 54.

(l) Caſaub. in Athen. pag. 110.

(m) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. lib. 1. p. 301. C.

(n) Menag. in Diog. Laert. lib. 9. n. 20.

(o) *See the above quoted paſſage of Clemens Alexandrinus.*

cerning the Nature of God, very little different from (A) *Spinoziſm.* He wrote ſome ‡ Verſes againſt *Homer* and *Heſiod* on the Follies which they ſung of the Gods. He held a Maxim which Fundamentally ruined and overturned the *Pagan Religion*, viz. * that it is not leſs impious to aſſert that the Gods were Born than to affirm that they ſhall dye, ſince in each caſe it would be equally true that their exiſtence is not perpetual. This Maxim is very true and not at all Contradictory

‡ [illegible] Laertius, lib. 9. [illegible] See alſo Sextus Empiric. adv. Math. p. 57, 381.

* [illegible] Xenophanes dicebat ſimiliter eſſe impios qui naſci affirmant Deos, & qui mori dicunt. Utroque enim modo contingit, ut non ſint aliquando Dii. *Ariſtot. Rhetor. lib. 2. c. 23. p. 446. B.*

by the way that I take that Opinion to be ill founded, which affirms him to have been a Diſciple of *Archelaus*. Which is *Lucian's* (a) Opinion.

(A) *Very little different from Spinoziſm.*] If we had all his Works, we ſhould be much better able to underſtand his Syſtem: And if all our knowledge of his Opinions was ſolely owing to ſome ſmall and very obſcure Fragments cited by *Cicero*, it were impoſſible to avoid confuſion; (b) *Xenophanes qui mente adjuncta omne præterea quod eſſet infinitum Deum voluit eſſe, de ipſa mente item reprehendi ut cæteri: de infinitate autem vehementius, in qua nihil neque ſentiens neque conjunctum eſſe poſſit.* Theſe Words of *Cicero* teſtify that *Xenophanes* taught that the Intellect is God, and that all that is infinite is God. As for the firſt part of this Doctrine, *Cicero* forbears the Repetition of what he had ſaid before by way of Refutation of thoſe who held the Divinity of the Intellect; and he ſuppoſes that the ſame Refutation falls alſo upon this firſt point of the Opinion of *Xenophanes.* But with regard to the ſecond part, he lays down what he thinks can refute it; for he obſerves that an Infinite containing nothing ſenſible, nor ever admitting any conjunction, cannot be God. I ſhall not Examine the weakneſs of this Argument, it being wholly unneceſſary: For every Body will clearly apprehend that ſince there is ſomething joint and ſenſible in a Finite Extent as Man is, ſuch things alſo are not incompatible with an Infinite Extent. I eaſily believe that *Cicero* did not apprehend the Opinion which he mentions; he divides it into two Parts, when perhaps it ought not to be divided. It is more probable that *Xenophanes* intended to ſay that God was nothing but the infinity of Nature (c) accompanied with an Intellect. It would be very prepoſterous to aſſert on the one hand that every Infinite is God, and on the other that the Humane Intellect is God: This would be to multiply the Deity in a contradictory manner, and to err incoherently. I very well know that the Ancient Philoſophers don't appear to us in the leaſt exact, in the remaining Fragments of their Opinions concerning the Principles of all things: But what particularly obliges me to believe that *Xenophanes* did not make that diviſion aſcribed to him, is to ſee, that according to the Teſtimony even of *Cicero* himſelf, he taught that there was but one ſole Being, and that this Being was Immutable, Eternal and the True God: (d) *Xenophanes paulo etiam antiquior unum eſſe omnia, neque id eſſe mutabile & id eſſe verum Deum, neque natum uſquam quicquam & ſempiternum conglobata figura* (e). This Citation is more diſtinct than what *Ariſtotle* Relates of *Xenophanes's* Opinion. (f) Ξενοφάνης δὲ πρῶτος τούτων ἑνίσας (ὁ γὰρ Παρμενίδης τούτου λέγεται μαθητὴς) οὐδὲν διεσαφήνισεν, οὐδὲ τῆς φύσεως τούτων οὐδετέρας ἔοικε θιγεῖν· ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν ὅλον οὐρανὸν ἀποβλέψας, τὸ ἓν εἶναί φησι τὸν θεόν. *Xenophanes autem, quanquam prior iſtis, unum poſuerat, (nam Parmenides ejus auditor fuiſſe dicitur) nihil tamen clarum dixit, & neutrius horum naturam attigiſſe videtur: ſed ad totum cœlum reſpiciens, ipſum unum ait eſſe Deum.* Theſe Words of *Ariſtotle* inform us that *Xenophanes* took up with confuſed Notions, and that he did not Examine in particular whether Unity, belonged to the Deity according to Reaſon, or according to Matter, and that he aſſerted in General *what is One is God.* Others tell us that he maintained that (g) Nature never had a beginning, and ſhall never have an end, and that ſhe is always like her ſelf; but that he ſpoke of the Gods in the plural Number. It is true (h) indeed that he rejected the common Opinion that the Gods ſtood in need of and commanded one another. Dependance ſeemed to him incompatible with the Divine Nature. He added that the Gods ſaw and heard in General, but not particularly this or that. For ſo I underſtand theſe Words of *Euſebius*, (i) ἀκούειν δὲ καὶ ὁρᾶν καθόλου καὶ μὴ κατὰ μέρος, *in univerſum audire & cernere, non vero per partes.* This ſavours of *Spinoziſme*; for *Spinoza* affirms that God ſo far as he is a Subſtance is barely endued with thought in general, and that the particular cognizances of every object do not unite in one ſole Mind, in order to repreſent all things to the ſubſtance of God. I own it may be pretended that *Xenophanes* intended to aſſert that by a ſingle act of the mind God ſees all things, and not every one of them by a particular Idea. He might explain himſelf if he were to return into the World: But he would not be a little puzzled to remove the difficulties propoſed to him concerning his Contradictions, and Incoherencies. He admitted (k) an infinity of invariable Worlds, and four Elements of all things. But to what purpoſe is this infininity of Worlds, ſince he taught that all things were but one Being, and that this ſole and only Being was God? Is not this to ſpeak of the World, like the People who call *America* the *New World*, and who give the Name of World to Mankind, and even to a Great Lord's Footmen, &c. (l) He aſſerted that (m) God was a round figure, and yet made him infinite. He ſaid (n) that God did not in any thing reſemble Man, and that he heard and ſaw all things without Reſpiration. A fine exception indeed! Was it neceſſary to expreſs it? If the Deity hath nothing common to Men, is it not Evident, that he is without Lungs and doth not breath? Why did he not alſo at the ſame time except the Eyes, the Ears, and the Face, &c. as well as the Act of Reſpiration? *Xenophanes* ſpoke more properly in the Verſes which (o) *Clemens Alexandrinus* cites; for he ſaid no more there than that God is not like Man either in Body or Soul; and that if Brutes could paint, they would repreſent the Deity in the ſhape of their own Species. He continually return'd to his Unity. (p) Σύμπαντά τε εἶναι, νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν, καὶ ἀΐδιον, *ſimulque (Deum) eſſe* OMNIA, *mentem, prudentiam, æternitatem.* All the Eleatick Sect (q) with him believed the Unity of all things, and their Immobility (r): And perhaps I ſhould not be at all miſtaken, if I ſhould venture to ſay, that from thence aroſe the Doctrine ſo much cried up by the *Scepticks*, I mean that our Senſes deceive us, and that we ought not to rely on their Evidence. For when it was objected againſt thoſe Philoſophers that continually New Generations happen in the World; which ſuppoſes that there are two Principles, one Active and the other Paſſive; or at leaſt that the ſole ſubſtance of Nature is not immutable; they fond no better Expedient to ſolve this Difficulty, than to deny every Generation. They were therefore obliged to aſſert, that Nature continues always the ſame, and that the Variations which we believe ſhe ſuffers are nothing but meer illuſions of our Senſes, and meer appearences. Upon conſulting *Euſebius* he informs us that *Permenides* taught that the Univerſe being Eternal and Immovable, and one ſole Being, remained always the ſame with regard to the Reality of things, and that the various Generations were barely founded on a falſe prejudice of the Senſes: (ſ) Ἀΐδιον μὲν γὰρ τὸ πᾶν καὶ ἀκίνητον ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθειαν. εἶναι γὰρ αὐτὸ μόνον μονογενές τε καὶ ἀτρεμές. οὐδ' ἀγένητον. γένεσιν δὲ τῶν καθ' ὑπόληψιν ψευδῆ δοκούντων εἶναι. καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας. *Etenim ſempiternum eſſe orbem hunc univerſum, omnique motu carere;*

(a) Lucian ubi ſupra.

(b) Cicero de natura Deorum, lib. 1. pag. m. 44.

(c) *Theſe Words of* Minucius Felix pag. m. 151. Xenophanes notum eſt omne infinitum cum mente, Deum tradere, *favour my Opinion. Some Philoſophers deprived God of his Underſtanding.*

(h) Euſeb. ibid.

(i) Ibi[illegible]

(k) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. in [illegible]

(l) See Furetiere's Dictionary at the Word monde.

(m) Diog. Laert. ib.

(n) Id. ib.

(o) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. lib. 5. p. 601. & ex eo Euſebius ib. lib. 13. cap. 13. pag. 678, 679.

(p) Laert. ibid. See alſo Euſebius, lib. 14. c. 1[illegible] pag. 7[illegible]

(q) Euſeb. ibid.

(r) Id. ib. 14. c. 17.

(ſ) Euſebius ubi ſupra lib. 1. c. 8. 23. C. Plutarch tradictory to the Doctrine of the Incarnation. He believed the Moon (A△△) an inhabited Country, and that it was impoſſible to predict Future ‡ Events; and if the Conjecture of a Learned Critick is well grounded, he aſſerted that in Nature Good exceeds (B) Evil. He is not alone in this Opinion; and 'tis likely that

---

(d) Cicero, Academic. quæſtion. lib. 2. fol. m. 211. D. (e) Conſult Sextus Empiricus. Pyrron. hypotyp. l. 1. c. 33 (f) Ariſtoteles, Metaphyſ. lib. 1. cap. 5. p. m. 648. E. NOTE *that another Tract of* Ariſtotle, *which I quote in the Remark* F. *teaches us much better the whole Syſtem of* Xenophates. (g) Οὔτε γένεσιν, οὔτε φθορὰν ἀπολείπει· ἀλλ' εἶναι λέγει τὸ πᾶν ἀεὶ ὅμοιον. Nullum penitus vel ortum vel interitum relinquit, ſed ſemper ſimile hoc univerſum eſſe ratus. *Euſeb. de præparat. Evangel. lib. 1. cap. 8. pag. 23. ex Plutarchi Stromatu.*

‡ Cicero de divinat. lib. 1. [illegible]

æterni; ipſiſque (a) naturæ veritatem omnino conſtare defendit ſingularem enim illum & unigenitum, ſtabilem ac quietum, nec certo ullo tempore generatum eſſe; Generationem porro ad ea rejicit, quæ falſa quadam opinione putentur eſſe, adeoque ſenſus omnes e communione veritatis excludit. Let us alſo conſult the ſame Euſebius, if we would ſee a ſolid Refutation of this Subterfuge. *Ariſtotle* clearly evinced to theſe defenders of immutability, or ingenerability, the Confuſion with which the refuge they had choſen was clogged; for ſince they durſt not deny the Mutation of Appearances, that is, that we do feel the Earth at one time Cold, and Hot at another, it follows that Nature is not immovable; and that ſhe muſt of Neceſſity change in the ſubject which produces, or receives our ſenſations. Senſe is a Paſſion, the Alteration of which ſuppoſes an efficient Cauſe and a Paſſive Principle. And thus your Unity of all things is ruined. Beſides, this Alteration is incompatible with your pretended immobility, or incorruptibility. (b) Εἰ γὰρ πρῶτον ἔστιν ἂν τὸ [illegible] ——— ἔπειτα δὲ ἐν τῷ ὂν ἓν εἶναι, μὴν οὐδὲ ἀκίνητον ἡ γὰρ αἴσθησις ἀλλοίωσις τις κίνησις. *Habemus ergo primum id eſſe, quod diverſum vocatur ——— deinde quicquid eſt, non eſſe quid unum. Adde ne immobile quidem illud eſſe, cum ipſa ſentiendi ratio motus quidam ſit.* I ſhall touch again on this Subject in the Remark E.

I ſhall obſerve by the by that there is a great deal of probability that the Author of the *Art of thinking* cenſures *Ariſtotle* unjuſtly in Favour of *Parmenides*. It were to be wiſhed, ſaith he (c), " that *Ariſtotle* who took care to Advertiſe us of this (d) Fault, would with equal caution have avoided it. For it is too Evident that he hath fallen foul upon ſeveral Ancient Philoſophers, by citing their Opinions very unſincerely. He refutes *Parmenides* and *Meliſſus*, for having admitted but one Principle of all things, as if they had meant the Principle of which they are compoſed, whereas they meant, the ſole and only Principle from which all things derive their Original, which is God. " The Author of the *Art of thinking* does *Parmenides* and *Meliſſus* a greater Honour than they deſerve. He repreſents their Opinions concerning the Origine of Created Beings as Orthodox; and yet they at beſt want very little of being as impious as thoſe of *Spinoza*: They acknowledged no difference betwixt the Principle of which all things are compoſed, and that which produced them. They admitted but one ſole being, and yet pretended that all things were Eternal. This is what is imputed to them in *Euſebius* as we have ſeen above. *Ariſtotle* doth not charge them with all this in all reſpects: He owns that *Permenides* teaching on the one ſide that in reality there is but one Being, but that according to Appearance there are ſeveral, accommodated himſelf to Appearance, and ſuppoſed two other Principles, which are Heat and Cold, Fire and Earth: (e) Ἀναγκαζόμενος δ' ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς φαινομένοις, καὶ τὸ ἓν μὲν κατὰ λόγον, πλείω δὲ κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν ὑπολαμβάνων εἶναι, δύο τὰς αἰτίας, καὶ δύο τὰς ἀρχὰς τίθησι πάλιν, θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν, οἷον πῦρ καὶ γῆν λέγων. Τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν &c. *Coactus vero illa, quæ apparent, ſequi, & unum ratione, plura vero ſecundum ſenſum putans eſſe, duas cauſas rurſum, ac duo principia ponit, calidum, & frigidum, velut ignem & terram dicens. Horum autem alterum*, &c. It is hard to apprehend by what turn of (f) thought ſuch a great Number of the Ancient Philoſophers could believe that there is but one ſubſtance in the Univerſe. But it is very eaſy to apprehend that this being granted, they were then obliged to aſſert that the Univerſe perpetually continues in the ſame State: For a Being which neceſſarily exiſts, and which alone is all things, muſt of neceſſity be perfectly Immovable. No External Cauſe can change it, nor can it alter itſelf. It hath independently on its own Will exiſtence, and all the Attributes of its Nature. Whatever it hath once, it ought to poſſeſs continually; for what had no Beginning is not liable to Deſtruction. This alſo proves that it cannot acquire any thing new, ſince the production of one new quality would be the deſtruction of ſome other (g). Thus far the Syſtem of *Xenophanes* and *Parmenides* runs glibly. But as Experience convinced them that Changes do happen in Nature, ſuch as internally and effectually affect our Minds, tho' they are ſuppoſed to be meer illuſions of the ſenſes, theſe Philoſophers ſhould have acknowledged that they had built upon a falſe ſuppoſition, and ſhou'd have admitted two Principles, one Active and the other Paſſive. This being granted, we may believe that the Active Principle remains always in the ſame ſtate in the midſt of the Continual Variations of Nature (h). Its uniform and invariable Action received on different Subjects, muſt neceſſarily produce all the Viciſſitudes in the World. Don't we ſee that the Motion of the *Air*, without altering in itſelf, produces different effects, according as it meets with a Mill, a Veſſel, ſcattered Straw, or a heap of Leaves, &c.

(A△△) *He believed the Moon an inhabited Country.*] As *Cicero* informs us; and he is not the only Author, who aſcribes this Opinion to him. (i) *Habitari ait Xenophanes in Luna, eamque eſſe terram multarum urbium & montium.* *Lactantius* ridicules this Opinion, and repreſents *Xenophane* believing, not that the Circumference of the Moon was inhabited, but that it contained within its Boſom an Earth, Peopled with a Race of Men. He juſtly blames him for having aſſerted that this Planet is Eighteen times bigger than the Earth: (k) *Xenophanes dicentibus mathematicis orbem lunæ duodeviginti partibus majorem eſſe, quam terram, ſtultiſſime credidit. & quod huic levitati fuit conſentaneum, dixit, intra concavum lunæ ſinum eſſe aliam terram, & ibi aliud genus hominum ſimili modo vivere, quo nos in hac terra vivimus. Habent igitur illi lunatici homines alteram lunam, quæ illis nocturnum lumen exhibeat, ſicut hæc exhibet nobis. Et fortaſſe noſter hic orbis alterius inferioris terræ luna ſit.* I am not willing to Engage that he has rightly underſtood this Philoſopher's Notion; but ſeveral very great Men of theſe latter Ages would laugh at him for making a jeſt of it. This Opinion of *Xenophanes* is an Honour to him: It is alſo the Opinion of ſeveral celebrated Mathematicians. See what Dr. *Wilkins* Biſhop of (l) *Cheſter* ſaith on this head. His Treatiſe of the *World in the Moon* was Tranſlated into *French* by the *Sieur de la Montagne*, and Printed at *Rouën* in 1656. in 8°. See alſo Mr. *Huygens's Coſmotheoros*, of which Mr. *Baſnage de Bauval* gave us an Extract in his Journal for the Month of *May* 1698. The Opinions of *Xenophanes* concerning the motion of the Sun and Moon are very deſpicable. He (m) ſaid that " The *Sun* is Eclipſed, when extinguiſhed; he gives a farther Account of the Eclipſe of the *Sun*, which remains for a whole Month, and again of another ſort of Eclipſe which changeth the Day into Night; that there are many *Suns* and many *Moons* according as the Earth is diſtinguiſhed by Climates, Circles and Zones. At ſome certain time the Orb of the *Sun* falling upon ſome diſtrict part of the habitable World, wanders in a *Vacuum*, and becomes Eclipſed. The ſame perſon affirms, that the *Sun* proceeding in its motion in the infinite ſpace appears to us to move orbicularly, when truly it receives that Repreſentation from its infinite diſtance from us.

(B) *That in Nature Good exceeds Evil.*] *Diogenes Laertius* Accounts amongſt the chief Opinions of *Xenophanes* (n) τὰ πολλὰ ἥττω νοῦ εἶναι, that moſt things are worſe than, or inferior to the Mind. But it ſeems unworthy of a Philoſopher to talk thus; for the meaneſt Peaſant knows very well, and

(a) This paſſage ſeems to be corrupted. I had rather [illegible]

(b) Euſeb. ubi ſupra l. 14. c. 17. p. 756. D, ex libro 8. Ariſtoclis de Philoſophia.

(c) Art de penſer, 3. part, chap. 18. p. m. 316.

(d) That is, the Sophiſm call'd ignoratio elenchi, to prove a different thing from that in queſtion.

(e) Ariſtoteles, Metaphyſicæ lib. 1. c. 5. p. 648. E. See alſo chap. 3.

(f) I think they were led into this Opinion by this ſuppoſition, that ſince nothing can be produced out of nothing, whatever exiſts has a neceſſary exiſtence, and is therefore Eternal and infinite, and that Infinite can be but one.

(g) From hence we may draw a ſtrong proof that our Souls and matter are not uncreated beings. See the Remark E.

(h) Stabiliſque manens dat cuncta moveri. Boet. conſol. Philoſ. l. 3. metro 9.

(i) Cicero Academ. quæſt. lib. 2. fol. m. 211. C.

(k) Lactant. lib. 3. cap. 23, pag. m. 207.

(l) He Married a Siſter of Cromwell, by whom he had a Daughter, who was Married to Dr. Tillotſon Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury.

(m) Plut. de placitis philoſoph. l. 2. c. 24. pag. 901.

(n) Plurima deteriora mente eſſe. Diogen. Laert. ubi ſupra. 19.

if the queſtion was only about Evil (C) morally conſidered, I don't believe he would find one Opponent. For every Body owns that Good and Honeſt Men are very rare, and

no Body needs to be taught, that the Mind of Man is better than Matter, Water or Air, &c. Wherefore we ought to believe that Xenophanes intended to ſay ſomewhat greater. This is the Conjecture of Meric Caſaubon (a). He pretends that this Philoſopher taught that the Divine Mind, which made the World, endeavour'd to endow all Creatures with a ſtate of Perfection; but that having found very ſtrong Obſtacles in Matter, he could not always compaſs his Deſigns; and that on ſome occaſions he was forced to produce evil things. Which is to ſay, that in this conflict he was ſometimes vanquiſhed, but oftner vanquiſher; and that the greateſt part of things were ſubmitted to the Deſires and Power of the Divine Mind, and conſequently ἥσσω τε εἶναι, doth not mean worſe than the Mind but ſubjected to it, and the ſubject of its Triumph. *Caſaubon* confirms his Conjecture by a paſſage in *Plato*, where it is ſaid that Neceſſity and the Mind concurred in the production of the World, and that Neceſſity ſuffered her ſelf to be perſuaded to conſent that things for the moſt part ſhould be governed for the beſt: (b) Μεμιγμένη γὰρ οὖν ἡ τοῦδε κόσμου γένεσις ἐξ ἀνάγκης τε καὶ νοῦ συστάσεως ἐγεννήθη· νοῦ δὲ ἀνάγκης ἄρχοντος, τῷ πείθειν αὐτὴν τῶν γιγνομένων τὰ πλεῖστα ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιστον ἄγειν, ταύτῃ κατὰ ταῦτα (c) δι' ἀνάγκης ἡττωμένης ὑπὸ πειθοῦς ἔμφρονος, οὕτω κατ' ἀρχὰς ξυνίστατο τόδε τὸ πᾶν. *Mundi enim hujus generatio ex neceſſitate mentiſque coitu mixta eſt. Nam cum mens neceſſitati dominaretur, propterea quod perſuadendo eam ad optimos ut plurimum rerum eventus induceret, ipſaque hac ratione cedens ſapienti perſuaſioni pareret, mundi hujus exordia conſtiterunt.* (d) *Caſaubon* obſerves that *Homer* on a particular occaſion having ſaid that Evil exceeds Good, it was converted into a general (e) Maxim; as if univerſally ſpeaking the Miſeries of Humane life overbalanced the Happineſs of it. The ſame Critick obſerves that thoſe who ſpoke of this Subject with the greateſt modeſty, excuſed Providence on Account of the Fatal neceſſity which conſtrained it to open a Gate to ſeveral Evils. *Qui parciſſime loquebantur Deum excuſabant qui Bonus non niſi bona in operibus ſuis & omni adminiſtratione ſua propoſuiſſet, ſed materiæ obluctantis vel deficientis neceſſitate coactus, etiam malis non paucis invitus locum reliquiſſet.* He adds that *Euripides* hath ſtrenuouſly refuted the Common Opinion that Evil ſurpaſſes Good, and he cites the beginning of that Confutation.

Ἔλεξε γάρ τις ὡς τὰ χείρονα
Πλείω βροτοῖσίν ἐστι τῶν ἀμεινόνων.
Ἐγὼ δὲ τούτοις ἀντίαν γνώμην ἔχω,
Πλείω τὰ χρηστὰ τῶν κακῶν εἶναι βροτοῖς.

The immediate following Words (f) of *Euripides* ſeemed to *Caſaubon* to be written by an inſpired Pen. *Pliny* differs from this Poet's Opinion; for tho' he doth not determine that it is clearly apparent, that Nature behaves her ſelf to us rather like a cruel Step-mother, than a Tender indulgent Parent, yet he intimates that he is of that Opinion: (g) *Principium jure tribuetur homini cujus cauſa videtur cuncta alia genuiſſe natura; magna ſæva mercede contra tanta ſua munera: non ſit ut ſatis æſtimare parens melior homini, an triſtior noverca fuerit.* She ſets the Preſents ſhe makes us, ſaith he, at the Price of a Thouſand Afflictions. To this purpoſe he diſplays a long deſcription of Humane Infirmities, and oppoſes them to the Advantages of Animals over Mankind; nor doth he forget the Vices in which Men exceed Brutes: (h) *Uni animantium luctus eſt datus, uni luxuria, & quidem innumerabilibus modis, ac per ſingula membra: uni ambitio, uni avaritia, uni immenſa vivendi cupido, uni ſuperſtitio, uni ſepulturæ cura, atque etiam poſt ſe de futuro. Nulli vita fragilior, nulli rerum omnium libido major, nulli pavor confuſior, nulli rabies acrior. Denique cætera animantia in ſuo genere probe degunt: congregari videmus, & ſtare contra diſſimilia: Leonum feritas inter ſe non dimicat: ſerpentium morſus non petit ſerpentes: ne maris quidem belluæ & piſces, niſi in diverſa genera, ſæviunt. At hercule homini plurima ex homine ſunt mala.* He doth not forget the reflection which ſeveral have made, (i) that it would be beſt for Man not to be born, or to dye quickly. He affirms in another Book that the greateſt Bleſſing that God beſtowed upon Men amongſt ſo many Pains of life, is the Power of killing themſelves: (k) *Nec ſibi poteſt (Deus) mortem conſciſcere, ſi velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vitæ pœnis.* He hath enumerated ſeveral of the Follies of Paganiſm, and concluded that of all theſe things there is but one certain, which is, that all things are uncertain, and that Man is the moſt miſerable and vaineſt part of the whole Creation: (l) *Quæ ſingula improvidam mortalitatem involvunt, ſolum ut inter iſta certum ſit, nihil eſſe certi,* NEC MISERIUS QUIDQUAM HOMINE, AUT SUPERBIUS. *Cætera quippe animantium ſola victus cura eſt, in quo ſponte naturæ benignitas ſufficit: uno quidem vel præferendo cunctis bonis, quod de gloria, de pecunia, ambitione, ſuperque de morte non cogitant.*

PLAUTUS does ſo naturally expreſs the contrary ſentiment to *Euripides*'s Maxim, that I think my ſelf obliged to Tranſcribe his Words.

Satin' (m) parva res eſt voluptatum in vita, atque
in ætate agundæ,
Præquam quod moleſtum'ſt! ita cuique comparatum'ſt in ætate hominum.
Ita Dis eſt placitum, voluptatem ut mœror comes
conſequatur:
Quin incommodi plus malique ilico adſit, boni ſi obtigit quid.

Diphilus the Poet ſuppoſed Fortune to oblige us to drink a Liquor compoſed of three Evils, and only one good.

Ὥσπερ (n) κυαθίζουσ' ἐνίοθ' ἡμῖν ἡ τύχη,
Ἓν ἀγαθὸν ἐπιχέασα τρί' ἐπαντλεῖ κακά.
Fortuna nobis, tanquam cyathos expiſcantibus,
Si unum bonum infundat, tria mala affundit.

(C) *About Evil morally conſidered.*] A Hundred things would offer themſelves to our Obſervation upon the queſtion, Whether *Euripides* is rather to be believed than *Pliny*, and ſo many other great Men, who have maintained that the Evils of Humane life ſurpaſs the good things of it. Let us dwell a little upon this Subject, and premiſe that if the Diſpute barely relates to vicious Evil, the thing will ſoon be terminated on *Pliny*'s ſide: For where is the Man who dares maintain that Virtuous Actions are in proportion as ten to ten Thouſand compared with the crimes of Mankind? But in the Second place if the queſtion about Evil concerns only Afflictions, *Euripides* will find a party. As to the Second point I ſhall refer to the following Remark, and offer ſomething on the firſt.

How deteſtable ſoever the Opinion of two Principles hath always appeared to all (o) Chriſtian Communions, yet it hath not prevented the admitting into Chriſtianity a Subaltern Principle of Moral Evil. For Divines teach us that a great Number of Angels having ſinned, made a party in the Univerſe againſt God. For brevity ſake this party is denoted by the Name of Devil or Dæmon, and he is acknowledged for the cauſe of the Fall of the firſt Man, and for the perpetual Tempter and ſeducer of Mankind. The Devil having declared War againſt God from the Moment of his Fall, hath always continued in his Rebellion. He continually applies himſelf to uſurp the Rights of his Creator and debauch his Subjects, in order to make them Rebels and engage them to ſerve under his Enſigns againſt their common Maſter. He ſucceeded in his firſt hoſtilities with regard to Man: He in the Garden of *Eden* attacked the Mother of all living, and vanquiſhed her; immediately after which he fell on the Man and defeated him.

Sacred Hiſtory (p) tells us of but one good Man in and that nothing is more Common than thoſe who ſwerve from the Rules of Virtue. But without all doubt, *Xenophanes* intended to ſpeak of Phyſical Evil; and his ſenſe was, that the Sweets of Life (D) do not equal the bitter Potions which it obliges us

---

(a) Meric. Caſaubon. in hæc verba Diogen. Laertii.

(b) Plato in Timæo, p. m. 1058. D.

(c) Meric Caſaubon reads τῆς ἀνάγκης.

(d) Mericus Caſaubonus ubi ſupra.

(e) Τὰ χείρονα [illegible].

(f) Cætera quæ bene multa talia, quæ θεόπνευστον pectus ſpirare videantur. *Mericus Caſaubon.*

(g) Plinius lib. 7. init. pag. m. 3.

(h) Id. ib. pag. 5.

(i) [illegible] See the Sentence in Cicero [illegible]

(k) [illegible]

(l) Id. ibid.

(m) Plaut. in Amphitr. act. 2. sc. 2. init. pag. m. 26.

(n) Diphilus apud Stobæum.

(o) *For the Marcionites and Manichees do not deſerve to be call'd Chriſtians.*

(p) *Compare with this Remark G. of the Article* [illegible]

in *Adam's* Family, and reduced to one good Man the Family of that good Man, and ſo on in the other Generation to *Noah*, in whoſe Family we find three Sons whom God ſaved from the Deluge with their Father, Mother, and Wives. Thus at the end of ſixteen hundred fifty ſix Years, all Mankind, except one Family of Eight Perſons, were ſo deeply engaged in the Intereſt of the Devil, that the Enormity of their Crimes render'd it neceſſary to extirpate them. Error and Vice, ſoon after the Deluge, lifted up their Heads in *Noah's* Family: His Deſcendants plunged themſelves into Idolatry, and all manner of Debaucheries; that is to ſay, the Devil kept his uſurped Power over them. There was no more than one handful of People, confined in *Judea*, that eſcaped him with reſpect to Orthodoxy; and yet it muſt be owned that the Arms of the good Party were very uncertain with reſpect to that alſo, ſince that very Nation ſuffered it ſelf to be ſeduced to Idolatry from time to time; inſomuch that their Conduct was an alternative of the true and falſe Worſhip. But as for Vice it never ſuffered a real *interregnum* amongſt the Jews, any more than in other Countries: And conſequently the Devil continually kept one foot in the ſmall Conqueſts which the good party Recovered. There happen'd a happy Revolution at the Birth of JESUS CHRIST: His Miracles, his Goſpel, and his Apoſtles made glorious Conqueſts. Then the Empire of the Devil received a very great Check, and a conſiderable part of the Earth was wreſted out of his Hands; but he was not ſo driven out that he did not preſerve ſeveral Intelligences, and a great many Creatures there; he maintain'd himſelf there by the abominable Hereſies which he ſowed: Vices were never intirely driven out of it, and ſoon after entred into it again, as it were, in triumph. Errors, Schiſms, Diſputes, and Cabals introduced themſelves, together with the fatal train of infamous Paſſions which generally accompany them. The Hereſies, Superſtitions, Violences, Frauds, Extorſions, and Impurities, which have appeared all over the Chriſtian World for ſeveral Ages, are things which I ſhould only be able to deſcribe imperfectly, tho' I was Maſter of more Eloquence than *Cicero*. What *Virgil* ſaid (a) is true in a literal ſenſe. Thus whilſt the Devil reigned uninterrupted without the limits of Chriſtendom, he ſo ſucceſsfully diſputed the Ground in Chriſtendom, that the progreſs of his Arms were beyond compariſon, ſuperior to Truth and Virtue. A ſtop was put to them, and he was forced to retire in the XVIth Century; but what he loſt on one ſide, he regained on the other; and what he did not do by Lyes, he effected by the corruption of Manners. There is no ſhelter, no Fortreſs where he does not make Men feel the effects of his power in this particular. Leave the World, ſhut up your ſelf in a Monaſtery; he will follow you, he will bring in Intrigues, Envy, Factions, or, if he can do no worſe, Lewdneſs; this laſt reſource is almoſt infallible, *Diaboli virtus in lumbis eſt*, ſaith St. *Hierome* (b). A modern Author affirms, (c) *That in thoſe Places where Popery is yet predominant, there is no true piety* ——— *and that* Italy *and* Spain *are places, where there is ſcarce any more true Virtue than in Turky.* He ſaith in another Book (d) *That it is a notorious and acknowledged Truth, that all the Convents of* Spain *and* Portugal *are places of proſtitution and lewdneſs; and that when Chance draws the Curtain, to give us an opportunity of ſeeing what paſſes in the French Monaſteries, we diſcover that they take a little more care of external appearances, but at the bottom are as impure as others.* He ſpares the Proteſtants a little; but yet doth not ſtick to ſay, (e) that corruption runs very high amongſt them, and is become general, not only amongſt the Reformed in *France*, but alſo thoſe of *England*, the Northern Kingdoms, and the Provinces of *Germany*; that the Princes and Sovereigns of thoſe places think of nothing but their political Intereſts; that the People are without Piety, and the Paſtors remiſs; that a prodigious indifference for Religion reigns every where generally ſpeaking; that Princes take no care of the Truth; that the Women (f) of *England* are debauched to the laſt degree, and that the Proteſtant Countries in *Germany*, are plunged into ſuch a ſink of Debauchery, as debaſes them, and makes 'em brutiſh. If it be ſaid that this Author's deſcriptions are overſtrained, it will nevertheleſs be true, that the corruption of Manners amongſt the Chriſtians is deplorable.

Theſe two things require our Reflection. War prevails at leaſt for as long a tract of time as Peace amongſt the Chriſtians: I confine my ſelf to Chriſtianity, becauſe it is unneceſſary for me to ſpeak of the Infidel Nations; they are continually in the ſervice of the Devil, and ſubject to his Empire; and the Uſurper there is not in the leaſt interrupted. It is undeniable that War is the Devil's time, or, if I may ſo expreſs my ſelf, his turn of reigning; for without mentioning the Violences and Debaucheries committed in it, every body is neceſſarily obliged to profeſs that they will ſuffer no Injuries; it is abſolutely neceſſary to quit the Trade, or revenge an Affront: but this is manifeſtly to withdraw our Allegiance to the Empire of JESUS CHRIST, and deſert to the Enemy. Times of Peace do not ſeem ſo favourable to the Empire of the Devil, and yet they are very much ſo; for as People grow rich (g), they grow more voluptuous, and plunge themſelves deeper in Luxury and Eaſe. My other Remark is more deciſive. The Roman Catholicks and Proteſtants agree, that very few eſcape Damnation. They allow none to be ſaved but only the Orthodox who lead good lives, and repent of their ſins at the point of death. They don't indeed deny but that habitual Sinners may be ſaved, upon a ſincere Death-bed Repentance, but withal maintain that nothing is more rare than ſuch a Repentance. According to which it is plain, that for one Man ſaved, there are perhaps a Million damn'd.

Obſerve that all that I have been ſaying is every day preached. No more is meant by it than (which is alſo my Opinion) that Man is naturally ſo prone to Evil, that except the ſmall number of the Elect, all other Men live and die in the ſervice of the Evil Spirit, and render the Paternal Love of God ineffectual to remedy their Wickedneſs, or bring them to repentance.

(D) *That the ſweets of Life do not equal the bitter Potions.*] Thoſe who hold the contrary Opinion, chiefly inſiſt upon a parallel betwixt Diſeaſes and Health. There are very few Perſons, whatever Age they be of, but can reckon up, incomparably more days of health than ſickneſs; and there are a great many who in the ſpace of twenty Years have not been afflicted with Diſeaſes that will take up in all 15 days. But this Compariſon is fallacious (h); for Health conſidered alone is rather an indolence, than a ſenſe of pleaſure; it is rather a bare exemption from Evil, than a Good, whilſt Sickneſs is worſe than a privation of pleaſure: It is a poſitive ſtate which plunges the Mind into a Senſe of ſuffering, and loads the Patient with Pain. One (i) judiciouſly ſays, that *when Health is alone, it is a Good which is not much perceived, and ſometimes only ſerves to make us the more ardently deſire all other Pleaſures which we cannot have.* Let us make uſe of a Compariſon taken from the School-men: They ſay that (k) *rare, i. e.* porous Bodies contain but very little Matter under a great extent; and that *denſe* Bodies contain a great quantity of Matter as to ſwallow. Many People are perſuaded it is true, and do not want plauſible

---

(a) Non mihi ſi linguæ centum ſint oraque centum, ferrea vox, omnes ſcelerum comprendere formas —— poſſim. Virgil. Æneid. lib. 6. v. 625.

(b) Montagne, Eſſais, l. 3. chap. 5. p. m. 134.

(c) Jurieu, Vrai Syſteme de l'Egliſe, pag. m. 262.

(d) Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud, tom. 2. pag. 392. (e) *See the Abbot* Richard, Critique des prejugez de Mr. Jurieu. pag. 134. *He quotes the* Avis aux Proteſtans de l'Europe.

(f) Id. ib. pag. 258. *quoting the ſame* Avis aux Proteſtants.

(g) Nunc patimur longæ pacis mala, ſævior armis Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulciſcitur orbem. Juvenal Sat. 6. v. 291.

(h) *See the Article* Pericles

(i) *I think it is Mrs.* de Scuderi.

(k) Rarum eſt quod ſub magna dimentione parum continet materiæ: denſum quod ſub parva dimenſione multum continet materiæ.

are couched in a ſmall compaſs. According to this Principle, if one ſhould ſay that there is more matter in three feet of Water than in two thouſand five hundred foot of Air; this is a lively image of ſickneſs and health. Sickneſs reſembles the *denſe* Bodies, and Health the *rare*. Health laſts many Years, and yet contains but a ſmall portion of Happineſs. Sickneſs continues but a few days, and yet comprehends a vaſt load of Miſery. If we had a Scale adapted to weigh both a Diſeaſe of 15 days, and the Health of 15 years, we ſhould obſerve the ſame difference that we find in the Balance betwixt a Bag of Feathers and a piece of Lead. In one Scale we ſhould ſee a Body which takes up a great deal of room, and on the other, one which lies in a very ſmall compaſs; and yet one of them is not heavier than the other. Let us then beware of the Illuſion which the extenſion of Health may draw us into, when it is parallell'd with Sickneſs. But you will ſay that Health is conſiderable, not only by reaſon it exempts us from a very great Evil, but alſo by the liberty which it affords us, to taſte a thouſand lively and very ſenſible Pleaſures. I grant all this, but it ought to be farther conſidered, that there being two ſorts of Evils to which we are ſubject, it only ſecures us from one, and leaves us wholly expoſed to the other. We are ſubject to Pain and Sorrow, two ſuch terrible things, that it is not to be decided which is moſt dreadful. The moſt vigorous Health doth not ſecure us from Grief. For Grief flows in upon us through a thouſand and a thouſand Channels, and is of the nature of *denſe* Bodies. It compriſes a great deal of Matter in a very ſmall volume; Evil is heaped up, crowded and preſſed cloſe in it. One hours Anxiety contains more Evil, than there is Good in ſix or ſeven pleaſant days. The other day I was told of a Man who killed himſelf, after an anxious Melancholy of three or four Weeks. Every Night he laid his Sword under his Bolſter, in hopes that he ſhould have courage enough to end his Life, when darkneſs ſhould increaſe his Grief: But his Reſolution failed for ſeveral Nights ſucceſſively. At laſt, not being able to reſiſt his uneaſineſs, he cut the Veins of his Arm. I aver, that all the Pleaſures which this Man had enjoyed in 30 Years, would not equal the Evils which tormented him the laſt Month of his Life, if both were weighed in the Balance. Look back to my parallel of *denſe* and *rare* bodies, and remember this, that the good things of this life are a leſs Good, than the evil things are an Evil. Evils are generally more pure and unmixt than good things; the lively ſenſe of Pleaſure doth not continue long, it immediately grows flat and dull, and is followed with a diſguſt (a). What appeared an exalted good when we did not poſſeſs it, ſcarce touches us in the Enjoyment: So that we acquire with a thouſand Fatigues and Uneaſineſſes, what we poſſeſs with no more than a moderate Pleaſure; and very often the fear of loſing the Good we enjoy, ſurpaſſes all the Pleaſures of the fruition of it.

I have been ſhewed a very fine paſſage of *Pliny*, which is alſo very proper to confirm the Thoughts which I have juſt now offered. (b) *Si verum facere judicium volumus, ac repudiata omni fortunæ ambitione decernere, mortalium nemo (c) eſt felix. Abunde igitur, atque indulgenter fortuna decidit cum eo, qui jure dici non infelix poteſt. Quippe ut alia non ſint, certe, ne laſſeſcat fortuna, metus eſt: quo ſemel recepto, ſolida felicitas non eſt. Quid quod nemo mortalium omnibus horis ſapit? utinamque falſum hoc, & non a vate dictum quam plurimi judicent! Vana mortalitas, & ad circumſcribendum ſeipſam ingenioſa, computat more Thraciæ gentis, quæ calculos colore diſtinctos, pro experimento cujuſque diei in urnam condit, ac ſupremo die ſeparatos dinumerat, atque ita de quoque pronunciat. Quid quod iſte calculi candore illo laudatus dies, originem mali habuit? Quam multos accepta afflixere imperia; quam multos bona perdidere, & ultimis merſere ſuppliciis? iſta nimirum bona, ſi cui inter illa hora in gaudio fuit. Ita eſt profecto, alius de alio judicat dies, & tamen ſupremus de omnibus: Ideoque nullis credendum eſt. Quid quod bona malis paria non ſunt, etiam pari numero; nec lætitia ulla minimo mœrore penſanda? Heu vana & imprudens diligentia! numerus dierum comparatur, ubi quæritur pondus.* I find another paſſage which gives a lively image of the ill ſtate of Felicities, I ſpeak of thoſe common to all Men, I mean corporeal Pleaſures. (d) *Quid autem de corporis voluptatibus loquar, quarum appetentia quidem plena eſt anxietatis, ſatietas verò pœnitentiæ? Quantos illæ morbos, quam intolerabiles dolores, quaſi quendam fructum nequitiæ fruentium ſolent referre corporibus!* —— *Triſtes verò eſſe voluptatum exitus, quiſquis reminiſci libidinum ſuarum volet, intelliget*——

Habet omnis hoc voluptas,
Stimulis agit fruentes,
Apiumque par volantum,
Ubi grata mella fudit,
Fugit, & nimis tenaci
Ferit icta corda morſu.

Boetius ſuppoſes Philoſophy expreſſing her ſelf thus to him. It appears by this Diſcourſe, that if anxiety precedes the enjoyment of Pleaſures, Diſguſt and Repentance follow cloſe after it. A vaſt number of Authors obſerve this miſerable *concomitance*, or, to ſpeak more intelligibly, this connexion of Pleaſure and Uneaſineſs. I have cited two (e) in my firſt Edition, and now I add a third, which is *Antiphanes*.

Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δ' ἔν γε τόπῳ, ἔνθα τὸ
Ἡδὺ ἔνεστι, πλησίον που καὶ τὸ λυπηρόν. αἱ γὰρ ἡδοναὶ
Οὐκ ἐπὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐμπορεύονται, ἀλλ' ἀκολουθοῦσ'
αὐταῖς
Λύπαι καὶ πόνοι.

Id eſt,

At in eodem ipſo, in quo
Jucunditas ineſt, propè ſanè & moleſtia præſto eſt.
Voluptates enim
Non ipſæ ſolæ ingrediuntur, ſed earum comites ſunt
Dolores ac LABORES.

Let us alſo obſerve another Circumſtance. We are not only in fear of loſing what we poſſeſs, but alſo vexed to ſee other People equal or ſurpaſs us, and that others will ſoon be able to come up to us, and afterwards get before us. Obſerve that in order to prove that Good is not ſo perfectly Good, as Evil is Evil, I have made no uſe of this Argument, that it rarely happens that a good uſe is made of the Favours of Fortune, ſo that they do not lead us to great miſeries, that they may be ſaid to be a Grace, (f) and not a Snare; I ſay, I have omitted this Reaſon, becauſe I do not here pretend to conſider the cauſes and occaſions of Good and Evil, but Good and Evil formally taken. It would be to depart from the ſtate of the Queſtion to ſay, that Man afflicts himſelf without cauſe. For it is not our buſineſs here to know whether his Grief is reaſonable or the effect of his weakneſs; but the Queſtion is, to know whether he grieves. That very thing that a Man vexes himſelf without reaſon, and makes himſelf unhappy by his own fault, is an Evil.

We muſt own with *Seneca*, conſidering the multitude of good things which Nature has imparted to us, and the inexhauſtible Induſtry with which the Wit of Man diverſifies Pleaſures, and diſcovers the ſources of them; that God not contented to provide barely for our Neceſſities, hath beſides furniſhed us with ſuperfluities enough to live deliciouſly. *Unde hæc innumerabilia oculos, aures, animum mulcentia? unde illa luxuriam quoque inſtruens copia? Neque enim neceſſitatibus tantummodo noſtris proviſum eſt: uſque in delicias amamur. Tot arbuſta, non uno modo frugifera, tot herbæ ſalutares, tot varietates ciborum, per totum annum digeſtæ, ut inerti quoque fortuita terræ alimenta præberent. Jam animalia omnis generis, alia in ſicco ſolidoque, alia in humido innaſcentia, alia per ſublime dimiſſa: ut omnis rerum naturæ pars tributum aliquod nobis conferret* (g). —— (h) *Unde iſta palatum tuum ſaporibus exquiſitis ultra ſatietatem laceſſentia? unde hæc*

(a) Πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστὶ καὶ ὕπνου, καὶ φιλότητος, μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς, καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο. Omnium quidem ſatietas eſt, & ſomni & amoris cantuſque dulcis & egregiæ ſaltationis. Homer. Iliad. lib. 13. v. 636.

(b) Plinius lib. 7. cap. 40. pag. m. 62. Mr. du Rondel has acquainted me with this Paſſage.

(c) Euripides in Medea v. 1228 & 1230. p. m. 327. ſays the ſame thing.

(d) Boe… de C… ſol. … lib. … 3. pr… p. m.

(e) Uſque adeo nulla eſt ſincera voluptas, Sollicitique aliquid lætis intervenit. Ovidius Metam. l. 7. v. 453. Medio de fonte leporum Surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipſis floribus angat. Lucret. lib. 4. v. 1127.

(f) Munera iſta fortunæ putatis? inſidiæ ſunt. Quiſquis noſtrum tutam agere vitam volet, quantum plurimum poteſt iſta viſcata beneficia devitet, in quibus hoc quoque miſerrimi fallimur, habere nos putamus, habemur. Seneca epiſt. 8.

(g) Seneca de beneficiis, lib. 4. c. 5.

(h) … c. 6.

plauſible Reaſons for it, as we ſhall ſee hereafter. And even thoſe who acknowledge

[illegible] ille fuit, in quo [illegible] natura? Nonne ſi [illegible] dixit,

——Deus nobis hæc otia fecit

All that *Seneca* ſaith in this part of his Book *de Beneficiis* is very true; but doth not *Pliny* withal aſſure us (*a*) that Nature makes us buy her Preſents at the price of ſo many ſufferings, that it is dubious whether ſhe deſerves moſt, the Name of a Parent, or Step-mother? To reconcile theſe two Author, we ought to conſider what Divinity teaches us of the Oeconomy of God, as a Father, and as Judge of Mankind. Thoſe two Relations require that Man ſhould be ſenſible of Good and Evil. But the Queſtion is, whether Evil exceeds Good? and upon this Head I am apt to think that we can go no farther than Opinions and Conjectures. A great many ſay, that moſt Perſons, after they are a little advanced in years, grow like *la Mothe le Vayer* (*b*), who would not again have paſſed through the ſame Good and Evil which he had felt in his life. If it be ſo, it ought to be believed that every one who keeps a juſt account, finds that the Pleaſures which he enjoys, do not equal the uneaſineſſes and pains with which he is afflicted. I don't alledge that none is content (*c*) with his condition, for that is no proof that every Man believes himſelf leſs happy than unhappy. Four Afflictions mixed with Twenty Felicities, would be ſufficient to engage a Man to with an alteration of his Condition, I mean ſuch an one as is not charged with any Inconvenience, or at leaſt where he ſhould find but two of them to forty Advantages. On the other ſide, none ought to alledge againſt me what (*d*) *Lactantius* ſaith, that Men are ſo nice, that they complain of the leaſt Evil, as if it abſorbed all the good things they enjoy: For it is to no purpoſe to conſider here what the abſolute quantity of Good and Evil diſpenſed to Man, may be in it ſelf; we are only to conſider their relative quality; or to expreſs my ſelf more clearly, we ought to conſider nothing but the feeling of the Mind. A very great Good in it ſelf, which raiſes but a very mean pleaſure, ought not to paſs for more than a moderate Good; but an Evil, tho' very little in it ſelf, which gives an Uneaſineſs, Grief and Pain, that are inſupportable, ought to paſs for a very great Evil: So that to make a Man paſs for leſs happy than unhappy, it is ſufficient that he is afflicted with three Evils for thirty Felicities which he enjoys, if thoſe three Evils, as little in themſelves as you pleaſe, give him more diſturbance than thirty good things, as great in their own nature as you pleaſe, afford him Pleaſure. The Government of a Province is in it ſelf a much greater good than a Ribbon; and yet if a Duke and Peer is ſenſibly touch'd with a greater joy at the receipt of a Ribbon from his Miſtreſs, than in obtaining the Government of a Province from his King; I aver, that a Ribbon is a greater Good to him than the Authority of a Governour. By the ſame Reaſon it is alſo a greater Evil for him to be deprived of this Ribbon, than to be deprived of his Poſt, if he is more griev'd at the loſs of the Ribbon than at that of his Poſt. On which account no Man is able to judge aright, either of the Miſery (*e*) or Happineſs of his Neighbour. We don't know what another ſenſibly feels, we only know the outward cauſes of Evil and Good: Now theſe Cauſes are not always adequately proportion'd to their effects; thoſe which ſeem to us very ſmall, frequently produce a lively Senſe; and thoſe which appear to us great, very often occaſion but a very faint one. The following words of *Tacitus* are really an Oracle: (*f*) *Neque mala vel bona quæ vulgus putet: multos qui conflictari adverſis videantur, beatos, ac pleroſque quamquam magnas per opes miſerrimos, ſi illi gravem fortunam conſtanter tolerent, hi proſpera inconſulte utantur.* We ought only to extend the ſignification of the Word, *inconſulte*, ſo that it may comprehend the Diſpoſition of the Temper which makes us receive the Favours of Fortune with inſenſibility or without joy.

All this ſhews that none can determine poſitively whether his Neighbour's Deſtiny be drawn out of *Homer's* (*g*) two Veſſels, in ſuch a manner, that the Doſe of Good be as large, or perhaps larger than that of Evil. All that can be ſaid with full certainty, is, that no Man's Fate was ever drawn wholly out of the good Veſſel. To which purpoſe I have an excellent paſſage of *Pauſanias* to cite; it is the reflection which he made upon hearing that one *Aglaus* was happy his whole life. (*h*) [illegible] *Quod vero ſcriptis mandarunt Aglaum Pſophidium, (i) ſicuti & Crœſum Lydorum regem, vitam omni fere ætatis tempore beatam egiſſe, id ego ut credam non facile adducor. Nam ut hominem qui levioribus multo, quam alius quiſpiam qui iiſdem vixerit temporibus, incommodis affectus, non difficillime fortaſſe reperias, uti navem adverſis tempeſtatibus minus agitatam; ſic propemodum neminem unquam crediderim perpetuo moleſtiarum & calamitatum immunem fuiſſe; quando neque ulla navis memorari poſſit, quæ ſemper ſecundiſſimis uſa fuerit tempeſtatibus. Nam & Homerus id ſenſiſſe videtur, quo loco duo, bonorum unum, alterum malorum, dolia apud Jovem ſtatuit. Id enim ille ex Delphico Apolline didicerat; qui ipſum & miſerum ſimul, & beatum dixerat, utpote ad utramque vitæ ſortem genitum.* As this *Aglaus* was alive in *Crœſus's* time, there is no room for any ſurprize that *Solon* omitted him, (*k*) when he named to that Monarch three Men who to him ſeemed happy; for he believed that to deſerve that Title, one ought to be ſhelter'd from the inconſtancy of Fortune, and that during life no Man is ſecure from this inconſtancy. If *Solon* had affirm'd that thoſe three Men, during their Lives, never felt either Grief or Pain, (*l*) he had been miſtaken, and had contradicted that profound good ſenſe which made him look for Happineſs, not at the Court of *Crœſus*, but amongſt Men of mean condition.

PRINCES and great Men are not ſo happy as other People.

It is certain that thoſe who would find Perſons, who have had more Happineſs than Uneaſineſs, will rather meet them amongſt (*m*) the Peaſants, or the meaneſt Handicrafts-men, than amongſt Kings and Princes. Read theſe words of a great Man: (*n*) "Do you believe then that "Uneaſineſs and the moſt deadly Pains don't hide "themſelves under the Purple, or that a Kingdom "is an univerſal remedy againſt all Evils, a Balm "that aſſwages them, or a Charm which enchants "them? Whereas by the courſe of Divine Provi"dence which knows how to counterpoiſe the moſt "exalted Conditions; this Grandeur which we "admire at a diſtance, as ſomething more than "Humane, is leſs ſenſible to thoſe who are born "in it, or confounds it ſelf in its own Plenty; "and on the contrary, it is attended with a new "ſenſibility for Griefs, whoſe Blow is the hard"er, by reaſon that great Men are leſs prepared "to receive it.„ Theſe are the two Sources of the Unhappineſs of Princes: Their Being continually accuſtomed to the charming ſide of their condition, renders them inſenſible of the Good, and very ſenſible of the Evil. When three pieces of good News and one of bad are brought to them, they ſcarce feel how much felicity there is in the former, but are touched to the quick with the Miſfortune of the latter. Can they then want uneaſineſſes? Are their Proſperities not thwarted by ſome ill Fortune? Read all that *Guſtavus Adolphus* did in *Germany*, and you will there find a ſuperiority of Fortune, to be parallel'd with very few Examples; and yet you'll obſerve ſuch great

---

(*a*) I have quoted his words in the Remark B. See the words of Socrates in the Remark D Δ.

(*b*) See the Remark F in the Art. Vayer, and what has been ſaid of Cicero in the Art. Tullia, Remark R.

(*c*) Theſe Verſes of Horace lib. 1 initio Sat. 1. contain a true matter of fact. Qui fit, Mæcenas, ut nemo quam ſibi ſortem Seu ratio dederit, ſeu fors objecerit, illâ contentus vivat? laudet diverſa ſequentes.

(*d*) I have quoted his words in the Article Tullia.

(*e*) Felicitas cui præcipua fuerit homini non eſt humani judicii: cum proſperitatem ipſa alius alio modo & ſuopte ingenio quiſque terminet. Plin. lib. 7. cap. 40. p. m. 62.

(*f*) Tacitus Annal. lib. 6. cap. 22.

(*g*) See the [illegible] chæus.

(*h*) Pauſanias lib. 8. pag. 556.

(*i*) This is not well Tranſlated by Romulus Amaſæus. It ſhould be, tempore Crœſi. This fault has not been mended in the Leipſick Edition, 1696.

(*k*) Plutarch in Solone, pag. 93.

(*l*) See above the words of Pauſanias.

(*m*) See Horace, Epodon Ode 2.

(*n*) James Benignus Boſſuet, Biſhop of Meaux, Oraiſon funebre de Marie Tereſe d'Autriche, Reine de France, p. 78, 79. Dutch Edition.

ledge; that Nature hath furnished Mankind with an infinity of agreeable conveniencies

mixtures of disadvantageous Events, that you will easily believe him to have run through a great deal of Uneasiness (a). Besides, suppose that the Victories obtained in some Provinces, do not concur with the Losses sustained in others, you will have reason to believe that is joy not pure and unmixed. An hundred anxious Reflections disturb it. It is conceived that the attack was made too soon or too late; too many Men are lost, and due advantage was not taken of the disorder of the vanquished, but they were permitted to return from their fright; and by a different conduct it is believed the Victory had been more substantial. How many Generals are there who pass the Nights very ill after intire Victories? They are sensible that they are beholden for them to a lucky Chance, to the fault of the Enemy, and sometimes even to their own faults. They conceive they have not done what they might have done. They are apprehensive of the Comments of the experienced, and of the malicious reflections of their Enemies. In a word, they cannot bear a good Testimony to themselves, nor internally applaud the Elogies bestowed upon them. This disturbs and racks them. Whilst their Consciences are sometimes in a sound Sleep, with regard to the Law of God, they are touched to the very quick with respect to the transgression of some martial Laws, and the non-observation of some Rules which a most expert General would have followed. Observe that the most fortunate Princes either in gaining of Battles, or conquering of Towns, are those, whom the defeat of an Army, or the raising of a Siege afflict the most unmercifully. A long train of Adversities hath hardened others; but they grow almost insensible of good success, and infinitely sensible of the least Disgraces. *Augustus* is an Example of this. On a thousand occasions he obtained the most important and glorious advantages over his Enemies that he could have wished, and scarce experienced any of the effects of ill Fortune: But the loss of three Legions so horribly afflicted him, that it may be justly said of him, that the Evil he suffered on that account, exceeded the Good which Ten Victories had made him sensible of. Read what follows: (b) *Graves ignominias cladesque*, saith *Suetonius*, after having made a long enumeration of the Successes of that Emperor, *duas omnino, nec alibi quam in Germania, accepit, Lollianam, & Varianam: Sed Lollianam majoris infamiæ quam detrimenti: Varianam pene exitiabilem, tribus legionibus, cum duce, legatisque, & auxiliis omnibus cæsis. Hac nuntiata, excubias per urbem indixit, ne quis tumultus existeret: & Præsidibus provinciarum propagavit imperium, ut & a peritis & assuetis socii continerentur. Vovit & magnos ludos Jovi Opt. Max.* SI REMPUBLICAM IN MELIOREM STATUM VERTISSET: *quod factum Cimbrico Marsicoque bello erat. Adeo namque consternatum ferunt, ut per continuos menses barba capilloque summisso, caput interdum foribus illideret, vociferans;* Quintili Vare, legiones redde: *diemque cladis quotannis mœstum habuerit ac lugubrem.* I cannot better prove, than by the Example of *Augustus*, that we ought not to look for happy People upon the Throne; for, if any Monarch was ever Fortune's Favourite, it was *Augustus*; and yet the (c) List of his Griefs is so large, that no one will deny, that at least he was sensible of as much Evil as Good. See what I observe concerning (d) *Charles* V., (e) Queen *Elizabeth*, (f) *Lewis* XI. and (g) *Lewis* XIII. Mr. *Silhon* saith judiciously, that *the* (h) *whole lives of* Ferdinand, Charles V. *and* Philip II. *were nothing but a mixture of Good and Evil; that in them we see Prosperities without number, and Misfortunes without measure; Wounds covered with Lawrels; and Triumphs adorned with Mourning*—— *Look upon* Ferdinand, *proud of the reduction of the Kingdom of* Granada, *and obtaining the Title of Catholick: See him triumph over* Naples, *and the Fortune of* France: *Behold, a Caprice gives him* Navarre, *and Chance guides him to the discovery of an unknown World, and new Riches*—— *But let us consider the other side of his Life, and turn the Scales. We shall see a Prince ill treated by Fortune, and a Diadem bruised with her Blows. We shall see a Father burying his only Son, and solemnizing the Funeral of his eldest Daughter. A Husband losing a Wife, who had been his Glory, and more the Companion of his Fatigues than of his Bed. A Master forsaken by his Servants and Creatures: An old Man driven from his House, and a Father-in-law despoil'd and stript by his own Son-in-law.* Add to this, that he could not bear the Reputation of a great Captain. And this jealousie was not the least of his uneasinesses. See in the Original what Mr. *Silhon* saith of (i) *Charles* V. and *Philip* II. And see what *Plutarch* relates of a great Prince (k) who was esteemed happy.

So that the Abbot *Regnier* (l) had reason to say,

Qu'ont ils d'ordinaire,
Qu'ont ils au dessus
Du destin vulgaire
Ceux qu'un sort prospére
Eleve le plus?
Une montre vaine
De grandeur humaine,
Qui marche avec eux,
Des dehors pompeux,
Brillants agreables,
Des soins devorants,
Des biens apparents,
Des maux veritables.
Les grands en un mot
N'ont pas le bon Lot.

The following words of the Count *de Bussi* struck me the first time that I read them: (m) "When you "and I shall no longer have upon our hands the "expence of the War for our Children, we shall "meet with other troubles in time of Peace; for "in short, we must have some. To which purpose, hear our Friend *Comines* talking on this "Theme of the Crosses of Human life. *No Creature is exempt from Trouble, all eat their Bread in "Pain and Sorrow; our Lord promised it when he "made Man, and hath faithfully performed it to "all sorts of People.*" If *Philip de Comines* had been ask'd, *do you believe that Monarchs have a larger share in the execution of the Promise of our Lord than other Men?* I am throughly persuaded that he would have answered (n) *Yes, I* BELIEVE *it.*

What I have just been saying of Kings, may, in proportion, be said of all those whom Providence raises to eminent Posts, and who participate of any sort of Grandeur. Their Lot is a mixture, in which Evil is for the most part predominant. Great Knowledge and a sublime Genius do not exempt Men from this Fatality. No, look rather amongst the most ignorant Rabble, than among Illustrious Learned Men for Happiness: The Glory that surrounds Authors and celebrated Orators, doth not secure them from a thousand Troubles. It exposes them to Envy two several ways: They have Rivals who persecute them, and are jealous, in their turn, of the Praises which others deserve; a Typographical Error gives them more disturbance, than four Letters full of Elogies can afford them Pleasure. The Glory which they have acquired diminishes their Sense of Flattery, and makes 'em more sensible to the privation of it, to Censure and sharing of Fame, &c. Besides, the more Learning they have, the more they know that their Works are imperfect. If they guard themselves against the Weakness of Prejudices, and the irregularities of a hundred mean Passions, and are willing to conform their Language and Conduct to this temper of Mind, they become odious, and must not expect any external Advantages. If they externally conform to the depraved Taste of the World, they reproach themselves a hundred times a day with this ignominious Hypocrisie, and thereby disturb their repose. There are very few who, like *Democritus*, can know the extravagance of Humours, and divert themselves with it: That Philosopher was Master of this Talent. Read *Hippocrates*'s Letter to *Damagetes*, and add to it the Paraphrase upon it which an Author

(a) *See [illegible] Tilly's Publish some Manifesto against those who blamed him for not preventing the taking of Magdeburg.*

(b) Suetonius in Augusto, c. 23.

(c) *You'll find it in* Pliny, lib. 7. cap. 45.

(d) *In the Remark* K *of his Article.*

(e) *In the Remark* Q *of his Article.*

(f) *In the Remark* T *of his Article.*

(g) *In the Remark* B *of his Article.*

(h) Silhon, Ministre d'Etat, B. 2. discours 3. pag. 135. *Dutch Edition.*

(i) *He is in the [illegible] [illegible] Nephew. He was [illegible] some [illegible], wherein he found the Character, [illegible], that a German to Ferdinand.*

(k) *To* Agamemnon. *See* Plutarch *de tranquillitate animi*, p. 466. &c. *Read the whole Dissertation of* la Mothe le Vayer, *upon Prosperity in the* 8. vol. *of his Works.*

(l) *In a piece of Poetry prefixed to* M. Leti's Critique sur les loteries.

(m) Bussi Rabutin's *Letters of the* 1st *part*, pag. 25. *Dutch Edition.*

(n) *See the last chapter, and the conclusion of his Memoirs.*

veniencies, and appointed all other things for their uſe, conſider Man (*D* Δ) in another reſpect as an unhappy being. The neceſſity to which ſo many People are reduced, of ſeeking a Remedy againſt their uneaſineſs (*D* Δ Δ) amongſt forbidden pleaſures, is no ſmall part of the rigorous ſeverity of their Fate. However, we may alledge the Authority of *Ariſtotle*; for that great Genius, who Philoſophized with ſo much Application, and Penetration, acknowledges that there

tine (*a*) of the XVI. Century publiſhed. He elegantly and particularly unfolds what the Greek Author ſaid in general. He diverted himſelf with this Cenſure, one may perceive that he was vexed, and that if he had been asked,

Quelle (b) humeur ſombre
Fas tu voir a contretems?

he might have ſaid

C'eſt que je ne ſuis point du nombre
Des Auteurs qui ſont contents.

Pauſanias mentions (*c*) the Oracle which was delivered to *Homer, you are happy and unhappy. Apollo* could not Anſwer better.

It is time to put an end to theſe Common-places. Give me leave then to conclude them with 4. Remarks. The 1. is, that if we conſider Mankind in General, it ſeems that *Xenophanes* might have ſaid, that Pain and Grief prevail over Pleaſure. 2. That there are ſome private Perſons, who afford room to preſume, that in this life they taſte much more of Good than Evil. 3. That there are others of whom we may believe that they have a much larger ſhare of Evil than Good. 4. That my Second Propoſition is more eſpecially probable, with reſpect to thoſe who die before their declining Age; and that the third appears chiefly certain in thoſe who arrive to a decrepit Old Age. When *Racan* (*d*) ſaid,

Que pour eux ſeulement les Dieux ont fait la gloire,
Et pour nous les plaiſirs.

in Engliſh,

For them alone the Gods have Glory made,
And for us Pleaſures.

Doubtleſs he conſidered only the flower of our Age; it is then that Pleaſures are predominant; and that Good turns the Scale: It is then that the *Pagan Nemeſis* makes Advances, and gives Credit: She is then willing that Accounts ſhould be given without any Compenſation; but ſhe reimburſes her ſelf in Old Age.

Multa (e) ſenem circumveniunt incommoda, vel quòd
Quærit, & inventis miſer abſtinet, ac timet uti:
Vel quòd res omnes timide gelideque miniſtrat,
Dilator ſpe longus, iners, avidusque futuri:
Difficilis, querulus, laudator temporis acti
Se puero, cenſor caſtigatorque minorum.
Multa ferunt anni venientes commoda ſecum,
Multa recedentes adimunt.

But this Poet hath not ſaid all, nor was it neceſſary for him to touch on the diſadvantage of Old Age which *Juvenal* diſplays.

Ut (f) vigeant ſenſus animi, ducenda tamen ſunt
Funera natorum, rogus aſpiciendus amatæ
Conjugis, & fratris, plenæque ſororibus urnæ.
Hæc data pœna diu viventibus, ut renovata
Semper clade domus, multis in luctibus, inque
Perpetuo mœrore, & nigra veſte ſeneſcant.

Add to this that Paſſage of *Virgil*:

Optima (g) quæque dies miſeris mortalibus ævi
Prima fugit: ſubeunt morbi, triſtiſque ſenectus;
Et labor, & duræ rapit inclementia mortis.

OBSERVE that *Racan* Advances a Maxim which gives the Lye to the greateſt of the Ancient Poets, for ſee what *Homer* ſaith:

Ὠ'ς (*h*) γὰρ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι.
Ζώειν ἀχνυμένους· αὐτοὶ δέ τ' ἀκηδέες εἰσί
Sic enim fato-tribuunt dii miſeris mortalibus,
Ut vivant triſtes: ipſi verò ſine curis ſunt.

(*D* Δ) *Even thoſe who believe that Nature* ——— *appointed all other things for their uſe, conſider Man* ——— *as an unhappy being.*] Have we not ſeen above, *Pliny*, after a Prologue which allows the Superiority to our Species, placing it below all other Animals on Account of ſeveral diſadvantages? Could *Seneca*, who ſo lively repreſents the Favours which God beſtows upon Men, have denied *Pliny's* Obſervation? Could *Socrates*, who ſo advantageouſly deſcribed the Prerogatives of Humane Nature, have denied it? Thou thinkeſt, ſaid he, to a Diſciple, who denied Providence, (*i*) "That the "Gods take no care of Man, they who have al"lowed him alone the Privilege of going erect, "which affords him a great Advantage in the view "of diſtant things, in conſidering things above at "his Eaſe, and avoiding many inconveniencies. "In the next place, all Animals which go, have "indeed Feet; but they ſerve them for no other "uſe than barely to go: Whereas the Gods beſides "this have given Hands to Man, which render him "the Happieſt Animal in the World. All Ani"mals have Tongues; but there is none "beſides that of Man, that can form Words, "to explain his thoughts, and communicate "them to others. And to ſhew that the Gods "take even care of our Pleaſures, they have not "determined the Seaſon for the Amours of Men, "who may continually enjoy, till their extreme "Old Age, a pleaſure which the Brutes taſte only "at a certain Seaſon of the Year. Laſtly, not con"tented with beſtowing ſo many Advantages on "the Body of Man, they have endowed him with "a Soul, tranſcendently excellent, and ſurpaſſing "all others. For which amongſt the Souls of o"ther Animals is it, that hath any knowledge of "the Eſſence of the Gods, the Works of whoſe "Creation are ſo ſtupendious? Is there any other "Species beſides that of Man that ſerves and adores "them? What Animal like him can defend him"ſelf from Hunger, Thirſt, Cold and Heat? "Which of them like us can find out Remedies a"gainſt Diſeaſes, or exerciſe his ſtrength? Which "of them is ſo capable of Learning, or ſo perfectly "retains the things which he hath ſeen, heard, "or known? In a Word, it is clear that Man is a "God in Compariſon with other living Species, "conſidering the Advantages of Body and Mind, "which he Naturally hath over them." It is very likely that after this Beautiful deſcription, he would have owned the deplorable Condition of Man, if the Scales had been turn'd, if he had been deſired to examine the Matter throughly.

(*D* Δ Δ) *Of ſeeking a Remedy againſt their uneaſineſs amongſt forbidden pleaſures.*] Is not this to deliver ones ſelf from a Phyſical Evil by a Moral one? Is not ſuch a Remedy worſe than the Diſeaſe? And is not the Man very miſerable, who can have recourſe to no other refuge than this? It is very certain that a vaſt Number of People find no other Remedy. Domeſtick Brawls, and the ſight of an ill management at home force Men out of Doors to Gaming, or to Drinking at the Tavern. Without which they cannot drive away their Melancholy; and that is the ſole diverſion which they oppoſe againſt uneaſineſs. Some Men deſignedly intoxicate themſelves to avoid the Sorrows of the night, the time when they are moſt uneaſy. They have found their ſleep prevented by them, and their thoughts too cruelly kept intent on their Miſery. Wherefore by the help of Wine they procure a profound ſleep to themſelves. Which is ſo much time ſnatched out of the Hands of ill Fortune; it is to ſecure the moſt formidable part of 24 Hours. Generally ſpeaking Women cannot make uſe of this Buckler againſt Anxiety, and therefore their Condition is more deplorable than that of Men. Whence *Medea* declares in *Euripides* that a Woman ill Married is in ſuch a miſerable Condition, that it is better for her to dye than live with her Husband; ſhe cannot like the Men go out of her Houſe in queſt of neceſſary Conſolations.

(e) Horat. de arte poetica, v. 169.

Juvenal. Sat. 10. v. 240.

(g) Virgil. Georgic. lib. 3. v. 66.

(h) Homer. Iliad. lib. 24. v. 525.

(i) Xenoph. de memorab. Socrat. lib. 1.

there is more (D △△△) Evil than Good in Nature, and that for that Reaſon *Empedocles* diſliked the Hypotheſis of the Unity of a Principle, and firſt began to ſuppoſe two Principles, one of Good, the other of Evil. The Holy Scripture * ſo emphatically repreſents the Miſeries of this life, that it is ſufficient to afford a Demonſtrative Argument on this Controverſy. I wonder that the Rabbin *Maimonides*, who had a great deal of knowledge and Judgment, and was a pretty good Philoſopher, could (D △△△△) think that he had fully refuted the Doctrine I ſpeak of. There is ſome probability that *Xenophanes* believed the incomprehenſibility (E) of all things. He gave the *Ægyptians* good Advice, when he ſaw them lamenting in the Celebration of their Feſtivals. *If the Objects of your*

* See particularly the Book of *Job*, and that of the Pſalms in ſeveral places.

Κἂν (a) μὲν τάδ' ἡμῖν ἐκπονουμέναισιν εὖ
Πόσις ξυνοικῇ, μὴ βίᾳ φέρων ζυγόν,
Ζηλωτὸς αἰὼν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, θανεῖν χρεών:
" Ἀνὴρ δ' ὅταν τοῖς ἔνδον ἄχθηται ξυνὼν,
" Ἔξω μολὼν ἔπαυσε καρδίαν ἄσης,
" Ἢ πρὸς φίλον τιν', ἢ πρὸς ἥλικα τραπείς.
" Ἡμῖν δ' ἀνάγκη πρὸς μίαν ψυχὴν βλέπειν.
Et ſi nobis hæc quidem peragentibus bene
Cohabitaverit maritus, non violentum nobis imponens jugum,
Beata eſt vita: ſin minus, ſatius eſt mori.
" *Vir vero cum dolet propter res domeſticas,*
" *Foras egreſſus ſedat cordis bilem,*
" *Converſus aut ad aliquem amicum, aut coætaneum,*
" *Sed nos oportet ſpectare ad unam animam.*

(a) Euripid. in Medea v. 241. p. m. 176.

(D △△△) *Ariſtotle—— acknowledges that there is more Evil than Good in Nature, and that for that Reaſon Empedocles—— firſt began to ſuppoſe two Principles.*] Before I cite his Words, I ought to obſerve that he gives himſelf the Liberty of unravelling *Empedocles*'s Opinion, and explaining it according to the Spirit, rather than the Letter of it; but after all he takes for granted that Good is the cauſe of all Good, and Evil the cauſe of all Evil. The two Principles of *Empedocles*, were Amity and Diſcord: (b) Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τἀναντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἐνόντα ἐφαίνετο ἐν τῇ φύσει, καὶ οὐ μόνον τάξις καὶ τὸ καλὸν, ἀλλ' ἀταξία, καὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν, καὶ πλείω τὰ κακὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τὰ φαῦλα τῶν καλῶν· οὕτως ἄλλος τις φιλίαν εἰσήνεγκε, καὶ τὸ νεῖκος ἑκάτερον ἑκατέρων αἴτιον τούτων· εἰ γάρ τις ἀκολουθοίη καὶ λαμβάνοι πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἃ ψελλίζεται λέγων Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, εὑρήσει τὴν μὲν φιλίαν εἶναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τὸ δὲ νεῖκος τῶν κακῶν· ὥστ' εἴ τις φαίη τρόπον τινὰ καὶ λέγειν, καὶ πρῶτον λέγειν τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀρχὰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, τάχ' ἂν λέγοι καλῶς· εἴπερ τὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἁπάντων αἴτιον, αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθόν ἐστι, καὶ τῶν κακῶν τὸ κακόν. *Cum autem contraria quoque boni ineſſe naturæ apparerent, nec ſolum ordo, & pulchrum, verum etiam inordinatio, & turpe, pluraque mala, quam bona, & turpia quam pulchra, ideò alius quidam amicitiam introduxit, & contentionem, utrunque utriuſque horum cauſam. Si quis enim ſequatur, & ſecundum ſententiam accipiat, non ſecundum ea, quæ balbutiens Empedocles dixit, inveniet amicitiam quidem bonorum cauſam eſſe, contentionem verò malorum. Quare ſi quis dicat quodam modo dicere, & primum Empedoclem dicere malum, & bonum eſſe principia, fortaſſe bene inquiet: ſiquidem bonorum omnium cauſa, ipſum bonum, ac malorum, ipſum malum eſt.* Obſerve that he elſewhere (c) cenſures this Opinion of *Empedocles*, and that he did not believe any Eternal Principle of Evil; for he affirms (d) that there is nothing but Good in the Eternal beings.

(b) Ariſtoteles Metaphyſ. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. m. 646.

(c) Id. ib. lib. 12. cap. 10. pag. 745.

(d) Id. ib. lib. 9. cap. 9. p. 747.

(D △△△△) *I wonder that the Rabbin* Maimonides—— *could think that he had fully refuted the Doctrine I ſpeak of.*] He Confeſſes that the *Heathens* and even ſome of the *Rabbins* made Declamations on the ſuperiority of Evil, and he calls them ridiculous and ſenſeleſs Men. *Sæpiſſime*, ſaith he (e), *ſolent in Cordibus hominum imperitorum ejuſmodi Cogitationes exſurgere, ac ſi longè plura eſſent in mundo Mala quam Bona, ita ut in multis Poematis & Canticis Gentilium hæc & ſimilia reperiantur.* Miraculi inſtar eſſe quando in tempore Boni aliquid invenitur. Mala autem eſſe multa & perpetua. *Atque his Error non ſolum in vulgo obtinuit, verum etiam apud eos, qui ſapientes haberi volunt, & apud ipſum* Alraſi *in libro illo celebri quem* Sepher Elohuth *h. e.* Theoſophiam *nominavit, in quo multa ex deliriis & ſtolidiratibus ſuis congeſſit, è quibus & iſtud eſt, quod plura exiſtunt mala quam bona; eo quòd ſi Comparationem inſtituas inter recreationes & voluptates hominis, quæ tempore tranquillitatis percipit, cum doloribus, Cruciatibus, perturbationibus, defectibus, curis, ſollicitudinibus & afflictionibus, deprehendatur, vitam hominis illorum bonorum reſpectu eſſe vindictam magnam & malum magnum.* He ſays that the cauſe (f) of their Extravagant Error is, that they fancy Nature was made only for them, and that they reckon that as nothing which has no Reference to their Perſons, from whence they infer that if any thing goes ill with them, all is amiſs in the Univerſe. He adds, that if we would conſider the ſmallneſs of Man, with reſpect to the Univerſe, we ſhould be ſoon convinced that the ſuperiority of Evil has no place among the Angels or the Celeſtial Bodies, nor among the Elements and the mixt inanimate Beings, nor among ſeveral ſorts of Animals. This Obſervation of *Maimonides* doth not reach the Mark; for thoſe whom he refutes mean nothing elſe but that Evils among Men ſurpaſs Good things. What doth it avail then to convince them of their Error, to ſay that Evil doth not ſurpaſs Good in the reſt of Nature? All inanimate Bodies are uncapable of Good and Evil; they muſt not therefore be put into the Account when this queſtion is in diſpute: And there is no Body but may maintain, that all in which we place the Order, Beauty and Perfection of the Celeſtial Bodies, &c. being changed, it would be no Evil with reſpect to the Univerſe, tho' Man or ſome other particular Creatures ſhould ſuffer Damage by it. If the Sun and the Planets, had the ſame variation as the Ships, which go to and come from *Marſeilles* to *Naples*, ſometimes in fewer and ſometimes in more Days, without any fixed Rule, could not one pretend that with reſpect to the Univerſe it is not an Evil, an imperfection and a diſorder?

(e) Moſes Maimonides in More Nevochim part. 3. cap. 12. p. m. 354, 355.

(f) Cauſ erroris in eſt illius Hominis & omnium ipſius ſociorum eſt quod, &c. Id. ib. pag. 355.

After this *Maimonides* ſays that the Evils of Mankind may be reduced to three Claſſes: The firſt proceed from Man's having a Body: The Second proceed from Men's Machinations one againſt another: The third are thoſe which a Man brings on himſelf by his own Fault. He makes fine Remarks on all this, but they are Foreign to the queſtion; for the diſpute is not about the cauſe of Man's unhappineſs, but whether it be matter of Fact, that the Evils which he ſuffers ſurpaſs the good things he enjoys. It ſignifies nothing to tell us that we our ſelves are the cauſe of our misfortunes, that we often trouble our ſelves without any Reaſon for it; and that the Pleaſures of life are numberleſs, and ſometimes very long; for all this is uncapable of ſolving the Difficulty. A Grain of Evil, as I may ſay, (g) ſpoils an Hundred Pound of Good; a little piece of Iron hot in the 7 degree, burns more than an Hundred Feet hot in the 4 degree. No Evil is ſmall when it is looked on as great, and nothing troubles an uneaſy Man more than to know, that he has no Reaſon to be uneaſy. There is, ſays Mr. *de St. Evremont* (h) "a ſort of uneaſineſs of which I cannot imagine "the cauſe; and as one does not know how to find "the true Reaſon of it, I think it very difficult to "allay, or to preſerve one ſelf from it—— This "ſort of uneaſineſs is common to all Men: They "are uneaſineſſes which make us fall out with our "ſelves, and ſhewing us that we have no Reaſon to "be uneaſy, force us in ſpite of Self-Love to confeſs that we are unjuſt and unreaſonable to our "ſelves.

(g) The Sea water, whoſe bitterneſs is intolerable, contains 40 or 42 times more ſalt Particles than Sea

(h) St. Evremont in his Diſcourſe of Vexations and Troubles, him from the Extract of an anonymous Writer, who Criticiz'd that Author. pag. 17 for my Edition (Tom. 4. pag. 4 which is the Dutch one, 169 contains but part of what this Critick mentions.

(E) *Xenophanes believed the incomprehenſibility of all things.*] Let us begin this Remark with a paſſage of *Diogenes Laertius*: (i) Φησὶ δὲ Σωτίων πρῶτον αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι τὰ πάντα, πλανώμενος, that is, *Sotion, who ſays that Xenophanes*

(i) Diog. Laertius lib. 9. n. 20.

your Worship, said he †, *are Gods, don't weep: If they are Men, offer no Sacrifices to them.* Others tell us that he ‡ made use of this thought, when the *Eleates* desired to know of him whether they ought to Sacrifice to *Leucothea*, and shed

‡ Plutarchus de superstit. in fine, pag. 17

ers in the first, who maintained that all things are incomprehensible, is mistaken. We are not satisfied by these Words whether *Diogenes Laertius* denied that *Xenophanes* held the incomprehensibility; for he might not deny it, and yet charge *Sotion* with an Error. This *Accusation* would be just, if before *Xenocrates* others taught, that all the Objects of our Minds are beyond our Comprehension. There are a Thousand such places in *Diogenes Laertius*: they don't redound to his Honour: For an exact Genius would avoid these Ambiguities and Obscurities. I suppose he intended to say (a) that *Xenophanes* did not teach the incomprehensibility; but at the same time I think he is to blame to speak thus of this Philosopher. For all Appearances engage us to believe that *Xenophanes* taught, that we could not comprehend any thing in the Nature of things. (b) *Plutarch* charges him with saying, that our Senses and Reason are fallacious Faculties; and others will have it that he denied the Evidence of sense, in order to conclude that nothing ought to be relied upon but Reason, and they tell us that he was the first Author of this Doctrine. (c) *Οἴονται δεῖν τὰς μὲν αἰσθήσεις καὶ τὰς φαντασίας καταβάλλειν, αὐτῷ δὲ μόνον τῷ λόγῳ πιστεύειν. Τοιαῦτα γάρ τινα πρότερον μὲν Ξενοφάνης καὶ Παρμενίδης——— ἔλεγον. Sensus visaque omnia funditus repudianda, rationi uni fidem habendam opinantur. Ac primum quidem Xenophanes, & Parmenides——— in ea sunt doctrina versati.* I believe *Plutarch* represents the System of *Xenophanes* more faithfully than *Aristocles*. For I am persuaded that *Xenophanes* relied no more upon Reason than upon his Senses, upon the following Account. He was the first (d) who Taught that whatever was made is corruptible. He also Taught (e) that all things were but one sole Being; and that this sole Being continued always the same, and could not be Subject to any change. (f) *Ὅθεν ἠξίουν ἕν γε τὸ ὂν εἶναι, καὶ τὸ μὴ ὂν ἕτερον εἶναι, μηδὲ γεννᾶσθαί τι, μηδὲ φθείρεσθαι, μηδὲ κινεῖσθαι τὸ παράπαν. Hi quicquid esset, unum duntaxat esse: quod ab eo diversum esset, id non esse: generari nihil, nihil corrumpi, moveri omnino nihil statuebant.* But a more exact Account of the Principles of *Xenophanes*, in their Natural Connexion, runs thus. (g) First of all he affirmed that nothing was made out of nothing, that is, to remove all Ambiguity, that a thing which had not always existed never could exist. From whence he concluded that whatever is, always existed: But, added he, what always existed is Eternal; what is Eternal is infinite; what is infinite, is but one, for if it contained several Beings, one would terminate the other, and it could not then be infinite. Besides, said he, what is but one, is throughout like it self; for if it comprehended any difference, it would not be one, but several Beings. In short, this sole, eternal and infinite Being, ought to be immovable, and immutable; for if it could change its place, there would be something beyond it, and then it would not be infinite: And if it could suffer any alteration without changing of place, something that did not always exist would begin to be produced, and something which had always existed would cease to be. But that is impossible; for every thing which not having eternally existed shou'd begin to exist, must be produced out of nothing, and every thing which never had a Beginning hath a necessary existence; and therefore cannot ever cease to be. These were his Principles, if we believe (h) *Aristotle*. I don't doubt but they appeared very evident to him, and that he was persuaded he had a Gradation of consequences necessarily drawn from an incontestable Principle. The Orthodox Divines will deny him, that nothing can have a beginning; but would grant him that the Being which never had a beginning is one only, infinite, immovable, and immutable, and that every being, whose existence is necessary, is not obnoxious to destruction. They teach with Reason, that God is not Subject to any Alteration; for if any change should happen to him, he would get, and lose something. What he should acquire would be either distinct from his substance, or a mode *Identical* with his substance. If it was a distinct being, God could not be a simple being; and what is worse, would be composed of an increated, and, Created Nature (i). If it was a mode *Identical* with his substance, God could not produce it without producing himself. But as he exists independent of his own Will, and did not give himself his being at the beginning, it follows that he can never do it. Besides, nothing that necessarily exists can ever cease to be: from whence it must of necessity follow, that God never can lose what he once had. But what is called a modification, or *ens inhærens in alio*, is of such a Nature that it cannot be produced but by the ruin of another Modality; perfectly in the same manner that a New figure is necessarily the Destruction of the Old one. Wherefore if God acquires something new, he must necessarily lose some other thing: for this new Acquisition will not be a substance, but an Accident, or an *ens inhærens in alio*. Seeing therefore nothing which necessarily exists can cease to exist, it follows that God can never acquire any thing new. Thus the immutability of God is supported by Evident Notions. *Xenophanes* added to his Maxims the following one, that nothing is made out of nothing; but every Accident produced anew, and distinct from the Divine substance, would be produced out of nothing. Wherefore he was obliged to deny that the Eternal being can acquire any new Mode distinct from its own substance. But he found himself very much perplexed when the Continual Generations in Nature were objected to him. They prove both that the Universe is not one sole Being, and that it contains something mutable, since it actually changes. In order to clear himself of this Objection, he excepted against the Evidence of the Senses; he urged that they deceive us, that it is not true that there happen any Generations in Nature, and that they are but false Appearances. But he was doubtless answered, that the Appearances of the Senses would not change at all, if our Mind continued always the same, and if the Beings without us did not change; and therefore at least, what in us is the passive Subject of perceptions, which you call the fallacies of the Senses, must needs be mutable and variable: Wherefore what you assert that there is no change in the Universe, is not true. I cannot see that he could make any other reply than that our Reason is as fallacious as our Senses, and that every thing is incomprehensible to her. For if when she is founded on Evidence, which is her *ne plus ultra*, she doth not hit on truth, it is a sign that Truth is a thing incomprehensible, and impenetrable. Now Building upon Evident Notions, I asserted that nothing is made out of nothing; whence it necessarily follows that nothing can begin, and that every thing that once exists, exists always, which evidently proves the immovableness, and immutability of all things; I had, I say, clearly comprehended this, and yet the experience of my Sensations and Passions, convinces me that I ammutable: I have not therefore comprehended any thing with certainty, I have not therefore a Faculty adequately proportioned to Truth. Thus we may suppose him Arguing, and thence we may conclude that the Sect of the *Acataleptics* (k), and that of the *Pyrrhonists*, owed their Birth solely to the Principle of the immutable Unity of all things asserted by *Xenophanes*. I do not affirm, that he was in the right in the consequences just mentioned. The only Reason why I alledge this is to shew that I don't Contradict the Writer of this Philosopher's (l) life without very just Reasons. First I have on my side the Evidence of (m) *Sotion*, *Cicero*, *Plutarch* and some Verses of (n) *Xenophanes*, which were unknown to (o) *Diogenes Laertius*. In the Second place I may affirm that *Xenophanes* held some Principles which as I have just now given several Proofs of it, necessarily engaged shed Tears for her or not. I must not forget that he was banished his Country †, that he retired to *Sicily* and lived at || *Zancle*, and *Catana*, that he * founded the *Eleatick Sect*, that *Parmenides* was his Scholar, and that he complained of

---

(a) See below the passage de Sextus Empiricus.

(b) Xenophanes [illegible] omnes sensus fallaces esse, & communiter, atque cum illis ipsam quoque rationem in omnibus criminatur. Plutarch. in Stromatis apud Eusebium præparat. Evangel. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 23. B.

(c) Aristocles, de Philosophia, lib. 8. apud Eusebium ubi supra. lib. 14. cap. 17. p. 756. B.

(d) Πρῶτος ἀπεφήνατο [illegible] Primus definivit omne quod fiat corruptioni obnoxium esse. Diogen. Laert. ubi supra n. 19.

(e) See Plato in Sophista p. m. 170. C.

(f) Aristocles ubi supra, apud Eusebium ubi supra. (g) *See* Aristotle's *Treatise* de Xenophane, Zenone & Gorgia, init. *in the 1st Tome of his Works* pag. 937. *Edit of* Geneva 1605. (h) Ubi supra.

(i) *If he is a being is distinct from another, it is not compounded of it; and therefore a being distinct from any other being is made out of nothing, and consequently Created.*

(k) *Those, who taught the incomprehensibility.*

(l) *See what I have said of Diogenes* Laertius *at the beginning of this Remark.*

(m) *See the first quotation of this Remark.*

(n) *See hereafter the passage of* Sextus Empiricus.

(o) *He quotes the beginning of it in* vita Pyrrhonis lib. 9. n. 72.

ed him to assert the Incomprehensibility. But let us here cite the Verses in which he declares his Opinion.

> Καὶ (a) τὸ μὲν οὖν σαφὲς οὔτις ἀνὴρ γένετ' οὐδέ τις ἔσται
> Εἰδὼς ἀμφὶ θεῶν τε, καὶ ἅσσα λέγω περὶ πάντων.
> Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα τύχοι τετελεσμένον εἰπών,
> Αὐτὸς ὅμως οὐκ οἶδε, δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται.
> *[illegible] nemo vir scit, sed neque sciet unquam*
> *De Diis & cunctis a me quae dicta fuerunt.*
> *Namque licet sit perfectum quod dixerit ille,*
> *Ille tamen nescit, cunctis & opinio in his est.*

It is Evident by these Words of *Xenophanes*, that it is impossible for any Person to arrive at the clear and certain knowledge of the Truth; and that a Man can't know that he has met with it, tho' he shou'd hit on it; He adds, that there is nothing but Opinions within our Reach. *Sextus Empiricus* ranks him (b) amongst those, who deny a *criterium veritatis*, a Rule or measure of Truth. I own that he disagrees with those, who (c) place him in the Number of the Acatalepticks; but withal he ascribes to him the Opinion, that we do not comprehend things to that degree of certitude which amounts to Science, and that our determinations never go beyond likelyhood and probability. Is not this really to assert *Acatalepticism*, or the incomprehensible Nature of things? (d) Φαίνεται μὴ πᾶσαν κατάληψιν ἀναιρεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπιστημονικήν τε καὶ ἀδιάπτωτον, ἀπολείπειν δὲ τὴν δοξαστήν. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐμφαίνει τό, δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται. ὥστε κριτήριον γίνεσθαι κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν δοξαστὸν λόγον, τουτέστι τὸν τοῦ εἰκότος, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν τοῦ παγίου ἐχόμενον. *Videtur non omnem tollere comprehensionem, sed eam quae est ex scientia, & quae non potest aberrare. Relinquit ergo opinabilem; hoc enim indicat illud, cunctis & opinio in his est: quo fit ut ex ejus sententia id quod judicat sit ratio opinabilis, hoc est, ratio ejus quod est probabile, non autem ea quae sequitur id quod est firmum ac stabile.* So that I don't see that Mr. *Menage* (e) was much in the Right to say, *that Sextus Empiricus* in this place favours *Diogenes Laertius* against *Sotion*. And I am the more confirmed in it, because that Learned Commentator says just before that *Cicero* and *Origen* are favourable to *Sotion*. (f) *Sotioni assipulatur Cicero in Lucullo: Parmenides, Xenophanes*, minus bonis quamquam versibus, sed tamen illis versibus, increpant eorum arrogantium quasi irati, qui, cum sciri nihil possit, audeant se scire dicere. *Item Origines in Philosophicis:* Οὗτος ἔφη πρῶτος ἀκαταληψίαν εἶναι πάντων, εἰπὼν οὕτως. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα τύχοι τετελεσμένον εἰπών, Αὐτὸς ὅμως οὐκ οἶδε, δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται. As for the particular question whether this Philosopher was the first, who asserted the incomprehensibility, as *Sotion* affirms, there is more Reason to continue in suspence, since *Plato* saith that (g) before *Xenophanes* others believed the Unity of all things; an Opinion which seems not very widely distant from that of the Incomprehensibility. Nothing is finer, than the Verses of *Timon* recited by *Sextus Empiricus* (b). I do not know why the Interpreters have not turned that place into Latin.

The Reasons, which led *Xenephanes* to the Unity of all things, were probably the same which *Aristotle* ascribes to *Melissus* and (i) *Parmenides*. They seem very subtil, tho' according to the Natural Quality of great *Genius's*, *Aristotle* hath described them a little Obscurely, by reason he affected Brevity. Those Arguments are doubtless Sophisms, as well as those which may be read (k) above; nevertheless they might have imposed upon the Readers, and I don't know whether *Aristotle* hath throughly refuted those two Ancient Philosophers. Consult the Jesuits of *Coimbra* (l), who have represented one of the Reasons of *Melissus* and *Aristotle's* Answer in their full force; And you will find that nothing can be weaker than this Answer, and that *Melissus* is not Guilty of false Argumentation in this Proposition, *If every thing, that was made, hath a Principle, that which never was made hath no Principle.* This *Aristotle* assures us is a manifest Paralogism. (m) Ὅτι μὲν οὖν παραλογίζεται Μέλισσος, δῆλον. οἴεται γὰρ εἰληφέναι εἰ τὸ γενόμενον ἀρχὴν ἔχει ἅπαν, ὅτι καὶ τὸ μὴ γενόμενον οὐκ ἔχει. *Igitur quod Melissum captiose ratiocinetur manifestum est; sumpsisse enim arbitratur, si quicquid ortum est principium habeat, id non habere, quod ortum non est.* But, added *Melissus*, nothing (n) was made, for if any thing had been made, it would have been produced out of nothing, or from something else: If out of another thing, it must necessarily have pre-existed, which ruins your supposition: if out of nothing, then something might be made out of nothing which is false. This is a demonstrative Argument against *Aristotle*, who denied Creation properly so called. And as for his distinction betwixt a Principle of Substance, and a Principle of Forms and Qualities; it is insignificant in the Hypothesis of the Impossibility of the Creation: For every substance which never began, and necessarily exists, must be immutable. It wou'd be therefore in vain for you to hunt after the Principles of Generation and Corruption; for there wou'd be none, if all things were Uncreated, as they are according to *Aristotle*, who never opposed the Axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit*. But after owning that this Objection of *Melissus*, which it is impossible to solve any other way than by the Orthodox *Christian hypothesis* concerning the Creation, really surpassed all *Aristotle's* strength, it must also be acknowledged that the other subtilities of *Melissus* and *Parmenides* were less puzzling, and when applied to experience, that is, to the variety of things which the Universe exposes to our view, they did not appear any thing but Puerilities.

I observe by the by, that the Jesuit, who Commented on *Cicero de Natura Deorum*, takes *Xenophanes's* part against *Aristotle* somewhat rashly. *Dubio procul*, saith he (o), *exciderit illi* (Velleio) *convitium illud quod in Xenophanem contorquet Aristoteles lib. primo Metaphysicorum, capite quinto, ubi & obscurum illius, vel ingenium, vel dicendi genus notat, & hominem quasi agrestem magna quadam negligentia despectat, & ab toto Philosophorum senatu relegandum censet. Eam tamen Xenophani de Deo sententiam ascribit quae minime agreste ingenium sapiat: nempe* τὸ ἓν εἶναι τὸν Θεόν. id quod est unum, esse Deum: *vel ut Theophrastus habet apud Laertium:* unum, & universum, & omne esse Deum. This Father is very much to blame for ascribing a reasonable Opinion concerning the Nature of God to *Xenophanes*: For the Sentiments of that Philosopher on that head are abominably impious, and amount to a more dangerous *Spinozism* than that which I have refuted in the Article of *Spinoza*: *Spinoza's* Hypothesis carries its Preservative along with it, by the mutability or continual corruptibility which he attributes to the Divine Nature with respect to Modalities. This Corruptibility is contradictory to common sense and at once shocks those of mean parts and those of the most exalted Capacities: But the Immutability in all respects attributed to the Infinite and Eternal Being by *Xenophanes*, is a Principle of the purest Theology; wherefore it is more liable to seduce us in favour of the rest of his Hypothesis. On the other side, the pernicious Fall of this Philosopher may prove more contagious than *Spinozism*. For not being able to maintain the Post to which his Reason had led him, he fell into a Precipice; and found fault with his Reason which had perplexed him, and thrown him into Nets which he could not break: He accused it of being incapable of comprehending any thing. And indeed several others would be reduced to the like extremities, if they had not recourse to an Assistant superior to Reason. But the Jesuit whom I refute is not wholly to blame: He had just Reason to Censure *Aristotle's* contempt of *Xenophanes's* Genius; for tho' a true Greatness of Mind and a solid force of Argumentation would not suffer a Man to sink at this rate, yet it is true that a mean

---

† Diog. Laert. ubi supra n. 18.

|| The same Town with *Messana*, now *Messina*.

* Clem. Alex. Strom. [illegible]

(a) Xenophanes apud Sextum Empiricum adversus Mathematicos, pag. 146. 157. 2[illegible]. *See also* Plutarch de audiend. poet. pag. 17. E.

(b) Ibid. pag. 146.

(c) Ibid. & pag. 156. 157.

(d) Id. ib. pag. 157.

(e) Menagius in Diogen. Laert. lib. 9. n. 20.

(f) Menagius ibid.

(g) Plato, in Sophista pag. 170.

(b) Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhon. hypotypos. lib. 1. cap. 33. p. 46. edit. Genev. 1621.

(i) Aristoteles, Physicor. lib. 1. cap. 3.

(k) *In the Article* Stilpo, *Remark H.*

(l) Conimbricenses *in the* Paraphrase *upon the* 3. *chapter of the Book of Aristotles's Physicks.*

(m) Arist. ubi supra.

(n) See the Conimbricenses ubi supra.

(o) Lescalopier, in Cicero de nat. Deorum. lib. 1. n. 28. pag. 46.

of (F) Poverty. His Answers to a Man with whom he refused to play at Dice, is very worthy of a Philosopher. This Person calling him Coward; Yes, replyed he, I am extremely so, with respect to scandalous actions.

ZABARELLA,

mean capacity, would never have flown so high as *Xenophanes*, nor have fallen like him. He argued more consequentially than *Aristotle*, who denying a Creation, admitted an Eternal Matter susceptible of an infinity of Forms. If the Elephants need not fear these Cobwebs, much less need the Flyes. It is not a meanneſs of capacity (a) which makes men doubt (b) that they are not arrived at a juſt certainty: It rather fills them with confidence (c), than inſpires them with diffidence; and we may very well ſay that the Acataleptics, (d) *Faciunt ne intelligendo ut nihil intelligant*. They fall into the Doctrine of Incomprehenſibility not by an utter Ignorance of things, but by knowing them much better than the greateſt part of the World; tho' they don't know them according to the juſt repreſentation of them. Beſides, there are ſome who direct their Hypotheſis to the glory of God, intimating that the ſenſe of our weakneſs, and the Infinity of God, diſables us from aſpiring to that Knowledge which is a Portion of the Divine Nature. We have ſpoken before of a Poet, who ſaid that the Gods reſerved Glory for themſelves, and Pleaſures for us; but theſe tell us, that God keeps Knowledge to himſelf, and beſtows Opinions on us (e). Which puts me in mind of a thought of *Plutarch*, that ſeems to me very excellent. Wherefore I ſhall cite it, according to *Amiot's* Verſion. (f) "Wiſe Men ought to petition for all "good things in their Prayers, but what we ought "moſtly to deſire of them is the knowledge of "themſelves, in as great a degree as is proper "for us; becauſe there is no gift either greater "for Man to receive, or more magnificent and "worthy of the Gods to beſtow than the know"ledge of the Truth. For God gives all other "things to Men which they want, but hath re"ſerved this for himſelf, and accordingly makes "uſe of it: And he is not at all happy in the "poſſeſſion of vaſt quantities of Gold, nor power"ful by holding the Thunder and Lightning in "his Hand, but rather by his Wiſdom and Know"ledge; and this is one of the beſt and wiſeſt "things which *Homer* (g) ſaid, ſpeaking of *Ju*"*piter* and *Neptune*:

"*Both of one Line, both of one Country boaſt;*
"*But Royal* Jove's *the Eldeſt, and Knows moſt.*

"He affirms that the preference and the prece"dence of *Jupiter* was more venerable and worthy, "becauſe he was more wiſe and intelligent. And "as for me I am of Opinion, that the Beati"tude and Felicity of Eternal Life, which *Jupiter* "enjoys, conſiſts in that he is ignorant of no"thing, and that of all things which ever were, none "eſcapes him: And I believe that an Immorta"lity deprived of the Knowledge of all things "which exiſt and were, would not be a life, but "a ſpace of time only. So that we may ſay, "that the deſire of underſtanding Truth is a de"ſire of the Deity, eſpecially the Truth of the "Nature of the Gods: The ſtudy of which Sci"ence, is, as it were, the Profeſſion and beginning "of Religion, and a more holy Work than a "Vow of Chaſtity, or cloiſtering ones ſelf with"in a Temple." Add to this, that the Chriſtians with reſpect to whatever conſtitutes the Character of ſpeculative Chriſtianity, make publick profeſſion of the incomprehenſibility, and look upon theſe as *Turks*, who refuſe to believe what ſurpaſs the extent of their underſtanding. Such is the Myſtery of the Trinity, which, as Mr. *Nicolle* owns, (h) "confounds Reaſon, and prompts it to revolt. "If there be any viſible Difficulties, they are thoſe "which are contained in that Myſtery, that three "Perſons really diſtinct have only One and the "ſame Eſſence, and that this Eſſence being the "ſame thing in each Perſon with the Relations "that diſtinguiſh them, may be communicated "without the communication of the Relations "which diſtinguiſh the Perſons. If Human Rea"ſon conſults her ſelf, ſhe will riſe up againſt thoſe "inconceivable Truths. If ſhe pretends to make "uſe of her own Light to penetrate into them, it "will only furniſh her with Arms to engage a"gainſt them. Wherefore in order to believe "them, ſhe ought to blind her ſelf, to ſtifle all "her Ratiocinations, and to depreſs and ſink her "ſelf under the weight of Divine Authority." The *Socinians* themſelves in ſome reſpects are Acataleptics; they cannot ſay, with any ſincerity, that it is not an incomprehenſible thing, that a Self-exiſtent Nature ſhould be Mutable. Wherefore, in ſome reſpects, their raſhneſs ſurpaſſes that of *Xenophanes*. The latter ſaid, at laſt, that he did not comprehend either that an Eternal Nature is Mutable, or that it is Immutable; but the former decide it to be Changeable: Whence it follows that a Being which neceſſarily, and from all Eternity Exiſts, (i) is liable to Deſtruction; which is the moſt contrary Notion in the World to our Ideas of things.

I cannot conclude without obſerving two things: One is, that the Evidence of *Xenophanes's* Principles, with reſpect to the Immutability of what is Eternal, is as conſpicuous as the cleareſt Ideas of our Mind; ſo that it being inconteſtable, on the other hand, by what paſſes within us, that there are Alterations and Changes, the beſt courſe that our Reaſon can take, is to aſſert, that all things had a Beginning, God alone excepted. This is the Doctrine of the Creation; for to pretend to explain the Generations of Nature, by ſuppoſing many Eternal Principles, the action and re-action of which diverſifies what would remain Uniform, if nothing External intervened, is to avoid one Inconvenience, and fall into a much greater. My Second Obſervation is, that the Evidence of *Xenophanes's* Principles furniſhes us with an excellent Demonſtration againſt *Spinoza*; for if whatever had no Beginning is Immuttable, *Spinoza's* God is incapable of any Change: He is not then the immanent cauſe of all the alterations in the (k) Univerſe. Every immanent Cauſe produces ſomething in it ſelf: But that thing is either a Mode Identified with the Subſtance which it modifies, or elſe an abſolute quality, and really diſtinct from its ſubject of *Inheſion*. If an identified Mode, God cannot produce it; for ſince the Divine Subſtance neceſſarily exiſts, it cannot depend on any efficient Cauſe. If it be a diſtinct quality, God can then create Beings diſtinct from himſelf; and then there is no longer room for *Spinoza's* Hypotheſis. Add to this, that the production of a Mode or (l) Accident, is the deſtruction of another. Whence it follows, that if God was the immanent cauſe of the changes of Nature, ſome eternal Modalities would have periſhed: For *Spinoza* cannot, without contradicting himſelf, affirm that what he calls God, had not always Modalities. Examine his diſtinction betwixt *Natura naturans* and *Natura naturata*, and you will find a heap of Contradictions in it.

(F) *And that he complained of Poverty. I am ſo poor*, ſaid he once (m) to *Hiero* King of *Syracuſa*, *that I am not able to maintain two Servants. How*, replyed *Hiero*, Homer *whom you commonly blame and cenſure, tho' dead, maintains above ten Thouſand.*

(h) *Nicolle, Perpetuité de la Foi*, pag. 158, 159. edit. [illegible]

(i) *They ſay that God beſtowed upon matter what Form he pleaſed, when he made the World. He therefore deſtroyed the Eternal Form of Matter. Whether this Form was a mode or a diſtinct accident, is of no importance to me: It was a real Being, which ceaſed to be, tho' it had no Beginning, and no efficient cauſe.*

(k) Note, *that if the Fathers believed what the Miniſter, who wrote the Paſtoral Letters, imputes to them concerning the generation of the Word, their Opinion concerning the mutability of God, had been almoſt as impious as that of* Spinoza. *See* Janua cœlorum reſerata pag. 128. & ſeq. (l) *I mean ſuch accidents as are* ens inhærens in alio. (m) Plut. in apophth. pag. 175.

Terence ſays this upon another occaſion in his Prologue to the Andria. (e) *Diogenes Laertius* in Pyrrhone lib. 9 num. 72. *reckons* Plato *among the Scepticks, for ſaying*, Τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεοῖς ϗ θεῶν παισὶν ἐγχωρεῖν, τὸν δὲ εἰκότα λόγον ζητεῖν; Se veritatem quidem Diis Deorumque filiis relinquere, id autem quod ſit veriſimile indagare. (f) Plutarch *at the beginning of his Treatiſe concerning* Iſis and Oſiris. (g) Ἦ μὰν ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμὸν γένος ἠδ' ἴα πάτρη, ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πρότερος γεγόνει ϗ πλείονα ᾔδη. Eſt ambobus quidem ſane genus & patria una, Sed Jupiter natu prior erat, & pluraque noverat. *Homer. Iliad* lib. 13. v. 354.

(A) *And*

Z.

ZABARELLA, or DE ZABARELLIS (*Francis*) Archbishop of *Florence*, and a Cardinal, was one of the most celebrated Canonists of his time. He was Born at *Padua*, in the Year * 1339. He studied the Canon-Law at *Bologna*, and taught it at *Padua* with great applause. That City then subject to *Francis Carrara*, being attacked by the *Venetians* in 1406, deputed *Zabarella* to the King of *France* to desire his assistance, which he not obtaining, *Padua* found it self obliged to submit to the Republick of *Venice*. This Act of submission was very solemn: *Zabarella*, at the head of Fourteen other Deputies, delivered the Banner of *Padua* to the Senate in the great Place at *Venice*, and made an Eloquent (*A*) Speech on that occasion. Some time after this he went to *Florence* to teach the Canon-Law, and was there so loved and esteemed, that the Archiepiscopal See becoming vacant, he was chosen to fill it: But this Election proved ineffectual, for the Pope being more diligent, had already bestowed it on another. *Zabarella* being invited to *Rome* by *Boniface* IX, stayed there some time, and gave his Opinion on an important Question proposed to him, concerning the methods of putting a stop to the Schism. He afterwards returned to *Padua*, and was honoured with several Deputations. He wisely refused the Bishoprick of that City conferred on him, because he would not expose himself to the Indignation of the Senate, who had nominated another to that Dignity. Pope *John* XXIII, resolving to corroborate himself with Learned Men, obliged him to come to his Court, and gave him the Archbishoprick of *Florence*. He did not confine his Liberality to that alone, but created him ‡ Cardinal in 1411. He sent him on an Embassy β with another γ Cardinal, and *Emanuel Chrysoloras*, to the Court of the Emperor *Sigismund*, who demanded a Council, as well on account of the *Bohemian* Heresies, as the Anti-Popes. This Pope charged his Ambassadors to chuse such a place for the holding of the Council as should not be suspicious to him. And it is said that he noted several Cities in Writing which he desired, but at the moment of their departure, tore the Paper on which (*B*) he had written them, and gave them full Power on that Head. Which was the reason that they left it to the choice of his Imperial Majesty. The City of *Constance* was pitched upon. *Francis Zabarella* frequently appeared at the Council held there, and advised the Deposition of *John* XXIII, who was charged with 40 Crimes of a very deep Dye. If the right of Election had been left to the Cardinals, it is highly probable that *Zabarella* (*C*) would have succeeded the deposed Pope; but this Right was divided between them

* *His Epitaph imports that he died being 90 years of Age in 1417.*

‡ *He made him Cardinal Deacon (and not Cardinal Priest, as Gesner in* Biblioth. fol. 251. *asserts) by the Title of St. Cosmo and St.* Damian.

β *In the year* 1413.

γ *It was* Antony de Chalant. *See* Spondanus ad ann. 1413. n. 5.

(*A*) *And made an eloquent Speech.*] He was not only a learned Civilian, but also a (*a*) good Orator. He pronounced an Eloquent Oration on the 4th of *July* 1397, on the Nuptials of *Nicolas d'Este* with *Giliola*, the Daughter of *Francis Carrari*, the second of that Name, Lord of *Padua*. And seven years after he made a Speech to the Lady *Belflora*, who married the Son of the same *Carrari*, when she made her entry into *Padua*, and was received under a Canopy; I say he made a Speech to her, in the Name of the University (*b*). He also made the Funeral Orations of *Francis Carrari*, and *Arcuanus Buzackarinus* (*c*).

(*a*) *See* Tomasin elog. parte 1. pag. 3.

(*b*) *Taken from* Panzirolus, de claris legum interpret. lib. 3. c. 38. pag. m. 443.

(*c*) Tomasin. elog. parte 1. pag. 10.

(*B*) *At the moment of their departure tore the Paper.*] *Panzirolus*, whom I have faithfully followed in the Text of this Article, ascribes this Alteration of the Pope (*d*) to Inspiration. But that we may see this passage in its full extent, which is too briefly related by him, I will cite a *French* Author. (*e*) *It never appeared more clearly, that the Providence of God at once frequently overthrows all the Designs of Humane Prudence, in order to accomplish its own. The Pope, as* Leonard Aretin, *his Secretary and Confident, assures us, had in appearance given full Power to his Legates to agree with the Emperor on these two* (*f*) *Points, as they should think proper; but because on the other hand he would not be at the Emperor's discretion in a City where that Prince was Master; he noted in a private Paper certain Cities of* Italy, *besides which he very particularly, and peremptorily charged them not to accept of any; and yet when he dismissed them, as he was exhorting them to acquit themselves of their Duty, and being just going to deliver them this Paper, which he had in his hands, he, all of a sudden, changed his Mind; and after having expressed himself in their praise, with the greatest Transports of tenderness and Affection, protesting that he had a full and intire Confidence in their Fidelity; he told them, that contrary to his former resolution, he would not limit their Power, and immediately before their Eyes, tore the Writing, after having shewed it to them. But, he was not long without altering his Mind a second time; for, understanding that his Legates had at last consented, in compliance with* Sigismund's *Desire, that a general Council should be summoned to assemble on the first of* November *the following Year at* Constance, *a City of* Germany, *subject to the Emperor; he was like to fall into Despair, and a thousand times cursed his Fortune, or rather imprudence, in changing his Resolution so easily, and delivering up himself, as it were, bound Hand and Foot to a Prince who would always have it in his power to put in execution whatever it should please the Council to order against him. But he was obliged to dissemble his Resentment, for fear of rendring himself suspected*, &c.

(*d*) Quod divino impulsu factum esse videtur. Panzir. ib. pag. 445.

(*C*) Zabarella *would have succeeded the deposed Pope, but.*] *Panzirolus*'s Relation is not very exact; for it necessarily tends to persuade us, that *Zabarella* was alive at the time of the entrance into the Conclave for the Election of a Pope. Which is false. The Electors entred (*k*) on the 8th of *November*, and *Zabarella*, according to *Panzirolus*, died on the 5th, others (*l*) say on the 6th. So that I find that *Tomasin* Conforms himself better to the circumstances of time: *Zabarella*, according to him,

(*g*) See Maim-bourg ubi supra lib. 6. p. 26

(*h*) Constantiæ extinctus est anno cis. ccc. xvii. viii Idus Novembris. Tomasin ubi supra pag. 5. Freherus in Theatro pag. 17. has eighty transcribed this for he extinctus est Id. Nov.

(*e*) *Maximbourg*, Hist. du grand Schisme d'Occident B. 4. pag. 106. *Dutch Edition. He quotes Saint* Antoninus *Archbishop of* Florence part. 3. Tit. 22. (*f*) *That is the time and place of the Council.*

them and the other Members of that Council. They were divided into five Classes, each of which nominated six Persons, who, in conjunction with the Cardinals, Elected *Otho Colonna* Pope, who took the Name of *Martin* V. This was in the Year 1417. *Zabarella* died at *Constance* ‖ on the 5th of *November*, the same Year ‡. His Funeral was celebrated with great Magnificence; the Emperor and all the Council being present at it: The Funeral Oration was pronounced by *Poggius*; the Corps was carried to *Padua*, and interred in the Cathedral Church on the left side of the Altar of the Blessed Virgin. Our *Zabarella* wrote (*D*) a great many Books, and deserved the Publick Esteem, as well for (*E*) his virtuous Life, as his Learning. He appointed for his Heir (*F*) *Bartholomew* **ZABARELLA** his Nephew †, of whom I shall speak in a Remark. I must not forget that amongst his several Scholars, one was *Peter Paul Vergerio*, who wrote * an excellent and very exact Letter, on the Life and death of his Professor.

ZABARELLA (*James*) one of the greatest Philosophers of the XVIth Century, was born at *Padua* on the 5th of *September* in 1533. Having learned Rhetorick and the Greek Tongue under γ excellent Professors, he applied himself to the study of Logick, and the Mathematicks, in both which he made great Progresses. He extremely delighted in Astrology, and amused himself in drawing a great many Horoscopes, and 'tis reported, that he many times made true Predictions. He acquired a profound Knowledge of *Aristotle*'s Physicks and Ethicks; wherefore we ought not to be surprized that the University of *Padua* placed him amongst his Professors, in the Year 1564. He taught Logick there for the space of 15 Years, and afterwards Philosophy to the time of his death. He Published several Commentaries on (*A*) *Aristotle*, which shwed that his Genius

‖ And not in his own Country as Forsterus affirms Hist. Juris Civil. Rom. lib. 3. c. 37. p. m. 616.

‡ And therefore he did not flourish in the Year 1414, as Gesner affirms in Biblioth. fol. 261.

† Taken from Panzirolus de claris legum interpretibus lib. 3. c. 23. p. m. 443. & seq.

* Panzirol. ib. p. 434. Mr. Teissier says nothing of it in Bibliotheca bibliothecarum.

γ John Faseolus, & Francis Robortellus.

him, would have been made a Pope, by the unanimous consent of the Electors, if Death had not transported him to Heaven. He also tells us that this Cardinal supplied the Pope's place in the Council. (*a*) *Concilio convocato Pontificis vicem gessit. Unde omnium consensu summus Pontifex dictitatus, re quoque ipsa designatus fuisset, ni Deus Opt. Max. ipsum in Cœlum, ibi satius Ecclesiæ suæ profuturum evexisset. Panzirolus* missed *Doujat* (*b*), who assures us that *Zabarella* died after the Election of *Martin* V.

(*D*) *Wrote a great many Books.*] Six Volumes of Commentaries on the Decretals and *Clementines*. One Volume of Counsels. A Volume of Orations and Epistles. A Tract *de horis canonicis. De felicitate libri tres. Variæ legum repetitiones, Opuscula de artibus liberalibus. De natura rerum diversarum. Commentarii in naturalem & moralem philosophiam. Historia sui temporis. Acta in Conciliis Pisano & Constantiensi. In vetus & novum Testamentum: De schismate* (*c*). This last Tract did not please the Court of *Rome*. The Protestants have Published it several times (*d*) with other pieces of the same nature, in which the jurisdiction of Princes is maintain'd exclusive of submission to the Popes. To which purpose read the following words of Bellarmin: (*e*) *Occasione longissimi schismatis scripsit etiam librum de schismate, in quo sunt aliqua corrigenda: quare in indice librorum probibitorum, liber ejus de schismate cum præfationibus, Argentinæ impressus ab hæreticis, probibitus est, donec corrigatur.* Observe that *Zabarella* is cited under the Name of Cardinal (*f*) without any Addition.

(*E*) *As well for his virtuous Life.*] He not only slept but little, and was extremely careful not to lose any time, but was endowed with a Probity and Chastity which was very particular: Being an Enemy to Luxury, his domestick Affairs were managed with the utmost frugality, in order to diffuse his Wealth abroad amongst the Poor. He never connived at his Neighbours Faults, but always exhorted his Friends and Pupils to a virtuous life. (*g*) *Somni parcissimus, & ne quam temporis jacturam faceret, valde sollicitus. Vir recti animi, suavissimæ consuetudinis, & integerrimæ, castissimæque vitæ fuit, familiares & discipulos ad bonos mores hortari solitus ab ipsis non secus ac pater diligebatur. Domi parcus, foris fortunas inter pauperes dividebat.* I believe one of the things which made him thought worthy of the Bishoprick of *Padua*, was his Charity to the Poor, (*h*) when Arch-Priest of the Cathedral Church there. I have related the (*i*) Reason which procur'd him to refuse that Bishoprick. That refusal acquir'd him the admiration of the *Paduans*, and obliged them to resign to him a very rich Abby which had belonged to some Monks. This he held but a very short time, he soon return'd it to its ancient Possessors, which they with the utmost gratitude acknowledged, and as much as possible perpetuated his Memory, preserving his Sacerdotal Vestments to this day in their Monastery, in several places of which (*k*) his Arms are set up. It was by reason of (*l*) his holy Life as well as Learning, that he was chose the Archbishop of *Florence*, when he was only Professor of the Canon-Law. I have (*m*) also given the reason why this choice was ineffectual.

(*F*) *Bartholomew* ZABARELLA *of whom I shall speak.*] He was the Son of *Andrew Zabarella*, Brother to our *Francis*; and professed the Canon-law at *Padua* with great applause. He was afterwards called to *Rome*, where he discover'd a great stock of Learning, as well in his Disputes, as Consultations. He was first raised to the Archbishoprick of *Spalato*, and then advanced to that of *Florence*, and at last to the Dignity of Referendary of the Church by Pope *Eugenius* IV. 'Tis thought he had risen yet higher, if he had not died before he arrived at Old Age in 1445. His Body was carried to *Padua*, and interred in his Uncle's (*n*) Tomb. I am surprized that his Name doth not appear in the Epitaph of our *Francis*, and that instead of it we see *Joannes Jacobi viri clarissimi Filius id monumenti ponendum curavit. Panzirolus* and *Tomasin* mention the whole Epitaph; and the last observes, that the Author of the *Patavina felicitas*, & *Swertius* (*o*) have erroneously copied it. The same may also be charged on *Panzirolus*; for in his Book we read *Obiit Constantiæ* Mccccviii. which ought to have been Mccccxvii. An infinity of Copists and Printers of Inscriptions are guilty of the like negligence. But to return to our *Bartholomew*. He died at the Age of 46 Years, on the 12th of *August* 1445, in the Embassy with which *Eugenius* IV. honoured him to the Kings of *Spain* and *France*. It is affirmed that (*p*) the Pope design'd to make him a Cardinal.

(*A*) *He Published several Commentaries on* Aristotle, *which shewed.*] He Published some Lo-

(a) Tomasin. elog. parte 1. pag. 5.

(b) Doujat. Prænot. Canonic. pag. 609.

(c) Ex Tomasino ib. pag. 9. *See also* Oldoini in Athenæo Romano pag. 258.

(d) *For instance at* Basil, *by* Oporinus, *in* 1565. *in fol. I make use of this Edition.*

(e) Bellarm. de scriptor. Ecclesiast. p. m. 384. (f) Tomas. ib. pag. 5. (g) Panzirolus ubi supra pag. 445.

(h) In Cathedrali Patavina Ecclesia Archipresbyteratus honore insignitus pauperum incommodis mira subveniebat liberalitate. Tomasin. ubi supra pag. 4.

(i) *In the Text of this Article.*

(k) Id. ib.

(l) Florentiam vocatus jus Canonicum explanavit, ibique ob vitæ SANCTIMONIAM ac doctrinæ præstantiam ab illius Reip. proceribus ad Archiepiscopatus dignitatem conclamatus est. Tomas. ubi supra pag. 3.

(m) *In the Text of the Article.* (n) Panzir. ubi supra pag. 446, 447. (o) In de Gymnasii- liciis orbis. (p) *Taken from* Riccobonus in descriptione Patavini apud Freherum in theatro pag. 19.

Genius was capable of unravelling great Difficulties, and comprehending the most obscure Questions. Being very frequently deputed to *Venice* on important Affairs, he made Speeches to the Senate with great ſucceſs. He refuſed the Offers of *Sigiſmund* King of *Poland*, who invited him into his Realm. He died at *Padua* in *October* 1589, and was buried in St. *Antony's* Church, where his Funeral Oration was pronounced by *Riccobonus*. He bore the Title *(B)* of Count *Palatin*. He had by his Marriage with *Elizabeth Gavacia*, ſix *(C)* Sons and three Daughters, and Calculated the Nativities of them all. In which I do not know whether he ſucceeded well, and for inſtance, whether he fore-told that the Senate of *Venice* ſhould give him a thouſand Crowns, as a Portion for the marriage of his youngeſt Daughter †. Authors differ in ſeveral particulars concerning him, which ought not to be matter of Diſpute. Some ſay he was a handſome *(D)* Man, others, that he was Ugly. Some aſſert, that he had a very active, quick, and ready Wit; others, that he *(E)* could not reſolve the Objections of his Pupils without asking time to conſider them. He is accuſed of holding ſome *(F)* impious Tenets, as not believing the Immortality

† Taken from James Philip Tomaſini parte 1. elogior. pag. 134. & ſeq.

gical Treatiſes in the Year 1578. In which he amply treated of the Method; and it was believed, eſpecially in *Germany*, that on that Head he was the beſt Guide that could be had (a). Here is the Elogy beſtowed on the Commentary which he Publiſhed in 1582. (b) *Anno* 82. *edidit illa admirabilia commentaria in poſt. Anal. Ariſtotelis quibus omnibus Græcis, Arabibus, Latinis palmam in hoc divino Ariſtotelici ingenii opere illuſtrando præripuit.* *Francis Piccolomini* his Collegue, and Rival, attacked him on the Doctrine of the Method. *Zabarella* Publiſhed his Reply in the Year 1584. *Imperialis* obſerves, that *Zabarella* was inferior to *Francis Piccolomini* in (c) the Art of Diſcourſing, but when he took Pen in hand, he exceeded him in the force of Argument: When he had occaſion to ruin his Adverſaries Hypotheſis, he brought a crowd of Reaſons to cruſh them: When he was obliged to maintain his own Opinions, he was very happy, in a clear and intelligible manner of performing it. So that he ſcarce had his equal for deſtroying the adverſe ſide, and defending his own. (d) *Neminem facile quis dixerit æquare Zabarellæ Scriptorum venuſtatem atque elegantiam, quibus accedit incredibile argumentandi robur & opinionum firmitas, quo nomine vix alius in evertendis aliorum placitis uberior, in aſtruendis propriis fœlicior unquam eſt habitus.* His work *de rebus naturalibus libri* XXX *quibus quæſtiones, quæ ab Ariſtotelis interpretibus hodie tractari ſolent accurate diſcutiuntur*, was Printed in 1589. He dedicated it to Pope *Sixtus* V. the Epiſtle Dedicatory being dated at *Padua* the firſt of *October*, the ſame Year. He had before Publiſhed a ſmall Specimen of it in 1586, and Dedicated it to that Pope's Nephew. His Commentaries on the three Books of *Ariſtotle de Anima*, did not appear till after his death, and were Publiſhed by his Son *Francis Zabarella* in 1604.

(a) Keckermann. præcognit. logicor. tract. 2. c. 5 p. m. 134.
See Tomaſin elog. parte 1 p. 137.
(b) Id. ib.
(c) *See the Remark* E.

(d) Imperialis in Muſæo hiſtor. pag. 115.

(B) *The Title of Count Palatin.*] Which one *James Zabarella* obtained from the Emperor *Maximilian*: And his Son *Julius* was continued in that quality by the Emperor *Ferdinand* I. who, beſides, entailed the Honour on the Eldeſt Sons of the Family. And accordingly *Julius Zabarella* his Son bore that Title, and cauſed it to deſcend to our *James* his Eldeſt Son (e).

(e) Ex Tomaſino elogior. parte 1. pag. 139.

(C) *Six Sons and three Daughters.*] The Eldeſt of which was *Julius*, a good Mathematician. You will find in *Moreri that he gave up himſelf to Debauchery with Women, to that exceſs, that he contracted a great Weakneſs in his Nerves, which obliged him to keep his Bed five Years before his death* (f). Mr. *Moreri* makes him Author of ſeveral Books, of the moſt conſiderable of which he mentions the Titles; but he is miſtaken, for all thoſe pieces were written by *James Zabarella*, and not by *Julius* his Son.

(f) Moreri *had this from* Mr. Teiſſier's *addition to the Elog.* Tom. 2. p. m. 124.

(*D*) *Some ſay he was a handſome Man, others, that he was ugly*] His Effigies in *Tomaſin* repreſents his Air to be very agreeable, and admirably confirms theſe words (g) *Vultu ſpectabilis*: But in *Imperialis*, the Print of him expreſſes a dull, untractable, and ſordid Look, which very effectually proves the Truth of theſe words, (h) *Nec ſubhæſitantis linguæ nota vel* TETRICA *forte* ORIS SPECIES *ullas unquam ſuæ gloriæ maculas aſpergere potuerunt.* Is it then poſſible, that in things expoſed to the view of the World, Authors ſhould differ as much as White and Black, as well by the ſtrokes of their Pens, as by thoſe of the Painter's Pencil? If the Queſtion was about the Inclinations of the Mind, I ſhould not be ſurprized at this diverſity of Relations, for it is eaſie to fall into contrary Determinations with reſpect to thoſe inviſible Objects, which only diſcover themſelves by equivocal Indications; but the Queſtion relates to the Face: ought it not to be out of Diſpute whether it was handſom or ugly?

(g) Tomaſ. ubi ſupra pag. 138.
(h) Joh. Imperialis in Muſæo hiſtor. pag. 117.

(*E*) *That he had a very active ——— that he could not reſolve.*] This is alſo another Subject on which the Hiſtorians ought not to oppoſe one another. They ſhould agree whether *Zabarella*'s Genius acted in a ſprightly or ſluggiſh manner. He was Profeſſor about Twenty five Years in one of the moſt famous Univerſities of *Europe*. Which gave him a thouſand opportunities of publickly diſcovering whether he wanted conſideration in the reſolution of Doubts, or whether he could reſolve them as ſoon as propoſed. Why then ſhould *Tomaſini* expreſs himſelf in this manner: (i) *Nactus eſt Mercurium feliciter ſtantem, quam ob cauſſam* CELERES *ingenii motus, & ad quævis excogitanda* FACILES ET EXPEDITOS *habuit in omni vita*; and *Imperialis* on the contrary tell us? (k) *Carpebant in te plurimi memoriæ labem, & quendam in agendis* TORPOREM, *quibus ad privata vel publica negotia minus reddebaris idoneus:* SEGNIOREM *te pariter quam ferret ingenii claritas in quæſtionibus inopinate ſolvendis prædicabant, cum te Scholarium Theſibus nonniſi per* INTERPOSITAS HORAS *reſpondere ſolitum dicerent?* Some Pages after, he obſerves that *Zabarella* ſtuttered, and that his words and deportment were rough and unpoliſhed. (l) *In eo præſtitit Jacobo Zabarellæ Collegæ ſuo* (Franciſcus Piccolomineus) *quod ipſe facilitate quadam dicendi præditus juncta comitati morum ac eximiæ humanitati, alter ſermone durior, blæſus, incomptus, civilibus in ſtudiis inops potius quam redundans.*

(i) Tomaſ. ibid.
(k) Imperial. ibid.
(l) Id. ib. pag. 115.

(F) *Of holding ſome impious Tenets.*] On this Head Mr. *Moreri* is faulty. *He is accuſed by* Imperialis, ſaith he (m), *of having oppoſed the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul, and given ſeveral Marks of Impiety and Atheiſm in his Writings.* The laſt part of this Accuſation is not in *Imperialis*; and if the firſt is, it is not expreſſed as a thing affirmed by that Author, but rather as a very uncertain Rumor, which he in ſome ſort refutes. His words run thus: (n) *Præterea impenſius te aliquanto impugnaſſe immortalitatem animæ, deterrimam Alexandreorum ſententiam palam profeſſum: quos tamen de te rumores ut forte ab exulceratis animis excitos, ita vel eluſit poſteritas, vel admirabilis ac prope divina tuarum (o) virtutum fama compenſavit: præaltæ ſiquidem mentis lumen in ſcriptis diffuſum tuis, nullam debet luem temporis nullamque livoris noxam vereri.* This Calumny, if I am not miſtaken, was only grounded upon this. There reigned in *Italy*, and chiefly at *Padua*, for above an Age, a famous Diſpute about this

(m) The words of Moreri *are taken from* Mr. Teiſſier ubi ſupra
(n) Imperial. ubi ſupra pag. 117.
(o) *See* Tomaſini's *words at the end of the text of this Article.*

Immortality of the Soul; but his Exemplary Life is praised ‡. I shall speak of

‡ [illegible] 138.

his Question, whether it was possible to prove the Immortality of the Soul from *Aristotle*'s Principles. Some Professors who were looked upon as Favourers of *Alexander Aphrodisiensis* defended the Negative. Others maintained the Affirmative. *Pomponatius*, one *Zabarella*, *Cremoninus*, &c. took the first side, whence an Infinity of such Persons as are incapable of using distinctions when they are most necessary, peremptorily charged these Philosophers with teaching the Mortality of the Soul. This is the Sophism, *a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*. In a word, this is an injustice and an iniquity, which superiors ought not to suffer: For there is a prodigious difference betwixt absolutely affirming that the Soul is Mortal, and maintaining that according to the Hypothesis of such a Philosopher, it is impossible to prove that it is not Mortal. See the Article of *Pomponatius*. The Inquisitors Acted on a Principle of Equity towards *Zabarella*; for they contented themselves with his Declaration that by the Power of the Divine Grace, he was fully persuaded of the Truth of the Orthodox Opinion, tho' Natural Reason and *Aristotle*'s Principles seemed incapable of forming in him this excellent persuasion. He published a Tract in which he maintained, that the existence of a first Mover separate from the Bodies which compose the Universe could be no otherwise proved than by supposing the Eternity of Motion. Which was to declare that a Christian Philosopher cannot produce any Proofs of the existence of a first Mover, whose Nature is Spiritual; for it is a Doctrine of the Christian Faith, that Motion is not Eternal. *Zabarella* asserted, that in order to believe this existence which no Natural Reason can demonstrate, the Grace of the Holy Ghost was necessary. The Holy Office found nothing unreasonable in this Assertion, but gave their approbation to this Philosopher's Book. Which emboldned *Berigardus* to take the Liberty of affirming the same Opinion. It is true he did not do it so bluntly; for he introduced an Interlocutor opposing this Thesis. To which purpose let us cite a pretty long passage out of his Preface: (a) *Denique ut constet ea quæ dicuntur in nostro Circulo permissa jam fuisse a S. Officio, libet pauca subjicere, maximè ne cui durum videatur quòd introduco Aristæum defendentem sententiam Jacobi Zabarellæ viri in hoc Lyceo celeberrimi. Hæc sententia libro de Inventione æterni motoris approbato sæpius a S. Officio, docet unicum medium philosopho naturali ad demonstrandum dari primum motorem a materia abjunctum esse motus æternitatem, quæ quia non datur, ut fide divina certi sumus, sequitur primum motorem demonstrari non posse naturaliter, sed ad hoc opus esse Dei contactu peculiari. Neque propterea Zabarella putat eam quam vocat demonstrationem primi motoris ex motu æterno, esse veram demonstrationem, utpote cujus medium falsum est, sed loquitur ex falsis principiis Aristotelis, nempe si verus esset motus æternus, inde solùm ostendi posse primum motorem. Hanc Zabarellæ opinionem jam permissam si tuerer, id fortasse tutò facere possem; verùm contrariam existimo magis esse consentaneam pietati, propterea illi oppono Charilaum qui Circ. II. & XVIII. contendit Deum verum cognosci posse naturaliter, & licet rationes illæ seorsum acceptæ non videantur sufficere ad convincendos pertinaces Epicuræos, ut concludit ultimis verbis, omnibus tamen simul instructis, ait intellectum rectè dispositum posse elevari ad hanc cognitionem naturaliter, sed absque merito gratiæ & gloriæ, ut sic inexcusabiles verè dicantur a Divo Paulo qui contemptis his rationibus ad falsas & irreligiosas opiniones delapsi sunt. Zabarellam tamen sequi videtur Campanella cap. 9. n. 2. ubi ait religionem veram (ac proinde Deum) citra fidem cognosci non posse: quin etiam apud Philosophos plus valere fidem quam rationem.*

A REFLEXION upon the consequences from the eternity or the beginning of motion with respect to the existence of God.

In the mean while till I can come at this Tract of *Zabarella*, which is very hard to be gotten in this Country (b), I shall make one Reflection. I am not satisfied with my Conjectures on this Philosopher's way of Arguing. He asserted that (c) the Consequence is right from the Eternity of Motion, to the existence of a first Spiritual mover, but that a motion which had a beginning is no manner of Proof that there is a first Mover distinct from Matter. In order to Argue thus, it is necessary to suppose it (d) impossible that a Material Principle should Act Eternally, tho' it may be capable of Acting for several Ages. But I don't see on what such an Assertion can be grounded; for if *Zabarella* grant me that a Material Principle could produce motion, which in *Moses*'s Hypothesis did not begin till six days before *Adam*, he must then believe that this Principle having being at rest from all Eternity was at last moved by its self, and that it will once return to rest, since its Materiality will never suffer it to do any thing Eternal. But who doth not see the absurdity of this Hypothesis? Every one clearly Apprehends, 1. That all Bodies which have been at rest from Eternity, will for ever continue so, unless drawn from it by some External Power. 2. That all Bodies, which might begin to move and continue in motion as long as the World has lasted according to the Scripture, might also persevere Eternally in that state. 3. That all Bodies which might begin to move one Hundred Ages ago, might have began twenty Thousand Years, a Hundred Thousand Years, &c. sooner; for there is no more Reason to fix the beginning of Motion to one hour than another, unless we have recourse to the good Pleasure of a Spiritual Cause: But if a Body might have began to move before any Term assigned, it would follow that it might have been always in motion, and consequently Motion might have been Eternal without being produced by a cause distinct from Matter. What I have just been saying shews that we may very reasonably conclude the existence of a first Spiritual mover, from the beginning of the motion of Matter, and that we could not make that Conclusion, if we should once grant, that a Motion which began might proceed from a Material cause. And consequently I don't find that *Zabarella* argues justly on this Head.

Besides, it seems to me much easier to prove, that there is a first Mover distinct from Matter if we take Motion to have had a beginning, than if we suppose it Eternal. Let us suppose that it began, and it will necessarily follow, either that all Bodies began to exist, or that having existed from all Eternity, they remained an Eternity in a state of rest. If all Bodies began to exist, they must necessarily have been produced by a Spiritual cause, which is the first Mover which we are in quest of; for the Spiritual Principal Author of the existence of all Bodies, will also be the Principle of their Motion. And if all Bodies are Eternal, and yet their Motion is not Eternal, it follows that they have not in themselves the motive Virtue; for if they had, they had Moved Eternally. That Virtue is threfore separate from Matter, it is therefore in a Spiritual Subject, which again is the first Mover which we search after. If it be the (e) efficient cause of Bodies, so much the better; for by a stronger Reason it will appear the efficient cause of motion. If it be not their efficient cause, if Matter exists by its self, that will not hinder its being the cause of their motion, since it is visible that a Nature which hath been at rest during an eternity, does not begin to move its self, but must be drawn out of this state of rest by an External Principle. On the other side if we suppose that Motion is eternal, it will be more difficult to maintain that it proceeds from an immaterial cause; for it may be urged that the same necessity whereby Matter hath Eternally existed without (f) being Created, hath made it move eternally without the help of an External Principle, or Spiritual mover. I cannot then comprehend the course which *Zabarella* steers; for whatever I have thought of on this Head tends rather to make me believe, that he designed to divert himself by broaching a Paradox, than to engage me to think that he suffered himself to be seduced by specious Reasons. Was he afraid it should be urged to him that a Spiritual Mover would not have left Matter in a state void of Action from all eternity, and that therefore the beginning of motion is a Proof that the first Mover

---

(a) Conclus. Berigardus in proœmio Circuli Pisani [illegible] c. 6.

(b) The Scholars are [illegible] would [illegible] of buying their Books and even of enquiring whether they are to be found in a Library.

(c) Thus Berigardus makes him argue.

(d) Berigardus in Circulo [illegible] pag. 5. advances this proposition, *Nulla virtus materiata æternum motum ciere potest.*

(e) *Note that many great Orthodox Philosophers maintain that a Creature may be Eternal.*

(f) *I suppose that* Zabarella *argued against some Men, who did not believe the Creation.*

of the Treatiſe in which he maintains (G) that the Proof of a God drawn from the exiſtence

is not a Spirit? for this Objection is ſtronger againſt thoſe who ſhould maintain the materiality of the firſt Mover. Is it not more difficult to comprehend that a corporeal cauſe ſhould act freely, and begin its Actions at pleaſure, than to apprehend the ſame of a Spiritual Nature?

(G) *I ſhall ſpeak of the Treatiſe in which he maintains that the Proof of a God drawn from the exiſtence of a firſt mover is invalid, unleſs we ſuppoſe motion to be Eternal.*] All the former part of this Article, and what is contained in the Remark H. was written in the Month of *March* 1697. I read it over again in *Auguſt* 1701. in order to ſend it to the Preſs; and whilſt I was peruſing it, I remembered that for two or three Years paſt I had *Zabarella*'s Works by me. I therefore believed that I ought to examine what he ſaith, and compare with that the Conjectures which I made when I had no other Guide than a Citation of *Berigardus*. This Examination made it appear to me, that my Conjectures do not reach the Mark, and that the ſtate of the *Queſtion* is different from what I imagined. Notwithſtanding which I have publiſhed them without any Alteration; they may afford matter of Reflection, and ſerve as a Teſtimony of my Ingenuity, and make it appear that I make uſe of no manner of Artifice. There are a great many Authors who on parallel occaſions would have Corrected their Manuſcript, and yet would ſay, *This is what we Conjectured before we ſaw the Book, and after we have read it, we have found our Conjectures exactly conform to it.* But I deſire to act with more ſincerity, and am willing that the Reader ſhould know the difference betwixt what I determined concerning *Zabarella's* Book before, and what I ought to ſay after I have read it. Purſuant to which I ſhall inſert a ſhort Analyſis of this Treatiſe.

It is intituled *de inventione æterni motoris*, and contains but eight Pages and a half in my (a) Edition. The Author's firſt Theſis is, that it is impoſſible to diſcover any otherwiſe than by Motion that there is an immaterial ſubſtance; but he proteſts that he confines himſelf to the knowledge which may be acquired by the light of Nature, and that he excepts Revelation. (b) *Hac præmiſſa proteſtatione, nos hac de re ſecundum principia philoſophiæ Ariſt. eſſe loquuturos, & illam tantum ſubſtantiarum a materia abjunctarum notitiam, quam via naturali adipiſcimur, conſideraturos, omiſſa penitus earundem cognitione, quam revelatione divina & lumine ſupernaturali accepimus; veriſſimam illam quidem, ſed Ariſt. cujus dicta interpretanda ſuſcepimus, prorſus abſconditam.* He Embraces the Opinion of *Averroes*, who rejected the other Proofs which *Avicenna* pretended to find in *Ariſtotle*'s Books, theſe for inſtance: There is a Being dependant on another, therefore there is a firſt Being which doth not depend on any thing whatſoever; for otherwiſe we ſhould be obliged to admit a progreſs *in infinitum*. But this firſt Being is God, therefore, &c. There is a Perfection and Goodneſs greater than another; there is therefore a Sovereign Perfection and Goodneſs. But the Being which hath this perfection and Goodneſs is God, wherefore there is a God. *Averroes* Anſwers that all this proves only the exiſtence of a Nature independent of, and more perfect than others, but not its Immateriality. He adds (c) that the Ancient Philoſophers, who admitted nothing but Matter would ſay that this independent and moſt perfect Nature, is nothing elſe but Heaven. *Zabarella* concludes that in order to come naturally to the Notion of an immaterial Subſtance, we ought to argue thus: Heaven hath an inceſſant Motion; every thing which moves is moved by another; whatever is corporeal is moveable, and there is no Infinite Progreſs betwixt the movers and the things moved; wherefore there is a firſt Mover diſtinct from Matter.

He afterwards enquires whether Motion, whatever it be, affords a proof of the exiſtence of ſuch a Mover, and declares for the Negative; for he concludes, that nothing but the eternity of motion can prove the exiſtence of a Mover ſeparate from Matter. He examines their Opinion who pretend that *Ariſtotle* (d) maintained, that even Motion which began is able to lead us to the knowledge of a firſt Spiritual mover. This Philoſopher, ſay they, Argued thus: Whatever moves, is moved by another, and there is no ſuch thing as a progreſs *in infinitum*; wherefore there is a firſt Mover, which is immoveable, and conſequently incorporeal, for if it were a Body, it muſt of neceſſity be moveable. *Zabarella* Anſwers, that this Argument of *Ariſtotle* can only lead us to the exiſtence of a mover that is immoveable in no other than a general ſenſe, which may comprize the Souls of Beaſts. Thoſe Souls, continues he, are immoveable ſo far as they are not movable in themſelves, but only by Accident. But tho' they are accidentally moveable, they are call'd the firſt Movers, according to the order eſſential to moving things. (e) *Si hunc Ariſtotelis diſcurſum conſideremus, manifeſtum eſt, per eum nos non duci ad alium motorem immobilem, quam late acceptum, qui animas quoque animalium mortalium complectatur; immobiles enim ſunt, quatenus non ſunt per ſe mobiles, quum incorporeæ ſint, ſed tamen ſunt per accidens mobiles: neque per id fit, quin dicantur motores primi juxta ordinem moventium eſſentialem.* He adds, that thoſe whom he oppoſes being very ſenſible of the lameneſs of this Argument, have ſupplyed the defect of it, in this manner: Heaven moves; it is therefore moved by ſomething elſe; wherefore there is a firſt immoveable Mover. But is this Mover Eternal, or not? If it be, we have what we look for: The motion of Heaven, be it what it will, be it but of two Days, leads us to the exiſtence of a Deity. But if this Mover is not Eternal, it will one day periſh, wherefore there is ſomething, which will deſtroy it; it is not then the firſt Mover, and we ought to transfer that Character to that Being which ſhall prove it's deſtroyer. Yet we were come ſo far as the firſt Mover, and we Argued on that Hypotheſis: What Abſurdity more ridiculous than to offer in Anſwer what is contradictory to a Suppoſition, of the Truth of which the differing parties agreed? But that thing, which ſhall occaſion ſooner or later the deſtruction of that, which we have conſidered as the firſt immoveable Mover, muſt it not be the firſt Mover? And to be ſo, ought it not to be in ſuch a ſtation as nothing can be above it, which is able to produce any Alteration in it? It is then Eternal, it is then what we were to come to upon our following the Track of *Ariſtotle's* Argument. But let us hear *Zabarella's* Anſwer, which turns ſolely on the Solution of the following Dilemma: The firſt Mover is or is not Eternal; If it is, we have gained our point: If it is not, there is then another Mover which can deſtroy it, there is a Mover ſuperior to this firſt Mover. But this is abſurd, and contrary to the ſuppoſition, to which both parties agree. He Anſwers (f) that the firſt Mover which his Adverſaries have hit on is not Eternal, but of the ſame Nature with the Soul of Brutes, that it is the form of Heaven, and that Heaven being compoſed of four Elements oppoſite to each other, had a beginning and ſhall have an end, in like manner with other parts of the World; (g) that from the Deſtruction of Heaven will neceſſarily reſult the Deſtruction of its moving Soul; that it ſhall not periſh by the Act of a firſt Mover; and that therefore tho' it ſhall be deſtroyed it doth not follow from thence that there is a ſuperior Agent or efficient Cauſe above it; it is ſufficient that it be united to a Body naturally corruptible, for the Corruption of that Body neceſſarily draws on the Corruption of the Form or Soul, which in it performed the Functions of a firſt Mover. (h) *Quando igitur hi dicunt, ſi primus motor univerſi eſt corruptibilis, ergo non eſt primus, negandum eſt conſequens: ad probationem autem, quum dicunt, corrumpetur à motore priore, hoc quoque eſt negandum; non enim ex eo quod eſt corruptibilis, requiritur motor prior, à quo corrumpatur, ſed quum ſit incorporeus, & forma corporis, ſatis cauſa eſt ad ipſum interimendum corruptibilitas corporis, cujus eſt forma; corpus autem ipſum, quum ſit elementare, a ſuo contrario lædi & interimi poteſt.* Whereſore, concludes he,

Motion

(a) That, of Francfort ſumptibus hæredum Lazari Zetzneri 1618. in 4.

(b) Jacobus Zabarella de rebus naturalibus p. m. 253.

(c) Quare illi philoſophi quorum mentionem facit Plato in Sophiſta, qui præter res corporeas & ſenſiles nil aliud exiſtere concedebant, dicerent illud ſummum & optimum, & perfectiſſimum non eſſe niſi Cœlum, nec ullum præter illud dari alium Deum. Id. ibid. pag. 254.

(d) In 8. lib. Phyſic. auſcultationis.

(e) Id. ib. pag. 255.

(f) Id. ib. pag. 256.

(g) Dicam itaque, e interitu Cœli neceſſario fieri ut anima quoque motrix intereat, quia licet hæc contrarium non habeat, tamen ex ſubjecti corporis interitu neceſſitate deficeret, quum ſit forma materialis, qual ſunt animæ animalium animam humanam ſemper excipio. Id. ibid.

(h) Id. i

existence of a first Mover, is invalid, unless we suppose Motion to be Eternal. I shall occasionally say that there are more Ambiguities (H) than are imagined in the Controversy of the Eternity of the World.

ZAHURIS

Motion in general proves no more, than the existence of a first immoveable Mover in the same manner as the Souls of Brutes are immoveable; and nothing but an an Eternal Motion can prove an Eternal Mover. (a) *Ex motu igitur absolute accepto absque consideratione æternitatis nil aliud ostenditur, quam dari primum motorem universi immobilem eo modo, quo animæ animalium brutorum sunt immobiles, hoc est, non per se mobiles; quod autem nec per se, nec per accidens mobile sit, proinde a materia abjunctus, & impatibilis, & infatigabilis, & sempiternus, ea ratione non ostenditur; quapropter nullum aliud philosopho naturali medium requiritur ad demonstrandum primum motorem æternum, nisi motus æternus; quando enim sumimus motum universi unum & eundem numero æternum esse, statim inferimus, cum ab uno tantum motore totum produci; quare necesse est, motorem illum esse infatigabilem, & sempiternum.*

It would not be easy for the Peripateticks to refute *Zabarella's* Reasons: For he argues *ad hominem* against them; he makes his Advantage of their Doctrine of substantial Forms, and the motive and Primitive Virtue of the (†) Souls of Brutes. The Moderns who have justly rejected these Principles might confute him without any difficulty, and find nothing knotty in his Objections. Observe by the by how pernicious and dangerous the consequences of the *Aristotelian* Hypothesis about the internal activity of Forms distinct from Matter may prove. For it is a Principle which admits of almost an infinite Number of first Movers, from whence it is easy to proceed to the rejection of a first Universal Mover, or to assert that it is subject to Death. The Soul of each Man and each Brute is in its kind a first mover. It moves it self, and imprints motion on the Body of which it is the Form. We may in proportion find the same Principle in inanimate Bodies. The Form of ponderous Bodies hath no need of any external Mover to press them towards their Center, nor that of light Bodies to drive them from it; but is it self their first Mover in this respect. Now if this *Aristotelian* Hypothesis be once admitted, an Universal Mover of the Heavens will be no longer necessary, every Planet will be Moved by its Form, the Heavens and fixed Stars will be moved by theirs, and none of these Movers will be accounted incorruptible, but will be liable to the common destiny of Forms, which cannot subsist after the dissolution of the Matter united to it. *Zabarella* very clearly apprehending this Consequence asserted that the Soul of the Heavens would one day perish, since the Matter of them was composed of Principles which clash with each other. It is so evident that Matter is changeable, that the Ancient Philosophers who believed that the *Genii* were not entirely separated from Matter, believed them Mortal, not excepting the greatest of them all. An Evidence of which is *Plutarch's* Story, (b) *the great Pan is dead.* If *Zabarella* has been able to penetrate into the Consequences of the common Doctrine of the Schools, he was not less in the right when he asserted that in order to find a first Eternal Mover, it is necessary to stop at one only cause which produced all Motion. It is an Advantage which we meet with in the *Cartesian* Philosophy; it ascribes to God all the moving and immediate Power of the Universe, and doth not divide it betwixt the Creator and the Creatures. The multitude of Movers may insensibly lead to the most dangerous Atheism, and from hence doubtless proceeds the Atheism of the *Chinese* Philosophers (c). They first of all believed a superior, immaterial and Infinite Deity; but attributing great Natural Powers to Bodies, and chiefly to the Celestial ones, they by little and little forgot the immaterial Divinity, and stopped at material Principles. The visible (d) and material Heaven is at present their great God.

Finally, we ought not to be surprized that the *Italian* Inquisition permitted *Zabarella* to follow *Averroes*, in the rejection of some Proofs of the existence of a God. This sort of Liberty is very extensive every where; and provided a Doctor owns that this existence may be proved by other means, they give him leave to confute this or that particular Proof. The *Cartesians* are not more baffled on any Head, than on Mr. *Descartes's* Demonstration of the existence of God. He was obliged to Answer a vast Number of Objections. And we every day see the most Orthodox themselves renewing this Dispute. Mr. *Werenfels* Professor at *Basil* maintain'd in a Printed Tract that this Argument of *Descartes* is a meer Paralogism. Mr. *Swizer* Professor at *Zurich* Answer'd him; as hath also Mr. *Jaquelot* a Minister at the *Hague*, whose Answer is inserted (e) in the *Histoire des ouvrages des sçavans.* Mr. *Brillon* a Doctor of the *Sorbonne* saw this Answer, but not being satisfied with it, he published a Memorial to prove (f) that *Descartes's* Argument was a Sophism, and not a Demonstration. Father *Francis Lami* a Benedictin Monk refuted this (g) Memorial. Mr. *Jaquelot* (h) replyed for himself. Mr. *l'Herminier* a Doctor of the *Sorbonne* lately, Published a Book in which he not only rejects *Descartes's Demonstrations concerning the existence of God*, but also most others. (i) "Of five offered "by St. *Thomas*, which are also commonly made "use of by Philosophers and Divines, this Doctor "rejects four, and allows only one of them to "be valid against the Atheists. For he looks upon "it as a Paralogism to prove the Deity by any "of the following Reasons. That all that exists "cannot be contingent, and that there must be "some Being which necessarily exists of its self. "That we cannot admit an Infinite Number of "Causes mutually subordinate, and that it is absolutely necessary to acknowledge a first Cause "on which all others are dependent. That Matter cannot move it self, but that a first Incorporeal "Mover must necessarily exist, from which it mediately or immediately received its moving impulse. "That in those Beings which exist, there appearing "several degrees of Perfection, as Goodness, "Beauty, Power, &c. there must undoubtedly exist "a Being supremely perfect, with respect to "which they may be said to be less or more perfect in proportion to their approaching more or "less to its Perfection. After having ranked "these four Demonstrations amongst the Sophisms, "the fifth which Mr. *l'Herminier* looks upon as "a real Demonstration of the existence of God, "is that drawn from the structure of the Universe "and the manner of its subsistence in such an "excellent order in all its parts, and with such "a constant regularity of their Motions." This is what we find in the Journal of *Trevoux*, in the Extract of (k) Mr. *l'Herminier's* Book. 'Tis long since a very Famous (l) Schoolman declared, that all the Proofs which Reason can afford of the existence of God are only Probable. But this *Sorbonne* Doctor doth not go so far.

(H) *More Ambiguities than are imagined in the Controversy of the Eternity of the World.*] All Christians (m) are agreed that nothing besides God hath perpetually existed; but several assert that he might have actually created the World as soon as he formed the Decree in order to its production; from whence they conclude, that the World might have existed from all Eternity, since the Decree for its production is undoubtedly Eternal. Several also affirm that it is impossible for a Creature to be Eternal. And each of these parties is stronger in Objections than Solutions. But this Dispute which hath been rendred so tediously long, and difficult, would soon cease, if the Disputants of each side would but explain themselves exactly, and remove the Ambiguities about Eternity. The Question ought to be put thus: *It is impossible that God and his Creatures should have always existed together.* And then one would

not

(a) Id. ib. pag. 257.

(†) [illegible] Omne enim corpus cui motus extrinsecus incidit inanime est. Cui vero intus ex seipso inest, animatum.

(b) Plut. de oracul. defectu pag. 419. *See also the Remark I in the Article* Chrysippus.

(c) *See the Remark R. in the Article* Spinoza.

(d) *See several Proofs of this in the Apology for the Dominicans Printed at Cologne in* 1699. p. 79. & seq.

(e) *For May* 1701. pag. 193. & seq.

(f) *In the* Journal des sçavans *for the Year* 1701.

(g) *See the* Journal *of* Trevoux *for January and February* 1701. pag. 104. & seq. *Dutch Edit.*

(h) *See the* Histoire des ouvrages des sçavans *for May* 1701. pag. 226. & seq.

(i) Journal de Trevoux *for May and June.* 1701. pag. 317. *Dutch Edit.*

(k) *It is intituled* Summa Theologiæ ad usum Scholæ accommodata.

(l) Gabriel Biel in Magistrum Sententiarum distinct 2. quæst 10. art. 3.

(m) *Except some Hereticks, who acknowledge the Eternity of Matter.*

ZAHURIS, is the Common Name beſtowed on a certain ſort of Men in *Spain*, who, as it is pretended, are ſo ſharp ſighted, as to ſee Veins of Water, Metals, Treaſures, and Dead Bodies under Ground. Their Eyes are very Red. *Martin Del Rio* tells us that when he was at *Madrid* in 1575. he ſaw a little Boy of this ſort. It is Remarkable that tho' this Author is very ready to impute extraordinary effects to the Devils, yet he doth not believe that the *Zahuris* diſcover ſubterraneous Waters and Metals by any magical pact; but believes that the Vapours diſcover the Water to them, and that they know the Mines by the Herbs which grow in thoſe places. But as for Treaſures and Dead Bodies, he ſaith the Devil ſheweth 'em to them; ſince they can Mark out what Treaſures and Corps they ſee, and are able to do it only on *Tueſday*, and

not ſo boldly take the *Negative ſide*; for this Term, the Eternity of the World, this Term which ſtartles ſo many People, would not here make any Impreſſion on the Mind. And the better to remove this ſtumbling Block, it ſhould be ſaid that a Creature which had been always coexiſtent with God may not be Eternal, for which this Reaſon ought immediately to be alledged, that the Duration of Creatures is ſucceſſive, and that Eternity is a ſimple Duration which eſſentially excludes the time paſt, and the time to come. By this eſſential difference betwixt the Duration of God, and that of the Creatures, we ſhould put an end to almoſt all the Diſpute, and each party would find their Account in it. We ſhould grant to thoſe who deny that a Creature can be Eternal, that they are in the right, and ſhould not deny that it is impoſſible for God and the Creature to have always exiſted together, ſince it is certain that a Cauſe doth not comprehend in its Idea a priority of Time with reſpect to its Effect, and that this holds more eſpecially true with reſpect to an Omnipotent Cauſe which needs only Will in order to produce actually whatever it pleaſes. Mr. *Poiret* hath very clearly apprehended the Ambiguities which perplex this Controverſy, and render it in a manner a Diſpute about Words. He judiciouſly obſerves that it is not true that the Creatures would be Eternal, if their exiſtence had no beginning, and tells us that thoſe who affirm it are ignorant of the Eſſence of Eternity. (a) *Aſſerentibus (Platoni ut ajunt & Ariſtoteli) mundum exiſtentiæ initio carere, fuit objectum, ſi id ita ſe haberet, mundum igitur æternum fore. Ecce, homines iſti ſibi imaginantur Æternitatem, quaſi eſſet infinitorum momentorum ordo principio atque fine carens, quæ vera æternitatis ignorantia eſt. Falſum eſt, mundum ſtatui æternum ſi dicatur vel ſemper exſtitiſſe, vel non poſſe affirmari in eo eſſe aliquod momentum quod ab alio non fuerit præceſſum: quamvis enim hoc eſſet, nihilominus mundus temporarius eſſet & dependens; neque hoc quicquam Dei Æternitati aut Potentiæ detraheret.* Obſerve by the by that this Author doth three things. We have juſt now ſeen the firſt, which is the falſe Conſequence that the World will be Eternal if it never began. In the 2. place he owns that the Arguments commonly alledged againſt thoſe who ſay that the World had no beginning are weak. He excuſes thoſe who not having the light of Revelation, did not believe the beginning of the Univerſe. He tells us that when he was writing that Chapter he was perſuaded that it was not poſſible to hit on any good Reaſons againſt thoſe of that Opinion, tho' he had long ſearched after better Proofs than all thoſe which he had read and found weak. (b) *Poſtquam aliorum quæ occurrerunt rationes infirmas deprehenderem, alias diu in mente mea quæſieram, putavi ſepoſita revelatione non poſſe ex lumine naturæ demonſtrari Mundum ſic eſſe, ut prius non fuerit.* 3. At laſt he brings a Proof which offered its ſelf to his Mind whilſt writing, he brings it I ſay againſt theſe People. But obſerve that an Objection was ſtarted to him (c), to which he gave an Anſwer (d) which doth not deprive it of its force.

There are other Quibbles which are predominant in this Diſpute. Thoſe who ſay that the Creatures did not always coexiſt with God, are obliged to acknowledge that God exiſted before them. There was therefore ſuch a thing as *before*, when God exiſted alone; it is not then true that the Duration of God is an indiviſible Point: Time therefore preceded the exiſtence of the Creatures. Theſe Conſequences make thoſe Gentlemen fall Contradictions. For if the Duration of God is indiviſible, and without either Time paſt or Time to come, it follows that Time and the Creatures began together, and if ſo, how can we ſay that God exiſted before the exiſtence of the Creatures? That Phraſe is improper and Contradictory. And the following are no leſs ſo, *God might have Created the World ſooner or later than he did Create it, he might have done it one Hundred Thouſand Years ſooner, &c.*

It is not obſerved that by making Eternity one indiviſible inſtant, the Hypotheſis of the beginning of the Creatures is weaken'd. How do you prove that the World did not always exiſt? Is it not from the Argument that there was an Infinite Nature which exiſted when the World was not in being? But can the Duration of that Nature ſet Bounds to that of the World? Can it hinder the Duration of the World from extending its ſelf beyond all the particular Beginnings which you would aſſign for it? You ſay that the Creatures want a Point of indiviſible Duration to be without a beginning; for according to you they were only preceded by the Duration of God which is an indiviſible Inſtant. You'll be anſwered, that they did not therefore begin, for if a Stick wanted only one Point (I mean a Mathematical Point) of four Foot, it wou'd certainly have the whole extent of four Foot. This is an Inſtance that may be founded on the Common (e) Definition of the Duration of God, a Definition much more incomprehenſible than the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; for if it is impoſſible to conceive that all the Members of a Man ſhould be contained diſtinct from each other within the Compaſs of a Mathematical Point; how ſhall we conceive that a Duration without beginning or ending, and which coexiſts with the ſucceſſive Duration of all Creatures, is comprized in an indiviſible Inſtant (f)?

This Hypotheſis raiſes another Difficulty in favour of thoſe who aſſert that the Creatures had no beginning. If the Decree of the Creation doth not comprehend a particular Moment, it never exiſted without the Creatures; for it ought to be underſtood under this Phraſe, *I will have the World to exiſt.* It is viſible that by virtue of ſuch a Decree the World muſt have exiſted at the ſame time with this Act of the Will of God. But ſince this Act had no beginning, neither had the World any. Let us ſuppoſe then that the Decree was conceived thus, *I will have the World to exiſt in ſuch a Moment.* But how can we ſuppoſe that, if the Duration of God is an indiviſible Point? Can this or that Moment be choſen rather than any other in ſuch a Duration? It ſeems therefore, that if the Duration of God is not ſucceſſive, the World could not have a Beginning. This Objection (g) was propoſed to Mr. *Poiret* in 1679. He returned an Anſwer (h) which no ways removes the Difficulty, and even takes away all ways of doing it; for he ſuppoſeth that it is not poſſible there ſhould be any Moments before the exiſtence of the Creatures: Nay he ſeems to ſuppoſe that the Decree of the Creation was only made at the very Moment that the Creatures exiſted. To this purpoſe let us cite his Words: (i) *Nec poterat exiſtere mundus, nec momenta ulla, ſine alio decreto, nempe eo cùm dixit Deus*, Volo mundum exiſtere; *& tunc, (ut ait Scriptura,)* dixit, & facta ſunt, *tunc exſtitit extemplo mundus: Et hoc fuit primum ejus momentum, & ante hoc nullum fuit de facto poſſibile momentum; eſtque contradicens concipere ante mundum plura* and *Fridays*. He doth not (*A*) argue very consequentially on what is related of these People; and all those who cite him (*B*) have thereby acquired no other Reputation, than that of Ignorance in the Latin Tongue, or of relying on falsified Quotations. *Gutierrius*, a Spanish Physician, laughs at what is said of the (*C*) *Zaburis*.

(a) Petrus Poiret, cogitat. rationales de Deo, anima, & malo lib. 3. cap. 16. n. 9. p. 433. edit. 1685.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 439.

(c) *'Tis to be found at page* 674. 675. *of that Book of Mr.* Poiret.

(d) *You'l find it at* pag. 678. *of the ſame Book.*

(f) *It is taken from* Boetius *who ſays* lib. 5. de conſol. Philoſ. proſ. 6. p. m. 135. *that Eternity is* interminabilis vitæ tota ſimul & perfecta poſſeſſio.

(g) *The School-Men take great Pains to make this intelligible. See among others* Caramuel *in his* Philoſophia rationalis & realis lib. 7.

(h) *It is at page* 675. & 676. *of his Book.*

(i) *It is* ibidem pag. 68[illegible].

ZANCHIUS, or ZANCHUS (*Basil*) one of the Learned Men of the XVI Century, was of *Bergamo*. He took the Habit of a regular Canon, and applied himself with extreme ardour, not only to the study of Philosophy and Theology, but also to Philosophical Learning. The Works we have of his (*Y*) are Evidences of his Erudition. He acquired such an extensive Knowledge, that he was thought worthy to be Keeper of the *Vatican* Library. Which Post he discharged with the utmost Reputation, and the satisfaction of the Learned. He died very piously * at *Rome* in the Year 1560. This is what I have Extracted from *Ghilini*'s *Teatro*. I am sorry that I cannot find in it the Circumstances of a Particular which I have read elsewhere, I mean that *Zanchius* labouring under a cruel

plura momenta ex quibus unum eligatur ad existentiam primi mundi, cæteris partim sine mundo prætermissis: nam momentum est modus creaturæ qua existentis. For my part, I offer a quite different Supposition, and assure my self that it will solve the difficulty. I suppose that amongst the possible Beings which God knew (*a*), before he made the Decrees of the Creation, we ought to place a successive duration without Beginning or End; and whose Parts are as distinct from one another, as those of the possible extension which God likewise knew before his Decrees, to be Infinite, according to all the Three Dimensions. He left in the state of possible things, part of this Infinite Duration, and made Decrees for the existence of the other. He chose such a Moment as he thought fit in this Ideal Duration for the first which should exist, and fixed to it the Act by which he decreed the Creation of the World. Which is the Reason why the Eternity of that Act doth not prove that of the World. Thus we see again that the indivisibility of the real Duration of God, doth not prove that the World did not begin. We have also in this Ideal or Possible Duration, the true measure of Time. Others vainly look for it, in the motion of the Heavens. Others yet more whimsically assert, that Time is an *Ens rationis*, a manner of conceiving things, and that without Motion, or Humane Thought, there would be no such thing as Time. A gross Absurdity: for tho all created Spirits should perish, tho' all Bodies should cease to move, there would be a successive regulated duration in the World, which would answer the possible Duration known to God, and which he would go by, to preserve every thing more or less, and for so many Years. An Extension which remains at rest, requires no less to be created every moment of its duration, than an Extension which moves. The conservation of Creatures is always a continual Creation, whether they move or continue in the same situation. The true measure of the absolute quantity of things, either with respect to Extention or Time, is only to be found in the Ideas of God. Man knows nothing of it; he is only acquainted with relative Magnitude or Littleness. The same space of Time appears to him short or long, according as He diverts himself or is tired. The very Hour which seems short to one, appears long to another.

(*A*) *He doth not argue very consequentially.*] For if it be once granted that the *Zaburis* see dead Bodies and Treasures, there is no reason to pretend that they don't see Veins of Water, and Gold and Silver Mines. Why then doth *del Rio* grant the one, and deny the other? For he denies it, when he says that they know by the Vapours and Herbs, what lies hidden in a certain place of the Earth. A Knowledge acquired by this sort of Observation, can by no means be termed a Sight. And to argue consequentially on this head, he ought to deny the Facts, or explain them all by the same Hypothesis; for if the Devil is the cause of the two last, he may very well be so of the two former.

(*B*) *Acquired no other Reputation.*] One of those who wrote concerning the Wand of *James Aymar*, alledges (*b*) *Martin del Rio*, as an Author who on the Subject of the *Zaburis*, advanced no higher than natural Causes. But this is apparently false, since of the four Operations of these People, he ascribes two to the Devil. See what that Author makes him say: Del Rio *relates that there are certain Men in* Spain, *commonly called* Zahuris, *by reason of their sharp sight. He saith that he saw one of them at* Madrid *in* 1575, *and that those* Zahuris *were reputed to see through the thick surface of the Earth, Springs of Water, Treasures, and metallick Mines; and tho' these effects seemed very surprizing, he informs us that he explain'd them naturally, and that several Philosophers referred them to natural Causes.* 1. He doth not say that those People (*c*) are called *Zaburis* from their sharp sight. 2. This Author suppresses the sight of dead Bodies, which is not less mention'd than the others. 3. *Del Rio* doth not say that he naturally explained those three Effects; he saith, that with respect to the two first, he persists in the natural Explanation which he had given elsewhere (*d*); but he attributes the other to the Devil.

(*C*) Gutierrius—— *laughs at what is said of the* Zahuris.] He calls them *Zabories*, and so much the more blames the popular Credulity in this respect, because they suppose these People to be Born on *Good-friday*, and that they enjoy this miraculous Privilege by virtue of their Birthday. (*e*) *Ex magis isti damnandi, quia ex superstitiosa hominum opinione admittantur putantes tali prærogativa hos impostores donari, quia nati fuerint die illa sacra, humano generi semper fausta ac felici, in qua celebratur apud Catholicos memoria Passionis Domini* JESU-*Christi, feria inquam sexta Judæorum perfidia crucifixi, & quemadmodum tunc terra commota atque monumentis apertis latitantia, ac sepulta corpora apparuerunt hominibus illa die, sic altera in qua recolitur felix illa memoria si natalis alicui hominum fuerit, illam virtutem videndi potentiæ tribuit, aut donat quæ ad interanea terrarum pertingere possit: Vide quam futile ac irreligiosum commentum.*

(*Y*) *The Works we have of his are Witnesses of his Erudition*] *Ghilini* represents him to have throughly studied the Latin Tongue, and acquired as large a stock of Fame thereby, as the most excellent Professors of that Language. (*f*) *S'affaticò molto nell' acquisto della lingua Latina, dalla quale ne conseguì la maggior gloria, che dar si possi al più esquisito professore di così necessaria favella.* He perfected, adds he, *Marius Galezinus*'s Dictionary. I believe he should have said that of *Marius Nizolius*. (*g*) *Assaissimo li devono tutti i studiosi, e devono anco in gran parte riconoscere dal suo infaticabile intelletto la perfezione del fruttuoso Dizionario de Mario Galesino, il quale fu aumentato, e ridotto al termine, che hoggidì si vede; che hà per titolo* Verborum latinorum ex variis auctoribus lib. 1. *Vanno anco attorno con molta commendazione del suo nome queste altre opere.* Dictionarium Poeticum, & Epitheta veterum Poetarum: de horto sophiæ libri duo carmine conscripti: Adnotationes in divinos libros: Quæstiones in libros Regum, & Paralipomenon: Poematum libri octo. To which add *Giraldus*'s words: *Est* el Perſecution (Z) and Oppreſſion, miſerably ended his days. He was related to || *Zanchius*, whom I ſhall next mention, and had two Brothers Regular Canons as well as himſelf †.

---

* *Taken from Ghilini, Teatro parte 1. pag. 26 & 27.*

(*a*) *This word ought to be understood according to our way of apprehending things, or what is call'd in the Schools, Priority of Nature, signum rationis.*

(*b*) *See the* Mercure Galant *for the Month of* February 1693. pag. 135.

(*c*) Norunt Hispaniæ genus hominum quod vocant ZAHURIS, nos *Lynceos* possumus nuncupare. *Mart. del Rio, disq. Magic. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *quæst.* 4. *p. m.* 35.

(*d*) Commentar. in Medeam Senecæ v. 231.

(*e*) Joan. Lazarus Gutierrius Sepulbedensis, in Academia Pinciana Medicinæ publicus Professor, opusculo de Fascino, dubio 6. num. 16. pag. 143.

(*f*) Ghilini teatro Tom. 1, pag. 26.

(*g*) Id. ib.

ZANCHIUS (*Jerome*) one of the moſt celebrated Proteſtant Divines, was born at (A) *Alzano* in *Italy* on the 2d of *February* 1516. He entred into the Congregation of the Regular Canons of *Lateran*, at the age of 15, and continued there about 19 Years. He at firſt applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy and School-Divinity; but after having heard *Peter Martyr*'s Prælections at *Lucca*, on the Epiſtle of Saint *Paul* to the *Romans*, and the *Pſalms*, he engaged himſelf in the more profitable ſtudy of the Scripture and Fathers. Every body knows that *Peter Martyr*, who was a Canon of the ſame Congregation, communicated the Proteſtant Doctrines to ſeveral of his Brethren before he threw off the Monkiſh Habit. The Impreſſions which he made on them were ſo ſtrong, that in the ſpace of one Year, Eighteen of the Fraternity imitated him in the Abjuration of Popery. Our *Zanchius* was one of them. He left *Italy* in 1550, and ſtayed ſome time amongſt the *Griſons*, and afterwards at *Geneva*, whence he deſigned for *London*, being invited thither by *Peter Martyr*, who intended to procure him a Divinity Profeſſor's Chair in *England*. But finding himſelf intreated by the Scholarchs of *Straſburg*, to fill the vacant Place of the deceaſed *Gaſpar Hedion*, Divinity Profeſſor there, he accepted that Employ in 1553, and exerciſed it almoſt Eleven Years, reading now and then ſome Lectures on *Ariſtotle*. The Univerſity exacted of him the Signing of the *Augſburg* Confeſſion, but did not obtain it without ſome Limitations which the Scholarchs agreed to. He was admitted one of the Canons of St. *Thomas* in 1555. He loved (B) Peace, and hated Theological Civil Wars, which nevertheleſs he could not avoid. He was accuſed of Error, he defended himſelf, and this Affair was carried on ſo warmly, that it was reduced to the terms of his voluntarily retiring, or the Scholarchs diſmiſſing him. He did not find his Account in this alternative; wherefore he ſtirred very much to maintain his Poſt. A thouſand Expedients were ſought after, and at laſt that of obliging him to ſign a (C) Formulary; which he did with ſome Reſtrictions: but that did not prevent the triumphing of his Adverſaries, nor hinder their ſpreading

(a) *Eſt & Petrus Zanchus Bergamas, qui mutato vitæ inſtituto a Sodalibus* Baſilius *vocitatus eſt: vivit adhuc, a prima ejus adoleſcentia mihi cognitus Romæ in ſtudiis bonarum literarum verſatus, nec minus in ſacris bene eruditus: plurima ad hanc diem tum ſoluta oratione, tum pedeſtri & carmine perſcripſit, inter quæ Romæ publicata in manus peritorum vagantur duo libri verſu heroico elaborati ad Petr. Bembum Card. qui inſcribuntur* Hortus Sophiæ, *& præterea alia ſimul impreſſa: extat & laborioſum opus,* Sylva vocabulorum *ex optimis auctoribus linguæ Latinæ, item Nizolii ex Cicerone Paralipomena.*

(Z) Zanchius——*labouring under a cruel Perſecution and Oppreſſion, miſerably ended his days.*] *Paul Manutius* deplores his Deſtiny in a Letter to *Gambara* an intimate Friend of the deceaſed. *Baſilii Zanchi*, ſaith he (b), *poetæ ſummi, hominiſque non vulgariter eruditi, miſerabilis & indigniſſimus interitus hilaritatem mihi prorſus omnem eripuit. quem enim donare ſummis præmiis ob excellentem virtutem; decorare honoribus ob ſingularem integritatem, atque innocentiam æquum fuit; eum tam ignominioſe vexatum, tam acerbè, tam crudeliter extinctum, quis non ferat iniquiſſimè? equidem, ut audivi, etiam dolore tuo vehementer dolui. nam & vixiſtis una ſemper conjunctiſſimè, alter alteri egregiè carus.* What follows in this Epiſtle of *Manutius*, is to be found (c) above; to which I refer you, that you may ſee the Elogies which he beſtows on our *Baſil*'s Verſes.

(A) *Born at* Alzano *in* Italy] The difference which Mr. *Teiſſier* (d) has diſcovered betwixt *Melchior Adam* and *Thuanus*, is really no difference. The former, ſaith he, writes that *Zanchius* was a Native of *Alzano*, but *Thuanus* and *Verheiden* ſay he was born at *Bergamo*. I own that theſe two laſt Authors give him the Epithet of *Bergomas*; but ſince it is not leſs proper to thoſe born in the *Bergamaſque*, than to thoſe that are born in the City of *Bergamo*, it is by no means juſt to impute to *Thuanus* and *Verheiden* the limited ſenſe that is aſcribed to them. We may very well ſuppoſe that they deſign'd to ſay in general, that *Zanchius* was born in the Province of *Bergamo*, which being ſo, *Melchior Adam* differs from them no otherwiſe, than in expreſſing the Native place of this great Divine more particularly: (e) He calls it *Alzanum*, and ſaith that it is ſituated in the Valley of (f) *Seri*. But it is beyond diſpute, that *Alzanum*, and this Valley belong to (g) the *Bergamaſque*. Mr. *Teiſſier* is again miſtaken when he ſays that *Alzano is a little Town four Leagues diſtant from* Venice. If inſtead of four Leagues he had put forty, he needed not have feared ſaying too much. But *Melchior Adam* deceived him: he had read ſomewhere that our *Jerom*'s Father having received the News of his Father's death, quitted his Studies of the Civil-Law, and married. The care which he was obliged to take of his Siſters, ſuggeſted to him that he ſhould do much better to apply himſelf to his domeſtick Affairs, than to follow the Barr; upon which he left the City, and removed to *Alzano* four Miles (h) diſtant; which he did (i) like a good Husband, that is, as I think, to ſpend leſs. This is what *Melchior Adam* found in ſome (k) Book. Upon which he falls to conjecturing, but is not happy in it; he ſays in a (l) Marginal Note, that in his Opinion the City which *Zanchius*'s Father left was *Venice*. If he had been a good Geographer, he had never hit on that Thought, but would have known that the diſtance betwixt *Alzano* and *Venice* is above forty Leagues. His Gueſs is turn'd into a real Affirmation by Mr. *Teiſſier*, who beſides tranſlates *quartum lapidem*, by four Leagues, tho' in the Latin ſtyle they contain only four thouſand paces. I take *Bergamo* to be the City, from whence *Zanchius*'s Father departed, on account of good Husbandry. *Quenſtedt* hath committed two groſs faults: he ſays page (m) 276, that *Jerome Zanchius* was born at *Alzano* in the Valley of *Seri*, four Miles from *Venice*; and in pag. 302, he makes him a Native of the City of *Bergamo*.

(B) Zanchius *loved peace.*] He was according to *Melchior Adam*, (n) *litium fugitans, concordiæ amans.*——(o) *Modeſtiæ ſingularis, pacis Eccleſiarum ſtudioſiſſimus.* (p) Others ſay that very few ſurpaſſed him in Learning, Piety, and Modeſty. See the Remarks in which I examin the Narrative of *Thuanus* and *Moreri*.

(C) *Obliged him to ſign a Formulary, which he did with ſome reſtrictions.*] We ought to know that there happened ſome Broils betwixt him and *John* *Marbachius*

|| Hieron. Zanchius epiſt. [illegible]

(a) Lilius Gregor. Gyrald. de poetis ſuor. temporum dial 2. pag. 569. Tom. 2. oper. edit. 1696.

(b) Paulus Manutius epiſt. 28. lib. 4. pag. m. 226.

(c) *In the Remark* B *of the Article* Gambara.

(d) Teiſſier addit. aux eloges Tom. 2. pag. 160.

(e) Melch. Adam. in vit. Theol. exter. pag. 148.

(f) In valle Seriana, Id. ib.

(g) *See* Leander Alberti deſcript. Ital. pag. m. 638.

(h) Ad quartum inde diſtans lapidem. Melchior Adam. ibid.

(i) Quod rebus ſuis conſultius fore judicaret. Id. ibid.

(k) *He might have found it in the 2d Book of* Zanchius's *Letters* pag. 444.

(l) Id. ib.

(m) *Of his Book* de patriis illuſtrium virorum.

(n) Idem pag. 142.

(o) Idem. pag. [illegible]

(p) Sanderſon de obligat. conſcient. prælect. 2. apud Pope Blount. cenſ. Author. pag. 541.

ing the News of their Victory every where. He deſigned to retrieve himſelf, and new Propoſals of Accommodation were begun, when a favourable Opportunity afforded him a handſome Pretext to extricate himſelf out of this Labyrinth. The Church of *Chiavenna*, in the *Griſons* Country, invited him to be their Miniſter, and he accepted that Vocation. He ſurrendred his Canonſhip, deſired leave to depart, and retir'd from *Straſburg* in *November* 1563. From which time to the Year 1568, he very well ſerved the Church of *Chiavenna*, and met with ſome Croſſes * there alſo. He was offer'd a Divinity Profeſſor's Chair at *Heidelberg*, which he accepted, and began the exerciſe of that Function in *February* 1568. He was alſo promoted to the Degree of Doctor the ſame Year, in the preſence of *Frederick* III. Elector *Palatin*: At whoſe ſollicitation he wrote a large Book againſt the Antitrinitarians; and after the death of that Prince, refuſed the Invitations of the Univerſity of *Leyden*, and the Church of *Antwerp*, chuſing rather to ſtay at the College of *Neuſtad*, where *John Caſimir*, Count *Palatin* got together the Profeſſors, whom the new Elector, a great favourer of Lutheraniſm, had obliged to leave *Heidelberg*. Upon the death of this Elector, the Adminiſtration of the *Palatinate* fell into the hands of the ſame *John Caſimir*, who re-inſtated the Profeſſors in their former Poſts; but *Zanchius*, by reaſon of his great Age, was declared *Emeritus*. He died at *Heidelberg* on the 19th of *November* 1590. He loſt his Sight ſome time before his death †. It doth not appear by *Melchior Adam*'s Life of him, that he was ever Married; but according to *Thuanus*, he left a numerous (*D*) Iſſue. He compoſed ſeveral Works, which

* [illegible] ſe quidem ſed non [illegible] *[illegible]*, Melch. Adam in vit. Theol. exter. pag. 151.

† Taken from Melchior Adam in vitis Theolog. exterorum. pag. 143. & ſeq.

Marbachius, Miniſter, and Divinity Profeſſor at *Straſburg*. They differed on the Doctrine of Predeſtination, and its dependencies; but the Fire lay hid under the Aſhes till 1561. when *Zanchius* engaged the Authority of the Magiſtrates to ſuppreſs a Book of *Telemannus Heſhuſius*, which had been re-printed at *Straſburg*, and *Magdeburg* was expreſſed in the Title as the place of the Impreſſion. This Book treated of the Real Preſence *in, cum, ſub pane*, and contained a Scandalous Preface againſt *Frederick* III Elector Palatin, *Melancthon*, and ſeveral other excellent Divines. The Author of this Preface accuſed all thoſe of Hereſy and Atheiſm, who did not approve his Opinion concerning the Reality and Oral Manducation. *Zanchius* occaſioned the ſuppreſſion of this Book, not on account of its Doctrine, which he left to the judgment of the Church, but for the Calumnies of the Preface. This diſpleaſed *Marbachius* and the other zealous Aſſerters of Lutheraniſm, and put them upon trying all ways to remove *Zanchius*. To this purpoſe they examined all his Lectures and the Sheets he had dictated, and when they had extracted whatever they could, they accuſed him of Heterodox Notions, with regard to Predeſtination and Perſeverance, &c. The Diſpute was vigorouſly debated; *Zanchius* conſulted the Divines of ſeveral places of *Germany*, and offered a verbal Conference with his Enemies. But this Propoſal was rejected, and they in the mean time (*a*) declaimed againſt him before the People with great animoſity. At laſt, the Affair came to Arbitration; and the following Perſons were prevailed on to come to *Straſburg*: From *Tubingen*, *James Andreas*; from *Deux Ponts ken*) *Cuman Flinſbach*; and from *Baſil*, *Simon Sulcerus* and *Ulrick Coccius*; the Arbitrators declar'd that there was no Hereſy in *Zanchius*'s Opinions; but drew up Articles which he ſigned in this manner, on the 28th of *March* in 1563. *Hanc doctrinæ formulam ut piam agnoſco, ita etiam recipio* (*b*): That is, *as far as I acknowledge the Formulary of Doctrine to be pious, ſo I receive it*; or, *I acknowledge that this Formulary of Doctrine is pious, and ſo I receive it.* The Latin words will bear both ſenſes, and I would not anſwer for *Zanchius* that he was not ſenſible of this ambiguity, and that he did not pretend to take advantage of it. However it be, his Adverſaries were yet more ſubtil; they (*c*) ſo dextrouſly ſlipt ſome ambiguities into the Articles of the Formulary, that they could explain every thing to their advantage: and accordingly they did not fail to interpret every thing to his Prejudice; which revived the Quarrel, but he quitted the Diſpute and went to the *Griſons*. Thus *Henry Altingius* relates the thing. But we may add to his Narrative ſome particulars which he omits, and *Melchior Adam* furniſhes us with. The Accuſations charged againſt *Zanchius* turn'd not only on the Doctrines of Predeſtination, and perſeverance; but alſo on the Euchariſt, Ubiquity, Images, Antichriſt, and the end of this World. The Chapter of St. *Thomas*, of which he was a Canon, tried ſeveral ways of accommodation; and the Diſpute was laid before the council of Thirteen. He perſonally conſulted the Churches and Univerſities of *Germany*, and Publiſhed the Deciſions which he obtained from them. He deliberated ſometime about the ſigning the Formulary drawn up by the four Arbitrators, and excuſed himſelf out of fear of ſcandalizing the Godly, and confirming Erring Men in their Opinions. At laſt being reſolved to ſubſcribe it (*d*) for peace ſake, and out of a Belief that it would be no prejudice to his Opinion, he armed himſelf with a precaution in the manner of Signing it, and meaſured the Artifices of his Enemies by his own Candor. This *Melchior Adam* tells us; but for my part, I confeſs I cannot diſcover this Candor; for *Zanchius*'s Subſcription is ſo ambiguous, and liable to Shifts and Subterfuges, that it doth not appear he couched it in that manner, without a further Proſpect. Is it not owned that he choſe this Phraſe rather than another out of precaution? But if there was an Artifice herein, it did not ſerve its Author at all, nor contribute to the work of Peace. (*f*) *Sed ne ſic quidem* bene coiit gratia: *cùm ſtatim poſt adverſarii de victoria jactitare, triumphare, & laureatas in Saxoniam, atque alias regiones literas miſere.*

I had written thus far without ever thinking of conſulting *Hoſpinian*'s Sacramental Hiſtory; which I afterwards did, and found a long relation of this Diſpute. I there ſaw (*g*) that one of *Zanchius*'s good Friends broke with him, and took advantage of a Letter which he had communicated to him. I ſaw that (*h*) *Marbachius* and his Adherents forbore ſpeaking to him, and ſo much as pulling off their Hats after the diſgrace of *Heſhuſius*'s Book. But what ſerves moſt to prove the certainty of my Conjecture, is that I there find that *Zanchius* in his Mind put a very particular ſenſe upon the expreſſions of his Subſcription. His Mental Reſervation was: (*i*) *Hanc doctrinæ formulam recipio quatenus illam piam eſſe judico.* His Adverſaries ſent Copies of what he had ſigned to all parts, without ever (*k*) mentioning the terms of his Subſcription; by reaſon they feared that their triumph would not appear very conſiderable to thoſe who were capable of examining the equivocal words of *Zanchius*.

If we believe a Letter (*l*) which he wrote to *David Chaillet*, dated the 1. of *November* 1563, they made uſe of many Frauds. This Letter deſerves to be read; he therein makes his Apology, and endeavours to prove that he did nothing againſt his Conſcience.

(*D*) *But according to* Thuanus, *he left a numerous Iſſue.*] His Words are: (*m*) *Scripſit multa*--- *quorum*

(*d*) Perſuaſus tamen concordiæ cauſa, cùm ſine præjudicio doctrinæ ſuæ id factum iri intelligeret, his verbis, ut ſibi caveret, ſubſcripſit: Hanc doctrinæ formulam, ut piam agnoſco; ita etiam recipio; & ſubſcripſit quidem aliorum calliditatem ſua ſimplicitate menſus. Melch. Adam ubi ſupra pag. 150.

(*e*) *See the foregoing quotation.*

(*f*) Id. ib.

(*g*) Hoſpin. Hiſtor. ſacrament. parte 2. pag. 536.

(*h*) Id. ib.

(*i*) Id. ib. pag. 543. (*k*) Id. ib. (*l*) *It is in the* 2. *Book of* Zanchius's *Letters*, pag. 81. & ſeq. (*m*) Thuan. lib. 9. pag. 379.

which doubtless are as good as those of the more modern Divines, and yet nobody reads them: They are sold almost for nothing in the Auctions of Libraries; and the Grocers more eagerly catch them up for their despicable price, than the Students in Divinity, or even the Ministers themselves. The Fate of other Divines, who shone so brightly in the XVIth Century, is very like this. We may justly censure (E) *Thuanus* in some particulars, and Mr. (F) *Moreri* also; for the Proofs which they bring of *Zanchius*'s Moderation, are not good, tho' it is really certain, that few Ministers have been so moderate. He did not believe the Pope to be Antichrist, and † highly condemned the prepossession which he thought he observed in the Writings of several Protestants. His Conference with the Pope's *Nuncio* in 1561 is very curious. *Pallavicini* speaks of it at large, in the 10th Chapter of the 15th Book of his History of the Council of *Trent*. To conclude, there are several Authors named ZANCHIUS, as appears by the *Scene* ‖ of the Writers of the *Bergamasque* published in 1664. Amongst others there was one *Jerome* ZANCHIUS, who published some Law-Books. He was second β Cousin to our Divine. It will not be an unacceptable thing to the Reader, if I say here that our *Jerome* had a Servant named *Frederick Sylburgius*, who became a very Learned Man. He kept him γ four Years, and then recommended him to *Lælius Zanchius*, that he might procure him δ a place at *Padua*. His Letter of recommendation is dated the 2d of *April* 1565.

† See the Quotation out of Father *Labbe* in the Remark *e*.

‖ *Donato Calvi* is the Author of it: It's intitl'd *Scena letteraria de scrittori Bergamaschi*.

β *Zanch. epistol. lib.* 2. p. 414.

γ *Id. ib.*

δ *Id. ib.* pag. 415.

ZENOB-

---

quorum partem, dum vixit, in lucem dedit, partem filii, quos PLURES *reliquit, post mortem ejus publicarunt.* This is somewhat Hyperbolical; for the Epistle Dedicatory to *Zanchius*'s Letters signed by his Heirs, mentions the Names of only two Sons, and that of his Son-in-law. Here follows what I find concerning his Marriages. His first Wife was a Daughter of *Celius secundus Curio*, by whom he had a Daughter who did not live long. He afterwards married the Sister of a Gentleman named *Laurence Lumage*: the two Twins of which she was delivered in the Year of her Nuptials died soon after. The Daughter who came into the World the following Year died at three Years old. This is what *Jerome Zanchius* wrote (a) to *Lælius Zanchius* on the 2d of *April* 1565. He there tells him that he had then two Daughters.

(E) *We may justly censure* Thuanus.] *Peter Martyr* left *Italy* in the Year 1542, and *Zanchius* did the same in 1550. wherefore the following words of *Thuanus* are not exact: (b) *Hieronymus Zanchius* ——— *paullo post Petri Martyris* ——— *discessum ob eandem caussam Argentinam concessit.* II. They are also faulty in another particular: for *Zanchius* did not go to *Strasburg* till after having resided about (c) nine Months in the *Grisons* Country, and as long at *Geneva*. III. *Vermilio in Angliam evocato Anno* 54. *in munere successit.* This Latin may signify that *Peter Martyr* went into *England* in 1554. But that is false, he went thither in 1547. However, not to take the Expression in the strictest sense, let us grant *Thuanus* that the Year which he mentions concerns only the installation of *Zanchius*; that cannot remove the justice of my Criticism, since it is certain that *Zanchius* was installed in 1553, not in *Martyr*'s, but *Hedion*'s place. (d) *Successit ei* (Caspari Hedioni) *in professione* Hieronymus Zanchius *Italus*. (e) *Cum anno* quinquagesimo tertio, *in demortui* Casparis Hedionis *locum Theologus, qui in schola sacras literas doceret, esset sufficiendus: ab amplissimo illius Reipubl. magistratu & scholarchis decretum est, Italum quendam, Martyri non absimilem, vocandum. Itum ergo primum est a* Cœlio Secundo Curione, *cui ea cura ab Argentoratensibus demandata, ad comitem illum* Martinengum: *&, cum hic Ecclesiam Genevæ plantatam destituere nollet ad istum* Zanchium: *quem inde Argentoratum ipsi etiam Scholarchæ, missis benevolentiæ plenis literis, invitarunt.* It is indeed true, that the Letter (f) written to him by *James Sturmius*, in the Name of the Scholarchs of *Strasburg*, offers him the same Employ, and the same Salary which *Peter Martyr* had; but that doth not import that he succeeded him, properly speaking. IV. He left *Chiavenna* only to go immediately to profess Divinity at *Heidelberg*; *Thuanus* is therefore (g) to blame to assign him a Post at *Basil* betwixt his leaving *Chiavenna* and his going to the *Palatinate*. V. He is yet more mistaken when he says that he did not go to the *Palatinate* before 1577, since he went thither ten years before. VI. He should not have omitted that he went thither to teach Divinity in *Heidelberg*, and that he continued to do so in that University, till the Troubles which arose against the Calvinist Doctors, after the Death of the Elector *Frederick* III. He ought not, I say, to have directly sent him from *Basil* to *Neust* for he did not teach in this last City till after he had been a Professor eight Years at *Heidelberg*. To these six Errors in Fact, let us add one in Reason. VII. " (h) A great Moderation was observed in " his Writings, and he always discovered his sin- " cere desire to determine all the Differences occa- " sioned by Religion: FOR at the Age of Seven- " ty Years, he addressed his Confession of Faith " to *Ulysses Martinengue*, a Noble *Venetian*, Count " *de Barco*, and published it as well in his own " Name as that of his Family, for that was the " Title it bore. In this Confession he protests " that he had not absolutely, and in all particulars " renounced the Church of *Rome* and all her Do- " ctrines, but only those which are not conform to " the Writings of the Apostles, and the Doctrine " which she her self formerly taught, and which " was believed by the Primitive and Pure Church: " And that when he left the Romish Commu- " nion, it was with a design to return to that " Church, in case, that correcting her Errors, she " should reassume her antient Form: That he de- " sired with all his Heart, that this happy Change " might one day happen; for what can a pious " Man more ardently wish for, than to live to the " last of his Days in the Church, in which he had " the privilege to be regenerated by Baptism, if " the Communion held with it does not offend God? *Luther*, *Calvin* and that *James Andreas* whom *Thuanus* immediately mentions as (i) a Divine much more exasperated against the Romish Church and the Pope, would all very sincerely have signed this Confession of *Zanchius*; wherefore it is not a good Proof that *Zanchius* differed from other Ministers.

(F) *And Mr.* Moreri *also.*] I. When he saith that *Zanchius* was an *Apostate Monk* of *London*, it is not his fault, but that of his Dictionary. The Printers have put *de Londres*, (of *London*) instead of *de l'Ordre*, (*of the Order*), and I observe this to shew to what Errors they expose the Readers: For how many Readers easily believed from hence, that *Zanchius* stole out of a Monastery at *London* when he turned Protestant? II. He was not a *Hermit of St. Augustin*, as Mr. *Moreri* affirms; those so called are different from the Regular Canons. Grant that both have St. *Augustin* for the Author of their Rule; that should not prevent our observing a distinction when we speak of them. III. He had from Mr. *Teissier* (k) the pretended difference betwixt *Melchior Adam* and *Thuanus* concerning the Birth-place of *Zanchius*. IV. And the

pretended

(a) *This Letter is in the 2d Book of* Zanchius's *Letters*, pag. 414. & seq.

(b) Thuanus, Hist. lib. 99. pag. 379. ad ann. 1590.

(c) Melch. Adam ubi supra pag. 149.

(d) Melch. Adam in vit. Theol. German. pag. 242.

(e) Id. in vit. Theol. exter. pag. 149.

(f) *It is the first of the 2d. Book of* Zanchius's *Letters*.

(g) Postea Clavennæ, in Rætia, dein Basileæ usque ad annum 78 ac postremo Neapoli Nemetum docuit. Thuan. ib.

(h) … supra.

(i) An… riot co… Romanæ Ecclesiæ Pontifici nominis oppugna… tor Ja… bus An… dreas… Thuan…

(k) Se… Rema…

ZENOBIA.

ZENOBIA, one of the moſt illuſtrious Women that ever ſwayed the Scepter, pretended * to be deſcended from the *Ptolemies* and *Cleopatra's*. She Married *Odenatus* † a *Sarracen* Prince, and contributed very much to the (*A*) great Victories which he obtained over the *Perſians*, and which preſerved the Eaſt to the Romans, when after the taking of *Valerian* it was very probable that *Sapor* would have wreſted all that Country from them. She was alſo Honoured with the Title ‡ of *Auguſta*, when *Gallienus* in grateful acknowledgment of the Services of *Odenatus* made him Emperor in the Year of Chriſt 264. After the Death of her Husband ſhe ſupported her Power, and Reigned very Vigorouſly and Glorioſly. Her Sons β by Reaſon of their nonage enjoyed only the Imperial Name and Honours. She did not only preſerve the Countries ſubject to *Odenatus*, but alſo Conquered γ *Egypt*, and prepared for farther Conqueſts when the Emperor *Aurelian* declared War againſt her. She ζ loſt two Battles, and was conſtrained to ſhut up her ſelf in the City of *Palmyra*, where *Aurelian* beſieged her. She defended her ſelf very bravely; but ſeeing that in all probability the Emperor would take the City, ſhe privately retired out of it. Of which *Aurelian* being informed cauſed her to be ſo diligently purſued, that ſhe was overtaken in the Ferry in order to paſs the * *Euphrates*. This happened in the Year 272. The Emperor ſaved her Life, and after making her an Ornament of his (*B*) Triumph

* Trebellius Pollio in triginta Tyrannis, p. m. 195.
† Procopius, [illegible] Trebellius Pollio ibid. pag. [illegible] [illegible] Principes Palmyrenorum.
‡ See Tillemont, Hiſt. des Empereurs tom. 3 pag. m. 97[illegible].
* Trebell. Pollio ibid. pag. 325.

γ Zenobia [illegible] Vopiſcus in Aureliano. ζ [illegible] in Annal. [illegible]
* Palmyra built by Solomon was 2 days Journey diſtant from that River.

pretended four Miles diſtance betwixt *Venice* and that place. V. Which he ſhould have call'd *Alzano* and not *Azano*. VI. He ſays after *Thuanus* that *Zanchius* went directly to *Straſburg*. VII. And hath increaſed the Error of his pretended ſucceſſion to *Peter Martyr*; for one may well without being guilty of above one falſity ſay that *Zanchius* was called to *Straſburg* to ſupply the place which *Peter Martyr* had left void, but one cannot without redoubling the Blunder affirm that he *publickly profeſſed* Hereſy *at* Straſburg *in* Martyr's *place*. Is the publick profeſſion of a Doctrine made in another's place? VIII. He ſhould not have Copied *Thuanus* with regard to *Zanchius*'s pretended reſidence at *Baſil*. IX. Much leſs ſhould he have imputed to him the ſaying that this Miniſter taught at *Spire*. For he doth not ſay ſo, his *Neapolis Nemetum* is *Neuſtad*, a City continually mentioned (*a*) in the *Gazettes* for theſe ſeven or eight Years paſt. *Thuanus*'s Tranſlater was to blame to call it *Spire*. Mr. *Teiſſier* may then if he pleaſes allow us to diſlike the following Period of his Additions, (*b*) *Zanchius never Taught at* Baſil, *or* Spire, *as* Thuanus *believed*. X. *Heidelberg* was not the laſt place where *Zanchius* taught, as *Moreri* avers. He was declared *emeritus*, when his Collegues the Profeſſors of *Neuſtad* were re-eſtabliſhed in *Heidelberg* And if he died in the laſt mentioned City, it was by Accident; he took a journey thither (*c*) to ſee his old Friends. XI. To prove *Zanchius* more moderate than all other Proteſtants, to prove it I ſay, by the already cited Words of *Thuanus* is an illuſion. XII. To Conjecture that Father *Labbe* grounded himſelf on the ſame Words, when he ſaid that *Zanchius was the moſt ſubtil of his Communion*, is a Thought which doth not much contribute to the credit of that Jeſuit, and which appears ill grounded when we Conſult the Original. To allow no more Capacity and Subtilty to our Adverſaries than in proportion to the regard they have for us, or the Moderation with which they ſpeak of our Cauſe, is not to act on the Foot of Reaſon, but to be blinded with Prejudices. However the place where Father *Labbe* beſtows this Elogy on that Miniſter, affords us a more probable Conjecture than that of *Moreri*. This Jeſuit cites a paſſage where *Zanchius* ſpeaks very ill of the Proteſtant Writers. Whence it might more probably be inferred that this Miniſter's reſentment againſt his Brethren rather than his Modeſty towards the Church of *Rome* occaſion'd the praiſes which Father *Labbe* beſtowed on him; and perhaps it were better to ſay that Father *Labbe* had no regard to any thing but the parts of *Zanchius*, which doubtleſs were very ſubtil. But to enable the Reader to judge the better of it, I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage, which clearly diſcovers the Temper of an Author, whoſe Anger was not intermittent, but continual. (*d*) *Quid de cæteris Lutheri & Calvini Miniſtris dicam, qui dum Conciliorum, Patrum, ſcriptorum antiquorum opuſcula interdum volvunt, apertiſſimam hæreſeon ſuarum damnationem legunt: numquid non diſſimulant, numquid non tergiverſantur, numquid non argutantur? Audi domeſticum teſtem Hieronymum Zanchium omnium Sacramentariorum ſubtiliſſimum:* Legi librum (*Pſeudo Evangelici neſcio cujus*) ſed non ſine ſtomacho perlegi; cùm nimirum viderem qualiſnam ſit ſcribendi ratio, quâ in Eccleſiis ex Evangelio reformatis (*an nomine Lutheri, Calvini, ſimiliumque ſectas appellat*) permulti, ne dicam plerique omnes, utuntur: qui tamen Paſtores, qui Doctores, qui Columnæ Eccleſiæ videri volunt. Statum cauſæ ne intelligant, de induſtria ſæpenumero tenebris involvimus: quæ ſunt manifeſta, impudenter negamus: quæ falſa, ſine fronte aſſeveramus: quæ apertè impia, tamquam prima fidei principia obtrudimus: quæ orthodoxa, hæreſeos damnamus: ſcripturas ad noſtra ſomnia pro libidine torquemus: Patres jactamus, cùm nihilminùs quam illorum doctrinam ſequi velimus: Sophiſticari, calumniari, conviciari, nobis eſt familiare; modò cauſam noſtram, ſive bonam ſive malam, quo jure, quaque injuria tueamur; reliqua omnia ſuſque deque facimus. *Hæc ille τὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης, ut de Epimenide Cretenſi dixit Apoſtolus, Paulus cap. 1. Epiſtolæ ad Titum, ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής.*

(*a*) I write this in July 1697.

(*b*) Teiſſier ubi ſupra pag. 161.

(*c*) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra pag. 152.

(*d*) Philippus Labbe, diſſert. de ſcript. Eccleſiaſt. tom. 1. pag. 807. 808. *Note that he quotes none of* Zanchius's *works, which ſhews that he did not go to the fountain head, but relied upon the quotation of another Man.*

(*A*) *And contributed very much to the great Victories which he obtained.*] This is teſtified by *Aurelian* in a Letter which he wrote to the Senate. (*e*) *Audio P. C. objici quod non virile munus impleverim, Zenobiam triumphando. Ne illi qui me reprehendunt ſatis laudarent, ſi ſcirent qualis illa eſt mulier, quam prudens in conſiliis, quam conſtans in diſpoſitionibus, quam erga milites gravis, quam larga quum neceſſitas poſtulet, quam triſtis quum ſeveritas poſcat. Poſſum dicere illius eſſe quod Odenatus Perſas vicit, ac fugato Sapore Cteſiphontem uſque pervenit. Poſſum aſſerere, tanto apud Orientales & Ægyptiorum populos timori mulierem fuiſſe, ut ſe non Arabes, non Sarraceni, non Armeni commoverent.*

(*e*) Trebellius Pollio, in triginta Tyrannis, pag. 329. vol. 2. hiſt. Auguſtæ Scriptor. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1671.

(*B*) *An Ornament of his Triumph.*] Her Letter in Anſwer to that of the Emperor *Aurelian* to Summon her to ſurrender her ſelf, ſhews that ſhe deſigned to follow (*f*) the example of *Cleopatra*, in putting an end to her life rather than to live without reigning; but ſhe altered her Reſolution, and ſubmitting to neceſſity adorned *Aurelian's* Triumph. Where ſhe appeared ſo overloaded with Jewels, that tho' very ſtrong, ſhe was ſcarce able to ſupport the Weight. But at the ſame time Golden Fetters were faſtned to her Feet, and Chains of the ſame Mettle bound her Hands. (*g*) *Ducta eſt igitur per triumphum ea ſpecie ut nihil pompabilius populo Rom. videretur. Jam primum ornata gemmis ingentibus, ita ut ornamentorum onere laboraret. Fertur enim mulier fortiſſima ſæpiſſime reſtitiſſe quum diceret ſe gemmarum onera ferre non poſſe. Vincti erant præterea pedes auro, manus etiam catenis aureis: nec collo aureum vinculum deerat, quod ſcurra Perſicus præferebat.*

(*f*) Deditionem meam petis, quaſi neſcias Cleopatram reginam perire maluiſſe, quam in qualibet vivere dignitate. *Vopiſcus in Aureliano*, pag. 481.

(*g*) Trebellius Pollio ubi ſupra pag. 336.

FATHER PAGI affirms that *Zenobia* was led in Triumph in the Year 274. two Years after ſhe fell

Triumph preſented her with a Country Seat (C) near *Rome*, where ſhe quietly ſpent the remainder of her days. It is reported that upon her Evidence *Aurelian* put many Perſons to Death. She was Beautiful, Chaſt, Learned, (D) Valiant, and Temperate, tho' on ſome Political occaſions ſhe would Drink great Quantities of Wine. If to theſe excellent Qualities ſhe could but have added that of a good Mother in Law, ſhe might have been placed amongſt the greateſt Rarities; but ſhe was ſo far from having ſuch a Virtue, that ſhe was ſuſpected of having conſented to the Aſſaſſination of (E) her Husband in the Year 267. from a reſentment of the tenderneſs which he ſhewed to his Son *Herod*, whom he had by another Wife.

[illegible]

She engaged in Diſputes concerning Religion, and protected *Paulus* (F) *Samoſatenus*

fell into *Aurelian's* hands; and refutes ſeveral very Learned Chronologiſts, who have miſplaced the Year of theſe two Events. See his *Diſſertatio hypatica* towards the end.

(C) *A Country Seat where ſhe quietly ſpent.*] Let us farther cite *Trebellius Pollio*. *Huic ab Aureliano vivere conceſſum eſt. Fertur que vixiſſe cum liberis, matronæ jam more Romanæ, data ſibi poſſeſſione in Tiburti, quæ hodieque Zenobia dicitur, non longe ab Adriani palatio, atque ab eo loco cui nomen eſt Conche.*

(D) *She was Beautiful, Chaſt, Learned, Valiant, and Temperate, tho'.*] *Pollio* having ſpoken of the hunting exerciſes which enured *Odenatus* to the moſt rigid Fatigues, adds that *Zenobia* had acquired the ſame robuſt Temper, and that according to the Report of ſeveral ſhe was more Vigorous than her Husband. (a) *Non aliter etiam conjuge aſſueta, quæ multorum ſententia fortior marito fuiſſe perhibetur: mulierum omnium nobiliſſima Orientalium fœminarum, & (ut Cornelius Capitolinus aſſerit) ſpecioſiſſima.* The laſt Word would afford me a good Proof, if it were certain that this Auther made uſe of it. But the Manuſcripts vary; ſome have it *expeditiſſima*, inſtead of *ſpecioſiſſima*: Wherefore we ought not to depend upon it: Let us look for other Evidences. The following Picture repreſents her of a deep brown Complexion, but very charming withal, and as having the fineſt Teeth in the World. (b) *Fuit vultu ſubaquilo, fuſci coloris, oculis ſupra modum vigentibus, nigris, ſpiritus divini, venuſtatis incredibilis: tantus candor in dentibus, ut margaritas eam plerique putarent habere, non dentes.* (c) "Her "Chaſtity was ſo extraordinary, that ſhe made "uſe of the Liberty, which Marriage allowed her, "no farther than was neceſſary for the procrea- "tion of Children. (d) *Cujus ea caſtitas fuiſſe dicitur, ut ne virum ſuum quidem ſciret, niſi tentatis conceptionibus. Nam quum ſemel concubuiſſet, expectatis menſtruis continebat ſe, ſi prægnans eſſet; ſin minus, iterum poteſtatem quærendis liberis dabat.* This is what ſome rigid Caſuiſts would impoſe upon all Married People. And thoſe who write for Polygamy apply this Morality to their pernicious deſign; for they pretend that a Man ſhould abſtain from his Wife during her impregnation, and that if he cannot contain he ought to have another which is not with Child. A Learned Commentator on *Tully's* Offices obſerves, that if the Age he lived in produced ſuch Women as *Zenobia*, there would be leſs danger in Marriage for ſtudious Men, or thoſe of a weak Conſtitution; a ſort of Men, adds he, who have Reaſon to fear either Diſhonour, continual janglings, or an immature death. His Maxims are ſomewhat ſevere, read what follows. (e) *Cum——— ſacræ literæ omnes vagas libidines deteſtentur: in ipſo etiam matrimonio hic finis ab ipſa natura deſtinatus, diligenter conſideretur, & (quantum vel naturæ imbecillitas, vel conjugii ſervitus ſinit) ſervetur ne homo infra beſtias ſeſe abjiciat: quarum pleraque non niſi certo anni tempore ad procreationem incitantur: & femellæ pleræque, concepto fœtu, marem non admittunt. Eadem etiam Zenobiæ Palmyrenorum reginæ continentia celebratur, quæ cum ſe gravidam ſenſiſſet, Odenatum maritum in thalamum ſuum non admiſit. Digna (ut quidam exclamat) quæ ſine omni dolore pareret: cum in matrimonio non voluptatem, ſed procreationem ſobolis ſpectaret. Cujuſmodi matronas ſi noſtra ætas ferret, etiam ſtudioſi homines, & non firmiſſima præditi valetudine, minore periculo uxores ducerent: quibus nunc aut infamia, aut rixæ perpetuæ aut immaturus obitus cum detrimento rei familiaris ſunt metuenda. Ridentur hæc ſcilicet a laſcivis hominibus, & in luſtris ac ganeis magis verſatis, quam in Theologia & Philoſophia: quibus nos hæc non præſcribimus. Indulgeant illi genio: ſed probus adoleſcens hominem ſe eſſe, non pecudem meminerit. Quod ſi verum eſt, quod ἀνώνυμος Ptolemæi ſcribit interpres, Ægyptios ſingulis menſibus ſemel tantum conſuetudine uxorum uſos; quo infantis concepti momentum deprehenderent: quid Chriſtianis facere par eſt propter Deum, ſummam & continentiam & abſtinentiam flagitantem?* It would be to no purpoſe to urge againſt *Zenobia*, that ſhe had (f) but very few Maids in her ſervice; for her Domeſticks were moſt Eunuchs, advanced in Years: Such Servants were much fitter to attend a warring Queen than Chamber-Maids. As for her Learning, it is ſufficient to declare that *Longinus* inſtructed her; that ſhe ſpoke the *Ægyptian* Tongue in perfection, and that ſhe underſtood the Hiſtory of *Egypt* and the Eaſtern Hiſtory ſo well, that ſhe compiled an Abridgment of it. She read the *Roman* Hiſtory in *Greek*, and underſtood *Latin*, but durſt not ſpeak it. (g) *Ipſa Latini ſermonis non uſque quaque ignara, ſed ut loqueretur pudore cohibita: loquebatur & Ægyptiace ad perfectum modum. Hiſtoriæ Alexandrinæ atque Orientalis ita perita ut eam epitomaſſe dicatur: Latinam autem Græce legerat.* I was willing to excuſe her Drinking; by urging that She put Foot to Foot and Drank Glaſs for Glaſs with her Generals and Strangers, only to endear them to her, or bring them over to her ſide; but I own my ſuppoſition to be very Arbitrary, and the Expreſſion of the Hiſtorian (h) ſignifies that She Drank down the *Perſians* and *Armenians*. Tho' it is true that he ſaith She was otherwiſe Sober.

(E) *Conſented to the Aſſaſſination of her Husband ——— from a reſentment.*] The Hiſtorian having repreſented the exceſſive complaiſance of *Odenatus* to *Herod* his Son by another Venter, adds that *Zenobia* being animated with a Step-mother's reſentment againſt this *Herod*, increaſed his Father's Love to him. Which ſeems to hint that *Odenatus* had no great Affection for *Zenobia*; for if he had loved her very tenderly, he would have favoured *Herod* leſs, than the Children he had by her; and not have looked upon *Zenobia's* hatred as a great motive to redouble his Tenderneſs for *Herod*. (i) *Erat circa illum* (Herodem) *Zenobia novercali animo: qua re commendabiliorem patri eum fecerat.* This Author a little farther ſpeaking of *Mæonius* the Murtherer of *Odenatus* ſays: (k) *Hic conſobrinus Odenati fuit: nec ulla re alia ductus niſi damnabili invidia, imperatorem optimum interemit, quum ei nihil aliud objiceretur præter filii Herodis delicias. Dicitur autem primum cum Zenobia conſenſiſſe, quæ ferre non poterat ut privignus ejus Herodes priore loco quam filii ejus Herennianus & Timolaus, principes dicerentur.* From hence we may judge what Perſons of no Virtue will do, ſince *Zenobia* endued with ſo many excellent qualities, ſacrificed her Husband to an Ambitious Tenderneſs for her Children, and to the Chagrin of a Mother in Law which continually preyed upon her.

(F) *She protected Paulus Samoſatenus.*] I can ſcarce believe that the Reaſon why ſhe favoured him was that which you will immediately ſee in the Words I extract from Page 1040 of the third Volume of Mr. *de Tillemont's* Hiſtory of the Emperors. "(1) S. *Athanaſius* ſaith that ſhe "was

(a) Id. ib. pag. 299.

(b) Id. ib. pag. 333.

(c) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. tom. 3. pag. m. 1041.

(d) Treb. Pollio, ubi ſupra pag. 330.

(e) Hieron. Wolfius, Commentar. in Ciceron. de Offic. lib. 1. pag. m. 72. 73.

(f) In [illegible] Eunuchos gravioris ætatis habuit, puellas [illegible] mis raris. Trebell. Pollio ubi ſupra pag. 335.

(g) Id. ib.

(h) Bibit ſæpe cum ducibus, quum eſſet alias ſobria. Bibit etiam cum Perſis atque Armeniis ut eos vinceret. Id. ib.

(i) Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

(k) Ibid.

(1) Athan. ſolit. p. 857.

ſatenus, who was Condemned by the Council of *Antioch*: And her protection prevented his being driven from his Church. From which he was not forced till after *Aurelian's* Victory over this Princeſs. See Father *Pagi's diſſertatio hypatica* towards the end.

ZENO of *Elea* one of the moſt Eminent Philoſophers of Antiquity, flouriſhed in the † 79. Olympiad. He was Diſciple of *Parmenides*, and even according to ſome Authors, his Adopted * Son. He was a (*A*) very handſome Man. And ſome Writers repreſent him beloved by his Tutor to an unlawful Degree. *Moreri* informs us that he was the (*B*) Inventor of Logick. He ſhould have acquainted us alſo that he attempted the reſtoration of his Country's Liberty when labouring under the Oppreſſion of a Tyrant, and that when the Enterpriſe was diſcovered he ſuffered the moſt cruel Torments with an extraordinary

" was a *Jew*, [by Religion without doubt] (2) " Which *Abulpharagius* after him tells us. (3) but at " leaſt ſhe followed ſeveral of the Jewiſh Opinions; " and ſhe is ſaid to have been the cauſe of *Paulus* " *Samoſatenus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, (4) of whom ſhe " was Protectreſs, (5) falling into the Hereſy of " *Artemon* [whoſe Opinions concerning JESUS " CHRIST] very nearly reſembled thoſe of the " Synagogues." For to perſuade the World that ſhe was of the Jewiſh Religion, another ſort of Evidence ought to be produced. It is eaſy to conceive that a Pagan Princeſs ſhould take Pleaſure in ſtopping the courſe of a Synodical Decree, if it be never ſo little intimated to her that the Condemned Perſon is worthy of her Protection, and that the fomenting diviſions amongſt Chriſtians tends to the Advantage of Paganiſm. Some Learned Men believe that *Paul Samoſatenus* was not Condemned by the Council of *Antioch* till after the fall of *Zenobia*; but Father *Pagi* (*a*) hath ſolidly refuted them.

(*A*) *He was a very handſome Man* ——— *repreſent him beloved by his Tutor to an unlawful Degree.*] I elſewhere mention (*b*) the reproach thrown at *Apuleius*, importing that he was handſome, and dreſſed too well for a Philoſopher. To which beſides other particulars, he offered in Anſwer that Beauty had not been always ſeparated from Perſons of his profeſſion, and he proves his aſſertion by the inſtances of *Pythagoras* and *Zeno* of *Elea*. (*c*) *Præterea, licere etiam Philoſopho eſſe vultu liberali. Pythagoram, qui primum ſeſe Philoſophum nuncuparit, eum ſui ſeculi excellentiſſima forma fuiſſe: item Zenonem illum antiquum Veliâ* (*d*) *oriundum, qui primus omnium dictionem ſolertiſſimo artificio ambifariam diſſolverit, eum quoque Zenonem longè decoriſſimum fuiſſe, ut Plato autumat.* *Plato's* Citation is right, but there are certain particulars in this paſſage of his which every Body doth not approve, and I take him to be juſtly Cenſured for it. His Words run thus: (*e*) Ἔφη δὲ δὴ ὁ Ἀντιφῶν, λέγειν τὸν Πυθόδωρον ὅτι ἀφίκοντό ποτε εἰς Παναθήναια τὰ μεγάλα Ζήνων τε ϗ Παρμενίδης. τὸν μὲν οὖν Παρμενίδην, εὖ μάλα ἤδη πρεσβύτην εἶναι, σφόδρα πολιὸν, καλὸν δὲ ϗ ἀγαθὸν τὴν ὄψιν, περὶ ἔτη μάλιστα πέντε ϗ ἑξήκοντα. Ζήνωνα δὲ, ἐγγὺς ἐτῶν τετταράκοντα τότε εἶναι, εὐμήκη δὲ, ϗ χαρίεντα ἰδεῖν. ϗ λέγεσθαι αὐτὸν παιδικὰ τοῦ Παρμενίδου γεγονέναι. *Dicebat ergo Antiphon, Pythodorum narraſſe, Zenonem atque Parmenidem veniſſe quondam ad magnorum Panathenæorum celebritatem: & Parmenidem jam ſenem, atque canum, aſpectu decorum fuiſſe, annos ferme quinque & ſexaginta ætatis agentem; Zenonem verò annos penè quadraginta natum; procero inſuper & grato corporis habitu: dicebatur autem in deliciis Parmenidi fuiſſe.* *Athenæus* blames *Plato* for having unneceſſarily blemiſhed the Manners of theſe two Philoſophers. Thoſe who deſire to ſee his own Words may be ſatisfied by the following Citation. (*f*) Παρμενίδη μὲν γὰρ ϗ ἐλθεῖν εἰς λόγους τὸν Πλάτωνος Σωκράτην, μόλις ἡ ἡλικία συγχωρεῖ· οὐχ ὡς ϗ τοιούτους εἰπεῖν ἢ ἀκοῦσαι λόγους· τὸ δὲ πάντων χαλεπώτατον, ϗ τὸ εἰπεῖν οὐδεμιᾶς κατεπειγούσης χρείας, ὅτι παιδικὰ γεγόνοι τοῦ Παρμενίδου Ζήνων ὁ πολίτης αὐτοῦ. *Parmenidem certe cum Socrate Platonis confabulatum fuiſſe ætas vix permittat, nedum hos vel illos ſermones edidiſſe ruiſſe, aut audiviſſe. Quod autem indigniſſimum eſt, nullâ compulſus neceſſitate ſcribere is non erubuit Parmenidi Zenonem civem ſuum in amoribus & deliciis fuiſſe.*

(*B*) *That he was the inventer of Logick.*] *Ariſtotle* allows him that Honour, as *Sextus Empiricus* (*g*) and *Diogenes* (*h*) *Laertius* obſerve. But his Art of reaſoning ſeems deſigned to perplex, and not to clear a Subject. And he accordingly uſed it only to diſpute againſt all comers, and ſilence his Adverſaries, whatever they aſſerted, tho' never ſo contradictory. *Plutarch* gives him this Character. (*i*) Διήκουσε δὲ Περικλῆς ϗ Ζήνωνος τοῦ Ἐλεάτου πραγματευομένου περὶ φύσιν ὡς Παρμενίδης, ἐλεγκτικὴν δέ τινα, ϗ δι᾽ ἀντιλογίας εἰς ἀπορίαν κατακλείουσαν ἐξασκήσαντος ἕξιν· ὥσπερ ϗ Τίμων ὁ Φλιάσιος εἴρηκε διὰ τούτων.

Ἀμφοτερογλώσσου τε μέγα σθένος οὐκ ἀπάτηλον
Ζήνωνος, πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος.

Audivit Pericles Zenonem quoque Eleatem, de natura, Parmenidis more, philoſophantem: qui impugnans quemlibet, uſum paraverat quemdam refutandi, qui deduceret ad perplexitatem. Quod Phliaſius Timon affirmat quoque, his verbis.

Omnia perſtringens, Zeno diſceptat, utraque
Ex parte invictus, ſed non fallax.

Theſe Verſes of *Timon* appear leſs mutilated in *Diogenes Laertius*; I Copy them from the *Amſterdam* Edition.

Ἀμφοτερογλώσσου (*k*) τε μέγα σθένος οὐκ ἀλαπαδνὸν
Ζήνωνος πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος, ἠδὲ Μελίσσου,
Πολλῶν φαντασμῶν ἐπάνω, παύρων γε μὲν ἥσσω.
Expreſſitque (*l*) *Plato vires utriuſque periti*
Linguæ Zenonis, jurgatoriſque Meliſſi,
Phantaſias qui aluit paucas, multaſque ſubegit.

Theſe Verſes repreſent a Man who overthrew ſeveral Opinions, and kept very few for himſelf. If he was not the *Palamedes* of whom *Plato* relates ſome particulars, he perfectly reſembled him. This *Palamedes* argued ſo ſubtilly that he rendred both ſides probable to his Auditors: he convinced them that the very ſame things were alike and unlike, that they were but one thing and different things, and that they reſted and Moved at the ſame time. (*m*) Τὸν οὖν Ἐλεατικὸν Παλαμήδην λέγοντα οὐκ ἴσμεν τέχνῃ, ὥστε φαίνεσθαι τοῖς ἀκούουσι τὰ αὐτὰ ὅμοια ϗ ἀνόμοια, ϗ ἓν ϗ πολλὰ, μένοντά τε αὖ ϗ φερόμενα. *Enimvero Eleatem Palamedem artificio ſuo efficere ſolitum accepimus, ut eadem audientibus ſimilia & diſſimilia, unum & multa, manentia & fluentia viderentur.* *Diogenes Laertius* (*n*) ſaith that *Zeno* was called the *Palamedes* of *Elea*, in *Plato's* Sophiſt: but Mr. *Menage* charges him with two Errors. He ſhews that this *Palamedes* is not mentioned in that work of *Plato*, but in the Dialogue entituled *Phedrus*; after which he proves by the Evidence of *Quintilian*, that this *Palamedes* was *Alcidamas* the Rhetorician. (*o*) *Quæ non de Zenone Eleate, verum de Alcidamante intelligenda ſunt, ſi fides Quintiliano. Ita enim ille libro III. inſtitut. Oratoriarum capite I. ubi de Scriptoribus Artis Rhetoricæ*: Et Hippias Eleus, & quem Palamedem Plato appellat, Alcidamas Eleates.

This

---

† Diog. Laert. lib. 9. n. 25. pag. [illegible] edit. Wetſten. [illegible]

* Id. ib. n. 25.

(2) Abulf. p. 8[illegible]

(3) Theod. hær. l. 2. c. [illegible]

(4) Ath. p. [illegible] d.

(5) Theod. [illegible]

(*a*) Pagi, diſſert. hypat. pag. 317. & ſeq.

(*b*) In the Article of Apuleius.

(*c*) Apuleius, apolog. pag. m. 275. 276.

(*d*) See Menage in Diogenem Laert. lib. 9. n. 28. where he ſhews that Velia is the ſame Town of Italy with Elea.

(*e*) Plato in Parmenides pag. m. 1110. A.

(*f*) Athenæus lib. 11. pag. [illegible] F.

(*g*) Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathematic. p. 139.

(*h*) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. n. 25.

(*i*) Plutarch. in Pericle, pag. 154. The tranſlation of theſe words may be ſeen in the Remark D△

(*k*) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra.

(*l*) Theſe Verſes were thus rendred from a Copy, in which there was Ζήνωνός τε Πλά. τον ἐπιλήπτορος instead of Ζήνωνος πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος.

(*m*) Plato in Phædro. pag. 1231.

(*n*) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra.

(*o*) Menagius in Diog. Laert. lib. 9. n. 25. pag. 403. col. 2.

ordinary Reſolution. This Action (C) is related with a Thouſand Variations,

(C) *This Action is related with a Thouſand Variations.*] The *Elean* Tyrant which he deſigned to deſtroy was *Nearchus* according to ſome, and *Diomedon* according to other Writers (*a*). *Plutarch* calls him *Demylus*, as we ſhall ſee hereafter: *Tertullian* Names him *Dionyſius*, and doubtleſs by a miſtaken (*b*) Chronology takes him for the *Syracuſian* Tyrant, which we find every Moment mentioned in Authors under the Name of *Dionyſius*. *Zeno Eleates*, ſaith he towards the end of his Apology, *conſultus à Dionyſio, quidnam Philoſophia præſtaret, cum reſpondiſſet*, contemptum mortis, *impaſſibilis flagello Tyranni objectus, ſententiam ſuam ad mortem uſque ſignabat.* Here is one Teſtimony of the Admirable Conſtancy of this Philoſoper. I believe *Tertullian* placed the Scene (*c*) of all this not at *Elea*, as he ought to have done, but at *Syracuſe*. Others lay the Scene in the Iſle of *Cyprus*, and are beſides miſtaken both in the Perſon tortured, and the Tyrant. (*d*) *Ducebatur intrepidus* (Euſebius) *temporum iniquitati inſultans, imitatus Zenonem illum veterem Stoicum qui ut mentiretur quædam laceratus diutius, avulſam ſedibus linguam ſuam cum cruento ſputamine in oculos interrogantis Cyprii Regis impegit.* *Valeſius*'s Note on this paſſage of *Marcellinus* will diſcover the Errors of this Hiſtorian, and if you conſult Mr *Menage* (*e*), you will find a very happy Conjecture concerning the occaſion of theſe miſtakes. *Zeno's* Action it ſelf is differently reported. Some ſay that being required to declare his Accomplices, he averred that all the Tyrant's Friends had a hand in the Conſpiracy, that he might ſhew him that every Body had abandoned him. And after this general Declaration he named ſome particular Perſons, and deſired to whiſper the Tyrant, who approaching the Philoſopher he fixed his Teeth ſo deep in his Ear, and kept his hold ſo faſt that nothing but pricking him could force him to let go. (*f*) Εἶτα περί τινων εἰπὼν ἔχειν τινὰ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ οὖς, καὶ δακὼν, οὐκ ἀνῆκεν ἕως ἂν ἀπεκεντήθη, ταὐτὸν Ἀριστογείτονι τῷ τυραννοκτόνῳ παθών. *Deinde cum de quibuſdam dixiſſet, quædam ſibi ad aurem loqui velle, eam mordicus apprehenſam non ante dimiſit quam ſtimulis foderetur, idem agens quod Ariſtogiton tyrannicida.* (*g*) Others ſay that he did bite off the Tyrant's Noſe. And ſome aſſure us (*h*) that he having declared his Accomplices, and called the uſurper the Plague (*i*) of his Country, he addreſſed himſelf to the ſtanders by, telling them that he was aſtoniſhed at their cowardice, and that the fear of being treated like him could oblige them to continue in ſlavery: After which biting off his Tongue he threw it into the Tyrant's Face; whereby the Citizens were ſo incenſed that they immediately ſtoned the uſurper of their Liberty. This is what *Diogenes Laertius* tells us. *Plutarch* obſerves that *Zeno* in biting off his Tongue, and throwing it in the Tyrant's Face, practiſed his Maſter's Maxim, that Diſhonour is terrible to great Men, but that none but Children, Women, or baſe Cowards are afraid of pain. (*k*) Ζήνων τοίνυν ὁ Παρμενίδου γνώριμος, ἐπιθέμενος Δημύλῳ τῷ τυράννῳ, καὶ δυστυχήσας περὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν, ἐν πυρὶ τὸν Παρμενίδου λόγον, ὥσπερ χρυσὸν ἀκήρατον καὶ δόκιμον παρέσχε· καὶ ἀπέδειξεν ἔργοις, ὅτι τὸ αἰσχρὸν ἀνδρὶ μεγάλῳ φοβερόν ἐστιν. ἀλγηδόνα δὲ, παιδὲς καὶ γύναια, καὶ γυναίων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες ἄνδρες, δεδίασι· τὴν γὰρ γλῶτταν αὐτοῦ διατραγὼν, τῷ τυράννῳ προσέπτυσεν. *Zeno Parmenidis diſcipulus, Demylo tyranno inſidiatus, re infeliciter geſta, doctrinam Parmenidis, velut aurum in igne, illæſam ac probam facto oſtendit. Scilicet turpitudinem magno viro metuendam eſſe: dolorem a pueris & mulierculis, ac viris animum muliebrem gerentibus timeri. Linguam enim ſuam dentibus amputatam, in tyrannum expuit.* (*l*) *Hermippus* ſays that *Zeno* was beaten in a Mortar.

Valerius Maximus could not fail to mention the conſtancy of this Philoſopher; but he is guilty of ſome Faults: For inſtead of aſcribing what relates to the Tyrant *Nearchus*, to *Zeno*, he beſtows it on another; and beſides ſuppoſes that *Zeno* deſigning to deliver the *Agrigentins* from the Tyranny of *Phalaris*, did and ſuffered what others relate with reſpect to the Tyrant of *Elea*. *Qui* (Zeno Eleates) *cum eſſet in diſpicienda rerum natura maximæ prudentiæ, inque excitandis ad vigorem juvenum animis promptiſſimus, præceptorum fidem exemplo virtutis ſuæ publicavit. Patriam enim egreſſus, in qua frui ſecura libertate poterat, Agrigentum miſerabili ſervitute obrutum petiit, tanta fiducia ingenii ac morum ſuorum fretus, ut ſperaverit, & tyranno & Phalaridi veſanæ mentis feritatem à ſe deripi poſſe. Poſtquam deinde apud illum plus conſuetudinem dominationis, quam conſilii ſalubritatem valere animadvertit; nobiliſſimos ejus civitatis adoleſcentes cupiditate liberandæ patriæ inflammavit. Cujus rei cum indicium ad tyrannum manaſſet, convocato in forum populo, torquere eum vario cruciatus genere cœpit: ſubinde quærens, quoſnam conſilii participes haberet: At ille nec eorum quempiam nominavit, ſed proximum quemque, ac fideliſſimum tyranno ſuſpectum reddidit: increpitanſque Agrigentinis ignaviam ac timiditatem, effecit ut ſubito mentis impulſu concitati, Phalarim lapidibus proſternerent. Senis ergo unius eculeo impoſiti, non ſupplex vox, nec miſerabilis ejulatus; ſed fortis cohortatio totius urbis animum, fortunamque mutavit* (*m*). After which he relates what follows. (*n*) *Ejuſdem nominis philoſophus, cùm à Nearcho tyranno, de cujus nece conſilium inierat, torqueretur, ſupplicii pariter atque indicandorum conſciorum gratia; doloris victor, ſed ultionis cupidus, eſſe dixit quod eum ſecreto audire admodum expediret: laxatoque eculeo, poſtquam inſidiis opportunum tempus animadvertit, aurem ejus morſu corripuit, nec ante dimiſit, quam & ipſe vita, & ille corporis parte privaretur.* *Oliverius*, who commented on *Valerius Maximus*, finds but one Fault in it: He doth not blame *Valerius Maximus* for any thing but ſaying that *Zeno* the chief of the Stoicks was put to Death for endeavouring to deſtroy a Tyrant. This Cenſure is unjuſt; and tho' it be ſaid (*o*) that *Zeno* voluntarily killed himſelf at the Age of 90 Years, it will not convict *Valerius Maximus* of any Error, ſince he doth not ſay that one of his two *Zeno's* was the head of the Stoicks. Doth not *Diogenes Laertius* (*p*) ſay that there were eight *Zeno's*? It is not then neceſſary that he, who is diſtinguiſhed from *Zeno* of *Elea*, ſhould be the founder of the *Stoicks*. *Henry Valeſius* (*q*) blames *Valerius Maximus* for making two *Zeno's* of one *Zeno* of *Elea*. One of our beſt Criticks (*r*) made the ſame obſervation, and beſides pointed out what might miſlead this Ancient Author. He obſerves that *John Vorſtius* making the ſame Critical Remark expoſed himſelf to Cenſure, by making *Nearchus* Tyrant of the *Liparitans*. *Vorſtius* grounded this Opinion on *Zeno's* being examined concerning the Arms which by his means were brought to the Iſle of *Lipara*. He conceived that this Philoſopher after having delivered the *Agrigentins* from the Tyranny of *Phalaris* retired to this Iſle, and endeavoured to free it from the Tyranny of *Nearchus*. But *Perizonius* clearly proves (*ſ*) that it was the City of *Elea* which *Zeno* attempted to free from the Tyranny of *Nearchus*. But to go on; I ſhall take the Liberty to obſerve that theſe Learned Men ſuffer the greateſt Fault of *Valerius Maximus* to eſcape unpuniſhed; that is, the bringing *Zeno* into a Plot againſt *Phalaris*: Which Chronology will by no means allow. Let us ſuppoſe that *Euſebius* is miſtaken in placing the twenty eight Years of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny betwixt the ſecond Year of the thirty firſt Olympiad, and the ſecond of the thirty eighth. And let us prefer his placing this Tyrant at the end of the fifty third Olympiad

(*a*) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, n. 26.

(*b*) Antiquior Zeno Eleates Dionyſio Tyranno centum quinquaginta annis circiter. Menag. ib. pag. 404.

(*c*) *I mean that he thought the whole matter happen'd at* Syracuſa.

(*d*) Ammian. Marcellin. l. 14. c. 9. p. 46.

(*e*) Menag. ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Diog. Laertius ubi ſupra, n. 26. pag. 565. ex Heraclide in Satyri Epitome.

(*g*) Laert. ibid. n. 27. ex Demetrio in Æquivocis.

(*h*) Id. ib. ex Antiſth. in Succeſſionibus.

(*m*) Valer. Maxim. lib. 3. cap. 3. n. 2. in extern. pag. m. 280.

(*n*) Id. ib. n. 3.

(*o*) Oliverius ſays ſo.

(*p*) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, n. 29. Jonſius de Scriptor. hiſtor. philoſ. p. 116. reckons [illegible] Zeno's.

(*q*) Ex uno Zenone Eleate duos perperam fecit. Henric. Valeſius, Notis in Amm. Marcellin. lib. 14. c. 9. p. 46.

(*r*) Ut modo duorum Fabiorum res geſtas uni cum adſignaſſe contra Pighium probavimus, ita contraria plane culpa unius Philoſophi facta, in duos ejuſdem nominis diviſit. lib. III. cap. 3. Nam quum retuliſſet, quam patientiam Zeno præſtitiſſet, &c. Jacobus Perizonius Animadv. hiſtoric. 85.

(*i*) Μετὰ τὸ μηνῦσαι τοὺς φίλους ἐρωτηθῆναι πρὸς τοῦ τυράννου εἴ τις ἄλλος εἴη· τὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν, σὺ ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἀλιτήριος. Illum quum amicos indicaſſet, rogatum à Tyranno eſſet ne alius quiſpiam, dixiſſe, Tu civitatis pernicies, Id. ibid. *This will be better underſtood, if it be read in* Seneca *at the end of this Remark.* (*k*) Plut. adverſus Colotem, circa fin. pag. 1126 Vide etiam de garrulit. p. 505. (*l*) Apud Diogenem Laertium ubi ſupra.

(*ſ*) Mr. Perizonius *cites* Cicero de nat. Deor. lib. 3. & Diogenes Laertius ciations, as I ſhall ſhew in the Remarks. I have but two Faults to (D) charge on Mr. *Moreri.* The Opinions of *Zeno Eleates*, were very near the ſame with thoſe of *Xenophanes* and *Parmenides* concerning the Unity, Incomprehenſibility, and Immutability of all things. I cannot believe that he aſſerted that there is nothing (D△) in the Univerſe, for how could he pretend that he, who maintain'd that Principle, did not exiſt? How could he, who aimed at nothing but by his Arguments † *pro* and *con* to perplex all thoſe with whom he diſputed, and confound them ſo, that they ſhould not know which way to turn themſelves, be guilty of ſuch a palpable Abſurdity? Could not he ſee that it was eaſie to confound him, by asking whether nothingneſs could Reaſon? He argued ſtrenuouſly againſt the exiſtence of Motion. Some of his Objections

† See Plutarch's words towards the end of the Remark D△

Olympiad after 16 Years uſurpation. And even let us with ſeveral Learned Men (a) ſuppoſe that *Phalaris* ſeized the ſovereign Authority in *Agrigentum* about the fifty ſecond Olympiad, and that he held it ſixteen Years according to ſome, or twenty eight according to others; it will nevertheleſs appear that he was dead before our *Zeno* was of age to undertake what *Valerius Maximus* relates of him. We have ſeen above that *Parmenides* was about 65 years old when *Zeno* was but 40. But *Parmenides* flouriſhed (b) in the 80th Olympiad: judge then whether *Zeno* could make any figure in the 69th. But to deal plainly, I find ſome perplexity in the time when *Parmenides* is ſaid to have flouriſh'd. For ſince *Pericles*, who died in the 87th Olympiad, was *Zeno*'s Diſciple, the flouriſhing time of *Zeno* ought to be placed about the 76th (c), and that of *Parmenides*, (d) his Tutor, a little higher. This is ſufficient for my purpoſe. I ſhould have examined all this more exactly, if I had Publiſhed the Article of *Phalaris*, which when going to begin, I was informed that a worthy Nephew of the moſt Illuſtrious Mr. *Boyle* had Publiſhed the Life of that Tyrant. After which I made a vain ſearch in ſeveral places, which was the cauſe that I omitted that Article; and I refer it to another time, when I may make uſe of that Author's Learning, ſince I know † no more of his Book but what is extracted out of it by the Journaliſts. However, it is to be believed that *Valerius Maximus* did not mention two *Zeno*'s, without ſome ſort of Reflection. He knew that *Nearchus* lived after *Phalaris*; ſo that being miſtaken in making the *Zeno Eleates* (e) contemporary with *Phalaris*, he could not perſuade himſelf that the ſame *Zeno* who deſigned the expulſion of *Nearchus*, was he who contrived a Plot againſt the Tyrant of *Agrigentum*. Obſerve that ſeveral Criticks will have it, that *Seneca* meant our *Zeno* of *Elea*, when he ſaid, (f) *Notus eſt ille tyrannicida, qui imperfecto opere comprehenſus, & ab Hippia tortus, ut conſcios indicaret, circumſtantes amicos tyranni nominavit, quibus quam maxime caram ſalutem ejus ſciebat. Et cum ille ſingulos, ut nominati erant, occidi juſſiſſet, interrogavit: Ecquis ſupereſſet? Tu, inquit, ſolus: neminem enim alium, cui carus eſſes, reliqui. Effecit ira, ut tyrannus tyrannicidæ manus commodaret, & præſidia ſua gladio ſuo cæderet.* But without offending *Muret* and *Juſtus Lipſius*, I am apt to think, that *Seneca* meant one of thoſe whom *Hippias* the Son of *Piſiſtratus*, cauſed to be tortured. And tho' *Seneca* relates what others aſcribe to *Zeno* of *Elea*, yet I do not believe that he had him in his Eye. It is cuſtomary for him and ſeveral other Authors to apply to ſome Perſons, what has been ſaid of others.

(D) *Two Faults to charge on Mr.* Moreri.] The firſt is his quoting *Diogenes in the* 9th BOOK *de hiſt. Græc. & de Sect. Philoſ.* When it is certain that *Diogenes* never wrote on the *Greek* Hiſtory, of the *Greek* Hiſtorians, nor is his Book intitl'd *de Sectis Philoſophorum*. But the Title of it runs thus, *de vitis, dogmatis, & apophthegmatis clarorum Philoſophorum, libri X.* His ſecond Fault is ſaying that *Diogenes ſpeaks of ſeven other* Zeno's, *whoſe lives he hath not given us.* For one of them is *Zeno* of *Citium*, the Head of the *Stoicks*, whoſe Life *Diogenes* hath written at large.

(D△) *I cannot believe that he aſſerted that there is nothing in the Univerſe.*] Wherefore I ſuſpect *Seneca*, who charges him with this Opinion. *Juſtus Lipſius* alſo diſtruſts the truth of it. (g) *Audi, quantum mali faciat nimia ſubtilitas, & quam infeſta veritati ſit. Protagoras ait, de omni re in utramque partem diſputari poſſe, ex æquo, & de hac ipſa, an omnis res in utramque partem diſputabilis ſit. Nauſiphanes ait, ex his quæ videntur eſſe, nihil magis eſſe, quam non eſſe. Parmenides ait, ex his quæ videntur, nihil eſſe in univerſum. Zeno Eleates omnia negotia de negotio dejecit, ait nihil eſſe. Circa eadem ferè Pyrrhonii verſantur, & Megarici, & Eretrici, & Academici, qui novam induxerunt ſcientiam, nihil ſcire. Hæc omnia in illum ſupervacuum ſtudiorum liberalium gregem conjice. Illi mihi non profuturam ſcientiam tradunt, hi ſpem omnis ſcientiæ eripiunt: ſatius eſt ſupervacua ſcire, quam nihil. Illi non præferunt lumen, per quod acies dirigatur ad verum: hi oculos mihi effodiunt. Si Protagoræ credo, nihil in rerum natura eſt, niſi dubium: ſi Nauſiphani, hoc unum certum eſt, nihil eſſe certi: ſi Parmenidi, nihil eſt præter unum: ſi Zenoni, ne unum quidem. Quid ergo nos ſumus? quid iſta quæ nos circumſtant, alunt, ſuſtinent? Tota rerum natura umbra eſt, aut inanis, aut fallax. Non facile dixerim, utrum magis iraſcar illis, qui nos nihil ſcire voluerunt: an illis, qui ne hoc quidem nobis reliquerunt, nihil ſcire.* I have cited thoſe words of *Seneca* ſomewhat at large, in order to diſplay all the degrees of Scepticiſm, amongſt which there is none ſo extravagant as *Zeno*'s Notion. And if he really maintained ſuch a Paradox as this, either he deſign'd it only for his own diverſion, or he did not underſtand the word *nothing* in the ſame ſenſe as others do, or elſe he talked idly. But we don't find any Tracks of Folly in the reſt of his Opinions. Wherefore we ought rather to ſolve it by taking it for a witty diverſion, or a particular Notion of the word *nothing*. We may paſs the ſame judgment on *Gorgias Leontinus*'s Book (h) in which he maintained three Aſſertions: Firſt, that there is nothing; Secondly, That if there is any Being, Man cannot comprehend it; Thirdly, That tho' Man could comprehend it, he could not expreſs it. But let us ſee *Juſtus Lipſius*'s Reflection on *Seneca:* (i) *Sententia eſt. Zeno Eleates moleſtiâ nos liberavit, & omni inquiſitione: nam ait,* Nihil *eſſe. Sed hæc mira, & eximiè fatua aut ſapiens ſententia, nec mihi nunc capienda. An ad contemptum rerum retulit, Nihili hæc (non tamen* Nihil*) eſſe? velim, & ſic laudem, non ſolum tolerem. Si aliter, & de ipſa exiſtentia; elleboro hæc egent. Ceterùm Zeno Eleates nuſquam tale, apud Laertium quidem, ubi Dogmata ejus diverſa, ſed, nec alibi commemini legiſſe. Viderit Seneca.* What *Plutarch* relates of *Zeno* will doubtleſs be objected againſt me: "*Pericles*, ſaith he, (k) did by ſnatch-"es, and by the by hear ſeveral Lectures of *Ze-"no Eleates*, who diſcourſed and treated of na-"tural Philoſophy much at the ſame rate as *Par-"menides* did; only that he had by Exerciſe and "Practice, gotten a kind of habit or knack of con-"futing any Opinion right or wrong, and of baf-"fling People by thwarting and oppoſing whatſo-"ever they ſaid, and ſo running them aground "that they did not know which way to turn "themſelves. And accordingly *Timon* the *Phlia-"ſian* hath given the account of him in this pair "of Verſes.

Zeno's *great force, who ſpoke to either part,*
Confuted all, and never fail'd in's Art.

It will be objected againſt me that a Philoſopher of this Humour, was capable of ſhifting to that degree, as to maintain that every thing is nothing. I anſwer, that it is not at all probable that ſuch a ſubtil Diſputant ſhould run into ſuch Extremities, out of which it ſeems impoſſible for him to extricate himſelf.

But

(a) Car. Boyle, apud Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ. 1696 pag. 102, 103. *In the Abſtract of* Phalaris's *Letters Printed at* Oxford *in* 1694.

(b) Chron. Euſeb.

(c) Jonſius de Script. Hiſt. Phil. pag. 116. *places him in the* 78. *Olympiad.*

(d) *In the Edition of* Diogenes Laertius, 1692. *he is placed in the* 64 *Olympiad.*

(†) *I write this in the year* 1696.

(e) *Nay, he ſuppoſes that he was very old in the time of the Plot.*

(f) Seneca de ira, lib. 2. cap. 23. pag. m 141. *See the Commentators upon it.*

(g) Seneca epiſt. 88. p. m. 361.

(h) *See* Sextus Empiricus adv. Mathemat lib. 7. cap. 2.

(i) Lipſius manuduct. ad Stoic. Philoſ. lib. 2. diſſ. 4. ſub fin. p.m.693. to.4.oper.

(k) Plut. in vita Periclis pag. 154.

ons on that head are (*E*) preſerved in *Ariſtotle*'s words; but it is very probable

But however incredible this may appear, let us ſay that the Conſequences of Pyrrhoniſm may have occaſioned the aſſertion of a great many extravagant things, and let us moderate a little the Poſitions we have read. We may alſo ſay, that perhaps *Zeno* maintained that there was nothing, only in arguing on thoſe Principles which he would deſtroy. It may be that from an Argument *ad hominem*, it was concluded that he taught it poſitively and abſolutely, tho' he advanced it only as a Doctrine which reſulted from the Hypotheſis, whoſe Falſehood he had undertaken to ſhew. We know that he argued thus: If there is a Being, 'tis indiviſible, for Unity cannot be divided; now that which is indiviſible is nothing; for that cannot be accounted among Beings which is of ſuch a nature, that being added to another, it will not encreaſe it, and being taken away from another, doth not diminiſh it: and therefore there is no Being. This Argument is mentioned (*b*) by *Ariſtotle*, who looks upon it as ridiculous. We'll omit the Greek, and ſet down rather *Fonſeca*'s Paraphraſe, from which we learn that *Zeno* thus attack'd a Doctrine of *Plato*: (*c*) *Poſterior ratio quam affert* (Ariſtoteles) *pro opinione naturalium contra Platonem, erat Zenonis Eleatæ, Parmenidis diſcipuli, qui hunc in modum argumentabatur. Ipſum unum ſeparatum ſi datur, eſt omnino indiviſibile, ergo nihil eſt; unde ſequitur: non tantum illud, non eſſe ſubſtantiam rerum, ſed neque omnino quicquam, quod ad eas pertineat. Conſequentiam verò ex eo firmam putabat Zeno, quia nihil eſſe credebat, niſi quod aliquam magnitudinem haberet: quam ob Cauſam, ſæpe utebatur hoc quaſi Principio, Quod nec additum facit majus, nec detractum reddit minus, nihil eſt. Quocirca dicebat nihil eſſe, quod omni ex parte eſſet ens, niſi Corpus, quando quidem ſolum Corpus additum ſecundum quamcunque dimenſionem facit majus. Siquidem linea addita non facit majus, niſi ſecundum longitudinem; nec Superficies, niſi ſecundum longitudinem & latitudinem: Unde ſequebatur Unitatem abſtractam, qualem ponebat Plato, itemque Punctum, nihil omnino eſſe, quia nequeant rem ullam majorem facere.*

(*E*) *Some of his Objections* againſt the exiſtence of Motion, *are preſerved.*] Read (*d*) *Ariſtotle*'s Phyſicks, where you will find *Zeno*'s four Objections examined.

THAT time is not diviſible *in infinitum.*

The Firſt is (*e*). If an Arrow, which tends towards a certain place, ſhould move, it would then move and reſt at the ſame time. But that is a Contradiction: therefore it doth not move. The Conſequence of the Major is thus proved. The Arrow is every moment in a ſpace equal to it ſelf. It is then at reſt; for a thing is not in a ſpace when it leaves it: Wherefore there is no moment in which it moves; and if it moves in ſome moments, it will be at once in motion and at reſt. To comprehend this Objection the better, two Principles which cannot be denied ought to be carefully obſerved: one is, that a Body cannot be in two places at once; the other, that two parts of Time cannot exiſt together. The firſt of theſe two Principles is ſo evident, even without making uſe of any attention, that it wants no Explanation: But as the other requires a little more reflection in order to apprehend it, and contains the whole force of the Objection, I will render it more obvious by an Inſtance. I ſay then that what ſuits *Monday* and *Tueſday* with reſpect to ſucceſſion, ſuits every portion of Time whatſoever. Since then it is impoſſible for *Monday* and *Tueſday* to exiſt together, and that of neceſſity *Monday* muſt ceaſe to be before *Tueſday* begins to be, there is no part of time whatſoever, which can co-exiſt with another; each muſt exiſt alone; each muſt begin to be, when the precedent ceaſeth to be; and each muſt ceaſe to be before the following can begin to exiſt. From whence it follows, that Time is not diviſible *in infinitum*, and that the ſucceſſive duration of things is compoſed of Moments, properly ſo called, each of which is ſimple and indiviſible, perfectly diſtinct from time paſt and future, and contains no more than the preſent time. Thoſe who deny this Conſequence, muſt be given up to their Stupidity, or their want of Sincerity, or the inſurmountable power of their prejudices. But if you once grant that the preſent time is indiviſible, you will be unavoidably obliged to admit *Zeno*'s Objection. You cannot find an inſtant when the Arrow leaves its place; for if you find one, it will be at the ſame time in that place, and yet not there. *Ariſtotle* contents himſelf with anſwering, (*f*) that *Zeno* very falſly ſuppoſes the indiviſibility of Moments.

Zeno's 2d. Objection was, That if there be Motion, what moves may paſs from one place to another; for all Motion comprehends two Extremities, *terminum a quo*, and *terminum ad quem*, the place from whence it departs, and that to which it comes. But theſe two Extremities are ſeparated by ſpaces which contain an infinity of parts, ſeeing Matter is diviſible *in infinitum*; it is then impoſſible for the Body that is moved to proceed from one Extremity to the other. The intermediate ſpace is compoſed of an infinity of Parts, through which it ought to run ſucceſſively, one after the other, without ever being able to touch that which is before at the ſame time that it touches that which is behind: ſo that to run through one Foot of Matter, I mean, to reach from the beginning of the firſt Inch to the end of the 12th Inch, an infinite time would be neceſſary; for the Spaces, which it is ſucceſſively obliged to run through, betwixt the two Extremities, being infinite in number, it is plain that they cannot be run through in leſs than an Infinity of moments; unleſs it were pretended that the Body which moves is in ſeveral places at the ſame time, which is falſe and impoſſible. To this *Ariſtotle* makes a wretched Anſwer: He ſaith that a Foot of matter being no otherwiſe infinite than in Power, may very well be run through in a finite time. I ſet down his Anſwer with the perſpicuity which the *Coimbrian* Commentaries have given it. (*g*) *Huic rationi ſatisfactum ab ſe jam ante Ariſtoteles ait, videlicet cum hoc libro docuit infinitum ſectione, quod non actu, ſed poteſtate infinitum eſt, tempore finito decurri poſſe. Enimvero cùm tempus continuum ſit, parique modo infinitum, eodem infinitatis jure, eiſdemque partium diviſionibus ſibi mutuò reſpondebunt tempus & magnitudo. Nec contra naturam talis infiniti eſt hoc modo pertranſiri.* You have here two Particulars: 1. That each part of Time is diviſible *in infinitum*; which is invincibly refuted above. 2. That a Body is only Infinite in Power. Which ſignifies that the Infinity of a Foot of Matter, conſiſts in that it may be divided without end into ſmaller parts, but not in its being actually ſuſceptible of that diviſion. To urge this, is to impoſe on the World; for if Matter is diviſible *in infinitum*, it actually contains an Infinite number of parts, and is not therefore an infinite in Power, but an Infinite which really and actually exiſts. The Continuity of parts doth not hinder their actual Diſtinction; conſequently their actual Infinity doth not depend on the Diviſion; but it ſubſiſts equally in a cloſe quantity, and in that which is called *diſcrete*. But if we ſhould grant this Infinity in Power, which by the actual diviſion of its parts, would become an actual Infinite, we ſhould not loſe any ground, for Motion hath the ſame Virtue as Diviſion. It touches one part of the Space without touching the other, and touches them all one after another; is not this actually to diſtinguiſh them? Is not this to do the very ſame thing which a Geometrician performs on a Table, when he draws Lines which mark out all the half Inches? He doth not break the Table into half Inches, but makes a diviſion which expreſſes the actual diſtinction of Parts: And I don't believe that *Ariſtotle* would have denied, that if an infinity of Lines was drawn on an Inch of Matter, it would introduce a Diviſion which ſhould reduce that to an actual Infinity, which, according to him, was only virtually ſo. But what would be done, with reſpect to the Eyes, by drawing Lines on an Inch of Matter, is certainly done

(*b*) *Ariſtot.* Metaphyſ. lib. 3. cap. 4.

(*c*) Fonſeca in Ariſtotle's *Metaphyſ.* lib. [illegible] p. m. 473, 474.

(*d*) *In the 9th Chapter of the 6th Book.*

(*e*) *I reckon it the firſt, becauſe* Ariſtotle *propoſes and anſwers it at the beginning of the Chapter; but afterwards he places it in the third rank.*

(*f*) *Vide* [illegible] Hoc vero eſt falſum, cùm tempus ex momentis individuis non conſtet, ut neque alia ulla magnitudo. *Ariſtoteles* Phyſic. lib. 6. c. 9.

(*g*) Conimbricenſes in Ariſtot. Phyſic. lib. 6. c. 9. pag. m. 147, 148.

bable that he alledged ſeveral others, which perhaps were the ſame with thoſe I ſhall (F) mention, ſome of which oppoſe the exiſtence of Extenſion, and ſeem much

tion with reſpect to the underſtanding by Moti-on (a). We conceive that a Body which moves by ſucceſſively touching the parts of ſpace, doth determine them as effectually as the Circle in the mind. But beſides, when it may be ſaid that the Diviſion of an Infinite is ended, is there not then an actual Infinite? Don't Ariſtotle and his Followers aſſert, that an Hour contains an infinity of parts? Wherefore when it is paſt, it muſt be owned that an infinity of parts did actually exiſt one after another. Is this a virtual, and not an actual Infinite? Let us then ſay that this Diſtinction is null, and that Zeno's Obſervation remains in full force. An Hour, a Year, or an Age, &c. are each a finite time. A Foot of Matter is an infinite ſpace; and therefore there is no Body in motion that can ever reach from the beginning to the end of a Foot. We ſhall ſee in the following Remark, whether this Objection may be eluded, by ſuppoſing that the Parts of a Foot of Matter are not infinite. Let us content our ſelves in this place with obſerving, that the ſubterfuge of the Infinity of the Parts of Time is null; for if there were in an Hour an infinity of Parts, it could never either begin or end. All its Parts muſt exiſt ſeparately; any two of them never do, nor can exiſt together: They muſt then be comprized between a firſt and laſt Unity, which is incompatible with an infinite number.

The 3d. Objection was the famous Argument called *Achilles*. Of which *Zeno* of *Elea* was the Inventer, if we believe (b) *Diogenes Laertius*, who tells us nevertheleſs that *Phavorinus* aſcribed it to *Parmenides*, and ſeveral others. This Objection hath the ſame Foundation with the 2d, but is more adapted to the declamatory Style. It tends to ſhew that the ſwifteſt Body in motion purſuing the ſloweſt, can never reach it. (c) *Γίνεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ διχοτομεῖν. ἐν ἀμφοτέροις γὰρ συμβαίνει μὴ ἀφικνεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸ πέρας, διαιρουμένου πως τοῦ μεγέθους. ἀλλὰ πρόσκειται ἐν τούτῳ, ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ τάχιστον τετραγῳδημένον ἐν τῷ διώκειν τὸ βραδύτερον. ὥστ᾽ ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν λύσιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτήν. Ob idem autem evenit atque in diviſione in dimidia. Nam in utraque accidit, ut ad finem non perveniatur, quoquo modo magnitudine diviſa. Sed in hac additur ne illud quidem, quod celerrimum eſt, (quod tragicè prolatum eſt) id quod tardiſſimum eſt attingere perſequendo. Quamobrem ſolutio eadem ſit neceſſe eſt.* Suppoſe a Tortoiſe to be twenty Paces from *Achilles*, and limit the ſwiftneſs of that Hero in proportion as 1 to 20. Whilſt he advances 20 Paces, the Tortoiſe advances one: She will then be before him ſtill. Whilſt he proceeds to the 21ſt Pace, ſhe will gain the 20th part of the 22d, and while he gains this 20th. part, ſhe will go through the 20th part of the 21ſt part, and ſo on. *Ariſtotle* refers us to what he ſays in anſwer to the 2d Objection: And we may refer him to our Reply. See alſo what ſhall be ſaid in the following Remark, concerning the difficulties of explaining wherein conſiſts the ſwiftneſs of Motion.

I proceed to the 4th Objection, which ſhews the contradictions of Motion. Suppoſe a Table of 4 Ells, and take alſo two Bodies of the ſame meaſure, one of (d) Wood, and the other of Stone. Let the Table be immoveably fixed, and bear the piece of Wood according to the length of two Ells Weſtward, and ſuppoſe the piece of Stone placed to the *Eaſt*, and only to touch the edge of the Table. Suppoſe it to move on the Table Eaſtward, and that in half an Hour it goes the length of two Ells; it will become contiguous to the piece of Wood. Suppoſe that they touch one another only by their edges, and in ſuch a manner, that the motion of the one towards the *Weſt* doth not hinder the motion of the other to the *Eaſt*. At the moment of their contiguity, let the piece of Wood begin to tend towards the *Eaſt*, whilſt the other continues to tend towards the *Weſt*; let them move a pace equally ſwift. In half an Hour the piece of Stone will finiſh its courſe over all the Table, and ſo it will move through a ſpace of four Ells, the whole length of the Table, in an Hour. But the piece of Wood will run through the ſame ſpace of four Ells in half an Hour, by reaſon that it touched the whole extent of the piece of Stone by the edges. And therefore it is true that two Bodies moving with an equal ſwiftneſs go thro' the ſame ſpace, one in half an Hour, and the other in an Hour: And therefore an Hour and half an Hour are equal Times; which is contradictory. *Ariſtotle* ſaith that this is a Sophiſm, ſome of thoſe Bodies is conſidered in reference to a ſpace which continues at reſt, meaning the Table, and the other with reſpect to a ſpace in motion, meaning the piece of Stone. I own he is in the right to obſerve that difference, but this doth not remove the difficulty; for a thing, which ſeems incomprehenſible, remains ſtill to be explain'd, that is, that a piece of Wood ſhould at the ſame time move 4 Ells on its *South* ſide, and but two on its inferior ſurface. But I ſhall illuſtrate this with a clearer Inſtance. Suppoſe two Books in Folio of equal length, as two Feet each. Place them on a Table one before the other; move them at the ſame time one above the other, one towards the *Eaſt*, and the other towards the *Weſt*, till the *Eaſtern* edge of the one, and the *Weſtern* edge of the other touch one another: And you will find that the edges by which they did touch one another, are now 4 Foot diſtant from each other; and yet each of the Books hath moved but the ſpace of two Feet. You may ſtrengthen the Objection by ſuppoſing whatſoever Body you pleaſe in motion, in the midſt of ſeveral others, which are moving ſeveral ways, and in various degrees of ſwiftneſs; you will find that the ſame Body will in the ſame time run through ſeveral ſorts of ſpace, double, triple, &c. to one another: Conſider well of it, and you will find that this is only explicable by Arithmetical Calculations, which are only the Idea's of our Mind; but that the thing doth not ſeem practicable in the Bodies themſelves: (e) For we ought to remember theſe three eſſential Properties of Motion. 1. It is impoſſible for a Body in motion to touch the ſame part of a Space twice ſucceſſively. 2. It never can touch two of them at once. 3. It never can touch the third before the ſecond, nor the fourth before the third, &c. He that can Phyſically reconcile theſe three Particulars with the diſtance of four Feet betwixt two (f) Bodies, which have run through no more than the ſpace of two Feet, muſt be no ignorant Perſon. Obſerve that theſe three Properties are as neceſſarily requiſite to a Body which croſſes Spaces, whoſe motion is contrary to its own, as to one which paſſes through Spaces where it meets with no reſiſtance.

(a) *The ſame difficulties may be raiſed from the ſmall Wheels of a Coach, making as much way as the great ones, with the ſame number of rotations about their Center. The ſame may be ſaid of a very ſmall Wheel and a very large one fixed to one and the ſame Axis.*

(f) *For inſtance, the two Folio Books above mention'd.*

(g) *See the* Art of Thinking, part. 4. pag. 1. ch. 1 m. 392. *and the Remark* D *of the following Article towards the End.*

(F) The ſame I ſhall mention.] I am apt to think that thoſe who would revive *Zeno's* Opinion, ought to argue thus.

OBJECTIONS againſt the exiſtence of Extenſion.

I. There is no Extenſion, therefore there is no Motion. The Conſequence is good, for what hath no Extenſion takes up no room, and what takes up no room cannot poſſibly paſs from one place to another, nor conſequently move. This is inconteſtable: The difficulty is then to prove that there is no Extenſion. *Zeno* might have argued thus. Extenſion cannot be compoſed of Mathematical Points, Atoms, or Parts diviſible *in infinitum*; therefore its Exiſtence is impoſſible. The Conſequence ſeems certain, by reaſon it is impoſſible to conceive more than theſe three Modes of compoſition in Extenſion; Wherefore the Antecedent alone remains to be proved. A few Words ſhall ſuffice as to Mathematical Points; for the moſt inapprehenſive Capacities may apprehend with the utmoſt certainty, if they conſider it with a little attention, that (g) ſeveral nullities of Extenſion joined together will never make an Extenſion. Conſult the firſt Body of Scholaſtical Philoſophy that comes to hand, and you will find the moſt convincing Reaſons in the World, ſupported by many Geomemuch ſtronger than all the Reaſons which the *Carteſians* can alledge. I mean ſome *Carteſians*, who publickly aſſert, even in Countries where the Inquiſition prevails,

---

(b) … & Achillea primus oratione argumentatus eſt; quamvis Phavorinus Parmenidem & alios complures profert. Diogen. Laert. lib. 9. n. 29. (c) *Ariſtotle*, ubi ſupra. (d) *Another matter would be as proper, Wood and Stone being here uſed only for an Inſtance.*

Curve, as there are parts in the Circumference, Geometrical Demonſtrations againſt the exiſtence of theſe (a) Points. Wherefore to ſay no more on that head, let us believe it impoſſible, or at leaſt inconceivable that Matter ſhould be compoſed of 'em. Nor is it leſs impoſſible or inconceivable that it ſhould be compoſed of the Epicurean Atoms, that is, of extended and indiviſible Corpuſcles; for every Extenſion, how ſmall ſoever, hath a right and left, an upper and lower ſide: Wherefore it is a conjunction of diſtinct Bodies; and I may deny of the right ſide what I affirm of the left, for theſe two ſides are not in the ſame place. A Body cannot be in two places at once; and conſequently every extenſion which fills ſeveral parts of Space contains ſeveral Bodies. I know beſides, and the Atomiſts do not deny it, that by reaſon two Atoms are two Beings, they are ſeparable from one another: Whence I conclude with the utmoſt certainty, that ſince the right ſide of an Atom is not the ſame Being with the left, it is ſeparable from the left; And therefore the Indiviſibility of an Atom is meerly Chimerical. Whence it follows that if there be an Extenſion, its parts are diviſible *in infinitum*. But on the other ſide if they cannot be diviſible to *in infinitum*, we ought to conclude the exiſtence of Extenſion impoſſible, or at leaſt incomprehenſible.

The diviſibility to *in infinitum* is an Hypotheſis embraced by *Ariſtotle*, and almoſt all the Profeſſors of Philoſophy, in all Univerſities for ſeveral Ages. Not that they comprehend it, or can anſwer the Objections it is liable to; but becauſe having clearly apprehended the impoſſibility of either Mathematical or Phyſical Points, they found no other ſide but this to take. Beſides, this Hypotheſis affords great Conveniencies: For when their Diſtinctions are exhauſted, without being able to render this Doctrine comprehenſible, they ſhelter themſelves in the nature of the Subject, and alledge, that our Underſtandings being limited, none ought to be ſurprized that they cannot reſolve what relates to Infinity, and that it is eſſential to ſuch a Continuity to be liable to ſuch Difficulties as are inſurmountable by Humane Nature. Obſerve that thoſe who eſpouſe the Hypotheſis of Atoms, don't do it, becauſe they comprehend that an extended Body may be ſimple, but by reaſon that they believe the two other Hypotheſes impoſſible. We may ſay the ſame thing of thoſe who admit of Mathematical Points. In general, all thoſe who argue on Extenſion, determine the choice of an Hypotheſis no otherwiſe than by virtue of the following Principle: *If there are but three ways of explaining a Subject, the truth of the third neceſſarily reſults from the falſity of the two others.* Whence, they don't believe themſelves miſtaken in the choice of the third, when they are clearly convinced that the two others are impoſſible; and accordingly the impenetrable difficulties of the third don't ſhock them in the leaſt: They comfort themſelves with the Conſideration that they may be retorted, or with a perſuaſion that after all this Hypotheſis is true, becauſe the others are not ſo. The ſubtil *Arriaga* having propoſed an inſoluble Objection, declares that he will not therefore change his Opinion; for, ſaith he, other Sects cannot reſolve it better. (b) *Video hac adhuc urgeri argumento ſupra facto, quod a nemine vidi ſolutum, ſed nec illud ſolvere præſumo: cum autem commune ſit omnibus ſententiis de continui compoſitione, non eſt cur propter illud aliquis à propria ſententia diſcedat*———— (c) *Quòd autem alia in ſententia Ariſtotelis difficilia valde ſint, & quæ a nobis ſolvi non poſſint, non cogit nos hanc ſententiam deſerere: materiæ enim difficultas eſt talis, ut ubique aliqua nobis inexplicabilia occurrant. Malo autem aperte fateri me ignorare ſolutionem aliquorum argumentorum, quam eam dare quæ forte a nemine intelligatur.*

A *Zenoniſt* might tell thoſe who chuſe one of theſe three Hypotheſes; you don't argue juſtly, you make uſe of this disjunctive Syllogiſm.

Matter is compoſed either of Mathematical Points, or Phyſical Points, or of Parts diviſible to *in ifinitum*.

But it is not compoſed of———— (d) nor of———

Therefore it is compoſed of————

The fault of your Argumentation is not in the Form, but in the Subject: You ought to lay aſide your disjunctive Syllogiſm, and make uſe of this Hypothetical one.

If Extenſion exiſted, it would be compoſed of Mathematical Points, or Phyſical Points, or of parts diviſible *in infinitum*:

But it is not compoſed of Mathematical Points, or Phyſical Points, or of Parts diviſible *in infinitum*.

Therefore it doth not exiſt.

There is no fault in this Syllogiſm; the Sophiſm *a non ſufficienti enumeratione partium* is not in the *Major*; the Conſequence is therefore neceſſary, provided the *Minor* be true. To be clearly ſatisfied of the truth of which, we need only conſider the Arguments which thoſe three Sects alledge one againſt another, and compare them with their reſpective Anſwers. When each of thoſe three Sects attacks, it triumphs; but when on the defenſive, it is utterly ſilenced and confounded in its turn. To be convinced of their weakneſs, it is enough to remember that the ſtrongeſt of them, that which beſt diſputes the ground, is the Hypotheſis of the diviſibility to *in infinitum*. The School-men have armed it from head to foot with all the Diſtinctions which their great leiſure would allow them to invent. But all this only ſerves to afford their Scholars Matter for talk upon a publick Diſputation, that their Relations may not ſuffer the Diſgrace of ſeeing them mute. And accordingly a Father or a Brother go away better ſatisfy'd, when the Scholar diſtinguiſhes betwixt a *Categorematical* Infinite, and a *Syncategorematical* one, betwixt the Parts *communicantes*, & *non communicantes*, *proportional* and *aliquot*, than if he ſhould anſwer nothing. It was therefore neceſſary for the Profeſſors to invent a ſort of Jargon; but all the pains which they have taken, will never be able to obſcure this Notion which is as clear and evident as the Sun: *An infinite number of Parts of Extenſion, each of which is extended, and diſtinct from all others, as well with reſpect to its Entity, as the room it takes up, cannot be contained in a Space One hundred Millions of times leſs than the Hundred Thouſandth part of a Barly Corn.*

DIVISIBILITY *in infinitum* would hinder all manner of Contiguity.

Another Difficulty is, That an extended Subſtance muſt neceſſarily admit of an immediate Contact of its Parts. In the Hypotheſis of a Vacuity, ſeveral Bodies would be ſeparated from all others, but ſeveral others muſt immediately touch. *Ariſtotle*, who denyed this Hypotheſis, is obliged to own that there is no part of Extenſion which doth not externally and immediately touch ſome others; which is incompatible with the diviſibility to Infinity; for if there be no Body but what contains an Infinity of Parts, it is evident, that each particular part of Extenſion is ſeparated from all others by an Infinity of Parts, and that the immediate Contact of two parts is impoſſible. But when a thing cannot have whatever is abſolutely neceſſary to its Exiſtence, it is certain that its Exiſtence is impoſſible: Wherefore the Exiſtence of Extenſion neceſſarily requiring the immediate contact of its Parts, and that immediate contact being impoſſible in an extenſion diviſible to *in infinitum*, it is evident that the Exiſtence of ſuch an Extenſion is impoſſible, and that it barely exiſts mentally. What the Mathematicians acknowledge with reſpect to Lines and Superficies, with which they demonſtrate ſo many excellent things, muſt be owned to be true of Bodies. They (*) honeſtly own that length and breadth without depth, are things which cannot poſſibly exiſt any where but in our Imagination. As much may be ſaid of the three Dimenſions. They cannot find any room any where beſides in our Minds; nor can they exiſt any other way than Notionally. Our Mind is a certain ſort of Ground, where a hundred thouſand Objects of different Colours, Forms, and Situation unite: For from an Eminence we may ſee at once a vaſt Plain covered with Houſes, Trees, and Flocks, &c. Whilſt it is ſo far from Truth, that all theſe things can poſſibly be ranged

(a) See among others a Book of Libertus Fromondus Profeſſor at Louvain, intitled Labyrinthus ſive de compoſitione continui. 'Tis a much ſtronger Book than the Anſwer Publiſh'd in 1636. by James Chevreuil (in Latin Capreolus) Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Paris to two queſtions of Cardinal de Richelieu de demonſtratione magnitudinis in puncto &c.

(b) *Arriaga diſput. 16. phyſ. ſect. 11. n. 241. p. m. 433.*

(c) *Id. ib. ſect. 12. n. 256. pag. 435.*

(d) *For Brevity ſake, I don't expreſs the rejection or the admiſſion; for according to the Laws of Logick, one may proceed here from the rejection of the two parts to the admiſſion of the third.*

(*) *Compare with this what is ſaid towards the end of the Remark I in the following Article.*

prevails, that it is impossible to know that there are any Bodies, any otherwise than by Faith: Our Senses deceive us, say they, with respect to the Qualities

ranged in this Plain, that there are not two which can find room there; each won't require an infinite Space, since it contains an Infinity of extended Bodies. There should be infinite Intervals left round each one, by reason that there is an Infinity of Bodies betwixt each part, and every (i) other part. Let no Body say that God can do every thing; for if the most strict Divines venture to say, that in a right Line of 12 Inches, he cannot render the 1. and 3. Inches immediately contiguous, I may very well say that I cannot make two parts of Extension immediately touch one another, when an Infinity of other parts separate them from one another. Let us therefore say that the Contact of the parts of Matter is only Notional; and that the extremities of several Bodies no where unite but in our Mind.

(i) The [illegible] samples.

I shall now make a quite contrary Objection. The Penetration of Dimensions is impossible, and yet it would be inevitable, if Extension should exist; therefore the existence of Extension is impossible. Put a Canon Bullet upon a Table, a Bullet I say, covered over with some liquid Colour, make it roul on the Table, and you will find it trace out a Line by its motion: You will then have two strong Proofs of the immediate Contact of the Bullet and Table. The weight of the Bullet will shew you that it immediately touches the Table; for if it did not touch it in this manner, it would remain suspended in the Air, and your Eyes will besides convince you of this Contact by the track which the Bullet hath left. But I maintain that this Contact is a Penetration of Dimensions properly so called. That part of the Bullet which touches the Table is a determinate Body, and really distinct from other parts of the Bullet which do not touch the Table. I affirm the same thing of that part of the Table touched by the Bullet. These two parts touched are each of them Infinitely divisible in length, breadth and profundity; they must therefore mutually touch one another according to their profundity, and consequently they penetrate one another. This is every day objected to the Peripateticks in their publick Disputes: And they defend themselves by a Jargon of distinctions, proper for no other use than preventing the Anger of a Scholar's Relations, if he should be silenced; and as for the farther use of these distinctions they have never served to any other purpose than to make appear it that the Objection is insoluble. Here is therefore a very singular thing: If Extension existed, it would not be possible for its parts to touch one another, and it would be impossible that they should not penetrate one another. Are not these most evident Contradictions comhended in the existence of Extension?

DIVISIBILITY *in infinitum would confirm the penetration of Dimensions.*

Add to this, that all the *ways of suspension* which destroy the reality of corporeal Qualities, overthrows the reality of extension. Since the same Bodies are sweet to some Men, and bitter to others, it may reasonably be inferred that they are neither sweet nor bitter in their own Nature, and absolutely speaking. The modern Philosophers, tho' they are no Scepticks, have so well apprehended the foundation of the *Epoche* with Relation to Sounds, Odours, Heat and Cold, Hardness and Softness, Ponderosity and Lightness Savours and Colours, &c. that they teach that all these Qualities are perceptions of our Mind, and do not exist in the Objects of our Senses. Why should we not say the same of Extension? If a Being, void of Colour, yet appears to us under a Colour determined as to its species, figure, and situation, why cannot a Being without any Extension be visible to us under an Appearance of determinate Extension, formed, and situate in a certain manner? Observe also, that the same Body appears to us little or great, round or square, according to the place from whence we see it: And certainly, a Body which seems to us very little, appears very great to a Fly. It is not therefore by their proper, real, or absolute Extension that Objects present themselves to our Mind: Whence we may conclude, that in themselves they are not extended. Would you at this day Argue thus: *Seeing certain Bodies appear sweet to one Man, sower to another, and bitter to another, &c. I dare aver that in general they are savoury, tho' I don't know the tast proper to them, absolutely and in themselves?* All the modern Philosophers would explode you. Why then would you venture to say, *tho' certain Bodies appear great to this Animal, middle-sized to that, and very little to a third, I dare aver that in general they are extensive, tho' I don't know their absolute extension?* Let us see the acknowledgment of a celebrated Dogmatist: "(b) It is clearly discernible by the Senses, that such a Body is larger than another; but we cannot certainly know what is the true and natural size of each Body; to comprehend which we need only consider, that if all Mankind had never seen those External Objects any otherwise than thro' magnifying Glasses, it is certain that they would not have formed any other Idea of Bodies and all the measures of Body, than according to the size in which they had appeared to them through those Glasses. But our Eyes themselves are Spectacles, and we don't know exactly whether they diminish or increase the Objects which we see, and whether those Artificial Glasses, which we believe diminish or increase them, don't on the contrary establish their true magnitude; wherefore we do not certainly know the absolute and natural magnitude of each Body. Neither do we know whether they appear of the same size in our Eyes as in those of other Men. For tho' two persons measure them, and agree that a certain Body for instance is but five Feet; yet what the one conceives to be a Foot, differs perhaps from what the other takes to be so; for the one conceives what his Eyes report to him, as doth the other also; but perhaps the Eyes of the one do not report the same thing which the Eyes of the other represent, because the Spectacles are differently wrought." Father *Mallebranche* (c) and Father *Lami* (d), a Benedictine Monk, will give you an excellent Account of all these particulars, which is capable of carrying my Objection to a very great Degree of strength.

THE *means of suspension make use of against the existence of Extension.*

(b) [illegible] Art de penser, 4. part, ch. 1. pag. m. 397. [illegible] *See also* Rohault Traité de Physique 1. part. chap. 2[illegible] n. 9. pag. m. 201. *where he mentions the various appearances of the same Colours: he knew it by Experience.*

(c) Mallebranche, Recherche de la verité B. 1. chap. 6. & seq.

(d) Lami, Connoissance de soimême tom. 2. p. 112. & seq.

My last Difficulty shall be grounded on the Geometrical Demonstrations so subtilly displayed, to prove that Matter is divisible *in infinitum*. I maintain they are proper for no other use than to make it appear that Extension doth not exist any where but in our Minds. In the 1. place I observe that some of these Demonstrations are made use of against those who affirm that Matter is composed of Mathematical Points. It is objected to them, that the Sides of a Square would be equal to the Diagonal, and that amongst concentrical Circles, the least would be equal to the largest. This Consequence is proved by making it appear that the right Lines which may be drawn from one of the sides of a Square to another will fill the Diagonal, and that all the right Lines which may be drawn from the Circumference of the largest Circle, will find room in the smallest Circumference. These Objections are not stronger against Bodies being composed of Points, than against their being divisible *in infinitum*; for if the parts of a certain Extension are not more numerous in the Diagonal Line, than in the sides, nor in the Circumference of the largest Circle, than in that of the smallest concentrical Circle, it is clear that the sides of the square equal the Diagonal, and that the smallest concentrical Circle equals the greatest. But all the right Lines which can be drawn from one of the sides of a Square to another, and from the Circumference of the largest Circle to the Center, are equal to each other: they ought then to be considered as *aliquot* Parts; that is as parts of a certain Magnitude and the same denomination. But it is certain that two Extensions, whereof the *aliquot* parts and of the same Denomination, as *Inch, Foot, Pace*, are in equal Number, do not exceed one another: It is then certain that the sides of the Square would be equal to the Diagonal Line, if the Diagonal Line cannot be intersected by more right Lines than the sides. The same may be said of two concentrical Circles. In the 2. place I affirm that it being very true that if Circles did exist, as many right Lines might be drawn from the Circumference, to the

GEOMETRICAL *demonstrations alledged against the existence of Extension.*

ſities of Matter, wherefore we ought to diſtruſt their Evidence concerning the three Dimenſions. It is not neceſſary, add they, that any Bodies ſhould exiſt; for God can

it follows that the exiſtence of a Circle is impoſſible. I aſſure my ſelf that it will be allowed me that every Being which cannot exiſt, without containing properties which cannot exiſt, is impoſſible: But a round Extenſion cannot exiſt, without having a Center, in which as many right Lines as there are parts in the Circumference meet; and it is certain that ſuch a Center cannot exiſt: It muſt then be owned that the Exiſtence of this round Extenſion is impoſſible. But that ſuch a Center cannot exiſt, I ſhall clearly prove. Let us ſuppoſe a round Extenſion whoſe Circumference is 4 Feet; it then contains 48 Inches, each of which contains 12 Lines; the Circumference will then contain 576 Lines; which is the Number of right Lines that may be drawn from the Circumference to the Center. Let us trace a Circle very near the Center; it may be ſo ſmall that it will not contain above 50 Lines; it cannot then give paſſage to 576 right Lines; wherefore it will be impoſſible for theſe 576 right Lines begun to be drawn from the Circumference of this round Extenſion to reach the Center: And yet if this Extention exiſts, theſe 576 Lines muſt of neceſſity reach the Center. What remains then to be ſaid, but only that this Extenſion cannot exiſt, and that accordingly all the properties of Circles and Squares, &c. are founded on Lines without breadth, which cannot exiſt otherwiſe than *ideally*? Obſerve that our Reaſon and our Eyes are equally deceived in this caſe. Our Reaſon clearly conceives; 1. That the concentrical Circle neareſt the Center is leſs than the Circle which encompaſſes it: 2. That the Diagonal of a Square is larger than the ſide. Our Eyes ſee this without, and more certainly with Compaſſes; and yet the Mathematicians teach us, that as many right Lines may be drawn from the Circumference to the Center as there are Points in the Circumference, and that from one ſide of a Square to the other as many right Lines may be drawn as there are Points in the ſide. And beſides, our Eyes ſhew us that there is not in the Circumference of the ſmall concentrical Circle any one Point, which is not a Point of a right Line, drawn from the Circumference of the great Circle, and that the Diagonal of the Square contains no one Point that is not a part of the right Line drawn from one of the ſides of the Square to another. Whence then can it proceed that this Diagonal is greater than the ſides?

This is what relates to the firſt Proof, which I ſuppoſe *Zeno* might have made uſe of to refute the exiſtence of Motion. It is founded on the impoſſibility of the exiſtence of Extenſion. We ſhall hereafter (a) ſee another Reaſon of the ſame impoſſibility. I am willing to believe that what he might have ſaid in the laſt place, by making uſe of Geometrical Demonſtrations, is eaſy to be refuted by the ſame means; but I am ſtrongly convinced that the Arguments taken from the (b) Mathematicks to prove the diviſibility *in infinitum*, prove too much: For either they prove nothing, or they prove an infinity of *aliquot* parts.

II. *Zeno's* Second Objection might have been this. (c) Granting that there is an Extenſion extraneous to our Mind, I ſhall not yet ſtick to ſay, that it is immovable. Motion is not eſſential to it, nor is it contained in its Idea, and ſeveral Bodies are ſometimes in a ſtate of reſt. It is then an Accident. But is it diſtinct from Matter? If it be diſtinct, of what muſt it be produced? Doubtleſs of nothing; and when it ceaſes to be, it will be reduced to nothing. But don't you know that nothing (d) is made out of nothing, and that nothing returns to nothing? Beſides, muſt not Motion neceſſarily be diffuſed on, and through the Body that is moved? It will be then as much extended as it, and of the ſame figure; there will therefore be two equal Extenſions in the ſame ſpace, and conſequently a Penetration of Dimenſions. But when three or four cauſes move one Body, muſt not each of them produce its motion? muſt not theſe 3 or 4 Motions penetrate together, both with the Body, and amongſt themſelves? How then can each produce its effect? A Veſſel moved by the Winds, Tide, and Rowers, deſcribes a Line which participates more or leſs of theſe three Actions, according as one of 'em is ſtronger than the others. Will you venture to affirm that inſenſible Entities penetrated amongſt themſelves, and with the whole Veſſel, will ſo far reſpect one another as not to confound themſelves? If you ſay that Motion is a Mode which is not diſtinct from Matter, you muſt then allow that whatever produceſs it, creates Matter; for without producing of Matter, it is impoſſible to produce a Being which is the ſame thing with Matter. But would it not be abſurd to aſſert, that the Wind which moves the Veſſel, produces a Veſſel? It doth not appear that theſe Objections can be any otherwiſe anſwered than by ſuppoſing with the Carteſians, that God is the ſole and immediate cauſe of Motion.

III. Another Objection is this. It is impoſſible to affirm what Motion is; for if you ſay that (e) it is to paſs from one place to another, you explain an obſcurity by a greater, *obſcurum per obſcurius*. And I immediately aſk what you underſtand by the word *place*? Do you underſtand a ſpace diſtinct from Bodies? If ſo, you will involve your ſelf in an Abyſs (†) which you will never be able to get out. Do you underſtand by it the ſituation of a Body, among ſome others which ſurround it? But in this caſe you will define Motion in ſuch a manner, that it will a Thouſand and a Thouſand times ſuit with Bodies that are at reſt. It is certain that hithertho no true Definition of Motion hath appeared. That of *Ariſtotle* is abſurd, and that of *Deſcartes* is wretched. Mr. *Rohault* after much Pains in endeavouring to find one which ſhould rectify that of *Deſcartes*, produceth a deſcription (f) which may agree with Bodies, of which we conceive very diſtinctly, that they don't move at all; wherefore Mr. *Regis* thought himſelf obliged to (g) reject it: But that which he hath given (h) is not capable of diſtinguiſhing Motion from Reſt. God, the only mover according to the Carteſians, muſt do with reſpect to a Houſe the ſame thing as with reſpect to the Air, which flies from it in a high wind: He muſt create the Air every moment with new local Relations, with reſpect to that Houſe: And he muſt alſo every moment create that Houſe with new local Relations with reſpect to that Air. And certainly according to theſe Gentlemens Principles, no Body is in reſt, if an Inch of Matter is in Motion. All then that they can ſay centers in explaining apparent Motion, that is, explaining thoſe circumſtances which make us judge that one Body moves, and another doth not. But all this is uſeleſs labour; every one is capable of judging of Appearances. The Queſtion is about explaining the very Nature of things which are out of our minds; and ſince in that reſpect Motion is inexplicable, one had as good ſay that it doth not exiſt out of our Minds.

IV. I ſhall now offer an Objection very much ſtronger than the precident. If Motion can never begin, it doth not exiſt; but it is impoſſible for it ever to begin; therefore &c. I prove the Minor thus. It is impoſſible for a Body to be in two places at once: But it could never begin to move without being in an infinity of places at once; for tho' it moved never ſo ſlowly, it wou'd touch a part diviſible *in infinitum*, and which conſequently correſponds with infinite parts of ſpace; therefore, &c. Beſides, it is certain that an infinite Number of Parts doth not contain any which is firſt; and yet a Body in motion can never touch the Second before the firſt: For Motion is a Being eſſentially ſucceſſive, of which two Parts cannot exiſt together; wherefore Motion can never begin, if Extenſion is diviſible *in infinitum*, as doubtleſs it is if it exiſts. The ſame Reaſon demonſtrates that a Body in motion, rolling in a ſloping Table, could never fall off the ſaid Table; for before it falls, it muſt of neceſſity touch the laſt part of the Table. And how will it touch that, ſince all thoſe parts which you will take for the laſt, contain an Infinity of parts, and an infinite Number hath no part which can be laſt? This Objection obliged ſome Scholaſtick Philoſophers to ſup-

poſe

(a) *In the Remark* F Δ Δ.

(b) *There are very fine ones in the* Art of thinking 4 part ch. 1. p. 392. & ſeq. *See alſo* Rohault's *Phyſicks* 1. part. c. 9.

(c) *Take this for a* dato non conceſſo.

(d) *Zeno might have ſaid it boldly, for all the Ancient Philoſophers admitted this maxim of* Lucretius, Res —— non poſſe creari De nihilo, neque item genitas ad nil revocari. Lucret. lib. 1. v. 265.

(e) Migratio de loco in locum.

(†) *See the Remark* F Δ Δ.

(f) *Motion ſays he,* Phyſ. 1. part. ch. 10. n. 3. p. m. 62. *conſiſts in the ſucceſſive application of all the External parts of a Body to the ſeveral parts of the Bodies that are immediately near it.*

(g) *See his Phyſicks, Book firſt,* 1. part. ch. 1. p. 42. *of the* 1. tom. *at Lyons*, 1691. in 12.

(h) *Motion ſays he,* ibid. pag. 43. *in the ſucceſſive application of all the external parts of a Body to ſeveral parts of the Bodies, which immediately touch it.*

can without that communicate to our Mind whatever it feels and whatever it knows, and conſequently the Proofs of the exiſtence of Matter which Reaſon affords us, are not evident enough to form a good (F Δ) Demonſtration

poſe that Nature hath intermixed Mathematical Points with the parts diviſible *in infinitum*, to the end that they may ſerve to connect them, and compoſe the extremities of Bodies. They thought by that means to anſwer alſo the Objection of the penetrative Contact of two Surfaces but this ſubterfuge; is ſo abſurd that it doth not deſerve to be refuted.

V. I ſhall ſcarce inſiſt on the impoſſibility of Circular Motion, tho' that would ſupply me with a forcible Objection. I ſay only in one Word, that if there were a Circular Motion, there would be a whole Diameter (a) at reſt, whilſt all the remainder of the Globe moves very ſwiftly. But conceive this if you can in a Continuity. The Chevalier *de Meré* remembers this Objection in his Letter (b) to Mr. *Paſcal.*

(a) To wit the Axis.

(b) I ſhall ſpeak of it in the Remark D of the following Article.

VI. To conclude, I ſay that if Motion exiſted, it would be equal in all Bodies; there would be no *Achilles*'s nor Tortoiſes; the Hound would never reach the Hare. *Zeno* Objected this; but it ſeems that he went only up on the diviſibility of a Matter *in infinitum*; and perhaps, ſome will ſay, he would have given over that inſtance, if he had been to deal with Adverſaries who would have admitted either Mathematical Points or Atomes. I anſwer, that this Inſtance equally ſtrikes at all the three Syſtems: For ſuppoſe a Road compoſed of indiviſible Particles; place the Tortoiſe one Hundred Points before *Achilles*, and if ſhe goes on, he will never reach her: *Achilles* will go but one Point every Moment, ſince if he went two he would be in two places at the ſame time. The Tortoiſe will Advance one point each Moment: Which is the leaſt ſhe can do, nothing being leſs than a Point. (c) The formal Reaſon of the ſwiftneſs of Motion is inexplicable: The moſt happy thought on this head is, that no Motion is continued, and that all thoſe Bodies which ſeem to us to move, ſtop by intervals. That which moves ten times faſter than another, reſts ten times to the others Hundred. But however well contrived this ſubterfuge appears, it is really worthleſs; it is refuted by ſeveral ſolid Reaſons which you may ſee in all the Bodies of (d) Philoſophy. I Content my ſelf with that which is drawn from the motion of a Wheel. You may make a Wheel of ſo large a Diameter that the part of the Spokes the fartheſt diſtant from the Center will move one Hundred times ſwifter than the part fixed in the Stock. And yet the Spokes remain always ſtrait: An Evident Proof that the lower part doth not reſt, whilſt the upper moves. The diviſibility *in infinitum* of the Particles of Time, rejected (e) above as viſibly falſe and contradictory, is of no force againſt this 6th Argument. You will find ſome other very ſubtil Arguments in (f) *Sextus Empiricus.*

(c) Becauſe 'tis plain that the Atomes of Epicurus are diviſible in infinitum, ſince they have the 3 dimenſions, and that no Body can deny it as to the ſpace they fill up, I have not applyed this inſtance to them.

WHAT uſe ought to be made of the foregoing diſpute.

Thus, or in a manner very near like it, we may ſuppoſe our *Zeno* of *Elea* to have oppoſed Motion. I will not aver that his Reaſons perſuaded him that nothing moved; he might be of another Opinion, tho' he believed that none could refute them, nor elude their force. If I ſhould judge of him by my ſelf, I ſhould affirm that he as well as others believed the motion of Extenſion; for tho' I find my ſelf very incapable of ſolving all the difficulties which we have juſt now ſeen, and tho' the Philoſophical Anſwers which may be made to them do not ſeem to me very ſolid, yet that doth not hinder me from following the Common Opinion. Nay, I am perſuaded that the expoſition of theſe Arguments may be of great uſe with reſpect to Religion: and I ſay here with reſpect to the difficulties of Motion, what Mr. *Nicolle* ſaid of thoſe of the diviſibility *in infinitum.* (g) *The Advantage which may be drawn from theſe ſpeculations is not merely to acquire the ſort of knowledge, which in it ſelf is very barren; but to learn to know the bounds of our underſtanding, and to force it againſt its Inclination to own that ſome things exiſt, tho' it is not capable of comprehending them: for which Reaſon it is neceſſary to fatigue the Intellect with theſe ſubtilties, in order to quaſh its preſumption, and rid it of the Aſſurance of ever oppoſing its faint light to the Truths which the Church propoſes, under pretext that it cannot comprehend them: For, ſince all the force of Humane Underſtanding is not Proof againſt the ſmalleſt Atome of Matter, and is obliged to own that it clearly ſees that it is infinitely diviſible, without being able to comprehend how it can be: Is it not to Sin viſibly againſt Reaſon, to refuſe to believe the ſtupendious effects of God's Omnipotence, which is of it ſelf incomprehenſible, becauſe our Minds cannot comprehend them?*

(F Δ) *The Proofs of the exiſtence of matter which Reaſon affords us are not evident enough to form a good Demonſtration.*] There are two Philoſophical Axioms which teach us, One (h) that Nature does nothing in vain; the other, (i) That things are done in vain by more means which might have been as commodiouſly done by fewer. By theſe two Axioms the Carteſians, whom I am ſpeaking of, may maintain that no ſuch thing as Matter exiſts; for whether it doth or doth not exiſt, God could equally communicate to us all the Thoughts which we have. To ſay that our Senſes aſſure us with the utmoſt Evidence that Matter exiſts, is not to prove it. They deceive us with reſpect to all the Corporeal qualities, not excepting (k) the magnitude, figure and motion of Bodies; and when we believe them, we are perſuaded that out of our Mind there exiſts a vaſt Number of Colours, Savours, and other Beings which we call hardneſs, fluidity, cold, heat, &c. Yet it is not true that any thing of that Nature exiſts out of our Mind. Why then ſhould we rely on our Senſes with reſpect to extenſion? It may very well be reduced to appearance in like manner with Colours. Father *Mallebranche* having diſplayed all theſe Reaſons to doubt of the exiſtence of Bodies in the World, concludes thus: (l) "It is "then abſolutely neceſſary, in order to be poſi"tively aſſured of the extraneous exiſtence of Bo"dies to know God, who hath beſtowed on us this "ſentiment, and to know that being infinitely "perfect he cannot deceive us. For if the Intel"ligence which gives us the Ideas of all things, "would, if I may ſo ſay, divert it ſelf by repre"ſenting Bodies to us as actually exiſting, tho' "there were none; it is evident that it would be "no very difficult thing." He adds, that Mr. *Deſcartes* could find no other ſteady foundation, than the Reaſon grounded upon this, that God would deceive us, if there were no Bodies; but he owns that this Reaſon can never paſs for Demonſtrative. *To be fully convinced of the exiſtence of Bodies*, ſaith he (m), *it muſt be demonſtrated to us not only that there is a God, and that God is no deceiver, but alſo that God hath aſſured us that he hath really Created many; which I don't find proved in Mr.* Deſcartes's *Works. God ſpeaks to the mind, and obliges us to believe only two ways, by Evidence and by Faith. I grant that Faith obliges us to believe that Bodies exiſts; but as for Evidence, it is certain that it is not full, and that we are not invincibly inclined to believe the exiſtence of any thing elſe beſides God and our own Soul.* Obſerve that when he affirms, that God hath not invincibly obliged us by Evidence to determine that Bodies exiſts, his deſign is to teach us that the Error in which we ſhould be in this reſpect ought not to be charged on God. This is to reject Mr. *Deſcartes*'s Proof, and to ſay that God would be no Deceiver even tho' not one Body ſhould exiſt in the Nature of things.

Michael Angelo Fardella, a *Sicilian*, publiſhed a Logick at *Venice* in 1696, in which he aſſerts the ſame Principles with Father *Mallebranche*; As appears by the following extract of his Book. He

particularly

(h) Natura nihil fruſtra facit.

(i) Fruſtra fit per plura quod æque commode fieri poteſt per pauciora.

(k) Mallebranche ubi infra pag. 70.

(l) Mallebranche, Eclairciſſemens ſur le 1. livre de la recherche de la verité pag. 64. Paris 1678.

(m) Id. ib. pag. 68. 69.

(d) See Arriaga ubi ſupra ſect. 11. *He follows the hypotheſis of the* moralæ *or interruptions of motion: He anſwers the Objections very ill, and owns that of the Wheel to be inſoluble:* Oviedo *in his Body of Philoſophy tom.* 1. *p.* 357. & ſeq. *does mightily ſtrive to reſolve it, and believes he has found out a new ſolution of it.* Gordiani nodi nova ſolutio, *ſays he.* (e) *In the Remark E.* (f) Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhon. hypotyp. lib. 3. c. 8. (g) Nicolle, Art de penſer 4. part ch. 1. pag. m. 394. 395.

ſtration on this Point. As for the Objections which may be grounded on the diſtinction of a full Space and a *Vacuum*, and which might prove very puzzling to the modern Philoſophers, I think it is very likely (F △ △) that he did not forget them. Not being contemporary with *Diogenes* the Cynick it was not his

Lecture

(a) *particularly applies himſelf to prove, that it is very poſſible that Objects ſhould not be conform to their Ideas. He ſaith, that he very clearly conceives that the Author of Nature might ſo diſpoſe our Senſes that they might repreſent to us thoſe Objects as exiſtent, which really do not exiſt. Yet when he defines* (b) *the ſenſations in the ſecond part pag. 98. he ſays, that they ariſe in the mind from the impreſſion which outward Bodies make on the extremity of the Nerves. When it is objected to him that if the Evidence of the Senſes is not infallible, Jeſus Chriſt impoſed on the Apoſtles when to convince them that his Body was real, he ſaid,* Handle me and ſee, for a Spirit hath not Fleſh and Bones; *he anſwers that the ways of Arguing, which the Scripture moſt commonly makes uſe of, are rather drawn from a Logick accommodated to the Capacity of the vulgar, than from a real Logick: Whence he concludes, that Jeſus Chriſt in order to perſuade the Apoſtles that he was no Phantom, but a real Man, made uſe of that ſort of reaſoning which was beſt adapted to vulgar Intellects, by which Men uſe to ſatiſfy themſelves of the exiſtence of things. He adds that God is not obliged to give us infallible ſatisfaction that there are Bodies which exiſt, and that if we have more than a moral certainty about it, we owe it only to Faith.* Father *Mallebranche's* Reaſons are very ſtrong, but I may very well venture to ſay that they are much weaker than thoſe we have ſeen (c) above. I ſhould be glad to know how Mr. *Arnauld* would have refuted this, no Perſon being more capable than himſelf to find out a Solution. By his Examination of Father *Mallebranche's* Opinion he hath diſcovered that he throughly underſtood the Art of Attacking. He hath ſtruck at the foundation of his Adverſary's Doctrine; for he he hath ſhewn, that if there are no Bodies we are (d) *forced to admit ſome things in God which are utterly contrary to the Divine Nature, as that of being deceitful, or ſubject to other Imperfections, which the light of Reaſon evidently makes appear to us, cannot be in God.* He makes uſe of eight Arguments, which Father *Mallebranche* (e) calls *good Proofs but very ill Demonſtrations. I believe,* continues he, *that Matter exiſts, but I believe it as well* proved *and ill* demonſtrated. *I believe it alſo as* Demonſtrated, *but preſuppoſing Faith.* He propoſes an Objection which (f) he grounds on the ill and impious thoughts of the Mind, and anſwers (g) *That it is certain that the Body doth not immediately actuate the Mind, and that it is God alone who immediately puts all the Good and Evil thoughts into the mind, as it is he alone that moves the Arm of an Aſſaſſinator or impious wretch, as well as the hand of the Alms-giver; and that the only thing which God doth not do is Sin, that is, the conſent of the Will. It is indeed true, that God doth not inſtill into the mind of Man vain and ill thoughts any otherwiſe than conſequentially to the Laws of the union of the Soul and Body, and of Sin which hath changed the union into dependance. But how will Mr.* Arnauld demonſtrate, *I mean regularly demonſtrate that he did not commit ſome Sin or other ten or twenty Thouſand Years ago; and that it is not by way of Puniſhment for that Sin that he is afflicted with theſe uneaſy thoughts, by which God chaſtizes him, and deſigns to oblige him to deſerve his recompenſe, by oppoſing what he calls the motion of concupiſcence? Will Mr.* Arnauld *demonſtrate, that God who could permit Sin and whatever follows from it, which, as a conſequence of the Natural Laws he hath eſtabliſhed, oblige him to put into the mind ſo many filthy thoughts and impious inclinations, could not permit that he himſelf ſhould have Sinned twenty Thouſand Years ago? Will he demonſtrate that God could not without the help of a Body give him diſturbing thoughts, in conſequence of the Laws of the Union of the Soul and Body, which he foreſaw, and which he can follow without his having formed any one Body? But let him Argue as much as he will I ſhall break without the leaſt difficulty, the chain of his Demonſtrations, by telling him, that God might have deſigns which he did not impart to him.* Mr. *Arnauld* offers a great many things by way of Reply, and particularly (h) that there are in Father *Mallebranche's* anſwer *ſome extravagant propoſitions, which ſtrictly taken tend to the eſtabliſhment of a very dangerous Pyrrhoniſm.* His Proof of which may be ſeen in the following paſſage: (i) "*I beg of him to tell me, what he means, when he grants that this Propoſition may be taken for an Evident Principle:* God is no Deceiver, and it is not poſſible that he ſhould take pleaſure in deceiving us. *Doth he acknowledge that the Evidence of this Principle is abſolute, or doth he think it reſtrained by this* Condition, if I ſhould not have committed ſome Sin 10 or 12 Thouſand Years ago, *for the Puniſhment of which God might take pleaſure in deceiving me? If he anſwers that it is abſolute, what he ſaith of the Sin I might have committed ten or twenty Thouſand Years ago is foreign to the purpoſe. And if he ſaith that this Principle is not abſolute but reſtrained by that Condition, nothing can be eaſier than to convince him, that it cannot be aſſerted without overthrowing the Divine Faith, and all Humane Sciences. For he affirms, that not only the Divine Faith, but whatever we know by ratiocination, is grounded on this Principle.* That God is no Deceiver——— (k) *But this Principle, that God is not a Deceiver, will be utterly uſeleſs, if he who makes uſe of it was obliged to prove that he hath not committed ſome Sin ten or twenty Thouſand Years ago. I will ſay no more: The conſequences of this ſhifting are ſo horrible and impious, that it is even dangerous to dwell too long upon——— it.* (l) *It is neceſſary that* God ſhould impart all his deſigns to us, *that we may be aſſured he doth not intend to deceive us? If ſo, none can be certain of it: And thus there will be no Divine Faith, no Humane Sciences, according to the Author himſelf, as I have juſt ſhewn.*

It was requiſite for ſeveral Reaſons that I ſhould ſet down ſome paſſages of the diſpute of theſe two illuſtrious Authors, and that in general I ſhould inſert in this Remark what I find in it. For in the 1. place. I was obliged to prove that there are ſtronger Objections than thoſe of Father *Mallebranche*. In effect if it were true that the actual exiſtence of extenſion includes (m) Contradictions, and Impoſſibilities, as has been ſet forth (n) above, it would be abſolutely neceſſary to recur to Faith in order to be convinced of the exiſtence of Bodies, and Mr. *Arnauld* who hath found other refuges, would be obliged to have recourſe to that only. In the 2d. place the Article of *Zeno* of *Elea*, requires a large Account of the difficulties which this Philoſopher might have propoſed againſt the Hypotheſis of Motion. 3. It is of uſe to know that a Father of the Oratory as illuſtrious for his Piety, as for his Philoſophical Learning has ſſerted, that nothing but Faith can fully convince us of the exiſtence of Bodies. The *Sorbonne* nor any other Tribunal ever gave him any Trouble on this occaſion. The Inquiſitors of *Italy* never diſturbed Mr. *Fardella*, who aſſerted the ſame thing in a Printed Book. This ought to inform my Readers, that they ought not to be ſurpriſed that I ſhould ſometimes ſhew that with reſpect to the moſt myſterious Evangelical Subjects Reaſon puts us to a ſtand, and that then we ought to be fully ſatisfied with the light of Faith.

(F △ △) *I think it is very likely that he did not forget* the Objections which might be grounded on the diſtinction of a full Space and a *Vacuum*.] *Meliſſus*, who ſtudied under the ſame (o) Maſter with him, denied Motion, and made uſe of this Proof: (p) if Motion exiſts, there muſt of neceſſity be a Vacuity; but there is no Vacuity, therefore &c. This ſhews that in *Zeno's* time there was a great Philoſopher, who did not believe motion and a full ſpace to be conſiſtent together. Where-

fore

(a) Journ. des Savans of the 30. of July 1685. pag. 451. 452. Dutch Edit.

(b) *The Author of the Journal is miſtaken. He is in the wrong to pretend that Mr. Fardella contradicts himſelf: It is no contradiction to ſay that there are Bodies, and that it were poſſible there ſhould be none, and yet that we ſhould have the ſame ſenſations we have now. The Author of the Journal might have made a better Objection, which is, that ſuppoſing* CHRIST *accommodated himſelf to the popular Logick, it cannot be proved by the Scripture that there are Bodies. How then can one be ſure by Faith that there are Bodies?*

(c) *In the* Remark F, *where the* 1. *Objection is propoſed.* (d) Arnauld, Traité des vraies & des fauſſes idées pag. 324. (e) Mallebranche, Reponſe au livre des vraies & des fauſſes idées pag. 321. (f) Id. ib. pag. 325. (g) Id. ib.

(h) Arnauld Defenſe contre la reponſe au livre des vraies & des fauſſes idées pag. [illegible]

(i) Id. ib. pag. [illegible]

(k) Id. [illegible]

(l) Id. [illegible]

(m) *That is, if according to the light of Reaſon it ſhould ſeem to imply ſome contradictions and impoſſibilities.*

(n) *In the firſt Objection of the* Remark F.

(o) *That is, under* Parmenides. See Diogenes Laertius lib. 9. n. 24. 25.

(p) Ariſtotel. Phyſ. lib. 4. textu 61.

Lecture that was refuted by Walking. Every body admitted the Method which *Diogenes* made uſe of to confound the Arguments of the Philoſophers

fore ſince *Zeno* (a) denyed a *Vacuum*, I cannot perſuade my ſelf that he did not make uſe of the ſame Proof with *Meliſſus*, againſt thoſe who admitted Motion. He made it his buſineſs to oppoſe them, and uſed Arguments to that purpoſe. Would he have forgot the Argument which the Aſſerters of a *Vacuum* have ſo often employed? He might have turned it otherwiſe than they, but not leſs ſpeciouſly. If there was no *Vacuum*, ſaid they, there would be no Motion; but Motion exiſts, therefore there is a *Vacuum*. He would have argued on the contrary foot, agreeing with them in this Principle, that Motion cannot exiſt in a full Space; for from this Poſition common to them and himſelf, he might have drawn a Conſequence diametrically oppoſite to theirs. His Syllogiſm ought to have run thus: If there was any Motion, there would be a *Vacuum*; but there is no *Vacuum*, therefore there is no Motion. Obſerve, that when I ſay his manner of arguing would not have been leſs ſpecious than theirs; I mean this only with reſpect to Philoſophers very capable of comprehending the Reaſons againſt a *Vacuum*; for I know very well that to the Populace to deny a *Vacuum*, was almoſt as ſtrange a Paradox as to deny Motion. *Anaxagoras* found the Vulgar ſo poſſeſs'd with the exiſtence of a *Vacuum*, that he had recourſe to ſome trivial (b) Experiments to deſtroy this falſe prejudice. *Ariſtotle*, in the Chapter where he mentions this, alledges ſome of the Arguments which were made uſe of to prove a *Vacuum*. They are not of any force, and he refutes them pretty well in the following Chapter. (c) *Gaſſendus* hath given all poſſible force to the Experiments and Arguments which favour the Hypotheſis of *Epicurus* concerning a *Vacuum*; but he hath ſaid nothing really convincing, and the weakneſs of it is not expoſed in *the Art*, (d) *of Thinking*. However I believe our *Zeno* rendred himſelf formidable on this Topick: Such a ſubtile and warm Logician as he, could very dexterouſly perplex this Subject, and it is not probable that he neglected it.

SOME Arguments againſt a *Vacuum*.

But if he had known what ſeveral excellent Mathematicians (e) ſay in this Age, he would have made vaſt ravages, and given himſelf Airs of Triumph. They aſſert that a *Vacuum* is abſolutely neceſſary, and that without it the motion of the Planets, and the conſequences thereof are things inexplicable and impoſſible. I have heard a great Mathematician (who hath reaped great Advantages from the Works and Converſation of Sir *Iſaac Newton*) ſay, that it is no longer a Problem *whether Motion be poſſible, ſuppoſing a full Space*; that the Falſity and Impoſſibility of that Propoſition hath been not only proved, but Mathematically demonſtrated, and that henceforth to deny a *Vacuum* will be to deny a Point ſupported by the utmoſt Evidence. He maintain'd that Vacuity takes up incomparably more room than Matter in the moſt ponderous Bodies; and ſo that in the Air, for inſtance, there are not more Corpuſcles than there are great Towns on the Earth. Thus we are doubtleſs highly obliged to the Mathematicks: They demonſtrate the Exiſtence of what is contrary to the moſt evident Notions of our Intellect; for if there be any nature with whoſe eſſential Properties we are clearly acquainted, it is Extenſion: We have a perſpicuous and diſtinct Idea of it, which informs us that the Eſſence of Extenſion conſiſts in the three Dimenſions, and that its inſeparable Attributes and Properties are Diviſibility, Mobility, and Impenetrability. If theſe Idea's are Falſe, Deceitful, Chimerical and Illuſory, is there a Notion in our Mind which we ought not to take for a vain Phantome, or matter of diffidence? Can the Demonſtrations which prove a *Vacuum* remove our Diſtruſt? Are they more evident than the Idea which ſhews us that a Foot of Extenſion may change place, and cannot be in the ſame place with another Foot of Extenſion? Let us rummage as much as we pleaſe into all the receſſes of our Mind, we ſhall never find there any Idea of an unmovable, indiviſible and penetrable Extenſion. And yet if there is a *Vacuum* there muſt exiſt an Extenſion, eſſentially endued with theſe three Attributes. It is no ſmall difficulty, to be forced to admit the exiſtence of a Nature of which we have no Idea, and is beſides repugnant to the cleareſt Ideas of our Mind. But there are a great many other Inconveniencies which attend this. Is this *Vacuum* or Immoveable, indiviſible and penetrable Extenſion, a Subſtance or a Mode? It muſt be one of the two, for the Adequate Diviſion of Being, comprehends but theſe two Members. If it be a Mode, they muſt then define its Subſtance. But that is what they can never do. If it be a Subſtance, I ask whether it be created or uncreated? If created, it may periſh, without the Matter, from which it is diſtinct, ceaſing to be. But it is abſurd, and contradictory, that a *Vacuum*, that is a Space diſtinct from Bodies, ſhould be deſtroyed, and yet that Bodies ſhould be diſtant from each other, as they may be after the deſtruction of the *Vacuum*. But if this Space diſtinct from Bodies is an uncreated Subſtance, it will follow either that it is God, or that God is not the only Subſtance which neceſſarily exiſts. Which part ſoever we take of this Alternative, we ſhall find our ſelves confounded: The laſt is a formal, and the other at leaſt a material Impiety; for all Extenſion is compoſed of diſtinct parts, and conſequently ſeparable from each other; whence it reſults, that if God was extended, he would not be a Simple, Immutable, and properly Infinite Being, but a maſs of Beings, *ens per aggregationem*, each of which would be finite, tho' all of them together would be unlimited. He would be like the Material World, which in the *Carteſian* Hypotheſis is an Infinite Extenſion. And as to thoſe who ſhould pretend that God may be extended without being Material or Corporeal, and alledge, as an Argument, his Simplicity, you will find them ſolidly refuted in one of Mr. *Arnauld*'s Books, which I ſhall cite only theſe words: (f) "So far "is the Simplicity of God from allowing us room "to think that he may be extended, that all Divines have acknowledged after St. *Thomas*, that "it is a neceſſary Conſequence of the Simplicity "of God not to be extended." Will they ſay with the School-men, that Space is, at moſt, no more than a privation of Body; that it hath no reality, and that, properly ſpeaking, a *Vacuum* is nothing: But this is ſuch an unreaſonable Aſſertion, that all the modern Philoſophers who declare for a *Vacuum*, have laid it aſide, tho never ſo convenient in other reſpects. (g) *Gaſſendus* carefully avoided any reliance on ſuch an abſurd Hypotheſis; but choſe rather to plunge himſelf into the moſt hideous Abyſs of conjecturing, that all Beings are not either Subſtances or Accidents, and that all Subſtances are not either Spirits or Bodies; and of placing the extenſion of Space amongſt the Beings which are neither Corporeal nor Spiritual, neither Subſtance nor Accidents. Mr. *Locke* (h) believing that he could not define what a *Vacuum* is, hath yet given us clearly to underſtand that he took it for a poſitive Being. He had too clear a Head not to diſcern that Nothingneſs cannot be extended in length, breadth and depth. Mr. *Hartſoeker* hath very clearly apprehended this Truth. *There is no Vacuity in Nature*, ſaith he, (i) *this ought to be acknowledged without difficulty, becauſe it is utterly contradictory to conceive a meer nonentity, with all the Properties which can only agree to a real Benig*. But if it is contradictory that Nothingneſs ſhould be endued with Extenſion, or any (k) other quality, it is not leſs contradictory, that Extenſion ſhould be a ſimple Being, ſince it contains ſome things, of which we may truly deny what we may truly affirm of ſome others which it includes. The Space fill'd up by the Sun is not the ſame ſpace taken up by the Moon; for if the Sun and the Moon filled the ſame Space thoſe two Luminaries would be in the ſame place, and penetrated with one another, ſince two things (l) cannot be penetrated with a third, without being penetrated betwixt themſelves.

(a) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. n. 72.

(b) Ariſtot. ubi ſupra text. 51.

(c) Gaſſend. Phyſ. ſect. 1. lib. 2. cap. 3. oper. tom. 1. pag. 191. & ſeq.

(d) Art de penſer 3. part. ch. 18. n. 4. p. m. 329. & ſeq.

(e) Mr. Huygens. Sir Iſaac Newton, &c.

(f) Arnauld, Defenſe contre la reponſe au livre des vraies & des fauſſes idées pag. 360.

(g) Gaſſend. ubi ſupra cap. 1. p. 182.

(h) Locke, *An Eſſay concerning Human Underſtanding*, Book 2. ch. 13. p. m. 188. 189.

(i) Non entis nulla ſunt accidentia, *is a common Notion as evident as any other*.

(k) Hartſoeker, Principes de Phyſique p. 4.

(l) Quæ penetrantur cum uno tertio penetrantur inter ſe.

Philoſopher whom he heard dogmatically deny Motion. He took a turn in the Auditory, thinking that it was ſufficient to ſhew the falſity of what the Profeſſor had

ſitive. It is moſt evident that the Sun and Moon are not in the ſame place. It may then be ſaid truly of the Space of the Sun, that it is penetrated by the Sun, and it may as truly be denied of the Space penetrated by the Moon. Here are then two portions of Space really diſtinct from one another, by reaſon that they receive two contradictory Denominations, of being penetrated, and not being penetrated by the Sun. Which fully confutes thoſe who venture to aſſert, that Space is nothing but the Immenſity of God; and it is certain that the Divine Immenſity could not be the place of Bodies, without giving room to conclude that it is compoſed of as many real diſtinct Parts as there are Bodies in the World. It will be in vain for you to alledge that Infinity hath no Parts, this muſt neceſſarily be falſe in all Infinite Numbers, ſince a Number eſſentially includes ſeveral Unities. Nor will you have more reaſon to tell us that incorporeal Extenſion (a) is wholly contained in its ſpace, and alſo wholly contained in each part of its ſpace; for it is not only what we have no Idea of, and beſides thwarts all our Ideas of Extenſion, but alſo what will prove that all Bodies take up the ſame place, ſince each could not take up its own, if the Divine Extenſion was intirely penetrated by each Body, numerically the ſame with the Sun and with the Earth. You will find in Mr. *Arnauld* (b) a ſolid Refutation of thoſe, who attribute to God, the diffuſing himſelf throughout infinite Spaces.

By this Specimen of the Difficulties which may be raiſed againſt a *Vacuum*, my Readers may eaſily apprehend, that our *Zeno* would, at preſent, be much more formidable than he was in his time. It is no longer to be doubted, would he ſay, that if all is full, Motion is impoſſible. This Impoſſibility hath been Mathematically proved. He would not diſpute againſt thoſe Demonſtrations, but admit them as inconteſtable; he would only apply himſelf to prove the impoſſibility of a *Vacuum*, and would convince his Adverſaries of Abſurdity. He would confute them on whatſoever ſide they turned; he would plunge them into perplexities by his Dilemma's; he would make them loſe ground wherever they ſhould deſign to retire; and if he did not ſilence them, he would at leaſt force them to confeſs, that they neither underſtand nor comprehend what they ſay. *If any one ask me* (they are Mr. *Locke's* words) (c), *What the Space, I ſpeak of, is? I will tell him when he tells me what his Extenſion is.* ——— (d) *They ask whether* this Space *be Body or Spirit? To which I anſwer by another Queſtion, Who told them that there can be only Bodies and Minds. If it be demanded, (as uſually it is) Whether the Space, void of Body, be Subſtance or Accident, I ſhall readily anſwer, I know not: Nor ſhall be aſhamed to own my Ignorance, till they that ask, ſhew me a clear diſtinct Idea of* Subſtance. Since ſuch a great Metaphyſician as Mr. *Locke*, after having ſo well ſtudied theſe Subjects, is not able to anſwer the Queſtions of the *Carteſians* otherwiſe than by other Queſtions which he thinks yet more obſcure and perplexed than theirs, we may judge that the Objections which *Zeno* might propoſe, could not be anſwered: and we may certainly conjecture that he would addreſs himſelf thus to his Adverſaries: You ſhelter your ſelves in a *Vacuum* when driven from the Hypotheſis of Motion and a full Space; but you cannot hold out in a *Vacuum*, the impoſſibility of it is demonſtrated. Lay hold then on ſome better means to come off; that which you have already choſen being to avoid one Precipice by throwing one's ſelf into another. Follow me, I will ſhew you a better way. Don't conclude from the impoſſibility of Motion in a full ſpace, that there is a Vacuity, but rather conclude from the Impoſſibility of a Vacuity that there is no Motion, I mean real Motion, but at moſt an appearance of Motion, or an Ideal and intellectual Motion. See the Margin (†).

Let us, from what has been ſaid, deduce a few Corollaries.

I. The Firſt is, That *Zeno's* Diſpute could not be wholly uſeleſs: For if he miſſed his main aim, which is to prove that there is no Motion, he would have the advantage of ſtrengthening his Hypotheſis of the *acatalepſia*, or incomprehenſibility of all things. The Demonſtrations of our Modern Mathematicians, to prove a *Vacuum*, have convinced them that Motion in a full Space is not comprehenſible. They have therefore admitted the ſuppoſition of a Vacuity, not by reaſon they did not find it ſurrounded with ſeveral inconceivable and inexplicable Difficulties; but being obliged to chuſe one out of two Incomprehenſible Syſtems, they preferred that which leaſt ſhocked them. They choſe rather to ſatisfie themſelves on the Mechanical, than the Metaphyſical part, and even ſlighted the Phyſical Difficulties which fell in their way; this, for inſtance, it is not poſſible to give a Reaſon for the reſiſtance of Air and Water, if there be but ſuch a ſmall quantity of Matter, and ſo much Vacuity in thoſe two parts of the World. Other Mathematicians (e) deny a Vacuity ſtill, not but that they are ſenſible of the Difficulties which obliged others to admit it; but they are more ſenſibly touched with the diſmal perplexities they find in that Suppoſition: they don't think it reaſonable, on account of thoſe Difficulties, to renounce the cleareſt Idea's which we have of the nature of Extenſion. Obſerve that ſome Philoſophers (f) of the firſt Rank don't believe that we know either what Extenſion or Subſtance is; they cannot talk otherwiſe as long as they believe a Vacuity. Which affords no ſmall occaſion of triumph to *Zeno* and all other *Acataleptick*s: For when it is diſputed whether we know, or are ignorant of the nature of Subſtance and Matter, it is a Sign that we comprehend nothing, and that we can never be ſure that we hit the Mark, or that the Objects of our Minds reſemble the Ideas we have of them.

THE SYSTEM of *Spinoza* is incompatible with a *Vacuum*.

II. I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the Hypotheſis of a Vacuity is the moſt proper in the World to overthrow *Spinoza's* Syſtem. For if there are two different Extenſions, the one Simple, Indiviſible and Penetrable, the other Compounded, Diviſible, and Impenetrable; there muſt be more than one Subſtance in the Univerſe. This is the more eaſie to be inferred, by reaſon that the Impenetrable Subſtance would not be a perfect Continuity, but a maſs of Corpuſcles intirely ſeparated from each other, and ſurrounded by a large incorporeal Space. The *Spinoziſts* would not deny that each of theſe Corpuſcles is a particular Subſtance diſtinct from that of all others. And thus by their own Axioms, they muſt renounce their Syſtem, if they own that there is a Vacuity.

A NEW Proof againſt the real exiſtence of Extenſion.

III. The laſt Conſequence which I would draw, is that the Diſputes concerning a *Vacuum*, have afforded a plauſible Reaſon to deny the real Exiſtence of any other than an Ideal Extenſion. It is conceived in Arguing againſt the *Carteſians*, who deny the poſſibility of a *Vacuum*, that Extenſion is a Being which cannot be limited. It muſt then follow that there is no ſuch thing as Body in Nature, or that there is an Infinity of Bodies. One of 'em cannot be deſtroyed without annihilating all the reſt, nor can the ſmalleſt be preſerved without preſerving them all. Yet we know by evident Idea's, that when two things are really diſtinct, one of 'em may be had ſaid; but it is certain that an Anſwer of that nature is (G) more ſophiſtical than our *Zeno's* Arguments. I don't believe what ſome affirm of him, that he taught that Matter is compoſed of Mathematical Points: I ſhould rather think that he aſſerted || that it could not be compoſed of them. I muſt not forget that he was leſs reſolute in ſuffering Detraction, than the Tortures exercifed on him. He was very angry with a Man who abuſed him, and when the World was ſurprized at his Indignation, he anſwered *, *If I was inſenſible of Calumny, I ſhould be likewiſe inſenſible of Praiſe.* An Anſwer unworthy of a Philoſopher.

(a) Tota in toto & tota in ſingulis partibus. *This is what the Schoolmen ſay of the Preſence of the Soul in a Humane Body, and of the preſence of Angels in certain places.*

(b) Arnauld, *Letter* 8. & 9. *to Father* Mallebranche. *See particularly pag.* 171. & ſeq. & *pag.* 21[illegible]. & ſeq. *See alſo a Book of* Peter Petit, *a Phyſician of* Paris, *intitl'd* de extenſione animæ & rerum incorporearum natura, *and* M. de la Chambre's *Anſwer to it, which he Publiſh'd at* Paris *in the Year* 1666. *in* Quarto, *with this Title,* Defenſe de l'Extenſion & des parties libres de l'ame. *All the Reaſons he alledges to ſhew, that Extenſion and Spirituality may be together, are ſo weak, that they are only good to ſhew the falſity of his Aſſertion.*

(c) Locke ubi ſupra.

(d) Id. ib.

(†) *The* [illegible] Vacuity, [illegible] quidam vacuum eſſe corporum [illegible] quidem locum [illegible] idem eſſe [illegible] Ariſt. Phyſ. lib. 4. cap. 7.

(e) Mr. Leibniz, & Mr. de Volder a famous *Profeſſor of Philoſophy and Mathematicks in the Univerſity of* Leyden.

(f) *See above Mr.* Locke's *words.*

|| See Ariſtot. Phyſic. lib. 6. cap. 9.

* Diog. Laert. in Zeno lib. [illegible] pag. 18.

ZENO,

be preſerved or deſtroyed without the other; for whatever is really diſtinct from a thing being accidental to it, and each thing being capable of being preſerved without that which is accidental to (a) it, it follows that the Body *A*, really diſtinct from the Body *B*, may continue in being, without the Body *B* ſubſiſting, and that the preſervation of the Body *A*, doth not at all infer the preſervation of the Body *B*. This Conſequence which appears ſo clear and conform to common Senſe, cannot however agree with the Subject of which we ſpeak; and you cannot ſuppoſe that all the Bodies included in a Chamber ſhould periſh, and the four Walls be preſerved; for in this caſe there will remain the ſame diſtance betwixt them as before; but this diſtance, ſay the *Carteſians*, is nothing but a Body. Their Doctrine then ſeems to infringe the Creator's Sovereign Liberty, and his due unlimited Power over all his Works. He ought to enjoy an undoubted right of Creating few or many, according to his good pleaſure, and of preſerving or deſtroying this or that, as it ſeems good to him. The *Carteſians* may anſwer, that he may deſtroy each Body in particular, provided he make another of the ſame magnitude; but is not this to ſet bounds to his Liberty? Is not this to impoſe on him a ſort of Slavery, which neceſſarily obliges him to create a new Body every time that he pleaſeth to deſtroy another? Theſe are Difficulties, which cannot be anſwered on the ſuppoſition that Extenſion and Body are the ſame thing; but they may be retorted againſt thoſe who propoſe them to *Deſcartes*, if they acknowledge a *ſpacial* Extenſion really exiſtent and diſtinct from Matter. This Extenſion cannot be finite; one part cannot be deſtroyed without the production of another, &c. But if the nature of penetrable or impenetrable Extenſion draws along with it ſuch a large train of Inconveniencies, the ſhorteſt way is to aſſert that it hath no other Exiſtence than in our Mind.

(G) *An Anſwer like that of* Diogenes *is more ſophiſtical.*] (*b*) Πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα ὅτι κίνησις οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναστὰς περιεπάτει. *Dicente ſibi quodam non eſſe motum, exurgens ambulabat.* This is all that we find on this head in *Diogenes Laertius*, where the Fact is related with great ſimplicity: But the Moderns have a little amplified it. (*c*) *Vulgo etiam fertur Diogenes, cum negari a Zenone motum localem audiſſet, illico ſurrexiſſe, & itu redituque aliquoties magnâ feſtinatione replicata inambulaſſe, & rogatus, quis eum ſubitò enthuſiaſmus perculiſſet, reſpondiſſe:* Zenonem refello. They have named the Philoſopher who denied Motion, they have embelliſhed the Circumſtances of the Practical Anſwer, they have made it a ſubject of Declamations for young Rhetoricians. I am ſurprized that *Sextus Empiricus* ſhould not vouchſafe to name the Perſon, who thus refuted the Objections againſt the Exiſtence of Motion. What he ſaith is, that a *Cynick* made uſe of this way of refuting thoſe Objections: (*d*) Ταῦτά τοι καὶ ἐρωτηθεὶς φιλόσοφος, τὸν κατὰ τῆς κινήσεως λόγον, σιωπῶν περιεπάτει. *Ideoque cum propoſita eſſet Philoſopho oratio motum negans, tacitus ambulare cœpit.* In another place he expreſſes himſelf thus: (*e*) Διὸ καὶ τὸν Κυνικόν τε ἐρωτηθέντα κατὰ τῆς κινήσεως λόγον οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνασθαι, ἀναστάντα δὲ καὶ βαδίζοντα ἔργῳ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐναργείας πιστῶσαι, ὅτι ὄντως ἐστὶν ἡ κίνησις. *Ideoque aiunt ex Cynicis, cum ei propoſita eſſet contra motum oratio, nihil reſpondiſſe; ſed ſurgens ambulare cœpiſſe, opere & actu oſtendentem exiſtere motum.* It is better not to name the Perſon, than to affirm that *Diogenes* the Cynick, and *Zeno* of *Elea* were the Actors. For this (*f*) Chronological Error is inexcuſable: which the Jeſuits of *Coimbra* have aſcribed to *Simplicius* without refuting it. And in this particular they fell in with the common Blunder. *Certè*, ſay they (*g*), *hæc Zenonis tam abſurda opinio nulla melius quam experientia ipſius argumenta refellitur. Quod Diogenes Cynicus fecit, ut refert Simplicius hoc in libro commento 43. & lib. 8. comment. 25. Nam cum Zenonis rationes aliquando audiſſet, ſurrexit, nec aliter quam coram ambulando reſpondit.* They have avoided the other common miſtake; they don't believe that *Zeno* who denied Motion, and whoſe Arguments *Ariſtotle* examined, was the founder of the *Stoicks*; But have expreſly named (*h*) him *Zeno* of *Elea*. The Paſſage which follows is full of Faults: (*i*) *Continuum ex partibus indiviſibilibus conſtare contra Ariſtotelem conſtanter defendebat Zeno Stoicorum Princeps, quem ducem ſunt ſequuti ex Philoſophis Democritus, & Leucippus. Ex Theologis Antiquis. May.* in 2. diſt. 2. quæſt. 5, *Gerardus apud Tartaletum hoc lib. quæſt. 1. & Ægidius diſcipulus D. Thom. lib. 1. de generat. quæſt. 8. citatus a Veracrux 6. Phyſic. ſpeculat. 1.* There is no room to doubt that this Author in this paſſage deſigned to ſpeak of the ſame *Zeno*, whom *Ariſtotle* refuted in the 9th Chapter of the 6th Book of his Phyſicks. But it doth not appear that *Zeno* of *Elea* taught that Matter was compoſed of indiviſible parts. He contented himſelf with taking advantage of the contrary Doctrine, to ſhew the impoſſibility of Motion. Nay, he aſſerted that an (†) indiviſible Body did not differ from a Nonentity; and I ſhall make it appear below, that he did not admit of any Compoſition in the Univerſe. Notwithſtanding all which, he is taken (*k*) to be the Author of the Sect which maintained, that Matter is compoſed of Mathematical Points. It would be more reaſonable to aſcribe this Opinion to *Pythagoras* and *Plato*, as *Derodon* (*l*) hath done, going, with regard to *Pythagoras*, on the Teſtimony of *Sextus Empiricus*, and with relation to *Plato* on that of *Ariſtotle*. But what a Blunder is it to make the Founder of the *Stoicks* to be the Guide of *Democritus* and *Leucippus*! *Leucippus* preceded *Democritus*, and both of 'em preceded the Head of the *Stoicks* by ſeveral Olympiads. Beſides, their Atomes formed a Syſtem very different from that attributed to the *Zenoniſts* about the compoſition of Matter.

However it be, the Anſwer of *Diogenes* the Cynick to the Philoſopher who denied Motion, is the Sophiſm which the Logicians call *ignorationem Elenchi*. *Diogenes* ſwerved from the ſtate of the Queſtion; for the Philoſopher did not deny apparent Motion; he did not deny that Motion ſeems apparent to Human Senſe; but he aſſerted that nothing did really move, and proved it by very ſubtil and perplexing Reaſons. See what *Sextus Empiricus* ſays of the *Scepticks*: (*m*) Ὅσον μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς φαινομένοις δοκεῖν εἶναι κίνησιν, ὅσον δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ λόγῳ μὴ ὑπάρχειν. *Quantum ad apparentia quidem videri eſſe motum, ſed quatenus quis Philoſophicam rationem ſequatur non eſſe.* Of what force then is it againſt this Aſſertion, to walk or cut a Caper? Is it

(*e*) Id. ib. lib. 8. cap. 8. pag. 124.

(*f*) Diogenes the Cynick lived a long time after Zeno of Elea.

(*g*) Conimbricenſes in Phyſ. Ariſtot. lib. 6. c. 2. p. m. 118.

(*h*) Ibid. in cap. 8. pag. 145.

(*i*) Franciſcus de Oviedo Phyſic. controverſ. 17. p. 334. col. 1.

† Ariſt. Metaph. lib. 3. cap. 4.

(*k*) Arriaga *and many other* Spaniſh *School-men call thoſe, who hold that Matter is compoſed of indiviſible and unextended parts* Zenoniſts. *A very different Opinion from that of the Atomiſts.*

(*l*) Derodon, diſput. de atomis pag. 4. & 5. *He quotes* Sextus Empiricus lib. 9. adv. Mathem. & *Ariſtotle* lib. 1. de generat. tex. 7.

(*m*) Sext. Empir. Pyrrh. hypotyp. lib. 3. cap. 8. pag. 104.

---

cannot *be ſeparated from an* Ethiopian. *Wherefore they re-* ... *the diſtinction between a Mental and a real Separa-* ... *Which is a meer Illuſion; for the ſubject of the Black-* ... *of an* Ethiopian *is Matter, which would not be deſtroyed,* ... *the Body of that Man was calcined.* (*b*) Diog. Laertius lib. ... (*c*) Libertus Fromondus de compoſitione continui ... (*d*) Sextus Empiricus Pyrrhon. hypotypoſ. lib. 8 c. 22. ... 104.

Z E N O.

ZENO, an *Epicurean* Philosopher, a Native of *Sidon*, gloriously asserted the Honour of his Sect; for he * acquired a great Reputation. Amongst other Pupils, he was Tutor to (A) *Cicero* and *Pomponius Atticus*, whence we may judge of the

to prove any thing besides the appearance of Motion? And is that the Subject in Dispute? Did the Philosopher deny that? Not in the least; he was not Fool enough to deny ocular Phenomena, but he asserted that the Evidence of the Senses ought to be sacrificed to Ratiocination. Consult *Aristotle*; he will inform you that several Antient Philosophers, who found Reasons utterly to deny the plurality of Parts, Divisibility, and the Mobility of the World, afterwards made no account of the Testimony of the Senses. (a) *Ἐκ μὲν οὖν τούτων τῶν λόγων, ὑπερβάντες τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ παριδόντες αὐτὴν, ὡς τῷ λόγῳ δέον ἀκολουθεῖν, ἓν καὶ ἀκίνητον τὸ πᾶν εἶναι, καὶ ἄπειρον ἔνιοι. Ob hasce igitur rationes nonnulli sensum prætereuntes, despicientesque quasi rationem sequi eum oporteat, universum ipsum, unum & immobile & infinitum esse asserunt.* *Parmenides* and *Melissus* are the Antient Philosophers of whom he speaks. It must be believed that *Zeno* of *Elea* retained the Substance of the Doctrine of *Parmenides* his Master. *Plutarch* having said, that *Parmenides* admitted the Eternity and Immutability of all things, adds, that *Zeno* of *Elea* (b) did not particularize any thing, but seemed to float in uncertainty. But others (c) say, that with *Xenophanes*, *Parmenides*, and *Melissus*, he taught the Unity and Incorruptibility of all things, and the Imperfection of the evidence of the Senses. He was not humble enough to continue in his Tutor's Principles without any alteration: We see his Innovations in a Book (d) ascribed to *Aristotle*. They don't hinder his believing that there was no Generation: So that by a necessary Consequence of his Principles, he was obliged to oppose the Motion, Divisibility, Composition of Extension, &c. We have already seen in the Article of *Xenophanes*. That the Author of the *Art of Thinking* hath drawn up an Indictment against *Aristotle* in favour of *Parmenides* and *Melissus*. And long since Attempts have been made to give their Opinion a favourable sense, and a great air of Conformity to the Principle of the Orthodox, concerning the Nature of God. But in all Appearance, *Aristotle* doth not deserve Censure here; for he very well apprehended, and exactly related what they taught, and consequently we must believe their System to be a sort of Spinozism. There is no room to Conjecture that they (e) expressed themselves by Riddles or Emblems; for the particular Doctrine of the Unity and Immutability of all things was a Consequence of several clear and evident Principles. See above the Article *Xenophanes*. So that it was in good earnest, and as a Systematical Doctrine, and not out of a witty Conceit, that they denied Motion, and asserted that its Existence was barely mental. Here follow the Names of some Apologists for those Philosophers: (f) *Si prædicti Philosophi suum illud dogma ad hujus tam recondita (g) veritatis intelligentiam retulere, non modò reprehendendi non sunt, sed magnopere etiam commendandi. Certe Parmenidem defendit, atque interpretatur Simplicius, hoc in libro ad textum 6. Bessario, 2. Libro contra Calumniatorem Platonis, capite 3. & Nicolaus Cusa, in lib. de filiatione Dei. Lege etiam pro eadem re Eugubinum, lib. 3. de perenni Philosophia cap. 6. & 7. & F. Mirandulam lib. 6. de examine vanitatis, cap. 1.*

The result of all this is, that *Diogenes*'s Answer was sophistical, tho' it proved proper to draw on him the applause of the Company. It was a scoffing Answer, which I believe the Philosopher concerned took no other notice of, than to despise it. Perhaps he heartily laughed at it; being a thousand times happier than the Sophist *Diodorus*, who was not in a laughing Condition, when his Lectures against the Existence of Motion, were attacked by a malicious Irony. (h) He having put his Shoulder out of joint, applied himself to *Hierophilus* the Physician to get it set. How, said the Doctor? Your Shoulder dislocated! that cannot be; for it is neither removed out of the place where it was, nor where it was not. This was one of this Sophist's Reasons against Motion. If a Body moves, said he, it doth it either in the Place where it is, or in the place where it is not. But it doth not move either in the place where it is, (for if it is there, it doth not depart) or in the place where it is not, for it can neither act nor suffer where it is not. Therefore, &c. *Diodorus* being then very little able to relish this Logick, entreated *Hierophilus* not to remember his Discourses, but to give him a necessary Remedy.

(A) *Amongst other Pupils he was Tutor to* Cicero *and* Pomponius Atticus.] Mr. *Menage*'s Words are *Zenonem Sidonium & Cicero & Atticus Athenis audiverunt, ut indicat ipse Cicero libro II. & V. de finibus, & lib. III. Tuscul. Quæst. & libro I. Academ.* I found the passage in the 3d Book of the *Tusculanæ Quæstiones*, and it containing one of our *Zeno*'s Principles, I shall set it down: (i) *Solent isti negare nos intelligere quid dicat Epicurus. Hoc dicit, & hoc ille græculus me audiente Athenis senex Zeno istorum acutissimus contendere, & magna voce dicere solebat, eum esse beatum, qui præsentibus voluptatibus frueretur, confideretque se fruiturum aut in omni, aut in magna parte vitæ, dolore non interveniente: aut si interveniret, si summus foret, futurum brevem: si productior, plus habiturum jucundi quam mali. Hæc cogitantem fore beatum, præsertim si & ante percepta bonis contentus esset, nec mortem, nec deos extimesceret. Habes formam Epicuri vitæ beatæ verbis Zenonis expressam, nihil ut possit negari.* I have also found the passage in the First Book of the Academical Questions, which runs as follows: (k) *Carneades nullius philosophiæ partis ignarus, & ut cognovi ex iis qui illum audierant, maximeque ex* (l) *Epicuræo Zenone qui quum ab eo plurimum dissentiret, unum tamen præter cæteros mirabatur, incredibili quadam fuit facilitate.* I have not found the Passage (m) in the Second Book *de Finibus*, but I have found this in the First Book: (n) *Hic mihi Phædrum, inquam, mentitum, aut Zenonem puta, quorum utrumque audivi, quum mihi nihil sanè præter sedulitatem probarent. Omnes mihi Epicuri sententiæ satis notæ sunt, atque eos quos nominavi cum Attico nostro, frequenter audivi, quum ille quidem utrumque, Phædrum autem etiam amaret, quotidieque inter nos, ea quæ audiebamus, conferebamus: neque erat unquam controversia quid ego intelligerem, sed quid probarem.* Let us add to these three passages, that wherein the Pontif *Cotta*, *Cicero*'s Contemporary, acknowledges himself to have been a Disciple of this famous Epicurean: (o) *Zenonem, quem Philo noster coryphæum appellare Epicureorum solebat, quum Athenis essem, audiebam frequenter, & quidem ipso autore Philone, credo ut facilius judicarem, quam illa bene refellerentur, quum à principe Epicureorum accepissem quemadmodum dicerentur. Non igitur ille ut plerique, sed isto modo ut tu, distinctè, graviter, ornate. Sed quod in illo mihi usu sæpe venit, idem modo quum te audirem acciderat, ut molestè ferrem tantum ingenium (bona venia me audies) in tam leves ne dicam in tam ineptas sententias incidisse.* Mr. *Menage* hath not, like *Gassendus*, referred us to one of *Cicero*'s Letters to *Atticus*, to find the great tenderness of these two Illustrious *Romans* for our *Zeno*: (p) *Quando Cicero & ipsum audivit & de eodem ad Atticum scribens:* Zenonem, *inquit*, tam diligo quam tu. *Gassendus* seems to me to be mistaken. This Letter of *Cicero* was written in the Year 702 of *Rome*. What probability is there that *Zeno* was alive at that time, since he was very old when (q) *Cicero* was present at his Lectures in the year of *Rome* 674? How is it probable, if then alive, that we should find no hint of his great Age, in the Epistle of *Cicero*, cited by *Gassendus*, nor in the preceding Letter, where he mentions the same Man? Observe, the time when he lived. Voſſius (B) is miſtaken on that Head. Zeno is repreſented as a Philoſopher who Treated his Adverſaries with (C) a great deal of Contempt, and very roughly. There is ſcarce any greater inſtance of his Boldneſs than the Book which he wrote againſt (D) the Mathematicks. A Work

---

* See the Remark A.

(a) Aristotel. de generat. & corrupt. lib. 1. c. 8. p. m. 395.

(b) Ἰδίως μὲν οὐδὲν ἀπεφήνατο, διηπόρησε δὲ περὶ τούτων πλεῖον. Nihil hoc in genere singulare vulgavit, sed ancipiti fere dubitationis æstu fluctuavit. Plut. in Stromatis apud Eusebium præpar. Evang. l. 1. c. 8. pag. 23.

(c) Aristocles de Philosophia lib. 8. apud Eusebium lib. l. 14. c. 17. p. 756.

(d) Aristot. lib. de Xenophane, Zenone, & Gorgia.

(e) *As the Jesuits of* Conimbra *fancy in Phys.* Aristot. lib. 1. c. 7. p. m. 92.

(f) Conimbricenses ibid. *See the same also in* lib. 1. de generat. c. 8.

(g) *That is to say, that* In divina bonitate sunt omnia immensurate & unicè, sicut in monade omnis numerus uniformiter est, & in centro omnes lineæ ad se ipsæ, & ad unum medium, a quo processere, conjunctæ & copulatæ continentur.

(h) Sextus Empiricus ubi supra lib. 2. c. 22.

thenis Cicero & Atticus A. U. DC LXXIV. Olymp. CLX nem audiverint. *Jonsius de Script. hist. Philos.* pag. 183.

Obſerve that in the beſt Editions, for inſtance, that of Mr. *Grævius*, this Philoſopher is not called *Zeno* but *Xeno*. *Manutius*'s Conjecture on this head is incomparably better than that of *Corradus*. (*a*) According to *Corradus* the *Epicurean* Philoſopher is meant there; but according to *Manutius* (*b*), *Cicero* ſpeaks of an *Agent* of *Pomponius Atticus*. Obſerve that it is believed by ſeveral (*c*) that *Lucretius* was a Diſciple to our *Zeno*, and ſee what I have Remarked againſt (*d*) the Memorial, wherein the Baron *des Coutures* was cenſured for having advanced that *Zeno was the Honour of the Epicurean Sect.*

(*B*) *Voſſius is miſtaken on this Head.*] (*e*) He ſaith 1. That *Zeno* the *Sidonian* a Philoſopher of the Epicurean Sect was a Diſciple of *Apollodorus*. 2. That this *Apollodorus* was one of *Epicurus*'s Scholars. He cites *Diogenes Laertius* to prove both theſe Facts, and is miſtaken in the laſt; for *Diogenes Laertius* (*f*) only ſaith that *Apollodorus* ſurnamed κηποτύραννος *horti tyrannus*, was an illuſtrious aſſertor of the *Epicurean* Doctrine. If he had conſidered the paſſages which inform us that *Cicero*, *Cotta*, and *Pomponius Atticus* were Auditors of Zeno, he would not have made one of *Epicurus*'s Diſciples his Maſter; for ſince *Epicurus* died in the 2d. Year of the 127th Olympiad, and *Cicero* heard *Zeno* in the 674th Year of *Rome*, that is, the 1. Year of the 175th Olympiad, it is impoſſible that *Zeno* ſhould have been inſtructed by an Auditor of *Epicurus*. There are above 190 Years betwixt the Death of *Epicurus* and the Year when *Cicero* heard *Zeno's* Lectures. (*g*) See *Jonſius* who hath noted this miſtake of *Voſſius*. (*h*) Mr. *Menage* has adopted it.

(*C*) *Treated his Adverſaries with a great deal of Contempt, and very roughly.*] *Cotta* attempting to prove that the *Epicureans* were Slanderous, alledges our *Zeno*. (*i*) *Zeno quidem non eos ſolum qui tum erant Apollodorum, Syllum, cæteroſque figebat maledictis, ſed Socratem ipſum parentem philoſophiæ latino verbo utens* (*k*) *ſcurram Atticum fuiſſe dicebat, Chryſippum nunquam niſi* (*l*) *Cheſippum vocabat.*

(*D*) *The Book which he wrote againſt the Mathematicks,*] Of which we are informed by (*m*) *Proclus*, who adds that *Poſſidonius* refuted it. Mr. *Menage* cites ſome of *Proclus*'s Words: (*n*) *Eum* (Zenonem) *integro volumine refutavit Poſidonius Apameenſis; alias Rhodius; teſte Proclo libro III. ad* 1. *Euclidis. Ζήνων, inquit, ὁ Σιδώνιος τῆς Ἐπικούρου μετέχων αἱρέσεως, πρὸς ὃν καὶ ὁ Ποσειδώνιος ὅλον γέγραφε βιβλίον, δεικνὺς σαθρὰν αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐπίνοιαν.* M. *Huet* having told us that *Epicurus* rejected Geometry and the other Parts of the Mathematicks, becauſe he believed that they being founded on falſe Principles could not be true, adds, that *Zeno* Attacked them another way. Which was by alledging that in order to render them certain, ſome things ſhould have been added to their Principles which were not joyned to them. (*o*) *Alia via adverſus Geometriam graſſabatur Zeno Epicureus, imperfecta ejus eſſe docens initia, unde nihil effici poſſet, niſi alia quædam adjicerentur, quæ in iis prætermiſſa ſunt: quam ejus ſententiam toto libro confutare conatus eſt Poſidonius.* The Mathematicks are the moſt evident and certain of all Humane Sciences, and yet they have met with oppoſers. If our *Zeno* had been a great Metaphiſician, and grounded on different Principles from thoſe of *Epicurus*, he might have compoſed a Work not very eaſy to be refuted, and cut out more Work for the Geometricians than can be imagined. All Sciences have their weak ſide; nor are the Mathematicks free from that Fault. It is true that very few are able to oppoſe them very well, becauſe to ſucceed in this Engagement 'tis requiſite not only to be a good Philoſopher, but alſo a very profound Mathematician. But thoſe endued with the latter Quality are ſo raviſhed with the certainty and Evidence of their inquiries, that they never think of examining whether there be any illuſion in them, or whether the firſt Foundation be well eſtabliſhed. They rarely think of ſuſpecting any deficiency. But what is very certain is that ſeveral diſputes prevail amongſt the moſt Famous Mathematicians. They refute one another, and Replies multiply amongſt them as well as amongſt other Learned Men. We ſee the Truth of this amongſt the Moderns, and it is certain that the Ancients were not more unanimous (*p*). It is a ſign that there are in this Road ſeveral dark Paths, and that the Mathematicians wander and loſe the Track of truth. Which muſt of neceſſity be the Lot of the one or the other, ſince the one affirms what is denied by the other. It may be urged that 'tis the Fault of the Workman, but not of the Art, and that all thoſe Diſputes proceed from ſome Mathematicians miſtaking that for a Demonſtration which is not ſo; but that very thing ſhews that ſeveral Obſcurities are intermixed with this Science. Beſides, a parallel Reaſon may uſe of with reſpect to the Diſputes of other Learned Men. It may be urged that if they cloſely followed the Rules of Logick, they would avoid the ill Conſequences, and the falſe aſſertions which miſlead them. Nevertheleſs we muſt confeſs that there are many Philoſophical ſubjects concerning which the beſt Logicians are incapable of coming to a certainty, by Reaſon of the want of Evidence in the Object; but Mathematical Objects are free from this inconvenience. Let it be ſo; but yet that Science is chargeable with an irreparable, and very enormous Fault; for it is a meer Chimera which cannot poſſibly exiſt. Mathematical Points, and conſequently the Lines and Surfaces, Globes and Axes, of the Geometricians are Fictions which never can have a being: they are then inferior to thoſe of the Poets; for the latter commonly contain nothing that is Impoſſible, but have at leaſt probability and poſſibility. *Gaſſendus* made an Ingenious Obſervation. He ſays that the Mathematicians, ſpecially the Geometricians, have eſtabliſhed their Empire in the Land of Abſtractions and Idea's, where they walk at their Eaſe; but that when they get into the Country of Realities, they ſoon meet with an invincible reſiſtance. (*q*) *Mathematici, imprimiſque Geometræ, quantitatem abſtrahentes a materia, quoddam quaſi regnum ſibi ex ea fecerunt quamliberrimum; quippe nullo facto a materiæ craſſitie, pertinaciaque impedimento. Quare & ſuppoſuere imprimis in ea ſic abſtracta ejuſmodi dimenſiones, ut punctum, quod foret prorſus immune partibus fluendo lineam, longitudinemve latitudinis expertem crearet, &c.——Atque iſta quidem ſuppoſitiones ſunt, ex quibus Mathematici intra puræ, abſtractæve Geometriæ cancellos, & quaſi regnum conſiſtentes ſuas illas præclaras Demonſtrationes texunt——* (*r*) *Uno igitur verbo Mathematici ſunt, qui in ſuo illo abſtractionis regno ea indiviſibilia ſupponunt, quæ ſine partibus, ſine longitudine, ſine latitudine ſunt, ac eam multitudinem, diviſionémque partium, quæ ad finem nunquam perveniat; non item verò Phyſici, quibus in regno materiæ verſantibus tale nihil licet.* He to ſhew inſtances the vanity of their pretended Demonſtrations, in two ſubtil Mathematicians attempting to prove that a finite and an infinite quantity are equal. (*ſ*) *Nuper Viri præclari* Cavalerius, & Torricellius *oſtenderunt de acuto quodam ſolido infinitè longo & cuipiam tamen parallelepipedo, cylindrove finito æquali.* Others prove (*t*) that there are infinite quantities bounded on each ſide. If they find Evidence in theſe ſorts of Demonſtrations, ought it not to be ſuſpected, ſince after all they can ſay, it doth not over-

---

(*a*) Corradus in Ciceron. epiſt. 11. lib. 5. ad Atticum p. 257. Edit. Græv.

(*b*) Manutius in 10. epiſtolam Ciceronis ad Attic. lib. 5. pag. 151. edit. Græv. See the ſame Cicero. epiſt. 37. l. 13. ad Atticum & ibi Manutium, aliosque comment.

(*c*) See the Remark X in the Article Lucretius.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Voſſius de hiſtor. Græcis lib. 1. c. 15. p. 105. & lib. 4. c. 10. p. 466.

(*f*) Diog. Laert. lib. 10. n. 25.

(*g*) Jonſius ubi ſupra pag. 184.

(*h*) Menage in Laert. lib. 7. n. 35. pag. 279. (*i*) Cicero de nat. Deorum lib. 1. n. 94. pag. 135. edit. Leſcaloperii. (*k*) See Lactantius divin. inſtitut. lib. 3. c. 19. p. m. 201. (*l*) ἀπὸ τοῦ χέζειν, *quod eſt* alvum exonorare. (*m*) Proclus pag. 55. apud Barrow lect. 5. Mathem. pag. 76. (*n*) Menag. in Laert. lib. 7. n. 35. p. 279. col. 1. (*o*) Huetius demonſtr. Evangel. præfat. n. 3. pag. 6. edit. Lipſ. 1694.

(*p*) *See* Huetius ubi ſupra axiom. 4. pag. 28. 29.

(*q*) Gaſſend. Phyſ. ſect. 1. lib. 3 cap. 5. pag. 264. oper. tom. 1.

(*r*) Id. ib. pag. 265.

(*ſ*) Id. ib. pag. 264.

(*t*) *See the* 12. *Chapt. of Father* Maignan's *Phyſicks* p. m. 295 *and the* 12 *propoſition, which runs thus,* Infinitum categorematicum eſſe poteſt, quamvis clauſum intrinſecis terminis etiam in eo genere in quo eſt infinitum.

over-

Work which is loſt, as well as that written by *Paſſidonius* to confute it. There are ſome who more regret the loſs of theſe two Books, than that of twenty or thirty Dramatical Pieces, or that of the beſt Hiſtorians of Antiquity.

ZEUXIS,

over-balance the Evidence by which common Senſe informs us that what is finite can never be equal with what is infinite, and that Infinity as Infinity cannot have any bounds? I add, that it is not true that Evidence can accompany thoſe Gentlemen in all their Walks. For Proof of which I ſhall call a Witneſs very well acquainted with their Subtilties. It were to be wiſhed, ſaith he (a), " that the Analyſis of infinite Diminutions, which is pretended " to be ſo admirably fertile, ſhould carry in its " Demonſtrations that Evidence which is, and of " right ought to be expected in Geometry. But " when they Argue *on the Infinite, on the Infinite* " *of Infinite, on the Infinite of Infinite of Infinite,* " *and ſo on, without ever finding Terms to ſtop them,* " and when they apply to finite magnitudes, in" finities of infinites, thoſe whom they would " either inſtruct or convince, have not al" ways the Penetration requiſite to ſee clearly in" to ſuch profound Abyſſes——— (b) Thoſe who " are accuſtomed to the Old ways of reaſoning " in Geometry don't eaſily quit them to follow " ſuch abſtracted Methods; they chooſe rather not " to go ſo far than to engage in the new Paths of " *the Infinite of infinite of infinite,* where one doth " not always ſee very clearly about one, and where " it is eaſy to go aſtray without perceiving it. " For it is not ſufficient in Geometry to con" clude, it muſt be Evident that the Concluſion is " good."

It is a pretty good ground of prejudice againſt the Mathematicks, to urge that Mr. *Paſcal* deſpiſed them even before he applyed himſelf to Devotion. He had been paſſionately fond of, and had made extraordinary progreſſes in them. He was beſides endued with a very ſolid judgment, and very few were capable of knowing the value of things better than he. And it was not by his Converſion to the only thing neceſſary, that he became diſguſted at theſe Sciences which had ſo charmed him. It was the Examination of the thing it ſelf, and the reflection he made on the diſcourſe of a Perſon of Quality, which cured him of his prepoſſeſſion in Favour of the Mathematicks. It would be too great a weakneſs to fancy that the Chevalier *de Meré* Attacked him with Pious Reflections. He undoubtedly made uſe of no other than Philoſophical conſiderations: Let us ſee the effect of them, and cite the beginning of a Letter from him to Mr. *Paſcal.* (c) *Do you remember you told me once that you were no more ſo fully perſuaded of the excellency of the Mathematicks. And now you write to me that I have wholly undeceived you, and diſcovered to you ſomethings which you had never ſeen, if you had not known me. But yet, Sir, I don't know whether you are ſo much obliged to me as you think. For you ſtill retain a Habit, which you Learned with that Science, of not determining on any thing whatſoever any otherwiſe than by your Demonſtrations, which moſt frequently are falſe. The tedious raciocinations drawn from Line to Line perplex you in a more ſublime knowledge which never deceives——— but you will continually remain in thoſe Errors into which the falſe Demonſtrations of Geometry have plunged you, and I don't believe you entirely cured of the Mathematicks as long as you affirm that the little Bodies, concerning which we diſputed the other day, may be divided in infinitum.* The Chavalier *de Mere* goes on offer to him ſeveral Objections on the infinite diviſibility of Matter. Some of which are pretty good, and the others very bad, and look rather like rallery than ratiocination; and indeed there is ſufficient Room left to be ſurprized that one and the ſame Letter ſhould be mixed with ſo many unequal things. The Author nevertheleſs boaſts of a prodigious ability in the Sciences of which we are ſpeaking. *You know,* ſaith he (d), *that I have diſcovered in the Mathematicks ſuch extraordinary things, which the moſt Learned of the Ancients never mentioned, and at which the beſt Mathematicians of Europe have been ſurprized: You have writ on my inventions as well as M. Huiguens Mr. de (e) Fermat: and ſo many others who have admired them. You muſt then judge from thence that I do not adviſe the contempt of this Science, which, to ſpeak truth, is really uſeful, provided we don't too much apply our ſelves to it; for commonly what is diligently ſought after in it appears to me uſeleſs; and the time which it takes up might be better employed. Methinks alſo that the Reaſons which we find in this Science, tho' never ſo little obſcure, or oppoſite to Senſe, ought to render the conſequences drawn from them very ſuſpicious, eſpecially, as I have already hinted, when they meddle with Infinity.* Obſerve that it is highly proper that thoſe, who apply themſelves to ſhew the weak ſide of the Mathematicks, ſhould convince the Publick that they underſtand them, that they have ſtudied them, that they acknowledge the uſefulneſs of them, and that they have no deſign to rob them of their juſt value. The Learned Biſhop of *Avranches,* above cited, hath acted according to this Rule, (f) after having ſaid ſeveral excellent things (g) concerning the uncertainties and illuſions of this Science.

Another paſſage of the Chevalier *de Meré's* Letter runs thus: (h) *I put you in mind that beſides this Natural World, which falls under the cognizance of our Senſes, there is another inviſible, and that it is in the latter that you may attain to the moſt ſublime knowledge. Theſe who only inform themſelves of the Corporeal World, commonly judge very ill, and always groſly, like* Deſcartes, *whom you ſo highly eſteem, who did not know the ſpace of places otherwiſe than by the Bodies which fill them up—— But without undertaking to convince him of this Error, know that it is in this inviſible World, of an infinite Extenſion, that we are enabled to diſcover the Reaſons, and Principles of things, the moſt hidden Truths, the Relation, exactneſs, and Proportion, and the true Originals and perfect Idea's of all that we ſearch.* Thus concludes his Letter to Mr. *Paſcal*: I beg leave to ſay that I don't apprehend what he drives at; for he expreſſeth himſelf ſo looſely that he gives us opportunity to conclude quite contrary to what he muſt have thought and repreſented. His deſign was to cure Mr. *Paſcal* entirely of the Mathematicks: He therefore intended to hint to him another Object than that of this Science, to mark it out to him, I ſay, as the ſource and ſeat of thoſe Truths after which we aſpire; and yet he deſcribes to him an Object which very nearly reſembles that of the Mathematicks: For they do not conſider *this World which falls under the cognizance of our ſenſes,* but *that inviſible World, of an Infinite Extenſion,* where we may *diſcover the exactneſs, proportion,* &c. I believe he intended to recommend the Philoſophy of Idea's, the moſt ſubtil Metaphyſicks, which only tend to the Contemplation of Spirits, and the intelligible World which is in the mind of God: But the Characters, which diſtinguiſh that Science from the Mathematicks, have not been conſidered by him; nor did he remember that the Mathematicks have this principal property of conſidering Extenſion as ſeparated from Matter and every ſenſible Quality. Extenſion or intelligible (i) Matter is their Object as ſenſible Matter is that of Phyſicks. Their excellency, according to the Ancients, conſiſts in diſengaging us from periſhable Corporeal things, and elevating us to thoſe which are Spiritual, Immutable and Eternal. Whence it proceeded that *Plato* diſliked the Conduct of (k) ſome Mathematicians, who attempted to make good their ſpeculative Propoſitions on Matter. I ſhall here tranſcribe a moſt excellent paſſage of *Plutarch,* which turns on a Maxim of *Plato* that (l) God is continually Employed in Geometrical Exercises.

(a) Journal de Trevoux for May and June 1701. art. 11. pag. 423. *Dutch Edit.*

(b) Ibid. pag. 430.

(c) Lettres de Mr. le Chevalier de Meré n. 19. pag. 60. *Dutch Edit.*

(d) Id. ib. pag. 63.

(e) *It ſhould be* Fermat.

(f) Hue[illegible] ubi ſupra axiom. [illegible] c. 4. pag. 31.

(g) Ibid. c. 5. pag. 33. & ſeq. See alſo from page [illegible] to page [illegible]

(h) Chevalier de Meré ubi ſupra pag. 65. 6[illegible]

(i) Hæc eſt illa Quantita[illegible] quæ dici ſolet materia intelligibilis ad differentiam materiæ ſenſibilis quæ ad Phyſicum ſpecta[illegible] illa enim ab hac per intellectum ſeparatur, ac ſolo intellectu p[illegible] cipitur. *Blancanus de natura Mathematicarum* pag. 6. (k) Plutarch, in Marcello. pag. 305. (l) Τὸν θεὸν ἀεὶ γεωμετρεῖν Deum ſemper geometriam tractare. Plut. ſympoſ. lib. 8. cap. 2 pag. 718. NOTE *that the Moderns, who doubt of the exiſtence of Bodies might make uſe of this Maxim, and ſay, that the Action of God* [illegible] *our minds, whereby he communicates to us the Ideas of Exten*[illegible] *and thoſe of Numbers, and Motion, and of the Relations of* [illegible] *to ſpace and duration* &c. *is only a Geometrical Work.*

ZEUXIS, a very Famous Painter, flouriſhed four Hundred Years (A) before JESUS CHRIST, towards the 95th. Olympiad. What we know of his Country

Exerciſes. (a) "This Sentence intimates ſome curious and difficult ſpeculation, and not that which "he has often mention'd, when he profeſseth Geometry as a Science that takes off Men from ſenſible Objects, and makes them apply themſelves "to the intelligible and Eternal Nature, the Contemplation of which is the end of Philoſophy, "as to view the Myſteries of initiation into holy "Rites: For the Nail of Pain and Pleaſure that "faſtens the Soul to the Body, ſeems to do us the "greateſt miſchief by making ſenſible things more "powerful over us than intelligible; and by forcing the Underſtanding to determin, the rather according to Paſſion than Reaſon: For it being accuſtom'd by the vehemency of Pain or Pleaſure, "to be intent on the mutable and uncertain Body "as if it really and truly were, grows blind as to "that which really is; and deſtroys that Inſtrument "and light of the Soul, which is worth a Thouſand "Bodies, and by which alone the Deity can be diſcover'd. Now in all Sciences, as in plain and "ſmooth Mirrors, ſome Marks and Images of the "Truth of Intelligible Objects appear, but Geometry chiefly; which according to *Philo* is the chief "and principal of all, doth bring back and turn the "Underſtanding as it were purg'd and gently looſen'd "from Senſe: And therefore *Plato* himſelf diſlikes "*Eudoxus*, *Archytas* and *Menechmus*, for endeavouring to bring down the doubling the "Cube to Mechanical Operations, for by this "means all that was good in Geometry would "be loſt and corrupted, it falling back again "to ſenſible things, and not riſing upward; and "conſidering immaterial and immortal Images, in which God being verſed is always God. "Several paſſages of (b) *Ariſtotle* inform us that Quantity, as diſengaged from whatever falls under the Senſes, is the Object of the Mathematicks. And the greateſt part of the Mathematicians own that this Object doth not exiſt out of our Intellect. Dr. (c) *Barrow* diſapproves the granting this. And his Cenſure falls expreſly on the Jeſuit *Blancanus* and *Voſſius*; but it is certain that *Blancanus* was in the right, and that he ought not to have been cenſured for any thing beſides aſſerting the poſſibility of the exiſtence of the Globe and Triangle &c. of the Geometricians: (d) *Ultimò dici poteſt: hæc entia eſſe poſſibilia quis enim neget Angelum, aut Deum ea poſſe efficere?* There is no need of a long diſcourſe to ſhew that it is impoſſible that that Globe, that Triangle, &c. ſhould really exiſt; we need only remember that ſuch a Globe placed on a Plane, will not touch it any where but in an indiviſible Point, and that rolling on the Plane, it will touch it always in a ſingle Point. From whence it will reſult, that it muſt be wholly compoſed of non-extended Parts; but that is impoſſible, and manifeſtly includes this Contradiction that an Extenſion ſhould exiſt and not be extended. It will exiſt according to the ſuppoſition, and it will not be extended, ſince it will not be at all diſtinct from a Being not extended. All Philoſophers agree that the material cauſe is not diſtinct from its effect; wherefore what would be compoſed of non-extended Parts, would not be diſtinct from them: But whatever is the ſame thing with a non-extended being, is neceſſarily a non-extended thing. Our Divines when they teach that the World was produced out of nothing, do not mean that it is compoſed of nothing: The Word *nothing* doth not ſignify the Material cauſe of the World, *materiam ex qua*; but the ſtate antecedent to the Creation of the World, which they call *terminum a quo*, and they acknowledge that taking the Word *nothing* in the firſt ſenſe, it is abſolutely impoſſible that the World ſhould have been made of it. It is not more extravagant to aſſert that the World was made of nothing as of its material cauſe, than to affirm that a Foot of Extenſion is compoſed of non-extended Parts. It is not therefore poſſible that an Angel, or God himſelf ſhould ever produce the Triangle, the Plane, the Circle, the Globe &c. of the Geometricians; and therefore *Blancanus* deſerved on this head to be cenſured.

I leave my Readers to determine whether my Cenſure of the laſt paſſage of the Chevalier *de Meré* is well grounded.

(A) *Flouriſhed* ——— *towards the 95 Olympiad.*] Mr. *Moreri* is guilty of a Fault in ſaying plainly (e) that *Zeuxis* lived in the 78th Olympiad; for he ought not to have been ignorant that *Pliny* (f), who ſpecified the Chronology of this Painter, (g) Namely in the fourth Year of the 95th Olympiad, refutes thoſe who have placed it in the 89th. I am ſurprized that *Scaliger* hath not obſerved this in his Note on the place of *Euſebius*, which makes *Zeuxis* to Flouriſh in the 78th Olympiad. *Euſebius* deſerved to be reprehended; by Reaſon it is undeniable, without giving the Lye to almoſt all thoſe who ſpeak of *Zeuxis*, that he was very intimately known to *Archelaus* King of *Macedonia*. But there were two of the Name of *Archelaus*, and the firſt not having began his Reign, according to *Euſebius*'s Chronology, before the beginning of the 87th Olympiad, *Zeuxis* muſt be arrived at a very Remarkable Old Age, if his Flouriſhing Condition fell in the 78th Olympiad, and yet he Worked at *Archelaus*'s Court. I own indeed they are not incompatible things; but however *Euſebius* was too forward; he ought to have referred *Zeuxis* to the Reign of this *Macedonian* King. I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the manner of the Ancients placing the Chronology of illuſtrious Men, naturally tends to Confuſion. The Year of their Birth and that of their Death ought to be ſpecified, and not the time when they flouriſhed; for that is loſe and uncertain, it advances forwards or goes back according to Tempers and Opportunities: Some are at the higheſt Pitch of their Reputation at 30. Others don't reach it till the Age of 60. Which makes me obſerve the Proof that *Pliny* uſes againſt thoſe who place *Zeuxis* in the 89th. Olympiad. He refutes them by Reaſon that it is an Olympiad wherein the Painter who taught *Zeuxis*, muſt be placed. This Reaſon may paſs, conſidering the time when *Zeuxis* appears in *Pliny*: But if we alter the Text from the 89th to the 79th Olympiad as Father *Hardouin* hath done on the Credit of the Manuſcripts, *Pliny's* Argumentation will ſcarce appear juſt; he will refute thoſe, who ſay that Painter Flouriſh'd in the 79th Olympiad, he will refute them, I ſay, by ſhewing that to be he time where the Maſter of *Zeuxis* ought to be placed. But why muſt this time be aſſigned to him? Becauſe *Zeuxis* did not ſignalize himſelf before the end of the 95th Olympiad. This is a weak Reaſon. Muſt not a Painter grow Famous till 60 Years after his Apprentiſhip? Wherefore I ſhould rather chooſe the ordinary Reading, than that of the Manuſcripts in the King's Library. I don't impute to ſuch a Learned Man as Father *Hardouin* what I am to ſay; his Printers muſt have forgot ſome Numbers. He pretends that *Suidas* agrees with *Pliny* on the time of *Zeuxis*, ſeeing *Suidas* building on *Ariſtotle* places the Birth of this Painter in the 86th Olympiad and makes him Flouriſh in *Iſocrates*'s time. A little after he refutes the vulgar Reading of *Pliny* concerning the 89th Olympiad, by Reaſon that it is certain even by Virtue of what he juſt before cited from *Suidas* that *Zeuxis* died in the 89th Olympiad. I am ſure that if my Eyes don't deceive me, Father *Hardouin's* Printers have confounded the Numeral Letters of the Original.

As for the reſt I would not depend too much on the preciſion of *Pliny*; (h) it ſeems to me ill placed. There is no need of being ſo nice about the time of the Reputation of a great Man, and it were eaſy to prove, from this Author's own Words, that he had been more exact, if he had ſpecified the Chronology ſomewhat more generally. For what

(a) Id. ib.

(b) Voſſius de ſcient. Mathematicis pag. 4. & ſeq. quotes them.

(c) Iſaac Barrow lect. 5. pag. 84.

(d) Blancanus ubi ſupra pag. 6.

(e) Mr. Hofman has committed the ſame fault.

(f) Mr. Felibien pag. 66 of his I. Entret. ſur les vies & ſur les ouvrages des peintres places Zeuxis in the 95. Olympiad; but the Printer has committed a fault in making this Olympiad anſwer to the Year of the World 583. It ſhould be 3583. Voſſius de 4. art. popul. places him alſo in the 95. Olympiad.

(g) *I don't mean with the utmoſt exactneſs. See the following marginal Note.*

(h) Ab hoc (*Apollodoro*) artis fores apertas Zeuxis Heracleotes intravit, Olympiadis nonageſimæ quintæ anno quarto, audentemque jam aliquid penicillum (de hoc enim adhuc loquimur) ad magnam gloriam perduxit, à quibuſdam falſo in octogeſima nona Olympiade poſitus, cum fuiſſe neceſſe eſt Demophilum Himeræum & Neſeam Thaſium, quoniam utrius eorum diſcipulus fuerit ambigitur. Plin. l. 35. c. 9. p. m. 198. 199.

his Country is (B) a little confuſed. Painting was then in the firſt Degree of its Luſtre: And he raiſed it from the beginning of Reputation to which *Apollodorus* had brought it, to a great perfection. Some Authors tell us † that it was he who invented the manner of (C) diſpoſing lights and ſhadows; and it is agreed on all Hands that he excelled in Colouring. *Ariſtotle* found Fault with his Pictures for not expreſſing the Paſſions, and yet *Pliny* β teſtifies the contrary of his Picture of *Penelope, in which*, ſaith he, *Zeuxis ſeems to have Painted her Manners.* He acquired immenſe γ Riches; and once made a ſhew of them during the Celebration of the Olympick Games, where he appeared in a Cloak Embroidered with Gold Letters expreſſing his Name. After he became ſo Rich, he would no longer ſell his Works; but gave them away, and freely ſaid, that he did not know how to ſet a price on them equal to their Value. But before this time he obliged People to pay for the ſight of them; and none were admitted to ſee his *Helena* on any other Condition than ready Δ Money; whence in raillery the Wits called that Picture, *Helena the Curtezan.* He made no ſcruple ‖ of placing under her portraicture the three Verſes of the *Iliad*, where *Homer* relates that *Priamus*, and the venerable Old Men of his Council agreed, that the *Greeks* and *Trojans* were not to blame, to expoſe themſelves for ſo long a time to ſo many Evils for the ſake of *Helena*, whoſe Beauty equalled that of the Goddeſſes. I cannot well determine whether this *Helena* of *Zeuxis* was the ſame that was at *Rome* in *Pliny's* time, or that † which he made for the Inhabitants of *Crotona*, to be placed in *Juno's* Temple. It will not be improper to recite here what *Zeuxis* required from the *Crotonians* with reſpect to that Picture. They had by the Power of Money prevailed on him to come to them, in order to get a great Number of his Paintings, with which they intended to adorn their Temple; and when he imparted to them his deſign

what doth he mean by this fourth Year of the 95th Olympiad? Would he be underſtood that before that time *Zeuxis* lived in obſcurity, and did not begin to make himſelf known before that Year? But this is not a proper way of ſpecifying the time when any Perſon flouriſhed; ought it to be noted with reſpect to a Reputation of ſome Duration; and if *Pliny* had done otherwiſe with regard to *Zeuxis*, he would have been very much miſtaken. In effect he informs us that this Painter did not give his Pieces for nothing, till after he was extreamly enriched. But when he gave them away *Archelaus* was alive; for the Preſent of his *Pan* to *Archelaus* is one of the Examples of his liberality related by *Pliny*. He had therefore acquired vaſt Riches and a great Reputation by Painting before the Death of the laſt *Archelaus*, that is, (a) before the end of the 94th Olympiad; and conſequently *Pliny* would have been ſtrangely miſtaken, if he had placed the beginning of his Reputation in the 4th Year of the 95th Olympiad. For my part, I believe that the middle way betwixt *Euſebius* and *Pliny* ought to be taken, the rather becauſe we Read in *Plutarch*, (b) that this great Painter floriſhed when *Pericles* cauſed a great Number of Publick Edifices to be built, the ſupervifal of which he entruſted to *Phidias*. But without alledging that *Pliny* (c) places *Phidias* in the 84th Olympiad, it is certain that *Pericles* cauſed the Erection of thoſe ſtructures to be made ſeveral Years before his Death, which happened in the 87th Olympiad. Wherefore it doth not appear that *Pliny* had a great deal of Reaſon to refute thoſe who placed *Zeuxis* in the 89th Olympiad, and to make him then but a Young Diſciple.

(B) *Of his Country is a little Confuſed.*] For tho' the Teſtimony of *Tzetzes* (d), who makes him a Native of *Epheſus*, ſhould not make us doubt that he was Born at *Heraclea*, ſince (e) *Cicero* (f) *Pliny*, and (g) *Ælian* agree in affirming it; it is not a little perplexing to chooſe out of ſuch a great Number of Cities which bore the Name of *Heraclea*, that wherein *Zeuxis* came in the World. Some (h) Conjecture that it was *Heraclea* near *Crotona* in *Italy*.

(C) *Who invented (i) the manner of diſpoſing lights and ſhadows.*] The Glory of invention being that on which Mankind ſets the higheſt Value, *Moreri* ſhould have imparted this place of *Quintilian* to his Reader. Inſtead of which he aſſures us, that *the Art of Shadows*, in the charming Pieces of *Zeuxis, exceeded all price.* Which is on the one ſide to forget the principal part, and on the other to ſtretch the thing too far. He forgot to tell us that *Zeuxis* was the Inventer of the mixture of lights and ſhadows in Pictures; and without any ground he ſaith, that the Art of ſhadows rendred *Zeuxis's* Pieces ineſtimable. His miſtake happened thus. He had read in (k) an Author from whom he took ſeveral things, *that it was obſerved of Zeuxis that tho' his pieces, wherein the Art of ſhadows appeared firſt of all, exceeded all manner of price, which reduced him to the neceſſity of giving them gratis; yet he was Guilty of the Fault of repreſenting the Heads* (l) *larger than they really were, as he did alſo moſt of the Members: In which Quintilian* (m) *obſerves that he did no more than imitate Homer, whoſe Beautiful Ladies are robuſt, and in good caſe: Moreri*, I ſay, had read this, and did not know how to make uſe of it. He ought to have extracted out of it what was ſaid againſt the Works of *Zeuxis*; but above all he ſhould have drawn out the Remark that the Art of ſhadows was the invention of this Painter. Or at leaſt after having left out this Obſervation, he ſhould not have connected the Words that go before it with thoſe that come after; for by that means he hath falſified the paſſage of *la Mothe le Vayer*, which wanted to be mended inſtead of being falſified. What makes me ſay ſo, is that this Famous Writer lays down for a certainty, that the true Reaſon why *Zeuxis* diſcontinued the Sale of his Pieces, was becauſe it was not poſſible for any Perſon to pay the full Value of them. But this is to take that Painter's (n) Words too literally, who probably did not think as he ſpoke: And if he had really believed it, he had been the moſt extravagant *bragadocio* in the World; and conſequently his Rodomontade ſhould not be alledged as a juſt Reaſon. It is very probable that the Pieces which he preſented after his being very Rich, were not better than thoſe which he formerly Sold; for it is not cuſtomary to labour more carefully what one has a mind to give gratis, than what one deſigns to ſell at a dear rate. To which purpoſe I remember it is commonly ſaid that an *Abbot's* Sermons are better whilſt he is aſpiring after a Biſhoprick than after he hath obtained it. And therefore if *Zeuxis's* Reaſon had been true, he ſhould have left off ſelling his Works ſooner than he did. I was ſurprized not to find *Quintilian's* Obſervation deſign of Painting *Helena* (D), they were extreamly pleaſed, becauſe they knew his principal Excellence lay in Painting of Women. He then asked them what Beautiful Virgins they had in their City, and they conducted him to the place where young Boys Learned their Exerciſes. Which gave him the moſt favourable opportunity poſſible of ſeeing if they were fine and clean ſhaped throughout, by Reaſon they were ſtark Naked; and he appearing very well pleaſed, they gave him to underſtand, that he might judge thereby whether they had Beautiful Virgins in their City, ſince they had the Siſters of thoſe very Young Boys whom he moſt admired. He then deſired to ſee the moſt Beautiful, and the Council of the City having ordered all the Virgins to come together to the ſame place, that *Zeuxis* might have his free choice, he ſelected five; and taking from each of them what ſhe had moſt charming, he formed the Picture of *Helena*. Theſe five Maids were highly extolled by the Poets on the Topick of † their Charms (F) having obtained the Suffrage of the very Perſon in the World, who beſt underſtood Beauty, and accordingly their Names did not fail of being Conſecrated to Poſterity, tho' I don't believe any Track of them is left. *Cicero*, who informs us of all theſe particulars, hath left his Reader to gueſs that the Painter would ſee thoſe young Beauties ſtark naked: But *Pliny* * expreſly tells us ſo, and that before he choſe the Five, he had ſeen all of them in that Condition. It is indeed true, that he ſays *Zeuxis* worked for the *Agrigentins*, and not for the *Crotoniates*; and that he doth not name the Picture: This being excepted, 'tis plain he relates the very ſame Story with *Cicero*. I muſt not forget that ‖ *Zeuxis* diſputing

---

† Luminum umbrarumque inveniſſe rationem, traditur. Quintil. l. 12. c. 10.

* De poet. c. 6.

β Plin. lib. 35 cap. 9. pag. m. 199.

γ Id. ib.

Δ Ælian l. 4. c. 12.

‖ Valerius Maximus l. 3. c. 7.

† The ſame Author ſays that Zeuxis's Marſyas bound up was to be ſeen in the Temple of the Concord. Zeuxidis manus vidi, says Petronius, nondum vetuſtatis injuria victas.

(a) Euſebius *places the Death of* Archelaus *in the* 3. *Year of the* 94. *Olympiad.*

(b) *In the life of* Pericles.

(c) Lib. 34. c. 8.

(d) Chiliad 8. hiſt. 196.

(e) Lib. 2. de inventione.

(f) Plin. lib. 35. c. 9.

(g) Var. hiſt. l. 4. c. 12. & l. 14. c. 17. & 47.

(h) Harduin. in Plin. tom. 5. pag. 199. Jacob. Prouſt in Cicer. l. 2. de invent. *Note that the Ancients, who were contented to call him* Heracleotes, *have done worſe than if we ſhould now a days denote a Mans native Country by ſaying that he was Born at* Clermont.

(i) *See Plutarch's paſſage concerning Apollodorus in the Remark G.*

(k) La Mothe le Vayer, Letter 9. *in the* 12 Vol *of the Edit. in* 12. *pag. m.* 76.

(l) *Pliny not quoted by La Mothe le Vayer informs us of it l.* 35. c. 9. Deprehenditur tamen Zeuxis grandior in capitibus articuliſque.

(m) La Mothe le Vayer *quotes* li 12. Inſt. c. 18. *but it ſhould be* c. 10.

(n) Po donare opera ſu inſtituit, quod ea nullo ſa digno pre tio permu tari poſſ diceret. Plin. ub ſupra.

Obſervations amongſt thoſe which *Felibien* hath given us about *Zeuxis*. Mr. *Hofman* hath tranſlated *Moreri*'s Expreſſion ſomewhat ambiguouſly; for the words, *Donare opera ſua*, INTER QUÆ UMBRÆ EMINEBANT, *inſtituit*, expreſſed as they are, ſeem to ſignifie that there was one of *Zeuxis*'s Pieces in which he had painted the Shadows, which was the moſt excellent of his Works; beſides, the word *eminebant* doth not ſeem deſigned for *umbra* in the Painters Stile; for no places appear to have leſs *relievo* in Painting, than thoſe expreſſed by Shadows (a).

(D) *Of Painting* Helena.] It is an inexcuſable Omiſſion in *Charles Stephens*, *Lloyd*, *Moreri* and *Hofman*, to have ſaid nothing of the Picture of *Helena*, but that *Zeuxis* painted it, tho' the Ancients have related ſo many ſingularities concerning it. *Charles Stephens* hath only cited *Pliny*, who ſpoke of it by the by; he ſhould have quoted *Cicero* and *Ælian*, who have touched on the Circumſtances. *Lloyd* and *Hofman* don't cite otherwiſe, properly ſpeaking, than *Charles Stephens*: For tho' they refer us to *Cicero*, it is plain that it is with regard to *Zeuxis* in general, and not with reſpect to *Helena*'s Picture; this, I ſay, is plain, becauſe they refer us alſo to *Plutarch*, in the Life of *Pericles*, where he doth not treat of this Picture. By reaſon of the Printer's Blunder, we find *Cicero* cited in Mr. *Lloyd*'s Dictionary thus, 2. *de Iuvent.* and in that of Mr. *Hofman* alſo, *lib.* 2. *de Juventut.* inſtead of *lib.* 2. *de Invent.* which is enough to make ſeveral Readers believe that *Cicero* wrote *de Juventute* as well as *de Senectute*. (b) *Voſſius* hath reproved *Bulengerus* for ſaying in his Book of Painting, that it was *Venus* and not *Helena* whom *Zeuxis* painted, from the five living Originals placed before him: But in the correction of this Fault, *Voſſius* himſelf hath committed another; he ſays that *Pliny* doth no leſs expreſly than *Cicero*, ſpecify that *Zeuxis* painted *Helen*. But it is not true that *Pliny* mentions it; he ſpeaks in general of a Portraiture. Obſerve that *Cœlius Rhodiginus* committed a groſs Solleciſm (c) in ſpeaking of the Picture of *Helena* the Curtezan. *Zeuxin*, ſaith he, *picturâ nobilem, inter cætera ejus artificii, haud parum multa quæ circumferuntur, & hominum deſideria vix explens, Helenam quandoque ab eo expictam ferunt, cui tantum ſanè attribuerit, ut non temere nec quemlibet, ac* (*ut Græci dicunt*) ὡς ἔτυχε, *ſpectatum admitteret, ni μισθὸν ἀργύρεον, id eſt propoſitam pecuniæ quantitatem erogaſſet.* The like faults in Language have eſcaped the beſt Authors.

(F) *Were highly extolled* —— *on the Topick of their Charms.*] One might very well doubt whether the five Virgins whom *Zeuxis* choſe, were each of them handſomer than thoſe whom he did not chuſe. The reaſon of this ſcruple is, that he deſigned only to unite in one Body, the particular Beauties which he found ſeparated in thoſe five Virgins: to which purpoſe there was no neceſſity that they ſhould be all very fine; it was ſufficient that one had the Beauties which the other wanted. But who can deny that there are Women moderately handſome, who upon the compariſon of one ſingle part with the ſame in another, will ſurpaſs the greateſt Beauties. Wherefore it doth not appear that *Cicero*, or the Poets of whom he ſpeaks, were neceſſarily in the right to prefer thoſe five *Crotonian* Maidens, choſen by the Painter of *Helena*, to thoſe who were paſſed by. Perhaps the Painter rejected ſome, who wanted very little to render them perfect Beauties; but were not at all for his purpoſe, becauſe he found the ſame Beauties they were endued with, in a more exquiſite Degree in one of the five: After which it was enough for another of the five, tho' but indifferently handſome, to have that very ſmall thing which thoſe whom he refuſed wanted. The Queſtion, as is viſible to all, is not important, it may be laid aſide; and if any Perſon ſhould aſſert that *Zeuxis* choſe the five fineſt of them all, not by reaſon of its being neceſſary to his Deſign, but to enjoy a more agreeable Proſpect, I will not oppoſe him. One of the chief Grounds of this Story is what is commonly ſaid, that nothing in the World is perfect. And this holds true eſpecially in relation to Beauty: I refer my ſelf to the Criticiſms which handſom Women paſs upon one another, and yet they don't ſee every thing, as *Zeuxis* did, being, without doubt, reſolved not to follow the method of which *Horace* ſpeaks in his 2d. Satyr of the Firſt Book.

Ne corporis optima lynceis
Contemplere oculis, Hypſæa cæcior, illa
Quæ mala ſunt ſpectes. O crus! ô brachia! verum
Depygis, naſuta, brevi latere ac pede longo eſt.

But after all, the Painter had no need of any thing beſides his own Imagination to draw the Picture of an accompliſh'd Beauty; for it is certain that our Ideas go beyond Nature. *Ego ſic ſtatuo, nihil eſſe in ullo genere tam pulchrum quo non pulchrius id ſit unde illud ut ex ore aliquo quaſi imago exprimatur, quod neque oculis, neque auribus, neque ullo ſenſu percipi poteſt, cogitatione tantum & mente complectimur* ——→ *Nec verò ille artifex* (Phidias) *quum faceret Jovis formam aut Minervæ, contemplabatur aliquem è quo ſimilitudinem duceret, ſed ipſius in mente inſidebat ſpecies pulchritudinis eximia quædam, quam intuens, in eaque defixus, ad illius ſimilitudinem artem & manum dirigebat* (d). It would not be more impoſſible to find as compleat Men as the Heroes of *Romances*, ting the Prize of Painting (F) with *Parrhasius* lost it in the following manner. *Zeuxis* painted some Grapes so extraordinary well, that the Birds flew down to peck at them. And *Parrhasius* painted a Curtain so artfully, that *Zeuxis* taking it for a real one, drawn before his Antagonist's Work, asked with the utmost assurance, why they did not immediately draw the Curtain, in order to shew what *Parrhasius* had done. And having found his mistake, he confessed himself outdone, since he had only deceived Birds, whilst *Parrhasius* had imposed on the very Masters of the Art. Another time he painted a Boy loaded with Grapes, and the Birds accordingly resorted thither; at which this Artist being displeased, ingenuously owned that his Work was not sufficiently finished, since if the Boy had been as naturally expressed as the Grapes, the Birds would have been afraid of him. We are told † that he wiped out the Grapes and only kept the Figure, in which he had the least succeeded. *Archelaus* King of *Macedonia*, made use of *Zeuxis*'s Pencil for the Embellishment of his Palace; on which occasion *Ælian* || presents us with a good Reflection of *Socrates*. One of this Painter's best Pieces was *Hercules* strangling some Dragons in his Cradle in the sight of his affrighted Mother: but he himself preferred his *Athlet*, or Wrestler, before the rest, and under it (G) placed a Verse which afterwards

---

* [illegible] Cicer. l. 2. de invent.

* Tantum diligentiæ ut Agrigentinis facturus tabulam, quam in templo Junonis Laciniæ publice dicarent, inſpexerit virgines eorum nudas & quinque elegerit, ut quod in quaque laudatiſſimum eſſet pictura redderet. Plin. l. 35. c. 9.

‖ Id. Plin. l. 35. c. 10.

(a) See Voſſius de Graphice pag. 69.

(b) De Graphice pag. 69. in libro de 4 artib. popular.

(c) Cœlius Rhodiginus antiq. lect. lib. 19. cap. 27. pag. m. 1086.

(d) Cicero in Oratore, init.

† Senec. Controv. [illegible] || Ælian. Var. Hist. l. 14. c. 17.

Romances, than to find as beautiful Heroines as those of the same fabulous Country. This is so true, that when Authors would in few words represent a Person perfectly beautiful, they content themselves with saying, that they surpass the fictitious Ideas of Poets and Painters (a).

(F) *Zeuxis disputing the prize of Painting with Parrhasius.*] The Fact relating to the Birds which *Zeuxis* deceived by his Painted Grapes is commonly ted after a very confused manner. But if *Pliny* were well consulted, Authors would not fall into that confusion; for they would there see that *Zeuxis* painted two several Pieces which related to this fact and that each had its particular Adventure. I don't take notice of what several Authors relate, that *Zeuxis* himself attempted to draw *Parrhasius*'s Curtain; for *Pliny* doth not tell the Story so: But that alteration of Circumstances is too inconsiderable to mention it. There is much more reason to think it strange, that *Moreri*'s Dictionary should say nothing of the Challenge or Wager of these two Painters, and that *Lloyd* and *Hofman* have given but a very small hint of it. As for what relates to the other Piece, wherein the Boy carried Grapes, Mr. *Moreri* hath mention'd it in a manner which cannot redound to his Honour, by reason that he hath omitted the principal Circumstances, not having given the least hint of the Judgment which *Zeuxis* himself made of this Piece; Mr *Hofman* hath not forgotten this, but he makes use of a Phrase which he ought intirely to have suppressed: *eadem ingenuitate*, saith he, *processit* (Zeuxis) *iratus operi ac dixit*. These words are *Pliny*'s, and are extraordinary proper in the Original, where they relate to the Story of the Wager, that is to say, to *Pliny*'s Narrative, with what ingenuity *Zeuxis* owned that he was outdone. But when in an Article where there is nothing of this Ingenuity, we are informed that *Zeuxis* acknowledged with the same ingenuity, &c. it throws us into impenetrable Obscurities, where we are left with room only to conjecture, that the Author gives us a very imperfect passage. Most Abbreviators are subject to this fault (b). But Mr. *Hofman* is on this Head much more excusable than Mr. *Lloyd*; for the last having retained the Phrase, *eadem ingenuitate processit*, which he found in *Charles Stephens*, might easily think that it concern'd a particular to which the Reader of *Charles Stephens* was referred. But Mr. *Lloyd* hath suppressed this Reference, and by this means hath encreased the obscurity of his Article. Not that I pretend wholly to excuse *Charles Stephens*, for his *ut in Parrhasio supra vidimus*, could not give him a right to make use of these words, *eadem ingenuitate processit*, because he had not been speaking of the success of the Wager. The Article of *Zeuxis* is much better in (c) *Calepin*, than in all the Dictionaries which I have just mention'd. But I have not found any Author, who hath worse expressed the Dispute betwixt these two Painters than he (d), who makes the greatest figure in the Commentary *variorum* on *Valerius Maximus*. He affirms that *Parrhasius* painted some Birds on a Cloth, so very naturally, that *Zeuxis* fearing the judgment of the Birds, with a modest ingenuity gave up the Cause. I am very much mistaken if his Phrase, *Zeuxis alitum judicium timens* is not a corruption of *Pliny*'s words, *Zeuxis alitum judicio tumens*; and if so, what greater Instance can there be of the Alterations made in the Thoughts of Authors?

Let us remember that *Lancelotti* of *Perugia*, takes all that is said of these two Pictures to be fabulous. He doth not believe that the Birds pecked at *Zeuxis*'s Vine, nor that *Zeuxis* mistook for a real Curtain that of *Parrhasius*. It is thus that he clears himself of the Objection of those who have a mean Opinion of the Moderns; he denies the Fact; a very convenient way of solving Difficulties. (e) *Oh, Zeusi con l'uva dipinta, dite voi, trasse gli uccelli a beccarla, il che non habbiamo d'alcuno de' nostri mentovati di sopra. Gia io hò dato dentro con un libro di Farfalloni contra gli antichi Historici, & bocci rotto, come suol dire il Volgo, un paio di scarpe, intendendola come vogliono i presenti o' posteri bell' Ingegni, è però non temo, che sono millanterie della Grecia, e Farfalloni di Plinio, e quello dell'uva, e quelli de gli animali, che dessero segno di riconoscere altri della loro specie fatti di colore per naturali.* Mr. *Perrault* full as zealous for the Moderns as *Lancelotti* is, hath hit upon a more solid Answer; for he alledges the like performances of a fresh date, which also prove that the nicety of painting doth not consist in that. His words are: (f) "*'Tis storied that* Zeuxis *represented some Grapes so naturally, that the Birds flew down to peck at them. But where is the surprizing Miracle of this? A world of Birds have killed themselves against the Heaven of* Ruel's *Perspective by attempting to pass beyond it, without our ever being surpriz'd at it, and even this hath not much redounded to the praise of that Perspective——* (g) *Some time since, going by the English Nuns, I was an Eye-witness of an Adventure full as Honourable to the Art of Painting, as the Story of* Zeuxis's *Grapes, and much more diverting. A new painted Picture was set to dry in Mr.* Le Brun's *Yard, the Door of which was open; in the fore-part of the piece a great Thistle was perfectly well represented. An honest Country Woman went by with her Ass, which seeing the Thistle, briskly ran into the Yard, threw down the Woman, who in vain strove to hold him in by his Halter, and if a couple of lusty young Fellows had not each of them bestowed on him fifteen or twenty Blows with a Cudgel to force him to retire, he had eaten the Thistle, I mean that it being newly painted, he would have licked off all the Painting with his Tongue——* Pliny *also relates that* Parrhasius *so naturally counterfeited a Curtain, that* Zeuxis *himself was deceived by it. Cooks, in our days, have a hundred times laid hold of Partridges and Capons naturally represented, in order to spit them; and what followed? The Company Laughed, and the Picture remained in the Kitchin.*

(G) *Under it placed a Verse which became famous.*] If we believe *Plutarch* (b), this Verse was placed

(a) Lateri applicet meo mulierem omnibus simulacris emendatiorem *Petronius.* Spondebatque dicam cui nitor ignotus oris, Membrorumque modus qualem nec carmina fingunt Semideis. Claudian. de laudib. Stilicon. l. 1.

(b) *Some Instances of it may be seen in* Gronovius's *Book* de pernicie Judæ. *See the* Nouvelles de la Republ. des lettres 1684. *for May* art. 6.

(c) *The Quotation out of* Pliny, *ought to be mended. It should be* 53 *instead of* 35. Charles Stephens *and Father* Cantel *in his* Valerius Maximus in usum Delph. quote. l. 55. (d) *His Name is* Oliverius. *See* Valerius Maximus Variorum *of* Leyden 1655. pag. 314.

(e) Secondo Lancelotti da Perugia Abbate Olivetano, l'Hoggidi parte 2. disinganno 15. pag. 308.

(f) Perrault, Parallele des anciens & des modernes tom. 1. p. 136. *Dutch Edit.*

(g) Id. ib. pag. 137.

(h) Plut. de gloria Atheniens. pag. 346.

which became famous β. It is not improbable that he highly valued his γ *Alcmena*, since he presented it to the *Agrigentines*. He did not aim at (*H*) hastily finishing his Works. It is said that having painted an Old Woman, he fell into such an extravagant Fit of laughter at the sight of that Picture, that he died of it, as (*I*) *Verrius Flaccus* δ relates. There is in *Lucian* a Description of a Piece of *Zeuxis* which deserves to be read: It represented a Female *Centaur*. I had collected several Particulars for this Article, which I suppress, on account of the Publication of *Junius* (*K*) *de Pictura Veterum* ‡. I shall here insert a Remark which was in the Additions to my *Projet*: It relates to a Book of (*L*) *Carlo Dati*. I shall not forget the first which I made in this Ar-

placed under the Pieces of *Apollodorus*. He doth not say that *Apollodorus* himself put it there, as (*a*) *Vossius* and Father (*b*) *Harduin* aver; he saith, in general, that it was placed in the Works of *Apollodorus*, ᾧ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπιγέγραπται, Μωμήσεταί τις μᾶλλον ἢ μιμήσεται. *Cujus operibus inscriptum fuit, Facilius hoc culpabit quis quam imitabitur.* This is not the only thing *Plutarch* ascribes to *Apollodorus*, instead of attributing it to *Zeuxis* as others do: He will have it also that *Apollodorus* invented Shadows in Painting. ἀνθρώπων πρῶτος ἐξευρὼν φθορὰν καὶ ἀπόχρωσιν σκιᾶς. *Primus hominum invenit colorum temperationem diversorum & umbrae coloribus exprimendae rationem.* The whole passage runs thus: Apollodorus *the first Inventer of the tempering of Colours, and of the Art of expressing Shadows, was an* Athenian, *on whose Works was written,*

'Tis easier to find fault with it,
Than to imitate it.

One of our (*c*) Poets shewing an equal assurance, saith of his *Franciade* in the following Verses,

Un lit ce livre pour apprendre,
L'autre le lit comme envieux:
Il est bien aisé de reprendre,
Mais mal aisé de faire mieux.

(*H*) *He did not aim at hastily finishing his Works.*] (*d*) *Plutarch* tells us that *Zeuxis* being informed that *Agatarchus* boasted of painting quick, and in a very short time, said, that as for his own part, he valued himself upon his slow performance, because that was the way to make his Works of a long duration. The same *Plutarch*, in another (*e*) Book, relates the Story, as if *Zeuxis* owned to some who reproached his sluggishness in working, *That he was long in painting his Pieces, because they were designed for a long time.* But all Writers make him answer, *That he painted for Eternity*: And thus this Thought has lately been applied to the Dictionary of the *French* Academy, in the Preface to that of *Furetiere*. Those who amplifie the boasting of this Painter, should tell us what Authority they have for it.

(*I*) *As* Verrius Flaccus *relates.*] He adds two Verses which allude to this Adventure,

Nam quid modi facturus risu denique,
Ni pictor fieri vult qui risu mortuus est?

But if it be true that *Zeuxis* dy'd in this manner, how is it possible that so few Authors should mention it? Was there any thing so remarkable in all his life as this extraordinary death? Notwithstanding who, amongst the whole croud of Antients which have mentioned *Zeuxis*, only *Verrius Flaccus* informs us of this uncommon particular. And that by chance, and so improperly, that he is reprimanded by his Abbreviator *Pompeius Festus*, for inserting such a thing in a Work designed to treat of the signification of Words. I wish we had the Passage of *Verrius Flaccus* entire: What remains of it, was in the most deplorable condition in the World, before *Joseph Scaliger* applied his conjectural Criticisms to it. If *Moreri* and *Hofman* had known this, they would doubtless have mentioned it, as they should have done, and then they had given us the two Latin Verses a little more intelligible. Honest *Ravisius Textor* (*f*) hath not inserted our Painter in his Catalogue of those who died of Laughing; which is doubtless an involuntary Omission.

Observe that *Simon Majolus*, Bishop of *Vulturara* is very much mistaken in relation to this fact. *Zeuxis Pictor*, saith he (*g*), *deformissimam spectans quandam picturam solutus in risum expiravit. Verrius alter pictor quod Anum quandam deformissimam pinxisset eandem mortem in risum solutus obiit, Rhodigino teste lib. 4. cap. 18.* There is a very considerable Omission in what he saith of *Zeuxis*, and a very great mistake in the rest: For this pretended Painter *Verrius*, who died of Laughter, is a chimerical Person: Besides, *Rhodiginus* is also very ill cited. See the Margin (*h*); you will admire the Metamorphosis of the Thoughts transcribed by some Compilers, which is sometimes as surprizing as those of *Ovid*.

(*K*) *On account of the Publication of* Junius *de Pictura Veterum.*] I had rather refer to the excellent and Learned Collections of *Junius*, than heap up things which are to be found there. I take this opportunity to observe, that this Work of *Junius* Printed at *Rotterdam* by *Reinier Leers*, would perhaps have yet lain hidden in a Closet, if the Abbot *Nicaise* (*i*) had not made a thousand efforts to procure the Edition of it, which was forgotten to be told to the Publick in the Preface. This excellent Work is dedicated to the Abbot *Bignon*, one of the most illustrious Protectors which the Sciences at present have, who also by his Wit, Eloquence, and extent of Learning, worthily maintains the glory of the Name which he bears. Read that Epistle Dedicatory (*k*).

(*L*) *It relates to a Book of* Carlo Dati.] Here is the last piece of the Additions to my *Projet*: "Since the Printing of this Article, a Book "came into my hands, which would have "saved me a great deal of labour, if I had met "with it sooner. It is the Life of *Zeuxis* written in *Italian* by *Carlo Dati*, and Printed at "*Florence* in 1667, together with those of *Parrhasius*, *Apelles* and *Protogenes*. The Author hath "collected whatever he found relating to those "four Painters in the Works of the Ancients, "and hath very exactly connected the whole; "besides, he hath added to each Life, several Remarks, enriched with an excellent and "curious Erudition. Those which relate to the "Life of *Zeuxis* would afford me a great "deal of Matter, if I was not in the last Page "of my *Prodromus*. I shall only observe that they "have informed me of a particular of which *Vossius* was ignorant; that is, that *Bullengerus* was not "the first who said that *Zeuxis* Painted *Venus* "and not *Helena*, from the living Originals which "he selected out of the Beautiful Virgins of the "City. *Volaterranus* and *John della Casa*, before "him, mistook the one for the other; and what "is more, *Lipsius* hath somewhere said (*l*), that "it was *Juno* and not *Helena* that *Zeuxis* painted. I shall say by the by, that *Carlo Dati* "hath drawn up an Indictment against *Pliny* which "he hath not backed with good Evidence. He "believes that because the Temple of *Juno Lacinia* was near *Crotona* in *Calabria*, the *Agrigentins* did not cause *Zeuxis* to paint a Piece "in order to be Consecrated in that Temple. But "were not the Temple of *Delphi*, and that of

---

[illegible]

γ Mr. *Moreri* pag. 16. says *Atalanta* instead of *Alcmena*.

δ At the word *Pictor*.

‡ It was Printed since my *Projet* in the Year 1692.

(*a*) De Graphice pag. 13.

(*b*) In Plinium, tom. 1. pag. 200.

(*c*) Ron-[illegible]

(*d*) Plut. in vita Periclis pag. 159.

(*e*) Id. de multitudine amicorum pag. 94.

(*f*) See *his* Officina *or* Theatrum historicum. l. 2. c. 87.

(*g*) Simon Majolus dierum Canicularium colloq. 4. pag. 165. edit. Romanae 1597.

(*h*) Zeuxis in pictorem risu emortuum prodidit Verrius, dum anum a se pictam ridet affluentius. Coelius Rhodiginus lib. 4. c. 18. p. m. 207.

(*i*) *Concerning his Officious humour towards Authors, and his Zeal for the promoting of Learning, see* M. Nicole's *Preface against the Quietists.*

(*k*) *It is very well written, and ascribed to Father* de la Baune.

(*l*) Lips. monit. polit. lib. 1. cap. 1.

Article of my Project. It points out some general Imperfections (M) in *Moreri's* Dictionary.

ZIA, or ZEA, an Island of the *Archipelago*, one of the *Cyclades*, was anciently called *Cea*, or *Ceos*. It is a ten Thousand Paces from the Promontory of *Attica*, formerly call'd *Sunium*, and at present *Capo delle Colonne*. It was anciently part of *Eubœa*, but the Sea separated it, and washed away almost one fourth part of its length, which was (A) 500 *ſtadia*, or fixty two Thouſand five Hundred Paces *a*. In *Strabo's* time, the four Cities which had been in the Iſle of *Cea*, ‡ were reduced to two, one of which was called *Julis*, and the other *Carthea*. One of the two ruined Cities bore the Name of *Coreſſus*, and the other that of *Pœeſſa*. There was in the Neighbourhood of theſe two laſt Towns a Temple dedicated to *Apollo Sminthens*; and betwixt the Ruins of *Pœeſſa* and this Temple, was that of *Minerva Nedufia*, which *Neſtor* Conſecrated after his return from *Troy* *. I have elſewhere || noted the Names of ſome illuſtrious Perſonages born in the Iſle of *Cea*, and whatever relates to it with reſpect to *Ariſteus* the Inventer of Honey. I muſt add here, that a Woman of this Iſland invented the Art of ſpinning (B) the production of the Silk-Worms, and weaving it into Stuffs; and that it was the Cuſtom of the Inhabitants to poiſon themſelves as ſoon as they (C) arrived at a certain Age. The Port of *Zea* is one † *of the ſecureſt Harbours in the* Mediterranean, *beſides*, the Ships there *take in freſh Water, Biſcuit and Wood*. The Iſland pays to the *Turk* * *ſeventeen Hundred Piaſtres for the* Carafch, *and two Thouſand five Hundred by way of Tenth.* ‡ The Biſhop of *Thermia* ſpends half the Year in this Iſland, which hath at preſent a large City and a ruined Caſtle. Conſult *Moreri's* Dictionary in the Word *Zea*; to which word he ſhould have referred the Reader, rather than to that of *Cea*, when he ſet down the Word *Z I A*.

a Plinius lib. 4. cap. 12. pag. m. 477. ‡ Idem, ibid. ‡ Strabo lib. 10. pag. 333. See also Pliny ibid. * Strabo ibid. || In the Article Julis. † Guillet, Athenes ancienne & nouvelle pag. m. 55. * Spon, Voyage tom. 1. p. Dutch Edition. ‡ Baudrand, Geogr. tom. 1. pag. 25.

ZIEGLER

" *Jupiter Olympius* filled with the Gifts of all " ſorts of People, as at preſent our Lady of *Loretto* is filled with *Ex Voto's* from all Catholick Countries ?,,

When I Publiſhed what you have juſt read, I did not know that *Taſſoni* fell into the ſame Error with *Juſtus Lipſius*. *Queſti fu colui*, ſaith he, (a) ſpeaking of *Zeuxis*, *che chiamato da gli Agrigentini, ò come hanno altri voluto da i (b) Protoniati, a fare il ritratto di Giunone, il copiò dalle fattezze piu belle di cinque vergine da loro elette fra un numero infinito, che ne vide d'ignude.* The *Italian* is not leſs liable to equivocal ambiguities than the dead Languages: If a French Man ſhould place his words as they are in *Taſſoni*, one would think with Reaſon that he ſaid that *Zeuxis* ſaw naked an infinite number of Virgins, and that out of this great number, the Inhabitants of *Agrigentum* choſe five to ſerve as an Original for this Painter. But the Circumſtances of this Picture ſhould not be ſo related.

(a) Aleſſandro Taſſoni, Penſieri diverſi lib. 10. cap. 19. pag. 414.

(b) 'Tis doubtleſs an error of the Preſs inſtead of Crotoniati

(M) *Some general Imperfections in* Moreri's *Dictionary.*] I ſhall ſet down another Piece of my *Project*, tranſcribed from pag. 387. " I don't " pretend to propoſe this Article as a perfect " Model: The World will do me ſufficient juſtice, " if they find it exempt from ſome Faults which " prevail in *Moreri*. That Author's manner of " citing Books, is certainly a great fault; he heaps " up all his Quotations at the end of each Article, " without diſcovering that ſuch a thing was ſaid " by this, and ſuch an one by that Author; he " gives his Reader a great deal of trouble, ſince " he is ſometimes obliged to knock at five or ſix " Doors before he can find the Perſon with whom " he would ſpeak. This is a predominant fault " in ſeveral other Books, the conſequences of " which were very well known to a (c) very knowing " and judicious Writer, who hath lately only given " us the Hiſtory of the Roman Emperors. To this " I further add, that Mr. *Moreri* advances a thouſand things, which we either do not find at all " in his Citations, or which he confirms by no " Evidence, or which are curtailed by the Omiſſion of certain Circumſtances, which are the " moſt material parts of a Fact, afford the greater pleaſure. To conclude, I ſay, he doth not " always repreſent Perſons by the moſt remarkable paſſages of their Lives. And I think thoſe " Faults will not be diſcovered in my Article of " *Zeuxis*.

(c) Mr. de Tillemont.

(A) *Which was 500 ſtadia, or ſixty two thouſand five hundred Paces.*] *Pliny* affirms it: and Mr. *Baudrand* is miſtaken in affirming (d) on the Teſtimony of this Author, that the Circuit of the Iſle of *Cea* was formerly ſixty Thouſand Paces. There is a great difference betwixt the Circuit and length of an Iſland; however he ought to have follow'd the account of his Author without any diminution. He adds, that at preſent the Circuit of this Iſland is ſcarce 40 Thouſand Paces, the Sea having devoured part of it.

(d) Baudrand Geograph. tom. p. 25.

(B) *A Woman of this Iſland invented the Art of ſpinning the production of the Silk-Worms.*] Pliny and Solinus *affirm it*. (e) *Ex hac* (inſula) *profectam delicatiorem feminæ veſtem, auctor eſt Varro.* (f) *Ceos quæ ut Varro teſtis eſt, ſubtilioris veſtis amicula arte laniſica ſcientia prima in ornamentum fœminarum dedit.* What follows is more exact. (g) *Telas araneorum modo texunt* (bombyces) *ad veſtem luxumque feminarum, quæ bombycina appellatur. Prima eas redordiri, rurſuſque texere invenit in Ceo Mulier Pamphila, Latoi filia, non fraudanda gloria excogitatæ rationis, ut denudet feminas veſtis.* *Ariſtotle* (h) furniſhed *Pliny* with this Fact. *Salmaſius* (i) aſſerts that *Ariſtotle's* words ought to be underſtood of the Iſle of *Cos*, and that *Pliny* is miſtaken in underſtanding them of the Iſle of *Ceos*. His pretenſion is not utterly groundleſs, but it is not inconteſtable.

(e) Plin. lib. 4. cap. 12. pag. m. 477. (f) Solin. cap. m. 22. (g) Plin. lib. 11. cap. 22. pag. (h) Ariſtot. Hiſt. animal. lib. 5. cap. 19. pag. m. (i) Salm. in Solin. pag.

(C) *The Cuſtom of the Inhabitants to poiſon themſelves aſſoon as they arriv'd at a certain Age.*] It is pretended that they were obliged to it by a Law. *Strabo*, on this Subject, cites two Verſes of *Menander*, and believes that the Perſons who had paſſed the Age of 60, were obliged to conform to that Law, that a ſufficient ſtore of Proviſions might be left for the reſt of the Inhabitants. (k) Παρὰ τούτοις δὲ δοκεῖ τεθῆναί ποτε νόμος, οὗ μέμνηται καὶ Μένανδρος:

Καλὸν τὸ Κείων νόμιμόν ἐστι Φανία
Ὁ μὴ δυνάμενος ζῆν καλῶς, οὐ ζῇ κακῶς

Προσέταττε γὰρ ὡς ἔοικεν ὁ νόμος τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἑξήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας κωνειάζεσθαι, τοῦ διαρκεῖν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὴν τροφήν. i. e. *Apud hos lex poſita aliquando videtur, cujus meminit etiam Menander:*

Optimum Ciorum inſtitutum eſt Phania
Qui non poteſt vivere bene, non vivat malè.

(k) Strabo lib. 10. pag.

Jubebat

ZIEGLER (JAMES) Profeſſor of Divinity, a Mathematician and Coſmographer

Jubebat enim, ut videtur, lex, eos qui ſexaginta annos exceſſiſſent, cicutam bibere, ut aliis victus ſufficeret. He alſo ſays that it was reported that the Inhabitants of that Iſle being beſieged by thoſe of *Athens* made a Decree, by which they Condemned all the Old Men to Death, upon which the *Athenians* retired. The Greek Word κονιάζεσθαι in *Strabo* ought to be changed into κωνειάζεσθαι, which ſignifies to drink the juice of Hemlock. This is *Caſaubon's* Conjecture (*a*), which he confirms by two paſſages, one out of *Heraclides*, and the other out of *Ælian*. The firſt of theſe Authors ſaith that the Air of the Iſle of *Cea* is ſo good, that Men, but more eſpecially Women, might live there to a great Age; but that they do not make any Advantage of this Favour of Nature, and before they ſuffer the Infirmities of a frail Old Age, they diſpatch themſelves out of the World ſome by the uſe of Poppy, and others by that of Hemlock. (*b*) *Οὔσης δὲ ὑγιεινῆς τῆς νήσου καὶ εὐγήρων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν, οὐ περιμένουσι γηραιοὶ τελευτᾶν, ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἀσθενεῖν ἢ πηρωθῆναί τι, οἱ μὲν μήκωνι, οἱ δὲ κωνείῳ ἑαυτοὺς ἐξάγουσι. Quum ſalubri cœlo fruatur hæc inſula, & extremam ſenectam attingere ibi hominibus detur, præſertim fœminis, non expectant tamen provectæ ætatis qui ſunt, fatum ſuum, ſed illud antevertunt priuſquam vel imbecillitas accedat, vel parte aliqua manci fiant, ita ut hi quidem papavere, illi vero cicuta ſibi ipſis vitam eripiant.* As for *Ælian*, he affirms that thoſe who by Reaſon of a decrepit Age found themſelves incapable of doing Service to the Publick, Aſſembled together at a Feſtival and drunk the juice of Hemlock. (*c*) *Νόμος ἐστὶ Κείων, οἱ πάνυ παρ' αὐτοῖς γεγηρακότες, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ ξένια παρακαλοῦντες ἀλλήλους, ἢ ἐπί τινα ἑορταστικὴν θυσίαν ἀθροισθέντες καὶ στεφανωσάμενοι, πίνουσι κώνειον. ὅταν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδῶσιν ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τῇ πατρίδι λυσιτελοῦντα ἀχρεῖοί εἰσιν, ὑποληρούσης ἤδη τι αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς γνώμης διὰ τὸν χρόνον. Conſuetudo eſt apud Ceos, ut ii, qui ſenio plane confecti ſunt, tanquam ad convivium ſe mutuo invitent, aut ad quoddam ſolenne ſacrificium conveniant, & coronati cicutam bibant: quum ſibi ipſis conſcii ſunt, ſe ad promovenda commoda patriæ inutiles amplius eſſe, animo jam ob ætatem delirare incipiente.* *Pinedo* (*d*), *Kuhnius* (*e*), and *Berkelius* (*f*) approve of *Caſaubon's* Correction, and there is no Reaſon to doubt of it. *Scaliger* (*g*) citing the paſſage of *Strab* reads κωνειάζεσθαι, and not κονιάζεσθαι. Another of *Caſaubon's* Conjectures is that *Stephanus Byzantinus* (*h*), who relates the ſame particular with *Strabo*, but inſtead of telling us that the Old Men drank Hemlock juice, ſaith that they fought Duels together, ἀγωνίζεσθαι, *in certamine dimicare*, made uſe of a Copy of *Strabo* where the Reading runs thus κονίεσθαι or κονίζεσθαι *in arenam deſcendere*, and not κωνειάζεσθαι. *Berkelius* rejects this Conjecture on pretence (*i*) that it is contrary to the Practice of the Old Men of *Ceos* and the Teſtimony of the Hiſtorians; but he did not in the leaſt apprehend *Caſaubon's* thought; he fancied that *Caſaubon* ſuppoſed that this Word might be that of *Strabo*, whereas he ſhould have known that *Caſaubon* ſuppoſed the Copy of *Stephanus Byzantinus* to be corrupted. Mr. *Kuhnius* (*k*) offers another Conjecture, which is that the Reading in *Strabo* was ἀκονίζεσθαι to Drink Aconite: The change of which Word in to ἀγωνίζεσθαι might very eaſily happen. *Pighius* (*l*) had before him told us that the Text of *Stephanus* ought in this manner to be Corrected.

It remains that we examine whether this Practice of the Old Men was founded on an Order of the State, or barely on one of thoſe Cuſtoms, which being linked to the Notions of a Greatneſs of Soul, are almoſt as ſtrictly obſerved as the publick Edicts. We have ſeen that *Strabo* was of Opinion that there was an Edict, which obliged them to deſtroy themſelves after having paſt the Age of 60 Years. But there is a great deal of probability that he is miſtaken, for ſince the Air (*m*) of this Iſle was very healthful, and the Inhabitants lived very long, the Senate would have deprived themſelves of ſeveral robuſt Subjects, who were yet capable of ſerving their Country, if they had forced all thoſe who were Aged 61 Years to poiſon themſelves. And obſerve that the expreſſions of *Heraclides* inſinuate rather a Voluntary Cuſtom than an Obligatory Law. Obſerve alſo that *Ælian's* Words very clearly ſpecify decrepit Perſons, and not thoſe who had attained the Age of 61. All which Naturally tends to the Refutation of *Strabo's* Opinion. If it were true, we could at leaſt prove that this Edict was not in force in the Iſle of *Cea* in *Tiberius's* time. The Proof which *Valerius Maximus* hath given us of it, is ſufficient to diſcover to us the true ſtate of the caſe. Wherefore it will be convenient here to conſider the circumſtances of that Writer's Narrative: They will make appear to us that the Publick Authority did not interpoſe any farther than to permit thoſe to poiſon themſelves who were weary of living, but not to command thoſe who had paſſed a determined Age. *Valerius Maximus* before relating what he ſaw in the Iſle of *Cea*, Relates that at *Marſeilles* a poyſoning Liquor was kept by the Publick, and given to thoſe who offered ſatisfactory Reaſons to the Senate why they deſired to rid themſelves of their Lives. The Senate examined their Reaſons with a Temperament, which neither inclined to favour a paſſionate Inclination to dye, nor contradicted a juſt deſire of Death, whether to deliver one ſelf from the Perſecution of ill Fortune, or ſecure one ſelf from running the riſk of falling from proſperity. This was the Rule of the Senate, they forced no Body to poiſon himſelf, but granted a permiſſion to do it when they adjudged it proper: None could kill himſelf in form, and *canonicamente* without leave from the Sovereign. (*n*) *Venenum cicuta temperatum in ea civitate publice cuſtoditur, quod datur ei, qui cauſas Sexcentis* (*id enim Senatus ejus nomen eſt*) *exhibuit, propter quas mors ſit illi expetenda: Cognitione virili benevolentia temperata, quæ nec egredi vita temere patitur & ſapienter excedere cupienti celerem fati viam præbet; ut vel adverſa, vel proſpera nimis uſis fortuna* (*utraque enim finiendi ſpiritus, illa ne perſeveret, hæc ne deſtituat, rationem præbet*) *comprobato exitu terminetur.* The Author adds, that he believed this Practice at *Marſeilles* to be borrowed from *Greece* (*o*); for I have obſerved, ſaith he, that it is alſo in uſe in the Iſle of *Cea*. He tells us that going into *Aſia* with *Sextus Pompeius*, and paſſing by the City of *Julis*, he was preſent at the laſt hours of a Lady Aged above 90 Years. She had declared to her Superiors the Reaſons which induced her to depart this Life, and after that ſhe kept her ſelf ready to drink the Poyſon; and believing that *Pompey's* preſence would add a great luſtre to the Ceremony, ſhe cauſed him to be moſt humbly ſupplicated to be preſent. He granted the Favour, and with the moſt preſſing inſtances eloquently exhorted her to conſent to live, but all in vain. She (*p*) thanked him for his kindneſs, and conjured not ſo much the Gods whom ſhe was going to, as thoſe whom ſhe quitted to reward him. She Declared that ſhe had been always Favoured by Fortune, and would not expoſe her ſelf to the reverſe of it. (*q*) *Ceterum ipſa hilarem Fortunæ vultum ſemper experta, ne aviditate lucis triſtem intueri cogar: reliquias ſpiritus mei proſpero fine, duas filias & ſeptem nepotum gregem ſuperſtitem relictura, permuto.* She left two Daughters and Seven Grand Children, and having exhorted them to a mutual Agreement, &c. with an undaunted Courage She took the Glaſs which contained the Poyſon, and after recommending her ſelf to *Mercury* to obtain a Happy and ſucceſsful paſſage, She greedily drank up the Mortal Liquour. (*r*) *Cohortata deinde ad concordiam ſuos, diſtributo eis patrimonio, & cultu ſuo ſacriſque domeſticis majori filiæ traditis; poculum, in quo venenum temperatum erat, conſtanti dextra arripuit. Tum defuſis Mercurio delibamentis, & invocato numine ejus, ut ſe placido itinere in meliorem ſedis infernæ deduceret partem; cupido hauſtu mortiferam traxit potionem.* I omit the Reſt of

---

(a) Caſaub. comment. in hunc locum Strabonis pag. m. 165.

(b) Heraclides de Politiis pag. m. 20. Note that Berkelius in Stephanum Byzantin. pag. 421. falſely ſuppoſes that Heraclides ſaid that the men were particularly obliged to execute the Law.

(c) Ælian. var. hiſtor. lib. 3. cap. 37.

(d) In Steph. Byzant. pag. 731.

(e) In Ælian. ubi ſupra.

(f) Ubi ſupra.

(g) Scaliger in Varronem de ling. Lat. lib. 6. pag. m. 118.

(h) Steph. Byzant. voce Ἰουλίς.

(i) Hæc quanquam ſpecioſa videntur, minime approbanda judico, cum antiquo ritui & hiſtoriæ plane ſint contraria. Berkel. ubi ſupra.

(k) Kuhnius in Ælian. ubi ſupra pag. 233.

(l) Pighius in Valer. Maximum lib. 2. cap. 6.

(m) See the paſſage of Heraclides above.

(n) Valer. Maximus lib. 2. cap. 6. n. 7. in ext. pag. m. 180.

(o) E Græcia tralatam inde exiſtimo, quod illam ETIAM in inſula Ceo ſervari animadverti. Id. ib. n. 8.

(p) Tibi quidem, inquit, Sex. Pompei Dii magis, quos relinquo, quam quos peto, gratias referant: quia nec hortator vitæ meæ, nec mortis ſpectator eſſe faſtidiſti. Id. ib. pag. 181.

(q) Id. ib.

(r) Id. ib.

grapher, Flourished in the XVI. Century. He was born at *Landshut* (*A*) in *Bavaria*. He is said † to have been a Mathematical Professor in the University of *Upsal*. *Paul Jovius* thought him *a Swede*, (*B*) probably from *Ziegler's* Writing some Books concerning that Country. But that Proof will be scarce sufficient to those who should only say that he resided there some time; for he declares himself that he compiled his Work concerning *Scandinavia* from (*C*) Memoirs Communicated to him whilst at *Rome*. The Bishop of *Passau*, ‡ a very Learned Prelate, was his *Mecenas*, and provided him with a Tomb in his Episcopal City at his own expence γ. *Ziegler* retired to this Prelate's Court, when the Terror of the Ottoman Arms obliged him to leave *Vienna* were he had taught a long time δ. He died in *August* 1549. and not in 1559, as *Moreri* says. The Reading of several of his Books is prohibited by the Inquisition; and that of others permitted only on Condition that some things be Corrected in them, and that the note of Condemned Author be always placed by the Word *Ziegler* §. Some Protestant Authors ‖ acknowledge him their Brother. In the Year 1523. he was strongly inclined to turn Protestant, as appears by a Tract, which he wrote at *Rome* in (*D*) Favour of *Erasmus* against *James Stunica*, and which was Printed at *Basil* by *John Froben* that Year. What he wrote on

* Schefferus in Suecia literata p. m. 255. He quotes Messenius in Sueopentap. c. 6.

‡ His Name was *Wolfgang*, and he was of the House of the Counts of *Salm*.

γ Gaspar Bruchius, de Laureaco & Patavio Germanico lib. 2. p. 173. 174. & in epitaphio Jacobi Ziegleri ib. pag. 322.

† Thuan. lib. 6. pag. m. 118.

§ See the Index librorum prohibitorum page 546. Edition 1667.

‖ See Mollerus hypomn. ad Sueciam literatam pag. 441.

of the Relation; and had not cited so much, if it had not been very rare to find in the heathen Writers, the manner of their recommending themselves to the Gods at the Point of Death. I don't remember to have ever found that they asked Pardon for their Sins. Nor do we see that this Lady of the Isle of *Cea* put up that Petition.

It is observable by the by that the Heathens admired less those, who destroyed themselves in their misfortunes, than those who rid themselves of Life, when under prosperous circumstances, only to escape the Inconstancies of Chance. A Man was no sooner prepossest with the Maxims of the *Stoicks*, but he lookt upon those as Cowards who were fond of Life during Bodily Infirmities or disgraceful misfortunes. In such cases Death was accounted the only Remedy, which one ought to have recourse to without Murmuring or Complaining, and it was pretended that none, but those who loved Life, would accuse the Gods and Men. *Otho* when dying made use of this Maxim. (*a*) *Plura de extremis loqui, pars ignaviæ est: præcipuum destinationis meæ documentum habete, quod de nemine queror; nam incusare deos vel homines, ejus est, qui vivere velit.*

(*A*) *He was Born at Landshut in Bavaria.*] And not at *Landau*, as we are told in the *French* Translation of *Thuanus* cited by Mr. *Teissier* (*b*). The same thing is asserted with the Addition of a fresh Error in *Moreri's* Dictionary; for it is there specify'd that *James Ziegler was Born at Landau in the lower Alsace.* The Dutch Editions, and that of (*c*) *Paris* have corrupted this place instead of Correcting it; for they have changed *the lower Alsace* into *the lower Germany*. *Thuanus* (*d*) called him *Lindauus*, which rather signifies that *Ziegler* was of *Lindau*, than of *Landau*. However it is, we ought to take it for granted that when *Gesner* (*e*) and several others call him *Landavum Bavarum*, they mean that he was born at *Landshut*. *Paul Jovius* is mistaken in making him a *Swede*. I shall produce his Words in the following Remark. His Error was followed by several, as Mr. *Mollerus* observes in his Additions to *John Scheffer's Suecia literata* pag 441. The Learned Mr. *Schurtzfleisch* (*f*), tho' none of *Jovius*'s followers, represents our *Ziegler* Originally a *Swede*. I don't know any more than Mr. *Mollerus* whether he is in the right.

(*B*) *Paul Jovius thought him a Swede, probably from his Writing some Books concerning that Country.*] He quotes him with great Elogies on what he wrote concerning the Cruelty of King *Christiern* II. (*g*) *Quis eò Latinas literas, quo Romana arma penetrare nequiverint, pervenisse non miretur? Hic enim in terra Gothica natus, ac educatus, adeo exactè, puriter & facunde, Christierni Daniæ, atque Norvegiæ Regis immanitatem, neque ipsi sanguinario Tyranno diu latam, neque demum Diis ultoribus neglectam perscripsit, ut eruditis gentibus pudori esse possit; quod Latinæ facundiæ fruges, sub Cimmerio cœlo pene felicius ac uberius, quam sub hoc benigniore, ac temperatiore plaga proveniant.* *Schefferus* observes that (*h*) this Work was Printed at *Strasburg* by *Wendelin Rhiel* in 1536. *Gesner* saith the same, but observes that it was Printed with some other Books of the same Author, and with a description of the Holy Land Written by *Wolffgang* of *Weissenburg*: (*i*) *Terra sancta, quam Palæstinam nominant, Syriæ, Arabiæ Ægypti, & Schondiæ doctissima descriptio, una cum singulis tabulis earundem regionum topographicis. Item, Holmiæ plane regiæ urbis calamitosissima clades ab eodem descripta: cujus libri & hic titulus est: Christierni secundi regis Danmarchiæ crudelitas perpetrata in proceres Sueciæ & populum Holmensem. Volumen impressum Argentorati apud Wend.* Rihelium, 1536. *in fol. cum alia descriptione Terræ sanctæ juxta ordinem alphabeti, ad scripturam proxime directa, authore Wolffgango Weissenburgio.* This History of the Cruelties of *Christiern* is inserted in the 2d. Tome of the *Scriptores historiæ Germanicæ*, Printed at *Basil* by the care of *Schardius* in 1574. It was annexed by *Wolfius*, with *Ziegler's Scandinavia*, to *Albertus Krantzius's historia regnorum septentrionalium*, of the *Francfort* Edition in 1583. (*k*) The *index librorum probibitorum* informs us that the Description of the Holy Land, &c. was Printed at *Strasburg apud Petrum Olipionem* in 1532. *Gesner* was ignorant of this Edition.

(*C*) *That he compiled his Work concerning Scandinavia, from Memoirs communicated to him whilst at* Rome.] I shall set down a piece of his Preface, extracted out of *Gesner's Bibleotheque* in the 368 leaf. *Ego qui de locis Septentrionalibus, veteri historiæ incognitis, commentarium editurus sum, atque ita ut illa loca rebus his, unde regiones beatæ dicuntur, affluentia sim ostensurus, ut hæc plena fide apud auditorem reponam, necessario quoque præfabor quibus auctoribus constet susceptum opus. Romæ dum essem, fuerunt in urbe continuo tempore, duo Archiepiscopi Nidrosienses regni Norduegiæ, prior quidem gente Danus, &c. Post hujus mortem substitutus ei Olavus Romam venit, quem frequenter conveni, & didici reliqua Norduegiæ quanta tradi ab uno potuerunt. Gothiam vero, Sueciamque, & Finlandiam, supraque has ad Boream Laponiam extensam, sed etiam Gronlandiæ Chersonesum & insulam Tylen accepi à reverendis episcopis, Joanne Magno Upsaliensi, & Petro Aorosiensi Gothis, tunc in urbe privatis amicis, & mecum conjunctissime conversatis. Et quidem Upsaliensis in commentario Schondiæ scribendæ antea fuerat, permiseratque id censuræ nostræ &c.*

(*D*) *A Tract which he wrote at* Rome *in Favour of Erasmus.*] The Title of which is, *Libellus Jacobi Ziegleri Landavi Bavari adversus Jacobi Stunicæ maledicentiam, pro Germania.* The Printer *Frobenius* saith of it: *Commodum à Roma missus est libellus,*

(*a*) Tacit. histor. lib. 2. cap. 47.

(*b*) Teissier, addit. to *Thuanus's* Elogies tom. 1. pag. 20. edit. 1696.

(*c*) *In the Year* 1699.

(*d*) Thuan. lib. 6. pag. 118. edit. Francof. 1625.

(*e*) Gesner in Biblioth. fol. 367.

(*f*) *Page* 34. *of his* dissertatio de rebus Sueo-Gothicis apud Mollerum hypomn. ad Sueciam literatam pag. 441.

(*g*) Paulus Jovius elog. cap. 138. pag. m. 281.

(*h*) Scheffer. in Suecia literata pag. 2 5. edit. 1698.

(*i*) Gesner. in bibl. fol. 367. verso.

(*k*) Page 546 of the Edition 1667.

on Aſtronomy (*E*) is not amiſs. There are ſeveral other Authors of this Name; ſome of which are in Mr. *Konig*, but not *Jerome* ZIEGLER Profeſſor of Poetry at *Ingolſtad* in the XVI. Century. He publiſhed *Aventinus*'s Annals, and wrote † ſeveral dramatick Poems which are publiſhed.

† See the *Epitome* of Geſner's Bibliotheque p. m. 355.

ZOROASTER, King of the *Bactrians*, was Conquered by *Ninus*, and paſſed for the Inventer (*A*) of Magick. *Euſebius* places this Victory of *Ninus* in the 7 Year of *Abraham*, and ſeveral Authors make *Zoroaſter* much Ancienter. Some make him of a much later Date: All Authors are full of (*B*) uncertainties on this part of the Hiſtory of this Famous Perſon, and ſcarce agree better on the reſt. Wherefore my Readers ought not to expect here any thing beſides a heap of uncertainties, and differing

libellus Jacobi Ziegleri Landavi Bavari, quo promittit perpetuam rerum geſtarum ſeriem ex quatuor Evangeliis contextam, & obiter Stunicam pro ipſius dignitate tractat——Videtur hic Landavus homo multæ reconditaque lectionis, ingenio feſtivo, magno judicio, ſtilo non neglecto, denique toto pectore Germanam ſpirans indolem.

(*E*) *What he wrote on Aſtronomy is not amiſs.*] At *Baſil* in 1536. was publiſhed in 4to. his Book *de conſtructione ſolidæ ſphæræ, cum ſcholiis in opuſculum Procli de ſphæra, & de canonica per ſphæram operatione, & de hemicyclio Beroſi* memorato a (*) Vitruvio. *Adjunctis Arati phænomenis Græcu cum commentariis Theonis.* His Commentary on the Second Book of *Pliny*, *quo difficultates Plinianæ, præſertim aſtronomicæ, omnes tolluntur: item Organum quo catholica ſyderum, ut apud Plinium eſt, mira arte docetur*, was Printed at *Baſil* in 1531. Of this *James Milichius* ſpeaks honourably in the Preface to a Book which he publiſhed on that Subject in (*a*) 1534 in 4. *Extant*, ſaith he (*b*), *in hunc librum* (ſecundum Plinii) *Cigleri hominis docti, Commentarii, erudite & ſubtiliter ſcripti, ſed neque integrum librum interpretantur, & à ſcholarum conſuetudine nonnihil recedunt. Quare ſpero eum boni conſulturum eſſe, quod amicis morem geſſi, qui mihi autores fuerunt, ut hæc ad utilitatem juventutis collecta ederem. Adeo enim nihil de ipſius exiſtimatione detraho, ut libenter profitear, me ab ipſo ſæpe adjutum eſſe.*

* Lib. 9. cap. 9.

(*a*) Father Hardouin pref. in Plinium mentions that edition, I have not ſeen it, nor that of the Year 1538. Halæ Suevorum in 4. mention'd by Geſner; but I have ſeen that of Francfort 1543. in 4. and that of Leipſick typis Wœgelianis 1573. in 4.

(*b*) Jacobus Milichius præfat. commentarii in 2. librum Plinii fol. A. 2 edit. Lipſ. 1573.

(*A*) *Was Conquered by Ninus, and paſſed for the Inventer of Magick.*] The following Words of *Juſtin* inform us that this was the laſt Victory of this Conqueror, and that *Zoroaſter* philoſophized very judiciouſly on the Principles of the Univerſe, and the Motion of the Stars. (*c*) *Poſtremum illi* (Nino) *bellum cum Zoroaſtre rege Bactrianorum fuit, qui primus dicitur artes magicas inveniſſe, & mundi principia, ſiderumque motus diligentiſſime ſpectaſſe. Hoc occiſo, & ipſe deceſſit.* (*d*) Some attribute to *Semiramis* the Glory of having vanquiſhed *Zoroaſter*. They doubtleſs mean ſomewhat more than what we read in *Diodorus Siculus*, (*e*) that being gone to her Husband at the Siege of *Bactra*, ſhe adviſed and made an Attack, which ended in the Reduction of the City. After which *Ninus* Married her. I believe they mean that one of the Wars which ſhe glorioully terminated after the Death of that great Monarch was that in which *Zoroaſter* loſt his Dominions. An Hiſtorian cited by (*f*) *Syncellus* Treats of the Birth of *Semiramis* and of that Magician, after having related the Actions of *Ninus* (*g*). It is then to *Semiramis* rather than *Ninus* that he aſcribes the Victory of which we are ſpeaking, and I cannot tell whether to confirm this, one would not take Advantage of the following Latin Verſes.

Perſarum (*b*) *ſtatuit Babylona Semiramis urbem,*
. . . .

. . . .
Juſſit & imperio ſurgere Bactra caput.

Mr. *Stanley* (*i*) ſaith, that *Zoroaſter* according to *Euſebius*, was contemporary with *Semiramis*; but it is certain that by the Relation of *Euſebius* he was vanquiſhed by King *Ninus*. If what *Arnobius* ſaith be true, that magical Secrets were uſed on both ſides in this War betwixt the *Aſſyrians* and *Bactrians*, it will be difficult to believe *Zoroaſter* the Inventer of that Art; for it muſt be ſuppoſed that theſe Secrets quickly paſſed into *Chaldea*, and that they grew to ſuch a great Perfection in a very ſhort time, that *Ninus*'s Magicians were able to conteſt with, and overcome the Inventer. I don't lay this down as an impoſſibility. But *Arnobius* Words run thus: (*k*) *Ut inter Aſſyrios & Bactrianos Nino quondam Zoroaſtreque ductoribus non tantum ferro dimicaretur & viribus, verum etiam magicis & Chaldæorum ex reconditis diſciplinis, invidia noſtra hæc fuit?* *Ammianus Marcellinus* (*l*) will have it that *Zoroaſter* was only the Augmenter of the Magical Secrets of the *Chaldeans*. Some Authors inform us that *Azonaces* was *Zoroaſter*'s inſtructer, and conſequently *Azonaces* muſt be conſidered as the Inventer of Magick: (*m*) *Hermippus qui de tota ea arte diligentiſſime ſcripſit, & vicies centum millia verſuum a Zoroaſtre condita, indicibus quoque voluminum ejus poſitis explanavit, præceptorem, a quo inſtitutum diceret, tradidit Azonacem, ipſum vero quinque millibus annorum ante Trojanum bellum fuiſſe.* St. *Auguſtin* (*n*) and *Oroſius* (*o*) have followed the Tradition mention'd by *Juſtin*. *Apuleius*'s Liſt of the moſt Famous Magicians of Antiquity places *Zoroaſter* in the firſt Rank, and makes him the moſt Ancient of all. (*p*) *Si quamlibet modicum emolumentum probaveritis, ego ille ſim Carinondas, vel Damigeron, vel Moſes, vel Jannes, vel Apollonius, vel ipſe Dardanus, vel quicumque alius POST Zoroaſtrem & Hoſtanem inter Magos celebratus eſt.*

Obſerve that *Diodorus Siculus* (*q*) who very amply relates the War betwixt *Ninus* and the *Bactrians*, calls the King of the latter not *Zoroaſtres* but *Oxyartes*, nor doth he mention any Magick. Yet he relates what he had read in *Cteſias*, an Hiſtorian ſufficiently enclined to ſpread ſuch (*r*) ſtories. (*ſ*) *Voſſius* and *Henry Valeſius* pretend that *Juſtin* ſays that *Zoroaſter* defended himſelf againſt *Ninus*, not only by force of Arms but alſo by that of Magick. But *Juſtin* hath no ſuch thing. The ſame *Voſſius* affirms that *Juſtin*'s Relation was taken from the firſt Book of *Cteſias*, as *Arnobius* aſſerts But this is a new falſity. *Arnobius*'s Words (*t*) are very confuſed, and this Fact doth not appear there.

(*B*) *All Authors are full of uncertainties concerning the Time of* Zoroaſter.] We have ſeen him made Contemporary with King *Ninus*, who according to *Euſebius* died about 825 Years before the taking of *Troy*. We have alſo ſeen (*v*) that *Zoroaſter* according to the Opinion of *Hermippus* preceded the Trojan War five Thouſand Years. *Hermodorus* the Platoniſt (*w*) followed the ſame Chronology with *Hermippus*, and *Plutarch* (*x*) mentions it as

(*i*) Thomas Stanleius hiſtor. philoſ. Orientalis lib. 1. cap. 3. pag. 10. ex verſione Jo. Clerici.

(*k*) Arnob. lib. 1. pag. m. 5.

(*l*) Cujus (Magiæ) ſcientiæ ſeculis priſcis multa ex Chaldæorum arcanis Bactrianus addidit Zoroaſtres. Amm. Marcell. lib. 23. cap. 6. p. m. 374.

(*m*) Plinius lib 30. cap. 1. p. m. 725.

(*n*) Magicarum artium fuiſſe perhibetur inventor (Zoroaſtres). Auguſtin. de civitat. Dei lib. 21. cap. 14.

(*o*) Oroſius lib. 1. cap. 4.

(*p*) Apuleius apolog. pag. m. 331.

(*c*) Juſtin lib. 1, cap. 1. (*d*) Theo in progym. cap. 9. pag. m. 112. (*e*) Diodor. Sicul. lib. 2. cap. 6. (*f*) Call'd Cephalion. *He lived under* Hadrian. *See* Marſham ubi infra. (*g*) Syncellus pag. 167. apud Marſham. Chron. can. ad ſecul. 9. pag. m. 144. (*b*) Propert. eleg. 10. lib. 3.

(*q*) Diodor. Sicul. lib. 2. cap. 4. & ſeq. (*r*) Henr. Valeſ. in Amm. Marcell. lib. 23. p. m. 374. (*ſ*) Voſſius de orig. idol. lib. 1. cap. 5. pag. m. 33. (*t*) Arnob. lib. 1. pag. m. 31. (*v*) *In the foregoing* Remark. (*w*) Apud Diogen. Laert, in proœm. n. 2. (*x*) Plut de Iſide pag. 369.

ing ſtories. We are told * that *Zoroaſter* laughed, the very day he was Born, which was peculiar to him, amongſt the whole race of Mankind; and that the Palpitation of his Brain was ſo ſtrong, that it repulſed any Hand laid upon his Head, which was a preſage of his Knowledge. It is added † that he paſſed twenty Years in the Deſerts, and that he eat of but one Cheeſe which never grew old; that the ♃ Love of Wiſdom and Juſtice obliged him to retire to a Mountain to live there in ſolitude; that when he deſcended from thence there fell a celeſtial fire upon it which perpetually burned; that the King of *Perſia* accompanied with the greateſt Lords of his Court approached it in order to put up Prayers to God; that *Zoroaſter* came out of the Flames without being damaged; that he comforted and encouraged the *Perſians*, and that he offered Sacrifices as if God had accompanied him to that place; that afterwards he did not live indifferently with all ſorts of Men, but only with thoſe born for Truth, and who were capable of the knowledge of God, whom the *Perſians* called *Magi*; that he wiſhed γ to be ſtruck with Thunder, and conſumed by it, and that he ordered the *Perſians* to collect his Bones after he was Burnt in this manner, and to keep and reverence them as a pledge of the Conſervation of their Monarchy; that they really retained a great Veneration for his Relicks, but in proceſs of time they neglected them, and alſo fell from their Royal Sovereignty. The Chronicle of *Alexandria* adds, that after having made this diſcourſe to them, he invoked *Orion*, and was conſumed by a heavenly Fire. Some Writers ſay ♃ that *Mizraim* the Son of *Ham* was inſtructed in Magick by his Father, and that he was ζ Burned alive by the Devil, whom he too frequently importuned; that the *Perſians* || adored him as a Favourite of God, and a Saint whom a Thunderbolt ſerved as a Vehicle to Mount to Heaven, and

* *Riſiſſe eodem die, quo genitus eſſet, unum hominem accepimus Zoroaſtrem. Eidem cerebrum ita palpitaſſe, ut impoſitam repelleret manum, futuræ præſagio ſcientiæ.* Plin. lib. 7. cap. 16. p. m. 35.

† Id. lib. 11. cap. 42. p. 102.

♃ Dio Chryſoſt. orat. Boryſthenica.

γ Cedrenus, & Suidas.

as being the moſt commonly believed: But according to *Suidas*, the interval betwixt *Zoroaſter* and the Trojan War was but 500 Years. Some very great Authors have ſaid that *Zoroaſter* lived ſix Thouſand Years before the Death of *Plato*: (a) *Eudoxus, qui inter ſapientiæ ſectas clariſſimam, utiliſſimamque eam* (Magicam artem) *intelligi voluit, Zoroaſtrem hunc ſex millibus annorum ante Platonis mortem fuiſſe prodidit. Sic & Ariſtoteles.* Others, as *Xanthus* (b) the *Lydian*, do not make him above ſix Hundred Years more Ancient than *Xerxes*'s Expedition. Others will have him to be confounded with a *Pamphylian* (c) whoſe Name was *Er*, and who was the Son of *Armenius*, and being riſen again twelve days after his Death, related what he had ſeen in the other World. His Narrations ſeem to prove that he had read *Homer*'s Iliads, and are at leaſt a Demonſtrative Proof that he lived after the Siege of Troy. You will find them in *Plato* (d) in the 10 Book of the Republick. It is *Clemens Alexandrinus* who ſuppoſes that this Man was the ſame with *Zoroaſter*'s which he proves by (e) the Latter; declaring himſelf the Son of *Armenius*, a *Pamphylian* by Birth, and Divinely inſtructed in ſeveral things in Hell. But ſince *Arnobius* obſerves that this *Pamphylian* was a Favourite of *Cyrus*, we have a Tradition according to which *Zoroaſter* appeared in the World much later than 'tis believed. (f) *Armenius Zoſtriani nepos, & familiaris Pamphilus Cyri*, are *Arnobius*'s Words. *Valeſius* (g) obſerves that *Armenius* is there taken for *filius Armenii*; and the Word *Cyri* ſeems to him very ſuſpicious, he rather inclining to have it *Nini*, becauſe, ſaith he, the Perſon ſpoken of is one *Zoroaſter* mentioned in *Cteſias*'s firſt Book. But *Cteſias* did not begin to ſpeak of the Kings of *Perſia* till his 7th Book; and his ſix preceding Books were employed in the Relation of the Actions of the *Aſſyrians* and *Medes*. I anſwer that it is not at all certain that *Arnobius* pretends, that *Cteſias* ſpoke of this Son of *Armenius*. Obſerve that ſeveral Criticks will have *Oſtanis* or *Hoſtanis* put into the place of *Zoſtriani*; but they are not aware that they aſcribe a very groſs Anachroniſm to *Arnobius*, for *Oſtanes* having followed *Xerxes* (h) in the Expedition to *Greece*, it is not poſſible that he ſhould have been Grand Father to a Friend of *Cyrus*.

Agathias, who lived in *Juſtinian*'s time, informs us, that according to the *Perſians* of that time, *Zoroaſter*, and *Hyſtaſpes* were Contemporary. But they did not ſay whether this *Hyſtaſpes* was the Father of *Darius*, or any other. *Marſham* (i) poſitively decides, that it ought to be underſtood of *Darius*'s Father, and grounds his Opinion on one of the Elogies ingraved on his Tomb, which makes him (k) the Inſtructer of the *Magi*; and beſides he alledges another Reaſon for it, *viz.* that the ſame Hiſtorian who affirms that *Hyſtaſpes* excell'd in Magick, ſtyles him the Father of *Darius*: (l) *Deinde* (poſt Zoroaſtrem) *Hyſtaſpes Rex prudentiſſimus Darii pater. Qui cum ſuperioris Indiæ ſecreta fidentius penetraret, ad nemoroſam quamdam venerat ſolitudinem, cujus tranquillis ſilentiis præcelſa Brachmanorum ingenia potiuntur: eorumque monitu rationes mundani motûs & ſiderum, puroſque ſacrorum ritus quantum colligere potuit eruditus, ex his quæ didicit, aliqua ſenſibus Magorum infudit: quæ illi cum diſciplinis præſentiendi futura, per ſuam quiſque progeniem, poſteris ætatibus tradunt. Ex eo per ſæcula multa ad præſens una eademque proſapia multitudo creata, Deorum cultibus dedicatur.* *Ammianus Mercellinus* had no Reaſon to ſay, that this Father of *Darius* was a King, and perhaps he committed this Fault having Read in general, that one King *Hyſtaſpes* was a great Magician, and believing that there was no other *Hyſtaſpes* than the Father of *Darius*. But it is beyond diſpute that a certain *Hyſtaſpes* elder than the Foundation of *Rome*, and a great Prophet, is mentioned by Authors. (m) *Hydaſpes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquiſſimus, a quo amnis quoque nomen accipit qui nunc Hydaſpes dicitur, admirabilis omnium, ſub interpretatione vaticinantis pueri ad memoriam poſteris tradidit, ſublatum iri ex orbe imperium, nomenque Romanum; multo ante præfatus, quam illa Trojana gens conderetur.* It ought to be Read *Hyſtaſpes* and not *Hydaſpes* in this paſſage of *Lactantius*. Thus alſo ſome good Criticks have Corrected two places, where *Juſtin Martyr* mentions this *Pagan* Prophet; (n) one of them tends to inform us that he predicted the conflagration of all periſhable things; and in the other he obſerves that the Reading of his Writings was prohibited on Pain of Death, becauſe they diſcovered the truths which the *Pagans* perſecuted. (o) Καθ' ἐνέργειαν δὲ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων, θάνατος ὡρίσθη κατὰ τῶν τὰς Ὑστάσπου, ἢ Σιβύλλης, ἢ τῶν προφητῶν βίβλους ἀναγινωσκόντων, ὅπως διὰ τοῦ φόβου ἀποστρέψωσιν ἐντυγχάνοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῶν καλῶν γνῶσιν λαβεῖν, αὐτοῖς δὲ δουλεύοντας κατέχωσιν· ὅπερ εἰς τέλος οὐκ ἴσχυσαν πρᾶξαι. *Operâ autem & inſtinctu malorum dæmonum mortis ſupplicium adverſus librorum Hydaſpis aut Sibyllæ aut prophetarum lectores conſtitutum eſt: ut per timorem homines ab illis, quò minùs ſcripta ea legentes verum bonarum notitiam percipiant, ſed in ſervitute eorum retineantur, abſterreantur.* I ſhall obſerve

(a) Plin. ubi ſupra.

(b) Apud Diogen. Laert. lib.

(c) Plato de repub. lib. 10. pag. 361.

(d) Pag. 361. & ſeq.

(e) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. lib. 5. p. 599.

(f) Arnob. lib. 1. pag. 31.

(g) Henr. Valeſius ubi ſupra.

(h) Plin. lib. 30. cap. 1. pag. 7?6.

(i) Marſham ubi ſupra pag. m. 145.

very, but as a living Star, whence it proceeded, that after his Death he was called *Zoroaster*. *Gregorius Turonensis* (C) relates very near the same thing of *Cush*, the Eldest Son of *Ham*. Others will have it that *Ham* himself was the *Zoroaster* of the Eastern Nations, and the Inventer of *Magick*. Mr. *Bochart* * very clearly refutes this Falsity. *Cedrenus* observes that *Zoroaster*, who became so famous for *Astronomy* amongst the *Persians*, was descended from *Belus*. Which imports that he descended from *Nimrod*. Some Authors have taken him for *Nimrod* † himself, others for *Assur* or *Japhet*. ß *The Ancient* Persians *believe Zoroaster* ancienter than Moses, *and some* Magi *affirm him to be the same with* Abraham, *and frequently call him* Ibrahim Zerdascht, *as much as to say*, Abraham *the lover of Fire.* The Eastern Christians say that Zoroaster γ *began to flourish in the Reign of* Cambyses, *and that he was a Native of the Province of* Media; *but others make him an* Assyrian, *and will have him to have been a Disciple of the Prophet* Eliseh—— δ Ben Schuhnah *saith, that he was a Disciple of* Ezra, *and that this Prophet laid his Curse on him, on account of his maintaining some Opinions which were utterly opposite to the Jewish Law; that he became Leprous by way of punishment for his Impiety, and that being forced out of* Jerusalem *on that account, he retired to* Persia, *where he set up a new Religion.* Some have taken him ε for the Prophet *Ezekiel*, and it cannot be denied that they ground their Assertion on the ζ Agreement of numerous Particulars which belong to the one, and are related of the other. *George Hornius* imagins, η *Zoroaster* to be the false Prophet *Balaam*. Mr. *Huet* θ shews that he was the *Moses* of the *Jews*, and mentions an infinite number of Particulars, in which the Scriptural Relations of *Moses* agree with the Pagan Stories of *Zoroaster*. There are scarce any who do not believe that there were several *Zoroasters*, as well as several *Jupiters* and *Hercules's*. See Mr. *Thomas Stanley's* Treatise ι which Mr. *le Clerc* hath rendred into Latin; and you will there find mention'd a κ *Chaldean*, a *Bactrian*, a *Persian*, a *Pamphilian*, a *Proconnesian*, and a λ *Babylonian Zoroaster*. Those are in the wrong who believe that *Zoroaster* taught a Diabolical Magick; for his Magick was only the study of the Divine Nature, and Religious Worship, as *Plato* (D) expresly declares. But tho' it is easie to clear him

[illegible]

δ Hyde, [illegible] pag. 313.

ζ Id. ib. pag. 312.

ε Hornius [illegible] lib. 2. cap. 4 pag. [illegible]

θ Hornius ubi supra pag. 132 & 314.

ι Intitled Historia Philosophiæ Orientalis.

κ In the 2d chapt. of the 1st. Book.

λ See the Remark E towards the end.

---

observe by the by, that these Books (a) as well as those of the *Sibyls* were the pious Forgeries of some Christians. *Marsham* might have made use of another Proof, and form his Argument thus: *Clemens Alexandrinus* saith, that *Zoroaster* was the same with the *Pamphilian* Son of *Armenius*; but, according to *Arnobius*, this Pamphilian was a Favourite of *Cyrus*, and we find in *Herodotus* (b) a Discourse of *Cyrus* and *Hystaspes* the Father of *Darius*; wherefore it is true that *Zoroaster* and this *Hystaspes* lived at the same time. *Valesius* (c) the younger affirms, that according to the Testimony of *Agathias*, some said that *Hystaspes* the Doctor of the *Magi*, was of a much older Date than *Darius's* Father. It is certain that *Agathias* doth not say this, but on the contrary, complains that the *Persians* did not express whether their *Hystaspes* was the Father of *Darius* or not. I mention this for no other Reason than to shew that the Citations of the most judicious Authors frequently deceive us, and consequently that Prudence obliges us to examine Quotations, by whomsoever alledged. I here repeat this Observation, tho' I remember to have made it in other places.

I should never have done, if I should censure all the mistakes of our Authors, and mention all their differences with relation to the Chronology of *Zoroaster*. But what farther confirms *Marsham's* Opinion is this. It is affirmed that *Pythagoras* was *Zoroaster's* Disciple under the Reign of *Cambyses* the Son of *Cyrus*. I have elsewhere cited the words of *Apuleius*, which inform us of this Fact. Some understand them as if *Pythagoras* having been a Slave in *Egypt*, was transported into *Persia*. Others will have him transported into *Babylon*, and there instructed by *Zoroaster* the *Babylonian*, whom they distinguish from the Persian. (d) *Hisce* (quinque Zoroastris) *addi potest* Sextus Zoroaster, *sic enim ab* (1) Apuleio *vocatur, qui Babylone vixit, quo tempore Pythagoras captivus à Cambyse eo deductus est. Idem scriptor eum vocat,* omnis divini arcanum antistitem, *eoque magistro præcipuè usum esse Pythagoram dicit. Videtur idem esse ac* Zabratus, *a quo* Diogenes (2) *affirmat Pythagoram purgatum esse omnibus pristinæ vitæ sordibus, & edoctum, quarum rerum probos expertes esse oporteret, uti & Physicam. Idem quoque erit* Nazaratas *Assyrius, quem* Alexander, *in libro de Pythagoricis Symbolis, affirmat magistrum fuisse Pythagoræ. Hunc eundem Suidas vocat* Zarem, *Cyrillus* Zaranem, *Plutarchus* Zaratam. These words are taken out of *Thomas Stanley's* Book: I don't know what he means when he observes that *Apuleius* making use of the Expression *Sextus Zoroaster*, which I don't find in the Book he cites. Nor am I more certain on what he grounds his Assertion that *Pythagoras* was brought Prisoner to *Babylon* by King *Cambyses*. The words of *Apuleius* plainly import (e) that he was sent into *Ægypt* with the Prisoners of that Monarch. In order to understand this perfectly well, *Herodotus* (f) should be consulted, who relates that *Polycrates* Tyrant of *Samos*, intending to put to death some Persons which he suspected to be hatching a Rebellion, entreated *Cambyses* to ask some Troops of him; which *Cambyses* accordingly desiring, *Polycrates* sent him into *Egypt* Forty Sail of Ships, in which he embarked these Persons, and prayed him not to let them return. *Apuleius* meant, no doubt, that some pretend that *Pythagoras* was one of those who were then delivered by *Polycrates* to *Cambyses*. He doth not speak of the transportation of *Pythagoras* either to *Persia* or *Babylon*.

(C) Gregorius Turonensis *relates very near the same thing of* Cush *the Eldest Son of* Ham.] The eldest Son of *Ham*, saith he (g), *was named* Cush. *The latter was the first Inventer of the Art of Magick by the suggestion of the Devil, and withal the first beginner of Idolatry. He was the first that moved by a diabolical suggestion, made a small Statue to be adored: He made Men believe that he had power to bring down the Stars and Fire from Heaven. He went to the* Persians, *who called him* Zoroaster, *that is, a living Star. Having also learned of him the custom of worshipping Fire, they adored him as a God, after he had been divinely consumed by Fire.*

(D) *His Magick was only the study* ——— *of religious Worship, as* Plato *expresly declares.*] There are four chosen Persons, saith he, appointed for the Education of the Eldest Son of the King of the *Persians*. They chuse the Wisest, the most Just, the most Temperate, and the bravest Man that can be found. The wisest Man instructs him in *Zoroaster's* Magick, that is, the Worship of the Gods: Besides, he teacheth him the Art of Reigning.

(a) See in [illegible] Clemens Alexand. Strom. lib. [illegible] pag. 570. D. Xen. [illegible]

(b) Herodot. lib. 1. cap. 209.

(c) Hadrianus Valesius in Ammian. Marcellin. ubi supra.

(d) Thom. Stanleius Histor. Philos. Orientalis, lib. 1. cap. [illegible] pag. 8, & 9.

(1) In Floridis.

(2) Porphyr. vit. Pythago[illegible]

(e) Inter captivos Cambysæ Regis, Egyptum cum adheretur (Pythagoras) Apul. Flor. pag. m 351.

(f) Herodot. lib. 3. cap. 44.

(g) Gregor. Turon. Histor. Francorum lib. 1. cap. 5.

him from this Accuſation, it is difficult to excuſe him on account of the Doctrine of two Principles, ſo ſtrong is the preſumption, that he actually taught that there are two coeternal Cauſes, the one (F) of Good things, and the other of Evil. Dr. *Hyde* in his excellent Tract of the Religion of the Ancient

Reigning. (a) *Ὧν ὁ μὲν μαγείαν τε διδάσκει τὴν Ζωροάστρου τοῦ Ὡρομάζου· ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο θεῶν θεραπεία· διδάσκει δὲ καὶ τὰ βασιλικά. Quorum primus magiam Zoroaſtri Oromaſi filii docet, eſt autem illa Deorum cultus; atque idem tradit inſtituta regia.* Obſerve that *Zoroaſter* is called the Son of *Oromaſius*, and that *Oromaſius* is the Name which he and his Followers gave to the good God. Whence to call him the Son of *Oromaſius* ſhould ſeem to be the ſame, as to call him the Son of the good God. Mr. *Stanley* conjectures with great probability, that the laſt Title was really beſtowed on him. (b) *Hinc colligas verba Platonis eſſe intelligenda de Mago Perſa, qui propter inuſitatam eruditionem ſigurate, aut fabuloſe dicebatur filius Dei, aut alicujus boni Genii, quo honore affecti ſunt Pythagoras, Plato, aliique præſtantiſſimi viri.* Thoſe who are diſpoſed to ſee a great many paſſages which teſtify, that the Magick of the *Perſians* inſtituted by *Zoroaſter*, was the ſtudy of Religion and Morality, need only read (c) *Briſſonius* and *Bullengerus* (d). Nor is any Perſon ignorant that *Gabriel Naudé* (e) hath learnedly and ſolidly juſtified our *Zoroaſter* againſt the Accuſation of the Black Art. He mentions ſeveral Authors who may be conſulted.

(F) *That there are two coeternal Cauſes, the one of Good things, and the other of Evil.*] *Plutarch* (f) having told us that *it is the Opinion of moſt, and of the wiſeſt of the Ancients*, adds; “ *Zoroaſter* the Magician, whom they report to “ be five thouſand Years older than the Trojan “ times, call'd one of 'em *Oromazes*, and the o- “ ther *Arimanius*——— and taught Mankind to “ make Vows and Offerings of Thankſgiving to “ the one, and to offer Averting and Feral Sa- “ crifices to the other. For they (g) beat a certain “ Plant called *Homomy*, in a Mortar, and call up- “ pon *Pluto* and the *Dark*; and then mix it with “ the Blood of a ſacrificed Wolf, and convey it “ to a certain Place where the Sun never ſhines, “ and there caſt it away. For of Plants, they be- “ lieve that ſome appertain to the Good God, “ others again to the *Evil Demon*; and likewiſe “ they think, that of Animals, ſuch as Dogs. “ Fowls, and Urchins, belong to the Good, and “ Water Animals to the Bad; for which reaſon “ they account him happy that kills moſt of them. “ Theſe Men moreover tell us a great many Ro- “ mantick things about theſe Gods, whereof “ theſe are ſome. They ſay that *Orimazes* ſpring- “ ing from pureſt Light, and *Arimanius* on the “ other hand, from pitchy Darkneſs, theſe two “ are therefore at War one with another. And “ that *Oromazes* made ſix Gods, whereof the firſt “ was the Author of Benevolence, the ſecond of “ Truth, the third of Juſtice; and the reſt, one “ of Wiſdom, and another of Wealth, and a “ third of Pleaſure which accrues from good “ Actions; and that *Arimanius* likewiſe made the “ like Number of contrary Operations to con- “ front them. After this, *Oromazes* having firſt “ trebled his own Magnitude, mounted up aloft, “ as far above the Sun, as the Sun it ſelf above “ the Earth, and ſo beſpangled the Heavens with “ *Stars*. But one Star (called *Sirius*, or the *Dog*) “ he ſet as a kind of Centinel or Scout before “ all the reſt. And after he had made four “ and twenty Gods more, he placed them all “ in an Egg-ſhell. But thoſe that were made by “ *Arimanius* (being themſelves alſo of the like “ Number) breaking a Hole in this beauteous and “ glazed Egg-ſhell, bad things came by this means “ to be intermixed with good. But the fatal “ time is now approaching, in which *Arimanius*, “ who by means of this brings Plagues and Fa- “ mines upon the Earth, muſt of neceſſity be him- “ ſelf utterly extinguiſhed and deſtroyed; at which “ time, the Earth being made plain and level, “ there will be one Life, and one Society of “ Mankind, made all happy, and one Speech. But “ *Theopompus* ſaith, that according to the Opinion “ of the *Magi*, each of theſe Gods ſubdues, “ and is ſubdued by turns, for the ſpace of three “ thouſand years apiece, and that for three thou- “ ſand years more, they quarrel and fight, and deſtroy “ each others Works; but that at laſt, *Pluto* ſhall “ fail, and Mankind ſhall be happy, and neither “ need Food nor yield a Shadow. And that the “ God, who projects theſe things, doth, for “ ſome time, take his Repoſe and Reſt; but yet “ this time is not ſo much to him, although it “ ſeem ſo to Man, whoſe Sleep is but ſhort. It was not a needleſs thing to ſet down this whole Paſſage, ſeeing it contains ſomewhat at large the Opinions and Precepts of *Zoroaſter*; and we may obſerve from thence, that the Aſſerters of two Principles, involved themſelves in ſeveral inconſequential Abſurdities, when they deſcended to a particular Explanation of their Syſtem. I have remarked the ſame thing when ſpeaking of the *Manichees*. But ſince, according to the moſt common Tradition, *Zoroaſter* muſt paſs for the Founder of the *Magi*, and it appears by a great number of Authorities (h) that they admitted a Good God, whom they called *Oromaſes*, or, *Oromaſdes*, and an Evil one whom they named *Arimanius*; it is very probable that he really aſſerted this Doctrine. Let us obſerve, that *Plutarch* having related what we have ſeen above, adds, (i) *Theſe are the Conceits of the Fable invented by the* Magi. If we ſhould infer from thence that he rejected, in general, the whole Hypotheſis of two Principles, the one Good, and the other Evil, we ſhould miſtake his Sentiments. He might indeed very well condemn the particular Explications of *Zoroaſter*'s Followers, but doubtleſs he admitted the whole foundation of their Syſtem, that the God whom they called Good, is not the cauſe of any Evil. I have cited, in ſome other places, ſeveral paſſages of his Works, wherein he declares himſelf very clearly on this head, and yet they don't diſcover the whole Foundation of his Doctrine. Wherefore I ſhall add here ſome Paſſages which will more clearly explain it to us. I believe that it agreed very well with the Opinion he attributed to *Plato*. “ Which Philoſopher, *ſaith* “ *he* (k), admits two Souls of the World, one “ Good, and the other Evil; and alſo acknow- “ ledges, betwixt theſe two, a third Cauſe, which “ is not without either Soul or Reaſon, nor in- “ gaged in it ſelf, as ſome think, but adjacent, “ and adherent to the other two, always deſiring “ and purſuing what is beſt——— becauſe the Ge- “ neration, Compoſition and Conſtitution of this “ World is intermixed with contrary Powers, “ which are not always equal, for the beſt pre- “ vails and is ſtrongeſt, but it is impoſſible that the “ worſt ſhould utterly periſh; ſo much it is im- “ moveable in the Body and Soul of the Univerſe, “ perpetually warring againſt a good One.„ He, in another place, more amply ſets forth this Doctrine of *Plato*, and gives us to underſtand that the Original of Evil is not lodged in an inſenſible inanimate Subject utterly void of Action and Qualities, and which is capable of the reception of all imaginable Forms, but in a Subject which moves and is united to a Soul, the Diſorders of which cannot be wholly and intirely corrected. I ſhall hereafter declare why I cite ſuch a long Paſſage.

“ The World, ſaith *Heraclitus*, neither did any “ one of all the Gods, nor any mortal Man create. “ As if he had been afraid, that not being able to “ make out the Creation by a Deity; we ſhould “ be conſtrain'd to acknowledge ſome Man to “ have been the Architect of the Univerſe. But “ certainly far better it is, in ſubmiſſion to *Plato*'s Judgment, both to avow, and in our Songs “ of Praiſe to attribute the Glory of the Struc- “ ture to God. For the Frame it ſelf is the moſt “ beautiful of all Maſter-pieces, and God the moſt

“ Illuſtrious

(a) Plato in Alcibiade 1. pag. [illegible] C.

(b) Stanleius ubi ſupra. pag. 11.

(c) Briſſonius de regno Perſarum lib. 2. p. 178. & ſeq. edit. Commel. 1595.

(d) Jul. Cæſar Bullengerus eclog. ad Arnobium pag. 345. & ſeq.

(e) Naudé, apolog. des grands hommes. pag. 134. & ſeq.

(f) Plut. de Iſide & Oſiride pag. 369.

(g) *That is, the Perſians.*

(h) Se *Diogen* *Laerti* proœmi n. 8. & *Agathia* hiſtor. lib. 2.

(i) Ἡ *ἐν ...* *Hæc* ſe habent magorum fabulæ. Plut. de Iſide pag. 370. A.

(k) Plut. Ibid. pag. 370. A.

ent *Perſians*, cites ſome Authors who clear him on this Head. I ſhall examin

“ Illuſtrious of all Cauſes; but that the Subſtance and Materials were not created, but always ready at the ordering and diſpoſal of the Omnipotent Builder, to give it Form and Figure, as near as might be approaching to his own Reſemblance. For the Creation was not out of Nothing, but out of Matter wanting Beauty and Perfection, like the rude Materials of a Houſe, a Garment, or a Statue lying firſt in ſhapeleſs Confuſion. For before the Creation of the World, there was nothing but a confus'd Heap. Yet was that confus'd Heap neither without a Body, without Motion, nor without a Soul. The Corporeal part was without Form or Conſiſtence, and the moving part Stupid and Headlong without Reaſon or Conduct. God neither incorporated that which is incorporeal, nor conveyed a Soul into that which had none before, like a Perſon either Muſical or Poetical, who does not make the Voice nor the Movement, only he reduces the Voice with harmony, and graces the movement with proper Meaſures. Thus God did not make the Tangible and Repercutient Solidity of the Corporeal Subſtance; nor the imaginative or moving Faculties of the Soul. But the taking theſe two Principles, as they lay ready at hand, the one obſcure and dark, the other turbulent and ſenſeleſs, both imperfect without the Bounds of Order and Decency. He alſo diſpos'd, digeſted and embelliſh'd the confuſed Maſs, that he brought to perfection a moſt abſolute and glorious Creature. Therefore the Subſtance of the Body is no other, than that all-receiving Nature, the *Seat* and *Nurſe* of all created Beings. But the ſubſtance of the Soul in *Philebus* he called an Infinite Being, the Privation of Number and Proportion; having neither Period or Meaſure either of Diminution or Exceſs, or Diſtinction or Diſſimilitude. But as to that order he alledges in *Timæus*, to be the mixture of Nature with the indiviſible Subſtance, but being appli'd to Bodies, become liable to Diviſion, he would not have it thought to be a Bulk augmented by Units or Points, nor by Longitude and Breadth, which are qualities more conſentaneous to Bodies than to the Soul, but that diſorderly unlimited Principle, moving both it ſelf and other Subſtances, that which he frequently calls Neceſſity; and within his Treatiſe of Laws he openly ſtiles the diſorderly, ill acting, or harm-doing Soul. For ſuch was the Soul of her ſelf, but at length one became wiſe, that by the participation of Underſtanding, Ratiocination and Harmony, ſhe might be the Soul of the World. Thus that All-receiving and material Principle, enjoy'd both magnitude, ſpace and diſtance, but Beauty, Form and meaſure of Proportion it had none. However all theſe it obtained, when it came to be embelliſh'd and adorn'd with all the Ornaments of Sea and Land, the Heavens, the Stars, and all thoſe infinite varieties of Plants and living Creatures. Now as for thoſe who attribute to *Matter*, and not to the Soul, that which in *Timæus* is call'd *Neceſſity*, in *Philebus*, *vaſt diſproportion and unlimited Exorbitancy of Diminution and Exceſs*, they can never maintain it to be the cauſe of Diſorder, in regard that *Plato* always alledges that ſame Matter to be without any Form or Figure, and altogether deſtitute of any quality or effectual virtue properly belonging to it; comparing it to ſuch Oils that have no ſcent at all, which the Perfumers mix in their Tinctures. For there is no likelyhood that *Plato* would ſuppoſe that to be the Cauſe and Principle of Evil, which is altogether faint in it ſelf, ſluggiſh and never to be rouz'd on to Action; and yet at the ſame time brand this *Immenſity* with the harſh Epithet of diſcharged and miſchievous, and call it *Neceſſity*, repugnant and contumaciouſly rebellious againſt God. For this ſame *Neceſſity*, which tranverſes Heaven (to uſe his own Phraſe in his Politicks) and turns it the quite contrary way from decency and ſymmetry, together with innate Concupiſcence, and that [illegible] Confuſion of ancient Nature, hurly-burly'd with all manner of Diſorder, before they were wrought and kneaded into the graceful *Beauty* of the World, whence came they to be convey'd into the ſeveral varieties of Forms and Beings, if the Subject, which is the *Firſt Matter*, were void of all quality whatſoever, and depriv'd all of efficient Cauſe; more eſpecially the Architect being ſo good of himſelf, and intending a frame the neareſt approaching to his own Perfections? For beſides theſe, there is no third Principle. And indeed we ſhould ſtumble in the perplex'd Intricacies of the *Stoicks*, ſhould we advance Evil into the World out of *non-Entity*, without either any preceding cauſe or effect of Generation, in regard that among thoſe Principles that have a Being, it is not probable, that either real good, or that which is deſtitute of all manner of all quality, ſhould afford Birth or Subſtance to Evil. But *Plato* eſcaped thoſe Pitfalls into which they blunder'd who came after him; who neglecting what he carefully embrac'd, the third Principle, and energetick Vertue in the middle between God and the firſt Matter, maintain the moſt abſurd of Arguments, affirming the nature of Evils to have crept in ſpontaneouſly and adventitiouſly, I know not how, nor by what ſtrange Accidents. And yet they will not allow an Atom of *Epicurus* ſo much as a moment's liberty to ſhift in its ſtation, which as they ſay, would infer motion out of *non-Entity*, without any impulſive Cauſe; nevertheleſs themſelves preſuming all this while to affirm, that Vice and Wickedneſs, together with a thouſand other incongruities and vexations afflicting the Body, of which no cauſe can be aſcrib'd to any of the Principles, deriv'd their Being from Conſequence. *Plato* however does not ſo; who deſpoiling the firſt Matter of all manner of diſtinction, and ſeparating from God, as far as it is poſſible, the cauſes of Evil, has thus deliver'd himſelf concerning the World in his Political Diſcourſes. The World, ſaith he, receiv'd from the Illuſtrious Builder all things beautiful and lovely; but whatſoever happens to be noxious and irregular in Heaven through its exterior habit and diſpoſition, from thence it derives thoſe Inconveniences, and conveighs them into the ſeveral Creatures. And a little farther in the ſame Treatiſe, in proceſs of time, when Oblivion had encroached upon the World, the Diſtemper of its ancient Confuſion more prevail'd, and the hazard is, leſt being diſſolv'd, it ſhould again be ſunk and plung'd into the immenſe Abyſs of its former Irregularity: But there can be no diſſimilitude in the firſt Matter, as being void of quality and diſtinction.

“ Of which when *Eudemus*, with ſeveral others, was altogether ignorant, he ſeems deridingly to cavil with *Plato*, and taxes him with aſſerting the firſt Matter to be the Cauſe, the Root and Principle of all Evil, which he had at other times ſo frequently dignify'd with the tender Appellations of *Mother* and *Nurſe*. Whereas *Plato* gives to Matter only the Titles of *Mother* and *Nurſe*; but the Cauſe of Evil he makes to be the moving Force reſiding within it, not govern'd by Order and Reaſon, tho' not with a Soul neither, which in his Treatiſe of the Laws, he calls expreſly the Soul repugnant and in Hoſtility with that other propitiouſly and kindly acting. For tho' the Soul be the Principle of Motion, yet is it the Underſtanding and Intelligence which meaſures that Motion by Order and Harmony, and is the cauſe of both. God therefore did not awake a ſluggiſh and ſleepy Matter into Action, but prevented it by a fix'd eſtabliſhment from being any longer troubled and diſquieted by a ſenſeleſs and ſtupid Cauſe. Neither did he infuſe into Nature the Principles of alteration and paſſive ſubjection to diſorders; but when it was under the preſſure of thoſe unruly diſorders and alterations, he diſcharg'd it of its manifold Enormi-examine whether they deſerve (F) Credit. It is even affirmed, that he was no

“ ties and Irregularities, making uſe of Symmetrie, Proportion and Number, as the moſt proper Inſtruments.

This Explication of *Plato*'s Doctrine concerning the Creation of the World, and the original of Evil, is one of the moſt beautiful places we find in *Plutarch*; and tho' this doctrine is not true, it deſerves to be read with attention, and contains ſeveral excellent Idea's, and ſublime Conceptions, of a ſurprizing fertility with regard to thoſe who know how to make good uſe of Conſequences. This is the Reaſon which engaged me not to curtail this paſſage. How many that ſhall read this, would not take the pains to recur to *Plutarch*, if I had only mention'd the Pages of the Author? Another Reaſon prevented my being contented with this: I find ſome particulars in this paſſage of *Plutarch* of which I ſhall make uſe (a) hereafter.

(F) *Dr.* Hyde——— *cites ſome Authors who clear him*——— *I ſhall examin whether they deſerve Credit.*] Thoſe who have read Mr. *Bernard*'s (b) Journal, need not be informed that the *Hiſtoria Religionis Veterum Perſarum* Publiſhed by Dr. *Hyde* (c) at *Oxford* in 1700. in 4to. is one of the moſt excellent Pieces that can poſſibly be written on that Subject. The Idea which that Learned Journaliſt hath given of it is ſufficient to convince us, that this Hiſtory of the Religion of the Ancient *Perſians*, contains an exquiſite Erudition and profound Diſcuſſions, which detect ſeveral uncommon Particulars, and diſcover a Country which we ſcarce knew any thing of before. But to come to the matter. Dr. *Hyde* affirms that the Ancient *Perſians* acknowledged no more than One ſole uncreated Principle, which was the Good Principle, or, in one word, God: And that they look'd upon the Evil Principle as a created Being. One of the Names which they gave to God was *Hormizda*, and they called the Evil Principle *Ahariman*. And this is the Original of the two Greek words Ὠρομάσδης and Ἀρειμάνιος: One of which was the Name of the Good, and the other that of the Evil Principle, as we have ſeen (d) above in a Paſſage of *Plutarch*. The *Perſians* pretended that *Abraham* (e) was the firſt Founder of their Religion. *Zoroaſter* afterwards made ſome Alterations in it, but 'tis ſaid that he made no manner of Change with relation to the Doctrine of one ſole uncreated Principle; but that all his Innovation in this particular, was the giving (f) the name of *Light* to the good Principle, and that of *Darkneſs* to the Evil Principle. Of which here follows an Evidence. (g) *Zerduſht aſſirmavit Lucem & Tenebras eſſe*——— *duo Principia ſibi invicem contraria: & ſic eſſe Yezdân & Ahreman, qui fuerunt*——— *initium eorum quæ inveniuntur in Mundo: ex eorum miſtione* [ſeu combinatione] *extitiſſe Compoſitiones; & ex variis Compoſitionibus producta fuiſſe formas. Et quòd Deus qui creavit Lucem & Tenebras, utriuſque Autor unicus ſit, ſine Socio, ſine Pari aut Simili; nec ei referenda ſit*——— *exiſtentia Tenebrarum, ſicut dicunt Zervanitæ: ſed Bonum & Malum, Integritas ac Corruptio, & Puritas ac Spurcities exiverunt ex miſtione* [ſeu commiſſione] *Lucis & Tenebrarum: & niſi hæc duo commiſta fuiſſent, non extitiſſet Mundus. Et hæc duo contra ſe invicem inſurgebant & de victoria contendebant, donec Lux vinceret Tenebras, & Bonum Malum. Tum poſtea ſalvum evaſit Bonum ad mundum ſuum, & Malum divertebat ad Mundum ſuum: & ſic fuit cauſa Liberationis. Cumque Deus excelſus hæc duo temperaverat & miſcuerat pro arbitrio ſuo, eaque in Compoſitione viderat, tum inſtituit Lucem ut originale quiddam, & indixit exiſtentiam ejus ut exiſteret. Sed Tenebræ ſecutæ ſunt ſicut umbra perſonam. Nam cùm videret eas quodammodo exiſtere, ſed non realiter exiſtere, tum planè produxit Lucem, & acquiſitæ ſunt Tenebræ per conſequentiam: nam ex neceſſitate extitit contrarium, quippe cujus exiſtentia fuit neceſſaria, &c. ut contingentis* [illegible] *creatione, non autem ex primâ intentione, ſecundùm exemplum quod adduximus de Perſonâ & Umbrâ.* These words clearly expreſs that in *Zoroaſter*'s Hypotheſis, the two Principles, one Good and the other Evil, *Oromazes*, *Arimanius*, or Light and Darkneſs were, properly ſpeaking, no more than Second Cauſes, and did not ſtrictly deſerve the Name of Principles. They were the Effects of another Cauſe, and the productions of God. The Abſurdities in the particular Explication of the Doctrine of this *Magus* are very numerous; for he aſſerted on the one ſide that God alone produced Darkneſs; and on the other that its exiſtence ought not to be referred to God. He ſaid that God intermixed the Light with Darkneſs, becauſe without this mixture the World could not have been produced; that Good and Evil, Purity and Impurity proceeded from this mixture: that there was a ſharp Engagement betwixt Light and Darkneſs 'till the latter was overcome; that after its Defeat it retired into its own World, and Light to its proper World alſo; that God having mixed theſe two Contraries together, eſtabliſhed an Original Light, and made it exiſt; that Darkneſs reſulted from it as a Shadow from a Body; for God ſeeing that Darkneſs exiſted in a ſort, tho' not really, gave a plenary exiſtence to Light, and ſo to Darkneſs by an inevitable Conſequence, and not according to the primitive and direct intention of the Creator. This Chaos of Thoughts appears very myſterious to us *Weſterns*: None but *Levantines* accuſtomed to a myſtical and contradictory Language can bear ſuch enormous Nonſenſe without Diſguſt and Horrour. But be it how it will, it may be replied to me, that *Zoroaſter* is cleared of his principal Accuſation, and it muſt no longer be pretended that he acknowledged two uncreated Principles, an *Arimanius* eſſentially Evil and ſelf-exiſtent. This is what remains to be examined.

I. I anſwer in the firſt place, that it is out of doubt, that the Greek Authors, who have aſcribed to *Zoroaſter* the Opinion of two Principles, have pretended to attribute to him a Doctrine contrary to the common Theology, as well as to the Principles of the *Ariſtotelians* and *Stoicks*: Thoſe two Sects agreed with the People on this Head, that the ſame God who ſhowers down Good upon the Earth, pours down Evil alſo; and that if he puniſhes on one ſide, he rewards on the other, *&c.* But if it was aſſerted that *Zoroaſter* and the *Magi* were of a contrary Opinion to that, it muſt have been believed that they taught that the Principle which diſtributed Good, is perſonally diſtinguiſh'd from the Principle which does the contrary, and that theſe two Principles are independent of each other, and the one Coeternal with the other *.

II. This is confirmed by reaſon, that this Hypotheſis was recurred to on no other account, than in order to ſhun the perplexity (h) which they met with in the Suppoſition, that the ſame Being, which is the cauſe of Good, is alſo the cauſe of Evil. But this difficulty had not been avoided, if *Arimanius* had been allowed to have been a production of a Good God; for the Queſtion would have returned, how *Arimanius* the Evil Principle could have been produced by a Cauſe infinitely Good. It is obvious to all Men, that to aſſert that God himſelf produced all Evils, or that he produced *Arimanius*, who conſequently is the neceſſary (i) Author of all Evils, amounts to the ſame thing, *quod eſt cauſa cauſæ eſt cauſa cauſati*. So that *Zoroaſter* could not eſcape the force of any one Objection, if his Doctrine had been what *Shahriſtâni* ſays it was. Therefore let us grant that the *Greeks* have not without ground charged him with admitting two Eternal Principles.

III. I am

(a) *In the following Remark.*

(b) Nouvelles de la republique des lettres *for February* 1701. *art.* 5. *and for* March 1701. *art.* 6.

(c) *Thomas Hyde* hiſt. religionis veter. Perſarum cap. 2. p. 161.

(d) *In the* Remark E.

(e) Id. ib. cap. 21. pag. 275.

(f) Id. ib. cap. 22. pag. 290.

(g) Shahriſtani apud Hyde ubi ſupra pag. 299. *I have left out the Arabick words which are in this and the following Paſſages of* Dr. Hyde.

(*) Dr. Hyde that this Doctrine was ta by tho whom Pl tarch tians.

(h) See Plutarch in the going Remark.

(i) & are aſſerting eſſentially without ry no Idolater, either with respect to the Worſhipping of Fire, or (G) the Adoration

III. I am not ignorant that it may be urged that the *Grecians* were very imperfectly acquainted with the Opinions of the Philoſophers whom they called Barbarous; and that what they wrote of the *Jewiſh* Nation, and the Antiquities of *Ægypt* is very unaccurate. But let this be repeated as often as one pleaſes I ſhall Anſwer that the *Arabian* Writers are not more credible, when they ſpeak of a Philoſopher ſo diſtant from their own time as this was.

IV. I gueſs that his Followers out of Charity as well as for their own intereſt have aſcribed to him the Creation of the Evil Principle, and that they did it ſince they became ſubjected to the ſevere Domination of the Mahometans who abhor them, and call them Idolaters and Worſhippers of Fire. Being unwilling any longer to expoſe themſelves to their hatred, and inſults, under pretext that they acknowledged an Uncreated Nature Sovereignly Wicked, and independant of God, they thought fit to varniſh over this part of their Syſtem with another Interpretation: For they cannot abſolutely, deny that *Zoroaſter* admitted of two Principles, ſince it is too well known that he acknowledged them. " (a) The *Tarikh Montekheb* ſaith, " that *Zoroaſter*, Author of the Sect of the *Megiouſch*, or *Magi*, was alſo the firſt who taught " the Doctrine of two Principles of all things, " and that the Sir-Name of *Megiouſch*, beſtowed on them, is a Word corrupted by the *Arabians*, from the *Perſian* Word, *Meikhouſch*, which " ſignifies ſharp-ſweet, by Reaſon of the two " Principles, Good and Evil which he eſtabliſhed. " Here is an Author who aſcribes to *Zoroaſter* the firſt eſtabliſhment of this Opinion; but Dr. *Hyde* alledges a paſſage which makes this Syſtem of a much older date, and beſides ſeems to hint that *Zoroaſter* only reformed it: (b) *Quoad Perſarum gentem* ——— *ei eſt Religio pervetuſta: & in eâ Ducti vocantur Keiomarſii. Iſti ſtatuunt aliquem Deum æternum quem vocant Yezdan, eo deſignantes τὸν Θεὸν: & alium deum creatum ex Tenebris, quem nominant Ahrenam, deſignantes Diabolum. Magnificiunt Lucem, eo uſque dum colant Ignem: & cavent ſibi à Tenebris. Nec deſtiterunt ſic facere,* (c) DONEC *prodiit Zerdusht jactans prophetiam. Aſſerunt itaque Deum Creatorem, quod ſcil. creavit Lucem & Tenebras; eumque eſſe Unicum, nec habere Socium. Et quod Bonum & Malum, & Probitas & Improbitas conquiſita ſunt ex mixtione Lucis & Tenebrarum: & quòd ſi hæc duo non fuiſſent mixta, non extitiſſet Mundus: &, quod hæc duo hoc modo mixta non deſinent, donec Bonum approprietur Mundo ſuo & Malum Mundo ſuo;* [i. e utrumque horum tandem concedet ad Mundum ſibi proprium, ſcil. in fine Mundi.] ——— *Et hanc eſſe Religionem Magorum.*

V. Laſtly, I ſay that Dr. *Hyde* owns that there are yet ſome Sects, which by acknowledging God and the Devil to be two coeternal Natures, agree with the Aſſerters of *Zoroaſter*'s *Oromazes* and *Arimanius*. His Words are: (d) Dualiſtæ *Diaboli coæternitatem aſſerunt. Sunt enim ex Indo-Perſis & Dualiſtis Manichæi aliiſque Hæretici (ut quidem ſunt in omni Religione,) qui opinantur Diabolum à ſeipſo proceſſiſſe, ut loquuntur, i. e. æternum fuiſſe, & malos Angelos ſibi creâſſe: ſed eſt Hæretica opinio, eaque ignorantium quorundam hominum qui peculiariter vocantur* ——— Thanavîa, *i. e.* Dualiſtæ *ſeu* ——— Domini duorum, *ſcil.* Aſſertores *ſeu* Autores duorum principiorum; qui (*inquit Shahriſtâni*,) Lucem & Tenebras *ſeu* Deum & Diabolum ſtatuunt duo Principia coæterna, in contrarium Magorum qui Lucem æternam & Tenebras creatas ponunt. *Iſti tales fuerunt, qui* Oromazen & Arimanium duos eſſe Deos aſſerebant *ut Plut. lib.* de Iſide & Oſir. There are ſome Particulars which are very extravagant concerning the Syſtem of the *Zoroaſtrian* Magi in the Book of a *Mahometan*. From which I ſhall cite what relates to the *Dualiſts*, who hold ſtill the coeternity of the Devil, and with great importunity aſk whence Evil could proceed, if the Evil Principle was not Eternal? (e) *Addit Shahriſtâni,* Quod Magorum peculiaris ſit ——— Doctrina, ubi ut ſtatuant ——— Doctores *ſeu Gubernatores* duos *æternos*, qui dividuntur in Bonum & Malum, & Probitatem ac Improbitatem, Emolumentum ac Nocumentum. Horum unus nominatur Lux, & alter Tenebræ, ſc. Yezdan *ſeu* Deus, & Ahreman *ſeu* Diabolus. Eorumque Religionem eſſe ſec. hanc diviſionem *ſeu* diſtinctionem; & quod omnes Magorum Quæſtiones verſantur ſuper duobus Cardinibus quorum unus eſt Explicatio cauſæ Miſtionis Lucis & Tenebrarum, & alter eſt Explicatio Liberationis Lucis à Tenebris. Et quidem, quod Miſtionem ſtatuant ——— Initium *ſeu ſtatum à quo*, & Liberationem ——— Reditum *ſeu ſtatum ad quem*. I ſhall further cite what follows; *Supradictus Shahriſtani pergit narrare*, Quod Magi ſtatuant ——— Principia duo, ſicuti diximus: ſed quod ——— Magi originales non exiſtiment expedire ut ambo ſint ——— æterna ab initio; ſed quod Lux ſit ——— æterna ab initio, & Tenebræ ——— productæ. Et quod tum, differunt de modo *ſeu cauſa* productionis ejus: cùm à Luce producitur tantùm Lux, quæ non producit ullum Malum; & quomodo ergo productum Principium Mali aut alius cujuſvis rei, cùm nihil adjunctum (*ſeu par fuerit*) Luci quoad primam ejus productionem & æternitatem. Some of the *Magi* aſſert that *Arimanius*, or the Evil Principle was Created by an Evil thought which aroſe in the Divine Intellect. This thought was, *What will happen, if I meet with no oppoſition?* What can be ſaid more deteſtable? Would it have been more Blaſphemous to allow this *Arimanius* to be Eternal, than to aſcribe ſuch an original to him? (f) *Aſſerentes Yezdân fuiſſe* ——— *ſine initio æternum, & Ahreman fuiſſe* ——— *productum & creatum. Yezdân cogitaſſe ſecum, Niſi fuerunt mihi controverſiæ, quomodo erit? Hancque cogitationem pravam naturæ Lucis minus analogam, produxiſſe Tenebras dictas Ahrenam, qui naturâ diſpoſitus ad malum & diſſidium & improbitatem & noxam & omnia nocumenta: & prodiens contra Lucem, eam oppoſuit tam naturâ* (ſeu facto) *quam dicto*. They add, that a War aroſe betwixt the Army of Light, and that of Darkneſs, which at laſt ended in an Accomodation, of which the Angels were the Mediators, and the Conditions were that the Inferior World ſhould be wholly left to *Arimanius* for the ſpace of ſeven Thouſand Years, after which it ſhould be reſtored to light. Before the peace *Arimanius* had extirpated all the Inhabitants of the World. Light called Men to its aſſiſtance whilſt they were yet but Spirits: Which it did either to draw them out of *Arimanius*'s Territories, or in order to give them Bodies to engage againſt this Enemy. They accepted the Bodies and the Fight, on Condition that they ſhould be aſſiſted by the Light, and ſhould at laſt overcome *Arimanius*. The Reſurrection ſhall come when he ſhall be vanquiſhed. This, they conclude, was the (g) cauſe of the Mixture, and ſhall be the cauſe of the deliverances. The Greeks (h) were not ignorant that *Zoroaſter* taught a future Reſurrection.

(G) *That he was no Idolater either with reſpect to the Worſhipping of Fire, or the adoration of* Mithra.] Dr. *Hyde* (i) affirms that the Aſſerters of the Ancient Religion of the *Perſians* deny that they ever paid any Divine Adoration to the Stars. They maintain that they do not adore the Sun, but only turn towards it when they pray to God. He has found amongſt *Zoroaſter*'s Precepts that the Sun ſhould be ſaluted, and Praiſes beſtowed on him, but not that there is any obligation of Worſhipping him religiouſly. He proves that their Ceremonies might very juſtly paſs for Civil Honours, and to this purpoſe he makes ſome extraordinary curious Obſervations. He applies to the Fire what he ſays of the Sun; the bows and proſtrations of the *Perſians* before the holy Fire were not a religious Adoration, but only a civil ration of *Mithra*. What appears least uncertain amongst so many things as are related of him, is that he was the Introducer of a new Religion into *Persia*, and that he did it about the Reign of *Darius* the Successor of *Cambyses*. He is still in great Veneration amongst those *Persians*, who are not of the Mahometan Religion, but retain the Ancient Worship of their Country. They call him *Zerdursht*, and several believe that he came from *China*, and relate an infinite Number of Miracles on that Head. A Specimen of which you may see in Mr. *d'Herbelot*'s * *Bibliotheque Orientale*, and in the History of the Religion of the *Benjans*, Written in English by Mr. *Lord*, and Translated † into *French* by Mr. *Briot*. Consult also Mr. *Huet*'s Evangelical || Demonstration, and Dr. *Hyde*'s Book. Many Authors believe that all the Works which have gone (*H*) under the Name of *Zoroaster*, some of which are yet in being, are supposititious. But Dr. *Hyde* is not of that Opinion.

(a) Herbe- lot, Bibl. Orientale pag. 931. col. 1.

(b) Ibn ... in libro de ... & ... apud Hyde supra cap. 9. pag. 163.

(c) This seems to signify that Zoroaster ...

(d) Id. ib. pag. 164.

(e) Id. ib. cap. 22. pag. 295. ponit Shahriſtani de religionibus Orientalium.

(f) Id. ib.

(g) Ejuſmodi fuiſſe cauſam Miſtionis, hanc vero cauſam liberationis, Id. ibid. pag. 296.

(h) See what Diogenes Laertius in prooem. n. 8. relates concerning the Doctrine of Magi.

(i) Hyde ubi ſupra cap. 1. pag. 5.

* At the word Zer-[illegible]. † This [illegible] Printed at Paris in the Year 1666, in 12. || Pag. [illegible] & seq. & pag. [illegible].

ZUERIUS BOXHORNIUS (MARK) Professor at *Leyden*, the Son of *James Zuerius* Minister at *Bergen-op-Zoom*, and *Anne Boxhorn* the Daughter

civil one. (*a*) *Idem quoque dicendum est de eorum cultu Ignis, quem (ut supra vetigimus,) imitando Judæos in Pyreo servârunt. Nam quamvis ei exhibuerint Reverentiam quandam, eamque per Prostrationes, hæ tamen non fuerunt Adoratio divina, sed tantum civilis, prout se habet mos Orientis erga quosvis Magnates, & olim fuit erga Angelos tanquam Dei Legatos ejus personam repræsentantes; cujus rei exempla affatim suppetunt non tantum in Vet. Test. sed & in Novo, ubi fœminæ ad veram Fidem conversæ (visis apud Christi sepulchrum Angelis,) adorârunt procidentes faciebus in terram: eique quamvis probè scirent non esse Deum, sed Angelos, ut constat ex verbis earum profitentium* se vidisse visionem Angelorum. He concludes (*b*) That the World is to blame to call them Idolaters, and Worshippers of Fire, and will have it that (*c*) *Zoroaster* was an Instrument to oblige them to persevere in the true Faith. He was a Man educated in the knowledge of the true God, whom he peculiarly Worshipped in a Natural Cave, in which he placed several Symbols representing the World. *Mithra* representing the Sun filled the Master's place. But it was not to *Mithra*, but to the true God that he paid his Adorations: (*d*) *Is cùm esset insignis Philosophus, Religione austerus, & totius Matheseos peritissimus, hac ratione Persas sui admiratione perculit, & suâ Doctrinâ attentos reddidit. Præsertim coluit Deum in naturali quodam Antro, quod ille Mithriacum effecit & mirificè ac mathematicè comparavit, ubi scil. Mithra præsidens, hæc inferiora Regio modo regens, eaque imprægnans sedebat: adeo ut omnes postea non tantum in summis Montium jugis antiquissimo more Deum colebant, sed & subinde illius exemplo, Sacra sua Mithriaca in tali Antro præstare & peragere didicerunt. In eo erant Mithra & hujus Mundi Symbolica philosophicè & mathematicè spectanda & contemplanda, non autem colenda; quâ itaque in re falluntur Autores; nam Persæ tunc talia Simulachra non colebant.* Consult this Learned Man in the 4th Chapter of his Work, where besides other excellent Learning you will find these Words of *Porphyrius*: (*e*) *Referente Eubulo, Zoroastres primus omnium in montibus Persidi vicinis Antrum nativum, floridum, fontibusque irriguum in honorem Creatoris, & omnium Patris Mithræ, consecravit: ita ut Antrum conditi à Mithrâ Mundi figuram ei repræsentaret: ea verò quæ intra Antrum, erant certis invicem intervallis disposita, ut Elementorum Climatumque mundanorum symbola seu figuras gererent.*

It is observable that in this Book of Dr. *Hyde* there are some Observations which may be serviceable to the Jesuits, on Account of the Charge brought against them concerning the Honours paid to *Confutius*, which they affirm to be purely Civil. Father *le Comte* who hath been so much (†) blamed for asserting that true Religion or the knowledge of the true God hath been in *China* for several Ages, will find a very good Second in this Learned *Oxford* Professor.

(*H*) *Many Authors believe that all the Works which have gone under the Name of Zoroaster —— are supposititious. But Dr. Hyde is not of that Opinion.*] *Suidas* affirms that there were extant 4 Books of *Zoroaster* περὶ φύσεως *de natura*; a Book περὶ λίθων τιμίων *de gemmis*, and five Books of judiciary *Astronomy*, ἀστροσκοπικὰ ἀποτελεσματικὰ *prædictiones ex inspectione stellarum*. It is very likely that what *Pliny* relates (*f*) as quoted from *Zoroaster* was taken from these Books. (*g*) *Eusebius* cites a passage, which contains a magnificent Description of God, as the proper Words of *Zoroaster*, ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ συναγωγῇ τῶν Περσικῶν *in sacro Persicorum rituum commentario*. I know no Body who doth not believe that *Clemens Alexandrinus* says, that (*h*) *Prodicus*'s Followers boasted of having *Zoroasters*'s occult Books. But perhaps his Words are intended in another sense, and mean that they bragged of having the occult Books of *Pythagoras*. They have Printed, together with the Verses, of the *Sibyls* at *Amsterdam* in 1689. according to *Opsopeus*'s Edition, *oracula magica Zoroastris cum Scholiis Plethonis & Pselli*. Those pretended magical Oracles are but two Pages. Let us see Mr. *Huet*'s Judgment on all the Books in general which go under *Zoroasters*'s Name. He calls them all supposititious. (*i*) *Ex cujus* (Zoroastris) *famâ & existimatione provenit eorum fallacia qui sub ejus nomine Oracula quædam magica Græcè scripta incautis obtruserunt. Edita illa sunt cum Pselli & Plethonis scholiis: sed si nares admoveris fraus subolebit. Vetustiora quidem illa sunt, nihilo tamen* γνησιώτερα (sinceriora) *Oracula, quæ Crœsi temporibus extitisse narrat* (1) *Nicolaus Damascenus. Insinceros quoque eos dixerim libros, quos Chaldaicè scriptos, & Chaldaicis commentariis illustratos, & effata ac sententias complexos Johannem Picum habuisse ferunt; insincerum & librum Zend, mihi de nomine solum cognitum, quo ritus magicos, & ignis colendi disciplinam ajunt contineri —— Insinceros & quos Hermippus, Plinio teste, ducentis versuum millibus sub Zoroastris nomine conditos indicibus quoque positis explanavit. Ex iisdem falsariorum incudibus profectus est supra memoratus Persicarum Legum codex Zundavastaw, quem vetustissimum tamen conjicio, & eumdem fortasse, qui ab* (2) *Eusebio Collectio sacra Persicarum rerum appellatur. Indidem profectus & quem se in arcanis habere jactabant, qui Prodici Philosophi doctrinam sectabantur, ut est apud* (3) *Clementem Alexandrinum; indidem & quos commemorat* (4) *Suidas; & qui de Magia, Zoroastris nomine, scripti circumferebantur, ut habet* (5) *Auctor Recognitionum; & quem tradit Auctor Astrologiæ cujusdam Persicæ, Ebraicè redditæ, ab eo lucubratum, & Regnum Dei fuisse inscriptum, & manibus Persarum assiduè gestari esse solitum.* Mr. *Huet* adds, that (*k*) *Porphyrius* (*l*) reproached the Christians with the forgery of several Books, and boasted of having proved that the Apocalypse of *Zoroaster* was one of those supposititious pieces.

Dr. *Hyde* acknowledges that the Ancient Hereticks (*m*) alledged some supposititious Prophecies concerning JESUS CHRIST under the Name of *Zoroaster*; but he saith that they had not presumed to do it, if they had not known that there were Authentick

---

(*a*) Id. ib. pag. [illegible].

(*b*) Id. ib. pag. [illegible] See also pag. 22.

(*c*) Id. ib. pag. 16.

(*d*) Id. ib.

(*e*) Porphyr. de Nympharum antro apud Hyde ib. cap. 4. pag. 118.

(†) *The Sorbonne condemn'd that proposition the 18 of October 1700.*

(*f*) Plin. lib. [illegible] cap. [illegible] p. m. [illegible] & lib. [illegible] cap. 10. pag. [illegible]

(*g*) Euseb. præpar. Evangelii. l. 1. sub fin. pag. [illegible]

(*h*) Clem. Alexandrin. Strom. lib. 1. pag. 304.

(*i*) Huet. ubi supra pag. [illegible]

(1) Nicol. Damasc. Hist. l. 7. in Exc. Const. Porphyr.

(2) Eus. Præp. Ev. l. 1.

(3) Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.

(4) Suidas in Ζωροάστρης.

(5) Auct. Recogn. l. 4. c. 27.

(*k*) Huet. ib. p. [illegible]

(*l*) Porphyr. in vita Plotini.

(*m*) Hyde ubi supra in epist. dedicat. See also chapt. 26. p. 340. 341.

ter of a Miniſter at *Breda* (A) of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter, was Born * at *Bergen-op-Zoom* in *September* 1612. He was but ſix Years Old when his Father dyed. Sometime after he followed his Mother to *Breda*, and was there Educated by *Henry Boxhornius* his Grand-Father by his Mother's ſide, till the Spaniards became Maſters of that City in 1625 when he was carried to *Leyden* by *Henry Boxhornius*, who having no male Iſſue obliged him to take his Name. This Young Scholar made ſuch great and haſty progreſſes, that he publiſhed ſome very good Poems in 1629. on the taking of *Boiſleduc*, and ſome other Victories obtained by the *Hollanders*. He was then aged but 17 Years: And but 20 when he (B) publiſhed ſeveral conſiderable Works. Whereby he got ſuch a great Reputation, that the Curators of the Univerſity of *Leyden* the ſame Year 1632. conferred on him the Profeſſorſhip of Eloquence. Which he ſo very worthily diſcharged that Chancellor (C) *Oxenſtiern*, then Ambaſſador extraordinary from *Sweden* in *Holland*, offered him an Honourable Poſt, in the Name of Queen *Chriſtina*; but *Boxhornius* preferred his Station in his own Country to all thoſe (D) Honours: and continuing as well by his Lectures as Books to give frequent Proofs of his excellent Learning, and of an Exquiſite knowledge in Politicks and Hiſtory, he was made Profeſſor of thoſe two Sciences in the place of *Daniel Heinſius* who was declared *Emeritus*. He diſcharged this employ in a manner very Advantageous to his Auditors, and very Glorious to himſelf. He was for ſome time embroiled with

* He was [illegible] *Breda* was the [illegible] *Henry*, he was a Miniſter, and died in 1643, being but little above 33. Years of Age, and a very Learned and hopeful Man. *Jacob. Expoſitio in vita Marci Zuerii Boxhornii, epiſtol. Boxhorn. præfixa.* See alſo *epiſt. Boxhornii pag.* 168. *edit. Francof.* 1679.

Authentick Works of *Zoroaſter* in which were contained ſuch Propheſies. He believes (a) that God revealed to *Zoroaſter* the coming of the *Meſſiah*, and that he inſerted this Miraculous Revelation in his Works. He takes the *Zundavaſtaw*, which Mr. *Huet* rejects, to be an Authentick piece: He gives us the true Title and Analyſis of it, and is perſwaded (b) that this Author's Works were written in the Ancient *Perſian* Language, and are preſerved to this preſent time.

(A) *The Daughter of a Miniſter at* Breda, *of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter.*] His Name was *Henry BOXHORNIUS* or *BOXHORN*, and he was Born in *Brabant*. He run through his courſe of ſtudies at *Louvain*, and after having obtained the Degree of *Licentiate* in Divinity, he was promoted to the Deanry of *Tillemont*, and expreſs'd ſuch a warm Zeal for the Romiſh Religion that he was made Inquiſitor. But he changed his Opinion, and embraced the reformed Religion. He was firſt of all a Miniſter in the Dutchy of *Cleves*, afterwards at *Woerden* in *Holland*, and then at *Breda* (c). He left this laſt place when the *Spaniards* took it in 1625. and retired to *Leyden*, where he took care of the Education of his Grandſon, (d) who affords the Matter of this Article. *Henry Boxhornius* wrote ſome Books of Controverſy. His Antagoniſt was *Henry Cuyckius*, who accuſed him of falſely pretending himſelf of the Family of the *Boxhorns*. This *Cuyckius* Profeſſor of Philoſophy at *Louvain*, Grand Vicar and Official to the Arch-Biſhop of *Mechlen*, and at laſt Biſhop of *Ruremonde*, publiſhed in 1596 an *epiſtola paranetica*, in which he exhorted *Henry Boxhorn* to return into the Pale of the Church. To which *Boxhornius* anſwered that he would have nothing to do with ſuch a Corrupt Church. *Cuckius* returned to the Charge: And *Boxhorn* replyed by an *Anti-Cuyckius* Printed at *Leyden*, in 1598. *Boxhorn* was Attacked on his Gentility; for *Cuyckius* would not admit of his pretenſion of being deſcended from the Houſe of *Boxhorn*, a Noble Family in *Brabant* (e).

(B) *And but* 20. *when he publiſhed ſeveral Works.*] As *Theatrum Urbium Hollandiæ*; *Scriptores Hiſtoriæ Auguſtæ* (f) *cum animadverſionibus ac notis*; *Poetæ ſatyrici minores cum commentariis*; *Plinii Panegyricus*. He deſerved a place amongſt the illuſtrious Youths, of which Mr. *Baillet* hath drawn up ſuch a Curious Liſt; for to ſay nothing of the Verſes which he publiſhed at the Age of 17, and which were very much (g) applauded, it is certain that in 1631. he publiſhed an Edition of *Suetonius* with Notes, which engaged the Profeſſors of the Univerſity to adviſe him to put in for the Greek Profeſſor's Chair then Vacant (h). He was therefore an Author at 19. and how many Books did he publiſh the following Year? There was no occaſion for an Officious Lye to make him an early Author; the ſtricteſt Truth was ſufficient for it: Wherefore I wiſh *Valerius Andreas* had been more exact, and had not ſaid that *Boxhornius* publiſhed Books at the Age of 16, and that he was made Profeſſor of Eloquence and Literature before he was 19 Years of Age. The firſt of his Productions appeared in 1629. and he was not Profeſſor before 1632. Add to this that he was 13 Years old when he left *Breda* to go to *Leyden*: Wherefore they are miſtaken by one Year who make (i) him but twelve Years old when he was matriculated at *Leyden*. It happened to *Boxhornius* as to ſeveral others; when Age increaſed his Learning he grew ſomewhat aſhamed of his firſt Productions, and accordingly diſcovered a ſort of deſire to diſown them. Tho' withal it appears that he had ſtill a Tenderneſs for them, ſince with this ſort of diſinheriting he took care to publiſh the Praiſes which *Salmaſius* gave them in his Letters to him. *Claudius Salmaſius juveniles hoſce conatus ſibi adeo probari tum temporis literis ad* Boxhornium *datis ſignificavit, ut maxima quæque ab ipſo non tantum ſperare, ſed ſibi & eruditorum orbi & quidem ex vero promittere adeoque præſagire fuerit auſus: quæ illius Herois verbis ipſis publice (k) alibi leguntur, eo nempe loco quo* Boxhornius *ipſe poſtmodum hæc ipſa aliaque Juvenilia damnavit, ac proinde inter ſcripta ſua vix numeravit.* This is what we find in *Boxhorn's* Life. Which brings into my mind what *Grotius* wrote to *Scriverius* (l).

(C) *Chancellor* Oxenſtiern —— (m) *offered him an Honourable poſt.*] *Boxhornius's* Hiſtorian doth not mention in what Year this Chancellor came into *Holland*; which if he had taken the pains to expreſs, he had avoided an Error in Chronology: He had not ſaid that a little after *Boxhorn's* refuſing to go to *Sweden*, he refuſed to go to *Dort*, whither he was invited by the Magiſtrates to teach in their College which they re-eſtabliſhed in 1634. *Non diu poſthac cum Reip. Dordracenæ proceres illuſtre ſuum & vetuſtiſſimum a Reformatione in fœderato Belgio Gymnaſium anno quidem unde octogeſimo ſuperioris ſeculi erectum, ſed collapſum reſtaurarent an.* 1634. *omnium calculis Boxhornius dignus judicatus & habitus eſt cui res literaria in copromovenda committeretur.* The Dates are confounded; for it is certain that the Chancellor of *Sweden* did not come into *Holland* before 1635. The Magiſtrates of *Dort* offered *Boxhorn* a better Penſion than he had at *Leyden*, and yet he did not accept their Offers; which procured him an Augmentation of his Sallary at *Leyden*. This is the common conſequence of theſe ſorts of refuſals, when Men either are willing, or know how to make the beſt of them.

(D) *Boxhorn preferred his ſtation in his own Country* with Salmaſius, but that Quarrel (E) which obliged him to take Pen in hand againſt that formidable Critick, was at laſt Compoſed. He freely communicated his knowledge to other Authors, as Valerius Andreas confeſſes in his Bibliotheca Belgica. He died after a tedious ſickneſs at Leyden on the 3d. of October 1653. Aged 41 Years. He wrote on ſeveral Subjects (F) and particularly on the Invention of (G) Printing. On which head he Advanced an Opinion very different from that of Mallinkrot, and yet his Diſſertation procured him the Friendſhip of that Learned Man. He very cloſely ſtudied the (H) Antiquities of Gaul, which led him to dive into the Scythian Tongue, and the Antiquities of that Nation, on which he wrote very ingeniouſly in Dutch and in Latin. He alſo was about a Bibliotheque (I) of Women, illuſtrious for their Learning, and Writings; but this Work never appeared. Some have pretended * that the Publication of a ſmall Tract, which he dedicated to his Scholars, and which explained the Conſtitution of

---

(a) [illegible] *Huet* [illegible] pag. 158. [illegible]

(e) [illegible] *Valerius Andreas has committed the ſame fault as to the Hiſtoria Auguſta.*

(g) *Omnium applauſu* [illegible] *ſe non ſemel audivi.* [illegible] *Bæclius in ejus vita.*

(h) *Suetonius tanto omnium favore exceptus eſt, ut clariſſimi hujus Acad. Profeſſ. ad linguæ Græcæ profeſſionem quæ jam vacat adſpirare me voluerint.* Boxhornius in epiſt. p. m. 15. edit. Francof. His Letter is dated the 29. of September 1631.

(i) *As* Valerius Andreas *does.* Hankius de Roman. rer. ſcript. pag. 295. *has tranſcribed moſt of his Faults.*

(k) In apologia pro commentario ad Agricolam Taciti adverſus Dialogiſtam.

(l) *See the Article* Thomæus,

(m) Ab Axelio Oxenſtierna regni Cancellario Fœderis Germanici Directore, ad Fœderatos Belgas legato extraordinario Reginæ & eorundem Procerum nomine ad amplissimas dignitates in Sueciam evocatus fuit. *Bæclius ubi ſupra.*

* Ex ejus vita conſcripta a Jacobo Baſelio, quæ extat in limine epiſtolarum Boxhornii.

Country to all theſe Honours.] Before his Hiſtorian publiſhed this, *Valerius Andreas* ſpoke of it: Whence then proceeds it that Mr. *Moreri* ſays that Boxhornius *went into* Sweden, *where his Merit preferred him to conſiderable* Poſts? Is it thus that theſe Words ought to be Tranſlated? *Evocatus ſuperioribus annis a Suecorum ad Ordines fœderatos Legato, Reginæ & Procerum nomine ad ampliſſimas dignitates in Sueciam illi ſeptentrioni amorem prætulit patriæ* (a).

That quarrel with Salmaſius *was at laſt compoſed.*] This muſt be underſtood with ſome Diſtinction: The Acts of hoſtility ceaſed, they ſeem'd outwardly to be good Friends, but their Hearts remain'd the ſame, and could not ſuppreſs their Sallies and eruptions on all occaſions. *Boxhornius* a Year before his Death, when already ſeized by his Mortal Diſtemper, diſdainfully received the viſits of ſtrangers recommended to *Salmaſius*. *Eos qui a Salmaſio venerant faſtidioſe excipiebat, jam tum nimio tabaci uſu corrupta valetudine quæ altero poſt anno eum cum vitâ deſtituit.* Theſe two Facts I find in the Funeral Orations (b) of *John Caſpar Lentzius.* And what relates to Tobaco puts me in mind of what I have heard, that *Boxhorn* had a Hat with a hole in the Brim to hold his Pipe, ſo that he could ſmoak whilſt ſtudying or Writing.

(a) Valerius Andreas Biblioth. Belg. pag. 641. Valeſius addit, Quare eas recuſavit, & apud ſuos mediocri in conditione eſſe maluit, quam apud exteros alto in faſtigio collocari.
(b) In Theatro Pauli Freheri pag. 1180.

(F) He wrote on ſeveral Subjects.] He muſt of neceſſity have been not only very Laborious, but alſo have known a great many things, and have been indued with a very great Facility in writing: for without that a Life ſo ſhort as his would not have ſufficed for all the Works which he publiſhed. I have already mentioned ſeveral of his Commentaries on the Ancient Authors, but have ſaid nothing of his Notes on *Juſtin*, *Tacitus*, and *Pliny*'s Epiſtles, nor of his Commentary on the life of *Agricola* publiſhed in 1642, and a little while after defended againſt the Attacks of an anonymous Writer. I have not mentioned his Annals of *Zealand* and *Holland*, which he publiſhed in *Dutch* with large Additions, and better digeſted; thoſe of *Zealand* in 1644. and thoſe of *Holland* in 1650. He Attempted to obtain the Title of (c) Hiſtoriographer of *Zealand*, and then that of Hiſtoriographer (d) of all the United Provinces: But I believe he obtained nothing; for if his requeſts had ſucceeded, the Author of his Life would have touched on this head; I don't find that he ſaith one Word of it. The *Index* to his Epiſtles notes that he obtained his requeſt with regard to *Zealand*; but when one conſults the Page to which it refers us, nothing like it appears. His Hiſtory of the Siege of *Breda* is written in good Latin. He wrote ſeveral Tracts on political Subjects, as an Apology for the Navigations of the *Hollanders. Diſſertatio de trapezitis vulgo Longobardis qui in fœderato Belgio fœnebres menſas exercent: Diſſertatio de ſucceſſione & jure primogenituræ adeundo principatu ad Carolum II. magnæ Britanniæ Regem: De majeſtate liber ſingularis adverſus J. B. cogitationes ſubitaneas in præcedentem diſſertationem.* It appears by this laſt piece that what he publiſhed in Favour of *Charles* II. King of *England* when fled from his Kingdom, had diſpleaſed ſome Republicans. There is a Collection of his *diſquiſitiones politicæ, id eſt, 60. caſus politici ex omni hiſtoria ſelecti*, printed in 1651. in 12. He publiſhed a great Number of Orations on ſeveral Subjects, and after his Death came out his *Idea orationum ex ſelectiori materia moderni ſtatus politici deſumptæ*, his *Inſtitutiones politicæ*, and his Latin Letters and Poems. The laſt Printed in 1659. was Reprinted in *Germany* in 1679. with a Preface written by *James Thomaſius* Profeſſor at *Leipſick*, which very well deſerves Reading.

(c) Boxhorn. in epiſtol. pag. 219. 226.
(d) Ibid. pag. 308.

(G) On the Invention of Printing.] He aſſerts that the Glory of this Invention is due to the City of *Haerlem*, and not to *Mentz*, as he formerly believed. *Cujus inventæ gloriam Harlemenſibus, non Moguntinis, ut olim, nunc denuo aſſertum imus* (e). His diſſertation on this Subject was Printed in 1641.

(H) He very cloſely ſtudied the Antiquities of Gaul.] Concerning which his Hiſtorian gives us the following information: *Nunc hiſce finem imponerem, niſi pauca dicendum eſſet de iis, quæ ſuper Dea Nehalemia* (f) *1647. primum in Walachria oris inventâ eſt commentatus, & inde ad Scythica gentis linguam, antiquitatem, & mores indagandos multa ingenioſe ſane ſcripſit & ſcripturivit non vernacule modo, prout inceperat, ſed & Latine: nominatim librum originum Gallicarum* (g), *in quo Gallos a Germanis ortos ex veteri ipſorum lingua aſſerere conatur, qui tamen non niſi a morte authoris & alia ejuſdem, prodiit in lucem, obſtetricante Georgio Hornio in profeſſione Hiſtoriarum non indigno ſucceſſore.* It appears by *Boxhornius*'s Epiſtles that his *Origines Gallicæ* were in the Preſs (h) in 1648. and continued ſo in (i) 1652. He ſpeaks of it only as of a ſmall Tract (k), but he had a good Opinion of his Syſtem. He hoped to (l) prove that the *Greeks* and *Romans* owed all to the Ancient *Frieſlanders*. His Treatiſe *de Scythicis* (m) *Originibus* was ended in 1647. but he had a hundred things to add to it; for in a Letter Written to Mr. *de Zulychem* in 1652. he hath the following expreſſions. (n) *De originibus noſtris & ſepultis hactenus Scythicis Antiquitatibus (nam & de iis quærere dignatus es) hoc eſt, ut ego accipio, Aſiæ totius & Europæ, ſuperbius forte & jactantius reſpondeo. Multa excuſſi diligenter, conquiſivi multa, multa meditatus ſum, multa etiam ignorata, feliciter, niſi fallor, tandem deprehendi; quæ aliquando publicis judiciis ſiſtere ac exponere tuo imprimis, quod, ſcio eſſe & graviſſimum pariter, & æquiſſimum, audebo.* He publiſhed a Latin diſcourſe in 1650. to ſhew the Affinity betwixt the *Greek*, *Latin* and *German* Languages.

(I) A Bibliotheque of Women, illuſtrious ——— but this Work never appeared.] *Valerius Andreas* is inſtead to blame for inſerting in the Catalogue of *Boxhornius*'s

(e) Epiſtol. pag. 157.
(f) He wrote two Tracts in Dutch upon the Goddeſs; one of 'em was Printed in 1647. and the other in 1648.
(g) That Book is intituled Originum Gallicarum liber, in quo Veteris & nobiliſſimæ Gallorum gentis origines, antiquitates, mores & linguæ aliaque eruuntur aut illuſtrantur. Cui accedit antiquæ linguæ Britannicæ Lexicon Britannico Latinum, inſertis explicatiſque paſſim Adagiis Britannicis. Prodiit Amſt. apud J. Janſſ. 1654. 4. (h) Epiſt. Boxhorn pag. 291. (i) Ib. pag. 315. (k) Sub Prælo jam eſt opuſculum Originum Gallicarum. *Ibid.* pag. 315. (l) Ibid. pag. 289. (m) Ibid. (n) Ibid. pag. 314.

of the Republick of the United Provinces was (K) reſented in *Holland*. His Sacred and Profane Hiſtory, which extends from the Birth of JESUS CHRIST to the Year 1650, is well eſteemed, and is in one Volume in *Quarto*. The beſt part of it is that of the XVIth, and the beginning of the XVIIth Century. *Boxhorn* was ſomewhat ugly, and ſo ſwarthy, that he was one day taken (L) for a *Spaniard*, which drew from him an Anſwer * full of Zeal for his Country; but it is the (M) Caſuiſts buſineſs to determine whether it be conform to the Spirit of the Goſpel. *Sorbiere* ſeeing him ſomewhat angry with *Grotius*, had the Equity to excuſe him; and beſides, to declare this Language conform (N) to the Laws of Policy. Some Learned *Germans* had no great opinion of his Erudition, and have obſerved numerous Errors in

* See the Remark L.

Boxhorn's Works, *Bibliothecam eruditione & ſcriptis illuſtrium fœminarum*; and doubtleſs he was the cauſe of ſeveral Authors imagining, and publiſhing alſo that *Boxhorn* put out this curious Tract. (c) *Voglerus* affirms it as poſitively as if he had read it, and is not blamed for it by *Meibomius* (b). What is certain on this head is, that *Boxhorn* had this Project in his Head: He had good Collections on this Subject, which he offered (c) to *Iſaac Pontanus* who (d) had ſome thoughts of an Undertaking of that nature: *But if you think no more of it, added he, and will be pleaſed to transfer to me this Commiſſion, I beg of you to ſend me your Memorials. Erneſtus Brinchius* communicated to him a Liſt of Learned Women. *Velim nobili viro Erneſto Brinchio gratias meo nomine agi, ob tranſmiſſum Syllabum eruditarum fœminarum. In quarum gratiam Bibliothecam meam, & amicorum ſcrinia nuper excuſſi. Deprehendi autem non pœnitendum earum numerum, quæ vulgo ignoramur. Si tibi animus ſit pergere in eo, quod aliquando cœpiſſe te intelligo, lubens qualiacunque mea tranſmittam, ſin verò tibi viſum lampada mihi tradere, ut tua non deneges, unice rogo.* I ſhall here occaſionally ſay, that Father *Jacob*, a French Carmelite, compiled a Book of the like nature; which abundance of Authors cite and refer to, and yet it never was Printed, nor ever will, for the Manuſcript is loſt.

(K) *Was reſented in* Holland.] *Sorbiere* writes this to *Patin*; his words are: (e) "I have ſent you "a very curious little Book intitl'd: *Commentariolus de Statu Provinciarum fœderati Belgii*, on "account of the Publication of which, they are "very angry in theſe Provinces, by reaſon it gives "a very accurate Deſcription of the Government "of that Republick, which ought to remain *inter* "*Arcana Imperii. Boxhorn* drew up this Commentary for us Scholars, and dictated it "to them in private; but the Secret took wind, "and there has been ſo many Copies of it handed about, that at laſt a Bookſeller put it to the "Preſs without putting his Name to it; and the "Impreſſion was ſold before the Publick had time "to find fault with it." I do not certainly know whether *Sorbiere* was in the right to ſay this, but I know that this ſmall Tract was Printed at the *Hague* for *John Verhoeve* in 1649, and in 1650, and that the Edition of 1650 was reviſed and enlarged. There were alſo other Editions. I have ſeen the 6th Printed at the *Hague* by *Hadrian Vlacq* in 1659.

(L) *So ſwarthy that he was one day taken for a Spaniard.*] This was in 1637, when the Spaniſh Garriſon left *Breda* according to the Capitulation. *Boxhorn* being then in the Prince of *Orange*'s Camp, and ſeeing that Garriſon paſs, heard a Dutch Soldier take him for a *Spaniard*: Upon which, *You miſtake*, ſaid he, *don't judge of me by my Hair and my Aſpect; if you knew the candour of my Heart, you would not doubt me to be a true Hollander. And if I were able, I would throw the King of* Spain *into a Fever, fix him ſo cloſe to his Bed, and ſo terrify him that he ſhould never more be capable of unjuſtly attacking our Liberty.* Thoſe who had rather read the Original Latin, ſhall ſoon be ſatisfied. (f) *Statura corporis ipſi fuit longa & erecta, & quam cum ſubfuſca facie crines efficiebant qualemcunque deformem: nigredinem cum candore animi ſui albicantem reddere ſolebat. Unde cum Bredâ captâ inter exeuntium Hiſpanorum ſpectatores & ipſe eſſet, & a noſtrate quodam milite ipſo audiente pro Hiſpano ob iſtam nigredinem haberetur, illi homini facete non minus quam vere reſpondebat, "Tu me ex vultu & crinibus Hiſpanum "judicas, ſed male: nam ſi candorem animi Belgici mei noſſes, qui tam magnus eſt ac nigri ſunt "mei crines, & in mea eſſet poteſtate, pro amore "in communem patriam vel hodie Hiſpaniarum "Regem febri affligerem lectoque alligarem, & metu "ſic terrerem, ut impoſterum abſtineret ab injuſta liberorum Belgarum oppreſſione & oppugnatione."*

(M) *It is the Caſuiſts Buſineſs to determine whether this Anſwer was conform to the Spirit of the Goſpel.*] The Accuſation which appear'd (g) in *March* 1694, if juſt, would prove, that *Boxhorn* would eaſily obtain his Abſolution, and even a full approbation of the Caſuiſts who ſhould prove like the accuſed Preacher; for we are told that he preached that the Precept of loving and bleſſing the Perſecutors of the Church, doth not engage us to any more than to wiſh and procure their Heavenly felicity. The temporal (h) Evil which *Boxhorn* would have done to the King of *Spain*, would not have prevented his wiſhing the converſion of that Prince. Beſides, a Diſeaſe is no Aſſaſſination; but the ſaid Preacher hath told us (i) in one of his books, that beſides, Aſſaſſination, *all other means are allowable and fair againſt a declared Enemy.* He hath ſo imperfectly anſwered the Accuſation, and that with ſuch perplexed and ſophiſtical (k) turns, that his Reply, in conjunction with the induſtrious care he took to withdraw his Sermons from the Preſs, have convinced all reaſonable Men, that he was very juſtly accuſed. Conſult (l) Mr. *Saurin*'s Book.

(N) *Conform to the Laws of Policy.*] *Boxhorn* was aged 30 years when *Sorbiere* (m) went to viſit him, and was known then by a great many, and perhaps too many Books. He, by degrees, grew warm againſt *Grotius* in this Converſation, and blamed him not only for his Method of re-uniting of Chriſtians, but alſo with reſpect to the political Affairs of *Holland*. (n) *Is viſus eſt τῷ μάνυ Grotio minus amicus; nam ſenſim procedente, ut fit, ſermone ad quæſtiones tunc temporis volitantes docta per ora virum & nupera ſcripta, non ſolum diſſentire (quod faciunt multi boni & amici Grotio) ſe fſſus eſt circa initium conciliationis modum & tributam nimiam Rom. Pontifici authoritatem, ſed ipſum inſimulatus eſt circa politica patriæ negotia, una cum cæteris Remonſtrantibus. Sorbiere* excuſes *Boxhorn*, becauſe it would not have been prudent in a Profeſſor, who intends to be ſucceſsful in his Affairs, and uſe his endeavours for the advancement of his demeſtick Proſperity, to expoſe himſelf to be diſgraced by the ruling Party. *Quærens apud me rationem qua excuſarem Boxhornium; aut quia junior res geſtas audierat ab aliis non probatæ fidei teſtibus: aut quia profeſſorium munus exercens conductum mercede ſe putabat a Calviniſtis, quorum excidere gratia, clavum Reipubl. tenentium, non eſt hominis bene rem familiarem gerere quærentis.* Perhaps there lurks a malignity in

(d) Ibid. pag. 120.

(f) Baſeli-... pag. ...

(g) *With this Title* Nouvelle hereſie dans la Morale touchant la haine du prochain, prêchée par Mr. Jurieu, &c.

(h) Note *that the violence committed by Souldiers upon the Enemy by wounding or killing them, and the miſchief which a private man ſhould do them, by giving 'em a draught, that occaſions a Fever, &c. are different things. The firſt is not brought into queſtion here, but is ſuppoſed without any difficulty.*

(i) *See the* Entretiens ſur la Cabale chimerique pag. 87. & ſeq.

(k) *He reckons among the Propoſitions complain'd of many Conſequences, which the Accuſer ſays, might be drawn from the Hereſies charged upon him; but he does not ſay that the Miniſter preached thoſe Conſequences. 'Tis therefore a baſe Trick to complain that he is accuſed of having preached thoſe Conſequences.*

(l) Intitl'd Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu, p. 807 & ſeq.

(m) Inviſi Boxhorn. juvenem annor. triginta . . doctum ſane, & multis ne nimiis dicam, libris notum. *Soberiana* p. 44 *Dutch Edit.*

(n) Ibid.

there

(O) in his Works; of which he was advertiſed, and reſolved to revenge himſelf by a *Satyr*, but I cannot tell whether he executed his Deſign.

ZUYLICHEM (*Conſtantin Huygens*, Lord of——) Secretary and Counſellor to the Princes of *Orange*, a polite Genius, and one of the good (*A*) Poets of the XVIIth Century, was born at the *Hague*, on the 4th of *September* 1596. He was the ſecond Son of (*B*) *Chriſtian Huygens*, Secretary to the Council of State of the Republick of the United Provinces, and was preferred to the Poſt I have mention'd under the Prince *Frederick Henry*, and continued in the exerciſe of it under his Succeſſors, 'till he reſigned it to his eldeſt * Son. In the Year 1661, he was ſent to the Court of *France*, to ſollicite the reſtitution of *Orange* which *Lewis* XIVth had poſſeſſed himſelf of. And in 1665, having at laſt obtained what he demanded, he took a Journey to *Orange*, in order to cauſe that Principality to be reſtored to its lawful Sovereign. Which † was performed with great ſolemnity. He lived to an extreme Old age, with the happineſs of retaining both the Solidity of his Judgment, and the vivacity of his Wit, and alſo to ſee his Family well ſetled, and the 62 Years Services he had done to the Houſe of *Orange* well approved. He kept a great (*C*) Epiſtolary Correſpondence with the moſt Illuſtrious Learned Men; and as he loved and underſtood the liberal Arts, he was a great Favourer of their Profeſſors. He dyed in 1687, aged 90 Years and ſix Months. He was Preſident of the Prince of *Orange*'s Council, Mr. (*D*) *Huygens*, one of the greateſt Mathematicians of *Europe*, was one of his three Sons.

* See the Remark *D.*

† See the Relation Publiſhed by *Chambrun* Miniſter of *Orange*, in the year 1665.

theſe Excuſes; but ſince *Sorbiere* doth not deny that *Boxhorn* might ſpeak according to his Perſwaſion, we ought not to ſuppoſe that he applied to him the Saying, *beneficium accipere libertatem vendere eſt*: A well paid Salary prevents ſpeaking ones Thoughts.

(*O*) *Some Learned* Germans—— *have obſerved numerous Errors in his Works, he*—— *reſolved to revenge himſelf by a Satyr.*] This appears in a Letter from *Rupert* to *Reineſius*. (*a*) *Videtur* Boxhornius *nimium tribuere ingenio ſuo, & ante tempus togæ brachium exerere. Quum olim vidiſſem* Florum *ejus, occurrebant multa valde putida; quæ privato ſtudio notata, ſed poſtea neſcio qua fraude in vulgus ſparſa, in ipſius Boxhornii manus veniſſe dicuntur. Etiam Satyram, ut audio, minatus eſt in literis ad quendam Dreſdenſem; quaſi pro meis agnoſcere debeam univerſa, quæ inimica manus tranſmiſit: Vivimus enim hic in Viperina ſocietate. Sed quicquid velit, agat, & typographica tuba proprium dedecus inſonet in eruditas aures: ego nullus trepido, quamvis illud poetæ inſuſurrare quiſpiam poſſit:*

Occurſare Capro, cornu ferit ille, caveto.

Reineſius in a Letter to *Hoffman*, hath theſe words: (*b*) Tragocerotem Batavum *qui neſcio quid* Ruperto *noſtro minatus fuerat, confidentiſſimum Criticum eſſe & in Antiquitate videre præ calore parum, oſtendam ex ejus* Quæſtionibus Romanis, *ubi circa* Inſcriptiones *nonnullas pueriliter hallucinatur*. See alſo the 27th Letter (*c*) of the ſame *Reineſius*; where he treats *Boxhorn* with a great deal of Contempt.

(*A*) *Of the good Poets.*] There are of his an infinite number of Dutch Verſes; and he hath alſo Publiſhed ſome Latin Poems under the Title of *Momenta deſultoria*.

(*B*) *The Second Son of* Chriſtian Huygens.] This *Chriſtian* was the Son of *Cornelius Huygens*, a Gentleman of *Brabant*, and of (*d*) *Gertrude Back*. He was the firſt of his Family that ſetled in *Holland*. He became allied to (*e*) a very conſiderable Antwerpian Family, by eſpouſing *Suſanna Hoefnagle*, the Daughter of *James Hoefnagle*, and *Elizabeth* (*f*) *Veſeler*. This *James Hoefnagle* was ſo rich, that he gave three hundred Thouſand Florins for his redemption from the Spaniſh Garriſon when it mutiny'd in *Antwerp* in 1576. This large Ranſom ſecured him and his Family from the fury of the Soldiers, as well as the fine Houſe which he had built; but did not prevent their killing even in his Arms, one of his Relations who fled to him for Protection. The Country Seat which he built about a quarter of a League from *Antwerp*, is ſtill known by the Name of *Lanternhof*. *Balthazar Hoefnagle* his eldeſt Son, married the Daughter of the (*g*) Chancellor of *Brabant*. As for *Chriſtian Huygens*, he ſerved Prince *William* in quality of Secretary of the Diſpatches, from the Foundation of the Republick of the United Provinces. The Hiſtories of *Reydanus* and *Hooft* relate a great Action of his, when he was that Prince's Deputy, after whoſe death he was Secretary of the Council of State. He died at the *Hague* in 1624, leaving two Sons and two Daughters. *Maurice Huygens* his eldeſt Son, and God-Son to Prince *Maurice*, was born at the *Hague* the 12th of *May* 1595., and was Secretary to the States after the death of his Father, and left Poſterity. *Conſtantin Huygens* the ſecond Son of *Chriſtian*, is the Subject of this Article. He had two Siſters: *Gertrude Huygens*, the Eldeſt, married *Philip Doublet*, Lord of *Saint Annelant*, &c. Receiver general of the United Provinces. From which Marriage proceeded *Philip Doublet*, Lord of *Saint Annelant*, &c, who married *Suſanna Huygens* his Couſin German, the Daughter of our *Conſtantine Huygens*. The other Siſter of the ſaid *Conſtantine* named *Conſtantia Huygens*, was born the 2d of *Auguſt* 1602, and married *David le Leu de Wilhem*, as I have ſaid above (*h*).

(*C*) *A great Epiſtolary Correſpondence.*] Chiefly with *Daniel Heinſius*, *Nicolas Heinſius*, the Son of *Daniel*, *Voſſius*, *Ericius Puteanus*, (*i*) *Balzac*, *Corneille*, and yet much more with Father *Merſenne*, and (*k*) Mr. *Deſcartes*. Obſerve alſo that he is frequently mentioned in the Printed Letters of ſeveral Learned Men. See amongſt others thoſe of Mr. *de Wicquefort* and *Barlæus*, lately Publiſhed in (*l*) Latin and French.

(*D*) *Mr.* Huygens, *one of the greateſt Mathematicians of* Europe, *was one of his three Sons.*] His Name was *Chriſtian*; he died on the 8th of *July* 1695 at the Age of 66 Years, without ever marrying. *Hymen* could not well agree with a Perſon like him, wholly Conſecrated to the enquiry after what was moſt profound in Mechanicks, Aſtronomy, Geometry, &c. See his Elogy in the *Hiſtoire* (*m*) *des ouvrages des Savans*. To draw up which, Mr. *de Beauval* had no occaſion for any thing elſe beſides a Catalogue of the Writings and Inventions of this great Man. You will alſo find his Elogy, as well as that of Mr. *de Zuylichem* his Father, in a Letter written by (*n*) *Sorbiere* the 13th of *July* 1660. when Mr. *Huygens* was but (*o*) 31 Years of Age. His eldeſt Brother, named *Conſtantine*, was Secretary to the Prince of *Orange*, by the reſignation of his Father, and continued in the occupeſſion of that Poſt after the acceſſion of that great Prince to the Throne of *Great Britain*. He died at the *Hague* in *November* 1697. Mr. *de Zuylichem* left a third Son who died at *Rotterdam* in the beginning of *July* 1699. He had the office of Deputy of the Admiralty of the *Maeſe* for life. He left a very eminent Family. His eldeſt Son poſſeſſes the Lordſhip of *Zeelhem*, of which Mr. *Huygens* the Mathematician bore the Title the laſt years of his Life.

(*a*) Epiſt. 21 *Reineſii ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum* pag. 64, 65.

(*b*) Ibid. epiſt. 26. pag. 99.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 111.

(*d*) *The Daughter of* Chriſtian Back, & Lucy Back de Weelden, *of the ſame Family with thoſe of* Aſten.

(*e*) *Being 26 years of Age.*

(*f*) *The eldeſt daughter of* George Veſeler *Intendant General of the Mints of the King* of Spain.

(*g*) *Call'd* Theodore van Liefvelt *Lord of* Hamme, Ste. Anne Opdorp. &c.

(*h*) *In the Article* Wilhem, *At the* [illegible] *extracted out of a Memorial imparted to the Bookſeller.*

(*i*) *Having inſcribed to him his Critique upon* Heinſius's Herodes Infanticida. *Several Letters he writ to him are Printed.*

(*k*) *See* Mr. Baillet *in his Life of* Deſcartes *paſſim.*

(*l*) *At* Amſterdam [illegible]

(*m*) *For Auguſt* 1695. art. 9. p. 542. & ſeq.

(*n*) Sorbiere, Lettres & relations pag. 143. & ſeq. Paris Edition 1660. in 8.

(*o*) Sorbiere *ſays he was but* 24. *He is miſtaken.*

17 JY 63

A
DISSERTATION
Concerning the Book of
STEPHANUS JUNIUS BRUTUS,
Printed in the Year 1579.

'TIS univerſally agreed, that he who compoſ'd under this Name the Book Entituled, *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos, ſive de Principis in populum, populique in Principem legitima poteſtate*, was not call'd ſo; but there are ſtill different Opinions concerning his true Name. The moſt virulent of all the Libels (*A*) that were ſent us from *France* by the Poſt in 1689. on account of the Revolution of *England*, attributes *Junius Brutus*'s Book to Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornai*: which is ſomewhat ſurprizing; for after the Proofs that the Author of another (*a*) Libel has taken from ſeveral very common Writings, no Body ought to be ignorant that *Hubert Languet* and *Junius Brutus* are the ſame Perſon. See here ſome miſtakes concerning this famous Book.

(*a*) *Important advice to the Refugees.*

I. Deckher's Error.

Mr. *Dechker* (*b*) Advocate in the Imperial Chamber of *Spire*, pretends, That if the Author had ſtyl'd himſelf *Lucius Junius Brutus*, he had aſſum'd a more proper Name, and better founded on *Livy*'s Hiſtory, than is that of *Stephanus Junius Brutus*, which he has taken in the *Hanaw* Edition of the Year MDVC, and he obſerves, that (*c*) *Boeclerus* has cited him *Lucius Junius Brutus*. But firſt, this is to be ignorant that the *Prænomen Stephanus* had appear'd in the preceding Editions, and even in the firſt, which is pretended to have been made at *Edinburg* in 1579. The *French* Verſion printed in 1581 in *Octavo*, bears alſo the Name of *Stephen Junius Brutus*. 2*dly*, Why muſt the Author have had more regard to *Brutus*, who deliver'd *Rome* from *Tarquin*'s Tyranny, than to *Brutus*, who deliver'd it from *Cæſar*'s? If there was no reaſon for his preferring one of 'em before the other, there was no reaſon for his calling himſelf *Lucius* rather than *Marcus*; he might therefore as juſtly take the *Prænomen Stephen*, as any other. Let no one ſay, that the manner of *Marcus Brutus* ſetting up againſt the Tyrant, is not as conformable as that of the other *Brutus* to the Author's Principles; nor let him add in confirmation of it, that he allows Perſons in any Office, as *Lucius Junius Brutus*, who was Tribune of the *Celeres*, to excite the People to take up Arms, but that he denies that Privilege to private Perſons, and much more, that of Aſſaſſinating the Tyrant, except in caſe of a Divine Inſpiration, in which he will have a Man to examine himſelf very exactly. Let no one uſe theſe Arguments, I ſay; for the Author has clearly (*d*) declar'd, that *Brutus* and *Caſſius* are in the Caſe of thoſe Murderers of Tyrants, to whom the Laws promiſe Rewards, and erect Statues. He has rank'd *Cæſar* in the number of Uſurpers, againſt whom it is lawful for any one to Conſpire. And ſo, Mr. *Deckher*'s Criticiſm is falſe, and little better than the pitiful and inſipid Jeſt of ſome People, who have ſaid, that *Hubert Languet* diſguiſed himſelf, amongſt other Names, under that of *Stephen*, not with reſpect to that *Stephen*, who Aſſaſſinated the Emperor *Domitian*, to whom *Apollonius* (*e*) *Tyanæus* cry'd out at three hundred Leagues diſtance, *Cheer up, ſtrike the Villain*; but with reſpect to St. *Stephen*, the firſt Martyr of the Goſpel, and the firſt Victim of Chriſtian Patience.

(*b*) *De ſcriptis adeſpotis, p. 89. edit. Amſtel. 1686.*

(*c*) *In Grotium de jure belli & pac. l. 1. c. 4. pag. 271.*

(*d*) *See his Queſtion* 3. *pag.* 198. *and* 211.

(*e*) *Xiphilin. in Domit. ſub fin.*

II. arclay's rror.

But this Advocate's Criticiſm is nevertheleſs more tolerable, than the Argument us'd by *William* (*f*) *Barclay*, to prove *Stephanus Junius Brutus*'s Work to be pſeudonymous, and that the Author only choſe the Name of *Brutus*, to take the Field with greater Diſtinction, on the Foot of Deliverer of the People; becauſe, ſays he, it is not probable, that the Poſterity of him, who expell'd *Tarquin*, continu'd to our Age, ſince one of the beſt Hiſtorians affirms, (1) that he dy'd the laſt of his Family, in the War againſt the *Veientes*. Certainly, this is racking one's Brain to little purpoſe; for it could never have enter'd into the Head of any Reader, that this Writer could have deſcended in a right Line from *Junius Brutus*, who deſtroy'd the Monarchy of *Rome*;

(*f*) *Lib.* 3. *contra Monarchomachos c.* 1. *p. m.* 311. *Vide etiam pag.* 189.

(1) *Dionyſ. Halicarn. l.* 5.

It was

(*A*) *The moſt virulent of all Libels.*] It's that call'd *The new Abſalom, &c.* 'tis aſcrib'd to Mr. *Arnauld*: this Opinion is Printed in a Book (*) intituled, *The Hiſtory of the Troubles cauſ'd by Mr.* Arnauld *after his death; or Mr.* Santeuil'*s Controverſy with the Jeſuits.* This is found at the 29 Page. If the Author of this Hiſtory is not miſtaken as to the Author of the Libel, he is out at leaſt as to the place of the Impreſſion; for 'tis falſe that Mr. *Arnauld* Publiſh'd this Writing in *Holland*. Nay, I don't think he was there at that time. The Hiſtorical and Political Mercury of the Year 1696. has given occaſion to take notice of the Diſcovery of the Author of this Libel, ſpeaking of this Controverſy of Mr. *Santeuil*.

Rome; and I don't think, that in reading the Books of Modern Authors, whoſe true Names are *Brutus*, any one will be ſo ſilly as to believe they are deſcended from the Family of the Ancient *Brutus*'s.

III. Hotman believed the Author of the Book.

The Error of thoſe, who father the Book on *Francis Hotman*, is nothing near ſo great as the fore-going (*a*). There are ſtill ſome Learned Men, who impute it to him. This is done by Mr. *Conſtant* (*b*), a famous Miniſter and Profeſſor at *Lauſanne*, in his Abridgment of Politicks (*c*).

IV. The Author of the *News from the Republick of Learning* confus'd.

He that compos'd the three firſt Years of the *News from the Republick of Learning*, having ſaid once accidentally, (*d*) that *Hotman* was thought to be conceal'd under the Name of *Junius Brutus*, gave ſome time after, (*e*) for his Authority, a Book printed at *Paris* in 1589. Intituled, *A Treatiſe concerning the Power of Kings againſt the King of* Navarre. But if he had been well acquainted with his *d'Aubigné*, he would have been able to inform us, at the ſame time, both that *Hotman* was reputed the Author of *Junius Brutus*'s Book, and that it was without any foundation. I am going to ſhew what *d'Aubigné* has ſaid of it: I begin with an Author (*f*), who has been very curious in theſe ſorts of inquiries; whoſe Words are theſe: "Mr. *Daille* told me, that he was inform'd, that the Author of the Book Intituled, *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, under the Name of *Stephanus Junius Brutus*, was *Hubert Languet*, a Learned Man, and a great Politician. Which I have had ſince confirm'd by M. *Legoux* of *Dijon*, who added, that M. *de la Mare* Counſellor of the ſame Town, had obſerv'd this in making *Hubert Languet*'s Elogy. Others attribute this Book to Mr. *du Pleſſis*, to whom I could willingly aſſign it on this teſtimony of (1) *d'Aubigné*: *There came out another Book, call'd* Junius Brutus, *or a Defence againſt Tyrants, written by a Learned Gentleman of the Kingdom, famous for many excellent Books, and ſtill living with great Figure.* In another place of his Hiſtory (2) *d'Aubigné* ſays, that this Gentleman confeſs'd to him, that he was the Author of it." There was reaſon upon ſuch Paſſages to attribute the Book to Mr. *du Pleſſis, as willingly* as to *Hubert Languet*. But if this Author had known *d'Aubigné*'s ſecond Edition, he could not have been in ſuſpence; for he would have ſeen that after the Year 1616, the date of the firſt Edition, *d'Aubigné* had diſcover'd all the Myſtery. Let us hear then what he ſays in the 2d Edition, which is of the Year 1626. "(*g*) Many Pens in all kinds of Writing were imploy'd both on account of Religion and Government. The firſt Point produc'd a great many Books; as for the ſecond, there was one in vogue, which I will obſerve amongſt others, call'd *A Defence againſt Tyrants*: In which, it was largely Stated how far Obedience to Kings extends, for what Cauſes, and by what Means People may take up Arms, and to whom it belongs to authorize them; whether Foreigners may be call'd in; whether they may lawfully give Aſſiſtance. *Hotman* was a long time wrongfully ſuſpected to be the Author of it; but afterwards a *French* Gentleman living when I write, confeſſed to me, that he was the Author of it. But it appear'd at laſt, that he was the Editor, it having been depoſited with him by *Hubert Languet*, of *Franche Comte*, (*h*) Agent in *France* for the Duke of *Saxony*." In another place of his (*i*) Hiſtory, he repeats the ſame thing in theſe Words: *There appear'd another Book, which was Intituled,* Junius Brutus, *or* A Defence againſt Tyrants, *own'd by one of the Learned Gentlemen of the Kingdom, celebrated for many excellent Books, and living ſtill in great Repute; treating the Queſtions concerning the bounds of our Obedience to Kings; in what Caſes it is lawful to take up Arms againſt them; who ought to attempt it; whether Foreigners may juſtly give their Aſſiſtance; in what manner all things ought to be manag'd: All this he handles like a great Lawyer, and a great Divine. Since that,* Hubert Languet *is known to be the true Author of it.*

COLOMIES cited, and a Reflection upon the Citation.

I ſhall obſerve three Things upon theſe two Paſſages of *d'Aubigné*.

V. Three Reflections on *d'Aubigné*.

The 1ſt. is, That I don't believe the Book in queſtion, was ever call'd *Junius Brutus*, and ſo, this Hiſtorian muſt have taken the Name of the Author for the Title of the Work; which at moſt, is but a little deviation a from rigorous exactneſs. Not but at the bottom, the Book might have been Intituled, *Junius Brutus*, and might be cited ſo. But that is not the thing in Queſtion; we know well enough that a proper Name has often been the Title of a Book, and that there is a Tract of *Cicero* Intituled *Brutus*; and we are ſenſible that Cuſtom gives great Privileges for the abridging of a Citation. 'Tis not therefore what we are in Diſpute about. The Queſtion is, Whether the Book we ſpeak of, had the Title, which *d'Aubigné* and *Boeclerus* give it.

My 2d. Reflection is ſomewhat more conſiderable. *D'Aubigné* was much in the wrong, to leave in his ſecond Edition what had been ſaid by him in the firſt, to denote Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornai*; for ſince he afterwards underſtood, that *Hubert Languet* was the true Author of the Book, and that the other only publiſh'd it, he ſhould no more have affirm'd ſo expreſly, that the other *had confeſs'd to him, that he was the Author*, and that the Book was own'd by the other. This was repreſenting Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornai* to all *Europe* as a Lyar, who adorn'd himſelf with borrow'd Plumes. But this will never appear true to thoſe, who know his Vertue, and the Glory he acquir'd. On the other-hand, there is no probability that *d'Aubigné* would have inſerted ſuch a Fact in his Hiſtory, if he had not firmly believ'd, he remember'd that *du Pleſſis*, who was ſtill alive, had ſpoken to him in thoſe terms. But this ſeems to me the unriddling of the Myſtery. Mr. *du Pleſſis* had own'd this Work in Expreſſions which equally agreed to the Compoſer and the Publiſher; as for inſtance, That he had oblig'd the Publick with the Book of *Junius Brutus*; that it was to him the Publick was indebted for that Preſent; and *d'Aubigne*, not taking ſufficient notice,

(*a*) See the Remark H of the Article Hotman.

(*b*) He is known by many good Latin and French Books, and laſtly by a Syſtem of Morality in Latin.

(*c*) At the 300 pag. of the Frankfort edit. 168

(*d*) In the News of Sept. 1684. art. 6. pag. m. 697.

(*e*) See a Latin Letter Printed at the end of the Treatiſe of Deckherrus de ſcript. adeſp. pag. 370. Amſt. edit. 1686.

(*f*) Colomies in his opuſcules pag. 130. Utrecht edit. 1669. the firſt edition is of Paris 1668.

(1) Tom. 2. l. 2. ch. 2. pag. 128.

(2) Tom. 1. liv. 2. ch. 15. p. 91.

(*g*) D'Aubigné, tom. 1. lib. 2. ch. 17. p. 124.

(*h*) D'Aubigné is miſtaken; Languet was of Viteaux in the Dutchy of Burgundy.

(*i*) Tom. 2. Book 2. pag. 672.

notice of it, determin'd theſe Expreſſions to the particular ſenſe of being the Author of the Book. Whilſt he had no other Information, it was a little fault to have limited that to a definite ſenſe, which was capable of another; but having at laſt publiſh'd the true Account, he could not leave his Text in its firſt ſtate, without making *du Pleſſis Mornay* paſs for a lying *Plagiary*. Such a negligence to recall his Memory, which probably might have ſhewn him, that this Gentleman expreſs'd himſelf no otherwiſe than the Editor of a Book would have done, is much leſs pardonable, than that we have obſerv'd elſwhere in the makers of Additions.

(*b*) *Edit.* of Gieſſæ Haſſorum 1687.

(*c*) *In his* Muſeum, *where he ſays* quiſ ſub Bruti nomine diſſimulet, *ſive Mornæus* is eſt, ſive *Hubertus Languetus*.

3*dly*, *D'Aubigné* ſeems to fall into a ſtrange Anachroniſm by the two Epochs he has fix'd for *Junius Brutus*'s Book. By his firſt Paſſage, he will have it to have preceded the Conſpiracy of *Amboiſe*, and that it was one of the Writings that encouraged the Proteſtants; and by the other, that it appeared the Year after the Maſſacre upon St. *Bartholomew*'s-day. Which ever of theſe two Dates we chooſe, no can Credit be given to the Account I ſhall extract hereafter from *Simon Goulart*'s Funeral Oration, the moſt authentick Piece we have for the Hiſtorical Syſtem of *Junius Brutus*'s Book. This is not the only fault *d'Aubigné* falls into with reſpect to the time, and the ſubject of the Libels of that Age.

VI.
Reflections upon *Placcius*.

Mr. *Placcius* Profeſſor at *Hamburg*, has inſerted in his Book, concerning *Anonymous* and *Pſeudonymous* Writers, all Mr. *Colomies*'s Paſſage, without adding the Correction of *d'Aubigné*'s ſecond Edition. He relates alſo a Paſſage of *Boeclerus*, which I find much alter'd in my Edition (*b*), though there is no Advertiſement in the Title-page that it is different from the firſt; but I find the ſubſtance of what Mr. *Placcius* relates intire in my Edition. *viz.* 1. That *Grotius* in his Apology againſt Mr. *Rivet*, attributes *Junius Brutus*'s Work to *du Pleſſis Mornai*. 2. That, nevertheleſs (*B*) ſome Pages of this Book were ſeen at *Lauſanne* written both with *Languet*'s own Hand, and as an Author writes. He means doubtleſs, that there were ſeen in it References and Razures, or ſuch other Characters as diſtinguiſh the Original of an Author from the Copies. Nevertheleſs, *Boeclerus* does not ſeem fully certain, in that Citation of *Placcius*, that *Languet* compos'd the Book; and he ſeems leſs ſo in another work cited by the ſame *Placcius* (*c*): But in his Political Diſſertations, printed after his Death (*d*) by Mr. *Obrecht* his Son-in-law, he expreſſes no uncertainty; but (*e*) poſitively aſcribes this Work to *Hubert Languet*.

(*d*) *At Straſburg in* 1674. *with his* Inſtitutiones politicæ.

(*e*) *See the* 2. *diſſertation p.* 322. *and the* 16. *p.* 209.

VII.
Du Pleſſis Mornay accus'd by *Grotius* of being *Junius Brutus*. How juſtified by *Rivet*.

The place where *Grotius* affirms, that *Junius Brutus*'s Book was written by *Mornai*, is at the 91ſt Page of his laſt Work againſt *Rivet*. 'Tis a poſthumous Piece, printed in 1645. with the Title of *Rivetiani Apologetici pro ſchiſmate contra votum pacis facti, diſcuſſio*. In a precedent Writing, I mean, in his *Appendix de Antichriſto*, he would not name *Mornai*. *Boucher's execrable Book*, ſays he, (*f*) *concerning the Depoſition of* Henry III. *King of* France, *was taken, both as to the Arguments and Expreſſions, not from* Mariana, *or* Santarel, *but from* Junius Brutus, (*I know him well enough; but let him be conceal'd, ſince he deſires it*) *and ſome other Learned Men of the ſame Sect. Liber flagitioſiſſimus Boucherii de abdicatione Henrici III. Galliarum regis non argumentis tantum ſed & verbis deſumtus eſt, non ex Mariana aut Santarello, ſed ex Junio Bruto (quis is ſit ſat ſcio; ſed quia latere voluit, lateat) & ex viris doctis quidem at factionis ejuſdem.* In a Letter (*g*) that he writ from *Paris* the 28th of *Feb.* 1643. he does not uſe that reſerve. *I think I have written, ſays he, that the Author of* Junius Brutus *is* Philip de Mornai, *and that* Lewis Villiers *was he who got it printed; I repeat it again, becauſe* Des Marets *advances, that it is an unknown Author: The thing however is known to a great many.* (*h*) *Puto ſcripſiſſe me antehac auctorem Junii Bruti eſſe Philippum Mornæum Pleſſiacum, editorem Ludovicum Villerium, Loiſelerium. Repeto id quia ignotum eſſe ſcriptorem dicit Mareſius, cùm plurimis ea res nota ſit: & idem Pleſſiacus teſtamento generos & amicos ſuos hortatus ſit, arma ut ſumerent, ſi Edicta à Rege non ſervarentur.* In another Letter, (*i*) he ſpeaks of one *Ruſdorf* a *German* Writer, who has cited *Junius Brutus* under the Name of *Mornai*. The Printers have blunder'd; for inſtead of *Ruſdorfius in Defenſione cauſæ Palatinæ*, they have put *cauſæ politicæ*.

(*f*) *Grot. append. de Antichr. pag.* 59. *edit. in* 12. *Amſt.* 1641.

(*g*) *'Tis the* 641. *of the* 2d. *part.*

(*h*) *Grot. epiſt. pag.* 949.

(*i*) *The* 645. *of the* 2d. *part.*

'Tis certain, that *Des Marets* in his Anſwer to *Grotius*'s Appendix in 1642. ſtill maintain'd, that *Junius Brutus* was an unknown and obſcure Perſon, whoſe Work none of the Reform'd would maintain, nor had ever prais'd or approv'd. He went ſo far as to ſay, that perhaps it was a Papiſt, as King *James* had ſuſpected, who had publiſh'd this Work under the diſguiſe of a Proteſtant, in order to render the Proteſtant Religion

---

The firſt Edition of *Junius Brutus*. An Examination of what *Voetius* ſays of it.

(B) *Some Pages of this Book were ſeen at* Lauſanne, *written with* Languet*'s own Hand.*] The firſt Edition of it might have been Printed at *Lauſanne*. Mr. *Rivet* above cited certifies it was done out of *France*: no body believes the Title importing that it was at *Edinburg*. *Barclay*, according to *Voetius* *, ſays in Præfat. *libri de Regno, &c.* that he us'd a Copy printed at *Edinburg* in 1579. he takes to be a Trick of the Bookſeller. I don't find this paſſage in my Edition of *Barclay* which is of *Hanaw* in 1617, in which there is no Preface. Beſides what *Boeclerus* ſays here of ſome Pages of the Original ſeen at *Lauſanne*, *Deckher* Page 90. ſays he heard in 1667, that the Original was found in the ſame Town. I don't know why *Voetius* conjectur'd, that the firſt Edition of this Book was in 1587. I confeſs that *Draudius*'s Catalogues make nothing againſt his Conjecture, tho' they ſay, that *Junius Brutus* was Printed at *Edinburg* in 1580; for as they have been brought down to 1610. in the Edition cited by *Voetius* (*k*), *Junius Brutus* might have been ſo mark'd, whether it was Printed the firſt time in 1587, with the antedate of 1580. or whether the firſt Edition was of 1580, without any antedate. But what will he ſay againſt the Epitome of *Geſner*'s *Bibliotheque*, Printed in 1583, where *Junius Brutus* is found as printed at *Edinburg* (*l*) in 8°. in 1580? What will he ſay of *Francis du Verdier*'s Bibliotheque printed in 1585, where (*m*) we find the *French* Tranſlation of this Book, as printed in 8°. by *Francis Stephens* in 1581? Theſe are convincing Proofs, that if the firſt Edition be not of the Year 1579. as the Title imports, yet at leaſt, it preceded the Year 1587. by ſome Years.

* *Voetius diſp. tom.* 4 *p.* 233.

(*k*) *According to* Voetius, Draudius *pag.* 913. *ſays*, Stephani Junii vindiciæ contra tyrannos &c. Edenburge 80. & 81 Latinè & Gall. *Draudius's edition that I make uſe of is of* 1625. *It mentions this Book four times, viz. p.* 809. (*where the Edinburg edition* 1579. *and the Straſburg in* 12 *are noted*) *pag.* 1235. *where the Edition of Amſterdam* 1611. *is mark'd: pag.* 1275. *where the Straſburg Edition is put again, & pag.* 84. *of the French Books, where we find the Title of the Tranſlation as in* du Verdier.

(*l*) *Pag.* 766. *and thereby it appears that* Voetius *ought not to take any advantage of* du Verdier*'s omitting to ſpeak of* Junius Brutus *in the Supplement to this Epitome, ſince this Supplement concerns only the omiſſions of the Epitome.*

(*m*) *Pag.* 300.

em odious. (a) *Quid quæſo ille ipſe Junius Brutus quem nobis exprobrat (homo anonymus, obſcurus, ignotus, cujus ſcriptum privata emiſſum autoritate Reformatorum nemo tueri velit; . . . . . (b) Junius Brutus quiſquis ille ſit . . . . (c) Nobis multa crimini dandum quod quæ ſecus quàm par eſſet ille* (Junius Brutus) *ſcripſerat, homo à nemine noſtrûm nec laudatus, nec approbatus, Boncherius ex malis peſſima fecerit & in virus tranſmutârit. . . . . (d) Qui vero poſſet conferri Junius Brutus, qui ſine Autoris nomine, ſine ulla approbatione prodiit, forte etiam confictus ab aliquo Pontificio in odium Reformatorum, ut ſuſpicabatur Rex Jacobus, cum hoc Santarelli Tractatu, &c.*

Mr. *Rivet* anſwering *Grotius's* poſthumous Book, ſay, (e) indeed that no Proofs can be given of what is advanc'd againſt Mr. *du Pleſſis*; but that in caſe he was the Author of *Junius Brutus*, ſome regard muſt be had to his Age, and the circumſtances of time, that is, he ought to be excus'd on account of his Youth, and the horrible Perſecutions the Proteſtants ſuffer'd. From whence it follows, that if Mr. *Rivet* does not confeſs that *Junius Brutus* is the diſguiſe of Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornai*, he does not deny it neither. Which ſhews, that he was more inclin'd to believe it, than not. The only thing he very clearly affirms, is, that the Book was printed out of the Kingdom, during the heat of Perſecutions and Maſſacres, when Mr. *du Pleſſis* was very young. But this plainly ſhews, that Mr. *Rivet* was not initiated into the Myſtery, and that he knew little better than *d'Aubigné*, the true date of the Book. 'Tis ſurprizing, that neither *Grotius*, whom hardly any thing eſcap'd in the Republick of Learning, nor *Rivet*, nor *Des Marets*, whoſe Reading was very vaſt, ſhould know nothing either of what *d'Aubigné* had ſaid concerning *Junius Brutus* in his ſecond Edition in 1626, or of *Simon Goulart's* Funeral Oration, ſpoken and printed at *Geneva* in 1628. The Learned are a ſtrange ſort of People, they run after remote (f) and fleeting things, and neglect what they have as it were under their very Noſes. 'Tis much like a Hunter, (g) *Tranſvolat in medio poſita & fugientia captat*,

VII. The Diſcovery made by *Goulart's* Funeral Oration.

At the Death of *Simon Goulart*, the Seals were remov'd for a full revelation of the Myſtery. *Theodorus* (h) *Tronchin* Divinity Profeſſor, making this Miniſter's Funeral Oration, declar'd, That his Memory and Reading were almoſt infinite; and that he was reſorted to as an Oracle, to know the truth of what was deſir'd to be known. A proof of which is, that King *Henry* III. being very paſſionately deſirous to know the Author, who was conceal'd under the fictitious Name of *Junius Brutus*, and all his expedients to this purpoſe having fail'd him, reſolv'd at laſt to effect it by a ſhorter way, as he ſuppoſed; which was to ſend to conſult *Simon Goulart*. But he, that he might not expoſe thoſe who were concern'd in it, was ſilent at that time; tho' he had ſeen the Original of the Author, and knew it was compos'd by *Hubert Languet*, and that *du Pleſſis Mornai* having got the Manuſcript into his Hands after the Author's Death, caus'd it to be printed by *Thomas Guarin*.

Hereby it clearly appear'd, 1ſt, That this Book at ſooneſt, was not printed till the end of the Year 1581. ſince *Languet* dy'd but on the firſt of *October* of that Year. 2dly, That all was fictitious in the Title of the firſt Edition, the time and place of the Impreſſion, as well as the Name of the Author; for the Book was ſaid to be printed at *Edinburg* (g) in 1579. Beſides, there was a Preface added to it in the Name of the Publiſher, in which, he took the fictitious Name of *Conon Superantius, Vaſco*, and a falſe Date both of Time and Place was us'd; *viz.* from *Soleurre*, the firſt Day of *January* 1577. It is eaſy to prove, that *du Pleſſis* was not in *Swiſſerland* in the interval between *Languet's* Death and the Publication of *Junius Brutus*; and I don't think, that any one will affirm, that *Thomas Guarin* was a Bookſeller (k) of *Edinburg*. It appears in the 3d place that the Excuſes alledged by Mr. *Rivet* are not good, ſince it is certain, that when *Languet* dy'd *France* was no longer in a condition of perſecuting the Proteſtants, except by Civil Wars, in which each Party ſuffer'd, and that Mr. *du Pleſſis* who was Thirty-two Years of Age, had already written ſome very excellent Books, the beſt perhaps he ever made, *viz.* his Treatiſe concerning the Church, and that concerning the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

IX. *Voetius's* Diſſertation cenſured by *Placcius*.

Voetius (l) Divinity Profeſſor at *Utrecht*, a Man of immenſe Reading, might perhaps, as well as *Grotius*, *Rivet* and *Des-Marets*, have been ignorant all his Life of this unridling of *Theodorus Tronchin*, had not the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos* been reprinted at *Amſterdam* in 1660. in which to theſe Words *Stephano Junio Bruto Celta*, this was added, *ſive ut putatur, Theodoro Beza Auctore*. The Magiſtrates of *Geneva* underſtanding this, thought themſelves oblig'd to vindicate *Beza's* Name from this falſe Imputation. They fear'd it would be a blot upon his Memory, ſeeing *Junius Brutus's* Book treated with the utmoſt Ignominy: For when King *James* was to ward off the Reproach that was urg'd upon the Proteſtants by it, he anſwer'd, that probably, ſome Papiſt had father'd this Book on the Proteſtants with a deſign to make them odious. (m) *Quem nobis objicit Junius Brutus, author eſt ignotus, & forte Romanenſis Eccleſiæ emiſſarius, ut per illum reformatæ religioni apud Principes conflarent invidiam.* And when the Writers of the Party were haraſs'd upon the ſame Subject, they fail'd not to ſay, that they objected to them an unknown Perſon, a Man without any Name or Figure in the Church, or in the World, a Phantaſm. This was a new Reaſon for them to juſtify this great Servant of GOD; however, it was much better that the Reproaches ſhould fall upon Lay-men, the true Authors of the Opinions objected againſt, than upon innocent Divines. For theſe Cauſes, and other Conſiderations moving them thereunto, the Magiſtrates of *Geneva* writ (n) to the Magiſtrates of *Amſterdam* the Proofs of *Beza's* Innocence; and hereby probably *Voetius* came to the knowledge of the Myſtery revealed reviſed by *Simon Goulart.* Be it how it will, he (*a*) publiſh'd in 1661. an Anonymous Diſſertation, which he inſerted four Years after in the fourth Volume of his Theſes, in which he ſhew'd by many Arguments, that *Beza* was not *Junius Brutus*, and enlarged much upon *Hubert Languet*.

(a) *Sam. Mareſius, Antichr. revel. lib.* 1. *p.* 336, 337.

(b) *Id. ib. lib.* 1 *p.* 5[illegible].

(c) *Id. ib. pag.* 55.

(d) *Id. ib. pag.* 61.

(e) *Rivet. operum tom.* 3. *p.* 1163.

(f) *See Maimb. Hiſtory of Arianiſm tom.* 1. *p.* 247. *edit. of Holl.*

(g) *Horat. l.* 1. *ſat.* 2.

(h) *See his Article above in its place.*

(i) *See the Remark B.*

X. Beza accus'd before the time mention'd by Placcius.

Mr. *Placcius* has Criticiz'd one of his Proofs in Defence of *Beza*. For *Voetius* having ſaid, that before the Year 1660. no Body, either among the Friends or Enemies of *Beza* and *Languet*, or among the Editors of *Junius Brutus*, had aſcrib'd this Book to *Beza*, either expreſly, or by way of ſuſpicion; and that therefore the new Conjecture of *an unknown Man given at random*, (*b*) was of no weight; Mr. *Placcius* ſhews him, that in 1652. one *John Philips* an *Engliſh* Man affirm'd, that *Beza* was the Author of *Junius Brutus*'s Book.

The thing might have been carry'd higher, ſince ſome *French* Jeſuits had a long time been before-hand with this *John Philips*; ſo that *Voetius* is out in taking advantage from the ſilence not only of *Becanus*, *Gretſerus* and *Eudæmon Johannes*, but alſo of the whole Society of the Jeſuits, *totaque Jeſuitarum natio*; for in 1611. we find that Father *Coton* (*c*) having collected ſeveral Paſſages from Proteſtant Authors, which he thought afforded an occaſion for Recrimination, and having not forgot *Junius Brutus*, put in the Margin *Theodorus Beza: ſive Stephanus Junius Brutus in libro cui titulus, vindiciæ contra tyrannos, &c.* The Jeſuit *Richeome* (*d*) with the very ſame view, and on the ſame occaſion, thus addreſs'd himſelf to his Adverſary: *How will you excuſe* Beza, *who conceal'd under the ambiguous Name of* Junius Brutus, *as you under that of* Anti-Coton, *accompany'd with three Letters, writ a Book concerning the Lawful Power of a Prince,* &c. A Miniſter of *Gergeau* call'd *David Home*, anſwering in 1612. the *Apology of the Jeſuits, written by a Father of the Society of* Jeſus *of* Loyola, denied what the Author of the Apology had aſſerted, that *Beza* had taken the mask of *Junius Brutus*. *David Home*'s Book is Intituled, *du contr' Aſſaſſin.* It has theſe Words at the 329th Page: *As for* Stephanus Junius Brutus, *whom he afterwards produces, we know no ſuch Man; but we ſay, that the Jeſuit in affirming him to be* Theodorus Beza, *without offering the leaſt Conjecture in the World for his aſſertion, Lyes Jeſuitically, that is, impudently, and like a* Machiavelist, *who holds that tho' a Lye be ſent about but for half an Hour, it ſtill does good in Matters of State, tho'* GOD *forbids us to bear falſe Witneſs againſt any one, as this Man does againſt* Beza, *in whoſe Writings there is not one word of Counſel to kill Tyrants,* &c. After ſome Citations, the Author goes on thus: *This is what* Beza *ſays, which ſufficiently gives the Lye to the Jeſuit, affirming him to be the Author of the Treatiſe produc'd under the Name of* Junius Brutus, *which has no conformity with that of* Beza, *and which is in all probability, the true Name of the Author, ſince there are many Learned Men, who are Surnam'd* Junius. An *Iriſh* Jeſuit (*e*) cited *Junius Brutus*'s Book as *Beza*'s in 1614. I queſtion not, but many others, both before, and after the Anſwers to the *Anti-Coton*, have imploy'd this Calumny againſt *Beza*, and I expect to have quickly return'd to me what I have lent to Mr. *Placcius*; I mean, that I ſhall be ſhewn, that I might have ſtill gone higher; from whence it will ſtill be more apparent, how reſerv'd we ought to be upon general Affirmations, though we ſhould have the vaſt Reading of the famous Profeſſor of *Utrecht*; for in fine, that great acquaintance he had with all ſorts of Books, prevented not his being Ignorant: 1. That before the Year 1660. *Beza* had been often accus'd of writing the Book of *Junius Brutus*. 2. That two Years before the Funeral Oration of *Simon Goulart*, the Publick was inform'd by *d'Aubigné*, that *Hubert Languet* had taken that diſguiſe. 3. That *Groitus* had publickly named Mr. *du Pleſſis Mornai* as the Author of that Piece.

XI. The Proteſtants Apology for the Church of Rome by Brereley.

Expecting the return of my Loan, I will ſay here that one *John Brereley* an *Engliſh* Prieſt, in his (*f*) Apology for the Catholicks by the Proteſtants, cites an Author call'd (*g*) *Sutcliffus*, who had ſaid, that the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, was a Book written either by *Beza* or *Hotman*. Tho' I can't diſcover at what time this Apology was printed firſt; yet I doubt not but it was before the Jeſuits Anſwer to the *Anti-Coton*, ſince I learn from the Tranſlator, that as ſoon as it appear'd in *Engliſh*, *Bancroft*, then Archbiſhop of Canterbury, order'd ſome Learned Divines, and particularly *Morton*, to anſwer it, and that *Morton*'s Anſwer is call'd, *Catholica appellatio pro Proteſtantibus.* Now this doubtleſs is *Morton*'s Work, which according to the *Oxford* Catalogue appear'd in 1606. under this Title, *A Catholick Appeal for Proteſtants*; and therefore I ought not to believe that this Catalogue notes the firſt Edition of the Apology in theſe words of the 107th Page, *The Proteſtants Apology for the Roman Church* 1608. Now, as *Sutcliffus*'s Work, cited by *Brereley*, is an Anſwer to a Petition of the *Presbyterians*, and the *Oxford* Catalogue places the Impreſſion of this Anſwer in the Year 1592. with this Title, *Anſwer to a Petition of the Conſiſtorian Faction preſented to her Majeſty*, it is evident, that *Junius Brutus*'s Book was attributed to *Beza* long before the Jeſuits anſwer'd the *Anti-Coton*.

It does not appear that *Brereley*, who produces a prodigious number of Proteſtant Authors upon all Subjects, had read *Junius Brutus*; for he cites nothing out of it: And for that reaſon the Biſhop (*h*) of *Luçon* did not cite it in the Book he publiſh'd againſt the Proteſtants in the Year 1618. wherein he objects to them ſome other Writers imbued with *Hubert Languet*'s Maxims, whoſe Paſſages he had found in *Brereley*, as Mr. *Rivet* intimates, in anſwering the Jeſuit *Petra Sancta*. (*i*) *A quo* (libello Epiſcopi Luſſonenſis) *video non pauca te mutuatum fuiſſe, quemadmodum ille, aut potius ſacerdos Anglus qui tum ei fuit à manu ex lacinius Anglo-papiſtarum.* I have not ſeen this Book of the Biſhop of *Luçon*; but that which makes me think that he has not mention'd *Junius Brutus*, is, that *David* (*k*) *Blondel* anſwering this Prelate, ſays nothing to him concerning

(*a*) He himſelf notes that Year in the 4th Vol. of his Theſes pag. 110. Placcius ibid. puts it in 1661.

(*b*) The Greek Phraſe he uſes is perhaps more emphatical. [illegible]

(*c*) Reponſe apologet. à l'Anticoton, & à ceux de ſa ſuite, pag. 173.

(*d*) At the 471 page of the categorical examination of the libel Anticoton printed in 1613. he puts in the margin. Junius Brutus de Beze de legitima poteſtate, &c.

(*e*) Henricus Fitz-Simon in Britannomachia Miniſtrorum, printed at Douai in 1614.

(*f*) Page 636 of the Latin Tranſlation done out of Engliſh by William Raynerius, and printed at Paris in 1615. in 4°. The Author is there call'd Brerleius, but in the Oxford Catalogue Brereley.

(*g*) 'Tis he who is call'd in Latin Matthæus Sutlivius (Raynerius ſhould have call'd him ſo) He was a good Proteſtant, but moſt oppoſite to the Presbyterians. I have given his Article.

(*h*) Since that time he was Cardinal Richelieu.

(*i*) Rivetus Operum tom. 3. p. 505. n. 5. Blondel in his modeſt declaration pag. 287. ſpeaks more expreſly: He borrows, ſays he, from the apology of John Brereley an Engliſh Prieſt, the invention of curtailing ſome paſſages.

(*k*) Modeſt declaration of the ſincerity of the Reformed Churches. Sedan 1619.

concerning this diſguiſ'd Author. 'Tis not hard to underſtand at preſent, why *Petra Sanila* (a) ſpeaks not of this Author; 'tis becauſe he borrow'd from the Biſhop (as Mr. *Rivet* taxes him with it) all the Citations of Anti-Monarchical Proteſtant Authors. Hence it appears, that the Author of the great Anſwer to *Maimburg*'s Hiſtory of *Calviniſm* is miſtaken in ſaying, (b) *That the Method attributed to Cardinal* Richelieu, *and the Jeſuit* Sylveſter *a* Sancta Petra *have furniſh'd* Mr. *Arnauld* with the Objection he makes to us about the Royal Authority, in his Apology for the Catholicks: for firſt, it is not in the *Method*, which was not publiſh'd till after Cardinal *Richelieu*'s Death, but in a Book he publiſh'd before his Cardinalſhip, that he objected ſuch Republican Writings: In the ſecond place, if Mr. *Arnauld* had drawn from theſe two Fountains, he would not have found there *Hubert Languet*'s Work, nor the *Magdeburg* Writing, which make the ſtrength of his Attack.

XII. The Magdeburg's Writing. This Piece of *Magdeburg* is Intituled, *de Jure Magiſtratuum in ſubditos, & officio ſubditorum erga Magiſtratus.* *Brereley* (c) ſpeaks of it only in general, and upon the credit of *Sutlivius*, who attributes it to *Beza.* This Work was publiſh'd in 1550, under the Name of the Inhabitants of *Magdeburg.* I don't know whether it be the ſame that *Sleidan* (d) has given the Abſtract of. I know it only by the *French* Edition of 1578. in 12°. It is Intituled, *Of the Right of Magiſtrates over their Subjects. A Treatiſe moſt neceſſary at this time to admoniſh both Magiſtrates and Subjects of their Duty. Publiſh'd by thoſe of* Magdeburg, *in the Year* M. D. L. *and at preſent reviſ'd and inlarged with many Arguments and Examples.* This Edition came out after many others. Mr. *Arnauld* (e) made uſe of a *Latin* Tranſlation, printed in the Year 1576. *apud Joannem Mareſchallum Lugdunenſem* in 8°. and done from the *French.* The Author of the Commentaries *de ſtatu religionis & reipublicæ in regno Galliæ*, makes mention of a Book that came out in the Year 1573. which is the ſame with this. He owns that (f) the Author intended to make an Apology for the Proteſtants, who were then the 4th time in a Civil War againſt *Charles* IX. *Thuanus* (g) expreſly obſerves under the Year 1574. that there came out a new Edition of a Book which had been printed in *Germany*, at the time of the Siege of *Magdeburg*, and that this new Edition was enlarged with many Examples and Reaſonings. *John Beccaria*, who anſwer'd this Book in 1590. repreſented it as a very new Book; (h) *Quum ſuperioribus diebus commentabamur aliquid de bello, liceret ne ſcilicet Chriſtiano bellare, vel non, prodiit libellus quidam cui hic erat titulus, De jure Magiſtratuum in ſubditos, & officio ſubditorum erga Magiſtratus.* 'Tis a ſign there was lately a new Edition of it, and that he knew nothing of the preceding. Some ſuſpect that (i) *John Beccaria* is not the true Name of this Author. What is certain, is, that he was not a *Catholick*: He was perhaps a kind of a *Socinian.* He uſes his Adverſary very ill, and treats him as a Sanguinary Soul, and an Enemy to Peace. (k) *Videri hominem eſſe vere ſanguinarium, bello, armiſque amicum, hoſtem capitalem paci, nomini regio infenſiſſimum, verſatum in literis humanis, præſertim hiſtoriis, atque ſi divinare licet leguleium, in divinis haud adeò multum: nihil prorſus habentem illius manſuetudinis & clementiæ illius pacifici, & mitiſſimi agni Jeſu Chriſti (qui quidem dixit:* (1) *Diſcite à me, quòd mitis ſum, & humilis corde: non autem dixit, Diſcite à me contendere, & litigare, multò certè minus bellare) ſed abundare ſpiritu contentionis, ambitionis, & ſuperbiæ: neſcire prorſus quid ſit vera concordia, quid pax, quid humilitas, quid patientia, quid ſit injuriam pati, ſed optimè ſcire quid ſit injuriam inferre, vel illatam vindicare: ignorare etiam omnino quid ſit proximus, illud bene ſcire,* (2) *Proximus ſum egomet mihi: Chriſti crucem nec ſcire, nec ſcire curare: omnia humana ad trutinam, id eſt, ad ſuum arbitrium ponderare.* We muſt confeſs, that Mr. *Arnauld* had but little knowledge of this Piece of *Magdeburg.*

A Civilian of *Bavarian* nam'd *John Baptiſt Ficklerus*, knew only the Edition of 1576. which determin'd him to anſwer it by a Writing that was printed at *Ingolſtad* in 1578. with this Title: *De jure Magiſtratuum in ſubditos, & officio ſubditorum erga Magiſtratus. Contra libellum cujuſdam Calviniani, ſub eadem inſcriptione, ſed reticito nomine authoris, & loci Typographiæ, ſuperiori anno editum: nunc autem veritatis ſtudio reformatum, retento quidem illius ſtylo, ſed pleriſque argumentis ad rei veritatem applicatis. Tractatus brevis & perſpicuus, hiſce ambiguis temporib. Chriſtiano homini lectu admodum utilis & NECESSARIUS.*

XIII. Father Labbe's fault. Let me ſay by the by, that it is not good ſpeaking of Books that we have not ſeen. Father *Labbe*, who had an almoſt infinite Reading, and yet had not ſeen *Brereley*'s Proteſtants Apology, heard it ſpoke of whilſt his Diſſertation upon Eccleſiaſtical Writers was in the Preſs; he had a mind to make an Addition of ſomething that was told him, which in three Lines coſt him two faults: The one is, (l) that he calls the Author *Bretleium* inſtead of *Brerleium*; the other is, that he aſcribes to him the Preface in which the Pope Saint *Gregory* is juſtified, whereas 'tis the Tranſlator, who has done it.

XIV. Beza's Adverſaries who could not accuſe him. What I have related of *Sutlivius* informs us, That the Proof *Voetius* has founded upon the ſilence of all the Epiſcoparians, is not better than that which he has grounded on the ſilence of all the Jeſuits. Beſides this, I obſerve that amongſt *Beza*'s Adverſaries, who would not have ſpar'd him, ſays he, if they could have faſten'd *Junius Brutus*'s Work upon him, he reckons at leaſt five, whoſe ſilence proves nothing. Theſe are they which he (m) names; *Charpentier, Baudouin, Caſtalio, Eraſtus, Morellus, Saravia, Montaigu, Tilenus, Ladus,* and Doctor *Eramble.* As for *Charpentier*, who ſpoke very ill of *Beza*, in the violent Satyr (n) he wrote to *Francus Portus* in 1572. he could not ſpeak of *Junius Brutus*, who did not appear (o) till ſome Years after. *Baudouin* and *Caſtalio*, who dy'd, the former in 1573. the latter in 1563. were ſtill

leſs

(a) Videſ. Petrus Sanila not. in epiſt. Petri Molinæi ad Balzacum.

(b) Tom. 2. pag. 586. in 4.

(c) In Apologia Proteſtant. pag. 613.

(d) Sleid. lib. 22. init. See the Chimerical Cabal 2d. edit. pag. 139. & ſeq.

(e) See his Apology for the Catholicks 1. part. chap. 4. p. 50.

(f) Commentar. de Statu reip. & relig. ad ann. 1573. fol. m. 118. verſo.

(g) Thuan. lib. 57. pag. m. 50.

(h) Jo. Beccaria, refutat. cujuſd. libelli p. 1.

(i) Voetius, diſp. tom. 4. p. 158.

(k) Beccaria ib. pag.

(1) Matth. 11.

(2) Terentius.

(l) Tom. 1. pag. 786.

(m) Voetius ibid. pag. 234.

(o) I don't think Carpenter writ any thing after the impreſſion of Vindiciæ contra tyrannos.

able to ſpeak of him. *Thomas Eraſtus*, it is true, writ againſt *Beza* upon the Subject of Excommunication; but this was long before *Junius Brutus*'s Book appear'd. *Eraſtus*'s Anſwer is dated the 24th of *December* 1569. *Beza*'s (a) Name was not in the Original; it being only inſerted by thoſe that publiſh'd it in 1589. after *Eraſtus*'s Death. Theſe two Antagoniſts had been very civil to one another at *Baſil* after the Diſpute. As for *Morellus*, I don't think, that after the National Synod held at *Nimes* in 1572, where his Opinion was condemn'd, he appear'd in the Liſts. This Man had maintain'd from the Year 1562. That the Right of Excommunication belonged not to the Conſiſtories and Synods, but to all the Body of the Church. He was Excommunicated for this Notion; and the Writing he publiſh'd upon that Subject was burnt, and prohibited to be read by every Body (b). He nevertheleſs perſiſted in his Opinion, and in 1572. was one of the Members of the Cabal, who endeavour'd to make ſuch a change in the Diſcipline of the Churches, that thence forward the Power of the Keys ſhould be adminiſtred by the whole Body of the People (c). *Ramus* (d) was one of the Pillars of this Cabal. *Beza*, who aſſiſted in the National Synod of *Nimes* in 1572. oppos'd this Faction *viva voce*, and by Writing, and made it vaniſh into nothing. However it be, it can't be deny'd, but that before the Year 1660. *Junius Brutus*'s Writing was often aſcrib'd to *Beza* in printed Books: never the leſs, he that publiſh'd it that Year at *Amſterdam*, knew nothing of it; for all the reaſon he gives why he would have the Title lengthen'd out with theſe words, *ſive ut putatur, Theodoro Beza Autore*, is, that he had ſeen a Copy upon which a Learned Profeſſor had writ that *Beza* had compos'd this Book. This deſtroys Mr. *Placcius*'s Conjecture, *viz.* (e) That the *Engliſh* Author he cites, was the cauſe of *Beza*'s Name appearing in the Edition of 1660. I wonder he did not quote *Milton*, who ſpeaks thus, in one of his Books: *Doctrina hæc nobis haud magis quam Gallis, quos tu hoc piaculo cupis eximere, debetur: unde enim Francogallia illa niſi ex Gallia? unde vindiciæ contra Tyrannos? qui liber etiam Bezæ vulgo tribuitur* (f). I ſhall obſerve that many believ'd *Milton* to be the Author of *John Philips*'s Apology. *Salmaſius* (g) affirms it roundly. Others ſay, that he either writ it, or adviſed the publiſhing of it: (h) *Eandem culpam commiſſam fuiſſe in* reſponſione Philippi Angli ad Apologiam Anonymi cujuſdam, &c. *aliquando Hartlibo ſcripſi, cujus libri authorem eſſe Miltonium, ſaltem ejus conſilio publicatum, firmiſſime creditur.*

XV. Some late Authors have been ignorant who was Junius Brutus.

Since *Voetius*'s Diſſertation, it has been eaſier to know what to depend upon, as to *Junius Brutus*; and yet Mr. *Colomies*, and the Author of the *News from the Republick of Learning* had but a ſuperficial Knowledge of this matter, the one in 1668, the other in 1686. Nay farther, Mr. *Arnauld* compoſing his Apology for the Catholicks in 1682. and drawing from *Junius Brutus*'s Book all that he could find proper to render the Proteſtant Doctrine ſuſpected to Sovereigns, never attempted to ſtrengthen his Proofs with Conſiderations taken from the Perſon of the Author; which makes it evident, that he knew not who he was. I obſerve all theſe little things to ſhew that thoſe Proteſtants, who have ſaid (k) theſe laſt Years, that *Junius Brutus* was an unknown Man, without Name, Character, or Authority, might talk in this manner without any fraud, tho' one of the Libels I have mention'd at the beginning of this Diſſertation, would inſinuate the contrary: I mean, that kind of a Sermon wherein the Author cenſures a pretended inclination for Libels and Civil Wars, with as great vehemence, as ever any Miniſter expreſs'd in a Sermon on a Faſt-day, in decrying his Auditors as guilty of the tranſgreſſion of the Decalogue.

XVI. The Libels of ſome private Perſons diſowned.

And ſince occaſion offers, it will not be unſeaſonable to ſay, That this Man's violent Reproaches have had a good effect. Perhaps (C) they are not the true cauſe why ſmall Libels don't ſwarm ſo thick as before; but 'tis certain at leaſt, that they

(a) See Beza's preface in the Tract de vera excommunicatione.

(b) See Thomas Eraſtus's Book de excommunicatione pag. 69, 70.

(c) Ant. Fayus in vita Th. Bezæ, pag. 49. See also Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. lib. 6. pag. 34.

(d) Simler in vita Bullingeri fol. 45.

(e) Placcius ubi ſupra.

(f) Joannes Miltonus defenſ. ſecunda pag. 99. edit. Hag. 1654.

(g) Salmaſ. reſponſ. ad Jo. Miltonum pag. m. 19.

(h) Hadrianus Ulacq. in præfatione apologiæ ſecundæ Miltini edit. Hag. 1654.

(k) Daillon's examination of the oppreſſion of the Reform'd. 1687. Jurieu, Anſwer to Maimb. 1683.

(C) *Perhaps they are not the true cauſe, &c.*] This *Perhaps* is reaſonably inſerted, for 'tis very probable that two other things have leſſen'd their Numbers; *Firſt*. The Indignation that all worthy Men expreſs'd againſt them. *Secondly*, The Readers beginning to be tired with them; which never fails to happen when the ſame Diſh is ſerved in too often, and when amongſt the multitude of thoſe who pretend to cook it many of them make it very flat and inſipid. 'Tis a Maxim that Authors ought carefully to ſtudy; That the Publick's Voracity ought never to be abus'd, and that Satiety is to be avoided even in admiration: to which end one ought never to obey too freely, this Compliment of the *Italian* Academies, *Di gratia, Signor, un' altra volta*. This Compliment is doubtleſs a Teſtimony of Approbation, and 'tis univerſally us'd to a Muſician, who has charm'd more than ordinary; and then the Company is not ſorry to be taken at their Word: but he that ſhould abuſe the Courteſy ſo far as to exceed the *Greeks* Rule, *δὶς ἢ τρὶς τὸ καλόν, bis & ter quod pulcrum*, and even what a Latin Poet * has ſaid, that there are ſome Poems that pleaſe tho' ten times repeated, *decies repetita placebit*, would deſerve to be referr'd to the Old Proverb of the *twice dreſſed Cabage*, *δὶς κράμβη θάνατος*, *crambe bis poſita mors*. 'Tis not fit the Publick ſhould be expos'd to the miſerable condition of thoſe Rhetorick Maſters heretofore, who were forc'd to hear the Declamations of a whole claſs variouſly turn'd concerning the overthrow of Tyrants.

> *Declamare* (†) *doces, ô ferrea pectora Vetti!*
> *Cum perimit ſævos claſſis numeroſa Tyrannos.*
> *Nam quæcunque ſedens modò legerat, hæc eadem ſtans*
> *Perferet, atque eadem cantabit verſibus iiſdem.*
> *OCCIDIT MISEROS CRAMBE REPETITA MAGISTROS.*

The condition of School-maſters is not better at preſent. They dictate a Theme to a whole Claſs, to have it turn'd ſeveral ways by their Scholars; literally by ſome, paraphras'd by others; in Verſe or in Greek by a third ſort, and in two ſorts of Latin Proſe by a fourth. 'Tis ſtill the ſame Theme, ſtill the ſame thing under different words. The Publick not being paid for this, has no reaſon to ſuffer it ſelf to be reduc'd to it. Now 'tis certain our Ears have been ſo frequently dun'd with the ſame things, and the boundaries of the number ten have been left ſo far behind, that we need not wonder that theſe ſhowers fall not ſo thick as formerly. When every one ſets up (‖) for the ſame Trade, 'tis no wonder that it proves good for nothing.

* Horat. de arte poet.

(†) Juven. ſatir. 7. v. 150.

(‖) Exſpectes eadem à ſummo minimoque poeta. Juven. Sat. 1. v. 14.

(a) *The Author of the Letters upon the Subjects of the time; that of the Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned; that of the defence of the Refugees againſt the important advice.*

(b) *Mr. Baſnage Miniſter of Rotterdam*

they have oblig'd the moſt excellent writers of the Party (a) to inform the Publick, that it was unjuſt to make the Body of the Refugees reſponſible for theſe bad Books. So that our Poſterity will always have ſome contemporary piece to wipe off thoſe ſiniſter Imputations that ſhall be thrown upon this Cauſe. Let it not be ſaid that theſe excellent writers, who have made this diſclaim, have done it without Naming themſelves; for having anſwer'd for the generality, whilſt none has excepted againſt their Declaration, 'tis a ſign that the Body acquieſces in it. Add to this, that the Name of him, who writ every Fortnight upon the Subjects of the Time in ſo fine and judicious a way, is very well known to every Body. And as for him, who publiſhes the inimitable *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, is any Body ignorant of his Name? A Name, that has long ago made itſelf famous both at the Bar and in the Church, both *viva voce*, and in Writing; a Name, which two Brothers make more and more celebrated every Day; the one by his (b) eloquent Sermons, and learned Anſwers to the Biſhop of *Meaux*; the other by the incomparable Journal (c) I have ſpoken of. To ſay nothing of a Couſin, (d) who has Succeeded *Caſaubon* in the attack of *Baronius*'s Annals. As to the Defence of the Refugees againſt the *Important Advice*, the Author of it muſt be a Perſon moſt worthy (e) of belief, when he affirms any thing in the Name of his Brethren. He fully anſwers the reproaches that concern the Satyrical Spirit, and he illuſtrates his Opinion upon the other Point, with a great dexterity of Wit. All things duly conſider'd, we muſt own that tho' a Diſclaim that ſhould have preceded the horrid Reprouches of the Adverſaries, and that ſhould have been made by Perſons charg'd with a Synodal Deputation, would have been much more glorious and authentick; yet nothing but an extravagant Spirit of Wrangling, can puſh a Man on to renew the Attack. But to return to my Subject.

XVII. The Funeral Oration of Goulart leaves ſome doubt.

Voetius had not that confidence in *Simon Goulart*'s Teſtimony, as to think it ſtrange, that any ſtill ſhould be Scepticks, as to *Junius Brutus*; and for my part, I confeſs, that I ſtill perceive ſome difficulties and intricacies, tho' I ſeem ſo ſtrongly to declare for *Hubert Languet*, who is the Perſon to whom Mr. *de la Mare* adjudges the Book. 'Tis in a Work (C△) not yet printed, and I don't know whether the thing be there particulariz'd, as in the Oration of the *Geneva* Profeſſor, or otherwiſe; nor what Proofs are given. If it could be prov'd that *Junius Brutus*'s Book was publiſh'd before *Languet*'s Death, farewell *Goulart*'s Depoſition. This will perhaps excite ſome one well-furniſh'd with Books and Time, to ſeek for ſome light upon this Subject; and I hope, that Mr. *Baillet* will exhauſt the matter in the great Work the Publick expects from him, concerning Authors under diſguiſ'd Names.

XVIII. A Fault in the continuation of the *Menagiana*.

There is in the Continuation of the *Menagiana* a Fault which I ought not to omit. "*Languet*'s Letters are an excenllet Book. Mr. *Languet* was Counſellor in the Parliament, "and a Man of great Merit. 'Tis he, who was the Author of that admirable Work "Intituled, *Vindiciæ regiæ contra Tyrannos*. He writ this Book in Defence of *Henry* "the IVth's Cauſe. As the declaring himſelf the Author, would have endanger'd his "Life, he took ſo good meaſures with his Printer, and the Secret was ſo well kept, "by the mutual Intereſt they had in it, that it was not known to be his Book till long "after his Death, and the Printer, who declar'd he had printed it, after the Peace, "diſcover'd alſo to *Henry* IV. how the thing was order'd." 1. This expreſſion, *Counſellor in the Parliament*, ought to ſignify that *Hubert Languet* had that Place in the Parliament of *Paris*. But it is certain, he had it not in any Parliament of *France*. 2. His Book had not the Title of *vindiciæ regiæ*, nor ought to have it. 3. Mr. *Menage* would never have call'd it *admirable*, if he had known what Subject it Treats, and upon what Principles it goes. 4. Nothing could be more pernicious to *Henry* IV. than *Languet*'s Book, ſince it authoriz'd the *French* to depoſe *Henry* III. and to place the Crown on

---

(*) *Vita Huberti Langueti pag.* 123.

(†) *Ibid. pag.* 124.

(††) *Ibid. pag.* 12

(C△) *Mr.* de la Mare *adjudges the Book. 'Tis in a Work not yet Printed.*] I ſpoke thus in 1696. but at preſent I muſt ſay that it has been Printed at *Hall* in *Saxony* in 1700. I have not found what I expected in it; but am left in all the uncertainty I was in before. Mr. *de la Mare* (*) ſays, that the Year 1580. abounded with Political Writings, ſince beſides the Treatiſe of voluntary ſlavery compos'd by *la Boetie*, and the *Franco Gallia* of *Hotman*, there came out *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, written by *Hubert Languet*. This is moſt certain, ſays he, I have a great many proofs for it, and had I only this I am going to mention, it would be ſufficient. (†) *Ad vindicias redeo, quas etſi nonnulli tribuere videantur Franciſco Hottomano, certiſſimum tamen eſt illarum auctorem eſſe Languetum, cujus rei quamvis alia me deficerent argumenta, ſunt autem quam plurima, unum inſtar omnium hoc erit, quod modo ſum prompturus Antonii Vioni Herovallii fide.* This great Proof, the only one that Mr. *de La Mare* would Communicate to the Publick, conſiſts in this, that he had heard Mr. *Vion d' Herouval* ſay that *Henry* III. Underſtanding that *Simon Goulart* knew the Author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, immediately ſent for him, and ask'd his Name; that *Goulart* only anſwer'd that his Oath obliged him to conceal it, during the Author's Life; that the King in vain added threatnings to entreaties; and that nothing was capable of ſhaking *Goulart*'s Conſtancy, who by a rare inſtance of Fidelity and Friendſhip, perſiſted to conceal the Myſtery which was only truſted to him during *Languet*'s Life. (††) *Cui* (Henrico III.) *cum Gulartius præfracte reſpondiſſet, non niſi poſt auctoris obitum nomen illius revelare ſibi licitum eſſe, quod ſolemni ſacramento obſervaturum ſe promiſerat, Rexque precibus minas adderet, perſtitiſſe tamen in propoſito Gulartium, neque precibus neque minis adduci unquam potuiſſe, ut priuſquam fato functus fuiſſet Languetus, quod ſibi ſoli commiſerat arcanum proderet, raro conſtantis fidei & amicitiæ exemplo.* Now here's a proof that's good for nothing: For tho' Mr. *Vion d' Herouval* ſhould have better known the circumſtances of the Fact, he would have taught us only what we knewn before. 'Tis plain that he had mediately or immediately the particulars he related to Mr. *de la Mare*, from the Funeral Oration of *Simon Goulart*: He could not therefore be a New Witneſs. Now either for want of Memory or becauſe others had miſinformed him of *Theodorus Tronchin*'s Account, he related it very ill, ſince it is falſe that *Henry* III. ſent for *Goulart*, and entreated and threatn'd him, and that *Goulart* anſwer'd, His Oath engag'd him to be ſilent, and that the Secret was committed only to him. I wonder Mr. *de la Mare* believ'd that a Miniſter anſwer'd *Henry* III. thus, with impunity. I ſay nothing of the falſe Dates he gives of *Stephen de la Boetie*'s and *Francis Hotman*'s Books.

(*D*) to

on the Head of the Duke of *Guiſe*. 5. And Laſtly, all the reſt of the Account, the ſecret of the Printer, and the diſcovery of the Myſtery after the Peace, are Diametrically contrary to Truth, and all Probability. I don't deny that in ſome Senſe, Mr. *Menage* might have thought that this Work of *Languet* is an admirable Piece: He might have found in it Learning and Wit, a great Order and Method, and the beſt and moſt ſolid Arguments that can be offer'd for the Rights of the People, which is a very Problematical point. It has many (a) fair ſides, and may be maintain'd with ſo many Plauſible Reaſons, that it ought not to be thought ſtrange, that not only factious, turbulent and reſtleſs Men ſhould have eſpous'd it, but alſo many Perſons of great Judgment and of an Exemplary Virtue. I may reckon amongſt the latter *Stephen de la Boetie*, who wrote the Diſcourſe, Intituled *de la ſervitude volontaire, ou du* CONTRE-UN. (b) *There never was a better Citizen, nor a greater Enemy to Commotions than he, and he had been more willing to uſe his skill and Learning in order to pacify them than to raiſe them.* That which is to blame is, that frequently the ſame Perſons who write for the Rights of the People, would write for Arbitrary Power, if Affairs ſhould change; that is, if a Deſpotick Power came to be exercis'd in their favour, and to the great prejudice of a Party they ſhould hate. When the Catholicks of *France* in the XVI. Century ſaw the Wars of Religion ariſe, they wrote ſtoutly for the Right of Kings; but when they ſaw the Right of ſucceſſion devolved on a Proteſtant Prince, they chang'd their Principles (c), and wrote ſtoutly for the Right of the People. We have ſeen this ridiculous caprice in the Article of *Claudius de Saintes*. I queſtion whether after the Death of *Henry* III. *Arnaud Sorbin* would have Written what he Publiſh'd (d) in 1576. Would *Peter Carpentier* have written againſt the Civil-wars in 1590. what he writ a little after the Death of *Charles* IX? He receiv'd a ſmart Anſwer, Intituled, *Petri Fabri reſponſio ad Petri Carpentarii famelici Rabulæ ſacrum de retinendis armis & pace repudianda conſilium ad V. C. Lomanium Terridæ, & Sereniaci Baronem.* It was Printed at *Neuſtad* in 1575. and Publiſh'd in *French* the Year following with this Title. *Traitté duquel on peut apprendre en quel cas il eſt permis à l'homme Chreſtien de porter les armes, & par lequel eſt reſpondu à Pierre Charpentier, tendant à fin d'empeſcher la paix, & nous laiſſer la guerre: par Pierre Fabre, à Monſieur de Lomanie, Baron de Terride & de Seriniac.* It was neceſſary, I ſhould ſet down this *French* Title; for the Readers had never believed by the *Latin* (e) Title that *Charpentier* exhorted the People to lay down their Arms, and only propos'd to them an Evangelical Submiſſion. In all Parties there are ſome indiſcreet Perſons who Publiſh Books, which are afterwards upbraided to the whole Body. An Engliſh; Man nam'd *William Allen*, under *Cromwell*'s Uſurpation, Publiſh'd a Book Intitul'd *Killing a Tyrant no Crime*. A Canon of *Aneci* quickly put this Doctrine on the Account of the Reform'd, in a Work that was Anſwer'd by the late Mr. *Turretin*. Was not this a ridiculous reproach? Can the wiſeſt and the beſt Regulated Communions reſtrain the unruly Pen of all private Members? *Guy Patin* ſpoke judiciouſly of this Engliſh Book, but he was ill inform'd of the Circumſtances. *They have Printed in Holland*, ſays he (f), *a little Book Intituled.* A Political Treatiſe, *&c.* That the killing of a Tyrant is no Murder. *'Tis ſaid to be Tranſlated from the* Engliſh, *but that Book was firſt written in* French *by a Gentleman of* Nevers, *call'd Mr.* de Marigni, *who is a great Wit. This Doctrine is very dangerous, and it were better to be ſilent about it. I don't love that there ſhould be ſo many Books* de venenis, *for the ſame reaſon: I have always had the Publick Good in View, and I don't love thoſe that oppoſe it.* 'Tis not true that the *Engliſh* Piece was Written by *Marigni*: An *Engliſh* Man is the Author of it, and *Marigni* was not able to Write ſo grave, and ſo ſerious a Book.

XIX. Another Book publiſh'd under the falſe Name of *Junius Brutus*.

Languet is not the only Perſon who diſguis'd himſelf under the Name of *Junius Brutus* The Famous *Socinian Crellius* did it alſo in a Book concerning Liberty of Conſcience. The Catalogue of the *Bodleian* Library mentions it in this manner: *Junius Brutus Polonus; Vindiciæ pro Religionis libertate*, and refers us to *Val. Magnus*. But if you conſult the Article of Father *Valerian Magni*, you'll find nothing relating to this *Junius Brutus Polonus*, except that there is mention made of a Book (g) Printed like his at *Eleutheropolis*; and there alſo the Catalogue refers us to *Pet. Haberkornius*, tho' Dr. *Hyde* has not put under that Name any thing relating to Father *Valerian*, or *Junius Brutus Polonus*. We are referr'd ſtill from the Article *Petrus Haberkornius*, to that of *Feurbornius*, where we find nothing that has any Affinity with the other Articles. I am not ignorant of the Relation that is between the *Capuchin Valerian Magni*, and the Profeſſor *Haberkorn*; they diſputed one againſt another *viva voce*, and *Haberkorn* has Publiſh'd amongſt other Books an (D) *Anti-Valerian*, which Mr. *Baillet* has not forgotten in his Curious Collection (h) of *Anti*'s. But ſince Dr. *Hyde* ſhews no ſuch thing, methinks his references are to no purpoſe, and that 'tis a little want of exactneſs, in one of the moſt exact Works that have been made in that kind.

The

(a) *We have here a notable inſtance of the uncertainty of Humane knowledge; for that ſame cauſe, which has ſo many fair ſides, has others that are frightful.*

(b) See Teiſſier Eloges tirez de de Mr. de Thou tom. 1 pag. 116. He quotes Montagne chap. 27. of the 1 Book of his Eſſays, and Thuanus Book 57.

(c) See the Article Hotomanus.

(d) He publiſh'd a Book Intitul'd, Le vray reſveille-matin des Calviniſtes & publicains François, où eſt amplement diſcouru de l'autorité des Princes & du devoir des ſujets envers iceux.

(e) The French *Title does not clearly expreſs the poſition which* Charpentier *had maintained.*

(f) Patin *letter 154. page 604. of the 1. Vol. It is dated the 21. of* Novem. *1659.*

(g) *The ſame* Bibliotheque *of the* Anti-Trintarians, *which ſays p. 117. that* Crellius *writ a Book under the Name of* Junius Brutus *ſays pag. 133. that this other Book was written by* Joachim Stegman *with this Title*, Brevis, diſquiſitio quomodo vulgo dicti Evangelici Pontificios ac nominatim *Valeriani Magni de Acatholicorum credendi regula judicium*, ſolidè atque evidenter refutare queant. *Eleutheropoli apud* Godfridum *Philalethium.* 1633. *in* 12.

(h) Tom. 1. n. 39. pag. 255.

(D) *An* Anti-Valerian.] Mr. (*) *Baillet* ſays that the *Anti-Valerian* was Written againſt a Book of Controverſy of Father *Valerian Magni*, Printed at *Vienna* in *Auſtria* in 1641. with the Title of *Judicium de Acatholicorum & Catholicorum regula credendi.* This is true; but I obſerve that this *Capuchin*'s Work is Compos'd of two Treatiſes which are not Twins. That which concerns the Rule of Faith of the Non-Catholicks is ſome Years Older than the other. It was Publiſh'd at *Prague* in 1628. Many Proteſtants Anſwer'd it. *John Major* in 1630. *James Martini*, and *John Botſac* in 1631. *Conrad Bergius* in 1639. The *Socinian Joachim Stegman*, whom I have mention'd (†) above, engag'd him in 1633. without naming himſelf. He did more injury to the cauſe than good. This *Capuchin*'s Book was Re-printed at *Vienna* in 1641. with the Author's Replies to thoſe five Antagoniſts, and with the Treatiſe Intituled *Catholicorum regula credendi.*

(*) Baillet tom. 1. of the Anti n. 39. pag. 257.

(†) *Letter I.*

The end of this *Dissertation* will be a passage of the Preface to the *Sorberiana*. "I "have not been able to know what's become of (a) his little Tract *de pace & concordia inter Christianos conciliandâ*, nor of the Translation he made of a Book Print-"ed in 1657. and Intituled *Junii Bruti Poloni vindiciæ pro religionis libertate*, which "was not Written, as some have thought by the Learned *Hubert Languet*, tho' he "formerly disguis'd himself under that Name in his *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*; and which "ought to be look'd upon as a Continuation of the Treatise *de libertate Ecclesiastica* "Printed in 1607. which is doubtless *Casaubon's*, who speaks of it plainly enough in "his 539. Letter of the *Hague* Edition, though he had spoken of it in ambiguous "words in two or three other foregoing Letters."

(a) *That is Sorbiere's.*

SINCE the first Edition of this Dictionary I have learn'd a thing (b) which I thought very curious. It is in an *English* Book which was Printed at *London* in 1649. as an Apology for a Book which the Ministers of that great City had lately Publish'd, and as an Answer to the Invectives dispers'd in a Book of *John Price*. The Book, in which the thing in question is to be found, is Intitled, *A modest and clear vindication of the serious representation, and late vindication of the Ministers of* London, *from the scandalous aspersions of* John Price, *in a Pamphlet of his, Intituled,* Clerico Classicum *or, The Clergies Alarum to a Third War.* John Price had tax'd several Ministers with Publishing Books, that were good for nothing but raising Rebellions, and he had put *Beza* in the fourth rank, as being the Author of the *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos.* You are much in the wrong, says the Answer, to follow in this the Popish Writer of a Book Inticuled, *Imago utriusque Ecclesiæ, Hierosolymæ & Babylonis, per P. D. M.* This Writer, who is thought to be *Tobias Matthews*, said in the 105. Page that *Junius Brutus*'s Book was of *Beza*'s Writing: Can you deal equitably with so Orthodox a Divine as *Beza*, when you take up the Calumnies of the Papists against so zealous a Protestant? Does not the same Author, who accuses him of Writing the *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, accuse him also of having usurped the Parish and Wife of another Man? The first accusation is as false as the last. 'Tis easy to prove that he's not the Author of that Book: Would so wise and so Learn'd a Man have affirm'd in a Book the contrary to what he had taught in another? He makes it his business in all his Writings to shew the Obedience that is due to Magistrates; he says nothing of the Deposing or Murdering of Kings, which is the only end of *Junius Brutus*'s Book. A great many passages directly opposite to *Brutus*'s Principles might be drawn from *Beza*'s Works: Here is one or two. Private Persons, says he (1), who are the Subjects of a Tyrant, have no remedy allowed them, besides amendment of Life, Prayers, and Tears. He will have them indeed to disobey the Orders of a Prince that are contrary to the Law of GOD, but not to take up Arms against him. (2) *Aliud esse non parere quàm resistere, vel ad arma se comparare quæ à Domino non acceperis.* He writ a Book *de Hæreticis à Magistratu puniendis* but he has not said a Word *de Magistratibus ab Hæreticis puniendis.* This Work of *Junius Brutus*, continues he, which good Authors, as you say, ascribe to *Beza*, was certainly written by a Jesuit. We know from good Hands that the Jesuit *Parsons* was the Author of it; some Persons still alive can witness that one *Rench* a Book-seller was Condemn'd to be hang'd for Printing this Book with another that the same Author Writ under the Name of *Doleman.* There is a Parliament-man, now sitting in the House of Commons who has caus'd *Junius Brutus*'s Work to be Translated into *English* by the same *Walker* who has Written the Monthly *Mercuries.* This Translation has been Publish'd; but lest it should be known that it is the Jesuit *Parsons*'s Book, *Junius Brutus*'s Name has been left out, and an other Title put to it.

(b) *Mr.* Hill *Minister of the English Church of* Rotterdam *was pleased to acquaint me with it, and to lend me the Book.*

(1) Nullum aliud remedium proponitur privatis hominibus tyranno subjectis præter vitæ emendationem, preces & lachrymas. *Beza in confessione fidei Christianæ cap. 5. circa finem.*

(2) Id. ib.

This is the substance of the *Latin* Extracts I caus'd to be made out of this *English* Book. 'Tis a curious thing, in my opinion, that *Robert Parsons* the Jesuit (z) should pass in *England* for the Author of *Stephen Junius Brutus*'s *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*: But I don't believe there is any reason for Fathering it upon him. It does not seem possible that an English Jesuit should write at that time upon such a Question, without saying any thing relating to *England*, and nothing but what bespeaks him a Good *French* Protestant.

(z) *Mr.* Hill *told me that* Christopher Love *Minister of* London, *who was Beheaded in* Cromwell's *time, maintained in a Book that* Parsons *is the pretended* Junius Brutus

A DISSERTATION

Concerning Defamatory Libels.

On Occasion of a Passage of Tacitus, *which I have mention'd in the Article* Cassius Severus, *and which informs us that* Augustus *was the first, that proceeded against those Libels by the Law* de Majestate.

I. A New thing under the Empire of *Augustus* concerning Libels.

I would fain know what reasons the Emperor *Augustus* went upon to Involve Defamatory Libels under the Crimes of High-treason; for as *Tacitus* observes, before this, Treacheries which had weakned the Armies, Seditions which had weakned the People, and lastly an ill Administration of Offices which had weakned the Majesty of the Republick, were only comprehended under this kind of Crimes: And Actions indeed were punish'd, but not Words. (a) *Legem majestatis reduxerat; cui nomen apud veteres idem, sed alia in judicium veniebant: si quis proditione exercitum, aut plebem seditionibus, denique male gesta Rep. majestatem populi Romani minuisset. Facta arguebantur, dicta impune erant. Primus Augustus*

(a) Tacit. Annal. l. 1. c. 72.

Auguſtus cognitionem de famoſis libellis ſpecie legis ejus tractavit, commotus Caſſii Severi libidine, qua viros feminaſque illuſtres procacibus ſcriptis diffamaverat. For which reaſon another (*a*) Hiſtorian obſerves, that it was a Novelty to ſee a Lady of the Family of the *Claudii* accus'd before the People, as guilty of High-treaſon, for having ſaid in the hearing of a prodigious multitude, that ſtopt her Coach, *would to* GOD *my Brother would return into the World, and loſe another Fleet, that there might be fewer People at* Rome. The Commentators obſerve here a Two-fold Novelty; one in the Sex of the accus'd, the other in Intituling a ſimple wiſh, a Treaſon. I don't ſee that even at preſent, it is a point of Law conſtantly Eſtabliſh'd, to make (*b*) Reproaches againſt the Prince's Perſon even in Writing, Crimes of High-treaſon. So that *Auguſtus* did a thing, ſo much the more ſingular, becauſe he principally Eſtabliſh'd it againſt Satyrs, which did not concern his Perſon. I have before related *Tacitus*'s Words, which ſhew that *Caſſius Severus*'s Libels againſt Perſons of Quality of both Sexes obliged this Emperor to make this New Law. I don't find that this *Caſſius* was accus'd of Libelling *Auguſtus*, and I find in *Suetonius* that this Emperor did not puniſh Satyrical Diſcourſes nor Writings that concern'd him. (*c*) *Nec quidquam ultra aut ſtatim aut poſtea inquiſivit. Tiberio quoque de eadem re ſedulo violentius apud ſe per epiſtolam conquerenti ita reſcripſit,* ætati tuæ, mi Tiberi, noli in hac re indulgere, & nimium indignari quemquam eſſe qui de me male loquatur, ſatis eſt enim ſi hoc habemus, ne quis nobis male facere poſſit . . . . . (*d*) *Etiam ſparſos de ſe in curia famoſos libellos, nec expavit, nec magnâ curâ redarguit, ac ne requiſitis quidem autoribus, id modo cenſuit cognoſcendum poſthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cujuſpiam ſub alieno nomine ederent.*

II. Three Hiſtorians give an imperfect account of it, eſpecially *Suetonius*.

But who would not be ſurpriz'd at this, that tho' three different Authors have ſpoken one after another of this Law of *Auguſtus*, yet we don't find the circumſtances of it exactly explain'd and confirm'd, by the mutual Aſſiſtance of the three Witneſſes? *Tacitus* barely tells us that the Crime of Writing Defamatory Libels, was brought under the Law *de Majeſtate*. *Suetonius* who comes after *Tacitus* does not ſpeak of this Law *de Majeſtate*; he only ſays that *Auguſtus* order'd that thoſe, who Publiſh'd ſuch Libels under another Name, ſhould be proceeded againſt. *Dion* who comes after *Suetonius*, does not ſpeak neither of the Law *de Majeſtate*, contenting himſelf to ſay, 1. That *Auguſtus* two Years before he died, order'd Informations to be made againſt Defamatory Libels, and that the *Ædiles* of *Rome* and the Governors of other Places, ſhould burn all the Writings of this kind that they ſhould diſcover. 2. That he puniſhed ſome Libellers. Of thoſe three Hiſtorians *Suetonius* has the leaſt clear'd up this Fact, ſince he ſeems to ſay (*e*) that provided a Man writ Libels under no Name or under his own, he might ſafely defame the Court and the City. Why then was *Caſſius Severus* baniſh'd? Why were *Labienus*'s Writings burnt? Can any one believe it was becauſe theſe two Authors had Publiſh'd their Books under the Names of others? What a fooliſh thought!

III. Vain attempts to juſtify *Suetonius*.

Torrentius would ſave *Suetonius*'s Honour by ſubſtituting, without the Authority of any Manuſcript, theſe Words *ſub alienove nomine*, for theſe *ſub alieno nomine*. But I obſerve that this Correction has been laid aſide with the utmoſt contempt; ſo far that *Suetonius*'s Commentator *in uſum Delphini*, thought it did not make a new Senſe, ſo little had he examin'd it. Others by *ſub alieno nomine, &c.* will have the Satyrs to be underſtood, in which the Names of the Perſons Satyriz'd, did not appear. But this explication is not minded: After all notwithſtanding theſe expedients, the moſt abuſive Satyrs, might have been Publiſh'd with impunity, according to *Suetonius*; provided they had been Anonymous, or no body had been abus'd under a falſe Name, but under their true Name, Which would be a ſhameful reproach to the Emperor's Council. Laſtly, ſome ſay that whereas the Laws of the 12 Tables had ſufficiently prohibited the making Satyrs in one's own Name, *Auguſtus* thought himſelf only oblig'd to condemn thoſe that were Publiſh'd under another Man's Name. But 1. we don't ſee that the Laws of the 12. Tables concern more or leſs Anonymous Satyrs, than thoſe that appear'd under a Man's true Name or a falſe one. 2. It had been very needleſs to forbid only thoſe that ſhould come out with the Names of the Authors: And what probability is there that the Ancient Laws of *Rome* ſhould have left ſo large a gap for any one that had a mind to evade them? 3. Is it uſual in making any Addition to a Law not to renew and confirm the Ancient Orders? 4. Can it be conceived that if the Ancient Roman Laws, had not puniſh'd the moſt puniſhable Satyrs, that is, the Nameleſs Ones, whoſe blows fall thickeſt and heavieſt, *Auguſtus* by ſupplying what was wanting in them, ſhould have forgot the moſt neceſſary remedy, *viz.* the puniſhment of Anonymous Libels?

IV. Whether Libels were comprehended under the Crimes of High-treaſon, becauſe they are an Uſurpation of the Supreme Authority.

'Tis more probable (*f*) that it was he, who caus'd the Law or the Decree of the Senate to be made, the Words whereof *Ulpian* has preſerved to us; *Si quis librum ad infamiam alicujus pertinentem ſcripſit, compoſuit, edidit, dolove malo fecit quo quid eorum fieret, etiamſi alterius nomine ediderit, vel ſine nomine; uti de ea re agere liceat: & ſi condemnatus ſit, qui id fecit, inteſtabilis ex lege eſſe jubetur.*

I confeſs that the Modern Hiſtorians are too Prolix, and that ſome of 'em Write more Volumes upon the Age they live in, than *Livy* did upon the time that paſſed from the Foundation of *Rome* to *Cæſar*. But on the other hand the Ancients are too ſhort, and 'tis better for our inſtruction that a Hiſtory ſhould contain too many particulars, than if too many were omitted.

Perhaps ſome will think that *Auguſtus* needed no great fetch of reaſoning to ſhew, that Libellers deſerved to be proſecuted as guilty of High-treaſon, ſince 'tis evident that a Subject who defames his Neighbour uſurps one of the Rights of Sovereignty, and that it belongs only to the Sovereign to inflict the pain of Infamy, as well as that of Ba-

(*a*) *Novo more judicium majeſtatis apud populum mulier ſubiit, quod in conferta multitudine ægre procedente carpento palam optaverit ut frater ſuus pulcher reviviſceret, atque iterum claſſem amitteret quo minor turba Romæ foret. Sueton. in Tiber. c.* 2.

(*b*) Auberi, *Hiſt. of Card.* de Richelieu *l.* 4. *p. m.* 405. *quotes an* Arreſt *of the Parliament of* Paris *of the* 17. *of* April, 1620. *which condemn'd to the Gallies a Man convicted of High-treaſon for having had a Hand in a Libel againſt the State.*

(*c*) Sueton. *in* Aug. *c.* 51.

(*d*) Id. ib. *c.* 55.

(*e*) Id modo cenſuit (*Auguſtus*) cognoſcendum poſthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cujuſpiam ſub alieno nomine ederent. *Sueton. in Aug. c.* 55.

(*f*) Baudouin *who relates thoſe words of the Law, is of opinion that it was inacted under* Auguſtus, *or* Tiberius. *See his Treatiſe* in leges 12. Tabul. c. 9. pag. m. 49. & 50.

The end of this *Diſſertation* will be a paſſage of the Preface to the *Sorberiana*. “I have not been able to know what's become of (a) his little Tract *de pace & concordia inter Chriſtianos conciliandâ*, nor of the Tranſlation he made of a Book Printed in 1637. and Intituled *Junii Bruti Poloni vindiciæ pro religionis libertate*, which was not Written, as ſome have thought by the Learned *Hubert Languet*, tho' he formerly diſguis'd himſelf under that Name in his *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*; and which ought to be look'd upon as a Continuation of the Treatiſe *de libertate Eccleſiaſtica* Printed in 1607. which is doubtleſs *Caſaubon*'s, who ſpeaks of it plainly enough in his 539. Letter of the *Hague* Edition, though he had ſpoken of it in ambiguous words in two or three other foregoing Letters.”

SINCE the firſt Edition of this Dictionary I have learn'd a thing (b) which I thought very curious. It is in an *Engliſh* Book which was Printed at *London* in 1649. as an Apology for a Book which the Miniſters of that great City had lately Publiſh'd, and as an Anſwer to the Invectives diſpers'd in a Book of *John Price*. The Book, in which the thing in queſtion is to be found, is Intitled, *A modeſt and clear vindication of the ſerious repreſentation, and late vindication of the Miniſters of* London, *from the ſcandalous aſperſions of* John Price, *in a Pamphlet of his, Intituled,* Clerico Claſſicum *or, The Clergies Alarum to a Third War.* John Price had tax'd ſeveral Miniſters with Publiſhing Books, that were good for nothing but raiſing Rebellions, and he had put *Beza* in the fourth rank, as being the Author of the *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*. You are much in the wrong, ſays the Anſwer, to follow in this the Popiſh Writer of a Book Intituled, *Imago utriuſque Eccleſiæ, Hieroſolymæ & Babylonis, per P. D. M.* This Writer, who is thought to be *Tobias Matthews*, ſaid in the 105. Page that *Junius Brutus*'s Book was of *Beza*'s Writing: Can you deal equitably with ſo Orthodox a Divine as *Beza*, when you take up the Calumnies of the Papiſts againſt ſo zealous a Proteſtant? Does not the ſame Author, who accuſes him of Writing the *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, accuſe him alſo of having uſurped the Pariſh and Wife of another Man? The firſt accuſation is as falſe as the laſt. 'Tis eaſy to prove that he's not the Author of that Book: Would ſo wiſe and ſo Learn'd a Man have affirm'd in a Book the contrary to what he had taught in another? He makes it his buſineſs in all his Writings to ſhew the Obedience that is due to Magiſtrates; he ſays nothing of the Depoſing or Murdering of Kings, which is the only end of *Junius Brutus*'s Book. A great many paſſages directly oppoſite to *Brutus*'s Principles might be drawn from *Beza*'s Works: Here is one or two. Private Perſons, ſays he (1), who are the Subjects of a Tyrant, have no remedy allowed them, beſides amendment of Life, Prayers, and Tears. He will have them indeed to diſobey the Orders of a Prince that are contrary to the Law of GOD, but not to take up Arms againſt him. (2) *Aliud eſſe non parere quàm reſiſtere, vel ad arma ſe comparare quæ à Domino non acceperis.* He writ a Book *de Hæreticis à Magiſtratu puniendis* but he has not ſaid a Word *de Magiſtratibus ab Hæreticis puniendis*. This Work of *Junius Brutus*, continues he, which good Authors, as you ſay, aſcribe to *Beza*, was certainly written by a Jeſuit. We know from good Hands that the Jeſuit *Parſons* was the Author of it; ſome Perſons ſtill alive can witneſs that one *Rench* a Book-ſeller was Condemn'd to be hang'd for Printing this Book with another that the ſame Author Writ under the Name of *Doleman*. There is a Parliament-man, now ſitting in the Houſe of Commons who has caus'd *Junius Brutus*'s Work to be Tranſlated into *Engliſh* by the ſame *Walker* who has Written the Monthly *Mercuries*. This Tranſlation has been Publiſh'd; but leſt it ſhould be known that it is the Jeſuit *Parſons*'s Book, *Junius Brutus*'s Name has been left out, and another Title put to it.

This is the ſubſtance of the *Latin* Extracts I caus'd to be made out of this *Engliſh* Book. 'Tis a curious thing, in my opinion, that *Robert Parſons* the Jeſuit (z) ſhould paſs in *England* for the Author of *Stephen Junius Brutus*'s *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*: But I don't believe there is any reaſon for Fathering it upon him. It does not ſeem poſſible that an Engliſh Jeſuit ſhould write at that time upon ſuch a Queſtion, without ſaying any thing relating to *England*, and nothing but what beſpeaks him a Good *French* Proteſtant.

(a) *That is Sorbiere's.*

(b) *Mr.* Hill *Miniſter of the Engliſh Church of* Rotterdam *was pleaſed to acquaint me with it, and to lend me the Book.*

(1) Nullum aliud remedium proponitur privatis hominibus tyranno ſubjectis præter vitæ emendationem, preces & lachrymas. *Beza in confeſſione fidei Chriſtianæ cap. 5. circa finem.*

(2) Id. ib.

(z) *Mr.* Hill *told me that* Chriſtopher Love *Miniſter of* London, *who was Beheaded in* Cromwell's *time, maintained in a Book that* Parſons *is the pretended* Junius Brutus

A DISSERTATION

Concerning Defamatory Libels.

On Occaſion of a Paſſage of Tacitus, *which I have mention'd in the Article* Caſſius Severus, *and which informs us that* Auguſtus *was the firſt, that proceeded againſt thoſe Libels by the Law* de Majeſtate.

I. A New thing under the Empire of *Auguſtus* concerning Libels.

I would fain know what reaſons the Emperor *Auguſtus* went upon to Involve Defamatory Libels under the Crimes of High-treaſon; for as *Tacitus* obſerves, before this, Treacheries which had weakned the Armies, Seditions which had weakned the People, and laſtly an ill Adminiſtration of Offices which had weakned the Majeſty of the Republick, were only comprehended under this kind of Crimes: And Actions indeed were puniſh'd, but not Words. (a) *Legem majeſtatis reduxerat; cui nomen apud veteres idem, ſed alia in judicium veniebant: ſi quis proditione exercitum, aut plebem ſeditionibus, denique male geſta Rep. majeſtatem populi Romani minuiſſet. Facta arguebantur, dicta impunè erant. Primus Auguſtus*

(a) Tacit. Annal. *l.* 1. *c.* 72.

Auguſtus cognitionem de famoſis libellis ſpecie legis ejus tractavit, commotus Caſſii Severi libidine, qua viros feminaſque inluſtres procacibus ſcriptis diffamaverat. For which reaſon another (a) Hiſtorian obſerves, that it was a Novelty to ſee a Lady of the Family of the *Claudii* accus'd before the People, as guilty of High-treaſon, for having ſaid in the hearing of a prodigious multitude, that ſtopt her Coach, *would to GOD my Brother would return into the World, and loſe another Fleet, that there might be fewer People at* Rome. The Commentators obſerve here a Two-fold Novelty; one in the Sex of the accus'd, the other in Intituling a ſimple wiſh, a Treaſon. I don't ſee that even at preſent, it is a point of Law conſtantly Eſtabliſh'd, to make (b) Reproaches againſt the Prince's Perſon even in Writing, Crimes of High-treaſon. So that *Auguſtus* did a thing, ſo much the more ſingular, becauſe he principally Eſtabliſh'd it againſt Satyrs, which did not concern his Perſon. I have before related *Tacitus*'s Words, which ſhew that *Caſſius Severus*'s Libels againſt Perſons of Quality of both Sexes obliged this Emperor to make this New Law. I don't find that this *Caſſius* was accus'd of Libelling *Auguſtus*, and I find in *Suetonius* that this Emperor did not puniſh Satyrical Diſcourſes nor Writings that concern'd him. (c) *Nec quidquam ultra aut ſtatim aut poſtea inquiſivit. Tiberio quoque de eadem re ſedulo violentius apud ſe per epiſtolam conquerenti ita reſcripſit,* ætati tuæ, mi Tiberi, noli in hac re indulgere, & nimium indignari quemquam eſſe qui de me male loquatur, ſatis eſt enim ſi hoc habemus, ne quis nobis male facere poſſit . . . . . (d) *Etiam ſparſos de ſe in curia famoſos libellos, nec expavit, nec magnâ curâ redarguit, ac ne requiſitis quidem autoribus, id modo cenſuit cognoſcendum poſthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cujuſpiam ſub alieno nomine ederent.*

II. Three Hiſtorians give an imperfect account of it, eſpecially *Suetonius*.

But who would not be ſurpriz'd at this, that tho' three different Authors have ſpoken one after another of this Law of *Auguſtus*, yet we don't find the circumſtances of it exactly explain'd and confirm'd, by the mutual Aſſiſtance of the three Witneſſes? *Tacitus* barely tells us that the Crime of Writing Defamatory Libels, was brought under the Law *de Majeſtate*. *Suetonius* who comes after *Tacitus* does not ſpeak of this Law *de Majeſtate*; he only ſays that *Auguſtus* order'd that thoſe, who Publiſh'd ſuch Libels under another Name, ſhould be proceeded againſt. *Dion* who comes after *Suetonius*, does not ſpeak neither of the Law *de Majeſtate*, contenting himſelf to ſay, 1. That *Auguſtus* two Years before he died, order'd Informations to be made againſt Defamatory Libels, and that the *Ædiles* of *Rome* and the Governors of other Places, ſhould burn all the Writings of this kind that they ſhould diſcover. 2. That he puniſhed ſome Libellers. Of thoſe three Hiſtorians *Suetonius* has the leaſt clear'd up this Fact, ſince he ſeems to ſay (e) that provided a Man writ Libels under no Name or under his own, he might ſafely defame the Court and the City. Why then was *Caſſius Severus* baniſh'd? Why were *Labienus*'s Writings burnt? Can any one believe it was becauſe theſe two Authors had Publiſh'd their Books under the Names of others? What a fooliſh thought!

III. Vain attempts to juſtify *Suetonius*.

Torrentius would ſave *Suetonius*'s Honour by ſubſtituting, without the Authority of any Manuſcript, theſe Words *ſub alienove nomine*, for theſe *ſub alieno nomine*. But I obſerve that this Correction has been laid aſide with the utmoſt contempt; ſo far that *Suetonius*'s Commentator *in uſum Delphini*, thought it did not make a new Senſe, ſo little had he examin'd it. Others by *ſub alieno nomine, &c.* will have the Satyrs to be underſtood, in which the Names of the Perſons Satyriz'd, did not appear. But this explication is not minded: After all notwithſtanding theſe expedients, the moſt abuſive Satyrs, might have been Publiſh'd with impunity, according to *Suetonius*; provided they had been Anonymous, or no body had been abus'd under a falſe Name, but under their true Name, Which would be a ſhameful reproach to the Emperor's Council. Laſtly, ſome ſay that whereas the Laws of the 12 Tables had ſufficiently prohibited the making Satyrs in one's own Name, *Auguſtus* thought himſelf only oblig'd to condemn thoſe that were Publiſh'd under another Man's Name. But 1. we don't ſee that the Laws of the 12. Tables concern more or leſs Anonymous Satyrs, than thoſe that appear'd under a Man's true Name or a falſe one. 2. It had been very needleſs to forbid only thoſe that ſhould come out with the Names of the Authors: And what probability is there that the Ancient Laws of *Rome* ſhould have left ſo large a gap for any one that had a mind to evade them? 3. Is it uſual in making any Addition to a Law not to renew and confirm the Ancient Orders? 4. Can it be conceived that if the Ancient Roman Laws, had not puniſh'd the moſt puniſhable Satyrs, that is, the Nameleſs Ones, whoſe blows fall thickeſt and heavieſt, *Auguſtus* by ſupplying what was wanting in them, ſhould have forgot the moſt neceſſary remedy, *viz.* the puniſhment of Anonymous Libels?

IV. Whether Libels were comprehended under the Crimes of High-treaſon, becauſe they are an Uſurpation of the Supreme Authority.

'Tis more probable (f) that it was he, who caus'd the Law or the Decree of the Senate to be made, the Words whereof *Ulpian* has preſerved to us; *Si quis librum ad infamiam alicujus pertinentem ſcripſit, compoſuit, edidit, dolove malo fecit quo quid eorum fieret, etiamſi alterius nomine ediderit, vel ſine nomine; uti de ea re agere liceat: & ſi condemnatus ſit, qui id fecit, inteſtabilis ex lege eſſe jubetur.*

I confeſs that the Modern Hiſtorians are too Prolix, and that ſome of 'em Write more Volumes upon the Age they live in, than *Livy* did upon the time that paſſed from the Foundation of *Rome* to *Cæſar*. But on the other hand the Ancients are too ſhort, and 'tis better for our inſtruction that a Hiſtory ſhould contain too many particulars, than if too many were omitted.

Perhaps ſome will think that *Auguſtus* needed no great fetch of reaſoning to ſhew, that Libellers deſerved to be proſecuted as guilty of High-treaſon, ſince 'tis evident that a Subject who defames his Neighbour uſurps one of the Rights of Sovereignty, and that it belongs only to the Sovereign to inflict the pain of Infamy, as well as that of Ba-

(a) *Novo more judicium majeſtatis apud populum mulier ſubiit, quod in conferta multitudine ægre procedente carpento palam optaverit ut frater ſuus pulcher reviviſceret, atque iterum claſſem amitteret quo minor turba Romæ foret.* Sueton. in Tiber. c. 2.

(b) Auberi, *Hiſt. of Card.* de Richelieu *l.* 4. *p. m.* 405. *quotes an Arreſt of the Parliament of* Paris *of the* 17. *of* April, 1610. *which condemn'd to the Gallies a Man convicted of High-treaſon for having had a Hand in a Libel againſt the State.*

(c) Sueton. *in* Aug. *c.* 51.

(d) Id. ib. *c.* 55.

(e) Id modo cenſuit (*Auguſtus*) cognoſcendum poſthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cujuſpiam ſub alieno nomine ederent. *Sueton. in Aug. c.* 55.

(f) Baudouin *who relates thoſe words of the Law, is of opinion that it was inacted under* Auguſtus, *or* Tiberius. *See his Treatiſe* in leges 12. Tabul. c. 9. pag. m. 49. & 50.

Baniſhment, Impriſonment, Death, *&c.* But this would be a very falſe reaſoning, and at once Converting into High-treaſon, the Violation of all the Laws, Adultery, Theſt, Fornication, *&c.* for it may be ſaid that a Robber not only deſpiſes the Laws of his Sovereign, but alſo uſurps a Right that belongs only to him: None but a Sovereign can take away a private Man's poſſeſſion, either in whole or in part. The right of Fining, Confiſcating, *&c.* muſt no leſs flow from the Supreme Power, than that of branding any one with Infamy; and conſequently a Satyriſt who defames his Neighbour cannot be guilty of High-treaſon, without concluding that a Robber, and a Fornicator are ſo too. Which would be ſo much the truer with reſpect to Fornicators, becauſe if they debauch a married Woman, they hazard the defrauding the true Heirs, by the Intruſion of an Illegitimate Coheir, and at the ſame time they bring a great diſhonour upon the Husband: If they debauch a Maid, they caſt upon her an ignominious blot which reflects upon the Family, and they cauſe her Father a real damage and a pecuniary loſs, like that which conſiſts in the decay of Merchandiſes. For indeed a deflour'd Maid, is like pall'd Wine, which ſinks in its price; it is a Commodity which the Proprietor has ſtill upon his Hands, unleſs he will put it off at a great loſs; I mean by undermatching his Daughter, or giving her an exorbitant Portion. We can't therefore this way juſtify the New Law of *Auguſtus*: The ſhorteſt way is probably to confeſs that it was not regular. I don't know but by a forc'd conſtruction it was derived from a Maxim or Definition, that is to be found in *Cicero*, which makes it a diminution of the Majeſty of the *Roman* People, to take any thing from the dignity, grandeur, or Power of that People, or from thoſe to whom they Communicated any Power. (*a*) *Majeſtatem minuere eſt de dignitate, aut amplitudine, aut poteſtate populi, aut eorum quibus populus poteſtatem dedit aliquid derogare.* I only believe that by the Law *de Majeſtate*, muſt be meant ſomething more than *Auberi* means in the place I have cited, where he ſays, that *Auguſtus* did but renew the Capital Action, which the Laws of the Twelve Tables had enacted againſt the Authors of abuſive Libels. I ſhall obſerve by the by that Mr. *Naude* has confounded thoſe Twelve Tables with a Decree of the Senate. Nay, He affords a Proof of his fault; for what he cites from *Arnobius*, manifeſtly proves the juſtice of my cenſure. *If the Parliament*, ſays he, (*b*) *had had leiſure to caſt their Eyes upon theſe Defamatory Libels, I dare ſay they would have hindred the ſale of a great part of them, had it been only to imitate the vertue of that Ancient Roman Senate, of which* Arnobius *ſaid, if my memory does not fail me*: Carmen malum conſcribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur, & vita, decemviralibus ſcitis evadere noluiſtis impunitum.

Tiberius maintain'd this innovation of *Auguſtus*, eſpecially on Account of ſome ſlandering Writers who attack'd his Perſon, and touch'd the moſt tender ſores of his Family. (*c*) *Mox Tiberius conſultante Pompeio Macro Prætore, an judicia Majeſtatis redderentur, exercendas leges eſſe reſpondit. Hunc quoque aſperavere carmina incertis auctoribus vulgata in ſævitiam ſuperbiamque ejus, & diſcordem cum matre animum.* He (*d*) afterwards extended this Law to every body: Poor *Cremutius Cordus* in vain pleaded that he (*e*) had written nothing offenſive either againſt *Tiberius* or the Empreſs, who were thoſe ſaid he, whom the Law *de Majeſtate* comprehended; this was not ſufficient to clear him from his pretended Crime, of having praiſed *Brutus* and *Caſſius*. (*f*) *Verba mea, Patres Conſcripti, arguuntur, adeo factorum innocens ſum. Sed neque hæc in principem aut principis parentem, quos lex majeſtatis amplectitur.* Note that *Tacitus* ſeems to have forgotten what he had ſaid in the 72 Chapter of the 1 Book: For as he makes *Cremutius Cordus* ſpeak, one would think that only Libels againſt the Emperor, and the Empreſs were comprehended under the Law *de Majeſtate*: But there is no ſuch reſtriction in the 72. Chapter.

V.
Nero bore Libels ſomewhat patiently.

But I muſt not forget to ſay, that this Law *de Majeſtate*, was not always fatal. *Nero*, as much a *Nero* as he was, not only did not annul the Decree of the Senate, which condemn'd the *Prætor* (*g*) *Antiſtius* only to Baniſhment and the confiſcation of his Eſtate, for having Publiſh'd ſome Satyrs againſt the Emperor; but he declar'd to the Senate that he permitted them fully to abſolve *Antiſtius*. (*h*) *Se qui ſeveritatem decernentium impediturus fuerit, moderationem non prohibere. Statuerent ut vellent, datam etiam abſolvendi licentiam.* The Senate ſtood to their firſt reſolution. Almoſt at the ſame time *Fabricius* (*i*) *Vejento*, Author of abundance of Libels againſt the Senators, and the Clergy of *Rome*, having been judg'd by *Nero* himſelf, was only Baniſh'd *Italy*. His Books were condemn'd to be burnt: They were afterwards bought up and read with the greateſt greedineſs, whilſt there was danger in doing it; but when it was permitted to have them, they were no longer cared for. (*k*) *Convictum Vejentonem Italia depulit & libros exuri juſſit conquiſitos lectitatoſque donec cum periculo parabantur, mox licentia habendi oblivionem attulit. Suetonius* obſerves as a very ſingular thing, that *Nero* was ſo little ſenſible to detraction, that he ſhewed no greater mildneſs to any, than to ſuch as exercis'd their Satyrical Wit upon him. Some biting Verſes againſt him were handed about and poſted up; but he was not concern'd at it, he made no ſearch after the Authors; and ſome of them having been impeach'd by the Senate, he prevented their being rigorouſly puniſh'd for it. (*l*) *Mirum & vel præcipue notabile inter hæc fuit, nihil eum patientius quam maledicta & convicia hominum tuliſſe, neque in ullos leniorem, quam qui ſe dictis aut carminibus laceſſiſſent, extitiſſe. . . . Vel contemptu omnis infamiæ, vel ne fatendo dolorem irritaret ingenia.* All the puniſhment he appointed for the biting raillery of a *Cynick*, who had inſulted him in the open Street, and for his being ridiculed on the Stage, was the baniſhing the Philoſopher and *Comedian* out of *Italy*. *Suetonius* could not tell whether there was more indolence than policy in it: For *Nero* by ſhewing his reſentment would have had reaſon to fear he ſhould incourage the Detractors

---

(*a*) Cicero l. 2. de invent. *I ſay nothing of a paſſage of* Cicero, epiſt. 11. l. 3. ad famil. *wherein he ſays, as ſome will have it, that* Sylla *made it High-treaſon to declaim againſt another*; eſt majeſtas (& ſic Sylla voluit) ne in quemvis impune declamari liceret; *I ſay, I don't ſpeak of it, becauſe I don't think it is well mended. Beſides, I ſhould prefer* Lambinus's *explication to that of* Manutius, *tho' I am of opinion that they are both faulty.*

(*b*) *Naudé, Dialogues de Maſcurat p.* 18.

(*c*) Tacitus, annal. *l.* 1. *c.* 72.

(*d*) Ex Suetonius in Tiber. *c.* 58.

(*e*) Apud Tacitum Ann. *l.* 4. *c.* 34.

(*f*) Id. ib.

(*g*) Probroſa adverſus principem carmina factitavit, vulgavitque celebri convivio. . . Exin . . majeſtatis delatus eſt. *Tacit. lib.* 14. *cap.* 48.

(*h*) Tacit. ib. *c.* 49.

(*i*) Quod multa & probroſa in Patres & Sacerdotes compoſuiſſet, iis libris quibus nomen *codicillorum* dederat. Ib. *c.* 50.

(*k*) Id. ib.

(*l*) Sueton. in Nerone *c.* 39.

ctors; and every one knows *Tacitus*'s Sentence in the 34th. Chap. of the 4th. Book of his Annals, on occaſion of a doubt like that of *Suetonius*: an injury, ſays he, that is deſpis'd, falls of it ſelf: If you are diſturb'd at it, you propagate and ſtrengthen it. *Carmina Bibaculi & Catulli referta contumeliis Cæſarum leguntur: ſed ipſe divus Julius, ipſe divus Auguſtus & tulere iſta & reliquere, haud facilè dixerim, moderatione magis an ſapientiâ: namque ſpreta exoleſcunt: ſi iraſcere, adgnita videntur.*

VI. *It is very neceſſary to reſtrain the licentiouſneſs of Libels. The Ancient Heathens reſtrained it.*

This is well enough, if the queſtion is only about pardoning the affronts, in which a Sovereign is Perſonally concern'd; but his Subjects ought not to be left expos'd to this Storm. *Domitian* (a) would deſerve a Hundred Encomiums, had he only puniſh'd thoſe who had ſlandered the Perſons of the beſt Quality of *Rome*, in which he did not uſe too much rigour. It ſeems then that *Auguſtus*'s extreme ſeverity againſt Defamatory Libels, if ſeparated from the abuſe his Succeſſors often made of it, conſiſted only in the Terms and in the Stately Word *de Majeſtate*, and ſo his conduct is not at the bottom to be condemn'd: For this licentiouſneſs of Libels, is one of thoſe that ought chiefly to be reſtrain'd in a Government. The Honour, Glory and Reputation of Families, things a thouſand times more precious than Gold or Silver, could not be ſafe, unleſs the inſolence, and malignity of Satyrical Writers were repreſs'd. Indeed they would begin with Perſons of an ill Life; but after ſuch a beginning they would ſpread like the Plague, without any diſtinction, upon ſacred and profane places, and upon both Chaſt and Lewd Families. Antiquity would have had a full experience of it, if it had not been at laſt prevented by good Laws, and by Proſecuting the Libellers, when Jeſts were carried too far, and when thoſe who were not yet bitten by theſe mad Dogs, reflected that their turn would alſo come, and that therefore they ought to concur with thoſe who had been already wounded, to put a ſtop to ſuch a diſorder. 'Tis in this caſe as in a Fire; (b) the Neighbours work as much to extinguiſh it, as they whoſe Houſe is Actually in Flames. *Horace* relates the thing thus:

> *Feſcennina (c) per hunc inventa licentia morem*
> *Verſibus alternis opprobria ruſtica fudit,*
> *Libertaſque recurrentes accepta per annos*
> *Luſit amabiliter, donec jam ſævus apertam*
> *In rabiem cœpit verti jocus, & per honeſtas*
> *Ire minax impune domos. Doluere cruento*
> *Dente laceſſiti, fuit intactis quoque cura*
> *Conditione ſuper communi: quin etiam lex*
> *Pœnaque lata, malo quæ nollet carmine quemquam*
> *Deſcribi. Vertêre modum formidine fuſtis*
> *Ad benedicendum delectandumque redacti.*

Cicero had alſo obſerved, that the Ancient *Greek Comedians* ſo abus'd the liberty they had to cenſure the ill Lives of private Perſons, namely and directly, that no Body could eſcape the ſlanders of the Stage, no not *Pericles* himſelf, who had ſo long govern'd the Republick both in Peace and War. It had been a tolerable thing, ſaid *Cicero*, if the wicked Citizens had been expos'd to theſe inſults, tho' it were better that ſuch Men ſhould be reproved by the Cenſor than by a Poet; but 'tis intolerable that ſuch a Man as *Pericles* ſhould not be free from them. *Apud Græcos antiquiores fuit lege conceſſum, ut quod vellet Comœdia nominatim vel de quo vellet (d) diceret; itaque ſicut in eiſdem libris loquitur Africanus, quem illa non attigit, vel potius quem non vexavit, cui pepercit? Eſto: populares homines improbos, in Rep. ſeditioſos, Cleonem, Cleophontem, Hyperbolum læſit: patiamur, inquit, etſi hujuſmodi cives à Cenſore melius eſt quam à Poëta notari: ſed Periclem cum jam ſuæ civitati maxima autoritate plurimos annos domi & belli præfuiſſet, violari verſibus & eos agi in Scena non plus decuit, quam ſi Plautus, inquit, noſter voluiſſet aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius Marco Catoni maledicere (e).* Of all the Treaſures in the World, none could be more expos'd to Moth and Ruſt, and to the Rapacious Hands of Robbers, than Honour and a good Name, unleſs the inſolence of theſe Satyriſts was reſtrain'd: For as, by I know not what diſmal Fatality, the Spirit of ſlander and revenge is often to be found with a ſeeming Auſtere Life, the impunity of Libels would give Birth to vaſt Numbers of them againſt the beſt Men; and if a Man ſhould provoke never ſo little a Bigot or a moroſe Phanatick he would preſently find his reputation ſtained by his Pen, and the popular credulity for this ſort of Writers would afford them a Sanctuary, even with reſpect to the moſt extravagant Calumnies. If theſe People would not put off the Vertues with which they ought to begin a devout Life, the Vertues, I ſay, which make an honeſt Man, and if they would follow the beſt advice that can be given them, not to pretend (f) to be devout before they are good Men, they would not diſtinguiſh themſelves as they do, by their Satyrical Diſcourſes and Defamatory Libels.

VII. What anſwer is to be made to thoſe, who pretend to juſtify the Writers of Libels.

Hence we ſee what anſwer is to be given to thoſe, who ſay that Libels are beneficial to the Society, in as much as they confine Perſons of both Sexes within the bounds of Decency: 'Tis a Bridle, ſay they, that reſtrains them: Free them from the fear of being Defam'd to the End of the World, and in all future Ages by ſome ingenious Satyrs, and there will be no extravagance but what they'l be guilty of. This is all wrong: We don't find that hitherto there has been any ſcarcity of Libels, and yet the World has not been, and is not better'd by them. Beſides, would not this pretended Curb become utterly uſeleſs, by the abuſe that would be made of the remedy, by defaming without quarter or diſtinction all ſorts of Families?

What then? Muſt ſome be allow'd to commit Infamous Actions, and others ſhall not be be allowed to puniſh them with all the Trumpets of Fame? I anſwer, that as it does not belong to private Perſons, to puniſh Theſt and Murder, and the care of it ought to be left to thoſe whom the Supream Authority has appointed for the puniſhment of Malefactors; the like ought to be done with reſpect to the penalty of Infamy. 'Tis' encroaching upon the Prerogative of the Sovereign, to pretend this ſort of puniſhment, when we have not a Character for it communicated by our Governors. A Criminal may then juſtly ask the queſtion that was put to *Moſes*, (a) *Who made thee a Ruler and a Judge over us?* What private Perſons may lawfully do againſt thoſe that deſerve Infamy, is exactly what they may do againſt a Robber or an Aſſaſſin. They may bring him before the Judges, and witneſs againſt him what they know; they may in like manner Impeach the Criminal Commerce, and Infamous Life of others; but they muſt do it with all the Characters of a formal accuſer: They muſt declare their Names and the places of their abode; and eſpecially prove judicially, if there be occaſion for it, all their accuſations. Now where are the Libellers that take this method? The firſt thing they obſerve is to conceal their Names, their profeſſion and abode. They are not very Conſcientious about their Proofs; the leaſt ſuſpicions, or hear-ſay's, ſerve them for a demonſtration: And therefore they are juſtly liable to the puniſhment of ſlanderers and falſe witneſſes; for to deſerve this puniſhment, it is not neceſſary that what a Man advances ſhould be really falſe; it is enough that he maintains it without knowing it, and without being able to prove it.

(a) Scripta famoſa vulgoque edita, quibus primores viri ac feminæ notabantur, abolevit non ſine auctorum ignominia. *Sueton. in Dom. c.* 8.

(b) Dente Theonino cum circumroditur, ecquid Ad te poſt paulo ventura pericula ſentis? Nam tua res agitur, paries cum proximus ardet Et neglecta ſolent incendia ſumere vires. *Horat. epiſt.* 18. *l.* 1.

(c) Idem. epiſt. 1. lib. 2. *To which may be added this paſſage* Succeſſit vetus his Comœdia, non ſine multa Laude, ſed in vitium libertas excidit & vim Dignam lege regi. Lex eſt accepta, chorusque Turpiter obticuit ſublato jure nocendi, Id. de Arte Poet.

(d) *See* Horace *at the beginning of the* 4. *Satyr of the* 1. *Book.*

(e) Auguſt. de civit. Dei, *l.* 2. *c.* 9. ex Ciceronis lib. 4. de Republica.

(f) *See the* Reflexions ſur les defauts d'autrui, *Printed in the Year* 1690.

I am perſuaded that Juſtice and the Publick Good require that Evil (b) Actions ſhould be brought to the Tribunal of Fame, to receive the puniſhment that is due to them, *intereſt Reipublicæ cognoſci malos*: But every body ought not to pretend to this Function. For if the ill action you deſire to make publick, deſerves to be puniſh'd by the Laws of the Land, you muſt leave it to the Magiſtrates, or at moſt help them by a Judicial Teſtimony, that the Crime may at once bear a double puniſhment, that of publick Fame and that of the Judges. We muſt remember that we are not to give an Account of our Conduct, to a Poet or any other ſuch Writer, but to the Magiſtrates. This is the Doctrine of a Good Author, as will appear by theſe *Latin* Words. (c) *Noſtræ contra duodecim Tabulæ cum perpaucas res capite ſanxiſſent, in his hanc quoque ſanciendam putaverunt*, ſi quis occentaviſſet, ſive carmen condidiſſet, quod infamiam faceret flagitiumve alteri. *Præclare, judiciis enim ac Magiſtratuum diſceptationibus legitimis propoſitam vitam, non poetarum ingeniis habere debemus, nec probrum audire, niſi ea lege ut reſpondere liceat & judicio defendere.* But if the Ill action be of another kind, going unpuniſh'd, either on account of the toleration of the Law, or becauſe of the Perſons who do it, neither does it then belong to every body, to take upon them to write about it. This ſhould be done by Hiſtorians, and none ſhould write Hiſtory but Men choſen and Authoriz'd by the Government. By this means the blot that Hiſtory ſhould caſt on the Name and Memory of thoſe, who deſerve the publick Infamy, would proceed from its true Channel, being derived from the Power of the Sword, wherewith the Sovereign is Arm'd for the puniſhment of the wicked. As the ſacred Hiſtory was not the work of a private Perſon, (d) but of Men Authoriz'd by GOD with a ſpecial Commiſſion to write it: So the Civil Hiſtory ſhould be Compos'd by thoſe whom the Sovereign of each State appoints for that purpoſe, and then it might be preſum'd that Hiſtory would not defame People upon falſe grounds; whereas as the World goes at preſent, it diſtributes Puniſhments and Rewards, Diſgrace and Praiſe, Condemnation and Abſolution, upon the firſt reports of Fame, Sopniſticated with a Thouſand Paſſions. And what is ſtrange is that the leaſt Hiſtorian claims the privilege that belongs only to ſome; he pretends that he is not bound to produce his Proofs and his Witneſſes. (e) *Quis unquam ab hiſtorico juratores exegit?*

I know there are inconveniencies on the other ſide; but there being ſome every where, the greateſt ought to be avoided, as doubtleſs are that multitude of Writers, who ſully Hiſtorical Facts with their impure Hands, not only for the preſent time but for future Ages; ſince there will ever be too many Continuators of (f) *Mellificium Pezelii*, *Sethus Calviſius*, *Sleidan*'s Commentaries, *&c.* too many Writers of Abridgments, *in uſum ſtudioſæ juventutis*; in a Word, too many Scriblers who will fetch their Informations from thence, and perpetuate (A) the falſities that are daily

---

(a) Exod. ch. 2. v. 4.

(b) Exſequi ſententias haud inſtitui niſi inſignes per honeſtum aut notabibli dedecore: quod præcipuum munus annalium reor, ne virtutes ſileantur, utque PRAVIS DICTIS FACTISQUE EX POSTERITATE ET INFAMIA METUS SIT. *Tacit. ann. l.* 3. *c.* 65.

(c) Cicero 4. de legib. apud Auguſt. *l.* 2. de civit. Dei, *c.* 9.

(d) 2 *Pet.* 1. 21.

(e) Seneca de morte Claudii.

(f) *If I ſpecify ſome Authors, 'tis without any affectation or deſign; but only becauſe I happen to remember Scrivener's complaints* Act. in Schiſm. Angl. pag. 2. *of the* Biblioth. univerſ. tom 16. *pag.* 44. & ſeq. & paſſim alibi, *and thoſe of* Schoockius Fabul. Hamel. *pag.* 140. *See alſo* Wicquefort, de l' Ambaſſadeur *tom.* 1. *pag.* 173.

(A) *Perpetuate the falſities that are daily divulged.*] I might have ſpoken of another ſort of Writers. Such as continue *Pezelius*, *Calviſius*, the *Theatrum Europæ*, &c. thoſe that publiſh *Synopſes rerum toto orbe geſtarum*, and abſtracts of Univerſal Hiſtory, *in uſum ſtudioſæ juventutis*, are I confeſs the greateſt propagators of falſe News; but they are not the only ones, nor perhaps the moſt dangerous preſervers of Falſities. There are ſome Hiſtorians, who taking a contrary courſe, deceive thoſe very Perſons who pretend to be hard to be contented. I mean ſome Hiſtorians like *Varillas*: They love to ſay wha is not to be found in common Hiſtories: They aſpire to the Glory of having diſcovered ſecret Memoirs, the occult qualities of the firſt Miniſters, and ſecret Intrigues and Negotiations, which no body knew before. If a thing has been omitted by every body, they'l be ſure to publiſh it for that very reaſon. Nay, they go farther; they build a whole Syſtem thereupon: This ſerves them as a Key to open the Cabinets of Princes, and they pretend to unfold many Myſteries by that means. When thoſe Gentlemen find in the corner of a Library, or among the duſty old Papers of an Inventory, a Printed Piece unknown to them, they read it greedily, for which they are to be praiſed. But if they find in it any ſingular rare and ſuprizing matter of Fact, they immediately take it up, and make it the *Baſis* of the conjectures they deſign to vent as matters of Fact, or Hiſtorical Illuſtrations. This is no laudable thing: 'Tis commonly the way to Illuſion. If any of theſe Men ſhould find an Hundred Years hence, a Copy of the Paſtoral Letter, which was immediately ſuppreſs'd by its Author, he would make his advantage of it. He would boaſt of having diſcover'd things unknown to all other daily divulged. What is ſaid of the firſt Impreſſions in general, that they are of long continuance,

> *Quo (a) ſemel eſt imbuta recens ſervabit odorem*
> *Teſta diu,*

is moſt true in particular of the firſt alterations of Events, from their Origine, by the diſguiſed relations that are made of 'em in haſte, and diſperſed with all the expedition imaginable. This is an Original Sin, the propagation whereof cannot be denied; too many examples prove it, herein the diſorder lies: For ſince all People reſemble thoſe of whom a Cardinal *Legate* ſaid, as he gave them his Benediction, *ſince they have a mind to be deceiv'd, let them be deceived*; and moreover ſince it cannot be doubted that a falſe report believed for three days (*B*) may do a great deal of good to a State, whereas a

other Hiſtorians; he would reaſon at Random hereupon, and give all *Europe* a New Face, with reſpect to the ſecret Motives of the Princes. He would revive a falſity, which lived but a few Days in the Common News, and perpetuate it; for there will always be ſome Hiſtorians, who will relate what they ſhall read in *Varillas*, for Inſtance. I muſt acquaint my Reader, that the ſuppreſſion of this Paſtoral Letter, came to my knowledge only by a ſmall (*b*) Printed Piece of 15. Pages in *4to*. Dated the 25 of *Jan.* 1696. I there found (*c*) that the Author of the Paſtoral Letters having cited, *as a Proof of the favourable intentions* of the Allies, *a proſpect of Peace drawn up by the Diet of* Ratisbonne, *which had been contrived by a Speculative Politician of* Amſterdam. . . . . *was ſo aſhamed of his being impoſed upon by that ſpurious Piece, that he immediately Printed another Edition of his Paſtoral Letter, in which he omitted this paſſage.*

(*B*) *A falſe report believed for three Days may do a great deal of good*, &c. (*d*) This Maxim is aſcrib'd to Catherine de Medicis, *that a falſe piece of News believed three days may ſave a Kingdom.* Hiſtories abound with the advantages of falſe News. The Heads of the League maintain'd themſelves a long time in *Paris* by that means. The Duke of *Maienne* not being able to deny, that he had loſt the Field of Battle at *Ivri*, made People believe that the *Bearnois* had been (*e*) kill'd, and that in other places the League was Triumphant. Theſe are the Words of an Hiſtorian: (*f*) *Seeing their Army thus ſhatter'd, they had recourſe to their uſual Artifices, which was to impoſe upon the* Pariſians *with lies, which they publiſh'd in abundance of Papers, importing that at the firſt Aſſault given at* Dreux, *the Inhabitants had kill'd above Five Hundred of the King's Troops, and wounded a greater number, and that the Mareſchal* de Biron *had been Mortally wounded. That in an Encounter near* Poiſſi *the League had obtain'd a great Victory. That in the Battle the fight was long, and the loſs almoſt equal, and that if the* Bearnois *was not dead, he was as good as dead*, *Peter Matthieu* relates that the Count *de Charolois*, wanting to have his Troops encourag'd by the hopes of a ſpeedy Succour, (*g*) *Suborn'd a* Cordelier *who pretended to come from* Bretagne, *and ſaid that he had left the Army ſo near, that it would be ſeen the ſame Day* . . . . *This Artifice increas'd if not the courage, at leaſt the patience of the moſt diſheartned, and that Lie proved uſeful for the little time it was believed. The great deſire of ſeeing the Troops of* Bretagne, *made it believed without any conſideration.* Theſe laſt Words are not needleſs, for they ſhew the Peoples inclinations to concur with ſuch Artifices: They eaſily believe what flatters them, and they make a ſhift to keep Life and Soul together. *Peter Matthieu*'s Marginal Note, deſerves to be Tranſcribed. (*h*) *When an Army or a Town*, ſays he, *is in expectation of relief, they muſt always be told that it is coming, and tho' there be News to the contrary, 'tis the General's prudence to keep up the former notion.* Syphax *ſends word to* Scipio *that he can't aſſiſt him, and that on the contrary he is for Carthage.* Scipio *treats and careſſes his Ambaſſadors, and gives them preſents, in order to make his Souldiers believe that* Syphax *was coming, and that the Ambaſſadors return'd to haſten his departure.* 'Tis with reſpect to theſe Stratagems, that it may eſpecially be ſaid, *nil ſub ſole novum*, *There's nothing new under the Sun.* The Moderns in this point are but the imitators of the Ancients (*i*). Sincerity was never pretended to in the freſh relations of Publick Miſfortunes, and it would be moſt times prejudicial to pretend to it. *Livy* juſtly cenſures the Roman Conſul, who after the fatal Battle of *Cannæ* acknowledged to the Deputies of the *Allies* all the loſs he had ſuſtain'd. (*k*) *Auxit rerum ſuarum ſuique contemptum Conſul nimis detegendo cladem nudandoque.* (*l*) The effect of this plain dealing was, that the Allies concluded from it that *Rome* would never be able to raiſe its Head again, and therefore that they ought to join with *Annibal*. We learn from *Plutarch* (*m*) that an *Athenian* was cruelly tortur'd, for telling an ill piece of News, that was however moſt true. Having heard of *Nicias*'s defeat from a Stranger, who was come a Shore at the Port of *Pyræeus*, he went in all haſte to acquaint the Magiſtrates with that great Misfortune. They ask'd him how he came by it, and becauſe he could not produce his Author, he was puniſh'd (*n*) as a cheat and a diſturber of the Publick Peace: Nor was he deliver'd from the rack, till the truth of his News was known. If he had made a falſe report of a Victory, he would not have ſuffer'd for it: *Stratocles* Action makes me think ſo. He perſuaded the *Athenians* to Offer a Sacriſice to the Gods for the defeat of their Enemies, and yet he knew that the *Athenian* Fleet had been beaten. The News of the diſaſter was at laſt Publiſh'd. They were heartily vex'd with the Impoſtor; but his Anſwer ſatisfied them, and there was an end of it: What injury have I done you? ſaid, he: I have made you live three Days happily. (*o*) [illegible] *Nullo vero pacto arbitror Spartanos toleraturos fuiſſe Stratoclis ſcurrilem inſultationem, qui ſuis ut ob lætum partæ victoriæ nuncium acceptum ſacrificarent perſuaſit: cumque ii de accepta clade vero allato nuncio ſuccenſerent, populum interrogavit ecquid injuriæ paſſi eſſent, qui ipſius opera triduum ſuavius vixiſſent.* It was a kind of advantage over the Enemy, will ſome ſay; the *Athenians* gain'd two or three Days rejoycing by it. They put off the uneaſineſs that the ill News was to give them. But in reality 'tis but a ſmall advantage; 'tis a ſad thing to be brought off, from a falſe perſuaſion that has rais'd a great joy; the weight of adverſity ſits more heavily afterwards. Beſides, Publick Rejoycings for an Imaginary Victory, expoſe a whole Nation to contempt, and make the Enemy very merry. If *Stratocles* had been treated as he deſerved, he had been ſeverely puniſh'd. For a private Perſon to uſe *Cicero*'s method is a thing of no great conſequence: Nay, in ſuch particular Conjunctures true prudence will not ſuffer us to believe any thing too lightly. (*p*) *Ciccero* . . . . . *cum Vatinii morte nunciata cujus parum certus videbatur autor, interim, inquit, uſura fruar.* 'Tis not certain that my Enemy is dead, and perhaps in a few days I ſhall hear, he is alive and well; but in the mean time I will take advantage of the current report I will believe it; 'tis an advantage to me. This is what *Cicero* ſaid; whether it was only a Jeſt, or an ingenuous Declaration of his Thoughts, it matters not. But ſhould a State uſe this method, and take ſome Meaſures upon the falſe News of the defeat of the Enemy, it would ſometimes run the risk of great Miſfortunes. An Hiſtorian relates that there being a report that *Scipio Africanus*, and his Brother, were taken Priſoners, and that *Antiochus* had defeated the Roman Army they commanded, the *Ætolians* immediately ſhook off the Yoke of the Romans. This muſt needs have been a pernicious ſtep. I will relate *Livy*'s Words, which have ſome things ſingular in them. We there find a Remarkable Inſtance of the frauds of Fame: It appears from them that the very Deputies of the *Ætolians* in the Army of the two *Scipio*'s had ſpread that falſe report, and that but one Hiſtorian has mention'd it. (*q*) *Valerius Antias author eſt, rumorem celebrem Romæ fuiſſe, & penè pro certo habitum, recipienai*

(*a*) Hor. epiſt. 2. lib. 1.

(*b*) It is intituled Parallele de trois Lettres Paſtorales de Mr. Jurieu, touchant l'accompliſſement des Propheties.

(*c*) Pag. 14. *he quotes the Paſtoral Letter of January 1695.*

(*d*) d'Aubigné Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, *Book* 2. *ch.* 1. *p. m.* 413. 414.

(*e*) D'Aubigné hiſtoire Univerſ. *tom.* 3. *Book* 3. *ch.* 6. *pag.* 322.

(*f*) Hiſtoire des choſes memorables avenuës en France depuis l'an 1547. juſques au commencement de l'an 1597. *pag.* 720.

(*g*) Pierre Matthieu, hiſt. de Louis XI. *l.* 3. *pag. m.* 144.

(*h*) Id. ib.

(*i*) *See* Ageſilaus.

(*k*) Titus Livius lib. 23. *pag. m.* 395. *He relates the whole diſcourſe of the Conſul to the Deputies of* Campania.

(*l*) Id. ib.

(*m*) Plut. in Nicia ſub finem *pag. m.* 542.

(*n*) [illegible] Pro mendace & civitatis turbatore in rotam deligatus & diu tortus eſt, donec advenerunt qui totam cladem ordine annuntiarunt. *Id. ibid.*

(*o*) Plut. de Repub. gerenda *p.* 799. *F. He mentions it alſo in the Life of* Demetrius *pag.* 893. 894. *and makes him ſay*, [illegible] Quid tandem injuriæ accepiſtis ſi duos dies tranſegiſtis per lætitiam? *This loſt battle is that of* Amorgus.

(*p*) Quintil. Inſt. Orat. lib. *6. cap.* 3. *p. m.* 294.

(*q*) Tit. Liv. lib. 37. *pag. m.* 708.

a true piece of News, believed as long, may occaſion the ruin of it; it can't be thought ſtrange that the firſt relations ſhould be ſo falſified: Politicks, which ſome body has defin'd

di Scipionis adoleſcentis cauſa Cn. L. Scipionem & cum eo P. Africanum in colloquium evocatos regis, & ipſos comprehenſos eſſe, & ducibus captis confeſtim ad caſtra Romana exercitum ductum, eaque expugnata, & deletas omnes copias Romanorum eſſe: ob hoc Ætolos ſuſtuliſſe animos, & abnuiſſe imperata facere, principeſque eorum in Macedoniam & in Dardanos & in Thraciam ad conducenda mercede auxilia profectos: hæc qui nuntiarent Romam, A. Terentium Varronem, & M. Claudium Lepidum ab A. Cornelio proprætore ex Ætolia miſſos eſſe. Subtexit deinde fabulæ huic, legatos Ætolos in ſenatu inter cætera hoc quoque interrogatos eſſe: unde audiſſent imperatores Romanos in Aſia captos ab Antiocho rege, & exercitum deletum eſſe? Ætolos reſpondiſſe, ab ſuis legatis ſe, qui cum conſule fuerint, certiores factos. Rumoris hujus quia neminem alium authorem habeo, neque affirmata res mea opinione ſit, nec pro vana prætermiſſa.

Don't think that *Catherine de Medicis* meant that a falſe News believed three Days can ſave a State, upon all occaſions. Such Maxims as theſe are not without exceptions. A falſe perſuaſion is ſometimes advantageous and ſometimes pernicious: And the ſame may be ſaid of a true one. But here is a thing more generally true, *viz.* That it is of uſe to conceal from the People part of the loſs in Battles and other great misfortunes. This deception is not what we call Myſteries of State, *arcana imperii*, but the common ſteps of Political prudence. No body ought therefore to find fault with a relation, that does not give a true account of a new event. The publick good requires the uſe of Rhetorical Figures in order to extenuate one's loſs and the Enemies advantages. But it were perhaps to be wiſh'd that theſe relations ſhould not be written, or at leaſt that they ſhould not be Printed; for the Impreſſion perpetuates them, and makes them ſerve as a Foundation for Hiſtorians. This brings a great uncertainty upon Hiſtory, and robs Future Ages of the Knowledge of the Truth; which is a great Counterpoize, as ſome think, to the profit and pleaſure that the reading of thoſe daily Prints occaſions in the World. The moſt moroſe muſt acknowledge that this reading affords many uſeful and agreeable inſtructions, and even that it may be inſtructive to ſome Polite writers. But in ſhort, will ſome ſay, there is no ſincerity in thoſe relations: They are rather Pleas than Hiſtories. Now, what's, a Plea? A Diſcourſe, in which a Man ſtudies to ſhew the fair ſide of his own Cauſe, and the foul one of his Adverſary. If they, who ſpeak thus, could find out a good expedient to avoid what they condemn, they would have the beſt invention of all Men. After all, the underſtanding Readers are not deceiv'd by ſuch relations: They eaſily diſtinguiſh ſuch as come neareſt to ſincerity; but 'tis not poſſible to publiſh in thoſe writings all that one knows; ſomething muſt be Sacrific'd to the Publick, and ſometimes to the Domeſtick intereſt. Beſides; Stratagems (a) being allowed in War, the Artifices of News writers muſt be excus'd; for the pains they take to thwart the relations of the Enemy are a kind of War; and therefore their writings have been called *arma Anſerina* by a Political Author. (b) *Hoc ſaltem indictum non abeat, quod auſu temerario quodam,* Relationes ordinarias *ſeu* Novellas, *uti vocantur,* Armis Anſerinis *meis non adjunxerim: unum, ut probe ſciam, tales ſæpe non in* Sibyllarum foliis, *ſed hominum cerebris naſci, creduloſque facile incertæ famæ auram captare: interim tamen etiam temporis filia comprobat, atque hactenus comprobavit, harumce ſparſiones non ſemper* Oreſtis ſomnia *& vanitates eſſe atque fuiſſe. Sparguntur* (1) *enim Victoriæ, deprimiturque pars adverſa. Sic conſtat, quod* Literis à Pompeio *per omnes provincias civitateſque dimiſſis de prælio ad Dyrrachium facto elatius inflatiuſque multo, quam res erat geſta, fama percrebuerit, pulſum fugere Cæſarem, pene omnibus copiis amiſſis;* (2) *qua fama ſane Pompeianos multis partibus auxerat. Finguntur clades ad vulgum (quia mundus, ut dicitur vult decipi) dementandum, ut iſte faveat huic vel illi parti, &c. Ita poſt* cladem Ivrenſem *&c.* The Author adds here what I have ſaid of the Duke of *Maienne*.

Note, That People are ſo us'd to the *Gazettes*, that they would look upon the ſuppreſſion of 'em as an Eclypſe. It would occaſion a kind of publick mourning. The Republick of Learning would loſe many Pieces by it, which are the very Kernel and Cream of the *Gazettes*, and contain ſome Rules for a profitable reading of 'em. Obſerve the following paſſage. (c) *Cum vero omnes novi quid ſciendi mira flagremus cupiditate, certaque juxta ac incerta avidiſſime arripientes, quiſque pro voto interpretamur, itaque* NOVELLAS *undique conquirimus, ut rerum geſtarum, imo & gerandarum (tanta enim ſcribentium vel credentium vanitas eſt) cognitione ſitientem animum expleamus. Hinc anxia curioſitate legimus aut rimamur, quid Novellæ apportent* Noſtrates, Jenenſes, Lipſienſes, Norinbergenſes, Hamburgenſes, *imo &* Pariſinæ, Hafnienſes, Amſtelodamenſes, Bruxellenſes, *aut aliæ, neſcio unde accerſita: Ut autem varia ſint illorum, qui eas legunt vel mirantur, ingenia, ita fieri haud poteſt, quin majorem ex illis fructum alius, alius minorem accipiat, quò igitur cum Voluptate, quam novitas ſuâ ſponte conciliat, Utilitas etiam jungatur, ideo inſigni cum commodo adhiberi poterit Nobiliſſimi & Conſultiſſimi Dn.* AHASUERI FRITSCHII *Diſcurſus,* De Novellarum, quas vocant *Neue Zeitungen* hodierno uſu & abuſu. Imp. Jenæ 1676. 4. *Itemque elegantiſſime docti* CHRISTIANI WEISII *in illuſtri ad Salam Auguſtæo Polit. Prof.* Schediaſma curioſum, de Lectione Novellarum, quantum ſcil. illæ uſum habeant in Geographicis, Hiſtoricis & Politicis, imò quovis curioſorum genere. *Cui etiam addidit* Specimen, quaſi Nucleum Novellarum, ſcil. ab Anno 1660. ad ann. uſque 1676. Weiſſenfelſæ anno eod. exc.

I have read ſomewhere in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, that it were to be wiſh'd that ſome body was engag'd to obſerve at the end of every Year, all the falſe reports that would have been ſpread. This would not be neceſſary with reſpect to all of 'em; there are ſome that the *Gazettes* themſelves take notice that: ſuch an employment would have been more neceſſary when daily News were not Printed. If it had been eſtabliſh'd at *Rome* when the *Turks* took *Rhodes*, we ſhould know abundance of falſities that were then vented in *Italy*. Some of them may be ſeen in the Letters which *Ruſcelli* has Collected: We know by thoſe Letters that the 10th. of *December* 1522. the Noveliſts of *Rome*, (d) gave out that the Siege of *Rhodes* was rais'd. The 28. of *Feb.* 1523. they gave out that it was not certain that *Soliman* (e) had taken the Town; and yet it had capitulated the 22. of *December* 1522. But who will wonder at this News, when he knows that it was given out at *Padua* as a certainty, and even from *Rome*, that the Pope had been kill'd with a Thunder-bolt on St. *Peter*'s Day, and that all the Citizens had taken up Arms. 'Tis only by chance that we know that ſuch a thing was reported. 'Tis mention'd in a Letter of *Matthew Boſſus*; without which probably we ſhould have known nothing of it. (*f*) *Hac ſub hora Auguſtinæ ad te dum ſcribo, ecce rumor aures implet civitatis, ſolemni Petri Apoſtoli die, paulo poſt vigeſimam horam, Alexandrum Romanæ Eccleſiæ magnum Pontificem ictu fulminis interiiſſe, & de perjucundis ſuis Pilcatis unum tactum, pariter ſuum dominum parentaſſe, populares in armis eſſe, vias urbis obliquas parum tutas, Curiales quati timoribus, Hiſpanos infeſtos & hoſtes haberi.* The Kings of *Spain* and *France*, and the Duke of *Alba* were reported all at once to be dead in *Holland* in 1580. This falſity was preſerved by chance in a Letter of *Juſtus Lipſius* (g). A compilation of ſuch things would be uſeful.

MR. DE *Vigneul Marvill* has made good obſervations on the *Gazette*. Here is one of his reflections. " (h) There is but one thing prejudicial to the writer of it, which is, that he is not abſolute Maſter of his Work, and being ſubject to Superior Orders, he cannot ſpeak the truth with that ſincerity which Hiſtory requires. If this point was granted him we ſhould have no need of other Hiſtorians." The latter part of this paſſage is ſomewhat Hyperbolical; but it is certain that Author mentions the main cauſe of the miſchief: The Weekly News writers, or be it any other Period longer or ſhorter, dare not ſpeak all they know. It would coſt them too dear; for not to mention the puniſhment they might fear from their Superiors, their News would not ſell well, and they would make themſelves defin'd (C) *ars non tam regendi quam fallendi hominem*, will have it ſo. But Men ought to be cur'd of their error, which they never can be with a good grace: and if ſome are, this does little Service, ſo many Pens having already canoniz'd the firſt reports, that People would at leaſt be divided in their opinions about them.

(a) Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirat? *Virgil. Æn. l.* 2. *v.* 390.

(b) *Arma Anſerina ſive armatura epiſtolaris à Doctore militari Tacito ſubminiſtrata, & in diſſertatione Politica diducta à* G. C. W. pag. 19.

(1) *James Hurault des Offices d'Etat, fol.* 110.

(2) *J. Cæſ. de* Bello Civil. *lib.* 3. p. m. 284.

(c) *M.*
Hertgen,
Bibliot
German
ca,
ſitia
forum
rum Ge
manica
parte 5.
ſub fin.

(d) *'Tis*
thought
that
the ſuc-
cours w
preſent
liſ.
Siege
raiſed,
the repor
gers.
me Sig
Letter
Mark A
tony Sic
li writt
from *R*
the 1.
Decemb
1522.
86. of t
Epiſtles
of the
Princes
Collecte
by *Ruſc*
and tra
lated by
Belleforeſt

(e) *See the ſame Letter fol.* 85.
It ſhew
large
People
ceive the
ſelves in
things
which th
deſire.

(*f*) Ma
thæus B
ſus par
3. *ep.* 8.

(g) M
Regis H
paniæ,
Galliæ &
Ducis A
bani nu
ciata no
bis ſub
dem te
pus. Ve
fama ſit
in uno
ſaltem
triade i
Lipſius
piſt. 4.
Theodor
Lemm
pag. 9
dit. Lu
Bat. 16
It is da
the 1.
Decemb
1580.

(h) Vigneul
Marvil
Mélan
d'hiſt.
tom. 2.
198. *Du*
Edit.

'Tis not enough to compare theſe baſe Writers to (a) Harpies that defile whatever they touch; it may be ſaid they are Executioners that diſtort the Neck, Legs and Arms of Hiſtorical Facts, and even ſometimes cut them off, and apply prepoſterous ones in their room; and this even at the very moment that an event ſprings out of the boſom of its Cauſes, and the exploits of a Battle are juſt born:

(b) *Modo primos incipientes*
Edere vagitus, & adhuc a matre rubentes.

'Twas formerly ſaid of the Muſes that they were the Proſtitutes even of Slaves; which may eſpecially be affirm'd of her that preſides (c) over Hiſtory: She's a true *ſcortum triobolare*, that plies upon the High-ways, and ſells her ſelf to the firſt comer for a morſel of Bread. Her bargain with the Book-ſellers is much beneath that of *Baudoin* and *du Ryer*, whoſe ſtated price was (d) *to tranſlate for thirty Pence, or a Crown a Sheet, and to write Verſes for four Livres a Hundred, when they were great ones, and for 40 when they were Small.*

Ah! (e) pudor extinctus, doctæque infamia turbæ
Sub titulo proſtant, & queis genus ab Jove ſummo
Res hominum ſupra evectæ & nullius egentes,
Aſſe merent vili, ac ſancto ſe corpore fœdant.
Scilicet aut Menæ faciles parere ſuperbo,
Aut nutu Polycleti, & parca laude beatæ.
Uſque adeo maculas ardent in fronte recentes,
Heſternique Getæ vincla, & veſtigia flagri.

Lucian has unwittingly drawn the Picture of our Age, ſpeaking of a War, which had produced ſuch a multitude of Hiſtorians, that one would have thought it was a faſhionable Trade. He compares it to the (*f*) epidemical diſtemper of the *Abderitæ*. We have ſeen, continues he, the truth of the Proverb, that War is the Mother of all things. (*g*) Ἀφ' οὗ δὴ τὰ ἐν ποσὶ ταῦτα κεκίνηται, ὁ πόλεμος ὁ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ τραῦμα, καὶ αἱ συνεχεῖς νῖκαι, οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐχ ἱστορίαν συγγράφει. μᾶλλον δὲ Θουκυδίδαι, καὶ Ἡρόδοτοι, καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἅπαντες. καὶ ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀληθὲς ἄρ' ἦν ἐκεῖνο, τὸ, Πόλεμος ἁπάντων πατὴρ, εἴ γε καὶ συγγραφέας τοσούτους ἀνέφυσεν, ὑπὸ μιᾷ τῇ πληγῇ. *Ex quo res præſentes moveri cœperunt, puta bellum iſtud contra barbaros, & acceptum in Armenia vulnus, & continuæ illæ victoriæ, nemo non hiſtoriam conſcribit. Imò vero Thucydides, Herodoti, & Xenophontes nobis facti ſunt omnes. Et ut apparet, verum fuit illud, Bellum omnium pater eſt, quandoquidem hiſtoriarum ſcriptores tam multos una hac plaga procreavit.* The Ancient *Romans* had infinitely more reſpect for the dignity of Hiſtory; for before *Pompey*'s time no body pretended to write it but ſuch as were eminent for their Birth and Merit, and when this great Man's Tutor undertook to write the Hiſtory of his Diſciple's Father, and of his Diſciple, ſome ſort of inconveniency was found in that Novelty, as *Suetonius* inſinuates. Yet this Innovator had Senſe and Learning, and had taught Rhetorick, but he was a Man of no Birth. He had been made free. That was the grievance. (*h*) *Lucius Octacilius Pilitus ſerviſſe dicitur; atque etiam oſtiarius, veteri more, in catena fuiſſe: donec ob ingenium ac ſtudium literarum manumiſſus, accuſanti patrono ſubſcripſit. Deinde Rhetoricam profeſſus, Cnæum Pompejum Magnum docuit; patris ejus res geſtas, nec minus ipſius, compluribus libris expoſuit: primus omnium libertinorum, ut Cornelius Nepos opinatur, ſcribere hiſtoriam orſus, non niſi ab honeſtiſſimo quoque ſcribi ſolitam.*

What

themſelves odious as ill affected Perſons, and in a manner Enemies to the Publick Good. No body will have them to lie groſly and dully for the ſake of their Country; but when they do it ingeniouſly and with conjectures and reflections equally witty, flattering and malicious, they are prais'd, admir'd and lov'd, and every body reads their Works. So that 'tis not for nothing that they follow the example of that Ancient Comick Poet, who only deſign'd to pleaſe the People.

Poëta (i) cum primum animum ad ſcribendum appulit,
Id ſibi negoti credidit ſolum dari,
Populo ut placerent quas feciſſet fabulas.

(C) *Politicks which ſome body has defin'd* Artem non tam regendi, quam fallendi hominem.] Dr. *Patin* mentions this definition after having a little ridiculed the *Jubilees*. (*k*) *Thus you ſee new factions in* Rome, *that will give us a new Pope, and then* pro jucundo adventu ad Papatum, *a new Jubilee. The new Wine of this preſent Year, which is a liquor drawn from the Vine, will produce more ſenſible effects in Mens Heads than this new devotion, which in its kind, returns but too often,* ab aſſuetis non afficimur: *But the World is ſo made,* populus vult decipi. *The late* John Camus *Biſhop of* Belley, *a Learned worthy Prelate, if ever there was any, ſaid, that* Politica ars eſt non tam regendi quàm fallendi homines: *I heard him ſay this once in his Chamber in* 1632. *and I have often remembred it ſince.* This Letter of *Patin* is dated the 13 of *December* 1669. He had not related the Biſhop's words in that manner in a Letter of the 8. of *May* 1665. Here is the whole paſſage: (*l*) *Six writers, who got their livelihood by writing News have been put in the* Baſtille, *within theſe three days,* hominum genus audaciſſimum, mendaciſſimum, avidiſſimum ut faciant rem, &c. *They fill their News with things they ought not to write. They have Printed here and cried about the Streets,* the Bull of our Holy Father the Pope againſt the *Janſeniſts, and three days after it was forbidden, and even,* ne quid deeſſet ad rationem veræ fabulæ, *a report was Publiſh'd and ſpread that the Commiſſary was ordered to Impriſon the Printer, if he had been found. The late Biſhop of* Belley, *who was an incomparable Man,* told me in 1632. Politica eſt ars tam regendi quam fallendi homines, *and this is no new invention, it is the ſame Play acted over. the ſame Comedy, and Farce; but the Actors are New: The worſt of it is that this Play will laſt a long time, and Mankind ſuffer too much by it.* There's a manifeſt difference betwixt the 1. and 2. Definition of Politicks: the ſecond is more honeſt than the firſt; but neither of them turns to the diſhonour of the Maſters of that Art, ſince their aim in what they do is the Publick Good, which they can't arrive to without imitating Phyſicians with reſpect to their Patients. If you would know *Patin*'s Judgment about the *Gazette*, read this (*m*). *They do nothing here that's good for any thing except the* Gazette *every* Saturday, *which is a very diverting and comfortable*

(*f*) Τὸ Ἀβδηριτικὸν ἐκεῖνο πάθος καὶ νῦν τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν πεπαιδευμένων περιελήλυθεν. Abderiticum illud malum etiam hoc tempore pleroſque doctorum invaſit. *Lucian. quomodo ſit conſcribenda hiſtoria pag. m.* 658. *tom.* 1.

(*g*) Id. ib.

(*h*) Sueton. de clar. Rhetor. *cap.* 3.

(*l*) Idem, *letter* 356. *pag.* 61. *of the ſame Volume.*

(*m*) Id. *letter* 40. *pag.* 173. 174. *of the* 1. *tome. It is dated from* Paris *the* 7. *of* June 1650.

table

IX. *The abuſe juſt now mention'd favours* Scepticiſm *in point of* Hiſtory.

What would become of the Enemies of Hiſtorical Scepticiſm, if this miſchief had prevail'd in the time of Ancient *Greece* and Old *Rome?* They are to be congratulated becauſe Printing is ſo modern an invention, and they may juſtly exclaim (a) *bona Hercule publica iſta licentia poſt caſum imperii Romani inventa eſt.* For if the Ancient *Greeks, Romans, Perſians, Carthaginians,* &c. had done what is now practiſed, they would have much ado to prove any thing to us, even with the help of Inſcriptions and Medals, which the Moderns boldly make uſe of to ſatisfy their caprices, without building upon any real Fact.

X. *Modern Satyrs againſt ſome* Gallantries. *Holland* complained of without reaſon.

Before I go further I muſt obſerve that there have been ſuch Men as *Caſſius Severus* at all times. We have ſeen in our Days a Man of Quality, who not content to write ſome Relations diſadvantageous to ſome Court Ladies, did not ſpare, (D) as it is ſaid, the Royal Family, and even the Head of it: Which ſhews that one may truly ſay of Satyrs, what *Malherbe* ſaid of Death, *That the Guard that waits at the barriers of the* Louvre *does not ſecure Kings from it:*

Que la Garde qui veille aux barrieres du Louvre
N'en defend pas les Rois.

This Lord has been wiſer and happier than the Satyriſt of *Auguſtus*'s Court. The latter not amending in his exile, ſo worſted his condition that at laſt he had ſcarce wherewithal to cover his Nakedneſs; but he whom I ſpeak of, came off cheap,

(a) *This is a Parody of* Seneca Præfat. l. 5. controv.

---

table thing, for as much as this Pratler never tells us bad News, tho' we perceive a great deal at this ſeaſon. Remember what *Petronius* ſays, *Mundus univerſus exercet hiſtrioniam,* and theſe Verſes of *Politian* againſt ſuch as condemn'd the Plays that were Acted in Colleges.

Sed (b) qui nos damnant, hiſtriones ſunt maximi.
Nam Curios ſimulant, vivunt bacchanalia.
Hi ſunt præcipue quidam clamoſi, leves,
Cucullati, lignipedes, cincti funibus:
Superciliosum, incurvicervicum pecus,
Quique ab aliis habitu & cultu diſſentiunt,
Triſteſque vultu vendunt ſanctimonias:
Cenſuram ſibi quandam, & tyrannidem occupant:
Pavidamque plebem territant minaciis.

(b) Politianus in Prologo in Plauti Menaechmos, ad calcem *epiſt. 15. lib. 7. fol. m. 165. verſo.*

Take notice that the Definition, which the Biſhop of *Bellay* gave of Politicks, would ſignify a very great fault, if it denoted the mutual deceits of Sovereigns. They are not ſo rare as they ſhould be. I have read within theſe three Days a Thought that is very ſprightly: 'Tis this, * *The Politicians have a Language peculiar to themſelves: Words and Phraſes with them don't ſignify the ſame thing with other Men. I don't know whether the Gentlemen of the French Academy have comprehended Politicks in the number of the Arts and Sciences of which they have given us a Dictionary. This in my opinion, would be neceſſary. For example, in Terms of Politicks, to Swear upon the Holy Goſpels to obſerve ſuch or ſuch a treaty, ſignifies ſometimes barely that one Swears it, but not that one will obſerve it; Nay, it ſometimes ſignifies, that nothing ſhall be perform'd. Moſt People don't underſtand this Language; but the Politicians underſtand it well, and take their meaſures accordingly.* I add that if the Gentlemen of the French Academy, would give us an Univerſal Dictionary of all Arts, they would cut out for themſelves an endleſs Work. They would daily diſcover new Arts that have Terms of a particular ſignification. The Art of Weekly relations is one of them; the Art of Controverſy is another. Words don't go there in their uſual Senſe: You ſee Pople who charge one another with horrid Doctrines; they reply, and rejoyn, and ſtill reciprocally find their Adverſaries Doctrine more and more abominable (†). This complaint appears almoſt in every Page; and allarms the Readers as if there was danger, that without a ſpeedy remedy this Gangrene will ſpread its Infection upon the whole Body. Such as are not us'd to this Style conceive a thouſand ſcruples; they fear they have diſobey'd Saint *Paul*'s Precept, (c) *a Man that is an Heretick reject*; for they have Converſed with the Conteſting Parties. Who would have believed, ſay they, that ſuch Doctors who have eat for a long time the Bread of the Orthodox, ſhould have nouriſh'd ſuch Monſters in their Hearts? One does not know whom to truſt to. Either of them or perhaps both muſt needs be diſguis'd Wolves rather than Shepherds. But have a little patience; ſtay till ſome expert Arbitrators initiated in that Language have reconcil'd the Parties, and you'll find thoſe Words ſignify nothing leſs than what you believed. The Accuſers on both ſides will be declar'd Orthodox: They ſhall not be cenſur'd, but only admoniſh'd to correct ſome improper expreſſions which had eſcap'd them. 'Tis ſuppos'd then that in reality their Mutual Accuſations ran only upon this, and that therefore the words *Pernicious Hereſy* and the like, ſignify with them only an ill choice of words. We may very well wiſh that the Gentlemen of the French Academy would not forget in a Supplement to the Dictionary of Arts, the proper ſignification of the words *Impious, Heretick, deſtroyer of the foundations of the Goſpel, Favourer of the* Socinians, &c. when they are to be found in the Writings of a Theological Proceſs; for otherwiſe our Mother Tongue will grow barbarous to moſt Readers.

(*) Lettres hiſtoriques, September 1696. *pag.* 251.

(†) *A ſmall piece of* Dorſcheus *Profeſſor of Divinity at* Straſburg, *intituled* Latrocinium Famæ Theologorum, *affords ſome inſtances of this. To which one might add many others.*

(c) Tit. *chap.* 3. *v.* 10.

(D) *Did not ſpare, as 'tis ſaid, the Royal Family and even the head of it.*] I add, *as 'tis ſaid,* becauſe though common Fame has aſcribed to the ſame Author *l' Hiſtoire amoureuſe des Gaules,* and *les amours du Palais Royal,* this Author diſown'd the latter. For 'tis of this Book we are to underſtand what he wrote to Mr. *de Saint Aignan* in theſe words: (d) *My Enemies ſeeing me in the* Baſtille, *thought my Impriſonment would not permit me to defend my ſelf, and that they might ſafely accuſe me; they therefore told the King that I had written againſt him. But his Majeſty who never condemns a Man before he be heard, ſurpriz'd them ſtrangely by ſending the* Lieutenant *Criminal to examine me.... (e) After having ſhewn me the Hiſtory written with my own Hand, I mean the* Original *I have been ſpeaking of, he ask'd me whether I had written nothing againſt the King. I anſwered that I was much ſurpriz'd to have ſuch a queſtion put to me. He told me he had orders to do it: I anſwer'd that I had not, and that there was no probability that having ſerved 27. Years without having receiv'd any favour, being twelve Years Maſter de Camp, General of the Light Horſe, and expecting every day ſome recompence from his Majeſty, I ſhould be wanting in my reſpect to him: That to deſtroy this probability my own writing or unexceptionable witneſſes ſhould be produced againſt me. That if either of 'em could be produced in the leaſt thing contrary to the reſpect I ow'd to the King and all the Royal Family, I would be willing to loſe my Head: but that I alſo beſeech'd his Majeſty to appoint the ſame puniſhment for thoſe, who ſhould accuſe me without being able to convict me. (f) From that time having not ſeen the Lieutenant Criminal nor any other Judge, I have been perſuaded that ſo black and ſo ridiculous a calumny had made no impreſſion upon the King, whoſe mind is ſo clear ſighted and hard to be ſupriz'd.* What he ſays, in another place of the late Dutcheſs of *Orleans,* is an argument that the chief Perſons of the Court did not believe him guilty of this ſecond Head of Accuſation. *The Death of Madam* Henrietta *of* England, ſays he, (g) *was a new misfortune to me: She had done me many good Offices with his Majeſty, and I hoped for others from her. For beſides that ſhe had joyn'd to a great deal of Wit, ſuch a carriage as made her beloved and reſpected by every body, She was naturally generous and kind.* Let us admire the untowardneſs of the publick, who ſtill perſiſt to believe that theſe two Pieces were written by the Count *de Buſſy.* Nothing can make 'em believe the contrary, neither the paſſages before cited, nor the difference that is to be found betwixt theſe two pieces, which is manifeſt to good Judges: For there's

(d) *The* Comte de Buſſy R butin, *uſage de advertis* pag. 27 Dutch Edit.

(e) Ibid. pag. 27

(f) Ibid. pag. 27

(g) Ibid. pag. 29

cheap, and applied himſelf (*D*△) *to things more worthy of his fine Wit and Charming Pen.*

It would be an an unjuſt thing to impute to him the bad imitations, of which he was only the Accidental Cauſe. But it muſt be confeſt this Maxim has been well verified,

there's incomparably more Art and Genius in the firſt than in the ſecond; the latter hath none of *Petronius's* thoughts like the firſt. The Journaliſt of the Royal Society was not ignorant of thoſe imitations of *Petronius*. The following words are to be found in the *Latin* Tranſlation of his Journal, of the Month of *Auguſt*, 1669. (a) *Non ita pridem amoroſam* Byſſi Galliarum hiſtoriam *cum* Petronio Arbitro, *ex quo illum duas ejus epiſtolas ſumpſiſſe mihi dicebatur, conferens, inter alias amoris blanditias, librum percurrens id inveni, quod mihi non parum de hoc* limacum *ſubjecto ſatisfecit, nimirum quod eadem animalia, ſicut & alia natura miranda, ut* truffi & fungi, *ſicut & procul dubio* coſſi, *vel magni quercuum vermes, aliæ* Romanæ *deliciæ, ab antiquis veneri incitandæ uſurparentur; hic enim legere licet, quo pacto miſer & debilis amator ſe præparat* cochlearum cervicium *munimento.* I don't know why this Count inſerted in his Hiſtory a moſt biting raillery againſt Mr. *Menage*, who reveng'd himſelf by Six *Latin* Verſes, as offenſive as can be written. For the reſt I don't believe what *Patin* ſays, in (b) his Letter of the 28. of *December*, 1665. (c) *Mr.* de Buſſi-Rabutin, *by the King's Command hath laid down his Poſt, and is removed from the* Baſtille *to the Houſe of the Mad-men, where he has two Chambers.* Mr. *de Buſſy* ſays, that upon the report of the King's firſt Phyſician and firſt Surgeon, *he was ſet at liberty to be cured in Paris*: Which is more credible. The grief he expreſs'd for having Compoſed the *Hiſtoire amoureuſe des Gaules* ſerved for an encomium in the Speech of the *Academiſt* who Succeeded him: 'twas the Abbot *Bignon*. (d) *He praiſed him nicely, and ſhew'd that if the work, which had occaſion'd all his misfortunes, deſerved the cenſure of all wiſe Men, the repentance which he had manifeſted for having made it, could not be ſufficiently praiſed.*

(D△) *And applied himſelf to things more worthy of his fine Wit and charming Pen*] There was a current report that he was writing the Hiſtory of *France*. Afterwards it was ſaid that he confin'd himſelf to the Hiſtory of *Lewis* XIV. But the event has ſhewed that the firſt report was falſe, and that the ſecond was not very well grounded; for if this Count had writ in earneſt the Hiſtory of *Lewis* XIV. we ſhould have ſeen a better Work upon that Subject, than that which came out in 1700. of which there is an extract in the *nouvelles* (e) *de la Republique des Lettres*. This extract will not permit us to doubt that this Work of his was compos'd with the utmoſt negligence. He went about it doubtleſs when he was weary of other buſineſs, and little cared to be well informed of what he writ, or to wait till the firſt News of his Village were confirm'd. He threw his matters in haſte upon the Paper, and took no pains to correct them afterwards: We can't give a Reaſon that is leſs, than this, to his diſadvantage, for what he ſays of the paſſage of the *Boyne*. All *Europe* knows that King *James* quitted that Poſt, and return'd to *France* a few Days after, and that King *William* Succeſsfully paſſed that River, and afterwards made all the ſteps of a Conqueror. And yet Mr. *de Buſſy* affirms (*f*) that the Count *de Lauzun*, who commanded the Troops of *France*, won the Battle of the *Boyne*. Had he ſpoken thus out of flatery, and againſt his Conſcience, he would be more to Blame; 'Tis therefore explaining the thing in the leaſt rigorous Senſe, to ſay he was deceiv'd by ſome Country-reports, and that caring little for this work, he did not mind whether this paſſage was right or wrong.

It had been better to have ſaid that in his diſgrace he writ and received many Letters, and compoſed the Memoirs of his Life; for the works that were publiſh'd after his Death, ſhew that this was his chief imployment. To this muſt be added the care he took to make his own Hiſtory ſerve for an inſtruction to his Children. His tract (*g*) *concerning the uſe of Adverſities*, ſhews that this was the end he propos'd to himſelf. 'Tis a little Book full of good Morality and Religion. His Memoirs in 2 Volumes Publiſh'd in 1697. are curious and well written. His Letters Printed in 4 Volumes the ſame Year deſerve the ſame Encomium. They would have pleas'd more, if upon good conſiderations many proper Names had not been left out, *and many paſſages which affected the reputation of certain Perſons.* Perhaps ſometime or other there will come out an Edition of 'em without any alteration or with a Key to open it. There are many Letters which ſhew that the Count *de Buſſy* wean'd himſelf by degrees from the World, that he was ſenſible of the emptineſs of it, and that at laſt he was wholly intent upon his Salvation. The beſt Chriſtians in the World could not be more charm'd than he was, (*h*) with Mr. *Abadie's* excellent work concerning the truth of the Chriſtian Religion. But his Converſion was ſomewhat ſlow and gradual. He a long time look'd behind him like *Lot's* Wife, and tried all the means that the moſt obſtinate deſire of returning to Court could put an ambitious Man upon, who knew not how to live deprived of it. The ill ſucceſs of his Petitions was a terrible mortification to him, but did not diſcourage him from preparing others on every occaſion. This we learn from the writings which his Heirs have publiſh'd: Had they ſuppreſs'd theſe Monuments of his impatience, they had Skreen'd his Memory from the Cenſure of ſome People, who can't pardon a brave Man his want of courage when he is deprived of his imployments. 'Tis not enough, ſay they, to be courageous in a Battle, a Man muſt alſo expreſs a great firmneſs under the loſs of his Eſtate. They wiſh Count *de Rabutin* had imitated thoſe Heroes of Ancient *Rome*, who encountered a Sentence of Baniſhment with contempt and indifference; and they think it ſtrange that being diſgrac'd like *Ovid*, for ſome tracts of Love, he ſhould have alſo imitated that Poet's Conduct in his diſgrace: every body knows what repeated complaints *Ovid* ſent to *Rome*, in order to be recall'd. That vaſt number of Poems full of ſupplications and humble lamentations ſhew more Wit than Virtue or Courage. But have thoſe, who cenſure the Count *de Buſſy*, taſted of a Court Life? Do they know what habits and diſtempers are contracted in it? If they did, they would perhaps be more indulgent to him. However he at laſt ſubmitted to the Providence of God. Read what he writ the 26. of *Jan.* 1680. (*i*) "It was a long time before I could believe "it was for my good, (as my Ghoſtly Fathers "told me) that Providence laid theſe Calamities "upon me. But at laſt I have been convinc'd of "it, for theſe three Years; not only for my good "in the other World, but alſo for my repoſe in "this. GOD does already reward me in ſome "meaſure for my pains by my reſignation, and I "ſay at preſent of this good Maſter what in my "fooliſh Youth I ſaid of Love. (*k*)

"*Il paye en un moment un ſiecle de travaux,*
"*Et tous les autres biens ne valent pas ſes maux.*"

He writ this to Madam *de Sevigni*, who a long time before had communicated a like thought to him. Theſe are her words: "(*l*) Don't you think I converſe with devout People as much as I can? 'Tis "indeed becauſe I find them more happy both in "their Life and at their Death, and I would gladly "partake of their condition. There is nothing like "Devotion for an unfortunate Perſon; it not only "ſolaces troubles, but converts them into pleaſures. This confirms what I have ſaid (*m*) in the *Penſées ſur les Cometes* and in the Remark Q of the Article *Epicurus*.

Note, That tho' this Count's *Poſthumous* works are fine and good; yet his *Hiſtoire amoureuſe des Gaules* will make him more talk'd of than any other Book. His deſtiny in this is like that of *Boccacio*. See his Article.

The falſhood above mention'd concerning the paſſage of the *Boyne*, calls to my Mind Father *Londel's Faſti*, where we find theſe words on the 11. of *July* 1690. *The Battle of the* Boyne *in* Ireland: Schomberg *is kill'd at the Head of the Engliſh.* This is a meer fraud, which can't be excus'd by the reaſon I have alleg'd to leſſen the Count *de Buſſy's* fault; for this work of Father *du Londel* was made with attention, and was doubtleſs poliſh'd and reviſed: theſe ſort of writings are only commendable for a great exactneſs. And therefore it will be no raſh Judgment to affirm that the Au-

thor

(a) *Acta Philoſophica menſis Auguſti 1669. pag. 84. edit. Lipſ. 1675.*

(b) *'Tis the 388.*

(c) Patin *tom. 3. pag. 153. He had ſaid in his 354. Letter: Mr de* Buſſy Rabutin *has been this day (18. of* April *1665.) committed to the* Baſtille, *for writing a Libel at which the Powers are offended. The Prince complained of it to the King, who has cauſed him to be arreſted.*

(d) Buſſy ubi ſupra *pag.* 281.

(e) Mercure Galant *of* June 1693. *The Count* de Buſſy *died of an Apoplexy at* Autun *the* 9 *of* April 1693. *The Abbot* Bignon *Succeeded him in the* French *Accademy in* June *following.*

(e) February 1700. *pag.* 162. &ſeq.

(f) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republ. des lettres *ibid. pag.* 168.

(g) *It was Printed in* 1694. *and Re-printed with the Author's Memoirs in* 1697.

(h) *See the* 2. Vol. *of his Letters pag.* 44. 128. 131. 135. 138. 142. *Dutch Edit.*

(i) Buſſi Rabutin, *Letter* 135. *of the* 3. *part pag.* 328. *Dutch Edit.*

(k) Buſſi Rabutin's. *Letters* 3. *part, Letter* 200. (*dated the* 14. *of* April 1672. *pag.* 361.

(l) *There is no ſweetneſs in a ſinful courſe of Life, that can be compar'd to the Sweetneſs, which a devout Soul enjoys.* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes pag. 570.

(m) *They are mention'd in the* Nou velles la Rep lique lettre *Febru.* 1699 223.

verified, DΔΔ) *that bad examples riſe higher and higher without ſtint.* How many Hiſtories have been Publiſh'd againſt the principal Perſons of the Court of *France*, *Bruſſels*, *&c.* with the Names, Surnames and qualities of every one of 'em, with the moſt ſecret Circumſtances, and Diſcourſes, and an Hundred things of ſuch a nature, that it was impoſſible they ſhould come to the writers knowledge? *Gabriel Naudé* might upon this occaſion ſay with better grounds what he ſaid (*a*) of *Procopius's* Secret Hiſtory, of *Matthew Paris's* Hiſtory, of the ſcandalous Chronicle of *Lewis* XI. of the Memoirs of the League, *&c.* Here one might reaſonably cry out,

> *Quod* (*b*) *genus hoc hominum, quæve hunc tam barbara morem*
> *Permittit patria?*

But this does not concern the Republick of *Holland*, ſince it is not true that it permits that the moſt Illuſtrious Families ſhould be thus barbarouſly abuſed. That Republick anſwered the following words, in 1665. to the Biſhop of *Munſter*, who complain'd amongſt other things of ſome writings. *Quidquid vero ſeu de hoc ſeu de aliis negotiis in noſtris terris typis divulgatum eſt, de iis aliud nihil dicemus niſi illud ſolum, non tantum hic, verum paſſim in aliis quoque regionibus ægre admodum frenari & inhiberi poſſe typographicas licentias quantumvis diligens fuerit cautela; noſque ipſi contra iſtiuſmodi abuſus ſevera ſæpe promulgaverimus edicta, eademque ſævis & rigidis confirmaverimus executionibus.* Theſe words contain'd in a Letter of their High Mightineſs, dated the 29th. of *September* 1665. and Printed with Licence, may ſerve for a general anſwer to all (*D*ΔΔΔ) complaints of this nature.

It

thor pitched deſignedly upon Equivocal Words, not to own the diſadvantage of his Party, and to conceal from the Reader the true Succeſs of that Battle. He is not contented to ſuppreſs the moſt Eſſential Circumſtance, which is to ſhew whether the Victory was doubtful, or whether it declar'd entirely for this or that Nation; but he has artificially ſlipt in a true Circumſtance, which is only fit to make one conclude that King *James* had the Honour of that Day. *Schomberg* falling at the Head of the *Engliſh* is a Principle, from which an Hundred Thouſand Readers would draw this Conſequence, *Therefore King* William *was repuls'd*. Nothing can excuſe this Author: Inſincerity, ſhame or the fear of diſpleaſing made him ſpeak as he did. Notwithſtanding this fault and ſome others (*c*) of the ſame nature his Book is good, curious, uſeful, and convenient, and of a fine invention. The like will be compoſed in (*d*) other Countries, but of whatever Sect or Nation a Man be, he ſhould get his Book read by ſome indifferent Perſon well Vers'd in the Art of qualifying things; for prejudices do not ſuffer things to be exactly defin'd. A meer Fight is call'd a Battle: The loſs of a Battle is term'd a Repulſe: A Battle is Styled an Encounter. The worſt is, that ſome call a Defeat what others call a Victory. (*e*) The Definitions of theſe things are no leſs different among Hiſtorians, than thoſe of Doctrines amongſt Controverſiſts: And as that which is Orthodox in one Religion is Heretical in another; that, which is a Battle won in the Hiſtorians of one Nation, is a Battle loſt in thoſe of another. 'Tis a very Ancient abuſe, for which we ſee no Remedy.

(*D*ΔΔ) *Bad examples riſe higher and higher without ſtint.*] *Velleius Paterculus* well expreſſes this Maxim, having related that *Tiberius Gracchus* was Maſſacred without any Trial. This was, ſays he, (*f*) the beginning of the Butchering of the Citizens in *Rome* it ſelf; from this Fountain ſprung the impunity of Maſſacres. *Quod haud mirum eſt*, adds he (*g*), *non enim ibi conſiſtunt exempla, unde cœperunt; ſed quamlibet in tenuem recepta tramitem, latiſſime evagandi ſibi viam faciunt: &, ubi ſemel recto deerratum eſt, in præceps pervenitur: nec quiſquam ſibi putat turpe, quod alii fuit fructuoſum.* "And no wonder; for "bad examples ſtop not where they begin: "but tho' the path through which they get in be "never ſo narrow, as ſoon as they are admitted "they make a new way, and extend themſelves on "all ſides without any bounds. Thus when a "Man once quits the right Road, he commonly "arrives to the brink of a Precipice: and nobody thinks that can be a diſgrace to him which "proves advantageous to another." The ſame Maxim may be ſeen in an Oration of *Julius Cæſar* related by *Salluſt*. He there ſhews that all (*h*) bad examples ariſe from a good beginning, becauſe the innovations, which at firſt are good and uſeful, quickly give occaſion to diſorders, that continually increaſe. To this may be applied the thought of *Juvenal*: (*i*) that Man never keeps within the bounds of permiſſion.

(*D*ΔΔΔ) *May ſerve as a general Anſwer to all Complaints of this Nature.*] And yet there are very few *French* Roman Catholicks, but ſay that the States are not diſpleaſed with the Liberty which the Book-ſellers take to Publiſh all ſorts of Satyrs againſt thoſe who are not in the Intereſt of their Country, ſome on long and narrow ſlips of Paper, and ſome in many Pages, all full of heinous Lies, eſpecially during the laſt War. The States were very glad, ſay they, to foment Animoſities and to keep up the hopes of the People, that they might more patiently bear the Charges of the War, and grow more in Love with their Country by their hatred of another. The *Athenians* uſed the ſame Policy, and if we had all that they ſaid and Publiſh'd againſt the *Perſians* and *Macedonians*, we ſhould find that the Magiſtrates gave their helping Hand to it, in order to Inſpire more Zeal for the preſervation of a Government, which beſides the Publick Shows and many other ſuch things agreeable to the multitude, afforded them the pleaſure of Compoſing and reading a vaſt number of Libels againſt the Enemy. Beſides it was a good way of purging the Satyriſts, by giving vent to the peccant Humours which might have occaſion'd defluxions on the Internal Parts; for if they had been reſtrain'd with reſpect to Strangers, they would have Vomited up their Gall on their own Maſters. This is what the *French* ſay, without forgetting that their Nation had been kept pure and clean from this licentiouſneſs, and that it is one of their nobleſt Triumphs. But they are told that all thoſe Political Myſteries which they ſpeak of are meer notions, and that the Conſtitution of a Free State ought to be minded, wherein 'tis an eſſential thing that every Member ſhould be ſecur'd from that rigorous proſecution, practiſed in Monarchies. However it be, I'll quote an Author who makes theſe Complaints: (*k*) They "have Printed in *Holland* within theſe few Years, "a great many Libels againſt *France*; there are Satyrical Hiſtories againſt the moſt Illuſtrious Perſons of the Court. It were to be wiſh'd that ſome "of our Authors would undeceive the Publick on "that Head, and ſhew that thoſe ſorts of Hiſtories are ſuppoſititious. The Authors of them "are poor miſerable wretches, who do it to get "ſome Money from a greedy Printer, and they "write down all that comes into their Head. How "could ſuch People know all the ſecrets and particulars which they relate? How came they by "the Letters which they have the impudence to "Print as true? Thoſe who beſt know the Court, "and have been there ſeveral Years, could ſcarce "tell ſo many particularities. Is it likely that a "poor Scribler lodged in a Garret, who knows nobody but a Book-ſeller greedy of Money, ſhould "be ſo well acquainted with all thoſe Adventures, if they were true? The late Mr. *Mezeray*, "whoſe Hiſtory of *France* is deſervedly ſo much "eſteemed, could not endure theſe ſorts of Hiſtories and Novels; he would have all to be true or "falſe (*l*): A mixture of both appear'd monſtrous "to him, and even of a dangerous conſequence "to poſterity; and indeed who knows but that "2 or 300 Years hence thoſe who ſhall write

"the

(*a*) Alii denique ſimiles libelli qui-ſtatim in vulgus effundunt, *quid Rex in aurem Reginæ dixerit, quid Juno fabulata ſit cum Jove.* Hi autem omnes quoniam facta plerumque atque infecta canunt, nunciique tam ficti quam veri tenaces exiſtunt &c. *Gabriel Naudæus, Bibliogr. polit. pag. m.* 70. *See concerning the words Printed in* Italick Plautus *in Trinummo act* 1. *ſc.* 2. *v.* 170. *pag. m.* 735.

(*b*) Virgil. Æn. *l.* 1. *v.* 539.

(*c*) *As for inſtance when he ſays upon the* 11. *of* Auguſt 1675. The rout of Conſarbruck, *without ſaying who thoſe were that were routed.*

(*d*) *It has already been done in* Brandenburg.

(*e*) *Compare with this the* Nouvelles de la Republ. des lettres 1686. *pag.* 277. 309. & ſeq. 354. 645. 560.

(*f*) Vell. Patercul. lib. 2. cap. 3.

(*g*) Id ib.

(*h*) Omnia mala exempla ex bonis initiis orta ſunt. *Saluſt. in bello Catilin. p. m.* 146.

(*i*) Nemo ſatis credit tantum delinquere, quantum Permittas: adeo indulgent ſibi latius ipſi. *Juven ſat.* 14. *v.* 233.

(*k*) Diverſitez Curieuſes 10. *part p.* 173 *and* 174 *Dutch Edition* 1690

(*l*) *Compare this with the Remark* C. *of the Article* Nidhard

XI. A CONFESSION of the Count de Bussy. The Secret History of Pope Alexander VI.

It will not be amiſs to inſert here the Publick Confeſſion of the Count *de Buſſy Rabutin.* " (*a*) Five Years ago being in the Country, and not knowing how to divert " my ſelf I verified the Proverb, that Idleneſs is the Mother of all Vices: For I went " about a Hiſtory, or rather a Satyrical Romance, without any deſign to make an ill " uſe of it; but only to keep my ſelf buſy, and at moſt to ſhew it to ſome Friends, " in order to divert them, and to be praiſed by them as a good writer. . . . . . (*b*) " Becauſe true events are never extraordinary enough to be very entertaining, I had " recourſe to invention, which I thought would be more pleaſing; and without any " Scruple of offending the Perſons concerned, becauſe I did it as it were for my ſelf, " I writ a thouſand things which I had never heard of. I made ſome happy, who " were not ſo much as heard, and others who had never thought of it; and becauſe " it had been ridiculous to chooſe two Women for the Heroines of my Romance, " who had neither Birth nor Merit, I made choice of two who wanted no good " qualities, and who ſo abounded with them, that Envy might contribute to render " credible all the ill things I could invent of them." You have here a true Picture of the conduct of Satyrical writers. Whether they write out of revenge or jealouſy; or whether they do it to improve their thoughts, and exerciſe their Pen; the main thing they aim at is the diverſion of the Readers, and to be praiſed for their Wit. Now becauſe they are afraid that meer Truth would afford but little diverſion, and that their Work would be accounted a ſad Piece, they ſeaſon their relations with a thouſand falſe Stories; they invent extraordinary adventures, and curious converſations, and apply to thoſe they ſpeak of whatever they have read that is moſt proper to give a high reliſh. If you examin the ſmarteſt and beſt written Satyrs, you'l find the Spirit of the Author, his Style and Character in all the Letters and Diſcourſes he aſcribes to Lovers. Is not this a Proof that he writes a Romance? If the Hiſtory of *Donna Olympia*, and an hundred other pieces of the ſame nature, were written with the ſimplicity that is to be obſerved in (*c*) *Burchardus*'s Journal, they would be incomparably more credible. I don't ſay, that the Readers would be more perſuaded of the truth of 'em, but only that they would appear more credible; for I know that the Readers proportion their perſuaſion to the probability the writers obſerve, and to the pleaſure they afford by their Wit and by the wonderful events they relate. This is ſo true that notwithſtanding the publick confeſſion of the Count *de Rabutin* moſt People do ſtill believe, that his relations are truly Hiſtorical. Take notice of the words, in which he tells us that his Manuſcript was falſified by a Lady he had lent it to. " (*d*) She added to, or left out of " that Hiſtory what ſhe pleas'd to expoſe me to the hatred of moſt of thoſe I ſpoke of: " Which is ſo true, that the firſt Copies that were ſeen were not falſified; but as ſoon " as the others appear'd, as every body loves the ſharpeſt Satyrs, the true ones were " thought Inſipid, and ſuppreſs'd as falſe.."

The Journal I have juſt now mentioned was written by a *German*, Maſter of the Ceremonies at the Court of Pope *Alexander* VI. His Nation and the Poſt he was in aſſure us, the one that he relates things faithfully, the other that he was able to come to the truth of what he relates; ſo that there is no reaſon to doubt of thoſe Infamous Spectacles wherewith the Pope and his Daughter fed their Eyes, I mean that Collation which the Duke of *Valentinois* gave to Fifty Curtezans, and the Combat of four Stone-Horſes let looſe upon two Mares. Beſides, as I have already ſaid, the plain and barbarous Style of the writer does not permit to ſuſpect that he writ for the diverſion of the Reader and his own commendation. You may Judge of it by this little Specimen. (*e*) *Dominica ultima menſis Octobris in ſero fecerunt cænam cum Duce Valentinenſi in camera ſua in palatio Apoſtolico quinquaginta meretrices honeſtæ, Cortegianæ nuncupatæ, quæ poſt cænam choreurunt*

" the Hiſtory of our Times, may take theſe Satyrical Pamphlets for Original and Authentick " Memoirs writ by Contemporary Authors, who " ought to be credited? Since we cannot extirpate thoſe plaguy Writers of Hiſtory, we muſt " at leaſt acquaint with it thoſe, who ſhall come " after us, that they be not deceived".

It muſt be confeſt that there are very good things in this paſſage, and that the Author has very good reaſon to ſay that it were to be wiſh'd that care ſhould be taken to refute what can be refuted; for what will our Poſterity think, when they ſhall read ſo many things made current, without any oppoſition? How will they be able to forbear believing that they are true? Will they not ſay that if they had been falſe, they would have been confuted for the Honour of thoſe whom they blemiſh? How many People are there, whom the Satyrs of the XVI. Century keep ſtill in an Illuſion? Thoſe of our time will not be leſs Active in future Ages, and we muſt not imagine, that they will not laſt long, becauſe they don't appear in the Book-ſellers Shops in two or three Months time. They will be preſerved in the moſt Famous Libraries, in which they have been carefully Collected. I don't pretend that there is a neceſſity to confute all ſorts of Libels; that would be an endleſs work and oftentimes very needleſs. It were ſufficient to refute thoſe which have ſomething of the Character of an Hiſtory, and to give ſome General Rules for diſcerning the Truth, and ſecuring ones ſelf againſt the boldneſs of thoſe Satyrical Writers. For example, a Man of ability andwell informed, ſhould Criticiſe the Book intituled (*f*) *Annales de la Cour & de Paris pour les annees* 1697. *and* 1698. If he ſhould demonſtrate the falſity of Five or Six of the moſt Remarkable things, all the reſt would fall of itſelf; eſpecially if the Readers were told that they cannot reaſonably believe what is advanced by ſuch Writers, unleſs their relations be attended with certain Characters, for want of which one ought to ſuppoſe that all their Stories are only the Diſcourſes of Taverns and Coffee-houſes. Theſe places are the *Magazines* and Store-houſes of falſe News, and may be rightly compared to *Natalis Comes* his *Mithology*. Such a work as the refutation I ſpeak of, would ſerve as a preſervative an Hundred Years hence, and would be of great uſe to thoſewho ſhould endeavour to find out Hiſtorical Truths.

The Author whom I have quoted has forgot a neceſſary reflection: He ſhould have complain'd of *France* as much as of *Holland*; for 'tis particularly in *France*, that the Writings of which he complains ſell well. If the *French* would neither read nor buy them, the Book-ſellers would not Print them, and thus the greedineſs of the *French* contributes as much as any thing elſe to the production of Libels: The Lyars and the Credulous maintain one another mutually; they live upon one another's Purſe.

(*F*) The

(*a*) Buſſy Rabutin's Letter to the Duke of St. Aignan inſerted in the Book concerning the uſe of Adverſity pag. 165. of the Dutch Edition. That Letter is dated the 12. of November 1665.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 166.

(*c*) Johannes Burchardus Argentinenſis Capellæ Alexandri Sexti Papæ Clericus Ceremoniarum Magiſter. *The* Excerpta *out of his* Diarium *were Printed at* Hanover *in 1696. by the care of Mr.* Leibniz, *with this Title,* Specimen hiſtoriæ arcanæ ſive anecdotæ de vita Alexandri VI. Papæ.

(*d*) Buſſy ubi ſupra *pag.* 269.

(*e*) Specimen hiſtor. arcanæ ſeu anecdotæ de vita Alexandri VI. Papæ, *pag.* 77. 78.

(*f*) *Printed in* 1701.

chorearunt cum ſervitoribus & aliis ibidem exiſtentibus, primo in veſtibus ſuis, deinde nudæ. Poſt cœnam poſita fuerunt candelabra communia menſæ cum candelis ardentibus & projectæ ante candelabra per terram caſtaneæ, quas meretrices ipſæ ſuper manibus & pedibus nudæ candelabra pertranſeuntes colligebant, Papa, Duce & Lucretia ſorore ſua præſentibus & aſpicientibus: tandem expoſita dona ultimo, diploides de ſerico, paria caligarum, bireta & alia, pro illis qui plures dictas meretrices carnaliter agnoſcerent, quæ fuerunt ibidem in aula publice carnaliter tractatæ arbitrio præſentium, & dona diſtributa Victoribus. Feria quinta, undecima menſis Novembris intravit urbem per portam viridarii quidam ruſticus ducens duas equas lignis oneratas, quæ cum eſſent in plateola S. Petri, accurrerunt ſtipendiarii Papæ, inciſiſque pectoralibus & lignis projectis in terram cum baſtis, duxerunt equas ad illam plateolam quæ eſt inter palatium juxta illius portam, tum emiſſi fuerunt quatuor equi curſerii liberi ſuis frænis & capiſtris ex palatio, qui accurrerunt ad equas, & inter ſe propterea cum magno ſtrepitu & clamore morſibus & calceis contendentes aſcenderunt equas & coierunt cum eis, & eas graviter piſtarunt & læſerunt, Papa in feneſtra cameræ ſupra portam palatii & Domina Lucretia cum eo exiſtente, cum magno riſu & delectatione præmiſſa videntibus.

XII. Laws of *Charles* V. *&c.* againſt Libels. How Pope *Hadrian* VI was diſſuaded from overthrowing *Paſquin's* Statue.

If I ſhould further enlarge upon the Subject of this Diſſertation, I ſhould hope my Prolixity would be excus'd upon conſideration of the exuberance and importance of the matter, and becauſe I ſhould take care, as I have done hitherto, not to tranſcribe the *Civilians* who have written ſo many (E) Books upon this queſtion. It is eaſy to be long upon a thing which affords ſo many reflexions, and wherein the Publick is ſo much concerned, that all Legiſlators conſpire in ſeverely puniſhing the Authors of Defamatory Libels. We have ſeen that the Laws of the Twelve Tables ſentenc'd them to Death, and it is not true that *Auguſtus* (a) repeal'd them in this reſpect: We have ſeen the contrary above. One of the greateſt Emperors that lived (b) ſince *Auguſtus*, appointed the puniſhment of retaliation; for he ordered that Libellers ſhould undergo the ſame puniſhment with thoſe they ſhould defame, and who ſhould be convicted: Nay he would not have 'em to go unpuniſh'd, tho' they ſhould ſay nothing but truth. (c) *Per hoc autem quod verum ſcripſerit infamans nullam meretur excuſationem, ſiquidem veritatem criminis per libellum famoſum pandere non licet, & edens libellum famoſum injuriarum tenetur, nec admitti debet edens libellum famoſum & injuriarum conventus ad probationem veritatis criminis. Joannes Thilemannus de Benignis, alias Goth.* Obſ. Practi. 86. *Quod etiam confirmatur per conſtitutionem Caroli V. criminal.* arti. 110. in f. *ubi hæc verba habentur: Et licet illata injuria prætenſi facti vera eſſet, debet tamen diffamator talis injuriæ ſecundum jus & arbitrium judicis puniri.* In *France* the famous edict of *January* condemn'd them and their Abettors to be whip'd, and in caſe of relapſe, to be puniſh'd with Death. (d) *Ne quis infames libellos ad quemquam traducendum faciat, divendat, aut divendendos curet. Qui ſecus faxit, primum fuſtigium, ſecundum, capitalis pœna indicta eſto.* I mean here by Abettors thoſe who procur'd the Publication, or the Sale of a Libel. This was renew'd by *Henry* III. in 1577. The Law of the Emperors *Valentinian* and *Valens* is very ſevere; for it condemns to a Capital puniſhment ſuch as meeting with a Libel by chance, divulg'd it inſtead of tearing or burning it. *Si quis famoſum libelium, ſive domi ſit, ſive in publico, vel quocunque loco etiam ignarus repererit, nec ſtatim corruperit, aut igne conſumpſerit, ſed vim ejus manifeſtaverit, quaſi auctor hujuſmodi delicti ſententiæ capitali ſubjiciatur.* See *Naude's Maſcurat*, at the 657. Page. But ſo many temptations to prolixity will not hinder me from making a ſtop, when I have related a thing which I remember I have promiſs'd, and 3. or 4. other conſiderations.

Pope *Hadrian* VI. hearken'd to reaſon, when it was repreſented to him that the remedy he was going to employ againſt *Paſquinades* would be uſeleſs. I'll uſe Mr. *Flechier's* words: " (e) Swarms of Libels were then current in *Spain*, againſt the Court " of *Flanders*, and *Ximenes* himſelf. The *Flemings* (1), who were not uſed to this ſort " of ſmart and ingenious Satyrs, complain'd of them, and the Cardinal had orders to " ſearch after the Authors and Printers, and to puniſh them ſeverely. He caus'd ſome " Book-ſellers Houſes to be ſearched, but ſo lightly that no body was in pain for it. " He was of opinion that inferiors ſhould have the liberty of revenging themſelves " for their ſufferings by words or writings, which laſt no longer than a Man's of- " fended at them, and which loſe their Charms and Venom when they are deſpis'd. " *Alphonſo Caſtile* Governor of *Madrid*, having met with ſome of theſe Works reflecting " upon Cardinal *Hadrian* and *La-Chaux*, Ambaſſadors of *Charles*, gave them a ſight of " 'em, and they were ſenſibly affected with it, eſpecially *Hadrian*, who was for ſome time " inconſolable. 'Tis ſaid that being afterwards raiſed to St. *Peter's* Chair, and " not being able to bear the Statues of *Paſquin* and *Marforio*, whom the Satyrical " Wits have choſen for the Confidents, and Authors of their Calumnies, order'd them " to be thrown into the *Tiber*; which had been executed, if the Duke of *Seſſa*, the *Spaniſh* Ambaſſador, had not very wiſely told him: *What are you going to do, Holy Father? 'Tis much better ſtill to pardon thoſe two Mutes, than to open the Mouths of all the* " *Town. If you throw them into the River, the Frogs will croak the railleries which we* " *read as we go by them: And what two Statues ſhall no longer ſpeak, will be made publick*

by

(a) Lewis Gilhauſen *pag.* 222. *of his commentary upon the Pandects,* De injuriis & famoſis libellis, *does falſly aſcribe this to that Emperor, and wrongly alleges* Horace *for it, whoſe authority would do him no Service, tho' he had quoted him better than he has done.* Hanc pœnam capitalem, *ſays he,* Auguſtus ſuſtulit, ut videre eſt ex Horatio, *lib.* 1. *epiſtolar. ad Auguſtum.*

(b) *Charles the Fifth, Conſtitutio Caroli V. Cæſaris de cauſſis capitalibus,* Art. 110. *edita in infamantem, pœnam eamdem irrogat quam mereretur diffamatus libello, ſi ejus criminis reus quo accuſatur peractus eſſet.* Petrus Gregor. Syntag. juris. l. 38. c. 6. *See alſo* Gilhauſen ubi ſupra *pag.* 225.

(E) *The* Civilians, *who have written ſo many Books upon, &c.*] Mr. *Furetiere* has quoted Four or Five in one of his *Caſes*. 'Tis where he would prove that his Book againſt ſome Academiſts deſerv'd not to be call'd a Libel by the Sentence of the *Chatelet*. I have to no purpoſe ſearch'd after *Gabriel Naudé's* Book intitled *Marfore ou diſcours contre les Libelles*. It was Printed at *Paris* by *Lewis Boulenger in* 8. I know not in what Year. *Leo Allatius* mentions it in a Book, (f) that he Publiſh'd in 1633. Mr. *Baillet* cites (g) a Book which I would fain have read. 'Tis the *Celeſtial Shield of* John *Baptiſt* Nocette a Genoeſe *againſt Defamatory Libels*. The Abbot *Michael Juſtiniani* (h) places the Firſt Edition of it at *Paris*, in 1653. in 4. and the 2. at *Lions* 1664. in 12. 'Tis written in *Italian*. *Alegambe's* Continuator (i) mentions but one Edition, *viz.* of *Paris* 1655. See the Margin (k).

" *by all the living Mouths.* The Pope made uſe of this advice, and was afterwards " leſs nice upon this Subject." That you may know more particularly the Senſibility of this Pope, I will ſet down the words of *Paulus Jovius*, who tells us that the *Spaniſh* Ambaſſador was forc'd to renew his advice. *Graviſſime etiam tulerat ſe famoſis carminibus apud Paſquilli ſtatuam fuiſſe laceratum; ſed id poſtea civili animo tulit cum didiciſſet, eam maledicendi licentiam obſcurorum hominum libertati atque nequitiæ dari, ut cum inſignes viros impunè carpſerint, fortunam ſuam ea vindictæ voluptate conſolentur. Decreverat Hadrianus uti poetis non obſcurè ſubiratus, Paſquilli ſtatuam, quæ erat in Parione, demoliri, atque eam in Tyberim præcipitare: ſed Ludovicus Sueſſanus urbano ſalſoque ingenio id fieri debere ſe negavit, ſubdens, Paſquillum vel in imo vado ranarum more, non eſſe taciturum: ad id vir pontifex, exuratur ergo, inquit, in calcem, ne ejus veſtigii ulla omnino memoria ſuperſit. Tum rurſus Sueſſanus, rectè inquit, ſed tam crudeliter concremato poetæ clientes non deerunt, qui patroni cineres invidioſis carminibus proſequantur, & ſupplicii locum quotannis ſtatuto ſolenni die concelebrent. Quibus verborum luſibus pontifex ab iracundia ad jocos hilaritatemque ſenſus omnes leniſſimè revocavit.* (a)

XIII. Princes, who have deſpiſed ſlanders.

Some Princes have been as inſenſible to ſlanders as Cardinal *Ximenés*. See in *Seneca* (b) how *Antigonus* (c) pardon'd ſome Souldiers who had Lampoon'd him. The ſame Author alleges (d) the patience of *Philip* of *Macedonia*, and *Auguſtus*. This Emperor expreſs'd an admirable good humour towards a Satyrical (e) Hiſtorian, who had abus'd him, and his Wife and Family. Nothing was more likely to exaſperate a Potent Prince, who beſides knew that the Witticiſms of the Hiſtorian had been taken up and ſpread all over the Town. The Chevalier *de Meré* has wiſely ſaid (f) *That ſlanders are very much to be fear'd when they are expreſs'd in Witty Words, becauſe People delight to repeat them, and love always to commend a good thought.* But *Seneca* ſays with more reaſon ſtill, that Witty ſayings, which expoſe their Authors to ſome danger, are more Studiouſly obſerved than any others. (g) *Multa & divus Auguſtus digna memoria fecit, dixitque, ex quibus appareat illi iram non imperaſſe. Timagenes hiſtoriarum ſcriptor, quædam in ipſum, quædam in uxorem ejus, & in totam domum dixerat, nec perdiderat dicta: magis enim circumfertur, & in ore hominum eſt, temeraria urbanitas.* Hower it be, the detraction of this Hiſtorian brought but a ſmall diſgrace upon him. Nothing can be more Rational than *Mæcenas's* (h) Arguments about the contempt that this Emperor ought to expreſs for ſlanders. He adviſed him not to hearken to the informers againſt Satyriſts, and to puniſh no body for ſpeaking ill of him. You may ſee in *Dion Caſſius* the reaſons of this Advice. The ſame (i) Hiſtorian will inform you, why *Cæſar* took no notice of the injurious things that *Cicero*, and ſome others divulg'd againſt him. He thought they had a mind to equal themſelves with him whom they abuſed, and that 'twas better to deprive them of this advantage, by avoiding to contend with them. The reaſon he went upon was contain'd in an Oration of *Quintus Metellus Numidicus*, if we judge of it by this Diſcourſe of *Aulus Gellius*; however, I would not have it to be extended ſo far as to *Cicero*. (k) *Cum iniquiſſimis hominibus non eſſe convicio decertandum, neque in maledictis adverſus impudentes & improbos velitandum, quia tantiſper ſimilis & compar eorum fias, dum paria & conſimilia dicas atque audias, non minus ex oratione Q. Metelli Numidici ſapientis viri cognoſci poteſt, quàm ex libris & diſciplinis philoſophorum. Verba hæc ſunt Metelli adverſus Cn. Manlium tribunum plebei, à quo apud populum in concione laceſſitus jactatuſque fuerat dictis petulantibus.* Nunc quod ad illum attinet, Quirites, quoniam ſe ampliorem putat eſſe, ſi ſe mihi inimicum dictitaverit, quem ego mihi neque amicum recipio, neque inimicum reſpicio, in eum ego non ſum plura dicturus: nam eum indigniſſimum arbitror, cui à viris bonis benedicatur: tum ne idoneum quidem, cui à probis maledicatur: nam ſi in eo tempore hujuſcemodi homunculum nomines, in quo pœnire non poſſis; majore honore quam contumelia afficias. But *Cæſar* not being as yet Emperor, his Conduct on this occaſion is not of ſo great Weight for this part of my work as that of *Tiberius* mention'd by *Tacitus*. A Lady was accus'd of having ſpoken ill of *Auguſtus*, and the Empreſs *Livia*, and *Tiberius*. She was proſecuted upon the Law *de Majeſtate*. *Tiberius* would have a diſtinction us'd; I will not, ſaid he, have her proſecuted for what concerns me; but if ſhe be found guilty as to *Auguſtus*, let her be puniſh'd. He anſwer'd nothing the firſt Day about his Mother; but the next day he declar'd, that ſhe deſir'd that no body ſhould be brought into trouble for Satyrical Words ſpoken againſt her. (l) *Adoleſcebat interea lex majeſtatis, & Apuleiam Variliam ſororis Auguſti neptem, quia probroſis ſermonibus divum Auguſtum, ac Tiberium, & matrem ejus inluſiſſet, Cæſarique connexa adulterio teneretur, majeſtatis delator arceſſebat.* De adulterio ſatis caveri lege Julia *viſum:* majeſtatis crimen diſtingui *Cæſar poſtulavit*; damnarique ſi qua de Auguſto irreligioſe dixiſſet: in ſe jacta nolle ad cognitionem vocari. *Interrogatus à conſule* quid de his cenſeret, quæ de matre ejus locuta ſecus argueretur, *reticuit: dein proximo ſenatus die, illius quoque nomine oravit*, ne cui verba in eam quoquo modo habita crimini forent: *liberavitque Apuleiam lege majeſtatis. Suetonius* (m) will give you a more particular account of this Emperor's indolence. I won't repeat what I have ſaid before of *Nero*'s moderation, and as for *Veſpaſian* I refer you to *Suetonius* (n). But upon this Head can any thing be Nobler than this Edict of the Emperor *Theodoſius? Si quis modeſtiæ neſcius & pudoris ignarus improbo petulantique maledicto nomina noſtra crediderit laceſſenda, ac temulentia turbulentus obtrectator temporum noſtrorum fuerit; eum pœnæ nolumus ſubjugari neque durum aliquid nec aſperum volumus ſuſtinere, quoniam ſi id ex levitate proceſſerit contemnendum eſt, ſi ex inſania miſeratione dignum, ſi ab injuria remittendum: unde integris omnibus hoc ad noſtram ſcientiam referatur, ut ex perſonis hominum dicta penſemus, & utrum prætermitti an exquiri debeant cenſeamus. Datum VI. Id. Auguſt. Conſtantinopoli, Theodoſio anno III. & Abundantio Coſſ.* This conſtitution is in the *Code* in the title, *Si quis Imperatori male dixerit.*

Modern

[illegible] The [illegible] is [illegible] by Spondanus pag. m. 782. [illegible] agree with [illegible] book.

(a) Paulus Jovius in vita Hadriani ſexti pag. m. 777, 778. *See alſo Camerarius's Hiſtorical meditations. He ſuppoſes that the anſwer was made by a Cardinal, and not by the Ambaſſador, and that 'twas a wooden Statue.*

(b) Seneca, de ira lib. 3. c. 22.

(c) He was the Grand Father to Alexander the Great, as Seneca ſays.

(d) Ibid. c. 23.

(e) Call'd Timagenes.

(f) Chevalier de Meré, diſcours de l'Eſprit.

(g) Seneca ubi ſupra c. 23. pag. m. 570.

(h) *See* Dion Caſſius lib. 52. *p. m.* 556.

(i) Dion, lib. 38. *pag. m.* 71. 72.

(k) Aulus Gellius, lib. 6. c. 11.

(l) Tacitus annal. lib. 2. c. 50.

(m) Sueton. in Tiber. c. 138.

(n) Idem in Veſpaſ. c. 13.

Modern History does not afford fewer instances of this patience. You'll find ſome in a *Latin* (a) Letter of *Balzac*, but not that of *Lewis* XII. which I have related in its proper place (b), nor that of *Catherine de Medicis*. We learn from *Brantome*, (c) *that She read even the Invectives that were made againſt her, at which She jeſted and laughed, without any emotion, calling them Babblers, and Authors of Idle-Stories*: Underſtanding that the *Hugonots* in the ſecond troubles had with them *a very fine Calverin* which they call'd *the Queen Mother*, (d) *She deſir'd to know the reaſon of it. Some body being very much preſs'd by her to tell it, anſwered, 'tis, Madam, becauſe it has a greater and wider Bore than any other. She was the firſt that Laught at it.* What She told ſome Soldiers who ſpoke moſt horrible Infamies of her, is to be ſeen in *Coſtar's* Letters with ſome flouriſhes. " (e) *Catherine de Medicis*, tho' She was of a Country " where they ſay, that *God has reſerved vengeance to himſelf, becauſe 'tis a dainty bit*, found " a greater pleaſure in pardoning than in puniſhing, when She ſaw ſome Soldiers " by her Couch, who ſaid of her all the filthy things imaginable, without minding " her or ſo much as depreſſing their Voice; for this Princeſs only look'd out of the " Couch, and fixing her Eyes upon thoſe Raſcals told them: *Friends, if you don't go* " *farther to ſpeak ill of me, I'll keep you from roaſting* (f) *the Gooſe, and eating it ſo* " *quietly as you do.* The Cardinal of *Lorrain* would have had them hang'd for an Ex- " ample; But She choſe rather to let Poſterity know that a Perſon, who was at once " a Woman, a Queen and an *Italian*, could command her paſſion, and deprive her- " ſelf of the pleaſure of revenge. 'Tis very likely this Story was taken out of *d'Aubigné*: But to ſhew how *Coſtar* accommodated the circumſtances of Facts to his own humour without conſidering the great abuſes that ariſe from ſuch a Liberty, it will not be amiſs to ſet down the words of that Hiſtorian. (g) *I have it*, ſays he, *from the Sieur* de (h) Talſi, *that the King of* Navarre *and the Queen Mother being* (i) *at the Window of a low Room heard two Black-guards, who were roaſting a Gooſe on a wooden Spit and Singing Infamies againſt the Queen: One often ſaid that the Cardinal had lain with her and that ſhe had a Pig in her Belly, the other ſaid 'twas a Mule; and then they curs'd the Bitch that did them ſo much miſchief. The King of* Navarre *was leaving the Queen to go and have them hang'd; but She looking out of the Window ſaid*, why, what has She done? If it was not for her you would not roaſt the Gooſe, *and turning to the King of* Navarre, *and Laughing She told him, Couſin*, our anger muſt not deſcend ſo low; that's beneath us. *This I mention to ſhew that there was nothing mean in her.*

Francis the Firſt is one of the Examples alledg'd by *Balzac*. But I find one thing in him to be blam'd, which is that this King ſuffered his Miniſters and Courtiers to be abuſed upon the Stage, at the ſame time that he permitted his own faults to be ript up. This was imitating a Conduct that Ancient *Greece* and *Rome* found no good in: 'Twas introducing an ill Cuſtom: And if it be an act of Magnanimity in a Prince to deſpiſe the Satyrs that concern his own Perſon, and to forgive the Authors of 'em; 'tis a viſible neglect of his duty to ſuffer his Subjects to be expos'd to the inſults of a Satyrical Pen. He may abate of his own Right; but the Honour of his Subjects ought to appear inviolable to him. Note, That *Francis* I. did not ſuffer the Players to name People. (k) *Accepimus tacitè, libenterque etiam ferre ſolitum, ſe præcipuoſque Regni ſui proceres, quorum ipſe operâ conſiliiſque utebatur, in Fabulis & Comœdiis publicis rodi & configi maledictis; tectè id quidem & involutè, ſed tamen ut ab omnibus perſpiceretur.*

XIV. The *Romans* were more jealous of their Honour than of that of their Gods.

The *Romans* did not permit the Comick Poets to abuſe the Magiſtrates, but they left them an entire liberty to make ſport with the Gods. St. *Auſtin* upbraided them with it ſeverely. *At Romani*, ſays he, (l) *ſicut in illa de* (m) *republica diſputatione gloriatur Scipio, probris & injuriis poëtarum ſubjectam vitam famamque habere noluerunt, capite etiam punire ſancientes tale carmen condere ſi quis auderet. Quod erga ſe quidem ſatis honeſtè conſtituerunt, ſed erga Deos ſuos ſuperbe & irreligioſè. Quos cùm ſcirent non ſolùm patienter, ſed etiam libenter poetarum probris malediĉtiſque lacerari, ſe potius quam illos hujuſcemodi injuriis dignos eſſe duxerunt, ſeque ab eis etiam lege munierunt, illorum autem iſta etiam ſacris ſolennitatibus miſcuerunt. Itane tandem Scipio laudas, hanc poetis Romanis negatam eſſe licentiam ut cuiquam opprobrium infligerent Romanorum, cum videas, eos nulli Deorum pepercisse veſtrorum? Itane pluris tibi habenda eſt exiſtimatio veſtræ curæ, quàm Capitolii, imo Romæ unius quam cœli totius: linguam maledicam in cives tuos exercere poetæ etiam lege prohiberentur, & in Deos tuos ſecuri, tanta convitia nullo ſenatore, nullo cenſore, nullo principe, nullo pontifice prohibente jacularentur? Indignum videlicet fuit, ut Plautus aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius M. Catoni malediceret: & dignum fuit, ut Terentius veſter flagitio Jovis optimi maximi adoleſcentium nequitiam concitaret.* This thought is older than St. *Auſtin*, for *Arnobius* had (n) made uſe of it before. A Modern does not mention it upon an occaſion wherein it would have ſerved his turn. 'Tis in a Letter wherein he deſign'd to attack the Houſe of *Auſtria*. He enters upon the matter in hand not citing *Arnobius* or St. *Auſtin*, but *Livy*. (o) The *Spaniards*, who firſt were for the ſame " Alliance (p) which their Partiſans blame at preſent, took no care to preſerve the " veneration, due to Holy things, or to maintain the immunities and privileges " of the Prieſthood. Perhaps the reaſon of it was, becauſe thinking themſelves to " be the lawful Succeſſors of the *Romans*, particularly in their deſign of forming an " Univerſal Monarchy, they fancy they may ſay as well as they, *As for Religion 'tis* " *more the intereſt of the Gods than ours. They may give orders if they pleaſe for hindring ſa-* " *cred things from being polluted by impure Hands. Ad* (1) *Deos id magis quàm ad ſe per-* " *tinere, ipſos viſuros ne ſacra ſua polluantur.* Is it not very likely that *Charles* V. Acted " by this Principle, when in 1552. he diſplac'd three *Lutheran* Miniſters in *Augsburg* for

" abuſing

(a) *Ad Phil. Coſpeanum pag.* 551. *edit.* 1651. *in* 12.

(b) *In the Remark L. of* Lewis XII.

(c) *Brantome in his Elogy upon* Catherine de Medicis.

(d) Id. ib.

(e) Coſtar *page* 729. *of the firſt volume of his Letters.*

(f) *This is abſurd, being ſeparated from the circumſtances mention'd by* d'Aubigné *here below.*

(g) D'Aubigne hiſt. Univerſ. *tom.* 1. *Book* 3. *chap.* 5. *pag.* 198.

(h) *'Tis very likely he, who was* d'Aubigné's *father in in Law, and whoſe name was* John Salviati. *See* d'Aubigné's *Hiſtory tom.* 2. *l.* 5. *chap.* 18. *pag.* 1143.

(i) *During the Parley for a Peace at* Talſi *in* 1562.

(k) *Balzac, ejuſd. epiſt. ad Coſpeanum pag. m.* 554.

(l) *Auguſt. de civit. Dei l.* 2. *c.* 12.

(m) *See the* 9 *Chap. of the ſame Book de* civitate Dei.

(n) Nec à vobis ſaltem iſtum meruerunt honorem (*Dii*) … Carmen malum conſcribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur & vita, decemviralibus ſcitis evadere noluiſtis impune: ac ne veſtras aures convitio aliquis petulantiore pulſaret, de atrocibus formulas conſtituiſtis injuriis. Soli Dii ſunt apud vos ſuperi inhonorati, contemptibiles, viles: in quos jus eſt vobis datum, quæ quiſque voluerit dicere: turpitudinem jacere, quas libido confinxerit atque excogitaverit formas. *Arnob. lib.* 4. *pag.* 150. 151.

(o) Coſtar, *Letter* 394. *of the* 1. *vol. pag* 974. 975.

(p) *That of* Cromwel.

(1) Livy *Book* 10.

“ abusing him, and suffered the rest to vilify GOD, his Mother and his Saints; as
“ the Duke of (a) Nevers reproach'd him in a Discourse he made to Pope Sixtus V.
“ upon the present State of Affairs. Doubtless the Emperor Charles remembred this
“ saying of Tiberius. *Let us leave to the immortal Gods the care of revenging injuries that*
“ *are done to them.* Deorum (x) *injuriæ Diis curæ.*

XV. The Council of Trent [illegible] power [illegible] the [illegible] Libels [illegible] of the Church.

I must not forget a thing which very much displeas'd the *Civilians* who were tender of the Rights of the secular Power. They look'd upon the Authority given to the Bishops by the Council of *Trent*, as an Act of Usurpation. Let us hear *William Ranchin* (b) “ This Council to the prejudice of the secular jurisdiction, ascribes to the
“ Bishops the (1) punishment of the Authors of Defamatory Libels, and of the
“ Printers, *&c.* . . . . Our Civil Laws give the Cognizance of them to the Judges and
“ Magistrates, and not to Ecclesiasticks. Some would except those that concern Re-
“ ligion; but this Exception is not pertinent, and here is an Argument against it. The
“ Laws of *Constantin* the Great, and of *Constantius*, made against such Libels, were en-
“ acted at such a time as this, that is, at a time when many Writings were published in
“ point of Religion. Doctor *Balduin* (2) has very judiciously observ'd it. *'Tis a ma-*
“ *terial thing*, says he, *to remember what were the times of* Constantin *and* Constantius,
“ *in which the Contentions of Religion, not unlike ours, inflam'd the Passions of the Parties*
“ *who thereupon sent out horrid Calumnies and defamatory Libels, as is done at present.* He
“ says this, explaining three Laws of the Emperor *Constantin*, and two of *Constan-*
“ *tius*, made upon this account, which we find at present in the *Theodosian Code.*
“ These words (3) of the Emperors *Valentinian* and *Valens* are also remarkable: *If any*
“ *one is concern'd for his Religion and the Publick Safety, let him declare his Name, and speak*
“ *with his own Mouth what he would have said in defamatory Libels.* This very well agrees
“ to Libels in point of Religion, and was never spoken in any other sense by those
“ Emperors. Now (4) all the abovementioned Constitutions, as also some others of
“ the same *Valentinian* and *Valens*, *Arcadius*, *Honorius*, and *Theodosius*, impose Penalties
“ on the Authors of such Libels, and the Publishers of 'em, and commit the Cogni-
“ zance and Punishment of them to their Officers and Magistrates, directing such Laws
“ to them, to be observed in their Judgments. Abundance of Ordinances of our Kings
“ mention in express words *Defamatory* and *Scandalous Libels* that concern Religion, pre-
“ scribe the Punishment due to them, and the particular Penalties to be inflicted on
“ the Authors, Printers and Publishers, and expresly give this Jurisdiction to the Royal
“ Judges. As that of *Henry* II. of the 11th of *December*, 1547. made at *Fontainebleau*,
“ and another of the same Prince made at *Chasteaubriant* in 1551. That of *Charles* IX.
“ made at *Mante* the 10th of *September*, 1563. That of the States of *Molins* in the Ar-
“ ticle 77. and abundance of others. I shall only set down the words of one of them,
“ *viz.* that of *Charles* IX. made at *Mante* the 10th of *September*, 1563. which speaks of
“ Defamatory Libels, Bills posted up, Books, and such-like things concerning Religion;
“ and as to Jurisdiction, it speaks thus: *Injoining all publick Magistrates, Commissioners of*
“ *Districts, and Our other Officers to whom it shall belong, to have an eye and regard to them,*
“ *charging Our Attorneys and Advocates to do their duty therein, and to lay aside all other*
“ *Affairs, in order to prove and punish the faults they shall find. And it is moreover enjoined,*
“ *that they shall observe the same Ordinance in every point, and proceed briefly against the In-*
“ *fractors, by the Punishments herein specified*”.

XVI. Libels complain'd of as being the cause of Sedition.

As there is nothing so useful, but in some respects is the cause of evil, it fell out that Printing, amongst a thousand Conveniencies it has brought with it, has occasion'd a notable Inconvenience, which is, that it has afforded Satyrical and Seditious Men a thousand opportunities of quickly dispersing their Venom every where. *Du Verdier Vau-Privas* has inserted in (c) one of his Books a *Latin* Poem, entituled, *Encomion Chalcographiæ*, where, after many Praises bestow'd upon Printing, many Complaints are brought in against the Licentiousness of Libels. The Author of that Poem being a *Roman Catholick*, it must be observed that he sutes his Style to his Prejudices in the following Verses:

Omnia dente petunt, fœdant spurcaque saliva,
Digni qui Anticyræ præmia sana ferant.
A quibus & Nemesis turpissima facta reposcat,
Quo meritas pœnas improba turba luat.
Principis ac Princeps lacerat caput, atque tacenda
Consilia in chartis vendere quisque solet.
De rebus magnis populi suffragia vana
Captant, quæ semper mens animosa fugit.
Quid non audebit furiosa licentia vulgi,
Talia si primi dant documenta duces?
Quæ non his oritur funesta Tragœdia nugis?
Accendit quas non hæc quoque flamma faces?
Rustica seditio belli cur cornua sumpsit?
Chartæ pellaces hoc docuere nefas.
Hæc quoque Gorgoneo perfudit sacra cruore
Progenies vulgi, quam nova secta tenet.
Quæque Numam simulat modo religione prophana,
Et geminos fertur ferre sub aure polos.
Omnia confundit, vertit sursumque, deorsumque,
Ac gerras præter nil sua sylva crepat.

Hæc

(a) See the Sr. Reynaud's Apology for the Catholicks, part 1, p. 78, 79. a long passage of the Duke's discourse.

(x) Tacit. lib. 1. [illegible]

(b) [illegible] Concile de Trente, [illegible]

(2) Balduin. [illegible] de [illegible] famos. libell. p. [illegible]

(3) Lib. C. Theod. de famos. Libell. Lin. C. Just. eod.

(4) Vide totum Titul. C Theodos. de famosis libellis.

(c) At the end of the Supplementum epitomes Bibliothecæ Gesnerianæ.

Hæc auſa eſt Aquilæ Romanæ vellere pennas,
Atque aves magni commaculare Dei.
Non adeo lædunt Bombardæ fulmina diræ:
Nil præter clades ſit licet illa tonent:
Nec tantùm nocuit cuiquam vis ſæva cicutæ,
Quantùm famoſi ſtigmata nigra libri.
Ita & mille modis eſſent hæc ſæpe notanda,
Aſt iter immodicum noſtra Thaleia fugit.

Eraſmus exclaim'd againſt the abuſes of the Preſs, and confuted the ridiculous excuſes of the Printers, who alledg'd that they ſhould want Bread if they did not publiſh Libels. (*a*) *Dicet hic aliquis: Hem divinator, quid hæc ad Typographos? Quia nonnullam mali partem invehit horum impunita licentia. Implent mundum libellis, non jam dicam nugalibus, quales ego fortaſſis ſcribo; ſed ineptis, indoctis, maledicis, famoſis, rabioſis, impiis ac ſeditioſis: & horum turba facit, ut frugiferis etiam libellis ſuus pereat fructus. Provolant quidam abſque titulis, aut titulis, (quod eſt ſceleratius) fictis. Deprehenſi reſpondent: Detur unde alam familiam, deſinam tales libellos excudere. Aliquanto meliore fronte reſpondeat fur, impoſtor aut leno: Da qui vivam & deſinam his artibus uti, niſi forte levius crimen eſt, clam minuere rem alienam, quam palam eripere famam alienam: aut ſine vi ad quæſtum abuti tuo alienove corpore, quam vitam alterius ac famam vita quoque chariorem impetere.* I think that the Author of the abovementioned Poem does the Satyrical Writers more Honour than they deſerve, by accuſing them to be the cauſe of Wars and Seditions. 'Tis certain that very often they aim at ſuch a thing, and are over-joy'd to think that their Libels have produc'd ſo great an effect; nay, they flatter themſelves with it when they have no reaſon to do it, and are very well pleaſed to have this laid to their charge. Can one build any certain Fact upon this Subject? I don't think any general Rule can be grounded upon it. At certain times Defamatory Libels do not ſtir the People, and the Publiſhers are balk'd in their expectations; but at other times they are true Incendiaries, and Trumpeters of Sedition. Beſides, the difference of Parties and Intereſts is to be conſidered; for the effects of Libels are accordingly very different, and even contrary to one another: They ſometimes unite thoſe they would divide, and divide thoſe they would unite. What is certain is, that the Tongue and Pen of a ſingle man are ſometimes more uſeful to a Cauſe than an Army of Forty thouſand Men. Francis I. confeſs'd that the Biſhop of *Sion* had done him more miſchief by his Words than all *Suiſſerland* by their Arms. (*b*) *Maxime vero ei glorioſum fuit Franciſci Regis judicium, quum aſſeveraret, me audiente, aliquanto plus ſibi ſumptus atque periculi Sedunenſis facundiæ indomitam vim, quàm tot legionum ejus gentis cuſpides attuliſſe.* I will not mention the confeſſion of a (*c*) King of *England*; for it would be an ill application of a Thought to the preſent Subject. The Queſtion is not here about the great things a King can do without going out of his Cloſet, by the ſole power of his Pen; nay, the Queſtion is not in general about the efficacy of the Pen in a War. A little Book came out upon this Subject (*d*) in 1679.

XVII. Whether it be too ſevere a thing to inflict the ſame puniſhment upon the diſperſers of Libels as upon the Authors of 'em. Some Remarks againſt thoſe who approve Libels.

I have call'd the Law of *Valentinian* and *Valens* a ſevere one, which condemns to a Capital Puniſhment thoſe who accidentally meeting with a Libel don't deſtroy it, but on the contrary encourage it. Does this ſignifie that I blame this Law? By no means: For I can't conceive that a man who in this caſe diſperſes a Libel, is leſs deſirous of doing miſchief than the Author himſelf, and therefore he deſerves the ſame Puniſhment. But what ſhall we ſay of the pleaſure that is taken in the reading of a Defamatory Libel? Is it not a very ſinful thing before GOD? We muſt diſtinguiſh. Either this pleaſure is only an agreeable ſenſation, that we are affected with when we light upon any Thought that is ingenious, and well expreſs'd; or 'tis a joy grounded upon the diſhonour of the perſon defam'd. I have nothing to ſay upon the firſt Caſe; for perhaps ſome would think that my Morality is not ſevere enough, if I ſhould affirm that a man is not Maſter of thoſe agreeable ſenſations, any more than of thoſe occaſion'd by Sugar or Honey when they touch his Tongue: But in the ſecond Caſe, every body will own that pleaſure to be a great ſin. The pleaſure in the firſt Caſe is of no continuance; it prevents our Reaſon, our Reflection, and is immediately ſucceeded by the grief of ſeeing our Neighbour's Honour blaſted. If it does not ceaſe immediately, 'tis a ſign that the Inſolence of the Satyriſt does not diſpleaſe us, and that we are glad to ſee him defame his Enemy by all ſorts of ſtories; and then we deſerve the Puniſhment to which the Writer of the Libel is liable. Here are the words of a Modern Author: (*e*) St. Gregory *excommunicating the Authors who had diſhonoured the Deacon* Caſtorius, *does not except thoſe who read that Book; becauſe, ſaid he, if Calumnies have always been the delight of the ears, and the happineſs of the people, who have no other advantage over honeſt men, is not he who takes pleaſure in reading them, as guilty as he who compos'd them?* 'Tis a certain Maxim, That they who approve an Action would willingly do it if they could; that is, if ſome reaſon of ſelf-love did not hinder them. There is no difference, ſaid *Cicero*, (*f*) betwixt adviſing a Crime and approving it when 'tis committed. The *Roman* Law confirm'd this Maxim, having ſubmitted the Approvers and Authors of Evil to the ſame Puniſhment. *Et ſi erat ſervus omni modo fugiturus, vel furtum facturus, hic vero laudator hujus propoſiti fuerit, tenetur. Non enim oportet laudando augeri malum* (*g*). We may therefore ſay, that thoſe who are pleas'd with reading Defamatory Libels, ſo far as to approve the Authors and Diſperſers of them, are as guilty as if they had compos'd them; for if they don't write ſuch Libels, 'tis becauſe they have not the Talent of Writing, or becauſe they will run no hazard. See in one of the *Provincial Letters* (*h*) the

---

(*a*) Eraſm. in explicatione proverbii Feſtina lente. It is the 1ſt of the 1ſt Century of the 2d Chiliad.

(*b*) Paulus Jovius elog. virorum bellica virtute inſign. lib. 5. p. m. 389.

(*c*) He ſaid this of the ſaid King Charles V. *There never was a King in* France *who made fewer Wars than he, who never ſtirs from his Cloſet, being always writing Letters; and yet no King did ever cut out ſo much Work for me.* Belleforeſt Chroniques & Annales de France, *fol. m.* 357. *ad ann.* 1364.

(*d*) *Intituled*, Arma anſerina, ſive armatura epiſtolaris, à doctore militari, Tacito, ſubminiſtrata & in diſſertatione Politica diducta à G. C. W.

the mortal Contagion of Calumny: St. *Bernard* is cited there, who maintain'd that Calumny kills not only those who publish it, but also those who do not reject it. The Heathens were not ignorant of this Morality: They said that Slandering was an ill thing, both in the Slanderer, and in him that believ'd Slanders. (*a*) [illegible] *Detractio namque importunissima res est: in qua duo sunt qui injuriam faciunt, unus cui injuria fit. Qui enim detrahit, injurius est, quod non præsentem accusat; item qui huic credit injurius est, quod prius credit quam rem compertam habeat; & illi cui absenti detrahitur, ab id fit injuria quod ab altero insimulatur ut malus, ab altero talis putatur.* See the Book entituled, *Question si* (*b*) *Mr. Arnaud est Heretique?* On the other hand, we ought to believe that the same baseness which induces some people to fire a Musquet upon their Enemy, would induce them to defame him by a Satyr, if they had no other Arms but their Pen. 'Tis just as amongst Beasts; some don't gore with their Horns, but bite; (*c*) 'tis because they have no Horns, and know how to use their Teeth. It may be said also, that a Satyrist who assaults the Honour of his Enemies with Libels, would attempt upon their Life with Sword and Poyson, if he had the same opportunity (*d*). To conclude, it is not always a good excuse to say, Such a Libel has not been answer'd, therefore it contains nothing but Truth: *Seneca* (*e*) laugh'd at this way of arguing.

A DISSERTATION

Concerning the

HIPPOMANES.

THE *Hippomanes* does chiefly signifie two things: 1. A certain Liquor that flows from the Privy-parts of a Mare ready to take Horse; 2. An Excrescence of Flesh which the new-foal'd Colts have upon their Foreheads. It is black, round, and of the bigness of a dry Fig. It's pretended that those two *Hippomanes*'s have a peculiar Virtue in Philtres and other such Compositions design'd for Fascinations; and that the last kind is of such a nature, that a Mare has no sooner dropt her Colt, but she eats this piece of Flesh, without which she would not suckle it. 'Tis added, that if she gives any one time to take away this *Hippomanes*, the meer smell of it makes her mad. Let us prove, but without a crowd of Passages, that if this be not true, 'tis found at least in the most authentick Authors. Let us hear *Virgil*:

> *Hinc* (*f*) *demum, Hippomanes vero quod nomine dicunt*
> *Pastores, lentum distillat ab inguine virus.*
> *Hippomanes, quod sæpe malæ legere novercæ,*
> *Miscueruntque herbas & non innoxia verba.*

I don't add to *Virgil*'s Authority that of his Commentator *Servius*, cited on this Subject by *Fungerus* in his Philological Lexicon, by *Calepinus*, *Decimator*, *&c.* for I don't find that *Servius* does any thing explain the sense of the Poet: But I will not forget that of *Aristotle*. He says (*g*), That what they call *Hippomanes* is a certain thing proceeding *ex pudendis equæ similis genituræ, sed multo magis tenuis quam semen maris.* Now let us hear *Pliny*, who has this passage: (*h*) *Equarum virus à coitu in lychnis accensum Anaxilaus prodidit equinorum capitum usus repræsentare monstrificè: similiter ex asinis. Nam Hippomanes tantas in veneficio vires habet, ut affusum æris mixturæ in effigiem equæ Olympiæ admotos mares equos ad rabiem coitus agat.* Thus much concerning the first signification: now for the second. (*i*) *Et sane equis amoris innasci veneficium, Hippomanes appellatum, in fronte, caricæ magnitudine, colore nigro: quod statim edito partu devorat fœta, aut partum ad ubera non admittit. Si quis præreptum habeat olfactu in rabiem id genus agitur.* *Aristotle* (*k*) had said the same thing; *Virgil* dropt a word about it, speaking of the Enchantments the unfortunate *Dido* had recourse to in her Despair:

> *Quæritur* (*l*) *& nascentis equi de fronte revulsus*
> *Et matri præreptus amor.*

It is easie to see that *Calepinus* has quoted those two passages of *Pliny* wrong, to prove the *Hippomanes* to be a little Excrescence of Flesh upon the Forehead of a new-born Colt; for *Pliny* speaks of it in this sense, only in the 42d Chapter of the 8th Book. Besides, *Calepinus* (*m*) has quoted the 18th Book instead of the 28th, and put *cariæ* instead of *caricæ*; and he ascribes five or six words to *Servius*, which are not to be found in his Commentary, and which signifie that the *Hippomanes* being eaten by a Man, makes him mad; *quod in humana viscera descendens hominem in furorem agat.* *Decimator*'s Dictionary ascribes the same thought to *Servius*. *Martinius* mangles the passage of the 8th Book of *Pliny*; he puts *equi* for *equis*; *fœtus* for *fœta*, (which is Nonsense) and a Comma instead of a Full-stop betwixt *admittit* and *si quis*. See Father *Hardouin* upon *Pliny* (*n*). It may be said in general, That the Writers of Dictionaries take more pains to compile new things, than to mend the faults of others.

I. Two sorts of Hippomanes. Servius and Pliny quoted wrong.

(g) [illegible] Humorem emittunt suis genitalibus similem genituræ, sed multo tenuiorem quam mares, quem *Hippomanes* nonnulli appellant. *Arist. hist. anim. l. 6. c. 18 pag. m. 668. See below n. X.*

(h) *Plin. lib. 28. c. 11. sub fin.*

(i) *Idem Plinius l. 8 c. 42.*

(k) *Arist. ubi supra c. 22.*

(l) *Virg. Æneid. l. 4. v. 515.*

(m) *The Edition I make use of, is that of* Lions 1681.

(n) *In the second Vol. pag. 272.*

(c) Res falsa & inanis nisi corrigatur habet communem fidem, multæ sunt homines [illegible] qui nihil audiunt leguntve quod non credant [illegible] refutatum [illegible] Senec.

(f) *Virg. Georg. l. 3. v. 280.*

II A Plant call'd Hippomanes by Theocritus.

I had reaſon to ſay that the *Hippomanes* does chiefly ſignifie two things; for there is a third kind not near ſo remarkable as the others, ſince it's found only in a paſſage of *Theocritus*: (*A*) Beſides, one muſt engage in a Controverſie with one of the moſt Learned Men of the XVIIth Century to prove it there. This paſſage ſays, (*a*) That the *Hippomanes* is a Plant in *Arcadia*, which makes Mares and Colts run mad. *Salmaſius* can't endure to hear of this Plant; he maintains that *Theocritus* did not ſay φυτὸν, but χυτὸν, and that he meant by χυτὸν the brazen Mare that was near the Temple of *Jupiter Olympius*, which excited Luſt in Horſes in like manner as if ſhe had been alive; a quality ſhe had deriv'd from the *Hippomanes* that had been mix'd with the Braſs in her caſting. We have already related a paſſage out of *Pliny* where mention is made of ſuch a thing; but it will be better to conſult *Pauſanias*, who will give us a larger Account of it. And as what he ſays is the Key of almoſt all the Criticiſms contain'd in this Article, it is neceſſary to inſert his words at length.

III A bra Horſe which cited Lu

Hear then how *Pauſanias* (*b*) ſpeaks: Phormis *going out of* Menalos, *his Countrey, went into* Sicily, *where he ſignaliz'd himſelf in ſeveral Expeditions under* Gelon *Son of* Dinomenes, *and* Hiero *Brother of* Gelon. *Having been very fortunate, he offer'd up Gifts not only to* Jupiter Olympius, *but likewiſe to* Apollo Delphicus. *Thoſe he offered to* Jupiter *are two Horſes with two Grooms, for each Horſe has a Groom:* Dionyſius *of* Argos *made one, and* Simon *of* Ægina *the other. Upon the ſide of the firſt Horſe was engraven an Inſcription, whoſe beginning is in Proſe, and much to this purpoſe, viz. Phormis* the *Arcadian* of *Menalos*, but now of *Syracuſa*, has offer'd it. *The people of* Elea *ſay, that through the artifice of a Magician ſome* Hippomanes *had been mix'd in the caſting of this Horſe, to the end it might afford a ſurprizing Spectacle. He is both ſmaller and leſs beautiful than many other Horſes in* (*c*) Altis, *and has a cut Tail, which renders him yet more ugly; nevertheleſs he ſtirs up luſtful deſires in all other Horſes, not only during the Spring, but all the Year round; for they break their Halters, or eſcape out of the hands of them that hold them, to ruſh with greater fury on this Statue* (*d*) *than if they were to leap the fineſt Mare that ever was. 'Tis true, their feet ſlip, but they don't give over neighing and renewing their furious Encounters till they have been forc'd from the Braſs by mighty whipping and downright ſtrength.*

IV Ser juſtly cenſur'd by Sa maſius

(*e*) *Salmaſius* has written a long Diſcourſe to ſhew that *Theocritus* ſpoke of this Statue, and not of a Plant call'd *Hippomanes*. Let us examin his Reaſons a little; we cannot fail to benefit our ſelves by following the footſteps of ſo Great a Man. 'Tis true, he ſeems not to love the plaineſt and moſt natural way, but rather chooſes to break into the midſt of Buſhes; yet one may ſometimes learn more by running after him through Wilds, than by taking a direct way to Truth under other Guides. He very juſtly (*f*) cenſures *Servius* for ſaying that *Virgil* pretended that the Plant *Hippomanes* was improperly ſo called. *Servius*'s reaſon is, That *Virgil* ſpeaking of another *Hippomanes*, obſerves it was properly ſo call'd, *vero quod nomine dicunt*. This reaſon is nothing worth, for the Poet did not expreſs himſelf after this manner, but becauſe he ſaw in the very Name the Property of the Thing: Now if this Property agreed with ſeveral other Things, with the Plant of *Theocritus*, the Matter that proceeded from a Mare, and the like, then might the ſame Name be given them in the proper ſenſe. *Salmaſius* imagins with a great deal of probability, that *Servius* took *Heſiod* for *Theocritus*, when he ſaid upon the third Book of the Georgicks that *Heſiod* makes mention of an Herb call'd *Hippomanes*, which made Horſes mad; for having had occaſion to ſpeak of the ſame thing in his Comment on the fourth Book of the *Æneid*, he quotes only *Theocritus*. If he had known two Poets who had ſpoke of this Plant, he would doubtleſs have nam'd them both either in the firſt place or the ſecond; but he has not done it, therefore we muſt believe he had only the Authority of *Theocritus*. He has nevertheleſs been the cauſe that even at this day the Dictionary of *Decimator* and the *Theſaurus Fabri* have quoted *Heſiod* and *Theocritus* for the Herb *Hippomanes*.

V Ser Philarg unjuſtly cenſured by Sa maſius

Servius and *Philargyrus* ſeem to have had more reaſon when they ſay, the former, that this Herb made thoſe Horſes mad that eat of it; and the latter, that it excited an exceſſive Luſt in Mares. *Salmaſius* pretends that they don't underſtand it at all, and that *Theocritus* meant only that the Horſes were enflam'd with a violent deſire of enjoying the *Hippomanes*; So that if this Poet ſpoke of an Herb, it muſt be underſtood that the Horſes were tranſported with a furious inclination to eat of it. 'Tis

---

(*A*) *The third kind is only found in a paſſage of* Theocritus.] I am not ignorant that in *Dioſcorides* we find an Herb call'd [illegible], and [illegible], and ἱππομανὲς; and in *Theophraſtus* an *Hippomanes* made of the Herb call'd *Tithymallum*, which is excellent and much cultivated at *Tegea*, (*g*) a Town of *Arcadia*. But becauſe *Salmaſius* (*h*) pretends that none but Cavillers, like to him who conceal'd himſelf under the borrow'd Name of *Cercoëtius* (it was Father *Petau*) would make uſe of the Authority of *Dioſcorides*, ſince that would be to give us the ſpurious Additions made to that Author for his true and real Writings, I think we ought to paſs by his Teſtimony. As for *Theophraſtus*, it is not certain whether we ought to read ἱππομανὲς in the paſſage I have quoted; *Salmaſius* (*i*) corrects the reading of it, ſubſtituting in its place ὁ ὀπὸς μόνος, pretending that the Author meant that Juice only was drawn from the *Tithymallum*. Thus we may ſee theſe Teſtimonies are only matter of diſpute. We muſt not ſay the ſame of that of *Theocritus*, ſince, over and above the Reaſons by which I have overthrown the χυτὸν of *Salmaſius*, it cannot be deny'd but that from the time of the Grammarian *Servius* the word φυτὸν was in the Text of that Poet. Nothing can be ſaid poſitively as to the Herb of which he has ſpoken. *Aloiſius Anguillara*, *Cratevas*, *Dodoneus*, and *Wecker*, who take it for (*k*) the *Stramonia*, call'd by the Arabians *Nux Methel*, and by the French *Pomme du Perou*, do not give us better Conjectures concerning it than (*l*) *Rodericus a Caſtro*, who has taken it for Fern, or (*m*) *Gaſpar a Reies*, who took it for the Herb *Flavia*.

(*a*) ἱππομανὲς φυτόν ἐστι παρ' Ἀρκάσι, τῷ δ' ἔπι πᾶσαι καὶ πῶλοι μαίνονται ἀν' ὤρεα καὶ θοαὶ ἵπποι. *Hippomanes* planta eſt apud Arcades qua concitati omnes & equulei inſaniunt in montibus & celeres equæ. *Theocrit. in Pharmaceutr. p. m.* 15.

(*b*) *Pauſan. lib.* 5. *ſub fin.*

(*c*) *It was the name of one of the Dependencies of the Temple of* Jupiter. *See Pauſan. p. m.* 156. *and hereafter n.* VIII.

(*d*) [illegible] Romulus Amaſæus *tranſlates it* nihil herclè minus furentur, *which weakens the ſenſe.*

(*e*) *Salmaſ. Exercit. Plinian. p.* 939. *&c.*

(*f*) Philargyrus, *another old Commentator on* Virgil, *is alſo involved in this Cenſure, ſince he has inſinuated the ſame thing with* Servius.

(*g*) *'Tis thus perhaps that the Greek words of* Theophraſtus *had to be rendred l.* 9 hiſt. plant. *c.* 15. Καὶ τὸ τιθύμαλλος ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἱππομανὲς, ἄριστον δ' ἐστὶ τὸ περὶ Τεγέαν, καὶ ἐκεῖ μάλιστα σπουδάζεται, *Salmaſius* Exercit. Plin. *pag.* 941. *refers* ἄριστον, &c. *to* ἱππομανὲς.

(*h*) *Ibid. pag.* 940.

(*i*) *Ibid. pag.* 941.

has done, though I know Cratevas *is more ancient by many*

(*l*) *Medic. Polit. l.* 4. *c.* 2.

(*m*) *In Campo Elyſio jucundar. quæſt.* 29.

'Tis thus (*a*) he explains the Greek Phraſe μαίνεσθαι ἐπί τινι. Let it be ſo; but it ſeems to me that the Explication of thoſe two ancient Grammarians is not ill. The Prepoſition ἐπὶ has ſo many ſignifications, that it would be ſtrange if it had not ſometimes that which we give to the Prepoſition *upon* in theſe Phraſes: *He was enraged, he was tranſported, he became furious upon it.* Theſe are all Phraſes where the Prepoſition *upon* does not denote the Object of the Paſſion, but the Occaſion of it.

I do not deny but *Philargyrus* has made *Theocritus* ſay what he does not ſay preciſely, *viz.* That the Herb *Hippomanes* excites in Mares that eat of it an ardent Lubricity; but it is nevertheleſs very likely *Theocritus* underſtood it ſo. For proof of this, we need only conſider his wiſh, that the Object of his Love, influenc'd with a deſire like to that of thoſe Mares, might come to him; as alſo what the Naturaliſts obſerve as to the exceſſive Luſt of theſe Animals. *Ariſtotle* (*b*) ſays no Female Creatures equal theſe in Laſciviouſneſs; and that to expreſs the Lubricity of other Females exceſſively luſtful, they made uſe of the name which denotes that of Mares. *Ælian* obſerves the ſame thing in the 11th Chapter of the 4th Book of his Hiſtory of Animals. Others (*c*) have remarked, that they will go in queſt of the Males even over Mountains and through Rivers.

> *Scilicet* (*d*) *ante omnes furor eſt inſignis equarum.*
>
> \- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
>
> *Illas ducit amor Gargara tranſque ſonantem*
> *Aſcanium; ſuperant montes & flumina tranant.*

Laſtly, *Horace* foretelling to a Miſtreſs who had taken too much upon her in her Youth, that the time would come Mankind would be even with her, tells her ſhe would then feel the Rage that tranſports Mares. (*e*) *Cum tibi flagrans amor & libido, Quæ ſolet matres furiare equorum, Sæviet circa jecur ulceroſum.* Let us infer from hence by the by, that Gallant Poetry was not in the Reign of *Auguſtus*, as now-a-days, an Enemy to all groſs Ideas; but let us chiefly remember to conclude from the Authorities which have been quoted, that *Servius* and *Philargyrus* have well enough underſtood the paſſage out of *Theocritus*, and did not deſerve the Cenſure *Salmaſius* has paſs'd upon them. It was much more natural to underſtand it of an Amorous Paſſion excited by the Herb *Hippomanes*, than of a deſire of eating that Herb: And it ſignifies little that only *Theocritus* (*f*) has ſpoken of this Plant, ſince he might have grounded his Aſſertion on ſome old Tradition which might be contradicted by the following Ages. When all's done, it would not be very ſurprizing that there ſhould be ſuch an Herb as could produce this effect. That which the *Italians* (*g*) call *Sferra Cavallo*, becauſe it is pretended Horſes no ſooner tread on it but they are unſhod, ſeems to me much more miraculous. *Pliny* (*h*) mentions an Herb by means of which the Woodpecker made a Wedge thruſt into a Tree jump out: Yet of this he ſeems to doubt in (*i*) another Book of his.

VI. Confutation of the Opinion of *Salmaſius*.

Let us look a little nearer into the Opinion of *Salmaſius*, and we ſhall find the changing the word φυτὸν into χυτὸν was not well imagin'd. To defend that Reading, we muſt ſuppoſe, firſt, That *Theocritus* believ'd that the Temple of *Jupiter Olympius* was not in *Elis*, but in *Arcadia*; or that knowing it was not in *Arcadia*, he has nevertheleſs averr'd it, either by reaſon of the nearneſs of thoſe two Provinces, or becauſe *Phormis* who conſecrated this brazen Mare was of that Countrey. This firſt Suppoſition is very abſurd; for who can ſuppoſe that the Ceremony of the Olympick Games could permit a fine Wit to doubt in what Province of *Greece* they were celebrated? In this reſpect the *Greeks* were all good Geographers, inſomuch that it can never enter into the opinion of any reaſonable man that *Theocritus* could err upon that Head, or dare to deprive the People of *Elis* in favour of thoſe of *Arcadia*, of the Temple of *Jupiter Olympius*, one of the VII Wonders of the World, and that for two bad Reaſons. But there are other Suppoſitions not leſs abſurd than the foregoing. We muſt ſuppoſe in the ſecond place, that ſpeaking only of the Luſt of Horſes, *Theocritus* made uſe of the Feminine Gender πᾶσαι ϗ πῶλοι, *and all the Mare-Colts*; ϗ θοαὶ ἵπποι, *and all the Mares* (*k*). What reaſon for this? A brazen Mare is the Object deſir'd; her *Hippomanes* ſtirs up only the Horſes, as *Pauſanias* obſerves; and yet *Theocritus* meant only the Luſt of Mare-Colts and Mares. The Reaſon is this: The *Doric* Dialect made uſe of the Feminine Article to denote a Horſe, in like manner as the common Dialect employ'd the Maſculine to denote a Mare. Let it be ſo; but as *Pauſanias*, even in the paſſage which *Salmaſius* quotes for proof of the Remark concerning the common Dialect, makes uſe of the Maſculine Article for Horſes and the Feminine for Mares, we muſt believe that thoſe who made uſe of the *Doric* Dialect apply'd to each Sex its proper Article upon certain occaſions: And it would be eaſie to prove that no *Grecian* has made a Horſe *Feminine*, as the French do the word *Perdrix*; or *Maſculine*, as they do the word *Lièvre*. Now if a like uſage cannot be ſhewn in the *Doric* Dialect, *Salmaſius*'s Anſwer will appear to be no better than an Illuſion. Thirdly, we muſt ſuppoſe that the *Hippomanes* of the brazen Mare extended its Virtue a great way, ſince the Horſes of which *Salmaſius* will have *Theocritus* to ſpeak, ran raging over Mountains, and flew to enjoy their beloved Object *ſuperatis Montibus*. No ſuch thing is hinted in the Relation of *Pauſanias*, and the quite contrary is to be found in theſe words of *Pliny*, *Mares* ADMOTOS *ad rabiem coitus agit*.

Salmaſius finding himſelf perplex'd with theſe Mountains of *Theocritus*, had a mind to change them into ſomething elſe that might better agree with his Notions: He pretends therefore we ought to read ἐν ἦρι, *in the Spring*; and not ἀν' ὤρεα, *thro'* the

---

(*a*) μαίνεσθαι ἐπί τινι non dicitur qui alicujus rei guſtu vel hauſtu ad inſaniam adigitur, ſed qui rei ejus cujus cupiens eſt quocunque modo potiundæ ardore inſanit. *Salmaſ. ubi ſupra.*

(*b*) τῶν δὲ θηλειῶν ἀφροδισιαστικώτατον [illegible]. Incenduntur libidine ex fœminis equæ potiſſimum. *Ariſt. hiſt. anim. l.* 6. *c.* 18.

(*c*) Infuriatæ agitantur equæ, ſpacioque remota per loca dividuos amne ſequuntur equos. *Ovid. l.* 2. *de arte am.*

(*d*) *Virgil. Georg. l.* 3. *v.* 266.

(*e*) *Horat. Od.* 25. *l.* 1.

(*f*) *See the Remark A.*

(*g*) *See* Matthiol. *upon* Diſcorides, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 135.

(*h*) *Plin. l.* 10. *c.* 18.

(*i*) *Idem l.* 25. *c.* 2.

(*k*) *I don't tranſlate* θοαί, *which ſignifies* ſwift of foot, *becauſe that Epithet is not ſuch a one as the* French *Tongue ought to admit of in a Verſion.*

the Mountains; but by misfortune nothing agrees worſe than this Criticiſm of his with the Text of *Pauſanias*, where it does plainly appear, that without any diſtinction of Seaſons, the Horſes burnt with Luſt after the Statue whatever (*a*) time of the year it was. Laſtly, *Salmaſius* had no reaſon to ſuppoſe that this Statue, impregnated with the virtue of the *Hippomanes*, was a Mare. I know very well *Pliny* has ſaid it before him; but *Pauſanias*, who made it his principal ſtudy to examin the Monuments of *Greece*, and who is an Author incomparably more exact than *Pliny*, leaves us no reaſon to doubt that this Statue was a Horſe, ſince he every where makes uſe of the Maſculine Article when he ſpeaks of it, and employs the Feminine in the ſame place to denote a Mare (*b*).

VII

A Reflexion upon the relation of *Pauſanias*.

I ſhall not examin what credit is to be given to *Pauſanias*'s Relation concerning the Taleſmanick kind of Virtue of this Statue; but ſhall however ſay, that the extreme fury of Luſt incident to Horſes might well enough be rais'd by a Statue without the help of any Philtre. Let us ſuppoſe them to have a Soul; could they not imagin that a Statue is the Animal it repreſents, or at leaſt that it is a very fine Statue? In the firſt caſe, why might not the ſame thing happen to them, *mutatis mutandis*, as to thoſe Birds who peck'd upon the Picture of a Vine? An Horſe painted by *Apelles* made the living Horſes (*c*) neigh. In the ſecond caſe, why ſhould they not be ſubject to the Infirmity many Men have been guilty of, that is, (*d*) to the laſcivious loving of a Statue? I confeſs it may be objected amongſt other things, that the Eyes (*e*) are not the ſole Guides in the love of Beaſts, as they very frequently are in that of Men; and that the Smell is the principal Vehicle of this Paſſion in the Machines of Animals; whence it follows, that a Statue is deſtitute with reſpect to them of the main Springs of Love. But the Queſtion is, Whether the skill of the Statuary might not ſupply this defect by the imitated poſture of a Mare exceſſively luſtful; and whether the Story ſo celebrated by the *Greek* Poets, and by *Auſonius* (B) after them, concerning *Myron*'s brazen Heifer, can be douted of? *Livy*, more credible alone than an hundred Poets, relates that at *Syracuſa* a Bull perform'd the carnal act upon the Statue of an Heifer. (*f*) *Vaccam æream Syracuſis ab agreſti Tauro qui pecore aberraſſet, initam ac ſemine aſperſam.* As much has been ſaid of ſome other Animals. (*g*) *Myronis æream buculam Taurus inſcenderet, caniculam, columbam, anatem coloribus expreſſas mares congeneres inſilirent.* It muſt not be diſſembled that *Livy* relates this fact as one of the Prodigies of that Year, and that in point of Prodigies one cannot well depend on him. If with the *Carteſians* we allow Beaſts to be meer Machines, we ſhall eaſily apprehend how a lively imitation of Poſtures might have notable effects.

VIII

Cardan's faults upon the ſame fact.

Cardan (*h*) who doubts not of the Fact related by *Pauſanias*, but moreover aſſigns the beſt natural Reaſons he can for it, did not take the Male for the Female. He was ſo well ſatisfy'd that *Pauſanias* ſpoke of the Statue of a Horſe, that it is one of the Objections he attempts to ſolve: but otherwiſe he does not ſeem to have well examin'd the paſſage of that Hiſtorian; for he makes him ſay that this brazen Horſe was at (*i*) *Heraclea* of *Elis*, a Province of *Peloponneſus*, in a place call'd *Quialten*. A ſtrange complication of Blunders. For, 1. *Heraclea* is the name of abundance of (*k*) Cities, but is not the name of any one Province (*l*). 2. At leaſt it is certain that there was not any Province of that name in all *Peloponneſus*. 3. There was indeed in *Elis* a City or Town of this name, (*m*) but it was not a place that contain'd any pieces of the Treaſure of *Olympia*. Laſtly, This *Quialten* is a monſtrous Abſurdity. This in my opinion was the manner how *Heraclea* and *Quialten* came to be foiſted in: *Pauſanias* having been ſpeaking of ſome Gifts which the City of *Heraclea* upon the *Euxine-Sea*, a Colony of the *Megarians*, had conſecrated, obſerves, that over-againſt them there were others conſecrated by *Phormis*, &c. and that the two Horſes which this *Phormis* preſented to *Jupiter*

(B) *Concerning* Myron'*s brazen Heifer.*] *Myron*, a Native of *Eleuthera* in *Bœotia*, made an Heifer of Braſs, which furniſh'd a fine Topick for the Poets. There are in the * Anthology near forty Epigrams upon this Subject. *Auſonius* has made eleven upon the ſame Theme, which are of an handſom turn; This is one of them:

Bucula († *ſum cælo genitoris facta Myronis*
Ærea: nec factam me puto, ſed genitam.
Sic me taurus init: ſic proxima bucula mugit,
Sic vitulus ſitiens ubera noſtra petit.
Miraris, quod fallo gregem? gregis ipſe Magiſter
Inter paſcentes me numerare ſolet.

Mr. *Menage* has exercis'd his *Greek* Muſe upon this Heifer with better ſucceſs in Father *Hardouin*'s opinion than all the reſt. See his Commentary upon the 34th Book (*h*) of *Pliny*, where he ſays that *Tzetzes* has mention'd the ſame Heifer in the 194th Story of the 8th Chiliad. See alſo the *Anti-Ballet*, ‖ in which a *Greek* Epigram of *Andrew Laſcaris* is cited. Note, that Dom *Lancelotti* of *Perugia* liſts amongſt the Fables whatever the Ancients have ſaid of the love of Beaſts for Pictures. *De gli animali*, ſays he ‡, *porto l'iſteſſa opinione, perche queſti non ſi riſentono al coito ſolamente per la viſta, ma per lo moto, per l'odore, e per la voce, niuna delle quali tre coſe ha la pittura, Farfalloneggi quanto vuole Plinio, Valerio, e chi chi ſia.* I have ſaid in the Article *Zeuxis*, that he is miſtaken about other things of the ſame nature, which he has deny'd; and why may he not about theſe? However, I will cite *Athenæus* ** [illegible] *Circa Pyrenæos montes in æneam vaccam bos tanquam initurus conſcendit: pictis verò cani, columbæ, anſeri, fœminis mares ejus generis ſeſe cùm adjunxiſſent & inſiluiſſent, deſtiterunt, quoniam id fieri non poſſe cognoſcerent.* Perhaps there is nothing more ſevere or ingenious in *Lelio Capilupi*'s *Cento Virgilianus* againſt the Monks, than the application of one of *Virgil*'s Verſes, which I ſhall cite below. Here follows a piece of it:

O fortunatos nimium, ſua ſi bona norint,
Non abſunt illis ſaltus, armentaque læta.
Cælati argenti ſunt, auri multa talenta,
Sacra deum, ſanctique patres, & chara ſororum
Pectora mærentum tenebris & carcere cæco
Centum ærei claudunt vectes, & ſæpe ſine ullis
Conjugiis vento gravidæ, mirabile dictu,
Religione ſacræ, non hæc ſine numine divum.
Jam nova progenies cælo demittitur alto.
Credo equidem nec vana fides, genus eſſe Deorum.

(*a*) [illegible]

(*b*) *De Salmaſius*? [illegible]

(*c*) *Plin. l.* 35. *c.* 10. *Valer. Max. l.* 8. *c.* 11. *ſays it was a Mare*, quo excuſabilior error equi, qui viſâ pictura equæ hinnitum edere coactus eſt.

(*c*) [illegible] *Id eſt juxta verſionem Romuli Amaſæi.* Illum invadunt nihil hercle minus furenter quàm ſi viventem pulcherrimam equam gregalem inituri adorirentur.

(*d*) *Many Moderns have made a collection of them, amongſt others* Balthazar Bonifacius hiſtor. ludicr. *l.* 14. *c.* 13.

(*e*) *See the paſſage of* Lancelot. *of* Perugia *in Remark* B.

(*f*) T. Liv. *lib.* 41.

(*g*) *Balth. Bonif. ubi ſupra. See Athenæus cited in Remark B.*

(*h*) *De Subtilit. l.* 13.

(*i*) *In Heracles Elidis Peloponneſi Provinciis equum æneum fuiſſe narrat in loco cui nomen erat* Quialten.

(*k*) *See Salmaſ. in Plin. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(*l*) *I don't deny that there were ſome little Iſlands of this name.*

(*m*) Strabo, Pauſanias, *and* Stephanus Byzantinus *mention it, but not* Emmius *in his* Græcia Antiqua, *nor* Ortelius, *nor* Lloyd, *nor* Hofman, *nor* Baudrand, *in their Dictionaries.*

* *Lib.* 4. *c.* 7.

† *Auſon. Epigr.* 63.

(*h*) *Tom.* 5. *pag.* 113. *and not* 213. *as it is noted in the* Anti-Ballet. *p.* 72.

‖ *Tom.* 2. *pag.* 72. & 256.

‡ *Secondo Lancelotti da Perugia Abbate Olivetano, Accademico, Inſenſato, Affidato, e Humoriſta, l'Hoggidi, overo* 2. *diſinganno* *il mondo non piggiore ne più calamitoſo del paſſato, parte* 15. *p.* 309.

** *Athen. lib.* 13. *pag.* 605.

Jupiter were in the *Altis*, that is, in the *Lucus*, or Grove that was a Dependance on the Temple.

IX. *Errors of John Baptist Porta, and of Wierus, and of the Commentary on Du Bartas.*

I have seen in a *French* Translation (*a*) of *John Baptist Porta*'s Natural Magick, a pretty long Chapter upon the *Hippomanes*, which I have not in my (*b*) *Latin* Edition. *Pausanias*'s Relation is there faithfully enough reported, excepting two falshoods; one is, that *Areas* an *Olympian* mingl'd some *Hippomanes* with the Metal of the Statue; the other, that he made a Mare. He says that *Ælian* relates the same Story, but 'tis an Error. *John Wierus* (*c*) has only avoided the first of these three faults: he says that *Phormis* experimented the *Hippomanes* at *Olympia*, *Novit vim Olympiæ Phormis Areas.* Note, That *Baptista Porta*'s Natural Magick printed in *Latin* at *Francfort* 1607. is divided into twenty Books; some preceding Editions, which the *French* Version cited by me went by, have but four. This Author does not say that *Areas* an *Olympian* mingl'd some *Hippomanes*, &c. but that *Phormis* the *Arcadian* discover'd the virtue of the *Hippomanes* at *Olympia*, *Tantam in eo vim novit Olympiæ Phormis Areas.* I believe *Cardan* occasion'd the Error of one *Peter Baistuau*, sirnam'd *Launai*, a Native of *Bretagne*, (for these are the Titles he lov'd to distinguish himself by) highly prais'd by *la Croix du Maine*. *Who wou'd not be surpriz'd*, says he (*d*), *at what* Pausanias *the* Greek *Historian relates concerning the brazen Statue of an Horse, form'd by a certain Artist in* Heraclea, *a Province of* Peloponnesus, *having a cut and deform'd Tail, but perfect in all the other parts of the Body, which however the other Horses endeavour'd to leap with so much heat and transport, as to break their Hoofs by their frequent rearings upon it, whilst the slipperiness of the Brass it was compos'd of still cast them off; and notwithstanding all the blows that could be given them, they could not be driven away, but neigh'd after the Statue as if it had been ready to take Horse?* *Du Bartas* meant to speak of the same Wonder (*e*) in these Verses:

> *Cette jument d'airain sur qui les estalons*
> *Lançoient estant en rut leurs fragiles talons.*

But *Simon Goulart*, his Commentator, has impertinently imagin'd that he treated there of *Myron*'s Masterpiece, *who made*, says he, *a Mare or Heifer of Brass so very natural, that the Horses ran to leap her.* If he had remembred *Pausanias*'s passage, or rather *Pliny*'s, and consider'd that the Epigrams he speaks of in the same place don't permit us to doubt whether *Myron* made an Heifer or a Mare, he would have been guiltless of this little Error. See the Remark *B.* in the foregoing page.

X. Whether there is a fourth sort of *Hippomanes.*

Besides the three sorts of *Hippomanes* I have mentioned, there are those that discover a fourth. They ground themselves upon *Aristotle*'s Authority, pretending that he acknowledged two sorts of *Hippomanes* in Mares, one that flows before the Horses approach, the other after they have allay'd their appetite by the first congress. *Salmasius*, (*f*) who finds this distinction in *Aristotle*, has occasion'd my attentive (*g*) reading the words of this Philosopher: but I have not found it there, tho' I saw in very few Lines the repetition twice over of the Remark concerning the *Hippomanes*. That repetition ought not to carry our thoughts to two different things: for tho' *Aristotle* be concise, 'tis nevertheless true that he considers the symptoms of lascivious Mares at two Essays; and the reason of his doing it is, that he particularly explains the accidents of those Mares that took Wind, if I may so speak, *quæ* ἐξανεμοῦσθαι, *eventari dicebantur.* He shews that this happen'd not to Mares who had an Horse at hand, in the place where he says that by reason of this accident the *Cretans* left the Mares and Stallions together: And having spoken of the Courses those took towards the North or South, to which this accident happen'd, he speaks in general of the signs by which the Mares are known to want the Horse; and as he had spoken of the *Hippomanes* with respect to those which do nothing but run, he speaks of it also with respect to all Mares (*C*) in general. I see

MARES that took Wind.

(C) *He speaks of it also with respect to all Mares in general.*] 'Tis thus I explain *Aristotle*, because otherwise he would seem to contradict himself, as may be seen by this Abstract. We see there that the Lust of the Mares is call'd a furious appetite of enjoying the Male, ἱππομανεῖν; that 'tis said also at that time that they take Wind, ἐξανεμοῦσθαι; that in that condition they depart from other Mares and Horses; that they run not towards the East or West, but towards the North or South; that they suffer nothing to come near them, except they are tir'd down, or come near the Sea-side; that then they cast out something call'd *Hippomanes*; that the Mares at the season of Copulation gather together; that they love Company more than before; that they move more frequently their Tails; that their neighing changes; that they cast the *Hippomanes. They piss also*, says *Aristotle*, *more frequently, and sport with one another when they are lustful.* I am sorry I am not clear-sighted enough to perceive much clearness and exactness in these words: But however it be, if the ἐξανεμοῦσθαι is not different from the ἱππομανεῖν, as the Species differs from the Genus, it will follow that *Aristotle* would teach us that lustful Mares avoid all Company, and yet that they associate with greater pleasure than before. Now, as this would be a ridiculous Contradiction, it must be concluded that *Aristotle* by ἐξανεμοῦσθαι meant only a kind of heat; or if it be said that this contains something common to all Mares, we must conclude it was a state that preceded the maturity of the Passion, and what *Aristotle* a little after calls ὥρα τῆς ὀχείας, *tempus coitus.* But this utterly overthrows *Salmasius*'s System, I mean that Explication he is so fond of, and repeats more than once in another page, after having justly censur'd the great Man who thought that *Aristotle*'s ἐξανεμοῦσθαι ought to be understood of the Mares that were impregnated by the operation of the Wind. 'Tis certain that *Aristotle* does not speak of this, and there would be no Objection against *Salmasius*, if he had contented himself to affirm that this *Greek* word signifies *the refreshing one's self with the Wind suck'd in with open mouth*: but he is unfortunate in what he adds to this Interpretation. Ἐξανεμοῦσθαι, says he (*h*), *est eventilari & vento excepto hiante ore refrigerari, quod equæ faciunt ubi ad satietatem initæ non fuerint. Ex eo quidem interdum & concipere autores tradidere, idque in Hispania tantum. Non tamen* ἐξανεμοῦσθαι *significat ex vento concipere. Loquitur Aristoteles de iis equabus quæ admiserint sed non satis, nec meminit eo loco conceptionis ullius quæ ex vento fiat.* Note, that *Salmasius* is mistaken in saying that this has been said only of *Spanish* Mares, since the same thing has been said of those of *Cappadocia* (*i*).

Let

(*a*) Printed at Roan 1626. in 12°. The Chapter upon the Hippomanes is the 27th of the 2d Book. It is found amongst Weckher's Secrets, as coming from Baptista Porta.

(*b*) Of Francfort 1607. in 8°.

(*c*) De Lamiis, c. 38.

(*d*) *Treatise concerning the Excellence of Man, printed at the end of the* Theatre du Monde *by the same Author.*

(*e*) *Sixth day of the first Week, v.* 826.

(*f*) Differentiam itaque constituit *Aristoteles* inter hoc ἱππομανὲς quod equæ tum ejiciunt ubi semel salita fuerint, estque simile [illegible], & illud ἱππομανὲς quod illis defluit ab inguine eo tempore quo maris cupiditate ardescunt nec dum admiserunt. *Salmas. Exercit. Plin. pag.* 941.

(*g*) Arist. *Hist. animal. l.* 6. *cap.* 18.

(*h*) *Salmas. Exerc. Plin, pag.* 943.

(*i*) *See St.* Aug. de civit. Dei, *l.* 21. *c.* 5.

I see no ground from hence for multiplying the Species: but yet if they were (a) multiply'd, *Salmasius* would still be mistaken, in pretending that *Aristotle's* distinction respects the non-enjoyment of some Mares, and the enjoyment of some others far from Satiety, and that those which air'd themselves were of the latter sort. This is by no means *Aristotle's* Doctrine; on the contrary, we should infer from his Discourse, that they totally abstain'd, since, besides the Reflection he makes upon the Conduct of the *Cretans*, he says in express words, that they wander'd from Company, and never suffer'd themselves to be approach'd till they were tir'd, or came near the Sea (b), and that then they cast the *Hippomanes*. (c) [illegible] .... [illegible], &c. *Cum vero ita affectæ fuerint, currunt relicta societate ... nec appropinquare quemquam patiuntur donec vel defatigatæ desistant vel ad mare deveniant; tum aliquid emittunt, &c.*

(a) *Father* Hardouin *in Plin. t. 3. p. 111. acknowledges two kinds of it.*

(b) *The* Geneva *Edition,* 1605, *and the* Paris, 1629, *put* Marem *instead of* Mare.

XI. Remarks upon *Hofman* and *Furetiere*.

Mr. *Hofman* (d) speaks of the *Hippomanes* according to *Salmasius's* Ideas, as well upon the passage of *Theocritus* as that of *Aristotle*; and therefore we need only refer him to what has been said above. Only let me be allow'd to tell him, that if he well consults *Pausanias*, he will not cite him (e) *de Arcad.* nor find there that *Phormis* dedicated a Mare in *Olympia*; for that Author expresly says at the end of the fifth Book, that *Phormis* consecrated two Horses and two Coachmen. As to Mr. *Furetiere*, I have no considerable faults to tax him with; I only observe, that he has been a little unexact in citing *Pliny* only for the *Hippomanes* on the Forehead of Colts. This naturally leads us to this fallacious thought, that *Pliny* speaks of no other *Hippomanes*. I could wish also he had cited *Aristotle*, whose Authority is justly greater than *Pliny's*. As to the other sort of *Hippomanes*, he shou'd not have cited *Servius*, but *Virgil*; *Servius* being only his Interpreter, without saying whether the fact be true or false. Neither *Cæsar de Rochefort's* Dictionary, nor *Castellus's* *Lexicon Medicum* copiously enlarg'd by *Bruno*, say any thing of the *Hippomanes*.

(c) *Arist.* ubi supra.

(d) *Vol.* 3. *p.* 162. & *Vol.* 4. *p.* 495.

(e) *The Book concerning* Arcadia *is the 8th; that wherein he speaks of* Phormis *is the 5th, and the first of the two wherein the Author treats of* Elis.

I will

The PRETENDED fœcundity of those Mares.

Let us not part with this Subject without observing that 'tis very probable *Aristotle* has divided into two parts what was told him concerning the heat of lustful Mares, rejecting what he thought incredible, and preserving the rest. But he would perhaps have done well to have rejected all those rambling Courses from one Pole to the other; to have rejected them, I say, as well as the (f) Conceptions produc'd purely by the Winds. *Virgil*, invested with all the Privileges of Poetry, would detract nothing from the Tradition; he has feign'd that the Mares sought the Winds, and found them endu'd with a prolifick Virtue. These are his words:

Continuoque * *avidis ubi subdita flamma medullis*
Vere magis (quia vere calor redit ossibus) illæ
Ore omnes versæ in Zephyrum stant rupibus altis,
Exceptantque leves auras: & sæpe sine ullis
Conjugiis vento gravidæ (mirabile dictu)
Saxa per & scopulos & depressas convalles
Diffugiunt, non, Eure, tuos neque solis ad ortus
In Borean, Caurumque aut unde nigerrimus Auster
Nascitur & pluvio contristat frigore cælum.

From this Description it may be collected that it was the West Wind that impregnated the Mares, and that they rested upon some rising ground to receive it, turning their Heads or Tails to it, (for that's a point that has not yet been clear'd by the Criticks, there being Reasons on both sides) after which they ran as if they had been mad, either from North to South, or from South to North. These Fictions are pardonable in the Poets; but we can't tell how to pardon (g) *Varro, Pliny, Solinus, Columella*, and some others, their reciting as a certain fact, that in *Portugal* the Mares produce Colts without any other Sire than the Wind. The Historian *Trogus Pompeius* (h) has much ridicul'd this. *Andrew Resendius* (i) a learned *Portuguese*, relates, that there is no proof of it in his Country. *Francis Fernand* of *Corduba* (k) has confuted the same Story with Arguments, Authorities, and Experience.

This shews that St. *Austin* has not well chosen all the Examples he has oppos'd to the Incredulity he observ'd among the Heathens, relating to the Mysteries of the Gospel: for, amongst other things which (l) he says were not doubted of, but yet were unaccountable to Reason, he speaks of the Mares impregnated by the Wind. It was not a fact that all the Heathens generally agreed in. We find it exploded in *Justin*, with the approbation of (m) *Leonard Coquæus*. *Eustathius* Bishop of *Thessalonica* looks upon (n) it as a Fable, and every body at present laughs at it (o). But after all, a better Reason might be given for it in the new Hypothesis that all Creatures proceed from an Egg, than from the Courses the Mares affected from one Pole to the other. If *Aristotle*, who appears not to doubt of this fact, would have exercis'd his Principles of Physick upon it, he would have found himself more work than *Descartes* did in the direction of the Loadstone. Mr. *Descartes* himself might here have been nonplus'd for want of a Gutter-work of insensible parts, such as would be necessary to explain the virtue of the Southern and Northern Winds upon Mares that had imbib'd the Western. However it be, I don't think that the present Managers of the Breed could supply *Aristotle* with Memoirs to corroborate those he has publish'd. Who would believe, for Example, that there was at *Opûs* (p) a Stallion which could do his Office at (q) Forty years old, tho' he wanted assistance to raise his Fore-legs? *Pliny* (r) has well copy'd this passage of *Aristotle*, when he says, *Opunte & ad quadraginta durasse aiunt adjutum modo in attollenda priore parte corporis*. But *Solinus* has perform'd the part of a very bad Transcriber in these words: *Notatum* (s) *etiam advertimus Opuntem nomine equum ad gregariam venerem durasse in annos quadraginta*. This Horse belong'd to an Inhabitant of *Opûs*, and *Solinus* has taken the Name of the Place for that of the Horse. (t) *Salmasius* has not suffer'd this blunder to escape him. The omission of the need he had to be help'd up by the Fore-feet, which was the principal rarity of the fact, deserv'd an equal Censure.

What I have said of St. *Austin* is applicable also to *Origen* and *Lactantius*, who have endeavour'd to evince the immaculate Virginity of the Mother of JESUS CHRIST by the Examples of Conceptions without the use of a Male, story'd by the Heathens. (u) *Quod si animalia quadam vento aut aura concipere solere omnibus notum est, cur quisquam mirum putet cum Spiritu Dei cui facile est quidquid velit, gravatam esse Virginem dicimus?* The Fathers made any shift, *& ex omni ligno Mercurium*. If they had only alledg'd this as an Argument *ad hominem*, they could not be blam'd; but they affirm it as a certain fact. I don't know whether they cite what *Pomponius Mela* relates of some Savage *Æthiopian* Women who became Mothers without the concourse of any Man: (x) *Super eos grandis littoris flexus grandem insulam includit, in qua tantum fœminas esse narrant, toto corpore hirsutas, & sine coitu marium sua sponte fœcundas: adeo asperis efferisque moribus, ut quadam contineri ne reluctentur vix vinculis possint. Hoc Hanno retulit, & quia detracta occisis coria pertulerat, fides habita est.* You see that *Hanno* is quoted; but he is falsified, for he has not said that the Women of that Island were without Men: (y) *Non recte Hannoni adfingit, insulam hanc habitari à feminis solis, & quidem sua sponte facundis, cum Hanno contrarium dicat: utriusque enim sexus homines in ea insula fuisse scribit, quamvis multo plures feminas.*

(f) *Many Authors, as Fr. Modius* Nov-antiq. lect. Ep. 74. *Dausquieius* in Silium Italicum l. 3. pag. m. 134. *falsly father upon* Aristotle *these conceptions.*

* *Virg. Georg. l.* 3. *v.* 271.

(g) *See Jo. a Wower de Polymath. c.* 11.

(h) *Justin. l.* 44. *c.* 3.

(i) *Antiq. Lusitanicar. l.* 1.

(k) *Didascal. multipl. c.* 48.

(l) *De civ. Dei l.* 21. *c.* 5. *See the last paragraph of this Remark.*

(p) *A Town of the* Epicnemidii Locri.

(q) *Arist. hist. anim. l.* 6. *c.* 22.

(r) *Plin. l.* 8. *c.* 42.

(s) *Solin. c.* 45.

(t) *Exercit. Plin. p.* 936.

(u) *In lib. adversus Celsum.*

(x) *Lactan. Divin. instit. lib.* 4. *c.* 12. *p. m.* 246, 247.

(y) *Pompon. Mela lib.* 3. *c.* 9.

(z) *Isaac. Vossius in Pompon. Melam ib.* Gaspar à Reies *quem vide in Elys. jucund. quæst. campo, quæst.* 41. *n.* 13. & *seq.* knew not *Mela's* error

---

(m) *In his Notes on St.* Austin de civit. Dei. (n) *In Iliad. lib.* 20. *v.* 225. (o) *Harduin. in Plin. tom.* 2. *pag.* 212. Note, *that some believe it is* Lewis Carion, Observat. l. 1. c. 17. & l. 2. c. 4.

VII. What is to be judged of the Hippomanes.

I will not conclude this Article without observing what *Aristotle* has so judiciously determin'd concerning the *Caruncula* on the Forehead of the Foal. He says, * That it is said to grow there, but that the Dam takes it off by licking, and that the Stories concerning its Virtue are to be reckon'd Fables invented by Women and Enchanters. Nevertheless this Virtue has been talk'd of in all Ages, and 'tis easie to observe that the persuasion which first obtain'd of its being serviceable as a Philtre, was grounded upon the Story that if the Mare did not swallow it, she did not nourish her Young. An ancient Poet, cited by *Apuleius*, reckoning up Philtres, calls this *hinnientium dulcedines*, which has a notable Analogy to the *Matri præreptus amor*, which I have cited from *Virgil.* But as Philtres rather produc'd Fury than Love, thence the *Hippomanes* came to be consider'd as a baneful Drug. *Juvenal* says that *Cæsonia*, by employing it upon her Husband *Caligula*, caus'd that mad Rage which prompted him to so many Crimes.

Et furere (a) incipias, ut avunculus ille Neronis
Cui totam tremuli frontem Cæsonia pulli
Infudit.
Ardebant cuncta & fracta compage ruebant,
Non aliter quam si fecisset Juno maritum
Insanum.

- - - - - - - - - -

Hæc poscit ferrum atque ignes, hæc potio torquet,
Hæc lacerat mixtos equitum cum sanguine patres,
Tanti partus equæ, tanti una venefica constat.

The World is not yet recover'd of this Superstition; for we find in a (*b*) late Romance, which is a faithful and pleasant Copy of the Conduct of many persons, some *Parisian* Ladies spending a Night in *watching* a Mare, *to catch somewhat they were made to believe a Foal brings into the World on his Forehead, and to dress it with certain Ceremonies, which in their Opinion become a wonderful and irresistible Philtre. This Philtre was to be given subtilly to the Soldiers, and to the Captain himself, if there was occasion for it, and immediately both the Captain and Soldiers were to run through the streets, and offer to do all that should be desir'd of them. The Towers and Gates seem'd, if I may so speak, to be ready to fall of themselves, to give liberty to whomsoever the Ladies pleas'd.* If we consult the Journal of the *German* Naturalists, we shall be (*c*) fully convinc'd that the Colts are foal'd with the *Hippomanes* on the Forehead; for they give us the Anatomical Figure and Description of one of them, which had been brought to a Physician call'd Mr. *Raygerus.* He had often desir'd to see some of them fresh, having before seen some that were dry: He experienc'd that the Mare gave Milk to the Colt as usual, tho' that part was taken from it; so that if on one hand he lends Assistance to the Ancients, he discredits them much on the other. His *Hippomanes* is much greater than *Aristotle* or *Pliny* represent it.

(*a*) Juven. Sat. 6.

(*b*) Avantures de Henriette Sylvie de Moliere, part 3. pag. 9. Dutch Edit. 1674.

(*c*) Annus ... Decur. ... impressus 1678. pag. 54. & seq.

* [illegible] Quod Hippomanes vocant, hæret quidem fronti nascentis pulli, ut narratur, sed equæ perlambentes abstergentesque id abrodunt: quæ autem de hoc fabulantur, figmenta muliercularum & professorum carminis incantamentorum esse credendum potius est. *Arist. hist. anim. l.* 8. *c.* 24. *pag.* 699, 700.

A DISSERTATION
UPON
The DAY.

I. Reflections upon the distinction of the Natural and Artificial Day.

Every body knows that the Word *Day* has several acceptations, and that there is the Natural Day, the Artificial Day, the Civil Day, the Astronomical Day, *&c.* I could make many Observations to shew that in the definition of these sorts of Days there's hardly ever any perfect exactness; but as the particularizing these Punctilio's would carry me too far, I shall omit more of them than I shall mention.

'Tis somewhat strange that Authors are not agreed in the definition of the Natural and Artificial Day. Some (*d*) define the Natural Day, *the Time betwixt Sun-rising and Sun-setting*, and the Artificial Day, *the space included in twenty-four hours.* Others define (*e*) the Natural Day, *the space of Time the Sun takes to circuit about the Earth*, and the Artificial Day, *the Time from Sun-rising to Sun-setting.* I confess that this difference lies more in the Terms than in the Thing it self, and that we are not oblig'd to give Words the same Sense that others give them; but it would be very convenient for Readers if the signification of certain Terms was fix'd, and was not converted from White to Black in passing from one Volume to another. Besides, they who define the Day, *the time from Sun-rising to Sun-setting*, fix upon the least common signification; for, for one Cosmographer who measures each Day's extent by it, in treating of the difference of Climates, (in which 'tis certain that the Sun's rising and setting only is regarded) there are millions that understand by the Word *Day* all the time that the Horizon is enlightned. This appears by these common Phrases, *At break of Day*; *It was already Day*; *It was Day still*; whereby the Twilight of Morning and Evening is manifestly denoted. 'Tis therefore exposing the Works of the Dogmatists to the Complaints and Censures of most People, to say the Revolution of the Sun comprehends the Day and the Night; but

(*d*) *Father* Labbé *Chron. abridgment tom.* 1. *and before him* Censorinus *as to the Natural Day, to which he opposes the Civil.*

(*e*) Coutel *p.* 13. *of the Eccles. Calculat.* Furitiere, & *before them* Gassendus Instit. Astron. *l.* 1. *c.* 22.

but by the Day is meant the time from the riſing to the ſetting of the Sun, and by the Night the time from its ſetting to its riſing. It would be better to ſay that the Day is all the time we enjoy the Light (*a*) of the Sun, and that the Night is all the time we are depriv'd of it. Beſides, it is not very reaſonable to call that the Artificial Day, which Nature makes by the real or apparent revolution of the Firmament about the Earth: this Title much better agrees to that part of the revolution in which the Artificers are employ'd in their Labour; and even this teſtifies that the Artificial Day ought not to be terminated by the riſing and ſetting of the Sun, it being not by that the Workmen can meaſure their Labour in the frigid Zones, nor always in the temperate ones.

In all things elſe we ſee that thoſe things which borrow their Names from Nature, have quite another generality than thoſe that take them from Art: It is therefore more reaſonable that the Natural Day ſhould be that which is uniform throughout the World, and that the Artificial Day ſhould be that which varies according to places, than to eſtabliſh the contrary. Let us ſay then, that the Word *Day* in its moſt proper ſignification ought to be taken for the time betwixt the Sun's leaving the Meridian, to its returning to it again; that this is the Natural Day, which comprehends (*A*) Twenty-four hours; that in this ſenſe the Days are not greater nor leſs numerous under the Poles than under the Æquator; that they are equal in all parts of the Earth; but as the moſt excellent parts of a whole have often the privilege of bearing the Name of the whole without addition, and by way of preeminence, it happens that where the Natural Day is compos'd of two parts, one dark and the other light, this, as the more noble, has been ſimply nam'd *the Day*; whereupon we think we have right to ſay, that in the temperate Zones each Day is longer or ſhorter than the preceding. This was doubtleſs the Origin of this ſecond ſignification of the Word *Day*. Order requires, that they who treat theſe Subjects dogmatically, ſhould characteriſe it by the addition of ſome Epithet, of *Artificial* for inſtance. But in ordinary ſpeech (*b*) there is no need of any addition, in order to conceive that the Day excludes the Night. However, this is not univerſal; there are popular Phraſes in which the Day is taken for Twenty-four hours; as when we ſay, that *a Child liv'd but four days*, that a *Voyage or a Marriage continued but fifteen days*; and thus of ſeveral other ways of ſpeaking, in which 'tis plain that the Day excludes not the Night.

II The Gauls and other Nations reckon'd by nights.

The old *Gauls* gave the Night the preference over the Day, calling the time of Twenty-four hours, which makes up the Night and Day, a Night. (*c*) *Caſar* informs us of this, and attributes the Origin of this Cuſtom to an ancient Tradition of the *Druids*, that the *Gauls* deſcended from *Pluto*. The *Germans* alſo (*d*) practis'd the ſame thing of reckoning by Nights. *Vigenere* in his Notes (*e*) upon *Julius Caſar* pretends there are ſtill ſome Remains of this Practice. *As for the* Germans, *ſays he, they ſtill obſerve this way of ſpeaking, and commonly ſay,* vor drey necthen, *before it be three Nights, inſtead of before it be three Days; and* Sant Johans nacth, Sant Martins nacth, *Saint* John's *Night, Saint* Martin's *Night, for Saint* John's *Day, St.* Martin's *Day. The French alſo in many places of this Kingdom uſe the ſame way of ſpeaking,* (*f*) anuict (to Night) *inſtead of* to day. *Nicolas Bergier*, Advocate in the Preſidial of *Rheims*, adds to theſe Remarks of *Vigenere*, *That the* French *who came from* Germany, *and ſeiz'd on that part of* Gaul *which is ſituate betwixt the* Rhine *and the* Maeſe, *and were call'd* Ripuarian French, *uſed the word Night to ſignifie the Natural Day of Twenty-four hours, as is manifeſt from theſe words in one of their Laws:* Si infra Ducatum eſt ſuper 14 noctes auctorem ſuum repræſentet. He ſpeaks thus (*B*) in his Poſthumous *Traité du Point du Jour*. The

(*a*) *Take in alſo the Light that precedes the Sun-riſing & ſucceeds the Sun-ſetting.*

(*b*) Vulgus omne à luce ad tenebras diem obſervat. *Plin. l. 2. c. 77.*

(*c*) Galli ſe omnes à Dite patre prognatos prædicant idque à Druidibus proditum dicunt. Ob eam cauſam ſpatia omnis temporis non numero dierum, ſed noctium definiunt, & dies natales & menſium & annorum initia ſic obſervant ut noctem dies ſequatur. *De Bello Gall. l. 6.*

(*d*) Nec dierum numerum ut nos, ſed noctium computant. Sic conſtituunt, ſic condicunt: nox ducere diem videtur. *Tac. de Germ. c. 11.*

(*e*) Pag. ...

(*f*) ... are ſome places ... night ... to come.

OF THE duration and equality of Natural Days

(*A*) *The Natural Day, which comprehends Twenty-four hours.*] What I ſay here of the duration of Twenty-four hours, ought not to be rigorouſly underſtood: For, if the Aſtronomers and Coſmographers don't deceive us, when they unanimouſly affirm that the ſpace of an hour correſponds to the aſcenſion of 15 Degrees of the Æquator upon the Horizon, the Sun's return to the Meridian will require ſomewhat more than Twenty-four hours. In effect, if the time employ'd in the aſcent of 15 Degrees of the Æquator upon the Horizon be an hour, this Circle will require Twenty-four hours for its revolution: But when that is finiſh'd, the Sun is not yet return'd to the Meridian, becauſe it has a peculiar motion which advances it near a Degree Eaſtward, whilſt the Æquator performs its circuit; and therefore the Sun muſt be carry'd near the ſpace of a Degree Weſtward, to make it anſwer to the ſame Point of the Firmament or the ſame Meridian it anſwer'd to the day before. You ſee then an Aſtronomical Day a little longer than Twenty-four hours. But moreover, an Aſtronomical Day is not perfectly equal to another, becauſe the obliquity and excentricity of the Eclipticſk hinder the Sun's making the ſame progreſs each day towards the * Eaſt. It advances 59 minutes $\frac{1}{3}$ each day, by the middle-motion; when it goes ſwifter, it advances near 2 minutes more; when it goes ſlower, it proceeds near 2 minutes leſs. Nature loves Variety even in the Heavens. The † *Ephemerides* which Mr. *Dalence* printed at *Paris* ſome years ago, ſhew a great deal of variety in the proportions of the increaſe of Days For Example: The 5th of *January* is longer by two minutes than the 4th; the 6th is longer by two minutes than the 5th; the 7th is longer by two minutes than the 6th; but the 8th is no longer than the 7th. All the other Months are full of the like inequalities, both in the increaſe and decreaſe; and even the increaſes of *January* don't anſwer the decreaſes of *July*. *It is certain*, ſays the Author of ‖ thoſe Ephemerides, *that* November *and* December *jointly are longer by half an hour and half a quarter than* September *and* October, *tho' there be on both ſides an equal number of days*, viz. 61.

(*B*) *In his Poſthumous* Traité du Point du Jour.] I call this Book *Poſthumous*, becauſe the Edition of *Rheims*, 1629. which I uſe, ſhews, that *John Bergier*, Attorney in the Preſidial of *Rheims*, printed this Work of his Father deceas'd. The Epiſtle Dedicatory to Mr *du Lys*, Advocate General in the Court of *Aides* of *Paris*, is from the ſame hand, and ſhews that this Magiſtrate was the Author's Patron. The Abbot *de Marolles* ſpeaks of another Patron in his Alphabetical Catalogue of Authors, who had preſented him with their Works. *Claude du Buiſſon*, ſays he, *declar'd to me the particular eſteem he had as well as I for* Nicolas ‡ Berger *of* Rheims, *who has written the Book of the great Roads of the Empire, and who had gone farther had he not been prevented by Death* at

OF BERGIER ...

* *See Gaſſendus inſtit. Aſtron. l. 1. c. 22. In the Abridgment of Mr.* Bernier *to. 4. p. 82. there is 56 minutes inſtead of 59.*

† *The title is,* The knowlege of the Times, or the *Calendar and Ephemerides of the riſing and ſetting of the Sun, &c. They began to be publiſh'd in 1679.*

‖ Pag. ...

‡ *He has committed the ſame fault as the Authors of the Catalogue of* Thuanus's *Library, who thrice put it* Berger *for* Bergier. La Mothe le Vayer *in the* Hexam. Ruſtic. *p. 25. where he cenſures two faults, calls him* Berger.

The Printers have foisted some faults into it, as *Nipuarian* instead of *Ripuarian*, in the foregoing passage. Mr. *du Cange* in his *Latin Glossary* has cited many Laws, Capitularies and Formularies, which shew that not only the *French*, but also the Northern People, *Saxons*, *English*, &c. have reckon'd by Nights. He shews also, that 'tis a most ancient Custom among the *Arabians*. See *Cluverius* chap. 33. of the first Book *de Germania Antiqua*.

III. ...f the ...vil and Astrono- ...mical Days.

Censorinus (a), as I have already observed, divides the Day into Natural and Civil, and calls the Natural Day the time betwixt the two Suns, if I may be allow'd that vulgar expression. The Civil Day he takes for the space of Twenty-four hours, or for an entire Revolution of the Heavens. *Bergier* (b) affirms that *Pliny* and *Macrobius* hold the same division of the Day, calling the Civil Day that of Twenty-four hours, and the Natural the only time of Light, commonly of Twelve hours, or a little more or less. But I have not found this division in either of these two Authors, or in (c) *Aulus Gellius*, follow'd upon this Head by *Macrobius*; but only that they give Twenty-four hours to the Civil Day, and relate the different beginnings it had in different Countries. At present most Writers consider the Natural and Civil Day as different, not in duration, but only as the Natural Day in a general manner signifies an entire revolution of the Sun about the Earth, and the Civil Day contains in particular the choice that certain Nations have made of Two Points, to denote the beginning and end of this revolution. Some have chosen the rising or setting of the Sun; others rather Mid-day or Midnight. Hence the Civil Day of some Countries has been included betwixt two risings or settings of the Sun, or betwixt two Noons, or two Midnights. The ancient *Romans* follow'd this last way, which is at present almost universal in *Europe*. These different sorts of the Civil Day cannot be perfectly equal, neither to one another, nor to the true Natural Day, because of the continual mobility of the moment of the Sun's rising or setting: but as this inequality is not sensible from one day to another, it is not regarded. And therefore the Nations whose Civil Day reaches from one rising or setting of the Sun to another, no less take the Day for the space of Twenty-four hours, tho' the Sun every day advances or retards his rising and setting, and that unequally, according as it is near the Equinoctial or Solstitial Points, than if they comprehended it betwixt two Noons. Whence it appears, that I had reason to say that the Natural Day in its most proper signification, is the time betwixt the Sun's quitting the Meridian to his recovering it again. It is by this the Astronomical Day is measur'd; for the Astronomers begin the Day at the instant the centre of the Sun touches the Meridian Line, and end it at the instant the same centre comes to touch it again. This is the least unequal Day possible to be found, and that by which all Astronomical Tables are calculated. An (d) Author whom I have cited tells us, *That the Astronomers begin their Natural Day at Noon the preceding Day; that for instance the second Astronomical Day of the month of* May *begins at Noon the first day of* May, *and ends at Noon the following Day, which is the second of* May, *the Noon whereof commences the third Astronomical Day.* For a greater Illustration he should have added, that tho' all the Astronomers begin their Day at Noon, yet they still are divided; some, as (e) *Ptolemy*, and *Tycho-Brahe*, begin their day where *Alphonso* King of *Castile* ends his. They, for example, begin the first day of *January* at Noon the first day of our Civil Year: *Alphonso* begins the first day of *January* at Noon the 31st of *December*; so that the first day of the Year to him is the last day of the preceding Year for the others.

(a) *Censorin. de die natali c.* 23.

(b) *Preface to the point of Day, citing* Pliny *l.* 2. *c.* 77. *and* Macrob. *l.* 1. *Saturn. c.* 3.

(c) *Aulus Gellius l.* 3. *c.* 2.

(d) Bergier *Pref. to the point of Day.*

(e) *See* Father Labbé ubi supra.

IV. ...gier's ...ok upon ...e Point ...f Day.

Since I have cited this little Work of *Bergier*, it will not be amiss to explain the Subject of it; it will serve for a Connexion or Introduction to the rest of this Article. I say then, that this Author intended to determin a Point upon the Earth, in which the Civil Day should begin in such a manner, that the same day (*Monday* or *Tuesday* for instance) should be carry'd successively throughout the World, and begin again at Twenty-four hours end in a place that should immediately touch the Point given. By this means there would be two places upon the Earth perfectly contiguous, one whereof should have the beginning of *Monday*, whilst the other had but the beginning of *Sunday*; whence it would happen, that each Day would last 48 hours, not with respect to a certain place, but to all the Earth; each Holy-day, for Example, would be kept 48 hours together. The Point *Bergier* chose for the beginning of the Day, was that wherein the 180 and 181 Degrees of Longitude touch one another in *Mercator*'s Maps: and thus one of the three *Subadibes* under the Æquator, cut into two by the 180th Degree of Longitude, would first receive the Day; *Sunday* would begin there in the Western-part, whilst *Saturday*'s Noon would be under the first Meridian, and the same *Sunday* would not begin in the Eastern-part till *Monday* began in the other. 'Twas the Pope's business, according

---

at Grignon, *at President* Belliévre'*s*, *who honour'd him with his Friendship.* I wonder that in the Edition of 1629. there is no mention of any preceding Edition; for there is in the Catalogue * of *Thuanus*'s Library, the *Archemeron, or a Treatise concerning the beginning of Days, by* Nic. Berger, 8° *Paris*, 1617. We also find there † the *History of the High-ways of the* Roman *Empire* by the same *Nic. Berger*, 4° *Paris*, 1622. It is a very Learned Work, which Father *Bacchini*, a Benedictin of the Congregation of Mount *Cassin*, one of the Authors of the Journal of *Parma*, has put into *Latin* ‖, and adorn'd with Notes. The Author deserv'd a more honourable Citation than that of *la Mothe le Vayer*, who says, ‡ *One* Bergier, *who after his Treatise of the High-ways, has written another little Discourse concerning the Point of Day, has bethought himself*, &c. It appears by *Thuanus*'s Catalogue, that this other little Book did preced, and not follow the History of the great Roads. Mr. *Henninius* ** has translated this History of the great Roads, and publish'd it with learned Notes in the 10th Volume of the *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*. Mr. *Oudinet* †† and the Abbot *du Bos* sent him some Notes, most of which were taken from the Copy in which the Author had written many things. There's a fine Elogy of our *Bergier* in Father *Commire*'s *Latin* Poems.

** *Professor at* Duisburg.

†† *Keeper of the King of* France'*s Cabinet of Medals.*

cording to this Author, to make this new Eſtabliſhment, and to appoint that, for the future each Holy-day, and each Day of the Week ſhould begin when it is Midnight upon the confines of the 180 and 181 Degrees of Longitude; prohibiting all the Catholicks in the World to begin their Day before the Midnight which follow'd that which was under that place. It is plain, that after ſuch an Order they who live under the 181 Degree of Longitude would not be at the end of *Lent* till 24 hours after thoſe under the 180 Degree had kept *Eaſter-day*. This would be very advantageous to them, if their appetite to Meat was very preſſing; for they would have but a little way to go, to be in a Country where they might eat it by the Laws of the Church. I need not advertiſe the Reader that this advantage was not put into the Account by *Bergier*; it would rather be (C) an Objection againſt him: But this is the principal advantage he finds in this new eſtabliſhment of the Point of Day, That there would be no more diſputes about the celebration of Holy-days, when in going round the World, either thro' the Eaſt or Weſt, People ſhould not reckon the ſame Day of the Week with the Inhabitants of the Countries they would land in.

V They who circuit the Globe get or loſe a Day.

There needs no explaining this; for no body is ignorant that they who make the Tour of the World Eaſtward, find themſelves older by a day at their return than thoſe who ſtaid at home; the contrary whereof is experienc'd by thoſe that travel round the World by the Weſt. They who return'd to *Seville* on board the *Victory*, which had carry'd *Magellan* as far as the *Moluceques*, after the Diſcovery of the Straits to which this Great Man gave his Name, found by their Journal (a) that the day of their arrival was the 6th of *September*, but at *Seville* they reckon'd the 7th. If they had gone from *Seville* to the *Moluceques*, and then to the Straits of *Magellan*, they would have found the 8th of *September* to be reckon'd at *Seville*, when they counted the 9th. Whence it is eaſie to underſtand, that there may be three Calculations at the ſame time in the ſame place. For if two Veſſels arriv'd at *Seville* which had circuited the Globe, one by the Eaſt, and the other by the Weſt, it is certain that *Saturday* the 3d of *September* at *Seville* would be *Sunday* the 4th in the computation of the firſt Veſſel, and *Friday* the 2d according to the Journal of the other Veſſel. Let each continue their own reckoning, and you'll quickly find three *Chriſtmas* or three *Eaſter-days, &c.* in one and the ſame Week, and it would be no longer a Jeſt to bid people ſtay till the Week *when two Sundays come together*. I add, That a Day is got or loſt, not only with reſpect to thoſe we find in our return home, but alſo to thoſe we meet in the way. Thus the *Hollanders* who diſcover'd the Strait *le Maire* in 1616. being arriv'd at the *Moluceques* the 31ſt of *October*, found there the 1ſt of *November*, and (b) found themſelves oblig'd to skip from *Monday* to *Wedneſday*, that they might be conformable to their Country-men ſettl'd in thoſe Iſlands. 'Tis thus alſo, that according to the Relation of *Joſ. Acoſta*, the *Portugueſe* and *Spaniards* who penetrated into the *Eaſt-Indies*, the one by the Weſt, and the other by the Eaſt, eſtabliſh'd there a different Account of Days; ſo that when it is *Sunday* at the Iſle of *Macao*, diſcover'd by the *Portugueſe*, it is but *Saturday* at *Manille* in the *Philippines*, diſcover'd by the *Spaniards*; and yet it is but about 100 miles from the Iſle of *Luſſon*, in which is the Town of *Manille*, to the Iſle *Macao*. This was the reaſon (c) why *Alphonſo Sanctius*, arriving from the *Philippine* Iſlands to this Iſle the 2d of *May* in his Account, and going to read in his Breviary the Office of St. *Athanaſius*, found that this was not the Goſpel for the Day in that place, and that the Calendar there noted the 3d of *May*, which is the *Invention of the Holy Croſs*. His ſurprize was probably greater than his perplexity, for it is no great matter to paſs from one Day of the Breviary to another; and if Cardinal (d) *de Pellevé* unthinkingly carry'd from the Day of St. *Paul's Converſion* to that of St. *Polycarp*, could have remedy'd this diſappointment by the help of the Breviary, he would have harrangu'd leſs ill than he did at the opening of the States of the League. *Nicolas Bergier* had no reaſon to ſay (e) that they who travel round the World enter upon a different calculation of the Day but two ways; one is, when they compare their Computation with that of the City in which they finiſh their Circuit; the other is, when they compare it with the Calculation of thoſe whom they meet upon the Oriental Ocean, and who make the Tour of the World another way. 'Tis certain, that this *Eoick* Sea, as he calls it, has nothing particular in this, abſolutely ſpeaking, ſince in whatever other part of the World two Veſſels meet, making the Circuit of the Earth, one from the Eaſt and the

(a) Francis Drake *and* Tho. Candiſh, Eng. *men*, & Oliver Vander Noort *of* Utrecht, *who made the Tour of the World thro' the ſame Straits, have experienc'd ſuch a miſreckoning of a Day.*

(b) *See* W. Schouten's *Journal.*

(c) Id quidem Alphonſo Sanctio contigit, qui cum è *Philippinis* ſolviſſet, venit ſupputatione ſua, in inſulam Macaum poſtridie Kalendas Maij. Recitaturus autem preces horarias in honorem S. Athanaſii, deprehendit ibi incolis Inventionem S. Crucis celebrari, quintum enim Non. Maij faſti inibi exhibebant. Idem illi, alio etiam tempore, ſed contrario calculo huc redeunti evenit. *Joſeph Acoſta Hiſt. Ind. Occ. l. 3. c. 23.*

(d) Id multum Cardinali Pellævæo incommodavit qui Orationem meditatus fuerat occaſione ex converſione B. Pauli ſumpta, quam tranſlato inſequentem diem conventu vix ac ridicule ad B. Polycarpi feſtum accommodare conatus eſt. *Thuanus l. 105. ad ann.* 1593.

(e) *Ubi ſupra pag.* 118, 119.

INCONVENIENCIES of the Line of the Point of Day.

(C) *Rather be an Objection againſt him.*] Thoſe who cenſure a Project, and by their Adverſaries Anſwer find themſelves obliged to reply, ſo diligently collect whatever is unfavourable to the adverſe Cauſe, that we may reaſonably wonder that the Sieur *Michalor* has not objected to *Erycius Puteanus*, that his propos'd Circle made way for a thouſand abuſes And indeed, through the whole extent of the Hemiſphere, it would be the eaſieſt thing in the world to elude the Laws of the Church concerning the Days of Abſtinence. A man might come off with one ſlender Dinner a week, if he would recur to the Sophiſtry of the *Spaniards Medianoche*. Going from home on *Friday* at midnight, he might find himſelf a moment after in a Country where it is *Sunday*, and where without violating the Canons of holy Mother Church, he might feaſt upon Capons for his Supper. He might leap over all the Vigils by making but a Journey of two or three ſteps under another Meridian, where it is Holy-day; and if he would not celebrate any Holy-day, no not *Sunday* it ſelf, (I ſpeak of Holy-days that come not two together) it were only paſſing from one Meridian to another, which would coſt but little time: for tho' one Celeſtial Degree anſwers to the ſpace of many Leagues upon Earth, yet 'tis certain that each Degree is contiguous to another; ſo that the Degree where the Day begins muſt neceſſarily touch another Degree where the ſame Day begins not till Twenty-four hours after. To prevent therefore the paſſing in a ſmall time from the place where it is unlawful to eat Fleſh, to another where it is lawful, it ſhould be order'd that the Eaſtern part of one of theſe two Degrees, and the Weſtern part of the other, ſhould remain uncultivated and uninhabited. Who knows not, that any one that would continue the Carnaval with impunity to the firſt *Sunday* in *Lent*, needs but go to *Milan*, where there is no obligation to Faſt till four days after *Aſhwedneſday*?

the other from the Weſt, they would find the difference of a Day betwixt their dates. There's no reaſon therefore on this Account to place the Point of Day on the Eaſt Sea rather than in another place.

After having repreſented the inconvenience which *Bergier* would prevent by his Line of the Point of Day, I think I ought to ſay in a few words, that it might be ſo conveniently remedied without this, that it is no wonder his Counſels had no effect. There are three Calculations at once in the ſame place; ſome reckon *Saturday*, others *Sunday*, and others *Monday*. Well! order the whole matter to be regulated by the date of the Inhabitants, and every Feaſt to be kept by their Calendar, and you remove all this diſorder. This Remedy would fail but very rarely, in caſe that thoſe who had taken the Eaſtern Road, and others who had taken the Weſtern, ſhould meet in a Country wherein there were no Chriſtians; then they could not conform to the date of the Inhabitants, and each would ſtand perhaps upon his own Calculation. This diſorder would be a very little one.

VI. *Eryius Puteanus* has written about the Point of Day.

I pretend not however to leſſen this Author's Merit: Such Propoſitions are ſeldom imagin'd but by men of a ſtrong Genius and of a great Capacity; and beſides, there is in the Tract I ſpeak of, an Erudition which alone might recommend it. If the Author had liv'd long enough, he would have complain'd, perhaps, of a Profeſſor of *Louvain* who is celebrated for his numerous Writings, and who a long time enjoy'd the place of *Juſtus Lipſius*. To ſpeak freely, *Eryeius Puteanus* does not ſeem to have dealt fairly with *Nicolas Bergier*. This Profeſſor publiſh'd a little Piece in 1632. with the Title of *Circulus Urbanianus, ſive linea* [illegible] *compendio deſcripta, qua dierum civilium principium hieraticum in orbe terrarum hactenus deſideratum conſtituitur.* The Year following he publiſh'd a larger Book, to defend the firſt againſt the Attacks of one *Michalor*, a Canon of *Urbino*. Theſe two Pieces in their moſt material points are wholly built upon *Bergier*'s Thoughts; for 'tis no conſiderable difference to place the Line of the Point of Day not in the Meridian oppoſite to that which is the firſt in *Mercator's Atlas*, as *Bergier* does, but in the Meridian oppoſite to that of *Rome*, as *Eryeius Puteanus* does. This, I ſay, would not ſecure a Man from the imputation of a Tranſcriber and a Plagiary; and yet *Puteanus* ſays not a ſyllable of the Treatiſe of the Point of Day, printed in 1617. and 1629. but ſets up for a Man who was the firſt Mover in this Subject. Wherein we may admire the good Fortune that preſides over ſome Writings. That of *Bergier*, which was incomparably more an Original than the other, and which we may ſay had been at all the charges, lay grov'ling in the Duſt, whilſt *Puteanus*'s was enrich'd with the Elogies of many Learned Men, with the Compliments of a Nuncio, of a Cardinal Patron, of another Cardinal, and of the Pope himſelf, and came out with thoſe glittering Ornaments. *Bergier* might have well ſaid, *Hos ego verſiculos feci, tulit alter honores.*

VII. How two contiguous places may differ 24 hours as to the beginning of the Day.

It may here be ask'd me, whether there be any part of the World where the Day takes its riſe; and whether it was poſſible for two contiguous Countries to differ 24 hours with reſpect to the Point of Day? I anſwer, firſt, That a Circle has, abſolutely ſpeaking, neither beginning nor end; and therefore the Day depending upon a circular motion, can neither begin nor end, but with reſpect to certain places; ſo that it is always beginning and ending in different reſpects, and is always in all the parts of its duration, at Midnight, at Mid-day, at Five, Six of the Clock, &c. with relation to different Countries. Secondly, It was hardly poſſible, otherwiſe than by a Divine or Human Inſtitution, for two contiguous Countries to differ more than a moment upon the Point of Day; for in whatever point of the Eclíptick we ſuppoſe the Sun to have been created, it muſt neceſſarily illuminate 90 Degrees round at once, which is half the Earth; and the Day muſt begin at once upon that half, naturally ſpeaking. If the Queſtion was about the Civil Day, that is, If all men ſhould agree not to begin the Day till a certain hour, or if God had commanded them to begin it preciſely in that manner, I confeſs there might be two Countries entirely contiguous, one of which would not enter upon *Sunday* till the other left it. But in this caſe a Day muſt be expung'd, and this Sentence of Excommunication, or rather of Annihilation, ſhould be pronounc'd againſt it:

Que ce jour ſoit raié des choſes avenües,
Jupiter le commande aux trois filles chenües,
Qui tiennent regitre des tems.

But ſtay a little. Chance, without the aſſiſtance of any Divine or Human Order, or the nulling of a Day, may make two contiguous Countries differ 24 hours as to the beginning of the Civil Day. For which we need only ſuppoſe two Ships, which in circuiting the Globe, one Eaſtward, and the other Weſtward, meet, for inſtance, in the mid-way: Suppoſe their Crews ſhould ſettle, one on the one ſide, and the other on the other ſide of an Iſland, and each ſhould preſerve their own Account of Days; *Sunday* will begin on one ſide, whilſt beyond the Line of Partition they'll only be beginning *Saturday*. This is what the *Portugueſe* and *Spaniards* experienc'd towards *Japan*.

VIII. ...till expreſs'd himſelf ... ſaying those who go round the World ... tho' the Eaſt, loſe a day.

Now ſince they who ſail round the Globe Eaſtward think they are at *Saturday*, whilſt they reckon only *Friday* at the place they return to; and ſince thoſe who make the contrary circuit reckon no more than *Friday*, whilſt their Countrymen are already at *Saturday*, 'tis plain that the former gain a day, and that the latter loſe one. And yet there have been Writers who have ſo confounded their Ideas upon this Subject, that they have aſcrib'd the loſs to the former, and the gain to the latter; this (a) *Erycius Puteanus* did. *Michalor*, his Critick, did not let this fault eſcape him; the conſequence of which Cenſure was, That *Puteanus*, who might eaſily have come off by

(a) Ab ortu in occaſum navigantibus dies unus uno circuitu in lucro eſt, ab occaſu in ortum unus interit. *And a little after*, Demet tranſeuntibus quantum unus in occaſum ambitus addit; addet quantum unus in ortum eripit.

an honest confession that he had used improper terms, obstinately maintain'd his expression. Had it not been better to have frankly confess'd his fault, since the Dispute turn'd only upon Words? By no means; after so many years Professorship in *Justus Lipsius's* Chair, after so many Books publish'd, must he confess that he has spoken wrong? No, God forbid he should do so much injury to his Rank. He therefore chose rather to have recourse to all the Cavils his Wit and Reading could suggest to him, than to submit to condemnation. He found himself the worse for it; his Adversary returning to the charge, unmercifully scann'd him even to the least Punctilios, and both as to this part of the Dispute, and the pretended Necessity and Uses of the Line of the Point of Day, he perfectly routed him, and remain'd sole Master of the Field of Battle. His first Critical Book is in *Latin*, but the Reply is in *Italian*.

I believe that *Erycius Puteanus* forgot but one Sophism, which would have been, to maintain that on one hand 'tis a loss to bring an Additional Day from a long Voyage, and on the other hand 'tis a gain to return to one's Country with a Day decreas'd. In point of Gallantry, this Thesis would pass for a Principle; and there's no loss more considerable than the getting of many years, nor a gain more important than the having liv'd less than another. The generality in this point follow the Lovers Style, looking upon the superiority they have over their Neighbour in number of years, to be a disadvantage. But as much as such sort of Cavils might avail in a Dispute, where the business should be only to jest, they would be as useless in a Dispute like that of *Michalor* and *Puteanus*: For the Question betwixt them was not to know whether those who make the Tour of the World by the East or West, grow older or younger by Twenty-four hours than those who stay at home. 'Tis manifest that the Age of both is precisely what it would be if they had not stirr'd from their Houses; and that the only reason why one counts less Days than the other, is, that the Days of those who travel Westward contain above Twenty-four hours each, and the others contain less. I confess that if two Men born the same day began at fifteen years of age to travel round the Earth, one by the East and the other by the West, and made thirty turns each year; the first would believe himself 54 years old, when the latter would think he was only 48. But this difference, which in case of Marriage, if it was real, might render the latter of these Travellers the more eligible Match, would be a meer Chimera in this Case: They wou'd be strangely impos'd on who should rely upon that advantage. Western Voyages are no Fountain of Youth, that remove Old Age; and, properly speaking, a man neither gets nor loses a moment whatever way he sails to circuit the Globe. It's however true that *Erycius Puteanus* us'd a most improper expression; for in short, it would be a very ill way of speaking, to say that we get Years by reckoning as the Christians, and lose them by counting as the Mahometans. 'Tis just the contrary, since a Thousand of our Years answer to a Thousand thirty two Mahometan Years, as is manifest, since the Year 1622. was the 1032. of the *Hegira* (a). This Example removes all the difficulty, because the same reason that lessens our Years with respect to those of the Mahometans, lessens also the number of the Days of those who make the circuit of the Earth Westward. That reason is, that the Years of the *Hegira* being Lunary, are shorter by eleven Days than ours.

IX. Authors who have committed the same fault.

Puteanus is not the only person who has been mistaken in this. I say nothing against (b) *Wendelin*, whom he calls the *Hipparchus* of our Age, and who uses a (c) Phrase which seems to import that he believes the Eastward Circuit gives a Day less, and the Western gives a Day more; for he (d) pretends that if the Pope follow'd *Puteanus's* Counsel, the Rubricks of the Breviary would shew the Western Travellers the Day they should expunge, and the Eastern that which they ought to intercalate. Does it not seem that the intercalary Day ought to belong to those who have fewer Days than the others? How then comes this learned man to give it to the Orientals, who are already at *Tuesday*, when the others are but at *Sunday*? I decide nothing upon this point; there will ever be a Subterfuge by the equivocation of ***exemptilis*** and ***intercalaris***. I will content my self therefore with saying, that in one sense ***Wendelin's*** expression is not exact. The Reader will own it, if he compares the Pope to a Father, who would reduce the Profit his three Sons had made to an equality, the first by staying at home, the second by circuiting the World Westward, and the third by doing it Eastward. Let us suppose that the Principal of the first is advanced from 10 to 15, that of the second from 10 to 14, and that of the third from 10 to 16. To make all their Gains equal, is it not necessary to take from the third and add to the second? And yet, according to ***Wendelin***, the Pope must do the quite contrary. The Inhabitants of ***Seville*** who remain'd at home pass'd from the 10th to the 15th day; the Western Travellers from the 10th to the 14th; and the Eastern from the 10th to the 16th. We must, says ***Wendelin***, take one day from those that have but 14, and give one to those that have 16. Let him rather say one is to be taken from these, and given to those; but the way of giving it is to reckon it to their Account as if they had furnish'd it: For is it not giving, to quit Arrears? Once more let us say nothing against ***Wendelin***, for his expression is good in a certain sense. Take a Day from the Western Travellers, and they will leap from ***Sunday*** to ***Tuesday***; oblige the Eastern to intercalate their ***Tuesday***, that is, to count it twice together, and you'll take away from them a Day, and so the Western and they will arrive the same time at ***Friday***.

X. *Bembus* criticis'd.

A man might more easily make work for ***Peter Bembus***, who speaking of the Return of *Magellan's* Companions, says, That they found the Years of their Voyage to be grown longer by a day; but that if they had sail'd Eastward, they would have doubtless

(a) *The time they call the Mahometan Æra, or Epoch, which began on the 16 of July 622.*

(b) Godefridus Wendelinus, *much esteem'd by* Gassendus *who had been his Disciple. See* Val. Andr. Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 194.

(c) *In appellatione circuli Urbaniani.*

(d) Ut inter Breviarii Rubricas illa quoque cum primis necessaria lex emineat, quæ dierum sacrorum navigantibus in Occidentem exemptilium, contendentibus in Orientem intercalarium formulas præscribat.

leſs found them grown ſhorter by a Day: For, as he goes on, the farther they had advanc'd, the farther they would have gone to meet the riſing Sun; and therefore, after they had finiſh'd their Tour about the World, they would have ſeen that Luminary riſe a day ſooner than when they ſet out. (*a*) *Semper enim tanto citius Orienti ſoli occurrens quanto plus itineris poſt ſe circumvectus reliquiſſet, emenſo demum totius terræ globo die uno prius ſolem ſibi Orientem, quam cum viæ ſe dederat, profecto habuiſſet.* Is not this an admirable reaſon? This Hiſtorian proves their Year who circuit the Globe Eaſtward to be ſhorter by a Day, becauſe it contains a Sun-riſing more. But is not this a proof that it contains 366 Days, and conſequently that it is longer by a Day? Note, That the Year being equal, that is, 365 times 24 hours, *&c.* both for thoſe that ſtay at home, and thoſe that go round the Globe by Eaſt or Weſt, is yet divided into more or leſs Sun-riſings; into 365 for thoſe who ſtay at home, into 366 for thoſe that return by the Weſt, and into 364 for thoſe that come home by the Eaſt. This is all the Myſtery. *Michalor* has not cenſur'd *Bembus* for this bad way of Reaſoning, but only for his reverſing the change which a circuit about the World gives to the Year. *Bembus* did not perſiſt all his lifetime in his Error, but expreſs'd himſelf as he ſhould do in the *Italian* Tranſlation he publiſh'd of his *Latin* Hiſtory, and inſtead of theſe words, *Uno ſibi annos illos die longiores factos . . . . uno breviores die redeunti ſanè fuiſſent*, he put, *Quelli anni tutti e tre eſſere d'un giorno fatti minori* (*b*) *. . . . d'uno piu lunghi ſtati ſarebbono. Bergier* did not perceive (*c*) this prepoſterous ſenſe of *Bembus*; for, far from reproving him, he cites him in *Latin* to confirm the ſame Tranſpoſition he had been making, ſaying, that the time of *Magellan*'s Companions was lengthened by a Day, and that if they had return'd by the Weſt, it would have been ſhortned by a Day (*d*).

XI. *lius Cæ- r Scali- r criti- ſed.*

Theſe perplexities will the leſs ſurprize us, when we find the Great *Julius Cæſar Scaliger* to be a little confus'd. Going to criticiſe *Cardan* upon this Queſtion, (*e*) *Why the Stars ſeem to Sailers to follow them, and the Shoars to remove from them?* he repreſents to him, That ſo common a Subject as that ought to be ſeaſon'd with ſome Novelty, ſuppoſe with this, That in failing towards the Eaſt the Stars ſeem to go before us. Whereupon he relates what the *Portugueſe* and *Spaniards* experienc'd in circuiting the World, and gives this reaſon for it: *The* Spaniards, *ſays he, go to* China, *and from thence to the* Cape of Good Hope, *following the Courſe of the Sun; the* Portugueſe, *on the contrary, ſail againſt its Courſe; and therefore* (*f*) *the days grow longer to the* Spaniards, *both becauſe they accompany the Sun, and enjoy the Light longer, and alſo becauſe the Sun retrogrades, and comes to meet them: but it leaves the* Portugueſe *behind it at Noon, who for their part turn their backs to it, and in the morning it flies from them when they expect its riſing, for it riſes later.* What can be more falſe than to ſay that the Sun goes before thoſe who ſail towards the *Cape of Good Hope*, in the Road taken by the *Spaniards*? What falſer ſtill than to pretend that the Days grow longer to thoſe who meet the Sun? 'Tis the very reverſe of it, for it brings them a new Day ſo much the ſooner. What can be more falſe in the third place, than to ſay that the Sun flies from the *Portugueſe* in the morning, and that they ſee it riſe later? How is this poſſible, ſince the readieſt way to meet by a circular motion, is to go to *China* by the Eaſt as the *Portugueſe* did, and to go thither Weſtward as the Sun did, after having left them behind it? In fine, what can be falſer than to pretend that if the Sun riſes later, the Civil Day muſt be ſhorter? (*g*) *Michalor* has only cenſur'd *Scaliger*'s third fault, except that he has farther obſerved that there was no need of conſidering whether the *Portugueſe* had as good a Wind as the *Spaniards*. And indeed, ſince *Scaliger* did not conſider the ſwiftneſs of motion, *celeritatem motus nunc non intelligo*, what ſignified the Winds to him (*h*)? Let the *Portugueſe* finiſh their round in three Week, and the *Spaniards* take a thouſand for it, the difference of Days will thence be neither greater nor leſs.

XII. Many ults of liny in few ords.

The Ancients were not abſolutely ignorant that the Artificial Day muſt be longer to a man travelling Weſtward, and that the Sun ſets ſooner to the Eaſtern parts of the Earth than to the Weſtern: But if we were to judge of their Knowledge by *Pliny*'s, we ſhould conclude they had no manner of Notion of this.

In the firſt place, this Naturaliſt (*i*) ſays, That it has been often experienc'd that the Beacons kindl'd on high Towers at the ſixth hour of the Day to give notice of the approach of Pirates, have been ſeen even into thoſe places where it had been three hours Night. A man needs not above three Lectures on the Globe, to ſee that this is a perfectly abſurd Fable. This ſixth hour of the Day with moſt Interpreters ſignifies Noon. *Alciatus* will have it to mean Sun-ſetting, and by this means he bates *Pliny* two thirds of his ſpace; but to no purpoſe, ſince he leaves him ſtill too much: For to make it three hours of Night in one place, whilſt the Sun ſets in another, you muſt allow 45 Degrees difference of Longitude betwixt theſe two places. Now each Degree of Longitude under the Æquator comprehends 25 *French* Leagues, of 2500 Geometrical Feet each; the Fires then in queſtion muſt have been perceiv'd at the diſtance, not indeed of 1125 Leagues, but at one differing from it only in proportion to the ſpace which ſeparates the Parallel ſpoken of by *Pliny* from the Æquator; notwithſtanding which abatement, this diſtance would contain ſome hundreds of Leagues. Judge what this would be, if *Pliny*'s ſixth hour was Mid-day; the diſtance would then be triple, and a Watch-light would have been ſeen at a greater diſtance than one third of the circumference of a good large Parallel. This had been a more wonderful thing than what the ſame Author ſpeaks of in the 22d Chapter of the 5th Book, where he ſays that Mount *Caſius* is ſo high as to be enlighten'd by the Sun three hours before day (*k*). And yet Father *Harduin* will not allow of *Alciatus*'s modification, but will have theſe Beacons to be kindled

(*f*) Longiores ita dies fiunt Hiſpalienſibus. Tum quia ſolis comites ſunt, lux eis productior eſt: tum quia retrocedit ſol atque in eorum occurſum abit. Luſitanos autem & relinquit à meridie non ſolum averſus ſed etiam averſos atque ab eis mane refugit cum ejus exortum, expectant ſerius enim oritur. *Jul. Cæſ. Scal. exercit.* 86. *de ſubtilit.*

(*g*) *Antapocriſi, part* 1. *p.* 44.

(*h*) Non eadem celeritate æquis tamen ventis Luſitani atque Bæthici parem marium tractum metiuntur. *Scal. ib.*

(*i*) In queis prænunciativos ignes ſextâ horâ diei accenſos, ſæpe compertum eſt tertiâ noctis à tergo ultimis viſos. *Plin. l.* 2. *c.* 71.

(*k*) Cujus excelſa altitudo quartâ vigiliâ orientem per tenebras ſolem aſpicit. *Id. l.* 5. *c.* 22.

) Nous le Pour. le p. 131. s Pariſ. ers. in Bergier vre l. 5. g. 218. ell.

) I have ed this alian as find it in Michalor.

) Ubi pra, pag. 98. 199.

) Theſe alſive preſſions ght be ctified by ying that oſe who turn me Weſt- ard find, t their ar, but at of eir Coun- y, a day rter; & oſe who turn by e Eaſt d it in e man- r a day nger.

)Cardan *amine* , 14. de Subtil. *but does not ex- min either here or in the 12th Book c.* 62. *uoted* Erycius uteanus *who did t know hat the* oks de Subtilita- *e are not divided into Chap- ers) the matter which* Pu- *teanus aſ- cribes to* died at Noon, and pretends to have (*a*) clear'd all the difficulties of this paſſage. He finds no Subject of Criticiſm in all this Chapter. Note, That this paſſage of *Pliny* concerning Mount *Caſius* labours under difficulties. *Ariſtotle* has ſaid as much of *Caucaſus*; but ſome (*b*) Learned Men maintain that there is no Mountain in the World from whence the Sun may be ſeen if he be four Degrees below the Horizon. According to this Aſſertion, the Sun itſelf plac'd upon the top of a Mountain, could not be perceiv'd above an hundred Leagues diſtance. How then was it poſſible to ſee *Pliny*'s Fires? Father *Hardouin*, upon the paſſage where Mount *Caſius* is mention'd, affirms that *Cabeus* has very well ſhewn that *Ariſtotle* was right in what he relates of *Caucaſus*. We ſhall ſhew the contrary under the word *Caucaſus*, by examining what three learned and ſubtil *Italians*, *Mazoni*, *Blancanus*, and *Cabeus*, have ſaid upon this paſſage of *Ariſtotle*.

In the ſecond place, *Pliny* ſays, That *Philonides*, a Courier of *Alexander*, (*c*) went in nine hours from *Sicyon* to *Elis*; but in returning was forc'd to travel three hours by night. The diſtance of theſe two Cities was 1200 (*d*) *Stadia*, and the way of the former to the latter was up-hill: And thus this Courier employ'd one while nine hours, and another fifteen, in performing the ſame Journey; nine hours in going to *Elis* aſcending, fifteen hours in returning to *Sicyon* deſcending. If you ask the reaſon of this prodigious difference betwixt going and coming, *Pliny* will tell you that this Meſſenger as he went to *Elis* follow'd the Sun, but in returning to *Sicyon* he travell'd againſt it. But this reaſon is ſo far from compenſating the difference betwixt nine and fifteen hours, that it can't make amends for the advantage of the declivity of the Road; for to gain an hour in purſuit of the Sun, one muſt make a Stage of fifteen Degrees, and conſequently our Courier gain'd but ſomewhat under ten minutes when he travell'd 60 Leagues from Eaſt to Weſt.

Laſtly, *Pliny* (*e*) ſays, That the Reaſon before given is the cauſe that the Navigators towards the Weſt proceed farther in the Day than in the Night, even when the Days are very ſhort. See here a heap of Falſities. For, not to ſay that our Pilots, whoſe Obſervations are more certain than thoſe of the Ancients, don't obſerve that Ships go ſlower by Night than by Day, other things being equal, who ſees not that this pretended ſlowneſs cauſ'd by the Night, can't amount to the proportion *Pliny* gives, nor proceed from the cauſe that he alledges? Let us ſuppoſe that a Ship in full ſail Weſtward makes 80 Leagues in nine or ten hours of a Winters-day, it gains not a quarter of an hour (*f*); and what's a quarter of an hour in compariſon of five or ſix hours, more or leſs, by which the Winter-night exceeds the Day in the Countries *Pliny* had in view? Add to this, That in failing Weſtward we follow the Sun equally by Night as by Day; whence it follows, that a Veſſel ought to proceed as much in the dark as during the Artificial Day, ſince the time of Darkneſs lengthens in the ſame proportion in a Navigation Weſtward with the time of Light. The Navigations of theſe later Times have taught us, that there reigns a conſtant Wind (*g*) from Eaſt to Weſt in the torrid Zone; ſo that thoſe who ſail there Weſtwards have always the Wind behind them, and thoſe who ſail the contrary way have the Wind in their Teeth. This is the reaſon why a Voyage from *Spain* to the *Weſt-Indies* requires leſs time than a Voyage back again. But we muſt not believe, as the Abbot *de la Roque* did, (*h*) a Tale that (*i*) was laugh'd at, *viz.* *That the* Spaniards *ſometimes ſail to the* Weſt-Indies *in twenty-four hours, but can't return in leſs than four months, have they never ſo favourable a ſeaſon.* *Pliny* might eaſily be deceiv'd by ſuch as did not well underſtand what they had heard of the effect of this Eaſtern Wind. There's no Sea in which the Eaſt Winds are more favourable than the *Pacifick*; and yet the *Spaniſh* Veſſels which croſs it in their way from *America* to the *Philippine Iſlands*, ſpend two months and an half in making 130 Leagues a day (*k*). I wonder that the Commentary *Variorum* printed at *Leyden* does not enlarge upon this. There can be nothing more jejune and miſerable than what we find there upon this Subject. We find nothing in it that inſinuates any diſtruſt, except two or three words, which teach us that (*l*) *Melichius* thought the ſtory incredible concerning the Beacons of the Towers, and *Philonides*. But I much more wonder at the great ſimplicity of *Salmaſius*, who has reported (*m*) the ſtory of this Meſſenger with marks of approbotion, and ſo little doubted of his diligence, that he made his Journey longer than *Pliny*. Obſerve, that (*n*) *Allatius* relates the Doctrine of *Julius Cæſar Scaliger* without cenſure, and maintains *Pliny* againſt *Milichius*.

XIII. Some faults of *du Pinet* & *la Mothe le Vayer*.

I would fain know how this Chapter of *Pliny* has been interpreted by (*o*) *Erycius Puteanus*, who boaſts of being the firſt that underſtood it. *Du Pinet* has put in the Margin of his Tranſlation, *That the Waves of the Sea incline more to the Weſt than to the Eaſt*, and that is the reaſon of what *Pliny* relates concerning Veſſels ſailing Weſtward. But would not this Reaſon be as good for the Night as for the Day? I omit the fault he has committed in tranſlating theſe words, *Eundem* (Solem) *remeans obvium contrario prætervertebat occurſu*, thus, *He met the Sun, which he left behind him, he went ſo ſwift.* I believe that *prætervertebat* there ſignifies more than Father *Hardouin* thinks, more than *offendebat*; and that *Pliny*'s meaning is, that the Courier meeting the Sun, went on and left it behind him. Which does not ſignifie that he went ſwifter than the Sun. Mr. *de la Mothe le Vayer* (*p*) alledges this Example of ſwiftneſs without finding any thing falſe in *Pliny*'s paſſage: Nay, he obſerves that *Philonides almoſt equall'd the courſe of the Sun*; and yet he had been juſt computing *Philonides*'s ſpeed to about eight Leagues an hour (*q*).

A DIS-

(*a*) Nihil opus iſthic ambagibus, ubi ſunt omnia per ſe perſpicua, luceque pleniſſima, ut vel ex interpretatione noſtra liquet. *Harduinus in Plin. to. 1. p. 277.*

(*b*) *See* Iſaac Voſſius *in Melam p. 90.*

(*c*) Ex Sicyone Elin mille & ducenta ſtadia novem diei confecit horis, indeque quamvis declivi itinere tertiâ noctis horâ remenſus. *Plin. lib. 2. c. 71.*

(*d*) *That is to ſay 60 leagues, of 2500 geometrical paces each.*

(*e*) Qua de cauſa ad occaſum navigantes quamvis breviſſimo die vincunt ſpatia nocturna navigationis, ut ſolem ipſum comitantes. *Id. ib.*

(*f*) *To lengthen the day a hour by a progreſs Weſtward one muſt travel Degrees, which under the Æquator make 37 leagues.*

(*g*) *See* V *renius's Geography l. 1. c. 2 and Rohault's Phyſicks part 2. c. 1 where he aſſigns the reaſon of this* Phænomeno *by the mo tion of the Earth according to* Copernicus*'s Syſtem: but ſee in the* Philoſophical Tranſactions *the hiſtorical relation of the regular Winds made by* Mr. Halley.

(*h*) *Journal de Sçavans 167 pag. 30. Dutch edit.*

(*i*) *Ibid. pag. 57.*

(*k*) *Hall ubi ſup.*

(*l*) *It ſhou'd be* Milichius, *a Profeſſor of the Mathematicks at* Wittemberg, *who publiſh'd a Comment on the 2d Book of* Pliny *in* 1534.

(*m*) *Salm exercit. Plin. pag. 45. where he computes* Pliny's 1200 *ſtadia to 16 miles; they are but* 150.

(*n*) *In lib de menſ temp. p. 1*

(*o*) Quem locum per Mazzonium ſuppletum, hactenus tamen non intellectum in Theoreſibus noſtris explicamu *Putean. vindic. circuli Urban. Note, That* Michalor *maintains to him that* Mazzoni, *Author of a learned Apology for* Dant *has only cited this place of* Pliny, *without adding any thing to the common reading* (*p*) *Letter 28. in Vol. 10. of the edit. in* 1681. Pliny *is there ill cited in chap. 7. (it ſhould be 71.) of book 2.* (*q*) *75 leagues of 2000 paces each, in nine hours.*

A DISSERTATION

Which was printed before ſome Eſſays or Fragments of this Work in the year 1692. under the Title of, A Project of a Critical Dictionary, dedicated to Mr. *du Rondel*, Profeſſor of Philology at *Maeſtricht.*

It has been reviſed and corrected, but not enlarged, except with ſome Citations, and a few Notes put at the bottom of the Pages. We have alſo plac'd there ſome of the Citations which in the firſt Edition were in the Margin. They will here ſerve inſtead of a Comment. The Remark made up of thoſe Citations ſhall be mark'd with a Latin *Letter; and if any thing be added to it which is not in the former Edition, it ſhall make a Paragraph, the firſt Word whereof ſhall be printed in great Letters. The new Remarks will be characteris'd with a* Roman Letter, *and with the* Greek Δ.

SIR,

YOU will doubtleſs be ſurpriz'd at the reſolution I have taken. I have reſolv'd to compile the largeſt Collection I can of the Faults that are met with in Dictionaries, and not to confine my ſelf to this Deſign, as vaſt as it is, but to make Sallies upon all ſorts of Authors, whenever occaſion offers. What! will you ſay, a Man from whom we expected quite another thing, and rather a Work of Reaſoning than a Compilation, engages in an Enterprize which requires a much greater expence of Body than Mind? 'Tis certainly a very wrong ſtep. You undertake to correct Dictionaries; a Work that your moſt malicious Enemies would impoſe on you, had they over your Deſtiny the ſame power that *Euryſtheus* had over *Hercules*. 'Tis worſe than going to fight Monſters; 'tis attempting to lop off the *Hydra*'s Heads; 'tis at leaſt the Task of cleanſing (*a*) *Augeas*'s Stables; 'tis, in fine, the Penance that ought to be enjoin'd thoſe turbulent men who have abus'd their leiſure and the Peoples credulity, to vent under the Name and Authority of the *Revelation* all ſorts of Chimera's, (*b*) *juſſit quod ſplendida bilis.* I pity you. Why don't you leave this Employment to thoſe robuſt Conſtitutions who can ſtudy ſixteen hours a day without prejudice to their Health; who are indefatigable in Citations, and all the other functions of a Tranſcriber, and much more qualified to acquaint the Publick with matters of Fact than thoſe of Right?

I. The Reaſons and Deſign of this Undertaking

If theſe are your Thoughts, Sir, you are to fear leſt your Friendſhip for me ſhould miſlead you, and correct your Error by this ſincere Confeſſion of mine, that I find my Capacity very ſmall which-ever way I turn my ſelf. I confeſs, that in this Undertaking I apply my ſmall Forces by their weak part, inſtead of chooſing a Subject that might draw them out to leſs diſadvantage. But, in truth, there is no difficulty in the choice, when a man is convinced, as I am, that the difference betwixt his ſtrong and his weak parts is almoſt inſenſible. And beſides, I will tell you freely, that if I had turn'd my Pen on what you believe the moſt advantageous ſide, I ſhould have been involv'd in the alternative, either of diſpleaſing ſome perſons whom Prudence forbids to provoke, or of diſpleaſing my ſelf. Now you well know that in matter of Compoſitions the Genius ought not (*c*) to be forc'd, and you are ſenſible that the judicious (*A*) Anſwer of an ancient *Greek* may be variouſly apply'd to one's ſelf. And then what's the diſadvantage of not ſhewing one's ſelf on the beſt ſide? 'Tis depriving one's ſelf, perhaps, of the Praiſes one might have received. I ſay perhaps; for the Caprices of Men and Chance have a ſtrange command in this. But omit the peradventure; what would this be after all, but a privation of Praiſe, that is a meer nothing to a man who never govern'd himſelf, and at preſent governs himſelf leſs than ever by this Principle? I could wiſh that the ancient (*d*) Poet, who had ſo well begun to ſhew the emptineſs of Human Affairs, had carry'd his Thought ſo far as to ſay, *cornea mea fibra eſt*: you would here ſee the application that might be made of the three Verſes he would have left us in this caſe. If on one hand I am not ignorant that my Enterprize requires great ſtrength of Body, I conſider on the other, that natural Patience, join'd with the cuſtom of medling only with Books, of going little out of one's Study, and avoiding as the Plague the ways of thoſe turbulent men whom I have ſpoken of, who buſily thruſt themſelves into all Affairs, even thoſe of State, may ſupply a great many things.

As for thoſe Learned Men, whoſe Erudition in matters of fact is proportion'd to the indefatigable application their robuſt Complexion allows them, I declare to you, Sir, that

(*a*) *It's ſaid that Mr. . . . . deſiring one of his friends to put down upon ſome little piece of Paper the faults he obſerv'd in his Dictionary, was anſwered that it requir'd Quires & Reams of Paper, and not little pieces.*

(*b*) *Horat. Sat.* 3. *l.* 2.

(*c*) *See in* Eraſmus'*s* Adagia, Noli irritare crabrones.

(*d*) Tu nihil invita dices facieſve Minerva. *Hor. de art. poët.*

(*a*) Non ego cum ſcribo, ſi forte quid aptius exit, Quando hæc rara avis eſt, ſi quid tamen aptius exit, Laudari metuam, neque enim mihi cornea fibra eſt. *Perſius Sat.* 1.

(*A*) *The judicious Anſwer of an ancient* Greek.] We find it in *Stobæus*. * Θεόκριτος ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί οὐ συγγράφει, ὅτι οὕτως ὡς μὲν βούλομαι, οὐ δύναμαι, ὡς δὲ δύναμαι, οὐ βούλομαι: *Theocritus quærenti quare non ſcriberet, dixit, quoniam ut libet non poſſum, ut verò poſſum non libet.* An ancient Rhetorician gave this Anſwer for the reaſon of his ſilence: *What I know is not ſeaſonable to ſpeak; and what would be ſeaſonable, I don't know.*

YOU will find above the words of this ancient Rhetorician, with thoſe of *Stobæus*, in the Remark *F* of the Article *Ariſtarchus*. And ſince that Remark will ſuffice for all the Comment I have occaſion for here, I need only refer to it, repetitions being to be avoided as much as poſſible.

that I don't pretend to uſurp their Rights; on the contrary, I only propoſe to furniſh 'em with an Eſſay, or Rough-draught, which may determine ſome of 'em to perfect this Plan, and to enlarge this Critical Dictionary with many Volumes. I am willing it ſhould be ſaid of me in this reſpect, what was ſaid to *Varro* upon matters of Philoſophy, *That he had ſaid enough to create Emulation, but not to give Inſtruction* (a). I even ſubmit to thoſe who ſhall ſay it would be a greater Favour than Juſtice in the Publick to treat me (b) according the Rule that *Ariſtotle* approves in one of his Writings; and I very ſincerely make the ſame Declaration as the ingenious Author of the Hiſtory of the Royal Society: *In anſwer for my ſelf*, ſays he (c), *I ſhall alledge, that what I have to offer, ſo far from preventing the Labours of others who could adorn ſo noble a Subject, is no otherwiſe deſign'd than as thoſe ſtately Edifices us'd at firſt to be repreſented by ſome few* Shadows *and little* Models, *which are not intended to equal the principal Structure, but only to ſhew by way of Abridgment, with what* Materials, *how much* Expence, *and how many* Hands *it might be afterwards raiſed.* I labour with the ſame intention; propoſing only to give the Sketch of a Deſign to ſuch as ſhall have the Capacity of executing it; and that they may fall to work as ſoon as may be, I will make all the haſte imaginable to publiſh my Draught, which will contain but one Folio.

II. That there are many faults in Books.

They will not want matter for larger Editions: For if this Subject can furniſh me with Materials for a large Volume, in ſpight of all the indiſpenſable Obligations that interrupt all my Time, and of the ſcarcity of Books I am reduc'd to, what will not Men of great Learning and great leiſure do, who have great Libraries at hand, if they would undertake to make Collections of this kind? They would return from all their Excurſions ſuceſsfully loaded with Booty; and no Prince, whatever care he takes for laying the Toils, and diſpoſing all things for a famous Hunting, can be more ſecure of a numerous Prey, than a learned Critick, who goes in chaſe of Errors, can be aſſur'd of a large Diſcovery of them. It would be ſomething curious, if this Work ſhould have the ſame Fate, as that of a learned *Suiß*, (d) entituled, *Theatrum vitæ humanæ*, which has been ſo often enlarged, as to grow at laſt into eight great Volumes *in Folio*. Doubt not but the faults of Authors would ariſe to as maſſy a bulk as this: And would a Theatre of theſe Faults in as many large Volumes, be in your opinion, Sir, leſs diverting or inſtructive than that of Human Life? Inform me, if you pleaſe, whether the Book entituled, *The Hunters*, which contain'd the Catalogue of *Theopompus*'s Robberies, had not its Title founded on the Compariſon or the Metaphor of Hunting I have made uſe of? You can inform me, Sir, I ſay, when you pleaſe, there being no body that is ſo well acquainted as you are with the moſt hidden particulars of Antiquity.

We ſhall eaſily be convinc'd that there are infinite Faults in Books, if we conſider that the greateſt men are not exempt from them, and that the leaſt Critick can ſpy out a great many. How often do we find in the Contents and Tables of the moſt indifferent Books, *Scaliger notatus, hallucinatio Scaligeri*, and the like? Mr. *Morus* (e) imagin'd there was in this a ſcurvy affectation of proud Authors, who deſire to be talk'd of. This may be true; but no Learned Man can deny that *Scaliger* may be cenſur'd in abundance of things; for which we need no other proof than (f) *Salmaſius*'s Works, where at every turn we find *Scaliger* caught in a fault. 'Tis true, he is not named, but pointed at by the lofty Title of *vir magnus, vir ſummus*: but all theſe great Civilities don't leſſen the reality of the Fault, when the Cenſure is well grounded. *Salmaſius*, who had not the ſame reaſons to keep fair with other Learned Men, exaſperated ſome of them, who reveng'd themſelves with unmerciful Criticiſms upon his Writings. He made his Defence, and attack'd them in his turn. The Battle was principally fought betwixt him and the Jeſuit *Petavius*, which was ſo obſtinate, as hardly to ceaſe but with their deaths. We may affirm, that they were two Champions worthy of each other, and that never Gladiators were better match'd than they: For it wou'd be unjuſt to determin the matter, by what thoſe have ſaid (g) who were Judges and Parties in the Quarrel. They were the two moſt Learned Men of *France*, and they might not only have enlighten'd their Age, but alſo have done it much Honour by their long Controverſies, if, to the ſhame of Learning, they had not tainted them with the exceſſive venom of their Spleen, which dictated almoſt as many Abuſes as Words. All the other Antagoniſts of *Salmaſius* were not capable of giving him preciſely blow for blow, I mean of diſcovering as many faults in his Writings as he diſcover'd in theirs; but nevertheleſs they made him ſenſible he was often out. Who can doubt, after this, that there is a vaſt Crop of theſe kind of Faults? Where will the Harveſt be wanting, when it is ſo plentiful in the Productions of the *Scaligers* and *Salmaſius's*; and who would be diſhearten'd with his Errors upon this conſideration?

A perſon of your Judgment needs not be put in mind that I have propos'd the Example of theſe two Great Men, not ſo much to reaſon from the greater to the leſs, as to give ſome ſort of conſolation to Authors of a ſecond Claſs, and to thoſe who, like my ſelf, are of the loweſt. The conſolation might be more effectual than the reaſoning could be juſt; for 'tis certain that Authors of the firſt rank are thoſe whom ſometimes the greateſt number of Faults eſcape: whether becauſe they are too bold in their de-

(a) Philoſophiam multis locis inchoaſti ad impellendum ſatis, ad edocendum parum. *Cic. Academ. quaeſt. l. 1.*

(b) Οὐ μόνον δὲ χάριν ἔχειν δίκαιον τούτοις, ὧν ἄν τις κοινώσαιτο ταῖς δόξαις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐπιπολαιότερον ἀποφηναμένοις· καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι συμβάλλονταί τι. τὴν γὰρ ἕξιν προήσκησαν ἡμῶν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ Τιμόθεος μὴ ἐγένετο, πολλὴν ἂν μελοποιΐαν οὐκ εἴχομεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ Φρῦνις, Τιμόθεος οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο. Verùm non ſolùm illis agendæ ſunt gratiæ quorum opinionibus quis acquieſcet, ſed illis qui ſuperficie tenus dixerunt: conferunt enim aliquid etiam iſti, habitum namque noſtrum exercuerunt. Si enim Timotheus non fuiſſet, multum melodiæ nequaquam habuiſſemus: ſi tamen Phrynis non extitiſſet, ne Timotheus quidem. *Ariſt. Metaphyſ. l. 2. c. 1. p. m. 645.*

(c) Dr. Th Sprat *Bp. of R* cheſter) *Hiſt. of the Royal So ciety, p.*

(d) Theod Zuinger, *Phyſician, Native of* Baſil, *dy in 158*

(e) Ille omnino, qui ſatis ad famam nominis adipiſcendam putant ſi præſcribere poſſint illud: *contra Scaligerum, vel Scaligeri error* ... *ſtenſurnec* eos præcipuè tango, &c. *Alex. Morus præfat. edit Scalig. in Euſebium,* 1658.

(f) *I don't ſpeak of the Action that* Scioppius, *the moſt terrible & furious of all the Criticks, brought againſt him (that would be too odious) pretending he had committed* 500 *falſities in a piece of* 120 *pages concerning the antiquity of his Family. 'Tis very certain that there are among theſe* 500 *Lyes imputed to him, many that are imputed with reaſon: To be convinced of it, we need only read what* Scaliger *and his friends anſwered, and what was replied to them.*

(g) *As Father* Labbe *in his* French Chronologer, *tom.* 5. *anno* 1652. Father *Denys Petau, ſays he*, the moſt learned Man that was in the World, died the 11th of *November*, in his 70th year. Salmaſius, who had try'd his skill with him in ſome points of Grammar, *impar longe congreſſus Achilli* in all the reſt, died the 3d of *September*.

decisions, and too much addicted to new ways, or whether they yield sooner or later to the vanity of distinguishing themselves by the multitude of their Writings, or for many other reasons, which I could easily expose if I meant to characterise any one by them; but 'tis not less certain, that these Examples afford Consolation. In point of Comfort, men are rather touch'd by popular and plausible Thoughts, than by Reasonings most agreeable to the Rules of Logick. We may say then, that the *Scaligers* and *Salmasius's* ought to have the same effect as to other Authors, that *Carthage* had as to other Nations: (a) *Post Carthaginem vinci neminem puduit*; None was asham'd to be beaten after *Carthage* was conquer'd.

I might join *Baronius* to these two famous Authors, who was undoubtedly a Great Man: They who have examin'd him to write against him, were perhaps his greatest Admirers; and yet how many faults has he in his *Annals*? They are not reckon'd by Hundreds, but by Thousands (b). He was mistaken, not only through a Party-interest, and an *Ultramountain* prejudice, but even in a thousand things of no Service to the Court of *Rome's* Pretensions. This has been manifested as often as he has been attack'd, and very lately the Publick had an opportunity of being convinc'd of it (c) in a solid manner. *Baronius* seems to have taken delight in deceiving himself, and purposely to have intersp ers'd his Work with Lyes, so thick they grow every where.

III. Yet a good compilation of them cannot be made without much labour.

I am not apprehensive you should conclude from hence that there is nothing easier than to compile Faults, and that these sorts of Collections require but little time, it being but transcribing the Censures Authors have given of one another; I am not afraid, I say, that so judicious a man as you should propose to me this Argument. You know too well, Sir, that there is no Process in which 'tis more necessary to hear both Parties, than in those that commence amongst the Learned. 'Tis folly to depend upon the Observations of the Aggressors; Prudence requires we should hear the Defendants Answers and the Replies of the Aggressors. I ask no more than this; I know that the Readers patience commonly stops short of it: But in a Design like this, it is not too much, in respect of many things, to compare together four Pieces successively published; two by the Assailant, and two by the Assaulted; and I dare even say, that in some Facts this is not sufficient. It will be granted me, that there are many Censors who commit more faults than they correct (d); at least it will be own'd, that the most Learned leave room to be censur'd in their turn. This is what *Casaubon* has been tax'd with in respect to his Critical Work on *Baronius*. Some (e) have reproach'd him with this in gentle terms; others in a very extravagant manner; tho' we must own a certain fatality which caus'd this Work, very good and very learned in other respects, to do more ill than good to the Reputation of the Author. But, in short, I desire only this Example to shew that after the reading of a Critical Book, we must suspend our Judgment till we have seen what the criticis'd Author or his Friends have to say. They who think all that's censur'd by the Aggressor to be faulty, and whatever he opposes not to be good, commonly find themselves in the end the Cullies of that Writer; for 'tis manifest to them that he has condemn'd good things, and pass'd by what really deserv'd condemnation, and that he himself has been guilty of many Blunders. An Author in other respects very sensible of Censure, will turn Critick upon himself, when he can hope to mortifie his Censors by it, by shewing them they were ignorant that such and such things deserv'd reproof. I would give you instances of this, but that I am satisfy'd they are well known to you, with the Reflection naturally resulting from it: which is, that a man chooses rather to do himself mischief, provided it redound to his Enemy, than do himself any good that might turn to his Enemy's advantage. Now, as the Fate of the Censor and the Apologist is sometimes the same, that is, that neither of them do see but part of their Adversary's defects, and do commit faults respectively in their turn, we see the necessity of pursuing them through the whole progress of a Dispute in the attempt of making such a Collection as this: For it ought to consist only of Faults averred and certain, as are, for instance, those upon which the animaverted Authors pass Sentence themselves, either expresly or by their silence, and those which they are disabl'd from defending but by notorious Absurdities. Not that I deny there are Faults which the first Censure brings to conviction; so that if I should resume the Metaphor of Hunting I used before, I ought to say, that indeed those who pursue the Faults of Authors, frequently find the Beast already slain, or upon his last Legs; but sometimes also they find one that puts them on a wrong scent, or avoids the blow, or even still vigorously defends himself, tho' wounded in an hundred places. The Cavils suggested to criticis'd Writers by vanity and a false shame, make the Application of the Metaphor but too just. But this is a proof that the Art of Transcribing is not sufficient to set a man up for this Hunting, and that the Edifice will be of no little cost, notwithstanding the plenty of Materials. Let me add farther, That of all Dictionaries there is none more difficult than this. In labouring upon others, we meet with abundance of things ready prepar'd in the preceding ones, which cost only the taking them; and as many others that want but a little alteration. Whatever we find good, is good Prize. But all this is of no use to me: what I find bad, is the only thing that can serve me, provided I know how to rectifie it.

You have seen a Reflection, supply'd to me by the reading of some of those Disputes, that contain a succession of Answers and Replies, *&c.* See here another arising from

---

(a) Florus ... 2. c. 15.

(b) Baron. Annales in quem ... divi Blondellus mille castigavit ...ntis, aliquando proditu...ris quibus erant exemplaris sui praetexuit: quod exemplis are suo redemptum bea...te proceres Amstelodamenses Bibliothecae publicae inferri curaverunt. Super haec vero & ea quae ab aliis animadversa sunt, quae subnotavimus etiam nos justum fere volumen implerent. *Alex. Morus ubi supra.* Holstenius *could shew* 8000 *falshoods in* Baronius, *and prove them by the Manuscripts of the* Vatican. *See* Patin *lett.* 164. *p.* 17. *tom.* 2. *edit.* 1691.

(c) *By the* Critica historico-chronologica *of Father* Pagi, *printed at* Paris *in fol. in* 1689. *and by the* Exercitat. Sam. Basnagii Flottemanvillei *printed at* Utrecht *in* 4° *in* 1692.

(d) *Saepe in judicando majus est peccatum judicii quàm peccati illius de quo fuerat judicatum. Amb. in Psal.* 50.

(e) *Mr* Godeau *for instance, in the Preface of his Hist. of the Church:* Casaubon, *says he,* who was a good Scholar, should have treated *Baronius* with more civility, he who never names *Scaliger* without the title of *Divine*, and content himself with censuring the things he believed him mistaken in, without attempting to make him pass at every turn for a man that had no good Learning. If he had engag'd in a carier as long as his, we should have seen whether he would not have made false steps. His *Exercitations* have produc'd others. Just subject of Censure has been found in his Censures, by which it appears that in such subjects there's nothing but may be defended and opposed with an almost equal probability, especially as to the Dates of Times.

the ſame Fountain. After the reading of ſome Animadverſions upon a Book, we think our ſelves undeceiv'd in many things, which were taken for true in reading it. Hence we paſs from the Affirmative to the Negative. But if we happen to read a good Anſwer to this Critical Piece, we ſeldom fail, in reſpect of ſome things, to return to our firſt Affirmation: whilſt, on the other ſide, we proceed to the Negation of ſome things which we believ'd upon the credit of the Animadverter. We experience a like revolution of Thoughts, when we come to read a good Reply to the Anſwer. Now, is not this likely to caſt the greateſt part of Readers into a continual diffidence? What can eſcape the ſuſpicion of falſhood with reſpect to thoſe who have not the Key of the Sources in their hands? If an Author advances things without citing the places he takes them from, he leaves room to believe that he only ſpeaks by hear-ſay; if he cites, 'tis fear'd that he unfairly relates the paſſage, or underſtands it ill, ſince we ſeldom fail in reading Animadverſions to find a great many ſuch Faults in the Book that's cenſur'd. What muſt be done then, Sir, to remove all ſubjects of diſtruſt, whilſt there are ſuch a great number of Books that were never anſwer'd, and ſuch a great number of Readers who have not the Books containing the ſequel of theſe Literary Diſputes? Were it not to be wiſh'd there was a Critical Dictionary in the World, to which recourſe might be had, to be aſcertain'd whether what we find in other Dictionaries and in all ſorts of other Books be true? This would be the Touch-ſtone of other Books; and you know a man ſomewhat nice in his Language, who would not fail to call a Work of this nature, *The Inſurance-Office of the Republick of Learning*.

Thus you ſee in groſs the Idea of my Project. My deſign is to compoſe a Dictionary, which, beſides the conſiderable Omiſſions of others, ſhall contain a Collection of Faults concerning each Article. And you perceive, Sir, that if, for inſtance, I had accompliſh'd a Collection under the Word SENECA, of all that is falſly attributed to that famous Philoſopher, there needs no more than to conſult this Article to know what we ought to believe concerning what we read about *Seneca* in any Book whatſoever: For if it was a falſhood, it would be noted in the Collection; and whatever is not put down there as falſe, might be look'd upon as true. This ſuffices to ſhew, that if this Deſign was well executed, the reſult would be a Work moſt uſeful and moſt convenient to all ſorts of Readers. I well underſtand, methinks, what ought to be done for the perfect Execution of this Enterpriſe; but I am much more ſenſible of my incapacity to execute it: And therefore I confine my ſelf to the producing only a Specimen, and leave the Continuation of it to perſons of requiſite Abilities, in caſe it be thought that this Project, rectified where-ever it ſhall be neceſſary, ſhall deſerve to employ the Pens of the Learned.

V. Why theſe fragments are publiſh'd beforehand, and their character.

But as I have foreſeen that my Specimen will be of extent ſufficient to engage me in a moſt painful task; and beſides, as I am very dubious of the method of executing this Project: do you know, Sir, the reſolution I have haſtily taken; which is, to hazard ſome Pieces of my Draught, and to ſend them out as the Forlorn-hope to ſcour the Country, ſound the Fords, and get Intelligence of the Enemy. If they make an unſucceſsful Sally, and return not with good News, I will take a Stoical Reſolution of giving my ſelf Repoſe; if the Succeſs be otherwiſe, I ſhall proſecute my Deſign. Thus you ſee what obliges me to ſet out with this little Forerunner. Whatever Deſtiny it meets with, it will afford me the opportunity of giving publick Teſtimonies of my ſingular Eſteem and Friendſhip for you; and if any thing be capable of diſturbing me for its ill Succeſs, it will perhaps be the conſideration that it was unworthy of your Patronage.

In the mean time I'll intruſt a little Secret with you; which is, that for the conſtruction of this Prelude I have been ſo far from publiſhing the beſt Fragments of the Critical Dictionary, that I have choſen thoſe that I moſt ſuſpected. 'Tis not hard to conjecture the reaſon of my Conduct, ſince common ſenſe teaches that the ſafeſt way of prognoſticating the future Fate of a Book, by feeling the Pulſe of the Publick, is to take the Specimen we expoſe from the worſt part of the Piece, rather than from the beſt. Beſides, when we deſire to profit by the Reader's Advice how to guide our ſelves better in the execution of a Project, we ought eſpecially to lay before the eyes of the Publick the Parts that are of the moſt doubtful goodneſs. I have therefore choſen the Pieces I moſt miſtruſted, or which contain'd each in its kind the moſt ſenſible Irregularities, as you would call a long Train of Reflections, a Digreſſion reſembling a Diſſertation in form, *&c.* I like the ſimplicity of a Plan; I admire its uniform and unperplex'd execution; and in this I place the Idea of Perfection. But when I come from the Theory to the Practice, I find it difficult to govern my ſelf by this Idea of Perfection. A mixture of ſeveral Forms, a party-colour'd Variety, and not ſo much Uniformity, are much my Talent.

I fancy this falſe Taſte is an effect of my Lazineſs: I would have the ſame Book to ſatisfie my curioſity upon all the things it leads my thoughts to, and I don't love to be oblig'd to paſs from Book to Book to find this ſatisfaction. As it is natural to judge of others by our ſelves, I imagin we do the Reader a ſignal pleaſure when we ſpare him the trouble of going out of his place, and ſearching in another Book for ſome little Explications he may deſire. This will immediately poſſeſs you with fears that this Book will be ſtuff'd with Parentheſes all over: But take courage; for, for their ſakes who love not Interruptions, I will take care to diſengage the Text from acceſſory Obſervations, which I ſhall throw into the Margin, and to the end of each Article, in favour of thoſe who deſire to know immediately the Dependances or Relations which connect things to one another. To refreſh the Readers, I will take care now and then to give them ſome gayer Touches, without abuſing the Privilege allow'd to theſe ſorts of Works, of expreſſing one's ſelf naturally; nothing is more neceſſary than ſuch paſſages in a Dictionary, which is naturally a dry and fatiguing Book. I heartily wiſh that theſe were all the bad ſides of it; but there are others more diſcouraging, ſince there is no Work that is judged of by ſo bad Principles as this. You find many Readers complaining that they meet with common things in it; what then would they have? nothing but exquiſite Learning, and what they knew not before? If ſo, it would not be ſuch a Book as it ought to be, that is, for every body's uſe and comprehenſion.

I refer my ſelf to you, Sir, who can definitively judge of every thing relating to Books: Would it be reaſonable to exclude from this Dictionary the Cenſure of a Fault, under pretence that this Fault is incapable of miſleading the great Doctors, however it be ſpread in the Works of a great many Writers? Doubtleſs you'll not be of this opinion: Every Falſhood that's diſpers'd in many Books may deceive a great many people, and that is a ſufficient reaſon to note it in a Critical Dictionary: And for this reaſon the Faults of the firſt Editions may be taken notice of, tho' they have been corrected in the ſecond; for how many are there who make uſe of the firſt Edition all their life, without ever conſulting others?

Have I not reaſon to fear that by thus giving you the Character of this Work, you ſhould aſk me whether this be the way of acquitting my ſelf of my Obligations to you; and whether I am not aſham'd to dedicate a Book to you (A△) loaded with the faults of the *Latin* Country, and an heap of Ordures of the Republick of Learning? I am as fully perſuaded as any man living, that nothing ought to be dedicated to you but a Collection of fine Thoughts, and Curioſities of Learning; and that the Preſent might be perfectly worthy of you, it ought perfectly to reſemble the Writings you have publiſh'd: Am not I then very much in the wrong to deviate ſo extravagantly from this Model, and without any reaſon; and even in quite different Circumſtances to recur to *Catullus*'s Expedient, and put his Menace in practice?

(*a*) *Ad librariorum*
Curram ſcrinia, Cæſios, Aquinos
Suffenum, omnia colligam venena,
Ac te his ſuppliciis remunerabor.

But, whatever may be ſaid of it, I am certain, upon mature conſideration, that if my Rhapſody deſerves not your Patronage, 'tis not for the reaſon I have alledged. I ſhould think it a much more paſſable Preſent, if it was compos'd of a far greater number of Lyes; and I ſhould not deſpair of procuring it your whole approbation one day, if I had a Noſe as ſagacious for the Falſities of Authors, as a Poet of your acquaintance boaſts he had in other reſpects (*b*).

It would be time to conclude this long Letter; but I have ſome difficulties to clear up, which will ſtay me ſome time longer.

VI. Anſwer to ſome Objections; 1. That this Book may create Enemies.

Firſt, Sir, the liberty I have taken to gather into heaps the Errors ſcatter'd in divers Books, may be thought a notable piece of raſhneſs: Is not this to create a vaſt number of Enemies on purpoſe? In attacking the Ancients, we bring upon our hands their numerous Partiſans among the Moderns; and when we cenſure the latter, we expoſe our ſelves to their own reſentment if they are living, or to that of their Family if they are dead. Now the reſentment of thoſe Gentlemen is no little one: They are reputed to be an extremely ſenſible, impatient, and vindictive Race of Men; and one would think their Relations think themſelves oblig'd to perpetuate, after their death, the blind love they had for their Productions. As for the Intereſt the Moderns take in the Reputation of the Ancients, I can't better repreſent it than by the paſſage I cite, in which (*c*) *la Mothe le Vayer* is angry with *Balzac*, who had criticis'd an Anſwer of *Pompey*.

In

(*a*) *Catull. Epig.* 14.

(*b*) Namque ſagacius unus odoror, Polypus an gravis hirſutis cubet hircus in alis Quam canis acer, ubi lateat ſus. *Horat. Epod. Od.* 12.

(*c*) *In truth I confeſs to you, that ſo unjuſt a treatment of all Antiquity raiſes ſuch an indignation in my ſoul, that I had rather it ſhould be you, or any body than my ſelf, who ſhould give this ſort of temerity the name that it deſerves.* Exclamet Melicerta periiſſe Frontem de rebus. *A man muſt have loſt all modeſty and judgment to proceed to ſuch a want of reſpect, and to ſo preſumptuous an extravagance,* ut inſolenter parentis artium antiquitatis reverentiam verberemus. (*Macrob.* 1. *Saturn.*) Hexam. Ruſtic. *pag.* 142, 143.

(A△) *A Book to you loaded with the faults of the* Latin *Country, and an heap of Ordures of the Republick of Learning.*] As every thing has two Faces, perhaps ſome people will ſay that I incur the Cenſure we read in a fine Treatiſe of *Plutarch*. But this would be a perverſe conſidering of the matter, and not by its fair ſide. It ought to be conſider'd according to the Idea of thoſe collections of Phyſical Obſervations, which only contain the *Diſtempers* incident to human Bodies, but which treat of them only to teach the Cure of them. However it be, theſe are *Plutarch*'s Thoughts: * "If any one rummaging the Ancients, "ſhould pick and cull all the worſt things he could "find, and make a Book of them, as the defective "Verſes of *Homer*, beginning with a ſhort Syllable, "or the incongruities met with in Tragedies, or "the obſcene and baſe Objections *Archilochus* makes "againſt the Female Sex, diſgracing himſelf by it; "would he not deſerve this Tragical Malediction,

"*Pox on your Taſte! muſt you, like Li e and Fleas,*
"*Be always fed with Scabs and Naſtineſs?*

"But ſetting aſide that Curſe, it would be a Col"lection that would neither bring him Honour nor "Profit, thus to rip up all the Faults of others; "as we read that *Philip* made a Collection of the "moſt wicked and incorrigible Men of his time, "whom he lodg'd together in a City he built for "'em, and call'd it *Poneropolis*, that is, the City of "Villains: So the curious collecting and amaſſing "together the Faults and Imperfections on all hands, "not of Verſes or Poems, but of the Lives of Men, "make very diſagreeable Archives and Regiſters of "their Memory, which they carry always about "them. And juſt as at *Rome* there are perſons who "care not to buy handſom Pictures, or fine Sta"tues, or even handſom Boys and Girls of thoſe "who expoſe them to ſale, but rather affect to buy "Monſters in Nature, ſuch as have no Legs, or "their Arms wrong-plac'd, or three Eyes, or the "Head of an Oſtridge, and are pleas'd with enqui"ring

"*Where Kinds of unlike Form oft blended be*
"*Into one hideous Deformity.*

"But he that ſhould commonly carry us to "ſuch Spectacles, would trouble and torment us "with the ſight. So thoſe who are curious in the "ſearch of other Mens Imperfections, the Infa"mies of Extractions, and the Faults and Errors "happening in other Families, ought to call to "mind as the former, that ſuch Obſervations have "neither conduc'd to their Pleaſure nor Profit.

* Plut. de Curioſitate pag. 520.

In anſwer to this difficulty, I ſay, Sir, that I don't think my Deſign to be dangerous in that reſpect; and therefore this Sentence might reaſonably be apply'd to me,

Periculoſæ (a) plenum opus aleæ
Tractas, & incedis per ignes
Suppoſitos cineri doloſo;

and yet, properly ſpeaking, I could not be call'd *raſh*. I repreſent not Authors under the diſadvantageous Idea that Slander employs to characteriſe them; I think they are too rational to take it amiſs, that for the ſake of the Publick Good I ſhould ſhew that they have been ſometimes in the wrong. I declare that in doing this I have no deſign to leſſen the Glory they have acquir'd, and that I ſhall carefully abſtain, where-ever Civility requires it, from all diſobliging terms, reſpecting their Perſons, or the body of their Work. The Fate of a Book depends not on ſome little Faults ſcatter'd here and there; nor will they diminiſh its juſt Price, or rob the Author of the Praiſes that are due to him. The Injuſtice and Malice of Mankind, as great as they are, are not grown to ſuch an exceſſive degree, as to hinder the generality of Readers from giving Praiſes to a good Book, notwithſtanding the Faults that are in it. This fine Maxim of a Poet of *Auguſtus*'s Time will always live:

Ubi (b) plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis
Offendar maculis, quos aut incuria fudit,
Aut humana parum cavit natura.

Eſpecially a Pardonis to be granted to the Faults, tho' numerous, of thoſe who are the Authors of large Dictionaries; and this Maxim is particularly to be urged on their behalf, (c) *Opere in longo fas eſt obrepere ſomnum*; and with that aſſurance I ſhall be the leſs ſcrupulous to criticiſe them, for I ſhould be very ſorry to leſſen the Praiſes that are due to them. The Publick is infinitely indebted to them for the Inſtructions they have given with the Sweat of their Brows, and the moſt oppreſſive Toil that can be undergone in a Pen-production. I refer my Reader to Mr. *Morus*'s Preface already cited, where he ſhews that the Faults of *Scaliger*, *Salmaſius*, and *Baronius*, ought not to deprive them of the Glory they have obtain'd. You ſee, Sir, to what my excuſes tend: I do not deſign to injure the Merit of Authors, nor to depart from the Rules of Civility towards them; and I have ſo good an opinion of their Modeſty, and their Zeal for the Inſtruction of the Publick, that I don't believe they'll reſent the liberty I ſhall take to ſhew wherein they have been miſtaken. Moſt commonly I ſhall not be the Diſcoverer of their Faults, but only the Reporter of what others have ſaid. I ſcruple to appropriate to my ſelf what I borrow from other hands; ſo that the Reader may be aſſur'd, that when I note a Fault without citing any one who obſerv'd it, I was ignorant of its being ever made publick. After all, I don't think that I ought to ſhew a greater Indulgence to my Neighbour than to my ſelf, and it will appear that I ſhall not ſpare my ſelf. In fine, it ought to be conſider'd that the Intereſt of the Publick ought to be regarded before that of private perſons; and that an Author deſerves no Complaiſance, who is ſo unjuſt (d) as to prefer the concealing of his Faults before the undeceiving of the Publick.

I know not whether it proceeds from my judging of others by my ſelf; but I don't think that thoſe whoſe Miſtakes I ſhall civilly relate, will be provok'd at it: for which reaſon I produce ſome which concern ſome perſons for whom I have an extraordinary eſteem, and who honour me with their Friendſhip. Thoſe whom I ſhall ſpare will have ſome reaſon to complain, becauſe it will be a ſign of my thinking them uncapable of heark'ning to Reaſon, or unable to bear the leaſt loſs. This laſt Motive is not always abſolutely to be rejected: For if there are any Authors whoſe Faults ought to be conceal'd, they are chiefly thoſe poor ones whom we could quickly ſtrip to their ſhirts, ſhould we fall upon them; and if there be others whoſe Faults ought to be diſcover'd, they are principally the great and famous ones, ſince, beſides that their Errors are infinitely more contagious, they have ſuch abundant Funds of Reputation and Treaſures of Fame, that an hundred Shipwrecks could not incommode them (e). For which reaſon there are few that retract (f) with leſs reluctancy, or bear Cenſure with a better grace, than thoſe who have moſt juſtly obtain'd the Title of Great Authors (g). Prepare your ſelf, Sir, to behold your ſelf in this Dictionary, if any Miſtake has eſcap'd you; but I have no hopes of being able to give you this Teſtimony of my good Opinion of you. You are too exact and penetrating, not to expel all ſorts of Falſhood from your Writings; and beſides, you are ſo great a Maſter of the *Greek* and *Roman* Antiquities, as to draw out nothing but what is rare and curious; ſo that a man ought to be I know not how many times more learned than my ſelf, to diſcover whether you have err'd or not. If theſe Anſwers are not ſatisfactory, I add on one hand, that the Publick Inſtruction deſerves I ſhould ſacrifice my ſelf to the ill humour of ſome private men; and on the other, that I ſhall give but too much occaſion to the Authors I cenſure to revenge themſelves. I heartily conſent to a retaliation either from Themſelves or their Poſterity. I'll take it as a kindneſs done me to correct me, and to furniſh me with better light; and I beſeech this favour of all my Readers. I will endeavour not to commit Faults, but am very certain I ſhall commit but too many. The complaint therefore will not lie againſt me, which is urg'd againſt thoſe Criticks who print nothing (B) for fear of Repriſals.

In

(a) *Horat. Od.* 1. *l.* 2.

(b) *Horat. de art. poet.*

(c) *Id. ib.*

(d) Nimis perverſè ſe ipſum amat qui & alios vult errare ut error ſuus lateat: quanto enim melius & utilius, ut ubi ipſe erravit, alii non errent quorum admonitu errore careat: quod ſi noluerit, ſaltem comites erroris non habeat. *Auguſtin. epiſt.* 7. *p. m.* 28.

(e) *Theſe words of Juvenal may be applied to them,* Non tam tenuis cenſus tibi contigit ut mediocris Jactura te mergat onus. *Juv. Sat.* 13.

(f) A futuris ſe deceptum eſſe Hippocrates memoriæ tradidit, more ſcilicet magnorum virorum & fiduciam magnarum rerum habentium. Nam levi ingenia quia nihi habent, nihil ſib detrahun Magno ingenio multaqu nihilomi nus hab turo co venit et am ſimplex ver erroris confeſſi *Celſus de Medic. l.* c. 4. Se *alſo* Quintil. *l.* 3. *c.* 6.

(g) Nu patienti reprehe duntur, quam q maxime laudari merent *Plin. e* 20. *l.* 7.

(B) *Who print nothing for fear of Repriſals.*] *Regnier* in his 9th Satyr calls upon his Cenſors to publiſh ſomething.

Qu'ils facent un ouvrage,
Riche d'inventions, de ſens & de langage,
Que nous puiſſions draper comme ils font nos eſcris,
Et voir comme l'on dict, s'ils ſont ſi bien apris,
Qu'ils monſtrent de leur eau, qu'ils entrent en carriere.

To

VII. 2. That it will cenſure ſlight Faults.

In the ſecond place it will ſeem ſtrange that I amuſe my ſelf with cenſuring little Faults, where the want of exactneſs is ſcarce ſenſible. Now I have my Reaſons for this, Sir: I well foreſaw what would be ſaid of it, and that the *minutiſſimarum rerum minutiſſimus ſciſciator* would be caſt in my teeth; nevertheleſs I have determin'd that theſe Ralleries were to be deſpis'd, and that even the leaſt ſlips were to be obſerv'd; for the more we criticiſe things with reaſon, the more we ſhew how difficult it is to be perfectly exact, Now, in carrying the Idea of perfect exactneſs ſo high, we oblige Authors to be the more upon their guard, and to examin every thing with the utmoſt circumſpection. Man is but too much accuſtom'd to remain on the hither-ſide of the Rules ſet before him; we muſt therefore ſtrain them to as high a pitch as poſſible, if we would have him come up cloſe to the point of Perfection. And moreover, ſince this Work may be ſerviceable to thoſe who will compoſe a very exact Hiſtorical Dictionary, which it is moſt neceſſary to engage in, I ought to deſcend to particulars with ſome ſort of nicety, or captiouſneſs if you'll have it ſo. 'Tis not out of inclination, but choice, that I deal in Trifles, and I ought to be thank'd for it, ſince it is a ſort of a ſacrificing one's ſelf to the good of one's Neighbour. 'Tis taking a Road out of the way of Praiſe, to bring others to a juſt accuracy; and is not this a conſiderable Sacrifice? There are not many who would make the like, for which I refer my ſelf to *Quintilian* (*a*).

I ſhall ſay ſomething below, that may ſerve as a Supplement to the diſcuſſion of this ſecond difficulty.

VIII. 3. That it will contain uſeleſs Diſcuſſions.

In the third place, I may be charg'd with giving my ſelf an uſeleſs trouble: For of what import is it, you'll ſay, to know there was a *Caſſius Longinus* who has been confounded with another; or whether he was capitally puniſh'd, or only baniſh'd? Is the Publick concern'd in this? What matters it whether *Scaliger* was angry or not angry with *Eraſmus* for having been call'd a Soldier? and ſo with the reſt. To this I have an hundred things to anſwer; and from the multitude of Thoughts which immediately offer themſelves to my mind, I find I could make a long Diſſertation upon this Subject, which would perhaps be tolerable: But as 'tis time to conclude, I reduce my ſelf to a few Notes; the reſt may come out at another more ſeaſonable time, or perhaps is unneceſſary, ſince every one may find it either by his own Meditation or in Books.

(*a*) Sive contemnentes tanquam parvaquæ prius dicimus ſtudia . . . . ſeu, quod proximum vero, nullam ingenii ſperantes gratiam circa res etiamſi neceſſarias, procul tamen ab oſtentatione poſitas. *Quint.* l. 1. *in Proœmio.*

I ſay then, Sir, that this Objection, which might perhaps be ſolid, abſolutely ſpeaking, and without reſpect to time and place, is of no force when referr'd to the Age and the part of the World that we live in. If Men were perfectly reaſonable, they would beſtow themſelves wholly upon the care of their eternal Salvation; One thing alone would be neceſſary, as our Lord told *Martha*, (*b*) *Porro unum eſt neceſſarium.* Who knows not alſo the good and wiſe Maxim, *Nature is content with a little*? Who can doubt but that if we contain'd our ſelves within the bounds of natural neceſſity, we muſt aboliſh almoſt all the Arts as things ſuperfluous? But Man can be no longer treated upon that foot; he has been time out of mind in the poſſeſſion of ſeeking the Conveniences of Life, and all ſorts of Pleaſures and Delights. Amongſt other things unneceſſary, it has pleas'd the *Europeans* to employ themſelves about, the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues have been the Subject of their Study and Enquiry, or at leaſt the Contents of the Books which remain in thoſe two Languages. Nor are they content to know in general what is contain'd in thoſe Books, but they are inquiſitive whether every thing in them be certain, and whether they cannot explain that wherein one Author contradicts another: And when they have been able to clear theſe Difficulties, and thoſe of all ſorts of Hiſtories, they have found it a very agreeable ſatisfaction, and have much diverted their Readers, and procur'd great Encomiums to themſelves, though theſe Illuſtrations were of no uſe to bring down the Price of Proviſions, or to keep off Cold or Heat, Rain or Hail. It ought not then to be reckon'd an impertinent raſhneſs in me to go to expoſe, as a Merchandize of great Price, a thing rejected by all the World as uſeleſs; for in this I govern my ſelf only by the long-eſtabliſh'd Taſte of the World. Whether men have reaſon or not in being pleas'd that they are not in an Error upon any point of Geography, Chronology, or Hiſtory, that's nothing to me: I am no wiſe anſwerable for that; 'tis ſufficient to my purpoſe, that (*c*) the Publick will exactly

(*b*) *Luke* 10. 42.

(*c*) *By this word I don't mean that every body is pleas'd with the ſame Confutations, but that ſome are pleas'd with one ſort, and others with another.*

To which he applies the *Italian* Story.

Qu'une fois un paiſant,
Homme fort entendu, & ſuffiſant de teſte,
Comme on peut ayſement juger par ſa requeſte,
S'en vint trouver le Pape & le voulut prier,
Que les Preſtres du temps ſe puiſſent marier,
Afin ce diſoit-il que nous puiſſions nous autres
Leurs femmes careſſer ainſi qu'ils font les noſtres.

Martial had thoughts of this nature before in his 92d Epigram of the firſt Book.

Cum tua non edas, carpis mea carmina Læli:
Carpere vel noli noſtra, vel ede tua.

And he ſaith in the 64th Epigram of the 12th Book,

Corrumpit ſine talione cælebs:
Cæcus perdere non poteſt quod aufert.

See Mr. *Saldenus* pag. 44 & 419 of the Treatiſe *de libris varioque eorum uſu & abuſu.*

YOU will find a Supplement to this in the Article *Ariſtarchus*. I have obſerved in another place, That the Readers who never write are very often more rigid and unjuſt in their Cenſures than thoſe who know by experience the pains of Compoſition. I think I may ſay there are two things which hinder the univerſal and unmerciful Criticks from ſhewing themſelves in Print. One is, the fear that every body ſhould fall upon their Works, and make them ſuffer the puniſhment of retaliation without mercy: The other, that they come not up to the Idea of Perfection which was the Rule of their Cenſures. † *'Tis eaſier to imagin an high Perfection than to find it; and it is the Fate of moſt Criticks to be able to find fault, and not be able to do better: They don't ſeem to have the faculty of ſpeaking or writing, they are ſo dry and barren.* The Author of this Judgment obſerves, *That Mr.* Conrart, *who had a moſt judicious and delicate Taſte, and whoſe Criticiſms were certain, and penetrating into all the folds and corners of a Work, had the prudence to publiſh nothing of his own, and that the little which come out is not very conſiderable.*

† *Vigneul Marville Melanges d'hiſt. & de literature* tom. 3. pag. 183. Rouën Edit. 1701.

actly know all the Falſhoods that are current, and makes Account (a) of theſe Diſcoveries.

Let it not be ſaid that our Age, cur'd of the Critical Spirit that reign'd in the preceding, looks upon the Writings of thoſe who correct the falſities of Fact, concerning either the particular Hiſtory of Great Men, or the Names of Cities, or the like, as a meer Pedantry; for 'tis certain, all things conſider'd, that men were never more devoted to ſuch ſorts of Explications. For one experimental Philoſopher, for one Mathematician, you find an hundred that throughly ſtudy Hiſtory with all its Dependencies; and the Antiquarian Science, I mean the ſtudy of Medals, Inſcriptions, Baſſo Relievo's, *&c.* was never cultivated as it is at preſent. To what does it tend? To the better eſtabliſhing the Time in which certain particular Facts happen'd; to prevent one Town or Perſon being taken for another; to fortifie Conjectures upon certain Rites of the Ancients; and to an hundred other Curioſities which the Publick has nothing to do with, by the ſqueamiſh Maxims which make the Subject of this third Difficulty; Maxims that have not diſcourag'd a (b) Great Man, as conſummate in the Affairs of State as in the Study of Human Learning, from publiſhing a great Book upon the Excellence and Uſe of Medals.

You, Sir, of all men in the World are the beſt convinc'd of the impertinence of theſe Maxims; they tend (c) to nothing leſs than the Ruin of all the fine Arts, and almoſt of all the Sciences which moſt poliſh and exalt the Mind of Man. According to theſe fine Reaſonings, we ſhould have nothing left but the uſe of Mechanical Arts, and as much Geometry as is neceſſary to perfect Navigation, Carriages, Agriculture, and the Fortification of Places. Amongſt all the Profeſſors, we ſhould have hardly any thing but Engineers to invent only new ways of Deſtruction to Mankind. It muſt be allow'd that the Publick has a very great Intereſt in all theſe things, ſince hereby we may commodiouſly ſtore our Towns with Plenty, and maintain an offenſive or defenſive War. It muſt be own'd on the other hand, with *Cicero*'s leave, that all the (d) Beauties of Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, ſerve only to pleaſe the eyes, and give an agreeable admiration to good Judges. The courſe productions of all thoſe Arts ſuffice to ſatisfie the Neceſſities of men; a man may be ſafely and commodiouſly lodg'd without the help of the *Corinthian* or the Compoſite Order, without Frizes, Cornices and Architraves. Much leſs is it neceſſary for the Conveniences of Life, to know all that is ſaid either of the incommenſurability of the *Aſymptotes*, or of Magical Squares, or the Duplication of the Cube, *&c.* The *Turks* amidſt their groſs Ignorance, are no leſs robuſt, and ſpend no leſs merrily Ten thouſand Livres a year, when they have 'em, than the Chriſtians; and that Governour of *Neuhauſel*, who (e) complain'd after the raiſing of the Siege of *Vienna* of the Inſincerity of the *French*, who had given the King of *Poland* paſſage through their Country, enjoy'd the Authority of his Poſt as pleaſantly as if he had been better skill'd in *Hiſtory* and *Geography*. So that if a man was at liberty to deſpiſe a Work which treats not *de pane lucrando*, or is of no uſe πρὸς τὰ ἄλφιτα, as your good Friends the Ancient *Greeks* ſaid, or in ſhort when the Publick can be without it, there are few Books but would be contemptible, and deſerve the blunt ſaying you doubtleſs have read in *Malherbe*'s Life. Mr. *de Meziriac*, attended with two or three of his Friends, brought him his Commentary on *Diophantus*; thoſe *Friends extraordinarily prais'd this Book, as very uſeful to the Publick*: Malherbe *ask'd them whether it would bring down the Price of Bread?* Another time he approv'd the giving Recompences to thoſe only who ſerv'd the King in his Armies and Affairs; and he ſaid *that a good Poet was no more uſeful to the State than a good player at Nine pins.*

It muſt therefore be granted me, that there are infinite productions of Human Minds, which are eſteem'd, not becauſe they are neceſſary, but becauſe they divert us: And is it not juſt on this ſcore to obſerve the Falſities of the Authors, when there are ſo many men who delight to know the Truth, even in things wherein their Fortune is not at all concern'd?

Is it not certain that a Shoemaker, a Miller, a Gardener, are infinitely more neceſſary to a State than the ableſt Painters or Statuaries; than a *Michael Angelo*, or a Cavalier *Bernini*? Is it not true that the meaneſt Maſon is more neceſſary in a City than the moſt excellent Chronologer or Aſtronomer; than a *Joſeph Scaliger*, or a *Copernicus*? And yet the Works of theſe Great Men (*f*) which the World might well enough diſpenſe with, are infinitely more valu'd than the abſolutely neceſſary productions of theſe Trades. So true it is, that there are things whoſe Prices are determin'd only with reſpect to an honeſt Diverſion, or a meer Ornament of the Soul.

IX. The ſame Arguments that prove the uſefulneſs of other Sciences, prove the uſefulneſs of critical Learning.

Here, Sir, you will not fail to foreſee that the Enemies of good Literature will invent an hundred Exceptions. Since they cannot deny that their Maxims tend to revive Barbariſm in all reſpects, they will expatiate on the Uſefulneſs ariſing from certain Sciences: But they will get nothing by it; for as ſoon as they place in the number of things uſeful, ſuch as have an Utility either by *Reſult* or *Emanation* (ſuffer me to uſe this old Sholaſtick Diſtinction, ſince it ſo well expreſſes both thoſe kinds of acceſſory Utilities, (g) which may come here into account) they'll find themſelves oblig'd to bring in Polite and Critical Learning. I can retort all their Obſervations againſt them. Here is a Specimen of it.

If

(a) *If it is not neceſſary to know them, neither is it neceſſary to be ignorant of them.* Scaliger *at the beginning of his Notes on* Catullus, *has this ſaying,* Etſi candide lector, hoc epigrammate patienter carere poteras, habet tamen quod te ſcire melius fuit quàm ignorare. *See the* News from the Republic of Learning, *in the Advertiſement of* Auguſt 1684. Lipſius *was curious of truth even in little things:* Admirabilis *Lipſius* alicubi ait ſe cupere etiam in minimis vera ſcire. *Epiſt. Hoffm. ad Reineſium. pag.* 100.

(b) *The Baron* de Spanheim

(c) *See the* News from the Repub. of Learning, *Septemb.* 1684. *art.* 4.

(d) *He endeavours in book 3. of the Orator to prove this Theſis,* In pleriſque rebus incredibiliter hoc natura eſt ipſa fabricata, ut ea quæ maximam utilitatem in ſe continerent eadem haberent plurimum vel dignitatis vel ſæpè etiam venuſtatis.

(e) *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans Nov.* 1687. *pag.* 366.

(f) Plus interfuit Reipub. Caſtellum capi Liga tum qu bene defendi ca ſam M. Curii. Credo,ſe Athenie ſium qu que plus interfuit firma tecta in do miciliis habere, quàm Minervæ ſignum ex ebore pulcherrimum: tamen ego me Phidiam eſſe mal lem qu vel optimum fabrum lignarium quare n quantu quiſque proſit, quanti quiſque ſit pon randum eſt: p ſertim cum p ci ping egregi poſſint aut fin re, op rii au aut ba deeſſe poſſin *Cicero Brut.*

(g) H *we give a greater latitude to this Diſtinction than the Sch*

If they tell me that the moſt abſtract Theorems of Algebra are moſt uſeful to Life, becauſe they contribute to the perfecting of certain Arts: I will anſwer them, that likewiſe a ſcrupulous enquiry into all Hiſtorical Facts, is capable of producing very great advantages. I dare ſay, that the ridiculous conceitedneſs of the firſt Criticks, who fell Tooth and Nail upon Trifles, for example, upon the Queſtion whether we ought to ſay *Virgilius* or *Vergilius*, has by accident been of great uſe; they thereby inſpir'd an extreme Veneration for Antiquity; they diſpos'd men to a ſedulous enquiry into the Conduct of ancient *Greece* and *Rome*, and ſo gave occaſion to Profit by thoſe great Examples. And what effect, Sir, do you think, would not a grave and majeſtick Sentence, taken from *Livy* or *Tacitus*, and utter'd as having heretofore inclin'd the *Roman* Senate to a certain Reſolution (*a*), have upon hearers thus diſpos'd? I will not ſcruple to ſay that it is capable of ſaving a State, and perhaps has ſav'd more than one. The Preſident of an Aſſembly pronounces thoſe *Latin* words with an Emphaſis; he makes an impreſſion upon their minds by the reſpect they have for the *Roman* Name; every one goes home convinc'd, and diſpoſes his Neighbours to a ſenſe of Obedience; and thus you ſee a Civil War ſtiff'd in its birth. *Malherbe* had no Notion of this, when he ſaid that a Poet is no more uſeful to a State than a player at Ninepins: For, not to deſcend to all (*b*) the particular good things a Poet can effect, don't you think, Sir, that one of the topping Men of a Pariſh has often by a Stanza of *Pibrac* emphatically pronounc'd, happily deſtroyed all the Contrivances of a Factious Declaimer? And in Domeſtick Affairs, do you think that thoſe golden Sentences recommended by *Moliere* are always ineffectual? I believe they are ſo often, but not always; and I don't think that *Horace* in the Verſes (*c*) I cite in the Margin ſpoke only of a Profit in Idea.

It will be ſaid, perhaps, that what ſeems never ſo abſtract and unfruitful in Mathematicks, brings at leaſt this advantage, that it leads us to undoubted Truths; whereas Hiſtorical Diſcuſſions, and Enquiries after Matters of Fact, leave us always in the dark, and generate Seeds of new Diſputes. But how imprudent it is to harp upon this ſtring! I maintain that Hiſtorical Truths may be carry'd to a more undoubted degree of certainty than what Geometrical Truths are advanc'd to, provided we conſider theſe two ſorts of Truths in the kind of Certainty peculiar to them. I explain my ſelf. In the Diſputes that ariſe betwixt Hiſtorians, to know whether a Prince has reign'd before or after another, 'tis ſuppos'd on both ſides that a Fact has all the reality and exiſtence it is capable of out of our Underſtanding, except it be of the nature of thoſe related by *Arioſto* and other fabulous Authors; and no regard is had to the difficulties alledged by the Scepticks, to make it doubtful whether the things which ſeem to exiſt do really exiſt out of our Minds. Thus an Hiſtorical Fact is plac'd in the higheſt degree of certainty that can belong to it, when once we have been able to prove its apparent exiſtence: For no more is required for this ſort of Truths; and it were denying the common Principle of Diſputants, and going from one kind of things to another, to bid us prove not only that a bloody Battle appear'd to all *Europe* to be fought at *Senef* in 1674. but alſo that the Objects are ſuch *ad extra* as they appear to us to be. Thus we are deliver'd from the impertinent Cavils which the *Pyrrhoniſts* call *Reaſons of Suſpenſion*; and tho' Hiſtorical *Pyrrhoniſm* can't be rejected in abundance of Facts, 'tis certain there are many others which we can prove with a full certainty; ſo that Hiſtorical Enquiries are not fruitleſs in that reſpect. We certainly ſhew the Falſity of many things, the Uncertainty of many others, and the Truth of the reſt: And thus you have ſome Demonſtrations of uſe to many more people than Geometrical ones; for few people have a taſte for theſe, or find occaſion to apply them to the reformation of Manners: but it will be confeſs'd, Sir, that all ſorts of people may profit, morally ſpeaking, by the reading of a great Collection of Hiſtorical Falſhoods well proved, tho' it were only by growing more circumſpect in judging of their Neighbour, and more capable of avoiding the Snares that Satyr and Flattery lay on all ſides to catch the poor Reader. Now, is it nothing to correct the bad inclination we have to make raſh Judgments? Is it nothing to learn to ſuſpend our aſſent to what we ſee in Print? Is it not the very Nerve of Prudence (*d*) not to believe too haſtily?

In vain ſhould we ſeek for theſe Moral Advantages in a Collection of Quinteſſences of Algebra. Beſides, by the Mathematicians leave, it is not ſo eaſie for them to arrive to a due certainty, as it is for Hiſtorians to come at the certainty they demand. No ſolid Objection will ever be made againſt this Truth of Fact, that *Cæſar* vanquiſh'd *Pompey*; and whatever Principles we diſpute upon, nothing will ſtand more immovably than this Propoſition, Cæſar *and* Pompey *have exiſted, and were not a meer modification of the Souls of thoſe who writ their Life*. But as for the Object of Mathematicks, it is not only very hard to prove that it exiſts out of our mind, but it is very eaſie to prove that it can be nothing but an Idea of our Soul. And indeed the exiſtence of a Square Circle without us ſeems not much more impoſſible, than the exiſtence of the Circle, of which Geometry gives us ſo many fine Demonſtrations; I mean, of a Circle from the Circumference whereof to the Center may be drawn as many Lines as there are Points in the Circumference. 'Tis ſenſibly manifeſt, that the Center, which is but one Point, can't be the common Subject in which ſo many different Lines terminate as there are Points in the Circumference. In a word, the Object of Mathematicks conſiſting of Points abſolutely indiviſible, of Lines without breadth or depth, and of Superficies without profundity; 'tis evident it cannot exiſt

---

(*a*) Compare with Seneca's 94th Epiſtle.

(*b*) Hor. Epiſt. 1. l. 2. recites them up.

(*c*) Os tenerum pueri balbumque poeta figurat: Torquet ab obſcœnis jam nunc ſermonibus aurem; Mox etiam pectus præceptis format amicis: Aſperitatis, & invidiæ corrector & iræ. *Hor. Epiſt.* 1. *lib.* 2.

(*d*) Νᾶφε ϗ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν· ἄρθρα ταῦτα τᾶν φρενῶν. Sobrius eſto atque illud teneto nervos atque artus eſſe ſapientiæ non temere credere. *Epicharmus apud Ciceronem, Polybium, Lucianum, &c.*

exiſt otherwiſe than in Imagination. Thus it is metaphyſically more certain that *Cicero* has had a Being out of the Intellect of any other man, than it is certain that the Object of Mathematicks exiſts out of our Underſtanding. I omit what the learned Mr. *Huet* (*a*) has repreſented to theſe Gentlemen, to teach them not ſo much to undervalue Hiſtorical Truths.

The abſtracted depths of Mathematicks, it may be ſaid, give lofty Idea's of God's Infinity. Be it ſo: But do you think that a great Moral Good cannot reſult from a Critical Dictionary? The infallible Oracle affirms that Science puffs up; and therefore there is nothing wherein 'tis more important to humble the Pride of Man. In mentioning Pride, we ſpeak a Fault the moſt remote from true Vertue, and the moſt diametrically oppoſite to the Spirit of the Goſpel. But what could be imagin'd more proper to give Man a true Notion of the emptineſs and vanity of the Sciences, and of the weakneſs of his Mind, than to ſhew him by heaps the Falſities of Fact that Books are fill'd with. Innumerable men of Letters, the moſt penetrating and ſublime Wits, have taken upon them for many years to illuſtrate Antiquity. That Attempt of the Criticks having the Actions of Men for its Object, ſhould be more eaſie than that of the Philoſophers, which has the Actions of GOD for its Object, and yet the Criticks have given ſo many Proofs of Human Infirmities, as to leave room to compoſe vaſt Volumes of their Falſhoods. Theſe Volumes may therefore mortifie Man with reſpect to his greateſt Vanity, I mean his Science. They are ſo many Trophies or Triumphal Arches erected over Human Ignorance and Infirmity.

Hence you ſee, Sir, that the leaſt Faults will have their uſe, ſince by the very Collection of numerous Lyes upon every Subject, Man will be the better taught to diſcover his weakneſs, and ſee the prodigious variety his Errors are capable of. This will make him more ſenſible that he is the ſport of Malice and Ignorance; that the one takes him when the other leaves him; that if he be intelligent enough to know a Lye, he is wicked enough to vent it againſt his Conſcience; or if he is not wicked to this pitch of propagating Falſhood, he is blind enough not to ſee the Truth. For my own particular, when I think that perhaps I ſhall make it my ſerious employment all my life to gather Materials for this kind of Triumphal Arches, I find my ſelf thoroughly penetrated with the conviction of my Nothingneſs. This will be a continual Leſſon to me of Self-contempt. No Sermon, no not of the Preacher, or *Eccleſiaſtes* by way of Excellency, could more firmly rivet in me this grand Maxim, (*b*) *I have ſeen all the works that are done under the Sun*, AND BEHOLD ALL IS VANITY AND VEXATION OF SPIRIT. (*c*) You ſee how conceited I am of my own Work: I ſhall ſpeak ill of it more than any body elſe, and I eſteem that Circumſtance more than all the reſt.

I was going to finiſh with this fine Morality, when it came into my head that I had not intimated I ſhall uſe the ſame Liberty and Civility towards Authors of all Nations and Religions: I therefore declare it here. Nothing is more ridiculous than a Dictionary where the Author turns Controverſiſt. This is one of the greateſt Faults of Mr. *Moreri's*, in which we find an hundred places that ſeem to be taken from a true Cruſade Sermon. For my part, I ſhall not ſay with *Annibal*, (*d*) *Hoſtem qui feriet mihi erit Carthaginienſis, quiſquis erit*, (*e*) *Civis*; but rather that all thoſe who depart from Truth ſhall be equally ſtrangers to me. You know ſome People who will ſeem aggriev'd at this, but who will rejoice at it in the bottom of their Soul, becauſe it will furniſh them with pretexts for Slander, and for playing the Zealots, two things which always attend them. But I ſhall go on in my own way, whatever they may ſay, and I will let 'em pick the bones they may find in it. Take with you the reaſon of my proceeding.

This Dictionary not concerning Errors of Right, Partiality in it would be incomparably more inexcuſable than in Hiſtorical Dictionaries; for a man is oblig'd in theſe to relate a thouſand things which are true in the Judgment of ſome, and falſe in that of others: He ought therefore to ſuppoſe a great difference of Principles in Readers, and to imagin that in the hands of ſome he will be in an Enemy's Country, and in the hands of others among Friends; and for that reaſon 'tis juſt he ſhould proportion his Style and way of deciding accordingly. But when a man only propoſes to collect Errors of Fact, he reaſonably ſuppoſes the ſame Principles to be in all his Readers, and that there's no man but will admit as falſe what he ſhews to be ſo: For the Proofs of a Falſhood of Fact are not the Prejudices of a Nation or particular Religion, but are Maxims common to all men. You hereby ſee, Sir, that Philoſophical or Theological Falſhoods make no part of the Plan of my Work: however it is true that Books wherein they are diſputed might furniſh out a kind of Falſhoods of Fact, which would not perhaps be the leſs uſeful to the Reader.

It moſt commonly happens that Diſputes in writing upon any Point degenerate into Perſonal Differences, and turn moſt times upon the Queſtion, whether an Adverſary's paſſage has been well or ill cited, well or ill interpreted. Here the Publick abandons the Diſputants, and, as was not long ſince ſaid by a good Wit, the Antagoniſts are oblig'd to part for want of Readers or Bookſellers. Whoever could have the patience to make an Analyſis of theſe Perſonal Quarrels, would have a great Harveſt of Faults belonging to the Juriſdiction of this Dictionary, many falſe Citations, or falſe Interpretations. Now theſe are Errors of Fact. You muſt acknowledge, Sir, there could be no Logick comparable to this, to teach the juſtneſs of Reaſoning, without reckoning this great Moral Advantage, that we ſhould at the ſame time diſcover abundance of tricks, or

(*a*) *Præfat. demonſtrat. Evang.*

(*b*) *Eccleſiaſt.* 1. 14.

(*c*) *Confer quæ Vigneul Marville Melang. tom* 3. *pag.* 206. *& ſeq. & pag. ult. of the Edition of* Roüen, 1701.

(*d*) *Thus Cicero* Orat. pro Corn. Balbo *pag. m.* 679. *relates the words of* Ennius: *but to make it a Verſe, it ſhould be* ferit, *and not* feriet.

(*e*) *Some Criticks would have it read* cujati' ſiet.

or at leaſt the Imperfections of our Souls; for what proceeds not from inſincerity, muſt be the product of dimneſs or weakneſs of mind.

'Tis a misfortune, that this kind of Knavery ſhould go unpuniſh'd ſo much as it does, by the little care that Readers take to compare the Anſwers and Replies together. But if any one took the pains to deſcribe in a few words the Progreſs of a Diſpute, he would bring to light all the Obliquities of the Caviller, and make 'em deteſted.

Pardon me, Sir, ſo long an Epiſtle Dedicatory, and make haſte to enrich the Republick of Learning with the Learned Works it expects from you. Your Modeſty and our Friendſhip forbid me to make their Encomium: But I could gladly wiſh the Publick might immediately give you the Praiſes you will receive when they ſhall appear. I am with all imaginable Reſpect,

SIR,

Your moſt humble and moſt obedient
Servant,

May 5th. 1692. * * * * * *

NOTE, That in the Compoſition of this Dictionary I have not followed all the Ideas of this Project. The deference I had to the Advices of ſome intelligent Readers made me follow another Method upon ſome Heads.

EXPLANATIONS

Of ſome things diſpers'd in this Dictionary, which may be reduc'd to Four General Heads.

I. *To the Praiſes given to ſuch perſons as deny'd the Providence or Exiſtence of* GOD. II. *To the Objections of the* Manichees. III. *To the Objections of the* Pyrrhoniſts. IV. *To Obſcenities.*

A General and Preliminary Obſervation.

IN compoſing this Work, I well perceiv'd that ſome Reflections ſtole in, which were ſomewhat free, and little agreeable to common Judgments; but I did not foreſee that they could give any Scandal. I imagin'd that the perſons whoſe Judgment ſerves for a Model, and corrective to that of others, would take notice of many things which might afford me an Apology.

I. I hop'd in the firſt place, that the Reader would conſider the nature of this Dictionary. 'Tis a vaſt Compilation, neceſſarily loaded with infinite particulars of Criticiſm, diſguſting and tiring to the laſt degree thoſe who are not of the Profeſſion; and I was oblig'd in theſe heaps of all kinds of matters, to ſuſtain two Characters, that of Hiſtorian and that of Commentator. It was not poſſible to reſcue it from the Contempt of a great many Readers, otherwiſe than by introducing ſome uncommon things into it. They that neither value Grammatical Diſputes, nor the Adventures of an inconſiderable private perſon, are a numerous party, and deſerve to have their Taſte conſulted; 'tis therefore allowable for an Author to ſeaſon his Book with ſomething that will recommend it to their Palate; and if he writes as an Hiſtorian, he ought not only to ſay what Hereticks have done, but alſo to ſhew wherein the ſtrength and weakneſs of their Opinions conſiſt. This muſt eſpecially be done by him, if he be himſelf the Commentator of his Relations; for in his Commentary he muſt diſcuſs things, and compare Arguments together *pro* and *con*, with all the impartiality of a faithful Relator.

II. I hop'd, in the ſecond place, that regard would be had to the manner of my mentioning ſome Opinions; it being neither in the ſtrain of a Dogmatiſt, nor with the biggotry of a Proſelyte-maker. They are Thoughts thrown at random, and accidentally, and which I would have to paſs for Sports of Wit, and be rejected entirely as ſhall be thought convenient, and that with a greater liberty than I have given my ſelf. 'Tis eaſie to perceive that an Author who deals thus has no ſiniſter intentions, and is not laying Snares; and if Reflections eſcape him that might be dangerous under another Form, no great Offence is to be taken at it.

III. I hop'd the Circumſtances would be obſerv'd that either make an Error formidable or not. The conſequences of it are to be apprehended when it is taught by thoſe, whoſe relation to the People gives them an opportunity of authoriſing themſelves, and forming a party. It ought to be follow'd cloſe, to be obſerv'd, and carefully reſtrain'd, when a man of a Venerable Character, a Paſtor, a Profeſſor of Divinity, ſows it in his Sermons, in his Lectures, in little Syſtematical Tracts, or by way of Catechiſm, and by (*a*) Emiſſaries that go from houſe to houſe to recommend the reading of his Books, and invite the People to go to the Conventicles where the Author explains his Reaſons and his Method more particularly. But if a Layman, and of no Character, as my ſelf, ſhould drop amongſt vaſt Collections of Hiſtory and Learning, ſome Error in Religion or Morality, I don't ſee any reaſon a man has to be concern'd at it. 'Tis not in ſuch Works as theſe that the Reader ſeeks the reformation of his Faith. No man takes an Author for a Guide in this matter, who ſpeaks only occaſionally, and by the by; and who by his very throwing his Sentiments, as Pins into a Meadow, makes it viſible that he cares not to be follow'd. The Errors of ſuch a Writer are of no conſequence, nor deſerve that the World ſhould be diſturb'd about them. And thus it was the Faculty of Divinity in *France* dealt with *Michael de Montagne*'s Book. They left untouch'd all this Author's Maxims, who, without following any Syſtem, Method or Order, heap'd together and ſpun out whatever his Memory preſented to him: But when *Peter Charron*, a Prieſt and a Theologal, came to vent ſome of *Montagne*'s Sentiments methodically in a Syſtematical Treatiſe of Morality, the Divines were no longer ſilent.

(*a*) *Note, That I joyn all theſe things together, without ſuppoſing that none is obnoxious to the* Laws *but thoſe who are guilty of it all: A part of it is ſufficient for it.*

IV. I hop'd in the fourth place, which was the main foundation of my confidence, that theſe two Points would eaſily be diſtinguiſh'd: 1. That I never advance any Doctrine as my own Opinion which is repugnant to the Articles of the Confeſſion of Faith of the Reformed Church in which I was born, and which I make profeſſion of. 2. That when I relate as an Hiſtorian what may be objected and reply'd to the Orthodox,

dox, and when I confeſs that by **Natural Light** we can't ſolve all the difficulties of the Unbelievers, I always make a **Digreſſion**, to draw from thence a Conſequence in favour of the Principle which the Reform'd conſtantly oppoſe to the *Socinians*; That our Reaſon being ſo weak as it is, ought not to be the Rule or Meaſure of our Faith.

Theſe are the Reaſons that made me believe, that if I ſometimes us'd the liberty of Philoſophiſing, as they call it, it would not be taken amiſs. I ſhould have deny'd it my ſelf, if I had foreſeen that the foregoing Conſideration would not have been Satisfactory.

But the Event has diſappointed my hopes. Complaints have been made againſt thoſe places in my Dictionary. I have never been covinc'd that they are juſt; yet I am ſorry that I have ſaid any thing that was ill took, and have always been diſpos'd to remedy the Scruples in a ſecond Edition. Underſtanding in what the Grievances conſiſted, it ſeem'd to me no hard thing to apply a Remedy, either by the ſuppreſſion of ſome Pages, or ſome changes of expreſſion, or by Explanations that might place things in a due light. I have engag'd in this without any reluctancy, as all Authors ought to do who are not bigotted to their Opinions, but are pleas'd to ſacrifice them to the Edification of the Reader. I wiſh the World may be ſatisfied with my Conduct, both as to what has been ſuppreſs'd, and to thoſe things I am about to explain; and methinks I have reaſon to promiſe my ſelf that they will. I have propos'd to my ſelf this End, and have us'd great application to arrive to it.

EXPLANATION I.

The Reflection that has been made on the good Morals of ſome perſons who had no Religion, cannot any ways prejudice the Chriſtian Faith.

SUch as have been ſcandaliz'd at my ſaying that there have been *Atheiſts* and *Epicureans* who have outdone moſt Idolaters in good Morals, are intreated to reflect well upon all the following Conſiderations; which if they pleaſe to do, their Scandal will vaniſh, and entirely diſappear.

I. The Fear and Love of God are not the only Spring of Human Actions. There are other Principles that actuate a Man; the love of Praiſe, the fear of Diſgrace, the Natural Temper, Puniſhments and Rewards in the Magiſtrates hands, have a mighty influence upon the Heart. He that doubts of it, muſt be ignorant of what paſſes in his own Breaſt, and what the common courſe of the World may give him an ocular demonſtration of every moment. But 'tis not probable there is any one ſtupid enough to be ignorant of ſuch a Truth. What therefore I have aſſerted concerning theſe other Springs of Human Actions, may be plac'd in the number of common Notions.

II. The Fear and Love of God are not always a more active Principle than the reſt: The love of Glory, the fear of Infamy, Death or Torments, the hopes of Preferment, act with greater force upon ſome men, than the deſire of pleaſing God, and the fear of breaking his Commandments. If any one doubts of it, he is ignorant of ſome of his own Actions, and knows nothing of what is doing daily under the Sun. The World abounds with People who chooſe rather to commit a Sin, than diſpleaſe a Prince who can make and ruin their Fortune. Men daily ſubſcribe Formularies of Faith againſt their Conſcience, either to ſave their Eſtates, or to avoid Impriſonment, Exile, Death, *&c.* A Soldier who has quitted all for his Religion, finding himſelf under the neceſſity of offending God if he revenges himſelf for having receiv'd a Box o'th' Ear, or of being accounted a Coward if he does not, never reſts till he has Satisfaction for this Affront, tho' at the peril of killing or being kill'd in a ſtate that muſt be follow'd with Eternal Damnation. 'Tis not likely that any one is ſo ſtupid as to be ignorant of ſuch things. Therefore let this Moral Aphoriſm take place amongſt firſt Principles, *That the Fear and Love of God are not always the moſt active Principle of Human Actions.*

III. This being ſo, it ought not to be reckon'd a ſcandalous Paradox, but rather a very poſſible thing, that ſome Men without Religion ſhould be more forcibly excited to a good Moral Life by their Conſtitution, in conjunction with the love of Praiſe and fear of Diſgrace, than ſome others by the Inſtinct of Conſcience.

IV. The Scandal ought to be much greater, when we ſee ſo many people convinc'd of the Truths of Religion, at the ſame time over head and ears in Vice.

V. Nay, it is more ſtrange that Heathen Idolaters ſhould do good Actions, than that Atheiſtical Philoſophers ſhould live like Virtuous Men: For the former muſt have been led to Crimes by their very Religion; it muſt have been a Point of Faith with them, That to make themſelves Imitators of God, which is the End and Subſtance of Religion, they ought to be Cheats, Envious, Fornicators, Adulterers, Pederaſts, *&c.*

VI. Whence we may conclude, that the Idolaters who lived virtuouſly, were only guided by the Ideas of Reaſon and Virtue, or by the deſire of Praiſes, or by their Natural Temper, or ſuch other Principles as may all be found in Atheiſts: Why then ſhould we expect to find more Virtue amongſt the Idolatrous Heathens than amongſt Men who have no Religion?

VII. I deſire you to obſerve, That ſpeaking of the good Morals of ſome Atheiſts, I have not aſcrib'd any true Virtues to them. Their Sobriety, Chaſtity, Probity, Contempt of Riches, Zeal for the Publick Good, Officiouſneſs to their Neighbour, neither

pro-

proceeded from the Love of God, nor tended to honour and glorifie him. Themſelves were the Principle and End of all this: Self-love was the only ground of it. They were only ſhining Sins, *ſplendida peccata*, as St. *Auguſtin* ſays of all the good Actions of the Heathens. I have not therefore prejudic'd true Religion in the leaſt by ſaying of ſome Atheiſts what I have ſaid; it is ſtill true that good Works are only produc'd by religious Men. And what is it to the true Religion if the Worſhipers of the falſe Gods are no better in their actions than thoſe who have no Religion? What advantage would accrue to it, if the Adorers of *Jupiter* and *Saturn* were not equally plung'd in the gulph of Perdition with the Atheiſts?

VIII. If thoſe who are ſcandaliz'd pretend that one can't praiſe the good Morals of *Epicurus*, without ſuppoſing it all one to a good Life, to have no Religion, or to profeſs any Religion whatever, they are ignorant in the Art of Conſequences, and perfect ſtrangers to the Queſtion. I never compar'd Atheiſm except with Heatheniſm, and therefore the True Religion is no way concern'd in it; the Queſtion being only about Religions introduc'd and kept up by the Devil, and to enquire whether thoſe who have profeſs'd a Worſhip ſo infamous in its Origin and Progreſs as this, have been more regular in the practice of Morality than the Atheiſts. I ſuppoſe it is a point undoubted and fully determin'd, That in the true Religion there is not only more Virtue than elſewhere, but that there is no true Virtue at all, nor any *fruits of Righteouſneſs* out of it. To what purpoſe then is this pretended fear that I injure true Religion? Is it concern'd in the ill that may be ſaid of the falſe one? And is it not to be fear'd that this great Zeal that is ſhewn, will ſcandalize Men of Senſe, who ſee that this is pretending to niceneſs in favour of a Worſhip, deteſted by GOD, and ſet up by the Devil, as is own'd by all the Doctors of Divinity.

IX. I could not have taken juſt exception to theſe Complaints, if I had made a Romance in which the Perſons ſpoken of had been virtuous, and atheiſtical: For, as I ſhould have been Maſter of their Words and Actions, I had been at liberty to deſcribe them in a manner ſuited to the taſte of the moſt ſcrupulous Readers. But my Dictionary being an Hiſtorical Work, I ought not to repreſent People as they ſhould have been, but as they actually were. I can neither ſuppreſs their Faults nor their Virtues. Seeing then I advance nothing concerning the Morals of ſome Atheiſts, but what the Authors I cite relate of them, no body has reaſon to be offended with me. To make my Criticks ſenſible of the truth of what I ſay, I need only aſk them, Whether they believe the ſuppreſſion of true Facts to be the Duty of an Hiſtorian? I aſſure myſelf they will never ſubſcribe to ſuch a Propoſition.

X. Not but I believe, there are ſome Ingenuous enough to confeſs, that a matter of Fact ought to be ſuppreſs'd by an Hiſtorian, when it is likely to leſſen the abhorrence of Atheiſm, or the veneration of Religion in general. But I moſt humbly intreat them, not to take it amiſs that I continue to believe, that GOD has no need of the Artifices of Rhetorick; and if this may be allow'd in a Poem, or a Piece of Eloquence, it does not follow, that I ought to admit it in an Hiſtorical Dictionary. They muſt give me leave to tell them, That it is enough for me to promote the Intereſt of true Religion; for all that ſhould be done for Religion in general, would ſerve as well for Paganiſm, as Chriſtianity.

XI. I ſhould have been ſo much the more blameable for ſuppreſſing the Truths complain'd of, becauſe, beſides the acting againſt the fundamental Laws of Hiſtory, I ſhould have omitted things which, at the bottom, are moſt advantageous to the true Syſtem of Grace. I have ſhewn in another place (*a*), that nothing can be more proper to prove the Corruption of Men, which is naturally invincible, and only ſurmountable by the Holy Spirit, than to ſhew, that thoſe who have no ſuper-natural aſſiſtances, are as bad under the practice of a Religion, as thoſe who live in Atheiſm. I add here, that no better office can be done to the *Pelagians*, than to ſay, that the fear of the falſe Gods was able to induce the Heathens to renounce ſome Vices; for if thro' fear of incurring the malediction of Heaven, they could abſtain from evil, they might alſo riſe up to Virtue by the deſire of ſpiritual Rewards, and in order to procure to themſelves the love of GOD; that is, they might not only have been able to fear, but alſo to love GOD, and act upon this good Principle. The two Handles by which Man is mov'd, are the fear of Puniſhment, and deſire of Reward. If he can be mov'd by the former, he may alſo by the latter; for one can't well be admitted without the other.

(*a*) See the *Penſes diverſes ſur* les Cometes, *p.* 437, 490, 599. *and the additions to that Book*, p. 58, 110.

XII. If any Perſons more equitable and intelligent than ordinary, ſhould alledge as the only reaſon of their Scandal, the affectation wherewith, they think, I have acquainted my Readers with the good Lives of ſome Atheiſts; I would deſire them to conſider, that in the preſent Caſe, Affectation is very excuſable, and may even be look'd upon as a ſubject of Edification. To underſtand which, one needs only call to mind an Epiſode of my Treatiſe concerning Comets. The true Deſign of that Book (*b*) was to confute by a Theological Argument, what is commonly ſaid about the preſages of Comets. The neceſſity of inforcing this Argument, put me upon drawing a Parallel between Atheiſm and Heatheniſm, without which, my Proof had lain open to an Objection which would have made it unfit to evince what was neceſſary for me to demonſtrate. Therefore there was a neceſſity for me either to leave that Objection, unanſwer'd, or to confute the Arguments of thoſe who ſay, that the Pagan Idolatry was not ſo great an Evil as Atheiſm. All the ſucceſs of the Combat depended very much upon the Succeſs of this Attack, and therefore according to the Rules of a Diſpute, and by vir-

(*b*) *Voize la preface de la* 3, *édition.*

tue of the Rights belonging to an Author, I was oblig'd to take advantage of whatever Logick and Hiſtory could afford me, to anſwer the Objection. It was not therefore deſignedly, or out of boldneſs, that I alledg'd ſome Matters of Fact tending to evince, that Atheiſts are not neceſſarily more diſorderly in their Lives, than Idolaters. The Laws of Diſputation, and the Right that every one has to anſwer the Objections his Aſſertion is expos'd to, laid upon me a neceſſity of taking ſuch a courſe. Great Complaints have been made againſt this part of my Book, and ſome endeavours have been us'd to make it appear dangerous. I was therefore oblig'd to maintain it, as far as Reaſon and Truth would permit; and conſequently, no body ought to be offended, if I acquaint my Readers, when occaſion offers, That Hiſtory informs us, that ſuch and ſuch Perſons, who deny'd either the Exiſtence, or the Providence of GOD, or the Immortality of the Soul, did nevertheleſs live like honeſt Men. This Affectation, which would perhaps be a juſt Subject of Scandal in another Book, is none at all in mine: On the contrary, it may ſerve to edify my Readers, ſince it ſhews, I have not advanc'd a Paradox out of a Principle of Vanity, but a Remark moſt ſolid and certain, and which ſeems falſe to none, but ſuch who have not examin'd it. There's nothing more offenſive, than a Man who to diſtinguiſh himſelf, raſhly leaves the common Road: And if there are any Writers, who have been ſuſpected upon that account not through their own Fault, but becauſe the Readers were not throughly acquainte, with the thing, nothing can be more edifying than to ſee ſuch Authors juſtify themſelves.

XIII. Entirely to remove all ſuſpicions of a vicious Affectation, I have taken care to remark (*a*), as often as poſſible, the bad Morals of Atheiſts. If I have not done it oftner, 'twas becauſe matter was wanting. The Publick (*b*) knows, that I call'd for Examples to be ſhewn me: No body has taken this pains, and I have not as yet, been able to diſcover them by my own Inquiries. I don't pretend to deny, that there have been in all Countries, and at all Times ſuch, as by their Debaucheries, and long criminal Habits, have ſtifled the explicit Faith of the Exiſtence of a GOD. But Hiſtory having not preſerv'd their Names, 'tis impoſſible to ſpeak of them. 'Tis probable, that amongſt thoſe Banditti, and hired Aſſaſſines, who commit ſo many Crimes, there are ſome who have no Religion; but the contrary is ſtill more probable, ſince amongſt ſo many Malefactors, who paſs thro' the Hang-man's Hands, there are none (*c*) found to be Atheiſts. The Ordinaries, who prepare them for Death, find them always ſufficiently diſpos'd to deſire the Joys of Heaven. As for thoſe profane Epicures, who in the Judgment of Father *Garaſſe*, and many other Writers, are downright Atheiſts, I have not brought them into the Liſt; the Queſtion not being concerning thoſe we call Practical Atheiſts, People that live without any fear of GOD, but not without a perſuaſion of his Exiſtence; but concerning Atheiſts in Theory: As for Example, *Diagoras*, *Vanini*, *Spinoza*, &c. whoſe Atheiſm is atteſted, either by the Hiſtorians, or their own Writings. The Queſtion only turns upon the Morals of this Claſs of Atheiſts in Theory, Examples of whoſe bad Lives, I deſir'd might be ſhewn me. If I had found any, I had made an ample mention of them. There's nothing eaſier to be found in Hiſtory than ſome Wretches, whoſe abominable Actions make the Readers tremble; but their very Impieties, and Blaſphemies, are a Proof that they believ'd a Deity. This is a natural Conſequence of all the conſtant Doctrine of Divines, That the Devil, the moſt wicked of Creatures, but incapble of Atheiſm, is the promoter of all the Sins of Mankind; whence the greateſt Wickedneſs of Man, muſt have the Character of that of the Devil, which is to be joyn'd with the Perſuaſion of the Being of a GOD. A (*d*) Maxim of the Philoſophers confirms this Reaſoning.

XIV. If what I have ſaid, is capable of edifying tender Conſciences, by ſeeing that the Poſition which frighted them, well agrees with the moſt Orthodox Principles, they'll find no leſs a Subject of Edification in what I am going to propoſe. That the moſt wicked Men are not Atheiſts, and that the greateſt part of Atheiſts, whoſe Names are come down to us, were virtuous Men, as the World goes, is a Character of the Infinite Wiſdom of GOD, and ought to make us admire his Providence, that has ſet bounds to Man's Corruption, that there might be Societies upon Earth; and if it has favour'd but a few with a Sanctifying Grace, it has diſpers'd a *Repreſſing* (*e*) Grace univerſally, which like a ſtrong Bank reſtrains the Floods of Sin, as much as is neceſſary to prevent an univerſal Innundation, which would deſtroy all Monarchical, Ariſtocratick, and Democratick Governments. 'Tis commonly ſaid, that the Means GOD has made uſe of to arrive at this End, has been, to preſerve in the Soul of Man the Ideas of Vertue and Vice, and a Senſe of a Providence which ſuper-intends all, which puniſhes Vice, and rewards Virtue. You'll find this Notion in the Common-places of Divinity, and in abundance of other Orthodox Works. What's the natural Conſequence of this Propoſition? Is it not to ſay, That if there are ſome People whom GOD does not forſake ſo far as to ſuffer them to fall into *Epicurus*'s Syſtem, or that of Atheiſts, 'tis eſpecially thoſe bruitiſh Souls, whoſe Cruelty, Boldneſs, Avarice, Fury and Ambition are capable of ruining quickly a moſt capacious and flouriſhing Country? Is it not to ſay, That if He forſakes ſome, ſo far as to permit that they ſhould deny his Exiſtence, or Providence, they are eſpecially Perſons, whoſe Temper, Education, lively Ideas of Virtue, love of Fame, or ſenſe of Diſhonour, ſerve as ſtrong Bridles to keep them to their Duty? Theſe are two Conſequences that naturally flow from the above-mention'd Principle of Divinity. Now, by informing my Readers, in ſome places

(*a*) *As in the Articles of* Bion Boryſthenita *&* Critias.

(*b*) *See the additions to the* Penſées ſur les Cometes, p. 86. *See alſo*, p. 75.

(*c*) *I ſpeak thus, becauſe I don't remember I have ever read, or heard of any Relations concerning the final Atheiſm of theſe People.*

(*d*) Ἀεὶ δὲ δ᾽ ὑπάρχει ἕκαστον, ἐκεῖνο μᾶλλον ὑπάρχει. Propter quod unum quodque eſt *tale*, illud ſemper eſt magis *tale*. *Ariſtot. analyt. poſter. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. *p.m.* 105. *etiam Metaphyſ. lib.* 2. *cap.* 1. *pag.* 645. *F.*

(*e*) *I had it from a Divine, that 'tis under this Idea they ſpeak of the Providence of GOD in as much as it has not permitted an inundation of Crimes to deſtroy Societies.*

places of this Dictionary, that the moſt wicked Wretches have had ſome Religion; and that thoſe who have had none, have liv'd by the Rules of Virtue, I have ſaid nothing but what agrees with theſe two Conſequences; and therefore there's no longer ground for a juſt offence.

XV. It will be much more juſt to conſider in this the Finger of GOD, and the admirable Conduct of his Providence, which arrives to the ſame End by different ways: the *Repreſſing* Principle, ſo neceſſary for the preſervation of Societies, as Divines teach, works its effects by the Bridle of Idolatry, in ſome Countries, and in certain Perſons, and by Conſtitution, or the vivacity of Ideas, and a liking to Moral Virtue in ſome others. The *Greeks* Ingenious and Voluptuous, and thereby obnoxious to a frightful train of Crimes, had need of a Religion that ſhould burden them with infinite Obſervances. They would have had too much time to run into Evil, if the multitude of Ceremonies, Sacrifices and Oracles, had not given them many avocations, and ſuperſtitious Terrors had not alarm'd them. The *Scythians*, a Stupid People, unexperienc'd in Cloaths and Diet, needed only to deſpiſe Pleaſures, or not to know them. (*a*) This alone maintain'd their Republick, and hindred them from injuring one another. They were ſo fram'd, as to be all content with what they had at home. Such a Nation has neither occaſion (*b*) for a *Code not Digeſts*.

These Fifteen Conſiderations ſeem ſufficient to remove the Stumbling-block, which was thought to be laid in ſome places of my Dictionary. They might afford Matter for a large Book: I have only curſorily propos'd them; for I have ſomewhat more largely treated of them in another place (*c*), and I ſhall treat of them more amply (*d*) in a Work that I have promis'd.

(*a*) Aurum & argentum perinde aſpernantur, ac reliqui mortales appetunt.... Hæc continentia illis morum quoque juſtitiam edidit, nihil alienum concupiſcentibus: QUIPPE ibidem divitiarum cupido eſt, ubi & uſus. Atque utinam reliquis mortalibus ſimilis moderatio & abſtinentia alieni foret.... Prorſus ut admirabile videatur, hoc illis naturam dare, quod Græci longa ſapientium doctrina, præceptiſque philoſophorum conſequi nequeunt. *Juſtin lib.* 2. *cap.* 2.

(*b*) Juſtitia gentis ingeniis culta, non legibus. *Id. ibid.*

(*c*) *See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes.

(*d*) *See the Preface of the* 3*d. Edition of thoſe Thoughts.*

EXPLANATION II.

How what I have ſaid concerning the Objections of the Manichees, *ought to be conſidered.*

THOSE who are ſcandaliz'd at ſome things that I have obſerv'd in the Articles wherein I have treated of *Manicheiſm*, would be wholly inexcuſable if they went only upon my ſaying, That the *Queſtion about the Origin of Evil is very difficult*. For the Ancient Fathers ingenuouſly confeſs'd it, as does every Orthodox Divine at this Day. I don't think then, that the rock of offence conſiſted in this; but rather, in my ſuppoſing the Objections of the *Manichees* inſoluble, whilſt only diſcuſs'd at the Bar of Reaſon.

This muſt needs ſcandalize thoſe, whoſe great Zeal for Evangelical Truth perſuades them, that it triumphs over Error in all kinds of Combat, and whatever Arms it oppoſes. They find ſo much pleaſure in the reading of a Book, wherein Tranſubſtantiation is routed, whether it be aſſaulted by the Teſtimony of the Senſes, and the Principles of Philoſophy, or whether impugn'd by the Scripture, and the Tradition of the firſt Ages; they find, I ſay, ſo much ſatisfaction in ſo compleat a Victory, that they eaſily fancy all other Diſputes of Orthodoxy have the ſame fate. Agreeably flatter'd with ſo ſweet a Perſuaſion, they fret and fume if any one maintains, that all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, defended and attack'd by the Arms of Philoſophy, don't happily leave the Field; that ſome of them give ground, and are forc'd to retire into the Fortreſſes of Scripture, and to ask leave for the future to arm themſelves in another way, or otherwiſe they'll refuſe to enter the Liſts.

Thoſe, who are vex'd to ſee themſelves thus diſturb'd in the poſſeſſion of an imaginary compleat Triumph, fear moreover that by the confeſſion of a ſort of inferiority, Religion will be expos'd to a total defeat, or at leaſt its Certainty notably weakned, and the Intereſt of the Enemies of the Goſpel advanc'd.

A Scandal receiv'd in this manner, has two favourable Circumſtances; one that it proceeds from a good Principle, the other that it may be eaſily remov'd. It is produc'd by the love of Truth, and it is only riſing up to the conſideration of the Character of Goſpel Truths, to be deliver'd from all this diſturbance. For we ſhall ſee, that far from being the property of thoſe Truths to be reconcil'd with Philoſophy, 'tis on the contrary (*e*) eſſential to them, not to be ſquar'd by its Rules.

(*e*) *Re- ſtrain th to Goſp Truths, which c tain My ſteries; it muſt b confeſs'd that the Moral P cepts of* JESUS CHRIS *are eaſily reconcil'd with N tural Reaſon.*

THAT the Myſteries of the Goſpel being above Reaſon, it follows, that the Objections of the Unbelievers can't be anſwer'd by natural Reaſon.

The *Roman Catholicks* and *Proteſtants* fight it out upon abundance of Articles of Religion, but they perfectly agree in this Point, That the Myſteries of the Goſpel tranſcend Reaſon. There are even ſome Divines who acknowledge the Myſteries deny'd by the *Socinians*, to be againſt Reaſon. I will not take advantage of that Conceſſion, it ſufficing me, that they are unanimouſly acknowledg'd above Reaſon; for from thence it neceſſarily reſults, that it is impoſſible to ſolve the difficulties of the Philoſophers; and conſequently, that a Diſpute, wherein Natural Light only is imploy'd, will always terminate to the diſadvantage of the Divines, who will be forc'd to give, ground and to retire under the Artillery of Revelation.

'Tis evident, that Reaſon can never reach what is above it; but if it could afford Anſwers to the Objections that oppoſe the Doctrines of the Trinity, and the Hypoſtatick Union, it would reach to theſe two Myſteries, it would get the maſtery of them, manage and ply them, even to the comparing them with its firſt Principles, or with Aphoriſms deduc'd from common Notions, till at laſt, it had concluded, that they agree

agree with Natural Light. It would therefore exert it ſelf beyond its Strength, and exceed its own Limits, which is expreſly a Contradiction. It muſt be ſaid then, that it cannot furniſh Anſwers to its own Objections; and therefore they remain victorious, till recourſe is had to the Divine Authority, and the neceſſity of captivating the Underſtanding to the Obedience of Faith.

Let us try to put this in a clearer Light. If ſome Doctrines are above Reaſon, they are out of its reach; If they are out of its reach, it can't attain to them; If it can't attain to them, it can't comprehend them; If it can't comprehend them, it can't find any Idea or Principle that can afford Solutions; and conſequently, its Objections will remain unanſwer'd, or, which is the ſame thing, will be anſwer'd by ſome Diſtinction as obſcure as the Theſis it ſelf which is attack'd. Now 'tis very certain, that an Objection founded upon diſtinct Notions remains equally victorious, whether it have no Anſwer to it, or ſuch an one as no body can underſtand. Can the Match be equal betwixt a Man who objects to you what you both moſt clearly conceive, and You who defend your ſelf with Anſwers which neither You nor He comprehend at all?

HAT
he end
a Phi-
ophical
pute,
that
n't be
in'd
en it
ne up-
Myſte-

Every Philoſophical Diſpute ſuppoſes the contending parties to be agreed about certain Definitions, and to admit the Rules of a Syllogiſm, and the Characteriſticks of falſe Reaſoning. After this, the whole buſineſs conſiſts in examining, Whether a Theſis be mediately or immediately conſiſtent with the Principles agreed upon; Whether the Premiſſes of an Argument are true; Whether the Conſequence is well drawn; Whether a Syllogiſm be imploy'd with four Terms; Whether any Aphoriſm be violated of the Chapter *de Oppoſitis*, or *de Sophiſticis Elenchis*, &c. The Victory is obtain'd either by ſhewing that the Subject of the Diſpute has no Connexion with the Principles agreed upon, or by reducing the Reſpondent to an Abſurdity. This may be done, either by ſhewing that the Conſequences of his Poſition are contradictory, or conſtraining him to anſwer things wholly unintelligible. The End of this kind of Diſputes is to clear up Obſcurities, and make Evidence ſhine forth. Hence we judge, that during the courſe of a Diſputation Victory declares more or leſs for the Opponent or Reſpondent, according to the greater or leſs perſpicuity in the Propoſitions of the reſpective Diſputants; and at laſt we determine that ſhe wholly declares againſt him whoſe Anſwers are ſuch as we comprehend nothing in, and who acknowledges they are incomprehenſible. Hereupon we condemn him by the Rules of adjudging the Victory; and even when he can't be purſued into the Miſt he is involv'd in, which forms a ſort of an Abyſs betwixt him and his Antagoniſts, we conclude him utterly defeated, and compare him to an Army, which having loſt the Battle, eſcapes the Conquerours purſuit only by the favour of the Night.

The Concluſion from this is, That the Myſteries of the Goſpel being of a ſupernatural Order, neither can nor ought to be ſubmitted to the Rules of Natural Reaſon: They are not adapted to the Teſt of Philoſophical Diſputes; their Greatneſs and Sublimity hinders them from ſtooping to them. It would be againſt the Nature of Things, for them to come off victorious from ſuch a Combat, whoſe eſſential Character it is to be the Object of Faith, and not of Science: They would be no longer Myſteries, if Reaſon could ſolve all the Difficulties of them; and therefore, inſtead of thinking it ſtrange for any one to ſay that Philoſophy may attack them, but not repulſe the Attack, it would be a ſubject of Scandal (*a*) to hear the contrary.

If thoſe, whoſe Scruples I would cure, yield not to theſe Conſiderations, in which they'll find, perhaps, ſomething too abſtracted, I intreat them to have recourſe to Reflections that are more adapted to every one's Capacity: I beſeech them to conſider a little the Genius that reigns in the New Teſtament, and in the Miſſion of the Apoſtles.

CON-
DERA.
ON
on the
thod
:
SUS
HRIST
d the
oſtles
d anci-
Fa.
rs have
ſerved
teach-

The humour of diſputing is a thing which ſeems no-wiſe approved in the œconomy of the Goſpel. JESUS CHRIST commands immediately Faith and Submiſſion. 'Tis his common Exordium, and alſo of the Apoſtles, (*b*) *Follow me*, (*c*) *Believe, and thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Now, that Faith which he requir'd was not procur'd by a Train of Philoſophical Diſcuſſions and great Reaſoning; but was the Gift of God, a pure Grace of the Holy Spirit, which fell for the generality (*d*) on ignorant perſons. It was not even produc'd in the Apoſtles by reflecting on the Holineſs of the Life of Jeſus, and the Excellence of his Doctrine and Miracles. They ſtood in need of a Revelation from (*e*) God himſelf, that He whoſe Diſciples they were, was his Eternal Son. If JESUS CHRIST and his Apoſtles ſometimes deſcended to reaſoning, they ſought not their Proofs in Natural Light, but in the Books of the Prophets, and in Miracles; and if ſometimes St. *Paul* made uſe of ſome Argument *ad hominem* againſt the Gentiles, he did not much inſiſt upon it. His method was entirely different from that of Philoſophers: They boaſted of ſuch evident Principles, and of a Syſtem ſo well built, as to fear no other Obſtacles to Perſuaſion but the ſtupidity of the Auditors, or the malicious artifice of their Competitors; and they offered to give an Account of their Doctrine to all the World, and to defend it againſt all Gainſayers. St. *Paul*, on the contrary, own'd his Doctrine to be obſcure (*f*), that he knew it but imperfectly, and that nothing of it was to be underſtood (*g*), unleſs God communicated a ſpiritual diſcernment, without which it muſt be reckon'd Folly. He confeſſes (*h*), that moſt of thoſe converted by the Apoſtles were ignorant and of mean condition. He does not challenge the Philoſophers to Diſputation, but exhorts the (*i*) Believers to ſtand well upon their Guard againſt Philoſophers (*k*), and to avoid the Conteſtations of that Science, which had ruin'd the Faith of ſome perſons.

(*a*) *Note, That we deſign not to condemn thoſe who labour to reconcile theſe Myſteries with Philoſophy; their motives may be good, & their labour, by the bleſſing of God, may ſometimes be uſeful.*

(*b*) *Luk.* 5. 27. & 9. 59.

(*c*) *Act.* 16. 31.

(*d*) *Matth.* 11. 25.

(*e*) *Ibid.* 16. 17.

(*f*) 1 *Cor.* 13. 12.

(*g*) 1 *Cor.* 2. 14.

(*h*) *Ibid.* 1. 26.

(*i*) *Coloſ.* 2. 8.

(*k*) 1 *Tim.* 6. 20, 21.

The ancient Fathers govern'd themſelves by the ſame Spirit; they demanded a ready ſubmiſſion to the Authority of God, and regarded the Diſputes of Philoſophers (a) as one of the greateſt Obſtacles the true Faith could meet in its way. *Celſus* the Philoſopher laugh'd at the Conduct of the Chriſtians, *who,* ſaid he (b), *will neither hear your Reaſons, nor give you any for what they believe, contenting themſelves with ſaying, Examin not, only believe; or elſe, Your Faith will ſave you; and 'tis a Maxim with them, that the Wiſdom of the World is an evil* . . . . (c) *If, as uſually, they confine themſelves to their* Examin not, only believe, *they muſt at leaſt tell me what things thoſe are they would have me believe.* But obſerve how he is anſwer'd. (d) " If it were poſſible for all men, neglecting the " Affairs of Life, to apply themſelves to Study and Meditation, we need ſeek no other " way to make them embrace the Chriſtian Religion: For, not to ſay any thing of- " fenſive to others, no leſs exactneſs will appear in it than elſewhere, whether in the " diſcuſſion (e) of its Doctrines, or in the illuſtration of the enigmatical expreſſions of " its Prophets, or in the ſignification of its Goſpel-Parables, and abundance of other " things which happen'd, or were ſymbolically ordain'd. But, ſince neither the Ne- " ceſſities of Life, nor the Infirmities of Men, will permit many perſons to apply them- " ſelves to ſtudy, what more profitable method could be found for all the reſt of the " World, than that which JESUS CHRIST was pleas'd to uſe for the Conver- " ſion of the People? And I would fain be told, with reſpect to the great number of " thoſe who believe, and thereby have eſcap'd the Deluge of Corruption in which they " were plung'd, Which is better for them, to have thus chang'd their Morals, and cor- " rected their Life, by believing without examination, that there are Puniſhments for " Sins, and Rewards for Good Actions; or to have waited to be converted till they " were receiv'd, when they not only believ'd, but had carefully examin'd the founda- " tions of thoſe Doctrines? It is certain, that in following this method but few would " arrive whither their pure and naked Faith has conducted them; but moſt of 'em " would have remain'd in their Corruption . . . . (f) But ſince they make ſo much " noiſe about believing without examining, we muſt tell them, that as for us who " obſerve the Profit which hence redounds to the Generality, we frankly confeſs, that " we recommend it to thoſe who are not in a capacity of abandoning all things, to ap- " ply themſelves wholly to the ſearch of Truth".

This paſſage of St. *Paul,* (g) *We walk by faith, and not by ſight,* would alone ſuffice to convince us, that amongſt the Philoſophers there's nothing to be gain'd by him that attempts to prove the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion, or to ſtand upon the defenſive: For herein lies the difference betwixt the Faith of a Chriſtian and the Science of a Philoſopher; This Faith produces an accompliſh'd Certainty, but its Object ſtill remains inevident; Science, on the contrary, at once produces the Evidence of the Object, and a plenary Certainty of Perſuaſion. A Chriſtian therefore attempting to maintain the Myſtery of the Trinity againſt a Philoſopher, would oppoſe an inevident Object againſt evident Objections: Would not this be fighting blind-folded and with hands ty'd, with an Adverſary who has the uſe of all his Faculties? But if the Chriſtian could ſolve all the Philoſopher's Objections, only by the Principles of Natural Reaſon, the Aſſertion of St. *Paul* would not be true, *that we walk by faith, and not by ſight:* for Science, and not Divine Faith, would be the Portion of a Chriſtian.

Can any Scandal ariſe from an acknowledgment which is a Natural Conſequence of the Evangelical Spirit, and of the Doctrine of St. *Paul?*

If theſe Reflections upon the Conduct of the firſt Ages have not ſufficient force; if, I ſay, ſuch Objects conſider'd at a diſtance, make not an impreſſion deep enough, let me intreat you to be at the pains of examining the Maxims of the Modern Divines.

The Catholicks and Proteſtants agree in this Poſition, That Reaſon is to be rejected in the judging of a Controverſie about our Myſteries; which comes to this, That this Conceſſion ſhall never be made, That, if the literal ſenſe of a paſſage of Scripture includes inconceivable Doctrines impugn'd by the moſt evident Maxims of the Logicians and Metaphyſicians, it ſhall be declar'd falſe; and Reaſon, Philoſophy and Natural Light ſhall be the Rule to be followed in the choice of a certain Interpretation of Scripture preferably to all others. They not only ſay, that all thoſe are to be rejected who make ſuch a Preliminary demand in the Diſpute, but alſo maintain that they are engag'd in a way that can lead only to *Scepticiſm,* or Deiſm, or Atheiſm: So that the moſt neceſſary Barrier to preſerve the Chriſtian Religion, is the Obligation to ſubmit to the Authority of God, and humbly to believe the Myſteries he has been pleas'd to reveal, however inconceivable and impoſſible they appear to our Reaſon.

It ſeems that the *Papiſts* and *Lutherans* ought more ſtrongly to inſiſt upon this Principle than the *Calviniſts;* for the Doctrine of the Real Preſence has a more particular occaſion for it; and yet the *Calviniſts* are as jealous of this Theſis as the others, and drive it with great Zeal againſt the *Socinians;* and whenever they ſee ſome of their Doctors ſtraggle from the common Road, to make more work for Reaſon, they vehemently anſwer them, and make them ſuſpected of the *Socinian* Hereſie.

It would be eaſie to gather up the Proofs of all I have ſaid, but it would be to very little purpoſe; for whoever is acquainted with Books of Controverſie, muſt know that the *Roman Catholicks* continually recommend the Sacrifice of Reaſon, and the Captivity of the Underſtanding, and that the Miniſters impute the *Socinian* Impieties to the refuſal of this Sacrifice. The Diſputes of (h) the Univerſity of *Franeker,* ſilenc'd by Authority, and thoſe of the two (i) *French* Miniſters put to an end by (k) the *Walloon*

Synod,

(a) *See the paſſages of the Fathers which Mr.* de Launoe *has compiled, chap.* 1. de variâ Ariſtotelis fortunâ.

(b) Origen *againſt* Celſus, *book* 1. *c.* 2. *p.* 5. *of* Bouhereau's *Verſion.*

(c) Id. ib. *pag.* 7.

(d) Id. ib. *pag.* 5.

(e) *This muſt be underſtood not with reſpect to the Principles of Logick & Metaphyſicks treated of in this Diſſertation (for 'tis certain the Fathers did not diſcuſs the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation by thoſe Rules) but to Principles taken from the word of God when the Queſtion is about a Myſtery of the Goſpel.*

(f) Ibid. *pag* 6.

(g) 2 Cor. 5. 7.

(h) *In* 1687. *There are in the* Bibliotheq; Univerſelle, *Extracts of many Books publiſhed* pro *and* con *upon this Controverſie.*

(i) *Mr.* Jurieu *and Mr.* Saurin.

(k) *In* Sept. 1696.

Synod, have made too much noiſe, and are of ſo late a date, that there's no need of uſing any Citations. I will only ſay, that one of thoſe two Miniſters maintain'd as the *Univerſal Doctrine of the Church, and particularly of* Calvin *and his Followers,* That the Foundation of Faith is neither the Evidence of Objects, nor the Evidence of Revelation; and that the Holy Spirit perſuades us of the Myſteries of the Goſpel, without evidently ſhewing us either what we believe, or the Divinity of the Scripture, or the truth of the ſenſe of ſuch and ſuch paſſages. He was acknowledg'd to be Orthodox; his Adverſary obtain'd a like Teſtimony of his Orthodoxy; but this proves nothing againſt me, for he own'd that Faith is inevident as to the Object, and that the Evidence accompanying it as to Revelation is an effect of Grace. He is therefore one of thoſe who ſay that Myſteries are not under the Juriſdiction of Reaſon, and that Reaſon or Philoſophical Light is not the Rule we are to conſult in our Diſputations about 'em.

Now, if all Orthodox Divines, upon the Myſteries of the Trinity and Hypoſtatick Union, both Catholicks and Proteſtants, unanimouſly reject the arbitration of Reaſon, 'tis a manifeſt ſign they find it incapable of giving Proofs or Solutions in the Controverſies about thoſe Myſteries; for when the Queſtion is about the Divine Exiſtence, they deſire nothing more than to diſpute by the Light of Reaſon, becauſe it furniſhes Arms both to attack and repulſe the Enemy, and to give an entire Victory. The reaſon therefore that they act quite otherwiſe with reſpect to the Trinity and Incarnation, *&c.* is their knowing Philoſophical Principles to be inſufficient to do good, but capable of doing much harm. If Juſtice and Prudence allow the excepting againſt a Judge, 'tis only in caſe of Incompetence and Partiality. The more Zeal a Man has for his Cauſe, the leſs he neglects his Advantages; and if he has a true ſenſe of his Intereſts, he never refuſes well-affected perſons.

I conclude from all this, That there is nothing eaſier than to ſatisfie thoſe who have been offended with my Conceſſion; for 'tis only deſiring them to obſerve, that if they will be ſcandaliz'd at it, they muſt complain that all the Orthodox Divines are a Scandal to them. There's no medium betwixt taking well what I have ſaid, and taking ill what is ſaid by the Divines moſt contrary to the *Socinian* Hereſies.

AN ANSWER to ſome Objections: the firſt is, That we give too great advantage to Hereticks and Infidels, by owning that their Philoſophical Objections againſt the Myſteries of the New Teſtament can't be anſwer'd.

If it be objected, That my Conceſſion is really offenſive, ſince 'tis giving too great an advantage to the Unbelievers, to allow their Objections againſt our Myſteries to be philoſophically unanſwerable: I anſwer two things. *Firſt,* That Scandal muſt then be given not only by what I have ſaid upon this Subject, but alſo by what the moſt Orthodox Divines have publiſh'd upon it. I ſay, *ſecondly,* That this is not giving to Unbelievers any advantage they can juſtly boaſt of, as they might do if our Preachers imitated thoſe Philoſophers, who ſignifie by poſted *Si quis's* that they are ready to defend ſuch and ſuch Propoſitions againſt all Oppoſers, and that at ſuch a day, and at ſuch an hour and place they will make 'em appear as clear as Noon-day. If the Apoſtles, St. *Paul* for example, when amongſt the *Athenians,* had petition'd the *Areopagus* to permit him to enter the Liſts with all the Philoſophers; if he had offer'd to maintain a Diſputation upon the Three Perſons which are but One God, and upon the Unity of the Hypoſtaſis of the Divine and Human Nature in Jeſus Chriſt; and if before the beginning of the Diſpute he had agreed about the truth of the Rules eſtabliſhed by *Ariſtotle* in his Logick, whether concerning the Terms of Oppoſition, or the Character of the Premiſſes of a demonſtrative Syllogiſm, *&c.* if, *laſtly,* theſe Preliminaries being well adjuſted, he had anſwer'd that our Reaſon is too weak to comprehend the Myſteries againſt which they propos'd their Objections, he had incurr'd all the ſhame that a non-plus'd Reſpondent could ever ſuffer. The Victory of the *Athenian* Philoſophers had been compleat; for he would have been judg'd and condemn'd by the very Maxims whereof he had own'd the Certainty before. But if theſe Philoſophers had attack'd him by ſuch Maxims, after he had declar'd to them the Foundation of his Faith, he might have oppos'd this Barrier to them, That his Doctrines were not under the Precinct of Reaſon, that they were reveal'd by God, and ought to be believed without comprehending them. The Diſpute, if it were regular, was not to turn upon the Queſtion, Whether theſe Doctrines were contrary to the Maxims of Logick and Metaphyſicks; but upon the Queſtion, Whether God had reveal'd them. St. *Paul* could not have the worſt of it, except it had been proved to him that God did not require the belief of thoſe things.

You ſee by this how imaginary is the pretended Triumph of the Unbelievers; for our Divines don't pretend to prove the Trinity and Incarnation by Philoſophical Arguments, admitting only the Word of God for the Foundation of their Proofs and Solutions. This is their Fortreſs, their place of Arms, which it ought to ſuffice them to defend, and ward off all the blows levell'd at them by an Heretick, who bottoms upon the ſame Principle with them, the Divine Authority of the Scripture. It is no great matter if the Enemy ſeize the reſt, being a Country which they have voluntarily abandon'd. 'Tis no great Victory to ſeize a place which no body deſign'd to keep. (*a*) *Facile erat vincere non repugnantes.*

To the end that thoſe who read this, having no other Book, may be fully aſſur'd I don't advance a thing at random, I'll remove all their Scruples: I'll cite the Teſtimony of two (*b*) famous Writers, one a Prieſt, and the other a Miniſter, and both very Orthodox, upon the Trinity, Incarnation, Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſome other Myſteries. "This (*c*) proceeding is unreaſonable, as being contrary to the "firſt Principles, and the very Foundations of the Chriſtian Religion. If this Reli-"gion told men that it propoſes to them a Faith exempt from all difficulties; that "nothing

(*a*) Cicero Tuſcul. quæſt. *lib.* 1. *init. fol. m.* 2454 C.

(*b*) *Mr* Nicolle *and M.* Claude.

(*c*) *That is, to make a Collection of Reaſons which have ſomething ſurprizing againſt the Trinity,* &c.

" nothing can be alledged againſt its Myſteries with any ſort of probability; and " that the Proofs upon which it eſtabliſhes the Truths it teaches are ſo clear, as to force " the incredulity and reluctance of all ſorts of perſons, however prepoſſeſs'd; theſe " would be grounds for pretending to overthrow its Doctrines, by thus heaping up pro- " bable Objections againſt what it commands us to believe. But it is very remote " from this Language: It not only does not tell them that the Truths it teaches can't " be aſſaulted by any probable Reaſons, but tells them it is neceſſary they ſhould be, " and that 'tis an infallible Conſequence of the Deſign God has had in the diſcovery " of Himſelf to Mankind by the true Religion (a)." Mr. *Claude* having ſaid nothing againſt this paſſage of Mr. *Nicolle*, ought to be thought the approver of it; for if he had found any Subject of Cenſure in it, he was oblig'd by all ſorts of Reaſons to cenſure it in refuting, as he did, the Book concerning the perpetuity of Faith.

THE SECOND Objection is, That Anſwers are given to theſe Philoſophical Objections.

Let us ſee whether any one can have any reaſon for Scandal, under pretence that the Philoſophical Objections againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity, *&c.* ſilence not the Profeſſors of Divinity, and that in the Theſes they frequently expoſe to diſpute upon theſe Points, they ſolve all the Difficulties that can be propos'd to them. I deſire ſuch as ſhall urge me with this, to conſider two things: One is, That their Objection can't be good againſt me, but it muſt be ſo againſt all the Divines who acknowledge the great Myſteries of the Goſpel to be inexplicable by Natural Reaſon: The other is, That the Proteſtants can't make uſe of this Objection; for it proves too much; namely, that the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is not expos'd to invincible Attacks, philoſophically ſpeaking. 'Tis the general Doctrine of the *Roman Catholicks*, that a Body may be in ſeveral places at once. The *Thomiſts* contenting themſelves with what's neceſſary, have not dar'd to affirm it can be ſo *circumſcriptively*, but at moſt as JESUS CHRIST is under the Sacramental Species. The other School-men, eſpecially the Jeſuits, have been much bolder; they have maintain'd the *circumſcriptive Replication* (b), and in this have reaſon'd more conſequently than the *Thomiſts*; for if the Reaſons alledg'd againſt this *Replication* were good, the *definitive Replication* (c) would not be tenable. The *Replication* is not only taught by the Divines, but alſo in all the Bodies of Philoſophy, and 'tis ever one of the Theſes order'd to be publickly maintain'd in the Schools of Natural Philoſophy. All imaginable Objections are diſcuſs'd in the Books of Scholaſtick Divines, who treat of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and in the Bodies of Philoſophy, in the place where the Queſtions *de loco* are explain'd: not one of thoſe Objections remains unanſwer'd. Does this hinder the Proteſtants from perſiſting to maintain that the poſition of a Body in many places at once is involv'd in a thouſand Contradictions, and abſolutely impoſſible? Nothing therefore can be inferr'd to the advantage of an Opinion, from the poſſibility of oppoſing ſome Diſtinction (d) or School-term againſt whatever the moſt ſubtle Adverſaries can object. All does not conſiſt in giving an Anſwer, but in giving a Solution which raiſes ſome Ideas, and is exempt from the *petitio principii*, and which ſhews the Objection to be built upon foundations that have no connexion with common Notions. Here you ſee three Characters which are wanting in the School-mens Anſwers to the Objections againſt Tranſubſtantiation: Therefore their laſt and principal Refuge is to ſay, That the Omnipotence of God ſupplies what Reaſon can't comprehend, and that 'tis our Duty to captivate our Underſtanding, and ſacrifice our Knowledge to the Authority of the Church.

They have been no leſs ſubtil and ingenious to invent Difficulties and Anſwers with reſpect to the Trinity, than to Tranſubſtantiation. But the *Socinians* are as ill ſatisfied with theſe two kinds of Anſwers, as the *Proteſtants* are with thoſe relating to Tranſubſtantiation: Both, ſay the *Socinians*, want the three Characters obſerved before: They ſuppoſe what is in queſtion; they are as obſcure, or obſcurer than the Doctrine it ſelf which is the Subject of Controverſie; they are too inconceivable to be confuted; 'tis a Diſpute wherein Night parts the Combatants; for if the Reſpondent wraps himſelf in a Diſtinction wholly incomprehenſible, the Opponent muſt neceſſarily retire; or if he ſtays, he ſees no opportunity of ſtriking a blow. No man will ſhoot, where there is not the leaſt glimpſe whereby to diſcover or gueſs at the Mark; and as the higheſt degree of Evidence has this property, that it can't be prov'd, the loweſt degree of Inevidence has this deſtiny, that it cannot be aſſaulted. So that no Conſequence can be drawn in favour of a Doctrine from this, that its Opponents, tho' never ſo well provided with Philoſophick Weapons, at laſt meet with an Intrenchment of Diſtinctions, involv'd in ſo impenetrable a Cloud, that they are forc'd to proceed no farther.

There are both in the *Proteſtant* and *Roman Communion* a great many perſons who are diſſatisfied with the Explications of the School-men, and think that theſe people have more confounded than explain'd the Myſteries of Religion. Some Proteſtant Divines could wiſh that the Scripture-terms had been inſiſted on, that the Doctrine of the Trinity had been included in five or ſix Lines, and that, inſtead of following the Diſputers from one Objection to another, they had been told, *We don't propoſe this to you as a thing you are to comprehend, but as a thing you are to believe: If you can't believe it, beg the Grace of God that you may; if you obtain nothing by your Prayers, your Diſtemper is incurable: Our Diſtinctions and Subtilties will ſerve only to harden you; you'll never leave complaining that we explain an obſcure Doctrine by another more obſcure, obſcurum per obſcurius.* 'Tis very probable that this Myſtery propounded in a few words, according to the ſimplicity of the Scripture, would much leſs ſtartle and fright Reaſon, than it does by that great train of Explications which accompanies it in *Thomas Aquinas*'s Commentators. Many *Roman Catholicks* would heartily ſay, if they durſt, againſt the Subtilties of the School-men,

---

(a) Nicol *Prejuge de la Fo. pag. m.92,* 93.

(b) *'Tis th the Schoo call the po ſition of th ſame Bod in ſeveral places, without penetrati of dimenſions.*

(c) *Thu they call the poſiti of the ſa Body in many pl ces at on with pe tration o dimenſi*

(d) *Compare wit this w I have ſaid in t Article of* Zeno *about th* Objectio *relating the divi bility of* Matter.

men, what the Abbot *Faydit* has publiſh'd of them: But tho' they want his Courage to print a ſtrong Invective, as he did, upon this Subject, they nevertheleſs think as he does. See the Margin (*a*).

Mr. *de Balzac* has ſaid excellent things in the fifth (*b*) Diſcourſe of his *Socrate Chrétien*, of which this is a piece. (*c*) "Thoſe who have tranſlated from one Language into "another with the greateſt Reputation, have taken Rivers for Mountains, and Men "for Cities. The miſtakes of your Doctors are not leſs than thoſe. Human Rea"ſon falls into more ſtrange Ambiguities when it treats of Divine things: Being "weak and ſhort as it is, it ought to be cautious, and conſider its own ſtrength; it "ought to be more diſcreet and reſerv'd: there may be an intemperance in the deſire "of learning and enquiring: 'tis a Vice to know too much News; Ancient Morality has "condemn'd it; *Theophraſtus*'s Characters don't forget it. And if it be true what was "heretofore ſaid, THAT WE OUGHT NOT TO BE CURIOUS IN A "FOREIGN REPUBLICK; what Audaciouſneſs is it, I pray, what Sacrilege, "for a Citizen of the lower World, an Inhabitant of the Earth, to meddle ſo much "with the Things above, and the Affairs of Heaven? In what Country is he more a "Stranger than in that? Is there any Republick more unknown to him? Is there any "foreign place he is more remote from, or has leſs Society and Correſpondence with? "We owe ſo much Reverence to That Majeſty which conceals itſelf, as not to pry "after Him with ſo much diligence and forwardneſs. Let us ſtop at His Outworks and "Ramparts, without purſuing Him into His Fort and Intrenchments; Let us adore "the Veils and Clouds He has plac'd betwixt us and Him. Since He inhabits a Light in"acceſſible, let us leave off attempting the place of His abode: Let us not endeavour "to ſurprize Him by the ſubtilty of our Queſtions, to force Him with the violence of "our Arguments. If the preſervation of our Eyes be valuable, if our Life be dear to "us, let us ſhun that formidable Preſence, that fatal Light, that Light which dazles "Angels and Men. . . . . (*d*) At the unmeaſurable diſtance we are from Him, con"fin'd to the loweſt Story of the World He has built, we would aſcend His Throne, "and touch His Crown. We aſpire to His ſtricteſt Confidence and Familiarity; at "leaſt, we pretend to ſee Him with the Eyes of Fleſh, to comprehend Him with a "Mind drown'd in Blood, and bury'd in Matter. We undertake to diſcourſe of His "Nature and His Eſſence, to give relations of His Conduct and Deſigns, with the "Jargon of *Ariſtotle*'s Philoſophy".

Balzac had the *Spaniſh* School-men in view; but there is no Subject for which they better deſerve this Cenſure, than their Explications of the Myſtery of the Trinity: So little reaſon is there to conclude they have ſucceeded well, under the pretence of their inventing Anſwers to Objections.

But to be impartial to every body, we muſt ſay, that thoſe who engage in Diſputes with the *Socinians*, and take new Roads, ſeldom fail to loſe their way. This has been experimented in *England* (*e*) five or ſix years ago: A famous Divine, thinking he could not confute ſome *Socinian* Writings by the School-Hypotheſis, imagin'd another; but he was thought to eſtabliſh Tritheiſm, and it was not ſuffer'd to take footing. From whence we may infer how impoſſible it is to confute the Philoſophical Objections of the *Socinians*; and ſince they acknowledge the Scripture, they ought immediately to be aſſaulted by it. This is the weak part in their Defence; the other is the ſtrong part.

As ſtudious as I am to be ſhort, I muſt obſerve the Method an able Divine, who has ſince been many years Biſhop of *Salisbury*, took to refute the Objections of a famous Libertin (*f*) whom he converted: He has given us the Hiſtory of the Conferences he had with him, where we find, amongſt other things, that in anſwering the Difficulties upon the Myſteries of the Goſpel, he had only recourſe to this, That the incomprehenſibility of a Doctrine is not a ſufficient reaſon to reject it, ſince there are a great many moſt certain things in Nature which 'tis impoſſible to comprehend. He mention'd ſome of them, and particularly the Union of the Soul and Body. The Objection made to him was, That it is not in the power of Man to believe what he does not conceive; and that 'tis opening a door to all the Impoſitions of Prieſts, to give Credit to Myſterious Doctrines. (*g*) *Ne myſteriis fidem adhiberet, elabendi viam quærebat; autumabatque à nullo mortalium id fieri poſſe, quandoquidem credere, quod concipere, vel cogitatione comprehendere nequimus, non eſt penes hominem. Credere myſteriis inquiebat nihil aliud eſſe, quam feneſtram aperire præſtigiis ſacerdotum; cum enim populo hac in re obſequente uterentur, omnia illi pro lubitu perſuaderent, qui, impoſito rudi myſterii nomine, domabatur, nulloque negotio credebat.* He anſwer'd (*h*), That it ought not to be wonder'd that the Eſſence of God is incomprehenſible, ſince there is (*i*) in each Being ſomething we can't account for, and (*k*) the poſſibility of many Facts acknowledg'd to be true by all the World, may yet be attack'd by ſpecious Arguments; and therefore the Revelation of the Myſtery of the Trinity and Incarnation, and ſome others, being certain, we ought to ſubject our Reaſon to 'em; for the ſole Argument that can be oppos'd to 'em is, that they tranſcend our Reaſon: but is not the ſame difficulty to be found (*l*) in many things which we admit the truth of? He was ſo far from reckoning the School-mens Anſwers any thing, that on the contrary he confeſs'd they only ſerv'd to render the Difficulties more obſcure. (*m*) *Curioſitatis revera nimium introductum, eaque magis conducit difficilioribus obſcurandis, quam explanandis. Sunt autem defenſa vacillantibus argumentis, illuſtrataque ſimilitudinibus non adeo idoneis ac congruis, additaque nova ſubtilitates, magis intricantes, quam extricantes, quæ omnia haud quaquam negavi. Oppoſitio Hæreticorum priſcis temporibus*

(*a*) To know to what a ſtrange nonplus the Abbot Faydit has reduc'd the School-men, we need only conſult the Author who has attempted to anſwer him, or the excellent Extract Mr. de Bauval has given of his Anſwer, in Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Scavans, May, 1699. pag. 214. & ſeq.

(*b*) Intitul'd, Concerning the too great ſubtilty in matters of Religion.

(*c*) Balzac Chrétien Socrate, pag. m. 57. & ſeq.

(*d*) Id. ib. 62, 63.

(*e*) I writ this in Novemb. 1701.

(*f*) John Wilmot E. of Rocheſter, born April 1648. who dy'd penitent in 1680. See the Hiſtory of his Converſion by D. Burnet. I uſe the Latin Tranſlation publiſh'd at Utrecht, 1698.

(*g*) Roſtæ Comitis in extremis poenitentia, ſeu pœnitentia ſalutaris, pag. 51.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 53.

(*i*) Certum in unaquaque re quid eſſe cujus ratio reddi nequit. Ibid. pag. 52.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 53.

(*l*) Note, That the Author who publiſh'd a Treatiſe of Religion againſt the Atheiſts, Deiſts, and new Pyrrhoniſts, at Paris, in 1677. ſtrongly preſs'd the Argument, That Unbelievers cannot avoid in their Principles believing things incomprehenſible. See Chap. 3, 4, & 5 of the ſecond part.

(*m*) Comitis Roſtæ in extremis poenitentia, pag. 54, 55.

peribus nimium curioſitatis inter Patres excitavit, quam Scholaſtici ſequiorum ſeculorum mire adauxerunt; verum ſi myſteria potius ea ſimplicitate, qua in ſacris tradita ſunt literis, quam ſecundum abſurdiſſima in ea fanaticorum hominum commentaria accepta fuiſſent, non minus (a) *incredibilia viderentur, quam aliqua eorum objectorum, quæ quotidie in ſenſus incurrunt.*

Let us not omit this Obſervation. *Luther* and many other Proteſtant Divines had never maintain'd that there are things falſe in Philoſophy which are true in Divinity, if they had believ'd that the Anſwers to the Philoſophers Objections againſt our Myſteries were ſatisfactory; for they maintain'd this only on account of thoſe Myſteries.

I don't ſee then that hitherto the Objections I had to ſolve in this Explanation have been able to give me any diſturbance. Let us try in ſome others.

THE THIRD Objection, That I ought not to have applied to the Arguments of the *Manichees*, what might be acknowledged with reſpect to the Arguments oppos'd to the Myſteries of the Goſpel.

If it be objected, That my Conceſſion is ſcandalous, becauſe it relates not to the Philoſophical Reaſons which may aſſault the Trinity, Incarnation, and ſome other Myſteries, but to the Diſputes about the Origin of Evil, many Faults will be committed: For, *firſt*, the Objector will be ignorant that the Decrees of God about the Fall of Man, and the Conſequences of this Fall, are one of the moſt incomprehenſible Myſteries of Religion; *Secondly*, That our moſt Orthodox Divines acknowledge it.

The Writings of St. *Paul* teach us, That this great Apoſtle propoſing to himſelf the Difficulties of Predeſtination (b), could get out of them no otherwiſe than by aſſerting the abſolute Power of God over his Creatures, with an Exclamation upon the Incomprehenſibility of his Ways. Could he more clearly ſignifie, than by ſuch a Solution, the inexplicable Doctrine of the Decrees of God about the Deſtiny of the Elect and Reprobate? Is not this telling us in plain terms, that Predeſtination is one of the Myſteries which moſt puzzle Human Reaſon, and moſt unavoidably command it to humble itſelf under the Authority of God, and ſacrifice itſelf to the Scripture? The Objections it forms againſt the Myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, are for the moſt part ſenſible only to thoſe who have ſome Tincture of Logick and Metaphyſicks; and belonging to the Speculative Sciences, they have leſs force upon the generality of Men: but thoſe it forms againſt *Adam*'s Sin, and Original Sin, and the Eternal Damnation of innumerable People, who can't be ſav'd without an efficacious Grace, which God affords only to his Elect, are founded upon Principles of Morality, which are known to every body, and which conſtantly ſerve for a Rule both to the Learned and Ignorant to judge whether an Action be unjuſt or not. Theſe Principles carry the utmoſt Evidence, and work upon the Mind and Heart; ſo that all the Faculties of Man revolt, when we muſt impute to God a Conduct not conform to this Rule. Nay, the Solution which is drawn from God's Infinity, and is employ'd as a powerful Motive to captivate the Underſtanding, is not exempt from a new Difficulty; For if that infinite diſtance which raiſes God above all things, ought to perſuade us that He is not ſubject to the Laws of Human Virtues, we cannot be certain that His Juſtice engages Him to puniſh Evil, and we could not confute thoſe who ſhould maintain Him to be the Author of Sin, and yet to puniſh it very juſtly, and in all this to do nothing but what is conſiſtent with the Infinite Perfections of a Supreme Being; becauſe they are not Perfections that are to be adjuſted to our Ideas of Virtue.

'Tis plain then, that the Doctrine of *Adam*'s Sin, with its Dependances, is that, amongſt all the Myſteries unconceivable to Reaſon, and inexplicable by its Maxims, which moſt neceſſarily obliges us to ſubmit to reveal'd Truth, notwithſtanding all the Oppoſitions of Philoſophical Truth.

It were to be wiſh'd that this point had been always remembred; for the unhappy Diſputes about Grace, which have caus'd ſo many Diſorders, were derived from the treating of this Myſtery as a thing reconcilable with our weak Reaſon. The *Roman* Catholicks here have acted incoherently; they have inſulted *Calvin* with the utmoſt fury, for literally following St. *Paul*'s Doctrine, whilſt they would explain it in a milder ſenſe, that Human Reaſon might lend an helping hand to it. They had not the ſame conſideration for Reaſon in the Explication of the Paſſages relating to the Trinity and the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. *Balzac*'s ſtrokes againſt his Adverſaries would do well againſt them. " The Miniſters, *ſays he*, ought to be laugh'd at for Fools, (c) after " the Advances they have made, and the Reſerves they would keep to themſelves. " When they have granted us the more, can they refuſe us the leſs? Having given " us the Myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, they have reſerv'd themſelves nothing afterwards. By the conceſſion of theſe two great aſtoniſhing Truths, they " have given up the liberty of their Mind; which liberty can't be loſt or preſerved, " but all entire. The ſame Authority which aſſures them of the certainty of the " Apoſtles Creed, aſſures them of the validity of all the other parts of Religion; and " they have no better grounds for conteſting theſe, than that. The Authority being infallible, it is univerſally infallible; it is equally infallible. The Chriſtian being the " Captive of Faith, and not the Judge of Doctrines, ought to obey the Voice that " ſpeaks, without deliberating about the Words, becauſe the Words would not perſuade, if the Voice had not already done it. A Man has no longer a Right to his " firſt Freedom, after he has taken upon him the Yoke of the commanding and victorious God. 'Tis not a proper time for the uſe of Reaſon, after we have ſubmitted to the " *Obedience of Faith*. How ridiculous, I pray, would it be, one while to quit Reaſon, " and another to reſume it; to make choice of ſome inviting parts of Chriſtianity, and " to reject the diſcouraging ones; to be half Infidel, and half Believer! This would " be capitulating with Jeſus Chriſt, and entring upon Articles with the Church. It " would

(a) *I don't underſtand this; and it ſeems the Author ſhould rather have ſaid* credibilia *than* incredibilia, *or inſtead of* minus *have put* magis.

(b) *See the Note* G *of the Article* Arminius.

(c) Balzac's S crate Chréti *Diſcour* 12. pag. 320. & *ſeq.*

" would be doing ſomething worſe, paſſing from Complaiſance to giving the Lye, " admitting one part of what She propoſes to our belief, and maintaining the reſt to " be falſe". *Calvin* might thus have defended himſelf againſt thoſe who diſlik'd his Hypotheſis of Predeſtination; he might have told them, You impertinently pretend to be ſqueamiſh, after having digeſted the difficulties of One God in Three Perſons, and of Tranſubſtantiation; you will not hear Philoſophical Arguments hereupon; you talk of nothing but the Omnipotent Power of God; you complain of our denying it, when we diſclaim the preſervation of Accidents without a Subject, and the preſence of a Body in different places: Why then do ye attack the Myſtery of Predeſtination by Human Arguments? Why don't ye believe that the Power of God extends even to the reconciling the liberty of Creatures with the neceſſity of His Decrees, and His Juſtice with the puniſhment of a Sin neceſſarily committed?

Be it how it will, it can't be deny'd that the Introduction of Moral Evil, with the Doctrines annex'd to it, is one of the moſt impenetrable Myſteries of the Goſpel. I'll cite ſome Authors upon it.

I repeat not what may be read in another place of this Work, that a Proteſtant Divine publickly confeſſes that St. *Auſtin*'s and *Calvin*'s Hypotheſis is to him an inſupportable Burden, and that he embraces it only becauſe none of the other Hypotheſes were able to give him ſatisfaction. *Calvin*'s *Latin* words which I have related deſerve a place here in the *French* of the Author. " Throughout (*a*) his Writings he perſeveres to exclaim that where-ever the Queſtion is about Sin, the Name of God ought not to be " engag'd in it, ſince nothing belongs to the Nature of God but perfect Juſtice and " Equity. 'Tis therefore a baſe and horrible Calumny to involve a Man who has ſerv'd " the Church of God ſo well, in this Crime, as if he made God the Author of Sin. " He conſtantly teaches indeed, that nothing is done but by the Will of God; and yet he " maintains, that the wicked actions of Men are ſo directed and govern'd by the ſecret Judgment of God, that he has no communication with their Vices. The Sum " of his Doctrine is, That God directs all things, by wonderful means unknown to us, " to what end He pleaſes, ſo that His Eternal Will is the Firſt Cauſe of all things. " And he confeſſes it to be an incomprehenſible Secret, That God determines what to " us appears unreaſonable; and nevertheleſs he affirms, That we are not to enquire too " curiouſly or audaciouſly into His Conduct, ſince the Judgments of God are a great " Deep, and that 'tis better to adore with all Reverence the Myſteries and Secrets " which exceed our Capacity, than to ſcan them, or intrude too far into them". You ſee how he adviſes not to approach this Abyſs, but with a Spirit of Submiſſion and Reverence for this great and incomprehenſible Myſtery. Mr. *Morus* being Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity in the ſame City of *Geneva* where *Calvin* had been, vehemently declaim'd againſt the Reform'd Divines who diſputed about the Univerſality of Grace. He had an eye to *Amyraldus* and *Spanhemius*. He made 'em the ſame Lecture as is us'd to audacious Writers, who have the boldneſs to dive into the moſt hidden Secrecies of the Creator. He puts them in mind of the graveſt Maxims that are imploy'd to recommend the Sacrifice of Reaſon, and the Captivity of the Underſtanding, to the Divine Authority, in relation to the moſt incomprehenſible Myſteries. His words have ſo much Emphaſis, that they can't be tranſlated without loſing a great deal of their force. (*b*) *Quis non videat quæ de Trinitate, quam ſibi ſoli notam vetus ait ſcriptor, deque decretis Dei, quorum non aliter conſtat ratio, quam ſi nemini reddatur, deque aliis ejuſmodi, quæ nec licet ſcire, nec prodeſt, anxie diſputantur, non tuto, ſed fruſtra, diſputari? Nemo cæleſte myſterium diſcutiat ratione terrena, divina verba modu non penſemus humanis, inquit Chryſologus. Credere, quod juſſum eſt, non eſt diſcutere permiſſum, ait Ambroſius. Lauda, venerare, tuum eſt neſcire, quod agitur, inquit Author de vocatione Gentium. Quæ Deus occulta eſſe voluit, non ſunt ſcrutanda; quæ manifeſta fecit, non ſunt negligenda, ne & in illis illicite curioſi, & in his damnabiliter inveniamur ingrati. Nos autem faſtidimus aperta in ſcripturis, clauſa, & obſignata, in cælis quærimus, nunquam viſa perambulare, oculis quoque ſubducta calcare pedibus,* ἐμβατεύων, *Pauli vox agnoſcitor, ſatagimus ardeliones. Quare hi ſic, illi aliter, abſit ut dicamus judicium eſſe luti, non figuli, quæ ſunt Auguſtini verba, compeſcat ſe humana temeritas, & quod non eſt, non quærat, ne id, quod eſt, non inveniat:* Ὅτι ἀκατάληπτον τὸ Θεῖον *Damaſcenus aliique præſcribunt. Quid æternus minorem conſiliis animum fatigas? Audi Tertullianum: Præſtat, inquit, per Deum neſcire, quia ipſe non revelaverit, quam per hominem ſcire, quia ipſe præſumſerit; cedat curioſitas fidei, cedat gloria ſaluti. Audi Scripturam:* ARCANA DEO, *revelata nobis, & filiis noſtris. Moſes Dei Vocem audivit; faciem non vidit; quia fide, non viſu, ambulamus, & cujus ferre Majeſtatem non poſſumus, à poſteriori, ut loquuntur, opera cum Moſe luſtramus. Deus abſconditus habitat in caligine, inquit Rex Pacificus; in luce, ſed inacceſſa, inquit cæleſtis Apoſtolus. Hic ſubvectus in tertium cælum quæ viſere potuit, non potuit enarrare: nos humi ſerpentes adhuc enarramus velut conſcii, quæ nunquam, ne per nebulam quidem, vidimus. Non conſtat ſine arcano Majeſtas, nubes Dei gloriam obumbrat, Arca oppanſo velo tegitur: nos in horribile Dei Sacrarium miſſitios oculos evibramus, & nondum bene initiati Epoptas agimus. Ut ad ignem, Solemque, ſic ad Deum accedamus, hactenus ut calore foveamur, non voraci flamma, non radiis æſtuantibus hauriamur.* Very lately one of *Calvin*'s Succeſſors to his Chair has in a moſt preciſe manner acknowledg'd the incomprehenſibility of Predeſtination. I have not as yet had the happineſs to ſee his new Syſtem of Divinity; but this we find in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*: (*c*) " He begins with a Queſtion extremely difficult, " and which is a Rock of Offence to the prophane and weak; namely, Why God has " permitted Sin, which is the cauſe of ſuch a number of Evils, and which he might

" eaſily

(*a*) *Calvin's brief Anſwer to the Calumnies of a certain Pragmatick, attempting to defame the Doctrin of God's Eternal Predeſtination, pag.* 2037. *of his Tracts,* Geneva 1611.

(*b*) Alexander Morus *Oratione de pace, pag.* 53. & *ſeq. Edit. Amſterd.* 1648. *in* 12.

(*c*) *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres,* Novemb. 1701. *pag.* 493, 494. *in the Extract of* M. Pictet's *Chriſtian Theology, Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at* Geneva.

“ eaſily prevent? Mr. *Pictet* does not diſſemble the greatneſs of the difficulty, but places it in its whole light. Thoſe who venture to affirm that God knows not futurity, “ when it depends on the liberty of intelligent Creatures, eaſily diſengage themſelves “ from this difficulty, by ſaying God has not prevented what he has not foreſeen; “ But this is leaping into an Abyſs to avoid a Precipice; and 'tis ſtill more difficult to “ conceive that God ſhould not know futurity, than 'tis to conceive He has not hindred Sin, tho' he foreſaw it. The thought of thoſe who ſay God has permitted it to “ manifeſt his Wiſdom, or to exerciſe his Juſtice and Mercy, ſeems more reaſonable. “ And yet all this is not ſatisfactory; for, beſides that it was not perhaps impoſſible for “ God to manifeſt his Attributes otherwiſe, is it, for inſtance, a great Sign of Mercy, “ to permit a great Evil that might be prevented, in order to have an occaſion of remedying it? Mr. *Pictet* ſincerely confeſſes, that as the Scripture gives us no reaſon “ of God's Conduct on this occaſion, and ſufficiently intimates that there are Depths “ impoſſible for us to ſound, we ought not to attempt it.

Whoever can be reaſonably ſcandaliz'd with my Articles about *Manicheiſm*, may be ſo with this Profeſſor of *Geneva*'s Doctrine, as Orthodox as it is.

Let us add alſo the Teſtimony of a *Roman Catholick*, that the meaſure may be full. “ There are (a) ſhallow Minds, who had rather condemn boldly what they don't underſtand in the holy Fathers of the Church, than humble themſelves, as They “ did, under the weight of the Difficulties that are found in the Explication of the “ Myſteries of our Faith: For the Juſtification of a Sinner, and the Sanctification of a “ Chriſtian, is a Myſtery, and a great One. And 'tis from looking upon it as no “ Myſtery, that men boldly attempt to level all its Difficulties; that they form Syſtems “ that bring every thing to Evidence and Demonſtration, if we believe the Authors; “ and that they imagin a *Scientia media* in God, invented at firſt by the *Semi-Pelagians*, “ and *whereof Pope* Clement VIII. *excellently skill'd in this Subject, was wont to ſay*, as “ (1) *Lemos* relates it, *that it was an human invention to accomodate all things in appearance.* “ Away with thoſe human inventions, which explain not the Myſteries but by deſtroying them, and give not the Mind ſatisfaction but by ſeducing it with the fallacious “ appearances of Light and Evidence. Let us receive with humility what the Scripture “ and Tradition diſcover of them. Let us willingly be ignorant of what God will conceal from us. Let us ſtop where the Apoſtles and Doctors of the Church have ſtopt; “ and in reading St. *Auſtin*, ſo far from inſulting him as an erroneous Writer, who “ leads his Followers to a Precipice of Error, let us acknowledge it is not from his “ Expreſſions the Difficulties proceed, but from the Subject itſelf, as he anſwers “ *Julian.*

THE FOURTH Objection is, That we ought not to acknowlege diſadvantageous Truths.

If there be any that are offended at my departing from the Maxim, That we ought never to own to our Adverſaries that we cannot anſwer their Objections; I ſhall need but a ſhort Apology, having but this little Queſtion to ask them: Is not acting ſincerely a commendable thing? Is it not a matter of obligation, at leaſt of permiſſion? It can't be deny'd. I may then make uſe of this laudable Liberty, eſpecially when there is no Decree of a Synod or Conſiſtory to tye a man's hands in that reſpect. If any one can produce a Doctrinal Determination ſign'd by four Profeſſors of Divinity, and ſeal'd with the Seal of ſome Univerſity, which is no great demand; if any one, I ſay, can ſhew me ſuch an Act, importing that no Orthodox Man ought to own, not even when 'tis moſt true, that certain Objections of the Heterodox are unanſwerable otherwiſe than by Scripture, I will engage to do every thing they'll have me; for I am certain I ſhall never ſee ſuch a Subſcription.

But for a more ample ſatisfaction of the moſt ſcrupulous Readers, I make a Declaration here, That where-ever it is ſaid in my Dictionary that ſuch and ſuch Arguments are unanſwerable, I deſire not to perſuade others that they are abſolutely ſo; I mean no more than that they ſeem to me unanſwerable. This has no ill Conſequence; every one may imagine, if he pleaſes, that I am of this opinion for want of due penetration; I wiſh they wou'd add, that in conforming my ſelf to the Rules of Sincerity rather than to the Politick Maxims of the Spirit of a Party, I conſider that neither Hereſie nor Heatheniſm can draw any Advantage (b) from the unanſwerableneſs of their Objections againſt Myſteries.

THE FIFTH Objection is, That I have not confuted the *Manichees*.

The remaining Difficulty will require a little longer Examination. It is founded upon my relating at large the Objections of the *Manichees*, and not troubling my ſelf to produce the Arguments that confute 'em. What follows will give ſatisfaction to all reaſonable Readers. Four Reaſons hinder'd me from inſiſting on the Confutation of *Manicheiſm*.

The firſt is, That conſidering the preſent diſpoſition of men, there is no Hereſie leſs to be fear'd than this. The People can't but abhor an Hypotheſis which admits an eternal and increated Nature diſtinct from God, an Enemy to God, and eſſentially Wicked: And as for the bold Wits, or in general all thoſe who have cultivated the Study of Metaphyſicks, and have any Inclination to abuſe it, they diſlike nothing more than a multiplicity of Principles: the depravity of their Taſte inclines them rather to be perfect (c) *Unitarians*, than to declare for the *Dualiſts* (d).

In the ſecond place, all Chriſtians, however ignorant they be, ſo clearly include Omnipotence and Infinity in the Idea of the Divine Nature, that they have no need of borrow'd Arms to fight the *Manichees*. This Idea alone renders them ſecure in an offenſive War; it affords them a ſolid Confutation of that Heretical Hypotheſis: I therefore did not think it neceſſary to ſhew any of my Readers how it was to be attack'd.

Thirdly,

(a) *St. Auguſtin juſtifie de Calviniſme, p.* 179, 180. *'Tis a piece printed in* 1689 *with the Letters of the Prince of* Conti *to Father* de Champs.

(1) Inventum humanum ad accommodandum in apparentia omnia. *Lemos* 1 *tom. p.* 2. *Tract.* 5. *c.* 35. *pag.* 289.

(b) *See what I a ſwer to t firſt Obj ction.*

(c) *Thos ſhort we may cal thoſe w with th* Spinozi *acknowl but one Subſtanc in the U verſe: I note, th below I give th Name t thoſe w acknowl but one firſt Ca of all things.*

(d) *Th the P* ans*ca Follow of two Princi*

Thirdly, The Obſervation I made, and ſufficiently enlarged upon in the Remark D of the Article *Manichees*, contains all that is neceſſary to bring all Men of Judgment out of Conceit with the Doctrine of two Principles. I ſaid the Goodneſs of a Syſtem conſiſts in including nothing repugnant to evident Idea's, and giving the Reaſon of *Phænomena*. I added, that the Syſtem of the *Manichees* has at beſt but the Advantage of explaining many *Phænomena*, which ſtrangely perplex the Followers of the Principle of Unity, but otherwiſe it ſtands on a Suppoſition repugnant to our cleareſt Idea's; whereas the other Syſtem is built upon thoſe Notions. By this Reflection I give the Superiority to the *Unitarians*, and I take it from the *Dualiſts*. For all Men of reaſoning grant that a Syſtem is much more imperfect, when it wants the firſt of the Qualities I have mention'd, than when it wants the ſecond. If it be built upon an abſurd, confuſed, improbable Suppoſition, this Imperfection is not made up by a happy Explication of the *Phænomena*; but if it does not explain them all ſucceſsfully, this is made up by the Clearneſs, Probability, and Conformity that is found in it with the Laws and Idea's of Order; and thoſe who have embrac'd it for this Perfection, don't uſe to be diſcourag'd under Pretence that they can't give an Account of all Matters of Experience. They impute this Fault to the Narrowneſs of their Minds, and imagine that in Time, they ſhall be able to diſcover the true Means of reſolving the Difficulties. A *Carteſian* Philoſopher finding himſelf preſs'd with an Objection concerning the Principle given by *Deſcartes* of the Flux and Reflux of the Sea, anſwer'd among other things, (*a*) That an Opinion ought not to be lightly quitted, *eſpecially when it is well grounded in other reſpects. It was objected to* Copernicus, *when he propoſed his Syſtem, that* Mars *and* Venus *ſhould appear much greater at a certain time, becauſe they came nearer the Earth by many Diameters. The Conſequence was neceſſary; and yet nothing of this appear'd. Tho' he knew not what to anſwer, he did not think himſelf oblig'd to forſake it, but only ſaid that Time wou'd diſcover it, and that perhaps it was by reaſon of the great Diſtance. This Anſwer was taken for an Evaſion, and there ſeem'd to be ſome Reaſon for it: But the Teleſcopes having been ſince invented, it appeared that what was oppos'd to him as a great Objection, is the Confirmation of his Syſtem, and the Overthrow of* Ptolomy's.

Obſerve here by the By, a fine Example of what I have ſaid concerning the Perfection of a Syſtem: That of *Copernicus* is ſo diſentangl'd, ſo ſimple, and ſo mechanical, that it ſhou'd be prefer'd before *Ptolomy's*, tho' it cou'd not ſo well reſolve ſome *Phænomena*.

Laſtly, My fourth Reaſon is, That I pointed out ſo good and ſo certain a Remedy, that it would have been needleſs to uſe any other Expedient to compenſate the Diſadvantage. The Syſtem of the *Dualiſts* gives a better Account of many Experiences than that of the *Unitarians*; but on the other hand, it contains monſtrous Abſurdities directly repugnant to the Idea's of Order. The *Unitarian* Syſtem enjoys the Perfection oppoſite to this Defect, and therefore, all things duly conſider'd, is preferable to the other. This might have been ſufficient, but I further obſerv'd that the *Unitarian* Syſtem was conſonant to Scripture, and that of the *Dualiſts* irrefragably refuted by the Word of God. Can any one deſire a ſtronger and more demonſtrative Proof, to be ſure that the former Syſtem is true, and the latter falſe? Muſt I after this, to remove all Scruples, philoſophically refute *Manicheiſm!* Would not he have little Faith, who ſhould have Occaſion for ſuch a Diſpute? God ſpeaks, and does not this fully convince you? Would you have other Securities? Would you have his Teſtimony ratify'd by human Reaſon? Is not this unworthy of a Man of common Senſe? Do you fear the Objections of the *Manichees*, when you have the Authority of Revelation againſt 'em?

But now out of regard to the Men of little Faith, I'll propoſe ſome Arguments againſt *Manicheiſm*.

SOME Arguments againſt *Manicheiſm*.

I will not attack it in its weak Part; that is, I will not take Advantage of the palpable Abſurdities the *Manichees* ran into when they came to particular Explications of their Doctrine. They are ſo wretched, that it would be a ſufficient Confutation of 'em, barely to relate them. We have ſeen a Specimen of it above (*b*). Laying aſide the ridiculous Part of that Hypotheſis, I ſhall only conſider their Syſtem in the greateſt Simplicity it can be reduc'd to.

I will not make uſe of this Objection of *Simplicius* (*c*): The Principle of Good and the Principle of Evil would be contrary; but they could not be contrary without being under the ſame Genus; and therefore there would be ſomething above them, which thing would be but one, and have all the Eſſence of a Principle: that thing would be properly a Principle, and conſequently there would not be two firſt Principles; and thus the Suppoſition of two contrary Principles implies a Contradiction. This is more ſubtil than ſolid; for Genus's and Species exiſt only in our Underſtanding; and therefore the Genus including the two contrary Principles, would be at moſt but an Idea of our Mind, as the general Idea of Being, which, according to ſome Chriſtian Philoſophers, is univocal to God and the Creatures.

Simplicius's other Arguments are much more ſolid (*d*). He ſhews the Patrons of two Principles, one of Good, and the other of Evil, that their Opinion is wholly injurious to the God whom they call good; that it takes from him at leaſt half his Power, and makes him timorous, unjuſt, imprudent, and ignorant. The Fear, ſaid they, he was under of an Irruption from his Enemy, obliged him to forſake Part of the Souls, in order to ſave the reſt. Theſe Souls were Portions and Members of his Subſtance, and had committed no Sin. *Simplicius* concludes from hence, that ſuch a

---

(*a*) *Gadroys, Lettre à Mr. de la Grange Trianon pour ſervir de reſponſe à celle que Mr. Caillet a écrite pag. 13. & 14. That Letter was publiſh'd at Paris in 1677.*

(*b*) *In the Remark B of the Article* Manichees, *and in the Remark F of the Article* Zoroaſter. *See alſo the Remark E of this laſt Article.*

(*c*) *Simplic. in Epictet. Enchir. cap. 34 pag. 163. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1640.*

(*d*) *Id. ib. pag. 165.*

(a) Id. ib. pag. 166,

(b) Note that it appears from this that they acknowledg'd that Evil exceeds God in this World.

(c) Id. ib. pag. 168.

Treatment was unjuſt, eſpecially ſince they were to be tormented, and in caſe they contracted any ſtain, they were to remain eternally in the Power of Evil. So that the good Principle not knowing how to manage his Intereſts, expos'd himſelf to an eternal and irreparable Mutilation. Add to this, that his Fears were ill grounded; for ſince the Dominions of Evil were from all Eternity, and by their own Nature, ſeparate from Dominions of Good, there was no Reaſon to fear that Evil ſhould make an Inroad upon the Territories of its Enemy. *Simplicius* taxes his Adverſaries with giving leſs Foreſight and Power to the good Principle than to the Evil. The good Principle (a) did not foreſee the Misfortune of the Detachments he expos'd to the Enemy's Aſſaults; but the ill Principle very well knew what Detachments would be made againſt him, and prepar'd the neceſſary Engines to carry them off. The good Principle was ſo ſimple, as rather to ſuffer a Mutilation, than receive the Enemy's Detachments upon his Diſtricts, who by that Means would have loſt Part of his Members. The ill Principle was always (b) ſuperior, loſt nothing, and preſerv'd all his Conqueſts; but the good Principle voluntarily gave up many Things out of Fear, Injuſtice and Imprudence. The Author concludes, that by refuſing to acknowledge God the Author of Evil, they make him bad all manner of Ways. (c) Τὸ δὲ ἀγαθὸν, ὡς ἐκεῖνοί φασιν, ἑκουσίως ἑαυτὸ τῷ κακῷ συμμίξαν, καὶ δειλῶς καὶ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀνοήτως κατ' αὐτὸ μίξαν τὴν διοίκησιν· ὡς φεύγοντες αἴτιον αὐτὸν τῶν κακῶν εἰπεῖν, πάντοθεν ἀπογράφουσι. καὶ κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν φεύγοντες τὸν καπνὸν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐμπεπτώκασιν. *Cum* BONUM *ultro ſeſe cum* MALO *commiſcuerit, ſeque & timidè, & injuſtè, & amenter (ſi illis credimus) geſſerit. Itaque dum mali cauſam dicere Deum recuſant, ab omni parte malum deſcribunt: & ut proverbio dicitur, fumum fugientes in ignem inciderunt.*

I omit many other Obſervations of *Simplicius*, againſt the Hypotheſis of two Principles, becauſe they attack thoſe Parts of it, which were weak only through the particular Fault of the arbitrary Explications of thoſe who defended it. There's ſomething of this in his Objections which I have abridg'd; but I'll produce one that ſtrikes home the Doctrine of two Principles, tho' it be conſider'd with the greateſt Simplicity.

(d) Id ib. pag. 169.

(e) Id ib.

He ſays (d), it entirely deſtroys the Liberty of our Souls, and neceſſitates them to ſin, and conſequently implies a Contradiction; for ſince the Principle of Evil is eternal and incorruptible, and ſo potent that God himſelf can't conquer him, it follows that the Soul of Man can't reſiſt the Impulſe with which he moves it to Sin. But if a Man be invincibly driven to it, he commits no Murder or Adultery, &c. by his Fault, but by a ſuperiour external Fault, and in that Caſe he is neither guilty nor puniſhable. Therefore there is no ſuch Thing as Sin, and conſequently this Hypotheſis deſtroys it ſelf, ſince if there be a Principle of Evil, there is no longer any Evil in the World: But if there be no Evil in the World, it is clear there is no Principle of Evil; whence we may infer, that thoſe who ſuppoſe ſuch a Principle, deſtroy by a neceſſary Conſequence both Evil and the Principle of it. (e) Εἰ δὲ τούτων ὡς κακῶν ὄντων τὴν αἰτίαν ζητοῦντες, ἀρχὴν ὑπέθεντο κακοῦ· ἐκείνης δὲ ὑποτεθείσης καὶ βιαζομένης οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲν ἔτι κακόν· χαριέντως αὐτοῖς ὁ λόγος ἀντιπεριτρέπεται· συνάγεται γὰρ, ὅτι εἰ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ, οὐκ ἔστι κακὸν ὅλως· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔστι κακὸν, οὐδὲ ἀρχὴ ἄν τις τοῦ κακοῦ, ὥστε εἰ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ, ὥς φασιν, οὔτε κακὸν ἔσται, οὔτε ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ. *Quòd ſi talium facinorum ut malorum cauſam inquirentes,* MALI *principium ſtatuerunt; eoque ſtatuto, & quidem vim inferente, malum nullum relinquitur, feſtivè ſuo ipſi (quod ajunt) gladio jugulantur. Nam inde colligitur: ſi* MALI *principium ſit, nullum omnino eſſe malum. Si vero malum non eſt, ne principium quidem* MALI *eſſe. Itaque ſi eſt principium mali, ut ajunt, nec malum erit nec mali principium.*

(f) *In the Remark* G *of the Article* Paulicians.

This Objection is no leſs ſolid than ſubtil. It may be ſtrengthen'd by that which I have propos'd in another (f) Place, *viz.* That the Doctrine of the *Manichees* is deſtructive of all Religions, ſince if they argue conſequentially, they can hope for nothing from their Prayers, nor fear any thing from their Impiety. They muſt be perſwaded, that whatever they do, the good Principle will be always propitious to them, and the evil One always adverſe: One of 'em can do nothing but Good, and the other can do nothing but Evil. They are determin'd to this by their Nature, and they purſue this Bent to the utmoſt Extent of their Power.

The Argument I am going to make, ſeems to me very ſtrong. The beſt Way we can take in philoſophical Diſcuſſions, is to conſult the Idea's of Order. If we conſult them in the preſent Diſpute, we ſhall plainly ſee that Unity, and infinite Power, and Happineſs, belong to the Maker of the World. The Neceſſity of Nature required that there ſhould be Cauſes of all Effects; and therefore a Power ſufficient for the Production of the World did neceſſarily exiſt. Now 'tis much more conſonant to Order, that this Power ſhould be united in one Subject, than divided into two or three, or an hundred thouſand. Let us therefore conclude, that it has not been divided, and that it reſides entire in one ſole Nature, and that therefore there are not two firſt Principles, but one only. There would be as much Reaſon to admit an Infinity of them, as the *Atomiſts* did, as to admit only two.

If it be contrary to Order, that the Power of Nature ſhould be divided into two Subjects, generally ſpeaking, it wou'd be much more ſtrange, if thoſe two Subjects were Enemies, and diametrically oppoſite: Nothing but all manner of Confuſion could ariſe from it: What one would do, the other would undo; and ſo either nothing would be done, or if any thing was done, it would be an odd Work, and very far from the Juſtneſs of this Univerſe. Thus you ſee *Manicheiſm* refuted by a very ſtrong Argument. If the *Manichees* had admitted two Principles acting in concert in all Things, they had been expoſed to leſſer Difficulties.

However ſuch a Syſtem would have been contrary to the Idea of Order, with Reſpect to the Maxim (a), that Beings are not to be multiplied without Neceſſity; for if there are two firſt Principles, they have each all the Power neceſſary to the Production of the Univerſe, or they have it not. If they have, one of them is ſuperfluous: If they have not, that Power was vainly divided, and it had been better in one Subject; it would have been more active, *virtus unita fortius agit*, ſay they in the peripatetick Schools. Beſides, 'tis not eaſie to conceive how a Cauſe that is Self-exiſting, can have but a Portion of Power. Who could have confined it to certain Degrees? It depends upon nothing, but ſtands upon its own Bottom.

The Rabbin *Maimonides* ſeems too nice, when he rejects all the five Proofs of the Unity of God, made uſe of by the Philoſophers of the Sect of the *Speakers*, and when he praiſes one of 'em, who finding himſelf perplex'd by the Weakneſs of thoſe Proofs, ſaid, that the Unity of God was not known or could not be proved, but by Revelation ſupported by Tradition. (b) *Hæc argumentorum iſtorum debilitas ſic defatigavit & exercuit nonnullos, ut quidam illorum dixerit, Unitatem Dei haberi ex lege per Cabbalam; ſed à reliquis ludibrio tantùm fuit habitus & non niſi ſannis exceptus. Mihi autem videtur, Virum illum fuiſſe ſani admodùm ingenii ac judicii. Nam cùm nihil ſolidum & demonſtrativum in ipſorum rationibus vidiſſet, in quo animus ipſius acquieſcere potuiſſet, dixit, per Cabbalam ſive Traditionem hoc haberi ex lege.* The fourth of thoſe five Arguments was this: Either one God was ſufficient for the Production of the World, or was not. If one ſuffic'd, another God would have been uſeleſs; and if he wanted the Aſſiſtance of another God, each of them wanted the Force that is neceſſary; but ſuch an Imperfection is inconſiſtent with the Deity. *Maimonides* anſwers, That tho' one God had not been able to frame the Structure of this World, there could be no juſt Reaſon to call him impotent, or inſufficient, ſince he ought not to be call'd ſo who does not that which exceeds his Nature. 'Tis no Impotency in God not to be able to give himſelf a Body, or to make a Square whoſe Side ſhould be equal to its diagonal Line. This hinders not God from being omnipotent; the natural Impoſſibility of ſome Things does no Prejudice to the Omnipotence of God. If therefore it be maintain'd to be naturally impoſſible for one God to create the World, the Neceſſity of two will be no Sign of Imperfection or Defect in either of them. (c) *Sicut non eſt attribuenda Deo Impotentia, quia non poteſt ſeipſum corporeum facere, vel alium ſibi ſimilem creare, aut quia nequit creare quadratum, cujus latus æquale ſit diametro: ſic illi, qui duos Deos ſtatuunt, poſſunt dicere, non eſſe illis Omnipotentiam derogandam ideò, quia nullus illorum ſolus creat; eò quòd neceſſitas exiſtentiæ ipſorum requirat, ut ſint duo. Hoc verò non eſſe ex indigentia, quaſi unus alterius ope indigeret, ſed ex neceſſitate, contrariumque eſſe impoſſibile. Et ſicut non ideò dici poteſt, Deum non eſſe omnipotentem, nulloque modo Indigentiæ, Impotentiæ vel Inſufficientiæ titulo appellandum, quòd non poſſit exiſtere facere corpus aliquod, niſi creet Subſtantias individuas, illaſque per Accidentia, quæ itidem creat, conjungat, ut illi* Loquentes *aſſerunt; quia ſcilicet, ut aliter fiat, eſt impoſſibile. Sic, qui duos Deos ſtatuit, dicere poteſt, impoſſibile eſſe, ut unus ſolus faciat omnia, nec tamen Imperfectioni ipſius hoc adſcribendum eſſe, quia illa talis ſit, ut duo ſimul & unà ſint & operentur.*

It might be ſhewn that theſe are meer Cavils; but to avoid too long Diſcuſſions, I am contented to ſay that the *Manichees* can't uſe this Subterfuge; for if any Power ought to be eſſentially contain'd in the Nature of God, 'tis that of doing what he moſt earneſtly deſires. The Idea of God includes no Attribute with more Clearneſs and Evidence than Beatitude. If therefore any Want of Power is capable of making God unhappy, we muſt ſay that it is eſſential to God to be without this Want; but he muſt neceſſarily be ſubject to it, if the Opinion of the *Manichees* were true: therefore their Syſtem is utterly falſe.

Such is the Nature, ſay they, of the good Principle, that he can produce nothing but Good, and with his whole Might he oppoſes the Introduction of Evil. He wills then and deſires with the utmoſt Ardour, that there ſhould be no Evil: 'Tis therefore againſt his Will that there is Evil in the Univerſe. He has done all that he could to prevent this Diſorder; if therefore he has wanted a neceſſary Power to prevent it, his moſt earneſt Deſires have been fruſtrated, and conſequently he has wanted the Power moſt neceſſary to his Happineſs; therefore he has not the Power which he ought moſt neceſſarily to have, according to the Conſtitution of his Being. But can any Thing be more abſurd than this? Is not this a Doctrine that implies a Contradiction?

The two Principles of the *Manichees* would be the moſt miſerable of all Beings; for the good Principle could not caſt his Eyes upon the World, but he would ſee a dreadful Multitude of all kinds of Evils: Nor could the evil Principle peep abroad without ſeeing a great deal of Good. The Sight of Evil would afflict the one, and the Sight of Good the other. This would not be a Sight ſometimes interrupted, but continual, and without the leaſt Abatement. The moſt miſerable Men are not under ſo ſevere a Fate; they ſucceſſively paſs from Sorrow to Joy, and at laſt Death ſecures them from the Miſeries of this Life. But the two Principles of the *Manichees* are immortal, they can ſee no End or Interruption of thoſe unpleaſant Objects, which diſturb them to the higheſt Degree.

All that the *Manichees* could ſuppoſe, concerning the firſt Introduction of Evil, and its firſt Combination with Good in the Heart of Man, was ſubject to a thouſand Difficulties. Their own Weapons flew in their Faces: They could not bear the Hypotheſis which teaches that Evil proceeded from the ill Uſe of Free-will. God, ſaid

(I 2) they,

(a) *Non ſunt multiplicanda entia ſine neceſſitate.*

(b) *Maimonides in More Nevochim parte* 1. *cap.* 75. *p. m.* 175.

(c) *Id. ib.*

they, infinitely Good, would not have ſuffer'd his Creatures to degenerate from their original Goodneſs; and yet they did not own them to be incorruptible in a moral Senſe. We have ſeen that *Simplicius* objected to them, that the Souls the ill Principle had ſeiz'd on, and which were Portions of the good One, became evil, and liv'd eternally in Corruption and Miſery, under the Empire of the Conqueror. But here follows ſomething worſe. We know by Experience, that the ſame numerical Soul ſins and does good Actions. When a Man repents and implores the Mercy of God, and makes Amends for his ill Life by Alms-Deeds, *&c.* this is not done by two Subſtances, but by one and the ſame Subject; we know it by our inward Conſciouſneſs, and Reaſon will have it ſo: For why ſhould a Man afflict himſelf for, and repent of a Fault which he has not committed? I ask the *Manichees*, Whether the Soul which does a good Action, was created by the good Principle or by the Evil? If it was created by the evil One, it follows that Good may ariſe from the Fountain of all Evil: If it was created by the good Principle, it follows that Evil may ariſe (*a*) from the Fountain of all Good, becauſe the ſame Soul, on other Occaſions, is guilty of Crimes. Thus you ſee yourſelves reduc'd to overthrow your own Reaſonings, or to maintain againſt the internal and evident Senſe of every Man, that the Soul which does a good Action, is not the ſame that does a bad one.

(*a*) *That is, by the ill Uſe of Free-Will beſtowed upon Men by the good Principle.*

To extricate themſelves from this Difficulty, they had need to ſuppoſe three firſt Principles; one eſſentially good, and the Cauſe of all Good; another eſſentially evil, and the Cauſe of all Evil; and a third eſſentially ſuſceptible of Good and Evil, and meerly paſſive. After which they ſhould ſay, that the human Soul is form'd of this third Principle, and does ſometimes a good Action and ſometimes a bad one, according to the Influence it receives from the good and ill Principle.

THE Concluſion of this Explanation.

Thoſe who ſhall attentively conſider what I have ſet forth in this Explanation, will doubtleſs ceaſe to be offended with what I have ſaid concerning the *Manichees*; they will ſee that it may be read without Scandal, and with Edification, provided they well remember,

I. That it is the Property of Goſpel-Myſteries, to be liable to Objections which cannot be fully clear'd by natural Reaſon.

II. That the Unbelievers can juſtly draw no Advantage from this, *viz.* That the Maxims of Philoſophy don't afford a full Solution of the Difficulties they propoſe againſt the Myſteries of the Goſpel.

III. That the Objections of the *Manichees*, about the Origin of Evil and Predeſtination, ought not to be conſider'd in general as impugning Predeſtination, but with this particular Reſpect, That the Origin of Evil, the Decrees of God upon it, and the reſt, are one of the moſt inconceivable Myſteries of Chriſtianity.

IV. That it ought to ſuffice every good Chriſtian, that his Faith is built upon the Teſtimony of the Word of God.

V. That the *Manichean* Syſtem conſider'd in it ſelf is abſurd and unwarrantable, and contrary to the Ideas of Order; that it is liable to Retortions, and can't remove Difficulties.

VI. That my Conceſſions can't give Scandal, but at the ſame time the Doctrine of the moſt orthodox Divines muſt be concluded ſcandalous, ſince all that I have ſaid is a natural and unavoidable Conſequence of their Doctrine; and I have only related more at large what they more ſummarily teach.

Some perhaps will think my Confutation of *Manicheiſm* imperfect, becauſe I anſwer not the Objections I have drawn out, as coming from the *Manichees*. I deſire 'em to remember, that as for evident Anſwers drawn from natural Reaſon, I know none; and as for Anſwers which the Scripture affords, they are to be found in abundance of controverſial Books.

They who ſhall ask of what Uſe are the Diſcuſſions that have offended them, will ſee my Anſwer in the Third Explanation.

EXPLANATION. III.

That what has been ſaid of Scepticiſm *in this Dictionary, can't prejudice Religion.*

FIRST I lay down, as the Baſis of this third Explanation, this certain and undoubted Maxim: *That Chriſtianity is of a ſupernatural Order, and reſolved into the ſupreme Authority of God propoſing to us Myſteries, not for us to comprehend, but to believe with all the Humility that is due to an infinite Being, who can neither deceive nor be deceiv'd.* This is the Pole-Star of all the Diſcuſſions and Diſputes about the Articles of the Religion, which God has reveal'd by JESUS CHRIST.

Hence neceſſarily reſults the Incompetence of the Philoſophical Tribunal, to judge of Chriſtian Controverſies, ſince they ought to be ſubmitted only to the Bar of Revelation.

Any Diſpute about this ought to be rejected without more ado. No Man ought to be admitted to examine, whether we ought to believe what God commands to believe. It ought to be reckon'd a firſt Principle in Point of Religion. 'Tis for the Metaphyſicians to examine, Whether there be a God, and whether he be infallible; but Chriſtians, as Chriſtians, ought to ſuppoſe it as a Thing already determin'd.

The Queſtion then is only about a Fact; Whether God requires our Belief of certain Things? Two ſorts of People may doubt of it; thoſe who don't believe the Scripture to be divine, and thoſe who don't think the Senſe of the Revelation to be ſo or ſo.

All the Diſpute then that Chriſtians can admit with the Philoſophers, is upon this Queſtion; Whether the Scripture was written by inſpir'd Authors? If the Arguments the Chriſtians alledge upon this Subject, don't convince the Philoſophers, the Diſpute ought to ceaſe; for it would be to no purpoſe to deſcend to the particular Diſcuſſion of the Trinity, *&c.* with People who diſown the Authority of the Scripture, the ſole and only Judge of Right and Wrong in ſuch ſort of Controverſies. Reveal'd Authority ought to be the common Principle of Diſputants hereupon, and therefore there's no diſputing when one denies this Principle, and the other admits of it. *Adverſus negantem principia non eſt diſputandum.*

If thoſe who deny it, perſiſt to Clamour and Diſpute, they ought to be coldly anſwer'd, you depart from the Queſtion, *Non feritis theſim, non probatis negatum*; and if they laugh at this Anſwer, their Laughing ought to be deſpis'd.

THE Character of the Scepticks.

But of all the Philoſophers, who ought not to be admitted to diſpute upon the Myſteries of Chriſtianity, before having admitted Revelation for their Rule, there are none ſo unworthy to be heard as the Sect of the *Scepticks*; for they are a ſort of People that make Profeſſion of admitting no certain Sign of Diſtinction between Truth and Falſhood; ſo that if Truth, by chance, appear'd to them, they could never be ſure that it was Truth. They are not ſatisfied with oppoſing the Teſtimony of the Senſes, the Maxims of Morality, the Rules of Logick, the Axioms of Metaphyſicks, but endeavour to overthrow the Demonſtrations of Geometry, and all the Certainty of Mathematicians. If they went no farther than the ten Ways of Suſpenſion, and confin'd themſelves to uſe them againſt natural Philoſophy, we might ſtill treat with them; but they will go much farther: They have a ſort of Arms they call (*a*) the *Diallel*, which they handle on the firſt Occaſion; after which there's no withſtanding them on any Account whatever: 'Tis a Labyrinth, from which no Clue of *Ariadne* can wind one out; they loſe themſelves in their own Subtilties, and are wonderfully pleas'd with it, ſince this ſerves to ſhew more clearly the Univerſality of their Hypotheſis, that every Thing is uncertain, from which they except not even the Arguments againſt Uncertainty. They proceed ſo far in their Method, that thoſe who have well conſider'd the Conſequences of it, are forced to ſay, That they (*b*) know not whether any Thing exiſts.

Divines ought not to be aſham'd to confeſs, That they can't enter the Liſts with ſuch Diſputants, and that they will not expoſe the Goſpel-Truths to ſuch an Encounter. The Veſſel of JESUS CHRIST is not made to float upon that tempeſtuous Sea, but to ride ſecure from this Tempeſt in the Haven of Faith. It has pleas'd the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, ſhould Chriſtians ſay, to lead us by the Way of Faith, and not of Science, or Diſputation. They are our Inſtructors and Directors, we cannot err having ſuch Guides, and Reaſon itſelf commands us to prefer them before its Direction.

But is it not a ſcandalous thing, will ſome ſay, that I have related the Converſation of an Abbot, who ſays that *Scepticiſm* finds many Arguments in the Doctrines of Chriſtianity, that render it more formidable than it was? I anſwer, that this can offend none but ſuch as have not examin'd the Character of Chriſtianity. 'Twould be a falſe Notion to imagin, that JESUS CHRIST had any Deſign to countenance, either directly or indirectly, Part of the Sects of Philoſophers in their Diſputes againſt the reſt. His Deſign was rather to put all Philoſophy to Confuſion, and to ſhew the Vanity of it. He was willing that his Goſpel ſhould claſh not only with the Religion of the Heathens, but with the Aphoriſms of their Wiſdom; and that notwithſtanding this Oppoſition betwixt his Principles and thoſe of the World, his Doctrine ſhould triumph over the *Gentiles*, by the Miniſtry of a few illiterate Men, who had neither Eloquence nor Logick, nor any of the Inſtruments ſo neceſſary to all other Reſolutions. He would have his Diſciples, and the wiſe Men of this World, to be ſo diametrically oppoſite, that they ſhould mutually call one another Fools: He deſign'd that as his Goſpel appear'd Folly to the Philoſophers, their Science ſhou'd appear Folly to the Chriſtians in its Turn. Conſider well theſe Words of St. *Paul*: “(*c*) For Chriſt
“ ſent me not to baptize, but to preach the Goſpel: Not with Wiſdom of Words,
“ leſt the Croſs of Chriſt ſhould be made of none effect. For the Preaching of
“ the Croſs is to them that periſh, Fooliſhneſs: But unto us which are ſaved, it is the
“ Power of God. For it is written, I will deſtroy the Wiſdom of the wiſe, and
“ will bring to nothing the Underſtanding of the Prudent. Where *is* the Wiſe?
“ Where is the Scribe? Where is the Diſputer of this World? Hath not God made
“ fooliſh the Wiſdom of this World? For after that, in the Wiſdom of God,
“ the World by Wiſdom knew not God, it pleaſed God by the Fooliſhneſs of Preach-
“ ing to ſave them that believe. For the Jews require a Sign, and the Greeks
“ ſeek after Wiſdom: But we preach Chriſt crucified, unto the Jews a ſtum-
“ bing-block, and unto the Greeks, Fooliſhneſs; But unto them which are call-
“ ed, both Jews and Greeks, Chriſt the Power of God, and the Wiſdom of God.
“ Becauſe the Fooliſhneſs of God is wiſer than Men; and the Weakneſs of God
“ ſtronger than Men. For ye ſee your Calling, Brethren, how that not many
“ wiſe Men after the Fleſh, not many mighty, not many noble *are called*. But

“ God

(*a*) *See Sextus Empiricus Pyrrhon. hypotyp. lib.* 1. *cap.* 15. *& lib.* 2. *cap.* 4.

(*b*) *See what Sextus Empricus* ad v. Math. lib. 7. *relates of Georgias Leontinus*,

(*c*) 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *& ſeq.*

“ God hath choſen the fooliſh things of the World, to confound the wiſe; and God
“ hath choſen the weak things of the World, to confound the Things which are
“ mighty; And baſe things of the World, and things which are deſpiſed, hath
“ God choſen, *yea*, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:
“ That no Fleſh ſhould glory in his preſence. But of him are ye in Chriſt
“ Jeſus, who of God is made unto us Wiſdom, and Righteouſneſs, and Sanctification,
“ and Redemption: That according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him
“ glory in the Lord. (a) And I Brethren, when I came to you, came not with
“ Excellency of Speech, or of Wiſdom, declaring unto you the Teſtimony of God.
“ For I determined not to know any thing among you, ſave Jeſus Chriſt, and
“ him crucified. And I was with you in Weakneſs, and in Fear, and in much
“ Trembling. And my Speech, and my Preaching *was* not with enticing Words
“ of Man's Wiſdom, but in demonſtration of the Spirit, and of Power: That
“ your Faith ſhould not ſtand in the Wiſdom of Men, but in the Power of God.
“ Howbeit we ſpeak Wiſdom among them that are perfect: yet not the Wiſdom
“ of this World, nor of the Princes of this World, that come to nought. But we
“ ſpeak the Wiſdom of God in a Myſtery, *even* the hidden *Wiſdom*, which God or-
“ dained before the World unto our Glory. Which none of the Princes of this
“ World knew: For had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of
“ Glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not ſeen, nor Ear heard, neither have
“ entred into the Heart of Man, the things which God hath prepared for them that
“ love him. But God hath revealed *them* unto us by his Spirit: For the Spirit
“ ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what Man knoweth
“ the things of Man, ſave the Spirit of Man which is in him? Even ſo the things
“ of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received,
“ not the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know
“ the things that are are freely given to us of God. Which things alſo we
“ ſpeak, not in the Words which Man's Wiſdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghoſt
“ teacheth; comparing ſpiritual things with ſpiritual. But the natural Man re-
“ ceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: For they are Fooliſhneſs unto him;
“ neither can he know *them*, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned.”

(a) 1 Cor. 2. 1. & ſeq.

Do you think, that if the Apoſtles had been told that their Doctrine expoſed the dogmatizing Philoſophers to new attacks from the Scepticks, they would have been concern'd at it? They would have ſaid, Let us not trouble our ſelves with their Diſputes; *Let the Dead bury the Dead*; the more they ſhall fight and diſable one another, the more they will diſcover the Vanity of their pretended Science. Neither the Dogmatiſts nor the Scepticks will ever be able to enter into the Kingdom of God, unleſs they become little Children, unleſs they change their Maxims, renounce their Wiſdom, and make a Burnt-Offering of their Syſtems at the Foot of the Croſs to the pretended Folly of our Preaching: This is the old Man they muſt eſpecially put off, before they can be qualified to receive the heavenly Gift and to enter into the Way of Faith and eternal Salvation. But if the Scepticks make an ill Uſe of our Myſteries to root themſelves deeper in Uncertainty, and if they object againſt us ſome Arguments *ad hominem*, ſo much the worſe for them, except God make uſe of their Errors to make 'em ſee the Neceſſity of ſubmitting to his Word. This is what St. *Paul* and his Fellow-Apoſtles would have anſwer'd to ſuch Objections. We ought to be fully perſwaded, that if there had been Occaſion to give their Deciſion upon the Nature of the heathen Philoſophy with reſpect to the Difficulty or Eaſineſs of embracing the Goſpel; they would have poſitively determin'd, that the Method, Principles, Practices, and Diſputes of the *Peripateticks*, *Academicks*, &c. were ſo great an Obſtacle to Faith, that the moſt neceſſary Preliminaries to enter into the Kingdom of God, were to forget or lay aſide all thoſe Inſtruments of a wrong Science. I believe they would have made ſuch a Determination both for the preſent and the Time to come.

I have cited a Man, who ſeems to believe that the Subtilties of the Schools of Philoſophy, may upon favourable Occaſions be inſtrumental in the Propagation of the true Faith. *It may be*, ſays he (b), *that theſe ſubtil Doctors were neceſſary to the World; I mean the curious, diſputing, and contradicting World. Perhaps they entred into the Deſign of the Providence of God, for the Accompliſhment of his Son's Kingdom, for the laſt Perfection of the Oeconomy of his Church. You know that the Son of God ſent ſeveral Apoſtles to ſeveral Nations; you know that all the Miſſions he ordained, were not made at the ſame time, and by the twelve firſt Envoys. He never wanted, and will never want the like Ambaſſadors. There are always Meſſengers ready to receive his Orders, to execute his Commands, to ſet out for his Service. We ought not to doubt that he has more than one St.* Peter *and St.* Paul. *He has alſo more than one St.* Thomas. *How do we know but that he has ſent the modern St.* Thomas *to the Succeſſors of* Ariſtotle, *to treat them according to their own Humour, and to convert them in their Way, in order to gain them by their Syllogiſms and Logick? How do we know but St.* Thomas *of the Schools has been choſen to be the Apoſtle of the* Peripatetick *Nation, that was not well conquer'd and ſubdued? a preſumptuous and mutinous Nation, which has ſo little regard to Authority, which pretends to go always upon Reaſon, which continually demands why Things are ſo and ſo, which is ſo reſtleſs, ſuch an Enemy to Peace, and ſo diſpos'd to Innovations? Methinks this laſt Miſſion has not been uſeleſs, and there is ſome Probability in what I ſay.* If there is no Irony in this Diſcourſe; if it be all in a ſerious Strain, 'tis an empty thing dreſs'd in lofty Words. All Men in all Ages have required and will require, that the Knowledge of reveal'd Truths ſhould be enquired

(b) Balzac, Socrate Chretien, diſcours 5. pag. m. 71. & ſeq.

enquired after by other Methods than thoſe of Philoſophy. Philoſophy does not cure a floating Mind, which muſt be cur'd, if we deſire to get true Wiſdom by our Prayers. (*a*) *If any of you lack Wiſdom, let him ask of God that gives to all Men liberally and upbraideth not, and it ſhall be given him. But let him ask in Faith nothing wavering, for he that wavereth, is a Wave of the Sea driven with the Wind and toſs'd; for let not that Man think that he ſhall receive any thing of the Lord.* Judge whether the Scepticks, who are always ſo much the more in their Element, as the Efforts they make to invent Reaſons for doubting of every thing, ſucceed to the finding out ſpecious Objections againſt Certainty, are capable of Grace by the Way of Diſputation. The modern Miſſionaries of the Goſpel, ought to treat them as the firſt would have done; they ought to caution them to part with their Spirit of Contradiction, and to believe God upon his Word; and if they prove untractable, they ought particularly to remember this Precept of St. *Paul*, and apply it to thoſe Men, (*b*) *Avoid fooliſh Queſtions and Genealogies, and Contentions, and Strivings about the Law, for they are unprofitable and vain. A Man that is an Heretick after the firſt and ſecond Admonition, reject.* It would be fine Work to ſee our *Thomiſts* and *Scotiſts* undertake the Converſion of the new World by publick Diſputations as in *Europe*: They would be ſorry Converters at that rate. *Balzac* did not conſider it, or elſe gravely ridiculed the Schoolmen; their publick Diſputes convert no Body; every Body goes away with the ſame Opinions they brought with them.

We may affirmat this Day, juſt as in *Lactantius*'s Time, that true Religion ought to be enquir'd after (*c*) by addreſſing to the pretended and ſeeming Fooliſhneſs under which God has been pleas'd to hide the Treaſures of his Wiſdom. (*d*) *Quid putemus fuiſſe cauſæ, cur tot ingeniis, totque temporibus ſummo ſtudio, & labore quæſita* (ſapientia) *non repeiretur; niſi quod eam philoſophi extra fines ſuos quæſierunt? Qui quoniam peragratis, & exploratis omnibus, nuſquam nullam ſapientiam comprehenderunt; & alicubi eſſe illam neceſſe eſt: apparet, illic potiſſimum eſſe quærendam, ubi* STULTITIÆ *titulus apparet; cujus velamento Deus, ne arcanum ſummi ſui divini operis in propatulo eſſet, theſaurum ſapientiæ, ac veritatis abſcondit.* The ſame *Lactantius* has judiciouſly obſerved in another Place, that it becomes the ſupreme Majeſty of God to ſpeak magiſterially, and to ſay in a few Words, this is true, and not to argue and add any Proofs to his Deciſions. (*e*) *Quæ* (divina) *quidem tradita ſunt breviter, ac nude; nec enim decebat aliter: ut cum Deus ad hominem loqueretur, argumentis aſſereret ſuas voces, tanquam fides ei non haberetur: ſed, ut oportuit, eſt locutus, quaſi rerum omnium maximus judex; cujus eſt non argumentari, ſed pronuntiare verum.* If *Seneca* ſays that there is nothing more inſipid than a Law with a Preface, and that a Law ſhould not diſpute, but command; if he ſays this of human Laws, much more ought it to be ſaid of the Law of God? (*f*) *Non probo, quod Platonis legibus adjecta principia ſunt. Legem enim brevem eſſe oportet, qu facilius ab imperitis teneatur, velut emiſſa divinitus vox ſit. Jubeat, non diſputet. Nihil videtur mihi frigidius, nihil ineptius, quàm lex cum prologo. Mone, dic quid me velis feciſſe: non diſco, ſed pareo.*

From all that has been ſaid, it is eaſie to conclude, that we can't be allarm'd with the Objections of the Scepticks, without diſcovering the Weakneſs of our Faith, and taking Things in a wrong Senſe, which ought to be taken in a right one.

A true Believer, a Chriſtian who well underſtands the Genius of his Religion, does not expect to ſee it agree with the Aphoriſms of the *Lyceum*, nor to find it able by the meer Strength of Reaſon, to confute the Difficulties of Reaſon. He well knows that natural Things have no Proportion with the ſupernatural; and that if a Philoſopher was deſired to level and adjuſt the Myſteries of the Goſpel with the *Ariſtotelian* Axioms, it would be requiring of him what is inconſiſtent with the Nature of Things. You muſt neceſſarily make an Option betwixt Philoſophy and the Goſpel: If you will believe nothing but what is evident and agreeable to common Notions, chooſe Philoſophy: If you'll believe the incomprehenſible Myſteries of Religion, take Chriſtianity and leave Philoſophy; for to poſſeſs Evidence and Incomprehenſibility together is a thing impoſſible. Once more, a true Chriſtian well inſtructed in the Character of ſupernatural Truths, and well grounded in the Principles peculiar to the Goſpel, will laugh at the Subtilties of Philoſophers, and eſpecially of the Scepticks. Faith will place him above the Regions, wherein the Tempeſts of Diſpute reign. He'll find himſelf ſeated where he can hear the Thunder of Arguments and Diſtinctions roar below him, without any Diſturbance: A Poſt, that will prove an (*g*) *Olympus*, and the true Temple of wiſe Men (*h*), from whence he will ſee in a perfect Tranquillity the Weakneſſes of Reaſon, and the Wandrings of mortal Men under the Conduct of ſuch a Guide. Every Chriſtian who ſuffers himſelf to be ſtartled with the Objections of Unbelievers, has one Foot in the ſame Ditch with them.

What I am going to ſay, may acquaint us how important it is to know the true Uſe of Things: Many People have ask'd, To what purpoſe I have ſet forth ſome *Sceptical* and *Manichean* Objections? They might have found the Anſwer to this Queſtion, if they had look'd for it in my Dictionary, where it is to be ſeen in an hundred Places, and particularly in the Remark C of the Article *Pyrrho* (*i*). But ſince they would not, or did not mind it, let us here examine their Difficulty more at large. I think they could not much complain, if I ſhould only ask them, To what purpoſe are all the Particularities we find in Hiſtories? Is it not certain that there are many Particulars mention'd by Hiſtorians, whoſe only Uſe conſiſts in pleaſing the

---

) *Jam.* . 5. & 6.

) *Tit.* 3. & 10.

) *This* ght to under- nd with ſpect to e Infi- le.

(*d*) *Lactant lib.* 4. *cap.* 2. *pag. m.* 226.

(*e*) *Id. lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. *pag.* 149.

(*f*) *Seneca epiſt.* 94. *pag. m.* 388.

(*g*) Ut altus Olympi Vertex, qui ſpatio ventos hiemeſque relinquit, Perpetuum nulla temeratus nube ſerenum, Celſior exſurgit pluviis auditque ruentes ſub pedibus nimbos, & raucum tonitrum calcat. *Claudian de Mall. Theod. Conſul. v.* 206. *pag. m.* 6.

(*h*) Nil dulcius eſt, benè quàm munita tenere Edita doctrina Sapientum templa ſerena; Deſpicere unde queas alios, paſſimque videre Errare, atque viam palanteis quærere vitæ, *Lucret. lib.* 2. *v.* 7.

(*i*) *See alſo the Remark F in the Article of* Zeno Eleaſtes *at the End.*

the Readers, and which may be hurtful in the Hands of thoſe who abuſe the beſt things? Does this diſpenſe an Hiſtorian from relating the Truth with all poſſible Exactneſs? Muſt not therefore an Hiſtorian of Opinions exactly and amply ſhew the ſtrong and weak Sides of them, tho' it ſhould accidently occaſion ſome Diſorder, and tho' no other Good ſhould proceed from it, but the Amuſement of the Reader, and an example of the regard that is due to the Laws of Hiſtory? But this is neither the ſole not the principal anſwer I am to give.

Nothing is more neceſſary than Faith, and nothing more Important than to underſtand well the worth of this Theological Virtue. But what's more proper to acquaint us with it, than meditating on the Attribute which diſtinguiſhes it from the other Acts of the Underſtanding? Its Eſſence conſiſts in imprinting in us a ſtrong perſwaſion of reveal'd Truths, by the motive of God's Authority. Thoſe who by Philoſophical Reaſons believe the Immortality of the Soul, are Orthodox, but ſo far they don't partake of the Faith we ſpeak of. They partake of it only as they believe this Doctrine, becauſe God has reveal'd it, and humbly ſubmit to the voice of God the moſt plauſible Arguments Philoſophy offers to perſwade them of the Soul's Mortality. Thus the merit of Faith is enlarg'd, in proportion, as reveal'd Truth, which is its Object, exceeds all the Powers of our Underſtanding; for the more the incomprehenſibility of this Object increaſes by the numerous Maxims of Natural Light which oppoſe it, we muſt needs Sacrifice to God's Authority a ſtronger repugnance of Reaſon, and conſequently we ſhew our ſelves more obedient to God, and give him a greater Teſtimony of our Reſpect, than if the thing was moderately difficult to believe. Whence was it that the Faith of the Patriarch of the Faithful was ſo Eminent and Illuſtrious? was it not becauſe (*a*) *he believed in hope againſt hope?* There had been no great Merit in hoping for a thing, naturally very probable, upon the Promiſe of God; the Merit therefore conſiſted in this, that the dependance upon this Promiſe ſeem'd contrary to all Appearances. Let us ſay alſo, that the moſt valuable Faith is that which upon the Divine Teſtimony embraces Truths moſt repugnant to Reaſon.

(*a*) *Rom.* 4. 18.

(*b*) *Converſation of Marechal d'Hoquincourt with Father Canaye among the Miſcellaneous Works of Mr. de S. Evremont, tom* 4. *pag.* 209. *Dutch Edit.* 1693.

This Thought has been expreſs'd in a bantering way by a maſterly Hand. (*b*) *The D . . . . take me if I believ'd any thing,* ſaid the Mareſchal *de Hocquincourt*; *but from that time I could indure the greateſt Torments for Religion: Not that I ſee more Reaſon in it; on the contrary, leſs than ever: Nevertheleſs, I could indure the greateſt Torments without knowing why. So much the better, my Lord, reply'd the Father with a devout twang, ſo much the better; theſe are not Humane Motions; this proceeds from God. No Reaſon. That's true Religion: No Reaſon. What a Grace, my Lord, has God given you!* Eſtote ſicut infantes, *be ye as Children: Children have ſtill their Innocence, and why? Becauſe they have no Reaſon.* Beati pauperes ſpiritu, *Bleſſed are the poor in Spirit: They don't Sin; the Reaſon of it is, that they have no Reaſon.* No Reaſon: I know not why: *What fine Sayings? They ought to be written in golden Letters.* Not that I ſee more Reaſon in it; on the contrary, leſs than ever. *Truly this is Divine to thoſe who have a taſte of Heavenly Things.* No Reaſon. *What a Grace, my Lord, has God given you.* Give this Thought a ſerious and modeſt turn, and it will become reaſonable. Here's the Proof of it. I take it from a Book wherein ſome Thoughts of Mr. *de Saint Evremont* are examin'd; and this amongſt others, that our underſtanding is not ſufficiently convinc'd of the truth of Religion.

(*c*) *Diſſertation ſur les oeuvres de Mr. de S. Evremont, pag.* 249. *& ſeq. Paris* 1698.

(1) *I. Part. qu.* 1. *a.* 8. *ad.* 2.

(*c*) "To anſwer clearly to this, we muſt obſerve a common Principle of Divines. The Mind is induc'd to believe Myſteries in a quite different way from that which gives it an evident Knowledge of Natural Things. It knows the latter by demonſtration, and it believes Myſteries upon motives of Credibility, ſuch as are the Miracles wrought by JESUS CHRIST, and his Apoſtles, the unanimous Belief of all the Faithful for ſeventeen Centuries, *&c.* All which Motives ought to induce us to believe prudently the Faith which the Church propoſes to us: And this well explains theſe words of St. *Paul, That in this preſent Life we ſee the Myſteries as Riddles, waiting to ſee them evidently in Heaven.* But Mr. *de St. Evremont* requires demonſtrations; and therefore will have no Faith. St. *Thomas* (1) ſays expreſly in ſome Places of his *Summa, That no Body ought to go about to demonſtrate the Myſteries of Religion*; and he adds in other Chapters, *That when the Fathers proved the Faith, they did not pretend that their Arguments were demonſtrative, but only ſolid Motives to induce us to believe the Arguments propounded to us.* Why, ſays Mr. *de St. Evremont*, is not our Reaſon enlightned; becauſe, as St. *Thomas* ſays, Reaſon muſt ſubmit to Faith. Upon which I call to mind ſome Words of *Petrus Bleſenſis* in his 140th Epiſtle written to *Petrus Diaconus*, who was with the King of *England*. After he had ſpoke of the Myſtery of Tranſubſtantiation, *Reaſon*, adds he, *does not go ſo far, but we are carried thither by Faith; a Faith that is ſo much the ſtronger as it is not ſupported by Natural Reaſon. Reaſon grows weak where Faith grows ſtrong: Reaſon is overcome that Faith may be more Meritorious: However, don't think,* adds this Father, *that Reaſon envies the ſuperiority of Faith; on the contrary, it voluntarily and humbly ſubmits to it. It will reſume its Light in Heaven, where Faith will not be, and then Reaſon will reap what Faith ſows in the preſent Life; and 'tis juſt it ſhould reap the fruits of Faith, ſince at preſent it depreſſes it ſelf, that Faith may reign with a full Power.*"

This is the Doctrine of the *Roman* Catholicks: Take from it Tranſubſtantiation, and put the Trinity, for Inſtance, in its room, and the moſt Orthodox Proteſtant Divinity will ſubſcribe to it. I ſhall quote two Proteſtants, whoſe Teſtimony will have the more Weight, becauſe they are of ſuch Profeſſions, as are not thought to be

Schools which beſt teach the humbling of Reaſon, and the exaltation of Faith: One is a Phyſician, the other a Mathematician; the former declares (a), that when he meditates on Myſteries, he always ſtops when Reaſon is arrived to this Point, *O the depth!* He proteſts, that if rebellious Reaſon, or the Devil, endeavour to perplex him, he diſengages himſelf from all their Snares, by this one Paradox of *Tertullian*, This is certain, becauſe 'tis impoſſible. (b) *Nodos illos de Trinitate, Incarnatione & Reſurrectione, animi relaxandi gratia mecum interdum ſolitarius meditor, mentemque in his comprehendendis exercere ſoleo. Quæcumque mihi, aut Satanas, aut ratio rebellis objiciat, ea omnia uno illo paradoxo Tertulliani concilio expedio*; Certum eſt, quia impoſſibile eſt. There are ſome, continues he, who believe more eaſily becauſe they have ſeen the Sepulchre of JESUS CHRIST, and the Red Sea; but, for my part, I congratulate my ſelf for not having ſeen JESUS CHRIST and his Apoſtles, nor living in the Age of Miracles; my Faith would then have been involuntary, and I ſhould have no ſhare in this Bleſſing, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen and yet have believed.* He has a great Notion of the Faith of thoſe that lived before JESUS CHRIST; for tho' they had nothing but Shadows and Types, and ſome obſcure Oracles, they waited for things that ſeem'd impoſſible. (c) *Sunt qui promptius credunt, quod Chriſti ſepulchrum ſpectaverint, marique rubro viſo de miraculo nihil dubitant. Ego vero mihi gratulor, quod in miraculorum tempore non vixerim, quod nunquam aut Chriſtum, aut Diſcipulos viderim, quod nec cum Iſraelitis mare rubrum tranſierim, nec in eorum numero fuerim quos Chriſtus per miracula ſanavit: hic enim mihi nolenti volenti credendum fuiſſet, nec ad me pertinuiſſet benedictio de omnibus illis pronunciata, qui non videntes crediderint. Facilis eſt eorum, & neceſſaria credulitas, quia ea credunt, quæ oculi & ſenſus exploraverint. Eum mortuum & ſepultum reſurrexiſſe credo, inque gloria ejus potius quam in cenotaphio & ſepulchro contemplari cupio. Hæc autem credere minimum eſt; hanc fidem, ut æquum eſt, hiſtoriæ debemus. Illis erat præ cæteris nobilis & animoſa fides, qui ante adventum ejus vixerant: ex obſcuris enim vaticiniis, myſticiſque typis credenda expiſcati, expectarunt ea, quæ impoſſibilitatem quandam præ ſe ferebant.* He ſays, that Faith may not improperly be call'd a Sword (d) which cuts all the Knots we meet with in the Myſteries of Religion; but however, he uſes it rather as a Shield, finding that a Man becomes invulnerable in theſe ſorts of Combats, who arms himſelf with it. Upon ſome Heads he mentions the Objections that Reaſon and Experience ſuggeſted to him, and adds, that notwithſtanding this his Faith is very ſteady, and that Faith, in order to be perfect, will believe things not only above Reaſon, but that ſeem repugnant to Reaſon, and to the Teſtimony of the Senſes. (e) *Veriſſima tamen eſſe hæc omnia credo, quæ tamen falſa eſſe mihi ratio perſuadere parat. Nec fidei eſſe vulgaris arbitror res hujuſmodi credere, quæ non rationem tantum ſuperare, ſed & ipſi, & ſenſuum teſtimoniis repugnare videntur.*

Note, That this Writer ſpeaks thus in a Book, Entituled, *Religio medici, the Religion of the Phyſician*, and which, as ſome ſay, might be call'd, *The Phyſician of Religion*; a Book in one word that made ſome People believe that the Author (f) was ſomewhat remote from the Kingdom of Heaven. Therefore theſe words of the Goſpel might be applied to him, *I have not found ſo great Faith, no not in* Iſrael. (g)

The Mathematician I am to quote, publiſh'd a Piece at *London* of 36 Pages in 4*to.* in 1699. Entituled, *Theologiæ Chriſtianæ principia Mathematica.* He pretends, that the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion are only probable, and reduces the degrees of their probability, and of the decreaſe of it, to Geometrical Calculations. He finds that it may ſtill laſt 1454 Years, from whence he concludes, that JESUS CHRIST will return before that time. He dedicates this Book to the Biſhop of *Salisbury*, and ſhews in his Epiſtle dedicatory, that thoſe who ſhall blame him for calling the Principles of Chriſtianity only probable, are ſuch as have not well examined the Foundations of their Religion, and do not well underſtand the nature of Faith. Whence, ſays he, has this Virtue ſo many Encomiums given it in the Scripture, and ſo many Recompences promiſed it? Is it not becauſe it makes Men walk in the right Way, notwithſtanding all the Stumbling-blocks and the Fetters they meet with? I ſhall ſet down his Words: (h) *Quoſdam fore non dubito, majori ductos zelo quam judicio qui meos prorſus condemnabunt labores, meque Religionem potius evertere quam aſtruere temere nimis concludent. Illi utique omnia Religionis dogmata tanquam certiſſima amplectentes rem Chriſtianiſmo indignam me præſtitiſſe putabunt, qui ejus probabilitatem tantum evincere conatus fuerim. Illis vero ego nihil jam habeo quod dicam, niſi quod præjudiciis ſuis præoccupati, Religionis quam profitentur, fundamenta non accuratè ſatis hactenus examinaverint, nec fidei, quæ tantopere in ſacris literis laudatur, naturam ritè intellexerint. Quid enim eſt fides? niſi illa mentis perſuaſio qua propter media ex probabilitate deducta, quaſdam propoſitiones veras eſſe credimus. Si perſuaſio ex certitudine oriatur, tum non fides ſed ſcientia in mente producitur. Sicut enim probabilitas fidem generat, ita etiam ſcientiam evertit & e contra: Certitudo ſcientiam ſimul generat & fidem deſtruit. Unde ſcientia omnem dubitandi anſam aufert, dum fides aliquam ſemper hæſitationem in mente relinquit: & propterea fides tantis inſignitur laudibus, tantaque ſibi annexa præmia habet, quod homines non obſtantibus omnibus illis quibus premuntur ſcrupulis in recto virtutis & pietatis tramite progrediantur, quæque Creatori ſuo omnipotenti grata futura credunt ſumma ope præſtare conentur: Se tam paratos eſſe juſſis quibuſcunque divinis obſequi oſtendunt, ut ne ea quidem quæ probabiliter tantum ab ipſo proveniant, rejicere velint.*

There are ſo many who ſo little examine the nature of Divine Faith, and reflect ſo ſeldom upon this Act of their Mind, that they want to be rouſed from their incogitancy, by a long enumeration of Difficulties that encompaſs the Doctrines of the

(a) *Obſcuris aliquando deviiſque veſtigiis myſteriorum aliquod libens ſequor, donec ad O Altitudo ratio perveniat. Thomas Browne religio medici parte* 1. *ſect.* 8. *pag. m.* 46.

(b) *Id. ib.*

(c) *Id. ib.*

(d) Nec durior erit metaphora, ſi quis dicat: Gladius fidei. Eadem tamen in hujuſmodi nodis pro clypeo potius utor, quo titulo ab Apoſtolo inſignitur: cumque invulnerabilem fore comperi, qui hoc munitus in certamen deſcenderit. *Id. ib. ſect.* 9 *pag.* 48.

(e) *Id. ib. pag.* 49.

(f) *See* Patin's 3 *Letter, pag.* 13. *of the* 1*ſt. Volume.*

(g) *Matt.* viii. 10.

(h) *Johannes Craig, epiſt. dedicat.*

Chriſtian Religion. 'Tis by a lively ſenſe of thoſe Difficulties we learn the excellency of Faith, and of this gift of God. Hereby we learn alſo to miſtruſt Reaſon, and have recourſe to Grace. Thoſe who know nothing of the great Conteſt betwixt Reaſon and Faith, and are ignorant of the force of Philoſophical Objections, are not fully ſenſible of God's Goodneſs to them, and of the Method of triumphing over all the Temptations of preſumptuous Reaſon.

The true way of humbling it is, to know that if it be capable of inventing Objections, it is incapable of reſolving them, and in a word, that it is not by Reaſon that the Goſpel was eſtabliſh'd. (*a*) "'Tis only Faith that can teach that Divine Philoſophy, which none of (1) the Princes of this World had known. Whoever opens his Eyes to ſo pure a Light is truly enlighten'd. 'Twas not by ſtrength of Syllogiſms and Arguments that this Philoſophy recommended it ſelf to Men; but by its ſimplicity and the ignorance of thoſe that preach'd it to the World .... Faith having diſcover'd to Man the falſe glimpſes that ſhone in the Heathen Philoſophy, taught him not to reaſon upon things which God will not have ſubmitted to reaſoning, and let him know, that 'tis better to be ignorant of what God is pleaſed to conceal, and reſpectfully to adore the Secrets he has not revealed, than to attempt to fathom this Abyſs of Light, by the raſhneſs of our Conjectures, and the weak views of our Reaſon. 'Twas by this Divine Ray of Faith, that the Believer took pleaſure in ſacrificing that inſolent Curioſity, which made him too raſhly examine the Works of God, and ſtifling all the views of that proud Reaſon, which fixes him to the Creatures to make him a Rebel againſt the Creator. 'Twas by the Rays of this Celeſtial Light, that the Chriſtian perceived it was better to yield than to argue in Point of Religion; that narrowneſs of Wit is more advantageous to be a Believer, than all the force and penetration of the Mind, and that the ſimplicity of Faith is preferable to all the pomp of Science. Since the Works of God which have moſt the impreſs of his Omnipotence, and his Character, are thoſe we the leaſt comprehend; and therefore nothing is more juſt than to humble our Reaſon, and ſubmit it to the Light of Eternal Reaſon, which is the Rule of all Reaſons: and indeed there is no Science but requires ſubmiſſion for the eſtabliſhment of its Principles." I conclude with two very fine Thoughts of Mr. *de St. Evremont*. "(*b*) As to things purely Natural, 'tis for the Mind to conceive them, and its Knowledge proceeds from its application to the Objects. As to Supernatural Things, the Soul takes hold of them, loves them, faſtens and unites it ſelf to them, without being able to comprehend them. God has better prepar'd our Hearts for the impreſſion of Grace, than our Underſtandings for that of Knowledge. His Immenſity confounds our narrow Underſtanding. His Goodneſs is more adapted to our Love. There is ſomething unaccountable at the bottom of our Souls, which is ſecretly moved by a God, we cannot know ..... Who well conſiders the Chriſtian Religion, would think that God means to keep it in the dark from our Underſtanding, and make it turn upon the Motions of our Heart ...... (*c*) Provided a Man has reduc'd his Reaſon, ſo far as not to argue upon things which God would not have ſubjected to reaſoning, 'tis all he can deſire. I not only believe with *Solomon*, that a wiſe Man's ſilence is better in this Caſe than the diſcourſe of a Philoſopher, but I have a greater Eſteem for the Faith of the moſt ſtupid Peaſant, than for all the Leſſons of *Socrates*.

(*a*) *Rapin, Reflexions ſur la philoſophie pag. m.* 477.

(1) Veritas per Chriſtum: *Joann. cap.* 1. loquimur ſapientiam quam nemo principum hujus ſeculi novit *Paul.* 1. *Cor. c.* 6.

(*b*) *Saint Evremont, œuvres mêlées tom.* 3. *pag. m.* 51.

(*c*) *Id. ib. tom.* 2. *pag.* 24.

This, I think, is more than ſufficient to remove the Scruples which the pretended Triumph of the Scepticks had raiſed in the Minds of ſome of my Readers.

EXPLANATION. IV. *Concerning Obſcenities.*

That if there are ſome Obſcenities in this Book, they are ſuch as can't be juſtly cenſured.

BY ſaying there are Obſcenities in any Book, may be underſtood,

I. Either that the Author gives the Deſcription of his Debaucheries in lewd Terms, Applauds and Congratulates himſelf for them, exhorts his Readers to a laſcivious Life, recommends it to them as the moſt effectual Means of enjoying ones ſelf, and pretends that the Diſcourſes of People are to be laugh'd at, and that the Maxims of the Vertuous ought to be ſlighted as Old Womens Tales.

II. Or, that the Author relates in a free and jovial Stile, ſome Love Adventures, feign'd as to the Subſtance or at leaſt as to their Circumſtances, and Flouriſhes; and introduces into his Narrative many wanton Incidents, which he dreſſes in all the Charms imaginable, in order to make 'em diverting, and fitter to raiſe the deſire of Love Intrigues, than for any thing elſe.

III. Or, that the Author meditating Revenge upon an unfaithful Miſtreſs, or excuſing the Tranſports of his Paſſion, or making Invectives againſt an old Curtezan, or Celebrating his Friend's Marriage, or diverting himſelf with merry Thoughts, gives a free ſcope to his Muſe, and writes Epigrams, Epithalmium's, *&c.* whoſe Expreſſions are very obſcene.

IV.

IV. *Or*, that the Author inveighing againſt Lewdneſs, deſcribes it in too lively, naked and groſs Colours.

V. *Or*, that the Author in a Tract of Phyſick, Natural Philoſophy, or Civil Law, expreſſes himſelf filthily upon the Subject of Generation, or, the Cauſes and Remedies of Barrenneſs, or the Motives of Divorce, *&c.*

VI. *Or*, that the Author commenting upon *Catullus*, *Petronius*, or *Martial*, has fill'd his Commentary with ſmutty Diſcourſes.

VII. *Or*, that the Author giving the Hiſtory of a Sect, or Perſon, whoſe Actions were Infamous, has nakedly related a great many things offenſive to chaſte Ears.

VIII. *Or*, that the Author treating of Caſes of Conſcience, and particularly of the different Species of Carnal Sins, has ſaid many things that Modeſty can't eaſily digeſt.

IX. *Or*, laſtly, that the Author relating Hiſtorical Facts carefully cited from other Authors, which are obſcene and immodeſt, and making a Comment on his Narrative to illuſtrate it with Teſtimonies, Reflections, and Proofs, *&c.* ſometimes produces the Words of free Writers, ſuch as Phyſicians, Lawyers, or Poets; but ſays nothing that explicity or implicity contains the Approbation of Impurity; on the contrary, undertakes on many Occaſions, to create an Abhorrence for it, and to confute looſe Morals.

Theſe, I think, are the chief Caſes wherein a Writer can be accus'd of venting Obſcenities.

In the firſt Caſe, he deſerves not only all the ſevereſt Puniſhments of the Canon Law, but ought alſo to be proſecuted by the Magiſtrate as a diſturber of the publick Modeſty, and a profeſs'd Enemy to Vertue.

As to thoſe of the 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th Claſs, let every one judge of 'em as he pleaſes: I am not concern'd in them, mine being only the ninth Caſe; and 'tis ſufficient for me to examine what concerns that ninth kind of Obſcenity. However, I will make two or three general Reflexions upon the reſt.

THREE general Obſervations upon ſome ſorts of Obſcenities that are to be found in ſeveral Authors.

I ſay, in the firſt place, that there are ſeveral degrees in the ſeven Claſſes of Writers, whom I leave to the Reader's Judgment. A Man may keep himſelf within bounds, or may exceed them: This prodigiouſly varies the Differences and Proportions; and it would be very unjuſt to pronounce the ſame Sentence againſt all the Writers of the ſecond Claſs. The (a) hundred *Nouvelles nouvelles*, thoſe of the Queen of *Navarre*, *Boccacio's Decameron*, *la Fontaine*'s Tales don't deſerve the ſame rigour as *Aretin's Raggionamenti*, and the *Aloiſia Sigæa Toletana*. The Authors of theſe two laſt Works deſerve, as well as *Ovid*, to be placed in the firſt Claſs of obſcene Authors.

I obſerve ſecondly, that in all Times abundance of Men have agreed in condemning Obſcenities; and yet this never ſeem'd to be a deciſion of equal force with the Decrees, to which Poets, Commentators, *&c.* are obliged to conform on the penalty of being excluded the Rank of Honeſt Men. The Cenſurers of Obſcenities ſeem the more capable of terminating the Queſtion by a deciſive and executive Sentence, in the whole Commonwealth of Learning, becauſe they might make up a Senate out of all ſorts of Men. There would be in it not only Perſons venerable for the Auſterity of their Lives, and Sacred Character, but alſo Sword Men and profeſs'd Gallants, and, in a word, many who give Scandal by their voluptuous Life. This is a Prejudice of great weight; for the liberty of wanton Verſes muſt needs be an ill thing, 'tis diſclaim'd by thoſe very Perſons who live in Debauchery. But in vain have obſcene Writings been exclaim'd againſt, it has had no effect to diſtinguiſh between Honeſt and Diſhoneſt Men. There has been all along in the Republick of Learning, a right or liberty of publiſhing Writings of this Nature. This Right has never been liable to Preſcription, which has been prevented by many Men of Merit, by reaſon of the freedom they have given themſelves in ſuch ſort of Works; and this has brought no (b) Infamy upon them, nor any ways Incapacitated them for the Enjoyment of all the Honours and Privileges belonging to their State, nor prevented the Preferments they might hope for from their Fortune.

A Man would be hiſſed that ſhould go to prove *Boccacio* to have been a baſe Man, becauſe he writ the *Decameron*; or conclude, that the Queen of *Navarre*, Siſter to *Francis* I. was not a Princeſs of admirable Virtue, whoſe Praiſes reſounded every where, becauſe ſhe writ ſome Novels of Gallantry. *Antonius Panormita* loſt nothing, either of his Fortune or Fame, by his ſalacious Poem of the Hermaphrodite. The ſame may be ſaid of *Benedict le Court*, and the famous *Tiraquellus*: The former writing a Comment on *Martial d'Auvergne*'s Decrees of Love, gave himſelf great liberty: *Nonnunquam, etiam* ſays he in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to a Counſellor of the Parliament of *Paris*, *quod in amore jocatus ſim laſciviente calamo*: and every Body knows how many obſcene Collections *Tiraquellus* incerted in his Commentaries upon Matrimonial Laws. Did *Scipio du Pleix* uſe any Periphraſes or Reſerves in his Book call'd, *La curioſité naturelle redigée en queſtions ſelon l'ordre alphabetique*? Did he not explain things in the moſt natural terms imaginable? What did he loſe by that Book? Nothing at all. I ſhould never end, ſhould I undertake to give a Liſt of all the Civilians, who in Trials of Adultery or Impotency have alledged many Obſcenities, without any prejudice to their Reputation. I have named (c) three or four, *Antony Hotman*, *Sebaſtian Roulliard*, *Vincent Tagereau*, and *Annæus Robert*; this is enough: Let us name ſome Perſons of another Order.

(a) *They have been reprinted at Amſterdam in 1701. in 2. volumes in 12.*

(b) *I don't pretend to extend this to particular Caſes not confin'd within certain Bounds, nor to Perſons who are otherwiſe infamous for their Actions.*

(c) *See the Articles* Quellenec *&* Robert.

The *Dutch* could not endure that any Body should defame *Secundus* as an ill Man and a Rascal, or so much as deny that he was an honest Man, under pretence that he writ very lascivious Verses. *Ramirez de Prado*, who writ Notes upon *Martial*, printed at *Paris* with the King's License 1607, and full of lewd Explications, lost nothing by this of his Reputation or Fortune, no more than *Gonzales de Salas* for his Commentary of the same kind upon (*a*) an obscene Author. *Joubert* Chancellor of the University of *Montpellier*, and Physician to the King of *France*, and to the King of *Navarre*, lost neither his Honours nor his Pensions, nor his Preferments, for inserting several Obscenities in his Book of vulgar Errors. Nor is he on that Account esteem'd a less illustrious and honest Man. Did *Quillet's Callipædia* hinder him from being recompenc'd with an Abbey by Cardinal *Mazarin*? *Feramus*, Advocate in the Parliament of *Paris*, did not find that his Merit was less extoll'd, or acknowledg'd after he had writ Verses against *Montmaur*, wherein he sported with very obscene Fictions. And to come nearer our own Time, Was Mr. *de la Fontaine*, who publish'd so many lewd Stories less caress'd by every Body at Court and City? Great Lords and Princes, the Ladies of the highest Rank, the most illustrious Persons of the long Robe, have all courted and admired him. Was he not admitted into the *French* Academy? And is not that Honour for a Man of his Character, equivalent to a Mareschal's Staff for a Sword-Man? I doubt not but Mr. *de la Reinie* would have gladly entertain'd him at his Table (*b*) the very Day that he condemn'd his new Tales; in that kind of Books wise Men know how to distinguish between the Person of the Author, and his Writings.

Let us see whether the Protestants have been more rigid. I don't think that the Consistories ever thought of censuring *Ambrose Paré*, whose anatomical Books written in the vulgar Tongue, were very full of filthy Things. There are many Obscenities in *Joseph Scaliger's* Commentaries upon the *Priapeia* and *Catullus*. There are more still in *Janus Douza's* Commentary upon *Petronius*. One of those two Writers was Professor at *Leyden*, and the other was one of the Curators of that University. They did not lose in the least upon that Account their Authority, and the great Esteem they were in; and tho' *Beza* mightily exclaim'd against 'em in an Epistle (*c*) dedicatory to the States General, his Out-crys were not minded. *Daniel Heinsius*, Professor in the same University, enjoyed all the Honours he could pretend to. He was one of the Secretaries of the Synod of *Dort*, and receiv'd, on a thousand Occasions, many Testimonies of Esteem; and yet he publish'd some Poems that are far from being modest. What he and *Scriverius* call'd *Baudii amores*, is a very wanton Collection; and 'tis to be observ'd, that *Scriverius* was a Man of Merit, and of great Note among the Learned in *Holland*. Notwithstanding *Beza's* Exhortation, *Theodorus* (*d*) *de Juges* put out an Edition of *Petronius* with his *Prolegomena*, wherein he endeavoured to justifie those who explain the Obscenities of that *Roman* Author. It does not appear that *Theodorus de Juges* did suffer in his Reputation or Fortune upon that Account. He was a Protestant, and some Persons of his Family were Counsellors in the Court of *Castres*, whose Members were one half Protestants and the other *Roman* Catholicks; and he spent a considerable Part of his Life at *Geneva*. *Goldastus* enjoyed the same Impunity after his Edition of *Petronius*, which he publish'd with his *Prolegomena*, wherein he undertook to justify the Reading of such an Author, and made a particular Answer to *Beza's* Reflections. Shall I say that the famous *D'Aubigne* was very much respected at *Geneva*, tho' the cynical Liberty of his Pen was a notorious Thing? Shall I observe that the Consistory of *Charenton* never had any Thoughts of complaining of Mr. *Menjot*, tho' his Writings about Physick are intermixed with many obscene Things? Shall I add that *Isaac Vossius* being a Canon of *Windsor*, when he publish'd a Book full of filthy Things, the Dean and the Chapter did not meet to inflict upon him at least the slightest Punishment, *viz.* that of being censured for it?

'Tis therefore no wonder if the Faction contrary to those, who condemn Obscenities, did always maintain it self in the Common-wealth of Learning; for besides their alledging many Reasons for their Opinion, they shelter themselves under the Authority of many Examples. You may see those Reasons and those Examples in the *Prolegomena* of *Goldastus* upon *Petronius*. All those who have apologized for the Philosophers or *Casuists*, who advance obscene Things, alledge Reasons against Reasons, and Authorities against Authorities. They want neither great Names nor grave Testimonies, (*e*) *magno se judice quisque tuetur*. But don't think that I suppose that their Reasons and those of their Adversaries, to have the same Force. I have declar'd in several Places, that I absolutely condemn *Catullus's* Obscenity, and those of his Imitators, and the great Freedom of the *Casuists*; and I add now, that the Arguments alledged by those who plead for the Liberty of inserting obscene Things in an Epigram, seem very weak, if compared (*f*) with the contrary Arguments. I further say, that an Obscenity not so gross as others, and only design'd for a Jest, seems to me to be more blameable than a very obscene Invective design'd to create an Abhorrence for Impurity. And as for the Obscenities of the Stage, I am of Opinion, that they ought to be severely punish'd by the Magistrate. They are only a School of Debauchery, and belong rather to the first Class than to the seven Classes that follow it, and which make the Subject of my preliminary Remarks. I have still one more to offer.

For I say in the third Place, That if any one shou'd alledge that it were better for the Writers of these seven Classes, to apply themselves only to serious Matters, and to treat them with all the Modesty required by the Gospel, he would depart from the State of the Question. This Advice, tho' very good in it self, is not pertinent

(*a*) Petronius.

(*b*) *It was The 5th of* April 1675. *the Sentence may be seen at the End of the 3d Case of* Furetiere, *whereby the Sale of the Book is prohibited, and 'tis order'd that an Information shall be made about the Impression and Sale of it.*

(*c*) *That of his Sermon upon* CHRIST's *Resurrection.*

(*d*) *Mr.* Mentel *upon the Word* Joannes Caius Tilebomenus *calls him* Thomas de Judicibus *in the Preface to the* Judicium de Fragmento Traguriensi Petronii. *His Mistake about the Christian Name is more excusable than that of M.* de Clavigny de Sainte Honorine, *who, page 25. of his Tract concerning suspicious Books, pretends that* Theodorus de Juges *was called* Goldstadius. *He meant that* Goldastus *and* Theodorus de Juges *were the same Author.*

nent on this Occaſion, ſince they might anſwer, that the Queſtion is not, Whether they have choſen the good Part, and whether they have pitch'd upon the beſt Uſe they cou'd make of their Leiſure and Pen, but only whether they have taken a Liberty condemn'd, upon Pain of Ignominy, by the Statutes of the Common-wealth of Learning, the Regulations of civil Policy, and the Laws of the State? They wou'd readily acknowledge, that they could not avoid being condemn'd, if they were judged by the Laws of the Goſpel; but they wou'd maintain that all Writers are in the ſame Predicament, more or leſs, there being none but who may be told, that he might have pitch'd upon a better Employment: for to give an Inſtance of it, a Divine who has ſpent all his Time in writting Commentaries upon the Scripture, might have made a more pious Uſe of it. Had it not been better for him to divide the Day between mental Prayer and Works of Charity? Why did he not ſpend Part of the Day in mediating upon the Greatneſs of God, and the four laſt Ends? Why did he not ſpend the other in going from one Hoſpital to another to relieve the Poor, and from Houſe to Houſe, to comfort Afflicted Perſons and inſtruct little Children? Seeing therefore no Man can give a good Account of his Time at the Tribunal of the Divine Juſtice, and every Body ſtands in need of Mercy on account of many uſeleſs Things, and for having choſen what was not the moſt neceſſary Part; the Perſons I ſpeak of wou'd appeal to another Juriſdiction, and ask whether they have done any Thing for which in the Judgment of the Publick, and before the Tribunal of the Magiſtrates, they deſerve to loſe the Quality of honeſt Men, and to be deprived of the Rank and Privileges of Men of Honour. We deſire a Thing, wou'd they ſay, which can't be refus'd to many honeſt Women who go to the Play-Houſe and to the Balls, who love Gaming and fine Cloaths, and who are ſo fond of their Beauty, as to mind all the Ornaments that will ſet it off to the beſt Advantage. They are not ſo ignorant as not to know that their Conduct is not agreeable to the Precepts of the Goſpel; but whilſt they do nothing elſe, they may lawfully pretend to the Quality, Rank, and Privileges of Women of Honour. They deſerve to be cenſured by the Preachers and the Chriſtian Moraliſts, I grant it: but till the Publick, or the Magiſtrates have fix'd a Note of Infamy upon ſuch a Courſe of Life, they cannot be call'd diſhoneſt Women; and whoever ſhou'd call 'em ſo, wou'd be oblig'd to make 'em a due Satisfaction. They may alledge the Practice of all Ages, ſince there have been at all times many virtuous Women, who lov'd Gaming, Plays, Balls, and Jewels; and after all, they don't offend againſt the Laws of the State, nor againſt the Rules of humane Honour, and are not guilty of any Irregularity, that is the peculiar Character of gallant Women. The Poets, who make too plain a Deſcription of a Wedding-Night in an *Epithalamium*, may alledge the ſame Reaſons: they'll own that their Muſe might have pitch'd upon a more laudable Subject, and that the Compoſition of a Chriſtian Sonnet is preferable to that; but this very Compoſition is not the beſt thing they cou'd have done. It had been better for them to ſpend their Time in praying, and ſerving the Poor in Hoſpitals, *&c.* There is hardly any Employment but what may be blamed for this Reaſon, that a better one might have been pitch'd upon; and of all Profeſſions there is hardly any that is more to blame, if we judge of it by the Rules of Religion, than that which is moſt common; I mean the Profeſſion of thoſe who make it their Buſineſs to get Money either by Trading or other fair Means. Humanly ſpeaking, the moſt lawful Means of growing Rich are contrary, not only to the Spirit of the Goſpel, but alſo to the formal Prohibitions of CHRIST and his Apoſtles. And therefore it highly concerns all Men, that God ſhould be merciful to them for not making the beſt Uſe of their Time. The Poets I ſpeak of, having laid down this Principle, add, that they only tread in the Steps of many Perſons illuſtrious for their Vertue and Wiſdom; that the Liberty they take, always prevail'd among honeſt Men; that if it had been laid aſide for ſome Ages to be the peculiar Character of Debauchery, they could not be excuſed; but that it will appear that they may claim the Right of Poſſeſſion, (*a*) and that a Thing which has been practis'd by ſo many honeſt Men, cannot be accounted diſhoneſt. This is a Maxim of *Pliny* about the preſent Queſtion. He was one of the greateſt Wits, and one of the moſt honeſt Men of his Time; he made ſome Verſes (*b*) that were thought to be ſomewhat impudent, and was blamed for it: He alledged many great Examples in his Vindication, and would not inſtance upon the Emperor *Nero*, tho', ſaid he, I am not ignorant that Things don't grow worſe, becauſe they are ſometimes practiſed by wicked Men, and that they continue to be honeſt, when they are often practiſed by honeſt Men (*c*).

Thus much for the Poets. Now I muſt obſerve that the Authors belonging to the other Claſſes abovemention'd, may alledge the ſame Reaſons. Nay, ſome of 'em may ſay ſomething more ſpecious: A natural Philoſopher, for Inſtance, and a Phyſician, may maintain, that their Profeſſion requires they ſhou'd explain what concerns Generation, Barrenneſs, the Green-ſickneſs, a Woman's Delivery, and the *Furor uterinus*, as well as Fermentation, and what concerns the Spleen, the Gout, *&c.* A Caſuiſt will ſay, that it's neceſſary Confeſſors and Penitents ſhou'd be informed of the ſeveral Ways of offending againſt Chaſtity, as well as of the ſeveral Frauds that are committed in Purchaſes.

At leaſt we ought to do thoſe Authors this Juſtice, not to judge of their Words by their Writings. No neceſſary Conſequence can be drawn from one of thoſe two Things to the other. Some Poets are chaſte in their Verſes, and in their Lives; ſome are neither chaſte in their Verſes nor in their Lives; ſome are only chaſte in their Verſes

(*a*) *I ſay nothing of the Liberty* M. de Voiture *takes in his Poems. This is no new thing among Poets: They have long-ago proſtituted the Chaſtity of the Muſes. They alledge their multitude in their Vindication. There is no diſputing to them a Poſſeſſion, which they have preſcribed ſo many Ages ſince by the Conſent of all Nations.* Gitac. Reſponſe à la defenſe de Voiture pag. 74.

(*b*) *See the* 14*th Letter of the* 4 *Book of* Pliny *and the* 3*d of the* 5 *Book.*

(*c*) Neronem tranſeo, quamvis ſciam non corrumpi in deterius, quæ aliquando etiam à bonis fiunt. *Plin. epiſt.* 3. *lib.* 5. *pag. m.* 289.

Verſes; and ſome are not chaſte in their Verſes, tho' they are ſo in their Lives. All the wanton Strokes of their Epigrams, are only witty Conceits; their *Candida*'s and their *Leſbia*'s are fictitious Miſtreſſes: The Proteſtants cannot deny it of *Beza*, ſince he declares (a) that he lived a regular Life when he writ the Poems, intituled, *Juvenalia*, of which he did ſo much repent.

WHAT Courſe I have taken with reſpect to Obſcenities.

After theſe general Obſervations, I ſhall proceed to the Examination of what concerns this Dictionary; and the firſt Thing I ſhall obſerve upon this Head is, that if thoſe Obſervations are not look'd upon as a ſolid Juſtification, I ſhall never be the worſe for it; but if they are approved, they'll be of great Uſe to me. I am in far better Circumſtances than all (b) the Authors I have mention'd; for tho' *Catullus*, *Lucretius*, *Juvenal*, and *Suetonius* be never ſo much condemn'd, a Writer, who quotes them, cannot be blamed for it. Thoſe Authors are to be had in all the Bookſellers Shops; the Paſſages quoted out of 'em, cannot be more dangerous than they are in thoſe Authors themſelves; and there is a vaſt Difference between the firſt Authors of an Obſcenity and thoſe, who mention it only as the Proof of a Fact, or of an Argument which the Subject in hand requires from them. Granting that *Joubert* expreſs'd himſelf too immodeſtly, Does it follow from thence that I cou'd not alledge his Teſtimony, when I was to criticize a very weak Argument alledged againſt thoſe who accuſed the Phyſician *Herlicius* of Lewdneſs? However it be, if the Excuſes alledged in favour of *Suetonius*, *Joubert*, &c. are good and ſolid, all the better for me; if they are not good, it can do me no Prejudice; my Caſe is different from theirs, and much better. What they may ſay in their Vindication, may be alledged by me with greater Reaſon; and what is a weak Argument for them, may be a very ſtrong one for me. You need only compare together the nine Claſſes mention'd by me, and you'll find that the laſt, which belongs to my Work, is leſs liable to a juſt Cenſure.

This will more evidently appear, if I add to what I have ſaid above, concerning the nature of my Cauſe, this Conſideration, *viz.* That I have avoided three things that might have occaſion'd juſt Complaints.

In the firſt place, whenever I have ſaid any thing of my own, I have avoided all manner of Words and Expreſſions that are contrary to Common Civility and Decency, which is ſufficient in a Work of this Nature, intermix'd with Hiſtorical Narratives, and all ſorts of Diſcuſſions; for whoever ſhould pretend that a Compilation made up of Matters relating to Literature, Phyſicks and Juriſprudence, ought to be written according to the moſt ſtrict Rules of Decency obſerv'd in a Sermon, or in a Pious Book, wou'd confound things, and ſet up a kind of Tyranny over Mens Minds. A Word that ſeems unbecoming in the Mouth of a Preacher, and in a ſmall Romance deſign'd for the reading of the Ladies, will not appear ſo in a Caſe written by a Lawyer, nor in the verbal Proceſs of a Phyſician, nor in a Book of Natural Philoſophy, nor even in a Piece relating to Philology, or in the faithful Tranſlation of a *Latin* Book, ſuch as the relation of *Abelard*'s Misfortune. 'Tis therefore certain, that there are ſeveral degrees of Decency, with reſpect to the Style: The higheſt degrees belong to ſome Writers, and not to all. If an Ingenious Man was deſired by ſome Ladies to write a Romantick Hiſtory of *Jupiter*'s or *Hercules*'s Adventures, he ſhould never uſe the words, *to Geld*, *to Deflower*, *to get with Child*, *to lie with a Nymph*, *to Raviſh her*; he ſhould lay aſide every thing that might excite thoſe Ideas, or keep 'em at a diſtance by general and enigmatical Expreſſions. But if the Writers of an Hiſtorical Dictionary, wherein the Reader expects to find an exact Tranſlation of what is to be found in the ancient Mythology concerning *Jupiter*'s Adventures, uſed long Circuits, and far fetch'd Expreſſions, whereby the fate of ſome Nymphs wou'd hardly be gueſs'd at, they would be accounted over-nice and ridiculous. They don't offend againſt Decency, provided they keep within the bounds of Common Civility, abſtaining from ſuch Words as are uſed by the Mob, and which even a Debauchee carefully avoids in a ſerious Converſation. They may boldly uſe all the Words that are to be found in the Dictionary of the *French* Academy, and in that of *Furetiere*, unleſs the Reader be told, that thoſe words are odious and obſcene. This is the firſt thing I have obſerv'd; I keep to the Rules of common Decency, when I ſay ſomething of my own. I proceed to give an account of the courſe I have taken as to Paſſages quoted by me out of other Authors.

I have avoided, in the ſecond place, to expreſs in our Language the Senſe of a Quotation, that contains a very immodeſt thing, being contented to ſet it down in *Latin*. What I quote out of *Brantome* and *Montagne* cannot be offenſive, and I may ſay the ſame of *D'Aubigné*, and other *French* Writers ſomewhat too free, whom I have ſometimes quoted.

In the third place, I have avoided mentioning, in any Language whatſoever, ſuch things as are extravagant and enormous; and I have quoted nothing out of certain Books that are little known, and which I had rather leave in darkneſs than inſpire the deſire of buying them, as ſome wou'd do, if they were quoted in this Work. I could name a very Honeſt Man, who never was a Debauchee, who writ from *London* to one of his Friends, that he expected to find quite another thing in my Dictionary after the Clamours of ſome Men.

After what has been ſaid, it will be no difficult thing to know whether I have been juſtly or wrongly blamed. The whole Matter may be brought to theſe two Heads, 1. Whether I am liable to Cenſure, becauſe I have not wrapp'd up in ambiguous Periphraſes the obſcene Facts that are to be found in Hiſtory. 2. Whether I am to blame, becauſe I have not wholly ſuppreſt thoſe Facts.

(a) See the Article Beza Remark V & X.

(b) That is the eight Claſſes of Authors above mentioned.

HE IRST f the wo Queſtions to hich he preſent Diſpute may e reduced, runs pon Expreſſions. An Anwer to hat Quotion.

The firſt of theſe two Queſtions, properly ſpeaking, belongs only to the Grammarians: *Nihil hæc ad edictum prætoris.* Morality is not concerned in the Matter; the Moraliſts or the Caſuiſts have nothing to do with it. If an Action was to be brought againſt me, it were only about the Unpoliteneſs of my Style; whereupon I would appeal to the *French* Academy, as the proper and competent Judges of ſuch Cauſes. I am ſure thoſe Gentlemen would acquit me; otherwiſe they would condemn themſelves, ſince all the Words I make uſe of, are to be found in their Dictionary, without any Note of Diſhonour. When they don't declare that a word is Obſcene, all Writers may uſe it without any ſcruple; I mean ſuch Words as they have defined. But further, I ſhould not be unwilling to be condemn'd by them; for I don't pretend to be a polite Writer. Why ſhould I pretend to it, ſince many great (a) Authors, who lived at *Paris*, and were Members of the *French* Academy, did not care for it? Why ſhould a Man conſtain himſelf in a Book deſign'd for Things, and not for Words, and which being made up of all ſorts of Matters, ſome whereof are Serious, and others Comical, neceſſarily requires he ſhould uſe all manner of Expreſſions? The Author of ſuch a Work needs not be ſo cautious as a Preacher; and tho' the latter ought to avoid this Phraſe, *Thoſe who get a Maid with Child, ought to Marry her, or give her a Portion*, he may uſe it without any undecency in a Book concerning Caſes of Conſcience. So true it is, that an Author may expreſs himſelf differently, according to the Nature of his Books.

But if any thing can excuſe the Writers, who have no regard to a kind of refined Niceneſs that increaſes every Day, 'tis this, that there will be no end of it; for, in order to keep an Uniformity, a vaſt number of Words which the *French* Tongue cannot be without, muſt be accounted Obſcene; and the Writers who pretend to be ſo nice, may eaſily be convicted of abſurdity. It may be proved to them, that according to their Principles there are no preciſe and over-nice Women, and that thoſe whom we call ſo, are very reaſonable, and argue right. I deſire 'em to tell me, why the verb *to geld* appears obſcene to them. Is it not becauſe it offers an obſcene object to our Imagination? But for the ſame Reaſon the Word *Adultery* can't be pronounc'd without a greater Obſcenity. Thus this Word muſt be baniſh'd. There will be a neceſſity to baniſh likewiſe the words *Marriage, Wedding-Day, Bride's-Bed*, and a vaſt number of ſuch Expreſſions, which excite very obſcene Ideas, and incomparably more offenſive than that, at which the over-nice Lady in one of *Moliere's* Plays was ſo much offended. (b) *For my part, Uncle*, ſays ſhe, *all that I can ſay is, that Marriage ſeems to me a very offenſive thing. How can a Woman endure the thought of lying by a naked Man?* According to the Principles of our *Puriſts* nothing cou'd be more reaſonable than ſuch a Diſcourſe, and every virtuous Maid ſhould turn out of her Chamber all thoſe who ſhould talk to her of a deſign to Marry her. She might juſtly complain, that they have ſo little regard for her Modeſty, as to offer to her a frightful Obſcenity without ony cover. To aſk a Married Woman, whether ſhe has had any Children, would be a great piece of Uncivility; Politeneſs would require from us, that we ſhould uſe figurative Expreſſions, and imitate, for inſtance, the finical Woman, who ſaid, (c) "That her Companion had fallen into lawful Love (*which was Marriage*), and that "ſhe knew not how ſhe could reſolve to taſte brutiſh Pleaſures with a Man; "that ſhe had a mind to leave behind her ſome traces of her ſelf, *that is, ſome* "*Children.*

According to the Notions of the *Puriſts*, it would be a very reaſonable thing to exclaim againſt *Moliere's School of Women*, with all the fury he has ſo handſomely ridiculed, and which is, at the bottom, a downright Extravagance. Every virtuous Perſon ſhould ſay (d) *Children that come out thro' the Ear, are a thing of a wretched taſte . . . . . . Can any one that has any virtue, be pleaſed with a Piece that keeps Modeſty in a conſtant Alarm, and continually defiles the Imagination? . . . . . I poſitively affirm, that an honeſt Woman cannot ſee* that Play, *without being aſhamed, I have diſcovered ſo many Obſcenities in it . . . . .* (e) *Thoſe Obſcenities appear bare-fac'd and without any cover: The boldeſt Eyes are frighted with their Nakedneſs . . . . . . That paſſage of the Scene, wherein* Agnes *mentions what was taken from her, is more than ſufficient to prove what I ſay . . . . Fy . . . . .* (f) *I repeat it again, the Obſcenities of that Piece fly into one's Face . . . . . . Is not Modeſty viſibly offended by what* Agnes *ſays in the place I ſpeak of?* If ſome *Urania* ventured to anſwer, "(g) Not at all. She ſays nothing but what is very Honeſt; and if you will have it, that ſhe means ſomething elſe, the Obſcenity proceeds from you, and not from her, for ſhe ſpeaks only of a Ribbon that was taken from her:" the following anſwer would be a wiſe one: (h) "Ah! you may talk of a Ribbon as much as you pleaſe; but that *the*, where ſhe ſtops, was not put there for nothing: It occaſions ſtrange Thoughts; that *the* is extreamly Scandalous: And all your Eloquence will never juſtify the Inſolence of that Word . . . . . . There is an intolerable (i) Obſcenity in it." That Diſcourſe, tho' never ſo impertinent, would be juſt and honeſt, according to this Principle, *All Words that defile the Imagination, that is to ſay, that denote an obſcene Object, ought to be laid aſide.* According to this Principle, all thoſe that have ſome Modeſty, would be like the Marchioneſs *Araminte*, whoſe Character is as follows. (k) "She ſays every where (l) 'tis a horrid Piece, and that ſhe could never endure the Obſcenities it is ſtuffed with . . . . . . She follows the ill Example of thoſe Women, who being in their decline, would ſubſtitute ſomething in the room of what they have "loſt,

---

(a) *Mr. le Laboureur (See the Preface to his Additions to* Caſtelnau's *Memoirs)* & *Mr. de Mezerai Secretary to the* French *Academy.*

(b) *Moliere, Precieuſes ridicules ſcene 4. pag. m.* 17.

(c) *Sorel de la connoiſſance des bons livres pag.* 470. *Dutch Edit.*

(d) *Moliere Critique de l'Eſcole des femmes ſc.* 3. *pag. m.* 13.

(e) *Id. ib. pag.* 14.

(f) *Ibid. pag.* 16.

(g) *Ibid.*

(h) *Ibid.*

(i) *Note, That in this Paſſage of* Moliere *every body expects to hear* Agnes *ſay, that ſome body has got her Maidenhead; which excites a very obſcene Idea.*

(k) *Moliere ibid. ſc.* 5. *pag.* 26.

(l) *That is the Play Intituled,* The School of Women.

" loſt, and fancy that a ſcrupulous Niceneſs will ſupply their want of Youth " and Beauty. This Woman carries the thing further than others, and is " ſo nicely ſcrupulous, that ſhe finds Obſcenities where no body elſe would " find them. 'Tis ſaid her Scruples are ſuch as will disfigure our Language, and " that there is hardly any Word but what ſhe would curtail, by reaſon of the im" modeſt Syllables ſhe finds in them.

I think I have read ſomewhere, that over-nice Women carried their Scruples ſo far that they would not ſay *J'ai mangé des confitures*, but *des fitures*. At this rate, above one half of the Words of the Dictionary of the *French* Academy ſhould be left out, and then the reſt would be inſignificant, for they would want a Connexion; and thus we ſhould be obliged to explain our ſelves by Signs, which would occaſion more ſcandalous and more dangerous Obſcenities (a) than thoſe that come only into one's Ears. Here follows a Paſſage of the *Chevræana*, whereby my Aſſertion will be admirably confirmed. (b) " A Lady, who has " a great deal of Wit, but is too finical, told me one day ſhe never uſed any Words " that excite an obſcene Idea, and that ſhe ſaid to thoſe who knew the World, *Un* " *fond d'Artichaut; un fond de Chapeau; une ruë qui n'a point de ſortie*, for what we call " *un Cul de ſac*. I approved of it, and told her I would not fail to do the ſame. How" ever, I added, that on ſome occaſions we were obliged to ſpeak like others. She " very civilly defied me to give her any inſtance of it; and I ask'd her how ſhe call'd " in common Converſation a Piece that is worth ſixty Pence? Sixty Pence, reply'd " ſhe. But, Madam, how d'ye call that Letter of the Alphabet that comes next to " P? She bluſh'd, and at the ſame time reply'd, *truly, Sir, I did not think you would* " *teach me the Croſs-Row.*" You ſee Mr. *Chevreau* approves that one ſhould never uſe any *Words, that excite an obſcene Idea*; and by virtue of that Principle, he is of Opinion, that one ſhould never ſay, *un Cul de ſac*. He muſt therefore ſtrike out not only above two (c) Pages of *Furetiere*'s Dictionary, corrected by one (d) of the Politeſt Writers of our days, but alſo a vaſt number of Words, whoſe firſt Syllable excites more immodeſt Ideas than the Syllable *Cul*. He muſt alſo baniſh the Words *Adultery, Fornication, Incontinence*, and a hundred thouſand more: but as rigid as he is (A) about obſcene Words, he was not willing to grant upon one ſingle point whatever that nice Lady required; and therein he did not ſpeak according to his Principles. I am willing to excuſe him upon that account; for the Conſequences of his Aſſertion are ſo abſurd, and 'tis ſo impoſſible to put 'em in practice, that he is not to blame for not keeping to them. His only fault lies in not perceiving the falſity of a Principle, whereof the moſt neceſſary Conſequences are abſurd, and plainly tend to the deſtruction of the uſe of Speech. 'Tis to be obſerv'd, that there are ſome Ladies as virtuous as that nice Woman, who don't ſcruple to ſay, ***Cul d'Artichaut***, and ***Cul de ſac***; as

(a) Segnius irritant animos demiſſa per aurem, Quam quæ ſunt oculis ſubjecta fidelibus, & quæ Ipſe ſibi tradit Spectator. *Horat. de arte poet.* v. 180.

(b) *Chevræana* 1. *part. pag.* 101, 102. *Dutch Edit.*

(c) *At the beginning of the Syllable* Cul.

(d) *Mr.* Baſnage de Bauval.

(A) *As rigid as Mr.* Chevreau *is about obſcene Words .... he did not ſpeak according to his Principles.*] Immediately after having ſaid *, as Mareſchal *de Baſſompierre* did, that *all Men carry about 'em the Key of the Treaſure*, that is, of the Ladies Virginity; he affirms, that FAIRE DES ENFANS *is an obſcene Expreſſion*, † *and* that *it ought never to be uſed before Ladies, who have nice Ears.* Thoſe two Obſervations were not fit to appear together. Here's another that is a falſity. *The Latins* (Mr. *Chevreau* goes on) *had the ſame niceneſs as to* liberis dare operam; *which has been obſerved in the ſixteenth Letter of the ninth Book of* Cicero *to* Papirius Petus, *where one may further ſee, why they rather choſe to ſay* nobiſcum *than* cum nobis. Inſtead of the ſixteenth Letter, Mr. *Chevreau* ſhould have quoted the twenty ſecond; but this would have only prevented the leaſt Fault, for *Cicero* does not ſay what he aſcribes to him. He ſays nothing of *nobiſcum*, nor of (‖) *cum nobis*, and affirms, that *liberis dare operam* is a modeſt Expreſſion (‡). Mr. *Chevreau* has found (ε) ſome Obſcenities in *Malherbe*'s Poems, by reaſon of ſome Words that have a double Meaning, but were uſed by *Malherbe* in an honeſt Senſe. Mr. *Menage* ſaid upon this, and upon *St. Amant*'s taking this half Verſe of the ſame Poet, *qu'on ſurvit à la mort*, to be obſcene, (ι) " That a Man muſt have his Imagi" nation ſtrangely corrupted, to find ſuch Or" dures in Authors. *Quod ſi recipias, nihil loqui* " *tutum eſt*, ſays *Quintilian*, ſpeaking of a Man, " who found an Obſcenity in theſe Words of " *Virgil, Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere....* (ζ) But, to " return to *Malherbe*'s Verſe, *Je veux bander, &c.* " Thoſe who find an Obſcenity in it, have more " Reaſon than thoſe who found ſomething ob" ſcene in *Terence* and *Salluſt*; the Words *aures* and " *animos* removing all Ambiguity." Mr. *Chevreau* anſwered, (ϑ) *That a Man muſt be blind not to ſee ſuch things, and that when he does not perceive thoſe Obſcenities, 'tis a ſign he is very much uſed to them.... The Reader does not expect to find thoſe Obſcenities in Books, and bluſhes when he meets with them. What would Mr.* Menage *have ſaid, if after he had approved my Obſervation, he had read in a ſmall Book I have juſt now read,* Je ſuis convaincu qu'on examine aujourd'huy les choſes, *&c. and in another,* On vit dans le Conſiſtoire tout autrement? *If it be a ſhameful thing to ſhew thoſe Obſcenities, 'tis more ſhameful ſtill to write 'em; and there is a neceſſity to diſcover 'em, that others may avoid 'em.* A little after he blames this Expreſſion of *Malherbe, elle étoit paroiſſante juſques au Nombril*, (She was to be ſeen down to the Navel): (κ) he pretends, that *this laſt Word is one of thoſe that can't be modeſtly written...* (λ) *That Word, in its proper Senſe, belongs only to Phyſicians and Midwives, who call every thing by its Name; and herein Decency and Modeſty don't permit us to imitate them.* One wou'd think he had a Mind to revive the old Cuſtom, when the Words *Shoe, Foot, Bed, Breeches*, were not ſpoken without adding *under Correction, with Reverence*, &c. This was one of the moſt material Points of Civility, whereby one might know well-bred Children; at preſent it is quite out of Doors. But to proceed, " (μ) One cannot too " carefully avoid ſuch Obſcenities as leave filthy " Ideas in the Mind, and offend nice Ears. *C. Ser*" *vilius Glaucia* Quæſtor in the Year of *Rome* 640, " was look'd upon as the Filth of the Streets, by " reaſon of the Meanneſs of his Soul; and yet the " moſt eloquent Man among the *Romans* cou'd not " bear that he ſhou'd be call'd (ι) *Curiæ ſtercus*, " nor that the great Loſs the Common-wealth ſu" ſtain'd by the Death of *Scipio*, ſhou'd have been " expreſs'd in theſe Words, *Reſpublica morte P. Scipionis Africani caſtrata.* M. *de Balzac* did not ob" ſerve Decency, nor the Precepts of the ancient " Rhetoricians, whom he often call'd his Maſters, " when he writ to a Friend concerning a certain Per" ſon, *Qu'il étoit tout composé de parties honteuſes.* Our " Language

(*) *Chevræana* 1. *part. pag.* 350.

(†) *See what Mr.* Arnauld *ſays in his* Defenſe de la traduction de Mons *B.* 4. *ch.* 2. *pag.* 334.

(‖) *Note, That* Quintilian, *lib* 8. *cap* 3. *obſerves, that inſtead of* cum notis hominibus, *one ſhould ſay*, cum hominibus notis.

(‡) Liberis dare operam quam honeſte dicitur? *Cicero Epiſt.* 22. *lib.* 9. *ad famil. pag.* 58. *edit. Grav.*

(ε) Chev*ræana* 2. *part. pag.* 122.

(ι) *Menage Obſerv. upon* Malherbe, *pag.* 388.

(ζ) *Id. ib. pag.* 581.

(ϑ) *Chevræana ib. pag.* 123.

(κ) *Ibid. pag.* 124.

(λ) *Ibid. pag.* 125.

(μ) *Chevræana ib. pag.* 275. 276.

(ι) *Quintilianus Inſtitut. Orat. Lib.* viii. *cap.* vi. De Tropis.

as you may ſee in a Paſſage of *Coſtar* (B), which has a great Affinity with the Subject in hand.

I have already obſerved that 'tis impoſſible to ſatisfy the *Puriſts*, againſt whom I am writing. The Ground they go upon, will make 'em lay aſide, whenever they pleaſe, abundance of Words not yet condemn'd by them, which according to their Maxims, do not leſs deſerve to be rejected than thoſe which they have actually laid aſide. There's no avoiding their Cenſure. Tho' you relate Things in modeſt Words, as it has been practiſed in the 2d Volume of the *Menagiana*, they'll ſay, * *That there are ſome Paſſages in it plainly contrary to Modeſty, which cannot be read without Horror, by virtuous Perſons.* Cou'd Father *Bouhours* avoid being criticiſed, tho' in his *French* Tranſlation of the Goſpel he took all poſſible Care to lay aſide every Word that might appear never ſo little unbecoming †? Was not M. *Deſpreaux* (whom the illuſtrious Preſident *de la Moignon* || *often commended for having purged ſatyrical Poetry from the Filthineſs, which till then had been, as it were, peculiar to it*) accuſed of Obſcenity, for having uſed ‡ the Words *Embryo, voix luxurieuſe, morale lubrique*? If ſuch Words can't be admitted, there will be no end of cenſuring.

I know ſeveral Perſons who blame *Mezeray* for ſaying a that ſome Sparks, who had committed Adultery, were *mutilated in the Parts wherewith they had offended.* Their Cenſure is grounded upon theſe two Reaſons: One is, That there was no need to mention a Circumſtance that offers ſuch an obſcene Object: The other is, That he ſhould at leaſt have omitted all the Words after *mutilated*, that Word being ſufficient to expreſs the Thing. I deſire thoſe Criticks not to take it ill of me, if I believe the Circumſtance they would have omitted, to be one of thoſe which an Hiſtorian

* *Journ. des Savans of the 21. of February 1695. pag. 145. Dutch Edition.*

† *See the 3 Letter of a learned Lady to another Lady her Friend. p. 8.*

|| *See the Preface to Deſpreaux's Works.*

‡ *In the 10 Satyr.*

a *'Tis in the 2 Volume of his chronological Abridgement ad ann. 1313. where he ſpeaks of ſome Sparks who courted the Daughter in-law of* Philip *the Fair.*

"Language has been ſo modeſt for theſe ſixty "Years, that we ſeldom uſe the Words *Whore* and "*Bawdy-houſe*, which the Preachers formerly uſed "without any Scruple in their beſt Sermons.

It appears from all thoſe Paſſages, that *M. Chevreau* was very ſevere in his Theory; but his Practice was not anſwerable to it: For ſhou'd one ſtrike out of his Works every thing that defiles the Imagination, there would be abundance of Gaps in them. To ſpeak only of the *Chevræana*, wherein he appears ſo rigid a Moraliſt, How many Things are there in it that excite very obſcene Idea's? Some of thoſe Paſſages are only Quotations, and others proceed immediately from him. Why ſhou'd a Man preſcribe any Rules which cannot be obſerved in a general Hiſtory, nor in a Collection of all ſorts of Obſervations?

It will not be improper to give here an Inſtance of what he ſays concerning the Preachers of former Times; and therefore I ſhall ſet down ſome Paſſages out of a Sermon of *John de Monluc*, Biſhop of *Valence*, and one of the moſt eminent Preachers of the XVI Century. "(a) He who deflowers "and corrupts a Virgin, is guilty of Fornication, "a Crime mention'd in 22d Chapter of *Deuteronomy*; and yet in our Days no Account is made of "abundance of ſuch lewd Actions that are daily "committed: many poor Maids are enticed, ſeduced, and brought to Perdition; and thoſe who "have debauch'd them, glory in it, and think it "much to their Honour that they have been able "to conquer thoſe Women, who had for ſome time "reſiſted the Temptations of the Fleſh. But if "they are not puniſh'd in this World, the moſt "high God, who ſees every Thing, will in Time "call 'em to an Account: They ſhall give an Account of the Time they have loſt, of the Money they have ſpent upon Bawds, and of the "Faults committed by the Maid after ſhe has been "ſeduced; they ſhall be anſwerable for her being "forſaken and finding no Body to marry her. "Then they will know whether they had any "Reaſon to boaſt of ſuch an execrable Action "...... (b) Thoſe likewiſe infringe this "Command, who contrary to the order of Nature, they commit that enormous and deteſtable "Crime call'd *Sodomy*: Such Perſons are condemn'd "to Death by the Law of God, as we read in the "20th Chapter of *Leviticus* ..... (c) That Command is alſo tranſgreſs'd by thoſe, who commonly live in Delights and Pleaſures, who ſpend "their Time in Feaſting and Banquetting, and "pamper their Body to make it a Veſſel of Luxury and Whoredom. St. *Peter* gives a lively Deſcription of 'em in the ſecond Chapter of his ſecond Epiſtle ..... (d) *Sporting themſelves with "their own Deceivings, whilſt they feaſt with you; having their Eyes full of Adultery, and cannot ceaſe from "Sin beguiling unſtable Souls.* That is, their only End "and Intention is to deceive poor Souls, and by "their Banquets and Feaſts, to allure them to Adultery and all manner of Filthineſs. So that "their Habitations are Bawdy-Houſes, wherein People meet, Matches are made, and Women are ſeduced: in a Word, they are the "Plague of a Country; and yet ſuch People are "moſt eſteem'd and honour'd, eſpecially thoſe who "are the Ring-Leaders, and as it were, the Cocks "in their Pariſhes.

The Uſe that can be made of the Paſſages extracted out of that Sermon, is to know that the Liberty of expreſſing oneſelf in ſuch a plain manner, is not ſinful in itſelf, for then it wou'd not have been lawful in *Henry* II's Time. If it was lawful then, ſhou'd a Preacher uſe it in our Days, his only Fault wou'd conſiſt in not conforming to the Mode. But if any one ventured at this preſent Time to wear a Ruff, Wou'd he not offend againſt the Mode? And yet it wou'd be no ſinful Action.

(B) *A Paſſage of* Coſtar, *which has a great Affinity with the Subject in hand.*] The polite *Voiture* (who wou'd believe it?) was accuſed (e) of Obſcenity, tho' he was ſo well acquainted with the genteel Part of the World. Let us ſee what his Apologiſt anſwer'd: "(f) There is hardly any Lady that "ſcruples to repeat and ſing the Verſes which M. *de "Voiture* made upon a Lady's Back-Side, and I don't "know one that makes any Difficulty to ſay, *un "cul d'artichaud*, and *un cul de ſac*". The Apologiſt adds theſe remarkable Words. (g) *Let us hear our ridiculous Critick.* (2) 'Twas fear'd there was not enough of this ſort of Wit in M. *de Voiture*'s Letters, and that in this reſpect he would not come up to *Plautus* and *Ariſtophanes*; and therefore 'twas thought neceſſary to add theſe Words in the laſt Edition, which were wanting in the 178 Letter. *I conſent to the caſtrating of* Ulpian, *and even of* Papinian, *ſince you will have it ſo; for they beget nothing but Law-Suits. This Thought is very ingenious. Hitherto I have always heard People ſay, without any Scruple, that a Book, was caſtrated to denote a Book that is not entire, but curtail'd. If our Adverſary had any Intereſt in the Academy, he would get this licentious Expreſſion aboliſh'd, and this modeſt Phraſe ſubſtituted in its room,* to injure Books and make 'em Eunuchs. *The Paſſages of* Quintilian (3) *quoted by him, are wrongly quoted, and that Author maintains, That if ſome Expreſſions of* Salluſt *were accounted obſcene, 'twas not the Writer's but the Reader's Fault. As for* Celſus, *who pretended to find an* Obſcenity *in a Verſe of* Virgil, *the ſame* Quintilian *blames him for it, and ſays, that if ſuch a Niceneſs was allowable, no Man cou'd be ſure of ſpeaking modeſtly, and every Body ſhou'd be ſilent.* 'Tis to be obſerved, that *Coſtar*, who affords me this Paſſage, was none of thoſe learned Men who are unacquainted with the genteel Part of the World.

(a) *Monluc Biſhop of* Valence, *Sermons ſur les dix commandemens de Dieu, pag.* 504. *edit. of* Vaſcoſan 1558. *in* 8.

(b) *Id. ib. pag.* 506.

(c) *Id. ib. Pag.* 507.

(d) *Ibid. pag.* 508.

(e) *See the* 11 *Section, of* Girac's *Anſwer to the Apology for* Voiture.

(f) *Coſtar Suite de la defenſe de Voiture pag.* 187.

(g) *Coſtar ibid. pag.* 191, 192.

(2) *Pag.* 72, & *pag.* 73.

(3) *Page* 72. *Ductare exercitus, & patrare bellum* apud Salluſtium dicta ſanctè & antiquè ridentur à nobis, ſi Diis placet: quam culpam non ſcribentium quidem judico, ſed legentium. *Quintil. l.* 8 *cap.* 3 Si quidem Celſus cacophaton apud Virgilium putat *Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere*; quod ſi recipias, nihil loqui tutum eſt. *Ibid.*

ought never to forget; for if there is any Thing extraordinary in the Puniſhment inflicted upon a Malefactor, it ought to be particularly mentioned. The ſecond Remark does not appear to me better. A Sentence of Death may import that a Malefactor's Hands, Noſe, or Ears ſhall be cut off, before he be put to Death; and therefore the Word *mutilated* would not ſufficiently expreſs the Circumſtance which *Mezeray* was to mention. But ſuppoſing that this Word is ſufficient, Does it follow from thence, that the Addition of the reſt is a Fault? Don't we commonly ſay, *I have ſeen it with my own Eyes, I have heard it with my own Ears?* There are ſeveral needleſs Words in thoſe Phraſes, and yet no Body finds Fault with them. Laſtly, I ſay that thoſe Criticks contradict themſelves: they only blame this Addition as being unneceſſary; the Thing, ſay they, had been well enough underſtood without it. They are not therefore againſt offering an obſcene Image to the Mind, they wou'd only have two or three needleſs Sounds omitted. Their Zeal for Purity wou'd have been edifying, had they been altogether againſt the Uſe of any Thing in Hiſtory, that may excite an obſcene Idea; but they allow of it, provided it be done without any needleſs Words. Thus they deſtroy in this laſt Remark what might have been edifying in the firſt. Such is the nice Taſte of our *Puriſts:* They blame one Expreſſion, and approve another, tho' they offer the ſame Obſcenity to the Mind. The Obſervations printed at *Paris* in the Year 1700, againſt *Mezeray*, will be very acceptable to thoſe Criticks. See the Margin (*a*). He is blamed in (*b*) that Book *for commonly uſing the Words* Concubine, Baſtard, *and* Adultery, *which are inconſiſtent with the Niceneſs of our Age.* I am ſure they wou'd not condemn the Words *Favourite, natural Son, and conjugal Unfaithfulneſs*, which have the ſame Signification. How incoherently do they argue!

The new Whims of thoſe who, as I am told, begin to reckon the Words *lavement* and *medecine* among obſcene Terms, and to uſe the general Word *Remedy* in their room, wou'd be leſs unreaſonable. The Word *Gliſter* was laid aſide, as including too many Circumſtances of the Operation, and the Word *Lavement* took its place as having a more general Signification. But becauſe the Notion of the Word *Lavement* is grown too particular, and takes in too many Circumſtances, it will be quickly laid aſide for fear of ſullying the Fancy, and none but general Phraſes will be uſed, ſuch as *J'etois dans les remedes, un remede lui fut ordonn &c.* which do not more particularly denote a Gliſter or a Purge, than a Bag of Herbs hung about the Neck. Theſe are certainly very ſtrange Whims, and were they approved in all their Conſequences, they would deſtroy abundance of Expreſſions, to which every Body is uſed, and which are very neceſſary to thoſe who recover of a Sickneſs, and to their Viſitants; otherwiſe it wou'd be no eaſie thing to keep up a Converſation in their Chambers, and there wou'd be a Neceſſity to uſe the whole Jargon of finical Women: But after all, thoſe Whims are better grounded than thoſe of the *Puriſts*, who are willing that an obſcene Image ſhou'd be imprinted in the Mind, provided it be with ſuch and ſuch Words, and not with others.

To ſum up what I have ſaid upon this Head, I obſerve,

I. That the Queſtion is not about a Point of Morality, but about a grammatical Matter, which ought to be decided by the Judges of the Politeneſs of the Style.

II. That I ſhall ingenuouſly confeſs, I don't pretend to the Glory of ſuch a Politeneſs.

III. That I don't think all Authors are obliged to ſubmit to the new Notion of a polite Style; for were it exactly followed, there wou'd be no need at laſt of any Dictionary but that of finical Women.

IV. That this new Politeneſs is not ſo well eſtabliſh'd as to obtain the Force of a Law in the Common-wealth of Learning. The ancient Cuſtom remains ſtill (*c*), and may be uſed till a Preſcription begins.

V. That in ſuch a Book as this is, 'tis enough not to act againſt the common Practice; but any one who keeps within thoſe Bounds as carefully as I have (*d*) done, may uſe ſeveral Expreſſions which wou'd not be approved in a Sermon, or a Book written for the Ladies. 'Tis enough for him, that they are uſed in anatomical Books, in Caſes drawn up by Lawyers, and in the Converſations (*e*) of learned Men.

AN EXAMINATION of the Thought of thoſe who ſay that ſome things offend Modeſty.

But that it may the better appear that Morality is not concern'd in the preſent Queſtion, I muſt obviate another Objection. Let us ſee whether one may alledge this Pretence, That every Phraſe which offends againſt Modeſty, is an Attempt upon Morality, ſince it is prejudicial to Chaſtity.

Whereupon I obſerve in the firſt Place, that thoſe who ſay that ſome Things are repugnant to Modeſty, muſt needs mean either that they weaken Chaſtity, or diſpleaſe the Lovers of that Virtue. In the firſt Senſe, their Propoſition cannot be admitted; and if Women are to decide the Caſe, they'll be infallibly caſt. But doubtleſs Women are the moſt competent Judges of ſuch a Thing, ſince Shame and Modeſty are infinitely more allotted to them than to Men. Let them tell us what paſſes in their Breaſt, when they hear or read a Diſcourſe which offends Modeſty. I am ſure they will not ſay, not only that it fills their Minds with obſcene Thoughts, but alſo that it excites in their Hearts a wanton Deſire which they can hardly reſtrain; in a Word, that they find themſelves expoſed to Temptations whereby their Virtue is ſtaggered and very much endanger'd. We may be ſure, that inſtead of ſuch an Anſwer, they'll ſay, that the Idea which riſes againſt their Will in their Imagination, fills their Mind both with Shame, Indignation and Anger. But 'tis certain, that nothing can be more effectual than this, to corroborate Chaſtity and remove the contagious Influence of an obſcene

---

(*a*) Becauſe Mezeray ſays that a Prieſt was depoſed for being ſurpriſed with a Woman, and mutilated in thoſe Parts that are uſeleſs to an honeſt Clergyman, the Author of the Obſervations pag. 64. asks this Queſtion: "Had he not ſpoke with more Decency, if he had ſaid only that he was mutilated? Had not the thing been underſtood? However he might have pitch'd upon an Expreſſion leſs ſcandalous.

(*b*) Pag 18. & 19.

(*c*) M. Menage's Friends were accuſed of Obſcenity in the Year 1695. for a Book printed with Licenſe.

(*d*) Here I have follow'd Quintilian's Precept in relation to ſome Words that are grown obſcene. Vel hoc vitium ſit quod κακέμφατον vocatur; ſive mala conſuetudine in obſcenum intellectum ſermo detortus eſt, ut Ductare exercitus, & Patrare bellum apud Salluſtium dicta ſancte & antique, ridentur a nobis, ſi diis placet; quam culpam non ſcribentium quidem judico, ſed legentium, tamen vitanda, quatenus verbis honeſtis ne... nibus pe... diſſimu... & eva... centibus etiam v... tiis cedendum eſt, ſive junctura deformiter ſonat. Quintil. lib. 8. cap. 3. pag. 367.

(*e*) As they were made in M. Menage's Houſe.

obſcene Object imprinted in the Mind; ſo that inſtead of ſaying, according to the firſt Senſe, That what offends Modeſty, endangers Chaſtity, it ought to be ſaid on the contrary, that it is a Fence for that Virtue; and conſequently, if we underſtand this Phraſe, *Such a thing offends Modeſty*, in the ſecond Senſe, we ought to believe, that inſtead of weakning Chaſtity, it corroborates it.

And therefore it is ſtill true, That if an Author be blam'd for not following the moſt refin'd politeneſs of Style, 'tis a meer Grammatical Buſineſs, in which Morality is not in the leaſt concern'd.

AN OBSERVATION concerning the Vexation of Readers.

Groſs Obſcenities are leaſt dangerous.

If it be reply'd, That Morality is concern'd in it, ſince the Author expreſſes himſelf in ſuch a manner as vexes the Readers: I anſwer, That this Argument is grounded upon a falſe Hypotheſis; for there is no Writer that can prevent the Spite and Vexation of the Readers on a thouſand Occaſions. Every Controverſiſt, who defends his Cauſe with great Art and Subtilty, continually vexes the zealous Readers of the contrary Party. Whoever in a Relation of a Journey, or in the Hiſtory of a Nation, relates Things that are glorious to his Country and Religion, and ſhameful to Foreigners and other Religions, cruelly vexes the Readers, who are not prepoſſeſs'd as he is. The perfection of an Hiſtory conſiſts in being unacceptable to all Sects and Nations; for 'tis a ſign the Writer flatters none of 'em, but tells every one their own. Many Readers fall into ſuch a Paſſion when they meet with certain things in a Book, that they tear the Leaf, or write in the Margin, (*a*) *Thou lyeſt, Rogue, and deſerveſt to be ſtrapp'd.* None of theſe (*b*) Things can be alledg'd as a Reaſon why Authors ſhould be try'd at the Bar of Morality: the Criticks are their only Judges.

The only Thing that may be further objected, is, That Morality is concern'd in the reprſentation of obſcene Objects, becauſe it is apt to excite unlawful Deſires and lewd Thoughts. But this Objection is not ſo ſtrong againſt me as againſt thoſe, who uſe the Periphraſes and nice way of wrapping up things, which ſome complain I have neglected; for they don't hinder the Impreſſion of the Object upon the Imagination, but imprint it without exciting any Shame and Indignation. Thoſe, who uſe ſuch Periphraſes, don't pretend to make themſelves unintelligible; they know every body will underſtand what they ſay, and 'tis certain they are perfectly underſtood. The delicacy of their Touches has only this Effect, That People look upon their Pictures the more boldly, becauſe they are not afraid of meeting with Nudities. Modeſty wou'd not ſuffer 'em to caſt their Eyes upon naked Obſcenities; but when they are dreſs'd up in a tranſparent Cloth, they don't ſcruple to take a full view of 'em, without any manner of Shame, or Indignation againſt the Painter: And thus the Object inſinuates itſelf more eaſily into the Imagination, and pours its malignant influence into the Heart with greater liberty, than if the Soul was ſtruck with Shame and Anger; for thoſe two Paſſions exhauſt the activity of the Soul, and put it into ſuch a trouble that it can hardly have any other Sentiment. At leaſt 'tis certain, that Impurity cannot prevail ſo ſtrongly upon a Soul aſham'd and provok'd, as upon One that is free from Shame and Vexation. *Pluribus intentus minor eſt ad ſingula ſenſus.* When the Soul is affected with a Paſſion, it is leſs ſuſceptible of another.

I muſt further obſerve, That when an Obſcenity is imperfectly repreſented, but in ſuch a manner that One may eaſily ſupply what is wanting to it, thoſe who hear it finiſh the Picture that ſullies the Imagination; and therefore they have a greater ſhare in the production of that Image, than if the thing had been fully explain'd. In this Caſe they had been only paſſive Subjects, and conſequently the admiſſion of the obſcene Image wou'd have been very innocent; but in the other Caſe they are one of the active Principles, and conſequently, are not ſo innocent, and have more reaſon to fear the dangerous Effects of that Object, which is partly their Work. Thus this pretended regard to Modeſty, is really a more dangerous Snare; it makes One think upon a filthy Subject, to find out what was not clearly expreſs'd. Is it proper to put People upon ſuch Thoughts? Were it not better to prevent 'em altogether?

This is ſtill of greater force againſt the round-about Writers. Had they us'd the firſt Word they met with in a Dictionary, they had only touch'd upon an obſcene thing, and gone preſently over it; but the Periphraſes they have ſought out with great Art, and the Periods they have corrected and abridg'd, till they were ſatisfy'd with the fineneſs of their Pencil, made 'em dwell ſeveral Hours upon an Obſcenity. They have turn'd it all manner of ways; they have been winding (C) about it, as if they had been unwilling to leave ſuch a charming Place This is *ad ſirenum ſcopulos conſeneſcere*, caſting Anchor within reach of the *Syrene*'s Voice, and the way to ſpoil one's ſelf. 'Tis certain, that excepting thoſe who are truly Devout, moſt of our *Puriſts* are not in the leaſt concern'd for Modeſty, when they avoid

---

(*a*) *I have ſeen ſuch things written in the Margin of ſome Books.*

(*b*) *I except Hereſies, the reading of which has vex'd the Orthodox Chriſtians.*

(C) *They have been winding about it, as if they had been unwilling to leave ſuch a charming Place.*] This puts me in mind of an Inſcription (*) *ingrav'd in Golden Letters on a black Marble* upon the *Pont notre Dame* at *Paris*.

Sequana cum primum Reginæ allabitur urbi,
Tardat præcipites ambitioſus aquas.
Captus amore loci, curſum obliviſcitur anceps,
Quo fluat, & dulces nectit in urbe moras.
Hinc varios implens fluctu ſubeunte canales,
Fons fieri gaudet qui modo flumen erat.
Anno M. DC. LXXVI.

Thoſe Verſes were made by *M. de Santeuil.*

(*) *Deſcription nouvelle de la ville de Paris tom.* 1. *p.* 206. *Dutch edit.* 1685.

ſo carefully the Expreſſions of their Anceſtors, they are profeſs'd Gallants, who Cajole all ſorts of Women, and have frequently two Miſtreſſes, one whom they keep, and another who keeps them. Does it become ſuch Men to exclaim againſt a Word that offends Modeſty, and to be ſo nice when a thing is not ſufficiently wrapp'd up? We may apply to them what *Moliere* ſaid of a pretended Prude: "(a) Believe me, thoſe Women, "who make ſuch a-do, are not accounted more virtuous for it. On the contrary, "their myſterious Severity, and affected Grimaces, make every body willing to cenſure their Actions. People are mightily pleas'd to find out ſomething to blame in "their Conduct. And to give an Inſtance of it, There were t'other Day ſome Wo-"men at this Play oppoſite to our Box, who by their affected Grimaces during the "whole Play, and turning their Heads, and hiding their Faces, occaſion'd many ſcur-"vy Jeſts upon them, nay, a Footman cry'd out, That their Ears were more chaſte "than the reſt of their Bodies." The Men I ſpeak of, think only of making themſelves admir'd for the delicacy of their Pen.

The *Janſeniſts* are accounted the beſt Moraliſts; and I do but follow their Opinion, when I ſay, That a groſs Obſcenity is leſs dangerous than one that is nicely expreſs'd. I am not ignorant, ſays one of 'em, "(b) that they call *ordures* only ſuch "Words as are groſly obſcene, and *Gallantries*, thoſe that are expreſs'd in a nice and "ingenious manner; but Obſcenities, tho' cover'd with an ingenious Ambiguity, as "it were with a tranſparent Vail, do not ceaſe to be Obſcenities; they do not leſs "offend chaſte Ears, defile the Imagination, and corrupt the Heart; a ſubtil and im-"perceptible Poyſon, is not leſs mortal than a violent one. There are ſome Enco-"miums upon Modeſty, which Modeſty itſelf cannot bear. Witneſs that of (1) Fa-"ther *le Moine*. The groſs Obſcenities of a Carman or Porter, are not by a great "deal ſo pernicious, as the ingenious Words of a cajolling Spark." This *Janſeniſt* having mention'd ſome wanton Thoughts vented by Father *Bouhours*, under the Name of an Interlocutor in a Dialogue, which are expreſs'd in very nice Words, goes on thus: (c) *All* Parents, *without excepting thoſe that are moſt ingaged in the Vanities of the World, will acknowledge that thoſe pernicious Fooleries are* MORE DANGEROUS *than* GROSS *Obſcenities; that they corrupt Young People, and make a very ill Impreſſion upon 'em.* I have quoted in my Dictionary a Paſſage of M. *Nicolle*, wherein he poſitively affirms, That unlawful Paſſions are more dangerous, when cover'd with a ſhew of Virtue.

This cannot be deny'd: Nay, a Woman of an imperfect Virtue would run leſs danger among brutiſh Men, who ſhou'd ſing bawdy Songs, and talk lewdly like Soldiers, than among Men who expreſs themſelves in reſpectful Terms. They wou'd think themſelves indiſpenſably oblig'd to be angry with thoſe Brutes, and to leave the Room full of Rage and Indignation. But flattering Compliments, intermix'd with ambiguous Words, and ſome Freedom nicely expreſs'd, wou'd not ſtartle them; they wou'd lend an Ear to them, and gently receive the Poyſon.

A Lover wou'd immediately loſe all his Hopes, ſhou'd he groſly and filthily propoſe his ill Deſign: He is a Bungler in the Art of Love, if he has no regard to Modeſty in his amorous Addreſſes.

There is no Father but wou'd rather have his Daughters bluſh than laugh at a Story. If they bluſh (d), they are ſafe, Shame prevents the ill effect of the Obſcenity; but if they laugh, it makes an Impreſſion. If they laugh, 'tis doubtleſs becauſe the Obſcenity was artfully wrap'd up, and cover'd with an apparent Modeſty. Had it been groſly expreſs'd, it wou'd have excited Shame and Indignation. Farces in our Days are more dangerous than they were in the Days of our Anceſtors: In former times they were ſo obſcene, that virtuous Women durſt not appear at 'em; but now they don't ſcruple to ſee 'em under pretence that Obſcenities are wrap'd up, tho' not in impenetrable Covers. Are there any ſuch? They wou'd bore 'em thro', were they made up of Seven Hides like *Ajax*'s Shield.

If any thing cou'd make *la Fontaine*'s Tales very pernicious, 'tis their being generally free from obſcene Expreſſions.

Some Ingenious Men much given to Debauchery, will tell you, That the Satyrs of *Juvenal* are incomparably more apt to put One out of conceit with Lewdneſs, than the modeſteſt Diſcourſes that can be made againſt that Vice. They will tell you that *Petronius* is not ſo dangerous, notwithſtanding his groſs Obſcenities, as he is in the nice Dreſs of Count *de Rabutin*; and that the reading of the Book Intituled *Les Amours des Gaules*, will make One more fond of Gallantry, than the reading of *Petronius*.

It were wrong to conclude from what has been ſaid, That the leaſt Evil wou'd be to uſe the Expreſſions of Porters. I know the *Stoicks* laugh'd at the Diſtinction of Words, and maintain'd, That every thing ought to be call'd by its Name, and that there being nothing diſhoneſt in the Conjugal Duty, it could not be denoted by any immodeſt Word, and that therefore the Word us'd by Clowns to denote it, was as good as any other. You may ſee their Sophiſms in a (e) Letter of *Cicero*. Perhaps, it were no eaſy thing to ſilence 'em by the way of Diſpute, but they don't deſerve to be admitted to it.

What has been accounted a Rule of Decency and Modeſty in all Societies, time out of mind, and with the unanimous Conſent of the Publick, ought to be look'd upon as a firſt Principle, which none can be allow'd to contradict. And therefore when a whole Nation are agreed in calling ſome Words immodeſt, inſomuch, that the very Porters who uſe 'em moſt, are perſuaded of their obſcenity, and abſtain from them before

(a) *Moliere, Critique de l'Eſcole des femmes ſc. 3 p. 15.*

(b) *Reponſe à l'Apologie du Pere Bouhours pag.* lxxiii *& ſeq. edit.* 1700.

(1) *Lettre Provinciale XI. Peintures morales by Father le Moine B.*

(c) *Ib. pag.* LXXVIII.

(d) Erubuit, ſalva res eſt. *Terent.*

(e) *The 22d of the 9th Book ad familiar.*

before Perſons of Honour, and would be ſcandaliz'd to hear 'em pronounc'd in a publick Aſſembly, no private Perſon can be admitted to oppoſe ſuch a Judgment: All the Members of the Society are oblig'd to reſpect it. The Courts of Juſtice afford us a remarkable Inſtance of it; for Lawyers are not allow'd to repeat ſuch Words, when they plead for the Puniſhment of thoſe who uſe 'em to revile their Neighbours. They will have publick Modeſty reſpected in the hearing of a Cauſe; but when they judge by Report, they not only permit the Reporter to mention the very Words of the Offender tho' never ſo obſcene, but alſo command him to do it. This I have from a Counſellor in the Parliament of *Paris*, who told me within theſe few Years, that being willing to uſe a Periphraſe the firſt time he reported ſuch a Cauſe, the Preſident gave him to underſtand that there was no Occaſion to have a Regard to chaſte Ears, but to judge of the Nature of the Offence, and that therefore he was obliged to ſpeak the very Word it conſiſted in. I fancy the Inquiſition (CΔ) uſes the ſame Method.

The Stoicks went doubtleſs by the ſame Rule, and if in their private Conferences they did not think it neceſſary to prefer a Word to another, there was a neceſſity for them to conform to the common Style in publick. The unanimous Conſent of Nations ought to be ſubmitted to in that reſpect by all private Perſons.

Wherefore ſince the Word *Putain* (a Whore) which our Farefathers uſed in their (*a*) graveſt Books, as freely as the *Latins* uſed the Word *Meretrix*, begins to be generally decried 'tis fit all Authors ſhou'd begin to diſuſe it, and ſubſtitute the Word *Curtezan* in the room of it, ſince the World will have it ſo. But this is at the Bottom a groundleſs Nicety; for either the Word *Curtezan* excites as ſtrong an Idea as the other, or a weaker one. If the former, there's nothing got by it, every Body will have a Notion of an infamous Object; if the latter, 'tis leſſening the Abhorrence of the Publick for a Proſtitute. But does ſuch a Creature deſerve ſuch a Regard? Were it not better to aggravate the infamous Notion of the Trade ſhe profeſſes? Are you afraid of making her too odious? You are for giving her a handſome Name which formerly ſignified a (*b*) Court-Lady. One wou'd think you are afraid of offending her, and willing to pleaſe her by a quaint Name. The Conſequence of which wou'd be, if People argued right, that the Word *Curtezan* wou'd quickly grow obſcene, and a ſofter one ſhou'd be uſed inſtead of it. One ſhou'd ſay, *a Woman who behaves herſelf ill*, and then, *a Woman that is talk'd of*, and then, *a ſuſpicious Woman*, and then, *a Woman who does not live* (*c*) *a holy Life*, and at laſt deſire the moſt finical Ladies to invent ſome other Periphraſe.

AN Anſwer to the Objection grounded upon Uncivility.

I am juſt now ſenſible of another Objection. 'Tis a Piece of Uncivility, will ſome ſay, to inſert in a Book what cannot be ſpoken in the Preſence of virtuous Women; and therefore ſince Uncivility is blameable, morally ſpeaking, the Fault for which you may be blamed, does not concern Grammar, but Morality.

I anſwer in the firſt Place, That Uncivility is not an ill Thing, morally ſpeaking, but when it proceeds from Pride, or Contempt of others; but when a Man wants Civility, either becauſe he knows not the way of expreſſing it, or does not think himſelf obliged to follow it, he is guilty of no Sin. D'ye think that an old Profeſſor of the *Sorbonne* is bound to know all the Arts that are practis'd by the young Abbots of the Court, to expreſs their Reſpect to the Ladies with great Politeneſs? That Profeſſor has other Things to learn that are more important; and tho' he knew what ſort of Civility is in faſhion, he might lawfully diſpenſe with it. His Age and Character don't require he ſhou'd conform to it, but rather the contrary. I add, that new Civilities are a Slavery introduc'd by great Men, or invented by their Flatterers, to the Prejudice of the ancient Liberty. But if it be lawful for every private Perſon to depart from the old Cuſtom, 'tis alſo lawful to keep it till every Body has laid it aſide, and it becomes ſome Perſons not to be too haſty in taking up new ways. 'Tis with this as 'tis with Faſhions in Cloaths. Vain People immediately appear in the new Faſhion, but the grave and wiſe do it only when 'tis grown adult, if I may be allowed to ſay ſo. A Medium ought to be kept in thoſe Things; a Man muſt not be one of

(*a*) *The Tranſlators of the Bible of Geneva uſed it.*

(*b*) *See the Chevræana part. 2 pag. 415.*

(*c*) *Note that* Sandoval *ſpeaking of the abominable Actions committed* at Rome *by the Army of* Charles *V, in the Year 1527, is contented to ſay it was not a holy Action* obra no ſanta. *See la Mothe le Vayer pag. 177 of the 2 Vol of the Edition in 12.*

[CΔ *I fancy the Inquiſition uſes the ſame Method.*] I don't think the Inquiſitors will have ſuch Abjurations, as contain horrid Obſcenities, to be publickly read; but during the Trial they hear 'em, and when they are written down, they are read with a loud Voice in a private Place. Such was the Method of the Inquiſitors of *Rome* in the Year 1698 towards Brother *Peter Paul*, *di San Giovanni Evangeliſta*, a bare-footed *Auguſtin*, convicted of Prophanation and Impiety, and of an abominable Lewdneſs. I have a Copy of the Abjuration, *abjura Semi-publica*, which he made in a Chappel *al ſacello di Caſa Graniſi*, and I find that among other things he was told: (*) *Diceſti haver tu moſtrato e rimoſtrato alle tue ſopradette devote con le quali tu proſequivi gl' abbracciamenti in parte naſcoſte che tu per la dolcezza di quelli eri rapito in eſtaſi, e ſentivi un godimento infinito dell' amor divino, e che tu t' inſervoravi in quell' eſtaſi .... Hai detto haver bacciate alle tue donne le parti vergognoſe, e che doppo haverle coſi bacciate a toccate l'hai benedette & li hai aperti li meati, e pregavi dio che li conſervaſſe in tutto quello benedetto clauſtro verginale .... Hai detto che alcune donne ti hanno lavato le parti baſſe tre volte, la prima per purgarſi dalle colpe mortale, la ſeconda dalle veniali, e la terza dalle imperfettioni. Hai detto che alcune volte in godere delle donne tu ſentivi ſpecie di martirio ..... che un giorno parimente l'hai fatte radunare e ad una per una invocare e bacciare il tuo membro genitale.*

'Tis not to be queſtion'd that the Inquiſition wou'd publiſh thoſe Things, were it neceſſary to undeceive a formidable Cabal, and an exaſperated Mob, who ſhou'd maintain that a Monk had been ſeverely puniſh'd for ſmall Faults. Thus it was thought neceſſary to publiſh the Informations made againſt the Knights-Templars, tho' never ſo full of horrid Obſcenities, rather than People ſhou'd think their Order had been deſtroyed without a juſt Cauſe.

(*) *I have followed the Orthography of the Manuſcript Copy imparted to me by Dr.* Silveſtre *at his Return from* Rome *in the Year 1700.*

the firſt that takes 'em up, nor the laſt that leaves them; and none makes himſelf ridiculous by keeping the old Faſhion, but when it is quite out of Doors.

I anſwer in the ſecond Place, that an Author is not bound to ſuppreſs all the Words that cannot be civilly ſpoken in the Preſence of virtuous Women: Witneſs M. *de ſaint Olon*, who is no Stranger to the Ways of the Court: He wou'd not have ſaid before the Ladies in a ſerious Converſation what he has (*a*) writ concerning the Marriages of the *Africans*.

There are many Reaſons for taking a greater Liberty in a Book than in Converſation. An Obſcenity ſpoken before virtuous Women in good Company, makes 'em very uneaſie; they can't ward off the offenſive Blow; 'tis not in our Power to hear or not to hear, what we are told in our Language. The accidental Meeting of a naked Man, or the Sight of a lewd Picture, is not without Remedy; 'tis but turning one's Back, or ſhutting one's Eyes; but one can't ſtop the Mouth of a talking Man. The Shame occaſion'd by an Obſcenity, is much greater when we are ſurrounded with People who obſerve our Looks. The Confuſion and Perplexity of a virtuous Woman upon ſuch an Occaſion, makes her very uneaſie: This Uneaſineſs is attended with Indignation, becauſe Men don't uſe to talk ſo before Women whom they reſpect, and think to be honeſt, but before Women of whom they have an ill Opinion. There are no ſuch Inconveniencies with reſpect to a Book. If there is any Thing in it which you take to be too free, you may read it or let it alone. For Inſtance, you may foreſee that the Article of the Courtezan *Lais* in my Dictionary, will contain ſome Quotations of that Nature; don't read it. Let ſome truſty Perſons take a View of the Book, before you undertake to read it, and let 'em inform you of what is to be ſkipp'd. Beſides a Woman who is alone when ſhe reads a Book, is not expoſed to the Looks of a Company, (*b*) which is the Thing that moſt perplexes and confounds her: And becauſe an Author ſpeaks to no Body in particular, ſhe does not think herſelf ſlighted or offended.

But you cou'd not but know, will ſome ſay, that there are now many Women who read Books of Literature; and therefore you ſhou'd not have been contented with what you call common Civility; you ſhou'd have obſerved the niceſt and the moſt rigid Civility, that the fair Sex might not find any thing in your Book that might ſully their Imagination. My Anſwer is, that if it had been poſſible by obſerving ſuch a ſevere Civility to prevent the Reader's finding any ſuch Thing in my Dictionary, I had willingly ſubmitted to the Rules of the *Puriſts*, who come neareſt to the Taſte of over-nice Women; but I was ſenſible that the greateſt Niceneſs cannot remove any Image of an obſcene Object from the Mind of the Reader. This will not be eaſily believed, unleſs I ſhew the Truth of it with the utmoſt Evidence.

In order to it, I need only prove this ſingle Propoſition, *the moſt obſcene and the modeſteſt Words that can be uſed to denote a filthy Thing, repreſent it as lively and diſtinctly in the Hearer's and Reader's Mind the one as the other.* This ſeems at firſt a great Paradox, and yet it may be made ſenſible to every Body by a popular Argument. Let us ſuppoſe one of thoſe Adventures, which are ſometimes the Talk of a whole Town, a Marriage ready to be celebrated, and ſuſpended all of a ſudden by the Oppoſition of a third Perſon. That third Perſon is a Maid, who happens to be with Child, and demands that the Marriage her Lover has contracted with another ſhou'd be declar'd void. Let us ſuppoſe that a very virtuous Woman, who has only heard of this Oppoſition in general, is willing to know what Reaſons that Maid has for it. She might be told, *She has the Misfortune of being with Child; he has had her Company; they have had a cloſe View of one another; they have been too familiarly acquainted; he has had the laſt Favour of her; ſhe has granted him the moſt precious Thing ſhe had, as it appears from the Conſequences; what paſs'd betwixt 'em, can't be modeſtly ſpoken, chaſte Ears wou'd be offended at it; ſhe is obliged to get her Honour repair'd.* Many other Phraſes more myſterious might be found out in anſwer to the Queſtion of that virtuous Woman; but all of 'em wou'd imprint in her Mind the filthy and brutiſh Action, which has occaſion'd that Maid's Big-Belly, as ſtrongly as *Michael Angelo* cou'd have done it upon a Cloth: and if that virtuous Woman had heard by chance the bawdy Word whiſpered by a Debauchee in the Ear of another Debauchee, to let him know what it is, ſhe cou'd not have a clearer Notion of the Thing. None, tho' never ſo modeſt, can ſincerely deny what I have been ſaying, if they will examine what paſſes within their Breaſt: 'Tis therefore certain, that the modeſteſt and the moſt obſcene Words equally defile the Imagination, when the Thing denoted by them is a filthy Object.

THAT the niceſt Words ſully the Imagination as much as the moſt obſcene.

Tho' you uſe the modeſteſt Expreſſion made uſe of in the Scripture, to repreſent what we call conjugal Duty: (*c*) *Adam knew his Wife Eve*: (*d*) *Abraham went in unto Hagar*: (*e*) *I went unto the Propheteſs*: you'll never be able to weaken the Image of that Object; it will be imprinted in the Mind as fully as if you uſed the moſt obſcene Words. The ſame may be ſaid of the Phraſes, *to conſummate a Marriage, the Marriage was conſummated, the Marriage was not conſummated,* Expreſſions as it were conſecrated, that can't be avoided in the moſt ſerious Relations, and the moſt majeſtical (*f*) Hiſtories: Thoſe Words raiſe the ſame Idea as the Words of a Plough-Man.

But how comes it then, will ſome ſay, that a virtuous Woman is not offended with vail'd Expreſſions, and is angry with a bawdy Word? I anſwer that their Indignation proceeds from the acceſſory Idea's which attend ſuch a Word, but don't attend a Phraſe wrapp'd up in clean Linnen. The Impudence of thoſe who expreſs themſelves like Porters, and their want of Reſpect, is the true Cauſe of ſuch an Indignation.

(*a*) *In his Relation of the Empire of Morocco, printed at Paris in the Year* 1695.

(*b*) *The moſt virtuous Perſons, when alone, are not aſham'd of the State they are in when they get out of Bed, but they wou'd be aſham'd if they were ſeen by others.*

(*c*) *Gen. chap.* 4. *v.* 1.

(*d*) *Ibid. chap.* 16. *v.* 4.

(*e*) *Iſaiah chap.* 8. *v.* 3.

(*f*) *Thoſe for inſtance which treat of the Divorce of* Henry VIII. *and* Catherine *of* Arragon.

dignation. Their Expreſſion affords three Idea's: One is a direct and main Idea; the others are indirect and acceſſory. The direct Idea repreſents the Filthineſs of the Object, and does not do it more diſtinctly than the Idea of another Word. But the indirect and acceſſory Idea's repreſent the Diſpoſition of the Perſon who ſpeaks, his Brutiſhneſs and Contempt of the Hearers, and his Deſign of affronting a Woman of Honour. This is what ſhe is angry at. She is not offended, as ſhe is a modeſt Woman; for under this Notion nothing can offend her but the filthy Object: But ſhe is not offended at that Object; for if it had been repreſented to her Imagination with Phraſes as expreſſive as the bawdy Word, ſhe wou'd not have been angry; and therefore her Vexation proceeds from ſome other Reaſon, I mean from her being uncivilly uſed. Hence it is that a wanton Lady will often expreſs a greater Indignation againſt thoſe who talk Bawdy than a virtuous Woman, becauſe ſhe takes it for an Inſult and a bloody Affront. Her Reſentment does not proceed from the Love of Chaſtity, but from Pride and a Deſire of Revenge. As for virtuous Women, who are provok'd at a groſs Obſcenity, they are ſo out of a reaſonable Principle of Self-love; for they ought to be ſenſible of an Injury which deprives them of the Reſpect due to their Sex; and beſides 'tis very reaſonable they ſhould keep up a good Reputation, which they cou'd not do, ſhou'd they ſuffer that the ſame Things ſhou'd be told 'em that are told to lewd Women.

Thus I prove that it was impoſſible to leave out of this Dictionary every thing that ſullies the Imagination. It muſt needs be ſullied, which way ſoever the Reader be told that *Henry* IV had natural Children.

'Tis therefore certain that 'tis enough for me to keep within the Bounds of common Civility. If any one was ſo great a Lover of Purity, as to wiſh not only that no immodeſt Deſire ſhou'd ariſe in his Mind, but alſo that his Imagination ſhou'd be conſtantly free from every obſcene Idea, he cou'd not attain his End without loſing his Eyes and his Ears, and the Remembrance of many Things which he cou'd not chuſe but ſee and hear. Such a Perfection cannot be hop'd for, whilſt we ſee Man and Beaſts, and know the Signification of certain Words that make a neceſſary Part of our Language. 'Tis not in our Power to have, or not to have certain Idea's, when certain Objects ſtrike our Senſes; they are imprinted in our Imagination whether we will or not. Chaſtity is not endangered by them, provided we don't grow fond of 'em. If Chaſtity was inconſiſtent with every impure Idea, we ſhou'd never go to Church, where Impurity is cenſured, and ſo many Banes of Matrimony are bid; we ſhould never hear the Liturgy that is read before the whole Congregation on the Wedding-Day; we ſhou'd never read the moſt excellent of all Books, I mean the Holy Scripture, and we ſhou'd avoid as ſo many infectious Places, all the Converſations where People talk of Big-Bellies, Child-Births, and Chriſtnings. The Imagination runs in a Moment from the Effect to the Cauſe, and finds the Way ſo well beaten, that it goes from one End to the other, before Reaſon can ſtop it.

There is another Conſideration that may teach the Compilers of Literature, that 'tis enough for them to keep within the Bounds of common Decency; I mean, that they muſt not expect to be read by People, whoſe Ears and Imagination are ſo tender as to receive dangerous Impreſſions from the leaſt obſcene Object. I don't know whether it was reaſonably ſuppoſed in ancient *Rome*, that the obſcene Words ſpoken by little Children in the Chamber of a Bride, were the firſt ſhe had heard; but I am perſwaded, that in our Days, any Perſon of either Sex, who has been converſant in the World four or five Years, has heard abundance of obſcene Things, eſpecially in ſuch Countries where Jealouſie is not tyrannical: there People enjoy a great Freedom; merry Converſations, Sports, Feaſts, and Country-Journeys are very common; they only think of paſſing away the Time merrily. 'Tis true, the Preſence of the fair Sex prevents Obſcenities from appearing bare-fac'd, but they appear in a Diſguiſe; which, as I have ſhown above, does not hinder the Impreſſion of a filthy Object, no more than if one ſhou'd uſe the plain Words of a Clown. Women dare not be angry when Things are wrapp'd up, for fear of being accounted finical and preciſe. This is a meer Diſpute about Words: the Thing ſignified is admitted, but not all the Words that ſignifie it; and therefore an Author may very well believe his Readers will not be ſurpriſed, being ſtrengthen'd and harden'd by Cuſtom.

SECOND Queſtion. It cannot be ſaid that there are any Obſcenities liable to cenſure in this Book, as they conſiſt in the very Facts related by me.

'Tis certain, that Women who read Books of Literature, don't begin with that: they have already read Romances, Plays, and Love Poems. There's nothing in my Dictionary that can daunt 'em, after they have encountred ſuch Enemies. If the *luxurious* (a) Muſick of Opera's, the tenderneſs of Tragedies, the licentiouſneſs of Comedies, and the paſſionate Deſcriptions of the Effects and Diſorders of Love, make no dangerous Impreſſions upon 'em, they need not be afraid of reading the Articles of *Abelard* and *Heloiſa*.

This is what I had to ſay upon the firſt Queſtion I was to diſcuſs. I hope the Reader will be ſenſible of the whole force of my Juſtification, and own, that if there is any Obſcenity in my Dictionary that is liable to Cenſure, it does not proceed from the Expreſſions I uſe when I ſpeak of my own Head. What remains to be inquired into, is, whether it conſiſts in the things themſelves, when I ſet down the Words of other Authors, or only give the Senſe of 'em. This is the ſecond Queſtion I have undertaken to examine.

(a) *'Tis an Epithet of M.* Deſpreaux *in his 10th Satyr.*

None can be for the Affirmative upon this Queſtion, without laying down this Hypotheſis: 1. That that an Hiſtorian ought to ſuppreſs all the lewd Actions that are to be found in the Lives of Princes, or private Perſons. 2. That a Moraliſt, who condemns Lewdneſs, ought never to mention any thing, that offends Modeſty. The *Puriſts* I have been ſpeaking of muſt neceſſarily follow this Hypotheſis; and 'tis certain, there have been at all times many People, who have condemn'd the Hiſtories and Invectives, in which Lewdneſs is hideouſly deſcribed.

If our *Puriſts* are willing to argue coherently, and to keep conſtantly to their Maxims, they muſt admit the whole Hypotheſis I have mention'd. They muſt ſay, 1. That an Hiſtorian ought only to obſerve, that *Charlemagne*, the two *Joans* of *Naples*, and *Henry* IV. of *France* were not Chaſte. 2. That a Preacher, and a Ghoſtly Father, and any other Man who deſires the Reformation of Manners, ought to cenſure Lewdneſs only in general. I have quoted an Author, who continually condemns the Hiſtorian *Mezeray* for mentioning ſome particular Facts which offend chaſte Ears. He cenſures him particularly for what he ſays of *Margaret de Valois*, the firſt Wife of *Henry* IV.

There have been ſuch *Puriſts* in all Ages; but great Authors have at all times laugh'd at their Scruples and Fancy, ſo that the Commonwealth of Learning has always been divided into two Parties upon this Head: Each of 'em alledg'd ſeveral Reaſons and Authorities; each of 'em raiſed Objections, and made Anſwers, and no ſupreme Tribunal did ever determine the Matter. And therefore I am diſpenſed from entring upon a long diſcuſſion; this affords me a ſhort way to come off. For if thoſe who deſpiſed the Maxims of the *Puriſts*, did always make a conſiderable Party in the Commonwealth of Learning, if they always maintain'd their Right, if that Difference has never been decided, every private Man may lawfully ſide with them, and believe at leaſt, that 'tis probable they are in the right. None can reaſonably deny the Privileges of the Doctrine of Probability in this Caſe. Thoſe who follow the (*a*) *Anti-Puriſts*, are not reduc'd to two or three grave Authors: They may reckon 'em by hundreds, and Writers alledge the inſpired by God. You'll find in *Geneſis*, that *Moſes* tells us, without any compaſs of Words, (*b*) that two Daughters having made their Father drunk, lay with him, and had Children by him; that *Dina* (*c*), *Jacob*'s Daughter, was raviſh'd; that *Juda*, the Son of the ſame Patriarch, (*d*) defiled himſelf in an open Road with a Woman he took for a Proſtitute, but ſhe was his Daughter-in-Law, and knew him very well; and that *Ruben*, (*e*) eldeſt Brother to *Juda*, commited Inceſt with a Wife of his own Father. There are many things in *Leviticus*, which are not proper to be read in Proteſtant Churches. An abominable Action is related in the Book of Judges (*f*). The Prophets uſed the plaineſt Expreſſions to repreſent the Turpitude of Lewdneſs. See alſo the Deſcription of the Whore in the *Revelation*. They uſed ſome Compariſons (*D*) which the Miniſters durſt not relate at length. All the Proteſtant Tradeſmen in *France* could tell the popiſh Miſſionaries, in the Diſpute about the Merit of good Works, that *all our Righteouſneſs is as filthy Rags*; but the remaining part of the Paſſage was unknown to them, becauſe it was not put into controverſial Books. Has St. *Paul*, in his (*g*) Epiſtle to the *Romans*, ſuch a regard to Chaſte Ears as our *Puriſts* require? Does he not deſcribe in plain Words the abominable Impurities of the Heathens?

If it be objected to me, that the Sacred Writers have Privileges peculiar to them, *ſunt ſuperis ſua jura*; I anſwer, that not only the graveſt Heathen Writers, but alſo the ancient Fathers of the Church, writ with the ſame freedom. When *Livy* (*h*) does ſo gravely and majeſtically relate the ſuppreſſion of the *Bacchanalia*, he diſcovers ſeveral Abominations, which ſully the Imagination, and can't be read without horror. *Seneca*, the graveſt and moſt rigid Philoſopher of ancient *Rome*, deſcribes (*i*) the moſt infamous lewdneſs with the greateſt plainneſs. He condemns it with all the ſeverity of a Cenſor, but at the ſame time he makes a natural Deſcription of it. When the Fathers of the Church ſpeak of the *Gnoſticks*, or *Manichees*, or other ſuch Sects, they relate ſeveral things which not only defile the Imagination, but alſo make one's Stomach riſe, and might ſerve for a kind of Vomit. *Arnobius*, in his Invectives againſt the Heathens, is ſo little cautious in his Words, that Mr. *de la Fontaine* would certainly have dreſſed ſuch things more cleanly, and had been more reſerved in what concerns *Priapus*. St. *Auguſtin*, (*k*) on ſome Occaſions, expreſſed himſelf in very plain and obſcene Words. St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Chryſoſtom* have done the like; nay, the latter maintain'd, there was a neceſſity to do it in order to inſpire a true abhorrence for ſuch lewd Actions as one deſcribes. *Caſaubon* did not approve that (*E*) method; but he muſt give us leave to believe, that his Opinion about Moral Queſtions, is not to be compared with that of this Holy Father.

If

(*a*) *So I call for brevity ſake thoſe who laugh at the pretended niceneſs of the Puriſts.*

(*b*) *Gen. chap.* 19.

(*c*) *Ibid. chap.* 34.

(*d*) *Ibid. chap.* 38.

(*e*) *Ib chap.* 49. *v.* 4.

(*f*) *Chap.* 19.

(*g*) *Chap.* 1.

(*h*) *Titus Livius lib.* 39 *pag. m.* 749 *& ſeq.* Antony de la Faye *in his* French *Tranſlation of* Livy *has not weaken'd the* Original.

(*i*) *See the Hexameron ruſtique journée* 2. *pag. m.* 45. *& ſeq.*

(*k*) *See the Hexameron ruſtique ibid. pag* 58. *& ſeq.*

(*D*) *They uſed ſome Compariſons.*] The following Paſſage of Mr. *Menjot* will ſerve for a Commentary upon the Text of this Remark. (*) *Hic obiter obſervabimus mulierem menſtruatam dici* ἀποκαθημένην, *à ſeptuaginta … veteris Teſtamenti Græcis interpretibus*, ὡς ῥάκος ἀποκαθημένης πᾶσα ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἡμῶν, (1) omnis noſtra juſtitia eſt quaſi pannus menſtruatæ; *eò quod Iſraëlitica fœmina* αἷς ἦν τὰ κατ' ἐθισμὸν τῶν γυναικῶν, (2) *ut alibi loquuntur iidem interpretes*, during their monthly Courſes, *ſedêre conſuevisſent, ut conſtat ex hiſtoriâ Rachelis* (3) … … *Ità idem Eſaias antea dixerat* (4) λικμήσεις ὡς ὕδωρ τῆς ἀποκαθημένης, ventilabis, *hoc eſt*, *diſperges* ea (*de idolis loquitur*) ſicut immunditiam menſtruatæ, *ut fert textus vulgata lectionis*.

(*E*) Caſaubon *did not approve that Method.*] It does not become him to pretend to be wiſer than the ancient Fathers. If the queſtion was about the

(*) *Antonius Menjotius de paſſione uterina pag.* 4. *&* 5.

(1) *Eſaiæ c.* 64.

(2) *Geneſ. c.* 31.

(3) *Loc. cit.*

(4) *Ibid. c.* 30.

If a Liſt were to be given of all the Hiſtorians from *Suetonius* to *Mezeray*, who have groſly related lewd Actions, it would fill up many Pages; and if it be ſaid, that *Suetonius* has been blamed by famous Authors, my Adverſaries will get nothing by it, ſince thoſe who (*F*) vindicate him, are as eminent as thoſe who find fault with him.

There is a vaſt Number of Moraliſts, who have deplored the corruption of their Age, and plainly particulariz'd (*a*) Sins, and their ſeveral kinds. I don't pretend to excuſe all the Caſuiſts; but I can poſitively affirm, that in the Church of *Rome* none of 'em can avoid ſaying many things that offend Modeſty. 'Tis well known, that Father *Natalis Alexander* declared for rigid Morality, and was engaged in many Quarrels upon that Account. I peruſed t'other day in his Moral Doctrines what concerns Sins againſt (*b*) the Seventh Commandment, and hardly found any period in it, but what contains many groſs Obſcenities: And yet I think he is one of thoſe who treat that Subject with the greateſt Modeſty; but 'tis a Subject that does not permit a Writer to have a regard to Modeſty. The ſame may be ſaid of the (*c*) Canoniſts, and thoſe who write Anatomical Books: and to ſhew that to this very day Men of a good Taſte and great Politeneſs ſide with the *Anti-Puriſts*, I ſhall ſet down a Paſſage of the Author, who criticized Mr. *de St. Evremont*. *Don't we ſee ſtill*, ſays he (*d*), *in the Theological Treatiſes of Humane Actions, the Explication of all the lewd Thoughts and Actions that can be ſuggeſted by Luſt? Thoſe Explications are not contrary to Modeſty, being neceſſary to thoſe whom God has appointed for the direction of others, who ought to have a perfect Knowledge of Sins, with all their Circumſtances, in order to make a Sinner ſenſible of the State he is in, and work his Repentance. But if you maintain ſtill, that thoſe Treatiſes are inconſiſtent with Modeſty, is there any Science more contrary to it than Anatomy, wherein all the Parts of Humane Bodies are viewed? yet there's no Law againſt thoſe who meddle with it.*

The Party of the *Anti-puriſts* would be more numerous than it is, were it not that the Vanity or Malice of the Criticks ingage many Writers to ſide with the contrary Faction. There is hardly any Book but what is Criticiſed, and narrowly examined; and if there are any Thoughts or Expreſſions in it that want a certain niceneſs, ſeveral Writers will riſe up againſt it, and expreſs a great zeal for the intereſts of offended Modeſty. They fall earneſtly upon that Topick, and raiſe many Clamours. Nothing can be more eaſie, nor more proper to prejudice the Publick. A Critick who ſtrikes upon that Key is cried up by devout and polite People, and accounted the Protector of Purity: This is the Reaſon that moves him to declare for the *Puriſts*. He raiſes his Reputation two Ways: he ſets up for a Man who is concerned for good Manners, and who converſes with the polite World. This is only a piece of Craft in an Author: The Intereſt of Morality is no farther concerned in it than is neceſſary to form a fair out-ſide. Many who criticize Books only in Converſation, follow the Footſteps of the printed Criticks.

How many People inveighed againſt the Book (*e*) *de contactibus impudicis*, and the *hiſtoria Flagellantium*, becauſe Doctor *Boileau* was none of their Cabal in the Faculty of Theology? Had they been well pleaſed with the Author, who is a Man famous for his Probity and Learning, they would have approved his diſcovering the Obſce-

---

the ſenſe of a Paſſage of *Polybius*, *Suetonius*, or *Athenæus*, one might reaſonably prefer his Judgment. But for a Man, who made the ſtudy of Philological Learning his chief Buſineſs, to pretend to rectify the moſt holy Fathers of the Church, upon Matters of Conſcience, is what can't be digeſted. However, we muſt acknowledge his Candor: he did not diſſemble that his Cenſure upon *Perſius* might be confuted by the Maxims of St. *Chryſoſtome*; he very ingenuouſly quotes the Words of that Father. (*) *Poëta alioquin graviſſimus, & verecundiæ virginalis, ut teſtantur de illo veteres, à moribus ſuis heic diſceſſit. Sic enim alienam impudicitiam caſtigat, ut ſermonis licentia, etſi figuris obſcurati, caſtas aures offendat meritò. Omnino ſatius erat verecundiam ſilentio vindicare. Sed neſcio quomodo pervaſit etiam ſapientiſſimorum hominum mentes illa opinio, obſcœnitatem obſcœnitate aut liberiore ſaltem dictione eſſe caſtigandam. Quod quàm à recta ratione alienum? & tamen ſummis viris ita olim placitum. Quis ſine rubore quæ de ſpeculo Hoſtii ſcripſit Seneca legat, paullo qui ſit αἰδημονέστερος? quid beatus Hieronymus, ille tantus caſtitatis & virginitatis buccinator? nonne & ipſe aliquando in turpia turpiculè invehitur? ſanè quidem: neque id uno loco. Sed cauſſam quæ viros graves compulit, ut ita ſentirent, itaque ſciberent, aperit Johannes Chryſoſtomus, plenum illud omni virtute & ſanctimonia pectus. Ait ille homilia quarta in epiſtolam ad Romanos, eos quorum eſt ſcopus flagitia hominum nequam atque impudicorum reprehendere, cogit neceſſariò fœditatem illorum denudare, & quaſi ob oculos ſpectandam proponere: quia parum aliter profecturi ſint* Ἂν μὲν γὰρ, *inquit*, σεμνῶς εἴπω, οὐ δυνήσομαι καθικέσθαι τοῦ ἀκούοντος, ἐὰν δὲ βουληθῶ καθάψασθαι σφοδρῶς, ἀνάγκην ἔχω ἀπογυμνῶσαι σαφέστερον τὸ λεγόμενον. *Solet etiam in eam rem chirurgi exemplum afferre, qui ut tabo ac ſanie manans ulcus ſanet, non veretur ſibi manus inquinare, atque in fœtidiſſimum pus immittere.* Ὁ ἰατρὸς, *inquit, in priorem ad Corinthios*, σηπεδόνα ἐκβαλεῖν βουλόμενος, οὐ σκοπεῖ πῶς καθαρὰς διατηρήσει τὰς χεῖρας, ἀλλ' ὅπως αὐτὴν ἀπαλλάξειε σπουδάζει. *Quam ſententiam totidem ferè verbis ſæpe repetit, idemque in eam ad Theſſalonicenſes diſtinguendum monet, utrum dicantur ejuſmodi ſermones*, ἐξ οἰκείου πάθους, *an* ἀπὸ κηδεμονίας: *ex loquentis affectu, an curandi voluntate.* See the Margin (†).

(*F*) *Thoſe who vindicate* Suetonius *are as eminent as thoſe who find fault with him*] Beſides what I have quoted (‡) in another Place, I ſhall ſet down here a fine Paſſage of *Henry Glareanus*. (||) *De vitiis diſſertatio ſive diſputatio duplex eſt. Una, qua ad vitia homines allicimus ſuaſionibus, exhortationibus ac lenociniis: ut qui amare docent noſtra ætate, proh dolor! etiam potare, qui amatoria ludunt, ut juvenum mentes veluti inebrient, quales impudici Poëtæ. Ea diſſertio vitioſa eſt, ac deteſtanda, maximè homini Chriſtiano, plus etiam illis, qui juventuti ut magiſtri præſunt. Altera eſt diſſertio de vitiis, ut ea deteſtemur ac execremur: imò quoties de eis fit mentio, ut ab iis dehortemur, ab iis abſtineamus, & execremur. Hæc diſſertio neutiquam reprehendenda eſt; multi enim ſancti viri ac Doctores quemadmodum de virtutibus ſcripſerunt, ita è regione de vitiis copioſè diſſeruerunt. Ita quæ Cæſarum refert vitia Suetonius, in odium illorum monſtrorum id facit, ut ea ſcilicet fugiamus ac evitemus: imò cogitemus in quanta cæcitate fuerint perditi illi nebulones: & multò magis in quanta ſtupiditate mundus, qui talia portenta dignatus eſt ullo honore, cum nihil illis tetrius ac magis abominabile fuerit.*

(*a*) *See among others Joannes Sariſberienſis, Biſhop of Chartres, de nugis Curialium lib. 3. cap. 13. who alledges the Example of St. Paul in his Excuſe.*

(*b*) *Or, the 6th. according to the* Roman *Catholicks.*

(*c*) *When they explain the Title* de frigidis *and other Matrimonial Subjects.*

(*d*) *Diſſertat. ſur les oeuvres de Mr. de Saint Evremont pag. 216. 217. Paris 1698.*

(*e*) *That there were other Books moſt pernicious, printed at* Paris, *and written by ſome Doctors, againſt which the Sacred Faculty ſhould thunder out Anathema's, whereas they were ſilent: whereupon he named a Set of Books, among which that of Dr* Boileau de contactibus impudicis *was one.* Afaire de Marie d'Agreda pag. 11.

(*) *Caſaub. comment. in Perſ. ſat. 4. pag. m. 344. & ſeq.*

(†) *Note, That St.* Chryſoſtome, *and* Caſaubon *look upon this as a true point of Morality: One will have it to be advantageous to good Manners, and the other to be contrary to them. Wherefore I may ſay, that in a caſe of Conſcience and Morality in* Caſaubon's *Judgment ought not to be prefer'd; and I may ſay ſo without advancing any thing contrary to what I have ſaid above, that the thing I could be blamed for, would be only a Grammatical Buſineſs.*

(‡) *In the Article of* Suetonius.

(||) *Henricus Loritus Glaceanus præfat. in Sueton. apud Goldaſt. Prolegom. in Petronium cap. 2. pag. m. 30.*

nities cenſured by him; but becauſe they did not love him they ſided with the *Puriſts*.

But tho' this Faction be never ſo numerous, either thro' ſuch Motives or more honourable ones, 'tis certain the contrary Party is conſiderable enough to juſtifie thoſe who ſtand for it. The Authority of the ancient Fathers of the Church, who therein imitated the Prophets and Apoſtles, makes their Opinion ſo highly probable, that if any one ſhou'd obſtinately maintain that it can't be follow'd with a ſafe Conſcience, he wou'd not deſerve to be minded.

If the *Anti-Puriſts* were contented to ſay that their Opinion is better, one might think oneſelf obliged to debate the Matter with them, and to compare together the Reaſons of both Parties, tho' in Truth it ſeems very ſtrange that Chriſtians ſhou'd queſtion whether there is a better Courſe to be taken than that of the ſacred Writers. But after all, one might hear their Objections, and propoſe Difficulties. I have no need of ſuch Diſcuſſions; 'tis enough for me that the Conduct of the Hiſtorians or Criticks, who relate obſcene Things, is not only allowed and authorized by a conſtant Practice, but alſo very good.

For if thoſe Authors cou'd lawfully write what I have writ, I may lawfully do the ſame, and quote them. I deſire no more. Others may examine, if they pleaſe, whether I had done better in taking quite another Method.

The Right I have to quote what I have quoted, is grounded upon theſe two Reaſons: One is, that if every Body is allowed to read *Catullus* and *Martial*, &c. an Author may be allowed to quote out of thoſe Poets ſuch Paſſages as he thinks fit: The other is, that if it be lawful for an Hiſtorian to relate a lewd Action of *Caligula*, an Author may relate an obſcene Thought or Remark of *Montagne* or *Brantome*; for ſuch a Remark is not near ſo bad as the Infamies of *Caligula*. It were a Contradiction or an abſurd Thing to ſuffer that *Petronius* and *Suetonius*, and the moſt wanton Poets, ſhou'd be printed and publickly ſold with Notes explaining the moſt brutiſh Obſcenities, and to forbid the Author of a critical Dictionary, attended with a Commentary, to alledge a Paſſage of thoſe Writers for the Confirmation or Illuſtration of a Thing.

AN ANSWER to three Objections.

Here I muſt examine three Objections that are commonly raiſed: 1. 'Tis ſaid that a Phyſician and a Caſuiſt are obliged by the Nature of their Subject, to rake into many Ordures, but that my Work required no ſuch Thing. 2. That thoſe who write in *Latin*, may take a Liberty which the *French* Tongue will not bear. 3. That what was allowable in former Ages, ought to be forbidden in ours, becauſe of its prodigious Corruption.

The firſt Objection can only be made by ſuch Readers as know nothing of the Nature of my Book. 'Tis not a Book like thoſe that are entituled *Bouquet Hiſtorial*, *Fleurs d'exemples*, *Parterre hiſtorique*, *Lemniſci hiſtoriarum*, in which an Author inſerts only what he pleaſes. 'Tis an hiſtorical Dictionary with a Commentary. *Lais* ought to appear in it as well as *Lucretia*; and becauſe 'tis a Dictionary that comes out after many others, it ought chiefly to contain what is not to be found in others. The Reader muſt find in it, not only a general Account of ſuch Actions as are beſt known, but alſo a particular one of thoſe that are leaſt known, and a Collection of what is diſpers'd in ſeveral Places. Proofs ought to be alledg'd, examin'd, confirm'd, and cleared. In a word, 'tis a Compilation. But every body ought to know, That *a Compiler* (a) *who relates things, and Comments upon 'em, has all the Privileges of a Phyſician, and of a Lawyer*, &c. *as occaſion requires; he may uſe their verbal Proceſſes, and the Words belonging to their Profeſſion. If he relates the Divorce of* Lotharius *and* Tetberge, *he may publiſh ſome Extracts out of* Hincmar, *Archbiſhop of* Rheims, *who writ down the Impurities that were proved during the Trial.* This is what I ſaid in my Reflections upon the *pretended* Judgment of the Publick, in the Year 1697. I repeat it with this other Paſſage: "(b) When I ſhall be taught the ſecret of collecting in a Compilation
" whatever is to be found in the Ancients, concerning the Curtezan *Lais*, without
" mentioning any lewd Action, I ſhall plead Guilty. At leaſt it muſt be proved a-
" gainſt me, that a Commentator has not the Privilege of collecting whatever
" has been ſaid of *Helena*; but how can it be proved? Is there any Legiſlator who
" told the Compilers, *You'll go ſo far, and no farther: You ſhall not quote* Athenæus,
" *nor ſuch a Scholiaſt, nor ſuch a Philoſopher?* Is it not uſual for them to inſert in a
" Chapter whatever their reading affords them?" I could name many Divines, who having deſignedly pitch'd upon a certain Subject, have quoted out of all Authors whatever they thought fit, tho' they were things that defiled the Imagination; I ſhall only name three, (c) *Lydius*, *Saldenus*, and ***Lomeier***. They were *Dutch* Miniſters, the firſt at *Dort*, the ſecond at the *Hague*, and the third at *Zutphen*. They were very much eſteem'd for their Learning and Virtue. Whoever reads the Dialogues of the firſt concerning Nuptial Ceremonies, the Diſſertations of the ſecond (d) *de Canis pretio*, and the Diſſertation of the third (e) concerning Kiſſes, will find in them horrid Obſcenities, and abominable Quotations.

It will be ſaid, that thoſe Books are written in *Latin*. This is the ſecond Objection I am to anſwer, and I ſhall eaſily ſhew the weakneſs of it: for an obſcene object is no leſs offenſive to Modeſty, when it offers itſelf to thoſe who underſtand *Latin*, than when it makes an Impreſſion upon thoſe who underſtand *French*; and if it were a fault to imprint obſcene Objects in one's own and the Reader's Imagination, thoſe three Miniſters could not be juſtified. They underſtood what they writ, and made it intelligible to their Readers, and conſequently they have defiled,

(a) *Theſe words are taken from my Reflexions upon a Piece intituled,* Jugement du public *&c. pag.* 4.

(b) *Ibid. pag.* 14.

(c) *James.*

(d) *In the Book intituled,* Otia Theologica, *printed in the Year* 1684.

(e) *in a Book intituled,* Dierum genialium ſive diſſertationum philologicarum decas 1. *printed in* 1694.

filed, and do ſtill defile the Imagination of thoſe who read their Books. But were it not a very unjuſt Thing to tax them with ſuch a Fault? Thoſe who write in *French* ought not therefore to be taxed with it, for they do no more than underſtand what they write, and make it intelligible to their Readers.

I know two Differences will be alledged: One is, that thoſe who underſtand *Latin*, are not ſo many as thoſe who underſtand *French*: The other is, that thoſe who underſtand *Latin* are better provided than others, againſt the malignant Influence of obſcene Objects. I anſwer in the firſt place, That *Latin* is grown ſo common all over *Europe*, that the firſt Difference wou'd not be ſufficient to juſtifie thoſe who relate or quote obſcene Things in that Language; the Miſchief wou'd be very great. I ſay in the ſecond Place, that 'tis only by degrees that Study corroborates a Man againſt Objects that ſully the Imagination; and therefore *Latin* Obſcenities wou'd have a dangerous Effect upon Scholars. We hardly find, generally ſpeaking, that they are more chaſte and leſs debauch'd than other Young-Men. Laſtly, I ſay that moſt of my Readers are Men of Letters; for thoſe who have no Learning, little mind a Book intermixed with *Greek* and *Latin* Paſſages as mine is. However, if they are no Scholars, they can't underſtand the chief Obſcenities, ſince they are in *Latin*. To conclude, if there is any Solidity in the Differences objected to me, I may make Advantage of it.

I proceed to the third Objection, which runs upon the great Corruption of our Age. It is ſaid, that we have loſt both the Honeſty of Manners, and that of Words. The Words that were formerly modeſt, are no longer ſo; there's a Neceſſity to uſe others, otherwiſe we ſhou'd loſe the little Virtue that remains. I ſhan't examine whether there is any Reaſon to believe that Men are now more corrupt than they were in former Times. The (a) ſame Complaints have been made at all Times, and that very Thing ought to make us doubt of the Truth of it. I can hardly believe that the Corruption of our Age is equal to that of the Reign of *Charles* IX and *Henry* III. But ſuppoſing the Thing in queſtion, I ſhall draw a quite contrary Concluſion from it; for 'tis never ſo neceſſary to repreſent in a lively manner (G) the Turpitude of Vice, than when it prevails moſt; and 'tis a wrong Way of ſtemming the Current of Lewdneſs, to cry it down with ſoft Words, and to ſcruple to give an odious Name to a Proſtitute. Beſides, if there is ſo great a Corruption, What Benefit has the World got by that Chaſtity of Words introduced into the *French* Tongue within theſe ſixty Years, according to M. *Chevreau*'s Calculation? Is it not a plain Sign that the Proſcription of pretended obſcene Idea's is an inſignificant Remedy? Who told you they ought to be expunged, for fear of entirely deſtroying Modeſty? Have you conſulted the Women for whoſe ſake you chiefly abſtain from thoſe Words? Have they confeſs'd to you, that their Honour is very much endangered by them? Wou'd they not rather ſay, that 'tis a Satyr upon them, to believe they are not Proof againſt an Idea and a Word? Wou'd they not tell you, that if they are for Words, that don't expreſs Impurity ſo fully, 'tis to give a more exact Notion of their Virtue, becauſe they are more ſenſible of Modeſty than Women were formerly? and therefore they don't look upon Obſcenities as a dangerous Thing; Obſcenities wou'd rather give a new Strength to their Modeſty. The only Reaſon why they are offended with them is, becauſe they think there is ſome Unpoliteneſs and Uncivility in certain Words. Thoſe who pretend that conſidering the prodigious Corruption of our Age, every Expreſſion which they call obſcene, ought to be avoided, are like a Traveller, who to keep his dirty Cloak from ſoiling, ſhou'd take Care notto put it in a ſmoaking Room. If the Depravation is ſo great, that the reading of an obſcene hiſtorical Fact might move young People to commit Adultery, you may be ſure they are ſo many Perſons infected with the Plague, whom you are afraid of making worſe, by placing them near a Man who has got the Itch. A polite Style, and nice Expreſſions will not cure ſuch People, and ſtop 'em upon the Brink of a Precipice.

(a) *See a fine Paſſage relating to this in the 3d Volum of* Vigneul Marville's Melanges.

(G) *It is never ſo neceſſary to repreſent in a lively manner the Turpitude of Vice, than when it prevails moſt.*] See in the Article of *Peter Damian* what moved him to write the *Gomorrhæus*, and conſider how the *Dominicans* reſolved to preach againſt the unnatural Sin, when they came to know that it was grown very common. Preaching being allotted to them, they deliberated whether they ſhou'd thunder out againſt that Sin, or ſay nothing of it; and they concluded that there was a Neceſſity to thunder out againſt it, ſince it was grown ſo crying. (*) *Fratres Ordinis Prædicatorum, qui eum apud Chriſtianos locum invaſerunt, quem olim apud Gentiles obtinuerant Poëtæ & Satyrici, in tracta. de Turcis*: Quæſitum extitit de gravi infectione populi Chriſtiani, quoad prædicta vitia (Sodomitica) an videlicet tam gravis infectio ex negligentia officii prædicationis contingerent, dum ipſi prædicatores gravitatem hujus vitii fidelibus non proponerent? Quæſitumque ulteriùs extitit, an propter ſimplices & innocentes expediret Prædicatoribus ſub ſilentio pertranſire de hujuſmodi vitiis diſſerendo? Reſponſum fuit, quòd quia officium prædicationis eſt præcipuum in Eccleſia ad extirpationem vitiorum & plantationem virtutum, ſi gravitas hujus vitii fidelibus ardenter proponeretur, ut quia videlicet pro vindicta clamat ad cœlum, &c. Ad ſecundum quæſitum reſponſum fuit, quòd omnino ſub ſilentio pertranſire non expediret, etiam propter quoſcunque innocentes, multiplici ratione. Primò, quia videmus quòd tales innocentes etiam ex diabolica ſuggeſtione continuè ſeducuntur abſque auditione verbi Dei, & declaratione illorum vitiorum. Unde utriſque tam reis quàm innocentibus expedit talis declaratio verbi Dei. Secundò ad hoc nos admonet Scriptura, prout eſt illud; Si non annunciaveris iniquo iniquitatem ejus, ſanguinem ejus de manu tua requiram. Et iterum; Clama, ne ceſſes: annuncia populo meo ſcelera eorum. Ratione etiam concludebatur. Nam Apoſtolus Paulus expreſſiſſimè loquitur ad Roman. 1. de hujuſmodi vitiis, & ſicut cuncta alia ſcripta ipſius neceſſariò prædicantur, ita & præſens hæc materia, cùm non ſit data diſtinctio inter ſuas doctrinas, quare videlicet una magis debeat eſſe prædicabilis quàm altera. Ad hoc eſt Gregorius in Moralibus; Sicut incauta locutio in errorem pertrahit, ita indiſcretum ſilentium in errore relinquit.

(*) *Goldaſt. in prolegom. Petronii cap. 2. pag. m. 32, 33.*

Certainly

Certainly this is the Sophiſm call'd, *à non cauſa pro cauſa.* The Fate of Chaſtity does not depend upon that: you don't go to the Cauſe of the Evil; it requires a quite different Remedy. Young People have their Minds full of obſcene Thoughts, and go thro' a Courſe of filthy Things, at leaſt in Words, before they read *Suetonius.* Ill Converſations unavoidable to every Lad, who is not kept at Sight, are a thouſand times more dangerous than Hiſtories of Debauchery. A learned Man (*a*) ſays, that the *French* Tranſlation of *Plutarch* by *Amyot, is dangerous to Morality, becauſe Things are deſcribed in it with too great Freedom and Plainneſs, and becauſe there are ſome Words in it that have now an immodeſt Signification.* He'll give me leave to be of another Opinion. The Deſcriptions and Phraſes of *Amyot*'s Tranſlation have nothing in them that comes up to thoſe that are daily heard in the Commerce of the World. To which I add, that if this Verſion of *Plutarch* was dangerous to Morality, any other Verſion of *Plutarch* wou'd be ſo too, unleſs the Tranſlator took Care to leave out all the Paſſages wherein Things are deſcribed *with too great Freedom and Plainneſs.*

There is no Medium: either no lewd Action ought to be mention'd in a Book, or our Criticks muſt own it will always be dangerous, tho' written never ſo nicely. A Tranſlation will be more polite than the other; but if they are faithful, all the obſcene Objects that are in the Original will appear in them.

It may be granted to M. *Chevreau*, that *Faire des enfans* is a groſs Expreſſion, and that one ſhou'd ſay *Avoir des enfans*; but if any one ſhou'd further ſay that the firſt Expreſſion is very prejudicial to good Manners, and that the ſecond is very beneficial to them, be accounted a fooliſh Man.

Upon a due Examination of Things, it will appear that the Word *Paillard* ought to be rejected only for the ſame Reaſon that we reject the Words *Contaminer, Vilipender, Vituperer*, and a great many other old Words: That is to ſay, it has no other Fault but being obſolete. Thoſe who have nice Ears wou'd be diſpleas'd to hear the Words I have juſt now mention'd. For the ſame Reaſon they are offended with the Words *Paillard* and *Paillardiſe*; for if the Thing ſignified by them was the Cauſe of their Diſguſt, they cou'd not endure the Word *Impudique*, whoſe Idea is no leſs ſignificant than that of *Paillard.*

I ſhall make two other Obſervations: The firſt is, that our *Puriſts* generally approve on one hand what they condemn on the other. Ask a *Roman* Catholick, who is an Enemy to the Quietiſts, whether an Hiſtorian ought not to avoid touching upon Things that ſully the Imagination? he'll anſwer you, *'tis his Duty.* Tell him ſome Days after, that a Relation of Quietiſm is come out, containing a particular Account of the abominable Impurity of *Molino*'s Followers; give him to underſtand that you have been offended with the reading of that Book, and that ſuch Things are inconſiſtent with Modeſty; he'll anſwer you, that 'tis neceſſary to diſcover the Abomination of thoſe Hypocrites, in order to undeceive many People who are inclined to Quietiſm, and that the Author of that Relation is to be commended for expoſing to the publick View the infamous Practices of that Sect. Many other People will agree with you, that one can't have too great a Regard for modeſt Ears, and will exclaim with great Zeal againſt *Suetonius* and *Lampridius*; but if you ask 'em ſome Days after, Whether one ought to excuſe the Hiſtorians who have related ſo many abominable Things concerning the *Albigenſes, Fratricelli, Adamites, Picards, Lollards*, and *Turlupins*, their Anſwer will be that their Character of Hiſtorians and zealous Catholicks engaged them to acquaint the World with the Obſcenities of thoſe Hereticks, the Forerunners of the *Lutherans.*

The *Engliſh* Papiſts, who fled into *France* or *Spain*, did not offend the chaſte Ears of their Friends, when they publiſh'd ſeveral Satyrs againſt Queen *Elizabeth*, wherein they repreſented her as a Monſter of Lewdneſs. The *Leaguers* did not blame the Libels, which contain'd impudent Deſcriptions of the Lewdneſs of the Court of *Henry* III.

The ſame Inequality is obſerved among the Proteſtants. They did not complain that thoſe Libels againſt *Henry* III their Perſecutor, were offenſive to chaſte Ears. *Buchanan*, who publiſh'd a Book concerning the Lewdneſs of *Mary* Queen of *Scotland*, is a Man of bleſſed Memory among the Presbyterians; and yet that Book horribly defiled the Imagination. *Nicolas de Clemangis, Pelagius Alvarez, Baptiſta Mantuanus*, and many others, who made a very plain and obſcene Deſcription of the Lewdneſs of the Court of *Rome*, are placed by the Proteſtants among the Witneſſes of Truth. They quote 'em to this very Day upon all Occaſions, and long Paſſages out of thoſe Authors are to be found in moſt controverſial Books. You'll find many of 'em in a (*b*) *French* Book of the famous *du Pleſſis Mornai.* Not long ſince three (*c*) Miniſters, two of which are *Swiſs*, and the third a *French-man*, have reviv'd thoſe Quotations. *Henry Stephens*, who tells ſo many obſcene Stories in his Apology for *Herodotus*, was not blamed for it: That Book was thought very proper to ridicule the Church of *Rome*, and was approved upon that Account; there are many Editions of it, and I hear it has been lately reprinted at the *Hague.* Can there be a greater Collection of filthy Jeſts, Querks, and mean and obſcene Words, than what is to be found in ſome Books of *Sainte Aldegonde*, who nevertheleſs was very much eſteem'd and commended? The Book a *German* gave notice of in the *Nova literaria maris Balthici* in the Year 1699, which is to be intituled, *Sacra Pontificiorum Priapeia, ſeu obſcænæ Papiſtarum in auricularibus confeſſionibus quæſtiones, quibus S. Confeſſionarii innocentes puellas fœminaſque ad laſci-*

(*a*) *Dacier Preface to his Tranſlation of ſome Lives of* Plutarch.

(*b*) *Intituled* Le Myſtere

té.

(*c*) *Mr.* Heidegger in hiſtoria Papatus, *in the Year* 1684. *&* in Magna Babylone, *in the Year* 1687. *Mr.* Zuinger in Tractatu de feſto corporis Chriſti, *in the Year* 1685. *and Mr.* Jurieu *in his* Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme *in the Year* 1685.

viam ſollicitant, will doubtleſs be very well approved; and yet it will be very offenſive to chaſte Ears, ſince it will contain a Collection of the obſcene Queſtions of Confeſſors. Which puts me in Mind of the illuſtrious *Peter du Moulin*, who objected to the Roman Catholicks the Obſcenities that are to be found in their Books concerning auricular Confeſſion. He took notice (*a*) of ſome that are horrid, and no leſs abominable than the Lewdneſs wherewith *Procopius* accuſes the Empreſs *Theodora*. Many Proteſtant Controverſiſts (*b*) have publiſh'd the Obſcenities that are to be found in the Books of Confeſſors.

But to ſpeak of a thing of a later Date, I ſay that the Book intituled *Les avantures de la Madona & de François d'Aſſiſe*, publiſh'd (*c*) in the Year 1701, is indeed written in very modeſt Words; but the Idea's which the (*d*) Author excites in the Mind of the Reader, are ſo horrid and monſtrous, that none but *Lucian* and ſuch like Men, can bear their Enormity. The Proteſtants are not offended at it; on the contrary, they believe that the Author deſigning *to make every Body ſenſible of the Ridiculouſneſs of Popery without ingaging in any Controverſie*, has done a Service to the good Cauſe. Some Complaints have been made (*e*) of what he ſays in Favour of *Neſtorius*; but he has not been blamed for any Thing elſe. The Biſhop of *Meaux* being obliged to mention (*f*) a Thing of the ſame Nature, in order to ſhew the Extravagance of a fanatical Woman, thought he had been defiled by it, and for a Remedy had Recourſe to this Prayer: "(*g*) Lord, if I durſt, I wou'd beg of you one of your Seraphims, with "a hot burning Coal to purifie my Lips defiled with this Narrative, tho' neceſſary". Take notice of this laſt Word: it makes much againſt thoſe who ſay that the Imagination of the Reader ought to be reverenced even at the Expence of Truth. That Prelate, who is otherwiſe ſo careful to avoid Obſcenities, that he dares not uſe (*h*) the Word *Paillarde* (Whore) without making an Excuſe for it, did not think that the obſcene and horrid Extravagances of Madam *Guyon* ought to be ſuppreſs'd.

I don't mean, that generally ſpeaking, all the Proteſtants who have taken the way I have mention'd, deſign to bring Hiſtorians, Compilers, and Commentators under the Yoke of the *Puriſts*. I only believe that many of 'em pretend to do it; but ſince they approve afterwards what they had condemn'd, their Taſte and their Teſtimony can do me no Prejudice, and I may take Advantage of the Opinion of all the reſt who are not inconſiſtent with themſelves.

It cannot be ſaid that for the Good of the Church, an Author may be allowed to write Things that ſully the Imagination, and that in this Caſe he is to be commended for doing it. Such an Aſſertion can't be admitted; for if the publiſhing of Obſcenities was an ill Thing in it ſelf, it cou'd not be uſed for the Benefit of a good Cauſe, without tranſgreſſing againſt a Command of God, importing that (*i*) we muſt not do Evil, that Good may come of it.

I proceed to the ſecond Obſervation. Have I not acted againſt this fine Precept of *Iſocrates*, (*k*) *Believe that whatever cannot be honeſtly done, cannot be honeſtly ſpoken?* And ought not this Precept to be a Law to all Chriſtians, ſince St. *Paul* (*l*) wou'd not have any thing that is filthy to be named among them? I anſwer, that this excellent Axiom concerns (*H*) only the ill Cuſtom of young People and married Men, who ſpeak on all Occaſions of their lewd Practices and impudently Diſcourſe of every thing relating to that ſort of Pleaſures. 'Tis at leaſt certain that this Apoſtle never meant that Men ſhou'd forbear talking ſeriouſly, virtuouſly and hiſtorically of a lewd Action. He did not deprive Parents of the Liberty of examining their Children about the hiſtorical Facts contain'd in the Bible, and making 'em repeat that *Jacob*'s Daughter was raviſh'd, that a Son of *David* raviſh'd his own Siſter, *&c.* Nothing can be more ſhameful than this Action of *David*'s Son; and yet there's no harm in repeating, preaching, and printing it? Cou'd St. *Paul* forbid to mention it? Wou'd he have prohibited the reading of the Bible? Was he not willing that his Letters ſhou'd be read, and that the very Children ſhou'd know what he writ to the *Romans* concerning the abominable Life of the *Gentiles*? A Man muſt be mad to think that the Precept of *Iſocrates* ſignifies that a Scholar ſhou'd never give an Account to his Tutor or Father of ſuch Paſſages of the Iliad as concern the Adulteries of the Gods.

If one had a Mind to carry the Diſpute as far as it can go, it might be ſaid that Robbing, Betraying, Lying, and Killing are diſhoneſt Things, and that there is no Diſhoneſty in mentioning thoſe Crimes; but becauſe 'tis evident that the Precept of *Iſocrates* concerns only Sins contrary to Chaſtity, ſuch an Objection wou'd be a meer Cavil. The Cynicks and the Stoicks made uſe of it to juſtifie their Doctrine that there is no Obſcenity in any Word: *Cicero* (*m*) confutes 'em only by ſuppoſing that there is a natural Shame.

(*H*) *That excellent Axiom condemns only the ill Cuſtom.*] Here follows the Thought of a Commentator upon thoſe Words of *Iſocrates*. "*Prohibetur hic omnis αἰσχρολογία καὶ βλασφημία καὶ αἰσχρουργία, quibus nihil eſt indocto vulgo jucundius aut uſitatius, cum nihil ſit turpius & homine indignius .... Huc accerſatur Divi Pauli præceptum: πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία ἐν ὑμῖν μηδ᾽ ὀνομαζέσθω. Chriſtus etiam ματαίους λόγους ἀποδοῦναι ἐπεῖπεν. Sed nos parum curamus, proh dolor! reddendam Deo rationem de verbis. Nec mirum, cum tam flagitioſa & conſcelerata vitæ ſit & morum licentia. Væ væ nobis, niſi mature reſipuerimus.*

'Tis

(*g*) *Id. ib.*

(*h*) *This holy Apoſtle took care not to call the Proſtitute he ſpeaks of, an Adultreſs, μοιχαλίδα, μοιχαλίδα, but a publick Woman, and if I may be allowed to uſe but once theſe odious Names, a Whore, a Proſtitute, πόρνην. Id. Preface to the Revelation pag. 27. of the Edition printed at the Hague.*

(*i*) *Rom.* 3. 8.

(*k*) Ἃ ποιεῖν αἰσχρὸν, ταῦτα νόμιζε μηδὲ λέγειν εἶναι καλόν. Quæ facta ſunt turpia, ne dictu quidem decora eſſe puto. *Iſocrates ad Demonicum p. m.* 6.

(*l*) *Eph.* 5. 4.

(*m*) Nec vero audiendi ſunt Cynici, aut ſi qui fuerunt Stoici pæne Cynici, qui reprehendunt & irrident, quod ea quæ re turpia non ſint, nominibus ac verbis flagitioſa ducamus: illa autem quæ turpia ſunt, no-
us appellemus ſuis. Latrocinari, fraudare, adulterare, re turpe eſt; ſed dicitur non obſcœne: Liberis dare operam
ſtum eſt, nomine obſcœnum: pluraque in eam ſententiam ab eiſdem contra verecundiam diſputantur. Nos autem
m ſequamur, & omne quod abhorret oculorum auriumque approbatione, fugiamus. *Cicero de officiis lib.* 1. *cap.* 35.

'Tis time to conclude this long Diſſertation; 'Tis a Subject more difficult to treat than one can think. I hope my Juſtification will be fully approved, not by thoſe who are too preſumptuous to be able to ſee that they are undeceived, but by thoſe who have been too eaſily impoſed upon by others, or by ſuperficial Reaſons. If they were excuſable for being dazzled with ſpecious Appearances, before I publiſh'd theſe four Explanations, they can be no longer ſo if they perſiſt in their Illuſion. They ſhou'd have followed the Command of our Saviour, (a) *Judge not according to Appearance, but judge a righteous Judgment.* They have yielded to the firſt Impreſſions of the Objects, without expecting to hear the Reaſons on both ſides; which is always neceſſary, eſpecially when the Queſtion is to judge of a Writer who does not follow the moſt common Way. One ſhou'd immediately ſuſpect that he has ſome Reaſons for it, and that he wou'd not make ſuch a Step, if upon a long Examination of his Subject, he had not conſidered the ſeveral Parts of it more carefully than thoſe who only read his Work. This well grounded Suſpicion ſhou'd make People very cautious in giving their Judgment: but the Thing can't be help'd; all that can be hop'd is, that their ſecond Thoughts will be better than the firſt.

(a) John 7. 24.

I muſt acquaint the Reader, that I have juſtified, in ſeveral Places of this Dictionary, ſuch Things as might have offended ſome Readers.

17 JY 63

THE TABLE.

The Reader may obſerve, as he looks into this Table, that when the Figures ſtand alone, the Text is referr'd to; but when follow'd by the Letters *a* or *b*, that denotes the firſt or ſecond Column of the Remarks; and if the Letter *n* be added, it denotes ſome Marginal Note to the ſame Column.

And for the eaſier finding out of the Matters in the Table, the Figures are ſometimes follow'd by the Capital Letter referring from the Text to the Columes, with the Directions *ad in. ad med. ad fin.* which immediately diſcover the Matter ſought for.

That the Reader may alſo without Trouble know in what Volume he is to look, we take notice in this Place, that the Second Volume begins at Page 801. with the Letter *C.* The Third Volume at Page 1551. with the Letter *H.* And the Fourth Volume at Page 2439. with the Letter *P.*

We have mark'd this on the ſecond Page of every Leaf in the Index, that the Reader may not be oblig'd to turn back for Directions.

A B.

Abbey (*of* St. Denis). *The Ground of the Court's Power over its Monks,* 23. a. *An Abbey given for a Song,* 333. n.

Abbreviators, *ought to have a good Taſte,* 57. a. *See* Abridgments.

Abderame, *compar'd to* Alexander *and* Scipio *in point of Continence,* 11. b. *How he diſpoſed of the Daughter of* Eudes *Duke of* Aquitain, 2249. b.

Abderites: *What their Diſtemper was,* 15. b. *What* Cicero *underſtands by an* Abderite, 1109. b. *Whether they wrote a Letter to* Hippocrates, *to deſire him to come and ſee* Democritus. 1081. a.

Abelard (Peter): *his turn of Wit and his Vanity,* 20. b. *Had Thoughts of flying into* Turky *to avoid the Perſecutions of* Orthodox *Inquiſitors,* 158. b. *The Catalogue of his Manuſcripts,* 195. b. *They did not anſwer the general Opinion of the Author's Subtilty,* 196. a. *A Liſt of ſome particular Opinions, whether truly or falſly aſcribed to him,* 584. b. & ſeq. *His Deſcription of the Terrors he was under upon the Calling of any Council or Convocation of the Clergy,* 159. a. *His Works when publiſh'd fell much ſhort of the Reputation he had in his Life-time,* 196. a. *His Poſition that we ought to believe nothing that may not be prov'd by natural Reaſon condemn'd as Heretical by* Innocent II. *and the whole* Gallican *Church,* 2139. b. *A Fore-runner of the* Socinians *in the Point about Chriſt's dying,* 584. b. *Condemn'd by Proteſtants more than by many Catholicks,* 586. a. *The great Intereſt he had in the Court of* Rome, *by means of his own Scholars in the higheſt Promotions there,* 1333. b. *The Lamentation of the Women of* Paris, *on occaſion of his loſing his Manly Parts,* 1336. b. *The firſt who brought School-Divinity in vogue,* 1600. *His intemperate careſſing of* Heloiſia *deſcrib'd,* 1601. a.

A C.

Abiram; *whoſe Fate was the pretended Alluſion among the* Pagans *to the Fate of* Corah, Dathan, *and* Abiram, 215. a.

Ablancourt (Fremont d') *a Reflexion on one of his Thoughts, That Princes ought to underſtand* Latin. 2476. b.

Abrabanel (Rabbi) *liv'd on a foot of Civility with the Chriſtians, but wrote the bittereſt in the World againſt 'em,* 34. a. *His Interpretations on the Books of the* Old Teſtament *highly eſteem'd,* 33. *His idle Conceit about the Nature of the Serpent's Temptation,* 1251. a. *His impious Thought upon the motive of the Prohibition againſt touching one of the Fruits of the Garden of* Eden, 1257. b.

Abraham; *born and bred an Idolater, and made Idols, and ſold them, according to a Jewiſh Tradition,* 34. a. *The firſt who publickly maintain'd the Unity of God,* 34. b. *The firſt Refugee baniſh'd his Country on the ſcore of Religion,* Ibid. *Fear'd Death more than conjugal Diſhonour,* 2675. b. *His Diſſimulation not eaſily accounted for,* 2676. b.

Abram (Pere) *his Notes on the Paraphraſe of* Nonnus, *and his Commentaries on* Cicero *very learn'd,* 36. b. *Scarce known in foreign Countries to the moſt Learn'd, not even to* Dr. Cave, 37. a.

Abridgments. *Qualities requiſite to make a good Abridgment,* 400. b. *It requires a great Diſcernment,* 407. b.

Vol. II. 881.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 2439.

407. b. Advice to thoſe who undertake to Abridge, 1115. b. Abridgments would be found very faulty if compar'd with the Originals, 1130. b.

Abumuſlimus, General of the firſt Caliphs of the Race of Abbaſſ. His Metempſychoſis very different from that of Pythagoras, 41. a. The Agreement between his Doctrine and that of Spinoza, Ibid.

Abyſſins; why their Emperors have born the Name of Preſter John, 32. a.

Academicks; did not teach an Indolence to Inſenſibility, 1058. a.

Academy; the Founder of the middle, 317. a. The Founder of the third Academy did not differ from the ſecond, 857. a.

Acarnania; what point of Merit they pleaded to the Romans, when they ſollicited their Aſſiſtance againſt their Neighbours, 42.

Acatalepſis (The) or Incomprehenſibility of Things, by which of the Philoſophers firſt taught expreſly and formally, 318. b. Vide Incomprehenſibility.

Accidents; Peter D'Ailly explain'd 'em as Deſcartes does, 132. a.

Acciſſire; the meaning of this Term, 50. a.

Accius (Junius) a Latin Dramatick Poet. His Anſwer why he who ſucceeded ſo well on the Stage, could not ſpeak in the Courts, 48. b. A Comedian puniſh'd for naming him on the Stage, tho' he pleaded that 'twas permitted to name one who had given Pieces of his own to be repreſented, Ibid.

Acco; a word to frighten Children among the Greeks, its Original and Occaſion, 50.

Accurſius (Mariangelus) why he calls Salluſt Countryman, 52. a. Corrected 700 Paſſages in Claudian a Horſeback, 52. b. Added five new Books in his Edition of Ammianus Marcellinus, Ibid. The Oath he took to clear himſelf from Plagiariſm, 53. b.

Accurſius, a Florentin Civilian; Of Opinion that Theology was needleſs, and the Roman Laws ſufficient for underſtanding Divine Matters, 51. Author of the Maxim of Ignorance among the Lawyers, Græcum eſt non poteſt legi, 51. a.

Accuſations; a way to judge of the Truth or Falſhood of them, 614. a. b. Never receiv'd againſt Perſons abſent in the Service of the Republick of Rome, 873. a. Extraordinary Articles of Accuſation in an open Court, 305. a. In what Caſes the Accuſed ought to be clear'd, 2050. b.

Accuſers, how odious a Character, 884. a. Have in all Ages taken Advantage of what is ſaid upon the common News for a Foundation of their Accuſations, 1071. a. Hated even where they do but their Duty, 883. b.

Achilles; nurs'd with the Marrow of Lions, 57. a. Repreſented by the Poets not ſo much under the Idea of Bravery as that of invincible Courage, 58. b. His Temple ſwept by Birds, 65. b. The Splendor of his Apparition ſtrikes Homer blind, 66. a.

Acidalius; the ground of aſcribing to him the Treatiſe, intitled, Women not rational Animals, 68. b. The honeſt Deſign of this Treatiſe, 1392.

Acontius, his Conjecture on the Clearſightedneſs of the xvith Century, 70. a. The Character of his Book, de Stratagematis Satanæ, Inſcrib'd to Queen Elizabeth, 70. b. The Character of his Book de Methodo, 71. a. His Project of a general Comprehenſion and Toleration, 72. a.

Acoſta, why he changed the Chriſtian for the Jewiſh Religion, 72. His Argument againſt the Truth of the Jewiſh Religion, 74. b. The Reaſons on which he might have renounced Natural Religion, 75. a.

Actors, The Privilege of thoſe who are chief Actors on the great Stage of the World, 107. b.

Actuarius, a Dignity belonging to the Phyſicians in the Court of Conſtantinople, 57. a.

Adam, how long he continued in a State of Innocence, 17. a. his long Mourning for Abel, and Abſtinence from Eve's Embraces, according to the Jewiſh Fables, ibid. His great Knowledge, 79. a. His prodigious Stature, according to the Talmudiſts, 81. a. His Life written by Loredano, a Venetian Nobleman, a moſt ſcandalous and blaſphemous Piece, 1256. b. The Conceit of a Rabbi who mentions Adam's Tutor, 2500. b.

Adam (Pere) his diſtinction between inſpired Writings and the Expreſſions of thoſe who are inſpired, 83. b. His reading Lectures of Anatomy to a Nun on the Parts of Generation cenſured, 86. a.

Adamites, variouſly calumniated, 87. b. Proteſtants and Catholicks falſly Reproach each other with having Adamites among 'em, 88. b.

Adonis, alluded to by the Prophet Ezekiel under the Name of Tammuz, 93. a. The Poem of Cavalier Marini with this Title, highly priz'd by the Italians, 302. a.

Adolphus (Guſtavus.) An Order publiſhed in Rome againſt the keeping any Print, or Poem, or Medal of him, 1654. a.

Adoption; the Ceremony uſed in Adoptions among the Barbarians, 1648. b.

Adriani (John Baptiſta;) a high Character of his Hiſto. 77, 94. Not conſidered by the Italians according to his Merit, ibid.

Adrianople; ſo called by the Emperor Hadrian by advice of the Oracle, to be cured of ſome Returns of Madneſs, 159. a.

Adultery; its odd kind of Puniſhment among ſome of the Ancients, 152. a. Its very old and ignominious Puniſhment among the ancient Romans, 456. b. The ſeventh Commandment againſt Adultery ſtrangely Expounded away, 801. a. b. Damages awarded for Adultery by Caius Marius, 1277. Adultery puniſhed more ſeverely than Murther in Heathen Countries 2675. b. The Reaſon of this, ibid.

Ædeſius, a Chriſtian Zealot and Martyr, gives Hierocles, Governor of Ægypt, a box on the Ear in open Court, 1658. b.

Æſchylus; how ſav'd from being ſton'd to Death for an Impiety, 1227. a.

Affranchiſing; when the Affranchiſing of the Peaſantry began in France, and upon what Occaſion, 904. b.

Agatho; his Maxim that 'tis likely many things ſhould happen againſt all likelihood, 100. a.

Agathocles; his good and ill Qualities, 2885. a. Timæus ought not to have medled with his Hiſtory, 2887. b.

Age; wherein conſiſt the Pleaſures of old Age, 2737. b.

Ageſilaus would not ſuffer his Queen or Daughter to be better Dreſs'd than the other Women of Sparta, 103. a. A fine Saying of his, ibid. His Religion as a private Man, 103. b. His Religion as a King, ibid.

Agis, the firſt King of Lacædemon who died by the Hands of his own People, 213. b.

Agnes, Widow to Henry II. her ſingular Caſe of Conſcience propoſed to Peter Damianus the great Caſuiſt, 1341. a.

Agnus Caſtus, the Original and Reaſon of this Name, 2811. a.

Agreda (Mary d') Extract of a Pamphlet concerning the Condemnation of her Book, 109. b. 110. a.

Agricola (George) his Verſes upon Indulgences, 111. a. b. The Reaſons of his not turning Proteſtant, ibid. b. The Lutherans refuſe his Body burial, ibid.

Agricola (John) Founder of the Antinomian Sect, 112. He would have reſtor'd the uſe of holy Oil, ibid. One of the three who drew up the Interim or Project of Reunion of Proteſtants and Papiſts, 113. a.

Agricola (Rodolphus) his Reaſons for not Marrying, 114. b. His Prognoſtick of Eraſmus's Greatneſs, ibid.

Agricola (Cornelius) charges the Sorbon with ſelling their Opinion in favour of Henry VIII's Divorce, 119. b. Is ſuppoſed to be gain'd over afterwards by Cranmer, ibid. Said to have led the Devil about in a String, and in the ſhape of a black Dog, 120. a. What kind of Reformation he would be at, 123. b. His occult Philoſophy explain'd a kind of Quietiſm, 124. A remarkable Paſſage left out of his Works in the Edition of Lyons, ibid.

Agrigentum; the wonderful Quality of the Salt found there, 1404. b. An extraordinary Effect of the Zeal of its Inhabitants for the Statue of Hercules, 1405. a.

Agrippa, his quarrelling with the Trojans for not ſending Guides over the Scamander with his Wife Julia, no Argument that he loved Julia, 2684. b.

Agropoli (Marquis d') Grandee of Spain, put to trouble by the Inquiſition for Writing againſt ſome fabulous Traditions which make for the Glory of Spain, 284. a. Looked on as a Writer who betray'd the Honour of his Country, ibid.

Aguirre (Cardinal) wrote againſt the Deciſions of the Clergy of France in 1682, 125. b. Raiſed from a Spaniſh Monk to the Cardinalſhip, for his Zeal for the Court of Rome, ibid.

Ajax (Telamonius) his Anſwer to his Father, who adviſed him to Pray before he went to Battel, 127. b. Invoked by the Greeks before the Battel of Salamis, 128. The Arms of Achilles wafted to his Tomb by the Storm which Shipwreck'd Ulyſſes, ibid. Alexander would ſee and honour the Sepulchre of Ajax, 128. How the Crime which he committed againſt Caſſandra was expiated by the Locrians, 854. b.

Ailly (Cardinal d') his Character by Launoi, 103. a. Bewitched to Aſtrology, 131. b. Condemns ſeveral Tenets of the Church of Rome, ibid. One of the Forerunners of Deſcartes, 132. a.

Air; The Air the Principle of all Things, according to ſome Philoſophers, 1827.

Akiba (Rabbi) the Motive of his Studies, 138. The Reaſons of his altering the Hebrew Text of the Bible, ibid. a.

He's

He's the Compiler of the Jewiſh Traditions, ibid. b. His myſterious Doctrines of the Cloſeſtool, 139. a.

Alabaſter (William) Chaplain to the Earl of Eſſex in Queen Elizabeth's Days, upon his Expedition to Cales, his fondneſs of the Catholick way, 139. The ſtrange Effect of the laſt word of his Latin Tragedy Roxana on a Lady preſent at the acting of it, ibid. His whimſical manner of ſolving the Difficulty about our Saviour's being three Days and three Nights in the Bowels of the Earth, ibid. a.

Alains, leſs Barbarous than the Huns, 141. Their Worſhip, ibid. Conjugal Duty perform'd by them in Waggons, ibid.

Alamandus (Cardinal of St. Cecilia) harangues at the Council of Baſil againſt the Pope's Superiority over Councils, 142.

Alanſon (Duke of) the true Ground of the Hatred betwixt him and his Brother Henry III. 1624. b.

Albertus (Magnus) a Plea for his Writing on obſcene Subjects, though a Biſhop, 147. b. Said to have clear'd the Debts of his Biſhoprick of Ratiſbon by means of the Philoſophers Stone, ibid. His Body free from Corruption for ſeveral hundred Years, 146. b. The Invention of Cannon aſcribed to him, 147. His Sagacity in diſcovering that his Maid had loſt her Maidenhead by the Tone of her Voice, 1709. c.

Albigenſes; it is not true that they were Manicheans, 1153. c.

Alcæus, values himſelf more on being a Soldier than a Poet, 33. h.

Alciatus (Andrew) the firſt who corrected the barbarous Latin of the Civilians, 145. His Apology for his unconſtant unſettled Temper, 155. b. His mercenary Spirit ibid.

Alciatus (Terence) a Jeſuit, pitch'd on by Urban VIII. to anſwer Father Paul, 158. The reaſon of his Dilatorineſs in that performance, 159. a.

Alcibiades, the greateſt Lover of Pleaſure in the World, and the readieſt to quit them when his Affairs required it, 1630. a.

Alcinoi Menſa, & Alcinoi Apologus, the ground of theſe two Proverbs, 160. a.

Alcmena, why ſhe bore three Moons over her Forehead, 221. f. The opening her Tomb ſuppos'd to be the cauſe of a Calamity in Haliartus, parallel to the Accounts of Calamities in ſeveral Legends upon diſturbing the Bodies of the Saints, 165. b.

Alcyonius (Peter) ſuſpected of having deſtroy'd the only Manuſcript extant of Cicero de Gloria, to embeliſh his own Treatiſe de Exilio. 1. Loth to own that the Book de Mundo, aſcribed to Ariſtotle, and which he Tranſlated in Latin from the Greek, is a ſpurious Piece.

Alcoran, the Number of the Words which it contains, and how many of 'em are true, and how many falſe, 2110. a. The reaſons why the Spaniſh Inquiſition condemn'd Bibliander's Tranſlation of it, 619. a. Its Text corrected by Bibliander, 619. a. Of twelve thouſand Words which are in it, there are only three thouſand true, by Mahomet's own Confeſſion, 1110, kk. The Advantage the Mahometans reap hereby, ibid. The Expoſition of the Chapter of the Elephant in the Alcoran, according to the Turkiſh Commentators, 2017. c.

Alcoran of the Cordeliers, what it is, and the occaſion of writing it, 1352. H.

Aldobrandus; noted as an inſtance of the Ingratitude of the Publick to Men of Publick Spirits, 162.

Aldegonde (St.) whether he had ſufficient ground to ſend to the States of Holland, that Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Alençon were Married, 2651. a.

Aldhelme (St.) the manner of his proving the Perfection of his Chaſtity, 1340. b.

Alegambe (Pere) his notorious Lye of Beza, 560. c.

Aleſius (Alexander) his miraculous Preſervation, 1708. a.

Alexander; the Roman Emperor, his medly of Worſhips, and manner of preparing himſelf for them, 297. b. 298. a.

Alexander VI. (Pope) Died by the ſame Poiſon that he himſelf had mixed for Cardinal Hadrian, 1557. b.

Alexander VII. (Pope) a formal Story of his Inclination to turn Huguenot, 969. a. His Civil Carriage to ſome Engliſh Proteſtant Gentlemen, 970. a. How related by Blood to Mahomet IV, ibid. A very impudent Cheat put upon him by ſome Dutch Bookſellers, 971. a.

Alexander the Great; his Anſwer to him who offer'd him the Lyre of Paris, 63. b. His fine Anſwer to a Queen who ſent him delicious Refreſhments, 78. Why called Iskender Dhoulcarnein, 963. b. The Difference between his Character and that of his Father Philip, 2076. b. Whether the Romans ſent Ambaſſadors to him, 2077. a. His Chaſtity and Continence called in Queſtion, 586. b. Whether the Story of his being reprimanded by Apelles, for expoſing his Ignorance in Painting, be true, ibid. His Superſtition and Credulity, 346. b. An Apology for him in theſe Points, 347. a. Has Books ſent after him into Aſia, and particularly the Greek Poets, 1581. H. Forces theſe Words out of the Delphian Prieſteſs's Mouth, My Son you are invincible, 1757. E. By what means his Preceptor render'd himſelf agreeable to him, 1955. Z.

Alexander ab Alexandro (a Civilian) his Reaſons for quitting the Bar, 178.

Alexander (Cardinal) his vaſt Work againſt the Profeſſors of all Sciences not publiſhed after his Death, 171. a. The reaſon of his Willingneſs to quit this World, expreſs'd by himſelf in a Greek Epitaph, ibid. b. His Nickname of the Bearer of the Bulls, 172. Affected to ſay, that the Hereticks took the hints of all their falſe Doctrines from Eraſmus his Works, 172. a. Of a Friend, and once a Chamber Mate, turns a moſt bitter Enemy to him, ibid. b.

Alexandra; a Statue ſo called, of whom, 872. H.

Alexandra; a Poem that has much exercis'd the Ancient and Modern Criticks, 1928. y.

Alexandria; the Eternity of the World taught publickly there in the VIth Century, 211. b.

Ali, Son-in-Law of Mahomet, thrice put by the Throne thro' the Credit of Ayeſcha, Mahomet's Widow; and at laſt, when he aſcends it, ruined by her with his whole Family, 2111. b.

Allatius (Leo) how high he ſtrains the Power of the Pope, 183. b. His anſwer to Alexander VII. who asked him why he wou'd not Marry, 184. a. He wrote Greek forty Years with one Pen, ibid. A Defence of him by the Gentlemen of Port-Royal againſt Mr. Claude, ibid. b.

Alliances; the French and Spaniards reproach each other reciprocally on their entring into Alliances with Hereticks, 869. b. The Pope may make Alliances with Infidels, for Preſerving the Liberties of the Church, ibid.

Almachius; ſuppoſed to be an imaginary Saint, with the Reaſons of his Canonization, 183. b.

Almain (James) wrote for the Authority of the Council of Piſa above the Pope, 184.

Almanack; how it came to be St. Almanachus, 183. b.

Almoner; the Great Almoners of France appointed Commanders of the Order of the Holy Ghoſt, when and wherefore, 201. The Title of Great Almoner of France, when it firſt took place, in whoſe Reign, and in whoſe Perſon, 912. b. When called the King's Great Almoner, and under whoſe Reign did this Title begin, ibid. When call'd ſimply Almoner, ibid.

Almucheſi; a Magick Looking-glaſs, its Properties, 461.

Alpheus Varus; from a Cobler of Cremona, came to be Conſul of Rome, 180.

Alphonſo I. King of Naples, his extraordinary Love of Learning and Learned Men, 2330. a. An inſtance of his filial Duty, ibid.

Alphonſus X. King of Caſtile, his finding Fault with the Works of God in the Creation of the Heavens, 901. b. The firſt who cauſed the Publick Acts of his Kingdom to be drawn up in the vulgar Tongue, and the Bible to be Tranſlated into it, 901. He's confounded with another Alphonſus, neither of which is truly Author of the Code of Alphonſus, 902.

Alphonſines; Aſtronomical Tables, who the firſt Author of them, and what the Expence of them was, 901. b.

Alva (Duke d') his Anſwer to Henry II. of France, when ask'd about the Sun's ſtanding ſtill during the Battel of Muhlberg, fought by Charles V, 949. b. An Inſtance of his fierce intractable Temper, 1508. b.

Alum; a kind of it with which the Ancients rub'd over Towers of Wood, to render them incombuſtile, 329. b. Whether it has the vertue to render Wood incombuſtible, 330. a.

Amable (St.) his Gloves and Cloak born in the Air by a Sunbeam as he Travell'd, making a kind of Umbrella, 193.

Amama (Sixtinus) the occaſion of an Order of the Synod of Frieſland, that none ſhou'd be Ordain'd without a competent Knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew, 194. a.

Amaſtris; the Hiſtory of this Princeſs, and of the Town which bore her Name, 1109. a. b.

Ambaſſador; an Ambaſſador who ſcruples making Court to a Courtezan, is not fit for his Place, 937. b. The Anſwer of a Spaniſh Ambaſſador to a Roman Abbot, who told him there was but one way of coming at a Secret, and that was thro' a Courtezan, ibid. one Article of their Catechiſm, 558. A. Of all Religions are the ſame, 672. F.

Ambaſſadrice-Extraordinary; a Lady qualified with this Title, vid. Guebriant.

Ambition; the Ambitious ſubmit to the ſlaviſheſt Actions, 937. b.

AM AN. AP.

Amboiſe (Adrian d') his handſom Epitaph, 197. a.

Vol. II. 801. Amboiſe (Michael d') the Titles of his Books lively and promiſing, but the Subſtance good for nothing, 197.

Vol. III. 1551. Ambroiſe (St.) his Carriage towards Theodoſius the Emperor, 457. C.

Vol. IV. 1439. Ambroſians; a Title which ſome Sorcerers of Nancy in Lorraine gave themſelves, 1378. Art. IV.

Amelius, was 24 Years a Diſciple of Plotinus, 197. In one of his Books he cited the beginning of St. John's Goſpel, to confirm Plato's Doctrine, 198.

Amelot (Mr.) cenſur'd on his rendring a Paſſage in Father Paul unfairly, 1701. a.

America; which was the firſt Voyage that the French made thither, 1919.

Americans; the Corruption of their Manners, and their Averſion for Maidenheads, 1911. a.

Ameſius; his Character of the Puritans and Anti-Puritans in England, 199. No medium, according to him, between ſuppreſſing Epiſcopacy, and bringing back Popery, ibid.

Ammonius wrote a Book of the Courtezans of Athens, 208. His Aſs had a wonderful Taſte for Poetry, 209.

Ammonius (Sacca) called Theodidactus from his excellent Knowledge, not in Religion, but Philoſophy, 210. a.

Ammonius (Andrew) Secretary to Henry VIII. Eraſmus's Advice to him how to carry himſelf at the Court of England, 212. His pleaſant Account of the Executions in England on the Score of Religion under Henry VIII. and the Fruitfulneſs of Sects amidſt the Flames, 213. a. n.

Amniomancy; an Art of divining by inſpecting the Membrane in which the Fœtus is encloſ'd, 1773. a.

Amours; more condemned, and more pernicious to the State in Queens than in Kings, 2327. b.

Amphiaraus; the Fable of the Earth's opening to ſwallow him, an alluſion to the Story of Corah, Dathan and Abiram, 215. a.

Amphitryon; a Comedy of Plautus, 'till what Age acted in Rome, 221. a. falls very ſhort of Moliere's Amphitryon ibid.

Amurath IV. had Machiavel's Prince Tranſlated into Turkiſh for his own Reading, 1081. b.

Amyot (James) Biſhop of Auxerre, reproached by Charles IX. his Pupil, for his Avarice, and his Living on Neats Tongues, 199. a. Died worth 200000 Crowns in Caſh, ibid. b. A Judgment on his Tranſlation of Plutarch, 201. b. Had been a Calviniſt in his Youth, 202. b. A Paſſage in Plutarch about Pompey's biting the Courtezan Flora, not underſtood by him, 1322. a. A Diſſertation upon it, ibid. Ow'd his great Preferments to an humorous Emulation in Charles IX. 1559. b.

Amyrault (Moſes) Miniſter of Saumur, obtains that the Deputies of the Proteſtant Synods ſhou'd not kneel when they ſpoke to the King of France, 204. b. Paſſive Obedience his Darling Doctrine, 206. b. His generous refuſal of an active Obedience againſt Conſcience, ibid. b. His endeavour to prove that things may be foretold without the Spirit of Prophecy how intended, 912. b.

Anabaptiſts; in what Year they firſt landed in England, and how they were received there, 240. b. Subdivided into two Sects, that of the Hutterians, and that of the Gabrieliſts, ibid. a. n. Their Martyrs mixed with the Martyrs of Geneva, 241. b. Whether every Woman among the Anabaptiſts be obliged, by their Principles, to grant any Man the favour who deſires it, and ſo reciprocally, 2436. Reflections on this Principle, 244. a. Where their firſt Fury broke out, 681. b. Their Conferences with Luther, and bitter Curſes againſt him, ibid. An Inſtance of their being the moſt rigid of all Chriſtian Moraliſts, 2145. a.

Anacreon; which of his Poems are univerſally allowed to be his, and which ſuſpected, 224. a. b. The Gallantries between him and Sappho feign'd at Pleaſure by Hermeſianax, 2670. a.

Anatomy; a Doubt propoſed to the Caſuiſts, upon the Reading Lectures in Anatomy to Women, 86. a.

Anaxagoras; the firſt Heathen Philoſopehr who admitted a pure Spirit diſtinct from Body, 1827. a. What difference he made between the Souls of Men, and thoſe of Brutes, 2516. a. His laſt Requeſt upon his Death-bed, 225. b. The firſt of the Heathen Philoſophers, who ſaid that the Chaos was cleared by an Intelligence, 226. The firſt who made God the Author of the Order and Symmetry of the Parts of the World, 229. b. His Doctrine of the Homoiomeriæ confuted at large, 231. b. 232. a. b. His Prediction of the falling of a Stone from Heaven fulfilled, 234. a. His five Anſwers upon the News of the Sentence of Death pronounced againſt him, upon the News of the Death of his Sons, and upon his being asked, whether he had a mind to have his Corps buried in the Town where he was born, 236. a. Whom he thought the happieſt Man, ibid.

Anaximenes, his Notion of the Origin of the Gods, 151. a.

Ancients; a Reflection on the Parallel between the Ancients and Moderns, 1022. b. The difference between them and the Moderns as to Comedy, 2481. Several among them did not believe the common fabulous Traditions, 58. b.

Ancre (Mareſchal d') the ſtrange Rage of the Populace againſt his dead Body, 1015. a. His Faults extenuated in Mareſchal d'Estree's Memoirs, 1016. a. His vaſt Riches, ibid.

Anderini (Iſabella) a famous Italian Actreſs, her Profeſſion in the Epitaph upon her Tomb mentioned next before the Hopes of the Reſurrection, 257. a.

Andreas (John) the famous Canoniſt; the Anſwer he made his Wife, when, ſurprized by her in carnal Copulation with his Maid, ſhe asked him where were his Wiſdom and Prudence now? 254. b.

Androgynes; an Account of Plato's Androgynes, 1640. a. b. A kind of Hermophradites, 81. a.

Androis, what it was, 146. a.

Andromache; the Subject of ſeveral fine Tragedies, ancient and modern, 260. a. The Exceſs of the Paſſions in Corneille's Anromache, the Cauſe of an Actor's Death, ibid.

Anecdotes; the Sources for them, 282. a.

Angels (Tutelar or Guardian) the Doctrine of the Pagans concerning theſe Angels, 805. a.

Angels; two kinds of evil Angels according to Athenagoras, 418. b. No Syſtem or Hypotheſis can leſs diſpenſe with good and evil Angels, than that of Spinoza, 926. b.

Anger; a very judicious Advice to Friends, when either is angry with the other, 2723. b.

Angleſey (Earl of) his formal Atteſtation, that King Charles the IId. and King James then Duke of York, aſſured him Icon Baſilikè was not wrote by their Father, but by Doctor Gauden, 2053. b.

Anicius, the firſt Roman Senator who turned Chriſtian, 266.

Animals, how produced according to Anaxagoras, 226, 327. b.

Anjou (Rechin, Earl of) his mean Paſſion for his Wife Bertrada, after ſhe had married Philip King of France, 1325. b.

Annaliſts ought to have ſeveral Copies of their Annals, and lodge ſome of them in truſty Hands, 831. b.

Anne (Saint) neither the Scripture, nor the Writings of the three firſt Centuries, make mention of her, 269.

Anne (Mother of the Bleſſed Virgin.) a Diſpute about her Monogamy, 121. b. Ridiculous Legends concerning her, 1760. a. Her Feaſt how modern, and on what occaſion inſtituted, ibid. b.

Anne, the Propheteſs, Daughter of Phanuel, no Nun, 269. a. An Expreſſion in St. Cyril, no Ground for making her ſuch, ibid. b.

Anniceris; a Coachman of ſingular Addreſs in his Art, 1077. b. Why Plato deſpiſed him with all his Addreſs, ibid.

Anthony (St.) his Image ſnatched out of the Prieſt's Hand in a ſolemn Proceſſion, and toſſed over the Bridge of Geneva by Farel, one of the firſt Reformers, 1282. b.

Antichriſt; the vulgar Opinion that he is to be born of a Monk and a Nun, 701. a. Mrs. Bourignou's ſtrange Opinion concerning him, 702. b. The Pope, when declared Antichriſt by an expreſs Article in the Confeſſion of the French Proteſtants, and by whoſe Means, 1307. a. Legacies left by ſome Mahometans to a great Prophet, who is to come and deſtroy Antichriſt, 2176. a. A very ſingular Opinion of him, and how he is to poſſeſs himſelf of fortified Towns, 702, and 2087. b.

Antinomians; their Founder and Principles, 1781. b. Bare more Reſpect to Ariſtotle, than to the uncreated Wiſdom, 366. a.

Antiperiſtaſis; baniſhed out of Philoſophy, how it takes place in Religion, 2617. b.

Antonia; a Roman Family ſo call'd; a groſs Overſight of Father Vavaſſor's, with relation to it, given as an Inſtance of what ſtrange Overſights the learnedſt Men may commit, 274. a.

Antoniano (Silvio) his extraordinary Talent at Latin Poetry by that time he was ten Years of Age, 282.

Antony (Mark) the great Roman Orator and Lawyer; why he ever affected not to be thought a Learned Man, when in Reality he was very Learned, 275. b.

Apaſi (Michael) Prince of Tranſilvania, the Cauſe of enſlaving the Kingdom of Hungary, 285. b.

Apelles, the Comedian, the muſical Tone of his Voice, even in crying, 1446. b. Caligula prolonged his whipping, that he might have the Pleaſure of hearing him cry, ibid.

Apelles; a particular Inſtance of his great Talent in taking the Likeneſs, 186. b. A Proof of the Excellency of his Paintings, ibid. His Maſter-piece, 187.

Apicius; an Inſtance of his Gluttony, and Curiouſneſs in eating, 191. a.

Apion; the Matter of his Embaſſy from the People of Alexandria to Caligula againſt the Jews, 192.

Apocalypſe. See Revelations.

Apollinaris (Sidonius) a groſs Miſtake of his in Point of Chronology, 321. a.

Apollo, his owning Archilochus, the foul mouth'd, filthy Slanderer, for a Son of the Muſes, and reſenting his Death, though he had been killed in fair Fight, blam'd by the very Heathens, 331. b. This made uſe of by Origen and Euſebius, to expoſe the Pagan Gods, ibid.

Apologues; who was the firſt Author and Inventer of them, 1232. a.

Apollodorus; a famous Architect in Hadrian's Days, the Faults he found in a Temple built by the Emperor, very judicious, 1675. a. 194 a. Loſt his Life by it, ibid.

Apollonius Tyaneus; the Parallels made by the Heathens between his pretended Miracles, and thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt, diſturb the Chriſtians in St. Auguſtin's Days, 198. a. An Account of thoſe that had written the Life of this Impoſtor, 199. a. Aped the Son of God, 197. a. In what Point did he fall ſhort of him, and ſink ſhamefully, ibid. What is told of him, with regard to the aſſaſſinating Domitian, Diſſert. 1.

Apparitions; Stories of Apparitions not to be diſcredited in ſome Caſes, 1411. b. Accounted for by natural Cauſes, according to ſome Syſtems of Philoſophy, 1681. a.

Aquarius; the Sign in the Zodiac, its Original, 354.

Aquaviva (General of the Jeſuits) whether he approved Mariana's Book De Inſtitutione Principis, 1182. a.

Aquila; Author of the Alterations in the Hebrew Text of the Bible, 138. a.

Aquinas (Thomas) why he broke the Androis or Brazen Man of Albertus Magnus to ſhatters, 146. a. Of Opinion with Ariſtotle, that Women are Defects of Nature, where ſhe has not Strength enough to form the other Sex, 1394. a.

Aquitain; famous in the 5th Century for the beſt Wits and Orators in the Roman Empire, 2720. b.

Arabians, obſerve the Cuſtom of marrying thoſe of their own Tribe, 2092. b. The extraordinary Modeſty of the Women of Arabia, in the Days of Tertullian, 2089. b. Their Philoſophers will rather depart from the Doctrines of Mahomet, than contradict Ariſtotle, 364. a. Some of their Authors boaſt of having ſeen a Copy of the Goſpels, in which Mahomet was plainly and expreſly ſpoken of, and that there was but one true Copy beſides in the World, 1110. a. The Arabian Women propoſed as Patterns of Chaſtity by Tertullian, 2098. b.

Arbriſſell (Robert d') Founder of the great Abby of Frontevaux in France; whether the Reaſons maintaining that he lay in Bed with the Nuns of his Abby, by way of Mortification, be ſolid or no, 132. a. 1329. b. 1330. a.

Arcadius ſtands up, and is uncovered before his Preceptor, by the order of Theodoſius, 397.

Arceſilaus; the firſt notorious Wrangler among the Philoſophers, and the firſt Diſturber of the Publick Peace among them, by an obſtinate way of diſputing, 318. a. How he rectified the Doctrine of Democritus and Epicurus, 321. a. Led into Pyrrhoniſme by Plato's Books, 317. aa.

Archagatus, the firſt Phyſician that ever came to Rome. An. Ur. 531. 880. b.

Archelaus, Biſhop of Caſcara, his fiery Zeal, 2166. a. of Opinion that Manes ought to be deſtroyed like a wild Beaſt, ibid.

Archelaus, King of Cappadocia, in the Days of Tiberius is cited to Rome, and judged by the Senate, 328. a. eſcapes by counterfeiting Madneſs, ibid. b.

Archilochus, his Death reſented, 331. b. and Apollo blamed for owning him a Son of the Muſes, ibid. Vide Apollo.

Areopagus, how ſevere againſt Atheiſts and Enemies to Religion, 1035. H.

Areotatus, the Gallant of Chelydonis, Wiſe of Cleonymus, King of Sparta, how waggiſhly the old Men of Sparta uſed to call out to him in the Streets, while Sparta was beſieged by Cleonymus, 1001. a.

Aretin (Guy) the Inventer of the ſix Notes, Ut, re, mi, &c. in Muſick and the Gamut, 336. falſly ſuppoſed to be the Author of the three Books, in defence of the real Preſence againſt Berengarius, which belong to Guitmond, a Monk, ibid. a.

Aretin (Peter) immortalized not by his own Works, but by an unlucky Line upon him in Arioſto, 340. a. He own'd the lew'd Poſtures that paſs under his Name, 341. a.

Aretin (Leonard) his bold Plagiariſm, 337.

Aretin (Francis) his ſtrange Opinion, that the Marquis of Mantua was obliged to ſuffer his Daughter, betrothed to the Son of the Duke of Millan, to be viewed naked by Commiſſioners from that Duke, 2755. a.

Arezzo; its Inhabitants obliged by the Orders of Charles the VIIIth of France, to kneel before the Statue of a Lyon, and ask Pardon, 1076. a.

Argæus; Mount Argæus, where worſhipped as a God, ſworn by, and Statues erected to it, 846. b.

Argenis (Barclays) criticiz'd, 497. a. much admired and read by Cardinal Richlieu, 497. b. and by Balzac, ibid. its Latin bad notwithſtanding, ibid.

Argenternis, Profeſſor in the Civil Law, wrote down every thing remarkable that he heard in Converſation, tho' even from the meaneſt Perſon, 1401. b.

Argenteuil (Nuns of) expelled all at once for Incontinency, 1604.

Argians; the Rule of their Dates, their Æra and Account of Time taken from the Inſtallment of the Prieſteſs of Minerva, 983.

Arguments (Negative) in ſome Points of Fact when they take place, 704. a. Equal to a Demonſtration in ſome Caſes, 912. C. Books written for and againſt its Authority, 1669. F.

Argyropylus, The firſt Greek who taught Philoſophy at Rome, 344.

Ariminais, The Name of the Deity which the Perſians, and after them the Manichæans, acknowledg'd for the Principle of Evil, 344.

Ariſtides, the great Ingenuity of a Citizen of Athens, who voted for his Baniſhment, 356. a. Allow'd of Perjury, where the Intereſt of the State was concern'd, ibid. b.

Ariſtander the Soothſayer, an Inſtance of his extraordinary Power over Alexander the Great, 346. b.

Ariſtarchus, the famous Critick, Inventer of Aſteriks and Obeliks to mark the Paſſages in Books, 349. b.

Ariſtippus, his Doctrine led Men into Diſſoluteneſs only when miſunderſtood, 358. b.

Ariſton, an eminent Stoick Philoſopher, his manner of judging of the Greatneſs of God, 375. b. is much diſturb'd at the ſight of an Hermophradite-Ball, as being an Object that gave the Scepticks and Acalepticks, his Adverſaries, an Advantage over him, 358. a.

Ariſtophanes; his Deſign in writing his Comedy of the Clouds, according to ſome, 325. a. To whom is the Publick oblig'd for the firſt Edition of his Works, 2318. His laſhing the nocturnal Devotion of his times, 2871. b.

Ariſtotle, equall'd to Adam in Science and Underſtanding, 79. a. Hardly any of his Demonſtrations neceſſary but that of the Unity of God, 132. b. The Agreement between his Philoſophy and that of Plato, 210. a. Some of his Books condemn'd to be burnt by a Council held at Paris, Anno 1209. 434. a. Whether his Works in Greek were in France before the time of Averroes, ibid. His Books had like to have been all condemn'd to the Flames by Caracalla, on a belief that he had been an Accomplice in Poiſoning Alexander the Great, 2076. a. His extravagant Opinion concerning the formation of Woman, 1393. b. What kind of Knowledge he aſcribes to Brutes, 2518. a. b. The Hiſtory of the Preſervation of his Works, and the cauſes of corrupting the Text in divers Places, 2900. a. His Morals read to the People in the Churches inſtead of the Goſpel, in ſome Parts of Germany, 366. The firſt Reformers clamour'd loudly againſt his Philoſophy, ibid. b. Is unjuſtly Cenſur'd by the Author of the Art of thinking, in favour of Parmenides, 3049. a. The Hiſtory of the Deſtiny of his Works, 1900. a. His Ignorance and Errors about the Jewiſh Nation, 361. a. The Jews pretend he was of the Seed of Iſrael, and of the Tribe of Benjamin, 361. b. The ridiculous ground of ſome Mens believing him a native Jew, ibid. What the ground was of the action of Impiety brought againſt him, according to Origen, 362. a. The extravagant Elegies given him, 363. a. b. What is of glorious conſequence to him, but which at the ſame time makes his Works to be doubted, 1901. b. His Name or Works ſcarce heard of at Rome in Cicero's Days, 262. a. Who was the firſt that brought his Works into any Repute there, and digeſted them into order, ibid. b.

Whether he burnt all the Books of thoſe who had Philoſophis'd before him, and particularly the Books of Solomon, 1078. P. A ſilly Story of the Jews on this head, ibid. Allows Thales and Anaxagoras to have been wiſe Men, but not prudent, and why, 225. a. He is horribly ill

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 2139.

uſed by Luther, 1919. E. E. His Phyſicks and Morals, by whom Tranſlated, 344. b. Who have diſcuſſed what Works of his, or of thoſe that go under his Name, are genuine, and which are not, 1951. b. The Conformity between his Doctrine and that of Spinoza, 926. B. His Works brought to Rome for the moſt part with the Library of Apellicon, 561. b. Several faulty Copies taken of them, 562. a. The Indexes which we have at preſent made to them, by whom, at that time, after having put them in order, ibid. b. When and how Nature forms Women according to this Philoſopher, 1393. b. Who was the firſt of the Moderns, and in a manner the laſt, that took his Thought right, 926. A.

Arminians have run into Errors much more pernicious than thoſe of the 5 Articles, 1420. a. Theſe render their Schiſm incurable, ibid. Ought not to have removed the ancient Bounds of the Reformation, 373. E. They reject the Authority of the Synod of Dort, 1201. Are depoſed and baniſhed, ibid. The People curſe them as the firſt Cauſe of the Troubles in Church and State, ibid. b.

Arnauld (Mr.) The Reaſon he gives why the obſcene Latin Poets are not put into the Liſt of prohibited Books, 646. a.

Arnobius; his Opinion of the Language which our Saviour commonly made uſe of, 996. a. His ſcoffing at the Gods of the Heathens liable to be retorted, 983. b. Ridicules the Pagans on Jupiter's taking nine Nights to make Hercules, when Hercules could get 50 Children in a Night, 1644. b. Leſs Orthodox about Matter conſidered as one of the firſt Principles, than the Stoicks, 2492. b. Confutes the Pagans who held two kinds of Divinity, ibid. His Thoughts that they who believe a God may be happy, if right, whereas they cannot be unhappy if miſtaken, improved, and by whom, 2468. b. His Notions of the Natural Mortality of the humane Soul, 2606. a.

Arragon (Don Pedro d') Ambaſſador of Spain, called a wicked Man to his Face by Alexander the VIIth, and anſwers his Holineſs fiercely, 969. a.

Arragon (Joan of) the Poetical Apotheſis or Deification uſed towards her after Death, 310. a, b. The Deſcription of her Beauty, and of the Symmetry and Proportion of all the parts of her Body, ibid.

Arragon (Mary of) Wife of Otho the IIId. Emperor; entertains her Lover as a Chamber-maid in Woman's Cloaths, 314. He is diſcovered by the Emperor, and ſtript before many Witneſſes, ibid.

Arras; The Treaty of Arras relating to the Submiſſions made by Charles the VIIth of France, to the Duke of Burgundy, 776.

Arrianiſme; Its Extirpation in Spain by Recaredus, 370. I, K.

Arſinoe; An Iron Statue of her ſuſpended in the Air by the Means of Loadſtones, 2105. b. 2106. b.

Art of Slandering; There is ſuch an Art according to Scaliger. They who do not underſtand it, do more harm to themſelves than to others, 268. b.

Artemidorus; cited on occaſion of Dreams, and their Signification, 3. b.

Artillery, who was the Inventor of it, 146.

Artiſts; great Artiſts generally whimſical and untoward Humoriſts, 287. a. An Inſtance of their Inſolence to Perſons of the firſt Rank, 294. a.

Arundelian Marble; an account of them, 2698. a. b.

Aruſpices, by whom firſt inſtituted, 990.

Aſpaſia, the Miſtreſs of Cyrus the younger, her Hiſtory abridged, 991. a. b. 992. a. b.

Aſſe of Buridan; the Origin of this Proverb, 778. a. b. A comical Satyr, 308. b.

Aſs (Golden) of Apuleius, a Judgment upon it, 308. b. This Romance capable of a good Commentary, ibid. Some pretend to find the Myſteries of the great Work in it, ibid.

Aſſaſſins encouraged by the Example of Judith, 1785. a.

Aſterisks; who was the firſt Inventor of them and Obelisks, the firſt to damn, the ſecond to approve Paſſages in Books, 349. b.

Aſterites, a kind of Stone, which was fired by the Rays of the Sun, 1237. a. ſaid to be a powerful Philtre, and that which Paris gave to Helena, ibid.

Aſtrea, a Romance, the chief Exceptions to it, 1986.

Aſtrology; how an Aſtrological Prediction, which is no better than a Chimera, may yet happen to be accompliſhed, 902. a. The Objection againſt it from the different Fate of Twins, how anſwered, 2380. b. If it diſcovers Futurity, muſt be grounded upon a compact with the Devil, and is meer Magick, 2633. a. The Indulgence of Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Courts for Aſtrologers beyond Magicians or Conjurers highly blameable, ibid.

Aſtronomy, how far Socrates thought it a fit matter of our Study and Application, 238. b.

Atavus, what Relation it denotes, 1363. b.

Atheiſm: The Mahometans look on the Doctrine of a firſt Mover when join'd to that of the Eternity of the World, as pure Atheiſm, 434. b. The charge of it become a great Abuſe, 1680. b. Whether Atheiſm be a greater Evil than Paganiſm, 296. F. Whether ſuppoſing a firſt Mover, and yet admitting the Eternity of the World, be not Atheiſm, 433. E.

Atheiſts, their force of Soul ſaid to be Maniack and Unnatural, and compar'd to the Strength of the Lunatick in the Goſpel, 855. a. What, according to them, has been the Cauſe and Origin of human Laws, 1035. Their Syſtem of the Origin of Religion, ibid. Who are thoſe in ſome Peoples Opinion, who write beſt againſt Atheiſts, 1883. At what Age and Circumſtances Men begin to turn Atheiſts, 1909. a.

Athenians, when and by whom deliver'd from the Domination of the thirty Tyrants, 1019. E. How highly they prized the freedom of their City, 1025. Reproach'd with their meanneſs and want of Spirit by Demetrius, 1878. a. A Law of theirs againſt Malefactors, abrogated by Chriſtianity, 1179. F. Made a Decree that no Sophiſt ſhould plead Civil Cauſes, 1709. a. What kind of Inceſt allow'd, and what forbid by their Laws, 2674. a. By whom deliver'd from their Fears of an Eclipſe, and how, 2530. b.

Athens, rewarded the Aſſaſſin of Cotys the Tyrant with a Crown of Gold and the Freedom of their City, after they had complimented this ſame Tyrant with his Freedom there, and with a Crown of Gold, 1025. b. What a value they ſet upon the Freedom of their City, ibid. How the Athenians received great Princes who came to their City, 2523. a. Who was the firſt that brought Philoſophy to Athens, 321. b. A Diſpute between Neptune and Minerva, which ſhould give the Name to this City, 345. We have only the fair ſide of this Republick in Hiſtory, at bottom it was inſlaved by the Demagogues, 2468. a.

Atomiſts; their Hypotheſis not ſo Abſurd as that of the Spinoziſts, 1084. Q.

Atoms; the difference between the Atoms of Democritus, and thoſe of Epicurus, 1189. b.

Attila, orders a blaſphemous Panegyriſt upon himſelf and his Verſes to be thrown into the Fire, 2011.

Attalus, King of Pergamum, how he maintain'd his Dignity in Athens, 2522. a. The firſt who invented Embroider'd Hangings, 2526. b. The exceſſive Prices paid by him for fine Paintings, ibid.

Aubigné (D') has made too bold with a Paſſage of Monſieur de Thou, 96. b.

Aubigné (Monſieur d') Grandfather to Madam Maintenon. Whether the Son of Joan d'Albret, Queen of Navarre, by a private Marriage, 2348. a.

Audebert (Pere) a Jeſuit; Overtures made by him from the King of France and Cardinal Richlieu, towards a Re-union of the Romiſh and Proteſtant Communions, 205. b.

Aventine (John) his Annals publiſh'd by the Proteſtants from a perfect Original, 424. a. His Fate wherein reſembling that of Father Paul, 426. a.

Averroes; Ariſtotle's great Commentator underſtood not a word of Greek, 427. The firſt that ventur'd to Bleed a Son of his own at ſix or ſeven Years of Age, contrary to the Practice and Opinion of all the ancient Phyſicians, who reckon'd it Death before fourteen, 427. b. His great Hatred for Avicenna, and how expreſſed by him, ibid. His Opinion of the Unity of the intellectual Soul in all Men, and its diſtinction from the informing Soul, one Eternal, the other Mortal, 428. a. His Saying of the three Religions, the Chriſtian, the Jewiſh, and the Mahometan, 430. a. His Contempt of Tranſubſtantiation, ibid. His remarkable Wiſh, 433. a. His Prediction of the Calamities of Corduba, on ſeeing the Alcoran ſold at a Stall for a Ducat, and a prohibited Book of Bawdy Poems for ten Piſtoles, 433. b.

Auguſtin, (St.) intreated by the Chriſtians in his time to refute the pretended Parallel between Apollonius Tyaneus, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, 298. a. His Apology for Abraham's lying with Hagar diſcuſſed and confuted, 2679. a. b. His manner of refuting Cicero, where he values the Divinity of Romulus, becauſe eſtabliſhed in Times of Learning and fine Senſe, 2684. a. A thought of his upon the Conjugal Duties leſſening a Wiſe Man, 2640. a. In what Caſes it is a Sin, though a venial one, ibid. His Authority leſſened by ſome Romiſh Divines, in prejudice to the Reform'd Doctrines of Predeſtination, 2661. b. The Troubles he lay under from Dreams, after he had weaned himſelf from the Corruptions of the Fleſh, 1335. a. The Reaſon he gives why

Adam

Adam did not conſummate his Marriage 'till after the Fall, 17. a. Wherein does he make the opening the Eyes of our firſt Parents to conſiſt, 79. a. By whom treated with the Title of Hot African, Intricate and Obſcure, and charged with going beyond the Truth, in oppoſing the Enemies of Grace, 83. a.

Inclines to approve an Adultery committed by a Wife by the conſent of her Husband, in order to ſave his Life, 70. a. The Point argu'd, ibid. His Deſcription of the Perverſeneſs of his Childhood, 434. b. How his Syſtem perplexes the Court of Rome, 436. a. 437. b. A notable Paradox, whether St. Auſtin was a hard Drinker or no, curiouſly diſcuſſed, 438. b. His wicked kind of Prayer for Chaſtity before his Converſion, 698. b. Thought ſubtle Diſputations in Religious Matters an Evil fit to be deprecated by ſolemn Proceſſions, 1148. a. His Remark on the Words of St. Paul, Fly Fornication, 1318. b. Wrote a Retractation for calling the Muſes Goddeſſes, tho' only in a poetical Strain, 1386. b. Cenſur'd on a Thought of his about the Beaſtlineſs of the Cynicks, 1670. b. His Argument to prove the unreaſonableneſs of the Pagan Diſbelief with regard to ſome of the Scripture Miracles, ſhewn to be fallacious, 1766. a. Takes notice of a Diſpute in his own Time, and before him, whether Brutes had Souls, 2514. a.

Auguſtus, A Jeſt of his on Caſſius Severus, who was always Impeaching, though the Parties were always acquitted, 883. b. The Ground for ſaying that he deſign'd to Marry his Daughter Julia to Cotiſo King of the Getæ, 1027. a. His ridiculous Order enjoining all in any Country who had any Dreams concerning the Republick to declare 'em openly, 2133. b. Whether he was the Inventer of the Dances of the Pantomimi, 521. a. b. Not much skill'd in polite Learning, if we believe the Emperor Hadrian, 1556. a. In danger of being kill'd by his Father the very Day of his Birth, upon a Prediction that he ſhould be Emperor of Rome, 2379. a. A wiſe Edict of his for preſerving the Chaſtity of Maids, 2871. b.

Avicenna, his Opinion concerning the Production of new Men after the univerſal Deluge, 926. b.

Avignon, a cheap Purchaſe to the Pope, 2322. The price of Queen Joan of Naple's Iniquity, 2324. a.

Aunoi (Mademoiſelle d') a Character of her Writings, 2376. b.

Aurelian, his exceeding Severity of Life and Manners, 441. a. The rule of his Favours, ibid.

Aurelius (Marcus), his Anſwer to thoſe who adviſ'd him to divorce his Wife, 2000. b.

Aurelius (Petrus), his Deſcription of the Obſcenity of the Book de Matrimonio, by the Jeſuit Thomas Sanchez, 2668. a. 2669. a.

Auſonius, whether he was a Chriſtian or no, 450. a.

Auſtria (Don John of) Son of Charles V. twice deceiv'd in his Mother, and never knew his true Mother, 452. b. Who ſhe was according to the Menagiana, 453. b. n. His Anſwer to Don Carlos, Son of Philip II. who call'd him Baſtard, 454. a. Suppoſed by ſome to be Charles the Vth's Son by his Siſter the Queen of Hungary, 1727. b.

Auſtria (Houſe of) ſaid to be deſcended from the Senatorial Family of the Anicii in Rome, 266. Who firſt reſtor'd this Houſe to its ancient Splendor in Germany, 1118, 1119, 1120.

Authority (the Way of). People come back to it, after they have been running it down, 190. b. 2397. a. The Church ſubject to infinite Diviſions without it, 241. Whether there be any difference between the Church of Rome and the Proteſtants, with regard to this way, 1126. b.

Authors, the reſemblance of the Works of Authors of the ſame Party, 17. b. Their not having recourſe to Originals an almoſt unavoidable Cauſe of their Errors, 235. b. An Inſtance of this, ibid. What Authors have born the Title of Divine, 338. Apt to cite thoſe Works which they don't ſet their Names to, 147. b. What it is that makes ſome dye without the Quality of Authors, 159. a. Which is the true Epocha of an Author's Glory or Flouriſhing, 915. b. A Reflection on the Parallel between the ancient and modern Authors, 1022. b. Why great Authors are more ſubject to commit Faults than others, 538. b. One may paſs over the good Qualities of an Author, but not deny them, 534. b. They who are Aggreſſors in any Point, in what Caſes they may leave a Defendant's Replies unanſwer'd, and in what they may not, 535. a. A Jubilate Author, what it means, and whence borrow'd, 580. b. Italian Authors ridiculouſly Scrupulous in not uſing any Terms but what are claſſical even in Treatiſes of the Chriſtian Religion, 670. b. Thoſe Authors who uſe Quotations, and thoſe who write wholly from their own Stock, compared in Point of Excellence, 1189. a. b. In what Caſes they may prefer their own Judgments to thoſe of their Readers, 1571. b. An Inſtance of their exceſſive fondneſs for their own Productions, 1604. Thoſe who religiouſly quote Chapter and Page deprive themſelves of the Honour of being quoted, 2384. b. A Maxim which they ought to conſult carefully, Diſſert. VII. a.

Some ſeem to write with the greateſt facility, who write with extreme pain, 1497. b. 2143. b. 2145. a. Their tenderneſs for their Works, 1604. a. They ought in ſome Caſes to prefer their own Judgment to that of others, 1572. b. What they ought to do to obtain a Recompence from the Publick, 1574. b. Some Authors correct their Writings too much, 1497. b. 1945. a. Some are more hard to be contented in the beginning of a Work, than they are after, 1946. b. Others, to whom the Reviſing a Work which is to be Reprinted, coſts more trouble than the firſt Compoſition, ibid. Whether it be better for them to be judged by one that is an Author himſelf, or by one that is not, 1571. a. Complain of the Ingratitude of their Age, 2445. a. b. It's impoſſible but thoſe who have many Adverſaries ſhould contract a habit of an injurious Stile, an Inſtance of this in Pareus, 2457. b. Have a right to Coin new Words, 2674. b. Never fail, whatever Subject they write on, to diſcover what Religion they are of, 2808. b. Their vicious manner of citing Authors, 2866. D. A Reflection on the Conduct of thoſe, who get the Books of their Adverſaries cenſured or condemn'd by the Higher Powers, 2876. b. Breed a great deal of Confuſion by their Negligence, in not placing their Words in the natural Order of their Thoughts, 465. a. Change their Maxims according to Occaſions, but chiefly the Theologiſts, 476. a. A Moral which may ſerve for a Conſolation to the little Authors, 538. a. It's of great uſe to collect Examples of their unfair Dealing, 618. a. Ought to take Cognizance of the commoneſt Writings, and the Pieces which vaniſh the ſooneſt, 689. b. There are ſome things which Authors never publiſh, when once they come to know their own Buſineſs, 818, 819. P. Several of them would never have written, if they had never been attack'd, 812. a. People are apt to ſay, whether true or falſe, that they knew ſuch an Author familiarly, when he happens to become famous, 783. b. 869. b. They alledge and cite with a thouſand Alterations what the Ancients have ſaid, 1009. H. Cannot avoid being interpreted by the Age to come in ſeveral contrary Ways, 999. a. The Illuſion of thoſe Authors who value themſelves on being hated by oppoſite Sects, 1123. E. Whether the Proteſtant Authors have been hated by the Roman Catholicks, on the ſcore of having well defended their Cauſe, ibid.

Automatons: Whether Deſcartes was the Inventer of the Opinion, that Brutes are meer Machines, or Automatons, 2513. b. The Hypotheſis of Brutes being Automatons very favourable to Religion, 2604. b. 2605. a. What it is that incommodes this Hypotheſis moſt, 2610. a.

Autumn. The Autumn of beautiful Perſons is agreeable, 1266. a.

Ayeſcha, the favourite Wife of Mahomet, her Incontinence, 2111. a. Look'd on by the Mahometans as a Propheteſs, and an Oracle, ibid. b.

Ayrault (Peter) his Treatiſe of the paternal Power, on occaſion of his Son's becoming a Jeſuit againſt his Will, 134. Deprives his Son of his Bleſſing by an Act before a Notary-Publick, 135.

Azotus; its Siege, the longeſt that ever was, 455.

B A.

BAbylas (St.) who was the Emperor whom he ſtop'd at the Door of his Church, or whether he ever ſtop'd any, 4 7. a. b. His Bones ſilenc'd the Oracle of Apollo near Antioch, 458. b.

Babylonians; their Pretenſions to Regiſters of 470000 Years, 459. Confuted upon Enquiry by Ariſtotle, 460. A Correction of Father Hardouinus, with regard to a Paſſage of Pliny, about the Antiquity of Letters among them, 460. b.

Bacon (Fryar) His Letter to Clement IV. preſerved in the Library of Lambeth, ſetting forth that the Laity ought to read the Scriptures, 462. His Project of an Univerſal Grammar, ibid.

BA.

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1550.
Vol. IV 1439.

Bacon (Francis Lord) his Prophane Expreſſion in a Letter to the Prince of Wales, 463. a. his whimſical Will, ibid.
Bacoue (Leo) a Converted Hugonot, and the only one who roſe to a Biſhoprick under Lewis XIV. 463.
Bagni (Cardinal) his Exclamation on ſeeing the Councils in 37 Vol. 465. b.
Bajazet II. preſents Innocent VIII with the Iron of the Lance that pierc'd our Saviour's Side, 1755. b. Sends to Rome the Iron of the Lance which peirc'd our Saviour's Side, 1755. a. Had an Inclination for the Sciences 1886. b.
Baillet; his Doubt concerning a piece of Sacrilege, 476. b. Praiſed on his Civil Manner and Equity, 614. a. Has forget one Anti in the Collection which he has made of them, 1857. G. His Diſcourſe on the Lives of the Saints, 1933. b.
Baithuſeans; a Sect among the Jews, wherein it differ'd from the Sadduces, or whether it differ'd them at all or no, 3642. a. b.
Balbus (Cornelius) a Spaniard, the firſt Foreigner who came to be Conſul of Rome, 471. his Nephew Cornelius Balbus the firſt Foreigner who triumphed, ibid.
Ballads, more uſeful in ſome Caſes than Sermons or Pamphlets, 2651. b.
Baldus. The damage he ſuffer'd in his Knowledge by intermitting his uſual daily Studies, 475. a. his anſwer to the Biſhop of Pavia, who ask'd him, why the Laws Chang'd ſo often, 476. b. how he excus'd his contradicting himſelf in his Reaſonings, ibid.
Baldus, (James) His Pen a Sacred Relique, 476.
Baldus, (Bernardin) his reaſon for excuſing Faults in our Acquaintance, 478 a.
Baldus Lipatinus, a Provincial of the Franciſcans, on ſuſpition of being a Proteſtant, after 20 Years impriſonment, caſt into the Sea, 1748. a.
Balzac. A Pamphlet wrote by him at 17, in favour of Liberty, and the depoſing Doctrine, 481. b. his Stratagem to get himſelf preferr'd to Voiture, 484. A Blunder of his in applying a Thought of the Poet Agatho. 100. a. The Difficulty he found in Writing, 2144 a. Tax'd with Vanity in not quoting his Authors, 680. b. A ſhort and fine Elogy of him, 2879. b. His Railleries on the Impatience of Modern Wives, who happen to have Husbands of too nice a Conſtitution, 679. D. One perceives that his Compoſitions coſt him dear, 1497. G. How much he contributed to the Politeneſs which is ſpread over France, 1961. D. Was very Vain, 2445. H. Speaks honourably of the Prince of Condé, at the time when he was in Rebellion, 2397. a. A Judgment on his Works, 2879. N.
Bankrupts, the Puniſhment of Bankrupts in ſome Places of Bœotia, 1652. b.
Baptiſm of Proteſtants held invalid by ſome Popiſh Divines in the beginning of the Reformation, but declar'd valid by a Brief of Pius V. 2659.
Baptiſm, ſaid by ſome Learned Men to have been Adminiſtred to ſome Perſons of what Age or Sex ſoever, Naked as they came into the World, 1565.
Baptiſt (St. John) a pleaſant paſſage of the Abbot of Vitelloni upon his being ſhew'd the fifth or ſixth Head of St. John Baptiſt at Amiens, 2744. a.
Bar, no Scandal in antient Rome for a Lawyer to unſay and contradict former Opinions at the Bar in favour of his Client, 274.
Bara, the word in Geneſis which is rendred Create, does not ſignifie the producing out of nothing, 2184. a. who is the firſt Author of the Remark, ibid.
Barbara, (the Empreſs) her lew'd anſwer, 492.
Barbarus, (Hermolaus) his Queſtion, whether a Wiſe Man ought to Marry, concluded in the Negative, 488. b. conſulted the Devil for the ſenſe of a cramp Word in Ariſtotle, 490.
Barchochebas, his proof of the Courage of his Followers, 499. a. Two falſe Meſſiahs ſaid to be of this Name, one of which was put to Death by his Followers, for want of a good Noſe in Smelling, 501.
Barclay, (John) the Pride of his Wife's Heart, 496. b.
Barlette (Gabriel) his buffoon way of Preaching, 502. a:
Barlow, (Biſhop) his Book againſt the Depoſing Power of Rome, tranſlated into French, and publiſhed at Paris, 1681.
Barnes, (Dr.) Editor of Euripides, an Examination of the Explication which he gives of the Balance and Scales of Lucian, 1263. F.
Barnes, (John) a Benedictin, his Book againſt Mental Reſervation, 108. a. his deplorable end. ibid.
Baronius, (Dominick) maintain'd, that it was not neceſſary to profeſs the Truth outwardly in time of Perſecution, 511. a.
Baronius, (Cardinal) ſhews that a Miracle performed by St. Martin on a fair Tryal of Skill between him and St. Germain, does not prove the former to be the greater Saint, 843. b. condemns the Doctrine of Peter Damian, againſt the Secular Coercion of Popes over Emperors as Erroneous, deriv'd from Tertullian firſt, and afterwards from Julian the Apoſtate, 184. a. ſides with the Heathen Authors againſt the Eccleſiaſtical, to put a ſlur upon Conſtantine, 1290. b. Miſtaken in calling Ann the Daughter of Phanuel a Nun, 268. dare not decide between Socrates and Theodoret on the ſubject of one of the Kings of Perſia, 9. a. Why he never would name the Centuriators of Magdebourg, not even when he endeavour'd to refute them, 182. F. How it comes to paſs, that he confirms ſome Calumnies of the Pagans, 1290. B. He is an Enemy to Kings, and his Annals are full of Lies, 2694. B. A Confutation of his Annals, 798. G. Δ.

BA. BE.

Bartholomew (Maſſacre of St.) The Apology for this Maſſacre, by whom Written, 951. a. Its Cauſes falſly repreſented, 1955. Q.
Barthius, cenſures ſeveral great Men on their placing a Modern Poet in the Rank of the Antients, 1061. D.
Bartolocci (Father) miſtakes Monſieur Amyrault for a converted Jew, 102. a. gives a high Character of his Diſſertation concerning the Myſtery of the Trinity, ibid.
Baſil (St.) his Argument againſt the Marcionites of no Force, 2167. a. & ſeq. Solves the Difficulties of the Manichæans very ill, 2487. b. would not have People truſt to the Caſtration of Eunuchs, 1007. B. A Compariſon alledged by him on this occaſion, ibid. Makes but an ill Anſwer to the Manichæans, 2485. E.
Baſilides (Duke of Muſcovy) the occaſion of his ravaging Livonia, 650. b.
Baſina, her impudent Anſwer to her Adulterer Childerick, 515. a. Her Conduct worſe than that of Helen of Troy, ibid. b.
Baſſora (Prince of) the Traffick he drives by ſelling his Mahometan Subjects Places in Paradice, and ſigning Paſſes to them, which are to be allow'd by Mahomet, 2176. a.
Baſſompierre; the firſt of this Family was the Offspring of a Woman by a Spirit, 2404. 2405. H.
Battel; It's a Folly to pretend we have gained it, when the thing it ſelf has no Conſequences, 927. The moſt ordinary Cauſes of its Inſignificancy is the victorious Commander's fearing a Peace, ibid. A.
Baſtards, the natural Reaſon of their being robuſt and quick-witted, 1341. b. Whether it is any Diſhonour to be a Baſtard, 1880 a.
Baſtardy; no Suſpicions of Baſtardy a juſt Reaſon to deprive a Prince of his Crown, 101. a, b.
Battori (Sigiſmund) confeſſes his Impotence, and is divorced, 1631. a.
Bavaria. Annals of Bavaria, by whom compoſed, 1311. a.
Bavaria (Lewis of) razed out of the Catalogue of Emperors, but replaced by the ſame Hand, and upon a publick Recantation, 787. His Reign is reckoned but as an Interregnum by Rainaldus, who gave him no other Title but that of the Bavarian, ibid. B. His Apology by Herward, condemned by the Inquiſition; and why, ibid. C.
Baudius, like to be baniſhed Holland for writing a Poem in praiſe of Spinola, 525. a.
Baudovin (Francis) a famous Civilian, changed his Religion ſeven times, 530. a. His crafty Advice to the Cardinal of Lorrain for defeating the Reformed at the Conference of Poiſſy, 531. b.
Bautru (Monſieur) wherein conſiſted his Philoſophy, 537. Why his Lady would not be called by his Name, ibid. His Anſwer to his Confeſſor at his laſt Hour, 538. b.
Bayle (Mr.) Author of this Dictionary, admires at thoſe who admire Homer's Iliads, 61. a.
Beans, who was the firſt that abſtained from them, 216. b.
Beaſts (Brute) their Actions are perhaps one of the greateſt Abyſſes that our Reaſon can be exercis'd upon, 492. a. Whether Deſcartes may juſtly be reputed the Inventer of the Opinions which he had concerning Beaſts, ibid. 2513. a. b. What the Opinion was of the ancient Philoſophers about them, ibid. E. Whether the Ancients taught, that they were only Machines or Automatons, ibid, H. Δ. Facts related of Beaſts perplex the Followers of Ariſtotle no leſs than Deſcartes, 2604. B. A Liſt of thoſe who have believ'd that they had a reaſonable Soul, ibid. D. ibid. K. The Carcaſſes of Beaſts hung up and expoſed, to keep other Beaſts of their Species within their Duty, an acknowledgment that they have Free Will, ibid. F. Authors who have maintain'd that they were no more than Machines or Automatons, ibid. K. Diverſe Opinions about the Soul of Beaſts, 2712. a. b. 2713. a. Their Regularity, how it is a good

good common Place of Morality, and how not, 495. a. b.

Beatitude of Man, what is the formal and efficient Cauſe of it, 1190. G. An Opinion of Mr. Arnaud on this Head examin'd, ibid.

Beaucaire; his Talent in wording the Deciſions of the Council of Trent, 540. b. A Juggle between him and the Cardinal of Lorrain about the Jure Divino of Biſhops, 541. a.

Beaumont (Francis de) Sieur d'Adrets, his Cruelty in the Religious Wars of France, 545. b. Bathed his Sons in Blood, 548. a. Prefaces his Ordinances with St. Paul's Salutation, ibid. b. His Deformity deſcribed by Thuanus, ibid.

Beaune (James de) Treaſurer of France under Francis I. Hang'd for miſapplying the Publick Mony, 1350. b.

Beauty; how many things go to make a Woman a perfect Beauty, 1587. a. Can't maintain its Empire without the Auxiliaries of Wit, 1597. a. The Deſcription of a perfect Beauty, 310. A. B. Thirty things go to make a perfect Beauty, 1587. A △. Wherein conſiſts its force, 1597. a. The Autumn of Beauty is agreeable, 1266. O. 2062. A. There have been Cities, in which not only the Women, but the Men diſputed about Beauty, 2857. E.

Beda (Noel) his violent oppoſition to the Divorce of Henry VIII. 551. b.

Bedel (Biſhop) the Reverence of the Iriſh Rebels for him, 553.

Beings; diſtinction between Beings and half Beings, 2514. b. The Order and Gradation of Beings according to the Platoniſts, 2520. a.

Believe; nothing in the World ſo hard to a Man of Senſe as to believe, in the Opinion of Monſieur Des-barreaux, 1088 F.

Bellai (William du) what Charles V. ſaid of his Pen, 555. b. He perſuaded the Lutherans of Germany that his Maſter Francis I. had favourable Sentiments of them at bottom, at the ſame time that he was Burning their Brethren by dozens at Paris, ibid.

Bellai (Cardinal) privately married to Madam Chatillon, 558. b.

Bellarmine (Cardinal) compared to Demetrius the Silverſmith, 560. a. Compared to Leo an African, who was compared to Æſop's Bird, ibid. b. The Falſhoods publiſhed of him by ſome Proteſtant Writers, prejudicial to their own Cauſe, ibid. b. What he expunged and omitted out of the Virgin's Liturgies, 1562. b. His Controverſial Writings ſaid to have done more hurt than good to his Cauſe, 563. not to be bought in the Bookſellers Shops at Rome, 564. a. His Book de Romano Pontifice condemned by Sixtus V. for what Reaſon, 565. a. His fine Quibble when asked why ſo few Cardinals were in the Catalogue of Saints, 566. a. Clement VIII. his Character of him, 566. a. His Vow in Caſe he ſhould be made Pope, ibid. His Marks of the true Church the ſame which the Mahometans alledge for the Truth of Mahometiſme, 2115. a. in what Senſe Anſwers to him may bear the Title of Bellarminus Enervatus, according to the Roman Catholicks, 976. b. Cenſures Cardinal d'Ailly's maintaining from the appearance of of the Star, that the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt might be foretold by Aſtrological Calculations, 131. a. Forced to contradict himſelf in his Controverſies againſt different Sectaries, 275. a. New Lectures ſaid to be founded at Oxford and Cambridge for the confuting of Bellarmine, 560. C. The exceeding Praiſe given of his Controverſial Writings, 567. a. His Works of Controverſy compared to Homer, and why, ibid. His Contradictions, 2704. B. A famous Proteſtant Divine is forced to retract what he had charged Bellarmine with, 561. F. Some of his ordinary Sayings, ibid. P. He uſed to ſay there were too many Chriſtians, 3009. B.

Belleforeſt (Francis de) ſo ready a Writer, that he was ſaid to have a Mold to caſt Books, 568. Mercenary mean Authors terribly laſh'd upon his Back, 569. a.

Belliere: his Embaſſy to ſave Mary Queen of Scots, a meer Comedy, 1173. S.

Belot; his Reaſons againſt Writing learnedly in the vulgar Tongue, 571. a.

Bembus (Cardinal) why he would not have his Friends read St. Paul's Epiſtles, 572. b. Sincere in his refuſal of a Cardinalſhip, 573. b.

Benedictins; the Founder of their Order nearly related to to the Houſe of Auſtria, 266. Accuſed of Forgery, 1378. B.

Benefices; the Miniſters of Venice at the Court of Rome dare not accept of any Benefices, the State of Venice having made a Law againſt ſuch, 489. G. Beſtowed on Poets for a recompence of filthy obſcene Verſes compoſed by them, 2599. M. One turned out of his Benefices for not being able to pronounce the Letter Q rightly, 2551. G. Chriſtian Societies which have but ſmall Benefices, are Sufferers by the Inclination of the Clergy for Tranſlations, 44. b.

Benefit; The ill effects of a Benefit, eſpecially where a Woman's Dowry is the Benefit, 562. b.

Beni (Paul) his preference of Taſſo to Homer and Virgil, 576. a.

Benjamin; who was the Inventor of it, 353. a.

Benſerade; an Original in one kind of Poetry, 579. b.

Berengarius, who was the firſt Author that wrote againſt him in Defence of the real Preſence, 336. a.

Bergier; his Treatiſe of the Point of Day, Diſſert. xxxv. xxxvi.

Bern (Canton of) differ'd in three Points with Calvin, 817. b.

Bernard (St.) his Paſſion, Credulity, and Sower Temper, 583. b. 584. a. His Errors privileged, ibid. His Opinion of the Souls of the Bleſſed, 696. His Come-off upon the Falſhood of his Prophecy, ibid.

Bertelier (Philibert) Preſumptions againſt his Deputation to enquire at Noyon about Calvin's Life and Manners, 665. b. His publick Act of the City of Noyon, certifying John Calvin's Crime of Sodomy an arrand Forgery, 602. b.

Bertrada, Wife of Philip I. of France, her extraordinary Addreſs in managing two Husbands at one time, and making them live well together, 1325. a.

Bervaldus, a Phanatick in Chronology, 597. a.

Berytus; how it came to be a Titular Metropolitical See under Theodoſius the Younger, 594. b.

Beſſarion (Cardinal) his excellent Thought upon ſeeing a Canonization at Rome, 557. a.

Beton (David) Archbiſhop of St. Andrew's, Murthered in the Revolution of Religion in Scotland, 1840. A.

Bevilagua; Nuncio at Nimmegen, offered to viſit the Miniſters of the Proteſtant Princes, if they'd promiſe to return his Viſits, 969. a. n.

Beza (Theodore) does not think fit to explain the ſecret Reaſons of his quitting Lauſanne, 608. b. His Book de Puniendis Hæreticis turn'd on the Proteſtants, 609. a. Accuſed of an horrible Abomination, but without any Grounds, 614. 615. a. Some Lutherans, as well as Papiſts, twitted him with Candida the Taylor's Wife, 616. a. Cruelly reproached on account of his New Teſtament, 609. a. His undermatching himſelf ſomewhat ſuſpicious, 615. His extraordinary Beauty, ibid. Falſly ſaid to have own'd Bellarmine's Victory over the Proteſtants, 560. a. Vindicated from a Cruel Invective of Scioppius, 574. b. Cenſured on his Tartneſs and Diſingenuity, 534. and on his calling Baudovin a wretched Pedant, 535. a. His account of Calvin preferrable to Mainbourg's or Varillas's in all Matters which concern not Calvin's Reputation, 816. a. His great Moderation in ſpeaking of the Tragical end of Henry II. a great Perſecutor of the Proteſtants, 1618. a. The State with which he uſed to walk at one time in the Streets of Paris, 1708. b. Is cleared of an abominable Scandal which he has been charged with, 423. B. Whether he was of Opinion that Bellarmine had run down all the Proteſtant Controverſiſts, 560. C. A Bloody Invective of Scioppius againſt him, 573. N. He is calumniated grievouſly, 607. A. Kept Company in his Youth with a Woman upon promiſe of Marriage, which afterwards was executed, 608. C. Suppoſed to be the Author of the Book, Entituled, Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos, Diſſer. 3090. 3091. He looks upon the Hierarchy as a Fundamental Abuſe, 1840. b. His Story of a Woman and her two Daughters, 2584. Y.

Bias; his Mark of a virtuous Woman, 1785. a. A Maxim of this Philoſopher, 1785. D. His Dilemma about Marriage might be turn'd otherwiſe, 1785.

Bible: The Alteration of the Hebrew Text, with regard to the Age of the Patriarchs, 138. b. A Queſtion ſaid to be made to Bochartus, about this Holy Book, 649. D. Luther's Verſion, and that of the Low-Countries, ſaid to be Defective, 1131. G. A deteſtable Poſition of a Proteſtant Divine, with regard to the Evidence of the Divinity of this Book, 2371. C. What Politician is accuſed of having ſpoken againſt the Bible, 2658. I.

Bible of Zurich, Reviſed and Publiſh'd at Lyons by the Spaniſh Divines, 620. a. Contains the Principles of all Arts and Sciences, according to Alſtedius, 186.

Bibliander (Theodore) had a hand in Tranſlating the Zurich Bible, and Tranſlated the whole Alcoran, 619. b. Saluted his Cat, miſtaking her for his Maid, ibid.

Vol. II. 801. Vol. III. 1551. Vol. IV. 2439.

Bibliotheque; The Bibliotheque of the Jeſuit Authors, by whom begun, and by whom continu'd, 173. A. B. Qualities requiſite to make a good Bibliotheque, and the ordinary Defect of thoſe who undertake them, ibid. A living Bibliotheque, who ſo called, 1085. D.

Bibulus; what kind of War he made upon Julius Cæſar, 530. b. His publick Orders at that time, call'd Archilochia, and why, ibid.

Bigamiſts excluded from the Prieſthood by the Canons, 741. E. 743. B.

Bigots juſtify all their Paſſions at the Expence of Religion, 1719. F.

Billant (Adam) called the Virgil of the Joyners, 625. Does more Honour to the Joyners, than to the Poets, ibid. b.

Bion, the Philoſopher, valued himſelf on being the Son of a Whore, 626. b. Inſtances of his Wit, 627. a. Was one of the firſt who made a Jeſt of Religion, ibid. b. Why he wiſhed he was a Tart, ibid. A fine Deſcription of his Repentance, and exceeding Superſtition, before his Death, 628. a. The Anſwer attributed by Euſtachius to Antiſthenes the Cynick, is truly Bion's, ibid. b.

Bionei Sermones; what Horace underſtood by them, 627. a.

Birds; a Receipt for underſtanding the Language of Birds, 2894. a.

Biron (Mareſchal) a terrible Reprimand given him by Henry III. and his ſubmiſſive Behaviour, 1432. a. His Opinion about Henry IV's retiring, when hard preſs'd, into England, 1424. b. The Ground of his being ſuſpected for a Proteſtant, 1425. b. His Qualifications, ibid. His Maxim about prolonging a War, 1428. a.

Biron (Mareſchal Duke de) why he laughed at the Unfortunate Earl of Eſſex, 1428. a. His Character the ſame as that of Achilles in Homer, and Argantes in Torquato Taſſo, ibid. b. 1429. a. His inſupportable Pride and Vanity, 1428. 1429. b. His Life thrice ſav'd in Battel by Henry IV. Affronts the Queen of Navarre, and is mortified for it, 2352. b.

Birth; Great Men are willing to paſs over the Meanneſs of their Birth, 199. b. The Errors of People concerning the Birth of thoſe whom Providence has exalted above their Birth, 2910. a.

Biſhoprick; a kind of Denomination which needs not the ſame Arts to preſerve it, by which it is ſometimes obtain'd, 188. a.

Biſhops; the Title improperly given to ſeveral among the Ancients, 2705. b. An Apology for them that take up Arms, by whom written, and in whoſe Favour, 2647. a. Their Reſidence ſhewn by Experience to be no Preſervative againſt Corruptions, 1772. b. See Epiſcopacy.

Blanc (Le) ſuſpected of carrying on an Intrigue with Mareſchal Turenne, for reuniting the Reformed, 542. b. Reduc'd the Controverſie between Proteſtant and Papiſt to nothing, ibid. a.

Blanche (Queen of France); the Foundation of her Politicks, 903. a. Her affronting a Lady that gave her Child, afterwards S. Lewis, Suck, when ſhe her ſelf was in a high Fever, ibid. b. Her hard Uſage of the Queen her Daughter, S. Lewis's Wife, 904. a.

Blandrata, his Corrupting Tranſylvania and Poland with the Socinian Impiety, when ſo unſucceſsful elſewhere; accounted for by Mr. Malebranche's Combination of natural and moral Cauſes, 630. b. His Orthodox but Inſincere Confeſſion of Faith, 632. a. His unhappy End imputed to the Judgment of God, by Socinus and by Mainbourg, ibid.

Blaſphemy; the horrid Blaſphemy of an Engliſh Phanatick, compared with the Blaſphemy of Caligula, 1552. D. A terrible ſingular Blaſphemy, 2999. B.

Bleſkennius, his ſcandalous Account of the Manners of the Iſlanders, 1767. b.

Blondel (David) the Character of his Wit and Memory, 634. C. Has forgot a great many Authors who have affirm'd the Fact concerning Pope Joan, 1339. B. His great Talents, eſpecially Memory, 635. a. The Judgment of a Lady upon his Volume of the Sybils, ibid. b. His Book proving the Story of Pope Joan a Fable, offended ſome Proteſtants, 636. a. His Invectives againſt the Rump who beheaded King Charles I. and the States, who, inſtead of Revenging his Death, made Leagues with Cromwel, blam'd in Holland, 638. a. Why Sirmondus called him The Breaker of open Doors, ibid. b. The Ground of accuſing him of Plagiariſm, ibid. Said to have a Penſion for confuting the Story of Pope Joan, and not writing againſt Baronius, 639. b.

Blondel (Francis) why he thought the uſe of Chinchina in Phyſick a mortal Sin, 641. a.

Blondel (Francis) Profeſſor in Mathematicks; whether a Paſſage in his Travels, mention'd Pag. 641. b. ought, tho' true, to be ſuppreſs'd, 643. a. The croſſing his Genius ſpoil'd his being a good Merchant, or a good Poet, 643. a.

Blood (Circulation of the) underſtood by Ceſalpinus long before Harvey, 927. a.

Blount, his Tranſlation of Philoſtratus, enrich'd by impious Notes taken from Baron Herbert's Manuſcripts, 199. I. His Character and Tragical End, ibid.

Boaſters: A Deſcription of an impudent Boaſter, 808. a. b.

Bocace gave over reading the Bible, becauſe he thought Poetry was the Function which God had called him to, 644. b. His Decameron reliſh'd by the Proteſtants, 645. a. Why it has not been put in the Liſt of forbidden Books by the Inquiſition, 646. a. His Picture in Florence does not ſhew he had any thing in him agreeable, 1324. b. His Miſtreſs in his Fiammetta and Philocopo, was a Baſtard Daughter of Robert King of Naples, 1324. b.

Boccalini (Trajano) an Inſtance of the Difference between the Application of Rules, and the Act of Diſcourſing on them, 646. b. His ill Conduct the ground of a general Reflection on Lawyers, Phyſicians, and Divines, 647. a. Why he is liken'd to Terence, 647. b. Is murder'd by the Spaniſh Ambaſſador's Orders, ibid. Againſt what kind of Authors ought he to have made Apollo raiſe his Ban and Arrierban, 1004. F.

Bochartus play'd at Shuttlecock with the Queen of Sweden, 649. b. A Paſſage in Strabo about Telmeſſus wrong read by him, 2856. E. His Conjecture upon a Place of Suidas, where he ſpeaks of the Lobſters of Tenedos, is one of the beſt he has made, 2856. F.

Bodin, with all his Learning in the Law, had no Succeſs in his Pleas, 133. a. Believed the Exiſtence of Genii, which produced and preſerved all Sublunary Beings, 808. b. His Quality and Character, 654. b. 656. a. His Impiety and irreligion, ibid. a. b. His preference of the Jewiſh Religion above all others, 652. a. He aſſerts the Rights of the People above the Prerogative, 653. b. Maintains that Kings are bound by their Contracts, 657. a. Damns the depoſing Doctrine, and that of reſiſting even againſt Tyrants, without an expreſs Command from God, ibid. What means he allows to get rid of Tyrants, 658. a. Sides with the League againſt Henry IV. after all theſe fine Doctrines, ibid. The Anſwer that ſuch a Law was to be found on the back of the Salick Law made to him, and on what Occaſion, ibid. b.

Bodleian Library, (Catalogue of the) Books miſplaced in it, 2644. a. Peter Jarrige the Jeſuit confounded in this Catalogue with another Jeſuit call'd Peter Jarric, and the Work of the former aſcribed to the latter, 1746.

Bodies; how the Living differ from the not Living, according to Deſcartes, 1151. a. Are incapable of Thought, 1189. b. The Qualities of Bodies, which ſtrike our Senſe, are no more than Appearances, 2619. B.

Bodies, (dead) that have remained exempt from Corruption, 146. b.

Boethius; the Difference between his Objections and Anſwers about a Providence, 2630. a.

Bohemia (King of) his Exerciſes at School ſhew'd in the Vatican to Travelers, 188. b.

Boi (Syracuſano) ranſom'd himſelf from the Corſairs of Barbary by ſome Leſſons at Cheſſe, 658.

Bolſec; his Scandals of Calvin ſuſpected even by Roman Catholick Authors, 665. b. 666. a.

Bomberg (Daniel) the firſt who printed Hebrew Books at Venice, 1515. and the laſt who printed that Language well, 666.

Bonet (Honoratus de) Author of a Book, entituled, l'Arbre de Battailes, in which he aſſerts the Truth of Pope Joan's Hiſtory, 1339. a. Some Miſtakes about this Book, ibid.

Bongars (James) his Latin Letters, why learn'd by the Dauphin when he firſt learn'd Latin, and preferred for the uſe of young Princes to the beſt Claſſick Authors, 673. b. He cauſed the Queſtions to be publiſh'd, which the Jeſuit Cotton had drawn up to be ask'd the Devil, 673. b.

Bonnivet (Admiral) what he got by ſtealing in at a Trap-Door into the Queen of Navarre's Bed, 558. b. Thrice attempts to Raviſh Margaret Queen of Navarre, his Maſter's Siſter, 2339. a.

Books; as difficult to make juſt Additions to a Book, as to make a juſt Abridgment, 2138. b. Some People think the Titles of their Books may make them live, 197. What

What kind of Books at this time are like Mony cry'd down, 984. a. *The fureſt way to make a Book ſell*, 115. a. *Why Zealots let ſome Books paſs for ſeveral Years, and then attack them*, 122. a. *Licenſers and Cenſors of Books, very negligent in their Function, a memorable Inſtance of this*, 78. b. *Thoſe which abound with Quotations, and thoſe produced from one's own ſtock, compared in point of Excellence*, 1188. *The perfecteſt and moſt Pious liable to Cenſure*, 1393. a. *The Book Entitled*, Mulieres non ſunt homines; *its honeſt and ingenious Deſign*, 1392. b. *An inſtance of the Impudence of thoſe in* Holland *in falſifying Books*, 2507. b. *The miſchief of falſe Figures or Prints before them*, 694. a. *Who was the firſt Philoſopher that Publiſhed a Book*, 237. a. *A Cenſure on thoſe who put off the buying the firſt Editions of Books, in hopes of better and cheaper Editions afterwards*, 250. a. *The cheapneſs of them upon ſome occaſion in Antient Times*, 355. a. *The Curioſity of People for cenſured Books; a lively Inſtance of this in the Prelates of* France, 2647. b.

Borri (*Cavalier*) *his horrible Doctrines*, 683. a. *What he ſaid, when he heard he had been burnt in Effigy at* Rome, 633. a. *A Doubt whether his* Chiave del Gabinetto, *or the Count* de Gabalis *ought to paſs for the Original*, 684. a. *Boaſted of his being deſcended from* Burrus, Nero's *Governer*, 684. b. n.

Boſc (Peter du) *Miniſter of* Caen, *his great Qualities and Talents*, 688. *His Doctrine of the Obedience due to Kings*, 689. a. *preached with his Hat on*, 689. b.

Boſquet (Francis) *Biſhop of* Monpellier, *a remarkable Paſſage about the Superſtitions of Popery left out of the ſecond Edition of his Hiſtory of the* Gallican *Church, and preſerved by Archbiſhop* Uſher, 690. a.

Boſſulus, *a Frenchman, Preceptor to* Don Carlos, *Son of* Philip *the* IId. *He writ only the Heads of his publick Orations, and ſupply'd the reſt* Extempore, 691. b.

Boſſuet (*Biſhop of* Meaux) *his Miſtake on occaſion of the Ubiquity and the firſt Authors of this Tenet*, 3028. G.

Boucher (John) *a Doctor of* Sorbon, *ſuppoſed to have abetted* John Clement, *Murtherer of* Henry III. *of* France, 395. a. *honoured for it, and preferred by the Spaniards in the* Netherlands, 696. *Spoke the Funeral Oration of* Philip *the* IId. *at* Tournay, *ibid.*

Bouhours; *the Uſefulneſs of his Advice to Authors about ranging their Words*, 1185. b.

Bourbon (*Conſtable of*) *prompted to the Siege of* Rome *by Predictions*, 117. H. *Saves his Life by his Horſe's ſhod the Reverſe way*, 375. 376.

Bourbon (James de) *impriſoned by his Wife in a Caſtle in* Italy, 2269. b. *He makes his Eſcape to* Tarentum, *delivers up the Place, and goes into* France *to turn Monk*, ibid.

Bourbon (*Cardinal of*) *aſpires to the Crown of* France *at the Sollicitation of the League*, 1693. a. *recommended by his Maſter* Lewis *the* XIth *to* Edward *the* IVth, *as a fit Confeſſor for a Prince of Pleaſures*, 1157. b.

Bourbon (Charles *of*) *what provoked him to go over to* Charles *the Fifth, and turn ſuch an Enemy to* Francis *the Firſt*. 1350. b.

Bourbon (*Houſe of*) *how much obliged to M.* Schomberg, 1628. b.

Bourdeaux; *its Parliament cenſured*, 1711. K. *An Inſtance of their Courage*, 835. L.

Bourdelot (Abbé) *the Tricks he played* Bochartus *at the Court of* Sweden, 649. b.

Bourgoing (Edme) *Prior of the Convent, to which* James Clement *the Aſſaſſin of* Henry *the Third, belonged; praiſes his Pupil from the Pulpit, and compares him to* Judith, 1785. a.

Bourignon (Antoniette) *a She-Fanatick, who believed ſhe ſaw in an Extacy how* Adam *was made before he ſinned, and how he alone could produce without a Female*, 80. a. *What Spirit and Temper ſhe was of*, 702. a. b. *Why ſhe would give no Alms*, 700. a. *The near Agreement between her Notion of the Monſtrouſneſs of Man's being divided into two imperfect Sexes, and that of the Philoſophers of the* Terra Auſtralis, 2638. a. b.

Brachmanes, *not of the number of thoſe Philoſophers who went naked*, 1407. a.

Brandenbourg (*Elector of*) *writes to* Richard Cromwell *of the Invaſion of the Swedes in* Poland, *and their oppreſſing the reformed Religion*, 1012. K.

Brandon (Charles) *Duke of* Suffolk, *his Amours with the Princeſs of* England *watched, and diſappointed in* France, 1348. B.

Brantome; *what he ſays of the Birth of* Don John *of* Auſtria. *His falſe Thought concerning the Children of Great Lords; cited* 840. b. *His eaſie Apology for the Lewdneſs of* Joan *of* Naples, 2327. b. *What he ſays of the Beauty of* Donna Maria *of* Arragon, 313. a. *and of the Birth of* Don John *of* Auſtria, 635. A. *A falſe reaſoning of this Author about the Children of great Lords*, 697. b. *To praiſe* Francis *the Firſt, he ſpeaks with too much Contempt of the other Princes leagued againſt* Charles *the Fifth*, 941. A. *Cites the Prince of* Orange *impertinently on occaſion of* Charles *the Fifth's Sentiments of Religion*, 947. S. *His Relation concerning* Mary *of* England, *Queen of* France, *is different from that of* Mezeray *and* Varillas, 1348. C. *According to him 'tis poſſible that a Queen may impoſe a Suppoſititious Child in the midſt of a great Court*, ibid. *He commits two Faults with regard to a Cup which* Helena *had made in the ſhape of her Breaſts*, 1586. A. *What he ſays of the Liberality of the Cardinal of* Lorrain *to the Poor, and to the Ladies*, 1975. a. *What he thinks of the Ladies who followed their Husbands to the holy Land*, 1996. b. *Says four things with regard to* Joan *of* Naples, *which are all falſe*, 2263. b.

Braſil; *the Savages of this Country have no Religion*, 1917. g.

Braſs; *Stories about a brazen Head*, 461. b.

Bravery; *whether there be any Machinal Connexion between it and the Love of Women*, 1631. B Δ. *Is, of all the Vertues, the moſt ſubject to fanatical Tranſports*, 2527. b. *Is often joined with Softneſs, and a Love of Pleaſures*, 2838. A.

Brentius, *a flaming* Ubiquitarian, *is againſt allowing the* Zuinglians *a Toleration*, 755. b.

Breviary, *of* Burgos, *ordered to be purged of the Legends, but all in vain*, 1135. a.

Brevity, *in Stile, the way to Barrenneſs*, 48. a.

Brezé (Peter de) *Lord of* Varenne, *his witty manner of reproaching* Lewis *the* XIth, *on his aſſuming a Deſpotical Power*, 711. a.

Brezé (*Mareſchal* de) *his Bluntneſs to Cardinal* Richlieu, 713. b. *Gets himſelf prayed for in the Proteſtant Church of* Saumur, 205. I. *Draws his Sword upon the Mareſchal* de Chatillon, *and why*, 2097. b.

Briefs; *ſome judicious Remarks about the Style that ought to be obſerved in the Pope's Briefs*, 282. a. b.

Briſſac (*M.*) *his generous Remonſtrances to* Henry *the* IId *of* France, *againſt the Treaty of* Chateau *in* Cambreſis, 1613. b.

Britain; *the Gallantries of the* Britiſh *Ladies how publick, when the Emperor* Severus *was in that Province*, 1696. b.

Brothels; *an Apology for them, by whom written*, 801. a.

Broukolakas; *what the* Greeks *underſtand thereby*, 398.

Brueyere *cited*, 706. 2021. & alibi.

Brueys; *how he puſhes Mr.* Jurieu *on his Prophecies*, 1823. a. *His reflections on Mr.* Jurieu's *gay Humour in the Day of his Brethren's Adverſity*, 2621. G G.

Bruſſels; *whether the bombarding of* Bruſſels *by Mareſchal* Villeroy *had been fairly foretold by Mrs.* Bourignon, 2590. B.

Brutes; *the Opinion that Brutes have no feeling nor Paſſions, to whom firſt aſcribed*, 2514. a. b. *The Opinion that Brutes are meer Machines, to whom firſt owing in theſe latter Ages*, ibid. a. *Why* Deſcartes *may be notwithſtanding reputed the Inventer of this Opinion*, 2515. b. *The Opinions of ſeveral ancient Philoſophers about the Souls of Brutes*, 2516. a. & ſeq. *A Book ſhewing that Brutes have rational Souls, and act with an Underſtanding ſuperior to that of Man, written upon a ridiculous Occaſion*, 2603, 2604. a. *The impious and the* Epicureans *affect to bring Brutes as near to Men as poſſible in Perfection*, 2605. a. *No Difference between them and Man, but Religion, according to a Father of the Church*, 2606. b. *allowed a Degree of Reaſon, Liberty and Virtue by the* Socinians, *and even to be capable of Rewards and Puniſhments*, 2607. a.

Brutum Fulmen, *an Error of Mr.* de Thou, *about this Book*, 1703. a.

Brutus (Junius) *not diſpleaſed to be thought he was deſcended from him, who delivered the Commonwealth from the Tyranny of* Tarquin, 873. *It's much doubted, whether he was or not*, ibid. *The forbidding his and* Caſſius's *Images to be carried in a Funeral Proceſſion, only gave them a greater Luſtre*, 690. b.

Brutus *and* Cicero; *how they differ'd in their Taſte of Eloquence*, 739. I.

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 1459.

Brutus (Lucius Junius) *condemns his own Children to Death*, 731. C.

Bucer *endeavours to make appear, that the* **Doctrine** *of* **Luther** *and that of* **Zuinglius**, *about the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are the ſame at bottom*, 1703. a.

Buchanan; *the* **Agreement** *between him and the* Popiſh *Writers for the League in Republican Maxims*, 495. a. *The Preſumptions are all againſt him in his* **Difference** *with* Cambden, *in the Hiſtory of* Mary *Queen of* Scots, 830. b, *always went with a Staff and a Ring*, a. *The bitter Invectives of ſome* Roman Catholick *Authors, particularly of* Barclay, *againſt him*, 744. b. 745. a, b. *Whether his Political Maxims be the Maxims of Proteſtants in general*, ibid.

Budæus, *Inventor of the Word* Perfectibilibis, 490. a.

Bullen (Anne) *her ſpreading her Petticoats when beheaded, for fear her Feet ſhould be ſeen, an Inſtance of her Modeſty*, 661. a. *Her being called the* Engliſh *Hackney Mare, and* Francis *the* Iſt's *Mule, are Forgeries*, ibid. a. b. *Her greateſt Crime*, 662. b.

Bulls, *Popes Bulls for the making Biſhops in* France, *how prejudicial to the Rights of the* Gallican *Church*, 2156 a. *A Bull, declaring the King of* Navarre *incapable of Succeeding to the* **Crown** *of* France *by reaſon of his Hereſie*, 570. a.

Burgundy, (*Parliament of*) *its little regard to the Royal Authority*, 555. a.

Burleſque, *its Defence*, 1058.

Burnett, (*Biſhop*) *his Remark on the Conduct of the* Wittemberg *Divines, in relation to* Harry VIII's *Divorce, liable to exceptions from a malicious Wit*, 506. b.

Burnett (*Doctor*) *ſaying that Monſieur* de Thou *Printed the ſecond Volume of* Cambden's *Annals from a Copy furniſhed to him by the Author, ſhewn to be a great Error*, 831. a. b. *the Supplement to his travels cenſur'd on the ſubject of Cavalier* Borri, 685. b. *An Examination of the Difference between him and* Varillas *on Occaſion of* Cambden's *Hiſtory*, 830. 831. H. *What he ſays of the Divines appointed to reviſe* King Edward's *Liturgy*, 1752. b. *A notable Saying of his about the Church of* England's *not defining the manner of the real Preſence; ſo that Perſons of different Sentiments in this Point may be of the ſame Worſhip and Communion, without declaring themſelves*, 553. b.

Butas, *how the Name of this Author, by various Corrections, became at laſt* Plutarch, 786. Z.

C A.

Cabala, *finds every thing in every Text of Scripture*, 139. A. B. *They lay a great ſtreſs on the Book of the Creation*, 138. A.

Cacus, *The Son of* Vulcan, *why the* Romans *ſaid that he breathed Fire and Flame at his Mouth*, 2670. B. ad Fin.

Cæſar (Julius) *why he ruin'd a* Villa, *where his Mother had been confin'd*, 690. b.

Cain, *Opinions concerning the Mark which* God *ſet upon him*, 805. a. *ſeveral ways of accounting for his fear of being ſlain when there were ſo few to be afraid of*, 804. b. *St.* Cyril's *Opinion, what it was made* Cain's *Offering unacceptable to God*, 805. b. *Why* God *would take cognizance immediately of his Crime*, 804. A. ad Fin.

Cajetan (*Cardinal*) *thought to be the true Author of the Books, which paſs under the name of* Boccalin, 647. b.

Cajetan, *cenſured for denying to* Adam *a perfect Knowledge of the Stars and of the Elements*, 79. a.

Calais, *when taken from the* Engliſh, *and by whom*, 1294. H.

Calcagnini, *Convicted of Falſhood with regard to the* Venus *of* Apelles, 288. H. *Attacks* Cicero, 205. a.

Calderinus, (Domitius) *falſly placed by the Proteſtants among the Witneſſes to the Truth*, 803. b. *The firſt that ventur'd to Comment on the difficult Poets*, 808. *what he uſed to ſay to his Friends when they would make him go to Maſs*, 809. a. *reckon'd by the Proteſtants among the Witneſſes of the Truth*, ibid.

Calderona, *an Actreſs to* Philip, 455. b.

Calendar, *the Reforming it, propoſed to the Council of* Conſtance, 132. b. 2816. E. Δ. *Who were the firſt Authors that publiſh'd ſome Thoughts concerning this Reformation*, ibib. *Three Means propoſed for it by* John Maria de Tholoſſanis, *ibid.*

Calepin, *a Judgment on* Calepin's *Dictionary*, 2550. C.

Calenus (Olenus) *a Southſayer of* Etruria, *how he would have Juggled the* Romans *out of the Empire of the World*, 810. a.

Caligula. *The Complaint he made of his own Reign*, 1649. b. *his Converſation with* Jupiter *and harſh treatment of his Godſhip*, 811. a. b. *giving the Captain of the Guard always ſome Bawdy word out of Contempt, the chief cauſe of his Death*, ibid. *thrice decreed to Death by* Tiberius, *is ſaved by the Interceſſions of* Sertorius Macro, 2088. a. *obliges this ſame* Macro *and his Wife to kill themſelves with their own Hands*, 2087. a. *His Queſtion to a Comedian and Favourite of his*, 289. *His Impiety*, 111. G. *His Extravagancies to Honour the Memory of* Druſilla, 1129. C. *The* Jews *refuſe to place his Statue in the Temple of* Jeruſalem, 191. b. *Gives his Licenſe to ſeveral Books which had been ſuppreſs'd by Order of Senate, on account of the Invectives in them*, 884. K. *Complains that no great Calamities happened in his time*, 1649. R. *The means that* Macron *makes uſe of to Inſinuate himſelf into his Favour*, 2086. b. *His Ingratitude*, ibid. *and* 2087. b. *Uſed to ſay, that his Mother was Born in Inceſt between* Auguſtus *and his Daughter* Julia, 2369. a.

Callimachus, *his Maxim, that a great Volume is always a great Evil*, 1003. A.

Callipædia, *what Judgment ought to be made of this Book and its Author*, 2533. D.

Callirhoe, *The manner of her loſing her Maidenhead, an inſtance of the fatal Power of a falſe Religion*, 2683. b.

Calvary (*Mount*) Adam *ſuppoſed to be Buried there*, 811. I.

Calvin (John) *the virulency of the Book written againſt him, intituled*, Calvinus Judaizans, *by* Hunnius *a* Lutheran *Divine*, 1732. a. 1658. a. *the Device and Motto before the firſt Edition of his Inſtitutions*, 816. a. *the three Points which he refuſed to ſubmit to in compliance with the* **Canton** *of* Bern, 817. b. *what he thought of the* Revelations, 818. a. *tax'd with Frigidity or Impotency*, 819. a. *his ſending his Son to be cured at the* Shrine *of St.* Hubert *a Fable*, 810. a. *the reaſon of his changing his Name from* Cauvin *to* Calvin, 813. a. *what turn might a cunning Satyriſt give to* Calvin's *great Vertues*, 820. *his alleging St.* Chryſoſtom's *Example on an occaſion, a ſly way of threatning the Magiſtrates of* Geneva *with an Inſurrection*, 602. b. *Perſecutes* Blandrata *by Letters, and drives him out of* Poland, 631. b. *charg'd by* Caſtalio *for having wrote a Preface to a Book that was a Banter on Holy Things*, 889. b. *his bitter charges againſt the Court of* Rome, *compar'd with thoſe of* Peter Caſtellan, *Great Almoner of* France, 894. b. Calvin, Beza, *and others, too haſty in their Judgments of Perſons, who ſhew'd ſome favour to the Reformation*, 897. a. *A violent Enemy to* Ariſtotle, 367. a. *An attempt towards clearing him of having ſpoken indecently of* Sarah *and* Abraham, *on* Sarah's *deſiring her Husband to make uſe of* Hagar, 2678. b. *His Doctrine on this Point much purer than that of the Fathers, St.* Auſtin, *St.* Ambroſe, *&c.* 2680. a. *Never was in Prieſt's Orders, nor ever proceeded beyond the ſimple Tonſure*, 814. A. *Was Ignorant, there had been two* Seneca's, 814. A. *When and why he publiſh'd his Inſtitutions*, 814. B. *Refuſes to ſubmit to the Deciſions of the* Synod *of the* Canton *of* Bern, 816. F. *Praiſed for his not having written on the* Revelations, 818. M. *Silly Stories told of him*, ibid. n. *His Diſintereſtedneſs*, ibid. *His Quarrels with* Caſtalio, 889 G. *He's reproach'd with having too greedily pick'd up any little Stories of his Enemies*, 889. G. *He does not ſpeak more ſtrongly againſt the Popes and Court of* Rome *than* Caſtellan, 907. b. *Whether ever he was in* England, 1099. A. *Some Preliminary Queſtions and Reſponſes very Impious, which he ſays* Caſtalio *made uſe of before he drank off his Glaſs of Wine*, 889. G. *Goes to* Paris, *at his return from ſtudying the Law*, 2275. a. *Treated ſome Perſons roughly, who were Protected by the Queen of* Navarre, 2178. a. *Gives his Judgment roundly of the Conduct of* Sarah *and* Abraham, 2678. H. 2679. I. *Makes uſe of Phraſes in his Catechiſm concerning the Lord's Supper, which ſeem to admit of a real Preſence*, 2703. a. n. *Calumniated by a* Lutheran, 3028. b.

Calviniſts, *had no form of Religious Worſhip at the time that* Beza *turn'd the Pſalms into Metre*, 2205. a. *Their Re-union with the* Lutherans *never to be accompliſh'd, as long as the Judges are Eccleſiaſticks*, 1723. a. *Violence exerciſed on them by the* Lutherans, 1735. B. *Are falſly accuſed of deſigning to introduce an equality of Conditions*, 2817. A. ad med. *Why all attemps for uniting the* Calviniſts *and* Lutherans *have been hitherto* is unſucceſsful, and why 'tis probable they ever will. 1755. a.

Calviniſm, look'd on as a Kingdom of Antichriſt, no leſs than Popery, by Matthias Hoe, a famous Lutheran Divine and Interpreter of the Revelations, 1685. Whether the Doctrines of Calviniſm tend to Indulge our Luſts and Paſſions, 1143. b. 1145. b. The Judgment which ſome Lutherans make of Calviniſme, to wit, that it's an Antichriſt as bad as the Popiſh Antichriſt, 1685.

Calvino, Turciſmus cited in relation to Beza, 616. a.

Calvinus Judaizans, The Hiſtory of this Book, 1731. I.

Calumniators, are treated with too much Indulgence, 267. b. There is no ſhameful Artifice that they are not capable of, 306. 307. K. The beſt way to be reveng'd of them, is ſometimes not to Anſwer them, 647. a. Politicians find it the Intereſt of the Publick not to Diſcourage them too much, 1103. b. A good ſaying of Simonides concerning Calumniators, 1146. I. ad fin. How treated in the Days of Gregory the Great, 1463. a. b. 1464. a. A way to ſtop the Mouths of your ſly Inuendo Calumniators, 2090. b. They have nothing to fear when they are Powerful, 2327. a. When Hereſie is the Point they ſeldom or never meet with the Puniſhment they deſerve, 1997. b.

Calumnies, Conditions requiſite to make 'em Succeed, 561. a. The ſuppoſed Occaſion of Apelles his Drawing his fine Picture of Calumny, 287. a. b. In what Caſes we ought to deſpiſe Calumny, 382. G. Thoſe which are eaſily Diſprov'd, do a Service to thoſe who are Defamed, 587. a. Groſs and Diabolical Calumnies, which have prov'd of Advantage to their Authors, 1350. G. ad Fin. The uſefulneſs of Calumny in Religious Diſputes, 1157. a. What the conſideration of ſome Calumnies forc'd from St. Baſil, 2702. a. The credulity of the People, with regard to it, 2703. b.

Camden, his lodging the MSS. of the ſecond Part of his Annals in the Hands of Du Puy, a Printer at Paris, ſome ground to ſuſpect that the firſt Part was curtail'd by James I. 830. b. The Noſe of his Statue pull'd off for having performed the part of a Faithful Hiſtorian, 283. a. Why he would not have his Annals Tranſlated into Engliſh, ibid. Some ground for thinking he had no other hand in the Annals, which go under his Name, than barely the tranſlating them into Latin, 832. b. Preſumptions for the Truth of his Account of Mary Queen of Scots, in oppoſition to that of Bucanan, 830. b. His Teſtimony concerning Bucanan's Repentance thought to be not the moſt ſolid, 745. F. How a part of the Memoirs which he made uſe of came to be loſt, 832. M.

Cambrai; a powerful League made there againſt the Venetians, 2017. D.

Cambreſis (Chateau in) its Treaty, how ſhameful and diſadvantageous to France, 1614.

Cambridge (Univerſity of) taught Bodin's Republick in the Schools, at the time that Bodin was in England with the Duke of Alançon, 653. a.

Camels; in great Veneration among the Turks, 2104. C C. According to them there ſhall be a Reſurrection of Camels, ibid.

Cameron (John) what he could ſay of King James, 833. a. Dyes a Martyr for Paſſive Obedience, 833. b. Had favourable Thoughts of the Church of England, 835. a. His Conference with Tilenus, 833. A. Is like to be Murthered for Preaching Paſſive Obedience, ibid. C. Believed that the Reformation wanted Reforming, ibid. H.

Camillus (Julius) his bold Undertaking to teach Francis I. Greek and Latin to perfection in a Month, 1356.

Camillus (Marcus Furius) the moſt Heroick of all his Actions, 836. a. The Continency of the Ladies of his Family from Generation to Generation, 837. b.

Campian the Jeſuit, his Diſpute with Whitaker, 2035. b.

Camus (Mr. le) Biſhop of Bellai; his impertinent manner of retorting the Devotions paid to the Bleſſed Virgin, in his Diſputes with the Proteſtants, 1345. a.

Cana (the Marriage of) who were the Bridegrooms and Bride, 1754. E. Whether they ever Conſummated the Marriage, ibid.

Canathus, a Fountain near Nauplia, its Vertue, 1815. a.

Canonizations; the Expences of them condemned by Hadrian VI. 1564. The Expence of it on one Occaſion, 1357. b.

Canons (Evangelical) to whom ought they to be aſcribed, 210. b. The difference between them and the Harmony of Ammonius, 211. a.

Canticles; two Canticles made by Adam in the Library of the Eſcurial; one when he firſt ſaw Eve, the other after the Fall, 81. b.

Canticles (the Book of) the Judgment of Caſtalio on this Book, 888. a.

Canus Julius; his Anſwer to one who ask'd him what he thought of the Soul, juſt as he was going to be Executed, 668. b.

Capilupi (Lelio) his Cento Virgilianus commended, and ſome Lines of it quoted, Diſſert. 3117.

Capilupus (Camillus) extremely admired for his applying Virgil's Words to repreſent things Foreign to that Poet's Thought, 842. a. His Cento againſt the Monks inimitable, ibid.

Capiſtran (John) the Power of his Eloquence, 843. a. and of his Prayers, ibid.

Capiſtran, a Cordelier, obliged the Jews to wear the Letter Tau, as a Badge to be known by, 2328. b.

Capitol; the Dogs which watched the Capitol did not Bark by Day at thoſe who came into the Temple to offer up their Devotions, 595. C. ad med. An application of this to the myſtical Dogs, ibid.

Cappadocia; its Horſes appropriated to the uſe of the Roman Emperors, and interdicted the very Conſuls, 845. The low Price of Slaves and Oxen there, 845. b. When it became a Province of the Roman Empire, 328. Its great Riches at that time, 329. a.

Captains; what Qualities are neceſſary for great Captains, in order to their ſucceeding in their Enterprizes, 918. C. Several great Captains have dreaded the Sovereign Judge of the World, upon thinking of the Blood they had ſpilt even in Wars which they thought juſt, ibid. ad fin. Some Captains have loved their Pleaſure, but loved their Glory more, 1587. b.

Capuchins; when the Order commenced, 2287. b. 'Tis not true that Bernardine Ochinus was Founder of it, ibid. The Indignation of Pope Paul III. againſt the whole Order, and the occaſion of it, ibid. G. The Capuchins of Paris unfortunate in a Piece of Forgery, 1927. b.

Caracalla; the Saying of a Veſtal whom he put to Death for Impudicity, 1798. a. He is the true Son, and not Son in-Law of Julia, whom he Married, 1798. Kills his Brother Geta in his Mother's Arms, 1797. When Proclaimed an Aſſociate in the Empire, and by whoſe means, 1800. a. Why he Perſecuted the Peripateticks, and wou'd have burnt Ariſtotle's Books. Puts four Veſtals to Death, one of which he had enjoyed, 1798. a. When, and on what occaſion proclaimed Emperor by the Army, 1799. b.

Caraccioli; his Averſion for Mice made a means by Joan of Naples, of diſcovering her Love for him, 851. a. gave his Queen a Box on the Ear for refuſing him the Principality of Salerno, 851.

Cardan; his falſe Prediction about Henry IId. of France, 1618. b. Deplores his being Impotent from 21 to 31. What he attributes it to, 852. a. Was rather a Superſtitious Man, than an Eſprit fort, 852. D. b. Refuſed Five hundred Crowns to give Edward VI. the Titles the Pope refuſed him, ibid. Was rather a Fanatick than an Atheiſt, 853. a. Would fain have been thought the firſt that calculated the Nativity of Jeſus Chriſt, when there had been four before him Guilty of the ſame Impiety, 855. b.

Cardinals; a Cardinal of Quality a competent Judge of Beauty, 310. B. When they firſt began to keep Hounds and Horſes, and affect Luxury in their Furniture, 1618. b. The reaſon why they are not Holy according to Bellarmin is, becauſe they aſpire to be moſt Holy, 565. P.

Carians; the firſt who wore Creſts upon their Helmets, 2713. b.

Carmel; an Oracle delivered to Veſpaſian on Mount Carmel, and mentioned by Tacitus and Suetonius, maintained by the Carmelites to have been delivered by the true God, 2960. a. The Authors who have oppoſed this Notion of theirs, ibid.

Carmelites; their pretended Antiquity built upon what, 2960.

Carneades inſults over Chryſippus his Antagoniſt, 974. b. His Argument, proving the Notion of Juſtice to be a falſe Notion, 862. b. Deny'd the certainty of Humane Knowledge, even in regard to firſt Principles, 860. b. one particular Inſtance, in which he departed from this Doctrine, 864. b. Cato propoſed the remanding Carneades ſent on an Embaſſy from Athens to Rome, becauſe his Eloquence deſtroyed the differences of Good and Evil, 862. a. Gives ſome Modification to the Incomprehenſibility taught by Arceſilaus, 317. b. Had Doctrines for his Friends, and others for his Scholars, 839. a. No one could tell what appeared to him moſt probable, ibid. 'Twas ſaid, that the Sun was obſcured at his Death, 866. P. ad fin. How he explain'd the Liberty of Man, 1199. T. Refuted Juſtice, 861. F.

2681. H. The ground of Cato's Anger to Carneades, 2681. H.

Vol. II. 801. Vol. III. 1551. Vol. IV. 1439.

Caroli, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, and one of the firſt Reformers; his Accuſations of Calvin and Farel gave ill impreſſions of 'em at the beginning, 1286. b.

Carpocratians; condemned for placing Ariſtotle's Image next to that of Jeſus Chriſt, and adoring it, 366. b.

Carranza, Archbiſhop of Toledo, his being ſuſpected of Hereſy; the ground of ſuſpecting Charles V. 857. a. A Reflection on the Juſtice done his Memory by the People of Rome, 859. b.

Carrouzels; a Law obſerved in them, 1744. B. ΔΔΔΔ.

Carteſians; a Carteſian treated in the Style of Learned, for ſaying that this Propoſition, two and two make four, has no difficulty, 909. B. The ableſt of them are fond of middle Intelligences, 794. b. An explication of a Doctrine of ſome Carteſians, touching the Formation of Bodies, ibid. Their Argument to prove the Immortality of the Soul is not evident to all the World, 2537. a. What perplexes them moſt in the Doctrine of Beaſts being Automatons, 2709.

Carteſians; begin to doubt the Sufficiency of their Principles for producing all the variety of natural Effects, 808. b. their Categories, ibid. n.

Carteſianiſme; what Mr. Bourignon thought of it, 701. a.

Carthagena (John) a Jeſuit, his Poſition that a Pope may make uſe of the Arms of Infidels to defend the Liberties of the Church, 869. that Eccleſiaſticks are obliged to kill and deſtroy the Enemies of the State, ibid. That Subjects are not obliged to enquire into the Merits of their Sovereign's Cauſe, ibid.

Caſaubon (Iſaac) a conſiderable omiſſion of his, 406. a. His Submiſſion to the great Julius Cæſar Scaliger, 1479. b. His Opinion of the four Verſes aſcribed to Nero is ſurprizing, 2557. a. He is cruelly treated in a Satyr, 2775. b. He inſinuates that Cambden had no further Hand in the Annals which go under his Name, than barely tranſlating them into Latin, 832. L. His Obſervation on Homer, with regard to the Good and Evil which is in Nature, 3050. b. Wherein does he conſider Euripides as an inſpired Writer, ibid.

Caſa (John de la) Remarks on the Deſign and Matter of his extravagant Book, Entituled, Capitolo del forno, 2932. a. b. Why the Proteſtants cry'd out ſo much againſt his Works, 2601. b. He writes againſt Vergerio, and why, 2331. b. Several have condemned his abominable Book, Capitolo del forno, without reading it, 2933. a. b. A Poem addreſs'd by him to the Germans, 2961. b.

Caſe (Privileged) the difference between it and a common Offence, 147. a. n.

Caſſander; his Conſultation, 539. a. From whom did he take the Spirit of a Pacificator, 333. b.

Caſſandra; how her Prophecies were rendred uſeleſs, 870. a.

Caſſin (Monks of Mount) Benedictins, their Forgery, 1379. a.

Caſſius (Caius) call'd the laſt of the Romans, 876. Harangues his Soldiers in the Style of Religion, tho' himſelf a rank Epicurean, 878. b. why he wiſh'd there were Genii, tho' he did not believe there were, ibid. a.

Caſſius (Lucius) his Tribunal call'd the Shelve of the accuſed, 874. b. his Maxim in Criminal Tryals, Cui bono, 875. b. his Word equal to the publick Faith of Rome, ibid.

Caſſius (Severus) a pleaſant Saying of his, upon the Burning a Libel of Labienus, by a Vote of the Senate, 882. b. his incorrigible ill Nature and Proneneſs to accuſe, 883. b.

Caſtalio. Judgments on his Tranſlations of the Bible into Latin and French, 887. a. b. his own wicked Judgment on the Song of Songs, 888. a. the Names that Calvin calls him in two Leaves of one of his Books, 889. a. His Apology and Recrimination of Calvin and Beza, ibid. b. a horrid Blaſphemous Ceremony ſaid to be uſed by him in Drinking, 890. a. Teſtimony of his good Morals, ibid. how he came to take the Name of Caſtalio, 892. a. Whether he be the Author of a Book againſt the Power given to Magiſtrates of putting Hereticks to Death, 2776. b. a.

Caſtellan (Dr.) his honeſty in expoſing the Impudence of Aſtrologers before Francis I. 1618. b.

Caſtellanus (Peter) Biſhop of Macon, and Great Almoner of France; his bold Cenſure of St. Auguſtin, 436. b. his Anſwer to Francis I. who ask'd him whether he was a Gentleman, 892. b. What he thought of the Religion of the Court of Rome, 894. b. his hard Fate to be equally Cenſured, whether he Protected or Perſecuted the Lutherans, 896. a. the Power of his Eloquence, 892. b. piqu'd in honour to Study hard by Eraſmus's Rallying the French on their want of learned Men, 893. his Charity, with regard to Women of ill Life, 896. a.

Caſtelvetro, what he cry'd out when his Houſe was on Fire, 899. got a Gentleman Murder'd for Contradicting him, ibid. b. why he would not allow Virgil, Heſiod, &c. to be Poets, ibid.

Caſtile, when the Publick Acts began to be firſt drawn up in the vulgar Tongue in this Kingdom, 901. Diſorders occaſion'd in Caſtile by the Dream of a Woman, 1439. A.

Caſtor, whether he, who is the Author of ſeveral Books, be the ſame with the Son-in-law of Deiotarus, 1074. a. Three Reaſons for the Negative, ibid. There was another Caſtor that was an excellent Botaniſt, ibid.

Caſtration, whether it impairs the Natural Courage, or other great Qualities of the Mind, 1631. a. What Malefactors were Puniſh'd with Caſtration, 1338. b.

Caſuiſts, a Doubt propos'd to 'em upon reading Anatomical Lectures, 86. a. How ſmall a Nicety makes a Mortal Sin according to a certain Caſuiſt, 886. Some Caſuiſts will damn the Women for their Dreſs, for a Ribbon or Jewel, and at the ſame time preach the Men into Rebellion, 1036. why they may write on Obſcene Subjects, 1476. Whether they may treat of Caſes extreamly Obſcene and Filthy, with a pure and undefiled Mind, 2668. a. Their Books, properly ſpeaking, teach only the Art of Cavilling with God, 1975. S. Nothing eſcapes their Curioſity in Matrimonial Caſes, 2715. b. Looſe Caſuiſts make their Advantage of the Conduct of Abraham with regard to Sarah, 2675. b.

Catalogue of the Witneſſes of Truth, by whom compiled, 135. a. The occaſion of this Book, 1750. a.

Catechiſm, A Catechiſm given in the Method of Ariſtotle's Categories, 375. a.

Cataldus (Saint) a Native of Ireland, according to Uſher, and Biſhop of Taranto in Italy, 170. made the Stalking Horſe to a remarkable Fraud, 906. b. 907. a. b. his Prediction againſt Apocalyptick Babylon, a ſecond Fraud built upon the firſt, 908. a.

Catechiſm, Ariſtotle's Categories given for a Catechiſm, by whom, 366. a.

Catherine de Medicis, what Book ſhe made her principal Study, and recommended to her Children, 1082. b. Made Machiavel's Prince, her chief Study, 2082. L. Strange Fables vented in her Funeral Oration, 2666. F. Her inſenſibility to Slander and Satyr, Diſſert. xxiv. xv. a. A Maxim aſcribed to her, Diſſert. xvi. a.

Catharine de Navarre, Siſter to Henry the Great, refuſes to Marry upon the Condition of going to Maſs, 2346. N. Finds no great Comforts in Marriage, ibid. Stands firm in her Religion, ibid. O.

Catholicks (Roman) the plunge they are at in commending the Vertuous Deeds of any particular Pope, 1565. a. Several Catholicks have made Profeſſion all their Life time of the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, tho' at the ſame time they wiſh'd for a Reformation, 507. 508. The making the ſign of the Croſs upon themſelves, what it ſerves for, 1063. B. The Reaſon of Ringing a Bell at Noon, as is uſual in Catholick Countries, 1113. C. They have the free Exerciſe of their Religion in Holland, 1818. b.

Catholicon, who was the firſt that made uſe of this Title at the head of a Dictionary, 478. b.

Catholicon, a Paſſage of this Book, touching a Proceſſion of the League, 2215. b.

Catiline, how his Deſigns began to be Diſcovered, 1349. b. How he might paſs for one of the Husbands of Fulvia, ibid.

Cato, (Uticenſis) lends his Wife to Hortenſius to get him Children after ſhe had ſupply'd himſelf, and receives her again after Hortenſius's Death, 1697. a. Part of his Hiſtory, 2682. B. 2683. K. L. M. His ſurprize upon the reading of a Letter ſent to Cæſar in the Senate, 2719. b.

Cato (Marcus) an inſtance of the Reverence the Roman People had for him, 1318. b. his Character to be preferr'd to Cæſar's, 933. a.

Cato the Cenſor, his Maxim concerning Wives, 1160. b. 'Twas ſaid of him, that no Man dare make an unjuſt Requeſt to him, 645. b. The Reverence which the People had for him, a rare Inſtance of it, 1317. B. Lends out his Wife Murcia, and takes her home again after the Death of him to whom he had lent her, 1675. b. Harangues vehemently againſt the Liberty that Women took to meet in great Bodies, 2697. B. ad fin. His Averſion for all the Greek Literature, 2681. H.

Cattho (Angelo) Archbiſhop of Vienne in France, ſurprizing Inſtances of his Gift of Propheſy, 911. b.

Cauſe, the beſt ſtands in need of Moral Means to ſupport it, 73. a. Some Cauſes are capable of being well Defended, tho' they be ſomewhat wrong, 313. b. The beſt may be loſt in ſome Circumſtances, 1609. a. A good Anſwer of a famous Advocate, who was ask'd why he would plead bad Cauſes, 185.

Cauſe (Firſt) what ſome Philoſophers taught upon this Subject, 1103. a. b. 1104. a.

Cauſes (Occaſional) Reflections on this Hypotheſis, 807. D. ad med. No Hypotheſis more capable of giving the reaſon of Events than this, 1723. a. May be of ſome uſe towards Explaining Dreams, 1132. D. This Syſtem does not make the Action of God intervene in a way of Miracle, 2614. L. ad in. Whether they may be of any uſe towards reſolving the Difficulties touching Providence, 1907. b.

Cauſſin (Pere) Cenſured on his adding ſeveral Circumſtances to an ancient Hiſtorical Fact, without the leaſt Authority, 1290. a. the Splendor of his Countenance, and his wonderful Sympathy with the Sun, 919. a. Henry IV's Prognoſtick of him, ibid. b. Condemns a Cenſure made by Longinus, 1879. b.

Celeſtin III. a Ceremony uſed by him at the Crowning the Emperor Henry VI. King of Naples and Sicily, 1612. a. What he did to ſhew he could give the Imperial Crown to whom he pleaſed, 1612. A.

Celibacy, a Circumſtance ſhewing that it was not obliging on Eccleſiaſticks in the 12th Century, 1602. b. the ſpecious Reaſons, why the great Men of the Primitive Church recommended it to the Clergy, 1285. b. The Vow of Celibacy as eaſily kept as the Conjugal Vow, 1935. b. This no ſmall Advantage to the Patrons of Monaſtical Vows, ibid. Vows of Celibacy, by whom condemn'd in St. Jerom's Days, 2963. Law of Celibacy, an inexhauſtible Source of Impurities, 1023. A. 1046. B. 1248. I. ad fin. The number of Eccleſiaſticks, who find this Vow inſupportable, 1475. b. Whether the Philoſophers ought to prefer it to Marriage, 1587. b. Whether it be poſſible to keep this Vow, 1721. Its Suppreſſion became a great Expence to the chief Houſes of the Proteſtants in Germany, 1827. a. Injoin'd ſtrictly by Gregory the Great, notwithſtanding what the Centuriators of Magdeburg would make believe to the contrary, 1466. b.

Celſus, endeavours, in Oppoſition to Chriſtians, to ſhew that Brute Beaſts are not leſs excellent than Man, and even ſurpaſſes him, 2612. K. ad in.

Cenſoriouſneſs, no Condition, nor Age, nor Affinity, can ſecure the Converſation of Perſons of different Sexes from it, 1179. P.

Cenſure, the Tragical Effects of ſome Mens Cenſures, 1675. b.

Cenſures of Books, The unreaſonableneſs of thoſe Cenſures which ſtrike at a parcel of Propoſitions in a general manner, without qualifying each Propoſition in particular, 264. E. ad in. 487. G. ad in.

Centuriatours of Magdeburg, what they ſay touching Gregory the Great, ought to be rejected, 1466. Z. ad med. The Treatment that they met with, 1738. b. Some Faults relating to their Work, 1750. H. ad in. Their Work Dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, ibid. ad med.

Cerda (John de la) the Cauſe and extraordinary Manner of his Wife's Death, from Mariana, 1024. a.

Ceres, the ridiculous Object of the Grecian Womens Worſhip in one of her Feaſts, called Theſmephoria, 2870. b. The comical contrivance of an old Beldam to make Ceres laugh, taken from Arnobius, 2871. a.

Ceſalpinus, ſaid to be the firſt and the laſt of the Moderns that took Ariſtotle's Mind aright, 926. a. he underſtood the Circulation of the Blood long before Harvey, 927. a.

Cæſar (Julius) an Inſtance of his great Moderation, 913. His Actions ſaid to have made the natural Ramparts of Italy uſeleſs, 929. a. The numbers of the Slain, and of the Priſoners taken by him in all his Foreign Wars, 929. b. He was not always ſatisfied with verbal Promiſes from Perſons to ſupport his Intereſt, but exacted them under their Hands, 930. a. His Sentiments of Providence and Religion conſider'd, 930. b. 931. a. b. Had a Form of Prayer, which he repeated thrice when he went into his Coach, 932. a. Had thoughts of killing himſelf in his laſt and moſt doubtful Battel of Munda, 936. b. Whether Pride, a Looſeneſs, or the fear of a Fit of his Falling-Sickneſs, were the cauſes of his ſitting when the Senate came in a Body to wait on him, 933. b. 934. a. His being cut out of his Mother's Womb an Error, 935. b. That Fact concerns Scipio Africanus, ibid. a. n. Some Facts concerning his Commentaries, 936. a. b. Thoughts upon Salluſt's Parallel between Cato and Cæſar, and an enumeration of both their Virtues, 933. a. Was a Poet betimes, 47. b. Deſerv'd Death, though it did not belong to three or four private Perſons to attempt his Life, 935. D. X. What Arms his Aſſaſſins made uſe of to kill him, and afterwards to kill themſelves, 881. D. E. No Author but Valerius Maximus ſpeaks of his appearing to Caſſius, ibid. Whether he ever return'd into Gaul after his Paſſage over the Rubicon, 895. b. 914. a. His Moderation, ibid. Divers Judgments on his Commentaries, 730. G. Some Facts concerning them, ibid. S. Who firſt publiſh'd his Commentaries in Greek, 1801. Does not vouchſafe to riſe to the Senate, 1915. B. What Friends he made choice of according to Cicero, 1111. C. ad Fin. n. Poſſeſſes himſelf of the Treaſure that was laid up in the Temple of Saturn, 2107. b. Wiſh'd for a ſudden Death, 2047. a. His Sword ſhew'd at Auvergne, 930. H. ad Fin.

Ceſarius (a Monk) St. Chryſoſtom's Letter to him, expreſs againſt Tranſubſtantiation, 623. b.

Cethegus (Cornelius) the firſt who was famous in Rome for his Oratory and Eloquence, 936. b. The Family of the Cethegi would never change the Faſhion of their Clothes, 938. b.

Ceylan; the Opinion of its Inhabitants about the Salt Lake upon Mount Colombo, 17. a.

Chabot (Jane) Abbeſs of the Paraclet in France, profeſs'd the Proteſtant Religion without ever quitting the Habit of a Nun, 2454.

Chaize (Pere la) his Reputation vindicated in a conſiderable Point, 268. a.

Cham, by whom called Zoroaſter, 939. b. The Story of Jupiter's Caſtrating his Father, an Alluſion to Cham's Adventure with Noah, according to ſome Jewiſh Rabbins, 940. a.

Chamier (Daniel) a Hugonot Divine, ſaid to have taken up three Months time in drawing the Edict of Nants, 941. b. His Ill-breeding in a Conference between ſome of the Heads of the Proteſtants and the Commiſſioners of the Court, ibid. Falſly ſaid to be Head of a Sect call'd Metaphoriſts, 942. b. Dyes Sword in hand like Zuinglius, and other fiery Controvertiſts, 940. A. ad fin. His Character very well deſcribed, ibid.

Chanters; their Inſtitution and godly Education, 1465. O. Why the Heathens called them Bean-eaters, ibid.

Chaos; which of the Philoſophers was the firſt who ſaid it was clear'd by an intelligent Being, 226. a. 227. a. 233. b. Divers Significations of this Word, 2869. b. What it is according to Plato, 3101. b.

Chapter of Paris, its Tyranny towards ſome Boors their Tenants criticiz'd, 901. F. This the firſt occaſion of Affranchizing the Peaſantry of France, ibid.

Charenton, its national Synod, 1703. In what caſes they preached there in the Court of the Temple, as the French Authors call it, 1123. H.

Charity of the Faithful for the maintenance of Eccleſiaſticks reſumed without hazard, when they ſcandalize the Publick, 23. b.

Charlemagne; his Life aſcribed to Plutarch by Wicelius, 45. How he came to diſcover an Intrigue between his Secretary and his Daughter, and how he behaved himſelf upon the Diſcovery, 1164. B. ad Med. Whether he created the Peers of France, 1570. G. Sees his Daughter Imma carrying off her Lover by Night upon her Back, for fear the print of his Feet ſhould be diſcovered in the Snow, 1161. b. His Conduct thereupon, 1162. a.

Charles V. The Sorrow he expreſs'd in publick at his not having learn'd Latin, 1559. a. Strengthned his Forgeries by publick Authority, 1251. b. Slip'd his Opportunity of making a Conqueſt of France, 1241. b. Whether he made uſe of the Counſels of Cornelius Agrippa, 121. a. A good Saying of his, 453. b. n. What Grounds there are for believing that he dyed with favourable Thoughts of Luther's Doctrine, 867. a. The Ground of his Preference to the Imperial Crown before Francis I. 943. a. His Eſteem for the French Language, ibid. b. His ridiculous Speech, and as ridiculous Command to Paulus Jovius, 944. a. His Saying of Fortune, and deep Diſſimulation when he had the Pope Priſoner, 949. Deſigned to get himſelf choſen Pope, and make the Papacy Hereditary in the Houſe of Auſtria, ibid. a. His Advice to Philip II. his Son, 950.

Accuſes Henry II. of France before the Princes and States of the Empire, of entring into a League with Soliman, 315. Prepares, in Conjunction with the Pope, to accuſe him in full Council, ibid. B. An excellent Saying of that Prince, 468. b. The Ground of the Report that he died with Sentiments of the Lutheran Religion, 946. R. 867. C. Challenges Francis I. to a Duel, 944. E. Who aſſiſted him in his laſt Hours, 887. B. In what Sentiments he died, ibid. Facts concerning his Confeſſor, ibid. By what Conſideration did he carry his Point againſt his Competitor for the Empire, 933.

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 1939.

933. b. Brought the Court of France into a ſtrange perplexity, 1249. a. A Lord of the Low Countries burnt up the Houſe in which he had treated this Emperor, 2109. ad med. A generous Action of this Prince, 1959. b. Seizes himſelf of the Milaneſe, 2714. b.

Charles VII. King of France; a formal Sentence of Baniſhment and Excluſion paſs'd againſt him, 766. b. His unparallell'd mean Submiſſion to the Duke of Burgundy, 788. a.

Charles VIII. of France; given out that he was Suppoſititious. 1571. H. The Pox firſt known in France in his Time, 2535. A Chirurgeon prays before his Statue, and why, ibid.

Charles IX. of France, his Exploits in the Maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day, 2454. b. Shot with his own Hands at the Hugonots as they were flying from the Maſſacre, and cry'd Kill, kill, ibid.

Charles I. King of England; his Death imputed to the Presbyterians, is the cauſe of a thouſand odious Reproaches and Trembles to the Proteſtants of France, 206. F. In a Book dedicated to his Son Charles II. he is ſuppoſed to have died a Member of the Roman Catholick Church, 2048. a. Was not the Author of a Book that goes under his Name, 2053. b. His Prayer in time of Adverſity taken out of Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia, 2054. b.

Charron; ranked by Garaſſe among the Atheiſts under the Character of Melancholy, 955. a. Why ſome have thought him more dangerous than Montaigne, 958. a. Preferr'd to Socrates, ibid. b. His Advice to Criticks to beware of ſeven Miſtakes in reading his Book, of general uſe with regard to other Books, 957. a.

Chaſtity; the ſublimeſt Degree of it that a Woman deſires, 699. a. A Parallel betwixt the Chaſtity of Nuns and martyr'd Virgins, and that of Heroins in a Romance, 1245. b. How hard to be preſerv'd in the Month of May, 2747. a. A rare Example of this Virtue, 279. B. The moſt ardent Love of this Virtue does not neceſſarily exclude the machinal Diſpoſitions to Incontinence, 1017. b. Is not inconſiſtent with Bravery, 1605. b. Accompanied with an incredible Circumſtance, 1430. A. The Ideas of Honour in ſome Countries with regard to this Virtue, 1723. a. See Continency.

Chatel (John) his Apology, 689. a.

Chatellard, a French Gentleman beheaded in Scotland, for having attempted the Queen's Honour, 2599.

Chavagnac; Obſervations upon his Memoirs, 297. b.

Chedhorles, a Saint among the Turks, 963. They take him to be the ſame as St. George among the Chriſtians, and that he was one of Alexander's Captains, and that he and his Horſe are ſtill alive, ibid.

Cheeſe; who was the Inventor of making it, 352. b.

Chelonis, her wonderful Conduct between her Husband and her Father, implacable Enemies, 964.

Chemnitius, ſtiled a formidable Adverſary by Don Nicolas Antonio, 263. b.

Chereſtrata, Mother of Epicurus; why this Woman could not fail to bring forth a Philoſopher, 1185. B. b.

Cheriſs; in ſuch Veneration among the Turks, that none but they can wear the green Turbant, 2104. CC. ad fin.

Chevreau, an inexcuſable Blunder in his Hiſtory, 880. a.

Chicanry; Inſtances of its Power and Malignity, 1393. a.

Chigi (Auguſtinus) his exceſſive Prodigality in an Entertainment made for Pope Julius the 11th, 965. a.

Chigi (Fabio) Nuncio at the Treaty of Munſter, and afterwards Alexander the 8th, refuſed any Communication with the Proteſtant Miniſters, proteſting againſt the Peace, ſhaking the Duſt off his Feet, 969. a. n. 971. a.

Childerick, his Viſions, 515. b. Expelled on account of his Lewdneſs, 514. His debauching the Wife of his Protector, worſe than the Sin of Paris, 515.

Childhood; an Ambition which diſcovers it ſelf in one's Childhood, is to be dreaded, 1136. B.

Children of this World not wiſer in their Generation, than the Children of Light, how applied, 702. a. The frighting of Children, an ancient and univerſal Cuſtom. 'Twas anciently believed that their Nouriſhment made a part of their Education, 899. C. ad fin. Whether it be better to make them ſtudy at home, than ſend them to Univerſities, 1886. A.

China; The difference between the Chineſe outward and publickly preached Divinity, and their inward Doctrines, which are never imparted to the vulgar, 2784. a. The Men of Letters there are at bottom Atheiſts, 1738. L. ad fin. Whether they act prudently there in granting Toleration to Roman Catholicks, 2056. a. How many Characters the Chineſe make uſe of in writing, 1417. I. The greateſt part of them hold a Metempſychoſis, 1547. a. The Theology of a Sect among them, 2782.

Chinchina; its Operation ſaid to be Magical, and by Compact with the Devil, 691. a.

Chios; an Anſwer of Cicero to the Inhabitants of this Iſle, 1899. a.

Chiron; ſome Leſſons of his to Apollo about the manner of making Love, 351. a.

Chiron and Phenix could not both be Preceptors to Achilles, 60. b.

Choler would ſuffocate ſome Perſons, if not diſcharged upon Paper, 32.

Chorus; the Tragical Occaſion of augmenting the number of the Chorus to 15, in the ancient Plays, 1227. a.

Chriſt; whether he ought to be manifeſted after the Courſe of ſix thouſand Years, 138. C.

Chriſtian, the 4th King of Denmark, deſigning to divorce his Queen, the Judges gave Sentence againſt him, 1685. 1685. His Amours, his Marriage, and his Divorce from Chriſtina of the ancient Houſe of Monch, 1986. B.

Chriſtina, Queen of Sweden, writes to the General of the Jeſuites for two religious of his Company, 2072. Y. She never paſſed a day without reading ſome Pages in Tacitus, 1828. F. ad fin.

Chriſtianity; its Advantage over the falſe Religions, in ſtrictly joining the Idea of Purity to that of Beatification, 2683. b. Compared to an old Palace that's ſupported on all ſides with Props and Buttreſſes, 72. B. What Averroes ſaid of it when he reflected on the Practice of the Church of Rome, 430. H. ad fin. The Scandal of the Diviſions of Chriſtianity, 959. b. Differs from it ſelf, if we have regard to the ſeveral Ages of it, 7141. E. ad fin. Is animated by a Spirit of Perſecution, ibid. Its Eſtabliſhment alone a ſufficient Proof of its Divinity, 1971. N. ad med. Has eſtabliſhed it ſelf in theſe laſt Ages after a very different manner from that by which it was eſtabliſhed in the firſt Ages, 2017. b. Its Truth but ill proved from its Extent, 2097. P. Or from its Proſperity, ibid. Several Abuſes have crept into it, not unlike the Corruptions of Paganiſm, 2545. B. Why there have often been more impudent Sects in Chriſtianity than in Paganiſm, 1927. Y.

Chriſtians more cruel againſt thoſe who are not of their Religion, than the Mahometans, 2485. a. Their Morals compared with thoſe of the Mahometans, 2098. a. Who was the firſt Roman Senator, or great Lord that openly turn'd Chriſtian, 266. b. A great Defeat of the Chriſtians by the Saracens, 10. a. Their Duty when perſecuted, 206. P. They have no Right to reproach the Heathen Philoſophers, with the Violation of Faith and Allegiance to Sovereigns, 297. a. How long ſince bid adieu to Patience and Submiſſion to Powers, ibid. Their Device, 2745. A Country of Chriſtians, who do not underſtand one Word of their own Religion, 1110. A. Who is the Author of a bloody Invective againſt them, mentioned by Minutius Felix, 1364. F. Some Chriſtians in the Days of Gregory the Great, doubted the Immortality of the Soul, and the Reſurrection of the Body, 1435. a. A Chriſtian who is worthy of his Name, is the rareſt thing in the World, 1398. Whether one may be a Chriſtian without embracing any particular Communion, 1486. b. 2055. a. b. Quadratus and Ariſtides preſent Apologies for the Chriſtians, 1562. P. The Chriſtians of the fourth Century frequently made mention of the Nobility of their Birth, 1599. E. The Prejudices of the different Communions of Chriſtians one againſt another, 1649. a. It's ſtrange that Chriſtians having ſo pure a Syſtem of Religion, ſhould notwithſtanding live ſo inordinately, 1798. b. The Chriſtians can never pretend to reproach the Pagans on the Article of Life and Manners, 2077. They have been infinitely more cruel than the Followers of Mahomet, 2485. a. Have been accuſed in the firſt Centuries of being the Cauſe of the publick Calamities, 2949. E. ad med. And in their turn accuſed their Adverſaries of the ſame thing, ibid.

Chronology very ill obſerved by the Greek and Latin Hiſtorians, 850. b. That which claſhes with Appearances never to be admitted without an extream Neceſſity, 745. b. There's little Chronology in the moſt part of the Greek and Latin Hiſtorians, 848. K. ad fin.

Chronologers; ſome of them not exact in Hiſtories of their own writing, 309. b.

Chryſippus is accuſed by Plutarch of making God the Author of Sin, 977. a. There never was a greater Diſturber in the Commonwealth of Philoſophy, 981. b. Advances a ſmall Maxim, and contradicts himſelf, 975. a. b. Collects ſo many Reaſons for Uncertainty, that he can't afterwards refute them, 974. b. His Com-

C H.

pariſon of God with King Dejotarus, 1071. E. ad med. Is too ſolicitous to eſtabliſh that which the Antients call'd Fate, 1319. b. Amuſes himſelf too much with explaining the Poetical Traditions, 1824. C. ad fin.

Chryſippus, an Undermatch for himſelf, when he would anſwer the Difficulties which he ſtarts, 974. writ 705 Books out of an Emulation to Epicurus, 974. a. His repreſenting his Adverſary's Objections in their full force, the Ground for ſaying he contradicted his own Principles, 975. a. Happier in oppoſing than defending his own Doctrines, 975. a. His Indiſcretion as great as his Diſhoneſty, 976. a. His Method of anſwering impertinent Logicians, called the quiet Method, 980. a. He compoſed Songs for Nurſes, 981. b. On what Principle he killed himſelf, 982. Other Accounts of his Death, ibid. Makes the Heart the Seat of the rational Soul, 1815. a. Approved not the turning Men from Sin by a dread of the Juſtice of God, and why, 50.

Chryſoſtom (St.) his Sermon upon Abraham's diſſembling that Sarah was his Siſter, would not be born in theſe Times. St. Paul dictated ſeveral things to him, 457. a. Miſtaken in the Cauſe which he aſſigns of the Death of St. Babylas, 457. a. Condemns the Philoſophers on their renouncing Riches, and why, 225. a. He's miſtaken about the Death of Babylas, 456. C. ad fin. It's evident that he did not conſult Hiſtory in this Point, ibid. He advances ſeveral Falſities from an honeſt Intention, ibid. The general Ground of ſome of his Miſtakes, ibid. D. He's ill treated by Eraſmus, 1224. a. Why he did not appear at the Synod of Theophilus, 2360. b.

Churches not dedicated to God or the holy Ghoſt, 2453. What they who ſeparate from a Church are obliged to do in their Juſtification, 2383. a. b. 2384. a. A Queſtion, whether there be two Heads of the Church, St. Peter and St. Paul, or only St. Peter, ſtarted in Innocent X's Pontificate, 2156. a. Its preſent deplorable State, 1418. b. A bountiful Mother to thoſe who ſerve her, 821. b. Abuſes in it better tolerated according to the Opinion of many, than Remedies applied, which may endanger its Conſtitution, 897. a. An Apologue made uſe of in the 14th Century, to ſhew that the Princes who enriched the Church, might ſtrip her too, 2602. b. All Churches, falſe or true, uſe the ſame Topicks for and againſt Toleration, 2760.

Chymiſtry; the Study of it very much decry'd by the Phyſicians of Paris, about the latter end of the 16th Century, 2120.

Chymiſts; An Order obtained againſt them by the Sorbonne from the Parliament of Paris in 1629, as claſhing with the Principles of Ariſtotle, and conſequently with the Scholaſtick Theology, 364. a.

Cicero, how he clears himſelf of the Contradictions which he is charged with, 292. b. What he ſays of the Letters of his Friend Atticus, 420. K. In his Letters to Atticus, we have a juſt Hiſtory of the Times, and a Prophecy of what came to paſs after his Death, 420. K. His Eloquence was not reliſhed by all the World, 735. F. Differs very much from Plutarch in his Judgment and Taſte for the Writings of ſome Authors, 1885. b. Approves Mental Reſervation in Swearing, 1268. a. his Thought about the Nature of Brutes very different from that of Deſcartes, 2519. a. Miſtaken in the chief Circumſtances of a very memorable Donation of the Roman Senate, 2525. a. Thoſe Works of his which are loſt reputed the fineſt he Wrote, 2485. a. The Fragments of them, by whom Collected, ibid. The Reſpect which Alphonſo I. of Naples paid to the Ruins of a Villa, which according to Tradition had belonged to Cicero, 2330. a. Was reading Euripides's Medea when overtaken and Murthered by the Aſſaſſins, 1268. a. His Opinion of thoſe who deſpiſe their own Tongue, and the Authors of their own Nation, 47. b. A Thought of his concerning the Dogs which watched the Roman Capitol, applied to the Guardians of Truth, 595. b. His Thought that we came into the World to expiate our Crimes, borrowed from Crantor the Philoſopher and Poet, 1028. b. Thought it a Reproach to the whole Family of Junia, to have had one Orator of it that became a common Informer, 883. b. Unable to defend the Notion of Natural Right againſt the Academicks, 863. a. Apprehended no Danger from Cethegus, becauſe he was over-furious, 938. a. Reproached for ſpeaking in Greek before a Greek Senate, 995. a. A Reflection on his ſetting a value on the Godſhip of Romulus, becauſe eſtabliſhed in a clear-ſighted Age, 2684. a. Criticiz'd for his Improprieties and Barbariſms, 2695. a. b. Accus'd of Inceſt with his Daughter Tullia by ſome of his Enemies, 1924. b. That Verſe in the ſixth Æneid, Hic Thalamum invaſit natæ, &c. ſuppoſed by an Antient Writer to point at Cicero, ibid.

C I.

There are ſome Facts with regard to which his Authority is not deciſive, 873. a. Laughs at the Stories of Hell, 873. a. 1897. b. Took a great many things out of a Book of Crantor's about Conſolation, when he compoſed a Book on the ſame Subject, 1028. b. Diſplays all his Eloquence on occaſion of the Sale of the Pontificate of Peſſinunte, 1093. a. His Wife ſignifies to him on the part of the Veſtals, to execute his Deſigns for the good of his Country, 1162. C. To perfect himſelf in Action, he put himſelf under the Inſtruction of two famous Comedians, 1237. A baſe and brutal Revenge taken of him, 1375. Reproaches the Philoſophers with introducing Deities deſtitute of Life and Knowledge, 1813. His Principle, that a Doctrine which grows old is true, 1897. b. 1898. a. His contradicting himſelf with regard to Lucilius, 2042. I. The wrong his Freedman did him, in Publiſhing a Collection of his Railleries after his Death, 2609. M. ad med. A Paſſage of his preſerved to us by St. Auſtin, 1443. a. Had nothing to anſwer Cotta upon the Queſtion, whether the Faculty of reaſoning in Man be a Preſent from the Gods, 1488. b. According to him Providence toyls for the Pleaſures of Man, 2548. a. Whether he taught that Beaſts were Automatons, 2530. b. He is charged with Incongruity and Barbariſms, 2695. a. Had more Religion in his Heart than in his Head, 2789. H. ad fin. Who helped him to put his Library in order, 2902. G. Divorces his Wife Terentia ſeveral Years before he died, ibid. Z. Offers to go to Syria in Quality of Lieutenant to Dolabella, who had been his Son in Law, 1923. L. ad fin. He opens loudly againſt him after the Death of Trebonius, ibid. M. He is inconſolable upon the Death of his Daughter, ibid. O. He is charg'd with a Criminal Love for her, ibid. O. ad fin. His reaſon of our coming into this World, ibid. R. The Pagan Prieſts applied to have ſome of his Books interdicted by the Authority of the Senate, 2292. a. His Thought on the ancient Greek Comedy, Diſſert. xiii.

Ciceronians; why ſo called, 1210. I. ad in. The Poſitiveneſs and Superſtition of this Sect, 1130. D. ad med.

Cimbalum Mundi; Extracts from this Book, 2545. B. ad in. An account of this deteſtable Book, ibid.

Cinqmars; the Source of his Averſion for Cardinal Richlieu, 2007. b. His Execution, 1189. A. art. iv. ad med.

Cinyras; ſome will have him to have been the ſame with Noah, 1015. b.

Ciphers; are very convenient and very inconvenient, 207. a.

Circle; People who pretended to have found out the ſquaring of the Circle, 1982. d. According to the Mathematicians it can only exiſt in the Idea, 3709. b. 3080. a.

Circumciſion; forbidden upon the Penalties eſtabliſhed againſt Caſtration, 498. b.

Citations; citing the ancient Authors, from whom a Writer borrows Paſſages, not cuſtomary in the XVIth Century, 2874. a. Rules to be obſerved in Citations, 2697. b. It's dangerous truſting to them, without conſulting the Originals, 2822, 2823. A. ad fin. One ought to keep religiouſly to the Terms of Authors cited, 278. a. The injuſtice of not citing ones Author, 387. b. The folly of thoſe who cite their Plato's and their Ariſtotle's to prove a common Thought, 227. a. Advice to thoſe who cite Authors, 2058. a. A bad way of citing Authors, 2867. D.

Cities; ſome founded under a malignant Conſtellation, 2458.

Clara (St.) her deſire to dine with St. Francis granted, 1343. a. The firſt Courſe, and the Miracles which attended it, ibid.

Clarence (George, Duke of) his being drowned in a Veſſel of Malmſey, as a mitigation of Puniſhment, ſhocks Humanity more than the cruelleſt execution, 1157. a. The manner of his Death, 1156. G.

Claude (Mr.) his Diſpute with Monſieur Arnauld, 384. a. Accuſes St. Auſtin of changing from black to white on the Article of perſecuting Hereticks, 437. H. His Opinion in this point might have expoſed him to Cenſure, ibid.

Claude (Mr.) his Advice to a learned Man about his Studies, 1332. b. Had been under a Publick Cenſure, had he lived three or four Years longer, 437. The circumſtances conſpiring to raiſe the Reputation of his Books very judiciouſly remark'd, 997. b. His perſonal Diſpute with the Biſhop of Meaux, at the requeſt of Madamoiſelle de Duras, 998. a.

Claudian; ſome Reflections on his Doubts about Providence, being clear'd by the Fall of Rufinus, 1628. b.

C L.

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 2159.

Claudius *the Emperor would ſuffer no one to bear Office in Rome, who did not ſpeak the* Latin *Tongue*, 995. a. *Saluted Emperor in the Camp of the* Pretorian *Cohorts*, 897. a. *The Senate obliged to approve the Election whether they will or no*, ibid. *How his Mother uſed to treat him*, 295. a. *Was the laſt Man in* Rome, *who knew the infamous Proſtitutions of his Wife* Meſſalina, 1601. G.

Clearchus; *what he relates touching* Ariſtotle's *Converſation with a* Jew, 360. b. *Whether he deſerves to be believed*, 367. a.

Clemency, *often exercis'd out of Seaſon*, 1003. E.

Clemens Alexandrinus, *what he thought of* Diagoras *and ſome others who have paſſed for Atheiſts*, 1093. M.

Clement VII. *his Impatience to ſee the Marriage of the* Dauphin, *afterwards* Henry II. *conſummated with his Niece*, 1051. a.

Clement VIII. *offers Liberty of Conſcience to* Scipio Gentilis, *an* Italian *Proteſtant, if he would come and teach at* Bologna, 1402. a.

Clement IX. *diſguſted at the pretended Privileges of Papal Ground*, 1056. a. b.

Clement (James) *by whom moſt incited to Aſſaſſinate* Henry III. 1623. a. *An Extract of the Memorial preſented to the Pope by the Ambaſſadors of the League, in Juſtification of him*, 1628. b. *Aſſaſſinates* Henry III. *of* France *upon a Viſion, approved by a Monk*, 1785. C. *There's ſome appearance that the Preachers of the League had ſome knowledge of this Deſign*, 695. B △ △. *Some have preſumed to advance, that he did not kill* Hen. III. 1628. Q. ad in. *Is praiſed by the Jeſuits*, 1179. F.

Clementia Iſaura, *why ſo much honoured in* Thoulouſe, 651. b. n.

Cleopatra, *outdone in Luxury by the Son of a* Roman *Stage-Player*, 1228. b. *Wherein conſiſted the Force of her Charms*, 1074. 1705. A. ad fin. 1597. x. ad in.

Cleopatra, *Siſter of* Alexander *the Great, her Credit with him, and with their Mother* Olympias, 1108. A.

Cleoſtratus, *a Correction of his Cycle*, 1580.

Clerc (Le) *a piece of his Letter to Mr.* Jurieu, *in defence of* Epiſcopius, 1203. H. *Reflections on his Letter, and on the Conſequences of it*, ibid.

Clergy; *the Dangers of attempting the Reformation of the Concubinary Clergy*, 1564. a. *Great Flatterers of Princes*, 185. b. *Their Tyranny and Cruelty in* France *in the Days of St.* Lewis, 904. *Had power of Life and Death over their Vaſſals*, ibid. *Their Debaucheries agreeable to the Court*, 23. a. *They are a true* Imperium in Imperio, 725. d. *Their Concubinage*, 1017. G. *Their wicked Lives*, 1563. 1564. G. African *Clergy ſollicit the ſecular Arm againſt the Followers of* Pelagius, 198. b. *Clergy of* France, *their Propoſal to the Court for the Extirpation of Hereticks*, 2539. C. *An ill-grounded Complaint of theirs againſt the Proteſtants*, 2461. a.

Clio *the Muſe, her being got with Child a Leſſon to moſt Prudes*, 1160. a.

Clodia. *Miſtreſs to* Catullus, *under the Name of* Lesbia, 2038. A. *She was Sirnamed* Quadrantaria, *and turn'd common Strumpet*, ibid. *She's deſcribed by* Cicero *in his* Oration pro Cœlio, *who was accuſed of ſeveral Crimes, and particularly of attempting to poiſon* Clodia, *to be freed of a Debt he owed her*, ibid.

Clovis, *the ancient Writers contradict themſelves in placing him among the Legitimate*, 516. *All that is ſaid of the Kings of* France *before him is little better than Fable*, 2989. a. n.

Cloyſters, *are the ſame to Miſers as* Leghorn *was formerly to Bankrupts*, 185. *What* Eraſmus *thought of them*, 212. A. *Have given riſe to a Proverb*, 2654. b.

Cochleus; *what ſort of Machine he employed, but in vain, againſt the* Lutherans, 1292. A. ad med. *His Accuſations againſt* Luther, 2611. N △ △. ad in.

Cock, *the* Jews *offer a Cock for their Sins on the Feaſt of Reconciliation*, 1377. Art. 3. *The Ceremony uſed at this Oblation*, ibid.

Cocles (Publius Horatius) *a remarkable Variation in ancient Hiſtory, in a Circumſtance of his memorable Action*, 1691. b.

Coeffetau, *makes but a poor Anſwer to* du Pleſſis, *on occaſion of the Praiſes which* Carigius *gave* Luther, 1881. C.

Cœlius, *defended by* Cicero *againſt the Accuſations of* Clodia, 2039. A.

Coglione, (Bartolomeo) *raiſed from the loweſt Condition to the Embraces of* Joan *of* Naples, *for his pitching a Bar well*, 2329. a.

Colbert (*Mr.*) *his noble Contempt of a furious Lampoon*, 1611. a. *Hinders the Printing of ſeveral Books againſt the Houſe of* Auſtria, 1901. N. ad in.

Coligni (*Admiral* de) *Illuſions of the Author who wrote his Hiſtory*, 2472. a. *How killed*, 574. 575.

C O.

Collections *for the Church of* Germany, *particularly that of the* Palatinate, *by whom made*, 190.

Colomies (Paul) *a Refugee* French *Miniſter; his* Theologorum Presbyterianorum Icon, *againſt the Presbyterians in* England, *expoſed him to ſome Vexations*, 1003.

Colonna (*Cardinal*) *held eleven Biſhopricks*, 1005. b.

Coloſſus *of* Rhodes; Scaliger's *Blunder in computing the weight of it*, 910. a.

Colours *are not in the Bodies*, 2618. B. ad med.

Column *of Marble raiſed to* Julius Cæſar, *received Divine Honours*, 1112. D. *What Columns the* Romans *call'd* Roſtratæ, 1147.

Com, *a City of* Perſia; *what Saint is worſhipped there by the* Turks, 1287. b. *They call the Bleſſed Virgin there by the name of* Lela, ibid.

Combabus, *his privilege of Acceſs at all times to the King of* Syria, *not excepting the Critical Minute*, 1009. a. *The occaſion of it*, 1008. *His Friends gelded themſelves in complaiſance to him*, 1009. b.

Comedy, *the beſt Mint for Words*, 2674. b.

Comedies, *on what ſort of Perſons they make the beſt Impreſſions*, 15. a. *When were Love-Adventures firſt brought into Comedies*, 245. *A Play favour'd with a Prodigy*, 2320. Z. n. *Wherein conſiſts the difference between the Ancients and Moderns with regard to Comedy*, 2673. B. *Comedies made uſe of to repreſent the Abuſes of Popery*, 2690. a.

Comedians *may be buried in holy Ground*, 256. B. *Have furniſh'd a Martyr*, 2467. a. b.

Comenius; *his Character reſembles that of moſt other Phanaticks*, 1007. a. *He is divided between a fear of diſobeying God, and expoſing himſelf to be laugh'd at; how he got out of this ſtrait*, 1119. 1120. 1121.

Comes (Antonius Maria) *his Reaſons for changing his Name for that of* Mark Anthony Majoragius, 2130. b. *A Proceſs made out againſt him for this Change*, ibid.

Comets, *are always conſidered as Preſages of Evil*, 718. b. *Their Cauſe, and Reaſon of Calamities following them, according to* Bodin, 657. a.

Comforters; *a Rule for their Conduct with Perſons in Affliction recommended from* Ovid, 1030. a.

Comines (Philip de) *the Judgment that* du Haillan *makes of him*, 1570. F. *His Teſtimony of the Truth of* Angelo Cattho, *Archbiſhop of* Vienne's *Predictions*, 911. b. *He wrote his Hiſtory at his Sollicitation*, ibid. *The corrupting his Memoirs falſly imputed to* John de Selve, *firſt Preſident of the Parliament of* Paris, 2709. a.

Commentaries, *and marginal Notes, highly neceſſary for underſtanding Satyr*, 27. a.

Commentators, *what is the end which they propoſe to themſelves*, 1312. C.

Commodus *the Emperor, expoſes a Man to the wild Beaſts for reading the Life of* Caligula, 2832. a.

Communions, *the effect of Civil Wars raiſed in a Communion*, 203. b. *'Tis not for their temporal Intereſt, that all its Members ſhould be reaſonable*, 1133. Q.

Communion (*Occaſional*) *how it may be lawful*, 511. a.

Company; *the ill Effects and Conſequence of bad Company*, 218. a.

Compariſons; *a compariſon of Wits to Apples*, 48. K. *A Remark concerning the Deſign of Compariſons*, 2886. a. b. *Examples ſhewing Juſtneſs and Propriety of Compariſons in Diſcourſe or Writing*, ibid.

Compilers; *reduced to two great Claſſes*, 2188. D. *Their want of Exactneſs, and Reaſon of it*, 47. G. *A Compiler who ſhould not be eſteem'd at all in our Days, might be valued a thouſand Years hence*, 445. b. *An Example of the Alterations which Compilers make in Matters which paſs through their Hands*, 1208. D. *Do a great deal of wrong to Illuſtrious Men, by compiling all they have ſaid without the leaſt diſcernment*, 2027. a.

Conception (*Immaculate*) *the ſeveral degrees of the certainty of the Faith of this Article*, 2377. b. *The Faculty of Divinity at* Paris *make their Members ſwear to believe it as an Article of Faith*, 2137. a. *Are Excommunicated for this by the Biſhop of* Paris, ibid.

Conclave; *nothing ſo hard as to be aſſured of an Election to the Papacy, before entring the Conclave*, 1723. a. *How the Intrigues are perplexed in it*, 282. F. ad fin. *The Spring of Providence not more particularly diſcoverable in them, than in the Councils of Princes*, 282. b.

Concord. *By what Emblem the Ancients us'd to Repreſent the Power of Concord*, 2058. 2059. ad fin.

Concordat, *paſs'd between* Francis I. *and* Leo X. *and the Abuſes which it occaſion'd*, 2692. 2693.

Concubine. *A Lecture on the Conduct of Husbands, whoſe Wives are Concubines to Great Princes*, 124. *Eleven thouſand Prieſts allow'd Concubines in one Dioceſs at a Crown a-piece* per annum *to the Biſhop*, 124. b.

C O.

A Reflection on thoſe that Marry them at the point of Death, 356. a.

Condé (Lewis I. Prince of) Condemn'd to loſe his Head, 1517. b. n.

Condé (Lewis II. Prince of) The Declaration which he made of his Orthodoxy at the point of Death, 1480. E. ad fin. Sends for Spinoſa, and Diſcourſes with him, 2787. F.

Condition, none ſo Deplorable as that of not being able to die when one wiſhes for Death, 1563. a. Thoſe Conditions are generally the happieſt which make the leaſt ſhew, 253. a.

Confeſſion, by Letters maintain'd by Suarez, and Condemn'd by Clement VIII. 509. b.

Confidents, Reaſons for removing them from Young Princeſſes and Ladies, 2551. b. What makes the Confidence and Intimacy between Ladies and their Servants, ibid.

Confucius, as blind as other Learned Men of China, with regard to the true God, 1140. b.

Congreſs, in Tryals of Impotency, how Perform'd, and with what Ceremonies, 2527 b. upon what occaſion introduc'd into France, 2523. a. A Juſtification of what has been ſaid in this Dictionary, in relation to the Form uſed in the Congreſs, 2528. a. A Story out of the Menagiana, of a Miller and his Wiſe put to the Congreſs, 2529. b.

Conicks, who was the firſt Author that wrote on them, 195. 196. a.

Conjectures, one may be happier in Conjectures than another, and not be a Man of more Skill, 347. b.

Conjunctions, how many great ones of the Planets ſince the Creation, 131. a.

Conjurations, The form of Conjuring the Titular Gods of Cities Beſieged by the Romans.

Connecte (Thomas) a Carmelite of the xvth Century, his great and repured Sanctity, 1016. b. What courſe he took to beat the Women out of conceit with their high Head-dreſſes, ibid. Reckon'd by the Proteſtants in the Liſt of thoſe, who at ſeveral times have deſired the Reformation of the Church, 1017. Repreſented as a Hypocrite by others, ibid. b.

Conon, His Advice to the King of Perſia, how to get rid of Ageſilaus, 1019. a.

Conquerours, Reaſon would have them ſtop, and would not have them ſtop, 9. b.

Conqueſts, The firſt Conqueſts of Rome, compar'd with its after Conqueſts, 129. b.

Conſcience, a Doubt upon a Caſe of Conſcience, 89. a. One is always oblig'd to follow its Motions, 132. I. They who are moſt oblig'd in point of Intereſt to defend this Maxim, have had the folly to Attack it of late days, ibid. A Body cannot be too reſerv'd as to the charging Men with Sins againſt their Conſcience, 907. b. Whether Conſcience may be conſtrain'd to embrace the true Religion, 1461. E. 2d. Par. The Contradictions which they fall into, who aſſert this, ibid. They, who are Directors of Conſcience, ſhould have but very ſhort Converſations with their Devotes, 1471. G. ad fin. Its Liberty, 1847. H. ibid. K. A Compariſon of its force with that of the point of Honour towards keeping Women Virtuous, 2415. C. 3. Par. A delicate Conſcience afflicts it ſelf for Faults that are purely material, 2633. D.

Conſcience (An erroneous) its Rights, 132. I. Nothing can be more Juſt, than that which Archelaus has ſaid concerning it, 323. B. ad med.

Conſcience, an extraordinary Caſe of it propoſed by Agnes, Widow of Henry II. to Petrus Damianus, 1341. a.

Conſcience, its Inſtincts, how much weaker than thoſe of worldly Reputation and Honour, 2477. a.

Conſcientiarians, A Sect of Atheiſts, 1844.

Conſiſtory, (of Geneva) a fair Victory got by them over the Senate, 602. a.

Conſolation, a common Place of Conſolation examined, 218. K. A pernicious Maxim of Conſolation, 332. N. A common Place of Conſolation, 537. B. ad med. Another common Place, 1028. D. Another common Place, 1335. F.

Conſolation, moſt of its Topicks are Faulty and Defective, 1335. a. Reflections on the common Places, 1335. a.

Conſolatory Arguments, for the moſt part improper towards obtaining their end, 218. b.

Conſtantia, Wife to the Emperor Henry VI. brought to Bed publickly in the Meadows of Palermo, to prevent Suſpicion, 1612. a.

Conſtantine, The inconſiſtency of his Edicts relating to Arius, 386. A. His Donation, 1051. I. His Cruelties, 1281. A. What the Pagans aſcribed his Converſion to, ibid. B.

Conſtantine, the Reaſons of his Converſion to the Chriſtian Religion, according to the Heatheniſh Authors, 1290. b. The variations in ancient Hiſtory, about the Cauſe of putting his Son Criſpus to Death, 1289. a. his Donation, a Tale, and an Abſurdity, 1053. b. his Decree, Condemning thoſe to Death, who ſhould keep any of Arius's Books, ſaid to be a ſtrange Extravagance, 368. b.

Conſul, A Roman Conſul turn'd out of his Office for not reſpecting a Letter from the Senate, 837. E.

Conſulate, Who was the firſt Stranger that enjoy'd this Office at Rome, 471. D. ad fin.

Conſuls, Two Brothers Conſuls together, an. 595. the firſt time that this happened, 266.

Continence, Treated by the firſt Reformers in their Diſputes about Celibacy as an extraordinary Gift, 2348. b. Continence of the Ladies of one particular Family in Rome, 837. b. ſevere between a Man and a Woman, who have otherwiſe all things in common, 26. what the Roman Catholicks ſay to thoſe, who charge them with their falſe Pretenſions to it, 574. b. A rare Example of this Virtue, 10. b. Another Example, 279. B. It's ſometimes a Prejudice to the Health of the fair Sex, 304. G. How they ought to govern themſelves, who make Vows of Continency, 1327. L.

Contradictions, Religious Controvertiſts and Barriſters are very ſubject to them, 299. a. Theſe own the Charge fairly, thoſe always deny it, ibid.

Controverſies, a Method for the right handling them, 553. a. b. Who brought Religious Controverſie into the beſt Form, in the Judgment of Biſhop Mountague, 667. a. There is no Compoſing them by General, Equivocal, or obſcure Formularies, 2105. G.

Controverſy, 'twere to be wiſh'd that Criticks would Collect the ſcatter'd pieces of Eccleſiaſtical Controverſy, compare the Replies and Rejoinders of the Parties, that the Strength and Weakneſs, the Honeſty and Diſingenuity might appear at one View, 2166. b. the moſt difficult Religious Controverſies ariſe upon different Explications of Scripture Paſſages, 473. a.

Controvertiſts, Examples which perplex thoſe of the Church of Rome, 143. C. The Controvertiſts, who kept in their Writings any Meaſures as Men of Probity, were never odious to the Roman Catholicks, 1123. E. The weight of a Controvertiſt's Teſtimony when he would blacken his Adverſaries, 1878. b. One muſt have a care of being ſurprized by their Air of Triumph, 2098. b.

Contzen, (a Jeſuite) gives a relation of Violences exercis'd by the Lutherans on the Calviniſts, 1730. C.

Convents, Their Juſtification attributed to the Devil, 235. a. The ſtrange corruption of them in the XVth Century, 829. a.

Converſation, a Saying of ſome Ladies upon a Languiſhing Converſation, 537, a. 539. a. Who are the moſt agreeable Converſation, 2552. H. The Slavery of being eſteem'd Excellent Converſation, 2573. a.

Converts, obliged to ſpeak ill of their old Religion, 710. b. Are almoſt always obliged to ſpeak ill of that ſide which they have quitted, 759. a.

Copronymus (Conſtantine) the occaſion of his odious Nick-name, 934. a.

Copulation, which have moſt Pleaſure, the Males or the Females in the act of Copulation, 2895. a. b.

Coquetts, how they may be known, 2645. A.

Coras (John) A Counſellor of the Parliament of Tholouſe hang'd in his Robes for the Proteſtant Religion, 1767. a.

Cordelier, how Sacrificed, and to whom, 687. b. their Alcoran, when, and by whom written, 1344. a.

Cordemoi, An Examination of what he ſaies of Eudes, and Charles Martel, 10. b. His Judgment on the hardineſs of Modern Authors, 13. a.

Cordus Cremutius, put to Death for praiſing Brutus, and ſaying Caſſius was the laſt of the Romans, 883. a.

Coreiſchites, a Tribe from whence Mahomet is ſaid to be Deſcended, 2091. b.

Corneille, a Complaint of the exceſs of the Paſſions in his Andromache, by an Actor, who Dy'd in Acting them, 260. a.

Cornelia, Her tenderneſs for Pompey, the Cauſe of his ruin, 2273. a.

Cornelius a Lapide, aſcribes his own Thoughts to the Jews, 48. b.

Cornuelle (Mademoiſelle) a pleaſant Paſſage of her from the Menagiana, 1009. a.

Corunna, in Spain, the Reaſon of this Name, according to a Tradition embraced by Paul Jovius, 1647. b.

Corynth, the Women of Corynth Aſſembled in the Temple of Juno, where they were ſtripp'd, and their Clothes burn'd, 2528. D.

Coſmeticks, how Ancient, and how far honeſt and allowable, 1037. b.

C R.

Vol. II. 808. Cyran (Father) inſiſted on a Charge of Incontinence, 1063. a. Diſcover'd by the ſmell thoſe who had violated the Laws of Chaſtity, 1177. C. ad med.

Vol. III 1551. Cotta (Pontifex Maximus) the only Reaſon why he thought it Dangerous, not to believe there was a God, 1809. D. ad. med.

Vol. IV. 1459. Cotys, a Barbarian Prince, whom Ovid compliments highly in his Exile, adde quod ingenuus, &c. and whoſe Protection he deſires, 1026. b. His Caprice and Cruelty not to be conceiv'd without conſidering the Tendency of the infamous Theology of the Pagans, 1025. a.

Covetouſneſs, how it ſometimes opens the Eyes to ſee a falſe Worſhip, 119. a.

Councils (Eccleſiaſtical) the neceſſity of the holy Spirit's preſiding in them, 236. a. The precipitate proceeding of the Council of Epheſus, in the Condemnation of Neſtorius, 1360. b. His ſevere Invective againſt 'em, 465. b.

Council of Baſil; all the Relicks in Baſil placed one day along the Seats where the Biſhops were to ſit, 142, 143. The Deſign of this, ibid.

Council of Conſtance; the Project of a Reformation preſented in it, 171. b.

Council of Trent; what the Abbé St. Cyran ſaid of it, 28. a. The Spirit of this Council, 540. F. Who was called the right Arm of this Council, 1208. D. Reaſons why Vergerius was not admitted to the Council, 2950. F. Who are the propereſt people to draw up the Deciſions of Councils, 540. F. Why it is neceſſary that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould preſide in them, 2360. B. Their oppreſſing of Hereticks by the Imperial Authority, 2362. E. Have only ſerved to render them more obſtinate, ibid. Whether Councils lawfully Aſſembled may err in point of Faith, 1779. A.

Court; a Deſcription of Court-Attendance and Dependance, 2446. a. No Guard againſt the Attempt of a Queen's impoſing a falſe Child, 1349. a. When the Ladies coming to Court began firſt in France, 1353. a. The ill Effects of this Cuſtom, 1356. b. The great Model of moſt Religions, 2311. b. A Deſcription of the various Parts people act who ſollicit at Court, 2375. a. How difficult they are at Court in the Choice of Perſons, 2930. C. ad fin.

Court of Rome; its Corruption, 894. H. Had a hand in the Aſſaſſination of James Clement, 1628. Q. ad fin. An inſtance of its Tyranny, 2346. o.

Courtiers ought not to imitate the Huguenots, who invoke only God alone, 1056. E. ad med. Compared to the Euripus, 1775. C. ad fin. Are generally given rather to Ambition than Jealouſie, 2059. b. What Talents do they ſtand in need of moſt, 1395. B.

Courtezans; Cities anciently fam'd for fair Courtezans, a ſure ſign of their Opulency and great Reſort, 2357. Books of the Courtezans of famous Towns are of ancient Date, 208. b. They raiſe Men of Merit and no Merit, 937. a. Will be a Cauſe of Complaint as long as this World laſts, ibid. b.

Courtezans are, and ever have been, the way to Preferment, 937. b. And to the gaining a Proceſs at Law, 989. a Have a Power over Mens Hearts, even when they are grown old, 2650. B. Courtezans conſcientious, 2545. Q.

Crantor; his Opinion that an Exemption from Paſſions would coſt too dear, and transform into Stones or Savages, 1028. His Book of Conſolation, 1058. b.

Crater; what properly was the uſe of it among the Ancients, 1594. b.

Cratippus; his diſcreet Behaviour in a Diſpute with Pompey about Providence after his Defeat at Pharſalia, 1030. a. His Notion of the Soul of Man to ſupport his Opinion of the Truth of Divination by Dreams, 1031. a.

Crates (the Cynick) the Proof of Hipparchia's Paſſion for him, 1669. Where he conſummated his Marriage with her, ibid. b.

Creation; all Philoſophers are forced to admit it, 231. G. Art. VI. They who deny it are of Neceſſity obliged to allow Genii or Angels, ſome Beneficent, and other maliciouſly diſpoſed; the Importance of this Doctrine, 1238. a.

Creation not underſtood by the firſt, who invented it to be the producing out of nothing, 2184. a. Of what value the Author of the Book of it is among the Jews, 138. a.

Credulity, as it is the Ground of multiplying Miracles to Exceſs, proves often its own Cure, 67. a. Stifled by its own Fecundity, 67. H. Is the Source of the Multiplication of Miracles, ibid. Is blameable in the Orthodox as well as in Hereticks, 179. a. A Reflection on the Diſpoſition of the People to Credulity, 1229. 1230. C. ad fin.

C Y.

Cremonius (Cæſar) his Epitaph, ſhewing he did not believe the Immortality of the Soul, 1031. b.

Crequi (Marſhal) his Judgment of a Book-learn'd Frier after fifteen day's Converſation.

Creſpi (Treaty of) made by Francis the Iſt. proteſted againſt by the Dauphin and ſeveral of the Nobility of France, 1355. a.

Cretes, who were the firſt that wore Creſts on their Helmets, 2715. b.

Crime (State) Zealots mix Accuſations of State-crimes with thoſe of falſe Doctrine, 23.

Crimes are maintained by Crimes, 2077. b. The Crime of Nonconformity, who the Invention of it is aſcribed to, 1886. P.

Critias, his unnatural Deſign of depopulating his native Country of Attica, 1033. b. His Character of Learning, preciſely that of all Atheiſts, 1035. a. His account of the Origin of Religion, ibid. b.

Criticks; an inſtance of their differing about the Style of Authors, 1771. a. None ſo ſevere as thoſe who have never known the Labour of writing, 1571. a. A Rule for thoſe who impute certain Things to Authors, 502. a. Adviſed to beware of falling into ſeven Miſtakes upon reading of certain Books, 957. a. Remarkable Inſtances of great Criticks miſtaking modern Compoſition for Fragments of the Ancients, 2914. a. b. 2915. a. Inſtances of the Confuſions which they ſometimes occaſion in the Republick of Letters, 420. A. They are rarely agreed about the reading of Manuſcripts, ibid. They ſometimes change the Readings to ſerve a turn, or when they don't underſtand them, ibid. It is ſurpriſing, that two of the moſt excellent Men among them ſhould have been ignorant of a Fact, that there are few Men of Letters but know, ibid. Criticks on Mens Writings ought not to be confounded with Writers of Satyr and Libels, 909 D. The Reaſon why, ibid. The ableſt are ſubject to give us falſe Corrections, 1076. A. Their Illuſions, ibid. B. ad med. Their Taſtes extreamly different, 1739. a.

Critical Learning; the Study of it fallen, 175. b.

Criticiſm; this Study is quite gone to decay, 175. a. A Fatality inſeparable from it, 1183. B. ad fin.

Crito, Socrates's Diſciple, one of the firſt that wrote a Treatiſe of Coſmeticks, or beautifying Waſhes, 1037. b.

Croniades, a Diſciple of Epicurus, kept a Journal of his amorous Affairs and good Meals, 1192. a.

Croſs; an account of the Tree from which the Wood of the Croſs was taken, 36. a. Images of the Croſs condemned anciently, by whom, 2485. a. The Inſcription of the Croſs ſaid to be found in Rome in the Pontificate of Innocent VIII. 1755.

Cruelty; The Enormity of the Cruelties committed in ſome Parts of Europe, between the Years 1345 and 1390. not to be parallel'd in the preſent Age, 2325. a. Cruelty of Princes covered by Liberality, and a Care in puniſhing Miſdemeanors, 443. Reaſons for tranſmitting to Poſterity the Cruelties which Religion has occaſioned between Parties, 2084. b.

Cruſades, why they never ſucceeded, 696. E.

Cuckoldom; The Cuſtom of typifying Cuckoldom by Horns how ancient, 1811. a. & ſeq. One of the Puniſhments imprecated of old in ſolemn Treaties of Peace on the Violators, according to Homer, 1159. b. n. A Curſe of great Antiquity, 805. Wherein it reſembles Death, 537. b. The ſame common Places of Conſolation for both, ibid.

Curſes uſed by the Lacedemonians, Cuckoldom, the Itch of Building, and Love of Horſes, 1159. b.

Curtius (Quintus) a large Gap in him between the 1ſt and 2d Chapters of the 10th Book, 1581. a.

Cuſtom; its Authority, 346. a. Renders that innocent in one Country, which is againſt all Decency and good Manners in another, 2654. M. 4. Par. ad med.

Cydias, a Painter, how much his Argonatus ſold for, 1695. G.

Cynicks, a Set of Philoſophers, who was their Founder, A. 1100. 1101. Why they were called by this Name, 1670. D. ad fin. Their Sophiſms in Defence of their Bruitiſh Actions, ibid. Their Diſtinction of Beings and half Beings, 2514. b. The Reaſon of their Name, according to Lactantius and others, 1670. b.

Cyniras, King of Cyprus, Difficulties to puzzle thoſe who take him to be the Noah of the Bible, 990. a. Founder of the Worſhip of the Goddeſs Venus, who had been his Whore, ibid. Inventer of the Hammer, Anvil, &c. ibid.

Cypreſs; the Reaſon of its being uſed among the Ancients at Funerals, 1335. a. n. Why called the Virgins, 167. b.

Cypſelus, *the firſt Founder of Tyrannical Government, according to* Herodotus, 2557. a.

Cyran (Abbe de St.) *his Criticiſms on* Garaſſe *the Jeſuite's Works, one of the beſt of its kind, and the moſt uſeful,* 1384. a. *His Compliment to the Jeſuites,* ibid. C.

Cyrenaicks, *a Sect of Philoſophers,* 1641. F. *Wherein they differed from the* Cynicks, ibid.

Cyril (St.) *reproached on the Score of his precipitate Condemnation of* Neſtorius, 2360. N. *Depoſed by the Eaſtern Biſhops in the Council of* Epheſus, 2361. a. *The Reaſons of a Proteſtant Miniſter for maintaining the Reputation of* Neſtorius *againſt* St. Cyril, 2363. b. *Cenſured by the Emperor,* 2360. a. *His irregular way of proceeding with regard to* Neſtorius, ibid.

Cyrillee Lucar, *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople; *his Confeſſion of Faith conformable to that of* Geneva, 398.

Cyrus the younger, *his* Manifeſto *when he was going to depoſe his Brother,* 995. a. *The modern Form upon ſuch Occaſions,* ibid. *Why he fell in Love with* Aſpaſia, 993. C. ad in. *Why he thought himſelf more deſerving than his elder Brother,* 1054. C.

D A.

DAcier *ſhews his good Taſte in declaring for* Horace *againſt* Quintilian *with regard to* Lucilius, 2042. a.

Dædalus, *his extraordinary way of fortifying* Agrigentum *in* Sicily, 1404. b.

Daillé (*Mr.*) *his Book* de uſu Patrum *admired by the Presbyterians, and diſreliſhed by the Epiſcopal Party in* England, 1041. a. *His Cenſure of the Fathers, particularly* St. Auſtin, 85. a. 86. a. *What he ſaies of* Tertullian, 2733. b. *With what deſign did he read the Relations of Travellers,* 2936. I. ad in.

Damage; *Whether one is always obliged to repair a Damage done, by Reſtitution or otherwiſe,* 9. a.

Damaſcen (John) *the firſt of the Scholaſtick Divines,* 1045. *The Rule of the Faith of the* Greeks *about the* Euchariſt, ibid. b. *Many Catholicks don't believe the Miracle about his hand* 1044. b.

Damned; *what* Prudentius *thought of their State, and their number,* 2711. B. ad in.

Dancing; *diſapproving Dances, very prejudicial to the growth of the Reformation,* 2654. b.

Danes *driven out of* Scotland *by the Bravery of a Peaſant,* 1566.

Dante; *the Names of his Miſtreſſes preſerved, but not of his Wives,* 1049. a. *Furniſhes Arguments to thoſe who affirm he was a good Catholick, and to thoſe who deny it,* 1052. a. *His ſharp Anſwer to his Patron the Prince of* Verona, ibid. b. *Guilty of a ridiculous Lie, in making* Hugh Capet *the Son of a Butcher,* 840. *His Comedy of Hell, of Purgatory, and of Paradiſe,* 1044.

Darius; *the concern he was in while his Queen was in* Alexander's *hands,* 2074. b. *His Eſteem for* Alexander, *when aſſured he had offered her no incivility,* ibid.

Daſſoucy (*Monſieur*) *why called by the Women of* Montpellier *a Heretick in Love,* 1056. b. *In danger of being torn in pieces by the Women of* Montpellier, 1622. C.

David; *whether two Families of his Race paſſed into* Spain *after the Deſtruction of the firſt Temple,* 31. B.

Davila; *the Editions of* Davila *printed in the* Netherlands *varied from the* Italian *Editions, in complaiſance to ſome illuſtrious Families,* 250. a. *He and* Maimbourg *entirely oppoſite in their relation with regard to the Duke of* Guiſe, 1517. B.

Dauphin; *the Dauphin of* France *makes a ſolemn Proteſtation againſt the Peace concluded by his Father* Francis *the Iſt at* Creſpy, 1355. a.

Dauphin *of* France *has the Letters of* Bongars *given him to read,* 621. a.

Dead (*The*) *praying for the Dead, by whom condemned in the* Vth *Century,* 2963.

Death, *why preferable to Poverty,* 630. a. *Diſcourſes of it even from the Pulpit, ungrateful to a certain Prince,* 2337. a. *A fine thought of the Philoſopher* Arceſilaus *on Death,* 320. *In what caſes a Man's killing himſelf may be the ſign of a great Mind,* 359. b. *No Death nor Generation, properly ſpeaking, in Nature,* 2611. a. *Sudden Death reckoned a Bleſſing, and one of the Prerogatives of the golden Age,* 2947. a.

Debellare; *the difference between it and* vincere, *in point of Glory among the* Romans, 927. b.

Decalogue; *impracticable in the preſent State of humane Nature,* 668. D. ad fin.

Decemvirs *abrogated, and why,* 279. 280.

Decrees, *Academical, Synodical,* &c. *the manner how they are ſometimes extorted,* 109. C. 110. D.

Dedications; *Epiſtles Dedicatory when they ceas'd being profitable to Authors,* 1287. a.

Defects; *ſome Defects have given Names to illuſtrious Families,* 470. A. *A Reflection on ſecret Defects,* 478. H.

Deiſts; *At what time did they firſt begin to be known by this Name, in oppoſition to Atheiſts,* 1973. b.

Deity; *an Argument to prove the Exiſtence of a Deity,* 369. B. *The moſt profligate Perſons mentioned in Hiſtory have acknowledged a Deity,* 812. M. *The Pagans imagined that there were Deities which were jealous and envious of the Proſperity of Mankind,* 836. A. *An Heroick Prayer on this occaſion,* ibid. *Whether the Exiſtence of a Deity being effac'd, Men might retain the Ideas of Honeſty,* 1815. a. *There are certain Nations which have no Knowledge of a Deity,* 1803. b. *The Deities of the ſecond Rank were mortal, according to ſome of the Pagans,* 1537. b. *The Pagans repreſented the Deity under the Idea of a Being, which puniſhed Sinners by plunging them into new Sins,* 2255. a. Numa *would not ſuffer the Deity to be repreſented by Images,* 2636. N. ad med. *Three Means of reſembling the Deity,* 2545. b. *The Tutelar Deities were evoked out of the Places that were beſieged, when there was a likelihood of taking them,* 2768. a. *See* God, Divinity.

Delators, *a Character of them,* 598. E. *A wiſe and innocent Perſon ſhould deſire no other Victory over them, than a Deliverance from them,* ibid. *Are compared to Dogs, which are ſuffered to bark at good and bad alike,* 905. a. *See* Accuſers.

Delos, *its Inhabitants the firſt who cramm'd and fatted Fowls,* 1278. C. 2. Par.

Delphos, *its Temple pillaged,* 2597. A. *Its vaſt Riches,* ibid.

Delphians *puniſhed with Peſtilence and Famine for the Murder of* Æſop, 1139. E. *What they did to deliver themſelves from theſe Judgments,* ibid.

Deluge; *it's impoſſible to know any thing before it, but by the help of* Moſes, 1253. D. ad fin. *The Conſternation that People were in upon a Parſon's preaching a ſudden univerſal Deluge,* 2813. B.

Demagogues *kept the Republick of* Athens *in a real Slavery,* 2543. O. ad fin.

Democritus *judged worthy of divine Honours on the Score of ſome of his Predictions; laughed at all humane Life,* 1081. *What we ought to judge of his Opinion concerning Nature, which he called God,* ibid. O. *Whether he be much different from* Pere Malebranche, ibid. *His Syſtem not ſo abſurd as that of* Spinoza, 1084. Q. *Suppoſed a Soul in each Atom,* 1924. E. ad in.

Demons; *ſeveral have been of Opinion that* Demons *ingender,* 702. R.

Demonſtration; *Arguments which are ſtrictly demonſtrative, when long, and deduced from ſeveral Premiſes, are believed only upon the Credit of a few,* 295. b.

Demonſtration (*Moral*) *its true Nature,* 543. b.

Demoſthenes; *His Artifice to avoid haranguing the* Athenians *after he had touched a Bribe,* 1582. a. *His pathetick Apoſtrophe to* Minerva, *and Invective againſt the People of* Athens, *when he was going to be baniſhed,* 2544. b. *The longer his Orations are, the finer they are,* 369. a.

Dennis (*Abby of St.*) *its Monks, why encouraged in their Diſſoluteneſs by the Court of* France, 23. a.

Deſcartes, *his Obſervation about the origin of Philoſophical Errors holds good as to Errors in Criticiſm,* 879. a. *The difference between his Opinion about the Nature of Brutes, and that of* Cicero *and the* Stoicks, 2519. a. *His Judgment of* Hobbs's *Book* de Cive, 1679. a. *Praiſed in a publick Oration at* Utrecht *in his Life-time, by a poſitive Order from the Magiſtrate,* 1179. a. *Brings an Action againſt* Martin Schoockius, *a Profeſſor at* Groningen, *for calling him an Atheiſt, and obtains Judgment againſt him,* 256. a. *His Opinion which makes Brutes meer Machines, highly favourable to the Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion,* 2604. b. *The Antiquity of his Opinion about the Souls of Brutes,* 2516. a. *His Epitaph,* 236. N. *A Reflection on the Doubts which he exacts the better to arrive at the Truth,* 1145. L. *Owns that this Maxim, viz. God can neither deceive nor be deceived, admits of many Exceptions,* 2635. a.

Deſpreaux (*Mr.*) *the Reaſon he alledges for not ſinging the King of* France's *Victories in* 1672. 2886. I. ad med. *His Satyrs have need of a Commentary already,* 1055. *One cannot be of his Opinion touching the four Verſes which he aſcribes to* Nero, 2556. D. ad med. *An Obſervation in his Art of Poetry examined,* 2675. I.

Deſtiny. *See* Fate.

Devil (*The*) *his baſhful and weak Voice,* 490. a. *Can make uſe of a Wand as an occaſional Cauſe,* 2. a. *Apes the Works of God,* ibid. *Whether they who think there is a Devil, muſt neceſſarily believe the Exiſtence of a God,* 2633. b. *Compact with the Devil,* 801. C. ad med. I. ad med. *The Origin of Devils according to the* Rabins, 1254. *The Doctrine of the Pagans concerning Devils,* 3045. I. ad. med. *'Tis very ſtrange, that Chriſtian Judges ſhould receive their Teſtimony as*

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 1459.

true, and reject as null the Evidence brought againſt them, 1454. G. The Devil oppoſes all Truths, which God thinks fit to declare to Men, 1109. H. H. How it comes to paſs that he has oppoſed the Eſtabliſhment of Mahometiſm, ibid.

Devotion; Books of Devotion by Perſons of a looſe Life, a Scandal to good Minds, 341. a. The Writing Books of Devotion conſiſtent even with Atheiſm, and a contempt for all Religion. 346. b. The Scandal given by Nocturnal Devotions in the Primitive Church, the cauſe of aboliſhing them. 2871. b.

Diagoras, ſurnamed the Atheiſt, what drew him into his Impiety, 1091. C. He Publiſhed the Reaſons of his turning Atheiſt. ibid. C.

Dialogue; what are the Laws of it. 1214. Q.

Diana, an admirable Statue of this Goddeſs, 759. in Text. The Thought of an Hiſtorian on her Suffering her Temple of Epheſus to be burnt, 1121. C.

Dictionaries, nothing ſhould be ſuppreſs'd in them, 61 F. A Dictionary of the Bible, a Remark on one of its Articles, 1061. L. It ſhould not be thought ſtrange, if ſometimes in this Dictionary it be made appear, that Reaſon ſets us with regard to the Myſteries of the Goſpel, 3081. F Δ. ad fin.

Differences in Religion magnified by the Parties or Promoters, and always ſuppoſed of very great Conſequence, 1811. a.

Digeſts, when firſt began to be read in the Schools, 1777. in Text.

Dignities; in what caſe an honeſt Man ought to refuſe them. 419. F.

Dinant (Town of) treated with extreme Rigour, 761. C.

Diocles; his Surprize upon ſeeing Epicurus upon his Knees in a Temple, 1194. M.

Diodorus Siculus; the firſt of the Greek Hiſtorians who left off Fabling, 681. a. What he ſays of the Faults of Hiſtorians, 2884. C. ad med.

Diogenes; of Opinion that Beaſts had no Feeling nor Paſſion, 2515. a. The ground of this Opinion, ibid. He is the Inventer of voluntary Poverty, Faſting and Aſceticks, ibid. A ſuppoſed Diſpute between him and a civiliz'd Perſon about the Lawfulneſs of lying with one's Wife in Publick, 1670. b. His Anſwer to Antiſthenes, who took up a Cudgel to drub him out of Doors, 1100. 1101. A. His anſwer to Alexander, ibid. F. ad fin. Whether he was an Atheiſt, ibid. N. Is taken by a Pirate, and draws an Argument againſt Providence from it, 1581. I. His Opinion touching the Souls of Beaſts, 2514. C. ad med. He laboured to render himſelf inſenſible, ibid. Is not ſo far from Platoniſm as is commonly believed, ibid.

Diogenes Laertius; his Brevity ſometimes inſufferable, 358. a.

Diogenes of Apollonia; what he ſaid of the firſt Cauſe, 1105. B. ad in ad med. His Syſtem differed hardly any thing at all from Spinoſizme, ibid. How he Philoſophized about the Production of the World, ibid.

Dion, he and Tacitus differ about the reaſon which induced Auguſtus to make a Law againſt Libels, 882. G. ad med. He aſcribes to Cicero a Harangue which he himſelf has forged, 1368. F. ad fin. He falſifies two things in it, which ought to give his Reader a miſtruſt of ſeveral others, ibid.

Dionyſius, Biſhop of Alexandria, thought that the Revelations were written by Cerinthus, and St. John's Name put to 'em by that Heretick, 9921. b.

Dionyſius the Tyrant, how he expreſs'd himſelf, when he would ſay, that a Man ought never to demiſe the Tyrannick Power, 2528. F. ad fin.

Dionyſius (Halicarnaſſenſis) his good Taſte for Hiſtory, 1077. C.

Diſeaſes; Cabages ſaid to be a Sovereign Remedy for all Diſeaſes, 973. a.

Diſpenſations; A Diſpenſation for three young Widows to have a Man upon occaſion, ask'd of Clement VII. 2748. b.

Diſputes (Religious) the danger of entring into 'em with Perſons of greater or meaner parts than our ſelves almoſt equal, 435. b. Their Original and fatal Effects, according to the Targum, 18. a. In the heat of Religious Diſputes Men may let fall ſome Expreſſions of Hereſy, who at bottom are Orthodox, 69. a. What the heat of a Diſpute produces, 69. A. One is generally ſtronger on the Offenſive than on the Defenſive in it, 461. B. A Diſpute of twenty ſeven Years between two Divines, 1953. C. The Laws of Diſputation, 2628. C. ad med. Nothing is more uſeful toward getting clear of a Diſpute than a witty Jeſt, 2518. b. What was the Diſpute between Cain and Abel, according to the Targum, 18. b. When Diſputes degenerate into Perſonal Reflections, they never fail to injure the Reputation of the Diſputants, 1043. b. They are in this caſe the worſt Snare that their Deſtiny can lay for them, ibid. The miſchief in Diſputes of Religion is, that the ſame Perſons are Judges, and Parties, 1116. a. What abundance of Diſputes might ceaſe would People but underſtand one another, 1559. A.

Divination by Fire, by whom invented, 516. b. How Cratippus reaſoned on this Subject, 1031. d.

Divinities; believed to envy the Proſperity of Mankind, 836. a. A Divinity ſo much the more devoutly reverenced as it was not known at all, 930. H. ad in. There are two ſorts of Unbelievers, with regard to the Exiſtence, or the Non-exiſtence of the Divinity or Deity. Why better known, according to Lucan, in Greece, and in Italy, than at Marſeilles, 1110. A. ad med. The Pagans laid a great ſtreſs upon Tradition, to prove the Exiſtence of a Deity, 1368. Y Δ. ad fin.

Diviſibility, ad infinitum, deſtroys all Contiguity, 307. F. ad med. It ſuppoſes the Penetration and Dimenſions, ibid. Several difficulties againſt the Geometrical Demonſtrations of a Diviſibility ad infinitum, ibid.

Divorce; a Wife's demanding Conjugal Duty, ſo as to be overheard by the Neighbourhood, a ſufficient Cauſe of Divorce amongſt the Jews, 1257. b.

Doctors, happy for ſome of 'em that the People are not able to Catechize them, 436. b. The form of Doctor in Law; when it firſt commenced in Univerſities, and by whoſe means, 1778. One might be apt often to take them for meer Comedians, if it were lawful to judge of the Thoughts, 436. E. Some are very happy, in that the People will ſuffer themſelves to be led by the Noſe, according to their old wont, ibid. It's very rare to ſee Doctors exempt from all Ambition and Avarice, 1890. B. ad in.

Doctrine, inſiſting on the Ancient and common received Doctrine as the Proteſtants do, ſeems to ſuppoſe the Principle of the Authority of the Church, 190. b. The difference between rejecting the Reaſons alleged for the Doctrine, and rejecting the Doctrines themſelves, 2630. b. Some Doctors conſtrain'd to renounce a Theſis, in which they maintain'd, that Ego amat was as well as Ego amo, 2551. G. ad fin. There are a world of People, who are admirable at diſcovering the weak ſide of a Doctrine, and who yet can never find the ſtrong ſide of it, 406. b. No ſurer way of Attacking Doctrines than that of turning them into Ridicule, 2656, b. 2679. a. They who are fond of particular Doctrines, look upon all thoſe who oppoſe them as ſo many falſe Brothers, 575. b.

Doctrines very oppoſite to the true Faith, 728. B. What is neceſſary to be known, in order to the well Qualifying of a Doctrine, 2804. b.

Dogmaticks, The ordinary and inevitable Shelve on which they are loſt, 327. E. ad med. Do not propoſe the Arguments on both ſides, with the ſame force, 998. a.

Dogs, the true Reaſon of their never going into the Turkiſh Moſques, or the Greek Churches, 1647. a. A Thought of Cicero's, about the Dogs of the Capitol, 595. C. Dogs never go into Churches or Moſques of Miſitra, 1647. 1. The Reaſon of this, ibid. A Sermon on the different kinds of Dogs, 1126. a.

Dog's-ſtar, Its Worſhip, by whom Eſtabliſh'd, and the Nature of this Worſhip, 354. a. b.

Dolabella; his Manners, his Conduct, and the Troubles of which he was the Cauſe, 2922, F. G.

Dominicans always in War with the Franciſcans, 788. F. The Earneſtneſs of their Generals to get the Pugio Fidei publiſhed, 2010. A.

Dominick (St.) ſaid to be the firſt who had the knowledge of the Philoſopher's Stone, 147. b.

Domitian; what is told of Apollonius Tyanæus at the time of Domitian's Aſſaſſination, Diſſert. Numb. 1.

Domitius (L.) a young Gentleman of the firſt Quality in Rome, ſo modeſt he could not name the Name of the Courtezan Chelidonis, 964. b.

Donatiſts, their Error about Baptiſm condemned in a General Council, 1897. O.

Dorieus, Son of Diagoras, his Hiſtory, 1095. a.

Dorotheus; whether there was a Biſhop of Tyre of this Name who ſuffered Martyrdom, 1198. a.

Dort; its Synod would not admit the Remonſtrants as Members, but only as Perſons cited before them, 1200. 1201, 1202. See alſo 2995. I. & ſeq.

Drabitius made People believe that he ſhould baptize the Turk, 1118. b. Whether his Name was known in France, 1857. A. ad med. He ſays nothing of Tekeli, ibid. His Tragical End, ibid. D.

Draco, wrote his Laws in Blood, what the meaning of this is, 1938. Y.

Drelincourt (Charles) a handſom Anſwer of his to a French Biſhop, 364. A. An Extract of his Anſwer to Prince Erneſt, Landgrave of Heſſe. 2542. E.

Dreams; a Reflection on the pretended Preſages of Dreams, 2132. b. Can't always be thought the Effect of Chance, and confound Unbelievers more than they are willing to own, 2139. b. Alledg'd by Tertullian to prove the Excellency of our Souls, 347. b.

Drinking; *hard Drinking ſuch an accompliſhment in Perſia, that* Darius *values himſelf on it in his Epitaph*, 1053. a. *The way of Drinking in* Lacedæmon, 1037. b. *What* Demoſthenes *ſaid to thoſe who gave* Philip *of* Macedon *the Praiſe of bearing a great deal of Drink*, 1054. B.

Drunkenneſs; *Prize of Drunkenneſs, and the Succeſs of the Combat*, 3079. b. *A Treatiſe of his own Drunkenneſs, publiſh'd by* M. Anthony *the Triumvir*, 277. b. *The exceſſive Drunkenneſs of ancient* Rome, 2908. b.

Druſilla, *Daughter of* Agrippa; *whether ſhe abjur'd the* Jewiſh *Religion*, 1137. a.

Druſilla (Julia) *her Inceſt with her Brother* Caligula, 1138. b. *Impieties committed after her Death to Honour her Memory*, ibid.

Druſius; *the Judgment which Father* Simon *makes of him*, 1121. b.

Druſus (Marcus Livius) *his fine Anſwer to an Architect*, 1138. n.

Druſus, *Brother of* Tiberius, *his Friendſhip for* Germanicus, 1177. a.

Druſus, *Son of* Germanicus *and* Agrippina, *a Fame ſpread among the People that he had made his Eſcape out of Priſon*, 1178. b.

Dryades, *the difference between them and the* Hamadryads, *according to* Benſerade, 580. b. *A Compariſon between the Drunkenneſs of the* North, *and the Laſciviouſneſs of the* South *Countries of* Europe, 1223. a. b. 1224. a. b. *How Infamous in* Spain, 1225. b.

Duaren, *ſaid to have been a Proteſtant*, 1144. C. *The Reaſon he gives why he felt his Paſſion for the Reformed Religion to diminiſh*, ibid.

Duelling, *the force of a Sermon againſt* Duelling, 1288. b. *A memorable Duel between twenty two* Frenchmen *and as many* Flemmings, *Febr.* 5. 1600. 708.

Duels, *the firſt time that Seconds fought* Duels *in* France, 1688.

Duræus; *the Difficulties he ſurmounted to ſee his Friend* Paul Ferri, 1302. b. *Not being able to unite the* Lutherans *and* Calviniſts, *he undertakes to reunite all the Chriſtian Sects*, 1150. C. *His Conference with* Ferry *and* Ancillon, 1302. E. *Becomes ſomewhat a Viſionary*, ibid. *An Error of Mr.* Amyrault *about the time of his Death*, ibid. *And of the Catalogue of* Oxford, *which confounds him with the Jeſuit* Duræus, ibid.

Durazzo (Charles *of*) *his cruel Treatment of* Joan *Queen of* Naples, 2324. b. *Afterwards has his own Head ſtruck off by the Queen of* Hungary's *command, as he is drinking a Glaſs of Wine*, 2325. a. *A Hiſtory of the Princes of this Name*, 2265. a.

Dutch (*The*) *what they owe their Liberty to*, 454. a.

Dytenus; *a generous Conteſt between him and his Brother, which ſhould ſuffer Death, decided by their Father and Mother*, 1007. b.

E A.

EARS, *a Catalogue of Men who had a faculty of moving their Ears*, 1646. a.

Eating; *the little time allow'd for Eating formerly in* France, 2665. b.

Earth; *who was the firſt that maintain'd the Motion of the Earth round the Sun*, 348. a. Cleanthes *of Opinion, that his Country ought to try* Ariſtarchus *for Irreligion on the ſcore of this Notion of his*, ibid.

Eccleſiaſticks; *their irregular Lives turn'd to Advantage by the Sovereigns*, 23. F. ad fin. *Love to change their Poſts*, 45. a. *Are inclin'd to Flatter the higher Powers*, 195. b. *Are much to be dreaded when they turn Accuſers*, 362. G. *There are few of the abler Sort but love to make a noiſe in the World*, 587. b. *The ſame Spirit which has procured them ſo many Honours and Eſtates, had reign'd before in Paganiſm*, 1006. B. *The Rigour of the ancient Canons with regard to them*, 1462. F. *They praiſe all thoſe who are liberal to the Church*, ibid. I. *Several of them will rather ſtand Excommunicated by the Pope than quit their Wives*, 1470. C. *Thoſe of the* North *more unwilling to ſubmit to the Law of Celibacy, than thoſe of the* South, ibid. *The number of thoſe who find the Yoke of Celibacy too heavy is innumerable*, 1475. S. *Their Vices incurable*, 1563. Y. *Who introduced the Cuſtom of depoſing thoſe who ſhould lye with their Wives after their Ordination to the Prieſthood*, 1599. *They ſhould not be ſuffer'd to keep young Servant Maids, when they are not married*, 1781. b. *'Tis dangerous medling with them*, 2942. D. ad in. *See* Clergy.

Eclipſes; *who was the firſt among the* Greeks *that could foretel an Eclipſe*, 1673. b. *Which of the ancient* Greeks *after him firſt calculated the Proportions of the Intervals of Eclipſes*, ibid. *How terrible to People before the Days of* Socrates *and* Anaxagoras, 325. a. *When the Terror cauſed by the Eclipſes began to be cured in* Athens, 1530. b.

Eſchines, *an Orator, undergoes a thouſand ſharp Reproaches and why*, 1209. a. *A Story which he tells*, 2684. b.

Eſop, *ſaid to have riſen from the Dead, and fought with the Greeks at the Streights of* Thermopylæ, 1236. b.

Eſop, *a Roman Tragedian, his incredible Expence and Prodigality*, 1228. b. *Over acted a Part in his Tragick Fury*, 1229. a.

Eſop, *a Comedian in* Rome, *his Son drinks off a Pearl of great value*, 1509. a.

Eſſex (*Earl of*) *whether it be true that Queen* Elizabeth *ſhew'd his Head to Mareſchal* Biron, 1424. C.

Eſte (*Houſe of*) *a Blot in their Scutcheon remembred*, 345.

Eſtrix, *a Jeſuit, is Author of the Book* de fraudibus Hæreticorum, 1653. b.

E'Tampes (*Dutcheſs d'*) *her Treachery like to have put an end to the French Monarchy*, 1241. b. *Her Virtue on a Suppoſition that* Francis I. *never lay with her, exceeded that of Heroins in Romance or martyr'd Virgins*, 1245. b. *She prevails with* Francis I. *to demand ſome Jewels of Madam de* Chateau Briand, *which he had preſented her*, 1078. b. *Reflections on her* Calviniſm, *and her Motives, according to* Varillas, *of embracing it*, 1289. a. *Her pretended* Lutheraniſm, ibid. *Her Husband has Inſpection made into her Conduct*, 1291. a. *She forms a Faction to oppoſe that of* Diana *of* Poitiers, 1618. P.

Etaples (Faber *d'*) *ſnatch'd out of the Hands of the Inquiſitors by the Queen of* Navarre, 830. a.

Eternity *of the World, publickly taught in* Alexandria *by a Heathen Philoſopher in the 6th Century*, 211. b. *The Definition which* Boethius *gives of it, is as incomprehenſible as the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation*, 3065. H.

Eternity *of Puniſhment*, *Reflections on this Doctrin*, 2762. a.

Edinburgh, *erected into a Biſhoprick in favour of* William Forbes, 1332. b. *When the Caſtle of* Edinburgh *was built*, 1897. b.

Edict; *Edict of* Nants, *by whom drawn*, 939. C. *Edicts often contain Civilities which muſt not be conſtrued in the Letter*, 1197. K.

Editions; *a wipe for thoſe who wait for ſecond Editions*, 249. b. *No Edition but one may make ſome Advantage of*, 265. a. *There are ſeveral Authors to whom a ſecond Edition coſts as much trouble as a firſt*, 516. b.

Education *ſinks under the weight of Nature*, 63. a.

Edward I. *King of* England, *makes an Irruption into* Scotland, 1558. b.

Edward III. *King of* England, *angry at an Inſcription in* Windſor-*Caſtle*, 3030. A.

Edward IV. *his Orders to his Men upon obtaining a Victory*, 1159. a. *Compar'd to* Periander *and* Tarquin *the Proud*, ibid.

Edward VI. *King of* England, *his Death cauſed a great deal of Joy in* Rome, *but the Reaſons of this Joy ſoon ceaſed*, 1794. I. *'Twas taken ill at* Rome *that any one ſhould call him King*, 1802.

Edward (*St.*) *his Simplicity contributed much to the Sainting of him*, 1179. A. *Gives himſelf the Diſcipline, and why*, ibid. C.

Effigy; *a Saying of ſome who were burn'd in Effigy, that they never found themſelves colder in any Day of their Lives*, 683. C.

Egypt, *when Strangers were firſt permitted to come into* Egypt, 2357. b. *At whoſe Expence and Pleaſure was the famouſeſt Pyramid of* Egypt *built*, 1319. D. *When and on what occaſion did Strangers firſt ſet foot in* Egypt, 2713. *Which of their Kings drank Wine firſt*, ibid. ad fin.

Eleonara, *Heireſs of* Guyenne, *her Divorce from the King of* France, *and Marriage with the King of* England, 2000. A. *Her Galantries during the holy War with* Saladine, ibid. *Her Jealouſies, her Spirit of Revenge, and the Puniſhment of them*, ibid. G. *Her End*, ibid. G. ad med. *Has been put in the Catalogue of learned Women*, ibid.

Elephant, *an Expoſition of the Chapter of the Elephant in the* Alcoran, *according to the* Turkiſh *Commentators*, 2017. c.

Elephants (*white*) *in great Veneration among the Eaſtern People*, 1719. a. *When ſeen by the* Romans *for the firſt time*, 2627. *Their Chaſtity and Purity*, 493. b.

Elephantis, *a famous Courtezan that wrote Books full of Obſcenity*, 1853. b.

Elian *excuſes* Anacreon, 235. a. *Vents a Corrupt Maxim of Morality*, 1092. H. *His inexcuſable Partiality as an Hiſtorian*, ibid.

Elias, *whether his Complaint be that of an inſpired Perſon*, 83. D.

Elis, *its ſevere Law againſt the Women who ſhould preſume to ſee the Olympick Games*, 599. a. *This City made all Philoſophers free of it*, 2622. ad fin.

Elizabeth (*Queen*) *what point of her Conduct tends to juſtifie the Revolution againſt King* James II. 1169. b. *The difference between her Conduct and that of* Agrippina, 1171.

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 1439.

1171. b. *Her great desire to see* Henry II. *of* France. 1615. a. *Bonfires made in* Holland, *and Ringing of Bells, for her Marriage with the Duke of* Alençon, 2651. a. *A Discourse which is ascribed to her on occasion of the Death of the Earl of* Essex, 1417. C.

Eloquence; *the different Characters of the four greatest Masters of ancient* Rome, 1363. a. *An Observation of the Jealousie and Emulation occasion'd by Eloquence*, 248.

Embalming, *a Precaution taken against the Embalmers of Womens Dead Bodies, according to* Herodotus, 1969. b.

Embroidery, *Gold Embroidery, by whom invented*, 2526. N.

Enchanters, *the difference between 'em and Sorcerers*, 801.

Enemies, *no greater Enemies than those who are too lavish of their Praises*, 382. b. *We ought to abate much of the force of Terms, when one Enemy speaks of another*, 423. a. *And condemn no body upon their Testimony*, 301. *Nothing is more Dangerous than despising Enemies in some times of Difficulty*, 2658. b.

England, *Wool grown dear in* England *by the Number of Hereticks burnt daily*, 211. G. n. *The* Lutherans *and* Papists *burnt there at the same time*, 743. A. in Text. *A Design of Reforming all the Schools in* England, *Travers'd by the Civil Wars*, 1010. in Text. *In what the Nobility there surpass'd those of other Countries, and still surpasses them*, 1209. F. ad in. *The Learned of* England *not so easily impos'd upon as those in* France, *on the Subject of* Euripides, 1267. S. ad fin. *Cruelties exercis'd there by turns, between the* Romans *and the* Britons, 2815. b. *An Elegy of its Universities*, 1997. 2998. O. ad fin. *The Character of its People, in* Erasmus's *Days*, 1209. b. *its Ministers and Favourites corrupted of old by Bribes and Pensions from* France, 1157. b. *Destitute of a Fleet and Shipping in* Edward IV.th's *Days*, 159. b. *said to have been drawn into a War against* France, *in favour of* Julius II. *by a large Present of good Wines, Cheeses, Sausiges, and Gammons, from that Pope*, 1790. b. *its Court addicted to Punning in Queen* Elizabeth's *Days*, 655. b. *it's a mistake to say, That the* English *formerly Conquer'd the greatest part of* France, 961. a.

English, *how Converted to Christianity*, 1461. D. ad in. *Taken for Gods by the Natives of* New-England, *and why*, 2525. I. ad med. *Whether the* English *did formerly in a manner Conquer* France, 961. C. 2d Par. *Whether they made it Tributary*, 1157. H. ad in. *The* English *Divines accused of leaning to Pelagianism and Socinianism*, 505. A.

Ennius, *what* Quintilian *thought of him*, 2008. b.

Enoch, *whether the* Pagans *made any Allusion to his History*, 215. D.

Enocha, *a Comparison of this City with that of* Peneropolis, 806.

Εντελέχεια, *a word Essential to* Aristotle's *Physicks, but scarce intelligible*, 490. N.

Enthusiasms, *whether consistent with the Opinion of those, who say the Soul is not distinct from the Body* 1096.

Envy *at one Man's Prosperity often the cause of another Man's Rise*, 988. b. *its Tortures*, 1805. Z. ad fin.

Enzinas, *Author of a* Spanish *Translation of the New Testament*, 1118. b.

Eparchus, *Bishop of* Corfu. *Collected a great many good Manuscripts with which the Library of* Ausbourg *was enrich'd*, 1645. a.

Epernon (*Duke d'*) *the Present of the City of* Roan *to him, upon his being made Governor of* Normandy, 1626. a. *Maintains his haughty Spirit, even on his Death-bed*, 1519. E. *Boasted of his own good Fortune*, 2893. Art. III.

Ephemerides, *of* Julius Cæsar, *a Work wholly distinct from his Commentaries*, 473. M.

Ephesians, *one of their Laws*, 248. B. ad fin.

Ephori, *the Kings of* Lacedemon *how subject to their Caprice*, 106. b. 112. a.

Ephorus, *a celebrated* Greek *Historian in* Alexander *the Great's Days, knew so little of the* Spaniards, *that he took 'em for one City*, 1183. a. *would have said something of his own Country if he could*, 1185. a. *The Character of his Genius*, 2868. E.

Epicarmus, *a fine Thought and Expression of his word for word with the Scripture Sentence about Death*, 215. C. n. *an excellent Doctrine of his agreeable to the Scriptures*, 216. a.

Epicles, *what sort of Health he drank to* Antocles, 2535. H.

Epictetus, *what his Lamp was sold for*, 2609. m. ad. fin.

Epicurus, *Bred up while a Child to the Practice of Superstitious Rights*, 1186. a. *his Memory made infamous by the Bigotry and Malice of the* Stoicks, 1192. a. *his Passive Obedience*, ibid. *a supposed Dispute between him and a Pagan Priest*, 1198. b. *The difference between his Doctrine concerning a Deity, and that of the Modern* Chinese *and* Siamese, 2765. a. *Came nearer the Truth than any of the ancient Philosophers*, 668. ad med. *Had Scholars who were very orderly in their Life and Conversation*, 898. b. *What was the Pleasure which he recommended*, 908. N. *the Hypothesis of Fortune and Presages, is directly opposite to the System of this Philosopher*, 930. H. ad fin. *He did himself a Prejudice by not owning the Obligations he had to* Democritus, 1083. N. *His Courage and Gentleness*, 1186. C. ad. in. *What's the Ground of the ill Opinion People have of him and his Sect*, ibid. H. *A forg'd Dispute between him and a Platonist*, ibid. C. 2d. Par. *And between him and a Pagan Priest*, ibid. ad. med. *takes needless Precautions*, ibid. T. ad in. *He had acknowledged Spirits, if he had reason'd consequentially*, 2055. F. 2d. Par. *Whether he could have reconciled his System to the Publick Worship, and deceiv'd the* Athenians, 2056. I. *Is criticiz'd by* Plutarch, ibid. M. ad in. *And by* Cicero, ibid. *His Hypothesis concerning the Existence of the Gods is the weak part of his System*, P. ad in. *Whether he own'd a Providence*, ibid. ad med. *His Objections drawn from the Evil which happens in the World, ill refuted by* Lactantius, 2484. E. 2. Par. ad fin. *He rejected Geometry and other Parts of the Mathematicks*, 3075. D. ad in.

Epicureans, *would allow nothing Supernatural in Dreams*, 68. b. *Whether it was lawful for one* Epicurean *to rally another* 908. B. ad fin. *some of them more regular in their Manners than most Idolaters*, 876, 877. in Text. ad in. *Their strict Union*, 1184. I. ad in.

Epidemical *Distempers: The Mind no less subject to them than the Body*, 14. a.

Epigones, *how this Word ought to be Translated*, 92. B.

Epigrams, *pretended to be better written by the* French, *than by any of their Neighbours*, 1423. a. *the Qualities of a perfect Epigram*, 2374. b. 2375. E. ad in.

Epilepsy, *The Venereal Enjoyment called a short Epilepsy, by whom*, 1341. b. 1057. R.

Epinac (Peter d') *Archbishop of* Lyons, *a famous Antiroyalist at a Conference*, 2667. a.

Epiphanius (*Saint*) *mistaken, in saying that* Marcian *was never received into the Communion of the Church after his first Excommunication*, 2162. b. *does not say, that there were Impurities acted in the Assemblies of the* Adamites, 87. C. *Goes upon a false Tradition, about the Bellowing of the* Golden Calf, 1165. A.

Epirotes, *reduced almost to nothing by a Famine, and for what Cause*, 2628, 2629. in Text. ad fin.

Episcopacy, *the* Jesuites *discovered to be the Authors of Books written against it*, 175. a. *Fulminated by* Theodore Beza, 1840. b.

Epistles (*Dedicatory*) *The common Place of this sort of Epistles*, 270. C. *Are prepar'd for those, who are likely to Reward the Author best*, 2639. a. *It's a Fault not to Date them*, 2825. C.

Epistolæ obscurorum virorum, *an Effect of the reading them*, 1217. z. *Who is the Author of this Work*, 1683, 1684. F. ad fin.

Epitaphs. *When an Epitaph is cited, one ought not to change the least Letter*, 1892. E. *An Epitaph, full of Presumption and Orthodoxy*, 2452. G. *Are more to be rely'd on than History, as to the Day of a Person's Death*, 1125. D.

Epocha, *The Epocha of an Event wrong Mark'd by the General Term of this Year*, 685. a.

Erasmus, *his Prediction of* Calvin, 821. b. *what ground to suppose he made such a Prediction*, 822. b. *declin'd a Cardinal's Cap*, 1213. b. *troubled he should Die at* Basil, *tho' among his best Friends*, 1210. a. *his Answer to one who would excuse a Printer of Libels on his Poverty*, 1216. a. *what made old Age pleasant to him*, 1218. a. *why he dreaded* Luther's *downfal*, 1215. b. *his generous manner of rejecting Compliments made him on a Victory in a Controversy with one of his Friends*, 1314. b. *Censured on his maintaining, that Hereticks are to be proceeded against by Capital Punishments*, 1395. b. *his Explication of a* Greek *Adagy, destroys the Tradition of* Hercules's *Softness*, 1645. b. *his Censure of the Popish Custom, of Saluting the Virgin* Mary *in the Pulpit before Sermon*, 1815. a. *Criticiz'd upon Occasion of a* Greek *Proverb, and upon a Passage in* Cicero, 13. b. *what it was that disgusted him in the Protestant Religion*, 111. b. *his Advice to* Andreas Ammonius, *how to manage himself at the Court of* Henry VIII. 212. a. *lov'd his Bottle*, ibid. b. *accus'd on his giving the Title of King of* France *to* Henry VIII. *in a Dedication*, 550. b. *accus'd by a Cardinal as the Fomenter of the Boor's War in* Germany, 172. *his Strength did not lie in the* Greek *Tongue*, 893. b. *He cannot decide, whether he belong'd by his Birth to* Gaul *or to* Germany, *being Born at* Rotterdam, 2622. b. 2623. a. *His Statue placed in the Way, Presenting a Copy of Verses to* Philip II. *of* Spain, *when he made his Entry into* Rotterdam, 2623. a. b. *His Mistake in not finding more than three Women, call'd* Anne, *among the Ancients*, 269. b.

Criticiſ'd on his tranſlating a Paſſage from Ælian about lexander *and* Apelles, 287. a. *Miſtaken in his Senſe of the Proverb,* Archilocum teris, 330. b. *Looks upon* Luther *in the beginning of the Reformation, as a Deliverer,* 119. L. *Paſſes for a Favourer of the* Lutherans, ibid. *His Letters are often wrong dated and ill rang'd,* 211. B. *He cenſures the Poem of* Andrelinus, 271. a. *He uſes* Alexander *ſcurvily,* 278. a. *He cites a Paſſage from Ælian wrong, concerning* Alexander, 302. b. *His Conteſts with* Beda, 550. A B. *The wiſe Advice which he gave* Berquin, 618. a. *One of his Letters which had never been publiſh'd,* 677. L. *Could never have the favour of being cited by* Budæus, 303. b. *His Works corrected, by whom,* 893. E. *Allow'd too little time for the compoſing his Books,* ibid. *His Diſpute with* Eppendorf, 1204. B. *Why Old-age ſeem'd pleaſant to him,* 1218. EE. *His heroick Carriage toward an Enemy of his,* 1314. D. *Turns Politician with regard to the Court of* Rome, 1395. F. *Would not have Princes exhorted to deprive the Monks of the great Poſſeſſions which they had engroſs'd,* ibid. *His Printers play him an arch Trick,* 1727. H. *It's ſtrange that he never ſhould have read what Authors have ſaid of* Jupiter's *being chang'd into a Cuckoo to enjoy* Juno, 1817. I. *Writes a falſe Account of the too early Lying-in of* Luther's *Wife,* 2616, U△. *His Railleries open the way for the Reformation,* 2620, 2621. *in Tex. between* GG, and HH. *Underſtood a Paſſage in* Ariſtophanes *better than* Valerius Maximus, 2541. K. *The Magiſtrates of* Baſil *bid Mony for his Statue,* 2623. B. ad fin. *What he ſays of the Uſefulneſs of Hiſtory,* 2831. E. ad in. *Does a thing which ought to ſerve for a Model to all Authors,* 2982. A.

Erfort, *The diſſolution of its Univerſity, and the deſtruction of the Inſolent Scholars by the Burgers of the Town,* 1220. a. *The Confeſſion of* Ausburg *and* Hebrew *taught in its Univerſity by Conſent of the Profeſſors, tho' they were all* Roman-Catholicks *but One,* 1123, 1124. in Tex. ad fin.

Eric, *King of* Sweden *dethron'd by his Subjects,* 1387, 1388. C. ad med.

Erpenius, *The Preſent he made to the Emperor of* Morocco, 11116. C.

Errors, *Whether thoſe of the Ancients be more excuſable than thoſe of the Moderns,* 403. a. *A ſervile regard that People have for ſome Errors,* 728. b. *Popular Errors, whether One ought to regulate his Conduct by them,* 523, 524. E. ad med. *Errors in Religion by accident take deeper root when attack'd,* 2366. L. ad fin.

Erudition, *Whether it be in the decline at preſent,* 175. D. *The Picture of a Pretender to Erudition,* 293. E. France *ſeems too much diſguſted at whatever looks like Erudition,* 2937. I. ad. fin.

Eryngium, (*white*) *What's the Vertue of this Plant,* 2585. B.

Eſchylus, *The firſt who chang'd the Burleſque Language, and remov'd Objects of Horror from the Stage,* 1226. b. *What he ſaid when the People preferr'd the Tragedies of* Sophocles *to his,* 1227. b. n. *His Tragedies order'd to be Acted by a publick Decree of the Magiſtrates of* Athens *after the Author's Death,* 1228. b. *His Tomb in* Sicily *viſited by all Tragick Poets,* ibid.

Eteſian, *When the* Eteſian-Winds *began to blow, and upon what Occaſion,* 354. b.

Ethelred, *King of* England, *refuſes to hear the Pope's Miſſionary, except in open Field, and why.* 1461. d. *He's converted to Chriſtianity, and his Example follow'd by moſt of the* Engliſh, ibid.

Ethiopia, *The Country in which the Science of the Stars firſt began,* 1407. in Tex. ad. fin.

Etreè, (Gabriela d') *What ſhe ſaid upon ſeeing the Pictures of two Princeſſes, one of which was to marry* Henry IV. 2923. b.

Etruria, *The ancient Prieſts of this Country attributed two kinds of Thunder to* Jupiter, 2468. a.

Eu (*The Count d'*) *His good and gallant Qualities,* 1984. G. *His Marriage,* ibid.

Evagrius, *What he tells of certain Monks,* 88. E.

Evarige, *King of the* Goths, *a Compariſon between one of his Counſellors and* Apollonius, 299. K.

Eubates, *his Wife erects a Statue to him as a recompenſe for his Fidelity,* 1853. a.

Eubulides, *An Inventor of killing Sophiſms in a ſtrict ſenſe,* 1246. b. 1273. a.

Eucharist, Deſcartes' *Opinion concerning the Accidents of the* Eucharist, *reconcil'd with the Definition of the Council of* Conſtance, 151. a. *The manner of the Preſence of the Body and Blood of* JESUS CHRIST *in the Eucharist has not been defin'd by the* Church of England, 151. D. Beza *Calumniated on this Head,* 616. DD. *Expreſſions of* Calvin *on this Point, which ſeem to admit of a Corporal Preſence,* 1694. a. *The Maintainers of* Tranſubſtantiation *abuſe the Words* Change, Converſion, Tranſ-elementation, 2798. a.

Euclid, *An Inſtance of his great Modeſty,* 596. a. 346. a.

Eucrochia, *got with Child by the Heretick* Priſcillian, *is puniſh'd with Death,* 1705. B.

Eudes, (*Duke of* Aquitain) *Whether the overthrow and expulſion of the* Saracens *out of the* South *Parts of* France, *belongs the moſt juſtly to him or to* Charles Martel, 11. b.

Eudoxia, *ſends privately to* Ginſerick, *conjuring him to come and revenge the Death of* Valentinian, 1901. D.

Eve, *What ſhe meant by giving the Name of* Seth *to one of her Sons,* 18. C. *A Reflection on the ſmall Reſiſtance made by her to the Temptation,* 1251. B. *What Place was the Garden of* Eden *to her,* 1257. b.

Events, *What they ought to do, who reckon up myſterious Events,* 906. B. ad med. *There are ſome Events of which People think much and ſay little,* 887. b. *The moſt conſiderable depend on a Trifle,* 947. b. *It's of the laſt Conſequence to find 'em juſtly rang'd in their Order,* 1170. K. *The principal difference between the Relations of* Proteſtants *and* Catholicks *conſiſts in the ranging the Events in their due order,* ibid. *The Antients had a Saying,* That the Prudence of Man had a leſs ſhare in them, than his good or ill Fortune, 2905. a. *We never judge of Things but by the Event,* 2705. a.

Eugenius IV. *his moving manner of bemoaning the Death of* Ambroſius Cameldubenſis. 826. b. *His Reflection on his Death-bed,* 1259. a. *An odd Anſwer of the Cardinal his Nephew to the Pope's Subjects, who had loſt all their Cattel by an Incurſion of* Philip *Duke of* Milain, 1258, b.

Evidence, *A* Greek *Soldier not permitted to be an Evidence in a Court at* Rome *in his own Mother-Tongue,* 995. b. *Whether it be the Rule and Meaſure of Truth,* 2619 B. ad med.

Evils, *Miſtakes which ariſe from Mens judging of combin'd Evils,* 73. b. *no ſolving the Origin of Evil by Reaſons* apriori, 2486. a. *No neceſſity that the Soul ſhould feel Evil to be able to perceive Good,* ibid. b. *All efforts to reconcile the permiſſion of Evil by reaſon terminate in a begging of the Queſtion,* 2487. b. GOD's *giving Man a Free-will, does not remove the Difficulty,* 2488. b. *How the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtians claſh upon this Point,* 2490. a. b. *What the* Stoicks *anſwer'd when preſs'd upon the Point of the Origin of Evil,* 2491. b. *The* Pythagoreans, *ſaid to be the firſt, who gave riſe to this difficult Queſtion,* 2119. b.

Eumenes, (*King of* Pergamum) *the happy Union between him and his Brothers,* 2523. a. 2524, b.

Eumenius, *A Rhetorician at* Auton *in the Days of* Diocleſian, *his vaſt Salary from that Emperor,* 156. b. 163. a.

Eunuch, *A Compariſon between an Ox and an Eunuch from St.* Baſil, 1008. a. *A Virgin Princeſs's Notion wherein conſiſts the Joy of this World,* 2895. b. *Whether the Women committed to their Care be in ſafety,* 24. a. *What St.* Baſil *thought of it,* 1007. B. *Two ſorts of Eunuchs,* ibid. *Compar'd to Beaſts which have their Horns ſaw'd off, and yet do not forbear to Puſh and Butt,* 1603. a. *Their impotence with regard to Women, is of no conſequence with regard to the other Qualities requiſite to make a great Man,* 1615. a. *May be very brave in their Perſons,* 1627. a.

Eunus, *A Heathen Fanatick, his Device to ſtir up the People to Rebellion,* 499. a.

Euphorbia, *It's Vertues, and by whom found out and nam'd,* 1782. a.

Euphormio, (Barclay's) *damn'd by the Criticks,* 497. a. *which yet did not hinder the Author's being well receiv'd at* Rome, *and having Benefits conferr'd on him for that very Book,* ibid. N. O.

Euphorus, *Whether there has been any Author of this Name,* 1205. a.

Euphrates, *When it ſerv'd as a Boundary to the* Roman *Empire,* 1562. G.

Vol. II. 801. Vol. III. 1111. Vol. IV. 1419.

Evremont, (*Monſieur de St.*) *cenſur'd on his condemning the Method of the Schools, for the proving the Exiſtence of a* GOD *by Natural Reaſons*, 2140. b.

Euripides, *his Limitation of Juſtice*, 103. b. *a Favourer of Tyranny*, 1036. a. *how he might become ſo*, ibid. *Aſſiſted by* Socrates *in compoſing his Tragedies*, 1363. b. *The true reaſon of his being ſeldom or never mention'd by the Latin Poets, when much meaner Greek Poets are*, 1363. b. *Singing his Verſes ſav'd the remains of the* Athenian *Army after their Defeat in* Sicily *under* Nicias, 1364. a. *His Anſwer to One, who twitted him with his ſtinking Breath*, 1365. b. *The* Athenians *ſend an Ambaſſy into* Macedon *to recover his Bones; but are refus'd*, 1366. b. *His Friend* Philemon'*s exceeding Love and Eſteem for him*, 1367. a. *An Action of Impiety brought againſt him, for teaching the Doctrine of Mental Reſervations in Oaths*, 1368. a. *The difference between his Characters and thoſe of* Sophocles, 1365. a. *The energy of one of his Sentences*, 103. G. ad fin. *ſaid, That* GOD *concern'd himſelf with great Affairs, but left ſmaller Matters to Fortune*, 249. a. *The* argumentum ad hominem, *which a Courtezan uſed to him*, 1870. P.

Europe, *The People of* Europe *very ſubject to Drunkenneſs and Debauchery*, 1253. a.

Europeans, *'Twas only by way of Reprizal that they carry'd off the King of* Tyre'*s Daughter*, 1597. a.

Eurymedon, *How puniſh'd by* Jupiter, *and Why*, 1789. a.

Euſebius, *Condemn'd of a baſe piece of Flattery by* Baronius, 1290. b. *His Anſwer to the Parallel of* JESUS CHRIST *and* Apollonius, *but a dry Work*, 1658. b. *Miſtaken in his Chronicle, in ſaying, That* Caſſius *plunder'd the Temple of* Jeruſalem, 877. b. *Hard to be reconcil'd with himſelf as to what he ſays of* Apollonius Tyanæus, 298. b. *What he ſays of* Apollonius Tyanæus *examin'd*, 298. F. ad fin. *He places a Paſſage from* Porphiry *wrong, which he has preſerv'd to us*, 1205. a. *How he refutes the Slanders of* Hierocles *againſt the Chriſtian Religion*, 1660. A. *What he cites from* Phlegon, 2475. a.

Euthymius Zegabeus, *Stories which he tells us of a Stone*, 101. a.

Etropius, *Not over-curious in his Style*, 811. b. *Whether a Paſſage of this Author has been well Tranſlated by the Abbé de* Marolles, 825. b.

Eutichius, *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *of Opinion, That* Cain *and* Abel *fell out about a Miſtreſs*, 81. a.

Example, *They who give an ill Example ought to be ſeverely puniſh'd*, 2034. a. *The Contagion of ill Examples*, Diſſert. xx. a.

Excommunication, *a terrible Evil tho' not ſeconded by the Secular Power*, 74. a. *It's Effects deſcrib'd*, ibid.

Excuſes, *however good they be, 'tis ſtill better to have no occaſion for them*, 1219. b.

Exorciſms, *Exorciſing Sprights and Hobgoblins, of great Antiquity among the Heathens*, 1186. a. *A Form of Exorciſm, by whom compos'd*, ibid. n.

Exorciſts, *A mean and raſcally Imployment among the Pagans*, 1185. B. ad fin. *The manner of Exorciſing among them*, ibid. *What Queſtions the Exorciſts generally put to the Poſſeſs'd*, 1456. M.

Expreſſions, *An inſtance of the Illuſion of ſticking to the firſt Senſe which the Words of an Author convey*, 1051. b. *Some Expreſſions offend altho' they do not ſignify either more or leſs than others which do not offend*, 621. a.

Extenſion, *Whether we have any Idea of a Space extended and immaterial*, 2735. a. *It's compos'd of Parts, every one of which is a particular Subſtance*, 2789. H. 2d Par. *Art.* 1. *Objections againſt its exiſtence*, 3077. F. *Whether there be two ſorts of Extenſion, one Diviſible, Moveable and Impenetrable, the other Indiviſible, Penetrable and Imoveable*, ibid. ad fin.

Extracts, *The Art of making unfaithful Extracts from Books*, 550. b.

Ezekiel, *very near being rejected out of the Canonical Scriptures*, 1230. b. *What a certain Rabbin affirms of his Tomb*, 3024. D. ad med.

FA.

Faber (Tanaquillus) *criticiz'd on his Account of* Anacreon, 111. b. *Is miſtaken about* Euripides'*s Voyage into* Egypt, 1368. b. *See* Fevre.

Fables (*Jewiſh*) *their Right to a Place in this Dictionary*, 499. a. *The Difference between a Fable and a fabulous Narration*, 1331. b. *Criticiſms, proving that the Fables which paſs under* Æſop'*s Name, are none of his*, 1236. a. *Who is the Author and Compiler of them*, ibid. *How* Seneca *could ſay, That the* Romans *had never apply'd themſelves to compoſe Fables*, 1236. b. Fables *which flatter the Vanity of a Nation, not to be attack'd*, 283. *They who oppoſe them reputed Enemies of their Country*, 734. a. *Thoſe of the Ancients are very ill concerted*, 61. E. *None will be diſabus'd as to Fables which turn to their Advantage*, 283. B. in Text. *To whom may be aſcribed the inventing and perfecting of them*, 1235. A. ad fin. *Which are the moſt uſeful of all thoſe of Antiquity*, ibid. H. ad fin. *What Apology* Strabo *makes for* Fables, ibid. ad fin. ibid I. *How* Seneca *could ſay that the* Romans *never apply'd themſelves to the compoſing any* Fables, ibid. M. *They ſhould never be employ'd to the explaining Myſteries of Religion*, 2599. M. ad fin. *A Conjecture on the Origin of antient* Fables, 2838. B. ad fin. *Jewiſh* Fables *with Regard to a falſe Meſſiah*, 499. D.

Fabritius (Caius) *his Reaſon for chooſing* Cornelius Rufinus *General of the* Roman *Army, tho' a Man notoriouſly covetous and rapacious*, 1276. b.

Facility, *There is a real Facility, and a ſeeming Facility in Compoſing*, 1497. G. ad fin. 1144. G. ad fin.

Facts, *How ancient* Facts *came to be falſifyed*, 149. a. *Some of ſuch a Nature, that if they are related as doubtful, they may be pronounc'd falſe*, 51. a. *To be a credible Witneſs of the Truth of certain* Facts, *there needs no more than the Truth of the Relation*, 56. A. ad med. *One Cauſe of their Falſification*, 148, 149. *Whether it be ſufficient in ſome Caſes to deny a* Fact *where an Adverſary has not proved it*, 159. A. *How it comes to paſs that* Facts *are ſo variouſly related*, 236. M. 2d Par. *The Example of relating* Facts *is inſeperable from a great many fatiguing Circumſtances*, 262. B. ad med. *There are important* Facts *which we know only by one ſingle Teſtimony*, 882. G. *There are others, the publiſhing of which offends only becauſe they are true*, 1396. I. *There are others which put to ſilence all Philoſophy*, 912. C. ad med. *We ought in matter of* Fact *to follow the Advice which* Deſcartes *gives with regard to Philoſophical Speculations*, 1447. F. ad fin. *Some* Facts *are rendred Suſpicious only by a Wrong diſpoſing of the Circumſtances, however true they may be in themſelves*, 1463, 1464. *There is ſometimes a great Illuſion in proving* Facts *by the Reaſon of the Thing*, 2644. E. ad fin.

Fæneſſe (*Baron de*) *one of his Adventures pleaſantly related by* D'Aubigne, 813. a.

Faerne, *His* Fables. 2590. D. ad fin.

Faith (*Confeſſion of*) *an Inſtance of the Difficulty of finding Words for a Confeſſion that ſhall not be wreſted and accommodated by an adverſe Party*, 1609. b. Bucer'*s Judgment on this* Theſis, *That we are juſtified by Faith alone*, 740. C. *What it is that makes it become an Act of ſound Religion*, 1135. a.

Falcon-Stone, *A Place in* Scotland, *why ſo called*, 1566. b.

Falſhood, *There are ſeveral Things, the Falſhood whereof is ſufficiently expoſed by barely relating them*, 207. a. *Whether it may appear under the ſame Idea as Truth*, 336. b. *Notorious Falſhoods publiſhed in all Times*, 283. a.

Family, *Men are fond of knowing the* Family *of Great Men*, 104. b.

Families (*Few*) *that are not to be reproach'd with ſome ſcurvy Adventure*, 398. a. *Fabulous Traditions in moſt Great* Families, 1134. A. *Fabulous Genealogies of ſeveral* Families, 2961. G. ad fin. *See Genealogies.*

Fanaticks, *who ran naked about the Streets of* Amſterdam, 87, 88. in Tex. ad fin. *The Danger of* Fanaticks *in a State*, 499. E. *Are of courſe Incendiaries and Boutefeus*, 1009. G. ad fin. *Their latter Projects are ever over-turning their firſt*, ibid. ad fin. *They are*

are touch'd to the Quick when reproach'd with this ſort of Contradictions, ibid. *They are ever attentive to Events, in order to ſquare their Prophecies and Preachings to the News of the* Gazettes, ibid. *They do not loſe a Tittle of their Credit, by proving a thouſand Times abuſed the People,* ibid. I. ad med. *They are never found at a Plunge,* 1150. F. *Their Pertinaciouſneſs and Shifts to ſave their Credit,* ibid. H. *They will never want Partiſans, provided they have the Addreſs to hit the reigning Paſſion,* ibid. in Text. *By what Signs we may know when they are* Fanaticks *in reality,* 1150. T. ad med. *They cannot anſwer for their own Behaviour, and why,* 1172. F. *Are not embarraſs'd by the greateſt Difficulties,* ibid. G. *The XVIIth Century moſt fruitful in this ſort of People,* 1090. C.

Fanaticiſm, *One of it's principal Characters,* 1169. b. *A notable Inſtance of it's deſtroying natural Affection and Tenderneſs in the Soul,* 240. b. *It's prodigious Variety,* 1860, 1861. in Tex. *Its Contagion,* ibid.

Fantoms; *An Account of a* Fantom *that diſturb'd a Houſe,* 179. G. ad fin. *Whether it be not poſſible that they may produce themſelves before us,* 1668. a. *Stories concerning them,* 2672. H. ad fin. *Whether* Spinoza *had any Ground to deny their Exiſtence,* 2796. M. *See Spirits.*

Fardella, *His Logick,* 3078. a.

Farel, *An Inſtance of his wonderful Intrepidity,* 1282. b. C. 2 par. *He's ill us'd by* Eraſmus, ibid. L. *His Marriage,* ibid. I. ad fin.

Farnabius *criticiz'd on Occaſion of an Epigram of his upon* Fulvia, 1417. a. *His fiery Zeal,* 1282. b. *What way the Monks took to hinder the Effect of his Preaching,* 1283. a. *He is repreſented as an ill Man by* Eraſmus, 1282. b. 1286. a.

Farrelists, *A chimerical Sect,* ibid. b.

Fatality, *The* Pagans *annex'd it to certain inanimate Things,* 829. a.

Fate, *The Doctrine of the Stoicks touching* Fate, *which made God the Author of it,* 972. B. ad med. & ad fin. *How they endeavour'd to reconcile it with human Liberty,* ibid. *This Doctrine does not exclude Wiſhing,* 2056. I. *Invectives of the* Pagans *againſt* Fate, 2536. A.

Fate, *Suppos'd capable of being chang'd by a Word in a critical Time,* 809. b.

Fathers; *The Ancient Fathers made no Scruple of defending a good Cauſe by fallacious Arguments.* 1319. b. *Believ'd commonly that* Adam *dy'd in the Place where* Jeruſalem *was afterwards built and was buried in* Golgotha, 81. a. *An Inſtance of their Diſcretion and Regard to Circumſtances when ſpeaking of the* Pagan *Idolatries to the Heathen Emperors,* 272. *wrongfully tax'd with a blind Credulity,* 367. a.

Fatima, *Daughter of* Mahomet, *her Titles and the Prayers addreſs'd to her,* 1288. a.

Faults (*in Authors*) *thoſe to be moſt carefully obſerv'd which are likely to deceive moſt People.*

Fannia; *The Law* Fannia *when enacted in* Rome.

Favour, *What* Regnier *ſays of* Favour, 2302. a. Favourites *graſp at all Offices and Preferments, either for themſelves or their Friends,* 2032. Q. *Their Power over the Modes and Faſhions,* 2695. F. *The People take a Pleaſure in loading the* Favourite *with more Crimes than he is guilty of,* 3015. a.

Favre (Anthony) *his Judgment upon all the great* Civilians *of his time,* 1447. a.

Fauſta, *Her diſſoluteneſs and Impudence,* 2207. a.

Faydit (*Abbot*) *his manner of comforting a great and good Lady under the Calumny of lying with a* Taylor, 2688. b. *After what manner he ſpeaks of the Author of the Memoirs of* M. L. C. D. R. 2628. A. ad med.

Fear *of a Gibbet not ſo ſtrong as the Power of Shame,* 2476. b.

Feaſts, *The prodigious Sumptuouſneſs of a Feaſt made in* Rome *by one of the Commiſſioners of the* Pope's *Revenues,* 967. A. *Another of an extraordinary Expence,* 1237. A. *A Law for reſtraining the exceſſive Expences of Feaſts repealed by* Duzorius, 291. a. *Regulations for moderating the Expence of them* 1348. C. *The ancient* Romans *would not ſuffer Maidens to be preſent at them; and the ancient* Greeks *would not ſuffer even married Women to come to them,* 1936. in Tex. ad med. 195. in Tex. ad fin.

Felix, *Does not go into* Judea *till after the Condemnation of* Cumanus, 1128. B. *Had been the Husband of three Queens,* ibid.

Ferdinand I. *beſieges* Buda, *and his Army is cut in pieces by* Soliman, 1729. in Tex. ad fin.

Ferdinand II. *at his Acceſſion to the Empire, ſees himſelf ſtrip'd of two Kingdoms,* 2025. F.

Feria (*Duke of*) *dies of Grief upon ſome ill Conduct of* Aldringer, 167. B.

Ferrand, *To be pitied for engaging in an Apology for St.* Francis, 1149. G.

Ferrier (*du*) *endeavour'd with Chancellor de* l'Hoſpital *to have* Charles IX *declar'd Head of the* Gallican *Church, and the Church-Lands confiſcated* 1306. a. *What Book he us'd to read at Maſs,* ibid. b.

Ferrier (Pere) *Confeſſor to the King of* France, *is Author of a ſmall Book* de l'opinion probable, 1107. b.

Ferrier (Arnoul) *a famous Profeſſor of the Civil Law at* Toulouſe, 1123. a.

Ferroniere, *Miſtreſs to* Francis I. *pox'd by her Husband to ruine their Intrigue,* 1349. D.

Feuardentius, *Impertinencies of this* Cordelier, 1165. B. ad fin. *His Apology for the Worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin,* 1144. I. ad med. *His Accuſations againſt* Calvin, 2610. a.

Fevre (Madlle *le*) *Underſtood a Paſſage of* Plato *concerning* Prodicus, *better than* Creſolius, 2701. C. ad fin.

Fevre (Tanaquil *le*) *Who are very proper Perſons to judge of his Works,* 152. C. *Cenſur'd on his citing* Plato *and* Herodotus *concerning* Anacreon, 221, 222. B. ad fin. *What he ſays to a Journaliſt,* 371. b. *Gives us a Fragment of* Anecdotes, 553. a. *A Common-place which he makes uſe of,* 604. b. *Criticiz'd by Mr.* Dacier *with little ſucceſs,* 908. C. ad fin. *Wherein he has very well ſhewn the Miſtakes of the Interpreters of* Horace, *with regard to* Catius, ibid. ad med. *He wrongfully pronounces a definitive Sentence upon a Paſſage of* Plutarch *concerning* Critias *and his Atheiſm,* 1079. a. *Cenſures St.* Auguſtine *unjuſtly concerning the Liberties which the Comick Poets gave themſelves,* 2532. ad fin. *He and* Madamoiſelle, *his Daughter, Criticiz'd on the Subject of* Anacreon *and his Contemporaries,* 2672. a.

Ficinius (Marcilius) *What we ought to underſtand by his Commentaries,* 2646. E. ad fin.

Fictions, *The Fictions of the Ancients would be more tolerable, if they did not give themſelves the trouble to contradict one another ſo often,* 61. a.

Filleau, *King's Advocate at* Poitiers, *a fierce Perſecuter of the Proteſtants,* 2425. a. *His ſtrange Relation of a Cabal or Conſpiracy of Deiſts at* Bourg-fountain, 380. F. ad. in.

Finland, *Who was the firſt that tranſlated the New-Teſtament into the Language of this Country,* 118. a.

Fire, *Divination by Fire, who invented it,* 216. b. *From Heaven, ſuppos'd the Mark whereby* Cain *and* Abel *came to know* GOD's *preference of the Oblations of and before thoſe of the other,* 18. b. *The Pagans boaſt of the ſame kind of Marks,* ibid. a. *Gift of walking on live Coals of Fire peculiar to a certain People of* Italy, 1677. a. *Anciently never kindled, but drawn down on the Altars by Prayer,* 1162. b. *Fire Ordeal, a Reflection on that way of Purgation,* 1180. a. *The Pillar of Fire which mov'd by Night before the* Iſraelites, *had nothing common with a Fire which* Timoleon *ſaw in a Dream,* 2889. b. *Who was the firſt Inventer of Divination by Fire,* 228. b. *Tryal by Fire,* 333. a. *A happy Preſage when it kindled of itſelf upon the Altars,* 1163. C. ad med. *Which yet was not always certain,* ibid. *Which are the rareſt Bonfires that can be made to pleaſe the People,* 1554. H. *A Hiſtory of a Perſon, who walked upon red-hot Iron without being burnt,* 1679. A. *Was the Principle of all Things according to* Heraclitus, 2864. C. ad med.

Fire-arms, *ſaid to be firſt put in practice by* Berthold Schauartz, *a* German, 147. b.

Fitz-Simon, (*Jeſuit*) *cited,* 1169. I. *Whether he ever diſputed with* Uſher, 3009. C.

Flaccus, *A Sir-name ſpread over ſeveral Cities of* Italy, 2498. a.

Flames, *Breathing forth real Flames, a Device of the dreadfulleſt Incendiaries,* 499. a.

Flamminius, *had like to have been refus'd a Triumph for not opening the Senate's Letter till after he had routed the Enemy,* 837. E.

Flatterers, Charles V's *Flatterers curtail and enlarge Prophecies to fit 'em to him,* 950. a. *Mind the reality and not an empty Title,* 158. b. *Their Reaſon for not conſulting the* Sibilline *Books,* 442. b.

Flattery, *puniſh'd with Death in the Perſon of an Hiſtorian,* 2885. b.

Flattery, *A ſingular Inſtance of the Flattery of a* Roman

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III. 1551.
Vol. IV. 1439.

man *Senator,* 883. b. *An excellent Means for the avoiding the ſuſpicion of it in Writing the Actions of great Men,* 519. a. *A remarkable Inſtance of it,* 443. a.

Flechier, (*Mr*) *his Deſcription of the Baptiſm of* Rufinus, *Favourite of the Emperor* Theodoſius, *reputed a Maſter-piece,* 1638. a.

Fleece, (*Order of the*) *by whom inſtituted, and when renew'd,* 1369. a.

Flemmings, *Whether their Hiſtorians are partial and prejudic'd,* 344. H. *What* Comines *ſaid of them,* 2012. R. ad fin.

Fleſh and Blood, *Each Sect's aſcribing the Objections made againſt itſelf to this Principle, the ſource of an everlaſting Diſpute,* 544. b.

Fleſh, *A Society founded by the Counteſs of* Guaſtalla, *for gaining the Victory againſt the Fleſh,* 2956. a. *The Means us'd by the Members of this Society,* ibid.

Fleury, (*Abbey of*) *Several good Manuſcripts found there when the Proteſtants ſack'd it,* 705. a. *Some ſold to the Queen of* Sweden, *and others purchas'd under-han for the* Vatican, ibid.

Floral-Games, *After what manner celebrated,* 1118. B. *What paſs'd one Day between the People of* Rome *and* Cato *in the celebrating of theſe Games,* ibid. *When and by whoſe Authority celebrated for the firſt time,* ibid. E. *Where they rais'd wherewith to defray the Expence of them,* ibid. F.

Floron, (*A Spirit of the Order of Cherubims*) *what he anſwer'd when ask'd, What the Spots in the Moon were?* 984. X.

Florus, *cenſur'd for a groſs Fault which is not obſerv'd in the* Variorum *of* Holland, 736. A. *Is miſtaken in his Geography with regard to the Town of* Heraclea, 2562. a.

Foe, *The Founder of a Sect among the* Chineſe, 2784. a.

Fœtus, *It's Formation is the moſt exquiſite Workmanſhip of an Intelligence,* 247. b.

Foix, (Paul *de*) *why he refus'd to ſee* Francis Patricius *of* Ferrara, 388. a.

Foix, (Gaſton *de*) *A true Thunder-bolt of VVar,* 2005. a.

Folembrai, *A Royal-Seat built by* Francis I. *of* France, *burnt by whom, and for what Reaſon,* 1698. a.

Folly, *There's a ſpice of Folly always enters into the Compoſition of great Wits,* 856. T. ad fin. *Its Elogy by* Eraſmus, *very well receiv'd by the Publick, and eſpecially by the People of Quality,* 1215. K. *It has been re-printed about an hundred times,* ibid. *It is the higheſt VViſdom ſometimes to counterfeit it,* 2910. a.

Follies, *The Hiſtory of Mens Follies and extravagant Cuſtoms and Uſages, not without its Benefit,* 642. a.

Fondi, *Beſieg'd and taken by Aſſault by* Barbaroſſa *King of* Algiers, 1438. a.

Fontaine, (*la*) *cited on the Jealouſy of Siſters,* 1128. A. *Makes a Sophiſm in defence of his VVorks,* 1495. *He is Criticiz'd on occaſion of the Life of* Æſop *given by* Planudes, 1232. A. *He has not concerted the Relations in his Hiſtorical VVork, ſo well as* Madle Scuders *has done in a Romance,* ibid. C. *He might have ſucceeded better in the Story which concerns the tranſlation which* Socrates *had given of* Æſop's *Fables,* ibid. D. *VVho they are whom he acknowledges to be his Maſters,* 2004. L.

Fontevraud, *The great Merits of an Abbeſs of this Abbey,* 1330. M△.

Fools, *How wiſe Men come to get Fools to their Children,* 1341. a. *Men often avoid being deceiv'd by being errand Fools,* 102. a. *People who often counterfeited the Fool,* 328. K.

Forbes, 1920.

Forbes (William) *his Expreſſion about* Luther *and* Calvin, 1332. a. *Alledg'd wrongfully by le* Fevre *in his Diſpute againſt Mr* Arnaud, 1333. a.

Force, (James *de la*) *How preſerv'd at the Maſſacre of St.* Bartholomew, 1409. a.

Forgeries, *Not enforc'd by publick Authority now, as in the Reign and by the Councils of* Charles V. 1351.

Forms, (*Subſtantial*) *A reflection on this Doctrine,* 806. D. ad med. *Inexplicable Difficulties in this Doctrine,* 1437. a. *Into how many Abſurdities it leads thoſe who maintain it,* 2259. a. *Pernicious Conſequences that may be drawn from it,* 3061. a.

Formularies, *A hard Matter to draw up a Formulary thac cuts off all grounds of Diſpute,* 1514. a.

Fornication, *rewarded inſtead of being puniſh'd, in ſome Towns of* Germany, 147. a. *The Command againſt it in the Decalogue, how expounded,* 801. a. *VVhether the Magiſtrate has a right to puniſh it,* 176. A△△△. *The toleration which this Vice meets with,* ibid. ad med.

Fortune, *One muſt not abuſe it's Favours,* 56. b. *People procure its Favours by unlawful Ways, oftner than by lawful,* 178. C. *Artifices to make a Fortune,* 223. a. *People are apt to run down the Birth of thoſe to the loweſt degree, whom ſhe raiſes to high Dignities,* 297. a. *People often complain wrongfully of what they call her Caprices,* 578. b. *The Syſtem of the Atheiſts is inconſiſtent with the Notion of ſuch a Being,* 962. a. *She reſembles Women in this, that ſhe loves the Young better than the Old,* 973. a. Scioppius *acts the Divine on this Point very ridiculouſly,* ibid. *Does not take it ill to have her Favours raviſh'd from her,* 1203. a. *Is never ſo much honour'd as when curs'd and reviled,* 1675. a. *She's a Goddeſs that has among her Worſhippers ſome elect and others reprobated,* 2395. a. *How a Body ought to carry himſelf to her,* ibid. *Complaints againſt her,* 2460. C. *The Sacrifice which the* Roman *Ladies made to her,* 2725. a. *What the Ancients ſaid of her Influence,* 1892. K.

Whether ſhe favours ſome Perſons independently of their Imprudence, ibid. K. & ſeq. *It's a hard matter to know what ſhe is,* 2895. *The Idea which the* Pagans *form'd of her,* ibid. *We often impute to her what we ought to impute to our meer Imprudence,* ibid. *The Man who is unfortunate through his Imprudence, has as much right to complain of Fortune, as an unfortunate Man who has done his Duty,* 2896. a. b. *Men often impute to Fortune what is wholly owing to their own Imprudence,* 2895. b. *Whether ſhe favours ſome Men independently of their Prudence, and perſecutes others independently of their Imprudence,* 2893. a. b. 2894. a. b. 2895. a. b. *What the Ancients have ſaid of her Influence,* 2892. a. b. *Acquitted from an unjuſt Imputation, and a true Reaſon aſſign'd of the depreſſing ſome Men of the brighteſt Parts* *A Goddeſs who has among her Worſhippers ſome elect and ſome reprobate, without owing any thing to their own Conduct,* 2445. b. *The Honours paid her as a Goddeſs,* 1646. b.

Fortune-Tellers, *The Prediction of a* Fortune-Teller *notably accompliſh'd* 1426. b.

Forum; *There was a time when Perſons could not have their Statues erected in the* Forum, *without a ſpecial Privilege,* 836. D.

Foucher, *A Canon of* Dijon *cited,* 875. b.

Fountains, *The Devotions paid to them, very ancient among the Heathens, and a healing Virtue aſcribed to them,* 215. b. *Of a ſingular Property,* 1822. B B. 1828. L.

Fowls, *Who were the firſt that fatted and cramm'd them,* 1280. C. 2d Part.

France, *A Miſtake to ſay that the* Engliſh *conquer'd the greateſt part of* France, 961. a. *Whether the Meeting of the States-General would be a real Advantage to* France, 2190. a. *The Aſcendant of the Genius of* Spain *over that of* France *in the Reigns of* Lewis XII, *and* Alphonſo *the* I *of* Naples, 2329. a. *Leagues againſt* France *hard to be diſſolv'd,* 2329. b. *States-General of* France *refuſe to conſent to an Alienation of any part of the Crown-Lands, at the Requeſt of* Henry III, *and why,* 1625. b. *Whether properly tributary to* Edward IV. 1157. a. *Accus'd by the Pope and by* Charles V. *of entring into an Alliance with the* Turk *againſt the Chriſtian Powers,* 315. b. *Its Prelates have not the Liberty of propoſing what they pleaſe in their Aſſemblies,* 125. C. *The Stock from whence the Kings of* France *are deſcended according to ſome* 416. B. *Has been plagu'd with ſeditious Preachers,* 690, 691. in Tex. *Its Conſtitution heretofore much reſembled that of* Germany, 775, 776. B. ad fin. *The Court of* France *ſends Diſpatches to the States-General, recommending to them the Intereſts of the Houſe of* Orange, 726. E. *Kings of* France *heretofore were not reputed at Age till full 21 Years,* 902, 903. in Tex. ad in. France *trick'd and ſhamefully betray'd in a Treaty of Peace,* 942, 943. & ſeq. in Tex. ad fin. *It's Monarchy within a hair's breadth of Ruine by the Houſe of* Burgundy, 960. B. *Reſpects and practiſes the old Maxim,* Divide & Impera, 1439. a. *It's Laws do not permit the King to marry a Baſtard,* 1987. a. *Makes a Peace rather advantageous than glorious with* England, 1990. b. *Was loaded with more Impoſts under* Lewis XI. *than ever it had been under any of his Predeceſſors,* 1999. a. *Why it's Subjects are more enſlav'd and more quiet at this time than ever heretofore,* 2021. A. *The Scandal it is to the*

Court

Court of France to ſtand in need of the Pope's Bull, for confirming of Biſhops, 2155. a. There is hardly a Word of Truth in what is ſaid of it's Kings before the Days of Clovis, 2981. A. ad fin in marg. Power of the Parliaments of France in rejecting the Edicts of their Kings, moſt pernicious to the State, 1714. a.

Francis (St.) his Wife and Family, 1340. b. Ferrand to be pitied for engaging in the Defence of St. Francis, 1349. G.

Francis I. His Royal Seat of Folembrai, by whom burnt, and for what Reaſon, 1698. a.

A Judgment on the Hiſtories which had been wrote upon him in his own Life, and in that of his Son, 1549. a. Grew ill-humour'd as he grew old, 1605. a. Was very unhappy in the Choice of his Miniſters, ibid. Reliſhes Marott's Pſalms, 2004. M. ad in. 1007. O. ad med. Invites Melancton into France, 2027. F. Leaves his Curſe to his Children in caſe they do not revenge him, 1349. R. The Calumnies deſign'd to blacken him, ibid. Is ill uſ'd by his Mother, 1549. F. The wiſe Counteſs that was given him before he came to be King, 1349. C. ad in. His Amours with the Counſels of Chateau Briand, 960. C. His Murmurs againſt Providence, 1349. E. He ſends to one of his Miſtreſſes for ſome Jewels he had preſented, and having received them, melted up in Barrs, he returns them to her, and applauds her Conduct, 1007. Meets with an ill Return for all his favouring the Amours of Harry VIII. 944. G. ad med. His Soul goes ſtraight to Hell without ſtopping at Purgatory, 896. His Indignation at the reading a Paſſage in Dante, 876. b. The Slight he made uſe of to gain the Friendſhip of the Proteſtants, 815. E. ad fin. He takes a Progreſs to the Coaſt of Normandy for freſh Air, 997. a. Harrangu'd off hand by Alciatus, 158. G. Whether he ever aſk'd what an Ariſtotelian Philoſopher meant, 624. B. His generous Conduct towards Charles V. 994. b. It's an Illuſion to think he deſerves Praiſe for not attempting againſt the Emperor's Liberty, ibid. Said he never knew any learned Man whoſe Learning he had not exhauſted in two Years, except Caſtellan, 879. Had like to ſend Ramus to the Gallies for his Inſolence to Ariſtotle, 624. a.

How light he made of Admiral Bonnivet his Favourite's attempting to raviſh his Siſter Margaret of Valois, 2339. a. Why the Spaniſh Hiſtorians affect to cry him up, 1347. b. By whoſe Advice he forbore lying with Mary of England, Queen, to his Uncle Lewis XII. 1348. a. b. Like to have been put by the Crown of France by the ſame Mary's impoſing a ſuppoſed Child, 1344. a. How pox'd by the Husband of one of his Miſtreſſes, 1349. a. His Murmurs againſt Providence, ibid. b. The horrid Calumnies againſt him, 1350. b. 1351. a. b. The Form of a moſt wicked Oath pretended to be ſworn by him to Solyman II. upon a Treaty of Alliance, 1351. b. The Curſe he gave his Children unleſs they were reveng'd on Charles V. 1355. b. His way of currying Favour with the Proteſtants of Germany, 815. a. His Indignation at the Poet Dante's making Hugh Capet the Son of a Butcher, 840. b.

Francis II. had abſolutely deſtroy'd the Reformation in France, if he had lived a little longer, 1617. N.

Franciſcans, At a hard plunge about the Book of Conformity of the Life of their St. Francis with that of J. Chriſt, 1344. b. Do not obſerve their Rules, 1346. a. Their extravagancies in their Sermons about their Founder, ibid. b.

Frangipani, an Italian Family, boaſts that the Houſe of Auſtria is deſcended from a younger Brother of theirs, 1358. b. When they ſettled in Hungary, 1359. a.

Fratricelli, Their nightly promiſcuous Embraces of Men and Women how detected, 1562. a.

Frauds (pious) 560. E. ad in. 599. I. 612. O. ibid. AA. 742. H.

Free-will, the Difficulties of reconciling it with Fate and Providence have their Key in another State, 165. The Characters of thoſe who are apt to doubt they have Free-will, 1596. a.

Fregoſa, Envoy of France murder'd, and falſe Inſtructions imputed to him, 1397. a.

French, are forced to capitulate at Leith, and for ever to depart out of Scotland, 722. ad fin. Render'd themſelves odious there, ibid. Are driven out of Italy, 1906. I. Keep a mighty ſtir about the part which they had in the Battle of Raab, 1927. B. ad fin. Their Folly in Oppoſition to the Wiſdom of the Venetians, 2020. N. They are very far from idolizing their Monarchs ſo much as People imagine, 2021. A.

Friends, a Reaſon for excuſing Faults in our Friends, 478. a.

Friendſhip, not proof againſt the Devil of Uncleanneſs, 865. a. A high Inſtance of it in Philemon the Friend of Euripides, 1367. a.

Friſchman (Mr.) his piece concerning Cavalier Borri, recommended to be read, 685. What is ſaid in it of Borri's Eſſay towards a Reſurrection by Fire, ibid. b.

Froila King of Aſturias, whether his VVife was Daughter to Eudes Duke of Aquitaine, 2274. b.

Frontevaux, Its Monks and Nuns have a VVoman for their Head and General, 1325. b. An Apology for it, 1326. a.

Fryars, An Apology for 'em by Cardinal D'ailly, call'd the Buckler of Poverty, 132. a. The good Offices they do one another, 1347. a.

Fumbling, Its Signification, 2445. b. VVhere and by whom, and upon whom moſt practis'd, 2446. b.

Future State (A) aſſerted by a Perſon's appearing after Death according to promiſe, 668. b.

G A B.

GAbalis (Comte de) Whether it be the Original of the Chiave del Gabinetto, or this the Original of that, 684. a.

Gabriela d'Eſtree, The Diſguiſe Hen. IV. made uſe of to ſpeak to her, 1632. a.

Galba, His way of honouring a Malefactor who pleaded the Rights of a Roman Citizen, 456. a.

Galeazo (John) Duke of Milan, the Wickedneſs and Cruelty of his Uncle Lewis Sforza to him, 312. b. 313. b. A moving Deſcription of an Interview between him and Lewis XII. when the latter invaded Italy, 313. b. ſaid to have died of over-careſſing his beautiful Dutcheſs, ibid.

Gallatius (Tarquin) the Character of his Eloquence from Balzac, 1379. b.

Galliots, By whom firſt uſed, 2658.

Gaming, A fearful Inſtance of its Witchcraft, 538. b.

Games (Olympick) VVomen forbid to ſee them on pain of preſent Death, the Reaſon, 586. b.

Gammut, A Term in Muſick, by whom firſt invented, 336.

Garaſſe (Pere) His charging Beza with an Attempt of ſubſtituting a Negative to the VVords of Conſecration at the Conference of Poiſſy, diſprov'd by Catholick Authors, 616. b. 617. a. b.

Gaſſendus, His juſt Character 910. a.

Gauls, Their greateſt Obſtacle to the embracing Chriſtianity, and how remov'd, 1684. b.

Gaza (Theodore) burns his Tranſlation of Ariſtotle's Phyſicks and Morals out of meer Generoſity, for fear it ſhould prejudice the Tranſlation of them by his Friend Argyropylus, 343.

Gazetts, The Catholick Princes ſhould not ſuffer the Devotions and Prayers for a happy Campaign, to be publiſh'd in their Gazetts, the Reaſon of this, 128. a. The Publick deceived by falſe News long before the Invention of the Gazette, 102.

Geloſi, A Company of Players in Italy about the Beginning of the XVII Century, who acquir'd a ſurpriſing Reputation, 257. a.

Genealogiſts, Their Impudence and bold Undertakings, 2961. a. b. An Inſtance of a Spaniſh Genealogiſt, ibid. Genealogiſts derive Cardinal Mazarin's Family from the ancient Roman Conſuls, T. Geganius Macerinus, Proculus Geganius Macerinus, &c. 2962. a.

Genealogies, The VVeakneſs of St. Jerom and other primitive Fathers of the Church with regard to Genealogies and Pedigrees, 2962. a. The Accounts of 'em render'd obſcure by Grammatical Faults, 712. b.

Generals, Moſt ſecure by ſpreading a ſincere report of their Deſign, 102. a. Generals of Armies love to protract a VVar, 927. b. The Romans chang'd their Generals almoſt every Year, ibid. The good Policy of this, ibid. Some great Generals have on their Deathbed dreaded the Juſtice of God, on Account of the Blood ſhed by them in religious VVars, which yet they had thought moſt juſt, 930.

Generation, Neither Generation nor Death, properly ſpeaking, in Nature, 2611. a.

Vol. II. 801 Geneva, (the Magiſtrates of) tax'd with Indiſcretion on their Silence, when John Calvin was accuſed of an execrable Crime, 801. Some Perſons who were Anabaptiſts, have found a place in the Martyrology of Geneva, 541 b. Divines of Geneva cenſur'd as if they had introduc'd the Fatality of the Stoicks, 2419 a.

Vol. III. 1141

Vol. IV. 2419

Genii, The Doctrine of the Heathens concerning them, 807. a. The Aſcendant which the Genius of Auguſtus had over Mark Anthony's, ibid. Every Man's Genius forms its own Body, a Doctrine of the Cainites reconcilable to that of the Platoniſts, 807. a.

Gennadius, firſt Patriarch of Conſtantinople after its Conqueſt by the Turks. The Ceremony of his Elevation and Inſtalment by Mahomet II. 1116. a.

Generoſity, All Thoughts of it deſtroy'd by Love, 865. a.

Genoa, Exorbitancy of the Nuns there, 692, a.

Geometry, Requir'd by an Inſcription on the Doors of ſome ancient Greek Schools, as a neceſſary Qualification for Admittance, 1259. b.

George (St) How painted by the Greeks, 963.

Gerard, The Example which encourag'd him to aſſaſſinate William Prince of Orange, 1785. a.

Germain, (St) a remarkable Trial of Skill between St. Martin and him, 843. b.

Germans, put the very Hour of a Perſon's Birth in their Elogies, 938. b. The hard Condition on which Julius II. allow'd 'em to eat Fleſh on St. Martin's Day, 1791. b.

Germany, The Occaſion of the VVar which laid it waſte from 1618, to the Peace of Munſter, 132. b. VVho was the ancienteſt Hiſtorian of this Nation, 1161. A good Jeſt of Julius II. upon the Germans, 1791. b.

Gift (New-Year's) of what kind made to the Footmen of a Great Miniſter, 1584. a.

Gifts, variouſly diſtributed, ſome fall to one Soul, and ſome to another, 2686. V. ad fin.

Girls, The Difference between Italian and Flemiſh Girls, 2524. a.

Glaſs, Inſtead of it they uſe a Stone as hard as Marble and tranſparent in Cappadocia, 845. b.

Glory, A refin'd Deſire of Glory the Principle of condemning Riches, 106. b.

Gluttony, A School of Gluttony kept at Rome, 289.

Gnoſticks, Charg'd with many things they never allowed as part of their Belief, 808. a. How they might be led into their Impieties, ibid.

Goa (Vice-Roy of) aſſiſts the Miſſionaries in their Converſion of the Brachmans, by decrees of Confiſcation, 2103. b.

Goats, The Reaſon of the Maſſacre of the Goats in ſome part of France, 520. b.

GOD, The Tetragrammaton-Name, 192, 193. G. Has the Idea's of infinite different VVorlds, but perfectly regular, 253. b. Not to know him is a leſs evil than to attribute to him what the Gentiles attributed to their Gods, 327. a. VVhether the Incomprehenſibility of his Nature ought to make People neglect his VVorſhip, 375. C. ad fin. His Preſcience far from deſtroying, eſtabliſhes the Liberty of the Creature, 509. A. ad fin. A bold blaſphemous Criticiſm of his VVorks, 901. H. How the Author of the Criticiſm was puniſh'd, ibid. One may believe in God, and yet be perſwaded that Shame is founded only upon poſitive Laws, 1105. N. ad in. The Objections made againſt his Exiſtence, are not able to perſwade that he does not exiſt, ibid. To what degree has his Glory been proſtituted by the Poets of Paganiſm, 1097. b. The perfect Love of God is that of loving him for his own ſake, 1217. a. In what Senſe it may be ſaid that he's ſubject to Laws 1649. b. They who deny his Exiſtence have leſs Right to reject Magick and Genii than others, 1681. N. ad in. The great Efficacy of his VVord, 1769. a. His Spirituality proved, 1924. E. ad fin. The Belief of his Exiſtence, without the Belief of his Providence, cannot be either a Motive to Virtue, or a Reſtraint from Vice, 2025. a. The Anſwer made to a Prince who ask'd a Definition of God, 2735. a. As ſoon as he declares a new Doctrine to Men, the Devil oppoſes it, 2109. HH. It has always been lawful, and even neceſſary to prove his Exiſtence, 1139. L. ad med. It's infinitely more advantagious to believe there is a God, than to believe there is not, 2471. ad med. The Deſire of diſculpating the Divinity, has obliged the Theologiſts to turn their Thoughts an hundred different ways, 2493. I. ad med. Whether the Doctrine which would make him the Author of Sin, would neceſſarily lead to Atheiſm, ibid. That Syſtem which places him in the higheſt degree of Elevation and Glory, ought to be preferred to all others, 2456. a. He makes himſelf known to Men by oppoſite Methods, 2458. a. An Examination of what is uſually ſaid, that we muſt not meaſure his Privileges and Obligations by the Line of ours, 2619. B. ad fin. VVhether it be as eaſie for him to create a new Soul every Moment, as to produce it, 2518. b. He alone is truly wiſe, 2636. N. It is not ſafe to diſcourſe his Nature in the Preſence of thoſe who want Underſtanding, ibid. How we may reſemble him, ibid. VVhether the Conſequence be juſt from the Exiſtence of God to that of Demons, 2639. a. A Reflexion on the Incomprehenſibility of his Nature, 2646. b. Facts ſhewing that it's lawful for the Orthodox to diſpute about Arguments for his Exiſtence, 3064. ad fin. Two things naturally oppoſite, the Power of doing much Miſchief, and the Exerciſe of it on one hand, and the doing of a great deal of good on the other, naturally lead Men to the ſame thought, to wit, the Acknowledgment of a God, 2535. I. ad med. A remarkable Inſtance of this in the Americans taking ſome the Spainards, and others the Engliſh for Gods, ibid. The Belief of God's Exiſtence without the Belief of a Providence is alledg'd by the Siameſe, as an Inſtance of an Inducement to Virtue, 2764. a. b. God not able to form the VVorld without the Concourſe of uncreated Matter, how confuted, and by whom, 1660. a.

God, An Univerſity in Germany, like to have been ſuppreſs'd by it's Founder, becauſe 'twas made a Problem in a Metaphyſical Lecture, Whether there was a God or no, 2140. a. The Belief of the Plurality of God's accounted for among the Heathens, 807. b. How the Greatneſs of God may be perceiv'd, 357. b. Des Cartes's fam'd Argument for the Exiſtence of a God, viz. That the Idea of the moſt perfect Being includes Exiſtence, ſhewn to have been St. Anſelm's thought in the 11th Century, 269. b. Confuted by Thomas Aquinas of old, 270. a. u. By which of the Heathen Philoſophers firſt acknowledg'd to be the Author of the Order and Symmetry of the Parts of the World, 229. b. Some believe the Exiſtence of Spirits and Immortality of the Soul without acknowledging a God. 2634. a.

Goddeſs, Men who happened to lie with a Goddeſs, liv'd but a ſhort time after, according to an ancient Heathen Tradition 246. a.

Gods, Their Loves, 352. A. (TΔ) ad. in. The Pagans accuſed them of leading them into the Commiſſion of Evil, 1595. Great Philoſophers have aſſign'd for Authors of their Being Things which are not God, 1826. G. Others have deprived them of Life and Knowledge, ibid. M. N.

Good, Whether it ſurpaſſes Evil in the Nature of things, 3049. b.

Golden Number by whom invented, 1580. b.

Goods, Whether a Community of Goods be better than Property, 1186. b.

Gooſe (A) paſſionately in love with a beautiful Youth, 220. b.

Gothick Characters, when chang'd in France for the Roman, 463. b.

Goths, The Hiſtory of the Goths by Leonard Aretin, is only a Tranſlation from the Greek of Procopius, 337.

Government, Mr. Paſchal's Notions about it, 2468. a.

Grace (Univerſal) The Doctrine of the greateſt reformed Divines of France, 104. b. How it diſcovers itſelf in great Wits, and how in ordinary Wits, 2466. b. The Doctrine of Grace a Sea without Bounds and Bottom, 1784. a. The Inamiſſibility of Grace a ſettled Doctrine of the Calviniſts, 1332, b.

Gratian (Balthaſar) his Works complain'd of by two ſorts of Readers very much to his Glory, 2443. a.

Grammar (Donatus's) on Vellum, and another Book call'd Confeſſorialia were the firſt Books printed by John Fauſt Citizen of Mentz, and Inventer of that Art, in the Year, 1456. 53. a. 53. b.

Grammarians, *Poets and Rhetoricians invited by* Corvinus *King of* Hungary *to his Court, only to make them beg their Way home*, 670. a.

Grammont (*Mareſchal*) *loſt the Battle of* Honnecour *to favour Cardinal* Richlieu's *declining Affairs*, 1323. b.

Grand Signior, *In which of the* Ottoman *Race did this Title begin*, 1113. a.

Gratitude, *All Sentiments of it deſtroy'd by Love*, 865. a.

Great Men, *Nothing has been the Subject of more falſe Reports than the Sickneſs and Death of them*, 68. a.

Great Ladies *favour Muſicians more than all other Profeſſions of the ſame Rank put together*, 1398. a.

Greece, *infamous for falſe Witneſſes, a common Saying on that Occaſion*, 845. b.

Græcum eſt non poteſt legi, *the Original of it*, 51. a.

Greek Tongue, *thought to be in Danger of being ſoon loſt in the Days of* Plutarch, 996. a. *When the* Latin *Tongue began clearly to gain Ground of the* Greek, 996. b.

Greeks, *A Preſumption of their knowing but late what concern'd the Weſtern Nations*, 1183. a.

Greek *Philoſophers ſeeming ignorant of the Exiſtence of a God, very ingeniouſly accounted for*, 231. a.

Greek Poets, *Several of them buried and deſtroyed at the Inſtigation of the Primitive Chriſtian Clergy*, 1359.

Greek Profeſſorſhip (*Vacancy of the*) *at* Venice, *notify'd by Sound of Trumpet*, 162. a.

Greek Prieſts, *A Jeſt of the* Romiſh *Prieſts on them upon a pretended Anniverſary Miracle*, 1162. b. a.

Greek *Entertainments always ended with* Hercules's *Bowl*, 1645. a.

Gregory IX. *a Commentary on his Decretals, by* John Andreas, *entituled*, Novella, 255.

Grinding, *What it ſignifies in Scripture*, 2666. b.

Grotius *cenſur'd by a* Calviniſt *Miniſter, for not ſpeaking cautiouſly enough of the Right of Kings, nor carrying the Prerogative of Monarchy high enough*, 2173. b. *Said to have ſtolen his Treatiſe* De veritate Chriſtianæ Religionis, *and from whom*, 1611. b.

Guicciardine, *A Diſcourſe in him concerning the Manner how the Popes came to be Temporal Lords of* Italy *left out of his fourth Book, where now to be found*, 1791. b. *He is cenſur'd even by* Montagne *for attributing to ill Motives all the Actions related in his Hiſtory*, 1679. a.

Guitmond, *A Monk, the true Author of* 3 *Books*, De veritate Corporis Chriſti in Euchariſtia, adverſus Berengarium, 336. a.

Guilt, *Diſcovered by Silence*, 603. b.

Guiſe (*Duke de*) *his bold and vehement Remonſtrances to* Henry II. *againſt a Peace advantageous to* France, 1613. b.

Guſtavus Adolphus, *his Convention of the* Lutherans *and* Calviniſts *at* Leipſick, *in order to a Reunion, by whom fruſtrated*, 1685. b. *His Diverſions amongſt his Colonels and Captains*, 714. a.

H A.

HABIT *of Philoſophers when firſt left off in the* Roman *Empire*, 1775. a.

Hadrian's *Market, where and whence ſo called*, 499. b. *Equall'd to* Nebuchadnezzar *in a Hymn of the Jewiſh Ritual, and look'd upon as a greater Scourge than* Veſpaſian *or* Titus, 500. b. *The Names he gave the ſeveral Apartments of his fine Palace of* Tibur, 1555. a. Severian's *bitter Curſe accompliſh'd upon him*, ibid. b. *Why he got his Freed-man* Phlegon *to father the Hiſtory of his Life written by himſelf*, 1556. a. *His exceſſive Curioſity in prying into the Affairs of private Females*, ibid. b. *Travell'd always on Foot, and never cover'd his Head in any Weather*, 1557. a. *His unbridled Paſſion for* Antinous, *and extravagant Grief upon his Death*, 575. a. b.

Hadrian IV, *His Scrupulouſneſs with regard to Poetic Fictions ſo great, that he would not look at the fine* Laocoon *in* Rome, 1558. b. *Too much a Moraliſt to make a good Pope*, 1562. a. *Never chang'd his Opinion after his Elevation, That a Pope may err in Matters of Faith*, 1563. a. *The Cardinals like to be ſtoned for electing him*, 1561. a. *Suppreſſed the Penſions of learned Men from a ſordid Oeconomy*, 1563. b.

Hair, *The Loſs of it prejudicial to Beauty*, 1579. b. *A Man who had the Faculty of moving his Hair without moving his Hand or Head*, 1646. a.

Hali, *Eunuch and General of* Solyman, *his Behaviour to the Meſſenger, who in a mighty fright brought him the News of the Loſs of* Gran, 1631. a. *His ſtrange Figure from* Thuanus, ibid. n.

Hands, *The Cauſe of Man's Wiſdom, according to* Anaxagoras, 230. b.

Hangings, *When firſt made uſe of in ancient* Rome, 2526. a. *embroider'd* Hangings, *by whom invented*, ibid. b.

Hannibal, *deſpiſed the Painter who drew him with two Eyes, and rewarded him, who drew him in profil*, 519. b. *The excellent Moral of this*, ibid. *His Stratagem in a Sea-fight againſt* Eumenes *King of* Pergamum, 2525. a.

Hanno, *condemn'd by the* Carthaginians *as dangerous to the publick Liberty, becauſe he tam'd a Lyon*, 1579. b.

Happineſs, *Which is the higheſt pitch of it*, 1927. a. *In what Senſe is Pleaſure ſaid to be the* ſummum bonum, *or* Happineſs *of Man*, 1190. b.

Hardingberg, *The ridiculous manner of Electing its Burgomaſter, from* Huetius, *deſcrib'd in* Latin *Verſe*, 642. b.

Harmony, *The Syſtem of a pre-eſtabliſh'd* Harmony *between the Soul and Body of Animals examin'd and diſcuſs'd*, 2615. a. b.

Hatred, *What kind of it the State requires from the People againſt its Enemies*. 525. a. *That of Siſters greater than that of Brothers*, 591. b.

Hay, (Alexander) *a* Scotch *Jeſuit, dy'd of eating peel'd Barly not well boyl'd, and for what Crime*, 1567. b.

Hear-ſay, *In what Caſes it is lawful for an Author to report a* Hear-ſay, 475. a.

Heart, *It is not lawful to examine the* Heart, *or dive into the Intention, where an Action is good in itſelf. The* Heart *turn'd againſt* GOD *and the Magiſtrate by Phanaticiſm, a remarkable Inſtance of it*, 1552. a.

Heathens, *Believe the Deities envious at the Proſperity of Mankind*, 836. a. *Their Sacrifices, when they ceas'd, and under what Emperor*, 1775. a. *They refus'd a Funeral-Pile to thoſe, who kill'd themſelves*, 128. b. *They had a Glimpſe of the Incarnation*, 365. a. *They had no Notion of Juſtice*, 862. b.

Heavens, *The number of them according to* Abelard, 585. a. *An Objection againſt their Motion*, 640. b.

Hebrew, *Where firſt Printed, and when*, 666. *The ſpace of time in which the* Hebrew *Text of the Bible was alter'd*, 138. a. *The reaſon of its alteration*, ibid.

Heidelberg, *Ruin'd for being againſt the Emperor, and for being faithful to him*, 2458. a. *Sack'd by Count* Tilly *in* April 23. ad 1620. 2472. *An Evangelical Jubilee celebrated in* Heidelberg *in* 1617. *for their Deliverance from Popery a Hundred Years before*, 245. b.

Hell, *The Eternity of* Hell-Torments *cloſes with Reaſon, and with the Ideas of Infinite Goodneſs*, 2760. b.

Helena, (*of* Troy) *a* Spaniſh *Monk, too particular in deſcribing her Beauty*, 1587. a. *A Secret about her Death*, 1589. b. *Her excuſe, that ſhe was Fated to love* Paris, 1590. a. 1595. b. *What diſarm'd her Husband juſt as he was going to kill her*, 1589. b. *Thought improbable by ſome, that ſhe ſhould ever be carry'd to* Troy, 1591. a.

Helenion, *An Herb, its Original and Vertues*, 1589. a.

Hellebore,

Vol. II. [illegible]
Vol. III. [illegible]
Vol. IV. [illegible]

Hellebore, *taken by the Antient Philoſophers to purge the Brain, and quicken the Wit*, 863. a.

Heloiſa, *chooſes to be Miſtreſs, rather than Wife of* Peter Abelard, 1603. a. b. 1604. *Her fine Deſcription in* Latin *of the obſtinacy of her Love for him*, 1603. a.

Helvicus, *In what Point his Chronological-Tables judg'd moſt defective*, 1607. a.

Henry, II. *of* England, *inſolently treated by* Heraclius, *Patriarch of* Jeruſalem *in an Aſſembly of the* Engliſh *Clergy*, 1643. a. b.

Henry, II. *of* France, *his Perfidiouſneſs in ſeizing* Metz *very proſperous*, 951. a. *Aſſumes the Title of* Protector of the German Liberty, 1610. a. *His Stratagem to get a young* Italian *Lady to his Bed*, 1679. b. *Condeſcends to be examin'd Judicially upon Interrogatories in a Law-ſuit between his Father's Concubine and her Husband.*

By a Law of his, in what Caſe Mothers are reputed to Murder their own Children, 2478. b. *The behaviour of a young* Scotch *Lady upon finding herſelf with Child by him*, 1619. b. *The inſolent Behaviour of the Duke of* Nevers *to him, from a regard to the Glory of* France, 1615. b.

Henry, III. *of* France, *his Indiſcretion in diſcovering ſome Imperfections of a certain Lady, did him much prejudice*, 812. b. *Turns Catechiſt to the wicked and rebellious Divines of* Paris, 696. a. *Underſtood not the Art of Reigning, ſo well as the Morality of the* Goſpel, ibid. *Repreſents to the States of* Blois *the neceſſity of alienating part of his Demeſnes, and the Propoſal rejected*, 954. a. Bodin *fancy'd the* French *Monarchy would end in him, becauſe he was the* 63d *and Climaterick King*, 655. a. *Puts a barbarous Affront upon his Siſter, the Queen of* Navarre, 2353. a. *How unlike himſelf before and after he was King* 2184. b. *Why hated by the Ladies*, 1622. b. *Would be only call'd Brother* Henry, *when he retir'd to certain Convents*, 1626. b. *His extraordinary Eloquence and Grace in Speaking*, 1627. a. *Myſterious Circumſtances obſerv'd in his Death*, 1629. b. *Facts concerning the Houſe in which he was Aſſaſſinated*, ibid.

The cauſe of the Dutcheſs of Monpenſier*'s hatred to him*, 1623. a. *The movements ſhe gave herſelf to be reveng'd of him*, ibid. *She uſed to ſhew with with pleaſure the Sciſſars, with which ſhe intended to clip* Henry III. *when the* League *deſign'd to thruſt him into a Monaſtery*, 812. b. *What provoked her*, ibid. *A bitter Satyr of Pope* Sixtus V. *on him*, 1625. b.

Henry IV. *of* France, *The Ceremony uſed at his Abſolution*, 694. a. *His ſhuffling between his Wife and his Miſtreſſes below any Tradeſman*, 2352. a. *His Notions about the Qualities of a proper Wife*, 1633. a. b. *The Ceremony of his Abſolution*, 1624. b. *His Defence of himſelf againſt thoſe who charg'd him with giving himſelf up to unbecoming Pleaſures*, 1640. a. *Whether he ever ſaid, That Kings were great Knaves*, ibid. *His Anſwer to* du Haillon, *a vain and arrogant Boaſter of his Hiſtory*, 1573. b. *What he ſaid when told, He expos'd his Perſon too much to reſcue Mareſchall* Biron *in an Ingagement*, 1430. a. *Whether* Ravillac *was mov'd to murder him by reading* Mariana*'s Book about the lawfulneſs of murdering Tyrants*, 2180. b. 2183. a.

If he had made uſe of mild Intreaties the Edicts of Nantz *had never been ratify'd by the Parliament of* Paris, 1713. a.

By a Deſign concerted before-hand between Cardinal Perron, *and a* Hugonot *Miniſter, who were to Diſpute before* Henry IV. *The Miniſter ſuffers himſelf to be worſted*, 2620. b.

Du Vair*'s Anſwer to him, when ask'd his Opinion about legitimating the Duke of* Vendoſm, *and ſettling the Crown of* France *on him*, 1429. b.

Henry VIII. *of* England, *The Title of* Moſt Chriſtian, *deſign'd by Pope* Julius II. *to be transferr'd to him, and taken from* Lewis XII. 1790. b. *The* Sorbon *charg'd with ſelling their Opinion in favour of* Harry VIII*'s Divorce*, 119. b.

Heraclitus, *conceals his Works in the Temple of* Diana, *in hopes that being found one Day, they might paſs for myſterious*, 1262. b.

Hercules, *Six Heroes of this Name according to* Cicero, *Forty according to* Varro, 1644. a. *His Bowl the laſt Round in the* Greek *Entertainments*, 1645. a. *His drowning himſelf at Fifty becauſe he had not ſtrength enough to bend his Bow, an Allegory*, 1647. b. *The ground of a Parallel between him and* Moſes, 1648. *The Lips of a beautiful Braſs Statue of him in* Agrigentum, *worn thin by the Kiſſes of Votaries*, 1404. b.

His Picture taken from an Apparition of him, 1646. b.

Hereſy, *Something ſuper-natural in the Birth of it, according to a Proteſtant Divine*, 2127. a. *Perſecuting them at Home, and careſſing them Abroad, an Article of the Religion of Sovereigns*, 556. a. *The number of the principal Hereſies, from the Days of the Apoſtles to* Luther, 1751. b.

Hereſiarch, *The Argument from a Phyſician, who gives his Patient Arſenick, to an* Hereſiarch, *who inſtills poyſonous Doctrine, wherein defective*, 2627. a.

Hereticks, *Abſurdities imputed by the Fathers to the antient* Hereticks, *which they never held*, 808. a. *Why their Books ſhould be ſuppreſs'd, when thoſe of the* Orthodox, *in which their Objections are propos'd are not ſuppreſs'd*, 976. a. *More heroical to grant Protection to perſecuted Wretches, whom we believe* Hereticks, *than if we believ'd them* Orthodox, 2339. b.

Whether they had their Martyrs in the three firſt Centuries, 2163. a. & ſeq.

The pretence that the Orthodox *had not Tribunals of their own in the three firſt Centuries, no Argument that the* Hereticks *might not boaſt of having Martyrs*, 2166. a.

Are leſs rigorouſly uſed by the Turks, *than by* Chriſtians, 2362. a.

Hermolaus Barbarus, *A very Learned Man; the great Generoſity of* Lorenzo de Medicis *to him*, 490. b.

Hermorphradites, *A Paſſage of an* Hermophradite *Monk, who got himſelf with Child*, 1639. a.

The Poetical Origin of Hermophradites, 2660. a. *The Platonick Origin of them*, 2640, a. b.

Herodotus, *thinks it probable, That* Helena *never was carry'd to* Troy, 1591. a.

Heſhuhans, *A Chimerical Sect of Hereticks*, 1658. a.

Heſiod, *The firſt that diſtinguiſh'd four kinds of Reaſonable Natures*, 1577. b.

His Account of the Age of Man, 1578. a. *The proportion he makes between it and ſeveral other Mortal Natures*, ibid.

Which alnoe, affords the greateſt Objection to the Manicheans *againſt the Unity of* GOD, 2151. a.

Heteroclite, *An Heteroclite Poet in* France, *his new Manner and Talents*, 2369. b.

Hexameter-Verſe, *the only Meaſure known among the* Greeks *for Six hundred Years*, 332. b.

Who was the firſt Inventer of other Meaſures, ibid.

Hierachy, *Books written againſt the* Hierarchy *in general, by the* Jeſuits, 175. a.

Hipparchia, *Wife of the* Cynick Crates, *her ſubtil Sophiſm to* Theodorus *the Atheiſt, and how retorted*, 1671. b.

Hipparchus, *The firſt who diſcover'd that the fix'd Stars had a motion from* Weſt *to* Eaſt, 1673. a.

Hiſpanienſis, *The difference between it and* Hiſpanus, 471. b.

Hiſtorians, *The neceſſity of confuting particular Paſſages in thoſe, whoſe Authority in the main is too low to do any miſchief*, 822. b.

The dangers they run by being ſincere and honeſt, 832. a. *The Candor of the* Belgick *and* Germanick *Hiſtorians a Chimera*, 944. b.

Wherein the Moderns manifeſtly excel the Antient, 1021. a. *The Sincerity of the French Hiſtorians in one Inſtance not to be parallel'd by thoſe of any other Nation*, 1617.

What kind of Matter affects them moſt, 1649. b. *The Cunning of the Spaniſh Hiſtorians, in magnifying* Francis I. *of* France, 1347. b.

The Impertinence of the French Hiſtorians in ſpeaking of what paſs'd between Queen Elizabeth *and Mareſchal* Biron, 1427. a.

In what Caſes to be excuſed, and in what not;

not according to Diodorus Siculus, 2884. C. ad med.

Hiſtory, *Better forbear writing them, if the Times will not bear Truth, than tell Lies*, 519. b. *The Reaſon of it*, ibid. *The Miſchief of Lying Hiſtories, that they ſpoil the Credit of the true*, 557. a. *The difficulty it lies under with regard to the Readers*, 571. b.

Which corrupts Hiſtory moſt, Flattery, or Satyr? 2193. b. *How a wiſe Man ſhould write Hiſtory the of his own time*, 2183. b.

Its variations in the Circumſtances of Facts, no Argument againſt the Truth of Hiſtory in the main, 1551. a.

A Rule for avoiding Partiality in the writing of a Hiſtory, 1887. b.

Hobs, *his Deſign in Tranſlating* Thucidides, 1677. *His Principles of Philoſophy not proper to deliver him from the fear of Evil Spirits*, 1681. a.

Hookſtrat, (James) *A* Dominican *of a very ill Character, was one of the firſt that wrote againſt* Luther, *and thereby did him no diſſervice*, 1684. a.

Hoffman, (Daniel) *A* Lutheran *Divine, Author of a troubleſome Diſpute in* Germany, *Whether what is true in Philoſophy, may be falſe in Divinity*, 1687. a.

Hoffman, (Melchior) *The* Elias *of the* Anabaptiſts, 1689. *A Prophecy that he ſhould preach the Goſpel over all the Earth, having with him the* 144000 *mark'd Perſons in the* Revelations, ibid. a.

Holland, *(Counteſs of) Her being deliver'd of 365 Children evinc'd by the beſt Hiſtorians to be a Falſity*, 1413. a.

Homo, *Its definition*, 684. b.

Homer, *Criticiz'd upon the Speech of* Phænix, 59. b. *Had no Idea of heroick Honour*, 62. b. *Struck blind by the glory of an Apparition of* Achilles, *as he was keeping Sheep near his Tomb*, 66. a. *Scarce an Art or Science, but is to be found in his* Iliads *or* Odyſſeys, 899. b.

The Emperor Hadrian *conſults the Oracle about his his Country and Family*, 2512. a. *The Anſwer of the Oracle*, ibid.

His Poems by whom divided into Books according to the number of the Alphabet, 350. a. *The Collecting his Works by* Piſiſtratus, *an antient vulgar Error*, ibid. b.

A Sentence of his, That it might not misbecome the Gods to take on them the Nature of Man, in order to enlighten the World, approv'd of by Ariſtotle, *and conſtru'd by ſome Divines as a Glimpſe of the future Incarnation of* GOD, 365. a.

Ariſtotle *and he parallel'd in their Deaths*, 367, a. b.

A Judgment upon him, and which is the beſt Piece in his Iliads, 260. b. *A ſmall Remark upon his making* Andromache *feed* Hector's *Horſes*, ibid. *Who was the firſt that took the deſign of his Works right for the explanation of Juſtice and Vertue by Allegorical Narrations*, 234. *Recourſe had in Antient Times to* Magick *for the finding out* Homer's *Country*, 928. a. *Contradicts himſelf about* Augury, *in two places of the* Odyſſes *and* Iliads *compar'd with other places of each*, 275. a. *Why he gives two Names to the ſame thing*, 2682. b.

The Author of this Dictionary *admires thoſe who ſtill admire* Homer's Iliads, 61. a.

Mezerai, *Anſwers his own Objection about the Praiſes* Homer *beſtows on* Penelope, *very ill*, 2512. a.

Homæomeriæ *(the Doctrine of the) confuted at large by Arguments of the Author, without the aſſiſtance of* Ariſtotle, 231. b.

Honey, *Who firſt found out the Secret of drawing* Honey, 352. b. 354. b. *And the firſt that mix'd* Honey *with Wine*, ibid.

Honnecour, *(Battle of) loſt by Mareſchal* Grammont, *to favour Cardinal* Richlieu's *declining Affairs*, 1323. b.

Honour *of being a Citizen of* Lacedæmon, *and ſpeaking* Greek *according to the Poet* Alcmæon, 163. a.

Hopital, (Michael *del) Chanceller of* France, *how Painted in the* Icones *of* Theodore Beza, 1710. b. *The Author of ſeveral excellent Laws in* France, 1711. a. *Humbles the Power of the Parliaments*, a. ibid. *His Indulgence to his Servants, a great diſhonour to him*, 1741. a. *Said to have reſembled* Ariſtotle, Cato *and* St Jerome, ibid.

Horns, *Their Antiquity as Emblems of Cuckoldom*, 1811.

Horſe, *The Horſe of* Sejanus, *a Fatality attend'd him*, 877. a. Brazen-Horſe *which inſpired Love*, Diſſert. 3112.

Horſe *(Commiſſary General of the) when firſt created, and by whom*, 578. b.

Hortenſius Hortalus, *comes into the Senate-Houſe with his four Sons, deſcended from Conſuls and Dictators, to beg Bread for them*, 1698. b.

Hoſpital, *(Chancellor del') his Opinion of the Contracts of Sovereigns*, 555. b.

Hotman (Francis) *convicted of great unfairneſs in citing a Catholick Hiſtorian on the Article of Pope* Julius II. 1788. b.

Hottinger, *his Project of ſending proper Perſons into* Æthiopia *to enquire into the true State of Chriſtianity there*, 1723. b. *Is viſited by the Deputy of the* Janſenites, ibid. a.

Houlieres, (Madamoiſelle) *her great Character of Wit and good Senſe*, 1611. a.

Hubert, (St) *whether* John Calvin, *ſent his Son to be cured at his Shrine of the bite of a mad Dog* 818. b.

Huetius, *his attempt to prove that* des Cartes's *Opinion about the Nature of Brutes, was borrow'd from* Cicero. *and other Authors ſhewn to be vain* 2519. b.

Deſcribes in Latin *Verſe the ridiculous manner of Electing a certain* Burgomaſter, 642. b.

Hugonotiſm, *ſaid to be favour'd by* Alexander VII. 969. a. b.

Hugonots, *Sixteen Methods of Converting them recommended by the Clergy of* France *to the Controverſial Writers* 2126. b. Hugonots *of* France *ow'd their firſt good Condition to the adherence of* Anthony de Bourbon *King of* Navarre; *and the decline of their Affairs, to his change*, 2445. a. *Their triumphant State and vaſt Aſſemblies in* Paris, *for ſome time, under the Reign of* Charles IX. 1708. *Succours ſolicited for 'em by the* Spaniſh *Ambaſſadors at the* Engliſh *Court*, 1615. a.

Nick-nam'd Parpaillot *in ſome Parts of* France, 1056. a.

Hugonot Miniſters *deny'd the Title of Paſtors* 1394. a.

That of Divini verbi Miniſter *in the Title-pages of their Works or under their Prints, ended in* Paul Ferri, *and was never allow'd any other Miniſter after him*, 1305. a.

Several of 'em who receiv'd Penſions from the Court of France, *vindicated as to their Honeſty*, 1310. a. *How they called the Lord's-Supper in the beginning*, 9335. b.

Human Souls, *How diſpos'd of after they leave their Bodies, according to the* Cynicks, 2515. a.

Humoriſts *(Academy of the) in* Rome, *celebrate the Obſequies of Mr.* Peiereſc *in forty ſeveral Languages*, 2501. b.

Hungary, *Who was the firſt Cauſe of its loſing its Liberties, and of its being chang'd from an Elective to an Hereditary Kingdom*, 285 b.

Hus, (John) *Cardinal* d' Ailly's *Advice to him before his Tryal* 131. b. *Condemn'd by the ſame Cardinal*, ibid.

Husbands, *Remarkable Inſtances of tender* Husbands, 1606. a.

The Lacedemonians *reputed the beſt* Husbands *in the World*, 106. b.

The Way of chooſing Husbands *in* Lincopen, 641. b,

A Treatiſe to prove, that a Man may be a ſufficient Husband *without any viſible Teſticles, highly commended for its Wit and Learning*, 2530. to 2553,

Hutten, (John] *kill'd by the Duke of* Wirtenberg 1733. a. *His Body taken up four Years after was not corrupted but bled afreſh*, ibid.

Hymen, *A witty Thought upon* Ovid's *arraying* Hymen *in a Saffron Colour Robe*, Croceo velatus amictu, 2935. a.

Hypocondriacks, *An Inſtance of three notable* Hypocondriacks *all at the ſame time*, 2695. b.

Hypotheſis, *(An) does not afford a demonſtrative Proof when the Matter of Fact, which it explains,*

Vol. II. 801. Vol. III. 1551. Vol. IV. 1439.

may be explain'd by a different Hypotheſis, 669. a.

An Hypotheſis, ſhewing how certain Miracles may be in Vogue in one Age, and not in another, 1980. b.

J A. J E.

JAMES I. Suppos'd to have curtail'd Cambden's Works, 830. b.

Orders David Pareu's Commentary on the Epiſtle to the Romans, to be burnt by the Hands of the Common Hangman, 1456. b.

Iambicks, By whom invented, 332. a.

Janos (Kamini) abdicated Prince of Tranſilvania, his unfortunate Death, 284. b.

Janſenius, His Doctrine exactly that of St. Auſtin 436. a.

Janſeniſts, Their Deputies in their Returns from, Rome through Zurich, make a Viſit to the Learned Proteſtant Miniſter, Hottingen, 1723. a. Diſtinguiſh'd in their Books by the Particle ON, 2471. b. Expoſe themſelves to Cenſure by criticizing on Odericus Raynaldus, 143. a. Call'd Engliſh Dogs why and by whom, 2126. a.

Their ſhort way of anſwering the Accuſations of the Jeſuites, 2091. a. By whom firſt invented, ibid. b. The vaſt Expence they were at in defending their Cauſe at Rome, 1338. a.

Idea's of Vertue, preferr'd by the Pagans before the ill Example of their Gods, 1825. b.

Jealouſie, An Example of the Force of it, 826. a. A remarkable Inſtance of it in a learned modern Roman, 1652. a. An extravagant Inſtance of it, 2689. b. Various Reflections on it and Love, 2708. a. b.

Jealouſie of Don John of Auſtria, the Loſs of the Netherlands to King Philip II. 454. a. Jealouſie which reigns between excellent Preachers, is equal to that of Poets, or celebrated Beauties, 1695. a.

Jerom (St.) How he calls the Female Sex, 693. b. Miſtaken in ſaying Arius the Arch-heretick made his Peace with the Council of Nice, 368. b. His Friendſhip for Paula, a Subject for Slanderers, 24. a. His Zeal for ſome Practices in the preſent Worſhip of the Church of Rome, and Indignation at the Prieſt Vigilantius, who condemn'd them, 2963. b. His Maxim with regard to the Confutation of Heatheniſm exploded, 1320. a. His Anſwer to thoſe who approved not retiring from the World, but encountring Vice, 1328. a.

His Zeal for Saints, and the Honour paid to them, and his Indignation and Invectives againſt Vigilantius on this ſcore, 2963. b.

Jeruſalem, Which Town of Europe was to be the New Jeruſalem, according to the Prophecies of the Anabaptiſts, 1689. b. The corrupt Lives of the Chriſtian Clergy there, after its Recovery from the Saracens, 1643. a.

Jeſt, A Mark of its being good to Perfection, 580. a. A remarkable Example if its Power over Cruelty 545. b.

Jeſting below the Character of a Monarch, 2962. a.

Jeſuitiſſes, A late Order of Religious Women in the Romiſh Church, when and by whoſe Means aboliſh'd, 2091. b.

Jeſuites, Their Judgment of St. Auſtin, 86. a. Their Method of preſerving themſelves Chaſte, 1745. b. The People of Landsberg forbid to buy their Beer, and why, 1746. a. Inſtances of the extraordinary Chaſtity of ſome of 'em, 2177. b. A perfidious Example of ſeducing Young Men into their Order, whoſe Education is committed to them, 134. The Advantage they reap by having Doctors of all Opinions within their own Society, 562. a. Their reporting that Beza recanted at his Death, a very unlucky Buſineſs for them, 612. a. What turn they gave it, ibid. b. Their ſly way of calumniating in indeterminate Expreſſions, 2090. b. How rebuked for it, and convicted by their Adverſaries, 2091. a. A Compariſon between their Learning Jeſuits in the XVI. Century, and that of the more modern 175. b.

Jews, Their Deſcendants not permitted to depart Portugal without the King's ſpecial Leave, though Chriſtians for ſome Generations, 72. b. The Reaſon of their abſtaining from Pork, 90. b. Three hundred thouſand forced to quit the Dominions of the Catholick King John II. in one Day, 32. a. The ſpace of Time in which they alter'd the Hebrew Text of the Bible, 138. a. The Reaſon of this Alteration, ibid.

Impleaded before Alexander the Great by the Cananites, for having taken away their Country, by the Iſmaelites, for their Part of Abraham's Succeſſion, and by the Egyptians for their Rings and Jewels, 2076. b.

More odious to the Turks than any other People in the World, 2014. a. Their Cuſtom of planting a Cedar at the Birth of a Son, and a Pine at the Birth of a Daughter, 498. b. Their Horror for the Fair of Terebinthus, whence it proceeds, 499. b. Expell'd Rome by Tiberius on a ſacrilegious Fraud of a Jew, 1373. b.

By what Mark diſtinguiſh'd from the Chriſtians formerly in Naples, through the Care of Capiſtan a Cordelier, 2328. b. They claim kindred with Ariſtotle, and pretend he was of the Seed of Iſrael, and of the Tribe of Benjamin, 361. b. Learn'd the Immortality of the Soul, and a State of future Rewards and Puniſhments from the Greeks, and not the Greeks from them, according to one Doctor's Opinion, 2641. b.

Fables of the Jews with regard to the falſe Meſſias, 499. d.

Jewiſh Penances extremely ſevere, 74. b. A good Noſe one Mark of the true Meſſias among them, 501.

Ignorance, An Enquiry into the Nature of that Ignorance, which excuſes, 2625. a. b. 2626. a. b.

Ignorance oftner the Ruin of Subjects than the Ingratitude of Princes, 1154. b.

Iliads (Homer's) they are to be admir'd at, who ſtill admire that Poem, 61. a.

Illuſion, Very great ſometimes in proving Facts by the Reaſon of the Things, 2644. E. ad fin.

Inſtances of the Illuſions of Proofs drawn from the Conformity of Styles, 1216. b.

Illyricus, (Flavius) a Lutheran Divine publiſh'd a Romiſh Miſſal which makes much againſt his own Sect, 1749. a. & ſeq.

Images, Uncarv'd tolerated by the Turks in the Greek Churches, 2126. b. An Inſtance of the fiery Zeal of the firſt reform'd Miniſters againſt 'em, 1282. b. The Writers for them have ſo corrupted their Hiſtories as to make the Truths which they relate ſuſpected. 1044. b.

Whether the pricking Wax Images in Witchcraft, or ſetting them before a Fire can have any Power over the Life or Health of the Perſons repreſented, 2632. b. The Antiquity of Images in Witchcraft, 2635. a.

Imagination, Whether it can be chaſte in Caſuiſts treating of obſcene Caſes, 2668. b.

Imma, Daughter of Charlemaine, a Relation of her extraordinary Adventure with Eguiard Chaplain and Secretary to her Father, 1161. b. It exceeds any Tale in Boccaccio, or in the Heptameron of the Queen of Navarre, 1162. a.

Immortality of the Soul, People's not appearing to their Friends after their Death upon a Promiſe made, no ground for denying the Immortality of the Soul, 669. a. Oppos'd in a Book expreſly written againſt it by Acoſta, 73.

Learnt by the Jews from the Greeks, and not the Greeks from them, according to one Doctor's Opinion, 2641. b.

Imperfections, Of the Soul of Man, what the Stoicks attributed them to, 978. b.

Impieties, Impieties touching the Miracles of Moſes, and generally touching the whole Scripture, 728. b. A great Impiety, and great Piety equally rare, 1004. b.

Impoſts,

Impoſts, *Their Original in* France, 1651. b.

Impoſtors, *The Book* de Tribus Impoſtoribus, *a meer Chimera,* 339. a. *Falſly aſcrib'd to* Peter Aretin, ibid. *Aſcribed alſo (but falſly) to* Bernardins Ochinus, 2392.

Impotency, *a barbarous Curioſity of the Ladies in the Court of* France, *to examine about a Caſe of Impotency,* 2464. a.

A Diſſertation about Women who bring an Action of Impotency againſt their Husbands, 2526. a. b. & ſeq.

A very ſingular Action of Impotency brought by a Wife againſt her Husband, 2530. b.

Imprecations, *The ſingular Effect of an* Imprecation, 433. O.

Improvement of the Mind, *Cardinal* Richlieu's *indefatigable Application to it,* 2158. b.

Impurities, *The ancient Fathers did not ſtick at inſerting the groſſeſt Impurities in their Works upon ſome Occaſions,* 81. a.

Impurities, *The Cauſe of the Murder and Downfal of many Princes,* 326. *An* Opinion *touching the Impurities of the Stage,* 2669. b. *A lively Idea given in the modeſteſt Terms of the Impurities of the ancient Stage in* Rome, 2669. b.

Incarnation, *A Glimpſe of it among the Heathens,* 365. a.

Inceſt, *What kind of Inceſt prohibited by ancient* Athens *and* Lacedemon, 1674. a.

Incontinence, *An approv'd Remedy for it beſides Marriage,* 1698. a.

Incubus's, *The Opinion that certain Perſons of extraordinary Merit have been begotten by thoſe Spirits is very ancient* 702. b.

Indexes, *The Life and Soul of Books,* 282. b. *The proper Qualities for compoſing a good Index,* 283. a.

Indifference in Religion, *Why it offends more than a falſe Worſhip,* 76. a.

Infallibility, *Knights of the Infallibility of the Pope, by whom inſtituted,* 2170. a.

Infallibility *of the Pope* ex Cathedra, *compar'd to the Oracles of* Jupiter, *according to the* Gallican *Church: The* Infallibility *of a Council compar'd to the Oracle of* Apollo, 105. a.

Infidels, *Whether Chriſtian Princes may enter into Alliances with Infidels againſt any Chriſtian Powers,* 316. a.

Information, *Of the Penitentiaries of* Paris, 2475. b.

Informers, *See Accuſers.*

Ingratitude, *Of the Publick to* Aldobrandus, 169. a. *Moſt frequent from Sons towards their Fathers,* 946.

Innocence, (*State of*) *how long it laſted,* 17. a. *diſcovered by Silence,* 603. b.

Innovations, *In States and Synods very dangerous to the State,* 190. b.

Inquiſition, *forc'd to humour the Superſtitions of the Body of Catholicks,* 110. b.

Defend the doubtfulleſt Traditions, if favouring the worſhipping of Saints, 110. *Its Antiquity and firſt Inſtitution, according to* Francis Macedo, *a Cordelier,* 2072. a. *Expunges all Praiſes of Hereticks, even of Princes, out of all Books,* 1654. a.

Inſcriptions, *The Cuſtom of Funeral Inſcriptions in ſome* Roman Catholick *Countries,* 339. b. *The Difference between them and Epitaphs,* ibid.

Inſtance *of the Authority of Pamphlets,* 948. a.

Intelligences, *The Belief of mediate Intelligences as univerſal as the Belief of a God,* 808. a.

Intereſt, *Too powerful an Intereſt is often an Obſtacle to Preferment,* 566. b.

Intricacies, (*incompatible*) *who abounds with them,* 1233. b.

Invention of Fables, *To whom to be aſcrib'd,* 1232. B. in Tex.

Invention *of Divination by Fire,* 228. b.

Joan, Queen of *Navar, Her heroick Courage in Childbirth,* 2340. b.

Her Marriage of Conſcience with a Gentleman of her Court by the Approbation of her Proteſtant Miniſters, to whom ſhe had confeſs'd ſhe cou'd not contain, ſhewn to be without any ground, 1348. a.

Invocation, of Saints, *An odd Argument for it,* 2385. a.

Condemn'd anciently by the Paulicians, 2485. a.

Joan II *Queen of* Naples, *her refin'd Policy to cover a real Conſpiracy againſt her Husband's Life,* 2326. a.

The barbarous Murder of her Husband Andrew, *and the ſuppoſed Cauſe of it,* 2321. a.

Informations exhibited againſt his Murderers, by Order of Clement VI. 2325.

An eaſie Apology for her Lewdneſs, by Brantome, 2327. b.

Mary *Queen of* Scots, *compared to her in all her Deſtiny,* 2323. a.

The way ſhe took to diſcover her Paſſion for Caraccioli *Grand Seneſchal of her Kingdom,* 851. a.

Joan (*Pope*) *the Scandal taken at* Blondel's *Book proving her Hiſtory a Fable,* 636. a.

Some Circumſtances concerning this Book, 637. b.

Said to be an Engliſh *Woman, and call'd* Johannes de Anglis, 1339. b.

John (*King of* France) *his being taken Priſoner fairly propheſied,* 2601. b.

John (*Prophet*) *a* French *Popiſh Fanatick how he extricated himſelf from a conſiderable Difficulty alledg'd by the Queen of* Poland *againſt the Truth of his Propheſies,* 2171. a.

John (*St.*) *the Evangeliſt, why drawn by the* Painters *with a Cup in his Hand,* 1764. b.

Jon (Denys du) *Father of* Francis Junius, *his tragical End at* Iſſodun *in* France, 1804. b.

Jordan (*St.*) *chides a Monk for touching a Woman's Hand, and anſwers his Excuſe,* 1328. a.

Joſeph, *The Husband of the bleſſed Virgin, ſaid to have had the Gift of* INFRIGIDATION, *the meaning of this,* 699. a.

Why reckon'd a Martyr by Carthagena *a Cordelier,* 896. b.

Joſephus, *cenſured on his making the Invention of Weights, Meaſures and Landmarks, a Proof of a knaviſh Heart,* 806. a.

Seems affectedly to vary from the Scripture Accounts, 29. b.

Wrongfully quoted by Photius, 273. b.

Oppoſes and contradicts Moſes, 30. a.

Cenſured on his abſurd Opinions about the Serpent that tempted Eve, 1250. b.

His Teſtimony concerning Antipater, *Father of* Herod *preferr'd to that of* Euſebius *and* Africanus, 273. b.

Falſly ſaid to repreſent the Sadducees *as an immoral, wicked Generation,* 2643. b.

Jovian, *The Chriſtians and the Heathens ſtrive, the former to juſtify, the latter to run him down on occaſion of his diſhonourble Peace with the* Perſians, 1775. b.

Would not accept the Empire till he had declar'd himſelf a Chriſtian, and the Soldiers had declar'd that they were Chriſtians, 1766. a.

Said to be the firſt who gave away an Inch of Ground from the Roman *Empire,* 1554. a.

Jovius (*Paul*) *confuted as to what he delivers of* Cornelius Agrippa's *Magick* 120. a.

His hint of a famous Paraſite, 965. a.

Iphicrates, *The Reaſon his Son gave, why he lov'd his Mother better than his Father,* 1025. b.

Irreligion, *The Opinion of the Motion of the Earth round about the Sun, conſtrued Irreligion among the ancient* Greeks, 348. b.

Vol. II. 801. **Iſauricus (Leo)** *forges a Letter from* **John Damaſcen,** *and ſends it to the* **Caliph** *of* **Damaſcus** *with a Deſign to deſtroy him,* 1044. a.

Vol. III 1551.

Vol. IV. 2439. **Iſabella,** *Queen of* **Hungary,** *treated with great Reſpect, by* **Solyman** *the Magnificent,* 1728. a. b.

Iſhmael, *A Figure of Modern Controverſiſts,* 97. b. *A difficulty raiſed upon* **Hagar's** *carrying him away upon her Back, when turn'd away by* **Sarah,** *he being then 16 Years old,* 98. a.

Iſland, *When firſt inhabited,* 1677. b. *Shewn not to be the* **Thule** *of the Antients,* ibid.

Iſraelites, *Their going away with the Jewels and Rings of the* **Egyptians,** *how juſtifiable,* 2077. a.

Iſrael, (Manaſſeh ben) *his Curſe on* **Hadrian,** 501. a.

Italian Muſick, *A Diſcourſe on it written by Monſieur* **Maugars,** 510. b. n.

Italians, *What they meant by* è **motto canonicamente,** 192. a. *Some Learned* **Italians** *have a mighty averſion to ſpeaking of* **Latin,** 2406. a.

Italy, *The* **French** *are driven out of it,* 1906. *I.*

Jubilee, *An Evangelical Jubilee celebrated in* **Heidelburg** *in 1617. for the deliverance from Popery a Hundred Years before,* 245. b.

Judea, Felix *does not go into* **Judea** *till after* **Cumanus's** *Condemnation,* 1128. *B.*

Judges, *Severe* **Judges,** *why call'd* **Judices Caſſiani** *by the* **Roman** *Authors* 876. a.

Judith's *Example, an encouragement to Regicides,* 1785. a.

Julia, *Wife of the Emperor* **Severus,** *the Anſwer of a* **Britiſh** *Lady, when tax'd by her of lying with her Gallants without the leaſt precaution,* 1796. b.

Julia, *Wife of one* **Mark Antony,** *and Mother to another, who was Triumvir, her great Courage and Reſolution,* 276. b.

Julius II. *A bitter Enemy to* **France,** 1790. a. *Wherein he reſembled* **Julius Cæſar,** *and wherein* **St. Peter,** 1792. a.

Jupiter, *threatned with being ſent home to* **Greece,** 811. b.
   Plutarch *of Opinion, That* **Jupiter** *ſhould rather be defective in point of Power than of Goodneſs,* 2491. b.
   His Oracle not ſo infallible, as that of **Apollo,** 105. a.

Jurieu, *The Conſequences of his Poſition, That the Faithful diſcern the Truth, not from evident Proofs, but Proof of Sentiments; not by diſtinct Ideas, but a kind of Taſte,* 2373. a. b.
   He overthrows all that **Luther** *and* **Calvin** *had built, and makes the Proteſtant Churches ſchiſmatical,* 2374. a. b.
   Severely chaſtiz'd for his Legendary Gloſſes to expoſe a Popiſh Legend, 2188. a.
   Cenſur'd on a Conceſſion that looks very odd from him, 1310. b.

Juſtice, *The Rule and Meaſure of* **Juſtice** *in* **Lacedæmon,** 103. a.

Juſtin, *no exact Abridger,* 57. a. *Criticis'd on his mentioning a Tranſaction as happning in* **Cappadocia,** *which paſs'd in* **Iſaurus** *in* **Piſidia,** 845. a. *And on his Reaſonings upon the Motives of* **Laodice's** *Cruelty, the Wife of* **Ariathes** *King of* **Cappadocia,** 849. b. *Guilty of a great Error about the Affairs of* **Athens,** 1019. b. *His want of Exactneſs not to be excuſ'd by ſaying he only abridg'd another Hiſtory* 1021. a.

Juſtinian, *His Code when firſt read in the Schools,* 1777, 1778. in Tex.

K E.

KEmpis (Thomas a) *by whom tranſlated into Arabick,* 1417. a.

Keys, *St.* **Peter's Keys** *thrown into the* **Tyber,** 1788. a.

Kiſſes, *of Lovers diſtinguiſhable, tho' in diſguiſe,* 621. a. n.
   Reflections on the Cuſtom of Kiſſing, when Perſons Salute, 2524. b.
   The raſhneſs of Kiſſing a fine Face, to what compared by **Socrates,** ibid.
   One Kiſs given by a Maid after Contract, entitles her to half her Joynture by the Law of **Naples,** *if the Man dyes before conſummation,* 2525. a.

Kircher, (*Father*) *The ſame Invention owing juſtly to him and to Father* **Maignan** *at one and the ſame time,* 2124. a.

Kings, *The common Executioners in* **Sparta** *would not obey the Order of putting their* **Kings** *to Death,* 213. b.
   The **Meſſenians** *were not allow'd to ſay, that* **Ariſtodemus** *kill'd* **Theopompus,** *but only that he wounded him,* ibid.
   Aſſerting **Kings** *to be only Magiſtrates, tends to diſſolve the bonds of Civil Society,* 187. a. *The Judgment of ſome eminent* **Civilians** *in this Caſe,* ibid.
   Aſſaſſines encouraged to attempt upon their Lives by the Example of **Judith,** 1785. a.
   Hugonot *Miniſters Enemies to* **Kings,** *a Calumny,* 689. a.
   Not Tyranny, ſo often as Gentleneſs drives 'em from their Crown, 694. b.
   More **Kings** *depos'd for being too good, than too wicked,* 213. b.
   The difference between their Reſentments and that of private Gentlemen, 1427. b.
   Almoſt always forced to cringe in their Differences with the Pope, 1788. b.
   More ruin'd by Condeſcenſion and Good-nature, than by Tyranny and Iniquity, 1156. a.
   The Power of the People in **France** *over their* **Kings** *alternatively maintain'd both by the* **Proteſtants** *and* **Papiſts,** 1719. a.
   The Services which are above their acknowledgment render them ungrateful, 1154. b.
   In good Policy no **King** *ſhould favour the Rebellion of another* **King's** *Subjects,* 886. a.
   No Converſation ſo dangerous to Men of Learning, as that of **Kings** *that are given to Learning,* 897. b.
   The Power of **Kings** *irreſiſtible when joyned with that of an Eccleſiaſtical Party,* 111. a.
   An ill Maxim among them, To reward Rebellious, and neglect their Faithful Subjects, 944. a
   Their Gentleneſs more prejudicial to the State, than Severity and Rigour, 1620. b.
   More at a loſs what to do with their Horns than meaner Folk, 2355. a.
   No Hiſtorian can be ſincere who writes of a **King,** *during his own or his Son's Life-time,* 2474. a.
   What the Religion of a **King** *is,* 103. a. 103. b.
   The difference between the Religion of a **King** *as a private Man, and as a Prince,* 946. b.
   Grotius *cenſured by a* **Calviniſt** *Miniſter for not ſpeaking cautiouſly enough of the Right of* **Kings,** *nor carrying the Prerogative of the Monarchy high enough,* 2173. b.

Knights, *The Cuſtom of ſtriking Perſons gently when they are Knighted, probably comes from a Practice of the ancient* **Romans** *in the Enfranchiſing their Slaves,* 694. a.
   The Order diſhonour'd in **Rome** *two ways,* 1892, 1893. F.

Knowledge, Human and Divine, when they may be ſaid to differ eſſentially, ibid.

L A.

LAbadie (Mr.) a Fanatick Anabaptiſt Miniſter, his Proof of the Spiritual Perfection of a young Laſs under his Direction, 2145. b.
Labadiſts, Three Preſages promiſing them a long and glorious Settlement, and yet they ſoon came to nothing, 956. b.
Labienus, The firſt Man in Rome, whoſe Satyrical Republican Pamphlets were burn'd, 883. a.
Lacedæmon, the Honour of being a Citizen of Lacedæmon, and of ſpeaking Greek according to the Poet Alcmæon, 163. a.
Lacedæmonians, reputed the beſt of Husbands, 106. b. Their Rule in Drinking, 1037. b.
Lactantius, perfectly a Maſter of Cicero, 177. a. A Correction in his Text by Thomaſius, proved to be a falſe and wrong Correction, ibid. His Arguments deſign'd to overthrow all Philoſophy, Examin'd and Anſwer'd, 319. a. b. Puts no difference between Men and Brutes, but the ſenſe of Religion, 1606. b. His Solution of the Origin of Evil not only Weak, but Erroneous and Heretical, 2486. a. Shews the Heathens had no Notion of Juſtice, and that Carneades might eaſily have refuted what they could offer in behalf of it, 862. b. His raillery on Jupiter's ceaſing to get Children, 1647. b. His miſtake, with regard to the Original of the Floral Games, 1319.
Ladies (French) a Satyrical Deſcription of their Naked Breaſts in the XVIth Century, 1050. a.
Ladies (Roman) what Sacrifices they made to Fortune, 1725. a. Privileges of Phyſicians with the Ladies, 311. b.
Laertius (Diogenes) miſtaken as to the firſt Introducer of the occaſion of Diſputing Pro and Con, 317. b.
Lais, a Paſſage between her and Apelles, 287. a.
Laius, The firſt that is ſaid to be guilty of Pederaſty, 972. b.
Lambert (Biſhop of Liege) Murder'd by Alpaide's inſtigation, Concubine to Pepin, 185. His brave Chriſtian indignation againſt her at Pepin's own Table, ibid. b.
Lami (Pere) his Judgment of Alſtedius's Encyclopædia, 186. a.
Lami (Sieur) a Sage Paſſage of his in a Lecture of Anatomy, 894. a.
Lampridius, what he ſays of Hardrian's Building Temples to Chriſt, rejected as a Fable, 1557. a.
Landsberg, why its Magiſtrates Prohibited the buying of Beer from the Jeſuites, 1746. a.
Language, whence proceeds the Obſcurity of the French Language, 713. b. The Care and Methods of the Romans to make their Language Univerſal, 995. b. 996. a. What Language our Bleſſed Saviour uſed ordinarily, 996. a. Various Characters of the Principal Living Languages of Europe, 943. b. Do not ſupply words enough to preſerve from Equivocation, or prevent Cavils, 1052. a. Language of Perſia, much improv'd by the Care of the King thereof, 1418. a. The difference between the Language of an Orator and that of an Hiſtorian, 1016. b.
Languiſhing Converſation, a knack of reviving it, 539. An inſtance of it, ibid.
Laſciviouſneſs, the Danger of only ſeeing Laſcivious Embraces exemplified in a Hermit, who let fall his Breviary out of his Hand at the ſudden Sight of the fond Brandimart and Fleurdelis, 1327. a.
Latin. The Averſeneſs of ſome Learned Italians to the ſpeaking of Latin, 2406. a. The Obſcurity of moſt Authors, who write in the Latin Tongue, 173. b. When Aboliſh'd in France in all publick Acts, 1356. b. When it began to gain ground clearly of the Greek, 996. a. An Attempt made by the Royal Profeſſors in the Univerſity of Paris, towards a Reform in the Pronunciation of Latin, 2551. G.
Laud, his Library at Lambeth plunder'd by Hugh Peters; who was ſuppos'd to have made away with Cambden's Papers, 832. b.
Law, a Law made for the reſtraining the exceſſive Expence of Feaſting, 261. a.
A Law in Athens, againſt the Study of Phyſick by Women or Slaves in Athens, 1665. a. A memorable Caſe occaſion'd by Repealing this Law, ibid. b.
Laws, compar'd to Bread and Eggs, 177. b. When and under what Emperor, put into the German Tongue, 1357. a.
Laws made againſt Polygamy, ſaid to hinder the Converſion of the Infidels, 2120. b.
Law of Athens, whereby Criminals were to execute themſelves by a Poiſon'd Draught, abrogated by Chriſtianity, 2180. a.
Law in Rome to Expel Rhetoricians, 1278.
Law (Civil) but three Schools allow'd for it in the whole Roman Empire, one at Rome, one at Conſtantinople, and one at Berytus in Phœnicia, and Eight Profeſſors, 594. b.
Law (Roman) when reſtor'd, and under what Emperor, after an intermiſſion of 500 Years, 1778. a. Doctors in Law, when firſt made, ibid. Civil or Roman Law when firſt Re-eſtabliſh'd and by whom, after the Incurſions of the Barbarians in Europe, 1777. 1778. A. and C.
Lawyers, Their Right, with regard to the Liberty of contradicting themſelves, according to Cicero, 277. b.
Leſpe, of Mornac and Mombriſſon, the meaning of it, 540. a. b.
Learned, a Reflection upon the Poſterity of Learned Men, 1401. B. Several Learned Men of Opinion that Minerals are produced by Intelligent and Spiritual Beings, 2714. b. Montagu's compaſſion for the hard Fate of Learned Men, 891. a. Oſtentation, how Indecent to Learned Men, 868. b. Learned Princes, their Converſation dangerous to Learned Men, 897. b.
Learning, no remedy againſt the Abſurdities in Religion, 2684. the true Picture of a Pretender to Learning, 193. b. A Reflection on the obſcure condition of the Deſcendants of the moſt famous Perſons in the Commonwealth of Learning, 1401. a. The Learning of Aſſyria miſtaken by Pliny, 460. a.
Lebniz (Mr.) His Hypotheſis, and that of other Moderns, That the Soul with the perfectly form'd Body of all Animals were created in the Beginning, and that Generation is only the extenſion of the Individuum occaſionally Explain'd, 2712. a. A Curious Fragment of his, concerning the Soul of Animals, and the Primitive Subject to which they are united, 2611. b. his Syſtem of the Pre-eſtabliſh'd Harmony between the Soul and Body of Animals examin'd and diſcuſs'd, 2612. a. b.
Legate, The Blunder of a Legate at the Council of Soiſſons, 585. b.
Leith, The Scotch force the French to Capitulate at Leith, and for ever to quit it, 722. in Tex. ad fin.
Lela, a Name given to the Bleſſed Virgin, by the Turks, 1287. b.
Lemnos, Why the Women of Lemnos Maſſacred their Husbands, 1676. a.
Lent, does not begin at Milan 'till four Days after Aſhwedneſday, Diſſert. xxxvi. A Book concerning the Reaſons for Aboliſhing Lent: Written by the Duke of Alva's Orders, 1508.
Lent-Biſhops, who ſo Nick-nam'd, and why, 540. a.
Leo I. His extraordinary Vigilance and Care to extirpate the Manichæans, 2153. a.
Leo X. Calls the Bleſſed Virgin Goddeſs in one of his Epiſtles, 571. b.
Leo, an African, born at Granada in Spain; the Advantage he had by having a Claim to either Country, 560. a.
Leo X. the firſt Pope who threatned to Excommunicate thoſe who read Prohibited Books, 2081. a. Appear'd publickly at a Play after he was Pope, and Aſſiſted at the Conferences of the Poets of his time, 2078. b. When Cardinal de Medicis, he uſed to divert himſelf with the Quarrels and Jealouſies between the Learned, and took delight in Diſquieting one Rival by Protecting the other, 161. a. Was made a Cardinal at the Age of Fifteen, 692. a.
Leo, The Hebrew, his Syſtem of Maſculine and Feminine, compounding Parts in every Man and Woman, and his Allegoriſing the Sacred Text about Adam and Eve, 1255. a. b.
Leontium the Courtezan, her Complaints of Epicurus in his old Age, 1191. b. ſaid to be Suppoſititious, ibid.
Leproſy, how derived to the Children of Catharine de Medicis, 1295. b. n.
Leridano, a Nobleman of Venice, his Book of the Life of Adam, how Scandalous and Blaſphemous, 1256. b.
Lesbia, why ſo called by Catullus, 913. her true Name, ibid.
Letters of Compliment, not over-ſcrupulouſly bound to Hiſtorical Truth, 2117. a.
Letters (Provincial) of Mr. Paſcal, their Elogy, 2469. a. ſeveral Facts concerning them, 2470. a. b. Which are reputed the beſt Letters for the uſe of young Perſons of Quality, 621. a.
Lettice, an Enemy to conjugal Duty, 92. a.
Leviſton (Madam) a Scotch young Lady, her Behaviour upon finding her ſelf with Child by Henry II. of France, 1619. b.
Lewdneſs, the Lewdeſt Perſons have ſometimes a ſenſe of Modeſty in their moſt diſſolute Actions, 2404. b.
Lewis XI. The 50000 Crowns a Year which he paid to Edward IV. call'd by the French a Penſion, and by the Engliſh a Tribute, 1157. a. His Cowardice, and Dread of Edward, ibid. b.

Vol. II. 801. Vol. III. 1551. Vol. IV. 1459.

Lewis XII. *a generous Saying of his after he came to be King,* 558. b. *Gives the Place to* Jaſon Mainus, *a famous Profeſſor at* Paris, 1158. b. *Compar'd for it to* Pompey *the Great,* ibid. *ſuppoſed to have kill'd himſelf with the Embraces of his young* Engliſh *Queen,* 1158. a. *The ſame Queen attempted to have impoſed a Suppoſititious Child upon him,* 1340. a.

Lewis XIII. *Inſtances of his Love and Reſpect, and extravagant Jealouſie, with regard to the ſame Lady,* 1589. b. *What he ſaid to Cardinal* Richlieu *the Day that Mareſchal d'Ancre was Aſſaſſinated,* 1015. b.

Lewis XIV. *His Letter to the Conclave upon the Death of* Innocent XI. 1758. *His pretended Letter from the Camp before* Ipres *to Mr.* Renaud, 1777. a. *A Hint of his has more power over the Ladies than all the Sermons of his Clergy,* 1017. a. *A Prediction, by which he was to be General of the* 144000 *ſealed Perſons in the* Revelations, 2169. b.

Leyden, *a remarkable Judgment of the Divines of* Leyden, *upon the Difference between* Altingius *and* Mareſius, 191.

Libels; *the common and only Preſumption for the Truth of ancient Libels of no force,* 268. b. Auguſtus *was the firſt who ordered Perſons to be proſecuted for Libels upon the Law* de Majeſtate, 881. b.

Liberality, *called Squandring, by* Plutarch, 177. b.

Liberty; *a Queſtion about the Liberty of brute Beaſts,* 1609. b. *Puniſhing Malefactors an Argument for the Liberty of Man,* ibid. *The hanging Wolves from Gibbets, as they do in* Germany, *and crucifying Lions to deter others, as they do in* Africa, *an Argument for the Liberty of brute Beaſts,* 1610. a. *It is an inſupportable State to ſome Nations,* 846. a.

Library. *An Emulation between the Kings of* Ægypt *and* Pergamum, *which ſhould have the beſt furniſh'd Library,* 1511. b. *That of* Alexandria *ancienter than that of* Pergamum, ibid. *A Paſſage relating to the Hiſtory of Libraries,* 671. b. *A Library erected by* Auguſtus's *Order in one of the Temples of* Rome, 1281. a. *A great fault of Library-keepers,* 1619. a. *Which have been the moſt famous Libraries,* 1521. a.

Life; *the deſire of living in Perſons infirm and impotent, a Scandal on human Nature,* 96. b. *More ſhameful among the* Romans *than now,* ibid. *The ſolemn Profeſſion of an old Man, who in all outward appearance had been happy, that he would not, if in his power, live over his Life again,* 2933. b. 2934. a. *The Miſeries of human Life, an indiſpenſable Topick of Conſolation in certain Caſes,* 1028. a. *A Diſpute between two Beggars, wherein conſiſts the greateſt Pleaſure of Life,* 2895. b.

Lilly, *blows miraculouſly in* Charles *the* Vth's *Garden the Night he died,* 950. b.

Limbo, *an account of the ſeveral* Limbo's, *according to the* Roman Catholicks, 1477. b.

Lincopen, *the way of chuſing Huſbands there,* 641. b.

Lipſius (Juſtus) *his Attempt to clear* Chryſippus *from making God the Author of Sin is vain,* 978. a. *His Advice to young Men concerning a Stile in Writing,* 48. a. *his Elogies on a Book or Pleading of* Sebaſtian Rouillard, *a Lawyer, proving that a Man without any viſible Teſticles may be capable of Matrimonial Duty,* 2530. b. *He and* Strada *criticize* Cornelius Tacitus, *on a point of* Roman *Hiſtory,* 837. a.

Livy; *how much ſold for before the uſe of Printing,* 2451. b. *Contradicts himſelf in ſpeaking of* Alexander *the Great's coming into* Italy, 2077. a. *Gives a Character of the Populace,* 1678. a.

Loadſtone; *inſtances of ſeveral ancient Temples, in which Statues have been ſuſpended in the Air by Loadſtones,* 2105. b.

Loans *by* Henry VIII. *in* Germany, *at* 12 *per Cent.* 1621. b. *How miſchievous to* France, ibid.

Logicians; *very inaccurate in their Stile of old,* 980. b. *Compared to* Penelope, 981. b.

Longinus, *his Contempt of the Philoſophers of his Time,* 198. *A Criticiſm of his criticiz'd,* 2836. a.

Looking-glaſſes; *the making uſe of them a great Reproach, eſpecially upon Scholars and Philoſophers in the ſecond Century,* 305. b.

Lorrain; *Princes of the Houſe of* Lorrain *compared to* Neapolitan *Horſes,* 850. b.

Lorrain (*Cardinal of*) *would expoſe Popery to ſome hazards, rather than loſe the Opportunity of ſhewing his Eloquence,* 96. a.

Lotos; *the* Lotos *Flower, why called* Antinoian, 272. a.

Love; *whether Men or Women are fitteſt to make the Attack in Love,* 2660. b. *The Original of Love according to* Plato, 80. a. *Unnatural Love not Criminal among the* Lacedæmonians, 106. b. *The Knowledge of great Imperfections may hinder its growth, but the greateſt cannot ſmother it when it has taken ſtrength,* 1009. b. *Who was the firſt that introduced the Cuſtom of ſinging Love-Songs in Company,* 165. *Verbal Declaration of it to a Woman of Quality,* 851. a. *Deſtroys all Sentiments of Gratitude and Generoſity,* 869. a. *Love-Verſes not ſo prevalent now as in former times,* 1601. b. *They ſtifle the Sentiments of Conſcience ſoon, but rarely thoſe of Honour,* 1602. b. *An extraordinary Inſtance of the Power and Triumph of Love,* 1413. a. *Said to be a Plank after Shipwreck,* 1296. b. *An extraordinary Inſtance of its Power and phyſical Vertue,* 1277. a.

Lovers, *why they are forgiven falſe Oaths, according to* Plato, 1341. b. *Their Cuſtom of Biting frequently mention'd in the ancient Poets,* 1320. b. *The Hiſtory of a Huſband and Wife, who had been always called the two Lovers,* 1605. b. 1606. a. *Their Kiſſes diſtinguiſhable, though in a Diſguiſe,* 631. a. n.

Low-Countries; *reaſonable Offers made to them by* Spain, 1374. a. *Why rejected by the Prince of* Orange, ibid.

Lucian, *a groſs Error of his in relating the Occaſion of* Apelles's *fine Picture of Calumny,* 287. a. *No Conduct ſecure againſt his Banter,* 713. a. *Cenſur'd on his not believing* Phædra *and* Sthenobœa *capable of accuſing their beloved* Bellerophon *and* Hippolitus, *as the Story ſays,* 1009. a.

Lucretius, *his invoking* Venus *in the beginning of his Poem acknowledges a Providence, and overthrows the Doctrine of* Epicurus *about the unconcerned State of the Gods,* 1192. b.

Luſtre, *ſtifling the Luſtre of ſome Perſons ſerves only to raiſe it, a fine Example of this,* 690. b.

Luther (Martin) *a great Enemy to* Ariſtotle *and his Philoſophy,* 366. b. *A Saying in his Book* de Chriſtiana Libertate, *the innocent Occaſion of the Sect of the Anabaptiſts,* 239. *His firſt Conference with the four Heads of Anabaptiſm, in which he is curſed by them,* 681. b. *What moved him to Marry, when he heard 'twould make every Body and even the Devil himſelf laugh, was that he was reſolved to ſpite the World and the Devil,* 675. a. *Much dejected at his Marriage in the beginning,* ibid. *The fierceſt of all his Books was that which he wrote ſoon after his Marriage, againſt* Eraſmus, ibid. b. *How it might be ſaid there was ſomething Divine in his Marriage,* 675. b. *His Quarrel with* John Agricola, 112. *How dear his Reputation in* Saxony, ibid. *Reputed a Hero by ſome eminent Catholicks,* 119. a. *A Prophecy concerning him by a* Cordelier *ſeveral Years before his appearing on the Stage,* 1668. a. *His Verſion of the Bible ſaid to be naught,* 1131. D. *Whether the Pope's making* Martin Luther *magnificent Promiſes by his Nuncio, in caſe he would ſubmit, be true in fact,* 1948. a. b. *The Expreſſion of* Forbes *concerning him and* Calvin, 1332. a. James Hockſtrat *the Dominican's Writing againſt* Luthur *did him no Diſſervice,* 1684. a.

Lutheraniſm; *the Schiſms in it for the firſt fifty Years not above ten or twelve,* 1751. b.

Lutherans, *their Reconciliation with the* Calviniſts *by the Influence of* Guſtavus Adolphus, *by whom fruſtrated,* 1685. b. *They refuſe Chriſtian Burial to thoſe they look on as Hereticks,* 111. b. *Refuſed to Communicate with the Church of* Ireland, 553. a. *Why the Attempts of reconciling them and the* Calviniſts *have always been ineffectual, and why 'tis probable they ever will,* 1723. a. *A Conference ſet on foot at* Ratiſbonne, *for the reuniting them and the Papiſts, by whom, and how it ended,* 173. b.

Luxury *of the* Romans *in watering their Plane-trees with Wine,* 1695. a.

Luz, *a ſmall Bone in the Spinal Marrow, according to the* Jews, *which is the Principle of the Reſurrection,* 500. b.

Lycurgus, *when he publiſh'd his Laws,* 1010.

Lyes, *none ſo abſurd but will be handed down from Generation to Generation,* 840. b.

Lying-in, *a ridiculous Cuſtom of Mens Lying-in inſtead of their Wives in ſome Countries,* 2880. a.

Lyons, *the Opinion of the antient Naturaliſts, that Lyons have no Marrow in their Bones, contradicted by Anatomical Experience,* 57. b. *The* Carthaginians *condemn'd* Hanno *as a dangerous Man to the publick Liberty, becauſe he tam'd a Lyon,* 1579. b. *Lyons crucified in* Africa *to deter others, an Argument for the Liberty of Brute Beaſts,* 2610. a.

Lyons (*Bank of*) *by whom firſt ſet up, and at what Intereſt,* 1621. b.

Lyre; *the difference between the Lyre of* Achilles *and that of* Paris, 636.

Lyſimachus, *odd Preſages of his attaining to the Royal Dignity,* 348. a.

M A.

MAbillon, P. cenſured on his favourable Judgment of Epiſcopius's Work, 1265. b.

Macedon (Philip, King of) diſmiſſes all Alexander's Confidents upon their giving him a Jealouſie of his Intentions, 58. b.

Macedonius, Patriarch of Conſtantinople, how he purged himſelf of Incontinency in a Council of Biſhops, 1665. b. n.

Machiavel, his writing of the military Art compared to a Philoſopher's writing a Book of Hunting, 557. b.

Macriani, a Family in Rome, the Men and Women whereof had a particular Superſtition for Alexander the Great, and had his Head engrav'd on all their Plate, Rings, Bracelets, &c. 2076. a.

Madneſs, a Remedy for Madneſs preſcribed to the Emperor Hadrian by an Oracle, 259. a. Affected by ſeveral great Perſons in Caſes of Danger or deep Deſign, 328. b. This Circumſtance not to be omitted by an Hiſtorian though ever ſo conciſe, ibid.

Maffei (Pere) why he always ſaid his Breviary in Greek, 2406. a.

Magdalen (Mary) her Body removed from Aix to Vezelai upon the Irruption of the Saracens, 1249 b. The Riſe and Progreſs of a great Controverſie upon the Queſtion, whether Mary, Siſter of Lazarus, the Woman who was a Sinner, Luke 7. and ſhe out of whom ſeven Devils were caſt, be one and the ſame Perſon, 1314. b.

Magicians; the difference between them and Sorcerers, 1907. a.

Magick; none have leſs Right to reject it than thoſe who deny the Exiſtence of a God, 1681. a. Noble Youths ſacrificed in the Days of Hadrian and Heliogabulus, that their Entrails might be inſpected by Magicians and Diviners, 272. a. A Magick Ceremony of ſacrificing a wild Bull in Rome for ſtopping a Plague in Hadrian the IVth's Pontificate, 1563. a.

Magiſtrates; it does not become 'em to make uſe of the falſe Colours of Rhetoricians, when the Queſtion is about a Fact expoſed to daily Experience, 909. b. Superior Magiſtrates among the Romans, were not to be impeached by their Subalterns, 149. a. Whether the Magiſtrates have Power to puniſh People for the Sin of Fornication, 176. ΔΔΔΔ. Magiſtrates of Landsberg, why they prohibited the buying of Beer from the Jeſuits, 1746. a.

Magyrus (the Jeſuit) and David Pareus, treat each other with very civil Titles, 2458. a.

Mahomet, the Teſtament or Concordat between the Chriſtians and him ſhewn to be a Forgery, 2103. b. His Vigour as to Women, 2100. b. His Rageo for fortifying the Reins, 2108. b.

Mahomet II. Monuments of his Greatneſs erected by the Chriſtians, 2113. a. His Daughter Fatima, her Titles, and the Prayers addreſſed to her, 1288. a. Great Rejoicings at Rome upon his Death, 2113. b. The Letter which Pope Pius the IId. wrote to Mahomet the IId. condemned by the Proteſtants, and juſtified by the Catholick Authors, 2110. & ſeq.

Mahometaniſm; the Differences between it and Paganiſm, as to the Original of both, 681. a.

Mahometans recommended themſelves to the Prayers of their Saint Fatima, and at the ſame time make Wiſhes for her, 1287. b. Leſs rigorous to the Chriſtians than thoſe to Hereticks, 2362. a. Their great regard for Ariſtotle, 364 a.

Maid of Orleans; by what Hiſtorians own'd to have been a Counterfeit, 1570. b. m. By whom tutor'd, and taught her Leſſon, 1571. a.

Maidenheads reſtored by bathing in the Fountain Canathus, 1815. a. Ways among the Ancients of diſcovering whether a Girl had loſt her Maidenhead, 1078.

Maignan (Father), the ſame Invention owing juſtly to him and Father Kircker, at one and the ſame time, 2124 a.

Maille (Jaquelin de) an extraordinary Paſſage concerning him in a Battel with the Sarazens, 715. a.

Maimonides; the Honour and Glory of the Jewiſh Nation, 79. b. Allows Beaſts to have Reaſon, and a kind of Free-will, 2606. b. The Conſequences of this Opinion, ibid.

Mainbourg; the Overtures which he pretends were made by King John towards a Reconciliation of Sweden to the Church of Rome ſuppoſititious, 1388. b. An Artifice of his to diſguiſe his Plagiariſm, 1654. b. His Malice in ſaying that Catharine de Bore, Martin Luther's Wife, was very handſome, 674. a.

Maintenon (Madam) how pretended to be deſcended from Joan de Albret, Queen of Navarre, 2348. a.

Maldonat, his Charge againſt the Reformed, that rejecting the Doctrine of a real Preſence leads to Atheiſm, anſwered and confuted, 1940. a.

Malebranch (Pere) his Argument to ſhew that we could not know what Matter is if it were uncreated, 1198. b. His Doctrine concerning our Ideas only a reviving of ſome Objections of Porphiry againſt his Maſter Plotinus, 198.

Malefactors; the puniſhing Malefactors, one of the beſt Arguments for the Liberty of Man, 2609. b.

Malherbe called a Court Pedagogue by Balzac, on account of his Nicety and exact Periods, 2145. a. A Reflection of his on Cain's killing his Brother, 206. b.

Malice; a great Inſtance of it in Cardinal Richlieu, who makes a falſe Quotation to fix a horrible Slander on Beza, 618. b.

Mamre; Oak of Mamre, under which Abraham uſed to ſit; how long it ſtood, 36. b.

Mamonis, his exalted Idea of the Divinity, 1681. a.

Man; the Age of Man according to Heſiod, 1578. a. The Proportion he makes between it and that of ſeveral other mortal Natures, ibid. His Condition alone affords the greateſt Objection to the Manicheans againſt the Unity of God, 2151. a.

Manes, Founder of the Sect of the Manicheans; his Quality and deſervedly Tragical End, 2147. b. Had like to have been killed by the People, while he diſputed publickly with Archelaus, a Biſhop, 2166. a.

Manicheans grow mighty powerful under the Name of Paulicians, and by what Means, 2484. A terrible Slaughter of them, 2485. a. Their Tenet of two diſtinct Principles, whereby they account for the Origin of Evil, not to be refuted by any Arguments, a Priori, 2486. a. Why a Manichean at this Day would be a more terrible Adverſary than in former Times, 2490. a. From whom they borrowed their Tenet of two Principles, one of Good, the other of Evil, 344. Where their Hereſie has at this time the greateſt footing, 2485. a.

Mankind eaſily deceived, and difficultly undeceived in Religion, 96. a.

Manners; an Affectation of the Manners of foreign Countries leads to Ridicule, 150. b.

Mar; a Title of Honour among the Eaſtern People, like Mr. or Monſieur among us, 29. b.

Marble-Table, a kind of a Bar, at which the Princes of the Blood of France uſed to be tried, 766. b. The Dauphin called to it, and Sentence of Baniſhment and Excluſion paſt upon him, ibid.

Marble, Arundelian Marbles, how brought into England, 2698. a. b.

Marca (Peter de la) Archbiſhop of Tholouſe, a Manuſcript of his committed to the Abbot Faget, and publiſhed by him, ſhews he did not differ from the Proteſtants in the Doctrine of the Euchariſt, 2158. b.

Marcus Fabricius, a Proteſtant Profeſſor of Heidelburgh, maintains the Uſefulneſs of Plays, 2320. b.

Mares, their exceſſive Heat, Diſſert. xxix.

Marceſius, a Hugenot Miniſter; his capitulating with Altingius at the Point of Death, about a form of Reconciliation, 191. b. what he got by putting in his Oar among the Janſeniſts and Jeſuits, 2176. a.

Margaret, Queen of Navarre, receives a Box no the Ear from the King her Husband for having heard ſome new form of Prayers from the Hugonot Miniſters in her Chambers, 2337. a. Her Curioſity to have a ſenſible Demonſtration of the Separation of the Soul from the Body, ibid a. Her extraordinary Beauty, 2104 b. She outdoes Katharine de Medicis at her own Weapon, 1636. b. Her Maids of Honour fool thoſe of Katharine de Medicis, ibid.

Margaret of Valois, Siſter of Charles the IXth. and Queen of Navarre, compared her childiſh Actions with thoſe of Alcibiades and Alexander the Great, 2349. a. Her Affectation, when asked by her Mother, whether the King her Husband had conſummated, ibid. Her Brother Charles the IXth, an Oracle, when to wheedle the Hugonots he ſaid he gave his Siſter not only to be a Wife to the King of Navarre, but to all the Hereticks. 2350. a. Does the Office of a Midwife to her Husband's Miſtreſſes, 2351.

Maria Cornelia, Wife of Don John de la Cerda, her Death more heroick and ſingular than that of Portia Cato's Daughter, 1024. b.

Mariana, miſtaken in attributing the Decay of Letters and Learning in Caſtile to Alphonſus's permitting the publick Acts to be drawn up in the vulgar Tongue, 901. a. His Jeſt on Alphonſus, ibid. His wonderful Unconcernedneſs as well at the Cenſures on his Hiſtory of Spain, as at the Apologies made for it, 2179. a. A great Lover of Liberty, and ſevere upon Kings, 2178. b.

Market; Hadrian's Market, where and whence ſo called, 499. b.

Marolles (Abbé de) criticised upon his Translation of Filium cognovit, 811. a.

Vol. II. 801. Marot's Psalms relished by Francis I. 2819. M. ad in. 1007. O. ad med.

Vol. III. 1551. Marriage (The) Contract between Henry IV. of France, and one of his Mistresses torn by Mr. de Rosni before the King's Face, 2910. b.

Vol. IV. 1459. Marriages; how a Minister that has liv'd in Continence 'till 69, may come to fall in Love, and marry at that Age, 1584. b. The Effects of Reconciliation not found to be so sweet in Marriage as Gallantry, 190. b. Its Inconveniences, a Motive of renouncing it unworthy a spiritualiz'd Soul, 698. a. A warning to old Men not to marry young Women, 2146. b. Marrying a Mistress that one has debauched to save her Reputation, is but skinning over the Wound, 987. a. A Reparation of Honour as to the Magistrate, but not as to the World, ibid. The Laws of Athens allowed of Marriages between Brother and Sister on the Father's Side, 986. a. The difference between Solon and Lycurgus upon the point of Marriage, ibid. b. The degrees prohibited in Athens and Lacedæmon, 2674. a. Whether Women are obliged before-hand to acquaint those they are designed to Marry with any bodily Imperfections they may have, 2725. a. The Complaint of Luigi-Groto upon the hard Terms of Marriage, compared with other Bargains, 2726. a. why Recommended to the Clergy by the Visitors in the beginning of the Reformation, 741. a. Marriage makes a sensible alteration in the Voice of Preachers the first Year, 1085. C.

Marrow; the Opinion of the Antient Naturalists, that Lyons have no Marrow in their Bones, contradicted by Anatomical Experience, 57. b.

Marsilius Ficinius; his appearing after Death to Michael Mercalus according to Promise, and attesting a future State, 668. b.

Martial; by whom castrated for the use of Youth, 2730. b.

Martin (St.) a remarkable Trial of Skill between him and St. Germain, 843. b.

Martyr; why the Blood of the Roman Catholick Martyrs in Japan shou'd have no such increase as in the Primitive Times, 1741. b.

Martyrologies, tho' unskilfully Written, wound Tyrants deeper than the sharpest Satyrs, 1281. b. Some Persons who were Anabaptists have found a place in the Martyrology of Geneva, 241. b. Two Martyrologies of the Anabaptists, and each criticis'd by the opposite Sects among them, 241. b. The Origin of the fabulousness of the Popish Martyrologies, 2941. b.

Mary, Queen of Scots, compared to Joan I. of Naples in all her Destiny, 2323. a. Presumptions for the Truth of Cambden's Account of her, in opposition to that of Bucanan, 830. b.

Mary (Virgin) the critical time in addressing Prayers to her, 852. b. The extravagant Honours paid to her by the Roman Catholicks, what they owe their Original to, 1815. a.

Mass; a Mass designed for ending the Difference between the two Religions, 54. The Mass in seven Points a reformed Mass proposed to be introduced by Francis I. of France, 2335. b. What Domitius Calderinus used to say to his Friends when they would make him go to Mass, 809.

Massacre; the reason of the Massacre of the Goats in some part of France, 520. a. b. General Massacre of the Protestants, when and where concerted, 94. b.

Mathematicks; the wonderful Genius of Mr. Pascal for them, 2465. a.

Matrimony; fewer Women commit Matrimony with their Footmen, then Men with their Maids, 1413. a.

Matter; the absurdity of making it capable of thinking, not lessen'd by saying, that this Power is communicated by a special Gift of God, 1827. b.

Maxims and Schemes of Policy form'd by Cardinal Richlieu from Barclay's Argenis, 493. a.

Maxim (A) of Cardinal Richlieu's, that Unfortunate and Imprudent, are but two Words for one and the self same thing, 2897. a. An ill Maxim among Kings, to reward Rebellions, and neglect Faithful Subjects, 944. a.

Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary, invited Poets, Grammarians and Rhetoricians to his Court, only to make them beg their way home, 670. a.

Maugars (Monsieur) Author of a Discourse on the Italian Musick, 510. b. n. His great Character of Signiora Leonara Baroni, ibid. b.

Maximilian I. His Expressions against the Popes, 1733. a.

Maximus Tyrius; his Explication of the Origin of Evil, 2495. b. & seq.

Mazarin (Cardinal) a fine Saying of his, 478. a. Reasons of his not answering all the Letters sent to him in the time of his Ministry, 2695. b. The Genealogists derive his Family from the Ancient Roman Consuls T. Geganius Macerinus, Proculus Geganius Macerinus, &c. 2963. a. His great Contempt for them on this Score, ibid.

Mecca; the Grand Signior's Yearly Present to it, 2169. a. The black Stone worshipped there, 98. b. The Cause of its turning black, 99. a.

Medina; the Character of a Priest of the Village of Medina in Spain, during the Rebellion of the Boors, 2442. b.

Medicis; the fabulous Origin of the House of Medicis, as delivered by a most Reverend Prelate of France from the Pulpit, 2666. a.

Medicis (Catherine de) got with Child after a ten Years Barrenness, by the Advice of Fernelius, and how, 1295. b. Was in terrible Frights that she should be divorced on the Score of Barrenness, 1296. b. Outdone at her own Weapons, and her Maids of Honour fool'd by those of the Queen of Navarre, 1636. b. Testimonies of her strong Inclination to become a Calvinist, 2770. a. b. How the Leprosy was derived to her Children, 1295. b. n.

Medicis (John de) afterwards Leo X. was made a Cardinal at 15. 692. a.

Medicis (Lorenzo de) his Generosity to the Learned Hermolaus Barbarus, 490. b.

Medicis (Mary de) wherein compared to Penelope, 2512. b.

Melancton; his Narrative about Castellan's destroying Bigorius with Francis I. by representing him a Republican and Aristotelian, false and groundless, 624. a. Disapproves the Predestination of Luther and Calvin, 2739. a. b. Censures the Divines of Geneva, as if they had introduced the fatality of the Stoicks, 2740. a. His Moderation, 2741. a. Is invited into France by Francis I. 1027. F.

Melquites; a Name of Reproach given to the Catholicks, why and by whom, 2362.

Memnon (General of Darius) his Answer to a Soldier who reviled Alexander, 553. b. n.

Memory, a false Definition of it ascribed to Aristotle, 2518. b. An Instance of a prodigious Memory, 1694. b. Local Memory, by whom first applied and improved, 2734. a.

Menage (Mr.) called the French Varro, 1188. b. Wherein he excelled his Original, ibid. n.

Menagiana; an excellent Lesson out of it for Superannuated Poets, 1065. b.

Menelaus; what disarmed the Cuckold when he was just a going to kill Helena, 1589. b.

Mental Reservation lessened in one of Euripides's Plays, for which he was brought into Trouble, 1268. a.

Merit; superiority of Merit sometimes an obstacle to Preferment, 943. a. In what Cases a high Merit may be a just Bar to one's Preferment, 276. b.

Messenians were not allowed to say that Aristodemus killed Theopompus, but only that he wounded him, 213. b.

Metamorphosis (Ovid's) less absurd than that of the Quietists, 707. a.

Metan; Inventer of the Golden Number, 1580. b.

Metempsychosis; the Belief of it produced a perfect indifference to Life, 1408. a. A Resolution, by whom so called, 41. b.

Mezerai; his Slander of Beza unbecoming a judicious Historian, 614. a. Answers to his own Objection about the Praises Homer bestows on Penelope very ill, 2512. a. He hath such Faults, that if there arose good Censurers, it may be wondered how he ever made himself esteemed, 2236. b. The first Edition of his Chronological Abridgment in 4to. why more valuable than the after Editions corrected by himself, 250. b.

Midwives (Men) first introduced in France, 1666. a.

Milan; the various Changes of its Government and Governors in the space of about seventy Years, 2723. a. b. 2724. b. How it came to the Kings of Spain, ibid.

Millenarians render the Reformed Religion odious to the supreme Powers, 2175. b.

Millennium; supposed to have been presaged by the Conjunction in Sagittarius on the 11th of December, 1662. by Serrius, and other Fanaticks, 2175. b.

Minerals; several Learned Men of Opinion that they are produced by Intelligent or Spiritual Beings, 2614. b.

Minerva; a passionate expostulation of Demosthenes with the Goddess Minerva in the Hour of his Adversity, 2544. b.

Ministers (Hugonot) denied the Title of Pastors, 1304. a. That of Verbi Divini Minister in the Title Pages of their Works, or under their Prints, ended in Paul Ferri, and was never allowed any other Minister after him, 1305. a. Several of them who received Pensions from the Court of France vindicated as to their Honesty, 1310. a.

Miniſter (*Eccleſiæ*) *not uſed as a Title by any before* Luther, 1344. a.

Miracles, *the Non-converſion of the Places where they have been wrought, no Argument againſt the certainty of their having been wrought in thoſe Places*, 1047. a. *A Jeſt of the* Romiſh *Prieſts on the* Greek *Prieſts, upon a pretended Anniverſary Miracle of the latter*, 1163. b. *Miracles wrought in the Temple of* Venus *on Mount* Eryce, *according to* Ælian, 1163. a. *An Hypotheſis, ſhewing how certain Miracles may be in Vogue in one Age, and ceaſe in another*, 1180. b. *Credulity multiplies them, and the multiplying Diſcredits them*, 67. a. *The Conduct of the Church of* Rome, *much like that of Paganiſm, on this Head*, ibid.

Mirtle, *why Sacred to* Venus, 1735. b.

Miſery. *The Miſeries of Human Life an indiſpenſable Topick of Conſolation in certain Caſes*, 1028.

Miſna, *from whoſe Writings Compos'd*, 138. b.

Miſſal, *an Ancient* Romiſh Miſſal, *publiſh'd by* Flavius Illyricus, *a* Lutheran *Divine, makes againſt his Sect*, 1749. a. & ſeq.

Miſtreſſes, *the Miſtreſſes of Modern Poets never praiſed in Verſe after once they become their Wives*, 2682. b. *The difference between the Ancient and the Modern Poets in this Point*, ibid.

Mneſitheus, *The Son of* Iphicrates, *the Reaſon he gave, why he lov'd his Mother better than his Father*, 1035. b.

Mob, *The Fury of the Mob againſt an Excommunicated* Hugonot *Miniſter*, 1308. a.

Moderation, *how it comes to be miſconſtrued Treachery, and by whom*, 1310. a. *Moderation in Opinions, its Fate*, 565. b. *Moderation of the Council of* Trent *in their condemning of* Arius, 368. b.

Modeſty, *when once turn'd out of Doors, ſeldom returns again*, 699. b. *Inſtances of a ſenſe of Modeſty in the Actions of the Lewdeſt and moſt Diſſolute Perſons*, 2304. b. *A rare Inſtance of Modeſty taken from* Bernia, 89. a.

Moliere. *His* Amphitrion *prefer'd to that of* Plautus, 221. a.

Monarchs, *Not ſo much Idoliz'd by the* French *as People imagine*, 2021. A. *The Character of Monarchs above a Jeſt*, 2961. a.

Monluc (John de) *Biſhop of* Valence, *his great Character of* Calvin, 820. b.

Monpenſier (*Dutcheſs* de) *the Cauſe of her Hatred for* Henry III. 1623. a. *The movements ſhe gave her ſelf to be reveng'd of him*, ibid. *Us'd to ſhew the Cizars with which ſhe intended to clip* Henry III. *when the League deſign'd to thruſt him into a Monaſtry*, 812. b. *What provok'd her*, ibid.

Monk, *a Paſſage of an Hermophradite Monk, who got himſelf with Child*, 1639. a.

Montagne, *his Compaſſion for the hard Fate of Learned Men*, 891. a. *His Judgment on the old Writers of* France, 556. b. *Thought the Prieſts ſquare Caps very ridiculous*, 689. b. *His Reflection on the giving of* Peter Aretin *the Title of Divine, which no Writer before him had but* Plato, 338. b. *Cenſures* Guicciardine *for attributing to ill Motives all the Actions related in his Hiſtory*, 1679 a.

Montefabro (*Count of*) *a famous Engineer in the* XVIth *Century, built the Citadels of* Antwerp *and* Turin, 1439. a. b.

Montmorancy (Anne de) *Conſtable of* France, *could not write his own Name*, 558. a.

Montmorancy (*Conſtable of*) *Author of the moſt diſadvantageous Treaty that ever* France *made*, 1613. a. *The Reaſons which mov'd him to this*, 1617. *Why the Head of this Family Style themſelves the firſt Chriſtian Barons*, 266. b.

Monuments, *pretended publick Monuments confirm Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm*, 694. b.

Mony; *the defaming Contempt of Mony, a Wile of the Devil, according to* St. Chryſoſtome, 225. a. *Reckoned by him among God's good Creatures*, ibid.

Moon, *an Anſwer of the Spirit* Floron *to* Cicchus Æſculanus, *about the Spots in the Moon*, 984. a. *By which of the Ancient Philoſophers believed to be an Inhabited Country*, 3094. b. *By whom firſt diſcovered to borrow her Light from the Sun*. 1407.

Morality, *much Stricter even among the Pagans in the* 2d *Century than in our Days, as to the outward behaviour*, 305. b. *According to* Taſſo, *it is not a Poet's Subject*, 899. b.

Moriæ Encomium (Eraſmus's) *very well receiv'd by the Publick, and eſpecially by Perſons of Quality*, 1215. K.

Mornac, *The Leaps of* Mornac *and* Montbriſſon, *the meaning of it*, 540. a. b.

Mornay (du Pleſſis) *the ſtreſs he lays on the Poet* Dante's *Invectives againſt the Court of* Rome, 1051 a. *Excuſed on his alledging Facts againſt the* Papiſts *without good Grounds, by ſaying that People were not over-nice in thoſe Days*, 2746. a. b.

Morton, *Anſwers the Slanders againſt* Beza *in the firſt Edition of his* Apol. Cathol. *by ſaying*, dum Papiſta fuit, Hircus fuit, *but Corrected this in the ſecond Edition*, 914. b. n. *The Reaſon of this*, ibid. b.

Moſes, *his Song in the* 15th *of* Exodus *exceeds all that ever were compos'd, in Poetical Beauty*, 2185. b. *What Body he appear'd in, according to Mr.* Poiret, *at the Transfiguration*, 2611. b. *Impieties touching the Miracles of* Moſes, *and generally touching the whole Scripture*, 728. B. *Oppos'd and contradicted by* Joſephus, 30. a.

Moſque, *No Place where a* Turkiſh Moſque *has been built, is to be deliver'd up by any Treaty*, 1776. a.

Mothers, *by a Law of* Henry II. *of* France, *in what Caſe reputed to Murder their own Children*, 2478. b.

Motion. *The ſuppos'd Effect of Bodies to remove from the Center of Motion overthrown by an Experiment*, 1125. a.

Moulin (Du) *his generous Refuſal of a Penſion from the Court of* France, 1310. b.

Munſter (*Treaty of*) *Anathematis'd by the Pope*, 971. a. *Canons of* Munſter *prove their Nobility by ſixteen Deſcents*, 2647. a. *An Epitaph upon the Tomb of a Canon, importing, That he Died a Captain in the Wars*, ibid.

Murder. *A Book ſhewing that there are thirty four Caſes in which a Man may innocently commit Self murder*, 2641. a.

Muſcovy (*Czar of*) *the manner of chuſing him a Wife*, 1371. b. n. *Why more fear'd by the* Turks *than any Chriſtian Potentate*, 2107. a.

Muſes, *why Conſecrated in the Temple of* Hercules *at* Rome, *and put under his Protection*, 1649. b. 1650 a. *Cardinal* Richlieu *exceeding Liberal to them*, 1422.

Muſicians, *have better luck among the Great Ladies and Princeſſes than all the other Profeſſions of the ſame Rank put together*, 2398. a.

Muſick, *which was the firſt Compoſition Set to Muſick*, 2185. b. *The ſix Notes of it* Ut, re, mi, *&c. by whom Invented*, 336 *By whom was the* Gamut *firſt Invented*, 336.

Myſteries, *the beſt way of Explaining them, is to keep to the moſt general Expreſſions*, 1045. b. *unreaſonable to expect the Anſwers of Divines about Myſteries above Reaſon ſhould be as clear as the Objections of the Philoſophers*, 959. b. *Myſteries of the Cloſe-ſtool*, 139 a. *Whether the rejecting of Myſteries be a good way to get many Followers*, 2757. b.

Mythologiſts, *a Cenſure of the ancient* Greek Mythologiſts 1580. b.

NA.

Nakedneſs, *why ſeveral Chriſtian Sects have gone without Cloaths, and not been aſhamed to diſcover their Nakedneſs, when none but the* Cynicks *among the* Pagans *could overcome Natural Modeſty to ſuch a degree*, 2927. b.

Names, *Two Names given to things in* Homer, *as* Scamander *and* Xanthus *to the ſame River, one according to human Language, the other according to the Language of the Gods*, 2682. b. *Some Names hard to be ſuſtain'd, as* Ariſtotle, *&c.* 368. a. *A Cuſtom of changing Names in the* XVth *Century*, 136. *They who were made Citizens of* Rome *took the Name of him who procured them that Honour*, 470. b. *The Misfortune of an unharmonious Name*, 478. b. n. *The Cuſtom of calling Men by their Chriſtian Names in* Latin *Books breeds a great deal of confuſion*, 1402. a. *The Benefit of having a Name that will fit in Rhime*, 1264. a.

Naudé, *his Opinion of four Books, written with the greateſt Art of any*, 652.

Nantes (*Edict of*) *had never been Ratify'd by the Parliament of* Paris, *if* Henry *the* IVth *had only made uſe of mild Entreaties*, 1713. a.

Naples (*Joan of*) *The barbarous Murder of her Husband* Andrew, *and the ſuppoſed Cauſe of it*, 2321. a. *Informations Exhibited againſt his Murderers, by Order of* Clement VI. 2325. *The way* Joan *of* Naples [illegible] *to diſcover her Paſſion for* Caraccioli, *Grand Seneſchal of her Kingdom*, 815. a. Mary *Queen of* Scots *compar'd to her in all her Deſtiny*, 2323. a.

Natural Right, *not admitted by ſome Philoſophers*, 339. b.

Nature (*Human*) *how ſuſceptible of the worſt Turns*, 141. b.

Navarre (Antony *King of*) *lured off from the Proteſtants by a vain Proſpect*, 1634. b.

Navarre (Joan *Queen of*) *her Heroick Courage in Childbirth*, 2340. b. *Her Marriage of Conſcience with a Gentleman of her Court, by the Approbation of her Proteſtant Miniſters, to whom ſhe had confeſs'd ſhe could not contain, ſhewn to be without any Grounds*, 2348. a.

Navarre (Margaret *Queen of*) *receives a box on the Ear from the King her Husband, for having heard the new Prayers from the* Hugonot *Miniſters in her Chamber*, 2337. a. *Her Curioſity to have a ſenſible Demonſtration of the Separation of the Soul from the Body*,

Vol. II. 801. Vol. III. 1551. Vol. IV. 1439.

2337. a. *Her extraordinary Beauty*, 2104. b. *She outdoes* Katherine de Medicis *at her own Weapons*, 1656. b. *Her Maids of Honour foil thoſe of* Katherine de Medicis, ibid.

Nazianzen (St. Gregory) *his Teſtimony of the Councils of his time*, 2361. a.

Necklace; *a Necklace fatal to all that wore it*, 813. a. *What Materials it was made of*, ibid.

Needle; *an attempt to prove its uſe among the Ancient* Egyptians, *and its being worſhipped under Hieroglyphicks as a Diety*, 1656. a.

Neapolitan Horſes; *Princes of the Houſe of* Lorrain *compared to them*, 850. b.

Nepenthes; *what it was*, 1595. a.

Nepos (Cornelius) *a Dilemma very hard for him to get over*, 1051. b. *His Life of* Conon *and that of* Ageſilaus, *look as if compoſed to confute each other*, ibid.

Nero; *the firſt* Roman *Emperor that had his Speeches made for him*, 1554. a.

Neſtorianiſm; *why favoured by the* Mahometan, *and other Infidel Princes*, 2362. a. b. *It is only a Diſpute about Words*, 2359. b. *Father of the Oratory at* Mons, *accuſed of renewing the Hereſy of* Neſtorianiſm, 2363. a. *Suppoſed to have favoured* Neſtorius, *upon which a Book of his was ſuppreſſed*, 2365. a. n.

Neſtorian, *and other Hereſies, would have overſpread the World; but for the Authority of the Emperors and Imperial Laws*, 2562. a.

Nevers (*Duke de*) *his inſolent Behaviour to* Henry II. *from a regard to the Glory of* France, 1615. b.

News; *an inſtance ſhewing how cautious Ambaſſadors ought to be in Writing News to their Principals*, 2651. a.

New-Year's-Gift; *of what kind made to the Footmen of a great Miniſter*, 1584. a.

New Jeruſalem; *which Town in* Europe, *according to the Prophecies of the Anabaptiſts, was to be the* New-Jeruſalem, 689. b.

Nice (*Council of*) *their Moderation in condemning* Arius, 368. b.

Nicephorus; *a fabulous injudicious Writer*, 1760. b.

Nicholas I. *Pope of* Rome, *deſerved the Title of Moſt Great*, 928. a.

Nicolle (*Mr.*) *his Objection againſt the Proteſtants Rule of Faith, leads directly to Scepticiſm*, 2372. b. *All his Arguments retorted*, ibid.

Nidhard (*Father*) *Confeſſor to the Queen of* Spain, *Wife of* Philip IV. *The ground of his great Favour in her Court, and his Elevation to the Cardinal's Cap*, 2378. a. *The honourable manner of diſmiſſing him from Court*, 2376. b.

Nigidius; *why he had the Sirname of* Figulus, *according to St.* Auſtin, 2380. b.

Niſmes; *the Fury of the Mob of* Niſmes *againſt an Excommunicated Hugonot Miniſter*, 1308. a.

Nobility; *the Ancient Chriſtians towards the IVth Century frequently mentioned the Nobility of their Birth*, 1599. b. *The Canons of* Munſter *prove their Nobility by ſixteen Deſcents*, 2647. a.

Nogeut (*Count de*) *his knack at reviving a Languiſhing Converſation*, 539. *An inſtance of it*, ibid.

Nonconformity; *a Crime; who the Invention of it is aſcribed to*, 2886. B.

Noſe; *a good Noſe one Mark of the true* Meſſiah, *according to the* Jews, 501.

Novellæ; *a Commentary on the Decretals of* Gregory IX. *by* John Andreas, *why ſo entituled*, 255.

Novels (*Gallant*) *by whom firſt brought in Faſhion in* France, 1743. a.

Nudities; *looking at them by whom reckon'd ſometimes a venial, and at other times a mortal Sin*, 88. b.

Number (*Golden*) *by whom ſettled, and when*, 1580. b. 1581. a.

Numen; *a Jeſuit cenſured on his blaming the uſe of this Word to the Holy Virgin*, 670. b.

Nuns; *their exorbitancy at* Genoa, 692. a. *Why they don't deſire a penetrative Virginity*, ibid. *The Mark which thoſe have in Death who have lain with a Nun*, 2177. a. *Thoſe who have been in any part of their Lives Lewd, were to be ſequeſtred from thoſe who had been always Chaſt, according to the Opinion of the Fathers*, 1325. a.

O A.

OAk of Mamre, *under which* Abraham *uſed to ſit, how long it ſtood*. 36. b.

Oaths; *the Form of the Oath exacted by the* Turks, *when they enter into an Alliance with Chriſtian Powers*, 1352. a. Euripides *brought to Trouble for leſſening the Religion of an Oath, and teaching Mental Reſervation in one of his Plays*, 1268. a. *Falſe Oaths of Lovers are forgiven, according to* Plato, 1341. b.

Obedience (*Paſſive*) *a Scotchman beaten in* France *for Preaching it*, 835. b. *By whom Paſſive Obedience was Preached up among the Proteſtants in* France, 505. *A ſhort Apology of an* Engliſh *Divine for Paſſive Obedience*, 1409. a.

Obſcenities, *whether Caſuiſts may be ſuppoſed capable of treating Caſes extreamly Obſcene without unchaſt imaginations*, 2668. b. *Why the obſceneſt* Latin *Poets are not put into the Liſt of forbidden Books, by the Inquiſition*, 656. a. *An Apology for the ſeeming Obſcenities, merry Tales, and Smut to be met with in this Dictionary*, 1194. b. 1195. a.

Obſcurity *of the Scriptures, a Notion of it*, 1219. a. *Obſcurity of Satyrical Writings*, 17. *Obſcure Paſſage in* Plautus, *how Diſcover'd, and by whom*, 1401. b.

Ochinus (Bernardin) *falſly ſaid to be the Author of the Book* de tribus Impoſtoribus, 2391. *Would never have quitted the Habit of his Order, being a profeſs'd Capucin, if he could have preached the Proteſtant Doctrines without hazard of his Life*, ibid.

Octavia, *Daughter of* Claudius, *and Wife of* Nero, *the Anſwer of one of her Maid-ſervants, who had the Queſtion given her to make her confeſs* Octavia *guilty of Adultery*, 2398. a.

Offence (*common*) *the difference between it and a Privileg'd Caſe*, 147. a. n.

Olivarez (*Count and Duke of*) *fomented the Amorous Inclinations of* Philip IV. *whoſe Governour he was*, 455. b. *His Reaſons for it*, ibid.

Ophites, *a kind of Heretick, who had a particular Veneration for Serpents, and very Blaſphemous Thoughts about them*, 1251. a.

Opinions, *of two Opinions, neither of which has any Foundation, one may be beſt for the Pulpit*, 81. a. *The Broachers of New Opinions, hardly ever know where to ſtop*, 445. b.

Oracles, *which were the famouſeſt of the Heathen Oracles*, 216. b. *All the Pagan Oracles did not ceaſe upon the Preaching of the Goſpel*, 219. b. *The Oracle of* Apollo *more Infallible than that of* Jupiter; *the latter compar'd to the Infallibility of the Pope* ex Cathedra, *according to the* Gallican *Church, the former to the Infallibility of a Council*, 105. a. Pythian *Oracle, in what kind of Verſe moſt uſually given*, 1263. b. *What Oracle ſubſiſted in the Days of* Conſtantius *the Son of* Conſtantine, 28.

Orange (William, *firſt Prince of*) *a Politick fetch of his, which coſt* Don John *of* Auſtria *his Life*, 454. a.

Orange (William, *Prince of*) *The Example which encourag'd* Gerard *to Aſſaſſinate him*, 1785.

Orators, *their repreſenting an Impiety as Succeſsful, repugnant to Decency and may prejudice good Manners*, 871. b. *The difference between the Language of an Orator, and that of an Hiſtorian in certain Caſes*, 1019. b. *Orators and Poets, not knowing when to give over, a great Fault*, 99. a. b.

Oratory (*Father of the*) *at* Mons, *accuſed of renewing the Hereſie of* Neſtorianiſm, 2363. a.

Ordeal, *a Memorable Inſtance of a Trial by Ordeal*, 314.

Origen *defends the Goſpel Precepts in Perſecution of Flying from one City to another, which* Celſus *Scoff'd at*, 395. b.

Original *of Evil*, Simplicius *his Thoughts about this Queſtion*, 2498. b.

Orleans (*Pere de*) *modeſt in his account of* Anne Bullen, 662. a.

Orleans (*Maid of*) *by what Hiſtorians own'd to have been a Counterfeit*, 1570. b. n. *By whom Tutor'd, and taught her Leſſon*, 1571. a.

Oromaſdes, *The Name of the Deity which the* Perſians, *and after them the* Manicheans *acknowledge as the Principle of Good*, 344.

Orpheus, *his Notion concerning the Origin of the Gods*, 231. b.

Orthodox *Principles often through Perſecution are quitted out of Diſlike for the Perſons of their Perſecutors*, 2997. b.

Orthodoxy, *Perſecution indiſpoſes ſome Men for it, and forces them out of the Orthodox Paths againſt their Inclinations*, 2997. b.

Oſtentation, *how indecent to Learned Men*, 868. b.

Otho, *Emperor, Convicted of Murder upon a Trial by* Ordeal, *and his Head demanded in a general Aſſembly by the Widow of the Perſon Condemn'd upon his Sentence*, 314.

Ottoman, *In which of their Race the Title of Grand Signior did begin*, 2113. a.

Oven, *A Cuſtom in the Convent of* Spain *for a* Monk *to ſhut himſelf up in a hot Oven, which paſſes for a Miracle*, 1677. b.

Overtures, *pretended to be made by King* John *towards a Reconciliation of* Sweden *to the Church of* Rome *ſuppoſititious*, 1388. b.

Ovid, *leſs abſurd in his* Metamorphoſis, *than the* Quietiſts *in theirs*, 707. a. *Condemn'd and Criticiz'd on his deſcription of the Paſſion of* Biblis, 620. 621. a.

Oxford (Catalogue of) an Error mark'd in it, 2481. b.
Oyl, by whom Invented, 351. b.
Oysters, sent fresh from Rome to Parthia in the Days of Trajan, 289.

P A.

PAciotti (Francis) Count of Montefeltro, a famous Engineer in the XVIth Century, built the Citadels of Antwerp and Turin, 2459 a.b.
Paganism; the Philosophers the only Men who wrote in Defence of it against the Christians, 198. b. The difference between Mahometanism and Paganism, as to the Original of both, 681. a.
Pagans prefer'd the Ideas of Virtue before the ill Example of their Gods, 1825. b. Their Notions of Divinity a true Atheism at bottom, 1830. a. Believed the Divine Nature subject to Ignorance and Caprice, 105. a. What Considerations led them to lay all the blame of their evil Actions on the Gods, 1596. a. Annexed Fatality to certain inanimate things, 829. a. Their Invectives against Fate, 2536. A. They boasted in several of their Cities, that they had the same holy Relicks, as others do now in our Days, 1006. a. Much stricter in their Morals in the second Century than in our Days, as to the outward Behaviour, 305. b. Their Oracles did not all cease upon the Preaching of the Gospel, 219. b.
Pain; the Dispute between the Stoicks and Peripateticks, about the Nature of Pain, a meer Dispute about Words, 1611. a. One may feel Pain without having ever felt Pleasure, 2485. E. ad in.
Painters drew the Goddesses after their own Mistresses, or after the famousest Courtezans, 1323. b. Christian Painters guilty of this Licentiousness in drawing the Virgin Mary, ibid. Those Pieces of theirs which remain unfinish'd by reason of their Death, more admired than their best finish'd Pieces, 2897. b. Ancient Examples of this, ibid. Hannibal despised the Painter who drew him with two Eyes, and rewarded him who drew him in Profil, 519. b.
Paintings, an Instance of the great value of Paintings by the best Hands in ancient Rome, 1695. a. What Pieces a Prince may be allow'd to paint with his own hand, 2327. a. A singular Instance of its bewitching Power over some Minds, ibid. The excessive Price paid by Julius Cæsar for an Ajax and a Medea, 2896.
Palavicini (Cardinal) angry at Father Paul's saying that the Reception of Zuinglius's Doctrine was an Argument that a higher Cause than Zuinglius was concern'd in it, 100. b. He accuses those of Rashness, who judge of the Providence of God, ibid. Forc'd to change some Elogies of Alexander VIII. in his History, after it had been printed off, upon a change of that Pope's Dispositions for his Family, 968. a.
Palmyra; a Description of the Cruelties committed at the Sacking of it, 445. a. b.
Pamphlets, their Authority shewn by an Instance, 948. a.
Pantomimi, their Original, and first Inventers in Rome, 521. a. Reckon'd among the Causes which shook the Roman Empire, ibid.
Papyrius Cursor, design'd by the Romans to Command against Alexander the Great, in case he should have turn'd his Arms against Italy after the Conquest of Asia, 2077. a.
Paquier, rectified in his Notion about the Talents of Persons compar'd with the Occasions and Circumstances of Action, 928. a.
Paracelsus believ'd that our first Parents had not the necessary Parts for Generation before they sinn'd; but that they afterwards grew out like Excrescences, 78. His ridiculous Notion about the Nature of Serpents, 1251. a.
Paraclet, a great Dispute among the Ecclesiasticks about the pronouncing this word, 2454. a. A Priest suspended by his Bishop for pronouncing it Paracletus in the Mass, ibid.
Paraclet (Monastery of the) used the Term Panem nostrum Supersubstantialem, instead of Quotidianum, and why, 1600. b.
Parasites, the hint of a famous Parasite, cited from Paul Jovius, 965. a.
Parchment, its Original and Occasion, with the Reason of the Name, 2521. a. b.
Pareus (David) a foreign Protestant Divine, his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans burnt by the hands of the Common Hangman, by Order of King James I. 2456. b. Letters between him and Magyrus, a Jesuit, address'd in very civil Titles, 2458. a. A Prophecy of his trac'd, 950. a.
Parisians (The) refused to make Bonfires for the Treaty of Ryswick, 'till compell'd to do it by Menaces, 1626. b.
Parliaments of France, their Power of rejecting the King's Edicts most pernicious to the State, 1714. a. Their Power humbled by Michael del Hôpital, Chancellor of France, 1711. a.
Parnassus Reform'd, a bold Falshood invented by its Author, to found a Criticism on the Romance of Theagenes and Chariclea, 1599. a.
Parpaillot, a Nick name for the Hugonots in some Parts of France, 1036. b.
Parrhasius painted Hercules from an Apparition of him, 1646. b.
Parrot, maintain'd by Scaliger the Father, against Cardan and all the Poets, to be an ugly Bird, ibid.
Party; Accounts of an opposite prevailing Party not to be highly believed, 88. a.
Pascal (Mr.) his Notions about Government, 2468. a. His wonderful Genius for the Mathematicks, 2465. a. How he stood with relation to the Jansenists towards his latter End, 2471. b.
Pasquier (Stephen) censur'd on his founding his Plea against Maldonat upon this, that he had attempted to prove the Existence of God by natural Reasons, 2139. a.
Passion of Byblis; Ovid commended and criticis'd on his Description of it, 620, 621. a.
Passions; we must watch the proper Seasons for curing them, 1032. a. Their Tyranny over us, and swaying against all the Ideas of Virtue and temporal interest, a Gulph to the Pagan Philosophers, 1597. a.
Passive Obedience, a Scotch Man drubb'd in France for Preaching it, 833. b. By whom it was preach'd up among the Protestants of France, 206. A short Apology of an English Divine for Passive Obedience, 1409. a.
Pastors; Actions commenc'd against the Ministers of France in their qualifying themselves Pastors, 648. a.
Paterculus (Velleius) his History, how near being lost to the World, 1474. a. He is quoted but by one Writer among the Ancients, ibid.
Patricians, when first bound by the Plebiscita, or Ordinances of the People of Rome, 1693. b.
Pattins; a Husband cheated half in half in Person by his Wife's Pattins, 1055. a.
Paul (Father) his Maxim about Self-murder, 2647. a. Noted for a Mistake about the Persons who presided as Legates in the Council of Trent, 186. b. His relating that the Pope made great Promises to Luther by his Nuncio, in order to bring him over, and the heroick Answer which he puts in Luther's Mouth, a meer Fiction, 1948. a. b. Disobliges Cardinal Palavicini, by saying, that the Reception of Zuinglius's Doctrine was an Argument that a higher Cause was concerned in it, 100. b.
Paul (Saint) whether his meaning in a certain place be, that the Husband may dispose of the Body of his Wife in favour of another Man, 70. b. Charged with making use of extravagant Expressions, 83. b. Compar'd to a swelling Sea, which overflows its Banks, 86. b. Treated very irreverently by the Italians, 87. a.
Paulinus (St.) his retiring from the World and turning Hermit, rallyed by his Master Ausonius, 450. a.
Pausanias, his tragical Adventure with Cleonice, 1000. a.
Peieresc (Mr.) his Obsequies are celebrated by the Academy of Humourists in forty several Languages, 2501. b.
Pederasty; Laius the first that is said to be guilty of it, 972. b.
Pelusiota (Isidorus) his whimsical manner of solving the Text of our Saviour's being three Days and three Nights in the Bowels of the Earth, 140. a.
Penance; extreme Severity of the Jewish Penance, 74. b.
Penelope; Mary de Medicis compared to her, in what, 2512. b.
Penitentiaries, of Paris, inform the first President, that in a Year's time six hundred Women had confess'd they had Murdered their own Children, 2475. b.
Pensioners; the Fate of old Court Pensioners, 1422. b.
People; their Flatterers would perswade us that there's nothing to fear from them so long as a Prince governs well, a false and dangerous Maxim, 694. b. A Maxim concerning them, 213. Why Seneca would never endeavour to please the People, 351. a. Their Power in France over their Kings alternatively maintained by the Protestants and Papists, 1719. a.
Perdiccas, King of Macedon, a singular Piece of Tyranny in his Court, 1259. b.
Perefixe (Archbishop of Paris) receives a visit from a Protestant Minister, tho' he had let him understand before hand, that he could not call him My Lord, 206. a.
Perfection; the highest is to bear Reproof and Praise with indifference, 629. b.
Peripateticks; their Tenet that Prayers and Sacrifices were useless, 362. b.

Vol. II. 801.
Vol. III 1551.
Vol. IV. 2239.

Perron (*Cardinal*) *by a deſign concerted between him and a Hugonot Miniſter, who were to diſpute before* Henry IV. *the Miniſter ſuffers himſelf to be worſted*, 1610. a. *His Compliment to the Queen mother of France, when the Gout had obliged him to receive her ſitting*, 534. a. *The malicious Turn he gives to ſome Apologies of the Proteſtants for Violences grounded on the Practice of eminent* Roman *Catholicks*, 1310. b. *His extravagant Judgment on* Q. Curtius, 1536. a.

Perſecutors *muſt renounce the Title of Conquerors*, 1614. b.

Perſecution; *the Goſpel Precept in Perſecution of flying from one City to another, ſcoffed at by* Celſus, *and how defended by* Origen, 365. b. *One curſed Effect of it, that it ſometimes makes Men quit the Orthodox Principles out of diſlike for the Reaſons of their Perſecutors*, 1997. b.

Perſia; *the Care of the King of* Perſia *for improving his Country Language*, 1418. a.

Perſians; *their Pretence for making War upon* Greece, 1593. b. *They honoured thoſe much who could bear a great deal of Wine*, 1054. a.

Petavius *exalts the Authority of St.* Auſtin *above that of all the other Fathers*, 437. b. *His Reaſon for not replying to a piece of a* Hugonot *Miniſter*, 1039. a.

Peter (*St.*) *his Keys thrown into the River* Tyber, 1788. a.

Peters (Hugh) *plundered* Laud's *Library, and ſuppoſed to have made away with* Cambden's *Papers*, 832. b.

Petrus Valleclauſa; Theophilus Rainaud *calls himſelf by this Name in ſome of his Works*, 2320. a.

Phalaris; *curious Reflections on the Letters of* Phalaris, *in a Book printed in* Germany, *in one thouſand ſix hundred ninety nine*, 333. b.

Phanaticiſm; *a remarkable Inſtance of its turning the Heart againſt God and the Magiſtrate*, 1552. a.

Pharamond, *but little Certainty whether there ever was ſuch a Man*, 1572. b.

Pharſalia; *what paſſed betwixt* Pompey *the Great, and* Cratippus *the Philoſopher, upon the Subject of Providence, after the Battel of* Pharſalia, 1030. a.

Phengites; *a white Stone of* Cappadocia, *hard as Marble, and tranſparent, which ſerved inſtead of Glaſs*, 845. b.

Phenix, *his Speech in the ninth Book of* Homer, *unworthy the Majeſty of an Epick Poem*, 61. a.

Philip *of* Macedon *diſmiſſes all* Alexander's *Confidents upon their giving him a Jealouſie of his Intentions*, 78. b.

Philip *the* Iſt *of* France, *twice excommunicated on account of marrying* Bertrada, *Wife of the Earl of* Anjou, 1325. a.

Philip *the* IId. *loſt the* Netherlands *by his Jealouſie againſt* Don John *of* Auſtria, 454. a. *What hindred him from proceeding againſt his Father* Charles *the* Vth, *as an Heretick after his Death, according to* Amelot, 867. b. *croſſed in his Deſigns againſt* England, *by Pope* Sixtus V. 1172. a.

Philip IV. *his amorous Inclination fomented by* Duke de Olivarez, *his Governor*, 455. b. *His Reaſons for it*, ibid.

Philo, *his Embaſſy from the* Jews *of* Alexandria *to* Caligula, *what it principally related to*, 292. b. *How oppoſed and fruſtrated by the Artifices of* Apion, ibid.

Philoſophers, *when they left off their Habit in the* Roman *Empire*, 1775. a. *The ancient* Greek *Philoſophers ſeeming ignorant of the Exiſtence of a God accounted for very ingeniouſly*, 231. a. *The difference between their banaying the Truth, and the ſharing the Oyſter in the Fable*, 974. C. *They were wretched Writers about the third Century*, 198. b.

Philoſophers (*Pagan*) *the Uſefulneſs of repreſenting their moſt beaſtly and abominable Practices in the ſtrongeſt Terms*, 1671. b. *Expelled* Rome *by a Law*, an. urb. 592. *under the Conſulſhip of* C. Fannius, 1278. *Who was the firſt of the Heathen Philoſophers that admitted a Spirit diſtinct from the Body*, 1827. a. *The only Men who wrote againſt the Chriſtians in defence of Heatheniſm*, 198. b. *The old Philoſophers had the ſame Diſputes about Predeſtination, that the* Jeſuits, Auguſtinians *and* Remonſtrants *have now*, 864 b. *Some Philoſophers allowed Brutes to have a Senſe of God and Religion*, 2606. b. *Which of them believed the Moon to be an inhabited Country*, 3049. b. *Uſed to purge their Brain, and quicken their Wit with* Hellebore, 863. a. *The Contempt of Philoſophers in* Longinus's *Time*, 198. *Some of them would not admit of natural Right*, 339. b.

Philoſophiſing; *in Religious Matters compared to corroſive Powders, which, together with the proud Fleſh, eat away the ſound Parts*, 75. a.

Philoſophy (Peripatetick) *how it tends to foment Diſputes in Divinity*, 1748. b. *Generally claſhes with Religion*, 366. b. *The ſecular Power always ſides with the latter*, ibid. *Who was the firſt that brought Philoſophy to Athens*, 321. b. *The diverſity of Opinions in this Point reconciled*, ibid. *A Motion made for baniſhing it out of the Univerſities of* Germany, *as repugnant to the Truths of Theology*, 1657. b. *They who quitted the Study of it for further Amuſements; why compared by* Ariſtotle *to* Penelope's *Lovers*, 2911. b. *How long a Courſe of Philoſophy uſually laſted in the 17th Century*, 2136. a. Lactantius *raiſed Arguments with a deſign to overthrow all Philoſophy, but is examined and anſwered*, 310. a. b. Martin Luther, *a great Enemy to* Ariſtotle's *Philoſophy*, 366. b.

Philoſtratus *tranſlated in the Camp of* Mathias Corvinus *for that Prince's reading*, 670. a. *His affirming that the Oracle of* Amphiaraus *was in Reputation in the time of* Apollonius, *contradicted by* Plutarch *and* Clemens Alexandrinus, 216. a.

Philtre; *the Root of* Eryngium, *or the hundred headed Thiſtle, reckoned a moſt powerful* Philtre *among the Ancients*, 2672. b.

Phlebotomy *reckoned mortal of old in Perſons before fourteen*, 427. b. *The Opinion of the Ancients about it in a tender Age*, ibid.

Phlegon, *Freedman of* Hadrian, *why he fathered the Hiſtory of* Hadrian's *Life on his Maſter, tho' written by himſelf*, 1556. a.

Phocion, *Inſtances of his generous Behaviour*, 1582. a.

Photius *quotes* Joſephus *wrongfully*, 273. b.

Phyſick; *a Law in* Athens *againſt the Study of Phyſick by Women or Slaves*, 1665. a. *A memorable Caſe, which occaſioned the repealing this Law with reſpect to the former*, ibid. b.

Phyſicks; *who was the firſt that is ſuppoſed to have written Phyſicks*, 167.

Phyſicians; *the exorbitant Fees that ſome Phyſicians demanded in the 13th Century*, 299. b. 300. a. *Their Privileges with the Ladies*, 311. b. *Who was the firſt Phyſician that ever came to* Rome, *and in what Year of the City*, 880. b. *Aſcribed much to the Influence of the Stars in diſcourſing of the Diſtempers of their Patients about the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century*, 1802. a.

Picture *of a Battel won by* Selym, *Emperor of the* Turks, *painted by his own hand, preſented to the Senate of* Venice, *which is ſtill kept by them*, 2327. a. *Picture of* Calumny *by* Apelles, 287. a.

Picus Mirandola, *his blind Submiſſion to Cardinal* d'Ailly's *Calculations*, 131. a.

Pillars; *the Pillar of Fire which moved before the* Iſraelites *cannot be compar'd to a Fire which* Timoleon *ſaw in a Dream*, 2889. b.

Pin (*Monſieur* du) *his Book ſuppreſſed on a Charge of his favouring Neſtorianiſm*, 2365. a. n.

Pindar; *his Digreſſions take up more than three fourths of his Odes*, 1661. b.

Pinedo; *upon the Queſtion, which was the wiſeſt,* Adam *or* Solomon, *and which is decided in the favour of the former*, Pinedo *excepts Politicks*, 79. a.

Pius II. *his Letter to* Mahomet II. *condemned by the Proteſtants, and juſtified by Catholick Authors*, 2110. & ſeq.

Piſa (*Council of*) *called at the Requeſt of the Emperor and King of* France, *in oppoſition to* Julius II. *afterwards ſhamefully deſerted by the ſame Princes, and ſacrificed to the Council of* Lateran, *called by the ſame Pope*, 1789. a.

Plagiariſm; *two memorable Inſtances of it in the Perſon of* Tortellius, 337. b. *In what Caſes privileg'd, and in what not*, 1184. b. *Artfully diſguiſed by* Mainbourg, 1654. b.

Plague; *an Antidote againſt it*, 431. a.

Plane-trees *watered with Wine in the days of the* Roman *Luxury*, 1695. a.

Planets, *in what Conjunctions of them are Prayers infallibly heard, according to Aſtrologers*, 300. C.

Planudes, *a huge Blunder of his in the Life of* Æſop, 1233. a.

Plato, *a very tender Diſtich of his*, 101. a. *His Opinion about the knowledge of Brutes*, 2520. b. *His Opinion of Eternal uncreated Matter not to be diſguiſed*, 1660. b. *His high Eſteem of* Æſop's *Fables*, 1234. b. *The Reaſon of his going about to burn all the Books of* Democritus, 1084. P. *How he is to be underſtood when he ſtyles* Sappho *the Wiſe*, 2672.

Platoniſts *might eaſily be reconciled to the Doctrine of the* Cainites, *which ſuppoſes that the Genius of every Man forms its own Body*, 807. a. *Their Opinion that God was not able to form the World without the Concourſe of uncreated Matter, how confuted, and by whom*, 1660. a. Platoniſts *nonpluſs'd upon their Syſtem, by the Objections of* Epicurus *againſt God's forming the World, and a Providence*, 1196. a. b. 1197. a. b.

Plautus;

PL

Plautus; *can't be ſuppos'd to falſify a Point of Hiſtory to keep up the Character of an Illiterate Perſon on the Stage*, 2503. a. *The ſenſe of an obſcure Paſſage in him how diſcover'd, and by whom*, 1401. b. *His* Amphytrion *not comparable to that of* Moliere, 121. a.

Plays; *Their Uſefulneſs maintain'd by* M. Fabricius, *a* Proteſtant *Profeſſor of* Heidelberg, 1320. b. *Their Authors not chargeable with the impious Maxims of Perſons repreſented*, 1269. b. *Made uſe of to repreſent the Abuſes of* Popery, 2690. a.

Pleaſure; *in what ſenſe the* Summum Bonum, *or Happineſs of Man*, 1190. b. *A Diſpute between two Beggars wherein conſiſts the Pleaſure of Life*, 2895. b.

Plebeian; *a Quality not inconſiſtent with that of* Noble *in ancient* Rome, 1693. a.

Pliny; *how ſmall a thing in his Belief would change Fate*, 809. b. *An Error in him about the* Aſſyrian *Learning*, 460. a. *An over-refin'd Thought of his*, 1228. a.

Plutarch; *His Miſquotations, and the reaſon of them*, 1816. b. *Tax'd with miſrepreſenting a Character, and calling that Liberality, which is truly Squandering*, 177. b. *Omits a very ſingular Fact in the Life of* Mark Anthony, 278. a. *Criticiz'd on a Conſolatory Argument to a Mother on the loſs of her Son, as alledg'd by him*, 218. b. *Made himſelf ſuch a Maſter of ſome Facts, that he could turn 'em ſometimes one way, and ſometimes another*, 53. b. *Of Opinion that it were better of the two, that* Jupiter *ſhould be defective in point of Power than Goodneſs*, 2491. b. *Confutes the Opinion of the* Stoicks, *about the uſefulneſs of Vice very ſolidly*, 2492. a. *Contradicts himſelf about the Death of* Caſſius, 877. b. *Tells the ſame Story ſeveral ways, and fathers it on ſeveral Perſons*, 1226. a. *How much given to Quotations*, 1188. b. *Fathers the ſame Story upon ſeveral Perſons, and tells it ſeveral different ways*, 1266. a. *Differs from* Cicero *in his Judgment of the Writings and Wit of ſome Authors*, 2885. b.

Poems; *The ridiculous ground of a certain* Pope's *conſidering all Poems* (*tho' on Sacred Subjects*) *as Heretical*, 2705. b. 2706. a.

Poets; *Poets and Orators not knowing when to give over, a great Fault*, 99. a. b. *Happier on Laſcivious than on any other Subjects*, 2204. b. *Several of the ancient* Greek *Poets burnt and deſtroy'd at the Inſtigation of the Primitive Chriſtian Clergy*, 2359. a. *A* Heteroclite *Poet of the Court of* France, *his Excellency and Talents*, 2369. b. *What Judgment is to be made of them from the graveſt Maxims ſcatter'd in their Works*, 1385. b. *An excellent Leſſon for Superannuated Poets, out of the* Menagiana, 1065. b. *Inſtances of the Poverty of Poets*, 2917. b. *A Poetical Parliament call'd upon a certain Poet's purchaſing a Houſe to live in*, 2918. b. *Poets, Rhetoricians, and Grammarians invited to Court, by* Corvinus *King of* Hungary, *with no other deſign than to make them beg their way home again*, 670. a. *The Miſtreſſes of Modern Poets never prais'd in Verſe after once they become their Wives*, 2682. b. Latin *Poets are not put into the Catalogue of Books forbidden by the Inquiſition*, 646. a. *Poets ſpeak of Providence in Metaphors too bold*, 1015, 1016.

Poetry; *The wonderful Taſt of an Aſs for Poetry*, 209. *The* French *Poetry in high Reputation about the* XIIIth. *Century, and made a Model by the* Italians, 2873. b. Moſes's *Song in the* 15th *of* Exodus, *exceeds all that ever was Compos'd in Poetical Beauty*, 185. b.

Poles; *ſolicit Pope* Sylveſter IId. *for the Title of* King, *under the Reign of* Boleſlaus *only*, ad majorem cautelam, 662. b.

Policy; *ſometimes makes uſe of the moſt ridiculous Pretences, a memorable Example of this*, 43.

Politick (A) *Fetch of* William, *firſt Prince of* Orange, *which coſt Don* John *of* Auſtria *his Life*, 454. a.

Polixena; *compar'd to* Anne Bullen, *in one Circumſtance of their Death*, 661. a.

Politian; *an* Epigram *of his on* Domitius Calderinus, 809. a.

Pollio (Aſinius) *his Judgment of* Cæſar's Commentaries, 930. b.

Polycarp (*St.*) *his Staff grown into a wild* Cherry-Tree, *now to be ſeen at the Gate of the Fortreſs of* Smyrna, 1647. b.

PO

Polygamy; *The Chriſtian Laws againſt it, ſaid to hinder the Converſion of Infidels*, 1120. b. *When made Capital in* France, *and by whom*, 1621. b.

Pompey (*Count*) *his turning* Proteſtant *gave ground for ſuſpecting that* Alexander *the* VIIth. *was inclin'd to* Hugonotiſm, 979. a. b.

Pompey (*the Great*) *why oppos'd in his ſuing for a Commiſſion, giving him a Command over all the Seas, when the ſame Commiſſion had been granted before to* Marcus Antonius Creticus, *without the leaſt Oppoſition*, 276. a. *The Honours done to* Poſidonius *the Philoſopher by* Pompey, 2128. b. n. *What paſs'd between the Philoſopher* Cratippus *and him, after his Miſfortune at* Pharſalia *upon the Subject of* Providence, 1030. a. *What his Miſtreſs* Flora *remembred him by*, 1320. b. *The Qualities which ſecur'd him the Love of his Wives, and even of* Julia, *tho' young when he was growing old*, 1321. a. b.

Poneropolis; *a City built by a* Macedonian *King, for the reception of all ſcandalous and flagitious Perſons*, 806. a.

Ponet (*Fryar*) *his ſeditious Sermons againſt* Henry III. 1626. b.

Pontignan; *his unuſual Adventures with a Couple of Ladies of Curioſity*, 1329. a.

Pontius (Conſtantinus) *Preacher to* Charles V. *what that Emperor ſaid of him, when he heard he was turn'd* Heretick, 868. a.

Popery; *expos'd to ſome Hazards by a certain Perſon, rather than he wou'd loſe the opportunity of ſhewing his Eloquence*, 96. a.

Pope; *ſacrifice the Intereſt of the* Romiſh *Religion to their private Intereſt as Sovereigns*, 1172. a. *Said to be the* Whore *in the* 17. *of the* Revelations *by the Poet* Dante, 1051. b. *The neceſſary Qualifications of a Modern Pope*, 566. a. *Pope's Bull for Confirming of Biſhops, a great Scandal to the Court of* France, 2133. a.

Pope; *ſaid by* Dante *the Poet to be the* Whore *in the* Revelations, *and* Rome *the Seat of* Antichriſt, 1051. b. *Not allow'd by* John de la Roquitaillade *to be* Antichriſt, 2603. b. *The Expreſſion of* Maximilian I. *againſt the Popes*, 1733. b. *A Diſcourſe of* Guicciardine's *concerning the Manner how the Popes came to be Temporal Lords of* Italy, *left out of his Fourth Book, where now to be found*, 1791. b. *Always in their Difference force Princes to cringe to them*, 1788. b.

Populace; *its Character from* Livy, 1678. a.

Porcus Trojanus; *what it meant among the ancient* Romans, 2908. b. n.

Pork; *the Reaſon of the* Jews *abſtaining from it*, 90. b.

Porphiry; *did not deny certain Matters of Fact alledg'd by the* Chriſtians, *the reaſon of this*, 545. a. *Had the ſame Thought concerning our* Ideas *that Father* Malebranch *has*, 198.

Portia; *the Daughter of* Cato, *and Wife of* Brutus, *ſwallow'd Live-Coals to kill her ſelf, after the Death of her Husband*, 1024. b. *Her Death not ſo Heroick, nor ſo ſingular as that of* Maria Cornelia, *the Wife of* Don John de la Cerda, *ibid.*

Portroyal; *The Gentlemen of* Portroyal, *and the* Janſeniſts, *and the* French *Nation in general, clear'd from M:* Jurieu's *Charge of* Socinianiſm, 2762. a. b. 2763. a. b.

Portroyal (*Meſſieurs de*) *their Cenſure of* Boccace, 645. a.

Portroyal; *The Deſcendants from the* Jews *not permitted to depart from thence without the King's ſpecial Leave, tho' they have been* Chriſtians *for ſome Generations*, 72. b.

Poſidonius *the Philoſopher, honour'd by* Pompey *the Great*, 2128. a. b.

PO

Poſſevin (the Jeſuit;) procures a Condemnation of Machiavel's Prince, though he had never read it, 2681. a.

Poverty; Death preferable to it, 630. a.

Power; of Kings irreſiſtible, when it is join'd with that an Eccleſiaſtical Party, 111. a.

Power; of Love, a great Inſtance of it, 1413. a.

Pox; who is the Patron Saint among the Catholicks of thoſe who have the Pox, 1761. b. How a Pox circulated in the Court of France, which kill'd Francis the Firſt and his Queen, 1349. a. b. a. The Saying of an Italian as he was dying of the Pox, 1334. b. Donna m' ha fatto, & Donna m' ha diſfatto.

Poyſon; The Athenian Law whereby Criminals were to execute themſelves by a Poyſon'd Draught, abrogated by Chriſtianity, 2180. a.

Praiſe; The love of Praiſe ſtronger than that of Riches and Dominion, 842. a.

Prayers; In what Conjunctions of the Planets infallibly heard, according to ſome Aſtrologers, 300. b.

Præadamites; how to frame a Præadamitical Syſtem which ſhall not claſh with the Scripture Account, 2639. A Book wrote to prove Præadamites, 2500. The Reparation made by the Author, ibid. b. A General Account of him, 2501. a.

Preachers; compared to Æolus, 69. a. The Jealouſy which reigns between your Top Preachers is equal to that of Poets, or Celebrated Beauties, 1695. a. The nominating of Preachers for the Pariſhes of Paris, when taken from the Sorbon, and given to the Archbiſhop, 2335. b. Reproach'd with their running into Digreſſions upon Death, when they have nothing elſe to ſay, 237. a. Four kinds of Preachers exemplify'd by Four kinds of Dogs, 2126. a. A Senſible Alteration in their Voice the firſt Year of their Marriage, 1085. C.

Predeſtination; the Diſputes about it between the Jeſuits, Auguſtinians, and Remonſtrants had a Being among the Old Philoſophers, 864. b. Predeſtination; of Luther and Calvin condemned and diſapproved by Melancton, 2739 a b.

Predictions; not to be ſolved by any Syſtem of Philoſophy, 912. a. The Prediction of a Fortune-Teller notably accompliſhed, 1426 b. A Prediction by which Lewis XIV. was to be General of the 144000 Seal'd Perſons in the Revelations, 2169. b.

Prefaces; Three or Four much admir'd, and which be theſe, 815. a. n.

Prelatures; obtain'd by Methods not to be nam'd, 178. b.

Preſages; promiſing a long and glorious Settlement to the Labadiſts, and yet they ſoon came to nothing, 956. b.

Preſence; (Real) by whom defended againſt Berengarius, 336. This Defence printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum, ibid. Phraſes made uſe of by Calvin in his Catechiſm ſeem to admit a Corporeal Real Preſence, 2703. a. n. The occaſion of theſe Phraſes, ibid.

Prieſts; the Title of Antiſtites giv'n ſometimes to ſimple Prieſts, 2705. b The danger of deſpiſing the Prieſthood on account of Perſonal Defects, repreſented in a Paſſage of the Siameſe Theology, 2767. a. More dangerous to offend them in their own Perſons, than in the Perſons of their Gods, 363. a. A Prieſt ſuſpended by his Biſhop for pronouncing the Word Paracletus in the Maſs, 2454. a.

Princes; more Princes dethron'd for being too good than too wicked, 213. b. Almoſt always forc'd to cringe in their Differences with the Pope, 1788. b. The Power of the People over their Princes alternatively maintain'd in France by the Proteſtants and Papiſts, 1719. a. More at a loſs than meaner Folks what to do with their Horns, 2355. a. No Hiſtorian can be ſincere, who writes of Princes during their own or their Sons Life-time, 2474. a. Their Influence irreſiſtible, when join'd with that of an Eccleſiaſtical Party, 111. a. At what Age Religion comes upon them, 628. a. In what Caſes their Requeſt is a Command, 450. a. Princes who are expelled for their Lewdneſs carry on their Gallantries abroad, 514. In Good Policy no Princes ſhould favour the Rebellions of one anothers's Subjects, 886. a. No Converſation ſo much to be feared by Learned Men as that of Princes when they love Learning, 897. b. Petty Princes compared to the little Devils in Rabelais, who deſtroy only Cabbages and Parſly, 243. a. A Maxim with them to reward Rebellions, and neglect their Faithful Subjects, 949. a. Their Gentleneſs and Over-eaſineſs more prejudicial to the State than the greateſt Harſhneſs and Rigors, 1650. b. The difference between their Reſentments and thoſe of Private Gentlemen, 1427. b. More ruin'd by Condeſcenſion and Good Nature, than by Tyranny and Iniquity, 1156. a. The Services which are above their Acknowledgment, render them ungrateful, 1154. b. A Good Conſcience and Juſt Claim but poor Reſſources for them in Civil Wars, 1156, b. The greateſt Benefits of one Prince to another, don't oblige againſt the Laws of Good Politicks, 1169. a. b. Why ſo many of them love Wars, 1216. a. Their Impurities the Cauſe of the Murther and Ruin of many of them, 326. What Pieces a Prince may be allowed to paint with his own Hand, 2327. a.

PR

Princeſſes; all their Precautions to prevent a ſuſpicion of impoſing falſe Children uſeleſs againſt Ambition, 1612. b.

Principles (Doctrine of two) one Good, the other Evil——Its Origin, 2496. b.

Print; mighty fondneſs of ſome Perſons for appearing in Print, 2521. b.

Printers; An Inſtance of the Miſtakes Learned Men are led into, thro' the Faults of Printers, 261. b. Their Faults of what Importance, and how grievous to an Author, 1152. a. b.

Printing; a Grammar of Donatus's on Vellum, and another Book call'd Confeſſorialia, were the firſt Books printed by John Fauſt, Citizen of Mentz, and Inventor of that Art in the Year 1456, 53. a. 53. b. By whom brought in uſe firſt in Naples, 2129. b.

Privileg'd Caſe; The difference between it and a Common Offence, 147. a. n.

Proceſſion; a Solemn Proceſſion to thank Heaven for the Death of John Calvin, 818. a.

Proclus; of Opinion according to the Doctrine of Plato, that the Souls of Brutes are but Images or Simulacres of the Rational Soul, 2520. a. He deprives them of Thought, without depriving them of Feeling, ibid. 6.

Proculus; his mighty Feats in Love, 1631. b.

Profeſſors (Royal) in Paris, made an Attempt in that Univerſity toward a Reform in the Pronunciation of Latin, 2551. G.

Profeſſorſhip; The Vacancy of a Profeſſorſhip of the Greek Tongue, notify'd as Venice by ſound of Trumpet, 162. a.

Prophaneneſs; why it generally changes into Superſtition at the apprach of Death, 627. b. Whether more excuſable in Poetry or in Proſe, 1385 a.

Prophecies; relating to the Turkiſh Greatneſs, and to its Downfall, 2207, a. & ſeq. A Prophecy of the Pagans, whereby Chriſtianity was to be deſtroy'd after a Duration of 363 Years; how accompliſhid, 2108. a.

Prophecy; concerning Martin Luther, by a Cordelier ſeveral Years before his appearing on the Stage, 1668 a.

Prophets; the difference between a Prophet and a Perſon who only receives the Gift of Expounding Scripture Prophecies, 2601. b. The latter more favour'd by God than the former, ib. How a Perſon ſetting up for Prophecy may be reputed a True Prophet in many Things, 2602. b. The Chief Character of a True Prophet, according to Maimonides, 2109. a. Prophet John, a French Popiſh Fanatick, how he extricated himſelf from a conſiderable Difficulty alledged by the Queen of Poland againſt the Truth of one of his Prophecies, 2171. a.

Proportion; between the preſent Extent of the Chriſtian, Mahometan and Pagan Religions all the World over, 2092. a.

Proſperity; how variable an Argument of the Favour of God, 2114.b.

Proteſtants; a General Maſſacre of 'em, when, and where concerted, 94 b. Said of them, That after they had ſhaken off the Pope's Yoke, they found that of the Secular Power as heavy, 170. A Project of a General Re-union among 'em, by whom encouraged, and by whom oppoſed, 1302. b. Prone to Credulity, if not curb'd by a Spirit of Contradiction to the Roman Catholicks, 1230. b. Articles were intended to be drawn up againſt Cardinal Richlieu, in order to his Diſgrace, one of which was his favouring the Proteſtants, 918. a.

Proverbs; *The Meaning of the Proverb*, He was wrapped in his Mother's Smock, 1773. a. *The Original of the Proverb*, Græcum eſt non poteſt legi, 51. a. *The Ground of that Proverb*, Neſcit prædicare qui neſcit Barcellare, 5:2. b. *An Account of Authors who have written upon the Origin of Proverbs*, 1781. a. b.

Providence; *whether the* Saducees *believ'd a Providence*, 1642. b. *Conſiderations on the Methods of anſwering ſome Difficulties about Providence*, 1629. a. *The Anſwer to the Difficulty drawn from the Proſperity of the Wicked, viz. That they are raiſed on high by Providence only that their Fall may be the greater, ſhewn to be impious*, 1630. a. *Juſtified on the ſame Principles by* Chryſippus *that Mr.* Malebranche *has follow'd*, 982. b. *Men doubt a Providence only when Things do not go well on their ſide*, 18. a. *The Reaſons of its Choice of the Inſtruments of the Reformation*, 111. b. *The belief of it ſtops all Criticiſing from the Irregularities in Nature and Morality*, 1650. b. *In what Reſpects it pleaſes all Parties*, 1276. b. *The Rule it lays on the Bold and the Wiſe, as a means to reſtrain Wickedneſs, and protect Innocency*, 1153. b. *The denying a Providence upon the Principles common to* Epicurus, *with all the other Sects of Philoſophers, leſs abſurd than ſuppoſing it*, 1195. b. 1196. a. b. *Man's Vanity is the Cauſe of his doubting a Providence*, 19. E. *An Axiom of a Modern Author about Providence*, 72. B. *Providence is ſuperior to all our beſt concerted Deſigns*, 282. 785. F. ad fin. *Whether one may be a Perſon of Probity without the belief of a Providence*, 418, 419, & ſeq. ad fin. in Tex. *We judge of the Deſign of Providence with too much Temerity*, 597. A. ad med. *Whether Providence in ordering the State of this World, order'd alſo the Diſeaſes and Vices which reign in it*, 982, T. ad in. *The Poets ſpeak of it in Metaphors ſomewhat too bold*, 115, 116. *The Proſperity of Wicked Men never makes us doubt of a Providence when we ſhare in this Proſperity of theirs, or are no ways incommoded by it*, 1090, C. ad fin. *The Reaſons which are borrowed from Common Life to prove it are not ſufficient to convince all ſort of Unbelievers*, Ibid. J. ad fin. *The Puniſhment of ſome Perſons notoriouſly wicked ſaid to have been a Sentence of Abſolution to Providence*, 1105. N. ad med. *It's often ſeen that Perſons who fancy they have had Inſpiration, diſtruſt Providence*, 1119. B. *Hears not the Sloathful*, Ibid. *Whether they that deny it are unfit to live in Society*, 1186. C. ad in. *In what Caſes are People always content with it*, 1276. F. *Its Decrees compaſs all Things*, 1518. C. ad. med. *People murmur againſt Providence, on account of the Proſperity of the Wicked*, 1579. a. *An Opinion which denies it, and even goes further than that of* Epicurus, 1741. D. ad med. *How it exalts and humbles Men at Pleaſure*, 1882. b. *The Evil Qualities of Men are often more uſeful to the accompliſhing the Deſigns of Providence than the Good*, 2053. a. *Whether it may be ſaid that Providence overturns Worldly Greatneſs purely to ſhew her Power*, 2535. I. b. ad fin. *Is queſtioned on account of the Proſperity of the Wicked*, 2635. a. *Providence conſider'd in one View is not proper to bring the Children of this World into the Ways of Virtue*, 2775. a. *How the Doctrine of Providence is capable of making us good, and comforting us in Diſtreſs*, 2867. A. *Blinds Men ſometimes*, 2892. I *They are accuſed of Raſhneſs by Cardinal* Palavicini, *who judge of the Providence of God*, 100. b

Provincial *Letters of Mr.* Paſchall, *their Elogy*, 2469. a. *Several Facts concerning them*, 2470. a. b.

Prudentius; *in his Poem about the Origin of Sin, does not well anſwer the Objections of the* Manicheans, 2167. b

Pſalms; *the way of ſinging the* Pſalms *about the Time they were firſt put into Metre by* Clement Marot *in* France, 2205. a. *The Singing of* Pſalms *when firſt prohibited in* France, ibid. b. *Who was the firſt that ſet them to Muſick abroad*, 206 a.

Puccianiſm; *a very ſhort-liv'd Hereſy*, 2521. b.

Puniſhments *of Malefactors one of the beſt Arguments for the Liberty of Man*, 26 9. b.

Purum Putum; *its Signification*, 180. a.

Puteanus (Ergeius) *his extreme fondneſs for appearing in Print*, 2521. b. *Why he affected to write Little Books*, ibid. *The vaſt numbers of Letters written to him, and preſerved and kept by him in order.*

Pyrenees (*Treaty of*) *concluded without the Intervention of the* Pope, *upon a Miſunderſtanding between him and* Mazarine, 957. b. *The Limits of Ancient* Gaul *and* Spain *ſearched out in the Ancient Geographers, in execution of an Article of this Treaty*, 2158. a

Pyrrhoniſm (*Hiſtorical*); *may ſtand it out againſt Solemn Oaths and Dying Proteſtations*, 660. b. *Confirmed by pretended publick Monuments*, 694. b.

Pyrrhoniſts; *The Doctrine of the Rigideſt* Pyrrhoniſts *favourable to Virtue*, 351. a.

Pyrrhus; *his Saying on the Death of his Son* Ptolomy, *ſlain in one of his Battels*, 1001. a. *Compar'd to a Gameſter who does not know how to make the beſt of a good Game*, 928. a.

Pythagoras; *his Rule about a Community of Goods, not ſo perfect as that which* Epicurus *eſtabliſh'd in his Society*, 1186. b.

Pythian *Oracles*; *in what kind of Verſe moſt uſefully given*, 1263. b.

Pythionice; *a Harlot, Servant to a Piper, and afterwards Miſtreſs to* Harpalus; *her Tomb in the* Eleuſian *Way was the fineſt Monument of* Greece, 1581. a.

Q.

QUeſtion; *a very Ancient one about the difference of the Word* Stolidus *in* Saluſt, 293. b.

Quietiſts; *The Agreement between their Opinions and thoſe of the* Heathen Brachmans, 706. a. b. *Their Monſtrous Notion of the Eſſential Union with God, diſtinguiſh'd by 'em according to the different States of Betrothing, Marriage, and Conſummation of the Marriage*, ibid. b. 707. a.

Quotations; *which requires the greater Genius, to compoſe with or without them*, 1188. a. b. *The way of Writing without Quotations from one's own Stock, and that of writing with abundance of Quotations, compared*, 1188. a. *Much affected by* Plutarch, 1188. b. *A falſe Quotation made on purpoſe to fix a horrible Blunder on* Beza, 618. b. *A ſtrange falſe Quotation of* Salmaſius *from* Horace, 288. b.

R.

RAab (*Battel of*) *The* French *keep a mighty ſtir with the part which they pretend they had in it*, 1927. b. ad fin.

Rabbins; *the reſemblance between the Style of their Relations, and thoſe of* Rabelais, 500. a.

Rabelais; *the Judgment of a Modern* French *Author on his Works*, 2511. a.

Raderus, *The* Jeſuit, *cenſured on his blaming the uſe of the word* Numen *to the Holy Virgin*, 670. b.

Ragoo; Mahomet's Ragoo *for fortifying the Reins*, 2108. b.

Rainaud (Theophilus) *calls himſelf* Petrus Valleclauſa *in ſome of his Works*, 2320. a.

Ramus; *had like to have been ſent to the* Gallies *by* Francis I. *for his Inſolence to* Ariſtotle, 624. a.

Rapin (P.) *an odd Blunder of his catch'd up and aggravated by Father* Vavaſſour, 292, 293. a. *A handſome Reflection of his*, 478. a. *Criticiz'd on his Account of the preſerving* Ariſtotle's *Works*, 2901. a.

Ratisbonne; *The Conference of* Ratisbon *for Reuniting the* Lutherans *and* Papiſts, *by whom ſet on foot, and how ended*, 173. b.

Ravens (*Two*) *One taught to Congratulate* Auguſtus, *and the other* Mark Anthony, 503, a. n.

Ravillac; *Whether he was mov'd to Aſſaſſinate King* Henry IV. *by reading* Mariana's *Book about the Lawfulneſs of Murdering Tyrants*, 2180. b. 2183. a.

Real Preſence; *by whom defended againſt* Berengarius, 336. *This Defence Printed in the* Bibliotheca Patrum, ibid. *Phraſes made uſe of by* Calvin *in his* Catechiſm, *ſeem plainly to imply a Corporeal Real Preſence*, 2703. a. n. *The occaſion of them*, ibid

Reaſon; *is a deceitful Guide without the Aſſiſtance of God*, 75. a. *Sometimes overthrown and dethron'd in one of its Provinces, while it continues Maſter in others*, 2170. b. *A Reflection on the weakneſs and Duplicity of Humane Reaſon*, 1671. a.

Rebels; *Clauſes declaring* Rebels *to have acted for the King's Service, when firſt inserted in Treaties of Pacification in* France, 2198. b. *Reconciliation between the* Lutherans *and the* Calviniſts, *by the Influence of* Guſtavus Adolphus, *by whom fruſtrated*, 1685. b.

Reformation in France; had been abſolutely deſtroyed by Francis II. if he had lived a little longer, 1617. N.

Reformations; how ſoon they riſe to perfection in Morals, and how ſoon degenerate, 1368. a. b. What gave many a diſguſt of it, 511. b. The Honour of the Reformation ſaves ſome of its Miniſters from publick Cenſures, 152. b. The Emulation between Charles V. and Francis I. how favourable to Reformation, 1351. a. Oppos'd in the beginning, by ringing the Town-Bells, upon the Preachers and the Monks ſtopping their People's Ears with raw Silk, 1283. a. The Project of a Reformation given in to the Council of Conſtance, by whom, 131. b. The Reformed Religion render'd odious to the Supreme Powers by the Millenarians, 2175. b.

Reformers; a witty Scandal upon the firſt Reformers, 819. a.

Refugees; hard to be contented, 70. a.

Regicides; encourag'd by the Example of Judith, 1785. a.

Regnier; what he ſays of Favour, 2302. a.

Relations; Hiſtorical Inſtances of their Progreſs and Improvement, from hand to hand, 921. b.

Relicks; ſeveral Cities in the Pagan Days boaſted of having the ſame Holy Relicks as they do now in our Days, 1006. a. The Occaſion of a Book written to prove, That the Spear which pierced our Saviour's Side, is a more precious Relick than the Seamleſs Coat, 2962. b. St. Jerom's Indignation againſt the Prieſt Vigilantius, who Condemn'd the Honour paid to the Relicks of Saints, 2963. b.

Religion des Hollandois, 2785. a.

Religion; The Conveniences and Inconveniences of a Diverſity of Religions, 1120. b. Brutes allow'd by ſome ancient Philoſophers, to have a Senſe of God and Religion, 2606. b. Made a pretence for giving no Quarter, 708. b. What the Religion of a Sovereign is, 103. a. 103. b. Neutrality in Religion, more ſhocking than a falſe Worſhip, 76. a. Great Revolutions in Religion may check Nature for a time, but the Spirit of Wealth and Honour will revert upon its Miniſters, 1006 b. Religion will not admit the Character of an Academick, (viz.) The ſhewing the ſtrong and the weak ſide of an Argument faithfully, 976. a. Mankind eaſily deceiv'd, and difficultly undeceiv'd in it, 99. a. All believe the Truth of their own Religion ſo evident, that they can't conceive how judicious Men can bring themſelves to die out of it, 296. b. Indifference in Religion, why it offends more than a falſe Worſhip, 76. a. Reſiſting high Offers to change one's Religion, how it is a Subject of Elogy, 639 a. The difference between it and a Woman's refuſing a Propoſal of Love and Preſents, 639 b. The Proportion between the preſent Extent of the Chriſtian, Mahometan, and Pagan Religions, all the World over, 2092. a. The difference betwixt the Religion of a Sovereign, as a Private Man, and as a Prince, 946. b. The Chriſtian Religion the only Syſtem to ſolve the Contrariety betwixt what we do, and what we know, 1597. a. Ample Offers made by Pere Audebert, a French Jeſuit, to the Proteſtants, toward a Reunion of Religion with the Roman Catholicks, 205. b. Religion more in danger by Ridicule, than ſerious Refutation, 627. b. A Maſs deſign'd for ending the Difference between the Two Religions, 511. Difference between the Religion of a King as a Private Man, and as a Prince, 946. b. Religion, according to ſome, the only difference between Men and Brutes, 2606. b. The Abſurdities of Religion are not to be remedied by Learning, 2684. It ſubjects Sovereigns to the People, but is far from ſubjecting the People to their Sovereigns, 7. a. Is not a Human Invention, ibid. The Diſputes about Religion are the cauſe of ſtrange Diſorders, 19. E. The early evil Preſage of this, ibid. The Policy of States durſt not truſt the ſupport of it to God alone, 72. B. Indifference in Matter of Religion very odious, ibid. G. Men are eaſily deceived by the Appearances of Religion, 101. a. Decays as it grows old, 176. A. ΔΔΔ. ad fin. Serves often for a Pretext to Informers, 245. a. They who make a Mock of Religion, are very prejudicial to youthful Minds, 627. B. ad fin. Whether it be Praiſing a Man, to ſay he reſiſted Temptations of changing his Religion, 639. b. ad fin. The Evil Cuſtom of Intereſting Religion in the Diſputes of the Learned, 776. b. We muſt not judge of its Goodneſs by the good or ill ſucceſs of a Battel, 754, 755. in Text. What Charron ſays of it, 958, 959. O. ad med. A Touch of the Parallel and Conformity between Religions, 961. in Text. A Man's witty Saying for or againſt Religion, does not plainly prove that he has, or has not any, 1105. N. People ſuffer Exile for it without forſaking their Vices, 1776. E. ad med. Inconveniences of Unity in Religion, 1820. Y. ad. fin. Diſputes in Holland concerning Religion, 1831. a. Maxims of a Latitudinarian on this Occaſion, 1898. b. There are Nations that have no Religion, 1917. Y. Whether great Revolutions in Religion ought to be imputed to the Conjunction of the Planets, or not? 2616. X. Δ. Falſe Religions in ſome reſpects, depreſs Men to the Condition of Beaſts, 2684. a. Some Men have their Religion in their Head, and not in their Heart, others have it all in their Heart, and none in their Head 2789. H. ad med. Euripides is brought into Trouble for leſſening Religion in one of his Plays, 1368. a. The greateſt Truths of Religion are by Strabo treated as if they were meer Fables, 705. Romance introduced into Religion by Superſtition 132.

Remedy for Madneſs, preſcrib'd by an Oracle for the Emperor Hadrian, 259 a.

Remond (Florimond de) the lowneſs of his Credit as a Hiſtorian, 822. b.

Reprobation; Spinoſa ſaid to have a Character of Reprobation in his Face. 2799. b.

Reproof; the bearing Reproof and Praiſe with Indifference, a Character of the higheſt Perfection, 629. b.

Republicks; apt to envy Men of a diſtinguiſh'd Merit. 1019. a.

Reputation; a high Reputation as dangerous under an ill Government as a bad one, 23. b.

Reſidence; Reaſons offer'd in the Council of Trent, for diſpencing with the Reſidence of Biſhops, 1772. b. A good Saying upon it of a Miſtreſs to her Gallant, who was a Prelate, 1161. a.

Reſurrection; an Eſſay of Cavalier Borry's towards a Reſurrection by Chymical Operations, 685. b. The Reſurrection of the Body ſuppos'd poſſible by Chryſippus, 982. b.

Revelations; Calvin commended for not meddling with them, 818. a. A Rock that all Fanaticks and Viſionaries ſtrike upon, 108. b.

Revenge; Neglecting Occaſions of gratifying our Revenge from a regard to Almighty God, a Worſhip more acceptable to Almighty God, than Prayer or Church Aſſiduity, 852 b.

Revolution; compar'd to falſe Miracles, 1159. a. One Revolution in a State paves the way to a ſecond, and that to a third, and ſo on, ibid. The Nature and Springs of State Revolutions, 1906. b.

Rhetoricians; expell'd Rome by a Law, 1278 Invited to Court by Corvinus King of Hungary, only to make them beg their way home again, 670. a.

Rhetorick; its Privileges almoſt as large as thoſe of Poetry and Painting, 306.

Rhime; The Benefit of having a Name that will fit in Rhime, 1264. a.

Richelet; his Letters the fineſt French Letters upon all kinds of Subjects, 2469. a. n.

Riches (Love of) and Dominion, not ſo ſtrong as the Love of Praiſe, 842. a.

Richlieu (Cardinal) trump'd up Bolſec's Slanders of Calvin, when the fierceſt Catholick Writers beſide him had rejected them, 666. a. His haughty Carriage to thoſe who belong'd to his Family, 713. b. What Lewis XIII ſaid to him the Day that Mareſchal d' Ancre was Aſſaſſinated, 1015 b Suſpected by the Court of Rome of deſigning to erect an Independent Patriarchate in France, 2155 a. His indefatigable Application to the Improvement of his Mind, 2168. b. A Paſſage in his Methode pour convertir, moſt injurious to the Memory of John Calvin, ſuppos'd to be foiſted in by the Publiſhers, 602. b. Makes a falſe Quotation, to fix a horrible Slander on Beza, 618. b. Form'd all his Schemes and politick Maxims from Barclay's Argenis, 493. a. Articles deſign'd to be exhibited againſt him, in order to his Diſgrace, one of which was his favouring the Proteſtants, 918. a. His Choice gives an advantageous Idea of the Perſon, 951. a. Backward in giving any thing to thoſe who ask'd, 1575. a. n. Exceeding liberal to the Muſes, 1421. His Endeavours to reconcile both Religions might have ſucceeded, if he had not dy'd ſo ſoon, 1302. a. Battels loſt in *in his Miniſtry to ſpight him, and others ſent to court him*, 1323. a. b. *His Maxim, that* Unfortunate *and* Imprudent *are but two Words for the ſame thing*, 1897. a.

Ridicule ; *more dangerous to Religion than ſerious Refutation*, 637. b. *Ridiculous Pretences ſometimes made uſe of in Politicks*, 43.

Right (*Natural*) *not admitted by ſome Philoſophers*, 119. b.

Ritual (Roman) *Ceremonies of Abſolving Perſons Excommunicate, taken from the Practice of the Ancient* Romans *in the Enfranchiſing their Slaves*, 694. a.

Rivet ; *his Converſation with a Jeſuit about the Obſcenities in* Sanchez, *affectedly innocent and impertinent*, 1669. b. *Goes on a falſe Suppoſition to deſtroy the Story of* Calvin's *Devotion for St.* Hubert, 819. a. *A better Caſuiſt than St.* Auſtin, *in the Point of Adultery*, 70. b.

Rochefoucault (*Duke de*) *his Memoirs preferable to* Cæſar's *Commentaries*, 930. b.

Rochelle ; *An Account of a Comedy acted at* Rochelle *in the beginning of the Reformation, expoſing the Monks, and exalting the* Hugonot *Miniſtry*, 1341. a.

Rohault ; *his Explication of* Tranſubſtantiation, *according to the* Carteſian *Hypotheſis ſhewn to be faulty*, 2122. a. *Miſtaken in ſaying, that* Hipparchus *made no other Obſervation on the fix'd Stars, than that they had a Motion from* Eaſt *to* Weſt, 1673. a.

Romance ; *Writers of Modern Romances, how they differ from the Ancient Mythologiſts*, 1676. b. *Superſtition has introduc'd it into Religion*, 132.

Rombouillet (*Houſe of*) *The Court that met there preferr'd to that of the* Louvre, 1422. b.

Rome (*Ancient*) *why they concealed the Name of their Tutelar God*, 2769 a. b. *The* Latin *Name of* Rome *induſtriouſly concealed, and why*, ibid. *Its Citizens, who were made Free, took the Name of him who procured them that Honour*, 470. b. *What ſaid to be one of the Cauſes which ſhook its Empire*, 521. a.

Rome ; *ſaid to be the Seat of* Antichriſt *by* Dante, *and the Pope the* Whore *of the* Revelations, 1051. b.

Rome (*Biſhops of*) *their Luxury reprehended betimes, by a* Pagan *Hiſtorian*, 2160. a.

Rome (*Church of*) *the Ancient State, and that of the preſent Church of* Rome, *under the ſame Circumſtances*, 110. b.

Rome (*Court of*) *how it could condemn* Janſenius, *and preſerve St.* Auſtin *in all his Glory*, 436. a. *Its Avarice and Rapaciouſneſs*, 1338. a.

Rome ; *its Rejoicings upon the Death of* Mahomet II. 2113. b *The Difference between it and Ancient* Rome *in this Particular, of Rejoicing at the Death of an Enemy*, ibid.

Rome (*Church of*) *her Conduct much like that of* Paganiſm *on the account of Miracles*, 67. a.

Romans ; *The Ceremony uſed by the Ancient* Romans *in Tranſlating the Statues of the Gods and Goddeſſes from the Conquer'd Cities to* Rome, 1816. b. *What Rights they reſerved when they beſtow'd a Kingdom or Principality*, 1007. a. *Whether they ever ſent an Embaſſy to* Alexander *the Great*, 2077 a

Romiſh Religion ; *its Intereſt ſacrificed by the Popes to their private Intereſt, as Sovereigns*, 1172. a.

Romuald (*St.*) *a ſtrange Blunder of his*, 812. b.

Roquitaillade (John de la) *a Fryar, and notable* Apocalyptical-Prophecy-Expounder *in the* XIV. *Century*, 2601. *His famous* Apologue *to ſhew that the Princes, who enrich'd the Church of* Rome, *ſhould ſtrip her in a ſhort time*, 2602. b. *He does not hold the Pope to be* Antichriſt, 2603. b.

Roſe ; *Romance of the* Roſe, *whoſe Work it is*, 24. b. *The Original of the* Roſe *according to the* Turks, 2108. b.

Roſe (Roman de la) *falſly aſcrib'd to* Peter Abelard, 1601. a.

Roſni (*Mr.* de) *tears the Contract of Marriage between* Henry IV. *of* France, *and one of his Miſtreſſes, before the King's Face*, 2910. b.

Rufinus ; *Favourite of the Emperor* Theodoſius, *a Deſcription of his* Baptiſm *reputed a Maſterpiece*, 2628. a.

Rycaut (*Sir* Paul) *Criticiz'd upon a Point about the Battle of* Clauſemberg *in his Hiſtory of the* Turks, 285. a. *Miſtaken in ſaying the* Turkiſh *Women have no hopes of Paradiſe*, 1575. b.

Ryſwick (*Treaty of*) *The* Pariſians *refuſed to make Bonfires for it, till forced by Menaces*, 1636. b.

S.

Sacrifices (Heathen) *when they ceaſed, and under what Emperor*, 1775. a. *Held uſeleſs by the* Peripateticks, 362. b.

Sacrifices *of Noble Youths in the Days of* Hadrian *and* Heliogabalus, *that their Entrails might be inſpected by the Magicians and Diviners*, 471. a.

Sacrilege ; *a* Sophiſm, *proving that all Thieves commit Sacrilege, and yet no Thief can commit it*, 529. b.

Sadduces ; *their Antiquity and Original*, 1641. b. *Confounded with the* Samaritans, *as to one Point*, 1645. b. Caiphas *ſuppos'd to have been a* Sadducee, 1646. a. *Whether they believed a Providence*, 1645. b.

Sagittarius ; *A Conjunction in* Sagittarius *on the 11th of* December, 1662. *never parallel'd but by the Conjunction in* Aquarius, *which preceded the Deluge*, 2175. b. *Suppoſed to have preſaged the coming of* Jeſus Chriſt, *and the* Millennium, *by* Serrius, *and other* Fanaticks, ibid.

Sainthibal ; *a famous Unbeliever, complain'd that his Soul had not the Gift of Final Perſeverance*, 627. b.

Saints ; *Debated at* Rome *whether thoſe of the* Old Teſtament *ought to have the Worſhip of Canoniz'd Saints, and Altars erected to them*, 1761. b. *An odd Argument for the Invocation of Saints*, 2385. a. *There have been Saints of all Profeſſions, but that of an* Attorney, 2467. b. *Invocation of them practis'd a long time among the* Jews, 1230. b. *Invocation of Saints condemn'd anciently by the* Paulicians, 2485. a. *The Church miſrepreſented, as worſhipping the Saints as ſo many Divinities*, ibid. *The Honour paid to Saints condemn'd by the Prieſt* Vigilantius, *in the* Vth *Century*, 2963. *St.* Jerom's *Zeal for them, his Indignation and Invective on their ſcore againſt* Vigilantius, ibid. b. *The Patron Saint among the* Catholicks *of thoſe who have the Pox*, 2761. b.

Sales (Francis de) *his Advice to the Pope and Cardinals, ſtops the Deſign of Aſſaſſinating* Beza, 6 3. a.

Salmacis ; *a Fountain that rendred thoſe who drank of it Effeminate* ; *The Moral of this*, 2660 a.

Salmaſius ; *his Notion of the Obſcurity of the Scriptures*, 1229 a.

Salmaſius ; *a ſtrangely falſe Quotation of his from* Horace, 288. b. *Sadly puzzled by the Title of one of the Emperor* Hadrian's *Books*, 1556. a.

Salt ; *The Præternatural Quality of the Salt of* Agrigentum *in* Sicily, 1464 b.

Salvian ; *his Opinion touching the Impurities of the Stage* —— *a lively Idea given in the modeſteſt Terms of the Impurities of the ancient Stage in* Rome, 2669. b.

Saluſt ; *A very ancient Queſtion about the difference of the Words* Stolidus *and* Vanus *in him*, 293. b. *Tax'd with Affectation in retaining old Terms, and of the contrary in coining new*, 49. b. n

Sampſon ; *A Diſſertation, ſhewing that the Scripture-Phraſe, that the* Philiſtines *made* Sampſon *grind, ſignifies, That they made him lye with their Wives, to get a Breed of brave Men*, 2666. b. 2667. a.

Sanchez ; *King of* Caſtile —— *An Exception to* Saluſt's *Maxim concerning Uſurpers*, 901. a.

Sanchez (Thomas) *reckons the looking at one's Nudity a Venial Sin, and the looking at the Nudity of others a Mortal Sin*, 88. b.

Sanctuaries, *and Privileg'd Places in the* Roman *Empire, enquir'd into and reduc'd*, 2522. a.

Sannazar ; *A bitter Invective of his againſt* Leo X. 1909. a.

Sappho ; *Authors divided about her Beauty*, 2672. *How* Plato *is to be underſtood when he ſtiles her the Wiſe*, ibid. *Criticiſms upon the Epithet* Maſcula, *as apply'd to* Sappho *by ſome of the Ancient Poets*, 2671. b. *Original Medals of* Sappho *ſtill extant*, 2673. a.

Sarah ; *her Diſſembling commended by the Fathers*, 29. b. *Her Conduct towards* Agar, *an Argument with St.* Auſtin *for Perſecution*, 97. a.

Sardinia ; *reckon'd a deſolate unhealthy Iſland in the* Romans *Days, whether State-Offenders were frequently baniſh'd*, 879. b.

Sarracens ; *a ſtrange Example of a* Sarracen's *Eſteem for the Valour of his Enemy*, 715. b. *Honour'd the Stone as a Relick, on which* Agar *granted* Abraham *the laſt Favour*, 98.

Satyr ; *An Inſtance of its Terrible and Tragical Effects*, 331.

331. a. *Its Tragical Effects on ſeveral Perſons*, 1675. a. *As ſubject to the Laws of Right Reaſoning as the Graveſt Writings*, 2187. a. *Satyrs want to be commented upon by Contemporaries to their Authors*, 1581. b. *Satyrical* (*Writings*) *grew obſcure*, 57. *Satyrical Republican Pamphlets— when firſt burnt in* Rome, 883. a *Satyrical Deſcription of the* French *Ladies Naked Breaſts in the* XVI. *Century*, 1050. a.

Satyriſts *Should lay out a great deal of Money on Spies*, 585. b

Savaron; *a Miſtake of his in ſuppoſing, That* Democritus *and* Epicurus *held that God was the Efficient, and the Atoms the Material Cauſe of the World*, 211. b

Savoy; (*Duke of*) *his Treacherous Invaſion of the Marquiſate of* Salluces, 1623 a. *The Medal ſtruck by him on that Occaſion anſwered in Coin by* Henry IV. ibid. b.

Sayings; *Wiſe Sayings appear with different Views according to the Degrees of the Hearers Senſe: How People may be too ſilly to be deceiv'd by them*, 2737 a. *Fine Sayings, the Reaſon why they are ſo variouſly related*, 236. a. *Saying of an* Italian *as he was dying of the* Pox, 1334 b. *A Fine Saying of Cardinal* Mazarine, 478 a *Fine Sayings of wonderful uſe in Human Life*, 357 a b.

Scaliger; *The Father— his Spirit of Contradiction*, 857. a. *Maintained againſt* Cardan, *and all the Poets, that a Parrot was an ugly Bird*, ibid.

Scaliger; (Joſeph) *thought no Man worthy his Good Word*, 818 *His Raſh Judgment of* Bellarmin, 565. a. *His Senſe of the Chronology of Scripture*, 597. a. *His Pretended Nice Taſte of the Style of the Ancient* Latin *Authors fairly diſprov'd*, 2914 a.

Scaliger; (Julius) *his Indignation againſt* Gabriel Attilius, *who ſlighted the Muſes when he got a Mitre*, 187 b. *Conjectures at the Cauſe of his Error in calculating the weight of the* Coloſſus *of* Rhodes, 910. a. b.

Scamander; *Contrary Modern and Anciet Authorities about the Bigneſs of this River*, 2684. b.

A Witty Scandal *upon the firſt Reformers*, 819. a *Scandalous and Flagitious Perſons provided for in a City Built by a* Macedonian *King for that purpoſe*, 806. a.

Scanderberg; *his Siege of* Belgrade, *the moſt unſucceſsful of all his Enterprizes*, 2331. b.

Schauartz; (Berthold) *a* German— *ſaid to be the firſt who put Fire-Arms in practice*, 147. b.

Schiſms; *the beſt Means of preventing them*, 553. b. *Schiſms in* Lutheraniſm *for the firſt Fifty Years not above Ten or Twelve*, 1751. b.

Scholars; *their horrible Inclination to Debauchery*, 113. b.

Schomberg; (M.) *prevents* Henry IIId*'s Deſign of declaring the Son of the Duke of* Lorrain *for his Succeſſor*, 8627. b.

Scioppius; (Gaſpar) *his Picture in Miniature, from Mr.* Baillet, 2698. a. *His Bitter Satyr againſt King* James I. *of* England, 2523, b. *Who ſuſpected to be the Author of it—upon its coming out*, 2524. a. *He acts the Divine ridiculouſly about a Point of Fortune*, 978. a.

Scotiſts; *their Doctrines of Univerſals, Diſguiz'd* Spinoziſm. 19. b. *Their Doctrine of Univerſals agreeable to the Chimara of* Spinoziſts, 927, a.

Scotland *forces the* French *to capitulate at* Leith, *and for ever to quit it*, 722. in Tex. ad fin. *The* French *render'd themſelves very odious in* Scotland, Ibid.

Scribere; *a Criticiſm on the Word, ſhewing that it imported publiſhing ones Works*, 274 b.

Scripture; *the Rule to be taken where Scripture is alledged to maintain Contrary Opinions*, 2664 b. *Scripture alone ſufficient to refute the Hypotheſis of two Principles, and all the Objections of the* Manicheans *and* Zoroaſter, 2152. b. *A Doctrine which attacks the Authority of the Holy Scripture*, 83. D. ad med. *Whether it furniſhes Materials and Principles for all kinds of Arts and Sciences*, 85. in Tex. *Whether the reading of it has not been interdicted by the* Laicks, *according to the Spirit of the* Church *of* Rome, 385, 385 O Δ ad med. *The Simplicity of the Style diſguſts St.* Auſtin, 434, 435. in Tex. ad B. *It's Interpretation ought to be accommodated to the Times, according to ſome Controvertiſts*, 478. H. *Whether its Divinity may not be proved*, 545. C. ad in. *Not ſo obſcure in* Salmaſius's *Judgment as* Eſchylus, 1259. N. *Unworthily treated by ſome* Roman Catholick *Doctors*, 1703. *A thought of the Hiſtorian* Matthieu *about the manner of teaching it*, 1730. E. ad in. *The manner in which a* Viſionary *would have it read to the People*, 1849. A. *There are Things in it capable of unhinging all Metaphyſicks*, 2597. b. *What* Libertines *ſay of the Spirit which dictated it*, 1684. c ad med.

Seamleſs; *Coat of our Saviour*, 1965. b.

Sectaries; *hate one another more in the beginning than the Stock from whence they ſeparated*, 108. a.

Sects; *not governed by a Principle of Authority, muſt neceſſarily be divided into ſeveral Branches*, 241. *How much Sects ſuffer by Apologiſts of imaginative conceited Wits*, 974 b. *Each Sect aſcribes all the Objection made againſt themſelves to Fleſh and Blood*, 544. b *Compar'd to Man, who is only innocent in the Cradle*, 177. b. *In Thirty or Forty Years very unlike their Founder*, 88 a. *How ſeveral Sects of* Chriſtians *charge each other with making God the Author of Sin*, 2490. a.

Selym; *Emperor of the* Turks, *preſented the Picture of a Battel won by him, and painted by his own Hand, to the Senate of* Venice, *which is ſtill kept by them*, 2327. a. *His Epitaph deſigned to out-do that of* Mahomet, 112, 117. b. n.

Senault; (Pere) *his Fine Deſcription of Baniſhment*, 1635. b.

Seneca; *a Groſs Miſtake of his about* Ariſtides, 357. a. *In what Senſe he allows that* Jupiter *darts his Thunderbolts*, 1036. b. *Either forgot, or did not know there was ſuch a Book as* Phædrus's *Fables*, 1236. b. *The Uſe he makes of a Thought of the Poet* Agatho, 100. a. b *Would ſay, That the* Romans *had never apply'd themſelves to compoſe Fables*, 1236. b. *Why he would never endeavour to pleaſe the People*, 351. a.

Senef; *There were Battels of* Senef *among the Ancient, where both ſides claim'd the Victory*, 1276. a

Sens; (*Council of*), 1140. *Made Deciſions in their Cups*, 582. *A Deſcription of their Good Fellowſhip by* Berengarius, 583. a.

Senſes; *The Pleaſure of the Senſes, or Senſual Pleaſure of a Spiritual Nature, and Bodily only by accident*, 1191. a. *Inſtances of thoſe who have loſt their Judgment and Common Senſe, with regard to ſome Particular Things, whilſt they have been entire and excellent, with regard to all others*, 2915.

Sentences *and Fine Sayings of wonderful uſe in Human Life*, 357. a. b *Books of Sentences, whether that burnt under the Name of* Peter Abelard *be the ſame with that of* Peter Lombard, 586. a.

Sermons; *The extraordinary Effects and Power of a Sermon*, 2332. b. *Seditious Sermons preached by Fryar* Ponet *againſt* Henry *the* IIId. *of* France, 1626. b. *Not ſo powerful over the Ladies of* France, *as a Hint from* Lewis XIV. 1017. a.

Serpents; *an Affectation of ſeveral of the greateſt Perſons of Antiquity to be thought to have ſprung from the Embraces of Serpents*, 2405. a. *A particular Sect of Hereticks who had a great veneration for Serpents, and very Blaſphemous Thoughts about them*, 1251. *A ridiculous Notion of* Paracelſus *about the Nature of Serpents*, 1251. a.

Severity; *Hereditary in the Family of the* Caſſii *in* Rome, 875. a.

Severus; *what his chief Conſideration was in chooſing a Wife*, 1795. b. *Why he bore the Adulteries of his Wife with ſo much Patience*, 1797. a.

Sextus Empiricus; *his Inſtance to ſhew that the Common Practice is not founded on an Immutable Law of Nature*, 1670. b.

Sforza; (Bonna) *Widow of* Sigiſmond *King of* Poland, *her Lewd Letter, and finely deſcribed by* Thuanus, 314, 315. a.

Sforza; *The Original of this Sir-Name*, 2721. a. n.

S F.

Sforza (Lewis) his Wickedness and Cruelty to his Nephew John Galeazzo, Duke of Milan, 312. b. 313. b.

Shame; The power of Shame stronger than the fear of a Gibbet, 2476 b.

Siam; alledg'd as an Instance, that the Belief of God's Existence, without the Belief of a Providence, is an Inducement to Vertue, 2764. a. b. A short System of their Theology, 2765, 2766. b. 2767. a.

Siamese; believe Spirits, and the Immortality of the Soul, without acknowledging the Existence of a God, 2634. a.

Sickness; Nothing has been the Subject of more false Reports, than the Sickness and Death of Illustrious Men, 68. a.

Silence; equally a Sign of Guilt and Innocence, 603. b.

Silenus; his Thought of Human Happiness, 2927. a.

Silk; a Pound of it in the Emperor Aurelian's Days, worth a Pound of Gold, 441. b.

Simon (Father) his Judgement of Calvin's Commentaries on the Bible, 818 a. A Despiser of St. Austin's Commentaries, 436. b. Preferr'd St. Chrysostom's Interpretation to his, 437. a. His Opinion of Leo Allatius, 183.

Simplicius; his Thought of the Question about the Origin of Evil, 2498. b.

Sin; ascrib'd to an incorrigible Vice in Matter thereby to clear God from being the Author of it, 978. b. How the several Sects of Christians charge each other with making God the Author of Sin, 2490. a. What Answer is to be made to those who ask, Why God permitted Man to Sin, 2495. b.

Sisters; their hatred greater than that of Brothers, 491. b.

Sixtus V. his bitter Satyr on Henry III. of France, 1625. b. Envy'd Queen Elizabeth the felicity of being able to strike off a Crown'd-Head, 1772. a. Cross'd the Designs of the King of Spain against her, ibid.

Slavery; how some Towns of Italy fell into Slavery, by too industriously endeavouring to avoid it, 2714. a.

Smell; knowing by the smell whether an accused Person be Guilty or Innocent, a Test of the Messiah, according to the Jews, 501, 540. b.

Smithfield; The Price of Wood raised by the Executions in Smithfield, 213. a n.

Smut; Valentinian, tho' a chast and vertuous Emperor, lov'd a smutty Jest, 450. b.

Society; Disturbers an Essential Part of it, 641. a.

Socinianism; why Princes are never likely to embrace this Sect, 2757. a The Jansenists and Abbots, and in general all the French Nation clear'd from all Suspicions of Socinianism, 2762. a. b. 2764. a.

Socinians; Their settled Doctrine, that it is not lawful to take up Arms against one's Prince, 2755. b. Yet praise in the Hollanders a Conduct which their Founder Socinus had expresly and particularly condemn'd, 2756. a. Their Tenets concerning the Souls of Brutes, the Degrees of Reason and Liberty in them, 2607. a. Their denying God the Prescience of Contingent Events, does not remove the Difficulties they propos'd by it, 2490. a. By the same Principles on which they reject the Gospel-Mysteries, they are constrain'd to deny the Creation of the World out of Nothing, 1198. a. Some of them have turn'd Spinozists, upon the Difficulties of conceiving a Material Principle, self-existing and distinct from God, ibid. b.

Socrates; his Answer to a Question of Faith of the Pagan Religion, 681. b. Returns Presents from three Great Princes, and refuses to visit them, because he thought them worthless Persons, 324. b. His requiring demonstrative Proof, that each particular Body in the Universe is in the best State it could possibly be in, shewn to be unreasonable, 237. a. b. 238. a. His Answer to a young Man, who desir'd his Advice about Marrying, 224. b. The wicked Courses of two of his Disciples, Alcibiades and Critias, one of the Grounds of the popular Prejudice against him, 1034. a. How vindicated by Xenophon on this Point, ibid. His Advice to his Disciples, with regard to Women, 1327. b. The reason of his turning Æsop's Fables into Verse after his Condemnation, 1233. b. Surpriz'd by Alcibiades as he was playing with his Children, 234. a.

Sodomy; Whether the Petition said to be deliver'd to Sixtus IV. for the Commission of Sodomy during the 3 hot Months of the Year, and granted by him, is a Fact that a prudent Writer against Popery might alledge, 2746. a. b. It's Punishment by Justinian's Laws, 1336 a.

S O.

Soissons (Council of) the reason of their Condemning Peter Abelard without hearing him, 583. a.

Soliman (the Magnificent) his Kindness to the Infant Son of Isabella, Queen of Hungary, and his Respect for the Queen, 1728. a. b.

Solipses; a Name for those Communions, who believe themselves alone in the way of Salvation, 408. b.

Solitaries; their Humane Figure alter'd in time, as their Sentiments, 88. a. Their insensibility to Women, ibid.

Solon; his Answer to a Comforter, who told him his Tears for his Son's Death were insignificant, 1335. b.

Soothsayers; All the Natives of a certain City in Asia born with natural Dispositions to Soothsaying, 146. Of old as necessary in an Army as a General, 808.

Sophism; a strange one about Sacrilege, 629. a.

Sophists; not allow'd to plead Civil Causes in Athens, 2709. a.

Sophisters; the Character and Practice of the ancient Rhetorician Sophisters, 975. b.

Sophocles; his Answer to all those who would know, why the Characters of the Women in all his Plays were good, and those in Euripides's all bad, 1265. a. Wherein he excell'd Euripides, 1263. a. b. The difference between the Characters of his Plays, and those in the Plays of Euripides, 1265. a.

Soracte (Mount) sent forth a Vapour fatal to Birds, 1677. a.

Sorbon; its Censures of the Book of Mary d' Agrada too mild, 109. a. Books upon this Censure, ibid. They durst not publish it without a Preservative 110. a. Charg'd with selling their Opinion in favour of Henry the VIIIth's Divorce, 119 b.

Sovereign; what is his Religion, 103. a. 103. b. One main Article is to caress Hereticks abroad, and persecute them at home, 556. a.

Souls; The Immateriality of the Souls of Beasts, and their being by Nature as Immortal as the Human Soul, by whom maintain'd, 2712. b. How this Doctrine was received, ibid. & 2713. a. Soul of Man, its Essence according to most of the Ancient Philosophers, 1827 a. Whether the Immortality of the Soul was taught by Aristotle, 361. b. 365. a. The Doctrine of the Propagation of the Soul, how long it subsisted in the Church, 269. b. Whether St. Austin admitted a Spiritual Substance and Soul in Brutes, 2614. b. The Antiquity of the Opinion, That Brutes have Rational Souls, 2605. b. The Immortality of the Soul oppugn'd, in a Book expresly written against it by Acosta, 73. The Imperfection of the Soul ascrib'd to an incorrigible Vice in Matter, to clear God from being the Author of Sin, 978. b. Chrysippus's Comparison of the rolling of a Cylinder, insufficient to acquit Fate from the Defects of the Soul, 978. a. Human Souls-----, how dispos'd of after they leave their Bodies, according to the Cynicks, 2515. a. The Opinion of the Stoicks, particularly Seneca, concerning the Essence of all Souls, whether Human or Brutal, and the Properties of the latter, 2516. b. The Intellectual Soul the same in all Men, according to Averroes, and distinct from the corruptible Soul, 427. b. Different Kinds and Characters of a strength of Soul, 956. a. Arguments for its Spirituality, weakned by the distinction between Bodies and Extension, according to some Peripatetick Protestants, 955. a. n. How it may suffer the Pains of a Real Fire in a State of Separation, 1191. b. The Antiquity of Mr. Descartes's Opinion about the Soul of Brutes, 2516, a. Souls of Brutes are but Images or Simulacres of the Rational Soul, according to the Doctrine of Plato, 2520. a. Immortality of the Soul learnt by the Jews from the Greeks, and not the Greeks from them, according to one Doctor's Opinion, 2641. b. What the Stoicks attributed the Imperfections of the Soul of Man to, 978. b. A Sensible Demonstration of the Separation of the Soul from the Body, 2337. a.

Sozomen; convicted by Baronius of Stupidity, 1219 b.

Spain; its Zeal in rewarding those who wrote against France, upon its making Alliances with Protestant States, how contrary to its own Conduct in after-times, 1738. a. The reasonable Offers it made to the Low-Countries, 1374. a. Why rejected by the Prince of Orange, ibid. The Aſcendancy of its Genius over that of France in the Reign of Lewis XII. and Alphonſo I. of Naples, 2329. a. How Milan came to be annexed to it, 2723. a. b. 2724. b.

Spanheim; what Judgment may be made of his and Mareſius's Hiſtory of Pope Joan againſt Blondel, 637. a.

Spanheim (Frederick) wrote in defence of the Hiſtory of Pope Joan againſt Blondel, 637. a.

Spaniards; ſhamefully protected and rewarded thoſe who made Panegyricks on the Murderers of Kings, 696. b. Had generally the better of France in Treaties of Peace, 1636. a.

Sparta; The Executioners here would not obey the Order of putting their Kings to death, 213. b. See Lacedemon.

Spear; that pierced our Saviour's Side, 2961. b.

Speech; uttered without a Tongue, 925. b.

Spinoza; his Syſtem and Notion of a Deity agreeable to that of Thales and Anaximenes, 1856. b. No Syſtem built on mere Reaſon can leſs diſpenſe with the Suppoſition of Good and Bad Angels, 927. a. The abſurdity of his Notion of God equal to that of the Heathen Divinities, 105. a. A Liſt of thoſe who have held the ſame Opinions that he has vented, 2782. a b. & ſeq. A Liſt of thoſe who have confuted him, 2789. a. b. 2794. b. God and Extenſion are the ſame Thing according to him, 2790. a. His Shifts and Equivocations, ibid. He deprives us of a Principle without which there is no ſuch Thing as Reaſoning, 2804. b. Whether he had any ground to deny the Exiſtence of Fantoms, 2796. M. Said to have had a Character of Reprobation in his Face, 2799. b.

Spinoſiſts; no Syſtem ſo neceſſarily ſuppoſes the Exiſtence of Intelligences as theirs, 808. a. Frighted at a Conſequence from their own Hypotheſis, 982. a.

Spirit; who was the firſt of the Heathen Philoſophers that admitted a Spirit diſtinct from the Body, 1827. a.

Spoleto; (Theobaldus Marquis of) his way of Treating the Priſoners taken by him in a War with the Greeks, 1336. b. The Expoſtulation of one of his Priſoner's Wives againſt his Caſtrating War, 1337. a.

Staff of St. Polycarp grown into a Wild Cherry-Tree, now to be ſeen at the Gate of the Fortreſs of Smyrna, 1647. b.

Stage; very ſerviceable in the introducing the Reformation in England and the Low-Countries, 2690. b. The Stage in Athens not permitted to vend Immoral or Irregular Maxims, 1268. b. Salvian's Opinion touching the Impurities of the Stage, 2669. A Lively Idea given in the Modeſteſt Terms of the Impunities of the Stage of Ancient Rome, ibid.

Stars; feigning the Souls of Departed Perſons to be changed into New Stars, a Flattery common to the Greeks and Romans, 272. b. 273. a. In what Country People began firſt to conſider the Stars, and make Obſervations upon them, 1407. Whether we ought to attribute to them any part in the great Revolutions of Religion, 2616. X △. Who firſt diſcover'd the fix'd Stars to have a Motion from Eaſt to Weſt, 1673. a.

State; (a Future) aſſerted by a Perſon's appearing after Death according to Promiſe, 668. b. Abuſes in the State in many Peoples Opinion better tolerated than Remedies apply'd which may endanger the Conſtitution, 897. a. State-Offenders, to what Place baniſh'd by the Romans, 879. b. State-Revolutions, one paves the Way for a Second, and that for a Third, and ſo on, 1559. a. The Nature and Springs of them, 2960. b.

Stoicks; What they attributed the Imperfections of the Soul of Man to, 978. b. They were the Phariſees of Paganiſm, 1190. Their Doctrine touching Fate made God the Author of Sin, 972. B. ad med. & ad fin. They are very ſolidly confuted by Plutarch in their Opinion about the uſefulneſs of Vice, 2492. a. They and the Peripateticks diſputing about the Nature of Pain, is a mere Diſpute about Words, 1611. a.

Stone; a Stone fal'n from Heaven, 234. a. The black Stone worſhipp'd at Mecca, 98. b. The cauſe of its turning black, 99. a.

Stories told ſeveral ways, tho' the ſame Stories; and father'd on ſeveral Perſons by Plutarch, 1226. a.

Stouppe; A French Miniſter of the Savoy in London, afterwards a Brigadier-General in the Service of France, and kill'd at the Battel of Steinkirk, 1785. a. Author of a Book Entitled, Religion des Hollandois, ibid.

Strabo; treats the greateſt Truths of Religion as Fables, 705. Of Opinion, that Legiſlators ſhould adopt the Tales of Poets as neceſſary for imprinting Religion in the Minds of the People, 1235. a.

Strada (Famianus) The Low-Country Editions of his Hiſtory varied from the Italian Editions in ſome places, in favour of ſome Illuſtrious Families, 150. a. His Judgment on Q. Curtius, preferr'd to that of Cardinal Perron, 1536. a. He and Lipſius Criticize Cornelius Tacitus, on a Point of the Roman Hiſtory, 837. a.

Strasburg; The New Jeruſalem, according to the Prophecies of the Anabaptiſts, 1689. b. The Indulgence of the Magiſtrates of Strasburg, for Maids who are got with Child, 176. b.

Stratagem; none more ſecure than the General's ſpreading a ſincere Report of his Deſign, 102. a.

Stile; Inſtances of the Illuſions of Proofs drawn from the Conformity of Stiles, 1216. b.

Subjects; Extraordinary Services turn to their Ruin, more thro' their own Ignorance than the Ingratitude of Princes, 1154. b. Subjects in France at this time more enſlav'd, and quieter than ever heretofore, 1021. A.

Subſtantial Forms; A Reflection on this Doctrine, 106. Inexplicable Difficulties in this Doctrine, 1437. a. Into how many Abſurdities it leads thoſe who maintain it, 2259. a. Pernicious Conſequences that may be drawn from it, 3061. a.

Succeſs; of great Affairs, owing as much to the Faults of one Party, as to the Prudence of the other, 454. a.

Suetonius; can't be deny'd the Character of a good Abbreviator, 2398. a. The Intervals and Diſtinctions of Events do not always appear in his Works, ibid.

Suicide; They who had committed it, were by the Heathen Religion refuſed a Funeral Pile, as by the Chriſtian Church they are refuſed Chriſtian Burial, 128. b. A Book ſhewing that there are Thirty Four Caſes, in which a Man may innocently commit Suicide, 2647. a.

Suidas; full of incompatible Intricacies, 1233. b.

Sun; by whom firſt diſcover'd to give light to the Moon, 1407. The Opinion of the Motion of the Earth round the Sun, conſtrued Irreligion among the Ancient Greeks, 348. b.

Superſtition; has introduc'd Romance into Religion, 132.

Supper (Lord's) how call'd in the beginning by the Hugonots. 2335. b.

Swans; The Reaſon of their Singing at Death, 2337. b. Why Tranſlated into a Cœleſtial Sign, 1592. b.

Swiſs-Cantons; The Title of Defenders of the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty given 'em by Julius II. 1789. a.

Switzerland (Ambaſſadors of) their free manner of Expoſtulating with the Treaſurers of France, upon the Management of Sums due to them, 1622. b.

Sword; A Naked Sword ſtuck in the Ground, worſhipp'd by the Alains, 1401. b.

Sybilline Books; The Reaſon of Flatterers for not conſulting them, 442. b.

Sylla; by what Means he came to know the Lewdneſs of his Wife Metella, 1601. b

Sylveſter II. (Pope) ſollicited by the Poles for the Title of King under the Reign of Boleſlaus, only ad majorem cautelam, 662. b.

Sylvius (Æneas) his judicious Reflection on the force of Vain-Glory, 842. a.

Synergiſts; A Party among the Lutherans, who ſtickled againſt the rigider ſort for the Rights of Human Liberty, 1784. a.

Synods; how their Sentences or Condemnations are obtain'd, 551. a.

Syſtem; of a pre-eſtabliſh'd Harmony between the Soul and Body of Animals examin'd and diſcuſs'd, 2615. a. b.

T.

Tacitus (Cornelius) Criticiz'd by Lipſius and Strada on a Point of the Roman Hiſtory, 837. a.

Tales (Merry) an Apology for the ſeeming Obſcenities of them, 1194. b. 1195. a.

Taliſman; A Taliſman engraved on the Door of the Shambles of Toledo, to keep out the Flies, 1647. a.

T A.

Talmud ; *the vast Expence of printing it*, 666. b.

Tanaquillus Faber ; *criticis'd on his Account of* Anacreon, 522. b.

Taſſo ; (Torquato) *cenſur'd on his maintaining from his Paſſion for* Eleonora d' Eſte, *that Charity was the Virtue of only ordinary Women*, 2328. b. *His Opinion, That Morality was not a Poet's Object, but barely diverting the Reader*, 899. b.

Tekely ; (*Count*) *the Intrigues between him and the Court of* France, *how and by whom carried on*, 136. b.

Telemachus ; *martyred for interpoſing to ſtop the Gladiators in the heat of their Exerciſe*, 183. a.

Tennis ; *by whom ſuppoſed to have been invented*, 2328. a.

Terebinthus ; *the Fair held there the Ancienteſt in the World*, 500. a. *The Reaſon of the Horror the* Jews *have for that Fair*, 499. b.

Terence ; *who is the Author of the Verſes which ſtand before his Comedies*, 293. a.

Terra Auſtralis ; *an Account of its Inhabitants, their Manners and Religion*, 2639. a. b. *Who is the true Author of this Account*, 2641. a.

Tertullian *makes uſe of the Story of* Achilles's *curing* Cleonymus *in a Dream, and divers other Facts of that kind, againſt the* Epicureans, *who would acknowledge nothing Supernatural in Dreams*, 65. b. *His miſtakes about the Time of* Marcion's *coming to* Rome, 2162. a. *Why the Atheiſtical Notions advanced in* Marcus Varro's *Books were judg'd more dangerous than ordinary by* Tertullian, 255. a.

Teſticles ; *a Treatiſe proving that a Man may be a ſufficient Husband without any Viſible Teſticles, highly commended for its Wit and Learning*, 2530. b. *to* 2533.

Teſtament ; *of* Mahomet, *being a Concordat between the* Mahometans *and* Chriſtians *prov'd to be a Forgery*, 2103. b.

Teſtament ; (New) James le Fevre's *Judgment on the* Greek *and Vulgar Editions of the ſeveral Books of the* New Teſtament, 1315. b.

Texts *of Scripture of our Saviour's being Three Nights and Three Days in the Bowels of the Earth, whimſically ſolv'd by* Veleuſiota, 1110. a.

Thales ; *explain'd the Generation of the World without the Direction of a Divine Intelligence*, 1826. b.

Theagenes *and* Clericlea ; *a Romance criticis'd upon*, 1599. a.

Theft ; *all manner of Thefts allow'd in Ancient* Egypt, 359. b.

Themiſtocles ; *prais'd by his Countrey for putting the* Greek *to death, who durſt interpret the Imperious Command of the* Perſian *Ambaſſadors*, 996. b.

Theodoſius *repealed a Cuſtom of puniſhing Adultery, which was worſe than the Sin*, 456. b.

Theognis ; *his Reaſon for preferring Death to Poverty*, 630. a.

Thevathat ; *the Name of a Subordinate Deity among the* Siameſe, *Brother to their Supreme Deity*, 2766. b. *Why they take him to be the ſame with* Jeſus Chriſt, 2767. a. n.

Thevet ; *a* French *Cordelier, juſtifies* Anne Bullen's *Innocence, in his* Coſmographie Univerſelle, 660. a.

Thiſtie ; (*Hundred-headed*) *reckon'd a moſt powerful Philtre amongſt the Ancients*, 2672. b.

Thomaſſin (Pere) *a very fine Thought of his about the ſeeming Ignorance of the Ancient Philoſophers, as to the Exiſtence and Providence of a God*, 231. a. *Of Opinion that the* Neſtorian, Iſene *and other Hereſies, would have overſpread the World, but for the Authorities of the Emperors and Imperial Laws*, 2562. a.

Thomaſius ; *a Correction of his in the Text of* Lactantius *prov'd to be a falſe and wrong Correction*, 277. a.

Thomiſts ; *their Phyſical Predetermination perfecting the Liberty of the Will, not comprehended even by themſelves*, 2167. *It overthrows St.* Baſil's *Anſwer to the* Manicheans, 2168.

Thou ; (*Mr.* de) *laments his having been oblig'd to follow* Bucanan *for want of having* Cambden's *Inſtructions about the Affairs of* Scotland *and* England, 830. a. *His Averſeneſs to the ſpeaking of* Latin, 2406. a. *His Judgment on* Amyot's *Verſion of* Plutarch, 201. b.

T H.

Thucidides ; *his Conciſe Sententious Style followed by few or none of his Contemporaries*, 1036. b. Hobbs's *Deſign in tranſlating him*, 1677.

Thule ; *of the Ancients falſly ſuppoſed by ſome to be* Iſland, 1677. b.

Thunder ; *its falling on Tombs look'd upon as a glorious Accident to the Deceas'd among the Ancient* Greeks, 1266. b.

Tiberius ; *what he envy'd in* Priam, 2143. a. *Stifled by* Macro's *Orders, his Captain of the Guards, after he had recover'd from a Fit, in which he had been look'd upon as dead*, 3087. *Expell'd all the* Jews *from* Rome *on a Sacrilegious Fraud of a few*, 1173. b.

Timotheus ; *his Anſwer upon his being reproached with his Mother's Incontinency*, 1020. a.

Timotheus, *the Muſician, his reproaching* Archelaus, *King of* Macedon, *with Stingineſs as he ſings to his Lute, and* Archelaus's *Anſwer to him*, 315. a.

Title ; *of Conquerors renounc'd by Perſecutors*, 1614. b. *Title of* Antiſtites, *given ſometimes to Simple Prieſts*, 2705. b. *Title of* Divine *given to* Peter Aretin, *which no Writer before him had but* Plato, 338. b. Montaign's *Reflection on it*, ibid.

Tobacco ; *why call'd* Santa Croce *in* Italy, 2658.

Toleration ; *the Arguments for Toleration ſaid to be unanſwerable, and the principal Books on this Subject named*, 2660. a. *An Anſwer to the Charge of thoſe who pretend that all who are for a Toleration favour the* Socinians, ibid. *Arguments againſt it, why compar'd to the Invention of Bombs and Carcaſſes*, 609. a. *The Toleration given by the* Mahometans *compar'd with that given by the* Chriſtians, 2103. a.

Tongue ; *a Remarkable Paſſage of a Boy who ſpit out his Tongue in Coughing, and ſpoke as well after as he did before*, 925. b. *Speech uttered without a Tongue*, 925. b.

Topknots ; (*Womens*) *a Collection of Curious Learning about their Antiquity, where to be found*, 260. b.

Torments ; (*Hell*) *the Eternity of them cloſes with Reaſon, and with the Ideas of Infinite Goodneſs*, 2760. b.

Torricellius ; *the Invention of his Phyſical Experiments, by whom claim'd, and falſly pretended to*, 2090.

Tortellius ; *Two Memorable Inſtances of his* Plagiariſm, 337. b.

Traditions ; *attribute Natural Properties of what kind to Miraculous Cauſes*, 1823. a. *The Diſagreement of the ancient Fabulous Traditions*, 353. b. *Traditions kept up for Ages together, without the leaſt Proof but the Vogue of a prejudic'd deſigning Party*, 830. b. *Tradition a ſufficient Argument of the Exiſtence of a Deity, according to* Plutarch, 1269. a. *An Inſtance of the Folly of Traditions preſerved in great Families*, 2916, 2921. a. *Fabulous Traditions in ſome great Families*, 1134. A.

Tragedies ; *He that has a Genius to write Tragedies, is of courſe a Maſter of Comedy*, 99. b. *A Definition of Tragedy*, 2737. a. *Controverſies againſt the* Roman Catholicks, *written by way of Tragedy, and repreſented in ſome Towns of* Germany, 2320. a.

Tranſlating ; *in what Caſes eaſy, and what difficult*, 2704. a.

Tranſlations ; *the different Judgments about the Tranſlations of* Ariſtotle's *Works*, 344. a. b.

Tranſlators ; *ought never to change the Senſe of the Original*, 629. a. *Sowers of Diſcord, why*, 163. a.

Tranſubſtantiation ; *A Letter of St.* Chryſoſtom *to the Monk* Ceſarius *expreſly againſt it*, 623. b. *Condemn'd by* Peter d' Ailli, *a Member of the Council of* Conſtance, 131 b. Rohault's *Explication of Tranſubſtantiation, according to the* Carteſian *Hypotheſis, ſhewn to be faulty*, 2122. a.

Treachery ; *how it comes to be miſconſtrued Moderation, and by whom*, 1310. a.

Treacle ; *by whom firſt Invented*, 261.

Treaſon (*High, againſt the Life of a King of* England, *how puniſh'd*, 1338. b.

Tree ; *of Knowledge of Good and Evil, what the Prohibition of Eating of this Tree imports*, 1255. a.

Tremoville (*Duke of*) *in* France, *deſcended in a direct Line from* Frederick, *laſt King of* Arragon, 2332. b. *Sends Plenipotentiaries to the Treaty of* Munſter, Nimmeguen, *and* Ryſwick, *to aſſert his Right, but his Claim is rejected*, ibid.

Trent; (Council of) its Character by the Abbot St. Cyran, 58. a. An Argument to prove its Deciſions binding, taken from the Conduct of the Synod of Dort, 2126. b. Its Solicitude about finding Terms in Controverted Caſes, which might fit all Parties, 540. b. Complains of the Pope's naming the Officers of their Aſſembly, and have liberty to chuſe their own Secretary, 1317. b. What the Abbot of St. Cyran ſaid of it, 58. a. Reaſons offer'd in this Council for diſpenſing with the Reſidence of Biſhops, 1772. b. A pleaſant Saying upon it of a Miſtreſs to her Gallant, who was a Prelate, 1161. a.

Trimmer; an example of a Trimmer from Macrobius, who taught Two Ravens, One to congratulate Auguſtus, the Other Mark Antony, 503. a. n.

Trinity; Whether Ariſtotle acknowledged the Myſtery of the Trinity, 365. a. The illuſtrating the Doctrine of the Trinity by a Parallel of Three Propoſitions in one and the ſame Syllogiſm, condem'd in a Council held at Soiſſons, as tending to Triheiſm, 22. b. Fewer Inconveniences in this Parallel than in the Three Dimenſions of Body, ibid.

Triumphs; of Love a great Inſtance of them, 1413. a.

Truths; a Coruption of the Heart is not what always hinders Men's perceiving the Truth, 2506. a. The Obſtacle is ſometimes in the Things themſelves, 2507. a. Truths which are reckoned Maxims, as contradictory as Truths and Errors, 603. b.

Tubal-Cain; a Reaſon for imagining him the Inventor of Chymiſtry, 640. b.

Turenne (Mareſchal) his conciſe way of Dining complain'd of by the Foreign Officers, 2663. b.

Turin; its Cittadel, and that of Antwerp built by Francis Facioti, Count of Monteſabro, a Famous Engineer, 2439. a b.

Turks; a Maxim of Religion with them not to deliver up any Place by a Treaty where a Moſque has been built, 1776. a. They keep no Treaties unleſs written in their own Language, 966 b. Modeſty of the Turkiſh Women, 2098. b. The Privileges of the Turkiſh Wives in this Life, and their Unhappineſs in the next, 2099. a. Not deſtitute of Books and Libraries, 1417. a. Their Cuſtom of ſolemnly curſing the Chriſtians in their Moſques on certain Days of the Year, 2909. b. The Reaſon of this, ibid. Prophecies relating to their Greatneſs and Downfal, 2107. a. & ſeq. Their Women have Hopes of Paradiſe notwithſtanding what Sir Paul Ricaut ſays, 1575. b. They hate the Jews more than any People in the world beſides, 2014. a. The Reaſon of this Hatred, ibid. They tolerate Uncarved Images in the Greek Churches, 2116. b. The Form of the Oath exacted by them when they enter into an Alliance with Chriſtians, 1352. a. Their Original of the Roſe, 2108. b.

Turonenſis; (Gregorius) a Lively Hint of his Credulity, 193. a.

Tutelar-God, why the Ancient Romans concealed the Name of it, 2769. a. b.

Tyranny; who was the firſt Founder of Tyrannical Government, 2527. a. Tyranny of our Paſſions over us, and ſwaying againſt all Idea's of Virtue and Temporal Intereſt, a Gulph to the Pagan Philoſophers, 1597. a. A Singular Piece of Tyranny in the Court of Perdiccas, King of Macedon, 1259. b. Tyranny does not ſo often drive Kings from their Thrones as Gentleneſs, 694. b 1156. a.

Tyrants; Dread to have their Infamous Actions expos'd to Poſterity, a Memorable Inſtance of this, 2832. a. Wounded deeper by Martyrologies, though unskilfully written, than by the ſharpeſt Satyrs, 2181. b. Whether Mariana's Book about the Lawfulneſs of Murdering Tyrants mov'd Ravillac to aſſaſſinate Hen. IV. 2180. b. 2183. a.

Tyrius; (Maximus) his Explication of the Origin of Evil, 2495. b. & ſeq.

V.

VAin Glory judiciouſly reflected on by Æneas Sylvius, 842. a.

Vair; (Du) His Anſwer to Henry IV. of France, when ask'd his Opinion about legitimating the Duke of Vendoſme, and ſetting the Crown of France on his Head, 1429. b.

Valentinian; tho' a moſt Chaſt and Virtuous Emperor, lov'd a Smutty Jeſt, 430. b. 'Twas by his Order that Auſonius wrote his Scandalous Cento Nuptialis, ibid. a.

Valerian; his Reaſon for not making Aurelian Governor to his Son, 441. a.

Valerianus; (Pierius) His Fine Satyrical Poem on the Elevation of Hadrian VI. to the Pontificate, 1559. b.

Valerius Maximus; the only Author who ſays that Caſſius ſaw the Spectre of Julius Cæſar in the Battel of Philippi, and turn'd his Back, 878. a.

Valette, (Duke de) his Execution in Effigy, and Flight into England, on a Diſgrace wilfully ſuffer'd by him to the Arms of France, to ſpight Cardinal Richlieu, 1323. a.

Vandome, (Abbot of) his Letter to Robert d'Arbriſſel, againſt his going into Bed to his Nuns by way of Mortification, prov'd not to be Spurious, 1329. b.

Vanity; The Cauſe of a Man's doubting of Providence, 19. E.

Vannozzi; his Method of tranſmitting to Poſterity only the Glorious Actions of Great Men without the Suſpicion of Faltery, 519. a. His General Rule in writing Hiſtories, ibid. b.

Varillas; cenſured for his making the Dutcheſs d'Eſtampes a Calviniſt, and the Motive he aſſigns of her Converſion, 1243. a b. Criticiz'd on his prefering Caſtalio's Style to Calvin's, 891. b. His Miſtakes and Inconſiſtencies concerning a Charge of Plagiariſm againſt Peter Alcionius, 161. b. His Falſe Account of Blandrata, 633. a. His Miſtakes about a Book written by John Calvin, 714. a. So enormous they are as enough to make one renounce Hiſtory, ibid. Particulars out of him about Calvin, which do not deſerve to be refuted, 819 a. A Remarkable Paſſage left out of his Manuſcript of his Hiſtory of Francis I. 819. b. His Equitableneſs to the Proteſtants in France commended in One Inſtance, 2618. b. His fine Deſcription of Two Rival Ladies, Iſabella of Arragon, and Alphonſina of the Houſe of Iſle, 313. a. Criticiz'd on his aſcribing to James Bongars an Anſwer to a Bull of Sixtus V. injurious to the King and Kingdom of France, 673. b.

Varro; (Marcus) why the Atheiſtical Notions advanc'd in his Books were judg'd more dangerous than ordinary by Tertullian, 255. a.

Varro; (the French) Mr. Menage ſo call'd, 1188. b. Wherein he excell'd his Original, ibid. n.

Vaſquez; of Opinion that Magicians are tolerated by God to prevent Atheiſm, 146. a.

Vaſſals; when ſold in France with the Lands as a Dependance, 904. a.

Vavaſſour; (Father) catches up and aggravates an Odd Blunder of Rapin, 292, 293. a.

Vendoſme; (Duke of) deſign'd for the Crown of France by Henry IV. 1422. b.

Venery; what Months and Seaſons People are moſt inclin'd to Venery, 2747. a. b.

Venetians; their Title to the Iſland of Cyprus how grounded, 1352 a. Their Wiſdom in oppoſition to the Folly of the French, 2020. N.

Venice; (Senate of) an Inſtance of their Rigorous Maxim, in not ſuffering their Miniſters to receive any Preferment at the Court of Rome, 489. Pleas'd with the Diſſolute Manners of their Clergy, becauſe it deſtroys their Power with the People.

Venus; of the Heathens had been the Whore of Cyniras, King of Cyprus, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, 990. b

Venus Anadiomene, Riſing out of the Sea, Appelles's Maſterpiece, 287. What Auguſtus paid for it to the Inhabitants of the Iſle of Coos, 288. a. The Myrtle ſacred to her, and why, 2735. b. the Invoking by her Lucretius in the beginning of his Poemis acknwledging a Providence, and overthrows the Doctrine of Epicurus about the unconcern'd State of the Gods; 1192. b.

Verſe; (Hexameter) the only Meaſure known among the Greeks for Six hundred Years 332. b.

Vertue; Reflections on the Admirableneſs of being vertuous, without deſiring to appear ſo, 217. a. b. The Belief of the Exiſtence of a Deity without the Belief of a Providence, no Inducement to Vertue, 2764. a. b. The Opinion of a Natural Connexion between Vertue and Happineſs, Vice and Miſery more operative than the Perſuaſion of a rewarding and puniſhing Providence, 2765. a. b.

Vervins (Treaty of) the only Treaty between France and Spain for a hundred Years, that had been advantageous to the former, 1636. a.

Veſpaſian; Several Authors of Opinion, that he was the Boar of the Foreſt of which David ſpeaks prophetically in the 79th Pſalm, 1960. b. He and his Son Titus Types of Antichriſt, ibid.

Veſtals; when oblig'd to leave their Cloyſter by Sickneſs, had Ladies of the higheſt Quality to attend them, 1278. a.

Villains; We are forc'd to admire ſome Villains on the ſcore of ſome Greatneſs of Soul in their very Crimes, 1368. E.

Villamarina (Iſabella) Princeſs of Salermo, her Extraordinary Accompliſhments and Elogy, 841. b.

Villanies; as few carried to the height as Heroical Vertues——— Mezrai, 1153. b.

Virgil; Criticiz'd upon a Paſſage relating to Dido, 1000. b.

Virgin (Bleſſed) her Image made after a Picture of Alexander the VIth's Siſter, who was very handſome, tho' not ſo vertuous, 1323. b. France put under her Protection, when and by whom, 2126. b. The Monks are not the only indiſcreet Votaries of the Virgin, 27. A Work concerning the Virgin ſtuff'd with the extravaganteſt Viſions, 108. a. Why it has not yet been advanc'd that ſhe alone Governs the World, 109. a. The danger of diſapproving the Errors which extend her Worſhip, 110 b. The Epithet of the Mother of God leads to ſtrange Conſequences, ibid. Conjectures on the Cauſes of the extraordinary Progreſs of her Worſhip, 2366. b. The Proteſtants give her the Title of Mother of God, as well as the Catholicks, 2368. b. Their prudential Reaſons for not uſing this Expreſſion ordinarily in their Books, 2369. a. A Fraternity of the Virgin kept in Boiſleduc, where Proteſtants are admitted as well as Papiſts, 2174. b. A Diſpute about the Lawfulneſs of this between Mareſius and Voetius, laſted Eighteen Years, 2175. a. Said to be a Fourth Perſon in the Godhead, 684. b. A Regular Brotherhood of the Bleſſed Virgin tolerated in Boiſleduc, into which the Proteſtants enter themſelves, 1174. b. An Apology for this Brotherhood by Mareſius, and a fierce Diſpute thereupon between him and Voetius, ibid. The Charge of giving her Titles too ſublime, how retorted on the Proteſtant Miniſters by a Biſhop of France, 364. A. ad. fin. Painters guilty of a great Licentiouſneſs in painting the Bleſſed Virgin after their own Miſtreſſes, or ſome famous Courtezan, 1323. b.

Virgin; Several among the Turks pretended to be Born of Virgins, and endu'd with a Miraculous Vertue to cure Diſeaſes, 2359. b. A Reflection on the Jewiſh High-Prieſts not being allow'd to Marry unleſs with a Virgin, 417. b.

Virginity; a Penetrative Virginity, the Meaning of it, 699. a.

Viſion (Ratified) what is meant by it, 702. b.

Uncertainty; The Hypotheſis of Uncertainty, by whom carried to the higheſt Pitch, 318. b.

Underſtanding; The difference between Underſtanding and Soul, according to the Platoniſts, 2520. a.

Univerſal Grace; The Doctrine of the greateſt Reformed Divines of France, 104. b. How it diſcovers it ſelf in great Wits, and how in ordinary Wits, 2466. b. The Doctrine of it, a Sea without Bounds or Bottom, 1785. a.

Univerſals; The Doctrine of them agreeable to the Chimera of the Spinoziſts, 927. a. The Scotiſts Doctrine of Univerſals, nothing but diſguis'd Spinoziſm, 19. b. The care the Romans took to make their Language Univerſal, 995. b. 996. a.

Univerſities; The Scholars in all Univerſities horribly Debauch'd, 113. b.

Vopiſcus; his Diſtinction between a Prince who is neceſſary, and a good Prince, 445.

Voſſius; his Civility and Moderation to thoſe whom he reprov'd, 514. a.

Voſſius (Iſaac) of Opinion that Beaſts can communicate their Thoughts to one another, ſooner and more happily than Men, 2607. b.

Urban VIII. his Epigram in Praiſe of Aldobrandus highly commended, 169.

Urbino (Duke d') preſſes Machiavel, who had written very judiciouſly of the Art of War, to draw up a Regiment before him, but all in vain, 2081. b.

Uſher; Whether ever Fitz-Simon the Jeſuit diſputed with him, 3009. C.

Uſurpers; An Exception to Saluſt's Maxim concerning them, 91. a.

Utrecht (Philip of Burgundy, Biſhop of) his exceeding Beauty, 1396. b.

W.

WAgers; They who lay Wagers deciſively, that ſuch a thing is not to be found in any Author, ſeldom fail to loſe.

War; A War againſt Women Explain'd, and Expoſtulated about, 1337. a. The prolonging a War one main Point of a General's Conduct, 142. b. a.

Wars (Civil) The good Effect of them, 445. a.

War (Art of) how much improv'd from what it was three or four hundred Years ago, 129. They that are ignorant of the Art of War, hardeſt to be dealt with by Great Captains, 102. Generals love to protract War, 927. b.

Watchings; Devotional Watchings in the Primitive Church, why ſuppreſs'd, 2871. b

Weights, Meaſures, and Land-Marks, by whom firſt Invented, 805. Whether their Invention proceeded from a Knaviſh Heart, 806. a.

Whore; and Concubine, two diſtinct Characters, 852. a

Widows; forbid by the Laws of Ancient Rome, to to Marry in Ten Months after the Death of their Husbands 2394. b A Comical Paſſage between Clement VII, and three young Widows of the Court of France, at the Interview between that Pope and Francis I. at Marſeilles, 2748. a. b.

Wife; The Liberty of Wives in ancient Rome, as great as that of Paris or London now, 1670. a. Reſtrain'd in ancient Greece, as in Italy at this time, ibid. A Diſcourſe of Henry IV. about the Qualities of a perfect Wife for a Prince, 1633. b. The greateſt Privileges of thoſe who have had bad Wives, according to the Hebrews, 628. b. Unlucky Wives commonly the Fate of Great Men, 651. A Cuſtom of Lending Wives among the Perſians and Lacedemonians, 1697. a. Whether there be any Sin in chuſing a handſome Wife, 674. a. The Caſe of a handſome and a homely Wife not parallel to that of a well-dreſs'd Partridge, and a piece of ruſty Bacon, ibid. b. A Wife's bearing chearfully with the Infirmities of a Husband admir'd by all the World, 96. b. Wives, why compar'd to the Fountain of Hammon, 2936. b. Chief Conſiderations of Severus in the Choice of a Wife, 1795. b. The manner of the Czar of Muſcovy's chuſing a Wife, 1371. b. n.

Winds; What ground there is for ſaying they are ſold to Paſſengers in Iſland, 1767. b.

Wine; Foreign Wine prohibited in Rome by a Decree of the Senate, 1278. b. Who firſt taught Men to mix Water with their Wine, 221. b. In Perſia they are moſt honour'd, who can bear moſt Wine 1054 a.

Wings; An Experiment of Artificial Wings in a Town of Italy, 1000. D.

Wiſe; The wiſe have not the Art of pleaſing, as many fools have, 1052. b.

Wiſdom; ſometimes it is the greateſt Wiſdom to counterfeit Folly, 2910. a.

Witchcraft; what kind of Poſtures were taken for Charms and Witchcraft among the Ancients, 165. a. Witchcraft of Gaming, a fearful Inſtance of it, 538. b. The Antiquity of Images in Witchcraft, 2635. a.

Wittemberg (the Divines of) the beginning and the end of their Opinion on the Divorce of Harry VIII. not eaſily reconciled, 506. b.

Witneſſes; Falſe Witneſſes in Cappadocia accuſtom'd themſelves to Tortures, and gave one another the Queſtion by way of Eſſay, 845. b. A Cuſtom of borrowing Falſe Witneſſes there, received in a Province of France, ibid. To be a credible Witneſs of the Truth of ſeveral Facts, there needs no more than the Truth of the Relation, 56 A. ad med.

Wits; Examples of great Wits that had been remarkably dull in their Childhood, 1208. b. Not the fitteſt Men to make Soldiers, 2445. b. Capital Cities take it ill that any ſhou'd ſet up for Wits, that have always liv'd in the Country, 2443. a. A great ſpice of Folly always enters into the Compoſition of great Wits, 856. F. ad in.

Wits (Great) the reaſon of their forging more Chimera's than other Men, 429. a. Their Works pleaſe at firſt for their Novelty, and at laſt for their Antiquity, 429. b.

Wolves; *who was the Inventor of Traps and Snares for* Wolves, *and other wild Beaſts*, 552. b. *Hanging them on Gibbets, as they do in* Germany, *an Argument for the Liberty of Brute Beaſts*, 2610. a.

Women; *when cruel and ambitious, exceed Men in their Vices*, 1261. a. *Are ſureſt to overcome by a Running-Fight*, 1327. b. *The Misfortune of thoſe who are married to Old Men*, ibid. *Their Touch to be avoided (according to St.* Jerom *) like the Bite of a Mad Dog*, 1328. a. *Why ſo apt to run after Religious Hypocrites, and Setters up of Conventicles*, 1560. a. b. *Their Gratitude to an Author, who wrote in Praiſe of the Sex*, 1361. *According to* Ariſtotle, *not made by Nature, but reſulting from an Imperfection in Matter, which prevents the formation of the Male*, 1393. b. *How divided about the Book, proving that Women have no Souls*, 1394. a. *The Queſtion whether they are Human Creatures, debated in a Council*, 1393. b. *Whether their uſing Men-Midwives in this Age, ſhews a greater Immodeſty than other Actions of the Women of Antiquity*, 1665. b. *The vertuouſeſt Women fancying there are Conjunctures, in which they may neglect the Surface of Honour, provided they preſerve the Subſtance, a dangerous Principle*, 903. a. *Why thoſe that are Unchaſt, have the greateſt power over their Husbands*, 2087. b. *No Women ſlander'd ſo much as by thoſe who have been their Slaves*, 646. b. *Women the cauſe of Wars from the earlieſt Times*, 18. b. *Are eaſily gain'd by Rhimes and Muſick*, 21. a. *A Woman that proſtitutes her Honour, to ſave her Husband's Life*, 73. a. St. Auſtin's *looſe Morality in this Point*, ibid. a. *The ſeveral Reaſons of their taking Abortive Potions, and murdering the Fruit of their Womb before, and after their Delivery*, 2478. b. & ſeq. *Infallible Signs, whereby to know whether Women have had Children*, 2479. b. *The unreaſonableneſs of lodging the Sovereign Authority in Women*, 2404. a. *The prodigious height of their Head-Dreſſes call'd* Hennis, *about Three hundred Years ago*, 1017. a. *A Point of their Conduct much approv'd*, 971. b. n. *A Woman between Thirty and Forty, will ſecure her Conqueſt better than an Artleſs Beauty of Fifteen*, 812. a. *They can forgive an Affront done their Honour, ſooner than the revealing a ſecret Imperfection*, 812. b. *When allow'd Funeral-Orations in* Rome, *and for what Merit*, 836. b. *A ſevere Order of* Innocent XI. *againſt their going with Naked Breaſts and Arms*, 1758. b. *The Morality of ſome Heathens, how Auſtere with regard to Women*, 1785. b. *Women dreſs for their own ſatisfaction, without a deſign to pleaſe any Man*, 693 b. *Their Luxury in Dreſs and Attire in St.* Jerom's *Days*, ibid. *They are aſſaulted even under the Appearances of the moſt Myſtical and Illuminated Theology*, 699. b. *Their Reign greateſt, when Luxury is in Faſhion*, 106. *The honeſt Deſign of a Diſſertation ſuppoſed to be written by* Acidalius, *that* Mulieres non ſunt Homines— 1392. A. *The Proportion of Pleaſure that Women have in Enjoyment above Men*, 2894 b. *How, and when formed, according to* Ariſtotle, 1393. b. *Fewer Women commit Matrimony with their Footmen, than Men with their Maids*, 1413. a. *Are forbid on pain of preſent Death, to be preſent at the Olympick Games*, 586. b. *The Reaſon of this*, ibid. *Whether they, or Men, ought to make the firſt Attack in Love*, 2660. b. Socrates's *Advice to his Diſciples, with regard to Women*, 1327. b. *The Characters of all the Women in* Sophocles's *Plays were good, and thoſe in* Euripides's *all bad*, 1265 a. *A Collection of curious Learning about their Topknots, where to be found*, 260. b.

Wood; *The Price of it rais'd by the Executions in* Smithfield, 213. a. n.

Word; *The difference between the Word of a Gentleman, and the Word of a King*, 103. b. *The Ancient* Roman *Authors complain'd of the want of Words in their Language*, 2674. b.

World (*The*) *Its Author compar'd by the* Brachmans *to a Spider; and its Creation and Annihilation explain'd by the Spider's ſpinning the Web out of its Bowels, and drawing it in again*, 707. a. b. *The requiring demonſtrative Proof that all its particular Parts are in the beſt State poſſible, ſhewn to be unreaſonable*, 238. a. *What Proof is ſufficient in this Caſe*, ibid. b. *Its Generation explain'd by the Ancient Philoſophers before* Anaxagoras, *without the Direction of a Divine Intelligence*, 1826. b. *The Eternity of the World taught publickly in* Alexandria, *by a* Pagan *Philoſopher in the* VIth. *Century*, 211. b.

Worſhip; *a Worſhip which conſiſted wholly in Weeping*, 89. E. *Its Penances in Acts of Joy*, 891. J.

Writers; *A Vice of Voluminous Writers*, 477. b. *Several are apt to brag of their Familiarity at the Univerſity with Writers who begin to have a great Reputation, an extraordinary Example of this*, 832. a.

Writers; *of Modern Romances, how they differ from the Ancient Mythologiſts*, 1676. b. *The Judgment of* Montagne *on the old Writers of* France, 556. b.

Writings; *How far a Conſequence may be drawn from a Man's Writings to his Morals*, 2931. a. b.

X.

XAnthus; *Two Names given to this River by* Homer, *viz.* This, *and* Scamander; *the one according to Human Language, and the other according to the Language of the Gods*, 2682. b.

Xenocrates; *his affected Chaſtity reprehended by* Ariſtotle, 89. a.

Xenophon; *Vindicates* Socrates *on account of the popular prejudice againſt him, occaſion'd by his two Diſciples,* Alcibiades *and* Critias, 1034. a.

Y.

YOung Men; *A perfidious Example of the Jeſuits ſeducing them into their Order, when their Education is committed to them*, 134. Lipſius's *Advice to them concerning a Stile in Writing*, 48. a.

Z.

ZAchary; *the Reaſon of his being ſtruck Speechleſs, according to a Legend cited by St.* Epiphanius, 1760. a.

Zapolina (*John*) *King of* Hungary, *dies of a Drinking-Bout on the News of the Birth of a Son*, 1727. b.

Zeal; *The prevalence of it begets an Indulgence for the bittereſt and moſt violent Writings*, 192. b.

Zoroaſter; *The Signification of the Word, and to whom attributed*, 939. b. *Held two diſtinct Eternal and Independent Principles, one Good, the other Bad*, 2149. b. *The Names he call'd them by*, ibid. *A ſuppoſed Diſpute between him and the Philoſopher* Meliſſus, *upon the Queſtion of two diſtinct independent Principles, one Good, and the other Evil*, 2151. b. & ſeq.

Zozimus; *his Contradiction*, 1690. b.

Zuinglius's Doctrine; *Father* Paul *diſpleas'd Cardinal* Palavicini, *by ſaying, That the Reception of* Zuinglius's *Doctrine was an Argument, that an higher Cauſe than* Zuinglius *was concern'd in it*, 100. b.

17 JY 63

FINIS.